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PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY
AT ITS
MEETING IN PHILADELPHIA, PA.
1913

The annual meeting of the Society, being the one hundred twenty-fifth occasion of its assembling, was held in Philadelphia, Pa., at the University of Pennsylvania, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of Easter week, March 25th, 26th, and 27th, 1913.

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

Adler, C.  
Arnold  
Barret  
Barton  
Bates, Mrs.  
Bender  
Bloomfield  
Bolling  
Brockwell  
Burlingame  
Carus  
Clay  
Cunningham  
Edgerton  
Ellis  
Ember  
Gottheil  
Grant, E.  
Grieve, Miss  
Groton  
Hans  
Haupt  
Hirth  
H history  
Hopkins  
Jackson  
Jackson, Mrs.  
Jastrøy  
Keizer  
Kent, R. G.  
Kupfer  
Kyle  
Lanman  
Lyman  
Malter  
Margolis, M. L.  
Michelsen  
Montgomery  
Moore, G. F.  
Müller  
Nies, J. B.  
Nies, W. E.  
Poevel  
Price  
Reider  
Rossengarten  
Rudolph, Miss  
Schoff  
Scott, Mrs.  
Steele  
Sulzberger  
Torrey  
Vanderburgh  
Ward, W. H.  
Yivaske  
Yohannan

TOTAL: 56.

The first session was held in Room 205, College Hall, on Tuesday afternoon, beginning at 3:15 p. m., the President Professor George F. Moore, being in the chair.
The reading of the minutes of the meeting in New York, April 9th, 10th and 11th, 1912, was dispensed with, because they had already been printed in the Journal (vol. 32, part 4, p. i-xi).

The Committee of Arrangements presented its report, through Professor Jastrow, in the form of a printed program. The succeeding sessions were appointed for Wednesday morning at half past nine, Wednesday afternoon at a quarter before three, and Thursday morning at half past nine. It was announced that there would be an informal meeting of the members on Tuesday evening; that the members of the Society were invited by Dr. Cyrus Adler, President of the Dropsie College, and his colleagues to a luncheon at the College on Wednesday at one o'clock; and that the Oriental Club of Philadelphia would, in celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of its foundation, entertain the men of the Society at dinner at the Franklin Inn Club on Wednesday evening at seven o'clock, while the visiting ladies were invited to be the guests of Mrs. Cornelius Stevenson at dinner at her home at the same hour.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

The Corresponding Secretary, Professor A. J. V. Williams Jackson, presented the following report:

The correspondence of the Society has been constantly increasing, and during the past year the Secretary has interchanged letters with a large number of Oriental scholars in Europe and Asia, as well as with members in this country. As directed at the last meeting, the Secretary sent a greeting by cablegram to the International Congress of Orientalists, which met at Athens at the same time, and transmitted the good wishes of the Society to a number of the members longest on the roll. Replies have come in acknowledgment of these greetings, and the newly elected members have sent letters of acceptance and appreciation.

Among the correspondence with foreign members may be specially mentioned an interesting letter from Mr. Ely Bannister Soane, written at Chia Surkh in Southern Kurdistan and dated May 26, 1912, in which he makes some noteworthy remarks regarding the sect of the Ali Illahi and their possible connection with the Yazidis; numbers of whom are scattered through Kurdistan. He writes:

"They are just as secretive as the Yazidis, and though the religious chief, Sayid Rastam, is a close personal friend of mine, I have never got much out of him; but I find that in Kerind, which is a stronghold of the Ali Illahi, there is the same aversion to any mention of Satan, who is also called MalekTaus (see Layard), and the same secret meetings take place. This seems rather interesting and looks as if they and the Yazidis are two branches, from a common origin, which have
developed along different lines — the Ali Ilahi, or Persian section, adopting Muhammadan outward semblance as a self-protective measure. Their initiation ceremony is also called Jaa. Do you think this is any relic of the Avestic Yaohdah, the modern ritual also being one of purification?

It is a sad duty to record the loss of several valued members by death during the past year.

Professor Willis J. Beecher, D. D., of the Theological Seminary at Auburn, N. Y., whose work along theological lines is well known, died May 10, 1912. He had been a member of the Society for twelve years.

Rev. Dr. David Blaustein, who became a member of the Society in 1891, died in the summer of 1912. He will be long remembered for his ability and noble character, no less than for his educational and humanitarian work.

Rev. Dr. Arthur W. Ewing, of Philadelphia, President of the Christian College at Allahabad, India, died September 20, 1912, at Allahabad. Dr. Ewing had devoted himself for years to philanthropic and educational work among the Hindus, but had found time also for the pursuit of Oriental studies. A number of years ago he published in the Journal a valuable article entitled 'The Hindu conception of the functions of breath' (JAOS, 22 [1901], p. 249—308).

Professor William Watson Goodwin, the distinguished Greek scholar of Harvard, has likewise died since the last meeting. He was one of the oldest members of the Society, having joined in 1857, and he always attended some of the sessions when the meetings took place in Boston or Cambridge. After the meeting last year the Secretary sent Professor Goodwin a hearty letter of greetings from the Society, as instructed, and received from him a cordial response expressing his appreciation of the remembrance.

Professor Alfred Ludwig, of the University of Prague, Bohemia, who had been an honorary member of the Society since 1898, died June 15, 1912. The work of this noted scholar, especially in the line of Vedic criticism, is too well known to require any record here. His learning was profound and his scholarship broad and varied, including not only researches in various branches of linguistics, but likewise investigations in Homeric studies, in Hebrew, and even in Finnish literature.

In concluding this report the Secretary wishes to express once again his appreciation of the continued co-operation of those who are associated with him in the work of the Society.

Professor Lamnan spoke briefly on the character and achievements of Professor Goodwin; Professor Bloomfield, on Professor Ludwig; Professor Barton, on Dr. Blaustein.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER.

The annual report of the Treasurer, Professor F. W. Williams, was presented by Professor Torrey, as follows:
Receipts and Disbursements by the Treasurer of the American Oriental
Society for the Year Ending Dec. 31, 1912.

Receipts.

Balance from old account, Dec. 31, 1911 $1958.75
Annual dues ........................................ 1905.50
Life membership .................................... 75.00
Contribution for the Library ....................... 100.00
Sales of the Journal ................................ 345.26
State National Bank dividends ..................... 128.14
Coupons from bonds ................................ 50.00
Sale of 13 shares of National Bank stock ......... 2000.00
Withdrawn from Savings Bank ...................... 1017.08

$6979.51

Expenditures.

Printing of the Journal, Volume 32 $1958.31
Sundry printing and addressing ...................... 57.54
Freight and mailing ................................ 21.76
Library Fund (deposited in Savings Bank) ......... 200.00
Editor's honorarium ................................ 200.00
Postage of the Treasurer, 2 years ................. 21.30
Subvention to Dictionary of Islam, 3 years ...... 150.50
Investments in bonds ................................ 3842.91
Balance to new account .............................. 5702.02

$6979.51

Statement.

1911 1912
Bradley Type Fund $3052.29 $3178.21
Collected Fund 1000.00 1000.00
State National Bank shares (sold 1912) 1950.00
National Savings Bank deposit 20.76 225.51
Interest, Collected Fund 330.65 380.38
2½ Ch. R. I. & Pacific Ry. bonds (bought 1912) 1787.50
1 Virginian Railway bond (bought 1912) 980.00

$8353.10 $7561.90

Report of the Auditing Committee.

The report of the Auditing Committee, Professors Torrey and Oertel, was presented by Professor Torrey, 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.

New Haven, Conn., March 17, 1913.

Charles C. Torrey

Hanns Oertel

Auditors.
REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN.

The Librarian, Professor Albert T. Clay, presented the following report:

During the past year much has been done in classifying the books of the Library. Under my predecessor the serial publications were classified and given their own shelf number. Since then many new serials have been added to the Library, but they have been placed on the shelves without any attempt at cataloguing. This year we have made an inventory of all these publications, some 200 titles, with a view to cataloguing them and completing the classification. We have also some 244 volumes ready for binding, which will represent an outlay of about $200. This has been provided for by the appropriation made one year ago. The catalogues of manuscripts were also catalogued under my predecessor, as well as the Bibliotheca Indica, but the work has not been kept up to date. This is now being done. In addition we have commenced to make a classified arrangement of the other accessions.

In order to make the work permanent in character and make the Library really accessible to the members of the Society, it is planned to prepare: (1) an author catalogue; (2) a scheme of classification adapted to the needs of an Oriental library; (3) a shelf-list, in which the cards are arranged in the order of the books on the shelves. The shelf-list will in reality be an inventory of the Library and should always be complete.

With the assistance of a trained librarian who is giving partial time to the work, we hope to accomplish these things in about two years, after which it will not require much time to take care of the accessions and keep everything up-to-date.

I might add that among the book accessions we frequently receive books for review. These have heretofore been acknowledged in the same way as other books, but with the consent of the Editors of the Journal acknowledgment of these will hereafter be made in the columns of the Journal.

REPORT OF THE EDITORS.

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

In spite of a slight increase over last year’s bill, the cost of printing the last volume of the Journal was well within the limits of our budget. The delay in issuing the last part of last year’s volume and of the first parts of the current volume was due to the tardiness of the contributors in sending in copy. The Editors hope that the remaining numbers of the current volume will be issued at the regular quarterly dates.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS.

The following persons, recommended by the Directors, were elected members of the Society (for convenience the names of those elected at a subsequent session are included in this list):
Corporate Members.

Mr. Eckley B. Cox, Jr.  Dr. Felix Freiherr von Oesele
Mr. Edward T. Curran  Mr. T. Ramakrishna
Rev. Dr. O. E. Keiser  Dr. Joseph Reider
Dr. G. L. Kheiralla  Mr. J. G. Rosengarten
Mr. Walter S. Kupper  Prof. William C. Thayer
Rev. Dr. David Levy  Rev. Dr. Royden K. Yerkes
Prof. Henry Malter  Dr. S. C. Ylevske
Rev. John Meighan

ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 1913-1914.

The committee appointed at New York to nominate officers for the year 1913-1914, consisting of Professors Montgomery, Gottheil, and Barret, reported through the chairman, Professor Montgomery, and nominated the following, who were thereupon duly elected:

President—Professor Paul Haupt, of Baltimore.
Vice-President—Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., of Philadelphia; Professor Hanns Oerstel, of New Haven; and Professor George A. Barton, of Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Corresponding Secretary—Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of New York.
Recording Secretary—Dr. George C. O. Haas, of New York.
Treasurer—Professor Frederick Wells Williams, of New Haven.
Librarian—Professor Albert T. Clay, of New Haven.

Directors—The officers above named, and Professors Richard Gottheil, of New York; Charles R. Lanman, of Cambridge; E. Washburn Hopkins, of New Haven; Maurice Broomfield, of Baltimore; George F. Moore, of Cambridge; Robert Francis Harper, of Chicago; Dr. William Hayes Ward, of New York.

Professor Jastrow announced that Provost Edgar F. Smith was unfortunately prevented from being present and welcoming the members to the University.

After a recess of ten minutes, the President delivered the annual address, the subject being 'Bahism and Bahaism.' The Society thereupon adjourned for the day, at 5:10 p.m.

SECOND SESSION.

The members reassembled on Wednesday morning at 9:35 a.m. for the second session. The President, Professor Moore, was in the chair. After the election of a corporate member (included in the list above), the Society proceeded to the hearing of communications, as follows:

Professor G. A. Barnes, of Bryn Mawr College: Kugler's criterion for determining the order of the months in the earliest Babylonian calendar.
—Remarks and a question by Professor Jastrow and reply by the author.
Dr. S. C. Yelvisker, of Luther College, Decorah, Iowa: Dialectic differences between Assyrian and Babylonian. — Remarks by Professor Haupt.

Professor G. M. Bottke, of the Catholic University of America: The Santikalpa of the Atharva-Veda.

Professor C. C. Torrey, of Yale University: A possible metrical original of the Lord’s Prayer. — Remarks by Professor Moore.

Professor M. Bloomfield, of Johns Hopkins University: A preliminary exploration of the Reverse Vedic Concordance. — Remarks by Dr. Michelson.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the receipt of greetings from Professor Toy, and was instructed to send a message to him and to some of the members longest on the roll. After a recess of ten minutes at eleven o’clock, the reading of papers was resumed, as follows:

Mr. W. H. Schoeff, of the Commercial Museum, Philadelphia: Identifications of South Indian place-names mentioned in the Periplus. — Remarks by Professor Hopkins, Professor Jackson, and Professor Moore.

Professor C. A. B. Brockwell, of McGill University: The couvade in Israel. — Remarks by Dr. Michelson, Professor Max Müller, and Professor Montgomery.

Professor Max Müller made a few remarks, presenting a specimen of the Kunjara language of Dar Fur in Arabic script.

At noon the Society took a recess until a quarter before three o’clock.

THIRD SESSION.

The afternoon session was opened at 2:55 p.m. in the large lecture-room at the Dropsie College, President Moore being in the chair.

President Cyrus Adler, of the Dropsie College, made a brief address explaining the foundation and purposes of the College. Professor Bezold, who was present at the meeting, was invited to say a few words regarding a new projected Assyrian dictionary.

After the election of an additional corporate member (included in the list above), the reading of papers was resumed, in the following order:

Dr. E. W. Buringham, of the University of Pennsylvania: Buddhaghosha’s Dhammapada Commentary. — Remarks by Professor Lanman.

Mr. F. A. Cunningham, of Merchantville, N. J.: The identity of Phil with Tiglath-Pileser II.

Dr. A. Forum, of Johns Hopkins University: The Sumerian noun. — Remarks by Professor Jastrow and Professor Arnold.
Mr. W. S. Kupper, of New York: On some modern vernacular folk-songs of India. — Remarks by Professor Gottheil.

Dr. A. Emmer, of Johns Hopkins University: Some Egyptian and Coptic etymologies.

Dr. F. Alexander, of Johns Hopkins University: Paścadivyādhiśvāsā, choosing a king by divine order.

Professor P. Haury, of Johns Hopkins University: Two poems of Haggai in the Book of Zechariah. (Presented in abstract.)

Professor P. Haury: The fifth Sumerian family law. (Presented in abstract.)

Professor P. Haury: A new Assyrian verb. (Presented in abstract.)

Professor A. V. Williams-Jackson, of Columbia University: On some fragments of Persian poetry.

Rev. Dr. J. B. Nis, of Brooklyn, N. Y.: The Sumerian signs Tūr, Gām, Allu, Mēn. — Remarks by Professor Barton.

Professor R. J. H. Gottheil, of Columbia University: The Peshitta text of Genesis 32. 25.

Dr. A. Yohanan, of Columbia University: On the date of composition of Nisāmī’s five romantic poems according to different Persian manuscripts.

Professor R. G. Kent, of the University of Pennsylvania: Classical parallels to a Sanskrit proverb. — Remarks by Dr. Yohanan.

Professor I. M. Paca, of the University of Chicago: The animal DUN in Sumerian inscriptions. — Remarks by Dr. J. B. Nis.

Professor M. C. Mangold, of Dropsie College: Additions to Field from the Lyons Codex of the Old Latin. — Remarks by Professor Moore.

Rev. Dr. F. A. Vanderburgh, of Columbia University: A deed of sale in the reign of Nabopolassar.

At 5:40 p.m. the Society adjourned for the day.

FOURTH SESSION.

The Society met for the fourth session at 9:40 a.m. on Thursday morning in Room 206, College Hall, University of Pennsylvania, the President, Professor Moore, being in the chair.

The President reported for the Directors that the next annual meeting would be held at Cambridge and Boston, Mass., on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of Easter week, April 16th, 17th, and 18th, 1914. He reported further that the Directors had reappointed Professors Oertel and Torrey as Editors of the Journal for the ensuing year.

The President then announced the following appointments:

*Committee of Arrangements for 1914*: Professors Lanman and Lyon, and the Corresponding Secretary.

*Committee on Nominations*: Professors Hopkins, Kent, and Ropes.

*Auditors*: Professors Oertel and Torrey.
The President announced that, because of the large number of technical papers and the brief time available at the meetings, one half-day session at the next meeting would be held in two sections, for special Indo-Germanic and Semitic communications respectively.

On motion the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

The American Oriental Society desires to express its thanks to the Provost and Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania for their hospitable welcome, to the President of the Dropsie College and his colleagues for the entertainment so generously provided, to the members of the Oriental Club of Philadelphia and to Mrs. Cornelius Stevenson for their gracious hospitality, to the University Club, the College Club, and the Lenape Club for courtesies extended, and to the Committee of Arrangements for the thoughtful provision they have made for the entertainment of the members.

The reading of papers was then resumed, in the following order:

Professor R. J. H. Gottheil, of Columbia University: Modern frauds in Ancient Palestine. — Remarks by Dr. Ward and Professor Jastrow.
Professor P. Hatt, of Johns Hopkins University: The Maccabean prototype of Luther's 'Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott.' Remarks by Dr. Michelson.
Professor E. W. Hopkins, of Yale University: The Lokapālas, or world-protecting gods. — Remarks by Professor Lamman and Dr. Edgerton; additional statement by the author.
Professor M. Jastrow, Jr., of the University of Pennsylvania: Wine in the Pentateuchal codes. — Remarks by Professors Jackson, Haupt, Moore, Brockwell, Arnold, Max Müller, and Montgomery.
Mrs. S. B. Scott, of Philadelphia: Notes on Mohammedanism in Borneo. — Remarks by Professor Gottheil, Dr. Yohannan, Mr. Ellis, Professor Barret, Professor Jastrow, and Dr. Michelson.
Professor C. R. Lanman, of Harvard University: Symbolism in India. — Remarks by Professor Hopkins and Miss Grieve.
Dr. T. Michelson, of the Bureau of American Ethnology: On various attempts to connect the language of American Indians with the languages of the Old World. — Remarks by Professors Jastrow, Max Müller, and Moore.
Professor J. A. Montgomery, of the University of Pennsylvania: A Mandala inscription on a lead tablet. — Remarks by Professors Max Müller, Gottheil, and Barton.

Mr. William T. Ellis exhibited a vase from Korea, Grecian in form, inscribed in ancient Chinese characters, for the inspection of the members. Professors Haupt and Brockwell made some remarks regarding it.
The following communication was then presented:

Professor G. A. Barton, of Bryn Mawr College: The names of two kings of Adab. (Presented in abstract.)

The Society adjourned at 12:27 p.m., to meet at Cambridge and Boston on April 16, 1914.

The following communications were presented by title:

Professor G. A. Barton, of Bryn Mawr College: A Syriac grammatical manuscript of the fifteenth century.

Dr. F. R. Blake, of Johns Hopkins University: (a) The expression of indefinite pronounal ideas in Hebrew; (b) Some peculiar Philippine constructions.

Dr. E. W. Burkslawke, of the University of Pennsylvania: Dukkhan arvaceous quoted in Bidpai's fables.

Professor C. E. Conant, of the University of Chattanooga: Notes on the phonology of the Tirurai language (Philippine).

Dr. F. Ederstrom, of Johns Hopkins University: The verses of the Vikramacarita.

Dr. A. Esber, of Johns Hopkins University: The origin of the pronominal suffix of the third person masculine singular, in Egyptian.

Professor I. Friedlaender, of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America: (a) Gnostic elements in heterodox Islam; (b) The rebirth of the Hebrew language in Palestine.

Dr. L. H. Gray, of Newark, N. J.: Iranian Miscellanies.

Dr. G. C. O. Haas, of the College of the City of New York: The Tapatissamvaran, a drama by Kulasukha Varman, translated from the Sanskrit and Prakrit.

Professor E. W. Hopkins, of Yale University: The epic Narada.

Dr. Mary L. Hufsey, of Cambridge, Mass.: A deed of land dated in the reign of Ellil-bani.

Professor A. V. W. Jackson, of Columbia University: On some words in the Old Persian cuneiform inscriptions.

Mr. Charles Jounston, of New York: A catechism of the Vedanta.

Professor R. G. Kent, of the University of Pennsylvania: The chronology of certain Indo-Iranian sound-changes.


Dr. A. Pome, of Johns Hopkins University: (a) Nisan; (b) Gold and silver in Babylonia in the third millennium B.C.; (c) A new Creation and Deluge text.

Professor J. D. Prince, of Columbia University: (a) An unread Babylonian ideogram; (b) A Tammuz incantation.

Mr. G. P. Quackenbos, of the College of the City of New York: A study of Bana's Cañdīsātaka.
Rev. Dr. W. Rosenau, of Johns Hopkins University: (a) Some psychological terms in the Hebrew text of Maimonides; (b) The Strack edition of the Talmud.

Mr. G. V. Sculce, of Johns Hopkins University: Some unpublished cuneiform fragments in the British Museum.

Mr. W. H. Scrowe, of the Commercial Museum, Philadelphia: (a) Some features of the Kushan coinage; (b) A note on the name of the Erythrean Sea.
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CONSTITUTION.
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ARTICLE IX. An Annual meeting of the Society shall be held during Easter week, the days and place of the meeting to be determined by the Directors, said meeting to be held in Massachusetts at least once in three years. One or more other meetings, at the discretion of the Directors,
may also be held each year at such place and time as the Directors shall
determine.

Article X. 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.

Annex 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
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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, 1896, the fiscal year of the Society shall
 correspond with the calendar year.

III. c. At each annual business meeting in Easter week, the President
shall appoint an auditing committee of two men—preferably men residing
in or near the town where the Treasurer lives—to examine the Treasurer's
accounts and vouchers, and to inspect the evidences of the Society's prop-
erty, 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 farther 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
shall also have the privilege of taking a copy of these 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.
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X. Six members shall form a quorum for doing business, and three to adjourn.

SUPPLEMENTARY BY-LAWS.

1. 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, pleasing himself to make good any detriment the Library may suffer from their loss or injury, the amount of said detriment to be determined by the Librarian, with the assistance of the President, or of a Vice President; and he shall return them within a time not exceeding three months from that of their reception, unless by special agreement with the Librarian this term shall be extended.
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Recent Researches in the Sumerian Calendar. — By
George A. Barton, Professor in Bryn Mawr College
Bryn Mawr, Pa.

There are many unsolved problems in Sumerology, and one
of these is the arrangement and development of the calendar.
For the period of the dynasty of Ur the area of uncertainty
has been for Lagash and Nippur reduced to narrow limits,
but for the earlier period there is as yet no agreement.
The uncertainty is well illustrated by the fact that Genouillac in
1909 arranged the names of the months in a certain order
for the period of Urkagina, beginning the year with the month
Ezen-Bau at the vernal equinox;¹ the present writer in 1910
found thirty-six month-names for the same period, which applied
to thirteen months, (one of them being the intercalary month),
which he believed represented a year beginning at the autumnal equinox;² in the same year Myhrman compiled four lists
of months which were in use during the period of Ur, one of
which began with ŠE-KIN-KUD, and two with the month
GAN-MAS.³ He was influenced in the arrangement of these
last mentioned lists by an old theory of his friend Radau, who
had contended that the calendar began with that month.
Finally Langdon 1911, arranged for the Urkagina period a
calendar of twelve months. He ignored may the variant
names. He began the year with the month August-September.⁴
Each of the three investigators who treats the calendar of
Urkagina has arranged the months in a different order and
would begin the year at a different period. Langdon endeavor
s to connect the calendar of the Urkagina period with that
of the Ur period, and believes that he has discovered a law

¹ Tablettes numériques archaïques p. xvii ff.
² JAOS, XXXI, 281 ff.
³ Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania. III, 45 ff.
⁴ Tablets from the Archives of Dirchom, Paris, Geuthner, 1911, p. 5 ff.
by which the months were gradually shifted. If one could accept his system and believe that his knowledge of the Babylonian seasons and harvests is accurate, Langdon would persuade him that the Sumerian calendar was invented 2100 years before the Ur dynasty or about 4400 — 4500 B.C. Such wide differences of opinion serve to show that we are all in a good degree groping in the dark.

Meantime Thureau-Dangin has collected from unpublished tablets the names and order of the months as he believes they were arranged in the calendars of Umma and Jōkha. While these calendars belong to the Ur period and the arrangements proposed rest in many instances on doubtful data, their variations in one or two clearly established points from calendars previously known throw light on a number of problems. They also make it clear there was no such thing as a uniform Sumerian Calendar for the whole of Babylonia.

It is the fashion among some Sumerologists to assume that all who engage in Sumerian studies except one's self and one's teacher or pupil, are ignorant of the first principles of the science, and accordingly each scholar fiercely asserts the correctness of his own opinions. So long as this is the case, and so long as the results obtained differ as widely as those referred to above, the general public cannot be blamed for thinking that Sumerology is not yet a science, but belongs to the realm of imaginative fiction.

It is not in this spirit that the writer approaches the study. He readily acknowledges his own humble position among the devotees of the craft, and is eager to learn from any and every quarter. So long as we are dealing with a matter which strives to escape from imaginative literature and to find standing room in the realm of science, it is quite right to test each theory by such facts as can be ascertained, and in this testing the humblest workers may find a place. It is with this purpose that the following criticisms are offered.

Myhrman, followed by Langdon, gives two lists of months of a year beginning with a month GAN-MAŠ. There is really no decisive evidence offered in support of such a year. It is true that in the great grain account published in CT, III, (Nr. 18343), the accounts run from GAN-MAŠ to ŠE-IL-IA, but that does not prove that the year began with GAN-MAŠ, but only that at the beginning of that month was
the new grain ready to be put into circulation. A modern firm might for economic causes run their fiscal year from Feb. 1st to Jan. 31st, but this would not imply that the calendar of the time did not begin its year with Jan. 1st. That the year of the authors of this tablet began with ŠE-IL-LA is shown by the fact that the intercalary month was DIR-ŠE-KIN-KUD (cf. col. x, 48, xii, 49, and xiii, 9). If the year had begun with GAN-MAṢ, the intercalary month should have been a second ŠE-IL-LA. The lists which begin with GAN-MAṢ may, therefore, be disregarded.

On the other hand a tablet published by Rada̦n, EBH, 299, (viz. EAH, 134), testifies to a year which began with ŠE-KIN-KUD and concluded with EZIN-MI-KI-GAL. This list which simply couples the names of certain officials with the different months, clearly arranges them in their calendar order. This is confirmed by a tablet recently published from Drehem.1 Clearly, then, there were places in the Ur period where the calendar began with the month with which in other places it ended. Langdon2 has rightly pointed out that in the tablets from Drehem published by him one can see the year shifting from one system to the other, sometimes DIR-EZEN-MI-KI-GAL3 being the intercalary month, and sometimes DIR-ŠE-KIN-KUD.4 As ŠE-KIN-KUD is a name which signifies the "grain" or "barley-harvest" and as that harvest begins now about the middle of April,5 it is clear that originally that month came a month later than in the calendar of the time of Ur at Tellih. For some reason, probably because intercalary months were not appointed often enough, it had been drawn back one place in the calendar. At Drehem we see the change in progress.

The recognition of this fact solves a difficulty which I felt when writing on the calendar two years ago;6 but the right solution of which I did not then find. It accordingly necessitates a slight modification of my arrangement of the months, as will be pointed out below.

Langdon’s inference that this process had been going on for such a length of time that the calendar had been drawn five

---

1 La trouvaille de Drehem, par H. de Genouillac, Paris, 1911, Nr. 65.
3 Ibid. Nr. 55.
4 Ibid. Nr. 2.
5 JAOS, XXXI, 299, n. 1.
months out of its original position, is based upon a number of misconceptions. One of the most fundamental of these is the notion that the barley harvest ever came as late as July-August, and that the date harvest came in July. These are simple facts which can be ascertained from modern conditions without a knowledge of Sumerian. Barley harvest began in the latter part of March and extended into April. The wheat harvest followed on after it. The date harvest at Busrah, which is farther south than Telloh, begins now about the middle of September and lasts for six or eight weeks. Langdon has also overlooked the fact that as early as the time of Urkagina the appointment of an intercalary month was in use. It is inconceivable that a people who had invented an intercalary month to keep their agriculturally named months in coincidence with the agricultural seasons, should permit it to be drawn absolutely out of touch with them at a time when the agricultural names were fully understood. Indeed, on Langdon’s theory the month names must have become fixed about 4400 B.C. and the process of dislocation must have been far advanced by 3000—2800 B.C., where we must place Urkagina. The month names of the time of Urkagina make such a theory wholly untenable. They are not only in a thoroughly fluid state, some months being named from any one of several agricultural processes which took place in it, but the names themselves occur in their fullest forms. They are still whole sentences, which have definite agricultural meanings. They are not the mere meaningless fragments which some of them had become by the Ur Period. Such changes as are traceable in the Sumerian calendar before the Ur period occurred in the space of 500 years and not 2100 years.

Langdon rightly begins the year toward the autumn. He makes the first month Aug.-Sept., instead of Sept.-Oct. In the present state of our knowledge this is not a serious divergence, though his reason for choosing it, viz.: —that SE-KIN-KUD and SU-NUMUN originally belonged five months from the time where we later find them, is a misconception of the

---

1. JAOS, XXXI, 259, n. 1.
Babylonian seasons. That the year began in the autumn as late as the time of Gudea,¹ is a fact to which attention has previously been called.² The change from this to a year which began with the vernal equinox was an innovation introduced between the time of Gudea, therefore, and the dynasty of Ur. What was the cause of the change, we can only conjecture, and conjecture in the absence of facts is futile. But all the information points to the theory that a definite change to a year beginning in the spring, had been made at Telloh within the comparatively short period between Gudea and the dynasty of Ur.

Langdon equates the stellar mouth-name of the period of Urgagina, viz.: —ITU MUL-BABBAR-SAG-E-TA-SUB-A-A, (i.e., $ \begin{array} \text{иру} \text{мун-буаббар-саг-э-та-суб-а-а} \end{array} $ with ITU BAR-ZAG (i.e., $ \begin{array} \text{иру} \text{бар-джаг} \end{array} $), which occurs in the Ur period at Nippur. Langdon reads $ \begin{array} \text{бир} \end{array} $ Bar instead of BABBAR, which is, of course, possible. He then takes BAR-SAG as the name of the star, instead of interpreting SAG in the sense of "front" or "leadership" as I would do,³ and takes the reading BAR-ZAG as another spelling for this. There is hardly a possibility that this is right, since in EA 134 it is spelled ITU BAR-BAZAG-GAR (\begin{array} \text{иру} \text{бар-базаг-гар} \end{array}). Though the BAR-ZAG is spelled differently in the two texts the presence of the GAR or GA-RA in both the Ur names introduces an element which is not in the earlier name, and the identification of either with the earlier name is extremely improbable. Langdon thinks that its use as a month name arose from the acronomic setting of some unidentified star, though he admits that this is the opposite of the usage of the Persian period. The view formerly expressed by me,⁴ that the star is Sirius, that the reference is to its heliac rising, and that the month is identical with the month LIK (month of the dog), once called LIK-BAD (month the dog dies), though conjectural, is still the most probable conjecture.

In this connection the date of DP 99 should be discussed. When writing two years ago, I recognized it as an intercalary month, though a part of the name was not then clear.

² Cf. JAOS, XXXI, 263, and the references there given.
³ JAOS, XXXI, 266.
⁴ Ibid., 266 f.
to me. The month name is written (turning the signs into Assyrian script), $\text{.paused text}. The $\text{paused text}$ is very puzzling, and two years ago I was inclined to regard it as "day 2" inserted in a peculiar way. Analogy of later texts proves, however, that that is impossible. Hammurapi, for example, (King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, pl. 14, 1, 6), says, in appointing an intercalary month ITU KIN.\textsuperscript{4} NANA II=$\text{paused text}$, "a second Uulu let it be registered".\textsuperscript{1} We thus learn that an intercalary month could be called the "second" of the preceding month. Applying this to the $\text{paused text}$ of this old month name, we should render it, "Second Babbar, appointed". The inference lies close at hand, that BABBAR is an abbreviation for ITU-MUL-BABBAR-SAGE-TA-SUB-A-A. If this was the case, this astral month was the closing month of the year, and not the first month, as Langdon supposed.\textsuperscript{2}

Kugler\textsuperscript{3} has made an interesting suggestion concerning another month name, Antasurra. A longer form of it occurs, though mutilated by the breaking of the tablet, in DP 116. It is ITU-NIN-GIR-SU-E-BIL-AN-TA-SUR-RA, "Month when the god Ningirsu pours out fire from heaven". Kugler interprets it as a reference to a shower of meteors. Kugler shows that about 2700 B. C. the Leonid meteors which now come about the middle of November fall about July 14th. According to the data given by him, the Persid meteors, which now fall in August, then fell about June 26. At that time, accordingly, the month, June-July, would include both these showers, and a month might well be named for them. Langdon objects to this interpretation of the name (op. cit. p. 13, n. 5) on the ground that Antasurra was a part of the temple of

---

\textsuperscript{1} Similarly Bu 88; 5–12, 12 (CT, VIII, 3) is dated in ITU KIN-NANA II =$\text{paused text}$, and Bu 91; 5–9, 820 (CT, VIII, 27) is dated ITU BARZAG-GER II =$\text{paused text}$. These are other instances of the practice in question, and the last example shows that in the reign of Abišu Nisan he was used as an intercalary month.

\textsuperscript{2} That GAL-CA-A is to be taken in the sense of *sažzu*, "appoint", (Br. $\text{paused text}$), is shown by CT, III, 18433 *passim*, where, whenever an intercalary month occurred in the year, we read ITU DIR I=$\text{paused text}$ SABA-NI-GAL, "One additional month in (it) was appointed"; cf. iii, 35, 45, vii, 40, ix, 12, 29, 32, 41, 48, xvi, 45.

\textsuperscript{3} Sternekunde und Sterndienst in Babylon, II, 174 ff. and ZA, XXV, 278. In my former article I read the name Antagarra, but this is incorrect.
Ningirsu (SAK, 243), and that it was also a proper name of men. Kugler’s interpretation is plausible and attractive, though as yet uncertain.

Of the reconstruction of the calendars of Umma and Jōkha by Thureau-Dangin one feels some doubt. For example, it is assumed from the statement of a text, that “From the month ŠE-KIN-KUD to the month Dumuzi was twelve months”, that the year began with the month ŠE-KIN-KUD. While the fact that at Drehem ŠE-KIN-KUD began the year establishes a presumption that the same was the case at Umma, the statement itself does not prove it any more than the statement that from December to November is twelve months would prove that our year begins with December.

The statement does prove that at Umma, (and the same seems to have been true for Jōkha), the Feast of Amarna was called the feast of Tammuz. A deity sufficiently akin to Tammuz to be identified with him, seems to have been especially honored in the winter time.

Taking into account the new information which has come to light, the table of months published in vol. XXXI should be corrected as in the following list. The position of those preceded by an interrogation is still in doubt: The position assigned to those preceded by two question marks is wholly conjectural.

The exact date of the new year cannot as yet be accurately ascertained. Probably it was not accurately determined astronomically, but came somewhere near the date harvest. It may have ranged from the end of August to the end of September.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tentative List of Months.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First month,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU EZIN-BA-U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU EZIN-BULUK-KU-NINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU EZIN-ŠE-KU-NINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU EZIN-AB-UD-DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU GAR-KA-ID-KA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second month,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU ŠI-GAR-MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth month, (??)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU UZ-NE-GU-RA-A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fifth month, (??) | ITU GAI-ŠAG-GA 1
Sixth month, | ITU AMAR-A-A-SIG-GA  
| ITU AMA-UDU-TUK  
| ITU ŠE-KIN-KUD  
| ITU MAL-UDU-UR  
| ITU MAL-UR  
| ITU*SIG-BA  
| ITU SIG-BA-U-E-TA-GAR-RA-A  
Seventh month, | ITU UDU-SU-ŠE-A-IL-4NINA  
| ITU UDU-SU-ŠE-A-IL-4LA  
| ITU UDU-SU-ŠE-A-KU  
| ITU UDU-SU-ŠE-A-4NINA  
| ITU UDU-SU-ŠE-A-4NIN-GIR-SU  
Eighth month, | ITU ŠE-GAR-UDU  
| ITU KARU-DUB-BA-A  
| ITU KARU-IMI-A-TA  
| ITU SI-NAM-DUB-NI-BA-DUR-BA-A  
| ITU-KARU-IMI-DU-A 2  
Ninth month, | ITU HAR-RA-NE-MA-4NINA  
| ITU HAR-RA-NE-MA-A 3  
| ITU EZIN-4NE-ŠU  
Tenth month, | (?) ITU-4NIN-GIR-SU-E-BIL-AN-TA-SUR-RA  
| (?) ITU AN-TA-SUR-RA-A

1 This conjecture is based upon the fact that at Umma and Jokha the feast of Tammuz came in the winter. As there is some probability that this was a feast of Tammuz, (cf. JAOS, XXXI, 268), I place it tentatively here.

2 This name, which occurs in DP, 114, was overlooked by me when writing my former article. It means "Month when the storehouse tablets are sealed".

3 I regret that in my former article (JAOS, 263, n. 1), I misunderstood Thureau-Dangin’s position as to the reading of this name. It is not certain that GUD should be read ḤAR, but Thureau-Dangin still holds that opinion.
Eleventh month,

ITU EZIN-BULUK-KÜ₂-NIN-GIR-SU
ITU EZIN-ŠE-KÜ₂-NIN-GIR-SU
ITU EZIN-DIM-KÜ

(??) ITU EZIN₂-LUGAL-ERIM
(??) ITU GAL-UNUG₃-GA
(?) ITU MUL-BABBAR-SAG-E-TA-SUB-A-A

Twelfth month,

Intercalary month,

ITU BABBAR-MIN-GAL-LA-A
A Political Hymn to Shamash. — By J. Dyneley Prince, Ph. D., Professor in Columbia University, New York City.

This hymn of Šamaš-šum-ukin, the rebellious viceroy and brother of the last great Assyrian king Ašur-bāni-pal, is of peculiar interest, because it is more than the ordinary invocation of a king to a god. After the usual praises of the divine power of the sun-god, Šamaš-šum-ukin says, in line 9: "a mighty one as a partner thou givest me", a clear allusion to his imperious brother Ašur-bāni-pal. The hymn continues significantly in line 13: "the unopened documents of my glory thou proclaimest", implying that an unknown, but glorious future awaits the king. Most significant of all, Šamaš-šum-ukin prays in line 27: "my partner may I overcome", and in line 30: "may I change my command", viz., release himself from the Assyrian overlordship, plainly showing that, at the time when this hymn was composed, the rupture between Ašur-bāni-pal and Šamaš-šum-ukin was contemplated, even if it had not become a fact.

The Semitic-Babylonian cuneiform text is published by David H. Myhrman in Babylonian Hymns and Psalms (Philadelphia, 1911), Plates 22—23, without photographic reproduction. The plates, although mutilated here and there, are plain enough to indicate the nature of the inscription, which is couched in fine style, characterized by an abundance of epithet, giving a literary merit to the production far above that of the ordinary conventional prayer. The whole hymn breathes a sincerity entirely natural in view of the special purpose and earnest desire of the supplicant.

Obverse.

I (ra)-lu-u git-ma-.lu a-pil di-ina arzi il Babbir-ra
Great one; perfect one; son of the god in the month of Šamaš;
A Political Hymn to Shamash.

2 . . . -tu šu-u pi-tu-šu pa-an kalām-me mu-kal-lim nūra
. . . . . . he who opens the face of the lands; who reveals light;
3 (muš)-te-šir ina šarun-ti-ma UB-KAL mimna šum-šu
Who rules aright in my kingdom, the mighty ruler of everything;
4 . . . dannu il Šamaš (d. U-tu) ša-ru-er malāti
. . powerful one, Šamaš, glory of the lands.
5 (UD-KIB)-NUN-K1 cu-lul E-Babbar-ra
Sippar, the shadow of the Temple of Šamaš
6 . . . . . ina il Marduk tuk-lat Babīti (KA-DINGIR-RA-KI)
. . . . . by means of Marduk the help of Babylon
7 . . . . (elī?) bi-ti-ka u-taq-qu-šu il Anunnaki il Icgi
. . . . (upon?) thy house the Anunnaki (and) Igigi pour out (bounteously).
8 il Me um-me cil-mal quqqa-du 4-tal-la-la mēšara-ka
The goddess Me, mother of the black-headed, justifies thy righteousness.
9 dannu ina tap-pa-a tu-šar-ši
A mighty one as a partner thou givest (me).
10 ana la ša-ra-šu ta-nam-din ap-šu
To him who is unworthy thou givest a son.
11 da-(al)-ti sik-hur šam-e tu-pat-ti
The door (and) the bolt of heaven thou openest.
12 ana la sa-ti-la ta-šak-kan nūra
For him who seeth not thou makest light.
13 duppi tanadūtia (UB-MU) la pi-ta-a tu-ša-as-ši
The unopened documents of my glory thou proclaimest.
14 ina tišši immere tu-sal-tar šīra
Among the lambs thou makest plenteous the meat.
15 dāitān (DI-KUD) il Anunnaki bēl il Icgi
Judge of the Anunnaki, lord of the Igigi;
16 il Šamaš bēria dūr ši-ma-a-ti a-ta-ma
Šamaš, my lord, wall of my fate art thou.
17 ana-kū m, il Šamaš-šum-ukin mār ili-šu,
1 Šamaš-šum-ukin the son of his god, (thee)
18 ina suš-šu-pa-ni dub-šu g ša-(al-tu) gš as-ma-ru-šu
For our protection a foundation, door (?), lance;
19 lu šal-ma iecur nūri (XU-CAB) gš narkabat ci-(mit-tim)
šē-ma
Verily propitious, bird of light, to the chariot of my span favorable
20 pal-xa-ru ad-ra-ku u šu-ta-du-ra-ku
I reverence, I fear and I am greatly in awe (of thee)
21 (mi-)šî-bi ia-ši u bitia (E-MU)
who makest glad myself and my house.
22 (at-ta-) kar áb (A-A) amēli abu (A-A) -ku-nu əb (A-A)
māt əli . . . .
I proclaim the father of mankind, your father, father of
the land of . . . .
23 (na-piš)-tu ši-išu a-lak-ti dum-mi-ig
(my life) do thou order; my going do thou favor.
24 (tu-sar)-ši ra-i-na lu-šu-u-ə
Do thou grant mercy; may I drink
25 ni-me-qa šuttu iaru-u-ə (ME-U-A)
wisdom; in dreams where am I?
26 šuttu at-tu lu ana ṭamīq-tim šuk-na
O turn the black dream to favor!

Reverse
27 is-ša-riš lū-liš tap-pa-ə lū-uk-šu-ud
Righteously may I walk; my partner may I overcome!
28 ina u (UD)-mi-ia lu-ʁak ṭamīq-tam
In my days may I prolong (thy) favor!
29 ... šu ... ma-ka ša ṭamīq-tam
... of favor.
30 dašu (DI-KUD) lu-(nak)-kīr qa-bu-u-a
O judge, let me change my command!
31 . . . . . . . ri-ša-a-tu bit bituša (BIL-TU-MU)
. . . . . . . (may he fill?) with joy the house of my
tribute!
32 il Me ri- . . . . li-iz-iz ina xegallia (KAN-MU)
Goddess Me . . . . may she be strong for my plenty!
33 il Me ma- . . . . li-iz-iz ina ṭamīq-tam
Goddess Me . . . . may she be strong for my
favor!
34 šep taš-taq-ti (ti lu)-šal-li-šu ina 'idnia
The foot of my progress may she make perfect for my power!

35 A-A .................. pa-(kâ)-di ina arkia
.................. to preserve behind me!

36 li .................. il Bu-ne-ne rubu-ka damiç-tim
(May) the goddess Bunene (endow) thy prince with favor!

37 il A-(A) .............. ta(?), si xul-gu-uma
May the goddess A-A .................. they are destroyed.

38 il Šamaš abu (A-A) .......... at-(ta) ri-ša-a rî-e-mu
Šamaš, father (?) .................. do thou grant mercy!

39 il Šam-ši abu(?)-ha .......... 
O Šamaš, thy city ..............

40 il Me ........................ ru-bu-ka
Goddess Me .................. thy prince

41 il Me ...................... -ka li-tûb-bu
Goddess .................. may thy . . . be sweet!

42 KA-KA(?)-MA(?) ...... GA(?)-TU-LAL il Šam-ša
a prayer .............. a complete one to Šamaš.

Grammatical Commentary

1. *ina arxi Babbar-ra* 'in the month of Šamaš' — the seventh month, *Tašritum = Tišri*, which was dedicated to the sun-god. The form *Babbar* is a reduplication of Sum. *bar*, the primary meaning of which is ‘divide, penetrate’ (see my MSL., 53 and cf. below on line 4). The reduplication has its counterpart in Sum. *tattab* from *tab* ‘two’.

It is probable that this line is not the first line of the inscription, as the epithets herein contained apply rather to the king than to the god. The expression ‘son of the god’ implies always a pious person (cf. line 17) and could only have been used of Šamaš-sum-ûlûn, whose name probably precedes this first line. The following epithets in lines 2—3 fl. are undoubtedly descriptive of the god himself.

2. UB-KAL is clearly a combination of UB — *na’âdu*, Br. 5783 and *tanattu*, Br. 5784 respectively — ‘be lofty’ and ‘glory’. KAL = *kal* and lig = *damnu* ‘mighty’. The familiar *akkali* ‘leader’ in Semitic, from Sum. *ab-kal*, is probably a
variant of this \textit{ub-bal}, as $\overline{\text{AB}} = \text{Sem. nasiku 'prince, prominent person} and appears also as a prefix in Sum. \textit{ab-zal} 'seer'.

4. Šamaš is here called \textit{il U-tu}, which I interpret to mean the god of the setting sun; viz., $\overline{\text{u-}}$ is the abstract prefix so common in Sumerian, $\overline{\text{tu}} = \text{erēbu 'enter, set'}$, said of the sun. \textit{U-tu} is, therefore, the epithet of the setting Šamaš; while \textit{Babbar} = UD is the sun-god in his noonday glory. I am not inclined to connect $\overline{\text{u-tu}}$ with UD = \textit{ud} etymologically, as I did in MSL, 355, although there was no doubt, a paronomastic suggestion between the two forms.


7. \textit{Utaqqu} is the \textit{Htal} of $\overline{\text{772}}$; an unusual form. Šamaš is the god of plenty here, as in line 14.

8. \textit{il Me} is evidently a variant of the reduplicated \textit{il Me}mē, a secondary name of the goddess Gula, who seems to figure here as the consort of Šamaš. The form \textit{il Me} appears in this inscription in lines 32; 32; 40; 41.

9. \textit{Ina tappu 'as a companion'}; \textit{ina = 'for'}; we should expect \textit{ana}. \textit{Tappu 'partner'} is probably a Sumerian loanword from Sum. \textit{ab 'two, another'}, and is not from Sem. $\overline{\text{723}}$; Muss-Arnolt, \textit{Dictionary}, s. v. \textit{tappu}.

10; 12. Note in these lines the characteristic Babylonian disregard for the case-endings, an indication that these suffixes probably ceased to be pronounced at a comparatively early date.

14. The sun-god appears here as the god of plenty, as in line 7.

18. \textit{Ina xulupani dublu 'a foundation to protect us'}; a difficult phrase. \textit{Xullupu = 'cover'}; hence 'protect' and \textit{dublu = išdu 'foundation'}; II. R. 35, 43 cf. The $\overline{\text{mi}}$ is probably the 1 p. pl. suffix. The metaphor is plainly that of a fortification. The sun-god is called here "the door" (\textit{daltu}) evidently of safety for his worshippers, and also "the lance" (\textit{asmaru}, from the same stem as Ar. \textit{musmaru 'nail"}, because of his penetrating power. He is therefore a weapon of defence.

19. \textit{XU-CAB = iscur nārī 'bird of light'}, because of his flight across the heavens. Note that the storm-god Zū is also pictured as a bird.

22. This \textit{A-A} here = \textit{abu 'father'}, as in line 38, and is not the goddess \textit{A}, seen in line 37.
26. At-tu, an unusual feminine adjective from ṭuṣu 'be dark, cloudy'.

36. il Bu-ne-ne was the consort of Malik with whom she attended the sun-god.

37. Clearly the goddess A here, the consort of Šamas.

38. Here again A-A = abu 'father', as in line 22.

42. KA-KA-MA = Sum. inim-inim-ma = Sem. šiptu ‘incantation, exorcism’. We expect rather Sum. a-ra-zu = ñasitu ‘prayer’, as this hymn is an invocation. GA-TU-LAL is composed of the elements GA-TU = malu ‘be full’ and redundant LAL = lá; also = malu.
Some Notes on the So-called Hieroglyphic-Tablet. — By Ellen Seton Ogden, Ph. D. Albany, N. Y.

The following notes are an attempt to read the so-called Hieroglyphic Tablet published in T. S. B. A. Vol. VI, p. 454 ff. Menant, Houghton, and Delitzsch have each discussed it wholly or in part, and for their suggestions grateful acknowledgment is here made.

The tablet is clearly a sign list. The characters at the right hand of each column correspond to those on the kudurrus of the Cassite and Pashe dynasties, differing from those of Hammurabi’s time on the one hand and from the archaic forms of Nebuchadnezzar II on the other. The signs on the left, except a few obviously late ones, are seemingly older and show little more than a passing resemblance to Babylonian traditions of writing.

Two problems are therefore to be solved:

1. The general plan and interpretation of the sign list.
2. The identification as to origin and date of the archaic characters at the left.

The association of several words under one sign seems to have been determined partly by unity of idea and partly by similarity of sound. In some groups a clue was found in the

4 My attention was first called to this fact by Dr. Geo. A. Barton of Bryn Mawr.
chief syllabic value, which under varying transcriptions stood for other more or less closely related words. Elsewhere, with several syllabic values, the divergence is greater. Generally the meanings given to the signs at the left fall within those listed by Brünnow and Meissner under the case-sign, but this has not been held to rigidly, because the present knowledge of lexicographical material is still far from complete. Of course the equations assigned these unknown characters and couched in the phraseology of Babylonian signs hold only as far as the idea, if the theory of a non-Babylonian origin is accepted.

As to the identification of the archaic signs three theories are tenable:

a) That they are Babylonian, of a date and locality as yet unknown.

b) That they are foreign to Babylonian life and writing.

c) That they are Babylonian, but strongly under some foreign influence. In favor of the first view is the resemblance of certain of the characters to Babylonian signs, but at best this evidence is slight. A more clearly defined similarity exists between them and the proto-Elamitic, and if the parallel tablet in C.T.V., 81–7–27, 49 1 and 50, be collated together with this one, it makes a total of thirty-one signs in which this similarity challenges attention. What really results therefore is a triangular relationship between the three, the Babylonian, proto-Elamitic and these characters. Whether this is due to coincidence or to common origin with subsequent independent development, only future research can answer.

Meanwhile the writer would suggest the following as a possible solution, though one as yet unproved.

If, as has been thought by some, the Cassites were an Elamitic people, it is likely that they used or were familiar with the early Elamitic writing now known as proto-Elamitic, and also with its later forms. As part of their very strong influence upon Babylonian affairs, may not these Cassites have made some attempts to equate their own older signs with those of the language about them? If so, something like the present sign-list would have resulted.

1 See J. A. O. S. Vol. 32.
Col. I. Cases 1, 2. The case sign is RA (Hinke 113).

Col. II. Cases 3, 4. The case sign is NAM (Hinke 37).

3) $\text{[Image]} \Rightarrow ?$ ?

4) $\text{[Image]} \Rightarrow ?$ ?

Cases 5, 6. The case sign is AB, ĒŠ (Hinke 77).

5) $\text{[Image]}, AB, (\text{Rec. 344, 550 bis})$, $\text{abu}$, father; $\text{nāṣīku}$, prince; $\text{sibu}$, old man. Allied with this sign is AB $\Rightarrow \text{[Image]}$, līttu, offspring; mīru, the young of an animal; banū, ša alādi.

6) $\text{[Image]} \Rightarrow \text{[Image]}$, AB (Rec. 345) tāmtu, sea; eptu enclosure; (arab) Tēbbūtu, the mouth of floods; (āmelu) īrsētu, irrigator. Allied with this sign is ĒŠ $\Rightarrow$ house, inclosure.

Col. III. Cases 1—4. The case sign is AZA, AZ, AS (Hinke 206). The sign is a compound of PIRIK $\Rightarrow$ lion, and ZA $\Rightarrow$ stone, jewel. In the early archaic inscriptions it appears only in the place name AZ (ki). Later it is equated with

a) (is) sīgaru, some means or implement of restraint.
b) aṣu, physician, or according to Langdon²

¹ Hinke, Selections from the Kudurrû Inscriptions.
An ointment or paste used in medicine.

The use of AZ. = šigaru in the sense of ‘chain’ or ‘fetter’ is indicated by the combination in which the sign occurs.

AZ. BAL = ėrinu, năbaru, cage.
AZ. GU = (iš) šigaru, ša kišadi, chain for neck.
AZ. LAL = (iš) šigaru, ša kalī, harness or leash for a dog. (LAL = kasu, kumu, rakātu, to bind, and žamatu, to yoke).
AZ. BAL, LAL, K = (iš) ėrinu, cage, but used also as a synonym of šigaru. There is probably a connection between this šigaru = (iš) ši, GAR and īškaru = (iš) GAR or KAR, fetter or chain, if they are not the same word differently transcribed.

1) \[\text{sign} \] + \( \text{UR} (?) \) + ZA (Rec. 438, 9), stone lion colossus. UR. MAH is the usual transcription for nergaltu, the stone bas-relief of a lion placed at the entrance of palace or temple to ward off the evil power of Nergal the “destroyer”. Rec. 439, as yet unidentified, resembles this present sign more closely than Rec. 438, but may be only a variant. UR. MAH is also the usual form for nēšu, lion, whereas šunu, labbu, and (iš) Nergal as the lion-god are transcribed by PIRIK.

2) \[\text{sign} \] + NUNUZ + ZA (Rec. 283, suppl. 480), (hānu) ėrimmatu, necklace, or chain in the sense of fetter; cf. DAK. NUNUZ. GU = nīru, yoke (Br. 8182). Is this the same as ėrinu above? The pictograph represents a link-chain plus the sign for stone.

3) \[\text{sign} \] + NUNUZ + ZA (Rec. 283, suppl. 480), (iš) šigaru, chain or fetter.

4) \[\text{sign} \] + AZA (Rec. 185, suppl. 518), aea, physician. The pictograph is difficult to explain, unless by an association of both form and idea with GIR below, which see.

Cases 5–8. The case sign is GIR, NĒ, PIRIK, UG, (Hinke 202). Primarily this is GIR the sign for sandal.

\[\text{Brūnnow, A Classified List of All Simple and Compound Ideographs (Leiden, 1899).} \]
foot, but through similarity of form, there have been confused with it three other signs, as follows:¹

a) \[\text{sun Sign} = \text{moon Sign} = \text{KIŠ (ki).}\]

b) \[\text{sun Sign} = \text{moon Sign} = \text{GIR, sandal, foot.}\]

c) \[\text{sun Sign} = \text{moon Sign} = \text{ANŠU, ass.}\]

d) \[\text{sun Sign} = \text{moon Sign} = \text{PIRIK, UG, lion.}\]

Even the inscriptions of the archaic period show interchange of usage, a process heightened by time and growing complexity of the language. This interchange accounts for some of the parallelism between the groups above and this.

5) \[\text{sun Sign} = \text{moon Sign} (\text{Rec. 283, suppl. 480}) \text{kurru,} \text{"Fulhsessel" (H. W. B. p. 355).} \text{This is the same sign, without ZA, as in cases 2, 3 of the AZ group.}\]

6) \[\text{sun Sign} = \text{moon Sign}, \text{GIR (Rec. 224, 226, suppl. 224), šepu, foot; kūšu, step; gašru, powerful. Without syllabic value it equals tallaktu, paddamu, uršu. The pictograph represents a sandal with thongs. The expression GIR or GIR NITAH = sakkanadhû and the association with emûku suggests that this form of sandal was one of the insignia of power.}\]

7) \[\text{sun Sign} = \text{moon Sign} = \text{NÊ (?), namru, bright, nûru, light.} \text{The pictograph represents a lamp in the form of a bird, such as appears on the seal-cylinders and kudurrus as the emblem of the fire-god Gibil-Nusku,² Its presence here is accounted for by the confusion between NÊ = \[\text{moon Sign}\] and NÊ = \[\text{sun Sign}\], fire.}\]

8) \[\text{sun Sign} = \text{moon Sign} = \text{NÊ (?), GUNNI (?) (Cf. Br. 9763) kinuwa, brazier. For pictograph see Rec. 176 and the discussion under ID below.}\]

Col. IV, Cases 1, 2. The case sign is DAR, SL, SU, UGUN

¹ For fuller discussion of this group, see E. S. Ogden, The Origin of the Godu-Signs in Babylonia, Leipzig, 1911.
² See also Langdon, op. cit. p. 272.
³ Ward, Seal Cylinders of Western Asia (Washington, 1910).
(Hinke 267 and Clay, Marushu, 28). Two signs, SI-GUNU and TARRU, have coalesced under this sign.  

1) \(-\frac{\text{\vphantom{I}I\vphantom{I}}}{\text{\vphantom{I}I\vphantom{I}}}\;\text{DAR (Rec. 34)}\; tarru,\; bird,\; or\; SI,\; SU (Rec. 48)\)  

2) \(-\frac{\text{\vphantom{I}I\vphantom{I}}}{\text{\vphantom{I}I\vphantom{I}}}\; ?\; ?\; The\; sign\; seems\; to\; be\; composed\; of\; AS + SA + GA.\; For\; a\; possible\; connection\; compare \(-\frac{\text{\vphantom{I}I\vphantom{I}}}{\text{\vphantom{I}I\vphantom{I}}} = katu\; (Br. 3486)\; and\; II.\; Rawlinson\; 37, 45 c, f, where\; this\; is\; equated\; with\; libbi.\)  

Cases 3, 4. The case sign is SUM, SU, RIG (Hinke 172), kišutu, burning. šassūru, uterus (or foetus?); arkhātu, back, behind; baldū fullness, pudendum feminae; mašādū, to press. The pictograph equals SAL + SU (Rec. 190), the latter in the sense of mašku, skin; šaru, zurnu, body; ruddu, to increase; erēbu, to enter.  

3) \(-\\text{\vphantom{I}I\vphantom{I}} - \frac{\text{\vphantom{I}I\vphantom{I}}}{\text{\vphantom{I}I\vphantom{I}}}\; \text{SU (Rec. 330)}\; šassūru,\; uterus.\)  

4) \(-\\text{\vphantom{I}I\vphantom{I}} - \frac{\text{\vphantom{I}I\vphantom{I}}}{\text{\vphantom{I}I\vphantom{I}}}\; \text{SUM (Rec. 59)}\; dašādū,\; be\; plentiful.\) The pictograph represents two crossed palm branches.  

Case 5. The case sign is broken, but in C. T. V, 81-7-27, 49 and 50 and J. A. O. S. Vol. 32, the sign at the left of this case is equated with \(-\\text{\vphantom{I}I\vphantom{I}}\; DU,\; be\; plentiful.\)
Col. I. Cases 4—6. The case sign is ŠAL, SAL, MURUBT (Hinke 167), zinništu, woman; urū, pudendum feminae; rapāšu, to extend.

4) $\mathcal{E}$ ? (broken).

5) $\mathcal{E}$ SAL, Rec. 327) zinništu, woman.

6) $\mathcal{E}$ MURUR (Rec. 231), bitū, fullness; pū, mouth; urū, pudendum feminae (Br.10962—4).

Cases 7, 8. The case sign is SAL + KU = NIN (Hinke 170) beltu, lady, mistress.

7) $\mathcal{E}$ NIN (Rec. 335) beltu, lady.

Col. II. Cases 2, 3. The case sign is GE, KIT, SAH, LIL (Hinke 136) bitū, structure (?) (Prince, M. S. L. p. 131); bitū, storm-demon; sāru, zahiššu, wind.

2) $\mathcal{E}$, LĒI, (Rec. 415), kisaltu, a spacious place.

3) $\mathcal{E}$ (?), E, LIL (?), Cf. šarru E, LIL, LAL (Br. 6249, M. 3799),1 bit urštī; bit šori; bit zahiššu.

Cases 4—7. The case sign is BAR, DAG (Br. 5528) BAR = parru, net; šuparruru, to spread out, DAG = rapāšu, to spread out; nāšū and nagāšu, to destroy.

4) $\mathcal{E}$ BAR (?), (M. 3869) šubtu, dwelling.2

5) $\mathcal{E}$ BAR, (Rec. 426) parru, net; šuparruru, to spread out.

6) $\mathcal{E}$ DAK (?), I, NA, ŠI, ZA (Rec. 322) abnu, stone or jewel. The sign was originally NI + UD = “shining light”, “full of light”. The present pictograph is analogous, NI + ZA, “full of brightness”, or a “shining stone”.

7) $\mathcal{E}$ GUG, GUK (Rec. 463), kudku (?).

Cases 8. The case sign is Š (Hinke 133) kibū, to speak; škā, canal.

8) $\mathcal{E}$, Š (Rec. 109), kibū, to speak; škū, canal.

Cases 9, 10. The case sign is Š (Hinke 252), bitū, house.

2 Langdon, op. cit. p. 263.
9) 

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \]

\( \approx \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \), \( \tilde{E} \) (Rec. 428) bitu, house.

10) 

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \] (\( \approx \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \)), E. LIL, Cf. 

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \], E. LIL.

LAL = bit imšiti; bit šerti (Br. 6249, M. 3799).

Case 11. The case sign is KU, DUB (Hinke 258).

11) 

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \]

\( \approx \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \), UDU (Rec. 456, Clay, Murashu, 219) = immuru, lamb.

Col. III, Cases 3–5. The case sign is ID, I, A, (Hinke 146). The original pictograph represents a forearm and hand. The meanings overlap those of DA = idu, hand or side, and of ZAG = idu, side, and it is evident that the three signs were more or less exchanged.

3) 

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \] = \( \approx \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \), GIBIL (Rec. 82–5), burning torch. For a possible channel of connection compare \( \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \), GIBIL (Br. 9702) šepidū, torch (sign name KI-IZAKKU) and \( \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \), AZAG (Br. 6592) asakku, sickness? Demon? It is possible that this is an allusion to the torch burned at the exorcism of demons of sickness.

4) 

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \] = \( \approx \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \), ID (Rec. 115) idu, hand; ēmušu, power. It requires very little conventionalizing to reduce the pictograph of a hand and forearm to this character, which differs in outline from the Cassite sign to the right only by the grouping of the so-called gnu wedges.

5) 

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \] = \( \approx \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \), ZAG (Rec. 176) idu, pātu, hand, side; ēmušu, power. Also ašru, čērētu, shrine. The pictograph represents an hour-glass shaped altar such as appears on the seals. In support of this compare ZAG-AN (usuq) = čērētu (Br. 6499); (LU) U. SUG, GA, and (LU) U. SAG, GA = usukku, temple devotee.

\(^1\) Ward, op. cit. p. 361–7.

\(^2\) Gudea, B. 3, 15; A, 18, 14.
Three Babylonian Tablets, Prince Collection, Columbia University. — By Rev. Frederick A. Vanderburgh, Ph. D., Columbia University, New York City.

Three light dull-red baked clay-tablets, each five and a quarter centimeters long by three and a half in breadth and two in thickness; corners and edges rounded.

Nr. 1.

Memoranda for the month of Simânû of food consumed by messengers going to Anšân, Sabûm and Šimâš; also of those returning from Susa, Hubunuri and Adamdu. The temple in which the memoranda were made and the approximate date can only be conjectured. Perhaps the capital city at this time was Ur. The obverse contains eleven lines and the reverse nine. The signs are all legible.

Obverse

BAR zid ud-min-kam šá-uru
Ten (ḫa) of meal for two days in the city,
ia ḫa zid kaskal-ša
five ḫa of meal on the journey,
im-e-ša šukkal
for Imeta the messenger,
an-ša-an-ki-ša gin-ni
on going to Anšân,

5 BAR zid ud-min-kam šá-uru
Ten (ḫa) of meal for two days in the city,
ia ḫa zid kaskal-ša
five ḫa of meal on the journey,
iu-na-ba-a gin-ša
for Lunabā the weigh-master,
sa-bu-um-ki-šu  gin-ni
on going to Sabûm.

ia  ka  zid  lugal-ma-gur-ri  šukkal
Five  ka  of  meal  for  Lugalmagurri  the  messenger,

10  nanā-erín-ki-ta  gin-ni
coming from Susa.

BAR  zid  ud-min-kam  ša-uru
Ten  (ka)  of  meal  for  two  days  in  the  city,

Reverse

ia  ka  zid  kaskal-šu
five  ka  of  meal  on  the  journey,

i-ti-da  šukkal
for  Itida  the  messenger,

ši-ma-šši-šu  gin-ni
on  going  to  Šimāš.

15  ia  ka  zid  dingir-ra-ne  šukkal
Five  ka  of  meal  for  Dingirrane  the  messenger,

hu-hu-nu-ri-ša  gin-ni
coming  from  Huḫunuri.

ia  ka  zid  ā-ne-ni  šukkal
Five  ka  of  meal  for  Aneni  the  messenger,

a-dam-dun-ki-ta  gin-ni
coming  from  Adamduš.

itu  guš-du-ne-sar-sar
The  month  of  Simanu.

The  first  two  signs  are  BAR  and  KU.  BAR  with  ka
equals  'ten';  otherwise  BAR  equals  'one  half'.  Here  ka  must
be  understood  with  BAR,  whose  value  when  standing  for
'ten'  was  probably  1/2;  we  know  it  to  be  maš  when  standing
for  'half'.  KU  as  'meal'  or  'flour'  has  the  value  zid  =  As-
syrian  kēmu.  One  ka  is  approximately  equal  to  one  liter.
The  duties  of  a  šukkal  (LAH),  equal  to  sukallu,  also
called  luḫ,  were  more  than  those  of  merely  bearing  a  mes-
sage;  they  were  doubtless  administrative  and  representative.
This  is  confirmed  by  such  expressions  as  the  following  which
is taken from a brick of Temti-agun: “Temti-agun the šakkal of Susa for his life a zī-anum to Ismekarab has built”. te-temti-a-gu-an šakkal šu-si-im a-na ba-la-ti-su zī-i-a-nam a-na is-me-ka-ra-ab i-pu-ūš. In a brick by Temti-halki, Temti-halki is called the šakkal-mah of Elam (and) Šimū. arah simānī is the third month of the year — May-June; the ideogram itu gud-du-ne-sar-sar given in the tablet is old Babylonian; the Assyrian ideogram is itu šeg-ga.

Memoranda for the month of Airu of wine consumed by messengers returning from Susa and also Šabūm, as well as those journeying to Anšān. The nature of the mission of these messengers is not divulged. Their names are given and in some cases their occupation, or the fact that they are officials. The obverse contains thirteen lines and the reverse nine, including the date, which, however, forms a line separated from the rest of the composition by the space of a centimeter. One sign was almost wholly erased by the pressure of a finger before the tablet was baked. The characters are clear, although made with a fine stylus.

**Obverse**

_ia ha kaš_
Five _ka_ of wine,

šu-dingir-nin-šul šukkan
forŠu-ninšul the messenger,

_ia ha kaš ur-dingir-igi-ši gin-giš gal_
five _ka_ of wine for Ur-igiši the chief weigh-master,

nanū-erīn-ki-ta gin-ni
coming from Susa.

5 BAR kaš ša-uru
Ten (_ka_ of wine while in the city,

āš kaš u-sa kuskal-šu
one (_ka_) of wine of the sa-plant on the journey,

la-ni-a lā-giš-ku gu-la
for Lana the chief spearsman,

1 Scheil, Textes Élamites-sémitiques première et troisième Série, Pl. 7; 15; 20; 74.
ia ḫa ḫaš ʾsīš-ki-ni šukkal
five ḫa of wine for Iššī-ki-ni the messenger,
ia ḫa ḫaš zib-ūš-ni-šu dumu nu-bandā
five ḫa of wine for Zib-ūš-ni-šu the junior overseer,
10 sa-bi-um-ki-ta gin-ni
coming from Sābum.

BAB ḫaš ud-min-kam šā-uru
Ten (ḫa) of wine for two days in the city,
āš ḫaš ū-sa haskal-šu
one (ḫa) of wine of the sa-plant on the journey,
šu-dingir-en-līl šukkal
for Šu-enlīl the messenger.

Reverse

DIŠ ḫaš šā-uru
sixty (?) (ḫa) of wine while in the city,
15 DIŠ-ĀŠ ḫaš haskal-šu
ninety (?) (ḫa) of wine on the journey,
nim an-šā-an-kī-me
for the ruler of the Anšānites,
gir šu-dingir-en-līl šukkal
for the gir Šu-enlīl the messenger,
an-šā-an-kī-šu gin-ni
going to Anšān.
ia ḫa ḫaš i-sar-ba-kal šukkal
Five ḫa of wine for Isarbakaš the messenger,
20 ia ḫa ḫaš ba-ba-a dumu nu-bandā
five ḫa of wine for Babā the junior overseer,
nanā-erin-ki-ta gin-ni
coming from Susa.
itu gan-maṣ
The month of Airu.

1. ḫa is a measure for liquids as well as for dry material,
with the same capacity in either instance.

3. gin (TU)-giš (Uš) — 'weighing-man'; here we have gin-
giš gal; in Tablet Nr. 1 simply gin-giš.
6. There are two kinds of wine mentioned in this Tablet. One is plain kaš (BI); the other is kaš (BI) -u-sa. The ordinary Assyrian word for kaš is šikaru 'strong drink', also 'date-wine', the verb being takāru 'be drunk'. The sa-plant, from which the other wine is made, may be the same as the sa-tree which had a strong fibre with which ropes were made, the word being connected with sa used for 'net'.

7. li-geš (IZ) -lu = 'man of wooden weapon'; the value of KU in this connection, I must say, is not determined. In the expression 'chief helper', or 'chief spearman', 'chief' is expressed by gu-la 'great'; in line three, where we have the expression 'chief weighmaster', 'chief' is expressed by gal.

14. If the sign DIS stands for 'one', it should probably have the value āš; if it stands for 'sixty', giš should doubtless be the value.

16. nim an-sá-an-lu me = 'ruler of the Anshanites'. nim = šašu 'high', i.e., a ruler or minister like a secretary of state. me at the end of the line may be the sign of the plural, a shortened form of meš.

17. gir = šepu 'foot'; also amšu 'power'; then an official, for whom we have no Assyrian equivalent; this officer seems to have charge over other officials, particularly with reference to food supply.

20. mu (= li) -bandá (TUR) = labuttu 'official', perhaps 'overseer', and dino (TUR) = a 'youth of (attending upon) a mu-banda'.

22. The month of Airu, second month, April-May, written in the Tablet itu gaud-maš 'fields in blossom'. This is old Babylonian. The Assyrian ideogram is itu gud-ši-dā 'directing bull'.

Nr. 3.

Memoranda for the month of Kasilimu of wine, food, meat oil and also of women laborers for the officials of Adamdu and Susa. The obverse contains nine lines and the reverse twelve. The colophon, giving the date, is inscribed along the left side.

Obverse

Dīš kaš du bugal
Sixty (?) (ka) of best common wine,
DIŠ gur igal DIŠ udu
sixty (?) (ka) of best food, sixty (?) sheep,
ū-ba-apā-te-si a-dam-dun-ki
for Ubā patesi of Adamdun,
a-dam-dun-ki-ta gin-ni
coming from Adamdun.

5 PA kaš BAR-min ̆ka ̄zd:
Twenty (ka) of wine, twelve ̆ka of flour,
limu (ZA) ̄a-gam ni ud-limu-kam
four vessels of oil for four days,
šu-kar-ti ̄a-gis-hu gu-la
for Šušarti the chief helper,
mā-id-ta i-še-ne zid-a
who goes out on the river-boat for meal.
īa ̆ka kaš es ̆ka-gar
Five ̆ka of wine, three ̆ka of food.

Reverse

10 DIŠ ̄a-gam ni ša-uru
sixty (?) vessels of oil in the city,
as-kaš ū-sa ia ̆ka gur
one (ka) of wine of the sa-plant, five ̆ka of food,
kaškal-šu
on the journey,
dingir-ma-mi šukkal
for Dingirmasu the messenger,
nanā-šrin-ki-śu gin-ni
going to Susa.

15 es ̆ka kāš min ̆ka gur
Three ̆ka of wine, two ̆ka of food,
DIŠ a-gam ni-гиš
sixty (?) vessels of oil,
īš-me-a ši-kašar
for Išme an official;
ešu gene eš ka sid-be ia gin ni-giš-ta
thirty women (each one) three ka of wheat-flour
(and) five measures of oil (per diem),

ne-ra aš aq hu-hu-nu-ri-la ne
for which they make an agreement,
viz., they of Ḫuḫunuri.

20 lu iš-me-a lu-kabar
for Išme an official,

hu-hu-nu-ri-ki-ta- gin-ni
coming from Ḫuḫunuri.

itu ezin dinigir-ba-ū
Month of Kisīlimu.

5. The decimal system seems to be represented in two ways
in these Tablets. 'Ten', 'twenty' and 'thirty' are represented
by the use of the upright and one, two or three horizontals
respectively; thus, BAR = 'ten', = val. u; PA = 'twenty',
= val. nu; and AŠ = 'thirty' = val. ešu. Down below,
line 18, the corner wedge system is used; ES = 'thirty' =
val. ešu.

6. a (ID) -gam = 'vessel' of some sort, gam itself being
equal to kipattu.

8. ma-id (A. TŪ) -ta 'boat-river-from', ę (UD. DU) -ne =
'this going out', sid (KU)-a: whether KU-a stands for asūtu
or kēmu is not quite clear; possibly the sign may not be KU.

16. ni-giš = 'oil of wood'. In lines six and ten giš is
omitted.

19. In ne-ra, na must be a pronoun and ra a postposition,
aš a noun = ēdu 'one', bārumu 'scall', magāru 'favor', miharu
'agree' and other words of similar meaning, and aq a verb
equal to ēpišu 'make' and banu 'build', me at the end of
the line is the sign of the plural.

21. hu-hu-nu-ri-la-ša 'from the place Ḫuḫunuri'; ki, however,
might be omitted; see Tablet 1, line 16.

22. Month of Kisīlimu, ninth month, November-December,
written in the Tablet itu ezin (SAR) dinigir-ba-ū, month of
the festival of Bau who was the goddess of agriculture. The
Assyrian ideogram is itu gan-gan-ū.
Cities mentioned in the Tablets

Anšān, mentioned by Nabonidus in the Abu-Habba Cylinder as a province of which Cyrus was king, must have been a very ancient center. In a list of dates given by Dungi one date reads thus: \textit{mu dumu-sal lugal pa-tesi an-ša-an-ki-ge ba-tug}, rather doubtfully translated by Scheil as 'the year when the daughter of the king became patesi of Anšān'. Gudea in Statue B also gives an interesting fact about Anšān. He says that he thrust down the weapons of the city of Anšān in Elam: \textit{giš-ku uru-an-ša-an nim-ki mu-sig}.

Sabūm. On a door-socket, in which Adad-nannar memorializes the dedication of a temple built in Gis-su by Gimi-Sin, king of Ur, Sabūm is placed in the same list of cities as Lagāš. Adad-nannar, the chief minister calls himself patesi of Lagāš, Gudeum, Hamasi, Ganbar and Sabūm.\(^4\)

Susa, mentioned in the book of Esther: 'Given in Shushan the palace'; 'the city of Shushan was perplexed'. In our Tablet we have the Sumerian name for Susa: \textit{nanna-erīn-ki} 'place of the goddess among cedars, plainly indicating the existence of a sacred grove'. In Dungi's Brick C, we are told that he built a temple to the god of Susa; from other sources we learn that this divinity was Šušinak.\(^5\)

Šimāš. This was an old Babylonian city existing at a time when its ruler was a šukkal or a šukkal-mah.\(^6\)

Huhunuri was a city flourishing in the dynasti of Ur, destroyed by Bur-sin.

Adamun. From certain tablets we learn that Adamun was a city governed by patesi and flourishing in the same period as the city of Huhunuri.

Date of the Tablets

The nomenclature for the months would place the Tablets not later than the third or fourth Dynasty of Ur. The second month was written in the time of Sargon I: \textit{esīn gan-maš},

\(^1\) Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, Vol. V, Plate 64.
\(^2\) Old Babylonian Inscriptions, Plate 125.
\(^3\) Price's Great Cylinder Inscriptions A and B of Gudea.
\(^4\) Revue d'assyriologie VI, S. 99.
\(^5\) Scheil, Textes Élamites-sémitiques première et troisième Série, Pl. 7; 15; 20; 74.
instead of simply *gan-maš*, and the third month: *exin gud-du-ne-sar-sar*, and not simply *gud-du-ne-sar-sar*, as in the Dynasties of *Ur*. The name of the ninth month was written *exin dingir ha-šu* both in the time of Sargon I and of Dungi I, II and III. The six cities named in the Tablets, some of them Elamitic cities, are all mentioned in texts written concerning rulers of cities when *Dungi*, or *Bur-sin*, or *Gumil-sin* were supreme at *Ur*. 
The Oath in Cuneiform Inscriptions. — By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Professor in Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

1. The Oath in Sumerian Inscriptions.

Sumerian literature in its original form is well represented by commercial and historical documents. We have, however, no original Sumerian religious composition, but of late copies of such literature we possess an abundance, as Langdon's *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms* well demonstrate. In this later class of Sumerian literature no indication of the taking of an oath has thus far been found, and even if there should be found such an indication it would not help us in the study of the growth of oath-taking, since obviously the same reference may have in mind different incidents. We shall, therefore, confine our study to oaths found in commercial and historical inscriptions.

While our contract tablets are primarily commercial documents, yet they are often found very useful for historical research, since most of them mention contemporary rulers either in their date formula, or as parties interested in the transaction. Those documents which are primarily historical we shall study later, but shall now confine our attention to contract or commercial literature.

---

The very earliest known Sumerian contract tablets (c. 4000 B.C.) such, for example, as AO 2753 which was published, transliterated and translated by F. Thureau-Dangin, RA VI, Nr. 4, p. 143, "Contrats archaïques", Nr. I, contain no oath nor any indication that would lead us to think that an oath was taken. Yet the argument *e silentio* may not have much real force here in considering the custom of oath-taking of this early period, since our records are so scanty.¹

After about five or six hundred years, when we approach the period immediately preceding the time of the Ur-Ninurta dynasty, i.e., c. 3500—3400 B.C., we meet with what seems to be a real development in the direction of that oath-taking custom which became so common in later times, especially during the great legal period of the Hammurabi dynasty. Thureau-Dangin has published, in his RTC, and transliterated and translated in RA VI, 4, p. 146 ff., "Contrats archaïques", four business contracts, RTC 12—15,² from Tello, belonging to this Pre-Ur-Ninurta period which contain no mention of an oath, but which contain the names of witnesses (*galu-ki-enim*) to the contract. In the case of Nr. 12, which is a document about a donation, the transaction seems to have taken place in the temple (*ki-nad Di-abzu-a*, "in the resting-room — lit., "place of rest" — of *Di-abzu-a*", i.e. a definite room, as it seems, in the temple where the transaction took place). Nos. 13 and 14 which are contracts of sale have, besides the witnesses, the name of the official scribe (*dub-sar, "writer of tablets"*), while Nos. 14 and 15 have the *dub-sar-gan*, "the scribe of the field" (the land-surveyor) which is sold.

From the dynasty of Ur-Ninurta and the reign of Entemena of Lagash (Tello) we have one business document, RTC 16,³

¹ See S. Langdon, *Sumerian Grammar*, p. 6 ff. for a full list of Sumerian literature.

² The others belonging to this period, namely RTC 1—11, contain no mention of witnesses.

³ It is interesting to notice that the chief part of this compound *galu* contains within itself a religious idea, since it denotes a prostrate man in the act of adoration. This would teach us that the early idea underlying the action of a witness was a religious one. The witnesses at this early stage might well have been considered a sufficient guarantee of truthfulness without the taking of an oath.

which also contains evidence of the presence of witnesses (galū-ki-enim-mu-bi-me) and a scribe (dub-šar) but has no formal oath; and a similar one, RTC 17, from the reign of Enlitarzi of Lagash in which the wife of Enlitarzi himself appears in the contract which is signed before witnesses among whom are scribes. There is an interesting statement at the end of this contract; it reads dū-bā zag-gi bi-ag “each of them thereunto put his right hand”. As we know from Babylonian and Assyrian Literature the hand played an important part in the ritual of an oath, and since the Arabic ايم means oath as well as right-hand we are perhaps right in seeing in this expression an indication that an oath was actually taken. In this same dynasty the reign of Lugalanda is represented by one contract, Nik. 17, where witnesses (galū ki-enim-mu-bi-me) occur. These three tablets also come from Tello.

On the famous Obelisk of Maništusu, King of Kiš, contemporaneous with Lugalanda of Lagash, we have commercial transactions which were ratified in the temple before certain specified persons, although there is no mention of an oath. Face A Col. 8 l. 19, for example, shows us that the transaction took place before (pān) La-mu-um priest of Zu-Mal-Mal who was god of Kiš, which would be in the temple of that god; a scribe (dub-šar) was always present, cf. Col. 16 l. 7 of Face A, and Face D Col. 12 l. 13 pān ilu Nin-šar, “before the god Nin-šar”. Here the scribe is mentioned in Col. 14 l. 16 of Face D.

The legal form used in these tablets which was the form used up to and including the period of the dynasties of Ur-Nina and Kiš is not very different from that employed during later periods. As a rule, the names of the interested persons are first given, then follow the object and nature of the transaction, then the mention of any extra incidents connected with it, then the witnesses and other officials, then sometimes the place where the transaction took place is mentioned, and, finally, the date. There is, however, no oath. Our conclusions are

1 See p. 34, n. 4.
2 Compare for an interesting parallel Ezra 10, 19, and many other such examples in the Old Testament.
3 Published, transliterated, and translated by V. Schell in Délégation en Perse, Mémoires, Tome II, Textes Élamites-Sémithiques, Première Série p. 6 ff. Of early Semitic record this is perhaps the most important.
naturally limited as our records are few and all come from Lagash with the exception of the Obelisk of Maništusu which was found at Susa.

It is not till we reach the dynasty of Ur (c. 2295 BC) that we meet with contracts which contain a direct oath. Here again many documents are found which contain no such oath but which were witnessed before certain persons whose names are often given. Further, there are other contracts that are merely sealed, while still others are drawn up in the temple of a deity (e.g. RA VIII, Nr. 1, in the temple of Nin-mar-ki, E. d.-Nin-mar-ki-ka). As such contracts are many I shall not deem it necessary to name them, but shall confine my study to those which contain a direct expression of an oath.

Up to the dynasty of Ur, as we have seen, no contract has been found which contains any such expression of an oath. This does not mean that the custom of oath-taking may not have existed during that period, since an oath may actually have been taken before the custom of recording it in set terms arose; but so far as our inscriptions go we have no evidence that such an oath was recorded till the time of this dynasty.

Following are all the Sumerian contract documents which contain an oath. All of them with a few exceptions, which will be noted as we meet them, come from Tello. It is also to be noted that they all belong to the dynasty of Ur. This is perhaps due to the fact that most all of our tablets come from the same place. There are a few whose dates either are not given or are defaced, but we are pretty certain that they belong to the same dynasty since they were found in the same place and bear the same marks of composition and arrangement as those that are dated. The dynasty of Ur, according to Hilprecht’s Chronological list of the Kings of Ur and Nisim, began in 2295 and lasted till 2178 B.C. The rulers were Ur-Gur 2295—2278, Dungi 2277—2219, Bur-Sin 2218—2210, Gimmil-Sin 2209—2203, and Ibi-Sin 2202—2178. Many of the contracts belonging to this dynasty mention the fact that an oath was taken without stating whether any person or thing was invoked, others state that the oath was taken by invoking the name of the king. This is interesting for later, e.g. during the Hammurabi dynasty, the king is specifically named and as a rule one or more deities are invoked at the same time. During this early period such a form never occurs—either
there is no invocation at all, or merely the name of the king is invoked.

I. Those contracts which contain an oath but no invocation.

Reign of Dungi 2277—2219 B. C.

1. ITT 923.1. This is a tablet containing an account of five different transactions: 1. A confirmation of the sale of a slave, which is sworn to (nam-erim-am2, "an oath there is") in the presence of the assessor (maskim3). The name of the swearer, as a rule, as here, comes before the oath. 2. Ninni-ka is accused of stealing a cow, but swears (nam-erim-am) not guilty in the presence of the assessor. 3. An act of repudiation on the taking of an oath (nam-erim-am), before the assessor. 4. Lugal-gi-na is accused of theft, but swears (nam-erim-nam) not guilty before an assessor. 5. A suit about a garment. The case is not very clear as the tablet is much broken. The oath (nam-erim-am) is sworn in the presence of the assessor. Then follows the name of the patesi (Ur-4 Lama pa-te-si) who seems to have acted as judge for the above five suits. Then comes, as is usual, the date.

In addition to what has been said about the word nam-erim in my Inaugural Dissertation already referred to in the footnote it may be well to note here the depth of meaning underlying it. As nam = simtu = destiny, and erim = hostile it is evident that this word was originally connected with the idea of malediction or curse and, when used in the oath formula, indicated that curse which would fall upon the per-

1 Those thus marked have been transliterated and translated by H. de Genouillac in RA VIII, 1-2 p. 1 ff., "Textes juridiques de l'époque d'Ur".

2 For a technical discussion of this word see my Inaugural Dissertation, The Oath in Babylonian and Assyrian Literature, Munich 1911, p. 26 f., which will soon be published by P. Geuthner, Paris, with an Appendix by P. Humbel.

3 See, for a full discussion of this term, Babylonian III, 2 p. 88, "Sa-tilla. textes juridiques de la seconde dynastie d'Our", by P. Pelagaud. For the rendering "Assessor", see de Genouillac, op. cit.

4 Although the word for judge does not occur here, as it does in many cases, yet the patesi's name occupies the same place in this tablet as the judge does in many others.

5 In its Assyrian form it appears as mamitu, bam, curse, oath. In later Babylonian and Assyrian literature the curse almost completely replaced the oath in legal proceedings.
juror. Therefore, in essence the oath was a conditional curse, and was expected to have the power of drawing forth from the contestants in a dispute the truth under penalty of malediction, and when the name of the king was invoked it was done with the purpose of making the oath more solemn and binding; and, learning from experience that oaths were sometimes broken, to guarantee its preservation.

The legal literary form used in these tablets is so similar in every case that it may be well to give an analysis of the form which it takes in order to avoid unnecessary detail and repetition in our discussion of the other documents of this period. It will be seen that this form differs only in the oath formula from that of the earlier tablets. First, the names of the parties to the contract are given; secondly, the object and nature of the transaction are noted; thirdly, the mention of any extra incidents connected with the transactions; fourthly, the oath; fifthly, the name of the witness or witnesses, though not always given, and that of the assessor and judge or judges; and lastly, the date, often giving the day or year when some important event happened.

2. ITT 936*. Here are two transactions; the first dealing with a robbery the details of which are not given, but an oath (nam-erim-am) is taken before the assessor; the second is a note of adoption of a female slave probably by her father. In this last case no oath is taken. The matter is confirmed (ba-nu[gi-in]) before an assessor. The word ba-na-zi-in is interesting because its chief element gin — to establish. It cannot, however, be said to be a substitute for an oath because in RTC 291 we have the same word in a contract where a formal oath occurs. The judge in both cases seems to be Ur.4 Lama the patesi. Then follows the date as usual.

3. ITT 948*. This is a case of repudiation. The husband seemingly without definite cause repudiates his wife before consummation of marriage. The oath (nam-erim-am) is taken before the assessors, Ur 4 Lama the patesi being judge.

Reign of Bur-Sin.

1. RTC 291+2. Galu-duga fails to pay Atud for a slave

---

1 Compare the interesting place in Noh. 10, 29.
2 These marked thus † have been transliterated and translated by F. Pédaud. "St. tilla, textes juridiques de la seconde dynastie d'Omar", Babyloniaca III, 2, p. 81 ff.
which he has received from him, but Atud receives in compensation one of Galu-duga's own slaves. Alla son of Galu-
duga and another person take an oath (nam-erim-am) evidently
that the slave for compensation would be given to Atud. The
oath is taken before the assessor and the judge is Ur ḡ-Lama
the patesi. The date is that of the year when Bur-Sin
became king, hence the same patesi as in the preceding reign.

2. Pcl. XVIII (Pl. III)§. In the exchange of a house it
is complained that the manager Nagu did not confirm the
transaction. An oath is taken (nam-erim) to that effect. A
second oath (nam-erim) is recorded, but it is not certain that
it has anything to do with the same exchange. The assessor
is present, and there are two names Ur-ka-silim and Gudea
which are probably those of the judges.

3. I TT 752*. This tablet contains a collection of different
transactions. The first has to do with inheritance. The next
two seem to be related, the one dealing with the incapacity
of an architect, and the other with a man who has also lost
the confidence of his master. In the first transaction an oath
(nam-erim-am) is taken, and also in the first of the last two
(nam-erim-am), which on account of their seeming inter-relation
may be considered as having applied to both cases. In any
case we learn that the three proceedings took place before an
assessor, Ur ḡ-Lama the patesi being judge.

4. I TT 830*. Here we have the confirmation of the sale
of a girl by her father where, as in a regular law-suit, an oath
is taken (nam-erim-bi ba-tar) by interested parties, before an
assessor. No judge is present.

5. I TT 963*. Here are three law-suits about contested
property. The tablet has been broken at the end of the first
transaction but we can be tolerably sure that an oath was
taken as in the other two, each of which has nam-erim-am
before the assessor. It is interesting to note that the judge
(di-kud) in this last case who seems to be the same man as

---

§ These marked thus § have been published, transliterated and trans-
listed by Pešgad in Babylonica III, 2, p. 81 ff.

* Or nam-erim-bi in-tar or nam-erim-bi in-kud. Tar is a better
rendering than kud, compare tar-ru-da, shortened to tar-da. In any case
the rendering would be "his oath he has taken".
the assessor in the other transaction, namely Ur.-Ka-di, is associated in his capacity as judge with another man, namely Gudea, who is called the elder of the city (ab-ba-uru).¹

6. ITT 3516. This is a case of seizure. The matter is taken to court and an oath is taken (nam-erim-am) before an assessor and the sentence is confirmed.

Reign of Gimmil-Sin.

1. Pêl. VIII (Pl. III)§. A certain man gave his son a house and a slave. The gift is ratified by oath (nam-erim-am) which is taken by three free-men and a slave to insure the constancy of the gift. No assessor, no witnesses, and no judge is present.

2. Pêl. XI (Pl. V)§. Sale of a female slave. The witnesses whose names are recorded take an oath (nam-erim-bi i in-tar) before the assessor. Two judges are present.

3. RTC 295+. An oath taken (nam-erim tar-a-bar) in a previous transaction is protested and claimed irregular by a certain woman Sig-tur-tur and her son Gud-a-gir. The case is brought before judges and an assessor and an oath is taken (nam-erim-bi in-tar).

4. ITT 744+. A document concerning a dispute between a master and his slave, the details of which are very uncertain. An oath (nam-erim-am) is taken before an assessor and a judge.

5. ITT 746+. A contested slave-sale in which the witnesses are relatives of the contending parties. The testimony, as it seems, is contested, but the purchaser on presenting a superior testimony takes an oath (nam-erim-am) before an assessor and two judges and the case is ended.

6. ITT 733+. A dispute about a cloak in which an oath is taken (nam-erim-bi in-tar) by the slave that he did not give the cloak to the man who stole it. It is interesting to note that the oath was taken in the temple of Ninmarki (E-d. Nin-mar-ki-ka) before an assessor. Relatives of the interested parties are mentioned as being present, perhaps as wit-

¹ Compare the same office in the Hammurabi dynasty; also Ruth 4, 2. Compare E. Cuq. "L'organisation judiciaire de la Chaldée à l'époque de la prem. dynastie", RA VII, 2, p. 65 ff.
necesses. A certain Gudea an elder of the city acts as assessor, and there are three judges. Notice the interesting phrase ki-di-dur-ba u nam-erim-tar-a-ba, "at the place where the seat of justice is and where the oath is pronounced".

7. ITT 939*. A dispute between a buyer and seller of plants in which the oath (nam-erim-am) settles the matter. Witnesses, an assessor, and two judges are present.

8. ITT 2802. Here we have a purchase contract which is badly broken. An oath is taken (nam-erim-am) in the presence of witnesses.


Reign of Ibi-Sin.

1. ITT 920*. A house was given to Ud-id-da by the patesi which he gives away by contract. Ud-id-da desires it back, arguing that he had no right to give away such a gift. A magistrate takes an oath (nam-erim-bi in-tar) that Ud-id-da had given away the house. The man who received the house together with a witness also takes an oath (nam-erim-bi ib-tar). Ud-id-da loses the case. There were two assessors, three judges, and three personally named witnesses.

Undated.

1. ITT 924*. The text of the tablet is in a poor condition. It seems that there are disputes about four accounts which are regulated by judicial authority and an oath (nam-erim-am) was taken in each case. No officials are mentioned but we find the interesting expression ne Ur-ama-mu-dib u Ur-št. Al-la dub-tar ud-na in-gi-ni-šš "by authority of Ur-ama-mu-dib and of Uršt. Al-la the scribe they will now keep their engagements", which shows that the transactions were carried on in an official way and perhaps a direct oath was taken. It is further interesting to note that one of the debtors was a priest (sangu).

2. RTC 294+. This tablet contains a sworn receipt for the payment of a slave. An oath was taken (nam-erim-bi tar-dan) that the slave was received. Witnesses are mentioned by name,

* Cf. above p. 49 note 1.
† Cf. ITT 990* p. 47.
and an assessor. There is an additional affair on the same tablet but no oath is taken.

3. Pl. XV (Pl. VI)§: A mutilated document concerning a slave sale in which an oath is taken (nam-erim-am). There are present witnesses, an assessor, and two judges.

4. Viroll: Compt. XVI.4 A mutilated business document in which nine different persons take an oath. The varying forms of the expression of swearing are: nam-ne-ru-am (twice), and nam-ne-ru (seven times).

5. ITT 1010*. A very imperfectly preserved text. It seems that a previous judicial decision is changed by the authority of a patesi, Ur-4-Lama. An oath is taken (nam-erim-bi in-[tar]), and witnesses are present. Although there is no evidence of a definite date, the fact that the patesi is Ur-4-Lama would lead one, unless there was more than one patesi by that name, to conclude that it was in the reign of Dungi or his successor Bur-Sin.2

II. Those contracts in which the name of the king is invoked.

Reign of Dungi.

1. RTC 2894. A case of repudiation of a female slave who presents her case in the name of the king (mu-lugal). Two interested persons, perhaps the witnesses, take an oath (nam-erim-am), but it is not at all sure that the swearer invoked the name of the king at the taking of the oath,3 and it is also questionable whether the slave took an oath. The transaction took place before an assessor and Ur-4-Lama the patesi.

2. Mylr. IV (Pl. 4, No. 7). An assurance that payment will be made in case Ur-Enlil fails to do so. There is here

---

1 Comptabilité Chaldéenne, par Ch. Viroleaud, Poitiers, 1903. The author has not published the text of this tablet. He gives a transliteration and translation. It comes from Tello and is preserved in the Imperial Ottoman Museum.
2 See above p. 38f.
3 A direct statement comes between mu-lugal and in-na-an-dug (so and so, she said) which may be looked upon as an indication that an oath was sworn though not expressed. See below p. 45, section 2, and note 2. See also RTC 293 below p. 44, and ITT 980 below p. 47.
no doubt about the fact that the oath is sworn by invoking the name of the king. The text reads *mu lugal-bi ni-pad*, "by the name of the king he has sworn". There are present four witnesses but no assessor.¹

Gen. Dräh. 5542.² A transaction concerning a barley loan in which an oath is taken (*mu lugal-bi in-pad*) before witnesses.

Reign of Bur-Sin.

1. Myhr. III (Pl. 3, No. 4). A slave swears that he will not run away from the house of his master. The name of the king is invoked (*mu-lugal ni-na-pad*, "by the name of the king he swore"). There are present three witnesses.

2. Myhr. V (Pl. 5, No. 11). A promise to pay on a specific day a loan. The name of the king is invoked (*mu lugal-bi ni-pad-da*, "by the name king he has sworn"). Witnesses are present.

3. Myhr. VII (Pl. 8, No. 14). An agent buys a palm grove for his patron. The agent and the seller, so it seems, ratify the transaction by taking an oath ([?][n? — [pad?]]) before the royal judge. Then another oath is taken by the name of the king (*mu lugal-bi [in-pad]*) before witnesses.

4. Myhr. Pl. 10, No. 18. A transaction about the loan of silver in which a receipt is sworn to in the name of the king (*mu-lugal ni-pad*), before witnesses.

5. Gen. Dräh. CB, Pl. V, No. 22. A commercial transaction giving an account of cattle which were perhaps collected for sacrifice. The oath is taken by invoking the name of the king (*mu lugal-bi in-pad-da*). This is an important document for two chief reasons: first, it shows that the legal literary form known in Nippur and its suburbs (for Drähem, where it was found, the Sumerian name of which has not yet been identified, is such a suburb) was the same as that used in Lagash and Ur. Secondly, its interesting date formula and the mention of the city of Ur show us that while the account was

¹ It seems that whenever an oath is taken by invoking the name of the king no assessor is present. See the doubtful cases RTC 269, above p. 42; RTC 293, below p. 44; ITT 932, below p. 45; and ITT 969, below p. 47.

² All marked Drähem were found at a place called in Modern Arabic Drähem, three miles south of Nippur.
drawn up and legalized by oath in Ur, yet it was dated in “the year of the construction of the throne of Enlil” who was the great Nippurian deity. It seems probable that the cattle, collected perhaps in Drehem, the account of which was made and legalized in Ur in the third year of the reign of Burns of that city, were meant for use in sacrificial services to Enlil of Nippur whose calendar system is used in the dating and who, though god of the tributary city of Nippur, was recognized in Ur. On account of the importance of the document and because it has never been transliterated or translated, I here append a transliteration and translation:

**Obv.**

1. **XX šil-qa**
2. **XXI sat-šil-qa**
3. **U-tud-da**
4. **Ur*-Dum-zi-da**
5. **u Nu-ur-1-li**

**Rev.**

1. **mu lugal-bi in-pad-da**
2. **qag Uru-ab-ki-ma**
3. **itu Šu-esša**
4. **mu d. gu-za d. En-lil ba- dim**

**Reign of Gimil Sin.**

1. RTC 2994. This tablet contains three property transactions. In the first Ur-agir swears (nam-erim-am) in the presence of witnesses; in the second no oath is taken; in the third there is an oath taken (nam-erim-am) and a reference to another oath, but here the text is incomplete. In the third it seems that the promise to pay is made by invoking the king (mu lugal), but again as in RTC 289 it is not at all certain that a direct oath was taken. The assessor is present at the first transaction, and likewise at the third, a circumstance which would lead one to conclude that the oath (in the third transaction) was not sworn in the name of the king (see p. 43, note 1).

---

1 See above p. 42 note 3.
2. Pél. XXI. This is a marriage contract and seems to contain either two separate oaths or one which is the development of the other. The first oath was taken in the name of the king (mu lugal). The substance of the oath being placed between mu lugal and nam-crim-an, and forming a direct assertion ending with ni-in-dug (so and so, he has said). There are no witnesses. The second is sworn in the name of the king (mu-lugal pad-da), but not, as Pélagaud thinks, in the name of the goddess Nimarki, also because here Nimarki-ka is a personal name. The sentence runs: Mu\textsuperscript{a}-Nimmar\textsuperscript{b}-ka-ge mu-lugal pad-da dug-ga-na ba-ni-gin-na-su, the mu here stands before a personal name, not the name of a goddess. Notice su at the end of the sentence which confirms that.

3. Myhr. I (Pl. 1, No. 1). A slave is brought into court to be reminded of the punishment due to a runaway. The fact is made impressive by the use of the phrase mu-lugal, which, with the direct statement constituting the substance of the threat and the phrase ni-in-dug (see p. 44) may indicate that an oath was taken. The presence of witnesses and dating of the document would seem to confirm this.

4. Myhr. II (Pl. 2, No. 2). A law-suit about a disputed office. An oath is taken by the name of the king (mu lugal bi in-na-pad), before witnesses.

5. Myhr. VI (Pl. 6, No. 13). A promise to pay at a stated time a loan or investment. Oath by the name of the king (mu-lugal in-pad). Witnesses are present, but are not named as such. They have the word igi, "before" immediately before them.

6. ITT 932°. A law-suit in which a complaint is addressed to the grand-vizir in the name of the king and is examined by the assessor and is repeated before judges. There is no mention of an oath nor does the phrase ni-in-dug with a direct statement occur, but one of the interested persons is presented in the name of the king (mu-lugal). It is very doubtful whether an oath was here taken.

\textsuperscript{1} See Babylonica III 2, p. 114, note 1 for place of publication.

\textsuperscript{2} See also Myhr. I (Pl. 1, No. 1), &c. But here no oath is expressed. The form mu lugal with a direct assertion may be considered a substitute for the regular oath formula.
7. ITT 1008*. A document of purchase in which an oath is taken by the king (\textit{mu lugal in-na-pad-da}) in the presence of witnesses. A second oath is referred to but the text is badly preserved.

8. ITT 3470. This is a commercial transaction in which an oath is sworn by the name of the king (\textit{mu lugal-bi in-pad}) before witnesses.

9. ITT 3523. Another case of seizure, as ITT 3516, but here the oath is taken by calling upon the name of the king (\textit{in-na-lugal in-na-pad-da}). The tablet is badly broken.

10. ITT 3599. This is a gift document, the oath in which is sworn by the name of the king (\textit{mu lugal-bi in-pad}). The complaint is made in court but no witnesses appear as far as we can make out from the broken tablet.

11. ITT 3592. A document dealing with a disputed purchase. The oath is taken by invoking the name of the king (\textit{mu lugal-bi in-pad}) before witnesses.

12. ITT 3598. A business transaction concerning real estate. There is a reference to an oath which, as it seems, was formerly taken (\textit{na-nu-erim-am}), and then the transaction is sworn to by the name of the king (\textit{mu lugal in-pad-da}).

13. ZA XXV, 1-2, Sprechsaal, "Some Sumerian Contracts" by S. Langdon, p. 205 ff., No. 1 B. 6. The purchase of a female slave. The transaction is ratified by an oath taken by the name of the king (\textit{mu lugal-bi in-pad}) in the presence of certain named persons who are undoubtedly the witnesses. There is a promise directly connected with the oath, namely, \textit{gala gala mu gi-gi-da}, "man shall not bring suit against man" a formula found here for the first time on tablets belonging to this early period, but very common during the Hammurabi dynasty. The interesting Semitic word \textit{bulašu}, under its Sumerian form \textit{giš-taš}, occurs in Obv. 1. 6 which is used so often in contracts of the Hammurabi dynasty, and may very well mean, as Langdon suggests, "dry" or "stamped", although it was not confined to slave-sales especially during the Hammurabi dynasty, as it is oftenest used in transactions pertaining to the produce of the field.

15. Gen. Drēh. 5541. A transaction concerning a barley loan in which an oath is taken before witnesses in which the name of the king is invoked (mu lugal-bi in-pad).

Reign of Ibi-Sin.

1. Gen. Drēh. 5539. A dispute about cows which is settled, and an oath by the name of the king is taken (mu lugal-bi in-pad) before witnesses.


Tablets undated or whose dates are uncertain or broken off.

1. Pēl. XIX (Pl. VII)§. A law-suit concerning the planting of a park. The condition of transaction is introduced by the phrase mu lugal, but no more direct evidence of an oath appears. The end of the tablet is broken. It is doubtful whether an oath was taken.


3. ITT 931*. A law-suit concerning a man's right to take a concubine in case of the barrenness of his wife. The text is very poorly preserved but it seems that the wife claims that an oath in the name of the king should not be taken (mu lugal ba-ra-mu-enim-enim) that her place be taken by a concubine. Witnesses are present among whom is a woman. The husband's name is Ur-Lama, perhaps the patesi whom we have already met.

4. ITT 960*. This is a very interesting document. It deals with arrangements for a marriage. It seems that the consent of the parents must be procured in case of this marriage, and even the opposition of the mother would be sufficient to defeat the case. Face 1, 12 has ki-mu-lugal-pad-da-ka ni-dur-ša "the place where an oath is taken by the name of the king"; shows us that there must have been at this time such a place legally designated, although I have not been able to find anything more definite till we come to the Hammurabi dynasty.

where we find such place commonly designated, e. g. at the šarrinu, etc. A direct statement comes between mu-lugal and in-na-ni-duq-ga (so and so, she said)\(^1\) and an oath is taken (nam-erim-am) by the father of the bride and the young people are given the right of marriage. Witnesses, an assessor, and three judges are present.

Among the many historical inscriptions belonging to the period previous to the Hammurabi dynasty and which is classed as Sumerian, I have found only one which contains an oath. It is a treaty which was transliterated and translated some years ago by Thureau-Dangin in *Les Inscriptions de Sumer et d’Accad*, and in 1909 was published, transliterated and translated by the same author in conjunction with L. Heuzey in *Restitution Matériel de la Stèle des Vautours*. E-an-na-tum king of Lagash (c. 2900 B. C.) made a treaty with the people of Gishu; E-an-na-tum swore to the people (nam-e-na-ta-tar, “by that which [šus-gal] I swore to them”), and they swore to him (nam-mu-na-ta-tar-ra\(^2\), “they swore”). The oath is quite elaborate. The king invokes the šus-gal (“net”)\(^3\) of Enlil (Bel), of the goddess Ninībarsag, of Enki ( Ea), of Enzu (Sin), of Babbar (Šamaš), and of Ninki; and the people call upon the name\(^4\) of the same deities. The oath was taken in the camp of the god Nin-gir-su (a-la-gi\(^5\) Nin-gir-su-ka) the son of Enlil.\(^5\) The same object by which the oath is sworn, namely the šus-gal, will slay the person who proves to be a perjurer.

In the foregoing study every instance of an oath in the literary remains of the Sumerians has been recorded and commented upon wherever necessary. The study, therefore,

---

\(^1\) See p. 42, n. 3.

\(^2\) The following are variations of the same formula which are found in this inscription: nam-e-ja-ta-tar-ra, “by which they swore”; nam-ni ma-ni-tar-ra, “by whom they swore”; also, the phrase occurs: mu-paž-da, “whose name was pronounced”.

\(^3\) Symbolically used. Cf. Hab. 1, 16: “Therefore he (the Chaldean) sacrificeth unto his θεός, and burneth incense unto his σέλαίνης”.

\(^4\) Here z̄ī

\(^5\) It is noteworthy that if we admit that in the oath by En-lil his son Ningir-su is included, then the number of those invoked would be seven, the holy number of swearing.
covers that period of history from the earliest times to the First Babylonian or the Hammurabi dynasty.

During this period commercial literature has shown a progressive development in the method of oath-taking. In transactions of the earliest periods no oath is recorded. This was due, it seems, more to the stage of legal development than to any lack of religious feeling connected with a legal promise. Legal precautions developed a legal form in which we see an external expression of the religious thought always underlying the idea of the oath. During the Pre-Ur-Ninan period (the tablets of which come from Tello) we meet with a fairly stereotyped legal form of transaction, as such contract as RTC 12—15 show. Yet no oath was taken. An advance in form at least is, however, evident. Witnesses are present, and the very word for witness, as we have seen above, shows the religious idea underlying this innovation in formula. In the Ur-Ninan period (the tablets of which come from Tello and Susa) there is still no expression of an oath, at least in contract literature, but the stereotyped legal form is still present, witnesses are recorded. There is an interesting reference in one document which indicates a tendency which later ripened, I mean the ritual act of giving the hand at the conclusion of a transaction (see page 35). The transaction is also referred to as having been ratified in a temple. When we reach the dynasty of Ur (the tablets of which come from Tello and Dréhem) we find not only the same stereotyped legal form but, in addition, the direct expression of an oath. This takes two forms; first, where a simple oath is sworn; and secondly, where an oath is taken by invoking the name of the king. Here also the oath was sometimes taken in a specific place.

The only historical inscription representing the whole Sumerian period which contains an oath belongs to the dynasty of Ur-Nina, and the reign of Eannatum king of Lagash c. 2900 B.C. Here we see the oath in a form which is not found in any commercial literature of the Sumerian period, but which is common in both historical and commercial inscriptions of later times. A treaty is made, the chief ritual of which is the taking of an oath by both interested parties. The oath is made by invoking the šuṣgal of deity named deities, and was taken in the camp or temple of Nin-gir-su. And what is still more interesting, a conditional malediction
was pronounced. Here we have the older form, the malediction, and its successor, the oath, side by side in an important transaction.

As this historical inscription shows, being the only evidence of an oath prior to the dynasty of Ur, we have in these inscriptions the evidence not of the growth of a religious idea, but that of a legal custom in commercial transactions. Long before the custom of recording an oath in a legal document arose, this historical inscription teaches us that the custom of oath-taking was known. The idea underlying an oath and perhaps also the custom of practically taking an oath is as old as religion itself. The foregoing study, however, demonstrates that the legal formula in contracts was the result of a long development.

1 Although, in very late literature, the malediction became again the more prevalent.
On Mayāvāda, by Hermann Jacobi, Professor in the University of Bonn, Germany.

In my last article¹ I have discussed the attitude taken up by the orthodox philosophers in India towards the epistemology of the Buddhists. In connection with this discussion I shall now treat the question about the nature of early Vedānta, and, as I hope, bring it nearer to a conclusion.

The arguments of the Buddhists of both the Nihilistic and Idealistic schools regarding the unreality of the objects of perception may thus be summarised. Our perceptions in dreams do not, in principle, differ from those in the waking state, and consequently the latter must be just as void and as independent of something existing beside them (their object) as the dream-impressions; further examples of impressions void of really existing objects are magic, fata morgana, and mirage. This view of the Illusionists is confuted much in the same way in the Nyāya and Brahma Sūtras; here we are concerned with the latter only. The discussion of Bādarāyana (B. S. II. 2, 28–32) as illustrated by the passage from the ancient Vṛttikāra, quoted by Saṅkaraśāmin in the Bhāṣya on M. S. 1. 1. 5 (see above, 31, 23), leaves no doubt on the point at issue, viz. that, according to these ancient Vedānta authors, there is a generic difference between dream-impressions and waking impressions, and that therefore the latter are not independent of really existing objects.

