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PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
AT ITS
MEETING IN NEW YORK, N. Y.
1909.

The annual meeting of the Society, being the one hundred and twenty-first occasion of its assembling, was held in New York City, at Columbia University, on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of Easter Week, April 15th, 16th and 17th.

The following members were present at one or more of the sessions:


The first session began on Thursday afternoon at three o'clock in the Trustees Room of the University, with the Presi-
dent of the Society, Professor E. Washburn Hopkins, in the chair.

The reading of the minutes of the meeting held in Cambridge, Mass., April 23d and 24th, 1908, was dispensed with, because they were presented in printed form as advance sheets ready to appear in the Journal (vol. xxix, 304—314).

The Committee of Arrangements presented its report, through Professor A. V. W. Jackson, in the form of a printed program, and made some special supplementary announcements.

The succeeding sessions of the Society were appointed for Friday morning at half-past nine, Friday afternoon at half-past two, and Saturday morning at half-past nine. It was announced that a luncheon would be given to the Society at Columbia University by the local members on Friday at one o'clock, and that arrangements had been made for a subscription dinner at the Park Avenue Hotel on Thursday evening at seven o'clock.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

The annual report of the Corresponding Secretary, Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, was then presented as follows:

The Corresponding Secretary desires at the outset to express his thanks and appreciation to his predecessor in office, Professor Hopkins, now President of the Society, for the kindly help lent to him when assuming the new duties and for the aid so generously given to lighten the burden of work inevitable in a secretarial position.

The correspondence for the year has been somewhat extensive. There has been an ever-growing number of communications called forth by the inclusion of the American Oriental Society's name in the lists of organizations that are regularly published in various bulletins and records in different parts of the country. This is a good thing, as it draws wider attention to the scope and aims of the Society, and it might perhaps be well for us later to consider the question of enlarging somewhat the list of cities in which our meetings are held, since several Boards of Trade in other places have made tender of opportunities that might be offered if their particular city should be chosen for one of the annual meetings.

A pleasant part of the interchange of letters which has been carried on since the last meeting has been the correspondence with the newly elected members and with those who had been chosen as honorary members and who have expressed in complimentary terms their appreciation of the distinction conferred by the Society's electing them.

A sad but sympathetic part of the year's work has been writing expressions of thought and remembrance for those who have been herea
by the death of some member of the family who was thus lost as a member from our own midst. The list is not small considering our limited membership.

DEATHS.

HONORARY MEMBERS.

Professor Richard Pischel.
Professor Eberhard Schrader.

CORPORATE MEMBERS.

Mrs. Emma J. Arnold.
Mr. Ernest B. Fenollosa.
Mr. Francis Blackmore Forbes.
President Daniel Coit Gilman.
Professor Charles Eliot Norton.
Professor John Henry Wright.

Professor Pischel, one of our more recent honorary members, was a German Sanskrit scholar of wide learning and whose name was recognized with honor throughout the learned world. He died at the age of fifty-nine, in December, 1908, at Madras, India, shortly after reaching the land to which he had devoted his life's studies and which it had ever been his heart's desire to visit.

Professor Schrader, of the University of Berlin, was made an honorary member of the Society in 1890, in recognition of his distinguished services to Oriental science especially in the line of Assyriological research. His long and eminent career, which led him to the position of a Privy Councilor at the Royal Court of Germany, lent a special dignity to the list of the Society's membership.

Mrs. Emma J. Arnold, of Providence, R. I., a corporate member of the Society since 1894, died at the home of her husband, Dr. Oliver H. Arnold, of Providence, on June 7, 1908.

Ernest F. Fenollosa, of Mobile, Alabama, since 1894 a member of the Society, died in England in October, 1908, just as he was about to return to America. His special interest lay in the field of Japan, where he had lived for some time, and he was a very agreeable lecturer and writer on the subject of its art, its history and its civilization.

Francis Blackman Forbes, of Boston, a member since 1864, died at his home in Boston, May 21, 1908, at the age of sixty-eight. Mr. Forbes had been a merchant in China for twenty-five years, until 1882, when he removed to Paris for four years and afterwards returned to his home in Massachusetts. His interest in Chinese flora and the fine collection of specimens which he made in that field won him a fellowship in the Linnaean Society of London.

Daniel Coit Gilman, who was an active member of the Society for over half a century, having joined in 1857, and who was our president for thirteen years, from 1893 to 1906, died at his birthplace in Norwich,
on October 13, 1908, in the seventy-eighth year of his age. After his graduation from Yale College in 1852, he continued his studies at Cambridge and at Berlin, and then entered upon a distinguished career as an educator, as is well known to those who are acquainted with the educational development of this country whose interests he served so faithfully. He was President of the Johns Hopkins University from 1875 to 1901, when he retired as emeritus to take the presidency of the newly founded Carnegie Institution. He had previously enjoyed the honor of being appointed by the President of the United States to act as one of the five members of the United States Commission on the subject of the boundary line between Venezuela and Colombia. The valuable services which he rendered to the American Oriental Society during the thirteen years in which he was our presiding officer, and the distinction which he lent by his association with the Society, will always remain a bright memory.

Professor Charles Eliot Norton, of Harvard University, art critic and man of letters, who joined the Society in 1857, the same year as Mr. Gilman, passed away in the week after his contemporary's death. He died at Cambridge, Mass., on October 21, 1908. The public press throughout the land paid tribute to his memory. Although not an active attendant at the Oriental meetings, he never lost his interest during the fifty-one years of his membership. The part which Mr. Norton took as one of the first scholars to draw attention to Fitzgerald's version of Omar Khayyam will always associate his name with the interest taken in the Persian poet.

Professor John Henry Wright, of Harvard University, a member of the Oriental Society since 1896, died at Cambridge, Mass., on November 25, 1908. Professor Wright was born in Urmiah, Persia, the city which is believed by some to have been the birthplace of Zoroaster. Although Dr. Wright's specialty was in Greek, he had early taken an interest in Sanskrit in his student days, and showed his interest in the Oriental Society by joining it ten years ago.

In conclusion the Secretary is pleased to add that the major part of his correspondence has been of a special or technical character as associated with work now incorporated in the Journal or as carried on with fellow-searchers for light in the realm of the Land of the Dawn.

The details of the Secretary's report were accepted as presented and it was directed to place the report on record.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER.

The report of the Treasurer, Professor Frederick Wells Williams, was presented by the Corresponding Secretary and read as follows:
Receipts and Disbursements by the Treasurer of the American Oriental Society for the Year Ending December 31, 1908.

Receipts.
Balance from old account, Dec. 31, 1907 .......................... $ 59.12
Dues (190) for 1908 ........................................ 950.00
  (64) for other years ......................................... 820.00
  (14) for Hist. S. R. Sect. .................................... 28.00
  .................................................. $ 1,298.00
Sales of Journal ................................................ 198.73
Life Memberships (2) ......................................... 150.00
Subscriptions collected for Or. Bibl. Subvention ........................................ 96.00
State National Bank Dividends .................................. 122.21
Annual Interest from Savings Banks ............................ 47.22
  .................................................. 1,907.22
  .............................................. $ 1,966.34

Expenditures.
T., M. and T. Co., printing vol. xxviii (remainder) $ 1,364.48
Librarian, postage, etc. ...................................... 7.09
Other postage and express ..................................... 6.77
Subvention to Orientalische Bibliographie .................. 100.00
Balance to general account ................................... 488.00
  .................................................. 1,966.34

Statement.
1907 1908
Bradley Type Fund ........................................... $ 2,481.90 $ 2,659.41
Colheal Fund .................................................. 1,000.00 1,000.00
State National Bank Shares .................................. 1,950.00 1,950.00
Connecticut Savings Bank ...................................... 6.03 6.39
National Savings Bank ......................................... 11.87 12.11
Interest Colheal Fund ......................................... 149.27 185.69
Cash on hand .................................................. 102.83 12.54
Interest ......................................................... 55
  .................................................. 5,762.38 5,530.14

The report of the Treasurer was supplemented verbally by Professor Jackson with a statement, merely for record, that the Directors had voted that the Society should continue next year to contribute as before to the Orientalische Bibliographie, and that the Treasurer was authorized to pay said contribution directly out of the funds in the treasury.

Report of the Auditing Committee.

The report of the Auditing Committee, Professors Torrey and Oerite, was presented by Professor C. C. Torrey, as follows:

We hereby certify that we have examined the account book of the Acting Treasurer of this Society, and have found the same correct, and
that the foregoing account is in conformity therewith. We have also compared the entries in the cash book with the vouchers and bank and pass-books and have found all correct.

CHARLES C. TORREY, } Auditors.

HANNS OERTEL.

NEW HAVEN, April 17, 1909.

REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN.

The Librarian, Professor Hanns Oertel, presented his report as follows:

Miss Margaret D. Whitney has continued her work of cataloguing the Society's Library. The response to a circular letter to our exchanges asking that incomplete sets be, as far as possible, completed, has been very cordial and generous. The next report of the Librarian will contain a bibliographical list of all periodical literature deposited in our Library. As in previous reports, the Librarian again calls attention to the absolute necessity of a small sum of money for the binding of our accessions. It is impossible to allow unbound volumes to go out of the library, and as almost all of our members live at a distance, unbound books cannot be used by them.

The thanks of the Society are again due to Miss Margaret D. Whitney for her continued interest in the Library, to Mr. Schwab, Librarian of Yale University, for many favours, and to Mr. Gruener of the Yale Library for valued assistance in mailing.

REPORT OF THE EDITORS.

The report of the Editors of the Journal of the Society, Professors Oertel and Jewett, was made by Professor Oertel as follows:

The editors regret that owing to the delay in setting up and correcting one of the articles, it has not been possible to complete the current number of the Journal in time to have it in the hands of the members before this meeting. It will be sent out early in May. As is well known to the members, the cost of printing of the Society's Journal has for some years past exceeded the Society's income and made it necessary to draw on our invested funds. It did not seem wise to the editors to continue indefinitely such a policy of living beyond our means. They, therefore, reluctantly decided to publish the Society's Journal for the current year in one volume of about 100 pages less than has been customary.

By direction of the Board of Directors, the Editors will make arrangements for printing the next volume of the Journal abroad, and they expect that the saving thus effected will make it possible to print the Journal as before without exceeding the income of the Society.

The Editors, finally, desire to call the attention of members to the rule that all papers read at the Society's meeting are presumed to be available for printing in the Society's Journal and subject to the call of the Editors for that purpose.
ELECTION OF MEMBERS.

The following persons, recommended by the Directors, were elected members of the Society:

HONORARY MEMBERS.

Rev. Canon Samuel R. Driver, 
M. Charles Clermont-Ganneau,
Professor Hermann Jacobi.

CORPORATE MEMBERS.

Mr. George William Brown, 
Mr. James H. Hyde,
Mr. Charles Dana Barrage, 
Mr. Thomas W. Kingsmill,
Señor Felipe G. Calderon, 
Rev. M. G. Kyle,
Mr. Irving Comes Demarest, 
Mr. Levon J. K. Levonian,
Dr. Carl Frank, 
Mr. Albert Howe Lybyer,
Dr. Herbert Friedewald, 
Mr. Charles J. Morre,
Miss Marie Gelbach, 
Mr. Albert Ten Eyck Olmstead,
Dr. George W. Gilmore, 
Mr. Walter Peterson,
Miss Luise Hassler, 
Mr. George V. Schick,
Edward H. Hume, M. D., 
Rev. Sydney N. Ussher.

OFFICERS FOR 1909-1910.

The committee appointed at Cambridge to nominate officers for the ensuing year consisted of Professors Francis Brown, Torrey, and Oertel; (see Journal, vol. xxix, 311) and their report recommended the following names, which were duly elected:

President—Dr. William Hayes Ward, of New York.

Vice-Presidents—Professor Maurice Bloomfield, of Baltimore; Professor Paul Haupt, of Baltimore; Professor Henry Hyvernat, of Washington.

Corresponding Secretary—Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of New York.

Recording Secretary—Professor George F. Moore, of Cambridge, Mass.

Secretary of the Section for Religions—Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., of Philadelphia.

Treasurer—Professor Frederick Wells Williams, of New Haven.

Librarian—Professor Hanns Oertel, of New Haven.


ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT.

At four o'clock, at the conclusion of the business session, the President of the Society, Professor E. Washburn Hopkins,
of Yale University, delivered his annual address on "Exagge-
ration of Tabu as a Religious Motive."

The Society adjourned at the close of the address to meet
at half past seven o'clock for dinner at the Park Avenue Hotel.

FRIDAY SESSION.

The members re-assembled on Friday morning at half past
nine o'clock for the second session. The following communi-
cations were presented:

Doctor K. Asakawa, of Yale University, Notes on village
administration in Japan under the Tokugawa.—Remarks by
Professor Hopkins.

Professor L. C. Barret, of Princeton University, Concerning
Kashmir Atharva-Veda, Book 2.—Remarks by Professor Lan-
man.

Professor G. A. Barton, of Bryn Mawr College, The nota-
tion for 216,000 in the Tablets of Telloh.—Remarks by Pro-
fessors Jastrow and Haupt.

Doctor George F. Black, of Lenox Library, N. Y., Concern-
ing the Gypsy Lore Society, presented by Dr. C. F. G. Scott.

Doctor A. Ember, of Johns Hopkins University, Hebrew
stems with prefixed ֶ—Remarks by Professors Haupt and
W. Max Müller.

Dr. M. Margolis, of the Jewish Publication Society, Phila.,
The necessity of complete induction for finding the Semitic
equivalents of Septuagint words.—Remarks by Professor Haupt.

Mr. L. J. Frachtenberg, of New York, The superstition of
the evil eye in Zoroastrian literature.—Remarks by Professors
Hopkins, Müller, Jastrow, Peters.

Professor L. Friedlaender, of the Jewish Theological Semin-
ary of America, The Fountain of Life and the Islands of the
Blessed in the Alexander legends.—Remarks by Professors
Haupt and Jastrow, and Doctor Yohannan.

Professor R. Gottheil, of Columbia University, The Kitâb
Dinân Mey.

Professor A. V. W. Jackson, of Columbia University, A
legend of aerial navigation in Ancient Persia.—Remarks by
Professors Friedlaender and Jastrow.

Professor M. Jastrow, of the University of Pennsylvania, An-
other fragment of the Etana myth.

At twelve thirty the Society took a recess till half past two
o'clock, and were invited to luncheon as guests of the local
members.
On convening again after luncheon the session was held in the auditorium of Schermerhorn Hall, Columbia, President Hopkins presiding, and the following papers were presented:

Professor R. Gottheil, of Columbia University, The origin and history of the minaret.—Remarks by Professor Jastrow.
Miss L. C. G. Grieve, Ph. D., of New York, The Dasara Festival at Satara, India.—Remarks by Professor Hopkins.
Professor Paul Haupt, of Johns Hopkins University, The Location of Mount Sinai.
Professor C. R. Lanman, of Harvard University, Pali book titles and how to cite them.—Remarks by Professors Hopkins and Haupt.
Professor W. Max Müller, of Philadelphia, Scenes of the religious worship of the Canaanites on Egyptian monuments. Illustrated by stereopticon photographs.—Remarks by Professor Haupt.
Professor D. G. Lyon, of Harvard University, The Harvard excavations at Samaria. Illustrated by stereopticon photographs.—Remarks by Professor Lanman.
Dr. T. A. Olmstead, Preparatory School, Princeton, N. J., Some results of the Cornell Expedition to Asia Minor and the Assyro-Babylonian Orient.
Dr. Truman Michelson, of Ridgefield, Conn., The general interrelation of the dialects of Asoka's Fourteen Edicts, with some remarks on the home of Pali.
Professor F. Hirth, of Columbia University, On Chinese Hieroglyphics.

At five thirty the Society adjourned for the day; and the evening was reserved for an informal gathering of the members for supper and general conversation.

SATURDAY SESSION.

On Saturday morning at half-past nine, the fourth and concluding session was held in Room 407 of Schermerhorn Hall, and was devoted to the reading of papers and the transaction of important business.

In the business portion of the session, which formed the first matter of consideration, the Committee on the Nomination of Officers reported the names as already given above.

The Chair then appointed as committee to nominate officers at the first session of the next annual meeting, the following members:
Professor Robert F. Harper, of Chicago;
Dr. George C. O. Haas, of Columbia;
Dr. Albert A. Madsen, of Cleveland, Ohio.

The Directors reported that they had appointed Professor Hanns Oertel and Professor James R. Jewett as Editors of the Journal for the ensuing year.

The place and date of the next meeting as appointed by the Directors was further announced to be Baltimore, during Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of Easter week, March 31st, April 1st and 2d, 1910.

The Committee to audit the Treasurer’s accounts consists of Professors Torrey and Oertel.

Professor Hirth brought before the Society for consideration the question of the tariff imposed upon books in foreign languages imported into the United States. Upon motion of Professor Haupt, the following petition was unanimously adopted and the Corresponding Secretary was instructed to forward it in an appropriate manner to the authorities at Washington:

The American Oriental Society, assembled at its annual meeting held in New York, April 17, 1909, respectfully petition the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America that all scientific books dealing with foreign languages imported from abroad be admitted free of duty.

The presentation of papers was resumed in the following order:

Professor Christopher Johnston, of Johns Hopkins University:
   (a) The fable of the horse and the ox in cuneiform literature.
   (b) Assyrian lexicographical notes.
   (c) The Sumerian verb.

   Remarks by Professor Haupt.

Dr. Ishya Joseph, of New York, Notes on some matters relating to Arabic philology.—Remarks by Professor Haupt.

Professor Hanns Oertel, of Yale University:
   (a) Some cases of analogy formation.
   (b) The Sanskrit root देख, ‘stumble’.

   Remarks by Professor Hopkins.

Dr. F. A. Vanderburgh, of New York, A hymn to Bel, Tablet 29623, British Museum, as published in CT. xv, plates 12 and 13.
Dr. A. Yohannan, of Columbia University, A Turkish manuscript treatise on physiognomy.

Professor Paul Haupt, of Johns Hopkins University:
(a) Pi-hahiroth and the route of the Exodus.
(b) The disgrace and rehabilitation of Galilee.—(Isaiah ix.1.)

At eleven thirty Vice-President Haupt was invited to the Chair by Professor Hopkins on his withdrawal. The session continued as follows:

Professor F. Hirth, of Columbia University, On early Chinese notices of African territories.—Remarks by Professors Haupt and W. Max Müller.

Professor A. V. W. Jackson, of Columbia University, Notes on Zoroastrian chronology.

Professor I. Friedlaender, of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, N. Y., 'Abdollah b. Sabā, the Jewish founder of Shiism.

Before the session closed, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

The American Oriental Society desires to express its thanks to the President and Trustees of Columbia University and to the local members for the courtesies which they have extended to the Society during this meeting; and to the Committee of Arrangements for the provisions they have made for its entertainment.

The Society adjourned at half past twelve on Saturday to meet in Baltimore, Md., March 31st, April 1st, and 2d 1910.

The following communications were read by title:

Dr. Bigelow, of Boston, Nirvana and the Buddhist moral code.

Dr. Blake, of Johns Hopkins University:
(a) The Tagalog verb.
(b) Brockelmann's Comparative Semitic Grammar.

Professor Bloomfield, of Johns Hopkins University, Studies on the text and language of the Rig-Veda.

Professor Gottheil, of Columbia University, A door from the Madrassah of Barkūk.

Reverend A. Kohut, of New York:
(a) Royal Hebraists.
(b) A tradition concerning Haman in Albiruni, and the story of Rikayon in the Sefer Ha-Yashar.

Professor Prince, A Hymn to Tammuz.
Dr. W. Rosenau, of Johns Hopkins University:
(a) The uses of ש in Post-Biblical Hebrew.
(b) Abstract formations in the philosophical Hebrew.

Professor Torrey, of Yale University:
(a) The question of the date of the Samaritan schism.
(b) The lacuna in Neb. ix. 5f.
LIST OF MEMBERS

The number placed after the address indicates the year of election.

I. HONORARY MEMBERS.

M. AUGUSTE BARTH, Membre de l'Institut, Paris, France. (Rue Garancières, 10.) 1898.

Dr. RAMKRISHNA GOPAL BHANDANWAR, C. I. E., Dekkan Coll., Poona, India. 1887.

JAMES BURDRESS, M.I.D., 22 Seton Place, Edinburgh, Scotland. 1890.

Prof. CHARLES CLERMONT-GANNEAU, 1 Avenue de l'Alma, Paris. 1907.


Prof. BERTHOLD DELBRÜCK, University of Jena, Germany. 1878.

Prof. FRIEDRICH DELITSCHE, University of Berlin, Germany. 1893.


Prof. ANTOINE ESSTEN, Steglitz, Friedrich Str. 10/11, Berlin, Germany. 1903.

Prof. RICHARD GARBE, University of Tübingen, Germany. (Bissingen Str. 14.) 1892.

Prof. KARL E. GELDER, University of Marburg, Germany. 1905.

Prof. IGNAZ GOLDSCHMIDT, vii Holló-Utcza 4, Budapest, Hungary. 1906.

Prof. FRIEDRICH GRIFFIN, C.E., D.Litt., I.C.S. (retired), Rathfarnham, Camberley, Surrey, England. Corporate Member, 1899; Hon., 1905.

Prof. Ignazio Guarn, University of Rome, Italy. (Via Botteghe Oscure 24.) 1893.

Prof. HERMANN JACOBI, University of Bonn, 59 Niehulstrasse, Bonn, Germany. 1900.

Prof. Hendrik KERN, 45 Willem Barentsstraat, Utrecht, Netherlands. 1898.

Prof. ALFRED LEDWIG, University of Prague, Bohemia. (Königliche Weinberge, Kramersgasse 40.) 1898.

Prof. Gaston MASPERO, Collège de France, Paris, France. (Avenue de l'Observatoire, 24.) 1898.

Prof. Eduard Meyer, University of Berlin, Germany. Gross-Lüchtersfelde-West, Mohnhagen Str. 7) 1906.

Prof. Theodor Noelle, University of Strassburg, Germany. (Kählergasse 16.) 1878.

Prof. Hermann Oldenbourg, University of Göttingen, Germany. 1910.

(27/29 Nikolausberger Weg.)

Prof. Eduard Sachau, University of Berlin, Germany. (Wormser Str. 12 W.) 1887.
List of Members.

Emile Senary, Membre de l'Institut de France, 18 Rue François 1er, Paris, France. 1908.
Prof. Julius Wellhausen, University of Göttingen, Germany. (Weber Str., 18 a.) 1902.
Prof. Ernst Windisch, University of Leipzig, Germany. (Universitäts Str. 15.) 1899.

II. CORPORATE MEMBERS.

Names marked with * are those of life members.

Rev. Dr. Judith Edwards Abbott, Tardeo, Bombay, India. 1900.
Dr. Cyrus Adler, 2041 North Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1884.
F.Stubbs Allen, 246 Central St., Springfield, Mass. 1904.
Miss May Alice Allen, Williamstown, Mass. 1906.
Prof. Kinkichi Asakawa (Yale Univ.), 870 Elm St., New Haven, Conn. 1904.
Miss Alice M. Bacon, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1907.
Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., 44 Wall St., New Haven, Conn. 1868.
Prof. Leroy Carr Barret, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1893.
Prof. George A. Barton, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1888.
Prof. L. W. Batters, 232 East 11th St., New York. 1894.
Prof. Harlan P. Beach (Yale Univ.), 346 Willow St., New Haven, Conn. 1896.
Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D.D., Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y. 1900.
Harold H. Bender, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1906.
Prof. George R. Berry, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1907.
Prof. Julius A. Bemer (Union Theological Seminary), 700 Park Ave. New York, N. Y. 1907.
Dr. William Studholme Bigelow, 40 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. 1894.
Prof. John Binney, Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn. 1887.
George F. Black, Ph. D., Lenox Library, Fifth Ave. and 70th St., New York, N. Y. 1907.
Dr. Frank Riegold Black (Johns Hopkins Univ.), Dixon Park, Mt. Washington, Md. 1909.
Rev. Philip Black, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1907.
Rev. David Blaustein, Chicago Hebrew Institute, 485 West Taylor St. Chicago, Ill. 1891.
Dr. Frederick J. Bliss, Protestant Syrian College, Beirut, Syria. 1898.
Francis B. Blomholt, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1909.
Prof. Carl August Bromblen, Augustana College and Theol. Seminary, Rock Island, Ill. 1900.
List of Members.

Prof. MARKS BROOKFIELD, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1881.

Dr. ALFRED BOSSERT, Le Rivage près Chambéry, Switzerland. 1897.

Dr. GEORGE M. BOLLING (Catholic Univ. of America), 1784-Corcoran St., Washington, D. C. 1896.


Prof. HEWARD BRANDSTETTER, Reckenbühl 18, Villa Johannes, Lucerne, Switzerland. 1908.

Prof. JAMES HENRY BREASTED, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1891.

Prof. CHAS. A. BRIDGES (Union Theological Sem.), 700 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1879.

Prof. C. A. BROOKE BROCKWELL, McGill University, Montreal, Canada. 1906.

Prof. FRANCIS BROWN (Union Theological Sem.), 700 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1881.

Rev. GEORGE WILLIAM BROWN, Jubbulpur, C. P., India. 1909.

Prof. CARL DARLING BUCH, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1892.

HAMPDEN H. BUR, Division Sup't. of Schools, Alfonso, Caviere Provinces, Philippine Islands. 1908.


CHARLES DANA BURRAGE, 85 Ames Building, Boston, Mass. 1899.

Prof. HOWARD CROSBY BUTLER, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1908.

Rev. JOHN CAMPBELL, Kingsbridge, New York, N. Y. 1886.

Rev. SIMON J. CARR, 1527 Church St., Frankford, Philadelphia, Pa. 1889.

Prof. FRANKLIN CARTER, Camp Hor. F. J. Kingsbury, Waterbury, Conn. 1873.

Dr. PAUL CARR, La Salle, Illinois. 1897.


Miss EVA CRANNOG, Hemsway Chambers, Boston, Mass. 1888.

Dr. F. D. CHESTER, The Bristol, Boston, Mass. 1891.

WALTER E. CLARK, 37 Walker St., Cambridge, Mass. 1906.
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China: Shanghai: China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

Tonkin: l'École Française d'extrême Orient (Rue de Coton), Hanoi.

India, Bombay: Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

The Anthropological Society. (Town Hall.)

Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal. (57 Park St.)

The Buddhist Text Society. (85 Jum Bazar St.)

Lahore: Library of the Oriental College.

Sierra: Office of the Director General of Archaeology. (Benmore, Simla, Punjab.)


Java, Batavia: Bataviasche Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen.

Korea: Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Seoul, Korea.

New Zealand: The Polynesian Society, New Plymouth.

Philippine Islands: The Ethnological Survey, Manila.

Syria: The American School (care U.S. Consul, Jerusalem).

Revue Biblique, care of M. J. Lagrange, Jerusalem.

Al-Machriq, Université St. Joseph, Beirut, Syria.

IV. AFRICA.

Egypt, Cairo: The Khedivial Library.

V. EDITORS OF THE FOLLOWING PERIODICALS.

The Indian Antiquary (Education Society’s Press, Bombay, India).

Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes (care of Alfred Hölder, Rothenthurmstr. 15, Vienna, Austria).

Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung (care of Prof. E. Kuhn, 3 Hess Str., Munich, Bavaria).


Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (care of Prof. D. Karl Marti, Marientr. 25, Bern, Switzerland).

Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft. (J. O. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, Germany).

Orientalische Bibliographie (care of Prof. Lucian Scherman, 18 Ungerer Str., Munich, Bavaria).

The American Antiquarian and Oriental Journal, 489 East 57th St., Chicago, Ill.

American Journal of Archaeology, 65 Sparks St., Cambridge, Mass.

Transactions of the American Philological Association (care of Prof. F. G. Moorr, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.).

Le Monde Oriental (care of Prof. K. F. Johansson, Upsala, Sweden).

VI. LIBRARIES.

The Editors request the Librarians of any Institution or Libraries, not mentioned below, to which this Journal may regularly come, to notify them of the fact. It is the intention of the Editors to print a list, as
complete as may be, of regular subscribers for the Journal or of recipients thereof. The following is the beginning of such a list.

Andover Theological Seminary.
Boston Public Library.
Brown University Library.
Buffalo Society of Natural Science, Library Building, Buffalo, N. Y.
Chicago University Library.
Columbia University Library.
Cornell University Library.
Harvard Sanskrit Class-Room Library.
Harvard Semitic Class-Room Library.
Harvard University Library.
Nebraska University Library.
New York Public Library.
Yale University Library.

Recipients: 225 (Members) + 75 (Gifts and Exchanges) + 18 (Libraries) = 414.
CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

With Amendments of April, 1877.

CONSTITUTION.

ARTICLE I. This Society shall be called the American Oriental Society.

ARTICLE II. The objects contemplated by this Society shall be:
1. The cultivation of learning in the Asiatic, African, and Polynesian languages, as well as the encouragement of researches of any sort by which the knowledge of the East may be promoted.
2. The cultivation of a taste for oriental studies in this country.
3. The publication of memoirs, translations, vocabularies, and other communications, presented to the Society, which may be valuable with reference to the before-mentioned objects.
4. The collection of a library and cabinet.

ARTICLE III. The members of this Society shall be distinguished as corporate and honorary.

ARTICLE IV. All candidates for membership must be proposed by the Directors, at some stated meeting of the Society, and no person shall be elected a member of either class without receiving the votes of as many as three-fourths of all the members present at the meeting.

ARTICLE V. The government of the Society shall consist of a President, three Vice Presidents, a Corresponding Secretary, a Recording Secretary, a Secretary of the Section for the Historical Study of Religions, a Treasurer, a Librarian, and seven Directors, who shall be annually elected by ballot, at the annual meeting.

ARTICLE VI. The President and Vice Presidents shall perform the customary duties of such officers, and shall be ex-officio members of the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE VII. The Secretaries, Treasurer, and Librarian shall be ex-officio members of the Board of Directors, and shall perform their respective duties under the superintendence of said Board.

ARTICLE VIII. It shall be the duty of the Board of Directors to regulate the financial concerns of the Society, to superintend its publications, to carry into effect the resolutions and orders of the Society, and to exercise a general supervision over its affairs. Five Directors at any regular meeting shall be a quorum for doing business.

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. There shall be a special Section of the Society, devoted to the historical study of religions, to which section others than members of the American Oriental Society may be elected in the same manner as is prescribed in Article IV.

Article XI. 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.

II. The Recording Secretary shall keep a record of the proceedings of the Society in a book provided for the purpose.

III. a. The Treasurer shall have charge of the funds of the Society; and his investments, deposits, and payments shall be made under the supervision of the Board of Directors. At each annual meeting he shall report the state of the finances, with a brief summary of the receipts and payments of the previous year.

III. b. After December 31, 1886, 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.

IV. The Librarian shall keep a catalogue of all books belonging to the Society, with the names of the donors, if they are presented, and shall at each annual meeting make a report of the accessions to the library during the previous year; and shall be further guided in the discharge of his duties by such rules as the Directors shall prescribe.

V. All papers read before the Society, and all manuscripts deposited by authors for publication, or for other purposes, shall be at the disposal of the Board of Directors, unless notice to the contrary is given to the Editors at the time of presentation.

VI. Each corporate member shall pay into the treasury of the Society an annual assessment of five dollars; but a donation at any one time of seventy-five dollars shall exempt from obligation to make this payment.

VII. Corporate and Honorary members shall be entitled to a copy of all the publications of the Society issued during their membership, and
Constitution and By-Laws.

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.

VIII. Candidates for membership who have been elected by the Society shall qualify as members by payment of the first annual assessment within one month from the time when notice of such election is mailed to them. A failure so to qualify shall be construed as a refusal to become a member. If any corporate member shall for two years fail to pay his assessments, his name may, at the discretion of the Directors, be dropped from the list of members of the Society.

IX. Members of the Section for the Historical Study of Religions shall pay into the treasury of the Society an annual assessment of two dollars; and they shall be entitled to a copy of all printed papers which fall within the scope of the Section.

X. Six members shall form a quorum for doing business, and three to adjourn.

SUPPLEMENTARY BY-LAWS.

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; further, 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.

3. Persons not members may also, on special grounds, and at the discretion of the Librarian, be allowed to take and use the Society's books, upon depositing with the Librarian a sufficient security that they shall be duly returned in good condition, or their loss or damage fully compensated.
Publications of the American Oriental Society

will be sold as follows:

1. Members of the Society receive the current number of the Society's Journal free of charge.
2. To those who are not members of the Society the price of the current volume is six dollars, carriage to be paid by the purchaser.
3. The back volumes of the Journal will be sold separately as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol. I</td>
<td>1845-1849</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. III</td>
<td>1852-1853</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. IV</td>
<td>1853-1854</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. V</td>
<td>1855-1856</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. VI</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. VII</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. VIII</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. IX</td>
<td>1859-1860</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. X</td>
<td>1861-1866</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XI</td>
<td>1862-1866</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XII</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XIII</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XIV</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XV</td>
<td>1870-1879</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XVI</td>
<td>1894-1896</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XVII</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XVIII</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XIX</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XX</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XXI</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XXII</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XXIII</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XXIV</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XXV</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XXVI</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XXVII</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XXVIII</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XXIX</td>
<td>1908-1909</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XXX</td>
<td>1909-1910</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only a very limited number of volumes I and VI can be sold separately.

4. A discount of 20 per cent. will be allowed to public libraries and to the libraries of educational institutions.
5. A limited number of complete sets (vol. I—vol. XXX) will be sold at the price of $150, carriage to be paid by the purchaser.
6. The following separate prints are for sale:

- H. G. O. Dwight, Catalogue of works in the Armenian language prior to the seventeenth century. $5.00
- N. Khanikoff, Book of the Balance of Wisdom. 5.00
- Burgess, Shya-Siddhanta. 8.00
- Panjapi, Memoir on the language of the Gypsies in the Turkish Empire. 5.00
- L. H. Gulick, Panape Dialect. 2.50
- Whitney's Taittiriya-Prātiṣākhya. 6.00
- Avery's Sanskrit-Verb-Inflection. 3.00
- Whitney's Index Verborum to the Atharva-Veda. 8.00
- The same on large paper. 8.00
- Hopkins' Position of the Ruling Caste. 5.00
- Oertel's Jagatmya-Upanisad-Brahmans. 2.50
- Arnold's Historical Vedic Grammar. 2.50
- Bloomfield's Kāśīkrta-Sūtra of the Atharva-Veda. 8.00
- The Whitney Memorial volume. 3.00

7. Beginning with volume XXX the Journal appears in four quarterly parts of which the first is issued on December first, the second on March first, the third on June first, and the fourth on September first. Single parts of the Journal cannot be sold.

All communications concerning the Library should be addressed to

HARRIS OERTEL, 2 Phelps Hall, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.,
U. S. A.
TO CONTRIBUTORS.

Fifty copies of each article published in this Journal will be forwarded to the author. A larger number will be furnished at cost.

GENERAL NOTICES.

1. Members are requested to give immediate notice of changes of address to the Treasurer, Prof. Frederick Wells Williams, 135 Whitney avenue, New Haven, Conn.


3. For information regarding the sale of the Society's publications see the next foregoing page.

4. Communications for the Journal should be sent to: Prof. James Richard Jewett, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., or Prof. Hanns Gertel, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

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 assessment, 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.

Persons interested in the Historical Study of Religions may become members of the Section of the Society organized for this purpose. The annual assessment is $2; members receive copies of all publications of the Society which fall within the scope of the Section.
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
AT ITS
MEETING IN BALTIMORE, MD.
1910.

The annual meeting of the Society, being the one hundred twenty-second occasion of its assembling, was held in Baltimore, Md., at the Johns Hopkins University, on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of Easter week, March 31st and April 1st and 2d.

The following members were present at one or more of the sessions:

Barret, Davidson, Hyvernat, Quackenbos,
Blake, Edgerston, Justrow, Rosenau,
Bloomfield, Ember, Kent, R. G., Rudolph, Miss
Boiling, Foote, Kyle, Schick,
Brown, F., Gildersleeve, Lyon, Steele,
Brown, G. W., Grieve, Miss, Margolis, Torrey,
Burlingame, Haas, Meyer, E., Vanderburgh,
Casanowicz, Harper, R. F., Michelson, Ward, W. H.
Clay, Haupt, Montgomery, Yohannan,
Collitz, Haynes, Müller,
Conant, Hopkins, Mus-Arnolt,
Currier, Husey, Miss, Oertel,

Total: 45.

The first session began on Thursday afternoon at three o'clock in the Donovan Room, McCoy Hall, with the President, Dr. Wm. Hayes Ward, in the chair. In the absence of both the secretaries Dr. George C. O. Haas was appointed to act as recording secretary for the meeting.

The reading of the minutes of the meeting in New York,
April 15th, 16th, and 17th, 1909, was dispensed with, because they had already been printed in the Journal (vol. 30, p. i-xii).

The Committee of Arrangements presented its report, through Professor Haupt, in the form of a printed program. The succeeding sessions were appointed for Friday morning at half past nine, Friday afternoon at half past two, and Saturday morning at half past nine. It was announced that a luncheon would be given to the Society by the University at the Johns Hopkins Club on Friday at one o'clock, and that arrangements had been made for a subscription dinner at the same place on Friday evening at seven o'clock. The Johns Hopkins Club and the University Club extended their courtesies to the members of the Society during the meeting.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

The annual report of the Corresponding Secretary, Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, was then presented as follows:

The Secretary has the honor to report that he has endeavored to carry on the duties of his office during the current year as before, and has had pleasant correspondence, not only with the newly elected members, honorary and corporate, but also with various persons who take an interest in Oriental matters and have been attracted by the aims of the Society. A special phase of the correspondence is represented by letters to and from one engaged in writing a report for a Japanese publication on the history of learned organizations in America. Several communications have been received requesting the Society to consider different cities from those where it has met in the past, as places for the annual meeting. Most noteworthy among these is an invitation from the Conventions Bureau of the Business Men's League of St. Louis, accompanied by letters from the Governor of Missouri, the Mayor of St. Louis, and a number of local civic bodies.

The Secretary has to record the loss of several members whose names have added honor to our list.

DEATHS.

HONORARY MEMBER.
Professor M. J. De Goeje.

CORPORATE MEMBERS.
Mr. Henry Charles Leh.
Miss Maria Whitney.

Professor M. J. De Goeje, of the University of Leyden, who died in May, 1909, was elected to honorary membership in 1898 as a representative of Dutch scholarship and in recognition of his distinguished con-
tributions in the field of Semitic philology, especially Arabic, which are too well known to need record here.

Mr. Henry C. Lea, of Philadelphia, who had been a member of the Society since 1888, died in October 1909. He was a zealous furtherer of scholarship, historical and antiquarian, and the author of numerous works on mediaeval history.

Miss Maria Whitney, sister of the late Professor W. D. Whitney, died in January last. She joined the Society in 1897.

The Secretary cannot close this report without a word of appreciation of the help he has received from his Baltimore colleagues on the Committee of Arrangements (Professors Bloomfield and Haupt) in arranging the details of the meeting at which this report is presented.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER.

The annual report of the Treasurer, Professor F. W. Williams, was then presented, as follows:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dues (190) for 1909</td>
<td>$ 850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48) for other years</td>
<td>214.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) for His. Stud. of Relig. Section</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Membership payment</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State National Bank Dividends</td>
<td>194.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual interest from Savings Banks</td>
<td>42.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of Journal</td>
<td>408.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,334.29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. M. and T. Co., Printing Vol. xxiv and sundry</td>
<td>$ 1,357.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor's Honorarium</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian, Scribe and Postage</td>
<td>64.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer, Postage</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subvention to Orientalische Bibliographie</td>
<td>95.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to general account</td>
<td>715.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,334.29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>1909</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Type Fond</td>
<td>$ 2,653.41</td>
<td>$ 2,781.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coheal Fund</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State National Bank Shares</td>
<td>1,950.00</td>
<td>1,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Savings Bank</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Savings Bank</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>12.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest, Coheal Fund</td>
<td>193.09</td>
<td>237.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in hand</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>24.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 5,890.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 6,013.09</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE.

The report of the Auditing Committee, Professors Torrey and Oertel, was presented by Professor Oertel, as follows:

We hereby certify that we have examined the account book of the Treasurer of this Society and have found the same correct, and that the foregoing account is in conformity therewith. We have also compared the entries in the cash book with the vouchers and bank and pass books and have found all correct.

CHARLES C. TORREY. \{ Auditors.  
HANNES OERTEL.


REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN.

The Librarian, Professor Hannes Oertel, presented his report as follows:

The library was unfortunate in losing the help this year which Miss Margaret D. Whitney has very generously given the last three years. As a consequence the accessioning had to be done by paid labor, and it was through the kindness of my fellow editor, who allowed his honorarium to be used to defray this expense, that this work could be carried on. However, it will be necessary to provide hereafter a regular appropriation for the librarian to pay for the labor of accessioning and acknowledging; the work of binding has been entirely discontinued owing to lack of funds. It will be impossible to continue for any length of time a policy which is sure to result in confusion and loss, and the Librarian again wishes to impress upon the members of the Society the absolute necessity of a regular allowance for the payment of clerical help.

This report was completed when the Librarian received the sum of one hundred dollars from Professor Jewett as a second most welcome gift toward the expenses of the library.

Upon motion it was voted to convey the thanks of the Society to Professor Jewett for his two gifts.

REPORT OF THE EDITORS.

The report of the Editors of this Journal, Professors Oertel and Jewett, was presented by Professor Oertel, as follows:

Pursuant to a vote of the directors at the last annual meeting, the editors arranged to have the Journal published hereafter in four quarterly numbers. The first of these was sent to the members on December 1st, the second on March 1st. The third will be sent out on June 1st, and the fourth on September 1st. The second number contained the proceedings of the New York meeting. It is possible now to form an estimate of the cost of the printing of the current volume of the Journal. The first number of volume 30, including addressing and postage, cost 1271 marks and 30 pfennigs. The cost of the second number amounts
to 1006 marks and 50 pfennige. Figuring on this basis, the Editors estimate that the whole volume will cost 4536 marks, thus coming well within the estimated sum of $1800.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS.

The following persons, recommended by the Directors, were elected members of the Society:

HONORARY MEMBER.
Professor Hermann Oldenburg.

CORPORATE MEMBERS.

Mr. William E. M. Aitken, Miss Sarah Fenton Hoyt,
Prof. Cornelius B. Bradley, Mr. Charles Johnston,
Mr. Alexander H. Bullock, Prof. Roland G. Kent,
Mr. Eugene Watson Burlingame, Mr. C. O. Sylvester Mawson,
Mr. Francis A. Cunningham, Mr. William Merrill,
Dr. Franklin Edgerton, Mr. Bernard Revel,

Dr. William H. Worrell.

OFFICERS FOR 1910-1911.

The committee appointed at New York to nominate officers for the ensuing year, consisting of Professor Harper, Dr. Haas, and Dr. Madsen, reported through Professor Harper and recommended the following, who were duly elected:

President—Professor Maurice Bloomfield, of Baltimore.
Vice-Presidents—Professor Paul Haupt, of Baltimore; Professor Henry Hyvernat, of Washington; Professor Charles C. Torrey, of New Haven.
Corresponding Secretary—Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of New York.
Recording Secretary—Professor George F. Moore, of Cambridge, Mass.
Secretary of the Section for Religions—Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., of Philadelphia.

Treasurer—Professor Frederick Wells Williams, of New Haven.
Librarian—Professor Hanne Oertel, of New Haven.


At four o'clock, at the conclusion of the business session, the Society adjourned to the large lecture-room in the same building, where the President, Dr. William Hayes Ward, delivered the annual address on "Oriental Sources of Greek Mythology."

At five o'clock Professor Eduard Meyer of the University of Berlin, Exchange Professor at Harvard University and an
Honorary Member of the Society, delivered in the same hall an illustrated lecture on "The Egyptians in the Time of the Pyramid-builders."

The evening was reserved for an informal gathering of the members for supper and general conversation.

SECOND SESSION.

The members re-assembled on Friday morning at half past nine o'clock for the second session. The following communications were presented:

Dr. F. R. Blake, of Johns Hopkins University: 'To be' and 'to have' in the Philippine languages.

Professor M. Bloomfield, of Johns Hopkins University: Announcement of a work on Repetitions in the Rig-Veda.

Mr. G. W. Brown, of Baltimore: Prāna and apāna in the Upanishads.—Remarks by Professor Bloomfield.

Professor C. E. Conant, of the University of Chattanooga: RGH and RLD in Philippine languages.—Remarks by Dr. Blake.

Rev. Dr. C. W. Currier, of Washington: Gonzales de Mendoza and his work on China.—Remarks by Professor Jastrow.

Dr. A. Ember, of Johns Hopkins University: Semito-Egyptian sound-changes.—Remarks by Professor W. Max Müller.

Dr. M. Margolis, of Dropsie College, Philadelphia: Grammatical notes on transliterations in the Greek Old Testament.—Remarks by Professors W. Max Müller and Haupt.

Professor P. Haupt, of Johns Hopkins University: Babylonian words in the Talmud.

At twelve thirty the Society took a recess until half past two, and the members were invited to luncheon as guests of the University at the Johns Hopkins Club.

THIRD SESSION.

The third session was held in the large lecture-room in McCoy Hall, President Ward presiding. The following papers were read:

Professor L. C. Barret, of Dartmouth College: Myths about dragon-fights.—Remarks by Professor Bloomfield.

Dr. Lucia Grieve, of New York: The Mohurrum in Western India.

Professor P. Haupt, of Johns Hopkins University: A Maccabean oratorio.

Professor M. Jastrow, Jr., of the University of Pennsylvania: The Etana myth on the Babylonian-Assyrian seal-cylinders.—Remarks by Dr. Ward and Professor Bloomfield.
Professor G. A. Barton, of Bryn Mawr College: On the latest addition to the Babylonian Deluge literature; presented by Professor Torrey.—Remarks by Professors Haupt and Clay.

Dr. G. A. Reisner, of Harvard University: The Harvard excavations at Samaria in 1909; presented by Professor Lyon.

The reading of papers was concluded at four forty, and at five o’clock Professor Eduard Meyer delivered in the same hall a lecture on ‘Augustus Caesar.’ At half past seven the members met for dinner at the Johns Hopkins Club.

FOURTH SESSION.

On Saturday morning at half past nine the fourth and concluding session was held in the Donovan Room in McCoy Hall. President-elect Bloomfield presided in the absence of President Ward.

The directors reported that they had re-appointed Professors Oertel and Jewett as Editors of the Journal for the ensuing year.

They further announced that the next meeting would take place at Cambridge, Mass., on March 16, 17, and 18, 1911. (This date was afterwards changed by the Directors to April 20, 21, and 22 in Easter week.)

It was announced that the President had appointed as committee to nominate officers, Professors Hopkins, Christopher Johnston, and Barret; as committee to arrange the details of the next meeting, Professors Lyon, Lanman, and Jackson; as Auditors, Professors Torrey and Oertel.

On motion of President Francis Brown the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

The American Oriental Society desires to express its thanks to the Johns Hopkins University and to the Johns Hopkins and University Clubs for the courtesies they have extended to the Society during this meeting; and to the Committee of Arrangements for the provision they have made for its entertainment.

The presentation of papers was then resumed in the following order:

Professor D. G. Lyon, of Harvard University: Another word on the structure of the Hammurabi code.—Remarks by Professor Jastrow.

Rev. Mr. M. G. Kyle, of Philadelphia: The ‘Field of Abraham’ in the geographical list of Shishak 1.

Dr. T. Michelson, of Ridgefield, Conn.: The dialect of the
Gimil: reedaction of Asoka's Fourteen Edicts.—Remarks by Professor Bloomfield.

Dr. Mary L. Hussey, of Cambridge, Mass.: Notes on some cuneiform tablets in the Semitic Museum of Harvard University.

Professor J. A. Montgomery, of Philadelphia: Some Judeo-Aramaic mortuary inscriptions from the Hauran.—Remarks by Professor Jastrow, Dr. Yohannan, and Professor Bloomfield.

Professor H. Hyvernat, of the Catholic University of America: On some so-called prehistoric tablets lately discovered in Michigan.—Remarks by Professors Jastrow and Haupt.

Mr. G. V. Schick, of Baltimore: On the stems ܕܹܬ and ܕ݂ܦ.

Remarks of Professor Haupt.

Rev. Dr. F. A. Vanderburgh, of New York: A hymn to Mullil (Cuneiform Texts, vol. 15, plates 7, 8, and 9).—Remarks by Professor Jastrow.

Rev. Dr. A. Yohannan, of Columbia University: Inscriptions on some Persian tiles from Rhages.

Dr. F. R. Blake, of Johns Hopkins University: Vocalic n, m, r, l in Semitic.—Remarks by Dr. Michelson.

Dr. A. Ember, of Johns Hopkins University: Some Hebrew etymologies.

Professor P. Haupt, of Johns Hopkins University: The priestly blessing.

Professor M. Jastrow, Jr., of the University of Pennsylvania: The Babylonian astrological series Anu-Enlil; presented in abstract.

Professor J. A. Montgomery, of Philadelphia: A novel form of early Syriac script.

The Society adjourned at half past twelve to meet in Cambridge, Mass., on March 16, 17, and 18, 1911. (This date was afterwards changed by the Directors to April 20, 21, and 22 in Easter week.)

The following communications were read by title:

Mr. W. E. M. Aitken, of Courtright, Canada: Collation of two unpublished copies of the Standard inscription of Ashurnasirpal.

Professor G. A. Barton, of Bryn Mawr College:

(a) The significance of Babylonian label tablets;

(b) The Babylonian calendar in the oldest temple archives;

(c) The location of the Land of Uz.

Dr. I. M. Casanowicz, of the National Museum at Washington: Note on some usages of ܐܬ. 
Professor M. W. Easton, of the University of Pennsylvania: The physics and psychology of the Vaiśeṣika system.

Dr. A. Ember, of Johns Hopkins University: On the transliteration of Egyptian.

Professor E. W. Fay, of the University of Texas: Two Indo-Iranian notes.

Dr. L. H. Gray, of Newark, N. J.: The Parsi-Persian Burj Nāmah, or Book of Omens from the Moon.

Professor F. Hirth, of Columbia University: On methods of studying Chinese.

Professor E. W. Hopkins, of Yale University: Mythological aspects of woods and mountains in the Sanskrit Epic.

Professor A. V. W. Jackson, of Columbia University: On the precise location of the Pass of the Caspian Gates.

Professor Hermann Jacobi, of the University of Bonn: When were the philosophical Sūtras of the Brahmans composed?

Mr. Charles Johnston, of New York: On a Buddhist catechism.

Professor C. R. Lanman, of Harvard University: Buddhaghosa and the Way of Purity.

Professor D. G. Lyon, of Harvard University: Some recent accessions to the Harvard Semitic Museum.

Professor W. Max Müller, of Philadelphia:

(a) The swords of the ancient Orient.
(b) An American scarab.

Professor J. D. Prince, of Columbia University: A hymn to the goddess Kir-gi-lu (Cuneiform Texts, vol. 15, plate 23).

Rev. Dr. W. Rosenau, of Johns Hopkins University:

(a) A word about Abraham Geiger;
(b) Some educational theories held by the Rabbis prior to the last century.

Professor C. C. Torrey, of Yale University:

(a) A bilingual inscription from Baal-Peor;
(b) The American School in Jerusalem.
The Mystery of Fu-lin.—By FRIEDRICH HIRTH, Professor in Columbia University, New York City.

The several accounts we possess in Chinese literature of that mysterious country in the extreme west called Fu-lin declare it to be identical with the country known in ancient times as Ta-ts'in. The texts of the T'ang dynasty speak of "Fu-lin, that is the ancient Ta-ts'in," or of "Tat's'in, also called Fu-lin," and it appears that the two names were interchangeable. From the Chinese point of view the question would, therefore, be simple enough. If Ta-ts'in is Syria, Fu-lin must be Syria. I am nevertheless disinclined to be guided by this kind of logic and fully admit the difficulty of the Fu-lin problem.

My present view, which in its main features has undergone little change from the one expressed twenty-five years ago in my first study of the subject, is briefly this: Ta-ts'in is the Roman empire with all its grandeur emanating from Rome, its capital; but the detail placed on record in the contemporaneous Chinese texts is confined to its Asiatic provinces, for which reason not Rome, but Antioch is described as the capital city. Its relations to China were of a commercial kind. Fu-lin is the Eastern empire of Byzantium, but as in the case of Ta-ts'in, the Chinese accounts are confined to certain Asiatic portions of it, and its relations to China were chiefly ecclesiastical. This at least is the impression I have received from the study of the Fu-lin chapters in the Chinese standard histories. I admit that Chinese literature contains a few passages, to which I hope to revert on some future occasion, which seem to involve that, besides the countries described in the standard accounts, a Greater Ta-ts'in and a Greater Fu-lin were not unknown in China.

1 China and the Roman Orient: Researches into their Ancient and Mediaval Relations as represented in old Chinese records. Shanghai, 1885. I shall in the course of these notes refer to this book by the letters R. O. VOL. XXX. Part L.
This view has been recently abandoned by my esteemed friend Professor Éd. Chavannes, who thinks that Fu-lin is after all Constantinople and not Syria. His arguments are briefly these.

1. The name Fu-lin represents the Greek accusative πόλις in εἰς τὴν πόλιν, Istang-polin, according to Mas'udi the origin of the name Istambul.

2. The name Fu-lin appears in Chinese literature previous to the arrival of the Nestorians in China.

3. It may have been brought to China during the Sui period by the Western Turks, who had been visited by Byzantine ambassadors in 568 and 576 A.D.

4. The king of Fu-lin who sent ambassadors to China in 643 was called Po-to-li (波多力). By substituting the name would appear as Po-si-li, which may stand for βασιλεῖς.

5. The Arab general Mo-i, who was sent to effect the siege of Fu-lin, may be identical with Muawia's son Yezid ben Mnawin, one of three emirs who attacked Constantinople.

6. The king of Fu-lin who sent an embassy to China in 1081 Mié-li-i-ling-kai-su may have been identical with the pretender Nicephorus Melissenus, the character 朕 in that name being a mistake for 王.

Professor Chavannes justifies the changes he suggests in connection with such names as Po-to-li and Mié-li-i by the frequency of errors in the tradition of Chinese texts. I quite admit this argument as applying to certain works, such as the Tsho-fu-yuan-kui, from which his "Notes additionelles" have been mainly derived. This work bristles with mistakes; but I would be much less inclined to assume such errors in the texts of the standard histories, the tradition of which, as regards names, compares not unfavourably with that of our mo-

---

1 In his paper entitled "Notes additionelles sur les Tou-kiao (Turcs occidentaux)" in Tsoung-pao, 1904, p. 57, note 3, in which he says: "J'ai identifié ce pays [Fou-lin] avec la Syrie, parce que j'acceptais la théorie soutenue avec beaucoup de talent par Hirsch (China and the Roman Orient) qui voit dans le terme Fou-lin (anciennement but-lin) le nom de Bethléem, et qui considère Po-to-li, roi du Fou-lin, comme le bâtard, c'est-à-dire le patriarche des Nestoriens. Un nouvel examen de la question me conduit cependant à reprendre l'ancienne identification de Fou-lin avec Byzance."
dieval Greek and Latin classics. Conjectures of this kind may occasionally become necessary, but they ought in all cases to be supported by strong circumstantial evidence and ought also to admit of some plausible paleographic explanation.

I have called this paper "The Mystery of Fu-lin," and I wish to indicate thereby that I do not by any means pretend to have removed all doubt from what may remain a mystery for ever. I cannot, however, refrain from placing on record the arguments which have induced me to maintain my original view. I welcome Professor Chavannes' criticism as the best means throwing light on the problem, and I shall be happy to hear of his further researches in the direction indicated. There still remain quite a number of important points to be settled in connection with both Ta-ts' in and Fu-lin, and who knows whether some unexpected discovery will not some day either shake, or confirm, our present views, if not furnish clues which nobody has thought of.

1. The old sound of the name Fu-lin (拂 林).

The first character 拂, now pronounced fu in the Mandarin, and fat in the Canton dialect, has a final ɐ, according to all the mediaeval authorities quoted by K'ang-hi (Rad. 63, 5). In the T'ai-yüan, a work which appeared as late as the Sung Dynasty, its sound is described as 貨 鍮 切, i.e., p(o-k-m)at, or pat.

The second character 林, now pronounced lin in the Mandarin, and lam in the Canton dialect, was according to the T'ai-yüan pronounced 力 鍬 切, i.e., l (ik-k) am, or lam, and K'ang-hi quotes the name Fu-lin (Fat-lam or Fat-lam) as an example of that pronunciation (Rad. 140, 8).

As a further example of the old sound ending in m, and not in n, I may quote the name of one of the priests which appears in estrangelo characters as Ephraem (read Abraham by Kircher) in the Syriac part of the Nestorian inscription with the Chinese transcription 拂 林, = fu-lin, fat-lam or pat-lam. I need not say that 林 and 林 are identical in sound. Certainly the final of this character was m, and not n. In

1 Cf. my remarks on the "Textkritik" of Chinese authors, R. O., p. 8 seq.
order to express the syllable lin in ṭūn, a Chinese transcriber of the sixth century would have selected some such character as 窴, lin, the old final of which is n, rather than a sound ending in m. In the T'ang-shu-shi-yin, chap. 24, p. 3, ad vocem Fu-lin, the sound of the character 窴 is described as ㄦ, i.e. ㄌ ( createContext) zm = lam.

As may be seen from R. O., p. 287, note 2, I do not doubt the correctness of the etymology of the name Istanbul — Istanbulin (as ṭūn ṭūn) as suggested by Mas'udi;¹ but we have to take into consideration that, as Professor Chavannes says himself, it applies to about the year 344 H., i.e., the tenth century A.D., whereas the name Fu-lin was first used in the sixth, or seventh, century. But, even granting the Byzantine Romans of that early period having called their capital "Istanbul," this need not force us to identify the name with Chinese "Fu-lin."

2. First occurrence of the name Fu-lin.

I quite agree with Professor Chavannes about the Sui-shu being the oldest record in which the name Fu-lin is mentioned. Indeed I called attention to it on p. 17 and p. 288, note, of my book. The biographical portion, including the records regarding foreign countries, of that historian was completed in 636 A.D., as we are told in the Catalogue of the Imperial Library,² that is just a year after the arrival at Ch'ang-an of the first Nestorian mission under O-lo-pōn (probably a transcription for Rabān or Rabban,—id est, monasterii propositus, Assemani, Bibl. Or., III Pt. ii, pp. 911 and 913 — also very common as a name). It seems to me quite possible that the name Fu-lin was just then substituted in the final revision of the Sui-shu text for that of Ta-ts'ìn, which may have been the original reading. But even if this had not been the case, why could not the Chinese have received notices of the country under its new name Fu-lin from sources not connected with the arrival of its natives, just as well as Ta-ts'ìn was known to them at the time of the general Pan Chau's campaign long

¹ For a careful compilation of material regarding the origin and history of this name see E. Oberhammer in Pauly-Wissowa's "Real-Encyclopädie."
² T'ang-shu, chap. 45, p. 53.
before the first Ta-ts'ın mission reached China in 166 A.D.? We know that the emperor Yang-ti tried in vain to have intercourse with Fu-lin. Could not he, or his representative Pei K'ü, the author of the Sui-si-yü-t'u (隋西域圖), have heard the name as being identical with that of Ta-ts'ın through the Nestorians in other western countries which had then come into contact with China, such as Persia, which is described with considerable detail in the Sui-shu, with its city of Madain, then the see of Nestorian patriarchs? Certainly the appearance of the name Fu-lin in Chinese literature previous to that of the Nestorians in China does not argue against the identity of the country with Syria. Professor Chavannes refers to the three trade routes quoted from Pei K'ü's work in the Sui-shu (chap. 67, p. 19), the northern one of which leads by way of I-wu (Hami) past P'u-lei-hai (Lake Barkul), the Tié-lo (Tolos) tribes, the court of the Great Khan of the Turks, and, crossing the rivers that flow north, to the country of Fu-lin and to the western sea." The route thus described is in my opinion not the later road to Constantinople, which skirted the Aral, the Caspian and the Pontus, since the several rivers to be passed in it flow south; "the rivers that flow north" must be the Jaxartes and the Oxus, and I take it for granted that this northern route would have taken travellers to Antioch as the capital of Fu-lin. Neither John of Montecorvino nor Rubruck had to cross the "rivers that flow north," nor does Pegolotti recommend such a route except to those who may have merchandise to dispose of at Urgendj (see Yule, Cathay and the Way Thither, p. 288).

3. Who were the informants through whom the name Fu-lin became first known in China?

We know from the Kiu-t'ang-shu (K. O., pp. 55 and 105, K. 33) that the emperor Yang-ti wished to open intercourse with Fu-lin, but did not succeed. Professor Chavannes, who thinks of Constantinople, maintains that the name Fu-lin became known in China through the Western Turks, and he refers to the relations of those Turks with the Byzantine Court. "A Chinese envoy at the court of the Turkish Great Khan," he says, "may have met some of these Greeks, or heard them spoken about; and thus the name of Constantinople came to
China in its form "Palin, given to it by the Greeks themselves according to Mas'udi." I wish to offer a somewhat different explanation. In the introduction to the chapter on the western countries the *Sui-shu* (chap. 83, p. 1) confirms the emperor Yang-ti’s desire to have communication with as many countries as possible; the emperor, therefore, sent expeditions under Wei Tai (韋太), author of a lost work, called *Si-fan-ki* (西番記) and quoted in the *T'ang-tien* in connection with the Ephthalites, and Tu Hsing-man (杜行滿). The latter visited the regions of Western Turkestan. Other officials were sent to Japan, Siam, etc. After that he appointed Pei Ka to a special post in north-west Kan-su with a view of inducing foreign countries to send envoys to China. From the account of Persia (波斯, i.e. Persia, chap. 83, p. 16) we learn that Yang-ti had deputed an envoy by the name of Li Yu (李禺) for the special purpose of persuading the Persians to send a mission to China, and Persian ambassadors actually came to China together with Li Yu, offering tribute to the court. This Persian embassy, according to the *Te-fu-yian-lui* (chap. 970, p. 3), arrived with the envoys of quite a number of other states in 616 A.D., probably a few years earlier, since the wording of this record, though entered under that special year, seems to involve the Ta-yè period (605 to 617 A.D.) generally as the date of arrival.

When Yang-ti’s envoy Li Yu arrived in Persia, the Persian throne was occupied by Khosru II, the bitterest enemy of all the Christians, including his political opponent, the emperor Heraclius. Syria was again held by the Romans, after it had been devastated by the Persians a generation ago. Antioch, already reduced to great straits by the earthquake of 525 A.D., had been sacked and destroyed by Khosru I in 540 A.D. If Antioch was the capital of old Ta-ts’in, or as I maintain, of its equivalent, Fu-lin, the fall of this city would mark an event in the interpretation of the name inasmuch as a second Antioch had been built on Persian ground. Much of the mystery surrounding the Ta-ts’in and Fu-lin question may be explained thereby. I quote Rawlinson’s *The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy* (London, 1876, p. 395):

*The Persian prince [Khosru I] after the fall of Antioch*

---

1 See *Te-fu-yian-lui*, chap. 662, p. 22 seq.
passed the winter in building and beautifying a Persian Antioch in the neighbourhood of Ctesiphon, assigning it as a residence to his Syrian captives, for whose use he constructed public baths and a spacious hippodrome, where the entertainments familiar to them from their youth were reproduced by Syrian artists. The new city was exempt from the jurisdiction of Persian satraps, and was made directly dependent upon the king, who supplied it with corn gratuitously, and allowed it to become an inviolable asylum for all such Greek slaves as should take shelter in it, and be acknowledged as their kinsmen by any of the inhabitants. A model of Greek civilization was thus brought into close contact with the Persian court." Rawlinson adds in a footnote: "Here the Oriental accounts are in entire accord with the Greek. Mirkhond and Tabari relate at length the construction of this new Antioch in the vicinity of Al Modain, adding that the name given to it was Rumia (Rome), and that it was an exact copy of the town upon the Orontes."

The captivity of the Antiochian christians is referred to by Barhebraeus 1 and in Mar Amr's biographies of the Nestorian patriarchs. 2 Tabari describes the new city in two passages 3 with some detail. The great Persian king had endeavoured to build this new Antioch just like the old city in Syria, and when the captives entered its gates, everyone of them found a home so similar to the one he had left in Syria that he might imagine to be there. Khosru I did not, at least at first, interfere with their Christian idiosyncracies, but the history of the Nestorian patriarchs in the sequel abounds with examples of that tenacity with which the heroes among them would rather

1 J. B. Abelloo and Tho, J. Lamy, Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicam Ecclesiasticum, Paris 1877, II 86; *Hic (Chosroes Anuschervan) post annos octo Antiochiam invasit incenditique, ejus vero incolas captivos abduxit atque eis Mahuzzam condidit, quam Antiochiam appellavit, eosque illice habitare jussit." Mahurza is explained by Assemani (Bibl. Or. III Pt. ii, p. 761) to be a city in Babylonia "apud Ctesiphontem ex altera fluminis parte, ad provinciam patriarchalem pertinens, cademque Bagdadi suburbium, et Carucha, Coreh seu Charch, appellatur." Professor Jastrow tells me that mahurza is Babylonic for city.


undergo martyrdom of any kind than cease to be faithful to their traditions. Many of them are recorded to have suffered death and torture under the threats of Persian kings and Arabic caliphs. It is to this virtue of the Syrian captives that Tu Huan, the author of the Hing-k'ing-ki (杜環行記), who had been made a prisoner and retained in Persia for ten years after the battle of Tharaz in 751 A. D., refers when he says of the people of Fu-lin, which country he places in the west of Sham (¶, = Damask): “If they live as captives in foreign states they will rather accept death than change their national customs.” I have adopted Mr. Playfair's improved translation of this passage, though I do not with him apply it to the Israelites in exile, but to the Christians in their second Antioch near Madain. 1 A prominent case of Christian martyrdom has been recorded in Mar Amr's work (op. cit., p. 37) as having occurred in the third year of Abul-Abbas (752 A. D.; “per id tempus martyrium fecit Israel medicus, cui Deus requiem concessit”). Assennani (II, p. 432) refers to it in connection with the imprisonment of the patriarch Jacob (754—773 A. D.) by the caliph Abu-Jafar, under whose reign, just at the time when Tu Huan himself lived as a captive in Persia, the Syrian Christians suffered more than ever under the persecutions of Mohammedan potentates. These were the outposts of the people of Fu-lin, who may have furnished the Chinese envoy to Khosru II, Li Yü, with the accounts of their country in Syria, and if the envoy's visit to the Persian court, placed in the Ta-yé period by the Chinese historians, took place in the earlier part of it, when Syria was still protected by the Roman army, this would be a sufficient reason why Yang-ti's wish to communicate with the mother country Fu-lin could not be fulfilled. Such certainly was the state of things previous to the year 611 A. D., when Apameia and Antioch were sacked by the Persians under Khosru II. The Emperor's commissioner in Central Asia, Pei K'o, who shared his master's ambition to see ambassadors of all the great countries of Asia at the steps of the dragon throne, succeeded in a wonderful manner; for he communicated with all, “only Tién-chu (India) and Fu-lin (Syria) he did not reach to his regret.” 2


2 楚天竺拂菻不至为恨, Tang-shu, chap. 221A, p. 258.

I have always been of opinion that Ta-ts'in and Fu-lin have to be looked upon as the representatives of the Christian world. Even in the early accounts of Ta-ts'in we may notice an ecclesiastical colouring. "Their kings are not permanent rulers, but they appoint men of merit. When a severe calamity visits the country, or untimely rain-storms, the king is deposed and replaced by another. The one relieved from his duties submits to his degradation without a murmur."¹ This is clearly neither a Roman Emperor, nor a praetor or proconsul, but a patriarch of the Christian Church, the patriarch of Antioch as the head of all the Christians in Asia. With the settling of so many Syrian Christians in Persia after the fall of Antioch in 540 A. D., the Nestorian patriarch in Persia could perhaps lay claim to that dignity.² His residence in exile was merely a makeshift; to his own flock and to the Chinese behind them he was the patriarch of all the Christians, whatever the heterodox clergy in the west may have thought of it. It was the Nestorian patriarch who sent the first Christian missionaries to China, and whether he did so under orders from a still higher patriarch in Antioch, or on his own authority, it seems not easy to decide. We have a direct allusion to this crux by a Byzantine author, the archimandrite Nilos Doxopatres, a notary in the service of the patriarch of Constantinople, who in 1143 A. D. wrote, for king Roger II of Sicily, a short treatise on the patriarchal thrones.³ Doxopatres may have been a biased judge owing to his connection with the orthodox church, for he seems to ignore the schism when he says that "the patriarch of Antioch was in charge of all Asia and Anatolia and even India, whither he had sent a catholikos ordained by himself, styled the one of Romoyris, and also of Persia and Babylon, called Bagdad in his time,

¹ Hôu-kan-shu, R. O., pp. 41 and 100, E 19 and 20.
² According to Assemani, Bibli. Ori., III Pt ii, p. 617, the Nestorian Archbishop at Seleucia and the Metropolitan of Persia had to proceed to Antioch for their ordination by the Patriarch previous to 498 A. D., after which time the "Catholicus" of the Nestorians claimed the title of Patriarch, in order to be relieved of the perilous journey to Antioch.
and that he had had him altogether thirteen metropolitans."  

We know that the early Christians in India were Nestorians. The discovery of crosses resembling in shape the one appearing above the Nestorian tablet of Si-an-fu and, moreover, surrounded by Pehlevi inscriptions points to the Nestorians in Persia as their originators.

Doxopatres' statement seems to show that the patriarch of Antioch (i. e. of Syria or Ta-ts'in) was at least the nominal head of the Christians of Asia and that the several metropolitans, including those of the Nestorians in Persia and in India, were nominally appointed under his authority. If the patriarch of the Nestorians appointed his own men to the Persian sees and to those of India and China, as we have every reason to assume, he may either have had this power delegated on him, or he may have acted on a self-assumed authority, looking upon himself as the patriarch of Antioch living in exile. According to my personal view it is the patriarch at the head of the Christians in Asia who is meant by the term "king of Fu-im," or "of Ta-ts'in," in the later texts. To support this theory I wish to refer to an account of Ta-ts'in dating within scarcely a generation after the time when Nilos Doxopatres wrote that treatise according to which the "patriarch of Antioch" appoints the heads of all the other churches in Asia, including the one of the Christians in India. This it appears to me we may infer from Chau Ju-kua's texts regarding Ta-ts'in and Ti'en-chu (usually translated by India, but here covering the Christian settlements in that country). Chau Ju-

kua says of his Ti'en-chu: "The country is subordinate to the country of Ta-ts'in and its chiefs are selected by Ta-ts'in." I have endeavoured to explain this, at first sight startling, assertion by the relations existing, previous to the arrival of the Portuguese, between the Indian church of St. Thomas and the Nestorian patriarch as the ecclesiastical "King of Ti-


2 J. Richter, Indische Missionsgeschichte, Gütersloh 1906, p. 86.
ts'in." On entering deeper into the subject I am encouraged in maintaining this view, though there seems to be some doubt as to who the real chief of the church has been, whether the patriarch of Antioch or the one of the Nestorians in Persia. The Nestorian primate, to whom part of his jurisdiction may have been ceded by the Patriarch of Antioch (Privilegium a Patriarcha Antiocheno concessum Primi Selenciensi: ut Episcopos ordinare possit. Assemani, III Pt. i, p. 145), seems to have been more settled in his authority in later centuries, when the extension of his dominion had grown too much for his western colleague, than in ancient times. I do not venture to say that Nestorian patriarchs called themselves "Patriarchs of Antioch." There is, however, a strange synchronism between the statement, said to be the result of an error by Assemani (Bibl. Orient., III Pt. i, p. 289: "Golius apud Hottingerum in Bibl. Or., p. 62") to the effect that Elias III, catholic of the Nestorians 1176—1190, was

2 Ample material will be found in W. Germann, Die Kirche der Thomaschristen, Gütensloht, 1877, and Richter's Indische Missionsgeschichte. The following sentences are selected from Capt. Charles Swanston's paper "A memoir of the Primitive Church of Malayala, or of the Syrian christians of the Apostle Thomas from its first rise to the present time" in Journ. of the R. Asiatic Soc., Vol. i, pp. 173—192, and Vol. ii, pp. 51—62 and 235—247.
3 In 835, a merchant named Job conducted into Malabar, from Babylon, two Syrian ecclesiastics, Mar Saul and Mar Ambrose, sent by the Nestorian patriarch to rule over the church of St. Thomas." These prelates governed the church in Tropancor for many years." They were followed by a succession of teachers from Syria, who ruled over the church" (i. p. 178). "The authority of the Syrian bishops extends to all temporal and spiritual matters" (p. 180—181). "The Nestorian patriarch of Babylon,—a vague appellation, which has been successfully applied to the royal seat of Seleucia, of Utesiphon, and of Bagdad" (p. 183). "Whatever credit may be thought due to the current tradition of these christians, that the Apostle Thomas planted the seeds of the Gospel among them, so much may be considered established beyond contradiction, that they existed in Tropancor as a flourishing people, connected with the Syrian church, from the first centuries of the Christian era" (iii. p. 234). "Their liturgy is that which was formerly read in the churches of the Patriarch of Antioch, and their language is the Syriac" (p. 237). "They hold in the highest respect their Patriarch of Antioch or Mosul, and make mention of him in their prayers" (p. 239).
called "Patriarch of Antioch," and Chau Ju-kua's source, the Ling-wai-tai-tu, published in 1178, which says that the king of Ta-ts'in ("Patriarch of Antioch") appoints the lord of Trien-chu (here ruler over the Christians in India). Assemani (I. c.) admits that the Melchite, Maronite and Jacobite Syrians gave that title to their patriarchs, but by no means the Nestorians. For Assemani's views on the patriarchal title among Nestorians see also Bibl. Or., III, p. 57 seq.

Chau Ju-kua's account of Ta-ts'in¹ is mixed up with a good deal of ancient lore, of which it has to be freed before being taken into consideration. Thanks to the discovery of Professor Tsuobei of Tokio, who drew attention to the Ling-wai-tai-tu by Chou K'u-fei,² we are able to trace about one-third of the substance of Chau Ju-kua's work to this earlier writer, who had collected notices from personal enquiries, but did not publish them for a number of years, until he became tired of so many questions addressed to him about them by his friends. Thus the preface of his work, which may have been partly written some time before its publication, happens to be dated 1178 A.D., i.e., thirty-five years after the time in which Doxopatres wrote his treatise. It contains the account of Ta-ts'in partly copied by Chau Ju-kua, and in its simplicity makes the impression of a contemporaneous record.³

Chou K'u-fei says (chap. 3, p. 1): "The king is styled Ma-lo-fu" (馬樂弗, in Cantonese ma-lo-fat, or giving the last character its probable old sound: ma-lo-pat). Since ju 弼 occurs in a Sanskrit transcription for bha (see Julien, Méthode, etc., p. 104, No. 309), we may read: ma-lo-pa. This I look upon as the title by which "the king," or in this case the patriarch, was known to Chou K'u-fei's informants. It seems to correspond to Syriac Mar-ABA, which was indeed one of the titles by which the patriarch could be addressed. Mar is a title of honour given to learned devotees among the Nestorians, somewhat like our "Venerable." ⁴ Aba means "father." Mar-Aba may thus be translated by "Venerable Father." Its

---

¹ R. O., pp. 92–96 and 120–122.
² "Chau Ch'üfe's Aufzeichnungen über die fremden Länder", etc., in Actes, XIXe Congrès Int. des Orient, Rome 1889, II, pp. 69–133.
³ Tsuobei, op. cit., p. 107–110.
⁴ "Mar, Syriac, Dominus meus, ut post Assemanum observant docti Hagiographi", Ducange, Glossarium, etc., ed. L. Favre, s. v. Mar.
Greek and Latin equivalent was *Patricius* (*πατρίκιος*, *patrik*)

"Patricius," as a title, may be applied to a number of high positions in the ancient west. Petros Patrikios, the emperor Justinian’s ambassador to the Eastern Goths in 534 A.D. and to king Kοsr of Persia in 550 and 560, held this dignity. 2 Roman prefects and even church dignitaries could hold this title after Constantinus the Great, its supposed creator. 3 But I cannot quote any particular instance in which it applies to an oriental patriarch of either Antioch or Madain. 4 The root *patrik* would be an excellent equivalent for Chinese *po-to-lik*. But the Aramean form for the word "patriarch" itself, *battrīk*, would be fully as good from a linguistic point of view and would suit even much better on account of its sense.

I do not, therefore, hesitate to adhere to my original identification of the old sound *po-to-lik* with *battrīk* against Chavannes’ *βαρθλεῖον*.

Two years before Chōu K’u-fei published his accounts of Ta-ts’in and Tiên-chu, in 1176 A.D. the Nestorian church of Bagdad was under its patriarch Elias III, elected and ordained at Madain, where he was endowed with a greenish cloak, "pallio amictus pistucini coloris" (Mar Amr, ed. Gismond, II, p. 64). The sacred gown here translated by pallium is by later authors described as a kind of "pluviale," or rain cloak. The mistaken description of this gown may have caused the Chinese author to speak of a "green" (Vals) umbrella, by which the "king of Ta-ts’in" is protected when appearing in public. Elias III distinguished himself by his architectural works. He re-built the patriarchal palace together with the

---

3 Du Cange, *s. v.* Patricius.  
4 As a title, though it seems certain that Cosmas Indicopleustes (Migne, p. 125) speaks of a "Catholic of Persia," i.e. the head of the Nestorian church, under the name of *Harpaka*; at a time when, according to other sources (Amr, p. 23), Mar Aba occupied the patriarchal see (536–552 A.D.). This may be the basis of Assaman’s identification of the titles Patricius and Mar Aba (cf. also J. W. McCrindle’s note on the passage referred to in *The Christian Topography of Cosmas*, London 1897, p. 24).
Church ("cellam in aedibus Romanorum reaediticare coepit una cum ecclesia")—says Mar Amr, cf. Barhebræus' Chronicon, Abbeloos and Lamy, Vol. iii, p. 370), while according to the Chinese account of 1178 the king of Ta-ts'in had a subway built from his palace to the Hall of Worship (R. O., p. 93). Although the Nestorian patriarchs were even at this time crowned at Madain, their place of residence had since the eighth century been at Bagdad, for which reason Chow K'ü-fei, and with him Chau Ju-kua, speak of Ta-ts'in as "the general meeting ground for the nations of the Western heaven and the place where the foreign merchants of Ta-shi [Arabs and Persians] assemble." R. O., R 1.

The king of Fu-lin, who in 643 A. D., more than five hundred years before the time of Elias III, sent an embassy to China, did so at a time when Nestorians were in full grace with the Chinese court. The emperor Tai-tsung favoured them with a message under his imperial seal and graciously granted presents of silk. 1 The king's name, as entered in the two versions of the Tang-shu, was Po-to-li (波多力, in Cantonese Po-to-lok). What I consider to be the Syriac transcription of this title could, of course, apply to the orthodox patriarch Mar Joannes, the pontifex of Antioch, who died after eighteen years' government in 649 A. D., 2 and who is distinctly described as batrirk. 3 In his case—at that early time—the title batrirk seems certainly unquestionable, whereas his Nestorian contemporary Jesuab II is styled katulik. 4 On the other hand I observe that the Nestorian chiefs are styled batrirk in Mar Amr's biographies throughout, and that the Nestorians who erected the tablet of Si-an-fu say that this was done at the time when "the father of fathers" Mar Hanânjesus was the catholic patriarch. 5 This shows that the title, whether accorded to their primate by orthodox writers or not, was claimed for him by his own

1 R. O., K 34 and I, 41.
2 Barhebræus, op. cit., 1, p. 279.
3 Barhebr., II, p. 114. Regarding the titles by which the early Nestorian chiefs have been referred to see Christ, Harde, Historiae Primaeviæ Ecclesiæ Nestorianorum ad Amro Philo Mathaei Arabice scriptae versus specimen. Neumünster, 1890, p. 4.
4 batrirkis in estrangelo characters, see Havret, La stile chrétienne, etc., I, p. LXXIX.
subordinates, and thus circumstances may also favour the identification of the person called Po-to-liś with the patriarch Jesujah II, who was at the head of the Nestorian church from 627 to 646,—a man of great political importance, who had acted as ambassador of the Persian court to the emperor Heraclius. To whichever of the two dignitaries we may give the preference, we have to consider the ecclesiastical character of certain subsequent missions to China. One of these was sent in 719 A. D., when “their lord” (ktör ʃ) deputed a chief of Tu-huo-lo (Tokharestan) on a mission to the Chinese court. The Nestorian patriarch was probably in a position to do so through one of his subordinates, some bishop of Balkh, a city of Tu-huo-lo or Tokharestan. For only sixty-two years later the Nestorian chorepiscopus of Kumdân, Mar Idbuzid, who had his name engraved on the Nestorian tablet with those of his fellow priests in estrangelo characters, calls himself “son of Milis, priest of Balkh.” This Milis was evidently, like his son, a Nestorian priest, and since Idbuzid probably did not attain the dignity of chief of the church of Kumdân as a young man, which was the exception among Nestorian prelates, it would appear that the Nestorians actually had a church with priests in the city of Balkh about the time when the Fu-lin embassy of 719 A. D. came to China. I am not aware that the Byzantine Romans had any relations with Tokharestan in 719 A. D., when they had a narrow escape of seeing their capital sacked by the Moslems. A few months later Fu-lin sent “priests of great virtue” with tribute to China, a further reason for regarding these relations as more of an ecclesiastical than a political character. The Teö-fu-yüan-kui places a mission of priests in the year 742 A. D., while in 744, according to the Nestorian Inscription, “there was (it is not said when he had arrived) the Ta-ts’in priest Ki-ho, who had an audience with the Emperor.”

1 R. O., K 38.
5. Political facts stated in Chinese records excluding identification with Constantinople.

The Kiu-Tang-shu says: "Since the Ta-shi [Arabs] had conquered these countries they sent their commander-in-chief Mo-i [Muawia] to besiege the capital city [of Fu-lin]; by means of an agreement they obtained friendly relations, and asked to be allowed to pay every year tribute of gold and silk; in the sequel they became subject to the Ta-shi [Arabs]."¹

Professor Chavannes agrees with me in explaining the name Mo-i (摩訶) as a mutilation of the sound Muawia. He does not, however, refer it to the great Muawia, who, before he became caliph, had been appointed Governor of Syria (Fu-lin) under Othman, but to his son Yezid, in order to show that the passage refers to one of the sieges of Constantinople. In doing so he seems to overlook the fact that Fu-lin was not only conquered, but "in the sequel became subject to the Arabs," and that this means much more than a mere temporary conquest may be shown from a passage of the Kiu-Tang-shu (chap. 198 p. 29), which states that the Ta-shi, i.e. the Arabs of the caliph empire, "in the beginning of the Lung-so period (661-664 A.D.), on having defeated Po-ssi (Persia) and Fu-lin, began to be in the possession of rice and bread stuff."² Fu-lin can in this case only refer to Syria. Constantinople was never subject to the Arabs, nor did the imperial dominions outside of Asia supply them with grain.³

¹ 墨臣屬大食: R. O., K. 33; cf. I. 43.
² 初擊破波斯又破拂菻始有米麪之屬.
³ Something similar is remarked in the Sung-shi, ch. 80, p. 18, in the account of a mission from the Ta-shi having arrived at the Imperial court in 995 A.D., but the country is there referred to under its old name Ta-ts'in. The emperor asked the Ta-shi (Arab, or Persian, of the Caliph empire, then divided into numerous branches) about his country, upon which he replied: "It is conterminous with the country of Ta-ts'in, and considering it a dependency, it is now my native country which has control over it" (與夫泰國相鄰為其統屬今於國所管之). Since Syria had been conquered and was being held by the Fatimid Caliphs residing at Cairo at the end of the tenth Century, the mission referred to seems to have come from the Fatimid portion of the Ta-shi territories.

My identification, which may at first sight seem strange, is based on the Nestorian inscription, in which it is shown that the priests, with their “luminous religion,” came from Ta-ts’in, and that “a virgin gave birth to the holy one in Ta-ts’in (圣女誕聖於大秦).” Since Ta-ts’in, according to all Chinese accounts, is identical with Fu-lin, this is equivalent to saying that “a virgin gave birth to the holy one in Fu-lin.” The old sound of these two syllables, as shown above, was, or could be, pat-lam; and it seemed to me that “Bethlehem” is a much more appropriate etymology than polin. In those days, when an ecclesiastical current ran through the politics of the world, east and west, Chinese literature called the great nations by the birth-place of the founders of their religions. Thus the T'ang-shu account of India (chap. 291 A, p. 24 B) is introduced by the words “The country of Ti'en-chu, also called Mo-k'ie-to,” because Mo-k'ie-to, i.e. Magadha, was the little country where Buddha was born. Later on Arabia received its name Ti'en-fang (天方, “the Heavenly Square,” i.e. the Kaaba) from the sanctuary in Mohammed’s birth-place. Similarly we read in Chinese books: “Ta-ts’in, also called Fu-lin,” i.e. Bethlehem, because it was the birth-place of Christ.

7. The Language of Fu-lin.

We possess about a dozen transcriptions in Chinese characters said to represent words of the language of Fu-lin. They occur in the eighteenth chapter of the well-known cyclopædia Yu-yang-ting-tsu (西陽条緯) by Tuan Chi'ong-shih (段成式), who died in 863 A. D. 1

The most reliable edition of this work, the quotations from which in cyclopædias, dictionaries and concordances of the present dynasty contain a number of fatal misprints, is the one published in the Ming collection Ts'in-tui-pi-shu (津逮秘書), a rare work, of which there is a copy among the Chinese books of Columbia Library in New York. It appears that a

1 See Havet, La stèle chrétienne, I, p. XXIII.
2 天竺國或曰摩伽陀.
bibliophile by the name of Hu Ch'ên-hiang (胡震亨) had planned the publication of a collection of rare prints under the title Pi-tê-o-hui-han (秘冊澹庵), but that before the work saw the light, the blocks from which it was to have been printed were partly destroyed in a conflagration, when the damaged stock of blocks fell into the hands of Mau Tsin (毛晋, 1598–1657 A.D.), who published it under the above title with a number of additions constituting the greater part of the collection, in all 144 works. The texts added by Mau Tsin bear on every page the name of his studio Ki-ku-ho (汲古閣), and the Yu-yang-tsa-tsu is among them.  

The best edition next to this is the one of the collection Hiau-tsin-t'ou-yüan (學津討原), published in 1805 by Chang Hai-p'ông (張海鵬) in Chau-won near Soochow, who copied his text from Mau Tsin’s edition, which he compared with original sources.

The eighteenth chapter of the Yu-yang-tsa-tsu is inscribed wu-p'ên (木篇), i.e., "chapter on trees," and treats chiefly on exotic trees and shrubs, many of which are said to be indigenous of India, Persia, or Fu-lin, giving the names used in those countries in the shape of transcriptions. I have tried to identify some of these names with the assistance of my colleagues Professors R. Gottheil and A. V. W. Jackson, and have come to the conclusion that they are neither Latin nor Greek, but Syriac.

As to the question who may have supplied the information regarding these foreign words, we receive a clue in the description, on p. 9. of the Asa foetida tree, called a-wei (阿魏). Having said that it comes from Kiê-shê-na (伽倻那) in Northern India, i.e., Ghasma in the present Afghanistan, where it is called hing-yu, and that it also comes from Persia, where it is called a-yu (阿虞), and having outlined his description of the tree, the author continues: "This is identical with what the priest Wan of the Fu-lin country says; the priest Ti-p'o [Dêva] of the Mo-kiê-t'o [Maghada] country says, etc." (拂林國僧所說同摩伽陀國僧提婆言等.)

1 Hui-ko-shu-mu, IV, pp. 54–63.
2 See my "Die Länder des Islam nach chinesischen Quellen," p. 17.
3 I shall quote numbers of pages from the edition of 1805.
4 形虞—Skt. hingu, Hind. hing, Dakh. hinga, and similarly with various foreign writers. See Yule, Anglo-Indian Glossary, s. v. Hing.
We may be allowed to assume from this passage that the information on plants growing in Fu-lin and their native names were supplied by a priest coming from Fu-lin called Wan. Here two priests, the one of Fu-lin (Bethlehem), the other of India (Magadha), are placed in contrast with each other as representing Christian and Buddhist sources of information.

The following extracts are from the Fu-yang-tsa-tsu. The headings ("The Olive," "The Fig," etc.) have been added by me.

1. The Olive (p. 10R).

"The ts'ai-lun tree (齋陵, Canton Dial. ts'ai-l'un) comes from Po-ssâ (Persia). It also comes from Fu-lin. In Fu-lin it is called ts'ai-l'i (齋黎, Canton Dial. ts'ai-l'ai). The tree measures two or three chang (= 15½ or 23½ feet?) in height. Its bark is green; it has white blossoms like the pumelo (yu, 橙), and these are very fragrant. The fruits are like those of the yang-lun (楊 榡, Actinidia chinensis, Fl. "a climbing shrub which bears edible fruit about the size of a plum," Henry, "Chinese names of Plants," in J. of the China Branch, R. As. Soc., 1887, p. 281) and ripen in the fifth month (June). The inhabitants of the west press them into oil used for frying cakes and fruits, as we in China use kū-shóng (苦棗, a kind of hemp seed? Very doubtful, cf. Bretschneider, Botanicum Sinicum, III, pp. 376—378)."

There can scarcely be any doubt about the identity of this tree with the olive. Ts'ai-lun is Persian and Turkish zeitun زيتون, and ts'ai-l'ai of the language of Fu-lin is Aramean zaita ظايت. See Inmanuel Löw, Aramäische Pflanzennamen, p. 136, who says that the word applies both to the tree (Olea europaea, L.) and its fruit. No such name is known in Greek.

1 The foot of the Tang Dynasty, during whose reign the text of the Ye-yang-tsa-tsu has originated, was much smaller than the present Chinese foot. Cf. my notes in "Bausteine zu einer Geschichte der chinesischen Literatur," Ts'oung-pao, Vol. vii, pp. 502—505. The Chinese foot, ch'ien, 寸, of the K'ai-yüan period (713—742 A. D.) measured about 23 ½ cm., or say 9½ inches English measurement. This has to be taken into account in forming an approximate idea of the several sizes placed on record in our text. The chang, 畝, or Chinese rod, which is now usually taken as 11½, would thus correspond to scarcely 7¼ English feet in the Tang period.
2. The Fig (p. 12\textsuperscript{a}).

"A-i (阿爾, Canton Dial, a-yik). In the country of Po-si (Persia) they call it a-i (阿爾, C. D. a-yik; the second character was read jīt or yīt during the Tang period, see Tang-shu-shi-yin, chap. 13, p. 4). In Fu-lin it is called ti-ni (底尼; the second character appears as 真, chōn, in all the other editions and quotations I have seen, a mistake which has clearly arisen from a variant of the second character 細, K'ang-hi, Rad. 75, 5, being confounded with 細; another form for chōn). The tree grows to a height of 14 or 15 ch'í (about 11 feet). Twigs and leaves are plentiful and luxuriant. Its leaves have five lobes (葉有五出) like those of the pei-ma (檸檬—萊檬, Ricinus communis). The plant has no flowers, but fruits. The fruit is reddish like the pei-tsí (柿子—柿子, the Chinese Diospyros glutinifera?), and its taste resembles that of the sweet persimmon (甘柿, kan-shí). Once a month there is a crop."

The Po̍n-ts'au-kang-nu (chap. 31, p. 26) has under the head of iou-hua-kuo, the "flowerless fruit," the name ying-jī-kuo, 頂日果, representing the old sound ang-it and apparently a transcription of Hindustani anjir. The Persian name, according to the Yu-yang-ts'ia is a-yît = anjir, which is near enough, though not as perfect a transcription as ang-it, to Persian anjîr, a fig. The Aramean name, according to Löw, p. 390, is te(n)la (アンジール), or têna (アンジール), cf. Biblical teínah 7287. Our Chinese transcription ti-ni is certainly much nearer the Aramean word than the Greek ἄμμός for fig, or ἰπανός for capriflons.

3. The Myrtle (p. 11\textsuperscript{b}).

"The mo tree (沒, Canton Dial, mut, used up to the present day as a transcription for mur, the name given to the "myrrh" in several western Asiatic languages, but here clearly restored to as a transcription for Persian, or Pehlevi, ܡܘܪܕ, which

\footnote{A botanical prejudice, which has caused the Chinese to call the Ficus carica the "flowerless fruit" (iou-hua-kuo, 無花果) and induced Albertus Magnus to say of the fig-tree: "fructum proferte sine flore" (De vegetabilibus, ed. Meyer and Jessen, Berlin 1867, p. 386).}
Professor Jackson informs me occurs in the Bundehesh in the sense of "myrtle") comes from Po-si (Persia). In Fu-lin it is called a-t'ou (阿緍, the last character being also read so, tso and tsok, K'ang-hi, Rad. 129, 10, and Chalmers' K'ang-hi, p. 219). It grows to a height of one chang (7 3/4 feet) and more. Its bark is greenish (or, blueish) white. Its leaves resemble those of the huai (槐, now Sophora Japonica L., but possibly differing in ancient times, see Bretschneider, Bot. Sin. II, p. 379), though they are longer. The flower resembles that of the Kū (橘, Citrus of some kind), and it has large seeds (or, berries), black in colour, resembling in size those of the shan-chu-pū (山茶黃, Cornus officinalis, S. & Z., see Bretschneider, Bot. Sin. II, p. 326 and III, p. 507 seq.). Their taste is sourish and they are edible."

I do not hesitate to identify the botanical features of this plant with those of the myrtle, the Aramean name of which is asa <lo> [Low, p. 50: myrtus communis, L.]

4. Galbanum (p. 11).

"Pit-ts'ai (驪齊, Canton Dial. pit-ts'ai) comes from Po-si (Persia). In Fu-lin it is called han-po-li-t'o (碻勃梨陀; this is the reading of the Tsin-tai-pi-shu edition; other editions have substituted tu, or tuk, for the first character, and the T'u-shu-tai-ch'ong gives it this sound, which is clearly an error easily explained by the similarity of the two characters, by adding in a scholion: 音義, 'having the sound to,' C.D. t'it; the edition of 1805 prints t'it, hi, or huk. Regarding han, 頭, see K'ang-hi, Rad. 181, 3). It grows to a height of fully one chang (7 3/4 feet) and has a circumference of more than a ch'ī (9 3/4 inches). Its bark is green, thin and very glossy. The leaves are like those of the a-wei (Asa foetida), each three leaves growing on the twigs. It has neither flowers nor fruits. The inhabitants of the west usually cut them in the eighth month (September), and till the twelfth month (January) further trimming takes place. The new twigs are thus extremely rich and juicy, whereas without the trimming they would wither and die. When cut in the seventh month (August), the twigs yield a yellow juice somewhat like honey and slightly fragrant, which is used as a medicine for certain cures."
The Cantonese sound \textit{pit-ts'ai} is an excellent transcription of Persian \textit{bīrzan}، "Galbanum" (Johnson, p. 267). Its Aramean equivalent is \textit{chelbanita}، the product of 
Ferula galbaniflua، Boiss. & Buhse، according to Löw، p. 163. The defenders of the identity of Fu-lin with Constantinople might point to Greek χαλβαρη، which is indeed its botanical equivalent، but Professor Gottheil informs me that -ita is a characteristic Aramean ending، which distinguishes it from other Semitic dialects (bibl. chelbenah \textit{חבלנה}، etc.) as well as from the Greek and Latin forms of the word، χαλβαρη and galbanum.

5. The Nard (p. 12).

\textit{Nai-chi} (_countries). The first character according to K’iang-hi، Rad. 75، 9. could be read \textit{Я 妻} = not; the second، as equivalent to 纸 could be read \textit{丁 尼 妻} = ti، Rad. 113، 4; the \textit{Tsin-tai-pi-shu} edition confounds it with 纸، Rad. 113، 5. The old sound may thus be reconstructed as \textit{not-ti}، which may stand for \textit{nar-ti}، or \textit{nard} comes from the country of Fu-lin. It is a herbaceous plant (\textit{miau، مي}}) three or four \textit{ch'i} in height. Its roots are of the size of duck’s eggs، its leaves are like garlic (\textit{suam، سوم}} Allium sativum L. From the centre of the leaf rises a twig of great length، and on the stem there is a flower، six-lobed، of reddish white، with a brownish calyx، forming no fruit. The plant grows in the winter and dies in the summer، and it is related to our greens or wheat cereals. Its flowers are pressed into oil used as an ointment against colds. The king of Fu-lin and the nobles in his country all use it."

The name of this plant may be the Persian \textit{nard}، or Biblical \textit{nard}، or belong to any other dialect or language، since it seems to be international. Our author does not say anything about the language of Fu-lin، as he does in other accounts، and it apparently "comes from Fu-lin،" because it is so largely used there. Löw، p. 368، gives \textit{shebbalta}، as its Aramean equivalent.


\textit{Ye-si-mi} (野悉蜜، Canton Dial. \textit{ye-sik-mat}) comes from the country of Fu-lin. It also comes from the country of
Po-sî (Persia). It is a herbaceous plant, seven or eight ch'în in height. Its leaves are like those of the plum-tree and grow ample all the year round; its flowers are five-lobed and white, and they form no fruits. When the blossoms open out, the whole country is filled by their flavour resembling (in this respect) the chan-l'ang (澆糖, a doubtful tree with fragrant flowers, Bretschneider, Bot. Sin. III, p. 467) of Ling-nan (Canton). The inhabitants of the west are in the habit of gathering its flowers, which they press into an oil of great fragrance and lubricity."

Persian yasmin and Aramean yasmin داسمين are clearly the equivalents of this name ye-si-mi, which has been known in China since about the year 300 A.D., when it was described in the Nan-jang-ts'au-mu-chuang (南方草木狀, chap. I, p. 2) as being introduced by foreigners in Canton under the name of ye-si-ming (耶悉茗). In another passage of this work (chap. 2, p. 3) the Henna plant is said to have been introduced by foreigners together with the ye-si-ming and mo-li from the country of Ta-tsa'in. The Jasmine plant and the mo-li-hua (茉莉花) are now synonyms, but since mo-li is described in a separate paragraph, in which it is said that "its flowers are white like those of the tse'ang-mi (昔日, wall rose', Bretschneider, Bot. Sin., III, p. 302) and its fragrance exceeds that of the ye-si-ming", it appears that in 300 A.D. it denoted some other fragrant garden plant, imported from Syria together with its name mo-li. The latter might be connected with molo, αλο (αλο, Lôw, p. 317; Peganum Harmala L.?). The old work referred to contains a number of other botanical names clearly of western origin, such as hän-lu (旱陆, old sound hun-luk), for "frankincense," which may be a transcription of Turkish phyinuk (كركدس) (cf. R. O., p. 266 seq.), or ho-li-lo (訶梨勒, Canton Dial. ho-li-lak), the Terminalia Chebula, Retz., or Myrobalan, called halitag מִלְאָן and similarly in old Hebrew medicinal works (Lôw, p. 129). But since they have no immediate bearing on the Fu-lin problem, I shall not attempt to trace these names.

I do not wish to commit myself to identifications about which I do not feel tolerably confident both from the botanical and the linguistic point of view; but I hope to return to the subject as soon as I can offer some plausible suggestions
as to the five remaining plant names said to belong to the
language of Fu-lin, viz: a-po-ch'en (阿勃參), a-pu-to (阿密
燒), hün-han (群 漢), a-li-ho-t'o (阿梨喀地) and a-li-rō-fa
(阿梨去 伐 ?).

As to a-pu-to, stated (p. 9 n) under the name po-na-so (婆
娜索) to come from Persia, the Pön-ts'au-kang-mu (chap. 31,
p. 25) refers this name to the Jack fruit (po-lo-mi, 獵羅蜜; Artocarpus integrifolia), and gives as its Fu-lin equivalent a-
sa-to (阿薩 姆). But I doubt whether the Jack fruit tree
occurs in Syria, to say nothing of Greece. Mr. W. F. Mayers,
in 1869, took up this subject in Notes and Queries on China
and Japan, Vol. iii, p. 85, where he says: "It may be remark-
ed en passant, that an identification of the above and other
sounds attributed in the Pön-ts'au to the language of Fu-lin
might be of service in determining the precise region that is
indicated by this name in Chinese literature." The few ex-
amples I have endeavoured to trace to their real linguistic
origin seem to contain a broad hint as to the language of
Fu-lin being Aramean, and to the country where it was spoken
not being Constantinople, but Syria. Pure Syriac, or Ara-
mean, was particularly the vernacular in use with the Nesto-
rians not only in Syria, Mesopotamia, Chaldean and Persia,
but also in India, Tartary and China, whereas other denomi-
nations used a kind of Syriac mixed with Arabic and even
Greek elements. See Assemani, op. cit., p. 377 seq.


The account of Fu-lin as placed on record during the Sung
dynasty, probably in connection with an embassy of 1081 A. D.,
has puzzled the Chinese as it is liable to puzzle us, if we com-
pare its detail with that of older texts. It occurs in the Sung-
shêi (chap. 490, cf. R. O., pp. 62—64, 108—109) and has been
reproduced by Ma Tuan-lin (Wên-hiên-t'ung-k'au, chap. 330,
cf. R. O., pp. 88—91, 119—120). Ma Tuan-lin refers to "the
historians of the Four Reigns" (四朝 鬥 史, cf. R. O., p. 91,
note), who held that "this country had not sent tribute to
court up to the time of Yüan-fêng [1078—1086], when they
sent their first embassy offering local produce", and he draws
attention to certain discrepancies in the accounts of the Tang
and Sung dynasties.
In the interpretation of this mysterious text which I offered twenty-five years ago (R. O., pp. 298—301) I had pointed out the possibility of its covering the Seljuk dominions in Asia Minor. I am still inclined to maintain this view on geographical grounds, but venture to suggest a few slight changes in the text, which would place us in the position to adapt its contents to the political condition of the country in 1081 A.D., when its ruler is said to have sent ambassadors to China. The king, in the text referred to (R. O., pp. 62 and 108: N 3) is styled Miē-li-i-ling-kai-sa, 滅力伊靈啟, in Cantonese mit-lik-i-ling-koi-sut. I still think that the two last characters, the old pronunciation of which must have been kai-sut, stand for Greek καίσαρ, and that ling, 靈, is a somewhat imperfect attempt to render the sound Rūm. 1 “Rūm kaisar” would have to be looked upon as the equivalent of the title “Emperor of Rome, or the Romans” placed before the Chinese court in the garb of a Turkish combination analogous to such titles as “Tūrgāsh kakhan,” i.e. “the Great Khan of the Tūrgāsh” and many others occurring in the Old-Turkish stone inscriptions. The three first characters miē-li-i would represent the name of the ruler who calls himself “Emperor of Rome.” I have (R. O., p. 299) drawn attention to the anachronism committed by the several learned sinologues who identified the name with that of Michael VII Parapinaces, who had been deposed and withdrawn into a convent since 1078 A.D. This was the reason which had induced me to think of the Seljuk Soliman as the ruler adding the title “kaisar” to his own as “king of Rūm.” I did not realise then that in 1081, when that embassy arrived in China, another person lived in Asia Minor who actually claimed, and was subsequently granted, the title καίσαρ; and I now agree with Chavannes in referring to Nicephorus Melissenus, the pretender who claimed to be emperor just about the time when the embassy referred to arrived in China. Michael VII Ducas had withdrawn into the convent of Studion early in 1078, when one of this generals, Nicephorus Botaniates, who had been stationed in Phrygia, came to Constantinople and was crowned as Michael’s successor on the 13. April 1078. He had to fight a number of claimants who would not

---

1 It may not seem to be a scientific proof, if I refer to a Pidgin-English conversation with a Chinese cook, who asked for “one bottle that leng (rum)” to be served with a plum pudding.
recognise his authority. Chief among these was Nicephorus Melissenus, the descendant of a powerful family and husband of the sister of Alexius Comnenus, the emperor who succeeded Nicephorus Botanates. Nicephorus Melissenus had made an agreement with the Seljuk Turks of Iconium to the effect that, in consideration of their assisting him in gaining the throne, he would divide with them the provinces conquered by their united forces. No sooner was he sure of this support than he clad his feet in purple shoes, the insignia of Imperial dignity, and began to march about in Anatolia with the troops of his allies, the Turks. All the cities he approached opened their doors and recognised him as emperor, though he on his turn declared these same cities to belong to the Turks, so that through his treason the entire former proconsular part of Asia, Phrygia and Galatia fell into the hands of the Turks. From Nicaea he prepared an attack on Constantinople. Alexius, then a mere general, was instructed by Botanates, the emperor, to meet him, but for reasons of his own he did not proceed and handed over command to a feeble eunuch, who had to withdraw from Nicaea at the end of 1080. Melissenus intended to attack Constantinople early in 1081, when after a medley of intrigues his brother-in-law Alexius was elected emperor by the acclamation of his army. Melissenus then joined arms with him, and after the two armies had taken the capital, the two relatives divided the empire between them. Alexius got the European provinces, Melissenus received an apanage and the title kaišar (Anna Comnena, Alexios, ed. Schopen, Vol. i, p. 116. For further details see the historical works of Anna Comnena, Jo. Cinnamus and Nicephorus Bryennius in Niebuhr's Corpus Scriptt. Hist. Byzant., and the abstract in W. H. Waddington's paper "Nicéphore Mélisséne, prétendant au trône de Byzance" in Revue numismatique, Nouv. sér., Vol. vii, pp. 393—400).

Although the title "kaisar" is thus shown to have been officially conceded to Melissenus in the beginning of April 1081, the entire political situation seems to suggest that he actually claimed it, and probably had coins cast in his name as kaisar, ever since his commencing to pose as a pretender some time in 1078. If the embassy that arrived at the Chinese court in 1081 started from Asia Minor some time in 1080, there were at the time practically two rulers in the country dividing
The Mystery of Fu-lin.

supreme power between themselves, viz.: 1, Melissenus, the pretender, who considered himself emperor of Rome and claimed the title "kaisar", and 2, his ally, the Sultan of Iconium, who supported his claims and whose name was Soliman. Taking all this into consideration, we cannot well assume Soliman to have represented himself as kaisar in his credentials to the court of China. The one man who was a kaisar in Asia Minor by usurpation, if not by right, at that time, was Melissenus. This has led me to again examine the three characters preceding the words ting-kai-sat (= Rūm kaisar), and which I think might be a transcription of the kaisar's name, viz. Mie-li-i, in Cantonese: mit-li-i.

The stumbling block in this name, it appears to me, is the third character 火, i.e. In trying to find a solution to help us out of the difficulty I beg to call attention to a practice, occasionally noticeable in the prints of the Sung dynasty, by which some characters may be deprived of their radical or written with the wrong radical. Thus the character 火, shì, "lion," in the Hōu-han-shu (R. O., p. 101, E 39), appears as 火 in the Sung edition of 1242 (see facsimile, R. O., p. 9). Chau Ju-kua (chap. 1, p. 17†) has 紫; ting, for 紫, tièn, "indigo". In the ethnical name Siè-yen-ço, which is clearly the equivalent of the name Sīr Tūrdušch in the Old Turkish stone inscriptions, the second character 延, yen, must have been substituted for some character read tan (= tar), e.g. 曰, the original radical being suppressed (see my Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjilch, passim). If we assume, therefore, that the 火 in the kaisar's name stands for what in its original transcription may have appeared as 火, the radical No. 140 being suppressed, such a change would not be without precedent. According to the Chōng-tzü-t'ung (quoted in K'ang-hi, Rad. 140, 6) 火 was used by mistake for 火, and this character again, according to the T'ai-yün, could have the sound sin, or sun (聲 尋 音 紫, K'ang-hi, Rad. 140, 4; cf. Chalmers' K'ang-hi, p. 206†, where among other sounds sun, 心, is given to the two interchangeable characters 火 and 火). The kaisar's name may thus in its transcription be reconstructed into Mie-li-sun, or Cantonese Mit-lik-sun, the finals t and k of which may disappear by elision so as to leave us as the equivalent of the probable old sound some such name as Miltissun. This I venture to look upon as the equivalent, trans-
mitted probably by an interpreter who spoke some Turkish dialect, of the Greek name Μελισσέως.

