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EARLY ORIENTAL STUDIES IN EUROPE AND THE WORK OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY, 1842-1922

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

If anything can satisfactorily explain the absence of the President of the American Oriental Society from the annual meeting held in Chicago, it must surely be his presence in Jerusalem. The Society has every reason to be grateful for the warm interest that has taken Dr. Nies at this time to the Near East on a visit connected with the work of the American Schools for Oriental Research in Jerusalem and Baghdad. As it falls to my lot to preside at this meeting, I am mindful of the resolution passed in 1905 requesting that the presidential address deal with "some phase of the progress and significance of Oriental studies." The eightieth anniversary of the American Oriental Society furnishes a natural occasion for considering some aspects of its work, while the centenary of the Société Asiatique, with which our Society has recently established closer relations, and of Champollion's great achievement renders it proper to recall certain significant features of the earlier development in Europe of Oriental studies.

Four score years are a brief period in the history of the world; yet they form a considerable part of the time during which Oriental languages, literature and history have been intensively cultivated in Europe, and almost all the time in which they have been serious objects of study in America. Knowledge of the Orient among the ancient Greeks and Romans and in the Christianized empire was circumscribed, vague, and mixed with many errors; but what survives in extant works is often of priceless value. No amount of epigraphic material could compensate us for the loss of classical and patristic literature. The time may come when we shall have cuneiform inscriptions in the

---

*The Presidential Address delivered in Chicago, April 10th, 1922.*
Median language, but even then we shall no doubt prize the stories of Herodotus, Ktesias and Xenophon, however contradictory, ill-informed, and imaginary they may be. How scanty our knowledge would be of the Achaemenian Empire were it not for these authors, though we now possess a number of precious cuneiform texts! It is doubtful whether we shall ever have any sources for the history of the Battidae in Cyrene more complete and trustworthy than the narrative of Herodotus; or any native records to take the place of his account of Scythia. What would we know today concerning the Carthaginian Republic and its struggles with Rome but for Polybius? The annals of Alexander’s generals, preserved by Plutarch and Arrian, and the report in Megasthenes will always furnish the most detailed information concerning an important episode in the history of India. The excerpts of earlier writers in Diodorus, Nicolaus of Damascus and Trogus; the fragments of Theophrastus, Manetho, Berosus, Menander of Tyre, Philo of Byblos, Hanno, and Hiempsal; the descriptions in Strabo and Pliny; the allusions in Livy, and Tacitus, Cassius Dio, Herodianus, Ammianus Marcellinus, and the Scriptores Historiae Augustae; and the deposits of Oriental thought as well as references to historic events and conditions in the Greek and Latin church-fathers, are of abiding importance. The light thrown on contemporaneous social life in the Orient by these and many other authors is invaluable.

It is true that the Greeks and the Romans were not much attracted by the study of Oriental languages. H. Steinthal concluded his Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römen (1863) with the just observation: “Die Alten begreifen die Humanität nur in der Form der Nationalität, nicht universell. Darum bleibt ihnen auch das Wesen der Sprache verschlossen, welches so innig mit dem Wesen der Menschheit verknüpft ist” (p. 712). Nevertheless it would be well to have all the evidence collected that reveals even a slight interest, albeit practical rather than scientific, in the learning of foreign tongues. Rolfe’s article “Did Liseus speak Latin?” (Classical Journal 7.126) suggested to H. S. Gehman a series of studies, showing that now and then a Greek or Roman learned

* Interpreters of foreign languages among the ancients; a study based on Greek and Latin sources. Lancaster, Pa., 1914.
some 'barbarian' language, though more frequently the interpreters were foreigners. It may be added that Clement of Alexandria (Stromata 1.15) credits Democritus with a translation of the text (probably Aramaic) of the Achiacharus Stele; and that Greeks in Babylonia transliterated cuneiform texts for the learning of which there scarcely could have been any practical motive. The cultivation of Greek and Latin has had an immense influence in maintaining the interest in Oriental life and assisting in its historic reconstruction within a limited field.

In Mediaeval Europe the Jews continued to cultivate Hebrew and some dialects of the Aramaic; in Spain they acquired Arabic. Hayyuj, Ibn Janah and David Kimhi applied the principles of grammarians to the study of Hebrew. Arabic works found Jewish translators, such as the Tibbons; Jewish teachers found Christian pupils, such as Raymund Martini and Nicolaus de Lyra. The Moslems in Spain and Sicily were in a position to gain extensive knowledge of Northern Africa and Asia. Pope Sylvester II (Gerbert), who died in 1003, was acquainted with Arabic. Robert Kennet, with the aid of Pedro di Toledo, Hermann the Dalmatian, and an Arab, made a Latin version of the Koran in 1143 for Pierre di Cluny to refute. Raymund Lullus learned Arabic to convert the Moors, and the council of Vienne, in 1311, established chairs for Hebrew, Arabic and Aramaic at Paris, Oxford, Bologna and Salamanca. Accounts of travel by missionaries and merchants like Ruysbroeck, Carpini, and Marco Polo spread some knowledge of the eastern countries. But Oriental learning was at a low ebb during the second part of the 14th and the first decades of the 15th centuries, until Johann Wessel and Pico della Mirandola began to devote themselves to Hebrew and Arabic lore.

In the 16th century Hebrew grammars were published by Pellicanus (1504), Reuchlin (1506) and François Tissard (1508). The excellent introduction to Moses Kimhi's grammar by Elias Levita (1508) became known to Christian scholars; his suggestion that the vowel points were of Masoretic origin was adopted by Van den Campen in his grammar (1520), by Sante Pagnini (1520), and by Sebastian Münster (1534 and 1546).

While the reformers were chiefly concerned about translating the Bible into the vernacular, Catholic scholars sought the aid
of converted Jews and Oriental Christians in editing the original texts and rendering into Latin the early versions. Targum Onkelos was translated by Alfonso de Zamora for the Complutensian Polyglot (1514–1517). Widmanstadt edited and translated the Syriac New Testament (1553), and published a Syriac grammar (1556); later Targums as well as the Syriac New Testament appeared in the Antwerp Polyglot (1562–1571). Giustiniani published his Arabic Psalter in 1516, Potken the Psalter in Ethiopic, which he called Chaldaic, in 1518. A Persian version of the Pentateuch was printed in Constantinople (1546). A Latin translation of the Koran was printed before 1509, but suppressed because it was not accompanied with a refutation. Widmanstadt had in his library a MS. copy of another translation. Giovanni Baptista Raimondi had at his disposal sufficient knowledge and Oriental types to prepare, in 1546, a polyglot giving Arabic, Persian, Coptic, Ethiopic and Armenian versions. He was not able, however, to publish it. In 1539, Ambrosio Teseo gave to the world his Introductio in linguam Chaldaicam, Syriacam atque Armenicam et decem alias linguas. It does not diminish its merits that he generously included also a description of the system of writing employed by the devil. Filippo Sassetti (1540–1588) lived in India five years (1583–1588) and was the first European to study Sanskrit. He undertook the translation into Italian of a medical treatise called Rājanighantu, and suggested a certain kinship between the two languages. Savary de Brèves made himself thoroughly familiar with Turkish, and J. Löwenklau (d. 1593) wrote a history for which the annals were translated from the Turkish by G. Spiegel (1595). Adelung, in 1593, explained grammatically his rendering of the Lord's Prayer into Tagálog; and a Spanish-Japanese Vocabulario afterwards used by Rodríguez appeared in 1595.

The 17th century saw marked advance in many directions. A maturing Hebrew scholarship was represented by Salomo Glass, Schindler, and especially the Buxtorfs, father and son. It was
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1 On the probable origin of this term cf. Schmidt, “Traces of Early Acquaintance in Europe with the Book of Ethiopic Enoch,” *JAOS* 42, 448.
Jean Morin, however, and Louis Cappelle, men of less distinction, who paved the way for a definitive solution of the problem of the vowel points, one of the few important questions in Biblical criticism that have been absolutely settled, and in favor of the most radical position. The study of Samaritan by Morin and his editing and translating for the Paris Polyglot (1529-1545) the copy of the Samaritan-Hebrew text brought from Constantinople by Harley and the Samaritan Targum obtained by Pietro della Valle were of special value. Of another Aramaic dialect, Mandaic, already vaguely known to Abraham Echellensis, Europe became aware through Ignatius de Jesu (1662) and Boullaye de Gouz (1653), and the alphabet was printed by the younger Thévenot (1692). The Syriac text was edited by Gabriel Sionita for the Paris Polyglot, and Abraham Echellensis wrote a grammar (1628). Hilliger first saw clearly the relation of the so-called Chaldee, Syriac, and Samaritan (1679). Arabic grammars and lexicons were published by Martelotti (1620), Erpenius (1621), Giggei (1632), Obecini (1632), Guadagnoti (1642), Hottinger (1653), Golius (1651), Pococke (1652), and Castle (1657); and Arabic authors also began to appear in translation. Hinckelmann published his edition and version of the Koran (1594), and Maracci his, with refutation, in 1598. Turkish began to be seriously cultivated by Christian scholars. Megiser published his Thesaurus Polyglottus in 1603, and his Institutiones linguae Turcicae in 1612; André Duryet his Rudimenta Linguae Turcicae 1630-1634; Molino his Italian-Turkish dictionary in 1641; Maggio his Syntagmata 1670; Meninski his grammar in 1636, and his lexicon 1630; Melchizedek Thévenot his Elementa Linguae Turcicae 1692. Thomas Hyde discoursed on Turkish liturgy 1691; Paul Ricaut, in continuing Knolles' history, used material furnished by Bobrowski-Ali Begh (d. 1675), in 1669; Comenius used Turkish also in his Jana Linguarum 1648. The most important contributions to Persian were made by Giggei (1632), Golius (1653), Ignatius de Jesu (1661), Castle (1667), Meninski (1681), and Nicolai (1686). Georgian was for the first time studied systematically by Maggio (1643). Armenian began to be carefully studied by J. J. Schröder and de la Croze (1661-1739).

Jesuit missionaries, of more generous training than the Franciscans and Dominicans who had preceded them, devoted them-
selves to grammatical and lexicographical studies of the Far East; and the establishment of the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide (1622), whose tercentenary will be celebrated this year, greatly furthered this work. Little was done, however, to convey to Europe a knowledge of Sanskrit. From some source Kircher learned the value of some devanagari characters, which he was the first to print in China Illustrata (1667). In regard to Chinese, the grammatical studies and vocabularies of such missionaries as Mattei Ricci, Manuel Diaz, Lazar Cataleo, Gaspar Ferreira, Schale, and Alvaro Semedo were not known in Europe. The same applies to Antonio Gaubil’s translation of the Shu King (1669). But Claude Duret, in his Trésor de l’histoire des langues, 1613, gives some Chinese characters, M. Martini published his Atlas Sinensis in 1655, and Kircher in his Prodromus, 1630, printed samples of the Sin gan fu inscription and in China Illustrata, 1667, showed some understanding of these signs derived from a Chinese Jesuit, André Sin. Alvarez Rodriguez published his Vocabulario da lingua do Japam in 1603, and his Arte da lingua do Japan in 1604. These were followed by Collado’s Arte della lingua Japonesa, 1631, and Vocabolario, 1632. In the Philippines, Christoval Jimenes produced his Arte del idioma bisaya (1610), M. Cramer his Bocabolario bisaya (1637), and I. Colin discoursed del ingenio y letras de los Filipinos in his Labor Evangelica (1663). The Malay of Java was studied by S. Denckaertz, Vocabularium Duytsch-Maleysich en Maleysich-Duytsch 1623; David Haex Dictionarium Malaico-Latinum et Latino-Malaicum, 1631; and J. Heurnius, Vocabularium of te Wordenboek in Duytsch en Malaysch 1677. No important study of the Coptic seems to have been made in Europe before Athanasius Kircher, whose researches set forth in Prodromus (1630), Lingua aegyptiaca restituta (1642) and other works, facilitated by his contact with natives of Egypt still familiar with the language and with the ms. of a Coptic-Arabic lexicon, brought to Europe by Pietro della Valle, were as valuable as his guesses as to the meaning of the hieroglyphics were valueless. He has rightly been styled "the father of Coptology." While Ethiopic texts had been published (Psalter, Canticles and the New Testament) in the London Polyglot (1654–1657), the famous Anna Maria van Schuurman had written an Ethiopic grammar, and Hottinger had prepared
a vocabulary for his Heptaglotton (1661), it was Job Ludolf
who by his Grammatica Ethiopica (1661), his Lexicon (1667),
and his Historia Aethiopica (1669) laid the foundation for a
real scientific study of this language and its literature. Castle
(1666-1669) and Nicolai (1686) were indebted to him.

In the 18th century decided progress was made in under-
standing the relations between Hebrew and Arabic. This was
largely due to Albert Schultens (1737), and N. W. Schröder,
and the traditions of the Dutch school were followed by J. D.
Michaelis, J. G. Eichhorn, and J. G. Herder. C. F. Houbi-
gant published the first Hebrew Bible without the vowel points
and with a Latin version made from a critical text; Kennicott
and De Rossi collections of variants; and Bartolucci and Wolf
vast treasures of Hebrew lore. In Arabic much work was done
by Schultens, Reiske, Michaelis, Eichhorn, Antoine Galland,
Petit de la Croix, Herbélot, Sylvestre de Sacy, Olaus Celsius,
and George Sale, particularly by the publication and translation
of texts. Less was accomplished in Aramaic, although the monu-
mental work of Joseph Simon Assemani, Bibliotheca Orientalis
(1719-1728), furnished an incentive to the study of Syriac
upon which he drew extensively as well as on Arabic, Persian,
Turkish, Hebrew, Samaritan, Armenian, Ethiopian, Coptic, Geor-
gian and Malabaric sources. The so-called Johannes Chris-
tians were discussed without any effort to interpret the texts,
except the beginning of a version of the Codex Nazareus by
Kämper (1779) and Matthias Norberg (1780). J. J. Barthélémy
in 1730 undertook the translation of Phoenician inscriptions;
and in 1754 began the study of Palmyrene. J. C. Clodius
published in 1729 his Compendiosum lexicon latino-turcico-ger-
manicum; Bernhard von Jenisch his sketch of the Turkish lan-
guage in the introduction to Meninski's lexicon (1780); Ignatius
d'Ohsson his Tableau général de l'empire Ottoman (1787-1790).
Persian works were translated by De la Croix, Beck, Robertson,
William Jones, and Sylvestre de Sacy. The most extraordinary
new development came when Anquetil du Perron published his
translation of the Zend-Avesta in 1777. The opposition from
men like Robertson, Jones, and Jenisch was due in part to
prejudice and distrust, in part to arguments that still are valid,
since Du Perron claimed that the whole book was the work of
Zarathushtra. It might have been more gracious, but the idea
of literary accretion had not yet become as familiar as it is today. De Sacy had succeeded in the decipherment of Pahlavi when he wrote his Histoire de la dynastie des Sassanides, 1793. Klaproth was interesting himself again in Georgian; and Armenian was studied by many Orientalists. Moses of Khorene was translated, and la Croze left a ms. dictionary. Ancient India began to be known. Theophil Bayer published, in the Acta Eruditorum of the Academy of St. Petersburg, Elementa Literaturae Brahmanicae, 1728. A translation of a Persian version of the Laws of the Manavas was made by N. B. Halhed in 1755, and a rendering of a Persian version of the Upanishads by Du Perron in 1777. Bhagavadgita was translated by C. Wilkins in 1785, and Kalidasa’s Sakuntala by William Jones in 1789.

Chinese studies began in earnest. Thomas Hyde (1636–1703) at the end of his life occupied himself with Chinese, as may be seen from Gregorius Sharp, Appendix de lingua Sinica, 1767. Francisco Varo’s Arte de la lingua Mandarina appeared in 1703. Bayer published his Museum Sinicum in 1730, Fourmont his Grammatica Sinica in 1742. Among Fourmont’s disciples Deshauterayes was most critical, de Guignes most familiar with Chinese sources. His Histoire des Huns is a veritable storehouse, but it should be set in order and its contents sifted. Fourmont’s grammar was apparently based on Varo; de Guignes used a dictionary by Basile de Glomona based on a lexicon by Tse-gui. Grammatical studies of the Manchurian, Mongolian (by Bayer), Tibetan and Indo-Chinese appeared. Melchior Oyanguni’s important grammar, Arte de la lingua Japonica, was printed in Mexico, 1738. His El tagalismo elucidado was published in 1742, and the Vocabulario poliglotta of Nervas y Panduro in 1787. Guegnier’s Nederduitsch en Malaisch woordenboek was printed in 1708. Coptic was cultivated by La Croze (preface to Lexicon Aegyptico-Latinum 1722, the work published by Woide in 1775), Woide, Tattam, Zoega, Quatremère and Amadeo Peyron. James Bruce brought back from Abyssinia copies of the Book of Enoch in 1772, but Ethiopic studies were languishing.

The progress was greatly assisted by the founding of royal academies, such as the Academia dei Lincei in Rome (1603), the
Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres in Paris (1663, remodeled 1706), the Academies of Berlin (1700), Petrograd (1725), Stockholm (1739), Copenhagen (1742), Göttingen (1750), Erfurt (1754), Mannheim (1755), Munich (1739), Turin (1757). They generously supported Oriental studies, though only as a part of their work. Similarly limited, yet of great importance because dealing entirely with some part of Asia, were the Bataviaasch genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen (1772) and the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal (1784). Helpful agencies were also the journals published by individual scholars such as Leclerc's Bibliothèque Universelle (1686-1693); Bibliothèque Choisie (1703-1713); and Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne (1714-1726); and particularly J. D. Michaelis, Exegetische und Orientalische Bibliothek (1771-1785); J. G. Eichhorn's Repertorium (1779); and Hammer-Purgstall's Fundgruben des Orients (1810-1819).

In the early part of the 19th century, Gesenius wrote his Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache (1815), his grammar, and his treatise on the Phoenician inscriptions. De Sacy published his great Arabic grammar (1821). Du Perron was vindicated by the researches of Rask, Kneucker, and Eugène Burnouf. Colebrooke (1805) and Cary (1806) wrote their Sanskrit grammars; Lassen and Bohlen discussed the history of India on the basis of new sources; Rask wrote his Singalesisk Skriftlaære (1822); Roth, Weber, and Boethlingk began to delve more deeply into the Vedas; and Wilson (1819) presented the Hindoo Theatre. Abel Rémusat gave us his Essai sur la langue et la littérature Chinoises, 1811, Eléments de la grammaire Chinoise, 1822, and Recherches sur les langues Tartares, 1829. Leon de Rosny wrote a purely scientific grammar of the Japanese in 1811; Humboldt his Suppléments à la grammaire Japonaise (1826), Siebold, the Thesaurus linguae Japonicae (1835). William Marden wrote a Dictionary of the Malayan Language (1812); John Leyden, Malay Annals (1821); Roorda van Eysinga, Malaisch-duitsch woordenboek (1834). Brosset published Eléments de la grammaire géorgienne (1836), and Dictionnaire géorgien-russe-français (1840). Petermann wrote his Armenian grammar (1837); and Hammer-Purgstall published a Geschichte der Osmanen (1826), being the first and the last history of Turkey based throughout on native sources. Lebronne, Quatremère, Peyron, and Young continued their studies of Coptic; and Law-
rence published the text and translation of Enoch and other Ethiopian books.

But on the threshold of the new century two difficult tasks awaited Oriental scholarship. Hitherto it had been possible to learn languages from those who used them and alphabets from those who employed them, or at least the script was similar to some known system of writing and the tongue to some existing family of speech. But no man living employed cuneiform signs or spoke Sumerian, Akkadian, Assyrian, Susian, Haldian, or the Persian of the Achaemenian period, or knew that these were the languages written in the wedge-shaped characters. None was familiar with Egyptian hieroglyphics or the hieratic and demotic systems derived from them, or knew to what extent, if at all, the ancient language was identical with Coptic. Grotefend, in 1802, by a clever conjecture hit upon some names and a title in groups of cuneiform signs, but it took a long time before the real work of the decipherment was accomplished by Burnouf, Lassen, Westergaard, Rawlinson, and others. Barthélémy and Zoega had conjectured that the cartouches, or ovals, contained the names of royal persons. Studying the demotic text of the Rosetta inscription, Joh. David Akerblad, in 1802, identified, within these cartouches, a considerable number of signs corresponding to those in the Greek texts; and Thomas Young, in 1814 and subsequently, added to these and also conjectured the values of some of the hieroglyphs. But it was Jean François Champollion who in 1822 laid the real foundations of Egyptology in his Lettre à M. Dacier, and built upon them in ten years an amazingly solid structure. His glory is not dimmed by acknowledging the merits of his predecessors, nor enhanced by denying theirs. When the scope of his work is considered, it is as Eduard Meyer has so truly characterized it, an achievement without a parallel of its kind in the annals of history. The most comprehensive, discriminating, and withal enthusiastic treatment of his life and work comes from the hand of a German lady, Fräulein Hartleben, 1906. Among Champollion's disciples, Gazzera (1824), Greppo (1829), Salvolini (1832), Lepsius (1837), and Rossellini in his Elementa linguae aegypticae (1837), and Diccionario hieroglyphico (left in ms. 1843) reached very valuable results.

The purpose of this necessarily brief and inadequate survey
has been to indicate, in a general way, the order in which the various Oriental languages became known to European scholars, the interests, religious, commercial, or purely scientific, that led to a study of them, the channels through which knowledge came, the devotion, sacrifice, and genial insight of individual scholars, the value of material aid rendered by ecclesiastical and civil rulers through the endowment of learning and the founding of academies, and yet the sporadic character of the development, with accidental starts, periods of neglect, and sudden re-emergence of interest, and the need of the great Oriental societies for a systematic and continuous exploitation of the whole field. The first of these was the Société Asiatique founded in 1822. It is a pleasure on this occasion to render a tribute to this organization which for a hundred years has been able to maintain so uniformly the finest traditions of French scholarship. The Royal Asiatic Society was founded in 1823, the American Oriental Society in 1842, and the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft in 1844.

At the first annual meeting of the American Society in 1843, President Pickering began a remarkable sketch of the field it was proposed to cultivate by calling attention to the especially favorable circumstances of the time, the peace that reigned everywhere, the freer access to Oriental countries, and the greater facilities for communication. The earth seemed quiet in the days of Metternich and Louis Philippe. The treaty of Nanking had opened Chinese ports. The screw-propeller had been adopted in ocean-going vessels; Morse had completed his telegraph and he had already suggested the laying of a trans-Atlantic cable. The objects of the Society were to cultivate learning in Asiatic, African, and Polynesian languages, and in everything concerning the Orient, to create a taste for Oriental studies in this country, to publish texts, translations and communications, and to collect a library and cabinet. Most of the work has been done in the Asiatic field, and particularly in Sanskrit and the Semitic languages. Edward Salisbury, to whom the Society probably owes more of its prestige than to any other man, was professor of Arabic as well as of Sanskrit, and was deeply concerned in the development of a variety of Oriental studies. The first volume of the Journal contains a thoughtful article by him on the Persian cuneiform inscrip-
tions, and an earnest plea for the study of Egyptian. An equal breadth of interest characterized William D. Whitney, the distinguished Sanskritist. For many years the presidency was held by James Hadley, Theodore Dwight Woolsey, and Daniel Coit Gilman, scholars animated by the same spirit. The growing need of specialization demanded of Whitney's pupils and successors, men like Avery, Lanman, Hopkins, Bloomfield, Buck, Edgren, Jackson, Oertel, Woods, Edgerton, Barret, Clark, Ogden, and others, more exclusive attention to the language and literature of India. Some like Luquies, Jackson, Gray, and Kent, have devoted themselves chiefly, though not exclusively, to the Persian. In Hebrew, Arabic and Aramaic, Robinson, Toy, Moore, Adler, Haupt, Torrey, McDonald, Hall, Perkins, Stoddart, Gotttheil, Montgomery and Friedländer have been among the contributors. The forming of the Society for Biblical Literature and Exegesis in 1880 and such agencies for publication as Hebraica and the American Journal of Semitic Languages established by W. R. Harper, have no doubt tended to limit the number of workers within the Society in these fields. In the last forty years Assyriology has found many representatives in the Society: Ward, Peters, Francis Harper, Jastrow, among the departed; Haupt, Lyon, Barton, Johnston, Prince, Miss Ogden, Miss Hussey, Rogers, Clay, Olmstead, and others. A Turkish version of Tabari was translated by Brown, and Turkish dialects discussed by Van Lennep. Martin, S. Wells Williams, Hirth, and Laufer have represented the Chinese; Van Name, Williams, and Miss Mumford, Japanese; Rockhill, Tibetan; Bradley, Siamese. In Egyptology, Seyfwerth's was long the only voice heard, and always in opposition to Champollion's system, until work on sounder principles began to be done by W. Max Müller and James H. Breasted. Coptic studies have appeared by Prince and Worrell. The Zulu language was studied by Louis Grout. But the hope of Pickering that the work begun by Hodgson in the Berber tongues might be continued by American scholars has not yet been realized. Much was expected from the cooperation of Protestant missionaries in the Pacific islands; but aside from a very valuable Ponape grammar by Luther M. Gulick, little was done until in 1901 a Seminar for Malay languages was established at Johns Hopkins by Haupt, of which the first fruits have been studies by Blake, Conant
and Wolfenson, and a Comparative Tagalog Grammar to be published by the Society.

Much of the interest in Oriental studies created by the Society has been carried over into the American Philological Association founded by Whitney in 1869, the Archaeological Institute of America (1879), the Society for Biblical Literature and Exegesis (1880), and the American Historical Association (1884). Much interest awakened has found difficulty in expressing itself in the activities of the Society because of its confinement in the past to Boston or the cities on the Atlantic seaboard, and has quickly revealed itself in the growth of the Western branch. A very valuable library has been collected by exchanges and donations, of which a card catalogue has been made, and also a cabinet. It is significant of the spirit of the Society that in 1861 to 1865 the regular meetings continued to be held, the Southern members remained in the Society, and there is no hint in Journal or Proceedings of the tragic struggle through which the country passed, except that the dues were omitted in 1862–63. That is as it should be In republica literarum sileat Mars! The Society has always been deeply interested in the International Congresses of Orientalists; and it is to be hoped that they may soon be resumed again. From a purely scientific point of view it was highly desirable that closer relations should be established between the American Oriental Society, the Royal Asiatic Society, and the Société Asiatique. It would be well, in course of time, to extend such helpful cooperation to all the important European societies including the Italian, German, Austrian, Belgian, Dutch, and Russian societies. The Society is contemplating the publication of an Oriental Review, supplied with adequate fonts of good Oriental types, in connection with the Journal. There should be a printed catalogue of the valuable library of the Society. Bibliographies, with brief characterization of the contents of books or articles, like those published in the Rivista degli Studi Orientali, are desirable; and especially full accounts of works appearing in the Orient. Communications from missionaries, consuls and learned men in the Orient should again be sought, as in the earlier days. The establishment of scholarships or substantial prizes to make possible long continued researches would be of value. The Society might profitably arrange the
organization of an independent Society for the History of Religion to take the place of the Religious Section, as the American Philological Association continued the Classical Section. There should be a wider cooperation between philologists and students of the natural and social sciences, and symposia on important problems by Orientalists working in different fields. Above all, it must be the aim of the Society at this time to secure a comprehensive coordination, continuity, and strict scientific method in the realization of its objects. It has not been possible in this address even to touch upon the extraordinary development of Oriental studies in Europe since 1842. If a comparison should be instituted between the work of the great Oriental societies of Europe and that of the American Oriental Society as an index of the state of Oriental studies, there would no doubt be cause for humble reflections, a stressing of our country's youth and a plea for considerate judgment in view of the peculiar conditions of our academic life already referred to by Pickering in the first address to the Society. Nevertheless, the record of eighty years of noble effort justifies a sense of deep satisfaction and serene confidence for the future.
STUDIES IN MANICHAEISM

A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

STUDENTS OF MANICHAEISM are familiar with the discoveries made at Turfan and elsewhere in Chinese Turkistan, in the years 1903 and following, which brought to light an extensive mass of Manichaean Fragments dating back a thousand years or more. These fragments, consisting of hymns, prayers, confessions, religious treatises, and the like, contain portions of the long-lost Bible of Mānî. The discoveries were due largely to the expeditions of Grünwedel and Huth, Le Coq, Stein, and Pelliot. The more important of these fragmentary texts have proved to be written in a form of the Middle Persian language now usually termed Turfan Pahlavi, and in the Turkish of Eastern Turkistan, though a valuable treatise in Chinese has been made available, and also some Soghdian remnants.

The first scholar to identify a mass of the fragments as Manichaean documents, written down in a variety of the Estrangelo script, and then to decipher them, was the brilliant Berlin professor F. W. K. Müller, in 1904. Since that date the work of deciphering and translating the remains also in the other languages, together with the task of elucidating them, has been carried on especially by Müller, Le Coq, Salemann, Foy, Radloff, Andreas, Reitzenstein, V. Thomsen, Chavannes, Pelliot, Cumont, Alfaric, Legge, while contributory studies, on the linguistic side, have been made by Gauthiot, Meillet, Bartholomae, Geldner, and Tolman. Through the efforts of the discoverers and their fellow-workers we have therefore now available far more material for understanding Mānî's doctrines than was known centuries ago; and still more light on the subject may be expected in the future, when more of the fragments are published or new finds are unearthed.

The present writer, being interested in the Zoroastrian el-

---
ments in Mānī's religion, has been engaged for some time in preparing a small volume to be entitled Zoroastrian and Manichaean Studies. Besides dealing with the question of Persian influence upon Manichaism, the book will contain translations into English from the Petrograd as well as the Berlin fragments in Pahlavi from Turfan, accompanied by philological and ex-planatory notes that may possibly be of service to the general Iranian scholar as well as to the student of religion. A few special points that have been studied in connection with the preparation of that volume are discussed in the four divisions of the present paper.

I.

DIRECT MENTIONS OF ZOROASTRIANISM IN THE MANICHAEOAN FRAGMENTS

The well-known statement of Alūrūnī, in which Mānī is quoted as acknowledging Zoroaster, Buddha, and Jesus as his religious predecessors and as claiming to have come to the world as the fulfillment of the divine enlightenment, is too familiar to require citation here. Actual allusions to these three religious leaders, or to their followers, are found to occur incidentally in the Manichaean Fragments. Here are given the references in the texts thus far available relating to Zoroaster.

1. In the first place the name Zoroaster, under the Turkish form Zrāšt (Zrāšt), which became current in Chinese as 'Sou-lou-che,' has been shown by Le Coq—convincingly supported through linguistic evidence by Gauthiot—to occur as a Burxan, or divine messenger, in a Manichaean Uigurian fragment from Idikut-Shahri. Some ten times the name with its spiritual attribute (Zrāšt Burxan) is repeated in this particular fragment which records bits of a legend about a conflict between this

---

4 A brief abstract of the present paper was laid before the Société Asiatique at its Centenary Celebration in Paris, July 12, 1922.
4 See Alūrūnī, tr. Sachau, p. 193; cf. Arabic text, p. 207.
4 A collection of references to Jesus and of allusions to Sākyamuni (Sak-imun) as a Burxan is reserved for publication on another occasion.
hallowed personage and sorcerers or demons at Babylon. The city of Babylon was sacrosanct in connection with Mānī’s life and was even associated with Zoroaster through apocryphal legend. In any case this sand-buried fragment, discovered in Turkistan, has preserved reminiscences of some old Zoroastrian tale that must have had vogue among the Manichaens.

2. Not only that, but in a Turfan fragment in Pahlavi in the Berlin collection there is an explicit reference to Zoroaster by name (Zardāst or [?] Zorohušt), where he is mentioned by the side of the Persian angel Srōš (Avestan Sraoša). This mention occurs in an old Manichaean hymn which contains a reminiscence of the Zoroastrian belief in the re-awakening of the soul of Man (i.e. Primal Man, Gayomart). The text itself, however, has unfortunately not yet been published, but its contents are available in a German version by Professor F. C. Andreas, reproduced in Reitzenstein’s Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium, p. 3, Bonn, 1921.

3. Furthermore, in still another Turfan fragment, M. 16. 20-22 (Müller, Handschriftenreste II, p. 94) there is an allusion to a ‘Book of the Zoroastrians’ as containing a reference to a certain rite performed on the fourteenth day of the Zoroastrian month of Tir. The text reads:

\[ 'ǔd ād anif Zard[d?]uštgan
nībeg 'a.on nīhēsāt kā pad
čahārdah rāj i Tirmā
kūnḥn, 'o kūntingar \]

‘And in another book of the Zoroastrians it is written thus: “On the fourteenth day of the month Tir a deed for the doer”’

[The rest is wanting.]

4. There is likewise a probable allusion again to Zoroaster as a forerunner of Mānī, with a mention also of Jesus, in the TPhl. fragment M. 543. 1-2 (Müller, II, p. 79). The broken passage begins: \[//\] nanghēd ‘ǔd ḫzōhāt i Dēn Mādēs, the famous master and leader of the Mazdayasnian

* See Jackson, Zoroaster, pp. 90-91.
Religion.' Although the name Zoroaster is missing, owing to an initial break ( ///// ) in the page, the collocation with Dēn Māzdēs makes the conjecture reasonable, especially because there follows (line 7) an allusion to the Zoroastrian archangel Vahman (Av. Vohu Manah, 'Good Thought'). Mānī himself as a new voice, speaking in accord and giving the ordinances of a true creed for the faithful, is immediately implied in lines 2–3: Tō nōg harmōcāg ʾi Xvarāsān ūd rāyenāg ʾi Vahidēnān, lit. 'Thou (Mānī), the new teacher of the East and organizer of those of the Good Religion (Manichaeism). The context of lines 4–7 (fê zād ētā—sahrevārān, 'born of the seed of the rulers') shows Mānī's right by descent to the prophetic office; and directly afterwards comes an express mention of 'the Virgin Jesus' (Yīšō' kanīg) as another of the divine 'manifestations' (sanān). Consequently, judging from the entire collocation, the proposed interpretation of Zoroaster's being alluded to as the 'Famous Master of the Mazdayasian Religion' seems plausible. There happens to be likewise an incidental reference to the 'Magian Religion' (morgui nomin) in a Turkish Manichaean Fragment, T. M. 170, line 4, ed. Le Coq, Chotscho III, p. 39 (Berlin Academy, 1922).

5. In the light of the passage already presented and in view of Albīrūnī's reference to Mānī's having acknowledged Zoroaster, Buddha, and Jesus as his religious predecessors, we may take up still another Turfan Pahlavi passage. Before doing so, however, we may add Albīrūnī's own further testimony to the effect that 'Mānī proclaimed himself a prophet after having acquainted himself with the doctrines of the Magians, Christians, and Dualists'; and supplement this statement by the authority of An-Nadīm's Fihrist, that Mānī 'derived his teaching from the Magians and the Christians,' appending likewise Shahhrastānī's remark that Mānī's 'religion was a blend of Magianism and Christianity.'

---

1 The designation Vahiđēn is especially applied to Manichaeism elsewhere in the Fragments. Instead of Müller's reading harmōcāg, the vocalization harmōcāg, 'teacher,' is to be preferred, cf. Gauthiot, JA 1911, p. 590 n. 3. So also (now available) Bartholomae, Zur Kenntnis der mittellibratischen Mundarten, 1. 44 n. 1 (in Sitzb. Heidelberger Ak. Wiss. 1916).
2 Albīrūnī, op. cit. tr. p. 190, line 40; text, p. 207, line 13.
3 Cl. Flügel, Mānī, pp. 85, 164–166; Kessler, Mānī, p. 386.
4 See Shahhrastānī, tr. Haarbrücker, 1. 285; and cf. Flügel, p. 165.
Considering all this, a conjecture (but only a conjecture till more Fragments become accessible) may be hazarded that the three great religious predecessors of Mānī may possibly be alluded to as 'the three Sons of God' in certain lines of the long Manichaean hymn of praise and prayer, the Frašēgērdīq (itself the Zoroastrian designation of the Renovation of the World), M. 4, p. 4, lines 10–13 (Mū. II, p. 54\textsuperscript{m}), which runs as follows:—

\begin{verbatim}
āsāh
man bōz'gar pad 'istāsīn
anlīvag 'bag Mārī Mānī ad āhr
bagpūhrān.
\end{verbatim}

'mayest Thou come,
my Liberator, through praise,
Thou living God, Lord Mānī, with the three Sons of God.'

It should be observed in this connection that the same attribute bagpūhr, 'Son of God,' is twice applied to Jesus in a Manichaean citation from the New Testament (M. 18. 1, 3=Mū. II, p. 34\textsuperscript{b}), where it is, however, a translation from the Biblical text. Furthermore, Mānī is likewise called 'a Son of the Deity' (Mānī yazdān fraʒēnd, M. 311. 1=Mū. II, p. 66\textsuperscript{b}) and is so addressed apparently again as 'O Son of the Deity' ('ōn yazdān pūhr, M. 32. 3=Mū. II, p. 62\textsuperscript{b}); while Zoroaster and Buddha, the other two of Mānī's three spiritual forerunners, are distinctly designated as Burmaṇs, 'Divine Messengers,' in the Turkish Manichaean Fragments, as noted above (p. 16, n. 3). Hence there seem to be grounds for regarding 'the three Sons of God' in this passage as an allusion to Zoroaster, Buddha, and Jesus. In any event this suggestion may be offered wholly tentatively until further Fragments are published or discovered.\footnote{There is, for example, a possibility that the three above mentioned may be compared with 'the three gods' which appear as attendants on the soul of the righteous after death, as described in the Fihrist, Flügel, p. 100 (and n. 286), cf. also p. 92 (and n. 188). In that case it could be suggested that Primal Man (Ormazd), the Living Spirit, and the Third Messenger (Mithra) might come in for a claim to represent the 'Three Sons of God'; but we should have to wait, in any event, for further material in order finally to decide the question.}
In connection with the jottings above recorded it must be emphasized that no attempt is made to deal here with the more general Zoroastrian aspects and allusions, such as toOrmazd and Ahriman, Persian angelology and demonology, or to Buddhistic elements, with references likewise to our Savior, because those matters are reserved for treatment in the volume mentioned. There is space, nevertheless, to bring out two or three other Zoroastrian survivals, to which attention seems not to have been previously drawn.

II

WEIGHING THE SOUL IN THE BALANCE—A MANICHÆAN IDEA FROM ZOROASTRIANISM

The idea of the weighing of the soul in the scales of judgment after death is a characteristic one in Zoroastrianism. Although found in Egypt and elsewhere, it is a fundamental tenet in the Persian faith.\(^{11}\) Owing to the extensive influence of Zoroastrianism upon Manichæan eschatology it would be natural to look for some trace of this doctrine in the Fragments.

[Postscript.—In this latter connection compare Reitzenstein, Das Mani- dichische Buch des Herren der Grosse, pp. 49 n. 3, 48, 94 n. 5. Furthermore, there is a passage (now available) in a Turkish Manichæan Fragment, T II D, 175, 2, lines 1-10, Le Coq, Chotsho, III, p. 31, Berlin, 1922, which refers to 'three gods' in connection with the fate of the soul, as follows: 'The God of the Majesty of the Law comes with the three gods, which he himself is, to the soul . . . and sends it to the judge of the dead.' My Parsi pupil, Jal Dastur Cursetji Pavri, plausibly suggests that these three gods, associated with the dead, may be the well-known Manichæan personifications Xrošag, Padvaxtag, and Sr̄ū, cf. Chinese "Hou-lou-chō-tō, P'ō-lesa-bou-tō, and Sou-lou-ch'a-lo-yi," see Chavannes and Pelliot, JA 1911, p. 520-523, 524, 530, 542, 543 n. 2, 552, 567. The idea of these, though differing somewhat, would be parallel in general to the Zoroastrian notion of Mithra, Rashnu, and Sraoša. We may add that there is a Manichæan allusion to a judge of the dead in St. Ephraim, tr. C. W. Mitchell, i. p. lxx, who quotes Mānī to the effect that 'the souls come to the Judge.']

\(^{11}\) See Jackson, 'Weighing the Soul in the Balance after Death, an Indian as well as Iranian Idea,' in Actes du Xme Congrèes des Orientalistes (Session de Genèse, 1894), pt. 2, pp. 67-74, Leiden, 1895; and for Egypt see J. H. Breasted, Development of the Religion of Ancient Egypt, pp. 304-306, New York, 1912.
Search has now revealed such an allusion to the balance in one of the Turkish Manichaean Fragments brought back by Le Coq from Chotscho (Khocho).

The passage found occurs in Le Coq, Türkische Manichaica aus Chotscho II, p. 12, Fragment T. II. D. 173, recto, lines 7–12 (Abh. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, 1919), and the designation for the scales in Turkish, trazuk, corresponds to the familiar word Phl. tarázúk, NP. tarázú. The entire fragment is important for eschatology because it describes the fortunes of the lost soul, about whose fate the several majesties of the fire, waters, plants, and trees lament (quite Zoroastrian!) when it is brought to the judgment, at which 'the deeds done by itself appear before it' in the life-account, to be weighed. The text in transliteration from the Manichaean Turkish runs as follows (lines 6–12):

könni bûryug közûngû
ê û kösunûpûn tûnmîş ûz
ütûg tutûpan ✦ trazuk
‘icyttû olýurtur tiyûr ✦
[trazûk ay[sar?] qûlinçî aiûy
bolûr [‘îrîncî qilmîf
qûlinçî ‘îstîg bolûr

'The just judge seizes the confused soul which appears as in a mirror. In the balance it is placed down, it is said. If the balance rises, its deeds ... (?) its evil done deeds will ... (?)' [the sense is uncertain]

[End of the page; the reverse page contains the ensuing torments for the damned.]

Le Coq (to whom grateful acknowledgments are made for rendering such a text available) makes no observation as to the Persian significance of this passage in connection with the judgment scales, nor is special emphasis laid upon it by Reitzenstein (Das Iran. Erlösungsmysterium, pp. 33, 35), although the latter scholar draws attention (p. 36) to a Mandaean text with eschatological bearing (viz. Book of John, chap. 55, ed.
Lidzbarski, *Hibîl*, p. 196). It appears certain, however, that the real source of the belief as to the ‘balance’ was Zoroastrian, and it may have come into Manichaeanism through the Mandaean channel.

III

**REFERENCE TO A LIFE-ACCOUNT FOR THE HEREAFTE R IN MANICHAISM**

The idea of an account kept for the hereafter is a familiar one in Zoroastrianism and other religions. It is natural to look for some allusion to this doctrine also in the Manichaean Fragments.

A special reference is now to be found, I believe, in the Petrograd Fragment S. 9 in Turfan Pahlavi. This fragment is one among several brought back to Petrograd in 1908 by Krotkov, the Russian Consul at Črūmči (Urumchi). It consists of two folios and has been reproduced in the original Syriac script, accompanied by a transliteration into Hebrew characters and a tentative version (‘versuch einer übersetzung’), as well as a glossarial index, by the late Petrograd Iranist C. Salemann, under the title ‘Manichaica III–IV’ in *Bulletin de l’Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg*, 1912, pp. 7–14.

Having made a careful study of this piece in the original Estrangelo text, largely with the help of a magnifying-glass, I have prepared a translation of the whole, with annotations, which bear out the view that the first section (I) relates to the soul of Primal Man in Hell as overcome by the Powers of Darkness, and that the second section (II) appears to describe a colloquy in which a disciple receives from Mānî, who is named, an assurance of the ultimate redemption of the souls of the Elect as purified through the true faith, and the guarantee of the final triumph of good over evil.

It is toward the end of this fragment that there is found, I think, an allusion to promised reward for those whose reckoning in life has won sanctification. The text with reference to the triumphant Elect, as here transcribed from S. 9 verso, col. d, lines 18–33, runs as follows:
pad 'istāvīn dahn
viyābānd lašmān

d.20. 'ig ābān zendagān ○ ○
y y d (laysād) y y z y y d (yēzayēd) y frsr'yyd
     (frasrayēd)
cē nazd hān zamān
'īl nišānān ○ ○

d.25. xvanīhīst anīlagān
viśādān 'ī[i] šahriyār
     ○ ○ dafēdagīh 'ūd
aristābēdagīh
pādīnāhrēd a[c]
zhr 'īg. tāyēdān○ ○)

d. 30. šahriyār Mān[th]
xvadāi vaxd a[bdēsid]
nišān 'īg zamān
būrīst ○ ○

'The fountains of living waters shall unloose their mouths in praise. (Therefore) teach, worship, and chant aloud, because that time (and) its signs are near. Song belongs to the Initiated and Elect of the Ruler (i.e. Mānī); their accounting and steadfast mastery shall be rewarded by the eternal. (Thus) Mānī the Ruler, the Lord, taught (?) the signs of the (Time) supreme.'

Omitting here a philological discussion of some of the technical terms in the first part of the selection, which will be presented elsewhere, I turn at once to the two particular words under consideration in connection with the life-accounting.

d, 26. dafēdagīh: The reading is assured, and I think that this word is to be taken as an ordinary derivative abstract (-īh) based on dafēdag from *dastan, 'to write' (cf. Book Phil. rastan, 'to go, rafēd), which is contained in the well-known word dastār, 'book, record, account' (recall also the old Indo-Iranian loan-word dipī-, lipī-, 'writing, inscription'; Hübschmann, Pers. Stud. p. 61; Horn, Neupers. Ety. § 540). The meaning would therefore be 'reckoning, account, record,' and this interpretation would prove the fact of a survival in Manichaeism of the Zoro-
astrian doctrine of the reckoning or account demanded of the soul in the life hereafter. Similar in tenor is the following word.

d, 27. **aristābēdagīh**: Lit. 'established lordship, steadfast mastery,' i.e. upright stewardship. At least this is my suggestion, namely, to take this compound as made up of **aristā** 'constitutus' (cf. Bartholomae, Zum altiran. Wörterbuch, pp. 31 n., 37, 84, 138 n.), plus the abstract formation **bēdagīh** (or **-īh**), 'lord-ship.' This explanation gives an excellent sense, matching well with the preceding word, and has a far-reaching religious significance.

I need only add that **pādīšnōhrēd** is a derivative verb in the passive from the noun **pādīšnōhr**, which is found earlier in the same fragment (c, 23) and which is itself to be connected with Av. **xṇaōbra**—'satisfaction, propitiation,' presupposing a strengthened Av. form **pāti-xṇaōbra**—'satisfaction in return, requital, recompense, reward.' The other words are well-known, and the allusion to 'Lord Mānī' lends assurance to the promised reward hereafter for a life-account well balanced.

**IV**

**A NEW ALLUSION TO THE ZOROASTRIAN FIEND KUNDA, KUNDAG, IN MANICHAEISM FOUND IN THE PAHLAVI BOOKS**

A list of the Zoroastrian demons and fiends has been drawn up by the writer in the section on the Iranian Religion in the Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, 2. 649–668. A number of this infernal crew live on in Manichaean tradition. The flayed Archontes in Theodore bar Khoni's Scholia and elsewhere, together with the demons named in the Turfan Fragments, are more or less familiar. The Avestan Kunda, a personified demon of intoxication, plays an arch role among the horde (cf. op. cit. p. 661). While collecting the references to Manichaeism in the Zoroastrian patristic literature, or 'Book Pahlavi,' I have come across a hitherto unnoticed allusion to **Kundag Drūz**, 'the Fiend Kundag, or Kundi,' which may be worth while pointing out to Persian and Manichaean scholars alike.

The reference occurs in the noted Pahlavi work Dēnkart, 'Acts of the Zoroastrian Religion,' and is imbedded among a
dozen doctrines of Mānī later controverted by the Zoroastrian priest Atūrpāt, son of Māraspand, famous pontiff of Shāpūr II, in the fourth century A. D. The text of the passage (DK. 3. 200, section 8) is available in the edition of Dastur Peshotan Behramjee Sanjana, vol. 5, p. 243, Bombay, 1888, and in the later edition of the Parsi scholar D. M. Madan, vol. 1, p. 217, Bombay, 1911. A transcription from the original Pahlavi is here presented, following a plan previously adopted of inserting the Pāzand equivalents of Semitic words directly after their 'Huzvārishn' forms in the text, which is transcribed in general according to tradition.

Dk. 3. 200. 8: xadāk ('ēvak) paṭirak zak (ān) i akrūyāh ārāstār. Atūrēpāt gēttī\(^1\) būnēdātak\(^4\) rāi\(^5\) dāštān andarēnīd, Drāz astak Mānīi parkār\(^6\) pavan (pa) stān i Kūndag Drāz zak (ān) i būnēdātak drāyīstan davist.

'As one doctrine contrary to that which Atūrpāt, the adorer of holiness, enjoined, (namely) to hold the world as an original creation—the fiend incarnate, Mānī, lyingly taught to proclaim [its] original creation to be a circle on the support of the fiend Kūndag.'

This passage, here very literally translated, becomes full of significance in the light of Manichaean studies and is to be associated with other allusions to the particular demon Kūndag, such as ShGV. 16. 10–20; Bd. 28. 42; Av. Vd. 11. 9, 12 (=Phl. Vd. 9. 26, 35); 19. 41 (=Phl. Vd. 19. 138); cf. especially also Theodore bar Khoni, in Pognon, Coupes de Khouabir, p. 188, and the references in Cumont, La Cosmogonie manichéenne, pp. 23–29, 69–75.

\(^1\) Observe that Turfan Phl. has this word as ḡūk, S. 9 v, 12 (=Salemann, Manichaica III–IV, p. 37).


\(^3\) So Madan's text, rightly, see also Peshotan's footnote ad loc.

\(^4\) This Phl. form presumes an old Av. pārī-kara-, 'encirclement, enclosure, orb.'
ASSYRIAN EPISTOLARY FORMULAE

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

I. ROYAL LETTERS

Four opening formulae are used by the Sargonid kings of Assyria in their correspondence: 1. "Word (or message) of the king" (amāt šarrī)¹ 2. "Order of the king" (abīt šarrī)² 3. "Letter (or tablet) of so and so" (dupuš palāni)³ 4. "To A say: thus sayeth B" (ana palāni kibēma umma šarruma).⁴

In writing to persons of equal rank, the salutation, added to one of the first three formulae, was: "I am well! Greetings to you!" (šulmu iāši, lū šulmu ana kāša); while, with individuals

¹ See Harper, Letters (hereafter abbreviated Harp. or omitted) [287] 288-297 [298-300] 399-403 517-518 [571 ?] 944 1100 1170 [1172] [1186] 1256 [1258] 1260 [1380 ?]; CT xxii, 1. This formula is also used by the neo-Babylonian kings (Clay, Neo-Babylonian Letters from Erech, Nos. 2-6, 115).
² Harp. 301-307 417 945; Ungnad, Babylonian letters of Hammurabi, No. 132 (to Arad-Gula). This form is used by a princess (abīt mūrat šarrī) (Harp. 308).
³ With the exception of Harp. 430 (dupuš mar šarrī, letter of the crown-prince) and possibly of Harp. 1242 (dupuš šar Aššur), the name of the king is mentioned after dupuš: Esarhaddon (Harp. 918), Ašurbanipal (1022 [1040] 1151), Šamaš-sumukin (406 899 1385), Ummanaldaš (879), Nabû-bēl-šumāte (838); Uruana (409); Nabuchadnezzar (Clay, Neo-Babylonian Letters from Erech, No. 1).
⁴ Harp. 914 [924 (13th century) 1282]. This form, current in the letters of Hammurabi and in the Amarna-correspondence, has fallen into desuetude in the Sargonid period. Ašurbanipal uses it, in abridged form, in writing to the Babylonians, his clients (ana Babilai šabē kidinnia umma Ašur-bašarpî) (Harp. 926).
⁵ We find it in letters to the queen dowager (Harp. 303), to kings of Elam (1022 1040) and even in a letter to the Babylonians (Harp. 926) in which Ašurbanipal evidently wishes to flatter them by considering them as of equal rank with himself. Fuller and abridged forms were also used: Harp. 918 mentions sons, daughters, country, and magnates; 1151, which is fragmentary, mentions palace and country, while 879 says laconically: "Greetings to my brother!". Harp. 409 (from Uruana to a high official) reads: "ana hā" instead of "ana kāša".
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of lesser rank, the king merely said: "I am well! Be of good cheer!" (šulmu šašī, libbaka lu šabka). In hasty notes (Harp. 304–307 945) and in sarcastic letters (Harp. 403) the greeting was omitted entirely.

II. LETTERS TO ASSYRIAN KINGS

The opening words of at least half of the letters to Assyrian kings published by Harper are: "To the king my lord. Thy servant so and so. Greetings to the king my lord! May Nabu and Marduk bless the king my lord!" (ana šarrī bēlia, arduka pulānu, lā šulmu ana šarrī bēlia, Nabû u Marduk ana šarrī bēlia likrubû). Each one of the four parts of this formula will be examined separately.

(a) The Address.

The standard form ("to the king my lord") can be modified by the mention of the king's name,7 or by the addition of his titles and epitheta ornantia.8 A peculiar form of address, one word of which is still obscure,

---

7 E. g. Sargon (Harp. 30 524 542 1016 1226 1355) or Ašurbanipal (879 1195).
8 Bēl-bīnī uses the title "lord of kings" (bēl šarrānī) in addressing Ašurbanipal (Harp. 280 282 284–286 [458] 460 462 520 521 [789 790]); Harp. 793, where this title is omitted, was probably written to Ašur-etil-ilani (cf. Behrens, Assy. Babyl. Briefe, p. 26). Other titles found in the addresses are: šarrī kisšati (king of totality) (Harp. 1215, 6 1259 1282 1345 1461), šarrī kiššati dammu (mighty king of totality) (326), šarrī mudāti (king of countries) (137 238 259 262 266 274 276–277 279 326 328 334–335 497 699 717 736 etc.), šarrī šarrānī (king of kings) (258 730 cf. 1060, 6, 8), bēl šarrānī šarrī mudāti (lord of kings and king of countries) (284). Harp. 256 reads: "anu bēš šarrī bēl šarrānī" (to my lord the king, lord of kings) and in 1016 Sargon is addressed as "šarrī Bâbîl, šarrī mudāti, šarrī dammu bēlia" (king of Babylon, king of countries, mighty king, my lord). Harp. 654 reads: "To the great crown prince, the son of the king of the totality of countries."
Robert H. Pfeiffer.

reads: "Into the presence (?) of the king my lord may I come" (ana dinān šarrī bēšīa lullilik).8

Some letters published by Harper have no address or signature; these were supplemented by the messenger who brought the letter or by the envelope (cf. 1407).18

(b) The signature.

When the writer was not known personally to the king, he occasionally identified himself by adding to his name the mention of his profession,11 or of his parentage.13 In a few reports, mainly astronomical, the introduction is omitted and the signature is placed at the end.14 Urgent messages, letters of high officials, and military reports often contain merely the address and the signature, omitting all complimentary expressions.14

(c) The greeting.

Very often addanniš (strongly, from ana danniš: Harp. 855, 3) is added to the standard salutation ("greetings to the king

---

8 Harp. 422 [542] 698 721 747 749 793 [803] 832 833 835-837 899 900 913 925 994 999 1016 1027 1047 1072 1095 (1182?) [1269] [1304?] [1330] 1339 [1340]. In 1461 we should restore [ardu-ka] instead of [dup-ši], as Harper does. 422 reads: ana dinān Šarrūkin bēšīa, lā ana Šarrūkin bēšīa, ummi ana šarrī bēšī-su; this seems to indicate that the word dinān is pleonastic. 913 reads simply: ana dinān bēšīa. This form of address is also used in writing to high officials: the Sukkalt (746 781 805 844), the MAL.KAL. (Šakku dannu?) (1413) Nabu-šar-... (1185). On the meaning of this formula see especially: Behrens, Assy. Baby. Briefe, p. 27; Winckler, Altorient. Forschungen ii, 191; Waterman, AJSL 29. 1; Klauber, AJSL 30. 234. In some cases (542 698 793 1047) the invocation to Nabu and Marduk follows. 793 adds: "to the king my lord" at the beginning.

10 446(7) 444-449 455 (7) 466 472 475 477 490 632 997 1053 1164 1278. One letter to the king (1245) omits the address and signature and begins with the invocation. The following documents published by Harper cannot be classed as letters: 457 461 609 827 969 1105 1239 1280 1367-1369 1452.

11 "Prefect of Assur" (150); "the scribe of the new house" (189); "the commander of the fortress of Appina" (343); "priest of Bit-Kidnure" (710); "the scribe whom the king appointed in the house of the palace Overseer" (733); see also 166 415 419 533 812-829 (cf. 423 671) 1111 1234 etc.

12 E. g. 152 209 847.

13 Harp. 416 993 1000 1409 1447-1448 are astronomical reports; 222 702 1111 deal with other matters.

14 Harp. [73] 121-125 166 205 206 329 443 515 526 650 [765] 796 [1209?] [1414]; cf. 112 (to an official) and 152 (to the crownprince).
my lord") to express the superlative; not seldom it is repeated for emphasis, being found no less than five times in the introduction of Harp. 178 (cf. 977). Harp. 377, after repeating three times the word šulmu (greetings) adds: "a thousand greetings to the king my lord".

In isolated cases (Harp. 215 216) the signature follows the greeting instead of preceding it. In very many letters the opening formula contains only the address, the signature, and the greeting.15

(d) The invocation and the wishes.

The standard form ("may Nabû and Marduk bless the king my lord") is modified by the addition of uddanniš, strongly (repeated three times in 118). It appears also in isolated variations: "may they, in the faithfulness of their heart (ina kun li bíšunu), bless the king my lord" (Harp. 970); "a thousand times, exceedingly much, may they bless the king my lord etc." (Harp. 434); "may they bless the king, his servant [the writer], and his servants" (Harp. 872). A notable variety in the choice of the gods invoked and of the expressions of good wishes prevails in the Harper Letters.

(1) The gods.

The number of the gods named in the invocation varies from one to twenty. In certain cases a general mention is used: "the great gods" (Harp. 334–335 337–340 476 744 746 1202); "the gods of Assyria and Elam" (1400); "the gods of all countries" (831, cf. 7,17); "the gods of Esagil" (119; 120 [sic]); "the gods of Ekur and Nippur" (797 [1465?]); "the gods dwelling in Dûr-Šarrukin" (167 990). The clause "the great gods of heaven and earth" is used alone or added to a list of gods (434 549 [cf. 716] 654 970 [1465]; "dwelling in heaven and earth": 797).16

---

15 This form of introduction (ana šarrī bēlia, arduka pušunu, lū šulmu ana šarrī bēlia), being one of the most common in the Harper Corpus, is here listed only for volumes 1-2: 100-107 126-129 136 138 139 144-148 151 [153]; 154-156 157-165 168-172 173 174 179 180 182 188 190-191 192-195 196-199 201 202 207 208 212 218; cf. 175 (to the crownprince).

16 Harp, 7 reads: "The great gods of heaven and earth, the gods dwelling in Assyria and Akkad, the gods of all countries".
Single gods: Ašur of Ešarra: Harp. 941 [991]; in 419 Iš(?). ŠAR.RA should probably be read Ešarra; 733: "Ašur king of the gods, dweller of Ešarra”.
   Ištar of Arbela: Harp. 378 (cf. [1438]) [1031?].
   Nabû “the lord of countries”: 404, 10; Nabû: 1153, rev. 12.
   Nin.lil “the gracious mother”: Harp. 1060.
   Šamaš: 1439.

Two gods: Male:
   Ašur, Šamaš: 1094 1101.
   Bél, Marduk: 874.
   Nabû, Marduk: in hundreds of letters.
   Nin.ib, Nusku: 1131 1338.
   Šamaš, Adad: 2.
   Šamaš, Bél: cf. 958, rev. 8.
   Šamaš, Marduk: 852; cf. [278]; 958, rev. 24.

Female:
   Gula, Šarpanit: 1404.
   Ištar of Erech, Nanā: cf. 880 1387.

Couples:
   Adad, Nin.lil: 1223 (cf. [699]).
   Anu, Ištar: 781 1095.
   Nabû, Tašmēt, “the gods of this temple”: 872.
   Nergal, La-as: cf. 258, 8 (to the queen dowager).
   Sin, Nin.gal: Letters from Ḫarran: 131 133–135 [701] (cf. 132, to the Sukallu); from Kisig: 210 736; from Šattēna: 942; from Ur: 920 [974?] [1207] 1274; from unknown localities: [625] [935?] 1220 (“Sin, Nin.gal, into whose presence the king has come”) 1223 1395.
   Uraš, Nin.e.gal: Letters from Dilbat: 994 cf. 326 [764].
City and Temple:


Three gods (minor groups of gods within the lists are separated by semicolons):

Ašur; Bēl, Nabû: 352 [923?] [1048] 1179, obv. and rev.; letters of Ašurbanipal as crownprince to Esarhaddon: 1001 1026 [1257].

Ašur: Nabû, Marduk: 839.

Ašur; Nin.gal, Bēl-agi (lord of the crescent, i.e. Sin): 514 ("who love the name of the king").


Bēl, Ašur, Nin.ib: 493.

Bēl, Nabû; Bēlit-balatši: 740.

Bēl, Nabû; Nergal: 371 778-779.

Bēl, Nabû; Šamaš: 895 916, 9. 12 1109 1183 1237 1373.


Nabû, Marduk; Ištar of Arbela: 671 1438; cf. 378.

Nabû, Marduk; Sin: 116.

Sin; Nabû, Marduk: 1016.

Sin, Nin.gal, Nusku: 1150, 8.

Four gods:

Ašur, [. . . ]; Nabû, Marduk: 86.

Ašur, Bēl; Nabû, Šamaš: 76, rev. 6.

Ašur, Bēl; Šamaš, Marduk: 328.

Ašur, Ištar; Bēl, Nabû: 1389.

Ašur, Ištar; Nabû, Marduk: 177.

Ašur, Nin.lili; Nabû, Marduk: 149 [1220, 5-6?].

Ašur, Šamaš; Bēl, Nabû: 756 862 1245.

Ašur, Šamaš; Marduk, Nabû: 141 [722].

Ašur, Šamaš; Nabû, Marduk: 1410, rev.

[Asur?]; Šamaš; Sin, Nin.gal: 1228.

Ašur, Sin, Šamaš; Bēl: 377 [894?] ("and the great gods").

Bēl, Nabû; Bēlit of Erech, Nanâ: cf. 815.
Bēl, Nabū; Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Bit-Kidmuri: 186.
Bēl, Nin.lil; Nin.ib, Nuskū: 797.
[Nabū], Marduk; Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela: 696.
Nabū, Marduk; Sin, Nin.gal; Letters of Arad-Ea: 27 29 [612?]
667–669.

Five gods:
Ašur, Sin, Šamaš; Adad, Marduk: 603.
Ašur, Sin, Šamaš; Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela: 1098.
Ašur, Sin, Šamaš; Nabū, [Marduk?]: 1150.
Ašur, Sin, Šamaš; Nin.lil, Gula: 719.
Bēl, Bēlit šuni (MU); Nabū, Tašmēt, Nanā: 426.
Bēl, Nabū; Nin.lil, Bēlit of Kidmuri, Ištar of Arbela: 187.
Bēl, Šarpanīt; Nabū, Nanā, Tašmēt: 54 (to a princess).
Marduk, Šarpanīt; Nabū, Tašmēt, Nanā: 119 120 1385.
Nabū, Marduk; Sin, Nin.gal, Nuskū: 28.

Six gods:
Ašur, Sin, Šamaš; Nabū, [...], Marduk: 654 (to the crown-prince).
Ašur, Sin, Šamaš; [...]: Nabū, Nergal: 657.
Ašur, Šamaš; Bēl, Nabū; Sin, Nergal: 216.

Seven gods:
Ašur, Bēl, Nabū; Sin, Nergal; Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela: 697.
Ašur, Bēl, Nabū; Sin, Šamaš; Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela: 1384.
Bēl, Bēlit balāṭi; Bēlit of Babylon, Nabū, Tašmēt; Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela: 220 (to the secretary of the palace).
Nabū, Marduk; Šamaš, Bēl, [...]; Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela: 889.

Eight gods:
Ašur, Šamaš; Bēl, Nabū, Nergal; Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Bit-Kidmurra, Ištar of Arbela: [992] [1110].
Ašur, Šamaš; Bēl, Šarpanīt; Nabū, Tašmēt; Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela: 114 453.

[≠ Jastrow (Religion, ii, 602) restores "Ištar (?)"; I would suggest "Bēl" (cf. 371 778–9 and 216; see also 992+1110).]
Nine gods:
Ašur, Šamaš; Bēl, Nabû; Nergal, La-aš; Išum; Adad; *BAD. IR (Brünnow 1561): 434.
Ašur, Sin, Šamaš; Bēl, Nabu; Nergal; Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela: 662.
Ašur, Sin, Šamaš; Marduk, Šarpaniṭ; Nabû, Tašmēt; Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela: Letters of Arad-Nabû: 113 115 427 [495] [1133?] [1147?] ("who love thy kingship").

Ten gods:
...Ašur, Sin, Šamaš; Adad; Bēl, Nabû; Nin.ib...Nusku;
Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela: 923, 17f.

Fourteen gods:
[Ašur,] Sin, Šamaš; Adad; Marduk, Šarpaniṭ; Nabû, Tašmēt;
Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela; Nin.ib, Gula; Nergal, La-aš: 6.

Fifteen gods:
Ašur, Nin.līl; Sin, Šamas, Adad; Marduk, Šarpaniṭ; Nabû, Tašmēt;
Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela; Nin.ib, Nin.ib;* Nergal, La-aš: 358.

Twenty gods (or more):
Ašur, Sin, Šamas, Adad; [...] SAG.ME.GAR (i.e. Jupiter), DIL.BAT (i.e. Venus); Marduk, [Šarpaniṭ]; Nabû, Tašmēt;
LU.[BAD.SAG.UŠ] (i.e. Saturn), LU.BAD.GUD.BIR (i.e. Mercury); Šarrat[t...], Šarrat Kidmuri. [Ištar of] Arbela;
Nin.ib, [Gula], Nergal, La-aš: 7.

Uncertain fragments:
Ašur, Bēl, [...] [...], [...] 1250.
...Ašur, [...] Ištar, Marduk: 1430.
Bēl, [Šarpaniṭ]tum, Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Arbela, Šamaš(?)
...1166.
Nabû...Ištar of... 1075.
...Nin.līl, Aia, Adad..., Nabû, Tašmēt,... [Ištar of] Arbela; Nin.ib, Gula, ... 1166.
...Zamama, Nergal, DIL.TAR (i.e. daianu, judge, a title of Šamaš)... 916.

* Van Gelderen (B.A. iv, 510) considers this repetition a dittography; Clay (The Empire of the Amorites, p. 75) affirms with more plausibility that "both the god and the goddess are addressed" (i.e. Inurta and Ninurta), a view confirmed by the list of gods in 6, given above, which is practically identical and has "Nin.ib, Gula".
The interest of these lists transcends epistolary usage; they seem to grant us a unique glimpse into the private religion of the times. A considerable difference in matters of worship between individuals, cities, and professions appears in the choice of the gods invoked in these introductions; the patron gods of the city or of the profession of the writer, the gods with whom he feels himself in closest relation, are asked to bless the king. Physicians call upon Nin.ib and Gula, the healing gods (cf. e.g. Harp. 108-110). Priests would not omit, in their lists, the names of their own gods: Nabû-pašîr, a Sin priest, invokes Sin and Nin.gal; Arad-Ea, probably also a Sin priest, adds Nabû and Marduk to the list of his own gods (Sin and Nin.gal or these two and Nusku); a priest of Nin.ib invokes Bēl Ašur and Nin.ib (Harp. 493). Military men often omit the invocation of the gods. Sometimes it is possible to know the city from which the letter was sent by the names of the gods invoked: at Erech they call upon “Erech and E.Anna” or “Ištar of Erech and Nanâ”; at Nippur “Bēl (written En.lûl), Nin.ib, and Nusku”; at Aššur, “Ašur and Nin.lûl (or Ištar) or “Ašur” alone; at Babylon “Marduk and Sarpanit”; at Nineveh “Ištar of Nineveh” (186); at Arbela, “Ištar of Arbela” (671). Similarly the patron gods of the city are invoked in letters from Kutha (?) (1254), Dûr-Sarrukîn (167), and Dilbat (326 764 994). Sin and Nin.gal are found in letters from the centers of the worship of the moon god: Ur, Harrān, Kisig, and Šattēnā.

(2) The wishes.

The good wishes sent to the king may be classed as personal and political.

The first group contains wishes that could be sent to any private individual. The three blessings that the gods are asked to grant the king are long life, health and happiness, and offspring. The writers hope that the gods will give to the king “long days, protracted years”, “length of days, lasting reign”,

---

*a Omnē arkûte šanûta darûtu anu šarrī bēlīa liiddīnā*; Harp. 86 259 260 262 350 493 496 696 744 811 992 1117 1128 1173 (1217) 1220 (1243). “Many days ( omnē ma'ddi), long years”; 525 530 733 1092, 603 (cf. 797?7) reads: [ ... ] šalîtî omnē arkûte etc. 990 has “ omnē arkûte” only.

they beg the gods to "prolong the days of the king", "to keep him alive one hundred years", "to lengthen his reign", "to bless him for many years", in a word: "long live the king in Assyria!" In writing to the queen dowager they express the hope that the gods "may grant life to the king." The same thought is expressed more concretely in the wish that "the king may hold his grandchildren on his knees"; nay, they add with a touch of humor, "may the king see gray hairs in their beards!"

The formula commonly used to wish the king happiness and good health reads, literally: "May (the gods) give the king my lord well-being of the heart, well-being of the flesh." Another common expression is: "May the heart of the king be of good cheer!" The wishes for long life are variously combined with those for health and happiness: may the gods grant the king "long days, years of good health", "long days of happiness and health", "happiness, health, length of days", "long

---

21 "Umē šarri lurrīku": [80 at the end?] 119 120 ([471,5], cf. 1383, rev.2).
22 "C ràdāt anu šarri bēlia luballītē": 113–115 494 [495]; cf. 368.8, 453.6.
23 "Līšalīrū palūka": 716.
24 "Šādāt ma'dāte likrubū": 223 (to the enlū or gardener).
25 "Šarru bēlia ina ma'Allūr lá dārū": 1173.
26 "Šarru bēlia luballītē": 917.
28 "Parsāmāte ina sīkūtu limūr": 178; cf. 113, rev. 15f. ("their sons and grandchildren will grow old, the king my lord shall see it!").
29 "Tāb lībbī ṭā šērē anu šarrī šēlia lubītinā": 5 108–111 119-120 186 246 280–282 284–286 [313?] 378 391–392 437 [456] 465 496 514 521 525 570 [662?] 740 795 (lībbā: may they command) 852 [873] 1092 [1173] [1179] [1219] 1220 1243 1370 [1388] [1402?] [1430]. In 992 "kudā lībbī" (joy of the heart) is added; in 1150 "lūdinā" is wanting. Other variants: "Tāb lībbī ṭūd lībbī (696); "Tāb šērē ṭūd lībbī, . . . līruktū" (744).
30 "Lībbū ša šarrī šēlia ṭū ṭāb": (cf. Ylvisaker, Gramm. 501); 5 12 188 200 225-226 261 [313?] 424 548 [594] 730–732 883 919 970 [977] [1008] [1011] 1074 [1179] [1193]; "lī sab-šātu": 178 227; "ma'dīs ša lā bāb": 349; "uddannī" 178 227 [637] 730–731 919 etc.
31 "Umē arḵūtu šanətē ṭāb šērē": 1171; umē rukūte: [1023]. "Umē arḵūtu šanətē ma'dāte ṭāb lībbī" (long days, many years of happiness): 1143–1384.
32 "Umē arḵūtu ša šāb lībbī šērē lūbalītīša": 137. "Umē arḵūtu šērē u ṭūd lībbī . . . līruktū": 337–340 476 744 746 1202; cf. 257.
days of happiness, many years of rejoicing, contentment, and gladness".  

Offspring was the highest blessing. The culmination of a poetic description of national prosperity is: "procreation is blessed" (talitu ašrat) (Harp. 2, obv. 20f). A not uncommon wish is: "may (the gods) give the king my lord old age (and) progeny". The following, on the contrary, is found only once: "May the great gods establish the foundation of thy offspring like heaven and earth".  

Political good wishes to the kings of Assyria refer to the security and success of their rule: "may (the gods) make firm the throne of the king my lord"; may they give him "a scepter of righteousness, an everlasting throne". The writers wish the king "peace", they hope the king will attain his desire, see prosperity, and be granted by the gods the wish of his heart. These various good wishes are also found in manifold combinations. Stereotyped wishes are found in the body of some

araku ūnu ma'dātu": 521. "Arak ūnē tāb libbi u labar palē": 520. 700 (1136?).
- "Išu ertē la tāb libbi šanāte ma'dātu la ušu ʿādātā u rīṭātī": 530.
- "Śibītu šallū ana sarri bēla liddinā": [26] 76. rev. 10 353. rev. 378 453 (cf. 733 797: Ḡebī-c); "lūabbūtā" (satisfy): 113-115 177 494 (495) 970.
- "Išu ertē la šanē u šāšēm iši šarlu ʿištaba lūkinnā": 334.
- "Kûṣša la šarri bēla lūkinnā": 119-120; "ana ṣarābi", forever: 177, cf. 525. "Išu ertē la šarri bēla (herātika: 1107) ana umī šaṭi lūkinnā" (may they establish the foundation of the royal throne of the king my lord unto the last day): 455 [970] [1075?]. [1107]; cf. Kûṣša la ṣarābi" (eternal throne): 525 (cf. 812 923, 19); "Kunnu ertē la šarri lālāt" (firm foundation of the royal throne): 328 (ana umī šaṭi) 1387, 8; "Šarri la ṣarīna pale arakē" (eternal kingship, long reign): 916, 13.
- "Ḥattu širtu kûṣša ṣarābi": 260 262 350 811 [1117] [1128] "ḥattu širtu re'atu šenātēti" (righteous scepter, rule of mankind): 797.
- "Šarru ševaša šākā": 844, rev. 10.
- "Nimallu šallūša limur": 9 12; cf. "nimallu šarri bēla limur": 1383, rev. 3 (may the king see the prosperity of the crownprince).
- "Šumrat libbi ana sarri bēla lūkāṣītā": 141.
- "Maṣar la šarri my lord long days, endless years, protracted life, youth (uṣṣur), conquest (kušāḥu)": 493; "may they grant unto the king a life of long days, happiness, health, a lasting reign, and a firm foundation
letters after the mention of a royal votive gift (340,17–22; 404, 10–15) or of a religious ceremony (113 667 858 923; cf. 379, rev. 8f; 1383). Wishes for the royal princes are also found in letters to the king (404,13ff 434,7 453,13ff 1383,rev. 1–4). The longest complimentary introductions, presenting the richest variety of formulae of greeting, are to be found in the letters of Adad-šum-āstar (letters to the king: 1–3 5–9 11–14 16 357–360 362–365 650–653).

In a number of letters we find, after the greeting, the words: “All is well with so and so”. This expression is applied to the nation, to cities, to temples, to the military forces, the palaces, and the officials.

of the king’s royal throne unto the last day’’: 328; “peace, life and long days”: 279; “might and power” (Ilu donné): 1060 (partly obscure). 371, 14–18 expresses the hope that the king’s throne will pass down to his descendants and family forever. Nabû-bêl-šumâel writes to the king that he is sending his messenger with horses and men to greet him (832 833 835 836 837, cf. 721, 8f). “Bêl and Nabû will give the king a broad ear (i.e. a keen mind)’: 211/rev. 13f, 1153/rev. 12f.

a. “Šulmu ana puâmi” means “all is well with so and so”, while “la ūlamu ana puâmi” means “greetings to so and so” (see Delattre in PSBA 22, 294ff; Ylivisaker, Zur Baby. Assy. Grammatik, p. 63).


a. Calah (232–233), Dûr-Sarraûkin (232), Allûr (92 99 397), Babylon and Borsippu (313), Dûr (1093: to the secretary of the palace).


a. “The servants of the king” : 343 757. “Pišûti Bûti jarri” (the ad-
In some letters the writer tells the king that he is praying for his lord’s life and prosperity; this is regularly done after the invocation of certain gods. Occasionally the writer calls himself a “blessor” of the king.

Mention should also be made of a number of unique forms of introductions.

While most letters end abruptly after the discussion of the business in hand, we find at the end of some letters the date or stereotyped expressions, such as: “May the heart of the king be of good cheer” (153 157 495 etc.), “let the king do as he pleases”; “let the king notice”; “I am writing the king about this matter” (1164); “let the king listen” (116); “I remind the king of it” (680); “for the rest, let the king send in-

ministration (?) of B. p.); 5:12 178 586 (cf. 1347:15) (see Delitzsch, BA 2,20; Delattre, PSBA 22. 300; Behrens, Ass. Bab. Briefe p. 82, footnote 1). “Pištti ša bit kuliši”; 9 [597]. “Pišttiši gidda” (all the administrations); 970. “The court lady”; 232 [233].

* 326 412 418 [718] [841–842] 844.rev. 13 880 [1089, 1208] 1230 1261 [1338] 1387 1431. See also: 219 (private), 324 (to the queen dowager), 1431 (to an official).


* “Kuribša ša bēlīa anaku”: 844; “kāriš sarri bēlišu”; 266; “Kāribka” (thy bessor): 979 1092 1384 (all three by Marduk-šallim-abē).

* “This is the rest of the words of the former letter” (i. e. the continuation of an unfinished letter): 435; “The words which the Babylonians speak in the presence of the king”: 878 (cf. 1280?); “Let the king send instructions to so and so”: 976. The meaning of “Egiru ša šallimāti” (safe-conduct) is doubtful (446). “The word (dūbu) about the eclipse” 1006 (kī-bu, in 512, should probably be read “dū-bu”; the word of so and so to so and so).


* “Šarru bēlīa akit ša ili’u liš(u)”]: 267 269 336 496 497 [501] 628 717 [779] etc. Variants: “ki ša šarru ila’uni liš(u)”; 732; “umā ki ša ina pān sarri bēlīa maqrūnu liš(u)” (now let them do according to the pleasure of the king): 83 1060 1096; “as the gods of the king wish, let him do”; 1203, obv. 8f. Harper omits “idē-u” in 201; in 912 he reads: “li-din-na-ū” (for li-pu-ū?).

* “Šarru bēlīa ša ili”: 750 (ādi; 493 1234; idu; 498).
structions" (845); "now what the king wishes to say, let him say" (246); "preserve this letter" (269). Expressions of devotion, good wishes, and prayers (844) are also to be found at the end of Assyrian letters to the king.66

III. PRIVATE LETTERS

1. Formulae of greeting similar to those of royal letters. The "gardener" (erešu), who has, without sufficient reason, been considered no other than the king himself, uses the form: "Abū erešu ana pulaša; šulum iāši" (order of the gardener to so and so; I am well); 1435. The introduction of 896 reads: "Duppu pulaša ana pulaša; šulum iāš, libbaka lā ūbakā" (letter of so and so to so and so; I am well, may your heart be of good cheer). In 1112 we come across the ancient Babylonian form: "Ana pulaša kibēma umma" (to so and so say).

2. Formulae of greeting similar to those of letters to the king.

One letter has nothing but the address and signature in the introduction (523), four merely add the usual greeting (lā šulmu ana pulaša, greetings to so and so; 855 910 [933] 1093), and one (912) has the standard invocation of Nabû and Marduk after the address and signature. In a letter to the secretary of the palace (220) the address is followed by an invocation to seven gods (see above) and by wishes of "long days, happiness, and good health". The address "ana dinān pulaša lulkā", as we have noticed, is also used in writing to high officials (748 781 805 844 913 1185 1431); in one case (1185) the writer adds: "may Nabû and Marduk bless my lord". The introduction of 451 reads: "May Nabû and Marduk grant thee, as a gift, happiness, health, and long days". The initial formula of 1024 is also exceptional, in private correspondence: "Mā pulaša ana pulaša iḫšibī" (so and so says to so and so).

---

67 733: [1249]; 211 1153; [1098].
68 In replying to royal letters the subject in hand is introduced by the formula: "ina muḫḫi ... la šarru bēlī šparanārī mā ..." (concerning what the king wrote about ...). In referring to a conversation with the king the formula is: "ina muḫḫi la šarru bēlī šibunī ..." (concerning what the king said: cf. 18: "concerning what the king said yesterday ...").
3. Formulae of greeting proper to private letters.

The standard introduction of private letters in the neo-Babylonian period reads: "Duppu pulāni ana pulāni, lū šulmu ana: abia (219), akia (214), māria (1201) bēlia (907), kāši (185 has ka-a-si instead of kāši)" ("letter of so and so to so and so; greetings to my father, brother, son, lord, or to thee"; according to the degree of familiarity between them). Sometimes the greeting is omitted: "Letter of so and so to so and so": 527 623 830 [898] 906 949 1125. Invocations are seldom used and vary greatly: "May Bēl and Nabū greet (?) so and so" (345 806); "Greetings to my lord; may Bēl and Nabū declare the peace and happiness of my lord in Erech and E. Anna" (1129); "Greetings! May Šamaš declare thy life unto the last day!" (1439); "May Bēl, Nabū, Bēlit of Erech, and Nanā pronounce for you the judgment of Erech and of the gods" (815, a collective letter).

* This was also the standard form in private correspondence in the Sargonid period. We find it in: 185 214 219 [229] 806 854 897 901 907 1337 1407. 219 contains a prayer. "Lū šulmu" is omitted in 830 1201.
THE TOPOGRAPHY OF THE GUADEA INSCRIPTIONS
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The purpose of this paper is to discuss briefly one division only of the geography of the times of Gudea, as revealed on the Cylinders and Statues of that monarch, now in our possession. Gudea was patesi of Lagash, beginning about 2450 B.C., the supposed date of his accession to the overlordship of that great city.

The center of the politico-commercial activity of Gudea was the city of Lagash (modern Tello), situated in the lower Tigris-Euphrates valley, a few miles northeast of the modern town of Shatra, about an hour's ride east of the Shatt el Hai, a small stream, upon the banks of whose original channel the city of Lagash was probably built.

This great center was thus fixed in that wonderful alluvial plain, with an abundant supply of waters for irrigation, and presumably, from the inscriptions themselves, for shipping, in the Shatt el Hai, and probably within a few miles of an eastern irrigation branch of the Euphrates river.

The city of Lagash had been in existence at least from the reign of Mesilim of Kish in the third dynasty of that city (about 3600 B.C.). Hence Gudea came to the governorship of a city more than one thousand years old, splendidly situated physically and commercially, and with large prestige. Racially considered, it was located in Sumer, the southern division of ancient Babylonia, in distinction from Akkad, the northern section of that valley.

The political status of Lagash in Gudea's period seems to have been one of independence, as no mention is made in any of these documents of any clashes or battles between Lagash and its neighboring cities; no record is found of any tribute collected or paid, nor of any other marks of subservience or
sovereignty. Only one bit of military movement is mentioned and that was the conquest by Lagash of Anshan of Elam (Statue B vi 64-68), whence booty was brought and deposited in the temple of Eninnu. On the other hand, the Cylinders and all the Statues recite in enthusiastic and laudatory terms the religious activities of prosperous peace.

Gudea, the governor, seems to have been the first of a new line of rulers, as he nowhere refers to any of his ancestors. His aggressive spirit and devotion to the divinities of the city made him a force in the restoration of its crumbling temples of other days, and in the extension of the influence and power of the city. In the four great districts of Lagash—Nina, Uru, Urukugga, and Girsu—he demonstrated his devotion by his plans for his marvellous complexes of buildings. In Girsu he rebuilt Eninnu to his city-god Ningirsu. In Urukugga he constructed a temple to Gatundug; and, in addition, he dedicated shrines to Bau, Ninparsag, Eanna and others.

The material requirements to carry out such large building-plans, on the part of Gudea, were far beyond the available resources of Lagash, or even of Sumer as we see it from the known texts. Clay bricks were the only local available building material. All timbers, stone, metals, bitumen, etc., had to be imported, and some of them from territories on the edge of the known horizon of that day. It is largely in connection with such importations that we are introduced to the topography of the times of Gudea.

The first noticeable topographical lines laid down are mentions of the two great rivers of that famous valley, the Tigris and Euphrates; the former is mentioned four times and the latter twice. Their chief characteristic is their value in producing abundant crops, and hence prosperity to the entire country. They were the feeders of canals, which promoted irrigation and navigation for the entire list of great cities that dotted that famous early valley.

Of all the cities which are known to have occupied a prominent place in the life of that valley in Gudea’s day, we find the name of (a) Kish, the most ancient and strongest seat of Semitic culture, the chief city of Akkad; identified as the modern ruins and village of El-Ohémir, less than ten miles east of the site of old Babylon, and on the east bank of the old bed of the
Euphrates. Its first king, Mesilim, of the third dynasty (3638 B.C.), was ruler of several cities, among them Lagash, thus revealing the comparative importance of Kish in that valley about 1200 years before the time of Gudea. This city is mentioned but once.

(b) Nippur was a city of which the god Ningirsu was prince. It was situated fifty-five miles southeast of Babylon, and seventy miles northeast of Tello, and on the east bank of Shatt el-Nil. It was the one city that contained the central shrine of the god Enlil, the chief of the gods. Its antiquity and importance have been abundantly proved by the excavations of the University of Pennsylvania. It is mentioned once only.

(c) Eridu (modern Abu Shahrain), stood about ten miles south of Ur, and fifty miles south of Tello. It was ruled over by Ea, called the king. To this city Ningirsu made a visit, and in this place his sister was born. Eridu is mentioned ten times.

(d) Shuruppak (modern Fāra), east of the Euphrates, near Shatt el-Kar, the southern extension of Shatt el-Nil, about forty miles northwest of Tello, and twenty miles south of Bismya. It is mentioned once, together with Kish.

Apparently Gudea was on peaceful terms with all these four cities, and doubtless fostered trade relations with them. But his elaborate building-plans required him to search farther afield for the many varieties of material needed for those constructions. His own domain included, outside of the districts of Lagash, the city of Anshan (and possibly of Susa) in Elam, which he had taken by conquest. For any required raw materials not found in these districts, he must needs resort to his commercial pacts and treaties with the rulers and governments of other regions.

Gudea states that he travelled from the lower to the upper country, and that Ningirsu his god opened the ways for him from the Upper Sea (Mediterranean) to the Lower Sea (Persian Gulf), in search, doubtless, for the raw materials necessary to realize his ambitious building schemes.

There were three known general districts outside of Babylonia (Sumer and Akkad) which contributed to his purpose. The most complete list is found on the large diorite Statue (B Col. VI), on whose knees is found the ground-plan of the temple.
(1) The first and best established section of the then known world was Amurru (Martu), the Westland, Syria and possibly Palestine. Of the places mentioned in this region we find: (a) Amanus, a mountain of cedar, which yielded cedar timber, said to have been fifty and sixty cubits in length, and urkarina timber twenty-five cubits long. The fact that these statements follow immediately after the account of Gudea’s journey to the Upper Sea seems to locate this mountain in the Lebanons. (b) In the same narrative a few lines farther along, we find: “Out of Basalla, a mountain of Amurru, he brought great blocks of stone, to fashion into stelae” (c) Again, “Out of Tidana, a mountain of Amurru, he brought alabaster (or marble) for use in building the temple.” In the same list with these mountains we find, (d) “From the city of Urshu, in the mountain of Ibla, he brought zabalom, great ashuku, tulupa and plane-tree timber,” the last of which were used for heavy beams; (e) then follows Umanu, a mountain of Menua from which were transported great blocks of stone, as they were from Mount Basalla in Amurru, already mentioned. Although the Ibla and Umanu mountains have not been identified, they stand in a list of mountains, of which three are specifically identified and located in Amurru.

(2) The next quarter of the world from which Gudea imported his materials was Elam and its mountains, on the east and southeast of Lagash. Reference has already been made to (a) Anshan the city (and district) that fell to Gudea by conquest; and (b) Susa, which was probably the source of some of the workmen who came to Lagash to assist in the building of the temple of Eninnu. (c) Kagalad, a mountain of Kimash, was a source from which copper was imported. (Statue B Col. vi, 22, 23). Cyl. A (xvi, 15, 16) says, “Out of the mountain of copper in Kimash, they secured copper, and clay for making bricks.” That Kimash was a city of Elam is confirmed by its mention in a list of Elamite cities conquered by Dungi of Ur during the last four years of his reign. (d) “Out of Madga, a mountain of the River Luruda, he brought asphalt” or bitumen. Madga has been identified (King, Sumer and Akkad, quoting RT 22, 153) with Madka, of which Hununi, patesi of Kimash, was governor, thus locating it, beyond doubt, in Elam.

Before taking up the third general district I wish to mention
the names of the three mountains whose situations are still in
doubt: (a) From the mountain Barshib he imported two kinds
of stone, ha-una and na-lu-a (Statue B. Col. vi, 59–63); it
was located near navigable waters, either river or sea, because
the stone was loaded on boats for transportation to Lagash;
(b) the mountain Gubi, mountain of ḫulphu-wood, the source
of that wood which was used in the manufacture of weapons,
notably the shar-ur, which required a hard, tough and resilient
wood; (c) From the mountain of Ḫa-Hum, he brought gold-
dust or ore, which was used in overlaying the picturesque
war-club or mace made in the form of three lion-heads, so
set together that each looked towards a different third of
the horizon.

(3) The third general district which contributed to the wealth of
raw materials for Gudea's temples was the south, southwest, and
west of Lagash. The four names which seem to be generally
attributed to those areas are Magan, Meluhha, Gubi and
Dilmun. These are all mentioned together in one list as the
sources from which wood of many kinds was brought to Lagash
(Statue D, IV 10/11). (a) Beginning with the last, Dilmun, men-
tioned only in this passage, general agreement identifies the name
with the Bahrein islands in the Persian Gulf; but Meissner
(OLZ 1917, 201f.), on the basis of Sachau's Die Chronik von
Arbela, 23ff., identifies the name with Thālum in the region of
the islands of Bahrein.

(b) The next country, mentioned but once, is Gubi; also
the source of supply of timbers transported on boats to Lagash.
There are several local names in the region of Muscat, spelled
Ghubba, which might answer the requirements so far as the name
itself is concerned, but like most other districts around the
rim of Arabia, they are in these times especially devoid of
timber.

(cd) The next two places, Magan and Meluhha, are the
battle-ground of would-be connoisseurs of Sumerian, Babylonian,
and Assyrian topography and geography. These two places are
mentioned together in more than a score of passages in inscrip-
tions covering a range of more than 2000 years, from the days
of Naram-Sin to Assurbanipal. Identifications of these names
with certain places are almost as numerous as the scholars who
have attempted the task. Their locations have ranged from
Akkad and Sumer (Winckler) in Babylonia to Somaliland in eastern Africa (Albright). These conclusions are based on linguistic, geographic, inscriptive and modern local data, stretching from the times of Naram-Sin to the latest facts gathered from today's activities in various areas of southwestern Asia and Eastern Africa.

The latest published discussion (April, 1922) of the question of the ancient location of Magan and Meluhha is that by Langdon in the Journal of Egyptian Archeology for October, 1921. He reviews, criticizes and summarizes several of the most prominent positions taken by authors of earlier discussions. On the basis of inscriptive evidence of Naram-Sin, he locates these two lands and mountains, as they are both designated, on the western shore of the Persian Gulf, including the province of Oman. But he does not answer those who, like Haupt and Streck, claim that the Amarna letters and Assurbanipal texts furnish evidence that those lands were Egypt and the Sudan. He even admits that Streck's arguments are convincing, but he does not adopt his conclusions.

Lack of time will not permit me at the present moment to take up a full discussion of the problem, which I hope to do at an early day. But I should like to call the attention of students of those times to one line of investigation, which all the writers whom I have examined have failed to take into account. Almost every reference to those places includes some allusion to the sea, or to navigable waters, to boats, and to navigation.

No discussion of the problem of the location of Magan and Meluhha is complete without a study of, at least, three kinds of research:

(1) What is the character of the waters upon which any craft must necessarily have been propelled, in a journey to southern, southwestern, western or northern Arabia, or to Egypt, the Sudan or Eastern Africa? The currents, tides, winds and monsoons in the Red Sea and adjoining waters are today problems of navigation of no mean proportions; so that a writer in the Encyclopaedia Britannica says of those waters, "the movements of waters are of great irregularity and complexity, rendering navigation difficult and dangerous"; he says further, "the southwest monsoons bring navigation to a standstill in the summer, except in the case of powerful steamers."
(2) The second problem, especially troublous for the coast navigator, with few and far-apart shelters, was the long stretch of waters to be traversed to the lands and mountains in western Arabia and Africa, to secure ushu-wood, gold dust, diorite stone and other raw materials. The measured distances from Lagash to the points claimed as the identifications of those two names rather startle the impartial student of the problem. 
(a) From the head of the Persian Gulf (probably 50 miles south of Lagash) to Ras Musandum, the western headland at the narrow entrance to the Persian Gulf, as the crow flies, is about 600 miles, but along the coast 800 miles. 
(b) From that headland to Ras el-Hadd, the most southeasterly point of Arabia, is about 350 miles, with one good sheltered cove at Muscat. 
(c) From Ras el-Hadd to the Straits of Bab el-Mandeb is about 1500 miles, with only one place, Makalla, 300 miles east of Aden, that makes any pretensions to be a port. Besides this one good shelter for sea-craft, there is a second at Ghubbat Hashish, about 150 miles southwest of Ras el-Hadd. Thus the minimum distance from Lagash to the Straits of Bab el-Mandeb by water was about 2500 miles, as the crow flies, and 200 to 300 more if one should follow the shore lines. 
(d) The Red Sea, in a straight line from Bab el-Mandeb, to the north end whence branch off the Gulfs of Suez and Akaba, is about 1250 miles. The shore line particularly on the east or Arabian side is paralleled by almost invisible sieve-like coral reefs that are the terror of the navigator. Thus, from Lagash to the peninsula of Sinai by sea, is a distance of nearly 4000 miles through waters that even today will severely test the hardiest sailing craft.

If, however, the boatman should attempt to row or sail across the Strait of Bab el-Mandeb (="gate of tears," because of its perilous waters), he would find in the east channel, between the isle of Perim and the Arabian coast, a rapid current flowing into the Red Sea; and in the west channel, a current of salt water, though quite below the surface, flowing outwards into the Indian Ocean. The far-off reaches on the seas of Gudea's time must be taken into account, if we would locate Magan and Meluhha in southwestern Arabia, Sinai, Egypt, or East Africa.

(3) A third question cannot be set aside without some investigation. What kind of sea-going craft were in use in Baby-
Ionia 2500 B.C.? Were they of such build and character as to be manageable and serviceable, and safe on the different kinds of waters over which they would be obliged to ride to the far-off shores of Egypt or Eastern Africa? How were they navigated, and how successfully could they stem the tides and currents and winds that always agitate the course of their journeys? To answer these questions would greatly aid us in reaching the proper conclusions regarding the possible locations of the two much-discussed ancient lands. For the movements of the seas are nearly or quite as permanent as the directions and force of the winds; and the distance between points as fixed as the locations of the mountains. These phases of our problem must be considered, especially by those of us who would locate Magan and Meluhha at places from 3000 to 4000 miles from the city of Lagash, the center of Gudean culture in the twenty-fifth century B.C.

Facts regarding ports and coasts of Arabia are found in Handbook of Arabia, published 1920, by the Intelligence Division of the British Navy.
BRIEF NOTES

A Nilometer in the Egyptian Collection of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnology of the University of California

The provenance of the limestone here reproduced is Nag’ed-Deir, on the east bank of the Nile opposite Girgeh. The length of the stone at the top is 15 in., at the bottom 15½ in., the width 10½ in., and the thickness on top 1½ in. and 2 in. at the bottom. The inscription reads:

"Year 23, month Mesore, the 23rd day:
the mouth of the Nile under his majesty the king of Upper and Lower Egypt, Ne-maat-Rê', living forever."

The height of the river was indicated by a line below the inscription. The center of the line forms a mouth. Amenemhêt III (Ne-maat-Rê’=Lamaris), in whose 23rd year the nilometer was set up probably at or near Nag’ed-Deir, is well known for the interest which he took in the proper regulation of the inundation and particularly for his work of reclamation of the Fayyum district.

H. F. Lutz
University of California
The nominal prefix *n* in some Hebrew names

J. Barth in his study of "Das Nominalpräfix *na* im Assyrischen", ZA 2. 111–117, first elucidated the *na* prefix found in many Assyrian nouns, e. g. *napharu*, *napitištu*, *namrašu*, *narkapitu*, etc. He showed that the phenomenon was due to a dissimilation of *m* into *n* before a following labial. With few exceptions this dissimilation works regularly, and the rule is now accepted as a commonplace. It has been still more exactly worked out by Jensen, "Zu den Nominal-Praefixe n(-a, -i, -u) und n(-a, i,-o) im Assyrischen," ZDMG 43 (1889), 192. Barth proceeds to say, p. 116: "Eine derartige Empfindlichkeit bei der Ausprache des *m*-Labials in diesem Präfix weisen die übrigen semitischen Sprachen nicht auf," although he admits we find "vereinzelte Spuren, die mit dieser assyrischen Form zusammenhängen." He instances מַשְׁרַב Dan. 5, 5 Rabbinic מַשְׁרַב for Syriac من, and a few other possible cases.

But a few proper names, of ancient origin, in the Hebrew present this phenomenon.

(1) מַשְׁרַב. This is not to be interpreted, with *BDB* and König, *WB*, as from the Nif'al of מַשְׁרַב. Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, vol. 1, §203b, has recognized that the common noun מַשְׁרַב "striving", is originally an *m*-prefix formation (following Steinienger, ZATW 1904, 141, on a similar but doubtful etymology). But the logical deduction has not been drawn by the lexicons for מַשְׁרַב. It is to be compared with Arabic *miflah*, instrument for twisting string, *maffalah*, bobbin. The tribe was named after a characteristic art.

(2) The place name מַשְׁרַב, Neh. 11, 34, which has never been explained, is another case in point; it comes from מַשְׁרַב. It is our only evidence for the existence of the root *baldu*, so well known in Assyrian, in the Hebrew (which has preserved the related מָלַש, מָלַס). Also, if the vocalization is correct, it represents the archaic pass. participle of the Pi'el. May the name be possibly preserved in the Wady Deir Ballūṭ, to the N of Lydda?

(3) In this case I oppose a position which has become almost axiomatic. Von Calice, OLZ 1903, 224, proposed reading the Spring of מַשְׁרַב as "the Spring of Menepthah", Egyptian alternate form of Merneptah, the Egyptian Pharaoh. Meyer, *Die Israeliten*, 222, hailed this as "eine schöne Entdeckung,"
and it has been almost universally accepted. The discovery appears to be capitably corroborated by an Egyptian text which refers to "the Spring of Meneptah which is in the mountain," in Zaru, i.e. Palestine. Accordingly identification has been made either with Lifita or the Pools of Solomon. But if a native etymology can be had, it is to be preferred. And this can be found by regarding מֵיתָן as a regular transformation from מִיתָן. The word =Arabic miftāḥ, "key" (where Hebrew has מֵיתָן). The related Arabic mafsāh, "lock, Lock," would be a natural figure for a spring entailing also the idea of a key. In balancing our judgment on the proposed Egyptian etymology we must reckon with the (almost?) entire absence of Egyptian place-names in ancient Palestine.

The parallelism מֵיתָן מֵיתָן, "Memphis," may be of similar origin, but W. Max Müller holds, in Ges.-Buhl, that both forms may have come from Egypt.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY

Philadelphia Divinity School

An Inscribed Eye of a Babylonian Idol

A lady in New York City owns an interesting object about the size and thickness of a $20 goldpiece. It is composed of banded agate and is pierced by a hole through the entire flat diameter. It carries on its surface a six-line inscription written in the script of the new Babylonian empire, and is legible, except the last line which is partly broken off. On a wax impression of it sent to the writer the following inscription is found:

---

For the text see Breasted, Anc. Rec. 3, 629ff.; Gressmann, TuB 249.
1. To the god Nebo
2. Nebuchadrezzar
3. King of Babylon
4. Son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon, for his life,
5. presented (this).

Langdon in his *Neubabylonische Königinschriften* (VAB IV) has given in transliteration and translation readings from four similar objects. Of those, three are dedicated to Marduk, and but one, as this one, to Nebo.

The first two of these four were published by Schrader in the *Monatsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* in 1879; the first view is reproduced on p. 293 and discussed on pp. 292-294. A photograph faces p. 288, No. 2, but is not as clear as the copy on p. 293; the inscription appears on p. 202. It reads:

“To Marduk, his lord, Nebuchadrezzar, the king of Babylon, has presented (this) for his life.”

The second gem was also published by Schrader in the same volume facing p. 288, No. 4, and is translated on p. 295; it reads as follows:

“To Nebo, his lord, Nebuchadrezzar, the king of Babylon, the son of Nabopolassar, the king of Babylon, has presented (this) for his life.”

A third gem quoted by Langdon reads:

“Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, son of Nabopolassar, has presented (this) to Marduk his lord.”

The fourth gem reads as follows:

“To Marduk, his lord, Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, son of Nabopolassar, has presented (this) for his life.”

This first gem (38a) is reproduced again by Menant in *Revue Archéologique*, III Série, 6, 79, and discussed on pp. 79-86. The Berlin object (38a) which Schrader published is only a glass-paste replica of the original which Menant saw in Florence. Jeremias has reproduced the same in *ATAO*² p. 532.
Langdon does not say in his notes where the other gems are preserved.

The text of this New York gem closely resembles the second of the four collected by Langdon. It leaves out in the first line "his lord", reading simply "To Nebo," and Kudurru of Langdon is the ideog GAR-DU, and for Babylon, Langdon's copy reads as if both occurrences were the same ideograms, but this gem reads after Nebuchadrezzar KA-DINGIR-RA, and that after Nabopolassar's name TIN-TIR. While this is a small and apparently insignificant object, it is just one other remnant of an age which has a charm for both Semitic and Old Testament scholars.

IEA MAURICE PRICE

University of Chicago
REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Das Mahābhārata. Seine Entstehung, sein Inhalt, seine Form. Vor HERMANN OLDENBERG. Göttingen: VANDENHOECK UND RUPRECHT, 1922.

Among the papers left by the late Professor Oldenberg, who died in March, 1920, were found what at first appeared to be scattered notes on the great Hindu epic. A careful scrutiny revealed that though inscribed on sheets of all sizes and laboriously corrected these notes were actually a completed work, which Oldenberg’s colleague, Professor Andreas, has now made public, prefacing it with a single page of explanation and eulogy.