The oldest work on Vedānta Philosophy besides Bādarāyana's Brahma Sūtras, are the Karikās² on the Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad

---

¹ The Dates of the Philosophical Sūtras of the Brahmans: see JAOS. 31. 1 ff.

² Anandaśrama Series, No. 10. An English translation of the text and Commentary has been issued in India; but the book has not been accessible to me.
by Gaudapada. The chronological relation between Badarayana and Gaudapada will be discussed hereafter; for the present we have to deal with his philosophical opinions. Gaudapada is, as far as we know, the first author who formulated the Mayavada or the doctrine that everything except Brahma is an illusion; this doctrine was either originated by him, or by a school of thinkers of whom he became the head; the latter alternative would seem the more probable one.

Now Gaudapada has used the very same arguments as the Buddhists to prove the unreality (vaitathyam = asatyatvam) of the external objects of our perceptions; he states this argument in II 4 which is thus explained by his commentator, Sankara: "Things seen in the waking state are not true; this is the proposition (pratyijna); because they are seen: this is the reason (hetu); just like things seen in a dream; this is the instance (dreyanta); as things seen in dream are not true, so the property of being seen belongs in like manner (to things seen) in the waking state: this is the application of the reason (hetupanayay); therefore things seen in the waking state are also untrue; this is the conclusion (nigamana). Things seen in a dream differ from those seen in waking in that the former are reduced in size because they are within (the body of the dreamer). But there is no difference in so far as both are 'seen' and are 'untrue'." — And in II 31 all unreal things are mentioned together: "As dreams or magic or false margana are regarded (as unreal by ordinary men), so this whole world is regarded by those versed in the Vedaanta".

The argument thus expounded by Gaudapada forms the basis of his doctrine of Mayavada, and it is, as we know, the same argument which the Buddhists employed to establish the

1 I fully concur with Mr. Barneet in his review of Max Walleser, Zur Geschichte und Kritik des alteren Vedaanta (Heidelberg 1910) in JRAS 1910 that Gaudapada is the name of the author and that it has not wrongly been abstracted from the title Gaudapadhyya Karikas. Whether the author be the same as, or different from the Gaudapada the oldest commentator on the Sastra Karikas, in both cases there can be no doubt that Gaudapada was an actual name.

2 I am inclined to think that this Sankara is not the same as the author of the Sastra Bhasya. The latter would hardly have stated the argument in the form and the terms of an amamn according to Nyaya principles.
Śūnyavāda. As that argument is strenuously confuted by Bādarāyana, it is evident that he cannot have held the same opinion in this matter as Gauḍapāda, or, in other words, the Brahma Sūtras do not teach the Māyāvāda. This is one point which I wish to make.

The next question we must try to solve is whether Gauḍapāda is acquainted with the Śūnyavāda or the Viśṇuavāda. The answer is furnished by kārikās IV 24 ff. For in kārikā 24 a Realist contends that ideas (prajñāpti) and feelings would not arise if not caused by external things. The opponent, in kārikās 25–27, shows the unreasonableness of assuming objects existing beside and independent of ideas (prajñāpti, citta). This refutation is, as the commentator tells us, "the argument of the Buddhists of the Viśṇavādins school, who combat the opinion of the realists (bāhyārthavādins), and the Ācārya agrees with him thus far". That the statement of the commentator is right, is evident from the nature of the argument itself, and becomes still more so from the next verse (28), which furnishes the final decision of the Vedāntin: "Therefore the idea (citta) does not originate, nor does the object of the idea originate; those who pretend to recognise the originating of ideas, may as well recognise the trace (of birds) in the air". For here the fundamental doctrine of the Viśṇavādins, which admits only a continuous flow of momentary ideas, is clearly referred to and confuted. Since the Brahma Sūtras and the ancient Vṛttī refer to the Śūnyavāda only, as I hope to have established in my former article, the Gauḍapādiya Kārikās which allude to the latest phase of Buddhist philosophy must be considerably younger than the Brahma Sūtras. This has always been the opinion of the Pandits. It has, however, lately been controverted by Dr. Walleser; on the ground that the Gauḍapādiya Kārikās only are quoted in ancient Buddhist books as an authority on Vedānta philosophy. Even in case this assertion should be confirmed by the progress of research, the alleged fact would not necessarily upset the above result. For the enigmatical character of the sūtras of Bādarāyana make them unfit for quotations, at least of an outsider, to illustrate a point of Vedānta philosophy. And besides the

L. c. p. 29.
Buddhists may have ignored the old Vedānta of Bādarāyana as the Jainas did so late as the ninth century A.D. 1; but they could not well have ignored the Gauḍapāḍa, since that work taught a philosophy which resembled their own in many regards.

Our inquiry has established 1. the near relation, amounting almost to identity, between the epistemology of the Śūnyāvādins or Vijnānavādins on one side and of Gauḍapāḍa's Māyāvāda on the other; 2. the opposition of the latter to Bādarāyana on this head; and 3. the posteriority of Gauḍapāḍa to Bādarāyana. Now these facts admit, in my opinion, of a natural and probable construction, viz. that Gauḍapāḍa adapted the Illusionism of the Buddhists to the teachings of the Upaniṣads. This view is supported by the many coincidences between the Gauḍapadīya Kārikās and the Mādhyamika sūtras to which Professor L. de la Vallée Poussin has lately drawn attention. 2 The theory, that the Māyāvāda is a Vedantic adaptation of the Śūnyavāda, has been first put forward by V. A. Sukhtankar 3; I may add that I perfectly agree with him.

The probable history of the Māyāvāda may be briefly described: originally the doctrine of some school of Upaniṣads, it became an orthodox philosophy, when it had successfully been made the basis of interpretation of the Brahma sūtras, already by earlier writers and finally by the great Śaṅkara. For the two Mīmāṃsās are the preeminently orthodox systems; but we should never lose sight of the fact that they are originally and primarily systems of the Exegesis of the Revelation, the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā of the Revelation as far as it is concerned with sacrifice (karmakāṇḍa), and the Uttarā Mīmāṃsā with regard to Brahma. These two schools of orthodox theologians developed philosophical doctrines of their own, but these are found in the Bhāṣyas and are scarcely alluded to in the sūtras themselves.

1 Haribhadra, Śaṅkarānasaṃuccaya v. 5; Siddharśi, Upamitiḥhava-praṅgatā Kathā p. 661 ff.; see above vol. 31, p. 6 note 3.
2 JRAS. 1910, p. 128 ff.
3 WZKM vol. 22, p. 138 ff. see also above vol. 31, p. 8, note 1.
Sanskrit Kabairas or Kubairas and Greek Kabeiros. —
By E. W. Hopkins, Professor in Yale University.

The phonetic equivalence of the Greek and earlier Sanskrit forms is patent and has already been noted by Professor Wackernagel (KZ. 41, p. 314 ff.), who explains the labialization in the later Sanskrit form as due to the proximity of the labial consonant. The difficulty in the identification has lain in the apparently incongruous character of the two spirits.

In preparing a manual of Hindu mythology I have recently been impressed with the fact that the incongruity is more apparent than real. The variant Ko-beiros, which Hesychius identifies with the kobalt or gobelinus ordinarily called Kobalos was originally one with the form Ka-beiros. That is to say, the house-spirit full of tricks was at first not differentiated from the gnome of the mountain-caves, *kybêla*. The chthonic mountain-mother abstracted from the caves is *Kybêle* (*Kybéle*). I shall give no analysis of the character of the Greek spirit. The tricky troll of the Athenian home, the mysterious gnome of the mountain caves, with his phallic characteristics, his affinity with the worker in iron and fire, the hoarder of treasure connected with the god of luck, finally the mystery and reveling of the Kabeiros—these need only to be mentioned to be recalled. But as for Kabairas or Kubâras, who would think of him as capable of being interpreted in the same way, I venture to add even described with the same words?

The fact is, however, that Sanskrit scholars are obliged to depend in large part for their understanding of Hindu gods upon statements made in comparatively late literature, and when these statements are united in the current mythological handbooks with other data drawn at random from Vedic and

---

1 This paper was read at the Meeting of the Oriental Congress—Athens, April, 1912.
epic literature, the result is such a hodge-podge of truth and error that the god depicted represents neither the Vedic, epic, nor Puranic conception, but a fearful mixture of notions drawn from different millenniums. Thus the latest and least authoritative native authors furnish the data which give the outline of Kubēra as pictured in the standard mythology. He is a god having several wives, none of whom is known to any ancient writer; he possesses only eight teeth and has three legs, characteristics opposed to his earlier conception, though perhaps in part retained from traits not formally acknowledged; he has several sons, only one of whom is really known as such; he receives no worship, whereas he is worshipped in earlier literature; and finally, most of his characteristic traits are ignored altogether. A closer study of the Kubēra (Kabēras) of early literature will show that this "god" wins his high title late in life and that he is no bad representative on Hindu soil of the Greek Kabeiros-Kbēiros (Kabulos).

In regard to the form of the name, it appears as Kubēra for earlier ("Kabēra") Kabēraka (the ending -raka is secondary and is found also in the epic Kubēraka), in which ś → ā. Native authorities enlist the form with other words in -rā, gubēra, godhēra, kathēra, kubēra, gudēra, gudēra, etc., a formation which begins early and till late remains active enough to produce fresh combinations of the same sort, such as śrūmanēra and Sānyamanaēra, the Buddhistic tinge of which, together with the marked linguality of the earlier group, may suggest that forms in -rā were felt to be vulgar rather than acceptable Sanskrit. Professor Wackernagel also explains the form in u as a "mandartische oder pleisische Form" (loc. cit. p. 316). Yet the -rā words stand in close connection with -rū forms, and these again (madēra, sāhēra, etc.) are merely variants of older or perhaps more elegant forms in -ara, -rū, and -ru (cf. patēra =patāra = patara; also šatēra = šatri). Other variations also occur, mūhēra = mūhīra, etc. Some of these are not found in the extant literature, but there is no reason for supposing, for example, that a native scholar made out of whole cloth such words as gadēra, "cloud" or danēra, "harmful". It is with these forms that the word Kubēra is

1. The three-legged Kubēra is doubtless a phallic conception parallel to the parvēlas ἱκάτω of Theocritus.
grouped, which stands to Kubēraka as the similar guhēra stands to guhēraka.1

But if Kubēraka has a vulgar form it is no more than he deserves. For he begins as a vulgar little fellow. His name probably comes from kub (as dānēra from dān, guhēra from guh, etc.), to which native authorities assign the word lābra, “cover” as hole (cave) and as forest, kub itself being explained as “cover over” (kub, kumb, āchādane). Possibly kubja, “bent” may be from the same root. Kubēra then is etymologically a spirit of cover, of hiding. Hence his character as chief Guhryaka (guh, “hide”), allied etymologically again with guhēra as “blacksmith”, with that association of smith and secrecy seen in the case of the Kabirs and other gnomes. Our Kubēra is primarily and above all a Guhryaka-Yakṣa, “hiding-spirit”. Kubēra has a son Kubara (related in ending as patēra to patara “flyer”, bird) to which is prefixed nala, as I think for nara. sprite, the Nara’s being spirits belonging especially to the court of Kubēra and associated with him as a peculiar kind of Gandharva-spirit distinct from the Kinnaras. The nara anyway is a spirit (Naraka, “place of spirits”), of water particularly. There is a body of water underground where these water-spirits abound, the noise of running water being the “singing” of the Kinnaras, which accompanies the “dancing” of these spirits of cloud and waterfall. Nala is identical with nara and means a water-plant (cf. nalinā) or water-spirit (cf. Nalasetu). Narāyaṇa means the place of water (spirits).2

The form Kauvbēra is used of the followers of Kubēra or of his other belongings, or of the drama concerned with his daughter-in-law (Ramlāhīhisāra, H. 8694), but not of his son (as patronymic).

1 The AV. form Kauvbēka (Kashmir) is not so original as Kubēraka (v. L. Kabēraka). It is due to an attempt to make a regular patronymic of Kubēra, like Bhājurīyana and Dhrānava from Bhuvana and Dharvā. Kubēraka reverts to “Kubēra as Śahara to Śahara, Hāleya to Hali, etc. Compare dāvēka and dāvēra, the creature that bites (camel or fish).

2 Activity connotes energy and bravery, hence the tertium that connects water and bravery (puruṣa, a brave man, puriṣa, water, puriṣya, of fire as energetic); hence too the (vital) spirit, as an active energy and the hero (Nero, Neria, āṣa) on the one hand and Nēreus, waterspirit, on the other. Virtue, activity, is nerve (cf. guṣa, sinew and virtue). Nāt, “dance” is only a special form of activity and is related to the water-idea as salto and salvia come from sar “go”, “flow”.

The group of beings over whom Kubéra is lord are, as has been said, "liders", and his most characteristic name in all periods is "lord of the Guhyakas", who are also called the "other people", the old euphemistic designation (equivalent to "good people") of sprites, gnomes, and ghosts. His father is a doubtful personality, who is represented as a great seer or as the son of the Creator-god. His mother is the earth, represented as a cow, whence he is called "son of the cow"; yet another tradition, which had as yet scarcely obtained foothold in the epics, but appears in the subsequent Puranic literature, assigns him a nymph-mother called Ilavilā. He is primarily lord of the spirits who hide (and find) treasure in the mountains. The one son he has lives with him in the hill-country in the North, where, with them, bands of Guhyas or Guhyakas watch all gold and wealth hidden in the hills. Kubéra and his troops are under the patronage of the phallic mountain-god Śiva, to whom Kubéra stands in somewhat the same relation as that occupied in relation to Kubéra himself by his own underling, the great "Jewel"-spirit, whose name appears in full as Māṇi- (or Māṇi-) bhadra (or -vara), and whose father is declared in the later part of the epic to be "he of the silver navel".* It is Śiva who is the mighty god of the North and as such, though the especial friend of Kubéra, as the Mountain-goddess was also his friend (despite the fact that their anger was not restrained when Kubéra was indiscreet), he was historically the cause of Kubéra's remaining an inferior spirit. So rapid is the growth of Kubéra's reputation that, as patron spirit of wealth and treasure, he would undoubtedly have become to the North what Agni became to the East; but in fact he was scarcely able to attain the position of world-protector, and Śiva overshadowed him completely. He is first represented as a sprite of concealment, living on that as his sustenance and associated with similar spirits the "good people", who also are thus nourished by their earth-mother. Earth the shining goddess is their mother, earth (the soil) is their "dish", as contrasted with the "silver" dish (the moon) of the Manes. This is expressed in the following passages of

*This epithet is applied to the greater and lesser spirits; probably at first to Śiva and then transferred to Kubéra (cf. triśirgas and triśiras, of Śiva and Kubera). Cf. Guha as son of Śiva.
the Atharva Veda and the Great Epic, identical passages in variant forms.¹

AV, 8, 10, 28, so 'dakrāmat se 'tarajanaṁ āguacat tām itarajanaṁ upāhvayanta tirodha ehi 'ti; tasyāḥ Kubero Vaiśravana vatsa āsid, āmapitram pātram; tām Rajatanābhī Kuberaṁ 'dhok, tām tirodham evā 'dhok; tām tirodhām itarajanaṁ upajivanti, tiro bhate sarvam pāpmānam upajivanti bhavati ya evam veda (v. l. punya" for itara")

Mbha, 7, 69, 24:  
antarākham ca 'mapātre duṣgdhā punyajanādir. Viraṅ,  
duṣgdhā Vaiśravanaṁ teṣām vatsaś ca 'sid vṛṣadāvajah  
(v. l. in SL. text, ca 'sit Kuberaṁah).

Harivānśa, 382 f.:  
Yaksāś ca śrāvyate rājaṁ punar duṣgdhā vasumdhārā,  
āmapātre mahārajaḥ purā 'ntarākham aśrayam;  
vatsaṁ Vaiśravanāṁ kṛtvā Yaksāh punyajanāṁś tada,  
duṣgdhā Rajatanābhās tu pita Manivarasya yoḥ,  
Yaksātmajā mahātejas triśiraṁ sumahātayah;  
tena te varṣayanti 'ti paramāṁśīr uvāca ha.

About the same time probably as that of the first of these passages is that of the Brāhmaṇa which describes Kubera as lord of Rakṣasas (SB, 13, 4, 3, 10) and (or?) selagas (śrāvaka “snake”?). Rakṣasas the Hindus regard as brothers or cousins of the Yaksas, the former—being prevailing evil but sometimes good, the latter prevailing good but sometimes evil. The Gṛhyakas are often identified with the Yaksas, although they occasionally appear as a separate band. In fact, however, Yaksas are the genus and Gṛhyakas are the species, as Kiṁnaras are a species of Gandharvas. All these spirits, of hiding, helping, singing and dancing, together with serpents, dwarfs, personified gem- and jewel-spirits, and “wizard”-spirits, are under Kubera.

Kubera’s association with Śiva rests on a deeper basis than the hills where they live together. Both are genii of productivity. This is the reason why Kubera and Isāna (Śiva) are invoked together and especially “for the husband” at the marriage-ceremony (Śāṅkh, GS, 1, 11, 7). Kubera is god of increase, both of children and wealth. His wife is thus Rddhi, Prosperity, who is recognized as such in the later parts of

¹ Here and in the following I omit the macrons over ā, not usually written in Sanskrit words.
the epic; as Laksññi is also so closely connected with him that she is associated with Nala-Kübara at his court, possibly with the idea that she is really Kübara's wife, as was actually imagined in post-epic literature despite Viṣṇu's claim upon the lady. When a man marries and when a man digs for treasure, he makes offerings to Kübara as the spirit of good luck and prosperity in general. But the adoration of Kübara and the offerings made to him were regularly similar to those offered to his coadjutor the Jewel-spirit; though once identified with those offered to a recognized god, namely when the epic hero is digging for treasure.

Kübara is a god, deva, only in the later parts of the epic. The view that he was once a man, afterwards raised to godhead, is an exaggeration both of the epic data and of the historical facts. In the epic he is the “king of kings”, as is Raṇaññ the Rakṣas, and he is “chief of kings”; but he is never thought of as a mere man, as he is seldom thought of as a god in the full sense of that term. He is always a Guhyaka “hiding-spirit”, one of that spirit-clan to which are assigned dubious characters, such as animals and plants of recognized spirit-power, and in particular the half-gods or half-divine dīscaurī twins (Aśvins), though later (Puranic) tradition asserts definitely enough that Kübara, together with his follower Nandīvara (also the name of Śiva's follower and of Śiva himself), was a “god with human nature”, manusya-prakṛiti, for which there is no basis at all in the early texts. One may assume that all demoniac forms were “degraded tribes” of Hindus; but this opens up a question similar to that as to the interpretation of European fairies as wild men, etc. One might say that the Śabala are wild demoniac mountaineers and that Kübaras and Śabalas (κ - 3, r - 1) were originally one (cf. kṣīraudas and śimīdas as demons); but that would be guess-work and after all would not help us to determine what the epic Hindus thought of Kübara. Both epics state plainly that Kübara was not at first a god; but godhood was given to him as a special boon.

One other point in regard to a misunderstood tradition. The epic poets call Kübara Naravāhana (“having a vehicle of Naras”), and the later writers interpret this as “carried by men”, that is in a palanquin or naraṇyāna. One looks in vain, however, for any evidence that Kübara was carried by
men. In post-epical times he rides a buffalo; but that is another comparatively modern touch. The curious thing is that, if naras be men, Kubera is described as "carried by men" just when he is not so carried. Like other supernatural beings of the epic, gods, seers, angels, etc., Kubera has his own aeroplane, a very large and roomy car, which was especially presented to him by the Creator, and which has the reputation of being the fastest car on the road of spirits. And yet even as Kubera, who always rides in this car, is stepping into it, the poet calls him Naravāhana. But this absurdity is overcome if one remembers that the verb from which comes vāhana is used of the spirits called Guhyakas as "carriers" of Kubera's car. "By the Guhyakas", it is said, "is carried, uhyamānām, the car of Kubera". In other words, as explained above, the Naras are spirits, and Kubera's car is harnessed by spirits, sometimes described as Guhyakas and sometimes as mysterious horse-like birds or bird-like horses, who yet at the same time are Gandharvas, that is, I suppose, the Naras as singing spirits, half horse and half bird. They "fly" like birds and "neigh victory" like horses and are called Gandharvas as well as Guhyakas, so that there is not much doubt as to what Naravāhana in Kubera's case really means, "he who is carried by spirits", though the same word is applied in naravāhin to a palanquin used by kings and ladies in its normal human sense. The fearful foe of the gods, Nahusa, drove a team of spirit-saints and because they were saints he sinned. Kubera drove a team of his own spirits, who were his servants.

Gold is the metal with which Kubera is especially concerned. In this he differs from the Kabirs, who worked in baser metal, whereas the Northern mountains where Kubera lives are famous for "fair Himalayan mines of gold", not to speak of the gold brought from Hātaka, also in the Northern mountains, or of the "gold dug up by ants", which must also have come from the mountains (perhaps from the upper Ganges), because the only time it is mentioned it is spoken of as being brought down by the mountaineers of the North as tribute (to Delhi, as now named).

In connection with this gold (Kubera, by the way, is said to have a "body made of gold"!), there is a well-known proverb, which appears half a dozen times in the epic in almost
but not quite identical words and states that a rash and greedy man is like the climber after honey, which is to be got only by scaling cliffs, on the face of which, at the mouth of cliff-caves, the bees build. So the proverb: "He longs for honey but forgets the fall!". Now this proverb is applied to a king who has stolen another's wealth and is liable to fall in consequence, and the epic poet likens him to one who seeks to steal the "honey loved of Kubera". Of course the native expounder says that Kubera's pet food is honey, and perhaps it is; but it is worthy of notice that the poet is careful to say nothing about eating. He does not say it is Kubera's food but it is "that (thing) beloved by Kubera!", or "Kubera's gold honey", madhu pitakamāksikam, which the Petersburg Lexicon (comparing *suvarnamāksikam) interprets as pyrites, though saffron might just as well be meant, since this also is picked off the cliffs and it is dangerous work for one "who gathers samphire, dreadful trade", whether practiced at Dover, in Lemnos (home of the Koubi!), or in India. Yet the "honey of Kubera" is not on the face of the cliff but in a jar in a cave, and the application of the proverb must lie in the necessity of scaling the cliff to get to the cave. Now in India not only honey but gold is kept in jars, in fact the jar buried underground is the ordinary bank of the Hindu peasant to this day. Thus the allusion, made rather skillfully to what is called "Kubera's honey", is in fact to "the favorite of Kubera", i.e. gold. This gold is described as kept in a cave guarded by dragons (serpents) and he who attains to this, is made happy ever after: "It gives to mortals immortality; it makes the blind see; it restores youth to the aged" (Mbh. 5, 64, 18 ff.). Perhaps that is claiming a good deal, even for Kubera's gold, but it is as reasonable as to turn the gold into pyrites; though it might be saffron (kāvera, the name suggests this) and it is possible to take Kubera's honey literally as eating may be implied, though not stated. There is something Medean about the restoration to youth which suggests the possibility of a connection with the "dragon-guarded" Fleece, though they may be independent tales, and the Hindu version is perhaps not without conscious twisting to the honey-moral, which is the sole reason why it is dragged into the story. It is a tale which has to be explained by spirit-experts or jugglers with spirits, as if to be taken with a grain of salt.
(vidyājumbhakawārtika priests, also said to be jambhasādhakas ib. 16 and 20) and is told for edification rather than for belief. The moly (of Hermes) may also be compared with "Kubera's Gold", if it should prove to be a plant.

Another mark of Kubera is his interest, one might almost say ownership, in the "playground of the gods". For though this is recognized as "the gods' playground" in general, yet in particular it is called "the playground of Kubera". This is almost a foregone conclusion, since it is Kubera who possesses the mountain-top on which the playground is found. But the only play known to the gods is the dance, and this is the real meaning of ā-krīda (krīd “play” is really the same with kūrd, “leap, play, dance”; cf. Grk. kordax). The ākrīd-ābbhūmi, "ground for dancing", is also said to belong to the spirits who especially act as attendants of Kubera, probably the spirits of dancing waters. One of Kubera's spritelike characteristics is his trick of keeping spellbound a chance visitor from the earth, who is travelling through the hill-country and suddenly comes upon the "lake of lotuses of gold", near Kubera's home. Kubera receives him very politely and immediately proposes to entertain him with an exhibition of dance and music given by his attendant nymphs and musicians. At the end of the "divine year" during which the performance lasts, the guest hurries away, realizing for the first time the passage of time. As he departs, Kubera says, rather dryly, "Yes, this music is a very captivating thing" (hāryo 'yam gāndhāreṇa) and lets him go (Mbh. 13. 19, 33 f).

Among the regular attendants of Kubera are the Nāgas or mahoragases, the cobra-serpents famous for stealing and hiding jewels. If Kubera has more to do with gold than with iron or copper, it is not because he is never conceived as a smith, guhēra, but because he is rather a Guyaka than a guhēra; that is, he conceals gold and jewels rather than manufactures things from metal, though one tradition has it that he made his own palace, which is all of gold-work. But another tradition says that this palace was made by the "All-maker", and it is this figure of the All-maker which has put Kubera aside as a fashioner, as it has put aside Agni the fire-god as a companion to Vulcan, though now and then Indra or some other god takes the All-maker's place and is represented as himself the maker of arms and palaces. Never-
theless, both in the matter of gold and in that of jewels, Kubera has to do both with fire and with serpents. Thus one of the regents of the constellation under which a successful search for treasure may be prosecuted is the Serpent of the Depth, Ahi Budhnya, and the treasure is found through the combined aid of Agni and Kubera.¹

The fact that the Serpent of the Depth presides over the finding of treasure, has several bearings of interest. In the first place it suggests the relation between Kubera and the serpents in general. As inhabitants of holes, underground palaces, etc., snakes are looked upon both as guarding and as stealing treasure, especially jewels. The case of the Diamond Necklace is not more famous in modern literature than was the case of The Queen's Ear-rings in India, stolen by the king of serpents. Likeness also illustrates the connection between jewels and snakes, "brilliant as the golden stone guarded by serpents", etc. It is these serpents that are part of the retinue of Kubera, though he himself is not in any way serpent-like; but since he is guhya or guhyaka, the "Concealing" Nāgas are associated with him.

Another bearing of the fact regarding the Serpent of the Depth is that, as Kubera's treasure is found by men, so Kubera himself in turn is presented by the great god Śiva, his particular friend, with one quarter of all the wealth of the golden mountain (Meru), and it is thus that men eventually get it through the aid of Kubera, Fire, and Wind (which clearly indicate a sort of Vulcan with forge and bellows); for Kubera himself first gets out the treasure, which in this case is the gold of the hills, and then out of that which the supreme god of the mountains, Śiva, has allowed him, he gives one sixteenth to man. Analogy between the luck-spirit and the Hellenic god of luck is evident; but there is no special connection between the names or functions of Kubera and

¹ Possibly Kubera had to do originally with kupyā, copper and other base metals, as well as with gold. This word (ascribed in P.W. to kup, as irasamānum, or "metal easily moved") may be from "kup, "shine", and is possibly represented by the "copper-isle", Kypros, which is as likely to have been named "copper-land" as copper is likely to have been named "Cyprus-stuff". So the Kassiterides were named from their metal (Sk. kastīra is a late loan word). A parallel may be found in kēbara, "copper" from Šabara, mountaineer, as "mountain-stuff".
Hermes, and except for his association with Wind and Fire, Kubera has no likeness with Hephaistos.

The luck-function of Kubera and his kind stands of course in direct connection with that attribute of Kubera and the "good-people" which is the most conspicuous trait on his first appearance (in the Vedic text cited above) and on which the epic poets are never weary of harping. Kubera has "disappearance" as his very sustenance; he and his followers live on it, that is, like the goblins of other lands, they disappear at will; but also, as they disappear (fading out of sight, as one epic poet says, "like fata morgana"), so too they appear at will; and lastly, also like gnomes of other lands, things which have disappeared they can make appear to plain view. This they do by the application of magic, as when Kubera lets appear for an aged saint, who according to a third tradition of his birth is his own grandfather, a complete phantasmagoria of his beloved gardens and parks; or, again, by letting a mortal use some magic water, "and when he uses it he shall see all concealed things". This is what Kubera did for the hero Rāma, sending him a bottle of this magic eye-wash by a Guhyaka servant (Mbh. 3, 289, 9).

It may be asked whether there is any probability that the "good people" associated with Kubera are ghosts. I think not. Both in the Veda and in the epic the Yākṣas and other fairies are kept distinct from the Manes. It is a later tradition (still obtaining in Ceylon and India) which confuses "Yakkas" with the ghosts of the dead. Thus in the Atharva Veda, "the Fathers (ghosts) and the good people" are distinguished from each other, as both together are distinguished from the gods (AV. 8, 8, 15, etc.). Exactly so in the Great Epic, Guhyāḥ pitaṃgANEḥ saṃta, "Guhyakas and the seven groups of Fathers" (3, 3, 43) are differentiated, as in another passage (7, 69, 10 f.) "the seven seers, the good people and the Fathers". The Guhyakas, except as messengers, rarely leave their hills, though they occasionally join the host of gods demons, Fathers, and spirits who watch and admire a conflict of men; but unique is the notion that Guhyakas are among the luminous bodies of heaven, though even there they are differentiated from the equally luminous souls of departed saints which shine as stars on high. Such an isolated bit of poetic fancy cannot impugn the value of the current view,
that the Guhyakas, of whom Kubera is one and the chief, are earth-goblins, who belong to the shrinking class of hiding sprites. That they are not very martial spirits, like their cousin or brother Rakṣasas, may be gathered from the fact that cowardly soldiers do not go to the world of Indra, the god of battles, but to the "world of Guhyakas" (11, 26, 12 f.), though to get even to this place they must at least be killed with a sword, and not "killed anyway"; otherwise they go to the land of the peace-loving (not martial) Hyperboreans (Northern Kurus). Kubera's own world, in the formal enumeration of all possible worlds of spirits and gods, stands almost at the bottom of the list, only one degree higher in fact than the world of Death (Yama), which of course is underground. It is thus located far below the world of the real gods and turns out on examination to be in fact nothing save the mountain-region round the upper reaches of the Ganges (his paradise of Alakā), final indication of the essentially earthy, if not chthonic, nature of this goblin, who, though in time he became "king of kings", "god", and "guardian of the North", became thus exalted ever with the clear understanding that divinity was given him because he "clove to the Father-god" and was virtuous, instead of siding with his brothers, the Rakṣa-giants, who strove against the gods.

Kubera changes his form but once. That is when the gods and good spirits are all frightened at the onslaught of these same giants or feasts and take the shape of animals, "thousand-eyed Indra" naturally becoming the peacock (which explains why that bird still has a thousand eyes in its tail), Kubera becoming the chameleon (which explains why the chameleon is of such brilliant hues). Perhaps, however, the connection of thought originally was in the association of the chameleon also with holes, and hiding-places; for godhū, chameleon, is derived by native scholars (perhaps correctly) from the same root godh, yud, sīdā, from which comes Guhyaka.

Though Kubera has only one spirit-son, Nala-Kubara, the Rāmāyana assigns him an incarnation in the shape of the monkey called Gaudhamādana. As this is also the name of Kubera's favorite mountain, the tale may be due to confusion of thought or conscious feeling of appropriateness, especially

---

1 Cf. the "Banyan-tree of Vasuvāma", Mahāvamsa, 10, 89.
since Kubera seems to be an afterthought, the original story
being that Yama and not Kubera was sire of the incarnated
divinity called "Gandhamādana the apo". This fact is not
without further significance. The later inclusion of Kubera
when the gods are called upon to reincarnate themselves
in earthly forms to fight against the giant fiends, shows
what was thought of Kubera. He was not primarily one of
the great devas who so incorporated themselves. But later
he was assigned a son, on earth, as were the other gods,
because he was then risen to the position of guardian god.

Nala-Kübara, the only real son of Kubera, is a spirit noted
for his grace and good manners in the non-epic but popular
tradition of the Jains, as was his father for beauty in the
same cycle. Preller (fourth ed., p. 858) supposes that the
epithet mālāras, given to the Lesbian Kabeiros, implies (one
son) Hermes, a doubtful suggestion at most; but in any event
it is curious that Kubera’s one son should be a model of the
grace for which Hermes stands as type (kūbara itself is said
to mean “charming”). This son of Kubera wed the “fairest of
nymphs”, Rambhai, who was turned into a rock, like Niobe, for
certain indiscretions less innocent than those of her Hellenic
companion in suffering. She doubtless belongs to the large
class of those petrified spirits, which are found all over earth,
from India and the Pillar of Salt to the stones of South
America which “once were men” but died for impiety and
still “look like men”. Instead of men, women and spirits are
the favorite victims in India.

The attention paid in the Great Epic of India to the
lower mythology is in marked contrast to the indifference
displayed toward this most valuable survival of antiquity
both in Greek epic poetry and in earlier Brahmanic poetry
with the exception of the Atharva Veda. Elsewhere we pick
up as we can what the poet has unconsciously let fall. Here
we find the lower mythology itself presented as worthy of
regard. Thus Kubera himself, as a superior goblin become a
god, is naturally fitted, but also his humble followers are given
name and place, sometimes both, often only the name or only
the place. I have already pointed out that the attendant
spirits of Śiva have names reflecting Kubera’s own essential
characteristics. It remains to speak of the many little fol-
lowers of Kubera who are referred to by name, unfortunately
seldom of much significance, and of the enumeration of shrines sacred to the female followers of Kubera. There are several of these lady fairies or goblinettes who have renowned "bathing-places", that is, shrines at a river, where one may offer prayers or bathe, for the good of his life if not of his soul. At one of these shrines to a Yakṣī, one is said to "obtain all his wishes", while at another, if one only bathes there (it is a sort of Kurhaus), one is freed from all ills and evils, even "the ill (evil) of slaying a priest". Both Kubera and his attendant Manibhadra are, so to speak, patron saints of the travelling merchants, whose misfortunes are spoken of so often in Buddhist stories. These doubtless did much to elevate the rôle of Kubera and his attendants, the Yakṣas and Yakṣīs or Yakṣīns, to whom the caravanners prayed and raised shrines. It will be remembered in the tale of Nala that the master of the caravan at once assures that Damayantī may be the goddess of the place, either of the forest or "of this mountain", or a Yakṣī or a Rākṣasī and, believing her to be "goddess or fairy", first calls upon her "hurru nah svasti", "give us well"; and then, when he finds she is only human, concludes with the prayer, "Manibhadra, king of Yakṣas, have mercy upon us". This "Jewel"-spirit shares with Kubera the title "king of Yakṣas" (fairies); but very likely Kubera stole it from him as an extension of his own proper title, "king of gnomes" (Guhyākṣas); for though Kubera becomes the lord of the Yakṣas as well as the lord of all the Kīmūnaras and other spirits of this ilk, yet this is simply an illustration of his gradual evolution into a god. For example, the technical title, Kīmūnareśvara, "lord of Kīmūnaras" is not actually given to him till a later period than that in which he is spoken of as (informally) master of these spirits, just as he is not actually called a god till the later epic. He is made a god and so he is made lord and king of Yakṣas, but by nature he is lord of Guhyākṣas and Rākṣasas, spirits "concealing" and "guarding" (also "injuring"). From this point, with the advance in trade and exploration, Kubera rises to be lord of all the

---

1 It is not to be taken for granted that a fairy Yakṣī will be kindly disposed, though this is usually the case. There is such a thing as "possession by a Yakṣa", which drives one mad, or makes ill, etc. When roused to anger even a female saint may act like a fiend.
fairies and spirits and "guardian of the North". When he gets to that point he inevitably becomes the "god of the North" though still by grace of Śiva, his friend and over-lord.

Rubensohn, in his Mysterienheiligtümer in Eleusis und Samothrake, after saying very reasonably that both names and number of the Kabeiroi are still quite doubtful, suggests that further investigation may enable us to trace these spirits to their "Phoenician origin", and then sums up what we really know about them: "es sind chthonische Gottheiten, die in einem gewissen Verwandtschaftsgrad zur Kybele standen" (p. 128).

But Rubensohn, like his predecessors, imagines that the Kabeiroi were attached to the cults of Dionysos or Hephaistos because they were "not quite at home" in Hellas, failing to see that the lower mythological figures are never quite at home in the companionship of finer and loftier gods, not because these gods are necessarily racially distinct but because they represent a different civilization in which, to survive at all, the lower must cling to the higher. That has always been the case. That the Kabeiroi are accidentally attached to the mother-goddess Rhea is as much an assumption as that they were accidentally attached to Kybele. Their connection with Kybele is that of the gnome to its cave; their attachment to Rhea is through Kybele, who was identified with a higher conception of the earth-mother. It is also with the mountain "mothers" of the Śiva-cult that the Hindu counterpart of the Greek Kabeiros has closest connection, for these mothers too are mountain-spirits and their names are in part identical with Kubera's. Vittada, Vasudā, Pingākṣṭ, called "mother" spirits in the cult of Śiva, are merely Kubera's titles, "wealth-giver", etc., in a feminine form; as his own titles, "lord of beings" (spirits), are in part those of Śiva himself. Kubera (= Kabairas) is in fact a pigmy Śiva, as Śiva is a monstrous over-grown Kabairas. The spirit of the cave, the hiding spirit, who is guardian of treasure, lord of treasure-trove, and whose rôle as spirit of increase covers also

1 Vasudā is also "earth". Parallel forms are Vasudhāra, Vasudharā, Vasumādhāra, of which the first is one of the names given later to "Kubera's city", while all these forms designate the Buddhist goddess known as the wife of Kubera Jambhalou. Compare A. Poucher, Étude sur l'Iconographie bouddhique de l'Inde.
productivity (as genius invoked "for the man" in marriage), whose Guhya-name is reflected in the guhera, "smith", loha-
ghātaka, is as near a counterpart to the Greek Kabeiros as could be wished. The Kabeiroi also were eventually reckoned as "great gods". The part of the Kāboloi, the mischievous sprites hiding in the house rather than in the mountain-cave, is not so obvious in the epic; but literature outside of and older than the epics shows that the "servants of Kubera" were particularly annoying to children, and these must have been house-spirits who plagued children (as described in Hirap. GS. 2, 1, 3, 7; not included in the list at Pārask. GS. 1, 16, 23), as did Śiva's evil mother-spirits.

That Kubera is not mentioned in the solemn literature devoted to the great gods is not a proof that he was unknown to the early age of the first Vedas. He was not yet divine. It took a long time for him to become a god, but finally he achieved this and as god of the North became even a witness-god in the law-courts. If Śiva had been as non-local as Viśnu, Kubera would probably have taken his place as great god of the North. As it was, he remained at best a respectable deva, whose cult was largely augmented by the growth of commerce. As a god it was felt that he ought to be good-looking and so the epics represent him, beautiful, luminous, glorious to see. But probably the concurrent conception of him as a goblin, and goblins are seldom beautiful, resulted in the eventual triumph of the opposite view that he was deformed. Perhaps kubja (see above), "bent", with too few teeth and too many legs. Then, instead of referring Kubera to kubh, the wise men invented the word vera, gave it the meaning "body" and interpreted Kubera as ku-vera, "having a vile body". The beginning of this is found in the last (latest) book of the Rāmāyana, which explains that Kubera became jaundiced in one eye, because he indiscreetly looked at the Mountain-goddess when she was occupied with Śiva, her husband; a tale which, while it looks forward to Kubera's later ugliness, also reverts to his character as a Peeping Tom, or gnome. His later title, "Lord of Love", is connected with his attributes as marriage-divinity; for which reason also he is closely united with the amorous Gandharvas.
Atharvaprāyaścitāni. Text mit Anmerkungen von Prof. JULIUS VON NEGELEIN, University of Koenigsberg, Germany.

Om name 'tharavedāya | athā to yājñe karmāni prāyaścitāni vyākhāyāyama vidhy-aeparādhe | sarvatra puṇah kāryam 'kritvo 'ttarataḥ prāyaścittam prāyaścittam vā krtvo 'ttarataḥ samādhānam | yat pūrvam prāyaścittam karoti grhaḥ puṣubhir evai 'nam samardhayati | yad uttaratah svargena | vai 'nam | tal lokena samardhayati | katham agnī udhāyā 'vakhāyā

agnir iti säyam | sûryo jyotih jyotih sûrya | iti prātar | hiranyam antar dhārayed | ārṣeyas tat paśyam āhavanīyam abhyuddhared | atha 38 yasyā "havanyam abhyuddhrtam adityo | bhāyastam iyāt kā tatra prāyaścitā | darbhenā hiranyam | bāddhvā pāścād dhārayed | ārṣeyas 40 | tat paśyam agnim | āhavanīyam abhyuddhared | atha yasyā "havanyam abhyuddhrtam adityo bhūyidyāt kā tatra prāyaścitā | darbhenā rajatam | baddhva pārasād ḍhārayed 42 ārṣeyas tat paśyam āhavanīyam abhyuddharet | atha yasya sāyam ahuntam agnihotram prātar adityo bhūyidyat kā tatra prāyaścitā | maitrāh purojāsah carur vā | nityāḥ pūrasāddhômah samsthitahomesu mitrāḥ prāthivyā adhyakṣa 43 | iti madhyata opya sāmravabhāgah samsthadayed | atha yasya prātar akṛtam agnihotram sāyam adityo bhūyastamiyāt kā tatra prāyaścitā | vārunah purojāsā nityāḥ | pūrasāddhômah 44 | samsthitahomesu yat kim ce'dam varune | "ti 46 madhyata opya sāmravabhāgah samsthadayed | atha yasya prātar ahuntam agnihotram adityo bhūyidyāt kā tatra prāyaścitā | maitrāh purojāsā nityāḥ pūrasāddhômah | samsthitahomesu 45 mitrāḥ prāthivyā adhyakṣa iti madhyata opya sāmravabhāgah samsthadayed | ahuti 46 vai tābhyāṁ rghbhāyām juhyāt | 21

atha yo 'gnihotropo deti 49 svargām vā esa lokam yajamanam abhivahati | nā 50 huvā "avarteta | sa yady āvarteta svargad evai 'nam tal lokād āvarteta | 'tha yasya 'gnihotram āyuṃā-

---

37 Ap. 6. 10. 8. 37 B atha 38 C fūgt iti ein. 48 K. S. 25. 3. 17.
41 agnim fehlt bei D 49 K. S. 25. 3. 29 bestimmt, daß in analoger Weise
42 in ochtlicher Richtung ein Silberstück aufgehängt werden soll.
43 vgl. Kaud. S. 6. 9. 44 C ni 45 C 'dhamāṇ D 'ma. 46 AV.
46. 61. 3. 47 B 'sāmhitā 48 A 'hutti B 'hutti 49 udeti dem
Sinn nach gleich: prāsā udeti, der Adhvaryu wendet sich, nahdem er
die zum Agnihotra-Opfer erforderliche Milch auf dem Gṛhapatya-Feuer
zum Kochen gebracht hat, in ochtlicher Richtung zum Āhavanīya.
49 Vergleicht man auch die Oppergestaltteilweise oder ganz, so darf er nicht
ebenstehend (nach Westen zu) umkehren, denn das hätte den Opfer-
42 herra von der Himmelsweltwegwenden, den er durch seinen Gang nach
Osten dieser entgegenführt; s. Ait. Brāhm. 7. 5 und Kommu., dazu;
dasselbe
41 eine kleine Differenz im Ritual gegenüber dem unseres Textes; vgl. Agn.
42 Prāya. Thā. punar-annayane 'yaṃ viśeṣah | prācina-harante yavati gate
skāmanā bhavati tāvati, eva 'dhvany apaviṣyā sthālin anyenapraṣṭhit[e]
45 nītā tatraivo 'paviṣṭa umanyet | na svayam erug | pratyag gacchet | sthā-
46 lyām apa yudā nā 'iti tādā tatraivo "iyāṃ grhītvā (i) unnīya tena
48 homāh | 48 D ma
nam skandet kā tatra praśaścittār | apareṇā "havanyam daksīnām āniu acyō paviṣati | yat śruci ātisītām syāt taj juhuyād | atah yatraī vā vaskanam bhavati tam desam abhivimyāi

vimrgvarīm pṛthivīm āvadām | ti pṛamukho(l) paviṣyā | guir bhūmyām | iti tisrbhīr

ālabhya "bhīmartrayeta | tha cet sarva eva skanam syād yac caruthālayām ātisītām

syāt taj juhuyād | atah "havanyam ājya-"hum taj juhuyād | yan me skanam ity etayarcā | yan me skanam manasa jatāvedo yad vā skandad dvāsavo yatra-yatra utpṛco vipuṣha

samjuhomi satyāḥ santu yajamānasya kāmāḥ svāhe ty | atah yasyā guhohre medhyam āpadyeta kā tatra praśaścittār | apareṇā "havanyam uṣagam iva bhama nirūhā tatra tam āhūtim

juhuyād | tad dhutam cā "humūm ca bhavati | yac caruthālayām ātisītām syāt taj | atah cec caruthālayam eva medhyam āpadyeta kā tatra praśaścittis | tat tathā va huva "tāma ahiyoh đầyitvā śrāpavīyā tad asāt tatrai

vā "ainīyā | svāhāreyur | (atah ārdhām prasiddham agnihotram) | atah yasyā "havanyā-gūrhpatayaś aṅtareṇa yāno va

ratho vā nivarteta śvā vā "bhūhīvet kā tatra praśaścittār |
mantravanti ca kāryaṇī sarvāny adhyayanam ca yat
nāntarāgamanam teṣāṁ sādhu vichedānād bhayam
iti gūḍhapatyād adhy āhavanyā udatantum niśīcan
tyāt 66 tantum tanvan rajaso bhānum anv āhī
tvati jyotismatāh patho raksā dihi krītān anubānam vāyatā joguvām āpo
manur bhava janaya dāiyam janam tapnam sav iṣū se-
dur agne tvam pathā rajasi devayānah terāya āne prātām

sūrdānādi-pāthikṛti kāryā jāmiṣa-yajusa ārdhvaṁ cet tadaiva gāvā
tikramā "dy-upasthānāntam kṛtya kārtamaha samāpya teṣ eva gūḍhe anvādhh-
āṁ "di-pāthikṛti kāryā agnīmā vyavāye tu pāthikṛty eva assistantāvā phetā hi vedho ... sukra oc (āśv. 3. 10. 13) oc devānam api kālpayāt 't (ībid.) anadvān daksīṇā ... tato vīgu-smaranāṁ kārtamaha mādyāyān anyatra
purusādāna vyavāye manasvātā ca sarvyāstaḥ-homaḥ bandhāyana-mateḥ karma-mādhya dāriyāṇāṁ ca uśāṇāṁ mājārād-dānam agnīmādiyā
gumane yāvāg-agnīmādiyā gamane vā dāvāyār māmīti-
āntakāya śākṣaś-dāddā ājaya manuṣkṛtya šrāv-śrāvām samārtya tat-siddhā tea
āyaṁ "jyābhāgyād-ānāntam yathāsaṁbhāvam jūvāṁ sakṛty gṛhāvā "havanāte
juhoti ... yan maistāno (āśv. 9. 12. 11) "pi svāhā [agnaya i] pūrva agnī
cākṣe adit ībid. "kṣeṣā svāhā [agnī i] bhūḥ svāhā [agnaya i] bhūva
svāhā śīyā naiva ... svahā svāhā [sūryāye i]a] bhūr bhūvaḥ svāhā
svāhā [prajāpatiak i] oni svāhā bhramane i imān me varuṇa (rv. 1. 25. 19; āśv. 2. 17. 16) tvā [īvi yāmi (āśv. 7. 4. 3) tvam no agne (rv. 4. 1. 4) iti tiṣe]a ū samātum ... janaṁ (rv. 10. 53. 6) svāhā [agnaye
tantuma iti] udbhāvyā āne ... tantum etam (v. s. 18. 61) svāhā [agnaye
tantumā iti]i trayastraṁśat tantvār dādhiṁ (āśv. 3. 14. 10) svāhā gharma devāṇ apvetu svāhā [agnaye tantumā iti]i anv agnī
ūpāsam ... atātāna (t. s. 4. 1. 2. 3) svāhā [agnaye jātavedasa i]a] tvam namaṁ
mano jīva] bhūr agnaye ca prāhīru ca māhate ca svāhā [agnaye prāhīru
māhate i] bhūva vāyave ca tu rākṣikṣa ca māhate ca svāhā vāyave
prārākṣikṣa ca māhate i] suvar ādīṣa ca dive ca māhate svāhā ādī-
śāya dive ca māhata i] bhūr bhūvaḥ suvaḥ ca mātrāmse ca mākṣetrebhyā
cā digbhāya ca svāhā ca mātrāmse mākṣetrebhyo digbhāya māhate i] septa
te agne samidhā gūrṭeṇa (v. s. 17. 79) svāhā [agnaye vata i] prājā-
pate "rayāṁ svāhā [prajāpatiak i] tato viṣu-purvarunām nāntarāgma
niḥāki cinn nimmītī anāyupasya śrāṇa-vāraṁ śrāṇa-purvaṁ māhāt
māhāt [uḥ ca hotave vaḥyṛthāḥ prāṇavādharāḥ] vārūṇyas tantumatraya ca
śvagūnā ca manasvātī ca mahāvyāhāryata ca saṃprāyāntaṁ tathāva ca
prasaṃabhāva yawāsaya te maṇtriḥ prakṛtān ca septa iti septa te agne
iti maṇtriḥ ca saṃ mānādy-guṇaḥ
yayıam ėruhemădhă devaįh sadhahamădat mademă | svęhe ėti
sarvaṭrai ėtat prayaścittam antarāgamane smṛtam [86]
yojasya samatītari ėsi yañhasya tvā samatītyā samtaṇomi
vaśūnān ruddrānām adityānām maruṭām ṛṇāṁ bhūrgōnām
anugṛsām athavaṃ brahmaṇāḥ samatītari ėsi brahmaṇās
tvā samatītyā samtaṇomā [71] yān me cidrām manasa yac ca vā
cāh sarasaṭi manyumantum jāgām viśvai tud devaįh saha
saṃvidānān̄ samaddhatū bhraḥpatiḥ [3] mā na ėpo medham
mā brahma pramatiṣṭhāna | suṣyādā yañham syandhive upa-
hūto 'ham sumedha varcasvī | mā no medham mā no diśām
mā no himsyām yat tapāḥ śivā naḥ samavanta āyūse śivā bhā-
vanto mātaṇā [72] namas te pathyā revati [73] svasti mā paṁ-
ayanā [74] svasti mā punarayāṇayā [75] mā na ėpo medham [76]
jāgyrād gārhapatyā upaśameti kā tatra prayaścittir [79] yat

71 Nach Bls Conc. nicht zu belegen. 72 Soweit AV. 19.40.1 ff. Das
Folgende ist korrupt. 73 Vielleicht ist an RV. 5.51.14r gedacht.
74 B parānyā ṛṇā A svastimiparānayaḥ; gemeint ist vielleicht svasti
mā saṃprāya s. Conc.—B svasti mā punaratayāḥ. Die Miss.
lassen mē weg. 75 AV.19.40.2; D wiederholt: mā no medham (Bvedham) 76 AV. 7.67.1.
76 cf. in dem parallelen Paras des Ait. Brāhma. 7. 4: "nitya he 'gnir" 77 K. S.
25. 3. 5; Agu. Prāy. 11 a: āhavaniye cod driyāmāne gāṛhapaty ānučchet
evebhya eva (pra[?])ṇa kṣāmēbhīya maṇṭhayur anugāmāyē te ītaraṃ kṣāmābhīva
bhāṣman ṛṇaṃ samṛṣṭya maṇṭhayat | vidyāyānā āhavaniye gāṛha-
paty yady anučchheta tadā () anuṭataṃ gāṛhapatyam utpādayasyāma ti śa
samkālya bhāṣman ṛṇaṃ lapayivā tato maṇṭhayat | ito jārne prathama-
man ... prajānām (VS. 13. 34) iti pratiṣṭhayaṃ maṇṭrayātthāḥ | vṛg.
Aśv. Prāy. 5b: āhavaniye driyāmāne gāṛhapaty ānučchheta tadā tadātyo-
'lmukēbhīya maṇṭhayeyuh | āhavaniyam sūngūmayaḥ | u-nilukēkhaṃbhāye
bhāṣman ṛṇaṃ samṛṣṭya( ) ito jārne prathamaṃ . . . prajānām (Aśv. S.
S. 5.12. 22) iti maṇṭhayeyuḥ; u-kṣāya maṇṭrayāḥ tato gāṛhapatyād āhava-
nyam praṇyāngne samrūj le ... dadha (Aśv. S. 3.12. 23) ity upati-
ślichta | tataḥ pṛkṛtam karmā samāpya tapasvatāṃśīṃ kuryāt | athava "ha-
vaniyud eva() āhavaniyam praṇyaṃ daksināgnes ca" hāraṃ kṛtva pṛkṛ-
tam tapasvetāṃśīṭiḥ | athava saṃhārasanāṃ āhavaniyam daksināto vihā-
raṃ gatva gāṛhapatyāṃ āṣātāṃ niḥśāya tatāḥ pṛkṛtam āhavaniyam uddhā-
ret | homāṃ samāpya tapasvatāṃśīḥ | tasyāṃ pradhāna-devatāṃ agnis tapas-
vān janadvān yāvakān | śyāḥ tapasā janeyu agne ... dadat (Aśv. 3.
S. 12. 27) | cf. Aśv. Prāy. 10a āhavaniye driyāmāne anuvahita-gāṛhapatyā-
ṃā daksināma vihāram survam āhavaniyam gāṛhapatyāṣāte ( ) śiva āhav-
aniyam praṇyaṃ pūrvavā prayaścittām kvāvā gāṛhapatyāyā saścāpā upa-
viyā maṃśūge varca (RV.10. 128. 1) ity ādina tṛiṣi kāṣṭhiḥ śilāyā vāyā-
ṛṇāyapadhānaṃ kṛtva "ḥavanīye 'vādāhno- 'paṭākhe kuryāt | cf. Aṃ-
Puṭ. 12 a. yadi gāṛhapatyā nuṣṭeṣee anuvahitaṃ gāṛhapatyam anugataṃ
utpādayeyāṃ 'tiṃ samāpya gāṛhapatyā- nuṣṭe-bhāṣman pradhāna-ṛṇa
prāṇam uddvartayati tena "yatanā[c] cyavate" yat prayāṇam asuravad yajūsam tanoti | yad anugamayati svarā vai nam tat praṇā hāṣyur iti vā iti | 'tha nu katham iti | sabhasmakām āhavanyām daksinena daksināgni mahābhūtīta "yatanā pratisthāpya taṇa āhavanyām pranayet bhadrād abhi śreyah prehi ty etayarca gārhaḥpatyā ajyam vilāyo 'tpuṣya catagṛhitam gṛhitvā "hāvanīya-gārhaḥpatyāv antarena vyavetya juhuyād | ayam no agnir adhyakṣa iti dvābhyaṁ etena u va āsya saṃtvaramāṇasyā "hāvanīya-gārhaḥpatyau janītā vayam mā loko 'nusamāṇutām ity | etena ha va āsya saṃtvaramāṇasyā "hāvanīya-gārhaḥpatyau pāṃpanām apahatāḥ | so pahatapāṃma jyotij bhūtā devān āpy eti "ti | athā "hāvanīya ājyāḥ utum juhuyād asapatnām purastād ity etayarca | 'tha yaśa 'gniḥrotam śrāpyamāṇam visyandet tad adbhīr upānīmayet | tad anumāntrataye prthivim tuṣṭām ity etābhiḥ | prthivim tuṣṭām manuṣyān yajño gāt | tato mā dravīṇam āṣṭa antarikṣe tuṣṭām | divi tuṣṭām (apsv tuṣṭām) āhvānaḥ tāni | devān yajño gāt | tato ma dravīṇam āṣṭa | tratārām indram | yavor ojāse "ti cau "tā visṇu-varun-āṣṭvāyā roo japaṭhā | yad vai yajnasā rūṣṭam tad vaiṣṇavaṃ | yad guṇepitām tad vāruṇam | yajnasva va rūdhīr | bhavistham rūdhām āṃpnoti yatraī tā visṇu-varun-āṣṭvāyā roo japaṭhā | athā 'dbhutesv etā eva

samsārya mathitvā "yatanā nidhāna] bhūr ihip asthānādī vrato-pāṇīya-yaj-āṃpantam samāṇam |

tisro japat | tisro japat | iti\(^{109}\) yajñāpryāścittasūtre

prathamo 'dhūyaḥ samāptah\(^{108}\) |

atha yasya purodāse 'medhayam apadyeta kā tatra prāyāścittir | ājyena 'bhūghārya 'psv antar\(^{109}\) iti sakrd eva 'psu butvā 'thā "havaniya ājyā-"hutā juhuyād asapatnam purastād\(^{110}\) ity etābhāyam rgybhāyam | atha yasya purodāsaḥ ksāmo bhavati kā tatra prāyāścittih | so 'gnaye ksāmavate 'stākapālam purodāśam nirvapen\(^{111}\) nityāḥ purastādīhomāḥ | samshithaḥomesu pṛtanājitam sahamānām\(^{112}\) iti madhyata opyā tathā samaravabhāgaḥ samsthāpayed | athā 'havaniye tāthābhāyam rgybhāyam | atha yasya 'gnihotram tṛtiye nityahoma-kāle\(^{114}\) vichidyeta kā tatra prāyāścittih | so 'gnaye tantumate 'stākapālam purodāśam nirvapen\(^{114}\) nityāḥ purastādīhomāḥ | samshithaḥomesu tvam agne saprathā asi 'juśto hōtā vareṇyāḥ | tvāyā yājñam vitanvata\(^{114}\) iti madhyata opyā samrasvabhāgaḥ samsthāpayed | asapatnam purastād\(^{110}\) ity etābhāyam rgbyām | atha yasya\(^{116}\) sāmnāyaṃ\(^{117}\) vyāpayeta kā tatra prāyāścittih | prātardoham\(^{118}\) dvādham kṛtvā tena yajetā\(^{119}\) 'thā 'havaniya ājyā-"hutim juhuyat trātriṃ indram\(^{120}\) ity etayareca | prātardoham ced apahareṇāḥ | sāmydoham dvādham kṛtvā tena yajetā | 'thā "havaniya ājyā-"hutim juhuyat trātriṃ indram\(^{120}\) ity etayareca | 'thā cet sarvam eva sāmnāyaṃ\(^{121}\) vyāpayeta kā tatra prāyāścittir | andram purodāśam māhendram vā sāmnāyasyā | yatanā pratiṣṭhāpya tena yajetā | 'thā "havaniya ājyā-"hutim juhuyat trātriṃ indram\(^{120}\) ity etayareca | 'thā yasya havinī vyāpayenā kā tatra prāyāścittir | ājyayai 'tāni nirupya\(^{124}\) tena yajetā | 'thā "havaniya ājyā-"hutim juhuyat trātriṃ indram\(^{120}\) ity etaya

\(^{108}\) D ity athārvaśeveda vātānasūtre prāyāścittasūtra-prāsūnaye navamo 'dhūyaḥ | \(^{109}\) AV. 1. 4. 4. \(^{110}\) AV. 19. 16. 1. \(^{111}\) cf. Brahm. Prāy. 67a: yad agnaye ksāmavate 'stākapālam nirvapet yai 'vā 'sya ksāmāpiya tena tām eva 'sya bhāgadhyeyān āsmayaśāḥ; s. auch K. S. 25. 8. 18 ff. \(^{112}\) AV. 7. 63. 1. \(^{113}\) A homakale \(^{114}\) cf. Brahm. Prāy. 69a: yasyā jārāṃ vichidyeta 'ntaritān homān (? ) butvā 'gnaye tantumate 'stākapālam nirvapet \(^{115}\) RV. 5. 13. 4. \(^{116}\) cf. Ait. Brāhm. 7. 4. 1. \(^{117}\) B sāmnāyam CD sāmnāyam \(^{118}\) Nach Analogie des Folgenden müßten wir vor prātār- ergänzen: sāmydoham ced apahareṇāḥ; vgl. unten 4. 1; s. auch Ait. Brāhm. 7. 4. \(^{119}\) B sāmnāyam CD sāmnāyam • Nach Analogie des Folgenden müßten wir vor prātār- ergänzen: sāmydoham ced apahareṇāḥ; vgl. unten 4. 1; s. auch Ait. Brāhm. 7. 4. \(^{120}\) B sāmnāyam CD sāmnāyam • Nach Analogie des Folgenden müßten wir vor prātār- ergänzen: sāmydoham ced apahareṇāḥ; vgl. unten 4. 1; s. auch Ait. Brāhm. 7. 4. \(^{121}\) B sāmnāyam CD sāmnāyam • Nach Analogie des Folgenden müßten wir vor prātār- ergänzen: sāmydoham ced apahareṇāḥ; vgl. unten 4. 1; s. auch Ait. Brāhm. 7. 4. • Nach Analogie des Folgenden müßten wir vor prātār- ergänzen: sāmydoham ced apahareṇāḥ; vgl. unten 4. 1; s. auch Ait. Brāhm. 7. 4. B 'havaniyaḥ | ACD nirūpya B tīrūpya
res | 'tha cet sarvāṇy eva haviṃśi vyāpadyeran kā tatra 
prāyaścittir | ājayasyai 'tani nirupyaī tāya "jyahaviṣe-ṣṭyā 
yajeram | ity api hi kṛttita[ṃ] | madhya[ś] tv eva | bhavanti | 
tair yajeta | 'tha "havaniya ājayahutim juhuyāt trātāram indram | ity stayarca | 1 | atha 'to | drṣṭa- bhuvuddrāntu | tv | 127 
ācaksate | 'dya sāyam amāvāsyā | bhavisyati ti | na prātihār yā | ca | sa syād | atha sa yo 'yo bruyād adarsam ca 
dya purastād iti tām tu kim iti bruyād | atha va | sa syād 
evā 'dhas | tām eva prāyaścittām kṛtvā yajete | ti dvaiśyaanāḥ | 
krtyāṇa | vai prāyaścittir bhavati ti lāgali | samāpya | va | 123 
tenā haviṣa ya-daivaṭaṁ tad | dvai[ḥ] | syād | 122 | atha | nyad dvahir nirvaped agnaye dātre purodāsam indraya pra-
dātre purodāsam viśaye śipīviśuṣṭā purodāsam | athai 'tān | 
yathānirūpāṁ | 131 | tredhā kuryād yatā brahmāno-ktām | nityāḥ purastaddhomāḥ | samsthitahomeṣy | 128 | aṣṭi 
vasyam prāyaścittām kṛtya viṣum smṛtvā tena yajeta | yad va 
havishya vidagyāḥ haviṣi | ... sundhāke tamaṃ prayoge śūrdāṇādi havir utpadya sarva-prāya-
ścittīm kṛtyā viṣum smṛtvā tena yajeta | yad va dhvair yogadham 
jale prāṣṭā "jyahaviṣa-ṣaktarām sarvarāyaścittam viṣumaraṇam ca kuryāt | 
pākta pūrvam haviṃśa keśi-"dy-upaḥatā (cf. unter 2.6) prakṣa-
noma va śuddhiḥ | | yadā havir opakṛtya bhavati | ... vidagyāḥ haviṣi 
... sarvādāke taisām prayogā śūrdāṇādi havir utpadya sarva-prāya-
ścittām kṛtyā viṣum smṛtvā tena yajeta | yad va dhvair yogadham 
jale prāṣṭā "jyahaviṣa-ṣaktarām sarvarāyaścittam viṣumaraṇam ca kuryāt | 
pākta pūrvam haviṃśa keśi-"dy-upaḥatā (cf. unter 2.6) prakṣa-
noma va śuddhiḥ | | yadā havir opakṛtya bhavati | ... vidagyāḥ haviṣi 
... sarvādāke taisām prayogā śūrdāṇādi havir utpadya sarva-prāya-
ścittām kṛtyā viṣum smṛtvā tena yajeta | yad va dhvair yogadham 
jale prāṣṭā "jyahaviṣa-ṣaktarām sarvarāyaścittam viṣumaraṇam ca kuryāt | 
pākta pūrvam haviṃśa keśi-"dy-upaḥatā (cf. unter 2.6) prakṣa-
noma va śuddhiḥ | | yadā havir opakṛtya bhavati | ... vidagyāḥ haviṣi

śṣṭena prācārat | sēṣh-bhāve punar mantraman nirvā[ṇ]pādi kuryāt | ājayā-
hāga-ṣaktarām sarvāryaścittam viṣumaraṇam ca kuryāt | pākta pūrvam haviṃśa keśi-"dy-upaḥatā (cf. unter 2.6) prakṣa-
noma va śuddhiḥ | | yadā havir opakṛtya bhavati | ... vidagyāḥ haviṣi 
... sarvādāke taisām prayogā śūrdāṇādi havir utpadya sarva-prāya-
ścittām kṛtyā viṣum smṛtvā tena yajeta | yad va dhvair yogadham 
jale prāṣṭā "jyahaviṣa-ṣaktarām sarvarāyaścittam viṣumaraṇam ca kuryāt | 
pākta pūrvam haviṃśa keśi-"dy-upaḥatā (cf. unter 2.6) prakṣa-
noma va śuddhiḥ | | yadā havir opakṛtya bhavati | ... vidagyāḥ haviṣi .
amayata[h] 133 | trátráma indram 139 | uru viṣṇu viśramase 'tii 140 madhyanā opya 141 samsrāvabhaṅgāṃ samsthāpayet | pāṭhikṛti 142 'ty ācākṣate 142 paurṇāṃśya-amārāṣye 'ti cā 'tipanne 144 | 2 |
atha 'to 145 'bhyuj[d]drśānti 'ty ācaksate 'dya sāyaṁ amāvasyā bhaviṣyatā 'ti 146 na pratiharanāya 147 ca 148 sa śūyād ' atha sa yo nyo brūyād adarṣām cā dya paścād iti tam tu kim iti brūyād ' atha vā sa śūyād eva 'dhas ' tām eva prāyaścitām kṛtvā yajete 'ti dvai-pāyanaḥ ' kṛtasyā vāi prāyaścittār bhavati 'ti lāṅgālāl ' yena pathā vaivasvato 149 yamo rājā no yayau agnir nas tēna nayata 150 prajā[nā] vaivānaraḥ pathikrīd viśvagṛśīḥ ' samāpyaṇa va tēna haviṣa ya dāvataṃ tad dhāvā 151 śūyā 151 ' atha 'nyād dha- hari nīr-vapād ' agnaye pathikrīte 152 purodāsaṁ indrāya vrtraghun purodāsaṁ vaivānaraṁ 152 dvādaśakapālaṁ purodāsaṁ ' nityaḥ purastādādhomāḥ ' samsthitaḥomesu 154 tvam agne saprathā asī 155 ' yena pathā vaivasvataḥ 156 śāsa itthā mahān asī 157 ' vaivānaro na utāya 158 iti madhyata opya samrāvabhiṅgaḥ samsthāpayen ' mahāpāthikrītī 'ty ācaksata ' ubhayor api 159 pattayos 160 ' tad āhur na te vidura ye tathā kvramtyā ' athu na katham iti ' gāhapa-vyāyaṁ vilāyo 161 'tpāya caturgrhitam ājñātā 'havantiya-gāhapa-vyā śāntareṇa 'tivra-jya jhūhavyād ' asau ya udāyāt puro vāsāno nilaholito 'tha drṣṭām adṛṣṭām no duṣkrtaṁ tat 152 svāhē 'ty ' evam eva 'bhyuj[d]drṣte asau ya udāyāt paścād vāsāno nilaholito 'tya 163 'tha drṣṭām adṛṣṭām no duṣkrtaṁ karaṇā 164 svāhē 'ti ' sa ya 165 evam etena 166 tejasā 'jyena 167 yāsaṁ priṇati so ' syai 'sa 168 drṣṭāh prānān vāsā 169
dam idam viṣnur vicakrama ity reśā purayaḥ | pratipadaṁ maṇtrārvṛtyitā ity aḍhikam | tato gāhapa-vyād śāhaviṣaparyānyanti bhasma-lekham udak-dhāraṁ ca samānunyāt tantum tanvan ... avyā evyā jyotismatā iti maṇtram | pratyekom maṇtrārvṛtyiḥ | tata śāhaviṣyām anugamayītā 'gnihotra-madhaya (agnihotrac-istī-madhya) iṣṭivat punah pratiyād adg Pierce purovan ... vitanvaya (Āvā. 3.10.16) iti maṇtradvayeno pathiṣṭheta | tato 'gnihotram samāpya teṣv eva 'gusā pathiṣṭhīt kārya | 144 A cātipattre B natiṃpante C cātipante (kam hiśeṣen: atipate ośer atipatattau: korruppt); cf. in 2.3. 154-B tasyāto 155-D tay; cf. Kauś. Brāhm. 4.3. 147 C 'haranāda 148-B tva? nva? 149 Bei C ist dieser pada verderbt. 150 A naya C nayat 151-BCD haviṣyād 152 K. S. 25. 4. 22-26 bestimmt die Fülle, in denen den Agni pathikrī geopfert werden soll. 153 B vaivānaram C 'naraṇā 154. Hier wiederholt B einen Passus des Textes, nämlich 2.3: āgniṃ vāyaṁ trāṭāmāḥ haviṁahāte ' eva samsthāpayen (mahāpāthikṛtyā). 150 RV. 5. 13. 4. 150 Uermittelbar. 157 AV. 1. 20. 4. 158 AV 6. 35. 1. 159-B C itti statt api; L: āsti' 160: cf. oben 2. 9 letztes Wort. L: 'pannayaos. 151-ACD viliyo 162-ACD tat B ta statt karaṇā Sinn und Metrum wären herstellbar, wenn man lesen würde: duṣkrtaṁ adṛṣṭaṁ karaṇā 162 BC læsan tya aus. 163 C tat statt karaṇā 162 ya fehlt bei BC 159 B bāgīt tena eīn. 167 B tejasābdhureṇa 168 B līḍa 'ca aus; D liest statt soṣyāṣa: saṃyaṣa 169 B yah ca
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prinėti | 3 | atha yo 'hutra | 176 | navam praśnyād agnau vā "gama-
yet kā tatra praṣācitītī | so 'gnaye vratapataye | 171 | 'stākapālam
pūrōdaśam nīrvaṇa | nityāḥ pūrastādādhamāḥ | samštātahomēy
agnu praśānēhi prathāmas tvam hi vettha yatha hāviḥ | vanvant
havir yathā deverbhīy-yajamānaṃ ca vārddhāy āgni ca deva
savitā | tvam agne vratapāṣi | 172 | idavatsaraye 'ti 174 madhyata
opya samrāvabhihāgaḥ samsthāpayed | yady annagataṃ agnīṃ
śākamānāṃ mahathēyur mathite ānim adhīgacheṣyur bhadrād
ahī śreyaḥ prehi | 175 ti vyāhritbhīṣa ca mathitaṃ samrūpya
the 'tarasmin punas tvā prāṇa | 176 iti pāncabhir ājyā-'hurtī
tvā yatho 'ktam prākrtya vṛttrī | 177 | atha yasyā 'gūhotri
gharmādhūgaḥ dhūyamānaḥ vāsyet | 178 kā tatra praṣācitītā | 'asānam
pipase evai 'sa yajamānaya samprakhāya vāyat | 'ti 179
tām | 180 tvam | 181 apy | 182 adayat | 183 sāavyasād bhagavati | 183 'ty
etaya rcā | 'thā 'havaniya ājyā-'hurtī | 184 jhūyād dhāta dañhātu
naḥ pūrṇa darva | 185 iti dvābhāyaṁ rajāhyam | atha yasyā 'gū-
hotri | 186 gharmādhūgaḥ (vā 187) duhyamānaṃ paviṣet | 188 kā tatra
praṣācitītā | 189 bhavam vā 'sa yajamānaya prakhāya pa-

---

176 so rekonstruiert nach Ap. 9.12.10: yadi homaṃ 'pasaṃiddheṣvah āhut-
tesy agniya yajamānaṃ 'nityat... 177 K. Ś. 25. 4. 37 ff. bestimmt die
Opfer für Agni vratapati,

178 Vgl. sa hi veda yatha hāviḥ T. B. 2. 4. 8. 7. 179 AV. 19. 59. 1. 178 AV. 6. 55. 3. B idavatsaroyeti U pūr-

179 drāvaruṇyati 180 AV. 7. 8. 1. 178 Es könnte etwa an T. S. 1. 3. 14. 4.
gedacht sein. 177 C vṛttī D prāsyā vṛttī 181 ABUD vāsyet; cf.
hierzu Ap. 9. 5. 1; Ās. 3. 11. 4; Ās. Prāy. 3 b; Ait. Brāhm. 7. 3. Auch
Im folg. ist pipāse bei A u. C corr. 182 cf. Ait. Brāhm. 5. 2. 7. 6.
183 A tam 184 BCP nṛṇaṃ 182 A atha dādhyet D atha "dayat Āśv.
Prāy. 3 b: tvam bhākaṇyaṃ prakalpayaḥ 185 AV. 7. 73. 11; K. Ś. 25. 1. 19.'A.
hūtī 'hurtī; der im Anschluß hieran so lheraus häufig er-
wähnte Fall, daß die Opferkh lbhige Milch (Blut statt Milch) gibt, fehlt
unserei Texte. 180 cf. AV. 7. 17. 2; 3. 10. 7; s. auch Paipp. 1. 106. 8.
188 Brāhm. Prāy. 35 b kündigen an: athe 'dānti agnihotraprāṣācitānayā
abhāśāyante tad-arthaṃ idam ucyate... agnihotraṃ cet prāg adhīra-
'yata[s] iki... nisidet ucyate tatra yasām bhitē 'ty anena
mantragabhāmāntryā udasthā[ū] devity utthāpayo 'dapatram udhāi makhe
cū 'parghotyāt; cf. Ait. Brāhm. 7. 3. 187 vā fehlt bei BCD. 188 cf.
Āś. Prāy. 3 b, welches diesen Fall noch differenziert: atha yasyā 'gni-
hostrhāhanur satā(m)-sargaḥ arābhya dokama-paryantam upaviṣet | tāda
yasām bhitē... mulūṣe 'ty abhimāntrayāt | tatās tām utthāpayet
udasthūd... varṇayā ca | 'ty etad udbhājan yajamāno homakārī
tavyāt | atha asyā udhāi ca makhe cudapatram ugrahāya dugdhā bhā-
mānaṃ pāyaḥ | tasya brāhmaṃsaya vayājyam sativaṃsaṃ vā 'nām
na 'nityat | 189 cf. Āś. 8. 11. 1; Brāhm. Prāy. 40 b: yā agnihotrayo
'pāryat nisidet iti nisidanaṃgaṇṭiraḥ; cf. Ait. Brāhm. 7. 3.
Atavaprâyâscittâni 2. 5.

višati | tasyâ údhasy udâpatrôm ninayec 190 chaṃ no devir
abhîṣṭaya 191 iti dvâbhyaṃ | tâm anumantrayate yasmâd
bhûta niṣidasi 192 tato no abhayam kṛdhi pasūn naḥ sarvân
gopâya namo rudrâya muñhuṣa 193 ity | athai 'nam utthâpayata
uttiṣṭha devy adite devân yajâna bodhaya [indrâya kruva-
ti bhâgam mitrâya varunâya ce 'ty | utthitâm anumantrayate
udasthâd devy adite devân 194 yajâna bodhaya āyus ca tasya
bhūtîm ca yajamānâm 195 ca 196 vardhaye 'ty | atha "havanî
âjya"-hutir juhyân mā no vidan 196 ity etair abhayai rau-
draś ca | 4 | atha yasya vapam âhutim va grhitam âyeyâh
âkumîni śvâ vâ nyo, vâ "hared 197 vâto va vivamet 198 kâ tatra
prâyâscittir | divam prthivim 192 ity abhimantrâ yathā "hava-
nîya âjya"-hutir juhyâd vâta âvâtu bhësajam 200 iti sâktena|
tha yasya somagrahio grhito 'tisrâvet kâ tatra prâyâscittir |
drâspa cäkânde 201 ty abhimantrâ yathā "havanîya âjya-
"hutir juhyân manase cetase dhyâ 202 iti sâktena | 'tha yasyâ
'stâpadi vâsa syât kâ tatra prâyâscittir 203 | darbhena hiranyam
badhvâ 'dhy-adhi garbham hiranyagarbhaṇe juhyâd | yathâ
'mum sâ garbham abhyaçotayad yathâ mum garbham sadar-
bhâm 204 iva sahiranyam tam uddhrtya praksâla 205 'mupadam
'srâpaytvâ prâkâsirasam udâkapâyam karâsâktena 206 iva
juhyâd amangânâdhi 207 ti ve 'ty 209 aśthabhir nabhasvatibhir
hiranyagarbhaṇe vâ | 'tha yasyâ 'samâpte karmanâ tâ-
ntriko 'gnir upâsâmyet kâ tatra prâyâscittir | yam tvam agne 210
punâm tvâ "ditya rudrâ vasava 211 ity anyam 212 prânîya pra-

190 cf. Âśv. 3. 11. 5. 191 AV. 1. 6. 1. 192 AB. 5. 27. 2; 7. 3. 2; hierher
gehören auch die folgenden Zitate dieses Abschnitts; vgl. die analogen
Partien Ap. 8. 17. 6 f.; 193 M. Ś. 3. 2. 1, fortgesetzt durch Āśv. 3. 11. 1;
Ait. Brahm. 7. 3. 194 A 'vânam 195 D 'maṇâya 196 AV. 1. 19. 1.
197 Der gleiche Fall wird in dem korrupten Pāṇini Brahm. Prây. 77 b
behandelt; vgl. unten 3, 10; s. a. Manu 7. 21. Kâthya genügten von einem
Opferkuchen. 198 A vivamet (?) B viramu CD viramet 199 AV.
202 AV. 6. 41. 1. 203 Brahm. Prây. 78 byâda 'stâpadi syât 'stâpadyâ garbham kâle
âśvâ madâ prâtipya śâmâtre nîkhyânet | Kôm.: 'yâdâ prâbhâyâ
abhîyate kâla[ḥ]-parinâsâ✈ējânâc ca 'stâpadi syât ... śâmâtre nîkhyâpot
tasya adhastâd ayaspâram upâkrâya 'srâpayed ity arithâ ... mā bhûd iti
hiranyam 'stâpadam dâkṣâyâ tamsûnu eva kâle 'samâpte ca mahâ dyaut iti
paśûrayâne garbham upâsati 204 BCD saṃdarbham 205 B prâjñâlaya
206 AV 19. 52. 207 Wahrscheinlich Paipp. Citat. 208 A 'gandhitvety
B 'gandhitveto D 'gandhitveto 209 gemeint: AV 4. 15 ?? 210 ge-
meint ist wahrscheinlich AV. 18. 3. 6 (yam tvam agne). 211 AV. 12. 2. 6;
jvalya 218 mamā 'gne varca 218 iti sukteno pasamādhāya karma-
śesam 215 samāpnyur 215 atha yasyā 'samāpte karmani barhir
ādīpyeta 216 tatra tan 217 nirvāpya jhuyād yad agnir barhir
adahad vedyā 218 vāso apom 219 bhata tvam eva no jātavedo
217 durītā pāhi tasmāt 221 nirdagdha no amitrā 222 yathe 'dam
barhis tatha | amitrānām śriyam bhūtīm tām esām parinirjahi |
yāt-kāmās 223 te 225 jhumas tan no astu viśāmpate 224 | ye deva
yajñam āyanti te no rakṣantu sarvataḥ | avadagdham duśva-
pyayam avadagdha arātayaḥ sarvasa ca yātudhānyah | mā tvā
dabhyan yātudhānāḥ | mā bradhāḥ śarmabhīḥ 225 śtuhi 226 |
darbhā rājā samudriyāḥ | pari naḥ pātu viśvataḥ | atha 'nyad
barhir upakālpyo 'dakena saṃprokṣya punah śṛṇāti | 'dam bar-
hir amṛtene 'ha siktam hiṃsāmayam haritam tat śṛṇām
naḥ 227 | tad 228 vai purūnam abhinavam strusva vāsah praśa-
stam prati me grhāne 'ty 229 | atha yasya pītraye 230 pranito 'gnir
upāśāmyet kā tatra prāyaścitār | bhasmā "labhyā "bhimantrā-
yed 231 dviṣantam agne dviṣatam ca vittam | prajām 232 dviṣad-
bhaya nāya dāksīnena | pītraye pranīta upāśāmyamānaḥ pām-
mānam agne tam ito nūdasya | dviṣantam agne dviṣatam ca vittam
233 gačchā tvam ādāya parāvato 'nyān 233 | pītraye pranīta
upāśāmyamāna ita prajāṁ dīrgam āyus ca dhehi | yas 234 tvam
agne prammātanām pranīta upāśāmyasi 235 | sukhalam agne
ta[1] tvaya punas tvo 'ddīpayāmāst 'ty ucyāmānē 236 'gnim 237
pranītya prājāvāyē 238 ndrasya kuksi śaś ti 239 dvābhyaṁ sa-
midhāv abhyyādhyāt | 5 | atha yasya yūpo virohed 240 asam-
āpte karmani tatra jhuyāt yūpo virohāḥ 241 chataśkako
adhvarāḥ 242 samāvṛto mohāyāsan yajāmānasya loke | vedā-

212 C prakṣālya 214 AV. 5. 3. 1. 213 A karmaśeṣam karma sāpnyur
215 cf. AP. 37. 5. 1. 217 A tam; bei BCD fehlt tam. 218 A vedyām
219 AB apoś. Auch alle für die Textgeschichte in Frage kommenden
Mas. der AP., denen dieses Zitat entnommen ist (37. 5. 2) lesen pom resp.
apoś.; D apoṇaṇata 220 B 'da 221 Parallel AV. 1. 25. 1. 222 AP
50. 7. 3; 'mitrau tu 223 AB vīmāte 224 AV. 7. 79. 4. 225 BC
carmabhī 225-226 AP. 37. 5. 6 śāpyum icochata 227 AD śṛṇāṁtaḥ B
stātytam naḥ C tātṛtām naḥ; AP. 37. 5. 8 stāt tāt śṛṇām naḥ: te śṛṇām
232 BC yad 228 D fūgt hinter 'ty ein; athava 'nyad barhīo prachādaye
'ty 229 B pitrya 230 D 'yeta 231 B līśo; diese und die inzwischen-
liegenden Worte aus. 232 B 'nyāt 233 ABCD yāṁ 235 A upāśāmyati
B upāśābhīyeta CD upāśāmyati 236 BC ucyatiṇā. A ucyāmānē
237 B te 'gūm. 238 C prakṣālya 239 AV. 7. 111. 1. 240 D varohed;
bhigupto brahmapāt 243 parivrto 'tharavbhīḥ sāntah sukṛtām etu lokam [ yūpo hy aruksad dvīṣatām vadāhāya na me yañjō yajamānaḥ ca riyūt | saptarṣīṇām sukṛtām yatra lokas tatre 'māṃ yañjām yajamānam ca dhehi | yo vanaspattām upataṇpo babhūva 244 yad va grhān ghoram uta 'jagāma taṃ nirja-gāmo havīṣa gṛṣtena śam no astu dvipade śam catuspade | yo vanaspattām upatāpo na āgād yad va yañjām no 'dhhutam ājagāma | sarvaṃ tad agne hutam astu bhūga-saḥ śivān vayaṃ uttaremā 'bhi vājān 244 | tvāstre svāhe 'ti huttīa | tvāstā me daivyam vāca 245 iti tvāstāṃ vaśvārūpam 247 alabheta | 'tha yasyā 'samāpte karmanī yūpaḥ prapadet 248 tvatra jhunjhayat 249 | ya indrena śṛṣto yadi va marudbhira yūpaḥ papāta 250 dvīṣatām vadāhāya | taṃ nirjagāmo 251 havīṣa gṛṣtena śam no astu dvipade śam catuspade | tvāstre svāhe 'ti huttā tvāstā me daivyam vāca 252 iti tvāstāṃ sarvārūpam alabheta | 'tha yasyā 'samāpte karmanī yūpe dvāṅko 253 nipadet tvatra jhunjhayat a pavasa hiranyavad 254 aśravat soma viravat | vājān 255 gomantā 256 āharā 256 svāhe ti madhyata opaśaṃśrāva- bhūgaḥ samstāhpayod 256 | yadi 258 duṣṭam 258 havīḥ syat ki- távapannāṇaṃ 257 va 257 tat 258 tasmin bhāsmya upavaped apsu

ve ty eke | bhuvāya svāhā | bhuvanāya svāhā | bhuvanapateye svāhā | bhuvāmpateye svāhā | viṣṇuve svāhe ty | ete ha vai devānām rtvijas | ta eva 'syā tad dhutam | istam kurvanti | yat prayājesv ahutesu prag aṅgarah | skanded adhvaryave ca | yajamanāya ca | paśubhyas ca 'gham | syad yadi daskinā | brahmane ca yajamanāya ca | yadi prayág | dhotre | ca patuyai | ca | yady ndag agnāthe | ca | yajamanāya ca paśubhyas ca 'gham | sāst ca | anupraharesv | sahasrasrāga | ity etaya rci | 6 | atha yasya 'gnayo mi-
thah samṛṣyeraṇaḥ 277 kā tatra prāyaścitteḥ 278 | so 'gnaye vī-
taye 279 stākappālam puroḍāsāṁ (prāṁ) nirvapen 276 | nityāḥ
purastāddhāmāḥ | samṣṭhitaḥomesv agna ayāhī vitaye 277 grūṇāno
havyadātaye ni hoto satsi barhiṣṭi 'ti madhyata opya samṛṣa-
vabhāgaiḥ samsthāpayaḥ | atha yasyā 'gnayo grāmyena 275
'gninā samṛṣyeraṇaḥ kā tatra prāyaścittīḥ | so 'gnaye vīvicaye 279
stākappālam puroḍāsāṁ nirvapen | nityāḥ purastāddhāmāḥ | sam-
sthitaḥomesv agnīm ile purohitam 278 vivicem ratnadhā-
tamam pra na ayūṃṣi tāṁṣad | iti madhyata opya sam-
ṛavabhāgaiḥ samsthāpayaḥ | atha yasyā 'gnayah śāvēṃ 'gninā
samṛṣyeraṇaḥ kā tatra prāyaścittīḥ | so 'gnaye sūcaye 271
stākappālam puroḍāsāṁ nirvapen | nityāḥ purastāddhāmāḥ | sam-
sthitaḥomesv | agniḥ śucivratatamah 282 sūci vīpṛaḥ śucī
cāvīḥ | sūci rocata āhutaiḥ | ud agne sūcayas tava 283 sukra
bhṛājamaṇa iraṁ | tava jyottīṃs arcayaḥ svāhe | 'ti madhyata
opya samṛavabhāgaiḥ samsthāpayaḥ | atha yasyā 'gnayo dā-
vēna 'gninā samṛṣyeraṇaḥ 284 kā tatra prāyaścitteḥ 285 | annā-

277 Überhaupt gilt der Zusammenfall von Opfersubstanzen als ver-
hängnisvoll; s. Aśv. Prāy. 16a: carv-ādānāṃ samṛavā durgādi-gunaḥ
prāyaścittam | 278 Vgl. zu diesem Abschnitt die verkürzte Wieder-
gabe in 5, 4. 279 B titaye; cf. Ait. Brāhmaṇ. 7, 6: yasyā pūrkapatyā-
'havanīyaḥ mithaḥ samṛṣyeyātām | so 'gnaye vītaye 'ṣṭākappāla
puroḍāsāṃ nirvapet. 280 Über die dem Agni bei den einzelnen
Lauterungsceremonien zukommenden Attribute spricht Agn. Prāy. 14 b:
agnir gurūdhēsau vratapatyādikō gunāḥ | api v prāyaścitte -ṣṭūnāp
sthāne tasyai tasyai devataye pūrṇāhitau jahuyāī iti viṣṇāyate | dvādaśa-
grithena srucaḥ pūravyāva 'gnaye vīratapaye svabhā ti hiyāte sa
pūrṇāhitau dvādaśa-grithena 'ṣṭāgṛithena caturgrithena sruva-pūrṇena
ve 'ti caitvānāḥ pakpo (l) bodhīyanāl) prāyaścitteśṭīḥ saha vikalpyate | 277 RV.
6, 16, 10; Aśv. 3, 13, 7; Ait. Brāhmaṇ. 7, 6. 281 ABC grāmyena; 279 A vivivaye B vivivaya; cf. Aśv. 3, 13, 5; aber Ait. Brāhmaṇ. 7, 6: yasyā
sarva eva 'gnayo mithah samṛṣyeraṇa... agnaye ceciveye... und ibid.: yasyā 'gnayo nyair agniḥhiḥ (Comm.: āhavantyādy-agnaye 'nyadiyair
āhavantyādiḥbhīr lookikāagatibhir vā samṛṣyeraṇo 'so 'gnaye kiṃcavate...; vgl. Ait. Brāhmaṇ. 7, 7: yasyā 'gnayo grāmyena 'gninā samadhayeran so 'gnaye
samavrāgaya... | cf. Aśv. Prāy. 8a: grāmyenā 'ranyena vā samarpate
samāropya mahītva 'gnaye samavrāgaya pūrṇāhitāḥ | 280 RV. 1.1.1.
281 Aśv. 3, 13, 4, dessen Komm. sich hier als vortrefflich unterrichtet
283 RV. 8, 44, 17. 284 Die Profanation der heiligen Fener durch
Wasser usw. verlangt Sūhne (Aśv. Prāy. 16b): jalādīnā 'guy-opaghāte
punas tvā 'dityā rudra vasavā samindhataḥ punar brāhmaṇyo vasanātha
rudraft (l) | ghṛṭena tvam tano vardhayasya satyāḥ santu vyājana-nyaya
kāmāḥ (TS 4. 2, 3, 4 folg. mit Variation) svabā ity etaya samidham
dyam 286 vė šių yajamūnios samvjrjvyvta 287 upa to 257 ranyad grānam adh 288 abhyupaiti | so 'gnaye 'nnadaya 'napataye 'štakapalām purodašam nirvapen | nitāḥ purastāddhomāḥ | samsthithahomesv | apascād aghānānīsa bhūyasam 289 | iti madhyata oppa samsrāvabhāgaiḥ samsthāpayed | atha yasyā 'gnayo divyena 'gninā samṣrjyeran kā tatra prāyaścittih | so 'gnaye jyotismate 290 'štakapalām purodāsam nirvapen | nitāḥ purastāddhomāḥ | samsthithahomesu | vidyotate dyotate | vidyuto 'gnir jhīva 291 | iṣyaṭa bhrājanti dyotata 292 | a ca dyota- 

ā | iti madhyata oppa samsrāvabhāgaiḥ samsthāpayed | atha yasyā 'gnayo 'bhiplaveran kā tatra prāyaścittih | so 'gnaye 'p스mate 294 'štakapalām purodāsam nirvapen | nitāḥ purastāddhomāḥ | samsthithahomesv apāṃ agnis tanūḥbhīr 293 | iti madhyata oppa samsrāvabhāgaiḥ samsthāpayed | atha yady anugatam 296 abhyuddharet kā tatra prāyaścittih | so


284 A strāgham B annūdy (7) C annūda 287 A samjyavrjyvano B sanjyavrjvato C samvjrjvyvta upato; D samvjrjvyvta upato 290 feilt bei A. 288 AV. 19. 55. 5. 289 cf. Āś. 3. 13. 8; Ait. Brāhm. 7. 7 schreibt für den gleichen Fall die gleiche Spende für agni apamsatin vor. 284 D liest hinter jhīva: vidyotate dyotate dyotata iti madhyala 290 Bei B dittographiert. 292 Vait. 14. 1 A śvadyotata BC śvadyotaca? 293 cf. Āś. 3. 13. 8; KŚ. 25. 4. 33 schreibt das gleiche Opfer — offenbar ursprünglicher — für den Fall vor, daß sich humilische und irdische Feuer mit einander vermengen; ebenso Āś. Prāy. 8 a: vaidyutī-'gni
dsarṣeṣe samāropāṇādi agnaye 'pumsate pūrṇahutiḥ || 288 AV. 4. 15. 10. 290 Hier scheint von dem Eröschen irgendeines Ope
erfasers die Rede zu sein. Brahā. Prāy. 62 a (s.-folg. Anm.) beziehen sich jedoch auf das Āhavaniya-Feuer, dessen unser Text in diesem Zusammenhäng nicht gedenkt. Vgl. aber Agn. Prāy. 12 a: anvāhiteṣv agniṣu vadyāhāvaniyaḥ nukačhe tādā anvāhitaḥ āhavaniyām anugatam utpādyāyaḥ mi 'ti samkalpya | sav agnir uṣasām ālatune 'ti (AV. 7. 82. 4) gāhapa
tyād prāṇyaṁto bhūr iti manaso 'pādhānaṃ kuryat | tatajāyāpānaṃ sruvena juhoti | yo agnir devavitāte ..., myādaya (RV. 1. 12. 9) svāhā | agnaye pāvākaye 'daṃ tato | juhva juhoti | iti āpi visūpush | pāyitva (RV. 1. 22. 17) svāhā | viśvāja idam | tata[ḥ] sarvam-prāyaścittan | iti āpi visūpush RV. 1. 22. 17) japed ity eko | tato manasa yajamāna japatī | āgne vratapate | vratam cāriyāmi vāya vratapate adhiya vratapate vratāni vratapate (āp. 4. 3. 2) | vratapate prayottaram agni-prajugamāne vratopāyanta
dhopa nā 'vyāhhā | ibid. 12 b: prajute 'nagate prāg ghomād īṣṭa āgni jyotimān varumā | āgniḥotra-ṛtham pranita āhavaniyāḥomāt prāg anugate aśyam āgniḥotra-ḥṛṣam pranitām āhavaniyām anugatam utpādi
yāṣe 'ti samkalpya | pratār āgniḥotra-ṛtham iti pataḥ | udharaṇa-
gnu ye 'gnimate 'štākapālam puroḏāsām nirvapen 227 | nityāḥ purastaddhomāḥ | samsthitahomeṣu | śivau 228 bhavatam 229 adya 300 no 301 | 'gnuā 'gniḥ samsṛjyate 202 | kavir grhapatir yuvā havyavad juhvasyaḥ 203 | tvam hy agne 304 | agnuā vipro 205 viprema san sata sakhā sakhyā samidhyase | sa no rāsav suviryam 306 iti madhyata oppa tyha samsravbhāgani samsthāpayet 7 | atha 207 ya 207 ahitāgnis 207 tantrø 207 pravāṣe mṛtaḥ syāt 308 katham tatra kuryāt | katham asya 'gniḥotram juhuyur 209 | anyavatsāya 310 goḥ payase | 'ty āhur 311 adugāhāya 311 vā śūradugdhāya vā 311 | sarvaṃ 312 vā etat payo Yad 313 anyavatsāya goḥ śūradugdhāya vā sarvaṃ 314 vē etad agniḥotram yan mṛtaśya 'gniḥotram 315 | tēvā maṇtrena 'uddhṛtya hiranyam puraskṛtya rajatam puraskṛtye 'ti prastāḥ | [sāyam] hiranyam agrato kṛtvā 'havanīyasya pascaḥ (dhiranyam) nidhāya | prabha rajatam agrato kṛtvā 'havanīyasya purastan nidhāya 'ti viseṣāḥ | tato prāṇayama maṇtrena nidhāya 'gniḥ pratirhāpayet | tato 'gnu ye jyotisquante svāhā | agnu ye jyotisamata idam | varṇavya svāhā | agnu ye jyotisamata idam | varṇavya svāhā | varṇavya 'dam [Ap. 9, 9, 14; corr.] | iti pūrṇahutiṃ huvā tāsim eva 'gnu homa-samāyāḥ | Beim Erlöschen des Ahavaniya-Feuers soll ebenso wie bei dem des Dakṣināgni (cf. unten 6.1) verfahren werden; jedoch ist ibid. folgende Differenz vorgeschrieben: Ahavaniyaayo 'tara-paṣcima-desa prahvas tiṣṭhan dhātaḥ dhruṣām (RV. 10. 128. 7) ity ādīnā tri[n]ātā bhūtya ādādhātī 'ti viseṣaḥ | udhayor nāī dakṣināgnim prāṇīyā 'havanīyam api prāṇīya pūrvavad Ahavaniya-prāyaścitādi kṛtvā pascaḥ pūrvavad daksināgni-prāyaścitādi kuryāṃ]

227 Brah. Prāya. 62a: ahavaniyaṣugane 'pi praṇīya huvā śo bhute gnyoe 'gnimate 'štākapālam nirvapet | cf. ibid. Bl. 56a folg.: yasyā 'gni[ā]v agrnī abhyuddharyyur (vgl. Ait. Brāhm. 7. 6) bhavatam naḥ samanāsāv (Kau. 108. 2) ity abhimaṣtryā 'gnu ye 'gnimate 'štākapālam nirvapet | yasyā yaṃmanāsāv dairān mānaṇīt vā pramāṇād agrnī udhṛte prāṇe vidyāmāna eva punar abhyuddharyyam tatra bhukhyena rddhayam uddharyyur ... bhava'nātān naḥ samanāsāv iti ...

agnim 316 parişayur yāvad 317 asthnam 317 āharanām 318 āhṛtya 'gūniḥśā 319 sansprṣya tam pītrimedhena 320 samāpnyuyr aṭha yaḥ 321 samāropitā 'sāmāropitā mṛtaḥ syat kutham tatra kuryāt | so 'gnaye tantumate pathikṛte vratabhṛte 322 purodā- śam nirvaped ekakapālam saptakapālam navakapālam | nityāḥ purastādhdhamāḥ | samsthitahomesu | tvam agne saprathā asī 322 yena patha vaivarsvathā 322 tvam agne vratapā asī 322 | 'ti madhyata opya (aṭha) samrāvabhūgāḥ samsthāpayed | aṭha naśte arany syatām 322 anyayor aranyor vihṛtya tam 322 mithvāi 'tābhir eva hūtvā 'thai 'nam samāpnyuyḥ 322] 8 | aṭha yasyo

spruomi svāhā | prthivyās te sariram spruomi svāhā | 'ntari-
kṣāt235 ta ākāšam spruomi svāhā | mānuṣat236 ta ākāśad di-
vam237 ākāšam spruomi svāhe | 'ndrāt ṭe235 balam spruomi svāhā | somāte te rājña238 kirtim239 yasaś ca spruomi svāhe | 'ti ca huvā 'thai 'nam punah pradiśati vāyave tve240 'ty | atha yasyo 'paktaḥ paśur miyeta kā tatra prāyaścittiḥ | sprtibhir ēva huvā 'thai 'nam anūdiṣati rtave tve241 'ty | atha yasya 'pākṛtaḥ paśuḥ samsīryeta kā tatra prāyaścittiḥ | sprtibhir ēva242 huvā 'thai242 'nam anūdiṣati | rakṣobhyas tve 'ti | nā 'nudeśanan ity āhur | yo va eṣa prapatito bhavati tad yad enam adhigachehyur243 atha tena yajetā | 'tha 'yāy244 etan śīrma-mṛttaḥ bhavatas244 tayoḥ prajñātāny avadā-
nāṇy svadāye 'taraṣya vā paśoḥ samprāṣaṁ kṛtvā brāhmaṇaṁ paricaryeyur apo vā bhgyupahareyuh sprtibhir245 'yadi vā 'nyah sya[c]246 chāmitram246 enam prāpayeyus247 | sprtibhir ēva huvā sāmitram ēvaī nam prāpayeyur | atha urdhvam pra-
siddhaḥ paśubandho | 'tha ya upatāpinam yājaya248 kā tatra prāyaścittiḥ | sprtibhir ēva huvā 'gado haiva249 bhavaty | atha ved bāhava upatāpinah syuḥ kā tatra prāyaścittiḥ | sprtibhir ēva huvā 'gado hau va bhavaty | atha yo 'dhiśrite 'gnihotre yajamāno miyeta katham tatra kuryaḥ | tattāi vai 'tat paryā-
dadhyaḥ yathā sarvasah samdhyete250 'ty | athā 'havaniya niyāhutim jhuyayaḥ | yajña eti vitataḥ kalpamāna251 | 'ty etaya

235 A liest statt dieser und der inzwischenliegenden Worte nur: 'ntarikā śaṃsparṇomi svāhā tte; BC lesen statt 'ndrāt te: 'ndriddāki
D: 'ndrādi
236 BC mānuṣat
237 C dīvām;
D dīvam
238 A rāja BCD rajā
239 ACD kirtim B kirtī
t
V. S. 7, 7
240 A rām vetyety BCD rtave tvety
atha
241 Bei A verderbt.
242 D adhīvyāghacyeyur BC
adhīvyāgacyeyur; ṭaṇ offenhbar nur dittographisch aus dhi entwickelt.
243 Statt dieser und der inzwischenliegenden Worte liest A yaceto saṃ
śīrmaṃtṛa bhavata BC yacē [C vai] tausmaṃ śīrma [C rōma] mṛtaḥ bhava-
vasaḥ; D ya vaiśāgau śīrmaṃtṛa bhavata
244 A caṣṭhitrī C sprtibhi
245 BCD 'gyām amātrim
247 Das folgendes, im Text Aus-
gelasene ist ganz verderbt: A tad aha śaṃ vam samdhriyaḥ ca harati-
atha nu katham iti tat pāṇcāsya-pāṇya vaḥanti B tadāḥ śaṃ vam samdhī
yāṃ ca harati 'ty atha nu kam iti tat pāṇcīsa-pāṇya ca vaharanti C tadā
śaṃ vam samdhriyaḥ ca haratīty atha nu katham iti tat pāṇcāsya-pāṇya vaharanti; D tad aha śaṃ ci sadhriyaḥ ca haratīty atha nu katham iti
tat pāṇcīsa-pāṇya ca vaharantī; 1. etwā: tad aha śaṃcyu sadhriyaṇ ca
harati 'ty | atha nu katham iti pāṇīsa-pāṇya (? ) vahantī
249 A yajyayet
250 haiva fehlt bei ABC.
251 cf. Ait. Brāhma. 7. 2.
252 AV 18.4.13.
atha ya aupavasathey
dhani yajamano mriyeta katham
tatra kuryat | tatrai vai | tat pradadyad yathah sarvasah
samdhaye | ty | athah "havantya aiyahutim juhuyad | yajna
eti vitatah kalpamana | ity etayarca | athah "tha ya samasana
dhushu yajamano mriyeta katham
tatra kuryat | tatrai "vat | tatra 354 paryadadyad yathah sarvasah samdhaye
eram ity | athah "havantya aiyahutim juhuyad | ape "man
diva arudhman grhebhya | ity etayarca | atha yo dikshito mriyeta katham enam daheus | tair eva gnibhir ity ahur
havyavahana ca | te me 356 bhavanati tat kavyavahana ity | atha
nu katham iti | sakrtpinda | tisra ukhah | paryayita tab
pradadyuyus | ta dhunyuus | susamtapa ye | gnayo 358
jayerams taah samapnuyuh | bahir 359 | evam | (bhavanati)
te no vai te | tasya 358 tad eva brhmaamam yah adaha 360-purah 361
savane 361 purmedha 362 aise 363 vyakhyaatas | taah yadi pu
rastat tiisthamant upavadat tam bruyad vasunam tva devan
vyaatte | pahahami | gayatrih parsam 364 adahshira
vapadyasva ti | tam yadi daksinatas tiisthamant upavadat tam
bruyad rudrankam tva devanam vyatta 365 pahahami || traistuh
parsam 366 adahshira vapadyasva ti | tam yadi pahasat
tiisthamant upavadat tam bruyad adityanam tva devanam
vyatta | pahahami | jagatim parsam 368 adaha 369 sira vapodyasva
ti | tam yadi uttaratas tiisthamant upavadat tam bruyad 369
visvesam tva devanam vyatta | pahahami || anushtubhah parsam
adahshira vapodyasva ti | tam yady antardevbhya va tiista

354 A aupavasathey, verändert in au*; BC pavasathey D aupavasathey; cf.
Ait.Brahm.7.2. 355 A yah samasattre | B masamasam nehu; C sami
sattre dhushu mamamannu; unsere Leisung nach Ait.Brahm.7.2. 356 A tat
Ait.18.2.27. 357 D no
358 Die Mss. scheinen uba ah zu lesen.
359 A tahusamsatpayed agnyey BD tammasamspaye guayo C tamam
samtanam samtapaye guayo 360 Blohse Wiedergabe einer kaum ver
ständlichen und jedenfalls sehr korrupten Stelle nach Ms. A. B bahus
eva bhavanu no vai te tasya C bahir va eva bhavanati tenodaite tasya
D teno ete yad adobarhi |
361 AB paurasvane 362 A purmedha 363 A asayo
364 D adiso cf. Gop. Br. 1. 5. 22. 365 D parisam
366 In den
Ms. vyaatte | vydattte; so D an dieser Stelle und bei allen ihren
Wiederholungen. 367 B traistubham C bah 368 BC parisamadhah
369 B parisamadhah C parisamadhah 370-374 A liist diese und die in
zwischenliegenden Worte aus.
ntam upavadet tam bruyāt 370 ............ | tasmai namas kuryāt | sa cet prati namas kuryāt kušalenai vai "nam"371 yojāyet 372 | sa 372 cen 372 na 372 prati namas kuryāt tenā 'bhicaret | savyam 374 agranthinā prasavyam agnibhiḥ pariyaḍ 375 | vatsaro 'si 375 parivatsaro 'si samvatsaro 'si 377 'ti | tam 377 yaḍi 377 jighāsman 377 yayoḥ 377 varvam ā iti sūktena bhadhakīḥ 378 samidho 'bhūyādhyāt | trtāyāham na 'tijivat 379 | atha yo hota 'ṛdhhāhuta uccvīṣṭaḥ 380 śyrāḥ 380 sāhāva tenā "camyā 'gnir mā pātu vasu-bhiḥ purastad 381 ity etām japtvā yathā-ṛtham kuryād ya-thārthama kuryāt | 9 | iti yajnāprāyāscitte duvītyo 'dhūyāh sa-māyāḥ 382 ||

atha 'to somarūpaṇī vyākhyāśyāmāḥ | prajāpatī marañi | sāivasvato vāci 383 viśrṣṭāyām 383 | vidhānam 384 dukṣāyām | brahma-vratā savīṭā 385 samdhīyāmānā 386 | ndho 'chetō 388 divyāh 387 | suparpāḥ parinikāto | 'ditiḥ prāyāntī 388 | paśūṣṭhā nyupūto 389 | yajñī 390 hūyāmānā 391 | bhadro vičīryanāmā 392 | chandaṇśi miyāmānā 393 | bhagāḥ paṇyāmānā | 'suraḥ kritō | varuṇo 'pasamaddhāḥ | pūṣāḥ somakrayāne 394 | śīpi-viṣṭo "ravv 395 āśādyāmānā 395 | brhaspatīr uṭṭhito | 'vāyū 398 abhihiryāmānā 397 | 'dhipatiḥ prabhāyāmānā | 'gnsomiyāḥ paśāv 398 | atithi 399 (rudro | varunah 400 | sadātithye | varunah | satvāḥ | āśādyāmānā 401 | aindrāṅgo 402 | āgnāu 403

mathyamāna | aindrāgno 'gnau praṇītamāne saṁa tāṁnaprīto | tapo 'vāntarādikṣāyam | prthivy upasady antarikṣam upasadi | dyaur upasadi yājñasya pramā bhimo 'nmā proṭima vedyām kriyamāṇāyam | āśa vātary uparaveṣu | bhrātrvyāḥ dhīṣyeyuṣ | pāṣa vārbaraḥiṣṭi | vedyām stīryamāṇāyam | apsu visarjane praṣāpati hriyāno | 'gnir āgniḥriye vaisnava āśāna | karmāṇi | hasto viśṛṣṭo vaisnava yūpa | oṣadhaya āśa rāṣṭā gamā | medha āpriṣu | haviḥ paryagnikṛtaḥ | pītdevaṃ pāṣau samjñāpyamāne | yājñasya mithunam pannajante | rākṣa saḥ bhāgadheyam vapaṃ | udṛghyamāṇāyam | yājñasya satmitār vasati ṣamitaḥ abhiḥriyamāṇāś | indraṛg yo dorukhikāya | uttaramāṇāy | uttarāyam uttaravedi | śrnyam avāsdayati | mitrāyarvanor dhenuḥ | uttarāyam uttaravedi | śrnyam avāsdayati | viśvesam devānām āgniḥriye | chaṃḍāmsy upavaṇathe | havir upāvahṛtaḥ | sārasvataḥ prātaṃraṃ va | tharvaḥ bhyuptah | prajāpatit vibhājayāme | devata vibhakte | 'ndro vrtraḥ 'ndro | bhimātihendro | indro vrtratur | 'nuniyāmāna | 'yur upāṃsya | antaryāmayor | yamo 'bhūhiḥāḥ | āśa nihūyaparādāhāvaniye | sūpūtah pūtabhṛti susukra | 'ntim | 'ntim | 'ahāriḥ
"rkta 466 om 466 bhūr janad 467 iti gārhapatyē jyuhyād | yadi yajuṣṭa 468 om bhuvo 469 janad 470 iti daksināṅguṇa jyuhyād | yadi sāmata 471 om svar janad 472 ity āhavyante jyuhyād | yady atharvata 472 om bhūr bhuvah svar janad om ity āha-
vani̯a eva jyuhyād | atha daivatānī | āgneyaḥ hauṭraṃ | vāyavyam adhvaryam | sauryam adgūṭras | cāndrasamasm brahmātmav | tasya va ṣa'gniḥ hota 'śīl | vāyur adhvaryaḥ | sūrya udgāta | caṅḍramā brahmā 473 | prthivī va rāmā 474 āya-
tanam | agnir yotir antarikṣam (vai) 475 yauṣām āyatanaṃ 476 | vāyur yotir dyuṭa 477 (vai) 475 sāmrāṃ āyatanaṃ | āditya yotir āpo 'harvanām āyatanaṃ 475 caṅḍramā yotir iti ca 4 ca 4 | atha yad avoccāma 478 "pattan 479 somam 480 ce 'ti 481 yajamānaṃ ced 482 rájanaṃ 483 stena 484 ha va prathamas 484 ca 'hareyns cittiyaśāpatyār 485 va bhaved 486 ity āha 'śmaratho | ne | ty āhatubh kṛṇa-gopāyanāna | yadai 'va karmā 'bhyā 487 adhvarya 487 vihitā 488 tadai 'va sarvakratum praty āpado vīhitā ity āhur ācaryā atha katham atra 489 yajamānakarmāṇī syur | upacārābhaksapratiṣṭhā 486 ce 486 'ty adhvarya aṣya yajamānā 491 | karmāṇi kuryād 492 | atra 492 yajamāṇa-'sane mārjalye | va camasaḥ nidhiya tatrā 'hya bhākṣakāle bhākṣāy upasthaṇapayeyur a samiṣṭa-yauṣo homāt | prāk samiṣṭa-yaujā 494

467 fehlt in ABCD. 468 A yauṣṭhaṃ C yauṣṭhaṃ 468 A bhūva
58: tatra bhūḥ svāhā 'ti gārhapatyē juhoti 'ti varatate | tathau (i) ttarayor api yoṣam | yauṣṭha bhūva svāhā 'ti daksināṅguṇa sāmataḥ svāhā svāhā 'ti daksināṅguṇa sāmataḥ svāhā svāhā 'ty āhavyante ... ilīd. Bl. 6 a: tatra dhīnā-nukrañena purvaṁ gārhapatyē daksināṅgāyā āhavyati iti homō vidhyāte | ryagveda-"dīnam ca gārthapatyā"-dibhir abhisambhandhāḥ | śruttyamare ryagvedo gārhapatyē yaujvedat sa daksināḥ simāvades ta āhaṁyaṇi āhavatā iti | 475 Vgl. zu diesen Ausführungen KS 25. 1. 4–10.
476 ḍravām B unklar C yām 477 fehlt bei BCD 478 B-fügt sāmās ein.
477 CD dyaṃh 478 A avocāma BC avocāma 479 L: [u]patattau?
Der folgende Passus ist ganz korrupt und mir völlig unverständlich.
480 AC sāṃṣaṃ 481 D teti 482 A ced rājana B cend rājana
483 O cend rājana D caṇḍrojaṇas 484 L: stena? 484 C praman
484 L: vittam? D vyapālyur 485 BC bhavyad D bhavyad 487 A karmābhahadhvarya BCD karmābhahadhvarya 488 A vīhitat (?)
489 Bei ABC fehlt atra 492 A apavāraḥbhaksapratiṣṭhāt C upacāra-

bhaksapratiṣṭhāt C upacāraḥbhaksapratiṣṭhāt; L: prāyaścitte? 492 BC yajamānaya 493 ACD fügen hinter kuryād ein: adhy B ayca 492 A fügt hinter atra ein: bhākṣābhākṣapāya B bhākṣābhākṣapāryā C bhāk-

ṣābhākṣapāryā B D bhākṣābhākṣapārya L: anyutra bhākṣābhāṣaṇat
pāyaya? 494 BC "yājña D "yaju

VOL. XXXIII: Part I
homac 405 ced 402 yajamana 406 agacchet samastan eva bhakṣyaṇaṃ japtva bhaksayec cheṣam | samāyam vabhrathm abhunypeyūḥ. 406 | 5 | atha ha yam 407 jivan 407 na 418 śrutipatham gachet 408 kiyantam asya kālam agnihotram juhayur | yady eva hitam āyuṣ tasya 'ṣeṣam praśamkhyāyaḥ 409 śātvantam 409 kālam 409 tad 410 asyā 410 'agnihotram huttā 'tha 'syā praṇayāṇena pracareyur | vyākyātahī pātraviniyogam 409 pi 409 yathā iva sarīrādārsane | sa ca jīvaṃ 404 agacchet 404 katham ēvam ēvam prοṣyā 408 'gatāya 405 yathākāryam 405 karmāṇī kuryāt | sa 406 cēt svayam utthaḥ[ḥ] syād punar asya 'gniḥ ēdhāya 'dhhutāni 407 vacako japam | itī huttā marjyaitvā tato 'yam ēgatāḥ karmāṇi kuryāt 409 | sa cēt punar anuttānaḥ 409 syāt 408 tathā samsthitam eva 'syā 409 tad agnihotram bhavati | jūrāmāryam 407 ēvam etat suttam 409 11ā yad agnihotram | itī ha ēshrīt bhavati 512 ēvam 409 atha ya 413 aḥitagnir 413 vipravasann ēghībhīṣ pramīyeta 414 katham tatra pātraviniyogam prattiyād | itī aḥā 'smarathyo 413 | ēvady anyāni pātrāni yajña-yudhāni 414 ēvam upāśadya vihṛtya 'gniḥ aḥītya praśagyāya vahareyur nirmatyaṃ 417 ēvam praśagyāya vihāredu | itī etatā 'mgnaprātiṣṭhībhīṣ 418 ēsmasthāpyai 's evam pātraviniyogam ēty anucchādyāyam 419 | ēvam yad uṭsamānām 419 syāvānā sahitinām 421 pātrān | 'ty apṣu samāvapedam 422 ēṣā te 'gna 423 |

405 A homāyajamāna
406 B āpahareyuh C hareyuh
407 B jīvantaḥ D jīvāṇaḥ; (st. yanā L. yo)
408 Ein ähnlicher, z. B. Aiṭ. Brāhmaṇ. 7. 9 erwähnter Fall ist hier, daβ man von dem Aḥitagnir fälschlich hört, er sei gestorben; cf. (Āṣ. Prāya. 8b): yasmin param anayātī jīvāy eva mṛtasa status āruyeta | tādā 'gnye surasehāyaṃ puruṣahutvāḥ | cf. (Agn. Prāya. 14b): surahāya eva yasmini jīve mṛtasa status | yasmin param anayātī jīvāy eva mṛta iti yadi āśadah samāyeta tādā surahāyate 'tāḥ (ll) kartavyā | 409 D dī 'khyā 410 D tā vartamānakālām A tā vrataṃ 501 A tasyāḥ
410 A viniyoge 422 fehlt bei ECD
411 B jīvaṃ antaṇatgachet OD jīvaṃ as "gachet
412 A proksagnakāyādhākāya C proṣyagnakāyādhākāya; D proṣyagnatikāya yathā kārya 508 Diese und die durvānuslegenden Werke schen bei D.
413 B aḥīyāṇudhāti C aḥīyāṇudhāti
508 Mī. unklar; sie lesen hinter uttāḥ syād die Sūtra at; C utthayāḥ at
510 BC syām 510 BC jārāmārya A jārāmāryaṃ D jārāmāyaṃ 511 A sarvāra 412 D vādaṇa 412 ABC yat tryāhitagnir
512 cf. oben Anm. 308; —
415 "aghībhīṣ" ist wohl zu streichen. 416 A imayorathyoh B imayorathyoh
513 A yajñāni yuddhaṃ B yajyudhinnī 417 B nirmathya 515 C "nagah praḥhyā" 516 A anitādvedy B anutādvedy
432 VS 2. 147.
yo agnis 524 | tayā me 525 | hy āroha tayā me hy āviśe 526 | 'ty a-
śamanāynū va 527 | lohanāynū va brāhmaṇeḥhiyaḥ | prada-
dyad 528 | daśārātrim niyataśrata[ḥ] syuḥ | samvatsaram ca ṗi
gotrina | ekāḍāṣyāṃ kēṣāṃśru - lomanakānū 529 | vāpayitvā |
dbhūtanī prāyaścitṭiṃ 530 | vācakām 531 | japam iti hutā mā-
rjayīta 532 | tato yathāsukhacārīno 533 | bhavanti [ 7 ] | atha
yady enam anāhitagnīm iva rṛthā-'gniṃ 534 | dāheyr evam
asyai 'ṣa 535 | mṛtpātraṃvīyogyo 536 | 'ti patnya 537 | bhavati | 'ty
āhā śmarathyo | ne 'ty āhatuḥ kāṇvagopāyanaḥ | yadai va
karmā bhy ādhvaryaḥ 538 | vihitā tadai 'va sarvakrātan praty
āpado vihitā | ity āhur ācāryā | atha katham asyam apattau
yatha | 'va sartrā-'dārsane | va samājmatanān āpādam 539 | ka-
tham tatra pātraṃvīyogam pratiyād ity āhā śmarathyo |
'ranyor agnum samāropya sartrānāṃ artham . . . . . . . . . .
esā 540
tāṣūpa nirmathyā prajāvīya vihṛtya madhyo 'gniṃā 541 | edhāṃ 542
цитvā darbhan samstrya tatra 'syā sartrāi nidādhikhar | bhāra-
udāsamāni gāpayēdijyadyad 543 | agathāḥ 544 | syād atha 'py asaṃ Śa
kuryā[c] | cārtrā-'dārsane pālaśa-tsarūny 545 | ahṛtyā 'thai
'tāni puruṣa-''kritiṃ krtvā ghr[tena] 'bhavīya māṃsā 546-538-
iṣṭhasthī asya ghrāyata ca bhavati 'ti ha vi(r)ṇyayate 547 | yady
ābhāvanyo devalokam yadi daksinaṁgh pitrīkham yadi gāra-
patyo mānasyalokam | yadi yugapat sarvasv asya 548 | lokeṣy
549 | arundāham bhavati 'ti ha viṃśyayate | tasmād yugapad
eva sarvamāṃs sadayātya 'tha yady enam anuvijālaheta punar
dahet | stenam 549 | iva 549 | tv 549 | eva brāyād | yat kim ca vidhi-
vīhitam karma kriyate tasyai 'saī 'va sarvasya kiptiṣ sarvasya
prāyaścittīś ca | 'ti hi 550 | śrutir bhavaty 551 | athā 'py atra 'ṛgner

---

524 AV. 12. 2. 7?
527 BCD ca.
529 Vgl. das unten unter 4. 1 und 6. 5 Gegebene; s. a.
538 K. Ś. 22. 7. 33 folg.
539 BC rōma
540 D eitra
541 BCD
542 kāṣyā śatt vācakāṃ vgl. oben 3. 6; vācako japam
543 bei D 552 AB 'vārīno
544 bei D fehlte 'gniṃ 552 B asayāvā;
545 AC asayā sa 546 bei D fehlte mṛt
l.: pātriyo?
548 D karmābhī addhāvyanā 548 A 'apādīna
549 evē
unverständlicher; davor jedenfalls eine Lücke; D esām
541 AD
542 'nāmaṃdham, B 'nām medhāṃ 'nāme dhātyāṇu
543 D yathā
544 ABC agātha D gātha
545 544 B asama C asaṃ D asame
547 546 BCD māyāṃ
548 cf. Ait. Brāhma. 7. 2.
549 A unklar B avasya lokeṣy
549 D avanam ity
550 530 B ha
551 Hier endet nach D der Abschnitt 6; der Rest fehlt.