I am encouraged in this view by the mention of a coin the description of which, after a slight, but plausible change in the text, seems to be traceable. The passage I refer to, *R. O.,* N 16) speaks of gold and silver coins without holes being cast in this country, which the people are forbidden to counterfeit and which are described by the following words:

面盤 引勒佛者 爲王名

The change I wish to suggest in the text is the substitution of the character 背, *pei,* “the back,” for 艋, *kiō,* “all, alike;” “that is.” The two characters are quite similar to each other and may easily be confounded. Moreover, *kiō* gives a poor sense, whereas *pei* is constantly used in opposition to 面, *miên,* “the face,” the two terms in numismatic texts meaning the “obverse” and “reverse” of a coin. I do not, therefore, look upon the words *mi-lō-yō* (彌勒佛), the standard transcription for “Maitreya Buddha,” as the king’s name, but translate: “on the obverse [of the coin] is engraved a Maitreya Buddha, on the reverse there is the king’s name.” It is quite probable that the ambassadors of 1081 brought coins with them to China and on enquiry declared that the legend on the reverse represented the king’s name, and that some of these coins had been preserved in the Imperial collections at K’ai-fong-fu, since according to Edkins (*Chinese Buddhism,* 2nd ed., p. 117, note) “the *Kiu-shi-t’u-shu-pu* contains a rude representation of a gold coin of Mi-lī-ling-kai-sa.” I regret not to have had an opportunity of seeing the illustration referred to, because it might have given us a chance, rude though it probably is, to compare notes with a silver coin of Melissenus the pretender actually preserved to our days. The coin, which has been described by Waddington in the paper quoted from the *Revue numismatique,* is now in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris. Mr. Waddington’s illustration and description (Fig. 1) shows on the obverse the bust of the Virgin, facing, with hands held up in prayer, nimbus and the usual dress, the figure being described as μήτηρ ὑιοῦ in the customary abbreviation. On the reverse we find the legend Ναυτέρα δευτερη τω Μελισσεω in five lines.1

M-P [ΩΥ]. Buste de face et nimbé de la Vierge, les mains élevées; le tout dans un grènetis.

Fig. 1.
Coin of Melissenus the pretender and Mr. Waddington’s description.

It looks as if this coin has something to do with the one described in the Sung-shi. The Chinese scribe who first placed on record the details regarding it was, of course, not able to read the Greek legend on the reverse, but he must have been told by the ambassadors that it represented the king’s name Melissenus. The portrait on the obverse may have been mistaken for that of Maitréya, the Buddha of the future world so familiar to Chinese Buddhists,—a male deity, it is true, but generally represented as a beardless youth and very frequently with the nimbus round his head (cf. Grünwedel, Buddhistische Kunst in Indien, Berlin, 1893, p. 141: “in Schmuck und Tracht eines indischen Gottes oder altindischen Königs meist in sehr jugendlichem Alter”).

I do not venture to throw out any guesses as to the motives which may have caused the Byzantine pretender and ally of a Seljuk sultan to send a special mission to China. Nor am I in the position to throw light on the names mentioned in connection with the embassy of 1081. According to the Chinese text (R. O., N 3) the king sent "ta-shou-ling" Ni-seitou-ling Ssi-mong (大首領你廬都令屬孟), which may stand for “the governor Nestorius Simeon”, or “the governors Nestorius and Simeon.” The two names, if we are not mistaken in explaining them thus, are followed by the words 王來, p’an-lai, which I now believe means that they came in company,

\[1\] Clearly a high official, since in the passage N 12 we are told that “the towns and country districts are each under the government of a shou-ling.” The ta-shou-ling must have been superior to these local governors.
—bringing as tribute saddled horses, swords and pearls. I do no longer look upon the character  "p'an" as part of the name. 萬, now pronounced "p'an", must have been identical in sound and tone with  "pan". K'ang-hi, Rad. 9, 5, quotes several T'ang authorities to say that the two characters are identical in sound (伴 音 万). This would entitle us to look upon the two characters as interchangeable and to assume that 伴 may be a verb meaning "to come in company" similar to 伴, 伴, which is backed by passages in P'o-wen-yin-fu, chap. 26'A, p. 63'B, e. g. 時伴老人遊, "who traveled in the company of the old man?" I am encouraged in offering this explanation by a passage of the Sung-shi (chap. 490, p. 16'B), where an Arab embassy is stated to have consisted of 1. the ambassador (使, 使), 2. an assistant ambassador (副使), and 3. a p'an-kuan (判官), or "companion officer," "attaché." Possibly the passage involves that "the king sent a ta-shou-ling, accompanied by the Nestorian Simeon, or Simon, as attaché."

Professor Chavannes in his recent note on Fu-lin (p. 39) has made an important discovery in connection with the ruler of what I call Pseudo-Fu-lin, and this may, quite reasonably, have induced him to fall back on the former identification of Fu-lin with Constantinople. But since the Sung historians maintain that this Fu-lin had never sent any embassies to China before, this seems to involve its non-identity with the Fu-lin of the seventh and eighth century. Although merely a pretender, Melissenus was closely related to the Imperial court and his representatives ought to have been aware of the fact, if court missions had gone forward from Constantinople to China. The ambassadors, when cross-examined as to former relations between their government and the Chinese court, might have referred to the Fu-lin embassies of 643, 667, 701 and 719 A. D.1 On the other hand, if these former missions had been sent by Christian patriarchs, whether of Antioch, Madain, or Bagdad, the kaisar's messengers could not well refer to them as having represented the Roman emperors whom they had to look upon as the predecessors of their chief. Their silence as to former relations would thus be explained. The Sung-shi account describes a mission from Fu-lin, it is true;

1 See R. O., p. 126: Index to Translations, e. v. "Embassies".
but I think this name had in the course of time grown into a general term applied to the Christian world at large. Originally designating the Nestorians as representing the Latin population of Syria or Ta-ts'in, the cradle of their faith, it was later on applied to other Christians, those of Byzantium under the Sung, and even the Pope of Rome under the Ming dynasty. It had grown into a term which covered a multitude of nations and of governments, like our "America," which may mean the United States in one sense and all possible countries in another.
Mr. Kingsmill and the Hiung-nu.—By Friedrich Hirth,
Professor in Columbia University, New York City.

In his paper "Dr. F. Hirth and the Hiung-nu," published in the Journal of the China Branch, R. A. S., Vol. xxxiv, pp. 137—141, Mr. T. W. Kingsmill tries to show that the Hiung-nu and the Huns were different nations. He refers to my paper, presented to the philological section of the Royal Academy of Munich, entitled Über Wolga-Hunnen und Hiung-nu (München, 1900). The main object of that paper was to establish the literary proof, based on a text of the Wei-shu, for the identity of the Hiung-nu of Chinese history with the Huns of Europe. Mr. Kingsmill denies this identity, but, as I propose to show in the following pages, fails to prove his point.

A subsequent paper, presented by me to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Budapest and published in the Revue Orientale pour les études Ouralo-Altaïques, Vol. ii, 1901, pp. 81—91, under the title of "Hunnenforschungen," and a third paper, "Die Ahnentafel Attila's nach Johannes von Thaurócz," published in the Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg, Fifth Series, Vol. xiii, pp. 220—261, were apparently not known to Mr. Kingsmill. A study of the Chinese sources quoted in them might have prevented several serious errors in his criticisms. These I consider interesting, because they illustrate better than anything else the difference in our methods of research. I have on several occasions discussed the principles by which I am guided in this respect (cf. my China and the Roman Orient, pp. 152, 170 et passim). In identifying the ancient Chinese accounts of foreign countries, we should above all endeavour to recognize facts, and only after these have been established, should the linguistic explanation of names be considered as furnishing additional evidence. Mr. Kingsmill's method is the reverse of
this. He is unfortunately possessed of a regular mania to
discover etymologies, and his mind once being set on what
he considers similarity in sound, all passages in Chinese con-
temporaneous authors which might warn him as being on the
wrong track are ignored.

As an example we may consider the city of Ku-tsang (呉臧),
mentioned in the short, but important text of the Wei-shu
reproduced below on p. 42. In this text it is said that the
merchants of this country (Su-tô, or Suk-tak,粟特, Alans)
often went to the country of Liang (Liang-chou-fu in Kan-su)
for trade1 and that at the capture of Ku-tsang they were
all made prisoners (先多詣原因貢及克呉臧悉見虜); and that "in the beginning of the reign of Kau-tsung [452—466
A. D.] the king of Su-tô (Suk-tak) sent ambassadors to ask for
their ransom, which was granted by cabinet order (高宗初
粟特王遣使請求之詣職焉)."

Mr. Kingsmill's imagination here forestalls all further research,
so necessary in Chinese historical reading, by jumping im-
mmediately to one of his linguistic conclusions. "Ku-tsang," he says
"here is the country called by Ma Tuan-lin Kwei-shwang, and
by the Armenian writers Kushan. It formed the most power-
ful of the five states into which the Ephthalite kingdom was
divided," &c. This is a characteristic example illustrating the
dangers of basing historical inferences on mere similarity of
sound. It is typical of Mr. Kingsmill's method: the sound of
a word takes possession of his mind to such a degree that
all logical reasoning is temporarily forgotten in the pursuance of
a mere phantom. The nation known as Kui-shuang, or
Kushan, is by Armenian writers referred to Bactria, by the
Arabo-Persian reports to Tokharestan, Transoxiana, &c. (Th.
Nöldeke, Tabari, p. 115 note 2; cf. Ed. Specht, Etudes sur
l'Asie centrale, i, p. 8 seqq.) and has nothing whatever to do
with the Liang country of the Wei-shu. Liang was the seat of
an independent prince of Hiung-nu extraction by the name of
Tsü-kü Mu-k’ien (沮渠牧犍), who followed his father

1 The Aseri (Alans) carried on considerable trade, bringing Indian and
Babylonian wares, which they received from the Armenians and Medes
and transported on the backs of camels from the Caspian to the Pains
Maccota. By this means they had amassed considerable wealth, and wore
ornaments of gold (Strabo, XI, 5, 8 p. 506, Banbury, A History of An-
Tsü-k'ü Mông-sun (蒙 遁), as Prince of Ho-si (河 西 王) in that little dynasty known as "the Northern Liang," and whose biography is contained in the Wei-shu (chap. 99, p. 143 seqq.), His troubles with his brother-in-law, the Toba emperor Tai-wu, which have been described in my "Hunnenforschungen," led to the siege and final capture in 439 A.D. of Mu-kién's city of Ku-tsang. Before attempting guesses of any kind Mr. Kingsmill ought to have consulted the Pu-wón-yün-fu (chap. 22C, p. 150). There he would have found a number of passages concerning the city of Ku-tsang, the analysis of which would have revealed the real historical basis of this simple passage. But apart from this he might have read the whole account in plain French in Deguignes' Histoire des Huns, Vol. i, Part ii, p. 273. It was at this capture of Ku-tsang that merchants hailing from the distant west were made prisoners together with 20,000 inhabitants of the city, who were transferred to the Toba capital in Shan-si (Wei-shu, chap. 4A, p. 21). Ku-tsang was the residence of the Tsü-k'ü princes, and according to the Shen-si-t'ung-ch'i (quoted in the Tu-shu-pei-ch'üng, Sect. 6, chap. 578, ku-chü, p. 2) its ruins at some time or other were known to exist in close vicinity to the present city of Liang-chou-fu in Kan-su.

With such fundamental errors before us we can understand why it is impossible for Mr. Kingsmill to arrive at correct results in the most simple question of Chinese research. To expose his errors would require a volume, and would entail more valuable time than we can afford. Moreover, it is difficult to contradict him, because he makes mere assertions and seldom supports his opinions by reasons based on literature. The following is another characteristic example.

Of the country of K'ang-ku (康 畿) he says: "As a general mess has been made by translators over this country of K'angku, a few words may be useful. K'angku first appears in Szma Ts'ien, and is there, and, in the early Chinese authors, invariably Kashgar." No proof follows this startling assertion, but he goes on to speak about the descendants of Seljuk in the eleventh century, winding up with a sly hit at those wicked Sinologues who venture to differ, in saying: "A little knowledge, says Pope, is a dangerous thing, and in no instance do we find a better exemplification of the general truth of the aphorism
than in our would-be Chinese authorities." I cannot say that this kind of logic will convince me that ancient K’ang-kū is Kashgar. Has Mr. Kingsmill ever come across the following passage, describing the road from Tun-huang to the west along the southern slope of the T’en-shan to Su-lo [疏勒, i.e., the real Kashgar], "which is the northern road;" "west of the northern road," the account continues, "you cross the Ts’ung-ling, whence you come out to Ta-yüan [Fergana], K’ang-kū [Sogdiana] and An-ts’ai [the Aorsi; 北道西踏葱嶺出大宛康居奄蔡焉]!"

This passage occurs in the T’ien-han-shu (chapter 118, p. 6) and is certainly somewhat older than Mr. Kingsmill’s story of the Seldjucks. Or does Mr. Kingsmill maintain that the Ts’ung-ling is not the Ts’ung-ling? I do not intend to recapitulate the arguments which have induced Chinese scholars to identify K’ang-kū with Sogdiana or some territory in this neighbourhood, but west, not east, of the Ts’ung-ling. These scholars, I have reason to believe, are perfectly satisfied with the "little knowledge" so dangerous to them according to Mr. Kingsmill.

Another fatal mistake committed a generation ago and repeated usque ad nauseam up to his recent effusion about the Hsiungs-nu, is his identification of Ssu-ma T’ien’s An-ts’ai, also transcribed as Yen-ts’ai (奄蔡), the country of the Aorsi, subsequently called by western and Chinese authors alike Alan, or A-lau-na, with Samarkand. To arrive at this idea he has to do violence to a perfectly plain and simple passage in the Shi-ki (chap. 123, p. 54). It occurs in Ssu-ma T’ien’s account of An-si (安息, in Cantonese On-sak), i.e. Parthia, the linguistic basis of which name was, I am glad to observe, first correctly recognized by Mr. Kingsmill as Arsuk, the Chinese account substituting the name of its kings for that of the country (Journal, China Branch, etc., Vol. xv, p. 8, note 11). Unfortunately later editors have broken this text into two parts, 1. An-si (Parthia), and 2. T’iau-chi (Chaldæa). But

---

1 The character 者, k’i, after 者 yen, found in the present standard editions, has been clearly interpolated. It does not appear in the King-yu edition (1034–1058 A. D.; Han-shu-zi-yü-chuan-pu-chu, chap. 1, p. 5). Chavannes (T’oung-pao, 1907, p. 170) is, therefore, right in not translating it at all.
since T'iao-chü is represented in the text as forming part of the Parthian empire, I presume that the line being broken before T'iao-chü is due to a misunderstanding. To me the passage reads as follows: 安息 &c. ....... 其西則條枝北有安息, 條枝在安息西數千里臨西海 &c.

Speaking of An-si (Parthia), the author says in this passage: "West of it there is T'iao-chü (Chaldaea), in the north there is An-ts'ü (the Aorsi, or Alans); Li-kan (Syria) and T'iao-chü (Chaldaea) are several thousand 里 west of An-si (Parthia) near the western sea," &c.

The name Li-kan (黎軒) of the Shi-ki occurs in another transcription in the Ts'ien-han-shu (chap. 96a, p. 14b), according to which ambassadors from An-si (Parthia) brought as tribute to the emperor Wu-ti "big birds' eggs," i.e. ostrich eggs, and "jugglers" from Li-kiên (麗軒 賢人)." Since this passage is clearly copied from a parallel passage in the Shi-ki (p. 13b), the two names Li-kan and Li-kiên must have been identical in sound, though written with different characters in the two parallel passages. K'ang-hi's medieval authorities also describe the two characters as being identical in sound. The name occurs again in the Hsü-han-shu (chap. 118, p. 9b), which says: "The country of Ta-ts'ın (Syria) is also called Li-kiên (大秦國一名黎軒)." Since this third transcription is linguistically identical with that of the Ts'ien-han-shu, I do not hesitate to look upon the Li-kan of the Shi-ki as a variant of the name which, in the Hsü-han-shu and later records, is declared to be another name for Ta-tsin, or Syria.


2 It appears, however, that the character 軒, kien, had two ancient sounds, 1. けん, or kien, 2. kem. I refer to the work of Yang Shên (楊慎, died 1599 A.D.), reprinted in the Han-hai collection, Section 14, under the title Chuan-chu-ku-jin-lip (轉注古今略), where the character 軒 appears under the rhyme yin (十四聲) with the following note: 漢地理志臨軒縣名在張掖力長二習. I do not quite understand on what authority this statement is made; but if kien 古 can be shown to have been read kem during the Han period, this would tend to support from a linguistic point of view my conjecture, made on commercial grounds, as to the identity of Chinese Li-kan with Rekom, or Petra (see China and the Roman Orient, p. 187 seqq. and 171).
Now Mr. Kingsmill, who is so fond of fanciful and ingenious combinations, has an entirely different idea. He combines the two names An-ts'ai and Li-kan, each of which may be shown from ancient texts to have a distinct sense, and gives the following explanation (Journal, China Branch, &c., Vol. xiv. 1879, p. 7, note 9): "Im-ts'ai-li-kan แปลเมืองเหนือ. It seems most likely here that the two first characters are inverted and that we should read Ts'ai-im-li-kan, in the old pronunciation Sal-im-ar-kan for Salmarkanda, modern Samarkand, the Marakanda of Strabo and Ptolemy." And that in the face of the Shi-ki itself, on page 4, describing the country of "An-ts'ai" under this name pure and simple without any inversion and without the alleged appendix Li-kan. This description reads as follows: "An-ts'ai, about two thousand li northwest of K'ang-kü, is a nomad country and has in the main the same customs as K'ang-kü. Its archers number fully a hundred thousand. It lies close to a great ts'ö, which has no shores; for they say it is the 'Northern Sea' (兗在罇居西北可二千里行車馬與罇居大同俗控弦者十餘萬臨大澤無崖蓋乃北海云)."

Sü Sung (Han-shu-si-yü-chuan-pu-chu, chap. 1, p. 30) makes the following remarks in connection with the last sentence of my translation: "The Shuo-wén defines the word ai (巋) as meaning 'a high border'; this means that, since in looking into the far distance you do not see high shores, the raised parts must appear as low." A ts'ö (澤) thus described cannot be an ordinary "marsh." This, it is true, is the standard sense of the word; but broad sheets of deep water have also been called ts'ö, e.g. the Taiwu Lake near Soochow, which is known as "Ch'ün-ts'ö" (震澤), or the Lob-nor, which is called Yen-ts'ö (震澤), i.e. the "Salt Lake," or Lake Balkash, which is called "the biggest ts'ö in the north-western territories (西北境最大澤); Si-yü-shui-tau-ki, chap. 4, p. 42). Moreover, the text adds distinctly that "they say it is the 'Northern Sea' (北海), which would involve a gross exaggeration, if ta-ts'ö meant a mere marsh. It is for these reasons that I have translated "a great sea," and not "a great marsh," as Mr. Kingsmill does.

I do not, of course, object to the more literal translation, as long as it is understood that, since it is said to be "the Northern Sea," we must not think of a marsh in the or-
dinary sense of the word, I have, in my first paper on the subject, thought of the Black Sea as being covered by this ta-ts' b, but since its first mention goes clearly back to the oldest notice of the An-ts'ai (Aorsi), as placed on record in the Shi-ki, we have to look for their seats in their original homes between the banks of the Sea of Azof and the Caucasus. The Sea of Azof is described as a palus, i.e. "a swamp," by Pliny and other Romans. Early Greek writers speak of a Mæotēs λίμνη (Dionysius in C. Müller, Geogr. Graeci Minores, II, p. 111), and Jordanes (Mommsen, p. 89 seqq.), in his account of the Hunnic irruption, also styles it Palus Mæotis. This corresponds to what we know about the physical condition of its shores, which prompts Karl Neumann (Die Hellenen im Skythenlande, p. 536) to say: "Es verrät Sachkenntnis, wenn die Griechen die Maitis nie ein Meer, sondern stets eine Limne nannten." Herodotus (IV, 86) held that the Mæotis was not much smaller than the Pontus itself, and Ptolemy exaggerates its northern extension through more than six degrees of latitude (Bunbury, op. cit., Vol. ii, p. 591 seq.). This may have been a popular error among the ancients long before Ptolemy, repeated also at the court of the Indoscythians, where Greek traditions had been taken over from Bactria, and where Chang K'ien in 127 B.C. collected his notices of western countries subsequently reproduced in the Shi-ki. The Mæotis is said to be frozen in its northern part during the winter (K. Neumann, op. cit., p. 65), and this, too, may have helped to challenge comparison with the "Northern Sea" (Σκόρια), if this term refers to the Arctic Ocean as it apparently does in a passage of Pliny (II, 67), who says: "Ingens argumentum paludis Mæoticae, sive cae illius oceani sinus est, ut ultros adverto credisisse, sive angusto discreti situ restagnatio." It appears to me that the chief mistake made by Mr. Kingsmill in his attempts at identification is the ignoring of information, placed on record in notices quite as valuable as, though later than, those of Sî-ma Ts'ien. I am, of course, fully aware that the Shi-ki, in its chapter 123, is the very oldest source regarding the Chinese knowledge of Western Asia; but we should not forget that between the time when Chang K'ien laid his first report before Wu-ti (126 B.C.) and the time of Sî-ma Ts'ien's death, not much more than forty years may have elapsed and that much of the geographical
knowledge of the Chinese during the earlier Han Dynasty was placed on record soon after the Shi-ki was completed. Pan Ku's account in the Teien-han-shu, though compiled towards the close of the second century A.D., was based on records dating from the earlier Han Dynasty itself. Pan Ku's own brother, Pan Chau, must have returned from his famous expedition to the west with a tolerably complete knowledge of the facts placed on record in the Hou-han-shu, and during the period of the Three Kingdoms, at the beginning of the third century A.D., the knowledge of the west gained three hundred years before cannot have been forgotten, though added to and modified. Even the geographers of the Sui and the Tang dynasties (the latter with one notable exception, the division of foreign territories into nominal Chinese administrative districts), being so much nearer in time than we are to the Han period, must have been in the possession of traditions much more valuable as a source for identification than the linguistic speculations of a modern European. Mr. Kingsmill's Salim-ar-kand is one of these speculations. Why ignore what later, though still ancient, traditions tell us about Ants'ai? That so-called "old tradition which made Selim, the son of Feridun, the eponym of Samarkand" is extremely doubtful. The mention of a number of other supposed founders such as Alexander the Great and Shamar Abu Karib of South Arabia (Yakut, Vol. iii, p. 133), shows how little we know about the origin of the city, so that nobody can tell whether or not such a name existed at all during the second century B.C. Of Ants'ai, however, we read in the Hou-han-shu, chap. 118, p. 13: "The country of Ants'ai has changed its name into A-lan-liau (安南改名阿蘭聊國)." Professor Chavannes has proved beyond a doubt that by this name two different countries are covered, the one being called A-lan, the other Lian (Teoung-pao, 1907, p. 195 note 2, and 1905, p. 559 note 1); and according to the Wei-lio (I.c., p. 32) Ants'ai is also called A-lan (安南－名阿蘭).

1 Chavannes (Teoung-pao, 1905, p. 558, note 5) remarks with regard to this passage: "Hirth a bien montré (China and the Roman Orient, p. 139 note 1, et Uber Wolga-Hunnen und Hiung-nu, p. 249—251) que le nom Yen-tsa'i (prononcé Antsa'i) pouvait être de transcription du nom du peuple que Strabon appelle les 'Aopov. Le témoignage du Wei-lio que
But we have yet another transcription of the foreign name represented in Chang K’ien’s An-ts’ai. In the biography of the General Ch’ön T’ang (陳 漢, T’ien-han-shu, chap. 70, p. 78) we are told that Chü-ch’ü, the legitimate Shan-yü of the Hiung-nu, whom I look upon as the founder of Hunnic power near the confines of Europe (Über Wolga-Hunnen, &c., p. 269 seqq.) and who had been assigned to an unclaimed territory by his father-in-law, the king of K’ang-kü (Sogdiana), had attacked the capital of the Wu-sun and terrorized the population by his violence; that the Wu-sun were afraid to pursue him to his retreat, because an uninhabited waste on the western frontier obstructed the road for a thousand li (鳥 羽 不 放 走 西 畔 空 虚 不 爲 者 且 千 里); and that, after having committed all possible atrocities, he built a fortified city and “sent ambassadors to exact annual tribute from the countries of Ho-su (the Aorsi) and Ta-yüan (Ferghana), which these did not dare to refuse (遙 使 間 間 蘇 大 宛 何 國 還 不 敢 不 予).” The scholiast Yen Shi-ku refers to Hu Kuang (second century A. D.) as having said that “about a thousand li north of K’ang-kü there is a country called An-ts’ai, another name of which is Ho-su (闋 蘇),” and on this basis he concludes that the names An-ts’ai and Ho-su are identical. The two syllables ts’ai and su can easily be explained, both representing in their initials a sibilant in the transcription of foreign names and both representing a possible sai, sa, sa or su. The ho of Ho-su (闋 蘇) is read hop in Canton, and hak in Foochow. This latter sound could easily be proved to stand for har or ar. But Chinese sound authorities class the character with the rhyme “27. 合,” i.e. hop, and this is precisely what they do with a number of characters having the same final as an 色, e.g. 河, which is even now read both im (英) and yap or ap (英 色; see T’ang-yüan, chap. 20 et passim; Eitel, Cantonese Dictionary, p. 190). Though quite different in sound at the present day, the two characters may have been interchangeable at some time or other, the old final
possibly holding the middle between \( m \) and \( p \).\(^1\) Yen Shu-ku is, therefore, probably right in assuming the identity of the two names. The crux in the identification with the "\( \alpha \omega \rho \omicron \omicron \) of Strabo is the old final \( m \) in the first syllable of An-\( ts\'ai \). Precedents like Tam-\( mo \), 唐, for Dharma do not help us, because this transcription may stand for Pali Dhamma. I am in doubt about Sam-\( fo\)-\( ts\'i \) (三佛塞, Palembang in Sumatra), which as suggested by Groeneweldt (Notes on the Malay Archipelago, p. 62, note 3) might be identical with Arabic Sarbaza of doubtful tradition. It is possible, though not certain, that the hill-name Tam-man, 貫, 山, the Salan range, stands for Tarban, or Türmül, of the Old-Turkish inscriptions (see my Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk, pp. 41 seq. and 87 seq., and Parker in Thomson, Inscriptions de l’Orkhon déchiffrées, p. 196). But why must we have a linguistic precedent for \( m = r \) at all in the face of so much circumstantial evidence? We have other Chinese representatives of final \( r \), which in their way might be called ε\( \lambda \)\( \rho \)\( ο\)\( ν\)\( ο\)\( ν\)\( ο\), e.g. Huan Ts'ang’s 慶秣陀, nang-mot-to, which stands for Skrt. Nāmmada, the River Nerbudda (Eitel, 2nd ed., p. 107). Altogether I lay more stress on historical, than linguistic identification. The transcription A-\( l\)an (阿蘭) in the Hōu-han-shu and Wei-lo is clear and as little dependent upon differing ancient and dialectic sounds as any foreign name in Chinese records; it is as safe as if it were written in some alphabetic language to look upon it as representing the sound Alan, which in this neighbourhood and at the period of its first appearance in classical and Chinese literature alike can only apply to the Alans as a nation. According to the Hōu-han-shu, we have seen, the name A-\( l\)an had been changed from that of An-\( ts\'ai \), and Pliny (Nat. Hist., IV, 80), speaking of Scythic tribes says: "alias Getae, Daci, Romanis dicti, alias Sarmatae, Graecis Sauromatae, eorumque Hamaxobii aut Aoersi, alias Scythae degeneres et a servis orti aut Trogodytae, mox Alani et Rhoxa-

---

\(^1\) Pliny (VI, 88) refers to the Aoersi in one passage as Abroae, and it appears that the codices here offer no variants of this exceptional form (see Nat. Hist., rec. Detlefsen, I, 1866, p. 256), which may possibly be a mistake for Arroae. But if this were not the case, it might help to explain the finals \( m \) and \( p \) in the two Chinese transcriptions. Abroae might thus be a Latin mutilation of the Greek name heard with the digamma as Α\( \rho \)\( ρ \)\( ρ \).
In other words, he holds that the Alani were nearly related to, or formerly called, the Aorsi. This view, supported by quite a number of other arguments, has been adopted by modern European scholars (cf. Tomaszek in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie, etc., s. v. "Alani," "Aleanorsoi" — wahrscheinlich ein Konglomerat von "Alearoi" und "Aoposai, — and "Aorsoi"). That part of the Alans which figures in the history of western Europe during the fifth century soon disappeared without leaving traces of its existence; but the eastern Alans continued for generations "in their old seats in the steppes between the Caucasus, the River Don and the lower Volga, right among the Bulgars, the successors of the Huns; in Tauris, too, we find traces of them in the towns of Sogdia [Sogdak], and Theodosia (Kafja), about the year 500, had an Alanic name Abdardan (Tomaszek)." Under the Mongols the Alans were termed A-su (阿速), and sometimes A-sai, (阿思), the name A-lan occurring only once (Bretscheriderer, "Notices of the Mediaeval Geography," &c., in Journal, China Branch, &c., 1875, p. 261). These two forms may possibly be connected with the ancient names An-ts'ai and Ho-su.

With this material in hand we are now prepared to analyse what Mr. Kingsmill thinks an "improved" translation; for, with regard to my own, he says: "it is difficult to understand how he has been misled in the translation of a sufficiently simple passage, which refers to the Hsiang-nu only incidentally, and to the Hunami not at all."

I here insert Mr. Kingsmill's so-called translation of the Chinese text reproduced above.
Su(ke)te(h) is situated west of the Ts'ung-ling; it was the ancient Im-ts'ai and was also known as Wannasha. It lies close to a great marsh to the north-west of K'ang-kü, and is distant from Tai 16,000 li. In former days the Hiung-nu killed its king, and held possession of the country for three generations up to the time of King (H)wu'rsz.

"Formerly the merchants of this country went in numbers to dispose of their wares in the land of Liang; [a party] having entered Kutsang were made prisoners, and at the beginning of the reign Kao-ts'ung [of the Wei] the king of Su(ke)te(h) sent a mission requesting their enlargement."

"After this period no further diplomatic intercourse took place."

Before attempting any rectification I have to make a slight correction in the text. The character 己, ssü, should read 己, "a sign of the past," the two characters being easily confused (cf. Giles, Synoptical Studies in Chinese Character, No. 966—968). I have adopted this view through the perusal of a paraphrase furnished in a recent Chinese treatise on the subject, the Han-si-yu-lu-k'au (漢西域圖敘, chap. 6, by Li Kuang-t'ing, 李光廷, of Canton, preface dated 1870), which says: "In the beginning of the T'ai-an period of the emperor Wên-ch'üang [in reality 457 A.D. according to Wei-shu, chap. 5, p. 5*] the Hiung-nu prince Hu-ni, [his ancestors] having conquered the country three generations ago (己), sent ambassadors to ransom them [the prisoners], which was granted by imperial edict." It is with this one change in the text that I now add my own translation as first laid before the Munich Academy.

"The country of Suk-tak lies in the west of the Ts'ung-ling. It is the ancient An-ts'ai and is also called Wön-na-sha. It lies on a big sea [ts'ö] in the north-west of K'ang-kü [Sogdiana] and is 16,000 li distant from Tai. Since the time when the Hiung-nu killed their king and took possession of their country up to their king Hu-ni three generations have elapsed. The merchants of this country often went to the country of Liang for trade, and at the capture of Ku-tsang they were all made prisoners. In the beginning of the reign of Kau-tsung (462—466 A.D.) the king of Suk-tak sent ambassadors to ask for their ransom, which was granted by cabinet order. From
this time onward they sent no more tribute missions to our court."

It will be seen that Mr. Kingsmill’s mistakes are those of interpretation rather than of translation, though he was apparently not satisfied with my rendering 克姑滅 by the German "bei der Eroberung von Ku-tsang." 克, k'o, means "to conquer," whether you conquer a city, a country, or your own self. Cf. Giles, No. 6115: 攻城不克, "to attack a city and not conquer it," or "to make an unsuccessful attack upon a city." Mr. Kingsmill’s "a party having entered Ku-tsang" is an absolute mistake. The relative clause 誠聽焉 is left untranslated. Apart from the different spelling of names, his mistakes are thus the only points in which Mr. Kingsmill’s rendering differs materially from the one he found in my German paper. I, therefore, fail to see what induces him to say: "it is difficult to understand how he has been misled in the translation of a sufficiently simple passage."

As regards his interpretation, the one point of his disagreement, the identification of the country called An-ts’ai, is, of course, the pivot on which the entire question turns. Chang Ki’en, in his report, merely placed on record what his friends at the Indoscythian court had told him. They were the same informants who supplied him with that interesting word p’u-t’an (葡萄), "the grape,"—Greek βύρτος according to Mr. Kingsmill’s own happy idea, and who are known to have used coins with Greek legends as shown in Cunningham’s papers on the "Coins of the Indoscythians" in the Numismatic Chronicle. Chang Ki’en’s report on An-ts’ai is in my opinion the oldest example of the introduction into Chinese literature of a piece of classical lore, to wit, the story of the Μαυρός Λύκεων with its vast extension to the north and its connection with the Óceanos, here "the Northern Sea."

According to my view Hu-ni (麴, 曲, Hut-nqai) is Hernak, the youngest son of King Attila, who after the death of his father in 454 A.D. withdrew to the extreme parts of Scythia Minor ("Hernac quoque, junior Attilae filius, cum suis in extrema minoris Scythiae sedes delegit." Jordanes, ed. Mommsen, p. 127), which Strabo identifies with the present Crimea, and here according to Tomasechek the Alans had their city of Sogdak (Sudak, Soldain, &c.) since 212 A.D. All this is, however, immaterial. The main point I wish to contest against Mr. Kingsmill is the
identification of the term An-ts'ai, so sadly misunderstood by him. If once we are convinced that An-ts'ai, A-lan and Suk-tak must be the Alans of western sources, we are justified in drawing the following logical conclusions:

1. Of the Alans we know from European sources that, just about three generations before the embassy sent to China by the state of Suk-tak (former Alans) in 457 A.D., they were conquered by the Huns.

2. Of the Suk-tak nation we learn in the Wei-shu that their ancestors, the An-ts'ai (Aorsi, Alans), three generations before their embassy of 457 A.D., were conquered by the Hiung-nu.

3. Since the same nation cannot at the same time be conquered by two different nations, the result is that the Huns and the Hiung-nu are identical. Q. E. D.
Early Chinese notices of East African territories.—By
FRIEDRICH HIRTH, Professor in Columbia University,
New York City.

The earliest accounts in Chinese literature of Western territories contain no allusions of any kind that we might interpret as referring to any part of the African Continent. The name Li-kan, or Li-kién, which occurs in Su-ma Ts'ien’s Shih-chi (about 86 B. C.) is there coupled with that of Ti-an-chü (Chaldaea), and since in records that date from a few generations later the term is persistently declared to be identical with that of Ta-ts'ın, the Roman empire in its eastern provinces, I do not hesitate to look upon it as covering the Roman Orient, possibly including Egypt. This is also the case with the accounts of Ta-ts’in contained in the Hou-han-shu,—applying mainly to the first century A. D.,—in which the direction of the silk trade via Antioch in Margiana, Ktesiphon, Hira and, by the peripus of the Arabian peninsula, to the silk-buying factories of the Phenician coast, such as Tyre, Sidon and Berytos, is clearly indicated. Yet no mention of African ports can be traced back earlier than the beginning of the third century A. D., when fresh information, though transmitted unfortunately in sorely disfigured texts, had reached China. I refer to the account of the Wei-liao, where the city of Alexandria is manifestly meant by the name Wu-ch’-san. I admit that the Wei-liao is not very clear in its details regarding the dependencies of Ta-ts’in; but the one passage I refer to leaves but little doubt that Wu-ch’-san is Alexandria. It says: “At the city of Wu-ch’-san, you travel by river on board ship one day, then make a round at sea, and after six days’

1 For texts and translations see my China and the Roman Orient, Shanghai, 1885, passim.

2 An historical work referring to one of the so-called “Three Kingdoms,” the state of Wei (535 to 557 A. D.) and compiled between 230 and 265 A. D. See Chavannes, “Les pays d’occident d’après le Wei-liao” in T’oung-pao, Série ii, Vol. vi, No. 5, pp. 519, seq.
passage on the great sea, arrive in this country [Tats'in, or its capital Antioch]." This, I hold, describes the journey from Alexandria to Antioch. The first character of the Chinese transcription, *wu* (black), may stand for *a* and *u* in the rendering of Indian sounds; and it also represents the vocalic element of the first syllable (*a*, *o* or *e*) in the several West-Asiatic forms for "ebony," such as Persian *ahna*, in their Chinese equivalent *wu-man-tzē*. The second character *chʰ* (slow) stands for *di*, and the three characters may be said to stand for *adisan* or *odisan*, thus furnishing a still recognizable distortion of the name Alexandria. Unfortunately Chinese texts have preserved nothing beyond that name, assuming our interpretation of its transcription is at all correct.

In point of age the next mention in Chinese literature of an African territory is an account applying probably to the beginning of the Tang dynasty. It occurs in a text devoted to the Ta-shūi, i. e., the Arabs of the Khalif empire, in the *Tang-shu* (chap. 221b, p. 19), in a passage describing the extent of the Ta-shū dominions, "in the east of which there are the Tu-ki-shūi," i. e., the Tūrgāsh of the Old-Turkish stone inscriptions, the "south-west being connected with the sea." The Tūrgāsh being mentioned as the Eastern neighbors of the Ta-shū seems to indicate that the account belongs to the early part of the eighth century. It reads as follows:

"In the south-west [of the Ta-shūi, or Arabs] is the sea and in the sea there are the tribes of *Po-pa-li* [in Cantonese and old Chinese *Pū-pu-līk*, which I look upon as a transcription of *Barbarik*]. These do not belong to any country, grow no grain, but live on meat and drink a mixture of milk and cow's blood; they wear no clothes, but cover their body with sheep-

---

1 St. Julien, *Méthode pour déchiffrer et transcrire les noms Sanscrits, etc.*, No. 1313 and 1314.
4 See my paper "Chinese equivalents of the letter R in foreign names" in *Journ. of the China Branch, R. A. S.*, Vol. xxi (1886), p. 219. As there shown, final *t* in old Chinese stands for final *r*; *l* stands for *r*; and *t* before *l* (or *r*) becomes *l* (or *r*) by assimilation (see Schlegel in *Toung-pao*, 1900, p. 199).
skins. Their women are intelligent and graceful. The country produces great quantities of ivory and of the incense o-mo [in Cantonese o-mut = omyr, standing for Persian ambar, i.e. ambergri].

"When the traveling merchants of Po-si (Persia) wish to go there for trade, they must go in parties of several thousand men, and having offered cloth cuttings and sworn a solemn oath (lit. "a blood oath") will proceed to trade."

Another account written generations before the Tang-shu, the work of Ou-yang Sin completed in 1060 A.D., occurs in the Yu-yang-tsa-tsu by Tuan Ch'üng-shih, who died in 863 A.D. The transcription here used is identical with that of the Tang-shu, viz: Po-pa-li (Put-pu-li = Barbarik). Tuan Ch'üng-shih says (chap. 4, p. 3° seq.):

"The country of Po-pa-li is in the south-western sea. The people do not know how to grow grain and live on meat only. They are in the habit of sticking needles into the veins of cattle, thus drawing blood, which they drink raw, on having it mixed with milk. They wear no clothes, but cover their looms with sheep-skins. Their women are clean, white and upright. The inhabitants make their own countrymen prisoners, whom they sell to the foreign merchants at prices several times [more than what they would fetch at home]. The country produces only elephants' teeth and u-mo [ambergris]. If the Persian merchants wish to go to this country they form parties of several thousand men and make gifts of strips of cloth, and then everyone of them, including the very oldest men and tender youths, have to draw their blood wherewith to swear an oath, before they can dispose of their goods. From olden times they were not subject to any foreign country. In fighting they use elephants' teeth and ribs and the horns of wild oxen made into halberds, and they wear armour and have bows and arrows. They have 200,000 foot soldiers. The Ta-shi (Arabs) make constant raids upon them."

My identification of these two short accounts, which appear to be derived from a common source earlier than the year 863, is based chiefly on the great similarity which the Chinese transcription bears to the name of Berbera, the city and country on the east coast south of Abyssinia, and on the mention of ivory and ambergris as the chief products. Ambergris was as a matter of fact exported from the coast
of Berbera. The identification is, however, further supported by a later account of the same country in the Chiu-fan-chi of Chau Ju-kua, who describes it under the name Pi-pa-lo, in Cantonese: Pat-pa-lo, which is another intelligible transcription of the foreign sound Barbara.

Chau ju-kua describes the country as follows:

"The country of Pi-pa-lo contains four chou (cities), the remaining places being villages rivalling each other in influence and might. The people worship heaven, they do not worship Buddha. The country produces many camels and sheep, and the ordinary food of the people consists of camels' flesh, milk and baked cakes. The country has ambergris [lung-hien, lit. "Dragon's Spittle," the standard word for ambergris, see Giles, No. 4508], big elephants' tusks and big rhinoceros horns. There are elephants' tusks which weigh over a hundred catties and rhinoceros horns of ten catties and more. There is also much putchuck, liquid storax, myrrh, and tortoise-shell of great thickness, for which there is great demand in other countries. Among the products there is further the "camel crane" [lo-to-hou, i.e., the ostrich]. It measures from the ground to the top of its head six or seven feet. It has wings and can fly, but not to any great height. There is an animal called


2 Regarding this author see my papers "Die Länder des Islam nach chinesischem Quellen", T'oung-pao, Supplément, Vol. v, Leiden 1894, p. 12 seqq., and "Chau Ju-kua, a new source of mediaeval geography" in Journal, R. A. S., 1896, p. 57 seqq. Chau Ju-kua probably wrote at the time of the last Abbaside caliph Mustasim (1242 to 1258 A. D.), since in his description of Bagdad ("Die Länder des Islam," etc., p. 41) he describes its king as a linear descendant of Mohammed the Prophet, and adds that the throne was handed down to his own times through twenty-two generations. If we look upon Cessai as the genealogical head of the several generations the sixth of which saw the prophet himself, the twenty-second was that of the caliph Mustasim. The latest date mentioned in Chau Ju-kua's work is 1210 A. D. In the Ling-tei-tai-te by Chou K'ü-fei, published in 1178, which goes over the same field as the Chiu-fan-chi and from which about one-third of the matter placed on record by Chau Ju-kua has been copied (see K. Tsuhoi, "Chau Ch'ü-fei's Aufzeichnungen," etc., in Actes, XIIème Congrès Intern. des Orientalistes, Rome, 1899, Vol. ii, pp. 69-125), no mention is made of Pi-pa-lo.
tsu-la [in Cantonese: tsu-lup, a transcription of Arabic zarafa, the giraffe]. It resembles a camel in shape, an oxen in size, and it is of a yellow colour. Its front legs are five feet long, its hind legs only three feet. Its head is high up and turns upwards. Its skin is an inch thick. There is also a mule with brown, white and black stripes around its body. These animals wander about the mountain wilds; they are a variety of the camel. The people of the country are great huntsmen and hunt these animals with poisoned arrows."

Mr. W. W. Rockhill, who has collaborated with me in the publication of my translation of Chau Ju-kua's ethnographical sketches, holds that the "four cities" referred to are Berbera, the Malao of the Periplus, and Zeyla, the mart of the Aulites of the Periplus to the west of it; and to the east of Berbera, Mehet or Mait, the Monudon of the Greeks, and Lasgori or Guesele, the Mosallon of the Greeks. He refers to Ibn Batuta (II. 180), who says of Zeyla that it was an important city, but extremely dirty and bad-smelling on account of the custom of the people of killing camels in the streets. He also notes that the sheep of this country are famous for their fat. At Mulkashau, our Magadoxo or Mugdishn, he says, they killed several hundred camels a day for food. In the first century A. D. the Periplus mentions myrrh, a little frankincense, tin, ivory, tortoise-shell, odoriferous gums and cinnamon among the exports of the Berbera coast.

The Chinese name "camel-crane" is a translation of the Persian name of the ostrich, shutor-murgh, meaning "camel-bird" (Breuschneider, Mediaeval Researches, London 1888, Vol. i. p. 144, note 392). Chou K'ua-fel refers to the "camel-crane" in similar terms in his account of the Zinj tribes, but he adds that it eats all possible things, even blazing fire or red-hot copper or iron. In other words he justifies its wellknown characteristic, which is conveyed in the popular adage the "stomach of an ostrich." The Chinese author speaking of the camel as the animal from which the "striped mule" is descended would seem strange, if we did not assume that his remark on that point refers to the three animals, the ostrich, the giraffe and the mule. It certainly holds good for the giraffe, which, as Mr. Rockhill points out, was held by some to be a variety of camel, e.g. by Mas'udi (Prairies d'or, III 3). Mr. Rockhill has the following note regarding the striped mule of Pi-pa-lo: "This, I suppose,
is the same animal as the "hua-fu-lu," or "spotted fu-lu," of the Ming-shî, 326: Bretschneider (Ancient Chinese and Arabs, 21 note 7) says that "the hua fu-lu is probably the Hippotigris Burchelli; or Douw, the Tiger-horse of the ancients, which was brought several times to Rome from Africa. It inhabits the deserts of Eastern Africa, between the equator and the tenth degree of northern latitude, whilst the two other species of this genus of the horse family, the Zebra and the Quagga, are to be met with only in Southern Africa." Mr. Rockhill refers to Barbosa, who says that the people of Magadoxo "use herbs with their arrows."

There can be but little doubt that the Chinese account of Pi-pa-lo refers to Berbera, and this involves a broad hint as to the identification of another sketch of Chan Ju-kua's which is found in the Chu-fan-chi under the designation Chung-li. It reads as follows:

"The people of the country of Chung-li go bareheaded and barefooted; they wrap themselves about with cotton stuffs, for they dare not wear jackets, since wearing jackets and turbans is a privilege reserved for the ministers and courtiers of the king. The king lives in a brick house covered with glazed tiles, the people live in huts of palm-leaves thatched with grass. Their daily food consists in baked flour-cakes, sheep's and camel's milk. There are great numbers of cattle, sheep and camels."

"Among the countries of the Ta-shî (Arabs) this is the only one which produces frankincense."

"There are many sorcerers among them, who are able to change themselves into birds, beasts or fish and by these means keep the ignorant people in a state of terror. If some one of them while trading with a foreign ship has a quarrel, the sorcerers cast a charm over the ship, so that it can neither go forward or backward, and they only release the ship when the dispute has been settled. The government has formally forbidden this practice."

"Every year countless numbers of birds of passage alight on the desert parts of the country. When the sun rises they suddenly vanish so that one cannot find a trace of them. The people catch them with nets and eat them; they are remarkably savoury. They are in season till the end of spring, but as
soon as summer comes they disappear to return the following year."

"When one of the people dies and they are about to put him in his coffin, his kinsfolks from near and far come to condole. Each person flourishing a sword in his hand, goes in and asks the mourners the cause of the person’s death. 'If he was killed by someone,' each one says, 'we will revenge him on the murderer with these swords.' Should the mourners reply that he was not murdered, but came to his end by the will of heaven, they throw away their swords and break into violent wailing."

"Every year there are driven on the coast a great many dead fish measuring as much as twenty ch'ang in length, and two ch'ang through the body. The people do not eat the flesh of these fish, but cut out their brains, marrow and eyes, from which they get oil, often as much as three hundred tōng. They mix this oil with lime to caulk their ships, and use it also in lamps. The poor people use the ribs of these fish as rafters, the back-bones as door-leaves and they cut off the vertebrae to make mortars with."

"There is a shan [hill, range of hills, island, promontory, or high coast] in this country which forms the boundary of Pi-pa-lo [Berbera]. It is 4,000 li in circumference; for the most part it is uninhabited. Dragon’s blood is obtained from this shan [hill, island, etc.], also aloes, and from the waters, tortoiseshell and ambergris [liang-hien, lit. Dragon’s Spittle]."

"It is not known whence ambergris comes; it suddenly appears in lumps of from three to five catties, driven on the shore by the wind. The people of the country make haste to divide it up, lest ships run across it at sea and fish it up."

The essential point in the identification of this country of Chung-li is the mention of a shan, which may mean "a range of hills," at the boundary of Pi-pa-lo (Berbera). This port, well-known to the Arabs of the thirteenth century, was indeed separated from the adjoining high plateau by a range of hills, the natural boundary between the territory of Berbera and Somaliland. The extent of the shan, in this case "a plateau," being stated to be 4,000 li, would point to a large tract of land. I would not lay too much stress on the name Chung-li;
but final *ng* has been used to transcribe final *m* (see Julien, *Méthode*, etc., Nos. 485 and 486: *kany* for Sanscrit *kam* and *ghau*); *chung*, middle, is pronounced *tsany* at Shanghai, and *ts* is quite commonly interchanged with initial *s*, e.g., in the title *sengün*, "a general," of the Old-Turkish stone inscriptions, which stands for Chinese *tsiăng-kūn*. Chung-li may thus possibly be a transcription of the sound *Somali* or *Somal*. Another important characteristic is the remark that this country is the only one among the Ta-shū, or Arab, territories which produces frankincense. This, even if we admit the coast of Hadramaut to have participated in this industry, is a broad hint as to its identification with Somaliland.

Mr. Rockhill is of the opinion that the island of Socotra corresponds to Chau Ju-kua’s Chung-li, and in support of this view he quotes a number of interesting parallels from mediaeval authors. Thus the aloe, mentioned as one of the products of Chung-li, is referred to by Mas’udi (III, 37), who calls it *scoctri* from, the name of the island; Marco Polo (II, 398-399, Yule, 2nd ed.) says of its people, "they have a great deal of ambergris," and he relates the almost identical story told by Chau Ju-kua more than a century before him in connection with his Chung-li. He says (p. 399): "And you must know that in this Island there are the best enchanters in the world. It is true that their Archbishop forbids the practise to the best of his ability, but 'tis all to no purpose, for they insist that their forefathers followed it, and so must they also. I will give you a sample of their enchantments. Thus, if a ship be sailing past with a fair wind and a strong, they will raise a contrary wind and compel her to turn back. In fact they make the wind blow as they list and produce great tempests and disasters; and other such sorceries they perform, which

---

1 F. A. Flückiger, *Pharmakognosie des Pflanzenreiches*, 3rd ed., Berlin 1891, p. 45 seqq.: "Die Bäume, welche den Weihrauch liefern, wachsen im Lande der Somalitämme, im äußersten Osten Afrikas, sowie auch auf den jenseits liegenden südostarabischen Küstenstrichen Hadramaut, Schehr und Mahrah." "Der meiste und geschätztste Weihrauch wird im nordöstlichen Somaliland gesammelt." "In Arabien eingeführter oder dort gesammelter Weihrauch nimmt auch die Namen arabischer Landschaften an, z. B. Schehr, Morbat, Dhofar." In a special chapter on frankincense Chau Ju-kua mentions just these three places as producers of the drug.
it will be better to say nothing about in our Book." Chau Ju-kua is less discreet, when he informs us that the sorcerers of Chung-li changed themselves into birds or fish, in order to terrorize the population. According to him "the Government has forbidden such practices." This applies in Socotra to the "Archbishop," —in reality as late as 1281 a bishop ordained by the Nestorian patriarch of Bagdad (Assemani. Bibl. Orient. IV, p. 780). Rockhill quotes two other stories of sorcerers, one from Purchas' Pilgrims (IX, 254), who quotes Friar Joaoo dos Santos (A.D. 1597) as describing quite a similar trick practised by a great sorcerer on the isle of Zanzibar, and another, mentioned by Ibn Batuta (IV, 227), of sorcerers on an island in the eastern part of the Indian Ocean, who "raised storms by enchantment when vessels did not pay the customary tribute."

Taking into account the parallels to which Mr. Rockhill has drawn attention, I feel tempted to accept his suggestion as regards Socotra. The translation of shan by "a rocky island" is certainly objectionable, and since nearly all that can be shown to apply to Socotra from western sources occurs in the text after the words "there is a shan in this country," etc., the concluding part of the chapter may be regarded as an appendix to the account of Chung-li describing this outlying island of Socotra. The shan being stated to measure "four thousand li in circumference," fairly corresponds to the ideas current among western geographers of the period, if we look upon the li not as the Chinese li, but as the thirtieth part of a parasang, or a stadium, in which sense I have shown it is to be taken in the identifications of several western Asiatic itineraries (see my China and the Roman Orient, pp. 222-225).

Four thousand li would thus be equal to 133 parasangs. This may be an exaggerated estimate of the size of the island, but scarcely more so than the statements of Yakut (Wüstenfeld III p. 109, quoting al Hamadání) and Abulfeda (Geogr. d.'A., ed. Reinand and de Slane, Paris 1840, p. 371,—kindly furnished to me by Prof. Göttheil),—who state that the length of Socotra alone was "eighty parasangs."

This part of the coast of Africa was certainly well-known and much frequented by Arab and Persian traders during the thirteenth century. Chau Ju-kua is well acquainted with its products such as frankincense, aloe, dragon's blood
and ambergris, and since all these were staple articles of the Chinese market, we may infer that direct commerce was carried on through the mediation of Arab skippers plying between Ts’uan-chou-fu (Zaitun) and Canton in the Far East and the several ports en route, including those of Africa, and their Arabian homes. We need not be astonished, therefore, to find that remnants of the mediaeval intercourse between the coasts of China and Eastern Africa have actually been discovered. In April 1898 two small collections of Chinese coins were sent to me for identification, one by Dr. F. L. Stuhlmann, now at the head of the biological and agricultural Institute at Amani (East Africa), the other by Mr. Justus Strandes, both well-known African travellers. Dr. Stuhlmann wrote me that his collection of eight coins had been excavated in the neighbourhood of Mugdisho on the Somali coast together with a great many broken pieces of Chinese celadon porcelain, vitreous paste and Arabic coins; Mr. Strandes, who had purchased his collection of seven coins at the same place, wrote in similar terms. Both collections are now in the “Museum für Völkerkunde” of Berlin. The several coins were unfortunately in a bad state of preservation, but they were without exception of the Chinese type, i. e. round with a square hole and of bronze.

Those coins the legends of which I was able to identify are all dated from before the beginning of the thirteenth century, the eleventh and twelfth centuries being chiefly represented. I am, therefore, inclined to ascribe them to the very period covered by Chau Ju-kua’s account of Chung-li, which, owing to the fact that the Ling-wei-tai-ta of 1178 contains no mention of these territories, must be placed between this date and Chau Ju-kua’s time, i. e. about 1242 A. D. Chinese junks have visited Mugdisho in 1430 (see my Ancient Porcelain, Shanghai, 1888, p. 62 and note 155), but since no coins of the Ming Dynasty could be traced in the two small collections, unless they were among the few hopelessly disfigured unidentified specimens, I conclude that these unique traces of Chinese intercourse so far discovered had nothing to do with that later period.

Of the east coast south of Somaliland we possess short accounts of an island called Ts’ong-pa and of a country Kun-lun-ts‘ong-ki, both by Chau Ju-kua.
Ts'ong-pa, in Cantonese Ts'ang-pat, may be a transcription of Zanquebar, or Zanzibar.

Chau Ju-kua's text runs as follows:

"The Ts'ong-pa country is an island of the sea south of Hu-ch'a-la [Guzerat]. On the west it borders on a great mountain."

"The inhabitants are of Ta-shi stock and follow the religion of the Ta-shi. They wrap themselves in blue foreign cotton stuffs and wear red leather shoes. Their daily food consists of meal, baked cakes and mutton."

"There are many villages and wooded hills, and lines of hills rising one above the other."

"The climate is warm, and there is no cold season. The products of the land include elephants' tusks, native gold, or gold bullion, ambergris and yellow sandalwood."

"Every year Hu-ch'a-la [Guzerat] and the Ta-shi settlements along the sea-coast send ships to trade white cotton cloth, porcelain, copper and red ki-pet [cotton] in this country."

The chief difficulty in the explanation of this account is the mention of sandalwood among the products of the country, since it is not likely that Indian, Timorese, or far-eastern varieties were brought to this out-of-the-way part of the Indian Ocean as a market. I do not know whether the dye made of the rock-moss, or orchil, of Zanzibar may possibly be confounded with some dye made of sandalwood. The mistake might perhaps be accounted for in this way.

On the other hand we have unmistakeable evidence of the importation of Chinese porcelain. The late Dr. W. S. Bushell, in a review of my book on "Ancient Porcelain" (North-China Daily News, May 9th, 1888) has the following remarks on this point:

"Arabian writers tell us of fleets of large Chinese junks in the Persian Gulf in the eighth century, and the return voyage of Marco Polo in the suite of a Mongol Princess from Zayton to Hormuz is well-known. The "Chu Fan-chi," a book on foreign countries by Chao Ju-kua, an author of the Sung Dynasty, was published a century before the time of Marco Polo. Dr. Hirth quotes this to trace the export of porcelain even as far as the coast of Zanzibar, the great African mart of ivory and ambergris, which is described
under the name of Ts'eng-p'o. I may add that Sir John Kirk during his residence as Consul-General at Zanzibar, made a collection of ancient Chinese céladon porcelain, which he took to the British Museum last year. Some of it was dug up, I believe from ruins, mixed with Chinese cash of the Sung Dynasty, a striking confirmation of the Chinese writer, who was Inspector of Foreign Trade and Shipping in Fuhkien Province."
A Door from the Madrasah of Barlūk.—By Richard J. H. Gottheil, Professor in Columbia University, New York City.

The doors, of which a separate photograph for each wing is here given, are to-day placed in the entrance to the Hispanic Museum in New York City. They were bought in Cairo some years ago by Mr. Archer Huntington and belong to the finest period of Egypto-Muhammedan metal work. The doors are in a perfect condition; and though it looks as if in one or two places they had been restored, the restoration has been so cleverly done that it is hardly apparent. Each wing is made of wood completely covered with bronze. Along the sides the metal is very thin and artistically kept in place by nails forming diminutive rosettes. The rest of the wood is covered with thick pieces of metal so cut as to form polygonal rosettes the angles of which are filled up or embossed so that the rosettes stand out in relief. All of the embossed work, again, is damaskeened with silver and part of the unembossed surface is damaskeened with gold. Each leaf has a finely chiseled knocker placed about two-thirds of the way up. The inscription commences at the lower end of the right-hand leaf and is of silver damaskeened in plaques of bronze. It is in the late Naskhi form of the Mamluke period, and reads as follows: "

"Glory to our master the Sultan al-Malik al-Zahir Saif ad-dunya wal-din Abu Sa'id Barlūk, Sultan of Islam and the Muhammadans, the one who is munificent to orphans and to the poor, the help of warriors and of those who fight for the faith. It was finished in the month Rabi' al-Awwal in the year seven hundred and eighty eight of the Hijra."

On the bosses of the four central rosettes is the name Barlūk. In the centre of the rosettes in the middle which are
A door from
the Madrasah of Barkūk.
divided into halves there are also inscriptions which I have not been able to decipher satisfactorily.

It is quite evident that we have here a door from a building put up by the Burji Mamluke Zahir Saif al-Din Barkuk who came to the throne in 784 A. H. (=1382 A.D.). The doors were finished in April of the year 1386. It is also evident that the doors come from the Barkukiyyah or, as it is called, the Zahiriyyah al-Jadidah—the Madrasah built by Barkuk in the Suk al-Nahhasin, which served also as a convent for the Sufis. Van Berchem has given in his Corpus a number of other inscriptions similar to the one on these doors. The Madrasah has been often restored; within recent years by Herz Bey.

The inscription, however, contains one or two difficulties which it is hard to surmount. I do not refer to the form for اللة; that is not at all uncommon; but to the manner in which the date is expressed. The hundreds placed first is not an impossible construction, as compound numbers in Arabic can be expressed either in an ascending or a descending scale. But here the units are placed between the hundred and the decade, which will not do at all. Indeed, the whole order of the numerals is unusual in inscriptions. In many hundreds of inscriptions coming from Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia I have not found one case in which the order of the numerals is other than that of the ascending scale.

In addition to this, the last word of the inscription is uncommon. The expressions used are: عميرتatu for the عميراتatu. The only other case in which I have found it used is in the inscription of Ahmad ibn Muzaffar al-Din Uthmân ibn Mankurs on the fortress of Muleibbah in Northern Syria. The want of space may have occasioned the use of the shortened form in our inscription.

It would be hazardous to pronounce a judgment upon the genuineness of this door. But, it is surprising that Van Berchem in his Corpus of the Arabic inscriptions at Cairo mentions
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2 Van Berchem, Inscriptions Arabes de Syrie (Le Caire 1897), p. 86.
3 loc. cit. p. 304.
the fact that in the year 1893 a dealer, Hatoun, in the
Monski of that city, had for sale a door very similar (to judge
from the description given by Van Berchem) to the one at
present under discussion. The inscription is exactly similar
to the one I have given, only with the word جبریه omitted.
Van Berchem could not find any reason for the slightest
suspicion and pronounced the door to be genuine; but Herz
Bey pronounced it to be a piece of modern work manufactured
in the selfsame year 1893, and his judgment was supported
by others on the spot.

To add to the difficulty, Migeon, in his Manuel d'art Musul-
man, II, p. 196, gives a reproduction of a mosque door which
in every artistic particular is an exact copy of the one under
discussion, with the exception of the outer border which has
less rows of nails than has the door in the Hispanic Museum.
The inscription, however, is different and is similar both in
the upper and lower bands:

"Glory to our master the Sultan, the fighter for the faith,
Muhammad al-Nâṣir Sultan of Islâm and the Muhammedans,"
l. e. Nâṣir al-Dîn Muhammad ibn Kala'ûn, who ruled several
times in Egypt towards the end of the 13th century. Migeon
states that these doors are in the Arabic Museum in Cairo;
but I can not find them mentioned in the latest edition of the
Catalogue of that Museum.

1 loc. cit. p. 770.
2 Catalogue raisonné des monuments exposés dans le Musée Nationale
de l'Art Arabe ..., par Herz Bey (2nd Ed.). Le Caire 1906, pp. 173,
177, 212.

Postscript (August 18, 1908). In a letter, dated July 15.
1909, Herz Bey confirms my suspicions in regard to the
genuineness of the doors. He writes that they were made in
the year 1892 by an Arab workman named 'Ali al-Shiyasht
علي الشياشت for the Cairo Street of the Midway Plaisance
in the Chicago World's Fair. 'Ali, however, could not come
to an understanding with the managers of the "Street" in
regard to the price, and the doors remained in Cairo, where
they passed into the possession of the dealer Hatoun.
A Hymn to Bêl (Tablet 29623, CT. XV, Plates 12 and 13).—By FREDERICK A. VANDERBURGH, Ph. D., Columbia University, New York City.

The following is one of the collection of twelve unilingual non-Semitic Babylonian hymns copied from tablets in the British Museum by Mr. L. W. King, M. A., Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, and published in "Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum by Order of the Trustees," Volume XV.

Dr. J. Dyneley Prince, Professor of Semitic Languages in Columbia University, and myself have now translated the whole collection. Professor Prince has published three: viz. "To the Goddess Bau;" "To the God Nergal," and "To the Goddess Girgilu." "I have published in my "Sumerian Hymns" four: "To Bêl;" "To Sin," "To Adad," and "To Tammuz." I have another "To Bêl" that is expected to appear in the Journal of the American Oriental Society, and still another "To Bêl" is in preparation. The one of which a transliteration, translation and commentary are given in this Article is the fourth and last one "To Bêl" in the collection.

I am not aware that the hymn treated in this Article has ever been translated before or published.

This hymn in which Bêl is addressed in both the Eme-Ku and the Eme-Sal dialects of the non-Semitic literature of Babylonia must be recognized as very ancient. It is evident that Bêl is invoked here as the ruler of the nations in the same spirit in which he is honored in the inscriptions of the kings of the predynastic and early dynastic periods from the time of En-šag-kušanna until the time of Hammurabi. When the hymn was composed, Nippur, Ur and Larsa, the three cities therein mentioned, were flourishing towns.

Our copy of the hymn, however, is not Old-Babylonian, but New-Babylonian. While the composition is very old, the copy is not. For example, GIR or ELIM, MA, LUL, TA, KAN, BU are Old-Babylonian, but the following signs are New-
Babylonian: BIT, ZI, UN, AN, KIT, GA, DA, MI, TUR, IM, EN, NE, DAMAI, AZAG, KA, MAH, ŠIS, BL.

This hymn is apparently the most beautiful and interesting one of the four addressed to Bêl in CT. XV, 7-30. The conception of the subject is very picturesque and the lyrical quality characteristic of the religious literature of the Semitic race is fully as apparent here as in other Babylonian hymns. The thought is wrought into rhythmic stichs for recitation in divine service with some traces of strophic division. The essential attributes of the god and the power he exercises over the lands are dwelt upon, but, above all, attention seems to be focused on the heroic administration of Bêl in the conquest of an insubordinate city.

As to thought and form of statement, the hymn is clearly divided into three parts. Lines one to nine contain descriptive epithets of Bêl's divine attributes. (1) Bêl is known as the 'mighty one,' expressed by the Assyrian kabtu, synonymous with either giur or elim, and suggestive of the Scriptural idea 'almighty.' (2) Bêl was 'lord of the lands;' this uman corresponds to the Semitic bêlu, 'proprietor' of the lands: a 'lord' was an 'owner.' As Anu was the heaven god, Sin the moon god, Šamaš the sun god, Ištar the star deity, so Bêl was the earth god. (3) Bêl was a 'righteous' god, being called 'lord of righteous command.' (4) Bêl was a god of 'providence,' being 'father of the word of destiny.' (5) Bêl's particular care reached over the Babylonians; he was 'shepherd of the blackheaded.' (6) Bêl was a god of vengeance, a 'wild bull executing judgment on the enemy.' (7) Bêl was omniscient, 'the all-seeing one.'

Lines ten to twenty particularize the location of Bêl's dominion. The seat of his cult was Nippur, but he was honored also in Ur and Larsa. His temple, E-kur, was located in Nippur, whither kings and princes from distant lands came to do him homage.

In lines one to twenty it may be noticed that with a single exception a characteristic praise-refrain is observed in every stich.

At the end of line twenty there is a decided change in style. Lines twenty-one to thirty-four delineate the experiences of a city in siege under the surveillance of Bêl. Water and corn supplies are cut off. Scenes of famine are sketched and also
of conflagration and pillage. As the result the fear of Bêl extends over the lands.

Transliteration and Translation.

*Obverse.*

1. *ni-tuk gêr(KIL) šâ(U) eri-zu igi(ŠI)-ê(BIT)* — — —
   Thou art the mighty one of old; thy desirable city — —

2. *eš-ma ni-tuk gêr(KIL) šâ(U) eri-zu igi(ŠI)-ê(BIT)* —
   O king, thou art the mighty one of old; thy desirable city

3. *â-mu-ân kûr-kûr-ra-ge(KIT) gêr(KIL) šâ(U) eri-* — — —
   O lord of the lands, the mighty one of old; city — —

4. *â-mu-ân sa-ê-ga zî-da gêr(KIL) šâ(U) eri-* — — —
   O lord, head of life, the mighty one of old; city — —

5. *dim-ni mû-lil(KIT) a-a i(KA) na-âm-mâ(MAL) — ne* —
   O Bêl, father of the word of destiny; — —

6. *sîba sa-ê-gi(MI)-ga gêr(KIL) šâ(U) eri-* — — —
   O shepherd of the black-headed, the mighty one of old; city — —

7. *i-de gêbî u(IM)-te-na gêr(KIL) šâ(U) eri-* — — —
   O thou who art by thyself the all-seeing one, the mighty one of old; city — —

8. *âma erim(ŠAB)-na di-dî gêr(KIL) šâ(U) eri-* — — —
   O thou wild bull executing judgment on the enemy, the mighty one of old; city — —

9. *â-lul-la ma-ma gêr(KIL) šâ(U) eri-* — — —
   O thou powerful one of the countries, the mighty one of old; city — —

10. *eri-zu en-lil(KIT)-ki-zu gêr(KIL) šâ(U) — — —
    In thy city thy Nippur, the mighty one of old; — —

11. *ê-sîb ê(BIT)-kûr-ra-ta gêr(KIL) šâ(U) — — —
    In the foundation of E-kur, the mighty one of old; — —

12. *ki âm-lul ki ga-ta gêr(KIL) šâ(U) — — —
    In the broad land the great land, the mighty one of old; — —

13. *dâ(TUL) a-gas ki a-ga-ta gêr(KIL) šâ(U) — — —
    In the glorious dwelling of the glorious land, the mighty one of old; — —
14. šâ(LIB)-e(BIT) dim-ma-ta gür(KIL) šâ(U) — — —
In the midst of the house of the king, the mighty one of old;

15. e(BIT) kâ mah-ta gür(KIL) šâ(U) — — — — — — — —
In the house of the high gate, the mighty one of old;

16. e(BIT) gâ(MAL) nun mah-ta gür (KIL) šâ(U) — kâ
In the firm house of the exalted prince, the mighty one of old;

17. ma-mu šu-a-ta gür(KIL) šâ(U) — — — — — — — —
In the entrance of my land, the mighty one of old;

18. ma e(BIT)-gal mah-ta gür(KIL) šâ(U) — — — — — — — —
In the land of the exalted temple, the mighty one of old;

19. še-ib ūru-unu-ki-ma-ta gür(KIL) šâ(U) eri- — — — —
In the foundation of Ur, the mighty one of old;

20. še-ib utu-unu-ki-ma-ta gür(KIL) šâ(U) eri-zu — nê ka
In the foundation of Larsa, the mighty one of old;

21. eri a-dug(KA)-gu a-gi-a-zu
A city striveth; it is turned away by thee.

22. a-dug(KA)-ga a-ta gür(SÂ)-ra-zu
It striveth; it is shut off from water by thee.

23. eri še-kud(TAR)-da ki-lal-a-zu
It is a city with corn cut off; it is blocked by thee.

Reverse.

24. [nu]-nay nu-nay-a ud-zal(NI)-zal(NI)-la dî(RI)
They drink not, they drink not; the morning dawneth.

25. dam tu-ra-go(KIT) dam-mu mu-ni-ib-bi
To the young spouse, one crieth “My spouse.”

26. dû(TUR) tu-ra-go(KIT) dû(TUR)-mu mu-ni-ib-bi
To the little child, one crieth “My child.”

27. ki-el-e šes-mu mu-ni-ib-bi
The maid crieth “My brother.”

28. eri-ta damal gan-e dû(TUR)-mu mu-ni-ib-bi
In the city the bountiful mother crieth “My child.”

29. dû(TUR) bán(TUR)-da a-a-mu mu-ni-ib-bi
To the strong man one crieth “My father.”
30. *tur-e an-l(UD. DU) mah-e an-l(UD. DU)*
The small (flames) break out, the great (flames) break out.

31. *e-zir(BU) e-gub(DU)-ha mu-un-sar-ri-ni(NIN)*
On the street they stand, they cry.

32. *sal-la-bi ur-e am(A. AN)-da-ab-là*
Their booty men bear away.

33. *sig(PA) gan-bi mu bar-ri am(A. AN)-da-ab-là*
The staff of their youth the king of judgment beareth away.

34. *ki e-ne ki-zu-ge(KIT) ba-e-ni(IM)*
Those lands are in fear of thy land.

*ušu(ES) za ēr(A. ŚI) lim(b)(LUL)-ma dingir en-lîl(KIT)-a-kam*
34 (lines) Penitential hymn to Bēl.

**Commentary.**

1. *ni-tuk*: *ni*, a common pronominal verbal prefix of the second person; tuk means primarily ‘seize,’ ‘have,’ and then in an intransitive relation, ‘be present,’ ‘be.’

*gür(KIL):* the question might arise whether the sign is not *IZ*; it occurs nineteen times in the tablet; the wedges seem to make an enclosure of an equilateral rectangle, as is always intended in KIL, but usually in the sign *IZ*, the horizontal dimension is greater than the vertical. For examples of *IZ* in this collection of hymns in CT. XV, see Plates 10:24; 11:13, 14, 15 and 16; 14:35; 16:6; and 19:25. For examples of KIL, see Plates 7:27; 9:2 and 3; and 19:24, 27 and 28. Also cf. sign-lists of Delitzsch in Assyrische Lese-stücke, vierte Auflage, and Amaud in Tableau Comparé des Écritures Babyloniennes et Assyriennes Archaiques et Modernes, *gür* equals *kabtu*. If the sign is *IZ*, the value is *ges*, equal to *idlu*, ‘hero.’

*sā(Ū):* equals *labīru*, ‘old;’ see Prince’s Hymn to Nergal in JAOS, XXVIII, pp. 168-182. Brummer, in Die Sumerischen Verbal-Afformative nach den ältesten Keilinschriften, explains Ū as a compound sign, equal to ŚI, ‘eye,’ plus LU, ‘take away;’ giving the meaning ‘take away the eye,’ ‘become old,’ ‘elderly.’
eri or the Eme-Ku irdu equals alu, 'city,' and zu is the common pronominal suffix 'thy,' phonetically cognate with the personal pronoun za-en; the value eri for ER occurs in the ideogram for eridu; see Creation Legend, Tablet 82-5-22, 1048, CT. XIII, 35-38, Obverse, line 8, eridu (ERI, HI) ul ba-ri.

igi(SI)-e(BIT): the erasure of the last end of this line precludes satisfactory explanation of this word, although SI. BIT is sometimes equal to amaru, 'see,' igi commonly having the meaning 'eye' and € the meaning 'house,' i.e. 'eye-structure.'

2. clim-ma: by the process of gunation, several signs have developed from GIR; for example, KIŠ by the addition of MIN, ANŠU by the addition of PA, HUS by the addition of HI, AZ by the addition of UD, UK by the addition of ZA, and ELIM, or more exactly ALIM, by the addition of ĖR(A, SI). The sign in the text is somewhat indistinct; it appears to be GIR, but MA as a phonetic complement would indicate that the sign was ELIM. GIR equals 'power'; ELIM means 'lord,' 'king.'

3. û-mu-un, phonetic representation, is sometimes ideographically represented by the corner wedge Ú; the value umun may be shortened to û or mun or un, or it can be lengthened to û-mu-un-e, having the defining vowel e, as in Plate 10:3 where Bél is spoken of, and Plate 17:2 and 3 where Sin is spoken of. umun equals 'lord' (û) plus 'being' (mun).

kûr, 'mountain,' 'land,' is probably etymologically connected with ku, asâbu, subtu, 'dwell,' 'dwelling': ku being possibly a shortened form of kûr.ge(KIT) is a common sign of genitive relation: 'lord of lands.'

4. sag-ga: the sign is quite clearly SAG, but perhaps the clause is the same as the last clause in Plate 10:4, if so, the reading should be, 'lord of righteous command,' with dag(KA)-ya instead of sag-ga, dag-ga being equal to kibîtu, 'command,' and zi(d)-da being equal to kénu, 'righteous;' see Vanderburgh, Sumerian Hymns, p. 27.

5. mu-ul-lil(KIT) is Eme-Sal for en-lil(el-lil), mul(wul) being dialectically equal to en(ed). The meaning of lil is somewhat confused by the word's having been wrongly connected with zakiku, 'wind;' it more properly means 'structure,' 'fulness.'
a-a is the common word for ‘father,’ how it comes to mean ‘father’ is somewhat obscure; it may be shortened from ad-da, where ad equals abu. a primarily means ‘water,’ but also means ‘father,’ perhaps as ‘seed-producer.’ a-a is probably a phonetically lengthened a equal to abu.

i (KA): the meaning of KA here is not distinctly indicated. KA is a sign which has many meanings, but the one sometimes represented by i gives tolerably good sense here. nām-mā (MAL) is phonetic and is a lengthened form for nam which equals šamtu.

6. sība means ‘he who grasps the staff,’ and is the common word for ‘shepherd,’ though LAH. BA sometimes stands for ‘shepherd.’ say-gig (MI)-ga, equal to šalmut ḫakkādi, is an often repeated designation for Babylomians, as subjects of Bel or some other ruler.

7. i-de is Eme-Sal for igi (SI), equal to īnu, ‘eye.’ gaba equals pitta, ‘open.’ ni (IM)-te equals ramānu, ‘self,’ although the original meaning is ‘fear,’ yet when applied to the one who causes fear it comes to mean ‘self.’ ni-te literally means ‘fear a fear.’ i-de gaba ni-te-na then means ‘open eyed by thyself,’ na being a pronominal suffix equal to -ka.

8. ama: AMMU originally represented the ‘bull of the mountain,’ while the same form unguinated by the addition of the sign KUR, ‘mountain,’ being a picture of the bull’s head, represented the domestic bull. erim (SAB)-na equals ‘warrior,’ ‘soldier,’ ‘enemy,’ and di, ‘to judge.’ The whole expression ama erim-na di-di occurs in Plate 10 : 7.

9. ā-lul-la: ā is sometimes a nominal prefix, having a determinative force, like a in a-bīg; see Plate 19 : 2 and 3, also Plate 20 : 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9; see MSL. p. XVII, and ā-tu, Br. 1070. LUL sometimes equals āmmu, see Br. 7268 and 7276. Its original form was that of a gulated GIR; in the copy of Tablet 13963, Plate 10 : 8, it has been mistaken for GIR, as this line clearly shows.

ma-ma: MA is not so common an ideogram as KUR; MA means ‘earth,’ KUR means ‘mountain.’ MA. DA, ‘strong land,’ seems to be original and the Assyrian mutu a loan-word. Besides MA and KUR there seem to be two other Sumerian ideograms for mutu, namely KALAM and sometimes KL.

11. **še-ib** equals **šeš**, the Eme-Sal value for **GAR** which is equal to the Eme-Ku **še** no doubt; the Assyrian equivalent is **lihitu**, ‘layers of brick,’ from **labānu**. **ta** equals ‘in,’ meaning ‘source,’ as is shown by the expression **kūr babbar** etsa **kūr babbar** šu-sū, ‘from the land of the rising sun to the land of the setting sun.’

12. **damal**, Eme-Sal for **dayal**, equals **rapûn**, ‘broad,’ and **gal** equals **rubû**.

13. **dū**: TUL meaning ‘to cover,’ readily yields the meaning **šubtu**, ‘dwelling,’ with the value, however, of **dū**; **dū-axag** sometimes has the meaning of **šadū**, ‘mountain.’

14. **ša** (LIB) is a proposition or rather noun in the construct state followed by the genitive **d** (BIT). **dim-ma** equals **šarru**, ‘king.’ Br. 4254.

15. **kā** equals **bānu**, ‘gate,’ while **ka** equals **pû**, ‘mouth.’ **kā** must be pronounced differently from **ka**. KĀ represented ‘entrance to a house,’ but KAGU first represented ‘head,’ then ‘mouth.’ The meaning ‘high’ for **mah** is derived from that of being ‘important’ or ‘great.’


17. **šu-a-ta** means ‘in the entrance,’ or ‘when he enters,’ šu being equal to erēbu.

18. **d** (BIT)-**gul**, ‘great house,’ the Sumerian form from which the Assyrian **ēkalû**, ‘temple,’ is derived.

19. **uru** (SīS)-**unu-ki-ma**, Ur, apparently signifies the ‘protected dwelling place,’ **uru** being equivalent to **nasāru**. But it is to be noticed that the ideogram for Ur sometimes takes the form **uru-ab-ki**; see Code of Hammurabi, 2:17. It also takes the form **uru-un-k̑i-ma** in which **ma** becomes a true phonetic complement; see Hilprecht’s Old Babylonian Inscriptions chiefly from Nippur, Nos. 14, 15, 18, 19 and others. Ur was chiefly famous as being the seat of the cult of Nannar whose temple was called E-grīšīrgal.

20. **uru-unu-ki-ma**, the ideogram for Larsa which was one of the old seats of the cult of Šamaš, means the ‘dwelling place of light.’
21. *dnya* (KA) is a verb with the meaning here of *mahāsu*; the primary significance of the sign suggests that the meaning might originate from a contention of words, *zu* as a suffix here is subjective, considered as a relative pronoun the antecedent does not appear in the line.

22. *a-la* means 'from water,' *går* (SA) equals *esēru*.

23. *še-kud* (TAR)-*da* means 'with corn cut off,' *kud* being equal to *parāsu,* and *ki-lal* equals *sanāku,* 'blockade,' literally 'raise up the ground.'

24. *nag*; no doubt the text should be *nu-nag,* *nu-nag-a:* *a* is a vowel of prolongation; 'to drink no water' would be a *nu-nag.* *ud-zul* (NI)-*la* means *sēru,* 'morning,' *ud* is equal to 'light,' and *sal* to 'shine,' while *la* is a phonetic complement. *di* (KI) equals *nabātu*.

25. *dam* equals *hāru,* 'spouse.' *tur-ra* equals *sīhra,* 'young.' *get* (KII) is sometimes represented by *ana* although always secondarily. It is more commonly the sign of the genitive. *nu-ni-il-ib* equals 'one speaketh to him,' *ni-il* being an infix that represents a dative, the *ni* representing the 'him' and the *il* the 'to.' *bi* equals *kibā,* 'speak.'

26. The sign DUMU as equal to *mēru* or *mārtu* has the value *dā.*

27. *ki-el-e* equals *ardatu,* 'maid,' *ki* being a prefix of determination, while *el* means 'shining one.' *ses* equals *ahu*; there is doubt whether the archaic form meant 'protection' or 'other one.'

28. *damal* equals *ummu,* 'mother.' *gan-e* equals *alidu* or *alidu.*

29. *dā* (TUR) may equal *amēlu* and TUR with DA equals *bān-da,* 'strong.'

30. *al-ā* (UD. DU) equals *nabātu,* 'light up,' 'break out;' the prefix *al* being the same as *an.* Probably the city is set on fire, so it is the flame that breaks out.

31. *e-sir* (BU) equals *sīku,* *gub* (DU) equals *nazānu,* and *sar-ri* equals *sarāhu;* the *ni* (NIN) at the end may be a phonetic prolongation although the full force of the syllable is not very clear.

32. *sal-la-bi:* *sal-la* equals 'booty,' and *bi* is a pronominal suffix. *ur-e* equals *amēlu.* In *ām* (A-AN) *da-ab-la* *da-ab* is an
infix referring to the object *sal-la* and *lā* is the verb equal to *našū*.

33. *sig*(PA) may equal 'staff,' *gan* 'youth,' *mu* 'king,' and *bar-ri* 'judgment.'

34. *êne* equals *šunu*.

35. *lim(b)*: the sign is probably LUL which sometimes means 'woe,' see Brünnow's Classified List, 7271. *êr* (A. SI or A. IGI, 'water of the eye') commonly equals *bikītu*.

**Glossary.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-a</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-a-mu</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-dug(KA)-ga</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-gi-a-zu</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-ê(UD, DU)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>azag</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ama</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>âm(A. AN)-da-ab-lā</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-ta</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-de</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>igi(SI)-ê(BIT)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i(KA)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-gub(DU)-ba</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-sîr(BU)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elim-ma</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-ne</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-lil(KIT)-a-kam</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-lil(KIT)-ki-zu</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eri-zu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eri-ta</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erim(SAB)-na</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ê(BIT)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ê(BIT)-gal</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>êr(A. SI)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ud-zal(NI)-zal(NI)-la</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur-e</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>âru(SIŠ)-unu-ki-ma-ta</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utu(UD)-unu-ki-ma-ta</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>âšu(EŠ)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>û-lul-la</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>û-mu-un</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba-eml(IM)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bûn(TUR)-da</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bar-ri</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaba</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gal-ta</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gan-bi</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gan-e</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gâ(MAL)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gâr(SA)-ra-zu</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gig(MI)-ga</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gûr(KIL)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dam</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dam-mu</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damal</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di-di</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dimmer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dingir</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di(RI)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dim-ma-ta</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dû(TUL)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dû(TUR)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dû(TUR)-mu</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kâ</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki-el-e</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki-lal-a-zu</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki-zu-ge(KIT)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lim(b)(LUL)-ma</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ma-ma, 9
ma-mu, 17
maḥ-e, 30
maḥ-ta, 15
mu, 33
mu-ul-līi(KIT), 5
mu-un-sar-ri-ni(NIN), 31
mu-ni-ib-hi, 25
na-ām-mā(MAL), 5
ni-tuk, 1
ni(IM)-te-na, 7
num, 16
nu-nag, 24

sag, 6
sag-ga, 4
sal-la-hi, 32
sība, 6
si(g(PA), 33
ša(LIB)-e(BIT), 14
ša(Ū), 1
še-ib, 19
še-kud(TAR)-da, 23
šes-mu, 27
šu-a-ta, 17
tur-e, 30
tur-ra-ge(KIT), 25.
The Dasara Festival at Satara, India.—By LUCIA C. G. GRIEVE, New York City.

It is difficult for a mere European, brought up on a dictionary and accustomed to define everything accurately, to grasp the Proteanism, the fluidity, if I may so speak, of the Hindu divinity called for the most part simply Devi, the goddess, or Mai, the mother, or more simply still, Bai, the woman. Her names are legion: Mahalakshmi, Mahasaraswati, Jogeshwara, Kali, Bhawani, and many another, often strange and uncouth. But in the ultimate analysis, each female divinity, however different her attributes and forms of worship, is a manifestation of the same "eternal feminine," the goddess, the mother, the woman.

In every Hindu household in the Maratha country, Devi is one of the panchāstana, or set of five gods—the others being Ganapati, Vishnu, Sāmbb and Surya—represented by five small stones of appropriate colors and set on a tiny table in a particular order, according to the chief object of the householder's devotion. These are worshiped every morning directly after the Sandhya; but they may each and all be worshiped separately besides; and each has his particular day of the week and a high annual festival. Devi's days are Tuesday and Friday, when she is worshiped with red and yellow powder, marigolds, sweetened milk and a Sanskrit prayer.

Her great festival occurs in Ashwin (Sept.-Oct.) during the first ten days of the new moon, and is called Navarātrī. Among the Maratha Brahmans are three classes: Deshashas or hill Brahmans, Koukonaasth as or Brahmans of the western slope, and Karhadās, so called from their chief town. These last, being devotees of Kali, observe this festival with great solemnity. During the whole nine days they do not shave; and they arrange a little vessel, called abhishakpātra, so that water or oil may run continually on the head of the image of Devi. On the tenth day they kindle the hōm fire (with a Swedish safety match) in the presence of many Brahmans, and end the day with a great feast.

In every Hindu house this festival is observed. The image of Devi is set up on its little throne. Every day the worshiper
makes a wreath of flowers, usually marigolds, and placing one wreath on the neck of the image the first day, adds another each day. In front of the image a square is made of corn, gram or barley, mixed with dry earth. In the midst of this is set an earthen water-pot (gāger or ghat), and on this they hang a wreath of flowers, adding another each day. Every day cakes of wheat are prepared for offering; and if the family be sufficiently rich, a married woman, a Brahman and an unmarried girl are brought in to be fed and worshiped. Every day in Brahman households, a Sanskrit prayer, Saptastatti, is read after bathing, and the worshiper must not yawn nor leave his place on any pretence, nor make a mistake in a single letter. On the tenth day the worship is concluded by a great feast, in which the different castes follow different customs.

This tenth day, the Dasara, is the great day of the festival, and in Satara the greatest feast-day of the year. Shivāji, the liberator of the Marathas from the Mohemedan yoke, was a devotee of Kāli, or Bhāvāni, and of course made much of her high festival. There was sound reason in this; for it occurred at the end of the rainy season when the crops were all in, and settled dry weather might be expected. Furthermore, this tenth day, the Dasara, commemorated the setting out of Rāma on his march against Rāvana; and what more appropriate and auspicious day for summoning his army to march against foes, who were not only their enemies in religion, but, like Rāvana, had frequently carried off their women? Assembling his soldiery, who were mostly farmers cultivating little patches of ungenerous soil on the rough hillsides, he personally inspected every man and horse and had an inventory made of all their possessions. Then their horses and arms were worshiped, and a day set for their departure to the predatory warfare which was their joy and strength.

During the latter days of Satara's independence, when wealth had increased and valor departed, the Dasara procession was a grand sight. Starting from the Rang Mahāl, or chief palace of the Maharaja, on the upper road, the procession, numbering as many as 75 elephants in their gay housings, with instruments of music, chanting priests, prancing horses and gorgeously apparalled courtiers and servitors, marched to the Poyiche Nāka, or city limit, two miles away; and frequently the head of the procession had reached that point long before the rear
had started. Now a solitary unhappy elephant and a few ponies represent the kingly state.

But to the people, recalling as it does the great days of old, the festival is as dear as ever. On this day every house is whitewashed or painted; wreaths of marigolds are strung across the tops of the doors; and every man puts on a new white dress. Those who have horses wash them in warm water and give them an offering of food; wine, or eggs, or something supposed to be specially acceptable. A corner of the house is swept clean and washed with cowdung; and instead of swords and guns and other weapons whose use the Government has prohibited, axes, hoes and other farm-implements are carefully washed and placed on this spot, and are given offerings of flowers and sandalwood oil and red and yellow powder. Brahmans bring a drink offering, and other castes an offering of flesh; and after showing it to the tools they divide it up among the members of the family.

In the afternoon the horses have cloths, generally the house-wife's best sari, strapped on their backs; wreaths of flowers are placed around their necks; and the ladies of the family lend their anklets and even strings of gold and pearls to adorn the horses' hoofs; and if there be a light-colored creature, patterns are traced on his flanks.

In these degenerate days, if the horse belongs to a white man, the owner is supposed to worship the animal by giving a coin to the horse-boy; and this particular form of worship is not confined to Hindus but shared by Mohamedans and outcasts. Even the Sahib's cats and dogs have their wreaths of marigolds on this great day.

Early in the afternoon, the gaily dressed horses, and litters containing images of the gods, in small irregular processions, are brought to the Raj-wādā, or chief market-square. Here booths are erected for the sale of cakes and sweets, and especially of great bundles of branches of kāńchān, mountain ebony. Athletic sports of all sorts are carried on, interspersed with songs and recitations called kurtans. A large male buffalo, reka, has been fed up for ten days, or even as many months. At the appointed time he is led out in front of a temple of Bhāvāni, and after the proper ceremonies some descendant of Shivāji's family, always a man with the surname of Bhoule, strikes off the beast's head with a sword. Two strokes may
be given, but the act is more meritorious if only one suffices. The meat is then cut up and distributed to any who will take it. Goats and hens are sacrificed by the farmer caste.

The sacrifice of these animals on this day is common throughout the Maratha country and in many other parts of India. Indeed, the Dasara festival is a national one, and on it soldiers of every faith worship their arms; but beyond that, its significance and mode of observance are different in the different parts of the country.

As soon as twilight begins to fall, the great procession is formed in front of the Rang-Mahal. Bhavani, Shivaji’s sword, which he considered an incarnation of the goddess, and which is now kept in a small temple in the Rani’s Palace, is placed on a palanquin and leads off, followed by the Rajah’s elephant and ponies, the Rajah or his representative in an open carriage, the bloody sword with which the reda was slain, and the usual oriental rabble. Crowds of people of all sorts line the route, and congregate especially at the Naka, or sentry-box marking the city limit. For Satara is an unwalled town, Shivaji believing, like the King of Sparta, that soldiers are better than bricks for defence.

In former days the procession went farther, for the purpose of worshiping an apṣṭā or kānchana tree, the mountain ebony, which was then cut down and the leaves distributed to the crowd. This object has now been lost sight of; the procession merely passes a little beyond the city limit and then turns and goes back. Throughout the Maratha country, everyone, to keep the festival properly, must walk at least beyond the limits of his town or village, to commemorate the starting out of the army on that day. When the procession has passed the Naka, a man comes running through the crowd with his arms full of kānchana branches, which he distributes to the hundreds of eager hands reached out to him. The recipients pull off the leaves and bestow the mon their friends and acquaintance, saying, “This is gold!” This little ceremony is eminently Hindu; kānchana, besides being a name for the ebony and champak trees, also means “gold,” and the leaves of the kānchana, which in size and shape resemble gold coins, are called “soni,” the ordinary word for gold. This giving of “gold” leaves is said to represent the distribution of money among the crowd “in the brave days of old.”
The deepening darkness is put to flight by colored lights, sky-rockets and other fire-works; and the crowds return home to feast and make merry.

This festival has in some places a darker side. The Karhada Brahmans are strict worshipers of Devi; and her most acceptable sacrifice is a human being. This caste is perhaps one of the last vestiges of the dreaded Thugs who used to infest India; but in some respects their organization is quite different, though on that I need not dwell. The Government has attempted to suppress this sect, but has not fully succeeded. A favorite sacrifice is a son-in-law, who is invited to the house of his wife's parents and there poisoned. The best sacrifice is a wedded wife, and in return Kali promises her devotees great wealth. The proper method of conducting this sacrifice is to invite the lady to visit her mother-in-law for the whole ten days' festival. There she is made much of, given presents, bathed in perfumes, clad in fine new garments, and wreathed with flowers. Meanwhile, in the god-room, a hole has been dug in the floor in front of Devi's image, the sacred hom fire is kindled, prayers are said into the hole, and a lighted lamp set in each corner. At the right moment the unsuspecting victim is brought in and suddenly thrown into the hole, and the earth piled in on top. While I was in Satara an attempt was made to perform this sacrifice in a nearby village; but at the last minute the girl discovered the plot, and, escaping, fled to her father's house, where she was protected against her too religious friends.

Since the British Government is so inconsiderate and oppressive as to interfere with these little family matters, the usual method now is by poison; and such masters in the poisoning art are the Hindus that the dose may be administered many days previous to the intended death of the victim. It is even said that as long as six months before the festival, poison may be given which will cause the victim to die on the proper day. Though currently believed, this is not easy to credit; and by its nature is a matter not susceptible of investigation.

Next after their kindred-in-law, the best sacrifice is a Konkon Brahman; and in such dread do the Konkonasthas hold their Karhada fellow-castemen, that they would rather die of starvation than risk taking food at their hands.
The Interrelation of the Dialects of the Fourteen-Edicts of Asoka. 1: General introduction and the dialect of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra recensions. — By TRUMAN MICHELSON, Ph. D., Ridgefield, Conn.

In investigating the dialects of the Fourteen-Edicts of Asoka, it is necessary to remember that the Shāhbāzgarhi, Mansehra, and Gīrnār recensions are translations of an original composed in a dialect essentially the same as the dialects of the Dhauli, Jaugada, and Kālīst (edicts i—ix) recensions of the Fourteen-Edicts and the dialects of the six versions of the Pillar-Edicts; and that the dialect of this ‘Māgadhāni’ original has left traces in them. The dialect of the Kālīst redaction presents a rather curious problem: in edicts i—ix the dialect is practically pure ‘Māgadhān,’ with but few traces of the local dialect, but in edicts x—xiv the local peculiarities are prominent; yet at the same time the dialect is intimately related with the dialect of the Dhauli and Jaugada texts—for these two recensions are practically the same in both content and language. And as a matter of fact we can find a few faint traces of the local dialect in even the Dhauli and Jaugada texts. Examples are Dhauli vadhi for ‘Māgadhān’ vadhi; Dhauli and Jaugada bābhana- for bāmbhana-. (That bāmbhana- was the ‘Māgadhān’ correspondent to Sanskrit brāhmaṇa—is shown by the invariable bāmbhana- of the Kālīst text as well as by the occurrence of bāmbhana- in Dh., J. also.) If savatu at J. ii. 9 is not a mere blunder for savata (Sanskrit savattra)—which is found several times in J. as well as Dh., and the ‘Māgadhān’ portion of K.—it is a local peculiarity. The ‘Māgadhān’ dialect was undoubtedly the official imperial language, and hence—as Pischel has very justly remarked—understood even where it was not spoken as a vernacular. How far the ‘Māgadhān’ dialect as a koine had influenced the other local vernaculars, is impossible to say with certainty; but the ‘Māgadhism’ in the Gīrnār, Shāhbāzgarhi, and Mansehra recensions give the impression that they were taken over bodily from the original manuscript, and were really foreign to the spoken vernaculars.
The dialect of the fragment of the eighth edict of the Sopārā version (ed. by Bhagvānlal Ināraj, JBOAS, xv, 282—288) must be passed over in the present paper for two reasons, to wit, that the fragment is extremely small, and that it fairly bristles with easily recognizable 'Māgadhisms.' Examples of these are: nīkhamithā, line 5; hetā, bāmbhāvaj- iyam, hoti, line 6 (hoti also line 9); dasane, line 7; vudhānaṃ, patividhāne, line 7; ye (read bhūye), line 9; ane (i.e. ane), line 10. It may be mentioned, however, that the dialect agreed with that of the Shāhbāzgarhi, Mansehra and Girnār recensions in maintaining r as opposed to the l of the Dhauji, Jaugāda, and Kālṣi versions as is shown by rati in line 9. This fact enables us to interpret hiramina- in line 7; it is a cross between native hiramina- (so the Girnār text) and 'Māgadhan' hilanna- (so the Jaugāda and Kālṣi redactions). Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansēhra dhrama- has long been recognized as a cross of the same type (cf. Shb. and Maus. dhrama-; and Dh., J. and K. dhaguna-); and I have tried to show in IF. xxiii, pp. 240, 241 that Shāhbāzgarhi prati is to be judged the same way; moreover I hope to show in my forthcoming paper mentioned below, that crosses of this type are far commoner than supposed. It is perhaps worth while noting that jina in line 10 is to be read rājina, and so is identical with Mansehra rājina which has been recognized as standing for native rāno (i.e. rāno) through the influence of 'Māgadhan' lājina.

Another point that must be born in mind is the fact that the dialect of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra recensions is practically identical. In my opinion if we had texts absolutely free from 'Māgadhisms' it would be absolutely identical. It may be remarked that the evidence of both texts makes it comparatively easy to detect 'Māgadhisms' in either individual text. Thus Shāhbāzgarhi prati shows that Mansehra pati is a 'Māgadhim;1' similarly Mansēhra spagam, i.e. spargum (Sanskrit svargum) shows that Shāhbāzgarhi spagam is a partial 'Māgadhim' (cf. J. and K. svagam): the evidence of Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra vagrena (i.e. vargana) confirms this.

There are certain points of interest to the general Indo-European comparative philologist in the dialects of the Four-

---

teen-Edicts of Asoka. For example long syllabic \( \ddot{q} \) appears as \( \ddot{a} \)—and this only—in the dialect of the Gînâr version, e. g. atikrātam (Sanskrit atikrântam). This shows that this dialect is not a linear descendant of Sanskrit. Again the short \( \hat{u} \) of Gînâr susrûsâ, susrûsatûm is noteworthy in view of Avestan susrûsdnâ. Moreover Shâhârzârhi, Mansehra, and Kâlî kîti come from kîd + iiti, not kim + iiti as Johansson (Shb. ii, p. 52) has shown. Likewise it is worth while noting that Gînâr surunâru, Shâhârzârhi srûnyuyu, Mansehra srûney[u] agree with Avestan surunâoiti in structure as opposed to Sanskrit sînoiti as I shall shortly demonstrate in Zverg Sp. Furthermore the fact that the dialects of the Shâhârzârhi and Mansehra redactions have st corresponding to Sanskrit s(\( h \)) would seem to indicate that the lingualization of t and th respectively in Aryan \( \ddot{s} \) and \( \ddot{th} \) (Avestan \( \ddot{s} \)) was Pan-Indic and not Proto-Indic. (We may say Pan-Indic, even if this is not strictly accurate, for nearly all the Indic languages point to this; cf. Sanskrit s(\( h \)), Gînâr and Mâgadhi Pârâkrit sf, Pali and ordinary Pârâkrit, Dhauli, Jangâdâ, Kâlî, etc. \( \ddot{th} \) (written \( \ddot{t} \) on the Asokan inscriptions).

But in fairness I should remark that Gînâr uštâna- and other Middle-Indic words cited by Johansson to demonstrate his thesis that I. E. t\(\ddot{s}\) became s(\( h \)) in the I. E. period, in reality are not valid evidence, quite irrespective of the correctness or falsity of his contention, as I hope soon to show in the Indogermanische Forschungen.

It is proper for me to state that with Johansson and Franke, I reject Senart’s theory of historical and learned orthography in the inscriptions of Asoka.

Certain linguistic facts mentioned by me in the present paper will be proved at length in my ‘Linguistic Notes on the Shâhârzârhi and Mansehra Redactions of the Fourteen-Edicts of Asoka’ which is to appear in the American Journal of Philology, presumably in numbers 119 and 120. The same applies to the value of certain symbols used in these texts; certain linguistic statements concerning the dialect of the Gînâr redaction will also be fully discussed in the same paper.

1 According to Dr. Bloch the reading kîti on the Râmpûrvâ Pillar is really kim ti. If kiti were correct we should connect it with Shb., etc. kîti: see IF. xxiii, p. 253.
Where there is dispute regarding the precise values of certain characters in the Gîrnâr recension, I have in most cases briefly indicated the value I think should be assigned to said characters, and the reason thereof. But I expect to take these up systematically later.

In certain cases it is not easy to determine whether a given form in the Shâhbâzgarhi, Mansehra, and Gîrnâr redactions is a Mâgadhiism or is really native to the dialects of these texts. For example in the Shâhbâzgarhi and Mansehra versions two different formations in the gerund are to be found, namely, one in ti (i.e. tî, Vedic tû) and one in tu. Now there is but one form of the gerund in Dhauli, Jaugada, and Kâlî recensions, to wit, that in tu. It therefore seems plausible to consider the gerunds in tu in Shb. and Mans. to be Mâgadhiisms, especially as but one form of the gerund, that in tpa (Sanskrit trā), is native to the Gîrnâr redaction. Yet as the dialects of the Shb., Mans., Dh., J., and K. texts are in concord as opposed to the dialect of G. in some particulars—few, to be sure, when contrasted with the linguistic agreement of the dialects of Shb., Mans., and G. as opposed to the dialects of Dh., J., and K.—this conclusion does not necessarily follow.

It will be understood that in giving the characteristics of the dialects, the Mâgadhiisms are for the most part passed over in silence. Where there is room for doubt, I have tried to demonstrate briefly whether the form is a Mâgadhiism or not. Where a long elaborate proof is necessary to decide the point involved, I have given reference to my paper which is to appear in the AJP.

The orthography of the Shâhbâzgarhi and Mansehra redactions, as well as that of the Kâlî recension, limit our investigations to a certain degree. Thus it is impossible to say whether Shâhbâzgarhi and Mansehra puna is the equivalent of Gîrnâr puna or Kâlî puna, or both; for vowel quantities are not distinguished in the Kharoṣṭhî alphabet; nor is i distinguished from i, u from u in the Kâlî recension.

Bühler’s editions of the Gîrnâr, Shâhbâzgarhi, Mansehra, and Kâlî recensions in Epigraphia Indica ii. 447ff.; and his ed’s of the Dhauli and Jaugada redactions in ZDMG. 39, 489ff. and 37, 87ff. respectively have been made the bases of our investigations; though his ed’s of Shb. and Mans. in ZDMG. 43 and 44 have been consulted; as well as his ed’s of Dh.
and J. in the 1st vol. of the Archaeological Survey of Southern India.

Franke, Pâli und Sanskrit, p. 108 ff. should also be consulted for dialectic peculiarities. Johansson’s essay on the dialect of the Shâbbâzgarhi (and incidently the Mansehra) redaction is a systematic exposition by a comparative philologist. I have consulted it constantly, but the material in this paper is drawn from the inscriptions themselves. It should be noted that Johansson does not state what the characteristics of the dialect are, and treats the general relations of this dialect with the dialects of the other redactions only in a general way (see ii, pp. 24, 25). The present paper and my “Linguistic Notes on the Shâbbâzgarhi and Mansehra redactions of the Fourteen-Edicts of Asoka” which is to appear in AJP. (presumably in, no’s 119 and 120), are designed to supplement Johansson’s work.—Konow’s treatise on the dialect of the Gîrnâr recension is descriptive only, and nearly neglects the phonology.—Senart’s treatment of the various Asoka dialects is now nearly antiquated, though valuable at the time.

With this general introduction ended, we will now proceed to investigate the separate dialects.

**Dialect of the Shâbbâzgarhi and Mansehra redactions.**

The most important characteristics of this dialect are: three sibilants which correspond as a whole to the same sounds in Sanskrit, though subject to certain phonetic laws which have a slightly modifying effect2 (paśu-, śramaṇa-, uśilasa; loc. pl. -eṣu; etc.); r is not assimilated to any adjacent consonants whatsoever3 (śravakañ, śramaṇa-, suṣrūṣa, sahasra-, mitra-,

---

1 In the following citations, the forms are found in both versions, unless expressly stated to the contrary.

2 These laws are: 1. h- in dissimilated to s if the next syllable begins with a, 2. intervocalic h is assimilated to s if the preceding syllable contains a, 3. sγ and sγ become śś (written s), 4. Aryan ā and ṛḥ become ṭḥ. Exceptions are “Magadhisms”. The whole matter is taken up in detail in my paper which is to appear in the AJP. Examples are: susr̥ṣa, annubhāṣaṇi, manuṣ-, śh. tiṣṭṭhi, māṇ. [tiṣṭṭha].

3 Such is the view of Johansson. In AJP. I hope to show that we can hardly avoid assuming that r was in fact assimilated in the combinations ṛṛṇ and ṛṛṛṇ (in this case ṛṛ not śś is the result).—In the same periodical I take up the entire question as to whether dhvāra- is merely...
parakramena, agrena, vagrena, i.e. vargena, athrawa, i.e. ar-thava, dhrama-, i.e. dharma-, prava-, i.e. purva-, svarana, i.e. saraana, etc.); vocalic \( r \) becomes \( ir \) ordinarily, \( ur \) after labials (Sb. kiram, i.e. kiram, Mans. vudhrana, vudhrsu, i.e. vurdh-, Sb. mrgo, i.e. mrgo); \( h \) in the combination \( hm \) is assimil-
graphic for \( dhrama- \) (as Senart, Bühler and Johansson hold) or really represents \( dhrama- \) (as Pischel holds), and similar combinations. I come to the conclusion that those who hold that \( dhrama- \) is merely graphical for \( dhrama- \) are right. The matter is an exceedingly complicated one, and not to be disposed of in a few words. I therefore ask the reader to consult my article in A.J.P.—Johansson holds that \( r \) is assimilated to dental stops (which then become linguals) in the dialect of Sbh. (He does not discuss the dialect of Mans. in this connection.) I have exhaustively taken up this problem in the previously mentioned paper. My conclusions are that \( r \) in fact is retained before dental stops in both Sbh. and Mans. but that 'Māgadhism' have largely supplanted the true vernacular forms in both texts. Briefly my arguments are as follows: it being agreed that the language of Sbh. and Mans. is practically identical, it would be strange if Mans. and Sbh. should differ in such a point. Now in Mans., \( athora- \) (merely graphic for \( artha- \)) occurs a dozen and a half times; so there can be no question but that in the dialect of Mans. \( r \) is not assimilated to an immediately following \( th \), for no other correspondent to Skt. \( artha- \) is found in Mans. This makes it certain that the single \( athra- \) of Sbh. is the true native form, and that \( atha- \) (i.e. \( atha- \)), found more than a dozen times, is a 'Māgadhism' as \( ahta- \) and this only is the correspondent to Skt. \( artha- \) in the Diauli and Jangada versions of the Fourteen-Edicts as well as in the six recensions of the Pillar-Edicts. As a parallel where a 'Māgadhism' has nearly driven out the native form in Sbh. but never occurs in Mans. we have sare- (the true native form is \( sarva- \) which is found several times in Mans. and a few times in Sbh.). The word \( athora- \) in Sbh. is a blend of native \( athra- \) and 'Māgadhian' \( atha- \) exactly as Sbh. and Mans. \( dhrama- \) is a cross between \( dhrama- \) and \( dhana- \) (this last has long been recognized). Mans. \( sundhira- \) (i.e. \( vardh- \) and \( vadhrayisati \) (i.e. \( vardh- \)) show that \( r \) was not assimilated to an immediately following \( dh \); but 'Māgadhism' have largely usurped the place of the true native forms in Mans., and exclusively obtain in Sbh. (On Sbh. \( dipta- \) see A.J.P.) 'Māgadhism' or crosses between 'Māgadhism' and the true native correspondent to Indic \( r \) have ousted the vernacular correspondent in both Mans. and Sbh.