One may fittingly begin a review of Oldenberg’s Mahābhārata with a commemorative word. Not long before his death he had published a work on the Upanishads, quite a new departure for him who had already become an authority on Buddhism and on the Rig Veda. It seems as if his energy needed always a new outlet; and not content with covering so many fields with the fructifying streams of his ripe scholarship, at the last he turned it upon the province of epic poetry, with which it is somewhat of a surprise to find him engaged at all; for all his earlier productivity had to do with the earlier age of the Veda and of Pali literature. But he had evidently occupied his leisure with something more human than religious tracts; and in this, his last volume, he gives us the result of much meditation. Not investigation. He comments rather than theorizes, and with one exception the present study may be said to be chiefly a review of the great epic as an aesthetic production, a comparison of Hindu and Greek epic poetry, observations on metre, on metaphor, an inquiry into the moods of the epic writers, etc.—in short, the epic as literature, as a human document.

The one exception has to do with Oldenberg’s general theory of prose beginnings in connection with metrical verses, which latter he is inclined to think have in sundry instances been left stranded, as it were, with no vestige left of their original
prose environment. Rather dogmatically, as the reviewer thinks, on the basis of a few prose-and-metrical episodes, the author assumes rather than proves that the epic was written at first in prose and then converted into metrical tales, many of which, to be sure, have no prose attachment but may be supposed to have been composed after the prose epic had been converted into poetry. It depends somewhat on what one calls the original epic. If one finds in the Book of Beginnings the beginning of the epic, one may certainly point to the prose there embalmed and say, Behold the beginning of the epic in prose. But if one questions whether the whole Book of Beginnings is not really in the nature of an addition, whether it is not probable that there was an epic account of the gambling-scene and the resultant war as kernel of the whole, then the prose origin of the epic becomes a matter of grave dubiety. Similarly, why seek for the germ of epic form in the episodes now strewn through the immense poem, which has conglomerated into one whole a mass of originally discordant elements? Dahlmann's theory that the epic was at first a law-book, a theory damned by the author with scornful silence, might just as well be upheld on the basis of episodic preachings and the declaration in the Book of Beginnings that the epic is indeed a law-book as well as a kāvyam. Oldenberg himself is not quite consistent in his exposition of the prose origin of the epic. He seems at one time to regard the original form as prose (since vanished) interspersed with verses; at another, as wholly prose with later poetic intrusions.

In regard to other problematic matters, such as the theory that the original epical theme was inverted and that its present heroes became its villains, the author speaks as briefly as sanely; he will have none of it. He suggests, however, that the whole rôle of the man-god Krishna was a later contribution to the original theme. For the rest, in commenting on the part played by bards and on the military caste in general, he relies, with generous acknowledgment of indebtedness, on the work of specialists who have traversed this field before him. He prefers to linger over the episodes; Sāvitrī and Damayantī impress him by their strength and delicacy; he shows how the character of heroes and heroines is depicted and dwells on the manner in which the poet leads them along the path of fate. He muses
on the general view of the world held by the epic writers and compares the wild forest of their imaginings with the Hindu jungle, the vagueness of their characterization in many cases with their vague ideas of space and time; the epic is a reflex of Hindu mentality.

In discussing the epic language and metres Oldenberg is content to be merely a narrator of facts, and in this part of the book one wonders what kind of a public he is writing for, since he is at pains to explain at length the simplest linguistic and metrical phenomena. Apparently he intended his work for a general but cultivated circle of readers, to whom metre, style, and composition of the epic (including the plot) would be matter of novelty, though he prefaces this with a revolutionary theory of origins which only a specialist could properly evaluate. The author’s own style is felicitous and his work is agreeably lacking in the acrid contentiousness which disfigures so many works treating of the same subject.

E. Washburn Hopkins

Yale University


Despite the evidence of human experience, we are so accustomed to divide gods, men, and things into two mutually exclusive categories, the good and the bad, that it is not easy for us to conceive of a deity like Rudra, who is at the same time a destructive beast and a benevolent physician. For the mere historical evolution, through a euphemism, of the terrible Rudra of Rig-Veda into the epic Śiva of the Hindu trinity does not explain a contradiction that exists in the earliest Veda and seems to be quite natural to Vedic anthropomorphism. The apparent inconsistency in Rudra’s character is a part of the paleness of individuality, the diffuseness of attributes and functions, and the unmorality, according to our standards, that mark the entire Vedic pantheon. And it is this, together with a scholarly predisposition to seek in every god a definite force of nature, that has made so difficult a real understanding of Rudra’s origin, personality, and history.
Arbman attempts to solve the problem by an analytic and synthetic study of all the material, both Vedic and post-Vedic. While he may not have caught the god in the moment of his creation, and while his evidence may not amount to proof, he has at least evolved a theory that seems reasonable in itself, minimizes several difficulties, and appears to survive every test of application; and that is about the best that can be expected in such matters. The book is a real contribution to methodology. The material is handled with delicacy and sureness of touch, interpreted with keenness of perception, and presented with fairness and logic.

The author's interest is directed primarily toward the popular element in the ancient Indian religion, an element to which recent scholarship is giving increased attention in its search for the origins of India's complicated religious life. Outside of the mechanized and ritualized religion of the Vedic priests, in the popular cult of demons, which by its very nature was largely excluded from the hieratic texts, he finds, with unvedic distinction of personality, the real god Rudra. His theory, in outline, is as follows.

In his original character Rudra is a gruesome, terrestrial demon, a product of primitive conceptions of death and its horrors. From this ancient demonic figure there runs, entirely within the popular religion, an unbroken line of development to the popular god Śiva. The Rudra of the later Vedic tradition is not a direct descendant of the Rig-Vedic Rudra, but represents a far more original type out of which the Rig-Vedic Rudra was, relatively late, developed, in order then, still later, to give way to his popular double. The cause of the development is to be sought in the religious sterility of the Vedic sacrificial priests. In essential characteristics the popular Śiva type represents the original Rudra.

Although Rudra was a god of death, he was no Yama to show departing souls the way to immortality or to rule over them in the abode of the dead. He has no connection with the Pitaras. Rudra has many features in common with certain death-gods of other Indo-European peoples, with the Germanic Odin and the Greek Hecate. These agreements are certainly to be explained by close relationship, but Arbman postpones, without prejudice, a verdict on von Schroeder's claim that Rudra and
Odin represent a common inheritance from one and the same Indo-European type of god; at least Rudra-Śiva seems to belong to a more primitive, ruder type, perhaps to the corpse-eating demons of death.

Arbman sees in the Rudra of the Rig-Veda a priest-exalted but essentially demonic god who hurls his murderous missiles from heaven upon earthly creatures, but who has a positive side as a helper and benefactor of men when his favor is properly invoked. He has considerable individuality, but he is so lacking in concrete features that it is impossible to explain his original character with the Rig-Veda as the only, or even chief, source, as many scholars have attempted to do. But even in the Rig-Veda Rudra does not reveal himself in the thunderstorm; his bolt is merely the imagery of sickness and death—unless the same weapon is to make Varuṇa, Agni, Dyaus, and other gods and even demons into personifications of the thunderstorm. And the Rig-Veda itself shows that the connection of Rudra with the Maruts was one of association rather than relationship.

In the later Vedic literature Rudra appears as the same malevolent and benevolent individual whom we have just seen in the Rig-Veda, only here he is not a god of heaven, but an earthly being of a lower, more popular type, excluded from the soma sacrifice, friend and patron of thieves, seen sneaking in lonely places by herdsmen and maids, a demon of the mountains, the crossroads, and the wilderness, himself lord of the demon world. The evil which he inflicts consists of various maladies and epidemics. To him one sacrifices when disease breaks out among men or cattle. To Arbman, this late Vedic Rudra is, as we have seen, the real Rudra, descended through the popular religion from the original demon out of which the Brahmins independently developed the Rig-Vedic deity. Śiva likewise lives wild in the forest, wears an animal skin, in general stands close to primitive nature, and identifies himself with the popular Rudra of late Vedic tradition.

---

1 See Arbman's references on pp. 23ff.
2 Here is the chiasm of the two sides of Rudra. The god who causes the disease is asked to cure or prevent it: a sort of simulius similibus curandus. This is not sufficiently stressed by Arbman.
This leads into a long discussion of Rudra’s position in the Vedic ritual, and the relations between the Brahmanical religion and the popular cult, a discussion into which we cannot go here, but which is important for Arbman’s argument. He discusses, among other ceremonies, the *traiyambakahoma*; the *bali* as an uncooked, merely exposed, popular sacrifice; the word *deva* as including both gods and demons; the Maruts and the Rudras; Rudra as *bhūtapati* ‘lord of demons’; the *śatarudriya* as a rite applying to the world of demons and its ruler Rudra; the epithets of Rudra in the *śatarudriya*; (adversely) the identification of Śiva as a fusion of Agni with Rudra. An entire chapter is devoted to Rudra’s essential character as a god of death.

There will be much resistance among scholars to Arbman’s theory. The great majority of Western Vedists are on record as favoring the conception of Rudra as a god of the storm, especially the thunder-storm: Weber, Kuhn, Whitney, Lassen, Ludwig, Barth, Kaegi, Monier-Williams, Hardy, Deussen, Bloomefield, Hopkins, Macdonell. Hillebrandt views Rudra as a god of the climatic terrors of the tropical hot season that follows the rains, Bergaigne sees in him a form of *le père céleste*, and several have followed von Schroeder in considering Rudra the Indo-European leader of the souls of the dead, riding in the wind and storm. Arbman is closest to Oldenberg, who has recognized Rudra as an unheavenly product of the lower mythology, a death and disease-bringing power of the mountains and forests, akin to the European fauns and satyrs. Winternitz and, in less degree, Pischel have agreed with him.

To the reviewer, the situation is about as follows. (1) The interpretation of Rudra as a god of the thunder-storm is decidedly unsatisfactory. Almost the only evidence for that theory is the bolt with which the Rig-Veda arms him, and his association with the Maruts. But the thunderbolt is almost as common a weapon in the Vedic pantheon as the club in savage society; and the association with the Maruts is not one of character. Moreover, and this seems not to be mentioned by Arbman, thunder-storms in northern India are not of sufficient frequency and severity to explain the Rig-Vedic picture of the god and his terrors: a pupil of the writer has lived eight years near Allahabad and has never seen even a tree struck by lightning. Rig-Veda makes Rudra a devastating slayer of men and cattle;
the inference is that whole communities are laid low by his wrath. (2) There is, as Arbman claims, a decided break in the continuity of Rudra between the Rig-Veda and the later Vedic texts, a break which seems best explained by assuming a resurgence of an ancient popular tradition, which itself best explains the still later Śiva. (3) Rudra appears even in the Rig-Veda as a god of sickness, pestilence, and death. This is probably his original character. (4) If this was his real character, then the demonic prototype of the late Vedic Rudra is more original than the celestial Rudra of the Rig-Veda, and the latter was largely a hieratic adaptation which did not have sufficient vitality to persist unchanged even within the Brahman tradition. (5) One hesitates at Arbman’s early and definite localization of the god on the Muñjavant and in the Himalayas: the reviewer still retains a certain sympathy for Hopkins’ tirade against Oldenberg’s “Old Man of the Mountains.”

Of the larger questions involved only this need be said here: The antiquity of the Rig-Veda gives a presumption but not proof of priority. There is no doubt that in Rig-Vedic times there was a deep current of popular religion, flowing from very ancient sources, and for the most part avoiding hieratic channels. Every attempt to reconstruct this primitive folk-religion and every attempt to determine priority must be judged on its merits. It may add to our understanding of the earliest Vedas; in Arbman’s case it apparently does.

Princeton University

HAROLD H. BENDER


It has occasionally been recognized that the Yoga doctrine which has been found in Buddhism unites with the codified system of practical philosophy known as Yoga in presupposing, in at least one current of Indian thought, a long period of less organized belief in the efficacy of a physically induced and ecstatic concentration of the mind as a means of establishing some kind of contact between God and man. But the stream
has not often been explored back of the Upanishads. As a
philosophic system the Yoga is so closely connected with the
Sāṅkhya that little effort has been made to find special origin
for the distinctive practices that characterize the Yoga and
have for many centuries played so important a rôle in the re-
ligious life of India.
Chiefly Oldenberg and Garbe 1 have found traces of yoga ec-
stasy in the Vedic hymns. Their view is succinctly put by
Garbe: "Diese asketischen Kontemplationszustände des Yoga
sind das Endresultat einer langen Entwicklung, die uns zu-
rückführt bis in die Zeiten der Wildheit, zu den uralten
Ueberreizungskulten, die von jeher allerorts auf Erden bei den
Naturvölkern als Mittel zur Gewinnung von Zauberkräften
gült worden sind und von denen wir auch im Veda Spuren
vorfinden." 2 But so relatively slight in extent and so out of
harmony with the real life and spirit of the Veda have these
traces appeared that they have been generally ignored by most
scholars who have discussed its literature and religion.
Some phases of yoga must go far back. Life in India was
continuous from the four Vedas to the Upanishads, and the
practices of yoga, distinctive and exaggerated as they are in
their application and purpose, are for the most part and at bot-
tom ordinary human activities. Furthermore, there cluster
around the word tapas in both Rig-Veda and Atharva-Veda
the obvious nuclei of the physical asceticism which has always
remained the mechanistic foundation of the mental asceticism
of yoga. And there can be little doubt that here and there in
the Vedas are to be found emergences of the ecstasy of a lower
religious stratum which is alien to the spirit of the Vedas
themselves, whether that stratum come, as Gough thinks, 3 from
the non-Aryan aborigines of India or whether it represent a
more primitive and popular Aryan practice that found little
welcome in the aristocratic and hieratic productions of the
Vedic seers.

1 Hermann Oldenberg. *Die Religion des Veda*, Berlin, 1894, pp. 400 ff.;
246 ff.
3 Archibald Edward Gough, *The Philosophy of the Upanishads and An-
But Hauer goes far beyond this. He not only discovers genuine yoga ecstasy abundantly in the Vedas, but, in his own words (p. v), he views the Rig-Veda and Atharva-Veda in the light of religious-ecstatic experience. The first requirement in an estimation of his claim is an exact understanding of his use of terms. By *Yogapraxis* Hauer means the whole of India’s ecstatic practices (*Übungen*), whether they be ancient or modern, and whether they aim at the attainment of supernatural powers, communion with the gods, or union with the All-soul (p. 1). By the word “ecstatic” he designates all states in which the individual is more or less “taken out of himself” (*ausser sich*); i. e., all mental changes in which the waking consciousness, being concentrated upon one point (object, action, or thought), is altered, weakened, or even wholly or partly extinguished, so that the subconscious mental activity takes its place. Likewise, all means and practices that induce such states are designated as “ecstatic” (pp. 1–2). But, lest all this seem too general for identification, the author goes on to ascribe confidently to oldest India “eine Yogapraxis im eigentlichen Sinn d. h. ausgebildete, wirklich ekstatische Übungen, wie sie das spätere Indien aufweist” (p. 3).

It will be seen that Hauer goes the whole road. Here is no talk of vague traces, of crude beginnings, of primitive practices that may have later developed into yoga. This is yoga itself in the hymns of the Veda.

Hauer’s evidence lies mainly in his interpretation of nearly five hundred words, phrases, passages, and hymns in Rig-Veda and Atharva-Veda. The individual yoga activities that he identifies or infers include regulation of the breathing, sweating, the sitting posture, silence, solitude, begging, fasting, dancing, trembling, music, singing, shouting, consumption of toxicants and intoxicants, etc. He finds yoga in the *dikṣā* ceremony (pp. 65ff.); in the *brahmācārin*, conceived as a genuine ecstatic, “der auf brāhmaṇ ausgeht [car], d. h. einer, der sich mit der geheimen Zauberkraft zu erfüllen trachtet” (pp. 79 ff.); in *tapas*, which is interpreted as magic heat and in which is found a strong element of religious suggestion (pp. 98 ff.). He discerns it in Vedic words like *dakṣa* (p. 30), *vipra* (p. 49), *manyu* (p. 51), *man*, *dhī* (pp. 156 ff). He sees it in various Brahmanical sacrifices (pp. 116 ff., 128 ff.), and in the *keśin* and the *vrātya*,...
whom he views as primitive yogins unconnected with the Brahmanical sacrifice (pp. 168 ff., 172 ff.).

In particular the vrātya and in general all yoga that is not associated with the sacrifice are derived by Hauer from the warrior or princely caste and from the lands to the east of the great Brahmanical centers of culture, especially from Magadha. Later this vrātya type obtained recognition from the Brahmans, who had developed their own ecstatic practices. This union of the two distinct ecstatic systems resulted in the classical yoga (p. 186). In Hauer’s opinion all this raises to a certainty Garbe’s claim that the Sāṅkhya is a Kshatriya philosophy (p. 187), and explains, through the origin of the vrātya in Magadha, the presence of yoga in Buddhism (pp. 187 ff).

To the reviewer Hauer’s textual evidence seems to divide itself into several classes:

1. Vedic passages, especially in late hymns, which do seem to contain signs of the religious ecstasy of primitive peoples. Here apparently belong the RV. keśin or muni (and x. 136) and the AV. vrātya (and Book xv), as well as much of the Vedic use and worship of intoxicating soma, and, for various aspects of yoga, hymns like RV. i. 164 and AV. xi. 5.

2. Assumption of Vedic yoga by inference, parallel, association, or other indirect evidence. Thus (pp. 9 ff.) ecstatic breathing is assumed for the Veda from its appearance in the Upanishads; from the quickened breath in the ecstatic dance of primitive peoples; from the blowing of the fire in the Agni sacrifice that is indicated in the Brāhmanas; from the association in RV. of the word śusma ‘snorting, panting’ with Indra and Soma, of whom the one performs his deeds in ecstatic excitement and the other produces the excitement; from the ritualistic holding of the breath in the Sūtras; from the association in AV. of praṇa ‘breath’ and tapas ‘ascetic heat’; from the parallel in AV. of three phases of breathing, praṇa, apāna, and vyāna; etc.

3. Passages in which appear merely the physical attitudes and actions which later are used in yoga discipline to cause the subconscious mind to transcend the waking consciousness, and which may thus be considered the remote beginnings of yoga practices. In this class the reviewer would include the sitting posture of priests and gods, to which Hauer devotes many pages (pp.
21 ff.), and most of his citations for mystic silence, solitude, and uncleanliness of person (pp. 31 ff.).

4. Passages in which even extreme symbolism, poetic exaggeration, or religious fervor does not reach the ecstasy of yoga. A single example, more typical of the Veda itself, to be sure, than of Hauer’s treatment, will suffice. In RV. v. 59. 6, where the worshipers beg the Maruts to come to them as heavenly bridegrooms, and in other hymns, Hauer sees reflections of the idea of a mystic sexual union between the ecstatic votary and the divinity. But the Vedic phrase has exactly the same imagery and the same purpose as Psalm 19. 5, where the sun “is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race.”

5. Passages which by reason of the difficulty of their interpretation or by reason of the elusiveness of their application to yoga are at present incapable of final evaluation in this connection. Here one must place the Vedic references that seem to Hauer to point to the ecstatic side of Indra and other gods (pp. 41 ff.).

6. Passages in which the yoga interpretation appears to be incorrect, forced, or in some other way improbable. It is safe to say that no other hymn of RV. seems to Hauer quite so full of yoga material as the famous “frog-hymn,” vii. 103 (pp. 19, 31, 68 ff.). He finds plainly in it the dikṣā ceremony, if not by name; and he sees yoga in the soma of the Brahmans and the sweating of the Adhvaryus, in the estival silence, stillness, and fasting of the frogs, in their croaking, in their cloaking themselves (in mire), in their ātapas (hot mud), and perhaps in their contorted posture and their leaping, as well as in the shouting of the students and the singing and praying of the priests (p. 71). But to the reviewer there is not the slightest asceticism, physical or mental, in the hymn, and not a sign of ecstasy in the yoga sense. It is just two things: a naturalistic poem about frogs, real frogs, and a sacerdotalized rain-charm.

Hauer’s book offers much that is new, much that is true, much that is important; and his general theory and his textual exegesis should be taken into account by future writers on the nature and purpose of the Vedic Collections. His argument is

---

2. Mention should be made somewhere, however, of a carelessness in the
ably and honestly presented, but it is, after all, the brief of the plaintiff and leaves the rebuttal to others. One frequently gets quite a different impression in turning from Hauer’s carefully selected and arranged material to the hymns themselves. The dissimilarity between the *milieu* of the Veda and the classical *yoga* then becomes more apparent, and the author occasionally seems to have read back into the earlier text that which is distinctly a development and expansion of a later time.

Hauer, of course, makes no such classification of his material as was suggested above, but he would put most of his examples into the first two classes, whereas to the reviewer all of the other classes loom very large. Especially does mere poetic and religious exaltation (Class 4) seem to explain much that may, in words, go far beyond existing belief and practice and still fall short of *yoga* ecstasy, which is a species of self-hypnotism. One wonders, for example, what scholars, three thousand years hence, would make of the fervent transubstantiationist hymns in our Presbyterian and Methodist *sanhittas*. As a matter of fact, they are poetry (in a sort), and neither theology nor ecstasy. For the latter we must look to the Holy Rollers, or a negro camp-meeting.

Princeton University

HAROLD H. BENDER

*Bhagavadgītā. Texte Sanscrit.* Dr. St. Fr. Michalski-IwienSKI.
(Publications de la Société Asiatique de Varsovie: I.)


The new Asiatic Society of Warsaw has made a worthy start in its series of Publications with this edition of the Bhagavad Gītā, the first ever printed in the Roman alphabet, and the first European edition since Schlegel-Lassen (1846), which is long since out of print.

The succinct introduction shows that the editor is thoroly at home in the enormous literature on the Bhagavad Gītā and related subjects. It also shows that he is not slavishly dependent on his predecessors. He does his own thinking; and his conclusions are judicious and impressive. He rejects, on grounds
citation of bibliographical references that is not excused, in 1922, by the fact that part of the investigation was pursued behind British barb-wire (p. vi).
which seem to the reviewer compelling. Garbe’s dissection of the Gitā. Modern, western ideas of logic and consistency are out of place here. He views the Gitā as a whole (p. x), tho he shows that this view is quite reconcilable with certain opinions as to possible or probable stratifications in its text (pp. v, vi). Sāṅkhya to him means simply “la réflexion,” not “number-system;” briefly yet effectively he shows that this is the original Hindu interpretation, and hints at the evidence (far too extensive to quote in full) which proves that in early times “Sāṅkhya” meant something quite different from the system of Iśvarakṛṣṇa. He is an admirer of the Gitā’s thoughts, and grows eloquent in his appreciation of them (pp. x ff.).

As to the text itself, the editor states the familiar fact that there are almost no textual variants in the manuscripts and editions of the Gitā. Hence the editorial task is relatively easy. Presumably the great sanctity of the Gitā (somewhat, if only with reserve, comparable to that of the Rig Veda), its tremendous vogue as a sacred book among the Hindus, has protected it from many textual corruptions. Most of the variants of any consequence are listed on p. 46; a few others on p. v of the introduction. A rapid reading of the text has revealed few lapses. Obvious misprints are 2.5 bhunjiya for ‘iya, 2.68 ‘ūrtheyas for ‘bhyas, 4.35 bhūtany for ‘āny, 6.7 mānāpamānyayoh for ‘yoh, 6.19 neṅgate for neṅgate, 7.26 bhavisyāni for bhavis, 8.8 ‘gaminā for ‘gaminā, 9.11 mūdha for mūdha; 12.1 cāpy for cāpy, 17 title Sraddha for Śr, 17.21 puṇah for puṇah, 19.2 karmāṇām for karmāṇā, and, no doubt, 18.3 manisīṇāh for ‘gah. It seems that the editor rather than the printer must be held responsible for 2.11 gatasūn agatasūn ca (for gatas, agatas), 3.8 prasiddhyed with superfluous d and similarly 17.13 viddhihīnam, while conversely a d is lacking in 6.9 samabudhir, 16.9 ‘pabudhayaḥ. It happens not infrequently that macrons over long vowels are printed so faintly as to be virtually invisible (e. g. in 2.66 ‘śātir, and the i in 11.34 yodhavīrān), which will trouble beginners. Frequently, also, the spacing between words is disturbingly irregular. But it is only fair to add that in general the typographical style and format of the book, and of the cover, are extremely attractive.

*Add bhūtābhavāna for bhūta, 10.15. (Postscript in proof.)
The reviewer would differ from the editor in judgment only at a few points of the text. In 11.37 I should read tatparam for "lat, param;" in 8.20 I prefer (vyakto) vyaktát to vyaktáti, cf. 8.18 avyaktád vyaktayák; in 11.43 gurur need not be changed to guror against, apparently, all native authorities; in 13.4 I do not see the need for Boehtlingk's emendation viniṣcitam for .confirmed by a Madhu-páthaḥ of K. The editor's punctuation seems to me at times more confusing than helpful; why, e.g., separate māṃ from the following eva (7.18), or ṛṣiṣya from the following ca (15.13), by commas? These minutiae, however, are offered only in the hope of helping to render the text letter-perfect; they do not detract seriously from its usefulness. The book satisfies a long-felt want and will be welcomed by all Indologists.

University of Pennsylvania

FRANKLIN EDGERTON


For the study of ancient culture, the cuneiform tablets discovered by Hugo Winckler at Boghazköi will prove to be of the greatest importance. Not only do they unveil the history of a large part of Asia Minor from the days of Šarrukin I (about 2800 B. C.) down to the time of the destruction of the powerful empire of the Hittites (about 1200 B. C.), but they also show the development of culture during the second millennium B. C. and present a huge material for the linguist. Every student of the near East, therefore, is looking forward to the publication of the treasures unearthed by Winckler's excavations, and will be thankful to the authorities of the Berlin Museum who, in spite of all difficulties, are proceeding to edit this material so quickly.

The new publication which we beg to make known to the readers of this periodical bears the title given above. In the course of the year 1922 not less than five volumes—each containing 50 plates about the size of the well-known Cuneiform Texts of the British Museum—have been published. A short

---

1 Cp. the texts edited by Forrer in Die Boghazköi-Texte in Umschrift (BoTU), 2. Band (Leipzig 1922), Nos. 1–5.
2 Abbrev. KUB.
summary of the contents of these volumes will show their multiplicity and importance.

The first volume is the work of Dr. H. W. Figulla; it contains texts written in the official language of the Hittite empire which, as it seems, was not called Hittite but Kanesian, while Hittite was the language spoken by the inhabitants of the cities of Arinna, Nerig, Zippalanda and others. But as we are accustomed to call the official language 'Hittite', it would not be wise to change this name into 'Kanesian'; on the other hand, we may call the genuine Hittite—a language sometimes occurring in ritualistic texts—proto-Hittite. Among the tablets of vol. I, Nos. 1–10 represent duplicates of the important historical inscription of king Hattušil III, published in KBo III 6, and restore large passages of it. Nos. 11 and 13 belong to Kikkuli’s handbook of the τέχνη ἰπποθή other parts of which have been published in KBo III 2.5 and KUB II 12. No. 16 is a bilingual edict of an old king Tabarna, written in Hittite and Accadian. Unfortunately a great deal of the inscription is mutilated, but enough remains to corroborate the fact that the methods hitherto used in deciphering these inscriptions are correct.

Vol. II, also published by Figulla, contains in the main ritualistic texts used at the grand festivals of the Hittite kings, No. 2 being partially a duplicate of KBo IV 1. Though the general trend of these rituals is intelligible, the particulars offer considerable difficulties and will require special study. All the copies made by Dr. Figulla are beautifully done and will scarcely require any considerable improvements.

---

5 A Proto-hittite text is contained in No. 14; v. col. II 14 [š]a-at-ti-li ki-il-la-an ma-al-di 'in (Proto-) hittite he recites as follows' (follow Proto-hittite sentences); similarly I 17.
6 Keilschrifttexte aus Boghaskoi (Veröffentl. d. Deutschen Orientgesellschaft).

II 11: I 40 read ĐI(1)-eš-ni; II 25 ku-in (̣); II 75 nu-ul-ma-al(1)-kan; I 18: IV 37. tik-il-la-ir(!); I 11: II 44 ė-na-ah(!)-nu-wa-ar; I 13: I 18 [ša]-ja-an[1]-zi; I 49 U(!)[1]. MU; II 16 GAN missing after XX; III 6 hid-kat-ti-nu(1) -ul-ki-zi-bi-zi; III 30 hid-kat-ti(1)-nu-an-zi; II 46 [pi-e-h]u(1)-te-zi; III 51 š-e-te-ni(1)-zi; IV 42 ku(1)-pa; II 16: I 16 mi(1)-im(1)-ma; II 1: I 42 SUM(1).

HILA; II 8: VI 3 A(1). NA. Most of these and similar errors may be due to the scribe.
Vol. III and IV have been copied by E. F. Weidner and are as well done as those of Figulla. These texts are for the most part written in the Accadian language. Vol. III contains fragments of public treaties, letters, historical fragments and syllabaries. No. 14 is especially valuable: it is a treaty between king Muršili and Tuppī-Tešup, the grandson of Azira the well-known Amorite chief. A Hittite duplicate of this inscription is No. 119. Nos. 63, 66 and 68 are letters of Waš-ma'a-Rea (Ramses II.)² to the Hittite queen Pudu-Hepaz. No. 71 is a letter beginning [a-n]a iša-at-tu-ši-li šarrī rabī šarr màt ḫa-[š]a-[l-t]-ti aḫi-ja ki-bi-ma um-ma ʾka-da-aš-ma-an-tur-gu šarru raḫā šarr màt kārā-du-ni-ja-aš aḫu-ka-ma. No. 72 restores the beginning of KBo I 10 showing that Hattušil's correspondent really is Kadašman-EN.LIL as was already surmised from the contents. No. 74 is a letter from Tuthalia of Ḥatti to Tukulti-Ninurta I of Assyria. All these texts are of great historical and chronological value. A good many fragments have been joined by Weidner to the documents published in KBo I and are assigned to their right places. Among the historical fragments we call attention to Nos. 85 and 89, Accadian duplicates of KBo III 1*. The rest of volume III contains vocabularies.² Though they are rather fragmentary, a special study may increase their value by finding out duplicates from the libraries of Babylonia and Assyria.

Vol. IV is of the greatest importance for the study of Hittite culture which, as we see, is largely dependent on Babylonia. Very valuable is No. 1, treating of ceremonies before war. The text itself is Hittite. It begins ma-a-an-ša-an. I. NA ZAG KÜR LŪ. KUR ZŪR. ZŪR i-ja-an-zi. 'if they perform offerings on

---
¹ So probably to be read instead of Abbi-Tešup; cp. the sign dup in KUB III 14: 2.
² Other letters of Ramses II. are Nos. 22, 25, 28(?), 66, 68, and some fragments in which the name is destroyed.
* Now transcribed together with several duplicates by Forrer in 2 BeTU 23.
² KUB III 94: II 12 we read NA [ki-ša-na]-a-la-ša-ši-ti-ša-ša-n-[ar]. As the Hittite verb means 'to go to bed, to repose' etc., we should expect ša(!)-la-ša-ša-n(ā) in the Accadian column. The Semitic pronunciation kiš-su would better fit in with GIS. NA 'bed'.—III 95: to perhaps [na]-ru-n (i. e. nāru) = ku-na-ar 'to slay'.—III 103: I to li-ša-a-du (i. e. laḫdu) = ma-at ku-[mar] 'to jump (away), to flee'.

the border of the enemy's land, (then the offering priest) offers one sheep to the sun (-goddess) of Arinna and to [read: A.K.A(l)] Tešup, the protecting deity, to all the gods, to Telibinu of Durmitta, the male and the female gods, the...gods, all the
gods, to all the mountains and rivers. One sheep they offer to Zidharia'). At the end omena, taken from the kidneys of the
immolated sheep, are given in the Accadian language and
translated into Hittite. No. 3 contains proverbs in both languages,
No. 4 sentences probably taken from hymns; cp. obv.
10 ff.: šá-am-mi ši-e-ri a-na ku-ru-um-ma-at bu-li ta-pa-an-ni"
'thou createst the herbs of the field as nourishment for the
beasts' = Hitt. ú-li-li-jā-ás-ma ki-ik-la-an LIL-āš...[,] a-da-
an-na e-eš-šá-[at-til]; kíkklás therefore = 'herbs'; utiliš = 'field';
od-an-na = 'nourishment', šēšdā- = 'to create' (also = 'to produce, to
effect'). No. 5 presents short sentences in phonetic Sumerian,
translated into Hittite; e.g. l. 13 ff.: an-la ḫi-in-gal me-la-a
ši-im-li-im 'from heaven abundance copiously (me-ta-a = MÉŠ.
TA?)...,' Hitt. nu-ne-pi-šá-za i-[a-da] ḫu-um-ma-an he-ja-um-
a[a-n[i...]; nepš therefore = 'heaven' ijada" = 'abundance', ḫu-
man= 'copious'. No. 6 (belonging to No. 5?) shows how in-
tensely the Hittites studied Sumerian texts; there are two
columns, one containing Sumerian sentences in the usual spelling,
the other in phonetic transcriptions, e.g. Obv. 6: ûgal dšškur
gú-gal kalam-ma=lu-gal iš-kur ku-gal ga-lam-ma 'King Adad,
leader of the land'. Then follow Sumerian and Accadian texts
of mythological or religious character.11 No. 12 is an Accadian
fragment of the Gilgamesh epic14, mentioning a dream of Gilgamesh's
(Obv. p. 13) and the conflict between Gilgameš, Engidu and
Ištar. Among the following texts we find portions of Š.E.
NU, SUB (Nos. 13, 24), of the exorcism of the evil spirits (No.
16), of the series ḫu šamaš ina ñinika (Nos. 20, 21), a hymn to

11 štabanni.
12 Also KUB IV 4: I 14 ši-ša= Acc. ḫi-en-gal-li. The formation is
like ku-ša-ta (Acc. ter-játu) KBo I 35: 17; Arzawa-letter I 22.
13 No 11 is Sumerian and Accadian; l. 6 read ḫu-pa(l)-num-ma = (l.7)
ḫu-un-us-ša-ni, showing that bunene is the correct pronunciation of the
name of Šamaš's charioteer.
14 Hittite fragments of the same epic are KBo VI 1: 30–32, where the
hero is also called ḫī-gim-maš and his friend ḫī-en-ši-tum; a Hurritic fragment
(KBo VI 33) spells the name ḫ̣ū-ga-mi-ša-šu.
Nimurta, the ap-lim ešš-ra (No. 26; A 6 = ešš-ra), and portions of hemerologies (Nos. 42-46). No. 47 contains rites in Hittite with prayers in Accadian, the end (Rev. 32ff.) being a prayer to the stars.

The next section contains medical texts, the first (No. 48) showing that the term HU. HUR. RI which recurs in Hittite omens-texts is identical with Bûru. Ḥabrûd. TA (or DA), i.e. ʾissûr ḥurrı (cp. I 2. 8. 12 etc. with left margin, l. 1). The tablet has the signature DUB I (?) KAM Lû. ŠÂ. ZI. GA. The texts published by Weidner evidently prove that Hittite medicine was in the main totally dependent on Babylonia. The same is true with the omen literature, samples of which are Nos. 63 ff. We find astrological omen taken from the appearance of the sun (Nos. 63, 64, probably belonging to the series enuma anu ʾillî), omen of the tirânu (the intestines; no. 65) and of a part of the body (?) called MIR (No. 66)*, omen of the series summa izbu (Nos. 67-70) and—the most interesting fact—liver omen written on clay models of livers (Nos. 71-75). These clay livers are highly important for the identification of the different parts of the liver. We learn that the KI. GUB (= manzazu) and the GîR (= padânû) are located on the obverse, the Dân (= danânû) on the reverse. No. 72 shows that the manzazu may have the appearance of a saw-blade**, a picture of it being added. Sometimes the omen itself is Accadian, the interpretation, however, Hittite; e.g. No. 72 rev. summa

---

* No. 30 is a medical text.

** Note the frequent use of ZA (= amēlu) in these texts, e.g. 44: 8 ZA. Bî BE-bar (i.e. amēlu ša ilabbār). The text often gives several interpretations, e.g. I. 6: Išla'ma ** KI. II aššar-zu ana bî-ša ušūlub bîla šu tarpâš 'welfare; secondly: he may bring his wife into his house, his house will become large'; I. 7 ša miṣgâru KI. II aššatu ʾiṣḏâ KI. III (I cp. I. 10) ši-giša-a 'not favorable; secondly: he may take a wife; thirdly (!): rage' (= legû).

† The beginning is Sumerian (an ku-u-ga ki ku-a-ga 'pure heaven, pure earth' (kug = A2ZAG = ella); I. 33 an ši-ki-la ši-ki-la (škal = EL = ēbu).

* No. 59 does not seem to be medical, but probably is an omen text of the izbu-series.

** e.g. II 6 summa (= UD) reh MIR mûal-ši-ki-tum ši-li-af bīš aban šumuški lurrī-na-lu-tum ʾi-ti-e-ik-hu 'if the head of the MIR.... the full treasure houses of the king will grow empty'.

*** pl ši-ur-ši-ri (= šaššuri) is the 'edge of the saw'.

---
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(=BAD) rēš marri titu-ra-am ša širi šakin-ma me-šā uš-ta-ḫa-ak LŪ-āš ʾa-ii-li-mi-e-ja-ni ar-ma-ni-ṭa na-āš SIG (=lazzija)- at-ta na-āš ša-ma-aš-ša LŪ-āš ḫa-at-ɡa-u-wa-az ʾiḫ-e-ta-as ṣi-pa- ar-zi-zi 'if the head of the gall-bladder has a bridge of flesh and its water mingles, the man will be... and he will be sound and happy; or a man will rise from a secluded place'. The rest of vol. IV is filled with small fragments and supplements to KUB III. IV and KBo 1. Of special value is the re-edition of KBo I 27 (KUB IV, p. 50b) which is an Accadian duplicate (like KUB III 85. 89) of the great Telibina-inscription.

Vol. V, copied by Dr. Walther, is a collection of prophetic texts like KBo II 2, etc., the interpretation of which still offers, at present, considerable difficulties. As these tablets are less valuable for the average student of Hittite culture, I will not tire the readers of this periodical with a list of corrections which I might offer. I may only call attention to the corroboration of the reading of the name of the prince of Mirā ʾDIB+BA (?) KAK. TUR (KUB V 6: III 9, 21, 24) =maš-ḫu-i-lu-wa (ib. III 31), which already was suggested by a comparison of KBo IV 7: I 60 (ʾDIB+BA ?), KAK-wa) and KBo IV 3: I 1 (ʾDIB. B[?], KAK. TUR-wa) with maš-ḫu-lu-wa (KBo V 13: I 12).

University of Breslau

MINOR NOTICES


Directed against Friedrich Delitzsch ('Die grosse Täuschung') and A. Harnack. 'To discard in the twentieth century the Old Testament as canonical Scripture would be in direct contra-

\*\* =mašḫu+ particle ʾaḫu.
\*\* Cp. note 9 above.
diction to the testimony of Jesus and the apostles who found in the Old Testament divine will and promise; it would have disastrous religious consequences, and above all would simply mean an anachronism and the greatest folly which the evangelical church might commit'. The author then pleads for a proper understanding and evaluation of the Old Testament by means of judicious criticism.


Exceptions to Kittel's delineation of the future tasks in Old Testament studies from the point of view of orthodoxy.


A thoughtful study.


A concise history of Jewish Palestine from the beginnings to the present day. In the biblical part the author acknowledges himself to be entirely under the influence of Wellhausen.


Lazarus Lazarus (1822-1879), an elder brother of the philosopher Moritz Lazarus, was director of the Jewish theological seminary in Breslau from 1875 to his death and taught Talmud and rabbinical literature in that institution. The essay on talmudic ethics, now reprinted without alteration, was first published in 1877.

The British Museum with Bible in Hand. Being an interesting and intelligent survey of all the exhibits on view at the British Museum which confirm the absolute accuracy of the Holy Scriptures. By FRANK G. JANNAWAY. London: SAMPSON, LOW, MARSTON & CO. pp. 92.

Prefaced is a facsimile of letter of approbation by Sir Frederic G. Kenyon.

American re-edition of the English edition which appeared in 1905. A finely written account of the history of the English occupation of Egypt from the pen of the well-known traveller who took an active part in the struggle which he narrates, on the side of the native nationalist party. It is a record of intimate knowledge of the Orient, of courage, but also of one-sidedness and obstinacy. In the opinion of the author, he stands vindicated by recent political developments and he sees his country punished for the crime of occupation which he had sought to avert.


An interestingly written account of travel through Egypt, Sudan, Syria, Palestine, and India between 1919 and 1921. After-war conditions are portrayed largely from the official British point of view, and as an index to the feelings entertained in certain sections of the English press the policies recommended will make interesting reading. The decision of the United States government in 1922 to take no part in helping to keep the freedom of the Dardanelles is commented on in an unfriendly tone. The authoress is unacquainted with Oriental languages.


A useful compilation dealing with the area and population of China; geography; geology; fauna; flora; forestry & reforestation; climate & meteorology; people & language; newspapers & periodicals; products; mines & minerals; money, weights & measures; commerce; finance; currency; the new consortium (official documents); public justice; communications; defence; education; Greater China; the Russian problem in China; war & post-war problems; river conservation & harbors; manufactures; opium; religions (with Mission statistics); the famine in North China;
the Chinese customs tariff; the Chinese government (historical sketch and the present organization); brief biographies of prominent Chinese; and miscellaneous matters; also customs-revenue and trade statistics. There is a map of China showing railways.


A sumptuous publication with beautiful illustrations.


Chapter XX deals with the problem of Japanese immigration to the United States. The volume is replete with vivid description.

_Zen Buddhism and its Relation to Art._ By _Arthur Waley._ London: Luzac, 1922. 32 pp. 2sh. 6d.

A pamphlet which "makes no attempt at profundity", but which nevertheless gives a remarkable informative and readable, tho brief and popular, account of the fundamental ideas and historic development of Zen Buddhism, as well as of its "relation to art" (without illustrations, however; for them the reader is referred to the Japanese art publications _Kokka_ and _Shimbi Taikwan_).

_Vedic Antiquities._ By _G. Jouveau-Dubreuil._ Doctor of the University of Paris; Professor, College, Pondicherry. London: Luzac, 1922. 29 pp. 1 sh. 6 d.

The author believes that he has discovered tombs of the Vedic period in the Kerala province, and that such tombs are quite exact imitations of human habitations of the same period. He also finds interesting survivals of Vedic practices and traditions in out-of-the-way parts of this region.


Sanskrit text and German translation of an abridged form of this Sanskrit "court-epic". The abridgment, made by Cap-
peller, omits Chapters 5–11 and 19 entire and about one-half of the rest. The parts omitted are the most artificial and difficult sections.


The works attributed to Śankara which are here translated are all in verse, and were, says the translator, intended to “expound in a popular style” the Advaita philosophy. The translation likewise aims to be popular and “free of technical words and phrases”; “in some instances literal and technical accuracy has been purposely sacrificed in order to make the translation readable and comprehensible by itself independently of the text.”


Biographical sketches, by various Hindu authors, of twenty-six “eminent orientalists”, including Jones, Colebrooke, Wilson, Fergusson, Telang, Max Müller, Bühler, Monier Williams, Whitney, Deussen, Bhandarkar, etc.

**OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED**

(Some of the following will be reviewed in later issues.)


Reviews of Books


NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

The second half (Parts 3 and 4) of Volume 42 (year 1922) of the Journal has not yet been received in this country as this issue goes to press (May 1, 1923), altho final proofs with instructions to print were sent to the printers in March. It is hoped that by the end of this year we shall have reestablished regularity in the appearance of the Journal.

NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES, ETC.

The British Society for Old Testament Study, which includes in its membership the best-known Old Testament scholars of Great Britain, is devoted to the advancement of Old Testament studies and kindred matters, and has a Publication Fund from which it subsidizes important publications in such fields. It meets twice a year; its last meeting was held in London, January 2-4, 1923, under the presidency of the Rev. Canon G. H. Box, whose presidential address dealt with the need for widening the scope of Old Testament studies. Other papers were read by the Rev. Principal H. Wheeler Robinson and by Prof. M. A. Canney. Several foreign visitors, from India, South Africa, and the United States, were present. The secretary, Rev. T. H. Robinson, Lynwood, Llanishen, Glam., writes that "the Society would always welcome at its meetings any American scholars who are interested in the Old Testament and allied studies," and that he "would be very happy to supply any such visitors to this country information regarding our meetings."

Dr. Ernst F. Weidner, Berlin-Charlottenburg, Wilmersdorferstr. 95, announces that he is about to begin the private publication of a periodical, Archiv für Keilschriftforschung, which will appear beginning 1923 in quarterly issues of 48 pages each, long folio size and shape (approximately "foolscap"), "clearly and legibly typed and multigraphed". The prospective contents are thus described: "eine Reihe von Aufsätzen philologischen, historischen und kulturhistorischen Inhalts, von denen jeder höchstens 10 Seiten umfassen soll, kurze Mitteilungen gleichen Inhalts, Rezensionen, soweit der Kritiker wesentlich neue Gesichtspunkte beibringen oder zahlreiche Einzelzusätze machen kann (kleine Rezensionen und Anzeigen sind ausgeschlossen), und eine ausführliche Übersicht über Ausgrabungen, Museums-Erwerbungen, Vorträge, wissenschaftliche Gesellschaften und Personalien, die in der Folgezeit auf den ganzen vorderen Orient ausgedehnt werden soll." A Beilage each year will contain a bibliography. The price for the U. S. will be Five Dollars a year. It is proposed to strike off only one hundred copies. The first issue contains contributions by Meissner, Langdon, Ungnad, Ebeling,
Unger, Schroeder, and Weidner. Contributions are invited from scholars in these lines all over the world; they may be composed in German, English, French, or Italian.

A "Société Asiatique de Varsovie" has recently been formed in Warsaw, Poland, and has begun a series of Publications, of which the first two have appeared, viz., Bhagavadgītā (Texte Sanscrit), and Atmabodha, both published in 1922, both by Dr. St. Fr. Michalski-Iwinski, who is Secretary of the Society. A review of the former of these works is printed elsewhere in this issue of the Journal.

The Oriental Club of Philadelphia, at a meeting held on May 19th, adopted a minute in memory of the Hon. Mayer Sulzberger, one of the Club's founders, who died April 20, 1923. The concluding paragraph of this minute reads as follows:

"This Club, composed largely of men who are professionally engaged in study and research on Oriental subjects—subjects which are fairly recondite and removed from the interest of the everyday man—feels that it was given a peculiar strength in having the unfailing interest and support of this eminent jurist and public man, and through him a link between the world of study and the great outer world. The members of the Club have always felt that in an age and a land in which the great mass of the people have considered study that is not of direct material benefit to them as almost eccentric, there was profound encouragement in the fact that a man of his type should not only take a contrary view, but indicate by his presence and his interest that to him these studies were of major, and not of secondary importance. Judge Sulzberger had a profound respect for scholarship and for every scholar. He was tolerant of all opinions founded upon genuine study, and was a tower of strength in the studies to which this Club is devoted. We shall miss his inspiration and his genial personality."

PERSONALIA

Dr. Truman Michelson, Ethnologist in the Bureau of American Ethnology and Professor of Ethnology in George Washington University, has been elected president of the Anthropological Society of Washington, D. C.
THE IRREDUCIBLE MINIMUM IN LEARNING
A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

THOMAS F. CUMMINGS
BIBLICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK

In learning a foreign language three difficulties confront us at the outset—pronunciation, vocabulary, and construction. Three elements are involved in correct pronunciation—articulation, timbre, and rhythm.

Articulation is the proper joining of organ to organ for the clearcut production of any and all "letters". It can be noted by watching the positions of lips, tongue, and larynx. Sometimes a wedge between the side teeth is a help to seeing. A slip of paper before the lips will differentiate between an aspirate and non-aspirate p, t, ch, or k.

Timbre is tone-quality and depends on organic basis, or the way in which the native holds his speech organs. It is copied best in singing, audible yawning, or in the hesitant "-uh", which so often follows the words of an unready speaker.

Rhythm is the tune of language, its pitch, time and stress. It is best analysed by humming a short sentence, after it has been spoken. Then contrast one's own and a short foreign sentence. It is the rhythm which enables us to tell the meaning of the sentence "Tell the lookout to look out and cry Look out." In this the first "lookout" has the high-low, the second the level-level, the third the high-higher pitch. Rhythm is best notated by dashes and glides which correspond in elevation relatively to the pitch changes of the speaker's voice.

Failure to master these three in combination always makes the speaker reveal himself as a foreigner. The minimum attainment in pronunciation is easy intelligibility; and the hearer, not the speaker, must be the judge of this attainment.

In vocabulary we have a range from the active command of a few hundred words to the passive command of the twenty to forty thousand words of the educated native. First there are the essential words used by all; then those words known by every
adult; and lastly the technical terms known only by the skilled. In a study of Business Vocabularies made by the Russell Sage Foundation, pamphlet E 126\(^1\), we note that 2,000 letters give a vocabulary of 2,001 words, used and re-used to a total of 23,629 times. Some words are of a much greater frequency than others, for 43 words are used 11,815 times; that is, 2\% of the words in the vocabulary make 50\% of the text.

A study in the Gospel of St. John in Hindustani, as compared with Chapter IV of the same Gospel, shows that the Gospel text has 37 pages; chapter IV has 1/17 as much. The Gospel words are 11,200; the chapter's 1300; total vocabulary respectively 1,028 and 305; nouns 49\%\(^2\) and 25\%\(^2\); verbs 14\%\(^2\) and 16\%\(^2\); pronouns 1 1\%\(^2\) and 16\%\(^2\); prepositions 4 1\%\(^2\) and 20\%\(^2\). From this we conclude that the dictionary value and the practical value are very different, so that it is safe to say that in aiming to master a language one should make his acquisitions in about the following ratios for the first 1500 words: nouns 40\%, verbs 27\%, adjectives 8\% with cardinals and ordinals 10\% more, adverbs 6 3\%\(^2\), prepositions 3 1\%\(^2\), with all forms of pronouns, conjunctions, interjections and particles and articles, if any. As a guide for determining the 1500 words I would suggest John's Gospel plus the words of buying, selling, housekeeping, traveling, visiting. The tendency in picking up a vocabulary is to gather nouns faster than verbs and words faster than the ability to assemble them into proper sentences.

This last difficulty, of construction, demands most careful consideration. Words are the material of speech. We might liken substantives and predicates to the bricks, but case-endings, or positions, or prepositions, to the cement by which our linguistic edifice becomes knit together. Sentence forms might be likened to the ground plan of our edifice. Simple indicative sentences make the vestibule, but compound sentences open out a hallway. The imperatives form our office and workshop, but if we wish to erect a superstructure, then we must master the complex in its various ifs, its as's, its whens, its thoughts;

\(^1\) Another good list, Eldridge's, can be had from Dr. C. P. G. Scott, Yonkers, N. Y.

\(^2\) Of total vocabulary.

\(^3\) In frequency of occurrence.
and to adorn it we must master the participle in all its permutations and combinations. Some are content to live in a simple shack and make the imperative do duty for the whole. Others are satisfied with a single simple tense, not thinking that thereby they are betraying their own simplicity. But the real student will lay his foundations broad and deep enough to carry any superstructure he may find time to rear.

To do this he must note that the sentence is the unit of speech. He must aim at a command of every typical unit. So he must be able to interchange these units in all their subjects, predicates and modifiers without hesitation. Above all he must drill until he can deliver these units at the rate of five syllables per second. This cultivates the motor-memory to the point where command of these constructions becomes automatic. Then the language is mastered.

In planning one's own study or testing a language method, one should see if it includes the imperative, the indicative mode in the present, past and future tenses, the present and past participles, and a simple conditional. It is quite likely that one may need two or three forms of the imperative and of the second person in all tenses, to be polite to others. If one is giving his whole time to one language, he may be satisfied with the above for a few months; then he must branch out into the subjunctives and complexities of expression.

The time necessary to learn a language varies. Probably 900 hours, distributed over 150 days, or six months, would suffice for mastering a vocabulary of 1500 words with the major constructions. By this time one should be at loss for no word within his vocabulary, or how to use it. After this he may acquire words at rapid rate. One African missionary said he learned 100 words a day by the Loisyette method. Fast or slow, the test of mastery is ability to deliver your thought at the rate of five syllables per second.

One of the best tests of one's mastery of a language is found in the ability to ask and answer any sort of a question regarding any fact, or time, or place or manner or number or size, or person, or material, or comparison, or price, or frequency, or reason, in the proper voice and in the tense or person or number of the indicative mode, as well as in the conditional form.

The methods to be used involve this principle that every lan-
guage must be the medium of its own impartation. Primary is the Slip Method, i.e., reciting the vernacular from slips, on which English sentences are written, in any order at normal speed. Then the Dramatic Method, playing at buying, selling, house-keeping, travelling; the Picture Method, the Question and Answer Method, Story Telling, the Object Method, for which one's first sentence must be "What is this?" and the second, "Please say it again".

Reading may follow ability to speak but not precede it; and writing is the best training in reading.
A SUPPOSED WORK OF AL-GHAZĀLĪ

RICHARD GOTTHEIL

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Any addition to our knowledge of the literary activity of al-Ghazālī, the great Mohammedan theologian of the eleventh century—the greatest theologian that Islam has produced—must be welcome to every student of Arabic letters. It was, therefore, with more than ordinary interest that, some time ago, I hit upon a ms. in the Collection of the New York Library, said—in the colophon—to be by him, but bearing a title which I could find in none of our ordinary works of reference. We are pretty well informed about the works of al-Ghazālī—from the long account of his activities to be found in al-Subki's Ṭabaḳāt al-Shafī‘iyyah of the fifteenth century, through Brockelmann, to the excellent articles of our colleague Professor Macdonald in our own Journal and in the Encyclopedia of Islam.

The title of the ms. was الفرق بين الصالح وغير الصالح i.e. "The difference between a Righteous and an Unrighteous Man". A glance at the work, the first third of which is wanting in the ms., showed me that it dealt with the functions of a ruler, and with the duties that lay upon those appointed by him to positions of trust. It was interesting enough by reason of its matter and its fund of anecdotes; and I translated a good two-thirds of the New York ms. As I translated, I began to feel that I was upon familiar ground; I remembered that al-Ghazālī had written just such a speculum or "Manual of Ethical Guidance for Kings" addressed to Mohammed the Great Seljuk in the year 498 A. H. (=1104 A. D.), but under quite a different title التغيير الس偶然 في صبة الملوك "Refined Gold concerning Advice given to Kings"—or, as it is usually cited for short, تغيير الملوك . The question arose naturally, What was the relation of the one work or title to the other?—especially as Muhammad Murtada

* Vol. xx, pp. 71-132. 85
The learned Sayyid Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Husaini al-Zabīdi, known as al-Murtada, says in his preface to his Commentary upon the Iḥyā, in section 9, in his account of the works of Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī, arranged according to the letters of the alphabet, he mentions it in his book Naṣḥat al-

*Brockelmann, Gesch. der arab. Lit. I., p. 422.*
Mulāk’. From this expression it is clear that the Sayyid Muḥammad Murtada had himself never set eyes upon a copy of the Fark. He mentioned it and knew of it only through al-Ghazālī’s referring to it himself in his book Nasīḥat-al-Mulāk. In the same manner Molla Kāṭibī, author of the Kashf-al-Zunūn, since he had not seen the book nor had he seen the reference made to it by Sayyid Muḥammad Murtada, did not mention it in the Kashf-al-Zunūn. I have taken all pains possible to find a copy in some eastern library, in order that I might fill out the signature that is torn at the beginning of this copy. I have been unsuccessful. The present copy I found in this country. I even asked the priest Anastasius, one of the Carmelite fathers sent to Baghdad, to look for a copy in the libraries of Europe; perhaps there may be a copy there from which the present valuable copy may be completed. So God will etc. etc."

B. On the fly-leaf at the beginning:

\[
\text{هذا كتاب الفرق بين الصالح وغير الصالح لابي حامد محمد بن محمد الغزالي وكتابا يجل في كتابه نصية الملكوك إلى هذا الكتاب وكتابه نصية الملكوك فارسي وهذا الكتاب قد زينه على نصية أبواب حنة}
\]

\[
\text{الباب الأول في سيادة السلطنة ومرة السلطان}
\]

\[
\text{الباب الثاني في سيناء الوزارة ومرة الوزارة}
\]

\[
\text{الباب الثالث في ذكر الكتاب وإداهم}
\]

\[
\text{الباب الرابع في سقون هم الملكوك}
\]

\[
\text{الباب الخامس في ذكر حكمة الحكما}
\]

\[
\text{الباب السادس في شرف العقل}
\]

\[
\text{الباب السابع في نعت النسا}
\]

\[
\text{ثم إن هذه النسخة من كتاب الفرق بين الصالح وغير الصالح}
\]

\[
\text{يكلم على بن أبي العلامة أحمد الإمام الغزالي فرغ من نسخه في}
\]

\[
\text{حادي عشر في المجلة سنة ثمان وأربعين وستمائة وإسحاق بن}
\]

\[
\text{يذكر نسخة تكتب ورقيين الأولين المقرونين ولم يذكر على نسخة أخرى}
\]

\[
\text{يبلاغنا الشرقي إلى الآن حره مالك النسخة أبو محمد الحسن}
\]

\[
\text{بن أبي الحسن الهادي} (؟) بن محمد علي بن صالح بن محمد بن زين}
\]

\[
\text{الابدين بن نور الدين علي بن علي بن أبي الحسن الهادي} (؟)
\]

\[
* i. e. Häggi Khalifah.
\]
This is the book 'The Difference between a Righteous and an Unrighteous Man' by Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Ghazālī; and very often he refers to this book in his [other] book 'The Mirror of Kings'. But his book Naṣḥat-al-Mulāk was written in Persian. This book the author has divided into seven excellent chapters:
2. Chap. 2. Upon the Rule of Viziers and their Mode of life.
3. Chap. 3. An account of Scribes and their Good Breeding.
4. Chap. 4. Upon the loftiness of Purpose of Kings.
5. Chap. 5. An account of the wisdom of the Wise.
6. Chap. 6. Upon the excellence of Understanding.
7. Chap. 7. Upon the Description of Women.

This copy of the Kitāb-al-Fark was written by 'All ibn Abī-l-Āshā’ir al-Imām al-Ghazālī. He finished copying it on the 11th of Dhu-l-Ḥijjah in the year 648. I ask God that he may throw in my way [another] copy, from which we could make good the first two signatures which are wanting. But I have not yet been able to hit upon another copy in our excellent country the possessor of the present copy Abu Muḥammad al-Ḥasan etc. etc. in the blessed month Ramadān in the year 1218 of the Hijrah. The Sayyid Muḥammad Murtaḍa al-Zubādī has counted this book in the number of the writings of the 'Imām Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī in the chapter...
devoted to the subject at the beginning of his commentary entitled Ḩafṣ al-Sādah fi sharḥ iḥyāʾ al-ʿulūm. But, it appears from the manner in which he writes, that he had never set eyes upon the book, because he uses the words 'as he refers to it in his book Naṣāʾīḥ-al-Mulūk'. I have inquired far and wide but I have not been able to find any other than this present excellent copy. Know also, that it appears from an expression (?) that the author uses in the second chapter, in which he deals with the office of Vizier, that the writer (?) lived during the days of the Seljuk kings. He makes a second remark to that effect. Now, the book Naṣāʾīḥ-al-Mulūk was also composed by him for the Seljuks. In the Kashf-al-Zunūn, the author mentions the title al-fark bain al-ṣāliḥ wa-ghair al-ṣāliḥ by the ʿImām Abu Ḥāmid Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Ghazālī, adding 'he [the author] mentions it in the book Naṣīḥat-al-Mulūk. It is plain [from this] that Mollah Kātib, also, had not seen it'.

C. A third owner of the ms., and evidently its latest before it came to this country, has written the following upon the last fly-leaf, and tries to solve the difficulty by ascribing the book to quite a different author. He says:

"Know that the author of this book is ʿAlī ibn ʿAbī-l-ʿAshāʾīr al-Ghazālī. I think that his real name is ʿAlī ibn ʿAbī-l-ʿAshāʾīr al-Ghazālī, whom al-Sayyid Murtada mentions in his commentary upon the Ḥyāʾ. His words are: 'Says the learned ʿAlī ibn ʿAbī-l-ʿAshāʾīr al-Ghazālī, the writer of the book "The Balance of Honesty for those who are near to God and are worthy of his favor":"

---

1 The plural is often found in place of the singular when the work is cited.
2 It is equally plain that the writer is wrong—no mention of it is to be found in the printed copy.
he died in the year 721. Molla Kâtib Chelibi says in his Kashf-al Zunun 'The Balance of Honesty etc.' by Alî ibn Muḥammad al-Ghazâli who died in the year [date omitted]. He is not the celebrated al-Ghazâli. Remember this!"

Now the Tibr al-Mashûk has been printed; and I have had before me both the edition of Cairo 1899 and that which is on the margin of al-Ţurṭushi’s Sirâj-al-Mulûk, Cairo 1888/9. I have gone through it with some care and I cannot find that al-Ghazâli mentions anywhere in the book a work by himself entitled al-Fârâk. More than this: I have compared the New York ms. with the printed al-Tibr, and find that it gives exactly the same text, without any difference whatsoever, except in so far as one ms. would show readings that are at variance with those of another. I had, at first, supposed that our ms. might contain merely an abbreviated text of the Tibr. We know that several of al-Ghazâli’s works were so abbreviated. His Bîdâyat al-Hidâya was put out in a shortened form by a certain Muḥammed ibn Yâhya al-Âsârî. The Mukâshafât-al-Ḳulûb in the Bulak edition of 1883 is a Mukhtâsar; and the Iḥyâ’ itself was abbreviated in a Persian translation. But our ms.—with its differing title—is the Tibr al-Mashûk word for word.

Are we then in the presence of two different titles for the same bit of writing? Both Gosche and Macdonald have noticed that in the prologue to the Tahâfut, the Maḥâsid is called Mi’yar al-ilm—the reference being undeniably to one and the same work. And it is interesting to note that when a Turkish translation was made of the very book about which I am writing its title was changed to "The Practice of Kings"; and it should be remembered that Kâtib Chelebi, s.v. تبيه الداروک says that this was the title of the Persian original and that the translator into Arabic gave it the title البیر السپورد.

We are therefore, I think, forced to the conclusion that despite the statement of al-Murtada and despite the notes written by the possessors of the New York ms., we are merely in the presence of one and the same treatise, which has circulated under two different titles. The uncommon one of the two

9 i.e. 1321 A.D.
existed already in the thirteenth century, the date at which our ms. was written. We can hardly accept the suggestion of one of the owners that the author is not the great al-Ghazālī. And, I am afraid, we must convict another of the owners of a slight dishonesty, for he has copied the titles of the chapters which are wanting in the ms. from the other work, not noticing that he had himself laid stress upon the fact that no other ms. of the Fārik was available from which to take them. But mss. often have a peculiar history—and so have their owners.
THE FORM AND NATURE OF E-PA AT LAGASH

GEORGE A. BARTON

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

TWO RULERS of Lagash who lived about 500 years apart
tell us of building a structure which they designate by the ideo-
grams E-PA. They are Ur-Nina, who lived about 3000 B.C.,
and Gudea, who lived about 2500 B.C. Gudea makes it clear
in his inscriptions that this structure was a seven-staged zig-
gurat on the top of which was a chamber for the wife of the god
similar to that on the top of the eight-staged ziggurat at Babylon
described many centuries later by Herodotus

The passages in Gudea which make this clear are the following.
In the inscription on statue D, after telling how he built the
temple Eninmu for Ningirsu, he says (col. ii, 11 ff.): ē-pa ē-
ub-im-ın-na-ni mu-na-rū šāg-ba nīg-sal-us-sā ęba-ū nīn-a-na-gē
si-ba-mi-sa-sa: "Epa, his temple of seven stages (or zones) he
built. In it the bridal gift of Bau, his lady, he placed"

On statue G, i, 11 ff. after he has spoken similarly of building
Ningirsu's temple he says: ęnīn-gir-su lugal-a-ni ē-pa ē-ub-
imin ē-pa-bi ša-g-bi-šu ęa nīn-gir-su-gē nam-dug-tar-ra mu-na-
rū nīg-sal-us-sā šāg-šul-la ęnīn-gir-su-gē ępa-ū dumu an-na dam
kī ęg-ni mu-nu-la-ag-gē dingir-ra-ni ęnīn-gil-zi-da egir-bi šb-uš;
"for Ningirsu, his king, Epa, a house of seven stages, to its
height he built up. For Ningirsu, who decreed good, he built it.
The bridal gift, the joy of the heart of Ningirsu and Bau,
the child of Anu, the spouse whom he loves, he caused it to cover.
His god Ningishzida into it he carried up."

It is clear from these passages that Epa was a seven-staged
ziggurat. The mention of the bride-price, or bridal gift, or
marriage portion, and the carrying up thither of Ningishzida,
who appears to have been a form of Tammuz, make it also evid-
ent that on the top of this ziggurat there was a chamber,

1 Herodotus i, 181.
2 Statue E, i, 16 ff. and i, ii, 12ff. contain the same statement about the
building, but omit reference to the bridal-gift.
similar to the one at Babylon, later described by Herodotus. Amiand long ago recognized the Epa as a ziggurat; but he apparently did not recognize the presence of the shrine on its summit.

Peters in his *Nippur* hazards the opinion that the earliest builder of Ziggurats in Babylonia may have been Urengur, who about 2450 B.C. founded the dynasty of Ur and became the greatest builder in Babylonia before Nebuchadnezzar. Peters was led to this thought because he found no ziggurat below that of Urengur at Nippur and because Urengur was also the builder of the great ziggurat at Mugheir or Ur. This opinion is, as can be shown from the inscriptions of the rulers of Lagash, clearly mistaken. These rulers—at least two of them—built ziggurats, and one of them built his ziggurat about 3000 B.C.

The Epa built by Gudea consisted of seven stages, like the ziggurat of the temple of Nabu at Borsippa built many centuries later by Nebuchadnezzar. Ziggurats were of three kinds; possibly of four. There were those of seven stages, those of four stages, such as are pictured on the walls of the palace of Sennacherib at Kouyunjik, and those of eight stages (doubling the four) like that of Esagila at Babylon described by Herodotus. Peters states that the ziggurat at Nippur, excavated by him and Haynes, consisted of three stages.

If there were ziggurats of three stages they were built to correspond to the sacred number three, which represented the three elements, air, earth and water, corresponding to the triad of gods, Anu, Enlil, Enki.

It seems probable that the four-staged tower embodies the idea of the sacred number four, which stood for the four points of the compass. For the ziggurat of seven stages there are two possible origins. Such ziggurats may have resulted from a combination of three and four, or they may have been built

---

1 See *Records of the Past*, New series, II, pp. 90, and 100; also *Découvertes en Chaldée*, p. XXVI.
3 India House Inschr. iii, 65 ff.; cf. *KB* 2, 17 and *VAB* iv, 129.
4 See e. g. Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien*, pp. 311, 312.
5 *Loc. cit.*
to represent the seven zones into which the universe was supposed to be divided by the seven planets known to the Babylonians. Jensen, more than thirty years ago, recalling the seven zones (ub-tupqātu) into which Erech was divided by its walls, held that these "stages" or as he called them "inner rooms" in the Epa of Gudea, were built to correspond to the world-zones. If we could be sure that the idea of world-zones was suggested by knowledge of the planets, these passages would reveal the Babylonians as possessing a high degree of astronomical knowledge before 2500 B.C. I am inclined to believe that this is the case, although the idea of the seven world-regions may have been suggested by the fact that seven is the sum of two sacred numbers three and four, and so may be older than the knowledge of astronomy. In any event these passages in Gudea prove the antiquity of the material elements connected with the worship on the ziggurats, which Herodotus describes.

When now we turn to the inscriptions of Urinina, we find him claiming to have built ziggurats of two kinds. In two passages he declares that he built an Epa in connection with the temple of Nina, his favorite goddess. As we now know that the Epa was a seven-staged ziggurat, it thus becomes evident that this type of structure, so far from having been introduced by Urengur, was known in Babylonia about 3000 B.C. This fact carries back five hundred years our knowledge of the type of cult carried on on the Epa. If the Epa resulted from astronomical ideas, they, too, would be proved to be correspondingly early.

Urinina seems also to have built another kind of ziggurat, or at least a structure which was probably a ziggurat, which he designated KI-NIR, which may mean "ziggurat-dwelling"—ki meaning "dwelling" and nir meaning "ziggurat." Urinina built three KI-NIR structures, one in connection with the temple of Urinina, another in the temple of Ningirsu, and a third in the temple of Lugal-erim. That the KI-NIR was a ziggurat

---

*Kosmologie, 170 ff.*

*Ibid., 174 ff.*

*Tablet A, iii, 3.; Door-socket inscr., l. 23.*

*Threshold-stone, l. 13, Tablet E, iii, 3, Tablet B, iii, 6, Tablet A, iii, 3.*

*ObW 2823 and compare Haupt, ASKT 205 where we have igi-d-nir, literally "tower before the temple", defined as ziggurat.*
is further proved by the fact that in his Door-socket inscription, ll. 21–23, Epa is put in apposition with it. This makes it clear that both structures were ziggurats.

As we have shown the Epa was a seven-staged ziggurat. The Kinir may not necessarily have had so many stages. Probably it ordinarily had only three or four.

If KI-NIR represents a temple with a ziggurat, KI-NU-NIR,¹⁴ the name of the temple of Dumuzi in Girsu, mentioned by Urbau and Gudea, would mean “temple without a ziggurat.”

¹⁴ Ur-ban, Statue, vi, 10; Gudea, statue B, ix, 3; it is also frequently mentioned in the contracts, as e.g. in BTC 268 rev. 8.
THE KASHMIRIAN ATHARVA VEDA BOOK TEN

EDITED WITH CRITICAL NOTES

LEROY CARR BARRET

TRINITY COLLEGE, HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

Introduction

The Tenth Book of the Paippalada is here presented, elaborated in the manner of the preceding books: no new problems present themselves in this book, the shortest yet edited.

Of the ms.—This tenth book in the Kashmir ms begins f133b8 and ends f138b7, covering five folios. There is one real defacement causing a lacuna at the end of lines 3 and 4 of f134b: a crack across f135 does not make the signs illegible.

Punctuation, numbers, &c.—Punctuation within the individual hymns is irregular, as in previous books, and frequently the colon mark is below the line, not in it. No accents are marked. The hymns are grouped in two anuvākas: the hymns of the first are numbered in regular succession, 1 to 6, but "anu 1" does not appear after the sixth hymn; in the second anuvāka there are ten hymns numbered in regular succession except the tenth after which appears no numeral either for kāṇḍa or for anuvāka. In editing I have given sixteen hymns as the ms indicates, altho the last six might have been given as three; but the constraining reason for such combination in Book Nine, namely the ms method of indicating a refrain, is not present here. There are a few corrections marginal and interlinear.

Extent of the book.—The book as edited has sixteen hymns, of which one is partly prose and four are only irregularly metrical. If there is a stanza norm it would seem to be ten; eight hymns are edited as having ten stanzas; this breaks the regular progression of the stanza norms which runs from four to twelve in Books 1 to 9. Assuming the correctness of the stanza divisions as edited we make the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hymns</th>
<th>Stanzas Each</th>
<th>Total Stanzas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{160 stanzas}\]

*New and old material.*—Thirteen hymns may be properly called new, tho some of them contain stanzas or pādas already known: 121 of the 160 stanzas are new. The hymns which are § 19.27 and 31 appear here, the only complete hymns in the book which are not new.

**ATHARVA-VEDA PĀIPPALĀDA SĀKHĀ BOOK TEN**

1

[133b8] *atha daśama-[9]syārambhah ss ss om namo nārāya-\nīya z om hāsa tejane dhe-[10]no lambanastani | na tad vido yad āschasi | yad avitāṁ na tad ghasah |

The introductory phrases are correct. If, as seems likely, pāda a ends with tejane three syllables are lacking at the beginning; b seems possible tho lacking one syllable; in c read icchasi, remove colon, in d read probably āvittāṁ.

*patro*\[11\] *yas te prśhitbāhum astakam śamanām kṛdhi | atho duhitaram naptēm atho tvāṁ [12] śamanā bhava |*

Read: *putro* ye prśntbāhus tam u tvāṁ śamanām kṛdhi | atho duhitaram naptīm atho tvāṁ śamanā bhava z 2 z

This stanza has appeared Pāipp 5.1.3; there I departed from the ms and suggested sāsanām and sāsanā, but the double testimony of the ms is against this. In 5.1.3c naptīm is the reading.

\[\text{asāme kuru māṇagur asya śvasārāte nindate ma te sruhi te} | [13] \text{pāretakastū pākam vaḥ punar dadāmi yonav} \]

I am not at all sure of the word division or end of the stanza; with pākam and yonāu the last pāda would be possible.

\[\text{ekada tvāṁ hada tasyās tapatu si-[14]sjikaṁ | tasyādhi putrān bhṛtṛṇi ca tasya gośṭham vi tāvata} | \]

The first word here may be vehad, but the rest of the pāda
I cannot solve: in b perhaps some form of snih is at the end; in d perhaps vi dhāvata.

yasyasota nāsti vāki-[15]r yasyām ā vā havirgrhaḥ dunnāmnīś
tatra gaśchatu tatra sarvāḥ paretana

In a read yasyām and possibly vāsīr, in b grham; in c dunnāmnīś
and gacchata.

pari[16] dhāmāṇity ekā |

It seems probable that this refers to Ppp. 2.4.3 (=Ś 2.14.6),
which is as follows: pari dhāmāṇy āsām āsuḥ kāṣṭhām ivāsāram
| ajāisām sarvān aśīn vo naśyatetās sadānvāḥ. This is stanza
6 in the hymn here.

anna śvārānā kośe carūm atho gośthān vicāriṣṭān | a-[17]lho yas
svaṃne paśyāmi tā ita nāśayāmasi |

In a we may read yāṃ naśvarūm (or naśvarūm), in c yās, in d
ito.

kuṇvā yā gardabhīva [18] nirdhajat sūkṛīva tasye prati pravar-
taya | lapam aśmānam āsiniṁ |

In b read ni dhrajat, in c tasyāī, remove colon after c; for
āsinniā possibly aśanīm.

yoni-[19]r yābbhi gaschāt priyaṃ kāstāu pastāśuṇānīm kāstāu
panasyāśchidiyād athāinām [f134a] cātayālāi | paramām cet
parāvatāṃ

For pada a we may probably read yoner yābbhi gacchāt priyaṃ;
for the next two pādas I can suggest nothing; I would put
colon before athāinām, reading the last two pādas together as
they stand: or read parāvatam.

yā bhadṛā yāṃ śiśā yorjā payasā saha | [2] agniḥ tvāsmākam
gṛhe gārhapatyo ni yaschatu |

In pada a read yā for yāṃ, in d yacchatu.

idān vo devas vāsvadām [3] devo vṛhaspatiḥ idān vo viśve de-
vāsaṇām ajukṣāt |

Place colon after pada b; in cd read devā avasaṇām aghuṣanta.

pari prāgā-[4]d devo agni rakṣohāmi vācātanāh sedan viśvā apa
dvīpo dahān oṣvāṃsi [5] viśvahā |

Place colon after pada b; read rakṣāṃsi in d; this stanza oc-
curs KS 38.12.
paryame gām aneṣata pary agnim aharṣata | deveṣv akrata śravaṣ ka i-[6]māṁ gā dadhārṣati z ī ā

Read: parime gām aneṣata pary agnim aharṣata | deveṣv akrata śravaṣ ka imān ā dadhārṣati z 13 z ī ā

This stanza as emended appears RV 10.155.5 and VS 35.18, and with ab reversed at Ś 6.28.2.

2

[f134a6] tvayindriyam tvayi varcas tvam dharmapatir bhava |  
[7] tvam utaro bhṛattruyebyhas tava laksminī payasvati

Read uttarao in pāda c.

bhavetām aśvinā vahāṁ tava rā-[8]straṁ dīvi śrutaṁ tvam āyuṣmān sapatnāhottaro dēviṣato bhava

It seems probable to me that we should read tavetām at the beginning of pāda a; for vahāṁ possibly vāhāu; in b read śrītaṁ.

tikṣṣṇaśrhga vṛṣa-[9]bhas samudrāsvākṣatodaka tvam | sahas-ravirīs tāvābhāko gavāmpati

For pāda b read samudra ivākṣatudakam; in c āvīryas, in d gavāṁ-pate.

bhṛattreya-[10]ś ca saputtraś ca yas tvā sattro jighāṁsatī | śṛyantam sarvaśāṁ dadātu ya ivāṁ ve-[11]da z śṛyantam sarvaśāṁ mādāyo grha vi dhāraya

In pāda a read sapataṇā, in b śatrur: śrīyantam ṝ ṝ veda does not seem to belong to the verse and I would drop it out, but it seems to indicate that pāda c is śrīyantam sarvaśāṁ dadātv; for d we might read atho gṛham vi dhārayat. The restoration of cd is uncertain and I think śrīyantam must be a corruption: śrīyam ca might be a good emendation.

tvam | vaśi satyākūṭi-[12]ś satyadharmā gavesināḥ anāstrās tvam sarvasāī tvā bhṛattryeṇaṁ śṛyam ruha |

Remove colon after tvam which surely belongs in this stanza; in b read gavesaṇaḥ; in c anāstrās, probably sarvāṣtri, and tvam. This is stanza 5.


In pāda a read tubhyāṁ, in b śulkā; pāda c might stand but duhāṁ would improve it; in d viṣo maḥīḥ.
vāṃchanti tvā vṛhadraṣṭram deviś teṣāṁ sukhāhita | [15] tvam
devānāṁ bhava priyās tvayi gāvo adhiśruta |
In pada b read tvās is and sukhaḥita; in d adhiśritaḥ.

tvayindriyaṁ tvayi varcas tvam [16] yajño adhiśrutaḥ tavāyantu
kavāṁ devis tvam priyo ham vṛhaspateḥ
In pada b tvayi should probably be read, and adhiśritaḥ;
in c devas would seem more probable; in d I think we may read
ha vṛhaspateḥ.

agnī-[17]somā pavamānāṁ virād devi payasvatī | atandhram sarve
rakṣantu rāṣṭram te nāpa dā—[f134b] dyam
Read atandram in pada c, and at the end of d possibly dadhyuḥ
or dadhan.

agnir iva triṇāṁ pradhyā kaśkūlam ivā ruja | śriyāṁ bhṛatrīyānāṁ
adhas tvāṁṛ[2]kam ivādīpurṣkarā, z 2 z
Read: agnir iva triṇāṁ pradahya kaśkūlam ivā ruja | śriyāṁ
bhṛatrīyānāṁ adhas tvāṁṛikam ivādhipaṣ karāḥ z 10 z 2 z
In pada a pradahya seems a fair conjecture but prati might
be as good; I do not find kaśkūlam, but it might be equivalent
to kūlamkaśam.

3

hasīvarvaḥ valāṁ bhaṅdhi bhṛatrīyānāṁ śriyāṁ ruha |
Read aśvā iva in a, sinha iva in b, possibly bārvān balaṁ
bhaṅdhi in c.

ut te kṛṇo *** [4] po vrahma devāṁ abhiśvatam | āprītam ivar-
adukāṁ etāṁ khadirām āḥa *
Read: ut te kṛṇotu kaśyapo vrahma devāṁ abhiśtutam |
āprītam ivāradukām etāṁ khadirām ā hara z 2 z
There is a lacuna covering the end of lines 3 and 4; three
characters seem to be missing from line 3 (tho there is a trace
of the "tu" of kṛṇotu) and four characters from line 4.

***[5]ṛma haram utāītam ṛṣṇam ā harād aviduṣo grham yad
imāṁ devāsāṁ samāṁ bhṛtā la pra-[6]dād vṛhaspateḥ
A good reading for pada a would be utāīta varmaḥ harād
which is of course pure conjecture except varmaḥ; pada b seems
to end with harād and pada c with yad, tho Ś 4.18.2b is harād
aviduṣo grham. For the last two padas we may read with some
probability imān devās samāṁ bhṛṭāṁ tām pra dadād vṛhaspatīḥ.

The lacuna touches the end of line 5 but enough of the characters is left to assure the transliteration given; the tops of the characters are broken so that the ms may have had bhṛṭāṁ tām.

tān ā dhārikī samāhite ānão sūryāvicakṣaṇe | tebhīṣa tvam u-
[7]ttaro bhava bhṛṭṛvyāṇāṁ śriyāṁ ruha | aho yeṣāṁ payo hara

In pāda a read dhehi, in b ‘gnāu sūryā’, in e eṣām. Edgerton would read tebhāyas tvam in c.

ādityā rudrā [8] vasava rṣayo bhūtakṛtaś ca ye | śriyāṁ ca kṣat-
tram ojaś ca tubhyam devā asāviṣuḥ

Read kṣatram in pāda c.

[9] asurasindranāmāyusmān sataśārada | sa indrīva deveṣu
tviṣimān vi-[10]sā vada z 3 z

Read: asura ‘sindranāmāyusmān sataśāradaḥ’ | sa indrīva
devesu tviṣimān viṣa a vada z 6 z 3 z

[f134b10] idam rāṣṭram prathatāṁ gobhir aśvāṁ idam rāṣṭram
adhyeno-[11]rayā rasena asmāṁ ṣaḍ urvīr Ṛṣa samnamattu sa-
taḥotrā hataśatrūn sacittām

In pāda b the ms corrects to adnyeno°; the phrase appears
below in st. 8b where the ms reads anyenerā; this latter read-
ing can stand tho the word anya (=inexhaustibleness?) occurs
only in Ś 12.1.4; a better reading would be rāṣṭram madyene°.
In d I would suggest hataśatrūs sacittāḥ.

[12] īmaī rājāna īśibhir ghnantu sattrāṁ ime rājānas samityāṁ
evadeyuh | ime [13] rājānas pṛtāṁ mahanāṁ aham vrahmā vimrāho
hāṁ nirakṣāḥ

In pāda a read ime and īśubhir, in b samityāṁ; in c pṛtāṁ
sahāntāṁ; with ‘hāṁ pāda d can stand if nirakṣāḥ can mean
“protector.”

idam rāṣṭram kr-[14]amad vīraṇaj jisṇu ugraṁ idam rāṣṭram
gadamaṇ citraghoṣam | asme rāṣṭrā [15] balamāṁ nekhanāt
ahāṁ devebhyaḥ haviṣa vidhayān z

In pāda a kṛtamad would seem possible but kirtimad would
be better; read jisṇuṇgram; in b possibly gātumac, and citra-
ghoṣam. For c read asmāi rāṣṭraya balaṁ ni harantv.
yadi yuddhe yad mṛjataṁ [16] vo astu devāinasad yadi vā pīṭryeya | yena tīvyād dhena vo astu tasmā a-[17]ḥam devebhya haviśā jukomi |

In páda a I can make no suggestion for yad mṛjataṁ, but the rest of the páda seems good; in b 6ainasād: in c I would read yenaartviyād eno; in a and c read asti. Edgerton suggests anṛjutvam for yad mṛjataṁ.

yad vaṣ krūram manasā yaś ca vāco devenasā-[18]d yadi vā pīṭryeya | āpāiva duṣvapnim api datsuva vadhvan athā nandinas tv-[19]manasas sumetā

The ms corrects du of duṣvapnim to dva.

Read yac ca in páda a, devāinasād in b; for c we might read āpāiva duṣvapnyam api dhatsva baddham; in d sameta would seem possible.


In páda a I would suggest vidhiṁ bhajantv apurohitās but could not defend it strongly; in b prathayantu, in d samicināṁ and the same in e; in f havāṁ and probably ma imam. This is stanza 6.


In páda b read vahanti, in c rāṣṭraya, in d vahantu.


In páda c read mayā and prathamāṅśo, in d vaisiyāṁsas and sadam.

bahur yo vā prasṛṇo dhṛṣṇir astu bahukumārāṁ pa-[7]tīrūpaś pīṭṇāṁ satyāṁ vadantas sumatim caranto mītram grhyāṇā ja-[8]naso yantu sakhyāṁ |

In páda a read pramṛṇo dhṛṣṇur asti, in b pratīrūpaś; in d read mitram and probably janāso.

iha kṣaṭram dyumnam utsa rāṣṭram samīto indriyaṁ paśubhiḥ samvidā-[9]nām madhnavāṇapriyān yāś ca dviṣmedam
Read kṣatram in pāda a; in b sam etv seems probable tho śami tv might be possible: in c I would suggest mathnātu tān aprīyān yānś ca dviṣma, ending the stanza with this familiar phrase:

(dviṣmedām) rāṣṭram prathamūṁ sarvaśa | idāṁ rāṣṭram kṛtā-
[10]mad vīraṇv jīṣṇuagram idāṁ rāṣṭra paśumad vrahnaśvṛddham |
| idāṁ rāṣṭram hata advrāḫa jī-[11]ṣyu

For pāda a read idāṁ rāṣṭram o sarva-devam, pāda b as above at 3a; in c rāṣṭram and omit the colon after ovrddham; in d hata-advrāḥu. In spite of the punctuation these four pādas seem to belong together.

sapatnasāham pramṛṣṭamidam rāṣṭram drḥham ugraṁ sādhā-
mitram abhimāti-[12]āḥam sarga jīgāya dhṛtava vrṣṭih z 4 z

Read: sapatnasāham pramṛṣṭam idāṁ rāṣṭram drḥham ugram |
sādhāmitram abhimātiśāham sargo jīgāya †dhṛtava vrṣṭih |
z 12 z 4 z

In d I have thought of dhṛtavān vrṣṭē and also drtv īva vrṣṭih, but neither seems very attractive: Edgerton suggests jīgāyādṛṛta īva vrṣṭē.

The general intent of this hymn is clear but the details have not come out at all well.

5

(§ 19.31)

[f135a12] āudumbarena ma-[13]nīnā puṣṭikāmāya vedhasī paś-
ūnāṁ sarasāṁ śphātīṁ gūsthāṁ me savītā[14]viśā karat. | yo |
agnir gārhapatyaś paśūnāṁ adhipā asat. udumbaro vr-[15]ṣa-
manis sam mā srjatu puṣṭyā kartiśnām phalāvatīṁ svadhām irāṁ |
ca no gr-[16]ha | udumbarasya tejasā dhātā puṣṭim dadhātu te |
yad dvipaś catuṣphās ca yā-[17]ny a ye rasa | grhṣyāṁ teśāṁ |
bhāumānaṁ bhū ṭatra udumbaraṁ ra maṇiṁ puṣṭim pa-[18]ṣūnāṁ |
pārī jagrākāhāṁ catuṣpadaṁ dvipaṭāṁ ya ca dhānyaṁ payaḥ |
paśūnāṁ rasa-[19]ṁ odhināṁ vr̥haspatiś savītā me ni yaśchāt. |
aham paśuṁ adhi māṁ ma-[f135b]lyi puṣṭiṁ puṣṭipātir dadhā-
tu | mahyām āudumbaro maṇiṁ prajāya ca dhanena ca |
i-[2]ndrena |
jinvato maṇiṁ a maṁ saha varcasah | devo maṇiś sapattraḥa dhanasā |
dhanasā-[3]ye | paśor anyasva bhāumānam gavāṁ śphātīṁ ni yaśchatu |
yathāgṛte tvam vanaspatē puṣṭyā [4] saha jajñīṣe | evā dhanasya
The margin corrects to adhipā in f135a19, and to yaśchatāṁ in f135b13.

Read: āudumbareṇa maṁiṇā puṣṭikāmāya vedhase | paśūnāṁ sarvesaṁ sphātiṁ goṣṭhe me savitā karat z 1 z yo agnir gārhapatyāś paśūnāṁ adhipā asat | āudumbaro vrṣā maṁis saṁ mā sṛjatu puṣṭyā z 2 z kariśiṁiṁ phalavatīm svadhām irāṁ ca no grhe | āudumbarasya tejasā dhātā puṣṭiṁ dadhātu me z 3 z yad dvīpāc ca catuspāc ca yāṇy annāni ye rasāḥ | grhinīyāṁ teśāṁ bhūmānaṁ bhīhṛad āudumbarāṁ maṇiṁ z 4 z puṣṭiṁ paśūnāṁ pari jagrābhāhāṁ catuspādāṁ dvipādāṁ yac ca dhānyam | payaḥ paśūnāṁ rasam oṣadhināṁ vrhaspatis savitā me ni yacchatā z 5 z ahaṁ paśūnāṁ adhipā asānī mayi puṣṭiṁ puṣṭipāṭir dadhātu | mahyam āudumbaro maṇiḥ draviṇāni ni yacchatu z 6 z upa māudumbaro maṇiḥ praJayā ca dhānena ca | indreṇa jinvito maṇiḥ a māgaṁ saha varcasā z 7 z devo maṇiḥ sapatnāhā dhanasaṁ dhanaśātaye | paśor annasya bhūmānaṁ gavāṁ sphātiṁ ni yacchatu z 8 z yathāgre tvam vanaspate puṣṭyā saha jajniṣe | evā dhanasya me sphiṭam ā dadhātu sarasvatī z 9 z a me dhānaṁ sarasvatī payasphātim ca dhānyam | sinivāly upāvahad ayaṁ cāudumbaro maṇiḥ z 10 z tvam maṇīnāṁ adhipā vrṣāsi tvayi puṣṭiṁ puṣṭipāṭir jajăna | tvayiṁe vājā draviṇāṁ sarvāudumbarā sa tvam asmāt sahasvārd arātiṁ abhiṁiṁ kṣayaṁ ca z 11 z grāmaṇiḥ asā grāmaṇiḥ uttāhābhikṣakto 'bhi mā sīnca varcasā | tejo 'si tejo mayi dhārayā† nadharir asārīr | mayi dhehi z 12 z puṣṭiṁ asī puṣṭyā mā sam aṅgiliḥ grhamedhi grhapatiṁ mā kṛnu | āudumbara sa tvam asmāsu dhehi rayiṁ ca nas saravārim ni yaccha rāyaspoṣāya prati muṇce ahaṁ
tvām z 13 z ayam āudumbaro maṇīr vīro virāyocaye | sa nas sanīṁ madhumatiṁ kṛṇotu rayiṁ ca nas sarvavidāṁ ni yac- 
chāṭ z 14 z 5 z

Whitney translates vedhasè in 1b tho the Š text has vedhasā. 
Our ms omits 6d and 7a, which I have supplied from Š. The 
emendation in 11e is close to our ms and would seem as good 
as any of the other suggestions. In st 13 I have restored from 
Š. In 14b Š has badhyate which may be the true reading here.
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[f135b13] bhagasya rājñas sumatiṁ gamema yo havante [14] 
bahudhā mānuṣāsah | karma kṛṣṇābhagam ā vṛṇite sa no javeṣu 
subha-[15]gāṁ kṛṇotu bhagam purastāt pratibuddhyamānāṁ paśyema 
deviṁ uṣasāṁ vibhāṭīm [16] pratiś śubhrā draviṇaṁ sākāṁ bhagam
vaḥatu aditiṁ nā etu | bhago no dya [17] ssavite dadhātū devānāṁ 
panthā vibhīno na ehi | arṇāc bhadrās sumiti-[18]n na etv adhā bhage 
ma sumatāḥ no stu z bhageṇa vācām iśātām vadānī sarasvatī [19] 
madhumāṁ svarcasāḥ bhagenādattam upa medam āgāṁṁ yathā var-
casvān mami-[20]tim āvadānī | bhago mā gau avatu bhago māvatu 
dhānaye | akṣeṣu striṣu mā [f136a] bhago bhago māvatu ratyā bhago na 
madhyamānēsu prātar mā bhagāgamat. | bhago mā prātar u-[2] 
vatu bhago māhyandinaṁ pari | aparāhne vayaṁ bhagam vāsāiva 
pari darma te | bhagam devebhya-[3]ś subhagam bhagam maṇuse- 
bhyah divas prthivyākam antarikṣāṅ bhagam vṛṇe | so gre ramatāṁ 
[4] mayi sa mā prāvatu varcasā | bhagam vṛṇā vagaṁ vahantī 
vani prayanto bhagam id dhavante [5] bhageṇa dattam upa medam 
āgāṁ viṣeṁ bhūtaṁ draviṇena bhadrā | bhageṇa devas sam agan 
mayi-[6]mā viśvā bhuvanābhīvaste | prayaśchān nayati bahudhā 
vāsuni | sa no dadhāte atamad va-[7]miṣṭham vāto bhago varuṇo 
vāyur agniḥ kṣetrasya patni suhava no stu | hiranyākṣo [8] adhi-
paśyo nṛcakṣāṁ sarvāsākāṁ sajamāno na ehi ud ehi deva 
sūrya saha [9] sābhāgyena sā ṛṣabhasya vājena sahāvataṁ karṣena 
| hiranynecty ekā [10] z 6 z

Read: bhagasya rājñas sumatiṁ gamema yaṁ havante 
bahudhā mānuṣāsah | karma kṛṣṇābhagam ā vṛṇite sa no 
javeṣu subhagāni kṛṇotu z 1 z bhagam purastāt pratibuddhyamānāṁ 
paśyema deviṁ uṣasāṁ vibhāṭīm | pratiś śubhrā draviṇaṁ 
sākāṁ bhagam vahatu aditiṁ na āitu z 2 z bhagam no 'dya
savitā dadhātu devanāṁ panthā vibhinno na ehi | arvācī bhadrā
sumatir na etv adhā bhage sā su manaṇa no 'stu z 3 z bhageṇa
vācam iṣitām vadāni sarasyatāṁ madhumatim suvarcasam | bhage
nādattām upa medam āgān yathā varcasvān samītim āvadāṇi
z 4 z bhago mā gośv avatu bhago māvatu dhāne | akṣeṣu strīṣu mā
bhago bhago māvatu rātryām z 5 z bhago mā madhyamāḥneṣu prātar
mā bhaga āgamat | bhago mā prātar avatu bhago madhyandinam
pari z 6 zaparāhne vayaṁ bhagam vāsa īva pari dadhma te | bhagam
devbhīyas subhagam bhagam manuṣe bhīyat z 7 z divas prthivyā
aham antarikṣād bhagam vṛpe | so 'gre ramatāṁ mayi sa mā
prāvatu varcasā z 8 z bhagam t vṛṇā vaygaṁ t vahanti vane
prayanto bhagam id dhavante | bhageṇādattām upa medam
āgān viṣvam bhūtām draviṇa bhadram z 9 z bhageṇa devas
sam āgān mayimā viṣvā bhuvanābhivaste | prayaccham eti
bahuḥdā vāsūṁ sa no dadhātv t atamad vāsiṣṭham z 10 z vāto
bhago varuṇo viṣvā agniḥ kṣetrasya patni suhaṁ no 'stu | hiranyākṣo ati paśyo ni ca kāsāṁ sarvāśā sākāri sajamāno na ehi z 11
z ud ehi deva sūrya saha sāubhāgyena | sahārṣabhasya vajena
saḥāvataṁ karaṇena z 12 z hiranyenetey ekā z 13 z 6 z anu 1 z

Some of the emendations suggested are somewhat doubtful,
particularly 3b: in 9a we would get a good pāda by reading
vṛpāna navagvaṁ. Edgerton suggests yaveṣu in 1d; and dadh-
mahe in 7b since te seems out of place in the hymn. St 13
must have appeared in some lost part of the ms.

(S 19.27)

[f136a10] gobhiṣ tvā pāt vṛṣabha vṛṣa tvā pāt vājibhiḥ vāyus tvā
vṛṣ-[11]hmuṣa te indras tvā pāte indri momas tvā pāte osadābhiṁ
nakṣatraṁ pātū sūryaḥ | [12] mādhitis tvā candro vṛtthah vātāḥ
prāṇena rakṣatu tisrām dīvas tisrās prthī-[13]viś trīṇy antarikṣāṇi
caturas samudrān. | triṇṭṝtāṁ stomaṁ triṇṭṝtāṁ āhūs tā-[14]ś tvā
rakṣantu triṇṭṝtāṁ triṇṭṝtāḥ | triṇ nākāṁ triṇī samudrāṁ triṇī
vradhnām [15] trīṇī vāsīpaṁ trīṇī mātāriśvanas trīṇī sūryān,
gopīṇa kalpayāmi [16] te gṛṇena tvā sam uṣamy agnījena
vadhayaṁ agneś candrasya sūryasya mā prāṇam [17] māyino
dabhān | mā va prāṇam mā va pānāṁ mā havo māyano dabham | bhrājante vi-[18]ṣavedamo deṇa dāvyaṁ māvataṁ prāṇenāgniṁ
sam dadhata vātāḥ prāṇena sam-[19]hata prāṇena viṣvatomukham

The ms corrects to mṛṭhā in f136b1, and to abindham in f136b2.

Read: gobhiṣṭvā pātvṛṣabho vṛṣā tvā pātvōṣṭvā vṛṣṭvā vṛṣṭvā vṛṣṭvā pātvōṣṭvā vṛṣṭvā pātvā indiras tvā pātvōṣṭvā pātvā oṣadhibhir nakṣatrāṇo pātu sūryāḥ | mādhibhi tvā candro vṛtraḥ vātāḥ prāṇena raksatā z 2 z tisraṁ tisraṁ prthivīṁ trīṇy antarikṣaṇi caturas samudrān | trīrtaṁ tostam trīrta apā āhū tās tvā raksantō trīrtaṁ trīrtaṁ trīrtaṁ trīrtaṁ trīrtaṁ trīrtaṁ TV āhā rā tkāyāmi te z 4 z gīṛṭena tvā sam uksāṁy agna ājyena vaṛdhayan | agneś candrasya sūryasya mā prāṇam māyino dabhan z 5 z mā vah prāṇam mā vo 'pāṇam mā haro māyino dabhan | bhrājanto viśvavedaṁ devā ādhyena māvata z 6 z prāṇenāg- niṁ sam dadhāti vātās prāṇena samhītaḥ | prāṇena viśvato- mukhaṁ sūryam devā ajanayan z 7 z āyuṣāyuṣkṛtam jīvāyuṣmān ālu mā mṛṭhāḥ | prāṇenātmānyatāṁ jiva ma mṛtyor upa ga vaśam z 8 z devānāṁ nidiṁ māyam indro anvavindat pathibhir devayānaḥ | āpo hiranyam jugupus trīrddhibhiḥ tās tvā raksantō trīrtaṁ trīrddhibhiḥ 9 z trayastraṁśad devās tṛiṇ ca vīryāṇī priyāyamānā jugupur apsv antah | asminś candra adhi yad dhīrayāṁ tenāyanī kṛṇavad vīryāṇī z 10 z 1 z

The corrections bring the text here almost into accord with that of Ś: in 2c mādhibhi as here should probably be read also in Ś; in 6c Ś has dhāvata, in 7a it has sajanti.
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(S 19.27.11-15)

purastād aśvināv abhitaś carma yaśchatām tiraścīnāgyā [9] rakṣatu jātavedā bhūtakṛto me sarvatas santu varmaḥ z 2 z

Read: ye devā divy ekādaśa stha te devāso havir idam juṣhadhvam z 1 z <ye devā antarikṣa ekādaśa z 2 z ye devāh prthivyām ekādaśa stha te devāso havir idam juṣhadhvam z 3 z > asapattām purastāt paścān no bhavaṁ kṛtam | savitā mā daksināta uttarān mā saścāpatiḥ z 4 z dīvo mādityā rakṣantu bhūmyā rakṣantu avnayaḥ | indrāgni rakṣatām mā purastād aśvināv abhitaś śarma yacchatām | tiraścīnāgyā rakṣatu jātavedā bhūtakṛto me sarvatas santu varmaḥ z 5 z 2 z

Stanzas 2 and 3 have been supplied from Ś; our ms is perfectly capable of making such omissions without leaving a trace and the address to eleven gods seems less probable than the address to three groups of eleven; cf RV 1.139.11 and see Whitney on Ś 19.27.


Read: ye psv antar agnayaḥ praviṣṭā mroko manohā khano nirḍāha ātmadūṣis tanuddūṣih | idam tān ati srjāmi nira enaṁ nirṛtaṁ srjāmi z 1 z

Cf SMB 1.7.1ab and Ś 16.1.3 and 4; also Ś 10.5.21.

abhūtyā satvaya nir duṣṭvāṇyaḥ [12] suvāmi | vasīṣṭhārundhāti mā mā pātām prajāpateḥ

In pāda a we need something like sahovatyā; in d read sa mā and probably prajāpate. With pāda b cf Ś 16.1.11 and with c RVKh 10.85.5b.

prastaro yṛhaspateś ke-[13] sāh ardhukām cakṣusu suṣruṭāu karnāv aksatāu | pranāpānānu ṛdayājara-[14] saṁ mā māśin madhyam-aśrāmaṁ |

We might read in this keśa ardhukām cakṣusu suṣruṭāu, and perhaps also sā mā mā hinsin; after that I have no suggestion. Colon should stand after karnāu.

āpo mā śundhantu duśkrātā duritaḥ yo mā ca-[15] kṛma | ayo ma śuddhā udītas tanobhiḥ

I would suggest here duśkrātā duritād yad vā; but TS. 1.8.5.3e
is duritā yāṇi caṇḍma, and perhaps we might read so here. For ayo ma I have no suggestion; suddhā and uditas are possible as words and we should read tanūbhīḥ, but I make nothing out of the pāda.

vaiśvānaro raṃbhīḥ naṣ puṇātu vātāḥ [16] prāṇeneśiro navobhīḥ
dyāvāprīhīṃ payasā payasvāḥ | Śīvārī ya-[17]jñīye mā puṇām

Read naḥbhoḥīḥ in b, and remove colon at the end of c. This stanza appears Ś.6.62.1; TB 1.4.8.3; and MS 3.11.10; the Yajus texts have mā in a as well as other variants.

puṇantu mā agnayo gārhapatyāḥ puṇantu mā prṣṇyā de-[18]
devajrāṭāṁ | puṇantu sā śakvaris somapṛṣṭhāḥ pavamānāso va-
vṛjīnāḥ

The ms corrects to pavamānāpo.

Read: puṇantu māgnayo gārhapatyāḥ puṇantu mā prṣṇayo
devajrūṭāḥ | puṇantu mā śakvaris somapṛṣṭhāḥ pavamānāso
vṛjīnāḥ z 6 z

[19] yaṣ pavitā ma puṇātu mā vṛhadbhīr deva savitaḥ varṣīṣṭhyā dir
dyātmano pari

Read sa puṇātu and devas savitā; the omission of sa would improve the rhythm: we may read varṣīṣṭhāir but for the rest I can get nothing.

vrahma-[20]savaś puṇātu mā rājasavaśiḥ puṇātu mā śatam
pavitrā vitatā tiraś ca ya [[137a] tebhīr mā devās savitā puṇātu |

Read: vrahmasavaśiḥ puṇātu mā rājasavaśiḥ puṇātu mā śatam
pavitrā vitatā tiraś ca yā tebhīr mā devas savitā puṇātu
z 8 z

With pādas cd cf MS 1.2.1 where vitatāny āsu stands for our
vitatā tiraś ca yā.