7*
yasya paurnamasyam (vā) vyāpadhya kāmam tatra prākrūṭiḥ. kuryaḥ | tad yathā ya[h] krutā [dyāvakrato va vayo] vidyate | 'tha nirwapati | aśīgnya aśākapālam aśindram ekādāsakapālama asādy aham prāyaSaçciti | juhayād | yad udgaṇa mahāma aṣya. māno aṣya jagataḥ pārthivyasya mā naḥ prāpad uddhunā kācid anyā | kasmā devāya havisā parisādema svāhe ty | atha 'tah paśubandhah | pari yajnasya bhoksasya | bhujya ratkā | mo ye | kecit tatrasthāḥ paśavah somakārīṇā | teṣām bhākṣaḥbhākṣaṇam | tad yathā | varāha-mārj[a]-ra[m]ahīsam | 'akuṇa | 'nayo vādānāni māṃśāni āṃgallīna ca yady aśīnah syān māsi māsi saḍhatāram juhayit | sūryam te caksur gacchatu vāto ātmānam prāno dyām prsthāṃ antarikṣam ātmāṅgair yajñām prthivyāyurvirāḥ vācaspati chidraya vaca 'chidraya juhāvā devāvṛdham divi hotrām airaya svāhe 'ti saḍhatāram htuva prajāpaṭiḥ sarvam eva 'dam utsṛd | iti hi trutrīḥ bhavati | ity athāravavede vaitānasūtra prāyaSçcita - prasamge ekādā sau phayo | iti yajnāprāyaScitte tritiyo 'ahyāyaḥ samāptāḥ.

(sānnāyām. yad udbo-) dhayeṣu ced vatsā śāya śāyaḥ (yā). śāya śāyaḥ śāmāyām yujeta  | 'py ekasyā[ṃ]
dhitayam adhita dohayed | adhitubhi samsthapya 601 dhitanami vatsan 602 apakrtya 603 svah 603 sannayyena 604 yajeta 605 | sayam-

601 A samatha 602 A rasanaapakrtya B vatsanaaakryta C... tasna-thakryta; cf. Brah. Pray. 17b (sucrest korrupt); K. S. 25.4.39. 602 A sva B aubh 604 A sannayyena B sannayyena CD sannayyena 606 Hierzu findet sich in dem Passus Brah. Pray. 17a folgende, durch Korruption fast jedes Wortes leider verschleierte Parallele (ich zitiere ohne Veränderung des Textes): yadi vatsa apakrtya dhayeyuh tatra na "dhanaam vidhityate | kii tath mudratvema padhitate tatraadham prayaasittam vakyavyam bhavati | vatsprahaanam kii vatsanaathdhe prayaasitam | mrganapashudhine prayaasitam ma bhuh ity apakrty iti apakrtye dhune prayaasitam | ... | apare tu tatra dhyay tu vrihin eve 'chanti vayavya iti devata-viisaa-niyamottam | yavayya te | ... varittam vatsan apakrtya punar yajete ti ... vayavya yavayya praca-ryeta | ... nirupakalo va visasyate | tatra nimittakalo eva nirupah kuta ehad ganyate | sayyanandhartha vakyasya indriya vrihin nirvapeta svohbhute tasya anunivrapa iti | ... svohbhute eva vrihi-yavayya va prakhyabhyo nyadhibhyyo nyadhibhyyo nunivrapet | ... sannyaahabdvi dhota nirgataaanyahhydayetey yasya sannyaah yam camdran ahhyadity durisata | ... vgl. oben 2.1 u. Brah. Pray. 22a: sayyanandham iti samastati yam doham iti samasta-sayanandhasy a pahire dohe sa dvaidehe doham |(?) sayyanaparaheseena yaga eva bhavati | atha dvaideham dohan praruta tatra dugdhasam vata pakurmani dvidhayasyan kubhyam dohah karttau-ya | ekhaa dvyah pasunam va ekatra dugdhasam vatsapakaranady anyasanyah tawayo dugdhasise prakaideham dohey sa dvaideh abdyeya sayyanandhaso palanodbhavaya prcaah karttavyah | ... Bl.22b: yadi sayyanoda artham niyad indraya vrihin nirvapeta ... yadi sayyanode vati sa dhayeyuh prastardhotrtilit tatra vayaya purodhasau karttavyam | sayyanodha-prastarole dhite purodhasam vayavya ca yadi sayyanoda arthit iti vahhyo nirupah vijfahanam purva vata dhitie indraya vrihin yavun ya ... nirvaph karttavyah | yady ubhav nimdriam pancasaaravam odanam pacet | yady ubhav iti prakraya sayyanodhaprastardhan tu prayaasitkavye | yady ubhavis sriitvam niyetam | ity arthah | tatra 'daml prayaasitam pancasaaravam odanam pacet | yad ita vishyate yavunyagh prudhasah panchaarsaro va sarvaskante maaje dushe va vy asya yavad indraya ti yamastham namsaadrtyaajino. | 'nirdyangavacananadhya prakryo yogo yaguyo purodhah panchaarsaro va tat-samuihdo yaga suyet | ... Bl.24a: yasya sannyaah havis camdran ahhyudiyat vatsan u pratinuved sadahode haviratmanam vrato yathikalana yajeta ... Bl. 24b: dite l'hditye arthitgat vatsan upakrya punar yajet | cf. unten 5. 8 und Brah. Pray. 26b: yasya sannyaah yam camdran ahhyudita ahbyudityasya sanaatram, pashkaa mavyaya ity tuagta parvan vatsan apadakaroti ... cf. Agn. Pray. 6b: vatsanaam dhune vayave yaguyo | samaayya'arthau apakrtyan vatsanapane puneup yavan-devasya yaguyo nirupya tyagya vyavaya sarvapame stut prayaasitam | pita-srijam eva habeat parsayatam cet | vyartithama esa na vayagh | yavagyuyagya krtya punar yagya karttavya ... yjey A. Pray. 3a: sannyaarytham apakrtyam sarvapane vayudeivyam
doham 606 cod 606 apahareyu 606 prätardoham dvaídham krtvä 'nyatarat sáyamdohastháne krtvā bhābhyam yajeta 667 | prätardoham 608 cod 608 apahareyu, sáyamdoham dvaídham 609 krtvā nyatarat 610 prätardohastháne krtvā bhābhyaṃ yajeto 611 | bhuu ced dusyeyatām aindram pāncasārāvam 612 odanam 612 nirupya 612 "gneyena pracaryai "ndrenā 'unpraca-red uttaram upo 'ya(to) v(adjo) bhābhyaṃ yajeta | sarvāni ced dhaviṃ apahareyr dusyeyur 614 vā "jyena ca devata

yāvágnim nirupya śrāpayīvā yaṣṭavyaṃ | sa tvam no ... (RV. 8. 26. 28) śānasya prabhuṭaṃ yaś ... (RV. 7. 92. 1); vajy sa vai 2 (RV. 10. 50. 3) iti yā jusūvaṃkya | avalāha-parajiptaṃ 'stva puruṣa yajeta |

606 A. sáyamdoham veksavahareyub B sáyamdohā cādepahareyub.


608 A. prātardhi ced 612 A. cedvaídham B dvaídham C dvaídham 612 A. 'nyatara B yajete 612 A. pāncasārāvadanaṃ; cf. Āśv. 5. 10. 27; K. Ś. 26. 5. 2; a. auch unten in 4. 4.

613 ABC nirupya 2 D setzt mit dem korrupten Passus wieder ein; tathā bhuu ced dusyen mā tāṃ aindram pāṇcaśārāvam odanam niruṣaya.

614 Brahmr. Prāy. 7a bringt folgende Klassifizierung des rituell Unreinen: āsūṇam trividham varṇyaṃ; | jātivaṃsāḥ aśravadyaṃ ca ca jātivaṃsāḥ pañcusa-gruṣjanakā-ḍī; | aśravadyaṃ anūyādī-paripraśaṃ tatra 'pi melekhāṃ dibhāḥ māryah sāhā sanvyaśaharaṃ | sanvyaśadahāṃ māla-dibhāḥ;| evam aśibhāḥ upahatam dravyam apo bhavaharet | aṣṭa pratigmayet | vgl. ibid. 7b1; tad vā prakṣepya tatraī vo dākāṃ śāhīset....

ibid. 8a: atha pāṭraya apo 'bhavaharet iti varṭate | nirlikhe dāruṃmayam | niṣṭapen maṭhikṣaṃ | aśibhāḥ sanvyaṛajatam sanmādhyed iti 'saṣaḥ | athavā nirlikhe iti varṭate | nirlikheṇaṃ ca sanmādhyam maṭhikṣya niṣṭapananam sarvarna-rajaṇāyā 'dibhir eva sanmādhanam iti upasargah | — Über den Begriff des Subastiṇi siehe S. 9a, folg. eine Ausenanderersetzung. Nachdem eine Stellvertretung des Opferfeuers und des Opferherrn als ausgeschlossen hingestellt ist (Bl. 9a: agrañ ca pratiniḥitā svāminā ca pratiniḥdın iti | samavayāt yā hi yajate sa eva phalena sanpadihyate) tasmād yajamānaḥ pratiṣṭhitārhi nā iti; sagt der sehr korrupte Passus, in interessanter Weise den Begriff der Opferharte umschreibend: — yathā maṇāḥ[ḥ]-maṣṭura-krodava- ti yaṣa yaṇ(?) saṃpyogah | sarvatarīva pratiṣṭhitave | aṣṭiṇāya vai māṣāḥ | aṣṭiṇāḥaḥ krodava iti .... und ibid. 10a: atha yajyam anapratinīśyeyam
ced ājyam skanded \(^{622}\) vittam \(^{624}\) prāṇam \(^{624}\) dadyāt \(^{625}\) | tatho 'tpūtam \(^{626}\) upṭypamāram ced ājyam \(^{627}\) dadyād atho 'tptum \(^{628}\) upṭypamānam ced ājyam \(^{629}\) prāṇam dadyād \(^{630}\) devantaṅtare \(^{631}\) ced \(^{631}\) ājyam \(^{631}\) | śhutilopavasyaṭaye \(^{632}\) | tvam no agne | sa tvam na \(^{633}\) | iti sarvaprayaścitram \(^{634}\) jhuyat | tvam no agne varupaśya vidvān \(^{635}\) devasya hedo 'vayasi śisṭhāh | yājistho vahnitamaḥ śośucano viśā dvesāmsi prama-mugdhīr asmat | sa tvam no agne 'vamo bhavoti nediśto asya uṣaśo vyuṣṭau | ava yakṣaḥ no varuṇaḥ rāraṇo vihi mrūktam suhavo na edhi svahe 'ti | devata-vaḍānē yājī- 'nuvakāya-vyayāṣa \(^{636}\) 'nāmnāta \(^{638}\) prāyaścitānām vā \(^{637}\) yady
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 rkto 638 'bhy abādhaḥ syād 639 bhūr ānand iti gārhapatye juhuyād | yati yajuṣṭa om bhuvu ānand iti daksināgnau juhuyād | yati, sāmata om svar ānand iti abhavyantya juhuyād | yadi abhagyante sv. 640 devatām abhayaṁ yasyat 'vā pavāturum syat tato-ntayā yajeta "yasyat tani nirupya 641 | yadi bhāgnīmat 642 nā "vāhayaḥ 643 yatra smaret tatra 'nām upo-'tthāya "vāhaya 644 "vāpāsthānē 645 yajeta 645 nā 'bhāgali skamne 646 nā 'dhīrēta da-

yāga-bhāgasāh pūrvakāt paśyācitam visnuśamaragam ca haryan abhitā-yajyam vadhām avhitā-devatā-"dese dhūyē [l. 'mm] kuryan yadi yasāt kuryat tādā pūrvakāt paśyācitam kṛtya pūnak avadāya yajeta visya-kṛd-anantastvam smaranai aśayaṁ yādī pūrvatvat agnibhogyena pūrṇadi-"bani "guṇe yage kṛte uktam paśyācitam kṛtva "guṇyena 'guṇiyamānaḥ sarva-"prāyā to visnuśamaragam ca | nī. lūd: devate amūvākaṁ yajy:o vi'pārśīyata "jye avadāne haviṣ: vi devatā-vipārṣīyaṁ avāhanā "dīya wynkramal amūvākya-vipārṣīya nyādīyam anyaśya 'mubhāyaḥ | evaḥ yajya-vipārṣīyaḥ | aśya-vipārṣīyaṁ juhuṣavāḥ-pabhṛtyata iti iti | avadāna-vipārṣīyaḥ pūrvahād pūrvahād pūram iti iti | havir-vipārṣīyaṁ nīrśrāpālāḥ | yage ca nyādīyasya anyaśya yagāḥ | eteṣām mahāya anyatara-nimite ati prāyācitam karīvan | yad vo devā | nīhitāna svēhe 'iti (Aṣ. 3. 11. 2) tiṣṭhati aśayaṁ hitva jāvē yāya bhūr iti gārhapatye juhuyād yadi yajuṣṭo bhuvu iti daksināgnaḥ | vgl. dazu former Stellen wie Aṣ. Prāy. 9b: uha vāhata-. "dīya devatāṁ visṇavya-vipārṣīyaṁ yakṣya-vipārṣīyaṁ juhuyā- "pabhṛtyata "janāṁ-parīyaṁ "pūrvahād-pūram iti iti | Havir-vipārṣīyo nīrśrāpālāḥ | yage ca nyādīyasya anyaśya yagāḥ | eteṣām mahāya anyatara-nimite ati prāyācitam karīvan | yad vo devā | nīhitāna svēhe 'iti (Aṣ. 3. 13. 16) ity aśayaṁ hitva jāvē yāya bhuvu | tasmā yajamāno mukhyam dhanām dadyat | yajtī prīg yajya'-mūvāka-vipārṣīya-yakṣya-vipārṣīyaṁ kṛtya pūnak samuccarika yāgāḥ kuryāḥ | yagna-"nuntaram jānē prāyācitam eva | Über die Vertäuschung der Opfermaterialien. Sprechen auch Aṣ. Prāy. 10a: juhuyā- "pabhṛty-dhukra-"jānāṁ visṇavya-vipārṣīyaę yad vo deva iti aruvihutih brahma juhuyat | tasmā yajamāno mukhyam dhanām dadyat | vgl. lūd. 16b: haviṣyam vipārṣīyaṁ dhukra "pabhṛtyat yad vo deva iti pūrvavaj juhuyat | tasmā yajamāno mukhyam dhanām dadyat | kahānānudvēśānē (7) advāyuvā yāvāvāt "tadda ūgamya ca dhīrēta
ksinena ced yajeta 'rddharcat 457 pratiññham dadyat | purođåse dułhśrite 448 sarpisy annam catuhśaravam odanam brahmañcehinyo dadyat 449 | tatas tan eva punar nirvapet | purođase viñkśame 458 yato 450 'syā 'ksāmāh 451 syat tato yajeta 452 | dvesyāya tan dadyād daksiṁam ca 455 | puro-

ruṇa ca yāgakāle caturgrihītāna dhravāyāna yaṣṭavyān yajet | tad-deva-
tye yaṣyānucyake hotra paññhaty | anumāṇasamāṇaṃ yajamānaṃ | tato viṣṇusamāṇaṃ | vipasyāṣe 'vahāne brahmaṃ pūrvavād yad vo deva iti juhuyat | taśmī yajamāno mukhyāṃ dhanāṃ dadyat | cf. Agn. Prīya. 16a: abhiññum anvāhyā devatam upothāyā 'vahānena mānasā ty eka-aññena 'sthāṇīntaṃ yajet | yadi kasmī na kartiṣṭha yaṣṭavyā[ā]n devatām anā-
avāha [ev]o taram uttaram uttaraṃ karma kūryat tade yātii fasta samrast| tade eva [L.: 'aivo] poṭṭhāyā 'vahāyā | yadi abhiññimaṇe pramādād śravāhyā tade 'emāna eva krameṇa tām ājeyā yajet | nigamena ca niga-

mayaṃ | 452 A bāhyā 455 BC vāpasthāne 458 A yajed B yajeta; Āśv. 12. 19 cf. Āśv. Prīya. 17b: sunbhrātī 'ty atra bhāgini-nilēkke hotory aπi bhāgiṃnu puro ṇu vā vadati prāga vadanāṃ samaratā stci catur-

grihītāna dhravāyāye yāgah kartavyāyā | uvaḍaṇā-nāpataṇaṃ samraṇaṃ saty abhiññimī 'jaśa punar avadāya bhāginiya yāgah kūryaḥ | 447 Āśv. Prīya. 12b: upari sthāpanaṃ śakhe-'dhama-bhūriḥ-ādi yadi abhāvast potati tade brahma-priññṭha-mannau bharmavaco brahma-yajāhanaṃ harvāṃ 'ajeyā ca tiiriktaṃ mantriṇaṃ pūrvavat samathopāya 'jyau samākyayo sruk-

ruṇuvaṃ samurduya tenaśa mantriṇaṃ suvahākāranyena "havanīyaś dhrav-

āyaṃ svavā-putiṃ juhuyat | yajāhyā brahmaṇa idaṃ | aśīya-bhāgā-
nāpataṇaṃ sthālayāyena hutvā viṣṇu-śravāya kūryat | śakhe-'dhama-bhūri-

ḥrīḥ-prastara-veda-paristaraṇa-pavitra-viḍhitī-paridhy-udapeṇa "di-drayāv-

aṃ daḥa-"dna nāče (cf. oben in 2. 5.) viṣṇu-mūtrā-"dy-apahatam vā dhāravyas tuṣ-jātītyam anyad vidhāya svasthāne niyamate | tāti "ajyau samākyayo 'jya-bhāga-"nuṣṭhānaṃ vā svavhūti juhuyat | tvam agne ayai (Ap. 9. 12. 4) "saṇam svahā | agnaye "yasa idaṃ | prājapate na "yam svahā | praJA "idam tato visvamāraṃ pavitra-nāde mīndācage puṇyāścitaṃ ity uktam puṇyāścitaṃ prājapate | aśīya- "valokanā-"nuṣṭhānaṃ etat puṇyāścitaṃ tat-prak mīndā-"gaṇa ity kesi ca ca "yam vākyste | sarvadā "rundacyo vā 'dhama-bhūriḥ puṇyā-"nuṣṭhānaṃ ca aṇuṁ-tīrce..... 451 AD ruddharatā 459 cf. Brah. Prīya. 51 b: "yasya purojaśānu duḥṣāt iti bruhmanoktaṃ puṇyāścitaṃ pradhāneva eva tad bhavati | gemoine it M. S. 1. 4. 15. 450 cf. Ap. 9. 0. 15. 18; Āśv. 3. 14. 1. 455 A viñkṣepaṃ B viñkṣēhyato cf. M. S. 1. 4. 18. 451 A kṣāma BCE kṣāmaṇa 457 cf. oben 2. 1; vgl. Āśv. 3. 14. 2 and Brah. Prīya. 32a: atha yasya purojaśānu kāryata iti śrutidarśanaṃ pūjāpradityaṇāhidiṣṇu punah-

saṃskāra eva kārityava ity uktam | Agn. Prīya. 16a: haviṣa duḥṣēte catuhśaravam odanam brahmaṇam bhūjayat | yadya haviṣa apakṣaṃ bhavati tadā tenai va haviṣa tat karmā samāpya catuhśaravaspramātanau virāhīr odanam paktuva catuḥbrahmaṇam bhūjayat | daksīṇāgūlaṃ viṁśtya ta-

samim odanam paktuva ty āpasaṁbhaḥ 453 Agn. Prīya. 17b: keśe śiṣṭe "syā punar yajeta | ekadeśa-dāghe puṇyāścitaṃ na bhavati | [yadā] 'vadana-parāyanta na śiṣte tadā tenāva mātra-pacārṇaiva
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pitanasto garma visvayur yato jata tato 'py avam svaha ti juhuyat | kapale bhinne gayatrya tva satakasaryaya sandadhami ti samadhaya dhatu dadhatv ity eva juhuyad | agneyam ekakapalam nirvaped asvinam dvikapalam vaisnavam 'trikapalam saumyan catuhkapalam | nasthe bhinne ca bhargavo hota kita 'vapannam sannayam madhyamena parnena mahtyavat ivyayastu | anvapandita pratibhit ca na imam yajnam mimim | bhumin ity shavanta praharet | pata-madhya jaladav vartamanma indam prayacittam | kevala-patrabhedho shavantye prasya mimindar eva na bhur aya ma ity akta prayaacittam samudriksayan | cf. Agn. Pra. 14 b. kapale nasthe 'nudvaste 'bhyaravite va | udvasmata purvarg kappalaya 'suci-samsarga nimitta | yesum arapanau 'namataram udvasanam teasam | anudvaste kapale saty aravapadi krtam ced ubhaye | nimittayan anyatra-nimitte sati vaisvanaresti rkcya |}

kṣatām | pipṛtām no bhārīmabhīḥ
tveṇa valiṁkādvāre praśiṇeṭ | apsu va ṭūṃpiḥ | visyāṃdāma(ād)amāḥ
mahī dyauḥ ....... ity antarparidañdīyā nirvāpifyāḥ

[1913]

663. ca. 'Av. Prā. 16a. sāmānyayā pāka-samaye kumbhikā stīya bāhīḍ
patati cet taṇa taṭa pātrauṣadhi-ṣārāḥ mahī dyauḥ pṛthiuv ca na ity anena niraṇyaḥ [sarvāpyaṣaṭeṣṭaṁ kṛṣṇa vaśeṣeṇa yajat | sarvā-puṇa- documentary
puṇa-ṛohi."di | ṛkṣita-yāga | ny etat samānaṃ | ṛta-saḥ payo-vikaranatvaḥ
bahiṣparidhyā ānguren skandet | vgl. Brahm. Prāy. 16a. yadi praṛyāe-
jeṭhaye bahuḥparidhyā ānguren skandet sam abhinumaṭraṇaḥ adhəvya[ṇ] mā |

bhismit ḥitaḥ ity evam abhiḥ śūṣṇaḥ puraśvita dākṣiṇatāḥ paścād uttarata iti
mantravṛddyaśeṣāraktam abhimunaṭraṇaṃ | yasāvān diśi skanna bhavati
tatra yo yathā mantrah tamaṇaḥ bhimamaṇḍuḥ bhavati | nayeṣm abhi-
tyaṃ purastat paridadhātitya aparimāṇavād ādityasya purastat skanne
praṣaṭeṣṭaṁ na bhavati | 34 b. yadi bhaveva ānguren bahiṣparidhi
skannā bhavanti tada bhimamaṇḍaḥ-praṅkaṇṇaṃ karma pṛthak kartta-
yam abhiḥomā tu sad ete ca "ti abhiṣṭhitam bhruṇapryaṣeṣṭitaṁ
ṣraveṇa jhūṭam iti | vgl. auch oben 2.6 und 'Av. Prā. 19a. praṛyāe-
jeṭhayaḥ paridhi-deśāḥ bāhīṛ yady āngurah-patitaḥ purastat tādā brahma
tam āṅgaraṃ srava-dandaṇaṃ nīdāhyāḥ | mā tapo mā yaṣās tapan mā ya-
 jóparāṣ tapaḥ | namas te asta śute naṃ rudrasya te naṃ yatra niśh).
naśaśvaḥ pṛṣṭaḥ yatānam mā bhismit iti | yadi dākṣiṇatāḥ
patat sa eva srava-dandaṇaṃ nīdāhyāḥ | mā tapo "ti bhumāmaṇaḥ mā bhi-
smit yaṣāmaḥ mā bhismit iti | yadi pāḍīt patet tadaḥ | hotarāṇaḥ mā
bhismit pāṭhucūḥ mā bhismit yaṣāmaḥ mā bhismit iti | yadi uttaratāḥ patet
 tadaḥ | āgnīdāhām mā | yaṣāmaṇaṃ mā | iti | athāmaḥ annaṇa
naśaḥ aham yājnaḥ dādha niṣṭṛt upaṭaḥḥ | māmadanta iti na de-
vedāḥ | yacchate "ti | praṣṭaṁ angaṃ abhiṣṭuyāḥ | sahaṇa-ṛṣiga
vṛśabho jātaṇaḥ | praṭikāḥ | mā no kṣend māṃsato na tvā jāhāṃ go-po-
ṣaḥ ca na viraṇaṣuḥ ca na yacca śvaḥ "ti | tatha sarvas-pryaṣaṭeṣṭaṁ
viṣṇumanaṇaḥ ca | cf. Agn. Prā. 18a. folg.: praṛyāeṭhaye "puṃgaṃ
dahiṣparidhi niṛvyātasrava-dandaṇa Ṛṣiḥ | l.: "dandaṇaḥ "bhīmaṇḍaḥ | yadi
praṛyāeṭhayeḥ prabhāyābhiṣeṣṭaṁ ānguren gaccheta tādā srava[ṇ][ṇ]-dandaṇa
piṣaṭet | tvi niṣamah | mā tapo mā yaṣās tapan mā yaḥpātis tapan
namas te asta śute naṃ rudrasya te naṃ yatra niśhā | iti praṭi-
dāśaṃ jāpita tato (yadi) purastit ced adhya[y][u]ṛṣi | mā bhisṛṣr[ṇ] yajā
[continental script] | "jāras" mā bhismit yaṣāmaḥ mā bhismit iti | yadi pāḍīt dhotarāṃ
mā bhisṛṣr[ṇ] pāṭhucūḥ mā bhismit yaṣāmaṇaḥ mā bhismit iti | yadi uttara
āgnīdāhāṃ mā bhismit yaṣāmaṇaḥ mā bhismit iti | praṭiśiṣyam prva-
mahāmaṇeśṣah | atāhaḥiḥ amāṇanaḥr[ṇ]jed abhaḥ yaṣāmaḥ dādha

sarma yacchate "ti tam abhiṣṭuyāḥ sahaśara-ṛṣiga vṛśabho jātaṇāḥ omah-
prasūḥ gṛhavān sopṭaṭkāḥ | mā no kṣend māṃsato ca tvā jāhāṃ go-po-
ṣaḥ ca no viraṇaṣuḥ ca yaccha (‘Av. S.1.12.37) śvaḥ "ti | Dieses Zitat
ist ein besonders deutlicher Beleg dafür, daß die Agn. Prāy. die Mautra
te. namo astu parāyate namo yatra niṣṭadasi ty abhināmya "ham yajñam dadhe nirṛter upasthitā tam deveṣu pari- dadāmi vidvān suprajās tvam satam hi māmadanta iha no deva mahī śarma yachate ty adāya sahasraśringa ity anuprabhṛtya mā no mahāntam tvam no aṅge soma- nam svarāṇam kruṇhi brahmaṇaspati kakṣtvantam ya asis- jāḥ sa tvam no gne vrśabham carṣanām viśvarūpam adhāhyam bhṛhaspatim vareṇyam ud uttamam munugdhi no vi pāsam madhyamam ērtva aṅvāhāminī bāhāta ud uttamam varūpe ty etābhir juhu yat ] sarvāni ced āḥutveśyam patny anālambhukā syat tām aprudhya yajeta samāpya no ham asmi sā tvam in der speziellen Fassung des Āśv. S. bringen; statt: "na" liest unser Ma. hier und Blatt 16a: "ne", also doch wohl: ne 't.


it í tasyā dukṣīnaṃ hastam anvālābhya pāhavyaṭā | "hutis ced bahīṣparidhi | 688 skande āgniḥbramā | 688 brūyuh | 689 sam- 
krasīṣyām | 690 tvā juhudhi ti 691 | tasmai pūrṇapāṭraṃ de- 
dyyat | 692 | purodaśas ced adhiśrita udvijed utpaged | 693 
va 694 tam udvāsa barhisy āsādayet kim utpatasii kim utproṣṭhāḥ | 695 sāntaḥ śānter īha "gahi | aghoro yajñīyo bhūtvā "sida sadaṇaṃ 

pratigrāhā-"māṇtaraṃ ced ṛtanāti tām aparudhya samāpayet | sādhya- 
maṇtaraṃ āgnihostrāmāḥḥāḥ | 686 AV. 14. 2. 71 cf. Āp. 9. 2. 3. 
696 A "pākurvita" D "pāg[ṛ]hāni[ty]ātā" | 697 ABC bahīṣparidhi (A) ēñīṣ ḍhi sus) | 698 D "ḥūre | 699 A brūya | 699 C unklar; 
wohl: sakṛṣyān; denkbar wäre samgrahiṣyān; vgl. Āp. 9. 18. 1 und die 
Bestimmung in Āṣv. 3. 12. 16. 
691 Brah. Pray. 66b; yadi bahīṣ- 
paridhi ahūtī ṣkandey ugnidhāṃ brūyāti lāmām samāṣaṇa juhudhīti ..., 
der folgende Komm. liest samkāṣyā ... kasāṭi gatyarthah: zweifellos besser 
samkāṣya; wörtlich identisch mit MS. 1. 4. 13; cf. Min. 8. 3. 1. 3. 1 vgl. 
Āṣv. Pray. 9b: ahūte bahīṣparidhiṇīsamāṇo pūrvavad abhimārṣyā "pūrṇast 
tām ahūtin juhuyāt | yaṃjaṃmās tasmai dhānyāy-pūrṇapāṭraṃ tadāniṃ eva 
dadyāt | Āgn. Pray. 16a: ahūtī ced bahīṣparidhi āgniḥbramā etām 
juhuyād dvātavate pūrṇapāṭraṃ dadyāt | yadi āhyāmānaḥ "hutis bahīṣ-
paridhiṣ cīkṇet tām uṣṇaḥ-brīṃharyāṃ kṛte āgniḥbrmās tām ādāya tū 
ṛṣīṃ eva juhuyāt | homaṃ kṛtvate āgniḥbrmāya tadāniṃ eva yena yena 
kana cid dhānyādina rasādā no pūrṇa-pāṭraṃ dadyāt iti | Der Sūhne 
bedarf es, wenn die geopferte Speise auf die Strea herabfällt (Āṣv. Pray. 
18a); ahūtī hūyāno yadi barhiṣy adhipat etām āgniḥbrmā devaḥ 
janaṃ agna yaṇāḥ caśāṃca ṛti (Āp. 9. 10. 10) tām anumāṇytra tūṣīṃ 
eva juhuyāt | yaṃjaṃmās tasmai dhānyāy-pūrṇapāṭraṃ dadyāt | sarva- 
prāyaṣcīttam visṇumaraṇam ca kuryāt — oder wenn sie nicht ins 
Fenster fällt (ibid.): hute ḍaṭiṣ samāṇo putte tvam no agne sa tvam no agne 
(RV. 4. 1. 4. folg.) ity etābhūyam adhvanyō aruvahūtīḥ bhūtvā puṇar 
avādiya yajeta | 697 Āṣv. 9. 13. 17. | 698 AB utyuted 
694 Āṣv. Pray. 18a sieht auch solche folgenden, für die ausgebildete Kausikī der Sūhne 
sacramen interessante Möglichkeit vor: ekakapiḥ purodāsah sarvā 
hutas tat-pūrṇavarttana praḥāṣcīttam | yady ekakapiḥ purodāsah sarvā 
hutaḥ paryāva[ratae tu] tām adhvanyōḥ svasthūno paritīṣhpaṇy | 
praṇāṭaḥ varttāniḥ unavarttasaḥ ... mayantu (Āp. 9. 14. 1) yaṃjaṃno 
numaṇṭrayate | praṇāṭatre | nāmaḥ (Āp. 9. 14. 2) adhvanyōḥ aruvahūtī 
juhuyāḥ | askam dyāraṃ ... praṇāyāt (Āp. 9. 6. 7) śvāhā | yajñaye 
"daṃ" | askam aṃjata praṇāyaḥ ... praṇāṣāstamiḥ (Āp. 9. 6. 7) śvāhā | yajñaye 
"daṃ" | cf. Āgn. Pray. 17b: yadi purodāsah spuḥet vo ṣipted va ō yadi 
purodāsah bhīḍyāt | udshed (i.e. udvijed?) va tādā kim utpataσi ... 
sādahmaḥ svam iti barhiṣy niḥdyāya tato mā himṣit ... ammaṃ āśī 
barhiṣy iti abhiśaṃtrayet | 699 Āp. 9. 16. 11; Āṣv. 3. 14. 13; Āṣv. 
Pray. 18b: purodāsāya bhedane pataṇe kha kim utproṣṭhāḥ saṃ 
āṃtraḥ ihāghaḥ ... sādahmaḥ svam iti | barhiṣy niḥdyāya bhūmārṣ 
trayaḥ | tam [mā himṣit devaprapita] ... barhiṣy "ti | abhiśaṃtrya sarva- 
prāyaṣcīttam juhuyāt"
syam sthalyam
cet skanded adhirsitam unniyamam
ahutan skandet punar anya dohayitya dhiirtya uniy jhunyata
pracnams ced dhiriyamam skandet prajapater visvabhrtah skannahutum asi svaha
dohansaprabhtyah homa
skandet samudraṃ tvā

prakṣipet udāsita visyanude visyanudanena yadā bhasmām prāpyate
tadā mahi dyauḥ bharmabhīr (RV. I. 22. 13) ity bhavanitaya bhasma-mādhyo prakṣipet itatā punar utpattair ubhyayatra | ABC uhyamāna, cf. Āp. 9. 5. 7.

ef. AP 37. 3. 1 ajyathaḥ evavate prascalai va... ibid. 37. 30. 1 atha cet (udapātraṇa) prabhajaya....

Brahm. Prāy. 41 b: yadi dhyayamānān vabhibhūdayā anvām ēryakṛtyān praksāya punar dohayat. Daśā ēryakṛtyān stām ēryatātām Des Tetet esse est, bhoweit der unmittelbar folgende Komn.: yadi dhyayamānān vabhibhūdayā iti bhramanadharam anvām ēryakṛtyā. Āg. Prāy. 6 h. agnihotram adhirsitam srovaḥ abhi-
mantrayet | adhirsitam agnihotra-dravyam sthāli-mulena yadi sravati tada evaṃ abhi-mantrayet | gurbhaṃ śrawantām agadam akarmā gnir (akarma nach Āsv. 8. 3. 10. 31).... parastād (Āp. 8. 9. 4. 4) iti bhinnan sintam va bhinnam traya | (Western wörlich gleich Āsv. Prāy. 5. 6. 6. 6) sthāli-bhādengac viśeṣam agnihotra-dravyam duṣṭān bhavati | skandamāna ca viśeṣam abhyāhana yavati skannānā śāvan-mātram duṣṭaḥ [p] bhavati na pātraṃgata (cf. oben Anm. 724) | samudrāṃ vah prahinomi svam yonim apī gacata | ariṣṭa asmarān vīcī mayī gavah saṃtu gopātāv (Āsv. 3. 11. 6) | cf. unten in 4. 4 iti mantrāṇa duṣṭāya bhinnamātrā-bhinnamātrā māntrāna māntrāna kuryā | tata aśa(l) [bhavaharesu]h | skane payasya etad abhinmantrāṇa na bhavati agre vaksyamātvet | Ā A dhi-
frayamanam.

Bei A dittographiert.

A sannamahutam B sannamahutam C sannamahutam


BCD homa; Li a homāt; cf. Āsv. Prāy. 3 h: atha dahanādi-praṇa[-braṇaḥ] prāg yadi skanne samudram va iti mantrāṇa yad adya dhūhāṃ prāśiṣitam arṣpa... tan mayī ti [Āsv. 3. 11. 7] cābhinnamātrāṃ pāpan āpajey... tad apna prakṣepyā pātragata-seṣoṃ homāḥ homā-pramānāḥ svaḥyāḥ. Der Anfang dieses Pasas ermöglicht ein Verständnis, wo nicht eine Rekonstruktion, des obigen Textes; s. auch die unmittelbare Fortsetzung der Āsv. Prāy. athe mahanādi-pṛṣṭahuti-paryāṇaṃ dūghā- di-sādha-
praehinomt r ty274 ap275 ninyo276 27 d uttamam ity abhima-
untryo 27 d uttamam mumudhi na270 ud uttamam varuno277 27 ti
vruny(en)a278 27"jya"-butitr 278 juhuy[a279 27 (chhavli279 deva)

raha-homa-dravye skanne prajapater visarbhrti tararapnutum ast ty
japtva varunyap purvc喝utu juhuyut [anyo-hoakala-paryantam yajmai-
nasya 'nasamap bhavati [asee skanne styalyapunar-anunyapam ka-
rayitva purvcap juhuyat sthyapam apy abhyvay apy yajman samaptr11 yitya
purvacvad dhoama karivyaam [ahavav seopa juhuyat punar unnya yee
ayam aseexiti nimittsyapra kitchenad dhoama [varunyap japo varunyap
homo 'nasamap ca yajmanasunya nimittipam harmantrayap punarhomap
ca gangaliri [ayam aseexiti tytriva eva nimittapartat syan seopa-
seopunar unnyap homa iti keceti] Asv. Pray. 4 b; praectha-harman-
mantrapan dste punar-anunyapam.

274 AV. 10. 5. 23; Ap. 9. 5. 6; dhaarar wenren unreeha Subhastan dnom
Wasser ürbergehen; cf. oben Anm. 58. Asv. 3. 11. 6; Brah. Pray. 41 b;
samudrapa vah praehinomt ity anena muqtrpan [pa upaminya nicaa [L;
neicaar] dravyam prapyapan yatra skapadat tad apo ninyed iti brhamapan,
yad adya dudham abhimrantrayat, Asv. Pray.: atla shtalk-bheddad
bhimmapi skaman apy staharapan agnihotr-dravyam abhimrantrayet
[samudrapa vah 276 gopaitav (Asv. 3. 11. 6) ity apu praksipit]
277 AB ayonityo C apo minyot D apo nityot 278 RV. 1. 25. 21;
RV. 1. 24. 15; cf. Agn. Pray. 7 a: abutti-dvavyaya paryaapam anyap
dravyam ... juhuyat etad dohanat dy a praectha-harmanat praecthanarunat
pragagnihot (L: 'tre) skanne samudrapa ity anena 'bhimmypa
adya dudham (Ap. 9. 5. 6) iti payasa [payo-vyatrikte dravye
ahucinta-taxthapam skanne vakypayam, brham[agnikapita vigayandane
yad abhimaranam tad bhavati [tatah skannam apo 'bhyavahareynah
praktya eva homah prajapater visarbhrit tarnam hurtam asti 'ti
(Ap. 9. 6. 3) tatra skamahimarpanam seeopa juhuyat punar unnyyo
seevhyam aseexiti etad a homad varuntritapajtva varunyap juhuyad
umanam a 'nyamid dhoma-kalat [tatah] pryogah [praectha-harmanady-
uttarashuti-madhye agnihotrpan skandet tada prajapat... asiti
payo-'bhimmipanam samudrapa ity anena taspulidy-abhimaranam
krtva tatah skannam apo 'bhyavahareyt [tatah srucii madhye homa-dvavyaya
paryaapadrayayap cetmaiva [L: cet teniva] matra-pacarepiva homah na
'tre 'bhyayaniannan [yadi sanram skandet tatah punar unnyyo homah];
vgl. Ait. Brahm. 7. 3: 'yasya 'gnihotry upavyaptya duhymamipa spandas 
"yatra skapayadat tad abhyvayap ... tata yat pariaptaap
syat tena juhuyad yady alap homaya syd: yady us val samap sikkopa
syad ubhi 'nyam ahuya tam dudhvi tena juhuyat ...; cf. Asv. Pray. 3b:
patra-gataan tad duatah seon-bhete dravyapitareya homah]
278 A vrunyap ddyadyaahuhit BU vrunyap nadyap aajyshuti D vrunyapdogha-
dyadyahuhit 279 Ap. 9. 6. 1; Brah. Pray. 42 b: varunyapraecthapan
karivyap varuno etat (?) yajmaya grihitay ad erchati cf. oben Anm. 724.
279 D 'vaapi
sąjam [yasya] skanno 724 homah 723 syät 723 pratăr nā śnyat | pratăr yasya skanno 724 homah 723 [syät] sąjam nā śnyan (mantrasanskman) 724 ced abhivarṣen mitro janan yātayati 724 'ti samiddham adhāya nyā(m) dugdhva punar juhuyāt 726 | mitro janan yātayati bruvāno mitro dādhāra prāhitam uts dyām | mitrab kṣirāt animiṣa bhīcāte mitrayā havāyan ghrtavaj juhotas svāhe 'tī 727 mantra-samskṛtam 728 | kiśā-vapannam hiraṇyagarbha 729 iti valmikavapayām 740 avanyā 724 'nyām dugdhva punar juhuyāt 742 | 3 | anignhotram ced anabhyyuddhām sūryo

724 ABC skanno D skapanno 725 A homāṇ śyāt B homāśya C homāt D homā syāt 726 BCD homāt cf. Ap. 9. 6. 9; Agu. Prāy. 89: varuṇa-japo varuṇa-home nusānaq ca 727 1: vidheīch; ātmāpākyam; s. in fol... 728 RV. 3. 59. 1; Ap. 9. 2. 6 (fast wörtlich übereinstimmend); Āv. 3. 11. 22; K. 8. 25. 11. 23. 729 Brahm. Prāy. 42a: avalyaṃ nā myd eva kārttasacaknayam divyādir adhīhi sam-sarga ity arthaḥ | pāchalī-dravya-viḥṛtair ity arthaḥ.... tatra bhūr bhava yaśar iti punastādh dhoto vihād ity evam-ādi brahma-pāramitāt | vyākhyāti anignhotram iti vo cāryāḥ mitra iti pārvan svāhita juhuyāt parśamāpte cāmin āparahomānte stote ca parśamāpte ārya pūnāḥ (i) abhōma va 'paravīr ity. stāt strīram etad vratam ichantuḥ | teṣām ita prāg āparahomād anyaṃ dugdhvā 'tha punar anignhotraṃ juhuyāt(?) anyās dugdhvāye 'tī va nīṛjena dohanam niyavāyate | kiṃ tā punar anignhotram vindhyate anyād[ ] dravyam upādāya punar anignhotraṃ ātavāyam iti pāvasi va 'vāryate niyamah | kiṃ tarhi sarvādṛavyey eva vṛṣeṣu tatra (?) avalyaṇaśeṣāna etat | nai 'tān nāmākṛtaq | cf. Agu. Prāy. 9.9: mitro janān yātayati bruvāno iti samidd-adhānam anagṛtā (?) 'guṇhotra-dravya yada varṣet tādā nimittā-nimātaram mitro.... juhote 'ty abhavante samiddham adhāyāt | tatas tenaiva homah | vgl. Āv. Prāy. 4.4: anignhotra-dravya vyātir icau (?) ścotaq)iti tādā mitro.... juhote saṁhā | mitraye 'dām [i] samidd-āptaṃ nimittā-nimātaram eva juhuyāt | athaya praκra-μantra-sthāne anyāṃ tantraḥ | 725 ABC 'hotā 'tī 726 ABCD mantrapām 727 Āv. 4. 2. 7. 728 ABC vapaṃ 729 Maśa apu' resp. api; 730 Al. Mittel, sich eines unreinen Gegenstandes zu entführen, gilt das Herausgießen resp. Aussetzen desselben auf einen Ameisen- oder Maulwurfshügel, das Aufhängen auf Bäumen, das Fortwerfen in Wasser. Letztere drei Arten bei Beseitigung eines Fötus angewendet; K. 8. 25. 10. 14. 724 Āv. 3. 10. 23; Brahm. Prāy. 43b: kītāvapannam prajāvapatyarec valmika-vapayām avanī bhūr ity upaniṣṭhātaḥ... prajāpatyarca... hiraṇyagarbho ity etaya apari punāḥ prajāpate na hi tvatāni 'ty etaya... visya(?) samayā valmika-vapayāṃ kitāvapannam anāta-pañṇadihy avāryāte | vyāhārāvayā avamayaḥ iti...; cf. Agu. Prāy. 6b: duṣṭāni havīnay apari prakṣipta satvatra | prajāpate na tvad etāni anāma (Āv. 7. 80. 3) iti valmika-vapayāṃ avamayāvam duṣṭaṃ madhyamanena paśā-paṇḍena juhuyāt | prajāpate... vyūmaḥ (?) iti anena svāhākāraṇa- tene mantreyā valmika-dvāre prasūcet | apiṣu | tugāpi |
bhuyiyād\textsuperscript{743} ihai 'va kṣenyā edhi\textsuperscript{744} mā prahāṭir\textsuperscript{745} mām amum āmuṣāyānam\textsuperscript{746} iti śamayitvā prauṇyā pravṛttā-tipatt\textsuperscript{747} maitraṁ caraṁ nirvapet sauryām\textsuperscript{748} ekakapalām| varo\textsuperscript{749} dūksipā | gnaṁ upasamādhāya yajamānaḥ patni vā bhunājamā vāgyatā\textsuperscript{749} aranipūñi\textsuperscript{750} sarvāhānaṁ\textsuperscript{751} upeśyētāṁ\textsuperscript{750} dvayor\textsuperscript{755} gavoḥ\textsuperscript{756} sāyam āgurhotram juhuyād\textsuperscript{754} | agnaye

\textsuperscript{743} Brahm. Prāy. 51 a: anuddhātām ced abhyudiyād utterato gurhapatasya samāstirya 'gurhotra-pātrāṇi prauṇya samāstirya (?) pavitraṁ uptādya pavitrre prāksa... (?) arūṇam jhumum āyasthāḥoḥ co 'taraṇaḥ prauṇya āgurhotra-sāyamāni dūksipati... sānātītāṁ kṛtva āmuṣādānāṁ gurhapatasyā pākayanidadharmena 'jyaṁ asarurtyo taraṇaḥ āgurhotra-pātrāṇāṁ āvasthāḥpūñi ghrutvā pavitrre gurhapatye kṛtva "āyasthām aparīya ādhumāṁ | \textsuperscript{744} Ap. 9. 7. 6. (Die differenzieren Den Bestimmungen finden sich in 9. 7. 2 ff.; cf. 9. 7. 10); Āsv. 3. 12. 7.

\textsuperscript{745} D prahāsitaḥ idam āhām āmuṣāyānam iti \textsuperscript{746} A pravṛttāipyate B pravṛttāipataṁ C pravṛttāipacau (tvana?) a hieru Ap. 9. 7. 6; — Brahm. Prāy. 58 a folg. behandeln das gleiche Theem;... prāτar āgurhotraṇu ced abhyudiyād avv agni rāsaāgaram agraśādi (M. S. 1. 8. 9) ity unnitaṁ abhimaṇtrayate | (Komm.) prāτar āgurhotragrahamāḥ prasūte gnau prāτar āgurhotrāhram abhyudiyāt... na hi sūryabhyyanday ava yassā āhām āgurhotraṇu sūrye bhuyiyād bohimāna-darśanāṁ atade 'daśaś prayāscittām āmuṣāgamāṁ kuryād avv agni ity unnitaṁ abhimaṇtrayate bhrimānādarśanāḥ... anūdeśāḥ udhavaryr āvabhimaṇtrayate śahavatīyaṁ yajamāna hasi 've 'ty abhimaṇtrayate... mām amum iti nāmā ghrutāy āmuṣāyānam iti gotraṇu mām yajhādātān bhrāvṛya ity evam anyatra 'ha mum iti... prāτar varōra ity upeśoḥ nasaśād iti sāyamāgurhotra-kāṣṭikrama utsātaḥ | hutā pariśeṣe āhāma ānirvapet | sauryām ekakapalāṇaṁ hute hūnīmāte sūdayākriyaṁ āyād iti | iñbhuṣaṅgām dviṁ ṣaṁyātīgāva nāmaṇamaṇaṁ sarvāhānaṁ upaśyātan... anīsāṁsye... saiyatāṁ dvayor gavoḥ sāyam āgurhotraṇu juhuyād... sāyau pratnā anvāte na prāτar iti patṇī prātarkaṇaṁ eva pratiṣṭhidhaye... prāτar āgurhotraṇu ced abhyudiyād... anuddhātām... uddharaṇāḥ sābhāya prāk putrasāṁ 'huter idamā prāyaścittām... vgli. oben l. 2. \textsuperscript{747} ABCD saurya; cf. Ap. 9. 7. 6.

\textsuperscript{748} A varāno 'B caro; cf. Āsv. 8. 12. & 8.

\textsuperscript{749} Auch der Bruch der Schweigaubricht verlangt Sūkhe (Āsv. Prāy. 17 a): yatra vāgyamo vitiśa tad-bhrēse ato deva (RV. 1. 22. 16) iti japed api vā 'ṇyaṇa vaśpaviṁ | upaśeṣā-vidoṣāyamānā- dir yatra svaro viśita tad-bhrēse dviyāvṛtā bhrīrītīḥ ... sāyāna (Tait. Brahm. 3. 7. 11, 4–5) avso 'ti sruveṇātī juhuyāt| yatra ekārūṇy-abhi viśita viṇun-trīru no ātva eva pūraḥ paṭhet | \textsuperscript{750} BC arupṣajāṇi D arupṣaṇi\textsuperscript{751} A sarvāśaṁ BC sarvāḥnām\textsuperscript{752} B upāṣādaḥātāṁ; cf. Āsv. 3. 12. 9.

\textsuperscript{750} BC dvayoreyakaḥ-ḥot; dvayor gathoh; 'verbesteit nach Ap. 9. 7. 3.

\textsuperscript{755} Brahm. Prāy. 47 a: yadi rudraḥ paśuḥ abhimanyeṣe dvayor gavoḥ sāhāya dohane ca dohayitvā sāmāṇya sajīr jātavedā (M. S. 1. 8. 8) iti pūrveṇ āhūtī juhuyāt|... dvayor gavoḥ sāhāya dohana ca (?) dohityā... oṣha sāhāyanīḥ sāmāṇya bhūr bhūrah vār āgni-
vaśvānaruṣya dvādaśakapālam purodāsāṁ nirvaped | yadi hy ayaṁ divā praṇasū hi manyeta sajūr jātavedo748 divā prthivyā haviṣo vihi746 svāhe 'ti sajūruho747 va syāt sajūr agnaye divā prthivyā haviṣo vihi svāhe 'ti dvādaśarātram agnihotram juhuyād | yadi na viramayed agnaye750 suśīryatamo750 juṣṣava svāhe 'ty aparām dvādaśarātram758 nīṣayāḥ sāyamahuter atipattir760 prāтарāše prātarāhuter āsādā 'gnihotram ā751 ta-

hotram sajūr iti co 'kt[v]ā pūrṇaṁ śāntiṁ juhuyāt Bl. 48.a; dvayor gavor ekasya dvayor va niṣdane pūrṇaṁ prāyācittām ity upajātam iti kṛtvā prāyācittām luhvavāt. Bl. 60.b: dvayor gavor āyam agnihotram khuṭe...

apād mā daivyās taptus echād mā mānuṣyaḥ | namō dīvē namāḥ prthivi-

"va punar ādadhita\[173\] | 4 | iti yanāprāyaścitte catūrtho dhyāyah samāptāḥ\[173\].

\[173\] Aśv. 3, 12, 29 f.; Brahm. Prāy. 51 b; yasyo 'bhāj[\text{-}]v[\text{-}]...gārhapatiya-
havanīyāv snugstan śuryo bhyastam īyāt abhyutadi vā punar-
dheyaṁ eva tuṣya prāyaścittiḥ; K. Ś. 25, 3, 24; cf. Aśv. Prāy. 10 b;
gārhapatiya- havaniyayor naśe tā 'bhaya-nīṣṭha-bhūmanā ranti ayaṁ
ta (RV. 3, 29, 10) iti maṃtrenā samarpaye 'taḥ prathāmam jajne agniḥ
evād yone... praṇāma (Kau. S. 133, 6) mathīva gārhapatiya ādhāya
śata śhavantam prāyaśca pūrvakata prāyaścittam [d. h.: die beim Er-
lôtechen des gārhapatiya-Feners angewandte] kuryaḥ ubhayor ubhaya-
sāpekṣatvena krama- napatteḥ tata ubhayastru 'uvādhamo-pasthāne
\[173\] BC lesen statt dieses Kolophona: ity atharvavede vaītānasūtre prāya-
ścittā prasāne dvādaśamo 'dhyāyah [12]; B beginnt soudan mit: onu
D ity atharvavede vaītānasūtre prāyaścittā prasāngo dvādaśo 'dhyāyah"
Athen orāvāpyāścittānī. Text mit Anmerkungen von Prof. JULIUS VON NEGELEN, University of Koenigsberg, Germany.

agnihotram 774 ced anabhuddhātam sūryo 'bhūnīmloced 775 brāhmaṇo bahuvit 776 uddhāred 778 | yo brāhmaṇo bahuvit syāt samuddhāret 776 | sarvesāt vai 'nam tad brāhmaṇa uddhāred yenā 'ntarhita[m] 777 hiranyam agrato hared 775 | vāruṇam yavam mayam caron nirvaped 779 ita eva prathamam iti | ita eva

774 D 'tre
775 BD bhūnīmloced C bhūmloce; cf. Ap. 9, 6, 12.
776 A liest statt bahu': bu'; B bahuvit yo brāhmaṇo bahuddadha'; CD bahuvit uddhāred yo brāhmaṇo [bahuvit syāt; cf. Āśr. 3. 12. 16.
777 A yo nāyata'; die Stelle ist zweifellos verderbt.
778 Brahm. Prāy. 49a: yasyā 'gnum anuddhātam sūryo 'bhūnīmrocet(!) yo brāhmaṇo bahuvit sa uddhāret(!) yasya yajamanāṣaya 'gnim anuddhātam gurahapāyod aviyojanam ity arthah ... ʾtvig-vastirikto 'pi yo bahuvit sa uddhāred iti ... anyeno 'dṛṣṭam apy anuddhātam iti hiranyam baddhvā ārathīd 'grato hareta pāścad agniḥotreṇa 'nivyāt(!) | hirāṃyam baddhvā baddhvā uddhāred iti vakyayanam | yatra yatra hirāṃyam baddhvajeti tatra tatra ḍhāraṇam iti tane vai ke agnum tām baddhvā? 'grato hareita iti agnum uddhāram prakṛtam tasya 'grato naye ity arthah | pāścad agniḥotreṇa 'nivyād mugechched ity artham ... tatra bahuvit kācda ścaṣate | caturāśṣa-bhir vidiṣṭāyaśīrat adhīntah vijnātaḥ ca bhavanti | Bl. 51a: śūmanī tu viṣeṣaḥ | caturṛghitam ājyam agrato hareta caturṛghitena hirāṃyam pāścad ajaṃ ścaṣate | cf. Āśr. Prāya. 5 b: atāḥ 'navaniye 'pranīte yadi sūrya 'atāmāṣa[m](!) tadi bahuvitam brāhmaṇam sūnyam tene 'dīharaṇādini ... nāṃtanam kāreyat | agniprayāyanākāle hirāṃyam darbhair baddhvā 'nāyaḥ purastān naṭay | tataḥ pāścad bahuvit agnim prāpyayet | tataḥ śrayam-kāla-'ṭipatti-prayāscitāṃ vārūṇī-'ṣṭy-antam sarveṣāṃ kāreyam ity eke | kuśeṣaḥ 'pāś Odinā-vārūṇī-'ṣṭy-antam ity āpare | atāḥ 'navaniye 'pranīte yadi sūryodayas tadi sāṃśkṛtam caturṛghitam ājyam ekāḥ purastān naṭay | tataḥ pāścad dhīramyavadaśaṃ tāsathaṃ ekāḥ naṭay | tataḥ pāścad bahuvit agnim prāpyayet | tataḥ āyatam 'guniḥ mūlnāya purastāt pratyahmukha upavisyā jāvanāya iṣaḥ ]āya(l.; jāni aṣya) uṣāḥ ketunā svāho 'ti [Ā. 8, 9, 7, 10] hutsa prājakāla-'ṭipatti-'pratā-prati-vṛṣṭaḥ-ḥṛtyṣṭy-antam 'ahavantā-'ungamanvāraṃ kuryat | kuśe[ṣaḥ] 'pāś Romaniaḥ-‐pratā-‐vṛṣṭaḥ-ḥṛtyṣṭy-‐antam kuryād ity eke | 778 Ap. 9, 7, 1.
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prathamar jājñe 788 agnir abhyo yonibhyo adhi jatavedāh | sa gāyatrīyā triṣṭubhā jagatyā 'nuṣṭubhā devo devebhyo havyan vahatu praṇānam 789 iti pasčād gārhapatyā-lakṣanasya 'raṇi nidhyā matihvye 'ṣe rāyāni rāmasye 'ty ādāhyāt | iṣe rāyāi rāmasva 782 sahase dyumna urjē pātyāya | samrād aṣi sva-rād 783 aṣi sārasvatāu tvo 'tsau prāvatām iti | yah kaś cā 'gnumān anugachena 784 nirmanthya 785 ced 782 daksināṇigaṁ |
Ahuro 786 cet 787 sayam purvo 'nugached agnihotram adhishrityo 'uniya 'giniya purvayeno 788 'ddhirtaya 788 'gnihotreya nudraved 789 adattarpurya-dhanam 790 dadya 789 chvas tapasvatim nirvaped yahya tapasa janishv 791 'agnaye 792 pawako arcisah 'upe 'mam sujutum mama a no yahi tapasa javaanagnye 793 'pawakavida 789 hayya deveno no dadhad iti havamsi dadya sayam ahutam ati trarnemin 794 etad eva prayaacitam anyatrapi 'shutyaya 795 ced ahute cet pratapabhrf 796 'nugacched avadhisheam 797 aisyat tesv alabhyamuneo bhasman 'ranu samprasya matthvai 'vadadhya 798 agnaye jyotismata istim nirvaped ahute
dheyma va prayaacitam bhavet. Mit dem Fall, das irgendein Opferfeuer erlosch, beschaffen sich Agn. Pray. 18a: anagate tu manthanaadi-
tapasvati 'ityaapta tatra prayaacitam tatra tu javajama tu'vayan maitihya yadi tukkisgati 'sthapane anavakasas tada 'yavad-utpaatis taisvan ma[a]itham eva tata 'yajate nidhaye 'nuddhara-prayaacitapa-vrakasa- homah kartavya[sa]o cito 'nuddharaaya-prayaacitena sabha yadi kalolipitas tada mnamavathornim ca karyah 799 AD nirmathya ca B nirmanthyas ca C nirmanthyas ca ce 799 B ahute; ev. Ap. 9. 9. 6. 797 A c e 788 A 'nyodertaya 798 Braham. Pray. 51b folg.: sayaya 'hute 'gnihotre purvo 'gnir anugachet svapradhane 'gnihotrepa prasangike 'giniya ca sabha 'gnihotreca co ['ddravet'] stru 'nugached iti 'svayam anugataya(?) tad t(?) bhavati naganemeti yathagnugamyaya purvam iti ahuta iti prak 'purvasya 'hute ita eva prathamas jauna (MS.3.3.1) uddhyam abhimantrayate pradhanastvad anyasya ca 'nidebale adhavyary abhimantsnandini karoti ije 'raie ramanie ty (MS. ibid.) 'ahayamane uddhyam analisyaamane ca 'gnim abhimantrayate samriid atity (ibid.) 'adadhati 'amthahitim iti sayya 'dharmastirarnaya 'yam apaccadadyamahdakam 'saravatan tv (ibid.) ity shitam avasthaptam agnim abhimantrayata iti vyavahitam apy nuvanartate ['hunte 'gnaye jyotismate 'stakupalam nirvaped varunam yuvamahe carun hutyaya mtre upasatho na syat idam sayam agnihotre va visega 'bhirdhanan uohayan tu bhavati 798 B 'purvo 798 M. S. 4. 10. 2. Ap. 9. 9. 11 vgl. auch 'Avd. 8. 12. 27. 792 A agne 790 Die Worte von arciisah bia agneye fehlen bei C AD lesen: agne 794 A ahutenittita iterasamishm 790 BCD suitay 793 A aparvya 793 A lato diese und die zwiischenlegende Worte aus. vgl. Ap. 9. 9. 7; Braham. Pray. 68b: sayaya 'hute 'gnihotre [']paro 'gnir anugachet iti ... 37. 10. 1: aparaxho 'huto 'gnir upasamyati; vgl. ibid. 37. 13. 1 pranito 'gnir upasamyati 797 Braham. Pray. 52a folg.: sayaya 'hute 'gnihotre uddharanad arruba prak purvasya 'hute 'svapradhane ity ukta: tatra 'bhimasancantam krtvo 'ddharet ... anum adhavyuran grhyaya agnihotravravayaa soma sarmaa grhyaya sahasanayan somaasraya nodya chastram krtvo 'pate adhavyah paristarananti krtvo 'pasodyaana yuhuyat tamb sadya jyotismait bhuyo bhuya praasit 'nugame sakrd eva 'gihih huvhri pratisyamane 'nagate sa eka (?) bhuya pranayad abhimantranandini ca karyah(?) 123
a paristaranų įtvar mechetė sudėte 'angate agne(?) eva dakisnuo 'ginihotadravyasa pravygah (.) yadi hutukų samidhā ( ) nuggesti (...) bhūyo 'nugata abhimantaradāya maṇḍra ṣvaratane sakrī eva samid bhūyo bhūyo 'nugata skatra bhamsay avasthāpi te 'gner daršana tatrāspadehā na jyōtismatī ( ) agnimatī ( ) ādiatā yo 'yam eva utasthā pi bhūyo bhūtā prasīte prathamasyā 'gner daršana bhūvyūdrītalkalankanāgāni māte jyōtismatī bhavati gataśāyā uddharaṇābḥavād ītī eva 'ty abhimantarān bhavati īye rāyas iti ca mantratrayām bhavati | yasyā 'hute 'ginihotre pūraya 'guir anugachet tamo vā utasā yajhīm yuvata iti bhūmīmaṇṣa 79) 4 nyaste cf. Kau. S. 7, 8, 4. abhyuddhīto ['hute 'guir pramādād upaśāmyatī mathite vyāhytār jhuyat ... 80) Ap. 9, 9, 8; vgl. zu diesem Abschnitt Brahms. Prāy. 46b folge. yadi pūrvasyāṃ hūtyāṃ akṣāntā yastra va 'ty arthāḥ ity anena mantrānām samidham abhāyo 'tārāṃ yathāvidhiṃ jhuyatā ( ) vyākhyātā punar agnīhotra-vidhānam ( yadi pūrvasyāṃ hūtyāṃ abhavati 'nugachē agnir īdārār ārār āgnir [ M. S. 3, 2, 9] iti hiranyam niḥhāyo 'tārāṃ yathāvidhiṃ jhuyatā ( ) hiranyatā niḥhāyo 'ty agniṣaṃpādārārāhāṃ hiranyam niḥhāya jhuty agnīmatī eva juhoti 'tārāṃ iti uktām pūrṇaṃ agnīhotraṃ yastra pūrṇaṃ hūtyāṃ skandaṃ abhavati 'nugatāvā 'nugamā eva 'bhayāv bhavati tatrā 'gniṣpaṇādānaṃ pūrṇam hūryāṃ abhāyā samidham ādādiyāt ... ... vgl. fermer ibid. 63a: yasyā 'hute 'ginihotre 'paro 'guir anugachet abute iti prāk pūrvasyā huteḥ ( ) agnimatī ... anugamaya pūrvasmīna mathitvā prapāyey anugamayya pūrvaṃ sārmanāṃ mathitvā eva juhoti ... iti sāyata uktām agnīhotraṃ śvā bhute 'gnyaye tapasvate jamadvatye pava副本 'ṣākāpāṇaṃ nirvapet śvā bhute iti sāya prakāreṇ śvā bhute nirvapalī svavāhā evam arthāṃ kṛtyā 'nvedyā nirvapāḥ | yadi tvaṃ eva prācaṃ uddhṛtya daksināgniṃ anvantya śayamātrār jhuyatat ... ... Bl. 54b: yasyā 'hute 'ginihotre 'paro 'guir anugachet svavṛddhāṃ niḥdharmaṇād arabhāya prak pūrvam 'huter gārhapatyānugame anugamayya pūrvaṃ gārhapatyā namācūpya nirmathā pranayādārābhāya 'ginihotraṃ sādhanam | upavasāhaṃ kṛtyā 'gnyaye tapasvate iṣṭa uddhātānābhāvate gārhapatiṣaṃgame pāṭṣālam eva 'nugamayet ( ) anugimite yado aparo dpāyate tapasvate jyōtismatī ( ) uktām anugate jyōtismatī uktām anugate jyōtismatī na 'nugamita iti ... 81) cf. Āśv. Prāy. 7a: atha samārddhe jhuyatā na 'jāye( ) tada laṅkikāgniṃbrāhmaṇapārya-ajarka-dhārhatāmbā 'pū saṅkṣhe phṛthyavān hutila 'maṇṭaram eva maṇṭhānaṃ kuryaṃ | phṛthyavān pūrvasmīd āpi na bhavati | homāh kāryā | kāṣṭhe parāsaneśaṃdāyā ṣāyaṃ bhūtenābhāvāṃ-pāho ṣāya kāryā-āmba-āho bhīmaṇaṃ-āhānā bhūtenābhāvāṃ vṛtāṃ bhūtenābhāvāṃ-hoṃ bhūtenābhāvāṃ vasati-ūrānā | ajarka-home āja-mūrṇepu na 'ṁtātī | darbha-stamba-home darbhīsaṇe no 'pavīt | apsu home viveko na kāryā | cf. Aqu. Prāy. 18a: agnīhotra
parāpasyet tata abhrtya guhotram jhuyād 862 | yadi tam na
vined brāhmaṇasya daksine pānau jhuyāt | tato brāhmaṇam
na paricakṣita | yadi tam na vined ajāya daksine karne jhuyāt
| tato 'jām na 'snyād | yadi tām 883 na vined darbhas-
stambesu 864 jhuyāt | tato darbhesu nā "sita | yadi tām 885 na
vined apsu jhuyāt | tato 'dbhih pādau na prakṣālayita 886 | yadi
tān na vined dhiranye jhuyāt | tato hiranyam na bibhyād
| āpadi mathitvā vihrtya 867 'gnihotram jhuyād | agnihotre ced
anabhuddyhīte haviśi vī nirupete śakuni śyenah śvā vī 'ntarena
vyaveyād 888 idam viṣṇu 889 iti | idam viṣṇu vicakramām tredhā
nidadhe padam | samudham asya pāṃsūre | pra tad viṣṇu 810
iti bhamsanā padam upavapeda 811 | ano 812 ratā 'syā 813 pu-
rūṣo 814 [vā] vyaveyād 815 yad agne pūrvam nīhitam 816 padam
hi te sūryasā rasmin anvātātām | tatra rayistham anusum-
harāha: "tām sam naḥ sṛṣa sumatāvā vājāvatah 817 "ty āda-
dhyāt 818 \[2\] anvāhitagūc cetā 819 prayaṇya 813 tubhyam ta

kāle 'gnāv ajayamāne 'py anyām śuliya jhuyuhā | agnihoṁaṛṭham prajña-
yasa-kāle samārūṭho 'gnir mathyāmāno na jāyeta anyām laukikam agnita
śuliya prajnya tatrāya homaḥ[k] kartavyāh | etad anvāteto na bhavati
802 Ap. 9. 3. 3śf.
803 Es handelt sich aber offenbar um das männliche Wesen; s. K. Ś.
25. 4. 5; — D tan 801 K. Ś. 25. 4. 6: kuṣa-śambha 800 D ām.
808 Das Gleichle lehrt Āp. 9. 3. 14. Nach K. Ś. 25. 4. 9 soll das Wasser
in den zugehörigen Gefäßen an die Feuerstätten gestellt werden. Denn
vordem Wasser darf man nicht Ekel empfinden, so lehrt der Veda.
807 AB vihātya. — Die obige Auffassung der Substitutionsopfer lehrt
eindringlich den Glauben an die absolute Notwendigkeit des Voll-
zauges des Agnihotra.
808 cf. Āp. 9. 6. 11; vgl. auch Āp.
9. 10. 15, 11. 24; Āsv. 3. 10. 10.
809 AV. 7. 26. 4. 810 AV.
812 ABD ato 813 D
rathāśva
814 ABCD 'esa
815 A vyaveyād; Bavyavē
c C vyavaya; vgl. Āp. 9. 10. 17; l. ano-rathā-śvā-puruṣa-vyavaya?
816 So die Mea. mit M. Ś. 3. 4. 10.
817 T. B. 1. 4. 4. 10. Ap. Ś. 9. 10. 17;
Āsv. 3. 10. 16.
818 Brahm. Prāy. 70 a: yasya 'dhīsrīte 'gnihotre
haviśi vī nirupete some vī pratatte 'no ratā śvā puruṣa śvā kṛṣṇāh
śakunir anyād vā saḥtvam anātarā vīyāy[ā] trayastrīṃśat taptavā (MŚ.
3. 4. 9) ity āhavanāya hūtvā gām anvāvētya 'vardayet ... Bl. 70 b:
yady ano vī ratā vī 'ntarā vīyāyā iti katham pūtar atha śakunam
vī vinā vahār anātarā gacchit ...; daśa unter dem śakunī der Ath.
Prāy. der kṛṣṇākuni, also etwa der Rabe, zu verstehen sei, lehrt auch
der Komm. zu dieser Stelle, der den Text erweitert interpretiert: pu-
rūṣagrapana[n] dvipadāprasiṇdhya-arthaḥ ... śva-grahā[m] śiṅha-ārgha-
śvāpada-prasiṇdhya-arthaḥ kṛṣṇākunī[ḥ] kākāḥ (l) tasya graham...
ano-rathābhi pratyekam aklamasṛtanāṃ trayastrīṃśat taptavā iti; Bl.
rvatra\textsuperscript{822} pāthikrtvāma\textsuperscript{825} anādvaṃ | agnīnām cet kaścid upa-
vakṣṇet\textsuperscript{822} sa ṣam[yāyāḥ\textsuperscript{850}] prāg vāsaṃ\textsuperscript{831} pāthikraṃ\textsuperscript{832} syāc | cham[yāyāḥ\textsuperscript{833}] paraṃ\textsuperscript{834} paraśyaṃacet | idam ta ekam\textsuperscript{834} iti tānt\textsuperscript{835} sambharet\textsuperscript{536} paraṃ\textsuperscript{837} u ta\textsuperscript{837} ekam iti dvitīyam dviti-
yena\textsuperscript{839} trītyam trītyena jyotiṣe ti\textsuperscript{839} tasmād\textsuperscript{840} avakhya-
yāś\textsuperscript{841} tatra nirvapi | adhi ced anuprāya\textsuperscript{842} mathitva tatrai kān vaset\textsuperscript{843} kālā-ṭipāte\textsuperscript{844} ca dasapūrṇamāsavyo |

bhūma-kālāṃ prati nimittam pāthikṛt kāryā | abhūma-kālān-‘nekani
mitta-sambhavā sakṛt pāthikṛt kāryā | aṣṭākṣaraḥ | vettāha ki (RV. 6, 16. 3) ... oṣa ṣa agnīn pāthikṛtam a devanām ... (RV. 10. 2. 3) anādvaṃ daksināḥ.\textsuperscript{877} A sa sarvatra \textsuperscript{838} BCD kṛtvām \textsuperscript{832} bei A unklar \textsuperscript{822} bei A unklar \textsuperscript{820} A vataṃ l. | para-
śati? \textsuperscript{837} B schiebt ein [‘tī] syam anaddhan agnīnāṃ cet kaścid upavakaṣṇayet susamāḥ prāg vāsaṃ pāthikṛt \textsuperscript{832} B chaṃyā C chaṃpyā \textsuperscript{840} AV 18. 3. 7. \textsuperscript{835} A tām B tāṃ \textsuperscript{828} cf. Agn. Prāy. 2b- yady utpadaḥ pratyatno niḥphalaiḥ syat (cf. oben 5. 2) tadā-taḍa punar-ārambhā-vasāre mantrā āvarttyatvāyaḥ | evaṃ punah-punah āvarttyat | āhavanāṃ avadipyamām arvāva (l. : arvāk) śamya-
paritām idam ta ekam para u ta ekam iti samyapet | Comm.: āhavani-
yasyai kadeśāḥ samasto va yady āyatanaḥ bairi gachet [tadā] śamya-
paritām tadā idam ta ekam para uta ekam trītyena jyotisā samyapita | samyapaśāna tatu ca sarud adhi priyo devanaṃ parame janitre (RV. 10. 36. 1) iti tam ādāya yātane prakṣipya tato vyāhyatāmah |. In unserem Texte werden wir dem entsprechend zu lesen haben: sa [agnih] śamya-parāg-
āśad (besser: śamya-parāg aşad) [yadi syat] pāthikṛi syāc | chaṃyā-
prāg-āśe (besser: chaṃyāyāḥ prāg āśa) ced [agnih syat] | idam te ... Ap. Ś. 9. 1. 17 erwähnt den gleichen Fall; vgl. Áśv. Prāy. 2a: āhavani-
yasyai kadeśāḥ samasto va yady āyatanaḥ bairi arvāk śam[yāparasyat paṭati tadā idam te ... ekam maṃtriṇa punah śvayatne kṣipeṇ | samastā-
vyāhyāh-ḥomah kārya iti eko na visphulingaṃ va tatra ‘ayati prāya-
ścitaṃ | gurahatya-daksināṇyoḥ sva-śvayatnāh bairi-patane tūṣṭiṃ prakṣipya vyāhyāḥ homah kāryāḥ | cf. Áśv. Prāy. 16b: gurahatya-daks-
ināṇyoḥ āyatanaḥ bairi-pāte tūṣṭiṃ prakṣipya bhrama vyāhyāḥ bhūtāh jhunyāt |; ibid. 16. 16: prāk prakṣipya bhūyāna iti srug-udāpanād arvāk sarvaṃ ghyātā iti vṛtikrto-kṣaṇam (cf. oben 4. 1) etat-kāla-tiriktā-ṅgāra-ekā-
ṇāṃ idam ta ekam ......... parame janitre iti maṃtriṇa śvayatane punah kṣipeṇ | tatāh sarva-praṣācitaṃ na visphulinga-mārtrayai ‘tāt prāyaścitaṃ | etad āhavaniyasya ‘rvāk śamya-parāśat patane | yadi śamya-
paritām spy uttayāt tadā pāthikṛi | sauktā puṃpaḥūhitāḥ | agnaye pathikṛitvā svāhā te ti. \textsuperscript{837} ABCD paraśra \textsuperscript{839} B dvitrīyamāṣa C fehlt. \textsuperscript{822} A ‘tī trītyam \textsuperscript{840} A yasmād \textsuperscript{841} E wtwa
avakaṣṇe? A acakaṣṇa D avakaṣṇa \textsuperscript{842} A anuprāya B anup-
prāya \textsuperscript{842} l. āvayāt \textsuperscript{844} D ‘pāti B ‘tīpitvate; vom Verstreichensamen der zum Opfer festgesetzten Zeit scheint auch AP 37, 12. 1 zu reden.
vidhy-ardha-samāpte ced aparādham vidyāt (samāpte cet strin haviṛṣyād) 445 | agnaye vaisvānāraya dvādaśa-kapālam purodāśam nirvaped 446 | yasya havir niruptam purastāc candramā abhyundiyāt tāms tredhā tandulān vihajēd 447 | ye madhyamās 448 tān 448 agnaye dātre śtakapālam purodāśam nirvaped | ye sthavirēḥs tān indrāya pradātre dadhāni 449 carum | ye kāyōdhās tān visheve śripiśśāyā | śrite 450 prāg ukte 451 tandulaḥbhāvār ardham vā vidyāt | 3 | agnaye vitaye 452 śtakapālam purodāśam nirvaped 453 yasya 'gnayo mithah samsārjerān | agnaye vīcīcaye śtakapālam purodāśam nirvaped yasyā 'gnayo 454 grāmyena 'gninā samsārjerēn | agnaye śucaye 455 śtakapālam purodāśam nirvaped yasyā 'gnyah śaśvenā 'gninā samsārjerēn | agnaye 'mādēyā 456 'nnapataye śtakapālam purodāśam nirvaped yasyā 'gnayo dāvenā 'gninā samsārjerēn | agnaye jyotismate śtakapālam purodāśam nirvaped yasyā 'gnayo di-vyena 'gninā samsārjerēn | agnaye 'gninmate 457 śtakapālam purodāśam nirvaped yasyā 'gnayo 458 'bhiplaverēn | agnaye

tyam 868 cared agnaye tantumate 869 'štakapalum purodāsam nirvaped yasya samtatam 869 agnihotram juhuyah ś 4 atha sammitpatiteśu prāyascitteśu vaiviciṃ 870 prathamam kuryāt tato 'gnaye suçaye vṛatapatim antataḥ kṣāmavatīm 871 parivar-ttayed 872 yasyā 'gnisv 873 anyam 873 yajayed 874 yo 874 vā 874 yajen 874 | mārutaṃ trayodāsa-kapalum purodāsam nirvaped yasya yamau 875 putrau jāyayātām gavo vā yamasūr daksinā dhenur bhāryā vā 876 | prañāyaṃ cet skannam 877 skannā dyaur 878 ity abhimantraya | skannā dyauḥ; skannā prthivī skannāṃ viśvam

869 B tatam C tantam; cf. Āp. 9. 4. 15.
870 Nach Brah. Prāy. 65 a folg. wird aber die 'Vaivici vollzogen, wenn die Opferfeuer sich mit einander vermengen oder wenn deren Asche sich vermischt; ebenso Ait. Brāhm. 7. 6. Nach K.Ś. 25. 4. 32 ist das Opfer für Agni vivici in gleichem Falle fakultativ.
871 A kṣāmavatā. 872 B pativarttayed C parivarttayed 873 B yv anyam fehlt bei C; bei A umklar.
876 cf. den sehr korrupten Pasuṇa Brāhm. Prāy. 68 b; ferner Āv. Prāy. 8 b: yasya bhāryā gaur vā yamun yameta tadā mahābhāyā pūraṇāhūṭih | Agni. Prāy. 14 b: yasya bhāryā gaur vā yamun yamayet ćiti marutah | 877 Brāhm. Prāy. 72 a folg.: yadi prañāyaṃ skandet (!) hiranyam antardhhāya bhūtyo | 'bhyyāhīyo | 'āvone (l) 'paḍhṛpaṇa mano jyotir vardhadātum bhūtiḥ ity etabhīyaḥ athūti jahu-yat... Bl. 72 b: yadi prañāyaṃ skandet iti prañāyam ājyo prañāyaṃ ājyan adhaśīrāṃ gūtīṃ sadgdvinsītām prañāyam ity abhīdyate... hiranyam antardddhāya hiranyam tatrā vāsthpāyā yadi skanno bhūtya bhūnāmyaḥ bhūtya tatrā vā bhūmakhyena niyeti va-canaḥ... Bl. 73 a: 'nvam gūdhāḥ padān kārayīva mano jyotir vardhadātum bhūtiḥ ity etabhīyaḥ athūti jahu-yad... trayastraṃat tattava ity abhavante hūtva... Bl. 73 a: bhīyāḥ tatrā vā 'antardhhāya vāsthpāyā yat skannam hiranyam apanīya prañāyam 'nvam 'paḍhṛpaṇa 'nvam apanīya brahmaḥ 'hūti jhuhoti... Es ist von einigem Interesse, daß der Vers 'trayastraṃat tattavaḥ' als Zauber bei Zerreißungen verschiedener Art angewendet wird, z. B. (Bl. 75 b folg.): yadi ravaṇam ciudād, yadi dvīdha kuryāt paśavikurāt pāsto (?) eva trayastraṃat tattava ity etāyā 'grāthi[ha] 'sandhi[ya]... jayaṣṭayaḥ vā jhuḥaḥ (cf. ĀP. 37. 16. 1. 17. 1)... patra-saṃāyā[ṃ] mekalayām vā dvīdha kṛtaṃ punāḥ sannāhanam brahma-carinō mekalāchithe kṛtasya gopī tvādayas tayo mantri bhavanti... Bl. 94 b: yadi samā skamde vyākhyātaṃ prañāyena soma skamde iti; cf. K.Ś. 25. 6. 6-7, 10; prañāya-skandane caite caustrastraṃad-āho manem ichanti.
idam jagat skannādo 879 viṣve devāḥ pra skannā[ṛ] pra yatam 880 havir ity abhimāntrye 'ha gāvaḥ 881 praJayadvam 881 ity anyasya prādatājasya juhuyat pāsugavā 882 cet sruvair 883 hutc avāma 884 5āty 885 avadānam 886 akarme 886 5iḥ anyasyāṃ dṛjñatarāyam śrāpayasyur 887 5[ya]dy avadānam na vimd te tādā 'jasyāṃ vadyed 888 upākṛtaś cet pāsūḥ prapate 889 vayavāṃ yasāgūṃ nīryūṃ 'nyām tad-rūpaṃ tad-varnam iti samānam 5 5 atha yasyāḥ 'hargane 890 [viṣamānte yuḥ virohet 891 pravīhyā yuṣpavaṃdāḥyā avalopya tapo hy agne 892 amatarām amitrām 893 tapa śamsam araruṣah parasya tapo vaso cikitāno acītan vi te tiṣṭhantām ajarā ayasah 5 yo naḥ sanuṭyo abhidāsad agne 894 yo amtaro mitramahō vanusyaḥ 895 tam ajarebhūr vrṣabhīs tava 896 svais 896 tapā 897 tapīṣṭha tapasā tapasān vān 5 yasmāt 898 kroṭi ketum ā naktam cid dūra ā sate pāvako yad vanaspatiṃ 899 yasamān minoṭy ajarō (nabhihitā) 900 iti dve pañcabhir aparāmaṃ paryuṣyāṃ suparna vācam 901 iti virādhiṃ hutvā punahsamatāṃ tasmāṃ vāstram ājāṃ pingalamaṃ pāsum bahurūpam ālabhaṃ 5 gīṇāṃ tapaḥ vābhavad 902 vācā brahmaḥ maṇīna 903 rūpam 5 'ndrevaṃ devāṃ vātēna prāiapānt 904 sūreyena dyāṃ candramasā nakṣatrāṇi yamena 905 pitṛu 5 rājīna manusyaṃ upalena nādeyaṃ ajagūraṃ sarpāṃ vyāghrenā rāṇyāṃ pāsum chyeneṣa patatritro vrṣaḥ 5vān 5 rṣabhena gā 5 bastena jā 5 vrṣṇīna 'vīr 5 vrhiṇā


"nāṇi | yavenu | śadhir | nyagrodhana 909 | vanaspatin | udu-
mabeno | "rjum | gāyatrya | chandāsini | trivṛt | stomān | brā-
hamena vācam iti brahmā pūrnāhutim juhuyāt | 6 | iti 906 yajnāprasācitte pañcamo ʻdhyāyaḥ samāptah 906 |

athā ʻtah saumikānī vyākhyaśvāmo | havirdbāne cet pra-
pateyatam purā bahiśpavamānād adhvaryur dakṣinam ud-
grhiṇyāt | pratiprasthāto 'pastabhunyāt 907 | pratiprasthāto 'ttaram udgrhiṇyād | adhvaryur upastabhunyād 907 yathā-
prakṛti stambhāno pamānan 908(l) sam aśinor avasā nātana 909 mayobhuvā suprāṇī 910 gamena | a no rayim vahatam ota vīrān a viśvām aμṛth saubhagāni 911 | śiro yajnāsya pratidhi-
yātām 912 aμṛtām devatāmayam 912 | vaiśnavaḥ | (kriyām 912 śira aśvinaḥ | 914 pratihriyaṭām 912 aμṛtām 915) dyubhir akutbhiḥ 
paripātām 917 asmuṇ 918 arīṭebhīr aśvinā saubhagebhīḥ | tan 
no mitro varaṇo māmahāntām aditīḥ sindhūḥ prthivi 919 uta 
dyaur | ity āgudhūrye 920 juhuyād | audumbarm ced upaharey 
ynam eva kāmci prachiḍā vaḍaḥdyā adhvaryur udgāta yaj-
manā | urg asy ʻṛjum mayī ʻṛhehi | āryam tiṣṭha praṭiṣṭhitā | 
dhān stabdhyā ʻntarikṣam ca prthiyām ca dydhā bhave ʻti 921 |

906 Diese und die darzwischenliegenden Worte sind in den Ms. ganz entstellt. A yamena piṁ aśaṁ manuṣyaḥ phaleṇa nādeyātraṣaṅgraṇaṁ sarpān 
grāmyeṣaṅgraṇyaṁ paśvānaṁpanena paṭatiniḥ vṛṣabhena gaṁ vastenāja vṛnā
vṛiṣaṁniḥ aśawesadhyinyagrodhena [vāsanapātā] B yamena pitṛṇ aśaṁ 
manuṣyaḥ phaleṇa nādeyān aṣaṅgareṇaṁ sarpāṅ deyehaṁ "raṇyān paśaṁ 
cheyena paṭatiniḥ vṛṣabhāvabāṁ vṛṣabhopagāṅ vṛṣanāja vṛpiṇāvin vṛhiṇā 
ṁanāi vəvaseṇaṁadhiḥ nyagrodhena; C (ahixān B und D) yamena pitṛn 
aśaṁ manuṣyaḥ upalena nādeyān aṣaṅgareṇaṁ sarpāṅ ṛgṛhenaṁ paśaṁ 
chhetre paṭatiniḥ vṛṣabhāvabāṁ gaṁ vastenāja vṛpiṇāvin vṛhiṇiṁ-
ṇamni vəvaseṇaṁadhiḥ nyagrodhena; auch die folgenden Worte sind bei A und B sehr inkorrekt geschrieben.
907 Bei BCD lautet der Ko-
lphon: ity athāravede vyaśasyeṣe prāṣaṣeṣe prasūpeṣe prasūpeṣe.treṇādhyāyaḥ samāptah
908 ABC "pastha brāyāt" 909 A. paṇamane BD paṇamoe C paṇamane vielmöcht Imperative plus „anām.
910 RV. 5. 42. 18. 911 A "yitaṁ" 912 A "bharaṇī
er 312 Ap. S. 14. 33. 8; Ms.: pratiyagati (A "hūyaṁā") 913 B 914 A kriyātāt C kriyātāt; gemeint ist; 
śrīyātāt 914 C upādhiṇya 915 A pratiyagati; gemeint ist; pratiyagati 916 fehlt 
bei BCD; der in Klammern gesetzte Pasusa ist offenbar eine Wieder-
holung der letzten Worte der vorausgegangene Mantra. 917 C 
918 RV. 1. 112. 25. 919 AC "vīr 920 Vgl.
K. S. 28. 7. 911 AD bhavati; BC bhava
dhartri dharitrī janitri yamitri 'ti brahma Brahmsadda sahīpavamānena stūyur dhikṣātaya gārhapato 'nte gārhapato 'nu gacchheṣu. aigam naro didhitibhir aranyor hastacyutī janayanta prasadastam dūredrasmā gṛhapatim atharyum iti mathītva 'vadadhyād āśv anupranitās ced anugachched etayai 'vā matiṣvā ṃudadhyādagnaya ceng mithaḥ sansryeṇam aigam 'nu bhī sansryeṇa yāpeta āhaḥ bhūmikābhya ced anugaccheth gārhapatyāt prāṇya bhadrām karnebhir iti catarosā jaret bhadrām karnebhiḥ sṛṇyāma deva bhadrām pāṣeyma kṣabhir yajatrāḥ sthirāīsā āṅguīsā tuṣṭvāvānas tánabhīryās evaṃ devahumānas evaṃ svasti na indro vṛddharaḥ svasti naḥ pāṣa viśvavedaḥ svasti naḥ tārasya riṣṭa-nemībhiḥ svasti no bhṛaspatiḥ dadhatuḥ prasādaśā ma- manaḥ prāṃmataraḥ subhāmysāvāno vidathēu jagmayaḥ aigam-jihvā manavah sūracakṣasāsā visve no devā avasa gamanāna 'haḥ ṃatam in naḥ sarado anti deva yatra naḥ cakrā jara- sān taninām putrāsa yatra pitaro bhūravanti mā no mahāyā rīṣaṭayura gantoḥ iti preddho aṅga aigam iti catarosā jihyuḥ preddho aṅga didhi puro no jasraya sūrmyā yāvīṣthā tvām śāvanta upa yanti vājāḥ saapta te aṅge samihāḥ sapta jihvāḥ sapta rsayah sapta dhāma priyāni sapta hotraḥ sapta-lāḥ tvā yajanti sapta yonir āprnasva gṛhena svahā yaḥ me manasaḥ chidram yad vāco yac ca me hṛdaḥ aṅgeva no deva bhṛaspatiḥ samat tat sūcātu rādhāṣe mama 'gne varca ity ekā 'gnudhirayās ced anugaccheth gārhapatyāt prāṇya mamā 'gne varca iti ṃaṣṭbhir

322 Ap. Ś. 14, 33, 2; das Zitat ist in der Wiedergabe der Ms. völlig korrigiert; es lesen BD: dhartri dharitrī yamitri amitriti haritry adharitrī janitry amitriti haritrī bhadrām; AC bhṛamāṭaḥ; ABCD svarasā
324 ABCD svarasā
325 A bhṛyuh; B stuyur
326 A *tōtāpate* B *tō 'nu C tōyme;* 1: *patyo-tpate*
327 Vom Erschienen der Opferfeuer. handelt zusammenhängend K. Ś. 25, 3, 1 folg.; cf. oben 1, 5; 2, 7. RV. 7, 1; 1; Ap. 14, 16, 1
328 C *nīta;* A *cīte* B *niti D *āti*
329 C etayīva
330 C etayīva
cf. oben 2, 7; 5, 4.
332 A sōt
334 RV. 1, 89, 6, 7, 9. C viśvatejaḥ
335 A jumayāḥ
336 RV. 7, 1, 3.
337 VS. 17, 79.
338 AC yat svaghe hṛdaḥ B yaś tv agne hṛdaḥ
339 ABCD rādhase
340 AV. 5, 3, 1.
juhuyad | auttaravedikaś 942. ced anugacche chālāmukhyāt pranīye 'mo agna 944 iti trayodaśabhir juhuyat | imo agne vītamānī haryājasro vaksi deveṭatīm acha prati na im surabhiṇyā vyantu | sapta te agne samidho 945 | yan me manasaḥ chidrām 948 | mamā 'gne varca 942 iti juhuyat | pasuṣrapanaś ced anugacche auttaravedikāt pranīya tvam no agne 947 sa tvam na 948 iti sarvaprāyaścittām hutvā | yady ukhyō 940 'nugacchet punah punah prājvāya | 1 | kīyamāno vanā tvam 950 yan mātrī ajagam apaḥ | na tat te agne pramṛse nivartanam yad dūre sann ihā 'bhavaḥ | yās te agna ārdrā yonayo yāḥ kulaśrīn 951 | ye te agne āndavo yā u nābhayaḥ | yās te agne

tanva urjo namä tahi bhish tavam abhayibhih samvidanah satam cinva nas tanva nisdata | sikam hi sucina suchi prastast krutanah 'jani vidvan asya vratam dhruvam vayam ivam nurohata iti aihaya samidham krukam dadyad | vaso-yugam dhenum yadi ukhva vah bhidyeta tair eva kapalaih samoiyath 'nyam krivia syuta deebhiv amrtena ga ukham svasaram adhi vedin asthit satya purvair rishihi cakupano agnih pravidvan itah tat karotu stavadejarudharanamadhir ity anumantrayet vasativartita cet skandeyuh prthivi vibhuvartiti | calyakam cetty avrte namas te bhuno vishva[mi] tad grhivah manda vaisa iti catasahbh agnidhirite jhumyat | manda vasah sundhiny ajirah undatih suphenah jyoitismatis tamasvatir mitrabhratah kustedrabhratah svarastra ibha mava inyavatah vrsno aavya samdhanam asi vrsyaih tvo 'pamahyami deva vasava agne indra surya deva udno datto 'dadhim bhinttah divas pa-

---

932 RV. 2. 5. 4; Ap. 16. 15. 7. 933 C vidhah artvivah dhruvam vratam 934 Das Zitat ist in den MS. sehr korrigiert. AC lesen statt: 'rohate ity' 'rohosaty'; B 'rohsaty' 935 AC 'yugam dhenu BD 'gaham dhenum 936 A liit va ans. 937 M. S. 2. 7. 16. Ap. 16. 26. 6. 938 AD ca kuryan B cakurya C ca kuryan; gemeint ist wohl die Fassung von K. S. 39. 3. 939 Infoige seiner Korruption für mich nicht identifizierbar. BD: stavadejarudharamadhir C wie B, nur: stadeja 940 A 'yena 941 A 'variyata 942 Av. Pray. 13 a erwähnen einen in der Opferpraxis sicherlich sehr häufig aufgetretenden analogen Fall: prajntanam prakuphanam ca 'mbusandane suparave va ... 943 K. S. 35. 3; Ap. 14. 17. 3. 944 Durch Korruption nichtwidersprechend geworden. Statt des ca-Lautes vielleicht (mit A) va zu lesen; D statt dessen sintvaly urunphya ity 945 Ap. S. 14. 18. 1. 946 TS. 2. 4. 8. 1. Das Zitat, wohl aus abweichender Rezension hervorgegangen, ist veranschlagt; A liest: manda vaisadadvandubhejirah undati suphejah | jyoitismatis tamasvatir mitrabhratah kustedrabhratah svarastra ihimavatih | vrsyam samdhanam asi vrsyam tvo 'pamahyami | deva vasavo 'gai surya tro danno dadhishhurdivisparsyanyandantarika samdurad tato no vrsyayaan | deva yuyo mitravaramaryam abhra tadevatavityahayah tamtrannapanah marasaamohdavato dadhikamah divyah syr janyad antariksh samdurad tato no vrsyayavam iti BO mandaivasava shrudyati (?C shruddyah) iha hiejiandanduthi suphetah | jyoitismatis tamasvatir mitrabhratah kustedrabhratah svarastra ity amayata | vrsyo (C 'soo) aivosya samdhanam asi vrsyaih (C 'soo) tvopamahyami | deva vasavo agna (C agna) indrasuryo hmodato (no'ho) dadhiphit | divas powdyunajanyad antariksh samdurad tato no vrsyayavat | deva yuyo mitravaramaryam yuktam (C fligt no elu) devah saipayo apam nepat tanudnapah narihsuho nohidda dhiphinhiphit (C dadhindihhiphit) diva spunjanyad antarikshat samdurad tato no vrsyayavam iti
rjanyad antarikṣat samudrāt tato no vṛṣṭyā 'vata | deva vujo mitrāvarunā 'ryaman vuktam devaḥ sapitayo apām napat tananapān nara-samsa udu na datto 'dadhim bhintta divas parjanayā antarikṣat samudrāt tato no vṛṣṭyā 'vata 'ti | pravṛttāḥ cet syuḥ samāsincantvā 967 iti samāsincen 968 | nivṛttāḥ cet syuḥ apām urmi 988 'ti grhītvā śaḍbhīr hāvanīya jhūnyad | indriyāvān madintamas tam vo mā 'va kramisam | achinnam tantum prthivyā anu geśan 970 iti hutva 2 | abhivṛṣṭe 971 some dyana ca tvā prthivi ca śrūtām antarikṣat ca | indur indum avāgad indor imdru 'pāt 972 | yajnās ca tvā vāyus ca śrūtām ahaś ca tvā rātrī ca śrūtām darśas ca tvā paurnāmasāś ca śrūtām yajnās ca tvā dākaśas ca śrūtām dākaśas ca tvā mānasas ca śrūtām arkaś ca tvā svamedhau ca śrūtām | | | | | | | 973 | indur indum upūgat 974 sāyāme so ma 975 bhūt sarva 976 tasya 976 ta 976 imdru 976 | indrapattayo 'pahūtasya 'pahūto bhākṣayāmi 977 'ty abhīmṛṭasya 978 bhākṣayet | sasomam cec camasaṃ sadnasi stotrenā bhuyapakuryād dhiraṇyasgarbhas tad 979 iti 979 padam 979 iti 979 dvabhīyam 979 jhūnyat 980 | tad it padam na viciketa vidvān 981 yan 982 mṛtaḥ 982 punar apy eti jīvan | pravṛttā 983 ca sthālī syāt 983 trīyad yad bhuvanasā rathavrj jīvo garbh bra mṛtsasya jīvat svāhe 'ty | anyās ced 984 āgrayaṇād 984 grhīnyād 984 āgrayaṇās 985 ced upadasyed āgrayaṇād grhīnyād grahebhyo 986 va 'lṛtya 987 sūkra-dhruvau 988

parikrito bhavati | yadi somam na vindeyuh pūtikān abhiṣu-

nyur 1017 | yadi na pūtikān arjunāny 1018 atha 1018 

ea ca kā ca 'sadhir āhṛtyā 'bhīṣunuyā 1019 | pāncadaksināmām 

kratun samsthāpayeyur ekadaksinām vā | yena yajñena kāma
ceta tena yajeta | ajja yat kāmava tatra tad dadyāt | pra-
tāḥsavanāc cet kālaśo vidīryata vaispivasi śipivīṣavatītuṃ tretā 1020 
stūyār 1021 | (mādhyamindinā ceta 1022 pavamāne sa-mādhyam-
dināt 1023 pavamānā 1024) yadi mādhyamindinā 

"bhavasyā 1025 pavamānāya purastād vāṣat-kāra-
idhanam saṁ 1026 kuryād | yadi ṭṛitiya-savana ātad 1027 eva 1028 | 4 | bhūmim āgaṇā 1029 māta mātaram āpy āgat | "rdhyāsaṃ putraihibhā 
pasubhrī yo no dveṣī sa bhīdatam āti | yan mārtīkām 

bhīlyeta 1030 tada 'po gamayet 1031 tathāvva dārumayaṃ ya ārte cid abhiśīrṣa 1032 ātya ā "labbhyā bhūmantryate |

26. 12. 17 folg. Dem alohita entspricht hier vollständig avyakta-rāga-
pūpānaṃ yāṇāni. Als Surrogate werden genannt (der Stufenfolge nach 
eins für das andere) śyenōrya, pūtika, śadaru, arupadūrya, hariśakāsa, die 
Schilung der Pflanzen ist von Wichtigkeit. 1017 Wörtlich gleich 
PB 9. 5. 3; cf. Āv. 6. 8. 5 fr.: Brahmr. Prat. 83 a; K. S. 29. 12. 18; Pet. Wb. 
un pratinidhiṃ: somā-bhavaṃ bhavate pūtivākhaṃ pratinidhī vān |

1018 A arjunānaḥśāya B arjunānaḥśāya C arjunānaḥśāya D arjunānaḥśāya 
1019 Brahmr. Prat. 83 a; yadi na pūtikān ațaḥ 'ṛunāni yadi na pūtika-

traṇī ca viṁde[t] tata abhiṣunuyād iti vartate lohitā-ballīna haim-
avatasyā sthāne haimavato lohitākāra iti bhāvaḥ ...

maṇīvatsāsthāne bhāhtrālīna arjunāni varttate .... yadi na 'ṛunāni na viṁded iti 

varttate ca ca (? ) yā kā ca 'sadhir āryaya abhiṣunuyād vā 'ṛunāni na ... 
vimpade yah kāmā ca 'sadhir āryaya darbhākādi itīkā abhiṣunuyā və 

somāvikrayā ca kimaic dadyādy iti .... 83 a gedenkt noch des ālalas: dro-

pālaśe cet somam na viṁded skanded (? ) upasayēd (? ) vā ... tāt dhī-

rayā[m]ṭhe 'py aśa praksipya 'bhūnuyūd ... 1030 1031 cf. unten 
6. 6; statt trna erwarten wir rṣya 1032 B ci C cit 1033 A 

'dina BC dīnat 1034 fehlt bei A. 1035 'dina 

ārbha' wäre grammatisch richtig. 