The history of Indic \( r \) in both Sbh. and Mans. is treated in detail in the paper mentioned above. Scholars are divided as to whether \( mrgo \) represents \( mrgo \) or \( mrgo \). Bühler holds the latter, Johansson the former. Likewise there is dispute as to whether \( vudhrana- \) represents the actual pronunciation or is merely graphical for \( vurdha- \). I have tried to show that the view of those who hold that \( mrgo \) and \( vudhrana- \) are respectively merely graphical for \( mrgo \) and \( vurdha- \) alone is tenable. I have also tried to demonstrate that all other apparent products of Indic \( r \) than \( ir \)
lated. (bramana-); tm is retained¹ (Mans. atma-); sm before i becomes sp² (loc. sing. of a-stems, taken from the pronominal declension, *aspi, *asmi, cf. Avestan -ahmi as opposed to Sanskrit -asmin); sw- and xe- become sp³ (spanikena, cf. Dh. J. K. sucunaka, Shb. spasunam, Mans. spasuna,² Skt. svaras, Mans. spagram, K. etc. svagam, Skt. svargam; ciy and vy become vçi (S Shb. gerundive -tava, i.e. tava, v. g. vatavo, Skt. vañcana [see Whitney, Skt. Gr. § 964c end], diveni, Skt. divyäni); dr- becomes br- (S Shb. pada, a mistake for bada); tv becomes tt, written t and tt (gerund in ti, Vedic tv; tadattaye, Skt. tadatta); my becomes mn (Shb. smma, Skt. samyak); Aryan ūt (Skt. ūt, Av. āt) and ūth (Skt. ūth, Av. āt) alike become st (S Shb. asta, so probably in the 13th edict, Shb. dipista, Skt. (a)dipista; Shb. tistità, Skt. tīsthitā, Mans. tistita, Skt. tīsthitā); ūj becomes ūni, written ṅi (Shb. vananato, Skt. vyajanatasa); d is retained in the Iranian loan-word dipi; intervocalic j becomes y⁶ (Shb. raixa, samay, Kambaya, Kambayṣa, parinhotave;

and ūr in both Shb. and Mans. are either 'Māgadhismas' or blends of 'Māgadhismas' and native forms; and that ūr does not linguilize following dental stops in the true native forms of both Shb. and Mans. The whole problem is exceedingly complex and can only be summarized here.

¹ Native tm in Shb. is completely ousted by 'Māgadhāna' tt (written t) exactly as native prati by 'Māgadhān' paṭi in Mans. (See Michelsohn, IF. xxiii, pp. 240, 241.)

² The exact value of the symbol which Bühler transcribes by sp is in dispute. Provisionally I follow Bühler. The 'Māgadhān' loc. sing. -asi has largely taken the place native -aspi in both Shb. and Mans.

³ Graphically sp is often omitted.

⁴ In Mans. the 'Māgadhān' gerundive -tana- has completely usurped the place of native -tava- as Franke already has said; it is found a few times in Shb.

⁵ In my judgment (contrary to the opinion of Johansson), Mans. duvadāša is a Māgadhism as well as Shb. duvi and Mans. duve (cf. Kalsi duve, etc.).

⁶ Johansson, Shb. i, p. 177, 63 of the reprint, judges Shb. and Mans. uyamati (so for his -asi) wrongly. According to him it is 'eigentl. wohl ujana- st. ujana-'. Shb. and Mans. uyamati is merely graphic for uyāna-. That is to say that -d y- in word-composition have a different history than -dy- when not in word-composition (per contra, note ajja, i.e. ajja). The same holds true for the dialects of the Girnār, Dhauli, Jaugada, and Kalāi recensions of the Fourteen-Edicts; cf. G. uyānasi, Dh. (uyān)ati, J. and K. uyānasi as contrasted with G., Dh. J. ajja, K. aja (Skt. adya, Vedic adya). That the y is purely graphic for yy and the j for fj is shown by Pāli uyāna-, uyānas-, ajja. See Henry, Précis, section 87; 3 and E. Müller, Pāli Gr. p. 49; and for the principle
Mans. praṇyuhō|āvīṣte; intervocalic \( h \) is either lost, or weakly pronounced (ia. Mans. mao as contrasted with Shb. maḥu); Indic \( niḥ \) appears as \( ni \) in compounds (Shb. niśramatu, Mans. niśramaytu, niśramiśu; Shb. niśramanam); \( h \) as the correspondent to Indic \( dh \) in Shb. \( ḍha \); Indic *uṭṭhānām* is retained.

Jacobi, Erz. section 36. Windisch in his essay on Pāli (in the transactions of the International Congress of Orientalists held at Algiers) overlooks this fact when he takes Pāli niṣgāna- as a Māgadhī relic. In Prākrit of ī- in word-composition necessarily has the same history as īy- when not in word-composition, i.e. īy. Māgadhī īy. Against Johansson's supposition that where we have Ī for j in Shb. (and Mans.), ḍ can be safely considered a 'Māgadhism' is the following important fact, viz., that Ī for j is never found in the Dhauli. Jaungāḍa. or Kāśi redactions of the Fourteen-Edicts, and yet it is agreed that the dialect of the 'Māgadhā' original—of which Shb. and Mans. are translations—was composed in a dialect essentially the same as the dialects of these redactions. That j becomes ḍ in Māgadhī Prākrit according to the native grammarians proves nothing, for Māgadhī Prākrit has only two noteworthy agreements with the Māgadhā dialects of the Asokan inscriptions, namely that ḍ takes the place of r and e of original -ə (ə in the other dialects): but Māgadhī Prākrit has one special agreement with the dialect of the Gīrṇā reta, namely that Aryan ṝ (Skt. ṛ) and ḍha (Skt. ḍh) fall together in ḍ. I take Shb. and Mans. majva- to be a 'Māgadhism': cf. the correspondent in the versions of Dhä. J., K.

1 Johansson (Shb. ii. p. 17) is in error when he places niśramiṣu in the same category as dukaraṃ, Shb. dukataṃ, Mans. dukata (final is graphically omitted). In the first place (dukataṃ and dukata are 'Māgadhism' as I shall show in AJP. cf. Kāśi dukataṃ, and so must be left out of consideration. In the second place, note the difference in Kāśi dukataṃ, dukata and niśramaytu, niśramiṣu, niśramiṣṭa (possibly -ṣ, vijnikaraṇe); cf. also Dhauli and Jaungāḍa niśramacc (for the formation see Johansson, Shb. ii. p. 89, footnote 2). Shb. joti-kamalhāni is certainly a 'Māgadhism' as is shown by Mans. agi-kamalhāni, K. and Dh. agi-kamalhāni; Gīrṇā agi-kamalhāni points in the same direction, cf. the contrast with dukaraṃ, dukataṃ. Johansson read Gīrṇā agi-kamalhāni, and so offered an explanation which he thought preferable to the one given, but the ḍha is absolutely certain: see the plate in Epigraphia Indica ii.

2 I see no reason why Shb. uṭṭhānam, i.e. uṭṭhānam, should not be considered the true native word, and hence the exact equivalent of Skt. uṭṭhānam. The fact that the termination in any case is the vernacular one, supports this view. Per contra note the 'Māgadhā' endings -e and -ast in Mans. uṭṭhane, Shb. uṭṭhasti, Mans. uṭṭhasti. That these last cited forms are 'Māgadhism' is absolutely certain as Johansson previously saw. Johansson regards Shb. uṭṭhānam also as a 'Māgadhism'. This is highly improbable because *uṭṭhāna-never is found in any of the so-called Māgadhā versions of the Fourteen-Edicts. That the ḍ of Shb. dhrama|dhikānaye and dhramadhikān[e] is not a careless writing for ḍ is shown.
(written uthanam); &c appears as c† (graphical for cc² paço); the r of Kerulu,—the nom. sing. masc. of a-stems a few times apparently ends in -a (Shib. jana, etc.); original r-stems become a-stems (pituna, Shib. bhratunam, Shib. spasunan, Mans. spasuna, Shib. and Mans. matopitusa); nom. pl. of the cardinal number 4 caturo (Shib. cature with ‘Māgadhān’ -e; for -o); the locative plurals paṃcāṣu (Shib. pa[meṣṣu, Mans. pa[asṣu]) and asau by the analogy of a-stems; the genitive sing. of the first personal pronoun mahu (Shib. ma[ha], Mans. ma[; see above); ayo³ as a nom. sing. (only in Shib.); the peculiar optatives

by Mans. dhramadhithanag, dhramadhithana, Kālā dharmadhiṭhāṅgō. [For the view of Johansson, see his treatise on the dialect of the Shib. recension, i, pp. 165, 169 (51, 52 of the reprint), 168, 169 (54, 55), 170 (56); ii, pp. 17, 18.] These forms are ‘Māgnahim,’ On ‘Māgadhān’ uṭhanam- and Gīnar uṣṭānum-, see my coming paper in IF.

So Bühler reads in the two occurrences of the word in Shib. as well as Mans. in his ed. of these recensions in ZDMG. 43, 44; but in his ed. in Epigraphia Indica ii he reads pacha for the occurrence in the 13th edict for both Shib. and Mans. (Bühler in El. chh for ch); so that I am not sure but his readings in El. are really a mistake. The devanāgarī transcript in ZDMG. settles the reading in the 1st edict. If not a blunder, then Mans. and Shib. pacha (his pachha) in the 13th edict are ‘Māgnahim,’ cf. Kālā [pa[chā (B’s] [pa[chha]. [His reading pā[c (pachā in his transcription) in the 13th ed. of G. in ZDMG. 43 is an error.]

1 Johansson, Shib. ii, section 118 (end) explains this as ‘wohl eine Konfusionsbildung von mahu und aham.’ This does not strike me as convincing. The same form is found in Prakrit. Pischel’s explanation (Gr. section 418) that it corresponds to Skt. mahāyaṇa—phonetically impossible. The simplest solution seems to me is that mahu is for *mahama by influence of *mahuḥ. If we cared to go outside the Indic sphere, other solutions—all more or less bold—readily would suggest themselves.

2 According to Johansson, Shib. ii, p. 46, under different accentual conditions -e is becomes -em and -e in our dialect. I am not convinced of this. To begin with, a considerable portion of the material brought forward in reality is not decisive as Johansson himself admits (see p. 45, footnote 1). If the law be correct, extensive levelling must have taken place. It should particularly be observed that ayo is found as well as aya. In my opinion ayo is for ayo by the analogy of the nom. sing. masc. of other pronouns such as se, yo, etc. The form ayo, I hold to be a hyper-Māgadhān: see IF. xxiv, p. 55. Iyo is a blend of native ayo and ‘Māgadhān’ iyam, and is directly comparable to dhrama— a cross between native dhrama- and ‘Māgadhān’ dhanuma-. The sole support for Johansson’s theory according to the text of Bühler in El. seems to be dhrama, acc. sing. at Shib. xii, 6; and it is not venturesome to pronounce this a simple error (cf. Mans. dhramama in the corresponding passage as well as the quite numerous other accusative singulars of masculine
siyasu and hamneyasu (Mans. has lacunas where the forms would otherwise occur); gerund in *ti (written ti) corresponding to Vedic *ti (Shh. *tisiti; Mans. *darseti *darsaytei); certain lexical features such as *atra, *apagrathe (Mans. has a lacuna in the corresponding passage). Shh. meñeti (if not a blunder for ma- it corresponds to Gothic mainjan, Old Bulgarian miñiti), Shb. joti- (Skt. jyotis-), Shb. vuta (i. e. vuttā, Skt. upāti), Shb. vithenam (if not a mere blunder; see Johansson, Shb. i, p. 134. 20 of the reprint), Shb. *varacami, Shb. and Mans. *tathan. Mans. ravi, Shb. vo. Mans. asatasa, Shb. *asamanasa, Mans. *spasana, Shb. *spasunam, Shb. yo, Shb. yamatro.

From the above it will be seen how much nearer to Sanskrit the dialect of the Shāhhdāgarhi and Mansehrā redactions is than the dialects of the other versions of the Fourteen Edicts. Geographically this is just what we should expect.

a-stems in both Shb. and Mans.). On the gender of ayo, see Johansson, l. c., ii, pp. 84 (footnote 2), 79. Ipaṃ in both Mans. and Shb. is a 'Māgadhī'. I may add that J.'s [sic] vanishes in the ed. in EL and is replaced by imaṃ; his ia["0"] by im, which can be for imaṇi; and ayo is read at Shb. vi, 1, ayo at Shb. xviii. 11.

1 On the etymology of this word, see Bühler, ZDMG. xliii, p. 174.
2 On tathan, see Johansson, Shb. ii, p. 36.
3 On vo, see Johansson, ii, pp. 44. 45; Franke, Pu. Skt., pp. 105, 151. Mans. ravi corresponds to Skt. evam; cf. Johansson, Shb. i, p. 154, 40 of the reprint.

The etymology of this particle has not yet been solved. Johansson, Shb. i, pp. 154, 155 (40 and 41 respectively of the reprint) rightly saw that Bühler's explanation was untenable. The suggestion of Johansson that vo stands for *yava, a doublet of eved, is too far-fetched. His alternative will not be taken seriously. Yo is a fossilized nom. sing. masc. of ya- as is shown by the correspondents to Shb. vo (not the particle) at x, 21 in the Mansehrā and Kalai redactions, namely, yama. Similarly Shb. as and 'Māgadhā' as as adverbs are fossilized nom. sing. of sa- as is shown by the Girnar correspondent *ta (*tad). (Shb. se and 'Māgadhā' se are treated by Johansson, Shb. ii, pp. 42—44 without coming to any definite conclusion. However brilliant his suggestions are, his combinations are strained and complicated as compared with the solution offered above.) Shb. cayo (also hitherto unsolved) is simply ca + yo.

1 On the etymology of this word, see Johansson, Shb. ii, p. 98. Here again, I think Johansson goes too far afield in turning to extra-Indic Indo-European languages to explain this difficult word, admitting that occasionally we must do so to properly explain certain Middle-Indic words. I see no reason why yamatro may not be analyzed as ya- = madro, a possessive adj. compound meaning 'as many as.'
Indeed the dialect of Shb. and Mans. hardly belongs to the Middle-Indic stage of development.

We have next to take up the general relations with the dialects of the other recensions.

Special points of contact with the dialect of the Gînâr version.

These are very numerous. It is instructive to notice how much more striking the points of contact are between the dialect of Shb. and Mans. and the dialect of G. than between the dialect of Shb. and Mans. and the Mûgadhán dialects.

Examples are: final -as appears as -a; st is retained (Shb. Mans. násti, Gînâr násti; Shb. dhrâmasatva, G. dhammasatavo; Shb. [hast]ino, Mans. hastine, G. hasti-; Shb. vistritena, G. vistatana, etc.); the sound r; the sound n² (Mans. dhrumacarana, Shb. dhrumacaranam, G. dhammacarana; Shb. Mans. brâmana, G. brâmhana, etc.); ūn (written ūn and ūn) from Indic ūn² (Shb. G. amha-, aha-, Mans. ana-); jn becomes ū initially, and either ūn or ū medially (Shb. natinam, Mans. natina, G. nātinam; Shb. rānā, rāno, G. rānā, rānō); 11 (written

1 In Mans. *Mûgadhân* -e has entirely wiped out native -o.
2 In cases ending in a is replaced by n through the analogy of other words where dental n is obtained phonetically. This is true for Mans., Shb., and G. There are a couple of cases where the same phenomenon takes place in suffixes in the dialect of Shb. See Johanssen, Shb. i. p. 166 (52 of the reprint), and Michelson, AJP. xxx. i.c. Jœ ka[la]nukas] vanishes in Bühler's ed. in Kl. ii; I take gorana to be a blunder for "garaha", following Bühler. On Tampasaṇī, see Michelson, IF. xxiv, p. 35; also on Paṭiṅka. On Bühler's reading kērana in G. see Michelson, i. c. p. 93.
3 In Mans. we have doublets with oun²[written ūn²]; e.g. asa-, aha-, maṇati, maṇati. Similarly Mans. puṇaya, puṇān but always Shb. puṇā (G. puṇāma, Shb. puṇγa). I know no thoroughly satisfactory explanation of the doublets. The best I can offer at present is that as a and ū alike were foreign to the dialect of the Mûgadhán scribe, he was careless in distinguishing the two or was ignorant of their proper usage. The forms with ūn are purely fictitious. For the possibility of the principle, see Johanssen, Shb. ii. p. 43.
4 The alphabets of Shb., Mans., and G. hinder us from being positive in the matter. For Shb. rānā, rāko can be either rānā, rākō or rānā, rāko (and conceivably rānā, rākō); while G. rānā, rāko can be either rānā, rākā or rānā, rākō (it will be recalled that long vowels are not shortened before two consonants in the dialect of G.). Pali and the various Prâkrit languages point to ūn in the forms. Shb., Mans. asapemī,

\textsuperscript{1} ‘Māgadhān’ \textit{hotti} has nearly everywhere usurped the place of native \textit{bhoti} in Mans.; similarly \textit{kūta} (written \textit{ḳūta}) - the place of \textit{kūta} (written \textit{kūta}) - ; \textit{kọta} has everywhere taken the place of \textit{khoṭi}. In Shb. \textit{kīti} is found a couple of times. In G. \textit{hotti} is found a few times but \textit{bhavati} is greatly predominant. That \textit{hotti} is a ‘Māgadhism’ is shown by the fact that the Dhauṣa, Jaugad, and Kaśi reductions have \textit{hotti} and this only as the correspondent to Sanskrit \textit{bhavati}. Similarly regarding \textit{kūta} and \textit{kọta}.

\textsuperscript{2} The law for the retention or assimilation of \textit{r} in conjoint consonants in the dialect of G. is: \textit{r} is retained after stops and sibilants; and before \textit{r}; is assimilated to following stops, sibilants, and nasals. Exceptions are ‘Māgadhism’s.

\textsuperscript{3} Where we have \textit{kh} in G., Shb., Mans., these are ‘Māgadhism’s as is shown by the fact that in the dialects of the Dhauṣa, Jaugad, and Kaśi recensions, \textit{ḳkh} (written \textit{ḳk}, \textit{kk} and not \textit{ḳkk} of course initially) is the regular correspondent to Indic \textit{kś}. Cf. Johansson, Shb. ii, p. 23. [According to Johansson, Bühler reads \textit{samkhitena} in ZDMG.; in R., he reads \textit{samkhētena}.] I may add that I reject Pischel’s ‘law’ as Johansson and, I think, Bartholomae before me. As to whether Aryan \textit{ākk} is reflected by \textit{j̥k} in Middle-Indic languages, at present I am not able to judge.
rāṇā, rāno (and not -jin-); māyā (written maya in Mans. and Shbh.) as the inst. sing. of the 1st personal pronoun (and not māmayā); āham (and not hākam) as the nom. sing. of the 1st personal pronoun; y (and not h) in the ending of the 1st person sing. of the optative (Shbh. vṛacheyaṁ, G. gacheyaṁ); o-conjugation of karoti, prati (not in Mans.), and not paṭi, corresponding to Skt. prati (see Michelson, IF. xxiii, pp. 240, 241).

In the American Journal of Philology I shall show that it is possible that the law in the dialect of the Shāh bāżgarhi and Mansehra versions that ॄ converts a following intervocalic ॄ to ॅ is to be connected with the law that in the dialect of the Gīrnār redaction original ॄ (historical ॅ) converts a following ॆ to ॅ; it is also probable that Shbh. Mans. ॆ and G. ॅ from Aryan ॆḥ are to be brought into correlation: observe the retention of the sibilant and the deaspiration in both cases, even if the final result is different. It is certain that in the dialects of all three recensions that Indic ॆḥ becomes ॅ, but 'Māgadhisms' by chance take the place of the native sounds in the case of both the Shāh bāżgarhi and Mansehra versions.

It is more problematic if the law that in the dialect of the Gīrnār recension that original ॅ and ॅḥ become ॅś (Michelson, IF. xxiv, pp. 53, 54) should in any way be united with the apparent law that in the dialect of Shbh. and Mans. that ॅ is assimilated to an immediately ॅ after ॅ (Michelson, AJP. xxx), as vowel quantities are not distinguished in the Kharoṣṭhī alphabet nor are geminations. If the two are to be brought into rapport with one another, the law would be as follows: ॅ is assimilated to an immediately following ॅ in the combinations ॅṛ and ॅṛḥ in the dialects of Shbh. Mans. and G., becoming ॅś(ḥ) in the dialect of Shbh. Mans., ॅś in the dialect of G.; original ॅṛ remains in Shbh. Mans., ॅś in the dialect of G., but becomes ॅś in the dialect of G.

1 Cases where the ॅ is omitted are probably 'Māgadhisms.' Yet it is possible that the process which was completed in the case of ॅṛ, was beginning to take place in the case of ॅṛḥ, and hence the graphic fluctuation. The fact that ॅ is assimilated before ॅ but not before other consonants in the dialect of Shbh. and Mans., may be accounted for by the fact that ॅ as well as ॅ is a lingual consonant; ॅ would naturally be more readily assimilated to a consonant of its own class than other consonants. I call attention to the fact that in the American Journal of Philology I have shown that, contrary to the opinion of Johannson, ॅ is not assimilated to immediately following dental stops in our dialect, nor are the dental stops converted to lingual stops by the influence of the preceding ॅ.
Special points of contact with the dialects of both the Kālṣi and Gīrṇār reedications.

These are but few in number. Examples are: the contraction of aya to e (Shb. Mans. pujetavīya, K. pujetavīya, G. pujetavyā, a blunder for *pujetavāyā; Shb. lekhapesāmi, K. lekhapesāmi; Mans. hapesati, Shb. [hapecati], G. ḫapesati; Shb. [vadhe]sānti, anapesānti; Shb. aloceti, G. alocetā, Mans. drasēti; Shb. vijetavīyaṃ, G. vijetavyam; Shb. prativedetavo, prativedetavo, G. prativedetavāṃ); the phonetic correspondent to Sanskrit manusya-, Shb. Mans. manusa-, i.e. manusasa, G. manusasa- i.e. manussa-, K. manusga-, i.e. muniga-; -ya (and not ūyu) as the ending of the 3d person pl. of the optative active (Shb. anatrapeyuv, śruneyu, Shb. Mans. vaseyuv, sausrayeuv, Mans. śruneyu[u], Mans. havyuv, G. vasyuv, K. śuneyu, śruseyu, havyu, -neyu i.e. *haneyu).

It is an acknowledged fact that in edicts i—ix, the dialect of the Kālṣi recension is practically pure ‘Māgadhān,’ with but few traces of the native dialect. In edicts x—xiv the local dialect is prominent, but ‘Māgadhisms’ are not infrequent. It is probably due to this that we are unable to point out more special points of contact of the dialects of Shb., Mans., G., and K.

Special points of contact with the dialect of the Kālṣi recension.

For the reason stated above, few special points of contact can be shown, even if they existed. Examples are: the con-

In Dh. and J., aya is uncontracted; as also in the ‘Māgadhān’ portion of K. ‘Māgadhān’ aya for e has forced itself into several words in Shb., Mans., and G. I consider that Johanson’s attempt to formulate a law determining under what circumstances aya is retained and when contracted in the dialect of Shb. and Mans. (the dialect of G. is not treated) is a failure. In my judgement aya phonetically contracts to e in the dialects of G., Shb., and Mans. under all circumstances. The fact that Shb. and Mans. are not always in agreement in the use of aya and e distinctly points in this direction. For the principle involved, see Franke, Pāli and Sanskrit, p. 109.

On Shb. prati and patei, see Micheleon, IF, xxiii, pp. 240, 241.

This is the true native word. Manusa-, in the ‘Māgadhān’ portion is due to the influence of ‘Māgadhān’ manusā which is also found in the ‘Māgadhān’ portion of K. This does not affect the fact that ‘Māgadhān’ manusī itself is a contamination of *manusa- and *pulsa- (Michelson, IF, xxiii, p. 254ff.).
traction of aya to e in the 3d sing. indicative and 3d pl. of the imperative of the causative (Shb., Mans., K. pyjeti, Shb. pa'ti'vedetu,2 Mans. pativedetu,2 K. [pa'ti]vedentu, Shb. rocetu,2 K. locetu,2 Shb. Mans. aradhetu,2 Shb. aradheti, Mans. aradheta, Shb. vadheta, Shb. anneti); Shb. Mans. K. kiti from *k[a] *iti (Johansson, Shb. ii, p. 52); iman (written also ima in Shb. and Mans.) as nom. acc. sing. neuter; i in the gen. sing. of Shb. Mans. etisa, K. etisa (as shown by Shb. imisa: we should expect this in Mans. and the corresponding form in K., but 'Māgadhisms' have usurped the place of the native words).

Special points of contact with the dialects of the Dhau!i, Jaugāda, and Kālī (edicts i—ix) recensions.

It will probably always be a matter of dispute as to what are special points of contact between the dialect of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra redactions on the one hand and the dialects of the 'Māgadhan' versions on the other. For it is sometimes difficult to determine whether the seeming points of contact are not after all nothing more than 'Māgadhisms' in the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra versions. In some cases absolute tests are wanting, and the matter becomes more or less subjective. For example, I am persuaded that gerunds in tu, the iy passive, the word ca 'but' in Shb. and Mans. are really 'Māgadhisms', and not special points of contact with the dialects of the 'Māgadhan' versions.3 I am confident that

1 The contraction of aya in these forms is foreign to the dialects of the Gīrīrī, Dhauli, and Jaugāda redactions of the Fourteen-Bōlics. Hence where aya remains uncontracted in these forms in Shb. Mans. K., we can safely conclude that these cases are 'Māgadhisms.' (Exactly as where aya remains uncontracted to e in the dialects of Shh., Mans., G., and K.) Johansson, Shb. i, p. 141, 142 (27 and 28 of the reprint) attempts to formulate a law determining under what circumstances aya phonetically remains or is contracted to e successfully in my judgment, only he does not make use of the principle of 'Māgadhisms' in explaining the apparent exceptions. Anneti included for convenience.

2 3d pl.; iy graphically omitted.

3 For an argument in favor of holding such gerunds in -tu as occur in Shb. and Mans. to be 'Māgadhisms', see above p. 82. An argument to show that the iy passive in Shb. and Mans. is a 'Māgadhism' is that we should otherwise have to assume that iya remained or was contracted to i in both Shb. and Mans. under unknown conditions; whereas iya remains in Dh., J., and K. Moreover the present passive in iy is the only present
the following are real points of contact and not 'Māgadhism':
the contraction of aṅa to o in the correspondents to Skt. bhavati, bhavatu (Mans., Shb. bhoti, Shb. bhotu; Dh. J. K. hoti, hotu); original vocalic ṣṇ appears as a+a nasal (Shb. Mans. atkvaṃtum, Dh. J. K. atkvaṃtum); the initial i of iti is lost after immediately preceding vowels; the dat. sing. of a-stems ends in -āye (written -aye in Shb. and Mans.); the oblique cases in the sing. of a-stems ends in -āye (written -aye in Shb. and Mans.); sāntaṃ as a nom. sing. of the present

passive found in the dialects of the Pillar-Edicts. The fact that Mans. crn. āṇa (i.e. orabhisa) corresponds to Shb. aṇrbaḥṣiṣu points in the same direction. 'Māgadhian' s for native ς should be observed in the termination of both words. Note too the Shb. passive kaṇṇaṃti (*kany-) with active ending.—It should be noticed that cu and not fu alone is found in the Kali redaction of the Fourteen-Edicts as well as the various recensions of the Pillar-Edicts. The fu of the Dhauli redaction of the Fourteen-Edicts then would be a trace of the true local vernacular (cf. above).—This does not make it possible to declare cu the phonetic equivalent of Skt. tā, as t before ṣ remains in the dialect of the Delhī-Sivalik version of the Pillar-Edicts (cf. tṣāyatāṃ, Skt. tṣāyatāṃ). On the etymology of cu see Michelson, I.F. xxiii, p. 256 ff. I may add that I hold Shb. and Mans. hida to be a 'Māgadhism' also. Similarly Mans. hidaṃ, if not a pure blunder.

1 Johansson's explanation of this form is wholly erroneous. As Pischel (see his Gr. d. Pkt.-Sprachen) rightly saw, aye corresponds phonetically to Sanskrit aya. For the use of aye (*aiyī) as a gen. sing. no question will be raised. The use of aye as an inst. sing. is thus to be explained *aiṣ and *aya, the gen. and inst. sing. of a-stems respective phonetically fell together in *aya; likewise *avr and *a of the a-stems; after the syncretism of the gen. and dative, aye did duty as a gen. also: now aye had the function of both gen. and inst. aye was made to serve as an inst. Hence aye of a-stems also was used as an inst. It would be possible to assume that aye simply levellled aya. Another hypothesis that is also plausible is: the inst. aya was levelled to aya by influence of the gen. sing. aya (*aiyā); so when aye came to be used as a gen., it also was used as an inst. As a matter of fact all the above forces may have played a part in bringing about the result.—The original loc. sing., whatever it may have been, was simply wiped out in favor of aye. For aye in the oblique cases of a-stems in Pāli, and in the Gīrār redaction of Fourteen-Edicts; as well as in the dialects of the Pillar-Edicts see my forth-coming essay on the dialect of the Gīrār redaction. The dat. sing. of a-stems in aye is simply borrowed from the a-stems. Pischel (see his Gr. d. Pkt.-Sprachen) already saw the possibility of this explanation, but rejected it on what appears to me insufficient grounds. Johansson's explanation is untenable as Pischel presumably saw. See also Michelson, I.F. xxiii, p. 243.
participle (written samta once in Mans.); similarly Shb. Mans. karantam (written also karata in both Shb. and Mans., karata in Shb.), Kāśi kalantam (written also kalanta, kulata); the optative siyā (written siya in Shb. and Mans.). It should also be noted that in these dialects the nom. sing. neuter of a-stems is frequently replaced by the nom. sing. masc. (Shb. -o, Dh., J., K. -e; in Mans. ‘Magadhān’ -e replaces native -o). And the vocalism of ucauca- (written ucauca- in Shb. and Mans.) in the dialects of J., Dh., and K. is deserving of mention in contrast with Girnār ucauca-. (Such is the reading of J. in ASSI.)
A *Hymn to Tammuz* (Cuneiform Texts from the British Museum, Tablet 13821, Plate 18) with translation and commentary by Professor J. Dunneley Prince, Ph. D., Columbia University, New York.

**Transliteration and Translation.**

**Obverse.**

1. — — — — — ama-mu-ra nu-un-ti
   (Lament) for my mighty one who liveth no more.
2. — — — — nu-un-ti ama-mu-ra nu-un-ti
   — — — who liveth no more, for my mighty one who
   liveth no more.
   — — — who — — liveth no more; for my mighty
   one who liveth no more.
4. — — — — du mu-ud-na-mu nu-un-ti
   — — — — — — — — — my spouse who liveth no more.
5. — — — — — — mu mu nu-un-ti
   — — — — — — — — — who liveth no more.
6. — — — — dimmer gal mu-an-na nu-un-ti
   — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — great god of the heavenly year who liveth
   no more.
7. â-mu-un-e a-ra-li nu-un-ti
   Lord of the lower world who liveth no more.
8. â-mu-un-e sar-ra lamga ki nu-un-ti
   Lord of vegetation, artificer of the earth, who liveth no more.
9. *lax(?)-ba en dimmer dumu-zu nu-un-ti*
   The shepherd, the lord, the god Tammuz who liveth no more.
10. â-mu-un-e ba-ta(?)-ba nu-un-ti
    The lord who giveth gifts who liveth no more.
11. *mu-ud-na-bi-ta (an-na)-ka nu-un-ti*
    With his heavenly spouse he liveth no more.
12. — — — — mu-lin-na nu-un-ti
    (The producer of) wine who liveth no more.
13. — — — — lum-lum-ka na-am-mal nu-un-ti
    Lord of fructification; the established one who liveth no more.
15. ū-mu-un (gir)-ka na-ām-mal mu-un-ti
   The lord of power; the established one who liveth no more.

16. gud kala-a-dim alam-ne-en dib (LU)-dib (LU)-bi ū-ša (Ū)-a-dim ne-tuš (KU)
   Like a mighty bull is his appearance; the forceful one, like an ancient bull he coucheth.

17. gud kala-a-dim alam-ne-en mà bir-bi ū-ša (Ū)-a-dim ne-tuš (KU)
   Like a mighty bull is his appearance; in his ship of plenty like an ancient bull he coucheth.

18. me-e-xu(?)-da(?) LI ga-a-an-ma-kud
   In accordance with thy word(?) the earth shall be judged.

19. su-gir-ma LI ga-a-an-ma-kud
   (Thus) the high parts of the earth verily shall be judged.

20. — — — mi-tu — — me-a ga-a-an-ma-ab-gu (KA)
   — — — who — — — verily they shall cry out for it.

21. [šuku (PAD) nu]-kù-a-mu ga-a-an-ma-ab-gu (KA)
   For food which they have not to eat they shall verily cry out.

22. (a) nu-nag-a-mu ga-a-an-ma-ab-gu (KA)
   For water which they have not to drink they shall verily cry out.

23. (ki)-el šag-ga-mu ga-a-an-ma-ab-gu (KA)
   Verily the maiden who is pleasing shall cry out for it.

24. (kala) šag-ga-mu ga-a-an-ma-ab-gu (KA)
   Verily the warrior who is acceptable shall cry out for it.

25. — — — a(?)-zu gir-e kur aš ba-šub (RU)
   — — — thy — — — the mighty one, the land with a curse is destroyed.

26. — — — gir-e kur aš ba-šub (RU)
   — — — the mighty one, the land with a curse is destroyed.

Reverse.

27. (gir) kur-ra i-de ugun (DAR) nu ugun (DAR) kur-e
   Power of the land (is he). With (his) gift no gift can vie.

28. (gir) kur-ra gu (KA) xu-tu-ul-xu-tu-ul-e
   Power of the land (is he). The Word which overcometh disease.

29. gir ū-mu-un-da ī-mu-un-da
   Power he exalteth, exalteth.
30. [šuku (PAD)] nu-ku-a-mu ū-mu-un-da
   Food which they have not to eat he raiseth up.
31. a nu-nag-a-mu ū-mu-un-da
   Water which they have not to drink he raiseth up.
32. ki-el šag-ga-mu ū-mu-un-da
   The maiden who is pleasing he raiseth up.
33. kala šag-ga-mu ū-mu-un-da
   The warrior who is acceptable he raiseth up.
34. kala mu-lu-zu-ne mu-da-ab-za-lam-ma
   The mighty one who destroyeth your people.
35. dimmer ab-u tur mu-lu-zu-ne mu-da-ab-za-lam-ma
   The god Ninib destroyeth even the least among your people.
36. i-de-bar šag-ga-ni Nina-nam-a-e-bi-bi
   With her gracious aspect Ninā speaketh.
37. sar-bar šag-ga-ni xu-ub-na-an-ni-bur-ri
   In her gracious rising verily she shineth forth.
38. (ki) ḫum-dirig-ga-na ur-ba kala(?) alam
   Where she waxeth full, her procreative power is mighty
   of aspect.
39. mu-lu-nal PA gub (KAB) gub(DU) bi-na šam-el-teq-ga
   xu-ba-e-ku
   The creative one (with) the staff of her left hand, verily
   she establisheth the cleansing uxulu-herb.
40. qī-sa (DI)-da-ni im-e-a-an-me
   With her sceptre of judgment she commandeth.
41. mu-lu-nal li-du-ni im-mi-ir-ri-a-an-me
   The creative one with her firm voice she speaketh to him.
XLII. er-lim-ma dimmer dullu-zi-da
XLII lines. A hymn for the god Tammuz.

Commentary.

The present hymn to Tammuz in Eme-sal is one of a series
found in Cup. Texts from the British Museum, Vol. xv, plates 10ff.
Of these Dr. F. A. Vanderburgh has published in his thesis
"Sumerian Hymns" (Columbia University Press, 1908) Plates 10,
15—16, 17, 19 and also Plates 11—12 in the JAOS, 1908.
I have published Plates 14, 22, and 23 in the AJSL, while
Dr. Vanderburgh, who is at present preparing for publication
Plates 7, 8, 9, and 13—12, has aided me with the present
text by many valuable suggestions.
A Hymn to Tammuz.

Obverse.

Line 1. *anna = AM 'bull.' I render 'mighty one.' Note that the god Ea is also called a bull in ii, 58, 52.


Line 6. *dimnur gil *mu-an-na 'great god of the year (lit. 'name') of heaven,' in contradistinction to the present condition of Tammuz as lord of the lower world *arali, line 7, whither he had been transported, leaving the heavenly (or upper) year destitute of vegetation.

Line 8. *nu-mun-e *sar-ra 'lord of (spring) vegetation.' Note that *sar = SAR = kīrū 'plantation,' Br. 4315 and see Prince, Materials, p. 283.

The mourning ceremonial for Tammuz took place just before the summer solstice which was followed by a season of rejoicing at his re-appearance. For this mourning-ceremonial which was evidently practised at Jerusalem in the time of Ezekiel, cf. Ezek. viii, 14:

Probably also in Zech. xii, 10, the words *ste'er lī rū *dūr refer to the ritual lamentation for Tammuz.

*lamqa hi; he was the artificer of the earth, because he was the cause of plant life especially. For *lamqa, cf. Prince op. cit. 221.

Line 9. *lux(-)-*ba. Although the first sign is obscure, it is most probably *lux of the combination *lux-*ba = rē'u 'shepherd,' IV, 27, 1a.

The Sumerian form *dumu-zî 'son of life,' i.e., 'life itself' = the god of life par excellence, is clearly the original of the Semitic corrupted name of this god Tammuz, which appears also as the name of the fourth month. Note the fuller form *dumu-zî-đa in line 42, showing that the full form of the word for 'life' in Sumerian was *zîd.

Line 10. *ba-*lṣ(-)-*ba. This seems clearly *ba verbal prefix + the locative infix -lṣ- + the root *ba = BA = gāšu 'give, bestow,' Br. 107.

Line 13. I assume that some word meaning 'producer,' i.e. 'of wine' has been erased here.

Note the ES. form *mu-tim-*na for *geš-tin. See Prince, op. cit., p. 247 = kārinu 'wine.'
am-um-mal seems to consist of the abstract prefix nam- + mal — GA — šakatu, Prince, p. 231.

Line 15. This line evidently contains: gir-emâqu ‘power,’ Br. 9184 + the genitive suffix -ka.

Line 16. The second sign here must clearly be read kala owing to the following vowel of prolongation -a, and not ig, as is frequently the case. The suffix I read dim and not qim, as the hymn is in ES.

On alam, see Prince, 29. This is not a certain reading for the sign QALAM. Note that Hrozny reads this sign with value alana, probably associating it with Sem. ĩanu ‘appearance,’ Br. 7299, which seems to be its meaning here.

The suffix ne-en seems to consist of the demonstrative element ne- + the verbal -en, seen in maŠn to be.’

Note that the combination dîb (LU)-dîb (LU)-bi has the meanings sîtîpuru, Br. 10740; sîtîbuq, Br. 10741; and sîtîmaru, Br. 10742. Hence my translation.

a-ša(U)-a-dim consists of za—U—labėru ‘ancient,’ Br. 9465, + the prolonging vowel -a+ the suffix dim (GIM) — ‘like unto.’

tuš (KU) — asābu ‘sit, dwell,’ Br. 10523. The god is conceived of as sitting, i.e., couching like a powerful bull resting. The couchant attitude is no doubt suggested by the fact that the god’s power is temporarily at rest in the lower world.

Line 17. má — elippu ‘ship,’ Br. 3683. This is his ritual ship of state or wealth; bir — ēibtu ‘wealth,’ Br. 2029, probably referring to the ceremonial of carrying the image of a god in a small symbolical ship.

Line 18. me-e-su(?)-da ‘in accordance with thy word; me — qulû ‘utterance,’ Br. 10570. LI means ēruṭu ‘earth,’ Br. 1104; perhaps this is correct here in connection with the verb-root tar-kud — dâmu ‘judge,’ Br. 364. The prefix ga although productive properly, I render here as ‘shall,’ expressive of the singer’s hope and thus also in the following lines.

Line 19. sa-gur I render as ‘highlands’; see Br. 233 = Elam-tu — ma — diatu ‘land,’ Prince, 228. This combination seems to be in genitive apposition to the following LI = ēruṭu (see just above on line 18).

Line 20. me-a here is perhaps the cognate accusative of gu (KA) and means ‘they cry a crying’ — ‘they cry lustily for it.’

Line 22. Note the parallelism here with line 21. *nag* = *satu* 'drink,' Prince 251.

Line 23. *ki-ēl* = *ardatu* 'maid-servant.' For full discussion, see Prince 204. In *ṣag-ga-mu, *ṣag* = *damqu,* Br. 7291 + the relative suffix -mu, in this case probably not the -mu of the first person, but the indeterminative relative possessive -mu discussed Prince, p. XXI.

Line 25. *as* = *arratu* 'curse,' see Prince, 41. *sub* (RU) = *maqātu* 'overwhelm,' Br. 1432. Literally: 'the land he overwhelmed (with) a curse.' I render it passively "is destroyed" here, because the curse is negative on the part of Tammuz, consisting in his absence.

Reserve.

Line 27. The first sign here must be *gir* = *emūqa* 'power' fully discussed, Prince, 149. (gir) *kur-ra* seems to me to be an epithet of the god. *i-de* I take as prepositional; cf. Br. 4005: *mazar,* here = 'before' or 'in comparison with.' *ugun* (DAR) = the abstract prefix *u-* *gna-* *bilu* 'gift, tribute.' See Prince, 341. In the last part of the line *pāp* must be = *naḫaru,* here = 'vile with,' Br. 1143.

Line 28. *zu-tu-ul* *nu-tu-ul-e* by repetition means "to overcome disease thoroughly." Note *xutul* = *xatā sa murci,* Br. 2056: 'overcome disease.' Here Tammuz is the life giving Word, a conception which has many parallels in early Semitic literature and which culminated in the Word of the Gospel of St. John.

Line 29. I must regard *-da* here as a verb = *nāšā* 'lift up;' see Br. 6654 = *ṣaqū* 'be lofty.'

Lines 30—33 incl. are parallel with lines 21—24 incl. above.

Line 34. The suffix *zu-ne* ought to mean "your people" (*mudu* = *nisā, Br. 1339). See Prince, p. XXIII § 10 on *zu-ne* which can sometimes but incorrectly mean 'their.' *za-lam-ma* must signify 'destroy;' see Br. 11850: *za-lam* = *xulīqu* 'destroy.'

Line 35. The god *ab-ur* = *Nimbi,* Br. 3836.

Line 36. *-de* = *naplu* 'look, aspect.' Br. 4010. *bar* = *namārū* 'shine forth,' Br. 1775. *i-de-bar* is a combination which means 'aspect' in this connection. *ṣag* = *damqu* 'gracious,' Br. 7991, *na-ma-e-bi-bi;* the prefix *naum* is not necessarily negative; cf.
Prince, p. XXIX § 34: it merely serves here to strengthen the ordinary ba-prefix. bi-bi = qibê 'speak,' Prince, 57.

Line 37. sar = nippur 'rising,' as of the sun or a planet. DW 474. sar-bar is a synonym or a parallel of i-de-bar of the preceding line. I render the precative force of zu-in zu-ub-nani-bar-ri as +erily she shineth forth;' note that bar = namdru 'shine forth,' Br. 1775. pittu 'open out,' Br. 1791.

Line 38. (ki) really = 'place,' here probably = 'where, wherever.' on-dirig = 'fullness,' with abstract prefix on + dirig 'be full,' Prince, 81. I render ur here as bułtu 'procreative power,' Br. 11268 + the 3 p. suffix -ba. The sign after BA is probably lig or kala, as it seems to be pronounced in this hymn (note above line 16 LIG -a = kala-a). kala(?)+ ulam must mean 'mighty of aspect.'

Line 39. mu-lu-mal 'she who' (relative na-du) + mal = šakânû 'establish, make,' Br. 5421. This must be an epithet applied to Ninâ. PA can only indicate the goddess's sceptre of power; Br. 5593: xattu 'sceptre, staff.' kab = gubu = šumému 'left hand,' Br. 2684. I believe that DU = gub is a gloss giving the reading of KAB = gub(u). šam-nag-ga; this nag = elteg = urulu 'a cleansing plant like a soap,' DW. 43; the prefix šam = U is the determinative for 'plant.' ka here must = nadu 'put in a specified place,' Br. 10 542.

Line 40. In gi-su (DI) - dan-ni, gi = reed,' Prince, 138; sa (DI) = melku 'counsel, judgment,' Br. 9531; da is probably the infulx postposition before the suffix -ni 'her.' me = qalu 'speak,' Br. 10 561.

Line 41. li-du appears in li-du an-nu = dišum ša emârî 'high voice in singing.' It is probable that LI was pronounced nugg(b), a cognate of ma = qalu 'speak.' du in li-du = kânu 'firm,' Br. 4884. In im-mi-ir-ri-a-an-me, 'unto him' is contained in the -r- element.

It should be noted that in lines 36–41 the goddess Ninâ, the consort of Tammuz, is represented as being the revivifying power acting against the destructive force of Ninib. Ninâ is thus associated with Tammuz in this hymn as a life-giver after the winter solstice. While she and Tammuz are away, all vegetation ceases.

Line 41. er-lim-ma; the second syllable is really lîh, probably pronounced lim in conjunction with the following -ma.
Another Fragment of the Etana Myth.—By Morris Jastrow Jr.

I.

By a fortunate chance the Berkshire Athenaeum of Pittsfield Mass. has come into possession of one of the tablets of Ashurbanapal’s library.¹ Like the other specimens known to exist in this country,² this one also was brought to this country by the Rev. Dr. W. F. Williams, who, being at Mosul while Layard was conducting his excavations in the region, obtained some tablets from native Arabs. Three fragments are now in the possession of Dr. Talcott Williams of Philadelphia (son of Rev. Dr. Williams), a fourth after passing through several hands came into the hands of Mr. George Harding, a Trustee of the Berkshire Athenaeum who about two years ago presented it to the institution. My attention was called to it during a visit to Pittsfield, and I wish to express my obligations to Mr. H. H. Ballard, the curator of the Athenaeum who kindly placed the very interesting specimen at my disposal for study and copying. It measures $8\frac{1}{2} \times 10$ cm. and contains parts of 31 lines on the obverse and parts of 24 lines on the reverse together with a colophon showing parts of 6 lines. By comparison with similar colophons, the one on our text can be completed, adding about 3 more lines. Completing the tablet in this way, we are enabled to estimate the number of lines missing at the top of the obverse at about 9 lines. How many lines are missing at the bottom of the obverse and at the top of the reverse, it would, of course, be difficult to say,

¹ Discovered at Kouyunjik by Layard (1849). See Jastrow, Did the Babylonian Temples have Libraries (PAOS XXVII, 147 seq.) and Bezold’s Introduction to his Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection etc. (Vol. 5).

² Two have been published by me (1) “A Fragment of the Babylonian Dibbara Epic” (Phil. 1881) and (2) “A New Fragment of the Etana Legend” (Beiträge zur Assyriologie, Bd. III, pp. 363–383).
but from the comparison of this fragment with the twelve others known to us and a study of the various editions of the text that they represent, the conclusion may be reached that the obverse of our fragment covered about 70 lines and the reverse about 54. The tablet when received contained considerable incrustation. Thanks to careful treatment at the Chemical Department of the University of Pennsylvania (for which I am under obligations to my colleague Prof. E. F. Smith and to his assistant Mr. Wallace) and to a thorough soaking of the tablet in water, many lines or individual characters that were at first obscured became entirely legible, or sufficiently so as to enable me to practically make out all of the tablet that has been preserved. Conjectural restorations are indicated in the transliteration and translation by being placed within brackets. The clay of the tablet is of the reddish color that is characteristic of so many of the tablets of Ashurbanapal's collection. The characters are carefully written but often difficult to read especially in the crowded portions. An interesting feature is the small double wedge frequently appearing in some of the lines, indicating that in the copy from which our tablet was copied a line ended at the mark in question. The bearing of this feature on the interpretation will be shown further on. As to the holes evidently inserted into the clay before the characters were inscribed, scholars still waver between the supposition that they were made to protect the tablet from cracking in the course of baking, or as receptacles for wooden pegs on which the tablet rested while the one side was being inscribed. Probably neither supposition is correct. Tablets can be burned without air holes—witness the large historical clay cylinders and the business documents—and the attempt to steady the tablet by means of pegs at the places indicated by the holes would hardly prove very effective. The holes are both too close together and too irregularly distributed to make this supposition a plausible one. I have sometimes thought that they were inserted as a kind of guide to the scribe in copying his tablet, but this thesis also encounters objections.

---

1 The colophon takes up 9 lines and these being more widely spaced, the reverse contains fewer lines than the obverse. See below pp. 119—120.
2 On the reverse II, 3, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22.
That the tablet belongs to the Etana myth follows from the colophon and is confirmed by the context. It is therefore a curious chance that two of the four fragments of the royal library that found their way to this country should form parts of one and the same series.

II.

The fragment reads as follows:

Transliteration.

Obverse

[about 9 lines wanting]

1. [it-ti(?)]ka — — — ru-'a-u-[tu]^2
   [lu] it-ba-ri a-[nu-ku]
   [erû] pa-su i-pu-ša-ma [a-na širi izakkâr]
   — — — ša ru-'a-u-tu — — — —

5. [lim-di-ta]^3 ma kab-[la-ta-i] mu-ur-ri-e^4
   il [GAL-la]^5 ša ilâmi [a-šak-ku ni-kul-ma]^6
   al-ka(?)^7 ni-zak-pa-am-ma — — —
   ni-il-ma-a iršîtim — —
   ina mušar (il) Šamaš [su-ra-di mu-nil it-[mu-u]

10. [ša] i-ta-a ša (il) Šamaš [it-ti-ku]
   (il) Šamaš lim-niš ina ha-at ma-bi-ši [limahhîš(?)]^8

Restored portions and conjectural readings in brackets.

^1 A variant writing to ru-'a-u-tu. Cf. Mass-Arnolt, Assyr. Dictionary, p. 941, where it is used of the friendship between ox and horse.

^2 Restored according to rev. l. 8. Traces of km and ta are discernible.

^3 Restoration likewise based on rev. line 8 only that—since it is Shamash who is bringing the charge against the eagle,—rev. l. 8 reads tu-u-ri, whereas here where the eagle and serpent are forming a plan, we must read mu-u-ri, corresponding to the verbs in l. 7—8 which are in the first person plural.

^4 Traces discernible. Cf. rev. l. 9.

^5 Restored according to rev. l. 9 but nukûl again instead of takûl.

^6 The first sign can hardly be anything else than âl, though Geßlin (Brünnow Nr. 5004) is possible. The second sign is very puzzling. I have settled upon ka as the most likely, though it looks as though the scribe had started to write a different sign—perhaps Šun (Brünnow Nr. 250).

^7 Compare for lines 10—11, the parallel in the other fragment of the Etana myth published by me obv. l. 13 (Beiträge zur Assyr. III, p. 364), where we can now restore after ka-at the word ma-bi-ši and which on the other hand enables us to restore the end of l. 10 and 12 of our text. Note also that in the other fragment l. 10—11 appear as one line,
though with the indication that in the text from which it was copied there were two lines as in our text. The word **limūt** is of course conjectural but some such word must have stood there.

1 Parallel line in the other fragment **obv. 12** which suggests the restoration at the close.

2 Cf. the phrase **la na-šir manūt ǔānī rabūtī** (VR. 8, 67).

3 So the compound ideograph **Id-Hu** is to be read and not **nsūr**, as is shown by the phonetic writing **e-ru-ú** in the fragment published by Scheil (Rec. des Travaux, xxiii, p. 21; rev. ii. 2 and 4). This is confirmed by **e-ru-ú** in the fragment K. 1047 rev. 20 (Beiträge zur Assyri. ii, p. 445) which in turn corresponds to rev. 21* of our fragment where the ideographic writing **Id-Hu** occurs.

4 Restoration suggested by the other fragment **obv. 2** which itself may now be restored as follows: ڃ.tblū ɘri [li-mu-út-ik-pu-du-ma].

5 The restoration **li-ba-ša** is quite certain. Traces of **ba** discernible. Cf. the other fragment **obv. 3** where no doubt **limūt** is to be added.

6 Restored according to the other fragment **obv. 5**.

6. [u-mi-]ša[m-ma in-ta-na-ha-[ra (il)] Šamaš
[i-na] šu-ut-ta-ti a-ma-ta-ma mun-nu i-di-ki i-sak-na tušša
arad-ka

5. [ia-]aši erū bul-li-tu-an-ni-ma
[a-na] u-mi da-ru-u-ti zi-kir-kalu-uš-te es-me
(il) Šamaš pašu epaš-mu a-na erū i-sak-har-[zu]
lim-ri-ta-ma kul-ta-ti tu-ri-is
(ii) GAL-la ša ilāni a-sak-ku ta-kul

10. ta-ma-ta-a-ma la a-an-an-ni ka-ak-ka-[ri]¹
a-liq a-me-ta šā a-sap-pa-šak-ka šat-ka li-ṣu-[baš]
(ii) E-ta-na u-mi-ša-ma in-ta-ab-la-ra (il) Šamaš
ta-kul (il) Šamaš ku-bur šu'-e-a iršītim² mithar-ti² i-da-am
aš-li-[ta]
ilāni u-kal-biṭu e-dim-ma ap-kid

15. ig-dam-ra a-saš-ki-i-o (ŠAL) EN.ME.LI (meš)
aš-li-ta ina tu-ub-bu-ši³ ilāni ig-dam-[ra-]
be-lum ma pi-i-ka li-ṣa-an-ma id-nam-ma šaša ša a-[la-di]
kul-li-man-ni-ma šam-ma ša a-la-di bi-ti u-sul-ma šu'-[ma
šuk-nu-an-ni]⁴
(ii) Šamaš pašu i-pu-uš-ma a-na (il) E-ta-na i-zak-[kar-šu]

20. a-liq ur-ša e-ti-ik šad-a a-mur šu-ut-ta-tum ši-[rib-ša bi-ri]⁵
ina lib-bi-ša na-di erū u-kal-lim-ka šam-[ma ša a-la-di]
a-na zi-šir (il) Šamaš ku-ra-di (il) E-ta-na il-šik [ur-ša e-ti-ik
šad-a]
i-mur-ma šu-ut-ta-tum ši-rib-ša ib-ri ina lib-[bi-ša na-di erū]¹
ul-la-nu-um-ma ul-taš-ka-āš-[zu]⁶

¹ From this line on to the middle of l. 21 we have a duplicate in Harper's 2d fragment, Beiträge zur Assyr., II, p. 394 (K. 1547 Rev.).

² The reading confirmed by ir-si-[ti] in Harper's fragment l. 9. Note that line 13 of our text covers two lines in Harper's fragment (ll. 8—9).

³ Brünnow Nr. 11261 or perhaps repašši as Harper restores (ll. p. 362, line 10).


⁵ Restored according to the duplicate l. 16.

⁶ Restoration based on l. 23.

⁷ According to l. 21.

⁸ See the line before the colophon to K 2506 rev.—parallel to our text [u]-la-nu-um-ma ni-ta-ša-aš-šu. Correct Harper's reading of the line accordingly. For u-lannum in the sense of "recently just now," see e. g. Virolleaud, L'Astrologie Chaldéenne, Sin Nr. III, 4; xviii, 29 etc.
Colophon.

25. eru pa-šu i-pu-šum-ma ana (ii) Šamaš beli-šu [i-šak-kar] duppu II (lam) alla i-ši tum (?) — —
    Škal Ašur-bani-apal šar [kissati šar màt Ašur-kI].
30. ša ina šarrāni a-liq mah-ri-iša [minnu šip-rū šu-a-tu la]
    i-hu-us-zu]
    [ni-me-ki (ii) Nabu ti-kīp sa-an-tak-ki mu-la ha-us-mu
    ina duppāni aš-šar as-nīk ab-ri-e-ma
    a-na ta-mar-ti ši-ta-as-si-ia ki-vib Škal-ia u-ki].

Translation.

[Obverse.]

1. [Let us form (?)] friendship [you and I (?)].
Verily, a friend I [to thee will be (?)]
The eagle (?) opened his mouth and [to the serpent (?)]
spoke,
An agreement (?) of friendship [let us make (?)],
5. The wicked and mighty (?) let us crush (?)
The galiu (?) of the gods, [the asakku let us destroy].

---
1 Restored according to II R. 21, 26—34; 33; 38; IV R. 55 etc. etc.
2 While the restorations in this and the 4th line are of course purely conjectural, it is evident that the serpent and eagle are proposing to form an alliance.
3 Room for two signs—hence the suggestion to read ID-HU, though of course it is possible that the serpent is addressing the eagle.
4 me-ur-ri-is (like tu-ur-ri-is rev. 8) from aršu (?), perhaps related to rēšu (Muss-Arnold, Assy. Dict., p. 104) like arāsu to rēšu. One is naturally inclined at first to take ḫanīta and habattā as perennials “evil and wicked art thou” but there are various obstacles in the way. One should expect habattā as in the 4th tablet of the Creation Story I. 3. To denounce one as “evil and mighty” would be a strange combination. I prefer to take both words as descriptive epithets. The force of the ma which as the combining element outside of verbs is not infrequent in combination texts (see e.g. IV R. 34 Nr. 1, obv. 4) seems to be that of conveying a compound term “powerfully wicked” or “wickedly powerful.”
5 The addition of ša to Nus points to the reading galiu and I have no hesitation in identifying this with the well-known designation of a particular demon, for which, to be sure, the ordinary ideographic designation is Ti-Lat (Brünnnow Nr. 7783; but which is also written phonetically ga-šū and ga-liu. See Muss-Arnold, Assy. Dict., p. 217). The juxtaposition with the demon asakkw leaves no doubt as to the identification.
— let us set up — —
Let us lay a ban on the earth —
In the presence of Shamash, the warrior, the ban they laid.
10. Whoever [transgresses] the bounds of Shamash,
May Shamash grievously through the destroyer [cut off]!
Whoever [transgresses] the bounds of Shamash,
May he remove him and — — —
May the overpowering weapon [fall] on him — —
15. May the sling, the ban of Shamash hit him [and catch him]!
When they had laid the ban [of Shamash] on the earth — —
They set up, they ascended the mountain [they took the road (?)].
For one day they kept the charm of the god.
An ox, a wild ox, a wild ass, the eagle caught,
20. The serpent ate, drew back, the young [of the serpent (?)] ate.
A mountain goat, gazelles, the serpent caught,
The eagle ate, drew back, the young [of the eagle(?)] ate.
A wild mountain gazelle, a <dišane>, the eagle caught,
The serpent ate, drew back, the young [of the serpent(?)] ate.
25. — — of the ground the serpent caught,
[The eagle ate, drew back], the young [of the eagle(?)] ate.

---

1 For sahītu in the sense here taken it is sufficient to refer to the passage in the hymn to Shamash ZA IV, p. 31, col. III, 29 where the word appears in juxtaposition with mu-tirsu tāši “destroyer of cattle.”
2 Instead of la-ā a one is tempted in view of the preceding lines to read i-ta-ā, the accidental omission of the i being due to its resemblance to the preceding kam. However, tā as a synonym of sahītu is no doubt correct.
3 The reading ik-riš “drew near” is of course possible here and in the succeeding lines, but in view of ik-ka-š, the preference is to be given to ik-kal, just as in the Deluge myth (Gilgames XI, 155) ik-kal i-ta-ag-hi “ate and went away” which is a partial parallel to our passage. Cf. Mühl-Arnolt, Assyrische Dict., p. 54. Whether at the end of the line we are to restore sē or sīrū is also open to question, though the general sense is not affected whichever reading we adopt.
4 Cf. II R 6, 6d. Our passage fixes the correct reading of the term with an s and not šap-pa-ra as has been hitherto assumed. Delitzsch in his Assyrische Tiernamen, p. 48 read correctly sappara, but his comparison of a very doubtful Arabic term šaab u “young gazelle” is not acceptable.
5 Or di-lām-nu as II R 6, 7.
6 It is tempting to restore šaḫ šaḫḫari in view of II R 24 Nr. 1 rev. 19, but the traces do not favor this.
(When the eagle stirred up) tribulation(?), the young of the eagle raised an uproar.

When the young of the eagle] raised an uproar,
When the young of the eagle planned evil.

30. [The eagle directed his heart] in evil design.
To eat the young of his friend he determined.

[Reverse.]

[the eagle] daily faced Shamash.

[In] the hole I will die and he who stirred up, should settle the strife of thy servant.

5. Me the eagle let me live and Eternally, I will glorify thy name.
Shamash opened his mouth and spoke to the eagle.
The wicked and mighty one didst thou carry off.
The powerful one of the gods, the $ašakku$ didst thou consume.

10. Therefore thou shouldst die and to the unseen land Go! The man whom I shall send to thee may he seize hold of thee.
Etana daily faced Shamash.

1 The reading $ak-kul-li$ is suggested by the following $ištu$.

2 Cl. $e-sî-li$ $mâti$ (I R 40 col. IV, 36) by the side of $eštu$ and $išil-tu$
(see Jastrow, Religion Babyl. u. Assyr., I, p. 480 note 12 and II, p. 54 note 7). The general sense is “uproar” “Geschrei” as I rendered it I, p. 54, is perhaps better than “Verwüstung” (I, p. 480), though destruction is also involved.

2 While the restorations in these lines are again purely conjectural, the general context has, I think, been correctly caught with the help of the fragment above (p. 103, note 8) referred to.

* For $tuš-še$ in connection with $dilû$ see the Hammurabi Code col. VIII, 2 $tu-ša-a-am-mu$ $iš$-$ki$. The contrast to $dilû$ would naturally be $šakânu$.

* The emphatic form $ta-ma-ta-a-mu$ conveys the force of deserving death; it is a threat rather than a mere assertion.

* $asmanu$ is a new word and evidently a description of the dwelling-place of the dead. One is reminded of the a-$tar$ la a-$ri$ “unseen place” in the inscription IV R 16, 47* which, as I, 51 a-$tar$ la a-$ri$-e shows, refers to the nether world.

* Evidently in the sense of furnishing assistance, as in the passages quoted by Mass-Arnolt, Assyr. Dict., p. 861*.

* The phrase implies an appeal to the god (as above I, 3)—making the direct statement that Etana opened his mouth etc. superfluous.
Thou hast consumed, o Shamash, the strength (?) of my sheep, in the whole earth the young (?) of my lambs. 1
The gods I have honored, the shades, I have regarded, 15. The priestesses 2 have put an end 3 to my offerings. 4
My lambs through slaughter 5 the gods have put an end to.
O lord! By thy command may some one go out and give me the plant of birth!
Show me the plant of birth, tear out the fruit 6 and [grant me] an offspring!
Shamash opened his mouth and spoke to Etana.
20. Take the road, pass to the mountain, seek out the hole, [look] within it.
Wherewith the eagle has been thrown, I will show thee the plant [of birth].

1 A difficult line. The parallelism with az-ili-a leaves no doubt as to the force of ̄as-ē-a. In the Gilgamesh epic, ku-bar (VI, 123, 147, 188) written as in our passage, occurs in connection with the “horns” and “tail” of the divine bull, and the general sense of “strength” fits the context. The “strength of my sheep” would be equivalent to “my strong sheep.” As a parallel to this, I am inclined to take i-da-am az-ili-a, connecting the former with adamu “offspring.” Naturally, this is merely offered as a suggestion. To take idām as a verbal form from da'amus “dark” gives no good sense. Shamash being addressed could not be the subject, as little as irtūhum which is feminine. If my interpretation is correct, idām as a parallel to šēluw would have more specifically, the force of “vigorously.” Is this perhaps the underlying sense of the stem adāmu from which we get adamu in Assyrian “young, vigorous” and ṣek in Hebrew,—parallel to šēr “the strong one” as the designation of “man”—by the side of the other word for man among the Semites ʾāššāl etc. = Assyrian ensu, nilē, tanidēti etc. as the “weak” one?

2 Our text shows that “priestesses” are introduced—not priests as Harper assumed—hence the feminine plural igdāmū. The syllabary V.R 13 rev. 49 is, accordingly, to be restored [Sal En]-Me-Li = ša-il-tu. In the text IV.R 69 b obr. 7 we have the masculine equivalent with maškabu as in our case. See Jastrow, A Babylonian Parallel to the Story of Job (Journal of Bibl. Literature, XXXV, p. 159 notes 84—85).

3 igdāmū: I take in the sense of “destroy” as implying the rejection of the offerings. IV.R 69 c rev. 99 šaḫūtu “destroy” is employed in the same way.


5 Not as a sacrifice but as an actual destruction.

6 šēluw I take as a reference to the tearing out of the plant—not to the birth of a child as Harper assumed.
On the order of Shamash the warrior Etana took [the road passed to the mountain].

Sought out the hole, looked within it, [wherein the eagle was cast].

(Where) recently he had been left to perish.¹

Colophon.

25. The eagle opened his mouth and to Shamash his lord [spoke].

2nd tablet of the series ala i-ši tum (?) — — —

Palace of Ašurbanapal, king [of the universe, king of Assyria],

Whom Nebo and Tašmit [have granted wide] understanding,

Endowed with clear vision [for the glorious art of writing]²,

30. Whereas among the kings before me [none had acquired that art].

[The wisdom of Nebo, the grouping(?)]³ of all extant collections(?)

On tablets I wrote, compiled and revised, to be seen and to be read in my palace I placed.⁴

¹ II, 1 from /sweetalert.

² nisik dupšarruti is to be taken as a compound term “writing-art” and to be connected directly with the preceding ēna namūrum. The latter phrase might be rendered “clear insight.” To separate nisik dupšarruti from what precedes as Myhrman does (ZA, XVI, p. 167), following Delitzsch, Assyrische Wörterbuch, p. 263, is to lose the force of the whole line.

³ ti-kīp—for which Delitzsch’s explanation (Assyr. Thiernamen, p. 8), connecting it with talumīdu tēm “join” still seems to be the most satisfactory. Cf. also II R 49, Nr. 1 (olv. 13 and III R 57, Nr. 6, 52 seven ti-ik-pi stars = seven “joined” stars.

⁴ sweetkhu is certainly to be derived from satōkka with inserted n, as the variant sa-tak-ši (V R 51, col IV, 55) shows. My suggestion for sweetkhu is based on the circumstance that the ideograph for the word is the sign Tiš (Meissner, Nr. 7663) in S. A. Smith, Keilschrifttexte Ašurbanipal, I, p. 112. 15 = V R 13 and elsewhere (see Muss-Arnolt, Assyrische Wörterbuch, p. 787) in the phrase sašē santakkika = “thy collected troops.”

⁵ It is of course possible that the colophon contained several additional lines like IV R 56 and V R 51. A collection of all the various colophons and a careful renewed study of them is much to be desired, as a supplement to Delitzsch’s discussion in his Assyr. Wörterbuch, pp. 293–294. Such a study would show that the various classes of texts had distinctive colophons. See Jastrow, Religion Babylonians and Assyrians, II, p. 226 note 1 for the form characteristic of divination texts.
III.

The general character of the contents of the fragment is clear. The obverse evidently opens with a scene between the serpent and the eagle, in the course of which the two agree to form a friendship in order to carry out some plan of attack together. That plan involves the capture and destruction of demons and, apparently also, of placing the entire earth under a ban. The serpent and eagle swear a powerful and binding oath in the name of Shamash who is here viewed in his usual rôle of judge and punisher of those who do wrong.

The next scene leads us to the mountain whither the serpent and eagle have gone. During the one day that they kept the agreement, they succeeded in capturing a number of animals and sharing them together. Then the catastrophe occurs. Prompted apparently by a suspicion of the serpent’s fidelity, the eagle plans an attack upon the young of the serpent. At this point, unfortunately, the obverse of the fragment breaks off, and when the thread of the narrative is again taken up on the reverse, we find the eagle thrown into a hole and in a state of utter despair appealing to Shamash to help him out of his predicament. The sun-god reproaches him for what he has done, but according to the eagle’s prayer to let him live, declares that he will send a man to his assistance. The third scene introduces us to the man who is none other than Etana. He is a shepherd whose flocks have evidently suffered through the ban that has been laid upon the earth. They have failed to bring forth young and Etana, accordingly, appeals to Shamash to show him the plant of birth. Shamash in reply tells Etana to go to the mountain to the hole wherein the eagle has been thrown and there he will see the plant of birth. The fourth scene takes us back to the mountain but with the meeting of Etana and the eagle, our tablet—the second of the series—closes.

1 See K 2606 obv. 6 vi-e-um-ki-na (Harper, Beiträge zur Assyr., II, p. 399). It is interesting to note that on cylinders representing Etana’s flight, a shepherd with his flocks is pictured as looking at the eagle bearing Etana aloft. According to Dr. W. H. Ward’s plausible explanation, the accompaniments to a scene on a cylinder stand in a direct connection with the main representation, symbolizing other episodes that belong to it. In this case, therefore, the shepherd would be Etana feeding his flocks.
In order now to understand the purport of these four scenes it is necessary to pass to a consideration of the other fragments of this myth that are known to us. It is the merit of Dr. E. J. Harper to have added to the three fragments dealing with a story of the eagle, serpent and Etana found by George Smith among the tablets of Ashurbanapal’s library, seven others in one way or the other connected with the two. An eleventh fragment—also from this library was published by me as indicated above and a twelfth—in the older Babylonian script—by Scheil.

Harper divided his ten fragments into three groups as follows:—(1) containing a story of the serpent and the eagle together with what he calls—erroneously however—a prayer of Etana for his son; (2) the story of Etana’s ride on the back of the eagle, (3) an assembly of the gods. In my publication of the 11th fragment, I suggested a somewhat different order but Jensen’s discussion of the fragments together with the study of the 13th fragment, herewith published, has led me to a modification of my views. The new fragment shows that Jensen was right in his suggestion that the 11th fragment though ending with the consignment of the eagle to a hole in which he is to die does not necessarily involve the death of the eagle. My contention, therefore, that the episode of the eagle with Etana must be placed before the discomfort of the eagle was erroneous. I now accept Harper’s view which is adopted by Jensen that the story of the serpent and the eagle comes before that of the eagle and Etana. There is now also no reason for questioning the connection of K 8578 with Rm 79, 7—8, 43 as proposed by Harper, but on the other hand the new fragment while confirming my suggestion that the first line of K 8578 obv. is to be completed in accordance with the colophon to K 2606 rev., raises the question whether K 8578 represents the 4th tablet of the series?

1 Die Babylonischen Legenden von Etana, Zu, Adapa und Dikbarra Beiträge zur Assyr., III, pp. 391—408.
4 Revue des Travaux, xxiii, pp. 18—28.
5 It is an appeal of Etana to the sun-god.
6 Beiträge zur Assyr., III, p. 571.
7 Keilinschrifliche Bibliothek, VI, I. p. 100 note 2.
8 As was done by me in Beiträge zur Assyr., II, p. 370. See Jensen’s critique KB, VI, I, p. 102.
Attention has already been called to the fact that the colophon of our fragment contains as the opening line of the following tablet the same words as in the colophon to K 2606 rev. Moreover, the last line of K 2606 rev. would appear to be identical with the last line of our fragment. In the case of our fragment, however, the colophon states that this tablet is the 2nd of the series, whereas K 2606 is entered as the 3rd tablet of the series. It follows that we have here two different editions of the text and that what covered only two tablets in the one copy covered three tablets in the other. The marks on the reverse of our tablet indicating the ends of lines in the copy from which our fragment was copied shows, as a matter of fact, that the 12 fragments from Ashurbanipal's library represent different copies. Since K 2606 represents on the obverse the account of the assembly of the gods—Harper's third episode—we would have to assume in order that K 2606 rev. and our fragment should represent duplicates of one another, that the broken off portion of the obv. and the rev. of K 2606 contained considerably more than the episodes which in our fragment cover the obverse and reverse. A consideration of this thesis will show that it is improbable. The new fragment, as will presently be shown belongs to a tablet much longer than any of the others and to assume that K 2606 should represent part of a tablet again twice as long (at least) as the new one is certainly highly improbable. Moreover, if K 2606 belongs to a tablet so much larger than the one of which the new fragment forms a part, we would certainly not expect—since the tablets of any edition of a series are of the same size—that what covered two tablets in the edition of which the new fragment is a part should require three tablets in the other edition but rather the reverse. A simpler solution will be suggested in the course of this discussion.

IV.

The analysis given of the new fragment shows that it belongs to Harper's first group. The next point to be made clear is its relationship to the other fragments of this group.

1 See above p. 105, note 8.
2 A renewed examination of the fragment kindly made by Mr. L. W. King confirms Harper's reading (3 wedges).
Taking up K 1547 first, we note that the reverse is a duplicate of the reverse of the new fragment which we will designate hereafter as the 13th,—ll. 5—20 of the former—ll. 10—20 of the latter, i.e. 16 lines against 111/2 lines, indicating that we have two different copies before us. The indications in ll. 16, 17, 18 and 19 of the ends of lines in the text from which the 13th fragment was copied show that the scribe had an original before him in which the lines agreed with the length of those in K 1547. The obverse of the latter shows no points of agreement with the obverse of the new fragment but corresponds with the rev. of K 2527,—ll. 23—42 of K 2527 = ll. 1—24 of obv. of K 1547. Now, the obverse of K 1547 begins with the appeal of the serpent to Shamash for revenge upon the eagle who has eaten the young of the serpent. The lower edge of the obverse of K 2527 is preserved so that we have on the reverse, as on the obverse of K 1547, the continuation of the story—the advice of the sun-god to the serpent to enter the carcass of a wild mountain bull and to pounce upon the eagle as he swoops down to eat the flesh of the carcass. The immediate continuation of this episode is furnished by the reverse of the 11th fragment. Evidently the first seven lines correspond to K 2527 rev. 35—42 and to K 1547 obv. 17—24. The practical agreement in regard to lines (7 as against 8) shows that these three fragments belong to tablets of about the same size.

The strategy succeeds, the eagle is caught, stripped of his feathers and altogether badly battered is thrown into a hole and there left to die. This hole is evidently in the mountain, for it is to this hole to which Etana is sent by Shamash. The two tablets therefore,—K 2527 and the 11th fragment—closed with this episode, while the reverse of K 1547 represents the continuation. The obverse of the 11th fragment contains the incident of the treachery of the eagle and joins on to the end of the obverse of the 13th fragment—ll. 2—5 of the 11th fragment = ll. 29—31 of the 13th fragment, though the lengths of the lines do not correspond. The new fragment thus furnishes a piece of the narrative that takes precedence to what is contained on the other three—namely, the alliance between the eagle and the

---

1 Some of my readings must be corrected as Jensen (K. B. VI, 1, p. 106 seq.) very properly pointed out.
serpent, and their adventures until the point of treachery. Again, the obverse of K 2527 represents the episode after the destruction of the young of the serpent by the eagle, namely the appeal of the serpent to Shamash, but we have no means of accurately determining the size of the gap between where the obverse of the 11th fragment breaks off and where the obverse of K 2527 takes up the thread, but it was probably not large. At the top of the obverse of the 11th fragment only a few lines are missing, for the end of the reverse represents in all probabilities the last line of the tablet, followed by the colophon. Assuming that K 2527 and the 11th fragment represent parallel texts, both must have begun at the point represented by l. 27 of the obverse of the 13th fragment, which marks a new phase in the narrative—the beginning of the treachery. We thus obtain for these two tablets (a) obverse—20 lines of the 11th fragment plus 20 lines of K 2527—40, to which we may add as a maximum a gap of say 10 lines—50 lines and (b) reverse—21 lines of K 2527 plus 17 additional lines of the 11th fragment—38 lines which with 3 or 4 lines of the colophon would bring the total to about 42 lines. The break of circa 30 lines at the end of the obverse of the 11th fragment and the beginning of the reverse (20 of which are filled up by the obverse of K 2527) must of course be distributed between the two sides. We thus obtain for the total length of each of the two fragments between 90 and 100 lines, both covering the following episodes: (1) treachery of the eagle and destruction of the young of the serpent, (2) appeal of the serpent to Shamash, (3) advice of Shamash, and (4) success of the strategy and the discomfiture of the eagle. The new fragment covers this entire field and, in addition, starts at a point further back—the story of the alliance and of the adventures of the eagle and serpent in the mountain. It also continues the story after the discomfiture of the eagle, furnishing three new episodes: (1) the appeal of the eagle to Shamash for rescue, (2) the appeal of Etana for the plant of birth, (3) the coming of Etana to the place of the eagle in the mountain. The length of this tablet must therefore have been considerably greater, namely, 27 lines till the obverse of the 11th fragment plus 90 to 100 lines, and since at the top of the obverse only a few lines are missing,—inasmuch as we have the close of the reverse preserved—we may estimate the length of the
tablet to which the 13th fragment belongs at about 130 lines—perhaps only 124 lines divided between the two sides. The episode of the alliance and of the adventures of the eagle and serpent with which the obverse of the 13th fragment begins—say from 35 to a maximum of 36 lines—not being sufficient to cover an entire tablet, we are justified in assuming that in the editions to which K 2527 and the 11th fragment belonged, the tablet that preceded began at a point further back than the account of the alliance and the adventures, which could have been narrated on the reverse. In other words the relation of the edition of K 2527 and the 11th fragment, which we may call edition A, to the edition of the 13th fragment, which we may call B, is about the same as the edition of K 1547—the obverse of which = reverse of K 2527, and which we may call C, is to A; i.e.

(a) obverse of A in tablet no x of the series = rev. of B, and

(b) obverse of C in tablet no x of the series = rev. of the preceding tablet in A,

which means that the tablets of edition B contain much more than edition A, and the tablets of edition C much less than A. What therefore would be the 2nd tablet in B would be the 3rd tablet in A, while a part of it in C would even run over into the 4th tablet. The point is of importance for the relationship of the two remaining joined fragments of Harper's first group K 8578 and Rm 79, 7—8, 48.

Before taking these up, attention must be called to the relationship of K 1547 to the 13th fragment. Just as K 2527 and the 11th fragment end with the same episode—the discomfiture of the eagle,—so K 1547 and the 13th fragment end with the coming of Etana to the eagle, but while the first pair represent parallel texts, this is not the case with the latter pair, for the obverse of the 13th fragment begins at a point considerably further back than the obverse of K 1547 which (so far as preserved) starts with the advice of Shamash to the serpent. Since at the most six lines on the bottom of the reverse are missing to bring it to the point where the 13th fragment closes, there are (making allowance for a colophon on the reverse) at the most 10 lines missing at the top of the reverse. As a matter of fact, counting 8 lines back on K 2527, line 22 (= top of obverse of K 1547) would bring us to the beginning of Shamash's answer to the
appeal of the serpent and with which K 1547 in all probabilities began. The total length of K 1547 would thus be $8 + 24 + 17$ (additional lines on the 11th fragment) up to the discomfiture of the eagle — 49 lines. Then the 24 lines of the reverse of the 13th fragment plus a few lines missing at the top would make the total length of this tablet about 80 lines. The three editions would thus be made up of tablets as follows:

Edition A — Tablets of 90 to 100 lines
Edition B — Tablets of 124 to 130 lines
Edition C — Tablets of about 80 lines.

The calculation is naturally only approximate for the length of the lines differs somewhat also in the three editions but it is close enough for our purposes. The result reached above is thus confirmed that what corresponds to the 2nd tablet of the series in B would reach into the 3rd tablet in A and perhaps into the 4th tablet in C.

Coming now to the two joined fragments, they evidently contained the second address of the eagle to the sun-god promising to do all that was asked of him,¹ and the dialogue that ensued between the eagle and Etana upon the coming of Etana to the hole wherein the eagle lay. Etana asks the eagle to show him the plant of birth² but here, unfortunately, the fragment breaks off. The colophon to the 13th fragment, however, shows that the 3rd tablet of edition B began with an address of the eagle to Shamash and since K 8578 etc. begins with erā pi-ē-su, Jensen accepts my suggestion, made at the time of the publication of the 11th fragment, that this line is to be restored according to the colophon of K 2606 which tallies with that of the 13th fragment. Through the contents of this fragment the conjecture is strengthened, if not indeed definitely confirmed, since, as we have seen it contains an episode to which K 8578 etc. naturally joins on. We may therefore with perfect safety assume that K 8578 represents either

¹ Li. 5—6: Whatever he will say to me [I will do], whatever I will say to him [let him do]. See Jensen KB VI. I, p. 110. The reference is to Etana. Li. 7: According to the command of the warrior Shamash, [Etana took the road] begins the episode of Etana’s coming to the eagle, accompanied, apparently, by a young eagle to show him the way.

² Line 12 seq. evidently repeats in substance rev. 17 seq. of the 13th fragment—the same appeal being made by Etana for the plant of birth, but this time addressed to the eagle.
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the beginning of the 3rd tablet of edition B or the 4th (or more probably the 5th) of edition C. To which of these two editions it actually belongs, it is of course impossible to say. Dividing the contents of all the fragments of the first group now known to us (KK 1547, 2527, 8578 etc.) and the 11th and 13th fragments into episodes we obtain the following survey:

(1) The alliance between the eagle and serpent and the adventures of the two recounted on the obv. of the 13th fragment ll. 1—26.

(2) The treachery of the eagle proposed and carried out despite the warning of a "very wise" young eagle recounted (a) on the remaining portion of the 13th fragment, ll. 27 seq. and (b) on the 11th fragment obverse.

(3) The appeal of the serpent to Shamash for revenge on the eagle, recounted on K 2527, ll. 1—14.

(4) Advice of Shamash to the eagle recounted: (a) K 2527 obv. 15—28 (including 6 missing lines), (b) K 1547 obv. 1—9 (circa 8 lines missing).

(5) The carrying out of the strategy proposed by Shamash and ending with the discomfiture of the eagle recounted (a) on the reverse of the 11th fragment (end of tablet) (b) rev. 30—42 of K 2527 (circa 17 lines missing to end of tablet) (c) K 1547 obv. ll. 10—24 (circa 17 lines missing of episode).

(6) The appeal of the eagle to Shamash for rescue and the latter’s decision to send Etana to help the eagle out of his plight, recounted (a) on the reverse of the 13th fragment ll. 1—11 and (b) on the rev. of K 1547 ll. 1—6 (circa 6 lines missing).

(7) Etana’s lament and request for the plant of birth recounted (a) on the reverse of the 13th fragment ll. 12—18 and (b) on the reverse of K 1547 ll. 7—16.

(8) Address of Shamash to Etana and the order to the latter to go to the hole in the mountain into which the eagle has been cast recounted (a) on the reverse of the 13th fragment ll. 19—24 (end of 2nd tablet of edition B) and (b) K 1547 rev. 17—20 (circa 6 lines missing to end of tablet).

(9) Second address of the eagle to Shamash, the coming of Etana and the dialogue between the eagle and Etana recounted on K 8578 + Rm 79, 7—8, 43 (3rd tablet of edition B or 5th(? ) tablet of edition C).

Let us now take up the fragment K 2606 which contains in the colophon the indication that it is the third tablet of
the series *ala i-ṣi* "he left the city". Scheil does not appear to have noticed that the fragment published by him, which I designate as the 12th, runs parallel to a considerable extent with K 2606, so that in part the latter can be restored through comparison with the former, and vice versa some readings of Scheil can be corrected. But on the other hand the two fragments are not duplicates. Not only do they diverge from a certain point, but Scheil’s fragment is a large tablet dating from the Hammurabi period with two columns to each side. The two accounts appear to stand in the relation to each other of the beginning and end of an episode. In both a state of anarchy is described, due apparently to the hostility of the Igigi. The land is without a ruler. Authority is lacking, habitations and sanctuaries are not built, and the city is besieged by the Igigi, but while the description of the terror

1 II. 10—16 of K. 2606 correspond to II. 1—9 of the 1st col. obv. of the 12th fragment.
2 In K. 2606 I. 9, we must evidently read *ra*-*bu*-tum; II. 9—11 can now be restored according to II. 1—3 of the 11th fragment. In I. 4 of the 12th fragment we must read according to K. 2606, 13 *katt-ê-na u-ba u-gi-gu*.
For the latter we have in K. 2606 the ideographic form. In I. 2 of the 11th fragment read *im-ta-i-ka*. The traces of an additional line seem to have been omitted by Harper between lines 12 and 13.
Scheil’s reading for the beginning of 1. 7 can hardly be correct, while if we substitute *nā a-mi-šu-na* (like K. 2606 I. 14) we get a perfect sense. In I. 9 of the fragment we must read *la ba wa-a kib-ra ti ni-is pa-ra-ak-hi* like I. 16 of K. 2606. I. 8 of the fragment evidently contains the phonetic writing *ak-ni-a-am* for the ideograph *Za-Gin* = *sukum*, Brūnnow, N. 11776) in I. 15 of K. 2606. Cf. Scheil, *Recueil des Travaux*, xxiii. 22 who wrongly, as it now turns out, rejected the proposed reading. At the close of I. 10 of the 12th fragment we must evidently read *e-ba da-ad-nim* = *tin da-ad-mi* (I. 18 of K. 2606). At this point the two texts divide. It should be noted that this 12th fragment now in the J. Pierpont Morgan Collection in New York (see Johns, *Catalogue of the Collection* p. 22) is not only badly preserved but very difficult to read, so that without a parallel text one easily misreads certain signs.
3 See close of preceding note.
4 Apart from palaeographic evidence, the tablet has also the ear marks of the Hammurabi period in the expanded phonetic writings like *ak-ni-a-am*, *su-a-tum* *ši-im-tim* etc. The determinative for deity is omitted before Etana—also characteristic of the Hammurabi period. The tablet is a valuable indication of the age of the Etana story.
5 Seven in number. Cf. I. 17 of K. 2606 (II) *ni-bit-tum* with I. 19 (and 12) the ideographic form 5 + 2.
6 I. 19 *ala Igigi in-tas-[u]-ru-[u].* The city is evidently the one referred to in the opening line of the series *ala i-ṣi*, and where the subject is some god
in regard to which the An mumaki hold counsel is continued in the 12th fragment, in K 2606 the goddess Ishtar is represented as intervening. She looks about for a king and places him in control, while En-lil looks out for the sanctuaries of the gods(?). It would be in accord with the character of the Babylonian style of poetic composition to repeat at the close of an episode the description of the conditions existing at the beginning, witness the frequent descriptions of primaeval chaos in the Babylonian creation myth. Unfortunately, the reverse of K 2606 is not preserved with the exception of the closing line and a part of the last line. The colophon furnishes as the opening of the 4th tablet, a line that agrees with the one given in the 13th fragment for the 3rd tablet, and since the preserved portion of the closing line in K 2606 agrees with the closing line of the 13th fragment, it would be too strange a coincidence if the two tablets did not close with the same incident—the coming of Etana to the place where the eagle lies.

On the other hand, if what covered three tablets in one copy corresponds to two tablets in another, the tablets of the former must have been of a smaller size and we cannot therefore assume that from the point where the obverse of K 2606 breaks off to the end of the reverse there should have been included all the eight episodes covering about 125 lines embraced in the 13th fragment. We are thus confronted with a problem for which no definitive solution can be offered until more fragments of the narrative come to light, but the most reasonable conjecture is to assume that various versions of the tale existed, differing considerably from one another and in which episodes were included in one version that were omitted in another. So much is clear that the anarchy described in the 12th fragment and in K 2606 must have preceded the rescue of the eagle by Etana, and since the narrative can now be carried back continuously to the alliance

who is represented as deserting the city. If, as is possible from the reference in l. 24, the god is Enlil, the city in question might be Nippur.

1 Also designated as In-nin-na in l. 22.

2 The reading l. 24 pa-rak-bi iliui, seems to me preferable to parakk kushum which Harper proposes. The photograph (p. 505) favors either reading.

3 In the 19th fragment we have as the closing line uš-la-na-um-ma uš-ka-ba-šē-[šu] and in K 2606 ... la-nu-un uš-ta-ša-nu.
between the eagle and the serpent, the state of anarchy must have preceded this incident also. There is every reason, therefore, to believe that Scheil 1 is right in his supposition that the state of anarchy represents the beginning of the entire narrative, 2 just as the Gilgamesh epic opens with a description of terror and confusion existing in Uruk.

Accepting this as a working hypothesis, we would have to assume that the first tablet of the copy of which the 13th fragment represents the 2nd, contained the episode of the state of anarchy and the restoration of order. Then followed the eight episodes covered by the 2nd tablet, after which came another address of the eagle to Shamash—perhaps a second appeal—then presumably an answer of the sun-god and, finally, the coming of Etana to the eagle. The joined fragments K 8578 + Rm 79, 7—8, 43 represent the beginning of this immediate continuation of either the 13th fragment or of K 1547.

The episode in the 12th fragment and with which K. 2606 begins must therefore be removed from the position assigned to the latter by Harper as a third group and placed before the nine episodes into which we have divided the first group. Harper’s second group consisting of the joined fragment and supplemented by three further fragments and recounting Etana’s flight on the back of the eagle remains where it is and would thus form the conclusion of the tale. The flight naturally follows the rescue of the eagle by Etana. Taking the joined fragment Rm 2, 454 + 79, 7—8, 280 as one, it is clear that this and K 8563 are duplicates or parallels and that both began with the story of the flight. 3 K. 3651 of which only a part of the obverse is legible, joins on at l. 18 to the reverse of Rm 2, 454 etc. while Rm 522 (only one side preserved) duplicates K. 3651, beginning with l. 12 of K. 3651 and extending

---

1 L. c. p. 18.
2 If this be so, it must be borne in mind, as above pointed out, that K. 2606 being the 3rd tablet of the series represents the repetition of the description as an introduction to an account of the restoration of order by Ishar and Enil.
3 Harper has confused the obverse and reverse of K. 8563. In K. 8563, the beginning of the obverse is preserved. Lines 6—17 of K. 8563 = l. 1—16 of obverse of Rm 2, 454 etc. The reverse of K. 8563 refers to the “death” of the king (l. 4) and to his shade (e-ilmu-šu-lu l. 7) and therefore furnishes some incident that followed upon the flight.
5 lines beyond the latter, ll. 26—30 of Rm 522 corresponding to ll. 24 to 27 of the reverse of Rm 2, 454 etc. ¹ If we are to assume that these two fragments (K 3651 and Rm 522) also began with the account of the flight, we would have to suppose for the former at least 40 additional lines at the top, which would give us a tablet of at least 130 lines and for the latter an addition of 50 lines at the top which would give us a tablet of 160 lines. This is most unlikely and it is much more probable that both fragments began with the second—and fatal—flight to the place of Ishtar, the first ending successfully with the arrival at the gate of Anu, Enlil and Ea. ² This second flight forming a new episode would be an appropriate place at which to begin a new tablet. The joined fragment and K 8563 would thus contain both episodes, while the other fragments would begin with the second flight—the same relationship therefore as between K 2527 and K 1547. If we assume (as above suggested), that the story of Etana's coming to the eagle extended into the 5th tablet of edition C, we may suppose that the episode of the first flight was still told in this tablet and that the two fragments therefore represent the beginning of the 6th tablet of this edition—and in all probabilities the last tablet of the series.

The larger size of the tablets of edition B (to which the 13th fragment belongs) warrants us in assuming that both flights were included in one tablet. Rm 2, 454 might, therefore, represent the 4th tablet of edition B though this would assume a long narrative in the 3rd tablet before the actual flight began. Perhaps here too it may be more reasonable to suppose that the other two fragments represent the 4th tablet of edition B and the 5th of edition A, while Rm 2, 454 which is a much broader tablet than the others (see the photographs in Harper, B.A. II, p. 509 compared with p. 503) would then represent a fourth edition of the narrative—complete perhaps in three or at the most in four tablets. Certainly, the fatal issue of the second flight must bring us to the end of the narrative. The result of our examination thus shows that the fragments so far recovered represent five and probably six different copies of the text:

¹ Note also that ll. 18—25 of reverse of Rm 2, 454 etc. = ll. 17—25 of reverse of Rm 522 = ll. 18—24 of K 3651, obverse.
² ll. 34—36 of reverse of Rm 2, 454 etc. See also below p. 125.
(1) Edition A in 5 tablets
(2) Edition B in 4 tablets
(3) Edition C in 6 tablets
(4) Edition D in 3 or 4 tablets
(5) A fragment of an edition (K 2606)

which may not have contained all the episodes. All these are in
the Kouyunjik collection, to which is to be added the (6) frag-
ment of the Hammurabi period—a large tablet with two columns
to each side—representing the beginning of the story and
which probably told the whole story in one tablet.

V.

Combining now to the various fragments of the story and
leaving aside the possibility that in some version or versions
certain episodes were not included, we may reconstruct the
story so far as known to us up to the present as follows.
The scene is laid in a city which has been deserted by
its patron deity or possibly by the gods in general. A
state of confusion and anarchy exists, due apparently to the
hostility of the Igigi. The Anunnaki hold a counsel in order
to put an end to this state of affairs. The goddess Ishtar and
the god Enil appear to be the ones designated to come to the
rescue. A king is put in control on earth by the goddess,
while on high Enil aids in re-establishing order. As in so
many of the Babylonian myths, we thus have a correspondence
between occurrences on earth and phenomena in the heavens.
Confusion and anarchy below is paralleled by disturbances
on high. During this state of anarchy, productivity ceases
on earth. The sheep do not hear young, the gods are deaf
to appeals or powerless to intervene against the ravages com-
mitted by hostile powers.

Eagle and serpent are next introduced as forming an alliance
to carry on a work of destruction. They defy the authority of
Shamash who represents order and justice. From the fact that
the king whom Ishtar places in control is also designated as
\(r\&u\) “shepherd” and that Etana appears in the story as a
shepherd,\(^1\) we may perhaps be permitted to conclude that the
king who is installed or possibly re-installed by Ishtar is none
other than Etana. However this may be, there is certainly a

\(^1\) See above p. 111.
direct connection between the ravages committed by the eagle and serpent and the distress of Etana, both being due to the general confusion that exists through the lack of control on the part of those higher powers that represent order and the harmonic working of the laws of nature. The state of affairs reminds one somewhat of the conditions that prevail during the period that Ishtar is retained as a prisoner in the lower world, during which time likewise the animals do not bring forth their young. In this case we have, as is generally recognized, a nature myth portraying the change of seasons; and in view of the frequency with which this motif reoccurs in Babylonian myths, it is not improbable that the conditions portrayed at the beginning of the Etana story rest on the same general basis—a portrayal of the rainy and stormy season in the heavens and on earth, which could be symbolically represented as a time of confusion and disorder.

All this, however, must be viewed as merely conjectural until a fortunate chance shall bring to light more fragments of this part of the narrative.

The alliance between the eagle and the serpent comes to an untimely end. They go into the mountains to hunt for food. Each is accompanied by a young brood. First the eagle kills an animal and shares it with his young (or with the young of the serpent), then the serpent kills an animal and shares it with his young (or with the young of the eagle), but the eagle seizes the opportunity while the young of the serpent are engaged in eating to pounce down upon them. He does this despite the warning of one of the young eagles, described as "very clever" or "very wise", who urges him not to break the laws of Shamash i.e. not to run counter to the laws of righteousness and justice. The eagle consumes the young of the serpent and the latter appeals to Shamash for revenge for the injury inflicted. Shamash listens to the serpent and proposes a strategy. He advises the serpent to conceal himself within the carcass of a wild bull—one of the animals slain during the alliance between the eagle and the serpent—and then when the eagle swoops down upon it, to seize him and tear him to pieces. The strategy succeeds. Again the young eagle warns the father eagle and again the latter pays no heed to the

1 Can. Texts XV, Pl. 45 rev. 6–7.
warning. He lands upon the bull, the serpent jumps out, tears the wings and feathers of the eagle and the latter is left to die in a hole in the mountains. He does not die however. It is now the eagle's turn to appeal to Shamash to whom he promises eternal obedience, if only the sun-god will help him out of his plight. At the same time Etana "the shepherd" daily appeals to Shamash to again bring about fertility among his sheep. He asks the sun-god to show him the plant of birth that he may give it to his flock. Through the new fragment the meeting of the eagle and Etana is for the first time made clear. The plant of birth grows in the mountains in the very hollow into which the eagle has been cast. Shamash reveals this to Etana who takes the road to the mountain and, guided by one of the young eagles (if Jensen's restoration KB VI, 1 p. 110, S is correct), comes across the eagle. The eagle appeals to Etana to release him from the hole and as a reward promises to fly with Etana to the dwelling of the gods. We are unfortunately left in doubt whether Etana secures the desired plant and the gap in the narrative at this point also prevents us from ascertaining the purpose of the flight. In a general way we may conjecture that the eagle holds out the hope to Etana of being placed among the gods, in other words of securing immortality like e.g. Ut-napishtim, the hero of the deluge. This is a favorite theme in Babylonian myths which, it will be recalled is introduced into the Gilgamash epic.1 Etana mounts on the back of the eagle and together they fly upwards. They reach the heaven of Anu and at the gate of Anu, Enlil and Ea—i.e. the ecliptic,2 they make a halt. So far so good. Again a gap occurs in

1 See Jastrow, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria (English ed.) pp. 494 seq.
2 The ecliptic, known as the karrun Šamši "road of the sun" (see Kugler, Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel. I, p. 258; Thompson, Reports of the Astronomers etc., Nrr. 88, 103; Violleaud, L'Astrologie Chaldéenne, Isshtar. Nrr. XXI, 78, XXV, 57, 58 etc. etc.), is divided into three sections, known as the "road for Anu," "road for Enlil" and "road for Ea" respectively (Violleaud, Ishtar Nr. IV). The gate of Anu, Enlil and Ea is therefore synonymous with the entrance point of the ecliptic. The Etana myth thus assumes the established astrological system, as is also indicated by the goal of the second flight—the station of Ishtar, identified in the astrological system with the planet Venus. See Jastrow, Religion Babyloniens and Assyriens, II, pp. 441 and 444 seq. In the Adapa myth, the hero also reaches the gate of Anu (Jensen, KEllinschriften, Bibl., VI, 1, p. 96).
the narrative and when the thread is once more taken up, we
find the eagle urging Etana to continue the journey in order
to reach the place where Ishtar—i.e. the planet Venus—dwell.
As in the case of the first flight, a distance of three harsu
or six hours is covered. Whether at this point the eagle’s
strength is exhausted or whether the goddess herself inter-
venes, at all events the precipitous descent begins. The eagle
falls through the space of three double hours and reaches the
ground. The close of the narrative is missing but clearly the
purpose of the flight has failed. We are left to conjecture
what happened to Etana and to his ancient “airship.”

In view of the composite character of so many of the stories
that have come down to us from ancient Babylonia,1 it will
not seem hazardous to assume that in the Etana myth two
originally independent tales have been combined, one based
on a nature myth and describing a state of anarchy and con-
fusion in a city which was deserted by its patron deity or by
the gods in general. During this period all fertility ceases.
The Igigi are hostile to the city and among those who suffer
from the anger of the gods is Etana, the shepherd whose
sacrifices to the gods are of no avail in bringing about fer-
tility among his flocks. Order is restored through the inter-
vention of Ishtar—the goddess of fertility in cooperation with
Enlil. After the restoration, Etana appeals to Shamash—or
perhaps originally to Ishtar to show him the plant of birth
of which he has heard and through which his sheep can again
be brought to bear young. The request is granted. Etana,
it would appear, is also reinstated as ruler over his people and
it is reasonable to suppose that the tale ended with the
transfer of Etana as a favorite of the gods—like Ut-napishtim—to
a place among the immortals.

A second tale is that of an alliance formed by the eagle
and the serpent, the treachery of the former and his punish-

1 For the creation story see the author’s paper “On the Composite
Character of the Babylonian Creation Story” in the Noldeke Festschrift
Vol II, pp. 969–982; for the Gilgamesh epic, the author’s Religion
of Babylonia and Assyria (English edition), pp. 513 seq. and Hermann
Schneider, Die Entwicklung des Gilgameschepos (Leipziger Semitische
Studien, V, 1) who (p. 89) calls attention also to the parallels between
Etana and Gilgamesh which led to the later confusion of the two by
Greek writers.
ment through the intervention of Shamash—the representative of justice and order. This tale appears to be a piece of ancient folklore rather than a myth, to which there has been added after the manner of folk tales a moral—not to break the decrees of Shamash.

These two tales—the modified nature myth and the folk-tale with a moral—were combined, just as in the Gilgamesh epic the two independent series of tales of Gilgamesh and Etana were combined.¹ The alliance of eagle and serpent who join forces in a warfare against the animals of the mountains made a feature of the confusion that reigns while the gods manifest their anger or hostility. The serpent's appeal to Shamash for vengeance suggests Etana's appeal to the god for the plant of birth and the complete link between the two tales is brought about by the meeting of Etana and the eagle in the mountain where the sought for plant is to be found. The transfer of Etana to the gods leads to the episode of the eagle carrying him thither as a reward for helping the eagle out of his sad plight. That through the combination both tales underwent a modification is surely natural. So it is a reasonable conjecture that in the story of the eagle and the serpent, the former actually dies after being torn to pieces by the serpent. Indeed if one reads the description, it is difficult to see what else can happen to the eagle except death. There seems to be nothing left of him after the serpent finishes his work. In order to connect the two tales, the eagle is revived and is rescued by Etana. Similarly, in the original tale of Etana, there is every reason to suppose that he was actually placed among the gods. This is shown by the success of the first flight in which the goal is attained, since the heaven of Anu—the highest part of heaven—² is reached. The second flight is clearly a duplicate of the first and betrays in the language used its dependance upon the former. It is a favorite theme with the Babylonian theologians to whom we owe the preservation and final form in which the old folk tales and popular myths were cast, that man cannot come to the gods, nor can he find out what is in store for him after death, beyond the certainty that he will be condemned to inactivity in a

¹ See the references in the preceding note.
² Gilgamesh Epic, XI, 115.
gloomy subterranean cavern. There may be exceptions but that is the general rule. It would be quite in keeping with this spirit if in the combination of the two tales, Etana is pictured as prevented from attaining his goal. Instead of being brought into the presence of Ishtar he is thrown down to the earth. Just as he appears to be approaching his goal, the eagle with Etana on his back falls through the great space of three double hours¹ that he has traversed—just as Gilgamesh after all his wanderings comes back to Uruk whence he started out with his main purpose—the securing of immunity from death—unaccomplished. The two tales thus combined are made to teach a lesson or rather two lessons,—(a) one that the laws of Shamash cannot be transgressed without entailing grievous punishment and secondly—and more important—(b) that man cannot be immortal like the gods. It is this lesson which the Babylonian theologians made the burden of the composite Gilgamesh epic, as is shown by the close of the tale on its present form. It is this lesson likewise which is illustrated by the tale of Adapa who through a deception practised on him forfeits immortality;² and it is this same lesson which, as it seems to me, the Etana myth in its final form was intended to convey.

In view of the new and important fragments of the myth that have been found since Harper published his study of the text fifteen years ago, it would be profitable to reconsider in detail the many parallels of the story found among other nations and to some of which Harper already called attention.³

¹ That the 2nd flight is merely a duplicate of the first is seen in the persistence of the "three double hours" as the distance traversed. In reality the two flights cover six double hours and the eagle ought to fall this distance before reaching the earth.

² See Jensen, Keilschriftliche Bibliothek, VI, I, pp. 94—101.

³ Beiträge zur Assyriologie, II, pp. 404—407. In the story of the Kai Kaus or Kavi Usun, the King of ancient Iran (990 B.C. according to traditional accounts), who attempts to fly to heaven with the help of eagles and comes to grief, we can see the influence of the myth of Etana, transformed and adapted to teach the lesson of punishment for heaven-defying pride. In a paper on this story, read before the American Oriental Society, April 21st, 1909, under the title "A Legend of Aerial Navigation in Ancient Persia," Professor Jackson gave the various Persian and Arabic sources for the tale, viz: The Pahlavi Dinkart 9, 22, 5—12 (translation by West in Sacred Books of the East, v. 37, pp. 220—225); Tabari's Annales (ed. de Goeje 1, pt. 1, p. 603); Firdusi; Shahnume (ed. Vailers & Landaner 1, 411—412, II, 461—486; 2, 1638; II, 2018—2019);
To do so, here, however, would carry us too far and must be left for some other occasion.

Al-Tha'alibi, *Histoire de Rois des Perses* (ed. Zotenberg, Paris, 1900, p. 165), told in connection with Kai Kaus' building of a high tower in Babylon, from which the attempt to reach heaven by means of eagles was made. This interesting combination of the aerial flight with a tale that is evidently suggested by the biblical story of the Tower of Babel, is a direct consequence of the introduction of the moral element in the old nature-myth. The biblical story, voicing the same warning against ambitions pride, was associated with the tale of Kai Kaus and the latter made the central figure of the combined tales.

May we perhaps see in the flight of Ganymede with the eagle to the seat of the gods and in Psyche's flight with the winged Cupid and her fall to earth, (as told in Apuleius' beautiful tale of Cupid and Psyche — *Metamorphoseon V, 104*) traces with modifications of the episode in the Etana myth? Cf., moreover, Meissner, *ZDMG. 48*, p. 190, note 5 about the story of Kai Kaus.
The Origin and History of the Minaret.—By Richard J. H. Gottheil, Professor in Columbia University, New York City.

The minaret is usually considered to be one of the most distinctive features of the Muhammadan mosque and the history of its origin is naturally of interest to the student both of Islam and of the history of architecture. But unlike the Mihrab (prayer-niche) and Minbar (pulpit), the references to the minaret in Arabic literature are very few; and the traditions that have gathered around it are so scarce as to make one feel that the religious significance that attaches to the Mihrab and the Minbar are entirely wanting in the Minaret. Indeed, the name itself is strange, and in no way expressive of the purport for which the object was built. The word can have meant originally only "an object that gives light". As such, it is used in old Arabic poetry for the oil lamp or rush light used in the cell of the Christian monk, exactly parallel to the Syriac munārāt; from which, however, it is not necessary to derive the word, as Guidi and Fraenkel have done, seeing that the formation is perfectly regular. It is then used for a "light-tower" or "light-house"; the signification "a monk's cell or chamber for retirement", given by Lane from the Kanz al-Ma'rif must be a late and a local one. Schwally has suggested, and he is followed by Doutté, that the application of the word munārāt to the tower of a mosque is due to the light held by the Muezzin as he recites the call to prayer at night which gives the onlooker below the idea of a light-tower; but the explanation strikes one as involved and far-fetched. The transfer of the name from a light-tower

---

2 Guidi, loc. cit., p. 37; Fraenkel, Aramäische Fremdwörter, p. 270.
3 See, e. g., the description of the lighthouses of the coast of Syria in al-Mukaddasi (Ed. de Goeje), p. 177.
4 p. 1798.
5 ZDMG. 52, 145.
6 Les Minarets et l'appel à la prière in Revue Africaine, 43, 339.
to the tower of a mosque must have been occasioned by the
semblance of the one to the other. It is impossible to fix
the time at which this transfer was made. The earlier and
more significant designation of the minaret is mi'dhanah or
midhanah (pronounced in the language of the street ma'dhanah) —
"a place from which the time of prayer is announced"; but
it occurs seldom in the literature of the Middle Ages, and
seems to have been driven out completely by the more common
word mānārah.

It is generally conceded that the earliest mosque in Islam
had no minarets at all. The mosques built in the days of
Mohammed at Kūbah and Medinah were so simple that there
was no place for building anything like a tower, even if the
means and the necessary skill had been available. Caetani,
in his monumental Annales di Islam, has shown that the
mosque at Medinah was, at first, intended simply as a dār or
private dwelling for the prophet and his family; there was no
intention to build a place of assembly for the faithful. A
court with a portico around it, through which one entered
into the living-rooms of the family was all that it contained.
The whole was surrounded by a wall which was to preserve
the privacy of the dār. We have here, in embryo, the open
Sahn and the closed Litwān of the later mosques. Bilāl, the
first Muezzin, was in general the herald of Mohammed, not
only the caller to prayer. The Adhān itself was copied from
the Christians and the Jews. Ibn Hishām tells us that when

1 Or mā'na; Lane, Cairo Fifty Years Ago, p. 78. In a story told in
Kūbah al-dhāmānī, 83, صوومة ميزة, ميزة صوومة and صوومة ميزة ميزة are used promiscuously.
2 The historians of architecture, then, go too far when they say, as
does Adamy, Architektur auf historischer und ästhetischer Grundlage,
11, 16: "Ein oder mehrere Türme, Minarets, waren gleichfalls notwendige
Bestandteile für die Moscheen". So, also, Adolf Fäh, Grundriß der Geo-
schichte der bildenden Künste (Freiburg 1897) p. 252: "wesentlich waren
edlich die Minarets"; and Lübbe, Grundriß der Kunstgeschichte, 13th ed.
11, 70: "Minarets ... sind ebenfalls unumgänglich". The Adhān, itself,
however, is necessary; Dardir, Sharh aqrab al-musābik p. 46: "الاذان سنة
مودعة بكل مساعد.
3 4, 438 et seq.
4 Of course, Mohammedans do not admit this; in fact, the Jews are
presumed to have been surprised; al-Zurkant, Sharh al-Musatta, 121:
وذكر أهل التفسير أن النبي محمد لما سمعوا الآلات قالوا لقد أجيبت يا
جهم شقي، لم تكن فيها مسجع. Mohammedan Scholastics have all sorts
of consents in regard to the origin of the adhān, n. g. that Gabriel was
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the first Moslems came to Medinah they prayed without any preliminary adhān.¹ But the Moslems heard the Jews use a horn,² and the Christians the Nakūs or clapper (the so-called ṣeṣa, ṣāla, or ṣanawtān, a long piece of wood struck with a flexible wabull, the Aramaic nākōsa, which is still in use among the Nestorians); and they wanted something similar for their own use. So Mohammed gave the command “Rise, O Bilāl, and summon to prayer!”³ Later tradition has embellished this simple account. Al-Nawawi gives the words in this wise “Go to some prominent place and summon to prayer.”⁴ It was quite natural that Bilāl should make use of a position from which he could best be seen and heard. Upon one occasion, during the Ummat al-Kasa in the year 7, Mohammed ordered Bilāl to recite the Adhān from the top of the Ka'bah;⁵

the first to recite it in heaven (al-Sharkānī, Huqūqiyah I, 231), and that Adam or Abraham was the first on earth to follow the custom (al-Zarkānī, loc. cit.).