śatāṁ ca mā pavitāraḥ puṇantu sahasraṁ ca sravā-[2]ṇeṣu āpah
| āpā īva pūṭo ssy agnir īva suvarcā sūryā īva sucaksā

Read: śatāṁ ca mā pavitāraḥ puṇantu sahasraṁ ca sravaneṣu
āpah | āpā īva pūṭo 'smy agnir īva suvarcās sūrya īva sucaksā
z 9 z

urū-[3]yāśāv asṛpā udumbarāu yamasya dūtāu caratāu janāṁ
anu | īav asmaḥkhyam [4] drṣe drṣe drṣ sūryāya | puṇar dūtām asmad
dehi bhudram. z 3 z

Read: urūṇasāv asutṛpā udumbarāu yamasya dūtāu carato
janāṇ anu | tāv asmahbhyaṁ dr̥se-dr̥se sūryāya punar dātām aṣum adyeha bhadrām z 10 z 3 z

This stanza occurs RV 10.14.12; Ś 18.2.13; TA 6.3.2; the first two pādās appear again in Bk 19 on f266b. RV and Ś have udumbalāu but probably udumbarāu can stand with the same meaning; if dr̥se-dr̥se is not acceptable we will have to read with the others dr̥saye.
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tamā sūryasyāvṛtām anv āvṛtām anv āvṛtām | agnes tejasā
tē-[9]jasē bhūyāmas indrasyendriyasyendriyāvān bhūyāsam | idam
aham agne-[10]ṣ tejasendrasyendriyena somasya dyumnena viśveṣāṁ
devānāṁ kratunāmusyāḥ-[11]muṣyāṇasyāmusyāḥ putrasya varcas
idad aham agnes tejasendrasyendriyena so-[13]masya dyumnena
viśveṣāṁ devānāṁ kratunāmusyāmusyāṅasyāmusyāḥ putra-[14]
sya varcas teja indriyam prāṇam āyur ādāya tūṭyāyanam pāṣeśtvā
[15] duṣṣvapnena samsṛjya mṛtyor vyāttā samā api dadhāmi z 4 z

Read: agan devas svar aganma jyotir aganma | mahendro 'si paramēṣṭhī sumitra viśvatomukham a te ayāni samṛiṣṭaḥ z 1 z udyann adya mitramahas sapatnāṁ me 'va jahi | diva enaṁ raśmiḥhis saha rāṭrīṇaṁ tamasā vidhiṣ te yantv adha-
manī tamāḥ z 2 z sūryasyāvṛtām anvāvṛtāma anv āvṛtām | agnes tejasvī bhūyāsam indrasyendriyasyendriyāv-
vān bhūyāsam z 3 z idam aham agnes tejasendrasyendriyena
somasya dyumnena viśveṣāṁ devānāṁ kratunāmusyāṅasyāmusyāḥ putrasya varcas teja indriyam prāṇam āyur ni veṣṭayāmi | āyur ni yacchet z 4 z idam aham agnes tejasendrasyendriyena somasya dyumnena viśveṣāṁ devānāṁ kratunāmusyāṅasyāmusyāḥ putrasya varcas teja indriyam prāṇam āyur ādāya tūṭyāyanam pāṣeśtvā† duṣṣvapnena samsṛjya mṛtyor vyāttā samā api dadhāmi z 5 z 4 z

I am not at all sure of devas in st 1a; Ś 16.9.3. has aganma
svaḥ svar aganma: toward the end of 5 perhaps we might read
bhūtya enmā pāṣa isītvā, or ādāyabhūtyā. For st 2 cf RV 1.50.
11a and Ś 13.1.32bcd; vidhīs is not quotable but seems possible; perhaps vadhis would be better. For st 3 cf Ś 10.5.37ab and KS 5.5; for the rest cf Ś 10.5.36 and similar stanzas.
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Read: yo nas svo yo araṇo bhrātṛvyāsa ca jighāṁsati | indraś ca tasyāgniś ca marma skandheṣu vindatāṁ z 1 z yo mā śayānāṁ jāgratam yaś ca suptaṁ jighāṁsati | indraś ca tasyāgniś ca bāhū marmaṇi vr̥scatām z 2 z yo mā carantam tiṣṭhantam āśīnaṁ ca jighāṁsati | indraś ca tasmād agniś ca duritaṁ prati muṇcatām z 3 z yo mā caκsuṣa manasā yaś ca vācā jighāṁsati | indraś ca tasmā agniś ca ṭhināṁ vahatāpi tā z 4 z yaś pīśaco yātudhānaṁ kravyād yo māṁ jighāṁsati | indraś ca tasyāgniś ca kruddhāu dighābhīr asyatām z 5 z yo mā vrahmanā tapasa yaś ca yajñāīr jighāṁsati | indraś ca tasyāgniś ca hṛdaye dhanaṁ vindatām z 6 z yo me vrahma yo me tapam balaṁ śreṣṭham jighāṁsati | indraś ca tasyāgniś ca mūrdhānaṁ prati vindatām z 7 z yo me annāṁ yo me rasaiṁ vācaṁ śreṣṭham jighāṁsati | indraś ca tasmā agniś cāstrāṁ hīṅkāram asyatām z 8 z yo me tuntum yo me prajāṁ caκsu śrotram jighāṁsati | indraś ca tasmā agniś ca hetiṁ deveṣu vindatāṁ z 9 z yo me gobhīyo ṭbhīdaścad āsvabhyāṣ
purushebhyah | indraś ca tasmā agnīś ca jyānam deveśu vindatām
z 10 z 5 z.

In 4d Edgerton suggests heśāṃsi vahatām prati; something of the sort would seem appropriate. In 5d supply iṣubhis with digdhābhīr, or else read digdhēbhīr. In 10a Edgerton suggests 'bhidrukṣad, which fits well.
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Read: yo me bhūtim anāmayad dyuttam āyur jighānsati | indraś ca tasmā agnīś ca divo śmaśānim asyatām z 1 z yo me veṃa yo me śaphāṃ śriyaṃ śreṣṭhāṃ jighānsati | indraś ca tasyāgniś ca kṛtyāṃ vi tanutām grhe z 2 z yo me mṛtyum asamṛḍhim ahūnā rātriyā dītsati | indraś ca tasyāgniś cāriśā dahatāṃ svam z 3 z yo me prāṇam yo me 'pānāṃ vyānam śreṣṭhāṃ jighānsati | indraś ca tasyāgniś ca prāṇam-prāṇam anu hatām z 4 z yo mā devajanāśis sarpaśīr vidhyātā vrāhmaṇā | dyamā | agastyena medināv indraś cāgniś ca taṃ hatām z 5 z taṃ satyāujāḥ pra dahatām agnir vāśvānaro vṛṣā | yo mā durasyād dēkṣātāir
yaś ca dipsati vidvalaḥ z 6 z yo mā dipsaty adipsantam yaś ca dipsati dipsantam | vaiśvānarasya daṅṣṭrayor agner api dadhāmi tam z 7 z abhi tam dyāvāṛṭhivī sarītapatām tat te 'ghamenir ucyatām | nirṛtyā badhyatām pāse yo naś pāpam cikitsati z 8 z pratyagvadhaḥ praty uj jahi bhrāṭvyān ghora-cakṣusah | indrāgni enān vṛṣcatām māśām ucchēsi kaś ca na z 9 z pratyagvadheṇa pracyutān bhrāṭvyān dviṣato mama | apānān prāṇān sacid yad dviṣataś pārayādharā z 10 z agne ye mā jighhānsanty agne ye ca dviṣanty mām | agne ye mopā tapyante teśām priyatamaṁ jahi z 11 z tam dviṣantam avadhīṣam andhena tamasāvṛtam | etam martyo 'bhi padyasva mā te moci mahodaraḥ z 12 z 6 z

In st 2b if šepān may mean "cattle" it can stand; otherwise it would hardly seem possible. At the end of 5b perhaps dhyāsat might be acceptable. For st 6 cf Š 4.36.1: in 6c perhaps dikṣābhīr is possible, but Š in e has 6dipsēc ca. Our st 7 is a variant of Š 4. 36. 2. At the end of 10d perhaps spārayād dharabr̥t is intended, or something similar. With our 9d cf Š 11.9.13c, and with our 12d cf Š 4.16.7b.

[f138a3] dyāvāṛṭhivā śannahyēthāṁ mama rāṣṭrāya jayantī a-

Read: dyāvāṛṭhivē śanāh yēthāṁ mama rāṣṭrāya jayantī amīṭreṇhyō hetim asyanīṁ z 1 z vātā pavamānāu sam nāhyēthāṁ oo jayantā oo asyanīṁ z 2 z indrāgni sam nāhyēthāṁ oo jayantā oo asyanīṁ z 3 z mitrāvarunā sam nāhyēthāṁ oo jayantā oo asyanīṁ z 4 z bhavāśarvā sam nāhyēthāṁ oo jayantā oo asyanīṁ z 5 z aśvinī sam nāhyēthāṁ oo jayantā oo asyanīṁ z 6 z marutā sam nāhyēdhēvām oo jayantō 'mitreḥhyō hetim
asyantaḥ z 7 z pitaras samā nayadhvam ०० jayanto ०० asyantaḥ 
z 8 z sūryācandramasāu samā nayethām ०० jayantā amitrebhyo 
hetim asyantāu z 9 z ahorātre samā nayethāṁ mama rāṣṭrāya 
jayantī amitrebhyo hetim asyanti z 10 z 7 z
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gandharvāpsarasas sannayadhvam mama rāṣṭrāya 
jayantā a-[12]mittlebhyo hetim asyantaḥ z sarvapunyajanás samā 
vanaspatayas samā vanaspa-[13] tyās samā | vanaspatyās samā 
ōsadhayas samā | virudhas sannayadhvam mama rāṣṭrā-[14]ya 
jānanto amitrebhyo hetim asyantaḥ | sūryascandramasāu samā-
nahyasva mama [15] rāṣṭrāya jayaḥ | amitrebhyo hetim asyantau 
prajāpataye samā paramesṭhygam samā-[16]nahyasva mama rāṣṭrāya 
jayaḥ amitrebhyo hetim asyān | udārā udīrdhvam vi-[17]śvāní 
bhūtāṁ sannayethāṁ mama rāṣṭrāya jayantī amitrebhyo hetim 
asya-[18]nāṁ z 8 z

Read: gandharvāpsarasas samā naryadhvam mama rāṣṭrāya 
jayantī amitrebhyo hetim asyantāḥ z 1 z sarvapunyajanāṁ samā 
nahydvam ०० z 2 z vanaspatayas samā nahydvam ०० z 
3 z vanaspatyās samā nahydvam ०० z 4 z ośadhayas samā 
nahydvam ०० jayantyo ०० asyantāḥ z 5 z virudhas samā nah-
yadhvam mama rāṣṭrāya jayantyo amitrebhyo hetim asyantayā 
z 6 z sūryācandramasāu samā naryethām ०० jayantā ०० asyantāu 
z 7 z prajāpate samā nahyasva ०० jayann ०० asyan z 8 z paramesṭhin 
samā nahyasva ०० jayann ०० asyan z 9 z udārā udīrdhvam viśvāni 
bhūtāṁ samā nahydvam mama rāṣṭrāya jayanty amitrebhīyo 
hetim asyanti z 10 z 8 z
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tagṛ̥ṣaṭā sa imā senā ṛṣaṭu | anuṣṭhātar anu 
[19] tiṣṭha sarve virā bhavantu me | indro ṛṣaṭā | somo ṛṣaṭā 
varuṇo ṛṣaṭā | [20] vāyū ṛṣaṭa tvaṣṭa ṛṣaṭā | dhūṭa | ṛṣaṭa 
| savitā ṛṣaṭā | śūrya ṛṣaṭa | [138b] candramā ṛṣaṭa | sa imāṁ 
senāṁ ṛṣaṭa anuṣṭhātar anu zə z 9 z

Read: agni ṛṣaṭā sa imāṁ senāṁ ṛṣaṭa | anuṣṭhātar anu 
tiṣṭha sarve virā bhavantu me z 1 z indro ṛṣaṭā sa ०० z 2 z somo 
ṛṣṭa sa ०० z 3 z varuṇo ṛṣaṭā sa ०० z 4 z vāyū ṛṣaṭā sa 
०० z 5 z tvaṣṭa ṛṣaṭa sa ०० z 6 z dhūṭa ṛṣaṭa sa ०० z 7 z 
savitā ṛṣaṭa sa ०० z 8 z śūrya ṛṣaṭa sa ०० z 9 z candramā
raksita sa imam senam rakshatu | anusthatar anu tiṣṭha sarve virā bhavantu me z 10 z 9 z
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[f138b2] aha rakṣat tad imām anuṣṭhātar anu rāṭrī rakṣātri |
saṣṭamām anuṣṭhātry a-[3]nu z indrāṇī rakṣātri | varuṇāṇī |
| rakṣātri | sinīvali rakṣātri | sa [4] imām anuṣṭhātry anu | samudro |
rakṣatā | parjanyo rakṣatā | vrhaspati [5] rakṣatā | prajāpati |
rakṣatā | parameśṭhi rakṣatā | sa imām senā rakṣa-[6]tu z anuṣṭhātar anu tiṣṭha sarve virā bhavantu me zz zz ity atha-[7]rvaṇika- |
pāṭpalādāsākhāyām daśamaś kāṇḍas samāptah z z

Read: aha rakṣit tad imām senām rakṣatā | anuṣṭhātar anu tiṣṭha sarve virā bhavantu me z 1 z rāṭrī rakṣātri semāṁ o o | anuṣṭhātry anu ** z 2 z indrāṇī rakṣātri semāṁ o o z 3 z varuṇāṇī rakṣātri semāṁ o o o o z 4 z sinīvalī rakṣātri semāṁ senām rakṣatā | anuṣṭhātry anu tiṣṭha sarve virā bhavantu me z 5 z samudro rakṣitā sa imām senām rakṣatā | anuṣṭhātar anu tiṣṭha sarve virā bhavantu me z 6 z parjanyo rakṣitā sa o o o z 7 z vrhaspati rakṣitā sa o o o o z 8 z prajāpati rakṣitā sa o o o o o z 9 z parameśṭhi rakṣitā sa imām senām rakṣatā | anuṣṭhātar anu tiṣṭha sarve virā bhavantu me z 10 z 10 z anu. 2 z

ity atharvaṇi kapāṭpīṭalādāsākhāyām daśamaś kāṇḍas samāptah z z
THE HEBREW TERMS FOR GOLD AND SILVER

PAUL HAUPT

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

HEBREW kāṣf, silver (Syr. ḫispā, Ass. kaspū) is not a Babylonian loanword (contrast AkF 59). Nor can it be combined with Arab. kash, gain. The primary connotation is not pale (EB 4523; EB 112b) but fusible, just as Ass. ḥarpū, silver, is derived from šardū, to smelt. In Arabic we have ḥarfīf, pure silver, and in modern Arabic, ṭūbāq, which has the same meaning, and murāṭbaq, refined. In Ethiopic, bētar denotes silver, while Heb. bātar signifies pure (JBL 39, 164). Arab. ḥarrāf (or ḥafrāf) has the meaning money changer (prop. argentarius). Arab. āfrīf, red (= ḥarīf; JBL 39, 172, 1. 8; cf. also ḥarīb and AJP 43, 241) may be a transposition of Sum. zabār, copper, bronze, while āfrīf, pure, is derived from ḥarīpū (contrast AF 185). Heb. ḥāḇāf, to smelt, refine, test (> Surepta, Ass. Ārāpu) is a doublet of ḥarīf, to burn, and Arab. ṣārūba, to drink, orig. to be parched with thirst (cf. Heb. bāʿār to burn =

---

1 I adhere to the term Assyrian. In my paper Accadian and Sumerian, which I presented at the meeting of the American Oriental Society in Philadelphia, April 24, 1919, I stated that it was unnecessary to substitute Accadian for Assyrian, but in the abstract printed in JAOS 39, 143, d, the prefix un has been omitted.

2 For the abbreviations see vol. 42 of this JOURNAL, p. 301, n. l.—
   AT = Kautzsch-Bertholet, Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments (1923).
   BuA = Meissner, Babylonien und Assyrien (Heidelberg, 1920).—BuL =
   Bauer und Leander, Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache (Halle,
   1922).—JPOS = Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society.—PB = Polychrome
   Bible.—SATA = Die Schriften des Alten Testaments in Auswahl neu übersetzt
   von Gunkel, &c. (Göttingen, 1922).—pB = post-Biblical.—infra = below;
   supra = above; = middle; = at the end.

3 Bronze is called in Arabic: ṭādīs ḍhmar or ṭādī ḍhmār; cf. ṭādān, also ṭādīʿa, to be dark red or brown, or rusty; rust is connected with rust, ruddy, red, &c. Arab. ṭāṭā, copper, is derived from Ass. ṭāṭu-ṭāṭūd, to shine, glisten (HW 564) which is used specially of copper (ṭāṭū la ʿer).

4 Modern Ḥarand < Ḥarant < Ḥarpallu; cf. the reading Ḥarēṭādlā in

I. K. 17, 9.
Arab. bāğīra, to suffer from insatiable thirst). The f in Heb. šărāf is due to partial assimilation of the b (cf. rābāq and mu-rābāq cited above) to the s as in Ass. dišpu, honey = Arab. dibs (JBL 34, 186) while the c instead of ʃ is due to the r (JBL 40, 171"a", 173"a") just as the q in Heb. čakah, to laugh, instead of šahāq, is due to the q (JBL 39, 164"a").

Ass. kaspū, silver, must be combined with Arab. sākaba or sābaka, to smelt (syn. aḏāba). Arab. sabkāh denotes an ingot of gold or silver. Arab. sākaba, to pour out (syn. čāba) corresponds to Ass. šapāku, Heb. šašāk. The p in kaspū, silver, and šapāku, to pour out, is due to partial assimilation of the original b. Ass. sakāpu, to overthrow, appears in Arabic as bākasa (JBL 38, 47, n. 3).

The term hašmāl, which we find in Ez. 1, 4. 27; 8, 2, denotes, according to ΣΣ, electrum, i.e. a natural alloy of gold and silver. No native gold entirely free from silver has ever been found. Pliny (33, 80) says: Omnī auro inest argentum vario pondere. In order to obtain pure gold (cf. Arab. xīlāq) and silver it was necessary to part these two metals. This was performed by the agency of fire. In the bilingual incantation ASKT 79, 19 (CV 22) the fire-god is called the refiner of silver and gold, Ass. mudammig čarpa u-xurāgi (for Ass. damāgu see JBL 34, 55 37, 227). Cupellation is referred to in Is. 1, 25 (which is a secondary addition). Some of the various Hebrew terms for gold may be due to the fact that certain alloys of gold (EB"a" 12, 196") were regarded as different metals. On the other hand, the Romans regarded lead and tin as two varieties of the same species: lead was known as plumbum nigrum, and tin as plumbum candidum (Plin. 34, 156). A thin dark film forms when lead is exposed to ordinary air, while tin is not subject to tarnishing on exposure to normal air.

Gold is not only silver-bearing, it is found also in combination with lead, sulphur, tellurium, &c. The characteristic yellow color of gold is notably affected by small quantities of other metals. We speak of red gold, i.e. gold alloyed with copper; white gold, i.e. 20 parts of silver to 4 parts of gold; green gold, i.e. 70% of silver and 30% of gold; blue gold, i.e. 75%
of gold and 25% of iron. In French, German silver or argentan (i. e. an alloy of copper, zinc, and nickel or manganese) is called cuivre blanc, and brass (64 parts of copper and 36 parts of zinc) is known as cuivre jaune. The ancients called this alloy orichalc (δρεῖχαλκος) which became in Latin, through popular etymology, aurichalcum (Plin. 34, 2. 4). According to Schulten, Tartessos, p. 54 (cf. below, n. 10), δρεῖχαλκος may have been Tartessian bronze.

Heb. hašmdl may be identical with Ass. elmšu (=halmašu) which we find e. g. in KB 6, 166, l. 11 (for mašaru in this line cf. JBL 37, 256; contrast Streck, Assurb. 509; OLZ 24, 74). The final l in Heb. hašmdl may be a secondary addition as it is in Heb. karmél and gib'ol or in Arab. 'uqbilah, and the stem hašam may be identical with Syr. azmāk, to glitter. Pliny (33, 81) says: Electri natura est ad lucernarum lumina clarior argento splendere. The ē is due to the h; cf. Syr. pīqād, passover = Heb. pāš which may be derived from Ass. puššuxu, to appease (Pur. 27, 11). Puššuxu is identical with Heb. šibbāḥ, to still, calm, appease; Arab. sābbaxa means to assuage, allay, alleviate.

Syr. ĉemāk corresponds not only to Heb. zamāk, to sprout, but also to šamāk, to rejoice and Ass. šamāsu, to sprout, which has passed into Syriac as šēyāk (ZA 2, 265). We find in Latin: laetus ager, laetae segetes (AJSL 19, 199). Parsifal says to Kundry after the Good Friday Spell in the third act (p. 238 of Joseph Rubinstein's piano-score): Du weinest,—sich' es lacht die Aue. We speak of smiling meadows. For the two forms zamāk and šamāk we may compare the two spellings of the name Isaac with ĝ and ū; cf. also Ass. ĝunu (<cahānu) to fill a vessel, load a ship (HW 556) =Arab. ūhāna (contrast GB 16 689) i. e. a ū of ūn, to be full, which we have e. g. in Arab. āyāhāna, to be big-bellied, and ūhīna = āhīna, to be angry, prop. hitmēl ūmā (Dan. 3, 19). Cf. Ass. malttu, angry (NE 139, n. 17) and Arab. taṣānāda, ḫābīla, sākira, to be angry (syn. qūṣība ya-taṣājżaza) which mean orig. to be full. The primary connotation of Arab. ūn, proper or destined time, is fulness of time (Gal. 4, 4). For the prefixed ū cf. Arab. ūhāda to sharpen <hd (see Mic. 98") and ūdaxa, to crush =fūdaxa = ūdaga.

Words meaning to shine may also mean to blossom: Arab. zāhara and nāyyara have both meanings; nūr denotes light,
and nągr: blossom. Gr. ἀνθός, blossom, flower, is used also of the luster of gold; Lucretius (1, 900) has the phrase flos flammar. Heb. nı`ṣāq signifies blossom, and nī+zāq: spark (ZA 30, 66). Brightness may mean cheerfulness: Ass. namār kabitti, brightness of the liver, has this meaning; for I was cheerful we find kabitti immir, my liver was bright. In Arabic the stem čamāh appears as māхаца to flash (syn. ldma’a) and sāmāxā (syn. žāla’a) which is used of sprouting millet (jumām).

Ass. elimışu is generally combined with Heb. ūllamīš, quartz (EB 1751 abusive). Quartz is often auriferous; so ūllamīš may be a transposed doublet of hašmāl, and Ass. ʾšmarā may be a doublet of elimışu. The original meaning may be glittering. Ass. elimışu in NE 42, 11 is certainly a metal, not a diamond (cf. EB 4901 abusive).

I stated above that Arab. sābaka, to melt, was synonymous with adāba. The stem of ʾdāhab, gold, is a modification of ʾdāba, just as the stem of Heb. kōhen, priest, is a byform of kān (JAOS 42, 374). Arab. ʾdāhaba, to go away, is a byform of ʾdāba, to melt (used of snow, fat, &c.)=Heb. zūb, to run. To run may mean to become fluid, melt. We say, The ice begins to run. Arab. ʾdāyb al-ʾdāhab denotes a solution of gold, and ʾdāy yab means easily melted; the noun mīyāb signifies melting pot. Heb. zūb is used of a gonorrheal discharge (AV a running issue) and of a menstrual discharge. The definition gonorrhoea benigna, given in GB abusive, is incorrect; Lev. 15, 3 refers to acute and chronic gonorrhea (EB abusive 27, 983 abusive; 32, 912 abusive) although Holzinger states in AT abusive that zūb can hardly refer to gonorrhea (contrast S-S). We have this stem also in the name of the river Zūb which means run, but was misinterpreted as Lūkos (BAL 92). Arab. sāba-jažūbu, to run (syn. járdā) or to run away (syn. insālā hārabā) must be a dialectic form. I do not believe that Heb zahāb denotes aurum fluviatile, Sp. oro de rio=alluvial gold, placer-gold (Ger. Waschgold), i. e. native gold obtained from washing gold-bearing sand or gravel. Strabo (146) says ὁ δὲ χρυσός οὗ μεταλλέυται μῶνον ἄλλα καὶ στρεται καταφέροντι δ’ οἱ ποταμοί καὶ οἱ χειμαρροὶ τὴν χρυσίτων ἁμον.

---

* There is no reference to gold-washes (χρυσοπλύσια) in Job 28, 1; masōm laz-zahāb jasāqqi does not mean die Gründe, da man Gold auswascht (SATA abusive III, 2, p. 112; contrast EB 1752, l. 1; jasāqqi refers to the fine crush-
Heb. da'ăŏ represents the Aramaic (JBL 37, 222, l. 7) form; contrast Lam. 4, 9 and cf. Nah. 35, l. 3. For mēdībōl (Lev. 26, 16) read madībōl. Heb. zēb, wolf (not zē'ēb; cf. JBL 37, 214<sup>38</sup>), means golden, i. e. yellowish. The Palestinian wolves are tawny. Arab. ġī'b denotes jackal (Hommel, Sāugetiere 303; Jacob, Beduinenleben 18) and the jackal is called canis aureus (Ger. Goldwolf).

Also Syr. ḥarrā'a, which corresponds to Heb. ḥarāq, gold, means yellow. But the original meaning of ḥarāq (which appears in Greek as χρυσός) is dug out, Lat. effossum. It refers, not to alluvial gold, but to reef-gold, i. e. gold obtained from mining in the solid rock (Ger. Berggold). F. v. Duhn combined χρυσός with χαράσσεν (GB<sup>41</sup> 263<sup>24</sup>) but both noun and verb are Semitic loanwords (just as γλυκέν < Ass. gullupu = pB gilláf). Pliny (33, 69) says of reef-gold: Quod effossum est tunditur, lavator, uritur, molitor, and in the preceding paragraph: Quod puteis foditur canalicium vacant, aliō canaliense. The special Hebrew name for reef-gold (or native gold in quartz) is ḥarāq sagūr (Ass. xurāçu sagru; AkF 20), i. e. native gold shut up in quartz-veins. It may be rendered vein-gold. Ass. xarāçu means to dig, the noun xarāçu denotes ditch or moat (AJSL 23, 250). In Joel 4, 14 we must read 'emq hāh-ḥarāq, The Valley of The Gorge, i. e. the valley of Ajalon (DB 1, 280<sup>38</sup>) instead of 'emq hāh-ḥarāq which is supposed to mean the Valley of Decision (JAP 43, 240).

ing and sifting of gold ores (EB<sup>II</sup> 20, 239<sup>32</sup>, lbm, 241<sup>31</sup>). Zaqīq (cf. Mic. 94<sup>2</sup>) is a byform of daqīq; see Noldeke, Mand. Gr. 43; Nah. 35<sup>3</sup>; cf. Heb. gadō and gadā; Syr. mēqā and mēqā; Arab. ḍiba and ṣābā; jēfāma and jēfama >Heb. dagōn, grain, prop. cut off, with transposition and partial assimilation of m to d as in Heb. dān = Arab. sanād (JBL 35, 322<sup>2</sup>). Cf. also Arab. lāḏu = lāziq = lāziqā = lāqiq (Eth. laqā). The g is due to partial assimilation of the z to the q; in lāziqā the z has been assimilated to the l (JBL 36, 141, n. 3; AJP 17, 489, n. 1). The root lāz appears also in lāziqā = lāziqā, lāzima or lāzima, and modern Arab. lājjas. In addition to lāzima and lāziqā we have also lāza, lāziqa, and lāziqa. Ass. daqīq and dāqīq (<madāq) are derived from the same root (JBL 34, 55; 37, 227). Syr. ḍeqeq means not only pounded, fine, but also sifted. For ḥarāq in Job 36, 27 we must read ḥanāqū, they are stored, lit. bottled <Aram. ṣeqq, Arab. ṣiq, skin-bottle, wine-skin. For ḥanāqūh lē'-ēd meḥarō, they are stored for the flood of His rain, cf. Ps. 33, 7 (read kān-nēē)."
A transposed doublet of *harț*, ditch, is *čerḥ*, excavation, which denotes *cellar*, vault in Jud. 9, 46. 49 (ZA 11, 322; AT4) and 1 S 13, 6 (Nowack) although in the second passage it might also have the meaning *burial-vault*, sepulchral chamber (Löhr and SATA*: Grab, AT4: Gruft*) which *dāriḥ* (AJSL 13, 273) has in Arabic (and Nabatean). The Roman catacombs were used by the early Christians as temporary hiding-places in times of persecution (cf. also Dillm. *Chrest. Aeth.* p. 5, l. 5). *Σις* (τάφος, septicum, bêt qēbūrā) seem to have read *čerḥ* instead of *čēḥā* in Ps. 68, 7 (Moore, *Judges*, ICC, 266*¹*; contrast AJSL 23, 237, n. 62). We must certainly substitute *čēḥām* for *čēḥām* in Neh. 4, 7 (see S-S, SBOT, AT4): it means there *dugouts* (EB*¹¹* 32, 482*¹¹*). According to Moore (PB) *čēḥām* in Jud. 9, 46 may denote an *excavation* in the earth or rock not under, but behind the temple.

VG 242, e combines *čerḥ* with Syr. *gūrhā*, cell; but *gūrhā* <kūrhā which appears in Arabic as *kirḥ*. The *g* instead of *k* is due to the *r*; cf. Ass. *guzlu* = Syr. *kūhlā* (OLZ 16, 492; MVAG 26, 1, p. 37; PAPS 48, 243*¹*). AF 29 thought it possible that Syr. *kūrhā* was identical with Arab. *kūx*, hut, but preferred to combine it with PB *kūk*, wall-recess, niche (or *pigeon-hole*; EB 5133, 4; JSOR 1, 4) in which the dead bodies were laid. If this were correct, *gūrhā* could not be identical with *čēḥā*: the *čēḥā* is the sepulchral chamber (Lat. *cubiculum*) and *kūlēm* denotes the recesses (Lat. *loculi*) in the walls of the chamber, which were, as a rule, just large enough to receive a corpse. They were not arranged like berths in a state-room, as they are in the Roman catacombs, but entered the rock at right angles to the wall, so that their opening resembled the mouth of a baker's oven, the bodies being introduced endways, just as a baker's oven is charged by means of a *peel* (EB*¹¹* 5, 491*¹¹*). The bodies lay with their feet towards the chamber. The Arabic term for these wall-recesses is *luhād* (ZA 9, 332) <līhada = dāhala = PB *halād*, to burrow> Heb. *ḥold*, mole-rat (ZDMG 64, 712, 1. 13) which appears in Arabic as *xulād*.

gūmhā, Nab. gāhā, see Lidzbarski, Epigraphik 250. 393; Cook, Glossary of Aramaic Inscriptions 37; Cooke, North Semitic Inscriptions 237. Palmyr. gūmhā has no connection with Arab. jabb, beehive (ZA 9, 333) although we have beehive tombs (JBL 40, 173) and b may represent an original m (cf. Arab. kāriba, to be decrepit = kārima). For the elision of the m in Nabat. gāhā cf. Ass. Dāzu = Heb. Tammūz (ZA 2, 270).

If Arab. kūx, hut, represented Syr. kūrhā, cell (ZA 9, 333) we might compare Štōn (Deut. 4, 8) = Štrōn (JAOS 41, 186). We might also refer to Brücke’s theory that x was composed of z and r (BA 1, 257). But Arab. kūx represents merely a later form of Pers. kāx (see Pur. 16, 41). Nor is Syr. kāytā, whirlwind (JAOS 32, 13) derived from kērāk; to go around (ZA 9, 333): it must be combined with Ass. kūku (NE 136, 46; 138, 88, 91) < Sum. kuku, black (SGl 125). The original meaning is black squall which is also the primary connotation of Ass. akāmu, storm; cf. Syr. rūḥa, ukkāmta, a black wind, i.e. a stormy wind (contrast HW 56). Syr. kāytā (= Arab. zāyba’ah) is a blend-word (cf. JHUC 287, 34 and the so-called brunch-words or portmanteau-words) influenced by Syr. kārāktā, whirlwind. $^6$ has kāytā (cf. kāytā dē-pārēhā) in Ex 10, 22 for δ ὑβελλα. Ki-ba-a-ti (i.e. kēpāti; see BAL 102) at the end of the same line in NE corresponds to Syr. kēpāt bārdā, hailstones; cf. ZDMG 73, 166, 1. 6 and Heb. ābanim Josh. 10, 11.

Syr. hērīlā is the name of carthamus tinctorius, i.e. safflower or bastard saffron. Both safflower and saffron are derived from Arab. ʤfar, yellow; but ʧfārra means originally to have the color of brass; Arab. ʧifr (or ʧifr) copper, brass, gold, is the Sum. zabar which appears in Assyrian as siparru, bronze (BuA 1, 265; cf. also GB 551, l. 19). For the ʧ instead of x cf. the remarks above on garāpu = šarāpu. The original meaning of Sum. zabar is shining, lustrous; it denotes originally copper, just as χαλλὸς was originally the name of pure copper (cf. EB 893; SGL 219, 51). The Sumerian name for copper is urudu. The combination of melted copper and tin for the purpose of forming bronze is alluded to in the Sumerian incantation in which the fire-god is called the mixer of copper and tin. Ass. muballil eri ṣ-anaki (ASKT 79, 16; CV 22). Sum. urudu appears in Latin as raudus, rodus, rudus, which is not
connected with *rudis*, rough (Lagarde, *Mittteil.* 1, 88; CV xxxv; AkF 59). Ass. *anaku* < Sum. *nak, nik* (*naga, nigī*). The Ethiopic form is *nāk*. For the prefixed a cf. *JAOS* 37, 322, n. 11, and *anak*, beverage < *nak*, to drink (SGI 197).

The stem of Heb. *ḥarāḥ*, gold is identical with Arab. *ḥādir*, green (cf. Heb. *ḥaṣir*, grass). Similarly Eth. *yarq*, gold, corresponds to Heb. *jārq*, green; cf. *jērāṛāq* *ḥarāḥ* (Ps 68, 14; AJSL 23, 223). The primary connotation of the stem *yarq* is to go up; Arab. *yāraq* has the meaning of Heb. *'alē*. We have the same root in Arab. *rāqīqa*, to ascend, and *margāt*, ladder; cf. Ass. *margītu*, refuge, prop. high place, Heb. *mīṣgāb*, Arab. *ya'll*, *Mic. 72* and *ērī* ḫrōv *ṭēbēnu* ṭī (contrast BA 1, 174; HW 619). Ass. *mūraqū*, height, must be derived from *yarq* (contrast HW 133b; BA 1, 127; NBSS 50, n. 2). For *yaj-jārēq* in Gen. 14, 14 (cf. OLZ 18, 73; JPOS 1, 69) we must read *yaj-jorēq*, he raised, brought up (Ass. *usēlt*; Ass. *sālūtu* does not mean garrison, but levy) and for *yaj-jēḥalēq* at the beginning of the following verse we must substitute *yaj-jēḥāq* < *lāḥaq* = Arab. *lāḥiga*, to overtake. I have subsequently noticed that this emendation is suggested also in Perles’ *Analekten* (1922). The stem *lāḥaq* is a doublet of *dāḥaq*; cf. JBL 35, 322 and Arab. *dāḥqāba* (orig. *dāḥqa bi*): the original meaning of *dāḥqa* is to push, press, drive. The root is *dh*.

The primary connotation of Heb. *ḥātm*, gold, is subduable (JSOR 1, 8; contrast HW 499b, l. 12) = non-refractory, i.e. fusible and easily hammered up or beaten into thin leaves. Heb. *paz*, fine gold, must be combined with Arab. *fāzza*, to run, which is used of a bleeding wound (syn. *sāla-jasīlu*). Arab. *nasīf*, bleeding, is a transposition of the same root (cf. JBL 39, 154) with prefixed *n*. Arab. *fāzza*, to start (e.g. game) or *starīle*, rouse suddenly, means prop. to cause to run. In Syriac, *paz* signifies to *leap*, frisk, as lambs and kids. Heb. *mēfazēs* (2 S 6, 16) denotes leaping, dancing: David was leap-

---

* The primary connotation of *katāmu* is to cover (OC 33, 87). Heb. *kattōt* (> *χτόαντ*, tunic) is derived from the same stem which appears in Ethiopic, with reciprocal assimilation, as *kađena* (cf. Ass. *mundaḫu*, fighter = *mumdadḫu*). The root is *km*; cf. Arab. *kūma* and AJSL 23, 247. *Katāmu* to subdue, means prop. to cover on all sides, surround entirely, envelop. For *mīktām*, rite (i.e. a poem mystically or obscurely expressed) prop. *tecta locutio*, see JHUC 325, 38.
ing and dancing when the Ark was brought in. For mēfassēs u-mēbarkēr 1 Chr. 15, 29 has mēraqqēd u-mēbāḥḥēq. In Ethiopic we have zafana, to leap (<nafaza).

I do not believe that paz means alluvial gold (cf. above the remarks on sahāb). Nor do I think that paz represents an older form of bas, booty, so that the b would be due to partial assimilation (cf. barzel, iron=parzel; JBL 35, 280). It is true that saz, present, may be an older form of šē, sheep, and pazz = bass might have the meaning ἄρτογμα or ἄρτογμος in Phil. 2, 6, i.e. a thing to be grasped at, a prize to be seized on, a find. This might have denoted lump gold, nugget, Sp. pepita, RV has for όξυ ἄρτογμον ἔγνεκτο τῷ εἴναι ὦν θεῷ counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, and in the margin: a thing to be grasped. In Arabic, bass denotes not only spoil, but also victory, armor, raiment, fine linen, silk, &c. Similarly to rob is connected with rothe, and plunder signifies original household effects. There is no word 'ufās or mufās in OT (GB18 638): for kātm 'ufās Dan. 10, 5 we must read kātm u-fās=yē-fās. For 'ā cf. mē'āم, anything<mā'um; Arab. māmmā, whatever; Ass. mi-ma=Eth. mī, what? cf. Ass. ʾā下属, any one, Arab. ʾāmū-mā, whatever (see Kings 118, 1). BuL §34, b still combines mē'āmā with mām, spot, blemish.

Heb. bāṣr does not mean Bruchera, as it is rendered in AT4. Nor can it be combined with Arab. bāzar, bāṣr, ring, signet (ZA 2, 59) although Pliny seems to think that gold was first used for rings; he says (33, 6): Pessumum vitae scelus fecit qui primum induit digitis, and in 33, 42: Proxumum scelus fuit ejus qui primus ex auro denarium signavit. Heb. bāṣr denotes zahāb bahān, tried gold, i.e. assayed, refined (cf. Job 23, 10; Zech. 13, 9). Assay is identical with essay, to try, attempt, Fr. essayer. In Jer. 6, 27 the original text seems to have been mēbāṣṣēr nēṭattika bē-ammi, I have set thee as an assayer among my people (cf. JHUC 316, 28) that thou mayest know and try their way, and bōhōn, which we find at the beginning of the verse in H, is a gloss to mēbāṣṣēr, which has displaced the original reading (cf. Mic. 94,*; JBL 38, 146). Bōhōn is an Aramaic form. The Hebrew stem bāṣar, to inspect, examine, test, try, corresponds to Arab. bāṣara, to perceive >istābāṣara, to exam- 

* Cf. πάλαι, Strabo 146; palagae and palacurnae, Plin. 33, 77; contrast strigiles, Plin. 33. 62.
ine (syn. istabána). To test is derived from test, earthen pot (cf. Lat. testa) in which metals were tried. In Syriac we find the stem bagar in the transposed form bērāq, to explain clearly. Etb tabārāq means to shine, sparkle, while Arab. ábraq denotes leprous, orig. blank, white (cf. Ex. 4, 6; Num. 12, 9; 2 K 5, 27). Al-ábraq signifies moon (Heb. lēbaná). J. D. Michaelis' explanation of bāqr as aurum spectatissimum was correct.

Job 22, 24, 25 is a later addition; the apodosis to v. 23 is v. 26, just as the immediate sequel of John 19, 33 is v. 36. The glossator who added vv. 34, 35 meant to emphasize the fact that Jesus was a god who had no red blood like ordinary mortals, but ichor (Iliad 5, 340), i.e. lymph which may be regarded as blood without red corpuscles and diluted with water. The secondary insertion in Job 22, 24, 25 means that Job may throw away his finest gold and silver, because God will be his gold and silver. Ps. 73, 25 affords no parallel. Luther's Wenn ich nur Dich habe, so frage ich nichts nach Himmel und Erde (JHUC 287, 43) is beautiful, but untenable. In the first hemistic we must insert kamōka, like Thee, following Τ kēyātāk, not zālatēkā (Gunkel, Psalmen 231) or 'immēkā (SATA; AT; Duhm). The hemistic Mī-li kamōka baš-samājm means Whom have I like Thee in heaven? i.e. There is no god like Thee. The psalmist does not deny the existence of other gods. The 'immēkā in the second hemistic is synonymous with kamōka (GB 595). Bā'-ārāq at the end of the line is a corruption of bē-ārīq; cf. Arab. ārida mīn = sāfa; Jer. 20, 11; Ps. 89, 8; 16, 3 (Mic. 42, 12; JAOS 32, 124). The rendering in SATA, Nur Du bist hier mein Begehrr, is unwarranted as are also the translations in Budde, Die schönsten Psalmen (1915): Wen hab' ich im Himmel ausser Dir, und neben Dir mag ich nichts auf Erden (this would require insertion of bāk-kāl) or Schmidt, Psalmen (1917): Was beut mir droben der Himmel? Hab' ich Dich nur, was gilt mir die Welt?

The objection that the primary connotation of the Hebrew for gold and silver cannot be fusible, because these metals must have been known before the art of smelting was practiced, is not valid: there is no evidence that the names zāhāb, gold, kāsf, silver, &c. were used before smelting was invented. In the premetallurgical period ores containing gold and silver may have been called simply ābānim, stones (cf. Job 28, 2; Deut.

The art of extracting metal from their ores was no doubt known long before the ancestors of the Jews adopted the language of Canaan (JBL 36, 94). The blast furnace which was originally simply a cavity in the ground, partially filled with ignited charcoal and provided with bellows, is perhaps the oldest metallurgical contrivance. Before the minerals can be separated, the ores must be crushed (cf. VHOK 232; contrast EB 889'; GB 758'). Tarshish, where Solomon (c. 950) is said to have sent ships, denotes *spalling-floor*, ore-dressing (JBL 35, 280m). The ancients may have had a rude ore-mill like the Mexican *arrastre* (see cut in CD 318). If Tarshish ship should denote simply a *transoceanic ship* (AT 1, 519, note c), Tarshish must have been known long before the term was used in this sense. I stated in my paper *Elysium, Elishah, and Alāšia* (JHUC 287, 46) that Cretan adventurers may have established a colony in the valley of the Guadalquivir in the fourth pre-Christian millennium. 

Furnaces are referred to in the oldest legends of the OT,

---

The Isles of Elishah, whence, according to Ex. 27, 7, the Tyrians imported blue and red purple, i.e. the lichen-dyes litmus and archil, are the Azores which Pliny (6, 203) calls the Purple Islands. The cuneiform name of Cyprus in the Amarna Tablets, *Alāšia* (JPOS 1, 75) means Red Land, i.e. Copper Island. *Alāšia* etymologically = *Εὔπηθεα*. Cadiz and the adjacent islands were called *Εὔπηθεα*, the Red Land (Strabo 148) from the scarlet pigment obtained from the cinnabar mined at Almadén (JHUC 163, 52m; 287, 47). After the destruction of Tartessos (near the mouth of the Guadalquivir) c. 500 bc, *Gades* was often used for Tarshish; cf. Schulten, *Tartessos* (Hamburg, 1922) pp. ix, 46. Schulten agrees with me in thinking that Tarshish may have been an ancient Cretan colony, also in combining Plato's Atlantis with southern Spain (op. cit. pp. 80, 88). For *Εὔπηθεα* see ibid. pp. 20, 31, 32. Southern Spain was the center of a very old civilization as early as 2500 bc. (op. cit. pp. 8, 9, 12, 15). Sargon of Accad (c. 2775 b. c.) seems to call Tarshish *muši Anaku*, the Tin-land (cf. above p. 123; the tin came from Britain, the Jews' houses in Cornwall, &c.) while Esarhaddon (681–668) uses the name *Tarsitu* (see op. cit. pp. 14, 11, 16; cf. ZDMG 63, 516, I. 36; 64, 707, I. 7; JBL 36, 144, I. 13, 35, 280m).
e. g. Gen. 15, 17; 19, 28 (both J). The antediluvian son of Lamech, Tubal-cain, was supposed to be the father of all artificers in copper and iron (Gen. 4, 22). The frequent metaphorical use of the terms furnace, try, refine, &c. show that the OT writers must have been acquainted with metallurgy; cf. Heb. bahān, tīkhār, ziqqāq, garāf, maqrēf, kūr, kibšān, &c. and Deut. 4, 20; 1 K 8, 51; Is. 1, 25; 48, 10; Jer. 6, 29; 11, 4; Ez. 22, 18–22; Zech. 13, 9; Mal. 3, 3; Ps. 66, 10; Prov. 17, 3, &c. For kibšān see JBL 36, 93; for kūr: AJSL 23, 246. The kūr hab-barzēl was, of course, not an eiserner Ofen, as Luther rendered, i. e. made of iron, but an iron-furnace, i. e. a furnace for smelting iron. I have explained Mal. 3, 3 in JHUC 316, 28. The Messenger of the Covenant, referred to in Mal. 3, 1, is Ezra (JBL 38, 43, n. 4).
BRIEF NOTES

The Loss of the Urumia Concordance to the Peshitta

Some twenty-five years ago the task of preparing a concordance to the Peshitta version of the Bible was undertaken by the scholars in the American Mission at Urumia, Persia. The suggestion of the undertaking came from Professor George F. Moore of Harvard University, then at Andover Seminary, and the plan was taken up with enthusiasm by Dr. Benjamin W. Labaree and his associates in the Nestorian Mission. A tentative beginning was made, and specimen sheets were printed and sent to a number of the best Syriac scholars for comments and suggestions. Following the advice of Professor Moore, it was decided to confine the work at first to the Old Testament, and to base it upon the excellent edition of Justin Perkins, issued at Urumia in 1852. The magnitude of the task soon became apparent, and also the difficulty of financing the publication; nevertheless the work went on steadily, and was done in a scientific and thorough manner.

The all-important problem of finding the money necessary for printing and publishing the book was at last solved in a most satisfactory way. Thanks to the efforts of Professors D. B. Macdonald and L. B. Paton, of Hartford Theological Seminary, a Research Fund was established in that institution, the chief contributor being Mr. D. Willis James, and at the end of the year 1904 Hartford Seminary formally undertook to finance the Concordance. Professor Macdonald was given the oversight of the work, and from this time on he and the scholars in Urumia were in constant correspondence in regard to the details. The Seminary ultimately contributed nearly three thousand dollars.

After the murder of Dr. Labaree by natives in March, 1904, the work on the Concordance at Urumia was in charge of Dr. William A. Shedd, a man whose excellent Syriac scholarship and wide general knowledge fitted him admirably for the task, and until the terrible catastrophe of the great war he gave a
large amount of time and labor to it. At the time of his death, in the summer of 1918, everything was ready for the printer.

As stated above, the Concordance was based on the Urumia edition of the Old Testament, without the Apocrypha. The following details are quoted from a letter by Professor Macdonald embodied in the book *The Measure of a Man*, by Mary Lewis Shedd (New York, George H. Doran Co., 1922), p. 130. "With the Urumia text Ceriani's photo-lithograph of the Codex Ambrosianus was collated and all the variants recorded. The same was done with Barnes' critical edition of the Psalms and with his 'Text of Chronicles,' where the text of the Urumia edition was weak. The order finally adopted was that of the Hebrew text, as to books, chapters, and verses. Everything was put in except enclitics, inseparable prepositions, and particles; for proper names there were references only."

In 1919, after enduring many months of pillage, massacre, and every species of atrocity, the whole Nestorian settlement at Urumia, including the building and equipment of the American Mission, was wiped out by the Turks. Thus perished the last important remnant of the ancient Syriac Church, and the principal surviving representative of the great eastern branch of the Aramaic language. The Peshitta Concordance shared the fate of everything else in the Mission; it was destroyed, and nothing connected with it survived.

The extent of the calamity to Semitic studies and research in the loss of this great work, the fruit of twenty years of expert labor, is beyond estimation. Even those best acquainted with the field can form only an imperfect idea of the service which this Concordance would have rendered to Syriac Lexicography, to the critical study of the Syriac versions of the Bible, and to Semitic science in general. For generations past, indeed, such a work has been one of the chief desiderata. Now that the great achievement of the scholars of Urumia has been brought to naught, it does not seem likely that the task, however necessary, will be undertaken again in the near future. It is very much to be hoped, nevertheless, that some way may soon be found of enlisting once more the efforts of a group of competent scholars in this very exacting but most important joint labor.

*Yale University*

*Charles C. Torrey*
A Note on Pargiter’s Ancient Indian Historical Tradition

Pargiter argues (pp. 50, 77–8) that the Vāyu and Brahmaṇḍa Purāṇas were originally one, and that the differentiation of the one original into two versions with separate names was a later process. He argues also that the source of these and of the other Purāṇas was the old Bhaviṣya Purāṇa.

He has overlooked the fact that the Brahmaṇḍa Purāṇa has been preserved in Bali. Cf. Friederichs, JRAS 1876, 170–1: Weber, Indische Studien II, p. 131 ff. Although large parts of the Veda, the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa have been preserved in Bali, the Brahmaṇḍa is the only one of the Purāṇas which is known there. Friederichs dates the emigration from India about 500 A. D. and explains the existence of only one Purāṇa by the fact that there is in Bali only one Saivite sect and that this particular Purāṇa may have been the one Purāṇa sacred to that sect in India before migration. Laksmana Rao in a very interesting article in the South Indian Research 1919, 200–8 tries to show on the basis of colophons of manuscripts and editions and of other material that the Brahmaṇḍa is the oldest of the Purāṇas and that the Viṣṇu and Vāyu were originally only parts of the Brahmaṇḍa. “In conclusion, I would like to put forward a theory that up to the 3rd or 4th century A. D. there was only one book, known by the name of Purana and that was then or subsequently called the Brahmanda. It contained not more than 12,000 slokas. Parts of that Purana gradually separated themselves from it and formed into independent Puranas. Being chopped off in this way, the original Purana dwindled away into nothing as time went on. The greatest and perhaps the first portions cut off from the main book were the Vishnu and the Vayu Puranas. These separate portions acknowledged their source (in colophons etc.) for some time, but as the sectarian bigotry gained the ascendancy they felt it a disgrace to own their parent and began to lay claim to an independent origin.” Referring to Friederichs’ article he concludes “that when Indians first emigrated to Bali, there was only one Purana in existence or if some of the other Puranas had commenced to detach themselves from the main, they had not acquired the religious influence which they wielded in subsequent ages.” Juyhnball in an article in the Bijdragen tot
de taal-land-en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indie 1900, 272 gives a little more information about the Balinese Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, but has nothing which bears on the present problem. Friederichs states that the Balinese version contains "the history of the ancestors of old dynasties." Does this mean that it contains the dynastic lists? If so, does it contain the names which are missing in a great lacuna in the present Indian edition of the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa (Pargiter, p. 68)? A transcription of the dynastic lists in the Balinese version would be of the greatest assistance to students of the Indian Purāṇas. Also the date at which the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa was taken to Java should be determined as closely as possible. These facts might be of invaluable assistance in unravelling the history of the Indian Purāṇas. There may be more definite information in some of the publications by Dutch scholars in Holland and Java. What is stated above is all that has come to my knowledge. I give it in order to ask for information and because The South Indian Research may not be available to many scholars.

University of Chicago

WALTER EUGENE CLARK
REVIEWS OF BOOKS


This volume represents the patient, loving labor of years, summing up and completing a series of articles which have appeared in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society during the past fourteen years. It brings together from the Purāṇas (and the Epics) all the material which may have any historical bearing, organizes it, and subjects it to criticism. Irrespective of the amount of absolute truth which it may contain it is an important contribution to Indic Philology. Western scholars have neglected the Purāṇas and have been too much inclined to dismiss scornfully and without adequate investigation all their traditions as late fabrications which are false, mythological, and unworthy of being compared in any way with the much earlier and better-preserved Vedic texts. But the Purāṇas contain traditions which claim to reach far back into India’s past. Except for the Veda they are, at present, our only possible means of going back beyond 600 B.C. They deserve to be studied as carefully and as critically as the Vedic texts have been studied.

Little criticism is to be made of the analytical and descriptive portions of the book. They merely present the material as it is found in the Purāṇas. Closer study of the manuscripts of the Purāṇas, of which we have no really critical editions, and a more detailed analysis and criticism may modify many of the details. But such portions as draw inferences and attempt a connected historical narrative are open to serious question. Pargiter, in the enthusiasm of his hobby, is far too antagonistic to the Brahmans and to the Vedas and far too optimistic about the accuracy of kṣatriya tradition. He himself admits (p. 24) that the Purāṇas came under Brahman control in the ninth century B.C. Even if we could admit the accuracy of the earlier kṣatriya tradition the later Brahman tampering must have been much more far-reaching than he is willing to admit.
He seriously damages his own cause by extravagance and exaggeration.

Pargiter argues at length (p. 49 ff.) that the present Purāṇas, the earliest of which seem to have been compiled about 300 A.D., are based on previous Purāṇas which were in existence at least as early as the fifth century B.C. Further, he claims that these early Purāṇas represented a definite and generally accurate tradition which was established in the ninth century B.C. not long after the great battle of the Mahābhārata, and that this tradition in turn had been handed down accurately for centuries from the very beginning of the Aryan invasion of India by sūtras or bards at the courts of kings.

Pargiter takes for the date of Āpastamba the upper limit given by Bühler. Even if Hopkins (Cambridge History of India, vol. 1, pp. 249-50) is right in assigning Āpastamba to the second century B.C., still the passages adduced from the Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra prove conclusively that there were Purāṇas long before the compilation of our present texts. It may be noted that Chanda, The Indo-Aryan Races, pp. 27-8, points out two rules of Pāṇini which seem to imply the existence of ksatriya genealogies. As Keith has pointed out (JRAS 1914, 1027) the quotations in Āpastamba deal with Brahmanical lore. Clearly the Purāṇas had been heavily Brahmanized before his time, but there is no good reason for doubting that they contained genealogies and stories of ancient kings. Did these have exactly the same form as in the later Purāṇas? This cannot be proved positively one way or the other and there is no room for dogmatism. But the Puranic tradition did not have the same religious sanctity which the Vedic literature had and was not surrounded by the same safeguards. There was nothing to prevent serious distortion.

I can see no valid reason for doubting that there may have been a collection of legendary and historical material into some sort of literary form not long after the collection of the religious material of the Rig Veda. The same unknown political causes which contributed to the formation of the one may have led to the formation of the other. I can see no reason why the formation and compilation of such traditions could not have taken place outside of Brahman circles. Keith (JRAS 1914, 120, 1027) argues that there is no evidence to show that any but Brahmans
ever had a part in the formation and handing down of Puranic tradition. His conclusions are much too categorical and dogmatic. We know very little as to what actually went on outside of Brahman circles. The Buddhists and Jains had no difficulty in the sixth century and later in developing a huge literature apart from Brahman influence. There seems no good reason why a similar process could not have taken place earlier. There has been much discussion concerning the Itihāsa-Purāṇa mentioned in the Vedic texts and it has been denied with undue certainty that definite texts could be intended. There seems to me to be nothing in the evidence to disprove the existence of definite texts named Itihāsa and Purāṇa as early as the Upanishads, the Brāhmaṇas, and the Atharva Veda. I agree emphatically with Rapson (Cambridge History of India, vol. 1, pp. 298–9, 302).

Pargiter’s statements (p. 16) about the sūtras and māgadhās suggest an important question. He thinks that the institution of bards goes back to the very earliest times, since Puranic tradition places their origin in the reign of the mythical Prthu Vainya, to whom he gives no place in his dynastic lists, and yet Puranic tradition seems to connect the bards closely with Magadha and the country to the east of Magadha. This territory does not come prominently into notice until far down the dynastic lists, not until number 79 of Pargiter’s list (pp. 118, 282). The name Magadha does not occur in connection with the early kings. This evidence seems to show that the institution of bards does not go so far back as Pargiter thinks. Even if there was tradition about the earliest kings it is likely that much myth and legend was introduced into it at an early date. Even in the Rig Veda there is a thick haze of legend over many of the figures of the distant past. Why should the contemporary kṣatriya tradition have been free from legend? It is idle to argue as Pargiter does that the legendary nature of many of the Vedic stories is due to the fact that the Brahmans were in control of the Vedic literature and that the Brahmans were entirely untrustworthy. Such an absolute standard of truthfulness cannot possibly be maintained for kṣatriya tradition. In every country, even in practical China, such historical tradition becomes more and more hazy, more and more mythical, less and less historical towards the beginning. This is axiomatic. India does not form an exception. Pargiter accepts the genealogies and
stories as correct in the main all the way back to Purûravas. He admits that Purûravas and Ilâ and Manu are shrouded in myth. If accurate, organized, historical tradition began with Purûravas why is there this absolutely sharp line of cleavage between myth and history? Surely if there had been at that time an organized effort to preserve accurate historical tradition there would have been recorded something about the Arvan invasion itself and the period preceding it.

All the Puranic genealogies are traced back to the mythical Manu, the son of the mythical Vivasvat (the sun). From Purûravas (the son of Manu’s daughter Ilâ and Budha or Mercury, the son of Soma or the Moon), from Sudyumna (the name of Ilâ after her magical transformation into a man), and from the nine sons of Manu all the Purâna dynasties are traced. On this magical change of sex Pargiter (p. 295) bases the conclusion that three different races have been combined into one genealogy. The Aila race is Aryan. The Sadyumna race is Munḍâ. The other, which is represented by the descendants of the nine sons of Manu, is Dravidian. There is, however, as Pargiter himself admits (pp. 295–6), nowhere in Puranic tradition the slightest suggestion that any difference of race is involved. If the names of unimportant kings and accurate stories about them were preserved it is strange that such a fundamental fact as racial difference should have been glossed over so completely. Such suppression is just as damaging to ksatriya tradition as the suppression of the authorship of the Samhitâ of the Rig Veda is to Brahman tradition. Pargiter (p. 9) charges this to deliberate Brahman suppression in order to magnify the age and authority of the Rig Veda. Why should Aryan tradition have suppressed the fact of racial difference? Such suppression could hardly be explained except as an effort on the part of the Munḍâ and Dravidian races to place their descent on a par with that of the Aryans. But it was the Aryan race which was dominant politically; it was their civilization and language which prevailed; theirs was the early historical tradition until (according to Pargiter) it passed into the hands of the Dravidian Brahmans in the ninth century b. c. To account for the presence of Munḍâ and Dravidian genealogies in our Purânas we should have to assume an early Munḍâ and Dravidian historical tradition which was just as accurate as the
Aryan tradition. If so why does not Mūndā and Dravidian tradition reach back into the past beyond the Aryan invasion? Why does this become mythical at precisely the same point at which Aryan tradition becomes mythical? Why should the Dravidian dynasties have descended in direct line from the nine sons of Manu while the great, conquering, dominant Aryan race which formed the Puranic tradition descended from Ilā alone with her mythical changes of sex? If Pargiter’s theory is correct the irregularity ought to be on the Dravidian side. Why should the place of honor always be given to the Solar (Dravidian) dynasty of Ayodhyā (p. 296)?

In the Rig Veda which, according to Pargiter, reaches back to the seventeenth century B. C. the names of many kings who, according to Pargiter, are Dravidian are mentioned with absolutely nothing to suggest any differentiation of race. Cf. Keith, *JRAS* 1914, 735–6. These references are made in a text which constantly and emphatically states the great difference between the Aryans and other races. The Vedic evidence cannot be dismissed contemptuously as Pargiter dismisses it. It is much stronger than a mere argument from silence. There was every reason why difference of race should have been mentioned if it was known to exist. The Vedic evidence is a strong positive argument against Pargiter’s assumptions.

Pargiter argues that the Brahman priests were originally not Aryan at all but Dravidian. They were primarily magicians and were not connected at first in any way with the institution of sacrifice. The Atharva Veda is really representative of their original activities (pp. 308 ff., 319–20). At a later date they attached themselves to Aryan rulers, at first in the far west among the Yādavas, then from the time of Bharata on to Aryan rulers in the central country. They adopted the Aryan fire-sacrifice and a gradual fusion took place between Aryan and Dravidian religious beliefs and practices. From Purūravas on Aryan kings performed sacrifices for themselves (p. 309). No Brahmans were connected with them, and Pargiter seems to imply that there was no Aryan class of religious men. It seems impossible to eliminate such men entirely from Aryan civilization and it seems established that most of the magical practices of the Atharva Veda are deeply rooted in Aryan belief and practice.
The Dravidian race of Ayodhya has much the fullest list of dynastic names, 93 down to the time of the great battle. This forms the standard of Pargiter's calculations and he assumes the number 93 to be historically accurate. This implies among the Dravidians an accuracy such as is not found in any of the Aryan lists. The Aryan Yadavas have 59 names and the Aryan Pauravas have 51. Pargiter suggests (pp. 156-7, 261) that one gap in the Paurava list may be due to the Yadava conquest of the Pauravas, but that is not sufficient to explain the great discrepancy. It is difficult to see how such a strong, proud, independent Dravidian state could have adopted the Aryan sacrificial system at an early date and how so many Dravidians could have composed Vedic hymns. Yet Pargiter (p. 214, 262, 312) refers to king Mândhâtr (21 in the dynastic lists) long before the great development of Vedic sacrifice and its fusion with Dravidian elements under Bharata (44 in the dynastic lists) as a great sacrificer and hymn-maker. The same statement is made (pp. 97, 312) about the Dravidian king Bhalandana (number 6 in the dynastic lists).

Book seven of the Rig Veda is ascribed to the Vasishthas who, according to Pargiter, were intimately connected with Dravidian Ayodhya as hereditary priests, although some members of the family attached themselves to Aryan kings beginning with the time of Bharata. But this book differs in no way in language, gods, or ritual from the other books. Pargiter (pp. 307, 313) argues that many of the hymns of the Rig Veda have been translated from Dravidian languages into Sanskrit and that many Dravidian names of hymn-makers have been Sanskritized. If this were the case it is impossible to see how the original could have been obliterated so completely.

Pargiter repeatedly argues (pp. 5, 10, 62-3, 284, 326) that the chief part in the composition of the Rig Veda and Bráhmaṇas was played by ascetic devotees and recluses who lived in the forest apart from the world, immersed in spiritual problems. It is improbable that such recluses played any appreciable part in the composition of the Rig Veda and Bráhmaṇas. The Rig Vedic religion and ritualistic Brahmanism seem to have been aristocratic as well as priestly. Pargiter lays far too much stress upon solitary recluses in the forest. The growth of the recluse ideal and the formation of closely knit recluse orders
which could have developed a large literature was a slow one. Pargiter carries back into the period of the Rig Veda a state of affairs which existed only many centuries later.

It is noteworthy that so many of the kings who are well-known to Vedic tradition belong to the North Pañcāla dynasty as given by the Puranic lists. These kings although famous in Vedic tradition play little part in Puranic tradition. This fact is strongly in favor of Pargiter’s contention that the Puranic lists were not later inventions pieced together out of Vedic tradition with later fanciful additions. It points to the independence of the two bodies of tradition and (to some degree at least) to the trustworthiness of the Puranic lists of the other dynasties. The Rig Veda as it is is a Kuru-Pañcāla product. Hence it is natural that these particular kings should play a prominent role in it and that others should be mentioned only incidentally. Other kings not mentioned in Puranic tradition but found in Vedic tradition may be princes, nobles, and kings of smaller dynasties not preserved in the Puranic lists. In some cases the same person may be referred to in the two bodies of tradition under different names. Further, some of the names of the Rig Veda seem to fit into an evident gap in the Puranic list of Paurava kings. If the Purāṇas are valid here where they can be controlled by the Rig Veda it is probable that they are valid for many other matters about which the Rig Veda is silent. But to just what extent and how far back into the past? Here Pargiter is much too sanguine. These North Pañcāla kings come more than half way down the dynastic lists (number 62 and following).

It is pretty generally agreed that the Aryan invasion of India came from the North-west through the Kabul valley and the Punjab, although there is no definite tradition to that effect in the Rig Veda. The Purāṇas likewise know nothing of an invasion from the North-west. Very hazy traditions in them connect Purūravas with the central Himalayas and Pargiter (pp. 297–8) argues that the Aryan invasion came from that quarter, but without facing at all the enormous geographical difficulties of such an invasion. According to Puranic tradition the first centres of Aryan civilization were Allahabad, Benares and Kanauj. This seems, as Kennedy suggests (JRAS 1915, 509), to place a later situation back into the distant past
in an effort to exalt the sanctity of these eastern cities. With Pargiter's theory it is very hard to account for the silence of the Rig Veda about the eastern country. The Ganges is mentioned twice while the Indus is mentioned frequently. Even if most of the Rig Veda was composed later in the Kuru-Pañcāla country after Aryan expansion to the North-west the Indus is farther away than the Ganges and the Ganges as the old home must have maintained its prominence. Pargiter (p. 299) explains the frequent mention of the Indus as due to its immense size. The lower Ganges must have attracted attention for the same reason. If the Brahmans were recluses who had no interest in worldly affairs and slight knowledge of them it is difficult to explain the progressively wider geographical knowledge of the Yajur Veda, the Atharva Veda and the Brāhmaṇas.

It would be interesting to have put together in a more definite form than that given by Pargiter a list of hymnmakers so far as they can be determined from Puranic tradition, and to compare this with current opinion concerning the different portions of the Veda. I note here that the Vāmadeva family to which the hymns of book four are ascribed begins with number 70 of the dynastic lists (p. 222). The Kāṇva family, to which book eight is ascribed, and which was contemporary with the North Pañcāla kings who play such a large role in the Rig Veda, begins with number 53 of the dynastic lists (p. 227). This means that unless all the Kāṇva hymns which have been preserved come from late members of the family or have been completely rewritten some of them would be about two hundred years earlier than any of the hymns in the fourth book which, according to present opinion, is decidedly earlier than book eight. Further, the Madhucchandas group of hymns in the first book came into existence, according to Puranic tradition, with number 33 (p. 235), but Bloomfield finds in this group decided signs of lateness. There seems to be a great difference between the dates arrived at for different groups of Rigvedic hymns from Puranic tradition and from the study of language, metre, and repeated pādas.

In his treatment of the Paurava dynasty (p. 110 ff.) Pargiter notes two variant lists given in the Mahābhārata, but fails to make use of still a third list given from the Javanese Mahābhārata by Labberton (J.R.A.S. 1913, 6–7). This Javanese tradition seems
to go back to the eleventh century, a date much earlier than that of any of the Indian manuscripts of the Epic. It may be of help in restoring the Mahābhārata list of the Pauravas.

The dates calculated by Pargiter (pp. 182-3, 301) are interesting but so many uncertain factors are involved that no reliance at all can be placed on them. According to Pargiter, who assumes that the number of kings is 93 and that the average length of the reigns was twelve years, the great battle took place in 850 B.C., the Aryan invasion occurred about 2050 B.C., and the hymns of the Rig Veda are to be dated between the seventeenth and eleventh centuries B.C., with the bulk of them after the fifteenth century. There is nothing inherently improbable about any of these dates, but that is all that can be said. Keith's argument (JRAS 1914, 737-8) against such a long period for the composition of the Rig Veda and in favor of only two hundred years in not convincing. The plain fact is that we do not know.

It seems to me probable that we are to assume both Kṣatriya tradition and Brahman tradition. It is wrong to condemn categorically either tradition. We must keep our minds open. When the Veda does deal with contemporary events its evidence is of primary importance. When it deals with the past and becomes legendary it is still of the utmost value, since it has preserved the legends from a much earlier date than can be proved for any particular portion of the Purāṇas, but neither is to be cast aside lightly just because it fails to fit into some preconceived theory. In some cases the Purāṇas may be right and the Veda wrong. We must put aside all preconceived ideas concerning the period before 600 B.C. All of our theories are like houses of cards which a breath might destroy. In spite of page 12 Pargiter is not sufficiently critical of Puranic tradition, and in spite of page 14 he is too much biassed against Brahman tradition. The later Purāṇas show too much glibness and too much fertility of fancy in manufacturing long lists of names and in inventing stories to make us feel safe in pressing very far details of the stories and all of the names. It is impossible to defend as historical the schematic genealogies of Dharma and Kāsyapa, the long accounts of the Manus and Manvantaras, the lists of the Pitrēs, and the genealogies of the rulers of the different dvaras. It is too much to expect that the genealo-
gies and stories about ancient kings could have escaped contamination from these later legendary tendencies. And yet many historical facts may have escaped revision. The two traditions must be confronted calmly and judiciously. We owe Pargiter a debt of gratitude for the labor he has spent in collecting the Puranic material, but his treatment of it is not sufficiently critical for historical purposes. Its evaluation for historical purposes still remains for the future. But in the future the Puranic material must be treated with much greater consideration than has been done in the past. Considering the vicissitudes of Puranic tradition the surprising thing is not the amount of discrepancy but the amount of agreement. I agree with Pargiter that this is not to be accounted for on the supposition that Puranic tradition has been pieced together from incidental references in the Vedic texts held together by a large amount of pure invention. If so it seems to me inexplicable that so much of the Vedic material which was ready at hand was not utilized and that many important names of the Rig Veda were given no place in the genealogies.

I cannot agree with Pargiter's theories of three different races in the Puranic genealogies, of the Dravidian origin of the Brahmans and of an Aryan invasion through the central Himalayas with early settlements around Allahabad and Benares and a regressive movement through the Punjab into Persia where it gave rise to Iranian civilization. So far as I can see there is nothing in Puranic tradition which really warrants the first two conclusions. The third assumption is most improbable.

University of Chicago

WALTER EUGENE CLARK


This handsome volume will be welcomed by all those who are interested in the ancient civilizations of Western Asia, more especially those belonging to the Semitic branch. It contains more than its title indicates, for it is not a mere collection of inscriptions, nor intended primarily for the epigraphist, but is rather an attempt to bring clearly to the view of the wider public whatever knowledge can now be derived from the more than
seven hundred native inscriptions thus far discovered, as to the famous city Palmyra and its inhabitants. The inscriptions are classified, and in their several classes are arranged in such a way as to show their connection and relative importance. They are not transliterated, nor given in facsimile, except on the plates at the end of the volume, nor is there any philological comment or discussion. The sole aim of the author is to show what light these documents throw on the Palmyrene civilization in its principal aspects. No scholar is better fitted for this task than M. Chabot, with his long familiarity with all the minutiae of the North Semitic epigraphy, and his profound knowledge of all the linguistic and historical material which can be brought to bear upon the subject. As editor, moreover, of the forthcoming volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* devoted to the Palmyrene Inscriptions, he has an unrivalled command of this special field. The present volume is, in fact, a by-product of his labors on the greater work; a by-product made possible by the public spirit and generosity of the Duc de Loubat, already well known for similar services to the sciences of epigraphy and archaeology.

The introduction sketches the history of Palmyrene epigraphy, and gives a brief summary of the history of the city, as far as it is known, from the earliest times down to its destruction in 273 A.D. A plan of the surviving ruins is added. Then follow chapters on the Tariff Laws of Palmyra; Honorary Inscriptions; Religious Inscriptions; Mortuary Inscriptions; Tesseræ and Coins. The book is beautifully printed in large type, and superbly illustrated. The first twenty plates are phototypes, showing the best preserved of the more important monuments of the city: temples, colonnades, altars, gateways, ceilings, tombs, besides numerous details of sculpture and decoration. These are mostly from photographs hitherto unpublished. The remaining twelve plates, which are folded and therefore of double size, are heliogravures, executed in the perfect manner which we are wont to expect in the French publications of this nature. These include the facsimiles of inscriptions, the inscribed monuments of various kinds, and some four score of the best preserved and most interesting busts.

Here is valuable material, of many kinds, for the archaeologist and the historian. From the epitaphs alone it is possible
to obtain a surprising amount of information; and when to
these are added the many inscriptions of the other classes,
even though they are mostly stereotyped in form, the reader
under the able guidance of M. Chabot becomes acquainted with
numerous aspects of a highly interesting civilization: laws
and customs, materials and features of the social and economic
life, religious beliefs, and a development of fine art, especially
sculpture, which has only recently begun to attract the attention
which it deserves. Students of the Old and New Testaments
will find here much that is valuable, not only because of the
proximity of Palmyra to the Holy Land, and because the lan-
guage of the inscriptions resembles more closely the Jewish
Aramaic of the last centuries B. C. and the first century A. D.
than any other gentile dialect, but also because of interesting
resemblances in the religious ideas and modes of expression.
M. Chabot discusses at some length (pp. 73–81) the very nu-
merous inscriptions dedicated either to Baalšamin expressly named
or to the same "Lord of the Heavens" designated in the oft-
recurring formula, "He whose name is blessed forever, the good
and merciful," or occasionally as "Lord of the World"; showing
how the religion of the people of Palmyra had undergone a
syncretistic development resulting in the conception of a su-
preme deity. The identification of this deity with the Greek
Zeus, in certain bilingual inscriptions, is noted on pages 74 and
76. It might have been worth while to add, that the same i-
dentification was made in Phoenicia, according to Philo of By-
blus; and also—a far more interesting fact—that Zeus Olympius,
whose image was set up by Antiochus Epiphanes on the great
altar in the temple at Jerusalem, appears in the Book of Daniel
(11, 31; 12, 11; cf. 8,13; 9,27) as מונע נררי, that is, Ba-
alšamēm, with the characteristic substitution of ינש "abomi-
nation" for נר. The earliest mention of this god is said
(p. 73) to have been in the treaty of Esarhaddon with Tyre
(about 674 B. C.); the Zakar inscription, however, carries back
the first mention a full hundred years beyond this date. In
the list of countries in which the name is found (p. 74), Cilicia,
in two Aramaic inscriptions of the fifth century B. C. (JAOS
35, 371), can now be included.

On p. 79 M. Chabot raises the question whether the above-
mentioned syncretism may not have been due to Jewish influ-
ence, and on pp. 80f. he cites phrases and formulae in which the evidence of such influence seems to him to be unmistakable. I venture to question whether this conclusion is warranted. Palmyra undoubtedly contained a considerable Jewish population, and Jewish religious inscriptions have been found there, as M. Chabot notes; but religious conceptions similar to those embodied in the phrases mentioned seem to have been current in Western Asia for some time, especially in the regions under Hellenistic influence; the syncretism also was widespread in these regions. Even in Assyria, at a much earlier date, we find the frequently occurring divine epithet rémënu tāîru “merciful and gracious.” The phrase quoted from a single Palmyrene monument: אַנּוּכָה יִנְשִׁמֶה אֶל חָיוֹר, “who cried to him in distress, and he answered them with alleviation,” does indeed very closely resemble Ps. 118,5, but I can see in it no evidence of borrowing, only an accidentally similar expression of an acknowledgment which must have been very commonly felt.

I have noticed one or two misprints (76,9; 80,12) in the beautiful Palmyrene characters employed, but in general the typography is beyond all criticism. And, be it said once more, the magnificently executed plates at the end of the volume form such a collection of material for the archaeologist and the epigraphist as can be found nowhere else in a work of this convenient size and small cost.

Charles C. Torrey

Yale University


“The History of the Conquest of Egypt”—its shorter title and its more appropriate one—written by Ibn ’Abd Al-Ḥakam (died 871 A. D.) has occupied an authoritative place in the Arabic literature dealing with the early history of Mohammedan Egypt. The author came of a learned family; and while he had little of the sense of history shown by some of the later Arabic authors, he was considered an expert in the science of tradition. He has, therefore, preserved for us a great many facts and anecdotes which may occasionally make the reading of his work trying,
but never useless. The full title of his work reads, as on Professor Torrey's English title page: "The History of the Conquest of Egypt, North Africa and Spain"; but in the Arabic the title is merely "The Story of the Conquest of Egypt and Its History". That the author's interest lay specifically in his native country is evidenced by the small part that the story of the conquest of North Africa and of Spain takes in the work as now published—pages 183—225, i.e., 42 pages out of 319.

Most of the facts related are not new. Portions of Ibn 'Abd Al-Ḥakam's work have been published from time to time (see Introduction, p. 22) and through other historians the various events have become the property of those who read. Professor Torrey himself has said (JAOS 20, 209) that the author's work contains a great deal that is worthless and that he "was one who possessed few of the qualities of a good historian". The peculiar value of this book, however, lies in the fact that its author was the first Arabic historian of Egypt, and that the work that he produced was the starting point for quite a number of other histories dealing with the affairs of Egypt and with a description of its various parts. It is interesting for the history of Arabic literature to follow the fortunes of such a book as that of Ibn 'Abd Al-Ḥakam. On the one hand a writer like Al-Suyūṭī (A. D. 1500) has taken whole passages word for word; so that if we were possessed of a scientific edition of his history, it might perhaps serve to control passages where the manuscript authority is indeterminate. On the other hand, Al Kindi (A. D. 970) has made use of the material put at his disposal by Ibn 'Abd Al-Hakam as a basis, and has largely expanded the same by the addition of traditions and of facts gathered from other sources. I have pointed this out in the portion of Al Kindi's work on the Egyptian Cadis which I published in 1908; and it can be followed in the complete work of that author published by Guest in 1912.

Students of Arabic literature have for a long time desired to have a complete edition of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam's treatise.

1 Some of these have found their way into other works of Suyūṭī, e.g. those dealing with hadith. See his Kanz al- Ummāl in the shortened edition of al-Muttabkhī, vol. iii, p. 174, No. 2637; vol vii, p. 163, No. 1499, as well as on the margin of Ibn Ḥanbal's Marmad, vol. II, pp. 184, 314; vol. V, p. 372.
Professor Torrey tells us that he began the work in 1895; but that various circumstances have prevented him from finishing it until now. About the year 1904, Georges Salmon, of the Institut Français du Caire, had taken the work in hand; but other occupations deterred him from continuing it. It is well that it was so; for Massé’s edition (1914) of a portion of Salmon’s work is very much inferior in fulness and in quality to that given us by Torrey.

I need say little about the text that Professor Torrey has placed before us. For some reason or other, the family of Ibn ‘Abd Al-Hakam fell into disgrace (Introduction, p. 19), and it seems that only one codex of the author’s work was handed down to his chief traditor, Ibn Kudaïd. As this codex was quite faulty, it is not an easy matter for an editor to establish a finished and readable text. Professor Torrey, however, has been able to do this. He has made use of all the material at his disposal; and his accustomed accuracy and his far-reaching knowledge have combined to give us that text in a form that will easily cause it to be classed among the very best that modern scholarship has produced. In the Introduction, p. 7, note 1, reference is made to Guest’s article on the Khittas in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for January 1907. It would have been well had Professor Torrey added a reference to Casanova’s careful and exact study of the subject published in the Mémoires de l’Institut français d’Archéologie Orientale, Volume 35 (1913–1919). On page xxxiii, M. Casanova remarks that Mr. Guest did not have the chance to consult the work of Ibn ‘Abd Al-Hakam. A very excellent and detailed plan of Fustat is attached to the work of M. Casanova.

It was inevitable, considering the circumstances and especially the distance of the printing office from the editor (Leyden-New Haven) that certain errors should have remained uncorrected in addition to those detected by the editor and given on pages 64–65 of the Introduction. To mention only a few. Among the abbreviations (Introduction p. 25) we are told to accept Baladh, for Baladhuri’s historical work. Yet in most places I find it written with an ‘e’ i.e., Beladh—page 57, note 10; notes 6 and 7; p. 202, note 3; glossary, pages 50 and 51, and even

* On قابارية see p. xxxiv., on صاغة p. xxxvi.
in the Introduction, p. 1. P. 2, 3. كعب for كعب; p. 45, 12
فُم for فُم; p. 57, 18 for فُم; p. 56, 6 for أبعة; l.
.house for ُن; p. 58, 15 last word the letter ز is broken off; p.
78, 9 for مُحِيماٌ and مُحِيماٌ (See Ibn Duraïd, p. 129), p. 347 s. v. الموقِف 7, 5 in place of 7, 4. These
are extremely minor matters which have caught my eye in the
reading. They are, if I may use the expression, purely physical
and do not in the least detract from the value of the edition.

Professor Torrey has also added a glossary of words and gram-
matical usages that are novel or little used. It is always a
question how far such a glossary should go, especially in giving
references to similar forms or like usages. On p. 30 s. v. يل
one might add a reference to Popper’s Glossary in his edition of
the Nujum al-Dhahab; so also p. 31 s. v. بئل in the sense of
“offer.” To مفت “obligatory military service,” Dozy might have
been cited; to بْط “agreement”, Dozy and the explanation
“pactum” ZDMG 60. 370; to بِنُقَدِ Jâl, 1891, p. 315.

But the addition of these glossaries raises an important question.
They are becoming so numerous that a student of Arabic and
an editor of Arabic texts is bound to have not only a series
of dictionaries around him, but quite a multitude of small ad-
denda attached to various texts. It would be natural for him
to go to Gabriel Colin’s edition of Abenzor (Ibn Zuhr) or to
de Koning’s “Trois Traitées d’anatomie arabe,” for Arabic
medical terms. But if he has to consult for ordinary work
the glossaries in Ibn Kutaibah, in Baladhuri, two or three in
de Goeje’s edition of the geographical writers, in Tabari and al-
Arib, in Guest’s edition of al-Kindi, in Popper’s edition of the
Nujum and in Torrey’s of the Futuh Misr—to pick out a few
only—it becomes a severe tax upon his time and his patience.
ought it not to be possible for us to give some help to the dic-
tionary which is to contain all these, and much more, on which
Professor Fischer is at work and the last word about which
I read in ZDMG 72, pages 199 et seq. 1

2 Leiden 1903.
3 It is perfectly certain that Yākut not only knew of Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s
One query: on page 1 of the Introduction reference is made to the article on Ibn 'Abd Al-Hakam in the *Encyclopedia of Islam*. My own copy of the Encyclopedia does not reach as far as this. Is the reference made in advance of its appearance?

Richard Gottheil

Columbia University


The author, who is a well-educated and intelligent Hindu nationalist living in this country, advances the thesis that India is perhaps the most important element in international politics today, because it is the heart and core of British imperialistic policies, all of which revolve around Britain's desire to keep India. His arguments, tho they frankly present the question one-sidedly, are made the more plausible by the device of liberal quotations from British statesmen and semi-official British apologists. Not the least interesting parts of the book are those in which he addresses his fellow-countrymen, pointing out the desirability of their cultivating the friendship of foreign nations, in the hope of enlisting their sympathy or active aid against British imperialism, which he regards as a menace to the peace of the world.

**PERSONALIA**

Professor A. V. Williams Jackson of Columbia University was elected an Honorary Member of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland on April 17, 1923.

Professor Jackson delivered a series of six lectures on "Manichaeism—once a Rival of Christianity and Zoroastrianism", under the Haskell Foundation, at the University of Chicago, between April 11 and April 27, 1923. These lectures are to appear in book form. Their interest and importance will be evident from the fact that they will include the results of the author's intimate study of the newly-found Manichaean texts from Central Asia.

The Rev. Dr. Abraham Yohannan of Columbia University has been elected a Corresponding Member (*Académico Correspondiente*) of the Royal Academy of Fine Arts and Historical Sciences of Toledo, Spain.

---

History, but made use of it (vol. III, p. 31). How does it come that Heer in his *Die historischen und geographischen Quellen in Jähn's geographischem Woerterbuch* (Strassburg 1898) makes no mention of the Futül?
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY
AT THE MEETING IN PRINCETON, N. J., 1923

The annual sessions of the Society, forming its one hundred and thirty-fifth meeting, were held in Princeton, New Jersey, at Princeton University, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of Easter Week, April 3, 4, 5, 1923.

The following members were present one or more sessions:

Abbott                      Gellot                      Newell
Barret                      Gottheil                    Ogden, C. J.
Barton                      Grieve, Miss                Olmstead
Bates, Mrs.                 Haupt                       Pavry
Bender                      Hopkins                    Pfeiffer
Berry                       Hussey, Miss               Reich
Bloomfield                  Jackson, A. V. W.           Reilly
Briggs, G. W.               Jackson, Mrs.               Sanders
Butin                       Jastrow, Mrs.              Schoff
Chapman                     Kent, R. G.                 Schoff, Mrs.
Chiera                      Klein                      Sharekoff
Clay                        Lanman                     Shear
Cummings                    Levine                     Snyder
Davis                       Margolis, M. L.            Thacker
DeLong                      Matthews                   Vanderburgh
Dhalla                      Meek                       Waterman
Edgerton, F.                Montgomery                 Watt
Elzak                       Moran                      Wood, H.
Ember

[Total 57]

THE FIRST SESSION

At 11:15 A. M. the first session of the Society was called to order by President E. Washburn Hopkins. The reading of the Proceedings at Chicago in 1922 was dispensed with as they
were already in print (JOURNAL 42. 379–400): there were no corrections and they were approved.

Professor Bender, as Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements, presented its report in the form of a printed program. The succeeding sessions were appointed for Tuesday afternoon at 2:30 P. M., Wednesday morning at 9:30 A. M., Wednesday afternoon at 2:30 P. M., and Thursday morning at 9:30 A. M. It was announced that the members were invited to tea at the home of President and Mrs. Hibben on Tuesday afternoon at 5 o'clock; that there would be an informal gathering in Murray-Dodge Hall on Tuesday evening at 8 o'clock; that the members were invited to be the guests of the University at luncheon in the University Dining Halls on Wednesday at 1 o'clock; and that the annual subscription dinner would be held in Procter Hall at the Graduate College on Wednesday evening at 7:45 o'clock.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY

The Corresponding Secretary, Doctor Charles J. Ogden, presented the following report:

The official year 1922–1923 has not been marked by any outstanding event, and the record is one of consolidation rather than expansion in the Society's activities. There has been a normal increment of new corporate members, 45 in all, but the losses by death and thru resignation or failure to qualify have almost exactly balanced the accessions. With the large increase in our numbers during recent years, the Society now has in reality two classes of corporate members, the active, who are professionally engaged in Oriental scholarship thru teaching and research and are more or less regular attendants at the annual meetings, and the class of those persons who, as our announcement says, "are in sympathy with the objects of the Society and give it their help in the furthering of its work." The bond of allegiance of these "associate" members is naturally not so strong; and we might well consider how to keep their interest stimulated, especially thru the JOURNAL, which is the one activity of the Society that reaches all its members.

The Society has as usual been represented during the past year at a number of functions of an academic or commemorative character. Of prime interest was the international gathering of Orientalists at Paris in July last to celebrate the double centenary of the founding of the Société Asiatique and of Champollión's decipherment of the Egyptian hieroglyphics. Six of the twelve delegates appointed by this Society were fortunately able to be present: namely, Dr. Abbott, and Professors Breasted, Gottheil, Jackson, Jewett, and Lanman. Subsequently, in October, a special commemoration of Champollion's great discovery was held under the auspices of the University of
Grenoble, at which we were appropriately represented by Professor Breasted. We have also been invited to participate in the Fifth International Congress of Historical Studies, which is to assemble next week in Brussels, and Professor Carnoy of Louvain, a fellow-member known to many of us thru his sojourn in this country, will act as our delegate. In America the Society was represented at the memorial meeting for Mrs. Sara Yorke Stevenson held in Philadelphia on April 29, 1922, both by a committee of the local members in person and thru letters from Professors Breasted and Clay. At the inauguration of Dr. Charles Wesley Flint as Chancellor of Syracuse University on Nov. 17, 1922, Professor Ismar J. Peritz of that institution was the delegate from this Society.

Notice has been received during the year of the death of twelve members of the Society, two being Honorary Members, one an Honorary Associate, and nine corporate members.

FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH, Ph.D., born in 1850, was himself the son of a great scholar, the Hebraist Franz Delitzsch. He was first drawn to the study of Sanskrit, but soon turned to that of Assyriology, which he pursued thru a long and fruitful academic career as professor at Leipzig (1877-1893), Breslau (1893-1899), and finally at the University of Berlin (1899-1920). His lexicographical and grammatical works, most of which have gone thru many editions, are monuments to his great learning, but he was also at home in the domain of cultural studies and had always a special interest in the bearing of Assyriological investigation upon the interpretation of the Hebrew Bible, a subject that his famous lecture Babel und Bibel (1902) brought into the arena of popular controversy. Elected an Honorary Member in 1893. Died Dec. 23, 1922.

THOMAS WILLIAM RHYS DAVIDS, Ph.D., I.L. D., D.Sc., born in 1843, had been in his earlier years a member of the Ceylon Civil Service and was afterwards professor of Pali and Buddhist literature at University College, London (1882-1912), and professor of comparative religion at the University of Manchester (1904-1915). His greatest services to scholarship, however, lay in his extending the knowledge of the Pali literature and the Hinayāna school of Buddhism thru his numerous editions and translations of texts and his expository works, in which sympathetic insight and charm of style are happily united. Much of his work was done thru the Pali Text Society, of which he was the founder and the president. Elected an Honorary Member in 1907. Died Dec. 27, 1922.

PAUL S. REINSCH, Ph.D., I.L.D., from 1899 to 1913 professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin, and from 1913 to 1919 United States minister to China, gained distinction both as a scholar and as a diplomat. Of his numerous publications there may be mentioned, as bearing upon Oriental subjects, World Politics at the End of the Nineteenth Century as Influenced by the Oriental Situation (1900); Intellectual and Political Currents in the Far East (1911); An American Diplomat in China (1922). He was elected an Honorary Associate in 1921 and died in Shanghai, Jan. 24, 1923.

ADRISSON VAN NAME, A. M., who died at New Haven in his eighty-seventh year, was for forty years (1865-1905) the librarian of Yale University and rendered faithful service to this Society as Treasurer and Librarian, holding
the combined offices from 1873 to 1891 and the latter only from 1891 to 1905. With his passing one of the last links with the first generation of the Society is broken, for he was elected a member in 1863. Died Sept. 29, 1922.

Rev. James Buchanan Nies, Ph.D., of Brooklyn, came late in life to the study of Assyriology, after spending his earlier years in the active ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church. His extensive travels and wide fund of general information furnished him an unusual equipment for scholarly research, and he became a recognized authority in the interpretation of the remains of the Sumerian period, many of which were in his admirable collection of Babylonian antiquities. In addition to his investigations and publications, he was a wise and generous patron of research in the Near East. He was elected a member of the Society in 1906 and served as a Director from 1916 to 1919 and as President during the year 1921-1922. Died in Jerusalem, June 18, 1922.

Johann Friederich Scheltens, Ph.D., was born in the Celebes, of Dutch parents, and spent nearly thirty years of his career in Java as a government official and a journalist. After leaving the East Indies in 1903 he divided his time between travel and literary work and resided for a number of years in the United States. He was the author of Monumental Java (1912) and The Lebanon in Turmoil (1920), the latter having been his doctoral dissertation at Yale University. Elected in 1906. Died in London, June 14, 1922.

Howard Crosby Butler, A.M., professor of the history of architecture at Princeton University, held a leading position among the American scholars interested in the archeological exploration of the Near East. He organized and conducted expeditions to Syria in 1899, 1904, and 1909. Thereafter he established the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis, and explored that site for five seasons, from 1910 to 1914, and again with brilliant success in 1922, tho his exertions then brought on his own untimely end. His ability was displayed not only in field work but in the careful and elaborate publication of the archeological results. Elected in 1908. Died in Paris, Aug. 13, 1922.

Eliezer Ben Yehuda, a resident of Jerusalem, was internationally known in Judaism for his contributions to modern Hebrew literature and lexicography and for his endeavors to make the Hebrew tongue a vehicle of living speech. Elected in 1916. Died Dec. 16, 1922.

Rabbi Emil Gustav Hirsch, D.D., L.H.D., D.C.L., since 1880 minister of Sinai Congregation, Chicago, and professor of Rabbinical literature and philosophy at the University of Chicago since 1892, was a leader of the liberal movement in American Judaism. He was a distinguished orator and took an active part in civic affairs, but served the cause of scholarship as well thru his editorial work and his monographs and contributions to religious encyclopedias. Elected in 1917. Died Jan. 7, 1923.

Mrs. William Yonge Stevenson, of Philadelphia, was a student and amateur of the dramatic art and aided in the founding of the Philadelphia Art Alliance. In her plans for giving an American Passion Play she had become interested in the Orient and had recently traveled in Egypt, India, and Palestine in order to study the native background. Elected in 1919. Died Nov. 21, 1922.

John M. Burnam, Ph.D., had been professor of Latin at the University
of Cincinnati since 1900. His especial interest was in paleography, a subject
on which he wrote a number of monographs. He was a member of the Ameri-
can Philological Association, and joined this Society as a life member in 1920.
Died Nov. 21, 1921.

Frederick B. Wheeler, of Seymour, Conn., was a consulting engineer
by profession and a mathematician of considerable attainments. Thru
his study of anthropology and astronomy his attention was directed to the
ancient Orient, and he became a patron of the Yale Babylonian Collection.

Upon motion, the report of the Corresponding Secretary was
accepted.

Tribute was paid to members who had died during the year:
to Addison Van Name by President Hopkins; to F. Delitzsch
by Professor Haupt; to Doctor Nies by Professor Clay; to E.
Ben Yehuda by Professor Montgomery; to Rhys Davids by
Professor Lanman; and the Corresponding Secretary read a letter
from Professor Torrey regarding Doctor Scheltema.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

The Treasurer, Professor A. T. Clay, presented his report and
that of the Auditing Committee:

Receipts and Expenditures for the Year ending December 31, 1922

Receipts
Jan. 1, 1922 Balance ............................................................................. 1,866.51
Annual dues ....................................................................................... 2,381.58
Life memberships ............................................................................. 300.00
Interest on bonds:
  U. S. Liberty Loan ......................................................................... 170.00
  Lackawanna Steel Co. .................................................................... 100.00
  Virginia Ry .................................................................................... 50.00
  Minne. Gen. Electric ...................................................................... 50.00

  ........................................................................................................... 370.00

Dividend:
  Chicago R. I. & Pacific .................................................................... 120.00
Interest on Deposit Yale University .................................................. 72.51
Sales .................................................................................................. 709.49
Sale Offprints ................................................................................... 7.56

  ........................................................................................................... $5,827.65

Expenditures:
Contribution to American Council of Learned
  Societies .......................................................................................... 29.85
Yale University Press, commissions &
mailing journals ........................................ 203.84
Franklin Edgerton, Honorarium ...................... 200.00
Max L. Margolis, Honorarium ......................... 200.00
E. M. Grice, Honorarium .............................. 100.00
Printing Journal, Vol. 41, Part 5 .................. 987.54
Lloyds & National Provincial Foreign Bank, purchase of marks on account of Journal ................. 512.50
Printing, reprints ..................................... 54.51
Printing, programs .................................... 12.50
Printing, circulars .................................... 118.07
Membership Committee, Printing ................. 24.14
  clerical ............................................. 6.50
  miscellaneous ..................................... 1.50
  32.14
Middle West Branch expense ......................... 78.75
Editors expense ...................................... 80.22
Library expense ...................................... 2.95
Secretary's expense, printing ................. 40.16
  clerical .......................................... 14.12
  postage ............................................ 10.88
  65.16
Treasurer's expense, printing .................... 24.75
  postage ............................................. 4.51
  29.26
Jan. 1, 1923 Balance, ................................ 3,120.36

$5,827.65

The following funds are held by the Society:
Charles W. Bradley Fund ...................... $3,000.00
Alexander J. Coheal Fund ..................... 1,500.00
William Dwight Whitney Fund ........... 1,000.00
Life Membership Fund ......................... 3,050.00
Publication Fund .................................. 78.50

Total ........................................ $8,628.50

The foregoing funds, the interest on which is used for publication purposes, are represented in the assets of the Society held by the Yale University for the Treasurer, which on January 1, 1923, were as follows:
Cash ................................................. $3,120.36
Bonds:
$4,000 Third U. S. Liberty Loan .................. 3,920.00 (present value)
2,000 Lackawanna Steel Co. 5's 1923 .......... 2,000.00
1,000 Virginia Railway Co. 5's 1962 ........ 952.50
1,000 Minneapolis General Electric Co. 5's 1934 ........ 950.00
REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

We hereby certify that we have examined the account of the Treasurer of the Society, and have found the same correct, and that the foregoing account is in conformity therewith. We have also compared the entries with the vouchers and the account book as held for the Society by the Treasurer of the Yale University and have found all correct.

CHARLES C. TORREY
F. W. WILLIAMS
Auditors

March 29, 1923.

Upon motion the reports of the Treasurer and the Auditing Committee were accepted: and it was voted that the thanks of the Society be tendered to Professor Clay and Doctor Grice for their faithful labors.

REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN

The Librarian, Professor A. T. Clay, presented his report, and upon motion it was accepted:

During the year 1922-23 the library has been increased by the addition of 110 new titles and approximately 260 numbers of currently received periodicals. The new titles have been accessioned and acknowledged, and the cataloguing is now in progress. Numbers of periodicals have been added to catalogue cards and placed on the shelves.

In addition to the 110 titles noted above the library has been the recipient of a number of books dealing with subjects more or less unrelated to the other material in the collection, such as “Correct English and how to use it”, “The work of the church among the Mormons”, “The coal situation” etc., and of a small number of books duplicating works already in the Library. These have been filed away and are accessible but have not been catalogued.

Many volumes of periodicals are complete and should be bound. As new numbers come in some attempt is being made to prepare the volumes for binding, but the final preparation would be costly in time as well as in the actual expense of binding.

LIST OF ACCESSIONS FOR THE YEAR 1922-23


Albini, J. Vercingetorix. 1919.
Amira, Karl von. Die germanischen Todesstrafen. 1922. (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-philo-
logische und historische Klasse. XXXI Bd., 3. Abhandlung)

Anandalajñāna. Tarka-Sangraha of Anandalajñāna. Ed. with introd. by T. M. Tripathi. 1917. (Gakwad’s Oriental series, no. 3)


Bangkok, Siam. Vajiraranana national library. Records of the relations between Siam and foreign countries in the 17th century. v. 5. 1921.

Benjamin, C. D. The variations between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Joshua: chaps. 1–12. 1921.


Bhattacharya, Brindavan C. Indian images. Pt. 1. 1921.

Bhāta Vādindra. Mahāvidyā-Vidambana. With the commentaries of Anandapurna and Bhuvanasadura Suri. And the Dasa-sloki of Kularka Pandita with Vivarana and Vivarana Tippani. Ed. by Mangesh Ramakrishna Telang. 1920. (Gakwad’s Oriental series, no. 12)


The Buddhist Annual of Ceylon. v. 1, no. 3. 1922.


K. Česká společnost náuk, Prague. Trída filošoficko-historicko-jazyko-
spytňá. Mémories. 1919.

Chiera, E. Old Babylonian contracts. 1922. (Univ. of Pennsylvania. The University Museum. Publications of the Babylonian Section. v. 8, no. 2).

The China journal of science & arts; ed. by A. de C. Sowerby (Science), J. C. Ferguson (Literature & arts). V. 1, no. 1. 1923.


Gana-kārikā. Ed. by the late Mr. C. D. Dalal. 1920. (Gaekwad’s Oriental series, no. 15).


Gratet, M. La religion des chinois. 1922. (Science et civilisation).

Grousset, R. Histoire de l’Asie. 1921. 3v.


Günter, H. Buddha in der abendländischen Legende? 1922.


Henderson, J. R. The coins of Hindut Ali and Tipu Sultan. 1921.

Hespéria. Archives berbères et bulletin de l’Institut des hautes études marocaines. 1921.


Hoppner, T. Fontes historiae aegyptiacae. Pars I, Auctores ab Homero usque ad Diodorum continens. 1922. (Fontes historiae religionum ex auctoris graecos et latinos, fasc. 2, pars 1).


Jayasinha Sūri. Hammira-mada-mardana of Jayasinha Sūri. By Chimanlal D. Dalal. 1920. (Gaekwad’s Oriental series, no. 10.)

Jouveau-Dubreuil, G. Vedic Antiquities by G. Jouveau-Dubreuil. 1922.
Kavindracharya list. Ed. by R. A. K. Sastry. With foreword by Dr. Ganganatha Jha. 1921. (Gaekwad’s Oriental series, no. 17.)

Keith, A. B. Indian logic and atomism. An exposition of the Nyaya and Vaiṣesika systems. 1921.

Keith, A. B. The Kārma-minamsa. 1921. (The heritage of India series.)


Kolmodin, J. Traditions de Tsazzeza et Hazzeza. 1914.


Lanman, C. R. The Sanskrit mutes called mūrdhanya, that is domal, 1919. (Reprint from Festgabe Kaegi, Zürich, 1919.)

Law, B. C. Ksatriya clans in Buddhist India. With a foreword by Sir Asutosh Mookerjee. 1922.

Lewy, J. Studien zu den altassyrischen Texten aus Kappadokien. 1922.

Lewy, J. Untersuchungen zur Akkadischen Grammatik. 1921.

Lorimer, D. L. R. The phonology of the Bakhtiar, Badakhshani, and Madagashi dialects of modern Persian. 1922. (Prize publication fund, v. VI.)

Madras (Presidency) Finance (separate revenue) dept. Annual report of the Assistant archaeological superintendent for epigraphy, southern circle.


Morgenstierne, G. Ueber das Vehältnis zwischen Carudatta und Mrchakatika. 1921.

Mukherjee, B. L. The soma plant. 1922.

Nārada. Sangīta-makaranda of Nārada. Ed. by Mangesh Rāmakrishna Telang. 1920. (Gaekwad’s Oriental Series, no. 16.)

Narasim, P. L. A study of caste. 1922.

National research council of Japan. Proceedings. no. 1. 1922.

Transactions and abstracts. V. 1, no. 1.


The Orient; a magazine of art & culture. v. 1, no. 1. New York, 1923.


Paramāra Prabhādanadeva. Pārthaparākrama vyāyoga. Ed. by C. D. Dalal. 1917. (Gaekwad’s Oriental series, no. 4.)