1036 A sama B somāna C sama me 1037 fehlt bei C. 1038 Brahmr. Prat. 87 a; (yadi 
mādhyamindaṃ grāvā śryate [cf. oben 6. 3] ...) ... yadi prātāśavane 

kālaśe diryeta vāṣat-kāraṇidhanam ... ekasmin dārumaye kālaśa 
droṇaśataśaśa iti prayoga ....... etosmā aṣṭāman yadi kaśic diryeta ...

87 b [kansa verderbl]: yadi prātāśavana droṇaśataśaṃ kālaśo diryeta 

bhīmarākālaḥ tatra somasūryā 'śmin pātre samāvapti ya tritya (? )-

sthānāḥ[t] tu krivo 'dgābhiḥ prahītam samāvyām avasthāpya tasmin 

somam avanayet ....... 1039 Āp. 3. 20. 9; 16. 2. 1036 cf. 
Āp. 9. 16. 2 f.; Āv. 3. 14. 12; cf. oben 3. 7—8. 1041 A yogamayait 

BC yo maye; D yo gamayet 1042 AV. 14. 2. 47; vgl. K. S. 

25. 5. 29 f. und unten Note 1147.
sarvatra širne hinnie našte 'nyam krtvā punar mai 'tv indriyam\[1023\] ity ādātita\[1024\] | bahispavamānam cet sarpatām\[1025\] prastotā vācichīyeta brāhmaṇe varam dattvā tatās tam eva punar vṛttvāy | yad ugdāta vācichīyata sarvavedasa-dakṣīnena yajñena yajetai | 'vam sarvesām vichinnām sarpatām ekai-kasmin kuryād | dyaunā ca ma indraś ca me\[1026\] | tantam tan-vān\[1027\] | mā pragāma patho vayam\[1028\] iti | 'sastrāe\[1029\] cec chāstram ānuśaṇam\[1040\] vyāpadyeta mā\[1041\] pragāma patho vayam\[1038\] iti pañcabhir jhujhuyād | rāthamṇaram cet stūyamānam\[1042\] vyāpadyeta samyag digbhya\[1043\] iti dvābyām jhujhuyād\[1044\] | yavā'-dīnām avapannānām\[1044\] vyāvṛttānam uttarā-śaṃ\[1045\] yathāliyāgam dvābyām jhujhuyān | nāraśaṃśa(d) unne-tād\[1046\] upadasyeran\[1046\] ayam no agnir adhyakṣa\[1047\] iti dvābyām pānnejanyāś cet upadasyet samāśiṇcantv\[1048\] iti isamsiṇcet 5 | atha cet dhutā-hutau samau pttā-pitau vā samāryjeyatyām\[1049\] rājñasya hi sthā rtvijā\[1050\] gayāmdragānt kalpata yuvam huta 'hutasya ca 'syā yasye 'ndrāgnvitam pibata ghrtam imām ghrtam iti dvābyām jhujhuyāt | prātahsavanāc\[1051\] cet\[1032\] kalāsa\[1053\] vidṛtyeta vaiśuṇavatīsu\[1054\] dipiviṣṭavatīsu gaurvyetena stūyūh\[1055\] | samāna-janapadau cet samau samāsvau syātām pūrvo

---

1023 Kauś. 9. 2. 1024 AD 'dīta; K. S. 25. 6. 1 folg. lehrt
die Entstehungsgeschichte irdener Gesübe in interessanter Weise. 1025 ABC sarpatām 1026 TS. 4. 7. 6. 2. 1027 RV. 10. 53. 6; Āp. 9. 8. 7. 1028 AV. 19. 1. 59. 1029 Ā 'sastrāṇām 1030 AC 'sa B 'samā. 1031 Diese und die da-
'gim 1030 parigrbnyat 1036 pûrvo devata b parigrbnyat na 'tirânyā 1057 prâtar-anuvâkam upâkuryad | abhîstavya 'tha 1038 sampâśyâ 1038 pâvesâyâ gâryâtraye chandase 'bhîbhûtyay svâha 1060 'ti pûrastât prâtaranuvâkasya juhuyat | triśbhuha 1061 iti mîdhyam-dine 1062 vidvisanayoh sansâraya 1062 iti vijñâyate 1064 savantâs 'nantaram agnaye yavîsthâyâ stâkapâlam ity âhavanîye 1062 mahad 1065 abhyâdadyhayat 1065 sambhârânâm caturbhîs caturbhîs pratidisam juhuyad uttaman 1066 âgntûrye sonabhâga[m] bhâmanesu sanset 1067 vajrânam syenavisamasya 1068 ca phatkarâprabhrty 1069 anujnyat | sarvesu ca 'bhîcârikese samâdikîtanam ca vyâvartteta 'gneran brâmaṇaḥ 1078 procya jîva nâmâ sthâ tâ imam jivet(v) 1071 'pajjiva nâmâ sthâ tâ imaṁ jiveta jîvîkâ nâmâ sthâ tâ imam jiveta samjiveta jîvalâ nâmâ sthâ tâ imam jiveta samjiveta | samjivikâ nâmâ sthâ tâ imaṁ jive(s)t(v) e 'ty 1072 apah 1072 paribrâyât 1072 | tâsâm udag- arvak 1073 kuryad | upâmśavantâyamau 1074 ca cet te 1074 prâma- pânau 1074 pâtâm | upâmuśa-svamana to svânam pâtû | strotam ca 'svinau pâtâm | daksakratu te mitrâvarau pâtâm | stana ity rtupâtre 1078 | âtmanam ta âgravanah pâtû | ângani ca ta ukthyah pâtv | âyuṣ te dhruvah pâtû | vîryam te lakṣmîth pâtî iti juhu-

tantrāni yāni savantasyaḥ purastat samdhī camasaḥ | 1107
savaṇaṁ 1108 anupradānam syād | āsvamedhe ced aśvo na
"gacched āgneyo 'stākapāla iti mrgākharo 1109 saḍḍhaviṣkām 1109
iṣṭiṁ 1109 nirvaped daśa-haviṣam ity eke 1110 | vaḍavam ced aśvo
'bhiyađ agnaye 'mhomuce 'stākapālam sauryam payo 1111 va-
yavyāv ājyabhāgau 7 | somārupaśu 'kta ācāryakalpo | brā-
ḥamanam tu bhavati | trayastrimṣad vai yajñasya tana
| ity ekāṇa 1112 - trimśo 1113 pākanagṛṇam 1114 aśvaṇām 1115 ity
arthaḥpāṇ śiro ṛṣṭaṁ | trīṇa va caṭur-grhitāṇy anuvākasye 'ty
ācārya ēte nityaḥkalpyaḥ "rtvijeyarūpayasam 1116 tavan
ārtiṁ ārchatam cośṭtarām va samdhīm 1117 samdhāya juhuyād
iti taṭṭāśrayebrāhmaṇam iṣṭaṁ taḍ-daivatayām 1118 - edhikṛtyaṁ 1119
ārtiṁ vidyā jāmīṁ purasvādham māyāya va yajñasaṁ-
maṇḍhīṁ vāḥ-vaṇaś-cintāyām 1120 prāg viharanuḥ ārtaṁ pra-jā-
patiṁ manasi sārasvato vici vīṣṭṛṭyām vidhānaṁ dikṣāyām
brahmaratrāvaśe 'ty etena nyāyena vajasanyebrahmana-
moghena mantrāḥ 1121 kiptaṁ 1121 | pra-jāpataye śvāhā dhātre
svāhā paśṇe śvāhā 1122 'ty | aparāhniṁ cet pravargyo 'bhyaśtam
iḥe cakrava 1122 'ṣi 1124 divo 'cchuta 1125 iti jhuhiyād vyāṣṭībhīśa-
ca | śvaḥsuteṣu 1126 ced alautyām taḍ-aḥartāv 1127 apāga-
ched 1128 indraya harivata 1129 iti brāyūd ihā 'nvicamatbhivr
iti tīṣyābhīḥ | prātaranuvākam ced duritam upakuryāt pra vām
damsāṁsy aśvināv avocam 1130 iti pāućabhīr jhuhiyāt 8
pra vām damsāṁsy aśvināv avocam asya pātiḥ syām sugaṭaḥ
svuṁtraḥ | uṭa paśyam aśvunaḥ dirgham āyur astam īve ī

1107 AB vamata C vamasa
1108 ABD aśvaṇām C aśvaṇ
1109 ABD mrgākhaṣaṁdaḥkhaviṣyāṃ iṣṭiṁ BC mṛgāraṇvaṁdaḥkhaviṣyāḥiṣṭiṁ
1110 Einen allgemeinen Fall dieser Art erwähnten Brah. Prāy. 73 b:
yādai daivam manuṣād va pramādāt pāṇu upakṛṭāḥ pālāyeta . . . .
po devaṁ daivir viśa iti darśhyabхиyaṁ (śasya) co 'pasārati 'tī . . . .
hvajaṁ "dibhibe vātam apatya vāyasyaṁ vāyasyaṁ nirupye 'ty ānantaṁ
darsayati . . . . 1111 B payo
1112 ABD ekāṁ na B ekānta; cf. G. B. 2. 2. 10
1113 A triśo 1114 C kajñagṛṇaṁ
1115 D pāksamaṇaṁ 1116 BD "pāyaṁ 1116 C "rupa "A "kalpāghījyeta
1117 A saṁbdhit B saṁdvip C saṁbdhiṁ 1118 B devatayām
1119 BD ekṛktvā C ekṛtyā; beidh mit der Wiederholung: tavatya mahi-
yatam 1120 D cintanāyāp 1121 B mantra lupta
1122 gedacht ist an VS. 8. 54., das Zitat aber deckt sich mit M. Ś. 8. 6. 2;
cf. Ś. B. 12. 6. 1. 3 folg. 1122 VS. 15. 22; 22. 32. 1123 ABD
1124 AV. 2. 11. 5; 17. 1. 20. 1125 B deva 'ccha
1126 CD divočcha 1127 A sutyaṁ B sutya C sutyaṁ
1128 A "ritāv B "rittav C "rtav 1128 A adhyāgačhed 1129 Ap. Ś.
13. 17. 2. 1130 RV. 1. 116. 25.
jarimānaṃ jagamyām | 1 | madhyāḥ somasyāśvinā madāyā 
pratno hotā vivāsate vām | barhiṃmati rātrir viśritā gir iṣā 
yatam nāsatyo pa vājaḥ | 2 | yo vāṃ asvinā manaso jāviyāṇ 
rathah svāsvo viṣa ājjāti | yena gacchathāḥ sukṛto duronam 
tena nārā vartir asmabhyam yatam || 3 || rśim naraḥ ambasaḥ 
pānicajanyam rhiṣād atriṃ muncatho gaṇena | minamātā dasyov 
asvassyā māyā amupūrvaṃ vṛṣanā codāyamāt || 4 || aśvam na 
gudham asvinā durevair rśim naraḥ vṛṣanā rebham apsu | sam 
tam rihito viprutam damsobhir na vāṃ jūryamī pūryā 
ktāni || 5 || prātahsaṇanam cen madhyamindaṃ savanam abhy- 
astamiyād agnir mā pātu vasubhiḥ purastād 
itī juhuyād | 
agnaye svāhā vasubhyāḥ svāhā gāyatrīyai svāhā | madhyamindam 
cet trīyaśavanan abhyastamiyāt somo mā rudrair dakṣināya 
diṣāḥ pātv. 
itī juhuyāt | somāya svāhā 
rudrebyhyāḥ svāhā 
trīṣṭubhe svāhā || trīyaśavanan cet abhyastamiyād varuno 
mā "dityaiḥ" 
śuryo mā dyāvaprthivibhyāṃ pratīcyā diṣāḥ 
pātv iti juhuyād | varunāya svāhā "dityebyhyāḥ svāhā jagatayai 
svāhā | a bharatam śiṣṭataṃ vajrabhū āasmān indragni ava- 
tam saćibhiḥ | ime nu te rasmayaḥ śuryasya yebhīḥ sapitvam 
pitaro na āsan | indragnihbyam svāhe | 'ndraviniyubhyam svāhe | 
ratriparīyāyā ced abhivichidyerann indraya svāhe | 'ndranyai 
svāhā | chandobhyah svāhā | trviyām | ced 

duritam upā- kuryād agnaye rathamtarayā svāhe | 'sase svāhā | 
paṅktaye svāhā | 'śvibhyam svāhā | mā nāḥ piparid asvine 'ti | sarvatra 
'nājñāteśv' 
agnaye svāhā | yajñāya svāhā | brahma-se svāhā | 
viṣṇave svāhā | prajāpataye svāhā | 'numataye svāhā | 'gnaye 
sviṣṭakre svāhe 'ti | trātāram indram | 
yayor ojase 
'ti ca' | tā viṣṇu-varma-devatāyā | uktāni prāyaścittāny | athaī 
kāgnau yatra purodāśa uktā | stālīpākāṃ | tatra | kuryāt | purodāśeṣu japaī eva | kuryāt | sarvatra chedanabheda- 
vadāraṇa-dahanesu | 'khāsu | somakalāsa-mahāvira-

1112 RV. 1. 117. 1. | 1113 AV. 19. 17. 1. | 1114 AV. 19. 17. 8. 
1112 VS. 22. 27 ff. | 1113 AV. 19. 17. 4. | 1118 RV. 1. 109. 7. 
1112 B rtvi C rtvijoc | 1118 A āe D āa | 1119 cf. 760, vgl. 
ferner Āśv. Prāy. 18 b: anājñātiṃ yathātathap svāhā | agnaya idam | 
puruṣa-sampito yajñopa agnaya idam vyāśhrthomāṃ viṣṇumaraṇam ca 
kuryāt | 1115 AV. 7. 86. 1. | 1114 AB eva 
7. 25. 1. | 1115 B upā (?). | 1116 B 'kāmaśo ... 
(unklar) [kuryāt]; AC 'kāś tatra | 1117 AV. 
chedanabhedaṃvādāraṇa-dahanesu Böyle BC chedanabhedaṃvādāraṇa-dahanesu khusen
यज्ञा-भुंडेशु सर्वत्र शिर्पे भिन्ने ॥ नाटे ॥ नयम क्रत्वा पुनर्मा त्व इद्रियम इत्य नूदिता | सर्वत्रा मा नो विदान | इत्य अभयार ॥ अपराजिताः ॥ जुहयः अभयार अपराजिताः जुहयः ॥ ९ ॥ साष्ठो इत्यः ॥ ध्ययः ॥ अथा यत्र तत पर्थिवम अंतरिक्षम दियम् देवम् आसुराः और प्रयुक्तम् तद्न आभुतम् शामायत् अथावः प्रबहुर आभुतन्तम् | सो दृवा-ज्यम् इत्यः ग्रहितवा "हावनीये जुहोति | प्रत्हियवा श्रोत्रया "नरिक्षणे प्राप्यत् वायव्य हो द्रृष्टा नक्षत्रेत्रहि अध्यय धिपतये स्वाहे | ति सन्माप्याप्तिततित्रितित | तत्रात्र "नोकाः |

प्रायाप्तित्वा पारिनामनं याज्ञा उपालोक्ये | तासमाद द्रृष्टा-सामसो 'त्रा तम निमोदनते याज्ञिकाः |

इत्य अथावदे वैतानसुः त्राप्रायाप्तिप्राकरानाः ॥ सामाप्तम् ॥

1414 Agn. Pray. 5b: कुष्ठिने-द्राय्यूषु भ्रेनुमान्य द्रु (?) वा-द्राय्यूषुः कराराम् अभयात्रा भूमि-गताम् एवं दुस्तम् भवति | तैसैदूर्धे दीप फेरे दीप वपुसी ध्रुवम् इत्य नूदिता | फेरन दीप "श्रीववीकाली यह भवति | कर्काली यह भवति | कर्काली यह भवति |

1415 अभयात्रा भूमि-गताम् एवं दुस्तम् भवति | तैसैदूर्धे दीप फेरे दीप वपुसी ध्रुवम् इत्य नूदिता | फेरन दीप "श्रीववीकाली यह भवति | कर्काली यह भवति | कर्काली यह भवति |
Vedic, Sanskrit, and Middle Indic.—By TRUMAN MICHELSON, Ethnologist in the Smithsonian Institution. Washington, D. C.¹

In an interesting paper (JAOS. 32, pp. 414—428) Mr. W. Petersen has discussed the general interrelations of Vedic, Sanskrit, and Middle Indic. It may be noted that he uses 'Prakrit' in the sense of 'Mittelindisch'. The following criticism is presented by the writer as he believes that Petersen has overlooked the evidence of the Asokan dialects in a number of cases.

In the discussion as to whether Prakrit is derived from Vedic or Sanskrit, it should have been mentioned that it has been demonstrated that not a single dialect of the Asokan inscriptions can be derived from either the literary Vedic or Sanskrit. See Johansson, Sbb. ii, § 88; Michelson, JAOS. 31, pp. 232, 241; IF. 24, p. 54; TAPA. 40, p. 26.

The position taken, that during the period of the composition of the Vedic hymns two distinct groups of Indic dialects were developed and separated by an uncrossable gulf does not seem probable by the analogy of the Asokan dialects. Johansson and the writer have made it clear that the dialect of the Shālbāzgarhi and Mansehra versions of the Fourteen Edicts (for their speech is essentially one) is far closer to Vedic or Sanskrit than the other dialects are. There is no uncrossable bridge. It can be confidently asserted that this dialect, though it has certain ear-marks of the Middle Indic stage of development, such as the assimilation of stops of one order to those of another order, yet as a whole belongs to an earlier stage of development. Now if it is not feasible to draw hard and fast lines in the time of Asoka, what right have we to assume such lines in earlier times unless some definite proof be given?

¹ Printed by permission of the Smithsonian Institution.
Petersen has allowed traces of Middle Indic in the Rig Veda so far as phonetics are concerned. But Epic Sanskrit teems with Middle-Indicisms morphologically; and it should be especially noted that such forms phonetically do not present the same aspect as the later dialects (e.g. Epic Sanskrit kurmi, dādmi = Pali kummi, dammi respectively). Such forms are usually due to metrical considerations, and are borrowed from dialects. Are such dialects also to be classed as Middle Indic? Again I do not think a hard and fast line can be drawn.

The point made that Vedic and Middle Indic cannot have been contemporaneous dialects which arose in different localities, by the argument that it is highly improbable that one section of the country should have been so conservative and another so prone to innovation, is not in accordance with the evidence of the Asekan dialects: the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mānscha dialect is highly conservative while the Māgadhā dialect show numerous phonetic changes; the Gīrā dialect as a whole is not phonetically as archaic as the first dialect nor has it suffered as many phonetic changes as the second dialects.

The assumption that the sound-changes in Middle Indic were due not to gradual changes, but to the fact that the aborigines differed anatomically from the Aryans, and had linguistic traits widely different from them; and that it was owing to this that they were unable to speak the language as the Aryans, and so modified it to suit their own characteristics, is a point to be proved. Granting anatomical differences in the vocal apparatus, no such direct influence can be maintained until it has been shown that the non-Aryan languages of India possess the characteristic sounds of Middle Indic languages, that the groups of consonants which suffer assimilation in these languages are not tolerated in the non-Aryan languages and show the same assimilations, that the same loss of intervocalic consonants occurs in them.

An indirect influence can be maintained if it be shown that the non-Aryan languages do not possess the groups of consonants which suffer assimilation nor such consonants as are lost when intervocalic, even if the non-Aryan languages do not agree precisely with the Middle Indic languages. In the same way the change (or substitution) of one sound for another such as $s$ for $s$ cannot be charged directly or indirectly to the
influence of non-Aryan languages unless there be positive evidence. Similarly certain morphological characteristics of Middle Indic languages such as the almost complete loss of the perfect tense, the formation of other tenses on the present stem, extensive levelling of distinctions between singular and plural (e.g. Pāli brūmi, levelled by brūma), and the like cannot be charged to the direct or indirect influence of the non-Aryan languages unless it be demonstrated that the same or like phenomena respectively occur in them.

But again the evidence of the Asokan inscriptions indicates that the changes were gradual. Thus though the Girnār dialect possesses but one sibilant, it can be shown that this is a late development (see JAOS, 31, pp. 237, 246 and the literature cited there). Again the treatment of ṛ in consonant-ic groupes is a case in point (ibidem, pp. 236, 246); it is clear that the assimilation in certain cases is recent. From the state of affairs in the Girnār dialect, it might well be argued that the assimilation of ṛ in consonant groups (which assimilation is not connected with those in the Girnār dialect, and is merely a parallel development) in the Magadhan dialects is the result of gradual changes.

Moreover, it has been shown that some of the most characteristic assimilations in consonantal groups in the Middle Indic dialects had their beginning in even earlier times: see Wackernagel, AiGr. i. § 98 (and the literature cited there); Whitney, Skt. Gr. §§ 228, 232; Whitney-Lanman, Atharva Veda, p. lxvii and on i. 22. 1, iv. 19. 6, v. 20. 12. This is against any theory of direct influence on the part of the non-Aryan languages; and it supports the view that the phonetic changes were gradual and not due to mere substitution of sounds. And it may be noted that in part parallel assimilations are found in other Indo-European languages. Thus for example popular Latin tt from ct and pt (Italian otto, sette = Latin octō, septem respectively), Cretan Greek ττ from κτ and κτ (Aúττος, κττι for Aύττος, κττί; Buck, Greek Dialects, p. 68, § 86: 1, 2) are parallel to tt from κτ and pt in Middle Indic (Pāli satta, sitta—Skt. sakta, sikta—respectively); similarly Ionic-Attic Greek λλ from ly (άλλος) is parallel to Pāli, Girnār, Shāh-bāzgarhi, Manshera 1 (written I on inscriptions) from ly (καλλίνα- Skt. kalyāna-). Even Cretan Greek νν from πν (κρεβα for ὑπερβα, Buck, Greek Dialects, p. 69,
§ 86, 5) may be compared to a certain extent with Middle Indic \( \eta \rho \) from \( \nu \). These facts make it likely that at any rate certain typical Middle Indic assimilations of consonants are due to spontaneous change; and puts the burden of proof on those who maintain the changes are due directly to the influence of the non-Aryan languages. The same applies to the levellings in Middle Indic noted above.

The analogy of the English of the American Negro to Prākrit is not happy, except as a parallel in the indirect influence mentioned above: there is no proof that the peculiarities of his speech are due to his anatomy nor to the influence of his forgotten African language. Educated American negroes speak English faultlessly. The English of such negroes of Nassau (Bahama Islands), that I have heard, as far as pronunciation is concerned, is close to the British one. It is likely that the faulty English of the American negro is due to his wrong perception of the sounds\(^1\) and his unfamiliarity with the English of cultivated society.\(^2\) In the same way to the untrained ear of an American, there are sounds in the American Indian languages of the Northwest coast that are wrongly perceived, and hence wrongly imitated. (The sounds in question are various \( i \) sounds.) Similarly American Indian children at governmental schools at first mispronounce English and make havoc of English grammatical categories, but on becoming familiar with the spoken language they learn to speak English correctly. Again American Indian pupils after a more or less protracted stay at the schools lose the characteristic pronunciation of their own native languages owing to the fact that they hear English constantly spoken, and rarely (comparatively speaking) have occasion to use their

---


\(^2\) M. Fishberg, Die Rassenmerkmale der Juden, München, 1913, maintains (pp. 75–86) "daß die Ansprache in erster Linie von der sozialen Berührung abhängig ist", and instances Jewish and Negro pronunciation.
own languages. I admit I have never yet found a case where it can be proved that English has influenced the grammatical categories of the native languages of American Indian pupils. It may be noted, however, that in the drama of “The Little Clay Cart”, ascribed to King Sudraka, Candanaka tries to excuse his slip in Prakrit (which nearly cost Aryaka his life) by appealing to the grammatical categories of non-Aryan languages. As I am ignorant of these I cannot say whether his plea is well-founded.

In discussing the differences between the accentuation of Vedic and Classical Sanskrit, it would have been well to mention that certain Asokan dialects had a system identical with or very similar to the latter; see IF. 23, p. 231.

In conclusion the writer agrees with the thesis that Sanskrit, “though not in the very form in which it occurs in literature” was a truly spoken vernacular. Even the late Classical Sanskrit cannot have been wholly artificial; the existence of such an enormous literature necessarily presupposes a large audience who normally spoke a language that did not differ from the written one too violently. That the audience belonged to cultivated circles of society goes without saying. Petersen has done well to emphasize this aspect of the problem, as against Pischel, Gr. d. Pkt. Sprachen, § 6, note 2. But other phases such as the question as the genetic relationship of the Middle Indic dialects require more protracted and more intensive study before satisfactory answers can be given.
Notes on the Phonology of the Tiruray Language. —
By Carlos Everett Conant, Ph. D., University of Chattanooga, Tennessee.

1. Tiruray (sometimes called Tedurai) is one of the numerous Indonesian languages of the Philippine Islands. It is spoken by about four thousand people in the mountains south of the town Kotabatu (Cotabato) on the southern coast of Mindanao. The chief town of the Tiruray is Tamontaka.

2. Bibliography.

The author of the three items that follow is given anonymously as "un Padre Misionero", who, however, is known to have been Padre Bennásar.

*Observaciones gramaticales sobre la lengua Tiruray*, Manila 1892.

*Catecismo Histórico por el Abate Claudio Fleury y traducido al Tiruray por un P. misionero de la Compañía de Jesús*, Manila 1892.

*Costumbres de los indios Tirurayes escritas por José Tenorio (a) Siguyán y traducidas al español y anotadas por un Padre misionero de la Compañía de Jesús*, Manila 1892.

3. Chief Peculiarities.

Tiruray phonology presents several marked differences from that of other Philippine speech groups. Of these the more apparent are: (a) the rounding of Indonesian a to the o sound of Ger. *hoffen* or Fr. *école*, (b) diphthongization of final i and u to ei and eu, respectively, (c) f everywhere for p, (d) the frequent occurrence of a trilled r of varied origin, and (e) the change of Indonesian k to g under certain circumstances.

These, and other peculiarities of less frequent occurrence, are so striking as to give a Tiruray text a very foreign appearance when compared with other Philippine languages.
4. Indonesian a.

Under certain conditions an original a may be rounded in Tirurai, becoming a sound very close to the o in Ger. *hoffen*, Fr. *école*, e.g., IN *lima*: Tir. *limó* "five"; IN *anak*: Tir. *onók* "offspring, son, daughter, child". This change occurs independently only in a final syllable, e.g., Tir. *limó*, *lifo* (Phil. *lipat* "to forget"). Where it occurs in the penult, as in Tir. *onók*, it is by assimilation to the o (a) of the following (final) syllable.

Under other circumstances an IN penultimate a remains unchanged in Tirurai, as in the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philippine</th>
<th>Tirurai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bagá</td>
<td>bará</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>layag</td>
<td>layag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gapas</td>
<td>gafas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labi</td>
<td>labi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laki</td>
<td>lágei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>batu</td>
<td>batëu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kayu</td>
<td>káyeu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following examples a IN a > Tir. o in final syllables and the o thus arising assimilates to itself an original a of the preceding (penultimate) syllable:

(a) IN a > Tir. o in final position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Tirurai</th>
<th>Tirurai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na (enclitic)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du, ra, la (encl.)</td>
<td>ro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka (encl.)</td>
<td>go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dua, rua, lua</td>
<td>róo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lima</td>
<td>limó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuka</td>
<td>tuló</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoko, Ibanak</td>
<td>fió</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magindanau</td>
<td>sedó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgd.</td>
<td>sikó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>leñó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pia</td>
<td>fió</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sedá, Bis. isdá</td>
<td>&quot;fish, meat&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sikó</td>
<td>&quot;cat&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| yenó       | "sesame"
| fóó        | "thigh"
| motó       | "eye"   |
| abakó      | wogó    |
| Bagobo     | momo    |
| muma "man, male" | "uncle" |
(b) before a final surd stop (k, t):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word 1</th>
<th>Word 2</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bagobo</td>
<td>awak</td>
<td>owok</td>
<td>&quot;waist&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikol</td>
<td>lipát</td>
<td>lisot</td>
<td>&quot;forget&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>épát</td>
<td>efót</td>
<td>&quot;four&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagobo</td>
<td>alat</td>
<td>olot</td>
<td>&quot;basket&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisaya</td>
<td>dōgat</td>
<td>dogot</td>
<td>&quot;sea&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) before a final nasal (n, ŋ, m):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word 1</th>
<th>Word 2</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bisaya</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>mon</td>
<td>&quot;also&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisaya</td>
<td>buláwan</td>
<td>belowón</td>
<td>&quot;gold&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisaya</td>
<td>dálán</td>
<td>dolón</td>
<td>&quot;road, way&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag. Bis.</td>
<td>után</td>
<td>uton</td>
<td>&quot;debt&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibanak</td>
<td>ittam</td>
<td>tom</td>
<td>&quot;we&quot; (inclusive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisaya</td>
<td>kamú</td>
<td>gom</td>
<td>&quot;you (pl.)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibanak</td>
<td>nanám</td>
<td>nonom</td>
<td>&quot;flavor&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. But the change a > o is prevented by an adjacent s or y, and by an adjacent r, unless this r be preceded by n and the affected vowel be in final position.

(a) Change prevented by s:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word 1</th>
<th>Word 2</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag.</td>
<td>pisá</td>
<td>fisá</td>
<td>&quot;crack, break&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag.</td>
<td>bisa</td>
<td>bisá</td>
<td>&quot;venom, poison&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>bása</td>
<td>basá</td>
<td>&quot;word&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>bejás</td>
<td>begás</td>
<td>&quot;rice&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>tégás</td>
<td>tegás</td>
<td>&quot;hard&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag.</td>
<td>tawás</td>
<td>tawás</td>
<td>&quot;alum&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>gatas</td>
<td>ratas</td>
<td>&quot;milk&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgd.</td>
<td>nsan</td>
<td>usán</td>
<td>&quot;rice straw&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Change prevented by y:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word 1</th>
<th>Word 2</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>ayan</td>
<td>ayan</td>
<td>&quot;animal&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>layag</td>
<td>layag</td>
<td>&quot;sail&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis.</td>
<td>sayap</td>
<td>sayaf</td>
<td>&quot;kind of hat&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgd.</td>
<td>payák</td>
<td>fayag</td>
<td>&quot;clear, manifest&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bgb.</td>
<td>layáñ</td>
<td>layáñ</td>
<td>&quot;fly&quot; vb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis.</td>
<td>duyan</td>
<td>duyan</td>
<td>&quot;hammock&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Change prevented by r:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word 1</th>
<th>Word 2</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mgd.</td>
<td>bilañ</td>
<td>bilañ</td>
<td>&quot;cross-eyed&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal.</td>
<td>darah, Ibanak daga, Pang. dala,</td>
<td>dara</td>
<td>&quot;blood&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis.</td>
<td>bága, Mal. Ilk. bara</td>
<td>bará</td>
<td>&quot;embers&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Toba abara, Ibanak abagû wurà “shoulder”
Mal. barat “west wind” barat “tempest”
Mgd. suag suar “thorn”
Bagobo akar akar “deceive”

(d) But final a > o after ur:
Tag. bulû, Pang. burû buroburô “foam”
Tag. pulû furô “red”
Tag. sulû, Ilk. sugû (R.L.D) surô “ptias escondidas”

6. Indonesian i and u.
As a rule IN i and u remain unchanged in Tirurai everywhere except in the final position, where, in a number of the most common words, they are diphthongized to ei and eu, respectively.

(a) Indonesian final i > ei in Tirurai:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Tirurai</th>
<th>Tirurai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phil. tali</td>
<td>tâlei “tie with cord”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal. diri, Sangir dihi</td>
<td>lilei “post”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil. tani</td>
<td>tanêi “to free, liberate”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil. laki, lataki</td>
<td>lâgei “male”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Samar) siki</td>
<td>sekei “foot”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang. lai</td>
<td>bei “woman”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Indonesian final u > eu in Tirurai

| IN têlû, Tag. tatû | tetlêu “three” |
| IN pitu | fitêu “seven” |
| IN batu | batêu “stone” |
| IN kutu | kuteu “louse” |
| IN kayu | kayeu “tree, wood” |
| IN ulu | ulêu “head” |
| IN siku | sigeu “elbow” |
| IN abu | aweu “ashes” |

7. The Indonesian obscure vowel (pepet). The pepet vowel remains uniformly an obscure, colorless, ê in Tirurai: Tir. atêf, IN atêp “roof”; Tir. enêm, IN enêm “six”.

8. Indonesian p.
Every p, whether originally IN or not, becomes f in Tirurai:
Tir. fitêu, IN pitu “seven”; Tir. afei, IN apai, api “fire”; Tir.

atef, IN atēp "roof". The Tir. pronunciation of the Spanish name Policarpio is Fulicarpio.

9. Indonesian b.

IN b generally remains unchanged in Tirurai, as in Tir. batēu, IN batu "stone"; Tir. labi, Tag. labi "more"; Tir. dob, Tag. loob "in, within"; but it sometimes becomes w (u) when intervocalic, as in Tir. tawen, Bis. tabon "a kind of bird"; Tir. rawen, Bis. gābon "mist, fog"; Tir. atu, IN abu "ashes"; Tir. warú čéwarú, Phil. abāga "shoulder"; Tir. wogó čewogó, Phil. abaká.

10. Indonesian k.

An original k remains unchanged in Tirurai initially and finally in dissyllabic root words, e. g., Tir. láyen "wood"; ebuk, IN buék "hair"; but an intervocalic k is retained only exceptionally, as in Tir. sekél, Bis. (Samar) sikí "foot"; Tir. sikó, Mgd. sikú "cat", and regularly becomes the corresponding sonant ɣ, e. g., Tir. sigen, IN sikú "elbow"; Tir. lágem, Phil. laki "male"; Tir. ĭgor, Phil. ĭkug (ɣ=RGH cons.) "tail"; Tir. sigur, Bis. ńkud "back, behind"; Tir. ĭgogum, Bis. kamú "you".

IN k also regularly becomes ɣ in accentless prefixes and pronominal suffixes (or enclitics) beginning with IN k, e. g., Tir. ĭgimí-nu, Bis. ikalimá "the fifth"; Tir. ĭleu ĭgu, Bis. ńlu ko "my head"; Tir. ĭleu ĭgu, Bis. ĭlu ka "your head". In the foregoing examples the original k is, of course, really in intervocalic position, and hence in the same category as the intervocalic k of the foregoing paragraph, but by analogy this ɣ (k) has been extended so that it may follow any consonant, e. g., Tir. ĭvok ĭgu, Bis. an anak ko "my son"; Tir. ĭsafut ĭgum (gum=Bis. kamú with apocopeation of u) "your cloth"; and the original k is retained in the enclitic pronouns only after a', e', ɔ', ʊ (Bon, en, on, un) at the end of the foregoing word, e. g., Tir. sebaa' ku sa "I only"; Tir. ĭbu' ku "my sister".

11. The RGH consonant.1

The RGH consonant appears regularly as r, exceptionally as ɣ, e. g., Tir. baru, Bis. bāga "embers"; Tir. ĭgor, Phil. ĭkug "tail"; but Tir. gəkit, Ikl. rəkit, Ibanak gəkit, Mal. rəkit "raft"; Tir. rebá beside gebá, Mal. rebáh "fall to ruins". As Tirurai

---

does not permit both \( r \) and \( l \) within the same root word, an \( r \) (\( \text{RGH} \)) either assimilates to itself an \( l \) (of any origin), as in Tir. \( \text{rebur} \) (\( \text{lebur} \)), Mal. \( \text{lebur} \), Mgd. \( \text{lebug} \), Bis. \( \text{lebug} \), or is (more rarely) itself assimilated to the neighboring \( l \), as in Tir. \( \text{tíleri} \) (\( \text{díre} \)), Mal. \( \text{díri} \), Sang. \( \text{díhi} \), Tag. Bis. \( \text{ha-lígi} \) “post”, where the \( r \) (\( \text{RGH} \)) is assimilated to the initial \( l \).


The phenomena of the R.L.D interchange in Indonesian languages are so varied, and have in so many instances been influenced by the laws of assimilation, dissimilation, and analogy, that their classification in detail is rendered very difficult. As a general rule, the Philippine languages show \( d \) initially and finally, and \( l \) or \( r \) medially, in which latter case some languages, like Tagalog and the Bisaya of Cebú, Negros, Panay, and Mindanao, regularly have \( l \), exceptionally \( r \) (more rarely \( d \)), while others, like Bicol and Samar Bisaya, do not admit \( l \), and have only \( r \), or, exceptionally, \( d \).

The R.L.D consonant appears as \( r \) or \( d \) in Tirurai, apparently without regard to its position, but \( r \) predominales medially and always occurs initially in the accentless pronominal particles \( r\,r \) (Phil. \( ra, la, da \)) “of them, their”. Initially and finally, \( d \) predominates, but even here \( r \) appears in some common words where other Philippine languages show only \( d \), e.g., Tir. \( r\,t\,o \) : Mal. \( s\,u\,l\,u \), Mgd. \( b\,a\,g\,o\,b\,o \), Pang. \( b\,a\,k \), Ibl. \( b\,a\,n\), Tagbana \( p\,a\,n \), Bis. \( d\,u\,h\,a \), Pamp. \( a\,n\,d\,a \), Tag. \( d\,a\,l\,a\,w\,a \) “two”; Tir. \( e\,t\,o\,r \) : Phil. \( t\,u\,t\,u \), Ibl. \( t\,u\,t\,u \) (written \( t\,u\,t\,u \) in the Spanish sources), Pamp. \( t\,u\,a\,d \), Tag. Bis. Bkl. Sulu \( t\,u\,t\,u \) “knee”. (For the metathesis of Tir. \( e\,t\,o\,r \) \( \equiv t\,u\,r \), cf. Tir. \( e\,b\,u\,k \) : Pang. \( b\,u\,k \), Pamp. \( b\,u\,k \), Ibl. \( b\,u\,k \), Tag. Bis. Bkl. Sulu \( b\,u\,h\,u\,k \) “hair”). For final \( r \), cf. Sund. \( t\,u\,u \) “knee”.

Of the many examples of \( r \) (R.L.D) in medial position, the following three will suffice: Tir. \( i\,r\,u\,n \) (IN \( i\,r\,u\,n \) : \( i\,u\,n \) : \( i\,d\,u \)) “nose”; Tir. \( s\,u\,r\,o \) (IN \( s\,u\,r\,a \) : \( s\,u\,l\,a \) : \( s\,u\,k\) “concealed barbs”; Tir. \( á\,r\,e\,k \) (Samar Bis. \( h\,á\,r\,ó\,k \), Cebú Bis. \( h\,á\,l\,ó\,k \), Tag. \( h\,á\,l\,i\,k \), Mgd. \( a\,l\,e\,k \), Bkl. Bgb. \( h\,á\,l\,ó\,k \)) “sniff, kiss”.

Examples of initial \( d \) : Tir. \( d\,a\,l\,e\,m \) (Cebú Bis. \( d\,a\,l\,u\,m \), hi-\( l\,á\,l\,u\,m \), Ibanak \( a\,r\,á\,l\,á\,m \) “within, under”; Tir. \( d\,o\,l\,ó\,n \) (IN \( r\,a\,l\,a\,n \) : \( l\,a\,l\,a\,n \) : \( d\,a\,l\,a\,n \) “road, way”.

1 Cf. RGH Law, p. 77.
2 For the \( g \) of the R.L.D series in Ibanak, Pang., Ibl., Koro, Toba, and Mentawai, cf. my RGH Law, p. 83, and the literature there cited.
Examples of final d: Tir. fūsd (Phil. *pūṣûd, Jav. Dayak puser, Mal. puset, Toba puset), the final l of Toba and Mal. (d[RLO] by law of finals) “navel”; Tir. sēgōd (Tag. sigōd, sigir, Bis., Bkl. sugūd, Pamp. aṣyōd) “sting of insect”.

Examples of medial d: Tir. sedō (Ibanak, Bkl. sirá, Itawi tisra, Tag., Bis. isadō) “fish, meat”; Tir. sedēn (Day., pero, Jav. amperu, Toba pōgō, Ilk. aprō, Tag., Bis., Bkl. apdu, Malg. aferu) “gall”.

Rarely the RLO consonant appears as l in Tirurai, as in Tir. līle (initially, cf. above, 11) and Tir. kilai (Mgd. Ilk. kirāi, Tag. kilai, Ilk. kidāi) “eyebrow”, but this l is entirely exceptional and doubtless due to the influence of other words of similar meaning containing an original l.

13. Indonesian s.

An original s in most words remains unchanged, as in Tir. sigōu (IN siku) “elbow”; Tir. fūsd “navel”; bejās “rice”; but it sometimes becomes h medially and finally, e.g., Tir. rohok (Mal. Ilk. rusuk, Bagobo, Bis. gusuk) “rib”; Tir. uka (Tag. līsā) “nīt”; Tir. loneh (Bis. lōwās) “body”; Tir. urah (Toba uras, Ilk. ugas, Sulu hugas) “bathe, wash”.

The change of IN s to h also occurs in a few other speech groups of the Philippine Islands, notably in Ifugao (mountains of N. Luzón) where IN s everywhere becomes h, e.g., Ifg. hīku (IN siku) “elbow”, pūha (Ilk., Pamp. pūsa) “cat”, ahin (Tag. asin) “salt”. Sambali (Zambales Province, NW. Luzón) also changes IN s to h, but apparently only in initial and final position, e.g., Sbl. hiko (Ifg. hiku, IN siku) “elbow”; Sbl. hīa (Ifg. hia, Tag., Bis. sia) “he, she, it”; Sbl. bīth (Bkl., Pamp. bīth) “foot, lower leg”; but Sbl. pūsa (Ifg. pūha, Tag. pūsa) “cat”; Sbl. asin (Ifg. ahin, IN asin) “salt”.

In large portions of Samar and Leyte s has been weakened in pronunciation to h, initially, in the Bisaya “articles” and

1 See E. E. Schneider, Notes on the Mangyan Language, Philippine Journal of Science, vol. vii., no. 3, sec. D., Manila 1912, pp. 157–178. I am indebted to this work for the general statement: “Ifg. regularly has h for gen. Phil. s.” (p. 165, no. 17), and for the Ifugao and Sambali examples. The Ifg. examples were furnished by Mr. Schneider by Mr. H. Otley Beyer, of the division of ethnology, Bureau of Science, Manila, and the Sbl. words by Mr. Tranquillo Elicano, a native Sambali from Masinlok, Zambales.
pronouns: si, san, sa, siya, siru, and sin'o,¹ but not elsewhere.

This change of s to the mere breathing h is the result of relaxing the occlusion necessary to produce the sibilant, and although appearing only sporadically and with varying degrees of regularity within Philippine territory and in other IN languages, e.g., Sumbanese and Sawunese, it marks the beginning of a phonetic movement that has been completed in the Polynesian languages, where s has nearly everywhere weakened to h, which itself has in many languages disappeared entirely, e.g., IN sin, suan, siwa “nine” : Sumb. siwa or hiwa (s and h interchange in Sumb.), Sawu. heo (h always for IN s), Tonga hiwa, Hawaii iwa, Tahiti, Marquesas iwa. An Indo-European parallel to this change is found in Iranian, Armenian and Greek, e.g., L-E. *septm, Lat. septem, Skt. saptá, Avestan hapta, Gr. ἑπτά. Modern Gr., which still writes the spiritus asper tho it is never pronounced, has suffered the same loss of h as have many of the Polynesian languages, and in intervocalic position it was already lost in classical Attic.

In Armenian an initial L-E. s sometimes becomes h, as in Arm. hin “old”, Skt. sāna-s, Lat. sēnēr. Old Irish sen: and is sometimes lost, as in Arm. essēn, Lat. septem etc.

14. Original g, t, d, m, n, ŋ, and l regularly remain unchanged in Tirurai. For the Tir. assimilation of l to an r of the same word, see above (11).

¹ Cf. N. Romualdez, A Bisayan Grammar, Takloohan (Leyte) 1908, p. 7 footnote 2: "The use of s instead of the h in these articles depends upon the place where Bisayan is spoken. In the towns of Burauen, Dūlāg, and Abāyog, of the island of Leyte, and in some places in Sāmār, the h is never used, but the s instead; for these articles. Generally it is considered more solemn to use the s instead of the h in speeches, letters and poetry. But many times it is considered as a ridiculous affectation in places where the h is used".
Pancaadiyadhiivasa or Choosing a King by Divine Will.
— By FRANKLIN EDGERTON, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

1. In the Proceedings of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal for November 1891, p. 135 ff., Tawney has called attention to an interesting custom of which he collected some half dozen instances in Hindu literature, by which, it is alleged, a king was sometimes chosen by divine lot. The standard situation may be briefly described as follows: The king of a city dies without natural heirs. To choose a new king the emblems of royalty (viz. the state elephant, the horse, the pitcher with the consecrated water, and the chowries) are resorted to, and fate or divine will is supposed to give some sign through their instrumentality, by which someone is selected to rule the country.

The Kathakaosa has three instances: Page 128 (Tawney's translation), "Then the barons had recourse to the five ordeals of the elephant, the horse, and so on. The elephant came into the city park trumpeting. There he sprinkled the prince with the water of inauguration, and taking him (the hero of the story) up in his trunk placed him on his forehead". The people then hailed the man as king. In this passage only three of the emblems of royalty are specifically mentioned, viz. the elephant, the horse, and the water of consecration. Another story (p. 155) names all five: "Then the ministers had recourse to the five ordeals. The mighty elephant came into the garden outside the city. There the elephant sprinkled Prince Amaradatta and put him on its back. Then the horse neighed. The two chowries fanned the prince. An umbrella was held (i.e. held itself) over his head. A divine voice was heard in the air: 'Long live King Amaradatta!'" The voice

1 Additional instances are given by J. J. Meyer, Hindu Tales, 1909, p. 131 and in his translation of the Daishakumarakarita, 1902, p. 94.
in the air is an additional divine ratification of the choice which is not generally mentioned and was evidently not regarded as a necessary part of the election. In the third story (p. 4) we are simply told that an elephant was sent forth with a pitcher of water fastened to its head; it wanders for seven days and on the eighth finds the man of destiny asleep under a pipal tree and empties the pitcher on his head; this is symbolical of the coronation ceremony, and the man is made king.

In the KSS, 65 the elephant alone appears; even the pitcher of water is missing in this case; the elephant picks the man up and puts him on his shoulder, whereupon he is made king.

Two other parallels, referred to by Tawney, are found in Jacobi’s Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭri. On p. 37, a horse only is sent forth, the elephant as well as the other symbols being here omitted. The horse indicates the choice of fate by marching around the man to the right. The ceremony occurs again on p. 62, this time with the five regular emblems; upon seeing the fated man, the elephant trumpets, the horse neighs, the pitcher of water sprinkles him, the chowries fan him and the white parasol places itself above him. The people then salute him with cries of hail, and a divine voice, as once in the Kathākośa, ratifies the choice, giving to the new king the grand name of Vikrama.

In the Vikramacarita (Story 14), a king is chosen in exactly this way for a city whose king has died leaving no heir. In the Jainistic recension it is told very briefly: “Then the king of that place died without leaving a son. Thereupon his ministers consecrated the five divine instruments (pañcadvīyāṇy adhivāsītāṃ), and they gave the kingdom to him (the hero of the story) with great pomp.” In the Southern and Metrical Recensions the five emblems are not alluded to, but a she-elephant is sent forth with a garland on her trunk; she places the garland on the new king’s head, places him on her shoulder and takes him to the palace.

Again in Hemacandra’s Pariśiṣṭaparvan, VI, 231 ff. (ed.

*It should be remembered that a king in India is always distinguished by the chowries and the white parasol as his chief emblems of royalty, while both the elephant and the horse belong especially to the royal state.*
Jacobi), upon the death of a king his ministers "sprinkle" (with the sacred water of coronation) the five "divine instruments" (āryāṇī), and send them forth. They are named here just as in the Māhārāṣṭri story: the state elephant, the royal horse, the parasol, the pitcher of water, and the two chowries. When they find the man they seek (in this case a low-caste man, the son of a courtezan by a barber), the elephant trumpets and pours the water upon him and places him upon his own back, the horse neighs, the parasol opens up like a white lotus at dawn, and the two chowries wave and fan him as if dancing. He is then proclaimed king.

In the Daśakumāracarita (Meyer's transl., p. 94) the elephant alone appears and indicates the choice by lifting the man up and putting him on his back. In the Prabandhacintāmaṇi (Tawney's translation, p. 181) the elephant (again alone) "being duly inaugurated" sprinkles the chosen man (with the water of inauguration). The Paramatthadīpant (p. 73 ff) referred to by J. J. Meyer, is not accessible to me.

Four Jātakas introduce a similar ceremony. In these the chariot of state is used. The word phussaraṇtha or maṇgala- ratha does not mean "flower chariot" as the translator of Jāt. 378 wrongly states, but "auspicious, festive car" or, specifically, the royal chariot. In Jāt. 539 it is yoked to four lotus-colored horses (the lotus is an emblem of majesty) and upon it are placed the five "ensigns of royalty", vājaśaṅkudhābhūdām. The chariot is attended by a complete fourfold army, and by musical instruments going behind it "because it contained no rider." The housepriest of the late king sprinkles it (as if in coronation) with water from a golden vessel, and sends it forth to find one who has sufficient virtue to be king. The car finds the Future Buddha asleep under a tree, and stops, as if to be ascended. The Future Buddha is seen to bear the marks of royalty upon his person, and since upon being awakened he conducts himself in a manner suitable to such a position, he is made king by the housepriest. The same ceremony is alluded to in Jātakas 378, 445, and 529.

1 In Sanskrit these are generally referred to as vāja-skukdām; they are not to be confused with the paṇcādiṇī; they consist of sword, parasol, crown, shoes, and fan (chowries).
That the tradition of this ceremony has persisted in widely separated parts of India down to the present day is proved by a considerable number of instances of it which are recorded in the folklore of the modern Hindus. To be sure, the recognition of a definite group of five instruments of choice seems not to have come down to modern times; we never find more than two, and generally it is the elephant alone. Examples may be taken from places as remote from one another as possible in India: thus, from Kashmir, from Bengal, and from Ceylon. In Day's Folktales of Bengal, p. 99, the choice is made by an elephant, who picks the man up gently, places him on the howdah upon his back, and takes him to the city where he is proclaimed king. In a Sinhalese tale recorded by Goontilleke, Orientalist, ii. 151, the elephant kneels before the destined man, in this case a peasant, who is thereupon crowned king. In Knowles' Folktales of Kashmir we have four instances: on pages 169 and 309, the elephant occurs alone, on pages 17 and 159 he is accompanied by a hawk, evidently as a bird belonging to royalty, who perches on the man's hand, while the elephant bows before him as in the Sinhalese tale. In F. A. Steel and R. C. Temple's Wide-awake Stories, p. 140 (and notes pp. 327, 426), the elephant kneels and salutes the man with his trunk; (cf. also Steel, Tales of the Punjab, p. 131). Damant (Indian Ant. iii. 11; iv. 261) reports two Bengalese stories. In one the elephant picks up a woman of low estate, who then marries a prince; in the other, the elephant takes on his back a boy who is made king. The Madanakamārajankadai ("Dravidian Nights", p. 126f.), referred to by Knowles, was not accessible to me.

2. Jacobi's eighth Mahārāṣṭri story (Ausgewählte Erzählungen, p. 62, 34) reads: tattha abhyāsyāni pāṇcādīvāni. Jacobi of Mitila had died leaving one daughter.... The ministers and Pouihas began to deliberate among themselves about the choice of a match worthy of the Princess.... At last, not knowing what to do, they resolved to leave to chance the solution of the difficulty. They sent out a charmed chariot, convinced that by the virtue inherent in it they would find out the fortunate man.... The chariot was sent out, attended by soldiers, musicians, Pouihas, and noblemen. It came straight forward to the mango tree garden and stopped by the side of the table-stone Phrahong was sleeping upon.... They awakened him at the sound of musical instruments, saluted him king" 

Cf. the references in J. H. Knowles' Folktales of Kashmir, p. 159,
derives ahiyäsiyäni from Skt. adhyäsaṣa (Causative of y' as with adhi) and renders it "als Symbol die Herrschaft führen" (p. 93, s. v. ahiyäsaṣa); Tawney (Proc. Royal As. Soc. of Bengal 1891, November, p. 136) translates it by "had recourse to" without explaining what he takes to be the etymology of the word. The same rendering he uses in his translation of the Kathäkoṣa, p. 125 and 155. Unfortunately I have no access to the original text of the Kathäkoṣa and am thus unable to determine the Sanskrit word so translated. The Jainistic recension of the Vikramacarita, however, reads: 1 tatas tan- mantrihì panca divyäny adhiväṣitäni, tais ca dattam tasya rajyam mahatä mahena: This clearly shows that adhiväṣitäni, not adhyäsiyäni is the Sanskrit equivalent of the Prakrit ahiyäsiyäni. The Pariśiṣṭaparvan (vi. 236, panca divyäny abhiṣiktäni mantrihil) gives a further hint as to the meaning of the term by using y' sin with abhi in exactly the same connection, this being the technical term for the solemn rite of installing a king. 2 In the other Mähäräṣṭra tale (Jacobi, p. 37, 12, aśo ahiyäsio) the word is used with reference to the horse which there performs the function of the panca dív̄i. 3. As to the exact meaning of the Skt. past participle adhiväṣita and the nominal derivatives adhiväṣa and adhiväṣana our Sanskrit Lexicons are divided in their opinions. 3 Goldstücker (1859) in his revision of Wilson's Dictionary gives under adhivaṣana first (practically repeating Wilson) the two meanings: (1) "Perfuming or dressing the person . . ."; (2) "A religious ceremony, preliminary to any great Hindu festival; touching a vessel containing perfumes, flowers, and other things previously presented to the idol; or offering perfumes etc. to it". These two meanings he connects with väsä "perfume". But then he adds a second group of meanings which he refers to the causative of y' vas "dwell" with adhi. These are (1) "A summoning and fixing of the presence of a divinity upon an image etc., when he is wanted for any solemnity"; (2) "The placing of a new image in water etc., the day before the divinity is to be summoned to inhabit it". Apte (The Practical

2 The abhiṣeka was performed in India with water, instead of oil.  
3 As far as the formal side is concerned they may either be referred to y' vas (causative) "to dwell" with adhi, or to the noun väsä "perfume" and its denominative väsäng with adhi.
Sanskrit-English Dictionary, 1890) gives for adhivāsana: 1. "Scenting with perfumes or odorous substances (śaṁskāra gandhāmahāvyādyāḥ, Amarakoṣa"). 2. "Preliminary consecration (pratīṣṭhā) of an image, its invocation and worship by suitable mantras etc., before the commencement of a sacrifice (yajñāram- bhūt prāṇ devatādyāvyāhanapūrvakaḥ pūjanādiḥkarmanabhedah); making a divinity assume its abode in an image". The second meaning he assigns to the causative of वास. Under वास with adhi he gives (1) "to cause to stay over night"; (2) "to consecrate, set up (as an image)". In the Verbesserungen und Nachträge the larger Petersburg Lexicon assigns adhivāsana "bestimmte mit Götterstatuen vorgenommene Ceremonien" to the causative of वास "dwell" with adhi and under 5 वास (causative) with adhi it gives besides (1) "über Nacht liegen lassen"; (3) "heimsuchen", (4) "sich einverstanden erklären", also a meaning (2) "einweihen (ein neues Götterbild)" for which it quotes Vār. Brhatsaṁhitā, 60. 15. But in the same volume s. v. vāsāy with adhi, "mit Wohlgeruch erfüllen", this statement is corrected and the passage is assigned to the second meaning of this denominative, "weihen". To this later view Böhtlingk adheres in the smaller Petersburg Lexicon. Under 5 वास (causat.) with adhi the meaning "einweihen" is omitted; on the other hand, for vāsāy- with adhi the meanings (1) "mit Wohlgeruch erfüllen"; (2) "einweihen" are given, and under this second meaning adhivāsita "geweiht" of the Vikramacarita (Ind. Stud. XV. 359) is quoted. The meaning of the noun adhivāsana (cf. also adhivāsanaka and adhivāsaniya in the Nachträge 1) "Einweihen (einer Götterstatue)" is thus regarded as derived from the more original sense "Parfumieren". Monier-Williams' revised Dictionary (1899) distinguishes between (1) adhivāsana (from वास, causat., with adhi) "causing a divinity to dwell in an image", and (2) adhivāsana (from वास- with adhi) "application of perfumes"; "the ceremony of touching a vessel containing fragrant ob-

1 Of the native Hindu lexicographers, some define adhivāsana simply by śaṁskāra, śaṁskriyā, saying nothing about perfumes; others define it by śaṁskāra or śaṁskriyā dhūpanādibhiḥ or gandhāmahāvyādyāḥ. But if we remember that there was a fairly common noun adhivāsa, adhivāsana "perfume", one who has in mind the etymological weakness of Hindu lexicographers will readily admit the possibility of this second definition being influenced by this fact.
jects (that have been presented to an idol)”; “preliminary purification of an image”.

Finally, Langlois in the note to his French translation of the Harivaśa 5994 (vol. I, p. 451) says: “Cette cérémonie s'appelle Adhīvāsa ou Adhivāsana. Quand on consacre une idole, on pratique aussi l'Adhīvāsa: on prend le riz, les fruits et les autres offrandes pour en toucher le vase d'eau sacré, puis le front de l'idole en prononçant certains mantras. L'Adhīvāsa est la cérémonie par laquelle on invite une divinité à venir habiter une idole.”

I believe the group of words under consideration has nothing whatever to do with vāsa “perfume”; on the contrary adhi-
vāsaya is the causative of yā yās “dwell” with adhī and means “to cause to dwell in”; the adhīvāsa is a ceremony by which a deity or divine power is invoked to take its proper place in a sacred object, either in the image of a god or in some other thing which is to be consecrated to some divine pur-
pose. In the Agnipurāṇa (35, 1) the rite to be performed is in honor of Viṣṇu, and by the adhīvāsa the god is invoked to take his place in the image before the ceremony. In another passage of the Agnipurāṇa (64, 18; Dutt's transl. i. 234) an image of the water-god Varuṇa is set up at the dedication of a water tank or reservoir, and the adhīvāsa is performed, in order that Varuṇa may come and abide in the image, presiding over the reservoir and so causing it to stay full of water. The Mbh. V. 5135 (— v. 151. 38), prayāśvāmo ranājivam | adhivāsitastra | ca kṛtakāntumāntyāḥ, shows a compound adhīvāsitastra; the warriors swords are consecrated for a solemn purpose and divine power is invoked to abide in them. In Varāhamihira's Brhatasthāpita we have (60, 15):

---

* Strangely enough, in spite of this he translates the adhīvāsa... ātmānam of the text by "en parfumant ton corps".
* Or adhīvīśa; the two forms are interchangeable.
* Dutt's translation, i. 127; Dutt, in the note, defines adhīvāsa as a "consecration of an image, especially before the commencement of a sacrificial rite".
* Dutt translates: "we shall...march to the field of battle after having worshipped our weapons and duly performed all the auspicious ceremonies"; Pratāp Chandra Roy: "having...worshipped our weapons (with offerings of flowers and perfumes) we will...march to the field of battle"; Fauche: "nous marcherons vers le champ de bataille les armes parfumées des seuteurs du sacrifice et toutes les choses de bon augure accomplies avec empressement."
suptām (viz. pratimām) snrtyagātair jāgarakāih samyag evam adhvāsyā | dveçajnaprādīste kule saṃsthāpanām kuryāt. Here the image is regarded as “asleep” (suptām), until “by awakens-1 1 dces and songs” the sacrificer has “made (the god) to dwell in it” (adhivāsyā) or “completely imbued it (with the divine presence)”; whereupon he is to set it up formally at a time prescribed by a soothsayer. A passage from Suśruta (xi. 3) seems to me to support particularly my view. I quote Hoernle’s translation (Bibl. Ind., new series, 911, p. 63 f.): “He who wishes to prepare a caustic should, on an auspicious day in the autumn, after purifying himself and fasting, (select) a large-sized, middle-aged, uninjured Muskaka tree, bearing dark flowers and growing in an auspicious spot on a (lonely) mountain, and perform the adhvāsana or ‘preliminary ceremo-2 nomy, saying the following incantation: ‘Oh thou tree of fiery power! Thou of great power! May thy power not be lost! Oh thou auspicious one, stay even here and accomplish my work! When once my work is done, then thou mayest go to heaven!’”; later the worshipper cuts off such pieces of the tree as he needs to prepare the caustic.2 The mantra here quoted in connection with the adhvāsana-ceremony seems to me to make its nature and purpose clear. The magic or divine power which is supposed to reside in the tree is commanded to dwell and remain in it till the purpose of the per-3 former is accomplished.3

1 Jāgarakāih (var. lect. jāgarikāih and jāgaranāih) is an adjective. Kern wrongly translates it as noun (Journal Royal As. Soc., new series, vi. 334): “after the sleeping idol has been consecrated with wakes, dancing, and song”; so also both Petersburg Lexicons: “das Wachen”.

2 In the foot-note Hoernle adds: “The adhvāsana is an oblation (bali- karman) accompanied with an incantation (mantra). According to the commentators, Bhūja gives the following directions and incantation: ‘He should there, with his face to the east, offer an oblation and then, on all four sides, with joined palms, devoted mind, and pure body, addressing the tree, repeat (the following words): ‘Whatever spirits may inhabit this tree, let them depart hence; for to-morrow this tree is to be cut for a high object.”’

3 It is noteworthy that in all the passages where the adhvāsana ceremony is mentioned, so far as I have discovered, no reference is made to perfumes, although the frequent use of fragrant substances at religious cere- monies in India would make such references not at all surprising. In any event the employment of perfumes at the adhvāsana would be a mere accident, without any bearing on the original meaning of this ceremony.
Harivaśa 5994 contains the gerund adhivāśya, and the noun adhivāsana occurs in the same text at vs. 6026 below. The text in the first passage is doubtful (see BR. s. v. vāsya + adhī), and neither passage is perfectly clear to me as to meaning. There is, however, certainly nothing in the context to uphold Langlois' translation "parfumant" for adhivāśya (vide supra). If the reading of the Calcutta edition of 1839 be kept in vs. 5994, I should interpret adhivāśya 'imanā 'imānam as "imbuing yourself with (your divine) nature (essence or power)", "dedicating yourself". If we accept the reading of the "neuere Ausgabe"1 quoted by the Petersburg Dictionary, adhivāśyā 'āya 'ā 'imānam, it seems to mean simply "consecrating yourself"—the same thing in the ultimate outcome although the development of the idea does not show itself so clearly. The later verse, 6026, contributes nothing to an understanding of the problem.

The phrase pāncadivyāny adhivāsitāni, then, means "the five divine instruments were imbued (with the superhuman power they were expected to use)", "they were consecrated". This meaning accords well with the pāncadivyāny abhiśiktāni of the Pariśīta parvan. The neuter noun divya is frequently found in the law-books in the sense of "ordeal". In our passages the word is used in a concrete instead of an abstract sense. Instead of "divine ordeal or test" it means "the instrument of divine test".2

1 I have no access to this later lithographed edition.
2 Hence I prefer Tawney's "ordeal" to Jacob's "die fünf königlichen Insignien".
Tablets from Dréhem in the Public Library of Cleveland, Ohio.—By Mary Inda Hussey, Cambridge, Mass.

From the large number of tablets that have come to light as the result of recent clandestine excavations by the Arabs, ten are to be found in the Public Library of Cleveland, Ohio, having been presented by Mr. John G. White of that city. They are said to have come from Dréhem¹, a ruin in the neighborhood of Nippur; but the name of the month Šu-umun follows the nomenclature used at Umma (Jocha) and at Lagash (Tello), and there is reason to suppose that number one of this collection came from Jocha.

The Dréhem tablets are acknowledged by all to be the accounts of the stock-pens at Dréhem which supplied some great sanctuary, in all probability the temple of Ellil at Nippur, with cattle for its sacrifices. Attention has also been called to the large number of Semitic names, and Genouillac has pointed out the conclusion, namely, that Dréhem was near cities with a Semitic population, who sent their offerings to the Sumerian sanctuary. The Semitic names in these tablets are: "Dun-gi-UU, 5 Ob. 4 | Gimil-É-a, 4 Ob. 2 | Gimil-Sin, 9 Ob. 5, Rev. 6: 10 Rev. 9, both seal impressions Col. 1⁴ | Edin-

Description of Tablets.

1. Debit and credit account (ṣag niq-gar-ra-kum ṣag-hi-ta **ṣi(g)-ga)** of the sheep fold (ṣ-udu) concerning 165 qa of barley, in the month Šu-nunum, the year Anšan was destroyed (Dungi x + 32).

2. Account of the delivery of a large number (600 + 600 + [1]) of sheep and goats by Nalul during the last six months of the year Uruillus was destroyed (Dungi x + 43). [Sh]-ki-n-k[fcu]d] is the last month of the year Dungi x + 43, as has been noted by Thureau-Dangin: for the years x + 27, x + 30, x + 39, x + 40 of Dungi and the years 1 and 3 of Bûr-Sin.

---

1 Cf. ZA. XXV, p. 330; BA VI, 5, p. 71; Inventaire des tablettes de Tello I, p. 10, n. 1; Hilprecht Anniversary Volume, p. 200; Genouillac, Tablettes de Diéhem, no. 5544 sqq.; Babylonica, VI. (1912), p. 43.

2 Cf. Rev. d'Assyr. t. 8, p. 88.
3. Account of the delivery of sheep and goats by Ab-bašalu(g)-qa, which are taken in charge (ni-KU)² by Na-lul on the 13th day of the month Esen-an-na, the year that the great

¹ Cf. Inventaire, i, p. 6, n. 4.
high priest of Anu was invested high priest of Nanna(r) (Bûr-Sin 4). Note: udu-se gu(d)-e uš-sa Ob. 3, maš-gal-še gu(d)-e uš-sa Ob. 8, and sîl-ya, Rev. 2, sucking lamb.

No. 3.

OBVERSE.

REVERSE.

4. 4 cows, 2 lul-li rug-ya¹ from the month Ṣes-da-hû, and 2 šu-gid² from the months Ezen-Nin-a-su and Šu-eš-ša, delivered by Ab-ba-šši(g)-ya and taken in charge by In-ta-ê-a, the year Ṣašru was destroyed (Bûr-Sin 6). The last sign in Ob. 5 (ka + ša) is unknown to me.

¹ Huber in Hilprecht Ann. Vol., p. 194 translates "mit Abzug der Gebühren"; Genouillac, Inventaire, 2, no. 629, "paiement de dettes"; no. 788, "en paiement d'intérêt".
² For a discussion of this term see Rev. d'Assyr., t. 9, p. 42, n. 6.
5. An account of 21 sheep and goats, supplied (mu-tūm) by 16 different persons, among whom are Ur-šNin-kur-ra pa-te-si (of Šuruppak) Ob. 9, and Gu-de-a pa-te-si\(^1\) (of Kutha) Rev. 6; taken in charge by Ab-ba-šā(g)-ga on the 12th day of the month Ešen-maḫ, the year the high priest of Eridu was invested (Bûr-Sin 8). Note: udu-u-lum\(^2\) Ob. 5, 12, 14, Rev. 4:

\(^1\) They figure not infrequently in the Drehem tablets. Cf. the name-lists in Genouillac's works.

\(^2\) Cf. ganam-u-lum, in Genouillac. Tab. de Drehem, 4683, Rev. 7. Dhorme in Rev. d'Assyr., t. 9, p. 40, calls attention to the use of the vowel o to mark the species to which animals belong.
uz mas-nu-a še Ob. 7, a fat female goat that has not had a kid (?).
6. Account of the expenditure (ba-zi) by Abb-ša(lip)-ga of 12 sheep and goats, offerings (? nîm-dûr) of 6-XV from among the supplies (ša(lip) mu-tum-ra-ta)\(^1\), the 11th day of

No. 6.

**Obverse.**

**Reverse.**

the month Še-kin-kud, the year the high priest of Eridu was invested (Bûr-Sîn 8). Note: udu-a-lum-šē 3 kam-uš, Ob. 2, fat a-lum sheep for the 3rd time\(^2\); màš-gal lû-su šē. Ob. 4, fat goat-buck of the tanner\(^2\). Is màš-a-sîg, Ob. 7, interchange-

---

able with sig-māš. The sign sig (Recherches sur l'Écriture Cunéiforme, 464) varies somewhat from its usual form.

No. 7.

OBVERSE.

REVERSE.

1 Cf. Dhorme, Rev. d'Assyr., t. 9, p. 45, n. 2.
7. Account of the expenditure (ba-zi) by Ab-ba šá(g)-ga of 435 sheep and goats from among the supplies, the 27th day of the month U-ne-ku, the year the high priest of Nanna(r) of Kar-zi-da was invested (Bûr-Sin 9). Note: udu-a-lum-še, Ob. 8; the name Ur-Nin-ezen + ia (REC, 366), Ob. 3.
8. An account of supplies (mu-tum) of bullocks, sheep and goats, from Lugal-ma-gur-ri, dues from the akatu festival of the month Šu-numun in Gaēš (maš-da-ri-a. eki-ši Šu-numun, șa(g) Ga-es și), and from Ku-á; taken in charge by In-la-ē-a the first day of the month Eṣen-â-Dun-qi, the year Sîmanu was destroyed (Gimil-Sin 3). The seal of Nu-ūr-â-Sîn / dup-sar [du]mu I-ti-ir-ra has been run over the entire tablet, but the seal impression is in every case indistinct. Note: udu-șe gu(s)-e nā-sa, Ob. 2; udu-șe û-kam-us, Ob. 6.

9. An account of supplies (mu-tum) of bullocks, sheep, and goats, the offering (kaš-de-a) of Ka-ma-ni-xi šabra of Gimil-â-Sin, an evening sacrifice (a-mu-ba-a) for the temple of the gods they have been taken in charge (ê dingir-re-ne-ge-šu ab-KU). On the 28th day of the month Eṣen-â-Dun-qi they

No. 9.

OVERSE.

---

1 Huber in Hilprecht Ann. Vol., p. 213, where the "hi-de-a" consists of grain, regards it as a synonym of ab-dâ(g). Dherme in Rev. d'Assyr., t. 9, p. 53, AM. 13. renders it by libation where the offering is also made by a high official (sûkkal-maḫ) for ê-dingir-re-ne-ge. Cf. Genouillac, Tûb. de Drêhem, 4687.

2 Cf. Inventaire, 2, no. 650, šabra 4Enlil.

3 Delaporte, Rev. d'Assyr. t. 8, p. 195. No. 18 ob. 8.

4 See Inventaire, 2, no. 796, Dherme in Rev. d'Assyr., t. 9, p. 53, AM. 15.
were taken in charge by In-ta-ša, the year 4Gimil-Sin the king built the wall of the west, (named) Muriq-Tidnim (Gimil-Sin 4). Stamped seven times, but always indistinctly, with the seal of Lugal-amar-azag dupsar dumu Na-sag X.

10. Expended (ba-zi) by Ur-azag-nun-na: on behalf of the king 1 bullock, 10 sheep from the pasture (udu-šam) as šu-gid š-mu in the name of the commissaries (mu lu-šukum)-ra-ge-ne-šū); 10 dead sheep Šun-ši-uru-mú has received (šu-ba-an-ti); the 25th day of the month Erez-Me-li-gal, the year

4 REC. no. 344.

2 Cf. šu-gid š-mu mu-ib-Bur-Sin-ge-ne-šū, "reserve de cuisine pour les chauffeurs (?) de Bûr-Sin", Rev. d'Assyr., t. 9, p. 51, SA 172; šu-gid š-mu mu-ul-ul-ge-ne-šū, ibid., SA 159, 162, 188.
4 Giumil-Sin the king built the temple of the god X of Umma (Gimil-Sin 9).

1 REC. no. 458.
The obverse has been stamped nine times, and the reverse eight times, with a seal which reads: (Col. 1) "Gimil-Sin lugal ag-ga lugal uri-ma lugal-an-ub-da tab-ba" (Col. 2) "Hu-u[n ] dup-sar dumu Gimil-Adab sahar arad-zu. To Gimil-Sin, the mighty king, king of Ur, king of the four quarters of the world, Hu-u[n ] the scribe, son of Gimil-Adab the sahar thy servant. The left edge of the reverse bears two impressions of a seal likewise dedicated to Gimil-Sin by Nu-ur-Si[n ] dup-sar dumu I-ti.

1 For other seals dedicated to the same ruler, see Janneau, *Une Dynastie Chaldéenne*, pp. 49, 53-54.
Wine in the Pentateuchal Codes. — By Morris Jastrow, Jr.,
Professor in the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

I.

There are two views taken of wine in the Old Testament, one a decidedly unfavorable view, and the other of a more favorable character. As an illustration of the unfavorable view, the account given in Genesis 9, 20—27 of the beginning of viniculture furnishes a characteristic illustration. In this little addition to the Jahwist's account of the Deluge, the planting of the vine leading to Noah's fall from grace is clearly introduced as a protest against the use of wine. Similarly, in the folk-tale, Gen. 19, 31—38, of the origin of the tribes of Ammon and Moab, there is a very distinct antagonism against the use of wine. The drunken Lot because of the wine engages in shameful intercourse with his two daughters. The assumption in the Noah and in the Lot incident is that he who drinks wine gets drunk and disgraces himself.

This opposition to viniculture is in keeping with a tendency in many parts of the Old Testament which looks with disfavor on the advance to a higher form of culture. Abel the shepherd is given the preference over Cain the tiller of the soil and the city builder. In the Pentateuchal Codes agri-
culture is preferred to commerce which is looked upon askance. The simple tribal organization is preferred to a union into a Kingdom—in short, simplicity over any advancing form of luxury which comes with the higher culture. The prophets are full of protest against what from the ordinary point of view would be regarded as material and political progress. The Rechabites, surviving to the period of the Exile, represent this protest of the lower culture against the higher one, emphasized by their opposition to wine and by their dwelling in tents in preference to houses—the symbol of the higher culture, concomitant with city life.

The Book of Proverbs, despite the late date of its final form, maintains on the whole the antagonistic attitude towards wine. In such sayings as Pr. 23, 31, "Look not on wine when it is red, when it sparkles in the cup", etc.; Pr. 20, 1, "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is a brawler", the assumption still is that he who drinks wine gets drunk and is led to other excesses. "He who loves wine and oil will not be rich", (Pr. 21, 17) where the juxtaposition with oil illustrates the protest against luxury. A somewhat cynical point of view is set forth in the later chapter 31, 4—7, where we read:

"It is not for kings to drink wine, Nor for rulers to mix strong drink; Lest, drinking, they forget the law, And disregard the rights of the suffering. Give strong drink to him who is perishing, Wine to him who is in bitter distress;

1 The prohibition against taking interest—aimed against Babylonian practices—and emphasized in three of the Codes (Ex. 22, 24; Lev. 25, 36—37; Deut. 23, 20—21) is virtually an enjoiner upon commerce which cannot be carried on without making loans on interest. The words "to the stranger thou mayst lend on interest" (Deut. 23, 21) are a later addition—a concession to actual conditions, but not in keeping with the spirit of the original provision.

2 The institution of the kingdom is viewed as an act of disloyalty to Jahweh (I Sam. 12, 12). The view taken of the kingdom and what will happen through the institution is illustrated by Deut. 17, 14—17 and by the parable in Judges 9, 7—15.

3 Jer. 35, 5—10.

4 See also Pr. 20, 20—21; 29—30.

5 Toy's rendering and reading (Critical and Evangelical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs, p. 539).
That, drinking, he may forget his poverty,
And think of his misery no more."

Wine drinking had evidently become a common practice, but was still viewed with disfavor in certain circles whose contemptuous attitude is indicated in these words. Elsewhere, to be sure, e.g., Pr. 9, 2 and 5, "mixed wine" is introduced by the side of meat and bread without any implied opposition, though it is still a wide step to the praise of wine in the later Psalm 104, 15.

"And wine to cheer man's heart,
Oil to make his skin to shine,
And bread to strengthen man's heart."¹

We may perhaps be permitted to conclude from such passages as I Sam, 10, 3; 16, 20; 25, 18; II Sam. 16, 1—2, that by the time of the establishment of the Kingdom, the use of wine had become common; and it is significant that according to the Deuteronomistic Code (Deut. 14, 26) both wine and strong drink may be indulged in on the occasion of the festivals, showing that by the end of the seventh century opposition to it had ceased even in religious circles.²

The later view of post-exilic Judaism is reflected in the juxtaposition of "bread and wine", as the accessory to the blessing formula in Gen. 14, 18.³ Pre-exilic and post-exilic prophets still protest against excess in drinking and make use of the wine bibber as a picture of lewdness and disgrace. (Is. 5, 11; 22; 22, 13; 28, 7; Joel 1, 5; Zach. 9, 15) but it is no longer assumed that drinking necessarily leads to drunkenness.⁴ A good-wine crop is looked upon as a sign of divine favor and its failure as a sign of God's displeasure—on the same plane with a good or bad yield in corn or oil, e.g., Amos 5, 11; 9, 14; Is. 16, 10; 24, 11; Jer. 13, 12; 40, 10, 12; 48, 33; Zeph. 1, 13; Micha 6, 15; cf. Deut. 28, 39 and

¹ Horace Howard Furness' translation in Polychrome Bible, ed. Haupt.
² See also Deut. 28, 39.
³ Gunkel, Genesis p. 263, has happily and tersely described this chapter as a "legend of the time of Judaism", based on some historical reminiscences which are woven into the story, intended to bring Abraham into relationship with the great figures of Babylonian history.
⁴ In Hosea, 4, 11, the words "Harlotry and wine and mead take away the understanding", represent an old proverb inserted as appropriate at this place by some redactor.
Lam. 2, 12. The metaphor introduced in the late passage Zach. 10, 7, "their heart rejoiceth as with wine" approaches the attitude expressed in the 104th Psalm as quoted above. On the other hand when we are told, Gen. 27, 25, that Jacob brought his father, Isaac, wine, it is evident that the words "and he brought him wine and he drank" represent a later addition to the original Jahwist narrative \(^1\) to make the story conform to later conditions. Throughout the narrative (v. 17 and she placed the "dainties and the food"; v. 19, "eat of my venison" cf. v. 31—33) food only is referred to, and the manner in which the words in question are attached betray the later gloss or comment.

A distinction between earlier and later social conditions is also revealed in the stereotyped phrase נְדָעִין נְדָעָה נָחַפָּה (dāğān, tīrōs yīṣḥār) characteristic of Deuteronomy—\(^2\) for summing up the products of the land, where tīrōs takes the place of the later yayin and represents a preparation of the grape juice in a less advanced stage than the finished fermented product. It has, of course, been noted by commentators \(^3\) that the other two terms dāgan (corn) and yīṣḥār (oil) are replaced in later usage by בִּילֵים (hilīm) \(^4\) and יִנֶּן (yīnēn) so that there are substantial grounds for believing that the Deuteronomic phrase belongs to an earlier stage in agricultural development \(^5\) when so far as the grape was concerned the process of manufacturing a thoroughly fermented article had not yet been perfected. Without going into the vexed question of the etymology of

---

\(^1\) Recognized as such by Gunkel, Genesis, p. 278.

\(^2\) Deut. 7, 13; 11, 14, 12, 17; 14, 23, 18, 4; 28, 51. The occurrence of the phrase in such passages as Hos. 2, 10, 24, Haggai 1, 11, Joel 2, 10, and II Chron. 31, 5, and Neh. 5, 10, 40; 13, 5. 12 is of course a reminiscence or direct quotation of the Deuteronomic usage, while נְדָעִין נְדָעָה נָחַפָּה (ḥelōb, tīrōs, dāgan) in Num. 18, 12 is a variant phrase similarly dependent. The phrase נְדָעִין נְדָעָה (dāgan and tīrōs) e.g. Gen. 27, 28, 37 (Elohist); Deut. 33, 28; II Kgs. 18, 33; Hos. 7, 14; Zach. 9, 17; Ps. 4, 8; Is. 62, 8,—occurring chiefly in poetical passages—likewise represents a variant of the archaic formula.

\(^3\) E.g. Driver, Deuteronomy, p. 103.

\(^4\) Dāgan, however, continues to be used in later poetical compositions, e.g. in Ezekiel 36, 29; Ps. 65, 10; 78, 24.

\(^5\) Indicated also by the use of tīrōs and not yayin in the parable Jud. 9, 13 where the vine says "shall I abandon my tīrōs that rejoiceth god (Elohim) and men"?
yayin, as a loan-word in Hebrew, it points to the foreign origin of the process involved and it would be natural that as an importation among the Hebrews, due to advancing luxury, it should meet with opposition on the part of those who clung tenaciously to older established and simpler customs.

II.

The conservative character associated in all religions with practices of the cult should prepare us for finding traces of the earlier unfavorable view taken of wine and viniculture in the Pentateuchal regulations regarding the temple service. Such is indeed the case. In Lev. 10, 9 we encounter the prohibition emphasized as “an everlasting statute for all times” that the priests are not to drink wine (yayin) or strong drink (šēḥâr) upon coming to the “tent of meeting.” The little section (vv. 8—9) in which this prohibition is set forth is independent of the rest of the chapter and impresses one as an old ordinance which is carried over from earlier days. The mention of the “tent of meeting”—which whenever it occurs in the Pentateuchal Codes is, I think, an indication of an early practice, though modified and adapted to later conditions—points in the same direction. The decree finds its counterpart in Ezekiel 44, 21 where the priests are cautioned not to drink wine when they come to the “inner court.”

---

1 See Brown, Driver and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon, s. v. There is no underlying verbal stem from which ποιος might be derived in use in any of the Semitic Languages. The occurrence of a doubtful see in a syllabary does not justify us in claiming the word as Babylonian. The late occurrence in Arabic and Ethiopic proves nothing as to its origin. Even if it should turn out to be a Semitic word, it is clearly a loan-word in Hebrew.

2 The phrase “milk and honey” though characteristic of P (Ex. 3, 8; 15, 5; 33, 3; Num. 13, 27; 14, 5, 16, 18, 14) and of the additions to the Deuteronomistic Code (Deut. 6, 3; 11, 9; 25, 9, 15; 35, 3; 31, 20) reflects an even earlier social stage than dāqēn, tirēs and yēḏār and is evidently retained with intent to reflect the conditions prevailing during the nomadic period of Hebrew history. Mohammed’s prohibition of wine is a trace of the same opposition of the “nomadic” stage of culture against the innovations of higher civilization. See the incident referred to by Mittwoch, “Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Islamischen Gebets” (Abh. d. Kgl. Preuß. Akad. d. Wiss., 1913, Phil.-Hist. Klasse Nr. 2, p. 14).
representing the adaptation of the earlier law to the temple as sketched by Ezekiel. Now, to be sure, both in Leviticus and in Ezekiel the prohibition is limited (according to the wording) to the time of the actual carrying out of priestly functions, but it looks very much as though this were a concession made to later practice and that originally the priests were not permitted to drink wine at all as in the case of the nāzîr who, as his name indicates, represents one "set aside" or dedicated to a deity. The indications are that the term nāzîr is merely an old designation of a priest.¹ Like the kōhēn he is not to come into contact with a dead body (Num. 6, 6—7; cf. Lev. 21, 1);² and it is therefore a fair inference that the prohibition against drinking wine (gayîn) and strong drink (sêkâr) in Num. 6, 3,³ was likewise a general ordinance for priests.

¹ Amos 2, 11—12, who rebukes the people for giving the Nazarites wine and ordering the prophets not to prophesy, uses "nazîrites and prophets" as elsewhere we find "prophets and priests" contrasted or placed in juxtaposition, e.g., Jer. 5, 31; 26, 11, 16; Zach. 7, 3. Neh. 9, 38; etc. The later view of the "nazîrite" as one "set aside" without affiliation with any priesthood is illustrated in Luke 1, 15 foretelling the coming of John who "shall drink neither wine nor strong drink". The older attitude towards wine is well illustrated also by Jud. 13, 14 where wine and strong drink are put on the same level as "unclean" food—they defile and are therefore to be avoided by the wife of Manoah who is to keep herself free from contamination, as though she too were "set aside".

² The exceptions in v. 2—4 represent again a concession, due to the large body of priests assumed for the central sanctuary. From the fact that the exceptions do not apply to the high priest (v. 11), we may conclude that the law not to touch a dead body under any circumstances applied rigorously at one time to all priests.

³ The law in its original form read "From wine and strong drink he shall separate himself". What follows (v. 3—4) is in the nature of a "Gemârâ" to the law, specifying the answers to such questions, does wine and strong drink include vinegar of wine and of strong drink? Yes. How about grape juice? Yes— forbidden. How is it with fresh or dried grapes? They also are forbidden. In fact anything made of grapes is included in the prohibition (v. 4). Haggai 3, 11—17 furnishes an interesting example of such questions and priestly decisions (note the technical use of kârâ in the passage) as constituting a regular practice. For further illustration of this method of superimposing layers embodying decisions in regard to the details involved in a law, see the writer's paper on "An Analysis of Leviticus 13 and 14" in a forthcoming number of the Jewish Quarterly Review. This 6th chapter of Numbers
At all events, if the priest is not to drink wine on entering the sanctuary, the assumption is as in the passages voicing the opposition to wine, that he who drinks wine becomes drunk and with such an attitude towards wine, is it likely that wine should have been included among the ingredients of a sacrifice in Jahweh’s sanctuary?

III.

Taking up the passages in the Codes where wine is introduced, we find it in three sections which represent general summaries of priestly regulations and furnish clear indications of having been independent little groups. That at least, is certainly the case in Numbers, Chap. 15, 1–111 and Chap. 28–292—both belonging to the so-called Priestly Code. Attached to the burnt-offering in all the cases instanced is a mînâha or meal offering consisting of fine flour with oil and wine. The amount of the wine is throughout regulated to correspond to the amount of the oil—* 1/4 of a Hin of oil for a lamb and the same amount of wine, 1/3 of a Hin of oil and the same amount of wine for a ram and 1/2 Hin of oil and the same of wine for a young of cattle or bullock. This in itself is an indication that the wine is dependent upon the oil—constituting an additional ingredient added to the conventional

represents the combination of two distinct themes (1) the nâzîr law and (2) the laws regarding the one who vows to “separate” himself for a limited period, i.e., to become a temporary nâzîr—a later practice. The detailed analysis of this chapter must be left for some other occasion.

v. 1–16 is a little Tórd—furnishing general regulations for sacrifices and has no connection with the following sections which deal with miscellaneous ordinances, put together without any apparent method. The chapter is sandwiched in between a narrative of the people’s murmurings against Jahweh and the rebellion of Korah.

2 These two chapters form a little Tórd of sacrificial regulations for the daily offerings, for the Sabbath, for the new-moon, for the Passover, for the “day of firstlings”, for the first and tenth days of the seventh month and for the Hag or pilgrimage festival.

3 Num. 15, 4—9; 28, 5–7, 14. In the latter passage “and their libations are 1/2 of a Hin for a bullock, 1/3 of a Hin for a ram and 1/2 of a Hin for a bullock”—thus specified once for all, so that in the rest of the two chapters, the amount is briefly indicated by the phrase “their libations”.

4 Num. 15, 8 תֵּבִּים = 17 Num. 29, 12, 14 etc. etc. The combination תֵּבִּים תֵּבִּים Ex. 29, 1. Lev. 4, 3, 14; 16, 3; 23, 18; Num. 8, 8; 15, 24; 29, 2; Ezek. 43, 19, 22, 33, 25 etc. etc. (and תֵּבִּים תֵּבִּים Num. Chapt. 28, 11, 19; 29, 13, 17) is a later redundant designation.
minha of "flour mixed with oil". The manner in which the wine is always tacked on (Num. 15, 5, 7, 10; 28, 7-8, 14) as is a further indication of the supplemental character of the libation. Similarly, in Lev. 23 (Holiness Code) detailing regulations for the three festivals (Passover, Shabuot, and Sukkot) and the first and tenth days of the seventh month, the libation of wine for the minha introduced only in the case of the "wave" offering on the day after the first day of Passover (v. 13) is tacked on to "flour mixed with oil" in an unmistakable manner.

In confirmation of the view here taken of the wine as a later addition to the flour and oil, we find in Lev. Chapter 2, where the minha offering is set forth in detail, that the wine is omitted. In its place, apparently, we find the frankincense which is attached to the flour and oil. A handful of the flour and oil with all of the frankincense is placed as a "memorial" (םִנְּפָּר) on the altar, consisting of a "fragrant fire offering", while the rest (i.e., of the flour and oil) is given to the priest, forming as expressly stated "holy of holies of the fire offerings of Jahweh". Verses 4-9 represent again super-

---

1 Note how in Num. 28, 15, 24-31; 29, 11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38, 39 "libation" or "libations" is added at the close of the verse.

2 No sacrifices are prescribed in this chapter with the exception of the two "wave" offerings, one consisting of a one-year-old lamb with a minha for the day after the first day of Passover (v. 11-13) and one for the 50th day after the first day of Passover, consisting of a "new minha" (v. 16-17) specified as two loaves of "bread of waving" (תּוֹחַ הַרְכָּבָה) with seven lambs, one bullock, two rams (v. 18)—representing an addition to the "grain" offering to which as a second supplement (v. 19) a goat as a sin-offering and two lambs as a "peace-offering" are attached.

3 הַרְכָּבָה (v. 27, 28) as the designation of this 10th day is a later gloss. In v. 27, the Greek version omits these words.

4 v. 18 "and its minha 2220 of fine flour mixed with oil as a fire offering to Jahweh, a pleasant fragrance" clearly ends with מִנָּה בַּיּוֹן. To this there is added rather awkwardly "and its libation" to which furthermore on the basis of Num. 15 and 28-29 the gloss "1/4 of a Hin" is added. The amount of oil, be it noted, is not stipulated here any more than it is in Lev. Chap. 2.

5 Lev. 2, 1-3.

6 I use the conventional renderings for the technical term מִנָּה, בַּיּוֹן, מִנָּה, מִנָּה, מִנָּה, מִנָּה etc., though I am satisfied that all of them need investigation and that they embody much more primitive notions than are conveyed by the usual translations.
imposed layers upon the original minhå ordinance, indicating the various forms in which the mixture of flour and oil may be brought as (1) cakes or wafers baked in an oven, (2) baked in a flat pan in small pieces with oil poured on them or, (3) in a cauldron (2) (טָבָלָה עָלָם). In all cases some of the minhå is burnt on the altar and the rest given to the priests.\(^1\) Wine, however, is not mentioned and since it is stipulated that the cakes are to be “unleavened” (נָסָב v. 4–5) and it is further expressly stated that the minhå is not to consist of any leaven, (v. 11) it is evident that the wine as a fermented product would by virtue of this be absolutely excluded.

Similarly, in the minha prescribed in the second purification ritual\(^2\) for the one healed of the garat we have flour with oil\(^3\) but no wine and so in the minhå prescribed as a “guilt”

\(^1\) Lev. 7, 9 where these three forms of minhå are again mentioned, but no reference is made to any ashrå.

\(^2\) Lev. 14, 8–20. See the study of this ritual in the writer’s paper on Leviticus, 13 and 14—above referred to.

\(^3\) The amount of oil is here specified in a gloss as “one log” (Lev. 14, 10, 12; also v. 21 in the “substitute” offerings). Although the term minhå is introduced (v. 10) and the amount of flour specified as 320, this is done in order to make the ritual conform to the later practice of attaching a minhå to every animal sacrifice as set forth in Numbers 15 and 28–29. In the purification ritual the oil alone is utilized (Lev. 14, 15–16; 26–29) and instead of being partly offered with the flour on the altar and the rest given to the priest, it is used like the blood of the “guilt” offering (v. 14, 25) to touch the ear lobe, the right thumb, and the right large toe of the one to be purified and the rest to be poured over his head. This is certainly not a minhå, but some primitive rite to make the one out of whom the demon of disease has been driven immune against a renewed invasion. In this case the animal sacrifices have been superimposed upon the “oil” rite; and here again two layers may be recognized (a) an earlier one represented by an ewe (v. 10 cf. Lev. 3, 6) as a guilt offering (v. 14) and (b) two lambs (v. 10) one as a sin offering, the other as a burnt offering (v. 19) in accordance with the conventional later practice. With the growth of the priestly organization—especially in the sanctuary at Jerusalem—necessitating the providing of an income for the priests, animal sacrifices became predominant and the minhå became an adjunct to the various kinds of animal offerings—sin-offerings, burnt offerings and peace-offerings—with the natural tendency to increase these offerings steadily. A good illustration of this tendency is to be seen in a comparison of Ex. 40, 6–7 with Num. 28, 11–15, the sacrifices for the new moon, viz:
offering (טבש) (Lev. 5, 11—12) for the one who cannot afford even two turtle doves or two pigeons as a substitute for the ewe or kid (female), there is no wine, any more than in the minhā which is to accompany the "peace offering" (Lev. 7, 12—13). Furthermore, in a comparison of the sacrificial regulations for the new moon as given in Ezekiel, 46, 6—7 with Num. 28, 11—15, we have the direct proof that the wine is a later addition, for Ezekiel does not mention it, while it is included, as above set forth, in the Priestly Code. 1

The obvious conclusion therefore is that the wine represents a later addition to the ritual and the omission in Ezekiel forms a definite terminus for the introduction. It is clearly post-exilic and the manner in which the libation of wine has been tacked on to the minhā in the three sections discussed furthermore shows that even in the post-exilic codes, the wine represents a later layer superimposed on earlier ones. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ezekiel</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bullock</td>
<td>2 bullocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 lambs</td>
<td>7 lambs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ram</td>
<td>1 ram</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand the minhā is larger in Ezekiel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ezekiel</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ephah (of flour) for the bullock</td>
<td>3 3/20 of an Ephah for each bullock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ephah for the ram</td>
<td>9/20 for the ram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As much as one can afford for the lambs</td>
<td>1/10 for each lamb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One Hin of oil for each Ephah

The amount of oil is not specified in Numbers but the assumption is (cf. Num. 28, 5; 15, 4, 5, 9) 1/2 Hin for the bullock, 1/8 Hin for the ram and 1/4 Hin for each lamb as is shown by the amount of wine (only in Numbers!) in v. 14. See Carpenter and Battersby, Hazateuch 1, p. 128. In Lev., chapters 1 and 3—5 specifying the regulations for the burnt offering (תַּחַן) peace offering (טָעַת עַז) for the sin offering (תְּאָשָׁר) and guilt offering (נֵחָשָׁב) no minhā is attached, but in Chap. 6, it is tacked on to the burnt-offering (v. 7—11) and in Chap. 7, 11—13, it is rather awkwardly dovetailed into the "peace" offering as a kind of supplemental "thanksgiving" offering (תְּשׁוּבָה). Clearly then the practice as detailed in Num. 15 and 28—29 where the minhā appears as the regular addition represents the later practice.

1 The əšām is not to be distinguished in the Codes from the hattat, as the statement, Lev. 7, 7 "There is one law for the hattat as for the əšām" or Lev. 14, 13 "the əšām is like the hattat" shows. Whether originally there was a distinction is another question which is probably to be answered in the affirmative.
innovation therefore belongs to a period when all opposition to the use of fermented wine had disappeared, when it had not only become a common article of daily life but when wine had become as in Psalm 104 and Zachariah 10, 7; (cf. also Eccles. 10, 19) a symbol of joy. A trace of the older attitude, however, remained in the prohibition that the priest was not to take wine on entering the sanctuary, because of the old feeling that wine drinking leads to drunkenness. The subject is of interest because of the extensive use to which wine was put in the later Jewish ritual where, as is well-known, the wine becomes the symbol for the sanctification of the Sabbath and of the Jewish festivals and which is reflected in the New Testament passages regarding wine.

It is thus a far cry from the opposition to viniculture expressed in Genesis—maintained by the Rechabites down to the time of the Exile and implied in the Nazir's abstention from wine—to the use of wine as indicated in the latest layers of the Pentateuchal Codes, and it is a still wider step to the blessings over the "fruit of the wine" which is such a significant feature of the official Jewish ritual and to the use of four cups of wine as marking the divisions of the family service—the so-called Seder—on the eve of the Passover festival.

In view of the recent investigations of Professor Erdmannus, which have again moved the question as to the composition of the Pentateuchal Codes into the foreground, it is, I think, of some importance to show through a specific example, as I

---

1 May we perhaps see in the Talmudic ordinance (Berakhot 31a) forbidding any one who has taken a certain quantity of wine from reciting the prescribed prayers, a further trace of this feeling? See Mittwoch, "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Islamischen Gebets und Kultus" (Abh. Kgl. Preuß. Akad. d. Wiss. 1913, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Nr. 2, p. 14).
2 See the article Kiddush in the Jewish Encyclopedia VI, p. 483, and Talmud Babli Berakhot 35a.
3 Matthew 26, 27—29 = Mark 14, 21—25 = Luke 22, 17—18. Wine was considered the natural accompaniment to a marriage feast (John 2, 3—10). The passages in I Timothy 5, 23 where Timothy is urged not to drink water but to "use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine other infirmities" is significant, though naturally the warning against over-indulgence is still inculcated, e.g. I Timothy 5, 8; Titus 2, 3; Eph. 5, 18. The reference to the use of oil and wine for wounds in Luke 10, 34 is interesting.
4 Berakhot (Mishna) VI, 1.
5 Attestamentliche Studien. (4 Parts) See especially the 4th part giving the results of his study of Leviticus.
have endeavored here, the way in which the Codes reflect varying social conditions separated from one another by a span of several centuries. Prof. Erdmanns is no doubt right in many of his contentions as to the age of many of the provisions in the so-called Priestly Code and the Holiness Code. The criticism to be passed upon his analysis of Leviticus is that it does not go deep enough, whereas on the other hand his conclusions are too radical and not warranted by the evidence that he brings forward. Instead of maintaining that the entire legislation in the Pentateuch is pre-exilic, I venture to set up the thesis that all the Codes conventionally recognized by critics show evidence of having originated at a time when the religious organization at the sanctuaries scattered throughout Palestine was very simple, the religious practices still close to primitive phases of religious beliefs and the social conditions correspondingly simple. Over this basic stratum, a large number of layers have been superimposed, representing (a) more or less radical modifications of the original laws to adapt them to later conditions, and to make them conform to the needs of a large central sanctuary with an elaborately organized priesthood that had to be provided for; (b) priestly decisions in answer to questions regarding the scope and specific application of any given law; (c) comments of an explanatory character including glosses, definition of terms, variant expressions and the like. In other words we have in these Codes the same process that is to be seen in the superimposition of the Gemara upon the Mishna in the regulations of Rabbinical Judaism. The result is that the Pentateuchal Codes represent a continuous tradition and growing practice, extending from early days to the definite organization—though largely theoretical—of the post-exilic temple service. For the sake of convenience, such designations as the Priestly Code with its various subdivisions  may be retained, but it must be recognized that the terms do not convey any sense of organic unity, and that the subdivisions recognized have nothing more than a formal value. Each little section consisting frequently of a few verses only must be taken by itself and separated into its component parts—basic stratum and superimposed layers—and the attempt made to differentiate between the

1 See Carpenter and Battersby, Hexateuch I, p. 155 seq.
social and religious conditions reflected in the original law and those indicated in the subsequent accretions. Frequently, however, these little sections have been combined into a group where again the process corresponding to the growth of a Gemârâ around a Mišnâ may be followed in detail. Briefly put, the Pentateuchal Codes, properly interpreted, form the accompaniment to the social and religious evolution of Hebrew civilization from the beginnings of a confederation of the Hebrew tribes to the time of Ezra and perhaps even for some decades beyond Ezra.

1 I have endeavored to do this in the case of the şôra' of legislation (Lev. 13—14) in the article several times referred to and I hope to follow this up by studies of such sections as the Atonement ritual (Lev. 16), the Nazirite Tôrâ (Num. 6), the “red heifer” (Num. 19), the ordeal in the case of the woman suspected of adultery (Num. 5), etc., all of which will, I think, through the application of this method yield valuable results.
The Mystery of Fu-lin.—By Friedrich Hirth, Professor in Columbia University, New York City.

II.

(Continued from Vol. xxx, 1909, p. 31.)


At the time to which this name Fu-lin, said to correspond to the Ta-ts’in of the later Han period, is first applied in Chinese literature China had no political relations with either Rome or Byzantium. We read in the Kiu-t’ang-shu¹ that "the Emperor Yang-ti of the Sui dynasty [A. D. 605—617] always wished to open intercourse with Fu-lin, but did not succeed." We do not read in the Sui-shu history of Yang-ti’s reign of any attempt to communicate in a direct way with Fu-lin, whether this represents Syria or the great Roman empire of which it formed a part at times; but since the T’ang-shu² speaks of Pei Kü, the Emperor’s Commissioner in Central Asia, who "communicated with all countries except Ti-en-chu (India) and Fu-lin," we may take it for granted that the attempt to realize the emperor’s wish was made through Pei Kü and his emissaries. Knowing from the passage referred to that Pei Kü failed in this attempt "to his regret," as the text adds, we have in the first instance to look for the motive of the emperor’s desire and the reason which may have interfered with the desired communication.

It has been suggested by Professor Chavannes that the first knowledge of Fu-lin may have reached China through the Turks, who cultivated friendly relations with the Romans under Justin in 568. But these relations must have lasted but a very short time, since the Roman ambassador Valentine, sent to the Turkish court by Tiberius Caesar in 576 to announce his

¹ R. O., K. 33.
ascension to the Byzantine throne, met with a most ungracious reception, which put an end to all friendship between the Turks and Byzantium. While that friendly intercourse between Western Turks and Romans lasted and afterwards during the Northern Ts’i and Ch’ou dynasties, and up to the ascent of Yang-ti of the Sui in 605, there are no passages on record showing that anyone in China took particular interest in either the old Ta-ts’in (Syria) or Fu-lin, said later on to be its equivalent. Had this been the case the Chinese would have had every opportunity to collect information through the Western Turks, and it appears that, after a long pause marked by indifference as regards the traditional Ta-ts’in accounts, the first mention in a Chinese record which points to renewed interest being taken in the country is the remark found in the Tang-shu about Yang-ti’s having in vain tried to communicate with Fu-lin. Who knows whether he did not even then call the country Ta-ts’in and whether the new name Fu-lin was not substituted for it by the Tang-shu historian after it had become familiar through the Nestorians settled in China? We have to admit this possibility even for the occurrence of the name in the Sui-shu, in the description of Persia and the biography of P’ea Kù, because the final editing of this text fell in the year 636, that is the very time when it was likely to be affected by information brought to China by the Nestorians.

If we enquire into the possible motives which may have prompted Yang-ti’s wish for intercourse with India and Fu-lin, we have to dismiss from the outset all political schemes. For during the greater part of his reign Yang-ti managed his Turkish neighbours well enough without any foreign allies. The only country which gave him serious trouble was Corea. But what help could he have expected from India or from distant Fu-lin in his campaigns in the extreme northeast of his empire? His wishes were dictated far more by a kind of personal vanity, which led him into a life of luxurious splendour. Not too long after his ascent to the

---

1 See Chavannes, _Documents sur les Tou-kiue, Tures-occidentaux_. St. Petersburg, 1903, pp. 233—242, where Chinese and western sources are united into the best historical sketch we possess on these relations.

3 Chap. 83.  
2 Chap. 67.
throne his confidential adviser P'ei Kǔ had managed to kindle a certain ethnographical curiosity peculiar to the Emperor's character into a regular passion to see ambassadors from all possible foreign countries visit his court. His love of spectacular court festivities is one of the characteristics of his reign, and he may have felt flattered by the presence and admiration of so many foreigners at his gorgeous shows. Among these the strangers from the west seem to have monopolized his interest. P'ei Kǔ had acquainted him in his work, the Si-yü-t'u-k'i, with the result of his enquiries among the Central-Asiatic traders he had met during his residence in Chang-yé in Western Kan-su. Of this work we possess not much more than the preface, reproduced in P'ei Kǔ's biography. Its description, accompanied by coloured illustrations and a map, of forty-four foreign countries has not been preserved to our days, but the subject matter of its text must have been absorbed in the ethnographical chapters of the Sui-shu. From the description of the three roads leading to the Far West from Tun-huang, the thorough-fare from China, in the present northwest Kan-su, we find in this preface the terminus of all of them to be "the Western Sea", apparently corresponding to the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean, reached by the way of Fu-lin, Persia and Northern Po-lo-mön or Beluchistan respectively. "The Western Sea", the account says, "produces so many precious and strange things", and this was apparently the chief attraction in P'ei Kǔ's ethnographical speculations. Apart from what P'ei Kǔ and his emissaries had themselves seen, their knowledge of the more distant countries was based on former records, such as those of the Eastern Han dynasty, which were full of reports on the "precious and strange things" found in the countries of the Western Sea, especially in Ta-ts'in or Syria. The reputation of this country as a producer of all the mineral treasures and the manufactures in jewelry required to feed the market of a luxuriant race was not confined to the Roman

1 西域圖記, regarding which see my paper "Über die chinesischen Quellen zur Kenntnis Zentralasiens unter der Herrschaft der Sassaniden," W. Z. K. M. x 228 seq.
2 Sui-shu, chap. 67, p. 10 seqq.
3 Si-hai 西海.
4 西海多產珍異.
empire, east or west; it was also the traditional El Dorado of the Chinese according to their literary tradition. We need not wonder, therefore, to see a sovereign of Yang-ti's well known extravagance long for an extension of his ethnographical horizon beyond Eastern Turkestan and Persia to the further west, where the very best jewels were found in the greatest quantities. The same motive that made him cultivate the friendship of nearer countries which sent to his court ambassadors with tribute in the shape of articles of intrinsic value made him regret his inability to communicate with that storehouse of jewels Fu-lin. For it was for the special purpose of collecting the treasures of the western countries that he induced P'i'e K'ai to go to Chang-yê as superintendent of international trade. There the clever diplomat enticed traders by holding out advantages and so got them to visit the court. From this arose the traffic of the foreigners of the Western regions, which entailed expenses amounting to millions to the intermediate prefectures for the purpose of escorts and welcome.1

So much for the motive underlying Yang-ti's longing for Fu-lin. The reason why his emissaries could not reach that country can be guessed at from the political situation in Syria at that time. I have not been able to ascertain the exact year in which Yang-ti's ambassador Li Yü was sent to the Persian court. We merely learn in the account of Persia2 that "Yang-ti sent Li Yü, a hereditary noble of the eighth class, to go to Po-sä [Persia] in order to solicit the sending of ambassadors to follow Li Yü with products of that country as tribute".3

From the way the Tsö-fu-yüan-kai registers the fact it would appear that the mission may have been sent during any of the thirteen years of the Ta-yê period, i. e. 605 to 617. During all this time fighting took place somewhere in Western Asia between the Persians and the Romans. Hostilities had begun soon after the coronation of Phocas as emperor in 602, who had caused his predecessor Mauricius, the personal friend and

1 以西域多諸國物分采珍往張掖監諸商胡互市
2 之以利爾今入朝自是西域諸國往來相繼所經
3 州郡疲於送迎靡我以萬萬計。Sui-shu, chap. 24, p. 18.
4 Sui-shu, chap. 83, p. 10.
5 炳帝遼雲瞿尉李昱便通波斯尋使隨昱貢方物.
benefactor of King Khosru of Persia, to be murdered, thus creating a casus belli for a bloody strife which outlasted the life of Yang-ti as well as that of Phocas, whose successor, Heraclius, saw most of his Asiatic possessions.wrenched from him by Persian armies. It goes without saying that under the circumstances the Persians would not have allowed the Chinese ambassador to proceed to Fu-lin, whether we look for it in Syria or in Byzantium. For, neither could they guarantee him safe conduct nor was it in Khosru's interest to see him join the enemy.

On the other hand it is most likely that the ambassador's curiosity about Fu-lin was further stimulated by the existence of a Syrian colony in Madain, one of the cities where Persian rulers resided, formed of the union of the two cities Ctesiphon and Selencia, for which reason we find either of these old names occasionally applied to it. It is generally held to have been the capital of Persia, but the kings, especially Khosru II, resided in several other places in turn. There can be little doubt which of these places was held to be the capital by the Chinese mission under Yang-ti. It is clearly indicated by the mention of it in the account of Persia reproduced in the Sui-shu. "The capital", it is stated there, "is at the city of Su-lin west of the river Ta-ho, that is the site of ancient Tian-chi (Chaldaea). Their king's by-name is K' u-sat-ho [=Khosru]." This city of Su-lin is clearly identical with Selencia on the western shore of the Tigris. In another account the city is called Su-li and of it the text says: "the river passes through the middle of the city, flowing south", which again clearly refers to the cities of Selencia and Ctesiphon united to form

---

1 "The Sassanian court, though generally held at Ctesiphon, migrated to other cities, if the king so pleased, and is found established, at one time in the old Persian capital, Persepolis, at another in the comparatively modern city of Dastagherd. The monarchs maintained from first to last numerous palaces which they visited at their pleasure and made their residence for a longer or a shorter period." Khosroes II built one nearer Tahkt-i-Bostan." Rawlinson, The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy, p. 642 seq.

3 "Old sound Tat-hot or Tat-got, standing for Talagat or Taglat, i.e. Diglat, the Tigris.

4 波斯國都遠易水之西羅雀城即錫支之故地也其王字庫薩和.
the one city of Madain, the Tigris flowing south between the two cities. It is scarcely possible that the Chinese visitors could have spent some time at King Kosro II's court without coming into contact with the Nestorians living under their patriarch on the other side of the river in Ctesiphon. It is a remarkable coincidence that the Nestorians, though persecuted and martyred under Persian and Khalif rule before and after this time, happened to be in high favour just with Kosro II, who according to Assemani patronized them, in order to spite the emperor Heraclius, also a Christian, it is true, but strongly opposed to Nestorian heretics, the adversaries of the orthodox Roman church and friends of the Persians. He had for this reason taken the church of Edessa from the orthodox clergy and handed it over to the Nestorians and forced all the other Christians under his jurisdiction to embrace the Nestorian "heresy".

The patriarch of the Nestorians, we may conclude from all this, was under Kosro II a much more important personage than we might expect him to be as a mere clergyman. We learn from Assemani's further remarks that Nestorian patriarchs were sent by Kosro as ambassadors to Byzantium, and it appears that, in those all important relations with the Roman empire, they were the confidential advisers of the King, whose favour raised them to a quasi-political position as heads of the entire Christian population.