² As far as we know, the Jews used the horn (shōfar) only on certain festivals. On the Arabic pronunciation of شِفْر see al-Kaṣṣāfī (loc. cit.). وَسُمِّيَ الشَّفَرُ بِفَتْحِ الشِّكْلِ المُعَجِّبِ، تَشْهَدُ المَوَجَدَةُ الضَّمْوَةِ (= ṣāla); cfr. Jawālī, ed. Sachau, p. 94; Ibn Hishām, ed. Wüstefeld II, 108). The earlier traditions use the word قُرْن (Muslim, al-Sāhib, p. 164), or دُوٰ (Ibn Hishām I, 348; al-Zarkānī, Sharh al-Munawwara, p. 121; al-Shārīf, al-Husaynī al-Kubra, Hyderabad 1519, I, 196). Another word used appears in various forms: قُرْن فَقُرْن (Ibn Hishām II, 108), لَيْسَ (X, 131, 147) and تَقُرْن مَيْلًا (V, 478) decide for, though there are authorities against them. Another, and later, tradition mentions a fire-signal: كَرِيْزَةً أَنْ يَقُرِّنَ وَقْتَ الصَّلاةِ بِهَا إِنْ كَرَّوْنَ فَذَكَرُوا أَنْ يَقُرِّنُوا تَأَاوَأْ وَيَقُرِّنُوا نَافِعًا وَأَسْرًا بَلَآ أَنْ يَقُرِّنُوا إِلَّا مَعَهُ مُحَمَّدٍ ﴿صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمُ﴾. Muslim loc. cit.; al-Bukhārī (ed. Krueh) I, 75; Zarkānī, loc. cit.; Ibn Hishām II, 108 (note in one Ms.).

³ Payne-Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus 2400. The Nakūs was indeed used at first for the early morning adhān in Fostat; al-Makrīzī, al-Khitāṭ, 2nd ed., iv. 8. On the use of the word in the older poetry, see Jacob, Das Leben der vorislam. Araber, pp. 65, 122 and Douttée, Les Minareta, passim.

⁴ al-Kaṣṣāfī, ibid. p. 3; Zain al-Abidin, al-Bahr al-Rāḥīth, p. 298. وَسُمِّيَ الشَّفَرُ إِلَّا مَعَ مُحَمَّدٍ ﴿صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمُ﴾.

⁵ Ibn Saad, Biographien, ed. Sachau, III, 1, p. 167; Wellhausen, Mohammed in Medīninah, p. 362. Ibn Hishām, p. 822, says only that Mohammed ordered Bilāl to recite the adhān; but see Die Chroniken der Stadt Mecca, iv, 109.
which to some of the Meccans appeared to be an unholy act. Upon another occasion, so the tradition runs, Bilal issued the call from the top of a high house that happened to be in the neighbourhood of the mosque; and in the time of the Umayyads, the poet al-Farazdak still speaks of the Adhan as being pronounced “on the wall of every city”. Even in the later law books it was laid down that “the Muezzin, if he is on the road, may call to prayer while riding; if he descends (from his beast) he must halt, but if he is riding, he need not halt.” The example set by Mohammed, and especially by Bilal, was followed; even though no formal prescription can be found in reference to the ceremony. If the Mosque is large, says a later authority, “there is no harm if a Muezzin call to prayer from each one of its sides, so that all that are near it may hear him at one and the same time.”

There is then, as will be seen, no mention of a special place for the Muezzin. We first hear of minarets in connection with the mosque of Medinah under the Umayyad Wahd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik (86-96 A. H.). This holds good, also, for the early mosques built outside of the Balad al-Harim. The mosque of Kufah was built by Sa’d ibn abi al-Wakkas in the year 17; and that of Basra by Abi Musa al-Ash’ari in the same year; but in connection with neither of these is anything said about a minaret. The one attached to the Basra mosque is said to have been added by Ziyad ibn Abi Sufyan during the Caliphate of Mu’awiyah. One of the earliest mosques built was that of ‘Amr ibn al-Asi in Fostat, Egypt. It was,

2 Cited from al-Biladuri, ed. de Goeje, p. 275; Yākūt IV, 325.
3 al-Biladuri, pp. 346, 347; Yākūt I, 640.
4 al-Biladuri, p. 348.
to judge from the accounts, a very simple building, without even a concave mihrāb and with a very low roof;1 and certainly, it had no minaret. There is a definite tradition that before the time of Maslamah ibn Mukhallid, one of Mu’āwiya’s governors in Egypt (ca. 36 A. H.), there was no elevated place at all for the Muezzin. Mu’āwiya ordered him to increase the size of the mosque and “to build sawā‘īn” for the adhān. So Maslamah constructed for the jāmi‘ four sawā‘īn at its four corners. He was the first one to construct them in it; they having not existed before this time . . . the stairway, by means of which the Muezzins mounted was in the street, until Khalid ibn Sa‘īd transported it inside the mosque”. What the sawā‘īn was, we do not know. The Arabic lexicographers derive it from a root meaning “to be sharp, pointed” or “to be provided with points or teeth”;2 but the root is one that is very rare in Arabic and it has no congener in the other Semitic tongues.3 The word seems to have come to the Arabs from the name given to the cell of the Christian monkperhaps in connection with the Stylites who lived on the top of a pillar. At least, both Bar ‘Alī4 and Bar Bahlu‘ī5 gloss

---

1 al-Makriti, al-Khāṣṣa, 2nd ed., IV, 6; Abu-l-Maḥāsin I, 76; Lune-Poole, The Story of Cairo, p. 42. The same is true of the Jāmi‘ al-Axkar, the second mosque built in Cairo.

2 Tūf al-‘Arab V, 411: للراہب ... سبیت لدقة راسها وقال سبیبیته المصوومة من الأصمغ والصوومة لما الراہب: Liṣān X, 76; Zain al-Āhlim, al-Bahr al-Rū‘ik, p. 968; وعمن المصوومة المنارة وهي في الأصل مبتدع الراہب. زاناثشاری, Ans al-Ra‘īkha, s. v.: ومن المجار قولهم للشریدة ألا رفع و kısmı وحذف رأس والد فنف الصوومة مقال لا يثور المصوومة وجاوً بجریدة مصغية وجاوً عليه الصوامع والبرانس i.e. a sort of cloak; so, also, al-Janhart, s. v.: الصوومة كجزء بیت الصراری لصووم لدقة في رأسها والعلقات لاتفاعیما والبرانس وذوو الشریدة. In some traditions, the word is used for the place of the Muezzin: al-Sarṣahf, al-Masāḇīf 1, 138; ولا أكره ان ينطوي في صومعة; and cf#: Idrit, ed. Duzy and de Goeje, 189, 9.

3 Georg Hoffmann (Z. A. IX, 336) connects with it the word زوولغة “a whirlwind of dust”. Similar formations are discussed by al-Sṭāl, Maṭbu‘ II, 77.

4 Ed. Hoffmann, No. 968.

5 Ed. Duval 221, 26. Al-Kindı, in his account of ‘Ain Shams, says that the figures upon the obelisks are covered by a صوومة; which, of course, can mean only “a pointed hat” or “tapering hood” (Oestrup in Bulletin de l’Acad. Royale de Danemark, 1869, No. 4, p. 200) whence the
the Syriano "estōnā" by sauma'ah; and when the Caliph al-Walid mounted up to the southern tower of the great Church in Damascus before demolishing it, he found a monk living there in a sort of hermitage (sauma'ah), which he refused to leave. In the twelfth century the traveller Ibn Jubair found the custom still prevalent; a Mohammedan anchorite inhabited the western minaret, which place the philosopher al-Ghazâli used as a retreat. It is only in the Maghrêb that the term sauma'ah remained in use among the Mohammedans. Ibn Abî Zarî' in his description of the mosque of the Kairuanese at Fez uses it interchangeably with manârah. It has gone over into Spanish as "zoma".

Nor does it seem that all mosques, even in later times, had minarets; and the historians of architecture go too far when they describe them as necessary parts of the building. Al-Nu'aimi, who lived in the fifteenth century (or his epitomizer), in his description of the city of Damascus, gives us a more or less complete account of two hundred and one mosques; to which he adds twenty-eight by name only. He is very careful to mention the peculiarities of each building. But only twenty of the whole number are said to have had minarets. It is difficult to imagine that he makes mention of the fact only when the minaret was in some way noteworthy.


2 Ed. de Goeje p. 266, 19; Fr. Schiaparelli p. 257.
4 P. de Gayangos, History of the Mohammedan Dynasties in Spain I. notes p. 469; though this is doubtful. The word was entered in the first ed. of Engelmann. Glossaire des Mots espagnoles (Leiden 1881) p. 90, but it is omitted in the second ed. (1889) by Dozy.
5 Therefore, if there is no minaret, the adhâb is to be recited at the door; al-Râbî, Nihât al-Muhâdj (Cairo 1886) I. 265: لم يكن للمسجد مناداة صنعة إن تؤنف على الباب.
6 See Sauvage in J. A. ix Ser. VI. 409 et seq.
for, in most cases, the mere fact is adduced or the additional note that it was made of wood or was recently constructed. The conclusion to be drawn is that out of the large number of mosques in the city, only very few were provided with minarets.

In the same manner at Jerusalem, neither the Kubbat al-Sakhrā nor the Masjid al-Akṣā had a minaret; the style of their architecture, of course, made it impossible. At a later time, four were added on the Haram area. The only author that seems to mention them is Mujr al-Dīn (a late writer of the fifteenth century), who asserts that those that were to be seen at his day occupied the same position as did their predecessors during the reign of 'Abd al-Malik (72 A. H.).

The origin of the minaret is not apparent at first sight. Franz Pascha, in his “Baukunst des Islam”, sees no connection with the architecture of any other faith or race: “Ohne Vorbild wurden die Minarete . . . erfunden”; with which Pool is in substantial agreement: “With Christians, bells doubtless led to the idea of towers, and with Moslems the call to prayers by the human voice led to minarets”. Schwally, however, looks for some outside influence, but does not find it: “Wahrscheinlich sind die Muslimen nicht von selbst auf diese Gebettürme verfallen. Aber wo sind die Vorbilder, durch die ihre Architekten oder Bauherren bestimmt wurden, zu suchen?”

From what has preceded it is evident that the idea of the minaret arose during the Umayyad dynasty and in Syria. In part, it was copied from the towers of the Christian Churches. Whether the ṣarāmi which Maʿawiyah ordered his lieutenant in Egypt to build on the mosque of Amr were towers of any pretensions, we know not. But the suggestion of a tower as the place from which the call to prayers was to be made, or as belonging to a religious edifice seems to have come from the great church in Damascus which al-Walid finally turned into a mosque. Mohammad ibn Shakir says expressly that

---

1 Uns al-Jalīl (Cairo 1883), p. 379.
2 Handbuch der Architektur, 1886, II. 17.
3 Studies in Mohammedanism, 1892, p. 336.
4 Z. D. M. G. LIII, 144.

In fact “at each angle of this temple there was a small tower erected
the western and eastern minarets existed a long time before the days of al-Walid. Al-Walid built the northern one called *mal'dhunat al 'Ariya*, after a favourite designation of the city as "the bride of the world". What these towers had been used for is not certain; the variations in Mohammedan traditions seem to evidence this uncertainty. The one upon which al-Walid mounted is said to have been called *al-Su'ah*, which would suggest a clock tower. Yakut has the tradition that this same minaret was originally a fire-temple and that a flame rose up from it into the air.

But there was a more general influence at work, of which the towers on the Damascus church are only one expression. The earlier explorations of de Vogüé and the more recent ones of the Princeton expedition to Northern Syria leave little doubt that the Church at Damascus merely followed, in respect of its towers, an older Syrian and (we may add) Mesopotamian tradition. In the basilica of Tafba, which competent authorities date from the fourth and fifth centuries, de Vogüé sees the transition from the Roman basilica used for civil purposes to the Christian Church: "to the right of the façade", he says, "there is added a tower in three stages"—a style of architecture common in the Haurán. One has only to study the construction of the other Syrian Basilica—e.g. at Hass (fourth century), at Kašr al-Banāt (fifth century), of Kalb-Luzeh and Termann (sixth century) to see here the origin of the church steeple.

This Syrian and Mesopotamian tradition leads us back—of course—to the Ziggurats of the old Babylonian and Assyrian shrines. With regard to the Syrian Christians, the evidence is not more direct than that sketched above. Even if such Ziggurats had been standing in their day, they were too fervent anti-idolaters to have adopted anything as specially heathen as a Ziggurat would have appeared to them. In building towers they merely followed the architectural tradition as it


1 Maššādaš, p. 159.

2. III. 598.


4 See illustration in Butler, *loc. cit.* p. 220; who, however, places it in the sixth century.

5 Butler, *loc. cit.* p. 158.
was current in the country; for such towers were not uncommon in other than religious edifices—in large houses and even in connection with funeral monuments. 1 It was different with the Mohammedans. They showed very little distaste to accept ideas, formulas, as well as architectural and other traditions from systems that had preceded them or were even their rivals. What originality Islam possesses lies more in the ethical and religious fervour which they imported into that which they borrowed. The proof of this, in the present connection, is to be seen in the two minarets of Samarra: the so-called Mauliyah and the minaret of the mosque of Abū Dulaf.

During the last two years, these have been the subject of careful investigation on the part of two travellers—the General de Beylié and Ernst Herzfeld. De Beylié's Prome et Samarra 2 is valuable especially because it gives us, in addition an observant description of the mosque of Abū Dulaf, about fifteen kilometres north of Samarra in the very heart of the desert, and which has, also, a helicoidal minaret. Herzfeld's work is 3 strong on the historical and archaeological side. Herzfeld holds that the architects of al-Mutawakkil, in building the minaret of Samarra (850) followed a tradition which they had brought with them from Persia, and that this minaret goes back to the Ziggurat through Persian affiliations—more specifically through the celebrated Tirbal of Gör or Phiruzâbad. He seems to deduce this from the fact that this was the only Ziggurat at the time that had retained sufficient of its old form to serve as a model. The point must remain undecided. At least as late as the fourth century—as Herzfeld himself admits—Ammian mentions such a tower at the Nahar Malka near Ctesiphon and Zoëzimus knew of several at Bersabra, i.e. al-Ambar. The Borsippa tower which was described by Harpocriton in his Cyranides 365-355 4 R. C. and which was in use under the Seleucid kings up to 296 B. C. was still recognized as a Ziggurat by the Jewish traveller Benjamin

1 De Vogüé, loc. cit.; Kraus, Geschichte der Christlichen Kunst I. 398 speaks of these small towers as "die zu den Emporen führenden Treppen aufzunehmen."
2 Paris 1907.
3 Samarra, Berlin 1907. An illustration of the Samarra minaret can also be seen in Sachau, Am Euphrat und Tigris, p. 86.
4 De Miely in Revue Archéologique, 1909, p. 412.
of Tudeila in the twelfth century. That which distinguishes the Samarra minarets from the tower at Gor and from the relics mentioned by the writers of the fourth century is the fact that it is helicoideal or round. Diculafoy says expressly of the tower at Gor that "each of the stages is square and less in size than the preceding one." Ammian compares the tower at the Nahar-Malka with the Pharos at Alexandria, which evidently was not purely helicoideal. The idea that is peculiar to them all is that of a tower with an outside ramp; and it seems evident that we must look for the original of both the helicoideal and the square or staged tower in the Babylonian Ziggurat.

It must, however, be confessed that cogent proof of this statement can not at present be given. Herzfeld believes that the Ziggurat was simply a massive pile of bricks with an outer ascending ramp and that the Babylonians and Assyrians did not build what we are accustomed to call "staged-towers". He also holds that they were not merely portions of the Temple proper or adjunct to it; but that they also served as fortresses and were used for astronomical purposes. But it seems to me that he is mistaken in his interpretation of what evidence we have regarding the Ziggurat. When one commences to sift that evidence, it becomes surprisingly meagre; and we can reasonably doubt whether—as is currently believed—every temple had a Ziggurat. The following, however, seems to me to be sufficient to prove that the Ziggurat was indeed a stage-tower.

a. The ruins of the so-called "observatory" at Khorsabad. This is distinctly stated to contain evident traces of three stages and a part of a fourth—each stage receding from the one below it.

---

1 J. Q. R. XVII. 519.
2 L'art antique de la Perse, IV, 52.
3 I have omitted those remains that have not been definitely examined; e.g. at Kalah Sargat—"Trümmern des Tempels, eines Stufen turms oder einem anderen monumentalen Bau"; Sachau, Am Euphrat und Tigris, p. 113.
4 On the authority of Place, Perrot and Chipiez, Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité, II, 409. At Assur the height neither of the older towers nor of that of Shalmaneser II. can now be determined; W. Andrae, Der Anu-Adad Tempel in Assur (Leipzig 1909), pp. 113. 64—though in the reconstruction four stages are given.
b. The ruins of the stage-tower at Borsippa brought to light by Sir Henry Rawlinson. Three stages are said to be clearly defined. Hilprecht speaks of the "six or seven stages still to be recognized"; but upon what authority, I do not know. Its Babylonian name was E. UR. IMIN. ANKI, which Sumerologists translate either as "Temple of the seven planets of Heaven and Earth" or "Temple of the seven directions (spheres) of Heaven and Earth" (bit nibittu hammame zamâ wîrûzim). The name, however, need not necessarily stand in any relation to the architectural features of the tower or Ziggurat.

c. At Mughayyar Loftus seems to have found traces of two storeys of the Ziggurat, though his description is not at all clear. The second storey "recedes several feet from the lower wall", though it is closer to the edge of the first at its North-West end than at the South-East. He speaks of a gradual stepped incline between the two storeys, though its connection with the entrance in the lower storey is not defined. Taylor describes a staircase, three yards broad, leading up to the edge of the basement of the second storey; but no further traces appeared. There seems to be no positive evidence that we are at all in the presence of a Ziggurat.

d. For Birs Nimrud we are dependent upon the general description given by Rich, who saw traces of at least four stages, each one receding from the one below. No mention is made of a rampart.

e. At Abu Sharain, also, there is little positive evidence of a Ziggurat. There is a large basal substructure upon which some edifice has been erected, and to which an inclined plane led up. Too little has remained of the upper part to determine its character.

f. At Tell-Loh the excavators are said to have found the remains of some sort of a building with terraces receding one

---

1 Explorations in Bible Lands, p. 184.
2 Schrader, K.A.T., p. 618. Langdon, Building Inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian Empire I, 57 translates: "House of the oracular deity of the seven regions of earth and sky".
3 Travels and Researches in Chaldaea and Susiana, p. 128.
4 J. R. A. S. XV, 261.
5 Babylon and Persepolis, p. 167.
6 Taylor in J. R. A. S. XV, 404.
from the other. It is quite doubtful whether this is part of a Ziggurat at all.

g. At Nippur Hilprecht assumes that there was a Ziggurat of five stages, but no reason is given for this assumption; and I am not aware that the special monograph on the subject "E-kur, the Temple of Bel at Nippur" has ever been published. He confesses that very little is left of the higher stages of the Ziggurat of Ur-Gur. Haynes found only considerable remains of a sloping second terrace. Peters, however, thinks that there is sufficient warrant for supposing an original Ziggurat of two stories, upon which Ur-Gur built one of three. He confesses, however, that the two upper stages of Ur-Gur's Ziggurat "were so ruined by water that it was difficult to trace or restore them". Of the supposed causeway, only so much was found as lead up "to the top of the first terrace of the Ziggurat".

h. At Bismaya, too, the results have been very unsatisfactory and hardly warrant the supposition that traces of a real Ziggurat have been found. According to Banks, the small amount of the rubbish in the place in which it is supposed to have been would warrant, at best, the conjecture of a Ziggurat of two or three stages. In fact, not more than one stage, in reality, was found with a flight of steps leading up and this may be nothing more than an elevated platform for some building. Further down in the so-called plano-convex temple, the base only of some building was unearthed; nothing compels us to hold that this was part of a temple-tower.

i. The so-called Ṭirbal of Jaur or Gor (Firuzābād). Herzfeld represents this to be also merely a tower "von quadratischem Grundriß mit äußerer Wendelrampe". But Dienlafoy, who has examined the ruins minutely says distinctly that the tower "is composed above the platform, of four stages... Each stage is square and recedes from the preceding one by a space equal to 1/16 of the base".

j. The account of the temple of Bel at Babylon given by Herodotus. Whatever value we may place upon his trust-

---

2 Loc. cit. p. 574.
3 Nippur, 11, 122, 124.
4 Loc. cit. p. 162.
7 *L'art antique de la Perse, IV, 79, 85.
8 I, 190.
worthiness, there can be no doubt of the idea that he intended to convey. After mentioning the first tower, he speaks of an another tower having been erected upon this first one (\tau\iota\nu\gamma\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma, i.e. \tau\iota\nu\gamma\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma\iota\varsigma), and so on up to the eighth. He would hardly have described each one of these as an individual tower, if the whole had been one massive structure. Harpocrates also mentions three towers superimposed as still standing in his days; and he did not regard it as one single tower.

And finally, Benjamin of Tudela, though much too succinct in his account, speaks of the outer rampart as if it were not continuous:

"and every ten cubits there are ways (or slopes), by means of which one goes in a circle, encircling it until one reaches the top." He seems evidently to have a stage-like arrangement in mind. Unfortunately it is impossible to verify these statements. The bricks have all been carried off to be used in other buildings; and all that remains to mark the spot is a depression called by the Arabs al-sahn, "the bowl".

k. Representations in Babylonian and Assyrian art; two of which only have come down to us: the representation on the so-called Lofts boundary-stone and the relief from the wall of the palace of Sargon at Nineveh. The first of these Herzfeld ignores entirely; yet there can be little doubt as to the stage character of the tower it is meant to represent. As regards the second, Herzfeld is at pains to prove that it does not represent a Ziggurat at all; but his argument is not at all convincing. The rather crude manner in which the Assyrian artists expressed themselves need not deter us from seeing in the two curves that flank the portal an attempt to picture the inclined planes of a Ziggurat. Herzfeld suggests that they represent two towers; but then there would be no reason for the curves. And the portal reminds us of a similar portal which is part of the Tirbal of Gür, as described by

1 Zahnplund, Die Wiederherstellung Ninive (A. O. V. 4; 1903) p. 23 speaks of six stages; but does not give his authority for the statement.
2 Revue Archéologique, 1900, p. 412 et seq.
3 Adler's translation, J. Q. R. XVII. 527; The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela (1907), p. 43 is not quite exact.
4 Hilprecht, loc. cit. p. 553.
5 See e.g. Hommel, BABYII. Assyri. Geschichte, p. 19; Hincks, A New Boundary-Stone of Nelsuchadrezzar I from Nippur, Phil. 1907, pp. 17, 299.
6 Loc. cit. p. 27.
Dienlafoy: "on passait d'abord sous une porte signalée actuellement par les naissances d'un arceau de 60 cm. d'épaisseur, puis on s'engageait sous une galerie recouverte d'un berceau en partie conservé".¹

A reminiscence of the Babylonian stage-tower may also be seen in the stories told about the famous tower in the castle of Ghumdân in Şan'a. The ordinary report was that it was seven stories high; i.e. that it had seven stages;² though al-Hamdanî, in his Ikil, is certain that it had twenty, and not seven, stories.³ A glance at the picture of the castle given in the Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum will show how the mistake arose. The rock has evidently been built upon in terrace-like formations.

The evidence here adduced does seem sufficient to permit the view that real stage-towers did exist in connection with Babylonian and Assyrian temples. But it may be wrong to assume that these were the only kind of towers constructed there. The two round towers in the mosques of Samarra and Abu Dulaf seem to point to the possibility that some of the Babylonian Ziggurat may have been built in a similar round form.

It is, however, in another part of the Mohammedan world that we are able to trace the further influence of the old Mesopotamian tradition. All through the Middle Ages, Egypt stood in close connection with Irâk and with Persia; until the Ottoman Turks brought the influence of Constantinople to bear upon the land of the Nile. The great centres of literary and of artistic development in Irâk made their influence felt in

¹ I am not able to follow Jeremias in attributing a cosmic character to the Ziggurat; Das Alter der babylonischen Astronomie, 1908, pp. 32-34. Max von Oppenheim, Von Mittelmeer zum Persischen Golf, II, 240, speaks of the tower of 'Akar ('Akr) cuf, to the north-west of Bagdad as a relic of the Babylonian period (cfr. also, Niebuhr, Reisebeschreibungen II, 305; Rich, Narrative of a Journey to the site of Babylon, p. 80; Ker Porter, Travels II, 275; Layard, Nineveh and Babylon p. 476). But Peters, Nippur, I, 188, 354, is probably right in holding that it does not contain the remains of a Ziggurat. The Arabic legends in regard to its origin can be read in Tahari II, 917 etc.; Yâkût I, 863; al-Hamadhânî pp. 196, 210; Hanzae Isphahanensis Annumiv Libri X, ed. Gottwaldt, p. 30.
³ D. H. Müller, Die Burgen und Schlosser Sudarabiens I, 13, 15, 36.
⁴ Vol. IV, 1. Tab. 1.
the land which has so seldom been ruled by men of its indigenous races. One of the earliest monuments of Arab architecture is the mosque of Ibn Tulun in Cairo. There can be little doubt of the connection of its "corkscrew tower" on the one hand with the Pharos in Alexandria, on the other with the minaret of Samarra. We can have some correct idea of the form of the Pharos from the description left us by Arabic writers, from a mosaic in St. Mark at Venice (twelfth century) and from a curious representation found in some manuscripts of two noted Arabic writers—Yakut and al-Kazwini. It was of three storeys; the first square, the second octagonal and the third round. The minaret of Ibn Tulun, also, has three storeys, but the forms of the second and the third are reversed. Now, it is quite possible that in building his minaret, Ibn Tulun was partly inspired by the Pharos at Alexandria. We know that he repaired it and added a Kubabb or dome on the top. But there is a distinct tradition, upon the authority of al-Kuda'i (died 454-5 A. H.) that Ibn Tulun fashioned both his mosque and its minaret


2 Alfred H. Butler was the first to suggest that the Pharos served as a model to the workmen of Ibn Tulun; see *Academy*, Nov. 29, 1886; *Arab Conquest of Egypt*, p. 398. Van Berchem (Corpus, p. 481) holds the same view. On the other hand, Herzfeld (*loc. cit. p. 83*) thinks that the Pharos was rebuilt in accordance with the form of the minaret of Ibn Tulun. *I*, 263. *II*, 68.

3 Hardly sure, as Butler, *Arab Conquest of Egypt*, p. 391 asserts. See Khotaj, *2nd* ed., i, 234. The earliest coins containing a representation of the Pharos are dated in the year 15 of Domitian, i.e. 80 A.D. Here it has in reality only two stages, seemingly square. On the coins of Comodinus the representation is strictly conventionalized; three round towers superimposed. See E. D. J. Duthil in *Bulletin de l'Institut Egypt*, 1887, p. 54. Herzfeld (*loc. cit. p. 83*) suggests that the form of the Pharos itself is not Greek, but that it was inspired by Babylonian precedents.

4 Khotaj, 2nd ed. pp. 253, 254 (cfr. al-Sin'iyi, *Jumu* I. 44). The text is not quite plain: "Ahmad ibn Tulun made some repairs in it and placed on the top a Kubabb of wood, that whoever entered it (the minarab) might be able to go to the top. It was spacious, but without a stairway".
after those of Samarra. There is little reason to doubt the correctness of this tradition, or to call it—as Herzfeld does—"Geschichtskonstruktion". Al-Kudai stood in high renown among Mohammedan historians of Egypt,¹ and his work was used liberally by all who have written on the history and the antiquities of the country. Ahmad ibn Tulun had spent part of his youth in Samarra;² and when he succeeded in swinging himself upon the throne of Egypt, he kept up connection with his friends in that city.³ It was with him that commenced that artistic influence of Mesopotamia in Egypt which had formerly belonged to Syria. It was one more avenue opened through which that artistic influence of late oriental civilization was to affect the early Middle Ages, on which Strzygowski has dwelt so often.⁴ And one is tempted to see both in the Pharos and in the minaret of Tulun nothing more than a combination of the square or angled Ziggurat and the round one that has been presupposed in order to account for the Samarra towers.

But in one important particular the minaret of Ibn Tulun differed from the Pharos; and here we must see the direct influence of Mesopotamia. In the Pharos, the ascent was covered and was, therefore, an integral part of the building. Yakut says "It has a wide stairway which a horseman can ascend with his horse";⁵ "The ascent is roofed over" with slabs that rest upon the two walls that enclose the staircase. One mounts up to an elevated platform with encircling battle-


² Tabari III, 1670; Vollers, Fragmente aus dem Mazfib des Ibn Sa'id, p. 7; Abul-Mahasin II, 6.
³ Vollers, loc. cit. p. 47, 15.
⁵ Consequently, there were no steps. Ibn Khurdadbeh, Kitab al-Masalik, (ed. de Goeje) p. 114, 16 has جرج, which reminds him of the ascent in the minaret of the Samarra mosque. Mas'udi has the same expression; and the doubt of Butler (Arab Conquest of Egypt, p. 392, note 2) "it does not seem quite clear whether there were actual steps or an inclined plan for mounting the tower", is not justified.
⁶ Yakut has سقفة and not the unintelligible سقفة of al-Kazwini.
ments, from which one has an outlook over the sea. In this there is a space as if it were a square tower which one ascends by another series of steps unto another place from which one can look down upon the roof of the first. It is also surrounded by battlements. In this space there is a pavilion like a watchman's cabin. That he is speaking here of an inner staircase is plain from his statement a little further on that this staircase winds around "something like an empty well"—a fact that is also reported by the Chinese author of the thirteenth century Chao-Yu-Kua in his ethnographic work Chu-fan-chah: "in the middle of the tower there was a spring". Idris (twelfth century) says explicitly: "one mounts by means of a wide staircase, constructed in the interior, just as is the custom in mounting mosques". The minaret of Ibn Tulun, however, has its ascent outside, in the form of a rampart, just as was the case with the Ziggurat. The persistence of this tradition in Mesopotamia itself is seen in the tower built at Bagdad by the Caliph al-Muktafi in the eleventh century (the Kubbat al-himar or "Cupola of the Ass") "ascended by a spiral stair of such an easy gradient that the Caliph could ride to the summit on a donkey trained to an ambulating gait".

The combination of the square or angled base surmounted by a circular tower remained the predominant type of the Egyptian minaret; though the ascent has been placed inside. This general character, of course, admitted of certain variations. The minaret upon the tomb-mosque of Kala'un is made up of a square base, surmounted by another square retrocession and by a circular top; that on the tomb-mosque of Barkuk:

2 *Description de L'Afrique*, p. 139.
3 Van Berchem, Saladin and de Beylié have correctly described the Pharos as telescopic in form; while the minarets at Samarra and Abu Dulaf are helicoïdal. See *Prisme et Sarrma*, p. 116, note.
4 Guy le Strange, *Bagdad during the Abbasid Caliphate*, p. 254. A similar tower "up which four horses could be driven" is mentioned by Chao-Yu-Kua as existing at Lu-Mei, which Hirth supposes to be Damascus. If this is so, the author must confound the tower to which he refers with some other—perhaps the Pharos itself, as de Goeje suggests; loc. cit. p. 47.
5 Coste, Plate IX; Saladin I, 112. Cfr., also, the minaret of al-Ghurt, Coste, Plate XXXVI; Prisse d'Avennes, *L'Art Arabe*, plate XXVI.
of a square base, followed by a circular construction, and then by a round top resting on pillars.\(^1\) Sometimes the circular part was broken into an hexagonal or an octagonal. The minaret on the mosque of al-Hasan has a square base surmounted by an octagonal tower; which is followed by a second octagonal tower; the whole surmounted by a top piece resting upon columns.\(^2\) This is also the form of the minaret on the madrasah of Muhammad ibn Nasr. The minaret of the tomb-mosque of Kait-Bey has a square base that develops before the first stage is finished into an hexagonal. Upon this is a circular tower, surmounted by a round top resting on pillars.\(^3\) At other times the square base was broken as in the minaret of the mosque of al-Mu‘ayyid, where it is hexagonal;\(^4\) or in that of the Azhar where it is also hexagonal—surmounted by a decagonal, and this is crowned by two towers that support the top piece.\(^5\)

Both forms, the square and the round tower, have, however, persisted uncombined in various parts of the Moslem world; the cleavage is rather marked. The square minaret persisted in Syria\(^6\) (whenever Egyptian influence was not at work), as can be seen in the “Ma‘dhanat al-'Arûs” in the Cathedral mosque at Damascus\(^7\) and even in the general character of the “Minaret of Jesus” there. That of the mosque of Zakariyya (the cathedral mosque) at Aleppo is a simple square all the way up.\(^8\) The Umayyads carried this form into Spain; the most noted example to day being the Giralda at Sevilla,\(^9\) which has been copied faithfully in the tower of the Madison Square Garden of New York City. It was also carried into Africa, where, to this day, the usual form of the minaret is square. Witness the Jama Zaitoum at Tunis, the minaret of the Kalaâ Beni Hammad (the Berber capital of North Africa); the Katubia in Morocco, the Mosque at Oran or the Mansurah

---

\(^1\) Coste, Plate XIV.

\(^2\) E. T. Rogers and Miss Rogers in Art Journal, 1880, p. 77.

\(^3\) Coste, Plate XXXII.

\(^4\) Coste, Plate XXXI; Saladin I, 144.

\(^5\) Coste, Plate XXXVII.

\(^6\) Mukaddam (ed. de Goeje), p. 182.

\(^7\) Saladin I, 72. The top of the “Minaret of Jesus” is evidently a later addition.

\(^8\) Saladin I, 299; Adolf Fih, Grundriss der Gesch. der bildenden Künste, p. 280; Lülske, Gesch. der Architektur, p. 81; W. and G. Marçais, Les Monuments Arabes de Tunis, p. 45.
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at Tlemcen. Only in a few cases, as at Hamouda Pasha in Tunis, is the absolute square broken into a hexagonal.

On the other hand, the round minaret is generally found in Mesopotamia and the countries further east. Some of the great mausoleums, it is true, seem to represent an angular base surmounted by a short, pointed tower—such as the tomb of Zubaidah the wife of Harun al-Rashid near Baghdad with its pyramidal stalactite top or the tomb of Hasan al-Asri at Zohair near that same city, with its tower curiously formed of eight stages in telescopic arrangement. Nor are peculiar forms wanting; e.g. the minaret in the Suk al-Ghazal at Baghdad, which though round increases in width towards the top where it finishes in a beautiful stalactite top (similar to the minaret at Amadieh), or the minaret at al-Āmah with its eight regular storeys, which reminds one forcibly of some of the towers recently found at Axum. In some cases, but at a later period, the round form was frankly discarded—as in the minaret of the Bibi Khanum at Samarkand—that noble structure erected by Timur to his much-beloved wife—which is octagonal in form, or in that of the Royal Tekiāt at Teheran, which is square. But in general, one will find round minarets of one sort or another from Mesopotamia up to the confines of China. There is, of course, much variety in the details of these round minarets, and their architecture has been affected by local taste and racial traditions. The Minār Kalān (the great minaret) at Bokhara is an immense structure “36 feet at the base and tapering upward to a height of 210 feet.” At times a sort of spiral is worked into the tower, as at the Imperial mosque of Ispahan, or at the “Gūr Amīr”, the mausoleum of Tamerlane. In the Minar of

---

1 Saladin I, 198, 217, 224, 228 etc.
2 Saladin I, 320; de Beylié, Prone et Samarra, p. 32.
3 Revue du Monde Musulman VI, 645.
4 De Beylié, Prone et Samarra, p. 48.
5 Binlde, Am Kūrtistan, p. 207.
7 ibid., p. 69.
8 Skrine and Ross, The Heart of Asia, p. 392.
10 Skrine and Ross, The Heart of Asia, p. 374.
11 Saladin I, 397.
the Kutab mosque at Delhi, the smooth surface is broken by projecting ribs which form flutes which are alternately angular and circular up to the first storey; circular in the second and angular in the third. The fourth storey is plainly round. It is this round form, though much smaller in circumference, that has been adopted by the Turks and which they evidently learned in Mesopotamia. It is this style that is found, again with very few exceptions, in Constantinople and the Balkan Peninsula.

But it is not only in Mohammedan countries that the idea first expressed in the Babylonian Ziggurat has survived. I should not like to be misunderstood as falling in with the Babylonian exaggerations of some of our most learned Assyriologists and of seeing everything through spectacles coloured by the grandeur of the antique world. But in matters of art and of architecture especially, the borrowings and the influences have been so numerous, that one civilization may be said to stand upon the shoulders of its predecessor. It is a well-known fact that the early Christian basilica had no towers attached or superposed. The same is true of the earliest Byzantine churches in Italy—the classic home of the campanile. Even to this day there are none attached to the cathedral of Parenzo (533-543), of Prado (571-586) or to that of San Lorenzo at Milan (6th century), which are among the earliest examples of church architecture in the West. It is true that some of the old Italian churches have at present campaniles adjoining. This is the case with a number of the Ravenna churches—the Basilica Ursiana, Sant' Apollinare

1 Ferguson, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, p. 505. A similar method is employed in many of the grand palaces of Mesopotamia and in the Minar, or lighthouse at Beni Hammad in North Africa. See De Beylié in J. A. X. II (1900) p. 197.
2 Ferguson, loc. cit. John J. Pool, Studies in Mohammedianism (1892) p. 336 "It is not exactly a minaret, that is to say, it is not now, if it ever was, connected with a mosque, but it is a lofty turret or tower which is called a minar".
3 One might go still farther and examine the connection that exists between the Babylonian Ziggurat and the stage-temples found in Turkestan, at Turfan, Astana and Syruch (Grünewedel, Bericht über archäologische Arbeiten in Jalsukhatari und Umgebung in Abhandl. Phil. Philol. Klasse der Bayer. Akad. 1906, p. 49; Regel in Petermann's Mitteil. for 1879, 1880 and 1881); but such an examination would be foreign to the scope of the present paper.
Nuovo, Sant' Apollinaire in Classe. San Vitale is even sur-
mounted by two towers. It must be noted, however, that the
towers on San Vitale are not campaniles in the true sense
of the term, but merely means for reaching the gallery. As
regards the campaniles themselves, all authorities agree that
though the main edifices of the churches are of the fifth and
sixth centuries, the campaniles were erected at least two
centuries later. The dating of the campanile is in no way
affected by the undoubted fact that the bell was used in
connection with early Christian churches. Gregory of Tours,
towards the end of the sixth century, seems to be the first
to mention it as part of the church paraphernalia. The
Chronicle of the abbots of Fonteineelle, speaking of the years
734-738, mentions the "Campanum in turricula collocandum
ut moris est ecclesiarum". Some of the belfries (e. g. of St.
Satyrus) are supposed to be as old as the sixth century. But
belfries are not towers. The oldest campaniles are supposed
to date from the beginning of the ninth century—those of
Santa Maria della Cella at Viterbo and Sant' Ambrogio at
Milan: though that of Sant' Apollinaire in Classe is held by
some to be of the eighth century. The campanile of Sant'
Apollinaire Nuovo is however reliably dated between 850
and 878.

It is therefore a pertinent question—whence did this ad-
tion to church architecture come? The writer of the article
"Kirchenbau" in the *Protestantische Real-Encyclopädie* is of
opinion that it was an original conception both in Italy and
in the Frankish Empire, and that it had no connection
whatsoever with the East. I understand this to be also the
meaning of Adolf Fäh's words: "Ein neues Element bilden

---

1-8: Le torri della basilica di San Vitale, dalla muratura sincrona
ad essa, furono erette per dare accesso alla gallerie superiore"; Venturi,
*Storia dell'arte Italiana* (Milan 1902) II. 100.
2 G. T. Rivoira, *Le origini della architettura Lombardia* (Rome 1901),
3 Venturi, loc. cit. II. 149; *Protest. Real-Encycl. VI*., 704.
4 Cited from Eulart, *Manuel d'archéologie française* p. 174 in Arthur
6 Dahin and Van Bezdol, *Die kirchliche Baukunst der Abendlandes*,
I. 135.
7 X., 786.
The Origin and History of the Minaret.

die meist kreisrunden Türme". But one might well ask in return—if they were not necessary as belfries, what purpose did they serve? In Ravenna they could hardly be needed as towers of defence, since the whole city was enclosed by a wall. Nor could they be used as light-houses; for that purpose they were too far distant from the shore. It is certainly peculiar that the rise of the campanile or church tower synchronizes with the coming of the Arabs into the Mediterranean. The first Arab raid upon Sicily is said to have taken place in the year 701; and though Sicily and certain parts of Southern Italy did not come under their direct rule until the Aghlabites were strong in Africa during the ninth century, Arab influence permeated the Eastern Mediterranean long before that. I do not know what authority there is for the statement that the columns for the basilicas at Ravenna were made in Istria by oriental workmen; but Ravenna was a great centre from which Oriental influences passed on into Europe—not only in art, but also in decoration, in mosaics, and in miniatu-painting as well. The basilica of St. Mark at Venice, supposed to contain the remains of the saint brought thither in 828 from Alexandria, is adorned with columns garnered in the East; and the campanile has an "ascent by a continuous inclined plane built between an inner and outer wall and turning with a platform at each angle of the tower" which reminds one at once of the ascent in the Pharos at Alexandria. Like the minaret, the campanile could be either round or square. Most of the early examples are round; but square ones are not wanting, e.g. at San Giovanni Evangelista, San Francesco and San Michele in Affricisco in Ravenna. And like the minaret, the campanile was at first not an integral part of the church building. It was generally placed near to it, sometimes even leaning upon it; until in the church

1 Grundriss der Gesch. der bildenden Künste, p. 228.
2 Weil, Chalifen I, 478.
3 Weil, loc. cit. II, 249; Müller, Islam I, 551.
5 Ch. Diehl, Ravenne, pp. 107-109; Venturi, Storia dell' Arte Italiana II, 110, 127; Corrodo Rici, Ravenne (Bergamo 1902), pp. 5, 7, 64.
6 Lane, Cairo Fifty Years Ago, p. 108: "... not otherwise connected with the mosque than by an arch, over which is a way to the terraces above the arcades".
spire it became almost a necessary part of every Christian place of worship.

It seems to me, therefore, that a possible explanation of the sudden appearance of the campanile in Italy during the eighth and ninth centuries, would be that they are due to Mohammedan influence. Whether this influence came from Egypt, or from Syria and Mesopotamia, or even from the Maghreb, is a point upon which I should not like to insist. But this much does seem to follow from a study of the history of the monuments, that the old idea of the Ziggurat or tower in some way connected with worship at a shrine has filtered down to us through the Mohammedan minaret and finds its expression to day in our church steeple.

April 1909.
The Vedic Dual: Part I. The Dual of Bodily Parts.—By Dr. Samuel Grant Oliphant, Professor in Olivet College, Olivet, Mich.

Neither native nor occidental grammarians have adequately defined the scope of the dual in Sanskrit, but both agree on the general strictness of its use. The great Pāṇini states the general rule for grammatical number with the utmost simplicity,—bahuṣu bahuvacanam | dvayāyor dvivacanāikavacane (I. 4. 21f.), i.e.: In the case of many, the plural; in the case of two (or) one, the dual (or) the singular (is used). As regards the dual he appears to know only two exceptions. In I. 2.59, he states:—asmado dvayoc ca, or that the plural of the first personal pronoun may be used of two, and in the next section he adds:—phalguniprosthapadānāṃ ca nakṣatre, or that the plural may be used instead of the dual of the lunar mansions phalguni and prosthapādā. We may add that both of the Pāṇinean exceptions are found in Vedic.

Whitney (Sk. Gr. § 265) admits “only very rare and sporadic exceptions” to its strict use “in all cases where two objects are logically indicated, whether directly or by combination of two individuals.” Speijer (Sk. Syn. § 26) states:—“In all periods of the language the dual is the proper and sole number by which duality is to be expressed”. He thinks it not improbable that in the voluminous mass of Sanskrit literature sundry instances may be found of duality expressed by the plural number but he is confident that “the number of such exceptions cannot be but exceedingly small”.

Students of Vedic syntax, however, occasionally observing some of the phenomena to be presented in this study, have had an idea that this strictness of use was not as well maintained in the older period of the language. Professor Delbrück, for instance, in his Altind. Syn. (p. 102) asks: “Stehst der Plural als allgemeiner Mehrheitskasus auch da, wo man den Dual zu erwarten hätte?” and adds: “Es gibt unzweifelhaft im Veda Stellen, an welchen der Plural auffallend erscheint”.

The first instance he cites is that of RV. III. 33, which we notice here as it does not recur in the subsequent study. In
this hymn the two rivers, Vīpāṭ and Čutudri, are described in stanzas 1—3 in the dual. In stanzas 4, 6, 8 and 10, the rivers speak in the first plural, but this is an exception recognized in all periods of the language. (Cf. Pan. l. c.; Speijer, op. c. § 25). In 5, 9, 11 and 12 they are addressed in the plural, a not uncommon mark of great respect in the later language, though Speijer (Ved. u. Sk. Syn. 10g.) pronounces it post-Vedic and post-Pāninese. In the closing 13th stanza the waters are addressed in the plural, naturally enough as āpas is plurale tantum. The latter half stanza returns to the dual as the address is dropped and the two rivers are compared to two bulls. Surely everything is normal enough, with the exception of the unusual plural of the second person in address in the Vedic. Had we plurals in the descriptive stanzas 1—3 and plural and dual transposed in 13, Delbrück might well have thought the numbers remarkable. He is still less happy in his citation of RV. IV. 38. 3, for he overlooks the fact that the pāldhis belong to a horse, in which case the dual is hardly to be expected. The other instances he cites are fully considered in § 6 of the present study.

With truer insight Professor Bloomfield has long been of the opinion that for some reason or other the hieratic language of the RV. admitted the dual more freely than the Atharvantic or popular speech. This needed closer definition.

It was, then, to investigate the phenomena associated with the Vedic dual and to determine the extent of the supposed encroachments of the plural upon its domain that this study was undertaken. In its preparation all the dual substantives and adjectives, including participles, have been collected from the entire Rig and Atharva Vedas. These have been grouped into several parts as follows: 1. The dual of natural bodily parts; 2, the dual in comparisons; 3, the dual of implemental pairs; 4, the dual of cosmic pairs; 5, the dual of conventional, customary or occasionally associated pairs; 6, the elliptic dual; 7, the dual dvandva compounds; 8, the anaphoric dual; 9, the attributive dual. These have been studied each as a unit and also in its relation to the others.

The present paper is concerned only with the first of these, the dual of natural bodily parts, for these have been the center of the doubt and the controversy. The study has for convenience of treatment been subdivided into seven parts, three
of which have to do with the supposed use of the plural for the dual. We shall consider first the duality of bodily parts, naturally dual, (a) when associated with an individual; (b) with a duality of persons; (c) with a plurality of persons—and then a plurality of bodily parts, naturally dual, associated (a) with a plurality of persons; (b) with a duality of persons; (c) with an individual. The seventh section on a duality of naturally singular parts is added for completeness. The conclusions reached from the study of each section will be presented at the end of the section.

§ 1.

A duality of bodily parts, naturally dual, ascribed to an individual.

ānas, ‘shoulder’. RV. 0—3—6 (§ 4); AV. 1—6—0.

ānsān, RV. I 158. 5\textsuperscript{a}, (dāsāsyā); AV. IX. 7, 7, (ṛshaḥsāya);

X. 2. 5\textsuperscript{a}, (pūrusāsyā); X. 9. 19\textsuperscript{a}, (aghnyāyās); XI. 3. 9,

(odaṇāsyā): ānṣābhyaṁ, RV. X. 163. 2\textsuperscript{b} = AV. II. 33. 2;

(yaṃsīnas). See also § 2 (AV.) and § 3 (RV.).

aks, ‘eye’. RV. 1—0—9 (§§ 4, 6); AV. 0—1—0.

aksōs, AV. XIX. 60. 1\textsuperscript{b}, (mantrākṛtaś).

ākṣi, ‘eye’. RV. 1—0—0; AV. 3—2—1 (§ 4).

āksīṁ, AV. X. 9. 14\textsuperscript{a}, (aghnyāyās); XI. 3. 2, (odaṇāsyā).

aks, ‘eye’. RV. 0—7—0; AV. 0—14—0.

aks, RV. I. 72. 10\textsuperscript{a}, (divās); I. 116. 16\textsuperscript{a}, 17\textsuperscript{a}, (rjrāčvasyā);

X. 79. 3\textsuperscript{a}, (agnēs);

aksāv, AV. I. 27. 1\textsuperscript{d}, (paripanthinas); IV. 3. 3\textsuperscript{a}, (yā-

ghṛṣaśa); V. 23. 3\textsuperscript{a}, (kumārāsya); V. 29. 4\textsuperscript{a}, (pičācāsya);

VI. 9. 1\textsuperscript{b}, (vadhūyōs); VI. 9. 1\textsuperscript{b}, (vṛṣṇāntyās); XIX.

50. 1\textsuperscript{a}, (yīksāsya): āksābhyaṁ, RV. X. 163. 1\textsuperscript{a} = AV. II.

33. 1\textsuperscript{b}, (yakṣmīnas); AV. XI. 3. 34\textsuperscript{c}, (odaṇādatas): aksōs,

AV. V. 4. 10\textsuperscript{a}, (takmaghritasya); VI. 24. 2\textsuperscript{a}, (ādyuttasya);

VI. 127. 3\textsuperscript{b}, (āmayavāsīnas). See also § 2 for one RV. and two AV. duals. The remaining dual will be included in pt. II.

\textsuperscript{1} For the sake of convenience this section is made a repertory of all the terms indicating parts of the body of which the dual is found in either Veda and a statement is given of the number of times the word is used in each grammatical number. References are given to the following sections or to the parts of the study, for the use of the plurals and of such duals as do not fall within the scope of this section.
anúkṛyā, "āṁsayor madhyadheśasya ca saūdhi" (Śāy.), AV. 2–1–0.
anúkṛyā, AV. XI. 3. 9, (odanāśya).
anúvṛṛj, 'flank'. AV. 0–1–0.
anúvṛṛjau, IX. 4. 12a, (ṛṣabhāsya).
aṣṭhivāl, 'knee'. RV. 0–2–0; AV. 0–8–0.
aṣṭhivāntā, RV. VII. 50. 2a, (mantrakṛtās); AV. IX. 4. 12a;
7. 10, (ṛṣabhāsya); X. 2. 2a; XI. 8. 14a, (pūruṣasasya); X.
9. 21a, (agnayāśa);
aṣṭhivādbhyām. RV. X. 163. 4a, AV. II. 33. 5a, (yakṣmimānas);
AV. XI. 3. 45a, (odanādatas), 45a, (tvāstūr).
āṇḍa, 'testis'. AV. 0–1–0.
āṇḍa, IX. 7. 13, (ṛṣabhāsya).
āṇḍi, 'testis'. AV. 0–1–0.
āṇḍyā, VI. 138. 2a, (pūruṣasasya).
irnā, 'fore-quarter'. AV. 0–1–0.
irṇābhyyām, X. 10. 21a, (raṇāyās).
uḥklakhu, 'sole'. AV. 0–1–0.
uḥklakhā, X. 2. 1a, (pūruṣasasya);
uṇāṭhā, 'lap'. RV. 61–2–0; AV. 15–0–0.
See § 7 and pt. IV.
ūrū, 'thigh'. RV. 1–6–0; AV. 1–13–0.
ūrū, RV. X. 85. 37–AV. XIV. 2. 38a, (vadhūyōś); RV.
X. 90. 11a–AV. XIX. 6. 5a; RV. X. 90. 12a, (pūruṣasasya);
X. 162. 4a, (striyās); AV. VIII. 6. 3a, (kanyāyus);
IX. 7. 9, (ṛṣabhāsya); IX. 8. 7a, (āmayavinās); X. 2. 3a;
XI. 8. 14a, (pūruṣasasya); X. 9. 21a, (agnayās); XI. 3. 44a,
(odanādatas); ārūbhyyām, RV. X. 163. 4–AV. II. 33. 5a,
(yakṣmimānas); AV. XI. 3. 44a, (odanādatas); ārvōs, RV.
VIII. 70. 10a, (indrasya dāsāsya vā); AV. XIX. 60. 2a,
(mantrakṛtās). See § 2 (AV.) for the remaining dual.
ōnti, 'breast'. RV. 0–1–0. Cf. pt. III.
orōs, IX. 101. 14a, (matūr).
ōṣṭha, 'lip'. RV. 0–1(pt. II.)–0; AV. 1–1–0.
ōśṭhau, AV. X. 9. 14a, (agnayās).
kaphāṇḍā, 'elbow'. AV. 0–1–0.
kaphāṇḍāu, X. 2. 4a, (pūruṣasasya).
kārāśna, 'fore-arm'. RV. 1–2–0.
kārāśna, III. 18. 5a, (agnēś); VI. 19. 3a, (indrasya).
lāṅka, 'ear'. RV. 5–8–3 (§§ 4–6); AV. 2–11–0.
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kārṇā, RV. IV. 23. 8a, (ayōś); IV. 29. 3a; VI. 38. 2a, (indrasya); VI. 9. 6a, (mantrakīta); VIII. 72. 12a, (gharmasya); AV. X. 2. 6a, (puruṇasya); X. 9. 13a, (aghnyāyās); XII. 4. 6a, (vācāyās); XII. 5. 22, (brahmagavyās); XVI. 2. 4, biś, (mantrakīta); kārṇābhyaṃ, RV. X. 163. 1b = AV. II. 33. 1a, (yakumīnas); AV. IX. 4. 17a, (ṛṣabhasya); IX. 8. 2a, (āmayavīnas); kārṇayos, AV. VI. 141. 2a, (vatsāsya); XIX. 60. 1b, (mantrakīta). See part II. for the other two duals (RV.).

kārṇaka, ‘outspread leg.’ AV. 0—1—0.
kārṇakau, XX. 133. 3a, (kumāryās).

kaçaplakā, ‘buttock.’ RV. 0—1—0.
kaçaplakā, VIII. 33. 19a, (asangasya).

kuksi, ‘flank, loin.’ RV. 4—5—1 (§ 6); AV. 3—5—0.
kuksi, RV. II. 11. 11a; X. 28. 2a; 86. 14a; AV. II. 5. 4a, (indrasya); AV. IV. 16. 3a, (vārṇasya); IX. 5. 20a, (ajāsyā); X. 9. 17a, (aghnyāyās); kukṣibhyām, AV. II. 33. 4a, (yakumīnas); kukṣyos, RV. III. 51. 12a; VIII. 17. 5a, (indrasya).

kulphā, ‘ankle.’ RV. 0—1—0. Cf. gulphā.

kulphā, VII. 50. 2a, (mantrakīta).

krodā, ‘breast.’ AV. 2—1—0.
krodā, X. 9. 25a, (aghnyāyās).

gabhasti, ‘hand.’ RV. 6—25—0.
gabhastī, VI. 19. 3a; VII. 37. 3a, (indrasya); gābhastī, I. 82. 6a; 130. 4a; III. 60. 5a; V. 86. 3a; VI. 29. 2a; 45. 18a; VIII. 12. 7a; X. 96. 3b, (indrasya); IX. 76. 2a, (sāmasya). See § 3 for the other twelve duals.

gavínika, ‘groin.’ AV. 0—2—0.
gavānike, L. 11. 5a, (nāryās); IX. 8. 7a, (āmayaviṇas).

gavini, ‘groin.’ AV. 0—5—0.
gaviniyōs, L. 3. 6a, (āmayaviṇas); V. 25. 10b—13b, (nāryās).
gulphā, ‘ankle.’ AV. 0—2—0. Cf. gulphā.
gulphā, X. 2. 1a, 2a, (puruṇasya).
cāksan, ‘eye.’ AV. 0—1—0.
cāksani, X. 2. 6a, (puruṇasya).
cāksus, ‘eye.’ RV. 36—0—1 (§ 4); AV. 78—1—3 (§§ 4, 6).
cāksuṣi, AV. IX. 5. 21a, (ajāsyā).
jaghaṇa, ‘buttock, haunch.’ RV. 1—1—1 (§ 4); AV. 1—0—0.
The one dual belongs to part II.

jāṅkha, ‘leg.’ RV. 2—0—0; AV. 0—2—3 (§ 6).
jāṅgeha, AV. X. 2. 2°, (pūruṣasya): jāṅghayos, XIX. 60. 2°, (mantrakātas).

jānu, 'knee.' RV. 1—0—0; AV. 1—3—0.

jāṁabhyaṃ, IX. 8. 21°, (amayavini); X. 2. 3°, (pūruṣasya):

jānunos, X. 2. 2°, (pūruṣasya).

dāṇśtra, 'tusk, molar, fang.' RV. 0—1—1 (§ 6); AV. 0—4—1 (§ 6).

dāṇśtra, RV. X. 87. 3° = dāṇśtrāu, AV. VIII. 3. 3°, (agnēs):

dāṇśtrabhyaṃ, AV. X. 5. 43°, (vaiśvānarāśya); dāṇśtrayaṃ, IV. 36. 2°; XVI. 7. 3, (vaiśvānarāśya).

dānta, 'deciduous middle incisor.' AV. 0—4—0.

dāntāu, VI. 140. 1°, 2°, 3°, 3°, (cičos).

dośa, 'fore-leg.' AV. 0—2—0.

dośani, IX. 7. 7, (ṛṣabhāśya); X. 9. 19°, (aghnyaśas).

nās, 'nose, nostril.' RV. 0—1—0; AV. 2—1—0.

nāsos, RV. V. 61. 2°, (āghasya); AV. XIX. 60. 1°, (mantrakātas).

nāsā, 'nose, nostril.' RV. 0—1(pt. II)—0; AV. 0—1—0.

nāse, AV. V. 23. 3°, (kumārasya).

nāsikā, 'nose, nostril.' RV. 0—1—0; AV. 1—4—0.

nāsike, AV. X. 2. 6°, (pūruṣasya); X. 9. 14°, (aghnyaśas);

XV. 18. 4, (vṛatyasya): nāsikabhyaṃ, RV. X. 163. 1° =

AV. IL 33. 1°, (yakṣminās).

nādi, 'retroflex' (Sāuy.), 'seminal ducts.' AV. 0—1—0.

nādyaṃ, VI. 138. 4°, (pūruṣasya).

nrbhū, 'arm of man.' RV. 0—1—0.

nrbhūbhyaṃ, IX. 72. 5°, (sotūr).

pakṣa, 'wing.' RV. 3—5—2 (§ 4); AV. 1—6—1 (§ 6).

pakṣā, RV. I. 163. 1°; VIII. 34. 9°, (cyenāśya); X. 106. 3°,

(čakunāśya): pakṣāu, AV. IV. 34. 1°, (odanāsya); VI.

8. 2°, (suparnāśya); VIII. 9. 14°, (yajñāsya); X. 8. 18°;

XIII. 3. 14°, (baṁśāśya); X. 9. 25°, (aghnyaśas). See

§ 3 for the other two RV. duals.

pakṣauru, 'side, costal region.' AV. 0—1—0. See § 3 for

the only dual.

pativēdana, 'husband-finder, breast.' AV. 0—1—0.

pativēdanāu, VIII. 6. 1°, (kanyāyas).

pād, 'foot.' RV. 16—10—8 (§§ 4—6); AV. 11—13—7 (§ 6).

pāda, RV. I. 24 8°, (sūryasya); VI. 29. 5°; X. 73. 3°, (in-

drasya); X. 90. 11° = pādāu, AV. XIX. 6. 5°; pādāu,

RV. VI. 47. 15°, (pūruṣasya); AV. I. 27. 4°, (mantra-
kṛta; VI. 9.1, (vadhūyās); X. 1.21, (kṛtyās); XI. 8.14, (pūrasasya); XIX. 49.10, (stenaśya): padabhyaṁ, RV. X. 90.12, 14 = AV. XIX. 6.6, 8, (pūrasasya); AV. V. 30.13, (āmayavinas); XII. 1.28, (mantrakṛtas); padós, RV. X. 166.2, (sapatnaghaṁ); AV. I. 18.2, (striyās); XII. 4.5, (viklindvās). See also § 6 and pt. II.

pāṇi, ‘hand.’ RV. 0—2—1 (§ 6); AV. 1—1—0.

pāṇ, RV. IV. 21.9, (indrasya); VI. 71.1, (savitūr): pāniḥbhyaṁ, AV. II. 33.6, (yakṣminas).

pāda, ‘foot.’ RV. 2—0—2 (§ 6); AV. 1—5—1 (§ 6).

pādabhyaṁ, AV. IX. 8.21, (āmayavinas); XI. 3.46, (odanādatas): pādayos, XIX. 60.2, (mantrakṛtas). See also §§ 2 and 3.

pādayā, ‘little foot.’ RV. 0—1—0.

pādayā, VIII. 33.19, (āsaṅgāasya).

pāryā, ‘side.’ RV. 1—0—0; AV. 2—5—0.

pāryā, IX. 4.12, (ṛṣabhāsya); IX. 5.20, (ajāsya); IX. 8.15, (āmayavinas); XI. 8.14, (pūrasasya): pāryābhyaṁ, II. 33.3, (yakṣminas).

pārṣu, ‘heel.’ RV. 1—1—0; AV. 2—3—1 (§ 4).


prāpaḍ, ‘forepart of foot.’ AV. 0—1—0.

prāpados, VI. 24.2, (ādyuttasya).

prāpada, ‘front part of foot.’ RV. 0—1—1 (§ 6); AV. 1—3—1 (§ 4).

prāpadabhyaṁ, RV. X. 163.4, = AV. II. 33.5, (yakṣminas); AV. X. 3.47, (odanādatas); XI. 3.47, (savitūr).

barjahyā, ‘nipple.’ AV. 0—1—0.

barjahyā, XI. 8.14, (pūrasasya).

bāhāva, ‘arm.’ RV. 0—3—0.

bāhāva, II. 38.2, (savitūr). See § 2 for the other two duals.

bāhū, ‘arm, fore-leg.’ RV. 2—50—10 (§§ 4—6); AV. 2—19—7 (§ 4).

bāhū, RV. I. 95.7,; X. 142.5, (agnōs); I. 102.6,; III. 51.12,; VI. 47.8 = AV. XIX. 15.4,; VIII. 61.18,; 77.11, (indrasya); I. 163.1, (harināsya); I. 190.3,; IV. 53.3, 4,; VI. 71.1, 5,; VII. 45.2,; 79.24, (savitūr); V. 43.4, (omasūtvanas); X. 90.11, 12 = AV. XIX.
bhuríj, 'hand, arm.' RV. 0—4—0; AV. 0—1—0.
bhurijos, RV. IX. 26. 4°, (sotúr). The other four duals belong to part III.
bhedá, 'pudenda.' RV. 0—1—0.
bhedaú, IX. 112. 4°, (náryás).
bhrá, 'brow.' RV. 0—1—0.
bhruvós, IV. 38. 7°, (dadhikráyas).
mátasma, 'lung.' RV. 0—1—0; AV. 0—2—0.

ruská, 'testis, pudendum.' RV. 0—1—0; AV. 0—7—0.
ruskúñ, AV. IV. 37. 7°, (gandharvásya); VI. 127. 2°, (ámayávıñás); XX. 136. 1°, 2°, (náryás mahánugyáyas): ruskábhyañ, VIII. 6. 5°, (kanyáyás): ruskávos, RV. X. 38. 5°, (indrasya); AV. VI. 138. 4°, 5°, (náryás).

? raji, 'pudendum?' RV. 0—1—0.
raji, X. 105. 2°, (pátnyáas). So GRV. and BRV. GWB. and LRV. take it as some kind of a maned animal. PWB. merely cites Sáyana's two guesses—rajasi dyá-váryithiváv iva or mahántatá raji-káu náryácandrama-sáv iva.

vártman, 'eyelid.' AV. 0—1—0.
vártmabhyáam, XX. 133. 6°, (kumáryás).
vṛkkaú, 'kidney.' RV. 1—0—0; AV. 0—2—0.
vṛkkáu, VII. 96. 1°, (páruñasya); IX. 7. 13, (rśabhásya).

śípra, 'lip.' RV. 0—6—2 (§ 4).
ciptime, I. 101. 10\textsuperscript{b}; III. 32. 1\textsuperscript{r}; V. 36. 2\textsuperscript{a}; VIII. 76. 10\textsuperscript{b}; X. 96. 9\textsuperscript{a}, (indrasya): ciptimehym, X. 105. 5\textsuperscript{r}, (indrasya).

ciṃakapāla, 'cranial hemisphere,' AV. 0—1—0,
ciṃakapāla, XV. 18. 4, (vratyasya).

cīnca, 'horn.' RV. 2—6—5 (§§ 4, 6); AV. 2—8—1 (§ 4).
cīne, RV. V. 2. 9\textsuperscript{a}—AV. VIII. 3. 24\textsuperscript{a}; RV. VIII. 60. 13\textsuperscript{a}, (agnes); IX. 5. 2\textsuperscript{b}; 70. 7\textsuperscript{b}; 87. 7\textsuperscript{a}, (somasya); AV. II. 32. 6\textsuperscript{a}, (kimes); VIII. 3. 25\textsuperscript{a}, (agnes); IX. 7. 1, (rashbhasya); X. 9. 14\textsuperscript{b}, (aghnyaya); XX. 130. 13, (prdayakas, cf. 129. 9, 10), cīnegabhym, IX. 4. 17\textsuperscript{a}, (rashbhasya); XIX. 36. 2\textsuperscript{a}, (mani). See part II. for the other RV. dual.

cīnati, 'hip.' RV. 0—1—0; AV. 0—6—0.
cīnati, AV. IX. 4. 13\textsuperscript{a}; 7. 9, (rashbhasya); X. 2. 3\textsuperscript{a}, (purushasya); X. 9. 21\textsuperscript{b}, (aghnyaya): cīniabhym, RV. X. 163. 4\textsuperscript{a}; AV. II. 33. 5\textsuperscript{a}, (yaksminas); AV. IX. 8. 21\textsuperscript{b}, (omayavisas).

cītra, 'ear.' RV. 2—0—0; AV. 19—4—0.
cītra, AV. XI. 3. 2\textsuperscript{a}, (odanasya); XIV. I. 11\textsuperscript{c}, (suryasyas, cf. RV. X. 85. 11\textsuperscript{c}—cītram): cītrabhym, XI. 3. 33\textsuperscript{ad}, (odanاداتas).

sākthi, 'leg.' RV. 1—0—0; AV. 1—1—0.
sākthibhyam, X. 10. 21\textsuperscript{b}, (vaivayyas).

sākthi, 'leg.' RV. 0—2—0; AV. 0—3—0.
sākthya, RV. X. 86. 16\textsuperscript{b}, 17\textsuperscript{a} = sākthya, AV. XX. 126. 16\textsuperscript{b}, 17\textsuperscript{a}, (indrasya); sākthya, AV. VI. 9. 1\textsuperscript{b}, (vadhuyos).

sandhi (jānūnas), 'knee-joint.' AV. 1—1—0.
sandhi, X. 2. 2\textsuperscript{b}, (purusasya).

stāna, 'nipple, teat.' RV. 3—1(pt. II.)—0; AV. 1—3—5 (§ 6).
stāna, AV. IX. 1. 7\textsuperscript{b}, (madhukacayyas); X. 2. 4\textsuperscript{b}, (purusasya).

See § 6 for the other dual.

hānū, 'jaw.' RV. 1—5—1 (§ 6); AV. 1—6—0.
hānū, RV. IV. 18. 9\textsuperscript{b}; V. 36. 2\textsuperscript{a}, (indrasya); X. 79. 1\textsuperscript{b}, (agnes); X. 152. 3\textsuperscript{b} = AV. I. 21. 3\textsuperscript{b}, (vṛṭasya); AV. VI. 56. 3\textsuperscript{a}, (svajasya); X. 9. 13\textsuperscript{a}, (aghnyaya); XIX. 47. 9\textsuperscript{a}, (vīkasya): hānvos, RV. I. 52. 6\textsuperscript{b}, (vṛṭasya); AV. I. X. 2. 7\textsuperscript{b}, 8\textsuperscript{c}, (purusasya).

hāsta, 'hand.' RV. 29—17—5 (§§ 4, 6); AV. 22—16—4 (§ 4).
hāsta, RV. IV. 21. 9\textsuperscript{a}; VIII. 66. 3\textsuperscript{c}, (indrasya); hāstān, RV.
X. 117. 9\*; AV. XL 8.14\*, 15\* (pūrṇasasya); AV. VI
81. 1\* (nāryā); VII. 26. 8\* (visṇa); VII. 109. 3\* (ki-
tavāsya); VIII. 1. 8\* (āmayaviniśas); XIX. 49. 10\* (ste-
nāsyā); hāstābhijām, AV. III. 11. 8\* (satyāsya); VI.
102. 3\* (bhāgasya); XI. 3. 48\* (odanaśatas); XI. 3. 48\*,
(rtāsya); XIX. 51. 2 (pūṣṇās): hāstāyos, RV. I. 24. 4\*,
saviṭṭur; I. 38. 1b (pitūr); I. 55. 8\*; 81. 4\*; 176. 3\*; VI.
31. 1b; 45. 8\* (indrāsya); I. 135. 9\* (vāyōs); I. 162. 9\*,
(camītūr); IX. 18. 4\*; 90. 1\* (sūmasya); AV. I. 18. 2\*,
(striyās); XVIII. 3. 12\* (mantrakīrtas). For the other
duals see §. 3 (1 RV., 4 AV.) and pt. II. (2 RV.).

In this section are listed 146 of the 191 duals of the
natural bodily parts, found in the RV, and 212 of the 225 such
duals in the AV.

Of the RV. instances, 96 pertain to the various gods. In-
dra leads with 65. Savitar follows with 10 and Agni is close
behind with 9. Only 39 pertain to human beings, and of these
11 pertain to the yakṣmin (consumptive) of X. 163, a hymn
distinctively Atharvanic and at home in AV. II. 33. Seven
pertain to animals, 3 to demons and 1 to the inanimate gharma.

The different sphere of the AV. is well shown in its con-
trasts to these numbers. Humanity comes to the front with
124 duals and the sick still lead with 30. The animals get
49 duals and the gods drop to the third place with only 24
duals in all. Indra still leads them, but with a paltry 7.
Agni is a close second with his 6 and Savitar has but a single
dual. The demons have 5; inanimate objects 9, of which 4
pertain to the odana.

Thus these duals clearly establish the hieratic character
of the RV. and the demotic character of the AV. The im-
portance of this distinction will appear later.

Only in 4 instances out of these 358 duals is there the
slightest need to comment upon any grammatical usage. In
three instances the dual is predicate to a singular—AV. IX.
7. 9—bālam āri (strength his thighs) and ad. 13—krōḍho vṛkkaś
manyūr anāgāi (anger his kidneys, wrath his testes). In RV.
X. 85. 11—gṛotram te caṇkṛ bhūtām (thy chariot wheels were
an ear) shows the reverse, a singular predicate to a dual.
The AV. XIV. 1. 11 has this pada with the normal gṛotre.
§ 2.

A duality of bodily parts, naturally dual, associated with a duality of persons.

The RV. has five instances of this phenomenon:—aksi (acínos), I. 120. 6.—aksi caubhas pati dán. *(Hither your eyes, ye lords of splendor); báhává (mitrávarunayos), V. 64. 2,—tá báhává suceétáná prá yantam asmá árcate, *(Stretch forth with kindly thought those arms unto this one that sings); VII. 62. 5,—prá báhává sisrtam áywáse na, *(Stretch forth your arms to grant us life); báhúbhýam (mitrávarunayos), VIII. 101. 4,—báhúbhýam na urusyatam, *(Keep us in safety by your arms); báhácás (mitrávarunayos), V. 64. 1,—pári vrajéva báhvócor jagan-vánsá svárrnam, *(As in the pen-fold of your arms encompassed ye the realm of light).

The AV. also has five instances:—ánsán (acínos), IX. 4. 8,—indrasyátu varúṣasya báhí acínor ánsan marútám iyám kakút, *(Indra's strength, Varuna's arms, the Aúvins' shoulders, this Marut's-hump); aksyáu (vadhúyín vadhúaac.ca), VII. 56. 1,—aksyáu nán mádhusúnika, ánikam nav samánjanam, *(Of honey aspect be our eyes, an ointment be our face); urábhýam (mitrávarunayos), XI. 3. 44,—tátaç cáinam anyábhýam urábhýam práçyábhýam cáitám púrva ḍayáḥ práñan | úrí te marisyata ity enam áha | tám vá */ mitrávarunayor urábhýam tábhýam enam práçisám tábhýam enam ajigamam | *(If thou didst eat this with other thighs than those with which the Rishis of yore did eat it, thy thighs will die', thus says one to him. — — — 'With the thighs of Mitra-Varuna, with these I ate this', etc.); pácábhýam (acínos), XI. 3. 46,—tátaç cáinam anyábhýam pácábhýam */ */ */ acínor pácábhýam */ */ */ *(If with other feet', etc. — — — 'With the feet of the Aívins, etc.); báhúbhýam (acínos), XIX. 51. 2,—acínor báhúbhýam púspó hastábhýam prásíta á rabhe *(With the Aívins' arms, with Pushan's hands, I, impelled, seize thee).

It will be noticed that nine of these ten passages refer either to the Aívins or to Mitra-Varuna. Though it is true that of all the Vedic pantheon the deities of these respective groups are the ones most intimately associated, that Mitra is so closely assimilated to Varuna that, as Macdonell (Ved. Myth., p. 27) observes, he has hardly an independent trait left, that only on the rarest occasions are the Aívins separable,
yet there is never a unification of the members of either dual. Nowhere are they invoked in the singular; nowhere described by a singular epithet; nowhere is a singular verb predicated of them. The immediate context in at least seven of our passages would positively forbid such an hypothesis as an explanation of the dual.

Nor are they metri causa, as the plural will scan in each of the eight metrical passages. That they are mere grammatical lapsus linguæ or due to laxity of thought on the part of the Rishis, should be our dernier ressort. We hold that this interpretation is unworthy and unnecessary and that a study of the passages, both by themselves and in contrast with those of § 5, in which a plurality of these same bodily parts is associated with these same dual divinities, reveals a conscious purpose in the selection of the grammatical number. In the passages before us this purpose is the dissociation and individualization of the members of the duality. Such an assumption is made imperative by AV. VII. 36. 1, where the eyes and singular face must individualize the bride and the groom. Each nāu receives its full interpretation only in "of each of us."

In AV. IX. 4. 8, the phrase marśtām iyām kakāt requires the individualization of the Maruts, for they can possess no collective kakāt. The natural extension of this distributive idea to the former part of the pada gives the clearest and best explanation of the dual, aṣṭinor āṅśāu.

If we compare the five RV. passages, each having the idea of duality so strongly explicit in it, with those of § 5, we can hardly decide otherwise than that in the passages with the dual, the Rishis address the deities with an implied ‘each of you’, and in those passages that have the plural, with an implied ‘both of you’.

We have thus a logically consistent and satisfying explanation of the eight such duals found in the metrical portions of the Vedas. In each of the two passages from the Odana Sūkta (AV. XI. 3), the same explanation may apply, if not so obvious and compelling, or the duals may in each instance be echoic of the perfectly normal duals of the same words immediately preceding.
§ 3.

A duality of bodily parts, naturally dual, associated with a plurality of persons.

We find twenty instances in the RV.:—(1), ānsayos (marutām), V. 57. 6—ṛṣṭāyo vo maruto ānsayor ādhi sāha ējio bāh-vor vo bālau hitām | urmā cīrṣāsv āyudhā rātheśu vo viçvā vah cīr ādhi tanūsu pipiçe | (Lances are on your shoulders twain, O Maruts; energy and strength are placed together in your arms; manliness on your heads, weapons on your cars, all majesty is moulded on your forms); (2), gābhastyoś (marutām), I. 64. 10—āstāra isum dadhure gābhastyoḥ (The archers have set the bow in their hands); (3), I. 88. 6—iṣā syā vo maruto 'nubharrte prāti ṣṭobhati vāghato nā vānt | āstobhayaṛū vṛthisām ānu svadhmā gābhastyoḥ || (This invigorating hymn, O Maruts, peals forth in praise to meet you, as the music of one in prayer. Joyously did Gotama make these sing forth a gift of praise unto your hands); (4), V. 54. 11—āhīṣeṣu va ṛṣṭāyāḥ patsā khāḍāyā vākiṣaṃ rukmā maruto rāthe cūbhāḥ | agnibhrājaśo vidyāto gābhastyoḥ cīpraṃ cīrṣāsv vitattā hiran-yāli || (Lances on shoulders, spangles on feet, gold on your breasts, splendor on your car, fire-glowing lightnings in your hands, visors wrought of gold arranged upon your heads); (5), gābhastyoś (somāsvātiśām), IX. 10. 2—hinvāyāso rathā iva dadhanvīṛā gābhastyoḥ | bhārāsah kārināṃ iva || (Driven on like chariots the Somas flow in the hands, like hymns of the singers); (6), IX. 13. 7—dadhanvīṛā gābhastyoḥ (they flow in the hands); (7) and (8), IX. 20. 6—65. 6—mrjāṃāno

1 The passage is difficult and has no satisfactory explanation in commentator or translator. The principal mooted points are the substantive implied in a, the subject and object of āstobhayaḥ in c, the syntax and reference of āśām in e and of gābhastyoś in d. Stanzas 4 and 5 are replete with the idea of the excellence and potency of Gotama's former hymns. Here he expresses his confidence of continuing merit and the consequent acceptance and approval of the present effort; the anubhārtri of a, Āstobhayaḥ has the Gotama of 4 and 5 for its subject, and its object is implied in āśām, the antecedent of which is āśā anubhārtri of a. The case of āśām is the partitive gen. after the idea of 'give, present' implied in āstobhayaḥ (cf. Speier's Sk. Syn. § 119 and E. Siecke, De gen. in ling. Sansk. imp. Ved. iv. § 7, p. 36). Gābhastyoḥ depends upon same idea of 'present' in the verb, and refers to the Maruts. This gives at least a consistent sense and a possible syntax.
gābhastyoh (cleansed in the hands); (9) and (10), IX. 36. 4<sup>a</sup> and 64. 5<sup>a</sup>,—cumbhāmāna rtāyūbhīr mṛjāmāno gābhastyoh (made radiant by pious men, cleansed in their hands); (11), IX. 71. 3<sup>a</sup>,—ādhibhūtā satāḥ parāte gābhastyoh (Soma pressed by the stones becomes clear in the hands); (12), IX. 107. 13<sup>a</sup>,—tām nā hinvanty apāsa yāthā rāthaṁ nadiṣv ā gābhastyoh (Skilful men drive him as a car, in streams in their hands); (13), IX. 110. 5<sup>a</sup>,—cāryābhār nu bhāramāno gābhastyoh (Borne on by the arrows, as it were, of the hands); (14), pāksa (vāmām), VIII. 47. 2<sup>a</sup>,—pāksa vāya yāthopāri vy āsmē ċārma yachata and (15), VIII. 47. 3<sup>a</sup>,—vy āsmē ċāhi ċārma tāt pāksa vāyo nā yantana (Spread your protection over us as birds spread their wings); (16), bāhūbhyaṁ (āṅgirasāṁ), II. 24. 7<sup>b</sup>,—tē bāhūbhyaṁ dhāmitām agnim ācāmāni (They leave upon the rock the fire enkindled with their arms); (17), bāhūbhyaṁ (āṅgīnāṁ), X. 7. 5<sup>a</sup>,—bāhūbhyaṁ agnim āyāvo ājananta (With their arms did men generate Agni); (18), bāhvoś (marūtāṁ), see no. 1 above; (19), bāhvoś (mṛniṁ), VI. 59. 7<sup>b</sup>,—indrāgni ā hi tánvāte nāro dhāvāni bāhvoḥ (Indra-Agni, men are stretching the bows in their arms); (20), hāstābhyaṁ (mantrākhyām), X. 137. 7<sup>a</sup>,—hāstābhyaṁ dācaśākhābhyaṁ (With our hands of ten branches we stroke thee).

The AV. furnishes these six instances:—(1), paṭāuraṁ (strīnāṁ), XI. 9. 14<sup>b</sup>,—pratiţghnāh śāṁ dhāvāntu ēraṁ paṭāurāv ēghnānaṁ (Let them run together, without anointing, smiting each her breast and thighs); (2), pādābhyaṁ (devānāṁ), X. 7. 39<sup>a</sup>,—yāsmai hāstābhyaṁ pādābhyaṁ vācā crōtrena cākoṣa [Unto whom (Skambha), with hands, with feet, with voice, with hearing and with sight (the gods continually render tribute)]; (3) and (4), hāstābhyaṁ (mantrākhyām), IV. 13. 7<sup>a</sup> and 8<sup>c</sup>,—hāstābhyaṁ dācaśākhābhyaṁ ..., anāmayitābhyaṁ hāstābhyaṁ tālībhyaṁ tāabhhi mr̥cāmāni (With our hands of ten branches, ..., with hands that banish disease, with these we stroke thee); (5), VI. 118. 5<sup>b</sup>,—yād hāstābhyaṁ cakrmā kilbāsiṁ aksānān ganām upalīpsamānaṁ (If we have committed sins with our hands, in our desire of the troop of the dico); (6), X. 7. 39<sup>a</sup>, see no. 2 above.

An examination of these passages in detail will readily show in twenty-two of them the same clearly marked individuality of action among the plurality of actors that we found in the preceding section in the case of the duality of actors.
In fifteen of the twenty instances in the RV., it will be seen at once that the specified act naturally and imperatively demands the exercise of both of the given bodily members for its performance. Such are the acts in nos. 2 and 19, aiming the bow; in nos. 16 and 17, kindling fire with the fire-sticks; in nos. 14 and 15, birds spreading their wings; in nos. 5 to 13 inclusive, the pressers cleansing the soma. In all the AV. passages we have evidence of the individual element in the action. In no. 1, the sg. āras and dual paṭaurāṇi serve this purpose; in nos. 2 and 6 the singulars of b as well as the duals of a indicate the individual rather than the collective homage of the gods; in no. 5 the gamblers seek forgiveness each for his own sins, not for their joint offences; in nos. 3 and 4 and in RV. no. 20, it is the shaman that acts. It may be that in AV. nos. 3, 4 and 5 and RV. no. 20, we have a single subject speaking in the first plural and that these really belong in § 1 rather than here.

It remains to show that the same explanation holds in the other four passages. We should remember that the Rishis have all the Oriental exuberance and liveliness of fancy, love of variety and of profuse ornamentation. They excel also in the use of the swift, bold and sometimes startling transition. They were often consummate artists, masters of word-painting. They exhibit their skill now throughout an entire hymn, now in a stanza that is a miniature master-piece, now in a single word that is a thrill with poetic concept. The difficulty is for the cool, logical and too often phlegmatic Occidental mind to appreciate the riotous luxuriance of their imagination and the art that is in its expression.

In our no. 4 of the RV: the swift transition from the plurals of a and b to the duals of b and c and then back to the plurals of a is but a part of the Rishi's artistic equipment, of his professional stock in trade, by which he presents to view now the group, now the individual member of it and now again the group. To us, unfamiliar with the real nature of the vidyut, it may seem to accord ill with the imagery of the context and even to make the picturesque almost grotesque, to represent the individual Māruts as clutching with both hands their missile bolts, but surely there is nothing incongruous in this to the Hindoo familiar with that magnificent but appalling electrical display by which the whole arch of
heaven, from zenith to horizon, is made to glow with such continuous flashes of flame that the intense inky blackness of the monsoon night is made to rival the brilliance of the tropical noonday.

In nos. 1 and 18 of the RV., which are from successive pūdas of the same rc and separated only by our alphabetic scheme of listing, the transition from the plurals of a and b to the duals of c and d may be compared in effect to a painting in which individual Maruts are strongly limned in the foreground and the Marut host sketched in more vague and shadowy outlines in the background. Too fanciful? There are scores of such artistic transitions in the RV. Again as the lances are the vidyut flashes the Rishi is not without skill in his art when he makes them in their play rest upon both shoulders of the individual Maruts. In no. 3 of the RV. a like interpretation presents an individualistic touch at the close of the rc that has opened with a collective plural address. Gotama's gift of song is unto you, O Maruts, yea unto you individually as well as collectively.

So in every instance cited the use of the dual resolves the plurality of persons and presents the component individuals. The art of the hieratic Rishi is pronounced in at least four of the passages and the demotic shaman of the AV. shows no parallel. The results accord with those of § 2 and are the proper contrast to those derived from the study of the next section.

§ 4.

A plurality of bodily parts, naturally dual, associated with a plurality of persons.

We find these thirty-five instances in the RV.:—(1), án̄sesú (marūtīm), I. 64. 4,—án̄sesv esānū ni mūrksur rṣāyāh (The lances on their shoulders beat down); (2), I. 166. 9.—án̄sesv ā vah prāpatheṣu khādāyō (Spangles on your shoulders in your journeys); (3), I. 166. 10,—án̄sesv ṣṭāḥ paviṣu kṣurā adhi (On shoulders, buckskins; on fellies, knives); (4), I. 168. 5,—ālsāṃ á̄n̄sesu rambhīvas rārahī (On their shoulders rests, as it were, a lance); (5), V. 54. 1p,—án̄sesu va rṣāyāh patsā khādāyō (Lances on your shoulders, spangles on the feet); (6), VII. 56. 15.—án̄sesv ā marutaḥ khādāyō vo (On your shoulders, O
Maruts are spangles; (7) akṣaṇi, (pāruṣāṇām), VII. 55. 6,—yaśe yāc ca carati yāc ca pācyati no jānuḥ | tēsāṁ sām haṃmo akṣaṇi (Of him who sits and him who walks and him who looks on us, of these we close the eyes); (8) akṣābhīs (yājamanānām), I. 89. 8,—bhadrāṁ pacyemakṣābhīr yajatrah (May we with our eyes behold the good, ye adorable ones); (9) and (10). I. 139. 32,—dūhiṣ canā mānasā svēbhīr akṣābhīḥ sōmasya svēbhīr akṣābhīḥ (Not with the thoughts, the mind, but with our own eyes, our own eyes of Soma given, have we behold the golden one); (12), IX. 102. 8,—krātvā cūkṛēbhīr akṣābhīr ruñor āpa vrajaṁ divāḥ (With our eyes clear with wisdom unbar the stall of heaven); (13), apikaksēbhis (devānām), X. 134. 7,—pakṣēbhīr apikaksēbhīr ātrābhī saṁ rabhāmahe (To your wings, to your shoulders, there do we closely cling); (15), kārṇēbhis (yājamanānām), I. 89. 8,—bhadrāṁ kārṇēbhīḥ śṛṅvya devā (May we, O Gods, with our ears hear the good); (14), cākṣāṇi (pāruṣāṇām), VI. 1. 4,—cākṣāṇīva śurye sāmā caranti (As the eyes of men turn to Sūrya); (15), jaghānān (devānām), VI. 75. 13,—ā jaṅghanti sāṃ esam jaghānān āpa jūmāte (He lashes their backs, lashes their haunches); (16), pakṣān (vīnām), I. 166. 10,—vayō nā pakṣān vṝ ṣu ṣu ṣu vṝ ṣu dhīre (As birds their wings, the Maruts spread their glory out); (17), pakṣēbhis (devānām), same as no. 12 above; (18), paḍōbhis (yājamanānām), IV. 2. 14,—paḍbhīr hastēbhīc cākṛmā tāndhīḥ (We have done with our feet, our hands, our bodies); (19), X. 79. 2,—āṭraṇy asmā paḍbhīḥ sāṃ bharantu uttānā hastā nāmasādhi vikṣū (With their feet they gather food for Agni, with upraised hands and reverence in their dwellings); (20), patsū (marutām), see no. 5 above; (21), bhāhavas (vīnām), X. 103. 13,—ugrā vaḥ saṅtu bāhavo (Strong be your arms, O heroes, in battle); (22), bāhūn (yātudhānām), X. 87. 4,—pratīcō bāhūn prāti bhavandhi esām (Break their arms raised against you); (23), bāhūhbhis (marutām), I. 86. 6,—prā jīgāta bāhūhbhīḥ (Advance with your arms); (24), agnimānθanānām, III. 29. 6,—yādi mānthanti bāhūhbhir vi rocāte (When they rub Agni with their arms, he shines forth); (25), (mahatō mūnyamanānām), VII. 98. 4,—sākṣāma tān bāhūhbhiḥ čaḍānān (We shall subdue them confounding in their arms); (26), bāhūṣu (marutām), I. 166. 10,—bhūrūni bhadrā niṁryeṣa bā- hūṣa (Many goodly things are in your manly arms); (27), VIII. 20. 10,—rukmāso adhi bāhūṣa (Golden ornaments upon their
arms); (28), čiprās (marūtām), V. 54. II,—čiprāh čiršaṁ vi-tāta hiranyāyilḥ (Visors of gold arranged upon their heads); (29), VIII. 7. 23,—čiprāh čiršāṁ hiranyāyilḥ (Visors of gold upon their heads); (30), āryaṁ (āryaṁ), III. 8. 10,—āryaṁ vṛccāṁ cṛūṅpīnāṁ sām dādyre caśālavaṁ śvāravāḥ prthi-ivyāṁ (The sacrificial posts set in the earth and adorned with knobs, seem like the horns of horned creatures); (31), sak- thāṁ (marūtām), X. 61. 3,—vi sakthāṁ nāro yamuh putrakṛtye nā jānayaḥ (The heroes spread their thighs apart like women in childbirth); (32), hāstebhīs (yājamānānāṁ), see no. 18 above; (33), hāstāṁ (marūtām), IX. 79. 4,—āpāṁ tvā hāstāṁ dudhān hāmnānaḥ (Sages have with their hands milked the soma into the waters); (34), hāstesu (marūtām), I. 37. 3,—iheva cṛva eśāṁ kācā hāstēsū yād vādaṁ (The whip in their hands is heard as if here, when they crack it); (35), I. 168. 3,—hāstēs ū khāti ca kṛti ca sām dadhu (A ring and a dagger are held in their hands).

The AV. has fourteen instances of its own;—(1), cākṣuṁ (cākṣuṁ), III. 1. 6,—cākṣeṁ agnir ā dattāṁ (Let Agni take their eyes); (2), cākṣuṁ (pārśuṁ), V. 24. 9,—āryaṁ cākṣuṁ ādhipatiḥ (Śūrya is overlord of eyes); (3), pārśuṁ (duruṇānāṁ), VIII. 6. 15,—purāṁ pārśuṁ purō mākha (Whose heels are in front, in front their faces); (4), pārpaṇāṁ (duruṇānāṁ), VIII. 6. 15,—yēsāṁ pačāt prapādāṁ (The fore-parts of whose feet are behind); (5), bāhācā (auroṇa), XI. 9. 1,—yē bāhāvo yā isavo (What arms, what arrows!); (6), cārtaṇāṁ, XI. 9. 13,—mūhyantu eśām bāhāvāḥ (Let their arms fall); (7), (8) and (9), bāhūn (cārtaṇāṁ), III. 19. 27, VI. 65. 2, XI. 10. 15,—vṛccāṁ cārtaṇāṁ bāhūn (I hew off the arms of the foemen); (10), āryaṁ (duruṇānāṁ), VIII. 6. 14,—yē purve bādhvō yanti hāste āryaṁ bibhrataḥ (Who go before a bride, bearing horns in the hand); (11), hāstēs ū (yā- jamānānāṁ), IV. 14. 2,—krāmadhvam agraṁ nākam ukhyān hāstēsū bibhrataḥ (Stride ye with fire to the vault of heaven, bearing pottīres in your hands); (12), (13) and (14), (brahmā- nāṁ), VI. 193. 5, X. 9. 27, XI. 1. 27,—brahmānāṁ hāstēsū prapṛthāk sadayāṁ (I place these separately in the hands of the Brahmanas).
The AV. has also three repetitions from the RV.: āksīni, IV. 5, 5\textsuperscript{a} = āksīni RV. VII. 55, 6\textsuperscript{a}; bāhūcas, III. 19, 7\textsuperscript{a} = RV. X. 103, 13\textsuperscript{a}; bāhūn, VIII. 3, 6\textsuperscript{a} = RV. X. 87, 4\textsuperscript{a}.

A comparison of these passages with those of § 3 in which the dual is associated with a like plurality of persons, shows that in these the plural is thought of as general and collective. The Rishis here view the concert rather than the individualization of the action. In nos. 18 and 32 of the RV. tanūbhīs shows there is no idea of individuality. So do vikṣā of no. 19, the plural simile jānayāḥ of no. 31, and the context of no. 27, which has tanīṣu in 12\textsuperscript{b}, rāthēṣu in 12\textsuperscript{a} and gṛiyas in 12\textsuperscript{a}. In no. 7 tēpām is plainly “of all these”, not “of each of these”. Nos. 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 21, 22, 25, 32 and 33 are obviously general and collective, not specific and individual. In nos. 1 to 6, 20, 23, 26 to 29, 34 and 35 the Rishis refer to the Marut host, not to individual members of it. A comparison of no. 15 with the no. 14 of § 3 shows that here the simile looks to the ensemble of wings. So the comparison in no. 31 is general. In nos. 16, 24 and 31 the use of both the bodily members is indeed necessary in any single case, but comparison with nos. 16 and 17 of § 3 shows that the Rishis by the plural generalize the act that the dual would individualize. So with the remaining passages, nos. 12, 15 and 17 of the RV. and all of the AV., the plural is general and synthetic where the dual would resolve the group into its components.

§ 5.

A plurality of bodily parts, naturally dual, associated with a duality of persons.

There are but three instances of this phenomenon, all in the RV. The passages are:—(1), kārnāis (aṭṭiv轰炸), I. 154. 2\textsuperscript{a}, —cṛutām me aṭṭivbhīr matinām ēṣā narā nicetāra ca kārnāiḥ (Hearken, ye heroes, to the invocations of my hymns, ye who are worshipped and are observant with your ears); (2), paṭṭhis (mitrāvūranayos), V. 64. 7\textsuperscript{a},—sūtām sōmāṁ nā āṣṭiḥbhīr ā paṭṭhir dhāvantaṁ narā bibhṛatār arcanānasam (As to the soma finger-pressed, either speed with your feet, O heroes, supporting Arcanānas); (3), bāhūbhīs (mitrāvūranayos), VI. 67. 1\textsuperscript{a},—sāṁ yā raṭṭmēva yamātar yāmiṣṭhād vā jāńāṁ āsa—
ma bähūbhiḥ svāḥ (The peerless twain who by their arms as with a rein, best control the peoples).

Concert of action is clearly indicated in all, but most clearly in the third passage. The invocation of the first and second passages has an implied "both of you." Compare and contrast the passages in § 2.

§ 6.

A plurality of bodily parts, naturally dual, ascribed to an individual.

We expect the plural when a plural numeral is added. There are these instances: RV. akṣābhiṣ (agnes), I. 128. 3
—catāni čākṣuṇo akṣābhiṣ (Observant with a hundred eyes); X. 79. 5—tāsmāi sahaśram akṣābhir vi čākṣe (He looks on him with a thousand eyes); pādās (ghṛtāsya), IV. 58. 3—catvāri čīṇa trāyo asyo pādā (Four are his horns and three his feet); bāhūn (tarmasya), II. 14. 4—nāra cakhvāhāsam navatim ca bāhūn (Showing nine and ninety arms); bāhūṣu (brāmāṇḍasya), VIII. 101. 13—citrēva prāty adarcy ayaty āntār daçaśu bāhūṣu (Radiant Usas is seen advancing amid the ten arms); čīṇa (ghṛtāsya), IV. 58. 3—see pādās above; hūṭāsas (ghṛtāsya), IV. 58. 3—dvē čīrscë saptā hūṭāso asya (Two are his heads and seven his hands).

AV. padbhīs (pūruṣasya), XIX. 6. 2—trihhiḥ padbhir ċyām arohat (With three feet he climbed the sky); cākṣaniṣṭi (bha-

1 The plural is the natural number in the following instances: RV padbhīs, IV. 58. 3 (āgyasya dādhlākṣī); pādabhīs, II. 31. 2 (ča čaḥ āgyasya); pādās, I. 163. 9 (āgyasya); pṛṇapadās, VI. 75. 7 (āgyasya).

AV. jāṅghās, IX. 7. 10 (ṛgḥāsya); X. 9. 23 (aghnāyasya); jāṅghābhīs, IV. 11. 10 (anadūhās); pādabhīsam, IX. 8. 4 (sthunā viṣvāvāmśī); pādās, IV. 15. 14 (manḍūkāṣya); IX. 4. 14 (ṛgḥāsya); padbhīs, III. 7. 2 (hariṇāsya); IV. 11. 10 (anadūhās); IX. 14. 9 (ajāsya); pātēs, VI. 92. 1 (āgyasya); pādās, XIV. 1. 60 (ḍasāṇya); stāṇās, IX. 7. 14; IX. 9. 22; 10. 74 (aghnāyasya); stāṇās, XII. 4. 1 (vaṃśī); stāṇāḥyās, X. 10. 29 (vaṃśī).

Twice in AV. such a plural is resolved into two duals:

padās, XV. 3. 4 (ṣamāṇya vrāṃśasya).

tāsyā grīṣmac ca vasantaḥ ca dvāḥ | pādār ċātan ċaraḥ ca varṣaḥ ca dvāṁ. (The summer and the spring were two of its feet, the autumn and the winter were two).

stāṇās, VIII. 10. 18 (virājo vaṃśāviva).

bhṛgha ca ratnaśatrām ca dvāḥ stāṇav ċātan | yajūḥyajñyām ca va-maderyām ca dvāḥ. (B. and R. were two of her tents, Y. and V. were two).
vāsyā) XI. 2. 5, —yāni cáksūṇi te bhava. (To the eyes that thou hast, be homage, O Bhava). In this latter instance the numeral is expressed in the sahasrākṣa of 3, 7, and 17.

That these plurals are due to poetic tropes or to mythic or mystic creations of Hindoo fancy admits of no question. No one thinks of a literal interpretation. The hundred or the thousand eyes of Agni are the bright flames that dart forth beams of light in all directions. The metaphor requires the plural. The numeral is intensive. By its use Agni is represented as sharp-sighted or omnivident. The nine and ninety arms of the Asura Uraṇa mean only that the demon is many-armed or strong-armed. The ten arms of brahmāndu are, as Sāyaṇa says, the ten diṣṇu or regions of the universe.

It is liturgical mysticism that turns the ghṛta into a gāura, or Indian buffalo, and then proceeds to invest it with the symbolism of such an odd plurality of natural members, four horns, three feet, two heads and seven hands. Speculation as to the interpretation of these symbolic members was rife among the native commentators and their inability to think the Rishi's thoughts after him is shown in the great variety of conclusions reached. Without undertaking to decide among them we know that the plural members are mystic and symbolic and that the Rishi had no conscious conception of the resultant zoomorphic incongruity of his fancy. The addition of the hands shows that the idea of an actual gāura is not present to his consciousness.

In ĀV. XIX. 6, the shifting mythic symbolism produces an almost continuous change in the anatomy of the cosmic pūruṣa. In 1 he has a thousand arms, a thousand eyes and a thousand feet; in 2, three feet; in 4, four feet; in 5 and 6, two arms and two feet; in 7, one eye. There are similar changes in the corresponding RV. X. 90, but they do not come so apace.

Of the same nature are the plurals implied in dvīgu compounds. Thus in RV. I. 31. 13, Agni is caturākṣa; in I. 79. 13, sahasrākṣa; in V. 43. 13, a tridhāntacīragṛgo vṛssabhās; in V. I. 8;

---

1 Bhava is identified with Rudra. Cf. VS. 16. 16. 28; 39. 8 and CB. 6. 1. 3. 7. In RV. 2. 1. 6; AV. 7. 87. 1; TS. 5. 4. 3. 1; 5. 5. 7. 4 and CB. 1. 7. 3. 8; 6. 1. 3. 10 this deity is identified with Agni.

2 Vid. TA. 10. 10. 2; CB. 1. 2. 16; Sāyaṇa on RV. I. e.; and Mahādhara on VS. 17. 91. The last is especially rich in alternatives.
a sahāsraçṛṅgo vṛṣabhās; in VIII. 19. 32; a sahāsramuṣko devās; in I. 97. 6, he is viśvānuskha; in III. 38. 44, viśvāruṇa; etc., etc. These devī compounds are figurative allusions to the phenomena of fire, celestial or terrestrial. A similar interpretation explains all such in either Veda.

Closely akin to these plurals with numerals are those in metaphors and poetic symbolism in which the number is obviously determined by the figure. A clear instance is RV. X. 127. 1.—rādī vṛjy ākhyaḥ āyati purutrā devy aksābhis (The goddess Night, as she approaches, looks about in many a place with her eyes). Her eyes are the stars and the plural is as natural here as is the dual in RV. I. 72. 10, in which aksī dīvās (eyes of the sky) are the sun and moon.

A number of such instances cluster about Agni. In RV. I. 148. 2 he is transformed into an uḍāk mahan that uṛṣyāḥ padā nī dviṅkati sānāu (Plants his feet upon the broad earth’s back). The tauropoeia justifies the plurality of feet. In III. 20. 2, the Rishi says to Agni—tisrās te jihva . . . . tisrā u te tancō (three are thy tongues, . . . three also thy bodies), in which the plurals are due to the symbolism of the metaphors. Sayana identifies the three tongues as the three sacrificial fires, gārhapataya, āhavaniya and daṇśina and makes the three bodies pāvaka, pūramana and ācuci. Other interpretations have been given but none that impugns the figure which justifies the plurals. Our principle becomes clear, if we compare two such passages as V. 2. 9—ciṣite cṛṅge rākṣase vinilṣe (He whets his horns to gore the Rakṣas) and I. 140. 6—bhimō nā cṛṅga davāvāva dugādhis (Like one terrific he tosses his horns). In the former the tauropoeia is complete and the duality of horns naturally follows; in the latter the simile in which Agni is compared to a bull rampant in the jungle suggests the metaphor by which the tips of flame are called his horns. The flames are uppermost in thought and the plurality of horns inevitably follows. Sayana well says cṛṅga cṛṅgased unnata ṣeṇḍas (flames shooting up like horns) and Yaska (Nir. I. 17) gives cṛṅgani as one of the eleven synonyms of ‘flames.’ In II. 2. 49—piṣṇyāḥ pattarām citāyantām aksābhiḥ pāthō nā pāryān pānast ukhē ānu (The bird of the firmament, observant with his eyes, as guard of the path looks at both races). The first metaphor avifies the celestial Agni and suggests the second, in the transition to which the first
fades away as the plurality of phenomena comes to the front in thought and leads to the plural eyes in the new metaphor. Sāyana’s svakṣyāir jñālārūpāir avayavāih (his own members having the form of flames) expresses the idea.

Similar is RV. X. 21. 7c,—ghṛtāpratikam mānuṣo vi vo māde cakrān cetistham aksābhīr vivekastे (With butter-smeared face you are merry in spirit, bright, observant with your eyes, you wax great). In a Agni is an ṛtvij (priest); in c the personification is fading from thought in the transition to the new figure in d. Sāyana’s vyāptāiś teṣābhīs (far-extending, radiant flames) well explains the metaphor in aksābhīs and its plural form. Parallel to this is VIII. 60. 13.—vicāno vṛṣabhō yathā āgniḥ cīgāge dāṇḍaṁ dḥyaṁ asya hānava na pratidhiṣe su-jāmbbhāh sāhāve yathāḥ (Like a bull Agni doth whet and toss his horns. Sharp are his jaws and not to be withstood, with good teeth, strong and swift). The simile in a and b shows the proper duality of horns. In c comes the new figure and its natural resultant in the plural hānava. So in X. 79 we have a shift from hānā in 1a and ahoṁ in 2a to sahāsram aksābhīr in 5a.

The sacrificial aspect of Agni in II. 13. 4c,—āśīvaṁ dāṇḍrāḥ pitār atti bhōjanam (Insatiate with his tasks he eats his father’s food) should be contrasted with the zoomorphic Agni of X. 87. 3a,—ubhōbhajātmun āpa dhēhi dāṇḍrā hūṁrāh cīgāno tvaram pārum ca (Apply thy tasks destructive, whetting both, the upper and the lower). The dual of the latter is required by the personification; the plural of the former is as necessary to the metaphor of the consuming flames. In it the personification is arrested and the metaphor predominates. There is no need of disregarding the usual distinction between dāṇḍra and dānta, as is so often done in the interpretation of the former passage.

One passage relating to Agni remains. This is the much mooted 1 IV. 2. 12.—ātus tvāṁ dhṝṇāṁ agna etan padbhīḥ pagṛṣer

1 For a summary of the earlier discussion of this passage and of the word padbhīḥ, see M. Bloomfield in A. J. P. XL. 350ff. and in Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Orientalistes, L, or the Johns Hopkins University Circulars, 1909, no. 19, p. 15ff. In the latter paper Professor Bloomfield concludes,—“Shocking as may seem the paradox, we shall, I think, have to endure it, that Agni is here said to see with his feet; of course, the pun as well as the paradox between padbhīḥ and pagṛṣer
ādbhutaṁ aryā ēvāh. We believe that Sāyana’s gloss on pādhāṁ—pādaĭś svatejōdhāṁ pacya (He sees with his feet, his own bright flames)—embodies the Rishi’s meaning so far as the noun itself is concerned. We do not, however, feel compelled to construe it with pacya. It is not so unusual for words at the beginning of successive padas to be syntactically connected that we may not construe pādhāṁ with ētas or with the implicit idea of motion in ētas. The passage would then mean:—Hence (speeding) with thy feet (i.e., thy nimble jets of flame) mayst thou, O Agni, noble one, behold those wondrous ones (i.e., the gods) in visible presence (i.e., go thither carrying our oblations and prayers). In either case the passage swings right into line with all the others considered relative to Agni and the metaphor affords ample explanation of the plural. In the latter case the paradox and supposed difficulties of the passage vanish.

We shall next consider the passage X. 99. 12 that has so long proved a puzzle for the commentators: eva mahā asura vakṣāthāya vamrakāṁ pādhāṁ ēpī sarpad ēndram ēs ēyānāh karati svastim ēsam ēsam ērjānā sukṣitim vićcēm ēbhāh | (Thus, Āsura, for his exaltation did the great Vamraka crawl upon his feet up to Indra. That one, when supplicated, will give him a blessing; food, strength, secure dwelling, all will be bring him).

Bloomfield has shown (ll. ec.) that pādhāṁ everywhere means primarily “with the feet” and has argued plausibly for an occasional secondary meaning, “quickly, nimbly, briskly, etc.” Cf. our colloquial “with both feet.” This word may, then, be considered to lie within this range of meaning. Vamraka, too, is a mooting word. Its possibilities are, however, either an ant, or a Rishi, or a demon. In a study to be published separately the writer has maintained that Vamraka is here Ant, the personified type of his genus. If, then, vamraka is ant, the plural pādhāṁ is natural; if Rishi or demon, the plural is

may have invited an unusually daring poet to this tour de force. Of itself the likening of the nimble jets of flame to moving feet is not out of the Rishi’s range. The exact sense of the passage is not quite clear, but its obscurities are not likely to affect our judgment of pādhāṁ either way or another.”