Pargiter, F. E. Ancient Indian historical tradition. 1922.
Pavjee, N. B. The indigenous far famed Soma and the Aryan autochthones in India. 1921.
Philippine Islands. Bureau of civil service. 22d annual report. 1922.
Plessis, J. Etude sur les textes concernant Istar-Astarté. 1921.
Rigvedā. Der Rigveda; oder, Die heiligen Hymnen der Brāhmaṇa. Zum ersten Male vollständig ins Deutsche übersetzt. Mit Commentar und Einleitung von Alfred Ludwig. 1876-81. 4v. in 3.
Rudrakavi. Rākṣatraudhavansakāvyā of Rudrakavi. Ed. by Embar Krishnamacharya with an introd. by C. D. Dalal. 1917. (Gaekwad’s Oriental series, no. 5.)
Saunaka. The Rg-Vedapratisakhya with the commentary of Uvata. Ed. by Mangal Deva Shastri. Part of the introd. 1922. 2 copies.
Scheftelowitz, I. Die Entstehung der manichäischen Religion und des Er- lösungsmysteriums. 1922.
Sikha-Samuccaya. A compendium of Buddhist doctrine comp. by Santideva. Tr. from the Sanskrit by Cecil Bendall and W. H. D. Rouse. 1922. (Indian text series.)
Sodhaha. Udayasundarikathā of Sodhaha. With introd. partly by C. Dalal and continued by Embar Krishnamacharya. 1920. (Gaekwad’s Oriental series, no. 11.)
Sofia-Alessio, F. Ultima Tibulli dies. 1920.
Standley, P. C. Trees and shrubs of Mexico. 1922. (Contributions from the U. S. nat. herbarium. v. 23, pt. 2.)
Stein, O. Megasthenes und Kautiliya. 1921. (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Sitzungsberichte, 191 Bd. 5. Abhandlung.)
Sullivan, L. R. A contribution to Tongan somatology. 1922. (Memoirs of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum. v. VIII-no. 4.) (Bayard Dominick expedition. Pub. no. 2.)
Swanton, J. R. Early history of the Creek Indians and their neighbors.
REPORT OF THE EDITORS OF THE JOURNAL

Professor Edgerton, the senior editor of the JOURNAL, presented the report of the Editors, and upon motion it was adopted:

The first half of Volume 42 was printed in September, 1922, but did not actually reach this country until late in November. The second half is now (March 1923) in press and should appear very shortly. The Volume will contain 421 pages.
Owing to the chaotic conditions in Germany at present, it has proved impossible to continue printing there, in spite of the best endeavors of both the editors and the printers. We are therefore printing Volume 43 in this country. We have made a contract with the Jewish Publication Society of America, and believe that this marks the beginning of very satisfactory and, we trust, permanent relations with this Society, which has shown a very praiseworthy desire to serve oriental scholarship in this country by renouncing all hope of financial profit from the printing of the Journal. The terms on which it has undertaken to print Volume 43 will make it cost our Society but little more than it would probably cost to print in Germany. Volume 43 will be issued in five parts and will contain 480 pages. It is hoped that the first part will appear very shortly.

In accordance with instructions given to the Editors by the Board of Directors, approximately one-fourth of the space of the Journal will henceforth be devoted to reviews of important new publications on oriental subjects. We have already received for review a considerable number of such publications, and have arranged for reviews of most of them. Several such reviews will appear in the first part of Volume 43. We bespeak the cooperation of the members of the Society and of orientalists generally in this new venture. The editors hope that all reviews published in the Journal will be not perfunctory notices but profound and penetrating studies, of real scholarly value. To achieve this result it will be necessary to find reviewers who are not only competent in scholarship, but also able and willing to give generously of their time and energy to the task of reviewing. This will not infrequently imply a spirit of self-sacrifice on the part of the reviewers, since the small fee which our Society can afford to pay for reviews will hardly seem a compensation for their time and trouble. We hope, however, that the importance of the undertaking will seem to reviewers, as it seems to the Editors, sufficient to justify this sacrifice.

FRANKLIN EDEGERTON
MAX L. MARGOLIS
Editors

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Corresponding Secretary presented the report of the Executive Committee as printed in the Journal (42, 213 and 377). He also reported that the Executive Committee had approved the request of the Société Belge d'Études Orientales for affiliation with the Federation of Asiatic Societies.

Upon motion the report of the Executive Committee was accepted.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS

On recommendation of the Directors, Professor M. Winternitz of the University of Prag and Professor H. Zimmern of
the University of Berlin were duly elected honorary members of the Society.

The following persons, recommended by the Directors, were duly elected corporate members of the Society; the list includes one elected at a later meeting.

Mr. William Y. Bell
Dr. Renward Brandstetter
Rev. George Weston Briggs
Prof. John F. B. Carruthers
Rabbi Adolph Coblenz
Prof. Thomas F. Cummings
Dr. Barnett A. Elzas
Dr. A. L. Frothingham
Miss Ann Lillian Leathers
Prof. Isadore Levine
Mr. Leon J. Liebreich
Prof. Francis C. MacDonald
Rev. Dr. Philo Laos Mills

Mr. Samuel Pitlik
Prof. Lucius C. Porter
Dr. Nathaniel Reich
Mr. Halsey A. Rine
Mr. Samuel Rosenblatt
Mrs. Wilfred H. Schoff
Dr. T. Leslie Shear
Miss Marion W. Sleezer
Mr. N. L. Thacker
Prof. Rudolf Tschudi
Mr. W. H. Weigel, Jr.
Mr. Peter H. Wooldridge

[Total: 25]

Professor Haupt, for the Committee on the Nomination of Officers for 1923, reported nominations for the several offices as follows:

President: President Cyrus Adler, Dropsie College, Philadelphia.
Vice-Presidents: Professor Roland G. Kent, Philadelphia.

Professor C. R. Lanman, Cambridge, Mass.
Professor Ira M. Price, Chicago.

Corresponding Secretary: Dr. Charles J. Ogden, New York.
Recording Secretary: Professor LeRoy C. Barrett, Hartford.
Treasurer: Professor John C. Archer, New Haven.
Librarian: Professor A. T. Clay, New Haven.

Editors of the Journal: Professor Franklin Edgerton, Philadelphia.
Professor Max L. Margolis, Philadelphia.

Professor N. Schmidt, Ithaca.
Professor H. H. Bender, Princeton.

The officers thus nominated were duly elected.

President Hopkins delivered an address on "The Development of Hindu Ethics".

The session adjourned at 12:40 P. M.

THE SECOND SESSION

The second session was called to order at 2:30 o'clock on Tuesday afternoon; the reading of papers was immediately begun.
Professor PAUL HAURT, of the Johns Hopkins University: (a) The Sumerian Origin of the Semitic Word for ‘Snow’; (b) Plato’s Atlantis; (c) Leprosy and Framboesia; (d) Apples of Gold in Baskets of Silver. Remarks by Dr. Elzas, Dr. Chapman, Prof. Olmstead, and the author.

(a) Heb. šālāg, snow, denotes also fullers’ earth = pABL allāg or allāk < Ass. allaku, whitener, Fr. blanchisseur (cf. Mark 9, 3) < Sum. uslāk (JHUCC 306, 4). We speak of snowy linen; the Semites regarded snow as a white blanket (<blank, white). Sum. uslāk, bright (RA 17, 33) < sa, bright + lāk = lax, lux, to wash, rub (cf. JAOS 37, 322, n. 11). Arab. ġazālī, washerman, may be derived from allāg.

(b) Atlantis is not a great land submerged in the region of the Azores, but southwestern Spain, which was supposed to be an island as was also Cornwall whence tin was brought to Spain and thence to the East (contrast GA 1 161, 837). Sargon of Accad (c. 2975 n. c.) calls southwestern Spain māt Anaku, the Tin-land, while Esarhaddon (681–668) uses the name Taršis which we find in OT. According to Strabo (139) the people of Tarshish had annals, poems, and laws, which were said to be 6000 years old. After the destruction of Tartessus near the mouth of the Guadalquivir (c. 500 B. C.) Tarshish was often confounded with Gades (Cádiz). Cf. JHUCC 287, 46; Schulten, Tartessos (1922) pp. 6, 10, 14, 55, 80, 88.

(c) Heb. ġaraʾ (= Ass. qēnita = Arab. nāḏʾah, whiteness) denotes a variety of skin-diseases (Numbers; SBOT, 45) including frambesia which makes hairs turn white (Lev. 13, 3, 10, 25). Patients suffering from this highly contagious disease must be segregated, contaminated houses and clothing thoroughly cleansed and disinfected or destroyed (Lev. 13, 46, 58; 14, 41, 45). This disease is due to a minute protozoal blood-parasite, treponema pertenue, which resembles the morbid agent of syphilis, treponema pallidum.

(d) Prov. 25, 11 means: Like gold gravings (piṭṭāḥ) on chased silver plate is a word spoken in the nick (< to nick, to nod, wink; cf. ZA 33, 62). ‘Al-ofndy signifies lit. at his (=the; cf. Kings 299, 30) great (GK 285 124, ‘) turn. Heb. ḫōn, wheel < yapan = pand (AJSL 22, 258) denotes prop. turn which may also mean turning-point, crisis (cf. Arab. ḫānak, moment) and also (in pB Hebrew) form, mode (cf. Arab. faww, find). It is a form like ḫār, treasure; ḫār, cairn (PAP 58, 241). Contrast JBL 33, 291; AJSL 36, 258; JAOS 40, 324.

Professor GEORGE A. BARTON, of the University of Pennsylvania: (a) The Form and Nature of E-PA at Lagash; (b) The Comparative Degree in Sumerian; (c) Mormonism and Oriental Research. Remarks by President Hopkins and Dr. Ogden.

Rev. Dr. JUSTIN E. ABBOTT, of Summit, N. J.: Thomas Stevens and the discovery of the Devanāgarī manuscript of his Christian Purāṇa.

Thomas Stevens, born 1549 died 1619, has the double distinction of being the first Englishman positively known to have visited India, and the first European to have taken a scholarly interest in the vernacular literature of India. He went to Goa as a Jesuit missionary in 1579. He was greatly honored for his character and linguistic ability.
He was the first to prepare a Marathi Grammar. He wrote a small Catechism in Marathi, and an immortal work, his *Christian Parāja*. Until recently only manuscripts of this work in Roman character were known, and an edition based on these was published at Mangalore in 1907. In Aug. 1922, however, I discovered in the library of the School for Oriental Studies in London a Devanāgari manuscript of this work, which is without doubt the original text of this opus magnum of Thomas Stevens.

Professor Max L. Margolis, of Dropsie College: The Parasitic Vowel in Segolate Forms. Remarks by Professor Haupt and the author.

Dr. Edward Chiera, of the University of Pennsylvania: An Amoritic Legend in Sumerian. Remarks by Professor Clay.

A Sumerian tablet from the Nippur collection contains an interesting legend which is staged in the city of Ninab. It starts with a description of the land, which lacks important things for civilized life. The god Martu remarks to his mother that all his friends have wives and that she should provide him with one. The marriage with the goddess Namrat follows, and the land is placed in a more normal condition. The interest of the story lies in the fact that all the gods mentioned are foreign deities.


Professor LeRoy Waterman, of the University of Michigan: (a) Note on a Votive Prayer to Nabu; (b) The Assyrian reading of the name Sargon.

(a) A discussion of Ashurbanipal's votive prayer to Nabu, line 4, (Layard Pl. 85 and duplicates) as raised by V. Schel ZA XVII p. 95, in view of another duplicate text of the prayer in the possession of the University of Michigan.

(b) A critique of the evidence for the reading Sharr-ukēnu, and a presentation of the evidence for the reading Sharru-akīn.

The session adjourned at 4:30 o'clock.

THE THIRD SESSION

The third session was called to order at 9:35 o'clock on Wednesday morning: the reading of papers was immediately begun.

Rev. Dr. Frank K. Sanders, of New York City: (a) A New Series on Living Religions. (b) A proposed plan to enlist the cooperation of missionaries.


Two modes of dating are recognized by Biblical chronologers: coincident-dating and post-dating. The annals of Menahem and Pekahiah (II Kings 15. 13, 17, 23) show what may be called inconsequent post-dating. This was an arbitrary imitation of the scheme we find in the upper portion of the Assyrian Canon before the changes introduced by the Sargonides. Menahem and his son were pro-Assyrian, and nothing was too Assyrian for them. Their so-called first year answers to the 'eponym-year' of the Assyrian kings. They probably introduced the eponym system into their administration. This leads to a number of important conclusions.

Professor Leroy C. Barret, of Trinity College: The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Book Ten. Remarks by Professor Bloomfield.

Professor Aaron Ember, of the Johns Hopkins University: (a) Egyptian T³ mh, 'Delta,' and T³ mrij, 'Egypt'; (b) Several Egyptian Etymologies. Remarks by Professor Meek, Dr. Elzas, Dr. Reich, Dr. Chapman, and the author.

(a) Mḥ and Mḥ-t are old Eg. words for sea, <mḥ, fill and mḥj, be inundated. Mḥ yr-t (big sea) = the primeval waters. Mḥj, Lower Egypt, <mḥ, sea, here = the Mediterranean. Heb. māḥā and Arab. māḥā, destroy, efface, meant originally to flood. Arab. māḥāh, north wind = Eg. mḥj-t, north wind.

Eg. mṛ, sea, is a synonym of mḥ; cf. mḥ yr = Lake Moeris. In T³ mṛj Egypt, mṛ = the Mediterranean. T³ mṛj properly means sea land, and was originally a designation for Northern Egypt only (= T³ mḥ).

Mr, sea, is etymologically = Ass. Amurrū, West, Mediterranean = Arab. ḫmrūh. Mḥj T³ mḥ and T³ mṛj are expressions like Ass. māṭ šāmtām.

(b) Nn-bm, spleen, prop. not conducive to walking.—ṛṣrjt, bean <ṛṣṛ, be pregnant.—ḥō, metal = Arab. ḫūr, Heb. ḫēr, well, pit.—ḥm-t, woman = perforata; cf. Heb. ḥēhād, ḥm, phallus, prop. perforator.—ḥm, phal- lus = ḥmn, hoe, plough.—ḥm, phallus = Heb. ḫɔmez, abdomen, 'Bilin- himes, phallus.

Professor Theophile J. Meek, of Bryn Mawr College: Babylonica: a discussion of some difficult passages and words in the inscriptions of the Babylonian kings. Remarks by Professor Haupt.

Professor E. Washburn Hopkins, of Yale University: A Buddhistic Passage in Manu. Remarks by Professor Jackson.

This paper discusses the provenance of the opening verses of the twelfth book of Manu and shows that they agree with the Ten Sins of Buddhism, the arrangement being Buddhistic and not Brahmanic.

Professor J. A. Montgomery, of the University of Pennsylvania: Some Notes on the Septuagint. Remarks by Professors Haupt, Gottheil, Olmstead, Dr. Chapman, and the author.

Professor Charles R. Lanman, of Harvard University: Sanskrit Books for Western Students: the need and the essential requirements. Remarks by Professor Edgerton.
Indianists have generally assumed for the last fifty years that the greatest possible service to science lay in extending by original research our knowledge of ancient India. I maintain that at the present this is unquestionably an error. The general need of suitable English books, —readers, grammars, dictionaries,—for beginners in Sanskrit is now more urgent than any other whatsoever, since the existing works are either unprocurable or difficult to use effectively. The readers all fall in the choice of the specimens of the literature. The inexorable requirements for beginners are: simplicity of language, intrinsic interest of subject-matter, and (in narrative pieces) quick-moving action and abounding incident, with the omission of tedious descriptions and passages textually corrupt.

Professor Richard Gottheil, of Columbia University: A New Title in the list of al-Ghazâlî’s Works. [Printed in the Journal, 43.85-91.]

Professor Thomas F. Cummings, of the Biblical Seminary in New York: The Irreducible Minimum in Learning a Foreign Language. Remarks by Professors Lanman, Bloomfield, and Haupt. [Printed in the Journal, 43.81-84.]

It was voted: that the Corresponding Secretary send the greetings of the Society to the recently organized Société Belge d’Études Orientales.

The session adjourned at 12: 35 P. M.

THE FOURTH SESSION

The fourth session was called to order at 2:30 o’clock on Wednesday afternoon: the reading of papers was immediately resumed.

Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia University: The Date and Manner of Mâni’s Death. Remarks by Professor Meek, Dr. Ogden, and the author.

Rev. Dr. Abraham Yohannan, of Columbia University: Ithoter Rivâyat, an eighteenth century Zoroastrian manuscript in Persian. Remarks by Professor Jackson.

This manuscript is dated A.H. 1187 = 1773 A.D. It states that the Zoroastrian Mobeds and Dasturs of India sent seventy-eight (Gujarati ihoter) questions to the Mobeds and Dasturs of Yezd and Kerman in Persia, requesting them to explain certain Zoroastrian religious ceremonies which were not clear to them. The manuscript contains both the questions and the answers in full.

Professor A. T. Olmstead, of the University of Illinois: Early Ashur. Remarks by President Hopkins.

This paper is a preliminary statement of those parts of my History of Assyria which are based primarily on the results of the German excavations of the Ishtar temple at the earliest Assyrian capital.

Professor Maurice Bloomfield, of the Johns Hopkins University: The Sālibhadra Carita, a story of conversion to Jaina monkhood.
This is a mahākāvyya elaborated by the learned and elegant writer and redactor Pradyumnaśūri from the simpler chronicle by Dharmakumāra. It tells how a wealthy and luxurious young merchant prince obtained enlightenment (pratyekabodhi) on coming in contact with King Śrenīka whom he found like any other mortal. Together with his brother-in-law, Dhanya, he receives instruction from Mahāvīra, turns wandering beggar-ascetic, dies from fast under a tree on the sacred mountain Vaibhāra, and enters into highest bliss.

President Julian Morgenstern, of the Hebrew Union College: The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel. Remarks by Professor Olmstead, Mr. Moran, Dr. Chapman, and the author.

The Bible shows evidence that three distinct calendars were employed at different periods in ancient Israel. The oldest, the Canaanite calendar, was employed until about 608 B.C. The second, a soli-lunar calendar based upon a Babylonian original, was employed from about 608 B.C. to the beginning of the Greek era, or even later. In this calendar the months were indicated by number. The third calendar, also soli-lunar, but with a more exact system of intercalation, employed the Babylonian names of the months. It was introduced during the Greek period. A reorganization of the religious festivals accompanied the various changes of the calendar.

Professor Franklin Edgerton, of the University of Pennsylvania: Sāṅkhya and Yoga in the Bhagavad Gītā. Remarks by President Hopkins, Professor Lanman, and the author.

In the Gītā these terms denote primarily not metaphysical systems, but methods of salvation. Sāṅkhya means the "way of knowledge"—salvation by realization of supreme truth, represented as implying renunciation of all activities, i.e. asceticism (elsewhere associated rather with Yoga!). Yoga means the "way of disciplined activity"—salvation by participation in normal action, as prescribed by duty, without interest in results. To be sure, the word yoga is used in other senses in the Gītā; but never when bracketed with Sāṅkhya. Crucial passages: 3. 3ff., 5. 2ff., Is this understanding of the terms a personal idiosyncrasy of the Gītā's author—or must we revise our notions of the history of the expressions?

Professor George R. Berry, of Colgate University: Priests and Levites.

Ch. 40-48 of Ezekiel are regarded as belonging to the late Greek period; the accounts concerning priests and Levites in P as largely unhistorical; the material original with the Chronicler as entirely unhistorical and the unhistorical material in P and the Chronicler as much more ideal than anachronistic. Consequently, the designation of priests as Aaronites in P and the Chronicler is substantially ideal, corresponding to no material historical reality. The distinction between priests and Levites is also principially ideal. The references to Zadokites in ch. 40-48 of Ezekiel correspond to the conditions of the Maccabean period.

Mr. Jal C. Payry, of Columbia University: The Zoroastrian 'Bridge of Judgment' in the Pahlavi Literature.
This paper presents the results of a detailed study of those passages in the Pahlavi texts (the patristic or extra-canonical writings of the Zoroastrians) in which the Chinvat Bridge, "Bridge of the Separator," is alluded to. These passages are treated in such a way as to bring out the various aspects of the eschatological ideas of the Zoroastrian Church as developed during the Sassanian period and later, thus supplementing the Avestan texts themselves.

The session adjourned at 4:35 P. M.

THE FIFTH SESSION

The fifth session was called to order at 9:30 o'clock on Thursday morning.

It was announced that the Directors had accepted the invitation to meet at Columbia University, New York City, during Easter Week 1924; the exact days to be determined by the Executive Committee.

The Corresponding Secretary, Doctor Charles J. Ogden, spoke briefly concerning the plans of the Committee on the Extension of Membership and Resources.

Informal reports were received concerning the American Schools of Oriental Research; the centenary celebration of the Société Asiatique; the proposed publication of Blake's Grammar of the Tagalog Language and Edgerton's Pañcatantra; and the Directors' action proposing to devote the income of the Nies Fund to publications in the Semitic field.

After a brief discussion upon the proposal to hold separate sessions, Indo-Iranian and Semitic, it was voted to lay the matter on the table.

President Hopkins appointed as a Committee on Arrangements for the meeting in 1924 Professors Gottheil, Prince, Davidson, and Mrs. A. V. W. Jackson, and the Corresponding Secretary, ex-officio.

As the Committee on the Nomination of Officers for 1924, the President appointed Professor Barton, Mrs. Jastrow, and Doctor Haas.

As auditors the President appointed Professors Torrey and F. W. Williams.

The following resolution was adopted:

The American Oriental Society desires to record its grateful appreciation of the cordial hospitality extended to it by Princeton University during its sessions; to acknowledge its indebtedness to Professor Bender and the local committee for their careful
provision for our comfort; to express to President and Mrs. Hibben the pleasure afforded by the opportunity to meet them in their home; to express thanks to Dean West for his cordial words and deeds of welcome in Procter Hall; to Doctor Russell for the delightful musical program rendered; to Doctor Gerould and the staff of the University Library for the special exhibit made ready for our inspection; to the Nassau Club and the Present Day Club for the many courtesies extended to us. We shall carry from Princeton memories of a place where beauty furnishes inspiration to learning.

The reading of papers was resumed.

Mr. N. L. Thracker, of Brooklyn, N. Y.: Are the Land of PUNT and the God Bes African or Indian?

The African theory for Punt is based chiefly on the cult of Bes and pygmies connected therewith. However: (1) Facts concerning the direction, population and products of Punt; (2) The Dwarf Incarnation of Vishnu and the dwarfs used in temple-worship in India, corresponding to Bes and pygmies; (3) The stories in Egyptian and Indian literature concerning the migration to Egypt; (4) Records of certain Indian Princes showing that they are descended from those who went to Egypt in the Second dynasty and returned to India after the rise of Islam; seem to prove that Punt should be sought in India.

Dr. Nathaniel Reich, of the University of Pennsylvania Museum: Recently discovered Egyptian-Greek papyri of a family-archive in Thebes.

Dr. Charles J. Ogden, of New York City: Bhāṣa’s Treatment of the Udayana Legend.

This paper examines the legendary material utilized by Bhāṣa in his play Pratijñāyugandharāyaṇa. The action of the drama is too episodic to enable us to reconstruct from it the whole story of Udayana’s captivity and his wooing of Vāsavadattā; but it is evident that Bhāṣa treats the incident in a more realistic and serious fashion than does the light-hearted account of the Kathāsaritsāgara, and herein he is probably more faithful to the original legend. A passage in the sixth act of his Svapnāvāsavadatta is, however, in agreement with the Kathāsaritsāgara; hence it would seem that divergent recensions of the tale were current even in Bhāṣa’s time.

Rev. Hugh A. Moran, of Ithaca, N. Y.: Possible Sources of the Western Alphabet in the Astrological Signs of the Orient.

Some light may be thrown on the sources of our alphabet by a study of the signs used in primitive astrology. The Signs of the Zodiac are amongst the most primitive known and are common to East and West. Among the primitives from which Chinese ideographs are built up are twenty-two horary characters, twelve of which correspond to Signs of the Zodiac. These and a few other astrological figures were first scratched on "Calendar Stones" and on the walls of caves. They de-
developed into a numerical system for counting days, months and years, were used with phonetic value in ideographic writing, and they show interesting correspondence with early alphabetic forms.

The following papers were presented by title:

Professor Maurice Bloomfield, of the Johns Hopkins University: On the meaning of the words pratyekabuddha and pratyekabodhi.

This paper elaborates the hint held out in the author's Life and Stories of the Jaina Savior Pārśvanātha, p. 5, note 9. Both in Buddhist and in Jaina religion the words imply enlightenment thru some particular(sing)e event which impresses a single individual with the perishableness of earthly things, and thus brings about his enlightenment and salvation.

Dr. Charles J. Ogden, of New York City: On the names of an ancient Hindu people, Vatsa, Vaccha, Vanisa.

This name of a people who dwelt along the lower reaches of the Jumna, about 500 B.C., appears in Sanskrit as Vatsa, in Prākrit as Vaccha, and in Pāli (Aṅguttara-Nikāya and Jātaka Comm.) as Vanisa. Since the Pāli form, unlike the Prākrit, is not phonetically derivable from the Sanskrit, an original *Vassa may be conjectured, whence Vatsa in Sanskrit through a sort of dissimilation (Wackernagel, Altind. Gramm. 1, § 153), and Vanisa in the dialectical source of the Pāli form through so-called 'spontaneous nasalization' (Geiger, Pāli, p. 43; cf. Grierson, JRAS 1922, p. 381-388).

Mr. N. L. Trucker, of Brooklyn, N. Y.: Are the Hieroglyphic and the Sanskrit Languages Related?

Although it is held that no connection whatever exists between the Hieroglyphic and Sanskrit languages, the number and nature of the analogies between the two seem to indicate that there is some relation, because: (1) When a Sanskrit word equivalent to a Hieroglyphic determinative is broken up into syllables, these correspond to the pictures in the phonetic group for the determinative; (2) The relation of many so-called African words can be traced to Sanskrit; (3) Although in the grammar definite functions have been assigned to certain signs, in translations these functions have been neglected; (4) Transliterations into Sanskrit are at the same time coherent translations.

Dr. Frank R. Blake, of the Johns Hopkins University: Construction of co-ordinated words in modern spoken Tagalog.

This paper deals with the Tagalog material collected as described in my article presented to the Society last year on 'Long-distance collection of Philippine linguistic material.' The material here treated seems to show that the original characteristic Philippine construction is everywhere giving way to a simpler analytic construction like that in English, for instance. The material collected for the other languages, Ilokano, Pampanga, Bisaya, Bikol, etc., will be published later.

Professor George S. Duncan, of the American University and the V. M. C. A. School of Religion, Washington: Select Babylonian Business Documents from the reign of Darius I.
Dr. GEORGE C. O. HAAS, of New York City: The Meters of King Harsha's Sanskrit Drama Priyadarśikā.

This play contains fewer stanzas and shows less variety of metrical structure than either of the other dramas attributed to Harshadeva. In its 49 stanzas only 8 different verse-forms are employed, three of these occurring but once each; and 21 stanzas, or somewhat less than half, are in a single meter, the śārdulovikrīdita.

Dr. DAVID I. MACHT, of the Department of Pharmacology, Johns Hopkins University: An Experimental Appreciation of I Kings 1, 5.

This passage referring to Adonijah and his followers speaks of swift runners as being in his suite. The old Hebrew commentators quote two passages in the Talmud stating that such messengers or runners were splenectomized in order to make them run faster. References to such a practice are also found in Pliny's Natural History and in modern literature. The author in conjunction with E. M. Finesilver undertook a physiological research on the subject. For the purpose of determining whether the excision of the spleen exerts any influence on the muscular integration, white rats were used. The result of this work indicates that splenectomized rats as compared with normal rats are more efficient in running and in muscular coordination.

Dr. CLARENCE A. MANNING, of Columbia University: Yermak Timofeevich in Russian Folk Poetry. [To be printed in the JOURNAL].

Rev. Dr. SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, of Cairo, Egypt: Notes on the Recent Census of the Moslem World.

The Society adjourned at 11:15 A. M., to meet in New York in 1924.
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
MIDDLE WEST BRANCH
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

AT ITS SEVENTH MEETING AT CHICAGO, FEBRUARY 23-24, 1923

In 1922 the Executive Committee of the Middle West Branch accepted the invitation of the University of Michigan to meet at Ann Arbor, February 23 and 24, 1923. In the early part of February, 1923, so many members of the Branch were seriously ill and the prospects of the meeting were consequently so poor that the Executive Committee found it advisable to change the place of meeting from Ann Arbor to Chicago; for the central location of Chicago made it apparent that a larger number of members could be got together than at Ann Arbor. A timely invitation from the University of Chicago was therefore welcomed.

The Secretary-Treasurer, Professor T. George Allen, was one of those whose illness made attendance impossible. In his absence, Dr. William F. Edgerton acted unofficially as Secretary-Treasurer. There are known to have been present the following members.

Clark  Keyfitz  Olmstead
Edgerton, W. F.  Lauffer  Price
Eiselen  Luckenbill  Sellers
Fuller  Lybyer  Smith, J. M. P.
Kelly  Maynard  Sprengling

Some visitors also were present at each session.

The number of papers on the program was small enough to allow ample time for discussion. At the beginning of the first session, the members voted to discuss each paper immediately after the reading of the paper itself. The discussions were general, and proved to be a valuable part of the program.
At the Friday morning session, the following papers were read:

Professor WALTER E. CLARK, of the University of Chicago: Some Misunderstandings about India.

Professor IRA M. PRICE, of the University of Chicago: Some References to Transportation by Water in Early Babylonia. Early Babylonia developed a net-work of canals for irrigation and transportation. Numerous references in Sumerian documents speak of digging, maintenance and use of such canals, both for irrigation and transportation. Transportation by boats between fields and cities, between centers of commerce, and foreign parts, is often cited in the Gudea inscriptions. Conventional boats are pictured on early seal-cylinders, though furnishing little light on the construction of the marine equipment of that day.

Professor MARTIN SPRENGLING, of the University of Chicago: Kalila wa Dimma Studies: The King of the Apes.

Dr. A. R. NYKL, of Northwestern University, was unable to be present to read his paper, “Two Editions of Ibn Hazm’s ‘Character and Conduct’”; but he sent the following abstract to the Secretary-Treasurer:

Asln’s Spanish translation is based on a more complete Cairo edition, in which there is a good deal of self-analysis (reminding one of Montaigne and Spinoza), which is almost entirely omitted from the Cairo edition (Muhammad Edhem’s). The thesis set forth by the Zāhirite philosopher is that the ultimate goal of all human action is the avoidance of pain (kannā), the only way of attaining this ultimate goal being the concentration on such work as would assure the seeker eternal life in the Janna.

The following papers were read at the Friday afternoon session:

Professor D. D. LUCKENBILL, of the University of Chicago: The Origin of the Akkadians. (To be published in the July, 1923, number of AJSL.)

Dr. JOHN A. MAYNARD, of the University of Chicago: The Foundations of Pan-Amurrism.

This new theory is based on historical, philological, and mythological arguments. Comparative mythology does not confirm Pan-Amurrism. The proofs advanced to turn Tammuz and Gilgamesh into Amorites are unreal.
Professor A. T. Olmstead, of the University of Illinois: The Imperial Free City of Assyria.

Professor Eugene H. Byrne, of the University of Wisconsin: Studies in the History of Trade with the Near East, Suggested by Recent Work in the Archives of Genoa. (Read by title).

A short business meeting followed the reading of papers. In accordance with the custom of the Branch, a Nominating Committee was nominated from the floor, and instructed to report nominees at the Saturday morning session. Professors Kelly, Olmstead, and Clark were nominated and elected the Nominating Committee.

Professor Price read a letter from Professor Waterman inviting the Branch to meet at Ann Arbor in 1924. President Eiselen stated that, while he recognized the prior claim of the University of Michigan and the desirability of going farther away from Chicago than Evanston next year, he wished the Branch to understand that it would be cordially welcome at Evanston. Professor Clark stated unofficially that the western Branch of the American Anthropological Society would welcome a joint meeting with this Branch. Professor Olmstead suggested that a committee be appointed to arrange a joint meeting with the Anthropological Society two years hence.

Professor Luckenbill suggested that the end of February is not a good season for the meeting. After general discussion, Professor Luckenbill moved that the time of meeting be referred to the new Executive Committee with instructions to consult the membership before making a decision. Professor Smith moved to amend this motion in such a way as to refer both time and place of the next meeting to the new Executive Committee. Professor Luckenbill accepted the amendment, and the motion, being properly seconded, was carried unanimously.

On motion, the Chair appointed a Special Committee to frame a resolution to be addressed to the parent Society, expressing the desire of the Middle West Branch to have adequate representation on the Board of Directors. The special Committee was instructed to report Saturday morning. The session then adjourned.

President Eiselen opened the Friday evening session by introducing Professor E. J. Goodspeed, Secretary to the President
of the University of Chicago, who officially welcomed the Branch on behalf of the University. President Eiselen then delivered his presidential address on "Some Unfinished Problems." After the presidential address, Professor Lybyer read a paper on "The Return of the Turk." After the close of his paper, Professor Lybyer answered questions propounded by a number of members and visitors.

The Saturday morning session was opened by the reading of the following papers:

Dean Samuel A. B. Mercer of Bexley Hall, Gambier Ohio: The Anaphora of St. Gregory. (Read by title by Dr. J. A. Maynard.)

Professor O. R. Sellers, of McCormick Theological Seminary: Meter in Egyptian.

Though we are uncertain as to the pronunciation of the Egyptian language, I think it reasonable to suppose that an ordinary word will have one beat, while a long word may have two beats and a short word or a word in close relation with the one following may have no beat. On this basis we find 3+3 meter (e. g., Pyramid Texts 546), 2+2 meter (Pyramid Texts 550), 3+2 meter (Death a Glad Release, Erman, Aeg. Chrestomathie, p. 33), and 4+3 meter (Song of the Thresher, Erman, Aeg. Chrestomathie, p. 32).

Professor Martin Sprengling, of the University of Chicago: Writings of Ibn el Muqaffa' recently published.

The reading of papers was followed by a business meeting. Professor Kelly, as Chairman of the Nominating Committee, reported, and the Society unanimously elected, the following as the officers for the ensuing year:

President, Professor Ira M. Price, of the University of Chicago.
Vice-President, Professor Louis B. Wolfenson, of the University of Wisconsin.
Secretary-Treasurer, Professor T. George Allen, of the University of Chicago.
Members of the Executive Committee, Professor F. C. Eiselen of Garrett Biblical Institute and Professor Moses Buttenwieser of Hebrew Union College.

Professor J. M. P. Smith, as Chairman of the Special Committee elected the previous afternoon, introduced the following resolution:

"Resolved that it is the sense of the Middle West Branch
of the American Oriental Society that the officials of said Branch should have the same voting representation on the Board of Directors of the American Oriental Society as the corresponding officials of the parent Society."

This resolution was seconded by Professor D. D. Luckenbill and carried unanimously.

Professor Olmstead moved that the Branch express its thanks to the University of Chicago and to the Oriental Institute for the hospitality extended on such short notice; and that the Branch further express its regret that its Secretary-Treasurer had been unable to attend the sessions, and also its sympathy for him in his illness. This motion was duly seconded and unanimously carried.

On request, Professor J. M. P. Smith read to the Society a cabled article on the discoveries of Tutenkhamon's tomb in Egypt, from Professor Breasted, now in Egypt, which had been printed in the Chicago Daily News of February 22nd. The meeting then adjourned.

T. GEORGE ALLEN, Secretary-Treasurer

by WILLIAM F. EDGERTON
IN THE YEAR 1904 I was privileged to journey with the late Prof. J. Euting in the districts east of the Jordan. It was on this journey that I first became acquainted with the poems of Nimr, the ṣəḥ and the “Ḥatim Tai” of the ‘Adwān. Prof. Euting recited some stanzas by Nimr, but whether he had committed any poems to paper I do not know. I made several journeys into the country of the ‘Adwān and was successful in collecting about a score of poems and some oral traditions concerning the famous ṣəḥ himself. Further journeys undertaken together with my friend Mr. E. N. Haddad into the same and adjoining districts have more than doubled the original collection.

Nimr belonged to the family of the Qaṣīdī, as he tells us in a poem addressed to Muṭlaq es-salmān, ṣəḥ of the Ḥrēṣi, a subdivision of the Beni Ṣāḥir (Poem B. 5). He was the second of three brothers. The oldest was named Sāliḥ and the youngest Kayid. He seems to refer to these two, though not by name, in a poem in which he pours out his deep sorrow and despair over the death of “the little love,” i.e. the beloved wife Waḍḥa.

In the days of Nimr and Waḍḥa the power of the ‘Adwān Bedu extended over the whole Belka, which the lovesick Nimr would willingly have given away, yea, he would have added half of Taṭilla as a present to those who would bring Waḍḥa back from her parents, to whom she had gone on a visit which had been prolonged beyond the “three nights” agreed upon (Poem II).

In those days there circulated a Bedawi proverb, according to Burckhardt,1 methel el-belka ma teltaka, “thou canst not find

---

1 Acc. to Suleiman ibn Muh. Eff. ḥaṭīb es-ṣalṭi.
3 *Travels in Syria*, p. 369.
a country like the Belka", while Taflila, then as now, enjoyed a high reputation for its extremely fruitful soil.

The Emir of the 'Adwān was, in Nimir's time, his cousin Diyaū el-'Adwān, mentioned in a poem. When Burckhardt in 1812 visited the Belka he found that the 'Adwān, who had formerly been the chief tribe of the province, had been reduced to the lowest condition by their inveterate enemies the "Beni Sakaṭārik". The Beni Ṣaḥr had to retire northward before the ever increasing power of the Wahabī. In their distress they appealed to the 'Adwān Bedu who allowed them to graze their cattle in the 'Adwān country for a small annual tribute. The Beni Ṣaḥr returned evil for good, and gradually detaching the other tribes from their alliance with the 'Adwān, they finally drove these across the Zerka and took possession of the land of their benefactors. Burckhardt relates that Ḥamūd eš-ṣāliḥ, chief of the 'Adwān, tried to regain the country with the aid of the Pasha of Damascus; he failed, as the Beni Ṣaḥr were too strong. The second chief of the 'Adwān in those evil days joined the Beni Ṣaḥr together with his thirteen sons. At the time of Burckhardt's visit the 'Adwān were driven into the mountains of Adjūn. It is quite probable that the great political calamity which befell the 'Adwān in the declining days of Nimir's life may be referred to in some of his poems where he speaks with disgust of "beggars" and "shepherds" as being put over him (e.g. Poems XXXIX. 12; XXXIII. 12; see below). The sun of the prosperity of the 'Adwān set completely in the year 1864, when their old hunting and camping ground passed entirely into the control of the Turkish Government. Even to this day the greatest enemies of the 'Adwān are still the powerful Beni Ṣaḥr.

The Beni Ṣaḥr are a clan of the Beni 'Ali Anēzeh, who defeated the French troops at Mount Tabor.

---

1. Ib. p. 403.
2. Also acc. to Saleiman ibn Muh. Elf.
4. L. e. the biblical Jabbok.
6. This was not Nimir, who according to tradition and his own poems had only four or five sons, though he was at one time allied with the Beni Ṣaḥr.
7. R. N. Upton in Fraser's Magazine, 1876, p. 382; 1877, p. 441.
At one time, however, Nimr united himself with the Beni Ṣaḥr in war upon his own people, a situation which was very repugnant to his feelings, for he breaks out in the words:

"O my loneliness in my circle after being
Entertained, and entertaining those who came to me;
After I had been a place of refuge to him who took refuge with me,
I do not to-day find for myself a partner."

And contemplating what he had done, he exclaims in real anguish of soul at the thought of his degrading action:

"Would I had been created a bird...
Who dies in the world even if he were not born a second time,
Who prefers a miserable death to a life with shame."

(Poem A, vv. 9-12.)

Nimr’s marriage with the daughter of one of the Ṣeyāḥ of the Ṣḥûr, the sister of Ibn Haḍḍāl Jedē’a (Poem I), brought about more friendly relations between the two tribes. It seems that strong bonds of friendship bound Nimr to Ibn Haḍḍāl his brother-in-law, although in the fierceness of his anger when Waḍḥa stayed with her parents a longer period than Nimr had permitted her, at her brother’s request, Nimr, in true Oriental fashion, which knows little restraint in giving expression to love or hatred, uttered this imprecation against him:

"A lightning flashed, O Ḥamūd, toward Ibn Haḍḍāl;
May God grant that his land be barren." (Poem I, v. 3.)

In later years, after Waḍḥa’s death, he poured out his grief to him in the words:

"I complain to thee, O Jedē’a, of the things which have happened to me.
O my stay, O Jedē’a, time has forsaken me."

Nimr’s personal reputation was that of a brave warrior, as may be inferred from the story of the terrified maiden (cf. story of How Nimr got his Wife), who finding herself in the power of a ruffian, called upon the name of Nimr as being

---

* Spier in ZDMG 66: p. 197, lines 3, 4.
one to conjure with, although he was personally unknown to her. His recognized courage is referred to also in the humorous poem of "The Leopard and the Gun," as I have called it, which my Arab informants declared to be worthy of Mutanabbi. As the arms of famous warriors had names, so Nimr’s gun was known by the name of marīda. He mentions the gun by name in a poem (Deathbed Scene).

In various poems Nimr refers to the fact that he obtained his best-beloved wife without payment of the usual bridal price. He says:

"She came to me a gift; nor did I send the dowry for her; I have paid no treasures for her." (Cf. Poems VIII:11; XVI: 9; XVIII: 13.)

"She came to me a present. I sent her no dowry of noble camels." (Poem I: 3).

Nimr never details in his poems the circumstances which bestowed upon him this great happiness. They are, however, well known, although they are related with some variations. One story is that Nimr delivered Waḍba from the clutches of a slave, i.e. a black man, and in gratitude for her preservation, her parents sent her to him, attired in richest bridal robes, without requiring the invariable return of the bridal price. However, according to Suleiman ibn Muḥammad Effendi, ḥātib es-

galī, the story is as follows:

"It came to pass that Nimr went one day on a ṭazzu against the Ṣḥūr; with him were twenty men armed with guns. All that night they did not come up with the enemy. On the following day they hid themselves in a cave which was near by, called marārāt or ḥāf es-sāmik, in the district of Sāmik, the great plain which stretches north-east of the town of Madeha. When morning came the sister of Waḍba went to gather wood, and as she went she passed near the entrance of the cave in which the men were hidden. She belonged to the family of al-Quṭād, the inveterate enemies of Nimr. Now one of the Ṣḥūr Bedu had followed in her steps. And the evil of his soul prompted him to take away her honor, and when she came near the mouth of the cave he seized her unawares and led her within the cave, while in vain she cried out against him. Then she cried out with a loud voice: ‘I stand under the protection of Nimr
ibn 'Adwân,' little knowing that he himself was within. And when that evil one was about to force her, Nimr shot him down before he had dishonored her. Then Nimr confessed to her who he was, but made her promise not to betray him nor his men. Then the girl went home and calling her father and her brothers and making them swear not to reveal what she was about to tell them, she related all that happened. Nimr asked the girl in marriage, but the men of the tribe desired that Wadjha should be given in her stead, for they well knew what influence and experience Wadjha had, and they said: 'Surely she will protect us (i.e. bring no shame upon us) in the land of strangers.' Nimr's frequent reference to Wadjha as 'the daughter of a clan' (cf. Poems I. 2; VII. 11; XVII. 6) bears out the high opinion which her clansmen had of her.

It must be also to such recognized characteristics as these that Nimr alludes in the line 'She has the nature of leopards,' i.e. heroes (Poem XVI. 9); and indeed all that is said of her reveals a nature far above the ordinary. Her resourcefulness is adequately demonstrated by her ride upon the ḍelāl by night, so that both she and the messenger of Nimr might be enabled to keep their words. Wadjha's superiority is shown by the fact that she became an object of praise to all who came to the tent (cf. Poems VIII. 11; XVII. 6), while her hospitality and courtesy to the stranger have inspired many a line in her husband's poems, when after her death he saw the cheerless cold hearth looking inhospitably at him (Poem XLI, Introduction).

Her virtues were incomparable (e.g. Poem VIII), and are often dwelt upon. 'She is not a gossip'—an obvious danger in a community where the life of one's neighbor is so much revealed to the eyes of the curious—"the way of foul speech I have not found in her" (Poem XXXVI. 10); nor did she ever leave the path of virtue; temptation to evil was rather a stimulus to resistance than otherwise. Thus he says to her:

"I have never seen her sitting between two;
She has never waved to her neighbor with her hand;
She has not winked at an illustrious one with the pupil of her eye;
And the father of deeds never looked for a promise from her.
The odor of her sweat diffused like garden flowers;
The roses of virtue are growing over her cheek.
And if the piper should pipe between the two divisions
(i.e. the rows of the tents),
And if the devil should flatter her, he would stimulate her resistance.” (Poem XVIII. 9–12.)

Her intellectual superiority and purity of soul called forth many couplets in praise of her:

“And mind and dignity and beauty are with the beautiful;
And a chaste soul that walks in no vice.” (Poem IX. 9.)

Her personal virtues are visibly indicated on her forehead by the letter ḫ, i.e. ḫiyā, “virtue” (“And when the forehead becomes visible, over it is written the letter ḫ,” Poem XXIII. 9); while the ǧ, i.e. ǧamir, with which “her name is provided,” expresses her inherent worth (Poem XXXIII. 19). She had also that helpful practical love to one’s neighbor without which the other virtues lose half their value. Thus he says:

“She is quick toward her neighbors (i.e. to help) and considerate of the guest.” (Poem XXXIII. 10.)

“She is free from worldliness;
She is neither worldly nor of the worldly ones.” (Poem VIII. 8.)

She had a conciliatory disposition and never allowed a strife to continue over night, so that her “neighbors never went to bed in her anger” (Poem XVIII. 15). The cheerfulness of her disposition is praised in the words:

“With laughter and with love she consoled us,
In language of pearls for beauty and loveliness.” (Poem IV. 11.)

It is therefore not surprising that the poet husband should say that she “has no equal among settlers or Bedu” (Poem XXIV. 9), that all women disappointed him but Wadīḥa (Poem addressed to Ṭenēn) whose equal “he has noted only in piles of sheets of paper (i.e. ancient poetry)” (Poem XVIII. 3).

Wadīḥa influenced Nimr not only as poet (Poem XXII. 4, 5). By her gentle nature, but evidently firm character, she exercised a beneficial influence upon the perhaps impulsive and somewhat violent disposition of her warrior husband. Her very
presence sufficed to hold back his hand from evil and his mouth from speaking guile:

"By God, there are not between me and her anger and reproaches. I restrain my tongue, I hold back my hand from what is faulty." (Poem VI. 10)

Nevertheless she once went back to her family because Nimr "had angered her" (Poem II). She is his "patience" and "great comforter" (Poem XVI. 12f.; XVIII. 6).

"If I come home disturbed in mind, Waḍḥa would console me. As if she were the Merciful one", who soothes her child" (Poem VIII. 6; XVII. 5).

Yet with all this "she has the nature of leopards" (Poem XVI. 9), of those strong and beautiful animals which seeing one cannot but greatly admire, although one knows that clothed in all this beauty there reposes a fierce and dangerous strength; though "sweet to the neighbor" she is to the antagonist "twice foul" (Poem XVI. 11), a trait considered praiseworthy in a Bedawiye. Waḍḥa and Nimr lived together for twenty years (Poem XXXVIII. 9). If Nimr's devotion to Waḍḥa was exceedingly great and his admiration of her boundless, her own unlimited devotion to Nimr is adequately expressed in the following line from Nimr's poems:

"She would swear only by the life of her support" (i.e. Nimr; Poem VIII. 7).

She bore him only one son, 'Agāb, to whom the poet-father poured out his lamentations over her untimely death. It took place while Nimr was on a journey (Poem XXVI. 2) to Damascus (Poem V, Introduction), 'Agāb being 70 days old (Poem IX, Introduction). Waḍḥa's age is nowhere stated, but she must have been of a tender age when married, for Nimr alludes to her as a "tender girl." If we assume that she married Nimr at the age of twelve or thirteen, which is by no means early, she must have died at about the age of thirty-three, 70 days after 'Agāb's birth. Her place of burial, frequently alluded to in

* Fāṭimah.
the poems, is in the district of diyāb (Poem V. 9) at Zabarāt Nimrin in the Rōr (Poem IX. 8; XVI. 14; XVII. 2; XVIII. 6) not far from the Dead Sea in a place called glā'. The tomb is daubed with red and pointed out to this day. Wāḍḥa was the tenth wife of Nimr according to one account (Story of the šēḥ), according to another the eighth.

Nimr had besides ‘Agāb at least three other sons, named Fāris (from whom Nimr was called Abu Fāris, he being the first born, cf. Poem XXXV. 3), Muslat, and Sulṭān, and one daughter Sāra (Poem XXIV. 6; cf. notes to Poem C., verse 1). With the exception of Muslat all are referred to in his poems. Fāris, or as he is also called Fādīl, was the father of Qablān, the father of Fāhid, the father of Fawāz, the father of Šāliḥ, who was still living, a very old man, in 1906.

Nimr's exclusive devotion to Wāḍḥa, evident enough in his eulogies and lamentations, is still further emphasized by the fact, often expressed in his poems, that after her death no woman found favor in his eyes, and though he married many—according to some native authorities eighty—he divorced them all and returned them to their homes. This is the more remarkable in that it entailed great material losses, as his wives were not divorced for any reason which would enable him to reclaim the bridal price.

The opinion of some of the companions of Nimr was that he was a trifle crazy in consequence of his love for Wāḍḥa, as he implies in some of his poems, e.g. XI. 18; XIII. 14; XV. 8. The Arabs, accustomed to such stories as Majnūn Lēlā, Ḥātim Tai and others, would scarcely have held him in derision solely on account of his love for Wāḍḥa. Their antagonism may have arisen out of the fact that he idealized Wāḍḥa so much that he could not find a worthy successor, but divorced scores of women, which could not be done without giving offence to both the gentler sex and their male defenders. As the Bedawiyeh is by no means held in seclusion, but enjoys the fullest liberty, some of his antagonists may have been women.

There are certain qaṣāyād relating to Wāḍḥa which have been interwoven with poems evidently by another hand or at least claiming to be by another hand; for example, the poem ascribed to Ḥammūd ibn Ḥadḍāl (poem II), who, listening to Nimr's complaint, reproaches him from his point of view. One
need not infer from the uniting of two or three poems by means of a story or another qasīde which takes up the challenge, that a regular collection of the poems of Nimr ever existed. Such collections, more or less complete, are by no means unprecedented; but I was unable to discover any even after protracted and careful inquiry in all possible directions. The circumstance is, however, interesting as showing what special poems had appealed to the imagination of other poets, and possibly even of the community or district with which such poets were associated. On the other hand it may be that Nimr is defending himself here against the attacks made upon him—a not unnatural course. If this is the case we cannot but admire the skill of the poet in presenting his own case and that of his imaginary opponent.

It is likely that these groupings of poems have grown out of discussions which Nimr had with the men. This seems to be borne out by the following lines, where direct reference is made to the fact that the people are gossiping about Nimr:

"There came to me my consumer and said to me, 'Thou hast consumed thyself.'
I said, 'If thou couldst see thyself, thou wouldst not ask.'
He said, 'I am ashamed and the people gossip about it.'
I said to him, 'Thou art stupid; leave me in peace with it'."

(Poem XXVIII. 4. 5.)

The incident which led to the cessation of Nimr's elegiac poems relating to Wadhā and his irreparable loss is related in the story of šēh Tibbāt and his three sons. This šēh addressed to Nimr a qasīde reproaching him for excess of grief and reflecting upon the transitoriness of human things. When Nimr recited this qasīde to his tribesmen, one of them told of a still greater misfortune which had befallen a Bedawi of the Dā'āf, who while hunting had accidentally shot his only son, and whose wife and three daughters were burnt to death the same day. Nimr was completely overcome by this dreadful story of woe, and resolved that he must no longer yield to such unbridled grief, but follow the more dignified course of suffering silently, like the much more deeply afflicted šēh. Henceforth he wrote no more amorous poems.

The religious attitude of Nimr is clearly mirrored in his poems.
One finds the usual references to sacrifices (Poem XX. 8), writing in the sand (XL. 6), predestination (VI. 4), the bird of death (XII. 4; XXIX. 3), “the green bird” of ill omen (XLII. 12), the Day of Resurrection (XII. 15; XXV. 8), and an implicit belief in “the One of Whom there are no descriptions” (XXXII. 1). He cheerfully curses his opponents, committing them to the tender mercies of the ḡann and fera'in. There is also another side to his faith, which he expresses in the words:

“To whom, O men, shall I complain of the aching heart, to whom?
And healing is absent from the bazaar of lovers, O mankind!
I commend my state to Him who lifts up the clouds;
My God, be He exalted, knoweth the secret of my condition.”
(Poem XXX. 15, 16.)

In some of the poems mourning customs are referred to (XX. 13ff., cf. Spoer, ZDMG 66 Poem IV. 8).
In old age, when contemplating his past heroic deeds, his successes in the hunt as well as on the ḍazzu, he feels comforted by the thought that the Creator is good, and that although the good things have passed away the evil things likewise perish:

“Praised be He who has done so to us, be He praised!
Neither well-being has remained with us, nor has evil continued.” (Poem XXXIX. 7.)

The poems of Nimr reveal the man in all his moods, the passionate lover, the inconsolable mourner, the fearless warrior and hunter, the šēh who in the lifetime of Waḏha and the time of his wealth had an ever open hand and hospitable roof for all who came. By his friends he was called “the protector of the weak” (Poem II. 1; XXXV. 3).
Nimr’s was a name to conjure with, yet in old age we find him ill and forsaken. The numerous friends of his prosperous days pass by him and do not even return his salutation:

“I had among the Arabs many friends,
They pass by me and do not return unto me the salutations.”
(Poem XXXIX. 9.)

Well might he say of himself, “that which has happened to Job, I possess it” (in a poem to Jusif Ibn Abu Nṣēr; XXXVI. 8).
To the last moment, however, the noble pride of his soul was not crushed by all the calamity which had befallen him. With bitter contempt he speaks of the degradation into which his own clan has sunk. In the burning pain of his wounded soul he cries out:

"O my district, in thee was a shepherd of sheep made ṣēḥ, And after me beggars were made ṣuyūḥ, and a vile one"

(Poem XXXIX. 12)

This was the hardest blow to the proud old ṣēḥ of the ‘Adwān. His own great calamity he had learned to lay before "Him who knows the secret of my condition." But for this condition of his people he knows of no remedy and he bursts out in anguish of soul:

"By God, if it were not for the sake of modesty and fear I should say, May they be destroyed, or may they be for destruction."

(Poem XXXIX. 11.)

Where no honor is left, there life must cease. This, as well as many other references which point to a loss of power, may refer to the political overthrow of the ‘Adwān by the Beni Ṣāḥr, an event which took place during the decline of Nimr’s years (Poem XXXIX).

One cannot help feeling, when reading these poems, that their writer was a man of noble character, passionate in his love and hatred, generous like Ḥātim Tai and lovesick like Mājinūn Lēla; a true Bedawi in whom the strong light of the virtues of his race was not overshadowed by the meanness which so often mars the life of these people. We are therefore not surprised at the eulogy of Nimr’s nobility of character in the poem by Jusīl Ibn Abu Nṣēr.

His love, we must not forget, was built upon the moral and mental perfections of Wadḥa and not merely upon her physical attractions, which assuredly must have been very great, and Buerkhardt is undoubtedly right in saying that the “Bedouins are perhaps the only people of the East that can with justice be entitled true lovers.”

Nimr died in the year 1238 A. H., a broken and disappointed man, only unshaken in his devotion to Wadžha. This is touchingly brought out in one of his poems when he thought that he was dying. The Bedu who are standing around his bed are addressing him, Nimr having asked for his gun, marída:

"Thy gun does not profit thee, O poor one.
Seek for thyself fine castles in Paradise."

To this Nimr answers:
"I desire neither castles nor gardens in Paradise;
I desire Wadžha who keeps herself hidden in a grave."

(Poem XLII. 4, 5.)

His prayer that the grave might take him as one "who seeketh refuge" and "as the protected guest," ṭiḥib u ḏiḥil, was at last fulfilled, but not until he had drained the cup of earthly suffering (Poem XXXVI. 7) and had seen those of high estate trampled under foot. He lies buried at 'Ain 'Ağüz, just beyond the shadow of a group of mighty trees. His tomb is surrounded by 21 square hewn stones, about three feet high. On the front part of the tomb is a pointed slab, into which an epitaph is cut. Upon a horizontal stone laid across the two upright stones in front of this slab sacrifices are still offered. I myself have seen the blood-daube stones.

The story is told²⁴ that when Nimr was dying at 'Ağüz, his sons asked him whether he wished to be buried at Nimrīn where Wadžha was buried, or in Jerusalem, the Holy City. He answered with a play upon the name of the place: 'ağüz nam yağüz='Ağüz will also do. This is a good story but hardly likely to be true of Nimr; if he had any choice in the matter, he would probably have chosen Nimrīn.

The epitaph is as follows:

Year 1238
Surely has led thee
The All-Merciful from thy camping places;
And the eyes of the people (or, the noble ones) feed in thy camping place;

²⁴ For a description see A. Goodrich-Freer, In a Syrian Saddle, p. 119.
²⁵ Heinrich Frauenberger in the Globus for 1893, pp. 19 ff.: "Von Amman nach Djerash."
And the worms of the grave eat thine eyes;
And thy camping places are a spectacle to the eyes of the people;
May the All-Merciful cover the sins of Nimr ibn 'Adwān.  

_Inscription on Nimr's Tomb (incomplete)_

١٣٣٨
قد انقلب
الحمان عن دارك
وعيون لدام شرمي بدارك

Unfortunately the copy of the inscription which I made about 18 years ago has become illegible in the course of time, and the photograph is not sufficiently distinct to supply the missing line. I give therefore Frauenberger's German translation, made by the Dragoman of the German Consulate in 1893:

"Der Tod führt dich aus deinen Lagerstätten fort;
Und das Schicksal führt dich von einem Haus zum anderen;
Und die Würmer des Grabes weiden in deinen Augen;
Und die Augen der Ueberlebenden schauen in deine Lagerstätten."

The last line is omitted in this translation. I give the incomplete Arabic text above.
دوام الفير يأكل عيونك
وادي رانك لعِيْبُون النَّاب مَرَّاَء
تعمد الرحمان نمر ابن عدوان

Text of Nimr's Poems

A

زِحل مَرَّة نمر رحل واقام عند بني مخير وتجارب هو وبنى مخير مع العدوان فطردهم ويلي مع بني مخير بالبلقا بلاد العدوان قام
بندى ويعرف اهله وقومه لأجل يلقون ويرفعونه ويرفعونه المنازل
ويطردون بني مخير ويرجعون من بسان الى البلقا فقال:

1. يا خالقى يا عالم السوى منى
2. يا قلبلنا نحن فكون
3. يا مخلق باماك مشردت ومستى
4. يا واحد امراك بين كتاب ونون
5. يا رب فرسخ برزخ الهم عني
6. يا من عليك اعاص انتان يهون
7. أنت الاثنين ترب مسنتي
8. واحد نهد فلتي والآخر يعون
9. يا حمدود قول لمحمد يعبر عنني
10. ربع نداندنا وإذا يعون
11. داموا بوجهي والمواقف عنتي
12. ذهبوا ذهاب السلح ما ينتوني
13. يا حربون عند الناس لاضحك بنيتي
14. وإذا اختلفت بابكي واكتزي نبولي
15. واليوم ما لي مهوأ غير أوتي
16. وإضُع بالطراف النصاي انتوني
17. يا يا وحنين بدبري تعلق ما انتي
18. متواتت وواصت الي بحوتي
19. من بعد مايننى منى الى الزيديتي
20. اليوم ما لاني لحالي زيون
21. يا ريحني خلفي طير بلتي ويعتنى
22. ويعنوف رحارات السما ستونه
23. يوم بالدنيا ولو ما ينتي
24. موتة كدا ولا معاه بعون
B

أبوه يا المربع مطلق ابن سلمان محاور الحريشي من لومة بنى مخر
اشترا له قرب زهيد من الجياد وأتلي قسم للعالي حين اعتراها بلمّة
ają وحدها الحضور تمرتني مدركي نديمه نمر ابن عدنان وانا معتاي
بظهر السمر وات يا نسر بيلقك الحبي بالحال ارسل عليه تصيد يطلسه
بأعدامه الجياد:

1 يا طروحف ينتي شرق تمكدون
2 يا مرافقين الرشد خذوا وصاي
عمطلق السمان ملروم تلقوه
3 ذي الخيرا يا جامي الناسين
4 عالوصف عمارا حمرا ممنعو الي يتوقون
معطاه تركف على السككاء
5 حمرا صريحة الطول والرام ياعور
والدليل ردى موقع باللبناء
6 أصبر على حمراك من هلي واصون
عبال الفريجي معطين الهدوء

وبدين تكتم نسر سلمان مطلق وقال:

6 يا طروحف ينتي شوب الغرب تمكدون
7 تريتهم يا جواد خذوا وضية
8 يا نسر هو تنها عرش الهون بالهون
من شاهد نفسه وقع بالشمات
9 يا نسر عمر ما راح منك خال مطعون
بهونك بينك وธรรมดา ساحرات
10 نسر رداً له بالجواب:
11 أصبر علتي يا أخوتي ساعه بمقدار
بمقدار الغطاء الفلم بالمدواة
12 فصلت بك براث ما لون من لون
لما لقيت الى ئدناك بوادي
13 حارم علتي شرب بن وغلبون
لغير بردى من غميراك هوائي

C

ويتلم ابيات بينه يه ع발ه:

1 يا فارس الليف خمسة اشكال
ً

تنزيل زغل وثلاثة زلال

1 واحده كهولة محتالة بوسط ميدان
2 خيالها يفرح بجزء الشغل
3 واحده مثل الصيد حلوات الأرقاب
4 التي خواهين يا سعد الزمان
5 واحده مثل المعرض، انضقي على البال
6 نباتات خيالها من الهمم خال
7 واحده بحياة شفقت الشبل والجلال
8 ومن الظفر ومن همها ما تقال
9 واحده قوية البارب، وذيله متوال
10 لو انقطع صروع اعتنائها ما توالي

D

عدون يوما من الأيام أن نسر فقد قررنا فارسل على الوجهي شيخ
عريان النبايا والظرافين من عريان بلاد غزى لا كل يطلونه الترب
المطلوبه، ولي انذكرت عندهم، والوجهي الذي عدي له مرى نسي صافة
وعنه عفي وامه تراها تحكم عن ولد عطشها قصصت أن ترسل البار
لنسر فعاد السرسال جارغ ولنك لقي واخير نسر بالامر عجل له بجواب
ودقته

1 يا راكب من فوق حرم وميامي
2 ورمي الندران وهذة المرافين
3 وأمه لفتنا من بلاد عبيده
4 يا وده اجنا من اجراه النساء
5 والوق ما هو ملك يآ الوجهي
6 والوق ما بين الرجاحيل بو عيب
7 أن كان لنور العدلى ثريدي
8 شوار النبا امامه مركبت على عيب
9 واخذ الابن بظهره الرسول
10 يا عيب ثم القال لمfell

E

حد توانا بواقة راي بها نسر نسر الخلا فارتهن محترما وهو يصمم
مع يندقيه ولته تقاطعه وتركده بالضح، يا نسر رزه واوزته زين نرينّي
فيمن برميه فليس على لها واقته وبنى ابيان تقل شعر المنطي يوصف

الإله:
1. طلبيت انا صوب الخليل بالكلايف
2. احب جبل السيد ما فيه ربيه
3. وتنى واحدة الجبال جملة السيد خليف
4. والى يبدي بمال السيد ما ينميته
5. يا اندف قلي عليك الموافيه
6. عمري دنيا والمانيا قرببه
7. ملحك بدمتته اكلوف التضايف
8. بزررك ممجرج من قضايب سكينة
9. فردت لها البنقه:
10. إن كنت ممرعوب من الموت خليف
11. حق القتار وافرغ قطبايع سبيبه
12. وقع الفيد عق ما كان وافق
13. يا عرف كله يا ربوتي عجببه
14. وقع الفيد عق ما كان وافق
15. كله لعين النافرات الجديبه

Arabic text of Nimr’s Poems: Transliteration

A

zi'il mara nimr rahl wal agar 'ind bini sahir u tahara'ab hu wa
bini sahir ma' al-'adwan fa'at radohum wa buji ma' bini sahir bil-
balga (blad al-'adwan) agar yansid wayu'arrif ahlah u gomah
la'gl yalfun wa yarq'una wa yarq'i'una al-manazil u ya'trid'n
bini sahir u yarq'i'una min besan ilala l-balga (fag'al):

1. yâ 'halghi yâ 'alim as-sirr minni
   yâ gayil laal-sai cim fayakuni
2. yâ mihiqgin bal-milk masrak u sinni
   yâ wahdan amrak beni 'caf'in u nuni
3. yâ rabb farsi rubzah al-hamm 'inni
   yâ min 'alek as'ab is-sai yahuuni
4. allah bi'nen zurgin sabanni
   wahad nahaf galbi wal-ahar ihuni
5. yâ hmu'd gul la hu'mud iqizz 'inni
   rab'in tidanuna u'anna ihuni
6. داسو بواحد واللوازيم ِرايدي
    إنيفو داهاب الاملح مي تمانعني
7. يا همود َّيند أنناس لهنهاك بيسيمي
    ويدا هتفت ددقي واقي اربني
8. واليهم مي لى شاهتين ِّيزر أفينمي
    واودد بيترئ اس ِّسافينا سنني
9. يا وليزيتي بيدرتي َّيعوب ماني
    ميتاني وداني ونانس اللي ياغني
10. أم باد ماني مانوا ليازيديباني
    واليهم مي لاجي لى حالي زحني
11. يا رتني هيستهت ِّييرين ياللي وراني
    وينيبد ربره عسّانا بامتي
12. يامير باد دريا وان لاي مي للاني
    موسد ِّصابلا ون ما اساه بيهوني

B

نوباء يارراب ُّمعلاج يبن سلمان مهفص ظاهر برغشا مين لينبم مي شاهر استرالاوه إفرز زينا ماج جيايده وانشا ديسامين بالايلي حين إيشرها بلامم ؤاودر باراا هارد البرد البره تاراني ميتاداري بنمبتبي نيمير ينب ِّادواان وانا ميالي بشر البهر الفارس وانتيا يا نيمير ياعلراك الهادر بالبر هارل رسارل ؤاله غشدا يرعتليه بادامو الهايوا:

1. يا ترس ياللي شوب دارجيم بنيديدن
    يا مرفسين أر ريسد فيعد ويشتي
2. 'أ ميلاج أساب مالمان مالزيم تلفيّن
    ديب الالا لامنها تتاليشي
3. 'الواسف ِّسري هامرا مانويت انلي ييسفي
    مالامنا تاركيز ِّالمكمالاتي
4. هامرا دارييات أت تيل وارد راس نا ير
    وناد ديل ريدن مسانعهين بنامبشي
5. ِّيشا ِّالا هامراك مين حالى واسون
    تيارالا جردي ميتشبى الالوتي

    ويبعدين تييالام نيمير بيسان معلاج وجال:

6. يا ترس ياللي شوب الطراب بينديدن
    طراريادو يام ِّيواد فيعد ويشتي
7. يا نيمير هاوعنها تارا ِّياهن الاب هون
    مان كفت نافان وقبي ِّباش سيماشي

H. H. Spöer
8. yā nimr ‘umur mā rāḥ minnak ḥaiyāl maṭ’ūn:
   bhōṣak b‘ēnak war-rimag ṣāfnātī
   u nimr radd ‘loh bal-ḡiwaḥ:

9. aşbir ‘alaiya yāḥūi sā’tin ibmigdār
   bimigdār ṭaṭṭāt al-galam bad-diwaṭī

10. faṣṣalt lak badlāt mā lön min lön
    lima lağet allī ‘agadrak iwāṭī

11. ḥārim ‘alaiya šurb binnin u ṭalyūn
    ṭēr tarwa min qimirak ihwāṭī

C

wa yammam abyāt inabbeb bah ‘iyālah:
1. yā fārs al-biḍ ḥamsat aškālī
   ṭiintēn zaṭal u ṭalāṭat zalālī
2. wāḥda kīḥēla imḥaffala ṭawast mīdānī
   ḥaiyālīha yafrah ibgazz al-maṣālī
3. u wāḥda miṭl aṣ-ṣēd hilwāt al-argābī
   allī hawāhīn yā sī’id az-zimānī
4. u wāḥda miṭl ad-dirr itfaḍḍī ‘ala l-bālī:
   ibāt ḥillīha min al-hamm ḥālī
5. u wāḥda biḥīma ṣaflat aṣ-ṣēl waq-ḡilālī:
   wamm az-ẓifar wa min hammah ma tbālī
6. u wīḥdatin giwiyat ar-rās waq-dēl miṣwālī:
   lau ṣaṭṭa’ ṣrūr ‘inānha mā tiwānī

D

‘addūnā yōman min al-aiyām an nimr fagad frusuh farsal
‘ala l-uḥēdī šēh ‘urbān at-tayāhī waṭ-ṭarābīn min ‘urbān iblād
ṭażza laqīl yantūnah al-faras al-mantūlī wallī inḍakarāt ‘in-
ḍahum wal-uḥēdī allāḍī ṭada lōh mara tasaṣ ṣālīha wa ‘indaḥ
‘aḡi wa ummah tarāhī tḥakam ṭa n walaḍ ba’lāha famanā’at
an tarsil al-faras linimr fa’ād al-мирāṣl fārān wa lannah lafa
waḥbar nimr bal-amr ‘aḡgal lōh baq-ḡiwaḥ u dazzāh:
1. yā rāčibin min fōq ḫurrīn wimʾēdī
   wimraffāʾ ad-dirʾān wahid al-ʿaraqīb
2. wimmah lifatna min bilādin hiʾidī
   wabūh aḡāna min ‘imām as-sabāsīb
3. wal-bóg mā hu šimtak yal-uḥēdi
    wal-bóg mā bēn ar-rağaḏil bu 'ēb
4. in čān lišōr al-'aḏāra tirīdī
    šōr in -nsā sāsah mračcāb 'ala 'ēb
5. waḥtum al-abyāt biṯāha r-rasūl
    yā 'ēb šummal-gāl šummal-gīl

E

ḥaddatōna bwāği’tin ra’a bha nimr nimr al-ḥalā fartaḥāq muḥtāran u hu yiṣa’ṣa’an ma’ bindiğiyyatuh ulannah tihātibah watraẓadah baṣṣiẓq ānim razzin wa wazznah zēn tarannī di-
min ibramyah falabba ṭalabba waqataloh wa bana abyāt tigil
ši’r al-matnabbi biwaṣf al-asad:

1. ṭallēt ana šōb al-ḥalā bal-ṭalāyif
    aḥṣib ġīl aṣ-ṣēd mā fiḥ ribā
2. wanni bargaṯ al-ǧīl laḡimlat aṣ-ṣēd ḥāyīf
    willi ya’di biḏ-ṣēd mā yin’adībah
3. yā bindiği yiḥali ‘alēḏi l-wiṣāyif
    ‘imri dana wal-mīnāya ǧiriba
4. milḥak idigginnah ikfūf an-nīzāyif
    bizrak имвdahraq min ǧidāyib sičiba
    faraddat loḥ al-bindiğiyyah
5. in kint mar’ūbin imnal-mōt ḥāyīf
    ḥigg an-nazār wafrīq ǧidāyī’ sibibah
6. wiği’ al-fahad ‘iḏib mā čān wāği’f
    yā ’ird čafah yā ribū’i ‘iḏiba
7. wiği’ al-fahad ‘iḏib mā čān wāği’f
    killah la’en an-nāṯrāt al-ǧidīla

Translation

A. Nimr and the Beni Şaḥr

Nimr was once angry, and he went to dwell with the Beni Şaḥr. Then he and the Beni Şaḥr made war upon the ‘Adwān

---

* I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Mr. Haddad for many valuable suggestions in connection with the difficult translation of these poems.
and drove them away, and he stayed with the Beni Şahr in the Belka, the land of the ‘Adwān. And he began to compose and to write to his family and his people that they might come and agree with him and take him home and drive away the Beni Şahr and return from Besān to the Belka. And he said:

1. O my Creator, O Knower of my secret,  
   O Speaker of the thing—be! and it will be;
2. O Creator in the world of idolaters and Sunnites,  
   O Only One, Thy command is between kāf and nūn.
3. O Lord, remove from me the isthmus of grief,  
   O Thou to whom the most difficult things are easy!
4. God has bound me with two blue ones (i. e. eyes);  
   One has perplexed my heart, the other has betrayed.
5. O Ḥamūd! tell Ḥamūd he should be in my place.  
   A clan came near to us and betrayed us.
6. They trampled upon my face and our necessities were trodden under foot.  
   They went the going of the salt and showed me no favor.
7. O Ḥamūd, among the people I laugh with my teeth,  
   But when I am alone, I weep, and think of what saddens me.
8. And now I have no other diversion than to hum,  
   And I bite the edges of the lips, my teeth!
9. O my loneliness in my circle after being  
   Entertained, entertaining those who came to me;
10. After I have been a place of refuge to him who took refuge with me,  
    I do not find today for myself a partner.
11. Would I had been created a bird that soars and sings,  
    Who wades through the expanse of heaven with its greatness;
12. Who dies in the world even if he be not (created) a second time,  
    Who prefers a miserable death to a life with shame.

B. Nimr and Muṭlaq

One day, O ye of the spring-encampment, Muṭlaq, ṣeḥ of the Ḥreši, a division of the Beni Şahr, bought a beautiful mare,
of the noble ones, and he made an oath by the Highest when he bought her, before the chief of the nobles of his people present: "Behold, I will slaughter Nimr Ibn 'Adwân while I am on the back of the mare." And, O Nimr, this news reached thee. And he sent at once to him a qaṣīde that he would fight him unto death.

1. O ye messengers, O ye who stretch yourselves towards the East,
   O ye companions of Rōshd, receive my commands.

2. Ye must enter at Muṭlaq es-Salmān's;
   A wolf of the wilderness, O protector of horses
   which remain behind at the ṭazzū;

3. In respect of its type, he is buying a red one, the desire of onlookers;
   Taught to run before the fleetest horses.

4. A red one, beautiful of stature, and the head stretched,
   The tail is like the long fringes of the sleeve which wave on the mountains.

5. Take care for thy red one, for those who warn [thee];
   The family of the Qarīḍī hit the aim!

After this Nimr speaks in place of Muṭlaq and says:

6. O messengers who stretch toward the West,
   Lie down to rest, ye noble ones, and perform ablutions.

7. O Nimr make it easy, and thou wilt see (that) the easy
   (is returned) by the easy.
   He whom his soul sees comes into derision.

8. Never, O Nimr, has a stabbed rider of thy people returned.
   I will slay thee, thyself, and the horse standing quiet.

And Nimr returned to him the answer:

9. Wait, O brother, for me as long as one hour,
   As long as the dipping of a pen in the inkstand.

10. I'll cut thee out garments not colored by means of dye,
    Until I shall see what fits thy measure.

11. May there be forbidden to me the drinking of coffee
    and the smoking of a pipe,
    Except my stroke be satiated with thy inside.
Five Poems by Nimr Ibn 'Adwab

C. Nimr admonishes his Children

Once he composed verses and admonished in them his children.

1. O Fāris, the white ones are of five kinds,
   Two are counterfeit and three noble.
2. One is like a high-bred mare, saddled in the midst
   of the race-course.
   Her rider rejoices over the slaughtering of the stragglers at the time of the ṭazzu.
3. And one is like the wild game, that have beautiful
   necks.
   He who guards them, O happy one of the times!
4. And one is like pearls and quiets the mind;
   Her husband passes the night free from cares.
5. And one is an animal, suited for the carrying of burdens
   and the pack-saddle,
   And she takes no heed of glanders and its anxieties.
6. And one is pig-headed, and her tail is raised;
   When the rings of her rein are broken she does not stop.

D. The Lost Mare

It is said that one day Nimr, missing his mare, sent to El-Wahide, Seḥ of the Tayāha and the Tarābūn Arabs from the Arabs of the district of Gāza, desiring that they should give up the stolen mare which had been found with them. But El-Wahide, who had died, had a wife whose name was Šālha, and he had left an orphan. And his mother ruled in place of the son of her husband. She refused to send the mare to Nimr and the messenger returned empty. And when he came back home and informed Nimr of the matter, he quickly prepared an answer for him and sent it:

1. O rider on a thorough-bred ruddy camel
   That has long, slender legs and hocks,
2. And his mother came to us from a far country,
   And his father came to us from the uncles of the
   Sabāsib,
3. And deception is not thy characteristic, O Wahide,
   And deception among men is a shame.
4. If thou desirest the counsel of the maidens,
The counsel of women, its foundations rest upon
shame.
5. And I seal the verses by Ṭāhū, the prophet;
O shame then on what is said, and on what was said.

E. The Leopard and the Gun

We are told that once upon a time Nimr saw the nimr
(i.e. leopard) of the wild. And he became frightened and per-
plexed and he began to talk with his gun, and she conversed
with him and strengthened him, saying: "In truth, O Nimr,
do not fear, lift up and aim well. I am security, thou wilt
bring him down." And he fulfilled her wish and killed him.
And he composed verses like the poem of Mutanabbi of the
description of the lion.

1. I looked forth into the open with the ammunition.
   I thought of the kinds of game, there is no doubt.
2. And behold, I met the chequered of skin, watching
   for all the game.
   And he who hunts the game, one may not hunt him.
3. O gun, O thou which containest the various des-
   criptions;
   My age is approaching, and the things predestined
   are near.
4. The palms of the pure ones pounded thy salt.
   Thy seed is rounded, cast from staves.
Upon this answered the gun and spake:
5. If thou art terrified of death, art afraid,
   Aim well and distinguish the waving of his tail.
6. The leopard fell after he had been standing.
   The width of his sole, O my people, it is a marvel.
7. The leopard fell after he had been standing.
   That is all for the eyes of those whose curls are
   hanging loose.

Notes to the Arabic Text

Poem A. Nimr and the Beni Ṣahl.
V. 5 بِعَضِيَنِ to shear. بِعَضِيَنِ he should be in my place; however,
Socin-Stumme, Diwan aus Central-Arabien, have the mean-
ing “to cut off some one from something,” which gives a better sense here. “O Ḥamūd, tell Ḥamūd, he should be cut off instead of me.” This rendering agrees also with Poem C v. 2.

V. 6 ḥalfnoun אמי אי דאואא סע cum "marcher sur." Dozy, op. cit. devoirs. Plural of ביארד אית מלח "làzim."


V. 8 أقال قضیه ای اوشی orig. gloss. Acc. to Wetzstein, “Sprachliches aus den Zeltlagern etc.” ZDMG 22. 150, it has the meaning of “träge sein” for which we may well say in this passage “hum”. The explanation أقال قضیه as given by our informant is perhaps his own interpretation of a word which he did not understand.

V. 10 جنیوي للبزدو+آ+ای ای لبوریدنی وما اثی ای ماتیاباب الوی "hospitalier".

V. 11 وسع ای آریشی وی وھ" cf. Socin-Stumme, op. cit., sub "menschenleere Wüste." متون plur. of متروئ "منث".

V. 12 يخلع تانیه ای پنی " orig. gloss; cf. Dozy, op. cit., "donner aux terres le deuxième labour." منحوت ای کفید "cf. Lane, Arabic Lex., کفید "distress, trouble." عیبی ای معاشه.

Poem B. Nimr and Muṭlaq.


V. 1 طروف ای مرامیل cf. v. 6; sgl. طرف, cf. Soc.-Stumme, op. cit.; cf. also v. 6; بیکی آی با + الی =النس— also v. 6.
Poem C. Nimr admonishes his Children.

Introduction: قدّم أي يسّم. orig. gloss.

V. 2. "خلال أي صاغ—انتان إي تتين" 2 Turkish: unmixed, pure money of full weight.— "زين = حقل "لابة أي محلة،" "to ornament."

V. 3. منطرش من العدو... 3 Poem A, v. 5. مثال orig. gloss. According to Wetzstein, ZDMG 22. 131, "معدل "has the meaning of (1) merchandise loaded for transportation; (2) time of transportation; (3) means of transportation, i.e. animals, carriages, porters, ships, etc.

V. 3. 3 Poem B, v. 1.

V. 4. "فضّى على بلك faddi 'ala balak, cheer up!"

V. 5. "صلح لي أي خلت... 5 cf. Musil, Arabia Petraea, III. 277.

V. 6. "وأخذه... 6 Poem B, v. 1. وقف أي تواي، "wihdatin."

Poem D. The Lost Mare.

Introduction: حبيوا أي عدون. orig. gloss. orig. gloss. "أي تذكّر... 7 cf. Socin-Stumme, op.
cit., Poem 68. 8 "sterben" — orig. gloss.

V. 1 جمل حَزَّير وأحمر أي ميَّدٍ — orig. gloss. Probably a camel of noble breed, raised by the mo'dan tribe of Mesopotamia, is referred to.

V. 2 امل جمال أي سامس — orig. gloss. 

V. 3 هاذا أي بو — رجل رجاحيل

V. 4 cf. ZDMG 6. 373:

"Wer aber mit Weibern zu Rat geht, mit dem will ich nichts zu tun haben."

Poem E. The Leopard and the Gun.


V. 1 طالت — الخلاف — orig. gloss.

V. 2 فاذا انا أي ونَّى — يشرقي أي خايف — orig. gloss. — الى — Orig. gloss. — يا الى أي يبقي — Orig. gloss.

V. 3 يا الى أي بالي — وصافي — Orig. gloss. — اكله — كلمة — Orig. gloss.

V. 4 قصت — قصيب — Orig. gloss.

V. 5 نماين من تحت افرق طدام — Orig. gloss. — تعاين جيدا أي حتى النظر — Orig. gloss.

V. 6 جماعة أي ديوغ — Orig. gloss. — Plural of Orig. gloss.
Notes to the Translation

Poem A.
We may infer from the introduction that this poem dates after or about the year 1812. See page 178 above.
Verse 2. kāf and nūn are the two letters which form the word kun, be!
V. 3. The evil eye is blue.
V. 4. Ḥamūd es-ṣāni i. e. Ḥamūd the farrier, Nimr’s friend. Ḥamūd es-ṣāliḥ, the other Ḥamūd mentioned here, is Nimr’s cousin and enemy. He was Chief of the ’Adwān in Burckhardt’s time (op. cit., p. 368f.); cf. p. 178.
V. 5. Qaridi, name of Nimr’s family.
V. 6. A clan, i. e. the Beni Ṣaḥr.—“Salt”, i. e. powder.

Poem B.
V. 7. “Whom his soul sees,” i. e. he who is proud; cf. the Palestinian: min shāf nafso, he who sees his soul, or hāda shāyif nafso, this one sees his soul, i. e. he is proud.
V. 8. “The horse standing quiet”, i. e. horses standing on three legs and the fourth just touching the ground.
V. 11b. i. e. until I shall kill you.

Poem C.
Verse 1. Fāris was a son of Nimr. Nimr had at least three sons besides ’Agāb, the son of Wādḥa, and one daughter called Sāra. The son called Fājil was regarded by some of our informants as being the same as Fāris. With the exception of Muslat, all his children are referred to by name in his poems.—“The white ones,” i. e. women.
V. 6. “Her tail is raised”, a sign of stubbornness in a camel, here applied to a stubborn woman. V. 6b. A thoroughbred horse or camel would stop at once.

Poem D.
This poem is significant because of the light which it throws upon the position that a Bedawiye may hold in her tribe.
Verse 1b. These are good points in a camel.
V. 4b. Said of a house not built upon rock; cf. Mat. 7. 26f.
Poem E.

Nimr's gun was called marida, it is mentioned by name in one of his poems, cf. page 180.—Here is a play on the word nimr, the name of the ḥābi and of the animal that was confronting him.

V. 4. "Salt", i. e. saltpeter for making powder.—"Seed," i. e. bullets, v. 7.

V. 7b. i. e. for the sake of the maidens.
YERMAK TIMOFEYEVICH IN RUSSIAN FOLK POETRY

CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Folk poetry of every age and country has tended constantly to confuse historical and mythical heroes by ascribing to the former all the qualities of the latter, until it is impossible to know the historical basis for many of the exploits which are recounted. Russia is no exception to this rule. Yermak Timofeyevich, the first conqueror of Siberia in the reign of Ivan the Terrible (the latter part of the sixteenth century), so fascinated the minds of the folk poets that he became a national hero. We have the original songs which describe his invasion of Siberia and his earlier life along the Volga River, but in a short time Yermak appears in songs where he clearly does not belong, and he ultimately makes his way into the bylines or national epics, so that we can see clearly in his case the path which he took in becoming a legendary figure.

The personality of Yermak Timofeyevich is very obscure. We know nothing definite about his life until he suddenly appears at Perm with a band of Cossacks and, in some connection with the trading family of the Strogonov, invades Siberia. We are not even sure of his name; for Yermak is not a Christian name, and though the New Chronicle calls him Yermolay, Yermak is the name by which his associates knew him and it is under that name that he has become famous. M. Putsillo ("K voprosu, kto byl Yermak Timofeyevich, pokoritel' Sibiri," Russky Vvestnik, Vol. 156, p. 275ff.) considers many of the difficulties in the common narrative and cites other authors as V. Bronevsky, who wrote a history of the Don Cossacks in which Yermak figures, but there seems to be no other evidence than that of the historical songs.

These songs have been collected in a volume by V. Th. Miller entitled "Historical Songs of the Russian People of the XVI-XVII Centuries" (Istoricheskiy Pyesni russkago naroda XVI-
Yermak Timofeyevich

XVII w.) and published as Vol. XCIII of the Collections of the Section of Russian Language and Literature of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1915. This contains some 35 songs and fragments which contribute to our knowledge of Yermak and which come from eastern Russia, from the province of Olonets to Astrakhan, the Don and the Terek. Of this group the most complete versions are those from Olonets and Siberia which carry through Yermak's career with some degree of fulness, especially No. 159 of the collection. Those from the south contain in general material which is foreign to the Yermak tradition and know little of the hero after he starts for Siberia.

It may be of interest to summarize briefly the most complete of these tales, No. 159. Yermak had been in some sort of a fight on the Caspian Sea, where he killed the Persian envoy Koramyshev Semen Konstyantinovich. He thought over the situation of his band in these words: "In Astrakhan we cannot live; to live on the Volga is to count as thieves; to go to the Yaik is a great journey; to go to Kazan—there is the Terrible Tsar, the Terrible Tsar our Lord Ivan Vasilyevich;—to go to Moscow is to be arrested, scattered throughout different cities and placed in dark prisons. Let us go to Usolya, to the Stroganovy, to Grigory Grigoryevich, to the Voronovy; let us take a supply of lead, powder and grain" (ll. 20-31). They spent the winter in a cave on the Chusovaya River, and then went further up the Serebryanaya River to Zharavl' where they left their boats and marched across country to the Tagil' River, where they built others. They sailed along the Tagil' and other rivers until St. Peter's Day (June 29). Yermak with three hundred men as one of three columns descended the Tobol' River to the Irtysh. Then in a great battle they defeated the Tatars under Kuchum. "The Cossacks killed a large number of the Tatars and the Tatars were astonished at the strength of the Russians, because they could not kill one of them. Heated arrows were hurled against them as in sheaves but the Cossacks stood unharmed" (ll. 97ff). Kuchum was captured and Yermak thought of peace. He took an embassy back to Moscow with rich presents. They induced the boyar Nikita Romanovich to plead their case and finally the Tsar pardoned Yermak for the affair with the Persian envoy. "The next year the Tatars
rose against Yermak Timofeyevich on the great Yenisey River. Yermak's Cossacks had been sent in different directions and he had with him only the Cossacks on two boats. And they fought with the Tatars for a long time. And to help his companions Yermak tried to leap to the other boat and he stepped on a treacherous passage. His right foot slipped and the board rose from the upper end and struck him. It shattered his stormy head and threw him into the swift Yenisey River; there death met Yermak" (ll. 198ff).

This version of the story is probably correct. Yermak shows himself throughout as he was in real life, the leader of an unruly and undisciplined band of followers, half bandits, half soldiers. This is in accord with the spirit of the times; for in this century the term Cossack was applied to any outlaw or man who was fond of an unrestrained and independent life, and was not, as later, the name of a special body of soldiers. (Cf. Putsillo, op. cit. p. 282.) The victory over Kuchum was fought on October 23, 1581, and the capital of the Siberians, Irtysh, was taken three days later, on October 26.

The details of the song vary in the different versions, but these variations are to be found far more in the earlier relations between the Tsar and Yermak than in the exploits of the hero insofar as they are mentioned. In most of them, as in Nos. 170 and 186, Yermak simply announces his intention to leave for Siberia and indulges in a certain amount of prophecy. Another variation is in regard to the Persian envoy; for in No. 157 the envoy seems to be Russian instead of Persian, but he is of the same name and the circumstances of his death are quite similar.

We can regard these narratives as the first step in the development of Yermak. But he was not destined to stay a long time in this stage. The south of Russia and in particular the district along the Terek wanted to take the hero with them on their raids against the Turks, and so in No. 176 we find him in prison in Turkey for 33 years. His beard has grown until it is below his silken belt and his red curls rest on his shoulders, but his energy is not diminished and he challenges the Sultan: "Thou, sultan, son of a sultan, thou the great sultan! Set me at liberty; I will cut down all Turkey and thee, O sultan, will I take captive" (ll. 23ff).
The most important event of the reign of Ivan the Terrible was the capture of Kazan, the capital of the Golden Horde, in 1552. This was a very long and severe struggle, since the Tatar capital was well fortified and Ivan was compelled to make use of engineers in order to force an entrance into the city (cf. Howorth, History of the Mongols, Vol. 2, p. 421). There is a separate historical song which tells how the engineers of the Tsar arranged a mine under the Tatar powder magazine and also put an extra fuse in place, so that at the very moment that the mine was exploded this other fuse would light a light in the presence of the Tsar and his army. The accomplishment of such an engineering feat was of course quite outside the sphere of Yermak Timofeyevich and his Cossacks, but popular interest in him could not permit him to be absent from the capture of Kazan. The Yermak legend was therefore extended so as to allow him to be the hero of the siege.

In No. 162 we have a full account of this. The Tsar threatened Yermak for sacking some of the imperial boats but the Cossack defended himself by saying that the boats which he had seized did not bear the royal seals and consequently they did not deserve immunity from robbery. The Tsar consented to pardon him and his men, provided they would capture for him the city of Kazan. Yermak promised to take the city in three hours. He entered the city as a beggar and noticed where all the powder of the city was concentrated. "Dig a trench, brothers, under the powder store. When Yermak put a light to the wax fuse, he put it in a keg full of powder, and he placed the other where he sat with the tsar. Then Yermak said to the Terrible Tsar: When the light burns up hither, I will take Kazan. The light burned up and a black cloud rose over Kazan" (ll. 46ff.). Then to the Cossacks he said: "Run to Kazan city quickly, drive all the Basurmans from the city; do not take a single soul prisoner, since prison does not suit the Cossacks of the Don" (ll. 58ff.). In return for this Ivan named Yermak prince of the glorious, quiet Don.

We have here a distinct step in the process of turning Yermak into a culture hero. We will pass over the difficulties which this episode introduces into the character of Yermak, because the leader of a band of outlaws hardly stands in any such attitude toward the sovereign and toward technical military science
as this implies. There are also chronological inconsistencies. Yermak was hardly an old man at his death in 1582, and yet it is presumed that he was an experienced chieftain as early as 1552; and still other songs do not assume any great difference in time between this capture of Kazan and the Siberian expedition. Of course there is yet no absolute chronological impossibility, but the presumption for it is very strong.

Still more fantastic is the story of Yermak killing a boyar in the presence of the Tsar. According to No. 169, collected in the Ural District, Yermak went to the tsar to ask pardon for his offences, and one of the boyars interfered and recommended that he be hanged. Then "his heroic strength, i.e., his strength as a bogatyr, rose, and his heroic blood, i.e., his blood as a bogatyr, flamed up" (ll. 65–66), and he drew his sword and killed the boyar. "Yermak sits in misfortune and is wrung by misfortune and the other boyars became frightened. They ran from the imperial rooms and the tsar’s appearance changed" (ll. 70ff). Ivan the Terrible was a rough and fickle ruler but no man could act in this way before him and be saved, much less an outlaw leader who was already under heavy charges. On the other hand there are not lacking instances where the bogatyrs at the court of St. Vladimir act toward their sovereign in this disrespectful manner. Thus Ilya of Murom, the old Cossack, appeared in disguise at court and, when he did not meet with sufficient honor, became unruly, killed many of Vladimir’s servants, and was only reconciled when Vladimir sent him Dobrynya Nikitich to make peace on these terms: "Let strict ukazes be promulgated throughout all the towns of Kiev and Chernigov that all the pot-houses and drinking places of whatever sort be opened freely for the space of three days, that all the people may drink green wine without price. And whoso drinketh no green wine, let him quaff the beer of drunkenness; and he who drinketh that not, sweet mead; that all may know that the Old Kazak Ilya of Murom is come to famous Kiev town" (Hapgood, Epic Songs of Russia, p. 79).

Another song in which Yermak acts to satisfy his wounded honor is No. 164 from the Don. In this the captured murza Itslanber enters a tent and greets all the Russians except Yermak. The Cossack in anger then cuts off his turbulent head, very much as Ilya would have done in the same conditions.
We can then sum up this part of our paper as follows: Yermak, the conqueror of Siberia, has a tendency to enter various other spheres of action. At the same time as soon as we leave that field in which his real life was spent, the episodes in which he figures have a tendency to become more and more miraculous and to approximate those of a Russian bogatyr. The Kazan legends often suggest that Yermak became the head of the Don Cossacks and lived a while a life of peace as in No. 167, "Let us go, brothers, to the quiet Don, let us repent. Ye brothers who are unmarried, all marry" (I. 59ff.). There does not seem to be any historical basis for this placid life; and Yermak, once a hero, must remain such and meet with ever more adventures.

Accordingly Yermak makes his appearance in the bylina, the epic songs which cluster around the name of St. Vladimir, Fair Sun Vladimir, the ruler of Russia at the time of her conversion to Christianity (980–1015). The two byliny in which he appears are that of Tsar Kalin and that of the Tsar Mamay and Babishcha Mamaishina.

There is little need here to summarize all the forms of these byliny. This has been done by A. V. Oksenov in his article, "Yermak v bylinakh russkago naroda," published in the Istoricheskky Vyestnik, Vol. 49, p. 424ff. In this article Oksenov has endeavored to trace all the existent forms of the bylina legend, without however touching any of the historic material.

In the first legend, Yermak is the nephew of Vladimir. On the advice of Ilya of Murom Vladimir has begged and secured from the Tatars a respite of three months before surrendering Kiev. Ilya has gone to collect the bogatyrs to defend Russia but has not returned. Under these conditions Yermak begs permission to take the field. Vladimir at first refuses but later consents after the boy shows his valor by emptying a pail of sixty puds. He goes to battle and fights alone against the leaders of the Tatars for three days and nights without stopping. Then Ilya arrives and the bogatyrs falling upon the Tartar hosts cut their way to the centre and Yermak kills the Tatar tsar Kalin. According to other versions it is not Yermak but Ilya who kills the chieftain of the enemy. This legend, however, sometimes does not end successfully for the Russians, and it is one of these forms which Miss Hapgood gives in her volume (op. cit., p. 210ff.). In this version two Tatars appear wherever one is killed and in
the end the bogatyrs are either killed or carried off to a subterranean cave. Yermak alone is left and he returns to Kiev and receives the congratulations of Vladimir, who offers to reward him. Yermak rejects all offers of land or wealth and requests the privilege of drinking beer and wine without price in all the pothouses of the kingdom. In still other forms Yermak is worn out by his exertions and dies with the others.

The other legend, that of Tsar Mamay and the Babishcha Mamaishina, is somewhat similar. Tsar Mamay was the actual head of the Tatars in 1380 when they were decisively defeated at Kulikovo by Dimitry Donskoy. Here again Yermak is the champion of Kiev and fights without support until he is forced to flee. Fortunately at this moment Ilya rouses himself from a drunken stupor and indifference and takes part in the battle. No sooner is this fight won than Yermak takes the field against a female foe, the Babishcha Mamaishina, one of those female monsters who occur so often in Russian song. She fights with Yermak for twelve days and nights without either securing an advantage, until Ilya interferes and tells Yermak that he is still young and does not know how to fight with women. Following the advice of the older man, Yermak seizes her by her white breast and soon overthrows her.

It will be noticed in all this that Yermak is the chief bogatyry of the third generation. The first generation is that of the elder heroes, Svyatogor and his fellows, who are far more powerful physically than Ilya or any of his (the second) generation. Now it is Yermak who forms the third generation, powerful and young but not the equal in experience or strength of Ilya. Furthermore in some of the versions Ilya is the uncle of Yermak who is related to him and not to Vladimir. Orest Miller (Sravnitel'no-kriticheskiiya nablyudeniiya nad slovecyom soslovom narodnago russkago epasa, Ilya Muromets i bogatyrstvo Kievskoye, p. 699) queries whether Yermak may not be an alternative form of Falcon the Hunter, the son whom Ilya kills. This motif which appears in the Persian legend of Sohrab and Rustem is the subject again of the Hildebrand Fragment of the old pagan German poetry (cf. Thomas, An Anthology of German Literature, p. 3). It is perfectly true that in later forms of these stories the father discovers his son's identity before it is
too late and there is a reconciliation. This happens also in some of the later forms of the Hildebrand-saga and in some versions of the Falcon story. There does not however seem to be any necessity for supposing that Yermak has taken the place of a son of Ilya, that reconciliation has taken place, or that in one version father and son were always together.

On the other hand, in the Yermak byliny Ilya does not appear in a very enviable rôle. He is indifferent or drunken. Perhaps it may be that he has been with the elder heroes and has been drinking their wine, which is not suitable even for his generation. Yermak has for his part declined to taste this supernatural drink (cf. Oksenov, op. cit. p. 440). Perhaps he may be regarded as passing beyond the natural age of fighting and as already declining in strength and vigor. However that may be, we have here frankly the appearance of the next younger generation as the chief champion of Holy Russia. This probably means little more than that Yermak was of a far younger stratum of legend, and this we know from our acquaintance with history.

The German saga of the Nibelungen shows us the same confusion of times. When Kriemhild is on her way to the court of King Etzel or Attila (who lived in the fifth century A. D.) she stops on the way with her uncle Bishop Pilgerin of Passau, who was actually bishop there in 971–991. Thus we have a mythical heroine, married to Attila and the niece of a man who actually lived in the tenth century. The byliny which started in much the same atmosphere in Russia rapidly came to reflect the prehistoric and pre-Christian heroes of their country. At the same time they included the heroes who fell at the battle of the Kalka in 1224 when the forces of the Russians were overthrown. We find here the very names which tradition places around Vladimir. Next the Russian victory at Kulikovo in 1380 gave us the memory of Mamay. Why Dimitry Donskoy, the leader of the Russians and himself a popular hero, did not enter the charmed circle, we cannot tell. He remained outside but his opponent was included among the foes of Russia. Then two centuries later, when Yermak appeared in Siberia, he touched the popular fancy and for his exploits was included in the list of bogatyrs.

We can well understand why Yermak did the conventional things in the byliny. His exploits had been remote and dif-
ferent; even his death was extraordinary. The bylīny authors did not recognize this peculiarity. For them the bogatyrs were the great heroes who fought at Kiev against the Tatars. For them the bogatyrs drank from huge cups, handled huge weapons and fought for long periods of time. Everything about them was on a grand scale. So they applied to Yermak the conventional characteristics of their favorite heroes. He was young, younger than any of the others, and he could not pass from history in the way in which they did. All Russia knew that Yermak Timofeyevich had to reach Siberia. They knew that he had to annex the land to Russia and be pardoned by the Tsar but at the same time they placed him in the latest possible strata of their work. The disappearance of the bogatyrs in the struggle with Tsar Kalin probably looks to 1224. The conflict with Mamay certainly places Yermak in connection with the heroes of the fourteenth century. Outside of the mythical apparatus there is nothing that can connect Yermak with Vladimir. He remains throughout a straight hero, young and late in coming, who rises as the old Kiev heroes begin to pass away. This is a tribute to history and the historical sense and there is little or no need to find for Yermak a place in the highly organized pantheon of the past. There is no need to speculate whether the name of Yermak has been attached to some old hero who has lost his name before the increasing fame of the young man. He is simply a later hero enrolled among the earlier immortals.

We shall probably never know what were the personal characteristics of Yermak Timofeyevich which so endeared him to the heart of the Russian people. His Cossacks were practically wiped out but he had opened a way to Siberia. He was a pathfinder whose exploits fired the hearts of his people and made him an object of song. More and more was the simple story of his life magnified in popular tradition and made like the tales of the heroes of the past. And therein lies its value. We can see how one incident after another became connected with his name and we can trace his career from a Cossack leader to a Russian bogatyrl. If we could analyze this story more carefully, we should probably have a key to the strange mixture of myth and heroism, of history and romance, which in the folk poetry of Russia developed into the bylīny. Perhaps others
of the bogatyrs developed in the same way; but we are fortunate in the case of Yermak for he lived late enough to give us some historical information about his career and to figure to some extent in written history. Through the historical songs and the byliny we can trace his rise in popular thought and song; and his great value is that he illustrates the change of a human hero into a culture-hero endowed with all the befitting mythical and super-human qualities.
NARD

WILFRED H. SCHOFF

PHILADELPHIA COMMERCIAL MUSEUM

Those who have enjoyed a Madonna of Murillo will remember how she rests her foot on the crescent moon, that golden boat of Astarte, at sunyde times and in divers places otherwise called Aphrodite, Anaitis and Ishtar. Frazer tells of a village of Cyprus where the Virgin Mary is worshipped under the name of Panaghia Aphroditessa, the Most Holy little Goddess of Love; and it is not entirely unreasonable that, as the Mother of the most precious Child, she should be thought to retain some, at least, of the attributes of the ancient Mother Goddess. Let us now see how some of the offerings to that great Mother have likewise been handed on.

St. Paul’s saying “that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die” strikes at the heart of primitive religion. The re-awakening of life in the spring, the sprouting of trees, flowers and grass were mysterious evidence of divine life and had a direct relation to the lives of men depending upon their flocks. As they changed their manner of living and became agricultural rather than pastoral, the ear of corn took its place along with leaf and bud; and where this was a winter crop, the spring festival was applicable to both. “First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear,” is thus also an expression of early ideas. The same Semitic root which means ‘to put forth’ covers both the ear of corn and the hyacinth, and we remember how Hyacinth, Anemone and Narcissus alternate with Adonis and Tammuz in the worship of the Mother Goddess. This

1 Adonis, Attis and Osiris, 32.
2 sunbêl.
3 sunbûl.
4 Anemone is Naamani ‘my darling’ as Adonî is ‘my lord’ and Dodî ‘my beloved’.
same root covers the sign of the Zodiac, of the sixth month \(^1\), during which the descent of Ishtar to Hades in search of her lost husband was celebrated; and the same root, again, covers the nardostachys \(^{a}\), spica nardi, or spikenard of India.