When the first Nestorians came to the capital of China, in 635, they were allowed to build a church and, since they came from Persia, that church was called "the Persian Church", and O-lo-pun, the leader of that first western expedition, was called "a Persian Priest". As such he is described in the Imperial edict authorizing the practice of Nestorian rites, dat-

---

1 Wei-shu, chap. 102, p. 12. "宿利城" **河經其城中南流."
2 "Omnium Persarum regum maxime Nestorians favit Chosroes Abruzua, qui ut Heraclio Imperatori negre faceret, Edessaem Ecclesiam Orthodoxis crepsiam, Nestorians tradidit, et reliquas suas dilitanis Christianos ad amplexandum Nestorii haeresim adequit". Assenoni, IV p. 94.
3 Po-si-shi 波斯寺.
4 Po-esi-seng 波斯僧.
ed 638 and preserved in the T'ang-hui-yao. The Nestorians, however, did not look upon themselves as Persians. They were merely the guests of Persia; exiles, prisoners, treated as slaves at times and as friends and a most useful element of the population at others. Their real home, at least that of their leaders, was in Syria. It probably took the Chinese over a hundred years to realize this. For it appears that the Christian churches continued to be called “Persian” until the year 715, when another edict was issued saying that “since the Persian religion came from Ta-ts’in [i.e. Syria], the names of the Persian churches in the two capitals would have to be changed into Ta-ts’in [i.e. Syrian] churches.” If we take into consideration the simple fact that in all Chinese passages bearing on this point the two names Ta-ts’in and Fu-lin are declared to apply to one and the same country, we are led most naturally to think of the inmates of the first Nestorian church, or monastery, established in China as the foreigners who introduced the name Fu-lin as a substitute for Ta-ts’in. Since the Buddhists, whose leaders had come from India, called their country after Buddha’s home “Magadha”, they followed this precedent and called their country, Syria, after Christ’s home “Bethlehem”, of which “Fu-lin” in its old pronunciation but-lim is the transcription.

II. The name Fu-lin applied to the Patriarchal court.

The outcome of my enquiries into the meaning in Chinese literature of this term Fu-lin is this: we must be prepared, according to time and circumstances, to interpret it in three different senses, viz.

1. The court of the Nestorian patriarch in Madain or Ctesiphon together with the Christian population of Persia, which had come from Syria;
2. Syria itself;
3. the Roman empire with Byzantium as its capital.

---

1 Reprinted in Havret, La stèle chrétienne de Singan-fou, p. 376.
2 J. A. O. S. xxx 6 seqq.
3 波斯經傳出自大秦傳習而來久行中國***其南京波斯寺宜改為大秦寺 Havret, L c.
As an example of the first-named among these three interpretations, I wish to refer to a passage in the T'ang-shu, treating, in an account of Persia, on an episode in the history of that country regarding which we happen to possess some information in western authors. "After the murder of Khosru II," the text says, "his son Shü-li [Sheroe] ascended the throne. Yabgu Kagan sent governors to watch and direct him. After the death of Shü-li [Sheroe] Persia would no longer be subject [to the Turks] and made Khosru's daughter Queen. The Turks killed her, too. Sheroe's son Tan-kie then took refuge in Fu-lin and the people acknowledged him as heir to the throne. This was I-ta-chi [Ardeshir III]."

I quite agree with Chavannes in the identification of the name I-ta-chi with that of Ardashir III. But if Ardashir III, a minor, is said to have taken refuge in Fu-lin, the political situation forbids the assumption of his having gone to either Constantinople or any other place held by the Romans at the time. For the young Prince had a dangerous opponent to his accession to the throne in the person of a close friend of the Romans, Shahr-Barz, who, "before committing himself to the perils of rebellion, negotiated with Heraclius and secured his alliance and support by the promise of certain advantages". The Roman emperor is even said to have supplied Shahr-Barz with troops to assist him in his struggle against Ardashir and his guardian Mihr-Hasis. To flee to Byzantium or to the Romans anywhere would have amounted to a surrender of his cause. Fu-lin has, therefore, to be looked for in some other region. The place of refuge was in reality not Constantinople, but according to Tabari the city of Ctesiphon, which had been fortified for the purposes of defence against Shahr-Barz and to which Ardashir had been brought [sic] with his royal household. Ctesiphon, it is true, was one of the places of residence of the Persian kings; but at the time there was no king besides Ardashir, and since Tabari says distinctly that he was

1 Chap. 221 B., p. 15.

2 殺王庫薩和其子施利立葉護使部帥監統施利死遂不肯臣立庫薩和女爲王突厥又殺之施利之子單鷇方奔拂薌國人迎立之是為伊坦支. Cf. Chavannes, Documents, etc., p. 171.

3 Ranlivan, Seventh Monarchy, p. 541 seq.

4 Noshke, Tabari, p. 387.
brought there, he must have previously resided at some other capital and Ctesiphon must be looked upon as a place of refuge ad hoc. As far as western authors go, we certainly know of no other place to which Ardeshir III can be said to have fled than Ctesiphon. Why then does the Chinese historian, whom we may suspect of having received his information through the Nestorians residing in China, then the only foreigners hailing from Persia, call Ctesiphon Fu-lin? I am inclined to think that the protection the prince expected to find there was of a moral kind in the first instance. For the only man in the country who might have been able to smooth over the difficulties in which Persia found herself at the time was the head of the Nestorian Christians, Yeshu'yabh, who held the patriarchal throne from 628 to 682 A.D. This view may be supported by the following facts, placed on record by Mar Amr. 1 "During the reign of Yeshu'yabh, Sheroe 2 had died and Artaxerxes [Ardeshir] had succeeded him, after whose death by murder Sheroe's sister Börân [Baurâna] took charge of the kingdom. Further, since the kingdom of the Persians had been in trouble through the action of its kings at the time of Sheroe and Ardeshir, the queen was afraid to enter [the government of] the kingdom falling to her, and thus she sent this father [Yeshu'yabh] on an honourable mission to Heraclius, the Roman emperor, for the purpose of renewing the treaty of peace, and she sent with him bishops and metropolitans," etc. According to Bar Hebraeus the Patriarch had been ordained in 626 A.D., and from the manner in which he represents the situation 3 it appears that he had been sent to Heraclius by Sheroe, that in the replies he gave the Emperor about his religious views he had utterly disavowed his Nestorian principles, that some of his own people would have liked to see him deposed on account of this betrayal, but that the Persian king supported him against his adversaries. 4 Whichever of the two versions may be correct, it appears that Yeshu'yabh held a confidential position with either Ardeshir's father, or his aunt Börân, or both, and that young Ardeshir's flight to Ctesiphon, called Fu-lin by the Chinese historian, was

1 Vol. II. p. 31.
2 Or Kobad II. Ardeshir's father.
dictated by the wish to benefit by the advice and moral protection of the patriarch, the shrewd diplomat and former ambassador to the emperor Heraclius, whose residence was in the Syrian settlement on the Ctesiphon side of the city of Madain.


I have enumerated a number of arguments speaking in favour of the name Fu-lin standing for Syria, or let us say the Roman Orient generally, the identification I had proposed for the name Ta-ts' in. I have, however, always been of the opinion that, according to the knowledge of the Chinese, there was also a "Greater Fu-lin", just as modern developments have shown a Greater Britain grown out of little England. We are now at last in the position to prove that, whatever the vagueness in the Chinese mediaeval accounts of this country may have been, there was at least one traveller as early as the beginning of the eighth century who wrote Chinese and who knew that, besides the Fu-lin of the early Nestorians, there was a Greater Fu-lin to the North-west of it. This knowledge, which might have changed materially the accounts of Fu-lin in the two T'ang-shu had their authors known of the existence of the little work recently recovered from the rubbish of an abandoned Buddhist library, has been placed on record by a travelling priest making his way from India to China through Western and Central Asia. This little work, which had been lost to later generations and which possibly had never been circulated to any extent among readers in China, is the Hui-ch'au-wang-wu-t'ien-chu-kuo-chuan, i.e., "Account of Hui-ch'au's travels to the countries of the Five Indies." What we have now is merely a fragment the beginning and end of which are lost; but, such as it is, the fragment is a most valuable contribution towards our knowledge of Western Asiatic countries as represented in Chinese literature. It is certainly not the least important among that stupendous mass of old manuscripts recovered by Professor Paul Pelliot from a rock chamber at Tun-huang during his great expedition in 1907—08. The first report on these dis-

1 J.A.O.S. xxx 7.

2 慧超往五天竺國傳.
coveries will be found in a letter addressed by Pelliot to Professor Sénart, dated Tun-huang, March 26, 1908, and reproduced in B.E.F.E.O., Tome VIII, Nos. 3-4, 1908 (p. 11 seq. of the Reprint). On his way from Tun-huang to Paris, where the originals are now preserved, Professor Pelliot paid a visit to Peking. Some learned Chinese of the then Imperial capital were most enthusiastic about these unexpected additions to their native literature and some of them asked permission, before they were taken away to France, to photograph some of the texts discovered in Tun-huang. These texts were transcribed, edited and published by a well known Chinese scholar, Mr. Lo Chöén-yǔ¹ of Peking, under the title Tun-huang-shi-shih-i-shu² in four fascicules. The book was laid before the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles lettres by Professor Chavannes and reported on in the Comptes rendus of June 1910, p. 245 seq. Messrs. Chavannes and Pelliot have already turned to account another important fragment published in this valuable collection in their learned paper "Un traité Manichéen retrouvé en Chine" in the Journ. Asiatique, X. Sér. 18, on p. 500 of which some further notes on Lo Chöén-yǔ's publication will be found. That part of it which interests us on account of the Fu-lin question is Hui-ch'au's report referred to above.

A work of the same title is referred to in the Buddhist thesaurus I-ts'ê-king-yin-i, chap. 100. But here the first character, Hui, in the traveller's name in the title, as given in the body of the book, is 惠 instead of 慧, which character appears in the Index, though. This need not make us feel suspicious, because the two characters are often confounded in the names of Buddhist monks. The book on which the I-ts'ê-king-yin-i is supposed to give a commentary must have been differently arranged, since on the one hand many of the names occurring in the fragment are not explained, and on the other it contains names not found in the fragment. In the text itself (p. 14) the traveller says that he came to An-si, the seat of a Chinese

¹ 羅振玉. ² 敦煌石室書.
³ For its loan I am indebted to Mr. K. Asakawa, Professor and Curator of Japanese and Chinese collections at Yale University, who was also the first to draw my attention to the occurrence in it of the names Little and Greater Fu-lin.
⁴ Chavannes and Pelliot, op. cit. p. 504, n. 2.
⁵ 安西.
resident, at the beginning of the eleventh month of the 15th year of K'ai-yüan, which date corresponds to the year 727 A.D. The few years preceding this date must, therefore, be regarded as the time to which the traveller's account applies. This fragment, as far as it goes, covers the same ground as Hsuan-tsang's Ta-t'ang-si-yü-ki, which is nearly a century older, and it repeats, or confirms, many of the facts we may gather from the older books. Yet it is full of interest on account of the clear idea it gives us of the political relations during one of the most interesting periods of Islamic rule in Western Asia. It also throws many valuable sidelights on questions not sufficiently clear in the accounts of previous and later authors. If, for instance, anyone were to doubt with the late Mr. Kingsmill the identity of Su-lü with Kashgar, the starting point of so many of his errors, a passage in Hui-ch'uan's fragment saying that "the people of foreign countries themselves call it K'ie-shih-k'i-li," which name by all the rules of transcription represents the sound "Kashgir", is apt to remove every shadow of uncertainty. I subjoin the translation with the corresponding Chinese texts of a few pages which are apt to throw light on our subject. The headings (Persia, etc.) have been added by me.

Translation, pp. io—II.

[Persia.]

From T'u-huo-lo [Tokharestan] you go one month and come to the country of Po-sa [Persia]. The ancestors of these kings had held sway over the Ta-shi [Arabs]. The Ta-shi [Arabs] had been camel drivers to the kings of Po-sa [Persia]. Afterwards they had rebelled and then killed the other kings and set themselves up as masters of the country. So it happened that now this country has been by force swallowed up by the Ta-shi [Arabs]. Their dress is the old one, namely a wide cotton shirt. They cut beard and hair. As regards food they indulge only in pastry and meat, but they have rice which is also ground into pastry and eaten. The country produces camels,

---
1 See my paper "Mr. Kingsmill and the Hiun-ning", J.A.O.S. xxx 35.
2 外國人呼伽師祇離國.
mules, sheep, horses of extraordinary height and donkeys, cotton cloth and precious stones. The dialects spoken in the country differ from each other and from those of the remaining countries. The inhabitants being by nature bent on commerce, they are in the habit of sailing in big craft on the western sea, and they enter the southern sea to the Country of Lions [Ceylon], where they get precious stones, for which reason it is said of the country that it produces precious stones. They also go to the K’un-lun country to fetch gold. They also sail in big craft to the country of Han [China] straight to Canton for silk piece goods and the like ware. The country produces good fine cotton. The inhabitants enjoy the killing of living creatures [cattle]; they serve Heaven [Allah] and do not know the law of Buddha.

[The Ta-shí,-Arabs.]

From the country of Po-sái [Persia] you go north ten days into the hills [the continent?] and reach the country of the Ta-shí [Arabs]. Their kings do not live in their native country, but they saw their residence (moved) into the country of Sian-fu-lín. On account of their having gained possession of that country by overcoming it, that country has retreated to places in the hills [on the continent?] and on islands but rarely visited. That country produces camels, mules, sheep, horses, cotton cloth and woolen rugs. They have also precious stones. Their dress consists of a wide shirt of fine cotton and they throw over it a cotton cloth to serve as an upper garment. The king and the people wear garments of the same kind and there is no distinction between them. The women also wear

---

1 Coast of Africa? Cf. Hirth and Rockhill, Chou Ju-kung, etc., p. 149.
2 Probably the western part of it, because Po-sái was said in the preceding paragraph to be a month’s journey west of Tokhara.
3 Arabia with Medina as the capital of former caliphs.
4 Little Fu-lín, Syria, with Damascus as the residence of Ommayad caliphs ever since Muawiyah transferred his capital from Medina to Syria and still so in 727, when the information laid down in this text had just been collected. Possibly 見 = 現, "now" instead of "they saw."
5 Possibly an allusion to the Byzantine Romans having been compelled to retreat from their Asiatic possessions in Syria to Asia Minor and Europe.
6 Caftan.
wide shirts. Men cut the hair of their heads, but grow beards; women keep their hair growing. As to food, high and low without distinction eat from the same bowl, seizing food with their hands, but they also help themselves with spoons. In selecting [food] they look for the most unsavoury.\(^1\) To eat what one has killed with one's own hands brings wealth without measure. The inhabitants love killing [living creatures, cattle]. They serve Heaven [Allah] and do not know the law of Buddha. The laws of the country do not contain the law of kneeling down.\(^2\)

[Ta-Fu-lin.]

The country of Little Fu-lin\(^3\) is near the sea. North-west of it there is the country of Greater Fu-lin. The army of this king is strong and numerous and [his kingdom] is not connected with [or subject to] the remaining countries. The Ta-shi\(^4\) have several times attacked it without effect.\(^4\) And the Tu-kü\(^5\) had encroached on its territory likewise without effect. The country has enough of precious stones and more than enough of camels, sheep, horses, cotton cloth and the like produce. The mode of dress resembles that of Po-si [Persia] and the Ta-shi [Arabs], but the language is different from either of these countries.

---

\(^1\) T. B. Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, p. 104, quotes the following from Fagir-Muhammad Asad’s directions for eating: “Let him not look from dish to dish, nor smell the food, nor pick and choose it. If there should be one dish better than the rest, let him not be greedy on his own account, but let him offer it to others.”

\(^2\) Before the king, — apparently referring to the first Arab embassy to the court of China, when the ambassadors refused to perform the prostration before the Emperor, because with their people “one knelt only before Heaven and not before the King.”

\(^3\) The characters 波斯 here used answer in every respect to the usual way of writing the name, viz., 波斯, and their ancient sound, *fat-lam* or *pah-lam*, is the same.

\(^4\) The great final defeat of the Arabs in 718 must have been fresh in the traveller’s memory when he wrote this paragraph.

\(^5\) Turks, first mentioned in connection with Byzantium towards the end of the sixth century; here probably the Bulgars, a quasi-Turkish race, which in 679 had enforced the cession of the Roman province of Moesia and the payment of an annual tribute before the very gates of Constantinople.
Although a few details in these accounts of Persia, the Ommeyad country and Greater Fu-lin are not quite clear, there can be no doubt about the meaning of the terms Little and Greater Fu-lin (Ta-Fu-lin). This term Ta-Fu-lin can, of course, only refer to the Roman empire with its military power as opposed to "the remaining countries", i.e., Persia, the Arabs, etc. If the ambassadors of Nicephorus Melissenus were accepted by the Chinese court in 1081 as representing the country of Fu-lin (J.A.O.S.xxx 24 seqq.), it is probably owing to the fact that the existence of a Greater Fu-lin had been known for the preceding three or four hundred years. But this need not affect the question of the meaning of the term when it became first known in China and as it appeared to the historians of the two T'ang-shu accounts. I look upon the remark made
with regard to the shifting of the capital of the Ta-shih or Arabs,¹ — as one of the most incontestable proofs for the identity of Fu-lin, here called Sian-Fu-lin, with Syria.

¹ For the Ta-shih 大食 of this text is merely another way of writing the name Ta-shih 大食 of the Tang-shu, Chau Ju-kua and other books.
Tamil Political Divisions in the First Two Centuries of
the Christian Era. — By Wilfred H. Schoff, Com-

The early history of the Tamil kingdoms in southern India
is very obscure. From the 9th century onward there is almost
a superfluity of epigraphic material. Prior to that time, in-
scriptions and coins as yet discovered are very few, and almost
the only available references to South Indian political con-
ditions are found in stray passages in Hindu and Tamil
literature or in occasional references of trade with Greece
and Rome.

It may be gathered that before the time of Alexander, the
Tamil states, comprising some of the earliest racial elements
in India, had been organized under a dynasty that had origin-
ated in northern, that is Aryan, India, and that in all prob-
ability established itself in Southern India as the result of a
naval attack and invasion. This dynasty had first borne the
name of Pāṇḍya, and it claimed descent from Pāṇu, the
father of the Pāṇḍava brothers, the heroes of the war re-
counted in the Mahābhārata. Several references in Greek lit-
erature speak in this connection. Arrian (Indika, VIII) derives
the dynasty from Pandaca, "only daughter of Heracles among
many sons. The land where she was born and over which
she ruled was named Pandaca after her".

Whatever this dynastic connection may have been, it is
certain that its power in South India began at the southern
extremity of the peninsula, and that its first capital was at
Korkai, the Colchi (Κόλχος) of the Greek and Roman writers,
and that it spread steadily northward until it embraced most
of the Tamil elements as far as the border of the Andhra
dominions, the modern Mysore. Subsequently the Pāṇḍyan
kingdom was separated into three independent states, Chēra,
Chola and Pandyas (respectively Malabar, Coromandel, and Tinnevelly-Madura-Travancore). As such they are recorded in the second Rock Edict of Asoka. It seems evident that the boundaries of these three states varied greatly, and that while Chera, the western kingdom, the modern Malabar, remained relatively quiet, the other two, Chola and Pandyas, always the wealthiest and most powerful of the trio, were constant rivals and often open enemies.

From the 9th century onward the Chola state was by far the most powerful of the three, and indeed conquered Pandyas and ruled it through a Viceroy who bore the official title of Chola-Pandyas. But for many centuries before this extension of its power, it seems clear that the Chola dynasty passed through a long period of relative weakness and almost extinction. One of the features of South Indian history is the incursion of the Pallavas, who established themselves over a great part of western and southern India, not as a colonizing people, but rather as a ruling caste maintaining itself by military power and commanding in that way the subjugation of the native peoples. This dynasty, whose capital was at Kanchi, is known to have flourished between the 4th and 9th centuries A.D., finally succumbing to the combined attacks of the Chalukya dynasty on its northern boundary, and the reviving Chola power on the south. How long before the 4th century it may have asserted itself, is unknown. But certain indications regarding the political allegiance of the Chola capital during the first two centuries of the Christian Era suggest that the Pallavas may even have been an important element at that time. It is known that a heterogeneous assortment of foreign clans swept over western and southern India as early as the 1st century, that they set up a powerful state in the Cambay region under the Satrap Nahapana, (78 A.D.) and that they carried on extensive raids farther to the south. In the following century when the Andhras succeeded in overthrowing Nahapana’s dynasty, they set up a memorial to record their victory over the combined Sakas, Yavanas and Pallavas, whom they despised as outcasts and sacrilegious innovators in settled Hindu customs. It is therefore not impossible that the Pallavas as the southern extension of this foreign incursion may have been making themselves felt as early as the 1st century of the Christian Era.
As already stated the earliest capital of the Tamil power was at Korkai. Before the Christian Era the capitals of the three states had been fixed at Karur in Malabar, Madura and Uraiyyur, the modern Trichinopoly. Of these, the last seems to have been by far the richest, most populous and most active, industrially and commercially, of the three. This much may be gathered from the Tamil poems; but the Tamil literature, while it gives a vivid picture of the prosperity of the Chola capital, does not refer clearly to its political allegiance. It seems to have been singularly subject to attack and control by widely differing political elements. And as early as the 1st century of the Christian Era, the dominant powers in Southern India seem to have been the Pandyan kingdom and the invading Pallavas; the Chola state being ground, as it were, between two mill-stones.

Strabo (XV, iv, 73) mentions an embassy from "King Pandion" to the Emperor Augustus in 20 B.C. Pliny (VI, 23), the Periplus (§ 54) and Ptolemey (VII) all agree in their accounts of the prosperous trade at the seaports on either side of Cape Comorin. It was a trade largely in the products of the Chola textile industries and pearl fisheries, in the gems and spices of the Chera and Pandya hills, and in the gems and pearl fisheries of Ceylon, then controlled by the Pandyan kings. From the Tamil poems we learn that the Chola state maintained a considerable navy which was used for commercial purposes, trading across the Bay of Bengal and as far as the Straits of Malacca, and we know from the Periplus that the products of this far eastern trade were transshipped in the south Indian ports for delivery to the Roman world. It seems clear that the intermediate position of Pandya enabled it, during the period from 50 B.C. to 150 A.D., approximately, to dominate all Tamil India, and that such parts of the Chola state as had not fallen under Pallava dominion, were, if not subject to, at least dependent upon Pandya. We may infer also that this supremacy of Pandya was disputed, unsuccessfully, by Chera.

The main highway across Southern India over which goods for the western trade were brought, is the Achenkoil Pass, and the terminus of this trade route was the port of Bacaré, mentioned by most of the Greek writers, and which I have identified as Porakad, the landing place of Kottayam. This
port, according to Pliny (VI, 23), had formerly been Pândya, but in his time, that is 70 A.D., approximately, belonged to Chēra. The Periplus, on the other hand, written some ten years later, makes Bacarē again Pândya (§ 54). Pliny mentions the Pândyan capital, Madura, but knows nothing of the Chōla capital. The Periplus, on the other hand, after describing the Pândyan dominions, speaks of another district beyond Colchi called the “Coast Country, which lies on a bay and has a region inland called Argarn”, from which were exported muslins, “those called Argaritic” (§ 59).

In this passage we may discern a hazy and yet correct reference to the Chōla state, and to its capital Uraiyūr, the modern Trichinopoly, which, as I have pointed out in a recent paper (JRAS, Jan. 1913), may be identified with this Argarn of the Periplus. Uraiyūr is merely the Tamil form of the Sanskrit Uragapura, “town of the serpent”, and the Greek transcription is very nearly correct.

Now Ptolemy, writing about 140 A.D., speaks of this place as “Argeiron in the land of Pandion” (VII) and Kalidasa in the Raghuvāṇasa (dating from about 400 A.D.) refers to Uragapura as the capital of Pândya (VI. 59–60).

How may we reconcile these later references that make Uraiyūr subject to, or dependent on, Pândya with those earlier ones that clearly make it independent? The explanation seems to be found in this passage of the Periplus.

The language used by the author of the Periplus is very fixed in its reference to foreign states or districts. An independent kingdom is referred to as βασίλεια and a subject state or district as τότες, or ιχθυς. Now while the author of the Periplus speaks of the “kingdom of Cērobothra” and the “Pandian Kingdom”, he refers to Chōla only as a “district” called the “coast country”; and yet he knows enough about it to have mentioned its king, if there had been an independent king in his time, who levied tribute on foreign merchants. It seems fair to infer that even in the time of the Periplus, say 80 A.D., the Chōla state, while not conquered and incorporated into the Pándyan Kingdom, had been reduced to a condition of helplessness between Pândya and the Pallava country, so that for commercial purposes it was practically controlled by Pândya.

That its commercial and industrial activity was not inter-
ferred with is amply shown by Tamil poems that tell of the active trade of the capital and of its eastern seaport, Kāviri-paddinam, which appears in the Periplus as Camara. It was evidently dependent upon the Pāndyan kings to such extent as its own rulers, the Chōla dynasty, had proven themselves unable to resist the Pallava incursions, and we may possibly read in the ship designs in the Pallava coinage of the 2nd century, some note of triumph in their ultimate invasion and control of that rich district. (Elliot, *Coins of Southern India*, plates I. 38, and II. 45).

This fall of the Chōla power may be placed toward the end of the 2nd century; but it seems clear that it did not come about without a considerable revival of that power at some time during that century, when one of its kings named Kari-kāla, according to a Tamil poem, invaded Ceylon and carried of thousands of cooies to work on the embankment along the Kāviri River, 100 miles in length, which he is said to have constructed. (Pillai, *The Tamils 1500 years ago*, pp. 64–78; Vincent Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 416.)

The Chinese traveler Yuan-Chwang, who visited the Pallava capital Kanchi in 640 A.D., speaks of Chōla as in that time a very restricted territory, sparsely populated by fierce brigands. The location of this remnant of the once powerful Chōla dynasty may be placed in the Cuddapah district, considerably north of its earlier dominions. (Beal, II. 227–230; Vincent Smith, *Early History*, 409, 417, 421.)

The subsequent extension of its power during the middle ages was due to the economic advantages of its position when not outweighed by superior force.

It is a notable fact that Yuan-Chwang refers to the “country of Chōla” without naming a king, in exactly the same way as the Periplus 560 years before, indicating at both these periods that the district was under a local rajah, not exercising kingly power.¹

¹ For fuller references to these questions the reader is referred to the following titles: Schoff, *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, and Mookerji, *A History of Indian Shipping*, both pub. by Longmans, 1912.
Classical Parallels to a Sanskrit Proverb. — By ROLAND G. KENT, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

In the story of the Blue Jackal the Hitopadesha version has the following couplet: yah svabhāvo hi yasya eyit tasyā 'sāv duratikramah | śāi yadi kriyate bhogī tat kim nā 'śnāty upānaham,1 “Indeed the real nature which may belong to anyone, that is hard to overcome; even if a dog is well fed, doth he not nibble at a shoe?” The corresponding story in the Pañcatantra2 does not contain this śloka; indeed I have not been able to trace the proverb farther in Indian literature.3 But this fondness of the dog for leather is proverbially referred to in classical writers. We find the proverb4 χαλέτιον χορίον κύριον γένοι.5 “Tis dangerous to let a dog taste leather” first in Theocritus (x. 11), where the connection makes it clear that it applies to the acquisition of a bad habit which, once established, cannot be resisted. In a different wording the proverb

---

1 So in Schlegel and Lassen’s edition (p. 92; iii. 55); Petersen’s edition (Bombay Sanskrit Series, no. 33) reads (p. 195; iii. 56); śāi yadi kriyate rājā tat kim nā ‘śnāty upānaham.
2 Hertel’s edition (Harvard Oriental Series xi), p. 68; i. 11; Bühler’s edition (Bombay Sanskrit Series, no. 3), p. 66; i. 10.
3 Bühlingk, Indische Sprüche (second edition), who cites the śloka as no. 5433 (vol. iii, p. 160), refers only to the Kavitāmṛtakapā. — The Vṛddhacāṇḍika (Ind. Sprüche, no. 2087) mentions “bits of a calf’s tail and of an ass’ skin” (cuntapucchakkaracarmakhandam) as characteristic of a dog’s abode; the Cāṇḍīya reads here antikkuṇrapucchhasaṅcayah.
4 C. S. Köhler, Das Tierleben im Sprichwort der Griechen und Römer, 1881, p. 82 ff., nos. 57—61.
5 In the Greek collections of proverbs χαλέτιον χορίον κύριον γένοι appears repeatedly; cf. Luntch, Corpus Paroemiogr. 2Grac. i. 374 (Gregorius Cyprius); ii. 51 (Diogenianus); ii. 296 (Macarius); ii. 719 (Apostolius); also Suikas ed. Gaisford-Bernhardy, ii. 2, col. 1586 ed. Becker, p. 1116. However, they take χορίον in another sense; the interpretation of Apostolius, to which that of the others is very similar, is as follows: τρί τῶν ἐκεί παιδίν χορήγησιν τῇ μήπω, τῷ ἀνθρωπῷ τῷ χαμόν καλεῖται, τῇ δὲ τῷ γεννημένῳ τόνον εἰς τὸν ἐμβρίων ἀλ. τῷ ἐμβρίῳ τίλ. τῷ ἐμβρίῳ τίλ.
appears in Lucian, *advers. indoct. 25*, ὀδὸς γὰρ κύων ἀπαχούσα ἀνευρείαν σκυταργαίῳ μαθώντα ("for a bitch will never stop eating leather, if once she has learned to do so"), and in Alciphrone, *Epist. paras.* 11, 5 (p. 72, 4 ed. Schepers — iii. 47), ὀδὸς γὰρ κύων σκυταργαίῳ μαθώντα τῇ τέχνῃ επιλυόμενον ("for a bitch that has learned to eat leather will never forget the trick"). In meaning the Greek proverb differs from the Sanskrit. The latter refers to the fact that innate traits cannot be eradicated, the former inculcates the lesson of *Principii obsta* (Ovid, *Rem. Amor.*, 92)3. Rather closer in sense to the Sanskrit proverb is the Latin, alluded to by Horace (Serm. ii. 5, 83): *Sic tibi Penelope frugist; quae si semel uno De sene gustarit tectum partita lucellum, Ut canis a corio nunquam absterrebitur uncto.* In the form *Non leviter corio canis abstræhitur ab uncto* it occurs in Alcimus de Insulæ *Doctrinae Minus s. Liber Parabolœrum* (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, vol. 210, col. 581 c). A Bâle manuscript of the fifteenth century has *Non canis a corio subito depellitur uncto* (J. Werner, *Latein. Sprichwörter und Sinnsprüche des Mittelalters, 1912, — Sammlung mittelalterlicher Texte*, herausgegeben von A. Hilka, vol. iii, p. 56, no. 119).5

1 Gregorius Cyp. (Leutsch. ii. 136) cites this proverb in the form ὀδὸς γὰρ κύων ἀπαχούσα ἀνευρείαν σκυταργαίῳ μαθώντα; *Apostolius* (Leutsch. ii. 587) ends with μαθώντα, and explains the application: ὅτι ὅπερ χρῆσθαι διάφανα. Cf. also *Apostolius* (Leutsch ii. 643) σκυταργαίῳ μαθώντα κύων ὅτι ἀνευρεία πρότειναι τὴν γενειακὴν κακίαν τῶν σκυταρδέων ἀνευρέα τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ, with which Haupt (*Opusc. iii. 380*) compares Demosthenes, *XXV. 40*, τὸν γεγονότοιο κἀκεῖνο προμηθέαν ἀτάκτως πολεμεῖν.


3 Peter of Blois cites this verse, *Epist. XV* (Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* vol. 207, col. 55 B; *Petri Blasensis Opera omnia*, ed. I. A. Giles, i. 57). — In spite of the scholiast and modern editors I am inclined to construe uncte not with corio, but with an implied sene.


5 In general, the fondness of dogs for a hide is referred to in Aeop's fable (218 Halm = 134 Schneider) *Κύων λαμβάνων (ποικίλλων ἀτέθλωστα εἰς ἄνδραν ὁ τῷ πατρὶ τῆς βίρσης βρέχεται ἤτοι)*, quoted by Plutarch, *vit. quin. δευτ.* § 19, p. 1067 F (οὐκε ἀνέλειπτον τῶν καινῶν ἐν φυτῷ διότι διδότων δεμάτων τῶν διαλέγεται ἤτοι), and translated by Phaedras 1. 29 (3, corium
The German proverb "An Riemen lernt der Hund Leder kauen" (Wander, Deutsches Sprichwörter-Lexikon, 1873, iii, col. 1683, s. v. "Riemen") resembles the Greek proverbs in meaning; its oldest occurrence is in a codex Sangallensis saec. XI: "Fone demo limble so beginnit ter hunt leder ezzen" (Müllenhoff und Scherer, Denkmäler³, vol. I, no. xxvi, 4; further references in the notes, vol. II, p. 134).

What the relation of these proverbs to one another is, if indeed there be any connection, would require a full collection of such material, which might throw an interesting light on the connection of Hindu and European proverbs, and perhaps also on the relation of the fable literature of the Hindus and that of the Occident.

*depressum in fluxio viderunt canes*. Martial (vi. 93, 4) mentions among malodorous objects a hide snatched away from a dog of the Fullers' Quarter, *detracta cani transstiberina culis*. 
Atharvapräyaścittāni. Text mit Anmerkungen von Prof. Julius von Negelein, University of Koenigsberg, Germany.

Sachindex

(Die einzelnen Stellen sind von einander stets durch Semicola getrennt; die Anmerkungen, weil im Text mit fortlaufenden Ziffern versehen, hier nur durch diese, nicht zugleich durch die Angabe der entsprechenden Seite bezeichnet. Deshalb verweist z.B. unter Agnihotra die Zahl: "5. 3" auf den Text; das folgende: "Anm. 743" auf die S. 117 unter 743 stehende Notiz.)

Agnihotra cf. Āhavaniya; Gārhapatya. Seine Vollziehung unterbleibt Anm. 632; (cf. verstreichen lassen); es wird un- rechtzeitig vollzogen 1. 2; 4. 4; 5. 1; cf. 5. 3; Anm. 743; 746, 760, 772, 778; seine Opferspeise — fällt herab 4. 3; kocht über 4. 3; Anm. 707; gelangt dabei ins Feuer Anm. 711; geht infolge des Aufplatzens der sthät (oder ihres Umkippens 6. 3) verloren Anm. 714; geht teilweise oder ganz verloren 1. 3, 5; Anm. 49, 93; (cf. verschütten); — es wird durch Unreinig- keit besudelt 1. 3; (cf. Unreinigkeit); erleidet Unter- brechungen 2. 1 (s. eindringen); die zum A° gemolkene Milch wird geraubt 2. 1; das aufgesetzte (adhīśīta resp. anabhuddhrta) A° knistert (?) 4. 3; Anm. 701; das Agnihotra des Verreisten 1. 1; des von tödlicher Krankheit Betroffenen Anm. 318; auf der Reise Verstorbenen 2. 8; Anm. 308. — Der Adhvaryu-Priester darf sich während der Vollziehung des A° nicht umwenden 1. 3; Anm. 49; — die Kuh, welche die zum A°-Opfer nötige Milch gibt, brüllt 2. 4; zuckt Anm. 727; setzt sich nieder 2. 4; Anm. 186, 189, 754; ist trächtig 2. 5; Anm. 203.

Āhavaniya s. Agnihotra; Gārhapatya. Die Sonne geht über dem herausgenommenen A° auf resp. unter 1. 2; wann soll es dem Gārha°-Feuer entnommen werden? 1. 1; es erwacht, während das Gārha°-Feuer erlischt 1. 5; Anm. 79; greift um sich Anm. 826, 836; erlischt Anm. 296, 297, 949; wird in erloschenem Zustande übertragen 2. 7; 5. 4. — Zwischen
das Gārha- und Å-s-Feuer drängen sich störende Elemente (s. eindringen). Beide Feuer erlöschen Anm. 772.

Asche. Das verunreinigte Agnihotra wird auf Asche geopfert 1. 3; ein Streif von Asche stellt den durch das Eindringen profaner oder unreiner Tiere oder Gegenstände unterbrochenen Zusammenhang beim Opfer her Anm. 63—64, 143; die störende Spur eines durch den Opferbezirk gelaufenen Hundes wird mit Asche bestreut Anm. 143, 818 (cf. Tiere); heiße Asche dient an Stelle eines Brandscheites zur Feuererzeugung Anm. 79; wird zur Wiedererzeugung eines heiligen Feuers berührt 2. 5; Anm. 772, 784; cf. 5. 1; die verunreinigte Opferspeise wird in Asche (oder Wasser) geworfen 2. 6; wenn die Asche von Opferfeuern sich vermischt, bedarf dieses der Sühne Anm. 870.

eindringen von Menschen, Tieren (s. d.) und leblosen Dingen (z. B. Kriegs- oder Lastwagen 1. 3; 5. 2) in den Opferbezirk (cf. Ahavaniya) Anm. 63, 143; von Raubvögeln oder Hunden 5. 2; von Menschen, Wagen, schwarzen Vögeln und anderen Lebewesen in diesen Anm. 818; — das Eindringen in den Opferbezirk wird entsühnt, indem man eine Kuh herüberführt Anm. 143; die störende Hundespur wird durch Bestreuen mit Asche unschädlich gemacht ibid.; Anm. 818 (s. Asche); durch Wasserguß getilgt ibid. (s. Wasser); der Prastotar oder Udgātar erleidet eine Unterbrechung 6. 5; — Störung bei den rātri-pātāyas 6. 9; cf. Agnihotra.

fasten, Sühne dafür, daß der Opferveranstalter Speise genießt oder aufs Feuer gelangen läßt, bevor die heiligen Feuer Opferspenden erfahren haben 2. 4; Anm. 170; Speiseenthaltung beim Opfer Anm. 257; die Milch beim Agnihotraopfer wird nicht genossen, wenn der Opferveranstalter auf einer Reise zugrunde gegangen ist Anm. 318; dieser muß sich der Speise enthalten, wenn das ganze Opfermaterial verloren gegangen ist Anm. 723; vgl. 4. 3; muß samt seiner Gattin schweigend fasten, wenn er das Agnihotra nicht rechtzeitig begonnen hat 4. 4; cf. Anm. 760; darf von einer Ziege nicht genießen, wenn dieser in Ermangelung eines geweihten Feuers ein Opfer zugekommen ist 5. 2; Anm. 801; — nach dem anvādhanā ist der Genuß von Honig, Fleisch usw. verboten Anm. 863; Genüß von Soma, in den Regen gefallen, erst nach erfolgter Sühne möglich 6. 3; der Bruch der Gelübdee-Vorschriften erfordert Sühne 5. 4; Anm. 863; die Feinde

Frau s. Unreinigkeit. Die Gattin des Opferveranstalters beteiligt sich am Agnihostra-Opfer 4.4; ist unrein, wenn sie Zwillinge gebärt 5.5; Anm. 875–6; menstruiert ist 4.2; Anm. 684; unrein ist die Wöchnerin Anm. 684; beide verunreinigen deshalb nicht minder als ein Śūdra das Opfermaterial Anm. 257, 327.

Gārhapatya vgl. Āhavaniya. Wann soll das Āhavaniya-Feuer dem G.-Feuer entnommen werden? 1.1; in welcher Weise? 1.2; wenn der Gārhapatya- oder der Daksīna-gni von seinem Platz herunterfällt (und übergreift), so soll man ihn (während bei dem gleichen, indes vom Āhavaniya-Feuer ausgehenden, Omen ein Mantra zu sprechen ist) schweigend zurücklegen Anm. 836 (vgl. das Herabfallen der Opferkohle s. Opferfeuer); Sühne nach dem Erlöschen des G.-Feuers oder des Daksīna-gnī Anm. 949; das G.-Feuer erlischt 6.1; Anm. 927. — Gegenseitige Vermischung: des G.- und des Āhavaniya-Feuers Anm. 852; des G., des Daksīna-gnī und anderer Opferfeuer Anm. 854; von Opferfeuern überhaupt (s. d. und: vertauschen); von Soma 6.6; Anm. 1049.

Gold, Verwendung des G., beim nicht rechtzeitigen Entzünden oder Erlöschen des Āhavaniya-Feuers 1.2; 5.1; Anm. 778, 800; beim Herabfallen des prsādājya Anm. 877; bei der Schwangerschaft der Opferkuh 2.5; — von Gold und Silber beim Erlöschen des Āhavaniya-Feuers Anm. 42, 296; beim Fehlen von Soma im Drona-Becher Anm. 1019.

Hund (cf. Tiere), dringt in den Opferbezirk ein 1.3; 5.2; Anm. 63, 818; raubt Opferteile 2.5; frisst, beschuppert oder berührt den Opferkuchen oder andere Opferteile Anm. 257; leckt, beschuppert oder verunreinigt Opferschalen; er frisst aus ihnen Anm. 657, 661; seine das Opfer störende Spur muss entsühnt werden (s. Asche; Wasser).

Neu- und Vollmondopfer, ihr unrechtzeitiger Vollzug 2.2; Anm. 142—3; verunglückter Vollzug 3.10; Anm. 142; Verspätung beim Beginn 2.2—3; 5.3; Anm. 826, 847.


Opferbutter, Schmelzbutter als Sühnmittel 1.5; als solches bei der Verunreinigung des Opferkuchens angewendet 2.1;
beim Verderben der Opferspeise gebraucht 2.1; das niedergefallene Opftertier damit besprengt 2.9; über die, aus Paläsa-Blättern gebildete, Figur eines Vermüttens gegossen 3.8; als Substitut für das avadana angewendet 5.5; Anm.888. Dem Vollzug einer gewissen Sühnehandlung muß das Anblicken von Opferbutter vorausgehen Anm.646; die Vermünnigung der Opferbutter verlangt Sühne Anm.625; das prasadāyiya fällt herab 5.5; Anm. 877.

**Opferfeuer** cf. Ahavaniya; Gārhapatya; Substitution. Es gibt keinen Ersatz für das O. Anm.614; die magische Bedeutung der O. 1.1; Behandlung der O. bei, vor und nach einer Reise 1.1; Sühne bei ihrem Erlöschen 2.4, 5; 5.1; 6.1; Anm. 784, 927, 943, 949; der rituellen Verwendung vorzeitig erloschenen Feuers 2.7; 5.4; Anm.297; der versehentlichen Wiederholung ihrer rituellen Anwendung Anm.297; ihrer gegenseitigen Vermischung 2.7; 5.4; 6.1; Anm.279, 863, 870; Vermischung mit einem weltlichen Feuer 2.7; 5.4; Anm. 279, 863; mit einem Leichenfeuer 2.7; 5.4; Anm. 855; mit einem Waldfeuer 2.7; 5.4; Anm.279; mit Wasser Anm.284, 327 s. Wasser; einem himmlischen Feuer 2.7; 5.4; Anm. 290, 294; Sühne für den Fall, daß der Opferveranstalter in die Feuer eines anderen oder ein Fremder in dessen (des Opferveranstalters) Feuer den Opferguß tat; daß ein fremdes Feuer des letzteren Feuer kreuzte 5.5; Anm.143, 826, 874; daß (infolge Herabfallens der Kohle Anm.836) die O. übergehen oder ausgehen 5.3; cf. Anm. 826, 836; Häuser in Brand setzen 5.4; Anm.863; — Verunreinigung des O. durch unreine Substanzen s. Unreinigkeit; Wasser; — seine Entzündung (auf rituellem Wege) will nicht gelingen 5.2; Anm. 801, 836; es entzündet sich selbst Anm. 327. — Die Opferkohe erlischt vorzeitig Anm.657; fällt aus der Umzäunung heraus Anm.667; fällt herab 2.6; fällt auf die Opferstreu 4.1. — Die Reihölzer werden unbrauchbar 2.8; Anm.327. — Unter den Opferfeuern werden genannt: ṛgniḍhriya, ahavaniya, ukhya, anuttaravedika, gārhapatya, daksināgni, paśuśrapana, pṛtya, śālamukhiya.

**Opfergefäße.** Zerplatzen alles festen, Überströmen alles flüssigen Materials Anm.1146; Zerbrechen, Spalten, Aufplatzen, Verbrennen der ukha (cf. 6.2; Anm.1147), des somakalasa, mahavira und der übrigen Opfergefäße 6.9; Anm.1147; — wenn ein O. bricht, soll man in einem anderen,
festeren, kochen 5.5; das Platzen eines irdenen oder hölzernen O. 6.5; des Opferbechers 6.4, 6; Anm. 1028; eines Kochtopfes 4.3; Anm. 713–4, 724; — die närāśansa erschöpfen sich 6.5; Anm. 1046. Der Adhvaryu verrichtet das Upākaraṇa zum Stotra über einem Becher, der, mit Soma gefüllt, sich noch im Sadas befindet 6.3; Anm. 980. Die stählt kippt um 6.3. Behandlung der O. eines Toten: die irdenen O. werden ins Wasser geworfen, die steinernen und ehrnen aber an Brahmanen wegeschenkt 3.7; Anm. 657, 661; verunreinigte hölzerne gegen gleichartige reine ausge tauscht Anm. 657; ihre Reinigung je nach ihrem Material vorgenommen Anm. 614. — Die Opferschale zerbricht und wird für das Opfer unbrauchbar 4.1; Anm. 656–7, 661. Hunde oder ähnliche unreine Tiere beschnuppern sie; sie platz; Opferschalen werden verwechselt; ihre Größe oder Zahl ist nicht die richtige; deren zwei oder mehrere gehen zugrunde Anm. 657, 661.

Opferkuchen, für Mitra als Sühneopfer 1.2; für Varuṇa als Sühneopfer 1.2; wird verunreinigt 2.1; misrät, was Sühne verlangt 4.1; Anm. 648; brennt an 2.1; 4.1; springt oder schnellt in die Höhe 4.2; Anm. 694; kippt um Anm. 694; fällt um oder platzt Anm. 695 s. verschüttet; schwindet dahin Anm. 652; wird durch Würmer usw. besudelt s. Un reinigkeit.

Opferpfosten. Der O. schlägt während der heiligen Handlung aus 2.6; 5.6; Anm. 247; wankt oder entwurzelt Anm. 248; fällt nieder 2.6; eine Krähé läßt sich auf ihm nieder 2.6.

Opferspende vgl. Opfertrank. Einzelne oder alle O. ver unglückten 2.1; 4.1; werden vertauscht (s. d.); sind ungar (vgl. Anm. 652) angebrannt oder völlig verbrannt Anm. 126; werden von Tieren (s. d.) geraubt; werden genossen, bevor dem Opferfeuer die übliche Spende dargebracht ist s. fasten; fallen aus der Umzäunung des Opferplatzes heraus 4.2; werden auf die Opferstreu verschüttet oder gelangen doch jedenfalls nicht ins Feuer Anm. 691; werden auf andere Weise ver unreinigt (s. d.); in diesem Falle müssen sie durch ein opferreines Material substituiert (s. d.) werden; cf. Anm. 614. — Das preṣāṇāya fällt herab 5.5; Anm. 877; der agrāyaṇa wird von einem anderen benutzt 6.3; er fällt herab oder geht aus Anm. 987; andere Libationen fallen herab ibid.; — Müßigriff bei der Vollziehung des Pravargya 6.8.
— Das sāmāyya verunglückt 2.1; wird durch Haare oder Wärmer veranstaltet Anm. 119; cf. 4.1; (andere Libationen fallen herab ibid.;) wird im Falle des vollständigen Verlustes durch den Opferkuchen ersetzt 2.1; cf. Substitution; wird, wenn verdorben, über einen Ameisenhügel ausgeschüttet 4.3; Anm. 664, 707, 741—2; läuft über Anm. 665; geht völlig verloren Anm. 665; die Kühe, welche die Milch dazu hergeben, dürfen nicht ihre Kühe getrunken haben 4.1.

Opferspruch. Die Auslassung, Vertauschung, das Zuviel oder Zuwenig von Opfersprüchen erheischt Sühne 4.1; Anm. 632, 645.

Opferstreu. Die O. respektive andere brennbare Bestandteile der Opferausstattung geraten in Flammen 2.5; Anm. 646; fallen herab 4.1; ein Zuviel oder Zuwenig bei ihnen Anm. 646. Die O. wird durch die herabgefallene ahuti verunreinigt Anm. 691.

Opfertier. Das beim Opfer verwandte Tier (s. Agnīhotra, die Kuh desselben) brüllt vor Hunger oder setzt sich nieder 2.4; — das Opfertier entzieht Anm. 332, 1110; cf. Pferd; fällt nieder 5.5; bricht zusammen, wird krank oder stirbt 2.9; Anm. 332; darf bei der Opferung nicht brüllen Anm. 178.

Opferrank. Geopferter und nicht geopferter, genossener und nicht genossener Soma vermischen sich mit einander 6.6; Anm. 1049. Der Soma brennt an 6.4; Anm. 1001; wird geraubt 6.4; Anm. 1016; geht zugrunde, wird verschüttet 3.4.5; 6.4; fließt über 2.5; bleibt vom Prātaḥsāvānas übrig 6.6; Somalibrationen mäulingen 6.3; Zufälligkeiten und Mißgriffe bei den drei täglichen Pressungen 6.9; Anm. 1055. — Konkurrierende Somaopfer unter Landsleuten und Feinden 6.6. Der zur Auspressung des Somatranks verwandte Preßstein platzt 6.3; Anm. 1028.

Opferveranstalter. Der O. ist in keinem Falle durch einen Stellvertreter ersetzbar Anm. 614; die heiligen Feuer werden magisch als sein Lebensodem aufgefaßt 1.1; er darf nicht Speise genießen, bevor die heiligen Feuer Opferspenden empfangen haben Anm. 170; erfährt Schädigung durch Zauber (?) 6.6; wird krank 2.9; 3.9; cf. Anm. 1071; treibt die Priester (?) schlecht herbei 6.9; stirbt — nach Anlegung des Agnihotra 2.9; auf der Reise in einem Dorfe Anm. 143;

1 Unklare Stelle. Lies vielleicht: ya upatāpinaḥ (erg.: paśuḥ) yojayat...
cf. 3. 6; am Upavasatha-Tage 2. 9; nach Vollendung der Opfer 2. 9; Anm. 561; nach der Weihe 2. 9; cf. 6. 7; ist verschollen 3. 6; erscheint wieder 3. 6; erscheint nicht 3. 6.

**Opferwagen.** Der O. fällt um 6. 1.

**Pferd** s. Opfertier; Tier. Das Pferd entweicht beim Rollopfer 6. 7; begattet sich während des Opfers 6. 7; ein Schimmel vertritt die Sonne und wird als das Symbol dieser in östlicher Richtung hingesetzt, wenn man sie nicht aufgehen sieht, während der Verse des Frühgebets rezitiert werden 6. 7; — das Pferd entschütt das herabgefallene pradāyya durch Beschmuppern Anm. 877.

reisen cf. Opferveranstalter. Unterschied zwischen vorübergehendem Ortswechsel und dauernder Übersiedelung Anm. 16; Verhalten vor und nach einer Reise 1. 1; sterben auf der Reise 2. 8; Anm. 143; nach dem anvādhāna ist es dem Haushalter verboten, zu verreisen 4. 3; 5. 3; Anm. 863.

**sānnyāsa s. Opferspende.**

**Silber** cf. Gold. Verwendung des S. beim nicht rechtzeitigen Entzünden des Āhavaniya-Feuers 1. 2; cf. Anm. 42.

**Substitution.** S.-Materialien beim Sühneopfer Anm. 6; cf. Opferspende; für das Opferfeuer und den Opferherrn gibt es keinen Ersatz Anm. 614; doch können Opferfeuer im Notfall durch weltliche Feuer ersetzt werden 5. 2; Anm. 801; an Stelle des weltlichen Feuers kann die rechte Hand des Brahmanen treten; an seiner Statt das rechte Ohr einer Ziege stehen; dieses durch darbha-Grasblätter; die letzteren durch Wasser; dieses durch Gold substituiert werden. Diese sämtlichen Dinge gelten dann als zum profanen Gebrauch ungeeignet; den Brahmanen soll man nicht ansehen; die Ziege nicht genießen; auf dem darbha-Grase nicht sitzen; mit dem Wasser nicht die Füße waschen; das Gold nicht tragen 5. 2. Opferbutter als Substitut eines avadāna 5. 5; Anm. 888. Substitute für den Soma 6. 4; Anm. 1016—7, 1019. Beim Zugrundegehen der Opferspende muß ein opferreines Substitutmaterial herangeschafft werden Anm. 614. — An Stelle komplizierter Opferriten können im Notfalle einfache Handgriffe treten Anm. 863, 836; die Sattra in Ekāha verwandelt werden 3. 9.

**Tiere s. Agnihotra; Opfertiere; Pferd; verunreinigen. Hund oder Raubvögel dringen in den Opferbezirk ein 5. 2; Anm. 808; rauben Opferteile 2. 5; Hund, Wildschaf, Katze**
und Wildschwein (Anm. 63), Löwe, Hyäne, Schakal, Krähe usw. stören das Opfer Anm. 818; deshalb muß ihre Spur entschärft werden (s. Asche; Wasser); Eber, Katze, Büffel oder Raubvogel sind nach Opferfleisch begierig 3. 10; Hunde usw. belecken, beschupppern und verunreinigen die Opferschalen; cf. Opfer gefäß; Hund, Raubvogel, Krähe, Maulwurf, Katze, Ichneumon usw. fressen, beschupppern oder berühren Opferkuhnen Anm. 257; die Krähe genießt vom Opferkuhnen Anm. 197; setzt sich auf den Opferpfosten 2. 6; dringt in den Kreis des Agnihotra ein Anm. 818; Insekten besudeln die Opferspeise Anm. 257; Wärmer suchen sieheim 2. 6; verderben sie Anm. 119; verunreinigen das Agnihotra 4. 3. Ein weißes Pferd wird angewendet, wenn die Rezitation der Frühgebete nicht mit dem Sonnenaufgang zusammensfällt 8. 7; Anm. 1104; das Pferd entschärft das herabgefallene prasadājya durch Beschupppern Anm. 877; Sühne ist erforderlich, wenn beim Pferdeopfer der Hengst nicht zurückkehrt oder wenn er die Stute beschäftigt 6. 7; — das Rind entschärft den störenden Einbruch in den Opferbezirk Anm. 63, 143; cf. Asche; — die Ziege kann als Substitut für ein Opferfeuer Spenden empfangen 5. 2; Anm. 801; ein weißer Ziegenbock wird der Sonne als Sühne dargebracht 6. 7; Anm. 1105.

Unreinigkeit cf. Asche; Tiere; Wasser. Drei Klassen von unreinen Dingen gibt es: das durch a) Geburt, b) Kontakt und c) Vermischung Unreine z. B. a) eine Zwiebel, b) den Südra und c) einen an sich reinen, aber mit rituell unreinen Dingen wie Kot usw. in Berührung gekommenen Gegenstand; man kann also: 1. von Hause aus unrein sein, 2. durch Berührung mit beleckten Mitmenschen oder verderbten Dingen und 3. durch das Eindringen von Unreinem unrein werden Anm. 614; — über unreine Tiere (s. d.) spricht der Text häufig; auch redet er von verbotenen Menschen; die Gattin des Opferveranstalters ist unrein, wenn sie menstruiert ist 4. 2; Anm. 684; desgl. die Wöchnerin ibid.; beide müssen deshalb dem Opfer fern gehalten werden s. Frau. Sühne ist notwendig, wenn ein menstruierendes Weib, eine Wöchnerin oder ein Südra die Opferspeise berühren Anm. 257; wenn unreine Weiber, niedere Menschen oder unreine Tiere (Esel, Schwein, Krähe; — ferner der Hund 1. 8) sie verderben Anm. 327; oder wenn die gleichen Wesen resp. Dinge, wie Kot, Urin, Same, Eiter, Tränen, Knochen, Abfälle usw.,
desgl. ein Wassertropfen, das Opferfeuer verunreinigen Anm. 327; cf. Anm. 859; wenn dieses sich mit einem Leichenfeuer mischt 5. 4; Anm. 855. Als besonders unrein und deshalb dem Opfer gefährlich gelten Haare usw. Anm. 126; Haare, Nägel, Würmer und andere ekellhafte Dinge Anm. 257; besonders Würmer 2. 6; Ausscheidungen des menschlichen Körpers, zu denen auch Blut und Träne gehören, wenn die letztere eine Schmerzensträne ist (vgl. die Entheiligung des Soma durch einen Wasser- oder Regentropfen s. Wasser:) Anm. 257, 616, 864; ferner Abfälle aller Art, sowie Leichen und Leichenteile Anm. 327; — als verunreinigend gilt die Erde, wenn (infolge Überlaufenlassens kochender Flüssigkeiten oder fahrlässiger Handlungen anderer Art) dieselbe mit dem Opfermaterial in Berührung kommt Anm. 711, 1146; ja unter den gleichen Umständen selbst das Feuer Anm. 711; — das Verunreinigte vernichtet man, indem man es in Asche (s. d.), Wasser (s. d.) oder vermittelst eines Paläsa-Blattes auf einen Ameisenhaufen schüttet s. Opferspende. — Die Verunreinigung mag besonders häufig die flüssige Opferspeise (sānṇāyāya s. Opferspende), sowie den festen Opferkuchen (2.1) und überhaupt das Material des überaus oft vollzogenen und häufigen Störungen ausgesetzten Agnihotra betroffen haben 1. 3. Unter den ihr ausgesetzten Opfergeräten spielten die carushält (Topf zum Kochen des Opfermuses) eine Rolle 1. 3; aber auch die übrige Opferausrüstung (Streu usw.) kann durch Kot, Urin oder ähnliches verunreinigt werden Anm. 646. — Wenn die ganze Opferspende verunreinigt ist, muß das Opfer von neuem begonnen werden 4. 1.

verschütten cf. Agnihotra; Gārhapatyā. Das Verschütten der beim Agnihotragebrauchten Milch 1. 3, 5; 4. 3; Anm. 49, 93, 186, 707, 711, 714, 718, 723, 727; des Opfermaterials Anm. 126, 621, 727; des Inhalts des Somabechers 2. 5; des Somatrankses 3. 4; des Opfermuses Anm. 621; der Opferbutter 4. 1; der vasativari 6. 2; der zu religiösen Zweckengebrauchten Wasser Anm. 962; der āhuti 4. 2; des prāsadāyā 5. 5; Anm. 877; des āgrayāṇa 6. 3; der Opferkohle 2. 6; 4. 1; cf. Opferfeuer, sein Übergreifen. — Entschüttung: s. Pferd; Tiere.

Verstreichen-lassen (cf. Agnihotra). Das V.1. des zum Neu- und Vollmondopfer vorgeschriebenen Termins 2. 2—3; Anm. 826; des allmorgendlichen und allabendlichen Agni-
hotra (s. d.); die Sonne geht über dem nachmittäglichen Pravargya unter 6. 8; über einer der drei täglichen Somapressungen unter 6. 9. — V. I. des Manonpifers Anm. 760; irgendeines Opfers oder Opfergliedes i. b. d., cf. Anm. 844; Versäumnis einer Observanz Anm. 760. Wenn man beim Rezitieren des Frühgebetes die Sonne nicht im Osten sieht, soll man ihr einen weißen Ziegenbock opfern 6. 7; Anm. 1104; beim Versäumen eines Zeitpunktes soll man die pāthikṛt-Sühne ausführen Anm. 825.

Vertauschen der heiligen Handlung 3. 4; Anm. 633; der heiligen Sprüche 4. 1; Anm. 637; der Gottheiten, denen die einzelnen Opfer gelten 4. 1; Anm. 633, 637, 642; (ihre ver- spätete Erwähnung 4. 1; Anm. 642); der Opferbutter, des Opfermaterials Anm. 637; der heiligen Feuer s. Opferfeuer.

Wasser s. Asche. Verunreinigtes Wasser wird fortgegessen Anm. 614. Merkwürdigerweise gilt Wasser als un rein, selbst wenn es nur tropfenweise ins Opferfeuer fällt Anm. 327; deshalb macht der Regentropfen, welcher das Agnihotra-Material benutzt, dessen Wiederholung nötig 4. 3; Anm. 736, 742; wenn in den Soma Regen fällt, muß Sühne erfolgen 6. 3; ja selbst die Träne entweicht 5. 4; Anm. 257, 616, 863. — Das Wasser wirkt im Ritual bisweilen entsühnend; cf. Anm. 614. Das zum Reinigen der Füße benutzte Wasser darf nicht ausgehen 6. 5. Ein Wasserstrahl stellt die durch einen Ein- bruch zwischen zwei Opferfeuern unter diesen verloren- gegangene magische Verbindung wieder her 1. 3; Anm. 63, 64, 143. Mit Wasser werden die Spuren omenvider, das Opfer störender Wesen verwischt Anm. 818; cf. eindringen; mit ihm findet die Reinigung goldner und silberner Opfergeräte statt Anm. 614. — Vorzugsweise aber dient das Wasser dazu, alles Urniene aufzunehmen und zu vernichten; unerüne Dinge überhaupt 4. 1; Anm. 614, 616, 724; namentlich wird grundsätzlich und stets alles verdorbene oder durch Würmer verunreinigte (s. Unreinigkeit) Opferspeise ins Wasser geworfen Anm. 742; cf. 2. 6; Anm. 257, 617, 621; desgleichen jedes angebrannte (Anm.126) oder infolge Überkochens herab- geflossene Opfergut Anm. 714; aber auch die unbranchar gewordene Opferzustung: vom Feuer angegriffene Reib- hölzer Anm. 327; geplatzte oder verunreinigte irdene oder hölzerne Gefäße 6. 5; Anm. 657, 661; die irdenen Gefäße eines Toten 3. 7; cf. Opfergefühl.
Register der Vers- und Yajus-Anfänge.

agnā āyāhi vitaye 2. 7.
agnaye 'umādaya 'nuspataye svāhā 1. 1.
agnaye 'bhuyujusasva svāhā 4. 4.
agnaye 'yavisthāya 'ṭākapālam 6. 6.
agnaye rathamantaraya svāhā 'ṣaṃ svāhā pāuktaye svāhā 'vībhīyām svāhā 6. 9.
agnaye saṅkhyatamo juṣasva svāhā 4. 4.
agnaye somāya vīṣava îndrāgnībhīyaṃ prajāpataye 3. 9.
agnaye svāhā yaṉaya svāhā brahmaṇa svāhā vīṣava svāhā prajāpataye svāhā 'numataye svāhā guaye vīṣṭākarte svāhā 6. 9.
agnaye svāhā vasubhyaḥ svāhā gāyatrayai svāhā 6. 9.
agnīṃ vayaṃ trāṭānuṃ 'havāmahe 2. 2.
agnījāvā manavaḥ sūrascakṣasah 6. 1.
agninā 'gnih samidhaye 2. 7.
agninā 'gnih saṃśijyate 6. 1.
agninā tapo 'svabiavat 5. 6.
agnīṃ naro dihitibhir aranyoḥ 6. 1.
agnih pravidvān iha tat karotu 6. 2.
agnīṃ āla pūrūhitam 2. 7.
agnīṃ prithiyā adityā upasthe 1. 3.
agnīṃ prithīyām amṛtasya jītyai 1. 2.
agnīr jyotir jyotir agnīḥ 1. 2.
agnīr naṃ teṣaṃ mayeṣu prājāman 2. 3.
agnīr bhūmyām 1. 3.
agnīr maṃ pātam vasubhiḥ purastāḥ 2. 9; 6. 9.
agnī ca deva saṅgat 2. 4.
agnīḥ śruci śravatamaḥ 2. 7.
agnes vṛt. 'a 'gnes.
agnī kāmāya yemāre 5. 8.
agnī prāsāhi prathamaḥ 2. 4.
agnes te vācmaṃ śrṇomi svāhā 2. 9.
agnīro yaṇīyo bhūtvā 4. 2.
agnīni...ta ukthiyā pātu 6. 6.
agnināṃ tantuṃ prithīvā anu geśaṃ 6. 2.
aṅsrayā sūrmiyā yavisthā 6. 1.
aṅṣro vaṣi devatātām aha 6. 1.
aṣṭha dṛṣṭam adṛṣṭam no duṣkṛtam kurat 2. 3.
aṅṣharvahīḥ śaṅtaḥ sakṛtāṃ etu lokāṃ 2. 6.
agnīṃ bhraspatim vareṇyām 4. 1.
agnīṃ śrṇadhīḥ prithi uta dyaṇḥ 6. 1.
agnīṃ básandi vācako japaṃ 3. 6. 7.
agnīya te rṇam śṛṇomi svāhā 2. 9.
agnī śaṅdāḥ sādhamaṃ madamaṃ 1. 3.
anamguṇḍhī (7) 2. 5.
anupurvaṃ vṛṣṇā codaṇṭiḥ 6. 9.
anubhaṣaṃ vayaṣa jagūrvaṃ apaḥ 1. 5.
anuṣṭubham chaṇḍasā yaṃ 3. 4.
anuṣṭubhāṃ hitva śāmandaṃ 3. 4.
antarikṣe ta śākṣeṃ śṛṇomi svāhā 2. 9.
naptarikṣa turīyaṃ 1. 5.
avy agnīḥ 5. 3.
apasādaghavaṃ sāyaḥ bhūyaṃ 2. 7.
apāṃ agnīs tanubhiḥ 2. 7.
apāṃ úrmiḥ 6. 2.
avy 'maṇ maṇaṃ arudhan grhobhayaḥ 2. 9.
apau turīyaṃ 1. 5.
apau antaḥ 2. 2.
abhayaṃ vo 'bhayaṃ me 'atu 1. 1.
amitrāṇaṃ śrṇyaṃ bhūtiḥ 2. 5.
ammaṃ samūha 4. 3.
अभ्यो योनिभ्यो अभिः जातवेदः 5. 1.
अयाहि तपसी जानेश 5. 1.
अयारिः अषि धृत्वा अयुं मौ देह
वाहस 6. 3.
अयुं तसा भूतिः का 2. 4.
अयुḥ ते धृत्वा पुत्र 6. 6.
आ भवेन्यां अभ्यस सहकर्षः 6. 1.
आस्थान सदाम् स्रवः 4. 2.
आः याहि याहि दाहे निर्तो उपातिः 4. 1.

Ita eva prathamān jāye
agnih 5. 1.
ıdaṃ viṣṇur vinakramō 5. 2.
ıdaṃ tu ekam 5. 3.
ıdaṃ barbir smṛṣte na saktam 2. 5.
ivaṭasārṇya 2. 4.
indur indum asvagū 6. 3.
indur induro 'pāt 6. 3.
indrapatsya pāhūtasya 'pahuto bhakṣayam ā 6. 3.
indūṣya kūṣir asī 2. 5.
indrāgulbhyap svāhe 'indrāviṇu-
bhyap svāhā 6. 9.
indrāt te bāham sṛppom svāhā 2. 9.
indrāya kṛṣita bhūgaṇ 2. 4.
indrāya svāhe 'indrānyai svāhe chanda-
dobhyah svāhā 6. 9.
indrāya harivasta 6. 8.
indrīyavan madīntaṁ 2. 2.
indreṇa devān 5. 6.
imam yajñam mimikṣatam 4. 1.
imena na te rāṣṭrayaḥ sūryasya 6. 9.
imā agne vitaśaṁ khyā 6. 1.
īṣā yātanās nṛṣatyo 'pa vājī 6. 9.
īṣo rīyam rāmesvā 5. 1.
īha gavaḥ prajāyadvīpyam 5. 5.
īha no devā mahi śarmā yachata 4. 1.
īha prajāḥ dirgham āyuḥ ca dhehi
2. 5.
īhāvindatiḥ 1. 6. 8.
īhai va kṣemā adhi 4. 4.

ukhām svasāram adhi vedim
asthāt 6. 2.
uta paśyam anuvan dirgham āyuḥ
6. 9.
uttīṣṭha deva adīte 2. 4.
uprūṣo viprūṣaḥ samjuchm 1. 3.

अद्वन्दगः दुहवणयम् अवद-
गिनः रुषयाः शर्वः पायत्नाः 6. 9.

aśva yakṣaṁ no varṇaṁ varāṇaḥ 4. 1.
āvāhīrām bādhana 4. 1.
āśva no guṇaṁ aśvinā durevāh 6. 9.

aśvaṇa vajraḥ uta 6. 3.
aśvāvat soma viravat 2. 6.
akṣputraṁ pusratā 1. 5.

āśva yudayat pācād vasāno ni-
lalolitah 2. 8.

aśvāna ivi śa jīramānum jagatmyām 6. 9.

aśhībhyām te majāmaṁ sṛpponī
vāhā 2. 9.

aśvaṁ indraṁ avataṁ saṁbhīgh 6. 9.
śaṁmān āstāda barhiḥ 4. 2.

aśvaḥ pathiḥ aśvaṁ sugavaḥ suvirah 6. 9.
abhā ca tvā rātrī ca śrītām 6. 3.
abhā ya dana kritam asi papaṁ 1. 2.

a gne pāvaka didyav 5. 1.
a gne pāvako anciṣa 5. 1.
a ca dyotate 2. 7.
āyena tejasā 'jyasa 4. 2.
ātmākṣaśr unṣaḥ prīha śatriah(7)
3. 10.

ātmanāṁ ta śṛgāyaṇah pātu 6. 6.
ātma yajñasya rāmhyā 6. 3.

ādityānāṁ tvā devānāṁ vyātha 'pi
duchānī 2. 9.

ādityās tvā tarpayanta 6. 3.

āśmuṣṭhatiḥ parśū adhaśārīrā 'vā-
padyava 2. 9.

a no yāhī tapasī jāneš 5. 1.
a no rayiṁ vahatām ota vitān 6. 1.

apattai samap ca 3. 3.

a parisvaḥ hiraṇyavat 2. 6.

a bhārataṁ śikṣatam vajrabāḥ 6. 9.
ud agne śucayas tava 2. 7.
udasthūd devy adite 2. 4.
od uttamānta varaṇa 4. 1, 3.
ud uttamāṃ mumudhi naḥ 4. 1, 3.
uddhāra “havanīyaṃ 1. 1.
uddhrīmaṇa uddhara pāpmano
mā yād avidvān yac ca vidvāṃ
cakāra 1. 2.
undattā suphena jyotiṣmati tu
mavrataḥ 6. 2.
upājīvā nāma sthā tā imāṃ jīveta 6. 6.
upahūto haṃ su-medhā varcasāv 1. 4.
upāśaṃsavyaṃ te vyānaṃ pātaḥ 6. 6.
upāśeṇe-prāṇyāmante te prajāpāsā
nau patāpaḥ 6. 6.
upe “māṃ sāstatiṃ mama 5. 1.
uru viṣṇo vikramava 2. 2.

uṛg asy ārjān mayi dhehi
6. 1.

ṛtave tvā 2. 9.
ydhāṣaṇa putraḥ paśuḥḥiti 6. 5.
rhād ātṛṇa munācatho gaṇaṃ 6. 9.
ṛṣīṃ nārāv amhasāḥ pākṣeṣaṇyāṃ
6. 9.
rāṣīṃ nārā vṛṣṇāḥ rebham apena 6. 9.

eṣā te agne 3. 7.

om svar janat (cf. svar janat)
6. 4; 4. 1.
om bhavo janaś (cf. bhavo janaś)
3. 4; 4. 1.
om bhūr janaś (cf. bhūr janaś)
4. 1.
om bhūr bhūrabh vras janaś 3. 4; 4. 4.
oṣadhuḥhyāsa te lomāni sṛṣomī svabhā
2. 9.

kakṣīvantam ya anuṣijāḥ 4. 1.
kuvir gṛmaṭipir yuvā 2. 7.
kaśmur devāya haviṣā paridādema
3. 10.
kāyamanā vanā tvam 6. 2.
kim utpataś kim utprioṣṭaḥ 4. 2.
kṛṣṇi brahmaṇaṃ jaya 4. 1.

gaṭṭa tvam ādāya parāvato
nyān 2. 5.

garbhā na mṛṣāḥ 6. 3.
gaviḍrāṇi kālpatā yuvāṃ 6. 6.
gāyatraṃ parādāṃ adhaḥśārā vapa-
dyaṇaṃ 2. 9.
gāyatraṃ tvā satākṣrayā samda-
dhāmī 4. 1.
gāyatraśa chandaśa bhūbhūtyai svabhā
8. 6.
grūṇaṃ havyādātaye 2. 7.
goṣa indo nṛṣa asī 6. 3.

gharīva viśvāyūḥ 4. 1.
candrāt te manaḥ śrīpomī svabhā 2. 9.
cāyakāṃ ca (?) 6. 2.

chidrāyā vācā chidrāyā
jihvā (?) 8. 10.

Janitā vayam mā loko ‘nus-
saptanatam 1. 5.
jātagumi parasāṃ adhaḥśāra vapa-
dyaṇaḥ 2. 9.
jīvā nāma sthā tā imāṃ jīveta
samjīveta 6. 6.
jīvā nāma sthā tā imāṃ jīveta
samjīveta 6. 6.
jīvā nāma sthā tā imāṃ jīveta
samjīveta 6. 6.
justo hota varṇyāḥ 2. 1.
jyotir bhūtvā devaṁ apy etu (?) 1. 5.
jyotiṣmatāḥ patho rakṣa dhīya kṛtān
1. 5.

tam vo mā ‘va kramāṇaḥ 6. 2.
tato no abhayaṃ kṛdhi 2. 4.
tato no vṛṣṭā vata 6. 2.
tato mā dhraṣṭām āśā 1. 5.
tatra: rāgāḥam ananāmbhāri tām
5. 2.
tatre ‘maṃ yajñāṃ yajāmanāma ca
dhehi 2. 8.
tad it paśaṁ na viciketa vidvān 6. 3.
tad vai purāṣam abhināvaṁ śṛṣṭiyā
2. 5.
tatam: tanvan rajasa bhūnam su-
vihi 1. 3; cf. 6. 5.
tan no astu viśāmpate 2. 5.
tan no nitro vucamo māmakṣaṇaṁ
6. 1.
दक्षकृतू ते मित्रवारुणां पृत्यम 6. 6.
दक्षान् का त्वा मानससा का श्रीतिम 6. 3.
दर्भो राजा समुद्रियाः 2. 5.
दर्शान् का त्वा गौरणासा का श्रीतिम 6. 3.
दिग्भयस से यज्तिः स्पृष्टसा साही 2. 9.
दिनां स्ताद्विया नारिकाणम् का 6. 1.
दिनां प्रतिर्थिम 2. 5.
दिनां खण्यादं नारिकाणं समुद्रत 6. 2.
दिना विधा (?) 3. 10.
दिना तुर्यां 1. 5.
दिना होत्राः सुयत साही (?) 3. 10.
दिना 'चाता (?) 6. 8.
दिना 'पति: तस्माद 2. 5.
दिना चूर्याः स्रज्ञायत अथायत 6. 1.
दिनां बेङ्ग 'वायुस्थेश्वर 4. 1.
दिना उन्मुद्दा 'दधिः भिन्नं 6. 2.
दिनां जनां अगां 4. 1.
दिनां अगा एतु (?) 1. 5.
दिनां जनां 6. 3.
दिनां जनां अगाः बौद्धय 2. 4.
दिनां जना गति 1. 5.
दिना 'युयो मित्रवारुणा 'र्याम्त मक्तां 6. 2.
दिना वासव्याः अगा 'वरा सुया 6. 2.
दिनां सपत्याः 'सप्तम सप्तम तनुसपालम 6. 2.
दिना देशब्यां बहुमुक्त प्राधन ५. १.
दिना कसां 6. 3.
दिना 'पति: आदि 'पादम 6. 3.
दिनां 'होत्रां लेख भुवानम 6. 1.
दिनां जनां अगाः बौद्धय 2. 4.
दिनां जनां गति 1. 5.
दिनां वासव्याः अग्नि 'वर्य 6. 2.
दिनां सपत्याः 'सप्तम सप्तम तनुसपादाल 6. 2.
दिनां देशायां बहुमुक्त प्राधन ५. १.
दिनां 'होत्रां लेख भुवानम 6. 1.
दिनां जनां अगाः बौद्धय 2. 4.
दिनां 'पति: आदि 'पादम 6. 3.
दिनां 'होत्रां लेख भुवानम 6. 1.

dhartri dharitri janitri ya- mitri 6. 1.
dhātā dādātu pitāh pitānaṣṭaḥ 4. 1.
dhānā dādātu naḥ pūrṇa darve 2. 4.
dhrvam dhravana 6. 3.
dhrvā dyuh 6. 3.

naktam cil dūra ā satē 5. 6.
na yat te agne pramya nivartanaṁ 6. 2.
namas te astv āyate 4. 1.
namas te pathya revati (?) 1. 4.
namas te 6. 2.
na me yajhō yajamāna ca riyāt 2. 6.
namo astra purāyate 4. 1.
namo yatra niṣīdasi 4. 1.
namo rudraya mūlāhāpse 2. 4.
nirāśama udno datto 'dādāṁ hi bhūnta 6. 2.
na vāṃ jyāsurīṃ pūrvyā kṛtaṇi 6. 9.
na 'nātraṇamam teasām śidhu vichedanād bhayaṁ 1. 3.
nirdagdhā no aṃātra 2. 5.
ni hotā satī karhiṣi 2. 7.
nediṣṭho anā upaśo vṛṣṭau 4. 1.

paraī ta ekam 5. 3.
pari naḥ pātu viśvataḥ 2. 5.
paśu naḥ surīn goṇaya 2. 4.
pāṃpamaṁ agne tam ito madhva 2. 5.
pāvako yad, vanaspatīn 5. 6.
pūrvo prāṇita upaśīmyamānaḥ 2. 5.
pīṛtāṁ no bharatābhiḥ 4. 1.
pibha gṛtām imāṃ gṛtām 6. 6.
putrā no yatra pitāro bhavantī 6. 1.
punar maī 'tv indriyaṁ 1. 4; 6. 5, 9.
punas tvā 'dityā rūḍrā vasavaḥ 2. 5.
punas tvā prāṇaḥ 2. 4.
punas tvā 'dipayamasi 2. 5.
puṣṭā puṣṭām prāṇena prāṇam te-
jaśe tejas caukṣaṁ caukṣaḥ śrō-
treṇa śrottraḥ śyāṣa 'yuḥ punar
dehī 6. 6.
pranājitaṁ sahāmanām 2. 1.
prthivim turiyaṁ mannyaṁ yajhō
gat 1. 6.
prthivi vibhūvartik (?) 6. 2.
prthivyam ca āṣāṁ bhava 6. 1.
prthivyāś te sarirām śṛṇṇīṁ svāhā 2. 9.
prthivyā śrotreyā 'nārakāyā prā-
manur bhava janayā dāvyaṃ ja-
naṃ 1. 3.
mantrasvanu ca kāryāṇi sarvaḥ
nibhyayanu ca yat 1. 3.
mām 'gne vareḥ 2. 5; 6. 1.
mayobhuvā suṣaṇitī gāmeṣa 6. 1.
maḥato mahām asya 3. 10.
maḥ dyaṇāḥ pṛthivi ca naḥ 4. 1;
cf. 4. 3.
mātā mātraram api ugāt 6. 5.
mā tvā dabh(ya)n āsudhaṇāḥ 2. 5.
mā ma aypo medhum 1. 4.
mā naḥ kiṃśana ririṣaḥ 4. 2.
mā naḥ piparid (t. piparid?) aśvinī 6. 9.
mā naḥ prāpad uchana kācid uṣyā 3. 10.
mānaṣṭa ta śāṣaḍa dīvyaṃ śāṣaṇa
sṛṣṭiḥ svāhā 2. 9.
mā no asya jagataḥ pārthivasya 3.10.
mā no mādhyā rīṣaṭāyur gantoḥ 6. 1.
mā no māhāntaḥ 4. 1.
mā no medhum mā no dikṣaṃ 1. 4.
mā no viduḥ 2. 4; 6. 9.
mā no hīṁśaḥ(ya) yut tapaḥ 1. 4.
māma ṣaṇāḥ śīvendhītī ajirāḥ 6. 2.
mā prāgāma patho vayaṇa 6. 5.
mā prāmaṇaḥ 4. 4.
mā bradānāḥ sarmabhiḥ śūni (?) 2. 5.
mā brahma pramanaviṣṭaḥ 1. 4.
mām anum āṃṣasyāṇaḥ 4. 4.
mā hīṁśaḥ deva pṛṣṭaḥ 4. 2.
mirah kṛṣṭir animūḥaḥ 'bhusaṇe 4.3.
mirah-pṛthivyā adhaṁyaḥ (?) 1. 2.
mirahākṣati kṣetraḥ kṣetraḥ saṃvāraṇā
dhā maṭi vata 6. 2.
mirhaṃ vayuṣaḥ ca 2. 4.
mirhaṃ havyaṃ gṛtvavaj juhota 4. 3.
mitrāḥ janānāḥ yālaṇaḥ 4. 3.
mitrāḥ dāduraḥ pṛthivim 4. 3.
maṇīśa dasyor aśvasya māyaḥ 6. 3.

ya indrena sṛṣṭo yadi vā
marudbhīḥ 2. 6.
yā imān 2. 2.
yā prā cid abhīrīṣaḥ 6. 5.

yukṣaṃd asmād āmayataḥ 2. 2.
yajamānaḥ ca vṛddhayaḥ 2. 4.
yugṣṭha vahumānaḥ śocanāḥ 4.1.
yujja eti viśataḥ kalpaṁaḥ 2. 9.
yujja ca tvā daksīṇaḥ ca śruṭaṃ 6. 3.
yujja ca tvā vāyus ca śruṭaṃ 6. 3.
yujjaṇaya tvā praṃayō-śeṣaḥ-hiṃ-
mayāḥ pṛthimāvyas paridhāma svāhā 4. 1.
yujjaṇaya saṃstātī suryāḥ yāvān
dvāntāyā saṃstāṇi 1. 3.
yujjaṇaya hi sthaḥ pṛjñā 6. 6.
yate jātā tataḥ 'py aśām (?) 4. 1.
yukṣmāmas te juhumaḥ 2. 5.
yat kim ca 'dama varaṇa 1. 2.
yat tvam agne 2. 5.
yatra devaiḥ sadhūmadam madhama
1. 3.
yatra naś ca kṣūrā jarsanaḥ tanūmā
6. 1.
yatho 'dama barhīs tathā 2. 5.
yad agnir barhīr adahā (?) 2. 5.
yad agne pārvaṁ nihilam padam
hi te 5. 2.
yad asmyt 3. 4.
yad uṣāgān mahato mahām asya
3. 10.
yad dūre samuḥ bhavaḥ 6. 2.
yad vaḥ gṛham ghoram uṣā "jagāma
2. 6.
yad vaḥca yāca maḥ hṛdaḥ 6. 1.
yad vaḥ yājīnaḥ no 'dbhutaṁ jagāma
2. 6.
yad vaḥ śaṅkādaḥ 'dvahī ṣastra-yastra
1. 3.
yam tvam agne 2. 5.
yam mātṛ śeṣaṁ apah 6. 1.
yam mṛtaḥ punar api eti jīvaḥ 6. 3.
yam me chidraṁ maṇasa yac ca va-
caḥ 1. 3.
yam me maṇasaḥ chidraḥ 6. 1.
yam me saṃgand 3. 4.
yam me saṃgand maṇasa_puṣṭadeha
1. 3.
yam rastraḥ no yayaḥ (?) 2. 3.
yayor ojasā 1. 5; 6. 9.
yayoḥ sarvaḥ 2. 9.
yam tvam agne pramattanām 2. 5.
yasmiḥ kṛṣṇī ketum a 5. 6.
yamad bhūta nīyadai 2. 4.
yamān minoty ajaraḥ 5. 6.
yāya te agna ārdrā yonayo yah kula-
yathinī 6. 2.
yāya te agna tāvya urjo nama 6. 2.
yupā pacēta dvijatam vadhaya 2. 6.
yūpo virūhaḥ chatakaka udvahah 2.
yūpo hy arukṣad dvijatam vadhaya 2. 6.
ye te agna ēndavo yā u nāmahayā 6.
ye devā yajnām āyunti 2. 5.
yeva gachathah sukto duroṣṣam 6. 9.
yeva patōha vaivasvataḥ 2. 5. 8.
yehiḥ sapitvām pitaro na śaṃ 9. 9.
yo agniḥ 3. 7.
yo āntrapāt mitramahā vanusyaḥ 5. 6.
yogakṣemnaya santāya 4. 2.
y maḥ sanuyo abhūtāsam agne 5. 6.
yo no dvēṣī sa bhūdyataṃ 6. 9.
yo vanaspatinām upatśopu na āgat 2. 6.
yo vanaspatinām upatśopu bhūva 2. 6.
yo vām aśvinī manasa śāvaya 6. 9.

rakyobbhas tvā 2. 9.
rathah sAvāvo vāś āśīgāti 6. 9.
rūtrāy yad enaḥ kītam asti pāpaṃ 1. 2.

rudrāṇum tvā devānām vyātāḥ pi dakāhāṃ 2. 9.
rudrā tva tarpayanto 6. 3.

vatsaraśi pārivatsarośi sa

 samyatsarośi sa 2. 9.

vanapade mātālah aya 3. 4.
vanvan hārvi yāthā devebhāya 2. 4.
vāya tvā na rohatā 6. 2.

varāpye vaśāḥ “dityehubbhāḥ vaśāḥ
jagatyaḥ vaśāḥ 6. 9.

vāyuro ma “dityah sūryo ma dya-
vāpytrībhīyam prateyaśī dīṣāh
pāta 6. 9.

varrodaasti dvuru vaśrvo me daḥ
vaśāḥ 6. 8.

vaśavas tvā “dīśe tarpayantu 6. 3.
vaśunām rudrāṇum śāhivāṃ mara-
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tam rupām bhūgānām auñgīram antahvānau brahmaṇāh samātir
ani 1. 3.

vaśunām tvā devānām vyātte pi
dakāhāṃ 2. 9.

vācakānaḥ japaḥ 7. 3. 7.
vaś tvā hotra prājñāḥ “dhravyaṇā
vakṣuṣo dgyārā maṇasaḥ brahmaṇāḥ
śrotrema “guciḥreṇai tāte tvā pa-
ścaabhir ytrvibhīr daivayairābyud-
īdhārami 1. 2.

vaś brahma 5. 6.
vaśaṃ gomantam abhara 2. 6.
vāta ṣvātā bheṣajaṇ 2. 5.
vākate prāṣaṇaṃ upāymi vaśāḥ 2. 9.
vāyevas tvā 2. 9.
vāṣaḥ prāṣaṇaṃ prati me grhāṇa
2. 5.

vi te tiṣṭhantām ajarā ayāsah 5. 6.
vidyotā bhājantaḥ dyotate 2. 7.
vidyotā “gnirjāvā 2. 7.
vidyotate dyotate 2. 7.
vidvāṃ asya vruṣaḥ dhrūva 6. 2.

vi pāṣāmandaḥyaṇam cīta 4. 1.
vi ṅireṇaḥ sunaḥ 2. 7.

viṣaṃ pāvṛiyeṇa 2. 7.
viṣavṛiṭiḥ prthivām śvadāmī 1. 3.
viṣaviṣam ratnavājaṃ 2. 7.

viśva dveśānai pramanamahāḥ by amat
4. 1.

viśavā sukṣityah prthak 5. 3.
viśe no devā asaṃ gamaun līka
6. 1.

viśveṣaṃ tvā devānāṃ vyātte “pi
dakāhāṃ 2. 9.

viśvaiś tad devāḥ sahe saṃvidaṇāḥ
1. 3.

viṣapevaḥ 2. 6.

viṣayannam (i. vēy annam? viṣayam?)
agni tvasaḥ maḥ 4. 3.
viṃsakaḥ lakṣemīḥ pāta 6. 6.
viṣaḥ mrīḷikaṃ sukavo na edhi 4. 1.

viṣabham carpagnāṃ viṣavarāpani
4. 1.

vṛgo aśvaya samaṇānaṃ asti vṛtyai
tvo panaḥsyām 6. 2.
vedābhigupto brahmaṇaḥ pārivṛtāḥ
2. 6.
vedyā vāso upo(m) bhata 7. 2. 5.
vaśvānaraḥ pathikṣyate viśvaṇṛṣṭiḥ 2. 3.
vaśvānam na utaye 2. 3.
vṣēma devahitaḥ yad āyuḥ 6. 1.

śatam inu śa rādō anti devāh 6. 1.
śatam cīrānās (1. "nēś?" tanvā niśṭata 6. 2.
śaṃ no astu driṣpade śaṃ catnapade 2. 6.
śaṃ no devir abhiṣṭaye 2. 4.
śaṅkā śānter āh “gābi” 4. 2.
śīśa itthā mahān aśi 2. 3.
śīre yajñasya pratibhiṇyataṁ 6. 1.
śīvā naḥ sampatvataḥ āyasa 1. 4.
śīvā vayam utāreṣā mhi vājān 2. 6.
śīvā bhavantu mātrāḥ 1. 4.
śīvā bhavatam adyo naḥ 2. 7.
śukra bhrājanāh trate 2. 7.
śukro ’śi 6. 8.
śucīr vipraḥ śucīr kavīḥ 2. 7.
śucī rocita śhutaḥ 2. 7.
śubhamyāvāna vidāthēṣu jagmayat 6. 1.
śuyadā (1. šūṃsa?) yāyaḥ syandāvadābhvam 1. 4.
śṛtām antarkṛṣṇam ca 6. 3.
śṛiyāṃ tītha pratiśthātā 6. 1.
śrotam ca śvināu pātaḥ 6. 6.

saṃvēṣāya āveśāya gāya-tryaiḥ ehandase bhībhūtai svāhā 6. 6.
sakā sakhibā samihyātās 2. 7.
sa gāyastryātriṣṭubhā jagatyā'nuṣṭubhā 5. 1.
samkrāhisyatā (7) tvā juhuddhi 4. 2(7).
sajur agnaye divā prthivyā haviṣo vīhi svāhā 6. 4.
sajur jātavedo divā prthivyā haviṣo vīhi svāhā 4. 4.
sajjīvikā nāma stha ta imaṃ jiveta 6. 6.
satyaṃ pūrvair śrībhū cakupaṃ 6. 2.
satyaḥ santu yaujamānasya kāmāḥ 1. 5.
sa tvāṃ naḥ 4. 1. 6. 1.

sa tvāṃ naḥ ’gne 4. 1.
sa tvāṃ no agne ’vamo bhāvo”ti 4. 1.
sa no rāṣya suśvīryān 2. 7.
saṃ tat śīneṣu rūdhātā 6. 1.
saṃ taṃ rīgītho vipraṃtaḥ daunṣobhiḥ 6. 9.
samudādaḥ bhṛhasptīḥ 1. 3.
sam naḥ śrī śrīmācyā vaujavyātā 5. 2.
sapta jīvāḥ sapta rāyaḥ 6. 1.
sapta te agne samidhāḥ 6. 1.
sapta dhāma priyāpi 6. 1.
sapta yonir āpurasya gurēṇa 6. 1.
saptasāṃk ṣukṛtāṃ yatra lokāḥ 2. 6.
sapta hotrāḥ saptaḍhā tvā yaujantī 6. 1.
sam aśinor avaśi niṇetanā 6. 1.
samaṇyo mohayāya yaujamānaya jāke 2. 6.
samaṃśiṣaṁ 6. 2. 3.
samudrāṇaḥ tvā prahīṇom 4. 3.
samudhām asya pūṃśe 5. 2.
samrāj aśi svarād aśi 5. 1.
sarvasvataḥ manyumantaḥ jagāma 1. 3.
survaḥ tad agne hutam aśi bhūguhāḥ 2. 6.
sarvasmaḥ evasā uddhṛto muṇeṣa tamātā 1. 2.
sann vājēṣu karmasā 6. 6.
sahase dūṃma ūrje pātyāya 5. 1.
sahastasāṇāḥ 2. 6. 4. 1.
sahāda aśi śhruvaḥ saho ma dah svāhā 6. 3.
sakāṃ hi śucin śucin 6. 2.
sarvasvataḥ tvā ’tāu pravatām 5. 1.
sukalpam agne tat tvāyā 2. 3.
suparna vīcāpi 5. 6.
suprajāśtvam śatam hi māmadanta 4. 1.
survaṇāḥ paraste sutah 6. 3.
sūryavaśīdg-bhavāt 2. 4.
sūryaṃ te cakṣur gacchatu 6. 10.
sūryāsya raśmiṃ anuvatāna 5. 2.
sūryāt te cakṣaḥ [h] śṛṇoṃi svāhā 2. 9.
sūrya jyotir iyotiḥ sūryaḥ 1. 2.
sūrya mā dyāvāprthivyām 6. 9.
somā te rājāḥ kirtīpi yasaḥ ca śṛṇoṃi svāhā 2. 9.
### Wortindex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>svasti na indro vṛddhaśravah</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svasti nāryaṇah (?)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svasti nāḥ pāśa viśvavedāḥ</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svasti nāś tārkṣya rīṣṭanemih</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svasti no byhaspatir dadhātī</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svasti mā parāyaṇah (?)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svasti mā punaḥparāyaṇah</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**havyāvāḥ juhvaśyaḥ** 2.7

havyā devoṣu no dadhāt 5.1

insacayati janayanta praśastam 6.1

hirānmayāmaratah tat śītaḥ nāḥ 2.5

hirānmaygarbhaḥ 4.3; 6.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ajā</td>
<td>5.2, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abj</td>
<td>3.9, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atithi</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atipatti</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atipanna</td>
<td>2.2, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atipāta s. kāla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atirētra</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atiṣṭa</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atharvan</td>
<td>3.2, 4.6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atharvaveda</td>
<td>1.1, 6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ apl</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhatupūrvadhana</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adāhpurāṇa</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adariṣaṇa</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aniti</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adugdha</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adobarṣiṣa</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adoga</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adbhuta</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adya</td>
<td>2.2, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhas</td>
<td>2.2, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhastat</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhi</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhipati</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhīṣṭa</td>
<td>2.9; 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhyadhī</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhyāyaṇa</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhyātma</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhvaryu</td>
<td>1.2, 2.6; 3.4, 5, 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anagni</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anagnirgha</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
udaka 2. 5.

udakapīḍa 2. 5.

udāgarvāk 6. 6.

udatantu 1. 3.

udapātra 2. 4.

udayaniya 3. 3.

udumbara 5. 6.

udgātār 1. 2; 3, 4; 5, 1, 5.

umita 3. 3.

umnetar (?) 6. 5.

umma 3. 1.

upacāra 3. 5.

upacārabhaksaprāyaścitti (?) 3. 5.

upatapa 3. 9.

upatipin 2. 9.

upadīkaśa 3. 9; 6. 7.

upārsaya 3. 2; 6. 3.

uparuddha s. rudh + upa.

upala 5. 6.

upavasatha 3. 2.

upavēśa 6. 6.

upasad 3. 1.

upasamaddha 3. 1.

upāsthāma 4. 4.

upāśavantaryāma 3. 2; 6. 6.

upākṛta 2. 9; 5. 5.

upāyana s. vrato.

ubha 4. 4.

ūma 1. 3.

udhas 2. 4.

ūru 3. 1; 6. 7.

ūrj 5. 6.

ūh + nis 1. 3.

rē s. arddhārca; tṛc; 1. 2, 5; 2.

1. 4, 6, 9; 3. 4; 4. 1.

rīṣa 3. 3.

rū s. tadahartan.

rtvīj 1. 2; 2. 6; 3. 9; 6. 4, 7, 9.

rūddhi 1. 5.

rābha 5. 6.

ekakāpāla 2. 8; 4. 1, 4.

ekatāntra 3. 9.

ekāhāyana 4. 1.

ekāgni 1. 1; 2. 9; 6. 9.

ekādāra 3. 7.

ekādaśakāpāla 3. 10.
ekānatisipāh (7) 6. 8.
ekha 3. 9.
ekaika 6. 5.
edha 3. 8.

aṇḍra 2. 1; 3. 3; 10; 4. 1.
aṇḍrayāva 6. 7.
aṇḍrāgna 3. 1, 3.
aṇḍrābhaṣaptāya 3. 3.
aṇḍrāvarana 3. 3.
aṇḍrāvaśaya 3. 3.

odana s. brahma* 4. 1.
osaḍhi 3. 2; 5. 6; 6. 4.

aṇṭaravedika 6. 1, 2.
sudumbara 6. 1.
sudgātra 3. 4.
supavasāthiya 2. 9.

kahubha 3. 3.
katham 1. 1, 5; 2. 3, 8, 9; 3. 5, 7, 8.
kapāla s. eka*; ekādaśa*; catuh*;
trayodaśa*; tri*; dvādaśa*;
dvi*; nava*; sapta*; 4. 1; 6. 2.
kam 6. 4.
kara s. kṛṣṭa.
+ āpa + a 4. 1.
+ āpa + a s. upakṛṣṭa; 2. 9;
4. 2; 6. 6, 8, 9.
+ abhi + āpa + a 6. 3.
+ paryagni 2. 9.
+ puna 1. 1.
karpā 5. 2.

karan a. avadāna*; àsanna*;
yajamāna*; 1. 1; 2. 5, 6; 3. 5,
6. 8; 4. 2.
karmaviparyaya 3. 4.
karmaśa 2. 5.
kulas a. tat*; soma*; 6. 4, 6.
kalpa s. kṛpta.
+ āpa 2. 5.
kalpa s. acaṣṭam*; nitya*.
kavyavāhama 2. 9.
kākṣ + a 1. 1.
kāpya 3. 5, 8.
kāma s. vāksya*; 3. 9, 10.
kāmasukta 2. 5.
kārīn a. soma*.

kārya s. yathā*; 1. 3.
kāla s. nityahoma*; bhakṣa*;
varttamāna*; 3. 6.
kālātipāta 5. 3.
kuncit 3. 8, 9; 6. 1, 4.
kim 2. 2, 3.
kṣant 3. 6.
kāvupana 2. 6; 4. 1, 3.
kṛttaśastotra 6. 7.
kṛtya 6. 7.
kuśala 2. 9.
kṛta 2. 2, 3; 3. 10.
kṛṣṇanta (?) 6. 4.
kṛṣṇa 6. 2.
kṛpta 6. 8.
kṛpti 3. 8.
keśāmātra 3. 7.
kratu s. sarva*; 6. 4.
krām + ati 3. 9.
+ āpa (?) 6. 4.

kṛṣṇapa s. soma*.
krī 3. 1; 6. 4.
+ pari s. parikṛta.
krīta 3. 1; 6. 4.

kritasoma s. a*.
kuśa + pra 2. 5; 5. 2.
kuśāma s. vi*; sarva*; 2. 1.
kṣamavati 5. 5.
kuśāmant 2. 1; 5. 4.
kṣīrārī 3. 3.
kuśodihā 5. 3.

khyā + vi + a s. vyākhyāta; 1. 1;
2. 9; 3. 1, 6; 6. 1.
khyā + pari 3. 1.
+ pra 2. 4.
+ sam+ pra 2. 4.
+ pra + sam 3. 6.
+ prati s. pratīkhyāta.

gaṇa s. ahar* 3. 3.
gam 6. 5.
+ adhi 2. 4, 9.
+ anu s. anagata; 1. 5; 3. 9
4. 3; 5. 1, 3; 6. 1.
+ a s. agra.
+ a 2. 4; 3. 5; 6. 8; 6. 7.
+ āpa + a 6. 8.

5 gar 1. 5.
gatha s. hiranya*; 2, 5.
2 ga 3, 8.
+ ud 3, 10.
gayatri 5, 6; 6, 6.
garhapati s. ahavanlya*; 1, 1, 3; 5; 2, 3; 3, 4, 8; 4, 1, 4; 6, 1.
garhapatatalaksana 5, 1.
garhapatayya 2, 3.
gusita 1, 5.
ghra s. agni*; 1, 1; 5, 4.
grapati 3, 9.
gbhitu s. catur*; 2, 5.
go 2, 8; 5, 5, 6.
gotri 3, 7.
gopaysa 3, 5, 8.
gaurivita 6, 6.
granthi 2, 9.
graha s. garbha; caturghrita;
sampkradhisayam; 3, 9; 6, 2, 3, 7, 10.
+ ud 3, 2; 6, 1.
+ pari 4, 1; 6, 6.
graha 6, 3, 7.
grama 2, 7.
grayya 2, 7; 5, 4.
gravan 6, 3.

ghra + abhi 2, 1, 9.
garbadgha 2, 4.
gbhta 4, 1.

cakṣ + a 2, 2, 3.
+ pari 5, 2.
cakṣas 1, 2.
catuḥkapāla 4, 1.
caturghrita 1, 5; 2, 3; 6, 8.
catuḥśarīva 4, 1.
candramās 3, 4, 10; 5, 3, 6.
cam + a 2, 9.
camaś 3, 6; 4, 3, 7.
car + abhi 2, 9.
+ pari 2, 9.
+ pra 6, 5; 9, 4, 1.
+ anu + pra 4, 1.
carma 1, 2; 4, 4; 5, 1, 3.
carsthā 1, 3.
candramasa 3, 4.
carin 3, 7.
 ci + vi 3, 1.

jit + sam 6, 2.
citvāryapattyas (?) 3, 5.
cinti 3, 8.
1 cya 1, 5.

ehad + anu (?) 3, 7.
ehuva 3, 1, 2; 5, 6; 6, 6.
ehāya 1, 1.
chit + pra 6, 1.
+ vi s. vichinnā; 2, 1, 10;
5, 1; 6, 5.
+ abhi + vi 6, 9.
chedana 6, 9.