1 So PWB. and GWB. Sāyana, Griffith and Ludwig take it as name of a Rishi; GRY, as that of a demon.
the intensive with Bloomfield's secondary meaning or else due to a paronomasia upon the literal meaning of his name. In any case the difficulty of the plurality of feet is removed.

In I. 163. 11\-ed, it is said of the horse:—tāva cṛṅgāni viśhitā purutrā āryaceṣu jārbbhurāṇa ca ranti (Tossing thy horns outspread in all directions, thou rangest in the wildernesses). With this we must compare 9th preceding:—hīranyaçṛṅgō t'yo aṣya pūḍā (Golden-horned is he, of iron are his feet). Sāyana explains the implied çṛṅgāni of 9th by umnata cīrasko hṛdaya-rumāṇa çṛṅgasthāniyā çīroraḥ (Prominent hairs of the head made fast at its centre and occupying the usual place of horns) and the expressed çṛṅgāni of 11th by cīrano niryutāḥ çṛṅghasthāniyāḥ kaṣāḥ (Hairs growing out from the head in the usual place of horns). Sāyana is thus consistent and we believe him alone of the commentators to be correct. He undoubtedly means the foretop. As hari is the predominant color of the Vedic horse, hīranya is a natural epithet for the foretop. What could better suggest the comparison in 11\-ed than the waving, tossing hairs of a heavy, shaggy foretop? The metaphor alone is ample reason for the plural horns. We have also the additional reason that in this hymn the horse is a celestial animal actually identified in 3rd with Aditya, the sun, and coursing the heavens in 6 and 7. This identification is more or less prominent throughout the hymn. The foretop, then, represents also the beams of the sun.

In IX. 15. 4th, the Rishi says of Soma in the press:—esa cṛṅgāni dōdhañcuc cīṅgāti yātthā vṛṣā (He brandishes his horns; he whets them as a bull of the herd). Oldenberg's identification of the horns of soma here with the horns of the moon affords no explanation for the plural and seems otherwise in-

---

1 LRV. renders 9th mit goldenem [vorder] hufe erz die beiden [hinter] füße” and in 11th renders cṛṅgāni by “hufen.” We believe the pūḍā of 9th is the pūḍās of the padapātha, not the dual of LRV. GRV. renders 9th “Goldhufg ist er, Eisern seine Füße” and cṛṅgāni of 11th by “Hufe”. This reduces the poetic figure to a mere comparison of material composing horn and hoof. Wilson renders 9th “His mane is of gold,” etc., and 11th “The hairs of thy mane,” etc. This does not render Sāyana properly. On top of the head “in the usual place of horns,” i.e. between the ears, is the foretop, not the mane. Griffith translates literally “horns” in both passages, citing Sāy. in 9th for “mane” and commenting on 11th “Meaning, here, perhaps, hoofs.” The meaning must, of course, be the same in both passages.
consistent with the entire context. Occidental commentators are silent. Sayana glosses ग्रंगझ by ग्रंगजव उन्नति अन-गृन abhisāvakale (Stalks or filaments of the soma plant that project like horns at the time of the pressing). This suits the case admirably. The figure explains the number and leads on naturally to the simile of h.

The omniscient Vṛćyakarman is the universal father and the architect of the world. In X. 81. 3 the Rishi says:—व्रजवात-चक्षुर uta vṛc-word vātobāhur uta vṛc-vātaspāt | sām bāhūbhyan bāharmi sām pātatrāir dyāvābhūmi janāya dena ekah || (With eyes and face on every side, and arms and feet on every side, with twain arms and with wings he kindles the fire, that lone god creating heaven and earth). The implied plurals of the compounds of a and b are hyperbolic and intensive. Cf. our “He is all eyes, all ears,” etc. The dual of c is noticeable. Though the god may have multiple arms yet in twirling the fire-sticks naturally but two are used. The plural pātatrāir may best be considered as poetic hyperbole again, akin to the implied intensive plurals of a and b. With two arms Vṛćyakarman starts the fire; with many wings he fans into fervent heat the flames that are to fuse heaven and earth for his welding. There is the prosaic alternative that pātatrāir may mean “pinions,” i.e. “wing-feathers” rather than “wings.”

There is a poor imitation of the passage in A.V. XIII. 2. 26—ये व्रजवार्षारिः uta vṛc-vārṣārīya yo vṛc-vārṣāpayī uta vṛc-vārṣapyathāḥ | sām bāhūbhyan bāhārati sām pātatrāir dyāvābhūmi janāya dena ekah || The diversity of bodily members in c may mean that the god, Śūrya this time, hears heaven and earth in his two arms and that the poet gives him the hyperbolic plurality of wings to indicate the swiftness and strength of his flight.

In a description of Indra in R.V. III. 36. 8 we have: hruddā iev iukṣyāy somadhanāḥ sām i vṛc-vācā samaṇa purāni (Like lakes are his flanks, soma-containing; verily he holdeth full many a ligation). In the R.V. kuksi occurs only in connection with Indra. It is found five times in the dual and only here in the plural. This unique plural may be considered as a hyperbole in thorough keeping with ṣ, in which the soma-filled Indra is too vast for heaven to contain him.

But one more instance remains. This is the A.V. XI. 6. 22.
—yā devaḥ pānca prāriṣṭo yā devā dvādaśa śāvah | saṁvatsa-
vāsaṁ yā duṇītrās tē nah santu sūdā śīvah । (The five divine
regions, the twelve divine seasons—the fangs of the year, let
these ever be propitious to us). The numerals in a and b and
the metaphor sufficiently warrant the plural. There is the
alternative of taking duṇītrās as the equivalent of duṇās. So
V. Henry, Les Lâvres X, XI et XII de l'Atharva Veda, has:
"En totalisant probablement, soit donc 5 + 12 = 17 × 2 (parce
que toute entité céleste a son double terrestre et réciproque-
ment) = 34, ce que qui donne une denture à peu près nor-
male".

Excluding from the count the natural plurals, the plurals
with numerals attached and those implied in the devīgu ep-
ithets, we have left in the RV, a total of thirteen instances
in which a plurality of bodily parts, naturally dual, is ascribed
to an individual. The AV. contributes one independent in-
stance and one adaptation from the RV. These include in
their number nearly all the mooted instances of plural for dual
in Vedic.

It was some of these that raised Delbrück's question¹ and
led him to remark:—"Es ist merkwürdig, daß vom Soma ge-
sagt wird grīṅāṁi dodhurat², 9. 15. 4, während es von Agni³
8. 60. 13 heißt grīṅa davidhent. In derselben Stelle wird von
den hānącas des Agni gesprochen. Ich möchte dahin auch
padhīś, 4. 38. 3, rechnen, bemerke aber, daß Ludwig das
Wort durch 'Schlingen' übersetzt. Diese und ähnliche Fälle
ließen sich wohl so erklären, daß man sagt, der Dual stehe
eben nur da, wo die Beidheit hervorgehoben wird, man könne
griṅāṁi sagen, wenn nur die Mehrheit ausgesprochen werden
soll, griṅa wenn man 'beide Hörner' sagen will".

Our study of the passages shows how utterly unsatisfactory
is Delbrück's conclusions. As there was need of caution in
entering upon this disputed matter we have considered each
instance separately and in detail and we think an ample rea-
son for the plural has been found. The numerical plurals and
the devīgu compounds furnished the key as their figurative
interpretation is beyond question. The next advance was the
extension of a like exegetical method to the interpretation of

¹ See p. 1 above. ² See p. 39. Cf. RV. I. 140. 6, p. 36.
³ See p. 57. ⁴ See n. on p. 34. The reference is to the feet
of the mythical horse, Daññikrā.
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the passage referring to the eyes of Rātri, which is indisputably correct; then to the seven passages referring to the plural members of Agni, and then to the remaining five passages of the RV. and the two of the AV. Every instance yields readily to the same solvent. The poetic figure,—metaphor, paronomasia, hyperbole, etc., or a combination of these,—that flits before the Rishi's mind at the moment or the mythic concept of his imagination, fixes the plural. In not a single instance could the dual have been used without a decided poetic loss.

It is in this section alone that any plural of bodily parts could be considered as an encroachment upon the domain of the dual. So far as these fifteen instances out of the entire five hundred and fifteen considered in these pages are concerned, the encroachment, if it may be so termed, is purely artistic and not syntactical.

The disparity of instances between the RV. and the AV. is but another indication of the enormous difference between these two Vedas in poetic power and artistic skill. The study of the "Dual in Comparisons" reveals the same striking difference in the use of figurative language. We have in this section the same principles operating in metaphors that we find there to be operative in similes. The two studies illumine each other and together show that the mooted use of plural for dual in Vedic is simply the difference between the highly figurative and richly poetic language of the hieratic Rishi and the more prosaic diction of the Atharvan Shaman, the difference between the imaginative conceptions of a poet and the mechanical composition of a versifier.

It is but simple justice to the much-contended Sayana to note that, whatever may be his lack of merit in some other respects, in several of these passages he alone of all commentators has caught the spirit and meaning of the ancient Rishis. Our method of interpretation was wrought out before reading his commentary, but we are glad it is supported by him.

\[\text{§ 7.}\]

A duality of bodily parts, naturally singular, associated with a duality of persons.

The RV. has these eight instances:—(1), upāśthā (pitrār uṣāsas = divāspṛthivyō), I. 124. 5, — ēbhā pṛṃṇāti pitṛr upās-
thā (Filling both laps of her parents); (2), tanvā (ascinos), I. 181. 4r.—arepāsā tanvā nāmabhīḥ svāh (Unblemished bodies, with marks their own); (3), VII. 72. 1r.—sparāyā ṣrīyā tanvā ṇubhānā (Radiant in body with an enviable beauty); (4), tanvā (mēnayos), II. 39. 2r.—mēne īva tanvā cūmbhamānē (Like two dames adorning their bodies); (5), tanvā (udāsos), III. 4. 6r.—ā bhāndaṁānē uṣāśā upeke uta smayetete tanvā vi-rūpe (Night and Dawn, closely united, come hither beaming and smile; different in hue are their bodies); (6), tanvā (di-cāpythyos), IV. 56. 6r.—punānē tanvā mithāl (Making pure their bodies alternately); (7), tanvā (indrānyos), X. 65. 2r.—mithō hinvānā tanvā sāmokasā (Speeding each the other, having bodies with one dwelling); (8), υρά (—1 hārī yājamānasya), X. 105. 2r.—hārī yāsa suyūjā vivrata vēr ārvāntānu υρά (Whose twain dun steeds, well-yoked, swerring apart, thou seekest after, fleet stallions).

There is no clear instance in the AV, as the tanū of IV. 25. 5r, like that of RV. X. 183. 2k, is better taken as a loc. sg. Some consider tanvā in our nos. 2 and 3 to be inst. sg.

These eight duals are obviously normal and need no comment in explanation or justification. They make the list of the duals of the bodily parts entirely complete for the two Vedas.

Our study of the dual of the natural bodily parts has been based only upon the two oldest monuments of the language, the Rig and the Atharva Veda. Among the results we may repeat by way of summary the following.

We have found 191 such duals in RV. and 225 in AV., also 62 plurals in RV. and 37 in AV. referring to the same bodily parts. Of the duals, 158 in RV. and 212 in AV, pertain to individuals and the dual expresses in each instance the natural number of the bodily parts specified. Of these as duals, there is no need of comment, as they are admittedly characteristic of the language at all periods. Their numerical distribution, however, has been found to indicate strongly the

1 A much mooted passage. Because of the close similarity of a to I. 63. 2r,—yūd dhārī indrā vivrata vēr—we prefer Bergaigne’s (II. 256) interpretation, and incline to modify it by accepting Sayyana’s ēparatītha as the sense of υρά. Cf. hastin as an analogous synecdochical metronym.
marked contrast between the hieratic character of the RV. and the demotic nature of the AV. An attentive scanning of the list will reveal many interesting and not unimportant details which neither our space has permitted nor our special theme has required that we should indicate. These have been thought an ample justification for the publication of the entire list, which is also more complete than Grassmann's and contains several corrections of his.

We have found only eight duals, all in RV., of bodily parts naturally singular, referring to a duality of persons. The number of such "pure" duals seems rather surprisingly small, less than two percentum of the Vedic duals. Their entire absence from the AV. is also striking.

We have found only two instances, both in AV., of a phenomenon natural enough, yet so rare, duals arising from the resolution of natural plurals.

We have found that of the naturally dual parts of the body, both duals and plurals are used in reference to a duality or a plurality of individuals, that the dual resolves the group and presents the acts of the component individuals, that the plural merges the individual into the concert of the group, that of a dualic group the dissociative dual is far more frequent than the synthetic plural (10 to 3), while of a plural group the plural is just twice as frequent as the dual (52 to 26), that the resolution of a plural group is far more numerous (20 to 6) in the RV. than in the AV. and is sometimes attended by distinctively hieratic and artistic characteristics and that its "ambal" nature is very marked.

We have found that 24 plurals in RV. and 20 in AV. refer to individuals, but in 4 instances in RV. and 16 in AV. this plural expresses the natural number of bodily parts and in 7 in RV. and 2 in AV. plural numerals are attached showing the figurative or symbolic nature of the plurals. For the remaining 15 instances we have found a simple logical and consistent explanation, based not upon any preconceived notions but upon ample evidence furnished by the Vedas themselves. Contrary to the impression of eminent scholars we find that Vedic Sanskrit does not admit plurals for duals with any marked freedom and that the supposed encroachment of plural upon dual is purely an artistic phenomenon in
every instance and one characteristic of the higher reaches of hieratic art.

Incidentally we have given a new or a modified interpretation to several passages, the more important of which have been briefly noted.

Finally, and by way of anticipation also, we may add that the conclusions drawn from the remaining parts of our study give ample confirmation to our main conclusions from the foregoing.
The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Book Two.—Edited, with critical notes, by LeRoy Carr Barret, M.A., Ph.D., Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H.

Prefatory.—The second book of the Kashmirian AV. is here presented, elaborated upon about the same methods and principles as was the first book, published in volume 26 of this Journal. As in the first book so here the transliteration is regarded as of first importance: the publication of Bloomfield's Vedic Concordance makes it unnecessary to report variants in full as was done for the first book, but if a hymn or a stanza appears in the Concordance then at least one reference is given, so that practically all the new material is immediately evident.

It will be noted that sometimes the transliteration of an entire hymn is given followed by an emended version, while again transliteration and emendation proceed stanza by stanza: no strong objection will be made to this freedom, if it is remembered that the work is still in an experimental stage. But it may be objected that while the word "experimental" is used here in the preface, further on the emendations are proposed with an air of considerable certainty: for I am sure it has not been possible to indicate successfully just the shade of certainty I feel concerning the proposed readings. Let us discuss the situation. Here is a manuscript, the sole and only one of its kind, written in such a slovenly fashion and so corrupt that in many places the true reading can never be attained: some of the hymns it presents are known in other texts, the rest are not known in any other text. In editing a hymn which appears both here and elsewhere one is constantly tempted to think that the Paipp. reading is only a corruption of the reading given by the other text, because one gets to feel that any and all mistakes are liable to appear in this manuscript. The easy thing then is simply to set down the reading of the other text as the correct reading of
the Paipp, but just because it is easy it creates a tendency that needs to be restrained. When we take up new hymns there is always a temptation to indulge freely in conjectural emendation, which is indeed a pretty pastime, but not productive of firmly founded results: when a pada or a stanza seems senseless (a conclusion which may sometimes be reached too readily) it would not be difficult, at least in some cases, to write one sensible and suitable to the context. But this is not criticism. Emendations are suggested here which are pure conjecture and not to be regarded in any other light; surely here if anywhere conjectural emendation has its opportunity but here as everywhere its value is very slight. Such are the principles I have tried to follow in editing this text: this statement of them may be taken too as a protest against certain methods of textual criticism, the methods of those who so gaily chop or stretch texts to make them fit a preconceived theory.

The transliteration is given in lines which correspond to the lines of the ms.; the division of words is of course mine, based upon the edited text. The abbreviations need little explanation; Q. is used to refer to the AV. of the Çaubikya School, and ms. (sic) is used for manuscript to avoid confusion with the other abbreviation MS. The signs of punctuation used in the ms. are pretty faithfully represented by the vertical bar (— colon) and the “Z” (= period); in transliteration the Roman period stands for a virāma. The method of using daggers to indicate a corrupt reading is that familiar in the editions of classical texts.

Introduction.

Of the ms.—This second book in the Kashmir ms. begins f. 29b, l. 6 and ends at the bottom of f. 48b,—19½ folios; of these f. 43 is badly broken and from f. 42a the larger part of the written surface has peeled off; other than this there is practically no damage to the ms. in this part. There are as many as 20 lines to the page and as few as 15, but the most of the pages have 17 to 19 lines.

Numbering of hymns and stanzas.—In this book there are no stanza numbers and furthermore the end of a stanza is not regularly indicated by a mark of punctuation; often a visarga or virāma is the only indication of the end of a hemistich. Most frequently the colon is the mark used if any
mark appears. Except when rewriting a stanza corrections of punctuation have not been mentioned regularly.

The hymns are grouped in anuvākas, all properly numbered save the tenth. The anuvākas consist of five hymns each save that the sixth has six. Practically all the hymns are numbered,—only three times is the number omitted and only five times is the wrong number written. At the end of No. 49 stands a sort of colophon, imām rākṣāmantraṁ digdhandhanam (sic); after some formule which are thrust into the middle of No. 50 stands iti agnisūktam; and after No. 69 stands iti sadṛtasūktam (sic).

Accents.—The accentuation in this book is about as poorly done as the punctuation. Accents are marked more or less fully on 30 stanzas of 12 different hymns, not counting a very few cases where an accent stands lonesomely on one single word: in no hymn is the accentuation marked on all the stanzas. No marks appear after f. 36b. I have marked the accents in transliterating, but have not attempted to edit them in the emended portions because they seem to have no value.

Extent of the book.—This book contains 18 anuvākas each having 5 hymns, except that anu 6 has 6, so that I have numbered 91 hymns; but hymns 1 and 2 of anu 17 seem to be in reality only one. The lacunae in f. 42 and f. 43 have not concealed the fact that anu 12 and anu 13 had 5 hymns each,—provided of course that the numbers written are correct, as they seem to be. The mutilation of the two folios has taken away No. 63 entire and parts of Nos. 60, 61, 64, and 65.

The word “hymn” means kāṇḍa whether verse or prose, and there are at least 20 hymns that are non-metrical. The 90 hymns as they now stand in the ms. present approximately 470 stanzas, thus showing an average of 5 stanzas which is clearly the norm here as well as in Q. 2 for 65 hymns here certainly have 5 stanzas each; only 4 have more than 6 stanzas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 hymn has</th>
<th>3 stanzas</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>3 stanzas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 hymns have</td>
<td>4 = each</td>
<td>= 12 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &quot; &quot; 5 &quot; &quot; = 325 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &quot; &quot; 6 &quot; &quot; = 60 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot; &quot; 7 &quot; &quot; = 7 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot; &quot; 8 &quot; &quot; = 8 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &quot; &quot; 11 &quot; &quot; = 22 &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 hymns = 437 stanzas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
83 hymns have 437 stanzas
2 hymns possibly have 6 stanzas each = 12 stanzas
5 hymns (uncertain) show about 17
1 is entirely lost
91 hymns 466 stanzas.

Counting in the 5 formulae which appear in the middle of No. 50 we have the approximate total of 470 stanzas.1

In Book One we saw that 67 out of 112 hymns clearly had 4 stanzas so that it seems that the verse-norm for Books One and Two is the same in C. and Pāipp.

New and old material.—In Book One about 150 stanzas out of 425 were new material; here in Book Two about 270 out of the 470 are new. There are 50 hymns which may properly be called new though a number of them contain pādas or even stanzas which are in the Concordance. The greater part of the new material is in the second half of the book; 17 of the first 46 hymns are new and 33 of second 44 are new. Perhaps it is also worth while to note here that of the 36 hymns in C. 2 18 appear in Pāipp. 2 in fairly close agreement just as 19 of the 35 in C. 1 appear in Pāipp. 1.

This book contains hymns and stanzas which appear in Books 1—7 and 19 of C.;—1 hymn of C. 1; 18 of C. 2; 3 of C. 3; 2 of C. 4; 8 of C. 5; 4 of C. 6; 2 of C. 19; and some scattered pādas of C. 7. Of the RV. there are 2 hymns and some stanzas, of MS. 2 hymns and some stanzas, of TB., Vait., and Kāyu. 1 hymn each.

ATHARVA-VEDA PĀIPPALĀDA-ÇĀKHĀ.

BOOK TWO.

1. [f. 29h 1. 6.]

C. 4. 7. 2—6.

Om nama sti:
lotamāyāī z z om rasāṁ prācyam viśam arasaṁ yad udicyam yatheda:

1 It will be understood that the figures given are not minutely exact, could not be and need not be: the total, 470 stanzas is a minimum. The ms. shows about 900 stanzas for Books 1 and 2; from this we may roughly estimate 5500 stanzas for the entire manuscript.
The invocation may be read oṁ namo 'sti lotamāyāṁ. The
stanzas may be read thus: arasāṁ práçyaṁ visām arasāṁ yad
udcyam | athedam adharacyaṁ karambhena vi kalpate z 1 z
karambhāṁ kṛtvā turiyāṁ pivasākām udāḥtam | kṣudhā kilā
tva duṣṭano jaksifipasya na rūrupaḥ z 2 z vi te madam
sārayati çarum iva pātayāmasi | pari tvā varmive çantam
varcasā | sthāpayāmasi pari grāmyavācitaṁ pari tvā sthāpayāmasi |
tva : stā vrksāva sthāṣaṁ abhisāte na rūrupaḥ pavastvaṁ yas
tvā pari akṛf : nam duruṣebhir ajanīr uta prakrīr asi tvam oṣadhī atiṣāta
na rū :

2. [f. 29b l. 14.]
āvidyad dyāvāprthivī āvidya bhagam açvinā :
āvidya vrahmanaspatim kṛnomy asaṁ visaṁ
Read āvedya in a, b, and c ; arasāṁ in d .

vaso hedada visaṁ yad ena :
d aham açitham utāir adadyāt praruṣo bhavādi jagadaś punaḥ
Pāda d may be read bhavāmi ō , but for the rest I see
nothing .

mā bibhe :
r nā marisyasi pari tvā māsi viçvātāḥ rasam viṣasya nāvidam
udhna :
[f. 30a. ] ś phena madann iva z
Read pāmi in b, uḍhna phenaṁ in d . Pāda a = Č. 5. 30. 8a;
c = SMB. 2. 6. 18c .
apāvocad apavakta prathamā dāivyā bhīṣak . sam aga :
cchasindragā yavayāva co viṣadūṣañīñ.
In VS. 16.5 and elsewhere is a variant of ab; a possible reading for ed is sam u gacchaisindrajā yavayāśa ca viṣadūṣaṇaḥ; read dāvyo in b.

yac ca piśtam yac cāpiśtam
yady agrham yac ca dehyam devās sarvasya vidvam so rasam krūtā viṣam

z 2 2 2

Read: yac ca piśtam yac cāpiśtam yac ca grhyam yac cādehyam | devās sarvasya vidvān so 'rasam krūtām viṣam

z 5 2 2 2

3. [f. 30a l. 4.]

C. 2. 10.

kṣetriyā tvā nirṛtya jahāsiṣcaṁsa druhō muṇcasi: vāruṇasya pācāt. | anāgasiṁ vrāhmaṇā tvā krṇomi civa te: dyāvāprthihiṁ bhūtāṁ caṁ te agnis saha dhībhīr astu maṁ gāvas sa:
hoṣadhībhīh caṁ antarikṣam sahavatam astu te caṁ te bhavantu pradi:
caç cātasaṛaḥ yā devīś pradiçaç cātasaṛa vatapatṭir abhi sūryo vi:
caṣṭe | tāsv edam jarasa ā dadami pra kṣyam etā nirṛiṣ parācaḥ:
sūryam etāṁ caṁ asaṁ grāhyā yathā devā maṁ muṇcantu asṛjau
parācaḥ:
tasaḥ evā tvāṁ kṣetriyaṁ nirṛtya jahāmiṣcaṁsā druhō muṇcāśi:
mi vāruṇasya pācā ahōmocī yāḳmaṁ duritā vādadyād druhaḥ:
pātraḥ grāhyāc cod amoci juhaṁrīvartim avidat syūnāṁ apy
abhūta:
bhadre sukṛtasya loke z 3 2

This hymn appears also in TB. 2. 5. 6. 1—2, and all but the fifth stanza in HG. 2. 3. 10; 4. 1: it will be noted that our version is more like these than the C. version. For Ppp. version read:

kṣetriyātvā nirṛtyā jāmiṣcaṁsā druho muṇcāṁ sarvasya pācāt | anāgasiṁ vrāhmaṇā tvā krṇomi civa te dyāvāprthihiṁ bhūtāṁ z 1 2 caṁ te agnis saha dhībhīr astu caṁ gāvas sahaṁsadībhīhīḥ | caṁ antarikṣaṁ sahavatam astu te caṁ te bhavantu pradiçaç cātasaṛaḥ z 2 2 yā devīś pradiçaç cātasaṛa vatapatṁ abhi sūryo vicaśte | tāsv etāṁ jarasa ā dadhāṁ
pra yakṣma etu nirṛtiṣ parācailḥ z 3 z sūryam ṛtaṁ tamasa grahyā yathā deva munecanto arjān paretāsah | eva tvāṃ kṣetriyāṁ nirṛtyā jamičansād druho munīcām varuṇasya pācāt z 4 z amoci yakṣmād duritād avadyād druhaḥ pātṛād grahyāc cod amoci | aha avartim avidat syonam apy abhūd bhadre sukṛtasya loke z 5 z 3 z

4. [f. 30a 1. 14.]

Qi. 2. 14.
nissālāṁ dhiṣnyāṁ đhiṣaṇaṁ ekāvā!
dyām jighatsvaṁ sarvaç canḍama napatiyo nācayāmas sadātvā | yā!
devāgha kṣetriyād yadi vā puruṣesītā | yad astu daçvibhyo jātā:
nācyatetasa sadātvā pari dhāmāny āsām āsrar gāsthām ivāsaram ||!
[f. 30b.] ajīso sarvān ājin yo nācyatetah sadātvā nira vo gośthād ajāmasi:
nir yonin nṛpānaça | nir vo magumdyā duhitaro grhebhyāc cātayāmasi||
amūṣminn adhare grhe sarvāsvant arāyah | tatra pāpmā ni yacchatu sa:

rvaç ca yātudhānyah z 4 z

Read: nissālāṁ ḍhiṣnyāṁ đhiṣaṇaṁ ekāvāyām jighatsvaṁ| sarvaç canḍasya naptvo nācayāmas sadāvah z 1 z yā deva aghāḥ kṣetriyā yadi vā puruṣesītāḥ yadi stha dasyubhyo jātā nācyatetasa sadāvah z 2 z pari dhāmāny āsām ācuḥ gāsthām ivāsaram | ajāsami sarvān ājin vo nācyatetasa sadāvah z 3 z nir vo gośthād ajāmasi nir yoner nir upāmasat | nir vo magumdyā duhitaro grhebhyāc cātayāmasi z 4 z amūṣminn adhare grhe sarvās-santv arāyāḥ | tatra pāpmā ni yacchatu sarvaç ca yātudhānyah z 5 z 4 z

Our ms. offers no help towards solving the troublesome st. 1a.

5. [f. 30b, 1. 4.]

Qi. 2. 12.
dyāvāprthivī urv āntārikṣam kṣē: ttraśya pattrir gāyo ḍbhūtaḥ utāntārikṣam urvātagopāṁ
tesu tápyantāṁ ma:
yi tasyamāne z
For b read kṣetrasya, patny urugayo 'dbhutah; in cd read ura vätagopaù te 'nu = tapyāmāne.

yadam indra śnui somapa ya tvā hṛdā coca thai jahavīmi vṛccasī tam kuliçeneva vṛkṣam yo smākam mana i
idam hinañ.

In a read idam and cṛṇaḥ, in b yat tvā, in c vṛccami, and
in d 'smākaṁ.

idam de vac cṛṇute yajñiyā sta bhāradvājo ma
yam uktyāni çaṅsatu | pāçe sa badho durite bhy ucyatām yo smākam|
mana idam hinañ

In a read cṛṇuta ye yajñiyā stha, in b ukthāṁ, in c 'bhi
yujyatām, and in d yo 'smākaṁ.

açitibhih tiṣṭbhisi sāmagebhir ādityē; bhir vāsabhār āñgirobhīḥ | iṣṭāpurtām āvatu naḥ pītṛgamām
āmum; dade harasā dāivyena

In c read iṣṭāpurtam and pītṛgam.

dyāvāprthivī anū mā didhyatām ; viçvē devāso anu mā rabhadhvam | āñgiirasas pitāras
somyāsah |
pāpas āricchatv apakāmasya kartā z

In a read didhyāthām, in d pāpam ārechchatv.

atīva yo maruto manyate no vrahma va yo nimdviṣataś kriyamānam tapūṇṣi tasmāi
vrajanāmi santu vra; hmadvīṣām abhi tam cóca dyāūḥ

In b read nindīsat kriyamānam, in c vṛjinañi.

A dadāmi te padam samiddhe jātavedasi | agni çarīram veveṣtu imani gacchatu te vasu |

In a read dadāmi, in c agniç and veveṣtv.

sapta prāṇān aṣṭāu majña | [f. 31 a] s. tāns te vṛccāsī vrahmanā yamasya gaccha mā
danam agnito araṅkṛtah z z ;

z 5 z prathamānuvākāh z z

Read: sapta prāṇān aṣṭāu majña te vṛccāmi vrah-
manā yamasya gaccha sādanam ag nidūto araṅkṛtah z 8 z 5
z prathamānuvākāh z.
venás tát paçyantá páramám padam yatrá
viçvam bhávaty ékanañdám | idam dhenur aduhaj jáyamánás
svarvido bhyanukti

c virāt.
The simplest emendation in a would be venás, but to let
venás stand and read paçyat as in Ç, is possible. In b read
ekanādám. Reading idam dhenur aduhaj jáyamánás we have
the same pada as RV. 10. 61. 19d. I am inclined to think
that the reading of d in our ms. is only a corruption of Ç.
abhy anuñata vrañ.

prthāg voced amṛtam na vidvān gandharvo dhāma paramam
guhā yat. ||
trīni padāni hatā guhās* vās tāni vēda sa pitūś pitāsat.
In a read pra tad and nu, in c nihitā guhāsyā, and in d yas,
sa no:
bāndhur janitā sa vidhartā dhāmani vēda bhūvanāni viçvā
yatā devā:
amṛtam anacānā samāne dhāmann addhīrayanta |
In b read dhamānī, in c amṛtam anacānās, and in d dhāmany
adhy airayanta. In the margin the ms. gives “to ba.”

pari viçvā bhūvanā!
ny āyam āpācaṣṭe | prathāmajā ṛtasyā vācas ivāktri bhuvā
neṣṭhā dhā:
sramṇ esa īna v elo agnih
In b read upatiṣthe, in c vacam iva vaktari, and for d
dhāsyur esa nanv eso agnih.

pari dyāvāprthi sadyāyam ṛtasya ta:
ntum vitatam ḍrkecaṁ | devo devatvam abhiraksamānas
samānam bandhum:
vi pariçchad ekaḥ z 1 : 2
Read: pari dyāvāprthiv śadyāyam ṛtasya tantum vitatam
ḍrce kam | devo devatvam abhiraksamānas samānam bandhum,
vi pary aicchad ekaḥ z 5 z 1 z
indra juṣasvā yāhi ċūra pivā su!
taḍa madhoç cakāna cărun madathah | ā tvā viçantu mutāsā indra!
prṇasya kukṣi viḍhy açatru dhehy ā nāh indra jaṭharaṃ
prṇasva madho:
rasya sutasya | upa tvā madesu vājo stu | indras turāśād
jagḥāna:
vṛtram sāsahā čatrūr mamuc ca | vajrīr made somasyāc*
ti hava me:
krio juṣasvā indra syagubhin matsa madaya mahe raṇāya
z 2 z:

Read: indra juṣasvā yāhi ċūra pivā sutasya madhoç ca | cakānaça căur madāya z 1 z ā tvā viçantu sutāsa indra
prṇasva kukṣi viḍhy açatro dhīeṣhy ā nāh z 2 z indra
jaṭharaṃ prṇasva madhurasasya sutasya | upa tvā madās suvāco
sthūḥ z 3 z indras turāśād jaghāna vṛtram sasahe čatṛūn
jamanuc ca | vajrī made somasya z 4 z ċrudhi havam me giro
juṣasvendra svaṇyugbhir matsva | madāya mahe raṇāya z 5 z 2 z

8. [l. 31 b, l. 1 l.]

ud itye kramam trayo vyāghraḥ puruṣo vṛkhaḥ hṛg veda
sūryo hṛg devo:
vanaspatir hṛg maṇavantu cattravaḥ paramena pathā vṛka
pare:
na stenor arṣatu | tato vyāghraḥ paramā akṣāu ca te hanu
can te vyāghraṃ:
jambyāmasya | āt sarvān vrṇśatin nakhām yat samnaso
vi yan na:
so na samnasa | pūrṇā mṛgasya dantā upaçirnā u pariṣṭayāḥ
vyāghraṃ:
datutām vayaṃ prathomām jambhayāmasya | ād iku stenam
ahyam yātu:
dhānam ato vṛkaṃ | nāivaraspaśain na grhaḥ paraç cara
dvipāc caṭu:
śpānto mā hiṇśir indrajās somajāsīḥ z om indrajās somajā:
asīḥ z 3 z
Read: ud ito ye kraman trayo vyāghraḥ puruṣo vrkāḥ | hṛg devas sūryo hṛg vanaspatir hṛṇ. me namantu catravāḥ z 1 z paramena pathā vrkāḥ pareṇa steno arṣatu | tato vyāghras paramena z 2 z aksyān ca te hanā ca te vyāghra jambhayāmasi | at sarvān vinçatiṁ nakḥān z 3 z yat saṁnamo na vi namo vi yan namo na saṁnamah | mūraṁ mṛgaśya dantā upaçirnā u prṣṭayaḥ z 4 z vyāghraṁ daṭvatām vayāṁ prathamaṁ jambhayāmasi | ād ittha stenam ahiṁ yatudhānam ato vrkām z 5 z īnāvaraspaśāṁ na grhas paraç cara dvipāc catuspānto āḥ mā hiṁśir indrajās somaja asi z 6 z 3 z

In st. 1 hiruk, as in Č., might just as will be written. If st. 2 and 3 were combined we would have a hymn of five stanzas, the norm of Bk. 2. In st. 6 we get good meaning by writing dvipāc catuspāṇ no mā; the meter is correct without no: paraç cara is a good ending for pāda b, but the rest seems hopeless.

9. [f. 31 b, l. 9]

Č. 1. 34. 1 (partly),

yāṁ vīru madhujātā madhune tvā panāmasi | madhor adhi praĵato si sā no madhumadhas kṛdhiḥ jihvā- yāgre me |

madhu jihvāmūle madhulakam | yathā māṁ kāmīny aso yāṁ vā |

vā māṁ anv ā yasya pari tvā paritannuteyakṣanākām avi | dviṣe | yathā na vidvāvahi na vibhavāva kādā cana rajāni |

vrūhi varunāyācāvyā purusāya ca | pathā me pathye revat i jāyām ā vaha sadhunā | jāyām me mitrāvaruṇā jāyām | devi sarasvatī | jāyām me açvināubhā dhattāṁ puṣkarāṣṭāja z 4 z

Read: iyaṁ virun madhujātā madhune tvā khanāmasi | madhor adhi praĵatāсан sa no madhumataṁ kṛdhi z 1 z jihvāya agre me madhu jihvāmūle madhulakam | yathā māṁ kāmīny aso yāṁ vā māṁ anv āyāsi z 2 z pari tvā paritamnekṣuṇāgam aoidvīse | yathā na vidvisvāvhe na vibhavāva kādā cana z 3 z rajāne vrūhi varunāyācāvyā purusāya ca | pathā me patye revati jāyām ā vaha sadhunā z 4 z jāyām me mitrāvaruṇā jāyām me devi sarasvatī | jāyām me açvināubhā dhattāṁ puṣkarāṣṭa jā z 5 z 4 z

For st. 5 cf. below, 35. 5.
daçavrksa saµcemam ahinsro grahyäc ca | atho yenaµ vanaspate:

ejivanäm lokam un annaya |

Read muñcemam in a, eunah in c, and lokam unnaya in d.

yaç cakära mu niskarat sa eva suviṣa:
ktamä sa eva tubhyam bhesajam cakära bhisañjati ca |

Read sa (for mu) in a, subhisaktamah in b, and bhesajani in d (or possibly with Ç, bhisañjã cuçih); but bhisañjati ca might stand.

catam te devävi:
dam vrahmañam ud viñdhra catam te bhy ottamam avidam
bhümyam adhi |

Read devä avidan in a, vrahmaña uta virudhaḥ for b; bhy
uttamam avidan in cd.

agä:
d ud agäd ayaµ jivanäm vrätam apy agät. abhūta putrañäm pitä:
nirñãm ca bhagavattamä

Read abhûd u in c, and bhagavattamah in d.

adhitam adhy agäd ayaµ adhi jivapurañgät: 
catam te sya virudhas sahasram uta bhesajäḥ z 5 z anu-
väkam 2 z:

Read: adhitim adhy agäd ayaµ adhi jivapurañ agät | catam
 te 'syā virudhas sahasram uta bhesajäḥ z 5 z 5 z anuväkaḥ 2 z.

11. [f. 32a, l. 8]
Ç. 2. 4.

dirghäyutvātha vīhate rānäya rṣyāmbho rksamānäs sadāiva |
ma:
ño sahasraviryaś pari ṇaṣ patu viçvataḥ

Read in a 'yutväya, in ab ränäyārisyanto rksamānäs; 
patu in d.

idäm viśkandham sätë: 
ayaµ rakṣopa bādhate | ayaµ no viçvabhesajo jaṅgināṣ
pätv añha:

saḥ |
Read sahate in a; raksān apa seems best in b. Our ms. here spells the name of this amulet with a nasal instead of jaṅgiḍa as in C; I am retaining it as possible peculiarity of the Pp.

devāir dattena maṃinā jaṅginena mayobhuvah vīskandham sarvā:
raksānai vyāyama sāmahe |

For b read jaṅginena mayobhuvah; for d vyāyāme sahāmahe.

khanac ca tvā jaṅginac ca vīskandhād a bhi muṇcatām | aranyād aty ādyataś kṛṣyāṇyo rasebhyaḥ z 1 z:

Read: canac ca tvā jaṅginac ca vīskandhād abhi muṇcatām | aranyād anya ābhṛtaś kṛṣyā anyo rasebhyaḥ z 4 z 1 z

In a canas, the reading of C, seems better; but khanas is not impossible.

It will be noted that our st. 1 is composed of hemistichs which are st. 1ab and st. 2cd in C.; Whitney suggests that the two hemistichs between have fallen out in the ms.; inserting them would bring this hymn to the norm of five stanzas. They read maṃin vīskandhadūṣanam jaṅgūdām bibhṛmo vayam, and jaṅgūde jambhād vīcārād vīskandhād abhiṣiocanāt.

12. [L. 32a, L 14.]


yeha yantu paçaço yeuyur vyāyur yaṣām mahātāram tujoṣā |
tvaṣṭā ye:
śām rūpayeyāni veda asmiṃs ām goṣṭhe savitā ni yacchāt. |

Read eha and ye pareyur in a, yeṣām sahaçārāṇaṃ jujoṣa in b; in cd rūpadheyāni vedāsmi tān.

imāṃ goṣṭham paçavas samā śravantu vrhaspatir a nātu prajānām. | si:
nīvālif nayaty agram esām ajīnmuḥhe anumatir ni yacchāt. |

Read nayatu prajānān in b, āgram in c: probably ajīnmuḥhe in d.

sam śām śravantu paçavas sām āçvā huta pāuruṣāḥ sam dhānasyā sphā:
tibhis samarāvena havisā juhomī |
sam succincti gavām kṣī:
[f. 32b.] ram sam ājyana balaṁ rasam samśikṣāsmakaṁ virā
mayi gavaç ca gopa:
tau
Read succincti in a, ājyana in b, samśikṣā asmakaṁ in c.
In the top margin of f. 32b is written gauṁ ōcāṁv.
ahāmi gavām kṣīram ahāraṁ dhānyaṁ rasam ahāraṁ
asmakaṁ:
virān ā patnīm edam astakam z 2 z
Read: ā harāmi gavām kṣīram ahāraṁ dhānyaṁ rasam
ahāraṁ asmakaṁ virān ā patnīm edam astakam z 5 z 2 z

13. [f. 32 b, l. 5.]

Č. 3. 14.
sám vat srjātv aryamā sám pū: ṣā sam vṛhaspātih sám indrā yo dhanaṁjaya ihā puṣyati
yād vasu:
In a read vas, in c dhanamjaya; in d read puṣyata as in Č.,
or puṣyatu as Whitney suggests.

ihāiva gava yeneho śakā iva puṣyata iho yad ya pra
jāyadhvam ma:

yi samjānānām astu vah
In ab read etaneho; in c I would incline to the reading
śāvā for yad ya.
mayaṁ gavo gopatyaś sacadharvaṁ mayi vo goṣṭha iha:
poṣayāti | rāyas poṣena bahulā bhavanitr jivā jivā:
ntir upa vā sademā |
In a we might read gopatayas (= bulls), but gopatinaṁ as in
Č. is better; read jivantir upa vas sadema in d.

sam vo goṣṭhena susādā sam rayyā sam sapuṣṭya a:
harjātama yan nāma tena mas sam srjāmasi |
Read aharjātasya in c, and tenā vas in d.

samjānānāṁ vihṛtāṁ a:
smin goṣṭhe karīśinīṁ bibhratis somya havis svāveçā sa ēta:
nāḥ z 3 z
Read: samjāmānaṁ avihṛtaṁ asmin goṣṭhe karīśinīṁ | bibhratis
somyaṁ havis svāveçā mā ētana z 5 z 3 z
This stanza and the first appear MS. 4. 2. 10; the readings
of st. 5a and d are similar to those in MS.
14. [f. 32b, l. 11.]

Ç. 2. 32.

udyāṇn adityās krimīn hantu sūryo nīmrocaṁ račmi; bhīr hantu ye ntaḥ krimayo gavi naḥ.
Read: adityaḥ in a, nīmrocaṁ in b, and 'ntaḥ and gavi in c.
yo dviṁśa caturakṣasā krimi;
č ārgo arjunah hato hatatratā krimin hatamahatā hataçvasā; In b read krimīs sūrāngo, in c hataḥhṛtā krimir, and for d hatamahatata hataçvasā.

hato rājā krimiṇām 'utāl'ām sthapacir hataḥ | hatāso sya veṣa: so hatāsaḥ pariveçasāh.
In b read utāisām sthapatir, in c 'sya veçaso; in d pariveçasāh.

pa te cçṛṇāmi çṛṅge yābhyaḥ yattam vi: tadāyasi | atho bhinnadi tam kumbham yasmin te nihatam viśam |;
In a read pra te çṛṇāmi, for b yābhyaḥ vitudāyasi; in c bhinnadmi, and in d nihitam viśam.

a:

trtrivat tvā kṛme hanni kaṇvavajī jamaḍagnivat. agastyāṁ vrahmaṇā;
sarve te krimayo hataḥ z 4 z.
Read: atrivat tvā kṛme hanni kaṇvavajī jamaḍagnivat | agastyāsyā vrahmaṇā sarve te krimayo hataḥ z 5 z 4 z.

15. [f. 32b, l. 18.]

Ç. 2. 31.

indrāda yā mahi drṣa;
[f. 33a. ] t krimer viçvasya tarhaṁ tayā pinaçma sam kṛmim
dṛṣa vakhalvaṁ iva | dr;
śṭam adṛṣṭam adruham ato kurīram adruham | algandūna
sarvā çalūlaṇa:
krimaṇa vacasā jāmbhayāmi | algandūna hanni mahatā va-
dena:
dunāddunārasā bhuvaṁ | sṛṣṭām asṛṣṭi ny akilāsi manāca vācān ya:
thā kriminām nyakhilacchavātāih atvāhamitnyahām cīrśa-
nyam a:
tho pārśvayaṃ krimām avaskavam yaram krimīṇa vācasa
jambhayāma:
si | ye krimayaś parvateṣu ye vanesu | ye ośadhīṣu paçusv
apsv antaḥ:
ye smākāṁ tanno sthāma caktrir indras tān hantu mahata
vadhena | 5 z:

z a 3 z
Read: indrasya ya mahī drṣat krimer vievasya tarhān |
tayā pinaśma saṅ krimin drṣadā khalvān iva zu z drṣtam
adrṣtam adruham atha kuriram adruham | algāndūṃ sarvān
caḷulān krimin vacasa jambhayāmasi zu 2 z algāndūṃ hanmi
mahata vadhena duṇā adunā arasa abhūvan | srṣṭān asṛṣṭān
ni kiriṃ vāca yathā kriminām ṣnyakhīl acchavātāiḥ | zu 3 z
anvāntyaṃ cīrṇyam atio pārṣṭeyau krimin | avaskavam
vyadhivaraun krimin vacasa jambhayāmasi zu 4 zu ye krimayaś
parvateṣu ye vanesu ya ośadhīṣu paçusv apsv antaḥ | ye smākāṁ
tanvo sthāma cakur indras tān hantu mahata vadhena zu 5 zu
5 z anuvākaḥ 3 z
The reading of our ms. in st. 3c does not force upon us
anything different from the reading of C₉₉₉₉, — cīṣṭān acīṣṭān
ni tirāmi; and in st. 3d we probably have only a corruption
of the reading of C₉₉₉₉, — nakir ucchisṭāti.

16. [f. 33a, l. 9.
(C₉₉₉₉. 2. 27.
yaça catṛn saṅjayaṭ sahamānābbhibhūr asī | sāmūṃ pratipraço :
jayarasa kṛnv ovadhe | suparnaś tvānim avidadat sukhacasm
tvākhanaṃ na:
sā | indras tvā cake hvo asurebhyas tarītave | pāyas indro
vy āśpān ha:
ntava asurebhyas | tayāham catṛn sakṣiye indraṇ čālavṛkān i:
va rudra jalājabheṣaja nilačitva karmakṛt. pṛṣṇaṃ durasyato:
jahi yo smān abhidāsati | tasya pṛṣṇaṃ jahi yo na indrā-
bhidā:
sate | ādhi no vrūhi cāktibhīṣ prāci mām uttaram kṛdhi
zu 1 zu
Read: ya catṛm saṅjayaṭ sahamānābbhibhūr asī | sāmūṃ
pratipraçojayarasaṃ kṛuv ośadhezu 1 zu suparnaś tvān avindat
sūkaras tvākahanā nasā | indras tvā cakre bāhūv asurebhyaḥ
staritave z 2 z pātām indro vy ācāṇāḥ hantavā asurebhyaḥ |
tayāhāṃ ċatrūn sūksya indrās sālavṛkāṇ īva z 3 z rudra jālāṣa-
ḥesaja nilacikhaṇḍa karmakṛt | prācāṃ durasyato jahi yo
'smān abhidāsati z 4 z tasya prācāṃ tvaṁ jahi yo na āndra-
bhidāsati | adhi no vrūhi caktibhiṣ prācī mām uttaraṁ kṛdhī
z 5 z 1 z.

In Č. the second hemistic of st. 1 is used as a refrain for
six stanzas to which our st. 5 is added as a seventh; it is not
beyond our ms. to fail utterly to indicate a refrain, but I have
preferred to arrange in five stanzas. For st. 1a Č. has nec
chatrūn prācāṃ jayāti; elsewhere our ms. follows it closely.

17. [f. 33a, l. 16.]

Č. 2. 30.

yathedaṁ bhūmyādi vātas trṣṇāṁ mathāyathī | eva maṇḍāmi
te mano ya:
thā māṁ kāṁty aso evā māṁ atvāyasī |

In a read bhūmya adhi, in b mathāyatī; in c mathnāmi, in
d kāṁny, and in e mām abhāyasī.

yemagaṁ patikāmaḥ;
janikāmo ham āgamām. açvās kanikradad yathā bhagenāham
sahā!

gamaṁ |

In a read eyam agan, in b 'ham āgamam; in d sahāgamam.

sa cen nayātho açvinā kāminā saṁ ca neṣitaḥ sarvān
ma; [f. 33 b.] nāsy agmata mām caksuṇi sama vratā |

In a read saṁ cen, in b neṣaṁh; for c d we may read
saṁ vāṁ manāsy agmata saṁ caksuṇi same u vratā.

yād antāraṁ tadā bāhyam yad bāhyam tad anta:
ram. kanyānāṁ viçvarūpāṇāṁ mano grṇādhi ṣaḍhe |

In a read tad; in d grhita is probably nearest to the
reading of the ms.;—Č. has grḥāya.

yas suparna raksā:
na vā na vakṣaṇa vā tṛtāṇipitāṁ manah | çalyeva gulma-
lūṁ yathā |

Z 2 z.

VOL. XXX. Part III.
Read: yás suparnā raksanā ā yás suparnā vaksanā ā | tatra ta arpitāṁ manaće calya īva kulmalaṁ yathā z 5 z 2 z
This version of this stanza is fully as good as the version in C., but it does not help to relieve the obscurity.

18. [f. 33b, l. 4.]

C., 6. 38.

siṁhé vyāghrā utā yā přdākāu tvīśir āgnāu vrahmaṇe sūrye: yā | īndram yā ā devī subhāgā vāvārdha sā ā nāitu varcasā samvī: dānā |
Read vrahmaṇe in b; in d we might read sā ā na etu, but sā na āitu, as in C., seems much better.

yā hastini dvīpini yā yā hīranyayē tvīśir ācvesu pū: ruṣeṣu goṣū | īndram yā ā devī subhāgā vāvārdha sā ā nāitu varca: sā samvidānā |
In a read dvīpini yā hīranye: d as in st. 1.

yā rājanye dundubhāv ayātāyām tvīśi: r ācvenāyām stanāyitnā goṣu yā īndram yā ā devī subhāgā vavā: rdha sā ā nāitu varcasā samvidānā |
In b we may safely read stanāyitnār ghoṣe, but for ācvenāyānā: I find nothing satisfactory,—unless perhaps ācvināyānā; to omit yā after ghoṣe would improve the metre. Read d as in st. 1.

rāthe ākṣeṣu paribhāsva vā: je parjānye vāte vārunāsya čuṣme | īndram yā divī subhā: gā vāvārdha sā ā netu varcasā samvidānā |
In a read ākṣeṣu vṛṣabhasya vāje: d as in st. 1.

yā rudreṣu yā: vasuṣv ādityeṣu marutsu yā | tvīśir yā viçeṣu devesu sā nāi: tu varcasā samvidānām. z 3 z
Read: yā rudreṣu yā vasuṣv ādityeṣu marutsu yā tvīśir viçeṣu devesu | īndram yā devi ā samvī: samvidānā z 5 z 3 z
This restoration of st. 5 is not entirely satisfactory but is fairly plausible; it has no parallel in C. or in TB. 2. 7. 7. 1 and 2 where the rest appears.
19. (f. 33b, l. 14.)

| yadi gādānām yadi nā |
| vyāñām nadīmām pāre nrpatis sakāh naḥ viṣve devāso abhi |
| rakṣatemām yathā jīvo vidatham ā vidāsi | yady avāre ya |
| di vāgha pāre yadi dhanvīni nrpatis sakāh naḥ yady at sudr |
| tyām yadi samṛtyāṁ nrpatis sakāh naḥ adhasparmyatāṁ |
| adhane |

[f. 34a.] bhavānv ena sūryām maghavānam pṛtanyām viṣve devāso bhi rakṣatemām | yā |
| thā jīvo vidātham ā vidāsi | imaṁ mṛtyu māināṁ hiṁśir |
| yo māṁ |
| hṛdāṁ anu sāca gopā | yo mahāṁ pipanti yom aham pip |
| parmi su |
| praajasā vāṁ maghavāṁ sūrīr astu z 4 z |

Read: yadi gādānāṁ yadi nāvyāñāṁ nadīmāṁ pāre nrpatis sakāh naḥ | viṣve devāso abhi rakṣatemāṁ yathā jīvo vidatham ā vidāsi z 1 z yady avāre yadi vaccha pāre yadi dhanvāni nrpatis sakāh naḥ | viṣve devāso + * z 2 z yady āt svadīṛtyāṁ yadi samṛtyāṁ nrpatis sakāh naḥ | viṣve devāso + + * z 3 z |
| adhasparmyatāṁ adhane bhavānv ena sūryāṁ maghavānam pṛtanyāṁ | viṣve devāso + * z 4 z imaṁ mṛtyu māināṁ hiṁśir |
| yo māṁ hṛdāṁ anu sāca gopā | yo māṁ piparti yam aham piparvä |
| suprajasāṁ maghavanāṁ sūrīr astu z 5 z 4 z |

For st. 4ab we might perhaps write adhas pātyantām adhāre bhavantu ye nas sūrīṁ maghavānam pṛtanyāṁ; but one could hardly insist upon it.

20. (f. 34a, l. 4.)

| ima nāvam a rohatā |
| acchidrāṁ pārayiṣṇuvaṁ nārācāṇśasya yā grhé ṣatārtrā |
| bhāgasya |
| ca | upadho gulgunā yakṣmas samtv aghnyā | rudrasyeṣvā |
| yātudhānā |
| n atho rājño bhavasya ca rudrā vaiḍaṭe dvipadāṁ catuṣp |
| padāṁ tayor va |
| yam aguvāke syāma | paktrir vithvi pratibhūṣantī n̄o va yaṁ de |
| vānāṁ sumatau syāma | pratīcī nāma te mātā catavāro ha te |
| pitā | tato ha jājinṣe tvam amirity arundhatī mātā nāmā |
| si māṭṛāu amṛtasyāiva vāsi arundhati tvāṁ sarvam abhiji |
| vam adhāyudham. z 5 z anu 4 z |
For the first stanza we may read, imāṃ nāvam ā roha-
tacchidrām pārayiśuvam | naraçānasasya yā grhe qatāritrā
bhagasya ca. With much hesitation the following is proposed
for the second stanza: upabaddhā gulgulunāyakāṁs āntv
aghnyāḥ | rudrasyeyā yātadhānān atho rājūo bhagasya ca.

To emend the rest and divide it into stanzas seems im-
possible; but a few points are clear. A stanza probably ends
with vayaṁ devānaṁ sumatāu syāma, and for the first pāda
of this we might read rudro va icāte catuṣpadāṇā; for the
other two pādas I can suggest nothing. Beginning with pratić
we have three good pādas of eight syllables each; in the rest,
which amounts to about one stanza I can suggest only the
possibility of reading mārṭto amṛtasyāīvāṣi.

We seem to have here a charm for protection of cattle;
and there are indications of the use of an amulet.

21. [f. 34a, l. 12.]

Ç. 2. 36.

ā no agne sumatiṁ ska:
ndaloke idamām kumāryāṁ mā no bhagena juṣṭā varesu suma:
neṣu valgr oṣam patyā bhavati snuṁbhageyam |

In ab we may probably read with Ç. saṁbhalo gamed
imām kumārinā saha no; in c read samaneṣu and in d bhavāti
subhageyam.

yam agne nārī pa:
tim videṣṭas somo hi rājā subhagam kṛṇotu suvānā putrā:
n mahiṣi bhavāśi gatvā patim subhage vi rājā |

In a read iyam and videṣṭa, in b subhagāṁ kṛṇoti; in d vi
rājāḥ.

somoju :

[f. 34b.]  ṣto aryamāṁ saṁbhrto bhaga dhātur devasya satyena
kṛṇomi pativedanam. || |

For ab read somajuṣṭāṁ vrahmajuṣṭāṁ aryamāṁ saṁbhrtaṁ
bhagam, and in d pativedanam. Perhaps however the nominative
may stand in ab.

yathākhamraṁ maghavaṁ cārur esu priyo mṛgāṇāṁ suṣadā
babhūva | yam |
vayaṁ juṣṭā bhagasyāstu sampriyā patyāvirādhayanti

For a read yathākharo maghavanç cārur esa; in c iyam
vadhū.
bhagasya nā?
vam ā ruha pūrṇām anuparasvatīm trayopāḥ pūṣāhitaṁ
yas pati:
ṣ patikāsyām

In a read roha, in b anupadasvatīm; for c tayopa pūṣāhito,
and in d pratiṃkāyāh.

idam hiranyām gulguluv ayas ākṣo atho bhaga |
ete patibhyas tvām adhuḥ patikāmāya vettave z 1 z

Read: idam hiranyām gulgulīy aukṣo atho bhagāh |
ete patibhyas tvām aduṣ pratiṃkāmāya vettave z 6 z 1 z

22. [f. 34 b, l. 6.]

C. 3. 17 (in part).

yunākta:

sīrā vi nu yugā tanotu kṛte kṣettre vāpatehā bājām | víra-
jas su:

niṣṭas sabharācchin no nedīya it śrīṇāh pakvām ā yuvaṁ sī:
rā yumjāntī kavaṇyo yugā vi tanvate pṛṭhak. dhīrā
devaśu su:
mnayo anudvāhās puruṣā ye kṛṇanti | lāṅgalaṁ phālam su:
mana jispāṭyā ĉunam kenaço anv etu vāhāṁ ĉunam phālo
vina:
dann ayatu bhūmim ĉūnāsirā haviśā yo yājātrāi supippala:
ōṣadhayas santu tāsmāi ĉunān naro lāṅgalaṇa ānaḍūdbhīh:
parjanyo bijam irda do | hinotu ĉūnāsirā kr:
ṇutam dhānyena indraṁ sıtaṁ ni gṛṇātu tām pūṣā mahyaṁ
rakṣa:

[f. 35 a.] ātu sā nah pāyasvatī duḥāṁ uttarāṁ uttarāṁ sā-
māṁ | úd asthād rathajīd go:

jid aćvajid dhiraṇyajit sūṇtayā pārīvṛtah | ēkaćcakrena salvi:
tā ráthanorjo bhāgais pṛṭhiṇī āty āṛṇāṁ z 2 z

There are just 24 pādas here but they do not fall readily
into stanzas; the first two are st. 2 and 1 in C, but our second
adds a pāda to C, 1: our third must end with santu tasmāi
but this gives five pādas the first of which seems out of place
here; in st. 4 it seems almost necessary to insert a pāda b in
accord with MS. We may read as follows:

yunakta sīrā vi nu yugā tanotu kṛte kṣettre vāpatehā bijam |
vīrajaç čūnstis sabhara asan no nediya it śrīṇāh pakvam a
yuvaṁ z 1 z sīrā yunjāntī kavaṇyo yugā vi tanvate pṛṭhak | dhīrā
devaśu sumnayāv anadvāhaḥ puruṣā ye kṛvanti z 2 z ālāṅ-
galaṁ phalaṁ suṇama sphāṭyā | ĉunām kināço anv etu vāhāṁ
čūnaṁ phālo bhindam etu bhūmīṁ | čūnaśtra haviśa yo yajētai
supippala osadhayas samu tasmā i 3 z čūnaṁ naro laṅgale-
naṇaṇaṁbhīr bhagaṁ phālaṁ śirapatir marudbhīṁ | parjanyo
bijam īraya no hinotu čūnaśtra kuṇuṁ dhānyam naḥ i 4 z
indraḥ sitāṁ ni grīmātu tām puṣa mahayam rakṣatu | sā naḥ paya-
svati duhām uttarāṁ-uttarāṁ samām i 5 z ud asthād rathajīd
gojīd aṣṭājīd dhānyayajī sitūtya parivṛttaḥ | ekacakrenā savita
rathenorya bhāgaiś prthivyam ety āprīnaṁ i 6 z 2 z

Stanzas 1, 2, 3, and 5 here are 2, 1, 5, and 4 in C.; the
other two appear MS. 2, 7, 12 and elsewhere. The omission
of 4b can easily be accounted for by the similarity of endings.
It might be a better arrangement to put the colon after sum-
nayaun and take laṅgalaun • in as st. 2e.

23. [f. 35a, 1. 3.]

gavāṁ grhā:
naṁ rasam oṣadhināṁ anujyeṣṭham varca āyur vikalpyas
ma mā hiṁśih:

pitāro vārdhamāno bhadrā gacchāṁśim abhi lokam ehi!

Read oṣadhinām in a, vikalpayas in b: for c I am inclined
to propose mā mā hiṁśiḥ-pitāro vārdhamānā, although the
second person in d makes somewhat against this; in d I
believe ançam is the third word so we might read bhadrā
gacchāṇaṁ abhi lokam ehi, though bhadrāun would seem better
in some respects.

yādfām bhaktam:
yadi vā vibhaktam kṣetram devānāṁ yadi vā pitṛnāṁ
ud u sūrya:

ud ite divā manusya vac chivā no stū prthivi uta dyāuh.

With kṣetram in b the first hemistich may stand: at the
end of c one naturally thinks of the contrast, gods and manes,
so we might read ete devā manusya vā or ud it te• • for d
chivā no stū prthivy uta dyāuh.

ūrjo vāṁ:
bhāgo varā prthivyāṁ devāir dvāro vrahmanā vāṁ dhāra-
yāṁ | cīvam ca:
gnam avasānam no stū ratim deverbhīṁ pitṛbhīṁ manusyaṁ

In a I think bhāgauṁ should be read, and varāya seems
possible; in b perhaps devir would be good: read 'stu in c,
and in d rātir might stand.
viçvāvaso!
stv āsadanaṁ kulāyāṁ gandharvā sovedaso mahyam ucuh ma mā hiṁ;
sīc cheva dhiyanta heto çantaṁ himās pari dadhmo manuśyaṁ

In a I think we may read 'stv āsadanaṁ kulāyāṁ, in b gandharvās sovedaso: in c if we have second person we should write mā mā hinsic īvā, but hinsic chivā if third person; I do not think hetoç is possible; at the beginning of d çataṁ himān is probable.

rudrā utse sa:
dam aksīyamāne devā madanti pitaro manuṣyāḥ yam bhāgo bhā!
gapateç ca devā urvīras taryā čaradas taremā z 2 z.

Read: rudrā utse sadam aksīyamāne devā madanti pitaro manuṣyāḥ | yam bhāgo bhāgapatiç ca devā űrūvīras taryā ũčaradas taremā z 3 z 3 z

In some respects these stanzas seem to have a connection with funeral rites, but their meaning and intent is wholly unclear; the corrections proposed are based almost entirely on palaeographic possibility and cannot be regarded as compelling, or even satisfactory.

24. [f. 35a, l 13.]
yam a:
smin yaksmaś puṣuṣe praviṣṭa iṣitaṁ dāivyāṁ saha | agniṣ ṭarīṁ gṛṛḥ;
tavodano apa skandayatv atidūram asmāt. | so nyena sap rčhatāṁ;
tvam asmāi pra savāmasi | yas tvā yaksma devešita iṣitaś pi?
[f. 35b.] tṛbhiç ca yaḥ tasmāt tvā viçve devā muñcantu pary aṁhasaṁ te te yaksma:
m apa skandayatv adhi | ya tvam eno nyakṛtaṁ yadā tvam akṛtam āḥṛtaṁ ta:
smāt vā viçvā bhūtāni muñcantu pary aṁhasaṁ | tāni te yaksmaṁ apa:
skandayatv adhi yad vā sāḍṛcā yad vā cakāra niṣṭyā tasmāt tvā pr;
thivī mātā muñcatu pary aṁhasaṁ sā te yaksmaṁ apa skandayatv ādhi:
apaskandena havisā yakṣman te nācayāmasi | tad agnir
āha tad u:
soma āha vṛhaspatis savitā tad indraḥ te te yakṣmam apa
skandaya:
tv adhidūram asmāt. so tyena mapṛyachatāṃ tvam asmāi
pra suvāmasya z:

z 3 z.

Read: yo asmin yakṣmaṇaḥ purusā praviṣṭa iṣitāṃ dāivyaṃ
sahāḥ | agniṣ ṯam gṛhtarodhano apa skandayante atidūram
asmāt | so 'anyena samṛcchataṁ tvām asmāi pra suvāmasya z 1 z
yas tvā yakṣmo devesita iṣitaḥ pitṛbhiḥ ca yaḥ | tasmāt tvā
viṣye devā muñcantu pary anahāṣāḥ | te te yakṣmam apa skan-
dayantv atidūram asmāt z 2 z ṭyat tvam eno 'nyakṛtām yad a
tvam akṛtam āḥṛtaḥ| | tasmāt tvā viṣyā bhūtāni muñcantu pary
anahāṣāḥ | tāni te yakṣmam apa skandayanta atidūram asmāt
z 3 z yad va dadarṣa yad va cākāra niṣṭyam | tasmāt tvā
prthīvī nātā muñcatu pary anahāṣāḥ | sā te yakṣmam apa skan-
dayantv atidūram asmāt z 4 z apaskandena havisā yakṣmam te
nācayāmasi | tad agnir āha tad u soma āha vṛhaspatis savitā
tad indraḥ | te te yakṣmam apa skandayanta atidūram asmāt
so 'nyena samṛcchataṁ tvām asmāi pra suvāmasya z 5 z 4 z.

The first stanza appears in the Pariṣṭas of the AV. 1 b.
1, 5. In stanza 3ab the sense seems to be "whatever sin or
evil has laid hold on thee;" as a possibility consider yat tvām
eno 'nyakṛtām yad a tvam akṛtam āḥṛtam. The two pādas
which stand at the end of 1 and 5 should doubtless stand at
the end of the others also.

25. [f. 35b, l. 9.]
agni agrā indra balā adityā ya ido iduḥ yudho:
idhi pratiṣṭhitāya hotā jāṭirāya juhuti | abhiyuktasya pradhane:
naya vo rdbhāram icchatām haviṣy agrē vidyatām prati-
grhnāta juhvatam:
jayatrā rājā varuṇena jayatrā rudrena kecīṇā | bhavena ji:
śnunā jayeta parjanyena sahīyasā āstrā tām preṇa vṛñhatā:
āstrā sarvyc ni yudhyata | gandharvena tvīṣmatā ratenā
upayo:
dhinā | sinīvāly anu matir vāhācvaṇa iṣaṅgināḥ jayanto
bhi:
prathatāmitrām sākam indreṇa medīnā z 5 z anuvākam
5 z;
For the first hemistic of st. 1 no reconstruction works out satisfactorily but for the second hemistic we might read yudho adhi pratiṣṭhitaya hota jāitrāya juhoti.

Pada a of st. 2 seems good as it stands but the rest seems past mending. For the other three stanzas the following reading may be found acceptable: jāitrā rājā varmēṣa jāitrā rudreṇa keṣiṇā | bhavena jīṣunā jayeta parjanyena sahyasā z 3 z astā vṛhāvatā rśvēṇa yudhyatā | gandharveṇa tvāṁmatā rathenopahāna z 4 z sintvāly anu matin vāḥqvān īśāṅginaḥ | jayanto bhi prathatāmitrān sākam īndreṇa medina z 5 z 5 z anuvākaḥ 5 z

Possibly mandreṇa might stand in st. 4a; and in st. 5b īśvāṅgīnaḥ might seem a good reading. This is surely a charm for success in battle.

26. [f 35b, 1.17.]

yat svapne ni jagattha yad vā cepiśe uṭtam āgniṣ ṭāt tasmād enaso;

[f. 36 a.] vrahmā muṇcatv anhasaḥ yada akṣeušu dudrohitam yad vā mitrebyas tvam somas tvā;

tasmād enaso vrahmā muṇcatv anhasaḥ yada kumāraś kumāreṇu yad vā jyāya;

s taresu nimeta kṛtvā cepiśe tačat kṛṇo agadaṁ čivam | pratidiniphalam;

ha tvām apāmārga babhūvyathah sarvām gaccha pathāṁ adhi maryaḥ yāvayā tvam|

prā apāmārga ośadhināṁ vícvāsāṁ eka ut pati tena te mrjum āṣthi;

tam atha tvam agadač caraḥ z z z

Read: yat svapne ni jagattha yad vā cepiśe 'uṭtam | āgniṣ tvā tasmād enaso vrahmā muṇcatv anhasaḥ z 1 z yad akṣeušu dudrohitha yad vā mitrebyas tvam | somas tvā tasmād . . . z 2 z yat kumāraś kumāreṇu yad vā jyāyas turesu | nimeta kṛtvā cepiśe tačat kṛṇo agadaṁ čivam z 3 z pratīcinaphalo hi tvam apāmārgo babhūvitha | sarvām mac chapathān adhi vartyo yāvayā tvam z 4 z apāmārga ośadhināṁ vícvāsāṁ eka it patiḥ | tena te mrjma āṣhitam atha tvam agadač cara z 5 z 1 z
In st. 2d it would probably be safe to read kruve. St. 4 occurs Ç. 7. 65. 1, and st. 5 is Ç. 4. 17. 8.

27. [f. 36a, l. 6.]

Ç. 19. 36.

catavāro anīnaçad rakṣamāṁ rakṣāṁ!
si tejasā ārohaṁ varcasā saha maṇir dūnāmaçātanaṁ
In b read yaksmaṁ rakṣāsī, in c ārohan, and in d dūnāmaçātanaḥ.

crūgaḥvyāṁ rakṣo:
nudate mūlena yātudhānyah | madhyena yaksmaṁ bādhate
nāmaṁ papmāti tatati.
In a read crūgaḥvyāṁ, and in d pāpmāti tātati.

ye yaksmaśo arbhakā mahāmco ye ca çāpathinah | sarvān
dūnāmahā maṇi:

c catavāro anīnaçat.
In b read mahānto, and perhaps we should read çabdīnaḥ
as in Ç.; in c read dūnāmahā.

catam virāṇi janayaç catam yaksmaṇam amāvapat:
dūnāstrīs sarvās triḍhvaḥ apa rakṣānsy apakramiṁ.
In a read viryāṇi janayaṁ, as suggested by Whitney; for b
çatam yaksmaṇ apāvapat: for ed dūnāmnas sarvās triḍhvāpa
rakṣānsy apākramit.

catam aham dūnāmaṇi:
nāṁ gandharvāpasaśām catam catam sunvatīnāṁ çata-
vāreṇa vāraye 2 2 z:
Read: catam aham dūnāmnāṁ gandharvāpasaśām catam
çatam ca çvanatīnāṁ catavāreṇa vāraye 5 2 z.

28. [f. 36a, l. 13.]

Ç. 6. 71, with additions: TA. 2. 6. 2.
vīccaṁ vijmi prthivava puṣṭam āyad āyatu prati grhṇāmy
annam vāicvānarasya ma:
hato mahimnā agniṣ ōd vīcva suhitaṁ kṛṇotu

For this stanza cf. MS. 4. 11. 1. In a read vivajmi prthiviva,
in b anyad āyat; in ed mahimnāgniṣ ōd vīcva suhutaṁ.
yad annam adbhir bahudhā:

virūpaṁ vāsū hiranyam acvam uta gām ajām avim yad

annam admy āntena de:
vā udāśyan uta vā karisyata.

In a read admi, in b vāso and avim; in c āntena, and in
d dāśyan adāśyann uta *.

yan mā hutam yad ahutam ājagāma yā:

smād anna manasod rārajīmi z yad devānāṁ caksuṣāka-

çīnāgniś tad dhā:

tā suhutaṁ kṛnotu |

In b read annāṁ; in cd it seems best to read with TA cak-

susa āgo asty agnis.* *

jamadagnis kasyapas sādv etad bharadvājo madhv annaṁ ||

kṛnotu | pratigrhitre gotamo vasiṣṭho vīcchāmitro naḥ prati-

ranyā ayuh:

pāṭhena pratirady āyuh zz 3 zz:

Read: jamadagnis kāśyapas sādhu etad bharadvājo madhy

annaṁ kṛnotu | pratigrahitre gotamo vasiṣṭho vīcchāmitro naḥ

pra tirantv āyuh z 4 z 3 z:

29. [f. 36b, l. 1.]

āgne yajñasya caksur edāṁ vidāmi yathedad bhāvīṣyāti

svāhā | āgne yajñasya:

crotram āgne yajñasya prāna | āgne yajñasyāpanāḥ āgne

yajñasyātmāṁ āgne:

yajñasya sarva idāṁ vidāmi yathedad bhāvīṣyati svāhā

z 4 z:

Read: āgne yajñasya caksur edāṁ vidāmi yathedad bhāvī-

syati svāhā z 1 z āgne yajñasya crotam edāṁ • • • z 2 z āgne

yajñasya prāna edāṁ • • • z 3 z āgne yajñasyāpaṇa edāṁ • • •

z 4 z āgne yajñasyātmāṁ edāṁ • • • z 5 z āgne yajñasya sar-

vam edāṁ vidāmi yathedad bhāvīṣyati svāhā z 6 z 4 z

In the margin the ms. has agni rēāṁ.

30. [f. 36b, l. 4.]

RV. 1. 89. 2, 3; 10. 15. 2 (= Q. 18. 1. 46); MS. 4. 14. 17.

devānāṁ bhadrā sumatīr ṛjuyatāṁ devānāṁ rātrīr abhī nu

ni vārtatāṁ:
devānāṁ sakhyāṁ úpa sedimā vayāṁ devānāṁ āyuṣ prá
tirantu jīvā!

se |
In a read ṭjūyatām, in b rātir abhi no; and in d devā na āyuṣ.

tān pūrvayā nividā hūmate vayāṁ bhagam mittrām aditir
dākṣam asrī:
dhim āryamnāṁ vāruṇāṁ somam açvinā sārasvatī nas
subhāgā máyas karat. | !
In a read hūmahe, in b mitram aditiṁ and asridham; in c
aryamaṇām.

idāṁ pitṛbhyo nāmo astv adyā yē pūrvāso yē pārāsās
pareyūḥ yē pārthi:
ve rájasy ā niṣatā yē vā nūnāṁ sūvrjināsi vikṣū
In b read ye 'parāsā pary ṭyuḥ; in e niṣattā, and in d
suvrjanāsu.

pratyāṇco agne sarvāḥ!
patantu krtyākrte ripave martyrāyaḥ kravyād ētṛṇa sā me
mrṭa krivi:
ṣnu mā dhichi nirṛter upasthe
In a read sarvāḥ, in b martyāya. In c kravyād and ma
mrṭa seem clear, and probably kravispo at the end of c;
perhaps a subject for dhahi should be supplied before mā.
This stanza has no parallel.

jāyassaç cáńsād utā vā kāṇīyasāḥ sajaː
taçcańsād utā jāmīcānsā ānādisṭam anyākṛtam yād ēnas
tān nas tásmāː
j jātavedo mumugdhi z 5 z

Read: jāyassaç cáńsād utā vā kāṇīyasas sajaṭaçańsād uta
jāmīcānsād | anādhṛṣṭam anyakṛtam yād enas tan nas tasmāj
jātavedo mumugdhi z 5 z 5 z

31. [f. 36 b, l. 13.]
imāu pādāu pra harāmy ā gṛhebhyas tvāstaː
yendraṣ paçcād indraṣ purastād indro naṣ pātu madhyatah
Read svastaye in b; indraṣ paçcād in c.
indram bhayam viçva:
tañ çudrâ ca nîryâ ca indrañ pathibhir adrava asamîddhâ-
ghâyâ:
vañ
Read bhayan in a, cânâryâ in b; in cd â dravat asamîddhâ
aghâyavañ.

indram haśyatâm vidhî vi nañ pâçän ivâ carat. | idamam
panthâ:

m adukšâma sugo svastivâhanâm |

In a we might read hrâsyatâm vidhir, or possibly harâyatâm;
for b vir nañ ✽ for cd emam panthâm arukâśâma sugam ✽, which is Ç. 14. 2. 8 cd.

yatra viçvâ pari dviño vrñakti:
nindatesv ântam ety anâhatah parâvrajata kim tat tava
kâm vakšana:
nn ivâ |

Read viçvân in a, and with ninditesv in b we have a possible
reading. In the rest I see no good reading; perhaps parâvrijata
is intended.

vicvañco yantaç çaphalâ viçvañcah parîmantînâh viçvak.:
[f. 37 a.] punarbhavâ mano asamîddhâghâyavañ z

Read: viçvañco yantu çaphalâ viçvañcah parîmantînâh |
viçvak punarbhuvâ mano asamîddhâ aghâyavañ z 5 z

In a çabala would seem very good; pâdas cd: occur Ç. 1.
27. 2 cd which has connections into which our stanzas evi-
dently fit (cf. Whitney's Trans.).

svasti vyacâkaçaṁ svasti pratyucâ:
kaçam svasti paridigdhâm ny apa svasty aparîntah pari-
vrâjam svârijâ svastena sa me i
bharad vâjâm svasti punarâyañam z 6 z anu 6 z

In the top margin the ms. gives svasty rca ✽.

Out of this I have been unable to make anything more than
the division of words may indicate, except that aparîntah is
probably for apsav antah.
32. [f. 37a, l. 3.]

ye uttārā ṛjā:
yate madhugo madhugād adhi vedāhe tad bhesajāṁ jihvā
tad madhumat ye pāurnamāsi madho çṛṅgo adho puspakaṁ
madhumān parvatāṁ asī | |
yato jātasyo oṣadhī | garbho sy oṣadhīnām apāṁ garbha
utāsitaṁ atho soma |
sya trātāsi madhura praṇa me vaca | çṛṇām vahāṁ madhuga-
gasya pitṛnāṁ eva |
jagrabhāṁ yo mā hiraṇyavarcaṣāṁ kṛnomi pāuruṣaṁ priyāṁ |
priyāṁ mā kṛ |
nu deveṣu priyāṁ rājasu mā kṛṇu priyāṁ sarvasya paṣyata
uta çūdra u : |
tārya z i z

Read: ya uttārād ajāyate madugho madughad adhi | vedāmahe
tad bhesajāṁ jihvā madhumatī pība z l z madhumatī pāurnā-
māsi madho çṛṅgo atho puspakaṁ | madhumān parvatāṁ asī
yato jātasyo oṣadhī z 2 z garbho sy oṣadhīnām apāṁ garbha
utāsitaṁ | atho somasya bhṛatāmsi madhunā prāva me vacaḥ
z 3 z çṛṇāṁ vahāṁ madughasya pitṛnāṁ eva jagrabhāṁ | yo
mā hiraṇyavarcaṣāṁ kṛnoti pāruṣaṁ priyāṁ z 4 z priyāṁ mā
kṛṇu deveṣu priyāṁ rājasu mā kṛṇu | priyāṁ sarvasya paṣyata
uta çūdra utārye z 5 z 1 z

In st. 1a the ms. might be transliterated uttārād ajā .
The last stanza occurs Ç. 19. 62. 1.

33. [f. 37a, l. 10.]

udnā vana hṛdā vana mukhena jihvayā vana | prapīnā :
payaśa vanaṁ
Read udnā in a, vana in c.

vāccha se padāu tatvāṁ vācchākṣyāu vāmccha śaktāu |
viccham a :
nu pra de vano nimnaṁ vār iva dhāvatu z
Read: vāccha me padāu tanaṁ vācchākṣyāu vāmccha
sakthyaṁ | vicim anna pra te vano nimnaṁ vār iva dhāvatu z 2 z
For ab see below No. 90. 2 and Ç. 6. 9. 2; for cd cf. Ç.
3. 18. 6.
ūrdhvāni te lomāni tiṣṭhanty aksāu:

kāmena çiṣyatam simida vatsena gāur iva udhna surāiva
paçyatam

In a read tiṣṭhantv, for b aksāu kāmena çiṣyatāṁ; in c
çimvattā and probably gor, in d udnas and srjyatāṁ rather
than paçyatāṁ.

imā!

gāvas sabandhavas samānaṁ vatsam akrata | hiṅñati kani-
kratīr āddhārā ni:

ravid vasā

A possible reading for c would be mahīmnābhīkanikrātr,
which carries one on to think of something like aravid vrṣā
at the end of d.

çṛṅgopasā galabhūṣa aghnyāç carmanvāśini | gavo ghṛta:
sya mātaras tā vatsēvā nayāmasi z 2 z

Read: çṛṅgāupaçā galabhūṣā aghnyāç carmanvāsinī | gavo
ghṛtasya mātaras tā vatsa ivā nayāmasi z 5 z 2 z

34. [f. 37a, l. 16.]

yaç ca varcas kanyāsu yaç ca

hastīṣv āhitam hiranyeṣu tad varcas tasya bhakṣi iha var-
casah

Read yaç ca in a and b; in d bhakṣya or bhakṣha.

yaç ca:

varco rājarather yaç ca rājasv āhitam nīske rukṣe yad
varcas tasya bhakṣi i:

ha varcasah

Read yaç in a and b; d as above; in a rājarathe seems
good.

yad apsu yad vanaspatāu yad aṅkau yaç ca sûrye

yajñe dākṣi:

nāyāṁ varcas tasya bhakṣi iha varcasah

Read yaç ca in b; d as above.

varcasvāṁ me mukham astu va:

[f. 37 b.] rcasvatāmdu me çirah varcasvāṁ viḍvatas pratyañ
varcasvāṁ varṇo stu me z

Read varcasvan in a, varcasvad uta in b; varcasvāṁ and
pratyañ in c, and varcasvāṁ varṇo 'stu in d.
subhagam
me mukham astu subhāgam uta me cirah subhāgo viçvataś
pratyañ subhāgo va
rño stu me z 2 z
Read: subhagam me mukham astu subhagam uta me cirahi
subhago viçvataś pratyañ subhago varno stu me z 5 z 3 z

35. [f. 37 b, l. 3.]
ud amāu sûryo agāt sahavat ta nāma ma | aham te madhuma
| tī madhugām madhumattarā |
Read asāu in a, tan nāma mama in b; madughān in d.
yad girisu parvatesu gosv açvesu yan madhu |
surāyām sicyamānāyām kilāle madhu tan mayi |
Read girisu in a.
yathā surā ya
thā madhu yathākṣā adhidevane yathāha gavyato mana
evā sām abhi te
manah
Read mām in d. Cf. Q. 6, 70. 1 for ab.
yā te padam padena rṣyataṁ manasa manah pratyaṁcam
agrabham tvā a:
çvam ivāçvābhidhānya
Read yathā in a, padenarsyataṁ in ab; pratyaṁcam in c,
and tvāçvam in cd.
mahyām tvā dyāvāprthivī mahyām devi sarasva:
| tī | mahyām tvā madhyaṁ bhūmyā ubhāv antāu sam
| asyatāṁ | z 4 z |
Read: mahyām tvā dyāvāprthivī mahyām devi sarasvatī
mahyām tvā madhyaṁ bhūmyā ubhāv antāu sam asyatāṁ z 5 z 4 z
For this last stanza cf. below, No. 90 st. 5, and Q. 6. 89. 3.

36. [f. 37 b, l. 9.]
yā vāîcvađe:
| vir isāvo yā vasūnāṁ yā rudrasya somasya yā bhagasya |
vîçve devā i:
| śavo yāvattīr vas tā vo agninā çarmaṇā çamayāmi |
Read isāvo in a.
yā ādide:
| vir isāvo yā vasūnāṁ yā rudrasya açvino yāvatīs tāh vîçve |
devā īṣa:
| vo yāvattīr vas tā vo devas savitā çamayāti |
Read in b rudrasyācvinor; the visarga indicates that the hemistich ends with tāḥ and yāvati seems out of place here, where another genitive would be appropriate; a possible reading might be yaḥ vrāspateḥ.

eyas te gniṣavo vāta yaḥ
tē apāṃ uchterityām uta vā marutsu | indrasya sāmnā
varuṇasya rājā tāḥ

vat sūryo vrhatā çamayāti |
Read for a yas te 'guna iṣavo vāta yas te, in b probably
utsṛṣṭyām; in c rājā, and in d tā vas seems better than tāvat.
mā vrhy ādityo mā vasubhyo mā rudrāyā:
gnaye paktivāya | indrasya çuc fo saruṇasya yā çucis tā vo
devy a:
ditiç çamayāti |

In a mā bibhrhy āditya seems possible, in b pärthiyāya.

yaç ca vāte viçvagvāte yaç ca rudrasya dhanvani | agni:
ś tva vasor iraçānas tvā sarvā bheṣajaś karat. z 5 z anuvā 7 z:
Read: yaç ca vāte viçvagvāte yaç ca rudrasya dhanvani | agniš tva vasor iraçanas tvā sarva bhisejas karat z 5 z 5 z
anuvā 7 z. In cd tā and tās would improve this very un-
certain reconstruction.

37. [f. 37b, l. 19.]
cittim yaktāsi manasā cittin devān ꞏ tāvṛdhaḥ jātavedaṣ pra
nas ti:
[f. 38a] ra agne viçvāmaruddhiḥ

In view of MS. 2.10.6 it seems clear that in yaktāsi we
have the root yaj; yaksasi might be the reading, but yaksyaµi
may be worth consideration. If viçvāmaruddhi is not accep-
table, we might read vidvan or viçvām.

yavayāyavayāssad dvēṣāñsi yavamaye:
nahaviṣā yas te mṛta dvīṣvapniyasya bhāvas sa te tudanta
etam pra:
hiṃmaḥ

In a read yavayāsmad; in c dussvapniyasya, and perhaps
mṛta rather than mṛta. In Q.19.57.3 occurs the phrase sa
mama yaḥ pāpas tān dvīṣate pra hiṃmaḥ; imitating this we
might reconstruct dvīṣate tudanta ː+, and this would call for
bhāvo.
yathā kalāṁ yathā çapham yatharṇo son nayanti | evā:
dussapnyaṁ sarvas apriye sun nayāmasi z

This is Č. 6. 46. 3 (= 19. 57. 1); read yathārṇau saṁ in b,
sarvam in c and saṁ in d.

araro hic çatam adya ga:
gavām bhakṣiya çatam ajānām çatam avinām çatam açvā-
nām puruṣā:

nām tatrāpi bhakṣayānum āmuṣyāyanam amuṣyāh putram

tam aham;
nirṛtaye prekṣyāmi tam mṛtyoh pāçaye badhnyāmi sa baddho

hato stu | z

sa tato mā mociḥ z i z

This prose portion falls into two parts thus giving the normal
five stanzas to this hymn. At the beginning araro might be
vocative of araru (cf. Č. 6. 46. 1) and hic might conceal some
form of the root hū: read ?araro hic çatam adya gavām

puruṣānām tatrāpi bhakṣiya z 4 z

For the rest there are similar passages in Č. 16. 7. 8 and
8. 1ff. Read: amum āmuṣyāyaṃ amuṣyāh putram tam aham
nirṛtaye presyāmi tam mṛtyoh pāçe hadhānāmi | sa baddho hato
stu sa tato mā moci z 5 z

With this hymn cf. Č. 6. 46 and 19. 57.

38. [f. 38a, l. 8.]
ye naç çapanty apa te bhavantu vrksān va:

vrīnām api tām jayāma | bhrājīya āyuṣ pratiram dadhānām va:
yam devānām sumatāu syāma

In b I think we must read vrīnām api tām; the margin cor-
rects to drāhiya in c, and we must read dadhānā: pādas cd
occur frequently but not together.

kṛtyākṛtam payasvān adarçata agneh | |

pratyasva nu dhuddhyasya prati sma rāivatām dahāḥ |

For b, a possible reading is ā dharsāta agniḥ; in c prathasva
and yuddhyasya are probable; d can stand, but rishato, or the
like, would seem better.

yas tvā kṛtye pratighā:|
yak vidvān aviduo grham | punas tvā tasmā dadhimo

yathā kṛt

kṛtam hanaḥ

In pratighāya, I think, lies the verb of the first hemistich
and we might read pra jaghāna as a possibility: in c it would
seem safe to restore tasmā dadhimo, and in d kṛtyākṛtam hanat.
punas kṛtyāṁ kṛtyākṛte hastigṛhya parā naya uto tvam uttamā punas tatarmāiva sudanāṁsvam |

Read hastagṛhya in b; uto tvam uttamā punas is probably a good pāda but for d I see nothing. Pādas ab occur Q. 5, 14. 4 ab.

kṛtyā yantu kṛtyākṛtam vrkī vāvimato grham stokam pākasava vardhatāṁ ma vrūṣṭa | oṣadhir iva | !

Read: kṛtyā yantu kṛtyākṛtam vrkīvāvimato grham | stokam pākasava vardhatāṁ ma vrūṣṭa oṣadhir iva z 5 z 2 z

Q. 6. 37. 1 d reads vrkā ivāvimato grham.

39. [f. 38a, l. 16.]
Vāit. 24. 1.

yat te grāvā bāhucyuto cakro naro yad vā te hastayor adhukṣam tat tāpyā:
yatāṁ ut te niṣṭyāyatāṁ soma rājan. z

In a read 'cucyon, in b adhukṣau; ta āpyāyatām tat in c.

yat te grābhā cicrda so:
ma rājin priyāṇy anā saukṛtā paroṇi | tat samjatsvājeneto:
vardhayasvā anāgamo yathā sadam it samaṃṣiyema z z om anā:

[f. 38b] gamo yathā sadam it samaṃṣiyema

In a read grāvā cicchidus and rājan, in b purūṇi; for cd tat samdhatsvājenota vardhayasvānāgaso **.

yām te tvacām bahhrutāṁ ta yonir hṛdyāṁ:
sthānā prayuto di vāsuto si tasmāi te soma luptam asmākām
etad u:

pa no rājan sukṛte hvayasva |

In a read bibhidur yām ca yonīm, in b sthānat and yadi vāsuto 'si with yad vā (as in Vāit.) for hṛdyāṁ; in c we may read guptam as in TB. 3, 7, 13. 3.

sam prāṇāpānābhyyām sam cakṣusā sami:
çrotreṇa gacchasya soma rājan. | yat te viliṣṭām sam u tanv
ayattaj jā:

nītāṁ nas saṅgamanāi pathinām.

In b read gacchasva; in c viriṣṭāṁ sam u tat ta etaj, in d jānitān and saṅgamane.
ahaç cariram payasā sam ev t va
nyo nyo bhavati varunosya | tasmāi tado havisā vidhemaḥ
vayam syāma:
patayo rayinām.
In a read ahaç and sam evy, in b anyo nyo and varṇo 'syā; in c ta indo and vidhema.

abhyaṣaranti jihvo ghṛttenāga paruṇṣi ta:
vardhayantī | tasmāi te soma nasa yad viṣāt vapa no rāja
sukṛte hvaya:

tva z 3 z.
Read: abhiṣaranti jihvo ghṛttenāga paruṇṣi tava vardhayantī | tasmāi te soma nama id vaṣāt copa no rājan sukṛte
hvayasva z 6 z 3 z.

40. [f. 39 b, l. 9.]

ihata devir ayam astu pantha ayam vo lokaç çaraṇāya:
sādhuḥ idam bavir juṣamānā ud ita kṣipra jñā varuṇena
prasūtā z:
In a read ihāita and panthā; in d kṣipra rājō and prasūtāh.

ihata rājā varuṇo dadābhir devo deveśu haviṣo juṣātaḥ kṛṇu:
śva panthā madayān dūrdibhīr anena babhro mahatā prthivi-
vyām.
In a the reading of the ms. may be rādābhir. Read in a
ihāitu; in this context dadābhir seems to be possible but it
is hard to give up the thought of some form or compound of
ṛta; in MG. 2. 11. 17 occurs prātī rājā varuṇo revatibhiḥ;
in b juṣātām ought to stand. In c read panthām, and we
might consider dṛttibhir as a possibility.

yad dhrīyad va madayān abhunja tirokoghānām iha rāṇītu | a:
neneve gām mṛjata dvīṣimato jahy osrāṁ ca bhūm ajanān
adhr̥ṣpataḥ |
Out of this all I can get is tvīṣimato jahy and perhaps
çatrūṇ ajanān adhr̥ṣpataḥ.

ye pārato madhyato ye ca yanta ye apsumado nihaṭās tire
agnayah:
te devajā iha no mṛdunn āpaç cā jihvan ubhayē saban-
dhavaḥ
Opposite the first of these lines the margin gives samcayam, and there is a correction to jinvan over jihvan. In a read yanti, in b apsusado nihitas; in c mrdann and in d ta a jinvan.

\[ \text{idam} : \]
\[ \text{vāpo hṛdayam ayam vasv aritāvari iha tvāṃ eta çakvarī yatraśivam :} \]
\[ \text{veçayāmasya} z 4 z \]

Read: idam va āpo hṛdayam ayam vatsa rātāvariḥ | ihettham eta çakvarī yatraśivam veçayāmasya z 5 z 4 z.

This is Q. 3. 13. 7; we might read idam vasv in b; for d Q. has yatredām veçayāmi vaḥ.

41. [f. 38h, l. 18.]
RV. 10. 159; ApMB. 1. 16.
ud asāu sūryo agād ud ayam māsako:
bhagaḥ tenāham vidvalā patim abhy a:
[f. 39a.] sākṣi viśāsahīhh |
Read māmako in b.

aham ketur aham mūrdhvā aham ugrā viśāda:

ni | named apa kradāṁ patis schānāyā upacarā |
Read mūrdhāham in a, viśādani in b; named apa kramā in c and upā carat in d.

mama putrā:

ç çattruhaṇo vo me duhitā virāṭ. | utāham asmi samjayā: |
patyār me çloka uttamaḥ
Read çattruhaṇo 'tho in ab; patyur in d.

yena devās surebhyo bhavanti marmattarā:

idāṁ utakra devāsapattra kilābhuvam

In a a good reading would be devā asurebhyo; for b read bhavanty amarmantarāḥ, and for cd idāṁ tad akrī devā asapatnā kilābhuvam.

sapatrā sapatnyaghni:
jayaty abhibhūvarī muṣṭāmy anyāsāṁ bhagaṁ vāmo yaste-
yācā:

m īva z 5 z anu 8 z

Read: asapatnā sapatnaghni jayanty abhibhūvarī | muṣṭāmy anyāsāṁ bhagaṁ varco astheyasāṁ īva z 5 z 5 z anu 8 z

In d vāmam would be about as good as varco. This hymn has a sixth stanza in the other texts.
42. [f. 39 a, l. 7.]

Cf. Q. 2. 24.

ṣarabhaka ṣeraçabha punar bho yā : nti yādavasya punar hatiṣ kimīdinaḥ yasya stha dam atta yo va praḥ ;
hī tam utta māmā sāṁsāmany atā āevrka āevrda sarpān-
sarpa : srokān mro jyarnyatro jarjunva paprado punar vo yanti yādavah :
punar jūtiṣ kimīdinaḥ yasya stha dam atta yo na praḥ | hī tam utva :
smā māṁsāny attā z 1 z

Read: ṣerabhaka ṣerabhac punar vo yantu yātavaḥ punar hetiṣ kimīdinaḥ | yasya stha tam atta yo vah prāhāit tam atta svā māṁsāny atta z 1 z āevrdaḥa āevrdaḥa punar vo * * | * z 2 z sarpānusarpa : * | * z 3 z mrokanumroka : * | * z 4 z jyarnyatro jarjunva paprado : punar vo yantu yātavaḥ punar jūtiṣ kimīdinaḥ | yasya stha tam atta yo vah prāhāit tam atta svā māṁsāny atta z 5 z 1 z

At the beginning of 5 it would be impossible to emend with any certainty; it is barely possible that jūrṇī (Q. st. 5) is there and perhaps also jyarni (Q. st. 7); yet it is fairly clear that these should all be grouped in one stanza, and that they are names of male demons, Cf. our No. 91 and the comments.

43. [f. 39 a, l. 12.]

Q. 2. 16.

dyāvaprthivī upaçrute mā : pātam svāhā | dhanāyāyuṣe pra[jāyai mā pātam svāhā | praṇā : pānāu mṛtyor mā pātam svāhā | sūrya cakṣuṣī mā pāhī svā hā | agne vičvambhara vičvato mā pāhī svāhā |

Read dyāvaprthivī upaçruter: the kānda is no. 2.

44. [f. 39 a, l. 15.]

Cf. Q. 2. 17.

āyurmā :
agni āyur me dhā svāhā varcodāgner varco me dhā svāhā tejo :
dāgniṣ tejo me dhā svāhā | sahodā agnes saho me dhā svāhā :
baladā agnir balam me svāhā z 3 z
Read: āyurdā agna āyur me dāḥ svāhā z 1 z varcodā agne varco me dāḥ svāhā z 2 z tejodā agne tejo me dāḥ svāhā z 3 z sahodā agne saho me dāḥ svāhā z 4 z baladā agne balam me dāḥ svāhā z 5 z 3 z.

45. [f. 39 a, l. 18.]

Q. 2. 17.

āyur asyā ā:

[f. 39 b.] āyur me dhehi svāhā | varco si varco mayi dhehi svāhā | tejo:
si tejo mayi dhehi svāhā | saho si saho mayi dhehi svāhā |
ballam asi balam mayi dhedhi svāhā | 4 z
In 1 read āyur asy āyur mayi; in 2, 3, and 4 read 'si; in 5 balam and dhehi.

46. [f. 39 b, l. 3.]

Q. 2. 18.

pičākṣā:

ṇam asi pičācajambhanam asi svāhā | yātudhānakṣiṇam a:
si yātudhānajambhanam asi svāhā | sadānvākṣiṇam asi:
sadānvājambhanam asi svāhā | sapattrakṣiṇam asi sapattāra:
jambhanam asi svāhā | bhṛātrvyakṣiṇam asi bhṛātrvyajaya:
mbhanam asi svāhā z 5 z a 9 z
Read 'ksavaṇam in each formula, pičācajambhanam in 1, sapattāra in 4, and bhṛātrvyajambhanam in 5. The kāṇḍa is no. 5.
In the margin the ms. has raksāmantraṃ vā agniḥ.

47. [f. 39 b, l. 8.]

ā te săuvīryam:

dade mayi te săuvīryam | a săuvarco dade mayi te săuvarcaḥ |
a săutejo dade mayi te săutejaḥ a săunṛmṇam dade mayi:
te săunṛmṇam | ā te săuçukram dade mayi te săuçukram
z 1 z:
At the beginning of 2, 3, and 4 read ā te.
48. [f. 39 b, l. 12.]
č, 2, 19.

ōm agna yat te tapās tena tām prati tapa yo śmān dveṣṭī
yāṁ ca vaya:

n dviṣmāḥ z te haraś tena tām prati hara yoh te cōcis
tenā tām prati:

çoca te rcis tena tām praty arca | agne yat te jyotis tena
tām prati da:

ha yo śmān dveṣṭī yāṁ ca vayaṁ dviṣmāḥ z 2 z

Read: agne yat te tapās tena tām prati tapa yo śmān
dveṣṭī yāṁ ca vayaṁ dviṣmāḥ z 1 z agne yat te haraś tena
tām prati hara ∗ ∗ ∗ z 2 z agne yat te çōcis tena tām prati
çoca ∗ ∗ ∗ z 3 z agne yat te rcis tena tām praty arca ∗ ∗ ∗ z 4 z
agne yat te jyotis tena tām prati dha yo śmān dveṣṭī yāṁ
cā vayaṁ dviṣmāḥ z 5 z 2 z

49. [f. 39 b, l. 15.]

prāc ē di!
g. gāyatram devatā yad devesu pīṭṛsu manusye♭cu naç çakā-
rrāya:
tām tasyāvedanam asī z svami cemam asmād yakaśa tas-
mād āma:

[f. 40 a.] yetu svāhā | dakṣīnā dig rathantarām devatā pratīci
dig vāmadevaṁ:

devatā udīcī dig yajñāyañhitam devatā ūrdhvā dig vṛhaddeva:
tā yad devesu manusye cva naç çakārayattarām tasyāvedanam
asī z muṁ:
cemam asmād yakaśa tasmād āmayatū svāhā z 3 z īmām
rakṣā:

mantram digṛhandhanam z z

Read: prācī dig gāyatram devatā yad devesu pīṭṛsu manus-
ye♭cu naç çakārayattvam tasyāvedanam asī | saṁ cemam asmād
yacchā tasmād āmayatūt svāhā z 1 z dakṣīnā dig rathantarāṁ
devatā ∗ ∗ z 2 z pratīci dig vāmadevaṁ devatā ∗ ∗ z 3 z
udīcī dig yajñāyañhitam devatā ∗ ∗ z 4 z ūrdhvā dig vṛhad
devatā yad devesu pīṭṛsu manusye♭cu naç çakārayattvam tasyā-
vedanam asī | saṁ cemam asmād yacchā tasmād āmayatūt
svāhā z 5 z 3 z
These formulae are suggestive of the sphere of the Yajur Veda. The emendation proposed is open to a number of objections, but it is fairly close to the ms. and offers a reasonable meaning. In the colophon we might read digdhanam.

50. [f. 40a, l. 5.]

agnim vayam träitäram havāmahe imam trāyā |
tasmād yakṣmā tasmād āmayata juśāno agnir ājyasya träitä |
träyatām svāhā |

Read ya imam trāyate 'smād yakṣmāt tasmād āmayatāt |
juśāno • • z 1 z

mitrā varunāv vayam träitäru havāmahe yā |
v ayimim trāyite smād yakṣma tasmād āmayata juśānāu |
mitrā |
varunāv ājyasya träitärāu trāyetām svāhā |

Read yav imam trāyete 'smād yakṣmāt tasmād āmayatāt |
juśānāu • • z 2 z

marutān vayam trātrī |

n havāmahe imam trāyāmta smād yakṣmād āmayata |
juśānāu maru |
tājyasya trāitäras trāyantām svāhā z |

Read maruto vayam träṭu havāmahe ya imam trāyante |
'smād yakṣmāt tasmād āmayatāt | juśānā maruta ājyasya-
• • z 3 z

agnaya ghṛtapataye svāhā |
agnināgni grhebhya svāhā | vājasyān agniye svāhā | agnim |
vayam svāgnaya svāhā | tena vrahmaṇā tenaç chandasā |
tayā devatayā |

āgirasvad devebhyaś svāhā z z iti agnisūktam. z z :

It is almost impossible to believe that these formulae belong in this place, thrust into the midst of five stanzas so symmetrical; but we cannot throw them out entirely. The first and last are in the Concordance: in 1 read agnaye, for the second perhaps agnīnāgne grhebhyaś svāhā can stand, vājasya is good at the beginning of 3 and agnaye should be read, in 4 svāgnayaś is probable, and in 5 read tena for tenaç; perhaps in 5 we should insert dhrūvās sidata (or the like) before devebhyaś, as these words appear in the numerous occurrences of this formula.
pitṛn vayam bhratṛn havāmahe | imāṁ tṝayantāmmābh yakṣmā tasmā
d āmayata | juṣāṇaṇ pitarā[yasya tṝatāras tṝayantāṁ svāhā z]
Read vayam tṝatṛṇ and the rest as in st. 3 except juṣāṇaṇ
pitara.
vṛhaspatiṁ vayam tṝatāram havāmahe imāṁ tṝayātāsmād yakṣmā:
tasmād āmayata juṣāṇo vṛhaspatir ājyasya tṝatāram trā:
yatāṁ svāhā z 4 z
Read: vṛhaspatiṁ vayam tṝatāram havāmahe ya imāṁ tṝayate
śmād yakṣmāt tasmād āmayataḥ | juṣāṇo vṛhaspatir ājyasya
tratā tṝayatām svāhā z 5 z 4 z

51. [f. 40 a, l. 19.]
agnim vayam tratāram yajāmahe meni:
[f. 40 b] hana valagahaṇaṁ juṣāṇo agnir ājyasya meniḥa
valagahaḥ:
tratā tṝayatāṁ svāhā z indraṁ vayam juṣāṇa indra ājyasya z
somaṁ vayam tṝatāram yajāmahe menihālaṁ valagahanam
juṣā:
ṇaṁ soma ājyasya meniḥa valagahaḥ tratā tṝayatāṁ svā:
hā z vičvān devaṁs vayam tṝatṛṇ yajāmahe menighno valaga:
ghnās tṝatāras tṝayantāṁ svāhā z vṛhaspatiṁ vayam tṝatāram:
yajāmahe menihālaṁ valagahanam juṣāṇo vṛhaspati |
ṛ ājyasya meniḥa valagahaḥ tratā tṝayatāṁ svāhā z 5 z:
z anu z
Read: agnīṁ vayam tṝatāram yajāmahe menihānaṁ valagahaṇaṁ | juṣāṇo agnir ājyasya meniḥa valagahaḥ tratā tṝayatāṁ
svāhā z 1 z indraṁ vayam * * | juṣāṇa indra ājyasya * * z 2 z
somaṁ vayam * * * | juṣāṇaṁ soma ājyasya * * z 3 z vičvān
vayam devaṁs tṝatṛṇ yajāmahe menighno valagaghnāḥ | juṣānā
ājyasya menihāno valagahanas tṝatāras tṝayantāṁ svāhā z 4 z
vṛhaspatiṁ vayam tṝatāram yajāmahe menihāna valagahanam
juṣāṇo vṛhaspatir ājyasya meniḥa valagahaḥ tratā tṝayatāṁ svāhā
z 5 z 5 z anu 10 z

52. [f. 40 b, l. 9.]
TB. 2. 7. 17.
ye keciṇaṣ prathamās satram asita yebhir ābhṛtaṁ:
yad idam vi rocate bhya juhomi haviṣā ghṛtena acvān goma:
māṁ ayam astu vīrāḥ
In a read āsata, in c tebhhyo; in cd āhrtenācyavān gomān ** viraḥ. Our pāda d is very nearly Q. 6. 68. 3 d; TB. has rayas pøsena varcasā sam srjātha.

nante rānās tapaso mucyte śudvinā: 
vnīyam dikṣāṁ viçanīyam hy etat. prápya keçāstuvate kā: 
nyano bhavantu teśāṁ vrahmeçe vapanasya nāmnyā 

In a read narte vrahmanas, and śudvīnāmniyam vaçinīyam hy etat would give a good pāda b; TB has dvināmni dikṣā vaçini hy ugra. For the rest it seems best to read with TB pra keçās svate kāññino bhavantī teśāṁ vrahmed içe vapanasya nānyali z 2 z

yenāvapat sa:

vitā čirśño agre kṣureṇa rājño varuṇasya keçān. | |
tenā vrahmano vapatedam asyācyāmo dirghāyur ayam astu:
)virāḥ z 

In cd asyāyūśmān seems the most satisfactory. Cf. Q. 6. 68. 3 and Whitney's Translation.

ma te keçām anugada vanta etat tayā dhātā dadhā: 
tu te | tubhyam indro varuṇo vrhaśpatis savitā varco dadham | 

In a read mā te keçān anugād varca, in b tathā; in d 'dadhan. This stanza appears MG. 1. 21. 8.

ā roha proṣṭham viṣahasya čaṭṛn ājasādikṣāṁ vaçini: 
hy ugra | dehi daksināṁ vrahmanebyho atho mucyasva varu:
ṇasya pāçat. z 1 z 

Read: a roha proṣṭham viṣahasva čatrān ājasām dikṣā vaçini hy ugra | dehi daksinām vrahmanebyho atho mucyasva varuṇasya pāçat. z 5 z 1 z

53. [L. 41a, l. 1.] 
MS. 2. 6. 3.

ye devās purassado gnimetra rakṣohaṃs te naṣ pā: 
ntu tebhhyo namas tebhhyas svāhā | ye devā daksināsado 
yamanetra rakṣohaṇa:
s te naṣ pāntu tebhhyo namas tebhhyas svāhā | ye devās 
paçcātsado marunnetra rakso: 
haṇas te naṣ pāntu tebhhyo namas tebhhyas svāhā | ye devā 
uttarātsadas somanetra:
rakṣoḥaṇas te naṣ pāntu tebhyo namas tebhyaś svāhā | ye
devaḥ antarikṣāssado:
vṛhaspatinmetrā rakṣoḥaṇas te naṣ pāntu te no vantu tebhyo
namas tebhyaś svāhā | ||

z 2 z

In 1 read 'gninetrā in 2 dakṣinātsado, in 5 antarikṣātsado
vṛhaspatinetrā and 'vantu; it seems probable that the phrase
te no 'vantu should be read in each formula as it occurs in
each one in MS.

54. [f. 41 a, l. 7.]
KS. 15. 2; MS. 2. 6. 3.
agnaye purassade rakṣoghna svāhā | yamāya dakṣinātsa:
de rakṣoghne svāhā | marudbhyaś paçcātśadbhyo rakṣoḥa-
bhyaś svāhā | somāya:
uttarāsade rakṣoghne svāhā | avaspate divaspate rakṣoghne
svāhā | ||
vṛhaspataye antarikṣasade rakṣoghne svāhā z 3 z
In 1 read rakṣoghne, in 3 rakṣoḥabhyas, in 4 somāyottarātsade;
a possible reading in 5 is avaspataye divassade; in 6 read
antarikṣātsade.