Nard, or more specifically spikenard, is the fibre-covered root-stock of a tall-growing valerian,\(^{\text{i}}\) having as its habitat the Himalaya and Hindu Kush Mountains. The characteristic hairy covering is the remains of the radical leaves. Nard first appears in literature in the Atharva-Veda\(^{\text{b}}\) where, mixed with honey and costus and made into an ointment, it becomes a sovereign charm to win a woman. “Of ointment, of madugha (licorice?), of costus, and of nard, by the hands of Bhaga, I bring up quick a means of subjection”. This association with costus is of interest, for that, also a herbaceous plant of the Himalayas, appears elsewhere in the Atharva-Veda \(^{\text{c}}\) as the sign and symbol of immortal life. Won by the gods in the third heaven from earth as they moved about in the sky in their golden boat, the costus was set as companion to the soma—that sacred drink which according to a recent writer was nothing more romantic than millet beer. \(^{\text{**}}\) Costus appears several times in the Atharva-Veda as a remedy against disease, especially fever.

Whether nard is a word of Sanskrit or Iranian origin seems doubtful. It may be an indigenous name borrowed of some earlier race by the conquering Iranians. Some lexicons refer it to a Sanskrit root nai, to smell, but Dr. Edgerton tells me that there is no such root in Sanskrit. Uhlenbeck’s etymological dictionary doubtfully suggests a word, nada, nala or nala, reed, which from the botanical standpoint would answer well enough. Persian dictionaries also connect the word with nai, reed, and Dr. Jackson writes me that we may perhaps tentatively assume the word ‘nard’ to be Iranian. Watt quotes various vernaculars of the Punjab, dala, bala, mala, ‘root’, and Sanskrit

---

\(^{\text{a}}\) as-Sunbulal(l)l.

\(^{\text{b}}\) sunbul-ul-fib.

\(^{\text{i}}\) Nardostachys Jatamansi, order Valerianaceae.

\(^{\text{c}}\) VI.102.3.

\(^{\text{**}}\) V.4.

\(^{\text{**}}\) Cf. Havell, *J.R.A.S.* 1920, pp. 349-351: “it is probable that the soma plant was *Eleusine coracana*, or *rāgi*, the common millet still used in the Eastern Himalayas for making the intoxicating drink known as *marua*.”
jatamāṇī (which latter has been adopted in the modern botanical name of the plant), referring to its resemblance to a tufted stock. In modern India fragrant and cooling ointments are still prepared from the drug, which are believed to have the power of promoting the growth and blackness of the hair. Although from quite a different part of the plant, the spikenard of commerce bears some vague resemblance to an ear of corn, or to bulbous flowers like the hyacinth, gladiolus or garlic; and it is of interest that another Semitic word used for nard means alike 'loose' or 'hanging' as of hair, 'heating', as of an oven, 'swelling' or 'filling', as of a river, 'bloodshot', as of an eye, and that various forms of the word covered alike the hyacinth and the red or bloody waters of the river Adonis rising in the spring floods and thus suggesting the revival of human life; for was not man himself, as Adam, the Ruddy One? This association of waters and human life is familiar enough. It may be worth while to recall another passage in the Atharva-Veda: 76

"As Indra is possessed of glory in heaven-and-earth, as the waters are possessed of glory in the herbs, so among all the gods may we, among all, be glorious." Something of the same association continues through the Vedic writings; nalada or nard is found not only in the Atharva-Veda, but also in the Aitareya \( ^{13} \) and the Sāṅkhāyana Āranyakas, \( ^{14} \) where it is mentioned as found in a garland, as well as in the Sūtras. In the Atharva-Veda \( ^{15} \) the feminine form of the word naladī occurs as the name of an Apsaras or celestial nymph. In this latter passage there are five Apsarases who are driven out by some herb, and their names, as Whitney suggests, \( ^{16} \) are all formed upon odor names, of which guggul or bdellium is one. We may thus trace the fact that a special portion of a special reed or herbaceous plant was in various ways connected with ideas of manly vigor and love, and that the uses of the drug had special reference to those ideas in their relation to a Mother Goddess.

\( ^{11} \) sajara: manasaśjar, sajjar, sajar, sajun.
\( ^{12} \) VI.58.2.
\( ^{13} \) III.2.4.7.
\( ^{14} \) X.1.4.
\( ^{15} \) IV.37.3.
So it appears in the earlier writings; but Caland, while he gives us as a charm to assure the safety of the herd, that nard pounded in water should be given the calves to drink while the priest performed a specified ceremony, observes that nard was subsequently reserved for the ritual of the dead and forbidden to the living. Still later, however, in India the word 'nard' referred to several varieties of aromatic grass which, in odor and appearance, resembled the Himalayan drug; and while familiar in ointments and perfumes, these were used also in ceremonial ointments in Mohammedan times, especially in anointing the Ka'ba and the Sacred Rock under the Temple in Jerusalem, which must have been survivals of extremely early practice,—the anointing of stock and stone for the Mother Goddess.

Laufer traces nard through early Chinese Annals and finds the word to be correctly transcribed, (na-lo-t'o=Sansk, nalada) and a fanciful analysis given as to nara-dhara ("held or carried by man"), because, it was said, men carried the fragrant flower with them in their girdles. He refers to another word in the Chinese Annals (mai-k'i) mentioned as a product of Fu-lin or Syria, and thought by Hirth to be the nard. It was said to be somewhat similar to garlic, shepherd's purse and wheat; and while he identifies this with Persian nargis, narcissus, it is still a fact that there is an underlying association, if not in language, yet in conception between the two products.

To English-speaking people nard is best known through the mention of it in the Song of Songs and in the Gospels, and to Jews through its appearance in the Prayer Book (carried down from the Babylonian Talmud) as an ingredient in the ceremonial incense. It is an interesting historical question how a Himalayan love charm came to find its way into those books. We may perhaps adopt the hypothesis that its ceremonial use was due to Persian influence, through association of ideas, similarity of

---

64 Dr. Edgerton cites the Naishadha-Carita.
66 Sīnā-Iranica, 428, 455.
67 This may, however, be a veiled allusion to the phallic symbolism which was usually attached to nard.
appearance, superiority of fragrance and extension of trade routes under the Achaemenid kingdom of Persia, and its successors, the Empires of Alexander and Seleucus.\footnote{As to the superposition of the patriarchal Semitic cult of the God of Heaven over the patriarchal autochthonous cult of the Mother Goddess, cf. Rostovtseff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, 72-3, 106-7.}

Let us approach the problem by recalling the substances specified for the ceremonial incense. In Exodus 30 the incense and anointing oil are separately listed: the one contains stacte, onycha, galbanum and frankincense, each of a like weight, the whole seasoned with salt; the other, flowing myrrh and cassia each 500 shekels, sweet cinnamon and sweet calamus each 250 shekels, and olive oil one hin: but the Babylonian Talmud apparently combines the two lists and adds a number of things that must have been unknown to pre-exilic ceremonial. The following is the list: balm, onycha, galbanum, frankincense, each 70 maneh, myrrh, cassia, spikenard and saffron, each 16 maneh, costus 12, aromatic bark 3, cinnamon 9, and the lye from the ashes of the leek 9 kab, Cyprus wine 3 seah 3 kab, salt of Sodom ¼ kab, and a dash each of the herb maaleh ashan and kippah of the Jordan, which may possibly be kopher or henna.\footnote{Cf. association of henna with nard, Cant. 4, 13.} It is here specified, as in Ezekiel and Leviticus, that no honey shall be used; but how this offering of the Ishtar cult should be prohibited and such exotic and idolatrous substances as spikenard, saffron and costus admitted is not so easily understood. Surely they, too, are associated with nature cults, whether of Syrian Astarte, Iranian Anaitis, or Indian Durgâ.

In the Song of Songs spikenard (Hebrew nèrd) appears twice—adorning first the bridegroom and next the bride.\footnote{Cant. 1, 12; 4, 13-14; cf. Rev. 3, 20.} This might be taken as chance illustrations in a love song at the wedding ceremonial, were it not that all the substances mentioned in the Song fall so naturally into separate offering lists—first, of the nature cult; second, of the pre-exilic sanctuaries; and finally, of the post-exilic temple. In the wedding ceremonial spikenard was associated more especially with marriages of royalty, for it was always a rare and costly substance, with production and export limited then as now, by the princelings of
the Himalayan states. In this connection Phyllarchus has a curious anecdote about the gift of a love charm, not named but probably nard, sent by Chandragupta to Seleucus at Antioch when he decided to abandon Greek customs for Oriental, and like Solomon of old, to take unto himself wives from all the peoples within his dominions. Philostratus also mentions a marriage balm prepared by the Indians of the Punjab, and says that unless the young couple have been besprinkled with it, their union is not considered complete or compatible with Aphrodite's bestowing her grace upon it. In the Song of Songs it is difficult to escape the conclusion that nard appears not as a popular love charm, but as a ceremonial offering to the Goddess of Love.

The earliest mention of nard in Greek literature is in Theophrastus who, writing in the 3rd century B.C., says that "aromatics come from Arabia, Media and India, but the choicest from India" and under these makes separate mention of spikenard. "The most fragrant of all aromatics come from Asia and sunny regions, while from Europe itself comes none except the iris." Arrian in his account of Alexander's return from India, quoting Aristobulus, says of the Desert of Gedrosia that it produces "many odoriferous roots of nard, which the Phoenicians likewise gathered; but much of it was trampled down by the army, and a sweet perfume was diffused far and wide over the land by the trampling; so great was the abundance of it." Strabo gives a slightly different account to the effect that the desert produced "aromatics, particularly nard and myrrh, in such quantity that the army of Alexander used them on the march for tent coverings and beds; they thus breathed an air full of odors, and at the same time more salubrious." And Pliny has more to the same effect. In these passages, however, it may be inferred that the substance was not the Himalayan spikenard which required abundant moisture and rich soil, but
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* Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, 1, 344.
* Life of Apollonius of Tyana, III, 1.
* Hist. Plant. 9, 7, 2-4.
* Anab. Alex. 6, 22, 5.
* 15, 2, 3.
* H. N. 12, 26; Pliny says that in his time nard held first place among ointments in Rome.
rather some variety of andropogon grass so generally used as a substitute.  

The poet Horace mentions nard in several passages, of which the most interesting is in the Ode addressed to Vergil, who is bidden to the Sabine farm and told to bring with him in return for a share in a cask of wine "of bounteous power to grant fresh hopes", "a tiny alabaster box of nard", with reference perhaps to Lydia or some other charmer.

The incident in the Gospels in which nard appears is of interest from more than one aspect. While every Gospel refers to it, the accounts differ somewhat in detail, and there are possibly two separate incidents assimilated into one account. However that may be, the "alabaster box of ointment of spikenard very precious" was produced under such circumstances that those present thought it to be a love offering appropriate to the calling of the woman who made it, and were reproved with the explanation that the woman had "come beforehand," and that the anointing was against the day of the burying. So far as I am aware, this is the only Western reference to the funeral use of nard, which according to Caland had by that time become general in India. The Gospel account confirms the distinctive nature of the offering in its mention of the price, 300 denarii; and the denarius, as we know otherwise, was the unit price of a day's labor.

Nard appears in the Periplus as an item of export at two Indian ports—that of Poclais (Pushkalavati) through the port of Barygaza, and that of the Ganges, through the ports of South India, whither it was brought by Bengal shipping. It appears in the Digest of the Roman Law in an Imperial rescript of

---

9 So Joret, Plantes dans l'Antiquité, 2. 647-8. These grasses are andropogon, var. cirratum, euarancusa, nardus, schoenantus: order Gramineae. Andropogon is from an, stamen (or man) and pagon, beard. These grasses, like spikenard, suggest the idea of masculinity.
10 Odes, IV. 12, II. 11: Epode XIII.
11 In another passage it is curious to note that the Loeb Library version renders as 'Persian nard', Achaemenium costum (Odes III. 1)—quite a different thing.
12 Mark 14, 3-4; Matt. 26. 6-9; Luke 7, 36-38; John 12, 1-8.
13 Periplus 48, 56.
14 39. 15. 5-7.
the Emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus relating to articles imported into Egypt from the East and subject to import duties. Here nard and the spike of nard are separately classified, and nard, specified as *folium*, has three subdivisions: 1, *pentasphaerum*, 2, *barbaricum*, 3, *caryophyllum*. *Pentasphaerum* seems to refer to the balls of leaf and fibre of the cinnamon laurel (some, however, would identify it with betel pepper) referred to in the Periplus as *malabathrum*; *barbaricum* refers probably to the port of that name at the mouth of the Indus, while *caryophyllum*, meaning literally 'nut-leaf', and later applied to the clove, has been identified by some with the aril or sheath of the nutmeg, which we know as mace. The identification is doubtful, for both clove and mace are supposed to have been brought to India from the Archipelago. Ptolemy mentions nard and fixes its habitat in the Himalayas.

Thus far we have considered nard as a charm for wedding or funeral. The association of these two rites, apparently at the opposite poles of human emotion, is not unreasonable from a primitive viewpoint. Whether like the waning and waxing moon, the descent and return of Ishtar, or the falling and budding of the leaves, death and revival were regarded as parts of the same cycle of life.

"I sometimes think that never blows so red
The Rose as where some buried Caesar bled;
That every Hyacinth the Garden wears
Dropt in her lap from some once lovely Head."

The use of the product in early medicine was somewhat different from its ceremonial uses. The Syriac Book of Medicines edited by Budge gives us presumably the practice of the school which flourished at Edessa during the late Graeco-Roman and Sassanian periods. In this compendium of practice nard appears in many prescriptions: as a remedy for colds and congestive conditions of the head and body generally; as a sedative in nervous diseases; in the treatment of paralysis; as a remedy for consumption, abdominal congestion or ulceration, dropsy, inflammation of the liver and spleen, and as an ingredient in external plasters for reduction of inflammation. In this book it does not appear as a nerve stimulant, which, aside from its physical
appearance, was the property that perhaps first commended its use as a charm. In present-day medicine it is practically unused, but on consulting physicians of different schools, the same diversity of practice is shown (depending, possibly, on the volume of the dose); a homeopath dislikes the valerians as "rough" stimulants; an allopath prefers better sedatives. The Syriac distinguishes two varieties—nardōn, which Budge equates with Arabic sujra(l), and nārdīn, equated with Arabic sunbul. Watt quotes from a Persian work on Materia Medica, which has nardēn in the index and sunbul in the body of the work, and distinguishes between sunbul hindī, sunbul-rūmī or uklešt, and nardēn uklešt, remarking that sunbul hindī is also sunbul-al-fūb or fragrant nard.

In the Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes, in its description of Ceylon, mention is made of the shipping that frequented its ports coming from India, Persia and Ethiopia, from Malabar and the Gulf of Cambay and from Sindu "where musk and castor are procured, and androstachys", which seems to be a corruption of nardostachys, spikenard. "Sindu," he says, "is on the frontier of India, for the Indus, that is, the Phison, which discharges into the Persian Gulf forms the boundary between Persia and India", an interesting sidelight alike on political geography and Biblical exegesis of that date.

The Arabic writers frequently mention nard and distinguish between sunbul al-fūb, which was probably spikenard, and sunbul al'asāfīr, sparrow's nard, which probably included one or more varieties of the andropogon grasses, chief of which is the citronella. Especially is this the case in the nard which was so liberally received in the golden age of the Caliphate from the islands of the Archipelago, where the true spikenard is not found. The vagueness of the information appears, for example, in Ibn Khordadbeh writing in the 9th century. He mentions Indian nard as one of the products of Jawa, that is, Sumatra. Edrisī, in the 12th century, mentions nard as a product of the Island of

---

47 Cf. Arny, Principles of Pharmacy, p. 743, sub verbo Valeriana.
48 fūb is from root fūb to be good, or delightful, or sweet. layyāb is to perfume or embalm. The plural ayyāb may underlie the race-name Aethiopian—people of the Incense Land.
49 XI. 337.
Salahat. Abūl Fadl Ja'far, in the 12th century, quotes nard as idhkhir, which was certainly andropogon grass, and says that the "best sort is sunbul al'asāfīr, also called 'asāfīr al-idhkhir," which doubtless should be transposed and written idhkhir al'asāfīr. This is in all probability the zigeir of the Periplus. Yākāt, writing in the 13th century, mentions as exports from Sumatra, aloes, camphor, nard, cloves, mace, and drugs and vases from China. Ibn al-Baitār, writing in the 13th century, and who was familiar with this trade, distinguishes three sorts of nard—that is, of sunbul: one called Indian, another Greek and the third mountain nard. He also distinguishes two varieties of Indian nard, as already mentioned, sunbul at-fāb and sunbul al'asāfīr, and Ferrand in this connection quotes from Dioscorides who mentions two species, Indian and Syrian, the latter "not because it comes from Syria, but because the mountain on which it grows reaches from Syria to India." Of the Syrian nard Dioscorides says that it has an "odor which recalls that of galangal. It is spicy and dries the tongue, and leaves an agreeable odor in the mouth if chewed for some time". As to Indian nard he says there is one which comes from the Ganges of "inferior efficacy because of the humidity of the region of its origin. It is longer and has a larger spike and the fibres are more intermingled. Its odor is noxious. The nard which comes from the interior of the mountain is superior to the other—more fragrant, with a shorter spike, having the odor of galangal and otherwise resembling the Syrian."

Nard as a product of Ceylon, Sumatra and other islands of the East is mentioned also by Kazwīnī in the 13th century, Ibn al-Wardī in the 14th, and Bākuwī in the 15th. Most of these passages read like references copied from earlier writers.

Other writers tell of the transfer of the word to an ointment from which the true nard was finally omitted altogether. Jaubārī, writing in the 13th century, says that musk is made by feeding young pigeons with cloves and rose water infused with wild pear and nard. Just how this produces the result is not apparent. Nuwayrī, in the 14th century, gives directions for making two standard ointments, the ghaliya and the nadd.

Nuwayrī was a celebrated historian and lawyer, who wrote an encyclopedia of human knowledge in five great divisions—
heaven and earth, man, animals, plants and history. Wiedemann has reprinted portions of an Arabic manuscript of Nuwayri in the Royal Library at Leyden, from which Ferrand \(^\ast\) takes a number of recipes for preparation of nadd, of which the following are typical:

"Tamimi mentions different sorts, such as the nadd al-musta'ini which was prepared for the Abbaside caliph Musta'in billah al-'abbāsī, consisting of 50 parts Indian aloe, same quantity Tibetan musk, 150 parts blue Shibīr ambergis, 3 parts riyāḥī camphor. Aloe, musk and camphor are ground separately with mortar and pestle and the musk pressed through silk cloth. Ambergis is dissolved in a jar or vase and the ground ingredients stirred in. It is then poured out on a marble plate to cool and cut into bars. For the preparation of the nadd generally used by ordinary people, take 50 parts superior aloe, same quantity Tibetan musk, 100 parts Shibīr ambergis, 3 parts camphor. Grind all together. Make into bars.

"Preparations of a nadd made for the Abbaside caliph Dja'far al-Mustawakkil'ālī Allah. Grind separately 20 parts kāmarānī Indian aloe, 25 parts rukk, 6 parts Tibetan musk, one part rukk with yellow leaves, one part saffron. Then grind together. Then take 50 parts blue Indian ambergis, cut into pieces and melt in a Mecca vase. Mix in the above ingredients, then cut into bars."\(^8\)

"Nadd prepared by the mother of the Abbaside caliph Mukta'dir billah, with which every Friday they perfumed the Ka'ba at Mecca and the sacred rock of the Temple at Jerusalem. 100 parts purified Tibetan musk, grind and pass through a cloth. Melt Shibīr ambergis, take from fire. When cool, pour in only the musk, but not the aloe. Work thoroughly, spread on marble, cut into rods and do the perfuming with them. Tamimi says the chief of the servitors of the Temple at Jerusalem gave some of this nadd to my father. My father dissolved it with beh and obtained a gāliyya extremely fragrant."

The foregoing was quoted by Nuwayri from previous writers. He then goes on to say that in his time the nadd was prepared in the proportions above given, but was called 'anbar (this being the word for ambergis). Crude ambergis was technically called al-'anbar al-asl, that is, original ambergis.

It is, of course, a question whether Arabic nadd had anything to do with Iranian or Indic nard. The word could readily have found its way into Arabic through Persian or Prakrit channels;

\(^\ast\) Textes Arabes relatifs a l'Extrême Orient, 620-625.

\(^8\) The rukk mentioned in these recipes was apparently a concoction of musk with other things, rated according to its content of musk—that is, one-third or one-half rukk.
but there is an Arabic word *nadd* meaning hill, mound or pile. According to Hava’s dictionary *nadd* or *nidd* means merely a compound perfume. It is also the name of a game of chance, similar to backgammon. Freytag is more positive. *Nadd*, he says, is from the Persian and means “a perfume composed of ambergris, musk and aloes-wood, by others called ambergris.”

Marco Polo gives one of the earliest accounts of India by a European, and says of the kingdom of ‘Melibar’, 42 “There is in this Kingdom a great quantity of pepper, and ginger, and cinnamon, and turbit, and of nuts of India. They also manufacture very delicate and beautiful buckrams. The ships that come from the east bring copper in ballast. They also bring hither cloths of silk and gold, and sendels; also gold and silver, cloves and spikenard, and other fine spices for which there is a demand here, and exchange them for the products of these countries.” It may be questioned whether the rendering, ‘spikenard’, is correct. Its association with cloves rather suggests the nárávastu, which, as Yule observes, is a grass with fragrant roots much used as a perfume in the Archipelago. Yule 43 also gives interesting details of three cargoes from Malabar that arrived at Lisbon in September, 1504, the items of their manifests totalling as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weight (cantars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinnamon</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloves</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac and brasil</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camphor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubehs</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mace</td>
<td>23/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spikenard</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lign-Alces</td>
<td>14/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this it now appears how small, and presumably how precious an item of cargo nard always was. Just as Sir William Jones was sent the wrong plant by the Bhutan authorities who prohibited the export of living plants, 44 so even today the supply is limited, only a small quantity coming down in any season from

---

40 III. XXV.
41 Marco Polo, ed. Cordier, II, 389-390.
42 Watt, *Dict. of the Economic Products of India*, sub verbo nardostachys.
the mountains. But an unromantic world no longer demands
the product, and the mountain princelings are deprived of the
revenues which it formerly yielded them.

According to the Book of Enoch,43 it was the fallen angels
who taught the female of the species "charms and enchantments
and the cutting of roots"; and it is to the prodigal impulse of
one of them that we chiefly owe this fragrant memory of other
days, from

"that broken box that gave
   Its treasure to the Lord
And filled the unclean leper's house
   With the scent of costliest nard".

43 I Enoch 8, 3.
STRAY NOTES ON THE ARAMAIC OF DANIEL AND EZRA
CHARLES C. TORREY
YALE UNIVERSITY

THE FOLLOWING BRIEF NOTES may be considered as supplementary to my Notes on the Aramaic Part of Daniel (1909) and to the textual annotations in my Ezra Studies (1910). They are chiefly the fruit of further observation of the Masoretic practice of combining alternative readings, a very important subject to which I have called attention in several places, and on which I have a more extended essay in preparation. I have included here only a few of the most striking examples. Among the other miscellaneous observations, a few are based on new material which has come to light. Several of the words discussed are found in the Hebrew text (Dan. 1,4; 2,1; 11,2; Ezr. 1,8,9; 4,7; 6,22; 8,17ff.).

Daniel

1,4. សូនិ ចិញ្ចិន ចូល មក ខ្លួន និង ែែេេ (cf. Gen. 39,23). The same combination in Job 31,7; see the variant in the Masoretic tradition.

2,1. “In the second year” could not possibly have been written by the narrator. It is perfectly evident from the narrative in the first chapter that according to his view half a dozen years (at least) must have elapsed between the accession of Nebuchadnezzar and the events of the second chapter. In my Notes pp. 9ff., I showed reasons for believing that chap. 1 was originally written in Aramaic, and that it was translated into Hebrew

* See for example the introduction to my Notes on Daniel, p. 12, and the following pages passim; my remarks in the AJSL 32 (1916), p. 67; and the instructive essay by my pupil, Dr. Otto H. Boström, entitled Alternative Readings in the Books of Samuel, issued in 1918 as one of the Publications of Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill.
by the author of chaps. 7–12. In the footnote on p. 101 I expressed the opinion "that slight traces of the process [of translation] can really be seen," and I gave some illustrations. In the troublesome date in 2:1 I think we have the best illustration of all. The original author wrote נֶשֶׁת, "And in the sixth year." By a very natural slip, of a common type, following the eye rather than the meaning of the word, the translator into Hebrew wrote נֶשֶׂת.

2,7. נֶשֶׂת is intended by the punctuators to leave open the choice between נֶשֶׁת and נֶשֶׂת (Theod., Vulg.). So very often in Daniel; see also 4:15.16, where the same thing is done on the basis of the other consonant reading—the reading being in each case presumably that of the principal manuscript.

2,9. We have here the combination of the two equivalent forms, נֶשֶׁת and נֶשֶׂת (with assimilation of the dental, as often elsewhere; cf. also the many similar forms in the Arabic of the Koran, for example). A typical and interesting manner of preserving two readings.

2,22. The combination of נֶשֶׂת and נֶשֶׂת (cf. 5.11.14). The Syriac nakhrat, which some scholars have thought to be intended by the consonant text here, is, I think, merely an artificial form created for the sake of assonance with שלושה. There is no trace of it in the older Aramaic.

2,23. The pointing נֶשֶׂת, which undoubtedly rests on ancient tradition, was probably intended to indicate a double reading, namely the combination of נֶ — suffix of 1st pers. sing. (supported by the context, as well as by LXX, Theod., and Syr.), and נֶ — suffix of 1st pers. plur. (derived from the preceding נֶשֶׂת). The text rendered by Theod. is doubtless what the author wrote. I have noted many cases in the O. T. text in which an unusual vowel calls attention to alternative readings.

2,24. As I showed in my Notes, two variant readings are combined here.

2,43. first word. Of the two ms. readings preserved here, the one is intrinsically as good as the other, but the consonant text deserves a slight preference in such cases.

2,48. As I have shown in my article "Medina and πόλις," in the Harvard Theological Review for October, 1923, the evi-
dence thus far available leads to the conclusion that the meaning “province” for מַדְרוּ is only Palestinian, confined to Hebrew-Jewish writings, the meaning in gentile Aramaic documents being always and everywhere “city.”

3,13. One of the most interesting and important of all the examples of “alternative” pointing, which combines the two (equally good) readings וְָ in 6,18, see the note there. The Aramaic hif'il was still frequently used in the period represented by the Biblical Aramaic, as also in the earlier stages of the language; it soon after disappeared from use, however, being displaced by other forms of expression, among them the very common indefinite third person plural. See also the note on 7,5, for a similar example.

3,14. The problematic word מַדְרוּ, used in the same way as in Daniel, has now turned up in an Aramaic letter written in Mesopotamia in about the year 660 B.C.; see Lidzbarski, Alt-aramaische Urkunden aus Assur (1921). In line 12 occurs the phrase: מַדְרוּ יָדַע אֶל מִלְּחָד אֵל. “He will ask whether these words are true”; and then, immediately after, the same phrase seems to occur again: “Summon them, ask them whether [these words] are true.” The characters here are partly obliterated, but the reading of this word is certain, and the restoration of the whole sentence hardly to be doubted. The supposed Persian origin of the word in Daniel is thus disposed of once for all. Lidzbarski, ibid., queries whether there may not be some connection with פּּ—a desperate conjecture. The explanation which I gave in my Notes seems to me to be not only satisfactory but certain: the root is Old Aramaic פּ, the familiar Arabic פּ (according to the native lexicographers a synonym of פּ, which is exactly what the context requires in these passages). The word surviving in this fixed use is the infinitive of the pe'al stem, in the adverbial accusative (see my Notes, for some of the numerous parallels). It is thus employed in the same way, and with the same meaning, as מַדְרוּ or מַדְרוּ in Biblical Hebrew, where one might write the question: מַדְרוּ מַדְרוּ חָדָד, “Are these words true?” Cf. also Prov. 8,8: מַדְרוּ מַדְרוּ, “All the words of my mouth are trustworthy.” In Daniel: “It is true, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego,
that you will not serve my gods?" The Massoretic punctuation is correct, and Theodotion's εἰ ἀληθῶς is an exact rendering.

4.14. Two readings are preserved here, namely שַׁעַעְתֶּן יָכוֹ דִּשֵּׁן, "until they shall know," and מַעַעְתֶּן יָכוֹ הָעִבְרֶנָּה. In order that they may know.

4.32. לִי combines לְךָ with לוּ. According to the latter (inferior) reading the sense would be: "And all the inhabitants of the whole earth are taken into account (by Him)." The negative would never have been written with final ה. Deut. 3.11 is not to be cited as an example, for the לְךָ of that passage is simply the combination of the readings לְךָ and לְךָ, as the LXX shows.

5.5. I explained the word מַעַעְתֶּן (מַעַעְתֶּן + מַעַעְתֶּן) in my Notes, but gave the meaning of the root לְךָ incorrectly. It is a synonym of לְךָ, stand. The root has all but disappeared from use in North Semitic, but is preserved in South Semitic; in Ethiopian it is the most common of all the verbs with this meaning. "Fire-stand" was the original signification of the compound noun.

5.7.16.29. What the author wrote, in all three passages, was שַׁעַעְתֶּן, "third", that is, "he shall govern the kingdom as third ruler." With this was later combined the reading מַעַעְתֶּן "third part" (Da`man, Gramm., p. 133), that is, "he shall govern the third part of the kingdom" מַעַעְתֶּן יָכְו. In combining the two readings it is obvious that the preference was given to the one which I have regarded as the original. The care and ingenuity with which the combination was effected are manifest, as usual.

5.10. מַעְעַעְתֶּן apparently combines מַעְעַעְתֶּן and the participle מַעַעְתֶּן.

5.12. The only possible explanation of the forms מַעְעַעְתֶּן and מַעְעַעְתֶּן is that they embody alternative readings. The pa`el stem of these verbs is as common as the pe`al in the meaning required, and thus the double tradition originated. In the one case, מַעְעַעְתֶּן and מַעְעַעְתֶּן are combined; in the other, מַעְעַעְתֶּן and מַעְעַעְתֶּן. These are typical and very important examples. In the verse 16 there was only the single tradition.
5, 13 (end). The anomalous יְסֹּפֶנּ is probably due to the combination of the two readings יְפֹּס and יְפֹּּס.

5, 21. As far as the sense is concerned, there is nothing to choose between the parallel readings יְפֹּּס and יְסֹּפֶנּ. If one must choose as editor, the consonant text deserves the preference here.

5, 25–28. As I showed in my Notes, pp. 36–40, this is an especially interesting and important example of the preservation of variant readings.

6, 1–3. דַּרְיוֹס הָמרָד, “Darius the Mede” (i.e. Darius Hystaspis, whose reign was transposed with that of Cyrus in Jewish tradition, as is shown conclusively by the joint testimony of the books of Daniel and Ezra), is the Darius intended in 1 Esdras, chaps. 3 and 4. In my Ezra Studies, the chapter treating of the “Story of the Three Youths,” I held that the king in that popular narrative was Darius III Codomannus, but I am now convinced that I was mistaken.

6, 18. The reading יְפֹּּס combines יְפֹּּס (hoṣ’ al) and יְסֹּפֶנּ, see the note on 3, 13. Similarly, יְפֹּּס in this verse contains the two readings יְסֹּפֶנּ and יְפֹּּס. Cf. also the note on 7, 5.

6, 20. We have here, in an ingenious combination, the alternative readings יְפֹּּס and יְסֹּפֶנּ. Could any better way of including both be found?

7, 5: The meaning of the pointing יָּסֹּפֶנּ (א) is that one MS.—or group of mss.—read יָּסֹּפֶנּ (as in vs. 4), while another gave the reading יְסֹּפֶנּ (cf. the יָּסֹּפֶנּ just below). On the employment of the anomalous vowel to call attention to the alternative tradition, see especially the notes on 2, 23; 3, 13; and 6, 18.

7, 8. The final vowel in יָּסֹּפֶנּ probably indicated that there was a variant יָּסֹּפֶנּ. It is hardly an instance of the confusion of the long and short vowels, for the case would be without parallel.

11, 2. I repeat here a conjectural emendation made by me some time ago, which subsequent study has seemed to me to confirm. In an article entitled “‘Yāwān’ and ‘Hellas’ as designations of the Seleucid Empire,” published in this Journal vol. 25 (1904), pp. 310 f., I maintained that the word יָּסֹּפֶנּ had accidentally fallen out of the text of Dan. 11, 2 after the word
網頁; the cause of the accident being the resemblance of the characters. I rendered accordingly: "And when he has become mighty in his riches, The Lord of All will raise up the kingdom of Yawān" [in the place of the kingdom of Persia]. This title of the God of Israel is just such as we should expect here. He was entitled נבש רע in 8, 11, and נר רע in 8, 25; and it is especially natural that the term should be introduced again here, because of the way in which it has just been used as the designation of the angels in charge of the Persian and Seleucid kingdoms. There is a סר רע and a ב ל רע, but the God of Israel is the נר רע and the ב ל רע.

The fact that the editors of our Hebrew-Aramaic text of Daniel had before them so many variants, and therefore concocted so large a number of the characteristic doublets (of which only a few receive mention here), can occasion no surprise. These were popular narratives, copied very often, not always with minute care, and still oftener retold or rewritten from memory. In the latter case, where the resulting form of text differed widely from the standard form, as for instance in the original of our "LXX" version of chaps. 4-6 (see my Notes, p. 30, footnote), we may take it for granted that the editors (wisely) left the eccentric recension entirely out of account. Only from the text or texts which kept close to the standard form were variants incorporated; either in the form of qere and kethîv, or, where this did not seem practicable or desirable, in other ways.

Ezra

1. 8. προστάτης is to be rendered "the governor of Judea," as in 1 Esdras, τῷ προστάτῃ τῆς 'Ιουδαίας. Sheshbazzar was not a Jew, but the Persian governor, as the circumstances of such a returning company would naturally seem to require. See my article, "The Chronicler's History of the Return under Cyrus," in AJSL 37 (1921), p. 93. The youthful prince Zerubbabel was at this time (in the view of the Chronicler) the Jewish leader, but holding no official position. It was only "somewhat" later, under Darius Nohus (according to the Chronicler and his

* It would not always differ widely, nor even considerably. It would require no unusual feat of memory to reproduce the whole zerubâlim.
Aramaic source), that he was made governor of the province. In criticising the chronology of this representation we have to remember that Darius Hystaspis (who, as “Darius the Mede,” was believed to have preceded Cyrus) falls out of the list of Persian kings, and that the length of the reigns of Xerxes (Ezr. 4, 6), who was believed to have had nothing to do with the Jews, and Artaxerxes I (Ezr. 4, 7–24) must have been totally unknown. The Chronicler wrote nearly three hundred years later than the accession of Cyrus, and it is abundantly evident from our O. T. writings that very little exact knowledge of Persian history was preserved in Jerusalem.

1, 9. I maintained in my Ezra Studies that the original of the loanword ἄκρατης is the Greek κρατήρ. Bewer, Der Text des Buches Ezra (1922), p. 15, objects to this, as others have done, “wegen der lautlichen Verschiedenheit.” In general, phonetic variation from the original is to be expected in words passing over from one language-family to another; it is therefore only the question, in this case, whether the supposed changes are supported by the analogy of other examples. The answer must be, as can easily be shown, that the changes are quite usual. For the beginning of the word, cf. καταφράκτης for καταφράκτης, κρατής for καταφράκτης, and many other words in which a Semitic γ replaces the Greek κ; also the following examples. The dissimilation of one r to l is common in all such borrowings. Cf. for example the Syriac gélbatâra for κραββατάριον, “barrow,” a good parallel to the word before us. Another, equally good, is the Arabic ghîrbâl, Syr. ‘arbâl, from the Latin cribrum, “sieve.” 2 The same phonetic improvement in borrowing this Latin word is to be seen in the Old French crible, English crible. The most familiar Semitic example is perhaps מַרְגָּרוֹת for μαργαρίτας. Without any help from the principle of dissimilation, moreover, the exchange of l and r is very common in Semitic words taken over from the Greek. There need therefore be no hesitation in deriving מַרְגָּרוֹת from κρατήρ, since the meaning, “bowl,” perfectly suits the context. Whether

---

1 This has been questioned because of the existence of a Syriac verb ’arab meaning “silt,” see Fränkel, Fremdwörter, p. 91, but this verb is certainly denominative.
κάρταλλος, "basker," is in turn derived from ἄπτωμα (as seems to me probable), need not be discussed here.

4, 7. In the twofold vowel-pointing of אֲמֵשָׁרֵא in this verse we have another way of preserving two traditions.

4, 10. I have no doubt that כָּיִם is collective-plural, "cities" (Ezra Studies, p. 186, and see Bewer, op. cit., p. 52), but I do not think that it is necessary to alter the vowel-pointing of the Masoretes, seeing that the short vowels i and a are so frequently interchanged.

4, 12. We have here one of the most interesting examples of a "doublet." The final κ of κερε was pushed over to the beginning of the following word merely in order to hold secure the place of the preformative of the imperfect tense. One ms. reading was זַלְכָּה, perf., and the other (decidedly preferable) was זַלְכָּה. The verb at the end of the verse similarly combines הָעִם (hif'il of עָה ב) and הָעִם, the better reading. The explanation which I gave in my Ezra Studies, 186 f., is incorrect.

4, 16. נָבִי (contrast the pointing in vss. 12 and 13) combined the form of the simple determined plural with the suffixed form נָבִי, the better reading here.

5, 1. The doublet here is evident from the sense and attested by the ancient versions. נָבִי combines נָבִי (the better reading, as in Theodotion's translation, cf. also 6, 14) and נָבִי, as in the "LXX" (1 Esdras), which reading of course requires the omission of the preceding נָבִי.

6, 8. If I am not mistaken, this נָבִי is the prototype of the common Syriac lam, "namely, to wit," and should be so rendered here.

6, 15. The explanation of the curious final κ in נָבִי is simply that the editors of the text chose this way of calling attention to a doublet, the one text writing the verb in the singular number and the other in the plural.

6, 22. Bewer, op. cit., in his comment on this verse, expresses

* This was in any case Artaxerxes Longimanus, of course. As I have shown elsewhere, our Biblical texts invariably distinguish the name of Artaxerxes Mnemon by writing it with כ (so everywhere in Ezr., chaps. 7 ff., and in Neh.)
his surprise at finding "Assyria" used in speaking of the Persian kingdom, and suspects the Hebrew text. We know, however, that from the Greek period onward "Ashur" was loosely used by the Jews to designate any and all of the Mesopotamian kingdoms, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, and Seleucid. Bewer himself refers (ibid.) to the Book of Judith. Another excellent example is 4 Macc. 13, 9, where the scene of Dan. 3, the casting of the three heroes into the furnace by the command of Nebuchadnezzar, is said to have been "Assyria." It was from this well-established use that the early Greek geographers derived their term Συρία, creating a new name in order to differentiate between the western part (the Abar Nahara) of the Seleucid kingdom and the eastern part, for which the name Ασσυρία was retained. There are other traces of this use, moreover, in the Hebrew O. T.; see the Lexicon of Gesenius-Buhl. In view of these facts, and since the Chronicler wrote in the Greek period, as is shown by many converging lines of evidence, and as scholars generally hold, why should there be hesitation to accept the text of Ezr. 6, 22 as it stands? The Chronicler is just the man to use terms in this loose way.

7, 14. With καταβαίνει is to be understood, as its subject, the pronoun of the second person singular: "thou art sent," see Bewer on the passage. Similarly, in the "Passover Letter" in the documents from Elephantine, there is to be understood with the (pe'il perf.) πέρσα the pronoun of the first person: "I was sent," as was first pointed out by W. R. Arnold, in his important article in the JBL 31, p. 17. A consideration of weight here, not emphasized by Arnold, is the modesty of the epistolary style, causing the writer to omit the (unnecessary) pronoun referring to himself. The matter is one of considerable importance, inasmuch as on the misinterpretation of this πέρσα in the papyrus document is based the view—from every consideration most improbable—that the Persian king himself had undertaken to prescribe to the Jews the details of the Passover celebration. I myself have no doubt that the details

---

8 W. F. Albright's article, "The Personality and Date of the Chronicler" in the JBL 42 (1921), throws no new light on this branch of the subject, and, though useful in other respects, is not likely to affect the present verdict as to the date.
were already perfectly familiar to the Jews of Elephantine, as to those everywhere else. The letter was simply the customary reminder, like the annual “festal letters” issued at Easter by the high officials of the Christian church. Cf. further the letters (also mere reminders, as far as the injunction to keep the feast is concerned) prefixed to 2 Macc. In our own day, in this country, the governor of the State sends out an annual proclamation in November, telling the citizens how to observe the Day of Thanksgiving, “assembling in the houses of worship,” etc., etc., as though the manner of the celebration were something new.

7, 19. I now agree with Guthl. contrary to my former view, that the original reading at the end of this verse was בֵּית אָרֶץ שָׂרָי עַל חוֹדֶשׁ (as in vs. 15), and suppose the accidental loss of the two words to have been due to the close resemblance of “Israel” and “Jerusalem” in the Semitic alphabet.

8, 17. This and the following verse contain such characteristic examples of duplex readings that I have included them here. בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל combines the reading בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, attested for the second century B.C. by the “LXX” (1 Esdr.), and undoubtedly the original, and בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, which later became current, and is rendered in our standard Greek (Theodotion) and the Vulgate.

In the second half of the verse it is plain that we have a doublet, of which notice is given by the anomalous 1 in בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. The one text had: בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל ובְּנֵי נְתִינִים. “To Iddo, my brother, and the Nethinim”; the other ms. reading was: בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל ובְּנֵי נְתִינִים “To Iddo and his brethren the Nethinim.” Either reading is suitable, but the former seems to me more likely to be the original.

8, 18. The first word in the verse is a duplex, and there are two corresponding renderings: “They brought to us,” as in 1 Esdr. and Vulg., the original reading, and “there came to us,” as in Theod. The thing of chief interest, however, is the “ע with dagesh” (!) in the word. If I am not mistaken, the reason for employing this sign of a doublet here was that the Masoretes regarded the הִי הִי of the verb as so superior a reading that they preferred not to include the qal either as qere or as kethiva, and yet were unwilling to leave the well attested form without any record; δ ἀντερτίων ποιήσα. 
ANOTHER OLD SYRIAC REFERENCE TO ZOROASTER

Abraham Yohannan

Columbia University

The principal allusions to Zoroaster in older Oriental literatures have been collected by Professor Jackson in Appendix VI of his Zoroaster the Prophet of Ancient Iran, pp. 274-286. Some supplementary references were gathered by him and myself in JAOS 28 (1907), pp. 183-188; cf. also Jackson, "Some additional Data on Zoroaster", in Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke zum siebzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet, pp. 1031-1038 (Giessen, 1906); likewise L. H. Gray (review of Zoroaster), Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, 4, 362, 364. As a more recent addendum, I wish to call attention to another old-time allusion to the Iranian Prophet in a Syriac treatise by Theodore bar Khoni, who lived about the end of the 6th or beginning of the 7th century of our era.


ON ZARADUSHT THE MAGIAN

'Concerning this impure (person) men have various opinions. There are those who say that he was of Persian race, and that he and his companions, Turkish Magians, used to practice Magism in a deserted place which is (situated) in the forest of Mabûgh, and that there was an impure spirit in the desert which injured wayfarers. Others, however, have said that he was a Jew, of priestly descent, and lived in Samaria, and was formerly called Azaziel. When Samaria was captured by the Assyrians, he also was carried into captivity. And because he was much inflamed with love for women, he fled from Nineveh and came
to Sejistân, 1 into the city of Zareg, to Khudös (Hutaosā), * wife of King Gushtāsp (Vishtāspa), and there he indulged in his desires, and because he was a magician, he drew many to himself. It is true that he was by race a Jew. He composed his teachings in seven languages—Greek, Hebrew, Gurzānian, Marvian, in that of Zarang, Persian, and in that of Sejistān. But this perverted and erring person departed in many ways from the fear of God (i. e. from the true religion).

In the beginning he set up four principles as the four elements—Ashuqar, Prashuqar, Zaruqar and Zarwân. * Of Zarwân he (Zaradusht) says that he is the father of Ormazd. 4 Concerning the conception of Ormazd and Ahraman he says thus: When there was nothing (in existence) but darkness, Zarwân was offering libations for a thousand years, and because he became doubtful lest he should not have a son, Satan was conceived along with Ormazd. When he (i. e. Zarwân) felt the conception of Ahraman, he said, 'Whoever comes first to me, him I shall make king.' Ormazd knew the thought of his father and told it to Satan. When Satan learned (this) he clove the womb of his mother and dropped from her navel. He went to Zarwân, and Zarwân asked him, 'Who art thou?' He answered, 'I am thy son.' Whereupon Zarwân said to him, 'Thou art not my son, for thou art dark and hateful.' When he had said this, Ormazd was born, fragrant and light, and Zarwân said, 'This is my son Ormazd', and gave him the twigs which he held in his hand. And he said to him 'Until now I was offering oblations for thee, henceforth do thou make oblations for me.' When these (things) had thus come to pass, Satan said to Zarwân,

---

1 Jackson, Zoroaster, pp. 44–45; Seistân or Sagastân
2 Avesta and later tradition refer to Hutaosā's interest in Zoroaster's religion, cf. Jackson, Zoroaster, pp. 68, 70, 193 n. 2.
3 These four are mentioned elsewhere in the Syriac Vies des Saints, Bedjan, p. 487; Paris, 1912. See also Nöldeke, Festgruss an Roth, p. 35, Stuttgart, 1893; cf. also the remark by Cumont, La Cosmogonie Manichéenne, p. 8 n. 2, Brussels, 1908. Professor Jackson suggests further connection of the attributes with the Manichaean tetrad, Zarwân, Rōšan, Zōr, Veṭi, in the Turfan Fragments.
4 The prevalence of the doctrine of Zarwanism in Sasanian times is well known; see for example Gray, 'Zoroastrian Material in the Acta Sanctorum,' in Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society, 1913–1914, p. 39.
'See, didst thou not promise, "The first one who comes to me, to him shall I give the kingdom"? Whereupon Zarwân said to him, 'Go thou, Satan, I have made thee king nine thousand years, and I have made Ormazd ruler over thee; and after that limit of time Ormazd shall be king and govern everything according to his will.' And Satan went and did whatever he pleased. When Ormazd created righteous (men), Satan created demons. The one made riches, and the other made poverty. When he gave women to the righteous (men), they (the women) fled and went to Satan. While Ormazd had held the righteous in ease and enjoyment, Satan also had the women held in enjoyment. When Satan permitted the women to ask for what they wished, Ormazd feared lest they should desire to cohabit with the righteous; and that punishment would thus come upon them (the men). He perceived a remedy, and made God Narsa, a person about five hundred years old, and placed him naked behind Satan, that the women should see him and covet him and ask for him from Satan. They raised their hands and said, 'Our father Satan! give us the God Narsa (as) a gift.'

In another place he says that the earth (was) a young virgin, and betrothed itself to Parisag. And the fire, he says, was endowed with the power of speech (rational), and used to march with Gunrap, the humidity of the trees; and about Parisag he says that sometimes he was a dove, and an ant, and an old dog. And that Kum was a dolphin, or a cock, pecking at the Parisag. Kaikāvus was a mountain ram, striking the firmament with his horns. The earth was a spider threatening to swal-

---

1 This name, as noted by Professor Jackson, recalls the Avestan angel Nairyōsanba, and Narēsp in the Turfan Manichaean Fragments.

2 Somewhat parallel is the myth of the reduction of the Archons in Manichaism.

3 In the Avesta the earth is represented as feminine (Spenta Armaiti). Regarding the names cited in this paragraph, it would be hazardous to explain Parisag as 'Fairy dog'?

4 Query: could one possibly suggest connecting Gunrap with the Avestan monster Gandarwa, whose head touched the mountains, although he himself lives in the waters (upār, Yt. 15.28, cf. Jackson, Grundriss d. iran. Religion, 2.667)? In Pahlavi he is called Gandarp, see the legend in West, SBE 18, 374–376).

5 Regarding the old legend of Kai Kāvus and aerial navigation, see the note by Jackson in an article by Jastrow, JAOS 30. 128–129.
low the heaven. They count as defiling, however, the menses and leprosy, because these were regarded as unclean in the law. He taught (men) to adore the fire. The days of the month he considered as deities. But, according to the testimony of his disciples, this erring man (impostor) was devoured by wolves, because when he wished to flee from them, they blinded him. There are those who say that at first he taught them the right, but when he wanted to depart, they did not let him and blinded him; then he turned and taught them the wrong.

From Zaradusht to the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ are six hundred twenty-eight years and seven months.

In conclusion I may say that this whole selection from Theodore bar Khoni contains a number of points of interest to the student of Zoroastrianism, as indicated also in the footnotes. Among these is the repetition of the probably doubtful story that Zoroaster may have been of Jewish instead of Iranian origin. Of special importance, however, is the statement at the close of the extract, which, like numerous other traditional accounts, places the date of Zoroaster in the 7th century B.C.; this constitutes an additional item to be included with the material assembled by Jackson, Zoroaster, pp. 150–178. It is for this reason that the entire chapter has been presented here in a translation from the original Syriac.

---

* The Avestan Vendidad, together with other sources, fully bears out this statement.
* In the Zoroastrian religion, each day of the month was consecrated to an angel or to Ormazd (see Jackson, Grundriss d. iran. Philologie, 2.641).
* This story seems not to occur elsewhere in the accounts of Zoroaster's death.
BRIEF NOTES

The Expression of the Comparative Degree in Sumerian

The ideas of the ancient Babylonians were of a simple character. They never taxed language to express very complex thoughts. In the texts that have come down to us, therefore, the expression of the comparative degree is rare. None of the Sumerian grammars contains a reference to it. The following instances are, therefore, of interest.

Gudea, Statue I says: (i, 1) ud... (ii, 3) gû-de-a-ša-te-ser šir-pur-la... (iii, 1) े-sira ku-tak kur-gê-la il-la-ni mu-na-ru; i.e. "when Gudea, Patesi of Lagash, E-sirara from the mountain its height had built." This evidently means "he had built it higher than the mountain", which is expressed by the idiom "its height from the mountain". It is the same idiom so well known in Semitic, whereby the comparative is expressed by saying that a thing is "high" or "great" or what not "from" something else.

Again, Gudea, Cylinder A, iii, 19, 20, we have: kur-ata il-la niniki-sù sukka ki-nim-lag-ga-zu iga-su ga-ma-gi: i.e. "Higher than the mountain, unto the city Nina, may the messenger of thy favorable word go before".

The thought is that some lofty angel of the goddess Gatundug, who is being addressed, shall precede him to the city. That the people of Lagash conceived supernatural beings as of enormous size is shown by the description of the gigantic hand of the god Ningirsu in the stele of the Vultures, col. V. A much later parallel is presented in the Christian Gospel according to Peter which, after telling how two angels came from heaven and brought Jesus forth from the tomb, continues: "And the head of the two reached to heaven, but that of him who was led by them overpassed the heaven."

Thureau-Dangin seems to have missed the point of the comparative use of ta. Making the il agree with uru (which he supplies) he translates (Inscriptions de Sumer et d’Akkad, p. 139): "(Vers la ville) qui du monde s’élève, vers la ville Nina," etc. Similarly in Sumerische und Akkadische Königsinschriften, p. 93, he renders: "(Zu der Stadt), welche über der Welt emporragt, zu der Stadt Nina," etc. The idioms which he employs might render the idea of the comparative degree, but do not make it really clear.

243
I mentioned this construction to Dr. Chiera, who afterwards came upon two parallel instances in Ni. 14061, lines 32, 33 (an unpublished tablet), and kindly supplied me with them. They are as follows: "šub uš-sa dirig ku-li-ma-šu, i. e. "a large portion, larger than my friend"; and maš dūg-sa-de udu dirig dūg-sa-ma-šu, i. e. "a kid for my beloved house-mate; a sheep (for me) more than my beloved house-mate."

In these comparisons the postposition employed is šu instead of ta, but the idiom is the same.

These facts naturally raise the question as to whether this idiom is native to Sumerian or is borrowed from Semitic. The employment of an analogous idiom in the Indo-European languages would lead us to think it is also native to Sumerian.1

GEORGE A. BARTON

University of Pennsylvania

A Buddhistic Passage in Manu

The Ten Commandments for all Aryans are given in Manu as enjoining contentment, patience, self-control, not stealing, purity, restraint of organs, devotion, knowledge (of the sacred texts), veracity, and freedom from anger. These rules have been reduced "for all men" to a group of five, "non-injury, veracity, not stealing, purity, and restraint of organs;" or, as suggested by Yājñavalkya, the latter group as universal injunctions may be filled out by "generosity, self-control, sympathy and patience"; but the later authority also has the ten commandments, though in slightly different form, "veracity, not stealing, freedom from anger, modesty, purity, devotion, contentment, self-control, restraint of organs, and knowledge."

These rules show no attempt to arrange the various injunctions in any categories. They are mentioned haphazard, as are the injunctions which make the eight-fold path of duty.

---

1 Since this article went to press Poebel's Sumerische Grammatik, 1923 has come to hand. On page 63 ff. he has noted the comparative use of dirig....šu, but has overlooked that with -ta.

1 Manu, 6. 92 and 10. 63; Yāj. 1. 122 and 3. 60. "Self-control" is mental; "restraint of organs" is physical; but the former when used alone sometimes includes the latter.
as given by Gautama and the Mahābhārata. The Ten Commandments of the Buddhists, however, show a careful arrangement of three sinful bodily acts, followed by four vocal sins, and these by three mental sins: One must not kill, not steal, not be sensual; not lie, not speak harshly, not speak maliciously, not talk foolishly (or boast); not covet (or be avaricious), not get angry (or wish evil or hate), not be heretical. The Fan Wang Chin version substitutes “sell intoxicants” for “speak harshly,” thus breaking the order, as it does in substituting “blaspheme” for “be heretical”; but the original grouping is attested by many native Buddhistic passages. Now in 12. 5f., Manu has this complete Buddhistic arrangement, except that the mental group stands first: “Covetousness, thinking of wrong things, adherence to false doctrine are the three mental sins; abuse, lying, detraction, and idle chatter are the four vocal sins; theft, killing (injury), and adultery are the three bodily sins.” As the groups can scarcely have originated independently, the unique character in Manu must point to it as a loan. I suggested thirty-nine years ago, in my notes to this passage, that it was Buddhistic because of the trividha-dvāra, as had Köppen (Religion des Buddha, p. 445), but since then this formula of thought-word-deed has been found too generally to permit its use as an argument for a loan, which in this instance must rest on the fact that though ten sins are recognized elsewhere in Brahmanic law they are nowhere else grouped in this way, whereas this is the regular grouping in Buddhistic works.

Further systematization in Manu appears in the statement (12.9) that mental, vocal and bodily sins cause, respectively,

---

* Gautama 8. 23: dayā surabhūteṣu kyāntir anātuyā saucam anāyāso maṅgalyaṃ akāryaṇaṃ aprīteṣi; Mbh. 5. 34. 72: anātuyārjanam saucam saṃtoṣaḥ priyavatāci, damab satyaṃ anāyāsah (the last is not “quietism” but earnest endeavor).

* Compare the rules given by the Mahāsudassana (Sutta 1. 16): Do not kill, do not steal, do not be sensual; do not lie, do not drink intoxicants; eat as you have eaten (yathā bhuttam bhujyatha). Here the list begins as usual, but introduces intoxicants as above (with ‘drink’ for ‘sell’). See also Dhammapada, 246 f.

* The Ordinances of Manu, Burnell and Hopkins, 1884.

* In Manu alone, 5. 165; 9. 29; 11. 232; manovākṣāya with deha or mūrti as synonym of kāya.
mental, vocal and bodily punishment, together with the surprising statement that rebirth in human form results only from mental acts, vocal sins being productive of rebirth as a bird or beast, while bodily sins result in rebirth as a tree or vegetable. This same scheme (which contradicts other dicta of Manu) is adopted by Yājñavalkya: antya-pakṣī-sthāvaratām mano-vāk-kāya-karmajāh: doṣaiḥ prayāti jīvo ‘yam bhavam yoniṣateṣu ca. This author also admits the “reward here and in the next world” to be the lot of only some sinners: vipākāḥ karmaṇām pretya keśāmacid iha jāyate: iha ca 'mutra vai keśāḥ, bhāvas tatra prayojanam. The two passages (3. 131 and 133) may be translated thus: “Through faults arising from mental, vocal, or bodily acts the vital soul in hundreds of births comes, respectively, into the existence of a low-caste man, a bird, and a plant. In some individuals the fruit of acts is produced after death; in some, here on earth; in some, both here and in the next world; this depends on the nature” (of the acts, that is, how bad they are). This last also is Buddhistic. Compare Dhamma-pada 126: “Some people are reborn; sinners go to hell; the righteous go to heaven; those free of desire go to Nibbāna”.

As a pendant to this Buddhistic passage in Manu, I may add that Yāna seems to be used in the Buddhistic sense in Mbh. 12. 279 (278). 21, Mokṣa-yānam idam kṛtstam, a vehicle of salvation attributed to Hārīta describing the life of a Parivražaka (ib. 18). The section fuses certain verses of Manu (6. 41, 47, 48) and emphasizes the virtues of meekness and friendliness, but it lacks a specifically Buddhistic character. The ordinary epic figure is the Vedic “Ship of Salvation” and mārga rather than yāna is used for “way of salvation.” In this passage yāna might be taken in either sense, as way or vehicle.

E. Washburn Hopkins

Yale University

* Compare the common epic remark that the fruit of an act ripens in the age corresponding to that in which it is performed, whether the act be good or bad, the ages being divided into childhood, youth and old age. Mbh. 12. 181. 15: 323. 14: 13. 7. 4.
An Arabic papyrus of the 8th century.

In the Encyclopaedia of Islam, vol. 1, plate 11 of the article on Arabia, there is a reproduction of an Arabic papyrus, which is described as dating from the conquest of Egypt, c. 24 A. H. The actual date appears to be more than a century later. The purport of the document, which is readily legible though not complete, is that one Yazid ibn 'Abdallah, connected with the Kūrah of Akhmim and Ṭaḥtā, assembled the principal men of the town of Akhmim and enquired of them concerning a certain 'Amr ibn El'Abbās and his clerks and officers, and they testified that neither 'Amr ibn El 'Abbās nor his clerks and officers had treated them unjustly, and that they had caused the document to be written as a quittance for him, Yazid ibn 'Abdallah, and for 'Amr ibn El'Abbās and his clerks. The text describes the document as a ṭāmār.

Yazid ibn 'Abdallah ibn Billāh, who became qādi of Egypt in 140 A.H., had previously been wāli or governor of Akhmim and was summoned from there to Fustāṭ to take up the appoint-ment of Qādi (Kindl p. 359). There seems to be no doubt that this Yazid ibn 'Abdallah must be the individual named in the papyrus, which can therefore be taken to date from near 140 A. H.

One may imagine that sufferers from official oppression are not likely to have got much satisfaction from the way in which their complaints appear to have been dealt with. Besides the illustration of Arab methods of administration which the text affords, there are two or three other points about it that seem worthy of remark.

Several persons are mentioned as witnesses. One of them has the name Ibn Hurmuz, clearly indicating Persian parentage. This individual is not likely to have come to Egypt at the time of the Abbasid invasion a few years before the date of the papyrus, for his tribal nisbah connects him with Wā'il, a branch of the tribe of Jūdām associated with Egypt from the time of the Arab conquest. The incorporation of a Persian in one of the Arab tribes of Egypt during the Umayyad reign seems to be pointed to. The fact can be added to the slender stock of signs of relations between Persia and Egypt at that period. Eight names in the document have tribal nisbahs, referring to
six different tribes, only two of the tribes being represented by more than one individual apiece. All the persons may be presumed to have been residents of Akhmim. The inference is that the Arab tribes were already considerably dispersed in that place.

The omission of alif in the spelling of several of the names is a noticeable feature. Ṭaḥṭā is spelt with an h instead of the usual ṣ.

Transcription of the text, in modern spelling.

London, England

Rhuvon Guest
REVIEWS OF BOOKS


This brochure forms Heft IV of a series of "Staatswissenschaftliche Beiträge" published under the general title of "Pflenge", now spelled "Plenge". Its author is a woman who does not read the cuneiform. She has based her work on translations of texts published by H. de Genouillac, Allotte de la Fuÿe, Nikolski, Thureau-Dangin, Miss Hussey, Förtsch, Pinches, and Langdon. Her manuscript was, however, read and approved by Professor Deimal of Rome, so that the work comes with a degree of authority. Here and there her work might be improved by taking into account later translations of her sources, but it is nevertheless a very helpful and useful piece of work.

The topics treated are as follows: I. The foundations of Sumerian economy, under which the land of Sumer and the Sumerian state are described and a sketch of the history of Lagash is given. This sketch is confined to Lagash because the documents which furnish the basis of this economic study came almost exclusively from that city. II. The general economic system of the Sumerians is described—the economic organization of the temple, the economic arrangements of the Patesi, and examples of private economic arrangements. III. The greater portion of the brochure is then devoted to the economic organization of the temple. Under this head the following topics are treated: the organization of temple-economy, the canal and building administration, the temple revenues from fields and cattle-breeding, the expenses of land-management, revenues from fisheries, from land rents and land taxes, from sales of produce. Then revenues from external sources are described. The discussion of these is preceded by a section devoted to money, prices, and interest. Transportation, stores and the management of stores, and the manufacture of reed-products are next discussed.
Then comes a treatment of temple-expenses for carrying on the cult, for festivals, and for rations for the various attendants. The section concludes with a discussion of the relation of the temples to one another. A few concluding pages are then devoted to "history and outlook". The facts which the author has gathered point to the conclusion that originally the temple-lands were the common lands of a tribe which were held in the name of the god, that during the time of the Urnina dynasty they were still to a considerable degree common lands, though by the time of Gudea they had largely ceased to be such and that certain of these lands were assigned to the use of the Patesi by virtue of his office as chief priest and ruler. Even in the period of the dynasty of Urnina private property in land was already known. The gods were thought of as gigantic men or half-men.

This useful little work concludes with tables of Sumerian measures, lists of the names of occupations, amounts of forced labor for canal building recorded in the tablets of the period, lists of divided fields mentioned in the tablets, lists of prices quoted in money, of monthly rations of barley assigned to slaves of the temple of Bau, of similar rations assigned to free attendants of the temple, of quantities of wool assigned to temple attendants, and of festal gifts from temple attendants of the temple of Bau.

The little book is an excellent compendium of the economic material contained in the archives of the earliest period of the history of Lagash.

GEORGE A. BARTON

University of Pennsylvania


This book, like At One with the Invisible, also edited by Professor Sneath, is made up of addresses by distinguished scholars which were delivered, at Professor Sneath’s request, before his seminary during the academic year 1920-21. The scholars who took part in the discussion embodied in the present volume
were each particularly eminent in his field, so that the bringing together of these addresses has produced a volume of peculiar value and authority. The idea of a future life among primitive tribes is treated by Professor Franz Boas of Columbia; ancient Egyptian ideas of the hereafter, by Professor Breasted; immortality in India, by Professor Hopkins; immortality among the Babylonians and Assyrians by Professor Jastrow, whose untimely death we still mourn; the ancient Persian doctrine of a future life, by Professor Jackson; immortality in the Hebrew religion, by Professor L. B. Paton; immortality in the Greek religion, by Dr. Arthur Fairbanks, of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts; immortality in the Synoptic Gospels, by Professor Bacon; Paul’s belief in life after death, by Professor Porter; immortality in the Fourth Gospel, by Professor Bacon; immortality in Mohammedanism, by Professor D. B. Macdonald; and the question of the reality of life after death, by Professor Sneath himself.

The whole makes a noteworthy contribution and brings together in readable form the best that is known on the subject. It would seem that these eminent scholars had vied with one another to give of their best, and to write with directness. Each address is a choice monograph on the topic handled. Only in Professor Bacon’s papers does one get the impression that the author is intent on proving a thesis rather than on stating facts. The fresh material from Jewish sources which Bacon has brought into comparison nevertheless challenges the attention of every student. In bringing these papers together the editor has rendered the history of religion a real service.

GEORGE A. BARTON

University of Pennsylvania


It would be difficult to collect within the space of ten pages a larger amount of misinformation and misunderstanding than are compressed into the ten pages of this brochure, reprinted from the Asiatic Review of April, 1922. The theses advocated are: 1. That the Hebrew name “Shinar” was derived from an old ideographic form of the name of Babylon, TIN-TIR₂, by re-
solving the second of the two signs into its component parts ŠE-NIR. 2. That the Tower of Babel is shown by this view of its origin to have been about 3000 B.C. a great state granary for storing corn. 3. That another old name for Babylon which has been read KA-DINGIR-RA should be read KA-AŠ-RA. 4. That the Hebrew kasdim (Chaldeans) is a corruption of this KA-AŠ-RA. Every one of these points rests on wrong assumptions. Not one of them is supported by the facts. We will take them in order.

1. The sign TIR pictured a forest. It consists of two trees with interlocking branches (see Barton, Babylonian Writing, No. 329). It was only in later conventionalized writing that it seemed to resemble ŠE-NIR. Even then, to read it as ŠE-NIR was to ignore the sign TIN which preceded it—a sign which originally pictured a leaf. If any inference can be drawn from the name TIN-TIR as to the original meaning of the name of Babylon it would signify "leafy forest". Moreover, had the sign TIN been read ŠE-NIR, it would have become in Hebrew Sinar not Shinar in accordance with a well known phonetic law. Further, it has long been known that the Hebrew Shinar is the Babylonian SU-MER. This was derived, apparently, from the city name GIR-SU spelled backwards, as often in the earliest inscriptions. SU-GIR, corrupted in Babylonian spelling to SU-MER, retained in pronunciation enough of a nasal g sound, so that it was represented in Semitic by the letter ghain, which the Hebrews graphically combined with 'ayin. Then by dissimilation of the nasal quality an n was inserted in Hebrew spelling. Such an origin satisfies all the conditions, historical and phonetic, while Dr. Waddell's does not.

2. With the misreading of TIN as ŠE-NIR, corrected, all ground for the belief that the tower of Babel was a state granary disappears. The description of Herodotus (I, 181) of the Ziggurat of Babylon makes it clear that it was an eight-staged ziggurat, similar to those adjoining every Babylonian temple, only higher.

3. KA-AŠ-RA is a reading for which there is no authority, and is in itself impossible. The RA is a phonetic complement, showing that we are to read the preceding sign as a word ending in R, i.e. as DINGIR.
4. The Hebrew word *kasdim* is, as scholars have long recognized, the *Kaldū* of the Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions. Waddell seems never to have heard of the phonetic law whereby in Akkadian and Assyrian a sibilant before a dental becomes *l*. The *Kaldū* (Chaldeans) appeared in southern Babylonia about 1000 B.C. and 400 years later established the Neo-Babylonian or Chaldaean empire. Of course the Hebrews would mention them. It is superfluous to seek another origin for the name.

This brochure illustrates the fact that Assyriology has many pitfalls, and that he who would, by means of it, make contributions to knowledge should study phonetics and history as well as the syllabary.

GEORGE A. BARTON

University of Pennsylvania

*Coins and Chronology of the Early Independent Sultans of Bengal;*


As the title partly indicates, the present treatise covers the coinage of the Sultans of Bengal for a period of one hundred years, taking in only the coins of the House of Ilyias and of the line of Raja Ganesh, a period from 1339 to 1431 of our era.

The inspiration of this work was the find of 346 coins at Dacca in 1918. Mr. Bhattacharji has produced a very painstaking work on the coins of this period. He has made a special effort to decipher the dates, and he has been able to prove through accumulated material now at hand that many coins previously published have been misread. One who is familiar with the coinage realizes that, on account of the poorly and faultily written dates, incorrect reading is not surprising. Besides, many coins have been badly mutilated by Schröffs, so that in many instances the inscription has been more or less obliterated. The author brings out the fact that both Edward Thomas and Blochmann, important as their works are, have fallen into frequent errors as regards the dates. Since these books were written, many Bengalese coins have come to light, and the Shillong and Calcutta Cabinets have published this series.

The history of the Bengal kings is very scanty, and the coins themselves must supply some of the gaps. The whole book
shows a most careful examination of all historical data and published accounts of coins.

Mr. Bhattasali has very ably proved from the coins in this find that the Sultan Beyazid Shah actually existed—a fact that had been previously only suspected. A more important discovery was five coins in the find bearing the name of Alauddin Firoz Shah, the son of Beyazid Shah. This ruler was hitherto unknown. The author also ascribes the coins of Danujamardana Deva to Raja Ganesh.

The whole is a very careful and scholarly work on the period which it covers.

HOWLAND WOOD

American Numismatic Society, New York

MINOR NOTICES

Die Lehre der Upanishaden und die Anfänge des Buddhismus.

That a second edition should be needed of this work only eight years after the appearance of the first edition is a signal tribute to its importance. It is the more to be deplored that its brilliant author was not spared to see the new issue of his work, and perhaps to revise some parts of it. The book is too well known to need description. It will remain for many years to come an indispensable handbook for the study of early Hindu philosophic and religious thought.


A Polish translation of this rather interesting minor work (in 67 stanzas—or, in other versions, 68) attributed to Śankara. The text, which is printed verse by verse along with the translation, is based wholly on that of Jibānanda Vidyāsāgara (Calcutta, 1897); it might have been improved at times by consulting other editions or manuscripts (e. g., verse 15b, read yuktyavaghānatah for yuktyānadāhānatah). Failure to note the allegorical allusion to the story of the Rāmāyaṇa in verse 49
spoils the rendering of that verse. But in general the translation seems competent, and will answer the purpose of making some of the main Vedānta ideas accessible in handy and popular form to those who are dependent on the Polish language for such information.


An exposition of the Sātvata religion (a devotional form of Vishnuism) and its historic background, by an enlightened adherent of that sect. The author is steeped in the ancient lore of Hinduism. His attitude is devout and essentially mystical; occasionally it may seem slightly naive to westerners; but generally speaking it is by no means lacking in intelligence, nor yet in critical power and acumen. Many of his observations are very suggestive, and for the most part he avoids the danger of reading too modern ideas into his texts. The book is analogous to what we might find in a historical study of Christianity by a western professor of philosophy who is at the same time an earnest Christian. It is interesting as a sample of what can be done to present a Hindu religious system in a form adapted to modern times, without sacrificing essential historic truth. It contains much that should interest professional students of Hinduism. To laymen it can be recommended only with reserve; tho intelligently apologetic, it is still apologetic.


This initial volume of a projected series contains 10 short extracts from the Younger Avesta, together with the three most important prayers. Facing the text (which is that of Geldner with minor modifications) is given a word-for-word English rendering, superior figures being used to identify the respective words translated. The notes are full and helpful. The author’s viewpoint is philological and unprejudiced, but some of his interpretations must be regarded as doubtful.  G. C. O. H.

This volume, which has been printed only in a small edition for private distribution, gives a succinct account of the life and work of the distinguished Parsi scholar and reformer. His efforts to introduce sound philological study of the Avestan and Pahlavi texts are related in Chapter III. A list of his writings is appended.

G. C. O. H.


Seven miscellaneous essays, only two of which (on caste and social organization) belong to the subject suggested by the title. The contents will hardly prove interesting or useful to western readers.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

The Middle West Branch of the Society will hold its next annual meeting on March, 28-29, 1924, at Ann Arbor, Michigan, as guests of the University of Michigan.
THE SÄLIBHADRA CARITA
A STORY OF CONVERSION TO JAINA MONKHOOD
MAURICE BLOOMFIELD
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

The Śālibhadra Carita was composed originally by Dharma-
kumāra in Vikramasāmyvat 1334 (1277 A.D.). According to
the Praśasti, 7. 150 ff., his spiritual descent is from the sect
(vānśa or gacha) of Nāgendra, thru Hemaprabha, Dharmanghoṣa,
Somaprabha, and Vibudhaprabha. Tho his work is said to be
the śrīśālilīkāthā, it was apparently not polished enough to
suit the taste of the time, and was, therefore, worked over in
the highest style of kavya by Pradyumnasūri (Pradyumnācārya),
as is stated in 7. 153:

iyam kathā vyuddhakumārikeva sadūṣaṇā bhūṣaṇavarjitaṁ
der just, kathā vyuddhakumārikeva sadūṣaṇā bhūṣaṇavarjitaṁ
prasādād babhūva pāṇigrahaṇasya
ded at the beginning of their publication of our text, give

A list of publications of the very active Yaśovijaya Jaina Granthamālā
(published under the care of His Holiness Shastra Visharad Jainacharya,
whose recent death is a great blow to Jainism and Jaina scholarship) is
appealed to the present text of the Śālibhadra Carita. Under nr. 15, the
text is announced as follows: Śrīśālibhadracaritam śīppaṇasahitatām śrī-
dharmakumārasudhīyā viracitam, apūrvo 'yama kathāgrantho mahākāvyasab-
dapratipāḍyāḥ. A recent leaflet issued as a sūcīpatra of the Śrīyaśovijaya
Jaina Granthamālā lists over 100 publications in Sanskrit, Hindi, Marāṭhī,
Gujarātī, and English.
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a list of texts which thus enjoyed Pradyumna’s favor (prasāda).
In addition to our Carita they are as follows:
The Mallinātha Mahākāvyā (Caritra) by Vinayacandrasūri
The Prabhāvaka Caritra by Prabhācandrasūri
The Upamitibhavaprappanācakathāsāroddhāra by Deven-
drasūri
The Kuvalayamālā Kathā by Ratnaprabhasūri
The Upadeśakandaliṭkā by Bālacandrasūri
The Vivekamānjariṭkā by Bālacandrasūri
The Samarādityasaṃkṣepa by Pradyumnācarya
The Śreyāṇsanātha Caritra by Mānatunga.
This list is rather longer than that mentioned by Jacobi, l. c.

The editors in the Preface cite the following stanza concerning
Pradyumna; it seems to be composed by themselves, in imitation
of the fourth stanza of Pradyumna’s Prāsasti in the Samarāditya-
saṃkṣepa (p. 415), to wit:
śiśyaḥ śrikanakaprabhasa sukaviḥ śribālacandrānujo
jyāyān śrijayasiṅhataḥ pratibhayā śrivastupālastutaḥ,
asmadgotramahattaraḥ kaviguruḥ pradyumnasūriprabhur
vidvadvandakavitvaśodhanadhanogradhanamudāsodhayat.

According to another stanza (7. 154) in the Prāsasti of Śāli-
bhadra the present work was written down at the first inspection
(prathamādarṣe) by the Gaṅin Prabhāvacandra, the author of
the Prabhāvaka Caritra.
The work is published for the first time (apūrva) as Nr. 15
of the series Yaśovijayagranthamālā, by Shah Harakhchand
Bhurabai, Benares, Virasanāvit 2436 (A. D. 1910). The text
is divided into seven Prakramas (sometimes, irregularly, called
Prastāvas), totalling 1171 stanzas. It is, on the whole, well
edited; the list of errata (śodhanapatram) is supplemented at
the end of this essay.

The scene of this story is Rājagrha, where rules King Śreniṅka
with his queen Cellaṅa and his son and minister Abhayakumāra.
It is an account of the conversion and salvation of the youthful
son of a merchant prince, Śālibhadra, or, for short, Śāli. His
father’s name is Gobhadra; his mother’s Bhadrā; his sister’s,
Subhadrā. The latter is married to a merchant Dhanya.
Gobhadra, tired of earthly futilities, turns ascetic, dies, and is

* Hence Śāli is also known by the patronymic Gāubhadra.
reborn as a glorious god in the Sāudharma heaven. There, remembering his former birth, he puts himself in touch with his son, and confers upon him wealth and earthly glory, so that Śāli lives in his palace, together with his thirty-two wives, in a state of bliss superior to that of the gods.

Certain merchants from a distance offer to King Śrenika some magic shawls for so high a price that the king ironically refuses to buy them. They then wait upon Bhadrā, Śāli’s mother, who buys the shawls at their full price and presents them to her daughters-in-law. Queen Cellanā hears of this, chides the king, and bids him get the shawls by fair means or foul. The king sends his doorkeeper to get the shawls from Bhadrā, but she is unable to deliver the goods which she no longer owns. The doorkeeper reports this, and also that Śāli is living in more than royal pomp. Śrenika decides to see for himself, and when Śāli beholds him in all his glory, he is seized by the conviction that all existence is worthless, where the highest ruler is a mere living creature, with feet and hands, like himself.

This is pratyekabodhi, as Śāli himself recognizes triumphantly in what is the climax of the story. He compares his enlightenment, to his own advantage, with that of the four classical Pratyekabuddhas, famous both among Buddhists and Jainas. Whereas they were enlightened by the perishable nature of mean or trivial things, Śāli has recognized the futility of life even tho veiled by the splendor of a king in all his glory.

Śāli resorts to the Gāpin Dharmaghoṣa, by whom he is instructed in the higher religion. Urged on by his growing aversion to the world (vārāgya) he abandons each day one of his thirty-two wives, so that it would take him thirty-two days to dispose of the lot. This comes to the notice of Dhanya, husband of Subhadrā, Śāli’s sister, who is seized by the spirit of the occasion, and exclaims that such shilly-shallying does not ferry one across the sea of desire. In proper course first Dhanya and then Śāli place themselves at the feet of the Holy Lord Vira; go out as homeless ascetics; return after long wanderings as emaciated monks to Rājagṛha; are not recognized by their mother Bhadrā, but receive their pāraṇa food from Dhanyā, Śāli’s mother in his former birth as a shepherd boy, named Sāṃgama (see below). They finally die of fast under a tree (pādāpopagama)
on the Vāibhāra mountain, and are reborn as gods in the Heaven called Sarvārthasiddha.

Śāli's glorious destiny is motivated by the story of his previous birth in which he performs the self-abnegating act of giving alms to a monk who has come to break his fast (pāraṇa). This is told in the first introductory book of the Carita, and not, as is the usual practice, by an omniscient Kevalin who appears at the proper moment at the end of the story, and explains the fortunes of the hero as due to his conduct in a previous birth. Śāli's prenatal predecessor is a shepherd boy, named Saṅgama, son of a poor widowed mother, named Dhanyā. On a certain festal day, when everybody is feasting, she obtains, thru contributions from charitable neighbors, materials for a luscious meal for her boy, also anxious for a feast. Just as he is starting to eat, a Muni who is about to break a month's fast comes along; Saṅgama presents him with his food; and the Muni eats and blesses him. After his death Saṅgama is reborn as Śālibhadra.

The text presents itself under the caption of a dānadharmakathā (1.1); more precisely as a dānāvadāna (2.1). In the Jaina system (see our text 3.49; 5.82) four dāna figures as one of the four prescripts for the life of a householder (grhīdharmā), namely, dāna, 'giving'; śīla, 'personal virtue'; tapas, 'asceticism'; and bhāva or bhāvanā, 'meditation'. The dāna, in turn, figures under the three heads of jñānadāna, 'confering knowledge'; abhayadāna, 'confering security'; and annadāna, 'giving food'. With amazing insistence Jaina texts dwell upon annadāna, especially when it takes the form of breaking the fast of an ascetic (pāraṇa). Our text is presumably the most elaborate and poetic exposition of the glory that ensues upon this last form of generosity. There is, however, scarcely a longer Jaina chronicle.

---

1 Glossed, avadānam atyadbhutaṁ karma. The word avadāna is certainly not ordinary in Jaina literature, but is commonly employed in Sanskrit Buddhist literature (Divyāvadāna, Avadānasūrī, etc.) to designate, with tiresome iteration, stories in which the karma accumulated in a certain existence bears fruit, good or evil, in a subsequent life. The word (7.94) vāsi-candana-kalpa, 'ascetic' to whom the (burning) sword and (cooling) sandal are all the same', as I have shown in JAOS 40.339 ff. (see below, p. 306), is another of the many technical specialities that connect, in this sfera, Jaina and Buddhist conceptions. So also the four Pratyekabuddhas (p. 275).

2 Cf. my 'Life of Pārśvanātha', p. 119 note.
which does not contain some account of, or allusion to, the merit of feeding a Yati. In the present text this virtue, displayed in a former birth, leads Śālibhadra on to the attainment of the true ideal of Jainism, the destruction of all karma (kṣīṇa-karma), thru the rigors of asceticism that disregards all suffering, and, finally, death from starvation in a holy spot.

The story is told very briefly and without the least ornateness in Trīṣaṭṭiśalākāpuruṣa Caritra, Parvan X = Mahāvira Caritra 10.57ff. Much later the fertile writer Jinakīrti (about 1438 A.D.) is the author of a Dhanyasāalicaritra, which, doubtless, deals with our theme; see Weber, Sanskrit- und Prākrit-Handschriften, vol. ii, p. 1109, note 4; C. M. Duff, The Chronology of India, pp. 254 ff. Guerinot, Essai de Bibliographie Jaina, no. 402 (p. 199), registers a Jaina Gujarāti tale, entitled Śālibhadra Śāhno Rās (published in Bombay, 1889).

In a tangled form, the events of our Carita are retold in Kathākośa, pp. 78 ff. of Tawney's Translation, and, partly, in the Āvaśyaka Tales; see Leumann, as reported by Tawney, ib. p. 238. In Kathākośa the name of the hero is Dhanya, both in the pre-birth and in the present-day stories. In the Āvaśyaka tale the pre-birth story is told with Dhanya as its hero. The same rebirth story occurs also as the story of Sthāvara and his mother, at the end of Jñānasāgara's story of Ratnacūḍa; see Hertel, Indische Erzähler, vol. vii, pp. 165 ff. (Leipzig, 1922).

Otherwise also the worthies of the story, Gobhadra, Bhadrā, Śālibhadra, and Dhanya, have a certain standing in Jaina tradition. Anent Gobhadra a gloss at Śālibhadra Carita 3. 71 quotes the following Prākrit śloka:

jena kayam sāmanmāṁ chammāse jñānasāmjamaraeṇa,
tam munim udāraκīttīṁ gobhaddarāṁ śiṁ namassāṁ.

'I revere that Rishi Gobhadra, the Muni of exalted reputation, who, devoted to contemplation and restraint, performed asceticism for a period of six months.'

'Rich as Śālibhadra', is a Jaina way of saying, 'Rich as Croesus'; see Hemavijaya's Kathāratnākara, story 3. Very definite is the allusion in Sūhāsanadvātriṇākā (Weber, Indische Studien, 15. 291) to our Śālibhadra as 'the son of the merchant-princess Bhadrā, who enjoyed the youthful aroma of his thirty-two wives.' Identical with our Dhanya is, probably, that Dhanya who along
with his two wives is converted to the Jaina faith in Caritrasundara's Mahipāla Carita; see Hertel, 'Jinakirti's Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla,' BKSGW, 1917, p. 19. A faint echo of our story is the mention of the farmer Bhadra in Śaligrāma, most generous to the poor (dīnānāparāyaṇaḥ), in Mallinātha Caritra 2.342. Śāli and the events of his life have, presumably, a historical kernel.

The text, in its final form, is written in the highest style of mahākāvyā, governed by the extremest habits of Hindu rhetoric (āraṇīkāra). To a Western reader its style, turgid, allusive, full of puns, alliterations, and double ententes, seems artificial or eufuistic. Aside from familiar devices, such as kalā in the double sense of 'accomplishment' and 'fase of the moon' (5.75), or the equally standard puns on guṇa and vaṇa (1.16; 5.54), the text goes far in the direction of independent tours-de-force. In 1.31 dehe occurs in three different meanings: (sam-)dehe, 'doubt'; dehe, 'burnt'; and dehe, 'in the body'. In 2.13 the word vaṣā occurs in vaśāsthūlaḥ (sc. gāvaḥ), 'sleek with fat'; suvaṣāḥ, 'good kine'; vaśāḥ (glossed, vaśyāḥ), 'subjected to'; and vaśādoṣadūṣitāḥ (glossed, vandhyādoṣadūṣitāḥ) 'free from the blemish of sterility'. In 2.77 repur means once 'dust', and once 'they jingled' (gloss, śabdāṃ cakrūḥ). In 3.51 the two syllables mātrā occur thrice, in the senses of 'with mother', 'measure', and 'not hither'. Yet more artificially, 3.6, mudvahe nyasya tadbhāram udvahē vratam udvahē, 'having unloaded the burden of that upon my joy-bestowing son, I shall take upon myself the holy vow', where the syllables mudvahe occur in three different senses.

Examples of double meaning (śleṣa) of one and the same syllables (indicated by the word pakṣe in the gloss) are 1.15, bahu-dānayo-pakhārika=bahudā+anyo, 'in many ways benefiting others', or bahu-dānya+upakhārika, 'benefiting with much grain', said of a village. In 1.22 kulina means 'of good family', and 'clinging to the earth' (ku-lina); aviparīṭa, 'traveled by birds' (avi-parīṭa) and 'not perverse' (a-viparīṭa); vipattra, 'protecting against misfortune' (vipat-tra) and 'wingless' (vi-pattra). Not infrequently precise phonetics are disregarded. Thus in 5.44 bindu means 'drop' and 'knowing' (vindu); in 5.150 sāradina, 'autumnal', alliterates with sāradināta, 'essential pusillanimity'; in 7.122 mahāsamarasamrāmbhe is either mahāsama-saṁrāmbhe
in great conflict', or mahā-śama-rasāni rambhe 'essence of great asceticism, O Rambha'. There is scarcely a stanza in the entire poem free from such rhetorical devices, some of which are pretty certain to occur in other texts of this class.

The following digest (uddhāra) of this Carita is made with reference to the events of the story and the skilful depiction of the characters in it, rather than the somewhat eufuistic diction which suits native, rather than Western, literary habits.

DIGEST OF THE STORY OF ŚĀLIBHADRA

First Prakrama: The Story of Saṅgama, the pious shepherd boy (pre-birth of Śālibhada).

Introductory stanzas extol the wish-tree (kalpadru) of the virtue of almsgiving (dānadharmā), one of the stated items of Jain religion; invoke the protection of Nābheya (=Ṛṣabha), the first Arhat, famous for his liberality; of Vīra, the last Arhat, the tree of whose wisdom, rooted in his great liberality during his first birth, has not been uprooted by the mighty elefant False Doctrine; and, finally, of gāur devī sarasvati. The favor of the spiritual ancestors of the author Dharmakumāra, namely the Śrisomaprabhasūrayaḥ, is next bespoken, 'at the touch of whose hands (rays) there is an outburst of taste (water) from me who am a stone'; strength is asked for the redactor (śuddhakrt) Śripadavyūma, pupil of Śrikanaprabha, himself pupil of Śridevānanda; and, lastly, praise is bespoken from the Śrimadudayaprabhasūrayaḥ. The Story of ŚriŚālibhada is then announced.

The first chapter (prakrama) contains an account of Śālibha-

---

2 ādānu dhanabhava yena ghratameghāyitam.
3 Meaning here, vāk sarasvati, 'the goddess of speech'.
4 The moonstone, touched by the rays of the moon, yields water.
5 The jejune work of the original author, Dharmakumāra, was adorned, i.e. turned into Kāvya poetry, by Pradyumna; see 7.153, 156, and the stanza at the bottom of p. 1 of the Sanskrit introduction to the text.
6 Udayaprabhasūri (about 1230 A.D.) is the author of Dharmanābhyyudaya Mahākāvya, or Samghapati Carita; see Guerinot, Essai de Bibliographie Jaina, pp. 79, 398.
dra’s existence in a former birth as the saintly youth Saṅgama. The scene is laid in the lovely and prosperous village of Śāli-grāma in the country of Magadha. The curtain rises upon the poor and virtuous widow Dhanyā, who is bringing up her beautiful orphan boy, Saṅgama. He does not even know the name of his father. By hard chores, such as scrubbing and pounding grain in rich men’s houses, she supports her son and herself. At eight years of age Saṅgama becomes a shepherd. By contemplating the Sun (or the Arhat), he is led to abandon the tyranny of his senses, and becomes enlightened. In the manner of a Sādhu, with staff and piece of cloth as a garment, his belly his only provision on the way, he herds his calves in the woods outside the village, and passes his time in devotion to the (eight) Mothers (37).

It happens that Saṅgama, accustomed to rough food, notices on a certain festival day, that delicacies are being consumed in every house but his own. As tho he were the son of a rich man, not sensing the proprieties of the situation, he asks his mother, politely to be sure, to prepare for him at once a pudding with sugar and milk. Dhanyā, realizing that Saṅgama can not have evil inclinations, promises to supply him with a feast, but she finds that she has not the means. She bewails her low estate of woman and widow, and complains to her father and mother (both dead) that she whose name is Dhanyā, ‘Wealthy’, is unable to provide her only son even a single feast (51).

The women of the neighborhood, disposed to be friendly, ask the cause of her grief. Dhanyā avows that she is not grieving for herself, but for her son whose desire, she says with self-persiflage, she is unable to gratify. ‘To-day my son, as charioteer, ignorantly hitched me, an old cow, to the chariot of his desire.’

She then tells them what she needs, and the women, severally, send her the ingredients for a feast, rejoicing the heart of Dhanyā

---

11 In a gloss at 1.35 he is called Saṅgamakā; also later in the text itself, 2.48.
12 jaganmitrāvalokena, glossed, sūryo ‘rahā ca.
13 kukṣiśambali: may perhaps mean, ‘all his provision being in his belly’.
14 mātrabhaktibhāk, glossed. aṣṭāu mātaraḥ; cf. 5.65. The ‘Mothers’ are doubtless intended in Prabandhacintāmanī, p. 182.
15 manoratharathe ‘dyā mām avenanab sutab sūtaḥ sarhyuyoja jard-gavim.
(73). Saṅgama leaves his calves in the forest, bathes, and returns home. Dhanyā gladly serves him the pudding she has prepared, and then goes away in superstitious dread of looking on him with delight\(^*\) (82). Along comes, like a wish-jewel, or the heavenly wish-tree, a great ascetic (yati) who is about to break a month’s feast. His brilliant presence in so humble a village suggests striking phenomena of nature and mythological events, such as Indra’s elephant coming down to earth, or the Gaṅgā flowing in the jungle, or the paradise-tree growing in the desert.\(^*\) Saṅgama realizes his opportunity, and determines to make the occasion redound to his spiritual advantage. With the hair of his body bristling with joy, he addresses the Muni in words of ecstatic praise of the latter’s virtues and beneficent power. In a state of supreme love (bhakti) he hands him his own dish (109). The Yati, weak from fast, comes to himself, accepts the food, blesses Saṅgama, and returns to his abode (111). Mother Dhanyā, returning from another house, not knowing what had happened in between, sets other food before him. This he eats, rinses his mouth, and, as tho he had reached the glory of a king, enters into a state of bliss (116).

The rest of the chapter (prakrama) does not really advance the story. Sts. 117–135 are devoted to praise of the virtue of alms-giving (dānaśīla), reinforced by sundry historical or legendary allusions to former dānas, placed by the side of Saṅgama’s act. In these figure the Savior Śreyāṇa, grandson of Nābheya (Rṣabha); the Princess Candanā\(^\#\) who gratified

---

\(^*\) samtosadṛśghhayat; comm. draśilaganabhayat; see Appendix iii.
\(^\#\) A quaint story, Mallinātha Caritra 7.1023 ff., tells how Candanā gave the Lord Vīra his pāraṇa, to wit: King Śatānīka attacks King Dadhīvāhana of Campā, who flees afoot, abandoning his queen Dhārīṇī and her lovely daughter Vasumati. Śatānīka makes Dhārīṇī his chief queen, but decides to sell her daughter as a slave, in open market. As Vasumati stands there, grass on her head as a sign of slavehood, a rich merchant, Dhanavāha, noting her grace and nobility, asks what is her descent and name, but she remains silent, too proud to make an appeal. Dhanavāha takes her home to his wife Mālā, and she lives with the pair as a cherished daughter, under the name of Candanā.

She, nevertheless, incurs the jealousy of her foster-mother Mālā. Once,
Lord Vira**, and the notorious Mūladeva, who has been canonized, as it were, by the Jains, as, perhaps, the most imposing example of the virtue of dāna (130)**. The text continues with reflections on Saṅgama's great act, which is sure to redound to his advantage at rebirth, even if the gods did not shower this world's goods upon him in his present existence (133)**. Unsuspected of spiritual greatness, of humble family, disregarded by illusion (Māra),

there being no slave available, Candāṇā washes the feet of Dhanavāha; during this act of filial regard her beautiful braid falls to the dusty earth: Dhanavāha lifts it up with his staff: Mūlā is confirmed in her jealousy, and decides to cut her off at the root like a poisonous creeper. When her husband goes to his business, she gets a barber to shave off Candāṇā's hair; beats her; chains her with strong fetters; and throws her into the cellar of the house. She threatens her servants: any one who tells will become a sacrifice in the fire of her anger. In the evening Dhanavāha returns and asks where his daughter is. All are silent, but an old maid-servant, thinking pitifully that her days are short, and that Candāṇā will perish from grief, points to the corner where Candāṇā is confined. He breaks open its door and sees Candāṇā starved, wilted, fettered like a she-elephant, bald as a nun. He goes to the kitchen but finds there no food, only a little coarse rice collected in the corner of a winnowing-basket. He tells her to eat that, until he returns with a blacksmith to cut her fetters.

Candāṇā stands there, reflecting that it would be better to give this coarse food to a guest, rather than that she, a princess, should eat it. It happens that the Holy Mahāvira is wandering about the city for alms. Candāṇā, fettered, winnowing-basket in hand, manages to place one foot outside the threshold of the house while the other remains inside. In deep piety she offers the rice to Vira, who, recognizing her purpose, stretches out his hand to receive it.

The gods come to the spot and acclaim her generous gift. They break her fetters like a rotten rope. Her pretty braid is again upon her head, and she appears dressed as a princess. All-knowing wisdom (kevalajñāna) comes to Candāṇā; she turns nun; in due time she will reach nirvāṇa.

In Mahāvira's biography, Kalpasūtra 5.135, Candāṇā appears at the head of 36,100 mns in Mahāvira's following. — Other cases of blissful dānas are cited in my 'Life of Pārśvanātha', p. 128, note 28.

** prabhūr; comm. śrīvīrāḥ.

** See especially the excellent study of Professor Pavolini in Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana, 9, 175 ff. Other treatments and other matters pertaining to this subject are discussed in my article, 'The Character and Adventures of Mūladeva', Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 1913, vol. 52, pp. 616 ff. Mūladeva, as the result of his deed, becomes King of Beṇūyāda.

** mahādāna 'pi yat tasya na surā vavyṣṇur vasu, dānam kilā vyālambhanta tath prabhūtaṁ bhavāntare.
he has reached enlightenment (135). Next, description of the boy’s mood and conduct when taken with his religious fervor: ‘Regularly he used to remember, in his mother’s absence to cry out in grief, “Alas, mother, (where art thou)?” But, at the contemplation of the Muni, she, in turn, was forgotten.’ Under ordinary circumstances even a thorn disturbs one’s piety, but now danger to life does not disturb his spirit. The great virtue of renouncing his food for another filled his own mouth with comfort, ‘for what was he, a mere shepherd boy, compared with the Muni, a great Indra, crested with flowers?’ (143) In sundry other ways he continues to reflect upon the superlative qualities of the Muni and upon the perfect way in which he has achieved dānaśila: ‘Having constituted me an eater of others’ food (parānna), my mother set before me a superb meal (paramānana). But I did set out food of the highest goal (paramārthānna), having, forsooth, attended to my own interests’ (145). ‘Now fitly this distinguished Muni may become for me a pool of the ambrosia of calm, an ever reliable refuge of peace’ (146). The honored Mahātman, exemplar of noble men, beautiful as a jeweled mirror, is reflected in Saṅgama, tho he be worthless. Saṅgama’s mind is immersed in the nectar-pot of meditation, which reaches to his throat; he abandons life thru fast; and enters that very day the pious state that results in complete perfection (160).

iti śālibhadra-kathāyāṁ prathamah prakramah samāptah.

Second Prakrama: Birth and marriage of Śālibhadra.

The scene changes from the village of Śāligrama to the city of Rājagṛha in the land of Magadha in Jambūdvipa, all of which places are described at length in the conventional, florid style practised by Kāvya writers, especially in connection with geographical and person names. There rules the glorious and pious king Śrenīka (Bimbisāra), familiar to both Buddhist and Jaina legend. Śrenīka is blessed with a perfect wife, Cellaṇā, and an intellectual son, prince Abhayakumāra, who acts as his minister.
(36). In the same capital lives a merchant-prince Gobhadra, with his wife Bhadrā, sunk in the depths of connubial bliss (47). The soul of Saṅgama, in the fulness of time, descends into the womb of Bhadrā. She sees in a dream a field of ripe rice which looks as tho it had come from Śāligrāma (‘Rice-village’) 44; reports the dream to her husband; and is told that she is big with a son. She is taken with a pregnant woman’s desire (dohada), in this instance, desire to give alms, 45 in which desire her husband supports her loyalty.

At the end of nine months she gives birth to a son (63). All the town joins in his birth-festival; the child is given the name Śālibhadra (to match the dream, as well as the names of his parents); and he is put in charge of reliable nurses. Every stage of his development, such as crawling, 66 walking, eating, talking, furnishes his father occasion for sacramental celebrations. As a child he plays about with animal companions, dressed in baby finery, a joy to his parents (82). ‘Some children are filthy as swine; some, frisky as monkeys; some croak weirdly like frogs; and some are like wild elephants. Śāli, however, loves cleanliness like a high-bred horse; is clean-limbed as a tortoise; mighty as a lion; and pure as an ascetic.’ 47 He is in due time made over to a noble teacher by whom he is instructed in the 72 accomplishments (kālāh) of a young gentleman (87).

Śālibhadra reaches young manhood in a marvelous state of beauty, which gives rise to a detailed comparison of his every part with the correspondingly beautiful things in nature. ‘Afraid of the overpowering lustre of his body, the yellow-blossomed pandanus arranges to protect itself, as it were, by a hedge of thorns’ (92). His every part is described painstakingly: feet, legs, navel, heart, arms, hands, throat, teeth, cheeks, face, brow.

candra’s Commentary on Yogaśāstra 2.114; Śreṇīka and Čelana (!) in Mahāvira Carita 10.90; etc. Cf. Weber, Samyaktva-Kānumdi, p. 12.

44 Allusion to the soul’s former home, which, by the terms of its name, is supposed to abound in rice-fields. For dreams that foretell the birth of a noble child, see my ‘Life of Pārśvanātha’, p. 189 ff. Such dreams are known as mahāśavapna, ‘great-dream’.

45 See the author, JAOS 40.1 ff., especially 17 ff.

66 rūṣaṇam, text, for riṅkhaṇam; see Appendix vi.

47 purīṣaśūkraḥ kecic cāpalyakaṇayaḥ pare, māyogomāyavaḥ ke ‘pi bālā vyālā ivetare, pāvītyaprtijātyāvah sahīnāṅgatvacakchapaḥ, sa tu siṅha ivāujasvi āmavān āmavān īva.
eyes, forehead, and hair. In a final burst of ecstasy his beauty is said to excel that of other men, to be equal to that of the gods, and to be highly admired by the Nāga maidens dwelling in the lower world (Pātāla). In addition, dāna (alms-giving), the most distinguished among virtues, like pāyasa (pudding) among foods, makes Śālibhadra shine as prince among young men (113).

Father Gobhadra, seeing his son such a paragon, chooses for him 32 beautiful maidens of Rājagṛha, as tho they were four times eight picked from the eight crores of heavenly women. They are accomplished, of good family, and all their bodily parts are like the lotus, matching Śālibhadra’s perfections. Following brilliant marriage festivities, Śālibhadra lives with his wives devoted by day and by night to the pleasures of the senses, a veritable elephant among women (140).

iti śrīśālibhadracarīte jannavivahavarṇano nāma dvitiyāḥ prakramaḥ.

Third Prakrama:

Gobhadra turns ascetic, dies, and becomes a god. He returns to shower blessings upon Śālibhadra, in which the six seasons cooperate with him.

Gobhadra regards the perfections of his son as a good omen, pointing to the fulfilment of his own career. Whereas some sons like gambling, rifle one’s property, or, like an overdue debt, bring sorrow, others, gifted with the virtues of the golden age, afford success and joy, as tho they constituted uncounted merit (punya). ‘Now that son of mine is like a black wish-jewel for increase of fortune, an antidote against sorrow, a joy to the coral-tree of the law.’ Gobhadra decides to unload the burden of householdership upon this son of a lovely mother, and to take the vow: ‘When there is a beautiful, beloved son, acknow-

---

*** Carried over from his pre-birth as Saṅgama who gained merit (punya) by feeding the ascetic (p. 265).

** They are, in fact, padmini.

*** nārīkūjjaratāḥ yāti.

**** kṛṣṇaś citrakāḥ, glossed by, kālī cintāmaṇīḥ; previously (1.85), kṛṣṇaś citrakāḥ.

***** bhāḍramātura, apparently only in Pāṇini, with pun on the name of his mother Bhadrā; see Appendix iv.
ledged to be a region-elephant, (the father) who does not desert the householder’s desire verily is a cattle-herd.”

Just as his thoughts are turning to Vīra, the park-keeper announces the arrival of that Holy Saint himself. Gobhadra with a select retinue goes to honor Vardhamāna on Mount Vaiśāhāra and listens to a sermon of his on saṁsāra. Gobhadra is inspired to devote himself to pure religion. Returning to his wife, he extols her many graces and virtues, which have led him on the way to religion, and requests her consent to his undergoing the dīkṣā with the Lord Vīra, in order that he may obtain the fourth and greatest purpose of life.

Bhadā remonstrates tearfully; she is weak, and has but a single son: will he abandon them both? In such case, is not staying at home more meritorious than the monk’s vow? ‘The male elephant may rudely spurn the lotus which clings to his feet, but how can even the most restive elephant cast off the spots on his face and trunk which are born on his body?’ After other arguments involving figurative, punning, or alliterative exhibits of no mean quality, she clinches her argument by the dogma that a true man is the one to uphold the family, not woman, weak and ignorant by name and nature.

Gobhadra retorts that she has, after all, her son to protect her; that merit (puṇya) is the essential at the two ends (beginning and end) of existence; man’s undertakings in between being non-essential; that religion (dharma) seeks no opportunity against man, whereas death ever lurks; that contempt for a child is

---

**supratika sati prite diggaja 'āgaje, nāśānām yas tyajaty āśāṁ satyaṁ paśupatiḥ sa tu.** The verse is a no more than usual example of the double entente style of the entire text: supratika, in addition to meaning 'beautiful', is also the proper name of a region-elephant; āśāṁ āśā means both 'householder's desire'; and, 'Śiva's quarter, the north-east'; and paśupati means both 'cattle-herd', and 'Śiva'.