Jan 2, 9; 5, 2, 5.
junapada s. samānā*; 6, 1, 4.
japa s. bhakṣa*; 2, 9; 6, 9.
jarumāya 3, 6.
jāgata 2, 9.
jāṅgala 3, 10.
jānu 1, 3.
jāmin (?) 6, 8.
ji s. aparājita.
jiv 3, 6, 9.
+ ati 2, 9.

jā 3, 8.
+ anu 6, 6.
+ a s. anajñata.
+ pra s. prajñāta.
+ vi 3, 8; 6, 6.
+ sam 3, 2.
jyotiṣmānti 2, 7; 5, 1, 4.
jyotis 1, 5; 3, 4.
jval + pra 2, 5; 3, 7, 8.

tanḍula 5, 3.
tanḍulabhāva 5, 3.
talkaṇāsa 6, 6.
tatrasta 3, 10.
tadhartan (?) vgl. aha; pta; 6, 8.
taddravatya 3, 3.
tādḍalavatya 6, 8.
tadrūpa 2, 9; 5, 5.
tadvṛpa 2, 9; 5, 5.
tan 1, 5.
+ sam s. samānta; 1, 3.
tan tự s. soma*; 6, 8.
tantu s. uda*.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit Word</th>
<th>Pāli Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dārā + abhi + udānabhuddṛśa; dṛṣṭabhuddṛśa</td>
<td>dārāpūruṣamāsa 5, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dasārastra 3, 7.</td>
<td>dasāharvika 5, 6, 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>das + upa 6, 3, 5.</td>
<td>dah 2, 9; 3, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ api s. apiḍagdhā.</td>
<td>+ api s. apiḍagdhā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ava 5, 1.</td>
<td>+ sam 2, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dahana 6, 9.</td>
<td>dahana 6, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 dā + + a 6, 5, 9.</td>
<td>1 dā + a 6, 5, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ vi + a s. vyātta; 2, 9</td>
<td>+ vi + a s. vyātta; 2, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 dā + ava 2, 9; 5, 5.</td>
<td>3 dā + ava 2, 9; 5, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>datar 2, 9; 5, 3.</td>
<td>datar 2, 9; 5, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dācūmya 6, 5.</td>
<td>dācūmya 6, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāva 2, 7; 5, 4.</td>
<td>dāva 2, 7; 5, 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāśya (?) 6, 4.</td>
<td>dāśya (?) 6, 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divya 2, 7; 3, 1; 5, 4; 8, 10.</td>
<td>divya 2, 7; 3, 1; 5, 4; 8, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dīśa s. pratidīśam.</td>
<td>dīśa s. pratidīśam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ mnu 2, 9.</td>
<td>+ mnu 2, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ pra 2, 9.</td>
<td>+ pra 2, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dīksa + upa s. upadīkṣā; 6, 7.</td>
<td>dīksa + upa s. upadīkṣā; 6, 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ sam s. saṃdīkṣita.</td>
<td>+ sam s. saṃdīkṣita.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dīksa s. avāntara; 3, 1; 6, 8.</td>
<td>dīksa s. avāntara; 3, 1; 6, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dīksāvāntvā (7) 6, 4.</td>
<td>dīksāvāntvā (7) 6, 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dīksita 2, 9; 6, 1, 7.</td>
<td>dīksita 2, 9; 6, 1, 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dip 5, 2.</td>
<td>dip 5, 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ a 2, 5.</td>
<td>+ a 2, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>durita 6, 8, 9.</td>
<td>durita 6, 8, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dūḥāritī 4, 1.</td>
<td>dūḥāritī 4, 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 dvā 4, 1.</td>
<td>1 dvā 4, 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dveṣa s. abhakṣa; 2, 8; 4, 2.</td>
<td>dveṣa s. abhakṣa; 2, 8; 4, 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duḥ s. adugdha; adudugdha;</td>
<td>duḥ s. adugdha; adudugdha;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 8; 2, 4; 4, 1.</td>
<td>1, 8; 2, 4; 4, 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dūrvāja 6, 10.</td>
<td>dūrvāja 6, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drīhā 5, 5.</td>
<td>drīhā 5, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dṛṣṭa 2, 3; 6, 10.</td>
<td>dṛṣṭa 2, 3; 6, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dṛṣṭabhuddṛśa 2, 2.</td>
<td>dṛṣṭabhuddṛśa 2, 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deva 2, 6; 5, 6; 6, 10.</td>
<td>deva 2, 6; 5, 6; 6, 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devāsās taddhāvatya; taddaijavatya; yaddevatya; vīgavṛunadvatya;</td>
<td>devāsās taddhāvatya; taddaijavatya; yaddevatya; vīgavṛunadvatya;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 2; 4; 6, 6.</td>
<td>3, 2; 4; 6, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devatāntara 4, 1.</td>
<td>devatāntara 4, 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devaśavatāya 6, 1.</td>
<td>devaśavatāya 6, 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devaśavatāya 4, 1.</td>
<td>devaśavatāya 4, 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devolokā 3, 8.</td>
<td>devolokā 3, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devaprajñ 3, 8.</td>
<td>devaprajñ 3, 8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dhana s. adattupūrva.
dhar cf. har; 1. 2.
+ ud 5. 1; 6. 7.
dhavanīya 3. 3.
dīśa + abhi s. abhīhitā.
+ aya 5. 1; 6. 1.
+ vi + aya s. avyavhitā.
+ a 5. 2; 6. 2.
+ anu + a s. anvādhāna.
+ abhi + a 2. 5. 9; 4. 3. 6. 6.
+ pari + a 2. 9.
+ pra + a 2. 9.
+ vi + a 2. 9.
+ upa + sam + a 2. 5; 4. 4.
+ ni 1. 1; 3. 3. 5. 8; 6. 7.
+ upa + ni 6. 7.
+ pra 6. 1.
+ prati s. rakmapratīhitā.
+ vi s. vihitā.
+ sam 3. 1; 4. 1; 6. 8.
dhār + abhi 1. 3.
dhiṣṭa 3. 2.
1: dhā 2. 9.
dhenu 3. 2; 5. 5; 6. 2.
dhruva 6. 3.
dhvānka 2. 6.

nakṣatra 5. 6.
nakha s. loma.
nama 2. 9.
nava 2. 4.
nakakapsāla 2. 8.

naś s. naśta.
nāśa 2. 8; 4. 1; 6. 4. 5. 9.
naḥ s. samaddhīdhambarhis.
+ upa + sam s. upasamaddha.
nādeya 5. 6.
nānakṛttra 3. 9.
nārāṣāpa 3. 3; 6. 5.
nīgama s. brahmāna.
nītya 1. 2; 2. 1; 2. 3. 4. 7; 8; 6. 4.
nītyaśāla (7) 6. 8.
nītyāhomakala 2. 1; 5. 1.
nīdhana s. vaṣṭākāra; 6. 4.
nībhūtāpūr (7) 3. 3.
nīyatavrata 3. 7.
nīyatva 2. 9.
nīrmastha 3. 7; 5. 1.
nīvatpānpabhyti 4. 1.
nivṛtta 6. 2.
nivṛtti 6. 8.
nīś 4. 4.
+ ni s. api 3. 2; 6. 3.
+ ud s. umūta 3; 2; 3; 6; 5. 1.
+ ni 2. 4; 4. 1.
+ upa + ni 1. 5.
+ pra 1. 5; 2. 5; 3. 1; 5. 3; 6. 1.
+ anu + pra s. anuprahitā.
urucakāsa 3. 3.
nyagrodha 5. 6.
naya 6. 8.
nuṣṭa 3. 1.

paṇca 1. 1; 2; 2. 4; 5. 6; 6. 5; 8.
paṇcabadakaśpa 6. 4.
paṇcāśāra 4. 1.
paṇcājaya 2. 9.
paṇcāyakti 3. 9.
1 paṇ 3. 1.
pat + ut 4. 2.
+ ni 2. 6.
+ sam + ni s. samprapti.
+ pra s. prapati; 2; 6; 9; 5. 5; 6. 1.
patatrina 5. 6.
pata 2. 6; 4. 2.
pārīnāma (7) 3. 8.
2 path 5. 3.
pathikrt 2, 3, 8.
pad + ati a, atipanna.
+ av a, avapanna; kijasa-
panna.
+ a 1, 3; 2, 1, 3, 8.
+ vi + a 2, 1; 3, 4, 10; 4, 2;
6, 5.
pada 5, 2.
pannejana cf. pannnejant.
payas 2, 8; 6, 7.
pur 2, 9.
purak 5, 3.
purasa 5, 3.
purakrita 6, 4.
purakhyata 3, 1.
puradi bhihi*; antahpari-
dhidaesa.
parima 6, 10.
paro 4, 1.
paryagukryta 3, 2.
paryuka s, ratri*; 3, 3.
paryan 5, 4.
paryam (?) 2, 9.
pavaman 6, 4.
pavitra 3, 3.
pai + para 5, 2.
pas 1, 1; 2, 6; 3, 1; 2, 3, 10; 5, 5, 6.
pasanga 5, 5.
pasubandha 2, 9; 3, 10.
pasurupaqa 6, 1.
pasuytha (?) 8, 1.
pascita 1, 2; 2, 3, 9; 3, 10; 5, 1.
p a, apita; pitapita.
paksagnim (?) 6, 8.
papi 5, 2; 6, 7.
patra s, purana*; 3, 3, 7.
patramiyoga s, mrty*; 3, 6, 7, 8.
pathikrt 2, 2.
pathikrt 3, 10.
pathikrt 6, 3.
pada 5, 2.
pannejan 6, 5.
papman (m.) 1, 1, 5.
parya 3, 3.
parthiva 6, 10.
palastrasara l, palastrasari (?); 3, 8.
pingala 5, 8.
pinda s, sakrt*.

pitar 3, 3; 5, 6.
pitdevatyai 3, 2.
pitmedha 2, 8, 9.
pitroka 3, 8.
pitriya 2, 5.
pipasa s, asana*.
pita s, a*.
pitapita 6, 6.
pata s, asthi*.
putra 3, 9; 5, 5; 6, 7.
punar 3, 6; 6, 4.
pumarjita 4, 2.
punashamasya 5, 6.
purastati 2, 2; 9; 5, 3; 6, 4, 6, 7.
purastadhama 1, 2; 2, 1, 2, 3, 4
7, 8, 5, 1.
pura 6, 1, 4.
purasma 5, 2.
purasavidhi 6, 8.
purasakrti 3, 8.
puridasa 1, 2; 2, 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 3,
19; 4, 1, 2; 5, 3, 4; 6, 9.
1 pa, s, anupata; upatma; an-
patala.
+ ut 1, 5; 2, 3.
pukhar 3, 3.
pukka 6, 4.
purapastra 4, 2.
puramamsa s, darapurnamasa.
purahuti 5, 6.
pusa 3, 1.
prthiqt 3, 1, 4.
prasadiva 5, 5.
prthita 3, 3.
paurumasya 3, 10.
paurumasyamavaya 2, 2.
prakrti s, ya thaa* 3, 10.
prajapati 3, 1, 2; 4, 3; 6, 8.
prajnata 2, 9.
pratikhyata 3, 3.
pratidiism 6, 6.
praptipratisthatar 6, 1.
pratima 3, 1.
pratishta 4, 1.
prathara 2, 2, 3.
pratyak 2, 5.
pratyuci 1, 5.
pratham 3, 5(?); 5, 1, 5.
pradatar 2, 2; 5, 3.
prasabhasavatī 2, 5.
prapatīta 2, 9.
prabhusa 6, 10.
prabhūtyā sa. aṅgaś.
prasmā 3, 1.
prasmukha 6, 7.
pravajī 2, 6; 3, 3; 4, 1.
prayuktā 6, 10.
pravara 3, 3.
pravargya 6, 8.
pravāsa 2, 8.
pravṛttā 3, 9, 10; 6, 2, 3.
pravvyā 2, 9.
prasiddhasa. 1, 3; 2, 9.
prastotara 6, 9.
prāk 6, 8.
prākṛta 2, 4; 3, 10.
prākūrā 2, 5.
prākumka 1, 3.
pracīna 4, 3.
pracūṣītītā 6, 7.
prānc 1, 5; 2, 6, 7; 3, 5, 9; 5, 1.
prāpa 1, 1, 2, 5; 2, 3; 3, 2; 4, 1; 5, 6.
prapajña 6, 6.
pratā 1, 2; 4, 3.
pratāpanuvikā 3, 2; 6, 6, 8.
pratāparāśa 4, 4.
pratāratati 4, 4.
pratārūḍha 2, 1; 4, 1.
pratārūḍhastāma 4, 1.
pratāsāvama 3, 3; 6, 4, 6, 9.
prādeśā 4, 1.
prāyaṣṭya 3, 1, 3, 8.
prāyaṣṭita s. sarvaś; 1, 1, 3, 3, 8; 5, 1, 5; 6, 9, 10.
prāyaṣṭitaaparakrama 6, 10.
prāyaṣṭiti s. upacārābhakṣaṇ(7); 1, 2, 3, 3, 5; 2, 1; 3, 8, 10.
prī 2, 3.
pi + abhi 2, 7; 5, 4.

phāṭkāraprabhṛti 6, 6.

bandh 1, 2, 2; 5.
barhi s. adobharhiṣa; samsa- 
ddhehomāś; 2, 6; 3, 2; 4, 1.
busta 5, 6.
bahisparidhi 4, 2.

bhāsparamāna 3, 3; 6, 1, 5.
bahis 2, 9.
bahu 2, 9.
baurūpa 5, 6.
bahuvid 5, 1.
bhūka 2, 9.
bhākapata ca. aindrāś.
budh + ud 4, 1.
+ ni 6, 10.
bhākapati sa. aindrābharapatasya:
3, 1.
brahmatva 3, 4.
brahman m. 1, 2; 2, 6; 3, 4; 5, 6;
6, 1, 5, 6, 7.
brahman n. 3, 3; 5, 6.
brahmahāli 5, 6.
brahnavrata 3, 1; 6, 8.
brahmaśūma 6, 3.
brahmanda 4, 3.
brahmapa 3, 7; 4, 4; 5, 1, 2, 6;
6, 6, 8.
brahmapa n. s. taikkātyā; vā 
jasaneyś; 2, 9.
brahmapangama 1, 1.
brahmaśabancin 3, 3; 6, 7.
brāhmapākṣa 2, 2.
brū + peri 6, 6.

bhāṣyā s. bhāṣyata; 3, 3, 5; 6, 3.
bhāṣyā s. a ś; upacāraś; 3, 3, 5.
bhāṣakula 3, 5.
bhāṣajī 3, 5.
bhāṣaṇa 3, 5.
bhāṣāṇya 6, 3.
bhāṣābhāṣāna 3, 5, 10.
bhāṣita 3, 3.
bhaga 3, 1.
bai + vi u. devatāvibhau- 
ktendra; 3, 3; 5, 3; 6, 7.
bhadra 3, 1.
bhaya 1, 3, 2, 4.
bhar 5, 2.
+ sam 5, 3.
bhāsman s. sabhasmaka; 1, 3; 2.
5, 6; 5, 1, 2.
bhāga s. aśyaś; samārāyaś; so-
maś.
bhāgadeha 3, 2.
bhāgini 2, 1.
bhānda s. yajñā-*
bhārundāsman 3. 8.
bhārgava 4. 1.
bhāryā 5. 5.
hīd s. bhinn; 6. 2; 5.
+kāya 4. 3.
bhinn 4. 1; 6. 5, 9.
bhuj 4. 4.
bhū + ann 5. 6.
bhūyas 1. 5.
bhedana 6. 9.
bhojya (?) 3. 10.
bhrān + vi 2. 5.
bhrātar 3. 9; 6. 7.
bhrārya 3. 2.

mani 5. 6.
1 math 2. 4; 8; 5. 2.
+nis s. nirvāmajña; nirvāmajónya.
madhyā (?) 2. 1.
madhyama 5. 3.
man + abhi s. abhimata.
manas 1. 1; 2; 3; 1; 5; 3; 6. 8.
manusya 5. 6.
mantra 6. 8.
mantray + ann 1. 5; 2. 4; 6. 2.
+ abhi 1. 3; 2. 5; 4. 1; 5. 5; 6. 3, 5.
mantrāvat 1. 3.
manthi 2. 4; 8; 3; 1; 5; 1; 2; 6. 1.
+nis 3. 8.
maṇḍhāri 3. 3.
maṇya s. sāma; dāru; devata; yava; loha.
mar 2. 9; 6. 7.
1 marj 3. 6. 7.
+ abhi + vi 1. 5.
marā s. jara.
mara + abhi s. abhimanyā.
mahā 6. 6.
mahāpāthikṛt 2. 3.
mahāvīra 6. 9.
mahendrā 2. 1.
3 mā 3. 1.
+ upa (?) 6. 1.
māpta 3. 8; 10.
madhyāndina s. sa; 3; 3; 6. 4; 6. 9.
mānusyaloka 3. 8.
māyā 6; 8.
māruts 3. 3; 5. 5; 6. 3.
mārjāra 3. 10.
mārjāltya 3. 5.
mārtikā 6. 5.
mās 3. 10.
mahīṣa 3. 10.
māhendrā 3. 1.
2 mi + pra 3. 7.
mātrāvarūpa 3. 2.
mithās 2. 7; 5. 4; 6. 1.
mithuna 3. 2.
mukha s. prāś; 3. 9.
mṛgākhara 6. 7.
mṛgāra 6. 7.
mṛpta s. śīrṣamṛpta; 2. 8.
mṛptastravinyoṣa 3. 8.
mṛtyu 1. 1.
mudha 3. 2.
mudhya 3. 8.
maitra 1. 2; 4. 4.
maitrāvarūpa 3. 3.
mogha 6. 8.
mōṇ + ā 4. 1.
+ sam + ā s. samāṇāta.
mīnce + abhi + ni 4; 4; 5. 1.

yaj s. yajamāṇa; 2. 9; 5. 5; 6. 4. 7.
yajamāṇa 1. 3; 2. 4; 9; 3. 5; 6. 1. 7.
yajamānakarman 3. 5.
yajamānāsana 3. 5.
yajas a. saṃśīja; 3; 4; 4. 1.
yajña 1. 3; 3. 1; 2; 3; 7; 6; 1; 4; 10.
yānabhaṇḍa 6. 9.
yājñāsandhindin 6. 8.
yājñāyudha 3. 7.
yāla s. vāg*.
yathukāryam 3. 6.
yathāprakṛt 6. 1.
yathārthah 2. 9.
yathālī̄gam 6. 5.
yathāvādam 3. 9.
yathāsaṃkhām 3. 7.
yathoktam 2. 4.
yaddevatya 3. 3.
yama 3; 2; 5; 5; 6.
yamastū 5. 5.
yava 5. 6; 6. 5.
yavamaya 5. 1.
lūgali 2. 2, 3.
lūga s. väha*.
1 iī + vi 1. 5; 2. 3.
lup + aya 5. 6.
lōka s. deva*; pītra*; mānusya*; 1. 3.
lōpa s. artha*; āhūti*.
lomanakha 3. 7.
lomānaya 3. 7.

rakṣa + upa 5. 8.
rakṣayāma 3. 9.
vās s. uktā; brāhmaṇokta; ya-thoktam.
vacasa 6. 4.
vajra 6. 6.
vadāva 6. 7.
vata s. aṅga*.
vad + ā 1. 3.
+ upa 2. 9.
vaniṇapati 5. 6.
vap 2. 6; 3. 7.
+ abhi 2. 2.
+ ā. 1; 2; 2. 1; 3. 4; 4. 6; 7; 8.
+ vi + vi 3. 4.
+ sam + ā 3. 7.
+ upa 2. 6; 5. 2.
+ ni s. nyūpta.
+ niś 2. 1; 3; 4; 5; 8; 9; 3. 4; 4. 1.
vapū s. vaṃśika*; 2. 5; 3. 2.
vam + vi 2. 5.
vār 6. 8.
vāra 6. 5.
vāraṇa 3. 10.
vāraṇa s. aindrāvarṣa; majtrī*; viṣṇuvarṣa*; 3. 1. 3.
vāraṇaḥ 6. 7.
vāraṇa s. tad*.
vārī + sam 2. 7.
vāram s. sampāraṇa*.
vāraṇa s. tad*.
vārī + ā s. vṛṣṭta; 1. 3.
+ abhi + ā 3. 3; 4. 2.
+ vi + s. vyāṛṛta; 6. 6.
+ ud 1. 5.
+ ni s. niṇṛṛta; 1. 3; 6. 2.
+ pari 5. 5.
+ pra s. pravṛṛta; 3. 9; 6. 2.
Wortindex.

viśvabhrīt 4, 3.
viṣama (?) a. ṣyena*.
viṣakarna 4: 3.
viṣṭa a. aindrāvaiguṇava 2: 2; 5, 3.
viṣṇuvarṇamdeva 1: 5; 6, 9.
visārjana 3, 2.
visṛṣṭa 3, 1, 2; 6, 8.
viśārṇa 6, 8.
viśīta a. viḍhī 3; 5, 5, 8.
viśīti 2, 7; 5, 4.
viṛṭi 2, 4.
viṛtratur 3, 2.
viṛṭrānas 2, 3; 3, 2.
viṛṭhāgni 3, 8.
viṣṇu 5, 6.
viṣṇo 5, 6.
veda s. atharva*.
vedana s. sarvavedasadakaśpa
vedi s. uttara*; 3, 1, 2.
vela s. vrata*.
veṣṭin 3, 9.
vairāmysītra 6, 10.
vaivīc 5, 5.
vaivādeva 3, 3.
vaivārupa 2, 6.
vaivānasa 2, 3; 3, 3; 4, 4; 5, 3.
vaiguṇa s. aindrā*; 1, 5; 3, 2, 3; 4, 1.
vaiguṇavant 6, 6.
vaiguṇavya 6, 1, 4, 6.
vatiyāsa s. ahuṭilopa*; yajyā-
vunākṣya*.
vaiṣkhyāta 3, 6.
vaiṣṭhra 5, 6.
vaiṣṭita 2, 9.
vaiṣṭiti s. cittaxyāpattyah.
vaiṣṭita 6, 5.
vaiśāḥiti 2, 4; 6, 8.
vaishva 2, 9.
vastra s. niyata*; brahma*.
vastrapatī 2, 4; 6, 4.
vastraabhrīt 2, 8; 5, 4.
vastravala 5, 4.
vastrapāya 5, 3.
vastrapatī 5, 5.
vaśī 5, 6.

sams 6, 6, 7.
śāpa + anu 6, 5.
śakuni 3, 10.
śakuni 2, 5; 3, 2.
sākṛtiṣṇa 2, 9.
sākṣa 2, 4.
sāma 6, 10.
+ uṣa 1, 5; 2, 5.
sāmya 5, 3.
īsār a. śiṅga.
+ sam 2, 9.
sarasāry 4, 3.
sarāva a. cutuḥ.
sātra 3, 8.
sātirādarāna 3, 6, 8.
śaśvat 1, 1.
śāstra 6, 8.
śāmitra 2, 9.
śālāmukhyā 6, 1.
śātu 2, 7; 5, 4.
śāpiṣṭha 2, 2; 3, 1; 5, 3.
śāpiṣṭhaṃvant 6, 4, 6.
śīras 6, 1.
śīṣ + uti 1, 3.
+ ut a. ucchīṣta.
śītā 6, 3, 5, 9.
śīryāma 2, 9.
śukrāśī 3, 3.
śucī 2, 7; 5, 4, 5.
śudrāṅgīhī 2, 8.
śeṣa a. kārma; 3, 6; 4, 2.
śuṣṭa a. kēṣa.
śyeṣa 2, 5; 5, 2, 6.
śyeṣavāpa 6, 6.
śrēpāta 1, 1.
śṛṇā 1, 3, 6; 2, 5; 5, 6.
+ dūṣ a. duḥśērīta.
śri + uñhi a. adhiśīta; 2, 9, 1.
+ 3; 8, 1.
śrī 3, 3.
śruta 5, 3.
śruti 3, 6; 8, 10.
śrutipatha 3, 6.
śreyāma 1, 1.
śrotriṣṇa a. uttarāvēdi; 3, 2; 6, 7.
śvetā 1, 2.
śloka 6, 10.
śvan 1, 3; 2, 5; 5, 2.
śravā 4, 1, 5, 1.
śvahauti (7) 6, 8.
śvetā 6, 7.
śaḍbhaviṣka 6, 7.
śaḍbhūtar 9, 10.
śga 6, 1, 2.
śpadāṅātri 3, 3.
śayatiṣara 3, 7; 6, 7.
śayatiṣaraḥ śiṅgārya 4, 3.
śayatiṣa 6, 6.
śayatiṣāna 4, 3.
śayatiṣātra 3, 6.
śayatiṣāthōma 1, 2; 2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8.
śayatiṣāvābhāga 1, 2; 2, 1—4, 6, 8.
śayatiṣāy 2, 1; 8, 6.
śayatiṣāu 3, 3.
śayatiṣāva 3, 6.
śuṣanāhiṣām (7) 4, 2.
śatāra a. samāsa; 3, 3.
śatāra 3, 9, 10.
śad 3, 6.
+ ava 3, 2.
+ a 3, 1, 10; 4, 2.
+ sam+ a a. saṃsāna.
+ ud a. uṣanā.
+ uṣa 3, 7.
śādarāha 2, 5.
śadā a. cutuḥ; 3, 1; 6, 3.
śaṃtāta 5, 4.
śaṃtēti 4, 3, 3, 2.
śaṃtila 6, 6.
śaṃdēsa 6, 6.
śaṃdēkāśā 3, 3.
śanḍātyāma 3, 1.
śaṃnaddhēdāradhēsa 3, 10.
śaṃnāpāta 5, 5.
śaptaśeni 2, 8.
śahāmaṣe 1, 5.
śaṃjasā 3, 5.
śaṃdēhāsa 1, 1.
śaṃdēhyāma 6, 4.
śaṃmā 5, 5.
śaṃsānuṣapāda 6, 6.
śaṃptya 6, 7, 10.
śaṃānāta 3, 8.
śamāya a. punah.
śamāropitāsamāropita 2, 8.
sthū + sam 1. 2; 2. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8; 5. 1; 6. 4.
sthāna = s. pratardhā; sāyam-dohā*.
sthālī s. cāru*; 4. 3; 6. 3.
sthālpašā 6. 9.
sthita = sam s. samathita.
sparś = sam 2. 8; 5. 1.
sprti 2. 9.
smar 4. 1.
surētihotrin 4. 4.
sru = svi 2. 5.
srne 1. 3.
sruva 3. 9; 4. 4; 5. 5.
svayamaththa 3. 6.
svar 3. 3.
svarga 1. 1, 3.
svisjakī 3. 9.

han 2. 9.
+ apa s. apahatapāpman; 1. 5.
+ ā 8. 7.
+ pari + nīs 2. 5.
har cf. dhar; 1. 2; 2. 9; 3. 2; 5. 1.
+ apa 2. 1; 4. 1; 6. 1, 4.
+ abhi 3. 1, 2.
+ abhi + ava 4. 1.
+ apa + ava 3. 2.
+ ā 2. 5; 3. 3; 7. 6. 4.
+ anu + ā 1. 1, 3.
+ vi + ā 5. 3.

har + ud 1. 1, 2; 2. 5; 5. 1; 6. 7.
+ abhi + ud s. anabhya-
dhyāta; 1. 1, 2; 2. 7; 5. 4.
+ sam + ud 5. 1.
+ abhi + upa 2. 9.
+ pari 1. 5.
+ anu + pra 2. 6; 4. 1.
+ vi 2. 8; 3. 7; 5. 2.
havirdhāna 3. 1; 6. 1.
havirbhūta 4. 1.
havīṣy (?) 5. 3.
havis s. dāśahariśka; sāddha-
viśka; 2. 1, 2, 3, 6, 9; 3. 2, 8,
10; 4. 1.
havasāhāna 2. 9.
hasta 3. 2; 4. 2.
2 hā 1. 5.
hi + pra 4. 3.
hita 3. 6.
hiriṣya s. sa*; 1. 2; 2. 5; 5. 1, 2.
hiriṣyagarbha 2. 5.
hu s. ardhaubhuta; ubhuta; ubh-
ita; ubhita; 1. 5; 2. 6; 3. 3; 10.
huta 1. 3; 2. 6.
ubhuta 6. 6.
hotar 1. 2; 2. 6, 8; 3. 4, 10; 4. 1;
6. 7.
hotrā 3. 3.
homa s. ājya*; 3. 5.
homakāla s. nitya*.
hastra 3. 4.
1 hrā + ā 1. 3.
Berichtigungen.

1. S. 73 Z. 8 lies statt dhārayed: dhārayed.
1. 5. S. 77 Z. 1 * cyavate71; cyavate.
   * Anm. Z. 3 streich: 79 A cyavante.
2. 2. S. 79 Z. 2 lies statt "jyāhavise-śtyā: "jyāhavise-śtyā.
2. 7. S. 89 Anm. Z. 19 lies statt vidyamāna: 'vidyamāna.
2. 9. S. 93 Z. 15 lies: pitṛmedha 282 |
3. 1. S. 94 Z. 13—14 lies statt brahma vratam: brahma vrata |
   letzte Zeile lies samrād āsandyām.
3. 2. S. 95 Z. 2—1 von unten lies nibhūyapūr śadhāvanīye.
3. 5. S. 97 Z. 18 lies statt ce' ty: ce' ty |
4. 1. S. 104 Anm. 618 lies statt bhūtaṃ: bhūtaṃ.
   * S. 105 Z. 9 lies statt upaśo: upaśo.
   * S. 106 Z. 4 lies statt om: om.
   * Anm. Z. 24 lies statt viparyāseno dvāsane: viparyāse 'muñḍrāsane.
   * Z. 63 * trarthīya: trarthīya.
2. S. 107 Z. 3 * vāhana: vāpyāse 'muñḍrāhane.
2. S. 108 Z. 32 * 'samkhya': 'samkhya-'.
2. Z. 44 * sunavāma-sama: sunavāma sama.
2. S. 109 Z. 21 füge hinter apy aga ein: gemeins ist yato jātāḥ |
   tato nyāpy avāṃ.
2. S. 110 Z. 6 lies statt 'āmika'-: 'āmika-'.
2. Z. 28 * jātavedā: jātavedāh.
2. S. 111 Z. 3 lies statt suprajās tvāmp: suprajātavāṃ.
   * Anm. Z. 5 lies statt sahaṃ: ahaṃ.
4. 2. S. 112 Z. 6 lies statt "gahi: "gahi.
   * Anm. Z. 18 lies statt "gūñdhrāḥ: "gūñdhrāḥ.
2. Z. 2 von unten lies statt nyāto: nyāto.
4. 3. S. 113 Z. 9 lies statt " śabdāyō: "śabdāyō.
   * Z. 12 * "dvāśitaṃ: "dvāśitaṃ.
2. S. 114 Z. 5 lies statt "prajāpater: "prajāpater.
   * Anm. Z. 17 lies statt "oben: unten.
2. S. 118 Z. 10 * "prajñāsy: "prajñāsy.
2. Z. 29 * "vīvādanaṭāḥ: "vīvādanaṭāḥ.
2. Z. 28 * "vṛtābhyo: "vṛtābhyo.
2. Z. 29 * "athā "pra": "athā "pra:.
2. S. 119 Z. 2 lies statt "saha: "saha.
   * Anm. Z. 21 lies statt "dātām: "dātām.
S. 120 Z. 2 * "havanīyāv: "havanīyāv.
   * Z. 7 * die: das.
17*
5. 1. S. 121 Anm. Z. 10 lies statt baddh[jeti]: baddheth[gemeint: badhyate].
   * * * Z. 18 * * * 'ddharaṇāpādīni: 'ddharaṇādīni.
   * S. 122 Z. 5 lies statt samṛād: samṛād.
   * S. 123 Anm. Z. 15 lies statt abhimāntaranāpādīni: abhimāntarāpādīni.
   * * * Z. 17 * * * samṛād: samṛād.
   * * Z. 21 * * säyam agnihotre: säyam-agnihotre.
   * * Z. 22 * * viśeṣā-bhidhānāt: viśeṣā-bhidhānāt.
   * * Z. 25 füge hinter Itarsācisminn ein: "lies wahrscheinlich: abutam iti 'tārasminn".
   * unterste Zelle lies statt kuryāt (!): kuryāt (!).
5. 2. S. 125 Z. 3 von unten lies statt dvipadāprāsidhy-": dvipadāprāsidhy-".
5. 3. S. 126 Z. 2 lies statt 'silcet: 'tiṣcet.
   * Z. 32 * * "-siddhy-": "-siddhy-".
   * S. 127 Z. 2 lies statt vāsam 321: vāsam 331.
   * Z. 6 * * anuprāṣṭyā: anuprāṣṭyā.
   * * Anm. 326: Dem hier gegebenen Rekonstruktionsversuch des Textes gegenüber ist es mir wahrscheinlich, daß wir statt upavaksāyet und avakhyāyas etwa avakṣāyet und avaksāyanē zu lesen haben, und daß śamyāḥ prāṇa parāśāc hinter den Mantra gehört, so daß die folgenden Worte zu übersetzen wären: "weem aber das Feuer, über einen Keulenwurf hinaus angeschwollen, erlischt, so möge er ihm nachgeben und sodann sich dort niedersetzen ... "; zu verweisen ist u. a. auf Kāṭh. 35. 17; T. B. 3.7.1. 3—4; eine eigentliche Rekonstruktion des Textes ist angesichts dessen ungewöhnlicher Verderbtheit ausgeschlossen.
   * S. 128 Z. 6 lies statt dadhāni: dadhāni.
   * Z. 7 * * dipivīśṭāya śīte prāg ukte: dipivīśṭāya śīte prāg ukte [.
5. 4. S. 129 Z. 4 lies statt saṅgiri: saṅgiri-.
   * Anm. Z. 19—13 streiche die Worte "unter" bis "verstehen", und setze an deren Stelle: "unter agnirhāḥ wären dann die Häuser zu verstehen, die sich auf dem Opferplatz befinden, aber nicht Feuerhäuser sind."
   * Z. 17 lies hindersamaṃvaye: a Dhātup. 4. 114 (Boehlingk).
5. 5. S. 130 Z. 1 dagnaye: agnaye.
5. 5. S. 131 Z. 16—16 (nabhihiṭa): (nabhihiṭa).
5. 5. S. Anm. Z. 2 praṇāyātān: jāyātān (wie Āp. S. 9. 17. 1).
5. 6. S. 132 Z. 14 vielmöglich Imperative plus "anas": "vielmöglich Imperative plus "anas";
   * möglich ist es auch, daß "pānaṃ" des Textes durch Fortfall einer Silbe aus 'pājāstamjahāna corrupiert und daß das Dyandva "stambhāna- "pānaṃ" eine grammatische Glosse ist.
   * * Z. 14 * * *o(l. 'nimitta-prāyaścittan') (l. prāyaścittan).
   * * Z. 22 * * smārṭavaj: smārṭavad.
   * * Z. 23 * * urddhvaṃ: urddhvaṃ.

6.2. S. 136 Z. 20 lies statt sthālti: sthält.

6.4. S. 137 Z. 14 * * upakrameranyan: upakrame 'ranyan.
   * * Anm. Z. 12 streiche: 'su'.
   * * Z. 14 lies statt krameranyan: krame 'ranyan.
   * * S. 138 * * Z. 23 * * prayoga: prayogas.

6.5. S. 139 Z. 12 lies statt nārāṣamsā(d): nārāṣamsād.
   * * Z. 14 * * iti saṁsūcet.

6.6. Z. 2 von unten lies statt vaśajaranṭuṣu: vaśajaranṭuṣu.
   unterste Textzeile lies statt stūyuh: stūyuh.

6.7. Anm. Z. 9 lies statt unuttā?: unuttād?

6.8. "letzte Zeile: gemeint ist prāthaśavanāc cet somo tiri-
cyeta... so richtig auch Pañca. Br. 9.7.
T. B. 1. 4. 5. 1.

S. 140 Z. 6 lies statt śākapālam: śākapālam.
   * Z. 9 * * saṁse[t]: saṁse[d].
T. S. 7. 5. 5. 1. T. B. 1. 4. 5. 6. 4. und Pet. Wb. n. prā-
taranuṣāka.

6.10. S. 141 Z. 13 lies: (samvatsare 1077 'sthīpyatuḥ 1077 maiddhyam 1089).
   * Z. 14 lies statt yājayet; samāpte samvatsare: yājayet (samāpte
samvatsare).
   * * Anm. Z. 17 lies statt "diyād: diyād.
   * * Z. 22 * * [']śavadvā [']śavadvā vā.
S. 142 Z. 1 lies statt savantiṃsyāḥ: savantiṃsyaḥ.
   * Z. 4 * * "daśa-haviṣyam", daśa-haviṣyam", und bemerke
unter dem Texte, daß diese Form eine Cor-
rectur der Masse ist.
   * Anm. Z. 3 lies statt erwähnten: erwähnen.

6.15. Z. 18 lies etwa: sparāhiṃkār cet pravargyas abhyastamiyaṭ.
   * Anm. Z. 9 lies am Ende der Reihe: l. taru-payasām?

6.19. S. 143 Z. 10—11 lies: prāthaśavanāc (madhyaṃdinaḥ savanam)
abhyastamiyaḍ.
   * Z. 13 lies: cet (āṭīya-) savanam.
   * * Z. 22 lies statt śrīvijāy: śrīvijāy.
S. 144 Anm. Z. 3 von unten l.: śāke [1789] raudranāmasaṃvatsare māṣa
māghe-.
Additions to Field from the Lyons Codex of the Old Latin.
— By Max L. Margolis, Professor in the Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa.

The following are Hexaplaric elements in the Old Latin of the first nine chapters of the book of Joshua (Codex Lugdunensis, edited by Ulysse Robert, 1900) hitherto unknown and therefore constituting additions to Field's monumental work:

5, 4—6 is presented by the codex in a composite text the constituent elements of which come from three recensions. Heavy-faced type indicates the recension with which the Latin ordinarily goes (r or ruf; see AJSL, XXVIII [1911], 4); Origen's plus (which was inserted in the Hexapla sub asterisco) is printed in Italics; Roman type indicates the text of B. Between Origen's plus and the B text there is an element which, as will be shown below, is derived from Symmachus; it is printed in Italics with the siglum σ in front. In the parallel column the Greek is printed as found in the sources pointed out except in the case of Symmachus where the Latin is simply translated back into Greek.

hoc autem modo purgavit Iesus filios Istrahel et hoc verbo quo circumcisa est omnis plebs quae exierat ex Aegypto masculi omnis viri bellatores mortui sunt in desertto in via exeuntibus ipsis ex Aegypto quia incircumcisa erat omnis plebs quae exierat et omnis plebs quae
fuerat in deserto in
15 via cum exierunt
ipsi ex Aegypto non
circumcisi erant

ś quia XL annis
habitantem filii
30 Istrahel in deserto
donec consummaretur
omnia plebs vironum
bellatorum qui exierunt ex Aegypto qui
25 non audierant vocem
Domini quemadmodum
autem circumcidit
Iesus qui aliquando
fuerant in itinere et
30 quia quando incircumcisi erant qui pro-
fecti erant ex Aegypto
omnes istos qui pro-
fecti erant circumcident
35 Iesus XL enim annis
conversatus est Istrahel
in deserto idoque incircumcisi erant illo-
rum plurimi viri bel-
latores qui exierant
de Aegypto qui non
obaudierant praeceptis
Domini quibus et definierat etc.

nußentes e in tis erum e

νας τῶν ἐξελοῦντων

αυτῶν εἰς Αἰγυπτον

ἀν εἰς Ἰσραήλ

e νας στὰ στῆ

ἐκδημαίναν οἱ υἱοὶ

Ἰσραήλ εἰς τῆς ἐρήμου

παῦ δὲ λαὸς ἄνδρες

tολεμαίται οἱ ἐξελοῦντες εἰς Αἰγυπτον οἱ

μη ακουσσάντες της φωνῆς

Κυρίου | ὥς τε τρόπον

περικαθάρανεν

Ἰσραήλ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ισραήλ

οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἐγκοστο τοι τῆς ὁδος

καὶ οὐ οὐ τοῦτο ἀπερ-

τίμητο εἴη τῶν ἐξε-

ελοῦντων ἐξ Αἰγυπτον,

ταῦτα τούτων

περιεθέμεν

Ἰσραήλ τοῦ ἐπὶ καὶ δύο

ανεκτράσαν Ισραήλ

εἰς τῆς ἐρήμου τοῦ ἔδρας

διαπεριμερθεὶς οἱ εἰλα-

οί αὐτῶν τῶν μαχητῶν

τῶν ἐξελοῦντων

ἐκ γῆς Αἰγυπτον οἱ

ἀπεδράσαντες τῶν

εντολῶν τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν

καὶ διωμένη κτλ.

1 hoc autem modo] tontou to τρόπον (ο has the dative, comp.
4, 3 τρόπον εἰς for on τρόπον; 2, 2 τῆς νῦν εἰς for τῶν νῦν; 8, 9
τῆς νῦν εἰς for τῆς νῦν) a rephrasing of on de τρό-
τον B. ἦς presapposes. tontou de τον τρόπον | purgavit! Correctly
for περικαθάραν. but 1, 28 Χ. has circumcidit: E. Comp. περι-
καθάραν = ἦς De 30, 6 (a περιεθέμεν) and περικαθάραν τιν ἐκαθα-
ράν — ἥρυ ἥρυ Le 19, 23 (but ακροβυστίαν τιν ἀκροβυστίαν Μu-
τον sine nom. = Field). Nevertheless E employs in the sequel,
the grosser περικαθάραν | 2 filios Istrahel] tontou ὑπά, so B
omitted in Λ 1. 28. Not in ὌΜ | 3 hoc verba] Read hoc verbum. Observe the literalness: καὶ for δὲ and λόγος (comp. De 15, 2 εὐτερος ο λόγος: κ for εὐτερος το προστάγμα — sii Λ is error for sic — προστάγμα also 19, 4 but Ngon have πραγμα comp. πραγματεια III K 19, 15) for τροπος (comp. Nu 18, 7 

κατα τους τρόπους τον θεοστρατιον; De 1, 14 Ἐγνώριην ἀφοῦ πᾶν ὁ λαος | 8 mortui sunt] Λ read sederon without ο in front which rests on error | 11 incircumcisa] Read circumcisa | 14 fuerat] Λ read γενέσεις with one v | 19 habitaverant] οδηγησαν on the basis of οδηγησαν M w sine nom (the singular is inexact; in marginal citations the scribe is interested in the main point of difference, here the choice of the verb, but he is careless in details which he assimilates to the reading of the text, here the sing. Φ namely read Ἐκαστος Κυριωτερας. But Λ (that is his source) follows ὌΜ: Ἐκαστος Κυριωτερας. The verb comports with the diction of στ, comp. δισερβωσιν στ Jd 19, 8 (Barthez. στ) and II K 5, 9 | 21—24 done consummaretur omnis plebs vitorum bellatorum qui excierunt ex Aegypto] —στ ἄνθρωποι, ἦ λεξικα

Σμ correctly done back into Greek by Field (ἀναλωθη is merely a slip for ἀναλωθη). In the parallel rendering of στ likewise recorded in Σμ aem is not εξετασω but τελωθη. 

ειλετωθη is found in στ for Ἔβερ Μ i 7, 2; Ἡλεν Ex 31, 15 and the part, for Ἰλας Ἡ 15, 18; on the other hand τελωθηθαι = Ἔβ Νu 14, 33; De 2, 14, I K 16, 11; III K 14, 10; Ps 9, 7 (consummata sunt καθη); Je 14, 15 and τελωθηθαι = Ἔβ Νu 9, 29; similarly aem Je 44, 12 will go back to τελωθηθαι; — αναλωθηθαι for Ἔβ is found in στ elsewhere: Ps 72 (73), 19, also Ez 24, 10. 11, and in agreement with Φ Nu 14, 33, 35; 32, 13. With αδερς τελωθαι comp. στ Is 42, 13 anor τελοσις τουτον οτι. The telltale word is plebs = λαος; while Σμ has τινωθη both for στ and στ, Field is right in writing ὅντως in στ's rendition; ὅντως is rendered gens throughout Joshua 27 circumcidit] see above on 1. 1 | 28 τους τους ηι] see above on 1. 2 | 29 fuerat] Inadequate rendering of εγνωστο. Of the passages cited in the Concordance under γενωμαι for the passives of τη, we may eliminate the forms of the aor. pass. Where the single v may be orthographic, in some cases the inferior spelling is singular or restricted to a few codd. (comp. e.g. Ge 11, 28 Ax); but there remain the passages with
the aer. med. (comp. in the Pentateuch Ge 21, 9; 35, 26; 36, 5; 41, 50; 46, 20, 27; Le 25, 45; comp. also Ge 17, 17 genetrix Α and cursive) | 30 quia] Read qui—esse | 31 qui perfeci erant | Α obliterates the partitive construction; comp. Ε | 33 qui perfeci erant | Inner-Latin addition | 35 και διο | Om Α = ΕΕ | 37 τη μαθαρετοι | Om Α = Ε | idemque | Prob. = και δια τουτο | 38 illorum plurimi] = autem or πλεονει το | 41 de Aegypto | =Ε ανεπτυτω ρηΕ.

The net result is the rendering of σ' covering the greater portion of v. 6.

6, 11 According to the margin of the Syrohexaplaris Symmachus rendered the verbs in a future (imperative) sense, thus drawing v. 11 to the instructions in the preceding verses. Reminiscences of this conception are found in n 85*: απελθωσι κομνφθης and Α circumueat ... et feratur, but manus, then erroneously carried into v. 12: praecedant.

6, 20 tubis cornes looks like a doublet = τοις σαλπιγξι τους κερατοις. Comp. Judges 3, 27 tuba cornes = σαλπιγξι κερατην 59; 6, 34 tuba cornes = κερατων; 7, 8 tubas cornes comp. κερατοι σαλπιγξι 55, σαλπιγξι 54, 59, 75; 16 tubas = σαλπιγξι 54, 59, 75; κερατοι σαλπιγξι 55; 18 tuba = τη σαλπιγξι 54, 59, 75; 18 tubis = τοις σαλπιγξι 54, 59, 75; 19 tubis = τη σαλπιγξι 54, 59, 75; 118: 20 tubas = τοις σαλπιγξι 54, 59, 75; 22 tubis comp. = σαλπιγξι 54, 59, 75. — κερατην is found in this chapter frequently in Hexaplaric additions for τρΨ. The three use it in v. 9 and elsewhere.

9, 1 f. The Hebrew order according to which the building of the altar and the reading of the Law follow after 8, 29 instead of after 9, 2 as in the Septuagint was naturally adopted by Origen (ΔΘθθβς). The Latin follows its text (r) of the parallel recension which in this respect goes with the B texts. Nevertheless at the end of verse 35 (end of chapter 8 in the Hebrew) the Latin inserts a fresh translation of 9, 1 f. The parallel renderings may be presented here in juxtaposition:
ut autem audierunt reges amorrem qui erant ultra iordanen in montanis et in campis qui erant in fine maris magni et qui erant ab antelabum et chettei et amorrei et channanei et factum est ut audierunt omnes reges qui erant trans iordanen in monte et in secelat et in omnibus litoribus maris magni contra faciem libani chettaeus et fereaeus et encha-
et ferezei et euchaei et gergessaei et iebussaei et conve-
nerunt in unum expugnare
resum et istrael simul omnes

The text of the second version is defective in the Latin, several names having dropped out. But the literalness of the translation is unmistakable. Contrast the two versions in Greek:

καὶ εγενέτο ως ἐρχομαι πατες οἱ
βασιλεῖς οἱ περαν του Ἰορδανον εν
τω ορει καὶ εν τω παραλι της θαλας-
της της μεγαλης και οι προς τον
Ἀστιλβαναι και οι Χετταιαι και οι
Ἀμορραιοι και οι Χαναιαι και οι
Φερεθαιοι και οι Ευμαι και οι Γερ-
γοται και οι Ικαβουσαοι και συνελ-
θων εις το αυτο εκτολεμησαν Ἰσραηλ
και του Ἰσραιλ αμα πατες

In all likelihood, the source is Theodotion; comp. transliteration of πῆθε (elsewhere II Chron. 26, 10; Obad. 19; Jerem. 39 (32), 44; 40 (33), 13; I Maccab. 12, 38), the construction πολεμων μετα for βυν ἄνα (comp. 22. al. Jerem. 41
(48), 12), εν στοματι εις παν πα (comp. III King. 22, 13 where en B error for en; II Chron. 18, 12). Professor Torrey will prob. be right in deriving the version of Chronicles from Theodotion, that is a parte potiori.

9, 7 Ἰσραηλ αυτο Ἰσραηλ Λ. only, contrast Ἰσραηλ ῬοΕ, οι
υπο Ἰσραηλ Β. Comp. De 27, 14 παντι Γηλ Ῥ, ο παντι
ανδρα Γηλ α' Γηλ (προς) παντα ανδρα Γηλ, but Γηλ προς παντα οικοι Γηλ
(just as Judges 12, 1 in Εφρααι Α for ανν προς Εφρααι B); comp.
also Joshua 10, 24 where ανδρα was inserted by Origen sub asterisco. The literal rendering is found in Ῥ in Judges and Kingdoms; contrast ανδρει ιουδα in Jerem. (e. g. 4, 4), but 44
(51), 26, 27 ανδρει (ανου) sub Ῥ; Isaiah 5, 3. 7 writes ανδρωτος
tou iouá. In Chron. ανου (Γηλ) ΒΑ 20, 27; elsewhere om
omnes Β 24, 30 or om Β Π 5, 8; om Ι 10, 7; 16, 3; or
ανδρει in the pl. Π 13, 15, 15.
The Chronology of Certain Indo-Iranian Sound-Changes.

Sanskrit ē normally represents an earlier diphthong. The main elements of the peculiar development of final -ās in Sanskrit and in Avestan to -ē1 were solved by Bloomfield (American Journal of Philology, iii. 25—45) who demonstrated that the ē is here the descendent of an IE. ē whose quality had not yet changed to ā, and that this -ē for -ās was extended at the expense of the less common ē for -ē.

In some details, however, Bloomfield’s article must be corrected. He argues that the immediate precursor of aśvē dravatī was *aśvē dravatī, and that the -ē is the product of compensatory lengthening due to the loss of -z (from -z) before a voiced dental stop, just as -iz- and -uz- before voiced dentals result in ī and ā (Am. Journ. of Phil. iii. 27). But we have here to deal with two sets of phonetic changes of very different date: that of final -ās to -ē appears in Avestan (where -ē is extended to use in all positions, regardless of the following sound, except before certain enclitics), but compensatory lengthening of a short vowel before z or ẑ + d or dh is unknown in Avestan;2 thus Skt. mūḥa-, Av. mīḍa-; Skt. āūḍa-, Av. āūḍā(y)-. It is manifest, therefore, that the change which produced final -ē for -ās is not the same as that which produced the long vowel of mūḥa-. Rather, the history of final -ē is the following: Final ē before a pause became a sound similar to the Skt. visarga. This ē-sound

1 Wackernagel, Altind. Gr. i. 538 (with bibliography); Brugmann, Grundr. i. 388, and KVG., i. 284; Thumb, Handbuch d. Sanskrit, § 184 ff.; Reichelt, Avestisches Elementarbuch, 83.

2 Av. ēś-aḥī (āḥī) is not equivalent to Skt. śidati, cf. Brugmann, Grundr., i. 172; 504; Walde, Lat. Etym. W. 3, s. v. seco.
was then transferred to positions within the sentence, where before voiced stops a voiced ū resulted which was lost with compensatory lengthening. Thus "ūs became "ōh and then ō before voiced stops. The further extension of this final ō to other positions in the sentence and its substitution for "ē from "ēs has been treated in masterly fashion by Bloomfield (Amer. Journ. Philol., iii. 32—39), and needs no comment here.

It is important, however, that IE. ōs became Skt. ās and appears before voiced initials as ā, not as ō, while IE. ōs, though appearing in Skt. as ās, has the form ō before sonants. Similarly, in Avestan, IE. final ās, ēs, ōs appear as ā, while IE. final ēs, etc. appear as ō. This difference of treatment can be explained in only one way: The IE. long ā, ē became ā in primitive Aryan before the short ō, ē became ā. In the period intervening between the change of the long vowels and the change of the short vowels, the loss of ō before voiced stops produced ā, ē from the short final ās, ēs, and ā from the long vowel followed by ē. These new long vowels ā and ē were not subject to a further change to ā, since the law converting IE. ā, ē to Aryan ā had already ceased operating.

As to the lengthening resulting from the loss of ē or ē before ā or dh in Skt., it has already been remarked that this change does not appear in Avestan; thus Skt. nēdiyasts, Av. nāziyāh-. Skt. mēdha-, Av. myađa- etc. We have here ample proof that the quality of IE. ē was maintained distinct down to the time of this specifically Sanskrit change.  

2 On the debatable question whether the Aryan possessed such an ē (from -ēs) see Wackernagel, Allind. Gr., i. 338; Brugmann, Grundr. 3, i. 886, § 1005, 5, note.
3 Cf. the examples in Wackernagel, Allind. Gr., i. p. 37, § 34; p. 274, § 297, b, ū; Brugmann, Grundr. 3, i. 735; KVG., p. 545, § 710, 2; Joh. Schmidt, KZ. xxx. 60 ff.; Bloomfield, AJP. iii. 27 ff.
4 Seemingly exceptions like Skt. ādhāv for *ādhar- (from *ādhar-ter) have ā by analogy of the ā in other forms and derivatives. Cf. Bloomfield, AJP. iii. 30; Wackernagel, Allind. Gr. i. p. 38 (middle). § 84; p. 44, § 40.
That the quality of ā was similarly maintained can hardly be proved, since the final -ā received a great extension, even in the middle of words. But words with an original long vowel show consistently -ādh(h)-, never -ādh(h)- nor -ōdh(h)-; thus, sādhī, sāsādhi, cakādhi; ādhvam, sādhvam, ārādhvam; ādaghnā (for *ōs-ā, cf. Lat ōs). The conclusions are therefore:

1. That IE. ē, ē became ā in the primitive Aryan period before the loss of final -h before voiced stops.
2. That IE. ē, ē kept their quality until after the loss of final -h before voiced initial stops.
3. That IE. ē certainly, and IE. ē presumably, kept their quality until after the Indian loss of ē and ē with compensatory lengthening before voiced dental and cerebral stops.

For convenience the following chronological table of the changes is presented:

**Primitive Aryan Changes.**

1. Palatalization of gutturals by following palatal vowels and ē.
2. Change of IE. ē, ē to ā, becoming identical with IE. ā.
3. Loss of final -h before initial voiced consonants, giving new ē and ō.

---

1 The ē of *sād-dhās “sixteen”, *sū-dhā “sixfold” (Wackernagel, Alt-ind. Gr. i. p. 38, § 34, b) may be the result of such an extension. The post-vedic sōdhun, sōdhar- from the root sah is certainly an imitation of the Vedic sōdham from sah (Bloomfield, AJP, iii. 30). Vedic sōdham etc. (Skt. sākati, Av. svačiti, Lat. recili) cannot have IE. ē and must be due to some analogy; there are some parallel forms of this root with zero grade showing seh- from *uēdh-: ādhvam (by the side of vēdhvam). ādēhā (by the side of vēdha-), ādēhā and aēhā; a comparison with certain forms of ruh such as ruśdha- by the side of vēdham, ruśhā by the side of vēdhar- suggests a starting point for an analogy-formation.

2 Whitney, Skt Gr.3, § 166; Wackernagel, Alt-ind. Gr., i. p. 273, § 287, a, a; Brugmann, Grundr.i, i. 735, § 880, a. According to the rule (allowed by Pāṇini and required by the Prātiṣākhya), that the first consonant of a group be doubled (Whitney, Skt. Gr.3 § 229; Wackernagel, Alt-ind. Gr. i. p. 112, § 68, a) the spelling ādhvam etc. is frequent.
(Division into Indian and Iranian.)

Indian Changes.

1. Cerebralization of dentals by preceding cerebral sibilants.
2. Loss of z and ą before voiced dental and cerebral stops, with compensatory lengthening.
3. Change of IE. ē, ń to ā, becoming identical with IE. ā.

Iranian Changes.

1. Change of IE. ē, ā to ā, becoming identical with IE. ā.
The Peshitta Text of Gen. 32, 25.—By Richard Gottheil, Professor in Columbia University, New York City.

In preparing the final part of my edition of the second half of the glosses of Bar Ali, I stumbled over the following:

\[ 
\text{حَدِرَة} \text{العَسَرَة} \\
\text{الضَّمَّر} \\
\]

i.e. “The flank became torpid or benumbed”. The dictionaries try to explain the word \( \text{ضَمَّر} \), which evidently comes from the passage Gen. 32, 25, as from the root \( \text{ضَمَّر} \), to change, to be altered—adding “for the worse”, to be displaced, dislocated. So Mrs. Margoliouth in her Compendious Syriac Dictionary, p. 586. Audo, Dictionnaire de la langue Chaldéenne, II, 584:

\[ 
\text{ضَمَّر} \text{جَلَّة} \\
\text{رَمَي} \\
\text{جَلَّة} \\
\]

i.e. to become slack; to lose the power of speech through laughter; his leg or his hand lost its cunning.

But these meanings are all derived from the passage in Genesis in its faulty tradition. And yet that tradition is quite old. Not only is the reading found in the Mss. used by Le Jay for the Paris Polyglott and by Walton for the London Polyglott, and taken over by Lee in his reprint for the London Bible Society. It is also to be found in the Urmi Edition printed by the American missionaries. That these are based upon good Ms. authority, may be seen from the fact that the Jacobite seventh century Ms. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan reads \( \text{ضَمَّر} \), as does the excellent Nestorian Massoretic Ms. in the British Museum (Add. 12, 138 fol. 15b) of the year 899 A.D., which the Rev. G. Margoliouth has been kind enough to look up for me:

\[ 
\]

Bar Ebhraya, in his scholia to the passage, is careful to punctuate the word: \( \text{ضَمَّر} \), (See Uhry, Die Scholien des ... Barhebraeus zur Genesis Capitel 21—50, Strassburg 1898, p. 12); and in the sixteenth century Abhdisho
of Jazartā wrote in his heptasyllabic poem dealing with Syriac homonyms: סמאיעו ינשנ (Hoffmann, Opuscula Nestoriana, p. 68, 8).

Of course, the correct reading is ינשנ, ינשנ become weak, feeble, dehilitated, torpid; and this reading was not unknown in certain parts of the Syriac Church. The scholarly grammarians and writer Jacob of Edessa (seventh century) reads correctly ינשנ ינשנ (see von Lengerke, Commentatio de Ephraem Syro, p. 20)—a reading which has been preserved in another place by Bar Ali himself (ed. Gottheil p. 108, 6) and by Bar Bahül (ed. Duval, col. 1283, falsely punctuated ינשנ). I might add that Payne-Smith in his Thesaurus, though seemingly suspecting the reading (see cols. 1360 s. v. לְסֵמָא and 2471 s. v. לְשֵׁנָה), has listed the passage also s. v. לְשֵׁנ כol. 4233).

The accepted reading in the texts has not failed to lead scholars astray; which a signal proof how necessary a correct edition of the Peshitta is. Ball, in his edition of the Hebrew text for the Polychrome Bible (1896) p. 91, has the following note:

ינשנ ג' אֵכָּרְפֶּנִבֶר which became dumb. ג' thus renders ינשנ v. 25. Here ג' evidently read הנשנה and pointed הנשנה of.

In this connection I might mention the curious translation in the Polyglotts of the Syriac rendering for ינשנ ד' — לְשֵׁנ. They translate “nervum muliebrum” which they have gotten from a false punctuation of the Arabic rendering al-nasara “the sciatic nerve”—a common expression in Arabic medical works. They punctuate al-nasara!!—which Payne-Smith has also incorporated in his Thesaurus.
The Čāntikalpa of the Atharvaveda. — By G. M. Born- 
ing, Henry E. Johnston Jr. Scholar in the Johns 
Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

In the Transactions of the American Philological Association, vol. xxxv, 1904, pp. 77—127, I published with introduction, translation and commentary the text of the Čāntikalpa as found in the Chambers Codex. Weber's transcript of this codex was at that time the only manuscript readily accessible, but since then there has been a considerable increase of such material. In the first place, I have had the opportunity to collate the Chambers Codex itself, and also the British Museum manuscript (L) mentioned on p. 78 of my edition; while, furthermore, the University of Tübingen's publication of its catalogue of Roth's manuscripts has brought to light another copy of the text. Of this last manuscript a copy, made by a pupil of Professor Garbe, was very kindly secured for me by Dr. J. von Negelein, my collaborator in the publication of the Atharvan Pariciṣṭas.

From this new material the chief result, as regards the published text, is the corroboration of my opinion, that the text could be little improved by the collation of additional manuscripts. There are, to be sure, some gleanings,1 but the

---

1 The following seem worthy of mention: 1. 6 read punarvaso with L (cf. p. 90); Roth punarvasor — 2. 2. Roth uses forms of agleṣa here and 12. 2 — 3. 2. L.Roth rṣudkarmapranidhākī. — 3. 4. L ugratejasam. — 4. 4. Read: dhūrasiddhike; Roth reads -saṇḍhakī; L -saṇḍhakīm, but M has -saṇḍhakī or -saṇḍhakāṁ corrected to -saṇḍhakī or -saṇḍhakē. and from this I would restore (cf. p. 21) the normal form. — 6. 7. ima ṛṣi it refers to Āṅkīk. 1. 14. 1—6. — 12. 2 Roth phalgunibhyam. — 12. 3. Read: omāma, with L.M.Roth, — ibid. Roth abhhijitaya. — 14. 2 L viśnaikām itsyādayo; Roth * itsyādayor. — 15. 1. L.Roth slakṣyaapare. — 15. 3. l sa-
līma lomika; Roth balimam lomaka. — 17. 3. l (a)dbhutopradty-abhicā-
desa; Roth (a)dbhutopara-abhicāreṇa. — 17. 4. L jalabhaya-jalakṣayoh: Roth jalabhaye jalakṣayayya. 18. 1. The correct punctuation is athārvoke-
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main importance of the new material lies in a different direction. That the published text was incomplete, was suspected neither by myself, nor—as far as I know—by anyone else who has handled it. There was, indeed, no ground for such a suspicion. The colophon of the Chambers Codex gives no hint of it; the contents of the text, a description of the mahācānti and its preliminary naksatrâyāga, seem complete in themselves; and the tract begins with an abruptness no greater than the beginnings of several Pariśītās. Under such circumstances it was impossible to divine that the mahācānti required two other preliminary ceremonies—a propitiation of the Vināyakas (cf. MG. 2. 14) and a grahāyāga. Nevertheless, after giving a brief introduction, both the London and the Tübingen manuscripts proceed to give a description of these ceremonies, and then label this portion of their text the first chapter, or the first half, of the mahācānti.

Immediately after this new material (of which I now present an edition to the Society) follows in each manuscript the text already published from the Chambers Codex. Curiously enough this is not designated in either manuscript as the second chapter, their colophons being (like that of the Chambers Codex) simply: Roth, iti cīr atharvavede mahaścāntiḥ samāptaḥ (!), L iti mahācāntiḥ samāptaḥ (!). This might at first sight suggest the idea that the first chapter is a later addition. Such a belief—except as a possible theory about the ultimate sources of the text—will prove however to be untenable. Not only is the first chapter cited by Śāyana, but the Pariśītās, cf. xxiii b. 19. 3; lxx. 9. 3, juxtapose a grahāyāga and a naksatrâyāga in such a way as to show that their authors had the text with both chapters, and there is also a reference from the second to the first chapter. From this it follows that the Chambers Codex is incomplete. On account of its pagination it is best to regard it as the second of two volumes which contained the whole text.
With the full text of the Čāntikalpa we get a better insight into Sāyāna’s employment of the ancillary Atharvan literature. Beside the Kāṇḍikā and Vāitāna Sutras and the (probably no longer extant) Āṅgirasakalpa, Sāyāna cites the Čāntikalpa, the Nakṣatricalpha and various Parāṣēṭras from ii. 5, 5 to xxxiii. 7, 3, cf. the references given in our edition, p. 645 f. That Sāyāna’s quotations from the Nakṣatricalpha come in reality from the second chapter of the Čāntikalpa was first pointed out by Bloomfield, SBE. xlii. p. 233, and is proved in detail in my commentary. The source of the quotations from the Čāntikalpa was unknown, but now proves to be the first chapter of that text. That Sāyāna has simply blundered, is to my mind clear beyond the possibility of discussion, and I think it possible to explain the origin of his mistake. The Chambers Codex of the Parāṣēṭras is an edition in three volumes, containing respectively AVPar. i—the true Nakṣatricalpha, AVPar. ii—xxxvi and AVPar. xxxvii—lxxii. If we assume that Sāyāna had only a broken set, namely vol. ii., of such an edition, we can understand why his citations from the Parāṣēṭras are so limited and also his ignorance of the Nakṣatricalpha. He was however familiar with the tradition of the five kalpas, and as the second chapter of the Čāntikalpa began with an elaborate nakṣatrayāga, he identified this portion of the text with the Nakṣatricalpha of which he had no knowledge except the name.

TEXT OF THE ČĀNTIKALPA.

ōṁ namaḥ śrībrahmaśvedāya namaḥ

Omitted in Roth. L. ōṁ nome.

1. ōṁ mahāçāntiṁ pravakṣayami yāṁ prāpya mahatīṁ çriyam |
   brāhmaṇañḥ kṣatriyaṁ vāpi vācyo vāpy upasārjati ||
   Roth çriyaḥ. L. brahmaṇaḥ; Roth brahmaṇa.

2. brāhmaṇañḥ sarvakāmāpiṁ kṣatriyaṁ prthivijayam |
   sarvatas tu samṛddhiṁ ca vācyah samadhibachāti ||
   Roth samṛddhi bachāti.

3. divyam vā pārthivam vāpy āntarikṣam athāpi vā |
   mahāçāntiṁ çamayaty anyad vā bhayam utthitam ||
   Roth va. L. pārthivāṁ. Roth çamayany. L. ucchitaṁ.

4. ārogyam arthaputraṁ çā 'namitraṁ tathāiva ca |
   saṁbhāgyaṁ ca samṛddhiṁ ca mahāçāntiṁ prayachati ||
   L. artham putraṁ; Roth numitra. Roth mahāçānti.
5. mahādevabhīmṛṣṭasya mṛtyor āsyagatasya va |
   grahaghorābhītapatasya mahācāntir vimocant || 1 ||
1. bhīṛṛṣṭasya. Roth ca. Roth vimocantm.

1. dānavāir abhīṃṛṣṭasya mahendrasya purā kila |
   mahācāntiṁ parirācāṁ bṛhaspatīr amanyata ||
Roth mahācāntī. I. vṛhaspatīr amanvata.

2. anayāṁ valagam kṛtyāṁ caṇkamānaḥ paraṁyaṁ |
   ichāṁ rddhiṁ samṛddhiṁ ca. mahācāntiṁ prayojaṁ ||
I caṇkṣaṁmañāṁ; Roth cīkṣaṁmañāṁ; perhaps caṇkṣaṁmañāḥ was intended.

3. payasaṁ samidhāḥ cānta yavān ājayāṁ prthak-prthak |
   rudrarudrāparārī mantrārī mahācāntīṁ prayojaṁ ||
I. pīyasāṁ.

4. cākabhakṣaḥ payobhakṣaḥ phalabhakṣo 'pi vā punaḥ |
   bhūtvā dvādaśāthram tu mahācāntiṁ prayojaṁ ||

5. bilvāhāraḥ phalāhāraḥ payasa vāpi vartayet |
   saptaraṭram ghrāṛṛt vā mahācāntīṁ prayojaṁ || 2 ||

1. saptarātram aṭo 'nyena vartayitvā yathāvidhi |
   mahācāntiṁ pravunjanaḥ payasaṁ vartayet sakṛt ||
I. yasyaścāt. L. pravunjanaḥ; pravunjita should perhaps be read.

2. kāmāṁ naksatrasaṁyogād anukūlam yādā bhavet |
   tadā karma pravunjītaḥ pahatya vināyakān ||
Roth kāmāṁ.

3. karmasiddhār mahāyogī īṣṭayuktāḥ samāhitāḥ |
   bahiḥ karma pravunjīta karmaśiddhitam avāpyyāt ||

4. āmnaye kāmikā maṇtram prajñātāḥ syuḥ prthagyidhāḥ |
   āvāpe tān pravunjīta prathamaṁ tantram isyate ||
Roth āmnaye. Roth maṇtra. I. Roth prajñāṁ. Roth -vidhā. With pada ḍ begins a dittography of one čloka in I.

5. balayaḥ cānu karmaṇi jyā căivānu devatāḥ |
   haviṣa ca pravunjītā jyena manaseti ca || 3 ||
I. Roth maṇayaḥ. Roth yā for jyā. I. manaseti; Roth tāmaseti (not clear).

1. nir lakṣaṁyam iti
1. lakṣaṁya. AV. 1. 18. 1.

2. cātvāraḥ khalu vināyakaḥ bhavanti ||
Quoted by Sāyaṇa at 7. 118. p. 542.
3. ċālakātāṅkaṭaḥ ca kūśmāṇḍarājaputraḥ cotsmrtaḥ ca devaya-
janāca cety
I. ċālakā-. 1. rājaputraḥ. MG gives third name as: utamita.
4. cetaśāni samanvāgatānām imāni rūpāṇi bhavanty
5. apāḥ svapne kāluṣaḥ paṣyati sarpāṇ paṣyati mundaṃ paṣyati jāṭilāṃ paṣyati kāśayarāsasah paṣyati bastiṇāḥ paṣyanty antarikṣaṇam sthānām caṅkramaṇam iva manyate dīvaḥ patanām iva manyate 'dhvānaḥ vrajan manyate pṛśthato mā kač cid anuvrajatī prāṣādārohaṇam an-
tarīkṣāt kramaṇam ity.
6. etaiḥ khalu vināyakāir grhitā rājaputraḥ rājyakāma rājyaṁ na labhaṁ kanyāḥ patikāmāḥ patiṁ na labhaṁ strīyaḥ putrakhāmāḥ putrān na labhaṁ hrotriya adhyāpākā ācā-
ryatvān na labhaṁ 'dhyetānām adhyayanānā mahāvī-
giṇakarāṇi bhavantī kṛstāṇi kṛsir alpaphala bhavati vani-
jāṁ vāpiyam alpaphala bhavati
I. rājaputraḥ. I labhaṁ. Roth omitā: kanyāḥ ... labhaṁ. I Roth kṛṣṭāṇa. I Roth bhavanti vanijāṁ.
7. tatra prāyaçaıttaṁ || 4 ||
1. mrgākharat kulaś kulalamaṛṭtikā guggulu vṛṣabhacarṇa ro-
caṇāḥ sarvabjāni sarvaratnāṃ upahṛtya
1. mrgākharākroḍā kulalamaṃṭṭikā (mr being inserted). I. Roth guggula. I. vṛjaṁ. I upahāṭya.
2. puradvārad vaṁtkad adhidevatavyayā rājānganaḥbhyaḥ ca
mṛṭṭikā mahāsarpıṣ ca
I. puraḍhāraḥ vaṁkād. I adhidevatavayayā-. Roth adhidevanavayaya-. lengthening in dual empl., but prob. read -veṣa-. I. rājāṅganaḥbhayaṁ. I mṛṭṭi. Roth -sarpıṣ. I Roth carry the samahkī over to next sentence.
3. etan samābhārān samāḥṛtya
Roth etaiṁ.
4. pavane kṛtvā
5. grāmacatuspate nagaracatuspathe vā vṛṣabhacarmāṣṭriya
I. vā vā paśhabhāν.-
6. tatraśāni svāpayet pāvamaṁbhiḥ || 5 ||
Roth tatratāṁ. I. pāvamaṁbhiḥ.
1. pavitraṁ cāṭadharāṁ <yad> rśibhiḥ pāvana∯<u> kṛtam |
tena tvāṁ abhiśiñeśāmī pāvamāṁiḥ punantu tvā ||
I. omits. See Bloomfield's Vedic Concordance.
2. yena devaḥ pavitraṇā "tmānam punate sādā "
tena tvām abhiśiṇcāmi "pāvamāṇiḥ punantu tvā "|
L omits: yena devaḥ, but repeats the verse correctly.
3. yā te lakṣmīr yaḥ ca pārṇā hṛdaye yaḥ canodare |
āurv upasthe pāyau ca "tām ito nācaśaṁy aham "
L yah; Roth yaḥ; for yaḥ ca. L yāḥ; Roth yaḥ. Roth pāyu.
4. yā ciraśi grivāyaḥ "ca "pānipādān ca sevate |
çroṇyāṁ prṣṭhe tu yālakṣmis "tām ito nācaśaṁy aham "
L çroṇyo. L nu. Roth yālakṣmi.
5. prācun diçaṃ avadhāyendraṃ daiva taṃ śīrṣaḥ pariṣaḍaṃ |
yāḥ kanyāḥ ye śiddhāḥ "|
L avadhāyendraḥ; Roth avadhāyendra. L śīrṣaḥ; Roth śīrṣa. L pariṣaḍaṃ.
L kaṁśyaḥ. This section is modelled after AV. 4. 40.
6. indrenā dattaḥ oṣadhaḥ "apo varunasaṃhitāḥ |
tābhīṣ tvām abhiśiṇcāmī "pāvamāṇiḥ punantu tvā "
L īddhaḥ " dattaḥ.
7. daksīṇāṃ diçaṃ avadhāya yamāḥ daiva taṃ yāmī pariṣa-
dami yāḥ kanyāḥ ye śiddhāḥ "|
8. yamena dattaḥ oṣadhaḥ "apo "| "| "|
9. pratctem diçaṃ avadhāya varunam daiva taṃ vāruntu pari-
ṣaḍam yāḥ kanyāḥ ye śiddhāḥ "|
L prat. L vaḥayaṃ.
10. varunena dattaḥ oṣadhaḥ "apo "| "| "|
11. udīṃ diçaṃ avadhāya somaḥ daiva taṃ somaḥ pariṣaḍaṃ |
yāḥ kanyāḥ ye śiddhāḥ "|
Roth omits.
12. somaṃ dattaḥ oṣadhaḥ "apo "| "| "|
13. dhruvaśiṃ diçaṃ avadhāya visṇuḥ> daiva taṃ vaiśṇavīm |
parsiṣam yāḥ kanyāḥ ye śiddhāḥ "|
14. visṇuṇā dattaḥ oṣadhaḥ "apo "| "| "|
15. vyadhvām diçaṃ avadhāya vāyuḥ daiva taṃ vāyuḥ pari-
ṣaḍam yāḥ kanyāḥ ye śiddhāḥ "|
Roth vāyu. L vāyuṃvām.
16. vāyuṇā dattaḥ oṣadhaḥ "apo "| "| "|
17. ārδhvaśiṃ diçaṃ avadhāya bhṛsparitam daiva taṃ bṛh-
spaṭyam pariṣam yāḥ kanyāḥ ye śiddhāḥ "|
L vṛsparitam; Roth vṛsparita.
18. bhṛsparitānā dattaḥ oṣadhaḥ "apo "| "| "|
L vṛsparitam; Roth vṛsparitamā.
19. sarvaśiṃ sarvān antardeçaḥ avadhāya brahmāṇaḥ daiva-
ṛtaṃ brahmaṁ pariṣaḍaṃ yāḥ kanyāḥ ye śiddhāḥ "|
Roth sarvāntardeçaḥ, with also some confusion after brahmāṇaḥ.
20. brahmamā dattā ośadhaya āpo varunasaṁmitāḥ |
   tābhiṣṭaḥ yām abhiśiṃcāmi pāvamānīḥ punantu tvā ||
  
Pādas ed are quoted by Sāyanā at 7. 118, p. 542.

21. pra patetaḥ pāpi lakṣmītī caeatrasāḥ || 6 ||
  AV. 7. 115. 1–4; quoted by Sāyanā, loc. cit.

1. atha snātyārdhātre sadyahpīḍitaṃ gaurasāryapataśālaṃ
gadyonmathitena vṛghrenāudumbareṇa sruveṇa jhuhoti ||
1. snātyārva.-. Roth -pīḍitaṃ. L. stavaṇa; Roth sravaṇa mūrdhni.

2. cālakāṭaṅkātaya svāhā kāṃṣāndarājaṃputrāya svāhōt svārṇaṃvārya svāhā
devayajanaṃya svāhety
Roth kāṃṣāndā.-. L. devajanaṃya svāhāḥety.

3. atha snāto yān tv āryām upatiṣṭhaṃ tām brūyād bhagavati bhagam
e dehi dhanavati dhanam me dehi yaṇavati yaço me dehi
sūbhāgyavati sūbhāgyam me dehi putravati putrān me dehi sarvavati sarvān kāmān me
deity
L. snato. Roth yān tvāryam upatiṣṭhaṃ. L. tā. Roth yaṇavati,
L. sūbhāgyavati. Roth putravati. Roth sarvavani. L. sarvāna kāmān me; Roth sarvān me kāmān.

A deletion in L. between dehi and ty.

4. *athendrānyuṣṭрайadūhitrikāṇi bhavanti bhagavati*
sarvabhūtecīvīṃ devī cārayaṃ tvāhām āgataḥ |
sūbhāgyakāmāṃ subhage jahi mahāyaṃ vinayakāṃ ||
*nityam || 7 ||
Roth athendrāny.-. L. -duhitraḵāṇī; Roth -duhitī kāṇī. Roth tvāpam.
L. -kāmā. The čolka is not marked off by punctuation in the ms.

1. ata ārddhava ānayakopahāralḥ
d. čuklāḥ sumanasa upahared raktāḥ sumanasa upahared
guptāc cāguptāc ca tāṇḍulāḥ phālkrāca cāphālkrāca ca
pīṣṭaṃ pakvaṁ cāmaṁ ca māνaṁ pakvaṁ cāmaṁ ca
dhāna matsyaḥ čaṣkulaḥ purodāṣāḥ kulaṃāṣa ajaka-
cigruna-bhūṣṭrāka-mùlako-padaṃcāṇāṅ gandhapāṇam ma-
ricapāṇam surāpānaṃ iti
Roth čuklāḥ sumanasaḥ. L. upahārenā. L. ārddhava. L. phālkrāco,
L. māṇa. L.Roth čaṣkulaḥ. L. guja-čiyuka.- L. -bhūṣṭrāka;- Roth
-bhūṣṭrāka.- L. maricayavaṃ; Roth maricapāṇaṃ.

3. naveṣu čurpeṣu caturbbhih kṛtvopahared
4. athopatiṣṭhate || 8 ||

1. cyeno vimukho bakaḥ pakṣī śāhakalakaḥ kalahabhirūr vinā-
yakaḥ kubjaḥ kūśmāṇḍarājaputo hāimavato jambuko virūpākṣaḥ *kālingakumārī* sūkaraḥ krodhi

2. vaiśravānāya rājñe namo
3. yaś tiṣṭhati vaiśravanasya dvāre kubjaḥ karalo vinato vinayakas tam ahaṁ čaraṇāṁ prapādye brahmacārīnam ammam

4. amusya kāmam imaṁ samardhaya
Roth kāmāḥ imaṁ; L. kāpayimānum. Roth somaddhaya.

5. vaiśravanāya rājñe namo
6. adha āvohūte vimalaṁ ādityam upatiṣṭhathe
L. tha.

7. namas te astu bhagavān chataracme tamonuda.
jahī me deva dāurāhīgaṁ sāṁbhāgyena mā saṁsṛjety
L. asru. L. bhagavān; Roth bhagavaḥ. L chataracmi; Roth not clear.
L. tya jaha (l. e. scribe started to skip pādas ed.) cf. MG. 2. 14. 31.

8. ata ārydbhavaṁ brāhmaṇatarpaman
9. gomithunam hiranyani vīsāc ca kartre daksinā || 9. ||
L. gomithuna; Roth so- (but not clear). Roth kartre ye.

1. athātu 'gnir mahācānte pralipte sthandhe same |
cuṭkavasah pramathnita proktate čāntivārinā |
Roth guer mahācāntā. Roth -vāsā pramathnita.
2. kravādagnim pranihr̥tya saṁbhared araṁ čubhe |
om ity etena mantreṇa mathitvāgniṁ samāhitah |
Roth kravādagnim pranihr̥tya. Roth čubhi.
3. ānco raṭjeti rcaṁ vidvān vibhāgaṁ manasā japet |
kravyāde nairṛtaṁ karma vakṣyate tat svake krame |
4. samāstvityena havyāṁ hi pūrñākhyāṁ sarpaśākutim |
huvā samindhayed aghan āhutir jhubyat tataḥ |
AV. 2. 8. 1. L. havya. L pūrṇāksaṁ. L samindhayed; Roth samindhayed; finite forms of caus. are not cited.
5. divas prthivyā akūtīṁ kāmasyendrasye nūro rajecti ||
AV. 19. 3. 1 (and elsewhere); 4. 2; 9. 2. 6; 19. 5. 1. L. dro; Roth ndra.
6. tçanām prathamaṁ devaṁ yajed brahmaṁ samākaitaḥ |
pākayānavidhānema prārambhē sarvakarmānām |
7. mahācāntīṁ prayuṇīnās tarpayitva grahān budhaḥ |
pūjita devaputrās te tuṣṭaṁ santu phalapradāḥ || 10 ||
Roth -çanti. L. putrārthe. L. prada.
1. devaputrā vāi grahā uçaṇā aṅgirāh suryāḥ prājāpatyaḥ somāḥ ketur budhāḥ çanāiçcaro rāhur ity L. uçaṇāṅgiraḥ; Roth uçaṇāṅgirā (double samālī). L.-patyaḥ. L.-rudaḥ.
2. ote brahmānam upasasur bhūgadheyam no bhagavan kal-payasveti Roth upasasur.
4. te devā abruvānu atha yasya nakaśatrām grahēparatām bhavati tam ārto dhitiṣṭhāti nāśyārthāḥ sidhyanti Roth ta; L. omits. L. abruvānu. L. nakaśtrā. L. ārta. Roth -ārthām. Roth ārthā. L. nāśyārthāḥ. There is a lacuna at this point.
5. svayaṁ vā manyetāṁ svastimān aham iti L. manyetā; in Roth the anusvāra is not clear. L. svastiprācan
7. pāurnamāsaṁ tantraṁ vrataḥyānaṁ kṛtva Roth dikṣitaḥ | anudikṣitaḥ. L. -vāsā.
8. purastād agner gomayena gocarmamātraṁ sthanḍilām upalipyā Roth -mātrāṁ. L. Roth elide at the end of this and the following sentences.
9. athāmiṣām grahānāṁ hirapmayāṁ charānām āsanopānat- pādaipithāni nidhāya L. -yāṇasyāda-. L. nidhāyā.
10. abhataṇa vastrenodagdaṇcāsanāny avachādya L. -āgadacāna-. L. Roth āsanāny. L. avatsādyā; Roth acatsādyā.
11. ādityādīn grahān āvāhayed Roth ādītsa. Roth grahāny.
12. yaṁ vahanti çonakānā iti navabhīḥ || 11 || L. yā.

1. yaṁ vahanti çonakānāḥ pratiłomā vājināḥ |
   tam aham sarvatejonnayaḥ ādityam āvāhayāmīḥya ||
   L. ryām. L. pratiloma. L.-yāmi ha. The meter is too bad to warrant corrections for its improvement.
2. yaṁ vahanti hānāvarṇāḥ anulomā vājināḥ |
   tam aham dvijāir āpyāyamānaṁ somam āvāhayāmīḥya ||
   L. yām. L. āpyāya-. Roth āpyāya-.
3. yasya raktāṁ rūpaṁ raktānulepanaḥ ca yah |
   tam aham raktavarpabhāṁ bhūnymam āvāhayāmīḥya |
   Roth raktām. L. -leyaḥ. L. stuvarpabhāṁ.
4. yasya pitam rūpaṁ pitānulepanaṁ ca yaḥ |
   tam aham pitavarpābaṁ budham āvāhayaṁthā ||
1. pitā. I. vṛdham.
5. yaṁ cāvāṅgirasah putro devānāṁ ca purohitāḥ |
   tam aham hiraṇyavarpābaṁ bṛhaspatim āvāhayaṁthā ||
1. yo nigirasaḥ. I. vṛhaspatim.
6. yasya cūklaṁ rūpaṁ cūklānulepanaṁ ca yaḥ |
   tam aham cūklavarnābaṁ cūkram āvāhayaṁthā ||
1. yāmī ha.
7. yasyāyasaṁ rūpaṁ āyaṁ ca prakṛtiḥ |
   tam aham *ādityatejoniṣṭhāpyāyamānaṁ mṛtyuputraṁ |
   āvāhayaṁthā ||
1. yasyāyaśaṁ. Roth āyasāya ca. I. ādityeṇoniyasthāpyamānaṁ.
8. yasya kṛṣṇaṁ rūpaṁ kṛṣṇānulepanaṁ ca yaḥ |
   tam aham kṛṣṇavarpābaṁ rāhum āvāhayaṁthā ||
9. yasya dirghā cikhaṁ mukhaṁ ca parimāṇḍalām |
   tam aham brahmaṇaṁ putram kētum āvāhayaṁthā ||
1. vṛahmanāḥ. Combined with next: I. -he || ty; Roth -he || ty.
10. ity āvāhaya varṇakamayir vṛksamayir dhātumayir va graha- |
    pratimāḥ pratyaṁmukhāḥ āsaneṣūpaveçayati || 12 ||
1. vṛksamayir. I. grahabratimāḥ; Roth pratimā I. āsaneṣupā-.

1. bhūskaraṅgāraṅkau raktau cvetau cukraničākarau |
   rāḥuketuyamaṁ kṛṣṇaṁ pitau budhabhaspati ||
1. āṅgāraṅko. I. vṛhaspati.
2. cāndanaṁ somačukrāu tu bhāumārkau raktacāndanaṁ |
   hāridrakāv ubhāu jñeyau viprāir budhabhaspati |
   kṛṣṇagura grahaṁ kārya rāḥuketucānačcarauḥ ||
1. jñeyo viprā; viprāu is also possible emendation. Roth kṛṣṇagura;
   I. not clear.
3. bhūskaraṅgāraṅkau tämrāu rāukmāu budhabhaspati |
   rājatau somačukrāu tu cēśaṁ kāṛṣṇayasa grahaḥ ||
1. tämaṁ rūkhambo; Roth tämu rekme. I. vṛhaspati. I. kāṛṣṇayasa;
   Roth kṛṣṇayasa.
4. grahaṁ diyadeśṭanāṁ naksatrapathacāriṇāṁ |
   yathāvarṇāṁ punyāṁ vāśasy evānulepanam || 13 ||
1. vāśamy; Roth vāśasy. Liloth āvāna-.
1. ima āpaṁ cīvāḥ cīvatamaṁ cāntāṁ cāntatamaṁ pūtāḥ pūta- |
   tamāḥ punyāḥ punyataṁ amṛtā amṛtatamaḥ pādyāc cār- |
   ghyāc cācamaniyāc cābhīṣecancyāc ca pratigrhnantu bhaga- |
   vanto devā grahaḥ ity apo nīnayati ||
Roth puryā pur-. I. amṛtatamyaḥ; Roth abbreviated. I. cārdhyāc.
Roth abhi-. I. pratigrhantu. Roth deva. I. cnahā.

2. ime gandhāh cubhā divyāh sarvagandhāhī samanvītāh |
pūtā brahmapavitrena sūryasya ca raçmbhīh ||
pratigrhantu bhagavanto devā grahā iti gandhārīr anulim-pati ||
I. brahmapavitrena sūryara ca. Roth anulimpayati.

3. imāḥ sumanaso divyāḥ surabhīrκṣayoniḥ īāḥ |
pūtā vāyupavitrena sūryasya ca raçmbhīh ||
pratigrhantu bhagavanto devā grahā iti sumanobhir a-bhyarcauyati ||
I. imā sumanasowe. I. surabhīrκṣa-. I. vāyu-. 4.

vanaspatriasa medhyo divyo gandhādhyā uttamaḥ |
abhāraḥ sarvaderanām dhūpo yam <pratigrhyatām ||
pratigrhantu bhagavanto devā grahā iti dhūpana dahati ||
I. vaisaupati-. I. gandhād śittamaḥ (for: anuttamaḥ). Roth uttamaḥ.

5. agniḥ ākraṣ ca jyotie ca sarvadevapriyo hi saḥ |
prabhākaro mahāteja dīpo yam pratigrhyatām ||
bālācīr dhūmapāchhaṃ <tu> timirāriḥ svayamprabhūḥ |
ōsadhiṃsahasampanno dīpo yam <pratigrhyatām ||
pratigrhantu bhagavanto devā grahā iti dipaṁ dadāti,
Roth dhuma-. Roth svayam pratigrhantu prabhūḥ. I. bhagavanto dvā;
Roth bhagavanto devā. I. dudāmi.

6. ime bhakṣāh cubhā divyāḥ sarvabhakṣāhī samanvītāh |
pūtā brahmapavitrena sūryasya ca raçmbhīh ||
pratigrhantu bhagavanto devā grahā iti sarvabhakṣān
nivedayati ||
Roth bhikṣa. I. sarvabhakṣān; Roth sarvabhikṣān.

7. hirāmayaṃśe camasān sarpiśaḥ pūrṇān upahāret |

8. paścāt agneḥ prāmukha upaścya

9. karmane vām iteyevamādi
Kanc. 1. 36; 56. 5,

10. devasya tvā savitur ity ādityādyēbhyyo grahebhyyo havir
       nirvapet || 14 ||
Cf. Bloomfield’s concordance.

1. athājyabhāgaṇte viśāsahim ity ādityāya haviṣo lutvāyam
      juhnyat samidha ādhāyopatiṣṭhate ||
Quoted by Sāyaṇa at 10. 2, p. 737; 19. 6, p. 286, AV. 17. 1. 1. I. sagid;
Roth samid.
2. çakadhumam iti somaya

3. tvayā manyo yas te manyo ity aṅgārakāya
AV. 4. 31. 1; 32. 1. Quoted by Sāyana at 4. 31, p. 675.

4. yad rājānāh somasyāno yuddhāh pata iti buddhāya
AV. 3. 29. 1; 7. 81. 3. Quoted by Sāyana at 3. 29, p. 494; 7. 85, p. 476. L. yajñyajānāh. Roth somasyaṅgaṃ.

5. sa buddhnyād bhadrād adhī ċreyāḥ prehi brhaspati na iti brhaspataye
AV. 4. 1. 5; 7. 8. 1; 51. 1. Quoted by Sāyana at 7. 6, p. 320; 52, p. 394. Roth praḥ. L. vṛhaspati.

6. hiranyavarna nūnaṁ tad asya çukro 'stīti çukrāya
AV. 1. 53. 1; 4. 1. 6; 17. 1. 20 (2. 11. 5). L. u nam.

7. sahasrabhaḥ puruṣaḥ kena pāṛṣṇi prāṇaya nama iti ca
nāścārāya
AV. 19. 6. 1; 10. 2. 1; 11. 4. 1. Quoted by Sāyana at 10. 2, p. 737; 11. 6, p. 86; 19. 6, p. 296. L. vālūḥ. L. prāṇayā.

8. divyam citrām rāhū rājānam iti rāhaye
Kāṇ. 90. 2; 100. 2. Roth rāha. L. rājanama.

9. yas te prthu stanaśitnur devo devān paribhūr ētena ketum kṛtvann aketava iti ketave

10. ketum kṛtvann aketave peco maryā apečase ik sam uṣadbhir ajāyathāh || 15 ||
L. kṛtvann. L. yeṣo. L. ajāyathāḥ; Roth ajāyathāḥ.

1. mādhukīr lohitāṅgāya nāyagrodhīr buddhāya ca |
adādyat samīdhah plākṣiḥ sakṣtra bhārgavāya tu ||
Cf. AVPar. xxvi. 5. 6 ff. A page is transposed in Roth so that 16. 1—17. 4 (incl.) stand after the colophon of the chapter. L. Roth mādhukīr. Roth -tāṅgāya nāyagrodhīna. L. sakṣirā.

2. ārkiś tu ravaye dadyād rāhor āranyagomayam |
dūnumbaryo guroṣ proktā ācyattās tu caṇāiçcare |
candraśa samīdhah pālācit ketor ghṛtayatāh kuçāh ||

3. atha caṅtāhi kṛtyaduṣanāi catañār mātrānāmabhīr vātospattyār ājyam juhuyād
4. abhayenopasthāya tantrām parisamāpayed

5. atha dakṣināḥ prayacchati || 16 ||
I. dakṣinā. Roth prayachanti.

1. bhārgavāya hayam dadyāt somaputrāya kāṃcanam |
vrṣabhaḥ lohitāṃgāya chagalīṃ dhūmaketave ||
Roth áṅgaja.

2. varam áṅgirasāya dadyād ādityāya tu gāḥ cūbhāḥ |
vrṣalīm mṛtyuputṛṇāya gajām dadyāt tu rāhave |
rukmāni candrumase dadyād etad ācāryaçāsanam ||

3. grhe bhṛhaspatān viprān bhojayed ghrṭapāyasam |
çukre sarvagunam tu annam madhuna cābhīghāritam ||

4. çanāiccare havisyānnam tathā kṣirādudanam budhe |
kṛçarānnena ketūnāṁ rāhor māṃsāndanena tu ||
Roth starts to omit pādas be. I. kṣirāduna; Roth kṣirādanam. I. vudhe;
Roth budhāḥ.

5. bhāume guḍāudanam dadyān modakaḥ samalāmkrtam |
sarpiṣā payasā cāiva sūrya caundre tathāudanam ||
Roth guḍāudanam. I. mohawkāḥ.

6. samidāḥānam eteṣām gṛahapūja vidhiyaṭe |
anudānām athāeteṣām eteṣām daksināḥḥyā smṛtāḥ ||

7. tad etaj janmani karmani yātrayāṁ pratiñomeṣu va graheṣu |
çantiḥbālaśajyām kuryād ity evam āhur maṇśinā ity |
I. etaj janmani. Roth graheṣu; çanti-. I. āhu. Roth maṇśinā.

8. atrāite çlokā bhavanti || 17 ||
I. bhavati.

1. yathā samutthitaṁ yantraṁ yantreṇa pratihanyate |
evam samutthitaṁ ghoraṁ cīghraṁ çāntir vināçayet ||

2. yathā bānaṇprahāraṇāṁ kavacām bhavati vāraṇām |
tadvad daīvopaghāṭanāṁ çāntir bhavati vāraṇām ||
I. vāya-. I. kevacām. I. tadvar devo-.

3. ahiṇsakasya dāntasya dharmārjitaḥdhanasya ca |
niṃyaḥ ca niyamasthasya sadā cāṅgṛahā grahāḥ ||
I.1 -dhasya ca. I. sănu. omitting: graha which is in margin, but cf. next note.
4. gahā gāvo narendrāṇaḥ ca brāhmaṇāṇaḥ ca viśeśataḥ |
   pūjitāḥ pratipūjyante nirdahanty anapamānitaḥ ||
I. omits: gahā, cf. last note. I narendrāṇaḥ ca vṛṣ-.

5. etad grahām atithyam kuryat samvatsarād api |
   śrogyahalasampanno jīvec ca caraḍaḥ caṭam ||
Roth: sampannā jivama caraḍaḥ.
   jīvec ca caraḍaḥ caṭam iti || 18 ||
Roth omits.

iti prathamo 'dhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ ||
Roth: mahācāntih (read: -cāntih) prathamārdham samāptam.

Zu dem von James A. Montgomery ibid. S. 435 veröffentlichten Texte ist Folgendes zu bemerken und berichten:

1) Zunächst ist zu lesen (s. die Tafel auf S. 434):

"Zah, zah (fort! fort!) auf den Riegel unter der Höhe (Plafond) des Hauses". היה על כתר החובה רדום בתרחש. נינו מארח את מעשה המר


3) Ibid. unten, 1: 

"Untersagt sei euch die Sonne und der Mond, verboten sei euch der Norden und Westen," der [Osten und Süden, ihre (der Tafel) Fessel sind eherne Ringe und eiserne Riegel" usw.

םְגוּלָה, talmudisch מְגוּלָה, מְגוּלָה, syr. selten סְגוֹלָה, ass.-bab. אַבְּגַל "Norden" (zu unserer Stelle vgl. den "Nordwind" im


2 Das אַגְּנָר scheint eine Zauberkraft gehabt zu haben, s. Sab. 67a:

דְּסַכְּבָּה סְכָה מְנוּרָה (Var. bei Aruch: אַבְּגַל אָגָר דְּסַכְּבָּה מְנוּרָה).
Zendavesta: "váto daëvo" ("Dämonenwind"); अरव "Westen", wie im Talm., ass. amuru (avuru); अखर "Osten", wie im Talm., ass. šútu. Es fehlt nun noch der "Süden" (im Talm. अखर, ass. šātā) und dieser wird wohl mit अखर, अखर, hebr. יב, syr. ܕܐܐܙܐ, ist, wie ähnlich z. B. talm. अखर "Fuß" = mand. अखर "Bleib", denn nach der Tafel ist nicht = "Blei", doch nach der Tafel ist zweifellos अखर (r) zu lesen. Es bedeutet vielmehr, wie häufig im Talm. (अखर) अखर "Riegel" (Querhaken), entsprechend קָרֶב, die, wie im Syr. "Ringe" sind und dienen hier zum Empfangen des "Riegels". Zu अखर "Semayasa" des Jubalantumbuches (Montgomery, S. 436), der Gigant अखर, अखर im Targ. j. Gen. 6, 4, b. Nidā 61*, vgl. noch den talmudischen Zauberspruch zur Bündigung eines अखर (Sabb. 67* नील अखर), mc. अखर प्रशंसा दि त्राप ब्र सह प्रशंसा दि त्राप ब्र सह गौद्रों ब्र सह; Ms. Oxf. (bei Rabbinowicz) अखर मरो ब्र मोहित ब्र मोहित है, Ms. Mün. अखर मरो ब्र मोहित ब्र मोहित है (das b in अखर ist daher jedenfalls sicher).

4) Ibid. l. nach der Tafel: अखर अखर अखर अखर, statt अखर, vgl. das अखर, oben.

5) अखर (S. 436) ist ein häufiger Name im b. Talmud.

1 Oder, was mir noch wahrscheinlicher ist, अखर (ar. کَلْس "Berg") ist eine bruchstückhafte Übersetzung des ass.-bab. šadu "Süden" vom Stamm šd- "hoch sein" von dem auch das gleichlautende Namen šadu "Berg" abgeleitet ist (s. Del., Hwb. e. v.). Vgl. das ḫṣàtij des Targ. j. zu अखर, bei dem Samaritaner ḫṣàtij (Levy, TWB. 1, 129), das "Bergland", "Hochland" ("Fiume"), das ḫṣàtij der Bibel (Ps. 83, 8), beute Dschabul, bei den griechenischen Targum, die Gebirgsgegend im Süden des toten Meeres (Gesen.-Buhl, s. v. ḫṣàtij, vgl. s. v. ḫṣàtij). Hervorzuheben ist auch, daß jene Gegend ja im "Süden" liegt! Zu ḫṣàtij vgl. auch das ḫabili (ga-ab-lam) bei Rawl. V 38, 842 zwischen ša-da-b (Hoch a., Berg) und o-a-baš ("Gehem"), Del. Hwb. 190* u. 642*

2 Vgl. Targ. Jos. 6, 1: अखर अखर अखर अखर, Ps. 197, 16: अखर अखर अखर अखर.
Iranian Miscellanea.—By Dr. Louis H. Gray, Aberdeen, Scotland.

a) On the Aramaic Version of the Behistān Inscriptions.

The value of the fragments of the Aramaic version of the Behistān inscriptions for solving some of the problems in the interpretation of these texts has recently been made evident by Tolman's identification of the Old Persian month Garma-pada with Tammuz.¹ These same fragments conclusively clear up two of the most difficult words in all Old Persian literature. The passage Rh. i, 65, the text of which has been definitely settled by Jackson² and by King and Thompson,³ reads as follows: *abīvarās gašāmēcā māniyamēcā višābėcā*. The principal translations of these words, since this establishment of the text, are: Bartholomae, "Weideland (?), (und) fahrende Habe, (und) liegende Habe, (und) (?)";⁴ Justi, "Volkversammlungen, Gehöfte, Hauskomplexe, (einzeln) Häuser";⁵ King and Thompson, "the pasture-lands, and the herds and the dwelling-places, and the houses";⁶ Tolman, "the revenue (?) and the personal property and the estates and the royal residences?";⁷ Weißbach and Bang, "das Weideland (?), die Viehherden und die Wohnungen, und zwar in den Häusern";⁸ Hoffmann-Kutschke, "die Zusammenkünfte des Volkes, die Gehöfte sowohl wie die Hauskomplexe wie die (einzeln) Klaßen".⁹

¹ American Journal of Philology, xxxi, 444 f.
³ Inscription of Darius ... at Behistūn, p. 14.
⁵ Indogermanische Forschungen. xvii, Anzeiger, pp. 105—108, reading *abīvarās* and *višābā* (?).
⁶ loc. cit.
⁷ Ancient Persian Lexicon and Texts, pp. 9, 84 f., 88, 116, 123 f.
⁸ Altperische Keilinschriften, p. xv; similarly Weißbach, Keilinschriften der Achāmeniden, p. 21, who omits the query and translates *māniyam* by "Wohnungen"; like Justi, he reads *višābā*.
⁹ Altperische Keilinschriften ... um Berge Bagistān, pp. 13, 51 f., reading *abīvarās* (?).
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The Babylonian version for this passage is lacking, nor do the two New Susian words preserved as the equivalents of gišām and māniyam, the ḫaṣṣā nēṣē as and kurtās respectively, give any assistance. Fortunately, the Aramaic version contains the equivalents for māniyānē tādā višātīṣē—allā ḫāṣē, "their wealth and their houses". The word ḫāṣē—a plural tantum, like its Syriac equivalent, Ḫāṣē—occurs seven times in the Old Testament, the Septuagint rendering being ḫāṣēra in Joshua xxii, 8. II Chronicles i, 11 l, ḫāṣētēs in Ezra vi, 8. Ecclesiastes v, 18, vi, 2, and ḫāṣē rov bēon in Ezra vii, 26. This term denotes material wealth, as in the mention of "the king's goods, even the tribute beyond the river" (Ezra vi, 8), and in Joshua xxii, 8, ḫāṣē, "wealth", is expressly distinguished from ḫāṣē, "cattle", just as gišām and māniyam are contrasted in Bh. i, 65. As to the etymology of māniyam, its translation by ḫāṣē suggests that it is to be connected with Sanskrit māṇya-, "honourable, venerable".

Turning to the second equation—vibāšē: ḫāṣē—we are confronted by some difficulty. So far as the syntax is concerned, I see no reason to depart from the view which I formerly expressed—although incorrectly reading vibāšē—that the form is an instrumental neuter plural, used with accusativus force. As to the form, I have been able to make no advance over my suggestion in a letter to Professor Tolman, incorporated by him in his Lexicon, that vibāšē is from the stem vibā-, and is to be compared with Avesta višan-, "householder". As in Bartholomae's similar suggestion to explain the difficult Old Persian word vibāšē in Dar. Pers. d, 14, 22, 24, from a stem vibā-, I feel the difficulty of meaning, since -an- normally forms nouns denoting a part of the body or nomina agentis, rather than words of relationship to something. Despite this, I see at present no alternative but to repeat the suggestion to which I have already referred, that vibāšē means "things
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relating to the house, rā ašān". It may be noted, in this connexion, that the Aramaic, being rendered from the Babylonian rather than from either of the other two versions,¹ does not invariably represent exactly the Old Persian text.²

The translation of the Old Persian passage abīcāri gaidāmčā māniyamčā vidabīsčā would accordingly be, "the pasturage, and the live stock, and the wealth, and the home possessions".

There is in these Aramaic fragments a very remarkable passage which has no parallel in any of the other versions of the Behistūn inscriptions. This passage, which begins with Old Persian Bh. iv, 37 (Babylonian, 97; New Susian, iii, 63), is as follows:³

Anā melā wā aṭarī ḫūra wī cībar
[...]
[Nā woḥrā qātī ḫūra ḫūra ḫūrā ḫūrā]
[Nā cībar ʾaṭarī ḫūra ḫūra ḫūrā ḫūrā]
[Nā bā ḫūrā ḫūrā wī ḫūrā ḫūrā ḫūrā]
[Nā máṣṣīn ḫūrā wī ḫūrā ḫūrā ḫūrā]
[Nā ṭuṣār ʾaṭarī ḫūrā ḫūrā ḫūrā]

"Thou who shalt be king after me, the man who lieth,
... of lies beware mightily ... who lieth.
... make known how thou hast been created, and how hath been thy going.
... saith, Hear what he saith before."⁴

¹ Ungnad, p. 83.
² An excellent instance of such divergence is the Aramaic rendering of Old Persian kāyngmata paraitā, "having assembled, they went" (for the form see Bartholomae, Griindriβ., I, 1, 220 f., Altiranisches Wörterbuch, col. 501), in Bh. ii, 43, 52, 58, by rān ʾaṭārā, "they assembled, they went", corresponding to Babylonian ip-ḫur-ru-nim-ma it-tal-ku² or ip-ḫur-ru-nim-ma it-tal-ku².
³ Ungnad, 67, P. 13447 b (Va.), p. 90. For a slightly different rendering see Sachau, Aramäische Papyri und Ostraka aus einer jüd. Militärkolonie zu Elephanteis, p. 197.
⁴ This use of rān substantiates the suggestion of Bartholomae (Altiranisches Wörterbuch, col. 77) that rān ʾaṭārā in Bh. iv, 37, 68, 87, should be read aparama instead of aparam; cf. also arkiʾa (Bab. 105) as the equivalent of aperama (Old Persian iv, 88).
⁵ Cf. the Babylonian plural parāšatu as the equivalent of the Old Persian drauga, "lie" (Bab. Bh. 14 = Old Pers. Bh. i, 84).
⁶ Cf. the "making" of the earth, etc., and the "making" of Darius, etc., to be king in Dar. Pers. d. 2 f. (addā), NR. a, 1–6, Xerx. Pers. a, 1–4, b, 1–7, etc. (addā, alaunāš).²
⁷ The word ṭuṣār represents Old Persian ṭuṣārā, "prior" (see Ungnad, p. 2, note to line 5).
b) A New Fragment of the Avesta.

In Manakji Rustamji Unvāla’s lithographed edition of the Rivāyats of Dārāb Hormazdīyār, to which more particular reference will be made below, there are a large number of citations from the Avesta, including Westergaard’s Fragment 4 (p. 179, l. 15—p. 180, l. 10),1 but all these, excepting one, are taken from the Avesta as already known. This one exception, which may be considered a new fragment, and as adding one word to the Avesta vocabulary, occurs twice in the Rivāyats: first, in a Rivāyat of Dastūr Barzū Qiyām-ad-Dīn Ṣanjāna, who flourished in the seventeenth century (p. 39, l. 14—p. 40, l. 8); and, second, in a response of the Persian dāstūrs to a letter of Barzū b. Qavām-ad-Dīn b. Kaikubād b. Omnāzdiyār, written in 1015 A. Y. (p. 431, l. 19—p. 432, l. 10).2 The variants of the two passages are unimportant; the text, according to the first occurrence, with the translation, runs thus: ahūrem mazdām raēvantom x’arnawashvantom yazamaide. amoštāspēntā huāsahā hušāngho yazamaide. vašnūm razistom yazamaide. arastātomēc frādat-gaēbom varzad-gaēbom yazamaide. baōxvētom vāčīm vaat frādat-gaēbom yazamaide. arastātom frādat-gaēbom yazamaide. vašnīm uši darmom maždaōtom ušāzātōm yazatōm yazamaide. ašāqām vavēsā sūrē spontā fravāpto yazamaide. vispehe ašāvēnā yazata yazamaide. ušēhemē pašū-ramē tōrēzēm namēnimē paši-latūm yēno hētām; “Ahura Mazda, radiant, glorious, we worship; the Amaspa Spantaś, rightly ruling, fair of form, we worship; Rašnu, most righteous, we worship; and Arštāt, furthering living creatures, increasing living creatures, we worship; the rightly spoken prayer, furthering living creatures, we worship; Arštāt, furthering living creatures, we worship; the mountain Üsīdaran, created by Mazda, the happy abode of Aša, the yazad, we worship; the good, mighty, holy fravāšis of the righteous we worship; every righteous yazad we worship; Üšahina, the counter-ratu; Barajya and Xmānya, the counter-ratu; yēno hētām.”

1 On this fragment see Haas, in Spiegel Memorial Volume, pp. 181—187.
2 Rosenberg, Notices de littérature partie, pp. 43, 67; or Barzū Qiyām-ad-Dīn see West, Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, ii, 123.
In this fragment the occurrence of the term paiti-ratu, "counter-ratu", which seems to be found nowhere else in Avesta literature thus far known, is noteworthy. Usahina, Barajya, and Nmany are frequently mentioned together as ašahe ratu, and the question arises whether paiti-ratu is synonymous with the ordinary ratu, or whether it bears some special technical meaning.

c) The Iranian Name 𐎿𐎠𐎼𐎦𐎢𐎺 radix.

In the last volume of this Journal (pp. 434—438) Professor Montgomery discusses a magical bowl-text which contains the words 𐎿𐎠𐎼𐎦𐎢𐎺 radix, "Samhiša, the lord Bagdānād". As Professor Moore suggested to him, this Samhiša is obviously the fallen angel Semyaza of the Book of Enoch, and it is equally evident that 𐎿𐎠𐎼𐎦𐎢𐎺 radix is equivalent to 𐎿𐎠𐎼𐎦𐎢𐎺 radix. The fallen angel 𐎿𐎠𐎼𐎦𐎢𐎺 radix is frequently mentioned in post-Biblical Hebrew, and his name means, according to Schwab, "nom du visionnaire".

As 𐎿𐎠𐎼𐎦𐎢𐎺 radix is composed of 𐎼 radix, "name", and 𐎠 radix, "seer", so 𐎿𐎠𐎼𐎦𐎢𐎺 radix is composed of 𐎠 radix, "God", and 𐎼 radix, "yesterday", which is, I think, represented by Modern Persian نیبل, "knowing" (Pahlavi 𐎦𐎥𐎤 radix, or else by بی, "learned, wise" (Pahlavi dānak). If 𐎠 radix is equivalent to 𐎼 radix, the latter is a paraphrase of the Ineffable Name. The Iranian appellation 𐎿𐎠𐎼𐎦𐎢𐎺 radix means "God-knowing", and I suggest that the Semitic appellative 𐎿𐎠𐎼𐎦𐎢𐎺 radix should be translated "he who sees the Name" rather than "name of him who sees". I am, of course, aware that 𐎿𐎠𐎼𐎦𐎢𐎺 radix scarcely describes the character of the fallen angel, but it was doubtless very appropriate before he fell and wedded one of the "daughters of men".

1 E. g. Yasna i, 7; ii, 7; iii, 9; vi, 6; xxii, 9; Gath ii, 1, 51; Srōz Bāz 1.
2 Enoch vi ff.; see Beer loc. cit., in his translation in Kautsch, Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments, ii, 217 ff.; Barton, Journal of Biblical Literature, xxxi, 165, explains Semyaza as "apparently the Heb. shem-er, 'my name is mighty'.
3 See Levy, Chaldaisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim, ii, 492, and Neubibraeisches und chaldæisches Wörterbuch, iv, 573; Jastrow, Dictionary of the Targumim, etc., p. 1394; for the legends especially Grünbaum, Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, xxxi, 235—248.
4 Vocabulaire de l'angélologie, p. 256.
5 Cf. Blau, Altejdisches Zauberwesen, p. 117 ff.; see also Jewish Encyclopedia, ix, 182—185, xi, 262—264.
6 I reached this conclusion before I knew the similar view of Nathaniel Schmidt, Harper Memorial Volume, ii, 349 ff.; "Semyaza = שמע, 'he sees the Name, i. e. God,' or שמע, 'he surveys the heavens', as he reveals 'the revolution of the world'."
d) Parsi-Persian Omen Calendars.

I recently published in this Journal (xxx, 436—442) and in the Dastur Hoshang Memorial Volume (pp. 454—464) two studies on Parsi-Persian omen-lists: one on the Burj-Namah, copied for me on 29 June, 1909, by Darab Dastur Peshotan Sanjana from a manuscript in the Library of the University of Bombay (BU 29); and the other on two brief madnawis edited by Salemann in Travaux du IIIme Congres des Orientalistes, ii, 497 ff. It was then unknown to me that another version of the Burj-Namah, differing in slight details, had been lithographed by Manakji Rustamji Unvala in his edition of the Ricayats of Darab Hormazd Yar (ii, 193 ff.). This work has not yet been published, but has been exhaustively analysed by Rosenberg, in his Notices de litterature parsie. Through the kindness of the editor and of Dr. Jivanji Jamsheedji Modji, I have received proof-sheets of the volume, and since the readings are better, it seems to me advisable to re-edit the Burj-Namah from it, particularly as my former translation contained a number of errors, one of which—the rendering of (II, 10, 23) by "boy and woman" instead of "child and wife" (though both are equally possible)—led me unjustly to criticise the moral tone of the poem. I also take this opportunity to correct a few minor errors in the two madnawis on which I commented in the Hoshang Volume.

The text and translation of the Burj-Namah, according to Unvala's edition, together with Dastur Sanjana's variant readings, are as follows:

بتظم ایند میلودان دادگر

حکایت در باب دیدن ماه تو اندرون هر یک برج که میابد

کوی هر ماه تو از تو دان?

زیر چمد جوین به زینتی تو ماه

که آن ماه کارت بود خویشتر

هم از تور تگر به زینتی کارارا

چو در برج جویرا به زینتی تو ماه

برهمند از کور وارا میبین

چو در برج خونخانکه بینی قمر

1 BU 29

میتموان

2 BU

زکنار دان

3 BU

در آن وقت کن تو
In the Name of God, Compassionate, Omnipotent!

Tradition on the Theme of What Happens at Sight of the New Moon in Each Sign [of the Zodiac].

(1) By the grace of God, Who giveth daily food, I shall tell of each new moon; be thou wise!

(2) When thou seest the moon from the sign of Aries, at that instant gaze on fire;

(3) In order that thy affairs may be better that month, consider now the word of the sage.

(4) Likewise at sight [of the new moon] from Taurus look on an ox in order that that month may be better for thee.

(5) When in the sign of Gemini thou seest the moon, at that instant gaze on an ascetic;
(6) Beware of mirage and look not upon it, in order that that month may be most good for thee.
(7) When thou seest the moon in the sign of Cancer—hark thou to tidings from the words of this sage—
(8) At that instant look on running water, but not on pleasant verdure or plants.
(9) When thou seest the moon from the sign of Leo, gaze a while upon the sky;
(10) Implore thy necessities from the pure Protector [God]; look not thou on child and wife, O famous one!
(11) When in the sign of Virgo thou seest (the new moon), be thou wise; of its signification hear thou from me thus:
(12) Look not thou, under these circumstances, with sadness on the face of any one else, in order that thou mayest not make thyself distressed with thyself;
(13) Recite thou praise of God with verity and perfectly, in order that thou mayest do happily in that moon, the new one.
(14) When in the sign of Libra thou seest the moon, gaze at that instant on a mirror and on gold;
(15) Implore thy necessities from the Creator of the world. Likewise of the sign of Scorpio I shall tell; be thou wise!
(16) Gaze thou, O man of good appearance, young man of vigour, not blind and not deaf;
(17) Look not on any thing abominable, O famous one, in order that that month may come to an end with goodness.
(18) When the moon entereth the sign of Sagittarius, gaze straightway on silver and gold;
(19) Look not on the face of the sick at that time: beware [of so doing] in order that thou thyself mayest be joyful.
(20) When thou seest the moon from the sign of Capricornus, straightway recite the Aśīm Vuhā [Aśīm volu] thrice;
(21) Gaze not on the sick and likewise [not] on children, in order that in that month thou mayest be very joyful.
(22) When in Aquarius thou seest the new moon, recite thou the Ayā Ahamvṛtya [Aśīm ahū vairya], listen unto them;
(23) Implore thy necessities from the mighty Creator; look not thou on child and wife, O famous one!

1 Rosenberg (p. 2, et., however, his uncertainty expressed on p. 4) renders "with pride." (Cf. RAMPHROTEIS).
(24) When thou seest the moon in the sign of Pisces, gaze straightway on rubies and pearls;
(25) Look and be joyful at that time; be joyous, and it is no harm to thee.
(26) Even so remember our verses now, in order that the Protector [God] may be guardian.

The two maqāmāt (reprinted from the Hoshang Volume) on the omens to be drawn from the appearance of snakes on each of the days of the week and in each of the signs of the zodiac are as follows, with their revised translations:

THE SIGHT OF A SNAKE ACCORDING TO THE GOOD AND BAD OF THE WEEK.

(1) On the Sabbath, the day of Saturn, [if] thou seest a snake, rear unto heaven thy castle and palace.
(2) On the day after the Sabbath, which is the day of the Sun, [if] thou seest a snake, kill it; it is a good work.
(3) Two days after the Sabbath—the day of the Moon it would be—when thou seest a snake, it would be desirable.
(4) Three days after the Sabbath—the day of Mars it would be—[if thou seest a snake,] dig up the serpent's foundation from the root.
(5) Four days after the Sabbath, which would be from Mercury, [if thou seest a snake,] it bringeth thee pleasure and society this day.
(6) Five days after the Sabbath, which would be the day of Jupiter, when thou seest a snake [and] killest it, thou killest Iblis.
The SIGHT of a SNAKE ACCORDING to the GOOD and BAD of the TWELVE [ZODIACAL] SIGNS, [ACCORDING TO] what MOON it is.

(1) When the moon should be in the sign of Aries, O friend, [if] thou seest a snake, much good it is. 

(2) In the sign of Taurus good doth it [the moon] show; to thee from a snake strength doth it show. 

(3) The moon in the sign of Gemini should be good; his [the snake's] head should be under stone and stock. 

(4) When the moon [is] in Cancer, [if then] thou seest a snake, thou cuttest off hope of thy wealth and life. 

(5) When the full moon entereth the sign of Leo, [if then] thou seest a snake,] good fortune increaseth, and calamity cometh to a head [i.e. ceaseth].

1 Rosenberg, who read an advance offprint of my article in the Hashanah Volume, does not think that this bracket should be supplied here. The parallelism of the other verses seems to require it, yet it is, of course, true that Friday, as the Muhammadan Sabbath, might form an exception to the other days of the week.

2 Rosenberg suggests يباه و زور. 
(6) Should the new moon be in the sign of Virgo when thou seest a snake, eat on earthenware.

(7) When thou seest a snake in Libra, it [the snake] is thy protector and asylum, [and] the might of thine arm.

(8) When the moon appeareth in Scorpio, it would be fortunate for the killing of a serpent.

(9) When the moon darteth his ray in the sign of Sagittarius, [if then thou seest a snake,] thou dost customarily see wealth anew.