55. [f. 41 a, l. 10.]
divo jāto diva:
sa putro asmāj jātām sahat saha açvatthat agre jāitrāyāt
sahadevam dāma:
si | taṁ tvām ā yathā ratham upa tiṣṭhantu rājānas suma-
tibhyo vi vabhuve |
tvayā vayaṁ devajātas sarvāḥ prā çocayāmasi | uta satyā
utānṛ :
taḥ yo açvatthena mittreṇa sumatīr īva gacchati jayaç ca
sarva:
ṣ pṛtanā yāç ca satyā utānṛtaḥ adhāraṇco ni druṅantu
sumatyā:
ululākṛta | açvattha mittrare puruṣam ye vātā prdanyā z 4 2:
The following seems a possible reading: dio jāto divas
putro asmāj jātām sahat sahaḥ | açvattho agre jāitrāyāt saha-
devaṁ dāmāsi z 1 z taṁ tvām ā yathā ratham upa tiṣṭhantu
rājānāḥ | samṛtibhyo vai vabhuve z 2 z tvayā vayaṁ devajāta
sarvāḥ pra çocayāmasi | uta satyā utānṛtaḥ z 3 z yo açvatthena
mitreṇa samārtur iva gacchati | jayac ca sarvās prtaṇa yaça ca
satyā utānrtāḥ z 4 z adhārangco ni dravantu samṛtyā utma-
lakrātāh | aca rattha mitraṃ puruṣāṃ ye vätaṣ prtaṇyanti z 5
z 4 z
The emendations are rather bold but in keeping with the
evident intent of the charm: cf. Ç. 3. 6.

56. [f. 41 b, l. 1.]
Cf. TS. 5. 5. 10. 3 and 4; Ç. 3. 26 and 27.
ugrā nāma stha teṣāṃ vaṣ puro grahaḥ pracī dik teṣām vo
agnir īsavaḥ:
te no mṛḍata dvipade catuspade teṣāṃ vo yāny āyudhānā
vā īsavas tebhya:
namas tebhyaṃ svāhā z kravyā nāma stha teṣāṃ vo daksinād
gṛhā daksinā di:
k teṣāṃ va āpa īsavaḥ virājo nāma stha teṣāṃ vaḥ paçcad
gṛhā pratīci:
dik teṣāṃ vaṣ kāsa īsavaḥ avasthā nāma stha teṣāṃ vā
uttarād gṛhā udī:
či dik teṣāṃ vo vāta īsavaḥ uttare nāma stha teṣāṃ va
upari grha:
ūrdhva dik teṣāṃ vo varṣam īsavaḥ te no mṛduta dvipade
catuspade te:
ṣām vo yāny āyudhānā yā īsavas tebhya nāmas tebhyaṃ
svāhā z 5 z:

z anu 11 z
Read: ugrā nāma stha teṣāṃ vaṣ puro grahaḥ pracī dik teṣām
vo agnir īsavaḥ | te no mṛḍata dvipade catuspade teṣāṃ vo
yāny āyudhānā yā īsavas tebhya nāmas tebhyaṃ svāhā z 1 z
kravyā nāma stha teṣāṃ vo daksinād gṛhā daksinā dik teṣām
va āpa īsavaḥ | te no * * * z 2 z virājo nāma stha teṣāṃ vaḥ
paçcad gṛhaḥ pratīci dik teṣām vaṣ kāsa īsavaḥ | te no * * *
z 3 z avasthā nāma stha teṣāṃ vaḥ uttarād gṛhā udīcì dik teṣām
vo vāta īsavaḥ | te no * * * z 4 z uttare nāma stha teṣāṃ va
upari gṛhā ārdhvā dik teṣām vo varṣam īsavaḥ | te no mṛdata
dvipade catuspade teṣāṃ vo yāny āyudhānā yā īsavas tebhya
nāmas tebhyaṃ svāhā z 5 z 5 z anu 11 z
yadidam divo yady avājagāma yady antarikṣād ya:
di pārthivoyah yadi yajño yajñapate sargas tebhyaś sarvebhyo
manasā:

vidhema |
Read ava jagāma in a, perhaps prthivyah at end of b;
yajñapates in c, and namasā in d.

yam indram āhir yam mitram āhu yama somam
āhuh yam āghim ā:
hur yam āhūs tebhyaś sarvebhyo namasā vidhema |
Read āhir at end of a, yam somam āhir āghim āhuh for b; for c we might read yam varunaḥ vrhaspatim āhūs.

yad indriyā jalpyāḥ:
prordhnavanti svapunām durbhūtam abhi ye śīnanti | ye
devānām rtvijō:
yajñiyānām tebhyaś sarvebhyo namasā vidhema |
For a yad indriyāja jalpyā prārdhnavanti would seem possible; in b read svapnām.

ye ċaṣaṇā nanama:
sā ni yanti sūryasya račmīr anu saṁ caranti | ye
devānām dharmadhṛto babhū:
vus tebhyaś sarvebhyo namasā vidhema |
In a read caṣamāṇā namasā, in b račmīn.

svarbhisiyer abhi ye bhāyanti yebhyaḥ:
f. 42a] krṇvaṇti yo rodayanti ye và strīnām pratirūpā babhū-
vus tebhyaś sarvebhyo namasā:

vidhema z 1 z
Read: sūrisu ye rabhanti ye bhānti ye bhyaḥ krṇvaṇti ye
rocayanti ye và strīnām pratirūpā babhūvus tebhyaś sarvebhyo namasā vidhema z 5 z 1 z

The reading suggested for pada a is of course only a bare possibility. Several of the padas of this hymn occur elsewhere also but in dissimilar context.

vyāvṛttāu payāu gāvāu viçeṣāu vijñātata vidveṣaṇam kilāsi:
tayatāṇāu vy atā diviṣāḥ vi kilināv atā diviṣat vāsatibhyas
samābbhyaḥ ato:
Imukam iva khaḍiram agnir vām astv antarā śīnas te
cakṣuṣo vyāghrah pari:
śūn jāne agnir vastv anterā yathā vām naçāsati vi dyāur
vyata tad vayas tata ka:
patyaḥ vya oṣadhe praraspaṣy agnir iva tam dāhāḥ
vyavāyamtu hṛdayāni vi ci:
tāni manāṇi ca atho ya tāmno saṅgataṁ tad vām astu
vidhulakam | asti vāiśāṁ:
vidviṣam ubhāu sannetārā viṣvaṅcāu pary ā vartayetāṁ
yathā vām naçāsati:

z 2 z

The transliteration praraspaṣy in line 5 is not certain.

It seems pretty clear that six stanzas are intended here, the first to end vy atā dvisāḥ but out of it I get nothing. Pāda a of st. 2 I cannot reconstruct out of vi kilināv atā dvisat
but for bcd it seems possible to read vāsantibhyas saṁ-
bhyah | atholmukam iva khaḍiram agnir vām astv antarāh.
The second hemistich of st. 3 is probably to be read agnir
vām astv antaro yathā vāṁ naço asati. St. 4 d is clear as it
stands agnir iva taṁ dāhah and for pāda a vi dyāur vy ety
tad vayas seems possible. For st. 5 we may read vy ava yantu
hṛdayāni vi cītāni manāṇi ca | atho yat tānvo saṅgataṁ tad
vāṁ astu vidhulakam; it seems possible to connect vidhulakam
with vidhura. Though not wholly satisfactory we may read
for st. 6 cd viṣvaṅcāu pary ā vartayetāṁ yathā vāṁ naço
asati; and the words ubhāu sannetārā seem good in pāda b.

Other than the above I am unable to suggest anything; it
is fairly clear that this is a charm to drive away a disease or
demon, perhaps one afflicting cattle.

59. [f. 42a, 1. 9.]
C. 5. 28. 3—11, 1, 12.

trayaś poṣa trivṛtaḥ crayanṭāṁ anuktu pūṣā payasā ghṛtena |
anyasya bhāumā puruṣaḥ bhāumā bhūmā paçūnām dahi

In a read poṣas and crayanṭāṁ, for c annasya bhūmā.puru-
ṣasya bhūmā, and in d ta iha crayanṭāṁ.

imam ā:
dītyā vasunā sam akṣatesam agne vardhayāmśvīrdhānaḥ
yasmin ttrivṛ chetām:
pūṣaviṣṇur imam indra sam śṛjā vīryena |
Read in ab ukṣatēmam, in b vardhaya vārvdānāh; in c trīvṛc chrayatām poṣayiṣṇur.

bhūmiṣ tvā pātu haritena vīcva!

bhir agnih pipartu payasā majāīśā vīrūdbhīs te arjuno sam-

vidānam va!

rcō dadhātū sumanasyamānām

In a read vīcvaḥdr, in b sajoṣāḥ; in c arjunaṁ, *mānam at end of d.

dvedā jātam janmanedāṁ hiranyāmm agner ekāṁ;

priyataṁ babhūvaḥ somasyāikāṁ hiṁsitasya parāpatat apām

ekāṁ ve!

daso retāhus tat te hiranyam trīṛtāstv āyuṣe

In a read tredhā and hiranyam, in b priyatamah babhūva,

in c somasyāikāṁ and parāpatat (before colon); in d vedhaso

reta śhūs, in e trīvṛd astv.

trīyāyuṣāṁ jamadagnes ka!

çyapasya triyāyuṣāṁ tredhāṁrtasya cakṣanāṁ trīṇy āyuṣī

nas kṛdhi |

In b read triyāyuṣam, in d nāś.

tra:

yas s*parṇās travitāyam ekāksaram abhisambhūya çakrā

praty ṛhā mṛ;

* * * * * na vīcva z divas tvā pātu haritaṁ ma!

In a read suparnas trīṛtā yad āyam, in b çakrāḥ; for the

second hemistich praty āhuṁ mṛtyum amṛtena sākam antar

dadhānā duritāṁ vīcva.

Inasmuch as f. 42 b is badly defaced I give now all that is

legible on it.

*na vīcva z divas tvā pātu haritaṁ ma

*ya pātu pra harād devapurāyaṁ imāsti

*tah tāṁs tvam bibhṛatāyuṣmān varcasvān utta

*amṛtena hiranyaṁ yābhede prathamā devo a

*nomy anu manyatāṁ trīṛtā vadhena | nava prā

*ir* āyuṭvāya çatacāradāya harite trī

*n* rajasāviṣṭān | a ta tritattva

*harjātassa yan nāma tena te ci çr

*z 3 z yajñentam tapasā vr

*y*nih upah tāgne jaraśaḥ parastā

*pati grhnāti vidvān vr

*s* ād a
Drawing on Q. to fill the lacunae we may read the remaining stanzas as follows: divas tvā pātu haritān madhyāt tvā pātv arjunam | bhūmyā ayasmayaṁ pātu prahrād devapurā ayam z 7 z imās tisro devapurās tās tvā raksantu sarvataḥ | tās tvām bibhrad ayuśmān varcasvān uttaro dvīṣītāṁ bhava z 8 z puraṁ devānāṁ amṛtaṁ hiranyam ya abēdhe prathamo devo agrā tasmāi namo daça prācīḥ kṛṇomy anu manyātāṁ trivrd ābādhe me z 9 z nava prānāṁ navabhīs saṁ mīmite dirghāyutāya caṭa-cāra-dāya | harite tviri rajiote tviri ayasi tviri rajasāviṣṭātiṁi z 10 z à tvā cṛtāv aryamā pūṣā vṛhaspatiḥ | ahaṛjātasya yan nāma tena te tī cṛtāmāsi z 11 z 3 z

60.

Q. 6. 122. 4 and 1.

The visible fragments of the last four lines of f. 42 b (given above) are clearly parts of Q. 6. 122: Whitney reports st. 2 and 3 as being in Pāipp. 16. Drawing from Q. we may get the following possible reconstruction: yajñāṁ yontāṁ tapasā vṛhatam anv ā rohāṁ manasā sayonih | upahūtā agne jaraśā parasatā tṛtye nāke sadhamādaṁ madema z 1 z taṁ prajānan prati grhnāti vidvān vṛhaspatiḥ prathamajā ṛtasya | asmābhīr dattāṁ jaraśā parasatā acchinnam tantum anu saṁ tarema z 2 z

61. [f. 43a, l. 1.]

" ne | paspāri vicvā bhuvanāni g*pā antarikṣasya*** vi *** nā bilāṁ te ghṛtaçcutaṁ nadīnāṁ pathe sūcrutam juhomi | pravidvān **
mumugdhi pāçányasya pattri vidhavā yathāsat. | anāturaṇa

varuṇ* the no svastibhir ati durgāṇi veṣyat. | tam açvinā pratigrhyā svast∗
doṣavena pūṣa se saṁ pra yacchāt. z 5 z anuvākam 12 zz

Read: ∗ | paspāra vicvā bhuvanāni gopā antarikṣasya mahato vimānaḥ z z∗ | nā bilāṁ te ghṛtaçcutaṁ nadīnāṁ patye sūcrutam juhomi | pravidvān∗ | mumugdhi pāç anyasya patnī vidhavā yathāsat z z anāturaṇa varuṇ∗ | the no svastibhir ati durgāṇi vikṣat | tam açvinā pratigrhyā svastaya ∗ doṣavena pūṣa me saṁ pra yacchāt z z 5 z anuvākab 12 z

VOL. XXX. Part III.
Of course it is impossible to know how many stanzas preceded these, but it seems probable to me that the hymn originally contained five; for six, or possibly seven, lines stood after the last line visible on f. 42 b and probably not more than two lines are broken from the top of f. 43: about that amount of space would be required for the last three stanzas of no. 60 (if it had five) and the first two and a half of no. 61.

62. [f. 43 a, l. 5.]

ye piç*
cā imām vidyām ākūtim mohayantu naḥ teṣām tvam agne
nācaya varca*
ttam atho prajām nācayāgne piṣcācānam varcaḥ cittam atho
prajānām yath*
caṁ mahyām dhārayathāham kāmayantu me|açaṁ myaham
rādhatv indriyena
**tām tvam agne kravyādas sarvān piṣcācān arciṣā daха prati dah*
**dānān sūra devān vicarṣaṇa yo no durasyād veṣāṇa
yathācaṁ
**naḥ enaṣ paçaugmitsanty açāyām puruṣeṣu ca|tāns
tvam sahasra
**pi** * i*  śa* * ha z* z* *

Read: ye piṣcācā imān vidyām ākūtim mohayanti naḥ | teṣām
tvam agne nācaya varcaḥ cittam atho prajām z 1 z nācayāgne
piṣcācānam varcaḥ cittam atho prajām | yathācāṁ mahyām
dhāraya yathā ha kāmayantu me z 2 z açāṁ mahyām rādha
yatv indriyena ** tām | tvam agne kravyādas sarvān piṣcācān
arciṣā daḥa z 3 z prati daḥa yatudhānān sūra devān vicarṣaṇa
| yo no durasyād veṣāṇaṁ yathācaṁ ** naḥ z 4 z
ye naṣ paçaṇ agna icchāntya açāyāṁ puruṣeṣu ca | tāns tvam
sahasraçaṅkasaṅ piṣcācān arciṣā daḥa z 5 z 1 z

64. [f. 43 b, l. 1.]

* * * * * * * * *
mi rekṣātim devānāṁ sarveṣāṁ sajaṭāṇā * d*v*nirṛtir h**;
açyapasya pratisaro dyauṣ pitā prthivī mātā yathābhī
cakra devā;
s tathābhī kṛṇutā punah yuṣ kṛtyā nilavati yuṣ kṛtyāṁ
paçyāvatīḥ;
kṛtyā yāc cakrun lohinis tā ito nāçayāmasi | yadiva yad i | mā jāhur ime bhadrāsi sunvati | kṛtyāsi kalyāny asi sāmum kartā :
rasvam jahi z 3 z.

Beginning with the second line visible on this page we have the last three stanzas of the third hymn in anuvāka 13; the first one of these is very near Q. 3. 9. 1. The following gives some emendations which seem possible: kaçyapasya pratisaro dyāus pita prthivi mātā | yathābhi cakra devās tathābhi krūtā punah z z yās kṛtyā nīlavatīr yas kṛtyās peçyavatīh | kṛtyā yāc cakrun lohinis tā ito nāçayāmasi z z ṭyadiva yad imā jāhur ime ṭhadrāsi sunvati | kṛtyāsi kalyāny asi sāmum kartāramyam jahi z z 3 z.

The first stanza varies decidedly from Q in pāda a, where Q has karçaphasya viçaphasya. The form peçyavant is not in the lexicon, but it seems a possible formation from piç. For pāda a of the last stanza we might read yad devā yad imāç cāhur; aramyam in pāda d is not satisfactory. The general sphere of the hymn seems to be indicated in the second stanza.

65. [f. 43 b, l. 6.]
vṛhat tc varcas prthatām apa dyām mitterbhy eti : sudubhisc suvarcāḥ ēte rājā varuṇo vratītum tasmāt tvam havisi bhagā :
dama z catam heman tān daçaya sapattrān viças tvā sarvān guñguvo bhava :
ntu z ya stotipānām praty ut pātayās tvā sujāto vilahā tvam n ica z :
indras tvam yoktre adhime vinakty asmāi yas tvā yacchan-
dām pratyum sī * * * :
shā jīgīsām prtanas saparye vṛhas tam avajanghani * * * ;
* rāsyā tc baliṁ soma sṛjātan upa sam * * * * * *
[f. 44 a. ] ro abhya prayaṅga damayā sapatnān. | ēte rājā
varaṇo vratītum tasmāt tvam :
havisi bhagadāsā z catam heman tān damayā sapatnān
viças tvā sarvā :
nguñguvo bhavanu z 4 z

The number of lines lost from f. 43 cannot be ascertained, but it is probable that this hymn contained not less than six stanzas. In the last stanza it may be possible to read in b
bhāgadāhā asaḥ, in c hemān tān damaya, in d viṣaḥ tvās sarvā guṇigavo. In the first stanza in pāda a it seems possible to read prathatām abhi, in b mitro bhy and svarcāḥ (but I see nothing for sudubhiś), and the next two pādas as in the final stanza. Further than these I cannot make suggestions: this seems to be a charm for the increase of a king’s glory and dominion.

66. [f. 44 a, l. 3.]

bhagāya rājñe prathamāṁ juhomi viḍve devaḥ:
uttare mādayantāṁ z ucaṁ patnibhya ucaṭibhya ābhyaḥ
patīm agni ā vahaḥ:

rātabhavyā |
In b read mādayantāṁ followed by colon; in d agna and rātabhavya.

patīm vṛṇiṣṭva haviṣā ṣrṇānas tam ā vahat savita tam te a:
ghnī tam āndra māsmi caṭācāradāya bhagabhaktā bhaga-
vati suvīrah |

In a ṣrṇāna is probably the better reading, in b savīta: in c we seem to have āndra but māsmi I cannot solve; in d read suvīrā,

yam arṣā samī patīm asye dideśita janed icchantaṁ tam iyā
vahāsi |

sumaṅgaly apatighnī suṣeṅva rāyas poṣena uciṣā sutasva
In a we may read asyāi dideṣitā, but for arṣā I have nothing; in b it seems clear that we must read tam iḥā vahāsi and icchantāṁ fits the connection very well, but jāṇe dhītsan-
taṁ is a possibility, I think. In d we may read sam iṣā
srjasva.

yat te pa:
tim aryamā jāyamānāṁ yāṁ dhātā ca kalpajam iḥā vahāsi a:
bhi vareṇa haviṣā juhomi | prajāṁ nāitu sumanasyamānāṁ
In a read jāyamānāṁ, in b yāṁ and kalpajām; in d nāyate.

patīm te dyā |
vāprthivī a dhātāṁ patīm mittrāvarunā vāto gniḥ saptar-
śaya di:
tis soma indras te tvā devaḥ pativatnī krāvantu z 5 z anu
13 zz:
Read: patin te dyavaprthiviti dhataum mitravarunah vato 'gnihi | saptasayo 'ditis soma indras te tvah devah pativatam krunantu z z z z anu 13 z

67. [f. 44 a, l. 13.]
yac tvaraya pra viveça janur jainivat uta | atho tanvam pasprca ta:
im ito nin nayamasi.
The ms. is slightly cracked and the first of pada a is not clear. In a read yas tvarayas, for b I have no suggestion: in c read pasparca, in d nir.
niṣ tvaraya nayamasi | ya imam pra vive:
catah atmam asya ma hiṃsīr anyatra cara meha bhuh |
For b read ya imima pra vivecitha, with colon following: in c asya.

yemam upayasi dhehasyaī rayiposanam. prajam ca tasya
mā hiṁ:
sir anyatra cara meha bhuh |
In a I think we must read yo 'rayemam, in b dhehy asyaī
dvaya.

yejarai:
yejaraye vihayasi hanami vi!
rudhā tvā | atho khanatramiś tvā varṣeṇa yathā bhagam
For a we might read yo 'rayemam vyayasi; for the second
hemistic I have no suggestions.

yejarai:
[f. 44 b.] sûryam strṣu yam āvato kym yyat pāutṛsadyaṁ
dāurbhāgyaṁ tam ito nir nayamasi z z:
For a we might read yo 'rayas sûryam strṣu, but b seems
hopeless and so leaves us uncertain about a: with pautrasa-
dyam the second hemistic can stand. The stanza is number
5, the hymn number 1 (in anu 14).

68. [f. 44 b, l. 2.]
agner vo balavato balena manyu vya nayamasi | indrasya
vas somasya vaḥ vrhaspa

ter vas prajapater vo balavato balena manyur va nayamasi |
yat te sûryam divi deve:
śu varcas tasya no dehi tamasi pracetāṁ aham ca vigras
tviṣitas tviṣīmān i:
māṁ vācaṁ vi cākṣiya z z z
Read: agner vo balavato balena manyum ava nayāmasi | indrasya vo •• | somasya vo •• | vrhaspater vo •• | prajāpater vo balavato manyum ava nayāmasi | yat te sūrya divi deveṣu vārcaš tasya no dehi tamasi pracetasaḥ z aham ca vigras tviṣitas tviṣimān imāṁ vācām vi cakṣiya z 2 z. We might also read vi nayāmasi, and dehi might be even better than dehi. If the formulae are to be numbered it seems that we must count six.

69. [I. 44 b, I. 5.] vātaś purastāt pavamenā bhasvān namas te: vidma te nāmadheyām mā no hīṃśih tapodāś puro daksināṭāḥ pavamenā bhasvā: n namas te vidma te nāmadheyām mā no hīṃśih | viçvāyur viçvajānīnaḥ pratī: cyā diçaḥ pavamenā bhasvān. namas te vidma te nāmadheyām mā no hīṃśih z: cīvo vāciṣvedeva udīcyā diçaḥ pavamenā bhasvān. namas te vidma te nāmadhe: yaṁ mā no hīṃśih z atiṣṭhāvā bārhaspatya ūrdhvāyā diçaḥ pavamenā bha: svān. namas te vidma te nāmadheyām mā no hīṃśih z 3 z iti śaḍṛṣṭa: süktam. z z

Read: vātaś purastāt pavamenā bhāsvān namas te vidma te nāmadheyām mā no hīṃśih z 1 z tapodāś puro daksināṭāḥ pavamenā •• z 2 z viçvāyur viçvajānīnas pratīcyā diçaḥ pavamenā •• z 3 z cīvo vāciṣvedeva udīcyā diçaḥ pavamenā •• z 4 z atiṣṭhāvā bārhaspatya ūrdhvāyā diçaḥ pavamenā bhāsvān namas te vidma te nāmadheyām mā no hīṃśih z 5 z 3 z iti śaḍṛcasūktam z z

In the margin opposite this hymn is written śaḍṛtasūktam vātā purastāt. Probably pavamanenā should stand for pava- mena.

70. [I. 44 b, I. 12.] apa dyor apā utanad apaskanḍya vaded ahim kalyāṇy āyatāh: smṛtam sumanās santu vidyātaḥ |
In a it seems possible to read apa dyor apa uttarād, in b apaskanḍya vadhed ahim: in c I think we should have kalyāṇi, followed by āyatāh rather than āyatāh; smṛtam is hardly
satisfactory and I have thought of ṛtaṁ, but no suggestions can be made with confidence; for d it seems as if we must read sumanasas santu vidyutaḥ.

yat parjas tayitnussa saṁ saṁ vyatate jagat. pa: tantu dvitiyā trayāvatī prthivī prati modate |

The transliteration of pāda a is not certain owing to a crack in the ms. We may read for ab yat parjanyas tanayitnus saṁ saṁ vyathate jagat: in c patanti would seem better, and if a form of dvittiya is to stand it would probably be dvitiyās; trayāvatī cannot stand, I think, and trṣyāvati would be a pretty emendation though the change to twelve syllables for d is rather sudden; if trṣyāvati seems worth consideration I would be inclined to push conjecture a little further and read in c udanvatīr yās. Cf. RV. 5. 83. 9.

cēsenābyy arkaṁ divṛkācve: dhenum kām iva ahiṁs tvam vidyutāṁ jahi māsmakām puruṣām vadhīḥ |

Pāda b seems to end with iva, before which gām is probable though dhenukām is possible; one may suspect that the syllables rkācve are a corruption of rśabho or else of a verb-form from the root ar, while the letters div could lead us in several directions: I think the import of the hemistic is ‘the thunders roar lustily.’ For cd we may read ahiṁs tvam vidyutāṁ jahi māsmakām puruṣām vadhīḥ.

abhikra:

dndāḥ stanayitnor avasphūrjad açanyā uta | devā maruto mṛdata nah pātu no |

duritād avadyāt.

Read abhirundah in a and avasphūrdad in b; the hemistic in this form is slightly asymmetrical but it results from the simplest emendation: in c read mṛdata (the ms. so corrects), in d pātu.

vīcite pari ṅo nama śādityaç carma yacchata | yūyata: parṇino çaram utāparṇo ṭṣādaça z 4 z

Read: vṛjite pari no nama śādityaç carma yacchata | yuyota parnimāṁ çaram utāparṇāṁ riḍādasaḥ z 5 z 4 z.

The first pāda is a variant of Q. 1. 2. 2a.
71. [f. 44b, l. 18.]

Cf. Q. 5. 14.

kṛtvayadhana vidva tam yaç ca:
kāra tam ijjahi da tvām icakliše vayaṁ vadhäya caṁ sasi-
mahe yathā:
[f. 45a] tvā devy oṣadham pratि�cinam phalaṁ kṛtam evā tvām
kṛtyane kṛtam hastigrīha paraṁ:
yañah punaś kṛtyāṁ kṛtyākṛte pratि�cinām phalaṁ kṛtam,
evā tvām kṛtyane kṛ:
tam hastigrī paraṁ nayaṁ punaś kṛtyā kṛtāmkrītī go dhenukā
vaṭum muṁ nayat. |:
čaktur vyaçaaktupeṣyaṁ pratि�cis prati tad vasat. yān te
ca kcuri vartanesu va:
ntā kūkhar vratāsu ca manḍūke kṛtyāṁ yāṁ cakrus tayā
kṛtyākṛto jahi:
agnir vaiṭus pratikūlām anukulam ivodakam čuke rathāi-
vartatāṁ kṛtyekṛtyā:
kṛtaṁtāḥ z 5 z anu 14 z

It will be noted that the ms. writes the four pādas beginning pratि�cinam phalaṁ twice; evidently a dittography. Stanzas 1 and 5 here are 9 and 13 of Q. 5. 14. and Q. 5. 14. 4ab also appears; with st. 4 cf. Q. 4. 17. 4.

Read: kṛtvayadhani vidhya tam yaç cazāra tam ijjahi na
tvām acakruśe vayaṁ vadhäuser sami čicitmahī z 1 z yathā tvām
devy oṣadham pratि�cinaphalam kṛtam evā tvām kṛtyena kṛtam
hastagrīha paraṁ nayaṁ z 2 z punaś kṛtyāṁ kṛtyākṛte gaur dhenukā
vaṭum muṁ nayat | čaktur vyaçaaktupeṣyaṁ pratičis
prati tad vasat z 3 z yāṁ te ca kcuri vartanesu va kūkhar
vratāsu ca manḍūke kṛtyāṁ yāṁ cakrus tayā kṛtyākṛto jahi
z 4 z agnir ivaitu pratikūlām anukulām ivodakam | sukho rathā
iva vartatāṁ kṛtya kṛtyākṛtām punah z 5 z 5 z anu 14 z

In st. 2b the neuter is difficult but not impossible, I think.
In st. 3b vatsam nayat would be a good reading; and in 3d
perhaps pratīcis would be better.

72. [f. 45a, l. 7.]

agnir dyumnena sūryo jyotisā dyāur mahi:
mnā antarikṣa vyacasā diçācābbhiḥ pṛthivi payobhir idam
raṣṭram vardhaya:
ntu praṭāvat. |
Read antarikṣaṁ, diça açābhiḥ and payobhiḥ, punctuating after each pair of words down to idaṁ.

tvāṣṭā rūpeṇa savitā savena ahar mītrenā varaṇena rātriḥ: pūṣā puṣṭīr bhagāṁṣena bhagadāy idaṁ rāṣṭram vardhayantu praśavat.

Read mītrenā, puṣṭībhiḥ, and possibly bhāgadheyaṇa bhāgadāḥ.

yāni vi:

çvakarmāṇi jaghaṇa medimaṁtarā dyākāprthivī ubhe | tasyāhuḥ kṣa:

ttriyaṁ garbham pari mā vapathā mūrdhāni cārayaṁsva

We may feel certain in reading dyāvaprthivī, kṣatryaṁ and dhārayaṁsva; viçvakarma ni would seem a better reading: it is probable that antara stands before dyāvā-, and sedima is possible palaeographically, giving sedimantarā.

çchandāṇsy abhito mayūkhā'sto:
mā tumā ya jarasyāḥ purisam tasyāhuḥ kṣatryaṁ nirmitair pari mā va:

patthā mūrdhāni dhārayaṁsva |

We might read: chandāṇsy abhito mayūkhās stomān tumā ye jarasyāḥ | purisam tasyāhuḥ kṣatryaṁ nirmitair * * z.4 z

parāṇī tasya vratathā yāpi mahati madaśpa:
dāṁ kṛṣṇuṣva durdharāya vā mā tvā dabham sapattrā dip-satus tava rāṣṭrā:

m uttamaṁ dyumnam astu z z z

Read: parāṇī tasya vratathā yābhī sahate saḍaspadaṁ kṛṣṇuṣva durdharāya vā | mā tvā dabham sapatna dipsatas tava rāṣṭram uttamaṁ dyumnam astu z 5 z 1 z

73. [f. 45a. 1, 16.]

idaṁ taṁ mittrāvarunā havir vāṁ yenāgre: devā amṛtatvam āyan. | yenāsmāī kṣattram adhi dhārayojo sapattrās pra:

diças santv asmāī |

Read tan mitra- in a, kṣatram in ĉ, and dhārayaujo 'sapatnās in cd.
ghṛṣasya dhārā mitrāvaruṇā duha vāṁ dhenur anupa:
[f.45b] sphurantī deva savitota vāyur agnir bhūtasya patir iha
caṁ raṁ yacchāt.

Read: mitrā in a, duhe in b; devas in c.

caṁ nas tam:
mitrāvaruṇā grāñtām tredhā mitrā bahudhā vañcerāṁ jayate
seno apa gho:
śa etat prthak satvāno bahudhā bhavantām
In a read tan mitrā, in b vañceran; in c read eti, and if
seno (= senā) does not seem acceptable we will have to read
senāpa or jayante senā.

hanāma mitrāvaruṇā samitrām bha:
vāsa bhadre sukṛṣasya loke pārayān nas savitā devo agnir,
jayāmedam ha:
visā kacypasya |
In a it almost seems that we must read amitrām; in b read
bhavāma, in c parāyan.

vāto yaṁ mitrāvaruṇā tad āha haviṣy antaraṁ
nirmitāṁ ka:
çyapasya adhvaryavo marutā yasyāsan tena devebhyo varu-
ṇāni caṅkruḥ:
∂ṁ tena devebhyo varimāṇi caṅkruḥ z z 2 z

Read: vāto yaṁ mitrāvaruṇā tad āha haviṣy antaraṁ nir-
mītāṁ kaçyapasya | adhvaryavo maruto yasyāsan tena devebhyo
varimāṇi caṅkruḥ z 5 z 2 z

74. [f. 45 b, l. 7.]
Q. 3. 3.
asikrat svapā iha bhava:
d'agne dambha rodasi urūcī | amuṁ naya namamā rātahavyo
yuvijanti supraja:
sam pañca janāḥ |
For this stanza cf. RV. 6. 11. 4 and MS. 4. 14. 15. Read in
a acikradat, in b dambhaya where Q. has vyacasva; in c namasā
rātahavyāṁ.
dūre diçchantam arçasa indram ā çyāvayantu
sakhyāya ri!
pum yadi gāyatriyam vrṛhatim arkam asmāi sāutrāmanya
dadṛcantu devāḥ | :
In a read cit santam arūṣāsa, in b cyāva- and vipram; in c yad gāyatriṁ, and in d dadhṛṣṭanti.

adbhyas tvā rājā varuṇa juhāva somas tvāyam hvayati par-vateḥbhyaḥ indras tvā:

yaṁ hvayati viḍbhyābhyaḥ cyeno bhūtvā viṣā paṭemaç
In c read viḍbhyā ābhyaç, and in d viça a paṭemaḥ.

cyeno havin nayatv ā para:

smaḍ anyakṣetre aparasyaṁ carantam açvināṁ panthāṁ

kṛnutāṁ sajan te garbham:

sajātā abhi sam saṁ viṣadṛṣṭvaṁ

In a read havir, in b anyakṣetre aparuddham carantam; in c açvinā and sugaṁ, in d abhi samviṣadṛṣṭvam.

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:
hito dūtā vā viṣi ya catrun. | senāgran viṣo vrṣanāno adhara

kāśi:

Reading viṣaṁ kauṭapasyapa ṇāṃ ṣaṅkṣe ṇaṃ vātaḥ pra:

hvatāni tvā paṇca janyāḥ pati mitrāvarṣa:

Read: hvayantv tvā paṇca janyāḥ pati mitrāvarṣa:
ta indraṅgī viṣye devā viṣi kṣemam adhīdharam z 3 z

Read: hvayantv tvā paṇca janyāḥ pati mitrā avrṣata | indraṅgī

viṣye devās te viṣi kṣemam adhīdharam z 7 z 3 z

75. [f. 45b, l. 18.]

prajāpatir a:

nuvartis sa prajābhir anuvantiḥ sa mānuvarti anuvantiṁ

kṛṇotu | i |

[f. 46a] indro nuvantis sa viryeṇanuvartis somo nuvantis sa

oṣadhibhir anuvartiḥ:

āpo nuvartayas tāś parjanyenānuvartayaḥ tā mānuvartayor

anuvantiṁ kṛṇo:
tu | devānuvartayas te mṛtenānuvartayaḥ te mānuvartayor anuvartīṁ kṛ
toṇu z 4 z
Read: praṇāyatiḥ anuvartis sa praṇāyayīḥ | sa mānu-
vartīḥ anuvartīṁ kṛṇotu z 1 z indro 'nuvartis sa viryānānu-
vartīḥ | sa . . . . z 2 z somo 'nuvartis sa oṣadhībhīr anuvartīṁ
sa . . . . z 3 z āpo 'nuvartayās tāś parjānyānānuvartayāḥ |
re mānuvartayā anuvartīṁ kṛṇantu z 4 z deva anuvartayās
te mṛtenānānuvartayaḥ | te mānuvartayā anuvartīṁ kṛṇantu
z 5 z 4 z

76. [f. 46a, l. 4.]
payo mahyam oṣadhayaḥ payo me vīrudho dadham | apām payasvā!
d yat payas tenve vṛṣṭantu vṛṣṭayaḥ
In b read dadhan, in c payasvad and in d tad me.
payo mahyam parasvanto hastino me payo da-
dham | pa:
yāṣ patatrito mahyam vīṇayā me payo dadham |
In b read dadhan, also in d.
payasvāndre kṣetram astu paya:
svad ṛtu dhām | ahaṁ payasvān bhūyāsam gāvo mota
payasvatīḥ
For ab read payasvan me kṣetram astu payasvad utsa me
dhāman; read ma utsa in d.
payo mahyam a:
psarasāṁ gandharvakā me payo 'dadham | payo me vīcva
bhūtāni vāto dadhātu me pa:
yah
In a read apsarasak, in b dadhan.
payo mahyam dyāvāprthivī antarikṣāṁ payo dadhat. | payo
me vīcva bhū:
tāni dhātā dadhātu me payaḥ
payas prthivyāṁ paya oṣadhīśu payo dhi:
vya antarikṣa payo dhaṁ payasvatīś pradiças santu ma-
hyam. z z:
z 5 z anu 15 z
Read: payas prthivyam paya osadhisu payo divy anarikse dhah | payasvatis pradicas santu mahym a z 6 z 5 z anu 15 z.

For the last stanza cf. VS. 18. 36; MS. 2. 12. 1, and others.

In the margin opposite st. 1 is written payas prthivyam -.

77. [f. 46a, l. 12.]

aham bibharmi te mano aham cittaṁ aham vra: vratam mamed apa kratav aso mamasaç ced asidapi amnasaistra samhi:

te ramataṁ mano mayi te ramataṁ manaḥ anjanasya madhusasya kuṭṭhasya na:
latasya ca | vírodikasya múlena mukhena mardanaṁ kṛtam
dadhu me antar a:
sya mukhena mandanaṁ kṛtam. | tatroy tvam vivartasa

yathā nemī rathacakram samantam pari ṣasva j e va pari ṣasva mā yathā:

[f. 46b] saṁ payite manaḥ z t z

The sphere of this is clear, it is a love-charm; cf. Q. 6. 102 and the many others. The division of the pādas presented by the ms. into stanzas, and the details of emendation raise many difficulties which cannot be convincingly settled. The last stanza is perfectly clear and is equivalent to Q. 6. 8. 1: read śvajasva māṁ in c and payate in d. We may feel sure, I think, that the next to the last stanza begins madhu me; it seems possible to read for the first hemistich madhu mayy antar a syān mukhena mardanaṁ kṛtam: in pāda c, read tatra, and at the end of d perhaps vartase, but for naraCi I can suggest nothing unless we take an entirely different turn and read the hemistichs tatra tvam vai varcasvān arani iva vartasi.

Another stanza is as follows: anjanasya madughasya kuṣṭhasya naladasya ca | virudhas tasaya - - kṛtam; but the emendation in pāda c is not very forceful. To start now with the first words, reading vratam in b and mamed aha in c we get three pādas of st. 1, and in view of Q. 1. 34. 2 I think we might read for d mama cittaṁ a sidasi (Q. - upāyasi). In the remaining part we find a whole pāda written twice, the correct form being mayi te ramataṁ manaḥ (Q. 6. 102. 2d has veṣṭaṭaṁ) which would be a good fifth pāda for st. 1 were it not for the intervening letters āmnāsāistrā and these seem beyond emendation.
78. [f. 46 b, l. 1.]

yathedaṃ açvinā triṇam vāto havatu bhūmyāṃ e
vā vayām vahāmasi yām vayām kāmayāmahe
Read triṇam in a, vahati bhūmyāṃ in b.

utvā mātā stāpayatu pra:
tvā nudaṭām açvinā | dā çvaçur iva mātaram mām evājotu
te manaḥ
Read ut tvā in a, probably sā çvaçrūr in c and evārnotu in d.

yathā:
ksīram ca sarpiç ca manuyāṇām hrye priyam. | evāham
asyā nāriyā:
hṛdo bhūyāsam uttamaḥ
Read hṛde in b, nāryā in c.

agnes tvā tapas tapatu vātasya vrāji mā sprkṣa tā:
ni śadanāni mādhava ut tiṣṭha prehy agnivat te kṛṇomi
In b read dhṛajir mā sprkṣat, in c sādhāva.

sūryas tvā tapas tapa:
tu vātasya vrāji mā sprkṣa tāti śadanāni mādhava ut tiṣṭha
prehi sū:
ryavat te kṛṇomi z 2 x
Read: sūryas tvā tapas tapatu vātasya dhrājir mā sprkṣat |
tāni śadanāni sādhāva ut tiṣṭha prehi sūryavat te kṛṇomi z 5
z 2 x.

79. [f. 46 b, l. 8.]
hiranyapuṣpi subhaṅgā rūpaç cāyam sumaṅgala:
tāv enām bhadrāyā dattām āṁṛtāv āṁṛte bhage
Read sumaṅgalaḥ in b.

hiranyapīḍvām haritaṁ tat te añge:
ṣu rohati tenemām açvinā nāri bhagenābhi śiṅcatam
In a read hiranyapiṇḍaiś, in c nārīṁ, in d śiṅcatām.

yathā rūpasudhṛta:
sṛpyanto yanti kāmināh evā tvā sarve devarāḥ petayo
yamtu kāmināḥ;
In d read prētāro yantu.
hiranyākṣa madhuvarṇo hiranyaparicantane aṅkam hiranyā yas tuva tenā:  
syāh patim ā vaha  
Read: hiranyākṣo madhuvarṇo hiranyaparicchandanaḥ | aṅko hiranyo yas tava tenāsyai • • • .

yadi vāspa dirocanam yadi vā nabhyas tira | yam tvā ma:  
hyam oṣadhir aṁkena ma nyānaya z 3 z

This stanza appears C. 7. 38. 5, which has tirojanam in a; this seems to me better than the tirocanam of the commentator. Read: yadi vāsi tirojanam yadi vā nadyas tiraḥ | iyaṁ tvā mahyam oṣadhir aṁkena me nyānayat z 5 z 3 z

80. [f. 46 b, l. 14]  
punaḥ prañam punar apānum a:  
smāi punar vyānam uta soma dhehi | ātmānaṁ caḥṣur udite  
samānas tam anu pā:  
hi tam anu jiva jāgavi |  
Read: apānam in a, adite in c and probably samānaḥ; in d jivāṁ jāgrhi: the omission of the second anu would improve the metre.

tvāṣṭā rūpeṇa savitā savena ahar mitreṇa:  
varuṇena rātrī indro jyeṣṭhena vrahmanāya vṛhaspatīḥ  
pūṣāsmāi puna:  
[f. 47 a] r asam dadhātu

Read: asaṁ in d; dadātu would be better too, in view of st. 5d and RV. 10. 59. 7a punar no asaṁ prthivi dadātu.

yathādityā vasavo ye ca rudrā viĉve devā aditir yā  
ca rā:  
trī yajño bhagas savitā ye ca | devā yamo smāi punar asaṁ  
dadhātu |  
Read: smāi and asaṁ in d; the colon should follow rātrī.  
somo rājā:  
asucit te punar mā indro marudbhīr aĉvinā te bhiṣaj yad  
agnī rudro vasuvi:

t ta punar dāt.
The first pāda of this stanza seems to have been lost; for pāda b I read: soma rājā vasuvit te punar dāt: pāda c begins with indro; read te in d.
punar dyāur devi punantarikṣam agnir vātaḥ pavaṁano
bhīṣajya:
tu | grāhyās pācāṁ nirṛtyās pācāṁ mṛtyoḥ parçād vāk ca
devi punar da:
dātu z 4 z
Read: punar dyāur devi punar antarikṣam agnir vātaḥ pava-
māno bhīṣajya-tu | grāhyās pācāṁ nirṛtyās pācāṁ mṛtyoḥ pācād
vāk ca devi punar dadātu z 5 z 4 z

81. [f. 47 a, l. 6.]

idam caksur patāvari mā hiṁsit purāyuṣaḥ yad vām:
tamo yad u lapiṣam apa vācaṁ ni dadhmasi |
Read rtāvari in a, in b pura ṣuṣaḥ might be better: at
the end of c I would read yat kilbiṣam, in d vāca (with
apavacām as an alternative).

idam dhehy ada gaṇaṁ yatho |
rmāti rohati | ayasmayaṁ tarāṇkuco akṣāur arāṁ sam apu
lampatu z
In a we may read adhiguṇam or adhi ganjaṁ, in b yathor-
myādhi or better yathormir adhi; in d upa limpatu seems
probable, and the locative dual might stand at the beginning;
I would suggest then akṣyo rasaṁ upa limpatu.

yama:

hy ābhyaṁ újayam nṛcaksā yam caṇaṁcačaṅkta nir yam
suparnā ud āhuc caksu:
ruditer anantarṁ somo nṛcaksā mayi tad darmaṁ dhātu |
The first two pādas do not connect well with either the
preceding or following, and it is possible that they were pādas
cd of a stanza whose first hemistich has fallen out: a possible
reading would be yama hy ābhyaṁ nj jayan nṛcaksā yam
caṇsena. It seems possible to read nir ayan suparnā with
some form of čakti at the beginning of the pāda; read uditeḥ
and insert colon; the last two words are probably dharmāṁ
dadhātu.

yathā caksuṁ suparna:
cça yathā čvačrū yathā čunāḥ evā me acvinā caksuṣa kṛnu-
tam puškara:
sraja |
Read suparnasya in a, čvačror in b; kṛnutam puškarasraja
for d: with this stanza cf. Q. 3. 22. 4.
yasyas suparnami prapatat cakusah caakshur adadhe
tasyaha samu:
draj e uva cakusah caakshur adadhe z z 5 z anu 16 z z z:
The second pada looks as if pada d had displaced a more
appropriate pada b; yet if we might read for a yas suparnasya
prapatat perhaps b could stand: in c we might read samudram
jateve. This is stanza 5 of hymn 5 in anu 16.
There are suggestions in the first two stanzas of healing
some disease of the eye, in the last two the suggestions are
rather of a charm for keenness of vision; of course both could
stand in the same hymn.

82 and 83. [f. 47 a, l. 14.]
agnis te haras sisaktu yatudhaha svaha vataim te prana
sisaktu:
suryaam te cakus sisaktu antariksham te crotam sisaktu
paramam te paravatam:
manas sisaktu yatudhaha svaha z z z apas te rasas sisaktu:
yatudhaha svaha | oshadhis te lomani sisajantu samudram
de vah:
s sisaktu yatudhaha svaha z z:
Read: agnih te haras sisaktu yatudhaha svaha z 1 z vataim
te prana sisaktu • • z 2 z suryaah te cakus sisaktu • • z 3 z
antariksham te crotam sisaktu • • z 4 z paramam te paravatam
manas sisaktu yatudhaha svaha z 5 z 1 z
apas te rasas sisaktu yatudhaha svaha z 1 z oshadhis te
lomani sisajantu • • z 2 z samudram te \( \frac{1}{2} \) vah sisaktu yatu
dhaha svaha z 3 z 2 z
In 83. 3 vah would seem a good reading.
The ms. so clearly separates these formulae into two groups
that I have not felt it advisable to unite them in spite of
their unity as regards content. Opposite 83 the margin has
rakshamantram ha 4.

84. [f. 47 a, l. 18.]
idaam te chiro bhinadmi yah:
tudhaha svahedam te mastiskam ni tarananaddi bhumiyaam
tehano bhina:
[f. 47 b.] dmi yatudhaha svahedam te jihva ni te griva
bhinaddi yatudhaha svahedam.
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te skandhā ni idām te sāu bhinadmi yātudhāna svāhedarāṁ

te bāhū ni te ḫrīda

yām bhinaddi yātudhāna svāhedarāṁ te pariśūr ni te čronī
bhinaddi yātudhā

na svāhedarāṁ te kloṃā ni te ḫṛṣṭhe bhinadmi yātudhāna
svāhedarāṁ te vastā ni

idām ta ṛūr bhinaddi yātudhāna svāhedarāṁ te jāṅghe
bhinaddi yātudhāna svā
dhām te gūlhāu bhinaddi yātudhāna svāhedarāṁ te pādāu
ni te tvacāṁ bhinaddi

yātudhāna svāhedarāṁ te prāṇam ni idām te pariṇāśi bhinaddi
yātudhāna svā
dhām te majjo ni tarāṇenaddi bhūmyām z 3 z

Read: idām te črī bhinaddi yātudhāna svāhā | idām te
mastiśkam ni tarāṇapena bhinaddi bhūmyām z 1 z idām te
hanū • • | idām te jihvām ni • • z 2 z idām te grīvām • • |
idām te skandhān ni • • z 3 z idām te hastān • • | idām te
bāhū ni • • z 4 z idām te ḫṛdayam • • | idām te ḫṛṣṭur
(Wackernagel, Altindr. Gr. § 51) ni • • z 5 z idām te čronī
• • | idām te kloma ni • • z 6 z idām te ḫṛṣṭhe • • | idām
te āstān ni • • z 7 z idām te ṛūr • • | idām te jāṅghe
ni • • z 8 z idām te gūlhāu • • | idām te pādāu ni • •
z 9 z idām te tvacām • • | idām te prāṇam ni • • z 10 z
idām te parāṇśi bhinaddi yātudhāna svāhā | idām te majja
ni tarāṇapena bhinaddi bhūmyām z 11 z 3 z

85. [f. 47 b, l. 8]
nandasodalam anta:
kajīṇu hāparajītā amūt bhūrūṇāy arpaṇa svāyam pācān
yāyati a

srar āitu sahakratur ātu ma prāṇo āthe balaṁ mano dadhātu
bhadrayā agni

r viṃvād vāsu mā svastaye daksīnā mā daksīnato daksīnā
pātu sa

vyataḥ paṣcād anāṁ vyadhāt pātu sarvasyā bhavahebhvyā
çatam āpo divyā mittra

sya ca daksīnā | dhātā savitā rudras te no muṇcāntv
aṅhasaḥ | çatam pācā

tu varūṇasya vrahmanaspateç ça te māntan pācāṁ no viṃya
çatāt pāçe

bhoyo vayantām z 4 z
This seems little more than words and phrases put together without connection, though there is in several places indication of prayer for protection; such as vyadhati patu, munvant vahasah. It does not seem to be metrical.

At the very beginning I think nandasodaram is not improbable, then probably atakajisum and aparajitam, these being in agreement with anum; doubtless we should read bhrunany, but it seems hardly possible to construe two accusatives with arpaya. If asrar is a verb, as seems possible, we would want to read yajaty asrahi (followed by a period). Reading aitu ma prano and bhadrayagnir we would get a fairly good sense for aitu sahakratuv... vicyada vasuhi (followed by period), though it would be quite possible to put the period after bhadraya and then read vasur maha... enain vyadhhati patu would be the last words which can stand, but it seems that a full stop comes after bhavahebhyah. Of course dhata... vahasah is good but of the rest I can make nothing though many of the words are obvious.

The above suggestions really offer no help in solving this hymn, for there is nothing in it that gives a solid base from which to work; at least I cannot see it.

86. [f. 47 b, l. 15.]

pracim dicam astham agnir mavatv ojame ba: laya dicam priyo bhuyasa anu mitvai me diaco bhavantu ghraptatikah:
dakshinam dicam astham indro mavatv ojase balaya pratcitam di:
cham astham varuno mavatv ajase balaya udicim dicam astham:
somo mavatv ajase balaya dhruvam dicam astham vişnur mavatv auja:
[f. 48 a] se balaya urdhvam dicam astham vrhaspatir mavatv ajase balaya:
dicam priya bhuyasa anu mitra me diaco bhavantu ghrpta-pratikah z:

z 5 z a 17 z

Read: pracim dicam astham agnir mavatv ojase balaya | dicam priyo bhuyasa anu mitra me diaco bhavantu ghrtpa-pratikah z 1 z dakshinam dicam astham indro mavatv • •
diçāmu • • • 2 z pratīcāṃ diçāṃ āsthām varuno māvatv • •
diçāmu • • • 3 z udātus diçāṃ āsthāṃ somo māvatv • •
diçāmu • • • 4 z dhruvan diçāṃ āsthāṃ visñur māvatv • •
diçāmu • • • 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5 2 5

ojase balāya | diçāmu priyo bhuyāśam anu mithrā me diço bhavantu ghṛt-pratikāh | 6 z 5 z 6 z 5 z 6 z 5 z

87. [f. 48a, l. 3.]
Kauç. 107.

manāyī tantu prathamaṃ pacced aṁvyātanvata tam:
nāri pra vrvimi va cādir nā santurvariśa durvyas tantur
bhavati sādhu:

n oður ito vrkaḥ ato horvarīr yūyām prāttar vṛdhīva
dhāvajā kharga:

lā yurva paturīr apā agram ivāyanam | patantu pratvarīr
ivrvarīr:
sādhunā pathā avacyu tātubhyete tedevācvarāv īva
pra stomas u:

rvarīnāṁ khaśayānāṁ astvāviṣam | nāri paṁcaṃāyōsam
sūtravat kṛ:

nutaṃ vasu ariṣto sya vasthā priyaṃda vāsī tatāutiṣa z 1 z :

Read: manāyāi tantuḥ prathamaṃ pacced anya atanvata 

tan nāriḥ pra vrvimi vas sādhrīr vas santurvariḥ 1 z sādhr

vas tantur bhavati sādhr otur etu vṛtaḥ | ato horvarīr yūyām

prāttar vṛdhīva dhāvata 2 z khargaḷa īva pataruṣa apām

ugram ivāyanam | patantu patvarīr ivorvarī sādhrnā pathā

2 z avacyāu te totudyete todēnačvarāv īva | pra stomas

urvarīnāṁ caśayānāṁ astvāviṣam z 4 z nāri paṁcaṃayūkhaṃ

sūtravat kṛṇatam vasu | ariṣto 'syā vastā 1 priyaṃda vāsī
tatāutiṣa+: z 5 z 1 z

The reading of 2b may not seem good but I regard it as

probable; Bloomfield reports sādhr utu as the reading of

three mss. but reads in his text sādhr etu ratho. In 2d Bl.

reads vṛdhīva. In 5b Bl. reads kṛṇute vasu, though all but

one of his mss. have kṛṇatam; in his note he suggests the

reading here given. For priyaṃda in 5d we should probably

read prendra as in Kauç, but for the rest our reading seems

as hopeless as that of Kaučika.
88. [f. 48a, l. 10.]

RV. 10. 152.

cäsa itthä mahañ asy ämittrakahāghato adbhubaḥ na yasya hanyā:

te sakbā na jiyate kadā ca na

In a read mahān, and in b amitrakhādo.

vrkṣo vy māvṛdhō jahi vy vṛtrasya:

hanū ruja vy manyumanyu vṛtraḥann amitrasyābhidāsati

Read: vy rakṣo vy mṛdho jahi vy vṛtrasya hanū ruja | vi manyum indra vṛtraḥann amitrasyābhidāsataḥ z 2 z

vi ni:

ndra vy mṛdo jahi nīdā yatsva pradhanyataḥ adhamaṁ gamayā taso yo:

asmā abhi dāsati

Read: vy na indra mṛdho jahi nīcā yaccha prtanyataḥ adhamaṁ gamayā tamo yo asmān abhi dāsati z 3 z

svastidā viçām pati vṛtraḥā:

vi mṛdo jahi vṛṣendraś pura etu nas somapā abhayaṅkaraḥ:

In a read patir, in b vṛtraḥā and vi mṛdho or vimṛdho; jahi does not fit in well here, and the reading of RV. is much preferable = vimṛdho vaḥt.

apendra dviṣato mano pa jijyāsato vadham vi mahaç çarma yaccha va:

riyo yavadhā vadham z 2 z

Read: apendra dviṣato mano pa jijyāsato vadham | vi mahač çarma yaccha vāriyo yavayā vadham z 5 z 2 z

89. [f. 48a, l. 17.]

yo titaro mañis tenāti taru:

śva saḥ sapattrāṇ dviṣato mañe prñutasva prdanyataḥ

In a read devo yo 'titaro; in b I think taruṣva dviṣāḥ is the best of several possibilities: in c read sapatnān, and for d prañutasva prtanyataḥ.

prñu:

[f. 48b] tasva pra dahasva sapattṛāṇ dviṣato mañe tarāpi mahatam duṣvasām varco bhaṅkti!

prdanyatām
In a read pra-nutasva, in b sapatnān; in b ati or ava would be better and then mahavān dviṣāṁ is at least possible; in d read bhaṅḍhi pṛtanyatām.

varo jahi manyum jahy ākūtīṁ dviṣatāṁ maṇe | devo yo ti:
taro manīṣ tenāṭi tara dhūrvatā |
In c read ‘titaro and in d dhūrvatāḥ.

ye dhūrvanti ye druhyanti ye dviṣanti pra:
tanyataḥ | sarvāṁ sapattrās te manir ṇa manyum dviṣatas karat.
In b read pṛtanyatāḥ; in cd sarvāṁ sapatnāṁ te manir nir.

tava citte ta!
va vrāte tavāivādhaspadam carāṁ | devo yo nyātaro manis
tenāṭi tara duṣyaṁā!

z z 3.
Read: tava citte tava vrāte tavāivādhaspadam karam | devo yo ‘titaro manis tenāṭi taraśva dviṣāḥ z 5 z 3 z
For 5d and 1b tenāṭi tara duṣṭarān might seem as good as the reading given above.

90. [L 48b, l. 6.]
Q. 6. 9.
ā te manač caksuć ca ā mā te hṛdayam dade pados 
ṭe padyam ā:
dade yathā tiṣṭḥāsi me vaçe vaçe
In ab read manač caksuć cā; in c pados, and in d vaçe only once. This stanza and the last one do not appear in Q., nor elsewhere.

vāṅccha se pādau tanvāṁ vācchākṣur vān: 
ccha sakṣnyu akṣo vrṣṇyantyāś kecā oṣṭhāu mām te kāmena 
āṣyatām
For a read vaṅccha me *, for b vaṅcchāksyāu vaṅccha sak-
thyāu; in e aksyāu and in d čusyatām: the sign transliterated ā in āṣyatām might be a poorly formed ċu.

māi tvā:
duśanimṛgām nomi hṛdayasprṛgam mamed apa kratāv aso 
mamāṣa:
č ced asač ced asidapi
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For the first hemistic I think we may read: mayi tvā dosanisprçham kṛnoma hṛdayasprçam; in c read aha, and for d see hymn 77 where I suggested mama cittam a sidäśi.

yasāṁ nābhīr ārohaṇaṁ hṛdi saṁvananaṁ kṛtam |
gāvo ghráṣya mätaro amu saṁ vānayantu me
In a read yāsāṁ, in d amūn.

mahyam tvā dyāvāprthi:
vī sahyam devī sarasvati mahyam tvendraç cāgniç cāhoratre
ni yacchatām. z:

Read: mahyam tvā dyāvāprthivī mahyam devī sarasvati mahyam tvendraç cāgniç cāhoratre ni yacchatām z 5 z 4 z
For st. 5 cf. above Nos. 9. 5 and 35. 5.

91. [f. 48b, l. 13.]
Cf. Ç. 2. 24.

bhūlir mūly arjuni punar vo yanti yādavaḥ punar jūtiṣ kimidinī;
yasya-stha [dam-atta yo va prāhīt tam utta ma saṁsāny attaḥ acchavo jigha:
cchavaḥ havisyaśaś pācyavaḥ sphaṭihārī ramahārī vāta jūte sa:
ojayaḥ punar vo yanti yādavaḥ punar jūtiṣ kimidinī yasya stha da:
ma atta yo va prāhīt tam utta māṁsāny attaḥ z z oṁ tvam utta små:
māṁsāny attaḥ zz 5 z anuvā 18 z z iti atharva:
[f. 49a] nī pipalādacākhāyāṁ dvitiyāṁ kāṇḍas samāptaḥ z z

Ç. 2. 24 is a hymn of eight stanzas divided between male and female kimidins; above in No. 42 we have a hymn, seemingly of five stanzas, devoted to the male kimidins and here are the stanzas against the females. An arrangement in five stanzas may be made with some degree of reason, but to emend the words which are supposed to be names of the demons is not possible: feminine vocatives are called for, and I can only suggest as more or less plausible arjuni, jighatsavah, spāṭihārī, ramahārī, manojavaḥ. Taking up these suggestions we may read as follows: bhūli mūly arjuni punar vo yantu yātavaḥ
punar jūtiś kimidiniḥ | yasya stha tam atta yo vah prāhāit tam atta svā māṁsāny atta z 1 z acchavo jighatsavālī punar • • •
z 2 z havisyavaś pācyavāḥ • • • z 3 z sphātihāri ramahāri • • • z 4 z vātajūte manojavāḥ punar vo yantu yātavāḥ punar
jūtiś kimidiniḥ | yasya stha tam atta yo vah prāhāit tam atta svā māṁsāny atta z 5 z 5 z anus 18 z z ity atharvani pāippa-
ludacākhyām dvitiyās kāṇḍas samāptah z z
Notes on Village Government in Japan After 1600, I.
By K. Asakawa, Ph. D., Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Introduction.

In the year 1600, Tokugawa Ieyasu, through his victory at the battle of Sekigahara, became the virtual ruler of feudal Japan, and proceeded to elaborate that careful system of government which, with remarkably few changes, continued to exercise an undisputed sway over the nation till the middle of the nineteenth century. In this system culminated, and with it ended, the feudal régime of Japan. Each of the larger phases of the system,—its relation to the Emperor and civil nobility, to religious institutions, and to the military, agricultural, and mercantile classes of society, and its moral, intellectual, economic and institutional contributions to the present era of Japanese history,—presents a field of fruitful study. It is the aim of this essay to analyze some of the leading features of the rural aspects of the great system.

Generally considered, the main objects of this system can hardly be said to have been entirely selfish. Coming after nearly three centuries of continual civil war, Ieyasu was as eager to restore at last the peace and order for which the nation had long yearned, as to perpetuate the political power of his own family. It was in fact the primary motive of his policy that the power of his house should depend upon the stability of the realm. It may indeed be said that every important phase of the political system which he built was so designed as to subserve this double purpose.

It is this full consciousness of its aims that characterizes the Tokugawa régime and distinguishes it from its predecessors in the history of feudal Japan. Ieyasu and his councillors would run no risk and leave nothing to nature, wherever their human intelligence guided them. They made every effort to
avail themselves of the wisdom to be derived from the study of the past political experience of both Japan and China, and sought to adapt it to the peculiar conditions prevailing in the feudal Japan of the early seventeenth century, always with the steadfast purpose of insuring peace and of perpetuating the new régime.

The general system so framed was characterized, in all its phases, by a studied balance of two elements seemingly contradictory to each other, namely, government by rigid laws and government by discretion. The historian who sees only the former, in which an elaborate machinery was set in motion, as if it were, regardless of the men operating it, would be puzzled to meet everywhere almost an excess of liberty that was left for the exercise of the personal sense of equity and proportion of the individual administrator. Nor would one succeed in regarding the latter element the only basic principle of the Tokugawa rule. It would seem that largely by a harmony of the two, the one not less important than the other, was served the primary aim of Ieyasu's government.

1. Government by rigid laws, which one might term institutionalism, may be conveniently discussed as in the following analysis. In the first place, a Chinese political idea was used to explain and emphasize the actual division of social classes. The nation was conceived as falling into two main classes, rulers and ruled, with a broad division of labor between them: the rulers to govern and in return to be supported, and the ruled to support and in return to be governed. True to the feudal nature of the society, the rulers were mostly warriors, and the ruled were mostly tillers of the soil. The separation between the noble functions of the former and the ignoble services of the latter was distinct and decisive, each class living a separate life from the other, with its own laws, education, taste and views of life. Less than two millions of the fighting class were thus superimposed upon more than twenty-four millions of the producing class.

In the second place, let it be noted that in each of the two classes, and in their mutual relationship, there had developed in the course of previous history an ill-defined but important division of sub-classes, which the Tokugawa rulers now organized in a minute and rigid gradation of rank. To enumerate but a few of the chief steps in the hierarchy, such
as concern the subject of this essay. The Suzerain appointed about forty Intendants with regular salaries over his own Domain Lands. He also received allegiance of more than two hundred large and small Barons, who, with some of their vassals, ruled over their respective Fiefs. The suzerain's domain lands were assessed as equivalent to about a fourth of the aggregate of the fiefs of all the barons. His intendants stood in their respective districts in immediate relation with representatives of the peasants, but the barons and their larger land-holding vassals were removed from the rural population under them by one or more intermediate grades of officials, whom we might conveniently designate Bailiffs.

The peasants of each Village were themselves divided into classes, according to their tenures. They, however, were all under their Village-Head, usually one but sometimes more, either elected or hereditary, and, holding office annually, for a term of years, or for life. He was assisted by several Chiefs, and was, with the latter, under the counsel and supervision of one or more selected Elders. In larger fiefs there frequently were District-Heads, who, being also of the peasant birth, each discharged in a group of villages functions similar to those of the heads of individual villages.

In the third place, all these grades were held together by a carefully studied system of checks and balances. These were evidently conceived in accordance with the two familiar principles that have characterized many a bureaucratic government in history, and were especially developed in China, namely, the principles of responsibility and of delegation,—the delegation of the suzerain's powers to his subordinate officials, and the responsibility of each functionary for his official conduct to those above him. Each official was inviolable, so long as he acted within the powers delegated to him, and each law was sacred, so long as it embodied the just will of the highest authorities. Every person, however high, was answerable for his act to his superiors, and the suzerain's punishment for wrongs committed by even the greatest baron was swift and was witnessed by all "men under him. It was very common that the officials or even all the members of a corporate body were punished for a grave offence committed by one of the latter, or otherwise held responsible for the due performance of public duties enjoined on them. This was especially
the rule with rural communities, with city wards, and with merchant and artisan gilds. It would not be difficult to see that the double chain of delegation and responsibility was forged in order to hold the society solidly together.

2. Beside these rigorous institutional arrangements of the Tokugawa régime, the latitude it carefully and generously left to the individual administrator for the exercise of his sense of equity and right proportion is all the more remarkable by contrast. Unless the suzerain's motive of deliberately balancing these two opposite principles is thoroughly appreciated, the story of his government is apt to baffle us at every turn, and has in fact betrayed many writers into inevitable errors. Rule by discretion should be absent in no form of government, and is likely to play a large part in a feudal government, which usually comprises arrangements essentially private and personal in origin. In the Tokugawa régime, discretionary conduct of affairs formed a predominant feature of its operation, and, what is more important, was maintained side by side with a rigid institutionalism, some phases of which we have analyzed, both elements supplementing and rectifying each other. The law was framed, or, at least, such was the ideal, with the conscious intention at the same time to guide the blind magistrate by its provisions and to allow the wise magistrate to supply them with his wisdom. Once promulgated, therefore, the law was a ready instrument in the hands of benevolent and experienced rulers. Not seldom was it expanded, bent, or even overridden, to give free play to a higher sense of equity. This was, in short, a system of government, one half of whose success depended upon the skill and the justice of the individual official, the other half being provided for by minute laws. The first half, it is easy to see, was ever liable to be turned to abuses by corrupt men, and the second always tended to become mechanical and unwieldy. The careful combination devised by the Tokugawa rulers served their aims with rare success, but failed them in the end, for, indeed, no human hand could strike an even balance and effect a complete organic union of the two factors for all time.

So much for the general system. We are now ready to devote our attention to that part of the Tokugawa régime which concerned the rural population, and observe how it
illustrates the general reflections we have made, and how its peculiar conditions reacted upon the entire system.

The peasants were a class destined, as has been said, to be ruled by warriors and in return to support them with fruits of their labor. It was first of all necessary to keep them submissive. There was no thought of ever allowing them to take part in the government of the country or even of theief. Not only would they be incapable of the work, but it would in all probability result in breaking the very fabric of feudal society. Nor was it a difficult problem to enforce passive obedience upon the peasants, for, habitually employing dull wood and metal as tools, as they do, and depending on mute but irresistible forces of nature, the peasants are always the mildest and most patient class of people. The rank and dignity of the authorities command from them more genuine respect than from merchants in the cities. Political ideas grow but slowly among the peasants. Their mental horizon is apt to be limited to their own interests, which are at once circumscribed and protected by custom. Only when these interests, their only citadel, are unreasonably attacked, they would be seen to lose their equanimity and become as ferocious as an enraged ox. So long as their interests are safeguarded, however, peasants would be a malleable material in the hands of a wise ruler. This was especially the case with the Japanese peasants. They had for centuries been inured to passivity. They were in most instances accustomed to a gregarious mode of living in old hamlets,—a fact which tended to develop fixed social forms and sanctions and a cordial spirit of mutual dependence and assistance among themselves. It will be seen later that this tendency was promoted by the Tokugawa rulers with extreme care. Altogether, this was not a life conducive to independence of thought and action.

Obedience, however, might not be contentment. It was necessary to control the peasants in such a way as to render them, not only submissive, but also contented,—so contented, if possible, that they would counterbalance whatever unstable elements of society there existed in and out of their circle, and throw the weight of their native desire for order and conservatism in the interest of peace and of the perpetuation of the régime.
This double task was at once imperative and difficult, for the Japanese peasants of the seventeenth century were less easily contented and should therefore be appeased with all the greater solicitude, than the serfs of the thirteenth. Not only did they form the bulk of the nation, and were, from the economic standpoint, the support of the entire body politic; but not only was there a degree of community of interest between them and the warriors, as against the rising burgher class; but also, more important than these circumstances, the peasants' position in relation to the land they tilled and to the warriors who drew revenues from the land had materially risen since the earlier period. Under the stress of the continual civil strife that raged before 1600, warriors found that they could no longer retain their rôle of seigneurs over landed estates, where they had for generations lived, in time of peace, amid their serfs, and, in time of war, defended their castles with their retainers. They were now obliged to betake themselves to the castles of the greater lords, to remain in their immediate neighbourhood, and to leave their land to be managed largely by the tillers themselves. From this time on, political conditions accelerated the change already begun. By the beginning of the seventeenth century, most serfs had turned freer tenants, and many of the latter had become proprietors employing tenants and laborers. A long experience had led the peasants to feel that the lord—and the lord became an impersonal being in the eyes of the peasants living on the suzerain's domain lands—cared much less for the land they tilled than for the dues levied upon it. This was in fact a fundamental point: the fiscal obligation of land, rather than the land itself, was now a controlling principle of the institutional life of the peasant. Between the lord and his land, the tilling of which he had overseen, had now stepped forth the peasant, who had formerly stood behind the land, and the lord's eye had turned to enforce from the land to what the peasant should bring to him from it. The peasant had become the virtual, though not theoretical, owner of cultivated land. This was a transitional state of things betokening a greatly advanced social position of the tiller of the soil. For although the process could not in all cases have resulted in his improved material condition, he must nevertheless under these circumstances have become more mindful of his rights and interests.
To illustrate. The lord's right of seizure over land had vanished, and even his right of escheat or mortmain, as the medieval jurist of Europe would call it, was very imperfect. Succession by testament was common; a collateral relative of the deceased to whom the latter had willed his holding inherited it without purchase-money ever being paid to the lord, and was, in default of a will and of a nearer relative, even compelled to do so, in order that the same dues as before would be forthcoming from the estate. As regards these dues, they were almost all levied on the productive capacity of each holding, capitation or house taxes being unpopular and unimportant, a fact indicating how far was the peasant removed from personal servitude to the lord. Regulations concerning alienation of land by sale, gift, or mortgage, and its division, were primarily actuated by the motive that the act should not affect the fiscal issues of the land. In matters of personal rights, also, the same consideration largely prevailed. Change of residence between different parts of the country was discouraged, mainly because it might introduce elements tending to disturb the unity of village customs, and thereby conduce to unrest and a consequent fiscal derangement. Marriage was in no way interfered with, so long as it did not directly or indirectly tend to diminish the public revenue of the village. When, in later years of this period, the running away of impoverished peasants became frequent, the lord seldom exercised a right of pursuit, provided the land deserted by the absconders was taken care of by their relatives or by the village and yielded the same dues as before.

All this points to a condition that deeply and radically affected all classes of the feudal society, and exercised a specially profound influence upon the rural policy of the period. The peasants were, indeed, still the "ruled" class, but it is easy to see that their interests called for the most scrupulous consideration of the suzerain's government. The barons, too, on their part, would court the good-will of the village population within their fiefs, for no lord could hope to wield influence for a long time over discontented peasants. The latter would often find a ready listener in the suzerain himself, who, while openly discountenancing popular riots and direct appeals, would eagerly punish the baron for maladministration and
indirectly right the wrongs of the aggrieved peasantry. Whether the suzerain or the baron, the inevitable criterion of distinguishing a good from a bad lord was the one’s regard and the other’s disregard for rural interests. And these interests could be studied only with sincere zeal and sympathy, for the peasants would not express themselves until it was too late—until their long pent-up grievances burst forth in violent mobs. The greatest stress was, therefore, laid everywhere upon the need of studying agricultural conditions and ministering to them with justice and skill. Under these circumstances, it was exceedingly difficult at once to secure from the peasants the degree of submission, and to grant them the degree of satisfaction, which were both absolutely necessary for the success of the régime. The ingenious and thorough manner in which this delicate work was generally contrived to be done by the feudal authorities is worthy of a careful study.

In the first place, the Tokugawa’s village administration was an example of extreme paternalism at once kind and stern. It was here that the greatest care was taken in balancing law and equity, inflexible justice and generous discretion. The fundamental conception was that the peasant was at once too passive and too ignorant to provide for the morrow, so that his ills should receive official attention even before he himself perceived their symptoms. It was unnecessary, and sometimes dangerous, that he should understand what the authorities were doing for him, for they were afraid that his too much knowledge might interfere with their exercise of equity and arbitrary adjustment. He “should be made to follow,” as said Confucius, and as was habitually repeated by the Tokugawa rulers, “but should not be made to know.” The peasants, accordingly, should not be allowed to become over-wealthy, for “if they grew too rich,” said a practical administrator, “they would cease to work, and employ poor warriors to till their land, and so the distinction between the classes would pass away,” yet the moderate holdings of the peasants were zealously protected by law and by precept, so that they would not become too poor. They should know in general, but not in exact detail, how their lands were valued, how their taxes were remitted or reduced in hard years, and what were the finances of the entire fief or domain land.
Nor was the penal law given publicity among them, and most legal provisions came to them in the form of moral admonitions. Yet the peasants were fairly well advised as to the general nature of the rights and obligations of their own class and of the officials directly concerned with their affairs. This knowledge was further reinforced by a qualified right granted the peasants to appeal from an unjust official to the baron or intendant, and thence to the suzerain's council.

Much of this paternalism and this limited publicity and protection was extended to the rural population by the rulers, and was utilized by the latter, in a manner at once effective and characteristic of their general policy. Ever since the Reform of 645, the Chinese village institution known usually as pao or lin had been familiar to Japan. It consisted in dividing the inhabitants of each village into groups; each comprising a certain number of house-fathers, who were held responsible for the order, the good behavior, and the performance of the political obligations of all the members of the respective groups. The institution was copied in Japan after the seventh century, and, despite the general social changes which followed, lingered till the beginning of the seventeenth. Then the early Tokugawa government seized upon it, and forced it on the lower warrior classes and the entire village and municipal population throughout the realm. The normal group of peasants, usually termed the five-man group, consisted of five land-holding house-fathers living near together, with all their family-members, dependents, and tenants. It was continually ordered, and the order was well carried out, that every inhabitant in the village, no matter what his status or tenure, should be incorporated into the system. That this old institution should now be, as it was, so eagerly resuscitated and so universally extended, was evidently due to a belief based upon the past experience in China and Japan, that the system would enable the rulers to attain with the least possible cost and friction a large part of the aims of village administration—to secure peace and order, to afford the exact degree of control and freedom that was deemed necessary, to insure a prompt return of the taxes, to inculcate the moral principles most desirable in an agricultural society under a feudal régime, and, above all, to hold the people responsible for most of these results.
Let us observe how these things were done through this simple institution. The responsibilities and the rules of conduct of the villagers were made known to them through edicts, public sign-boards, and also oral exhortations given by the intendant or bailiff and the village-head. The more important of these rules were re-iterated to the peasants with great persistence. Gradually, from about the middle of the seventeenth century, the older custom of certain warrior-officials to present to their lords written pledge under oath to fulfil their orders, repeating them as nearly as was practicable in the form they had been given, was extended to the five-man group in the village with respect to its duties. By the end of the eighteenth century, there probably were few villages in Japan that did not keep their so-called group-records (kumi-chō). The record began with an enumeration of such laws and precepts as had been repeatedly given to the villagers, and ended with an oath that those would be strictly obeyed and enforced in the village. All the house-fathers put their names and seals after the oath in the order of their groups in the village. The record was then periodically—in some instances as often as four times in the year or even once a month—read and fully explained by the village-head to all the people in his charge. As new laws were enacted, or as the village population changed, the record was revised and made anew, with the usual oath and affixed seals.

These laws, which were thus published among the people through edicts, sign-boards and group-records, and for the execution of which the peasants were held responsible by means of the system of the five-man group, are among the important sources for the study of our subject. Attempts may be made to reconstruct the rural government under the Tokugawa upon the basis of these laws. It should be noted, however, that they were never the whole of the laws relating to village administration. As has been stated, the penal side of the laws was, except in a few rare cases, carefully concealed from the peasants, the latter being merely told what to do and what not to do. Nor should it be forgotten that, even after studying penal laws from other sources, we could not be certain that all the law thus collected presented a sound basis for a discussion of the entire subject. In order to obtain a comprehensive survey of the institutional life of the village, it
would seem that one should do three more things from a vastly greater amount of materials. The laws should be interpreted in the light of the social and political conditions which called them forth. Then it should be studied how far the laws were actually enforced, how much they accomplished the result they were purported to bring about, and how they reacted upon the society. Finally, one should carefully examine if there were not certain conditions in the life of the village and of the nation that were too universal or too vital to find expression in the laws or to be materially affected by their operation.

From these points of view, it may almost be said that the first problem of the village administration under the Tokugawa, —of the paternal rule over the responsible village and the five-man group,—concerned its financial affairs, and that most of its other features were so modelled as to facilitate the collection of the taxes. Simple morals were inculcated for the sake of peace and order, and economic life was carefully regulated for the maintenance of moderate prosperity, but the peace and the prosperity subserved steady fiscal returns of the village. Nor is this strange when we consider that the peasants constituted the large class of people whose foremost part in the life of the State was to furnish the means to carry on the government of the nation. The warriors ruled the peasants, and the peasants fed the warriors and themselves. Few provisions of the laws for the village had no bearing, direct or indirect, upon the subject of taxation; few phases of the entire structure of the feudal rule and of national welfare were not deeply influenced by the solution of this fundamental problem. It is, therefore, not impossible, as we are about to do, to treat the whole subject of village government with its financial problem as its center.

If we might be allowed to anticipate a conclusion of this discussion, we should venture to say: it was probably inevitable, but it was none the less a tragic outcome of the Tokugawa régime, that, between the mounting expenses of the government and the falling or, at best, stationary productivity of the soil, the taxes should, as they did, grind upon the peasants with increasing weight, and that this fundamental malady should gradually sap the vitality, not of the nation, but of the whole system of government. It has often been said that had there
been no pressure from foreign Powers causing the downfall of the Tokugawa government in 1868, its days had then been all but numbered, and the statement seems the most tenable on the financial side of the question. That such a result was inevitable appears to have been due primarily to the fact that, from the economic standpoint, the feudal system in general was costly, and that the Japanese feudalism after 1600 was particularly wasteful.

It needs no reminder that feudalism as such would afford too inefficient an economic organization for a government whose growing budgets must be supported only by an increasing wealth of the nation. Agriculture, upon which the feudal society was built, was at the mercy of natural forces, and at its best could not support a large population. What few people subsisted therein could not hope to increase their wealth at a rapid rate or on a large scale, because they were encumbered by regulations designed to maintain rigid and stable classes of society, and by customs which frowned upon sudden departures from the settled routine of life, and because the intercommunication between the fiefs was inadequate, if not restricted. Even when it was tolerably free, its economic value was small, in proportion that money was scarce, credit undeveloped, and capital immobile. Under these conditions, both the population and the wealth of a normal feudal society would, as long as it retained its character, remain almost stationary.

It will, however, require an explanation that the economic organization of Japan under the Tokugawa was abnormally wasteful even as a feudal society. Out of the many circumstances that may be thought to have contributed to this state of things, we may introduce three at this stage of discussion, namely:—the separation of the warrior from land; an exhaustive degree of paternalism, attended by some serious errors, in the economic policy of the government; and finally, a long reign of peace breeding luxury and extravagance. The first of these conditions awaited the Tokugawa at their accession to power in 1600.

(1) Separation of arms from land. It has already been alluded to that the continual turmoil during the period of feudal anarchy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries had forced many a warrior to become a professional fighter, and to leave
the country and to live near his lord's castle. The introduction of gun-powder about 1543, and the consequent progress in organized tactics, accelerated this process. A further impetus was given by Nobunaga and Hideyoshi, who for political reasons forced large bodies of warriors to migrate from one place to another. During the period of civil wars, the military service of the vassal was often compensated for in money or in rice. When a baron apportioned a piece of land to his vassal, it often meant that the latter was granted the right over the dues from the land (所専の知行), instead of over the land itself (下地の知行). In this case, he was far from overseeing its cultivation in person, for he lived in his lord's castle-town.

This custom had so long been established in 1600, was so strongly reinforced by the increase of dispossessed warriors of the Osaka party in that and subsequent years, and indeed so much facilitated the control of the warrior class, that the Tokugawa found it not only impossible, but also impolitic, to return to the older system of feudal arrangement.60

It was a natural order of things that the congregation of warriors in the castle-towns, and, as it was now required of a large number of warriors in each fief, in the assigned quarters in Edo, should tend toward a greater cost of living than before. What was more important, the separation of arms and land made the collection of taxes more indirect and expensive than in former days. It was common in the early years of the fourteenth century that a knight with his attendants on foot could be maintained on seven acres of the average rice-land. Such a condition was, however, regarded unthinkable in the Tokugawa period,61 and the difference was generally attributed62 to the greater cost of living and of tax-collection due to the warrior's absence from the country. It will be seen later how the otherwise expensive system of indirect collection through several grades of officials led, also, to inevitable leakage and corruption.63

(2) Economic paternalism. In their zeal at once to secure rural tranquility and to insure steady returns of the taxes, the Tokugawa rulers continued throughout the period to enact and enforce minute regulations of agriculture, which must have had a benumbing effect upon the economic sense of the people. In one fief, the hereditary estate of the peasant
family was limited to between 500 and 5000 momme in productive value, representing probably about 1.25 to 12.5 acres of the average rice-land, and in few places in Japan estates smaller than 10 koku in assessed productive value, or perhaps about 2.5 acres of the same quality of land, were allowed to be divided amongst children. Agriculture was encouraged with great care. The villagers should look after the fields of those who were unable to work, and all should equally share the disaster of a drought or an inundation. Subsidiary occupations, especially the production and manufacture of silk, were in many places fostered and controlled. Careless cutting of bamboo and trees, the raising of useless and harmful crops, including tobacco, the building of new houses upon cultivated land, and a host of other actions, were forbidden on pain of joint punishment of the village or the group. Public granaries were established everywhere, and the manufacture of sake was kept within bounds.

Other occupations received perhaps more interference and certainly much less fostering care than did agriculture. The change of a peasant into a merchant was not permitted. The dimensions of woven fabrics, the output of merchandise, and the scale of wages of several forms of labor, were often fixed by law, while commercial transactions at rates higher or lower than current prices were declared illegal. The repeated debasing of coins by the Edo government, and the unfortunate custom of allowing certain cities to issue copper coins and many fiefs to circulate paper currency, must have seriously interfered with the growth of credit and legitimate commerce, and reacted unfavorably upon the economic life of the village.

Most stringent were restrictions relating to communication. There were many barriers at strategic points on the approaches to Edo, and, besides, minor passes impeded travel between and even within fiefs. Indeed, the very village could be considered a barrier in itself, for no unknown character should find in it even a night's lodging, it being illicit even for a hotel to keep an unaccompanied stranger for more than one night. Nor should the peasant go out of the village to pass a night elsewhere without an explicit understanding with village officials. There is reason to believe that the regulations of communication were enforced with a large measure of success.
It would be unjust, however, not to appreciate the probable motives which had compelled the authorities to issue these paternal measures of economic control. The prosperity of the warrior and the peasant depending on the success of the rice harvest, their interests were, especially in bad years, largely common, but antagonistic to that of the rice merchant. If, in years of rich crops, the peasant rejoiced and the warrior suffered, for the latter's income in rice would sell cheap, even then the merchant, who bought the grains at a low price, pleased neither the one nor the other. It was considered essential for the officials to insure the steady, mild prosperity of the farmers, and, at the same time, to prevent the merchants from profiting at the expense of the rulers and the bulk of the ruled. Few things were more dreaded as a dissolvent force of social organisation, than the passing of the control of the economic life of the nation from the warrior to the merchant. It is an important phase of the history of this period, which falls beyond the scope of this paper, that this perilous situation steadily grew up despite all the effort of the feudal government to arrest its progress. The presentiment felt by the authorities of this impending crisis is reflected in the nervous zeal with which they continually issued strict economic measures, some of which have been described.

(3) Peace and luxury. It would be difficult to gage the evils of so extreme a form of economic paternalism, for, immense as they must have been, they were largely negative. Flagrant, positive evils resulted from the long period of peace lasting for more than two and a half centuries,—the golden peace for the creation of which the founders of the Tokugawa régime had exhausted their wisdom, with so large a degree of success, and which enabled the brilliant civilisation of the Edo period to rise.

We have space enough merely to allude to the enormous expenses which the peace policy of the suzerain entailed upon all the barons throughout Japan. The baron's own income, after deducting from it the emoluments for his retainers, was seldom large, and yet he had to bear sundry expenses very onerous in proportion to his means, and, besides, render his regular, though seemingly voluntary, dues to the suzerain. Other occasional requisitions from the latter for special purposes were a source of continual embarrassment to the baron.
Many a baron was thus obliged to borrow heavily from his vassals, who could rarely expect reimbursement. Unfortunately, when the circumstances of the baron and the vassals became more straitened, their luxurious habits had advanced too far to be checked, much less to be eradicated. What had greatly tended to bring about this condition was the fact that each baron was obliged to pay his annual visit to the suzerain's court at Edo with his full retinue, and to maintain two establishments worthy of his rank, one at the Capital and the other at his castle-town. Edo was the fountain-head of luxury and extravagance, and its fashions were through this system of continual communication quickly diffused into all the chief centers of culture. There was little doubt that the system helped the prosperity of the Capital and of the towns on the high roads, but at the expense of the warriors and peasants. It was the suzerain's policy to impoverish the barons, and it was the barons' part to replenish their coffers from the peasants. The periodic absence of the baron and some of his vassals at Edo had also resulted in many a case in conspiracy or corruption among the retainers in the fief, which again bore heavily upon the tax-paying class.  

In the meantime, the suzerain's own finances at Edo, despite the great care with which the fiscal administration of his domain lands through his intendants was supervised, showed deficits that swelled as the luxury of his court progressed. They were barely balanced by the seigniorage derived from an increasing adulteration of the gold and silver currency. Many of the suzerain's immediate vassals residing at Edo were plunged into abject poverty.  

Nor should it be forgotten that there was something radically anomalous in the very idea of a perpetual tranquillity of a feudal society—an "armed peace," or, peace of an agricultural community guarded exclusively by a warrior class which did neither fight nor produce. All the numerous sumptuary laws enacted during this period for the warrior classes could not check the growth of luxury and extravagance of the unproductive and unoccupied men of arms. Indeed, sumptuary laws in a society where one class produces at best a fixed amount of wealth, and the other spends it on an increasing scale, are highly significant. Here they are always necessary and always ineffective.
All these evils were greatly intensified by the luxurious habits that had seized upon the peasants themselves. Before we discuss the effects of peace and luxury upon the economic life of the village, let us first observe how the peace itself had been secured therein.

Here, again, the paternalism of the government was, for evident reasons, hardly less exhaustive than in other matters of village administration. The family institutions—marriage, adoption, succession, and inheritance—were well guarded and controlled. The group and the entire village were made to be actively interested in the peace and in the maintenance of each household.76 The peasants should watch and correct one another's conduct,79 and disputes should as far as possible be adjusted by mutual conciliation.80 Private expulsion of an unruly member was rarely permitted,81 while sales of persons were illegal.82 Virtues which were inculcated among the villagers, and for the practice of many of which they were made responsible, were: filial piety, concord within the family, diligence, patience, obedience, charity, and mutual helpfulness in the hamlet.83 It was a common duty of the village to provide necessary measures for preventing and extinguishing fires, and arresting robbers and disorderly persons.84 Most heinous were riots of all kinds; for the mobbing of an intendant's office, for example, not only were the culpable parties beheaded, but also the village-officials were fined, deprived of land-holdings, or banished.85 Peasants were strictly forbidden to own fire-arms or to carry swords.86 It has already been shown that no one might without permission lodge a stranger or himself stay out of the village even for one night.74 All the servants hired into the village had personal sureties responsible for their good behavior.87 Catholic converts were excluded most rigorously.88 Dealings in smuggled foreign wares were forbidden.89 No books interdicted by the censor were to be admitted,90 while the study of Confucian classics by the peasants was discouraged.4 Festivals should not be celebrated on a larger than the usual scale, and no novel religious sects or practices should be initiated. The Buddhist church, whose rights were very narrowly circumscribed, was utilized as an agent of peace and contentment.91 It is not possible to enumerate other details of the careful measures which were provided for the purpose of maintaining the unity of village customs and population.
It is more important to know that not only did these measures successfully insure the social stability for which they were intended, but the effects they produced contained evils which could not have been entirely foreseen, but which, once grown, no new laws could eradicate. The artificial, dead peace, together with the debased currency of the period, had continually tended to breed luxury even among the toiling population of the village, and, furthermore, luxury did often so operate as to reduce the productive capacity of the peasant family. The logic of this serious condition is clearly shown in an outspoken memorial written in 1790 by a man in the Sendai fief who was familiar with rural conditions of the period and strove to improve them.

"Formerly", says he in one passage of this interesting document, "when the farmer could bring up two, three, four or five sons, all the younger sons were hired out by other farmers as soon as they were old enough, saved their wages, and married or were adopted into families. There was everywhere an abundant supply of cheap labor for the field. The farmers could also keep horses, which yielded manure. The productive power of the soil was therefore large, and rice was plentiful. They could likewise afford daughters. Marriage was inexpensive, the population increased at the normal rate, and the Heavenly Law was fulfilled." But now, continues the writer, marriages cost the man nearly 30 kwan and the woman's family almost 40. It being increasingly hard to maintain a household, the average peasant seldom had more than three children, and the poorer tenant only one child. Labor was scarce and dear, having risen from 5 or 6 kwan to more than 10, and rising every year. Horses were fewer, and manure less. It being in many instances impossible to take care of one's own holding, it was rented to some one else who seemed willing to till it, but who would be inclined to neglect the land that was not his own. In recent years most land yielded on the average only 15 to 16 koku per chō (74.5 to 79.5 bushels per 2.45 acres), instead of the former average of 20 (nearly 100 bushels). Yet the peasants understood little the cause of their trouble, and did not abate their thoughtless extravagance.

It is true that this document speaks of conditions in a particular fief, but, while some districts fared better, there
were others whose lot was still worse. The universal and persistent enactment of sumptuary regulations for the rural population has led some writers to fancy that the Japanese peasants must have been a model of frugality, but it is another evidence of the prevailing trend for needless luxury and the increasing difficulty of checking it. The village life under the Tokugawa would, of course, be considered extremely simple, according to the modern standard, but it was in many places positively extravagant in proportion to their limited earning capacity.

To sum up the foregoing discussion of the wastefulness of the Tokugawa feudalism. Peace and luxury led the peasants to spend, and the same condition, added to the peculiar feudal arrangement of the period, impelled the warriors more and more to absorb, the wealth of the nation that, owing to the exclusion of foreign trade and to the inadequate economic organisation of society, could not be increased correspondingly, and did in many instances diminish. We shall discuss briefly how these conditions influenced the system of taxation, and how the latter reacted upon the life of the village.

The taxation of the Tokugawa period clearly reflects the important characteristics of its feudal system. The separation of the warrior from land had resulted in the peasant's financial obligations acquiring the general appearance of being public taxes to the government, rather than personal dues to the lord. The State as a whole was largely feudal, but smaller districts were more bureaucratic than feudal. It is here that one has to discover the working of the system of taxation. There was very little in the whole system that savored of obligations due directly from the peasant to the lord. There were no banalities; whatever corvée originated in the personal relationship had become overshadowed by or incorporated into the corvée for the public; the peasant had no opportunity to entertain the lord at his own house, and was explicitly forbidden to entertain his agents; and confiscations of land were rare and meant merely changes of cultivators.

The principal tax was the land-tax, levied, as has been said, not upon each peasant as an individual person, but on the officially determined productive capacity of each holding. From the purely fiscal point of view, the peasant would be
considered an instrument to make the holding continue to yield what it should.

The Tokugawa inherited this system from the earlier feudal ages, which in their turn had accepted, though with serious changes, the Chinese notion of land-tax adopted in Japan in the seventh century. We are unable here to trace the interesting evolution of this tax in Japanese history, but the following data would be necessary for an understanding of the Tokugawa system. The land-tax was originally, when it was copied from China, a capitation-tax, paid by the head of each family as a unit, but assessed on the basis of the equal pieces of land allotted to all the peasants in the family above five years of age. From thus being a personal imposition levied through the family, the tax changed, during the transitional and the first feudal periods, into a tax still levied through the family (now nearly identical with the house) but assessed on its land-holdings. From this point on, this fundamental nature of the tax remained constant, but the method of its assessment, which had been made uncertain at the aforesaid change in the nature of the tax, gradually tended to become uniform and definite. At length, under Hideyoshi, at the end of the sixteenth century, the principle had been firmly established that the tax on each holding should be assessed at a certain rate upon the annual productive capacity measured and recorded in terms of hulled rice.

In the meantime, the ratio between the tax on land and its annual productivity, which in the eighth century was at most 5 per cent, had risen high during the thirteenth, due largely to the fact that the land-tax superseded other taxes, and then remained substantially the same till 1600 at 50 per cent. more or less. A strong tradition had grown up that the tax should not be raised much beyond this limit. Nor could this rate, high as it may seem, be considered extortionate from the point of view of the period. For, it should be remembered that, in the conception of the feudal lawyer, the peasant was the virtual but not the theoretical owner of the land he tilled, and his land-tax was rather a rent than a tax. Even as a rent, the rate could not be said to have been always excessive. When, after the fall of the feudal government, a complete survey of the cultivated area of Japan was made between 1873 and 1881, it was discovered that an
annual tax of 3% of the average assessed value of agricultural land would give a sum equal to the land-tax levied under the feudal rule.98

In 1600, when the Tokugawa came to power, they accepted in general the current method of assessing the productivity of land and the prevalent tax-rate, and modified and elaborated them with their characteristic care. While they were in no position to initiate a much lower rate of taxation, they showed an unmistakable disposition to lighten the burden of the peasant by various devices, some of which follow.

(1) The annual productive power of each land-holding was measured with scrupulous care, and determined usually a little below its actual capacity.97 What was more, there was a constant tendency to make the tax-rate itself definitely fixed beyond the caprice of the collector. This rate, even including the minor levies98 connected with the main tax, was, at least in the domain land, often below 50%.99 The assessment was probably at the time considered as not unreasonable. The apparent iniquity of the feudal tax arose, not so much from its rates, as from the method of its collection, and from the too infrequent revision of the recorded productivity of the holdings. The former of these difficulties will be discussed in the Notes102 & 103. As regards the latter, the probably complete records made during the first half of the seventeenth century, and the confessedly partial revision of the early eighteenth century, seem to have remained unaltered except in cases of urgent need. It is easy to see that both the area and the productivity of most pieces of land must have changed much during the more than two centuries of the régime. That such was the case was abundantly proved during the recent survey just referred to.109

(2) The Tokugawa government allowed a greater freedom than in the earlier period of partially commuting the land-tax into money. Local customs varied on this point, but frequently as much as half the tax was thus paid in money.110 That this was an important gain for the peasant will be seen when we note that the village was held responsible for the collection102 of the tax, and for its transportation, either to Edo, if the village was situated in a domain land, or to the lord's store-houses, if it formed a part of a fief.112 This burden remained oppressive, for no region was permitted to commute
all its taxes into money, but the burden would have been greater but for the limited commutation allowed.

(3) The old system of remitting taxes for special reasons was minutely elaborated under the Tokugawa. Remissions partial or entire, temporary or permanent, were granted to wood and waste land, land reserved for public purposes, newly tilled land, land once recorded but long since non-existent, land wasted by natural calamities, and the like. In this connection may also be mentioned the loans of seed-rice and rice for food issued by the authorities in bad years.

In fact, the land-tax could not, from its very nature and from the strength of the customary law, be increased beyond, say, 60 per cent., at most, of the estimated productivity of the soil. There were other items of taxation, however, which could be and were, especially in fiefs, expanded almost indefinitely. These were: corvées, sundry customary taxes, and special taxes on products and occupations. Generally speaking, all the three kinds of taxes were apt to be more uniform in the domain land than in the fief, and, within the latter, in the baron’s own land than in the land granted to the vassal.

The corvées were of two different kinds: labor for the baron or his vassal, whichever it may be, who had the superior right over the land in which the peasant lived, and labor for the public. The former was rendered in repairing the fences and thatched roofs of the lord’s buildings, transporting his wood for fuel, and the like; the latter consisted mainly in repairing roads, bridges and other public works. The corvées were levied either on the holding in land or on the adult peasant, and were often commuted in money. They were sometimes, in the first part of the period, partially paid for, and the expenses for extraordinary public works, as, for example, after a flood or an earthquake, continued to be supplied by the authorities. The general tendency in the fiefs was, however, toward a gradual increase of the imposition of unpaid labor. In 1616, the corvée in the Akita fief was 236 day-men per 100 koku; in 1845, it was in the Sendai fief as high as 6000 or more day-men. In 1799, the Mito fief employed nearly two million day-men out of the peasant population of two hundred thousand. These figures do not include the poorly paid service of the post-horse system, which proved a great burden to peasants near the high roads.
Of the customary taxes, some, as, for example, straw, bran, hay, and wood for fuel, seem originally to have been used, at least in part, in connection with the corvée for the lord, but were later commuted into rice and money, and became independent dues. There were several other taxes, including dues for the baron's groceries, for the bait for his hawks and fodder for his horses, for the performance of Shinto ritual services at Ise, and the like, which, beginning as incidental or local dues, became customary and universal within the fief. The villages of the domain lands paid fixed taxes whose issues were intended for the maintenance of the post-horse system, of the officials in charge over the suzerain's store-houses in Edo, and of men employed in his kitchen, all levied on the peasant holdings. On the same basis were imposed, in both domain lands and fiefs, dues paid in beans, a kind of sesame, millet, and glutinous rice, as well as those levied nominally on certain domesticated plants, on the use of grass on waste-land and of ponds and rivers, and many other items. These taxes would be considerable in the aggregate, even if each was small and did not increase, but in many a fief some of them were neither small nor fixed. At Mito, for instance, the bean, sesame, and millet taxes alone amounted to nearly 10 per cent. of the recorded annual productivity of land; at Akita, the bran, straw, and hay taxes, converted into money, increased from 4.8 lbs. of silver per 100 koku of the productive value of the holding about 1650 to 32.3 lbs. about 1860. These were conspicuous, but not extreme, examples. Perhaps not the least objectionable feature of the customary taxes was that frequently they were collected by officials specially despatched to the villages at a time when the latter had already paid their annual land-tax and were again almost as poor as before the harvest. The fear that the main tax might suffer if the customary dues were collected at the same time with it was so great that the latter were usually preceded by the former. Nor were they always consolidated, as they sometimes were, to a large saving of the expense of collection. Commuting in money was not always a blessing, for the rates would be unfavorable, particularly when the taxes had been, as they often were, farmed out to private collectors. 168

The evils of farming were probably more frequent with the taxes on various secondary occupations and products other
than the grains. These dues were extremely numerous in every fief or domain land. They did not always fall directly on the farmers, but nevertheless redounded to them in the form of increased prices of articles. As we come nearer the end of the period, especially after 1800, we see barons' governments recklessly multiplying the kinds of taxes of this class.\textsuperscript{109}

Over and above these multifarious taxes, there were expenses of the village administration to be borne, including the salaries of village-officials, repairs of the public works of the village, cost of policing the village against fire and robbery, of entertaining visiting officials, of making petitions, and the like. They were levied either on the holding, on the individual peasant, or on each peasant family. They were at first almost negligible, and, in the suzerain's domains, where the accounts of the village were to be open to the inspection of the peasant, continued to be comparatively light. In some fiefs, however, it was not uncommon that, owing to the venality of village and higher officials, the village expenses equalled or exceeded the total amount of taxes for the fiefs.\textsuperscript{110}

That the bribery of the officials was a frequent and serious evil is reflected in the continuous repetition of the instructions issued to them on this point and in the persistent order to the peasants to impeach corrupt officials. Unfortunately, however, there was every temptation for corrupt practices to grow up between the feared but ill-paid official on the one hand and the passive and blindly self-interested peasant on the other. For a considerate though illegal act of an official at the assessment or collection of a tax, a farmer would be induced to entertain him at his house, to bribe him, to sell him things at a nominal cost, or to borrow from him at usurious rates. Examples of self-denying rural administrators were not wanting, but more frequently both people and officials came to regard taxation as a field for secret dealings and understandings.\textsuperscript{111} These easily escaped the notice of special supervisors that the suzerain and the baron occasionally sent in circuit about villages,\textsuperscript{112} and continued to raise the expenses of the peasant.

Moreover, it should be noted that, both the suzerain and the baron ordered special irregular requisitions in addition to the regular taxes. Indeed, it was one of the suzerain's favorite methods of weakening the barons to impose requisitions upon the fiefs for extraordinary needs, such as the building
and repairing of the temples at Nikkô and Edo and of the Imperial palace, his own journeys to Kyoto, the reception of foreign envoys, and, in the later years, the defense of the coast against European aggression. Besides these requisitions from Edo, which were borne ultimately by none but the tax-payers, the people of specially ill-governed fiefs were subjected to illegal and irregular exactions by warrior-officials, some of whom even went to the extent of collecting the next years' taxes in advance.\textsuperscript{113}

All these numerous taxes—levied in so complex a manner on the peasant holdings, families and individuals, paid at so high rates in money, labor, rice and other products, and, above all, increased so continuously in many of their secondary items,—were, nevertheless, insufficient to meet the growing expenditures of the government.\textsuperscript{114} Still more unfortunately, when the tax-rates, originally high enough, were being raised, the productive power of the peasant family was, as will be remembered, already declining. If, in 1650, from his holding of 1 chô (2.45 acres) of rice-land, a peasant paid out of the average crop of 20 koku (about 100 bushels), 5 koku of the land-tax, 2 or 3 of the other taxes, and netted the remaining six-tenths of his income, he would, in 1800, be able to raise but 15 koku on the same land, while his land-tax and other dues had risen to 10 or more and village expenses absorbed at least 5. He had become a mere tool to move the spade.\textsuperscript{115} How was he to provide for his farming implements, horse and harness, incidental expenses, irregular imposts, sickness, and calamity? Where was the money to buy the very manure? This last question was serious, for although, it is true, the Japanese peasant was fortunate in being able to rely so largely on human labor and human manure, it was none the less becoming more and more difficult to go without buying other manure, as new land was tilled, rotations of crops were discarded, and the farming was growing yearly more intensive.\textsuperscript{116} When the farmer wished to borrow, he had to submit to rates of interest as high as 25 or 30 per cent. per annum, so that, it was said about 1720, a debt of five ryô would ruin his family in five years.\textsuperscript{117} That the average peasant did subsist despite these alarming conditions was due to the sundry crops of cereals and vegetables he was obliged to raise, and to such subsidiary industries, including the silk-culture, as he was
compelled to pursue. These, of course, if they brought to him the needed income, also made his otherwise arduous life toilsome to the extreme. Signs of his weariness, both material and moral, are visible from the early years of the régime, and continued to multiply through the period. Conservative as he naturally was, his fortune altered and his land changed hands with much ease.

One will now be able to appreciate the deeper significance of those minute measures of economic and moral paternalism of the feudal authorities which were discussed earlier in this paper. It was by dint of these measures that the meagre prosperity of the peasant might be maintained at all. The government was not, however, content with negative orders alone, but also eagerly encouraged the tilling of new land, putting restrictions only where they were necessary, and, it must be admitted, succeeded in making the acreage of cultivated land probably twice as large at the end of the period as at the beginning. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of this great fact, and yet it was not a pure gain to the peasant. The consequent decrease of waste-land deprived him much of the manure which Nature had afforded in the form of decayed hay, while at the same time more manure than before was needed in his increasingly intensive farming. Also, enlarged crops of rice throughout Japan tended, except in years of famine, to check the price of this cereal, which the farmer sold, from advancing in proportion to the continual adulteration of coins and rise of prices of other things, which he bought. Unfortunately, too, there was little outside market to which surplus rice could be exported, for Japan's door was closed almost totally against foreign trade. Nor should it be forgotten that so long as the principal form of agricultural labor remained manual, the very limit of the working capacity made an indefinite expansion of the cultivated area a physical impossibility. Small as was the average landed estate in Japan, it seemed in general to have been even too large for the holding peasant to manage. It is highly interesting to see that this fundamental condition served to make Japan persist as a country of essentially small farming, in spite of the universal need for more wealth. This condition not only tended to limit the size of the estate of the average peasant, but also, together with the taxes too
high in relation to the rent, made it an unprofitable investment for the rich to enlarge their landed properties. This natural equilibrium was only the more strongly insured by the restrictions imposed by law upon the alienation of land.

The selling and mortgaging of land was, indeed, a necessity for the penurious peasant. The authorities, in their anxiety to prevent aggrandisement by the rich few, forbade a permanent sale of old land, and restricted mortgage. However, "without free sale of land," wrote Tanaka Kyōgu, about 1720, "what province or what district, whether in a fief or in a domain land, would be able to pay all its taxes?" Mortgages often meant permanent transfers, and always were attended with high rates of interest. Hence, illicit or specially permitted sales were effected under all conceivable devices to elude the law. It should not be imagined, however, that the peasant cheerfully parted with his hereditary holdings of land. On the contrary, few things were done more reluctantly than this extreme measure, which deprived the farmer of the only material basis of his humble status, lowered him in the eyes of his neighbours, and disgraced him in the memory of his ancestors. Thus the peasant struggled on between his family pride and his penury, and between the restrictions of sale and mortgage and the forced necessity of modest livelihood.

The general tendency among the rural population was not towards a greater inequality, but towards a continual change of fortune within limited bounds.

The loss of the peasant estate was liable to be followed by more regrettable circumstances. While the poor peasant might be hired by a more fortunate neighbour as farm-hand, he oftener chose to migrate to a city and take service under a warrior or a merchant, for it would give him a higher wage with less labor than on the farm. When he returned, he would have acquired the speculative point of view and the extravagant habits that ruled in the larger cities. He thus carried about him a certain restless and flippant air, and the half-exhausted inhabitants of the village contained elements susceptible exactly to this sort of influence. Soon every part of the country came to feel a longing for easy money and easy life. From the end of the seventeenth century, the supply even for menial service in the warrior's or merchant's household was growing
scarce. In order to remedy this difficulty, the authorities, who in the earlier years had taken great pains to forbid sales of persons and to limit the terms of personal service, were now obliged to modify the law to a considerable extent. Every district, if not every village, contained landless persons who would live rather by speculation, trading on popular superstitions, contracts, gambling, fraud, or robbery, than any from of honest labor. Especially, provinces near Edo were infested with the most desperate classes of brigands.

These dangerous elements in the rural population made themselves felt in years of famine. They led or joined discontented peasants, hundreds or thousands of whom would rise in mobs, as it often happened in different parts of Japan, and everywhere in 1787–8, and destroy and rob merchants' establishments and demand radical changes of prices. As was characteristic with uneducated peasants, they were on these occasions extremely foolhardy, coarse and cruel, but, when confronted with strong armed forces, broke down abruptly. It was in order to prevent these events that good rulers filled public granaries in ordinary years, and in famines opened them and fed poor peasants on generous scales. A success of these measures was always considered a mark of wise rural administration, for it was tacitly understood that the people should not be expected to be able to provide for their own needs in hard years.

Riots took place only at unusual times. What was of continual occurrence in all parts of Japan from the beginning to the end of the Tokugawa period was the desertion of the impoverished peasant of his ancestral home and hamlet. In ordinary years, the estate of the runaway would be cultivated and its taxes paid by his relatives or village, but at every slight increase of hardship such large numbers would abscond that, despite the rigorous laws of the joint responsibility of the village, much cultivated land would be laid waste, or at best be thrust into unwilling hands and decline in productivity. A literal enforcement of law would only increase the number of runaways. Nothing is more significant of the rural government under the Tokugawa than this subject of the desertion of the peasant.