**śuklapākṣikatvamā dharmanāmām ānām.**

**This is mokṣa, 'release', the three others being dharma, 'religion'; artha, 'property'; and kāma, 'love'. Cf. Vasupūja Carita 4.8 ff.; Rainacūda (Hertel's Translation, p. 169); our Carita in the gloss to 2.112.**

**padmini, with double entente, 'female elephant'; so according to the Lexicographers.**

**padma, to pun with padmini.**

**āṅgaja with pun on the meaning 'son'.**
unbecoming: in the wise. The conclusion to be drawn is that, strong in her son, she should help her husband to fulfil his high purpose (39). Bhadrā is silenced by her husband’s argument. They both call on Śālibhadra, who receives them in great state, and with the reverence becoming in a son (44). The father now addresses his son, who is seated on his lap, as an intelligent being of strong character. He points out that Śālibhadra, as his noble successor, must undertake the life of a pious householder with its three stages of childhood, youth and old age, devoted to the fourfold dharma. He, Gobhadra, on the other hand, must prepare himself for victory over the enemy of Bhāva (pious meditation). Having wisely crossed the sorrowful river of householdership, in the company of Śālibhadra’s mother, he is now asking her for the ferry-money, i.e., presumably, the price to be paid for release from the further responsibilities of householdership (52).

Śālibhadra, for his part, objects to his father’s unloading the responsibility of a head of a family upon himself, a mere child. ‘Having yourself cut the snare of saṁsāra, like the fish Rohita, O father, will you go away and abandon us that are afraid, just where we are?’ (56). But Gobhadra insists that it is Śālibhadra’s duty to promote his spiritual efforts, if for no other reason, because a father’s glory in heaven confers honor upon the son. Turning to his wife Bhadrā, he bids her show true love to her son thru firm resolution, and, supported by her thirty-two daughters-in-law, keep up his household. After eight days’ ceremonies preparatory to his niṣkramaṇa, Gobhadra takes the vow at Lord Vira’s hand; accumulates great merit thru ascetic practice; dies from fast; and is reborn as a god (sura) in the Sāudharma heaven (72).

Up in heaven Gobhadra puts himself into rapport with his son. He remembers that, whereas he himself is a warrior, strong

---

**See under proverbs below, Appendix i.**

**dāna-śīla-tapo-bhāva-catubhālena śālitaḥ.**

**Text, rohitamatsyas, glossed, matsyarajas tu rohitah.** Conversely, the fish Tamulaka, owing to his guilt in eating other fish, goes to the seventh hell, Bhāvadevasūri’s Pārśvanātha Caritra 3,393.

**The solemn act of going out from home to homelessness.**

**Gobhadra seems to have high standing in Jaina tradition according to the Prākrit śloka, quoted on p. 261.**
in his reliance upon the Jina, his son has been left behind to fight the battle of life, with only his mother to stand by him. He decides to quench Śāli’s sorrows with an ambrosia shower from his own heavenly world. He leaves behind his glorious state, and visits his son (83), bringing with him, as presents to himself and wives, diadems, garments fine-spun as tho the made of the rays of the moon, unguents made from sandal, and wreaths made of the flowers of mandāra, the coral-tree of paradise (87). Śāli obtains from his father divine grace and beauty that ever renews itself; his affairs prosper of themselves, being, in this and other regards, superior to the gods who must call their minds into action before they can accomplish anything (104). ‘The Lords of the World (bhuanādhiśvarāh), in comparison with Śālibhadra, take demonic (asura) character, whereas the inhabitants of Hell are doubly lowered by him’ (105). The gods, in Jaina classification (84) (bhuanādhiśvara, vyantara, jyoṭiśka, vāmānīka), are separately shown to be inferior to Śālibhadra (109). He gives alms on an unheard-of scale of liberality (112). His 32 large-eyes wives afford him connubial bliss to a degree commensurate with his virtues (117). The happiness which is enjoyed by both mortals and immortals, superior to the whole world, comes to him, of all others, just as, e.g., wisdom and skill to a minister, or the rivers Gaṅgā and Sindhu to the great ocean (120). The seasons (11) show him love, extol him and cater to his pleasures. For instance, in summer, ‘The mountains, beholding the world in the flashes of lightning, roar, as it were, in thunderous voice: ‘There is no one on the stool of the earth like in beauty to Śāli!’ ’ (134). Or, ‘In winter when the sun’s glory is dimmed by snowfalls, the sun of Śāli’s happiness is in no wise diminished’ (145). And so, in their order, all the seasons please him, who is rich in virtue, just as virtues bring happiness to a great monarch, or holy vows to a great ascetic (154).

iti śrīśālibhadracarite gobhadrāgamanartuṣṭkavarṇano
nāma tṛtiyāḥ prakramaḥ.

44 Cf. Hertel, Pariśīloparus, pp. 14 ff.
45 The following type of description, referred to as rtuṣṭkavarṇana in the colophon to this chapter, is also known as sadṛtuvarṇana, each meaning ‘description of the six seasons’; see Hemavijaya’s Kathāratnākara, story 72 end.
Fourth Prakrama: The magic shawls; King Śrenika visits Śālibhadra; Śālibhadra's enlightenment (pratyekabodhi).

To the city of Rājagṛha come from another country certain merchants with their goods. They first present themselves to King Śrenika. The King asks them whence they have come with their honest ware. They reply that they are from the country where rules King Nepāla, and have with them a stock of rare shawls, which they wish to dispose of to the King. These garments are warm in winter, cool in summer, delicate as śiriṣa blossoms, and of enormous size. Thereupon they exhibit their precious wares to the King, as poets exhibit their compositions to a connoisseur (14). The King asks for some tangible proof of their value and is told that in winter a brass pot full of butter melts when enveloped in one of them, but that the same garment, in the noon-heat, makes a pot of ghee freeze. The King then asks the price and the merchants demand a lakh of gold. In amazement he retorts that, with such a sum, one may collect elephants, horses, and men, that will ensure victory in battle; but what power has a mere garment? The queen (Cellañā), joining the king unexpectedly, crushes the merchants’ hope of doing business by spurning these jewels of garments, as being of no more use than a bull’s dew-lap. Thereupon the merchants go to the abode of Śālibhadra (25).

His mother Bhadrā, having elicited by questions the virtues of the garments, buys them, eight in number, at their original price, cuts them up, and distributes the pieces among her 32 daughters-in-law, as foot-rugs. They, in turn, place them under Śāli’s feet (31). Bhadrā’s generosity elicits a group of proverbial stanzas on the relation of mothers-in-law to daughters-in-law: ‘Some mothers-in-law and daughters-in-law, by nature wind and gall, as it were (in the same body), live in strife with one another, and act like co-wives (in quarrel)’. Under pretense of friendship, they carry on, in their own interest, intrigues, such as are customary in the seraglio of a minister (44).

In the meantime Cellañā, King Śrenika’s queen, learns from the gossip of her tire-women what had happened in the matter
of the wonderful shawls. She chides the king for not having acquired them, and asks him to take them by force. The king sends a confidential servant to the merchants to demand the garments, but they inform him that Bhadrā, Śāli's mother, has secured them. When this answer is brought to the king, he, mindful of his earlier money scruples, determines to gratify the queen's desire. He sends a door-keeper to Bhadrā to obtain the garments at their proper price. Bhadrā tells him that, tho' neither price nor reluctance to part with the treasure counts when the king commands, she is unable to comply with the king's request, because she has already presented the shawls to her daughters-in-law (66). The door-keeper, wondering what sort of people Śāli and his wives may be, reports to the king that Śāli is living in more than royal pomp, and that his mother has distributed the costly garments among her daughters-in-law. The queen's ironic importunities have the effect of weaving Śāli's image into the king's soul; he sends his door-keeper a second time to Śāli's palace with an invitation to wait upon the king. Bhadrā, his mother, goes instead, and tells the king that her son does not leave the top of his palace even to visit his pleasure grove, any more than, for instance, Religion (dharma) leaves Āryadeśa (orthodox India). She, in turn, invites the king to grace her house with his presence; the king accepts the invitation. She arranges her palace for lavish hospitality. The king arrives, is received in state, and seats himself upon a jeweled throne (112).

Bhadrā tells her son that the king has come, but he says absent-mindedly: 'Look over the ware, weigh it, pay for it, and take it.' Bhadrā, delighted, exclaims that she is the most fortunate of women, because her son is so deeply immersed in pleasure as to misunderstand a plain statement. She replies that the king is present in all his majesty. 'The report, "It is the king!", tho' of one foot (i.e. one word), enters marvelously the root of Śāli's ear, like a centipede ('hundred-foot'), and brings him to repentance' (120). Śāli reflects that even the strong are of no account; that existence itself is destruction.

Śāli's misunderstanding seems to me founded upon a pun between kṛṣṇa and kṛṣṇaṣaka; his mother says the former; he hears the latter. Similarly Mahāvīrācarita 10.106.

**Śrīgarbhīśvarah.**
where the highest ruler is a mere living creature with feet and hands like himself (121). The idea that such a king is of no consequence is turned into a pratyekabodhi motif, i.e., it becomes for Śāli, uninstructed, the particular occasion for spiritual insight: 'Of him that wears the shape of a mere bubble in the ocean of samsāra, how much is his princehood valued by the wise? Out upon this non-existing glory which has no more permanent habitat than a wandering harlot'. 'I know that the Lord of the three worlds, holy Vīra, is my refuge; what use have I then for this eunuch king of a chess-board?' One is a real king only thru great virtue; what other king can then prevail against him? (128).

As if to clinch his own enlightenment by a particular event (pratyekabodhi), he recalls the four classical pratyekabuddhas, famous alike both among Buddhists and Jains. 'The world-disgust (vāïrāgya) of the king of Kaliṅga (Karakanḍu), why was it based upon (the spectacle of) a feeble bull?' And he contrasts (to his own advantage) the depressing circumstances of all the four Pratyekabuddhas' enlightenment with his own, which is occasioned by a king in all his glory—one might suppose a sight the reverse of depressing: Śāli's vāïrāgya has mounted 'like a warrior equipped for battle upon the king-elephant' (130).

'Because the king of Pāṅcāla (Dommuha, Durmukha) saw a fallen flag, he became disaffected (with the world); but this (Śāli) saw the king aloft in shining joy and serenity (and became disaffected)' (131).

'By way of a bracelet Nami's vāïrāgya came and was established, but Śāli's vāïrāgya came even by way of the king' (132).

'The samevega (spiritual awakening) of Naggati was incited

---

11 For pratyekabodhi see my 'Life and Stories of the Jaina Savior Pārśvanātha', pp. 5, 116 note. An additional instance of this mode of conversion by a particular (single) event, in Prabandhacintāmani, p. 29. In Umāsvāti's Tattvārthādhigama Sūtra 10.7 the pratyekabuddha is fitly contrasted with the bodhita: the first is enlightened by himself, the second by the instruction of another.

12 A šloka similar to the Prākrit in Jacobi, Ausgewählte Erzählungen, p. 38 bottom, is quoted in the gloss: śvetāṁ sujātam suvibhaktaśrīgarāṁ gosāthāgāne viśvya vyāsāṁ jārātām, rddhim tv anṛddhim (text, tvardddhim) prasamiksyā bodhāt kāliṅgarājarśir avāpa dharman.

13 For the form of this word see Appendix ii.
like a veritable kokila bird, when he came upon the fallen fruit of a mango-tree, but this man-lion’s (Śāli’s) samvega rose, lion-fashion, when he came upon the king’ (133).

Tho Śāli now, like one of true faith, looks upon Śrenīka as the unwelcome sight of error, he respects his mother’s wish, and descends with his wives from the seventh story of his palace to pay his respects. The king is delighted with him, embraces him, and, amorousely 44, sets him upon his hip. The king enjoys the highest bliss from this contact, whereas Śāli breaks into tears (140). Bhadrā tells the king that Śāli, accustomed to heavenly wreaths, clothes, food, and unguents, furnished him by his father, who is a god in heaven, abhors exceedingly men’s breath. 45 She begs him to let go Śāli, who is the pet of Fortune, and tender as a lotus 46. The King releases Śāli who again retires with his wives to the upper terrace of his palace (145).

Now Bhadrā orders a grand shampoo for the king. As he is being finally rinsed, his signet ring falls into the water, ‘like a beloved mistress in her tantrums, when she has become subject to anger and pride.’ The king is annoyed by the loss, but when, at Bhadrā’s order, the water is drawn off by a servant-maid, he easily sees the ring in the bath. ‘Like a villager in the midst of city-folk, like a coward in the midst of heroes, 47 like a pauper in the midst of the rich, like a fool in the midst of the wise, it seems now a lustreless thing among jewels’ 48 (156). This chills his love for Śāli, tho, at the same time, he recognizes his superior character. With play upon Śāli’s name (‘Rice’), he exclaims: ‘While we, ‘Barley’ 49, having fallen from our place, must endure splitting and other treatment of grain, ‘Rice’ (Śāli) alone of all

---

44 This is, perhaps, what seems to be intended by the expression tam bhūbhīd utsāgaraṇī gān nyāvīvīsat. The Digest paraphrases svatāntaṁ tan tāṁ śālīṁ nidāhācīkṛat. Cf., later on in the digest, Śāli’s thought, mayy api hanta svāmī vartate (p. 4, 16 from bottom).
45 naraśvāsāyyāsārīrī dūdayatetārām.
46 The scholiast remarks that lotuses are crushed (indiff rently) either by the hand (kara) of a king, or the trunk (kara) of an elephant, the king being addressed here in both aspects (rājakañjara, ‘king-elephant’).
47 Read śūreṣu for sūreṣu.
48 This is, again, a kind of pratyekabodhi.
49 hayapiyāḥ =yavāḥ, according to the gloss (only in Lexicografer). But the word plays with another meaning, namely, ‘fond of horses’.
grains** is not crushed' (166). 'No lie it is, he is surely 'Rice' (Śāli), crest-jewel of noble grains, for whose grains of virtue the king-parrots yearn forsooth' (167). The king, in this way, realizes that Śāli, as the impersonation of the Jina, has unexpectedly served him also for a noble purpose. Bhadrā then entertains the king sumptuously, and showers gifts upon him; the king returns to his palace (172).

iti Śālibhadrakathāyāṁ Śrīśrenikāgamanavanvarṇano
nāma caturthaḥ prakramaḥ.

Fifth Prakrama: Śālibhadra decides to turn ascetic, after debating the matter with his mother. His brother-in-law anticipates his course.

The fifth chapter announces its theme: 'The row of "Rice's" virtue-grains, can it in any way be counted? Yet the greatness of its measure must be divulged." The bliss of mortals and immortals, the rivers Gaṅgā and Sindhu**, become tasteless in the overflowing ocean of Śāli's vāirāgya (loss of taste for the world), produced by the mere sight of the king'. As an elephant-keeper stains a scent-elephant**, so the king stains him with the vermilion of passionlessness. A Brāhaspati in discernment, he considers the secret of contending against the Demon Illusion. The existence of kings has brought him bliss (thru pratyekabodhi); his spiritual eye is clear as a star (7). Nevertheless (remembering how he had attracted the king) he rails at the 'royal serpent'***, who constantly seeks to devour the unwary serpent-folk****, and decides to resort to the mantra (sacred formula) and the divinity which will prevent the destruction of bliss by the 'king-disease'***** (14). In this frame of mind he

---

** Read sarvasāsyeṣu for sarvaśasyeṣu.
*** śāleḥ punyakaṇḍraṇiḥ kiṁ gaṇeyā kathācycana, idamīyāḥ pararaṁ mānamahimāḥ paribhāvyatām.
**** Gaṅgā in heaven where live the immortals; Sindhu upon earth where mortals live.
***** Elefant during rut.
****** rājasarpa; double entente, 'royal serpent', and 'anaconda'.
******* bhogi-loka: double entente, 'serpent-folk', and 'folk devoted to the senses'.
******** rājamandya: double entente, 'king as cause of disease', and kaśaya-
resorts to the Gaṇa-leader (Sūri) Dharmaghoṣa\textsuperscript{44}, instructor in war against the ‘Serpent Existence’, who teaches him in a largish sermon how to cast off the fetters that bind to the world, by abandoning the triad of sins, and adopting the three restraints (gupti). Lauded by the three potencies, bhūs, bhuvas, and svar, he will then become ‘Lord of the World’ (35). Śāli, in ecstasy cries out, ‘I will abandon existence, and, thru your teaching, apply my mind to Salvation’. He then promises to return, as soon as he has bid farewell to his tenderhearted, loving mother (37).

Returning to the city he seats himself upon the roof of his palace, and lets his body hold communion with his mind. Like a good servant, his body promises obedience in the great undertaking before him: ‘Then may I (the Body), bravely enduring hardships, stoutly bearing the burden imposed upon me, swift to obey thy (the Mind’s) orders, not plunging into disrepute—may I, as thy servant, thus strive to fulfill thy every intention, so that (thou) my Master, after having obtained control, shalt not fail of thy purpose.’\textsuperscript{48} Grasping now this connection of the Mind with its vehicle, the Body, Śāli regards existence as a victorious race, run by a horse in one day (āśvina), coming to an end to-day or to-morrow (adyāśvina; 46).

He meets his mother, and tells her that he has heard from the mouth of the Guru the Law that furnishes refuge, and that he is exceedingly pleased with it. A mother should feel honored by a son whose numberless virtues confer honor upon the family\textsuperscript{49} (54). Bhadrā is much rejoiced, yet points out that the son of his father (Gobhadra) is not the bond-servant of lust, even tho he is sunk in the delights of Fortune (Śṛi); the Jaina truth sits upon him as does the milk of a lioness upon a golden dish\textsuperscript{50}.

\textsuperscript{44} ‘Sounder of the Law’, frequently mentioned on similar occasions; e. g., Ratznčija, p. 164 of Hertel’s Translation; Hemavijaya’s Kathāratnakāra, story 177; Sual in his analysis of the Adiśvara Caritra, p. 13, in Studi Italiani di Filologia Indo-Iranica, vol. 7 (1908).

\textsuperscript{48} In this stanza the author employs the four reduplicated participial adjectives sāsahī, vāvahī, cācāli, pāpati in the order in which they occur in Pāṇini; see Appendix iv.

\textsuperscript{49} With conventional pun upon guṇa and vañā.

\textsuperscript{50} Proverbial, see Appendix i.
Enough for him, therefore, that he devote himself to a pious house-holder's life (grhdharma); let him practise to perfection (samyaktva) the twelve vows of laymen (60).

But Śāli soon disabuses her mind as to his intentions: 'Thou didst, O Mother, fitly say a faultless word, "Thou (Śāli) art the son of that father (Gobhadra)". Now ponder the significance of that statement' (63). 'Leaving out of question the possible superiority of children over parents, how can I be the son of an imperial Sage, and yet be devoted to the five senses?' (64). 'If thru thee, tho thou art but a single mother, I am thus happy here, what then is to be said of good conduct in which the eight good Mothers 17 are involved?' (65). 'With me as a son, being the earth-sustaining boar (Viśu Avatar), having the form of Puruṣottama, be thou, O mother, like the primordial she-boar, 18 blessed in thy son' (66). In several other stanzas Śāli argues that the ascetic state will redound to the glory of both himself and his mother. 'The difference between a Sādhu (monk) and a Śrāvaka (lay-disciple) is said to be like that between Mount Meru and a mustard-seed; how can I then, O Mother, become an adept (siddhārtha) 19 while living the life of a house-holder?' (67). 'O Mother, do not therefore delay (thy permission)! Be thou the mother of a hero, a campaka-wreath among flower-garlands!' (69).

Bhadrā, struck by these words, as if by a hurricane, rolls in a swoon upon the stool of the earth, like a creeper cut from its root. No sooner is she restored than she resorts to every argument dictated by her love and Śāli's advantage, to induce him not to abandon her so early in life. Her love clings to him as a creeper to a tree; without him she is bereft of support; she is a heaven full of constellations, yet without sheen. Resignation does not suit early youth (76). She pleads quaintly: 'My child, like a verb-root that has two voices (parasmāipada and ātmanepada), thou enjoyest the bliss of both mortals and immortals; therefore it befits thee to occupy the two stations (padadvayī) of this world and the next world' (78). Then,

The eight sacred writings. Gloss, aṣṭau pravacanamātaraḥ; cf. 1.31.

17  ādipotriṇi=ādivarāhī.
18  Pun on the meaning, 'white mustard'.
following another line, Bhadrā points out that Śāli’s father had not taken the vow before he had adorned the family mountain with a young lion (namely, Śāli); that, therefore, Śāli also should first produce a son; afterwards he might place, as a coping, upon the temple of practical piety the five great vows (of a yati). For the present it is not fit that he should turn away (vāirāgya) from a world full of heavenly pleasures (90).

The son of Gobhadra (Gāubhadri) replies that his mother is preaching earthly, rather than heavenly interests; as for himself, he is sated with pleasure, because the praṇava (om) is established for him, embracing the knowledge (veda) which causes to spring up aversion to the world (99).

Returning to his evil experience with the king he bitterly exclaims: ‘That influence which is spat out (left behind) by licentious king-demons must be avoided like eating by night’  

(104). Further stanzas in the same strain contrast the call of the Lord Vīra to a holy life, which sits like a diadem upon the head, with the king’s command which had suddenly fallen upon Śāli to his injury and sorrow: ‘The crow, “possession by the king”, making noise on high, surely bodes misfortune as it touches my head’ (112). This is followed by four proverbs (115–118) which show how sensitive to treatment are noble things as contrasted with ignoble ones; e.g., ‘A common garment is cleansed by pounding it with alcali-stones; a garment of the gods, on the other hand, is spoiled by the mere touch of man’ (117). Thus the son of Gobhadra regards the king’s favors as degradation, whereas others would delight in being his slaves: his soul and body are alike afflicted by him (122).

Bhadrā, in great grief, takes up this same idea: the king (rājan) has turned out to be the king-disease (rājamandya); she has performed a grievous ajākṛpaniya  

act in introducing to him her son who is now afflicted by the king’s breath. Nevertheless, she continues to argue the trials of ascetic life; the needs of her widowhood; the loveliness of his wives; his own charming youth; and the god-like career of sensuous pleasure open to him. Śāli finally yields to his mother’s eloquence to the extent

---

* * *

14 A sin with the Jainas. The niśābhōjana-virati, ‘abstention from eating by night’, is described and illustrated in Vāsuptiśya Carita 1.412–567.

15 See Appendix iv.
of abandoning one wife at a time, each day, so that it would take him 32 days to dispose of the lot (140).

Now there lives in that same city Subhadrā, a younger sister of Śāli, married to an excellent, virtuous husband, Dhanya by name. One day while Dhanya is bathing, tears drop from his wife’s eyes upon his shoulder. Asked for the reason, she says that she is grieved because her brother, in order to restrain his senses, is daily giving up, one by one, his beloved wives. Dhanya replies that such cowardly conduct does not ferry one across the sea of desires; if procrastination in love and business†⁺ be ruinous, how much more speedy should be progress in religion? (151). Dhanya’s seven other wives, taking Subhadrā’s (and, incidentally, Śāli’s) part, then ask him why he himself is not practising what he is preaching: ‘Even cowards, more’s the pity, can tell all about battles, but they scarcely breathe when strife roars its strident sounds’ (153). Dhanya exclaims joyously that they, his wives, have become his spiritual guides; he will wait upon the Jina Lord to learn the holy life of an ascetic. As is usual in these cases, the wives make a show of objecting to being left without male support, and propose to follow him into homelessness. Dhanya is rejoiced, praises his wives, and meditates upon the arrival of the Lord Vīra (166).

iti śrīśālibhadralilākathāyāṁ pañcamahā prastāvah († here, instead of prakramaḥ).

Sixth Prakrama: Śāli turns monk; his wanderings; his return home; and his pārāyaṇa by his mother in the preceding birth.

In the meantime the Lord Vīra, string of pearls of the triad bhūs, bhuvas, and svar, guide across the waters of existence, attended by Suras, who prepared his samavasaraṇa†++, arrives on the Vāibhāra mountain. His arrival is opportune coincident with the faith that has come to Śālibhadra. Dhanya, who knows Vīra, the Cakravartin (Emperor) of the Holy Law, goes in company with his wives to the feet of the Lord, in order to obtain from him the means of salvation (8). Śāli then points out reproachfully to his mother Bhadrā, that his sister (Subhadrā)

†⁺ Two items of the puruṣārtha; see page 270, note 35.
†++ Place of descent from heaven, a technical Jaina term.
and her husband (Dhanaya) have assumed leadership in heroic conduct: why may he not follow them? (11). Bhadrā, realizing at last that Śāli can not be swerved from his purpose, tells king Śreṇikā that her son desired to take vows with the Saint Vīra, and asks him for the royal insignia,—golden pot, diadem, umbrella, and chowries,—in order to institute for her son the great festival of consecration (dikṣā). The king, at first, questions whether Śāli will be able to endure the hardships of ascetic life, but, finally realizing Śāli’s noble purpose, promises to arrange himself his ceremony of niṣkramaṇa. He dismisses Bhadrā in a state of delight (22).

Śāli asks his father, the Sura Gobhadra, by whose grace, he knows, he has so far tasted the sensual bliss that belongs to the gods, to favor him still farther by making his earthly bliss bear fruit in the solemn act of ‘going out’. He then enjoins upon his wives the care of his mother (35). After ‘hero-flags’ have been placed upon the cāitya sanctuaries, Śāli proceeds to the bath pavilion, where divine maidens pour over him the water of consecration; perfume and adorn him; and perform many other festive and sacramental acts in which the king’s insignia play a part (50). Thereupon he proceeds in the company of the king, his mother, and his wives to the place of Vīra’s samasaraṇa, and reverently asks the Lord of the World to guide him to the religion that brings nirvāṇa. He puts on the monk’s robe (paricīvarītah); plucks out his hair, which Bhadrā gathers up together with his jewels; and is given by Holy Vīra himself the rank of a wandering ascetic (57).

Dhanaya, his brother-in-law, with Subhadra his wife (Śāli’s sister), follows him into homelessness. The king returns to Rājagṛha. Bhadrā and Śāli’s wives also go back sadly to a home which now seems like a divine grove without devadru trees, like heaven without the sun, like the firmament without the moon, like a country without king (64). The wives feel like an army abandoned by its leader, like duties performed without knowledge, like magic rites, ineffective because done without a spell, like a catena of virtue without good fortune, like she-elephants without the lord of the herd, like a threshing-floor without grain. They

---

18 See above, p. 271.
19 See my ‘Life of Pārśvanātha’, p. 115, note.
reproach themselves for not having followed him on the road to
heaven, as stars follow the moon at the moment of his eclipse (73).

Dhanya and Sāli learn the scriptures from the mouth of the
Saint Gautama**, and then enter upon a course of severe asceticism
whose rigors in every particular of life, such as food, clothes, and bed,
are effectively contrasted with the Sages’ former life of luxury (99).
They engage in fasts of one, two, three, and four months respectively,
in consequence of which their figures become lean and emaciated.
They revere many Jaina ikons, and practise severe forms of asceticism,
actuated throughout by their longing for perfection. Freed from all earthly
attachments, they move without haste upon the mendicant’s path.
In the end they are so emaciated that their skeletons rattle in their bodies.
In the company of the Lord Vīra, and endowed with the (five) samitis***,
they arrive at the end of twelve years at the city of Rājagṛha (112).
The Lord Vīra makes his samavasarana upon Mount Vālībhāra, and is there revered by
the people. As the two Munis are about to break a month’s fast, they consult the Jina Lord,
who advises them to let Sāli’s mother perform this pious act (120).
Unperceived by their former friends, they quickly go to Bhadrā’s palace (126), and
stand in the customary place of mendicants, emaciated, silent,
motionless (138).

Bhadrā is rejoiced at the arrival of her daughter (Subhadrā),
her son (Sāli), her son-in-law (Dhanya), and the holy Lord Vīra,
and communicates the event to Sāli’s wives. She glories
especially in the presence of Vīra and Sālibhadra, the latter
being her sole possession, the life of her life (143).
She contrasts her own fate, during the twelve years she has been left behind,
with that of her daughter Subhadrā. Tho already overcome by
old age, she had remained behind like a blind she-jackal, while
her daughter, tender-limbed as a śrīṣa-blossom, had followed her
husband Dhanya into homelessness, thus becoming the crest of
the Meru-mountain of virtue. Dhanya, her son-in-law, too,
appears to her in the light of a great Muni: he shines with his

** Gautama is the first disciple of Mahāvīra; see, e.g., Ayāraṅga Sutta
2.15-26.
*** Five rules of personal behavior; see Umāsvāti’s Tattvārthādhigama Sūtra 9.5.
eight wives, who are like the embodied Mūrtis (152). She calls upon her daughters-in-law, whose husband has returned upon a great ship from a distant country, as it were, to make preparations for the bodily comfort of the guests. This they joyously hasten to do, giving orders to the servants, who skip about nimbly and egg each other on (161).

But Mother Bhadrā is not destined to break her son's fast. In spite of her longing to do honor and to entertain, she is so overcome by her emotions, that, as tho her eyes were shut, she does not see her son. Confused by the flood of her thoughts, she does not show honor to the two Munis as they stand in the court of the house (169). Śāli's wives also regret their separation from him, blaming themselves because they have not followed him into homelessness. When they turn their sight upon him, they, too, are unable to see him for the tears in their eyes; and he, in turn, is so emaciated as to be unrecognizable (179).

The sages' equanimity is not at all disturbed by this apparent disregard of their needs (186). As they are about to pass out of the city, a certain Mathitahārikā, a middle-aged woman (kātyāyani), sees Śāli and is filled with great joy and exaltation, 'as tho she were a mermaid (jalamānuṣi) in the milk-ocean of delight'. She sheds tears of joy, and milk oozes from her breasts, as tho in the stress of motherhood. Poor as she is, she offers sour milk as alms. The two Śādhus, having accepted the alms, 'purified by every test (sarvopadhāsuddha)', depart (204). Śāli asks Holy Vira how his pāraṇa came about, and the Master tells him that the woman, in her former birth, was his mother Dhanyā, dwelling in Śāligrama, and that she had now become a noble woman (satyā) thru her gift of sour milk (207).

iti śrīśālililākathāyāṃ śrīśālibhadravihaṁmatṛghāgamanaṁpāraṅnavarṇano nāma ṣaṣṭhaḥ prastāvah.

Seventh Prakrama: Śālibhadra and Dhanyā, ultimately enlightened, die by fast, and attain to Supreme Bliss.

Śāli, remembering Holy Vira's sayings, ponders the course of his own life. To begin with, man in general skips about as an

**Note:**

1. The gloss lists these Mūrtis, to wit: kṣiti, jala, pavana, hutāśana, yajamāna, ākāśa, candra, and sūrya.
2. ehireyāhītām cakrur artyanto 'tyantacañcalāḥ; see Appendix ii.
3. This is either a proper noun, or means 'with her necklace disarranged'.
actor in the play of Existence. He next lists and contrasts the events of his present life with those of his pre-birth: his life in a noble city, with his former life in a low-caste village; his mother's gift of the precious shawls to her daughters-in-law, with his former mother's destitution. In his former birth he did not even know the name of his father, much less had he seen him in the flesh; in his present birth his father Gobhadra (after he had become a god) had given the ehreyahira-command here on earth in his behalf (7). And so he refers everything back to the time when, in his former birth, his mother Dhanyā procured the ingredients for a feast from her compassionate neighbors, enabling him to gratify the Muni with the food he himself so keenly desired. But for the Muni's arrival, his birth as a villager would have been fruitless. And all led up to his receiving his pāraṇa from the hands of his former mother (15). Reflecting thus, as on the om of the Veda 'Aversion from the World', he turns to his brother-Muni, Dhanya, who is traveling on the way to the fortress 'Excellent'; reminds him of his early leadership when he himself (Śāli) was still weak in the flesh; and bids him engage together with himself in the final battle of victory over the Chief Trickster, 'Illusion'. Dhanya responds enthusiastically, pointing out, in harmony with his character, that delay or hesitancy pierce the vitals (of purpose) like an arrow, and that Śāli, in the past, had not made a long story of it, when there was question of giving alms (dāna). They go to Holy Vira, prostrate themselves before him, and constitute him their flag on the top of the high palace 'Self-restraint' (29). Vira encourages them to shoot with unerring aim at the target 'Contemplation' (dhyāna). They adopt the (five) Rules of Conduct (samiti), and abandon the four kinds of food along with all desires and hopes. Sustained in their resolution by the Sage Gāutama, they await death from starvation under a tree (38).

Bhadra and her daughters-in-law, all clad in white robes, their faces veiled, go out to do honor to the Jīna (Vira). They are joined by King Śrenika and his son and minister, Abhayakumā-

---

*narinartti naṭṭaḥ prāṇi kaṭare bhavanāṭake. For kaṭare see Appendix ii.
*See Appendix ii.
*dhūrtarājam mahāmoham.
*pādappagamam nāmānañānam; see Appendix iii.
ra. When Bhadrā fails to see Śāli and Dhanya with the Lord, she asks about them, and he tells her that they are engaged in the pādapopagama on the Vāibhāra mount (55). Bhadrā, like a hānsa-bird in a cage, like a jhasi-fish caught in a net, like a she-antelope struck by an arrow, terribly disturbed in mind, sighing, stumbling, and falling down at every step, wailing pitifully, approaches the place where are the two Munis. She is followed by Śrenīka and Abhayakumāra. When she sees them lying on the mountain-top, as tho they had been struck by lightning, she and her retinue fall into a swoon (61). After being revived, she bewails long and bitterly her fate as wife and mother. She is a woman who had one child and many cares. Her crowning misery is, that she could not retain her child for life, at the time when he returned home to break a month's fast. She did not then appraise her Muni son at his full value (76). She also neglected Dhanya, her son-in-law, who, instead of being Śāli's play-fellow, became his guide in spiritual matters (83). Now she addresses Śāli as an accomplished Arhat, as river of equanimity, as one to whom good and evil are the same, as one to whom a (burning) sword and (cool) sandal are the same **. She begs him to give answer, or to favor her, if only with a look (93). Śāli's wives join Bhadrā in regrets over their abandonment of their husband: 'weighed in the gold-scale of love, they are discovered to be equal to the (slight weight of a) guṇā' ** (100). It will redound to their everlasting shame that their husband, standing in the courtyard (of Bhadrā's house), did not regard them even with a look (105). They beg him to return, but, if he is resolved to fast to death, let him at least present them with the ambrosia of his speech. Bhadrā is moved by their laments to the pitch of again falling into a faint, and, after being restored, continues to cry (112).

At this point King Śrenīka steps into the breach, by consoling her with the thought that she is going to be counted most honorable and praiseworthy among noble women; that her son will be honored even by the gods; and that, of all women, she will wear a diadem upon her brow for having given birth to a lion-

---

** vāsikandana-kalpa; see Appendix iii.
** A berry used as a small weight; see the note on p. 61 of Tawney's Translation of Prabandhacintāmani.
son who roars at the 'Elefant Delusion'. Let her, therefore, with resolute words encourage her son in his great struggle (112). Bhadrā takes his words to heart; gives over her grief; consoles her daughters-in-law; encourages her heroic son to victory; glories in her own and her daughters-in-law’s distinction; blesses the hard road to perfection (siddhi) which the two Munis are treading; and returns to the city (131). Śāli and Dhanya ride under the sailorship of their captain Gāutama upon the ship 'Asceticism' (samnyāsa), die, and are reborn as supreme gods in the Heaven called Sarvārthasiddha where they enjoy the highest bliss (145).

\[\text{iti sūrśālibhadracarite sarvārthasiddhiprāptivarṇano} \]
\[\text{nāma saptamaḥ prakramahi.}\]

APPENDICES

Appendix i: Proverbs and Proverbial Expressions

Like most Jaina fiction texts, and, indeed, like most fiction texts in general, the author or redactor of the Śālibhadra Carita interlards his rather slender story with proverbs or proverbial expressions. Some of these occur elsewhere, but the majority appear to be new. The Jaina texts are not only full of religious apothegms (dharma), but they also exploit every faze of worldly wisdom (nīti, artha, kāuṭilya). To some extent such sayings are, doubtless, original with the Jaina writers, but, no less certainly, the same writers draw from the springs of popular inspiration in this respect, no less than in respect of narrative and folk-lore. These nīti-stanzas will have to be gathered and sifted into a huge supplement to Böhtlingk’s *Indische Sprüche*, so deservedly famous in Indic filology⁴. For the present a few illustrations of these conditions shall suffice. Thus:

1.25ab: uttamaḥ svagunāḥ khyātā madhyamāś tu pitur guṇāḥ.

'Highest is the character of them that are famous thru their own virtue; middling the character of them that are famous thru their father’s virtue' (Böhtlingk, 1178, 1182).

---

⁴ How familiar among the Jainas these stanzas are may be gathered conveniently from the foot-notes to Tawney’s Translation of Prabandhasamāpi, pp. 20, 23, 32, 35, 40, 68, 78, 92, 114, 138, 182, 198. See also my ‘Life of Pārvanātha’, pp. 208 ff.
3.34: siṁhārkanrpadeveṣu bāla ity avahilanaṁ, gūḍhayaprādha-pratayeṣu vīduṣāṁ nahi yujyate.

'It is not proper for wise people to underestimate lions, the sun, a prince, or a god on account of their youth, because great power is hidden in these' (Bohtlingk, 7043, with avahilanaṁ, not avahelanā, as Bö. emends).

4.126: parakāvyaiḥ kavitvarī yad garvo yācitabhūṣaṇāiḥ, yā ca yācanaya tṛptiś tad etan mārkhalakṣaṇam.

'When people establish for themselves the reputation of being poets thru others' poetry, or when they are proud of borrowed jewels, or satisfy their hunger thru begging—all that is the mark of a fool' (cf. Bohtlingk, 3917).

5.9: nṛsiṁhā na samihante bhakṣyaṁ kakṣikṛtam paraiḥ, svikurvanti tu gosṭhāsvās tat kṛtvā vigrahāgraham.

'Man-lions do not desire the food tucked away in the hem of others' garments; stable-dogs appropriate that, making it an occasion for strife.' Cf. Bohtlingk, 4979, 7322; Bhāvadevaśūrī's Pārśvanātha Caritra 5.182.

1.48, describing widowhood:

nimnaṁ strijanma tatrāpi vādhavyāṁ navyaduḥkhaktṝ,

dāustom (l) sthānāṁ anāsthāyā dāsyāṁ hāsyakaranāṁ jana.

'Low-grade is the birth of a woman. Her widowhood produces new pain. An evil station is that in which there is no support; servitude is cause for derision with people.'

3.29–30, describing men's and women's relation to the upkeep of a family:

stambhaḥ sāudham na tu sthūṇā yūtham hastī na hastinī,
durālānaṁ latā nāva rathamukṣā na gāur yathā,
evam uccaiḥ kulabhāram sāttvikaḥ puruṣo 'rhati,
abalā nāmadhāmabhyaṁ na nāri kovidāpy aho.

'The (male) stambha-post is (the foundation of) the palace, not the (female) sthūṇā-pillar; the male elephant is the herd, not the she-elephant. The (female) creeper is not at all a hard

---

* Variant reading, gūḍhayaprādha-prabhāveṣu.
* Both Sanskrit words seem to me back-formations from Prakritic forms (avahrei) which are ultimately derived from Skt. avadhīraya-, 'despise'.
* The conventional Hindu pocket.
* The noun stambha is masculine in gender; sthūṇā is feminine.
fetter (for an elephant to break); the cow is not a draught-ox. Thus a noble man is fit to hold high the family; not, alas! a woman, weak by name and character, even tho' she be an intelligent woman'.

3.58, dealing with the duty of son to father:
janakāṁ svāṁ kalāvantam budhaḥ sarminhibataḥ sutaḥ, 
trāyate vatsa no sūram api mandas tamograhaṁ.

The stanza has two meanings: 'A wise son (the planet Mercury) protects his accomplished father (the moon with its phases) when stationed near him, O Child; but not a foolish one (the planet Saturn) even a learned one (the Sun) from misfortune (eclipse)'.

3.89–93, describe a father's love for his son.
4.36 ff., describe the relation between wives and mothers-in-law.
5.98, illustrates equanimity.
5.105, showing that subservience is a kill-joy:
parājñā bhogasāukhyeṣu sarvāngasabhageṣv api, 
trasarekheva ṛatneṣu mahāmahimahānaye.

'The command of another reduces pleasures, even tho' they delight in every (other) particular, just as a floating line in jewels reduces their value.'

5.115–118: objects of high quality are easily spoiled by contact with coarse persons or things.
5.116: suvarṇaṁ vahininśiptam varṇikāväṛddhitam aśnute, 
usnaśvāsāvhiyoge 'pi māuktikaṁ mlānam iyate,
'Gold thrown into fire is improved in quality, but a pearl touched even by warm breath loses its lustre.'
5.117: sāmānyavasanaṁ kṣāraśilākutakakutṭanāih 
dipyate, devadūṣyaṁ tu narasparsena dūṣyate.
'Garments of average people are made to shine by pounding them with alcali stones; but the garments of the gods are defiled by the touch of man.'

5.153: kātarā api samgrāmāvartām āvartayanty aho, 
nā śvasanty api nisvānodvāmasāṁrávīne raṇe.

---

4 For rathamukṣā, see p. 301 and note 12.
5 For trasā-rekḥā, see p. 304.
'Behold, even cowards tell tales of battle; but they do not even breathe when battle resounds with its strident roar.'

The following are examples of proverbial expressions which accompany, pari passu, the set proverb stanzas, both constant elements of fiction:

1.44<sup>th</sup>: vadanti prati putrama hi pratyani kaṁ na mātaraḥ,
    'Mothers do not contradict their sons.'
3.44: mahānto hi jātu muñcanti nāucitīṁ,
    'Noble men do not neglect decorum.'
5.57: sīṅhāpayāḥ svarṇapātra evāvatiṣṭhate,
    'The milk of a lioness remains only in a golden vessel.'

This is supported in the gloss by a nīti-sloka which does not occur in Bōhtlingk:

kṣīraṁ śvānodare sīṅhādugdham asvāṁabhājane,
niśpuṇye śri rasendro 'gnāu dharmas tiṣṭhati nādhame.

'Milk does not remain in the belly of a dog; the milk of a lioness in a dish which is not gold; Fortune in him that has not accumulated a stock of merit; quicksilver in the fire; or religion in the vile.'

6.2: mahatām ... sṛṇaḥpraṇi yugmājāte iva dhruvam,
    'Unfailingly desire and fulfilment, as tho they were twins, come to noble (pious) men.'

Appendix ii: Characteristic Jaina Words and Forms.

Regarding the following, I do not guarantee that each item is exclusively Jaina. Each word or form occurs more or less habitually in Jaina literature, presumably mostly in literature composed in Guzerat. They are part of a larger collection of peculiarities, some of which may be gathered from the word-lists printed on pp. 220 ff. of my 'Life and Stories of the Jaina Savior Pārśvanātha' (Baltimore, 1919), and from the prefaces and introductions to the texts or translations of other Jaina fiction texts, such as Hemacandra's Pārisiṣṭaparvan; Pradyumna-nācārya's Samarāḍityasaṁkṣepa; the Kathākośa; Merutuṅga's Prabandhacintāmaṇi; Jinaśrī's Pālagopālakathānakan; the

* nisvāna-udvāna-sāṅrhāvīce: "characterised by uproar caused by emission (udvāna; not recorded in Lexx.) of shouts"??
Bharatakadvatriśikā; the Pañcadaṇḍachattraprabandha, and others. A larger collection of such material will be found in the author's forthcoming paper, 'On some Aspects of Jaina Sanskrit', which will show that this language has retained a certain productivity not altogether dependent upon Prākrit or geografical and dialectal influences.

Śālibhadra’s list may be fitly headed by a group of interjections which contain the elements re and ari (are), used mostly to address inferiors, in the sense of 'sirrah' or to express wonder:

kaṭare in 1.88; 2. 58; 7.3, 'wonderful to narrate', glossed by āścaryabhūtam in 2. 58; by āścaryārthe in 7. 3. At 1. 88 in parallelism with aho, and arire (see next). This word occurs also in Bhāvadevasūri’s Pārśvanātha 3. 492; 8.48, glossed, adbhutārtham avyayam, 'an indeclinable, expressing wonder'; in Hemacandrasūriprabandha, śloka 63 (Edition of the Prabhāvaka Carita, p. 300), kaṭare janānibhaktir uttamānāṁ kaśopalaḥ, 'behold, devotion to one’s mother is the touchstone of noble men.' In Kathākosa, in a stanza printed in Tawney’s Translation, p. 234, in a note to p. 3, lines 25–28, kaṭare karma-lāghavam, 'strange to tell, my karma is light!' Pischel, Hemacandra’s Grammatik der Prākritsprachen, vol. i, p. 157 (anent 4.350), prints a doubtful and unexplained word kaṭari, which is the Apabhraṣṭa form, and perhaps Prākrit form in general. Of this he cites a variant kūṭare, in vol. ii, p. 187. This, presumably, is the same word. In the Apabhṛṣṭa Sanatkumāra-caritam, elaborated by Jacobi, in the Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, München 1921, kaṭari occurs in stanza 777 by the side of vapuri and ari, in a sense similar to our word. In the Index, s. v. kaṭari, Jacobi also mentions kaṭa, and kata kaṭa, as occurring in the Nemināhacari (Nemināthacarita), of which his Sanatkumāra Edition is a part. The Apabhraṣṭa vapuri is a combination of vapus, which even in the RV. means ‘marvel’, and ri. The meaning is again áścaryam.

arire, in connection with aho and kaṭare, also something like ‘wonderful to tell’. The word is probably Jaina only, perhaps of Apabhraṣṭa origin; see ari are, ari ari, ari ri, and arire in the Index to Sanatkumāracarita, Jacobi, l. c., Glossary, p. 106. Sanskrit lexicographers report arare and areare. Malliṇātha Caritra 1.130, 264; 2. 378 has are re.
The exclamation ehi re yāhi re, 'come here sirrah, go sirrah!', yields the pretty feminine adjective ehireyāhīrā with kriyā, 'work', expressed or understood. Thus in 6.161, ehireyāhīrām cakruḥ, 'they ordered about'; and in 7.7, ehireyāhīrākāri, 'a great ordering about was caused'. In Pārśvanātha 6.82, karoti bhavakūpe 'smīn ehireyāhīrām kriyām, 'he makes in the puddle of this existence a great ordering about (sc., a great stir, or a great pother)'. The gloss there is, ehi re! yāhi re! yasyāṁ kriyāyām sā ehireyāhīrā, tām. The word is listed in the Gaṇa mayūravyānśakādi (to Pāṇini 2.1.72), but is not quotable in non-Jaina Sanskrit literature. It may, therefore, have been taken by the Jainas from Grammar. See below, p. 306 ff.

Other words that recur in Jaina writers are:

nīrāṅgi, 'veil', in nīrāṅgi-channa-vadanāḥ, 7.46, glossed kausumbhavastraṃ, tena channam dхаṅkitam vadanam yāśām tāḥ (dхаṅkitam, not in Leks.). This word occurs also in Mallinātha Caritra 3.68; Pariśīṭaparvan 2.8, 149, 496; Bharaṭakadvātrīṅśikā 2; and in Samarād. 4.555. It is listed in Hemacandra's Deśināmamālā 2.20, 90; 4.31, in the forms nīrāṅgi and nīraṅgi (glossed nīraṅgikā). Tawney, Translation of Kathākōsa, p. xxii, quotes nīraṅgi as a Prākrit word. In Pārśvanātha, 8.185, the word occurs in the feminine compound kṛtanīraṅgikā.

śrīkari, 'palanquin', 5.118; 6.45; Pārśvanātha 6.514 (glossed, sukhāsanam); Uttamacaritrakathānaka 234.

rorā, 'laborer, or 'beggar', in rora-grha, 1.91. Pariśīṭaparvan 8.72, 291, and Mallinātha Caritra 7.19 have the same word in the same sense. Pārśvanātha 8.221 has rāurageha, 'house of a laborer'. The form rora occurs also in the Aghata tale; see Charlotte Krause, Prinz Aghata (Leipzig, 1922), pp. 148, note 2; 150, note 1; it there alternates with rāṅka, 'beggar', which, according to Hertel, in his edition of Bharaṭakadvātrīṅśikā, p. 54b, is of Gujaraṭi origin. But the word occurs also outside that sphere. Deśināmamālā 7.11 has rora, along with roghasa and roṃikaṇa, all in the sense of rāṅka. Rora in the same sense in Dhanapāla's Pāiyalacchī, stanza 35, with many synonyms for 'poor'.

maṣṭ-bheda, in maṣṭibhedam akurvāṇāḥ, 3.71. Glossed, dāṇādīcārtyam asatyām ca maṣṭibhedah. The expression maṣṭibhedam akurvāṇah, therefore, seems to mean, 'not making an infraction of good character'. The subject of akurvāṇah is the pious
merchant Gobhadra, Śālibhadra’s father, who is praised as a holy man in a Prākrit śloka, reported above, p. 261. The statement there suits our word. In Pārvanātha 6.410 there is a half-śloka, vināīvādhyayanam siddhir lebbe māṣatūṣādibhiḥ, where māṣatūṣādibhiḥ is glossed by munivīsēṣāḥ, ‘totally without study perfection (or, magic power) has been obtained by the Sages so designated’. There seems to be some connection between māṣibheda and māṣatūṣādayaḥ, māṣa being ‘one who is of good character’ (namely māṣi). The word tuṣā, in the same sense, is also unknown hitherto.

pheronḍa = pheronḍa, 6.95 (glossed by śrgāla), Mallinātha Caritra 1.457, ‘jackal’. So also Pārvanātha 3.904, glossed the same way. Both forms in Lexs. Cf. phera, pheru, and pherava.

agaṇjita, 3.70, ‘unterrified’, also Pārvanātha 6.376 (here glossed, abhiita). Dhātupāṭha has a root gaṇj, in the sense of garj, ‘roar’.

maṅgini, 3.18, glossed nāuḥ, ‘ship’. Also Pariśīṭaparvan 2.402; Mallinātha Caritra 2.337.


rathakatvā, 2.16, glossed, rathānāṁsamūhaḥ, ‘mass of wagons’. Also cited in Böhtlingk’s Lexicon from some Pārvanāthacarita, 4.172, which is not by Bhāvadevasūri. Lexicographers and Grammarians have ratha-kadhā.

puṣpadantāu, dual, 3.119, glossed, dīvākariṇiśākarāu, ‘sun and moon’. Also Śatrumjāyamahātmya 14.225. Lexs. have puṣpavantu in the same sense.

chaṭācchoṭa, 1.104, 4.89. The passages are as follows: 1.104, ānandāśrujalodgāraīś chaṭācchoṭaṁ kirami iva; 4.89, hārīcandana-kāśmira-chaṭācchoṭa-dharā dharā. The compound chaṭācchoṭa seems to mean ‘mass’, in 4.89 ‘the earth carrying a mass of sandal and saffron trees’; cf. Prākrit chaḍā, ‘mass’, in Jacobi’s Ausgewählte Erzählungen, p. 109b (Skt. chaṭā). But in Pañcadaṇḍachattraprabandha, p. 24, we have: makaramaccha-nakracakra-suṣumāra-gajaturagavrṣabhākārapuccha-chaṭāchoṭtokalitām niranidhim, which Weber (p. 65) translates, ‘das meer, das durch die schwanzschläge von makara, fischen, krokodil-schaaren, delphinen, und von elephanten-, rossen-, stieren-ähnlichen gestalten aufgepeitscht- ward’. Weber, p. 24,
note 112, cites Molesworth, *Mahratti Dictionary*; ‘Mahratti and Gujarati chaṭāchoṭa, imitation of the sound of slashing or cutting rapidly a soft, yielding and rushing substance (as plantain-trees, hair, etc.).’ I find it impossible to harmonize the last statement with the use of the word in Śālibhadra.

jemana, 2.73, ‘eating’, in the combination, riṅṣaṇām (for riṅkhaṇaṁ ‘crawling’) kramaṇaṁ jemanam. Root jēma also in Dharmaparikṣa (see Mironow, p. 8, note 10). See Hemacandra, IV, 110, 230; and Jacobis, *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī, Vocabularies*, s.vv. jimiya and jemei.

catūrthapurūṣārtha, 3.22; Mallinātha Carita 3.208; Vasupūjya Carita 4.8 ff., ‘fourth purpose of man’, i.e., mokṣa, ‘release’. The four puruṣārtha are: dharma, artha, kāma, and mokṣa. Śālibhadra 4.109 mentions a puruṣārtha-trayi, followed by the fourth, namely mokṣa. Mallinātha Carita 2.232 puruṣārthas tṛtiyaḥ is a kenning for ‘love’. Cf. Weber, *Die Griechen in Indien*, p. 30, for possible connection with Greek ideas.


sarvaṛthasiddha (sc. mahāvīmaṇa), ‘heaven of complete accomplishment’: 7.139; Rāhuṇpēya Carita 468; Mahāvīra Carita 10.181.

The most important word nyuṇchana, apparently exclusively Jaina, occurs twice in Śālibhadra, 1.42; 7.64. In the first passage the pious and proper shepherd boy Sanhama asks his destitute mother to prepare for him a luxurious feast, quite beyond her means, and she replies, to wit:

matā provāca he vatsa rūpanārayanasya te,
nijalīlāvilāsasya bālakasya bāliḥ kriye. 41.
nyuṇchanaṁ tava netrānāṁ bhāṣitasyāvatāraṇam,
bhrāmye harī bhujayor jātamukhakasya mriye mriye. 42.

* From this it seems to follow that it was thought improper to sell things acquired by gift.
In 7.64 Bhadrā hears that her son Śālibhadra has gone to the Vāībhāra mountain to die by fast under a tree (pādapopagama), and she wails:

miyiye miiye tavāsyasya nyūñchanāṁ tava netrayob,
baliṣ kriye ca te yāmi nirmamavitvāvatāraṇam.

The comm. glosses avatāraṇam with lokoktyā "avataraṇum".
In Bhāvadevasūri's Pārśvanātha Caritra 6.1188 we have śironyuńchanaka, apparently in the sense of, 'some arrangement of the hair of the head':

prṣṭāu ca cakriṇā kim bho ihāgamanaṇakāraṇam,
kevalaṁ tāu dhūmītaḥ sma śironyuńchanakaṁ kila.

'And when the Emperor (Sanatkumāra) asked the two (gods, Vijaya and Vāijayanta): "Why, Sirs, have you come here?", they merely shook their

This passage is wanting in the three versions of the Sanatkumāra conversion story, Kathākośa p. 35, middle; in the Māhāraśtri version, Jacobi, Ausgewählte Erzählungen, p. 21, l. 5; and in the Apabhraṇsa version from the Nemināhacariu, published by Jacobi in Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie, 1921 (stanza 739, p. 58). The latter text, however, has the word niuńchanaun in 777; see pp. 62, 128.

Rāuhiṇeyā Caritra, stanza 122, describes the following ceremony which the mother of the thief Rāuhiṇeyā undertakes in honor of his first theft:

nyuńchanāṁ vihāyaśu pradipam saptavartibhīḥ,
vidhāya tilakaṁ mātā putrāyety āśiṣaṁ dadāu.

The root uńch, 'gather', 'glean'; nir-uńchana, 'lustration', and prońch, 'wipe out', throw no light on nyuńchana.

In 4.133 occurs Naggati as the name of one of the four Pratyekabuddhas, famous both in Buddhist and Jaina literature. This 'back-formation' of Prakrit Naggaī seems to be a genuine and exclusive product of Jaina Sanskrit writers, for it is employed also by Lakṣmivallabha in his Dipikā on the Naggaī story in Devendra's commentary on Uttarādhyayana Sūtra (Jacobi, Ausgewählte Erzählungen, pp. 48 ff.). The proper noun Nagnajit occurs as early as Mahābhārata (3.15257; 5.1882; 7.120); its Pāli form is Naggajī, Kumbhakārā Jātaka (408). Almost one would think that the avoidance by the Jaina Sanskrit writers of the form nagnajit, 'conquering the naked', is to spare the feelings of the Digambaras, who might not like its implication. But
the form Naggati has no discernible association or meaning.

In Śālibhadra 5.11 the word netra, ‘kind of a cloth’, is glossed by paṭṭakūlam, which occurs in the text of Rāhuṇeye Caritra 147, 176, 313; in Bhāraṭakadvātriṇīśikā 3; and in ‘Die Abenteuer Ambadas’, by Charlotte Krause, Indische Erzähler, Band iv, p. 167. Hertel in his edition of Bhar., p. 53, derives the Sanskrit word from Old Gujarāṭī paṭakula, ‘silk cloth’, citing other forms from Hindu dialects.

The word su-dhi, ‘teacher’ (śrīdharmakumārasudhiyāḥ, ‘spiritual teachers of Dh.’) occurs at the head of the Editors’ Introduction to Śālibhadra. It is quoted otherwise only from the Kośas, except that it is found in Prabandhacintāmaṇi, p. 2, where Tawney reads with some mss. svadhiyāḥ.

The ‘root’ vidhyāi, ‘to go out’, ‘be extinguished’, a Sanskrit back-formation of Pāli-Prākrit vijjhāi (itself from Sk. vi-kṣāi ‘burn out’) is common, eclectically, in some Jaina Sanskrit texts, and totally wanting in others. See my ‘Life of Pārśvanātha’, pp. 220 ff. It does not occur in the text of Śālibhadra, which has opportunity to use it (nirvāpaya-, ‘extinguish’, in 3.82; 4.26; 7.113); but the gloss at 6.176 knows the word: jvalatkaṣṭham nireṣa vidhāpyate (I for vidhāpyate), ‘a burning log is extinguished by water’.

Of grammatical peculiarities which Śālibhadra shares with other Jaina texts the most noteworthy is the desiderative particle cikīḥ 1.28; 4.113; 5.137 (glossed, cikīṣati), ‘desiring to perform’, all times at the end of a compound. The word occurs also Pārśvanātha 8. 25 (glossed, kartum ichub); Pariśṭaparvan 7. 90; 8. 453; Mallinātha Caritra 3. 116, 117; Jinaṅgiri’s Pālapālakathānaka 123, 124, 177; Merutaṅga, Nabhākarāja Carita 7. 60; 22. 22; Uttamacaritrakathānaka, 1. 98; and in the tale of Aghata, elaborated by Charlotte Krause, Prinz Aghata (Leipzig, 1922), verse 234; cf. p. 148; note 2. The form is reported by Vopadeva, but is notquotable from any Brahmanical text (cf. Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar 4392); there is, at present, no way of deciding whether or not the Jainas took and popularized the word from grammar merely.∗∗

∗∗ Mallinātha Caritra, 1.303, has cikīṣu.
Śālibhadrā 6.25; Mallinātha Caritra 7. 34, 917; and Pārśīṣṭaparvan 1.153 have the secondary pronominal adjective yauṣmākina, 'your', otherwise reported only by grammarians and lexicographers; Mallinātha 7. 677 has the corresponding āsmākina (Pāṇini); cf. māmakina and tavakina, Mallinātha 7. 124. Mākina occurs a single time in RV. Śālibhadrā 5.1 has idamiya, 'pertaining to him' (glossed, asyayam), patterned after tadiya, etc., whereas Pārśvanātha 3.465 abandons tvadiya in favor of tvatya, glossed tvatya (see Whitney, 1245b). Cf. kvatya, 'whence', in Mahāvīra Carita 11.43 (also Pāṇini). The Prākritism imālīḥ for ebbih occurs somewhere in Pārśīṣṭaparvan; in Pārśvanātha 1.805; 6.767; 7.398; and in Samarādityasaṅkṣepa 4.508, 619; 6.385; 8.520. It may be presumed that other analogical or Prākritic pronominal forms will turn up in Jaina Sanskrit.

In Śālibhadrā 5.102 the duplication bhoga-bhoga is Pāli: Prākritic; see my 'Life of Pārśvanātha', p. 223. For the perifrastic perfect participle sāmbhāvavāmāsīvān 5. 167, see ib. pp. 237 ff., where are cited parallels from Pārśvanātha and Samarādityasaṅkṣepa. In Mallinātha Caritra 7.993, occurs the fem. kathavāmāsuṣi. The imperfect third plural āiyaruḥ, 1.52; 4.4, is supported by the grammarians, but is not otherwise quotable; cf. the present third plural iyrati in Pārśvanātha, Pārśīṣṭaparvan; see ib., p. 237, and add Mallinātha Caritra 8.63. Finally, the expression, with mixed syntax, yūyam abhūvan, 5.157, for bhavantyo 'bhūvan, is paralleled by tvam abhūt, for bhavān abhūt in Pañcadaṇḍachattraprabandha, p. 26, l. 9. In Śālibhadrā 5.69 the expression, mātar mā tad vilambadhvam, 'Mother, do not therefore delay!', is based upon the same unconscious blend between mātar and the polite plural bhavatyāḥ.

Appendix iii: New words not in the Lexicons.

Considering that the Śālibhadrā Carita is a small text it shows a rather surprising number of new words, aside from an even larger number which it shares with native lexicons and grammars; see below, pp. 306ff. They are not all of them of equal importance; some are morphological variants of familiar words; some pertain to Jaina dogmatics; and some are more or less obscure in meaning. Collectively they seem, however, to show, along with the considerable list of new words in Bhāvadevasūri’s Pārśvanātha
Caritra, that the springs of Jainistic language have by no means run dry since the days of Hemacandra. The following list contains more than 100 more or less novel items of varying degrees of interest or originality:

1.29: maraṭṭaṁ in the following śloka:
   saṁmārjanaṁ caṅkāryā harymyaṇaṁ karmaṇaṁ iva
   gharāṭṭaṁ-dalayāmāsa maraṭṭaṁ vipādām iva.

Here the word maraṭṭaṁ, glossed ahāmkiṛāṁ prakāṣaṁ vā, is not in the Lexs. 'The noble lady scrubbed houses, as one wipes off the effect of deeds (done in a previous existence); with grindstones, she rubbed off...'

1.36: kukṣi-śambalin, glossed, pātheyam, 'one whose (only) provisions are in his belly', that is, 'one who takes no provisions with him'.

1.52: āveśin, in āveśinyas tāya śucä, 'affected' (by this grief). Gloss, tena šokena...vyākulāḥ.

1.57: īṣṭikāpākamūṣikā in the following śloka:
   ājanmaudūkhaḥ-daṅghdham māṁ vidagdha api mugdhavat
   tāpam kiṁ prchata ** svacchā īṣṭikāpākamūṣikā ||

'Why do ye tho ye are wise, foolish-like, plainly ask me, who have been afflicted (burned) by misfortune from the time of my birth, about my grief (fire), me who am (like) a mouse baked into a brick?' This translation of īṣṭikāpākamūṣikā is, of course, conjectural, my idea being, 'why do you ask a mouse baked into a brick whether it is hot'? Note that the verse is redolent of words for heat.

1.70: varāraṅgas, sc. sneham, glossed, pradhānato rakṣaṇaṁ yasya tam sneham (pradhānarakṣaṇiyam). The word seems to mean, 'exercising especial care'.

1.82: saṁtoṣa-drk, in saṁtoṣa-drk-bhaya, glossed, drṣṭi-laganabhaya, seems to be eufemism for 'envious look', in the nature of 'evil eye'. Cf. Crooke, Popular Magic and Folklore in Northern India, pp. 181 ff., especially p. 191 (to avoid: 'fascination' while a particularly good dinner is eaten). In our text Dhanyā leaves Saṅgama who is eating the feast prepared by herself, saṁtoṣadrṛghbhaye ṭā 'because she fears that her look may 'fascinate'."

** See my 'Life of Pārvanātha', pp. 224 ff.
** Read. prchatha.
1.101: kalyāṇatā, 'happiness'. With double entente, 'golden character'.
1.107: aparame, 'bereft of fortune', explained as derived from apa and ramā, 'fortune', apagata ramā yasmāt, but really to be taken as a-parama 'he who has no superior'.
1.110: praghrita, in praghritābhidhām bhikṣām...ṣaṣṭhim 'designation of a certain form of alma'. Seven technical bhikṣās, of which this is the sixth, are listed by the comm. in a Prākrit śloka, the sixth being paggahiya, which is explained in Sanskrit, to wit: bhoojanārtham karopāttabhoojyamadhyād dātum īṣṭā. In the Prākrit śloka read uddhaḍa for uddhaḍā.
1.126: gajapaṭi, glossed, desāntariyam vastram=gajavaḍīḥ (Prākrit), 'imported garment'. Cf. paṭi.
1.127: jāti-sāmsmara=jāti-sāmsmaraṇa, 'remembrance of former birth'.
1.146: tallikā, 'pool', in puṇyāmbhastallikā, 'pool of the water of virtue'; 5.47, āyallakāmbhastallikā, 'pool of the water of longing'. The latter passage is glossed: āyallako raparaṇaka utkaṭhā (read utkaṭā) sāivāmbhas tasya tatākikā. Here the word āyallaṅa is quotable only from the Lexs. The word tatākikā is not in the Lexs.; it glosses tallikā also at 1.146; and at 5.142, puṇyāmbhastallikā, 'pool of the water of virtue'. In 7.13, vātsalyāmṛtatallikā, 'pool of the ambrosia of kindness', the word tallikā occurs once more without gloss. For tatākikā (otherwise unquoted) cf. the words taṭāka and taṭākini, 'pool', 'pond'. Cf. also taṭāka, and taṭāga.
1.154: kadannakam=kadanna, 'wretched food', with pejorative syllable at the beginning and at the end.
2.3: lakṣa-dipaka, glossed, lakṣayojanāni yāvad dipakaḥ, 'shining to a distance of a lākh (of yojanas)'.
2.5: sapta-varṣa, 'holding seven countries', epithet of Jambudvīpa. Gloss, atra varṣāśabdāḥ kṣetrayācī. The countries are enumerated: bharata, hāimavata, harivarṣa, videha, ramyaka, āiranyavata (read, hāiranyavata), āirāvata (Lexs. only, āirāvata). See Umāsvāti’s Tattvārthādhigama Sūtra 3.10 (ZDMG 50. 313).
2.7: pārebdhi, compound adverb, glossed, abdheḥ pāram, . . . . avyayībhāvaḥ, 'on the other shore of the ocean (an indeclinable)'.
2.23: netra, glossed tadâkhyo vrksaḥ, 'name of a tree' (growing about hermitages).

2.26: śreṇi, 'supports of a king', glossed, râjñâm âsthâna-śreṇayo 'stâdaśa. The eighteen are listed as follows: malla, âpta, hita, snigdha, mantrin, amâtya, mahattama, buddhisakha, ubhayasakha, âmnâyika, sâmgrâmika, desiyapurusa, mânapurusa, dhanyapurusa, kâmapurusâ, vijñânapurusa, râjapurusa, vinodapâtrâni. The majority of these are not in the Lexs. Cf. the ratnâni ('jewels') of a king.

2.27: puśkarâvarta- vartaka, glossed, šreṣṭho meghâb, 'superior kind of cloud'.

2.29: bhrâmara-dhyâna, 'a kind of pious contemplation'. Glossed, vitarâgaṁ yato dhyâyan vitarâgo bhaved bhavi, îlakâ bhrâmaribhûtâ bhârâmaridhyânato yathâ (âloka).

2.73: ilopanayana, and vatsaragranthibhandhana, 'sacramental practices during early childhood'.

2.77: kanaka-ghurghurâh, glossed, suvarṣa-ghurghurâb, 'golden anklets'.

2.78: keli-dolâ, 'pleasure-swing'.

2.79: balâkṣapakṣapakṣin, glossed râjâhansa, 'bright-winged bird', kenning for 'royal hânśa'.

2.92: prabhâ, glossed, prakṛṣṭaṁ bhayaṁ yasyāh sā (qualifying prabhâ, 'lustre'), 'dangerous'.

2.128: kâyavatta, glossed prakṛṣṭadheha, 'of beautiful body'.

2.134: nâri-kuṇjaratâ, 'condition of being elephant among women'. See lexs. s. v. nâri-kuṇjara. In Pâncadânḍachâtra-prabandha, p. 28 (cf. 67), the word occurs in a different but obscure meaning.

2.135: dhoṅkâra, 'sound of a drum' = dhâum-kâra, Mallinâtha Caritra 4.165.

2.136: jhâtkâra, 'sound of a lute'. Cf. jhâmkâra (Prâkrit jhamkâra).

3.5: kṛṣapacitra, glossed kâli cintâmaṇiḥ, 'black wish-jewel'. Previously, krama citrakaḥ, in the same sense, 1.85. The word occurs also in the expression kṛṣapacitrakakūndalikâ, for which see note 5 to p. 173 of Tawney's Translation of Prabandhacintâmaṇi.

3.13: apa-taru, glossed nirvrksa, 'tree-less', qualifying maru, 'desert'.

Maurice Bloomfield
3.13: daśabhid, in the passage: samsāre...dharma daśabhidā bhinnah kila kalpadrumāyate. Glossed, kṣāntyādina (sc. daśabhidā). Perhaps, 'in the samsāra...religion, unfolded by the ten-fold unfolder, verily acts as the heavenly wish-tree'. The 'ten-fold unfolder' may be ten forms of ascetic practice (kṣānty-ādi); see Umāsvāti's Tattvārthādhihamasūtra 9.6, where the ten restraints are listed: kṣamā, mārdava, etc. In Mallinātha Caritra 3.229 the abstract daśabheda.


3.29: ratham-ukṣa (stem ratham-ukṣan) 'dray-steer', in the clause, rathamukṣa na gaur yathā, 'as the (male) dray-ox is not like the (female) cow'. It is not possible to construe ratham as an independent accusative. See the entire proverbial passage, p. 288. Inf.

3.30. 51: kulābhāra 'upholding the family'. Cf. kulaṁbharā.


3.55: grhā-vāsa, metrical for grha-vāsa 'householdership'.

3.66: pañca-mahāvatit, 'group of five great vows'. Ordinarily, mahāvratī.

3.80: trāyaśtriṇā, 'designation of aids of Indra'. See Umāsvāti, 4.4. Cf. trāyodaśa, 'relating to 13'.

3.87: hṛdyaka=hṛdaya, 'charm', or 'delightful gift'.

3.98: ākṛṣṭi-vidyā, 'magic charm by which one brings to one's presence'. Cf. ākṛṣṭi in Bhāvadevasūri's Pārśvanātha-caritra 1.576; and ākṛṣṭi-mantra in Lexs. An ākṛṣṭi-mantra is given in full, Divyāvadāna, p. 612 (ll. 16 ff.); the practice of ākṛṣṭi is described in Yasodharacaritā; see Hertel, Jinakirti's Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla, pp. 142, 143.

** But perhaps ratham is a nom., with anomalous gender: "the ox is the vehicle, not the cow" (cf. pāda b. "the he-elephant is the herd, not the she-elephant").—F. E.
3.125; 4.142: śvasani-sarpa, glossed (in 4.142), sarpaviśeṣaḥ, ‘serpent that kills by breath’. Lexs. only śvasana. In Divyāvadāna, p. 105 middle, occur four kinds of serpents, one of them the present kind, śvāsa-viṣa, ‘whose breath is poison.’


4.9: baladhūlī, ‘dust thrown up by an army, or by force’, i. e., ‘thick dust’. The śloka reads, samrāt (read ṛād) deveśu bhūpāla nepālo yatra bhūbhujām, śīraḥsu baladhūlīva gandhadhvādhirohati. Here the word gandhadhvālī, ‘musk’, is reported only in Lexs. and the word baladhūlī is uncertain.

4.15: ūrṇāyu-varṇikā, ‘woolen texture’. See ūrṇāyu, ‘wool’, (Böhtlingk), and ‘woolen blanket’ (quoted from Lexs. in Mon. Will., Appendix); and varṇakā (s. v. varṇaka), ‘woolen cloth’ (quoted from Lexs.). Cf. ūrṇāyu-varga in 4.32.

4.30: víra-kraya, glossed, yathākathitatamūlya, ‘originally stated price’.

4.32: dhāutika-rūpa, unexplained in the following two yugma stanzas: pūrṇam ūrṇāyuvargeṇa śītabhitārtirakṣanāiḥ, kṛtva ca dhāutikaraṇaṃ devārcāsas yad arjitaṃ; tenaṃyena puṇyena svajātāu prāpya ratnatām, kambalāṃ sālikāntānām anhrisevām ivāsadan. Seems to refer to some ascetic practice.

4.44: pārigrahika, ‘pertaining to a retinue’ in mantripārigrahikavgraḥa, ‘intestine strife’.


4.63: dipalaya = dipāli, ‘name of a lamp festival’; see Hertel’s Translation of Hemavijaya’s Kathāratnakāra, vol. 1, p. 97, note 3.


4.120: avagāhini, fem., ‘immersing itself’, ‘entering’.

4.125: paribhoga, metrical for pari, ‘enjoyment’.


4.143: yugmin. The Pet. Lexs. have, ‘von unbestimmter Bedeutung’, Satrunjayamāhāyāmya 3.4. The passage here reads: pitāsa... divyabhogaśriyam datte kalpadur iva yugminām,
'His father bestows upon him the bliss of divine enjoyment as the wish-tree (gives happiness) to Yugmins'. The word occurs a second time, 6.185, to wit, atisnigdham jaganmāityā manaḥ kim yugunikālavat? 'Why is their mind exceedingly tender with kindness to the world as in the time of the Yugmins?'

4.149: satvāhanā (caturvidhā), glossed asthi-mānśa-tvag-roma-bhedāś caturdhā, 'fourfold shampoo'. Lexs. have only neut. satvāhanam.

4.157: sormika, 'having waves'.

4.165: tala-haṭi, as gloss to adhitya kā, 'table-land'. Lexs. have neither tala-haṭi, nor haṭi.

4.170: dhūma-pāka, 'smoked food'.

4.170: dvipākima, glossed, vahnisūryātapapacita, 'zwieback'.


5.3: gandha-sindhura = gandhagaja, 'scent-elefant' (elefant during rut).

5.17: kekikekāyita: kekāya, 'cry kekā', as a peacock.

5.22: vinayāgastyadakṣiṇā, glossed, vinaya eva agastyas tasya nivāsāya dakṣiṇadiksamānā, 'a kind of reverence'.

5.66: adi-potriṇī, glossed, adi-varāhi, 'primordial she-boar'.

5.79: sapta-kṣetri, in sapta-kṣetri-niveśana, 'act of placing into the seven fields'. Cf. sapta-kṣetri in 6.37 (saptāṅgīn sapta kṣetram). According to Hertel, Translation of Hemavijaya's Kathāratanākara, vol i, p. 207, note 2, the seven fields are: the Monks and the Nuns; the male and female lay-disciples; the temples; the ikons of the Jinas; and the libraries of the Monks; see also vol. i, p. 232; vol. ii, p. 105, 290, and the same author's Translation of Jinakirti's Ratnacūda, p. 168 (Indische Märchenromane I). The word occurs also in Mallinātha Caritra 2.658.

5.84: śrī-kalyāṇācala, glossed merupavata, 'Mount Meru'. Cf. the mountain Śrī, mentioned frequently in Jaina literature; e. g. Bhāva Devaasūri's Pārśvanāthacaritra 3.120, 124; Prabhāndhacintāmaṇi, Tawney's Translation, p. 10.

5.88: jagati-drś, glossed jagan-netra, 'eye of the world' (sun, moon, etc.).

5.91: Gäubhadri, patronymic of Gobhadra. Neither in
Lex. Gobhadra, however, is mentioned in Kathakośa, pp. 82, 83 of Tawney's Translation.

5.92: arvācina-tā, glossed, ihalokāpekṣā, 'interest of the present or terrestrial world'.

5.94: kubja, glossed, trṇa-kuṭiraka, 'grass hut'.

5.97: taptāyogola-kalpa, 'age of the heated fire-ball', 'present age'.

5.103: uddhukṣita, glossed, dagdha, 'kindled'. Root dhukṣ, otherwise only in composition with sam.

5.105: trasa-rekhā, 'floating line in jewels', in the expression, trasarekheva ratneṣu mahāmahimahānaye, 'as a floating line in a jewel, calculated to diminish worth'. See p. 289.

5.109: suṣhītaka-prāya, 'for the most part unshaken', but with pun on 'some brilliant headgear worn by a king', parallel to kalyāṇa-māuli (glossed, suvarṇamukta). Sushītaka is glossed by Prākrit sūthiyā, lokabhāṣāyām idhuṇi, quotable neither from Hemacandra, nor Pischel's Index. The passage reads: kalyāṇamāulī śrīvīravāvyādeśe śīraḥśthite, kathām suṣhītakapārayām rājate rājaśāsanam. The sushītaka is, apparently, a headdress inferior to the diadem (māuli).

5.120: sakala-devāḥ, glossed svayaṁbhūdevatānām, saprabhavānām vā, 'superior gods'. Mallinātha Caritra 7.574 has devata sakala.

5.131: phālikā, in, katham... karpūraḥphālikābhīr, prāśādāśi-kharāṁ bhaveti, perhaps, 'how can the crest of a palace be made out of slabs of camfor?' phālikā seems to be a vṛddhi-derivative from phalaka.

5.134: vipijgāhīsu, 'desiring to immerse one's self'.

5.138: devadantin, glossed āṅrāvaṇa, 'Indra's elephant'. In Lex. said to be Śiva (erroneously).

5.150: tuṇḍa-tuṇḍava, glossed, mukhanṛtyam, 'mouth-dance', i. e., 'vain talk'.

5.153: udvāma, perhaps 'emission'? In the cpd. nisvānovāmānśāvīṇe; see p. 289 above. The gloss renders nisvāno-vāma by ravaḍ bhayānake.

6.11: nāśīrvirātā, 'position of a hero in the van of an army'.

6.22: vy-amrāksit, from vi + mṛś, glossed, prēṣayāmāsa, 'dismissed'.

6.41: manī-maya, metrical for manī- 'jeweled'. manī is quoted as an independent stem, Ādiśvara Caritra, 2.22: see
6.50: laṅkha, glossed vaṅśāgrādinṛtyādikārin. Seems to mean, 'some kind of acrobat or dancer'. In the dvandva compound laṅkha-maṅkha-vidūṣakān, the two last members of which are glossed respectively, maṅkhaś citraphalakahastāḥ, and vidūṣakā āmakaducakādīvācakāḥ (kad-ūcaka = kad-vada, not in Lexs.).

6.64: adevadru, 'without devadāru trees'. Neither devadru nor adevadru in the Lexs.

6.79: lūkā, glossed lokoktyā "lū". The sloka reads: yatra dehe uṇḍaśvāsīḥ śucisūcā prapaṇcitā (gloss, śucikakalpanā kathitā), lūkā jhalajhala tatra maṇayānīlā ṣrī gotā. Once more lūkā in 7.142: vyāmohena mahāhīmena mathitam no māyaḥ lūkaya kopena prabalātapa na madai rogāhiyogār iva. This lūkā with its colloquial lū seems to run parallel to yūka and yū 'louse'. The word is evidently pejorative, but I do not venture to guess its meaning.

6.81: kīṭṭita-lohata, glossed kīṭalohata, would seem to mean, 'red color of some insect'. Or, is kīṭṭita denominal participle from kīṭṭa 'rust', so that the compound means 'rusty color'? In antithesis with gāriṇkata, 'color of white mustard'.

6.82: kāntalohapātra, glossed kāntilohabhājanam, kāntilohabhājano 'ginitāpena dugdham utphānatiti lokokitāḥ (ut) phaṇ, not in Lexs.). The Lexs, have kāntalāuha = lohakānta 'magnetic iron'.

6.85: vāśvānara-rathyā, glossed agnisamānamārga, 'a particular division of the moon's path' = vāśvānara-pathā.

6.89: dhūpani, fem., ordinarily dhūpana, neut., 'exhalation'.

6.95: uttuṇḍa, glossed utpāṭitamukha, 'with open snout', (said of jackals).


6.116, 141: trilokitilaka, 'ornament of the three worlds'.

6.137: kiradāru, glossed, kirakāṣṭha, 'designation of a tree'.

6.155: dvādaśābdhiya, glossed, dvādaśābdānām samāhāraḥ, abdāni varśāṇi, 'period of twelve years'.

6.156: manorathika, 'springing from desire'
6.194: abdhijalamaṇuṣi, glossed jalavāsinī stri, 'mermaid'.
6.205: īrīyāpāthiki = āiryā°, q.v.
7.18: vi-sādhaya-, 'achieve'.
7.26: alpa-kālīna, in antithesis with sāśvata, 'of short duration'.
7.32: rādhā-vedhas, neuter, 'act of shooting so as to hit the aim'; cf. -vedhin, and -bhedin. See Merutuṅga's Prabandha-cintāmaṇi, pp. 45, 77 of Tawney's Translation. According to Leumann in a note to p. 45 of Tawney's work, Rādhā is a puppet (Prākrit puttalīya), painted into the middle of a butt, as a mark to shoot at. He who hits it is a rādhā-vedhin. On p. 45 the word Rādhā is inverted into Dhārā, the name of a courtezan.
7.33: netra-paṭṭa, glossed, deśāntarāyātavastraviśeṣam, 'imported garment'.
7.36: paṇcāngirakṣaṇa, glossed, sādhukṛtyā, 'paḍilehikari', 'some Jain practice'; in juxtaposition with paṇcanamaskāra, 'reverence to the Arhats, etc.'
7.38: pādapopagama = pādapopagamana (nāmānaśānam), 'death by fast under a tree'.
7.60: korīta, as gloss to utkīrṇa, 'heaped'. Dhātupāṭha has a root kur 'utter a sound', which does not suit.
7.94: vāsi-candana-kalpa, describing an advanced ascetic, 'he to whom the (burning) sword and the (cooling) sandal are all the same'. This word occur in Buddhist Sanskrit. See the author, JAOS 40. 339 ff. The antithesis between sandal and sword occurs also in Prabandha-cintāmaṇi; see p. 92 of Tawney's Translation; and cf. Böhltlingk, Indische Sprüche 4882.
7.118: cūla = cūḍā, 'crest'.

Appendix in: Words quoted only in Lexicons or Grammars, or quoted in their present meaning only in the same class of texts.

The Śālibhadra Carita, in common with many other Jaina texts, uses many words and expressions which are recorded hitherto only in the native Lexicons and Grammars. Beginning with the great and prolific Hemacandra, the Jaina were ardent students of filology. In the Mallavādi Prabandha, the scarcely
less famous Haribhadrasūri says of himself that his belly is so full of learning (śāstrapūrāt) as to threaten to burst, and that he is, therefore, tying it with a golden band. If he should happen not to understand the sense of a single word spoken by any one, he vows to become his pupil. See Candraprabhasūri’s Prabhāvaka Carita, pp. 104 bottom; 105 top. The same, or similar, statements appear in Māṇikyasūri’s Yaśodhara Carita, and in a Paṭṭāvali, extracted in Weber’s Handschriftenverzeichniss, ii. 3, p. 1034 (nr. 1989); see Hertel, Jinakirti’s Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla, pp. 142, 144. The monk Śobhana’s studies for twelve years not only Grammars, Lexicons, and Poetics, but also other sciences, in the 138th story of Hemavijaya’s Kathāratnākara (Hertel’s Translation, vol. ii, p. 81). Inasmuch, therefore, as Jaina texts are all relatively late, it does not follow that words which occur in them, and only Kośa and Vyākaraṇa texts besides, are any more ‘quotable’ than the grammatical forms of the Bhāṭṭikāvya. Thus maṇḍala (maṇḍalaka), cited widely by Lexicographers in the sense of ‘dog’, occurs in that sense in Pārśvanātha 3.1104; Dharmaparikṣā 2.36; 4.74 (Mironow, p. 8), but we may not, therefore alone, assume that the word is really Sanskrit. Nay, even if the word in that sense should ultimately turn up in ‘Classical’ Sanskrit literature, we should not be certain that the Jaina authors actually knew it as such: it would still be possible, or rather likely, that their knowledge of it is derived solely from the Kośas. The same caution should attend our judgment of many Jaina words. Thus, e.g., ajākrpaṇiya, Śalībhadrā 5.125; Hemavijaya’s Kathāratnākara, story 19 (Hertel’s Translation, vol. i, p. 54), in the sense of ‘unexpected untoward happening’. This Pāṇinean word, as yet unquoted in Sanskrit literature proper, is the precise opposite

12 Cf. Winternitz, Geschichte der Indischen Literatur, 2. 320.
14 Cf. the droll story in Prabandhacintāmaṇi, p. 39, where an entire family, down to the wretched one-eyed maid-servant, is clever enough to fill in stanzas partly recited before them (samasyā, dodhaka, or gadha-caturthaka). That was, doubtless, a Jaina family.
15 This word is also Prākrit, but that does not explain its origin, nor is it likely that the Sanskrit writers have borrowed it from that source: see Zachariae, Beiträge zur Indischen Lexicographie, p. 66.
of kākatāliya, 'unexpected favorable happening', which is very common in Sanskrit; see the author, AJP 40. 11 ff. Tho ajākrpanīya refers to a well-known apolog, and is probably good Sanskrit, the Jaina writers seem to derive it from Pāṇini, and not from any literary source hitherto unrevealed.

Quite certainly Pradyumnasūri, the learned, elegant, and fecund author or redactor of the present Śālibhadra Carita, does derive part of his verbal inspiration directly from the Grammarians. Thus we have stanzas 5.44, 45:

tad aham sāśāha kaṭṭaṁ māsaṁ bhārām āhitam,
cācalis tava nirdeśāir apakīrtāu na pāpatih;
bhūjīṣyas te yatiṣye 'haṁ sarvārthaprapyāptaye tathā,
labdhvā yathāham indratvām gosvāmi na vyathīṣyate.

The Body speaks to the Mind: 'Then I (the Body), bravely enduring hardships, stoutly bearing the burden imposed upon me, swift to obey thy orders, not plunging into disrepute—may I, as thy (Mind's) servant, thus strive to fulfill thy every intention, so that thou, my Master, after having obtained control, shalt not fail of thy purpose'. The four italicized reduplicated adjectives (participles) appear in the same order in Pāṇini 5.2.38. It does not matter that three of them (all but pāpati) are from Rig-Vedic times, whereas pāpati is cited only by Grammarians; our author obviously derived them from Pāṇini, and their individual chronology is negligible, in so far as our author's diction is concerned.

Once more, at Śālibhadra 4.50, occur three adjectives in -āyya in the following śloka:
śrīnākāyya 13 prasāyyo 14 'pi kambalā prājya-prāyyabhū 15 prasahya mahyam ānāyya sapradarpanī samarpyatām.
The passage is spoken by Queen Cellanā to King Śrenika: 'O (king), dwelling-house of Fortune! bring here by force, and proudly give me the shawl which, tho it be (intrinsic) worthless, confers great honor!' The theme of the command of the queen is a shawl of magic power. The three italicized words above are all from Pāṇini 3.1.138; our author's use of them throws not

---

13 Text, erroneously, labdhā.
14 Glossed, lakṣinīrgha.
15 Glossed, asaṁmata.
16 Glossed, bhūmānākāraṇgam.
the least light on their standing in literature. They may, or
they may not, be mere fictions of grammar, as far as Pradyum-
nasūri’s testimony goes.

Less stringent, yet quite convincing, is the alliterating use
of the words āśvina and adya-āśvina in 5.46.

dehavāhamanaḥsādisāṅgatyam avagamyā tat,

sa mene bhavam āśvinam adya-āśvinam jayotsavam.

‘Having understood this connection of the Mind seated in
the vehicle of the Body, (Śālibhadra) regarded existence as a vic-
torious race, run by a horse in one day (āśvina)\(^{\text{**}}\), coming
to an end to-day or to-morrow (adya-āśvina)\(^{\text{**}}\). The two glossed
words are cited respectively in Pāṇini 5.2.19 and 5.2.13; there
is scarcely a chance that our author knew them from literature
or any source of information other than that of the Grammarians.

The two curious compounded gerunds, kane-hatyā and mano-
hatya\(^{\text{**}}\) occur in 5.26 and 6.165 respectively in the sense of
‘being sated or satisfied’ (glossed, tr̥pti-paryantam, and tr̥pti-
sūcakam). Pāṇini treats these anomalous verbal prefixes (gati)
in 1.4.66, 3.1.6. I take it unquestioningly that Pradyumnasūri
has derived them from grammar, and not from any other source.

‘The Grammarians teach that any noun-stem in the language
may be converted without any other addition than that of an a
into a present stem’ (Whitney, *Skt. Gramm.* 1054). Such forms
occur scatteringly thru the language, and Jaina writers seem to
favor them. Thus our text, 1.118, has suvarṇāti, ‘to be worth
gold’, glossed, suvarṇāyate (neither in the Lexs.); 6.95, kāntā-
sangitanti, glossed, kāntāsangitam ivācaranti, ‘they practice
the song of female loves’. The word is used of the howl of
open-mouthed she-jackals (uttuṇḍa-candālapherandāḥ, glossed,
uptaṭitamukhavac caṇḍastṛgāḷyāḥ); 7.80, vajrati, ‘be hard as
adamant’, glossed, vajra ivačarati. Suali, in his ‘Analisi dell’
Ādiśvaracaritra di Hemacandra,’ *Studi Italiani di Filologia Indo-
Iranica*, vol. 7, p. 6, cites the forms paśavanti, 2.973, and, caṇ-
carikanti, 5.402. It seems as tho this phenomenon, whose
scope it is not possible as yet to state, is due to acquaintance with
grammar, rather than to inspiration from outside literary models.

---

\(^{\text{**}}\) Glossed, āśvina ‘dhvā sa yo śvena dīnenākena gamyate.

\(^{\text{**}}\) Glossed, adya śvo vā bhavam adya-āśvinam.

\(^{\text{**}}\) Not in the Lexa.
The same is true of occasional Vedisms in Jaina Sanskrit. Our text, 6.188, has the reduplicated participial adjective, governing the accusative, dadhi (glossed, dadhāti), quoted only from Veda and Grammarians. In the same śloka occurs nir-iyamānāyoh (glossed, nirgacchatoḥ) which is also pretty clearly a Vedic archaism. In 1.79, the participle eṣantyāḥ (glossed, āgachantyāḥ) is quotable only from RV. and AV. In 5.13 we have rājasarpāḥ prasarpantām yakāṃ jegilyate...bhogilokam, 'the anaconda (with double entente, 'royal serpent', meaning King Śrenika) who devours the poor serpent-folk (with double entente, 'his happy people')'. The pejorative or diminutive use of suffix ka with pronoun is essentially Vedic; see Edgerton, JAOS 31. 93ff., but is occasionally found in Jaina texts, see my 'Life of Pārśvanātha', p. 238. See also, as instances of real diminutives in our text, 5.108, naraka (glossed, kutsito naraḥ), 'unworthy man'; and, 5.126, pūtaraka, from pūtara, 'despised insect'; cf. kadannakam, above. Nevertheless yaka may be a mere Vedism. Mironow, Die Dharma-parikṣā, p.7 ff., cites from that text, anāśvāns, 'not having eaten'; viśvajānīna, 'ruler of all folk'; aśānyā, 'hunger'; caranyu, kenning for wind'. We may feel sure that some of these Vedic words are derived from philological rather than literary sources. So probably also the nominative nā, 'man' (stem nr) in Mahāvīra Carita 1.136.

The following is an additional list of words quoted only in Lexicons or Grammars, or quoted in their present meaning only in the same class of texts; it contains more than forty words, in addition to those discussed in the preceding.

1.38: utpaśya, 'looking up or upwards'. Glossed, unmukha. Also in Mallinātha Caritra 6.244.
1.40: sahya, 'health' (gloss, sahyāya = nirogāya).
1.65: dhūmari, 'mist', 'fog'; see Zachariae, l. c., pp. 55, 66.
1.77: kuṇḍalikā, 'mixture of rice and ghee' = kuṇḍala. This sense of kuṇḍalikā is not given in the Lexs.
1.93: śilāputra, 'good-for-nothing'. The interesting gloss reads:

nirbhāgyo durbhagaḥ paṅguḥ kuṇih kuṇthamatis tathā,
nicaḥ pāparato yas tu śilāputraḥ sa ucyate.

kecid evam āhuḥ: kasyāś cit striyo lojhako jātas tayāsāv aranye tyaktaḥ (accordingly lojhaka seems to mean 'bantling',
to be exposed in the forest). kunṭha-matis (not in Lexs.) = kunṭha-manas, 'weak-minded'. Mallinātha 7.393 has aśmaputra in the same sense.

1.96: pātraila-kr, glossed, pātrāya diyata iti pātraila; "dye trā ca" (Pāṇini 7.2.133), 'to give to a worthy person'.

1.115: 4.163: āśitambhava, glossed, trpti, 'satiety'; only in Pāṇini and Lexs.

1.117: pragunār guṇāyā is glossed by āudanikār guṇāyā. The word āudanika is quoted only in Gaṇa saṁśāpādi, to Pāṇ. 5.1.101. The reference of the scholiast is to the word puṇyapāka in the text, so that the meaning of āudanika, 'one who knows how to cook porridge', is relevant.

1.125: 7.2: Mallinātha Caritra, 8.466: aśādkśina, glossed, catuṣkarna, 'not seen by six eyes', i.e., 'known by two persons only', 'secret', Pāṇ. 5.4.7. Cf. the familiar śaṭkarnā, as contrasted with catuṣkarna in parallel senses, and see the author in Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 56, p. 13.

2.33: caturā, glossed hastīśāla, 'elephants' stable'. The neuter caturam occurs in that sense in the Lexs. only.

2.55, 56: tālākanda and tālākanda-mahāratnam, 'crystal', or 'jewel', glossed, amṛtakūṇḍasamam tālākandanaṁnam ratnaviśeṣā, and, śaṭkaraṇaviniśeṣā. The word is quoted in the Lexs. only in the sense of 'a certain bulb'.

2.66: pātriṇa, in sarva-pātriṇa, glossed, sarvapātrebhya yogānyi, 'filling the whole dish', 'abundant'.

2.73: The word riṅṣaṇam is to be emended to riṅkaṇam, 'crawling', and is so quoted only in Lexs.

2.93: lakṣmipuṣpa, glossed, padmaragamani, 'ruby'.

2.128: ciraṇṭikāś (emend, ciraṇṭikāś) ciraṇṭhī (the latter glossed, vadhūtyāha), apparently, 'a class of women described in the Kāmasūtra'. The Lexs. s. vs. ciraṇṭi, ciraṇṭi, 'a woman, married or single, who, after maturity, resides in her father's house'. Only in Lexs. and Gramm.—ciraṇṭi also in 4.36; ciraṇṭikā, glossed by vadhū, also in 6.140.

3.6: bhādramātura, glossed, bhadrā mātā yasyāsāu, 'son of a virtuous or handsome mother'. Here with double entente, Bhadrā being Śālī's mother.

3.8: cidrūpa, glossed, paṇḍita, 'wise'. In that sense only in Lexs.

3.15: 6.52: yāpyayaṇa, glossed, śivikā, 'palanquin', 'litter'. The same word in 6.7 (glossed sukhāsana). The Sanskrit form
is a facile, yet really senseless, folk-etymological back-formation of Prākrit jhampañā; see Zachariae, in Vienna Oriental Journal vol. 16, p. 25.

3.70: hindī, glossed, rātrāu rakṣācāra, 'night-watch'.
3.80: kuṛśīm-bhāri, 'gluttonous'.
4.9: gandhadhūli, 'musk'.
4.142: ku-rājya, 'evil government'.
4.153: jāngulīya, glossed, gāruḍiṭa, 'snake-charmer'. Lexs. have jāngulī etc. in that sense.
4.162: panipatyate, intensive from pat. Only in Gramm.
4.166: hayapriya, glossed, yava, 'barley'.
5.47: āyallaka, 'longing', in āyallakāmbhastallikā, 'pool of the water of longing'.
5.49: kalā-keli, glossed, kandarpa, 'sporting with the digits of the moon', as a kenning of Kāma.
5.116: varṇikā, 'purity of gold'; see Lexs., s.v. varṇaka.
6.36: vīra-jayantikā, glossed, vīra-patākā, 'hero-flag'.
6.43: somāla in su-somāla, 'very delicate'. Cf. 6.118, where the text has somā latā, for somālāta, 'delicacy'.
6.87: bhissā and bhissāta, 'inferior kinds of cooked rice'.
6.92: kāpurā-pāncāli, 'puppet made of camfor'. pāncāli, in that sense, only in Lexs. (frequent in Vikrama Carita, F.E.); it is glossed by pūtali, not in Lexs., and doubtless = puttali. Cf. puttikā.
6.94: kaṭūtkaṭā, 'dried ginger'.
6.94: aṭātyā, '(habit of) roaming'.
6.97: avāvari, fem. of adj. avāvan, glossed, oṛ apanayane, aṇuṇati doṣān, 'carrying off (blemishes)'. Pāṇini and Lexs.
6.191: kātyāyani, glossed, ardhavṛddhanāri, 'middle-aged woman'. Also in Prabandhacintāmaṇi; see p. 34 of Tawney's Translation.

7.4: kukkuṭa-grāma, glossed kugrāma, 'low caste village'.

Only Lexs.

7.5: mañji = mañjā, glossed ajā, 'she-goat'. Both only in Lexs.

7.18: varkara, glossed, hāsyena ajāputreṇa va, 'sport', or, 'kid'. In the former sense only in Lexs.

7.27: kalambo, glossed, bāṇa, 'arrow'.

7.57: kīl, 'bind', in jāla-kiliṭa, 'caught in a net'.

7.87: nir-vīra, glossed, nispatisūtā, 'woman without husband and sons'. In this sense only in Lexs.

7.138: sākhāpura, glossed, purasya samīparā yad upapuram, 'suburb' = sākhānagara.

Appendix v: Denominal Verbs and Participles:
Elative Verbs in taram.

In my 'Life of Pārśvanātha', p. 230 ff., I have listed a notably large number of new denominal formations. This seems to me to be a peculiarity of Jaina diction, for the present text also exhibits considerable fertility in this respect; see Suali's parallel observation on the text of the Ādiśvaracaritra, 1. c., p. 6. In addition to the denominals in -a, mentioned above, p. 309, Śālibhadra Carita contributes the following list:

1.2: ghṛtameghāyita, 'acted as a cloud rich in ghee'. The passage is, ādau dhanabhāve yena ghṛtameghāyitam. Gloss, ghṛtameghavad ācaritam. In 6.203 occur further the parallel compounds dudhameghāyita, mahāmeghāyita, dadhimeghāyita, and sudhāmeghāyita. The uncompounded denominative meghāyita is familiar, but these participles are denominals made directly from compounds.

1.15: sajjanaśa-, 'to act a good part'.

1.96: cintāmanīśa-, 'to act the part of a thought-gem'.

1.157: svāmiśa-, 'to rule'.

2.121: vasanta-samayāyita, 'pervaded by the spring season'.
The passage is, puṣpapraparikṣepāṅg vasantasamayāyitam, (sc. vivāham[!]), in stanza 126), 'a wedding turned into spring season by throwing bouquets of flowers'.

2.122: suparva-nagarāyita 'turned into a festive city'. The passage is, divyāṅg dūṣyāṅg alaṁkārāṅg suparva-nagarāyitam, (sc. vivāham), 'a wedding turned into a city festival by means of divine garments and ornaments'. Followed by another denominal participle, koṇita, in the expression nāyavallīdalāṅg pūgapūgāṅg kāuṅkaṇakkoṇitam (sc. vivāham). Here kauṅkaṇakoṇitam is obscure.


3.28: alāṇaṅg, 'fasten to an elephant's post'.
6.55: pari-civaṅgita, 'dress in a ragged monk's garment'.
6.63: vimukhāṅgita, 'averted'; gloss, vimukhacāṅgita.
6.69: tūṅgayaṅg, 'to make restless'; glossed, utsukikuryāṅg.
6.69: apakāṅgita, glossed, avaganita, 'disregarded'.
6.186: svargasargāṅgita, where sargāṅgita has the gloss, srṣṭi. 'there was created heaven'.

7.129: samdhīrāṅg (text, sandhīṅg), 'encourage'.

I add here, as established Jaina usage, tho not restricted to these texts, the frequent employment of the elative suffix tāraṁ to finite verbs: 2.105, plāvyāye-tāraṁ; 4.141; 5.115, dūdyāye-tāraṁ; 5.53, rocaye-tāraṁ; 6.93, papathire-tāraṁ; 6.159, tatvarire-tāraṁ; 6.191, mumude-tāraṁ. Cf. my 'Life of Pārśvanāṭha', p. 238.

Appendix vi; Emendations and Corrections.

1.2: for yathorviśasayāṅgriṅ, read ūśasya śriṅ.
1.19: for jaṅgama sevadhī, read ūmaś śevadhī. But sevadhī also in 2.55.
1.26: for nicchadma (glossed, nirmāṅg), read niśchadma, 'unprotected'; or, possibly, niḥsadma, 'without abode' (anyasadam, muḥsadmā, in alliteration).
1.52: in the note 9 on the stanza read in the gloss, āveśinya for aveśinya.

*4 Glossed, kramuka-samahāṅg, meaning 'samuhāṅg.'
1.57: for prćchata, read prćchatha.
1.68: for ৎtandulāṇ, read ৎtaṇḍulāṇ. So also in 5.107.
1.69, note 9: for sarkārām, read śarkārām.
1.71: for pratīvesanyāḥ, read pratīvesīnyāḥ, as in the repeated śloka 1.124.
2.5, note: for āiranyavata, read hāiranyavata.
2.73: for riṅṣanam, read riṅkhanam.
2.80: for śākaraḥ, read sūṭa.
2.122, note 3: for kramukasamahāḥ, read ॐsamūhāḥ.
2.128: for cirāṇṭikās, read cirāṇṭikās.
2.140: for nacāsātimatam, read na cāṭ.
3.46: Separate the two vocatives, anutsaka and mahotsāha, which are printed as one word.
4.9: for samrāṭ, read samrāḍ.
4.10: the alternate reading, kambalāḥ svabalāir iva, is to be taken into the text.
4.21: for kim balaṁ, read kimbalam.
4.43: for vāṭapattraṇa, read vāṭapattraṇa.
4.67: for kim rūpaḥ, read kimrūpaḥ.
4.118: for śrṇi-sūcyeva, read śṛṇi-sūcyeva.
4.153: for jāñguliyapadena vā, read jāñguliyapadeneva (?).
4.156: for sūresu read śūresu. This particular interchange between s and ś is a frequent Jainism; see e.g. Hertel, Indische Märchen, p. 130.
5.7: punarāvṛtā seems to stand for ुvṛttā, 'recurring'.
5.45: for labdhā, read labdhvā.
5.47: in gloss 5 read utkaṭā, for utkaṭhā.
5.61: for harmyāṇām, read harmyāṇām.
5.80: in tvam api pūraya sarvāṇgaśarpasvarvāśāḥ, separate ुcaṇga from sarvāśāḥ, 'having knowledge of all Aṅgas, full of thou all hopes'. With double entente, 'do thou of sound limbs, fill all the regions of space'.
5.103: for parādeśānalai mātār, read parādeśānalair mātār.
5.107: for ৎtandulāḥ read ৎtaṇḍulāḥ. So also in 1.68.
5.111: for nānārūpi cakre, read nānārūpīcakre.
5.119: for nyatkāra (gloss, tiraskāra), read nyak-kāra.
6.17: for tad duḥkhato, read tadduḥkhato.
6.18: for somā latā, read somālata, 'delicacy'.
6.43: for sukhāmāmūlāiḥ, read suṣamāmūlāiḥ.
6.54: for bhūṣanānyastadūṣañāḥ, read bhūṣanān nyastadūṣañāḥ. The rare masculine bhūṣanān also in 6.56.
6.93: for svāmisattāyā, read svāmisaktāyā.
6.110: for kīkāśa⁹, read kīkāsa⁹.
6.174: for pravrajīṣyāmaḥ, read the conditional pravrajīṣyāmaḥ.