(10) When the moon doth make its appearance in Capricornus, look not on a serpent, show not thy face.

(11) [If] the moon becometh visible in the sign of Aquarius, [if then thou seest a snake,] thou seest [i.e. sufferest] much oppression and cruelty.

(12) [If] the moon [be] in the sign of Pisces, in the sign of the Fish, [if thou seest a snake,] thou seest the passing of sovereignty.

(13) If [thou art] prudent, if happy and joyous, thou causest the divine compassion to come unto [thy] weakness.

As supplementary to my former studies, I may note that Rosenberg assigns both the Burj-Nâmah and the Mâr-Nâmah (the latter edited by Modi, Bombay, 1893) either to Anûstvân ibn Marzbân of Kirmân, who flourished in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, or to one of his pupils.

While I have endeavoured, largely on the basis of Rosenberg’s criticism on my article in this Journal and his pencil notes on the Hoshang offprint, to correct the errors of reading and translation to which I confess, I remain unchanged regarding the only matter which I regard as of real importance in this connexion—the problem of the ultimate source of this whole type of Parši-Persian omen-literature. I have long been perfectly aware of the existence of snake-cults in India, though I had overlooked the mentions of moon-omens in India made by al-Burâni (India, tr. Sachau, ii, 97; Chronology, tr. Sachau, p. 335); but these are scarcely of a weight sufficient to make any alteration in my theory. I have also long known that.

1 Rosenberg, reading خور, translates “drink wine in an earthen cup”.
2 Rosenberg translates “thou reachest God’s compassion with the feeble”.
3 Rosenberg, Notices, 11-13, 49, Бугаі-нама, 4.
as Rosenberg says, there was active communication between India and Persia in the Sasanian period, and long before; and that books of Indian authorship were translated into Pahlavi, and later into Persian and Arabic. It would indeed be strange if Indian works on astrology and divination had not been among this number.

But all this seems to me to be beside the mark. I myself mentioned, in the Hoshang paper, abundant instances of ophiomancy from India, Burmah, Melanesia, Greece, Italy, and the Balto-Slavs, etc. Instances of omens from the new moon are as wide-spread as the lunar light. Yet among only one people was the omen-system drawn up in regular and exact calendrical form—the Babylonians. If we assume an Indian source for such omen-lists as are here studied, we can allege in support of this view only the fact that omens were unsystematically drawn from moon and snakes, and the possibility that Indian works upon these omens were translated by Persians or Arabs, although no Indian book of this character is thus far known to exist. My own belief is still the one which I expressed in the *Hoshang Volume*: "In view, then, of the facts that omens from snakes cannot be explained as Zoroastrian, and that, while sporadic portents are drawn from serpents among Hebrews, Hindus, Burmese, Melanesians, Romans, Greeks, and Lithuanians, there is no systematic development of ophiomancy among any of these peoples, there seems to me but one possible derivation for the Persian *Mār-Nāmah*, for only among the ancient Babylonians was there at once a perfected ophiomancy and a regular calendar form for it .... I would tentatively suggest that the alleged Zoroastrian ophiomancy is, in reality, a survival of Babylonian lore on the same subject. Whether this knowledge was transmitted orally, or how it received its re-crudescence, of which the first trace known to me at present is al-Biruni's record, is a problem I cannot touch. I believe, however, that more than one element in Zoroastrianism, even as recorded in the Avesta, will ultimately prove to have Babylonian influence as at least a factor. The West of Asia has been for millennia a fusing-furnace of religions; Sumerians and Babylonians, Jews and Persians, Gnostics, Mandeans, and Manicheans, Muhammadan sects, and Nestorian Christianity have all contributed their share. In this snake-calendar, perhaps, is one indebtedness of the later Parsis to Babylonia."
In this same article I mentioned the close parallelism of the De Ostentis of Johannes Lydus to the Babylonian omen-literature. Since I wrote that paper, it has been shown by Bezold and Boll that much of Greek astrology, as in lunaries, brontologies, steropologies, seismologies, etc., was modelled on, and, at least in part, more or less directly translated from, Babylonian tablets. If Babylonian astrology thus lingered on, and was carried to Greece, it is still more probable that it long survived in its native home. In the absence of any Indian work showing either in form or in spirit the slightest kinship to such compositions as the Burj- and Mār-Nāmah, and with the rich abundance of Babylonian omen-literature which is amazingly like this portion of Parst-Persian, I can only abide by my conviction that these Iranian texts are to be derived from Babylonian, and not from Indian, sources.

e) Modern Persian bi-: Lithuanian be-.

In Modern Persian the future, the subjunctive, and the imperative are formed by the aid of the particle →, found in Aryan as ba-, in Kurdish as b- (be-, bi-, ba-, ba-), in Tališ as ba-, in Gilaki as be-, in Mazandarān as ba-, in Gabri as v-, etc. In Pahlavi the form is be- (cf. the antevoocal -e in Modern Persian), and in Pāzand bē-. The fact that in Pahlavi bē- is regularly rendered in Huzvaresh by barū (μ), "except, besides, without," has led some to consider the verbal particle bē- identical with the preposition bē. The correct view regarding the particle bē- is, however, that of Salemann, who connects it with the Avesta intensive particle bai, which is compounded of Avesta bā- + i. The cognates of bā are numerous and are traceable to the monosyllabic bases *bʰā and *bʰē:

2 Geiger, Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, I, ii, 229, 396.
3 Darmesteter, Études iraniennes, i, 313 f., Horn, Neupersische Etymologie, no. 143, Grundriss, I, ii, 150, West, Mainyo-i-Khard, p. 249. On the source of be, "without", see Salemann, Grundriss, I, i, 351, 318, Horn, i, ii, 29, 160.
4 Grundriss, I, i, 311.
5 Bartholomae, Altiranisches Wörterbuch, coll. 962, 912.
6 Brugmann, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik, p. 619, Feist, Etymo-
*bhā: Full grade: Avesta bā, Armenian ba(y) (?), Old Bulgarian bo;
Reduced or first null grade: Lithuanian bū, Gothic -ba(i), Lettish -ba.

*bhē: Full grade: Greek φῆ.
Reduced or first null grade: Lithuanian bē, be, Old Prussian bhe.

Thus far, however, it seems not to have been suggested that an exact etymological analogue to the Modern Persian verbal particle -ē is to be found in Baltic Lithuanian be- prefixed to verbs adds a continuative force, as be-vargēti, "I am continually miserable", mān be-kalbant, "while I continued speaking"; and in Old Lettish -ba was affixed to verbal forms to give a similar modification of meaning, as lāidi-ba, "let it continue to be".


1 On this difficult word see Hähnemann, Armenische Grammatik, p. 427 ff.

2 On -bae beside -ba see Brugmann, p. 669.

3 Kurschat, Grammatik der litauischen Sprache, pp. 190, 385, and especially Lexikon, Indo germanische Forschungen, xiv, 92. The relationship stated to exist between Lithuanian bē and beī by Gaugélot, ib. xxvi, 357, and Trautmann, p. 311, seems uncertain, for beī would appear to be the reduced grade of the base *be(h)ēi. Osthoff, Morphologische Untersuchungen, iv, 229, connects beī with Old High German ëh; the latter is connected with Sanskrit āhī, with the form āhhī in āhhitārī, "on-rushing", ābhīmanā, "one of the Agnis", ābhītāpadā-, "lamenting".

4 Bielesenstein, Lettische Sprache, ii, 372 ff.
The names of two Kings of Adab. — By GEORGE A. BARTON, Professor in Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

In the winter of 1903/4 Dr. Edgar J. Banks discovered at Bismya the statue of an ancient king. The statue bears on its right upper arm the inscription: ʼE-SAR ʾLUGAL-DA-UĐU LUGAL ʾUDNUN. In an article in AJSL, XXI, 59, Banks in 1904 interpreted the inscription as follows: "(Temple) Eshar. King Daddu. King of Udunn." Dr. Banks suggested that Daddu was equivalent to David! This interpretation was written in Babylonia without the use of Brūnnow's Ideographes, so that Banks did not then know the Semitic name of the city. In 1905 Thureau-Dangin in his Les inscriptions de Sumer et d’Akkad, 216, 217, rendered the inscription as Semitic, thus: ʾē-sar ʾṣarrum da-lu šar adab, “E-sar, roi fort, roi d’Adab”. The same scholar in his Sumerischen und Akkadischen Königinschriften, 1907, 152, 153, transliterates as in his earlier work, rendering: "E-sar, der mächtige König, König von Adab (Udad, Usab)." Through the authority of Thureau-Dangin the name of the king was generally accepted as Esar.

We have now before us Dr. Banks long delayed Bismya, or the Lost City of Adab, in which he takes up again (p. 198ff.) the discussion of the translation of this little inscription. He maintains that from an examination of the many inscriptions from Adab, which are as yet unpublished, but which were accessible to him at Bismya, it is clear that E-SAR is the name of the temple and not of the king. He also points out that the Code of Hammurapi (col. iii, 67-69) shows that the real name of the temple was E-MAH, and hence in the earlier writing the signs were read E-MAH. The first of these contentions of Banks is borne out by material published in his book. The vase inscription (p. 201) of a king of Kish, whom
he calls Barki, but which should be read Maški (or more probably Mēki) is in front proof of it. The inscription reads: "Mē-Ki 2 Lugal Kiš 3 E-Sar 4 Il-Il 3 Bir-Is-Sī 3 Gar Pa-Te-Sī Ud-Nū n4. "Mēki, king of kish, to E-sar brought, Birissi being Patesi of Adab." Here E-SAR is clearly the name of the temple to which the king of Kish brought the vase.

The copper inscription (Banks, p. 200) proves either that the temple was really named E-MAH or that there was a temple named E-MAH in Adab, or that the sign MAH had also the value SAR. It runs: (I) 14. MAH 2 E-SI-NIM-PA-U DDU 3 GAR PA-TE-SI 4 UD-NUN 4 E-MAH MU-NA-RU (II) 1 UR-BI KI KU 3 ITU BASI, "(For) the god Makh Eshkimpaudu, being Patesi of Adab, Emakh built; its foundations (were laid) in the earth, month Basi." Dr. Poebel has shown me a list of temple-names, which is to appear in his forthcoming volume, in which the temple at Adab is spelled E-SAR-Ra. This proves that the sign SAR was read sár and not maḥ. Either, then, the sign MAH had also the value sár, or there were two temples in Adab. In the present state of our knowledge we do not know which horn of this dilemma to accept. But whether there was one or two temples in Adab, it is now certain that one of them was called E-sar. Esar is not, then, the name of the king, but of the temple and is to be read Emah. Banks is, however, wrong in his reading of the name of the king. He still contends (Bismyù, 292) that the king's name is to be read Da-udu and that it explains the name David. The inscription must be read "Esar: Lugaldaudu, king of Adab". Lugal-da-udu is the king's name. It is parallel to Lugal-asum-gal, Lugal-pa-du-da, Lugal-sag-ga, Lugal-temen-na, and other well known Sumerian names.

The name of another king of Adab is given us in a vase inscription pictured by Banks, Bismyù, 264. It reads: 1 E-Sar 2 Meš-šit-tug 3 Lugal 4 Ud-Nun, "Esar: Mešhitug, king of Adab".

1 The reading BAR would require 1, not 2. The sign seems to be 2; cf. the writer's Babylonian Writing, 478.
2 This given us the name of one of the mothertn in the calendar of Adab. Each of the early Babylonian cities had a different calendar.
Kugler’s Criterion for Determining the Order of the Months in the Earliest Babylonian Calendar. — By GEORGE A. BARTON, Professor in Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.¹

In a paper read before the Oriental Society a year ago, the difficulties which confront the students of the early Babylonian calendar were pointed out, and some of the consequent diversity of opinion concerning it among scholars was noted. During the year that has passed Father Kugler has proposed in his *Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel*, Buch II, II. Teil, I. Heft, p. 213 ff., a new criterion for determining the order of the months. Many of the tablets have at the end of the account the words BA-AN or GAR-AN preceded by a numeral, Kugler holds that these numerals refer to monthly payments, and that the number refers to the payment of the month previous to that in which the tablet is dated. It is known from a passage in Gudea² that EZEN-BAU was the first month. Kugler finds a tablet dated in EZEN-BAU which concludes with XII BA-AN, which he takes to mean 12 payments, and to refer to the distribution made in the preceding months. He holds that the accounts were not written up until the month following that in which payments were made. This accounts for the number 12 on a tablet in the month EZEN-BAU. From this one fixed example he makes a general rule. A tablet that ends with III BA-AN or III GAR-AN belongs to the fourth month; one that has at its close VIII BA-AN belongs to the ninth month; if the months are named, their position in the calendar is, he holds, fixed.

Kugler himself is, however, confronted with the difficulty that, when the month name is the same, the numbers sometimes vary. Thus in the fourth year of Urkagina a month is marked IV BA-AN and in his fifth year, III BA-AN. Kugler

¹ Presented in March, 1913.
² Stat. E. V. 1–2; G III 5.
concludes that an intercalary month had been inserted in Urkagina's fourth year, and had pushed the months forward one place. It seems strange that the intercalary month should be introduced early in the year and not at its end, but for the moment we pass that difficulty by.

Langdon has tentatively accepted Kugler's rule, declaring that "the principle introduced by the genius of Kugler can be employed in settling the position of a month, but that certainty can be obtained only by the consistent evidence of several tablets."² Pinches accepts it also in theory, though he does not place much reliance on it.

If Kugler had really discovered a principle which would throw light on this difficult problem, no one would rejoice more than I. Unfortunately his induction is contradicted by much evidence that was in his hands when he wrote, and since his work appeared Dr. Hussey's important publication of Harvard tablets has given us a much larger number of texts by which to test Kugler's principle. When tested by all the available material, the theory utterly breaks down. In the case of EZEN⁻⁴ BAU the month for which the most material exists, two tablets dated in this month bear the desired subscription XII BA-AN, viz: TSA 10; H³ 27, but one has the subscription XI BA-AN (DP 112), another XI GAR-AN (Nik.⁴ 64), while two have for their subscription, IV BA-AN, (TSA 20; H 10). If, then, Kugler's principle were correct, EZEN⁻⁴ BAU would occur three times in the year; it would be at once the first, the fifth, and the twelfth month! Each of these positions for it is supported by two texts, so that there is only Gudea's inscription to act as an arbiter among them. Still another tablet (Nik. 1), if this rule were followed, would make AMAR-A-A-SIG-GA also the first month!

Again the evidence is conflicting in the case of EZEN-BULUK-KU⁻⁴ NINA. Kugler's principle would make it the second month on the authority of Nik. 57 and H 6, but the tenth month on the authority of Nik. 6. Similarly the month SIG⁻⁶ BA-U-E-TA-GAR-RA would be the fourth month on...

¹ PSBA. XXXIV, 257.
² PSBA. XXXV, 24.
³ Dr. Hussey's Sumerian Tablets in the Harvard Semitic Museum.
⁴ Nikolaki's publication of Likhatchef's collection.
the authority of H 9, but the twelfth month on the authority of Nik. 63. Were we to take into account month names which vary in their spelling, but which probably refer to the same month, further proof of the impossibility of deducing any rule from these subscriptions might be obtained, but such proof is not needed.

In reality the tablets on which these subscriptions are found are not all accounts of the same class. Those labeled GAR-AN with one exception record the distribution of grain for the wages or food of donkeys and the men in charge of the donkeys. The donkeys assume the most important place in these tablets because they are placed first and are most numerous. This statement is true of TSA 34, 35, RTC 51, Nik. 57, 64, 66, H 31, 34, 35, 36. The one exception occurs in RTC 55, which deals exclusively with 𒆠𒆠, which Pinches thinks may have been some kind of wheat. ¹ This exception is, however, more apparent than real, for 𒆠𒆠, whatever it was, figures in the donkey tablets also; see H 31 and Nik. 57. It is quite possible that the yearly accounts of ass-hire might, for economic reasons, begin with a different month from the yearly accounts of the wages of the employees of the harem.

An examination of the BA-AN accounts reveals the fact that they are not all of one class. Thus TSA 20 and H 10, which are dated in EZEN-₄-BAU and have the subscription IV BA-AN, record payments to herders of she-asses (SIB-AMA-GAN-SA-ME), fresh-water fishermen (HA-A-DUG-GA), gardeners (NU-SAR), head farmers (SAG-API), cow-punchers (LID-RU-ME), carpenters (NAGAR), overseers (MUM-ME), scribes (DUG-SAR), shepherd of the wool-bearing-sheep (SIB UDUB-SIG-KA-ME), porters (PA-IL-ME), bird-catchers (RI-HU-ME), etc. There are some others whose functions are not certainly determined, but in general it is clear that these men had to do with out-door affairs.

Another group of tablets has to do with the royal harem. These also bear BA-AN after their numbers. The names contained in them are those of women, boys and girls, though three or four men are included. To this series belong TSA 10,

¹ PSBA. XXXV, 31.
DP 112, Nik. 1, H 20, 21, 22 and 23. These include maidservants, pages, wool-workers (weavers), and a few men.

These tablets, which range in date from Luganda's sixth year to Urkagina's sixth year, all state that a certain Lugalpa-ud-du was SIB-DUN; i.e. the same officer was in charge of all these payments.

Another group contains a greater variety of workmen and takes in both men and women. This group includes TSA 18, RTC 54, DP 113, 114, 116, 117, Nik. 2, 16, H 15, 26 and 27. This series is by no means so uniform as the other two; it contains a far greater variety of workers, some tablets mentioning but one or two classes and others a considerable number. Thus TSA 18 records the pay of NAGAR, a carpenter, GI-SIG, "workers in wool" (weavers?), women of the palace, and QA-SU-DU, whose occupation is not determined. RTC 56 mentions GIN-US "weighers", RI-HU bird-catchers, SIB-GUD "ox-herds", NU-SAR "gardeners", DUP-SAR "scribes", NAGAR "carpenters", SIB-AMA-GAN-SA "herd- ers of she-asses", SIB-ANSU "ass-herds", SIB-UDU-SIG "shepherds of wool-sheep", and HA-A-DUG-GA "fresh-water fishermen". To these some of the others, as DP 113, and Nik. 9 add IGI-NU-DU "assistant gardeners", DU-A-KUD "diggers", NI-DU "gate keepers" and others. This list is by no means exhaustive. Some of the tablets mention PA-IL "porters", NIMGIR "stewards", SAG-NANGA "chiefs of districts" or "sections", SU-I "branders" or "barbers" etc. This group of tablets at times seems almost identical with the first group, and at times almost identical with the second, since, as in the modern cast, women seem to have been employed in out-door work. That all such accounts should begin their year at the same time is pure assumption; the fact that these numbers, when attached to the same month, differ so much is proof that, even if these accounts recorded monthly payments, such was not the case.

Kugler's criterion thus turns out to be no criterion at all. It rests upon no basis of fact.

As Kugler's criterion breaks down, his evidence for the year with an intercalary month fails. We can, however, from other evidence prove that the fourth year of Urkagina was an intercalary year. As pointed out last year, DP 99, a tablet dated in the year mentioned, contains the name of an intercalary
month. It was the custom in Babylonia to introduce the intercalary month at the end of the year. The year at Lagash, as previously shown, began in the autumn. Before the time of the dynasty of Ur a new calendar was introduced according to which the year began in the spring. In the earliest calendar the intercalary month fell about August; in the later calendar, about February. The tablets from the time of the First dynasty of Babylon reveal survivals of both systems; ITU KIN-\(^4\)NANA II \(^{\text{kam}}\), which corresponds roughly to August, being the intercalary month in CT VIII, 3, No. 12; while ITU DIR-SE-GUR-KUD, which corresponded roughly with February, was ordinarily the intercalary month. Originally the ordinary succession of the months in the year was not disturbed. Intercalary months were inserted at the end. When the beginning of the year had been pushed back to the spring by the introduction of a new calendar, two predecessors survived; one favored the introduction of the intercalary month at the end of summer, the other at the end of winter. Both customs can be traced in First Dynasty tablets. If ITU KIN-\(^4\)NANA was the intercalary month, the last six months in the year would be pushed forward one place in the enumeration. Perhaps it was this custom which led at least once in the time of the First Dynasty to making Nisan the intercalary month. This appears to have been the case once in the reign of Abishu (cf. CT VIII, 27, No. 320). Of course this would push all the months for the year forward one place, as Kugler supposes was done in the time of Urkagina, but it is hazardous to base a theory on the supposition that such irregularities had occurred before the mixture of precedents from different calendars had prepared the way for it.

Kugler has called attention to the fact that the label sent by Barnamtarra, wife of Lugalandu, with her contributions to certain festivals (DP 25), shows that the feast EZEN-AB-Ê occurred in the same month as EZEN-\(^4\)BAU. This had been recognized by me as a possibility, though I hesitated to adopt the view. It is, however, undoubtedly correct.

The same label of Barnamtarra (DP 25) affords other

---

1 See JAOS. XXXIII, 56.  
2 JAOS. XXXI, 253.  
4 JAOS. XXXI, 256 n.
evidence which Kugler has overlooked. The mutilated sign at the beginning of col. i, 3 is not DUB as Allotte de la Fuye supposed, but EZEN, and the tablet records the succession of feasts: EZEN-LUGAL-ERIM, EZEN-AB-E, EZEN-KISAL, and EZEN-BAU. This testimony confirms the conjecture which I made three years ago on other grounds, that ITU-EZEN-LUGAL-ERIM immediately preceded ITU EZEN-BAU.

Langdon and Pinches have both written on the calendar of Lagash in PSBA during the past year. The latter mentions the calendar only incidentally and with all reserve; the former finds himself beset with difficulties from conflicting evidence. A postscript to his last article expresses opinions diametrically opposed to those in his previous article.

Nevertheless in this wavering some things of interest have developed. He has now come around to my view that the month name ITU MUL-BABBAR-SAG-ET-A-SUB-A-A is a reference to the star Sirius. Since it now appears from the computations of the astronomer, Dr. Frothingham, that at 2500 B.C. the heliac setting of Sirius occurred on April 13th and its heliac rising on July 3rd, Langdon would now interpret SUB in the month name as SUB "be bright", "shine" rather than SUB "incline", "fall". This is probably right. It involves, however, no change in my previous arrangement of the calendar.

Langdon still believes that the harvest in Babylonia came in the month May-June, because in the list of months published in VR 43 line 13 calls the month Simanu arah ši-ir-i ebuου, or "month of the grain harvest". The document in question is, however, an Assyrian document, and the statement referred to is an Assyrian statement, true of Nineveh and its environs, but not true of southern Babylonia. Dr. Talcott Williams, whose boyhood was passed in that region, writes me: "The harvest in Mosul comes May-June. It is earlier from Baghdad to Bussorah by at least a month." The statement for Mosul is confirmed by Layard. Dr. Williams' statement is corroborated by Mr. D. Z. Noorian, who writes: "In southern

1 Allotte de la Fuye, in a private letter, admits that this is the probable reading.
2 Cf. PSBA, XXXV, 49 ff. with XXXIV, 248 ff.
3 PSBA, XXXV, 60. 4 Nineveh and Babylon, London, 1853, 351 ff.
Babylonia barley is harvested in the latter part of March; immediately after barley wheat is harvested, and so rice, rather early in April. Round about and south of Nippur all tender vegetation dies and dries up by the end of March except such as grows along canals or swamps.\(^1\) This is confirmed by a statement of Hilprecht's.\(^2\) The harvest at Lagash was earlier by from one to two months than at Mosul. All European scholars have based their theories of the calendar of Lagash on a statement intended for Nineveh. Their systems are accordingly wrong. The persistence of the agricultural seasons, unchanged through the centuries, is the surest datum on which we can build.

Two years ago I was led through pure conjecture to place the month ITU UZ-NE-GU-RA-A in the season Dec.-Jan. Recently a section of Hammurabi's laws has seemed to me to be evidence for a Babylonian agricultural custom which confirms the conjecture. In order to make the point clear it is necessary to quote two sections.

§ 57. If a shepherd cause his sheep to eat vegetation and has not made an agreement with the owner of the field, and without the consent of the owner has pastured his sheep, the owner of the field shall harvest the field, and the shepherd, who without the consent of the owner of the field caused his sheep to eat the field, shall pay the owner of the field in addition 20 GUR of grain for each BUR of land.

§ 58. If, after the sheep have come up out of the fields and are mingled on the public common by the city gate, a shepherd turn his sheep into a field and cause the sheep to eat the field, the shepherd shall oversee the field which he has caused to be eaten, and at harvest time shall measure to the owner of the field 60 GUR of grain for each BUR of land.

It would seem from these sections of the code that it was a Babylonian custom to let the flocks graze in the fields until after the crops had been planted in the autumn and had

\(^1\) Cf. JAOS: XXXI, 259 n. 1.
\(^2\) Explorations in Bible Lands, p. 446.

* The verb is it-ta-ah-la-la, which has been a puzzle to scholars. Schell rendered "et que le troupeau (?) en entier à l'intérieur de la porte s'est déjà glissé"; Harper, "have crowded their way out" (of the gate); Johns, "have passed into" (the common field by the city gate); Ungnad [sic sich ein Schupfloch (?)] "gegraben haben"; Rogers, "closed within" (the gate). This Babylonian ittaḥalu has the force of the 8th stem of the Arabic ḫaḏ, which means among other significations, "be put in disorder" or "confusion".
grown sufficiently so that crop might be harmed by the grazing of sheep; and that later the flocks were brought in from the fields and turned into a common by the city gate. It seems safe to assume that such an agricultural custom would be general and not confined to one city, and that it would apply to all flocks whether of sheep or goats. As the crops were sown in November the month UZ-NE-GU-RA-A “the month they call the goats”, i.e. to bring them up from the fields, would naturally fall in Dec.-Jan., where I placed it. The conjecture has, then, some slight confirmation. The changes which a year’s progress in knowledge would lead me to make in my previous arrangements of the months are indicated in the following list of month names, in which such new readings of the signs are adopted as seem to be established.

First month, Sept.-Oct.,

- ITU-EZEN^4-BAU
- ITU-EZEN-AB-Ê
- ITU EZEN-AB-Ê-LAGAŠ\(^1\)

Second month, Oct.-Nov.,

- ITU EZEN-BULUK-KU-\(^4\)NINA
- ITU EZEN-ŠE-KU-\(^4\)NINA
- ITU GAR-KA-ÎD-KA\(^2\)

Third month (?), Nov.-Dec., ITU ŠI-GAR-MA

Fourth month, Dec.-Jan., ITU UZ-NE-GU-RA-A

Fifth month, Jan.-Feb.,

- ITU GAL-ŠAG-GA
- ITU GAL-UNUG\(^4\)-GA

Sixth month, Feb.-March,

- ITU AMA-UDU-TUK

Seventh month,

March-April,

- ITU ŠE-GUR-KUD
- ITU GA-UDU-UR
- ITU GA-UR
- ITU SIG-BA
- ITU SIG-\(^4\)BA-U-E-TA-GAR-RA-A

\(^1\) H 17.
\(^2\) The reading is not certain. Dr. Hussey reads ITU NIK-KA-ÎD-KA, which would mean, “month of the possession of the rivers”, or month of high water. On this reading the month would correspond to May-June, when the water was at its height.
| Eighth month, April-May, | ITU UDU-ŠU-ŠE-IL-LA-4NINA  
|                 | ITU UDU-ŠE-A-IL-LA  
|                 | ITU UDU-ŠU-ŠE-A-4NINA-TIL-LA-BA  
|                 | ITU UDU-ŠU-ŠE-A-4NINA  
| Ninth month, May-June, | ITU UDU-ŠU-ŠE-A-4NIN-GIR-SU  
|                 | ITU ŠE-GAR-UDU  
|                 | ITU GUR-DUB-BA-A  
|                 | ITU GUR-IMI-A-TA  
|                 | ITU GUR-IMI-GABA-A  
|                 | ITU ŠI-NAM-DUB-NI-BA-DUR-BA-A  
| Tenth month, June-July, | ITU HAR-RA-NE-MA-A  
|                 | ITU HAR-RA-NE-MA-A-4NINA  
| Eleventh month, July-Aug., | ITU EZEN-4NE-GUN-NA  
|                 | ITU EZEN-BULUK-KU-4NIN-GIR-SU  
|                 | ITU EZEN-ŠE-KU-4NIN-GIR-SU  
|                 | (?) ITU 4NIN-GIR-SU-E-BLI-AN-TA-SUR-RA-KA-NA-NI-DU-DU  
|                 | (?) ITU AN-TA-SUR-RA  
| Twelfth month, Aug.-Sept., | ITU EZEN-4LUGAL-ERIM  
|                 | ITU MUL-BABBAR-SAG-E-TA-SUB-A-A  
| Intercalary month, | ITU BABBAR-MIN-GAL-LA-A  

1 H'26.
Two Forged Antiques. — By Richard Gottheil, Professor in Columbia University, New York City.

Archaeological frauds have been multiplying rapidly of late, and this country has become a dumping-ground for forgeries of many kinds. Not a few modern antiques — aged long before their time — have found a resting place in our public and private collections.

It has fallen to my lot to assist in the exposure of several such frauds. In 1890 I brought to the attention of this Society an Alhambra vase belonging to this category; in 1909, a pair of beautiful doors said to have come from the madrasah of the Mameluke Sultan Barkuk, in Cairo; and in the same year, a manuscript of that arch-forgers of Arabic History in the Island of Sicily, Vella. This last-named forgery is one of the two described in the following pages.

A. A Remarkable Gold Amulet.

During the last five or six years a certain number of amulets made of gold or silver foil have come to light, covered for the most part with Hebrew inscriptions. With the exception of one or two, these amulets are now in the possession of the New York Public Library. They are said to have been found in graves excavated at Irbid in the Hauran; a statement which rests entirely upon the good faith (God save the mark!) of the dealers themselves. At the last meeting of this society, Professor Montgomery favored us with a translation of two of these amulets. Since then, one further copy has been brought to this country, which raises the number of these objects in the New York Public Library to six. It is with the sixth that the present paper has to do.

In size and general appearance, it is easily recognized as belonging to the same class as the other amulets, though it is the first of the larger size to be presented in gold. As an ord-
inary amulet, it would not especially arouse our interest; but when we come to examine the writing upon it, our curiosity is engaged. The surface is divided into two fields, which are evidently quite distinct one from the other. The first field contains writing evidently meant to be either Phoenician or old Aramaic—a strange circumstance in itself, as the previous finds seem to point to a community of Jews living in Irbid during the first centuries of our era, when the Aramaic script had long given way to the so-called square characters. This circumstance, however, might pass; it would only make it necessary that we revise our dates in connection with this community. But the Aramaic inscription contains nothing but variations of portions of the ordinary Semitic alphabet, first in its regular and secondly in its reverse order; the so-called ḥiqqāṭ, and its complement the ṭashrāf. Even so, we might hesitate to declare ourselves doubters, when we remember the many uses made of the alphabet by mystics of early times and down through the Middle Ages; or, again, our amulet-maker might have belonged to the class of simple-minded and God-fearing men, like the monk in the story of Luther, who told merely the alphabet on their heads, preferring that God himself should put the letters into words pleasing in His sight. Yet, we are led to doubt the simplicity of the simple-minded man in our own case, for he has mixed up Phoenician or Aramaic letters of various epochs and has used some which belong to no epoch at all. Finally, at the end of the first two fields, he has added a line of letters that to all intents and purposes are Samaritan in character.

The examination of the second field confirms us as doubters. The Aramaic inscription in equivocal characters to which is attached a line of Samaritan is bad enough; but when to this is joined an old Babylonian inscription, the climax is certainly reached. For the Babylonian inscription is an old acquaintance found on a mace head of Sargon of Agade, whose name and title it gives. 1

This much, at least, can be said: the forger of the amulet was a man of no ordinary talent. He certainly had imagin-

---

1 Shar ganni | Shar ali | Shar ḫ-a-de kılı | a-na | bi Shamash | in the Ud-Kib. | num kılı ( = Sippar), see, e.g., Ball, Light from the East, p. 52; Radau p. 161, note.
ation, and a sense of historical proportion, if historical import-
ance is measured by bigness. He has roamed at will over a
space of some three or four thousand years; but we should
be thankful to him for this, for it has enabled us the more
easily to follow his somewhat tortuous footsteps.

B. The "Kitāb Diwān Miṣr".

Authentic documents from the early centuries of Moham-
medan dominion are of rare occurrence, and therefore are
highly prized. It is only of late that the finds of Egyptian
papyri have begun to yield of their fulness something in the
service of Mohammedan studies. The hand of time and the
negligence of man have ruthlessly destroyed the mass of re-
cords that must have existed in the chancelleries of the various
Moslem empires. I was accordingly much surprised and de-
lighted when, in 1908,¹ I was shown a manuscript (said to have been brought to this country by an Italian sailor) bear-
ing the title "Book of the Diwān of Egypt".² The volume had all the outward marks of great age; even the bookworm
had left many traces on the pages. The edges of the codex
had been frayed, and each page was set in paper that was
very evidently of much later date than the original. My inter-
est was deepened still further by the deciphering of the open-
ing paragraph. The manuscript contained nothing less than
a copy of the letters which had come to the Egyptian Caliph
Al-Mustansir Billah (1035—1094) from Arab rulers in Sicily
and Tunis, and the answers of the Caliph to them; and the
copy—it was asserted—had been made at the instance of the
Caliph himself in the year of the Hejira 467. Here, indeed,
was a find of considerable importance; for the reign of Al-
Mustansir was long and important.

I had hardly gotten as far as this, when doubts began to
be raised in my mind. How did the scribes of al-Mustansir
come to write in a well-defined Maghrebi script? True, it was
not the intertwined and entangled script in which later
Maghrebis delight; but it bore all the hall-marks of this extra-

ordinary development of Arabic writing. The manu

¹ The account of this forgery was read at a meeting of this Society in the spring of 1908.
² كتائب ديوان مصر
might indeed be a later copy of an earlier original. But, if the script was intertwined and entangled, what adjectives were fit to qualify the language it expressed? None that I could find. It was quite evidently Arabic—or was intended to be—but it was the most impossible Arabic that I had ever seen. Very soon certain peculiarities which were easily recognized as Maltese and Tunisian came to view, but most of the sentences could not be construed even upon the very liberal basis laid down by Arab grammarians. Through some of them shimmered an Italian construction or an Italian word composition. This was too much even for a willing believer. And the doubt once quickly entrained others. The thin brown paper was entirely foreign to Arabic manuscripts; the artistic design of the frontispiece was as un-Oriental and as un-Arabic as it could be. But enough! The story is as follows:

In the year 1782, there was in Palermo a certain Giuseppe Vella, a Maltese by birth, a member of the Jerusalem order and afterwards Abbot of St. Pancrace. At the time he was Chaplain at the Abbey of St. Martin, three leagues distant from Palermo. As a Maltese, he was naturally familiar with the local Arabic dialect of his birth-place; but he was ignorant of literary Arabic as well as of Mohammedan history. There happened to be four or five Arabic manuscripts in the library of St. Martin's, and when a certain Mohammed ibn Uthman came in 1782 as ambassador of Morocco to the court of Naples, he visited St. Martin's near Palermo. Whether because Mohammed ibn Uthman and Vella could in a measure understand each other's speech, or not, the two formed an acquaintance that was destined to be productive of much evil for students of Arabic. For hardly had the Moroccan delegate left when Vella announced the discovery in St. Martin's of a valuable Arabic manuscript giving the history of the Arabs in the Island of Sicily. A few years later (1786), having kept up by correspondence his connection with the Moroccan delegate, he noised abroad the receipt of another important manuscript found at Fez, containing the correspondence between the Norman princes, Count Roger and Duke Robert Guiscard, and the Fatimid Caliph al-Mustansir in Egypt. King Ferdinand of Sicily became deeply interested in these discoveries, and even went so far as to send Vella and three
students to Fez upon a mission of enquiry for other manuscripts dealing with the same subject. Patriotic Sicilians joined their king. Among these was Monseigneur Airoldi, Archbishop of Heraclea, Judge of the Apostolic Legation and of the Monarchy of Sicily, who paid all the expenses connected with the publication of the volumes and even had Arabic type sent especially from Parma for the purpose. Six volumes of this history appeared between the years 1789 and 1792,\(^1\) Vella hiding his own personality behind that of a suppositional Mustafa ibn Hānū. Airoldi had even commenced the publication of these texts in Latin and Italian, in 1788 (48 pp.).\(^2\) Writers on the history of Sicily generally accepted the manuscript as genuine, and Wahl, Rossi, Ferrara, Piazzzi, etc. made use of it in their works. Even so good a scholar as Olaus Gerard Trütschen at Rostock was caught in the trap of the wily Maltese, and republished a small portion in his “Elementa arabeum” (Rostock, 1792), and a professor in Stuttgart, P. W. G. Hausleutner, translated the first four volumes into German under the title “Geschichte der Araber in Sicilien”\(^3\) (1791—92). The Pope even lent his consideration to the fraud by a profuse letter of thanks, dated 1790. But there were not wanting conscientious students who quickly saw through the very evident fraud. Joseph Hager was called to Palermo in 1794 by the king himself; and in 1796 Monseigneur Adami, Bishop of Aleppo, who was on his way from Rome to his own diocese, was hidden to Sicily to examine the precious manuscript. Both men pronounced the manuscript a stupid forgery,\(^4\) the latter even writing a treatise in German which

---


\(^2\) *Codex diplomaticus Siciliiæ sub Saracennorùm imperio ab anno 827 ad 1073; nunc primam ex Mus. Mauro-occidentalis depromptus cura et studio A. Airoldi*. Pauromi 1788 (pp. I—48).


\(^4\) The report of Adami is published, together with a letter by the Chevalier d'Italinsky, in von Hammer’s *Fundgruben des Orients*, vol. I (1860), pp. 226 sq.
was afterwards published in a French translation.\footnote{I have not been able to see the German original. The title of the French translation is: \textit{Relation d'une insigne Imposition Littéraire découverte dans un Voyage fait en Sicile en 1794. Par Mr. le Dr. Hager. Traduit de l'Allemand, Erlangen 1799.}} In the meanwhile Vella had gone ahead with the printing of his second manuscript containing the correspondence between the Norman princes and the Egyptian Caliph. This was undertaken by the king himself and gotten out in two editions—one folio and one quarto—in regal style, the Arabic text side by side with the translation.\footnote{كتاب درويان مصر: \textit{Libro del consiglio de Egitto etc.} Palermo, Reale Stamperia, 1793. Cfr. Zenker, \textit{Bibliotheca Orientalis}, I, p. 94. A portion of this was republished in 1794 by the secretary of the Palermo Academy "del Bon Gusto" for use in one of the seminaries.} In this edition Giuseppe Vella's name is mentioned as translator with the ornate title, "Cappelano del sac. ordine Gerosolimitano, Abate di Sant. Pancragio, Prof. di lingua araba nella reale academy di Palermo e socio nazionale della reale academy della scienze". The first volume, containing no less than 370 pp., appeared in 1793 and the second was in the press when the bubble burst. Vella was arrested and tried before three different tribunals and condemned. But it is evident either that the authorities did not consider the crime to be a serious one, or that strong influence was exerted in his behalf. He was condemned simply to seclusion in a small villa at Mozzo Monreale, a suburb of Palermo.

In such manner was finished the first act of the drama; and it would seem that with the final condemnation of Vella the whole matter could be relegated to the lumber-room or finally classed among the rather numerous forgeries which have been committed at the expense of the Orient. But after the lapse of more than one hundred years, the forgeries of Vella received a new lease of life; and in order that this lease of life may be cut short, or at least not transferred to these shores, I ask the attention of the Society for a few moments longer. About the year 1905 a certain Varvaro read a paper before the "Società Siciliana per la Storia Patria" in Palermo—but which does not appear in its publications—in which he tried to establish the thesis that Vella had not entirely falsified the manuscripts that he brought forward, but that he
had based them upon authentic documents of great value which were in his possession, and that Vella's manuscripts might still be of great service in studying the history of Sicily in its relations with various Mohammedan states. The manuscripts to which he referred were not the two sequestered at the time of the arrest of Vella, for these are still, I am reliably informed, in the Archivio di Stato at Palermo. It seems that after Vella had been relegated to the villa in Mozzo Monreale he continued to write Arabic manuscripts. These formed parts of Vella's effects which passed on to his family and were preserved instead of being destroyed. The Varvaros are distantly related to the Vella family, and in course of time have become possessed of the books which (being entirely ignorant of Arabic) they consider to be of great value, and which they now desire to sell. At the meeting referred to, Varvaro brought with him one of the manuscripts. Professor Carlo A. Nallino, an eminent Arabic scholar, formerly of Naples but now connected with the University of Palermo, recognized immediately that it was not a genuine work, and later in the house of the Varvaros he saw two or three more of the manuscripts, one of which was the Kitâb Diwân Mîgâr.

It is this last volume, evidently a copy of the original corpus delicti, which has at length been sold, and has found its way (together with sundry other Italian things) to this country, in the hope that it may be sold here to some credulous American. Its sole value is a mournful one, and it belongs, by all right, in a Museum of Criminology.

In conclusion, I ought to say that I am indebted to Professor Nallino for the information contained in the second part of this paper.¹

¹ Note, 48/13. In his translation of al-Šairâfî's description of the Egyptian "Foreign Office" at the time of the Fatimides, M. Henri Massé has been led astray by the title, and has classified the "Kitâb Diwân Mîgâr" among the "recueils de modèles épistolaires à l'usage de la Chancellerie"! See his Ibn al-Šairâfî: Code de la Chancellerie d'Égypte; Extrait du Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'archéologie Orientale, Tome XI, Le Caire, 1913, p. 67.
Mohammedanism in Borneo: Notes for a Study of the
Local Modifications of Islam and the Extent of its
Influence on the native Tribes.—By Mrs. Samuel

The whole question of the nature and history of Mohammedanism in Borneo is much larger than the scope of the present paper. I have some incomplete notes to offer, which I venture to present at this time, because I think that even these have a certain theoretical significance that may be of interest; and because I hope that from this body of scholars intimately familiar with the various manifestations of Mohammedanism I may gain some valuable suggestions for further investigation of its history in Borneo.

In studying the effect of environment upon the religion of a primitive people, such as the jungle tribes of the interior of Borneo, it is of course necessary to take into account the possibility of foreign ideas interrupting the simple interplay of surroundings and sensibilities. Of the foreign elements to be reckoned with in Borneo the chief is Mohammedanism, brought to the coast settlements during several centuries by Arab traders and adventurers. While investigating the influence of the Arabs in Borneo, I became convinced that we have here a striking instance of the manner in which the introduction of a new religion into a country follows certain definite economic laws, similar to those that govern the growth of religions on their native soil.

There has been implied, if not actually stated, in many studies of religions, the theory that a religion develops according to environmental influences only so far as it is not interfered with by the contact of foreign ideas. Some such theories divide a religion into ideas appropriate to the native environment, and ideas that have come from the north, south, east, or west. Having traced the religious elements to their geographical or linguistic sources, the historian leaves the
matter,—and rightly perhaps so far as he is a mere historian. It has been recognized of course that there are local reasons why a new faith sometimes takes hold and sometimes does not. The reasons are usually stated parenthetically in a historical account. For the science of religion, however, to become really scientific, it would seem necessary to go further, to gather up these reasons and formulate them into laws of borrowing corresponding to the now very widely admitted laws of the growth of ideas according to the environment in which they were thought out.

The facts offered in this paper are presented in the hope that they may prove a minor bit of suggestive material for the formulation of a law of contact. They consist of a few notes, necessarily incomplete, on what happened when Indonesian Mohammedanism was brought in touch with Malay Paganism and the typical jungle religion of Borneo.

It was, to begin with, a great economic force that brought Mohammedanism to Borneo. And it was a geographical barrier—the jungle—that stopped it at the coast, and made it after four hundred years still a foreign faith. The sheltered waters, short distances, frequent harbors and favorable monsoons of the Malay Archipelago developed very early a seafaring small-trading population such as the Malays and Bugis about the coasts of many islands. They were all ready to form a link in the chain of commerce when the greater nations, first of Asia, then of Europe discovered and determined to have the spices and dazzling natural wealth of the tropical islands. Emporia were formed at Acheh, Bantam, and elsewhere, where the native traders of the Archipelago brought the collected wares to merchants of larger vessels capable of sailing the open seas. As the predominance of carrying trade in these products of the east shifted westward from China through India to Arabia, the religion of the Arab came to the Eastern Archipelago.

3 Crawford, History of the Indian Archipelago, Edinburgh 1820, iii, pp. 199—201; Hugh Clifford, Encyclopaedia Britannica, XVII, p. 474. Article, Malay Peninsula. In the second century B.C. the trade with
The first teachers of Mohammedanism in the Archipelago were Arab traders, pirates, and adventurers who came to seek their fortune and made converts only as a secondary task. Later, as the new faith gained headway, the prospect of making money attracted teachers from India, Egypt, Mecca, and Hadramaut. 1 From the 12th to the 20th century, following in the wake of trade, Mohammedanism has been spreading all over the Indian Archipelago. 2 Borneo was not exempt from its influence. The difference in the course of events in Borneo from that in Java, Sumatra, and many of the other centers, Ceylon was wholly in the hands of the Arabs; by the middle of the eighth century A.D. there were many Arab traders in Canton; from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries, until the coming of the Portuguese, they were the undisputed masters of trade with the East. They were probably early in the Malay Archipelago, but no mention is made of these islands in the work of Arab geographers earlier than the ninth century. G. K. Niemann, Inleiding tot de kennis van den Islam, Rotterdam 1861, p. 337, and Reinaud, Geographie d'Aboufeda, tome 1, p. CCCXXXIX, quoted by T. W. Arnold, The Preaching of Islam, London 1896, pp. 293—294.

1 C. Snouck Hurgronje, The Achehnese, trans. by O'Sullivan, London 1906, ii, p. 279. Which of these regions sent its missionary-traders to Borneo seems a little vague. They are generally spoken of simply as Arabs. They all claimed and were accorded in Borneo the title of Sird. Some of the Mohammedan influence in Borneo came either directly, or via the Javanese and Sumatran merchants who traded there, from the Malabar coast, where the Shafi'iya sect is predominant to-day as it was in the fourteenth century. Voyages d' Ibn Batoutah, Paris 1846–58, iv, pp. 66, 80, quoted by Arnold p. 294. For the Shafi'i Kings in Borneo cf. below p. 28. The predominant influence to-day, however, is that of Mecca. Besides the annual pilgrims who come to Mecca merely for a short time, there is a permanent colony of Malays in Mecca who keep in constant communication with their fellow countrymen in the Archipelago. And religious books printed in Mecca are carried to all parts of the Archipelago. The number of annual pilgrims to Mecca from Borneo increased in the latter part of the nineteenth century 66% in twelve years. Niemann pp. 406–7, and C. Snouck Hurgronje, Mekka, Hague 1889, ii, pp. xv, 399–400, quoted by Arnold, pp. 329–330.

2 With the Mohammedan conquest the Perso-Arabic Alphabet was introduced among the Malays. Hugh Clifford, ibid. p. 477; Marshall's Malay Grammar, London 1812, pp. 1, 2. Crawfurde, iii, p. 207, gives the following dates for the introduction of Mohammedanism into the Archipelago: 1204 A.D. the Achehnese, 1278 the Malays of Malacca, 1478 the Javanese, 1495 natives of the Spice Islands. Cf. also ibid. ii, pp. 304 to 306; and St. John, ibid. i, pp. 48–51. Cf. also Arnold, passim, pp. 296–343.
was that while in the latter practically the whole population became at least nominally Mohammedan, in Borneo the converts were, in spite of zealous propaganda, almost entirely limited to the partially civilized Malays of the sea-coast. So much is this true that in Borneo the terms Malay and Mohammedan have become synonymous and interchangeable. A natural highway of trade brought Mohammedanism to the harbors and rivermouths of the island. A natural barrier, the jungle, stopped it at the coast.

The coastal population of Borneo is composed of colonists of the trading nations mentioned above, the Malays and Bugis and others, from Sumatra, Java, the Malay Peninsula and Celebes. Most of these colonies were, however, formed before the conversion of the Malays to Mohammedanism. The Malay kingdom of Brunei was founded in the middle of the thirteenth century, though even before that there were probably some few colonists there. It became Mohammedan not until much later—some time before 1530. 1 Colonists from Java had settlements at Passir, Kotei, and Banjermassin, on the south coast of Borneo, at Sambas, Mampawa, and Landak on the west coast as early as 1360. 2 The introduction of Mohammedanism

---


into these various settlements, according to different accounts, occurred sometime between 1495 and 1770. Several Malay Sultans on the Kapuas river were converted to Islam as late as 1850. The Malays are Mohammedan, and both the Malays and Mohammedanism came from without, but it was not in the first instance the Malays who brought Mohammedanism to Borneo.

Before the Arabian era Malay traders and pirates were attracted to the mouths of the navigable rivers of Borneo for shelter, and found there opportunities for getting, with slight work, gold and diamonds; by raids on the weak Dyaks, cargoes of slaves; by barter with them, a wealth of rattans, camphor and other saleable jungle produce. They founded towns at the river mouths, later having outposts for trade farther up river. It was long after these communities were established that individual Arab adventurers came to Borneo and preached their faith. Later still, the converts were reinforced in number by Malays from Sumatra or the Peninsula,

Gekadieven oorsprong in den Malayischen Archipel, p. 118, identifies Tandoeng Poera, mentioned in the History of the Hindu-Javan kingdom of Madjapahit as among the conquerors of the great monarch of that realm, Hayam Wuruk, who reigned from 1351 (?)—1389, as probably Matalu, on the southeast coast of Borneo. Basing his evidence largely on a Portuguese report of 1514, published in 1882, and on corroborative notices especially in the Lava de 1516 of Duarte Barbosa, he concludes that the kingdom of Madjapahit cannot have succumbed entirely to Mohammedan domination until sometimes between 1516 and 1521. However uncertain may be the date of the colonies in Borneo, they seem at least to have been much earlier than this time. Cf. also Earl, p. 336; Raffles, ii, p. 171. Mohammedanism was introduced into Succadans on the West Coast of Borneo by Arabs from Palembang in Sumatra in 1500. R. P. A. Doxy, Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme, Leiden 1879, p. 386, quoted by Arnold, p. 316. Into Banjermassin on the South Coast in the sixteenth century from Daawak, one of the Mohammedan states that rose on the ruins of Madjapahit. J. Hageman, Beitrage tot de Geschiedenis van Borneo, Ts. Ind. t. L. 78, Deel vi, 1856, p. 236, quoted by Arnold, p. 316.

which had in the mean time become centers of Mohammedan propaganda. On the east coast of Borneo colonies were founded by the similar nation of Bugis, who migrated to Borneo both before and after the coming of Mohammedanism to their home country of Celebes about 1600.¹

We may take as a typical instance of the turn to Mohammedan in Borneo the narrative, which comes to us from many sources, and is apparently as reliable as any hundred and fifty year old story of these regions can be, of the founding of one of the chief Mohammedan kingdoms of Borneo, that of Pontianak, the great Malay trading centre of to-day at the mouth of the Kapuas river.

A fortune-hunting Arab, Serif Hoesein ibn Ahmed al-Kadri (I give Veth's Dutch orthography of the name) came to Matan, an ancient Javanese colony on the southwest coast of Borneo, in 1735. He found Mohammedanism already vaguely known there, strengthened it, instructed the people and was highly venerated. After a quarrel with the Sultan of Matan he fled to another Javanese-Malay colony, Mampawa, whose Sultan received him with open arms, built a mosque, gave him large control of his kingdom, and gave his daughter in marriage to the dashing handsome son of the Arab adventurer and a Dyak slave girl. This young half-savage-half-Arab, who nevertheless bore his father's title of Serif, at the age of twenty-two left his royal bride and started out to seek his fortune on the seas. After a wild career of piracy and audacious foreign trade, during the course of which he married the daughter of another Malay Sultan, engaged in opium trade, captured Chinese, English, French, and Dutch ships, he had amassed great wealth. Gathering about himself a band of Malay and Bugis followers of his own type, he came to the mouth of the Kapuas river and established himself with his retainers on a haunted island in the river, which gave him a

protected base from which to prey on trading prahus. The island was a shrewdly chosen location, not only for its accessibility to the sea and because its evil ghostly reputation secured him from attack, but it commanded the Kapuas river, the immense navigable artery, by which all the inland wealth of the whole western district of Borneo must come down to the sea. The Seriff Abdoee'r Rahman soon found it more profitable to give up piracy, turn into a respectable and pious Moslem, and become the protector instead of the assassin of traders, gaining his income by a levy on all boats using the river. He built a mosque, established the Mohammedan ritual, and made pious pilgrimages to the grave of his father, who had long before his death repudiated this scape-grace son. Thus was founded the Arab dynasty—racially half-Dyak—of the Malay kingdom of Pontianak.¹

And thus Mohammedanism came to the Kapuas river. It took it nearly one hundred years to extend its influence 300 kilometers up river to the Malay settlements of the lake region. And the reason for that is again the jungle. It is only in recent years when the Dutch have opened up the country, and made not only more intercommunication between the different parts of the country, but also more contact with the outside world, that Mohammedanism has greatly spread in their provinces.

¹ W. L. Ritter, 'Jutische herinneringen', Amsterdam, 1843, pp. 192, 193, C. L. Hartmann, Algemeen verslag van de residentie Pontianak over 1823, pp. 2, 3 (unpublished MS.), van Lijnden, p. 601, Muller, p. 346, and Tobias, p. 51, quoted by Veth, i, pp. 249—266; A. Pompe, Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Overzeesche Bezittingen, 2nd ed. Schoonhoven 1872, p. 226; Leyden in Moor's Notices, pp. 101, 102. The town was afterwards named for the spectra of the haunted Island. So great was the fear of this place that the Arab founder had to shoot up the woods for two hours before he could persuade his men to land. Leyden gives Pontianak or Pontianak as "the name the Malays give to a spectra of the forests which appears in the form of a winged female," Moor's Notices, app. p. 192; according to Veth the pontianaks are ghosts of children who have never seen the light on account of the death of their mothers, or, more usually, the mothers themselves who have died in childbirth, and go about in lonely places naked with loose hair, and moaning (i, p. 14); in the Malay Peninsula the pontianak is the ghost of all still-born child, while the ghost of a woman who dies in childbirth, the ghost that goes around with long floating hair is known as a langsnir. Both of these are supposed by the Peninsular Malays to be embodied in owls. Skeat, Malay Magic, pp. 325—327.
But to return for a moment to the earlier period. What effect had the establishment of the Malay and Bugis semi-civilized colonies, and their subsequent conversion to Mohammedanism upon the native savages who occupied Borneo previous to the coming of the sea-faring folk? Of the majority it may be said that it simply drove them back into their jungle, where in greater isolation than ever, they continue to live a wild free life of independence with all their old habits of thought and custom. Some were directly enslaved or conquered by the Malays, or remained among them, intermarried with them and adopted their manner of life so as to become almost indistinguishable from them. Between the entirely independent and the entirely subjugated Dyaks are the tribes who are called in Dutch-Malay terminology “serah-plichtig” and “hasil-plichtig” Dyaks, who, keeping their own political organization and manner of life, pay as “hasil” or “serah” a certain proportion of their gains in primitive agriculture or jungle life to the Malay Mohammedan prince whom they acknowledge as overlord. The hold on these Dyaks of the Malay prince is very slight and may be repudiated by them entirely simply by going (in the next of their frequent movings of the village) over the boundary of the territory which he theoretically controls. It is of course only among the last two classes of Dyaks, the entirely amal gamated and semi-dependent, that we find any evidence of Mohammedanism at all; and how much influence it has had in any case seems to depend upon the extent to which the Dyaks have adopted the Malay habit of life.  

1 "The aborigines, distributed by the geographical character of the region into numerous communities, have been further isolated by foreign rule and colonisation. The superior races have frequently turned their natural eminence into a means of oppression; and instead of drawing the natives forth from their barbarous haunts, have imprisoned them more deeply in their jungles." St. John, i, p. 18; cf. also Temminck, p. 185. Throughout this paper I have used the word Dyak in the widely-accepted though somewhat inexact sense as denoting all the native jungle tribes, as contrasted with the semi-civilized nations of later immigration. The Dyaks are not racially homogeneous, and probably represent several layers of migrations in the far distant past, but they have a certain cultural uniformity and may be classed as "aboriginal" in contrast with the Malays and Bugis and other comparatively recent colonists.

The population of Borneo is estimated at 1,800,000, of whom only 300,000 represent the Malays and other semi-civilized peoples. All the
I have attempted to analyse separately the Mohammedanism of the Malays, and that of the tribes of native descent who by conquest or commerce have come under Malay influence and given at least a nominal allegiance to Islam. But this is extremely difficult because the race nomenclature has become confused with a cultural one. All people, of whatever nationality, who have adopted the stage of civilization and something of the dress and manner of the typical Malay coast-dweller, are called Malays. Even, frequently, the classification is made religious, and since most Malays are Mohammedan, all Mohammedans are called Malays,—including Chinese, Dyaks, Klings, Arabs, Bugis, slaves from Sumbawa and elsewhere, Rayyats from Lingga, and even descendants of negro slaves brought here, as well as various racial mixtures of Malay with Arab,

rest are Dyaks. Holbe, Revue Anth., 1911, p. 435; the Malays are founds with a very few exceptions, only along the courses of the great navigable rivers, and most of them are in the trading towns at the river mouths. For typical geographical location of some Malay settlements, cf. Enthoven, pp. 123, 126, 135—137, 148, 153, 176, 185, 189—183; Low, pp. 221, 350 to 371; Boek, pp. 161, 162, 242, 243; Molengraaf, pp. 48, 286—293; Brooke in Keppel, pp. 43, 45, 52, 53; Brooke in Capt. R. N. Mundy, Narrative of Events in Borneo and Celebes, London 1848, i, pp. 193, 369; Sir Charles Brooke, Ten Years in Sarawak, London 1886, i, pp. 19, 22, 24; Maxwell, quoted by H. L. Roth, Natives of Sarawak and British North Borneo, i, p.1. A very few Malays singly or in small groups are found wandering in the far interior, or living in Dyak villages. They are either individual adventurers who have gone to seek the jungle produce themselves, or fugitives from justice. A. W. Nieuwenhuis, Influence of changed conditions on the physical and psychical development of the population of Central Borneo. Proc. Koninkl. Acad. v. Wetens. te Amsterdam, Mar. 1903, p. 12; ibid, Centraal Borneo, i, p. 4. Near the coast where there are gold, diamond and other mines, the Malays have forced the Dyaks to work for them in the mines. Elsewhere they have left the Dyaks to their old occupations and manner of life, contenting themselves with exacting tribute of rice and jungle products, and personal services at certain times, and further gaining from the Dyaks by forced trade at exorbitant prices. Observers agree in noting a marked difference in appearance and welfare between the absolutely free Dyaks of the interior, and those more or less subject to the Malays; cf. Enthoven, pp. 142, 163, 193, 217, 560, 561, 563, 567, 571, 572; Low, p. 17; S. Müller, ii, p. 385; quoted by Roth, i, p. 387 note; Earl, p. 318; Bock, pp. 210—211: Nieuwenhuis, Centraal Borneo, i, pp. 16, 26; Ida Pfeiffer, Meine Zweite Weltreise, Engl. Transl. New York, 1858, pp. 76, 77, 96.
Dravidian, Dyak, Chinese, and even European. Malay is in Borneo the great amalgam of race, language, and ideas. 1

Nevertheless it is possible to make a rough dual classification of the nominal adherents of Islam into those who use, entirely the Malay language, dress and manner of living, and those of Dyak or part Dyak descent who keep to a greater or less extent the native economic conditions and manner of life.

In general the faith of the Malays of Borneo represents what has been called "Indonesian Mohammedanism." There has been noted by scholars interested in this part of the world a type of religion extending all over the Malay Archipelago, nominally Mohammedan, which, while varying locally in many details, has enough homogeneity to be easily recognizable. Three influences, in Indonesia, have modified Mohammedanism and turned it into a definite religion of the region. They are:

1. The environment, which is geographically and economically similar for the coast peoples of many islands.

2. Survivals of early "Indonesian" pre-Mohammedan ideas and customs, so strongly held that the new faith to be successful must either absorb or tolerate them.

3. A generally prevalent mental attitude of primitive superstition.

---

1 Veth, i, p. 179 gives the following striking description of the Malays in Borneo: "In den uitgebrektsten zin begrijpt men thans onder dien namen allen die de Mohammedamenc godsdienst hebben aangenomen: alle belijders van den Prophet van Mecca, al waren zij ook geheel of gedeeltelijk van Dajaksche of Chinesche afkomst, of zelfs uit aangebragt neger-slaven geboren, worden, zoowel als de Arabieren van Pontianak, de Boegnizen van de Oostkust van Mampawa, de Javaamatische en Klingsche kolonisten in Succedum en Banjar-massim, de slaven van Soembara en elders aangevoerd, en de Orang-laut of Rajats, van Lingga en Bitung, herwaarts overgekomen, tot de Maleijers gerekend. Nogtans maken de Maleijers uit het Djohoresche rijk en zijn wijl verspreide volksplantingen afkomstig, over het algemeen het hoofd bestanddeel dier gemengde bevolking uit, hetwelk op de geheele geamalgameerde massa, waarin slechts de Arabieren en Boegnizen eenige meerder zelfstandigheid bewaard hebben, zijn stempel gedrukt heeft." Cf. St. John, i, p. 198; Earl, p. 239-240. The so-called "Emabohoe Malays" were originally Dyaks who were converted to Islam about 1850. Enthoven, p. 203. The Malay language is the same sort of composite as the people, containing words from Sanskrit, Persian, Singhalese, Tamoul, Arab, Chinese, Portuguese, Dutch, etc., cf. Holbé, op. cit., p. 481; Marsden, Malay Grammar, Introd. p. xviii.
Let us see how these three influences are exemplified in the religion of the Malays of Borneo.

As elsewhere in the Archipelago, Mohammedanism gained its way in Borneo partly by being already suited to the Malays’ temperament and manner of life, and partly by cutting or stretching itself to the Procrustean bed where it did not already fit. The Malays of Borneo in the pre-Mohammedan era, like the coast peoples of many other islands, were already sea-faring traders, given to adventure and piracy. They built their own boats and travelled in them from port to port. Some of them were artisans and manufacturers, but the majority engaged in trade. They bartered their manufactures, their sea-products, and their imported goods to the natives for the local articles of value, which they carried in small boats to emporia where they could sell them to European and Asiatic merchants. This trade, which still continues, has sometimes netted the Malays as high as 500% profit. Before the European policing of the seas they added piracy, openly or secretly, to their sources of revenue.\(^1\)

The Arabs who came to their shores with greater skill as navigators, greater shrewdness as bargainers, and at least as great unscrupulousness as robbers, won for their religion the glory of superiority in the Malays’ own characteristics.\(^2\)

---

1 The general articles of Malay trade past and present are described in Boyle, Adventures among the Dyaks of Borneo, London 1866, p. 106; M. Buys, Twee Maanden op Borneo’s Westkust, Leiden 1892, p. 8; Nieuwenhuis, Quer durch Borneo, i. p. 56; Brooke in Keppel, pp. 52, 53; Low, pp. 26, 57, 117, 366. For description of the Malay method of trade with the natives; cf. Sir Spenser St. John, Life in The Forests of the Far East, London 1893, ii. p. 298; Ada Pryer, A Decade in Borneo; Moor’s Notices, p. 6; Bock, pp. 87, 202, 203; Boyle, pp. 98, 321; Sir Charles Brooke, i. p. 45, ii. pp. 162, 164; Nieuwenhuis, In Centraal Borneo, i. pp. 13, 22, 24—26, 190, 129; Earl, p. 263.

2 Crawford, i. p. 139; Holbé, Revue Anthropologique, 1911, p. 450; Raffles, i. p. 250; Crawford, i. p. 139, says of the Arabs in the Archipelago, that “the genuine Arabs are spirited, fair and adventurous merchants. Their mixed race is of a much less favorable character, and is considered as a supple intriguing, and dishonest class.” It was very largely the half-breed Arabs who took the leadership of the Malays in Borneo, and directed piratical exploits. Cf. above p. 318 the account of the founding of the Arab dynasty of Pontianak. For their influence in Sarawak, cf. the Journal of Sir James Brooke in Keppel, pp. 54, 302, 303, also Keppel, pp. 268, 269, and Low, pp. 189—191; for further ana-
With this prejudice in its favor, Mohammedanism easily won converts, especially as there were elements in it favorable to the peculiar local conditions. The confession of faith, undoubtedly, in Borneo as in the Malay Peninsula and Acheh, was regarded less as a creed than a declaration of fealty. The Holy War against the infidel was held to justify their slave-hunting raids on the Dyaks of the interior, as well as piratical attacks on European vessels. The Hadji across the partially familiar seas, became to this boat-building, sea-faring people immensely popular, giving the Hadjis not only prestige and honour on their return, but opportunities for a wider area of trade. The Hadji, among the Borneo Malays, as in Acheh, is one of the most faithfully kept of the precepts of Islam. A great portion of the ritual prayers is neglected, as not fitting in well with their life. The laws of trade of the Koran are ignored, as according to Snouck Hurgronje they have had to be in all modern trading communities. Mohammedanism was embraced eagerly just in so far as it fitted in with the habits of their life which had grown from the environment.

But to realise the close relation between the modifications of Mohammedanism and the economic status of the Malays we must differentiate the position and morals of the rich and poor Malays; the large merchants on the one hand, who are chiefly the princes and rulers; and on the other hand the fisherman and mechanics who are of a very different type. It

i


In the Malay Peninsula the "Holy War" was held to justify the kidnapping of Sakai and Samang aborigines. In Acheh, according to Snouck Hurgronje, it owes its popularity "to its harmonizing with their war-like and predatory pre-Mohammedan customs." In both these places the ritual prayers are very laxly observed. Wilkinson says of the Malay Peninsula that "it is hard for a clerk or mechanic to keep the fast or to find time for the pilgrimage to Mecca." But in Acheh, where voyages are the order of the day, as in the trading ports of Borneo, the Hadji is popular. It is interesting to note how in different nations and among different classes of society various precepts of Islam are accentuated or ignored as they fit in or clash with local conditions. In Acheh, as elsewhere in the Archipelago, the laws of trade and property are not those of the Korm, but of the Adat (native customary law). Snouck Hurgronje, ii, pp. 279, 304-309, 320, 337; R. J. Wilkinson, Malay Beliefs, pp. 8, 16, 17; Spenser St. John II, 35.
is the wealthy who exalt the Holy War and become Hajjis. In keeping with their lawless, irresponsible manner of life they are gamblers, opium eaters and hard drinkers. And they ignore the precepts which would interfere with these customs, though as a rule they draw the line at eating pork. It is naturally the powerful princes who have encouraged, if not started, the unorthodox deification of living and dead rulers. The Sultan of Kotei is supposed to have been descended from a god, who in answer to the supplication of a dweller of Kotei, came down to earth and married one of his children. From them descended all the rulers of Kotei. The following curious Chinese account from about the year 1618 shows the divine right of the early officials of Brunei:

"In this country there is a temple in which three men are worshipped as deities, who were superintendents of public works and of the treasury at the time the country was founded; they fell in battle, and were buried together at this spot; a temple was erected over their tomb and when a merchant vessel arrives it must kill a cow or roast fowls, and offer at the same time melati and other flowers; if any man on the ship does not worship he becomes ill. When the people of the country go out trading, they make an offering of flowers, and when they come back, having made profit, they take two cocks, to whose feet they attach knives, and let them fight before the tomb; if one of these fowls is killed, they thank the deities for it, which is certainly very curious."\(^{1}\)

It must be remembered that this account was written at least 80 years after the country had become formally Mohammedan. Notice in this story the influence of the proverbial Malay love for cock-fighting. It is only the rich traders and rulers, again, who take advantage of the permission of polygamy, and only this small minority of the Mohammedans in Borneo seclude their women.\(^{2}\)

\(^{1}\) W. P. Groeneweldt, *Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca compiled from Chinese Sources*, Batavia 1879 *Miscellaneous Papers* 1, p. 224.

\(^{2}\) "The riches of the country were formerly entirely in the hands of the sultan and other great pangrans," Brooke in Mundy, i, p. 188; Spenser St. John, ii, p. 271; where there are mines, coal, gold or diamonds, these are owned by the princes. Euthoven, p. 165; Pfeiffer, p. 93. For the different classes of society, cf. Low, pp. 117—122; Brooke in
Among the poorer Malays of Borneo, on the other hand, the women go about the streets freely and unveiled. The position of women in many, if not all, places of the Archipelago seems to have been far higher under conditions of life of the pre-Mohammedan "adat." And the Mohammedan law on this point has been adopted only where changed conditions have paved the way for it. On the Lingga river in Borneo, where the Malays live in a village organized very much on the plan of the Dyaks', the chief, as is often the case in a Dyak village, was a woman. Where the conditions remained that led to freedom and prominence of women under the pre-Mohammedan code the orthodox theory of women's position has had little influence.¹

With the poorer Malays, the artisan, small-trading and fishing class in Borneo, there was less incentive than among the more wealthy traders to adopt foreign customs, and among these people we shall find the chief stronghold of anti-Mohammedan ideas. Their Mohammedanism is a thin layer of verbiage over a mass of native superstition. The rich rulers and merchants of Borneo have lost many of their native ideas through cosmopolitan contact, and have gained a superior intelligence in general as well as more knowledge of the meaning of Mohammedanism, both in their journeyings abroad and

Keppel, p. 50. In parts of the country where there are fewer opportunities for enrichment there is a slighter difference between the ruling class and the subjects; cf. Enthoven, pp. 131, 138, 190—196. We find among different writers very conflicting accounts of the character of the Malays. Probably the apparent conflict is due to the fact that the particular class or social position of the Malays described is not given; cf. Rev. Andrew Horsburgh, Sketches in Borneo, 1858, p. 10; Brooke in Keppel, pp. 163, 295; Pfeiffer, p. 108; Low, pp. 127—137. The Mohammedan prince of Sekadan was rough, uncivilized, and a drunkard. In 1867 a sultan of Sekadan died after only a few years' reign from "intemperance" or strong drink. The prince of Silat who died in 1871 was given to opium. Enthoven, pp. 190, 677, 678. There seems to be no religious scruple against opium among the Malays of Borneo, and the princes, at least, drink wine freely, not always refraining even in public. Low, p. 126, Earl, p. 255. They do, however, seem to refrain from the use of pork. Beck, p. 31, note; Groeneweld, Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca, compiled from Chinese sources, from Miscellaneous Papers, Batavia, 1879, i, p. 924.

¹ Ada Pryer, p. 120, probably generalizing from her experience of seeing women on the streets, says that women are never secluded in
in the schools of the Hadjís in Borneo, which are frequented by the wealthy only.¹

In general we may say that the economic conditions in Borneo, as elsewhere in the Archipelago, gave the Arab missionaries a ready hearing and led to an easy acceptance of at least a partial Mohammedanism. Like many other Indonesians, for economic purposes the Borneo Malays have exalted the Hadjí and the Holy War; they have ignored most of the ritual prayers and the prohibitions of their much-loved drink, gambling and opium; and among them the position of women is determined more by local conditions than by Mohammedan theory.

The second factor of Indonesian Mohammedanism—the survival of Indonesian pre-Mohammedan customs—is exemplified in Borneo particularly among the lower class Malays who have a folk-lore and superstitions similar in many respects to those of the Malays in the Peninsula, Aceh, and other parts of Malasia. Characteristic of these are the customs of taboo, the idea of the semangat or vital spirit existing in things as

Borneo, though Mohammedan. Low, p. 141, says that as in all Islamic countries the higher class women are secluded. Other writers agree that the Mohammedan women, not of the nobility, not only go about the streets freely, but do not even wear veils. Pfeifer, p. 47; Boyle, p. 17; Ida Pfeifer probably gets at the heart of the matter when she says that "The wives of persons of the higher class seldom go out; but this is merely from indolence and not to be attributed to any prohibition, for they may receive visitors at home." In other words the seclusion of women is a luxurious foreign fad, ill-adapted to the indigenous life, but practiced by those who can well afford it for the prestige it gives, as being possible only to the wealthy, and in accord with the religious teaching of the superior Arabs. The poorer women are too important factors in the economic life to bother about such things, religion or no religion. All through Malasia Mohammedanism has succeeded in establishing its dictates to women only as the economic conditions were suitable. In the Malay Peninsula, according to the pre-Mohammedan "adat," the position of women was a high one. Mohammedanism reduced it "in theory." Wilkinson, p. 17. Even among the ruling class, in the settled semi-agricultural community of Aceh, women were not disqualified. Four female sovereigns in succession have occupied the throne of Aceh. In each case devout champions of Islam have praised them. Snouck Hurgonje, ii, p. 335.

¹ Sir Charles Brooke, i, p. 38; Bock, pp. 254, 255; Spencer St. John, ii, p. 298; Low, pp. 50, 54, 138, 153, 154, 158, 160.
well as people, and a curious custom of using rice stained yellow with turmeric in various religious festivals.¹

One of the Malay customs noted by van den Berg as an anti-Mohammedan custom found among the Mohammedans all over the Archipelago including Borneo, and one naturally held to as strongly by the princes as the common people, is the possession of what the Dutch author calls "Rijksieraden," or insignia of office, consisting most often of weapons, the possession of which marks the rightful ruler. They are really fetishes which govern the possession of the throne and the fortunes of the kingdom. They are sometimes carried in war, oaths are sworn by them, and on occasions they are smeared with blood at sacrifices. The regard for these "rijksieraden" among the Borneo Malays is not unlike the feeling of the Dyaks for the head hunting relics, which are placed in front of the chief's door and must be touched only by the chief.

¹ For instances of the Malay practice of taboo in Borneo, cf. below p. 25. For taboo as practiced in the Malay Peninsula, cf. Skeat, Malay Magic, passim. The Achehese speak of prohibitions binding on all men as "pamali," the general Malay word for taboo in Borneo and elsewhere. Snouck Hurgronje, i, p. 274. "The spirit of life—which according to the ancient Indonesian belief existed in all things, even in what we should now consider inanimate objects—is known as the semangat." Wilkinson, Malay Beliefs, p. 49.

The yellow rice was used by the Malays of Sarawak in a ceremony performed on the return of chiefs from a successful war expedition, and was supposed to give them equally good luck the next time. The old chief's three wives and female relatives came dressed in their best "Each of the ladies in succession taking a handful of yellow rice, threw it over us, repeating some mystical words, and dilating on our heroic deeds." Keppel, p. 289. Sir Charles Brooke records that a Pangeran (noble) scattered rice over him as thanksgiving for a safe return from a dangerous journey. Brooke, i, p. 197. In the Malay Peninsula rice stained with turmeric is used for scattering over persons to be benefited or strewn on the house floor. Skeat, Malay Magic, p. 76. In Acheh glutinous rice coloured yellow with turmeric is used for offerings at the tombs of saints and is a favorite dish at religious festivals. Snouck Hurgronje, i, p. 31; ii, p. 293 (notice how much farther the new religion has advanced in Acheh, the only place of those mentioned where the ceremony is given a Mohammedan interpretation). Two instances I have found of a ceremonial scattering of yellow rice among the Land-Dyaks of Borneo. Brooke in Mundy, i, p. 335; Chalmers, O. P., p. 63, quoted by Roth, i, p. 248.
and which, like the "rijksieraden" are regarded as having supernatural qualities.  

Besides the survivals of pagan Malay ideas we find also in Borneo relics of other pre-Mohammedan influences, varying in the different localities. In the north there are evidences of a well-authenticated Chinese influence, in such legends as that of Mt. Kinabalu, the "Chinese widow," and other local ideas; also perhaps a trace of Chinese feeling in the fact that here, in contrast with other parts of Borneo where the graves of ancestors are notably neglected, the Mohammedans take great care of ancestral tombs and make pious pilgrimages to them.  

1 L. W. C. Van den Berg. De Mohammedaansche Vorsten in Nederlandsch-Indie, pp. 72, 73. The Javanese name for these is Oepatjars, the Malay, Kabesaran or Alat Karadjan, the Macassar, Kalompawang, and the Bugis, Aradjang. The Rijksieraden of Sanggau, on the West coast of Borneo consist of a kris, a sword of European make, a lance, a gong and a swivel gun, Bakker, Het Rijk Sanggau, in Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, 1884, p. 374, quoted by van den Berg, p. 79. Those of Kotaringin on the South Coast seem to be very numerous, some of the chief are two ebony chairs, swords and lances, some pieces of iron supposed to come from Madjapahit and a couple of large porcelain jars of Japanese or Chinese make, Pijnappel, Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, 1880, p. 281, quoted by van den Berg, p. 79. These Chinese jars, many of them of great antiquity, are valued at enormously high prices all over Borneo. They are held in reverence by Malays and Dyaks alike, and are supposed to possess supernatural powers. In the Malay kingdom of Semituan, on the Kapuas river in western Borneo, the royal insignia consist of a kris, said to have come from Madjapahit with the original settlers, a "pinggau", or earthen dish, to which four very little dishes, "anak pinggau", belong, and a pinggau half a meter in diameter with three anak-pinggau. The pinggau are kept in the ground except on special occasions when they are shown to the people, and then must not be kept above ground more than one day, or a great hurricane will burst over the country. The little dishes must always be buried on the same side of the mother dish, otherwise they have power to turn themselves around. Enthoven, p. 139. The burying of valuable articles for safety is common all over Borneo especially among the Dyaks. For the Dyak regard for the heads of slain enemies as the insignia of office of the chiefs, possessing supernatural power and to be touched only by certain individuals, cf. Brooke in Keppel, p. 54, and Dr. Wm. Furness, Home Life of the Head Hunters, p. 65; for regard of royal regalia in the Malay Penins., cf. Skeat, Malay Magic, pp. 23-29.  

Another foreign nation, the Hindu-Javan kingdom of Madjapahit has left material and cultural evidences of its former colonies all around the west, south and southeast coasts of Borneo. Strong Hindu-Javan influence can be traced in the Mohammedanism of the Malays in these districts of Borneo to-day.¹

Of nearly all these survivals of a pre-Mohammedan era, I believe it can be said that they either have some economic reason in the present manner of life of the people, or that at one time there has been an economic reason for them so strong that they have survived by the force of that impetus. A curious instance of the latter case is the taboo on cow's milk in Sarawak, where until a few years ago men still dated events from "the days of the Hindus." The Malays here, like the Dyaks, do not use the milk or butter of the cow. Concerning the Dyak custom Sir Hugh Low says "Their not using the milk and butter of the cow, in which the Hindus delight, has been accounted for by the supposition that at the first introduction of the animal into Java, from whence it came to Borneo, this was a precautionary measure to encourage the breed, by not depriving the calves of their natural sustenance." It may be mentioned that cows are still scarce in Sarawak where the pasture land is limited.²

Thus in Borneo the earlier ideas which survive and modify Mohammedanism are, everywhere their wide-spread typical Malay beliefs, with, in certain localities, remnants of influence of Hindu-Javan and Chinese colonies. Of the third factor producing Indonesian Mohammedanism

¹ Cf. above p. 4 note 2. Traces of Hindu-Javan influence can be found equally prevalent among the Malays and Dyaks of the regions of the former colonies of Madjapahit. Denison, Jottings of a Tour among the Land Dyaks of Upper Sarawak, Ch. i, thinks that the Land Dyaks are the descendants of the Madjapahit colonists on the west coast of Borneo who were driven inland by the introduction of Mohammedanism in 1559. While this may possibly be true, there are many considerations which point to its improbability, and I do not believe that the evidence at present justifies us in presuming this origin of the Land Dyaks.

² Low, p. 267; In the Memoirs of a Malayan Family, a Malay Ms. of c. 1760, translated and published by Marsden in 1830, a ceremony is described which implies that the Sumatran savage tribes did not drink milk though they had cows. Marsden comments on this that the natives of the Malay Islands neither drink milk nor make butter, p. 10.
—a mentality more primitive than that of the orthodox Arab teachers—we may fairly say that it has had more effect than the actual definite survivals of ancient customs in producing anti-Mohammedan ideas and distortions of Mohammedan customs. The Malays are described as being, with few exceptions, very superstitious and of a lower grade of civilization and intelligence than the Arabs. We have seen that on the whole Mohammedanism has changed their life less than their life has changed Mohammedanism.

Except in the case of a few individuals who have become wealthy and educated the new faith did not bring any revolutionary conditions which would alter the general mentality of the people. Most of the Malays are still in their mental attitude toward the outside world on the stage of animism and magic. The occult powers hold the same sway over their lives as they do over those of the Dyaks.

Comparing Malay magic as found in various parts of Indonesia with the magic of the Borneo Dyaks, it is doubtful whether there is greater similarity in the divination and incantations of the Dyaks and those of the Malays than arises from the fact that both peoples are below the intellectual attainments that show a reign of law and preclude superstitions. We find all over the world certain general forms of sympathetic magic, belief in charms etc. wherever there is a primitive stage of intellect and civilization. As the Malay civilization is wider in scope and more complex than the Dyak, so their magic is a little less naive and crude. The Malay is perhaps more akin to the folk-lore of early Europe, the Dyak like that of more primitive peoples.

But besides the general practices of magic and taboo, and an animistic theory of nature, there are certain definite ideas and customs of the Borneo Malay Mohammedans which correspond remarkably closely to those of the Dyaks. We must consider these special local modifications of Islam in addition to those characteristic of Indonesian Mohammedanism in general.

In regard to these customs the question of interest is, did the Malays bring them to the Dyaks? or are they of Borneo origin?¹

¹ Furness in his Folk-lore in Borneo, p. 10, says that the Dyaks are closely akin in every respect to the Malays, and no doubt adopted the
I do not believe that that question can be answered positively in the present state of our knowledge. We can only say this much:

1. Analysis will show them to be admirably adapted to the Dyak method of life.

2. The more the Malays live like Dyaks, the more of these customs do they have, and the more does their Mohammedanism become merely nominal.

3. They are not found among the Malays who are foreign traders so much as among those whose occupation keeps them close to the local environment.

4. They are not only practiced near the coast, but are customs characteristic also of the Dyak tribes of the far interior least affected by Malay influence.

Some of these customs concern the taking of omens from the cries of animals and the flight of birds; the taboo of the flesh of certain animals, especially deer; harvest taboos similar to those of the Dyaks in the few localities where the Malays practice any agriculture; taboos for illness and in case of death; women sorcerers and "doctors" who under the name of "Bayoh" perform the same functions among the Malay Mohammedans of Sarawak that the "Manang" do among the Dyaks. The same sort of objects are used as charms as among the Dyaks. An account is given of a Malay Sultan who permitted in his palace a three day ceremony to "drive away Satan" participated in by Malays and Dyaks together, in which women took the prominent part they customarily hold in Dyak ritual.

traditions which were rife among the Malays both before and after the latter became converted to Mohammedanism." On the other hand Sir Charles Brooke who spent many years among the Malays and Dyaks of Sarawak says of the Malays that "since their arrival they have been mixed with the Dyak and Malakan populations adopting many of their customs and much of their language," 1, p. 45.

1 Bock, pp. 32, 49, 110—112, 196, 230. "The Malays also have their manangs, who are called Bayoh, while the ceremony is Berasih, but I believe the better instructed Mahometans consider the practice of it altogether inconsistent with the true religion of Islam," Perham, Journal of the Straits Asiatic Society, 19, quoted by Roth, i, p. 262. The peladok, or mouse-deer is an omen animal in Borneo of Malays, Malakan, Sea Dyaks and Kalamantans, whose warnings must be rigorously heeded. The mouse-deer figures in some of the folk-stories of the Malay Pen-
Some of the Malays, like the Dyaks, place wooden figures outside their houses to keep off evil spirits. The Malays have a custom which they call "Bertapar", corresponding to the Dyak "Nampok", in which a man goes out alone to a mountain and spends the night alone on its summit, coming back with great power from the spirits. Malay parents give feasts to their relations to celebrate the different periods in their sons' education, and for a lesser festival kill a fowl, for a greater one goats, buffalo or deer. This is exactly the way the Dyaks use the ordinarily forbidden animals in festivals, for a lesser occasion fowls, the larger ones for a greater one. The Dyaks use pigs ceremonially, however, where the Moham medans use goats and buffalo. In both cases the reason is undoubtedly the same, the comparative scarcity of fowls, the greater scarcity of flesh.¹

When the Malays lead the Dyaks on piratical expeditions, they no less than the head hunters take pride and delight in the captured heads of the enemies. Though Sir Charles Brooke says that "they do not place them in their houses nor attach any superstitious ideas to them," we have evidence that the Malays have a very sincere regard for the "pantaks" or sacred enclosures to which the Dyaks bring the heads after an expedition to perform the first rites over them; and believe with the Dyaks that "whoever does the least damage to any of the

insula, but I do not find any record of the sort of superstitious regard in which it is held in Borneo; cf. Skeat, Malay Magic, pp. 179, 318. Of the Borneo Malays Haddon says, "A Malay told me, if a Sarawak Malay was striking a light in the evening in his house and a pelandok made a noise at the same time the whole family would have to leave the house for three days; should they not do so the house would catch fire and be burned down, or sickness or other calamity would overtake them." p. 386. A Kalamantan chief "resolutely refused to proceed on a journey through the jungle when a mouse-deer (Plandok) crossed his path, and he will not eat this deer at any time." Hose & McDougall, Journal of the Anthropological Society, 1901, p. 196. Of the Sea Dyaks Perham says, "If the cry of a deer, a pelandok, or a gazelle be heard, or if a rat crosses the path before you on your way to the farm, a day's rest will be necessary; or you will cut yourself, get ill, or suffer by failure of the crop." Perham, Journal of the Straits Asiatic Society, 19, quoted by Roth, i, p. 193.

¹ Bock, p. 32; Low, pp. 139, 140; Sir Charles Brooke, i, p. 156, quoted by Roth, i, p. 287; Sir Spencer St. John, i, pp. 143, 144.
wooden figures will be attacked by evil spirits and shortly die."

Sometimes the Malays tell a story to try to bring their superstitions under the guise of Mohammedan lore. The padi-birds—those birds of omen which frequent the rice-fields, roost together in large numbers, and are said to build nests in the high jungle not easily found or seen—figure in a tale which is a typical medley. The Malays say that these birds do not breed like other birds in the jungle, but about the houses of happy invisible beings called Orang Ka-benuar-an, "people of truthfulness", sylvan spirits who care for the seasons of flowers and fruits. The great Mahomet came and all the angels of heaven except the rebel Eblis protected his faith. Eblis went to the Orang Ka-benuar-an and persuaded them to cease being woodland spirits and follow him and he would make them angels. Allah's punishment for listening to the evil angel Eblis was that the Orang Ka-benuar-an must become invisible and no more go among men. But he let them have one bird to live with them and be their messenger to men and they chose the padi-bird. All the omen birds are regarded by the Dyaks as messengers sent by the good spirits to men. 2

Whenever the Malays do the same things that the Dyaks do, and are subject to the same influences, we find them, without regard to their Mohammedanism, holding the same superstitions as their Dyak companions. In many places, for instance, the Malays living on rivers have become expert canoeists, an activity in which the Dyaks excel, and here they have the same superstition as the Dyaks about the bad luck consequent upon holding the paddle in a certain way. 3

A few instances may be given also of notions that are purely local and due to the impression of some out-of-the-way experience. On one river the Malays worship the same rocks and hill-spirits as do the neighboring Dyaks. The water of one small river is considered sacred alike by Malays and Dyaks, and healing properties are attributed to it. At a spot on the Sarawak where some Chinese insurgents were fearfully cut up,

---

1 Brooke in Kappel, p. 173; Pfeiffer, p. 89.
2 From a verbal account given by a Malay, Motley, Contributions to the Natural History of Labuan, London 1855, pp. 35–38.
3 Sir Spencer St. John, ii, p. 283; Sir Charles Brooke, ii, p. 2; Haddon, p. 285, Nieuwenhuis, Centraal Borneo, i, p. 23.
twenty years after the event the Malays would not bring their boats at night for fear of ghosts. A purely local custom on the island of Taling-Taling, where the Malays make a living by collecting turtle eggs, is the magic practice resorted to by the Hadji in charge of the place to make the turtles lay. It consists of feasting, decorating the sands with flags, and after this is done tabooing the vicinity to strangers,—a very practical provision this last, as the turtles will not lay if disturbed, and moreover strangers who do not come cannot steal. Dyaks and Malays alike attribute magic power to gold dust, that beautiful, valuable thing which the searcher may with good luck pick up out of some of the river beds. The Dyaks scatter it on their fields to bring good harvests. The Malays shake it in their girls' heads to procure a luxuriant crop of hair. Malays and Dyaks, not far apart in their general mental development, have received similar impressions from their surroundings and incorporated them into their different religions.¹

The Malay Mohammedans show the same tendency as do the Dyaks to attribute supernatural powers to Europeans who excite their sense of wonder or affect their interests for good or ill. Ida Pfeiffer's immunity from danger in passing through hostile countries, her pedestrian prowess, and her strangeness made the Mohammedan Malays, no less than the Dyaks regard her as a kind of demigod. The Malays of Brunei attributed a cholera epidemic to a phantom Spanish vessel seen in the river the night before the epidemic broke out, a theory which illustrated, according to Sir Spenser St. John, the traditional hatred of the Spaniards with whom in olden times the kingdom of Brunei had constant feuds. The Dyaks defied the friendly Sir James Brooke, and invoked his presence at their harvest feasts; the Malays, when in 1881 a flood stopped just short of his statue, took it for a manifestation of the will of God that they should respect the descendants of Sir James Brooke as the flood respected his statue. In this instance the Moham-

¹ Gomes, Gospel Mission, July 1865, pp. 105—111, quoted by Roth, i, p. 355; Boyle, pp. 49—50; Bock, p. 112; Denison, chapter IV; Sir Spenser St. John, ii, pp. 294, 295; Brooke in Keppel, p. 113; Ibid. in Mundy, i, p. 304; Sir Charles Brooke, i, p. 285; Low, p. 118. The Malays who live in the region of Mt. Tilacang, which is held very sacred by the Dyaks, even after they have been converted to Mohammedanism, are said to "bestow a certain reverence on it." Molengraf, p. 47, 62.
medaens (of a sophisticated coast town by the way) are less frankly pagan than in some other cases we have been noting, and deification is cloaked under a mere “sign of the will of God”.

A higher name or phrase will often cover a multitude of primitive superstitions, which nevertheless retain their own true character. For this reason we cannot regard it as proof of Malay origin that many Dyak customs of the far interior are called by words of the Malay language, such as the taboo, which is known in many parts of Borneo as “pamali” the name applied to taboo by Malays in all parts of the Archipelago. Taboo is too wide-spread an institution to be considered peculiarly Malay. And the special forms of it found in Borneo are, as I have pointed out in previous studies, eminently adapted to the immediate environment. Because the Malay language is easily learned and has spread commercially everywhere Malay names for things and spirits are prevalent in the religious nomenclature of the various native tribes. It does not necessarily follow that Malay ideas have gone with the names. For instance the Dyaks of Kotel believe in a supreme being known as Mahatara, Hatalita, or Allah. From the first name we might infer that the belief had at least a relationship to Hindu ideas, from the second to Arabic. But the belief in a chief god can hardly be proved a foreign acquisition by these names, for the same belief is found among Dyak tribes in many parts of Borneo, and the deity is called by various names not suggestive of either of these foreign influences. The chief god is known in different regions as Juwata (thought to be probably a corruption of the Sanskrit Dewata), Tuppa, Sang Jang, Laki Tenangan, Batara, Totadungan, Balli Penyalong, and Ipu. It seems more than probable that usually when a Malay term appears in the Dyak religion it is merely an application of a foreign word to already existing ideas.

1 Pfeiffer, p. 94; Sir S. Spenser St. John, i, pp. 291, 292; Dr. A. Piton, Un Voyage à Borneo, Paris, 1888, p. 7.

2 Among the Land Dyaks the terms pamali and porich seem both to be used for taboo, probably with slightly varying significance. Low, p. 260; Chalmers in Grant's Tour, quoted by Roth, i, p. 388. For the names of the Supreme Being among the different tribes; cf. St. John, i, p. 110; ibid. in Transactions of the Ethnological Society, ii, p. 242; Bock,
If the likeness of religious customs on the part of nominally Mohammedan Malays and Dyaks is to be explained by the theory that the Malays before their conversion brought these customs to the Dyaks from the Peninsula, we shall have to have some further argument in favor of the supposition than the occasional appearance of a Malay term in the Dyak ritual or pantheon. I think it much more likely that most of the customs, at least, are of native origin and were followed by the Malays because they were in accord with the local atmosphere and method of life which the Malays must to a certain extent adopt.

It is the up-river Malays, settled, unlike most of their nation, in Dyak-like agricultural villages, among whom we find the harvest taboos. The utility of these to the Dyaks I have already discussed in a previous paper. For the taboos on eating the flesh of certain animals there would be the same practical reasons among the Malays as among the Dyaks. In the common experiences of piratical expeditions it is only natural that the Malays should come to have at least a regard for the tokens of prowess—the heads of the slain victims—and share the Dyaks’ superstitious attitude toward them. In short when the Malays live like Dyaks they think like Dyaks.

It is hard to tell where the Mohammedan Malays end and the pagan Dyaks begin. They shade into one another like red into yellow. The extremes are easily distinguishable. But where shall we classify the various depths of orange?

There is a legend of an old Dyak chief of mighty strength who left seven sons. The oldest promised to remain Dyak and support his brothers, the youngest followed his father as chief of the Dyaks, while the remaining five became founders of five Malay states. The Malays use this story to explain why they have a right to live at the expense of the Dyaks. It shows to the reader the extreme haziness of race distinctions, even in the minds of the natives themselves, where the two manners of life have amalgamated.\(^1\)

---

2 W. C. van der Meulen, quoted by Entoven, pp. 671, 672.
The key to understanding the situation is I think best given by the tribes of obviously Dyak origin whose history from the time previous to their conversion to Mohammedanism is well known. One tribe of these on a branch of the Kapnas river is known as the "Embahoe Malays". They are Dynks who within the last fifty years have been converted to Mohammedanism. They have simply taken the oath of fealty to Allah and Mohammed, at the urgence of their Malay overlord, and added to their old customs some Mohammedan ritual and a few brass cannon. They continue in an unchanged environment and gain a living in all their old Dyaks ways, and they have dropped none of their Dyak festivals and spirit-worship. They are head-hunters and openly eat pork and drink arrack.¹

The next step in Mohammedanizing is to give up pork. The pig is a potent factor in Dyak life, not to be dispensed with without a change of economy. And we are hardly surprised to learn that the Malay dress and other characteristics distinguished the Dyak converts on the Rejang river who went as far as giving up the festal use of the pig. In British North Borneo the inhabitants of the Kinabatangan river shade from the pagans of the upper river to the Dyak Mohammedans by giving up pork as they get nearer to the coast and to the Malay way of living. Analysis of the customs of the native Mohammedans shows that there is much native and little Mohammedan in the up-river districts, where the conversion has taken place through the agency of isolated missionaries and traders, and where there has been no real change of environment or incentive to adopt the Malay method of life. The more thorough-going adoption of Mohammedan principles occurs only in the villages nearer the coast where the coming of Malay traders and Europeans has changed the natives' real economic environment.²

¹ Enthoven, pp. 205—207.
² Sir Spenser St. John, i, p. 46; Ada Pryer, p. 80; Low, p. 308; Boyle, pp. 28, 319; Enthoven, pp. 169—171. Cf. also Enthoven's account of the Sintang "Malays" of the Upper Kapnas, of at least partially Dyak origin, who living up-river in an environment like the Dyaks', although Mohammedans keep to most of the Dyak customs, pp. 563ff. For further accounts of various degrees of conversion and adoption of Malay method of life, cf. Earl, pp. 271, 272; Nieuwenhuis, Quer durch Borneo, i, p. 51;
A description of what one might call this cultural conversion of the natives is given by Holbé in a recent article in the Revue Anthropologique. He describes the houses of a “Malay” village between the Kapuas river and Landak as constructed Malay fashion. The people are Mohammedan, have cows and no pigs, but resemble the Dyaks of the region.

"Quand un Dyak déserte le kampong paternel, vient à un centre Malayou et prononce le formule: La ila hill' Allah... il devient Malaï du coup."

I have taken my instances of Dyak conversion from the tribes of three great rivers, those arteries by which Mohammedanism and the Malays have penetrated at certain points toward the interior of the island. It is important to note that the farther up-river we go, the more closely does the manner of life of both Malays and natives necessarily approach the primitive jungle type, and the more loosely are the precepts of Islam followed by both Malays and native converts. There are far fewer Hadj from among the up-river people, and those who do go to Mecca are little respected on their return.

Among the Malays of the coast towns, however, especially the ports trading constantly with Europe and Asia, where European influence, has made the environment more cosmopolitan than Bornean, we find greater power of the generally familiar customs of Islam. There are mosques and prayers; there is verbal knowledge of the Koran, even if it is only used to determine the ceremonial of marriages and burials, or recited

Cator, p. 57; Sir R. Alcock, Handbook of British North Borneo, London, Colonial Exhibition, 1886, p. 37. Among the Malays, whose peculiar opportunities for sago trade has made their Malayisation fairly complete in many localities, an old custom to be given up was that of human sacrifice. This seems also to have prevailed at some time in other parts of Borneo. Spencer St. John, p. 46; Journal of the Straits Asiatic Society, 10, p. 182, quoted by Roth, i, p. 157; Low, p. 385, quoted by Roth, i, p. 157; Veth, ii, p. 321.

1 Holbé, Revue Anthropologique, 1911, p. 433.

2 Ethoven, p. 567. For descriptions of the Malay and Dyak up-river agricultural communities, cf. Nieuwenhuis, Central Borneo, i, pp. 19, 20; Bock, p. 49; Ethoven, pp. 131—134, 176—180. Low says of the coast Malays that "they seldom apply themselves to gardening or agriculture, trusting entirely for their supplies of rice and fruits to the industrious Dyaks of the interior, and to the Chinese gardens in the town for the vegetables they require," p. 160.
uncomprehendingly as a charm to keep off evil spirits; there are numerous Hadjis who return to great respect and to be reverently addressed by the title of Tuan-ku; and there is some observance of the month of Ramadhan. In Sarawak, particularly, the competition of Christian missions greatly increased the zeal and strictness of Mohammedanism. There was a noticeable pulling away from superstitions and toning up of the tenets of Islam after the establishment of a Christian mission in 1840.¹

In the ports, too, the Malays are kept stirred up by the Arabs. These have never come to Borneo in any numbers, but have been individual Hadjis and Mollahs, come to arouse the zeal of the converts, and they have been adventurers inciting, until repressed by Europeans, to plunder by land and sea in the name of the Holy war. They are for the most part found as individuals ruling by force of intellect and leadership over a village of followers and slaves. They all claim and receive the title of Seriff.²

Two classes of Mohammedans in Borneo yet remain to be mentioned, the Chinese, who are included in enumerations of Mohammedans but concerning whose religious customs I have not enough material to speak intelligently; and the Klings, a small number of colonists or merchants from India, who have in Sarawak their separate mosque of the Shia sect which stands alongside of the Arabian Sunnis without the usual antagonism. The number and influence of the Klings is so small as not to be, so far as I have been able to find out, a real factor.³

¹ Sir Charles Brooke, i, pp. 77, 78, 381, 360; Bock, p. 25; Keppel, p. 266; Boyle, pp. 131, 173; Miss Quigley in Missionary Review of the World, June 1907, p. 442. Low, pp. 123, 129.
² Holbe, loc. cit., p. 430; Brooke in Mundy, i, pp. 362, 364; Boyle, p. 298; Keppel, p. 268; Veth, i, p. 248; Low says that the seriffs "have always been held in high consideration. They are always addressed by the title of Tuan-ku, or 'your highness,' and on state days and festivals occupy a position more eminent than that of the highest hereditary nobles," p. 123. For the real intellectual and economic leadership which supports this prestige, cf. accounts of the Arabs above p. 323. In Aceh 'Teungku' is the title given to all "who either hold an office in connection with religion or distinguish themselves from the common herd by superior knowledge or more strict observance of religious laws." Snouck Hurgronje, i, p. 70.
³ Low, p. 126, 63 ff.
The Malays' purpose in converting the Dyaks, besides their mere religious zeal for converts, was to establish a basis for allegiance on which to build their political overlordship. More often than conquering the natives by force of arms, they would trade with them, convert them to Islam and then take tribute from them. The inducement for the Dyaks was that a man by adopting the Malay religion and manner of life could raise himself to the status of the superior, dominant race. The Malays made conversion easy by requiring nothing of the Dyaks that conflicted with their customs. As we have seen, however, near the coast where surroundings were more favorable to the Malay method of life than the Dyak, the Dyak customs dropped of their own accord.¹

All this, it must be remembered, applies to a very small portion of the Dyaks,—only those of the navigable rivers frequented by the Malays. The tribes who were protected far in the jungle, or who fled before the coming of the intruders to the tributaries and upper waters beyond the point of easy navigation, have preserved their resources as well as their customs untouched, and have a far better lot than their subject neighbors.

Their seclusion is, however, not likely to be long-lived. Within recent years there has been a rapid opening up of the country by Europeans, both Dutch and English.² The result has been a vast increase, even within the last decade of valuable material for knowledge of the people of the interior. Not only has the material increased in mass but there is a steady growth of reliability of observation as well as a more systematic method of presenting the results. Taking the sequence from the mediaeval travellers' tales; through the


² Nieuwenhuis, Influence of changed conditions, etc., p. 5; Buys, p. 189; Bock, writing in 1881 said of some of the up-river tribes of southern Borneo, "They would not even see a Malay, and always remained in the densest part of the forest where it was impossible to track them without a guide," p. 63.
abundance of popular literary generalizations which appeared about 1850 when the dramatic suppression of piracy had caught the attention of Europe; down to the accounts of scientific exploring expeditions of recent years, we find a steady development of completeness and systematic presentation of material, as well as vast increase in the amount of actual knowledge of the country.

Even yet the accounts we have of the Malay and Dyak Mohammedans in Borneo are too fragmentary to make any theoretical analysis of them definitely conclusive. They are sufficiently striking to be very suggestive. Within the next ten or fifteen years, as the material is coming in, it should be possible to make a comparative and schematic analysis of local conditions, which I believe will prove of great theoretic significance.

From the notes I have collected here I have formulated tentatively five principles of borrowing, several of them well recognized by writers on the history of religion, though seldom definitely stated.

A new religion is accepted:—

1. In so far as it fits in with the already existing ideals of the people.

In accord with this principle the Malays accepted that part of Mohammedanism which fit in with the trend of their habits and customs. The special precepts which they accentuated were the pilgrimage to Mecca and the Holy War, both of which furthered their ideals of trade and of piracy.

A new religion is accepted:—

2. In so far as it does not enforce precepts which are antagonistic to the peoples' ideals or unsuitable to the economic conditions.

We have seen how the ritual prayers, the prohibitions of drink gambling and opium, and the laws of trade and property of the Koran were ignored by the Borneo Malays when their habits or the local conditions made strongly against them, and how the position of the Malay women was determined more by their economic status than by orthodox Moslim theory.

If, then, it made so little change, why did even the nominal conversion take place? It was because Mohammedanism in
Borneo fulfilled the indispensable condition to the introduction of a foreign faith, our third principle, viz;—that

A new religion is accepted:—

3. When the new ideas offer better prospects than the people's old religion for success and happiness under the existing conditions.

The Hadji, the Holy War, the comradeship in the bonds of a common allegiance with foreign traders all offered wider scope for the Malays' ambitions.

Our fourth principle is that

A new religion is accepted:—

4. In so far as the forces that bring the foreign faith also bring a change in civilization.¹

We have seen that the Arabs coming to Borneo in small numbers did very little to change the real surroundings of the Malays. And no revolution of life has occurred that would lift them out of their old mental attitude of superstition. Therefore the Malays have accepted only certain superficial precepts of Mohammedanism which appealed to them, without changing their whole pagan attitude toward the outside world. The Dyaks have for the most part not accepted Mohammedanism at all, while they remain in their jungle environment, and a few have accepted the superficial Malay Mohammedanism just in so far as they have left the jungle and taken to the Malay manner of life. Mohammedanism has not brought to Borneo any change in civilization that would lead to a thorough-going change of the people's ideas.

It has kept its nominal hold by observing the law of borrowing that I have stated as my fifth principle, one very familiar in the history of religion, viz;—that

A new religion is accepted:—

¹ An interesting instance of protest against a pre-Mohammedan superstition after the coming first of the Mohammedan traders and then of the Europeans had changed the local conditions is given in the Sarawak Gazette, 122, p. 2, quoted by Roth, i, p. 287. During a terrible storm an old and nearly forgotten custom was resorted to—that of damaging trees and property to frustrate the evil spirit of the storm. After the storm had abated the losers of property complained to the government, allowing that in bygone days it had been a custom, but then, they state, their gardens were of little value; it was different now, as labour was dear and everything was of value in the market."
5. Only if it incorporates into itself or tolerates quietly the old traditions of the people that continue to fit their life,¹

We have seen that the converted Dyaks keep right on with all their savage anti-Mohammedan customs except as some of these have dropped of their own accord when the Dyaks adopt the Malay mode of life. Of the traditions that have survived in the Malay faith, we have seen that these are a medley of pre-Mohammedan Malay ideas with some Hindu-Javan, Chinese or Dyak influences in different localities, holding on because they are useful, or better adapted than the new religion to the state of mind that the environment has produced.

As the result of the working of these principles we have in Borneo, a quasi-Mohammedanism, or rather a new national or class religion, with a certain investiture of Mohammedan names and forms. We see that this resultant in the same country varies from one locality to another, from one class to another as the economic conditions are different.

I believe that our knowledge thus far of Mohammedanism in Borneo goes to support these five "laws of contact," and that further facts will be likely to corroborate them, though probably in a modified form. Of one thing I think we may at least be certain. The parallelism of religious and economic development holds true as rigidly in the borrowing of foreign ideas as in the growth of customs on the native soil. We have not reached in our explanation the full significance of a religious usage when we have traced out the history of its geographical migrations. Aboriginal or imported it has an equally vital relationship to the life of the people.

¹ Soouck Hurgromje recognizes this principle fully and states it in his general remarks on the spread of Islam. "Side by side with the law and doctrine which has developed in the school during the past 13 centuries, and which is universally admitted to be inspired yet is universally neglected, there exists an entirely different standard of religion law and morality which holds good in practice. This practical teaching is indeed largely coloured by the influence of the theory of the schools, yet to a greater extent it rests on a different basis; therein are expressed the views of life which controlled men's minds in the pre-Mohammedan period and therein do we also find traces of all that has befallen the various peoples since they embraced the creed of Islam," p. 277. "It is of course quite possible to admit the validity of a law without observing its precepts. Religious teaching, however, must neither admit any elements which are unacceptable to a large part of the community, nor reject things which are indispensable to a great number of the faithful," p. 290.
A Tammuz Fragment.—By Professor J. Dyneley Prince, Ph. D., Columbia University, N. Y.

The text of the following fragment (K. 3356) was published by Kerr Duncan Macmillan (Beiträge zur Assyriologie, V. p. 679) without translation or explanation. From obv. 1 to rev. 1, we may supply for the broken parts of the lines the general idea "may it (the evil) be conjured"; i. e., "be it conjured 6. by the — — word of him who is dead, 7. by the name of the spouse, 8. by Nanâ, etc., 9. by the consort who is sadly wailing, etc." The wailing Nanâ, weeping for Tammuz, appears also in CT. XV. obv. 14: or (ASI)-ri e-ne-ir zi-mu-nun-na-te-(ga) 'wailing for him let her begin' (Prince, AJSL. xxvii. p. 85).

The fragment under discussion is chiefly interesting because it seems to be, not the usual Tammuz-hymn, but an incantation, to remove evil from an afflicted person by adjuring the sorrows of Tammuz and his consort Nanâ. The idea of Tammuz and his grieving mother, as set forth by this text, seems to imply that their divine sorrows had a certain theological value; in other words, that they constituted a vicarious suffering to which men might look as a compensation for physical ailments. In this respect, the poem is a really striking prototype of modern Christian litanies, which adjure the Deity by the sorrows of the Incarnate God and His Mother to have mercy on mankind.

Text and Translation

Obverse

1. -ta
2. -ta
3. -ge (KIT)-ta
4. -ge (KIT)-ta
5. -ge (KIT)-ta
6. -KA ăig (BAD)-gā-ge (KIT)-ta — — — — — —
by the — — word of him who is dead — — — — —
7. mu mu-ud-na-su-ta — — — — — —
by the name of thy spouse — — — — — —
8. Nin-ri dam sib-ba-ta — — — — — —
by Nannâ the consort of the shepherd — — — — — —
9. dam-ma is-gig-ga-ab-ta — — — — — —
by the consort who is sadly wailing — — — — — —
10. 4Dumu (AN-TUR) Ci-ir-tur-ra-ge (KIT)-ta — — — — — —
by the divine child of Cirturra — — — — — —
11. XU-SI ci-ie-ba-ta gu (GA-TU) ci-ie-ba — — — — — —
by the excellent magnate; the excellent lofty one — — — — — —
12. LAX-BA (šiba) XU-SI eri (= ālu) še-bu-ge (KIT) ga
(?) DU (?)-DU (?)-da — — — — — —
(by) the shepherd, the magnate of the lower city; the lofty one, when he goes — — — — — —
13. u me-an am 4Dumu-zi, ag-gud (RAM-ŠU) duq (KA)-ga,
alx (DU)-lax (DU)-ga gud — — — — — —
(by) him who is the wild bull Tammuz, who speaks love, when he shines (may) the bull — — — — — —
14. LAX-BA (šiba) ag (RAM)-ta im ga (GA-TU)-a-ta-šu
(KU) — — — — — —
by the shepherd of love, by the exalted lord — — — — — —
15. 4Dumu-zi-ta im ga (GA-TU)-a-ta-šu (KU) — — — — — —
by Tammuz, by the exalted lord — — — — — —
16. XU-SI ga (GA-TU) šub (RU)-a XU-SI la (LAL) ba-
dā-gaz-ta-šu (KU) — — — — — —
by the exalted magnate who is abused, the magnate of fulness who is slain — — — — — —
17. ga ga (GA-TU) šub (RU)-a ga la (LAL) ba-ilā-gaz-ta-
šu (KU) — — — — — —
by the exalted one who is abused, by the lofty one of fulness who is slain — — — — — —

Reverse

1. im ga (GA-TU) šub (RU)-a im-ga (GA-TU) — — — — — —
by the exalted lord who is abused, the exalted lord — — — — — —
2. gud-gim xi-ni-šu (KU) š(sub—RU) — — — — — —
(by him who) like a bull with respect to his horns is aba-
ed — — — — — —
3. e-ci-gim qin — — — — 
(by him who) like sheep (?) — — — — 
4. tur-gim (ub-) — — — — 
(by him who) like a pasture — — — — 
5. adim-ma — — — — 
the mighty one — — — — 
6. bar-šu (KU) — — — — 
on one side (may the curse stand) 
7. bar — — — — 
on one side (may the curse stand) 
(a number of lines may follow.)