The peasant wishing to run away was apt to find a ready solution of his problem in the multiplicity of land tenures that
prevailed in feudal Japan. There were, besides the estates of civil nobles and of religious institutions, the suzerain's domain lands, the baron's fiefs, and lands apportioned to some of their vassals, with a great diversity of financial laws and customs. The deserter from a fief might pass into a domain land, as it often took place, or the reverse. He might also pass from the baron's own land to land held by one of his vassals. It was not uncommon that a vassal's land was situated adjacent to, or even in the same village with, a holding of his lord. A destitute peasant in the latter would either in some manner transfer the title over what little patches of land still remained in his hands to a person in the vassal's territory, preferably to its manager, who was generally regarded one of the most sinful of all men, or else himself move into the territory. The process of removal might also be reversed, according to the circumstance.

One remarkable fact in the economic history of this period is the apparently slow increase of population beside a great extension of the area of cultivated land. The latter increased from perhaps 5000000 in 1600 to more than 11500000 acres at the end of the régime, while the former rose from 26060000 in 1721 to only 26900000 in 1847. Allowing for the probable inexactness of the official statistics, it is worthy of note that, after the middle of the eighteenth century down to 1867, cases of considerable increase of population in the provinces are rarely met with. Evidently the terrible famines which visited Japan repeatedly at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century decimated the people. For under no condition would an isolated agricultural community be so helpless as under a universal failure of crops and famine. Yet it is striking that the nation should have been so slow, as it was, to recuperate. The successive famines reducing the population raised the wages, it was complained, but the natural equilibrium which should be expected did not follow. In a few fiefs, the population slowly increased between the famines and the end of the period, but their taxable population actually decreased. An explanation would suggest itself that it was the small land-holding peasantry, rather than the total population, that did not increase. It has already been shown that circumstances led peasants in many places to have recourse to illicit
sales and mortgages, to menial service to the merchant and warrior classes, to irregular modes of life, and to desertion. Not a few turned peddlers and petty merchants, much against the policy of the government, and thereby created more intermediate steps between the producer and consumer, raising prices and producing nothing.

There were not absent certain forces that counteracted the tendency of the taxable population to remain stationary. Among these may be mentioned the conscious measures adopted in many districts to increase their peasant population, either by generally good administration, by forbidding infanticide and giving bounties for births, by inducing people of other classes and districts to settle down as farmers, or by encouraging the opening of hitherto uncultivated land. Besides, the laws restricting changes of residence and sales of land, the high taxes of land discouraging aggrandisement by the rich, the general economic conditions still too little advanced to make the comparative disadvantage of the agricultural occupation overwhelming, and, also, the tenacious family institutions breeding conservative views of life,—these circumstances, too, must have tended to make the peasant think twice before abandoning his status. In the main, however, nothing could resist the two mighty forces that silently but surely carried the régime to its destiny. The first was the fundamental question of land versus population. If the average rice-land, such as formed the basis of taxation under the Tokugawa, was capable of supporting the population at the rate of one person on every one and a quarter acres, it would have taken thirty million acres, instead of the five to eleven and a half millions of the cultivated area during this period, to maintain Japan's rural population of about twenty-four million souls. The actual rate was only one half acre per head. It is true that potatoes, oranges, grapes, cotton, and a few other crops more valuable than rice were raised in some districts, but these were, except the first, purely local, and their cultivation was generally not allowed to encroach upon that of rice. It is also true that the government was alive to the danger of over-population, and forbade indefinite divisions of estates, but this measure created undesirable social conditions among the younger sons of the peasant. It must be admitted, too, that the peasant family could and
usually did undertake the silk-culture and other secondary occupations, and, indeed, these were the saving elements of the rural life. Nevertheless, one can hardly avoid the general conclusion that the Japan under the Tokugawa contained a population as large, if not too large, as could be supported by her intensive agriculture.

The second fundamental question was the productive power of the soil versus the expenditures of the government, the latter increasing and the former relatively decreasing though perhaps absolutely increasing.144 The economics of the nation were inadequate to support the finances of the State. One has but to remember with what unceasing effort, though with ultimate failure, the paternal rulers strove to bridge the widening gap with the labor of the peasant, whom they caressed, exhorted, threatened, and wearied.

In conclusion, let us, from the historical point of view, suggest a few other lines of criticism of the régime than have already been touched upon. One may attempt to judge the merit of a movement by comparing its final results with its original objects. Ask, therefore, if the ingenious and elaborate polity of the Tokugawa, so far as it concerned village administration, succeeded in attaining its primary object: namely, to secure the submission and the contentment of the peasant population to a degree that it would cheerfully and without friction contribute the fruits of its labor to the maintenance of the warrior class, and to the perpetuation of the power of the Tokugawa.

To this general question no impartial student would hesitate to return an affirmative answer. It was nothing short of genius in statesmanship that wove the great fabric of the Tokugawa government; it completely overwhelmed the lawless elements of which the Japan of the seventeenth century was full, and continued without serious interruptions to exercise an almost absolute control over national affairs during the rule of fifteen successive suzerains. The profound peace thus brought about enabled a large part of Japan's arable land to be turned to cultivation, numerous arts and industries to be built up, and a highly diversified civilization to be developed
and diffused among the people. If this wonderful régime failed to prevent the rise of certain evils, they would be found to have been largely due to the fact that the government was essentially feudal, and that it had to be built upon the existing conditions of the family and society. Nor did the evils harm any one so much as they did the suzerain's own government.

It would, however, be unjust to ignore the evils, even if we lay aside the question how much they were within the moral control of the suzerain. They were many, and some of them have been of immense magnitude. To be brief. Just as the suzerain's policy toward the feudal classes had subdued them at the cost of their true vigor and their genuine loyalty to himself, so his control of the peasants stifled their enterprise, limited their wealth, and levelled down their conditions. If they did not rise in a general revolt, it was because they were thoroughly deprived of not only the opportunity, but also the energy, to protest. When at last the national crisis came in the middle of the nineteenth century, just as the feudal classes chose to make no serious effort to defend the waning power of the Tokugawa, but, on the contrary, furnished men to efface it, so the peasants, also, proved surprisingly indifferent.

The great Revolution was begun and consummated by discontented warriors, with the rural population too weary and too meek to lift a finger in the cause of their own liberation. It has been said that the great reform was accomplished without a drop of the peasants's blood being shed, but the fact does not reflect honor upon them. They are still largely passive under the new rights that have been heaped upon them. What has been training them since the Revolution is not so much their new political power, for as yet hardly one in every forty farmers has a vote, as the national system of education, their amalgamation with the other classes of society, which is growing apace, and the object lessons in public interest taught by the stirring events that have transpired about them in the East.

If, however, the peasant has emerged from the feudal régime with little added wealth and energy, he has also inherited from it two important legacies: a moderate but secure holding in land, and a wonderful capacity for discipline. These are the great material and moral debts of the new age to the old. History will probably tell of what immense value the heritage has been for the upbuilding of a steady and collected nation.
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45. Den-so en-daku yō-ki, 田租沿革要記, [brief history of the land-tax in Japan], by Kōda Shisei, 幸田思成, of the same Department. Tokyo, 1898. 1 vol. (no. s.). Contains Koku-daka kō, 諏訪高, and errata of the Dai Ni-kan so-sei shi.

46. DEN-SEI HEN, 田制篇, [excerpts from sources and literature relating to land and taxation], compiled by Yokoyama Yoshikyo, 橋山由清, of the former Gen-rō-in. Tokyo 1883. 11 vols. (no. s.)
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47. Den-en rui-setsu, 田園類設, [notes on land and taxation], by Komiyama Mokunoshin, 小宮山茂進 (early 18th century), and revised and augmented by Tani Motonori, 谷本敬 (d. 1752), Ōishi Hisayoshi, 大石久敬 (d. 1707), and Yamashita Tadamasa, 山下重正, 1842. In the Zoku-zoku Gun-sho rui-zhi 續續群書類従 series, VII, (Tokyo, 1907). 287–354.

48. Hi-kata han-rei roku, 地方凡例録, [treatise on the taxation and rural administration of the suzerain's domain lands], compiled by Ōishi Hisayoshi, 1794. 2 copies. (1) Revised edition by Ōkura Gi, 大倉義, 1886. 11 vols. (no. s.). (2) Manuscript. 11 vols. (no. s.)
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49. Ji-kata ochi-do shū, 地方蕃簿集, [notes on financial administration of the domain lands], by Yasumichi?, 幸路. Revised by Ōtsuki Tadaoki. 大月祝年. Tokyo, 1870. 14 vols. (o.s.)

50. Ji-kata dai-gai shū, 地方概要集, [dōto], by Katō Takabumi, 加藤高美. Osaka, 1874. 2 series, 8 vols. (o.s.)


Many illustrations and accounts.

52. Ji-kata Gakari Atsukai-hō Shū- sei, 地方経済法協, 地方経済法協, [practical notes on financial administration]. Anon. 1796. Manuscript. 4 vols. (o.s.)

53. On tori-ka kokoro-e gaki, 御取簡心得書, [practical notes on taxation in the domain lands], copied by one Miyasaka, 宫坂. Manuscript. 2 vols. (o.s.)

54. Ban-shū go nen-gu mai osame-harai kashi no de-yako chu-go-yō tome, 播州御年賀米納添河岸之田役中御書留, [documents relative to transporting tax-rice from Harima to Osaka, in 1831]. Manuscript. 1 vol. (o.s.)
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56. Ta-kata ken-mi on tori-ka shi-tate kō, 田畑振見御取簡仕立法, [practical notes on assessing taxes and making accounts], by Kobayashi Tetsuzirō, 小林鉄次郎, of the financial department of the suzerain's government, 1848. Manuscript. 1 vol. (o.s.)

57. Wa-ta ken-mi shi-gō chō, 未授見仕様帳, [notes on measuring the productive power of cotton-land in Yamato, Settsu, Kawachi, and Idzumi], compiled by Ōno Chū-sai, 大野忠齋. No date. Manuscript. 1 vol. (o.s.)

58. Chi-so kai-zei hō-koku sho, 地租改正報告書, [report to the Prime Minister Sanjō on the reform of the land-tax], by (now Marquis) Matsukata Masayoshi, 松方正義, then Minister of Finance. Tokyo, 1882. 1 vol., 197 pages.

59. Fu-ken chi-so kai-zei ki-kyō, 府県地租改正紀要, [reports of the three Cities and thirty-six Prefectures on the change of the land-tax], compiled by the Department of Finance. Tokyo, [1882?]. 1 vol., 39 sections.

60. Go-nin-gumi sei-do no ki-gen, 五人組制度の起源, [on the origin of the five-man group system], by Prof. Miura Shūkō, 三浦同行. The Hō-ri ren-so 法理論叢 series, No. 9. Tokyo, 1900. 1 vol., 88 pages.
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66. HI-HAN TEN-KEI, 偏譜典刑, [orders of Ikeda Mitsumasa, 池田光政, lord of Oksyama 1642-71], compiled by Yussa Zhô-zan, 渡浅常山 (1708-81). Manuscript. 4 vols. (o.s.)
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70. Gin-dai e-shi, 銀臺逸事, [notes on the life of Hosokawa Shigekata, 細川重賢, lord of Higo and Bungo, 1718-85], Anon. Manuscript. 4 vols. (o.s.)

71. YÔ-ZAN KO SEI-KI, 龍山公世紀, [life of Uesugi Harunori, 上杉治憲, lord of Yonesawa, 1751-1822], compiled by Ikeda Nariaki, 池田成章. Tokyo, 1906. 1 vol. 1056 pages.
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73. U-YO SÔ-SHO, 羽陽實書, [writings of Uesugi Harunori, with notes on his life], compiled by Ysoita Baisetsu, 矢尾作梅雪, Nozoki Tai-kwa, Haru Raku-san, 原樂山, and Asaoka Nan-koku, 朝岡南谷. Yonesawa, 1879–83. 3 series, (kan-ō, gyô-so, and sei-toku), in 6 vols. (o.s.)

Largely superseded by the last two works.

75. *Sei-zan kan-setsu*, 青山閑話, [notes on the life of Hosoi Hei-shū, 細井平洲, once tutor and councillor to the same lord]. Anon. Manuscript. 1 vol. (o.s.)

76. *Shirakawa Raku-o kō to Tokugawa shi-dai*. 白河樂翁公と 徳川時代, [life and times of Matsudaira Sadanobu, 松平定信, lord of Shirakawa and councillor to the suzerain, 1759–1829], by Professor Mikami Sanshi. 三上参次. Tokyo, 1891. 1 vol. (o.s.)
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88. *Kei-zai rōku*, 經濟錄; [views on government], by Dazai Shun-dai, 太宰春臺 (1890—1747), 1739. Manuscript. 10 vols. (o. s.) Thoroughly Confucian.

89. *Shun-dai zatsu-wa*, 鑑臺雑話; [miscellaneous notes on history, morals, and literature], by Muro Kyū-uso, 室鳩巢 (1688—1734), 1732. 5 bks. In the *Ni-hon rin-ri i-ken* series, VII. 81—309.


92. *Ama no toku me*, 霊の燒く霧; [miscellaneous notes], by Mori-kawa Takamori, 森川孝盛, c. 1790. In the same series, XI, 122 pages.

93. *Ō-mei-ken i-so*, 時鷹館遺草, posthumous ethical-political works by Homi Hei-shū, once tutor to Usuii Harumori and other barons, (1728—1801). 6 bks. In the *Ni-hon rin-ri i-ken* series, IX. 9—161.

Examples of the great influence of Confucian ideas on rural government.


95. *Ninomiya zen-sei go-rui*, 二宮先生語録, sayings of Ninomiya Takanori, compiled by the same pupil. 4 bks. In the same series, X. 440—542.

96. *Chi-so ron*, 地租論, [on the land-tax and its relation to the life of the peasantry], by the late Fukuzawa Yukichi, 福澤諭吉, about 1893. In the *Fukuzawa Yukichi zen-shū* (全集), V.

97. *Hō-sei ron-san*, 法制論纂, [seventy-eight essays and addresses on the institutional history of Japan by various scholars], edited by the *Kokua-gaku-in*, 國學院. Tokyo, 1903. 1 vol., 1446 pages.
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Abbreviations.

The following abbreviations are used in the Notes for those works which receive frequent reference. Two capitals, (for example, 'BR'), are used for each old work which consists primarily of sources; a capital and a small letter, (for example, 'Mi'), for each old secondary authority; three capitals, (for example, 'DSR'), for each recent work consisting mainly of sources; and a capital and two small letters, (for example, 'Hrx'), for each recent secondary authority.


DSH 46. DEN-SEI HEN.  MK 62. Mura Shō-Ya ....  KYOTO.
MO 63. MURA SHŌ-YA .... OSAKA.
Ng 12. Nō-gyō zen-sho.
Nn 95. Ninomiya sen-sei go-rui.
NTK 72. NOZOKI TAI-KWA O.
OK 82. ON KE-MI TE-TSU-DZUKI.
Oo 93. O-mei-kwan i-so.
OO 84. Ō-SHŌ-YA .... OSAKA.
OT 23. ON TORI-KA KOKO-RO-E GAKI
RD 25. RITSU-REI DAI HIROKU.
RHI 24. RUI-REI HI-ROKU.
RR 32. RITSU-REI ROKU.
Sb 90. Sō-hō ki-gen.
SCR 39. SUI-CHIN ROKU.
SCY 40. SUI-CHIN YO-ROKU.
Sd 89. Shūn-dai zatsu-wa.
SDS 84. SEN-DAI HAN SO-ZEI YO-RYAKU.
Sg 66. Shū-gi gwa-sho.

Shr 76. Shirakawa Raku-ō kō ... .
Shz 102. Shi-gaku sa-sshi.
Srn 19. Simmons-Wigmore, 
Notes ....
Ssw 83. Shū-gi wa-sho.
T4 5. Tokugawa baku-ju shi-
    dai shi.
Tk 15. Tokugawa baku-ju ken-
    ji yō-ryaku.
Tkr 21. TOKUGAWA KIN-REI 
    KÔ.
Tmk 36. TOKUGAWA MIN-ZHI 
    KWAN-REI SHU.

Tuk 68. Tsugan Nobumasa kō.
To 3. Tokugawa shikiki.
Tk 99. Tokugawa sei-kyō kō.
Tt 56. Ta-hata ken-mi .......
Us 72. U-YÔ SÔ-SHO.
Uyz 74. Uesugi Yō-san kō.
Wa 57. Wata ken-mi ....
Wiz 38. Wigmore, Materials ..... 
YZS 71. YÔ-ZAN KÔ SARI-KI.
Zo 4. Zoku Tokugawa shikiki.

(Note: The Notes accompanying this article will appear in a subsequent number of the Journal.)

(NB: The sigla for the Septuagint codd. are, in the book of Genesis, those of the larger Cambridge edition; for the other books, those of Swete’s manual edition or those used in his Introduction; the figures refer to manuscripts in the edition of Holmes-Parks. A = Lucian. The abbreviations of the Biblical books are for the most part the same as in the Oxford Concordance.)

The first of the canons laid down by the noted Septuagint scholar LAGARDE requires on the part of the student who aims at recovering the original text of the Greek translation of the Old Testament, a “knowledge of the style of the individual translators,” with which is coupled a “faculty of referring variant readings to their Semitic original, or else of recognizing them as inner-Greek corruptions.” It is obvious that LAGARDE has reference merely to the material side of the task and ignores the formal questions of orthography and grammar altogether. It is a matter with which the future editor will have to grapple, whether, for example, he should admit forms with anaptyx, as ἀγαρεμα, ἀγαρεῖω, ἀμβαὶ. He will have to choose between ἂγεν and ἂγεν, ἀγενοςαν and ἀγενον, σονῆσαν and σονῆσας, φῆγε and φῆγεσα, ἀγήν and ἀγήσεται, δαυνοθρόσαται and δαυνογνται. With a view to all such questions the editor will have to study the grammatical evidence presented by the papyri and other


contemporaneous literature in order to determine the linguistic forms with which the translators may be credited. In this sense the way has been paved by H€hl€ng's "Grammatik der Septuaginta" which, however, ignores the cursive entirely. There will be also questions of internal Greek syntax on which the Semitic original has no bearing.

What Lagarde really means by the original text of the Septuagint is that text which, from among the conflicting forms it has assumed in the history of its transmission, conforms to the Semitic original underlying the translations ("die Vorlage") and to the conception of its meaning on the part of the translators (their exegesis). The First Lagardian Canon is thus a rule for identifying the Greek with the Semitic, the Greek text, buried at present in a mass of variants, with the great unknown quantity, the "Vorlage," with which the prototype of the received Masoretic text was by no means wholly identical. After an elimination of the irrational element of chance corruptions or of the disfiguring element of conscious alteration (diaseuastic corrections and interpolations), there remains the stupendous task of retroversion for which indeed a knowledge of the style of each individual translator is an all-important prerequisite. The pitfalls are many, not the least being mechanical haste. Lagarde himself was a sinner in that direction. Following the lead of Le 2613, he referred μερα παραφρασ― openly, publicly (comp. Talmudic אפרהב) Pr 10:10 back to רשם. He forgot that he was dealing with a translation which aims at elegance rather than at literal accuracy, as well as the fact that the rendering in Le is equally free. רשם means properly with head erect; one can be made to walk with head erect, but one cannot reprove a friend with head erect. It is a question of Hebrew idiom pure and simple. The Hebrew phrase underlying μερα παραφρασ― Pr 10:10 remains an unknown quantity.

The phrase occurs, for instance, also in I Ma 4:16: και μερα ταυτα λαθετα εκεινα και (εφ. SIX.) μερα παραφρασ―. Who will attempt to render it into Hebrew? As a matter of fact, in passages wanting in the Hebrew, all attempts at retroversion are un-

1 Göttingen 1907.
scientific. Take, for example, the plus Le 10:2: ἵππος τῷ ἡσυχασμῷ. Ryssel (in Kittel's Bible) renders: יְשָׁעֵהוֹ בְּרָדָא (comp. Ex 40:22); but just as possible, or the original (comp. Ex 28:43 30:21) is just as possible. Not even the particle is certain; for, though יְשָׁעֵהוֹ will suggest itself first, is quite as correct (comp. Ex 38:27 (40:37)).

It may be even laid down as a canon that certainty of identification is possible only when the translator has misread or misinterpreted the original. Just as complete identity is often a less reliable criterion of the affinity of languages than differentiations of sound regulated by law, so it is only through variation, provided it is psychologically explainable, that we may with certainty arrive at the true text underlying a translation. Thus ἴππος is 60:11 corresponds to יְשָׁעֵהוֹ, but מִנַּכֵּל or מִנַּכֵּל or (if the sense be "led as captives") מִנַּכֵּל would be possible equivalents, and we cannot say with absolute certainty that our text was read by the translator. But ἴππος Le 1:4 to which רַבּוּעַ corresponds in the Hebrew, points with necessity to רַבּוּעַ as its equivalent, and to nothing else; for both רַבּוּעַ and רִבּוּעַ (Ex 32:2) are reducible to one and the same consonantal text.

Not merely a "knowledge of the style of the individual translators" leads to correct identification, but equally a knowledge of the style of the individual Hebrew writers. Otherwise anachronism ensues. When Kittel (in his Bible) puts down στρεφόμενοι as Ge 37:32 = רִבּוּעַ as a variant for יְשָׁעֵהוֹ, he not only misconceives the paraphrastic character of the translation (hence also the free addition אָדָו), but, which is less pardonable, burdens the Jahvist with an expression which occurs but once in E (Ex 32:2), and is elsewhere in the Hexateuch confined to P.

1 The proportion of 1 to 3 is 163:251 in the Septuagint, 2:3 in Aquila, 5:4 in Symm., 1:4 in Theod., 3:8 in LXX., 0:1 in Hebr.

2 In accordance with a well-known orthographic rule; see WEILHÄUSER, Der Text der Bücher Sam added, pp. v-vii. Comp. Ex 15:32 יְשָׁעֵהוֹ (יְשָׁעֵהוֹ) / יְשָׁעֵהוֹ; 18:7 יְשָׁעֵהוֹ (יְשָׁעֵהוֹ) / יְשָׁעֵהוֹ.
The "units" of individual translations still to be determined. It is furthermore gratuitous to assume that each of the Biblical books was rendered by a new and "individual" translator. Prologues, as in the case of Ecclesiasticus, and colophons, as at the end of Job or Esther, are rare; for the most part we are left to internal evidence to determine the limits of a "unit" of translation. The "higher criticism" of the Greek version is in its very beginnings. We may assume, for example, that the Twelve are the work of one translator; the question is, how much more? A singular rendering like σωτάρω for Hebrew רַעַד (suggested by רַעַד σωτάρως Ge 1, Je 3:17 and רַעַד σωταρִי Ge 1:10) which meets us at 5:170 occurs again twice in Je 8:12 and 27:50. It would be reasonable to ascribe both Jeremiah and the Twelve to one and the same translator, provided of course a sufficient number of similar criteria were available.

The method of Procedure. In order, however, to discover the total sum of criteria, the student must obviously collect his data from the whole of the Greek Old Testament, whereupon he may proceed to distribute them among the various groups of translators thus brought to light. The right method would be first to ascertain the attitude of the general sum of translators towards all of the phenomena which go to make up a translator's style; on the basis of similarity or dissimilarity of "reaction," the idiosyncrasies of the individual translators will reveal themselves. For a translator's style is the total sum of "reactions" of the ways in which the original is handled by him in the various provinces of grammar, rhetoric, semantics, and exegesis.

Illustrations: Take, for example, the use of the historical present (with ἔστι or preceding καὶ) to express the Hebrew וַיִּשָּׁא_consecutivum cum imperfecto. Examples are frequent in K; there is just one example in Jd. How far the usage extends beyond the books just mentioned, remains to be investigated. It is clear that, in order to establish the interrelation of various books, the student must go through the entire Old Testament in Greek.

---

1 5 was apparently taken as μόνας accusativi; passivum pro activo?
2 Activum pro passivo.
3 מַגְּשֶׁה / מַגְּשֶׁה
4 E. g., 1K 5:6-11, 7; 2:21, 13; 17:11, 30:11, III K 18:49.
5 17.
Or take the criterion of "subordination in the place of coordination." The following types are met with:

Subordination in the place of Coordination.

(a) καὶ λαβοῦσα ἐφαγεν ἑβαζωθα τηθα (e.g. Ge 3:8, 4:1, 41 1415);
(b) καὶ παχυνοτος καταγγειε ἔοντερα ἔοντερα (e.g., Ge 45:12)
De 23 13(10) 30 2);
(c) ἀναγγείων καταφέκτωσεν αὐτοῖς (e.g., Ex 15:17)
Jb 39 31);
(d) ἀναγγείων καταφέκτωσεν εἰς ἐπίσταντα (e.g., Ex 33:4);
(e) καὶ ἐντελεῖα ἐφαγεν ἑλκασθα ... ἑλκασθα (e.g., Ge 2:16, 23 17 3)
43 16 + Ex 6 26 + Nu 21 16 8 IK 14 15 7; ibid. 34 8).

Or, "the generic singular for the Semitic plural"; e.g., Si 4 12 ὑμεῖς αὐτῷ ὑμεῖς / ἡμᾶς ἡμῖν;
47 22 τοὺς ἰσαρχαῖς αὐτῶν / ἡμῖν (719).

Or, conversely, "the plural for the generic singular in Semitic;" e.g., Ge 4:20 τῶν κατοικο-
νών / βίου; Ne 12 14 καὶ οἱ συναγιμένοι (apparently neuter plural)
λο αὐτοῖς (οἱ εἰς τοὺς γαθοφανείους) δροχονεν τῶν πόλεων =
πόλεων / πόλεων / τῆς καθορισμένης πόλεως / τῆς καθορισμένης πόλεως; Pr 11 10 Σ. συναγιμέ-
σοντας πόλεα / τοὺς καθορισμένους / τοὺς καθορισμένους; Is 1 23 ἰσαρχαῖς δοῦμα 10 / ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν;
13 15 οἱ συνεργαζόμενοι / οἱ συναγιμένοι γίνον / 
τῆς καθορισμένης πόλεως.

Or, "participial construction in the place of a finite verb in relative clauses;" e.g., Ex 20 2
Δεῦτε ἐναντία τῷ ἡμῶν ἡμῶν; 29 16 δεῦτε ἐναντία τῷ ἡμῶν ἡμῶν;
Ru 4 16 ὑπακούοντος σε / ἡμῶν ἡμῶν ἡμῶν and elsewhere.

Or, conversely, "a relative clause in the place of a Semitic participle;" e.g., I Es 6 69
(Ezr 4 2) ὅτε μετατητα (var. μετατητα) / 

Relative Clauses in the place of Participles.

Is 41 8 ὁ ἡμῶν = ἡμῖν / ἡμῖν, and elsewhere.

15 55 73 78. Lucif. 8 9. 3 omn exc n. 6 A.
20 omn exc 75. 65 7 245. 9 omn exc A.
8 The translator took ῶν ὁμοίως as a general expression summing up
the preceding particulars; in such cases, the Hebrew may and may not
prefix the conjunction which the translator is free to express if he so
chooses; comp. De 15 27 ὁ δὲ τὸν μνῆματα καθάρει / τιμᾶται, ὁ (var. ὁ καλ. καλ) πᾶς μνήματα παρὰς ΑΦ. alii.
19 But ποι ὁ σφάλμα Κεβα.
11 of 106 ὁς Α.

12 ὁς ὁ δὲ an equivalent of ὃς also De 32 32 (unless = ὃς / τὸν) and
Is 29 1; Jc 7 27 (unless τὸς = an abbreviated τὸς, comp. Arabic and
Aramaic imperatives of ἑν ὡς verbs). 13 AF alii.
Complete Induction prevents individualizing what is general

From an imperfect collation like the preceding it becomes evident that (1) a phenomenon may indeed be characteristic of certain groups only; (2) when a phenomenon is scattered over a wide area (possibly the entire area), it ceases to be a mark of individual style, but becomes a general characteristic of translation from Semitic into Greek; (3) certain manuscripts or groups of manuscripts (— recensions) show a predilection for a certain stylistic peculiarity. Thus I find that Lucian frequently substitutes the aorist for the historical present. But such results are conclusive only when complete induction is available; otherwise the student runs the risk of individualizing what is general.

and renders identification possible.

Many identifications, uncertain at the first blush, become incontrovertible when supported by further evidence which the complete induction alone will bring to light. That παρακρήμα, — on the spot, is the equivalent of הָשָּׁה, הָשָּׁה II K 312, Jb 40 7, 8, a matter of doubt for the editors of the Oxford Concordance, is corroborated by Ps 65 (66) 17: 2 (— שָׁהָה / שָׁה). We are safe in identifying δωκαν ϕαλάνσαν Je 43 (36) 20 with νῦν, if we compare τεσσαραγίνας — νῦν Ge 41 39. Si 44 1 δωκαν εὐδοκεῖν for νῦν, since νῦν ceases to be strange when ὁδὸς — νῦν Is 40 8 is compared. Ec 2 26 τοῦ προσθηκόν — καθ (ἡσύχας)/καθ (ἡσύχας), just as Le 19 21 ολ. καὶ συνάγεται — καθ / καθ. When it is remembered that in 99 instances δωκαν is employed for νῦν, it will not be difficult to identify καὶ τεσσαραγίνας Za 4 12 with τί πάσης πληθυντίος / τι πάσης πληθυντίος. Ps 15 (16) συνάγουσι τᾶς συναγωγᾶς αὐτῶν must certainly be reduced to τί πάσης πληθυντίος (τόπων) / τί πάσης πληθυντίος (τόπων), which proves that in the archetype τί πάσης was written πληθυντίος, that is, with the τ expressed, though perhaps “assimilated” in pronunciation. The evidence is afforded by the knowledge that συνάγων — καθ in 11 cases. The last two examples are illustrations of transposition for which other instances are available. Thus Nu 2 23 30, ἡμερίδιον — ἡμερίδιον / ἡμερίδιον; comp. ἐνυδαθὼν — ἐνυδαθὼν Ex 10 22 Nu 22 29 Jd 19 17 1 K 6 6 31 21 1 Ch 10 1, ἡμερίδιον — ἡμερίδιον Is 66 8, ἡμερίδιον — ἡμερίδιον. Do. ibid. 3 4. Is 35 2 καὶ δ’ λύτος οὖν — τί πάσης / τί πάσης, just as Ps 28 (29) καὶ δ’ ἡμερίδιον — τί πάσης / τί πάσης. While the latter identification

1 E. g., Jd 17 1 K 10 21 17 11 II K 18 43.
is supported directly by De 32 \textsuperscript{15} 33 \textsuperscript{1-26} Is 44 \textsuperscript{2}, we may cite in substantiation of the former, examples like Ex 17 \textsuperscript{8} Jo 7 \textsuperscript{11.1} 18 \textsuperscript{24} 2 10 \textsuperscript{23} where δ̄ λαός — ἀνθρώπινα, or Jd 20 \textsuperscript{23} where δ̄ λαός — ἄνθρωποι, or Mi 2 \textsuperscript{12} where δ̄ λαός ἁπλος \textsuperscript{5} or δ̄ λαός \textsuperscript{8} — ἀνθρώποι, or Si 45 \textsuperscript{18} where δ̄ λαός που — ἄνθρωποι, also Je 43 (36) \textsuperscript{6} where δ̄ λαός \textsuperscript{9} and Si 48 \textsuperscript{13} where δ̄ λαός — ἀνθρώποι. Instructive is also Ps 55 (56) \textsuperscript{10} where ἀνθρώποι corresponds to μισόι; comp. Sanhedrin 95 \textsuperscript{a} (and parallele): ὁ δῆμος ἢ ἀνθρώποι ἡ Ἰσραήλ ἡ ΘΕΙΑΣ "the Community of Israel is likened unto a dove". Only through the juxtaposition of the total number of passages \textsuperscript{10} where εἰλασμέναν τινι or ἲπτο τινι — θησάμενος was it possible for Prof. NESTLE \textsuperscript{11} to identify καὶ εἰλασμένως τὸ σώμα αὐτοῦ Mn 3 \textsuperscript{16} with μισόι in the place of our μισόι ἠνακέφαλην and thus to bring to light a reading which is unquestionably the original. He acknowledges his indebtedness to my article "LAMBANEIN (including Derivatives and Compounds) and its Hebrew-Aramaic Equivalents" which appeared in the AJSL, XXII (1906), 110 ff., closing with a confirmation of my own statement that we may obtain through just such work as I am planning, "in the place of the brilliant, but uncertain, guesses, results which may be predicted with almost mathematical accuracy."

Results which are equally certain are afforded it equally leads to by a possession of the complete material when we turn to inner-Greek corruptions. A few examples will not be amiss:

III K 8 \textsuperscript{40} καὶ κρατεῖν ἀντέχει Sixt. (= B. 92. 120. 158. 247) / δῆμος has been recognized as faulty. Mr. Burney emends καὶ κρατεῖν ἀντέχει; he compares Ps 7 \textsuperscript{12}, where ὄργαν ἐκάλεσ — ὑπερ-, and Is 26 \textsuperscript{21} ἐκάλεσ ὁ ὄργαν / ὑπερ-; he should have added ibid. 42 \textsuperscript{24} καὶ ἐκάλεσ ἡ ὄργαν ἡ ὄργαν / ὑπερ- and Si 5 \textsuperscript{8} ἐκάλεσ — ὑπερ-. But he fails to account for the "alteration" in the parallel passage II Ch 6 \textsuperscript{35} καὶ καταγεῖν ἀντέχει for which no variant reading is available. Nevertheless,
we must emend here likewise: μιᾷ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀντίστις or ἐν ἀντίστις. The emendation is rendered plausible by the knowledge that in four other places that have come under my observation ἐν ἀντίστις has by its side the corrupt variant παρά ἐμοῦ.¹

The corrupt reading ἀσκοφοφορεῖσθαι n / ἀσκοφοφορεῖς Ge 42 ¹⁶ finds its analogy in Is 16 ¹¹ where ἀσκοφοφορεῖς² or ἀσκοφοφορεῖς³ is found for ἀσκοφοφορεῖσθαι. The latter is of course the correct reading; the translator pointed ἄσκοφο (or ἀσκόφο, ἄσκοφος) ¹⁴ / ἄσκοφος.

Is 28 ²⁸ τῶν ἀναπνεύσασθαι is apparently corrupt. In the first place τῶν ἀναπνεύσασθαι is itacistic error for τῶν Γ' ; but the whole is corrupt. The translator wrote τῶν μὴ ἀναπνεύσασθαι = θ. With the aid of the emended text, we arrive at the reading ἄναπνεσθαι / ἄναπνεσθαι: (τῶν) μὴ c. infin. = μη c. infin., as may be seen from such an example as μη ἀποκαθέναι = ἀποκαθέναι Is 54 ².²¹ Hence we are led to the conclusion that the translator with his τῶν μὴ διαποκαθέναι μὴδέ ἀναπνεσθαι Za 9 ³ pointed his text ἄσκοφος ἄσκοφος / ἄσκοφος ἄσκοφος. An then to the solution of a more difficult problem: I K 13 ⁶ μη διαποκαθέναι ἀναπνεσθαι is reducible to ἄσκοφο for the received ἄσκοφος. For the graphic variant τὸ / τὸ I cannot quote another instance from my own observations; but undoubtedly examples will be found. On the other hand, I have met with a sufficient number of the (exegetical) misreading (misinterpretation) of τὸ into τῷ and vice versa, and in this very verb I am in a position to cite Is 53 ⁷ where both θ διαποκαθέναι and Σ διαποκαθέναι presuppose ἄσκοφο for the Masoretic ἄσκοφος. The form ἄσκοφο for ἄσκοφος, which suggested itself to the translator, is no more impossible than ἄσκοφο for ἄσκοφος, or ἄσκοφο for ἄσκοφο. This observation leads to another find. Je 44 ⁵ ¹² we read ἀσκοφοφορεῖσθαι / ἐν ἀντίστις. The consonants are supported by ἈΘΥΣ ἘΣ ἘΣ ¹⁰ ¹¹ ¹² ¹³; just how the word was pointed by them, may still be a matter of doubt; at all events, they took it as a denominative from ἐν ἀντίστις. According to Giesebruch, the ren-

¹ Le 20 ⁵ (16. 73. 77); IV K 6 ¹⁵ (243); Je 22 ¹ (106); 25 ² (A). Conversely we find the corrupt σαράζ B. 42 for the correct σαράζ réll En ²² ¹⁷ (Rothstein's retroversion σαράζ is thus rendered problematical).
² ⁹³. ² ⁶². ¹⁴⁷ (bad orthography). The corrupt reading underlies ≠σαράζ ² ²⁵.
³ Comp. Am 7 ¹¹. ¹² Is ³ ³. ¹³ Je ⁴⁷ ⁴⁰ ⁴. ³
⁴ Also ³⁴. ⁴⁹. ⁵¹. ⁶². ¹⁰⁶. ¹⁴⁷. ³⁰⁶. ³⁰⁹. Compl. Hier.
⁵ = Sext (and réll ex aül).
⁶ Actívium pro passìvo.
⁷ μακροφορεῖσθαι.
⁸ μακροφορεῖσθαι.
⁹ ἀναπνεύσασθαι.
¹⁰ ἀναπνεύσασθαι.
¹¹ ἄσκοφος ἄσκοφος.
¹² ut dividet possessionem.
doré of the Septuagint goes back to the same consonants and to the same interpretation. But, to say the least, that is by no means obvious. On the other hand, we find that ἀγοράσω corresponds in two passages to ἢλλη, just as in five passages it represents the synonymous ἀγοράζω, while ᾽Η 10 εἰς ἀγοράζω — ἢλλη. Hence it may be readily conjectured that the translator read in his text ἢλλη! / περίθλη, that is, the same consonants transposed, and that his grammar permitted him to see in the word the form ἢλλη as a possible by-form of περίθλη.²

Da 11.¹⁰ θ καὶ οἱ νῦν αὐτῶν συνάξουσιν ὅλον αὐταὶ μετὰ τολλῶν contains two corruptions: for αὐταὶ μετὰ read with ἈΛ. αἱ τολλῶν, and for συνάξουσιν read συνάψοντοι καὶ συνάξουσιν. Note the variant συνάψοντος 88 for συνάξουσιν, and the insertion of καὶ συνάψοντοι after τολλῶν in Ἀ. The whole is then — βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ οὕτως ὁ γένος ἡμῶν ἐστιν μισθὸς ἡγεμόνι αὐτῶν; συνάπτον τοῖς τολλοῖς, comp. with the object expressed verse 24. θ — ἥρως ὁ ἱερόνη, De 2: ¹² 2: ²³ ²⁴ ἐρμοῦμεν ἡγεμόνας and ibid. ¹³ ¹⁹ — ἱερόνη. Apparently συνάξουσιν was miswritten into συνάψοντοι, and then καὶ συνάξουσιν was omitted; συναψι — and συναξ — are proved as possible variants

¹ Ne 10: ²¹ and II Ch 1: ¹⁸; in the latter passage, ἢλλη is expressed by Ἁ (ὁ Ἀλλήγερος). Also 2: ² ⁶ ⁷ (68) ²⁸ ἢλλη is rendered ἄνεμος.
² I Ch 21 ²¹ ²² Si 37 ²¹ Is 24: ²; AL. Ge 47: ²⁹.
³ Observe that while Τ 32 supply an object denoting “portion, possession”—the “land of Benjamin” and chapter 32 are responsible for this curious bit of exegesis—, certain Greek manuscripts (8. ⁶ ⁸ ⁹ ¹⁰ ¹ⁱ ¹⁵ ¹⁷ ²⁴ ²⁵) rightly add αὐτοῦ, “to buy food”, a most natural thing to do during the momentary raising of the siege. It is true, ἔστω. Jb 40: ²² (29) is rendered by θ ἀγοράζων αὐτὸς (against Ἑρωδίους ἔτοι, Jb ἀγοράζων αὐτὸς, 2 δικαιοῦσαι αὐτῷ ζητεῖ θέτοντα) as ἵλλη and περίθλη are synonymous, it may still be possible to reduce ἀγοράζων in Ἡ to the received περίθλη. If so, that would be another illustration of the value of complete induction. But it remains difficult to see how ἢλλη and ἀγοράζω could be equivalent. Perhaps the Theodotionic rendering belongs to the first half of the verse (περίθλη; comp. De 2 ⁸ where ἦλλη is rendered in ᾿Ε by λιμάνιας I ἰπαράστατα = ἵλλη). An interesting variant in the Ἡ passage is ἀγοράζων (239). Of course, it may be a corruption from ἀγοράζων. On the other hand, it may represent the Masoretic ἢλλη in the sense “to slip through, run away” (see Giesebrecht ad locum). [Another variant is ἐπαναστάτη 26 — ?]
⁴ ἐπαναστάτη Q is corrupt, as it does not agree with τολλῶν; the abbreviated ἐπαναστῆ (so Ἀ) was incorrectly resolved.
not only from the reading in codex 88 but also from De 32 23,1
and IV K 5 12,2

II K 3 23 ματαιεῖ written L for Hebrew נַשָּׁ is certainly sus-
picious; τοσφορεῖ B, rall is graphically somewhat distant. But an
instance like Le 1 10 ανεών 54, 75 for ανεών will suggest the
possibility that ματαιεῖ is a misheard ματαιεῖ. Since ματαιεῖ is
used as an aorist, the ending -οια for -ον, so frequently met
with in the Greek of the Septuagint in aorists, becomes in-
telligible.3

κ and π are found interchanged in a number of instances.
I have noted some in a previous paper.4 Observe the addi-
tional examples: Za 9 4 καταχθεί/κατατηχεί; ibid., 12 4 καταχθεί/κατα-
tηχεί.8

The meaningless κατατηχεῖ w Ge 44 23 is due to ditto-
graphed ra; the correct reading is of course καταχθεῖ = βαπτὶσθαι(9).
The same error occurs Ge 44 31, 9, III K 8 11, 10 Am 3 11 11
Jl 3 (4) 2, 12. The next step is the simplex ταστεῖ 13 (hence also
without an intermediary Is 26 3, 14); and, conversely, Je 19 8, 15
Ex 44 14, 16

How complete in-
duction may be
at restoring the Greek original as it left the
translators' hands, or, more ultimately, at a
recovery of the Semitic "Vorlage," he is always face to face
with problems of identification. Whatever is isolated, depending
upon a particular constellation, cannot of course be covered
by a general rule. But all those facts which are general,
conditioned by causes which may occur again and again,
must be formulated as rules, and as such be placed at the
service of students. The complete induction of the

1 mataiw 59 / matate w rall.
2 mataiw 247 / matate 71, 119, 243.
Chrys as a synonymous variant for ἀκήθ. rall.
4 ZAW, XXVI (1906), 88.
5 καταχθεῖ 58, 40, 42, 49, 62, 86, 95, 166, 147, 185, 311.
6 Rell * a. b. rall = ταστεῖ (9). 7 καταχθεῖ. 8 rall = ταστεῖ (9).
9 ταστεῖ. 10 B 947. 11 196. 12 62, 147.
11 Jl 3 (4) 3, 311. 12 ταχθεῖ 36 / καταχθεῖ rall.
13 κατατηχεῖ B, rall / ταστεῖ AGA = ταστεῖ (9).
14 κατατηχεῖ RQ, rall / ταστεῖ A, 36, 42, 49, 90, 91, 166, 198, 236, 259.
306. Ald. = ταστεῖ(9), the intermediate κατατηχεῖ is found in 62.
sum total of general, typical facts can be secured only by two methods of procedure which can be easily combined. On the one hand, each article in the Concor-

Lexical equa-
tions.

Versions of the Old Testament, such as we possess in the Oxford publication, must be gone through for the purpose of establishing all lexical equations. It is obvious, following as it does from the nature of Semitic speech, that derivatives and compounds must be treated in conjunction with the primary words and the simplicia. It has been shown in this paper how the equation of ἐκάγων τοι or ἐκ τοια = ב יִבְנֶ is substantiated by the equation ἐκαγωγή = יִבְנֶה. The Greek compounds often serve merely to mark the “Aktionsart”! Whether we say in Greek ἀναγγέλλων, ἀναγγέλλων, or the simpler ἀγγέλων, the Semitic equivalents will in most cases be indifferently the same. Where, on the other hand, the pre-

verb retains its local force, as in the case of ἀγανώ, the Semitic equivalent will naturally differ, and the differences will become evident as the compounds are studied in their totality and with a view to each other.

On the other hand, the text of the vers-

Grammatical

ions must be investigated with a view to gram-

matical equations. I use the two terms, lexical and grammatical, in their widest connotations. When I say, ἀγανώ = יִבְנֶ, I abstract from all grammatical differences, such as the correspondence of the active to the Kal, of the passive to the Semitic passive, of the aorist to the perfect, and the like. Equally, when I treat of the equations: aorist = perfect, ἵσται c. conjunct. aor. = יִבְנֶ c. imperf., or of such stylistic peculiarities as “adjectivum pro nomine in genit.”, or “act-

ivum pro passivo”, I abstract from the lexical meaning of the words or phrases entering into consideration. While a modicum of grammatical observation is necessary for the proper grouping of lexical equations within each article, the material for a grammatical Concordance may be gathered direct from the texts. Complete induction, at all events, can be had only by means of the two lines of investigation, the

1 See the lucid exposition by Moulton, A Grammar of the New Testa-

ment Greek, vol. i: Prolegomena, chapter vi.
lexical and the grammatical. It is a stupendous work, but it must be done: it is of utmost importance not only for purposes of textual criticism, but equally for a study of the oldest exegesis of Scriptures. And the results will have a decided bearing upon an understanding of the New Testament likewise which, in language and range of ideas, is linked to the Old Testament in the Hellenistic garb.
A Hymn to Mullil. Tablet 29615, C.T. XV, Plates 7, 8 and 9.—By Rev. Frederick A. Vanderburgh, Ph. D., Columbia University, New York City.

Plates 7, 8 and 9 in Volume XV of Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum contain texts of sixteen tablets of Sumerian Hymns which are very important. The hymns are of sufficient length and variety to afford a good idea of what Babylonian Psalmody consists. Not one has less than thirty lines, and, in the collection, seven different deities are addressed: Bêl, Sin, Adad, Nergal, Bau, Kirgîlû, and Tammûz, gods whose functions relate to almost every phase of Babylonian theology.

This hymn, addressed to Bêl, who is called in the colophon, line 74, Mu-ul-lû, is the first in the collection and one of the longest unilingual Babylonian hymns on record. The first sixteen or eighteen lines, however, and the last thirteen are too badly broken to give a connected discourse. From line 20 to line 63, the text is in fairly good condition.

This hymn dwells upon the majesty of Bêl's word. The Non-Semitic Bêl, older than Nannar or Šamaš, who were successively rivals of Bêl as local gods, came to be recognized as “the Lord of the lands.” The place of his dwelling was in the temple, E-kur, located at Nippur, probably the “house” referred to in this hymn. As “the Lord of the lands”, he was conceived of as controlling the destinies of men. Thus, we find him approaching men and speaking to them, as the following hymn shows. The fuller development of Bêl's position, as belonging to a triad, where Anu was considered god of heaven, Bêl, god of earth, and Ea, god of the deep, was Assyrian. We have no trace of this thought in our hymn.

My translation of this very difficult hymn and its commentary have had the cooperation of Dr. J. Dyneley Prince, Professor of Semitic Languages in Columbia University, and Author of Materials for a Sumerian Lexicon, whom I have
consulted while preparing this work, and who is himself just publishing a translation of the interesting *Hymn to Kirgilus* from the same collection, Plate 23.

Transliteration and Translation.

**Obverse.**

**Broken Text.**

1. — — — — — — — nun(?)-e-bi ma-te
   — — — — — — — his prince(?) approacheth.

2. — — — — — — — [b]i ma-te
   — — — — — — — his approacheth.

3. — — — — — — — [gin(DU)]

4. — — — — — — — [gin(DU)]

5. — — — — — — — a gin(DU)

6. — — — — — — — mu-un-ši-gar(ŠA) ṣš(RI)
   — — — — — — — it is done; it is established.

7. — — — — — — — [u]-n-ša-am dimmer mu-ul-lil-ta ṣš(RI)
   — — — — — — — the word of Mullil, it is established.

8. — — — — — — — dimmer gu-la-a ṣš(RI)
   — — — — — — — of Gula, it is established.

9. — — — — — — — [a]m dimmer mu-ul-lil-ta ṣš(RI)
   — — — — — — — of Mullil, it is established.

10. — — — — — — — ma-ab-gu-la-a ṣš(RI)
    — — — — — — — which maketh it great; it is established.

11. — — — — — — — ma-ab-hul-a ṣš(RI)
    — — — — — — — which maketh it evil; it is established.

12. — — — — — — — sig(PA) he(GAN)-in-gug(KA)-ga ṣš(RI)
    — — — bearing] the sceptre(?), let him speak; it is established.

13. — — — — — — — nu-mu-da-ma(MA)-ma(MA)
    — — — — — — — the one who begetteth not.

14. — — — — — — — nu-mu-da-zu-zi
    — — — — — — — the one who giveth no life.

15. — — — — — — — sar-ra mu-ub-bi-ir
    — — — — — — — the one who bindeth the forest.

16. — — — — — — — bi šīša(TAR)-a mu-ub-ri
    — — — — — — — the one who setteth up the road.
A Hymn to Mullil.

17. - - - [-a]b(?)-il-e me-ri ám(Á.AN)-da-ab-il-e
     - - - the one who lifteth up, who lifteth up the dagger.

     - - - the one who at the fixed period (?) of plant-
          growth smiteth the head.

19. - - - gig-ga-bi-es ám(Á.AN) ši-tii(TI)-li
     - - - (to the sick one) (?) thou givest life.

LORD OF ABUNDANCE.

    To (?) the spouse that liveth not, the husband (?) that liveth not,

21. dam-ma nu-mu-un-tii(TI)-li-en dumu(TUR)-a nu-mu-un-
    til-(TI)-li-en
    the wife that liveth not, the child that liveth not (thou
    givest life).

22. zal(NI) nigin ne-en zal(NI) šá(LIB) ne-en
    Abundance of everything there is, abundance in the midst
    (of the land) there is.

23. šam(Õ) há imina-bi hi-bi-ta šam(Õ) kú mo-en
    The food of that land is sevenfold, in that land food to
    eat there is.

24. tür amar(ZUR)-bi a nag an-me-en
    In the resting place of their young water to drink there is.

25. ga-sá-an me-en nu-lu ká-shú(KU) eri-a kur(BAB)-ra me-en
    Lord art thou who for the gate in the city art protector.

26. el ki sug-bi má su-a me-en
    In the shining land on its water-ways shipping thou in-
    creasest.

27. peš a sug-ra ba-an-nigin-na me-en
    Plentifulness of water thou causest the water-ways to enclose.

28. mu gig gin(DU) eri-gá(MALi) peš me-en kud(TAR)-mu
    ká mo-en
    When an epidemic sickness is spread over the established
    city my (its) judge in the gate thou art.

29. ki il la ne-en õ(BIT) damal muh gá(MALi) saq õ(BIT) úr-
    ra-bi me-en
    Over the land, the high land, over the broad house thou
    art established; thou art head over the house and its
    structure (beams).
30. *li-d-sā*(LIB)-ni-māl(IG) *à*(ID)-nu-māl(IG) me-en
   In the midst of their cattle when they are without power
   thou art.

31. *nin gur*(DU) *sāl-māl*(IG) *li-d-sā*(LIB)-nu-māl(IG) me-en
   Faithful lord of compassion in the midst of the cattle
   that are unsustained thou art.

**LORD OF NEAR APPROACH.**

32. *à-mu-un-na e-ne-àm-ma*(MAL)-ni na-ma-da-te *mu*(lu)-da
    ni-ma-te
   The lord whose word approacheth, to mankind it is near.

33. *e-ne-àm dimmer gu-la-ge na-ma-da-te mu-lu-da ni-ma-te
    The word of Gula approacheth, to mankind it is near.

34. *e-ne-àm dimmer mu-ul-lil-la-ge na-ma-da-te mu-lu-da ni-ma-te
    The word of Mullil approacheth, to mankind it is near.

35. *(BIT) zí-mu eri-a ma ni-in-à mu-lu-da ni-ma-te
    My true house which in the city of the land endureth,
    to mankind it is near.

36. *mu-lu si-mu eri-a ma ni-in-à mu-lu-da ni-ma-te
    My faithful folk (priesthood) who in the city of the land
    endure, to mankind they are near.

37. *(BIT)-mu zu gał-gal-la gu-ma-te mu-lu-da ni-ma-te
    My house of great wisdom, may it be near; to mankind it
    is near.

**Reverse.**

38. *[mu]-lu ká sì il-il gu-ma-te mu-lu-da ni-ma-te
    He of the gate of the high tower (horn), may he be near;
    to mankind he is near.

**LORD OF SUPPLICATION.**

    Mighty, productive one thou art, let light extend, to his
    people he shall speak.

40. *e-ne-àm dimmer gu-la-ge ga-ba-da-peš mu-lu-na *mu-pad-*de
    The word of Gula, may it extend, to his people it shall speak.

41. *e-ne-àm dimmer mu-ul-lil-la-ge ga-ba-da-peš mu-lu-na *mu-
    pad-*de
    The word of Mullil may it extend, to his people it shall speak.
42. ud-da š(BIT) axaq-qa ga-ba-da-pēš mu-lu-na mu-pad-de
   The light of the shining house, may it extend, to his people
   it shall speak.
43. š(BIT) axaq š(BIT) pisun(ŠIT)-na ga-ba-da-pēš mu-lu-na
   mu-pad-de
   The shining house, the house of vessels, may it extend, to
   his people it shall speak.
44. mulu hul kine gâl(IG)-gâl(IG) e-ne zi mu-pad-de e-ne
   Sinners at the altar prostrate themselves, for life they speak.
45. š(BIT) ri-a-ni gâl(IG)-gâl(IG) e-ne zi mu-pad-de e-ne
   In the house of their protection they prostrate themselves,
   for life they speak.
46. dim-mâ(MAL)-ni sar mu-un-na-ra i-dib(LU) mu-un-na-
   ab-bi
   Before their king they hold a festival, the word they speak.
47. dim dimmer gu-la dim dimmer bara gin(GÎ)-gin(GÎ)-na
   i-dib(LU) mu-un-na-ab-bi
   To the queen, to Gula the queen, to the deity of the
   shrine, they turn, the word they speak.

LOD OF MAJESTY.

48. za-e ud-da ga-sâ-an-mu za-e ud-du a-ba da-pēš a-na a-
   âg(RAM)
   Thou who art the light, my lord, thou who art the light,
   who can reach (to thee)! What can measure itself (with thee)?
49. e-ne-âm dimmer gu-la-ge za-e ud-da a-ba da-pēš a-na a-
   âg(RAM)
   The word of Gula, thou who art the light, who can reach
   (to thee)! What can measure itself (with thee)?
50. e-ne-âm dimmer mu-ul-li-â-ge za-e ud-da a-ba da-pēš (a)-na
   a-âg(RAM)
   Word of Mullil, thou who art the light, who can reach (to
   thee)! What can measure itself (with thee)?
51. a ga-sâ-an-mu tûr-zu-da âu(KAK)-e alam-zu ta-a-an nigin
   Father, my lord, in thy court where thou art creative, who
   can encompass thy image!
52. mulu gam-ma-zu ëi mu-un-gam alam-zu ta-a-an nigin
   Of the men who bow to thee in the lands which submit
   not, who may encompass thy image!
53. *dumu*(TUR) *dur*?(KU) *gam-ma šū še-ir mu-un-ma-al alam-zu ta-a-an nigin
   Of the lofty (?) sons who bow down and exercise no power, who may encompass thy image!


**LORD OF RECOMPENSE.**

55. *aga*(MIR) *zag mulu*-e*-da e-ne šū al *kud*(TAR)-*kud*(TAR)-de
   With crowned head among the people (and) with uplifted hand he pronounceth judgment.

56. *e-ne*-ām *dimmer gu*-la*-ge e-ne šū al *kud*(TAR)-*kud*(TAR)-de
   The word of Gula, it with uplifted hand pronounceth judgment.

57. *e-ne*-ām *dimmer mu*-ul*-lil*-lā*-ge e-ne šū al *kud*(TAR)-*kud*(TAR)-de
   The word of Mullil it with uplifted hand pronounceth judgment.

58. *igi*(KI)-ni-da ud-de *ē*(BIT) *bar*-ri ud-de *ga*-ba-bi-ēs(RI)
   The light of his face in the house of decision, may it establish light.

59. *e-ne*-ām *dimmer gu*-la*-ge *ē*(BIT) *bar*-ri ud-de *ga*-ba-bi-ēs(RI)
   The word of Gula in the house of decision, may it estab-

60. *e-ne*-ām *dimmer mu*-ul*-lil*-lā*-ge *ē*(BIT) *bar*-ri ud-de *ga*-ba-
   The word of Mullil in the house of decision, may it estab-

61. *a*-ba *ba*- -a*-de a*-ba *ba*-tug*(TUK)-gā(MAL)-e a*-ba ba-an-
   Who can — — who can grasp it! Who can keep it!

62. *e-ne*-ām *dimmer gu*-la*-ge *a*-ba *ba*-tug*(TUK)-gā(MAL)-e *a*-ba ba-an-ši-ēg(RAM)-ē
   The word of Gula, who can grasp it! Who can keep it!

63. *e-ne*-ām *dimmer mu*-ul*-lil*-lā*-ge *a*-ba *ba*-tug*(TUK)-gā(MAL)-e
   The word of Mullil, who can grasp it! Who can keep it!
64. dumu (TUR)-mu — — — — — ba bad ág (RAM)-e
My son — — — who can measure it!
65. — — — — — ba bad a-ba ba-an-ág (RAM)-e
— — — — — who can measure it!
66. — — — — a-ba ba-an-ág (RAM)-e
— — — — — who can measure it!
67. — — — — a mu
— — — — — who can measure it!
68. — — — — an-si-ág (RAM)-e
— — — — — can keep it!
69. — — — es ba el bi es mal-e a-ba ba-an-
— — — — — who can
70. — — — — an-da ku mal-e a-ba ba-an-si-
— — — — — who can keep
71. — — — — ku mal-e a-ba ba-an-si-ág (RAM)-e
— — — — — who can keep it!
72. — — — — in-áug (KA)-ga ñe-ra ba-an-da-sab (RU)
speak — — — brother — — throw
73. — — — — in-áug (KA)-ga
— — — — — ba an-da sab (RU)
speak — — — — — throw
74. — — — — lum-ma dimmer mu-ul-nil
— — — — — of penitence to Mullil.
75. — — — — mu-bi im
— — — — — its lines in the tablet.

Commentary.


The beginning of each line up to line 20, being erased, a connected translation for this section is precluded. The closing words of each line, however, giving some complete clauses, are intact. Some of the characteristics of Bél or Mullil who seems to be the subject of the hymn therefore crop out here.

1. bi is no doubt a pronominal suffix in this line, te, occurring here and many times farther on, has in it the idea of 'approaching,' tešu being the Assyrian equivalent.

3. gin is a value of DU that might possibly fit here, equal to kānu 'set,' or the value geb might do, equal to mustú 'stand.'
6. mu-nu is a common verbal prefix signifying completed action, at an infix of location or direction, and gar(ŠA) or possibly the Eme Sal value mar as a verb, if we take its most usual meaning, equals the Assyrian šakānu. ēš, one of the values of RI, equal to naddu, gives the meaning ‘establish’ which is probably the one intended for the close of this and the following six lines.

7. e-ne-ām is probably the subject of ēš(RI). e-ne-ām equals amatu and is a dialectic phoneticism for inim(KA). Br. 508. e-ne-ām occurs 15 or 16 times in this hymn. e-ne-ām is an authoritative word. It sometimes stands for the god himself; see line 50. mu-ul-lil-lā is the Eme Sal form in Sumerian for Bēl’s name.

8. gu-la-a equals rābû ‘great,’ and was also the name of a goddess. She appears in this hymn evidently as the consort of Bēl. The gods sometimes had more than one consort. The chief consort of Bēl was Bēlit. The goddess naturally possessed the same qualities as the god with whom she was consorted, but in a diminutive degree. Gula is more generally known as the consort of Nin-ib.

11. hul, the common Sumerian word for ‘evil.’

12. We cannot state with much certainty the relation of PA in this sentence. he(GAN)-in-gug(KA)-ya is clearly a verb in the preceptive construction. in may be a part of the preceptive prefix, he-in being dialectic for gur.

13. ma(MA) = alādu, Br. 6769, and the infix da may be locative, the pronominal representative being understood.

14. zi is one of the common words for ‘life,’ = Assyrian nāpišti, but here evidently a verb.

15 & 16. sar-ra = keku, Br. 4385. ub and bi are verbal infixes, MSL, p. XXIV. ir = kamā, Br. 5386.

17. îl = nāši, Br. 6148. me-ri is phonetic for the Eme Sal: mer(AD), patra. ūm(A.AN) seems to occur sometimes as a verbal prefix. Br. p. 548, but it serves more usually as a suffix equal to the verb ‘to be.’ In da-ab, dab, ‘unto it,’ we have the pronominal object represented by ab.

18. šum(U)-sun(SE)-nu, a word not often found outside of the collection of hymns in CT. XV, is explained by Professor Prince in his translation of some of these hymns, as ‘plant-growth.’ It is to be regretted that the sign SE in this com-
bination in these inscriptions is not very readily identified; the phonetic complement na, however, helps to confirm the reading of the sign as sum. sig(PA) = mahāṣu, 'smite.' Br. 5576.

19. e is sometimes a postposition, Br. 9998. til(TI) = balātu.

**Lines 20 to 31. Lord of Abundance.**

The Assyrian Creation Legends assume that Bēl, the old god of Nippur, was the god of the earth par excellence, and that it was he who prepared the earth for the habitation of mankind. See Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 140.

20 & 21. dam = aṣṣatu and dunu(TUR) = māru, and the parallelism between the two lines would suggest that ma-at-la must mean 'husband,' being a dialectic form for māṭ(IG) which equals baṣū, also sakānu, signifying 'substance,' 'existence,' &c.

22 & 23. zal(NI) = bāru 'be abundant,' Br. 5314. nigin = napharu, Br. 10335. inum-bi = sibitti-sunu or sibitti-su. šam kā = ritu akālu, 'food to eat.'

24. tar = tarbasu and amar(ZUR) = bāru 'offspring.' a nag = mē šatū 'water to drink.' kur(BAB)-ra in 25 means 'protector,' from nasāru.

26 & 27. These two lines go together and illustrate how Bēl's and Ea's provinces overlap each other, as regards the water-courses. suğ = suṣu and su = rudū. pez = rapasu 'extent,' from which we derive the idea 'plentifulness,' and a may equal mā 'water.' bu-an-nig-in-na is a verb; the prefix, one of usual occurrence, in a pronominal way takes up the remote object just given. nigin as a verb = paharu; above, it is a noun.

28. This and the following three lines offer a considerable difficulty in translation. mu = šattu from the fuller form mu-an-na 'name of heaven,' i.e. 'year.' From gig 'sick' and gin 'going' we get the translation 'epidemic sickness,' kud(TAR) = damu 'judge.'

29. il = ēlō or našu, and muḫ, although usually a preposition, seems here to have the place of a postposition. ār-ra = gušānu 'beam.'

30 & 31. These two lines have parallel thoughts and consequently should be explained together. Their duplicates in Plate 24, possessing slight phonetic variations, help to a cor-
rect reading. Perhaps IG should be read gāl, but line 11 of Plate 24 gives ma-ul. Possibly lid is a loan-word from the Semitic līdu which is connected with alādu, but there are lexicographic references which connect it with lā, making it equal to the feminine lītu 'wild cow.' It is interesting to note also that the sign LID has a value aḫ = arḫu 'wild ox.' gin (DU) = kānu and ūl = tēmu.

32 to 38. Lord of Near Approach.

The Babylonian theologian, as pointed out by Professor Jastrow, regarded Bēl as representing providential forces which operate among the inhabited portions of the globe. This idea is apparent here in the lines about Bēl's near approach.

32. Possibly it is well to note the difference between na-ma-da-te and ni-ma-te. The first, it will be noticed, has the infix da which the second does not have. This must be because of the locative relation of da to the noun preceding the verb. Another difference is that the first verb has the prefix na where the second has ni. na does not often occur as a prefix; when it does, it usually belongs to the verb of the third person. na may probably be a harmonic equivalent of ni. ni and ne are both used with an aorist tense. If te means 'is approaching,' ni-te must mean 'is near.' ma as a prefix would be a harmonic equivalent of mu, but, as an infix, must have reference to matter going before. mu-da seems to be a scribal error for mu-in-da; see the same refrain in line 33.

35. ni-in-ū: nin (ni-in) is a reduplication referring to the indirect object, probably to ma 'land.' ū as equivalent to labāru can mean 'endure.' Possibly a value should be chosen for ū as meaning 'old' that may take the phonetic complement -ra; instances with ū + ra meaning 'old' are on record. On the other hand, ra may not be a phonetic complement at all.

38. si = karau 'horn.' Notice the precative form of the verb, qa-ma-te; the infix da now has dropped out.

39 to 47. Lord of Supplication.

The thought passes here from that of Bēl giving command to his people to that of the people offering prayer to Bēl.

39. damal = gabbū and gan = alādu. gab-da-pēš seems to be
for ga-ba-da-peš; see the next line, where ga is plainly precative, peš = ropasu 'extend' as above. pad = tamû 'speak.'

43. pisan(SIT)-na = pisannu 'vessel;' we are guided by the phonetic complement in determining this value of SIT; the value šid would have given alaktu 'going,' šiti = menûtu 'counting,' and sangu = sangû 'priest.' Sacrificial vessels are no doubt referred to.

44. ki-ne, 'place of fire,' hence 'altar.' gâl(IG) = labânu, Br. 2241. ri in line 45 = hatânu which gives us the word 'protection.'

46. sar; the right Assyrian equivalent for this word here is istunu, Br. 4311. No other meaning for SAR will suit in this line. From sar as 'forest' we easily pass to the conception 'park' and then to the 'festival' that might be held there. ra = ranû, Br. 6362. i-diḫ(LU) is the same as the Assyrian kubû. i-diḫ is said to mean 'seizing speech' and i-nim, referred to above, 'high speech.' It may not, however, be safe often to regard the parts of such composite words as having ideographic value. bi = kibû and nab (na-ab) calls up the double object, direct and indirect, giving such a use as in 'they speak it to him.'

47. dim = sarru, Br. 4254, and of course we can say 'queen,' if dim can mean 'king.' bara = parakhu and gin(GI) = târu.

48 to 54. Lord of Majesty.

The last two lines of this section are exceedingly difficult, lines 51 and 52 also give considerable trouble.

The thought that the loftiness of the deity as incomparable, found here, appears in other hymns, particularly the great bilingual hymn to Nannar, published in IV R. 9. See Vanderburgh's Sumerian Hymns.

48. a-ba = manmu 'who?' a-na = minû 'what?' a-a-dg(RAM); reduplication of a for a verbal prefix is unusual; ãg(RAM) = madâdu 'measure.' In line 50, na, by scribal error, stands for a-na.

51. târ, 'court;' see line 24. dû(KAK) = banû, epēšu, ritû, &c. alam, according to Sh. 378, but salam, according to Br. 7297, giving the Assyrian lânu and salmu 'image.' ta-a-an = minû 'what?'; Br. 3999. a-an above = 'what?' ta alone also can = 'what?;' Br. 3958. nigin = sâbrû similar in meaning to pa-bâru; see lines 22 & 27. gam in 52 = kanûsu 'bow down.'
53. dumu (TUR) = már[u ‘son; see line 21. dur (KU); possibly KU = rubû; if so, the value would be dur, Br. 10498 & 10547. It would not alter the sense very much, if we should read KU as equal to ka:kâ and say ‘son with weapons.’ šû = emûku power.' še-ir is dialectic for nir = bêlû, etellû, šarrû and other synonyms. ma:âl is the same as gâl (IG) = šakânû ‘establish.’

54. It is almost impossible to tell how KU and RAM should be read in this line. If the fourth sign is ĝu the value of RAM is āg. RAM can = āru ‘command,’ yielding a parallel with id (TUM) ‘wrath.’ li-a (dišû) ‘luxuriant growth’ + ĝu ‘vegetation’ form a parallel with zal (NI) ‘abundant’ + šim-e ‘herbage.’ The second KU read as tuš (ašâbu) makes a parallel to nû (rubâšu).

55 to 63. Lord of Recompense.

In passing from the previous section to this, there is a change in the pronouns used. In that section Bêl is referred to with the pronominal suffix -su ‘thy;’ in this section by the suffix -ni ‘his.’

55. agâ (MIR); this sign signifies ‘crown,’ and the value aga is apparently from the Semitic aqû. al = šîru ‘lofty,’ Br. 5749. TAR we have had above; with the value kud, required by the phonetic complement de, we are led to some such meaning as ‘judge,’ dânu, Br. 364. line 28.

mulu-e-da; in line 33 and elsewhere, we have mu-lu-da; is there any difference in these two phrases except phonetically? Is -e, in a case like this, equal to the definite article ‘the?’

56. šiq (ŠI) = pânû, Br. 9259. bar = pârîštu, Br. 1788.

61. tug (TUK) = ašâsu ‘seize.’
A Hymn to the Goddess Kir-gi-lu (Cuneiform Texts from the British Museum, XV., Plate 23) with translation and commentary. — By Professor J. Dyneley Prince, Ph.D., Columbia University, New York City.

The following Eme-Sal hymn to the goddess Kir-gi-lu (obv. 4; also Nin-kir-gi-lu, rev. 14) is distinctly a prayer for fertilizing rain, the granting of which in this petition is made the chief function of the deity. That Kir-gi-lu, occurring also Reisner, Sum. Bab. Hymnen, NO. III., Pl. 137, col. iii, 4, was no other than Ištar seems apparent from obv. 4, where Kir-gi-lu is mentioned as the tutelary deity of the Ė-Nand, the temple of Ištar. Ištar herself was the personification of fertility, the great mother of all that manifests life (Jastrow, Religion, Eng. Ed., p. 459), so that a hymn of this character, praying for plenty, is perfectly natural.

The exact meaning of the name Kir-gi-lu is not clear, but it seems undoubtedly to be connected with the idea of plentifulness. Note that the sign KIR-PES = mamitu 'fullness,' 6933; also KIR-GAL, 6941; = marâ 'be fat,' 6934; = rapišu 'extend,' 6936; salâšu 'to triple' = 'multiply,' 6937, all which meanings are in harmony with the general idea of fertility (MSL. 269). For further discussion, see also below on obv. 2.

In obv. 20, 21, I have rendered DA-MU as Bau, in spite of the absence of the god-determinative AN. Here it should be noted that in some forms of the Babylonian theology, Bau was the mother of Ea, the deity of the ocean; viz., of water. Jastrow has suggested (Religion, p. 61) that, since Ea represents the waters of the abyss or lower realm, Bau, his mother, probably was the deity of the waters of the upper realm; i.e., the clouds, which makes an allusion to her in the present hymn peculiarly appropriate and implies her identification by the writer with the water-giving Ištar.

1 MSL. = John Dyneley Prince, Materials for a Sumerian Lexicon, Leipzig, 1906. Numbers not preceded by a title are references to Brünnow's Classified List.
An interesting feature of this hymn is the occurrence of glosses giving the Eme-Sal pronunciation of certain signs; e.g.,

obv. 5: UN = u; UBUR = u-bi-ur for u-bu-ur; also rev. 8,
za-ur zu-ur, written under a sign which otherwise might be
difficult to place.

I am especially indebted to the Rev. Drs. F. A. Vander-
burgh and Robert Lau for many valuable suggestions in con-
nection with the rendering of this difficult hymn.

CT. XV. Pl. 23.

Obverse.

1. du(UL)-e pa-pa-al-ta er(A-ŠI) šeq(A-AN)-da..............
For growth in the bud; a lamentation for rain..............

2. azag-za-mu nin ga-ta dimmer Kir-gi-ru
My glorious wisdom, lady endowed with plenty, goddess
Kirgïlu.

3. kur-su(GUL)-sun(GUL) MU-GIG-IB ga-ta dimmer
an-na
who irrigates the earth, goddess endowed with fulness,
deity of heaven,

4. nin-zi-mu ga-ta dimmer 4 Nanâ-a-ra
O my faithful lady, endowed with fulness, goddess of
the house of Ištar!

5. dimmer u(UN)-mâ t-de ma-al ama ubur ri-da
O goddess of my people (land), wise one, mother of un-
failing breast!

6. lu-bur lii-e ga-ta dimmer sal-sag
Messenger of mercy, endowed with fulness, goddess of grace!

7. du(UL)-e pa-pa-al-ta tuš(KU)-a-ta
When growth dwelleth in the bud.

8. du(UL)-e pa-pa-al dimmer azag-ga-ta;
the growth of the bud (is) from the goddess of glorious
fulness.

9. du(UL)-e pa-pa-al dara(IB)-a-ta
When the growth of the bud becometh full.

10. ki-šy(RAM) me-e nu-ar ba-an-ag an-na
the beloved one establisheth the decree; heaven ordaineth it.

11. mulu-di ama-mu-ra duš(KA)-ga-na-ab me-na mu-un-gaba-e
For the man of judgment who prayeth to my mother,
his command she setteth forth.
12. ga-ta dimmer Gir-gi-lu-ge(KIT) dug(KA)-ga-na-ab me-na mu-un-gaba-e

For him who prayeth to the fulness of Girgılıu, his command she setteth forth.

13. ta-bar lil-e ga-ta dimmer sul-sag-bi me-na mu-un-gaba-e
(She) the messenger of mercy, endowed with fulness, his lady of grace, his command she setteth forth.

14. dimmer šeš-ki-ra muš(GIS)-gi-ta dug(KA)-ga-na-ab me-na mu-un-gaba-e

For him who prayeth to Nannar (Sin) with devout inclination (?), his command she setteth forth.

15. muš(GIS)-gi ama dimmer azag-ga-ta a-a-mu-ra dug(KA)-ga-na-ab

For him who prayeth devoutly inclining (?) before the divine mother endowed with glorious fulness; (viz.,) to my father.

16. me-na azag mu-un-tu(KU) mu-un-gaba-e me-na mu-un-gaba-e

his glorious command she setteth forth; his command she setteth forth.

17. me-na za mu-un-tu(KU) mu-un-gaba-e me-na mu-un-gaba-e

His command as a jewel she fixeth; she setteth it forth; his command she setteth forth.

18. azag ni-tuk-a azag-mu ba-ti

The glorious one she is; my glorious one she liveth.

19. za-gin(KUR) ni-tuk-a za-mu ba-ti

A crystal she is; my jewel she liveth.

20. lil es[AB] da-mu ide (ŠI)-ni-šū(KU) ba-gúl

The storm of the house, the goddess Bau before its very face rendereth nought.

21. (lil es[AB]) da-mu ide (ŠI)-ni-šū(KU) ba-xul

The storm of the house, Bau before its very face destroyeth.

22. a-a-mu ide(ŠI)-ni-šū(KU) ba-qi-er (the welfare?) of my father before his very face she seeketh (?).

23. a-a-mu ide(ŠI)-ni-šū(KU) ba

of my father before his very face she

24. i-dil(LU) mu-a-te er(ŠI) ęeq(A-AN)-da

lament for lack of grain, lamentation for rain
25. (Kur) gi-tu-gi(KIT) i-dib(LU) mu-a-se er(A-ŠI) seq(A-AN) da

of Kirgilu; a lament for lack of grain; a lamentation for rain

Reverse.

1. i-dib(LU)-ma me-a

my lament; the voice of...

2.

3. u-shu-na a-se-ir er(A-ŠI)-ra-ta

The gift of vegetation (in return for); penitential psalms and tears (she will grant?).

4. dumu-baqqad-mu er(A-ŠI)-zul ag-na me-(na)

O my broad headdress (all sufficient protection), I (?) making sad lament, the voice

5. me-e dimmer En-lil tub(KU)-bi seq(A-AN) ide(ŠI) gin(DU) a-mu lu

The decree of Bêl is established; the rain goeth forward; my water

6. a-e ri-gul-amu ga seq(A-AN) ide(ŠI) gin(DU) a-mu lu

Water for my city laid waste; plenteous rain goeth forward; my water

7. e-gul-la e-e ri-gul-la-mu zi

For my house laid waste, for my city laid waste, life (hath been decreed?)

8. lu-ni-el-ta in-ta sur-sur er(A-ŠI) gig ni-ib-

With her exalted hand in the rain-storm she establishes it; (in response to) troubled weeping

9. gaba-ni su-uš ašag ga al giš-e er(A-ŠI)-gig ni-ib-baš(BE)

Her breast is glorious (and) shining; the devastation (in response to) troubled weeping (she will remove?).

10. šur-ni u-kul-tir-ra-ni šag(?) er(A-ŠI)-gig ni-ib-

Her step (tread) the seed of her vegetation graciously (?) (in return for) troubled weeping (will cause to cease?).

11. utuga-a e-gul(?) gulg(?) bi mus(GIS) ba-an-tuk-a-ta

When on the day of plenty, with her many streams (?) she giveth ear,

12. en dumu(TUR) dimmer Nin-bi-gal-la-ge(KIT) nin-an-ni-

the lord, the son of the goddess Allatu (Ninkigal), unto her lady is inclined.
13. azag-zu-mu ninga-ta dimmer Gir-gi-lu kur-ta nam-ta-ê (UD-DU)
   My glorious wisdom, lady endowed with fullness, the
goddess Girgilu over the land cometh forth.
14. er(A-ŠI)-li(m)-mu dimmer Nin-Kir-gi-lu
   A penitential psalm to the goddess, the lady Kirgilu.

15. sal-zi-du i-di(k)UL) ga-man-lu-tin mutu nam-mu-un-zî
   Faithful lady, may (her) word give life; she is the one
   who endoweth with life!
16. du(UL)-ê pa-pa-al-la ga-man-lu-tin
   The growth of the bud may she endow with life!
17. du(UL)-ê ki-azag-mu ga-man-lu-tin
   The growth of my pure place may she endow with life!
18. ki-azag ki-?-na ga-man-lu-tin
   The glorious place; the place of ... may she endow with
   life.
19. ki-ag(RAM?) me-ê mar(?)-ra-mu ga-man-lu-tin
   The beloved one (the plaint which I make?) may she
   endow with life-giving effect!
20. azag a-a-mu ba-tîl-la-ta
   The glorious one; when she giveth life to my father;
21. za a-a-mu ba-tîl-la-ta
   The jewel; when she endoweth my father with life!

Commentary.

Obverse.

1. du(UL) = šuklušu 'complete,' 9142. The original meaning of
   the sign seems to be 'advance,' as seen in šubûu 'advance,
   cause to advance,' 9162. It also means naq̄ašu 'gore,' said of
   a bull, 9144. For this root-idea 'push,' see MSL 85, s. v.
   du(UL).
   pa-pa-al-ta, with suffix -ta; also 7, 8, 9. See 5631—5632:
   giš(IZ) pa-pa-al geštin = dillatu and papali; loanword. papal
   may be for pal-pal, a fuller form of PA-PA 'staff, shoot of a
   plant.' Cf. 5629: U PA-PA-PA = arurn 'a sort of plant.' I
   render 'vegetation' here.
   er(A-ŠI), also rev. 3: 'weeping' (lit. 'water of the eye');
   'lamentation' (see MSL. 104).
   šeq(A-AN) 'water of heaven' = 'rain.' See especially, MSL. 313.
It is highly probable that this line is the heading of the inscription. Note the refrain-like recurrence of the words du(UI)-e pa-pa-al in obv. 7, 8, 9. Obv. 25 is possibly another heading for the second part of the hymn given in the reverse.


nin-ga-ta; lit. 'lady endowed with breast' = 'plenteousness' (MSL. 111: ga 'breast, milk, plenty').

dimmer Kir-gi-lu, the name of the goddess. See also Introduction for discussion. Kir-peš = 6933: mamlu 'fulness' (MSL 269). gi seems also to mean 'plenteousness' (MSL 136). The name then appears to mean 'the lady who embraces (LU-DIB) copious plenty,' an epithet harmonizing admirably with her character as set forth in this hymn, where she is the giver of plenty-bringing showers. It is not certain whether the signs KIR-GI-LU should not be read Peš-gi-lu, or even Peš-gi-dib, peš being the usual Sumerian value for KIR (MSL. 269).

3. kars-sun-sun 'who irrigatest the earth.' sun = guš must denote irrigation here from the context, which demands a benevolent function of the goddess. With the value guš, however, it means 'inundation,' cf. rev. 6: guš = abatû 'destroy by water.'

mu-gig-ib = 1319: ištaritu 'goddess:' cf. also Reisner, Hymnen, pl.135, III. col. iii., 5: mu-gig-an-na = il išṭarit il Ad-nim 'the goddess of heaven.' mu-gig seems to mean 'heavy' or 'important name,' being a grandiloquent equivalent for the goddess Ištar, whose name was all-powerful. Note that gig = kibtu 'heaviness, trouble,' 9232. ib perhaps = barû 'be full,' as in obv. 9, q. v.

4. nin-zu-mu 'my faithful lady;' zi = kēnu 'faithful,' 2313, probably not 'lady of life' here, as nin-zi suggests nin-zi-da, the fuller form (see below on obv. 5). Reisner, Hymnen, 135, III. col. iii., 8: rubatum kēttum 'lady of faithfulness.'

ē nanû 'the house of Nann' was probably e-an-na in Ereh. Note the dative -ra for the genitive -ge(KIT).

5. dimmer u(UN)-mā. Un, here with the new value u(ES) especially glossed in, = mātu 'land,' 5914, or nīn 'people,' 5915. The usual EK value is kalama. The suffix mā here is, I think,
the ES suffix mā - EK -mu of the first person. See also rev. 1. Elsewhere in this hymn, the ordinary EK -mu of the first person is used, as obsv. 2-4; rev. 6, etc., perhaps, however, applied purely ideographically and to be pronounced mā, since the hymn is unmistakably ES.

i-de ma-al, lit. 'having eye' = 'perception' = mudā 'wise one,' 4011. On the val. ama, see MSL. 30.

The sign UBUR with value ubur (5553) also = ugan. 5552. The word u-bur seems to be a combination of the abstract u- + bur 'vessel,' MSL. 63, and probably means 'the vessel par excellence,' hence 'breast, teat.' Note that the gloss here indicating the pronunciation is written u-bi-ur and not u-bu-ur as might be expected. This practically gives the consonantal value b to the syllable bi, an unusual phenomenon.

zi-da = kānu 'fixed, unailing,' 2313.

6. la-bur = sukallu 'messenger,' 993.

lil-e must = silitu 'mercy' here, 5932, although this meaning is not well established. The context certainly requires a benevolent sense. lil seems to occur in an opposite sense in obsv. 20.

dimmer-sal-šag; I render 'goddess of grace,' regarding sal as the abstract prefix (as in sal-xul = limulli 'evil,' 10958) before šag = dumqu 'grace,' 7292.

7. tūš(KU)-a-tu 'when it is established,' lit.: 'when it dwells,' KU = asābu 'dwell,' 10523.

9. dada(IB)-a-ta 'when it becometh full.' See MSL. 72. IB means 'be plenteous'; cf. DAR = tarru, 3471 and dada(IB) = iaxu 'a swarm of fish,' 10483. Hence the rendering here.

10. ki-šag(RAM) = narānu 'beloved,' 971.

me-e = qītu 'voice, decree,' 10370 and 10374: parcu 'decree,' mā-ur must be ES for gar = šukānu 'establish,' 11978.

ba-an-ag 'makes, ordains;' ag = epēšu 'do, make,' 2778; also rev. 4. Here ba-an-ag may be construed participially 'maker of;' 'heaven is the maker of it.'

11. mušu 'man,' 6398 + di = demu 'judgment,' 9525.

ama-mu-ra 'to (-ra) my (-mu) mother' (ama; see on obsv. 5). dug(KA)-ga-na-ab; lit.: 'to him who (nab) speaketh (dug-ga = qūšā, 531).

me-e; here with third personal suffix -mu.

qību = paṭāru 'loosen, solve,' here = 'set forth,' 4488.

14. šēš-ki-ra 'to Nannar,' the moon-god. Cf. CT. XV., pl. xvii, obsv. 2-5, and see Vanderburgh, Sumer. Hymns, p. 45, for the term.
muš(GIŠ)-qi-ta 'with (ta) inclination' = muš(GIŠ)-qi. I assign the ES value muš to GIS which seems to serve here as an abstract prefix to the root qi, which connotes the idea 'bending.' The sense appears to require the idea 'prostration in worship.'

15. a-ua-mu-ra 'to my father;' a-ua = abu, 11690.

16. If the third sign is šub(RU), it seems to mean n adalah, 1434: 'fix, place' and qualifies me-nu 'his command,' but I am inclined to read it as ara.a, owing to ra in line 17 and a similar parallelism between lines 18 and 19.

mu-um-tu(KU) 'she establisheth' (also obv. 7). KU, 10528 = kanā fix, establish' (see MSL. 210, 211). In rev. 5, KU-hi must be read šub(KU)-hi, with the same meaning.

17. ra; also obv. 19 = abmu 'stone' or jewel.' MSL. 359–360.

Cf. Rev. 20.

18. ba-ti 'she liveth' (MSL. 330).

19. za-quin(KUR) 'jewel, shining object' (MSL. 362); usually with ideogram tak = abmu 'stone,' 11773. Note that zaquin is repeated in the second member here by the simple za 'jewel' (see on obv. 17).

20. lil-še(AB) da-mu; a very difficult combination. The first sign may be lil(KIT) = šaru 'wind;' 5933; zaquin 'tempest,' 5934. es(AB) means bitu 'house,' Sb. 189, while da-mu may signify the goddess Ba-a, 6662, in spite of the absence of the god-sign AN. See above Introduction.

(idem)-ni-šu(KU) can only mean then 'before its very face;' viz., directly, without resort to subterfuge, she destroys the storm of the hostile house, or perhaps the storm which attacks my house.'

ba-gul; gul must = abatu 'destroy;' 8954 (cf. rev. 6, 7), here used in rhymed assonance with the clear xul of the following line.

21. ba-xul; by paronomastic association xul = gullulu 'slight, treat lightly;' 9500; lamānu 'treat evilly,' here associated with the preceding gul.

22. ba-qi-(el). Thus Dr. Lau, who cites 7977: ba-qi-el-la(l) = iste, 'cares for, seeks.'

Line 23, although very mutilated, seems to imply a benevolent sense; viz., that the goddess aids the father after destroying the foes.

24. šāb(LU), also obv. 25, rev. 1, = qubû 'lament,' 4040.

Note also rev. 15.
nu-a-še must be the privative nu 'lack of' + a-še 'irrigation of grain.' On the following words, see on obv. 1. This is perhaps a heading of the reverse part of the hymn.

Reverse.

1. i-di(b LU)-mā; with apparent ES suffix mā of the first person. See on obv. 5.

3. u-su-nu 'gift of vegetation.' The second sign here is clearly se, sum, but to be read sun with the following -nu complement, as Dr. Lau has suggested. The preformative u must mean 'plant,' 6027. The whole combination then means 'plant-giving.'

a-še-ir = tanīnu 'penitential psalm,' 11574. This combination was probably identical with a-ši, obv. 1, which has the val. er,

4. damša saqqu-Šu means literally: 'my broad headdress,' saqqu = kušu 'headdress,' 8864, MSL, 310. The meaning of the line is obscure. Possibly 'headdress' means protection of the head, referring to the goddess as a protecting force. Cf. also Pl. XXIV, line 10 of Ct. XV.

5. The decree of En-lil = Bēl, who is the god having authority over the storm (see Vanderburgh, Sum. Hymns, pl. 15, line 15).

tub(KU)-bi 'it is established. See on obv. 16—17. On 5eq (A-AN), see on obv. 1.

ide(SI)-gin(DU) must mean that after the supplication to the goddess was made, the fructifying rain then went on. The allusion in the word a-mu at the beginning of the final mutilated phrase is of the same character.

6. er-gul-a-mu seems to mean 'my city laid waste;' gul is the same sign as in obv. 20 — ābatu 'destroy,' 8954.

ga 5eq(A-AN), I render, 'plenteous rain;' regarding ga as standing in adjectival relation to 5eq(A-AN).

7. 6-gul-la eri-gul-la-mu; here the possessive -mu applies evidently to both the nouns 6 and erī. The sign 6i must mean 'life' (MSL. 363—364), as the context demands a promise.

8. 6u-ni-er-la 'with her glorious hand;' 6u 'hand' being the symbol of the goddess's power.

im-ta 'in the rain-storm;' im = zumu 'rain;' 8374. The goddess establishes the coming of plenty by the coming rain.

zur-zur = zumu 'establish,' 9087 (9071); note the gloss here
er(A-ŚI)-giy may commence a phrase meaning 'in reply to troubled weeping, she will bestow rain or plenty.' Note that giy = marṣu 'troubled,' 9235.

Then follows a verb with the prefix nib- as in the following line 9.

9. su-ub = marṣašu 'glitter, shine,' 203.
I cannot render gā-al, as the line is very obscure.

10. A difficult line. I regard the first sign as ār = kīṣu 'step,' 11891. Perhaps her step or tread calls forth vegetation?

u-kul-tir-ra-ni; a difficult combination. I am inclined to render: u, probably merely the abstract preformative here + kul = šürū 'seed,' 1668 + tir = kīṣu 'plantation,' 7661. The sign rendered šag 'graciously' is very obscure in this text.

11. utu gā-a can only mean 'on the day of plenty,' = gā-a, as in rev. 6. e-gul(?)-gul(?)-ti is very doubtful, as the sign I read gul might just as well be RAM. The sense seems to be that e = iṣu 'water-stream,' 5841 (MSL. 92—93). If the second sign is gil-sun, this is the gil-sun 'inundation' as in obv. 3. read sun. The reduplication would then indicate the plenteousness of the fructifying waters.

muš = ES for giš; tu̇k must mean 'give ear' = šemū. 5727.
The suffix -ta appended here makes the whole clause dependent, as in rev. 20—21. We have a precisely similar construction in Turkish değdikerinde 'when they said' (-de = 'when').

12. In connection with Nin-ki-gal = Allatu, the goddess of the lower world, note that she was regarded as a representative of production as manifested in the earth.

mu-um-na-ni-me-en; lit. 'he is (mēn) to her' = ni; i.e., 'he is inclined towards her to do her will.'

13. nam-ta-(UD-DU) 'she cometh forth' (ē = açū 'go forth').
The n-prefix nam- is not necessarily negative.

14. er(A-ŚI)-līb(m)-ma; see Prince, JAOS, xxvii, 180.
With this colophon the hymn proper ends. Then follow seven lines of what appears to be additional addresses to the goddess, possibly the work of another hand.

15. sul-si-du 'faithful lady;' si-du for si-da = kēnu 'firm, faithful;' occurs also IV, 28, 29a.

ga-man-kū-tin must mean 'may she (prec. gā-) endow it
(-man-) with life (ku-tin): ku = 'establish' + tin = balatu 
dlife,' 9853. This is the refrain of the next three lines.

mu-ru as subject here must mean 'she is the one who,' as 
mulu = rel. ša = 'who, the one who.'

In nam-mu-aa-sti, we have again a nam-prefix which is 
clearly not negative, as in line 13, rev.

20. ba-ti-la-ta, with suffix -ta = 'when,' as in rev. 11.

21. These lines close with an unfinished clause, indicating 
that they were probably jottings from a parallel hymn.
The Parsi-Persian Burj-Nāmah, or Book of Omens from the Moon.—By Louis H. Gray, Ph.D., German Valley, New Jersey.

The title of Burj-Nāmah, “Zodiacal Sign Book,” is applied to a short Parsi-Persian poem “in 26 couplets, stating what the first appearance of the new moon portends in each sign of the zodiac” (West, in Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, ii. 128). It is contained on folio 64 of a most interesting collection of rivāyats and other Parsi-Persian material (for a partial list see West, op. cit., pp. 123-128) preserved in a manuscript belonging to the University of Bombay (BU 29). “All the 26 couplets are written in double columns, and occupy three-quarters of folio 64b” (letter of Darab Dastur Peshotan Sanjana, Bombay, June 29, 1909). The whole manuscript is officially entitled “Rivayet-i Darab Hormazdyar—Autograph of the compiler, written A.Y. 1048, A.D. 1679,” and is bound in two volumes, the first containing folios 1-287, and the second folios 308-556. In view of the exceptional value of the collection for students of Zoroastrianism, the following description of the codex, most kindly sent me by Fardunji M. Dastur, Registrar of the University of Bombay (Feb. 3, 1910), may well find permanent record here. “This Rivāyat was obtained for the Bombay Government at Bharuch by Professor Martin Haug in January 1864, and was shortly afterwards bound in two volumes. Originally, it must have contained 556 folios, each 10 1/2 inches high, 8 3/4 inches wide, and all written 21 lines to the page; but 47 of these folios were lost before 1864, namely folios 35-43, 160, 161, 288-307, 428-441, 535, and 540. The contents of folios 160, 161 were recovered, in 1893, from another MS. (W), formerly belonging to the Revd Dr. John Wilson of Bombay and now in the library of the Earl of Crawford at Wigan in Lancashire, which is descended from this MS. and was written in 1761-2 by Nashirwan Bahram of Bharuch. W is also an imperfect MS., as 55 of
its folios (corresponding with folios 65-107 of this MS.) have never been written; but all deficiencies of this MS. can be supplied from W, except the contents of folios 535 and 540, which must have been lost before 1762. This MS., itself, is probably the original compilation of Dārāb Hormazdyār Frāmroz Kiāmov-d-din (or Kāvāmu-d-din) Kār-Kubād Hamjiyār Padam Sanjānān, and contains eleven colophons written in his name and varying in date from 20 April to 21 November, 1679, at which latter date the compilation was completed. His names and dates occur on 13 a 8-10, 30 a 11-15, 34 a (centre), 50 b (bottom), 78 a (bottom), 106 b (bottom), 108 a 5-6, 196 b 3-4, 484 a 4-7, 518 b 5-8, and 550 a 16-18; the dates of which are six years earlier than that of Dārāb's supposed original Rivayat at Balsār mentioned in the Parsī Frākāṣ, p. 16, n. 3. Other copies of Dārāb's Rivayat exist in the Mulla Fīrūz Library, and in that of Dastur Dr. Jāmāsp Minochīharji, both in Bombay; and in some cases the arrangement of the contents varies, as appears from the catalogue of the Mulla Fīrūz Library (Bombay, 1873), pp. 172-178.

In BU 29 the Būrj-Nāmah immediately follows the Mūr-Nāmah, a similar list of omens to be drawn from the appearance of a snake on each of the days of the month. This Mūr-Nāmah I have already considered at some length in a paper which will appear in the Hoshang Memorial Volume now in press at Bombay; and the present contribution may, accordingly, be regarded as a continuation and supplement of my study of the "Snake Book."

The Būrj-Nāmah goes back, as we have seen, to 1679, and it is probably of somewhat earlier date, for it is scarcely likely that Dārāb Hormazdyār, the compiler of the manuscript which has preserved it, was also its author. In my study of the Mūr-Nāmah I have suggested that the whole basal system of this sort of angural calendars may have been derived ultimately from Babylonia. Perhaps the same suggestion may be made in the case of the Būrj-Nāmah, though whether the "astrological forecasts for the various months, taken from ob-

1 Two more references to the Parsī Frākāṣ are given by West (op. cit., p. 128), but the work is unfortunately inaccessible to me.
2 This catalogue fails, however, to mention anything corresponding to the Būrj-Nāmah.
servations of the moon," listed by Bezold (Catalogue of the Kuoushik Collection, K 5847, K 6468, 82-3-33 33 [pp. 745, 789, 1816]), furnish any parallels is, of course, impossible to tell until these tablets shall have been edited. It is at least certain, from the description of Ahlwardt (Verzeichnis der arabischen Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, v. 301-302), that the Berlin Arabic manuscripts 5904-5905 do not come under our category, despite their "Deutungen aus dem Stand des Mondes in den zwölf Tierkreis-Zeichen auf allerlei Ereignisse."

The tone of the Burj-Nāmāh is more specifically Zoroastrian than is the Mār-Nāmāh. The form of the bismillāh is distinctly Iranian (the article on the bismillāh by Goldziher in Hasting's Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ii. 666-668. entirely ignores the Zoroastrian adaptation of this phrase, though referring to Arabo-Greek forms, current especially in Egypt, such as εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ νομοθέτων; for a particularly elaborate Zoroastrian bismillāh cf. that prefixed to all three versions of the Sikand-Gūmānī Vijār [ed. Hoshang and West, pp. 3, 181]). A specifically Parsi-Persian word is کنام "making" (v. 3), which is a faulty transcription of the Pahlavi کنام "making" (cf. Justi. Bundahesh, p. 207, Spiegel. Einleitung in die traditionellen Schriften der Parsen, ii. 385). When the new moon is seen in Capricornus, the Āsām vohu (Yasna xxvii. 14) is to be recited (verse 20; on this prayer as a brātamrata, or "prayer to be thrice repeated," cf. Vendidad x. 8, Nirangistān 35); and when the new moon is seen in Aquarius, the Yādā aḥū væryō (Yasna xxvii. 13) must be repeated (verse 23; liturgically this prayer is a cafrūṣamrīta, or "prayer to be repeated four times" [Vendidad x. 11, Nirangistān 36]; for further literature see Mills, in Hastings, op. cit., i. 238-239, and JRAS., 1910, pp. 57-68).

There is, however, one non-Zoroastrian trait in the Burj-Nāmāh—its matter-of-fact acceptance of the vice of pederasty (verses 10, 21, 23), against which both the Avesta and the Pahlavi texts polemise (cf. Vendidad viii. 26-32, Dāštān-i Denik lxii. 6-7). It is true that this vice occurred among other Indo-Germanic peoples than the Greeks, from whom Herodotus (i. 135) states that the Persians learned if (cf. Schrader, Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde,
pp. 488-489); and the impossibility of making any people particularly guilty for its introduction is shown, were such proof necessary, by its occurrence among the American Indians (Waitz, Anthropologie der Naturvölker, iii. 113, 383; see also Post, Grundriss der ethnologischen Jurisprudenz, ii. 391-392 for legislation against it among American Indians, Semites, and Aryans). Despite the statement of Herodotus and the prohibitions of the Avesta, however, I am inclined to doubt whether paederasty was wide-spread among the Persians until a much later period, which perhaps began with the Mohammedan invasion of Iran. That it was lamentably common among the Arabicised Persians is only too plain from the Thousand Nights and One Night (cf., for example, Payne’s translation, ix. 69 sqq.). To some extent the practise formed part of the Babylonian cult (cf. the determined resistance to the מְצַיָּר in Deut. xxiii. 17-18, I Kings xiv. 24, xv. 12, xxii. 46, II Kings xxiii. 7), and this may perhaps have lingered on (possibly furthering, if not even more powerful than, the maleficent influence of Greece), to be still more enhanced by the sensuality of the Arab invaders. But on the other hand, India seems free from this vice, even so minute a scholar as Schmidt recording nothing regarding it in his Beiträge zur indischen Erotik.

This absence of paederasty from India, combined with the repeated mention of it in the Burj-Nāmah, makes it probable that the poem was composed in Persia, not in India, and that, as already intimated, Dārāb Hormazdyār was merely its compiler, not its author. How far previous to 1679 it was written is, of course, uncertain, but it may well be several centuries older, especially when it is remembered that the analogous Mār-Nāmah, contained in the same collection, occurs in principle in al-Biruni’s Chronology of Ancient Nations (tr. Sachau, p. 218), written in 1000 A.D.

For the text of the Burj-Nāmah, here published and translated for the first time, I am indebted to the courtesy of Darab Dastur Peshotan Sanjana, High Priest of the Parsis at Bombay, who, at my request, made the transcript for me from BU 29 in June, 1909. The text and its translation are as follows:
بچه‌ی این مریوان دادگر
بکوئین زعفران نمی‌توان
بینی‌ها، که در آن دم بی‌نیستی نگاه
زنجار دار کنون درنگر
گر آن ماه بی‌گناه بود یک ترا
در آن وقت کن تقو بی‌باه نگاه
گر باشندت یک ماه چندری
زنجات طبقه‌ای تنگ یک بخش یا
دگر سبزورا خوب یا آوروان
تو یک آسمان کن زبان نگاه
می‌پیند کریز و زن لاندان
تا کلمه‌ها و نظم و نگاخر
هم از یک بیز معوق به کوئین تو
حوار‌های بی‌مادته‌ای که کوئین گر
گر آن ماه به نیستی تقدیر خود بر
همانشکه تکه کن ای یک سبز
بی‌بی‌هور تا خود شوی شادمان
اشیام ایه بی‌خوان همانشکه سه ره
گر باشی در آن ماه بی‌سیم بی‌سیم
این‌ها اوه و قسم متفاوت تو این‌ها شنو
می‌پیند کریز و یک تو ای تسامدار
به لعل و جواهر مرآی آنگه نگاه
بی‌شاد و بی‌نی روی نزد ریحان
همین است مار کنون یا دلار
5

In the name of God, Compassionate, Omnipotent!

(1) By the grace of the Lord I shall tell, so far as possible, what the days bring according to each new moon.

* Dastur Darab's transcript has دوست.
(2) When thou seest the new moon from the sign of Aries, at that instant gaze on the fire;

(3) If in that moon thy affairs should be better, consider (that to be) from the making of a grain-jar.¹

(4) Also from Taurus (when the new moon appears), gaze (and) look on a cow if this month is to be better for thee.

(5) When thou seest the new moon in the sign of Gemini, at that moment gaze on her shining;

(6) Beware of mirage and look not on water if that month is to be most good for thee.

(7) When thou seest the moon in the sign of Cancer, hark thou to tidings from the speech of this physician;

(8) Then look to the gate of the soul, though for verdure (this sign) is good, Anwarān (?)

(9) When thou seest the new moon in the sign of Leo, gaze a while upon the sky;

(10) Ask thy need of a pure king; look not, so far as possible, on boy or woman, O famous one!

(11) When in the sign of Virgo thou seest (the new moon), be wise from its meaning, harken to me thus:

(12) Look not on women (and) make thy musician of smoke,² unless thou wouldst make thyself particularly sorrowful;

(13) Recite thou praise of God with perfect sincerity if fortunate doings are to be in that new moon.

(14) When in the sign of Libra thou seest the moon, gaze on a mirror and on armour smooth;

(15) Ask thy need of the Creator of the world. Likewise of the sign of Scorpio I shall tell, so far as possible:

(16) Look on Scorpio with a good gaze; young man, in tradition it is not blind and not deaf;³

(17) Look not on an abominable object, O famous one, if with goodness that moon is to come to thee.

(18) When the moon enters the sign of Sagittarius, look straightway on silver and gold;

(19) Look not on the face of the sick then; be on thy guard that thou mayest be joyful.

¹ The meaning of this line, if I have rightly rendered it, is very unclear to me.
² I.e. of nothing; in other words, "have no musician."
³ The meaning of the allusion is unknown to me.
(20) When thou seest the new moon in the sign of Capricornus, straightway recite the Ašm ahū (Ašm vaḥu) thrice;
(21) Look not on the sick and likewise (not) on boys, else wilt thou be unhappy in that month.
(22) When in Aquarius thou seest the new moon, recite the Aytā ahū vaïr (Yaṭā ahū vaïryū), listen unto them;
(23) Ask thy need of the mighty Creator; look not on boy or woman, O famous one!
(24) When thou seest the moon in the sign of Pisces, look straightway on gems and jewels;
(25) Look and be happy then; be happy, and it will not be harm to thee.
(26) Likewise is the snake now, O Creator, if the king be guardian.
Note on Some Usages of 'כְּלָם.—By J. M. Casanowicz,
National Museum, Washington, D.C.

In a former article in this Journal a number of passages from the Old Testament were quoted in which כְּלָם is not a preposition but an emphatic particle, meaning 'verily'. Professor Haupt pointed out to me that this emphatic כְּלָם can also be traced in some cases of כְּלָם, which is then not a compound of the preposition כְּ and the adverb כּל, meaning 'thus', 'therefore', but of the emphatic כְּ and the adjective כּל, meaning 'verily thus', as, for instance, in Micah i, 14, or 'very well', as in Gen. iv, 15; xxx, 15; Jud. viii, 7; I S. xxviii, 2, while in some passages it is to be rendered by 'not so', 'but', 'yet' (= Arabic lakin).

In the following passages of the 178 in which כְּלָם occurs the adopting of an emphatic, instead of a causal or argumentative, meaning for it would seem to establish a better logical connection of the context.

כְּלָם 'verily'.

1. Is. xxvi, 14. 'the dead will not live, the shades will not rise. Verily thou hast visited to destroy them and cause all memory of them to perish'. The difficulty of כְּלָם here in its usual causative or argumentative meaning was perceived by Delitzsch (in loco) and in Brown-Driver-Briggs in their Hebrew and English Lexicon, p. 487*, who explain it (as also in Is. lxi, 7; Jer. ii, 33; v. 2; Job xxxiv, 25; xlii, 3) as 'inferring the cause from the effect, or developing what is logically involved in a statement'. But we would expect כְּ instead of כְּלָם. But taking כְּ in the emphatic meaning the second hemistich is an epexegetical climax of the first: They will not live, they will not rise: yea, or, to be sure, thou didst visit upon them a radical punishment.

2. Is. xxvii, 9. יֶכְפֶר בְּנֵי הָעַמִּים הָזִים מִפְּגַם מָצָא כָּל מַעֲשֵׂה הָעָמִים, vv. 7 and 8 read: 'Has he smitten it as he smote the smiter? Or was it slain as its slayers were slain? By affrighting it, by sending it away dest thou contend with it; he drove it away with his rough blast in the dry of the east wind', v. 9 then goes on to say: 'Verily by this—they, only in this way—will the sin of Jacob be expiated and this will be the fruit of removing his sin', &c. So also Grätz, Monatsschr. für Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Jdth. 1886, 21, 'wahrlich'. However, the connection of v. 9 with the preceding and succeeding passages is rather loose, and it is possibly out of place here.

3. Is. lix, 7. יֵשְׁתִּיעֲשֵׂה בְּגָדָיו הַגָּדוֹל הָעַם, הַגָּדוֹל הָעַם יֵשְׁתִּיעֲשֵׂה. If the reading of v. 6 in the MT. is correct, viz., 'For your shame ye will have double, and for confusion they (or, you) will rejoice over their (your) portion', 9 introduces an emphatic parallelism: 'Yea, in their own land will they possess double and their joy will be everlasting'. See, however, the emendations of v. 6 by Oort (quoted in the critical notes to Kautzsch's translation) and Cheyne, SBOT, Isaiah, Hebr. edition, pp. 66 and 161.

4. Jer. v. 2. יְהֹוָה יְמֵי לַשְׁכִּירֵהוּ, 'and though they say, As Jivh lives, surely they swear falsely'. So the ARVV. This makes unnecessary the adoption of an adversative meaning for ב here. Duem (in Marti's Kurz. Hdk.) would change the 'sinless' הַשַּׁךְ, after viii, 6, into הַשַּׁךְ or מֵאָה and strike רַעֲשֵׁה. But for swearing falsely נַשְׁכָּבָע is always combined with רַעֲשֵׁה or רַעָב. In taking an oath it is not primarily a question of right or wrong, but of true or false.

5. Micaiah i. 14. נֵלָעַם הַנַּעֲשֶׂה לְעַמִּים הַנַּעֲשֶׂה, 'thus thou must indeed give a parting gift to Moresheth Gath', So Haupt.

6. Zach. xi. 7. כְּעַנַּנְתְּנִי, 'so I fed the flock of slaughter, verily the poor of the flock'. So the RV, LXX, ex τὸν ἐκατοντάρχονς—ζην ἐκκτιμήθην. 7. Job xxxiv, 25. נִכְבּוּ נְפֹר הַגִּבְרֹים הַנִּכְבּוּ נִכְבּוּ נְפֹר הַגִּבְרֹים, v. 24 reads: 'He breaks the mighty without an inquiry and sets others in their place'. 9 introduces not the cause, but the reason of 'without inquiry': 'Verily he knows their works (ec., without inquiry), and so he overturns them in the night so that they are crushed'. So Vulg.: novit enim opera eorum; LXX: ὁ γνώσθηκεν αὐτῶν τὰ ὁποῖα, omitting ב. 8. Job xlii, 3. הַגָּדוֹל הָעָמִים יְמִינָא הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים, הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים הָעַמִּים H
Note on Some Usages of בֵּין.

who is this that hides counsel without knowledge; thus indeed I have uttered that which I understood not, things too wonderful for me, which I knew not;' Kamphansen (in Bunsen's Bibelwerk), 'nay' ('ja'); Budde (in Nowack's Hdb.) strikes 3° to avoid the difficulty of the ב, while Duhm considers it a marginal gloss. LXX: τῆς θεοῦ διαχωρεῖται μου = לֹּעִי מִיבָי. בֵּין, 'very well', 'all right'.