7.3: for parāvṛttya, read, perhaps, parāvartya. But Jaina texts seem to confuse primary and causative forms a good deal; see Weber, Paṇcadaṇḍachattraprabandha, p. 3; and my 'Life of Pārāvanātha', p. 238.
7.63: for nirajanirañjana, read, perhaps, niraṇa nirāñjana, pace gloss kamalāvan nirañjana.
7.80: for triparikṣitavajrati, read triparikṣitaṁ vajrati.
7.96: for mṛgapaṅkṣigaṇākulāṁ read ṣkulā, agreeing with the subject of the sentence.
7.122: for mahāsamarasāmrāmbhe, read mahāsamaṁraṁbhe, with pun, to be sure, on mahāsama-rasām rambhe; see p. 262.

In 5.53; 6.122 we have the phrase, mṛṣṭam vāidyopadiṣṭam ca, 'delicacies and food prescribed by physicians'. The same phrase is printed in 4.81 as mṛṣṭam vāidyopadiṣṭam ca. Tho both mṛṣṭam and mṛṣṭam are good Sanskrit⁸¹, only one of these (here mṛṣṭam) should appear in a given text.

⁸¹ mṛṣṭam is perhaps a cross between mṛṣṭam and ỉṣṭam, under Prākritic impulse.
ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF COMPOUND POSTPOSITIVE IN EARLY SUMERIAN

GEORGE A. BARTON

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Poebel in his Grammatical Texts, Philadelphia, 1914, p. 24ff., states that the compound postpositive -ka-ka is a double sign for the genitive—a noun + a noun + a genitive + a genitive. In making a new translation of the early Sumerian royal inscriptions I have been led to study the subject somewhat minutely, and Poebel’s explanation does not suit any one of the cases which I have examined. As Poebel cites only hypothetical examples in support of his statement one is at a loss to know on what he bases it. If one may judge by the published translations of inscriptions Poebel’s view is shared by other scholars. It seems fitting, therefore, that the subject should be more fully and inductively examined.

It should be noted as a starting point for such examination that, when the relation to be expressed is the simple genitive, but one -ka is used, as in the Stele of Vultures, vi, 12ff.: gudein-na a-sag gan ki-dg "nin-gr-su-ka: "Guedin, the irrigated field which is beloved of Ningirsu.” Also (Stele of Vultures xii, 11-13): a-sag-da-na ki-gar-ra "nin-gr-su-ka: "That exalted field, the place of the luxurious crops of Ningirsu.”

It should further be noted that, in Sumerian, a postpositive governing a noun which is followed by a dependent genitive is placed after the dependent genitive. For example: 8-an-nat-tum pa-te-si 'ir-pur-la"-ra: "To Eannatum, Patesi of Lagash” (Galet A, 22-24). The -ra governs Eannatum. Again: nam-pa-te-si 'ir-pur-la"-la nam-lugal kis" mu-na-ta-sum: "(Ininni) to the patesiat of Lagash the kingdom of Kish added” (ibid. vi, 2-5). Here -ta after 'ir-pur-la" governs nam-pa-te-si

1 The view is reiterated in his Grundzüge der Sumerischen Grammatik, 1923, p. 135.
Similarly, in accordance with this rule, a postpositive governing a noun followed by a dependent genitive, when that genitive is denoted by the postpositive -ka, is written after the -ka and both postpositives retain their meaning. Thus: nam-tiL en-te-me-na-ka-šu: “For the life of Entemena” (Cone A, vi, 3, 4). The -šu governs nam-tiL, and the -ka is the sign of the genitive, and both retain their full meaning. Again in Urkagina’s “Oval plaque” inscription (Découvertes en Chaldée, p. L), col. V, 17ff., we find iš-ge-gir iš-sal-išib ki āg iš-ningir-su-ka-ra iš-e-ni mu-na-ru: “For Khegir, the priestess beloved of Ningirsu, her temple he built.” In this sentence the -ra of -ka-ra clearly means “for” and governs Khegir. Similarly in Urkagina’s Cones B and C, ix, 23ff.: iš-ki-sur-ra iš-ningirsu-ka-ta iš-a-šu iš-maskim-šu nu-ē: “In the irrigated land of Ningirsu, even to the sea, an overseer was no more.” In this sentence -la clearly means “in” and governs “ki” in l. 22. Another example: an-ta-sur-ra iš-ningirsu-ka-ta zu-su lugal u-ug iš-u-ug iš-sū mu-gaz: “(Eannatum) from the Antasurra of Ningirsu, Zuzu king of Opis, unto Opis pursued” (Galet A, v, 2–7). In this sentence -la means “from” and governs an-ta-sur-ra, while -ka has its usual meaning “of”. Still another is the following: iš-en-lil-lu iš-ad-da ni-sag-ga-ka-ni mu-na-ri: “For Enlil the house of the father of the loud thunder he built” (Urkagina, Stone Tablet, iii, 7–iv, 1). In this passage -ni has the force of ana, “for” (cf. Origin of Babylonian Writing, no. 2284) and governs iš-en-lil-lu, while -ka denotes the genitive relation after ni-sag-ga. Similarly in the Stele of Vultures (v, i): iš-an-na-tum a-la-ga-šu-dug-ga iš-ningirsu-ka-da iš-ningirsu mu-da-gul: “Eannatum in the devastated field of Ningirsu Ningirsu made to rejoice”.

In this connection it should be noted that the postpositive -ka does not always mean “of”, but is equivalent to other English prepositions. For example it may mean “in”. Thus in the Lament over the fall of Lagash, written in the time of Lugalzaggisi (Revue d’Assyr. VI, 29 and Cros, Nouvelles Fouilles, 47) we find: nu-ab-e-ga-ka šu-bi-us: “In the ruined reservoir they have shed blood” (col. iii, 9), an expression in which -ka means “in”. This meaning is also found when -ka occurs in a compound postpositional expression, as gi-ka-na iš-nin-mağ ter asag-ga-ka-ka šu-bi-us: “In the Gikana of Ninmakh, the grove of the holy
one, they have shed blood" (Ibid., ii, 10). Here the second -ka governs gi-ka-na, with which ter is in apposition, and the first -ka denotes the genitive after azag, which is in apposition with 4nin-mag.

Once more: 6-an-na-tum mu-pad-da 4nin-gir-su-da-ka kür-kür-ri sag e-da-sig: "By Eannatum, whose name was spoken by Ningirsu, the countries were subdued" (literally, "knocked on the head"), Galet A, iv, 20-24 In this sentence -ka is instrumental and governs 6-an-na-tum, while -da is also instrumental, governing Ningirsu.

Passing now to the passages which contain the compound -ka-ka, variant -ka-kam, we find, upon examination, that they fall into two classes which represent two distinct usages:

1. The second -ka (or -kam) is a postpositive governing a preceding noun in the dative case and having a meaning analogous to -ka-ra or -ka-la.

2. The second -ka (or -kam) performs the functions of the temporal adverb "when".

The first usage predicated above is very clear. Thus: e-ki-sur-ra 4nin-gir-su-ka-ka e-ma-ta-bal: "Over the boundary ditch of Ningirsu he crossed" (Entemena, Cone A, iii, 2-4). Here the second -ka means "over". Again: gán û-gig-ga ašág-ga 4nin-gir-su-ka-ka giš-ur-sur-ša e-da-lal: "Into the field Uligga, the irrigated field of Ningirsu, for battle he pressed" (Ibid., IV, 8-10). This passage is repeated in the Oval plaque of Urkagina (iv. 14ff.), thus gán û-gig-ga gán ki-âg 4nin-gir-su-ka-ka "nin-gir-su-giš-ugga" zig-ga-bi ni-ka-lam: "In the field Uligga, the field beloved of Ningirsu, for Ningirsu Umma his glory destroyed." In this form of the statement the second -ka means "in", but as in the passage in Entemena, it governs gán.

Again, in the Stele of Vultures iii,1ff.: e-ma-da-ga šir-pur-la bar nig-im-ha-ka-ka gab-bi šu-e-ga-ma-uš: "They said as to Lagash, on account of the hatefulness of its government, its control verily is ended." Here the second -ka governs bar.

Similarly Stele of Vultures iv, 21ff.: 6-an-na 4ininni ib-gal-ka-ka a-tum mu-ni mu-sa: "To Eanna the Ininni of the great enclosure, advancing, named his name." The second -ka here governs Eanna.

In Entemena's Vase Inscription (21,22) we find also the follow-
ing: ut-ba du-du sangu "nin-gir-su-ka-kam: "At that time Dudu was priest of Ningirsu". Here the second -ka means "in" or "at" and governs ud. This explains the rise of the second usage predicated above, of which we shall speak presently. In Gudea's Cylinder A (xiv, 8ff.) we have: ma-da-gi-sag-sar-sar ra-na gi-edin-na "nin-gir-su-ka-ka: "In the country's chief rich land, the Guedin of Ningirsu." The second -ka means "in" and governs ma-da.

The second meaning of the second -ka, "when", is proved by the following passages:

In Urkagina's Cones B and C, vi, 155ff. and ix, 35ff. this sentence occurs: gi en-ki-ka-ka lu ša tum: "When to the enclosure of Enki a man for burial was brought." The second -ka here means "when".

Similarly in Entemena's Cone, vi, 9 ff.: lu giš-uškī-a e ki-sur-ra "nin-gir-su-ka-ka e ki-sur-ra "nina-ka dźid-šu dźaš-gan tum-ne an-ta bal-e-da: "When the men of Umma the irrigating canal of Ningirsu and the irrigating canal of Nina, in order to bring the cultivated fields into their power, shall destroy". Here the second -ka of "nin-gir-su-ka-ka" clearly means "when". Again, Entemena, Brick A, viii, 1-5: [mu]-na [mu]-na-[sâ] en-te-me-na keš-šu ru-a "nin-gir-su-ka-ka: "Its name he named when Entemena was the reservoir builder of Ningirsu." The second -ka denotes the time "when".

Once more (ibid. viii, 8, 9): du-du [sangu] "nin-gir-su-ka-kam: "(It was) when Dudu was priest of Ningirsu". The final -ka again means "when". A comparison of this passage with the example quoted from Entemena's silver vase above, to illustrate our second usage of -ka-ka, shows how this adverbial use of the final -ka rose. Originally it was a postposition governing ud-ba; then, by the omission of ud-ba, it was employed alone to express the adverbial idea.

Another compound postpositive which is of frequent occurrence is -ka-gē. The uses of this combination are peculiar; they do not run parallel to those of any other compound postpositives. This is not strange, since the postpositive -gē, when employed singly, exhibits characteristics possessed by no other postpositive. It will tend to clearness to give first some examples of the meaning of -gē when used singly. It may express:

2. It sometimes means "to" or "unto" thus: "nin-gir-su-ge ê-nug ki-ga inin dûg-ge ur-ka-gi-na-ka 4ba-û mu-da-gû: "To Ningirsu at the temple of Erech a good word for Urkagina Bau spoke." (Urkagina, Clay Olive A.) In this passage -ge means "to" or "unto".

3. In a third usage -ge denotes instrumentality. Thus: a-sum-ma 4en-lil-ge: "Endowed with might by Enlil" (Galet E, iv, 7, 8); mu-šar sù-a 4nina-ge: "Whose great name was named by Nina" (Ibid, 11, 12).

4. A fourth and fairly frequent usage of -ge is to give emphasis to a nominative case. This usage is similar to the emphatic state of a noun in Aramaic. Thus: ininni-ge da-ni ni-dib: "Ininni his hand seized" (Stele of Vultures, iv, 19, 20); again: en-te-me-na-ge lugal ki-an-na-â-gâ-ge-ni 4nin-gir-su-ra id-nun-la mu-bi-kûr-ra e-na-ta ni-ê: "Entemena, for the king who loves him, Ningirsu, from the great river to the slope (?) of the mountain carried it" (Clay, op. cit, no. 5, iii, 2 iv, 2).

This second example explains, perhaps, how this emphatic usage arose. If the -la in e-na-la-ni-ê originally had a passive force as Langdon thinks (Sumerian Grammar, p. 147), this -ge may originally have been instrumental. In that case, the passage last cited would be translated: "By Entemena, for the king who loves him, Ningirsu, from the great river to the slope of the mountain it was carried." If this was the origin of the usage, that origin was forgotten by the time our inscriptions were written, for, as in the example previously cited, it is now employed with verbs which are active in form.

It is frequently employed after nouns which are in apposition with a preceding nominative. The following examples will illustrate this emphatic use of -ge in appositives: dingir-ra-ni 4nin-sag-ge nam-tîl-la-ni-kû ud-ul-la-ni 4nin-gir-su-ra sîb ge-na-gâl: "May his goddess, Ninshakh, for his life unto distant days to Ningirsu offer up prayers" (Urkagina, Stone Tablet, iv, 10-v, 5). Again: lugal-sag-gi-si pa-te-si gis-uâ-ka dingir-ra-ni 4nidaba-ge nam-dag-bi gû-na ge-û-ûl: "As for Lugalzaggisi, Patesi of Umma, may his goddess, Nidaba, bear his mortal sin on her head!" (Lament over Lagash, vii, 11-ix, 3).

Conming now to the compound -ka-ge we find two distinct uses. 1. It is employed in an instrumental sense, parallel to the instrumental use of -ge. In the inscriptions of Eannatum, Ur-Bau, and Gudea, it is used side by side with -ge to express
instrumentality. Thus: ᵃⁿ-nᵃ-tᵘⁿ ᵃ-pᵉ-sᵉ sʰⁱʳ-pᵘʳ-lᵃʰˡ⁻gᵉ ᵃ-n⁻lⁱ-l⁻gᵉ ᵃ-sᵘᵐ-mᵃ ᵃⁿ-gⁱʳ-sᵘ-kᵃ⁻gᵉ šᵃᵍ-pᵃᵈ-dᵃ ᵃⁿ⁻nᵃ⁻gᵉ gᵃ-zⁱ-kᵘ⁻ᵃ ᵃⁿ-gᵃʳ-sᵃᵍ-kᵃ⁻gᵉ ᵃⁿ⁻dᵉ-kᵃ⁻gᵉ ᵃⁿ⁻nⁱⁿ-nⁱ-kᵃ⁻gᵉ gⁱš-tᵘᵏ-pⁱ ᵃⁿ⁻kⁱ⁻kᵃ⁻gᵉ: "Eannatum, patesi of Lagash, (whose) name was spoken Enlil, (who) was endowed with power by Ningirsu, (who) was conceived by Nina, (who) was nurtured with the milk of life by Ninkharsag, (who) was named a good name by Ininni, (who) was given intelligence by Enki" (Galet A, i, 2–ii, 7). In this passage -ᵍᵉ and -ᵏᵃᵍᵉ are found side by side with identical instrumental significations. In the similar passages of Entemena and Eannatum II the names of the gods are thrown into the accusative and no post-position is employed. For evidence see Silver Vase inscription, Bricks A, B, and C, and Clay Nail Inscr.; also Eannatum's inscription in Découvertes, pl. 6, no. 4. Urkagina's inscriptions, like those of Urnina, do not employ the construction. The usage, although discarded by the immediate successors of Eannatum, was revived by Ur-Bau and Gudea five hundred years later, both of whom employ -ᵍᵉ and -ᵏᵃᵍᵉ in the same context to express instrumentality. (For Ur-Bau see Découvertes, pl. 8, col. i, 7–11, 3; and for Gudea, Ibid., pl. 16 (Statue B), ii, 8–iii, 6.)

2. Entemena on the other hand employs -ᵍᵉ and -ᵏᵃᵍᵉ side by side to express the genitive relation "of". Thus in his "Galet" inscription (Clay, Yale Babylonian Collection, no. 4) we have: en-te-me-na ᵃ-pᵉ-sᵉ sʰⁱʳ-pᵘʳ-lᵃʰˡ⁻gᵉ ᵃ-n⁻nᵃ⁻tᵘⁿ ᵃ-pᵉ-sᵉ sʰⁱʳ-pᵘʳ-lᵃʰˡ⁻kᵃ⁻ᵍᵉ: "Entemena, Patesi of Lagash, son of Eannatum Patesi of Lagash" (col. i, 3–8). Also du-du ᵃⁿ-gⁱʳ-sᵘ⁻kᵃ⁻ᵍᵉ: "Dudu, priest of Ningirsu" (ibid. iii, 2, 3). And finally: ᵃ-pᵉ-sᵉ gᵃⁿⁿⁱᵍʳ-sᵘ⁻kᵃ⁻ᵍᵉ: "The great Patesi of Ningirsu" (Brick C, ii, 2, 3, Clay, op. cit., no. 5). As a rule, then, the uses of -ᵏᵃᵍᵉ do not run parallel to those of -ᵏᵃ⁻kᵃ. I have noted but one passage where this could plausibly be claimed. That is the last but one cited, which, when read in full, runs: ᵃⁿ⁻bᵃ ᵃʳ⁻ʳᵃ⁻ⁿⁱ du-du ᵃⁿ-gⁱʳ-sᵘ⁻kᵃ⁻ᵍᵉ: "At the time his servant Dudu was high priest of Ningirsu". It may be argued that -ᵍᵉ here governs ᵃⁿ⁻bᵃ just as ᵃⁿ⁻kᵃ does in the silver vase inscription. Undoubtedly this would be the right interpretation, were there parallel usage to substantiate it, but, since there is no parallel, and since ᵃⁿ⁻bᵃ can be an accusative expressing time, the explanation first given is probably the right one.
THE BABYLONIAN ANTEDILUVIAN KINGS

W. F. ALBRIGHT

AMERICAN SCHOOL IN JERUSALEM

At last the great lacuna in our cuneiform Genesis—the list of the ten antediluvian monarchs—has been filled, at least in part, thanks to Langdon's publication (JRAS 1923, 251-9) of W(eld)-B(lundell) 62 in the Ashmolean collection. This tablet gives the list so long sought in vain, though it is unfortunately in an imperfect condition. The names are badly mutilated in several cases; one of them is quite illegible, at least in the present state of our knowledge. Fortunately, however, the last four names are preserved, as are also all the regnal years. Quite enough is available to make a comparison with the Greek list of Berossus possible. Langdon has made a good beginning of such a comparison, but more can be done.

The first two kings on the new list reigned in IJA-A-KI, that is, Subar (cf. Poebel, Historical Texts, p. 121); Langdon's reading Habur is entirely baseless, since the Sumerian town of Subar has, even when transplanted to the underworld and the banks of the river Hubur, nothing to do with the terrestrial river Hābūr in the land of the Šubar or Subarans (cf. AJSL 35. 171, note 1). The first one bears the name [ ]-alim, and is said to have reigned 18 2/3 sars (=67,200 years, since a sār is 3600). Though Langdon seems to have overlooked Poebel's suggestion that Alōros is to be identified with Lāl-ūr-alim-ma, the traditional king of Nippur who figures as the hero of the so-called “Babylonian Job,” this text would seem to confirm it, since we must surely supply [Lāl-ūr]-alim. In support of this view is the fact that the second name also contains the element lāl-[ ]-lā-gar, since such traditional pairs of names tend to resemble one another; cf. Mes-an-ni-pad-da and Mes-ki-ag-nun-na, E-ru-ru and Ba-lu-lu, etc. It is interesting to note that the first antediluvian king appears as ruler of Subar near Eridu, of Eridu itself (so apparently in the Poebel text of the Creation legend), of Nippur, and finally of Babylon in the official version handed down to us by Berossus. The story of Lāl-ūr-alim (Tābi-utul-Ellil) may then have been originally parallel to Adam's
Fall rather than to the career of Job. The Greek Ἀλαρός is presumably a dissimilation of Lat-ur, like Inanna for Nin-anna, Inurta for Nin-urta, etc. The second king of Šubari, [ ]-lāl-gar, who reigned 20 sars, is identified by Langdon with Berossus's second king, Alaparos or Alaporos, whose name he would read Ἀλαγαρός—Γ for Π. Since Alaparos is said to have reigned only three sars, I would suggest the identification of [ ]-lāl-gar with the Megalaros or Amegalaros of Berossus, the latter's fifth king, who reigned 18 sars (originally 20, see below). We should naturally transpose, as in Δαρογχαρ for Δαγχαρα, reading Melagamos or Amelagamos. Langdon does not identify Megalaros at all.

The second antediluvian dynasty, according to the new tablet, was that of Larsa, with two kings, [ ]-ki(?)-du-un-nu, the ša-kin-kin, who ruled 20 sars, and [ ]-uk(?)-ku(?), who reigned six sars (21,600 years, not 20,800, as Langdon erroneously has). Identifications are doubtful—but see below for a possibility.

The third dynasty, of Bad-tibira (Dur-gurgurri) also had two kings. Langdon's reading Bad-tibira for the usual Dur-gurgurri, and identification with the Pautibillon or Pautibilbia of Berossus, is very happy indeed, and solves this long puzzling point. For ἐκ Παυτίβιβλων we should naturally read ἐκ Παυτιβρων or the like; the present Greek form may be due to the contamination of βιβλως, βιβλον, etc. The first of the two kings bears the name [ ]-zi, and is called a shepherd; since Bad-tibira was one of the chief centres of Tammuz worship, we can hardly go astray if we read the name Dumu-zi, or even Damu-zi, following the older form which survived in the appellation damu, "son," of Tammuz. It is true that the Nippur lists of postdiluvian kings make Tammuz, now a palm-tree fertilizer, fourth ruler of the First Dynasty of Erech, but other lists may have had a different system. Nor is it impossible that Tammuz, the shepherd of Bad-tibira, and Tammuz of

---

4 Langdon still writes "Ellasar" for Larsa, following the identification of Arioch of Ellasar, Gen. 14, 1, with Warad-Sin or Rim-Sin of Larsa, now antiquated. Whichever one of the suggested identifications of Ellasar with states in Central and Northern Mesopotamia we may adopt, there can be no doubt that Arioch is a good Hurrian or Subaraean (Mitannian) name.

5 Langdon's copy of the text offers ma instead of ku.

6 Cf. Barton, Archaeology and the Bible, p. 264, n. 3.
Erech were considered as distinct; such doublets are by no means uncommon in ancient legend. At all events we can hardly avoid identifying our shepherd of Bad-tibira, who ruled eight sars, with Daōs or Dānos, the shepherd of Pautibiblon, who ruled ten sars, especially since Dumuzi or Damuzi (pronounced Dauwas), the hero of Bad-tibira, was also a shepherd (sib) in Babylonian mythology. It may be added that Daos had been previously identified with Tammuz by Pinches and others. Tammuz’s successor, [-en-lū-an-na], ruled six sars and may very probably be compared to the Amélôn of Berossus, who also reigned at Pautibiblon, for thirteen sars.

The seventh king of our cuneiform list ruled at Larak, the Larancha of Berossus, as pointed out long ago by Delitzsch. It is doubtful whether his name, Sīb-zi-an-na, is complete or lacks something at the beginning; if complete it is identical with that of the constellation Orion¹ (“the faithful shepherd of heaven”) which may, therefore, have received special divine honors at Larak. As seen by Langdon the name is clearly identical with that of Amempsinos, also king of Larancha, who also reigned for ten sars. We should perhaps read Σμήνως instead of Αμμήνως, the initial Αμ of the latter being due to the influence of the adjacent names Αμήλως and Αμηνως.

Dynasties with only one king instead of two having now become fashionable, we find the next antediluvian dynasty, that of Sippar, also with one ruler, the famous Enmeûranki (the Enmedurananna of the text is simply vertical dittography from the preceding Sibzianna), who reigned 20 sars according to the cuneiform text and 18 sars according to Berossus, the latter number going back, however, to 20, as will be shown below. Our new text seems to remove the most remarkable correspondence between the Hebrew and Babylonian lists of antediluvian patriarchs, since Enmeûranki appears as eighth king, and cannot, therefore, be compared with Enoch, the seventh. It must naturally be admitted that the order of the names is not of much moment, since the two Babylonian lists disagree among themselves quite as much as the two Hebrew systems preserved by E and J.

The last antediluvian dynasty is that of Šuruppak. Here

¹ For Sīb-zi-an-na cf. Weidner, Handbuch der babylonischen Astronomie, pp. 30 f. It may be added that CT XXXIII, 2, Col. II, 2 identifies the constellation Sīb-zi-an-na with the god Papsukkal.
there is a surprise for us. Instead of giving Ubar-Tutu and Ziusuddu, the Opartes (text Οτιωρης) and Xisuthros of Berossus, our new list gives Aratta (SU-KÚR-LAM)-gi son of Ubur(so)-Tutu and Ziusuddu son of Aratta-gi. This explains the Ardages (read ΑΡΔΑΓΗΣ for ΑΡΔΑΓΗΣ) of Alexander Polyhistor, and suggests that the latter drew on some unknown Hellenistic source for part of his Babylonian material. Apparently the Babylonians had two conflicting traditions regarding the parentage of Ziusuddu, which our text harmonized by considering one father as a grandfather. The recension of Berossus agrees perfectly with the Weld-Blundell tablet in the number of years assigned to Xisuthros's father, in both cases eight sars. Since the name of the Deluge-hero is written in its Sumerian form, Zî-ud-sud-du, there can be no longer any doubt that Ξισονθρος is a mistake for the more correct Ξισονθος, due to the influence of such Greek words as ἐρνθρός. With this is of course identical the name of the Flood-hero of Hierapolis, Sisyphes (reading with Buttmann CIΣKHΣC for CKΣKHΣC of the mss). The etymologies of Xisuthros based upon a transposition of Atra-hasis must now go by the board. It is a pity, however, that Langdon still insists on regarding a hypothetical Ula-napištim-[arik] as being the Assyrian equivalent of Zî-ud-sud-du, when the direct translation Ut-napištim râqu has been independently pointed out by Hommel (Nies, Ur Dynasty Tablets, p. 205), Zimmern, and the writer (JAOS 38 60 ff.).

The new list credits these ten kings with a total rule of 126 ³⁄₄ sars, or 456,000 years. Langdon has two mistakes, perhaps due to the compositor, as so often, which confuse his calculations; in the transcription he offers a total of 455,200 years, while at the opening of the article he gives the total as 127 ³⁄₄ sars, or 459,600 years. Now Berossus gives us only 120 sars, or 432,000 years, for the antediluvian period. It is clear that his system is secondary to that of the new cuneiform list, since the traces of a modification are still apparent. At present only two of the reigns given on the two lists are identical, but several others are practically so. Moreover, while [l]-lîl-gar and Enmeduranki have 20 sars each, (Me)lagaros and (Am)empsinos have 18 each, so Berossus seems to have reduced their reigns systematically. There is one other with 18 in the list of Berossus—Xisuthos (so). Since the first king of the cuneiform
list has $18\frac{3}{8}$ sars, and the last one has 10, while the first of the Greek series has 10 and the last has 18, there has evidently been a transposition; Aloros should have $18\frac{3}{8}$, while Xisuthos should have 10. This gives us $4\frac{3}{8}$ of the $6\frac{3}{8}$ sars eliminated by Berossus for cyclic reasons; his method in reduction was evidently to deduct from the highest reigns, so he may have taken the remaining two sars from the reign of Amelon.

The new list enables us to recover the original Sumerian scheme of antediluvian rulers with a high degree of probability. The number $126\frac{3}{8}$ sars, which also, as we have seen, lies at the bottom of the system preserved by Berossus, represents $20 \times 6 + 6\frac{3}{8}$. In other terms, there were seven rulers, the first six of whom reigned 20 sars each, while the last, whose reign was interrupted by the great Flood, ruled $6\frac{3}{8}$ sars, or one-third of the normal period. If now we turn to the cuneiform list, we find that there were at first three dynasties of two kings each, and that the first three kings ruled 20 sars each (assuming that the $18\frac{3}{8}$ is reduced from 20). Obviously the original scheme of seven kings—two each of Šubari, Larsa (Larak?), Badtibira, and one of Šuruppak—has been changed to one of ten kings by introducing extra rulers of Larak (or Larsa), Sippar, and Šuruppak. The confusion in the numbers is due to the attempt to distribute the numbers without changing the total length of the period. The 120 sars of Berossus represent a slight modification of the correct $126\frac{3}{8}$ (according to Sumerian calculation) in order to obtain a cycle of 12 world-years of 36,000 common years each (see below).

There is an extraordinary parallel between the two Babylonian systems which we have found and the two schemes of Genesis, preserved respectively by E and J. As well known, the former, “Sethite” genealogy has ten names, while the latter “Cainite” list offers only seven, omitting Seth, Enosh, and Noah. It would seem that both lists reflect—indirectly, of course—Sumero-Babylonian prototypes. It may be added that the scheme of seven kings is even more Babylonian in character than that of ten. Besides the seven planets, seven evil spirits, seven tubuqâti, seven nágé, etc., discussed fully by Zimmern, KAT 462 f., 615 ff., note the seven wise men of Enoch in the Gilgames Epic, and the seven gates of the underworld, seven ápšé (JSOC 7, 9, n. 28), etc.—According to one Sumerian theory Ziusudru did not disappear immediately after the close of the Flood, as in
the Assyrian recension and Berossus, but remained on earth (cf. *JAOS* 38, 61 f.). This theory is illustrated by the view of the Sumerian archetype list we have recovered, that Ziusudra ruled only 6½ sars, a third of the normal length of reign; presumably he lived 13½ sars after the Flood. It is interesting to note that Noah lived two-thirds of his life (six hundred years) before the Flood and one-third (350) after that catastrophe.

The development of antediluvian chronology in Babylonian erudite theory is closely paralleled by that of postdiluvian. According to the probably correct view of Poebel (*Historical Texts*, pp. 98 ff.) the Nippur chronology counted 32, 243 years from the Flood to the end of the Isin Dynasty. Now Berossus gives (cf. Eduard Meyer, *Klio*, III, 131 ff.; *GA* 4 I, 2, 351) the length of the period from the Flood to the beginning of the kingdom of Babylon (presumably the Amorite Dynasty) as 34,090 years, obtaining this result by subtracting the duration of the historical dynasties, which he reckoned as 1910 years to the death of Alexander (b. c. 323), from an arbitrary total of 36,000 years from the Flood to the same date. This period of 36,000 years is to be considered a world-year (equivalent to 360 days of a century each) which came to an end with the new dispensation introduced by Alexander the Great. Naturally it is hard to say whether this theory arose as a *bona fide* tribute to the friendly Macedonian rulers or as flattery. Now, as the writer has pointed out elsewhere (cf. *Rev. d’Assyr.*, 18, 94, note 2) the Harrânian world-year is simply a modification of the older Babylonian period of 36,000 years on the basis of the Julian calendar; that is, 365 ¼ X 100 = 36,525 common years. Evidently this reflects a new speculation of the Babylonian wise men of the Parthian period, who, disappointed in their hopes that Greek domination meant a new and happier age, extended the duration of the first post-diluvian world-year by 525 years, thus bringing its end to about 203 a. d.—assuming that they followed Berossus’s system in matters of detail. It is hardly necessary to point out the similarity between the course followed by these eschatological speculations in Babylonia and in Palestine, as illustrated by the prophecies of Daniel. Very probably the expectation in Babylonia of a new world age at about the opening of the Christian era, as reflected in the second chapter of Matthew, was based
upon speculation of this type, rather than upon astrological-
astronomical computation, as frequently supposed.

At the close of our paper we append a table illustrating the
 correspondences between the new cuneiform list of antediluvian
 kings and Berossus, altering the order of the latter for ease in
 comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cuneiform Names</th>
<th>Sars</th>
<th>Greek Names</th>
<th>Sars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. [Lāl-ur]-alim of Šubarri</td>
<td>18²⁶'⁴</td>
<td>Ἀλαρός</td>
<td>18²⁶'⁴ (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. [ ]-lāl-gar</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(Με)λαγαρός, (Μεγαλαρός)</td>
<td>20 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. [ ]-ki-du-un-nu, Larsa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(Αμμε)νωρ (?)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2. Άλαραρος (?)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. [Dumm]-zi sib, Badlabiru</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Δαιως, πομυη</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. [ ]-en-lā-an-na</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Αμι)νηλων</td>
<td>? 15 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. [ ]-sib-xi-an-na, Larak</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Σεμφινος (Σεμφινος)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. En-me-sur-an-ki(1), Sippar</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ενδωραγχος</td>
<td>20 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Aratta-gi, Suruppak or Ubir-Tatu his father</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Αράτταγης (Αράττας)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Zī-ud-sud-du, Šuruppak</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ζίουθος (Ζιουθος)</td>
<td>10 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>126²⁶'⁴</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>126²⁶'⁴ (120)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* We may safely assume that the list was originally compiled by gathering the names of the traditional first rulers of certain towns, selected because of their claim to superior antiquity. There were always certain places which made this claim, justly or not, and most such claims were taken by outsiders at their face value. Cf., for example, the Phrygian theory that they were the oldest of peoples, which was generally accepted, as was often also the Arcadian claim to be older than the moon (προσδιάλημα). Some of the names in our list are presumably divine, borne by the deity of the town, which regarded him as its first ruler, while other names are doubtless human, borne by traditional heroes who may actually have lived—after the Deluge. One would naturally ascribe Dumu-ei and Sib-xi-an-na to the former category, and Lāl-un-alim to the latter. Eameduranki may have been a man originally, but his name is suspicious, and his figure has distinct solar traits, borrowed perhaps from Utu, the god of Sippar, just as Gilgames borrowed from Lugalmar. Zimud, the Flood-hero, has a very suspicious name, "He who prolongs the day of life," but it may be an appellative, like Atahasis, "The very wise." It may be added that all the comparisons made between the names of Berossus and Genesis are proved false by our cuneiform list. It is likely, at least in the present state of our knowledge, that only the framework of the lists was borrowed—indirectly—from Mesopotamia, and that the names are genuine Canaanite or Hebrew, derived by combining the traditions of different clans or tribes regarding their founders. This is almost certainly the case with Adam and Enoch, archetype men, Seth, Lamech, and Cain.
BRIEF NOTE

An elucidation of the adverbial phrase n mt n š.t.

Back in 1882 Adolf Erman prefaced his commentary to the inscription of Uni (ZARe. 20. 1 ff.) with a statement that he intended to show by the analysis of a longer text, how far our understanding of Old-Egyptian texts reaches. He came to the conclusion that the intrinsic philological understanding of Egyptian texts was still wanting. A like analysis of the same text at the present time would undoubtedly show material progress in the philological interpretation of Egyptian texts, but it would, at the same time, reveal the need of investigation of many points which stand out as linguistic enig mata. The Uni inscription, in fact, offers quite a number of unsolved problems.

At present I wish to draw attention to a phrase which occurs in line 19:

\[
\text{ink wn(w) iry-n-in šhr}
\]

\[
(1) s \tilde{u} 3w.t(y) m \text{ pr-}^{3} \text{mr hnty-}^{3}
\]

\[
n \text{mt n š. t}
\]

Erman (l. c., p. 15) was unable to explain the phrase \( n \text{mt n š.t.} \). He wrote: "Aber was ist \( n \text{mt n št?} \) Ist es ein Titel wie \( mty, n x 3 \) (L. D. II, 142 c, Louvre C. 11.12)? oder ist \( n \text{mi là nà št zu lesen und gehört es zu št mty} \) (Louvre C 1)? oder steckt endlich ein Verb um \( n \text{mt} \) darin, das zum Folgenden zu ziehen wäre?"

Breasted, Ancient Records, I, p. 143 translated: "I was the one who made for them the plan while my office was (only) that of superior custodian of the domain of Pharaoh of [ — ] ."

Budge cites the passage in his Egyptian Dictionary, p. 331, but leaves it unexplained.

Breasted seems to have felt the force of \( n \text{mt n š.t} \) by inserting "only" in brackets. The passage should be translated: "I was the one who devised the plan for them while my office was that of Pharaoh's chief of the orchard, properly speaking."

The phrase \( n \text{mt n š.t} \) literally means "nach der Korrektheit des Platzes", and might also be translated by "nach der rechten
Brief Note

(Rang)stellung”, “according to the correct position (of rank),” thereby keeping more closely to its literal meaning. But there is no doubt, judging from the want of an additional word, like ḫw.t, that the phrase has taken on the more general meaning of “properly”, or, “properly speaking”, “eigentlich.” N mti n š.t, therefore, is to be explained as an adverbial phrase.

The revised translation of lines 16 (beginning with ḫḥb.wy) to 19 this runs as follows:

"His Majesty sent me at the head of this army; then (ıšš) (seil, came) the counts, then (ıšš) the royal treasurers, then (ıšš) the sole companions of the palace, then (ıšš) the nomarchs, the commanders of strongholds of the South and the Northland (and) the border districts (šmr is here a designation of Egypt’s border lands or neighboring vassal states), the chief interpreters, the chief prophets of the South and the Northland, the chiefs employed in government storehouses, those at the head of a troop of the South or the Northland (and) of the strongholds and cities which they ruled (and) the negroes of these countries (which are mentioned under the term šmr). I was the one who devised the plan for them while my office was that of Pharaoh’s chief of the orchard, properly speaking.”

Former translations ignored the fact that ıšš...ıšš expresses the graded formation of the army and its leaders. Uni marches at the head of the army, followed by the officers according to their rank down to the troop commanders of the South and the Northland, of the strongholds and the cities. The rear of the army is made up of the Negro-tribes. Uni, however, not only marches at the head of the army, but he also devises the plans, although “properly speaking” he is an inferior officer. The force of the phrase n mti n š.t comes out more fully with a correct understanding of the syntax of ıšš...ıšš.

University of California

H. F. Lutz
Reviews of Books


After twenty-three years of labour, Professor Winternitz’s “History of Indian Literature,” whose first volume appeared in 1908, is complete; but though its composition has occupied so long a time, the work, both in execution and in spirit, forms a unit. The author has attempted, with much success, a difficult task—a survey of a vast literature in many diverse fields, a literary evaluation, and adequate bibliographical references—a toil all the harder because of the utter vagueness of the Indian mind as to history or even as to accurate recording of names of authors. Chronological certainty can seldom be attained in matters purely Indian, whence, faute de mieux, it seems best to accept Indian tradition regarding authorship until definite scientific proof can be alleged to the contrary. These problems are judiciously weighed by the author; and though some may doubt, for example, whether all the works which he assigns to Bāsa (pp. 184-202, 644-646) were really written by that dramatist, it appears wisest for the present to take this position, at least as a working hypothesis.

It may be stated quite safely that Professor Winternitz’s “History” supersedes all works hitherto written on its theme. The volume under consideration discusses the artificial poetry of India, including the native theories of poetics, dramaturgy, and metrics, the court epics, pseudo-histories and real histories, lyric, proverbial, and didactic poetry, drama, fable-literature, romances, and campūs; the scientific literature on grammar, lexicography, philosophy, customary usage (if the reviewer may suggest this as covering all that is implied in the wide term dharmāstrā), practical science (arthaśāstra)—especially politics, hippology, elephantology, architecture, music, and precious stones—erotics, medicine, astronomy, astrology, and mathematics; and concludes with a brief “survey of modern
Indian literatures" and with addenda and corrigenda to the entire work.

From the nature of the case, the study as a whole is a compilation, though it bears throughout the stamp of the author's own judgment and individuality. For the technical reader its principal value is that it summarises the present state of knowledge and opinion on its subject; for the layman its length may perhaps be deterrent, and a condensation of all three volumes into a single one of less specialised character might be desirable. The reviewer has long been of opinion that there is need (1) of a strictly technical history of Indian literature corresponding to the Geschichte der römischen Literatur by Teuffel and his successors, including all the material of Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum and the catalogues of manuscripts which have appeared since, together with an exhaustive bibliography; and (2) of a purely literary history somewhat like Croiset's Histoire de la littérature grecque.

Particular interest attaches to the author's discussion of the dramas ascribed to Bhāsa (pp. 184–202), of the history of the Pañcatantra (pp. 272–311) and the Bhāthakāthā (pp. 312–353), and of the Kauṭūṭya-Arthaśāstra (pp. 509–524), while his judicious remarks on the Prākrits (pp. 97–98, 404) as literary languages developed from popular dialects deserve notice, as do his views on the question of Indo-Hellenic contacts in drama (pp. 174–180), fable (pp. 307–311), romance (pp. 371–374), philosophy (pp. 477–478), medicine (p. 554), astronomy (pp. 557–562), astrology (pp. 566, 569–570), and geometry (p. 577).

Although Professor Winternitz has included a vast amount, and has given abundant proof of his wide reading and deep reflection, there are a number of omissions; and, without attempting an exhaustive supplementation, the reviewer has noted the following addenda, including some studies which have appeared since the work was published.


p. 58, note 2: the Raghavaṃśa has been translated into Greek by Galanos (Athens, 1850) and into French by Fauche in his Œuvres complètes de Kalidasa (Paris, 1859–1860).¹

¹ Generally speaking, much additional bibliographical material might have been added from catalogues of manuscripts, printed books, etc.
p. 67, note 2, and p. 105, note 2: Fauche has also translated the Śīṣupālavadha (Paris, 1863) and Meghadūta (Œuvres complètes de Kalidasa).

p. 109, note 4, and p. 127, note 1: Fauche has likewise translated the Rūtasampāra and Gitagovinda (Paris, 1850), and Sir Edwin Arnold has made a poetic version of the Gitagovinda (The Indian Song of Songs, London, 1875).

p. 117, note 1: The Caurisuralapanaçārikā has been translated into English verse by Sir Edwin Arnold (The Thief’s Lament, London, 1896) and into French by Fauche (Paris, 1852), while an adaptation of the framework in English verse has been made by P. Seshadri (Madras, 1914).

p. 143, note 3: Bhartrhari has been translated into French by Fauche (Paris, 1852) and Regnaud (Paris, 1875); the Nītiśataka and Vairāgyasataka into English prose by Wortham (London, 1886), into English verse by Tawney (Calcutta, 1877), and into Italian verse by Pizzi (Turin, 1899); cf. also More’s Century of Indian Epigrams chiefly from the Sanskrit of Bhartrhari (Boston, 1898).

p. 189, note 2: the Madhyamavyāyoga has been translated into English prose by E. P. Janvier (Mysore, 1921; University of Pennsylvania dissertation).

p. 234, note 1: the Mālañjūmadhava has been translated into Italian by Cimmino (Milan, 1915); cf. also his Osservazioni sul rasa nel Mālañjūmadhava di Bharabhūti (Naples, 1915).

p. 286, note 1: the Pañcatantra has been translated into Greek (together with the Hitopadeśa and Sukasaptati) by Galanos (Athena, 1851), into French by Lancereau (Paris, 1871), and into Italian by Pizzi (Turin, 1896).

p. 293, note 2: the Hitopadeśa has been translated into French by Lancereau (Paris, 1882) and into English by Johnson (2nd ed., London, 1864) and Pincott (London, 1880).

p. 353, note 2: the Daśakumāracarita has been translated into French by Fauche (Paris, 1862).


p. 533, note 4: the first part of Śrikumāra’s Śilparatna appeared in 1922 in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series.

p. 556, note 1: on the problem of the nakṣatras see also Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, i (Leipzig, 1906), 70–88, where the theory of Babylonian origin is favoured.


p. 608 (on i, 62): the second volume of Sarup's *Nighañțu* has now appeared (Oxford, 1922).

p. 621 (on i, 246 ff.): well-founded doubts as to the exactness of these identifications have been advanced by W. E. Clark, "The Alleged Indo-Iranian Names in Cuneiform Inscriptions," in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, XXXIII (1917), 261–282.

A general reference might also be made to Sushil Kumar De's *Studies in the History of Sanskrit Poetics* (2 parts, London, 1922–23).

It is rather difficult to criticise Professor Winternitz's section on the modern Indian literatures. It is confessedly only a sketch; and an adequate discussion, which might conceivably be prepared by Sir George Grierson and Mr. R. W. Frazer, would fill at least a volume. Yet if this part had been expanded only a few pages, the reviewer cannot but feel that it would have been greatly improved. For the Dravidian literatures in general reference might well have been made (p. 579, note 2) to Caldwell's *Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian Family of Languages* (2nd ed., London, 1875), pp. 123–153, and for the Aryan languages (p. 585, note 2) to Beames's *Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India*, i (London, 1872), 82–96. The following bibliographical additions to this portion of the work may be noted.


p. 583, note 5: at least one Malayāḷam novel has been translated into English, the *Induleka* of O. Chandu Menon (Madras, 1890).

p. 583, note 8: a very serious omission is the failure to record the *Wide-Awake Stories* of Mrs. Steel and (SIR) R. C. Temple (Bombay, 1884) with its "analysis of the tales" and "survey of the incidents in modern Aryan folk-tales." Mention should also have been made of Swynnerton's *Indian Nights' Entertainments*; or, *Folk-Tales from the Upper Indus* (London, 1892) and *Romantic Tales from the Panjâb* (Westminster, 1903). Other collections worth noting are *The Talking Thrush and Other Tales from India* by Crooke and Rouse (London, 1899), Chillî's *Folk-Tales of Hindustan* (Allahabad, n. d.), Shankunny’s *Folklore in Malabar* (Calicut [1902]), Natesa Sastri’s *Dravidian Nights Entertainments, being a Translation of Madanakamarajadakai* (Madras, 1886), Anderson’s *Collection of Kachâri Folk-Tales and Rhymes* (Shillong, 1895), and Campbell’s *Santal Folk Tales* (Pokhuria [1891]), to mention only a few works in the reviewer’s private library.

p. 584, note 1: refer also to T. H. Thornton, "The Vernacular Literature and Folklore of the Panjâb," in *JRAI*, 1885, pp. 373–414, and to *LSI* IX, i, 618.


p. 597, note 1: a number of Bengali novels have been translated into English, among them being Bankim Chandra Chatterjee’s *Poison Tree* (London, 1884), *Kopal Kundala* (London, 1885), *Chandra Shekhar* (London, 1904), and *Abbey of Bliss* (n. p., n. d.), P. C. Mitter’s *Spoilt Child* (Calcutta, 1893), and N. C. Sen’s historical romance *Roshinara* (Trichinopoly, 1912).

In the autumn of 1919 the Society of Friends of Asiatic Art of the Netherlands held an exhibition of selected works of East-Asiatic art at Amsterdam, which are well reproduced in this volume in twenty-four photogravures with brief explanations. This new series, however, has a wider scope, and it is proposed to render accessible to the public in future issues all remarkable examples of Asiatic art found in public and private collections of Holland. This is a very praiseworthy enterprise, as only in this manner may we hope to arrive at a just appreciation of the monuments by having as much material as possible at our disposal. The editor expresses the wish that this publication may give an impetus to similar publications abroad, so that a sort of international archives of reproductions may be engineered, in which the necessary tools for a comparative study of the art of the East will be presented. In this issue monuments, chiefly of Buddhistic character, from China, Tibet, Japan, Siam, and Camboja are reproduced. The Tibetan painting of a White Tārā and the Japanese sculptures are particularly beautiful. Thanks to her former intimate relations with Japan, Holland can boast of many Japanese treasures which are not easily duplicated in any other country. The large size and fine quality of the reproductions permit one to study the designs with all details, and this publication promises indeed to become a thesaurus of oriental art. We anticipate with great eagerness the issues to follow.

B. Laufer

Field Museum, Chicago


H. Ranke, the well-known translator of Breasted's excellent History of Egypt, shows his great ability now by his new edition
of Erman's book on Egypt which appeared in 1885 for the first time. The important new material which through excavation has come to light in the meantime made it necessary to revise our views of ancient Egypt. It was a very difficult task which R. has executed in the best possible way. Although the framework and the leading ideas of the book remain the same, R. has worked in all the new results gained in the last four decades since the first edition of the remarkable book. There is a larger number of very instructive pictures in the text and of plates. At the end of the book there is added a list of the Egyptian kings and their dates (as far as they can be fixed). Then follows an index (pages 662-672), a list of all native texts cited, as well as of passages in the Old Testament and classical writers (pp. 679-680), and a list of abbreviations (pp. 682-692) which is at the same time a very useful bibliography of all important publications. The book marks a decided progress in Egyptology.

NATHANIEL REICH

University Museum, Philadelphia


Dr. Scheltema's attempt to provide English readers with a translation of a valuable as well as interesting Arabic source-document relative to the Civil War of 1860 in the Lebanon is one worthy of high commendation and special praise. The episode with which the document deals is one of the most important, the least understood, in the modern history of Syria. Many old men and women still living to-day in Syria could tell from first-hand knowledge much about the events recorded in this work; and yet how hard it is, with the religious bias and personal equation of the narrators and chroniclers, to disentangle the facts from the web of traditions and to ascertain the truth as it really happened! Nor is it an unusual thing to
hear an old man in our present day, in Syria, dating the events of his life, and often determining the date of his birth, from the third *haraki* (the Civil War of '60)—so great is the impression left by those events upon the minds of the subsequent generation.

Likewise should the acquaintance of Dr. Scheltema with the English and French literature on the subject be favorably commented upon. His mastery of many details connected with the subject is evident from a perusal of the Introduction and Conclusion he writes. Our only regret, however, is that his mastery of the intricacies and niceties of modern Arabic expression does not seem to have been such as to enable him to do justice to the Arabic original. In fact this is not to be expected from anyone, however scholarly and learned he may be, who has not spent a large part of his life in Syria.

Our purpose in the following paragraphs is not so much to make a general review of Dr. Scheltema's work as to offer criticisms and make corrections which, we trust, will prove of value to those who wish to make use of the book. The criticism is based on a manuscript found in the possession of *khawâja* Wadi’s, the son of the author Iskander Ya‘kûb Abkarius, a resident of Bayrût. Whether the manuscript used by Dr. Scheltema, known as No. 759 of the Landberg Collection in Yale University, or the Bayrût manuscript is the original one is hard to ascertain and is not of vital importance for our immediate object. What is more to the point is the fact that the two manuscripts seem so identical as to warrant the following criticism. The rhythm of the rhymed prose (*ṣa‘ī*) used throughout by the author, the context, and the kind of mistakes made by the translator, which in almost every case can be easily explained as we shall have occasion to see later, leave no doubt in our mind as to the identical wording of the phrases corrected in both the Yale copy and the Bayrût copy. Aside from omitting certain sentences in the one copy or the other, the only noticeable variation that we could discover was in the title of

---

1 The translator complains that “Abkarius’ handwriting is in places hard to decipher” p. 6, and that his diction is “involved and consequently obscure” p. 7. The handwriting of the Bayrût MS is perfectly clear, and to one familiar with modern Arabic literature the style is most simple and easy.
the book which the translator renders (p. 45): "Book of the Marvels of the Time Concerning the Massacres in the Arab Country." This evidently differs from our title only in the last word which in the former is: "‘arabistan," and in the latter: "Jubnan." And then follows the basmalah (in the name of God etc.) which, in the Yale MS., is according to the Muslim formula, but, in the Bayrūt MS., is according to the Christian formula.

In our criticism we shall desist from taking exception to certain statements made by the translator on his authority in the Introduction and Conclusion, and from pointing out the abject, and in many cases as it seems to us unnecessary, dependence on the Arabic original, often to the extent of sacrificing English clarity. We shall limit our criticism to the correction of (a) mispronounced and mistransliterated proper names of places and individuals, (b) faulty information given in the foot-notes, (c) mistakes in translation due to failure to comprehend the Arabic original. We shall not attempt to recast many sentences, which should be recast, nor to point out the variation in the shades of meaning rendered by the translation. The following corrections will serve only as an illustration.

(1) For "Malḥam" p. 19 F.N. 29, proper name of a person still in common use in Syria, read "Mulḥim". (2) For "'Amād" pp. 39, 51, 53, 61, 96, 124, etc., name of a family still surviving, read: "'Imād". (3) For "Mutāwilies" pp. 47 F.N. 5, 76, 90, 93, etc., the Shi‘ite sect of Islam, read: "Matāwilah". (4)

Here are some of the corrections to be noted in connection

6 It should be noted in this connection that the failure of the translator to distinguish in transliteration between Arabic hamżah and 'ayn and his use of the same sign ' for both is very confusing. Far‘ûn Shâ‘îl p. 107, for instance, should be: "Far‘ûn (rather Fur‘ā‘m) Shâ‘îl".

7 We are following the system of transliteration used by the translator, although in such case we would prefer the "g" for the "g" to represent the Arabic bāً.
with the comments made by the translator in his footnotes: (1) The Nakad family is neither “extinct” nor of “Maghrebine” origin, as stated in F.N. 31, p. 51. It is of Arab origin and is represented in our day by some thirty persons resident in ‘Abayh, of whom two were last year students in the American University of Bayrūt. (2) Nasîb Bey Janblât lived, before his death which occurred some two years ago, in Brâmiyâh, a suburb of Sidon, and not in “Bayrût” as stated in F. N. 39 p. 53. (3) The water brought by Amir Bashîr to his sarai in Bayt-ad-Din came from ‘Ayn-Zháltah, and not from “Bârûk”, as stated in F. N. 48 p. 55. (4) The famous Fâkhr-ad-Din, credited in F.N. 81, p. 65, with the planting of the pine grove of Bayrût, may have added a few trees to a grove already existing since mediaeval times. (5) For “an ajâwîda”, an epithet given by the translator to as-Sâyyid ‘Abdallah, and meaning a sheikh highly initiated in the Druze mystic rites, read: “a juwâyîda”, in the singular.

We shall now proceed to correct some of the mistakes made in the translation: (1) wahakama ʿala-a-l-aʾmârî bi-l-ājâl, rendered, “and passed judgment upon the conduct of our lives at their appointed term” p. 45, should be: “and determines the lengths of all lives”. (2) wakânat aḥâlihi min kâdîmi-z-samān min ʿābadati-l-aʿulâhân, rendered, “and its inhabitants have their origin in the most remote ages, preceding the epochs and times of the people who clung to vain beliefs” p. 47, should be: “and its inhabitants in remote ages were heathen”. (3) inbâxamât aḥâlî-l-bilâd ila jânblâsîyâh wayâxâbîyâh niš-boten ila yazbak, rendered, “The clans of the country branched off into Janblâtites and Yazbakites, the latter of whom claimed descent from Yazbak” pp. 51-52, should be: “The population of the land divided themselves into a Janblâtî and a Yazbaki party, the latter so called after one Yazbak”. (4) wakâna dhâlika min akbari-l-mughâlajât, rendered, “in consequence of critical circumstances surprising him” p. 57, should be: “and that was one of the greatest mistakes into which he was made to fall”. (5) wakâna...ʿadīma-d-durbak fi suḥkî tîrûkî-l-rîʿasâk bakhîlān safîh al-lîsân, rendered, “he lacked training in travelling the ways of authority [conducted the affairs of government] with stinginess of levity of the tongue [with circumspect language]” p. 57, should be: “he lacked training in pursuing the
right path of leadership, was stingy and filthy of tongue". (6) *wasārū ka'annahum hun ashābu-l-kauli wa-l-amal*, translated "becoming companions [closely united] in words and deeds" p. 60, should be: "and they conducted themselves as if they were free to say and do whatever they pleased." *ashābu-l-marāmat*, rendered, "companions of calamities" p. 62, should be: "those of evil designs." *ṣāhib al-makrumah was-siyādah*, rendered, "the companion of high deeds and dignity" p. 141-2, should be: "the possessor of noble deeds and lordship". *ṣāhib ad-daulah*, rendered, "the companion of empire" p. 143, literally means the possessor of power and corresponds to: "his excellency"*. (7) *fala'ibat bihimi-l-hamīyah*, rendered, "so their disdain [for a supposedly weaker enemy] had played them a trick" p. 63, should be: "so their enthusiasm was aroused". (8) *min ashaddi-n-nāsi ta'assuban fi-d-din*, rendered, "the most strenuous of men [a zealot] in the [Muhammadan] faith" p. 63, should be: "one of the most bigoted of all men in matters of religion". (9) *yuhaddi-l-hāl*, rendered, "and take the direction of the affair" p. 65, should be: "and quiet things down". (10) *liaji l-latīf-l-ashāb*, rendered, "because of their cutting the lines of communication" p. 66, should be: "in order to remove the causes of provoking trouble". (11) *wa'idh kāna 'inda duruzi bayt-miry ghubnun min al-āmi-l-mādi lam yasa'humu-l-'ihmāl wat-taghādi*, rendered, "And lo! the Druzes of Bayt Mary had practised deceit for a year past. Neither delay nor feigned indifference had made them swerve" p. 67, should be: "The Druzes of Bayt-Miry having received a bad deal [or bargain from the Christians] the year before, could neither let things go nor overlook [the grudge which they cherished]". (12) *akhadh watawazzī'una anti'takum wa'sīyālakum ila bāyrūt likay yatafarraghu lil-kītāb*, rendered, "each looking after his own family and belongings, they took these to Bayrūt in order to steer clear away of fighting" p. 67, should be: "they began to distribute their be-

---

* ashāb has evidently caused the translator a great deal of trouble, and is rendered by him "companions" when it has the idea of possessing or having.
* The Arabic expression is an idiomatic one that is very often used. The translator was misled by the etymological meaning of *la'ība*.
* The verb *yuhadda* is derived from *kada*a and not *kada*.
* The Arabic idiom is often used in the colloquial.
longings and families [among their friends] in Bayrūt in order to be free to carry on the fight". (13) fa'aḥrakū khān jamḥūr, rendered, "and burned down a public inn" p. 68, should be: "and burned down the inn of Jamḥūr." 

(14) wāmin kunākahntashaba-l-bīṭālu fil-mān bayna-l-faṣākāyn washṣatālat-n-naru fi buyūṭi-l-jarafayn, rendered, "and [spreading] from there, the hostilities between the [contending] bands involved al-Matn and the fire blazed up in the houses of the noble-born" p. 68, should be: "thence fighting between the two parties spread into al-Matn, and fire blazed up in the homes of both sides". (15) wakātalul-d-durūz bishajā'atīn wahanīyēh, rendered "and the war between them and the Druzes was kindled with respect to matters of religion" p. 69, should be: "and they fought the Druzes with valor and enthusiasm". (16) ḥatta idha ḥadatha 'alayhim amrun yudāṣī'una sawīyatān 'ala-l-imkān, rendered, "until an order came instructing them to break up as evenly as possible" p. 70, should be: "so that in case something should happen they could defend themselves as much as possible conjointly". 

(17) wa'idha bimaujatin 'azīmatin saḥabathuna ilā-l-'umk, rendered, "a huge wave came and carried them out of their depth" p. 72, should be "and behold, a huge wave came and carried them away into the depth [of the sea]". (18) al-iṣrafī, rendered, "French nation" p. 72, should be: "the Europeans". The same word is used later in different forms and rendered, "French consul" p. 94, "France" p. 98, "French Empire" p. 144; it should be: "European consuls", "Europe", "European Powers" respectively. 

(19) ilā ma shā'al-lah mina-z-zamān, rendered, "as long as it pleased the God of [all] time" p. 72, should be: "as long a time as it pleased God", i.e. to the end of time, everlastingly. (20) kāyrat al-ma'mariyāh, rendered, "their larger villages"
p. 74, should be: "the village of Ma'mariyah. wakāna had bāqiya fāniyin minhum fi-l-ma'mariyah, rendered, "And those that remained alive of them were only a few" p. 76, should be: "And some of them had remained in al-Ma'mariyah". *(21) al-harakah, rendered, "proceedings" p. 74, "commotion" p. 91, "disturbance" p. 99, "agitation" p. 100 etc. is the word still used by the people of Lebanon to designate their Civil Wars of 1840, '44 and '60. These harakah's are often referred to as the first, second and third, respectively. *(22) katabati-ad-durūz ila wāli dimashq irādan ḥāflan bil-khutum wā'l-asmā', rendered, "then the Druzes wrote to the governor-general at Damascus fully and circumstantially with seals and names attached" p. 79, should be: "The Druzes wrote to the Wāli of Damascus a petition all full of seals and signatures", i.e., signed by many people. *(23) al-ladhīna kānu yataṣṣaharūna bil-iṣyān, rendered, "who had supported the rebellion" p. 80, should be: "who openly arose in rebellion". *(24) samtana'u an yusallimu silāḥahum dūna an yafkudu arwāḥahum, rendered, "Now they would have refused to deliver their weapons if their spirit had not failed them" p. 85, should be: "But they refused to deliver their arms without losing their lives", i.e., while alive. *(25) rabātu wādy al-karn, rendered, "occupied Wādy al-Qarn" p. 90, should be: "stationed themselves at Wādy al-Qarn as highwaymen". *(26) tafarrahūt ahāli zaḥlah ba'da dhālika fi kulli fajjīn 'anīḥ, rendered, "And after this the inhabitants of Zaḥlah dispersed in all directions [taking] the mountain roads along the deep and long ravines" p. 98, should be: "And after this the inhabitants of Zaḥlah dispersed in all directions", or to all quarters of the earth. *(27) allāti lam

---

16 It is evident that the translator took al-Ma'mariyah, the name of a village in southern Lebanon and close by the scene of the battle described in the preceding lines, for a common noun, and derived it in the one case from 'amara = to populate a village or make it large, and in the other from 'umra = to live long.

17 The translator was misled by the etymological meaning of i'rādan and ḥāflan.

18 The translator confused ṣāḥara = to make public show of, with ṣāḥara = to support.

19 A common colloquial idiom.

20 fi kulli fajjīn 'anīḥ is an idiomatic expression and should not be translated literally.
tubki walam tadhar, rendered, "which was pitiless and did not [seem] to cease" p. 98, should be: "which did not spare [any one] nor leave [anything]".  

(28) kullu ḥā'ifah 'ala silāhiha wāḏifah, rendered, "the whole community stood under arms" p. 102, should be: "each community [i.e. both the Christian and Druze communities] stood under arms".  

(29) wa'āna la aḵdiru an u'tīyakumudh-dhimama ma lam tadkhabu, rendered, "and now I am unable to give you the assurance [which you demand]. Why do you not go etc." p. 107, should be "............. unless you go".  

(30) biḥādaš-s-sadād, rendered, "in that neighborhood", should be: "regarding that matter".  

(31) jadašukma bishārah-s-suṣa, rendered, "and the teacher of the Gospel as-Suṣa invited them", should be: "and Bishārah as-Suṣa invited them".  

(32) irtābu min dhālika-l-amri-l-munakar, rendered, "they thought that this thing was unknown" p. 113, should be: "their fears were aroused on account of that evil act".  

(33) allati ʿarda biḥa rabba-l-barāya biṭuḥdīmi-l-kurābina waq- ḍahāya, rendered, "which it had pleased the Lord of creation to confer upon him, by bringing offerings and sacrifices" p. 125, should be: "by which he won the favor of the Lord of creation thru the offering of offerings and sacrifices".  

(34) wala khaʃara 'ala kalbi bashar, rendered, "the heart had never been moved" p. 133, should be: "it never occurred to any human heart", i.e., mind—a very common Arabic expression.  

(35) wakāna ba'du muslimi-l-madīnati 'ala mashrabihi, rendered, "And some of the people of the city had been drinking", should be: "And some of the Muslim people of the city were of the same opinion."  

(36) wabūlaghu fi hajwihi maṭan maṭan wanathrān, rendered, "they vigorously censured them restoring order and dispersing [the mob]" p. 141, should be: "and they went

---

**22** A common Arabic expression used to convey the idea of utter destruction.

**23** The translator considered the negative particle, ma, an interrogative particle, which is grammatically impossible.

**24** The translator, taking the first name of the gentleman for a common noun, tried to give some translation of it. The name is not an uncommon one in Syria.

**24** Literally, of the same drinking-taste, quite a common Arabic expression to indicate oneness of thought.
to an extreme in censuring them in both poetry and prose”.  
(37) wayha'akum ma khiftumu Sultanakum, rendered, “and he will give judgment in what you fear from your Sultan” p. 142, should be: “woe unto you for not fearing your Sultan”.  
(38) waftauwa'da ilayhi ijar'a ahkamin fauka-l-adati-l-khairati-l-kamunin, rendered, “and he entrusted to him the wielding of power beyond the ordinary, breaking with custom” p. 143, should be: “and he invested him with plenipotentiary power”.  
(39) waja'alu yalamuna ba'dakum 'ala-l-hudur al-ladhi wa'ak'a fihi fi-l-ghurur, rendered, “And some of them began to blame for having come those who had persuaded them” p. 157, should be: “And they began to blame one another for presenting themselves [before Fu'ud Pasha] and for being so fooled”.  
(40) bilad safed, rendered, “the city of Safed” p. 52, should be: “the district of Safed”. 
(41) al-balad, rendered, “country” p. 79 should be: “town”.  
(42) al-`alim al-allaman, rendered, “the learned among the learned” p. 55, should be: “the learned, the most learned”.  
(43) shurakiahim, rendered, “comrades” p. 103 should be: “tenants”.  
(44) fildhat kabidi, rendered, “life blood of my liver” p. 119 should be: “a piece of my liver”.  
(45) al-asakir al-mansurah, rendered, “the troops sent for their succour” p. 122, should be: “the victorious troops”.  
(46) mukkamarah, rendered, “brotherly affection” p. 128, should be: “agreement to injure or destroy”.  
(47) ar-rum, rendered, “Greek” p. 138, should be: “Greek-Orthodox”.  
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---

*3 The translator was misled by the etymological meaning of nasman = to put in order, to organize (hence to compose words into poetry), and sathrun = to spread, to disperse (hence to spread the words in the form of prose).  
*4 The translator misread wayha'akum for wahaykumu, in which case the rhythm of the poem will of course be broken, and then he made the negative sa a relative pronoun, which is not grammatically possible.  
*5 The translator misread balad for bilad, the reference being to Hashayya.  
*6 Peasants who hold from, and till lands for, rich land-owners, receiving a certain part of the products.  
*7 Not an uncommon expression of endearment used particularly by a parent in addressing his child.
MINOR NOTICES


A translation of three chapters (those dealing with traditions of early Burma, down to 1287 A.D.) from the "Glass Palace Chronicle" compiled in 1829 by a group of Burmese monks and scholars on the basis of older chronicles (none, however, older than the 15th century according to our translator), inscriptions, and miscellaneous records. Judging from the present work, the Burmese seem to have a much greater flair for chronology than the Hindus: from about the time of Buddha this chronicle professes to record precise names and dates of Burmese rulers. Unfortunately for its credibility, it goes farther and names thirty-three pre-Buddhist rulers (without precise dates, to be sure). Interesting is a notation (p. 23) under a king dated 60 B.C.–6 A.D.: "It was in the sixth year of his reign [i.e.B.C. 55–54] that great questions were asked and answered between Milinda, king of Sagala, and Shin Nagasena in the Middle Country." This dating of the events told in the Milindapanha can hardly be strictly accurate (see Cambridge History of India, page 699), but it is after all only about half a century wrong. Presumably it represents nothing but a late combination of Ceylonese with Burmese traditions, the figures in both cases being, we must fear, anything but certain. Of course the Burmese records are greatly dependent on the Ceylonese for early times.


Translation of the quaint and interesting record left by the scribe of the famous Jesuit mission to Akbar's court (discovered in 1906 and published in 1914). The notes are very helpful.

Selections from Bishop Heber's Journal in India (1823-6), arranged topically under headings such as “British Settlements”, “Holy Places,” “Architectural Antiquities,” “Contemporary Personages,” “Customs and Manners,” etc.


At once an interesting record of journeys in the little-known borderland between India and Tibet, and a sympathetic and intelligent account of popular Buddhism in those regions in relation to historic Buddhism. The volume contains a map of the regions visited, as well as many beautiful illustrations, reproduced from photographs taken by the author, who is President of the Royal Geographical Society and Governor of Bengal.


A very complete and detailed account of the turbulent reign of the son and successor of Akbar, based on original sources, including many not utilized heretofore. One of the most interesting and valuable chapters is the long one on “Mughal Government”, which throws much light on the political machinery of the period. The author is anxious to bring out the best sides of his subject, which is very proper. It seems that he overdoes it at times, however; to attribute “strong family affections”, a “burning hatred of oppression and a passion for justice” (p. 440) to Jahangir, after the facts recorded about him by the author himself, seems “a bit thick”. After all
that can be said for Jahangir has been said, he appears as a rather pusillanimous, often a contemptible character; and he surely did not exhibit "strong family affections" in relation to his father. Nevertheless he was human, and it is well to remind us that nature does not produce exclusively villainous men.


Max Müller's dictum that "India has no place in the political history of the world", because it was wholly absorbed in otherworldly matters, has been shown by recent discoveries to be somewhat exaggerated. It is well to have gathered within the pages of one book the scattered evidences of political speculation in ancient Hindu literature. The book here noticed is a meritorious attempt in that direction. It leaves on the reader the impression that after all the speculative genius of the Hindus paid little attention to political matters. Such works as the now famous Kāṇṭiliya Arthaśāstra are mainly realistic treatises on the art of government, and have little to say about theories of the state. And while suggestions of such theories—of various sorts—are found in both Brahmanical and Buddhist works, they appear only incidentally, as stray hints and offhand guesses, rather than as anything approaching systematic speculations. In some later works of the commentary class we find perhaps closer approaches to serious attempts at political theorizing; but even they never acquire anything like the well-rounded outlines of Greek and European theorists. Our author brings out very sanely the fundamental differences between what have been called the Hindu theories of the "social contract" and the "divine right of kings" and their European analogs. Despite some superficial resemblances, he seems to be quite right in maintaining that to emphasize the analogies is more apt to be misleading than helpful.


It is hard to review "part of the introduction" to such a work
as that planned by the author and indicated by his title. It is equally hard to understand why such a work should be issued at all in such piecemeal fashion. The thirty-three pages contained in this part deal with the manuscripts, the style, meter and grammar of the text, the "lack of unity in [its] authorship", and the form of the text adopted by the commentator Uvaṭa.


This translation (with explanatory notes) is intended for the "general public". There is a brief introduction, and an abridged version of the Udayana-Vāsavadattā legend as found in the Kathāsaritsāgara, based on Tawney's translation. The translation of the play appears to be scholarly and accurate. The English does not always succeed in being smooth and idiomatic, but any one who has ever tried to translate a Sanskrit play must sympathize with the author on that score.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

By unanimous vote the Executive Committee has elected the following to membership in the Society:

Rev. John Wick Bowman  Rev. John M. Kelso
Rev. Thomas F. Carter  Dr. J. J. Obermann
Miss Lucy Cleveland  Dr. George L. Richards
Mr. Joel Hatheway  Mr. James R. Ware
Professor Arthur Jeffrey

The Executive Committee has fixed April 22, 23, and 24, 1924, as the days of the next annual meeting of the Society.

President Adler was empowered by the Executive Committee to appoint the Society's delegates to the Conference on the Philological Sciences to be held in Cincinnati on Dec. 31, 1923, in connexion with the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.
PERSONALIA

Rev. Dr. Frederick A. Vanderburgh, Lecturer in Semitics in Columbia University, and a member of this Society since 1908, died on October 29, 1923.

Dr. Louis H. Gray has been promoted from Associate Professor of Philosophy to Professor of Comparative Philology and Oriental Languages in the University of Nebraska.

Professor H. C. Tolman of Vanderbilt University, a distinguished Iranian scholar, a member of this Society and a frequent contributor to the Journal, died on November 24, 1923.
BABYLONIACA

Theophilus James Meek

University of Toronto

The god, "E-ul"

The god, "E-ul", appears, so far as I know, only in the personal name, En."E-ul". This name is found in two places: in a date formula of Warad-Sin, and in an inscription of Nabonidus. In both the reference is doubtless to one and the same person despite the fact that in the date formula she is called En (usually translated "high-priest") of Nannar and in the other nin and nin-dingir-ra ("high-priestess") of Nannar. This is simply another of the many instances to show that Sumerian gave little heed to gender and both en and nin could be masculine or feminine as the context required. According to the date formula En."E-ul" was invested high-priestess of Nannar by Warad-Sin, and according to the Nabonidus Inscription, Col. II, 1 ff., she was the daughter of Kudur-mabug and the sister of Rim-Sin, who we know was the brother and successor of Warad-Sin. Nabonidus tells us further, Col. I, 24; II, 10 ff., that he dedicated his own daughter to be high-priestess to Nannar in the same temple in Ur over which En."E-ul" had presided, viz. E-gi-par, and on this occasion gave her as her official name, Bel(en)-salji."Nannar. This would seem to be simply a fuller, Semitic form of the earlier name, En."E-ul", and in view of the circumstances recorded in the inscription and the antiquarian interests of Nabonidus it would seem very probable that he should have given his daughter the name of her distinguished predecessor. In that case the god "E-ul" must be identified with Nannar (Sin).

1 See Grice, Chronology of the Lurra Dynasty, p. 24.
2 Clay, Miscellaneous Inscriptions in the Yule Babylonian Collection, No. 45, Col. II, 1.
3 The classical example for nin is the god-name, "Ningirsu, "lord of Girsu". There is no indication that Ningirsu was originally a female deity, as some have argued.
Is there a root, erēšu, "to fashion"?

In Sidney Smith's recently published *First Campaign* of Sennacherib, line 81, appears the phrase, "dalāti" "šurmēni ši-ra-a-ti ša i-na pi-te-e u la-a-ri e-ri-eš la-a-bu, which Smith believes fixes for the root ṣē in architectural descriptions the meaning of cutting and fitting a wooden object to its place. The passage he accordingly translates: "lofty doors of cypress, which were well cut for opening and revolving". At first sight the suggestion is very attractive, but the question immediately arises as to whether this meaning for erēšu is supported by occurrences of the root elsewhere, and this must always be the final test of the meaning of a word. In most instances erēšu occurs in a context that gives little or no indication of its meaning and it could as well signify "to fashion" as "to smell". The following, however, are some occurrences that assuredly permit only the latter meaning:

Nabonidus Cylinder, V R. 65, Col. II, 13 f.: "I anointed the threshold, the bolt, the lock and the doors with oil and for the entrance of their illustrious divinities I filled the beautiful temple with sweet perfume" (i-ri-šu ša-a-bi).

*Ibid.*, Col. II, 15 f.: "O Šamaš, illustrious lord, on thy entering Ebabbara may the gates, the entrances, the shrines and the sanctuaries be acceptable in thy sight; like the forest may they smell sweet to thee" (ki-ma a-a-ri li-ri-šu-ku).

Nebuchadrezzar Wadi-Brisa Inscription, B Col. IX, 13 ff.: "Lebanon, the cedar mountain of the luxuriant forests of Marduk, whose odor is sweet (ša i-ri-iš-su ša-a-bu), whose cedars are tall".

The meaning "to fashion" for erēšu in these and similar passages is quite impossible and Smith's conjecture is therefore unsupported. His passage in Sennacherib ought accordingly to be translated: "lofty doors of cypress, which gave forth a sweet odor in opening and closing", and the generally accepted meaning for erēšu, "to smell", must stand.

**Names of Parts of the Doorway**

A frequent expression in the building inscriptions of both the Babylonians and Assyrians is some or all of the following

---

*According to Schroeder, *KAV*, No. 183, 10, šad erini =mdt Ḫatti, and Hatti in the late period came to signify Syria, Delitzsch, *Paradies*, pp. 269 ff.*
terms in conjunction: dalāti sippu šigaru hittu tallu kanakku, all of them written both with and without the determinative of wood, ʾisu. The meanings of the first three are well known: dalāti, "door-leaves"; sippu, "threshold"; šigaru, "door-bolt". It is the last three that occasion difficulty.

An expression found in the Assyrian inscriptions runs with some variation as follows: "I erected two pillars (dimmē) and set in place (emid) on them a beam (dappu) as the hittu (variant, kulu) of the gateway". The context suggests for hittu, variant kulu, the meaning, "lintel". This would exactly suit kulu, as suggested by its root kālā, "to complete, finish off" (cf. kīlī, "crown"). The meaning is furthermore supported by the significance of hittu in Syriac where it is found as a loan-word and rather interestingly appears in both its Babylonian forms, ḫēṭṭā and ḫēṭṭā. Its meaning is plank or beam, especially one resting on pillars, i.e., when part of a doorway, "lintel". To hittu, ḫittu one may accordingly assign the meaning "lintel". Another hittu appears with the determinative of vessel, karpatu, and must signify some kind of rectangular, box-like vessel, suggesting a lintel in shape.

A word evidently closely related to hittu is tallu. When signifying a part of the doorway it usually has the determinative of wood, ʾisu, but as in the case of hittu there is another tallu with the determinative of vessel, karpatu. In the Amarna letters it appears several times in lists of gifts, and in certain ritual texts we find it listed as a votive offering. According to the description in a votive inscription of Ashurbanipal, Bu. 89-4-26, 209, it had sides and bottom and was manifestly box-shaped, and was used to carry or hold a divine statue. A number of such caskets have been excavated in Babylonia and frequently are found with statues in them. Another ref-

---

1 Cf. e.g., Smith, First Campaign of Sennacherib, line 84; Rassam Cylinder of Ashurbanipal, V R. 10, Col. X. 101.
2 Cf. also kululu, which is mentioned several times in a Votive Inscription of Nabopolassar (King, Babylonian Boundary Stones, Plate C1). Here it appears in a list of priestly vestments that were given to Šamaš as votive offerings. Its meaning is clearly "turban, tiara, crown".
3 E.g., Thureau-Dangin, Rituals accadiens, p. 66, l. 19; p. 72, l. 12.
4 Published by the present writer in JAOS 38. 167 ff.
5 See, e.g., Koldewey, Das wiedererstehende Babylon, passim.
ference of some significance is Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, No. 8, 38 I.: *u amēla ša-na-a *šu-ta-at-na ak-ka-a-a-i *ša-lim* (not *ri-ši*, as Knudtzon) *ki-i ul-zi-su-šu*, “and after Šatatna of Akko had stood another man in a *tallu-vessel*.” This would suggest that a *tallu-vessel* was taller than it was wide and in this instance as tall as a man or taller. All these references suggest for *tallu* as part of the doorway the meaning “door-jamb”. Streck’s rendering, “Türflügel”, 21 is precluded by the fact that *tallu* often appears in conjunction with *dalēti*, “door-leaves”, 22 and so must refer to some other part of the doorway. The connection of *mâšu*, “double”, with *tallu*, noted by Streck, would seem to have reference, not to the double doors, but to the double doorjambs. The *tallē*, then, would be the two pillars (*dimmē*) on which the *ḥittu* or lintel was placed. “Doorjamb” agrees well with every context in which *tallu* is found and so can very well be accepted as its meaning.

The last word left in our list is *kanakkū* or *kanaku*, and the only part of the doorway so far unmentioned is the hinge, which accordingly would seem to be its meaning. The Babylonian hinge was of course a pivot and socket arrangement. The two words meaning pivot and socket are evidently *ṣarru* and *nukušu*, but which means “pivot” and which “socket” is difficult to say. The presumption is that *nukušu* means “socket”. It is usually found in the plural, showing that there was more than one connected with each door and the accompaniment of *elā* or *šapli* indicates that there was an upper and a lower *nukušu*, and of course every door had its upper and lower socket in which the pivot-post revolved. *Nukušu* is a loan-word from Sumerian, where it appears as *ni-kuš-ū* but this throws little light on its meaning. The expression *nu-kuš-ū = lā ūniḫu* 23 “tireless, unfailing, imperishable”; it could very well apply to the socket. In the early period it was manifestly made of wood as implied by the determinative *giš* but later it was ordinarily made of stone. As in the case of the *nukušu* there was an upper and a lower *ṣarru*, but it is significant that unlike *nukušu* the word appears

21 *Akkurbanipal*, p. 290, n. 2.
23 Br. 6387; CT XIX, 18, Rev. 8.
always in the singular. It would accordingly seem to have been a single post with upper and lower ends, and was manifestly the pivot-post that ran through the length of the door with both ends protruding slightly beyond the door to act as pivots in the sockets. The same word in Hebrew (扭) and other Semitic languages manifestly means "pivot", and the verbal form šarru, "to vex, oppress, force a way", could well suggest for širru the pivot, grinding down into the socket. Closely connected with širru and nukušu is kanakku. That it is the opposite and complement of nukušu is implied by CT XVII, 35, 59 (cf. IV R, 16, 59a): ša ina ša ŋa-nak-ki u nu-ku-še-e i-šar-ru-ru, "(the demon) who forces a way through door-pivot and sockets". The verbal form kanaku, "to seal, stamp", would likewise suggest for kanakku the meaning, "pivot". Like širru it is regularly found in the singular and so refers to the pivot-post and by this word it may best be translated.

---

See Brown-Briggs-Driver, Lexicon, p. 852.
‘GEBEN’ UND ‘NEHMEN’ IM INDISCHEN

PAUL TEDESCO

VIENNA, AUSTRIA

1. WAEHREN gr. θετός, στατός im Ai. hita-, stita- entspricht, steht gr. δοτός ai. datla- gegenüber, eine jedenfalls junge Neubildung aus dem Präsens-Stamm. Diese Neubildung kann auch geographisch nur eine schmale dialektische Basis besessen haben, denn im Mittelindischen setzt sie sich nicht fort.


2. Die mi. Sprachen bieten nämlich für das Particip von dā- in grossen Linien das folgende Bild:


* Das Iranische dagegen hat dāta-, stāta-.
* Die alte Form hat sich nur in der Komposition, in der dort lautgesetzlichen Gestalt, in dīta- erhalten, und so noch pāli atta-dāṣṭa-. 
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Zu den einzelnen Typen:

3. (1) dittā eignet nur dem NW, vereinigt aber dessen sämtliche Dialekte, abgesehen von einer kleinen dinā-Enklave im Puncti (nordöstl. Lahnda) und einem den inneren, dittā-Dialekten des nw. Himalaya-Abhanges aussen (gegen das Tibetische) anliegenden din-Streifen, der im Jaunsāri (bei Kalsi) in der Ebene einsetzend nordnordwestlich gerichtet über den Tehri-Dialekt des Gaṇvāli, das Kōći und die oberen Satlaj-Dialekte zum Kōli führt.

Sonst gilt aber dittā im ganzen Lahnda und Panjābi (nur das Bhaṭṭīāni, Südost, Staat Bikaner, das schon regelmässig Doppelsononanz mit Ersatzdehnung vereinfacht, hat dittā) und ebenso im anliegenden Berglande: So Tōrvāli (Svat-Kohistan) dīt, Kašmirī dyut (<*dittu, wie dyūkh* 'gesehen' <*ditthu*), gleiche Form die Kašmiri-Dialekte von Kīṣṭvar und Pogul; ebenso dittā, selten (Manḍēlāli und Haṇḍūri) dītā, in den Pahāri-Dialekten des Himalaya-Abhangs, so weit östlich reichend wie das dittā der Ebene (d. h. etwa bis auf die Höhe von exclus Umballa); endlich haben dittā auch die Gujuri-Dialekte des Panjab-Tieflandes und -Kohistans.

4. dittā, allen diesen Dialekten gemeinsam, ist zugleich das einzige Element, das sie alle vereinigt. Denn sonst sind Panjābi (und östliches Lahnda) und die westlichen Pahāri-Dialekte stark central überschichtet und das Gujuri sogar reines Rājā-
sthāṇī (Mēvāṭī); in dittā (gujūri dittō) aber haben sie alle das ursprüngliche NW-Element.

Also bilden Panjābī und Lahndā hier gegenüber den centralen Dialekten eine Einheit wie für die andern alten NW-Elemente des Panjābī (Gen. nw. -dā: centr. kō; Pron. 1 u. 2 Ps. Pl. nw. ast. tusl: centr. ham, tum; Part. Prä. nw. -(n)dā: centr. -tō usw., vgl. Grierson LSI Panj. 616ff.).

5. Und die westlichen Pahāṛī-Dialekte, alte NW-Sprache durch Rājasthāṇī überschichtet, haben—während im Gen. durchwegs das rājasthāṇī -rā usw. siegte und das centrale ham, tum nw. āsā, āssē, āssē auf den Raum westlich des oberen Satlaj beschränkte—in dittā das NW-Element östlich bis Kalsi erhalten, so dass nur ein NW-Element, das auch auf das Gaṅgvāli, Kumauni und Naipāli ausgedehnte Part. Pass. auf -dā, noch weiter nach Osten reicht.


Aus all dem erhellt, wie fest dittā im NW verankert ist.

6. (2) Aehnlich scharf begrenzt umfasst der SW-Typus didhō mit dem Centrum Gujarat 1 noch einen Bogen aus den benachbarten Rājasthāṇī-Dialekten (Sirōhī und Mēvārī von Udaipur [dīdō]), den Bhil-Sprachen (dīdō) und dem westlichsten Mālvi (Staats Rutlam dīlō); auf ihm beruht auch marāṭhī didhlā (selt.).

7. (3) Der Typus dīnna- findet sich in den verschiedensten Teilen des ni. Sprachgebiets:

1. Im NW (Enklaven im dittā- Gebiet):
   a) das schon besprochene West-Pahāṛī-Gebiet am oberen Satlaj (Jaunsārī dīnō usw.);
   b) nō. Lahndā von Punch (dīnā).

2. In der Mittelzone:
   a) Sindhī (dīdinō);
   b) daran östlich anschliessend die dīnō-Enklaven-Reihe im dīyō-Gebiet (in Palanpur und Malva auch mit dīd(h)ō in Fühlung), bezeichnet durch das südl. Marvāṛi von Palanpur (dīn-)

1 Doch ist im Gujarati nicht dō-, sondern—einzig im Ni.—āp- (<arpayā-) das übliche Wort für 'geben'.
und das westliche von Jodhpur (dīnā), Jaipuri (dīnā) und Dāngī-
Dialekt des Braj (dīn[k]au);
c) Mālvi im Staate Devas bei Indore (dīnā), und d a r a u f
beruhend dinnalā im Altmarāṭhi;
d) das ostcentrale Gebiet von Oudh (mit Cawnpore und Hardōl)
und Baghelkhand, wo dīn (dīnh) in allen Mundarten neben
dih- steht (dīnh aus dīn + dih-),—und zwar so, dass dīnh(h)
meer als reines Particip, dih- mehr mit Endung (dīhis wie
kahis, dēkhis usw.) üblich ist; doch kommt auch dīnh mit
Endungen vor (Typus dīnhis).—Mar. dīnalā beruht
auf dīnh des nō. anstossenden Baghēli wie mar. didhā
auf didhō des nw. anstossenden Gujarāṭī.
3. Im äussersten Süden: Singalesisch (dun < dinna- wie sun
< chinna-, bun < bhinna-).
8. Dieses Auftreten in den verschiedensten Gegendenden deutet
auf hohes Alter des Typus und wahrscheinlich einstige weitere
Ausbreitung und gibt so seiner Alleingeltung im Mi. eine ge-
wisse Berechtigung.
Andrerseits ist der Typus geographisch am wenigsten scharf
begrenzt. Erstens hängen seine Gebiete nicht zusammen: 
Nicht nur die NW-Enklaven und das Singhal. sind isoliert,
ondem auch in der Mittelzone ist das Westgebiet (Sindh-Agra)
von dem Ostgebiet (Oudh-Baghelkhand) durch das reine diyō-
Gebiet des Kanaujī und Bundēlī getrennt. Zweitens hat der
Typus nur im Sindhī in einem grösseren geschlossenen Gebiet
Alleingeltung; sonst bildet er entweder Enklaven (im NW im
dīṭā-, in der Haidarabad-Agra-Zone und Malva im diyō-Gebiet)
odern neben ihm steht in d e n s e l b e n Mundarten in teil-
weiser funktioneller Differenzierung ein zweiter Typus (dīhis
nennen dīn nicht örtlich, sondern im selben Dialekt funktionell
geschieden im Avadhī-Baghēli); wobei dieser letztere Verteil-
ungstypus klar aus dem ersteren entwickelt ist.
9. (4) Der Typus dīh- ist herrschend in Avadhī, Baghēli,
Chattisgarhī (dīhis wie kahis, dēkhis, lagis, bolāis, gaīs, bhais)
und, mit -al, in Bhojpuri (dīhles wie kahles, dēkles usw.); doch
hat er, wie gesagt, im Avadhī-Baghēli dīnh(h) neben sich; und im

---
* Z.B. Allahabad (LSI Eastern Hindi 101): dīnā, dinā; kīhis, dīhis, kahis.
* Baghēli (sbd. 154) dīñesī, (157) dīñesī, (172) dīñhis.
* Unklar Bloch, *Formation de la langue marathī*, S. 140.
östlichen Bhojpuri und Bagheli und im ganzen Chattisgarhi findet sich auch schon delas, bzw. deis (östl. bagh. deis: standard bagh. dihis = östl. bhojp. (Sahabad) deles: standard bhojp. dihas).


Er war zweifellos auch der Vorläufer der Eastern Hindi-, Bihāri- und Oriya-Typen dih(al)- und dē(l)-, die heute sein Gebiet unterbrechen; wie er auch tatsächlich noch heute neben dih-, dē- im Chattisgarhi steht (diye).

Formgeschichte.


7 Die einzelnen Sprachen der Eastern Hindi-, Bihāri- u. Oriya-Gruppe haben also, im Ueberblick, die folgenden Typen: Avadhī din(h) und dīh-is; Baghāli din(h), dih-is, selten, im Osten, dē-is; Chattisgarhi dīh-is und dē-is, im reichen Ptc. auch diye; Bhojpuri dih-is und, im Osten, dē-l-as; Magahi, Maithili, Oriya nur dē-l-.
Doch ist auch *diya*, der ni. Haupttypus, altererbt, älter selbst als das überlieferte ai. *datta- und mi. *dinna-*

Denn wie hindöst. *kiś, mūṅ, gayā, kiyā auf vorāurāunī *hūta-,*muta-,*gatu-,*kita- zurückgehen, so offenbar *diya*- da irgendwelche Analogiebildung ausgeschlossen ist—auf *dita-.

*dita-* aber ist unmittelbar gleich gr. *doros wie hīta-*θερός und sthīta-στερός.

Keiner der bisherigen Fälle von im Ni. erhaltenen, während dem überlieferten Ai. fehlenden altindogermanischen Sprachgut* kann sich mit diesem an Bedeutung vergleichen.

Die völlige Verdrängung von *dita-* aus der alt- und mittelindischen Überlieferung kann—wenn sie auch (worüber gleich)—eine gewisse geographisch-historische Berechtigung hat—doch keine wirklich sprachgeschichtliche Tatsache, sondern nur ein Ergebnis der Grammatiker-Konvention sein.*

13. Mit der Erschliessung von ai. *dita-* ändert sich nun die Beurteilung der überlieferten Formen. Denn hat *dita-* im Ai. bestanden, so muss es in sämtlichen Dialekten die älteste Form gewesen sein; und als—nur in manchen Dialekten—dialetisch verschiedene—Neubildungen aufkamen, müssen diese sämtlich neben *dita-* aufgekommen sein.

Diese Neubildungen waren Bildungen aus dem Präsenstamme *dad-*, und zwar mit *-la- oder *-na- Suffix, wobei ersteres durch das alte *dita-* letzteres durch die allgemeine Neigung der d-Stämme unterstützt wurde. (Vgl. übrigens *vita- und *vina- vid- 'finden'.) So entstanden—in verschiedenen Dialekten—einerseits *datta-, die überlieferte ai. Form, andererseits *danna-.

Da aber neben beiden zur Zeit ihres Aufkommens noch das alte *dita-* gestanden haben muss, wurden sie mit diesem zu *dita- und *dinna- ausgegliedert, wovon ersteres die Vorform des heutigen NW-Typus, letzteres die überlieferte mi. Form ist.*
In der überwiegenden Menge der ai. Dialekte aber haben entweder überhaupt keine Neuhbildungen stattgefunden oder sie haben sich nicht durchgesetzt; und *dita- blieb ungestört erhalten.


16. Für 'nehmen' zerfällt das Ni. in zwei grosse Gebiete: Centrum und Osten haben den Typus lē-, Westen und Süden grabh-

lē- selbst hat wieder drei Haupttypen:
1. lā-, reimend mit ka- ‘sagen’, in Assam und Ost-Bengalen;
2. lē- reimend mit dē- im ganzen Centrum und SW (Rajasthan, Gujarat);
3. lē- nicht reimend mit dē- im NW.

17. Also (1) Assam. la-‘nehmen’ wie ka-‘sagen’ gegen di-‘geben’; 
Prät. lāle wie kāle gegen dīle. Ost-Bengalen, z. B. Dacca-Distrikt (LSI Beng. 207) laīlo ‘er nahm’ wie kaiīlo ‘er sagte’ gegen dīlō ‘er gab’. 
Mainmings (ebd. 391, 234-5) la ‘nehmt’ gegen dī ‘gebt’.

Das mittlere Bengal (Calcutta, Bardvān, Santhal Parganas, Dinajpur, Rājbangší) hat nē-, nil-, immer reimend mit dē-, dil-. 
Da nun sogar westlich von der nē-, nil-Zone die Formen mit l-Anlaut wieder nicht mit dē- reimern (Midnapur layā, Dhalbhum laye; lāla gegen dial), so ist, solange sich nicht Formen wie *naitl finden, beng nē-wahrscheinlich zu sindhi niānu ‘wegnehmen’ und westpahārī nil-‘nehmen’** zu ziehen und nicht lautlich aus lē- entstanden. Dieselbe Möglichkeit besteht trotz des dort häufigen Wechsels von n und l für oriya nē-, nēla ‘nehmen’.

18. (2) Erst im westlichen Bengal, im Ubergange zum Bihār, reimt lē- mit dē-: im S (Manbhum līlek wie dīlek), in der Mitte (Malda līya) und im N (Purnea līl wie dīl).

Von da an westlich reimt lē- immer mit dē-: maithili-magahi lēl wie dēl, bhojpuri līhal wie dīhal, avadhī līk- is ‘er nahm’ wie dīk-is ‘er gab’ (vgl. kāh-is ‘er sagte’) und lin(h) wie din(h), kanauji und bundeli lāo wie dāo, Braj liyau wie dīyau und lin(h)au wie din(h)au, hindöst. liyā wie dīyā. Ebenso nördlich anliegend naipāi, kumaunī und garhväli līyō wie dīyō. Schliesslich im SW rājasthānī līyō, bzw. līnō und līd(h)ō wie dīyō, bzw. dinō und dīd(h)ō und gujarātī līdho wie dīdho.

19. (3) Im NW westlich vom Ghaggar—dem *dīta-Gebiet— 
dagegen reimt lē- im Präter. nur vereinzelt mit dē-: nur im östlichen Teile dieses Gebietes steht panj. lītā und lītā (‘dītā) neben līyā und (in den Himalaya-Dialekten) sirmaurī lītā: 
dītā. Die westlicheren Him.-Dial.—vom Baghāthī bis zum Pāḍarī —haben durchwegs lēa (mit gēa ‘gegangen’, pēa ‘gefallen’ reimend)

** Paṅgavālī ni-, nil, bhadraḿhī sa- gegen sonstiges Westpahārī lē-.
oder læ gegenbüber dittä; und ebenso hat das læ des Lahndă, das—

20. Da nun in diesen Gebieten das alte Wort für 'nehmen' offenbar ghin—war—denn dieses ist es noch heute in den centralen Einflüsse abliegenden Gegenen des Lahndă und hat sich in der Bedeutung 'kaufen' auch im Pahāri erhalten (§51)—, anderseits das nordwestliche læ—geographisch mit dem centralen zusammenhängt,—so ist læ—im NW nicht ursprünglich, sondern aus dem Centrum eingewandert.11

Im östlichen Teile dieses NW-Gebietes, wo læ—, liyā schon früher eingedrungen war und damit zugleich das centrale inner-sprachliche Prinzip der Reimung von 'nehmen' und 'geben', wurde liyā teilweise nach dittä umgeformt. Der tiefere Westen aber, in den læ—später eindrang und dem die Reimung von 'nehmen' mit 'geben' fremd war (er hatte früher ghinn—, gheddă: dē—, dittā), liess liyā—nur als læ einer seiner Gruppen, gea, pēa, angepasst—unausgeglichen neben dittā stehen. (læ—ist also das weitest-nordwestlich vorgedrungene Central-Element.)

21. Entstehung des Typus læ—.
Das rein mit ka—(<kah—) 'sagen' reimende læ—des Assamese und östlichen Bengali geht klar direkt auf lah—zurück: Bei dem mit dē— reimenden centralen læ—und seiner Vorstufe, dem mit dē—reimenden apabhrmās læ—'nehmen', vgl.
lēhi leppīnu leviŋu lēvi lai lijjai zu
*dēhi deppīnu *devīnu *devi dai dījjai—
ist dies aber lautlich nicht möglich, wie schon aus apabhr. lah—'erlangen' neben læ—'nehmen' und central kah—'sagen' folgt.

22. Vielmehr ist læ—eine Reimbildung zu dē—: Nach dem Gegenwort dē—with wurde *lahāi 'nimmt' zu læi umgeformt.
Im Präsens siegt so bei dem Ausgleich der beiden Gegenwörter stets dā—. Im Präteritum gewöhnlich ebenso liyō für *lahiō nach diyō, dann auch linō nach dinō usw. Doch hat hier, da (Ost) *lahia—und (West) laddha—gegenüber *dia—die volleren

11 Das wird sich später (§§22 und 32f.) noch durch zwei Indizien bestätigen.
Formen waren, lah-sich in manchen Gebieten, nur mit Uebernahme des i von *dia-, behauptet und seinerseits *dia- umgeformt: Däher der südwestcentrale Typus liddhō didhō aus laddha-+*dia- und der ostcentrale lih-is dih-is aus *lahia-+*dia-. 


23. Die lautliche Entstehung von le- ist damit so weit klar; Schwierigkeit macht aber, was noch nie beachtet wurde, die Bedeutung. Denn die Ost- und centralen Dialekte setzen ein labh- mit der Bedeutung 'nehmen' voraus, im Al bedeutet labh- das aber nie, sondern nur 'erlangen, finden,' 'nehmen' dagegen nur grabh- (und a-dā-).


18 Der Gujar.-Typus *dhō schon richtig zu mi. laddha- gemogen bei Beam's Comp. Gr. 3. 142; ganz irrig dagegen Hoerle's Comp. Gr., 141f., richtig aber hier lih- zu *lahia-.

19 Prüfpunkt für die geogr. Verteilung die Stelle 'er war verloren und ist wieder gefunden' der 'Verlorenen-Sohn'-Parabel.
das alte NW-Element erhalten (§4; nur das Pövādhi, sein öst-
lischer Dialekt, hat schon das centrale mil- und ebenso seine
N-Mundarten Dōgri und Kāngri, zusammen mit den benach-
barten südl. und östl. Kaśmirī-Dialekten) und ebenso in weitem
Umfange das sonst schon fast rein centrale Rājasthāni. Sindhi
hat neben labh-‘erlangt werden’ auch noch das Aktiv lāhānu
‘erlangen’.

26. Das südwestl. anschliessende Kacchi hat für sindhi
labh-, ladhō auch lajh-, laddha (LS1 Sindhi 190), womit es Jaina-
Māhārā. lajjhāt neben labbhāt fortsetzt, das also nicht mit
Pischel §541 ‘verlesen’, sondern nach Analogie der Dental-
stämme (bajjhāt: baddha-) auf laddha- aufgebaut ist.** Diese
charakteristische Coincidenz ergibt zugleich ein wichtiges Lokali-
sierungszeichen für die Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī: Diese beruht wohl
auf der der centralen Ueberschichtung vorhergehenden ursprüng-
lichen West-Süd-Mundart Gujarats, die dann durch jene
nach Kacch zurückgedrängt wurde.

27. Der anschliessende SW, Gujarāti und Marāthī, hat
ebenfalls guj labhū ‘erlangen’, mar. lābhṇē ‘erlangt werden’
und lākhē ‘erlangen’ (also ganz wie Sindhi); doch ist in Gujarat
jaḷ- (dem Guj. eigentümlich), in Mar. mil- und daneben im
Dekhan sāpad-, im Konkan gān- das wirklich übliche Wort
(nur bisweilen im Konkan auch lab-). Schliesslich hat das
Singhal. lab- (<labha- oder labhya-), lad- ‘erlangen’.

Also hat sich labh-‘erlangen’, dessen ursprüngliche Ausdehnung
über das Gebiet der ganzen West-Süd-Gruppe durch die beiden
Eckpfeiler des Kaśmirī und Singhal. markiert wird, im Westen
in weitem Umfange erhalten, ist dagegen im SW (Guj. und
Mar.)—sekundär—zurückgedrängt.

28. Im Centrum und Osten dagegen, wo wir für labh- die Bedeutung ‘nehmen’
voraussetzen mussten (§23), findet sich labh-
‘erlangen’ tatsächlich nie. Dafür haben diese
Dialekte vielmehr prāp-, mil- und bhēt-.

** Dieses analogische Entwicklungsprinzip, schon von Jacobi, KZ 28,249ff.,
erkannt, steht trotz des Widerspruchs Pischel’s (§§535,540 und sonst) durch
das Nl. als zweifellos fest.
Und zwar ist, wie der Prüfpunkt zeigt, mil- heute der üblichste Ausdruck, vor dem pûr- (dieses z. B. in Braj, Avadhi, Chattis-
agara, Magahi, Beng. und Assamese) und bhêl- (dieses vor allem östlich: Nagpurî Bhojpuri, Maithili, Beng., aber andererseits
auch im Westpahârî [Sirmauri und Inner Sirâjî] zurücktreten.

29. Das ost-centrale mil- hat sich auch stark ausgedehnt: 
na c h N W,—wo es das Westpahârî und selbst die östlichen
und südlichen Kašmiri-Dialekte (kaštvâri myul-, poguli mil-
râmbari mil- gegen hoch-kašm. lab-) umfasst, so dass die nw.
Hügeldialekte (das eigentliche Kašm. ausgenommen) labh-
'erlangen', während es sich in der anliegenden Ebene weit nach
Osten gehalten hat, überhaupt nicht kennen; und
na c h S W,—wo es vom Mâlvî (mil-) aus auch nach Gujarat
(Ahmadabad mäl-) und vielfach in das Dekhan- und Konkan-
Marâthî vorgedrungen ist.