Commentary

1—5. -ta preceded by genitive must mean: by the — — — — of; cf. 6—10.

6. Some adjective qualifying KA ‘word’ is omitted. For -ta in adjuration, cf. Gud. 4, 2: á "Nina-ta ‘by the might of Nina’. Note that -ta always reverts to the first word of the phrase.

7. mu-ud-na=xātu ‘spouse’, Br. 1304.

8. Apparently sīb is correct, as LAX-BA ‘shepherd’=sība occurs line 12.

9. The -ma in dam-ma is simply prolongation and not the oblique 1 p. The is = eš = A-SI ‘weeping’ (cf. AJSL. XXVII. p. 85; Prince).


11. XU-SI, I render, ‘magnate’ as the chief meaning of XU-SI (cf. M. 1198 ff.) seems to denote eminence; cf. M. 1221: = šaqû ‘high’ (M. 1220: = šadû ‘mountain’). XU-SI is also parallel here with ga (GA-TU).

Note the Eme-Sal form ci-ib-ba, for Eme-Ku dug-ga ‘good, excellent’.

12. û-ba, I render, ‘lower’ as ib-ta = šapliš, IV. 21, 13 b.


14—15. im = bēlētu, IV. 21, 27 b.

16—17. šub (RU) = maqātu, Br. 1432; nadû, Br. 1434. la (LAL) = talû ‘fulness’, Br. 984. In 16, gas = dâku ‘slay’, MSL. 130.

Note that -ta-su (KU), the double postposition, is not un-
common in contracts; cf. William M. Nesbit, *Tablets from Drehem* (Thesis, Columbia University), Tablet 12 obv. 2: *mu é-a-ni-ta-su* (KU) 'for the name of (for) his house'.

**Reverse**

2. This evidently refers to the abased condition of Tammuz whose horns are brought low. The same strain of lament probably runs through Rev. 3—5.


5. *alim = the enclosed xal-a-lim* (SI).

6—7. Evidently the conjuration: *ina azāti lizzis* 'on one side may the curse stand' = sum. *bar-ku xe-im-ta-gub* (DU); passim.
The name of the Erythraean Sea.—By Wilfred H. Schoff, Secretary of the Commercial Museum, Philadelphia, Pa.

The origin of geographical names is often beyond explanation: they arise by accident, pass from mouth to mouth and from age to age, taking on new meanings and new locations, until they become mere arbitrary words, and imagination must come in to explain them. So it is with the name of the Erythraean Sea. And while no man may surely say, here arose that word, yet as Sir Thomas Browne observed, “what song the Sirens sang, or what name Achilles assumed when he hid himself among women, although puzzling questions, are not beyond all conjecture”.

A recent paper in the J. A. O. S. (April, 1912) by Miss Sarah F. Hoyt of Johns Hopkins, has embodied much interesting information concerning this ancient name, and explains its origin, with the approval of no less an authority than our much-respected fellow-member Professor Haupt, as derived from the microscopic algae Trichodesmium erythraeum occasionally found in quantity on the surface of the Red Sea, to which they impart a reddish or yellowish tinge; the decomposition of which may have caused the first Egyptian plague (Exod. 7, 17—21).

Now it is true that from Roman times onward Mare Rubrum, Red Sea, meant the long gulf that separates Egypt from Arabia; and it is equally true that under certain conditions of wind and climate a reddish vegetable scum forms on its almost stagnant waters, from which the name “Red” might have been suggested. But this explanation impresses me as a little too simple, too obvious. The presence of algae in sufficient quantity to color the surface over a large area would be an exceptional occurrence, not likely to lend a name to the sea. This suggestion was made by Lobo more than a
century ago; he preferring, however, to derive the name from a dye, "sufo", which he said was produced by the *saph* or buhrashes, that gave the Hebrew name to these waters. That too seems improbable because the dye, if so produced, was not of commercial importance sufficient to characterize that sea. Another suggestion connected the name with Edom, meaning red, and would have made Erythraean a mere translation of Idumean.

The name Erythraean is Greek: Ὑδάματα ἐρυθρᾶ, or ἐρυθράια. It is not derived from any Semitic or Egyptian name, and it was not applied to the body of water which we know as the Red Sea. The Greeks knew that as the "Arabian Gulf", the natural Egyptian name. Consequently any explanation derived from the peoples of that region must be arbitrary and without foundation.

The early Greek literature conceived the habitable earth as a circular plane surrounded by the Ocean Stream. Little by little as the mental horizon of the Greeks was pushed outward it was seen that this scheme must be modified, and that the surrounding ocean here and there penetrated into the solid earth. Such irregularities were noted in the Sea of Azov and the Caspian Sea, supposed to communicate with the ocean stream; such also was our Red Sea, known to the Greeks as the Arabian Gulf. Of the navigation of the outer ocean the early Greeks knew very little. Vague stories came to them of Phoenician and Carthaginian trading beyond the Pillars of Hercules, and of a circumnavigation of Africa by Phoenician ships in the service of Egypt. Of the eastern ocean they had no knowledge until they were brought into contact with the great empire of the Persians, which had overthrown that of the Chaldaeans, and under both of which there had been sea-trading since time immemorial between the Euphrates and Western India. That was the sea-route which they meant by the word Erythraean, which came to them from Persia. It is through that connection that its origin and meaning must be sought.

*Ερυθρᾶ in Greek means red, ἐρυθράια to dye red, and ἐρυθαίνε to blush; there is a Greek personal name Ἐρυθράς that has some connection with these meanings, and a Greek city Ἐρυθρᾶ in Boeotia, whose oracles made the name familiar on Greek lips, as one readily to be extended to some new-
found region. Possibly all these facts may have had their share in the application of Erythraean to the waters between Babylonia and India, and later by a reasonable extension to the whole Indian Ocean and all the gulfs that communicate with it.

Hecataeus, the first of the Greek geographers, knows nothing of an Erythraean Sea. The first writers that give us the name are Herodotus, as quoted below, and Pindar (P. 4, 448), the latter in one passage only. From Herodotus, however, we have sufficient information clearly to explain the meaning of the name as current in his time, which referred to Persian and not Egyptian waters. He speaks, (1, 180) of the Euphrates flowing from Armenia through Babylonia and falling into the Erythraean Sea. Again (4, 37) he says:

"The Persian settlements extend to the southern sea, called the Erythraean; above them to the north are the Medes; above the Medes, the Saspires; and above the Saspires, the Colchians who reach to the northern sea, into which the river Phasis discharges itself. These four nations occupy the space from sea to sea....

"Another tract beginning at Persia, reaches to the Erythraean Sea; it comprises Persia, and after that Assyria, and after Assyria, Arabia; it terminates (terminating only by custom) at the Arabian Gulf, into which Darius carried a canal from the Nile....

"Beyond the Persians, Medes, Saspires, and Colchians, toward the east and rising sun, extends the Erythraean Sea, and on the north the Caspian Sea and the river Araxes, which flows toward the rising sun, Asia is inhabited as far as India; but beyond this it is all desert toward the east, nor is any one able to describe what it is. Such and so great is Asia."

The first Greek record of navigation in the Erythraean Sea is likewise found in Herodotus (4, 4):

"A great part of Asia was explored under the direction of Darius. He being desirous to know in what part the Indus, which is the second river that produces crocodiles, discharges itself into the sea, sent in ships both others on whom he could

1 Quotations are from Cary's translation.
rely to make a true report, and also Scylax of Caryanda. They accordingly, setting out from the city of Caspapyrus and the country of Pacyces, sailed down the river toward the east and sunrise to the sea; then sailing on the sea westward they arrived in the thirteenth month (τρισενταμηνή) at that place where the king of Egypt despatched the Phoenicians, whom I before mentioned, to sail around Libya. After these persons had sailed round, Darius subdued the Indians, and frequented this sea. Thus the other parts of Asia, except toward the rising sun, are found to exhibit things similar to Libya".

The truth of this story in Herodotus has been seriously questioned in voluminous arguments which are now so much waste paper, as we have written records of Hindu trade with Babylon, which they called Bavon, more than a century before that time, and we have the discovery of teak logs in buildings at the ancient Ur reconstructed by Nabonidus. These logs came from western India, from the Cambay region; and in the Periplus of the first century, we have a written record of the same trade still existing.

That the Persian Gulf was almost an inland lake was not fully understood by Herodotus, and it is clear that by the name Erythraean he meant the surrounding ocean to the south and east of the Eurasian continent. The eastern extension of that continent was quite unknown to him, as he supposed Europe to be larger than Asia, and imagined western India to be the eastern boundary of Asia. That Erythraean

---

1 Caspapyrus, Sanscrit Kasypapura. This was the Indus valley in the neighborhood of the confluence of the Kabul river, more or less the Punjab district. Hecataeus mentions this place as a city of the Gandharas. Pacyce, or the Pactyan land, was the upper course of the Kabul valley; or more generally the territory in which Pukhtu was spoken—southeastern Afghanistan. See Lassen, 1, 142–2, 631. Vincent Smith, Early History, 2nd Edition p. 53; Schoff, Periplus of the Erythraean Sea pp. 42, 189.

to his mind meant the southern and eastern surrounding ocean is clearly shown in 1, 203:

"The Caspian is a sea by itself, having no communication with any other sea; for the whole of that which the Grecians navigate, and that beyond the Pillars, called the Atlantic, and the Erythraean Sea are all one."

And that the name Erythraean in the mind of Herodotus did not specifically refer to the body of water we now call Red Sea is clearly shown by the following (2, 10):

"There is also in the Arabian territory, not far from Egypt, branching from the Erythraean Sea, a bay of the sea, of the length and width I shall here describe. The length of the voyage, beginning from the innermost part of this bay to the broad sea, occupied forty days for a vessel with oars; and the width where the bay is widest, half a day's passage, and in it an ebb and flow takes place daily; and I am of opinion that Egypt was formerly a similar bay, this stretching from the Northern Sea toward Ethiopia; and the Arabian Bay, which I am describing, from the south toward Syria; and that they almost perforated their recesses so as to meet each other, overlapping to some small extent. Now, if the Nile were to turn its stream into the Arabian Gulf, what would hinder it from being filled with soil by the river within twenty thousand years? For my part I think it would be filled within ten thousand."

The same topography is followed by Strabo (16, 3. 1) where he says, describing Arabia, "The northern side of this tract is formed by the desert, the eastern by the Persian Gulf, the western by the Arabian Gulf, and the southern by the Great Sea lying outside of both gulfs, the whole of which is called the Erythraean Sea".

This is confirmed by Arrian in his Indika (19), E. J. Chinnock's translation (Bohn Ed.), in the following passage:

"This narrative is a description of the voyage which Nearchus made with the fleet starting from the outlet to the Indus through the Great Sea as far as the Persian Gulf, which some call the Erythraean Sea." Again (40):

"The land of Persia has been divided into three parts in regard to climate. The part of it situated near the Erythraean Sea is sandy and barren, on account of the heat; the part from this toward the north enjoys a more temperate climate, the country is grassy and the meadows moist..."
Still further to the north the country is wintry and snowy." Again (43):

"The country on the right of the Erythraean Sea beyond Babylonia is Arabia, most of it; part of this extends as far as the sea of Phoenicia and Palestine-Syria; but toward the west in the direction of the inner sea, the Egyptians border on Arabia. . . .

"Alexander despatched men from Babylon to sail as far as possible on the right of the Erythraean Sea, and to discover the places there."

The first attempt to assemble and discriminate between the various explanations of the name Erythraean (Ἐρυθραῖα or Ἑρυθραία) is found in the book of Agatharchides on the Erythraean Sea, which may be dated about 120 B.C. Agatharchides was certainly in a position to know his subject; occupying a prominent official position in Egypt under the Ptolemies, he was fully acquainted with the southern incense trade and gives us the first detailed account of the power and wealth of the kingdoms of South Arabia, and of the way in which that rich trade was monopolized. His criticisms are therefore worthy of consideration. He says, first, that the name is derived by some from the color of the sea, arising from reflection of the sun which is vertical, or from the mountains which are red from being scorched with intense heat. This suggestion he dismisses as quite inadequate. The tremendous heat on the Red Sea and in the Persian Gulf is noted by many writers. Arrian in his account of the voyage of Alexander's captain Nearchus speaks of the possibility of sailing from Babylon around Arabia to Egypt, but says, quite incorrectly, "No man has ever made this voyage on account of the heat and desolation of the country. During the day one cannot keep cut under the open sky because of the heat."

1 Centuries later, the Persian traveler 'Abd-ar-Razāk writes of the climate of Oman (Hakluyt Society's publications, vol. 22 p. 9):

"Although it was at that time spring, in the season in which the nights and days are of equal length, the heat of the sun was so intense that it burned the ruby in the wine and the marrow in the bones, the sword in its scabbard melted like wax, and the gems which adorned the handle of the khandjar were reduced to coal."
Thus while Agatharchides admits that we might explain the name Erythraean, red, from the fact that the sea is, as it were, red hot, we should still be away from the truth.

Another explanation, which Strabo (6, 4. 20) quotes from Ctesias of Cnidus through Artemidorus, ascribes the name to a spring which discharges into the sea a red and ochrous water. This is certainly an inadequate explanation, and, as Agatharchides observes, a false one, "for the sea is not red". Yet this was the explanation adopted by Strabo and thence by the Roman geographers, and more recently by Professor Haupt. But Agatharchides is quite right in saying that mere color of the water is no guide to the name. The mediaeval Chinese writer Chau-Ju-Kua calls this same body of water the "Green Sea".  

Agatharchides then offers his final explanation (§ 5) in a story which he quotes from a Persian named Boxus whom he had met in Athens, and this story, the full importance of which has not been understood, I venture to translate entire.

"The Persian account is after this manner. There was a man famous for his valor and wealth, by name Erythras, a Persian by birth, son of Myozaeus. His home was by the sea, facing towards islands which are not now desert, but were so at the time of the empire of the Medes, where Erythras lived. In the winter time he used to go to Pasargadæ,

"Soon as the sun shone forth from the height of heaven,  
The heart of stone grew hot beneath its orb;  
The horizon was so much scorched up by its rays,  
That the heart of stone became soft like wax:  
The bodies of the fishes, at the bottom of the fish-ponds,  
Burned like the silk which is exposed to the fire;  
Both the water and the air gave out so burning a heat,  
That the fish went away to seek refuge in the fire;  
In the plains the chase became a matter of perfect ease,  
For the desert was filled with roasted gazelles.

"The extreme heat of the atmosphere gave one the idea of the fire of hell."

1 Chau-Ju-Kua: his work on the Chinese and Arab Trade in the 12th and 13th centuries, entitled Chu-fan-chi: Translated and annotated by Friedrich Hirth and W. W. Rockhill; St. Petersburg, 1911.  
(See map at end; also page 12. The name Green Sea is of Arabic origin, carried into Chinese records, Kia Tun speaks of Malabar as the "eastern shore of the Green Sea".)
making the journey at his own cost; and he indulged in these changes of scene now for profit and now for some pleasure of his own life. On a tide the lions charged into a large flock of his mares and some were slain; while the rest, unhurt and terror-stricken at what they had seen, fled to the sea. A strong wind was blowing from the land, and as they plunged into the waves in their terror, they were carried beyond their footing; and their fear continuing, they swam through the sea and came out on the shore of the island opposite. With them went one of the herdsmen, a youth of marked bravery, who thus reached the shore by clinging to the shoulders of a mare. Now Erythras looked for his mares, and not seeing them, first put together a raft of small size, but secure in the strength of its building; and happening on a favourable wind, he pushed off into the strait, across which he was swiftly carried by the waves, and so found his mares and found their keeper also. And then, being pleased with the island, he built a stronghold at a place well chosen by the shore, and brought thither from the mainland opposite such as were dissatisfied with their life there, and subsequently settled all the other uninhabited islands with a numerous population; and such was the glory ascribed to him by the popular voice because of these his deeds, that even down to our own time they have called that sea, infinite in extent, Erythraean. And so for the reason here set forth, it is to be well distinguished (for to say Ὑπέρθρα Θᾶλατα, Sea of Erythras, is a very different thing from Θᾶλατα Ἰπέρθρα, Red Sea); for the one commemorates the most illustrious man of that sea, while the other refers to the color of the water. Now the one explanation of the name, as due to the color, is false (for the sea is not red), but the other, ascribing it to the man who ruled there, is the true one, as the Persian story testifies."

1 The origin of these names, Erythras and Myoxanes, is a matter of conjecture. One ascribes a loan to the Persians from some earlier race. Myoxanes dimly suggests Māhya, the moon (perhaps Māhāzād, "known to the Moon" (cf. Justi. Iranisches Namenbuch); while Erythras might represent Areswā or Arcrāspa, two high priests from the north (cf. Dīskart V. and IX), or it may be Aras, the demon of envy, whom Zarathushtra called "most deceitful of demons" (Dīskart IX)—some divinity of an earlier race adopted by the Persians as their arch-devil.
Arrian likewise refers to this story (Indika 37) in his mention of the island Oaracta-(Kish). "In this island they said that the tomb of the first king of this country was shown. They said that his name was Erythras, from whom this sea is called Erythraean." Of Kish he also says (Indika 37): "It produces plenty of vines, palm trees and corn, and is full 800 stadia in length. In this island the sepulchre of the first monarch thereof is said still to remain, and his name was Erythras, and from him the sea was called the Erythraean Sea."

Strabo, in the passage already quoted (16, 3, 1) in describing Arabia bounds it on the east by the Persian Gulf, on the west by the Arabian Gulf, and on the south "by the great sea lying outside both the gulfs, the whole of which is called the Erythraean Sea." Strabo likewise, though in one passage (Hamilton & Falconer's translation, Bohn Ed.) he adopts the color theory of the origin of the name, admits the story of Erythras as follows (16, 3, 1):

"Nearchus and Orthogoras relate that an island Ogyria lies to the south, in the open sea, at the distance of 2000 stadia from Carmania. In this island is shown the sepulchre of Erythras, a large mound planted with wild palms. He was king of the country, and the sea received its name from him. It is said that Mithropastes, the son of Arsites, satrap of Phrygia, pointed out these things to them. Mithropastes was banished by Darius, and resides in the island; he joined himself to those who had come down to the Persian Gulf and hoped through their means to have an opportunity of returning to his own country....

"Nearchus says that they were met by Mithropastes, in company with Mazenes, who was governor of one of the islands, called Oaracta, in the Persian Gulf; that Mithropastes often his retreat from Ogyria, took refuge there, and was hospitably received; and that he had an interview with Mazenes, for the purpose of being recommended to the Macedonians, in the fleet of which Mazenes was the guide."

In this Persian story of Erythras may be found remnants of very early legend. We are introduced to a settlement in southern Persia on the lowlands bordering the gulf. Their

---

1 Vorochtha-Vroct-Kizmis-Kish.
chief went regularly to the Persian capital "at his own expense," presumably to offer tribute. During his absence, shall we say because the tribute was insufficient, a lion attacked and scattered his mares, driving them across to uninhabited islands accessible from the shore. The highland of Persia is still the "land of the lion and the sun". The lion is particularly a symbol of Persia; and have we not here the kernel of a story of attack by Persian forces upon a coast people of another race who were forced across to the islands of Ormus and Kish, and thence probably to the coast of Oman and southern Arabia? The opposition of the lion to the mare is the aggression of powerful Persia against helpless Arabia. The story is placed by Agatharchides under the empire of the Medes. I believe, however, that it may be given a much earlier origin, and that we may possibly have here an echo of the ancient conflict between the highland and the plain which characterizes the history of early Chaldaea.

The tomb of king Erythras, of which Arrian speaks, which was evidently a type of structure mentioned by modern travelers as still found in that region, seems to apply to a pre-Semitic race settled in the Persian Gulf and carrying on sea trade there. The remnants of that commercial system which Goetz, (Verkehrswege im Dienste des Welthandel p. 38), has aptly entitled "Turanian-Hamitic", may be traced through Makran and Baluchistan to Dravidian India on the one hand, and through Oman and southern Arabia, the ancient Habash to modern Abyssinia on the other. There is some significance in the mediaeval Arabic name for this sea (e. g. Mas'udi), "Sea of Habash". Had we the evidence, I believe we might find the name Erythraean to have sprung originally from some name of that race, possibly even a semi-totemic color handed down through the legends of the adjacent highlands, first Elamitic and later Persian.

Other meanings suggest themselves from the Persian connection. Firstly, of course Erythraean means oriental, eastern, pure and simple. As Herodotus observes, it is the sea "that looks toward the rising sun", from Persia; the eastern and southern segments of the encircling ocean as distinguished from the western and northern, to which he gives the name Atlantic; and so, poetically, we may call it the sea of the blushing morn—the sea of the rising sun. Especially in this
combination of the sun, and the color red or golden red, in accord with Persian beliefs. ¹

How beautifully Tennyson in the hymn at the end of his "Akbar's Dream" has given expression to this ancient Persian ritual:

"Once again thou flamest heavenward, once again we see thee rise,
Every morning is thy birthday gladdening human hearts and eyes.
Every morning here we greet it, bowing lowly down before thee, Thee the Godlike, thee the changeless in thine ever-changing skies.

"Shadow-maker, shadow-slayer, arrowing light from clime to clime,
Hear thy myriad laureates hail thee monarch in their woodland rhyme.
Warble bird, and open flower, and men, below the dome of azure, Kneel adoring Him the Timeless in the flame that measures Time!"³

While there are earlier connotations in the name of that ancient so-called king Erythras, the sun and the color red carry us to the very core of the Zarathushtrian faith.²

¹ With the earlier practices of sun-worship, Semitic or pre-Semitic, we need not concern ourselves. There are relics of this worship still on the island of Haftalu, the Astola of the Greeks, off the shore of Makran, that magic island of the Arab voyagers which magnetically attracted nearby ships to their destruction so that the use of iron in shipbuilding was made impossible.

² Darmesteter in his work on the Zend Avesta (vol. 3, p. lxxvi. note); and while he finally accepts Burnouf's interpretations of "man with gold colored (tawny, or red) camels", the color still remains.

Zarathushtra was said to have been born of the mingling of his guardian spirit with a ray of heavenly glory during a sacrifice, and the sun worship was centered in Mithra, one of the great spirits of the Mazdaean faith—"who first of the celestial Yasatas soared above Mount Hara before the immortal sun with his swift steeds, who first in golden splendor passes over the beautiful mountains and casts his glance benign on the dwellings of the Aryans".
The great Persian king Cyrus was by name "the sun of the morning". King Erythras himself, "the king of the rosy morn", we might also connect with Cyrus, save that his tomb was then too recent for its location to have been moved by legend from the mountains to the island of Kish.

Yet I believe that the story of Erythras ante-dates the Persian faith or the very existence of Persians on that coast.

So much, then, for Erythraean as the Sea of the East, the rising sun and the blushing morn.

Another meaning I think the name includes, derived from the purple-fisheries which were among its earliest commercial assets. Ἐρυθραῖος is to dye red, and the treasured dye of that hue running from bright red to dark purple, according to method of treatment, was a product of the shell-fish murrax; later cultivated on the Phoenician coast of Syria, but in earlier ages probably in the shallow, almost tideless, waters of the Persian Gulf. We have the word in Homer, not then as referring to a commercial dye, but as a shade varying from light red to dark purple and including the idea of brightness—glittering—gleaming. It is this impression of "gleaming darkly" that is connected with the very root of the word σοφίσκος. Aristotle (Color. 2, 4; also Probl. 38, 2) describes the color as the "reflected gleam on the shadow side of a wave", and it was that meaning which was carried to the shell-fish dye when first brought to Mediterranean lands by the people we call Phoenicians, whose legend connected them in earlier times with the Persian Gulf. Pliny speaks of that double tint as the most treasured of the shades of the purple (9, 60—63, Bohn translation):

"To produce the Tyrian hue the wool is soaked in the juice of thepelagiae while the mixture is in an uncooked and raw state; after which its tint is changed by being dipped in the juice of the buccinum. It is considered of the best quality when it has the color of clotted blood and is of a blackish hue to the sight, but of a shining appearance when held up

Hara is Haraberesaiti, or Elburz, "over which the sun rises, around which many a star revolves, where there is neither light nor darkness, no wind of cold or heat, no sickness leading to a thousand kinds of death, nor infection caused by the Daeras, and whose summit is never reached by the clouds" (Yasht 18, 23. Darmasteter iii, 496)."
to the light; hence it is that we find Homer speaking of purple blood" (Iliad E 83, P. 360). And he goes on to quote from Cornelius Nepos: "Violet purple was in favor, a pound of which used to sell at 100 denarii; not long after the Tarentine red was all the fashion. This last was succeeded by the Tyrian *dibapha* (double dyed) which could not be bought for even 1000 denarii per pound."

The eastern origin of the Phoenicians is stated by Herodotus (7, 89): "The Phoenicians, as they themselves say, anciently dwelt on the Erythraean Sea; and having crossed over from thence, they settled on the sea coast of Syria"; like Abraham the patriarch, they came from the land of Ur of the Chaldees, the center of sun-worship and of eastern trade.

Finally, we may quote from Strabo (1, 2, 35) who refers to the belief that the Sidonians were "a colony from the people whom they describe as located on the shores of the (Indian) Ocean, and who, they say, were called Phoenician from the color of the Erythraean Sea."

Was it the natural color of the sea that gave it the name, or was it the legend and faith of the people living around its shores and the artificial color of the dye which they drew from its waters? I believe we may attach to Erythraean that meaning also, "sea of the dark red dye people", and that in that sense it may be synonymous with purple, πορφύρα, and Phoenician, φοινικ; the sea on which the Phoenician race, who first brought purple to the Mediterranean lands, had before that time established their cities and industries and maritime commerce.

Whether there was anything more than an accidental connection with the name of the Greek city Erythrae in Boeotia we cannot tell. The likelihood is not great, but it might possibly be urged by some that Dorian Greeks were settled in many parts of that land before the Persian invasions of Greece. Alexander found Greek colonies at the gates of India that claimed a descent prior to the Greek companies exiled to the east by Darius, and at the Christian Era we find an archaic Dorian character appearing in the Greek lettering on the coins of Mesene at the head of the Persian Gulf, and on those of the Kushan kings. While certainly not a cause for the name, this might have given it familiarity in Greek ears.
We need not too sharply distinguish between these various meanings, and possibly the general acceptance of the name was due to the fact of its applicability from so many points of view. Purple Sea would hardly have suggested the sun; Phoenician Sea would have been a confusing name, while Erythraean Sea, as practically a synonymous word embracing all these meanings, made an ideally acceptable name.

In conclusion we may say that looking out of Greece through Persia to the ancient East, we may gather from the name Erythraean several meanings, all of them reasonable. *"Sea of the East, the Orient, or the rising sun"; "Sea where the sun was worshipped"; "Sea whence came the people who brought the purple or Erythraean dye", and finally, *"Sea of King Erythus" typifying the ancient pre-Semitic Akkadian-Dravidian trade. Certainly with these vistas of the past opened through that name, we cannot rest satisfied with an interpretation that would limit it to a temporary accumulation of vegetable matter localized at a point to which the name was not originally applied.*
The Cock.—By Dr. John P. Peters, New York City

In 1888 I read, before the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, a paper on Leviticus I., in which I sought to prove, from the animals there mentioned as sacrificial, and particularly from the non-appearance of the cock, that, before the time of the Babylonian captivity "the torah of animal sacrifice had completed the creative and reached the legal or unchangeable period." In the preparation of that paper I depended for my facts about the cock on Hehn's Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere. Since that time I have made an independent investigation of the history of that bird with results differing from or supplementing Hehn to such an extent that I have been led to formulate this new material in a second paper, commencing, however, as before, with Hebrew and Biblical use.

The first six chapters of Leviticus constitute a sacrificial code, which evidently, in its present form, is both a compilation and a growth. The final compilation is presumably post-exilic, but I fancy that the code itself represents pretty well the sacrificial practice of the Jerusalem Temple before the captivity, while parts of it go back in essence to a much older period. The rule with regard to sacrifice among the Hebrews was that the sacrificial animal must be both comestible and domesticated. Wild animals might not be sacrificed. Now in actual practice only oxen, sheep and goats were permitted to be eaten by the Hebrews in sacrifice. In the torah of the whole burnt sacrifices, however, contained in Chapter I., besides these three animals the dove, in two varieties, וָעָבֹד and וָע, was permitted to be offered. This permission is added like a sort of codicil at the end of Leviticus I. It gives the

1 The last, posthumous, 8th edition, by O. Schrader, adds nothing to the material in Hehn's original volume, in spite of the additional monumental material now accessible. A note by Schrader purports to give later Assyrian-Babylonian material, but is quite valueless and sadly misleading.
impression of an afterthought, as though of later origin. For trespass and sin offerings, where the flesh was not to be eaten, provided for in Chapters 4, 5 and 6, and for some other offerings, like the purification offering (Chap. 12), a similar provision was made. The use in sacrifice of the three animals mentioned and the two forms of dove can be traced back to the earliest Hebrew writings. Indeed, we may say that the sacrifice of oxen, sheep and goats long antedates Hebrew origins, and that the sacrifice of the dove was practised by the Hebrews certainly as early as 900 B.C.\footnote{Cf. the Yahawist, Gen. 15: 9f. In the Marseilles sacrificial tariff and in the similar tariff found at Carthage by Nathan Davis in 1888, commonly known as the Davis Phoenician Inscription, we have the same quadrupeds mentioned for sacrifice as in the Levitical sacrificial list, namely, the ox, goat and sheep. We also have two birds mentioned, connected together as one whole, as in the Levitical code. The words used for these birds, דב, דב, are elsewhere unknown. The close resemblance of the code, as a whole, to the Hebrew suggests that the birds here used are the same as those in the Hebrew code. Ball (Light from the East) calls attention to the fact that in the Samaritan Targum the word דב appears to mean “young pigeon”, being the translation of דב of Genesis 15: 9. Of course if דב be pigeon, then it follows of itself that דב in dves. These two tablets, while themselves not very old (somewhere, probably, between 300 and 500 B.C.), give us, presumably, the old Phoenician custom of sacrifice. If the translation suggested above be correct, then the old Phoenician code was practically identical with the Hebrew, and the natural conclusion would be that the Hebrew code was borrowed from a pre-Hebraic Canaanite source, considerably antedating, therefore, 900 B.C.} The domestication of oxen, sheep and goats extends into a hoary antiquity, dating both the Babylonian and the Egyptian civilizations. The dove also was domesticated at a very early period in Babylonia, in Syria, and in general, apparently, over the whole of lither Asia. It is noticeable that our own barnyard fowl, which is today found practically everywhere throughout the world, in cold countries and hot, as a part even of the household equipment of wandering Bedawin Arabs, does not appear in the sacrificial codes.

Outside of the dove, there is no mention of domesticated fowl in the Old Testament, with three possible exceptions. One of these is 1 Kings 5: 3, the account of the provision for Solomon’s table. This was to be supplied with ten oxen, fattened gazelles, roebucks, and דב, דב, rendered in the
English version "fatted fowl," following the Septuagint and Vulgate. The Briggs-Brown-Driver Gesenius suggests that these were geese. This would seem, on the whole, the most plausible conjecture, and, if correct, the passage would indicate that the Hebrews, at or after Solomon's period, did have access to one variety at least of domestic fowl, whether they raised them themselves or obtained them from others. It would appear, however, that these fowl were certainly not common. They did not constitute an ordinary article of food. They are mentioned nowhere else. Even if known within the creative period of the sacrificial torah, they never came to play such a part as articles of food as to lead to their adoption into the sacrificial code, either for general or for special sacrifices.

The goose and the duck were elsewhere domesticated at a very early date. We find evidence of this in ancient Egyptian and Babylonian monuments; and Greek and Roman literature and tradition represent the goose as early domesticated there also. Palestine was a land naturally ill adapted for the domestication of either geese or ducks, and while such domestication was possible on the low lands, in the regions regularly occupied by either Judah or Israel there was very little chance for such domestication and little temptation to it. It is natural, therefore, that we should not find any mention of geese or ducks in the Old Testament, in or out of the sacrificial code, with the possible exception of the passage alluded to; which would seem to show that they were known only as a luxury, procurable by one in Solomon's position, but not by the ordinary man.

The second exception is the peacock (יָנוֹן), mentioned in 1 Kings 10:22, and 2 Chron. 9:21, as imported by Solomon. As the name was imported with the bird, there is in this case no doubt as to its identification or its origin;1 which only shows, however, that at the time this passage was written, and traditionally since Solomon's time, the peacock was known to the Jews as a wonder bird, fit possession of great kings, and that it came originally from India, reaching the Mediterranean lands by way of the Red Sea.

---

1 The Hebrew and the Greek, like the Sanskrit, borrowed the name of the bird from the Tamil tegei.
The third possible exception is the cock, our domestic barnyard fowl, which, it is claimed, is mentioned under three different names in three different passages: Is. 22: 17, Job 38: 36, and Prov. 30: 31. In the first case the word used is כָּלָה, the common Hebrew word for "males", then "man", then "person or each". Jerome was advised by his Hebrew instructor, apparently, that the word in this passage, and nowhere else in the Old Testament, meant "cock", and he so translated it. Dominus asportari te faciet, sicut asportatur gallus gallinaceus. The word did in fact come to have this meaning in post-biblical Hebrew. The method of translation of sense seems to be indicated by the use of כָּלָה as a euphemism for "membrum virile". It was the salacity of the cock which led to his designation as כָּלָה, "male". The passage under consideration, as it stands in the Hebrew, is difficult. The LXX translators botched it badly. Their rendering, however, makes it plain that כָּלָה did not mean "cock" in their day, but only "man". After it had come to mean "cock", by the transition noted above, it was natural to read that meaning into this passage as a promising way of gaining an immediate sense. This seems to be what was done by later Jewish scholars, and by Jerome following them. His translation, however, ruins the passage as a whole, and today all commentators agree that כָּלָה does not either here or elsewhere mean "cock".

1 כָּלָה appears as the name of the cock in the language of Mishnah as early as about 60 A.D. (Yoma I. 8). Eusebius in his commentary on Isaiah mentions the Rabbinical interpretation of כָּלָה in Is. 22: 17 as "cock".

2 The difficulty in this passage has, I think, been caused by a play on the words כָּלָה and כָּלָה. In v. 16 Isaiah had reproached Shebna with his ostentatious pomp in cutting himself a tomb, כָּלָה, in the rock. In v. 17 he predicts his violent removal into captivity in Mesopotamia. "Behold, Yahweh casteth thee out with a casting, (כָּלָה) man". The word כָּלָה is used because it sounds, in common pronunciation, almost exactly like the word for "tomb" (כָּלָה). This diverts Isaiah for a moment from the direct line of his announcement of Shebna's captivity into burial figures: "Wrapping thee with a wrapping, winding he windeth thee with a winding." The resemblance in letters of כָּלָה and כָּלָה made the puzzled Greek translators translate τὸ στυγγόσκοφος τὸ στυγγόσκοφο—"thy glorious crown," which Jerome has still further twisted into coronam coronabit te tribulatione (evidently neither LXX nor Jerome could make much out of the passage). Then he takes up again his announcement of Shebna's coming captivity and proceeds: "Like a ball into a land broad
In the next passage, Job 38: 36, the word rendered cock is not דבד but דבש. According to R. Hash., in "the district of K. N." the cock was called דבש (seldan). Y. Ber. says that in Rome also it was so called; and Lev. R. that in Arabia the hen was called שלטנה (סנית). In classical Hebrew this word is an עָדָּא רָכְבּ, occurring only in this passage. The LXX has translated the verse: τῆς ἡ δέων γεννᾷ ἐφανέρωσε τοὺς σφόδρα καὶ πολλάκις ἔπετράγων, "Who gave woman wisdom of web and embroidery experience?" It is impossible to connect this with the Hebrew text, and its lack of relation to the context evinces its error. Jerome apparently learned from his Hebraeus the late Jewish tradition regarding דבש and translated accordingly: "Quis posuit in vicecibus hominis sapientiam vel quis dedit gallo intelligentiam", which makes good enough sense in itself, but has no relation whatever to the context (The same treatment of the Bible as texts without context which we saw in Is. 22: 17). This is part of a long passage, put in the mouth of Yahaweh, telling of His wonderful creation of the earth and the sea (4–11), the morning, the deep and the light (12–21), the snow, wind, lightning and rain (22–30), the stars and sky (31–33), the clouds (34–38); then the beasts, lions (39–4), wild goats (39: 1–4), ass (5–8) &c. Our verse falls in the creation of the clouds:

"Canst thou lift up thy voice to the clouds,
That abundance of waters may cover thee?
Canst thou send forth lightnings, that they may go,
And say unto thee, Here are we?
Who hath put wisdom in the inward parts?
Or who hath given understanding to the דבש?
Who can number the clouds by wisdom,
Or who can pour out the waters of heaven;
When the dust runneth into a mass,
And the clouds cleave fast together?"

Evidently there is no mention of the cock in this passage.

on both hands, &c.† Perhaps the idea of the passage might be rendered thus: "Behold, Yahaweh casteth thee out with a casting, man ([דבש] man, playing on דבש tomb], wrapping thee in a wrapping, winding he windeth thee with a winding), like a ball into a land broad on both hands; and there are the chariots of thy glory, shame of thy lord's house".

† Always in some other region; never in Palestine.
The context shows that the רות must mean something in the inner side of the clouds. The Peshitto and the Targum to this passage both support this by their very misunderstanding of the passage, the יהוה and רות being supposed to be, not the secret parts and hidden things within the clouds, but the reins and heart of man. A comment upon this verse in the Targum\(^1\) shows, however, that at a fairly early post-biblical period it was connected with the cock, and there is no doubt that the word רות in Neo-Hebrew does actually mean cock; but the context shows that, whatever its later meaning, in this passage (if indeed the text be correct) the word cannot have had that meaning.

There remains the passage, Prov. 30: 31, where the word rendered cock is רות. This occurs in one of the number riddles, in threes and fours. "There are three which march well, and four which walk well": (1) the lion; (2) רות; (3) the he-goat; and (4) the king. Beginning with (2) the Hebrew text is manifestly corrupt, and quite incapable of translation. It contains impossible words, and it is also defective, lacking the descriptive phrases which should accompany the names. The Greek, the Peshitto and the Aramaic Targum agree in giving a fuller and an intelligible text. Using in general that text, the answer to the riddle is as follows: (1) "The young lion, mightiest of beasts, which retreating before none; (2) The cock, which gallantly treadeth the hens; (3) The he-goat, leader of the flock; (4) And the king, boasting himself over the people."

Jerome evidently had the same corrupt text which we have, but in his time the tradition still lingered that the second member was the cock. Accordingly he translates מנה רות as gallus succinctus lumbos. Modern scholars have in general followed his rendering, omitting the gallus; and, as the creature most girded up in the loins is the greyhound, מנה רות has been commonly translated greyhound. Now in reality the Hebrew text confirms the Greek and Syriac versions both here and in (4). The impossible מנה of the Hebrew con-

---

1 Lagarde, Hagiographa chaldæa. The earliest Talmudic testimony to the interpretation of sekw as cock is a blessing in Berachoth, 80f. Possibly it was the meteorological function of the cock, as announcing the dawn, that referred to, which led to the interpretation of sekw as cock. More probably a false etymology, suggested by the Persian name, Parsende, forever, by which רות was derived from רות to see, forever.
tains the סֵפֶן of the Targum and Peshitto, translated by the σπαργαζων of the Greek. Similarly the וַעֲשֵׁי of the Hebrew suggests the hithpael participle לָכַּנְתָּר. The passage seemed to some scribe indecent, and he drew a line through it. All that survived his elision was the names of the creatures and the fragmentary confusion of letters which constitutes our present text. Jerome had before him, as already stated, this emended text, but with the tradition that the second member was the cock.

But while the evidence of the versions, supported by the sense of the passage, requires the translation of רַעֵשֶׁ by cock, it must be said that in Neo-Hebrew the word means starling, and that the same word has the same meaning in Syriac and Arabic. The word is to an extent onomatopoetic, as are cock and cuckoo. These latter were in fact originally one, applied to both cock and cuckoo, but ultimately differentiated to apply each to one specific bird. Somewhat similarly, I fancy, רָגָּשָׁ, as a word supposed to represent a bird sound, was applied to this half-known bird, the cock, as well as to the starling. Later the loan word, לַכַּנְתָּר, was appropriated to the cock, and רַעֵשֶׁ became the name of the starling only.

The 30th chapter of Proverbs, in which this passage occurs, is by general consent the latest part of that book, and is ordinarily supposed to have at least a half foreign tone. Toy, in his commentary in the International series, represents the extreme late date theory, placing it in the second century B.C. The reference to the cock in this passage probably involves an earlier date. At the time when this riddle was composed, the cock was known much as the goose and the peacock were known at the time of writing of the passages referring to those birds in Kings. Certain of its peculiar habits were matters of fairly common knowledge, and it was evidently being introduced among the Jews, or was domesticated among some of their neighbors. It was not yet, however, in ordinary use, and was still so much of a rarity that it had not achieved a real, permanent name. I think this riddle must be dated certainly earlier than 200 B.C.1

To sum up: While both the words רַעֵשֶׁ and לַכַּנְתָּר appear in neo-Hebrew for cock, it is clear that they do not have that

---

1 Possibly, of course, this riddle may have originated among the Jews in Egypt or elsewhere, and been imported into Palestine; which does not, however, affect the question of its date in Palestine.
sense in Biblical Hebrew. How the word גָּזָל, male, came to be an appellation of the bird is clear; why גָּזָל was so translated is not equally clear. The cock began to become known to the Jews in Palestine as early as the third century, and is mentioned in Proverbs 30: 31, but by a name, בַּעַל, which we find elsewhere, and in kindred languages, applied to the starling, or sometimes to the raven. The regular Talmudic name for cock, which appears also in the Targums, was בַּעַל or בַּעֲשׂוֹן, a loan word from the Aramaic, of uncertain, plainly not Semitic origin. The linguistic evidence would go to show that the cock was domesticated in Palestine some time between the close of the Canon and the commencement of the Mishnaic period.

From what source was he borrowed? In the later Apocryphal literature of the Jews the cock plays a part which is evidently borrowed from the Persians. So in the Greek Baruch Apocalypse, in the description of the third heaven (6, 7), the rustling of the wings of the Phenix, the forerunner of the sun, wakes the cocks, who then by their crowing proclaim the coming of the dawn. Similarly in Persian Sraosha, the heavenly watcher, awaked by Atar, the fire, in his turn awakes the cock. With this may be compared further the Slavonic Enoch (xvi. 1), according to which, when the angels get the sun ready for his daily journey, the cocks crow.

Both the New Testament and the Talmud mention the cock. He was clearly a familiar creature in Palestine at that period. The former gives us the picture of a use and knowledge of the bird similar to our own. His crow, ushering in the dawn, was a sound so familiar to all that cock-crow had come to be a designation of time (cf. Mark 13: 35). About 70 A.D. the Talmud (Gittin 57 a) mentions a custom prevailing in Palestine of having a cock and hen present at the wedding ceremony. Evidently they were fertility emblems, appropriate to a wedding for somewhat the same reason which led to the exclusion of the cock from the text of Prov. 30: 31.

Beside his function as a marriage bird, in Talmudic use the cock was also apotropaic. It is perhaps this characteristic which led to the blessing enjoined to be pronounced when the cock is heard to crow: (Bernkhoth 60 b): 1 "Praised be thou.

1 Already referred to on p. 368 of this paper, note. The passage suggests Persian influence.
O God, Lord of the world, that gavest understanding to the cock to distinguish between day and night."

On the other hand we find evidences that the cock was not domesticated in Palestine without opposition. So Baba Kam. 82b, notes that the breeding of cocks was forbidden while the temple was in existence, because they scratch the ground and pick up, and disseminate objects levittically unclean. Elsewhere the sale of white fowls is forbidden, apparently because they were used for sacrifice by the heathen.

Today the cock is used sacrificially among the Jews, both Sephardim and Ashkenazim, in connection with Yom Kippur, as an atonement² offering (Kapparoth)—a cock by the man; a hen by the woman—being swung three times around the head of the offerer, with the right hand upon the head of the victim, somewhat as in the sin and atonement offerings ordered in the Old Testament. The creature is killed, but is not burned; as seems to have been the rule with doves, when used as offerings, according to the old temple ritual. Its flesh may be given to the poor to eat or it may be eaten by those sacrificing, the money value being given to the poor. This sacrifice is mentioned for the first time by Natronai Gaon, head of the Academy of Sura in Babylonia, in 853 A.D., who describes it as a custom of the Babylonian Jews. It is also mentioned as a custom of the Persian Jews at an early date. The cock also has been, or is now used among Jews in various places for special sacrificial purposes of the purification or sin type (Kapparoth), also for apotropaic sacrificial purposes.³

The Jew has evidently felt the same influence toward using the cock in sacrifice which all other peoples and religions have experienced; and so strong has that influence been that, in

---

1 Jewish Enc., art. cock.
2 Among Sephardic Jews, at least, always white.
3 So when a man is sick, a cock is killed. Curtiss, Primitive Semitic Religion (p. 205), notes the same use in a Mohammedan village. Apparently there, and among the Nusairi also, a Kapparoth sacrifice of the sort described above was in use, a sheep being used by the wealthy, a cock by the common folk.
4 For the woman enceinte two hens and one cock are offered. For references and verification in Jewish Literature and practice, I am especially indebted to Prof. Adler and Profs. Ginzbarg, Gotthelf and Jastrow.
spite of the fact that theoretically sacrifice ended with the destruction of the temple, practically, as stated, the cock, not included in the old _torah_ of sacrifice, is today the one sacrificial animal of the Jews. Indeed, the cock may be said to be a natural sacrificial animal, its use for these purposes being almost universal. Its omission from the sacrificial codes contained in the Old Testament is due evidently only to the fact that it was quite unknown to the Jews at the time of the crystallization of the sacrificial _torah_.

Whence, when and how did the cock come into Palestine?

The ancestor of our common domestic fowl is the wild Red Junglefowl (_Gallus gallus_), whose habitat extends from Kashmir eastward along the southern slopes of the Himalayas, through Eastern India, Burma and the Malay Peninsula, and some of the East India islands. This wild bird often associates with the domestic fowls in the villages of the natives, and frequently crosses with them. There are three other species of wild Junglefowl, living respectively in central and southern India, Ceylon, and Java, but they had no part in the direct ancestry of our domestic fowl. It is barely possible but improbable that the Buff Cochin-China fowls are descended from some unknown, perhaps extinct wild Junglefowl, but with this possible exception, all varieties of domestic fowl are descended from the wild Red Junglefowl. The semi-tropical and tropical zone which the Red Junglefowl inhabits would seem to indicate that for many thousands of years its range has differed but slightly from its present distribution.

There are a number of reasons, derived from the study of comparative ornithology, which indicate that the original home of the Red Junglefowl, or at least the most anciently inhabited part of its present range, lies to the East and South, in the Burmese-Malayan portion of its present habitat, rather than to the West in the Indian region. Distributional study of other birds, as the Kalacca Pheasants, makes it certain that these originated in Burma and have since migrated westward along an elongated, sub-Himalayan finger, stretching as far as Kashmir. The same holds true of a number of other forms of life both mammalian and avian. There is no doubt that the Red Junglefowl is of tropical or sub-tropical origin. Neither

1 _Phasianus colchicus_ of Linnaeus; _Gallus banksii_ of Temminck; also _Gallus ferruginus_.

it, nor its domesticated descendants can bear extreme cold; and the elaborately specialized, exposed comb and wattles could have been evolved only in a warm country. The three other species of Junglefowl are all tropical and the affinities of the group among the other pheasants are altogether with south Chinese and Malayan genera.

Newton says: "Several circumstances seem to render it likely that fowls were first domesticated in Burma or the countries adjacent thereto." These circumstances are, I presume, the facts stated above, and it may be safely assumed that the Burmese region was the original site of domestication of the fowl; but from that region we have neither literature nor monuments to support this conclusion. The two centers of primitive civilization near the fowl's original habitat about which we have early information are China and India.

China.

In China we find very early traces of the domestication of the cock, such domestication being traceable according to tradition at least as early as 1400 B.C.; but here, even more than in India, it is extremely difficult to determine accurately early dates. There are no monumental records of any sort which carry us back to such a very early period, and the dating of literary records is extremely uncertain. We can really do little more than say that there is abundant evidence of the domestication of the cock in China at a very early period.

1 C. William Beebe, Curator of Ornithology, New York Zoological Park. The line of migration of the domestic fowl, as traced by archaeological and linguistic evidence, also suggests that its original home may have been rather the more easterly and southerly portion of its present habitat, from which it traveled westward up and against the line of Aryan invasion into Kashmir.

2 Alfred Newton, Dictionary of Birds; see also Encyclopaedia Britannica, article "Fowl".

3 I am indebted to Professor Friedrich Hirth of Columbia for the following note: The present word for the domestic fowl including its male, the cock or rooster, as the head of the family, is ki or kai, the latter being the Cantonese, as being probably the nearest approach to the ancient sound. This word can be traced with tolerable safety to the times of the Chou Dynasty (1122—249 B.C.?). The Shuo-wen, a Chinese dictionary, published in 100 A.D., defines the term as meaning "The domestic animal which knows the time"; and since the construction of the character of ki with nan (bird) as radical excludes quadrupeds,
It would appear that the Chinese were the first to breed the bird for utilitarian economic purposes, producing the Buff Cochin China fowl, a variety so firmly established and exhibiting such unique characteristics as to suggest, as pointed out above, the possibility of a separate species. Elsewhere the bird retains its primitive appearance as the Red Junglefowl, of which our ordinary game cock is perhaps the most nearly typical form, prized for its fighting qualities. Outside of China the breeding for more utilitarian qualities, which has produced our modern varieties, is of very recent date; and those varieties apparently all owe much to crossing with the already well established Chinese breeds.

and since pigeons, ducks and geese are not in the habit of indicating time, I think we are pretty safe in assuming that the word in those days and probably centuries before had the present meaning of domestic fowl or cock. But these are comparatively recent times. The most ancient source for the occurrence of words throwing light on Chinese culture are the hieroglyphic inscriptions on bells and sacrificial vessels of the Shang Dynasty, placed by that probably fictitious Chinese chronology between the years 1700–1122 B.C. The names of birds are very poorly represented in it and the domestic fowl is not mentioned at all. But this may be purely accidental, since the material now on record probably represents merely a portion of the words then in use, and a very small portion too. You will see that even, sheep and other domestic animals, which might have been used for sacrificial purposes, are not mentioned either, although the word for sacrifice itself occurs. I have in vain looked for the word in those most ancient classics, Chi-king, Shu-king and, Chia-tsing. To make up for this I can refer you to the Chou-li, regarding which work see my Ancient History of China, page 107 seqq., which may or may not have originated in the eleventh century B.C., and according to which the cock was used as a victim in the sacrifice (cf. "Le Tehou-li", translated by E. Biot, Paris 1851, page 42 of Index: "Ki-jin, officier de coqs; il présente les coqs que l'on sacrifice"). The word K occurs also in that most ancient Chinese Glossary, the K-ya, which may possibly date from the time of Confucius himself (fifth century B.C.). The cock also appears in the names of certain constellations; the astronomical nomenclature would thus raise a side question, quite apart from the legendary matter which trespasses on historical ground, e.g. the Emperor Huang-ti (twenty-seventh century B.C.) ascending a hill called Ki-tou, i.e. Cock's Head (E. Chaumette, Les Memoires Historiques de Semu-Trism, Vol. I, p. 30, note 5), which, like many other stories of the kind, is clearly a late fabrication, which does not deserve any notice in serious research.

1 The Greeks bred the bird for fighting purposes, continually drawing fresh blood from Medea, as we do for horses from Arabia. See Helm.
Central Asia.

There are, in Russian Turkestan, numerous remains of an extremely ancient civilization, ruin mounds indicating the existence of a large population inhabiting cities during a long period of time, in the now desert region southward of the Aral Sea. Some of these mounds were explored by Raphael Pumpelly, and large quantities of remains, including bones, collected and examined. The indications were that these ruins were flourishing cities from a period antedating 3000 B.C. to the commencement of our era. Among the bones found there were no chicken bones, evidence to that extent that the cock was not known to that civilization, and that the cock did not originally make his way to the west from China by way of Turkestan. Probably, however, it was from China that the cock passed to the Turks and later was brought westward with them, at a time when it had already long been domesticated in the West. Professor Gotthiel calls my attention to the evidence from Nestorian gravestones found in Semirjetshie, near China, that the old Turks had a “cock-year”, according to which they counted. The old Turkish name for cock was toqalk, Uigur taq, Mongolian twajak, Kirgiz niger-taule), the root used today from China to Turkey and Hungary.

India.

From India we have no monumental evidence of early date with regard to the domestication of the cock, for we have indeed no early monuments of any sort. We are compelled, therefore, to trust to literary evidence as far as that goes. In the earliest stratum of Indian literature, belonging to the Indus period of the Aryan invasion, the Rig Veda, there is no mention of the cock. On the other hand he appears in the Atharva and the Yajur Vedas, which belong to the Ganges period of the Aryan occupation, the earliest mention going back to 900 B.C., or somewhat earlier. From that period onward he is mentioned with increasing frequency both in the pre-Buddhist and in the Buddhist literature belonging to

1 I have taken this date from the most conservative scholars. A date at least 200 years earlier would seem to accord better with my other evidence about the cock.
this same general region, the Ganges northward and eastward. All these notices, moreover, clearly indicate both a condition of domestication and also the important part which the cock played in the life and thought of the people.

I am indebted to Prof. Chas. R. Lanman for the following interesting note, from which I derive the statements contained in the text.

The White Yajur Veda (Yāja Samayī-sāṁhitā, i. 16) says:

Thou art a cock (kukkūṭa) whose tongue is sweet with honey,
Call to us hither sap and manly vigor.

May we with thee in every light be victors.

(It is interesting to observe the three characteristics of the cock here mentioned: Crowing, salacity, fighting.)

The first two chapters of this text are the liturgical formulae which accompany the new-moon and full-moon sacrifices. This particular verse is address, not to a cock, but to a sacrificial implement with which the press stones are beaten, and which is likened to a cock on account of the noise it makes. (Cf. Sacred books of the East, XII, 30 and notes.)

This is the oldest occurrence that I know, except in so far as a replica of this formula is found also (according to Bloomfield’s Concordance) in several other closely related texts (Concordance, p. 328 a, kukkūṭa’i and kutaṅga’i). We may date this text at 900 B.C. or earlier.

In the Atharva-Veda, V. 81, 2, we read (Whitney’s version, Harvard Oriental Series, VII. 279):

What (witchcraft) they have made for thee in a cock (krka-vāku),
or what in a kurtva-wearing goat; in a ewe what witchcraft they have made — — I take that back again (I make it to revert upon its maker).

This is a passage which may be as old as the Yajur Veda passage, or possibly older.

In the Mahābhārata (iii. 228: 33) a cock is the emblem on the chariot banner of Skanda, given by his father, god Agni.

A verse attributed to Chanakya (about 320 B.C.; minister to Chandra-gupta, 263-235 B.C.) says you may learn four things from a cock:
1. to fight,
2. to get up early,
3. to eat with your family,
4. to protect your spouse when she gets into trouble.

In the Mānavā Law, Metrical Code, Dharma-gastra (Laws of Manu), cited by Bühler 163, we read:

iii. 239: A Chāndāla, a village pig, a cock, a dog, a menstruating woman, and a eunuch must not look at Brahmanas while they eat.

(240): If they see a burnt-oblation, the oblation becomes useless — —

Because

(241): A hind makes (the rite) useless by inhaling the smell (of the offerings);

a cock by the wind that he sets in motion by the flapping of his wings, &c.
From this it would appear that the Aryans did not find the bird in the Indus valley, but met him first when they occupied the Ganges valley, about the 10th century B.C. (or 12th, see note), either themselves domesticating him, or more probably finding him already domesticated by the previous inhabitants. This fits in on the one side with the theory of the ornithologists as to the native habitat of the bird; and on the other side with the fact that the cock was not imported by sea by the Phoenicians operating with Solomon. The latter found the peacock in the India which they reached by sea, he being a native of that part of the country, but not the cock, which belonged to another region remote from that coast. In point of fact the cock is entirely lacking in just the region westward which touched India by the water route. He made his way westward by land from Kashmir through Bactria.

**Bactria and Persia.**

If the cock moved northward and westward up and against the line of the Aryan invasion, he should have reached Bactria.

In XI—136 we read: The atonement for partaking of (the meat of) carnivorous animals, of pigs, of camels, of cocks, of swine, and of human flesh, is a Tapta-Krishna penance.

This last verse against "eating crow" &c. goes back to a much older prose-text, the Dharmasutra of Gahana (see J. B. E. ii. 284); and the prohibition is found in Vasiñhas Dharmasutra also (see J. B. E. xiv. 121).

Eating the flesh of the "village cock" is prohibited with that of the goose, Brahman duck, sparrow, crane, woodpecker and parrot in Manu (V. 12, J. B. E. XXXV. 171; cf. p. 172, verse 19).

In the Buddhist books the cock is mentioned in the early part of one of the very oldest, the first dialogue of the Digha Nikaya (text, vol. i, page 9, see David's transl. p. 19, rendered "fowls"). This book may date from about the time of Buddha, say 475 B.C. or thereabouts.

In the Questions of Millinda (about the 1st century of our era) is a whole chapter about the cock (text, p. 366, line 12, to page 368 line 1).

Five (ways) qualities of the cock you should imitate:
1. Monk should retire early for meditation: as the cock retires early to roost.
2. Rises early.
3. Cock is unremittingly busy scratching for food: monk should be unremittingly in pursuit of higher life.
4. Cock is blind by night: monk should be blind to delights and seductions of senses.
5. Cock will not desert his home: monk should never desert his "mindfulness" which is his home.
at a very early date. Bactria and the region westward, from
the Caspian Sea to Farsistan, was the home of the religion
of Zoroaster; and it is to the Zoroastrian sacred literature
that we are indebted for such knowledge as we possess of
the domestic animals, as of the civilization development in general
of that region at that period. The date of Zoroaster is un-
certain, but is quite certainly earlier than 600 B.C. There
are no monumental remains which go back to this period.
The name of the cock does not appear in the very earliest
stratum of Zoroastrian religious literature, the Gāthās, but
the character of that material is such that one would scarcely
except to find it there in any case. The cock is, however,
abundantly represented in what we may call the second stratum
of Zoroastrian literature. The earliest mention is presumably
in Vendidad, Fargard XVIII. In the early morning the cock
lifts up his voice against the mighty after-midnight darkness
(Ushah): “Arise, oh men, recite the Ashem Yad-va hishtem
that smites down the Daēvas”. From this onward he is
frequently mentioned, and indeed he played a role of great
importance in the Persian religion and literature. Besides his
common name, Halka, and his onomatopoeic name Kahrkās
(equivalent to cock-adoodle-doo), he had also a religious name,
Parōdarah, foreseer (i.e. of the dawn). Numerous passages in
the Vendidad, Būndehishn and later literature set forth his
sacred character. He was created by God to fight the demon
of idleness. By his crowing he puts to flight the demons. He
is the bird of light and hence of righteousness, scattering
darkness and repelling the hosts of evil that dwell in darkness.
He was also the symbol of the resurrection. Carrying out
the idea of the sacred character of the cock, in curious contrast
with the utilitarian economic breeding of the Chinese, it was
counted an act of piety to possess and to raise domestic fowl;

1 Jackson gives the year 600 for the birth of Zoroaster. (Cf. Persia Past and Present.) Having their conclusions on the appearance of Mazda in Median proper names in Assyrian inscriptions of Sargon, 715 B.C., Ed. Meyer and others date Zoroaster somewhere from 800 back to 1000
B.C. If the readings of the Assyrian inscriptions are positively assured, admitting no alternative, and if it can be proved that Zoroaster did in
fact invent the word Mazda and did not borrow it from already existing
use, local or otherwise, an earlier date than 600 would be proved beyond
question.
2 Cf. Vi. 18, 15, 16=23, 24; also Yasht 22, 41, 42.
but after he began to crow the cock might not be eaten. The part which the cock plays in Persian religion and mythology, and the manner of reference to him in Zoroastrian literature, seem to prove satisfactorily that he antedates that religion, and that he was domesticated in Bactria and westward among the Medes and Persians before the time of the founding or reformation of the Persian religion by Zoroaster. Zoroaster was, it must be remembered, a reformer, protesting against the superstition, the idolatry and the materialism of the religion of his age and people. The Gathas represent that protest and present the reformed religion in its most primitive and purest form. But, as always has been the case, in its second stage Zoroastrianism had to reckon with the religion it undertook to reform, and above all with the great underlying folk cult of that religion, compromising with its forms and practices and superstitions. That second stage is represented by the Vendidad and Bundahishn, and precisely such material as the cock cult or reverence in those books may be taken as evidence of the existence and importance of that cult, and hence as evidence of the domestication of the cock, before the time of Zoroaster. More than that we cannot say from Persian sources. From the fact that there is no name for cock common to Indians and Iranians, it is clear that he was not known before the separation of these two Aryan stocks. Comparing, however, what we have learned from Persian and

1 For further information about the cock among the Persians, cf. Jackson A. O. S. vol. xiii p. 15. I am also indebted personally to Prof. Jackson for much assistance in this research, and especially for pointing out to me that the cock is evidently pre-Zoroastrian among the Persians.

2 Possibly this statement should be somewhat modified. Prof. Jackson calls my attention to the fact that Kahrka, which appears in composition in Avestan Kahrkatāt, the popular onomatopoeic for cock, and in Kahrkās, the name for the vulture, apparently as “chicken-eater”, may be equated with the Sanskrit krāka (also onomatopoeic) in kraka-vāku, also a folk name for cock. With these, (following P. Horn, *Grundriß der wapierschen Ekleziologie*, p. 189) he also compares the Pahlavi Kark, Kordish Kērīn, Ossettish Kērk, hen. The suggestion is that there was an onomatopoeic root name for cock common to Indian and Iranian, which did not, however, by itself become the name of the cock in either Sanskrit or Avestan, although found in the later Iranian dialects. It should be said that the particular sound contained in this onomatopoeic belongs to other birds than chickens. So in Aramaean karkya, the same sound, means crane.
Indian sources, it would appear that the cock was derived from India and domesticated among the Iranians somewhere probably between the 11th and the 8th centuries.

Greece and Asia Minor.

Hefn in his *Kulturpflanzen* places the appearance of the cock among the Greeks after contact with the Persians, in the latter half of the 6th century B.C. The cock is first mentioned in Greek literature by Theognis, 525 B.C., and later writers frequently designate him as the Persian bird (occasionally also the Median bird). In fact, however, the cock is abundantly represented on monumental remains a century or even two centuries earlier. Hogarth found him on coins from the earliest stratum of the temple of Artemis at Ephesus, circa 700 B.C., and he appears on the very earliest Ionian coins found in Asia Minor, especially in the north, along the Dardanelles, as early as the 7th century. In southern Asia Minor, on the harpy tomb at Xanthus in Lydia, circa 600 B.C., there is a remarkably fine representation of a cock, used as a sacrificial bird, having the characteristic game cock appearance of the Red Junglefowl. In Crete the cock appears on the Melian gems about 700 B.C. On the Greek mainland we have numerous representations going back to the 7th century. Of these perhaps the earliest is a relief found in Sparta in 1880, representing the offering of a cock, apparently in connection with ancestor worship. Of almost the same age is a proto-Attic vase, figured in Ephemeris Archæologique, 1897. A Corinthian Alabastron, with a representation of a cock, in the Metropolitan Museum in New York, is dated 650–600 B.C. An ornithochore from the same place, showing an owl between cocks, is dated 600–550; and

---

1 Cf. Head, *Historia Numorum*. One coin ascribed to Darius I (p. 544), however, an electrum stater with a cock on one side, seems to belong to China. This is "one of a series of primitive types, among which are found bulls, lions, and fantastic winged animals." (Miss Agnes Baldwin).

2 Sir Arthur Evans thought that he had found the cock on one of the early Minoan monuments at Knossos, which would place his appearance in Greece as early as the third millennium (Journal of Hellenic Studies xiv. 1894, p. 349, fig. 65a, also *Scripta Minoa*, p. 183, fig. 74a). This is a very rude representation of a bird, lacking all the characteristic features of the cock, resembling representations of unidentifiable birds found on the Egyptian and Babylonian monuments.
a Chalcedonian amphora, representing a man between two cocks, is assigned to the same date. Indeed, any well equipped museum at the present time contains abundant evidence that the cock was known to the Greeks long before they came in contact with either Persians or Medes. The term Persian bird seems to have been given to the cock by Greek writers, after contact with the Persians, chiefly because of his great importance and his religious use among the Persians, which made him par excellence their bird; partly, perhaps, because of the tradition of his derivation from the East, the land from which the Persians also came.

After the commencement of the Persian era, the representation of the cock on coins, vases and monuments becomes more frequent. Both before and after that time the characteristic of the cock which seems to have appealed most strongly to the Greek imagination was his fighting qualities. To them he was primarily a game cock, and the cock fight is the most familiar and frequent representation on coins of the Greek period from India westward.¹ On this account he was sacred to Ares. That he was also associated with Hermes, presumably for his mantic qualities, is apparent from his representation with the caduceus.² Perhaps it was thru Persian use that he became sacred to Apollo, as herald of the sun. In that connection also he appears attached to the triskele on Pamphylian and Lycian coins.³ Further, as a derivation probably from his relation to the sun, reasoning from awakening to health, he was sacrificed to Asclepius. In this relation, also, he became the chthonic bird, and is used on tombs, as emblematic of the hope of a reawakening to life. He was a bird of good omen among the Greeks as among the Romans, and used sacrificially to avert evil.

¹ The usual type of autonomous coins in Asia Minor, going back to about 700 B.C., is a cock or a cock fight (viz. Pollux IX. 84, Hogarth, Archais Archeas, 1908, p. 89). A cock fight is also the commonest representation of the fowl on Attic vases. For a typical specimen cf. Attic Kylix in Metropolitan Museum, New York, 550-500 B.C.

² Cf., for instance: coins of Sophytes, prince of the Panjub, 316-306 B.C.; obverse, head of Sophytes or Athena; reverse, cock and caduceus, Head, p. 835.

³ Cf. Goblet d'Alviella, Migration des Symboles, pp. 76, 322; also Hunter, Numorum veterum descriptio, pl. VII, nos. 15, 16; Head, Coins of the Ancients, pl. III, fig. 135.
Throughout the whole Greek world, then, from 700 B. C. onward, the cock, always represented most unmistakably on monuments and coins, reproducing the game cock characteristics which belong to the original breed, was a familiar and omnipresent bird, sacrificial to a number of gods, representing an accumulation of sacred ideals and traditions, and popular for sporting purposes. On the other hand, the bird does not belong to the earliest stratum of Greek civilization. He plays no part in Greek mythology. There are no legends or folklore which attach themselves to him, as to the dove, the swan, the eagle, &c. He came in after the Greeks had passed that stage of their existence. The name by which he was known, ἀπθερών or ἀπτερός, is not Greek. 1 He is not mentioned in Hesiod or Homer, in one or both of which it seems that he must have played a part, had he been known. The latter mentions, among domestic animals, the horse, ass, mule, ox, goat, sheep, pig and dog, and among domestic fowl the goose, but nowhere the cock. 2 The Homeric poems, do, however, I think, give us a clue to the date and the origin of the cock among the Greeks. As already pointed out, the Greek word for cock, ἀπτερόν, fem. ἀπτερόω, (poetic ἀπτερός, fem. ἀπτερός) is foreign. If we could trace its origin we should presumably find the source of the cock for the Greeks. One turns naturally toward Asia Minor. The remains found in the interior of Asia Minor, both the Hittite and the proto-Armenian monuments, show no trace of the cock. Partly they are too early; partly, as I think will appear from what follows, they were not in the line of transmission or migration of the cock. While, as already stated, the cock is not mentioned in Homer, the word for cock does appear twice as a proper name. Αἴτερος, an Argonaut and commander of the Boeotians, was the son

1 Leo Meyer, Händbuch der griechischen Etymologie. 1. p. 296, derives ἀπτερός from ἀπτής, citing the analogy of ἀπτερός. He would make it mean: "Abwehr, wie der kampflustige Hahn gewiß leicht benannt werden konnte".

2 The pigeon is commonly included in the list, but, according to Seymour, Life in the Homeric Age, the pigeon, whi Jewell known to Homer, was a wild, not a domesticated bird.

3 The feminine formations are uncertain and variable, evidence of foreign origin.
of Alektryon (Ἀλεκτρυόνος II. XVII. 602). Appearing in connection with a man connected in early Grecian story with the exploration of the Euxine to its remotest eastern shores, the name suggests the possibility that the Greeks came in contact with the cock at the extreme eastern limit of the Euxine, and brought him thence to the Greek cities of Asia Minor and so to Greece itself. The Homeric passages, however, would show that the bird was not as yet possessed by the Greeks, but only just beginning to be known by name. The importation of the bird by sea along the Euxine would parallel, it may be observed, the early importation of the peacock by sea from India, and of the guinea fowl, in the time of Sophocles, from tropical Africa by way of the Red Sea and the Mediterranean.

Italy.

From Greece the cock spread with the early Greek colonies to Italy, where the monumental remains on which he appears are almost as early as those of Greece itself. The cock appears on the earliest coinage of Himera, a Chalcidic colony on the north coast of Sicily, founded about the middle of the 7th century. The coinage of Selinos, the most westerly Greek colony in Sicily, represents on one side Apollo and Artemis, standing together on a quadriga, and on the other side the river god Selinos, with a phiale and a laustral branch, before an altar, in front of which is a cock, behind on a stand a bull, and above it a Selinon leaf. Here the cock is evidently sacrificial and connected apparently with the sun. In Etruria

1 Leitus is also mentioned by Apollodorus, Diodorus and Pausanias. His tomb was shown at Platea. According to these later authorities the wife of Alektryon or Alektor, his father, was Cleobule. It will be noted also that the Ἀλεκτρυόν of Homer becomes Ἀλεκτρος in later writers, according to the dictionary the poetic form of the word. The latter is in Od. IV. 10 the name of a Spartan: ὁ δὲ Ἀλεκτρος Ἀλεκτρων ἔχει κοτήν.

2 This would date the cock among the Ionians of the Euxine region at or before 1000 B.C., harmonizing with the earlier dates suggested in the preceding pages, rather than with the later dates. If Rehn's facts and conclusions are correct the pheasant was brought to Greece somewhat later by this same route, i.e. from the eastern end of the Euxine by sea to the Greek cities.

3 The coins themselves may not be older than the commencement of the 5th century. Head, Historia Numorum, p. 143.

4 Do. 168.
the cock appears on top of sepulchral vases (chthonic use) of the Bucchero type as early as the middle of the 6th, perhaps even of the 7th century, and on wall paintings of Etruscan tombs, belonging, it is supposed, to the period when the Greeks had begun to influence Etruscan art. In Latium the cock appears on top of early hut urns (also chthonic) of about the same date as the Etruscan sepulchral vases. The cock is also a frequent emblem on the coins of Samnium and Latium in the 3rd century, and indeed he is almost, if not quite, as common on the coinage of Italian cities as on those of Grecian Asia Minor. A typical coin of the Samnian and Latin cities is that of Cales:1 obverse a head, reverse crowing cock and legend: Caleno.

It is generally assumed that the cock was introduced into Italy by the Greeks, and spread gradually from south to north. But the coins of Samnium and Latium, just described, with the figure of the crowing cock, resemble rather the cock of Gaul than that of Greece; and indeed the name of the cock in Latin, Gallus, or the Gallic bird, suggests a similar origin. The cock may, it is true, have been called gallus by the Romans for the same reason that he was called the Persian bird among the Greeks. Even this would show that he was at an early period very common and very important among the Gauls. But it seems to me that the use for the name of the bird of the word Gallus goes further, and indicates that the Italians actually received him from the Gauls. In that case he was domesticated in Central Italy before the coming of the Greeks.

Now we know from other sources that the cock played a part of great importance among the Gauls before the Roman conquest. Caesar so testifies. He tells us also of the religious significance of the cock among the Gauls in language that reminds us of Persian practice. Part of the Gallic race, he says, while raising fowls, yet regarded it as a sacrilege to eat them. The cock, we learn further, was associated with the great god of the Gauls, whom Caesar identifies with Mercury. From Gallic times, also, we have various clay and other representations of the cock, found in various places.2 Certain

1 Maury, Le Coq Gaulois, p. 57.
it is that after the Roman conquest he appears on coins from various parts of the country, and that from that time to this he has played a part in France which fairly entitles him to be called the national bird of France. As already noted the French bird is the cock in his form as chanticleer, the crower, or singer, the herald of dawn.

But how did the cock reach Gaul? From the Greek colonies on the coast, or by an independent route thru the interior of Europe? I am inclined to think by the latter route. The Romans found him not only in Gaul, but also in England and among the Germans. Evidently he was in the first century before our era pretty widely distributed as a domestic fowl, and also as a distinctly sacred bird, over western and central Europe. He was not a native. No chicken bones have been found among the shell heaps of Denmark or the lake dwellings of Switzerland, Italy or Hungary. His advent belongs to a later period. The linguistic evidence shows that he was not common property of the Indo-European peoples, nor even of the European peoples before their separation. Celt, Teuton, Lett and Slav know him by no common name. On the other hand, all peoples of Teutonic stock possess a common name for the domestic fowl, and that name, hahn or hen, the singer, connects him rather with the Persian forerunner of the dawn than with the Grecian fighting bird. Everywhere he has a religious character, and apparently the superstitions and religious usages connected with him among the Germans, as among the Gauls, point in the same direction. The evidence is far from conclusive, but I am inclined to

1 Maury cites also funerary stones of the first century, bearing cock on ensign, from Strasbourg and Narbonne (pp. 61 f.).

2 For the linguistic evidence cf. Hehn. He shows, among other things, that the Germans must have constituted one whole, dwelling together in one relatively small region, separate from other peoples, when they applied the name hahn to the domestic fowl; that the Germans must have been immediate neighbors of the Finns, and presumably not contiguous to the Lithuanians; that the Slavs and Lithuanians must have been already separate when the cock was introduced among them, and the Slavs themselves divided into two divisions. He attempts to show further, by the linguistic evidence, that at the time of the introduction of the cock the Slavs, already separated from the Lithuanians, must have been in close contact with Medo-Persian peoples, Sceythians, Scythomans and the like.
think that at the same time that the cock traveled from the eastern end of the Euxine thru the Dardanelles to the Aegean, he also traveled up the line of the Iranian emigration into Scythia, and so to the Teutons and the Celts; the two lines of migration ultimately meeting in central Italy.

**Cyprus.**

From Asia Minor and Greece the cock traveled southward to Cyprus. The earliest appearance is on the sarcophagus from Golgoi, now in the Metropolitan Museum in New York, circa 500 B.C., where his use is evidently cthonic. After that date he is quite common and in several sculptures he is represented as a sacrificial bird.¹

**Syria.**

Syrian literature is too late to be of any service in this investigation, and there is a curious lack of representations of the cock on monuments, coins, gems and the like from Syria. On some old Syrian gems there are representations of birds, but in no case a characteristic representation of the cock. The earliest representations of the cock which I can find is in a tomb at Marissa,² dating from about 200 B.C. This tomb belonged to a Sidonian colony settled in an Edomite city. The language used in the inscriptions was Greek; the animals depicted in the interior of the tomb showed distinct Egyptian influence. The cock himself is on the outer face of the door posts of the inner main chamber. He seems about to crow. In form, coloring and feathering he is still the Red Junglefowl. As already stated, the only mention of the cock in the Old Testament is in Prov. 30:31, perhaps about or after 300 B.C. He has no fixed name in Hebrew, and at that period seems to have been known to the Jews as a bird possessed by neighboring peoples, but not domesticated in Palestine. When finally domesticated among them (between 200 B.C. and the commencement of our era) he was called by an Aramaic name, *ts'negal*, which itself is not Aramaean.

¹ Cf., for instance, 1211 and 1222 in the Cypriote collections of the Metropolitan Museum, Temple-boy holding a cock.
but borrowed from some other people, from whom presumably the Aramaeans derived the bird. The data are meager and any deductions from such meager data must be viewed with caution. The suggestions from the data, such as they are, seem to be that, having reached Cyprus thru Greek influence, the cock was transmitted thence to Phoenicia, but did not become common until after the Greek conquest. The Jews, coming in contact with him as early as 300, thru the Phoenicians or other neighboring people, refused him admission because of the religious and sacrificial character which he possessed among heathen peoples; the same ground on which their ancestors had classed the swine, the hare, &c. as unclean in the dietary laws of Deuteronomy and Leviticus. In the mean time the Aramaeans had received the cock, with the name turnegal, from some other source. Thru their influence the bird and his name became common good of all Syria, and so he and his name finally found their way thru the wall of Jewish prejudice into Jerusalem.

**Arabia.**

From Arabia we have no monumental evidence of the cock, confirmatory evidence, so far as it goes, that his route from India was not by sea but by land. Arabic literature is too late to be of any value for our purposes. It may be worth noting, however, that the cock does appear, altho rarely, in old Arabic poetry, but only in connection with settled habits. From whatever source the domestic fowl was brought into Arabia the Arabs seem not to have borrowed the name with the bird, but to have invented a name of their own, not onomatopoetic however, but apparently depending on a characteristic not elsewhere similarly noted, viz. dujāj or dajāj, which Arabic lexicographers explain as given "because of his frequent coming and going (daqūq)." This is the common designation of both male and female. The cock as such, however, is called dīk.¹

¹ Is this borrowed from the Turkish? Prof. R. J. H. Gottheil. Cf. also Jacob, *Studien zu Arabischen Dichtern*, Heft III, *Das Leben der corislamischen Buchleuten*, Berlin, 1886, p. 84. The name of the cock is in itself an interesting study, which has not yet received the attention it deserves. In general each people uses popularly an onomatopoetic name, an attempted reproduction of the sound made by the cock (less
Egypt.

Earlier Egyptian scholars were inclined to find the cock in some of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, or in some of the bird forms on the monuments, apparently arguing from the present universal use of the bird that it must of course have been familiar among the old Egyptians. In point of fact these are all either uncharacterized pictures of birds, or identifiable with birds of quite a different character, such as the bustard or the quail! Egyptologists without exception are now agreed, I believe, that the cock is not found on Egyptian monuments before the Roman period, and that no word or sign for cock appears in the language. The argument from silence in this case is practically equivalent to a proof that the fowl was not known in ancient or even Ptolemaic (before the Roman period) Egypt, because the wall paintings in the tombs give us such minute and accurate representations of Egyptian life, domestic utensils and animals, creatures used for food and the like, that the cock, if in use, could not have been omitted. Why this was the case is another question. Had the cock been known in Babylonia or Syria or Asia Minor and the Aegean as early as 1400 or perhaps even 1000 B.C., it would pretty surely have been imported into Egypt. After that the Egypt-

often the hen), of the cockadoodledoo type. These names differ slightly from place to place, but are evidently not borrowed from one or more common forms, but invented by each locality for itself. Almost equally frequent are the semi-onomatopoetic names, which do not imitate but merely suggest the sound made (not sound pictures but sound hieroglyphs), and which often are or may be equally applicable to other birds, like cock (cuckoo) and kuru (crow). There is a great deal of similarity between names of this class over considerable areas, apparently due, however, as in the former case, not to borrowing, but to the necessary similarity of all attempts to translate or indicate the bird's own utterance. Then there are the names given to indicate some characteristic of the bird, like the French Chanteleur, the German Hahn, the Persian Pardarsh and probably Arabic dajjaq. Lastly there are names indicating a foreign origin, like Latin Gallus, or simply borrowed from a foreign tongue, presumably with the bird, like Greek christus and Aramaic Koragot. There is no name common to any large linguistic group, with the exception of the Mongolian-Turkish (mecuk and the Teutonic-Skand-

imagian Hahn.

A good illustration of the older method is found, by the way, in a recent article in the Zoologist for Jan. 1912, entitled "The Prehistoric Origin of the Common Fowl", by Frederick J. Stahls and A. J. Rowe.
ians were less inclined. I should judge, to borrow from outside sources religious ideas or articles of diet, the two being closely connected. In view of the importance of the cock among the Greeks, one is, however, inclined to wonder that the Greek mercenaries of Psammetichus and some of his successors, who pervaded Egypt, scribbling their names in temples of the upper Nile, and building in the Delta cities to dwell in, did not bring the cock with them for sacrificial purposes or for the sport of cock fighting. Or the Persians? Or Alexander and the Ptolemies? The silence of the monuments for precisely these periods seems conclusive, puzzling as the fact is. In answer to the question this silence raises, I can merely call attention in general to the apparent slow progress of the bird southward from the Aegean regions, in contrast with his rapid and triumphant passage westward and northward; to the religious prejudices, which would have been particularly strong against a Persian sacred bird, in view of Egyptian experience with the mad Cambyses; and perhaps also to the largely aquatic conditions of Egyptian domestic economy, better adapted to geese and ducks and cranes and herons than to chickens.

 Assyria and Babylonia.

In the earlier editions of his Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere, Hein states that the cock was unknown in Assyria and Babylonia before the Persian period. In the last posthumous eighth edition, O. Schrader, the editor, adds a note, in which he asserts that the cock is mentioned in the list of offerings of Gudea, 2700 B.C., that he appears in Assyrian times often as offered to the gods; and that he was especially common in neo-Babylonia, where he was kept in the neighborhood of temples. It is also stated that the cock was called in Assyrian by the name kurku, and in Sumerian kury; and that he was also further known in Sumerian as Tar-bugailu, supposed to be the source of the Aramaean Taruegal or Tawuqal. The idea that the cock is mentioned in the offering lists of Gudea is apparently connected with the identification of a bird on the Gudean monuments as the cock or hen, and also with the appearance of the word Kury in a sacrificial list of that period. The bird depicted on the Gudean monuments is one of those uncharacteristic and unidentifiable birds which are found on a number of early monuments in various countries.
The cock is singularly easy to represent by some characteristic peculiarities. His peculiar characteristics are so striking that they seize the fancy of the most inexperienced on-looker and, rude as his art may be, he generally contrives in some way to give the impression of the cock. It is owing to this fact that archeologists are practically agreed not to recognize as cocks the unidentifiable, uncharacterized birds which are found, as stated, on monuments of various countries. Anyone who has followed pictorial representations of the cock will see the reason for this. Such birds may be almost anything else, but they are not cocks.

As to the supposed identification of kurgi in the Gudean sacrificial list as cock, it may be said that Assyrian scholars have translated various words in the Babylonian-Assyrian word lists as cock. According to their transliterations and translations, he appears in Sumerian as lāru-gallu, kūkuraunu, and kurgi, and in Semitic as kurku or kurakku or kurakk. Of these supposed words for cock the one read ku-ku-ra-nu appears in a trilingual list, so far untranslated, of the object or character of which we know nothing, except that it does mention birds. Kūkuraunu would undoubtedly be a good onomatopoetic name for the cock, if the reading were certain, but the characters so transliterated might, so far as our present knowledge goes, equally well be transliterated kūdu ruanu—or rather from analogy this would be the natural transliteration—and still other transliterations are quite possible. But further, in the word list in which this word appears it is given as the equation of ṭurtugallu, which has been equated with the Aramaic tennegi or turnegal, cock. Now so far as our present information goes, Sumerian was a dead language many centuries before the Aramaeans reached Babylonia or parts adjacent. It is, therefore, rather startling to have an Ar-

1 So Prof. Clay calls my attention to a feminine proper name, ku-du-r (ka) ra-ni-tu, in the Cassite period, as also to the fact that the signs read ku-ka in the supposed ku-ku-ra-nu are a common way of writing the ku-du of Nibuchadrezzar and of Kuduru nin.

2 This identification was first suggested by Oppert: Zeitschr. Assy. V. VII. 339; and has since been adopted by a number of Assyrian and Syrian scholars.

3 As a curiosity it may be noted that Brockelmann in his Lexicon Syriacum gives the word Layā (akdaya) as cock, with a note from Jensen, 'Accadian'.
amaean word derived from Sumerian. If such a derivation occurred we should expect it to be mediatly thru the Semitic Babylonian, not immediately from the Sumerian. Moreover, whether the word transliterated tarlugallu was ever actually thus pronounced remains, as in so many Sumerian transliterations, subject to some doubt. If the transliteration be correct it would appear to mean tarru-king. Tar (or tarra) is interpreted in a trilingual list as bur-ru-um-tu—"variegated" (Cf. XIV, 4, 6), and the entire combination is apparently equated later (l. 11) in the same text by the Kukurunum or Kudurrum already noted. The argument then is that a certain otherwise unknown Sumerian word in a trilingual list dealing with birds may be transliterated tarlugallu, which sounds strikingly like the word for cock, tarpigull or tarpigal, used by the Aramaeans, who many centuries after Sumerian had become a dead language occupied or were in contact with the region where Sumerian had been spoken and where, in the Aramaean period, it still lingered as a church language; that in this trilingual list the word tarlugallu is translated by another unknown Sumerian word, the characters of which might be transliterated ku-ku-ra-an, which sounds like an onomatopoeic name for the cock; and that one element of the word transliterated tarlugallu is actually translated in a bilingual list by the Assyrian (Semitic) word burrunumu "variegated", a description which might be applicable to the chicken as a bird of variegated color. As an argument by itself to prove acquaintance with the cock in Babylonia in the Sumerian period (2000 B.C.), it can scarcely be accepted as possessing validity.

There are also in the Sumerian word-lists some fifteen forms

---

1 On this Prof. Prince writes me that the word does occur in the passage cited, "but in the full form—edin-dar (tar)-XU—Assyr. burrunumu, "variegated", also in loc. cit. I, 11 ku-kur-an-XU—Assyr. dar (tar) lugallum.—Dar (tar) in Sumerian does mean variegated in color, and edin-dar-XU means literally "the variegated bird of the field". Kukur-an-XU—Assyr. dar-lugallum, which Assyr. word is a Sumerian loan-word, meaning "the variegated king of birds". He suggests that the word would apply to the cock-pegasant or the peacock better than to the cock, for which he adds other reasons. As to the proposed identification of tarpigal with tar (or dar) lugallu, it may be further noted that the initial letters are not the same.

2 So far as this word is concerned, the list has two, not three columns.
of kuryj, mentioned with other objects of food for sacrifice, all, or practically, all being as yet unidentified. Kuryj also has been interpreted as an onomatopoeic, either borrowed from the "Avestan (old Bactrian) Kahrka"; or formed in the same manner, and meaning cock. Kuryj is interpreted in Semitic as kurku and the Semitic kurku; kurddu and kurddu have similarly been supposed to be onomatopoetic names for the cock. Accepting the transliterations given, which always, it must be remembered, are somewhat uncertain, the various names proposed for the cock might equally well indicate some other bird. They are mere guesses. Up to the present time we do not know the name of the cock in Assyrian-Babylonian. As Prof. Sayce writes: "There is no certain name for the cock or fowl in Assyrian. As you know, the identification of such words is always doubtful unless they are accompanied by pictorial representations."

It is in fact to these pictorial representations that we must turn to determine the date and character of the appearance of the cock in Babylonia and Assyria. Fortunately, as in the case of Egypt, pictorial representations of birds and animals begin early in Babylonia and are abundant, and hence the argument from silence is peculiarly significant. Beginning at an early date, we have unmistakable representations of ducks, geese, swans, hawks, eagles, and later ostriches, together with various fantastic and monstrous birds. Besides these clearly defined and characteristic representations of birds we have also from various periods birds not clearly defined, sometimes of the bustard type, sometimes waterfowl, sometimes of a small bird type. None of these, for reasons already stated, can we identify with the cock. The earliest monument on which a cock has been discovered is on the finials of two bow heads on a bas-relief from the palace of Sennacherib, but ascribed to Ashurbanipal, that is, about the middle of the 7th cent.

1 Cf. what has already been said about the date of the cock in Bactria, the names used, &c.
2 Mr. Finches, in a very kind and painstaking correspondence, has suggested other possible identifications from other undeciphered lists, none of which, however, are even approximately onomatopoetic.
3 The Semitic kurku certainly sounds more like the Aramaic kuriga, crane.
B.C. Nothing further identifiable with the cock is found before the late neo-Babylonian period, the time of Nabonidus, circa 550 B.C. To this period belong a couple of illustrations in Layard's Nineveh and Babylon of an engraved gem (p. 538), representing a cock on a stand like those used frequently on the boundary stones in connection with the emblems of the Gods. Before this emblem stands a winged figure, with cone and basket, while above is the crescent moon. The other is taken from a cylinder in the British Museum (p. 539), and represents the figure with the cone and basket standing before an altar, behind which altar are two stands bearing, the first the moon symbol, and the second the cock. Here the cock, like the moon, is plainly the emblem of a god. It is on these figures, I fancy, that Schrader bases his statement that the cock often appears in Assyria as offered to the gods. Neither of them in fact represents the sacrifice of the cock, nor have we anything in Assyrian or Babylonian art representing such a sacrifice. Both of them represent the worship of a god symbolized by the cock.¹ Who that god was we do not know.² There are similar representations of the cock on neo-Babylonian seals pictured by Ward.³ In general it may be said that

¹ In view of the relation of the cock to Persia, one is inclined to ask whether these two representations, attesting the introduction of the sacred bird of Persia into Babylonian mythology as a god emblem, do not belong rather to the Persian than to the neo-Babylonian period.

² The frequent connection of the cock with the sun, added to the combination of the cock emblem with that of the moon, suggests that the cock here also represents the sun in some form or phase. Layard calls attention to the supposition of Jewish commentators that the Nergal, made by the men of Gatha (II Kings 17:30), was the cock, and suggests that the Melchizedek of the Yezidis may also have been a cock, not a peacock. The identification of the cock as the emblem of Nergal seems not improbably correct.

³ Cf. W. H. Ward, Seal Cylinders of Western Asia; especially p. 421 and figs. 554, 556, 1126, 1254. Dr. Ward kindly made a special investigation at my request into alleged representations of the cock (or hen) on the ancient Sumerian Gudea monuments and the Kassite boundary (Kudurru) stones. He writes: "Certainly the Gula-Bau bird is not the cock. You will observe in S.G.W.A. figs. 230-235 it is represented with the goddess, and it is a long-necked bird. See also the stalk, p. 439. I have been all over the Kudurrus and I do not believe that the cock is on them. The tail of the cock nowhere appears. I have suspected the lesser or larger bustard, and yet the bird on the plow, or apart from the plow, might be a sparrow, or some such bird that follows the plow."
Ionians received the fowl from Media and Persia, where he had been known since a period antedating 1000; but he did not become common in Babylonia until the Persian conquest, in the latter half of the 6th century. Whence the Aramaeans derived the bird, we do not certainly know, but it was thru their agency, as the general medium of intercourse, that he was finally introduced to the Jews in Palestine, somewhere about or a little after 200 B.C., reaching Egypt only in the Roman period, 150 years later.¹

¹ Besides those mentioned in the notes, I also owe my thanks to the Smithsonian Institution and to Dr. T. Leslie Shear, Prof. Jasp. R. Wheeler and Prof. Egbert of Columbia for helping me "hunt chickens". After this article was in print my attention was called to the Arabic صمص (séch or séric), an onomatopoeicon for cock of the same type as the Hebrew כוכ of Prov. 30, 11.
Dialectic Differences between Assyrian and Babylonian, and some Problems they Present. — By S. C. Ylvisaker, Ph. D., Luther College, Decorah, Iowa.

The proof of the existence of the two quite distinct dialects, the Assyrian and the Babylonian, has been arduous but also gratifying. The texts upon which the proof is based, the collection of letters from the period of the Sargonide kings, edited by Prof. Harper, fall naturally into two groups: the letters written in the Assyrian script and those written in the Babylonian. Even a hasty comparison of the letters in the Assyrian script with those in the Babylonian cannot but reveal certain peculiarities in the one group which are not found in the other, and a more detailed and thorough study makes it apparent that these differences are of five kinds, such as concern phonetic laws, inflection, syntax, the use of words, and style. Permit me to make brief mention of the main differences under these five heads.

I. As regards phonetic laws, the Assyrian makes a sharp distinction between the palatals, the Babylonian does not—Assyrian: ikšibi, Babylonian: ḫšabi. The Assyrian pronounces the š as s and the combination št regularly becomes s or ss; the Babylonian has retained the š and before a dental this regularly becomes t—Assyrian: asakan—aktakan. Babylonian: altakan. The Assyrian frequently assimilates an m to a following t, the Babylonian softens the pronunciation of k or t after m or n to g or d—Assyrian: attahar—aamtahar. Babylonian: aamdahar. The Assyrian experiences no difficulty in the pronunciation of a double sonant, the Babylonian resolves the combination and simplifies the pronunciation by means of an n—Assyrian: imaqur—imaggur, Babylonian: imangur. In the Assyrian two neighboring vowels are frequently assimilated to each other—iḥabbatu—iḥabbatu, while vowel contraction is a prominent characteristic of the Babylonian.
in Babylonia the cock begins to appear on gems and seals first after the Persian influence has begun to make itself felt, but there is nothing to indicate any special reference to temples, such as Schrader asserts, beyond the fact that the cock was, as pointed out, a god emblem.

For Babylonia and Assyria, then, the linguistic evidence is unsatisfactory. If the name of the bird appears at all, it is in word lists of as yet unidentified creatures and objects. It is not found in any inscription or record with accompanying statements or qualifying words which would ensure or facilitate identification. The first representation of the cock yet discovered on any monuments, gems, cylinders, &c. is, for Assyria, from the middle of the 7th century B.C., a period of active contact with the Medes; and for Babylonia, a century later, when the Persians had begun to come into immediate relations with Babylon. The representations from this period show the cock as a sacred bird, the emblem of a god.

The question arises: why, if the Persians and Medes had the bird and if it past further to the westward at an earlier date, it did not also enter Assyria and Babylonia. I have already suggested that the cock past up the line of Iranian migration; and that he reached the Greeks thru the Euxine, not thru Asia Minor. Between the Medes and Persians, on the one side, and the Assyrians and Babylonians, on the other, lay a mountain region occupied by semi-barbarous tribes, never thoroly subdued by the Assyrians or Babylonians, and always more or less hostile to them. These formed for a long time a sort of buffer state between Medes and Persians and Assyrians and Babylonians, a barrier to communication and hence also to the transmission of such a creature as the cock, they themselves, from their hostile attitude and uncivilized condition, neither receiving nor imparting such gifts. Ultimately the barrier was worn away, and in Ashurbanipal's time a more direct relation established between the Assyrians and the Medes. A century later the barrier between Persians and Babylonians was broken down, and with the access of Persian plow." For completeness sake I may add that in the excavations at Nippur our earliest evidence of acquaintance with the domestic fowl was a rattle in the form of a hen. This could not, judging from its stratum, have been earlier than the Persian period, and I should be inclined to place it even later,
influence the cock invaded the Babylonian plain.¹ Why, when the cock had once been adopted in Babylonia, it did not follow up the line of the Euphrates into Syria more rapidly than it seems to have done, I cannot conjecture, unless it be something to do with its religious character and use; for, as already shown, the cock, once admitted into Babylonia, became a sacred bird, the special emblem of a god.

And now, in conclusion, I judge the history of the cock to have been this: The original home and probably the original place of domestication, Burma and its neighborhood, from which it spread into China at an early date, traditionally 1400 B.C., there to be bred into the Cochin-China fowl. It did not pass from China westward thru the Turks until a late date. When the Iranians entered the Ganges valley, in the second stage of their conquest of India, they came in contact with the domesticated fowl on its western limits. This was at a period not later than 900, and I suspect in reality more nearly 1200 B.C.

The cock past up the line of the Iranian invasion into Bactria, Persia and Media and so on into Scythia and Europe, stretching across finally to the British Isles, and spreading down from Gaul into Central Italy. The Greeks first came in contact with the cock in their expeditions to the extreme eastern end of the Euxine in the Homeric period, perhaps circa 1000 B.C., and later carried him from there to the coasts and islands of the Aegaean, where we find the cock a well known and domesticated bird on the earliest coins and monuments, from 700 B.C. onward. Spreading westward, the Greeks brought him into Sicily, whence he traveled up the line of Greek colonization into Italy, meeting the cock of the more northerly line of migration in Central Italy—Etruria, Latium and the regions thereabout. Somewhat more slowly the Greeks carried the cock southward into Cyprus; whence it was brought to the Phoenician cities, not becoming, however, well-established as a domestic fowl on the Syrian mainland until a late date.

Beginning in the 7th century B.C. the Assyrians and Bab-

¹ Possibly a further reason for the relative tardiness of the cock in Babylonia was the nature of the country, the rivers, canals and marshes so admirably adapted to geese and ducks may have constituted a barrier to the domestication of the fowl in that region.
II. Inflectional differences are many of, but referring to the summary on page 73 of my monograph entitled "Zur babylonischen und assyrischen Grammatik", I shall mention only a few more important ones. In regard to the inflection of nouns it is to be noted that the Assyrian regularly has a as the ending of the nominative and accusative singular, i as that of the genitive, while the Babylonian by its irregular use of the case-endings would seem to show that these were no longer in use. In regard to the verb, the Assyrian forms the Piel and Šālu Imperatives and Permainsives by means of a in the first syllable, the Babylonian has the usual forms. So the Assyrian gubbit, Babylonian gubbit; Assyrian gummur, Babylonian gummur; Assyrian ābul, Babylonian ābul, etc. But the difference appears in minor matters as well, as f. inst. in the treatment of certain verbs. The Assyrian present of nadānu is iddan, the Babylonian ināman or ināmaš; the Assyrian preterite is iddin, the Babylonian iddan or iddin; the Assyrian imperative is din, the Babylonian utin. The first t-form of naṣāri in Assyrian is _insn, in Babylonian ittašir. The Assyrian treats the verb ida "to know" as a TE verb, the Babylonian as "E. And so on.

III. The syntactical differences are also quite marked, the use of the enclitic ni in dependent clauses being characteristic of the Assyrian, the use of the overhanging vowel in dependent clauses and of the enclitic na characteristic of the Babylonian. Here there are also minor points of difference such as the idiomatic use of prepositions, etc.

IV. Closely connected with the syntactical differences are those involving the use of words. It cannot be by mere chance that the following words are used only in the Assyrian letters: the pronouns ammu, mēmēnu, zamutu; the verbs naṣū, naṣēš, and the defective verb lašū; the prepositions isši, battišši, battatuš; the adverbs udûši la, udā, umā, umaka, umaka, umurī̂, arūti, issūti, atā, bāti, bāši, bāramme, kallamari, kittu, lidīṣ, mā, mak and nak, ātūri, Šaddaqiš, timūši, tūrša, and the following only in the Babylonian: the pronoun aqa; the defective verb umu; the prepositions āltu, īttu, uttu; and the adverbs uššu, ul, ummu, arkanīš, arkašu, bani, hanīši, mak, midimma, minumma, Šaddaqiš. In the case of some of these words the subject-matter may, of course, have had more to do than is at present apparent.
V. All of these peculiarities taken together and coupled again with the individuality of the writer in each case would undoubtedly help us to explain the difference in style which one cannot but notice in the letters. But they would hardly explain all, and I think we would be justified in distinguishing between an Assyrian and a Babylonian style as well. However, this question of difference in style is intimately associated with a detailed study and comparison of syntactical constructions in the two dialects, and in this field very much still remains to be accomplished.

To summarize: If we could have heard the two dialects, Assyrian and Babylonian, spoken, I do not doubt that we would have noticed a difference more marked than that which exists among the various dialects in Germany. We would undoubtedly do better in choosing the sister languages Norwegian and Swedish for comparison: the Swedish, soft and musical, representing the Babylonian, the harsher and more strongly accented Norwegian representing the Assyrian.

In itself the knowledge of these dialectic differences between Assyrian and Babylonian is interesting enough to the philologist, it is important also in several respects: 1) it furnishes a very necessary key to the understanding of the epistolary literature; 2) it explains to our entire satisfaction difficulties of Assyrian grammar which otherwise would cause much trouble. As I have said before, there is much left to be done, both as regards the material already at hand, and what is steadily being published; but even at this stage we have a right to say that the importance of our knowledge of these dialectic differences will extend beyond the points I have mentioned.

It shows us the need of more painstaking and detailed study of the language from a purely grammatical point of view, also the need of a more complete grammar which treats the language with strict regard for historic development and resulting changes. The difficulties which would present themselves to one undertaking such a task we can as yet realize only in part. For instance, the correct application of the rules thus far laid down for the language of the letters is difficult enough and too much care cannot be exercised in their mastery in order to avoid what might become serious mistakes. Thus the specific rules for the Assyrian do not apply and must be carefully excluded in the translation of a
Babylonian text, and vice versa. But it becomes still more difficult to decide how far these rules, which are so rigidly observed in the language of the letters, are to be applied and taken into consideration outside this class of texts. In explaining a difficult form in a hymn, for instance, is, or is not, this or that phenomenon in the language of the letters to be compared as analogous and made to solve the problem for us? The question is really pertinent, as I have a definite instance in mind where in my opinion a rule taken from the language of the letters was wrongly made to apply in a text not of this class. It may be tempting enough to try to explain a form by every known means; it is another question if this be always permissible, for it is evident at the outset that not the same rules would apply for the language of the Hammurapi period in Babylonia and for that of the Ašurbanipal period in Assyria.

But on this very point I think we have one of the most difficult problems before us, this difficulty, namely, that the character and approximate date of a text should be known before it can be successfully worked out. In other words a certain amount of textual criticism will become necessary to determine which rules can be made to apply and which not. I do not claim that we as yet are in a position to cope successfully with the problem of textual criticism in Assyrian, but it is my conviction that it must be taken up sooner or later and that the letter literature in this very particular will prove an invaluable aid and provide a sure basis for further work.

But the letters, picturing as they do the language of their time in Assyria and Babylonia both consistently and in detail, put other texts from the same period in a strange light, and so are immediately confronted by the peculiar difficulties which the problem of textual criticism in Assyrian would present. I shall refer briefly to the historical inscriptions of the later kings to illustrate.

Tiglath-Pileser I of Assyria (1115—1100) has in his inscriptions side by side idū (a form hardly in use any more at his time), attaka, iuttakīru, ultalitu, multašparu (specifically Babylonian forms), and madatta, špaš, laššu (Assyrian).

Tukulti-NIN. IB. II (889—885) has likewise side by side aštarut (old form), uttezī (Babylonian), ašapar, ašakan, attahar, laššu, battubatte (Assyrian).
Ašurnaṣirpal II (884—860) has itti (Babylonian) and issi (Assyrian), ʾistanauma (old form), alltakun (Babylonian), asakaṭ, asarap, uṣṣûb, attaḥar (Assyrian).

Salmaneser II (859—825) has amdabhī (Babylonian) and madatū (Assyrian).

The Sargonid kings have in their historical inscriptions been more successful in fixing what we might call a classic language, but even here we meet with strange inconsistencies. Sennacherib has ašṭakaṭ (old form) and ʾulṭu (Babylonian). Ašurbanipal has ʾulṭeṣṣera, ašṭakanaṭu, ʾiṣṭenatu (old forms), muṭṭarhu, ʾulṭu, muṭṭahē, mandatum (Babylonian), and madatū (Assyrian).

The inscriptions of the Babylonian kings present similar difficulties. Nebuchadnezzar I (1152—1124) has ʾīṭu, ʾiṭakaṭ (old forms), ʾulteṣṣiru, ʾilṭaṭu, ʾilṭāṭu, mundabasīti (later Babylonian). Nebukadnezzar II (604—562) uses a language which seems to show none of the later Babylonian peculiarities, but which might very well have been used at least 1000 years earlier.

Intimate acquaintance with the language of the epistolary literature, where the most beautiful consistency prevails throughout, causes us to wonder all the more at the strange mixture of old and late, Assyrian and Babylonian, forms in the other branches of the literature. Hence the question of textual criticism in the Assyrian presents peculiar problems of which I have only mentioned a few. In closing I would ask one question: what bearing would this condition of things in the language of texts, where we cannot doubt that we have the originals, have on textual criticism in other languages, for instance the problem of the different dialects in the language of Homer?
The Animal DUN in the Sumerian Inscriptions.—By
IRA MAURICE PRICE, University of Chicago.

Lists of animals that came down from the period of the supremacy of the cities of Ur and Lagash contain among them one whose identity is still a matter of doubt. I have gathered up the facts known about this animal as a possible aid in determining its identity.

The inscriptions from the period of Lagash (2500—2400 B.C.) give us most of our data. De Genouillac in his Tableaux Sumeriens Archaiques has indicated some of the facts regarding this animal; others may be found in Gudea Cylinder B, and in Hussey's Sumerian Tablets in Harvard Museum.

De Genouillac after putting together the facts which he collected (T. S. A. p. XLIII) concluded that there must have been two kinds of DUN, (1) a wild DUN of the swamps (DUN-qiš-qa) and (2) a DUN of the plains (DUN-ū). The former DUN seems to be referred to in Gudea Cyl. B, XV, 12—14, where it is listed with work cattle, and worked with some kind of an instrument, that corresponded to the yoke of the ox or the packsaddle of the ass. The words used to describe the instrument would indicate that it was made of metal (DUN-e 'maš-ḫa [ |-mah; cf. ha-zi zahar R. T. C., 22).

In Gudea Cyl. B, IX, 16—19, the DUN seems to be associated with the ass, or was a kind of ass, in such expressions as (16) anšu DUN ʾūr-bi — — — — (18) anšu-zi-g-a anšu-Eridašt (19) anšu DUN-da. Whether this may have been some species of mule, or some cross between the anšu and another animal is not apparent in the passage. On Cyl. B, IX, 16, we find exactly the same phrase as on Cyl. A, VII, 20, except that anšu is omitted in the latter case, which would seem to indicate that, here, at least, anšu DUN and DUN alone are synonymous, for in both cases the same animal is referred to, viz., the animal called ʾag-kaš̄. On Cyl. B, IX, 16—19, as referred to above, we find the young ass, and the
ass of Eridu, but what could have been *anšu-DUN*? Was it merely a full-grown *anšu* or some other animal? Or—could it have been some species of wild ass or bison which roamed in herds in the swamps or lowlands of Babylonia, as the wild asses do today in the steppes of Tibet? We know that the Assyrians hunted them in the chase as pictured on the monuments. M. J. E. Gautier in his excavations at Susa has shown that the bison has been in existence from a very remote antiquity.

When we turn to the numerous lists of large animals we discover the DUN classified with asses. De Genouillac cites numerous cases: In *R. T. C.* 49, we find one list of 17 she-asses, 10 female and 4 male DUN, and all totaled as 30 (31) ass. Another case gives credence to this proposition, where a deal consists of a purchase of 4 she-asses and 2 DUN, which is called an "affair of the ass". When the money value of each is set side by side it is noteworthy that the less value is attached to the DUN. In one inscription (*R. T. C.* 50) the cash value of the DUN was 4 to 6 shekels while that of the ass was 20 shekels.

Again, the service of a DUN of a year or less old by the month was 50 to 70 *qa*, for a DUN of two years 80 to 100 *qa* for an adult DUN 300 *qa*, probably designating a large animal.

Another little hint of especial interest is the fact that the DUN yielded butter or cream, *šš-DUN* (*R. T. C.* 18, 62, 63). Is this to be compared with the same product supplied by the cow or the goat?

An examination of the *Sumerian Tablets of Harvard Museum* reveals some additional facts. Of the 224 women mentioned on the 54 tablets published in Part I, I find 20 were *gin DUN-nig-kū-a*, that is, a title indicating "care-taker of the DUN to be eaten". This title is mentioned 55 times, and shows that the DUN mentioned on those tablets were of a sufficiently docile nature to be managed by women. One man, mentioned 23 times in these inscriptions, named *Lugal-pu-ulu-du* is called *šš-DUN*, shepherd of the DUN, or rather DUN herd. He is also named several times in de Genouillac, *T. S. A.* (10 Rev. V, 18, 19; 11 Rev. IV; 12 Rev. V).

Another man, *Nim-gin-š-a-gub*, was a *gub-ra* DUN-š (23 Rev. VII, 16), evidently an overseer of the DUN. One woman
Šag-tar held the same office as attested in S. T. 22 Rev. V, 7 and T. S. A. (de Genouillac).

One woman’s name has incorporated in it this element, though it may not have had anything to do with the animal: Nin-DUN-ame-mu (23. Obv. I, 11).

Pinches found in the Amherst Tablets (36, III, 9) the name of a farmer whose chief business seems to have been that of raising the DUN or asses, or both: Suḫu dingir DUN-sig-riš.

The DUN mentioned in these inscriptions of Harvard Museum seems to have been an animal similar to the goat, docile, yielding milk, having a hide of value, and a ruminant, living of the fields. In all the 54 tablets published in Hussey’s S. T. only two men are mentioned as bearing any relation to the care of the DUN, while women are named in 55 passages as care-takers.

On the other hand, the DUN described alongside the ass and oxen is always cared for by men, and is classified with asses or oxen in the tables, as a beast of burden, and seems to have thriven in swamps or forests. Its value was less than that of the ass, and it required less food for its maintenance.

What were these two species of DUN? Have we the modern equivalent of either of them?

It is now almost a question for the zoologist.

---

1 Allotte de la Fuaye, in Hilprecht’s Anniversary Volume, p. 126, N. 2, Thureau-Dangin in: R. A. VI p. 197, and again Thureau-Dangin in Inventaire des Tablettes de Tell, p. 27, Note 3, offer suggestions for the solution of the problem, which do not quite satisfy the requirements of the cases, especially in the Gudea Cylinders and Hussey’s S. T.
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