9. Gen. xxx. 15. that is, doth not the Hebrew חָקַךְ את אִשָּׁה לֹּא לֹּעִי בֵּין אִשָּׁה לֹּעִי לֹּع

10. Jud. xiii. 7. And the princes of Succoth said, Are the hands (properly, palms) of Zebah and Zalmunna in thy hands, that we should give bread to thy hosts? And Gideon said, Very well, when Jvhv will have given Zebah and Zalmunna into my hand I shall thresh your flesh with thorns of the wilderness and with briars.' So also Kautzsch and Nowack: 'Nun gut'.

11. I S. xxviii. 2. "and Achish said unto David, know thou assuredly that thou wilt go with me into the campaign, thou and thy men?" And David said unto Achish, Very well, thou wilt learn what thy servant will do.' Kautzsch and Nowack: 'Gut nun'. LXX: οὖσαν θεοῦ γενεῖσαι; Vulg.: nunc etiam (דַּעְתָּה for דְּעָתָה). The meaning of 'verily' or 'surely' (so A.V.) for מַעֲרֵי would also be proper here. בֵּין, 'not so', 'but', 'yet'.

12. Gen. iv, 15. And I will be a fugitive and wanderer on the earth, and it will come to pass that whosoever finds me will slay me.' And Jvhv said to him, Not so, whosoever slays Cain vengeance will be taken on him sevenfold.' LXX: οὖσαν θεοῦ γενεῖσαι; Vulg.: nequamquam. Tuch, 'dennoch', 'aber doch'.

13. Jud. xi, 24. 'and Jephthah said unto the elders of Gilead, Did not you hate me and drive me out of my father's house, and why have you come now when you are in distress?' And the
elders of Gilead said unto Jephthah, But now we have turned again to thee.' Kautzsch: 'Ja'. Still, the argumentative meaning of 'would here also be in place: 'therefore', i.e., either because we want to make good the wrong done to you by us (Nowack), or because we are now in distress (König, Histor.-Compar. Syntax der Hebr. Spr. § 373 p.).

14. Is. x, 24. לֹּ֣א הָֽאֲרָ֣יִם אֵלָ֑י כִּ֛י הִרְדָּא֙ עַד־כָּל־הָ֔אָרֶץ יְבִ֖שׁ יְהוָ֣ה מְשַׁמֵּֽרָּה וּבַֽיּוֹם־הַשָּׁמֶֽרָה לֹֽא בְּיַעֲקהּ movement will the Lord God Sabaoth execute upon all the land'. 'Yet, thus says the Lord God Sabaoth, Fear not my people who dwell in Zion because of Asshur, etc.'

15. Is. xxx, 18. לְקַרְבָּנָ֖ו לֹֽא־לְתָֽאֵבְתָּם לֹֽא־לְקַרְבָּנָ֖ו לֹֽא־לְתָֽאֵבְתָּם יְהוָֽה אֵֽלֶֽהָּ לְקַרְבָּנָֽו לֹֽא־לְתָֽאֵבְתָּם יְהוָֽה אֵֽלֶֽהָּ מְשַׁמֵּֽרָּה וּבַֽיּוֹם־הַשָּׁמֶֽרָה. v. 17, 'thousand at the war-cry of one, and the war cry of five shall ye hear, till you are left like a pole on the top of a mountain and like a signal on a hill.' 'And yet, Jahvah waits to be gracious to you, and yet, he rises to show mercy to you, for a God of right is Jahvah,' etc.

16. Jer. xxx, 16. לֹֽא־כִּ֖י אֲלָחָ֑ן וּלְכַרְבָּנָ֖ו לֹֽא־כִּ֖י אֲלָחָ֑ן וּלְכַרְבָּנָ֖ו לֹֽא־כִּ֖י אֲלָחָ֑ן וּלְכַרְבָּנָ֖ו לֹֽא־כִּ֖י אֲלָחָ֑ן וּלְכַרְבָּנָ֖ו לֹֽא־כִּ֖י אֲלָחָ֑ן וּלְכַרְבָּנָ֖ו לֹֽא־כִּ֖י אֲלָחָ֑ן וּלְכַרְבָּנָ֖ו לֹֽא־כִּ֖י אֲלָחָ֑ן וּלְכַרְבָּנָ֖ו. v. 15b, 'thy pain is incurable on account of the multitude of thy iniquities; because thy sins were multiplied have I done these things to thee.' 'But all they that devoured thee will be devoured, and all thy adversaries will everyone of them go into captivity.'

17. Hos. ii, 16. לֹֽא־כִּ֖י אֲלָחָ֑ן וּלְכַרְבָּנָ֖ו וְלֹֽא־כִּ֖י אֲלָחָ֑ן וּלְכַרְבָּנָ֖ו וְלֹֽא־כִּ֖י אֲלָחָ֑ן וּלְכַרְבָּנָ֖ו וְלֹֽא־כִּ֖י אֲלָחָ֑ן וּלְכַרְבָּנָ֖ו וְלֹֽא־כִּ֖י אֲלָחָ֑ן וּלְכַרְבָּנָ֖ו וְלֹֽא־כִּ֖י אֲלָחָ֑ן וּלְכַרְבָּנָ֖ו. v. 15b, 'and she went after her lovers and forgot me.' 'But behold, I will prevail on her, and will lead her into the wilderness and speak to her heart.'

In Ezekiel, with his tendency to lengthy, discursive arguments, the function of כל seems sometimes to be to sum up and clinch as it were such an argument; so perhaps xviii, 30; xx, 30; xxiv, 6; xxxi, 10; xxxvi, 22; xxxix, 25.

1 Similar to עָבָד, cf. vol. 16, p. clxvii f.
Mythological Aspects of Trees and Mountains in the Great Epic.—By E. Washburn Hopkins, Professor in Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

1. Trees and Divine Groves.

Listed trees are frequently found in the Great Epic, as in 1. 68. 43f; 1. 207. 41f; 3. 24. 17f; 3. 64. 3f; the last two with groups of birds and animals, respectively. But these lists are for poetic effect only, as a single tree often serves the same purpose. Thus the hero is as conspicuous among his comrades "as a great Sala-tree on a river's bank," 3. 35. 25. Or he streams with blood and so "shines like a budded Aśoka-tree in spring" (caṣanta śokāvyāvat), 7. 131. 51, or "like a sandal-tree (reddened) with its own sap," 7. 116. 12, or, commonest of images, "like a flowering Kīṃśuka-tree," e.g. 7. 96. 17—18. In 5. 179. 31, Rāma is (both) "like an Aśoka at the end of winter, (and) like a flowering Kīṃśuka," and a double image is sometimes employed to liken a bleeding hero to a Kīṃśuka and at the same time to a tree surrounded with fire-flies (as the sparks come from his blade) at the eve of the rainy season (varṣīyadose), 7. 15. 18f. The blood-red Krodara-tree also serves this purpose, 5. 7. 97. 9, while like the "five-year-old Mango-grove filled when fruit-laden" is the fall of heads on the battle-field, 7. 45. 37 (citārāmo yathā bhagnah pañcavarṣaḥ phalopagah). From the mythological point of view such references are valuable chiefly in what they lack, namely any indication that the trees so frequently mentioned are holy. In fact, many trees are known only as useful, like the Pīl-groves of the Punjab. 8. 44. 31, on which, as on the Śamī and Īṅgūda (nuts), it is said that camels are fattened, 2. 51. 4; though the Śamī, is a holy tree, being the birth-place of Agni, 13. 85. 44, and use itself contributes to holiness. Thus the "great tree at whose foot the king sits" is described as punyadhara, or "bestowing good" in a religious sense, 3. 24. 24.

1 N. says it is a Kadamba-tree. It is described as latavatādvaratāḥ (bent under its canopy of creepers), a phrase perhaps borrowed from R. 5. 16. 28.
Of tabu-trees there are a number.\footnote{The names of a number of trees whose fruit must not be eaten are given in 13. 104. 62. Their use as food is tabu, \textit{parysiddha}. These are the \textit{pippala} or ficus religiosa, the \textit{vaja} or ficus indica, the \textit{soma}-tree (\textit{cannabis sativa}), the \textit{saka} or \textit{teoona} grandis, and the \textit{udumbura} or ficus \textit{ginnosera}. A list of significant-making trees is given just before, \textit{pryanagu}, \textit{sandal}, \textit{bilva}, \textit{tagara}, \textit{kesara}, etc., 13. 104. 88. In 13. 98. 30 are mentioned woods to make \textit{skiipa} (incense). The \textit{Sami}, \textit{pippala}, and \textit{polosa} are especially spoken of as \textit{samadhas}, wood for making sacrificial fire, and are mentioned along with the \textit{udumbura}, 12. 40. 11. In 13. 14. 58, ascetics live on the fruit of the \textit{Asvatha}, though this is a tabu-tree (\textit{=Pippala}). It represents the male element in the production of fire, versus the \textit{Sami}.} Thus only sinners make a tree use of \textit{Pulasa} (\textit{butea frondosa}) and Tinduka wood for seats and tooth-picks, respectively, obviously because they are sacro-sanct, 7. 73. 38: The last mentioned tree it utilized (as are others) to point a moral. It is productive of a short fierce blaze and a sluggish coward is exhorted to imitate this: “Better to blaze for a moment than smoulder long” (\textit{alatu
\textit{tindukasyeva mukhutan api ki jvala}) 5. 133. 14f. Similarly, the \textit{Salmali}-tree is an image of mortals’ (inconstant) thoughts, “tossed by the movement of the wind like the seed of the \textit{Salmali}”, 5. 75. 19, etc. The \textit{Suka} is opposed to the creeper as strength to weakness, 5. 37. 63 (said of the heroes and their foes), and the same image gives the epic equivalent of \textit{noble} \textit{obliga}: “As the \textit{Syandana}-tree, though slight in size, is able to endure much, so a noble family sustains a weight not to be borne by inferior people,” 5. 36. 36; with another image following a few verses later: “Even a great tree cannot withstand a great wind, while many by being united together (in a grove) endure the hurricane,” ib. 62 (\textit{vigrutamadina vaiti salilante \textit{nyonyasaanirayat}). Compare 12. 154. 4f.

But of ordinary (not supernatural) trees, some are distinctly “revered.” The most general case is the “one tree in a village”, because it is not specified of what sort it is. Standing alone it affords shade and a resting-place and for this reason it is a \textit{cuitya ararniyah} and \textit{supinijah}, that is, “revered and honored” (like a divinity; \textit{grumbadroma}, 1. 151. 33). The \textit{cuitya}-\textit{ykas} is thus an image of the grandeur of \textit{Garutmat}, the heavenly bird, 2. 24. 23. Yet only one such tree is noticed in the texts, the famous \textit{Aksaya}-\textit{vata} of \textit{Gaya}.\footnote{This is mentioned several times, yet not as a tree in itself undying, but as conferring deathlessness, \textit{aksayakarana}, or as making endless the}
able for an asylum of Saints are enumerated in 13. 14. 46 f. All Caitya trees are homes of spirits. 12. 69. 41 f.

It is to be noticed that the tree called Bhandira, the holy Nyagrodha of Vrindavana, is mentioned in the early epic only in the South Indian recension, at 2. 53. 8 f. The famous Khandira is known as a tree used for staking moats. 3. 284. 3.

The Ficus religiosa, Pippala or Aśvattha-tree (the sun is called the aśvattha, i.e. life-tree) is the chief of all trees, 6. 34. 26, and typifies, with its roots above and its branches below, the tree of life, rooted in God (above), 6. 39. 1 f. He who daily honors this tree worships God (Viṣṇu is identified with nyagrodha-udumbara-āśvattha, 13. 149. 101), 13. 126. 5 (it is as holy as a cow or rocanā, ib.). The four Vedas are “word-branched Pippal trees”, 7. 201. 76.

On the other hand, the Vibhittaka-tree stands in dispute as an unholy tree (see 3. 66. 41, entered by Kali); while, in general, “from one and the same tree are produced evil and good” (only SL. 5. 33. 22, ekasmād vai jāyate: sac ca sac ca). This refers to implements etc. made of the tree, for harmful or for religious purposes. The sin of Indra, divided among trees, rivers, mountains, earth, and women, 5. 13. 19, etc., seems to have had no effect upon the holiness of trees in general. The “tree of good” and “tree of evil” are metaphors. The hero of the epic is a “great tree of virtue,” whose trunk and branches are his brothers, though as with the Aśvattha (above) the roots are here divine (brahma; but also the Brahmaṇas). He is thus opposed to the “tree of evil,” the foe, as the Śāla to the vine, 5. 39. 53 and 56. Cl. kāmadrūma, 12. 255. 1.

Magical trees are for the most part supernatural, either

---

offering there given to the Manes. It marks the place where the Asura Gayas fell, or his sacrifice; 3. 84. 83; 87. 11; 95. 14; 7. 66. 20; 13. 88. 14 (proverb); R. 2. 107. 19; my Great Epic, 83, p. 2.

1 dvāra-takubha-kudamba-nirikkaḥ kurubaka-ketaka-jampu-putalikāḥ vata-varanaka-vatanaḥka bītaḥ savala-kapitha-prigala-sala-tekaḥ

2 badari-kunda-punnogār asokā-mrit-timuktakāḥ medhikāḥ koeikāraḥ ca campakāḥ panamśi lathaḥ

3 vanapr leva-vanapr vajāṇaḥ phalaprājādrāj yutam ...

4 kadalisa-sādābhitam keśanānapamā... devayudhbarivavemāt.

5 In this place occurs also the common figure of the wood and the tiger, which mutually protect each other, 5. 29. 54 f.; also lb. 57. 46; and of the lion, ib. 57. 64. The “wood-dwellers”, it may be remarked, are, unless qualified as saints, hermits, etc., simply “robbers” 7. 55. 5, etc.
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belonging to unearthly places or to prehistoric times, though of course plants that instantly heal wounds are in the hands of the wiseacres. Compare for example, 6. 81. 10: "Thus speaking he gave to him a fine wound-curing strength-endowing plant and he became free of his wounds." The Śleṣmātaka (fruit) stupifies: śleṣmātalī kṣiṇavṛcchā śrūṣi (you fail to understand), the commentator says that to eat the leaf or fruit dulls the intellect, 3. 134. 28. But medicinal plants belong especially to the mountain of plants (whence aid was brought to the brother of Rāma) Gandhamādāna (below), and the epic gives a special list of trees that grow on this favored mountain in the Himalāyas, 3. 168. 45 f. (saptapatra, etc.). In this realm of plants and vines, mythology is almost absent and even philosophy scarcely more than affirms that plants are sentient, but "they know not where their leaves are." 12. 251. 8.

There is an implicit denial of any active belief in the action of Karma ever resulting in a man being reborn as a vegetable; the worst he has to fear being re-birth as an insect, a demon, or a low savage. But vines and insects serve the poet better than the metaphysician and here the vines are Love's arrows and ear-rings, and the bees are like Love's arrows (tilakāṇas tilakāṁ jva, trees were the tilaka, forehead marks, etc.) 3. 158. 66 f.

That trees were sentient beings is philosophically proved in 12. 184. 10 f.; but the tales of the earlier period, assume this. Thus in the account of Bhagratha, the text of the South Indian recension says: "The trees, turning toward him with their faces, stood bowed down, wishing to go after their lord", SL 7. 18. 14. It is true that in 3. 230. 35, the "mother" of the trees is kind and gives boons and is compassionate, so that those who wish sons revere her in a Kāraṇja-tree, where she has her abode, while under a Kadamba-tree is worshipped Lohitāyani, 3. 230. 41, the daughter of the Red Sea, and nurse of Skanda; and there can be no doubt that these goddesses are dryads, not so much divine trees as spirits in trees. They are vegetal divinities, but, like many other divinities of like nature, they are savage and eat human flesh and are compassionate only when appeased by offerings. The name given to them (only here!)

B. has "the trees here going after him, the lord, king (ryā, sic) wish to arrive there where the two space-devourers Makha-Mukhān went." In 12. 269. 24 f., trees desire and attain heaven.
is Vṛṣikās, dryads, and they are described as "goddesses born in trees who must be worshipped by those desiring children."

Nevertheless, this Buddhistic attitude is off-set by a few passages, such as that already cited, in which not spirits in trees but the trees themselves act, think, speak, etc., undoubtedly a more primitive thought than that of a spirit in the tree. Thus in the age of Prthu Vānya, "when people lived in caves and trees," not only were all the trees good, so that clothes pleasant to touch and wear could be made of their bark, 7. 69. 5 and 7 (vṛṣāḥ in S.1.), but the trees personified came to Prthu Vānya and begged a boon of him, whereupon he commanded earth to milk out their wish, and the trees rose first to milk earth, so that the Śāla became the calf, the Plakṣa-tree the milker, and the Udumbara the vessel, 7. 69. 10 f. Or, if this seems too mystic to be primitive, one could appeal to the tree-marriage. In 3. 115. 35 f. (cf. 13. 4. 27 f.), two wives want children and embrace trees, one a Pippala and the other a fig (Aśvattha and Udumbara), at the proper time, and also (it must be said) take medicine. The trees, however, are exchanged, so that the woman who should have had a warrior son from the heroic tree bore a priestly son, and the priest's daughter, who wanted a saintly son, got a fighter; through embracing the Aśvattha instead of the Udumbara.

The "trees of gold", which one sees with disastrous results in a dream, seem to be connected with the idea expressed at 5. 46. 9 in the words "the tree of ignorance has golden leaves". As it is elsewhere expressed "Him whom the gods wish to destroy they make mad; (so that) he sees things upside down," and "he who is to die sees things inverted; he sees golden trees," that is, to see trees of gold is to share in the more general delusion of seeing things inverted or turned about, the sign of madness precedent to death.

More particularly, to see golden trees in a cemetery pressages death. In 3. 119. 12, "On committing this crime he saw golden

1. 3. 251. 16 (vṛṣāṃ jñātah; hence vṛṣikāḥ with S.1. better than the siddhiṣaḥ nāma nāmataḥ of R.). "Tree-girded Śiva," 7. 202. 35, is in S.1. still more emphatically "the tree" (epithet of Śiva), S.1. 7. 203. 32.

2. A parallel maraṇacīkhā occurs in R. B. 3. 59. 16: "He that is about to die smells not the expiring lamp, hears not a friend's word, sees not Arundhati" (a star). Cf. AJP. 29. 23, and add R. 2. 106. 13; 3. 30. 15; Mbh. 12. 322. 44. "House-grown" trees are forbidden, 13. 127. 15.
trees in full bloom on the earth of the Pitṛ-world (cemetery), "cāmikaraḥḥān kṣiṭijām...pitṛlokabhūnām. But the addition of the significant cemetery is not necessary. In 6. 98. 17, muniṣvara hi naraḥ sannāṁ vyakṣān paśyati kāñcanān, "he that is about to die sees all trees golden" (the moral: so thou wilt die because thou seest things wrong, viparitāni).

The later epic lays a good deal of stress upon tree-worship, doubtless reviving old practices as well as bringing in new ideas. Not only is Śiva identified with the bakula, the sandalwood tree, and the chado-tree, 13. 17. 110 (the last is the saŋtapaṭra, N.), and with the world-tree (ib. N.), and especial efficacy attributed to the grove of Deodars, ib. 25. 27 (from the wood of this tree the sacrificial posts are made, according to epic tradition); but the mere planting of trees is extolled as a meritorious act calculated to insure the planter "fame on earth and rewards in heaven," ib. 58. 24, since such planting "saves one's ancestors" and "gods, saints, and demigods have their resort in trees," ib. 26 and 29. On the other hand, one who cuts down the lords of the forest on the day of the new moon is guilty of Brahman-murder, 13. 137. 3. One should offer a lamp to a karaṇijata tree, holding in his hand the root of the svacalā, the latter being both the name of a plant and of the Sun's wife, if he desires offspring, ib. 123. 8.

Besides other wonderful trees there are five trees of Paradise which the epic writers regard as capable of being transplanted to earth. Thus the heavenly tree called Pārijata was seized by Kṛṣṇa and carried off by him in defiance of Indra, whose defence was useless, 5. 130. 49. In Har. 7168 f., this tree is identified with another heavenly tree, the Mandara; but in 7. 80. 30 the latter appears to be an independent tree on Mount Mandara. The Nairṛtas in the north country guard the Saugandhika-vana (cf. pundarīkacūḍām, 7. 97. 7) in the same way as the gods-guard their sacred trees in heaven, and the trees there are called saṃtānakās (nāgās) or immortal trees, distinct from the remarkable Kadali-trees which also grow on the grassy places of the favored region, 5. 111. 12 f. Bloody bodies in battle are likened to Pārijata-vanām in 7, 187. 34 (red); but the heavenly trees are not described in detail. Even the earthly banyan is figured only by allusion and implication, though it is probably the model of the "hundred-branch tree" to which Drupada is likened because of his
numerous descendants, 5. 151. 14. But magical trees are not confined to heaven. In the land of demons, Daityas, in the town called Hiranyapura, there are also “trees that bear fruit and flowers at will and go at will,” 5. 100. 15. Many even of the sacred asylums on earth have trees which grant wishes. Thus in the Alamba-tirtha the trees grant wishes, 1. 29. 40, and other trees there have branches of gold, silver, and beryl; one of the banyans being the resort of the little Vālakhiya saints, who hang from the branches head down, 1. 30. 2. On the Utsava hill there are also Kalpavṛkṣas (wish-granting trees), 1. 219. 3, though this is an artificial creation. Just as Indra has a kalpatrāṭā, or magic vine granting every wish, so the kalpa-tree grants wishes. This is so well known (though rarely referred to) as to introduce a simile in 3. 281. 5: “though adorned with care he seemed less like a (beautiful) kalpa-tree than like a cāitya-tree in a cemetery,” na kalpavṛkṣa sāḍhiro... śivasānačāityadrānumava. Cf. 8. 94. 44, and the kapparukkho.

The trees of earthly districts almost merge with those of heaven, as one climbs the mountains to the upper world; but in those divisions of earth known as Dvīpas are to be found similar trees, and where it is etymologically possible the local tree is adored by the inhabitants. Thus in Śaka-dvīpa the Śaka tree is worshipped, 6. 11. 28.

Of the divine trees three or four are specially prominent. The grove of Kadali-trees seen by Bhma on Mt. Gandhamadana is leagues in extent and the grove is “golden” and divine. It lies on the way to heaven, a narrow path, on which the hero is stopped by Hanumat, to prevent his being cursed. But he discovers that this golden grove of plantains, pisang trees, kadalisanda, conceals the further end of the “road to the world of the gods”, devalokāya māryah, 3. 146. 51, 58, 68, 93. Seven trees are “kings,” 14. 43. 3.

East of Meru. 6. 7. 14 f., in Bhadrāśa-dvīpa, there is a great mango-tree which always bears fruit and flowers and is a league high. It is frequented by Siddhas and Cāraṇas and its juice gives immortal youth, ib. 18 (the Kālāmra-tree). The name of the Dvīpa Jambū, is derived from the Jambūvṛkṣa, located “south of Nila and north of Niṣadhā” (mountains), called Sudarsana, an eternal tree which grants all desires and is frequented by Siddhas, etc. It is one thousand and one hundred leagues in height and touches the sky; its fruit being
measured by fifteen and ten hundred cubits (2500 aratni). Its juice makes a river which flows around Meru to the Northern Kurns. The red gold used for gods’ ornaments, like indra-gopa-, in color, comes from it and is hence called jāmbūnāda (red gold), 6. 7. 20-26.

As the juice of this tree makes a river, so the Ganges itself, which among the gods is called Alakananda (Alaka is Kubera’s city, and Alaka designates an inhabitant thereof, 3. 162. 13) has its source at the great jujube-tree which grows on Mount Kailāsa, mahānādi bādariprabhava, revered by gods and seers as well as by the aerial Saints called Vaihāyasas, and by Valakhilyas, and Gandharvas, 3. 142. 4 f. The tree grows beside the Ganges, according to 3. 145. 51 and is reached only by a long journey through many districts of northern Mlecchas and hills inhabited by Vidyadhara, Vānara, Kimnara, Kimpuruṣas, Gandharvas, and Cāranas (so SL 3. 145. 16), till one gets to the asylum of Nara-Nārayana, which is full of “heavenly trees,” i.e. “always bearing fruit and flowers,”’ on Mt. Kailāsa. The Bādari-tree is huge, with a thick trunk and its boughs afford constant shade. It is of incomparable beauty and its fruits are sweet as honey. The rest of the description is the usual picture of heaven. There are no mosquitoes or gnats; the grass is blue (vīla) and soft as snow. The “songs of glad birds” resound. There is an absence of thorns, darkness, sorrow, hunger, thirst, cold, heat; but the place is full of sacrificial glory and holy beauty, brāhmaṇa lakṣmi, though it had no light from the sun. The bādari is the most important of the many “divine trees” found there, ib. 27 f. As Sāka-dvipa has its tree of wonders worshipped by the inhabitants, 6. 11. 27; so Śāmalika-dvipa has a Śāmalika-tree, 6. 12. 6. This tree also is worshipped, just as Mt. Krāuṇca in worshipped in Krāuṇca-dvipa, ib. 7.

These last passages already reveal the close connection between the trees divine and the mountain heights, and more particularly show that the idea not only of a divine tree but of a divine grove was as familiar to the Hindu as to the Assyrian, German, or Roman. Such a grove, called vana-diṣyam, or devarāmyani (plural, 5. 14. 6; 186. 27), devapāṇa, upavana, vanānta, kānana, arāma, nandana, etc., is not only sacred to the gods but is where the gods themselves perform religious rites. In 3. 118. 9 f., Yudhiṣṭhira journeys from Sūr-
pāraka past a place by the sea and arrives at the sacred grove where the gods practiced austerity. There he sees the ayatāna (temple) of Retka’s son and of the Vasus, troops of Maruts, Asvins, Vaivāsvata (Yama), Aditya, the lord of wealth, Indra, Viṣṇu, lord Savitar, Bhava, Candra, the day-maker, the lord of waters, the troop of Śādyas, Dātar, the Pitrō, Rudra with his troop, Sarasvati, the troop of Siddhas, “and whatever (other) immortals” (there are).

2. Mountains.

The shrines but not the gods are found in this lowland place. The gods dwell upon the “ownerless” (13.66.36) mountains, the high places; and it is significant that it is not upon the Seven Hills of the more southern district but chiefly on the thousands of hills of the northern country that one finds the gods.1 Bhārata-land comprises the Seven Hills.

It is said in 3.39.40 that “the assembly of gods, tridaśānam samagamah, is found on the best of mountains” (Himavat); and in 7.54.25, “The gods of old made sacrifice on the top of Himavat.” When Nalūṣa, as king of the gods, devendra, sported in “all the parks and pleasure-groves” familiar to the divinities, he lived “in Kaḷāsa, on the top of Himavat, on Mandara, the White Mountain, Sahya, Mahendra, and Malayā,” as well as by seas and streams, 5.11.11f. But when the Pāṇḍus go to seek the gods, they travel to the northern districts to “divine Haimavata, holy, beloved of Gods,” 3.37.39. It is in the northern mountains also that one finds the most famous shrines of the saints. The Agastya-vāṭa (but also Mt. Kuṇjara), Vasiṣṭha’s mountain, parvata, and the still more renowned Bhṛgu-tūṅga, are visited by Arjuna in the Hima-

---

1 The Seven Hills of TS. 6.2.4.3 (where, 3.4.5.1, Viṣṇu and not Śiva is “overlord of the hills”) remain in epic tradition as the seven Khul-parvatas, 8.9.11 (cf. the seven mountains in Śaka-dvipa, 6.11.13). They are perhaps the “seven doors of heaven”, TB. 9.12.2.9. They comprise the Orissa chain, Mahendra; the southern part of the western Ghāṭa, Malabar (Malaya); the northern part of the western Ghāṭa, Sahya; Sūkt-mat (location in the east but doubtful); the Goodwana range called Bear-mountain, Ikṣavavat; the (eastern) Vindhya; and the northern and western Vindhya, Pārīyāra. In Sī. (only) 4.3.36, Arjuna is called “the eighth mountain”, implying the same ordinary number of mountain ranges. Among the Seven Hills, Mahendra is best known as a holy place, 1.215.13; 3.85.16f. (Rāma-tirtha). Twelve mountains are “kings,” 14.43.4.
layas, l. 215. l f. (with tuṣaṇa cf. taṅka, mountains-slope, only in the pseudo-epic).

The mysterious element comes to the fore in the description of one of the holy places in the hills: "Clouds arise without wind to bring them; stones fall; the wind is always blowing and ever rains the god (nītyān devaḥ ca varṣati). One hears a sound as of reading but (the reader) is not seen. A fire burns there (of itself) both morn and eve. Flies and mosquitoes interrupt devotion. Melancholy is born there and a man longs for his home", 3. 110. 3 f. 1

A religious explanation of these phenomena is essayed by the traveller's guide. The gods do not like to be seen and so they made this place, which is their resort, inaccessible. It is on Hemakūṭa (Rṣabhakūṭa). When the gods "gather at the river" (Nanda is its name), only a great saint may ascend the mountain. For here the gods sacrifice. The grass is sacred (kuṣa) grass and the trees grow like sacrificial posts and are used as such by the gods. "Here with the saints live ever the gods and it is their sacred fire which burns morn and eve. On bathing here all sins are destroyed," ib. 15 and 18. The weird sounds, however, have an historical explanation. The great saint Rṣabha, who lived in this holy place, was once disturbed in his meditations by a party of tourists, which made him very angry and he gave orders to the mountain: "If any man speaks in this place, throw stones at him and raise a wind to stop his noise," ib. 9 f. Hence came the universal rule that one should keep silence in the presence of holiness. "Sit thou down in silence" (tuṣāṇa āsāva), says Lomāśa, 3. 114. 16, "for this is the grove divine of Brahmag" (the Self-existent). But mountains in general are holy and have a purifying effect, according to 12. 36. 7 and 264. 40. 2

The myths of the mountains imply for the most part that they are living beings and of course divine. With other divinities the rivers, seas, and mountains approach and adore Śiva, 13. 14. 399; or Indra, saying "hail to thee", 5. 17. 22.

1 ib. 6: niśeṣo jñate tatra yah kāṇi smarate janaḥ. In the beginning of the description another reading is: "With the sound (of speech) clouds arise". For volcanic mountains, see 8. 81. 15.

2 Among puṣyaṇi are dharaṇībhistas ("earth-holders"); the hills uphold earth) and bathing and visiting the places of the Gods, devaṁbhūvahūtās, 12. 26. 7. Mountains assist at a sacrifice, ib. 321. 182.
So, conversely, a human being is represented as revering Mt. Rāvana and all (other) divinities and as “walking the deasil" around the mountain, 1. 220. 6. Compare 14. 59. 4 f. and the adoration of mountains and trees, in 13. 166. 31 f. In another passage it is said that the local mountain is revered by offerings of flowers and perfumes and cars (? navaratīṣṭhita), 2. 21. 20, although here Cāityaka, one of the five hills surrounding a town, is revered rather as a memorable place. There the minotaur, mānasūda rṣabha, which destroyed the inhabitants, was slain by Brhadhratha, who (perhaps with the help of the propitious mountain) killed the monster and made three drums of its hide, ib. 16 f. Possibly the fact that the hills are represented as running red with metal, dhātu, or chalk washed down in the rainy season may have helped in personifying the mountains as bleeding beings (with whom bleeding men and elephants are often compared), but even this was not necessary in a land where everything was alive.1

One hill in particular, said to be five (or) six thousand leagues in height, is called “garlanded,” Mālyavat, but it is garlanded with the samvarātaka fire, and here reside those who have fallen from the world of Brahma. They precede Aruna and then enter the moon after 66000 years, 6. 7. 28. It runs off to east and west into little hills called (uniquely) guṇḍikās (purvapurvānugandikās and aparayugandikās, 6. 7. 28 f. The title of Himavat as “Guru of mountains,” sāilaguru (rare and late), 9. 51. 34, of itself imparts personality to the mountain. So a mountain begets children upon a river, 1. 63. 35 f. Here the mountain, Kolāhala, in expressly said to be “gifted with intelligence,” celanāyuktaḥ. His daughter was called Girikā. Mountains speak, 12. 333. 30; as an echo, 334. 25.

On the assumption that mountains are alive rests one of the oldest legends in regard to them. RV. 2. 12. 2, yah prthivina mahanānām adṛṣṭaḥ yah paretvān prakīrtiṇam arunāt (“Indra made firm the shaking earth and brought to rest the excited mountains”) is explained by the legend narrated in MS. 1. 10. 13: teṣām indroḥ pakṣaḥ acchintā tār īmān adṛṣṭaḥ (“Indra out off the wings of the mountains and made earth firm”). In the epic, “like the mountains with wings out off”

1 Compare 7. 93. 36, adṛṣṭantā drauṣṭā kāle gārikāmundavā itva (gāri-
rikōdi-. 9. 78. 28, etc.); dhātan. 3. 158. 94 f.; 6. 93. 37, and often. N. takes
makhodhātu, 13. 17. 118, as Meru (epithet of Śiva).
is a standing simile, e.g. 6. 93. 36. That the old legend is in mind is shown by the addition of the words "of old," as in 7. 26. 65, where an elephant is likened to "a winged mountain of old"; and ib. 37, a fight of elephants "resembles that of two mountains of old, winged and wooded." But at present it is "something unknown that hills should move," 7. 103. 6.

Historically interesting is the fact that in times of distress (Kali, as reflecting history) the upper castes, when over-taxed, as an alternative to serving a Śūdra king take refuge in mountain-caves, girigahvana, not (apparently) artificial but the common resort of tigers and other wild animals, 3. 190. 61; 7. 107. 12 (of animals), as well as of Mlecchas, who in 7. 93. 48 are described as habitually living in caves, girigahvanacänañca. They are here savages, like those of the north, Pārvatiyasa, who fight with stones, an art unknown to the Kurus, 7. 121. 33. In the history of Sunda and Upasunda it is said that "they sent to Yama's home even him who sought refuge in inaccessible places," samidinam api duryäga, 1. 210. 20. So, when afraid of the Kāleyas, "some retreated to caves;" kecid guhāḥ praviviśur nirjharāhān ca ātre śrītāḥ, 3. 102. 14. The kandaravas (caves, a rare word in Mbh. but common in R.) are thus utilized by beasts and saints alike, guhākandara (samidināś), 3. 100. 17; ib. 40. 28. In 2. 31. 17 the caves of Orissa are mentioned (pravayānu daksināpathāḥ, guhām āśādayām āsa Kishināhūṃ lokaviśrutām) as being already famous. Cf. durī, 3. 64. 6; kandara, ib. 110; tatasūkandaram, 3. 40. 28.

Later legends representing the mountains as very much alive occur in the accounts of the Vindhyā, the Krāṇica, and the Māmaka mountains. The fact that Krāṇica is the son of Mānaka and Mānaka is the son of Himavat, gives even a genealogical tree; but the descent is not always so given and Krāṇica itself or himself is also called the son of Himavat. Although the Vindhyā legend is more popular, the story of Mānaka is more directly connected with the tale of the winged mountains. The epic use of Mānaka is to compare with this mountain a steadfast hero or elephant. For Mānaka was the only mountain that escaped or resisted Indra, when the others had their wings cut off. "Like Mānaka cast on the ground by great Indra" is the incredible fall of Bhima (as hard to realize); it is parallel to the "drying of ocean or removal, esarpa, of Meru, or the overthrow of Indra at the hands of
Vṛtra, or the fall of the sun, 7. 3. 4f.; 9. 12f. Stereotyped is the phrase “stood firm as Māṁaka,” e.g. 6. 92. 26; 7. 92. 17; 99. 28; 123. 2; 9. 19. 45, etc., referring not to being unshaken by the wind, as is Vindhyagiri, 7. 92. 53, but to its firmness against Indra Nagāri (“foe of the mountains”).

In 3.134. 5f., Māṁaka is said to be as superior to all other mountains as Indra to other gods, or as Ganges to other rivers. It is situated north of Kailāsa (q.v.) and is famous for the mass of gems and jewels deposited there by Maya in or near the lake Bindusaras, where Dānavas sacrifice, 2.3. 3. It is spoken of as having a vinaśana (see below, Meru) in the interior of the mountain where Aditi “cooked food of old for the sake of a son,” 3.135. 3. The legend that Ocean gave the mountain refuse when it escaped from Indra is preserved in 1. 21. 15, “Māṁaka’s asylum-giver is ocean.” There is a watering-place there of some renown, 13. 25. 59. It is to (hundred-peaked) Mt. Māṁaka that a Rākṣasa with “one hundred heads” is compared, 7. 175. 63.

Mt. Kṛṣṇaśa is called the White Mountain, because of the white silver there (Himavat is famous for gold-mines and gems), 3. 188. 112. Compare 13. 166. 30-31, “Himavat rich in herbs divine, Vindhyā in metals, Tirthas, and herbs; and Svetā full of silver” (rajatāvrtah). It is guarded by seven-headed dragons and in it is the golden lake where the mothers of Kumāra (Skanda) bore him (by proxy). Skanda shot at Mt. Kṛṣṇaśa and it fled but afterwards returned: “Skanda drew his bow and shot his arrows at the White Mountain, and with his arrows he split the mountain Kṛṣṇaśa (cf. Kṛṣṇaśa-nisūdaka, epithet of Skanda), the son of Himavat... Kṛṣṇaśa fell uttering fearful howls and the other mountains seeing his fall began to shout. But Skanda split the White Mountain, lopping off one peak and the White Mountain fled in fear from earth,” 3. 225. 10f.; 9. 46. 84. In 3. 229. 28, this mountain is called “Rudra’s seed;” though it was son of Himavat (whom Menaka bore to Himavat). Compare 8. 90. 68; 9. 17. 51; and the seed of Rudra (Agni) cast on Meru by Ganges, 9. 44. 9; 13. 85. 68.

The legend of Vindhyā (renowned for metals and plants, 13. 166. 31) represents that range of hills as angry with the sun for refusing to go round it as it does around Meru, in a respectful manner (pradaksinam). Vindhyā resolved to hide
the sun’s light, and for that purpose began to grow till it shaded earth from the light of sun and moon. The gods begged it to stop growing, but to no purpose. Then the great saint Agastya got permission from it to pass over it both on his way south and on his way back. But as Agastya (the civilizer of the South) never came back, the mountain could grow no more and is still waiting for the saint’s return before it grows higher, 3.103.16 and 104.12f. As the mountain rages here, so it may rejoice, “as a mountain rejoicing in heart receives the rain,” 4.64.5, that is, shows its bravery, since “water is the destruction of mountains,” parvatānāṁ jalan jara (as travel is the destruction of bodies; lack of fortune, of women; and word-arrows, of the mind), 5.39.78.

Another story illustrates a popular belief. The “Gāthās of the gods” say that there was a saint called Bāladhi, who desired to have an immortal son. The gods were kindly disposed toward him because he had been religious; but they said “No mortal is seen (to be) immortal; but he shall have a life conditioned by a cause,” nimittāyuh. Then he, thinking “mountains are indestructible,” said: “Let his life last as long as the mountains” (let the mountain be the cause). Then Medhāvin, his son, was born but, being arrogant, he insulted the saints. One of the saints, Dhanuṣākṣa, after vainly cursing him, took the form of a buffalo and charging against the mountains reduced them to ashes. So, the cause (of life) being destroyed, Medhāvin, the son of Bāladhi, was also destroyed. A Gāthā is sung about it to this day (“no one can escape what is ordained; Dhanuṣākṣa the great seer split the mountains”).

In connection with the mountain-myths may be mentioned the story of the nymph turned into stone, like similar tales in Greek mythology. The Apsaras Rambha, wife of Tumburn, was thus turned into a rock on failing to seduce Viṣvāmitra as she came under the curse of that saint, 5.117.16, etc.

1 This is the version in SL 3.136, which, at vs. 52, inserts half a dozen verses showing that the seer himself became a buffalo. The words in B. mahiṣaṁbh khedamana parvatāṁ are changed to mahārṣir and so in the Gāthā: mahārṣir khedamana Dhanuṣākṣo mahātharan. B., 155.52 and 55, represents the saint splitting the mountains “by means of buffaloes.” So, in the story of Kolūhala (p. 357, above), Vasu outraged by its behavior, kicked a hole in it, through which the river escaped.
Other legends abound, connecting some mountain with a god or saint, as in the landing of the ark on Nārāyanavana, 3. 187. 50. Often the Puranic story is just alluded to, as when Gvādhrana is mentioned as the place where Viṣṇu-Kṛṣṇa (called mahādrīdhyā in 13. 149. 32) upheld the hill for the sake of the cows, 5. 130. 46; 13. 159. 17 gām uḍaḍhīra (Sl. 7. 11. 4, dāvān muktvā ... dhrtvā Gvārdhanam), VP. 5. 11. In the mountain Mahendra (Orissa chain) lived Rāma (after “ejecting the ocean”) at the command of Kaśyapa Māra to “leave the earth,” what time he extirpated the warriors. 7. 70. 21f. On the Narmada river is the beryl-mountain (sometimes located in the north) and in this locality “Kauśika drank soma with the Aśvin and Cyavana paralyzed Indra and won Sukanyā as his wife,” 3. 121. 19. Both epics have the story of Gandhāmādana (also a name of Rāvaṇa, 3. 283. 5) as the home of medicinal plants, utilized by Hammat to cure Rāma’s brother. It bears the epithet mahāuṣadhisamāyuktaḥ parvataḥ, 7. 139. 86. In both epics, Mandara is the instrument used by the gods to churn ambrosia from the ocean, 1. 18. 13 = RB. 1. 46. 21 (C. 45. 18, less exactly like Mbh.).

This Mandara, “Indra’s golden mountain,” jāmbhūnādāparvata, 3. 139. 16, is identical with Indra-Kīlā, 3. 37. 42, and is especially invoked as the home of Śādhus and Munis. It is through the grace of this mountain that priests, warriors, and the farmer-merchant caste attain heaven. Tīrthas (3. 25. 12f.), sweet streams, nymphs, and the sound of Vedic recitation are found there, 3. 42. 22f. In 1. 18. 11, it is supported by the sacred tortoise (Viṣṇu). Vṛtra, it is said in 3. 101. 15, “fell like Mandara hurled of old from the hand of Viṣṇu.” Elsewhere it associated with Mt. Sveta: “We shall see the White Mountain and Mt. Mandara, where are the mānūvara Yākṣa and Kubera the king of Yākṣas, 88000 Gandharvas and four times as many Kimpuruṇas and Yākṣas” (who with Rākṣasas guard the mountain), 3. 139. 5. In 3. 163. 4, it lies east of (Meru and) Gandhamādana and “illuminates all the earth as far as the sea; and the region is protected by Indra and Kubera.” Also here it is said that when Soma and the stars have gone around Meru they “return to Mt. Mandara,” i. e.,

1 So Yudhiṣṭhira on leaving Kubera’s mountain “goes to earth” (and addresses it as a person, draṣṭa tava ‘svi, auf Wiedersehen!), 3. 176. 20.
to the east (S.I. has 'sāgaram'). It is located in the north, with Mandakini, in 5. 111. 12, and in the South in 5. 109. 9, its grottoes (as in the Indraloka ascent, called kuṇjas) being especially mentioned. In 5. 110. 9, it is found in the west. Here the root of Himavat is said to extend (in the western district) toward Mandara, inapproachable, sunk in the ocean. The fact that these three statements are virtually one description weakens the force of each statement and makes the eastern (Bengal) position of Mandara more probable, as this accords with tradition (at the present day "Mandargiri" is near Bhagalpar, Bengal). The fact that Mandara is especially Indra's mountain also helps to establish its geographical position, since "Indra's district" is the east.

But the epic has a vague notion of the northern mountains, the approach to which was difficult and the ascent impossible except to very great saints and heroes. The Panjus see, as they ascend from the south, the peaks of Kālīṣa, Māināka, the foot of Gandhamadana (pādās), and Śveta; whence they journey seventeen days to the back of Himavat and "four days later" come to the White Mountain, "like a huge mass of clouds and full of gems and gold" (gold is in all the mountains, 2. 50. 21; 9. 44. 15, etc.) without having yet reached Gandhamadana, 3. 158. 18f. But, when one stands on Gandhamadana, the "mountain of Indra and Kubera" (that is, Mt. Mandara) lies to the east, as opposed to Sainyamana, the region of the south (of Yama), to the abode of Varuna and the Asta-mountain (where the sun sets; itself opposed to Udaya, sunrise-hill), and to the abode of Brahmā, "great Meru, which illuminates the north," while next (to the east) is the "abode of Visnu." Compare the confused account of the Mahāpārśva mountains, and those "beyond Kālīṣa and Mandara," 13. 19. 20, 53.

1 Cf. arunākṣur yathā mandala parvatai Gandhamadanaṃ, (boasting; "like a fool who (pretends he) is going to climb Mt. Gandhamadana," 5. 160. 94.
2 Asta mahīḍra, 5. 181. 16; asta nāma parvata, 5. 110. 6 (astamānā = astam-ayana). The Udaya hill appears at 3. 224. 11. The Asta is conceived as a real "mountain-king," and there "and in the sea dwells Varuna protecting all creatures," 3. 163. 10. The gods find Śiva on Mt. Mandara, 7. 94. 37, though his regular abode is Kālīṣa, whose lofty peak serves the hyperbole of the poets as an image, "high as peaked Kālīṣa"
Despite the fact that the gods roam about as they will and are constantly found in each others’ pleasure-groves, they are ascribed in general not only to certain regions but also to certain mountains. Thus; “The Rakṣasas (rakṣāsas, sc. live) on Himavat; on Kailāsa (Hemakūṭa) live the Guhyakas; serpents and Nāgas on (Mt.) Niśadha; Gokarnam is a grove of asceticism (cf. 13. 18. 6. Krṣṇa practiced asceticism there); the White Mountain is said to belong to all the gods and Asuras; the Gandharvas (live) ever on Niśadha, likewise the Brahmās on Nila; but the resort of gods is the Peaked hill” (śrīgavāṁś tu... devānām pratisañcarah; a special range), 6. 6. 51f. Then follows the statement that the fire of destruction (sauvartaka) and the saints who precede Aruṇa (above, p. 357) are on top of Mālyavat, ib. 7. 28. Only devī Śānjīli (“Aquí’s mother;” cf. 13. 123. 2f.) is, however, especially ascribed to Mt. Śrīgavat at 6. 8. 9, which, like Meru, has three peaks, one of gold, one of gems, and one of all kinds of jewels, 6. 6. 4 and 6. 8. 8. The flank of Meru called Karnikāra (wood) is a favorite resort of Paśupati and Umā; and Hiraṇmaya is especially the mountain of Garuḍa, 6. 6. 24 and 6. 8. 6. The Gandharvas too live on Mandara (q. v.), on Meru (in Śāka-dvīpa), 6. 11. 15; and in Kuṣa, ib. 12. 14, while “all the districts” (sub Kṛṣṇa-dvīpa) have gods and Gandharvas, ib. 12. 21. Harigiri, “Viṣṇu’s hill,” is in Kuṣa-dvīpa 6. 12. 11. Skanda gives his special mountain, near Ellora, the name of devagiri, “hill of the god” (not “gods’ hill”). The devakīta (tirtha) of 3. 84. 141. (ib. 149, the “lake of Pitāmaha” near the Sairāja) may refer to the “hill of gods” (in general). The statement in 12. 27. 21, that Drāupadi grieves for her five sons “like earth deprived of five mountains” does not limit the number of mountains in any way.

Further examination of the data leads into the realm of cosmology and ethnology, with which mythology on its religious side is less nearly connected. Yet a word must be said in regard to the conception of the Himālayas in general and the site of the world-mountain Meru. It is evident that the epic

stood he, with club upraised,” 6. 94. 23, etc. “High as Mandara,” 1. 207. 32 (gopura). Gandhamādāna (Kubera’s own mountain) is where Pitāmaha receives in audience the gods and seers, 6. 65. 42. The pāda (above) of this mountain suggest the simile of 1. 126, 2. pādačāreṇa parvataḥ (Karṣa in arena) “like a footed mountain.” The pāda, foot (plain), of Himavat is “snowy” (hāima), 7. 55. 39.
poets are acquainted with the world as it appears from the Gangetic plains, where the Eastern Ocean is known but not near; where the “western littoral” is also known but distant, as are the “Punjab kings,” the mountaineers, and, more remotely, the kings of the Sakas, Pahlavas, Daradas, Kambojas, Yavanas, etc., e.g. 5. 4. 15f. But the flight of Indra to “the end of the worlds” sets him in a lake on an island in the sea north of Himavat, 5. 10. 45; 14. 8; and when Arjuna goes north he finds beyond the White Mountain the land of Kimpurushas, protected by Drumaputra, and still farther the land (protected by Guhyakas) called Haṭaka, near lake Mānasa, where there were “streams of saints,” ṛṣikulyas, and near Haṭaka (which gives its name to a kind of gold) he comes on the country protected by the Gandharvas (the Gandharva-nagara is localized here), whence he seeks to cross the “northern Hari-Varṣa” or unconquerable land of the Northern Kurns, 2. 27. 29 to 28. 11 (and expanded in Sl.), just as Bhima gets to the extreme south when he comes to Tāmralipta, 2. 30. 24. Jambūdvipa, 3. 79. 4 and 6. 1. 8 (yāvat tapati sūryo hi Jambudvīpasya maṇḍalam) and 14. 85. 39, is India.

Himavat itself is often personified, though too huge to be always thought of as individual. For the most part it serves as does any hill (1. 188. 7), for a type of stability, endurance, and size. A standing solemn asseveration is, “Himavat shall fall (or burst) and earth shall burst” (ere such or such happen), where the common distinction between earth and mountain again appears.1

A general description in 3. 108. 4f., lands Himavāt’s peaks, rivers, forests, caves, lions, tigers, birds (the kinds being given

---

1 called thi H. śālāk, etc., 5. 82. 48; cf. pated Dwīpar H. śīrṣet, 3. 19. 180, and oft. In 3. 32. 10, it is said that even Himavat, if “divided up and not added to,” bhakṣayamāgo hi anvēvāpah, might be destroyed. Its hugeness leads to the phrase “hide Himavat with a handful of grass,” 3. 35. 23 (like “hiding Meru,” ib. 29); “it cannot be moved,” 18. 35. 20; typical of dhīrṣa, 1. 189. 9. The most striking personification of Himavat occurs at 12. 25. 62, vikhyāto Himavein punyah Śākura-kēśuṣoro girīḥ, sākaraḥ sarvaratnānaḥ siddhaśeṣaṇasvātih, “Mt. Himavat, a mine of gems of all sorts, is called Siva’s father-in-law; it is holy and cultivated by saints and singers” (Siva’s wife is Pārvati, “daughter of the mountain”). Hence perhaps Siva is called Hāima, but, as he “lives in mountain caves,” it may be that hāima means “living on Himavat,” as he is Merudhāman, “living on Meru,” 13. 17. 61, 64 (hāima), and 91. Himavat is also “father of Ganges,” 6. 119, 97 and of Mt. Abu (below).
in detail), Kinnaras, Apsarasas, elephants, Vidyādharas, jewels, and snakes. In particular it is famous for its gold-mines and gold-bearing waters.¹

Kālāśa is of all the mountains in Himavat the most famous and serves as a means of comparison when one wishes to describe towers etc., which in Sanskrit as in our parlance are called “sky-scrapers,” divisprē, as in I. 185. 19; 2. 34. 20; cf. (not in B) SL. 1. 96. 56, Kālāśāsūkhaśūrār gopurāh. Even the house of lac is compared with it, I. 146. 12, or a man, as Balārāma is “like the Kālāśa peak,” I. 320. 20. It lies, as described in Vana, beside the upper Ganges but beyond the Northern Kurus and is near Mt. Māināka, 3. 145. 17 f., 41 and 51 (also SL. 1. 243. 31). The Sabhā of Kubera is “like the peak of Kālāśa” 2. 10. 2. It is said to be six leagues(!) high. All the gods assemble upon it, and the Yakṣas, Rakṣasas, etc. to be seen there are without number, 3. 139. 11f. The monster jujube described as being there and in Gandhamādana (ib. and above) shows perhaps that no great distinction was felt between them, unless one was a part of the other. According to 3. 12. 43, Kṛṣṇa once lived there (SL. quite different, vairājabhavana for Kālāśabhabhavana).² The two mountains elsewhere, as at a later date, are differentiated.

¹ Compare A. 111. 24, the “gold-mine of Himavat,” hāimavataś kanośīkūrvaḥ, and “gold-giving lake,” found at Uṭra-buṣa. In 3. 82. 55, Arhuda is “son of the Himālayas,” himaevatsuta, “where there was of old a cleft in the earth” and asylum of Vasītha. As it is near Prabhāśa (on the Gujarat coast) it must be the modern Mt. Abu, and not Māināka, as later in VP. The gold comes from “Rudra’s seed,” 9. 44. 15. Gold in the “essence,” aśīra, of all mountains (as honey is of flowers), 13. 17. 14.

² The commentators here understand badari and vīśilā to refer to the jujube tree and not to the stream or asylum of Nāruṣaṇa so called (5. 111. 4). But anyway Kālāśa seems to include, as a range, the further hill called Māināka and Gandhamādana. Cf. the later rajatobri “silver hill,” as epithet of Kālāśa, with the statement above regarding Śveta. In 3. 158. 17, where the heroes see Gandhamādana and Śveta after Kālāśa and Māināka, SL. has Meru for Śveta. In the more or less stereotyped geographical scheme of 6. 6. 1f., Gandhamādana lies north of Mālyavat, which is north of Niṣadh, and Niṣadh is the mountain west of Hemakūta (Kālāśa). According to a v. 1, in SL. “black men” live on Gandhamādana (in B, they are “happy” hṛṣṭa, kṛṣṇo narāḥ), 6. 6. 31 (36). In 1. 119. 38, Gandhamādana is this side of Indra-Kīṣa and beyond Himavat (cf. 3. 37. 41); it is protected by Sainas, Siddhas, and by mahābhūtas. Indradyumna-lake and Haṇsa-kūta lie beyond it (ib. 50). It is accessible only to aecetic mortals, and the vīśilā badari is there, 3. 140. 22; 141. 23.
Mt. Meru, if no cosmological theory stood opposed, would seem to be a hill “beaten by rain,” 7. 166. 14; 174. 20, etc., like other hills of the north country, only surpassing all and reaching higher than the sun, so that the sun goes around it, 3. 104. 2. It is Meru-giri, trikata, the best of peaked mountains, 5. 65. 5 (it has three golden peaks, 6. 82. 27), and it is covered with cloud but not stirred, mathita, by the wind, 7. 156. 81 ff. (“Wind shall bear away Meru, and the sky fall,” ere this thing shall happen, is said as above of Himavat, 5. 160. 98). The “rocks of Meru” (“may be counted,” 13. 26. 98) appear to be as well known as the “sands of the Ganges” (with the stars in the sky usually as type of countless hosts of cows), 7. 58. 7, yuvatyah sikata gango yavan Meror mahopalaH. Like other mountains it is red with metal, 5. 179. 30 (see above). Like other peaks it stretches to the heavens and “golden Meru” is a part of the Svarloka (light-world), holding parks of the gods, its extent being given in one place as three and thirty thousand leagues, 3. 261. 8. It is the “Indra of mountains” and is ever resplendent with sunlight, 1. 225. 37; 2. 38. 28; 3. 81. 5. Yet its glory excels that of the sun, and it is the home of gods, Gandharvas, and beasts, but not of men who are unrighteous. It is there the gods consulted how to use Mandara as a churning-stick to get ambrosia, 1. 17. 51f.; and 1. 18. The deva-sabha is on Meru, Sl. 2. 51. 43. It cannot be destroyed (or, Sl. turned round, vivartanam for vimardanam), 3. 36. 3 (cf. viparyasa, 7. 193. 7) or concealed (above). It is typical of dignity (Merupratimagaurava, “O thou as grave as Meru”), 3. 41. 40.

Yet the poets do not hesitate to say that the sun lights it, Sl. 4. 19. 13; that vultures visit it, 3. 225. 33; that the saint Visvamitra can “hurl Meru away from earth,” 1. 71. 36; and that the “house-goddess” can devour it, 2. 18. 8. Hiranyakashipu is known as “the shaker of Meru” (kampana), 13. 14. 73. On its wooded top sit saints and gods, 12. 324. 11—21. Asylums are found there, as, for example, that of Vasistha, albeit “on the flank” of the mountain, 1. 99. 6, though Yayati sports upon its very peak, Merusringe., uttare (northern), 1. 85. 9, as does Usanas with the demon Daityas, 6. 6. 22, and the

It is described in 3. 146. 22, as “dancing with clouds outspread” (as a ballet-dancer with skirts).
"wives of the gods" ascend it, 1. 134. 16. The mountain is spoken of as if the poets saw it before them. "He shone in splendor on his golden car as shines the sun on Meru," 7. 84. 17; "looked like Mahā-Meru with its clouds," 6. 109. 38; "resplendent as the peak of Meru," 7. 120. 4. A long description of it is found in 3. 163. 12f. It lies north of Gandhāmādana, is holy, the gate of the saints, and illuminates the northern district. There Prajāpati, the soul of being, abides. There too, in a blessed and healthful abode, live those who are called the putrā mānasāh of Brahma (his mental sons), of whom Daksā is the seventh (14). The "seven seers of the gods" (Devarśis) set and rise there. The topmost peak is occupied by Pītāmaha, "with the self-pleased gods" (ātmatyaptaiḥ); but beyond the seat of Brahmā is that of the eternal supreme Nārāyaṇa (God). This even the gods cannot see (or "see with difficulty," SL), 18. This place of Viṣṇu (God) is to the east of Meru and is inaccessible even to Brahmāris and so, of course, to the "great seers" (Mabārśis, by implication inferior to Brahmāris, ib. 21), though Manu holds a conversation there, 13. 98. 6. Around Meru revolve continually the sun and moon, from east to west, pradaṅkṣinam upāvṛtya kurutāḥ (cf. 3. 168. 36, girim āmantrya Sāśiram pradaṅkṣinam upāvṛtya), as do all the heavenly lights, which the sun drags with him as he makes the circuit, kurute (Merum) abhipradāṅkṣiṇam; for the sun, on reaching the Asta mountain and getting "beyond the twilight," takes the northern district as his course; bhajate... kāṣṭhām (to the north of Meru) and so returns, facing east, 30f.: Merum anuvṛttabḥ sa punar gacchati prāṇmukhāḥ (SL has suṣumnaḥ for sa Merum). Thus also the moon, dividing the months, goes with the stars (nakṣatras), and "passing on the other side of Meru... returns to Mandara" (i.e., the east).1 Meru itself is east of Ketumāla, 6. 6. 31.

1 The expression atikramana is a technical geographical term, meaning "passing behind" or "on the other side of," cf. Pañc. 3. 4. 20. In 30, above, it is used of the sun getting to the other side of the twilight. In 13. 98. 10, one who kills a refugee is likened to one who should atikramet (sic) the brightness of Meru, i.e., disdain. The account following (above) says that to make winter the sun goes to the southern district, but nothing more is said of Meru at this point. In 3. 164. 8, the mountain of the north is luminous with plants, and has no distinction of day and night; but the inhabitants see the sun rise and set (astāmanā, 9).
It is even possible that Mānāka is at times regarded as part of Meru. There is a vinaśana ascribed to Mānāka above, and in the Tirtha stories of Vana, 3. 82, 111, the vinaśana of the Sarasvatī, is where this river "goes concealed on Meru's flank" (and is seen again at Camasa, Śirodbheda, and Nāgodbheda).

The Meru of the Mahābhārata nowhere appears to be regarded as the axis of the world, the north pole to which the (later) Sumera is antithetical. In the "car of the gods," it is the perpendicular flagstaff of the car, that is it is a lofty mountain-range situated in the north, 7. 202, 78. In view of the theory recently propounded in this Journal that Babylonian and Hindu cosmology rest on the same basis, it is necessary to observe that there is in fact no southern pole, Sumera, recognized at all in the epic. One passage given above shows a doubtful reading (SL) of sumera for sa Meru, but in that case sumera is Meru itself ("fair Meru"), as shown by the context. The only other case where Sumera occurs is of a similar nature. Instead of the reading bahūna paraṇepetāḥ svayambhūr iva bhūmatā, in 6. 2078 (C.), the Bombay and South Indian recensions have 50. 46) sumerur īva, which, in the light of the similes just given, is evidently "resplendent as fair Meru."

Meru as described in the late geographical intrusion at the beginning of Bhisma's half way between the earlier and

---

1 It is only here that the Persians bear the (Paranic) name Pārāśakas, 6. 9. 66, Hūśaḥ Pārāśakaḥ saka (so too in SL; in VP, 2. 3, 13, Pārāśakaḥ sathā, to avoid three iambics). One very important difference between the epic and Paranic descriptions is that, whereas the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa 2. 4. 1, says that the Plakṣadvipa (and others) surrounds the sea, which in turn surrounds Jambu-dvīpa, ēśvaroṇa yathā dvīpa jambudvīpiṁ bhiveṣṭaḥ, sumevēśta kaśāram uṣandhim plakṣadvipas tathā sthitam, the epic nowhere says that a continent encircles an ocean, but only that an ocean surrounds each continent, 6. 9. 13f.; cf. ib. (8. 10 and 15) 11. 8, 11. 9, 12. 1f. Furthermore, in 6. 12. 27, after remarking that "jewels come into (are exported into) the Dvīpa called Puṣkara from Jambū-dvīpa" (just as "Indra brings the rain from Saka-dvīpa," 6. 11. 16), the poet says that all these dvīpas excel as they go north, both in virtue and in length of life, but that nevertheless they must all be regarded as one nation, "for that is called (one) nation where there is one law" (or religion), eka janapado vijan dvīpeṣu ekaḥ Bhūrata, uñca janapadaḥ iva dharmas ekaḥ pradīpyate, and finally he ascribes to the guardian elephants of space a "Plain" country still beyond those already mentioned,
later (Puranic) conception, and one among many indications that the muddled South Indian text (as published) is tainted with later passages is to be seen in this, that just where Meru is sufficiently described in the Bombay texts as being eighty-four thousand leagues high and eighty-four thousand deep, the SI. text adds (in the words of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, 2.2.8) that its apex is twice the size of its base, 6.6.10. To get a proper idea of the epic Meru it must be remembered that in this work the dvipas islands or continents, are not spheres, but parts of the earth, which to the observer stretch away to the north and north-west on a scale resembling in general that made with Mercator’s projection (the farther north the greater the extent), each continent having all its virtues including size, double that of the preceding. Meru is one of seven mountains running across Jambu the Rose-apple continent. It stands exactly in the middle, having south and east of it the three great ranges Niśadha, Homakaṭa (or Kālīsa), and Himavat (the thousand leagues between each range making a valley, vārṣa), and to the north and west of it the ranges called Nila, Śveta (White Mountain) and Śrīgavat, while north of the last the country “borders on the sea,” and so stops the row; but south of the south-eastern end, occupied by Himavat, lies the India of the plains, Bhārata-land. Other continents to the north and east of Jambu-dvipa (Rose-apple continent) are Ketu-māla, immediately west, and Kuśyapa-continent still farther west, which, along with Śaka-continents, or Nāga- (Ceylon? In SI. Śaka for Nāga, 6.6.56) 4, forms the ears of the “hare”-shape of part of Sudarśana, equivalent to Jambu continent (also of the discus). This in general is circular, but part of it looks like a hare and part looks like a tree and these shapes are reflected in the moon “as in a mirror.” It

tataḥ param samā nūma, having four corners, and thirty (leagues?) in extent, 6.12.33 (or “having thirty circuits” 5 ). This land called Samā is itself (ib.) described as lokasamasthitih, “the form of the world,” as if it were the tower of Babel in Sumerian land! Kuṣa is not an uncommon place prefix. Compare Kuśavarta a teacher on Mt. Nila, mentioned with Gāngādāra, in 13.25, 13; Kuśastamba, ib. 26. (Kusasthali is Dvāraku). Kuśadvipa was presented to Vidyujprahha by Śiva, according to 13.14.84.

4 Lanka also has its trikaṭa, three-peaked mountain (cf. triśrīgū, 8.15.8). The Vedic triśrīgū is an epiteth of Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu. Bhāratavarṣa is middle India, 6.9.4f.; 12.316, 14f.
is possible that the land called Kaśyapa may be Caspian land; at any rate that is where it should be according to the description. Meru rises in the middle of Hāvṛta, between Nila and Niṣadha and also between Mālyavat and Gandhamadana. On its flanks are Kētumāla on the west; Bhadrāśva, the land of the Kālamra-tree (above), on the east; the Northern Kurus and the Karpikāra forest, on the north. Ganges falls from its peak into lake Candra-mas, appearing first at Bindusaras near Māinaka, north of Kālāsa. On its south is Bāharata-land. The countries and mountains from the last north to Bāharata in the south lie like a bow (curved). The Śaka-continent also has seven mountain-ranges and the first is Meru (6. 11. 15). Meru is the house of divinities and is golden (even the birds being indistinguishably golden); so it resembles the sun (not in being round but in being brilliant), 6. 6. 10. The juice of the 1100 league high rose-apple tree (dvāsypaś, "touching the sky") runs around the base of Meru and gives health, agelessness, etc., to the Northern Kurus, as said above, 6. 7. 20.

But it would be a mistake to suppose that there are literally seven continents. Even in this description the poet says expressly: "There are many continents; I will describe seven," 6. 11. 4, using indeed a synonym, since sapta dvipaḥ meant originally the subahavvo dvipaḥ yāvīr santatum idam jagat ("very many continents extend the world"). They are thought of as comprising not the sphere of the universe but the earth, supratadvipaḥ, so called in 8. 90. 106; 12. 49. 37; cf. "earth with its seven continents and seas," R. 7. 38. 56. The poet of the Jambukhandavinīrmaṇa is quite right in saying there are more continents. In Saṅhāra is mentioned a Śaka-duvipa and the "seven dvipas" are here clearly equivalent to "the whole earth." Thus in 2. 12. 12, Hariscandra, a king, "conquered the seven continents," id est, the whole earth, and in 2. 26. 5f., "He conquered Śaka-duipa and king Prativindhya and whatever kings there were in all the seven continents," meaning of course in this conquerable earth. In 2. 32. 14, Śakala is a city of the Madras (Punjab). Compare 13. 35. 23; sapta dvipaṁ imāṁ varṣena bhimapavarṣati, "rains over this earth." But "earth has thirteen dvipas in 3. 3. 52 and 134. 20; and eighteen

1 Compare the use of "seven kings" of the Kīrātas, the "seven tribes" of Uśāva, 2. 27. 16; 30. 12, etc. "Seven" is often several.
in 7. 70. 15. The “gate of Mānasa lake,” according to the epic itself, 3. 130. 12. is called “the vṛṣam made by Rāma in the midst of the mountain,” apparently Mt. Kailāsa, where the famous lake (the brooding-place of swans) is situated, although the passage would appear also to include it within the “holy circuit of Kashmir,” Kāśmiramandalam (s Sarasvāpyam) not far from which is Visvupadām. The “seers of the north,” āuttara ṛṣayāḥ, held a conversation there with Nāhusa, Agni, and Kāśyapa, ib. 8 and 10.

The number of oceans is indifferently given as four or seven. The “four oceans united by Darbhin” are repeatedly alluded to: 3. 83. 156; 84. 126; 85. 63. On the other hand, the septasamudrāntā mahī of 7. 198. 55 (R. 4. 15. 8) and sapta samudrāḥ of R. 3. 78. 4 imply earthly oceans numbered conventionally as “seven” (still earlier, as in VS. 13. 31, there are three oceans; or only the eastern and western, as in Manu, 2. 22). But even “four oceans” are also recognized, as in Manu 8. 406 and Kath. 69. 181, catuḥsamudrā prthivī.

Thus the very account in the epic which is supposed to imply the Puranic cosmogony speaks of only four oceans in 6. 3. 38, catuḥvārah sāgarāḥ. In the account of the Dvipas also four oceans are expressly mentioned, ghṛtstotyāḥ samudraḥ ‘tra dādhamandodako ‘parah surodah sāgaras caiva tathā ‘nyo jalamāgarah, 6. 12. 2, though in 11. 8f. the kṣiroda is said to surround Śaka-dvipa. Apparently the original conception was that there was around all the earth four seas, one for each direction, just as there was a four-fold river running from the mountain in the middle of all the earth, and, to judge by the disposition of the four regions around Meru, there were at first but four dvipas. Thus in 6. 6. 12: “On the flanks of Meru are four (is)lands (tasya pūrśve pu mā dvipāḥ catvārah samsthitā vibho), Bhadrāsvala, Ketumala, Jambūdīpa, and the Northern Kurus.” In VP. 2. 2. 22, the first two are called vāraśi dve. Even there dvipa is used for vṛṣa. Compare VP. 2. 2. 3, where the vṛṣa called Bhārata has nine dvipas (Indra-dvipa, Nāga-dvipa, Gāndharva, Vāruna, etc.).

As late as the Śanti, 12. 14. 21f, the four Dvipas around

1 Jambūdīpa is mentioned as “famous” in 3. 79. 4. SL. 2. 96. 29 adds one passage to those giving “seven dvipas.” The dvipa is a safety-place of any sort, 2. 63. 7f.; 3. 177. 19; 8. 93. 5; 12. 802. 71f.
Mahā-Meru are spoken of as we should speak of the quarters of the earth. The king is said to have brought under his sway "Jambudvīpa, and Kṛauṇḍa-dvīpa which resembles it lying below, nādiherum, Mahā-Meru, and Sāka-dvīpa, to the east of Mahā-Meru, and Bhadrāśva of equal extent with Sāka-dvīpa lying north of Mahā-Meru;" and farther: "Dvīpas and antara-Dvīpas by plunging into the sea thou hast brought under thy dominion," vs. 25. Here the Dvīpas and "antara-Dvīpas" are all part of the conquest of a king of earth, as earth itself in 12. 14. 38 is described as suparvacanadvīpa, "(divine earth) with her mountains, woods, and islands."

In this book alone, 12. 336 f., occurs the description of the White Island, Śveta Dvīpa, otherwise known only from the Purāṇas (including the Harivaṃsa), which is a part of the earth lying in the northwestern direction where men profess a monotheistic cult. There is no reason to suppose that Śveta Dvīpa was ever heard of for centuries after our era. It forms no part of the very complete geographical sections in the early epic or even of the late intrusion which precedes the Bhagavad Gītā at the beginning of Bhaṣya.

Despite pretended familiarity with the northern country, it was really reckoned a death-journey to go thither. Thus when Sañjaya "says farewell and sets out for the Himālayas," it means he is going to the bourne whence there is no return, 15. 37, 34. Questionable also is the exact bearing of "Himavat" to the southerner. As Mt. Abu is a son of Himavat (above) so the "plain of Himavat" (prastha) extends so far south that it is within two leagues of Kurukṣetra. There, "on the plain of Himavat, besides the red Sarasvati" is the camp of the Paṇḍus, 9. 5. 50 f.; 6. 4.

Particularly in regard to Meru it is to be noticed that even in Śanti its peak joins that of Himavat and is of the same height, so that the two united peaks form simple edges (at least Śuka has to burst his way through them as they join together), which would be indistinguishable were it not that one peak is golden (Meru is hemagiri, 8. 56, 114) and the other (snowy or) silvery, 12. 334. 8 f. Nor does it accord with the notion of a polar mountain that its top has groves upon it and that not only gods and saints sit there but even "gentle and learned priests" live under the Jambū-tree on its very summit, 13. 162. 20 f. In Si. 13. 33. 22, Vatsanabha
proposes to expiate his fault by “going to the top of Meru” and committing suicide. In the epic, in short, Meru is felt to be a mountain like Himavat, only taller and farther north; but its peak rises like that of other mountains perpendicularly and not parallel with the plain of earth as axis of a sphere.

Another distinction between the epic and Puranic idea of the world must be kept in mind. In the Purāṇas, e.g. VP. 2. 7. 1f., there is fully developed the idea of the planetary spheres (not Dwipas) which go by the names Maharloka, Janaloeka, Tapoloka, and Satyaloka, superadded upon the older Bhuīloka and Svāvloka or Svargaloka (these are epic) with the intermediate Bhuvas as Bhuvarloka. Now the epic knows nothing of these seven spheres as such. It is only in its latest parts that it recognizes the seven spheres bhuvanāḥ (masculine!), 13. 16. 34 and 52: Dhruvah septasāyatā cāt va bhuvanāḥ septa śa va ca, “Dhrusa, the seven seers, and seven spheres,” not exactly as in the Purāṇa, even then, since there (loc. cit.) the pole-star, Dhrusa, is above the Seven Seers, and only four spheres rise above this. What the earlier epic recognizes is the (old) general conception expressed by “seven worlds;” compare (in the imitation-Upaniṣad) the half-verse tataḥ param ksetravido vadanti prākalpayad yo bhuvanāṁ septa, 3. 213. 22. So in 1. 179. 22, the septa lokaḥ are mentioned as in Mund. Up. 2. 1. 8; cf. AB. 2. 16; 4. 7; 4. 9; 5. 10. That is to say, the epic has the idea of the plurality of worlds, vaguely grouped as Seven Worlds, as this idea came down from antiquity together with that of the Seven Hills, Seven Seas, Seven Rivers, Seven Mountains, Seven Seers, Seven Flames, etc. But there is no recognition of the systematic sevenfold planetary sphere, whose names as subdivisions are not even mentioned till the Purāṇas (cf. 3. 261. 17f. many worlds). In this regard the ideas of space run parallel with those of time. The Puranic system of Manus and manvantaras (aeons and ages systematically arranged) is unknown to the early epic. The Anuśāsana, which is little better than a Purāṇa-addition to the poem, knows it well; and so do the later (335—350) Parvans of Sānti and possibly the Sun-Hymn (which alludes to Mithra of Persia) in Vana. The “worlds” of the epic are three or seven or twenty-seven or innumerable. Against the assumption of Indo-Babylonian cosmological unity stands the fact that the earlier the Indic data are the
slighter appears the resemblance to those of Babylon. Even if it be claimed that the epic represents only a disintegrated original system, it must remain an historical contradiction that its data show earlier conceptions than those of the Purāṇas and yet represent the system of the Purāṇas. The only parallel with Babylonian cosmology in India's very early literature is, as it seems to me, the "seven worlds;" but as these are not spheres and as seven is anything but a precise term, it would be periculous to make very much of that fact. Buddhistic world-theories are too late to be of importance in this regard, but they too have affected the later epic.
Expression of the ideas "to be" and "to have" in the Philippine Languages.—By Frank R. Blake, Ph. D., Johns Hopkins University.

One of the most important uses of the study of languages which lie outside of the more familiar Indo-European and Semitic groups, is to broaden our knowledge of general grammar, to make us acquainted with unfamiliar turns of speech, and to disabuse our minds of the notion that the way in which the better known tongues are accustomed to express a certain idea, is the logical and only way. In several articles previously published in the Journal I have illustrated this general principle by bringing forward some of the most peculiar linguistic phenomena of Tagalog and the other Philippine Languages. I have discussed their peculiar system of counting, in which the numbers intermediate between the tens are made, somewhat as in Latin duodeviginti, undeviginti, upon the basis of the ten toward which the count is proceeding; I have pointed out that simple adjectives have the same construction as relative clauses; I have shown that the case relation of a noun or pronoun may be expressed by the form of the verb.1 In the following paper I shall discuss the peculiarities involved in the expression of two ideas of fundamental importance, without a knowledge of which it is impossible to have the mastery of any language, the ideas "to be" and "to have."

In the languages with which we are most familiar, English, German, the Romance Languages, Latin, Greek, these ideas are expressed by verbs, and so to our minds this is the most natural and simple way of expressing them. We receive our first shock when we turn to Sanskrit, where we find there is

1 Cf. my articles, Contributions to Comparative Philippine Grammar II., JAOS, vol. xxviii., 1907; The Tagalog Ligature and Analogies in other Languages, JAOS, vol. xxix., 1908; Expression of Case by the Verb in Ta
no verb for "to have" at all, but that we must express the idea by the verb "to be" followed by the genitive, e. g., sama asti "it is of me, I have," a construction, however, for which we have been prepared by the Latin mihi est = habeo.

If we turn from the Indo-European to the Semitic field, conditions are still more unfavourable to our preconceived notions. Not only is there no verb "to have" in any of the languages except Assyrian, but the idea "to be" is often not expressed by the verb "to be," but by particles, or pronouns; in fact it is sometimes not expressed at all. For example in Hebrew "I have a horse" is rendered by "to me a horse" דע ר, "the man is good" by "the man good" בֵּית עָנָן or "the man be good" בֵּית עָנָן.

In the Philippine Languages we must break entirely with our traditions, for here we find generally speaking no verb for either "to be" or "to have," these ideas being expressed either by particles, or simply by the construction itself.

These two ideas are, however, not always expressed in the same way, there is not one particle which can always be used to translate 'to be' and another which can always be used to translate 'to have;' the mode of rendition depends on a number of things besides the fundamental ideas of 'being' or 'having.'

In the case of 'to be' we must distinguish three types of construction, viz.:

a) constructions in which some statement is made with regard to the class or characteristics of the subject, e. g., 'the man is good,' 'his father is a farmer';

b) constructions in which some statement is made with regard to the place of the subject, e. g., 'his father is in the house';

c) constructions in which some statement is made with regard to the existence of an indefinite subject, corresponding to English 'there is,' 'there are,' German es gibt, French il y a.

The first we will call 'copulative to be,' the second 'locative to be,' and the third 'indefinite to be.'

In the case of 'to have' we must distinguish two types of construction, viz.:

1 Here the particle which corresponds to Hebrew ו, Syriac ל, has become a verb and takes verbal inflection, cf. Delitzsch, Assyrisches Handwörterbuch, Leipzig, 1896, p. 310a.
a) constructions in which the thing possessed is definite, e.g., 'your brother has the money I sent you';
b) constructions in which the thing possessed is indefinite, e.g., 'have you any money?'

We will call these two types respectively 'definite' and 'indefinite to have'.

'Definite to have' is expressed in the same way as 'locative to be,' the original idea here being similar to that in Latin mihi est, 'is to me,' Sanskrit mana asti, 'is of me.' Modern Arabic مَنِي 'andi 'is with me,' Ethiopic ጥቸ ይ 'he is in me.'

'Indefinite to have' and 'indefinite to be' are expressed in the same way, the idea of 'having' being the original one and passing into that of 'indefinite being' when the possessor is indefinite; e.g., 'they (indef.) have visitors in the house' becomes 'there are visitors in the house,' just as in Spanish hay, and French il y a.

The five types therefore resolve themselves into three, viz.: a) copulative to be, b) locative to be and definite to have, c) indefinite to be and indefinite to have.

The negative of these three types is expressed in two different ways; either the negative is added to the affirmative construction as e.g., in English 'he is' and 'he is not,' or a negative particle meaning 'not to be,' 'not to have' is substituted for the affirmative particle meaning 'to be,' 'to have,' as e.g., in Hebrew יִישׁ - 'I have' and יִיש - 'I have not.' The first way is the regular one in the first type, the second in the other two.

The following table gives the particles which are employed to express 'to be' and 'to have' affirmatively and negatively in the three types of construction just discussed. A dash indicates that no particle is employed. Generally speaking these particles are invariable for person, number, mood and tense, though occasionally they are varied to express person or follow the tense formation of the verb. The particles will be known as quasi-verbal particles or quasi-verbs.

The languages treated are Tagalog; the Bisaya dialects.

It would be well to adopt some such designation in Semitic grammar for particles like Heb. נָּאא, יִיש, יָּא; Aral. يُخُ، Syr. لَ، Eth. דַּ, etc., instead of speaking of them as adverbs, nouns, or prepositions.

I have adopted in this article the spelling of the language names suggested by Prof. C. E. Conant in Anthropos, Vol. IV, 1909, pp. 1069.
Cebuano, Hiligayna, Samaro-Leytean; Bikol; Pampanga; Pangasinan; Ilokano; Ibanag; Bontok and Nabaloi Igorot; Magindanao; and Sulu.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aff.</th>
<th>Neg.</th>
<th>I copulative ‘to be’</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III copulative ‘to be’</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III copulative ‘to be’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag.</td>
<td>aff.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>walâ</td>
<td>may</td>
<td>walâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>dili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik. (Ceb.)</td>
<td>aff.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>uia, uia, nia,</td>
<td>may, dumia, aduma,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>dili</td>
<td>ana, ana, atoa</td>
<td>dumia may</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik. (Hil.)</td>
<td>aff.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>arai, arai, ara</td>
<td>may</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>dili</td>
<td>yara, yada</td>
<td>wala, wa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wala, wa</td>
<td>wala may, wa may</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik. (Sam.-Ley.)</td>
<td>aff.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ini, ini, adto, ito,</td>
<td>may</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>diri</td>
<td>waray waray</td>
<td>wala way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td>aff.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yaon, yaon,</td>
<td>may, iga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>di, bako</td>
<td>hitong, na</td>
<td>day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td>aff.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ni, ani, ti, ati, ta</td>
<td>tin, titu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>ali, ati, e</td>
<td>ala</td>
<td>ala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
<td>aff.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>ola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>ag, alaoa</td>
<td>andi</td>
<td>andi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilok.</td>
<td>aff.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>adda</td>
<td>adda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>di, suan</td>
<td>aon</td>
<td>aon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban.</td>
<td>aff.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>egga</td>
<td>egga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>ari, akkan, ji</td>
<td>aunan, an</td>
<td>aunan, an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igor. (Bon.)</td>
<td>aff.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>woda, woday</td>
<td>woda, woday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>adi, faken</td>
<td>ma’id</td>
<td>ma’id</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To 1974. The general principle of spelling which he there proposes, and which should certainly be followed by all those who are working in Philippine Languages, is to use the native name of the language wherever possible. The changes from the spelling formerly used in my Philippine publications are, viz., Bisaya for Bisanay, Pampanga for Pampanug, Ilokano for Hosoan, Magindanao for Magindanao.

¹ For the principal grammars and dictionaries of these languages cf. the list given in my Contributions to Comparative Philippine Grammar JAOS, vol. xxvii (1906), p. 323, ff. nt. 2; vol. xxviii (1907) p. 1. ff. nt. 2. To these add C. W. Seidenadel, The language spoken by the Bontok Igorot, Chicago, 1909.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I copulative ‘to be’</th>
<th>II locative ‘to be’ definite ‘to have’</th>
<th>III indefinite ‘to be’ indefinite ‘to have’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Igor.</td>
<td>aff.</td>
<td>guara</td>
<td>guara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>anchi</td>
<td>anchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nab.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag.</td>
<td>aff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>aden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg.</td>
<td></td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulu</td>
<td>aff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>sun, tuga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg.</td>
<td></td>
<td>wai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first type there are no affirmative quasi-verbs. The ligatures Tagalog ay, y, Bontok ya, which are very close to being such particles, are better regarded simply as connective particles between predicate and preceding subject.

In type I the negatives are based for the most part on a particle di which appears in the different languages in the varying forms di, ri, li, (Ibanag also ji),1 probably with final glottal catch (so at least in Tagalog and Bontok Igorot); dili and diri are apparently reduplicated forms of di (so Conant): in Tagalog hin-di, Pampanga a-li, Pangasinan a-li-oa, Ibanag a-ri, we have prefixed elements, a being perhaps the same prefix that occurs in Cebuan anin, anaa, Pampangan ani, ati. The element a in Pangasinan alioa seems to be the quasi-verb an. Pampanga ati is derived from ali by elision of the intervocalic i, and e is simply a contraction of ai (so Conant). A negative particle ag occurs in Pangasinan and Nabaloí, and perhaps in Ibanag ak-kan; the negative particle an, which is found in Ibanag uncombined, in Pangasinan and Ibanag combined with other particles (viz., an-di, an-an) as negative verbal particle of the two other types, probably occurs in Ilok sa-an, Ibanag akkan. Bikol bako, Bontok Igorot faken, and Sulu bukūn are evidently identical; these negatives mean not simply ‘not,’ but indicate ‘it is not this but something else’ in correcting a mistake. Nabaloí aligoa and probably Pangasinan alioa, Ibanag akkan, have the same meaning.

In type II the affirmative particles are in many cases derived from the demonstratives. Compare Hiligayna adto with demonstrative yadto; Samaro-Leytean ini, adto, ito, which form the

---

basis of quasi-verbal particles, with the identical demonstratives; Bikol idtong with demonstrative idto; Pampanga ni, ti, to with the demonstratives ini, iti, ita; Sulu ann with demonstrative auan; Hiligayna ari, yari, ara, yara are to be compared with the demonstratives, Cebuan k-ari and Ibanag yari, yara; Bikol yao, iyo in Tagalog demonstrative yao; Tagalog and Bikol na, Cebuan nna, anua seem to be connected with the demonstrative particle na; Cebuan nia, ania are perhaps to be connected with the demonstrative particle ia. The n- of nia may have been adopted from na, and on the other hand the final a of naa may have been borrowed from nia; what the prefixed a is that occurs before the Cebuan and Pampanga particles is not certain. Samar-Leytean ada and Ilokano ada are identical with Malay ada to be,4 In Pangasinan and Igorot, ota, woda, guara are apparently the same as the negatives wa and wala.3 Cebuan tnu and Ibanag egga are difficult; egga is perhaps the same as Bikol igua, the n (-ie) being assimilated to the y.

The negative particles of the second type are in most cases based on a particle wa (Nabaloi gua)2 or on one written variously la, ra, da, sometimes on both combined. The y or i at the end of the particle in Bisaya, Bikol, Igorot, and Sulu is simply the ligature i which has become an integral part of the particle. Pampanga ada perhaps contains the same initial a as the affirmatives ani, ati. Pangasinan andi, Nabaloi anchi,5 is apparently a compound of two negative particles, viz., the an which occurs as quasi-verb in Ibanag, and the di that forms the basis of most of the negatives of the first type. Ibanag an, though said to be a syncopated form of auan,4 is probably a simple negative particle; auan seems to be made up of this an and a particle au-, which occurs in Tagalog ay-au not to want, and ai-an, the Sulu prohibitive negative. In Igorot the meanings of affirmative and negative particles seem to be reversed. If the affirmative woda is the same as the negative wala, then it is possible to connect the

---

2 Cf. op. cit., p. 390, ft. nt. 3.
3 Cf. op. cit., pp. 332, 333.
negative ma'id with the affirmative may and explain it as may or ma + preposition id.

In type III the particle may probably contains the ligature y as in way, waray; the element ma is perhaps to be connected with the prefix wa that is used to form adjectives in many of the languages, e.g., Tagalog makes from lakas 'strength,' the adjective ma-lakas 'strong' originally perhaps 'having strength': Bikol igua contains perhaps the particle wa used affirmatively as in Pangasinan: Pampanga (a)tin is simply the (a)ti of type two with ligature n: Magindanao aden is perhaps a combination of ada (= Malsy ada, Ilokod ada) and the demonstrative particle en: the etymology of Cebuan duna, aduna and Sulu tugä is uncertain; the initial a of aduna is probably the same as the initial a of Cebuan ania, anoa, atoa, Pampanga ani, ati. In Pangasinan and Igorot, oala, woda, guara appear to correspond to the negative wala. The negative particles are regularly the same as those of type II: in Hiligayn a the ligature y and in Pampanga the ligature n do not form an inseparable part of the particle; in Cebuan duna may two affirmative particles are used together, and in Hiligayn wala may, wa may, the negative particle is prefixed to the affirmative. Sometimes another word or particle is employed so frequently in connection with the quasi-verb that it has become an integral part of the word: so, for example, in Tagalog may-roon = may, and Nabaloi guara-anan = guara. Here roon is the adverb doon 'there;' anan is perhaps a similar element.

In some languages the quasi-verbs of types II and III are varied to express person or tense. In some of the Bisaya dialects and in Pampanga different particles are apparently employed according to the person of the subject. In Cebuan (a)ma is employed with first person, anua or nua with the second or third, and (a)ma with the third person. In Pampanga (a)ni and (a)ti are used with all three persons, (a)ta only with the third. The reason for this seems to be that the forms used with the first and second persons are based on the nearer demonstratives, and mean 'to be here,' those that are employed only with the third are based on the more remote demonstratives, and mean 'to be there.'

In Samaro-Leytean the particles are varied like verbs to express tense, viz.,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'to be there'</td>
<td>ito</td>
<td>naka</td>
<td>makad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nada</td>
<td>kada</td>
<td>adto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to be here'</td>
<td>ini</td>
<td>nakanhi</td>
<td>(makanhi)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occasionally in Tagalog the combination of the particle *na* + an adverb of place is treated as if it were the past tense of a verb with prefixed *ma*, e.g., from *nuroon* is formed a present tense *nuroon*.

In Magindanau *aden* makes a preterite *naden*.

Sentences containing 'copulative to be' are expressed in most of the languages by simply juxtaposing subject and predicate. The normal order, affirmative and negative, in all the languages seems to be—predicate, subject, in negative sentences the negative standing before the predicate, e.g.:

Tag. *mataas ito-ng-lalaki 'this man is tall.'*

*matatapang sila 'they are brave.'*

*hindi mabuti ang tawo 'the man is not good.'*

*hindi sila*2 *matatapang 'they are not brave.'*

*hindi ko ina*4 *(she) is not my mother.'*

Bis. (Ceb.) *salapi an kooid 'I am rich.'*

*dili maayo si Pedro 'Pedro is not good.'*

Bis. (Hil.) *maayo ini 'this is good.'*

*si Pedro ako 'I am Pedro.'*

*maloloyon ang Dios 'God is merciful.'*

*dili ako*3 *si padre Ramon 'I am not Father Ramon.'*

Bik. *marahay ako 'I am good.'*

*bako ini-ing papel 'it is not this paper.'*

*bako-ng*4 *sako iyan 'this is not mine.'*

---


2 Negative examples are not always to be found in the material available for study, but the rule probably holds good in all cases.

3 To judge from these examples, when the subject is a personal pronoun in Tagalog and Hiligayna (presumably also in the other Bisaya dialects) it stands between the negative and the rest of the predicate.

4 When the predicate of a negative sentence in Tagalog is a noun modified by a possessive pronoun and the subject is not expressed, the postpositive form of the possessive seems to be placed between negative and noun as here.

4 A ligature seems to be regularly employed after the negatives *saaan, allas, obyon*, and also sometimes after *bako*. 
Pamp. masanting ya 'he is handsome.'
Pang. kapitan ak 'I am capitán.'
  balég so kataaon 'the master is powerful.'
  ag maronong
  alic-a maronong 'he is wise.'
Ilok. tao ak 'I am a man.'
  maymaya ak 'I am alone.'
  naimbag daytoy 'this is good.'
  di nasayaat toy a pusa 'this cat is not pretty.'
  saan a dékot toy a silid 'this room is not large.'
Iban. babayak 'I am a woman.'
  mapia im masipot 'the gentle one is good.'
Igor. (Bon.) kawis siya 'he is good.'
  adi kawis sa 'this is not good.'
Igor. (Nab.) kadubong-ko iai 'this is my hat.'
  aliąa-ko balei-ko 'it is not my house.'
Mag. mapia si Pedro 'Pedro is good.'
  Sulu maraiat tau ien 'that man is good.'
  bukun amu ien 'that is not exact.'

The subject, however, may also stand first, but this seems
to be the case in many of the languages at least, only when
it is specially emphasized. In the northern group of Philip-
pine Languages, Pangasinan, Ilokano, Ibanag, and probably Pam-
panga 1 this is apparently allowed only when the predicate is
definite, i.e., is preceded by the definite article or a demon-
strative pronoun. When the subject is a personal pronoun
these languages employ a special emphatic form, e.g.:
  Pang. si Juan so mabayani 'Juan is the brave one.'
    say kapitan so limma dia 'the capitán was the
    one that came here.'
  sisk so kapitan 'I am the capitán.'
  Ilok. sika ti napigga 'you are the brave one.'
    toy a tao ti naimbag 'this man is the good one.'
  Iban. sakan ig gobernador 'I am the Governor.'
    sikau si Pedro 'you are Pedro.'

Cebuan and Hiligayna seem to follow the same rule as the
northern languages, though they have no special series of emphatic

---

1 No examples are available, but the fact that Pampanga possesses a
  special series of emphatic personal pronouns, besides its general resemblance
  to the other languages makes this probable.
pronouns; the definite article may be replaced by the particle *y*, e.g.:

Ceb. si Pedro ang maloloyon ‘Pedro is the
si Pedro-y merciful one.’
Hil. siya ang amay ko ‘he is my father.
ako-y amay niya ‘I am his father.’

In Tagalog, Samaro-Leytean, Bikol, Bontok-Igorot, Magindanau, and Sulu, the subject may apparently stand first without special emphasis; in Tagalog and Bontok Igorot the subject and predicate are joined by the particle *ay* (after a vowel *ay* or *y*), and *ya* respectively, e.g.:

Tag. ang tawo ‘y mabuti ‘the man is good.
ikaw ay hindí matapang ‘you are not brave.
Sam.-Ley. si Juan diri maopay Juan is not good.
Bik. si Antonio marnot ‘Antonio is bad.
iñi bulaman ‘this is gold.
Igor. (Bon.) nan mamamagkid ya fanig ‘the girls are little.
sika yara antjo ‘you are tall.
Mag. su kayo makapal ‘the tree is large.
si Rudolfo mapuna a tau ‘Rudolf is a tall man.
su islam talau ‘the moro is a coward.
Sulu in salapa nia balawan ‘his betel-box is (made of) gold.
in batabata ini di masipug ‘this boy is without shame (not having-shame).

In constructions of type II, the affirmative is expressed by particles which, in many cases at least, are derived from the demonstrative pronouns; the negative particle is regularly the same as in the third type. When the sentence contains ‘locative to be’ the particle is regularly followed by the oblique case of the place in which or a demonstrative adverb of place; when it contains ‘definite to have,’ by the oblique case of the possessor. In the second case the subject of the sentence is the thing possessed. The rules with regard to the relative position of subject and predicate seem to be the same as in type I; in Tagalog, and apparently in Bontok Igorot, *ay*, *y* and *ya* are used as in type I, e.g.:

Tag. ang bata ‘y na sa bahay ‘the boy is in the house.
na sa bahay ang bata
ang pari ay walá sa simbahan ‘the priest is not in
walá sa simbahan ang pari ‘the church.’
ang kabayo ni Pedro 'y na sa akin 'I have Pedro's horse.'
wala kay Juan ang salapi 'Juan has not the money.'

Bis. (Ceb.) ania kanako ang sinina 'I have the shirt.'
tua sa ilalom sa lamesa 'it is under the table.'

Bis. (Hil.) adto siya sa Ogtong 'he is at Ogtong.'
wala siya sa San Marino 'he is not at San Marino.'

way diri ang amay ko 'my father is not here.'

Bis. (Sam.-Ley.) ini sa akon kamut 'it is here in my hand.'
aadto sa balay 'it is there in the house.'
nakadto ka sa Kathalogan 'have you been in Kathalogan?'

Bik. ang kupia iyaon sa lamesa 'the hat is on the table.'
day duman sa lamesa an sogkod 'the stick is not on the table.'

na saino dao an panyo ko 'have you my handkerchief?'

Pamp. ni-ko keni 'I am here.'
ta-yo karin king silid 'he is there in the room.'
ala-yo keti 'he is not here.'

Pang. oo-d abung to si Pedro 'Pedro is in his house.'
oo-d sika-y kaballo 'have you the horse?'

Ilok. adda iti simbaan si apo Padi 'the priest is in the church.'
adda ak ditoy 'I am here.'

aon ditoy ti aso 'the dog is not here.'
adda kenka ti pagtinteroak 'have you my inkstand.'

adda-da iti cocinero 'the cook has them.'
aon ti malo kaniak 'I have not the hammer.'

Iban. egga ip pirak nikau 'have you the money?'
aasu si Pedro tab balay 'Pedro is not in the house.'

Igor. (Bon.) woday-ak is nan afong 'I am in the house.'

* Here 'a' is assimilated to the following consonant, cf. Contributions to Comp. Phil. Gram., p. 396.
ma'id siya isna adwani 'he is not here to-day.
siya ya: woday isna 'he is here.'

Igor. (Nab.) guara-ak chi balei 'I am in the house.'
Sulu in barong mu am ha-lum bai 'your barong is
in the house.'
wai run pa-lum bai 'it is not in the house.'

In Magindanao this type, in the affirmative, seems to be
expressed in the same way as type I, without particle, the
prepositional phrase or adverb simply taking the place of the
nominal or adjectival predicate, e.g.:
su giat sa linuan na tulugan 'the knife is on the bed.'
su asu sa lamalama 'the dog is on the plaza.'

Some of the other languages also occasionally follow this
construction in the affirmative, e.g.:
Bis. (Ceb.) dinhi ako 'I am here.'
Bis. (Hil.) dira si Juan 'Juan is there.'
Ilok. dita ka pay 'are you still there?'
Iban. ajau ak 'I am here.'

In constructions of type III, in the case of 'indefinite to
have' the possessor stands sometimes in the nominative, some-
times in the genitive, sometimes, probably after the analogy
of type II, in the oblique. The original idea in the case of
the genitive in such a sentence as 'I have money' is probably
there is, there exists money of mine.' The possessor stands in
the nominative only, in Tagalog, and apparently in Hiligayna,
Samaro-Leytean, Bikol, and Sulu; in the genitive only, in
Ilok: in either nominative or genitive in Cebuan, Pampanga,
Nabalo, and Magindanao; in either genitive or oblique in
Ibanag, Pangasinan, and Bontok Igorot.

The thing possessed may be preceded by a ligature or in-
definite particle or it may stand alone. The ligatures are the
following viz.: Tag., Bik. -ng, Pamp. -n, Ceb., Hil., Pang. -y,
Mag. a; the indefinite particles, which in some languages (e.g.,
Ilok) seem to be used only after a negative, are viz.: Ceb.
Any, in, any, Hil. any, Iban. tu:-Bik. nin, Igor. (Bon.) nan,
Nab. ne, Ilok. ti, which are used in the same way as the in-
definite particles, although forms of the definite article, are
to be-classed here. In some cases a ligature has become an
integral part of the quasi-verb, so apparently in Tag., Bis.,
Bik. ma-y, Bis. wa-y, wala-y, wara-y, Bik. da-y, Pamp. ti-n,
Igor. (Bon.) woda-y. Sulu taga is probably tng (used as nominal.
prefix, e.g., tug-bai 'having a house, owner of a house') + the ligature a. The object may stand without preceding ligature or indefinite particle after some of these quasi-verbs, under just what conditions is not in all cases clear; in Tagalog or Bissaya an object that follows may directly has this construction.

In the case of 'indefinite to be,' the element that corresponds to the possessor, being indefinite 'one, they,' is not expressed; the thing that is or exists, the logical subject, stands in the same construction as the thing possessed; the place where is expressed by an adverb of place or by an oblique case.

Here, as in type II, the relative position of subject and predicate are governed by the same rules as in type I. In Tagalog the particles ay, y, in Bontok Igorot the particle yu are used as in the two other types.

The following examples will illustrate these principles, e.g.:

Tag. may ako-ng salapi  'I have money.'
    ako 'y may salapi  
    wala ako-ng anak  'I have no son.'
    ako 'y wala-ng anak  
    may tawo sa bahay 'there is a man in the house.'
    wala-ng tawo sa lansangan 'there is no one on the street.'

Bis. (Ceb.) duna-y ako-ng (gen.) tiempo  'I have time.'
    duna akó-y (nom.) tiempo  
    wala akó (nom.) ug humay 'I have no rice.'
    aduna ing katigayanan 'he has riches.

Bis. (Hil.) ako may asawa na  'I have a wife now.'
    may asawa na ako  
    wá-y kan'on ini-ng tauo 'this man has no food.'
    wala-y buut yana 'he has no sense.'
    wa ka-y buut 'you have no sense.'
    wala ako-y kan'on 'I have no food.'
    wala pa siya sing buut 'he has still no sense.'
    way ako sing katungdan an sa pagbuhat sina  'I have no obligation to do that.'
    wala may pilak ako 'I have no money.'

Bis. (Sam.-Ley.) may salapi ka 'have you any money?'
    waray ka salapi 'you have no money.'

Bik. igua ako-ng saro-ng ayam na magayom 'I have a pretty dog.'
day ako-ng gubing ‘I have no clothing.’
i ka dai-ng gubing ‘you have no clothes.’
day ako nin saro-ng sadit ‘I have not one cuarto?’
igua ka nin tubig ‘have you any water?’
dai-ng tawo sa harong ‘there is no one in the house.’

Pamp. atin kopia ning kapatad mo ‘has your brother a hat?’
atin mo1-n imalan ‘he has indeed clothing.’
atin palae karin ‘there is rice there.’
ala-n imalan mo ‘have you no clothes?’
ala ka-n imalan ‘there is no rice there.’
ala-n palae karin ‘there is no rice there.’

Pang. oala-y kaballo-m ‘have you a horse?’
oala-y kaballo’d sika ‘have you a horse at all?’
oala-y polvos yo ‘have you (pl.) any powders?’
oala-y polvos ed sikayo ‘there are powders in the house.’
anda g apo-y polvos ‘there are no powders at all.’

Ilok. adda tabako-m ‘have you any tobacco?’
adda aso-mi ‘we have a dog.’
aon ti aso-da ‘they have no dog.’
aon ti naimbag a arak-na ‘he has no good wine.’
adda tao itoy a balay ‘there are people in this house.’
adda arak ditoy ‘there is wine here.’
aon ti pusa iti balay itoy ‘there are no cats in this house.’

Iban. egga ginageram mu ‘have you slandered anyone
egga tu ginageram mu ‘have you any slandered one.’
aun yaya tu utok ‘he has judgment.’
aun sa tu utok ‘he has judgment.’
aun ak tu pirak ‘I have no money.’
aun as tu utok ‘Pedro has no
auat 2 tu utok takkuani Pedro ‘Pedro has no
judgment.’
at 2 tu tolay tab balay ‘there is no one in the house.’

Igor. (Bon.) woday ken sak’en nan afong ‘I have a house.’
woday nan afong-ko ‘I have a house.’
woda nan kayo ‘there is a tree.’

1 mo is here an adverb.
2 Here n is assimilated to the following consonant; cf. Contributions to Comp. Phil. Gram., p. 386.
woda nan onash id Faliddid 'there was a sugar-
cane-plantation at Faliddid.'
ma'id kayo-k 'I have no wood.'
ma'id noang 'there is no buffalo (here)._'
Igor. (Nab.) guara balei-to 'has he a house?'
anchi balei-to 'he has no house.'
guara anan tayo ne kabadyo 'we have horses.'
anchi chanum 'there is no water.'
Mag. aden aku bengala 'I have a shirt.'
adon a tau lu 'there are people there.'
da palay ko 'I have no rice.'
da musala nin 'he has no handkerchief.'
da tan lu 'there is no one there.'
kagay naden aku pilak 'yesterday I had money.'
Sulu in sapit tuga jungal 'the sapit has a bowsprit.'
tua tuga ekog 'men that have tails.'
tuga buling-batu ha Sog 'there is coal in Sulu.'
in hula ini tuga sanitan 'this country is possessed
with devils (has devils).' 
tuga tau ha bai ini 'there are people in this house.'
aun kah bili-bili ha Sog 'are there any sheep in
Sulu?'
aun ang gatus 'there are a hundred.'
wai run manok kabili ha Sog 'there are no capons
in Sulu.'
wai kasudahan in hinang ini 'this work has no end.'
The object of the quasi-verbal particles of this third type
is in many cases a verbal form, the construction corresponding
usually to the English idiom 'to have to.' This construction
certainly occurs in many of the languages and probably in all
of them, but a few examples from Tagalog will suffice to
illustrate the general principle, e.g.:
Tag. may siya-ng pinatay na tawo 'he has killed a man (he
has a killed man)._'
walà ako-ng sasabihin 'I have nothing to say (I have not
anything-about-to-be-said)._'
may nagnakaw na tawo 'there was a robber (a man
may tawo-ng nagnakaw)
that robbed)._'
Cf. also examples in next paragraph.
These particles in connection with their objects often express
indefinite pronominal ideas, such as 'some,' 'any,' 'something,'
‘anything,’ ‘no,’ ‘nothing.’ As in the preceding case the examples will be confined to Tagalog, e.g.:

mayroon ako-ng tinapay ‘I have some bread.’
mayroon ka-ng salapi ‘have you any money?’
mayroon siya-ng sinabi ‘did he say anything?’
mayroon kayo-ng hinahanap ‘are you looking for anyone, anything.’
walà ako-ng asawa ‘I have no wife.’
walà ako-ng sasabihin ‘I have nothing to say.’
walà ako-ng sinabi ‘I said nothing.’

All of the three types may also be expressed interrogatively, with negative interrogation, and in connection with special interrogative words such as ‘who,’ ‘what.’

The simple interrogative and negative interrogative of these types do not differ from the affirmative and negative except in the addition of interrogative particles, and the changes in position caused by them. Such particles are, e.g.: Tag. baga, kayá, Bis. ba, Bik. baga, Pamp. ta, kaya, kasi, Pang. kasi, Iban. dasi, Sulu kah. In some languages these particles are more commonly used than in others; they do not appear to be absolutely essential in any. They usually stand after or between two elements of the predicate, but may stand after the subject when it precedes the predicate. When special interrogative words are used they regularly constitute the predicate of the sentence, the remainder of the sentence standing as subject. These special interrogative words may be followed by the interrogative particles. Some examples from Tagalog will illustrate the general principles of construction, e.g.:

malaki baga ang iyo-ng aso ‘is your dog large?’
mayaman ka-baga ‘are you rich?’
na-sa bahay baga ang ina-mo ‘is your mother in the house?’
walà baga sa kaniya ang damit ko ‘has-n’t he my clothes?’
mayroon baga sila-ng salapi ‘have they any money?’
sino ka ‘who are you?’
sino kaya ito-ng bahayi-ng ito ‘who is this woman?’
kanino baga ito-ng bahay ‘whose is this house?’
sino-ng ‘ngalan mo ‘what is your name?’
sino ang | na-sa bahay ‘who is in the house?’

* Ligature used for the article ang.
ano-ng bulaklak ang na sa kaniya 'what flower has he?'
sino-ang sino-ng may roong1 baril 'who has a gun?'
ano-ng mayroon ka 'what have you?'

The foregoing discussion does not claim to be by any means an exhaustive treatment of the two important ideas 'to be' and 'to have' in the Philippine Languages, it simply indicates the lines along which their further study should be carried. It is practically impossible, on the basis of the material available for study to obtain a thoroughgoing knowledge of these three types of construction, and as such a knowledge is essential for the mastery of any Philippine language, those who have the opportunity to investigate these languages at first hand should attempt to supply this want. They should study these types from all points of view. Numerous examples should be collected illustrating the various types expressed affirmatively, negatively, interrogatively, with negative interrogation, and with special interrogative words. These examples should present instances of all the parts of speech, both alone and with all possible modifiers, employed as subject, predicate, or case form depending on the quasi-verb. Especial attention should be devoted to the construction of the pronouns (personal, demonstrative, the article, interrogative, indefinite particles, ligatures) and to the construction of postpositive words (i.e., pronominal or adverbial particles like Tagalog ka, mo; na, pa, baga, etc., which must always follow some other word); and the rules governing the position of the various elements should be carefully worked out and tested. Moreover any special idioms founded on these constructions should be pointed out and thoroughly discussed.

It is a difficult matter for those who have no special linguistic training to recognize what things are important and what are trivial in the great mass of material with which they are brought in contact, when they take up the study of a Philippine language, especially one of those about which little is known. For such it is hoped that the sketch here presented may furnish an introduction and guide to the study of one of the most fundamental portions of the grammar of the Philippine Languages.

1 Roong + ng > roong + ng > roong by assimilation of n to ng and simplification of the doubling. Italics are used to indicate that final ng results from n + ligature ng.