[30. Während sich aber das westliche labh-'erlangen' im Ost-
Centralen nicht findet, finden sich die ost-centralen prâp- und
mil- auch im west-südl. labh-Gebiet. Ersteres scheint nach 
sândhî pâ-, pâtö, mar. pâvē, pālā und pâvîlā im West-Süden
gleichfalls altheimatberechtigt und nur ausser Gebrauch ge-
kommen; und letzteres hat nicht nur, wie gezeigt, in weiten
Partien des West-Süd-Gebietes labh-'erlangen' verdrängt, son-
dern findet sich in der Bedeutung 'vereinigen' auch im labh-
Gebiet selbst (sândhî milânu, lahndâ mêl-), wohl eingewandert.]

31. Dadurch nun, dass, während der Westen übereinstimmend
mit dem Ai. nur labh-'erlangen' hat, der Osten, für den *labh-
'nehmen' vorauszusetzen, labh- 'erlangen' tatsächlich nicht kennt,
ergibt sich die dialektische Differenzierung der Bedeutung von
labh- als alt.

Und dass die Ost-Bedeutung 'nehmen' ebenso alt, nämlich
urindogermanisch, ist wie die—schon durch das überlieferte
Ai. markierte—West-Bedeutung 'erlangen', zeigt das Griechische.

Denn griech. λαμβάνω bedeutet nicht nur—wie ai. und
West-Süd labh— 'erlangen', sondern auch—wie vor-ost-centrales
labh— 'empfangen', 'nehmen' als Gegenwort zu 'geben', und
'kaufen', in welcher letzteren Bedeutungen ihm im überlieferten
Ai. und heutigen West-Süd durchaus grâbh- entspricht.

11 Für *pâtö nach dem Präsens, s. Note 45, unten.
Also λαμβάνω (1) 'erreichen, erlangen' (κλεός λαβέω, κτήμα ἂν νικῆσε) = ai, und West-Süd labh-; aber.

(2) 'empfangen' (παρ' οὔτε ἔλαβον τά δέ τά τόξα, μοσχός λαμβάνειν) = vor-Ost-Central *labh-, hindi lé- usw., dagegen 'ai,' grabh-, lahdā ghinn-, mar. ghe-;

'nehmen' als Gegenwort zu 'geben' [ηδέως αὐν λάβωμι χρήματα, εἰ διδοῖ (Xen. Cyr. 3.2.28); λαμβάνειν μᾶλλον ἢ διδόναι (Thuc. 2.97); οὔχ οὐς τι δώσοντ' ἀλλ' ὅπως τι λήψεται (Ar. Eccl. 783)] = hindi usw. le-, aber 'ai-', lahdā, marāthi usw. grabh- usw.;

ferner λαμβάνω 'etwas um etwas kaufen' (λαμβάνειν τι ὀβολοῦ) = hindi usw. lé- (vgl. LSI Western Hindi 604-5, 240), aber ai. usw. grabh-;

schliesslich der so häufigen Wendung λαβών τι 'etwas genommen habend, mit etwas' entsprechen die gleich häufigen hindi usw. lekar, aber ai. ghithā (oder adāya), mar. ghe'ēn usw.13

32. Von den ursprünglichen Bedeutungen von labh-, 'nehmen' und 'erlangen', hat also früh das Ost-Centrale 'nehmen', das West-Süd — dieses schon im überlieferten Ai.—'erlangen' verallgemeinert.


Tatsächlich hat heute das reine West-Süd-Gebiet grabh- 'nehmen'—labh- 'erlangen', das reine Centrum-Ost-Gebiet *labh-le- 'nehmen'—mil-(oder präp-) 'erlangen'.

33. Doch liegen entlang der ganzen Grenze Übergangsgebiete, die einen W-S-Ausdruck mit einem centralen konjugieren, also le- 'nehmen' und labh- 'erlangen' oder grabh- 'nehmen' und mil- 'erlangen' haben.

13 Diese völlige Übereinstimmung der Bedeutungen sichert neuerdings, trotz der Auslautdifferenz b:b, die Zusammengehörigkeit von gr. λαμβάνειν und ai. labh-.
Denn die ursprünglich koinzidenten 'nehmen' - und 'erlangen'-Isoglotten sind dies heute nicht mehr. Sondern die — auf der Höhe von Gujarat durch das Meer unterbrochene — 'nehmen' (grabh-: lē-) -Isoglotte zieht im Westen westlich, im Süden nördlich von der 'erlangen' (labh-: mil-) -Isoglotte, die sie etwa in der Gegend von Surat schneidet.


Diese Konjugierungen sind nun — besonders im Westen, wo heute lē- 'nehmen', das selbst schliesslich auf *labh- zurückgeht, neben labh- 'erlangen' zu stehen kommt — sicher unursprünglich und es fragt sich nur, ob in den beiden Divergenzgebieten das centrale (lē-, bzw. mil-) oder das West-Süd-Element (labh-, bzw. ghē-) das neueingedrungene ist — anders gesagt, ob die Divergenzgebiete ursprünglich dem West-Süd-Gebiet oder dem centralen angehört.


⁴⁴ Ursprüngliches West-Süd-Gebiet lässt sich natürlich nach diesen Isoglotten nicht bestimmen, wenn beides Centralelemente, lē- und mil-, eingewandert sind; so im westlichen Pahāri, ursprünglichem NW-Gebiet (§5).

35. labh-lebt also in diesem westlichen Divergenzgebiet in zwei Gestalten: labh- und læ-, und zwei Bedeutungen: 'erlangen' und 'nehmen'-fort; als nämlich das centrale *labh-‘nehmen’ schon in seiner ausgeglichenen Gestalt, als læ-, in den Westen einwanderte, wurde dort ein Zusammenhang mit dem bodenständigen labh-‘erlangen’ nicht mehr gefühlt und die beiden Wörter konnten unabhängig nebeneinander fortbestehen.

Die—ursprünglich eine—‘nehmen’(grabh-: labh-): und ‘erlangen’(labh-: mil-) Isoglotte ist also heute im Westen durch die ‘erlangen’(labh-: mil-), im Süden durch die ‘nehmen’(ghē-: læ-)-Isoglotte gegeben, jedesmal also durch die inneren Isoglotten-Stücke.

36. Es sollen nun die überlieferten indischen Frühdialekte auf ihre Einstellung zu dieser Hauptisoglotte geprüft werden.


37. Dagegen hat die spätere Schriftsprache aus der centralen Volkssprache die Wurzel læ-‘nehmen’ neu eingeführt, die, nach Muster von dē- aus *lēi:dēi abstrahiert, bereits den Reimaus- gleich von labh- mit dē- voraussetzt.17 Doch ist, wie die über-

17 Vgl. dazu Edgerton, JAOS 38.206f.
liefernten Formen (lāti, lalur, alāsit, lātvā) zeigen, die Neubildung keine lebendige — denn diese hätte nach volkssprachlichem lei- die Reim bildungen zu dā- ergeben —, sondern eine theoretisch-abstrakte: Man hat die aus dē-:lē-=dā-:x abstrahierte 'Wurzel' lā- künftig nach der denkbar einfachsten Art (lā-ti, lā-tvā) flektiert.


Im Pāli haben sich also, bei vorwiegend west-südlicher Grundlage, auch centrale Einflüsse geltend gemacht (Ujjain?).


Ob die übrigen Prākṛtis (z. B. Māgadhī und Śaurasenī) in diesem Punkte ost-centrale Verhältnisse reflektieren, kann ich derzeit nicht untersuchen. Doch lässt der starke Einfluss der Māhārāṣṭri und des Sanskrits und der überhaupt künstliche Charakter dieser Sprachen kaum viel erwarten.


41. Bei dieser Lokalisierung der Altdialekte nach der ‘nehmen’- und ‘erlangen’-Isoglotte ist indes zweierlei zu beachten: Erstens

---

11 Geiger, Pāli S. 3; Franke, Pāli und Sanskrit S. 138f.
ist es ungewiss, wie weit die Differenz der beiden Gruppen alt ist. Das System grabh-'nehmen', labh-(präp-) 'erlangen' des West-Süd ist, da die alten West-(‘Ai.’) und Süd-Dialekte (Mahrāštṛ) darin völlig mit den modernen übereinstimmen, sicher sehr alt. Für das Vor-Ost-Centrale aber steht nur so viel fest, dass es labh-, und zwar jedenfalls häufig, auch in der Bedeutung 'nehmen' hatte; nicht aber, ob deswegen labh-'erlangen' und grabh-'nehmen' schon früh aufgegeben waren. Denn die Durchführung einer Bedeutung bei einem Verb und die Eliminierung der Synonyme ist oft ein junger Vorgang.** Doch macht das hohe Alter der Durchführung einer der beiden Urbedeutungen von labh- im Westen das Analogie auch für den Osten wahrscheinlich.

42. Zweitens ist zu beachten, dass die Lage und ursprüngliche Ausdehnung des Vor-Ost-Centralen unbekannt ist. Das Vor-West-Süd war jedenfalls einmal im NW (Panjab), wo das grabh-labh-System noch heute am reinsten ausgeprägt ist, ansässig und hat sich von da aus allmählich Indus-, später küstenabwärts (Westl. Rajasthan, Sindh, Gujarat, Mahārāštṛ, Ceylon) ausbreitet, wobei aber neben kontinuierlicher Stoss-Schiebung auch mit Ueberspringung (so sicher Singhalesisch) und übrigens auch mit sekundären kovalā-Ausgleich ursprünglich verschiedener Altdialekte zu rechnen ist. Für das Vor-Ost-Centrale ist zunächst wahrscheinlich, dass es — von Anfang östlich vom Vor-West-Südlichen geschichtet — zur Zeit dessen Etablierung im Panjab an der oberen Jumna sesshaft war und von hier aus durch einfache Ausbreitung gegen O und S vordrang. Doch kann es auch durch Ueberspringung des West-Süd in seinen Altsitz gelangt sein und ferner bei seiner Ausbreitung auch andere Ost-Dialekte, darunter vielleicht auch ursprüngliche grabh- 'nehmen'—labh-'erlangen'-Dialekte, verdrängt haben.

Nach dem Gesagten wird die Lokalisierung z. B. des Pāli nach der 'nehmen'-Isoglotte ungewiss. Aber da hier lah-, wie es scheint, nur selten 'nehmen' und gewöhnlich 'erlangen', 'nehmen' aber gah- heisst, so scheint trotz allem — wenn man nicht eben eine untergegangene Ost-Gruppe mit ebenfalls dieser Conju-

** Andereorts sind wohl alle Alt-Literatur-Sprachen mit ihrer Mehrheit von Bedeutungen desselben Verbs und Mehrheit von Verben für dieselbe Bedeutung eben wesentlich Gemeinsprachen.
gierung annimmt — doch zumindest seine west-südliche Basis zunächst wahrscheinlich.

43. Dem ganzen Centrum, so weit le- mit ã- reimt, ist der Ausdruck le ãnā 'genommen haben kommen' für 'bringen' eigen. So ** hindöst. lā-, braj lā-, kanauli lā-, bundēli lā-, rāj. lā(r)-, -guj. lai āv-, lāv-; ** avadhi lai āv-, li āv-, lāv-, baghēli lai āv-, chartissg. lāv-; bhojp. lai āv-, maithili lā-.


46. Als Bedeutungs-Lehnwort hat es sich sogar noch darüber hinaus in das ghinn-Gebiet fortgesetzt. Denn ghinn āv- im westl. (Multan, Dera Ghazi Khan, Dera Ismail Khan, Mianval) und nordwestl. Lahnda (Dhanni), bzw. ghinn achn- im nordöstl. Lahnda (Pōṭhvāri und [hini achn-] Panchi) sind klar Abbildungen

** Prüfpunkt für 'bringen' die Stelle 'bringt schöne Kleider' der Verlorenen-Sohn-Parabel.


** Ebenso im Nordiranischen: buddh. sogdī. 'n. y. bringe' (Vess. Jāt. 1248); kurd. ènu 'bringen' (<è-nīn-).

** Camējī, Gādī and Curāhī, die statt ānd īnā haben, haben auch in dieser Verbindung lē īnā; ebenso mit ĭc-: curāhī lē ĭcā 'bringt' (LSI Pahāri 835).
des centralen lē āv-. Ebenso im SW kacchi gini ac- und tharélli (Sindhi) ginhí ac-; und auch die im restlichen Sindhi (Haidarabad, Lāsī, Lāṛī) übliche Wendung khanī ac-(khanau ‘aufheben’) kommt dem — wenn sie auch, da centr. lē-, lahndā ghinn- im Sindhi vāṭh-entspräche, nicht völlig homolog Ist — doch sehr nahe.

47. Im Gegensatz zur ‘nehmen’- und ‘erlangen’-Verteilung scheint also die von ‘bringen’ tatsächlich für einen ‘Outer Circle’ zu sprechen. Da aber änī-’bringen’ ursprünglich gemein-indoiranisch und lē āv-, jedenfalls Neubildung ist, wird auch das Vorceninale änī- gehabt haben und die Ueberenstimmung von Ost und West-Süd beruht auf blosser gemeinsamer Erhaltung des Alten.

48. Num zum grabh-’nehmen’-Gebiet. Dieses, den ganzen Süden und Westen umfassend, führt vom Singhalesischen (gani-, gat-) über das Olīyā von Cuttack (gheni ‘genommen habend’ [LSI Or. 386], wofür im Or. vom Kalahandi-Staat nē [ebd. 401]) und das Marāṭhī (ghē-, ghēt-lā) — mit einer Unterbrechung durch centrales lē- im Gujarāṭi — zum Sindhi von Kacchi (gin-, gidō) und weiter — nach einer neuerlichen Unterbrechung im Sindhi von Haidarabad usw., wo vathānu der übliche Ausdruck ist zum Lahndā, wo, so weit nicht im Osten von Jhelum (Saḥpur, Jhang, Lyallpur) und in Pešāvar lē- eingedrungen ist (§19), ghinn- wieder herrscht: Multan ghinn-, giddhā (LSI Lah. 305), Dera Ghazi Khan ghinn-, ghid(h)ā (345), ebenso Dera Ismail Khan und Mianval; ebenso nö. Lahndā (Salt Range und Pothvārī) und nw. (Dhannī) ghinn-, ghiddā. Doch geht ghinn-, ghiddā in den Murree Hills in ghin-, ghindā und dieses im Chishahi und Punchī in hin-, hindā über; dies bildet den Uebergang zu Kaśmirī hē- (Inf. kyōn‘), Ptc. kyot‘, das formantischen marāṭhī ghē-, ghēt-lā (worüber §58) am nächsten steht. 4

49. Mit diesem ghinn- bildet das Lahndā nicht nur das centrale

---

'Geben' und 'Nehmen' im Indischen

Kompositum lē āv- durch ghinn āv-, bzw. ghinn ach- ab, sondern auch centrale Verbal-Umschreibungen mit hilfszeitwörtlichem lē-, so dass Jhelum vēkh liyā 'er sah' (396), Hindkō von Pešavar vēkh littā (558) in Dera Ismail Khan dēkk giddā (399), im Dhanni vēkh ghiḍḍā (547) entspricht. Oder dhanni rakkh ghinn 'halte' (547) usw.

50. Ueberall, wo grabh-'nehmen' bedeutet (Marāṭhi, Kacchi, Lahndā, Kaśmirī), ist es auch das übliche Wort für 'kaufen' (so schon Apabhramśa und Skt.) und genau so lē- (allein oder mit mōl und anderem zusammengesetzt) in seinem Gebiete (so schon gr. λαμβάνει 'kaufen'). Nur der Osten (Assamese, Bengali, Oriyā, Magahi, ōstl. Bhojpuri, Maithili, Naipāḷi) hat geschlossen ein eigenes Wort für 'kaufen', kin=-mi. kina-<vorn. kriyāti, das sich zu ai. kriyati wie späteres dhunāti zu ved. dhunāti verhält (wozu Wackernagel Ai. Gr. S. 96 unten f.; nicht recht klar Pischel §511).

51. Doch erscheint grabh-'kaufen' auch ausserhalb seines 'nehmen'-Gebietes, nämlich im westlichen Oriyā (Bhartī) gēn-, und Bhuliā (Uebergangsdialekt vom Chattisg. zum Or.) ghēn-, im Standard Sindhi (Haidarabad usw.) gghin-, gghidō, und, nicht in geographischem Zusammenhange untereinander, in mehreren Westpahārī-Dialekten, nämlich im nördlichen Sirmauri (gīn-), Simla Sirāji und Sorācoli (gīn-), Pāngvāli und Bhadravāhi (gḥin-), während der Rest dieser Dialekte mōl lē- und mōl ān- hat.


52. Es ist daher für das Sindhi — wegen kacchi gīn-, lahndā ghinn— sicher, für das übrige *ginh-'kaufen'-Gebiet wahrscheinlich, dass *ginh- dort ursprünglich auch das Wort für 'nehmen' war. Dadurch wird das west-südliche grabh-'nehmen'-Gebiet, mit Ausnahme der relativ jungen centralen Unterbrechung im Gujarāṭī, geschlossen und im NW und SO erweitert. Wegen seines Auftretens an den verschiedensten Punkten des West-

**41 Prüfpunkt für 'kaufen' No. 240 der vergleichendennterterverzeichnise Wos des LSI.
pahāri kann *gīnḥ- für dessen ganzes Gebiet, also auch die heutigen lē-Dialekte, als das ursprüngliche Wort für ‘nehmen’ gelten, was zu der schon erschlossenen Unursprünglichkeit von lē- in diesem ursprünglichen NW-Gebiet stimmt (§20,22).


54. Die herrschende Form dagegen ist ai. grhnāti, fortgesetzt in pāli gauṭāti (°hati), M. Jm. (AMg.) Ś. Mę. Apabhṛ. gēnḥai, JM. JŚ. AMg. gēnḥai (Pischel §512). Im Vocalismus schliessen sich nun an das Pāli singh. ḍan-, an Mę. und M. oṛyā gēṃ- und mar. ghē-, an Jm. und JŚ. (die also wohl etwa in die Gegend von Gujarat fallen [§26]) kacchi gīn-; weiter sindhi ggnkh-, lahndā ghinn- und die Pahāri-Formen.

Schon früh wurde in den West-Dialekten (markiert durch Lahndā, Sindhi, Mar.) wahrscheinlich noch zusammenhängend nh > nh entcerebralisiert, während einfaches n umgekehrt zu y wurde (Bloch S. 140). Erst nachher wurde das h umgesetzt und *gīnḥ- zu ghīn- usw. Letzteren Wandel hat das Sindhi mit ggnkh- und das Kacchi mit gin- (gegen sūn- ’hören‘, han- ’schlagen‘) noch nicht; aber or. schon ghēn-, mar. ghē-, lah. ghinn-, westpahāri ghīn- und gin-. Doch zeigt lah. ghinn- gegen z. B. dh- ’bringen‘, w. pahāri g(h)īn- gegen dh-, dass auch hier die h-Versetzung erst nach nh > nh fällt.

55. Im Ptc. haben sich im W und S alte, aber nicht auf mi. gahi(t)a- zurückgehende Bildungen erhalten; or. und Pahāri haben Neubildungen aus dem Präsensstamm.


44 Mit Unrecht hält also Bloch S. 226 mar. ghētālā für eine Neubildung. Beames 3.143 weist dagegen schon richtig auf mi. ghētā. 5.
findet sich schon im südlichen Mi., aber nur im (im Gegensatz zum Ai.) schwundstufigen Inf. M. ghettum und -tavya-Ptc. AMg. ghettawva- ** und dem irgendwie zu *ghṛpta- gehörigen M. JM. AMg. ghettīna, während im Ptc. das altüberkommene gahita- nicht aufkommen liess. Formal stellt sich *ghṛpta zu grbh- wie -dhatta- in M. samāghatta- usw zum Präsensstamm dadh- (Pischel § 565; und das Passiv gheppai ist darauf analogisch aufgebaut; anders Pischel § 212).

Ebenso wie die Süd-Formen gruppieren sich die West-Formen: sindhī ggodḥō und lahnda giddā setzen ai *grbdha- voraus.

Sowohl *ghṛpta- wie *grbdha- sind zweifellos alte, von den überlieferten ai und mi Formen ghatō-, bzw. gahi(t)a- unabhängige Bildungen; sie verbinden sich mit den iranischen Formen av. garāpta-, np. girīṭ usw.

56. Schwierigkeiten macht noch die Bildung des Marāṭhi Präsens ghē-. Dieses muss eine Neubildung sein, denn M. gēnhaī zusammen mit den heutigen Nachbarformen or. ghen-, singh. gani-, sindhī gghēn- erweisen mit Evidenz, dass die ursprüngliche Marāṭhi-Form *ghēn- (< *genḥ- < *gēnha- ) gewesen ist.

Dieses vor-mar. *ghēn- 'nehmen' war nun Gegenwort zu dé- 'geben', genau wie im Centrum *lah-(lē-) zu dé-, und wie dieses wurde es mit dé- reimend ausgeglichen, wobei es seinen Anlaut behielt, sein n aber verlor; denn ghē- — und dies ist eben der Schlüssel zu seiner Entstehung — reimt durchwegs mit dé-. Es heisst Ptc. ghet wie dét, Absol. ghēn wie dén, ghīvāvā wie dyāvā, ghēn wie dén. Ausgegangen ist diese Ersetzung von *ghēn- durch ghē- von gegenwörtlichen Wendungen wie Marāṭhi-Śukasaptati ** S. 70, Zeile 13: tyaṭvarūn mī det hōtō tē ghēt nāhī 'deswegen g a b ich ihm was, aber er n a h m es nicht'; S. 71,8: nantar vānī vānī dévās kandī dén dravī ghēnī gharājval gēlā 'da g a b der Kaufmann dem Gott die Kauri und n a h m das Geld und ging nach Hause'; S.38,21: tuṭīlā sahasr mōhīrā

** Das -tavya-Ptc. hatte im jüngeren Mi. wohl gewöhnlich, so weit es nicht vom Präsensstamm gebildet war, durch Einfluss des Ptc. Prät. schwachstufige Wurzel: vgl. sindhī kiō < *krtavya- zu kiō, likō < *skṛtavya- zu likō, pībō < *pitavya-. Diese Neuerung wird im überlieferten Mi. durch Einfluss des Sanakriti verdeckt, kommt aber bei Formen ohne Anschluss im Ai. wie ghettawva- zum Ausdruck.

57. Im Ptc. war mar. *grabh-, wie *labh- im Centrum, widerstandsfaehiger; hier hat sich ghêlê naebn dilâ behauptet. In literarisch nicht festgelegten Uebergangsdiaken aber, wo durch Wegfall der Hemmungen der Tradition sich die Entwicklungstendenzen rein auspraegen konnten, kam es auch im Prater. zum Ausgleich: In den Katiâ-Dialekten von Chindvara (LSI Mar. 322) und Narsinghpur (327), die den Uebergang vom Mar. zum Bundelli bilden, heisst es in Chindvara détên (322, 9) nach *ghêlê und (mit einer dieses Dialekt eigentumlichen l-losen Prät.-Bildung, vgl. bolan 'er sprach') détân 'er gab' nach ghêlan (323, 3) 'er nahm', also wieder, wie in central dilêdî lêdî und dilîs lîhs, mit Sieg von 'nehmen' uber 'geben' im Präteritum. In Narsinghpur dagegen umgekehrt ghîlê 'er nahm' nach dîlê 'er gab'.


[59. Es ist dies eine der frappanten Uebereinstimmungen des äussersten NW g e g e n den mittleren Westen m i t dem Süden. Ebenso findet sich z.B. das Wort für 'kommen' singh. ê-(reimend mit der 'geben'). Prät. ê- = mar. (y)ênê-(dênê), dilâ in Kâsmirî yi-,(dî-), dê- wieder, und ebenso in einem Teil der nw. anstossenden Dard- (Païai, Sîn, Maiyâ [Grierson Piî. Lang. 66]) und der sô. anstossenden Westpahâri-Dialekten (pangvâli, curâhi, gâdi, camêâji tê, kaluî ëndô), während zwischen dem Mar. und dem nw. Gebiet Sindhi und nö. Lahnda ac-, bzw. achant (= kâsm. acht-'enter') und das übrige Lahnda (wie das Centrum) ëv- hat; nur das suppletive Ptc. Präs. zu sindhi açañu; ëndô (Trumpp

** Bloch's Erklärung von ghê- als Bildung aus dem Ptc. Mâh. gahia-(S. 229 and mehrfach) ist lautlich und morphologisch gleich schwierig und ohne Anhalt.

*** Freilich kann hier die Tendenz zur Reimausgleichung auf innersprachlichem Einfluss des benachbarten Bundelli beruhen, wo ja ë- und dê- reimen.
207; mit ḍūṇḍō 'gebend' reimend wie singh. ḍ- mit ḍē-, mar. yē- mit dē-, kaṁ.yi- mit di-) vermittelt die Verbindung. 11)

60. War aber das Ptc. Präts. im Vor-Kaṁ.*hētu, so war die Angleichung des ursprünglichen Präsens *hen-an di- im Kaṁmiri noch leichter als im Marāṭhī. Denn zu dem Gegensatz der Bedeutungen kam hier noch hinzu, dass im Präts. hier *hētu von jeher *dītu gegenüber, so dass die beiden Wörter im Präts. von Anfang reim-ähnlich waren.


61. Da also das Systempaar ḍhē-, ḍhēlā im Marāṭhī ursprünglich ist, so war offenbar dieses der Ausgangspunkt der Systemreihe ḍhunē, ḍhūlā 'waschen', 12) baghṇē, baghīlā, 'sehen', māgnē, māglā 'verlangen', mhaṇṇē, mhaṇīlā und sāngē sāngīlā 'sagen'. Denn keines der anderen Systeme ist historisch und nirgend anderswoher hätte -lā als Präts.-Endung für beliebige Präsensstämme abstrahiert werden können. 21


Nun haben allerdings diese Verba m. W. eigentlich keine ḍ-Flexion (mhaṇ- und sāng- gehen in Mar. nach der a-Klasse und māg- entspricht im Sindhi, trotz ai. mārga- und mārgaya-, nur Imper. mānu), aber bei dem Durchlaufenfliessen der a-
und aya-Flexion im Marāṭhi ist es sehr möglich, dass ein oder das andere dieser Verba einmal in irgend einem Dialekte aya-Flexion hatte oder hat (vgl. Thana mhanā [LSI Mar. 114] neben mhanā [98]) und daher mag sich der Komplex -illā festgesetzt haben. (Die entsprechende a-Form zu mhanillā scheint übrigens im mhanillā des O und SO vorzuliegen, worüber §63.)


63. Neben den besprochenen Bildungen mhanillā und mhatā bildet mhan- noch in der Hochsprache (Poona) in der Regel

14 LSI Mar. 25 & kurit 'he does' gegen 27 & karti. In der Jānāvāri (nach Bloch) dékhatā (Bloch 244) gegen dékhalā (253), kartā (245) neben karti, kartit (246).
15 So Bloch S. 226; LSI Mar. 31 dagegen hā-, hāt-.
16 Doch haben zur Entstehung des Systemtypus mar. khaṇ-, khatā jedenfalls noch andere, bisher noch unklare Einflüsse mitgewirkt. So findet sich im Mi. auffällig oft ein Ptc. auf -tu- neben nasalem Präsensstamm: JM. jitta- zu jīnai (dazu guj. jītei 'conquer'), katta- (Desi.) zu kāpai (Pischel §194), AMg. JM. khatta- zu khaṇai (Pischel §90); schliesslich findet sich der ganze Stamm von mar. khat-lā in lahndā von Dera Ghazi Khan khat- 'graben' wieder (LSI Lahndā 343).

Schliesslich ist im Osten und Südosten, Canda (315) und Bijapur (50) sehr häufig mhanīlā (analog LSI Mar. 31 khānīlā). Dieser Typus ist entweder eine Kreuzung von mhanīlā und mhaflā, oder er verhält sich von Anfang an zu mhanīlā wie (Thana) mhanāla zu mhanīlā, nur dass das t dem n zu t assimiliert wurde. Jedenfalls steht in Canda cerebrales mhanīlān dentalem sāngīlān, ghēlān, māngīlān gegenüber, in Bijapur aber wurde t auch auf die andern Formen übertragen, so dass es auch sāngīlā und ghēlā heisst. (Das beweist jedenfalls, dass das Sprachbewusstsein von Bijapur mhanīlā mit den -lā-Part. Typus dhūlā gruppierte; also wird die Form wahrscheinlich a-Form zur t-Form mhanīlā sein.)

64. Ausbreitung der Präterital-Bildungen von dā. Wie centrales lā- reiht auch kar- im Prät. sehr oft mit de- und zwar, soweit nicht Neubildung aus dem Präsenstamm eintritt — so Kašmīrī, teilweise Westpahārī (Kułūi und Gāḍī), Mittel- und Ost-Pahārī, teilweise Braj, Jaipurī, Mālī, regelmäßig Kanaudi und Bundelī und schliesslich, im Osten, Bengali und Assamese —, fast durchwegs im Westen und Centrum, im Osten und Süden aber nicht:

65. So Kašmīrī (nur mehr als Dativ-Postposition, das Verbum hat die Neubildung kor*) kyūn, Pl. kīr, fem. kīts, Pl. kītsa wie dyutn, diln, dilān, dilāsa;*1 im Westpahārī curāhī und camēāli (und ebenso das anstossende Bhāṭēāli-Panjābī [LSI Panj. 794]) kītā wie dītā, maṇḍēāli und kaṇḍūri kītā wie dītā; in den centralen Dialekten kītō, kītō, kīn(h)au wie dītō, dītō, dīn(h)au, guj. und rāj. kīd(h)ō wie dīd(h)ō, avadhī-bagh. kīnī wie dīnī und av.-bagh-chatt. kihis wie dīhīs.

Dagegen im Osten und Süden — Assam. und Beng. haben

*1 Bloch's Zurückführung von kašm. kyut auf kriya- (S. 207) statt auf *kītā- ist nicht richtig; auch die Kašm. Absolutive auf -sth, auf die er sich beruft, sind nicht nach Grierson KZ 38.480 Absolutive auf -tya, wohi, abgesehen von den lautlichen Schwierigkeiten, nur ganz wenige Formen (wie yith = itya) historisch sein könnten, sondern Absol. auf -sta, mi-ittā (Pischel §82), also gushtīth = AMg. -gacchītā, liṅkīth = ei. liṅkītā, maṅgīth = ei. mārgītā, dīth = *dīnā (zu *dīta-), ebenso kūrīth, maṅīth etc.
kārīl-, bzw. karīl- — maithili, magahi, bhojpuri kail gegen dēl (bzw. bhojp. dihal), oriya kalē gegen dēlā, mar. kēlā gegen dīlā.

66. Nicht ganz rein reimen 'gemacht' und 'gegeben' im Lahndā-Panjābi, indem durchwegs kīḍa dīṭā gegenübersteht. Doch ist kīḍa offenbar von camēalī usw. kīṭā nicht zu trennen, sondern lautlich daraus hervorgegangen. Denn wenn auch Grierson (LSI Lahndā 237f., Panj. 615) mit Recht das Fehlen der Vereinfachung von Doppelkonsonanz unter Ersatzdehnung des vorhergehenden Vokals als ein Hauptcharakteristikum der West-Dialekte bezeichnet, findet sich doch dieser Vorgang im Lahndā-Panjābi in einzelnen Wörtern, und zwar durchwegs, und dabei gerade in ausschliesslichen NW-Wörtern, wo also centraler Einfluss nicht möglich ist. So nicht nur dēkẖ- 'sehen' = centr. dēkẖ- (<mi. dēkkha-1)>, sondern auch (heute nur nw.) vēkẖ- 'sehen' (<vēkẖa- <vēkha-), ebenso (heute nur nw.) ḍẖẖ- 'sagen' <ākhya-, also mit sār. paccākha- gegen pāli, AMg akkhā- (Pischel 188-19), schliesslich punchī dinā <dīnna-. Warum allerdings im Gegensatz zu fast immer erhaltemen *dīṭa- *kīṭa- im NW regelmässig zu *kīṭa- geworden ist, ist nicht klar.


1 Pischel S. 378 unten; Bloch 45.
2 Vielleicht durch Restitution des Präfixes ā-. Lahndā-panj. ākẖ- ist mit der Ersatzdehnung auch ins Sindhi übergegangen (ākhī).
Tatsächlich muss *dia- im Guj. erst spät durch didhō ersetzt worden sein, neben av.-bagh.din(h) setzt didhis ebenso ein noch spätes *dia- voraus und rājasth. didhō und dinō bilden noch heute nur Enklaven im dīrā-Gebiet. Hier war also die Koinzidenz kia:-*dia- noch bis in späte Zeit gegeben. **

Im Sindhi dagegen, wo 'gemacht' und 'gegeben' nicht reimen (ddinō: kiō), hat sich tatsächlich *dia- nicht erhalten. *dita-scheint also hier schon sehr früh völlig durch dinna- verdrängt worden zu sein, wodurch die Koinzidenz mit kia- entfiel. **

Andererseits beweist die Tatsache der Reimgleichung (*kītta-: *dita-) trotz heutiger Alleingeltung von *dita- im Nordwesten, dass die Reimgleichung hier in sehr alte, vielleicht älteste mi. Zeit zurückgehen muss (als auch hier noch *dia- neben *dita- bestand).

69. Weitere Ausbreitung. Als die Neuformen von dā-neben *dīt(a)- und (später) die damit reimenden von kār-neben *kt(l)a- standen, konnten gleiche Neuformen auch neben andre mit *dīt(a)-, *kt(l)a- koinzidente Participia treten. So zu pia- oder vielleicht auch *pia- = πορός nordwestlich pītā wie kītā, gujar. pīlhā wie kīlhō (aber East. Hindi pīyis gegen kīhis).

70. Besonders weite Ausdehnung gewann diese Neubildung im Lahnda-Panjābī, das also für diesen Punkt wieder eine Einheit bildet (44). So lahnda (von Dera Ghazi Khan [LSI Lahnda 344]) niūa 'weggenommen': kītā, während sindhi niū (= M. nī-, AMg. nīya-**): kiō. Weiter lahnda-panj. sītā 'genäht',

---

** Als auch z. B. im Guj. neben *dia- das mit kādha- ausgeglichehne *dīdha-trat, trat ebenso neben kī- *kiddha-.

** Neben sindhi kīo steht kawā, was, da sich analoges bei echten i-Wurzeln nicht findet, wahrscheinlich nicht sekundär lautlich auf kīo, sondern direkt mit >a auf kīa- zurückgeht. kawā wäre dann ein Rest der aus NW eingedrungenen Sindhi vorhergegangen SW-Spräche, die nach Ausweis von Aśoka-Ed. Girmār und einiger Altelemente des Gujarāti (Bloch S. 48) >a hatte.—In jüngerer Zeit ist noch kīo- = lahnda kītā aus dem NW ins Sindhi eingedrungen. (Übrigens finde ich es im LSI in keiner Mundart.)

** Diese Form ist nicht nach Pischel §81 lautlich entstanden, sondern nia-: nī = cia-: cī (Pischel §502), pāli jīta-: jīti usw. Noch häufiger natürlich āvia-: āvēi = khaihā-: kāhēi usw., weil āy- schon als Wurzel gefühlt wurde; daher dann auch schon Prāsens JM. āyā (unrichtig Pischel §474) und mar. āyā (nia- neben nī- kann dann *pia- neben pīa- gestellt haben; siehe oben).


Dieses Verhältnis ist wohl jung dissimulatorischen Tendenzen entsprungen und *jāttā- neben *jāē- nach *kīttā- neben kīa- usw. getreten. (Einfluss des p-Stammes, im Kaus. ai. jōapaya-, jāapta- und Passiv Dera Ghazi Khan jēp-; ist unsicher wegen der stark abweichenden Bedeutung des Kausatifs und gleichen p-Stammes o h n e -ā-Präteritum in sindhi jēp- ‘geboren werden’. Vorzugsweise *jēō- gegenüber päli niṭa-, Māh. nāā- ist entweder (durch das Präsens jēnēt unterstrichene) lautliche Entwicklung (Pischel §276) von niṭēta- = γνωρίσ or altes *jāē- = gotisch kunb.)


**43** Das allgemein-indische Präsens sī- setzt ai. *sītā voraus, während sich ai. śītā nur in sindhi śūd̄a fortsetzt.
72. Ausser mit si. jjātō = nw. jjātā hat das nordwestliche -t-
Präteritum auf das SINDHĪ noch mit phō = nw. phā und khō
(Nebenform zu khō) = nw. khā übergegriffen. Diese sind also,
besonders klar khō, im SINDHĪ unursprünglich. Sindhi phā,
phōto 43 dagegen, das das LAhndā-Panjābī nicht hat, ist ein histori-
schtes System und dänach gebildet lā-, lātō oder lāyō 'apply'
(<lāgaya-), das im L.-P. immer regelmässig ist. (Si. lā- und
pā-, aus lāgaya- und prāpaya-, beide nach der i-Konjug., reimen
durchaus: lā, lān, lānḍō wie pāc, pāin, pānḍō.) Sindhi phā,
pātō 'string beads' dagegen ist, da pā- wie pē- nach der a-Konjug.
geht, nach phī-, phātō gebildet.

73. Das nordwestliche -t-Präteritum ist also jedenfalls ana-
logischen Ursprungs mit wahrscheinlich mehreren Ausgangs-
punkten. Jedoch zeigt die völlige Homologität des NW-Typus
auf -tā mit dem SW-(Gujarātī-) Typus auf -dhō (kīhā: kīdhō)
und dem nicht weiter ausgebreiteten centralen Typus kīnō
(kīnh), dass auch im NW das Prät. von dā- das Hauptmoment
war, wie sich dann tatsächlich, obwohl die andern Momente
auch anderswo zugetroffen wären, ein ni.- (mi.*-īta-)-Prät. nur
im *dītta-Gebiet entwickelt hat. Dass sich das -īta- und -ddha-
Prät. ausgebreitet haben, das -una-Prät. aber nicht (phā und
phādō, aber kein *pīno, *pīnḥ), liegt, da alle drei Bildungen gleich
stark fundiert waren, nur daran, dass das Prinzip der Scheidung
von Präsen- und Prät.-Stamm sich nur im Westen (*dītta- und
*dīddha-Gebiet) lebendig erhalten hat, im Centrum (dinna-
Gebiet) aber nicht mehr. 44

43 Ausdehnung zweckmässiger Formen über das ursprüngliche Be-
richtigungsgebiet.
44 Im SINDHĪ ist Vereinfachung von Doppelkonsonanz ohne Ersatzdehnung
Regel. Doch hat das Prät. vor ursprüngl. Doppelkonsonanz Länge, wenn
das Präsen diese hat: piś-, piśhō 'grind' (piśpa-, piśa-), pēh-, pēhō 'enter'
(praviatu, praviatu-) usw., entweder durch sekundären Ausgleich (*piśhō
nach piś- zu piśhō) oder indem noch zur Zeit der Doppelkonsonanz nach dem
Präsen Dehnungswechsel statt sonstiger blosser Vereinfachung eintrat (piśhō
nach piś- zu piśhō). Dieselbe Erscheinung, auch bei der Passiv-Bildung,
auch im Lahndā.
45 Grierson's Ansicht, dass in lahndā-panj. phā usw. ursprüngliches ai. t
erhalten sei (Pīt. Lang. 4 unten, LSI SINDHĪ 6, Lahndā 235), muss ich ablehnen.
Denn wie kaśām. a-c < āgata-, al-c < jātā- ga-ur < gata-, lahndā gē < gata-, phā
< pātiā-, jādā für *jādā < jātā- usw. zeigen, ist intervok. t auch im NW laut-
74. Der Präsensstamm dē.

76. So steht schon pāli vadēti (neben vadatti) zu ai. (und jedenfalls also auch früh-mi. Dialekten) vadīta-(pāli noch uḍīta-); ferner präkrṭ ś. sumarēti: sumarida-, ćinēti: ćinida- usw.


42 Geiger's Ableitung von dē- aus dem Imp. dēhi (§143) ist, abgesehen davon, dass der Einfluss des Imp. kaum so stark gewesen sein kann, schon deswegen schwerlich richtig, weil der ältere Präsensstamm dada-, dada- schon die neugebildeten Imperative dada und daddhi hat, dēhi also wahr- scheinlich schon aufgegeben hatte, so dass dēhi nicht (nach Geiger §125) wirklich historische Form (= ai. dēhi), sondern selbst erst auf Grund des Stammes dē- gebildet ist.


78. Das so im Früh-Mi. entstandene System dēti: *dita- war nun von eminenten formantischer Bedeutung.


** maṇṇēsi beruht also nicht auf *maṇṇēti neben maṇṇati (Geiger §139.2), sondern auf maṇṇita-, auggaheśi nicht auf *gaheśi (nach Geiger s. b. "häufig gebräuchlich", aber im Präsens mir nicht bekannt und, nach fremdländischer Mitteilung, auch in H. Prof. Geiger's Sammlungen nicht enthalten), sondern auf gaheṭa-


Wir haben also folgende zwei Systemreihen:

\[\begin{array}{ll}
gaṇhāti (?ati) & \text{gahēsāmi} 
gaṇhāta & \text{gahēsāmi} 
gaṇhī & \text{agagheśi} 
gaṇhētum & \text{gahētum} 
gaṇhēdu & \text{gahētā} 
gaṇhita & \text{gahēta-}
\end{array}\]

Pāli gahe-, Dhātup. ghaya- haben also wahrscheinlich mit aw. gouraya- wirklich geschichtlich nichts zu tun (§53).


80. dēti beruht also wohl auf *díta-. Wenn es im überlieferten Mi. stets dinna- gegenübersteht, so ist es entweder älter als die Verdrängung von *díta- durch dinna- oder die schriftsprachliche Eliminierung von *dí(t)a- entspricht nicht den wirklich sprachlichen Tatsachen (§ 15).

dē- findet sich auch im Iranischen: afy. 3. Sg. īi and balūci Inf. dēag, 1. Sg. dēn. Da sich aber dē- im Iranischen nur in diesen beiden stark vom Indischen beeinflussten Randsprachen findet und überdies im Iran. ohne ratio ist, ist es hier wohl aus dem Indischen entlehnt (Verf. Dialektologie § 25β).
ADVERBIAL KÜLLA IN BIBLICAL ARAMAIC AND HEBREW

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

It is a matter of common remark that אֲלֵּך, translated “the whole”, whenever it occurs in Biblical Aramaic is mil'el in accent. Kautzsch, Gramm. § 17, 2, notes this as unique: “Eine Zurückwerfung des Tones wird durch die Pausa nur in einem Falle bewirkt”, and cites אֲלֵּך, Ezr. 5, 7, with silluk, and Dan. 2, 40 with zahef katon. אֲלֵּך further occurs only in Dan. 4, 9, 18, 7-4-עִם and 4. 25, אֲלֵּך (Ginsburg, while Bär has א with dag. conj., cf. his note). For the recession of the tone in these cases, otherwise exemplified and following Massoretic use, see Kautzsch, § 17. 1. The three latter cases may be satisfactorily explained, but not so the first two, which are contrary to the universal rule of the Massora that the emphatic ending -א has the tone. (This remains true whatever may have been the actual state of the tone in Aramaic, cf. Kautzsch, l. c., Duval, Grammaire syriaque, c. 28.) Actually then all instances of אֲלֵּך are mil'el. The current commentators and lexicons note the fact of the accent but offer no explanation.

One of these cases invites initial attention, Ezr. 5, 7, in the epistolary address to Darius, אֲלֵך אָלֵּך. This appears to be wellnigh universally translated “all peace”, e. g. by Meyer, Torrey; so ס; in 2 Esd. “all” is construed with the next sentence. But we should expect in normal Aramaic usage לֶכ אָלֵּך, or אָלֵּך אָלֵּך, like the Hebrew use of אלה. The most recent commentator, Batten (p. 135), appears to feel the actual difficulty: he remarks that “there is a textual error”, and in his reconstruction of the text of vv. 6.7 (p. 139) manages to delete אֲלֵּך. But in Sachau's Elephantine Papyri, which
appeared two years before Batten's Commentary, this use of אֵלֶּ ר is corroborated, although the point has not, so far as I know, been remarked.

In the address of a letter, Pap. 13 (APO p. 60) we read: הָעַרְנָה בֶּדֶרֶךְ אַּלֶּ ר. Comparing Pap. 1 li. 1.2 (p. 3), בָּלָה אָבָנָה וַתִּשְׁתְּבַּה, and Pap. 12 (addressed to a woman) 1.1 (p. 58): נָלַחַת בֵּלֶּ ר שַׁלֵּךְ, we can restore the form of address in Pap. 13. Sachau gets this translation from his reading of the manuscript: “To my brother X: After thy health the God of heaven אֵלֶּ ר asks much.” Sachau confesses he does not know what to do with אֵלֶּ ר and suggests (coeli) totius. Ungnad, Aramaische Papyrus aus Elephantine, more acutely remarks that the papyrus is not certain, as Sachau thinks, as to the character preceding the defective: אֵלֶּ ר; this word he would identify as נָלַחַת, reading the verb as a plural נַלְחָת, which gives: “The gods of heaven all (altogether?) ask”, etc. Here again not נַלְחָת, nor נָלַחַת אָלֶּ ר; the form is not grammatically related, but is evidently adverbial, “altogether”. It may be noted that in one case (Pap. 12) אֵלֶּ ר appears in place of the customary נַלְחָת.

Applying this parallel to Ezr 5, 7, we have “Peace wholly (be yours)”. And pursuing the parallelism still closer, אֵלֶּ ר נַלְחָת may simply be abbreviation of the well known terms of epistolary address.

But this adverbial use of אֵלֶּ ר can be pursued still further in the papyri. The word occurs 15 times in Sachau’s collec-

---

1 Sachau’s most extensive note on this obscure word is at Pap. 1, 1, 30 (p. 20).

2 The use of an abbreviation here is parallel by the obscure לַד in place of the address in Artaxerxes’ letter to Ezra, Ezr. 7, 12, followed as it is by לַד which introduces the subject matter of the letter. It is not at all necessary with Torrey, followed by Batten, to emend לַד לַד, “perfect peace”, לַד is the gerundive, expletum, “to be filled out”, and corresponds to the Rabbinic לַד, I am interested to observe that the admirable Jewish Version so renders it: “and so forth”.

3
tion (see his Index, p. 284). In Pap. 2, l. 22, 26 (pp. 22f.) אכל צדדי occurs twice, parallel to אכל צדדי above. In the Aḥikar papyri it again is found twice in an identical phrase: Pap. 51, l. 12 (p. 153): אכל צדדי = Pap. 52, l. 12f. (p. 155): על עשתו ונעשה עוה אמתו אכל צדדי המ, i. e. “To his counsel and words Assyria (the army of Assyria) wholly was inclined.” The remaining cases appear in Pap. 1 and 2 and in the very obscure Pap. 8 (l. 13.17). In the following cases אכל צדדי as “wholly” suits best:

Pap. 1, l. 12: ורהทำไม הוא יברא על אכל צדדי מה לתוכו: “and the things which were (ודא, 3d fem. pl., not recognized by Sachau in his list of verb forms, p. 271) in this sanctuary wholly they took.”

Ib. l. 29: אכל צדדי מהו מַלַּא כֹּלֵם וּכְוָר מַלְאֵךְ אֱלֹהִים: “moreover wholly we have sent a message in a letter”. Ib. l. 30: אכל צדדי מהו מַלַּא כֹּלֵם וּכְוָר מַלְאֵךְ אֱלֹהִים: “also of that which has been done by us (so better than Sachau: to us) Arsham does not know at all.” There are some cases where it is uncertain whether the adverb or the emphatic אכל צדדי was intended. In Pap. 2, a first draft to Pap. 1, l. 29 (p. 24), the sentence just presented appears thus: אכל צדדי מהו מַלַּא כֹּלֵם וּכְוָר מַלְאֵךְ אֱלֹהִים: “about all that, ”etc. In Pap. 1, l. 11 אכל צדדי can best be translated in the dubious connection: “all that was along with the ⅓ (?) of the sanctuary;” but in the following line, אכל צדדי can be rendered “wholly they burnt with fire.” The parallel to l. 11 in Pap. 2, l. 10 places אכל צדדי in an earlier connection: אכל צדדי מהו מַלַּא כֹּלֵם וּכְוָר מַלְאֵךְ אֱלֹהִים: “and the roof of that sanctuary wholly their (its?) timbers, ” etc.

In Syriac אכל צדדי is found, apparently, as the emphatic. I have noted its occurrence in Thomas of Marg’a’s Book of Governors, ed. Budge, vol. 1, p. 81, l. 24: אכל צדדי רָםַלְמָן יַעַל אֱלֹהִים: “the Son of God be praised by all!”; also in a Palestinian Syriac text in the Studia Sinaitica, in a passage which I am not able
at present to verify. But in the majority of cases in the papyri the adverbial use נלכ in the sense of “altogether, wholly”, with negative, “not at all”, is preferable. It defies the usual construction of לכו. As an adverb the form is to be explained as a survival of the ancient accusative in –a, sc. כילה, not כילא. In addition to Ezr. 5, 7 this sense would be possible in Dan. 2, 40, כילה לוהי, “smashing wholly”, and in 4, 25, אמה כילה, “wholly it came upon”. The papyrus spelling of לכו for כילה might be explained if the final vowel were unaccented. And we may suppose the unconscious identification of the adverb with the emphatic form, cf. the possible accusative form of נריל, so explaining the ambiguity of use. The puzzling Massoretic accentuation would accordingly be justified and, after all, accent is one of the most permanent phenomena in language, a fact frequently illustrated in the Biblical Aramaic. Consequently correction is to be made of Kautzsch, Gr. § 50, in his denial of the occurrence in Biblical Aramaic of such accusative forms; to כילה Dan. 6, 3, and כילה אמץ Kt. Dan. 2, 40 (i. e. ‘ד’א), forms which have already been recognized, must be added כילה.

May a similar adverbial form be found in Hebrew? I would note briefly the obscure כילה in Gen. 18, 21, Ex. 11, 1, where adverbial כילה would suit best. (We may however compare the Akkadian kalliš “insgesamt, etc.”, Delitzsch, Ass. Hb. p. 329.) Also the occasionally awkward use of כילה כילה may be considered (in BDB p. 481 b, inf.). E. g. in Jer. 48, 38, כילה כילה כילה כילה, the adverbial sense of כילה, which otherwise has no

---

3 I find I have been long ago anticipated in this thesis. Von Lengerke in his Commentary, at Dan. 2, 39, cites Winer’s edition (ed. 4, 1828) of J. Simon’s Lexicon Hebraicum et Chaldæicum, s. r., as giving the form as an adverb, prorsus, omnino. So Winer has it, but calls it a Status Emphaticus. Looking into the 3d edition of the lexicon, edited by Eichhorn, 1793, I find this more complete statement: “cum Θ Paragogico (quod respondent Heb. θ Paragogico). Non est Emphaticum, ut Coccocius aliquae putant, qua tonus mansit in penultima. Simile occurrit in כילה Dan. 6, 3.” I am not able to pursue this acute observation further back; it is not found in Buxtori, who recognized the adverbial character of כילה.
grammatical relation, would suit capitally. Similarly in Ex. 14, 7: "he took 600 chariots and all the chariots of Egypt and captains" יָלַע, this phrase is without relation. May we suppose the orthographic יָלַע changed from original יָלֶנָ and so understand 'al kulla, "over all", or, "to the whole extent"?
HINDI RAGMALA TEXTS

ANANDA COOMARASWAMY

MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS, BOSTON

The Hindi Ragmala texts which are often found on Rajput (Rajasthani) paintings of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, representing Ragas and Raginis, are of great interest. Like the pictures, they represent given situations and associations, or in other words, a given character in a given psychological environment; corresponding to the ethos of the several Ragas and Raginis. These emotional situations are similar to those recognized by the rhetoricians, so that in the Ragmalaś the classification of heroines (Nāyikā bheda), phases of love in union (samyoga) and love in separation (vīraku), and times and seasons play a large part: and some of the pictures, e.g., the Abhisārikā type of Madhu-mādhavī Rāginī referred to below, could at the same time be used in illustration of the works of the rhetoricians. As literature, the Rāgmala poems are in fact related to such poetry as the Rasikapriyā of Keśava Dās and Satsāiyā of Bihāri; and like these works, they are far more than descriptions. Paintings and verses alike are traditionally and profoundly imagined pictures of human passion, and the more they are studied the more they reveal their content of experience. Their style is allusive and their vocabulary is rich in associations of both classical and folk origin. The Tertiary Prākṛts at this time have lost the greater part of their inflections, so that the poems consist to all intents and purposes of a series of words reduced to their bare roots. At the same time the poet wastes no words that can be spared: the consequence is that while the language is highly expressive, and is used to express the deepest emotion, the meaning of the lines must be grasped as a whole rather than word by word, and can be grasped only by one familiar with, and sympathetic to, Hindu modes of thought.

It is proposed here, and from time to time, to publish text and literal translation of several Rāgmala poems and other
Hindi texts which have been found on Rajput paintings. Apparently, no printed texts of Rāgmālā poems exist. The picture texts here discussed are derived from three incomplete sets of Rāgmālā paintings:

S. 1. A series of very brilliantly colored late sixteenth century pictures represented in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, by M. F. A. 22. 684 (reproduced C. P. pl. LXII) and in the Fogg Art Museum by another example. A few others of this series are known. All have complete texts on the reverse sides.

S. 2. A series of closely related, and only slightly less vivid, pictures, also of the sixteenth century, or perhaps ca. 1600, represented by fifteen examples in the Museum of Fine Arts (M. F. A. 17. 2371-2385; some reproduced in C. R. P., others in C. P.), two in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, one in the Freer Gallery in Washington, one belonging to Dr. R. Meyer-Riefstahl, and four still in my own collection. All of this series have the dāhā only, of the same text as S. 1, inscribed on the reverse sides. It will appear later that the (identical) texts of S. 1 and S. 2 are by a poet of the name of Lachimān.

S. 3. A series represented by two examples only, of early seventeenth century date, in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (M. F. A. 15. 51 and 15. 53, both reproduced in C. P.). Here the texts are superscribed, and can be studied in the reproductions.

The exact spelling of the originals is retained in the transliteration. The nasalization of a vowel by anusvāra is indicated by the sign `; in all other cases, anusvāra is represented by ū. A precise identification of b and v is in most of the texts difficult; b is often written with or without a bar across the circle, and v is usually distinguished by a dot ·; but the three forms may occur together in one and the same text. In the same way, y is distinguished from ū by a dot ·. ṭ (consonant) is always represented by d. kṣ is often represented by g, a peculiarity which I have not reproduced in the transliteration. The forms of single and conjoint letters are sometimes archaic.

* Dr. H. Goetz has argued that the Rāgmālā series S. 1 and S. 2 should be dated about 1700 ("Studien zur Rajput-Malerei," Ostasiatische Zeitschrift, X. 1922-3). I have sent in reply an article maintaining the view that they cannot be later than about 1600, and this may be expected to appear in the next volume of the OZ. A further reply will appear in the Burlington Magazine. Dr. Goetz has since written me that he now regards these series as of about 1610-20 (letter dated December 5, 1923).
I take first the Rāgini Madhu-mādhavī of S. 3 in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (M. F. A. 15. 53, reproduced in color, showing the text, in C. P. pl. LXVIII). The picture represents a palace terrace, and garden: a princess, attended by two maids holding dishes, is offering a dish of food to a peacock, which is perched on the cornice of the palace; there are more peacocks in the trees, the sky is overcast with monsoon clouds, and two female musicians stand on the right hand. The superscribed text reads:

Rāgini madhu-mādhavī: copai:
Madhu-mādhavī rūpanidhinā nārī
harita barana pahairai tana sārī;
Bhāvai bheja bhuṣana anīga nike
dekhi koṭi muni sajī hōī phīke;
Nikasi mahāla bārī mahi ṣhāṅki
nila jalada unāgi ghajā gādhi;
Madhura madhura dhunī garajata āvai
dāminī camakī raba jhalāvai;
Kuralahi khag ānandā surā vāngi
dekhi surjī hi rahi tihi rāgi.

Dohā:
Piya milāpa ki phula tanā, ṣhāṅki karata vinoda
Nṛpahīṁ dola kai maṇavāsā, tāthāi mana maṇi moda. 18.

The following words may be remarked upon:
1. 1: rūpanidhinā: more usually, rūpanidhānā.
1. 5: kuralahi equals krīdahirā, ‘are sporting,’ as in the Padumāvatī of Muḥammad Jaisī, stanza 33 (ed. and trans. Grierson and Dvivedi, Calcutta, 1896–1911);
sura equals svara. The use of avagraha marking the elision of an a is unique in the Rāgmālā texts known to me.

Translation:

Madhu-mādhavī, a woman that is a treasury of beauty,
wearing a green garment over all her body,
Many kinds of jewels adorn her limbs,
and seeing her, a myriad sages pale and faint.
Coming from the palace she stands in the garden;
heavy black clouds are gathering joyfully,
The sweet sweet rumbling of thunder is heard,
flashes of lightning light up the sky,
Birds are sporting with merry notes,  
the princess, seeing (all this beauty) stands there delighted.

Dohā:

Her body blossoms like an open flower for the meeting  
with her lover, she stands entranced,  
Enthralled by the thought of her lord’s embrace, there  
is bliss in her heart.

An almost identical picture and text are found in British Museum  
Ms. Or. 2821, the principal variations being that in I. 1 we find  
rūpanidhīna and in I. 5 kurahi.

A very different, but still related (both as to the picture  
and the text), version is found in the Rāgini Madhū-mādhavī  
of S. 1 and S. 2 (the latter reproduced in color in C. R. P. pl. 1).  
Here we see an abhisārikā, accompanied by a sakhi (S. 1) or  
alone (S. 2), in the dark night, just arrived at her lover’s house,  
and startled by a peacock’s cry. The text of S. 1 reads as follows:

(Atha) madhū-mādhavī rūpa barnamah: (copai):
Madhū-mādhavī rūpanidhi nāri,  
nila subhaga tana dūmaka sārī:
Bhai bheda bhūṣana ati nīke  
dekhi-darasu rati-gana mana phike:
Nila lamāla tilaku taki calī  
pruṣama biraḥa jābahi dalamāli:
Piya milāpa kahām jīya anurāgini  
baraṣata ghana niksi bhara jāmīni:
Capalā camakī ujjāri karī  
lāja gata lagi trīya lārakhari:
Tīhi chinā moru uṭhīyu kahārāi  
barajati bhāmīni bhujā uṭhāī.

Dohārā:

Bhairava bhūpa anūpa paha, calī trīyā abhisāra  
Na hisāira khaga dekhi drīga, bhai citta bikārāra. 2.

It will be observed that the copai begins as in S. 3; in the  
picture, too, we have the palace and the peacocks, but the  
circumstances and the hour are changed.

* It will be recalled that in Hindi poetry the lover is often compared  
to the bee in search of honey.
The following words may be remarked upon:
1. 3: takši, probably from takanā, to look, watch, seek.
1. 5: chinā equals kṣīna.

dohāra: the last line is rather obscure. I have understood hisāra (hisāra in S. 2) as equal to hisāra, castle, palace. Although she has reached the end of her journey, she does not see the house she seeks, being blinded by the lightning and startled by the peacock khaga, 'bird', may also represent khadga, 'sword', with reference to the lightning.

Translation:
Thus the description of Madhu-mādhavī:
Madhu-mādhavī, a woman treasury of beauty,
dark complexioned, all her body dusky,
With her many kinds of jewels, very lovely, pale of mien
by reason of her many desires.
With blue-black garment, going seeking, torn asunder
by her longing for her darling,
Her heart attached to union with her lover.—
Heavy rain is pouring down and black night fallen;
The flickering lightning flashes out (betraying her) and then for shame she staggers;
And in that moment a peacock rises screaming,
and with a startled gesture the impassioned woman lifts her arms.

Dohāra:
To Bhairava her noble lord, she goes afoot on abhisāra.
Seeing but the bird, and not his palace, her glances show
her heart's distraction.

I take next the Rāgini Vibhāsa (S. 3) of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (M. F. A. 15.51: reproduced, showing the text, in C. P. pl. LXIX). The picture represents the terrace of a palace, where a woman is asleep on a bed, a maid is looking through the open window, and Love standing in the doorway is aiming a flower-arrow at his beloved. The text reads:

Rāgari Vibhāsa: copa:
Megha-malāra kāma gati kinhī
egha vibhāsa asika bharī lihi;
Pauhaupa dhanukha bīna kara hiya
rati sangrama bīcāra hiya;
Vaha nêka ura háthi lagavai
badana mori piya péma upavai:
Don bulivamta don jujhakari
rake samâna kou nahi kari:
Sughara råpa dou unihari
vala triya piya jobana vârî.

Dohâ:
Suçiyata kathâ ju kâma ki, riti bînoda pada samga
Sarasa naina kari nirakhiie, sara sai sarasahi raânga 29.

In this text, the following words may be remarked on:
1. 1: megha-malâra, name of the râga to which Vibhâsa belongs;
literally, 'autumn clouds.'
megha vibhâsa; either the name of the râgi, or taken
literally, 'cloud glory.'
1. 2: Pauhaupa equals puşa,
1. 3: mori; probably from morând, to turn. Love turns her
face to his to kiss her mouth. Mori could also be taken
as meri, 'my', or mori, 'peahen', or from mundâ, 'to
coax', 'win'.
1. 4: jobana-vârî, i.e. yanvana-vâli. Vâra also signifies husband
and has many other meanings.
dohâ: riti equals 'way, going', but here more likely represents
bitt from bitânâ, 'to arrive, happen, pass.'
pada samga I render 'station of union.' Another possible,
but improbable, reading is pada tamga, or pada tak,
'(from head) to foot.'
sara sai equals 'from love, passion,'
sarasahi equals 'beyond measure', or 'impassioned.'

Translation:

Megha Malâra has prepared the path of love,
and the body is filled with the glory of the clouds
(or, 'the bodily vessel is filled to the brim by Megha
Vibhâsa').

Flower-bow (Kâmadeva) takes an arrow in his hand,
Rati is considering in her heart the battle of love.
He lays a loving hand on her breast,
and turning her face (to his), he wins love's answer.
Both are hardy and valiant fighters,
both are well matched and neither yields.
Both are alike in beauty of form, 
the tender girl and the lusty youth.

Dohā:

Hearing all the tale unfolded by love, 
there ensues the blissful station of union (or perhaps 'with foot set on the path of pleasure').
With swimming eyes she gazes, 
deeper dyed in the tincture of love.

A similar composition occurs with almost identical text, 
in the Rāgmālā of British Museum Ms. Or. Add. 2821 f. 29, of 
somewhat later date. Apart from changes in the quantity of 
some of the vowels, the only important textual variants are: 
1. 3: for pema upāvai, pema bō upāvai.
1. 4: for dou, eka ('each'): for unihāri, unahāri.

dohā: for nirakhie, nirakhiye.
The poet of S. 3 and British Museum Ms. Or. Add. 2821 remains 
unidentified. But the dohā to Vasanta Rāgīṇī in British Museum 
Ms. Or. 2821 corresponds to the dohā of the Vasanta Rāgīṇī 
of S. 2 (Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York); and we have 
noted elsewhere the partial correspondences in the texts for 
Madhu-Mādhavi Rāgīṇī, and those for Gandhārī Rāgīṇī.

A very different Rāgīṇī Vibhāsā is represented in the picture 
(S.1) recently given to the Fogg Art Museum by Dr. Denman 
W. Ross, and in the Vibhāsā Rāgīṇī (S. 2) of the Museum of Fine 
Arts, M. F. A. 17. 2382. Here the theme is a phase of love in 
union (samyoga): it is the cool dawn of a night of delight, 
and the two lovers are seated in a chamber; the hero is again 
shooting a flower-arrow, but in this case not at the beloved, but 
at a cock which is crowing loudly on a nearby tree. It may be 
remarked that the motif of the hero who shoots some animal—
lion, rat or bird—which disturbs the lovers, occurs elsewhere in 
Indian literature and art, especially in the Hamir Hath and 
corresponding illustrations, e. g. in M. F. A. 17. 2421. The 
text of the Fogg Art Museum Rāgīṇī reads:

Alha Bibhāsa: (saviyā)
Lachiman haranaī rāpa bibhāsa,
sakhi urbasī rambhā jāsu.

1 In Sastri, H., "The Hamir-Hath, or the obstinacy of Hamir", Journal of London Art, vol. 17, London 1916, the reproduction of the love scene where the hero is shooting at a lion, has been considerably edited.
Pritama biraha caṭapaṭi bhai,
sumsama bāgana bāna tanahāi;
Avā tāpa jaba taṭi sarira,
pī samādhī kini dhari dhāra;
Pritama dhyāna magana hoi gai,
krīḍa bhṛṅga ki nāi bhai;
Tāsan surata samaru nisi kīa,
koka kalāni lūṭi sukhu liiāi;
Adhara sadhara rasu pīau aghāi,
brāhaka agini saba gai ju dāi;
Makara dhuju pūjya bahu bhai,
bhayau prabhāta sirāṇi jāta;
Ālasu bahutu bishhāsai bhayau,
 nidrā sukhu prajanika mai ṭhayau;
Deha caṭaka hājak kan āhi,
pāga sāvāhā sīra upamā kāhi;
Sūrī sāṇha kau bāgau sohāi,
cūrī mautī ijyārā manumohau;
Phaitā kaitā jaraḵaṁ banāu
dekhai rūpu lājāi rati-rāu:

Do(harā):

Saba nisi gāi surata rasu, krīḍata koka bīlāsa:
Ekā-ki parajanika pai, nidrā karati bishhāsā. 35.

The following words may be remarked upon:

1. Lachiman: the author of the Rāgmālā here names himself. The name is also found in the doḥā text of the Paṅcama Rāginī of Series S. 2.

II. 3,4: We are familiar in Indian literature with the use of the language of human passion to express spiritual experience. In these magnificent lines, on the other hand, the technical language of yoga is used to describe the intensity of human passion.

tāpa equals 'heat', 'grief'; taṭī, from tapanā, 'to glow,' also represents tapasvī, 'a female devotee.'
samādhi and dhyāna are technical terms of yoga. ‘As the worm becomes the ichneumon’ is a phrase often used in Hindi literature to express a contemplation or regard so profound as to result in identification with the object of contemplation (such an identification being the goal of worship). The ichneumon lays its eggs in a living caterpillar, and the larvae feed upon its flesh, become pupae, and emerge as new ichneumons. Unaware of the precise details of this life history, Hindus have imagined that the caterpillar is thrown into a trance by the pain of the sting, and is so completely preoccupied by the thought of the ichneumon that it becomes the ichneumon itself. Cf. the Padumāvasī of Muhammad Jaisi, ed. and trans. by Grierson and Dvivedi, Calcutta, 1896–1911, p. 49 (footnote to translation).

1. 7: i. e. when the god of love has been worshipped by the performance of the whole ritual of love; pājyau, from pājanā, to perform the office of worship. The standard of Kāmadeva has the device of a makara.

1. 8: The peculiar form Bisbhāsai occurs twice, the normal Bibhāsa also twice.

II. 9–11: These lines above the usual eight, especially in the case of l. 11, are rather obscure.

sāpa? equals sāpa equals sarpa.

ijyāra, for ujyāra, ‘brightness’.


rati-rū, i. e. Kāmadeva.

Translation:

Lachman describes the form of Viḍhāsa,
like Urvasī or Rambhā,
And when she trembles with longing for the best-beloved, he aims his flower arrow at the crowings of the cock.

Her body glows with furnace-heat, like a devotee,
most intently centered on the thought of the beloved;
Sunk in the trance of considering the loved one,
as the worm becomes the ichneumon.

Fighting a joyful battle with him by night,
taking the pleasant spoils of the battle of love,
Drinking the nectar of his lips abundantly, 
all the burning fire of her desire is assuaged.
When many a rite has been paid to Dolphin-banner 
(Kāmadeva), 
the morning dawns and it grows cool.
Now is Vibhāsa wearied out, 
sweet sleep steals upon the bed.
Lo, the golden body in its fulness of power, 
and to what may be likened the turban upon the 
dark head?
The head-snake (braid) adorned like reins, 
with bright seed pearls enchanting the heart.
The girdle of her waist is adorned with gold thread, 
the Lord of Love (Kāmadeva) is abashed at the sight of 
such beauty.

Dohā:
The whole night passed away in love’s delights, and 
enjoying of amorous dalliance, 
United on the bed, Vibhāsa sleeps.

The third and last Rāgini presently to be discussed is the 
Gandhāra Rāgini of S. 1 in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston 
(M. F. A. 22. 684, reproduced C. P. pl. LXII). The picture 
represents a yogi seated on a tiger-skin beneath a tree beside a 
lotus-lake. He has two disciples fanning him. On the ground 
at his side sits a female devotee. The text reads:

A(tha) gaṅdhāra rūpa barnanām: (savaiyā): 
Birahā laharītī mai na samhāra 
tapāsī rūpa bhai gaṅdhāra;
Jāṭā maṇḍalī māthai sohā 
amga vībhūti malaṅkaṅga vikohai
Kṣīna sarīra kaṣāye śīra 
kanana basata sarvegra śīra,
Joga paṭā juna driḍha padmāsanu 
sohatu subhaga baghammaru dāsanu,
Tārī laṅī sumudrita naina 
hai paraṁ piya pekhyau aina.

Doharā:

Tihi chabi bibi samśaka calī, rahi praima pada pūrī 
Swāmi nisa(m)ga jogini bhai, amga caḍhāai dhūrī. 
Itī Gaṅdhāra. 6.
The following words may be remarked upon:

1.1: samhāra equals sambhāla, from sambhālanā, to support. We might translate ‘unbearably tossed about by the waves of viraha’. But the correct reading is probably lahāritana mai as in B.M. Or. Add. 2821, ‘enduring the surge of love-longing in her flesh’. It is clear in any case that here, as in many other places (cf. Grierson and Dvidedi Padumāvati, p. 13, footnote) that viraha means ‘unhappy love’, rather than ‘love in separation’: or, if we adhere to the usual rendering, we must understand that the separation may be psychic, and need not be spatial.


1.3, 4: describe the svāmī upon whom the yoginī’s gaze is ‘sealed’. Joga paṭā, the ribbon or braid used by yogis to support the right knee in certain āsanas. Juna equals grass; probably kuśa grass is intended.

1.5: baghammaru, more correctly baghambara.

dohā: the first line is very obscure. There is a word bibi, meaning ‘two or ‘double’; it occurs also in the dohā of B. M. Ms. Or. Add. 2821, fol. 14, Bilāval Rāgini. The doubtful character could be ga; we could then read saṅgaha (saṅgṛaha), ‘grasping’. On the other hand, saha caṅi may represent sahacarī, ‘wife,’ as in B. M. Or. Add. 2821, fol. 17: the earlier part of the line would still be obscure. For a similar case (although feigned, showing that heart-broken women sometimes ‘took the veil’), cf. the description of the false yoginī in the Padumāvati, can- to 40, 464:

“A yoginī is at the door and beggeth like one who has lost a beloved. Thoughstill in her first youth, she is living in austerity. She hath torn her veil and hath put on a beggar’s blanket. She hath the ashes of separation, and matted hair, a skin over her-shoulder, and a rosary round her neck. Her voice is wild, and her very footsteps burn the earth.”

(Grierson, Analysis of the Padumāvati, JASB 62 pt. 1, No. 2, p. 199: 1893.) Indian literature offers us many examples of wives following their husbands in the adoption of a religious vocation. In the present case the situation recalls the story of Pārvati, practising austerities with the object of regaining her husband’s love.
Translation:
Thus the relation of the form of Gandhāra:
Tossed in the sea of love-longing, unable to support (her grief),
the form of Gandhāra is of one devoted to tapas (austerity).
Lovely her head with its mass of tangled locks,
and brightly shines the sandal-paste smeared on her body.
With wasted frame in russet garb,
dwelling in the forest by a lotus lake,
Supported by a yoga paśū of (kuśa) grass, firmly
lotus-seated, fair and pure, seated on a tiger skin,
Gazing fixedly, she seals her eyes
upon the utter darling of her heart.

Dohā:
That beautiful woman (?), fully resting in the road of love,
Divided from her Lord, becomes a Yogini, and smears the dust (of ashes) on her body.
Just as in the case of Madhu-Mādhavi Rāginī, so here that of Gandhāra, British Museum Ms. Or. Add. 2821 (folio 17), offers us a picture and poem with some correspondences and some differences. The picture represents an emaciated male figure seated on the terrace of a palace with one female attendant with a peacock fan, behind him, and a male visitor before him. The poem reads:

Rāginī Devagandhāri: caupaśi:
Tapasi rūpa gandhāri nāri
biraha lahari tana mai aśi bhāri
Biraci tathāṁ duhbata dehi
pala pala mai trita cāḍhai sanekī
Mukolate kesa bhesa bairāgi
piya ke nāma jāpa jīpa lāgī
Joga jāṭā āsana dṛidha kiyaí
bhabana chāḍā baishti mañha liyai
Manasa yahai dhyāna jīya dharai
sāṁ mohti-mayā naika karai

Dohā:
Karata tahala saṅga sakacari, sou nipta bairāga
Mānahe murati citra kī, rahi pema labsa lāgī. 17.
The whole of ll. 3 and 4 continues the description of the female devotee. I take *mukalata* = *mukulita*, which with reference to the eye or a flower means closed or half closed or in bud, to mean dishevelled, when applied to hair. 'Like a vairāgi', she makes *jāpa jīpa* upon the name of the beloved. *Jāpa jīpa* is a repetition of sounds, intensifying the sense of *jāpa*, just as in the case of *jap tap*, in Ratan Devi, Thirty Indian Songs, p. 12. To 'make *jap*' is to repeat sacred words or *mantrams*, generally with the aid of a rosary. The repetition of the name of the deity is a characteristic element in the office of personal devotion. Thus, she makes her beloved her God. *Jatā* means matted locks, or long unkempt hair of a yogi. The taking of a firm seat (*cf. sthiram āsanam* in Bhagavadgītā 6. 11) with the *jatā* coiffure, or as before using a *yoga pafī* (represented in both pictures), implies the irrevocable adoption of the ascetic vocation, the homeless life. *Bhabana chādī* i.e. *bhavana chori* means 'having abandoned the home'; *mañha liyai*, lit. 'takes the monastery'.

Translation:

Gandhari's form is a woman devotee,  
waves of love-longing wildly surging in her flesh.  
Wherefrom is her body waxen weak,  
and every moment her love threefold increased.  
With hair dishevelled and the garb of a vairāgi  
she makes a prayer of her beloved's name,  
Having left the home and taken to the monastery and  
taken a firm seat, with the unkempt hair of a yogi.  
Making a meditation upon her desire, she supports her life,  
the heroine casts upon the *swāmi* the illusion of love.

*Dohā*:

Serving him menially like a wife, wholly turned away  
(from the world).  
Like a painted image, she abides given over to love.

*Literature*


ADISATI, ANVĀDISATI, ANUDISATI, AND UDDISATI
IN THE PETA-VATTHU

HENRY S. GEHMAN

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

It is a well-known doctrine of Buddhism that the superior merit of one person may be transferred to another. The common idiom for this is pattim dadāti, which is recorded in Childers's Pāli Dictionary. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this usage. In Dhammapada I, 8 a king made abundant offerings to a congregation of monks and made over to some petas the merit of his gift (bhante ito tesam petānam dibbannapānam samajjata 'ti pattim adāsi). In consequence the ghosts received celestial food and drink. In Dhammapada V, 1 = 60, the king's servant wanted to transfer the merit he had acquired to the king of the dragons, saying Tumhākaṁ tam pattim kaivā demi; and the dragon said, Mayham tam pattim dehi. In Dhammapada X, 6 = 136, a treasurer who was requiting good for evil made an offering and ascribed its credit to a malicious enemy, with the words: Aham imasmin dāne paṭhamaṁ pattim dammi; "I make over to that man the first-fruits of the merit of this offering." In Dhammapada XXIII, 5 = 326, a novice transferred his merit to his parents, saying: Mayhāṁ mātāpituvanaṁ imasmin bhāneḥ pattim dammi; "All the merit I have acquired by thus intoning the Sacred Word I make over to my parents." His mother used to say; Sāmanerena dinnapattim anumodāmi tāta; "Dear son, I am thankfully enjoying the merit which as a novice you have made over to me."

In a book like the Peta-Vatthu it is natural to expect many transfers of merit, since the spirits desire relief from their misery and torments. Human sympathy also moves men to make over to their deceased friends and kinsmen whatever spiritual credit they may acquire in bestowing gifts upon the Buddha and the Chapter of monks. The Peta-Vatthu, however, does not in this connexion employ pattim dadāti; on the other hand
we meet in the order of frequency of use, adisati, anvadisati, and uddisati with the accusative of the gift and the genitive or the dative of the person who is benefited spiritually or to whom the merit is transferred.

The purpose of this paper is to prove that in this connexion these expressions mean 'to make over, transfer, or ascribe merit to' or 'to give a gift in the name of'. This meaning has not been listed in any of our Pâli-English dictionaries.

Childers under uddisati records the prepositional use of the gerund uddissa as meaning 'on behalf of, for, on account of, with reference to.' This familiar signification of uddissa is also found in the frame-story of Peta-Vatthu IV.8: Savatthiya kire avidu re aññatarasim gâmake eko kutumbiko attano kutupakâm bhikkhuṁ uddissa viharâm kâresi; 'They say that in a certain town not very far from Sâvatthi a certain householder had a monastery built for the sake of a monk who was his personal friend.' This well-known usage of the gerund is derived from a sense similar to that of the four verbs under consideration.

Disati, Sanskrit dis, means literally 'to point, show.' With a prefix denoting direction toward a certain spot or away from the actor, the verb means, 'to point toward or in the direction of a certain person or object.' Thus when one directs up or shows towards (uddisati) a person some good thing, it would be for his benefit or in his behalf. This apparently is the origin of the above sense of uddissa.

No doubt when gifts were bestowed, the donor thought of the welfare of the Buddha and the monks. But he also had a selfish motive for his liberality; an avaricious life, according to the teachings of Buddhism, was bound to be punished in rebirths, and so every person who sought salvation was willing to give in order to accumulate merit. In many instances, however, a man donated a gift and transferred the virtue of the offering to some peta in torment. As he made the donation, he handed it to the needy recipient, but the spiritual value of the present or its merit, with an effort of the will, or by mere word, or in imagination, he 'pointed towards', 'showed in the direction of', or 'directed towards' (adisati, anvadisati, anudisati, uddisati) the ghost. In other words the donor made a mental reserva-

1 On anvadisati, which probably has the same meaning, see below, p. 412f.
tion or exercised some act of supererogation: "Now it is not
I that am giving this gift; let us pretend that So-and-so is giving
this; I have nothing to do with it; that one over there is re-
ponsible; I get and want no benefit from this; all the credit
belongs to that one to whom I am pointing or referring." We
may suggest that under such circumstances and with such
a line of development arose our signification of the verb when
compounded with a prefix of direction. All our examples to
prove the meaning of these four verbs will be taken from the
Peta-Vatthu or its commentary.

In II.8.8, we find dakkhiṇam ādiṣa me hitāya. We hardly need
to assume that hitāya, 'for the benefit of, for the advantage of'
had a part in the formation of the idiom under investigation.
The use of the genitive or dative of the person benefited probably
is as original as hitāya with the genitive.

Let us now note the opinions of the commentators on this
idiom. Mama dakkhiṇam ādiṣa of I.10.5 is defined as patti-
dānam dehi, an expression which we discussed in the first para-
graph of this paper. Let us now turn to II.2.6: Dehi pūtaka
me dānam datvā anvādisāki me; on this line the commentary says:
yathā dinnam dakkhiṇam majham uddissa patti dānam dehi.
In both these instances the lexicographer plainly considers that
ādiṣati and anvādisati in this connexion mean 'to make over
merit to a peta.' Datvā anvādisāki no of III.2.8 is construed
as ādiṣa no ti amhākam. In other words ādiṣati and anvādisati
are synonyms. Ādiṣeyya of IV.1.30 is interpreted by the word
uddiseyya. From this we may infer that in the mind of the
scholiast the three verbs ādiṣati, anvādisati, and uddisati are
synonymous. We shall, however, not be biased by this opinion
of the annotator, but it will remain our duty to examine each
word on its own merits in this particular context; his statements,
nevertheless, are interesting because they confirm our conclusions
of the study of the usage of these verbs in the Peta-Vatthu.

The verb anvādisati is found only in the locative of the past

---

* So in the Paramatthatha Dipani or the Commentary of the Peta-Vatthu
  edited by Siri Dhammārāma Tissa Nāyaka Thera and Māpalagama Chanda-
  joti Thera; revised by Mahagoda Siri Nānissara Thera; Colombo, Ceylon,
  1917. Hardy's text (Pali Text Society, 1894), however, reads patti dānam.
participle and always in the combination samanantaranudittthe. At first sight one might be tempted to derive it from Sanskrit *anudrṣṭa*, but in view of the fact that it is always used in connexion with the transfer of merit, it is better to take it from Sanskrit *anudṛṣṭa*. Accordingly this is the fourth compound of *disati* that is employed in the making over of the spiritual value of a gift. We may also note at this point that the commentary to I.10.7 defines *samanantarānudittiḥ* as *tassā dakkhiṇāya uddhiṭhasamanantarām eva*. Since the annotator uses the past participle in his rendering, we cannot determine whether he makes *diś* or *drī* the basis of this verb. Under III.2.12, however, he makes the following remark on *samanantarānuditiḥ*: *uddīsa+ samanantarām eva ca*. There is no doubt now that he takes it from the root *diś* and considers it synonymous with the three other verbs under consideration. A study of the context also convinces us that the commentator is right. *Anudīṭṭha* in the combination *samanantarānuditiḥ* therefore seems to mean that immediately 'after merit was ascribed' to a *peta*, the desired result was produced. Apparently *samanantarānuditiḥ* became a stereotyped expression or cliché to mark the transition between the making of merit over to a *peta* and the benefits that the spirit derived from the charitable act. It happened that *anudisati* was chosen for this particular purpose. In the succeeding paragraphs where contexts are quoted, we shall see that no other translation so adequately renders the sense as the meaning we have chosen. Accordingly it is preferable to derive it from the root *diś* instead of from *drī*.

---

3 So always in Minayeff, *Petasatthu*, Pali Text Society, 1888, except in II.1.8; II.2.9; II.3.27, where we find *'ardā anu*'. Hardy's text (a.e.) always reads *samanantarānuditther*, but under II.1.8 he quotes the variant *'ardā anu* and under I.10.7 and III.2.12; 16; 21; 25; 30 he cites *'ardā anu*'. Pāli MS. 123, iii of the Bibliothèque Nationale. (Hardy, Notes for an edition of the *Peta Vatthu*, *Journal of the P. T. S.*, 1904-5) also reads *'ardā anu* in III. 2.12: 16; 25. These variations in spelling, however, have no influence on our interpretation of the passages. It is noteworthy that the Colombo edition (a.e.) always has *'uddhiṭṭh* and that neither Hardy nor Minayeff recognize this variant. In spite of the fact that Pāli MS. 123,iii of the Bibliothèque Nationale (a.e.) has *'ardā ṛkhanuditiḥ* in I.10.7, we prefer to follow Minayeff and Hardy. The double *d* is probably a mistake due to the influence of *uddisi*.

4 So the Colombo edition (a.e.). Hardy's *uddisa* is obviously a misprint.
Let us now study the various cases in the Peta-Vatthu where the verbs under consideration occur.

In I.6, a *petī* tells her misery to some *theras*. In the frame-story which continues the narrative, we learn that she requested them to go to the house of her former husband, who would give them a present. She desired, however, that the donation should be made in her name or that the virtue of the gift should be made over to her (*tam dakkhiṇam mahāyam uddisaṃpeyyātha*; Ms. B reads *ādisayyātha*.) The monks went to the householder, who gave them kind treatment and alms. The recipients told the man their experience and had him ascribe the merit of the gift to the ghost of his former wife; *therā tam paravitti kutimīkassa ārocevā tam dānam tassā petīyā uddisaṃpeṣun.* In consequence of this transfer the *petī* became happy.

In I.9, a mendicant friar converses with a *devaputta* about a *petī* who in a previous existence had been the latter's wife. Since the fortunate spirit wished to alleviate the condition of his former spouse, he asked the monk for counsel. In reply the priest advised him to give a donation and make over to her the merit of the same; *yadi Bhagavaṇa aparīyasaṅghaṃ ca ekass' eva vā bhikkhuno dānam davā imissā uddissiyati ayaṃ ca tam anumodati, evam etissā ito dukkho mutti bhavissati.* So the *devaputta* gave the mendicant excellent food and drink and gave the credit of the gift to the *petī; davā tam dakkhinyam tassā petīyā ādisī.* In consequence of this transfer of merit she became happy. But he also placed in the hand of this monk a pair of celestial garments for the Buddha and as he handed them over, he ascribed the virtues of the gift to the *petī; puna tass' eva bhikkhuno hatthe dībhāsājukayuṇam Bhagavantam uddissa davā dakkhiṇam petīyā ādisī.* As a result of this credit she appeared like an houri arrayed in supernatural vestments and ornaments.

In I.10, we have a conversation between some shipwrecked merchants and a *vimānapetī*, who stayed in her palace. The traders asked her to come out, but she was ashamed to make her appearance, since she was nude. So one merchant said:

---

1 So reads the Colombo edition (o.c.); Hardy, however, has *uddissāpeyyātha*.
2 So the Colombo edition (o.c.); Hardy, on the other hand, has *uddissāpeṣum.*
"Come, I shall give you a cloak; put on this garment; don this tunic, and come out, beautiful one." In reply the peti said that she would derive no profit from material gifts put in her hand; and as she pointed out a lay-disciple, one of their number, she spoke (5):

_Etam achaḍāyitvāna mama dakkhinam ādisā
 tuddāham sukhitā hessam sabbakāmamādiḥhīṁ;

"Dress this man and ascribe to me the virtue of the gift; then I shall be blest, succeeding in all my desires." Reference has already been made to the note in the commentary on _mama dakkhinam ādisa_. The narrative continues (6):

_Taṁ ca te nāhāpāyitvāna vilimpiṭvāna vāṇijā
 vatttheh' achaḍāyitvāna tassā dakkhinam ādisum;

"After the traders had bathed and anointed him, they clothed him with the garment and transferred to her the virtue of the gift." Immediately after this was assigned to her credit (7, _samanantarāṇudīṣṭhe_), she received food, drink, and fine clothes. The possession of the _vimāna_ and this benefit, however, were not destined to be permanent; four months later she was to be reborn in hell. At this point the commentary takes up the narrative and tells us that the above mentioned lay-disciple thought of a method that would guarantee her release. He suggested that she should give a gift to his pious companions, the merchants. So she presented them with celestial food and drink and various heavenly clothes and ornaments. She also entrusted them with a pair of supernatural garments for the Buddha and sent with them her best regards for the blessed One. Through her magical influence the ship reached that same day the port which the merchants desired, from which they duly went to Jetavana and gave the Buddha the _peti_’s message and the set of garments. The following day the traders gave many presents to the Chapter over which the Buddha presided and made over the merit to the _peti_; _mahādānam datvā tassā dakkhidham ādimsu_. In consequence of this act she was reborn in the _tāvatimsa_ heaven.

Once the Elder Sāriputta met a _peti_ (II.1) who was wandering around without clothes and was consumed by hunger and thirst. In her request for help we find the words (6):

_ _datvā ca me ādisā yāhi kiñci
_moceti nam duggatiṁ bhuddante;_
“Go, make a donation and transfer to me the virtue of the gift; free me from my misery, venerable one.” The Elder gave the monks a morsel, a handful of cloth, and a bowl of water and ascribed to her the donation (7, tassā dakkhiṇam adisi). Benefits immediately followed this gift which was accredited to her (8, samanantarāṇudīṭhe). She received from supernatural sources food, clothing, and drink. When Sāriputta saw that she was well dressed and illuminating all the regions like the morning star, he asked her: “What good deed have you done? Whence have you such radiant power, and why does your figure illuminate all the regions?” The peti replied (14):

Bhikkhunam alopaṃ datvā pāniṃattaṃ ca colakam thālakassa ca pāṇīyaṃ mama dakkhiṇam adisi;

“When you gave to the monks a morsel, a handful of cloth, and a bowl of water, you made over to me the virtue of the gift.” Consequently she had excellent food, many fine garments, and four beautiful lotus-ponds.

In II.2, we find that the Elder Sāriputta meets his own mother, who as a peti was in great misery. She asked him for succour, saying (6):

Dehi puttaka me dānaṃ datvā anvādisāhi me;

“Give, dear son, a gift for me, and when you have given it, ascribe to me the credit.” We have already referred to the commentary’s explanation of anvādisāhi. So Sāriputta made four huts, which he gave to the Church of the four regions; this donation, besides food and drink, he designated as the gift of his mother; 8, Catassa kuṭiya katro saṅgha catuddise udā Kuṭiya annapāṇaṃ ca mātu dakkhiṇam adisi. Straightway after the credit of these gifts had been made over to her (9, samanantarāṇudīṭhe), she became happy.

In II.3, we have a conversation between Tissā and her co-wife Mattā, now a peti. Since the ghost was in intense agony, Tissā took pity on her and said: “Come, what shall I give you, or what shall I do for you in order that you may be happy and blest with the fulness of all pleasures?” In reply Mattā spoke (25):

Cattāro bhikkhā saṅghato cattāro pana puggalā atṭha bhikkhā bhajiyita mama dakkhiṇam adisa tadāhaṃ sukhitā hessam sabbakāmasamiddhīni;

“Here are four monks from the congregation and four others who are independent. Feed these eight mendicants and trans-
fer to me the credit of the gift. Then I shall be happy, blest in the fulfilment of all desires." So she fed the priests, clothed them, and ascribed to her the virtue of the gift (26, tassā dakkhiṇam ādisi). In this connexion we note that the commentary in repeating the above procedure uses the same expression: tam suva Tissā tam atthaṁ altano sāmikassa arocetvā duśiyadivase attha bhikkhu bhojettha tassā dakkhiṇam ādisi. Immediately after this assignment of merit (27, samanantarānudiṭṭhe), the desired result was produced, and her misery was at an end.

In II,4, Nandasena meets his wife Nandā, who is now a peta. He wished to take her home where she could have food, drink, and clothes, but she replied (7–8):

Hatthena hatthe te dinnam na mayham upakappati
bhikkhū ca silasampanne vitarāge bahussute
Tappehi annapānena mama dakkhiṇam ādisa
ladāham sukhitā hessaṁ sabbakāmasamiddhīti;

“What is given by your hand into mine does not profit me. But the monks who abound in piety and are learned and free from passion, these refresh with food and drink and transfer to me the benefit of the gift. Then I shall be happy, blest in the fulfilment of all desires.” So he gave many presents: viands, drink, solid food, clothes, dwellings, umbrellas, perfumes, wreaths, and various kinds of sandals. He refreshed the monks with food and drink; and made over to her the virtue of the gift (9, tassā dakkhiṇam ādisi). The desired result was produced immediately when this donation was made in her name (10, samanantarānudiṭṭhe).

In II,8, we encounter king Ajātasattu, who had a conversation with the peta Cūlaseṭṭhi. Since the monarch wished to alleviate the agony of the latter, the peta said (8):

Buddhaṁ ca saṅgham parivisayāna rāja annena pānena pi cāvareṇa
tam dakkhiṇam ādisa me hitāya evam aham cirataram pānito
sivā;

“Serve Buddha and the Church, O king, with food, drink, and the robes of monks. Ascribe the merit of this gift to my benefit; in this way I shall be content for a considerable time.” The king did so, and to this peta he ascribed, with the usual result, the virtue of the gift (9, tassā ca petassa dakkhiṇam ādisittha).
In III.2, we read about the ascetic Poṭṭhapāda, whose parents and brother had become miserable petas in consequence of their evil deeds. His brother addressed him (8):

Anukampassu kārṇiko datvā amādisāhi no
tavā dinneva dānena yāpessanti kurūrino;

"Be merciful and compassionate; give a gift and ascribe to us the credit. By your present which is bestowed, the cruel ones will maintain themselves." Reference has already been made to the commentary's note on anvādtsāhi no. When the Elder and twelve other monks had gone their rounds, he took charge of the food which was collected. A dinner was made for the Chapter of monks, and as the meal was served, the ascetic ascribed the virtue of the gift to his parents and brother (11, datvā anvādisi thero mātu pitu ca bhātuno), saying (11): Idam me nātinam hotu sukhitā hontu nātayo; "Let this merit be for my kinsmen; let my relatives be blessed." So his kinsmen received sufficient food, immediately after he had made this donation in their name (12, samanantarānudīṭhe). Still they needed clothes. So they said: "There is abundant food, reverend sir, but look, we are nude. Now, lord, put forth your power that we may obtain clothes." After the Elder had picked up some rags from a rubbish heap, he converted the cloths into garments and gave them to the Church of the four regions. As he gave his offering, the venerable monk transferred the virtue of the gift (15, datvā anvādisi thero mātu pitu ca bhātuno) to his parents and brother, saying (15):

idam me nātinam hotu sukhitā hontu nātayo;

"Let this merit be for my kinsmen; let my relatives be blessed." Immediately thereupon, when this donation was made in their name (16, samanantarānudīṭhe), they were dressed in fine raiment. Next they asked for a house. So the Elder built a hut of leaves and presented it to the Church. As he made his donation, the venerable monk made over the virtue of the gift to his parents and brother (20, same as 11 and 15 above), saying (20):

idam me nātinam hotu sukhitā hontu nātayo;

"Let this merit be for my kinsmen; let my relatives be blessed." Immediately when this credit was transferred to them (21, samanantarānudīṭhe), they received magical dwellings. Then they asked for water. So the sage filled a waterpot and
gave it to the Church. As he handed it over, the venerable one ascribed the credit of the gift (24; cf. 11,15,20 above) to the pesas in the regular fashion. No sooner had this merit been transferred to them (25, samanantarānudīṭhe) than they had drinking water and four beautiful lotus-ponds. Finally, since their feet were painfully chapped, they asked him to provide them with a carriage. So the sage took a shoe and presented it to the Church. As he gave it, the venerable one made over the merit of the gift (29; cf. 11,15,20, and 24 above) to his kinsmen with the usual formula. As soon as they were accredited with this deed (30, samanantarānudīṭhe), the pesas approached in a chariot.

In III.6, we have the story of the harlot Serini, who had been avaricious during her lifetime. In consequence of her uncharitable acts she was reborn in the world of the pesas. She appeared to a lay-disciple of her town, Hatthinipura, and with him sent a message to her mother (9):

Tato me dānām dadi tu tassā ca hotu jīvika
 dānām datvā ca me mātā dakkhiṇam adisatu me
 taddhām sukhita kessam sabbāmasamiddhini;

"Then let her give a gift in my name, and may she have long life; and when my mother presents a donation for me, may she ascribe to me the virtue of the offering. Then I shall be happy, blest in the fulfilment of all my desires." Upon his return to Hatthinipura, he narrated to her mother what had happened and told her in stanza 13 the same words that we find above in stanza 9. Accordingly she presented a gift and transferred to her the merit of the donation; 14, tato hi sā dānām adāsi tassā dakkhiṇam ādīsi. In consequence the péti was happy and of beautiful bodily appearance. The commentary on this passage repeats the same idea: Tam suvā tassā mātā bhikkhusaṅghassa dānām datvā tassā ādīsi.

In IV.1, King Ambasakkhara asked a péta why he was in such misery. The spirit replied (30):

Na m' atthi kammāni sayam katāni
datvā pi me nattthi so ādiseyya
 uccchādānaṁ sayanam atha 'nnapānam
ten' amhi naggo kasirā ca vutthi;

"I myself have not done any (good) deeds, and there is no one who in bestowing gifts would ascribe to my credit clothes, and
a bed besides food and drink. Therefore I am nude, and my condition is miserable." Here the commentary defines ādiseyya by one word uddiseyya, a form of which is found in stanza 36. The peta, however, advised him to visit an ārhat named Kappitaka and make a donation (36):

Tassa tuvaṃ ekam yugam duve vā
mam uddisitvāna sace dadetha
paṭiggahitāni ca tāni e' assu
mamā ca passetha samaddhādussan;

"If you give him in my name a pair of garments or a double set, and he accepts them, me also you will see furnished with clothes." We note here that uddisati has the same meaning as ādisati. The frame-story continues to narrate how the king called on the Elder, who was surprised that the ruler had become liberal. The prince gave him eight pair of garments and ascribed to the peta the credit of the gift; vatthāni datvā petassu uddisi. In consequence celestial raiment was presented to the peta.

The same idea recurs in later stanzas (51–52), although neither the word disati nor any compound of it is used. The king says (51):

Tam disaṃ samvegamalatham bhante
tappaccayā cākam dadāmi dānam;
paṭiggaṇha bhante vatthayugāni attha;
yakkhas' imi āgacchantu dakkhināyo;

"Reverend sir, I saw him in terror and in sin; therefore I give a gift. Lord, accept eight pair of garments, and let these presents go to the credit of the yakka." The ascetic replied (52):

Addhā ki dānam bahudhā paṭaṭṭham
dadāto ca te akkhayadhannam athu
paṭiggaṇhāmi te vatthayugāni attha;
yakkhas' imi āgacchantu dakkhināyo;

"Surely the gift in many ways is acceptable, and may it have endless virtue for you, the giver. I accept from you the eight pair of garments; may these presents redound to the credit of the yakka."

The fact that here the transference of merit is described makes us feel that we have found the only possible explanation of the meaning of the four compounds of disati. If they do not refer to this notion, what else can they signify? It is certain that no-
other rendering adequately translates these verbs in the passages which have been quoted.

In the commentary to IV.12, we find that a girl was desirous of performing the duties to the dead in behalf of her father (pitaram uddissa matakiccam kātukāmā); so she gave a gift to the Buddha and told him to assume that it came from her father. It follows that through this gift which was simply ascribed to his credit (tāya dakkhināya samuddhisthamattaye) the peta obtained a mango grove, a pleasure-garden, a vimāna, trees of plenty, and a lotus-pond, and great heavenly glory.

From this study of the verbs ādisati, anvādisati, anudisati, uddisati it is evident that in connexion with presenting a gift to a peta the only meaning they can have is 'to make over, transfer, or ascribe the merit or virtue of a gift to some one' or 'to give a gift in the name of some one' with the idea that he would receive spiritual benefits or alleviation from the pains of purgatory.
BRIEF NOTES

Arabic Doublets

It has been shown in JAOS 42, 375 that Heb. ʾqīṭr, ʾṣmā (AJP 43, 245; DB 2, 467a and 467b, 1. 9) is a doublet of ʾašān, smoke. Arab ʾājāna, to smoke, means orig. to go up, which is also the primary connotation of the doublet ʾaḥna, to stink. To reek (cf. Ger. riechen, rauchen) is now used for to stink, but originally it meant simply to smoke, fume; reek was even used for incense. Another doublet of ʾaḥna <ʾāṭīna is ʾārafa, to know, orig. to scent (cf. ʾaṭārāʾ = ʾēdēsqēv, Deut. 32, 17 ʾṣāʾr, wind, and Arab. nāṣīn) = Ass. erēšu (JBL 34, 72; JHUC 316,24). In ZDMG 69, 564 it has been pointed out that Arab. nāṭana, to stink, is the Heb. nāṭān, to give, which appears in Assyrian, with partial assimilation of the t to the n, as nāḏānû (SFG 43). The original meaning is to give out, emit, an odor, Heb. nāṭān rēḥ, Cant. 2, 13 (AV give smell; cf. Lat. ara dabant fumos). The root is tn>Heb. lānnīm, jackals, i. e. stinking (JAOS 42,376).

In addition to nāṭana, to stink, we find in Arabic: ʾatīna, ʾādīna, ʾānīta, nāṭīta which all have the same meaning. Nāṭana is a N of tn, and ṣāṭīna a causative with t instead of s as in ṣāqāqa (JBL 35, 321) which has originally the meaning of rāsana, to bear up in order to determine the weight. To weigh anchor means to raise or heave it up. The German term is den Anker lichten, and lichten is connected with leicht, Heb. qāl>ṣaqāl. The forms ṣānīta and nāṭīta are transpositions of ṣāṭīna; in ṣādīna the t has been partially assimilated to the n as in Ass. nāḏānū. In Syriac we have tēnānā, smoke, fume, reek, which is identical with Arab. nāṭānah, stench. To smell means especially to give out an offensive odor as does also Ger. riechen. Arab. ʾānūhata = ṣānīta as well as nāṭīta <hātana (with prefixed h as in ḥarāqā).

Instead of s as causative prefix we find not only t, but also I, e. g. ṣāḥāda, to sharpen (JAOS 43, 118) and ṣādāya, to beat in the skull &c. < dx = dq = dk (AJSL 23, 241) which appears also as ṣādāka > ḍākiša, to be stunned (cf. zāhima < zāxima > zānīxa,
Heb. ẓaḥnā, Eth. nesxāt, S of xn). In addition to šādāxa (and šādaha, ḍāhīša) we find also ūdāqa, ūdāqa, ūdāqa, ūdāxa, ūdāqa, ūdāxa, ūdāxa, ūdāqa, ūdāqa. The ẓ in these doublets is due to partial assimilation of the ẓ to the d (BA 1, 263, n. 33). In ūdāqa the ẓ appears as s‘; cf. ridā‘<ridāq (=ṣādir) and yaddāqah=yabdā‘ah<b‘>mab‘arah. For l=d cf. Baladīsan=Badaskīn (GB xv ad 10°; VG 132°; ZDMG 61, 195; JBL 35, 322°). F=t as in ‘ārida<‘ārida (=Ass. erēšu, to scent)<‘ārīṣa<‘ārīṣa. For ḍādāqa cf. harīqa=Heb. harīq (VG 521) and ahra‘a=āsra‘a. Dāmāxa<mādāxa is a denominative verb derived from a noun with prefixed m; cf. Eth dāmāqa=Arab. māda‘a<midāqq<dāq (JBL 34, 55. 183; 37, 277°°). In ūdāxa we have rhotacism; cf. rādama, to continue<sādama<dm>dama-jadāmu (or ḍadāmu) and rādama<sādama (or dāsama) to shut (the door)>sātama, Heb. satām<st<sd>Arab. sādā. The stem ūdāqa<rådāqa<dāqa<ţāda. For r=d cf. Copt. arīsin=Heb. aḏašim, lentils; ZDMG 61, 195, l. 11; and for y=r see: Jespersen, Elementarbuch der Phonetik (Leipsic, 1912) p. 106.

Johns Hopkins University.

PAUL HAUTF

Arabic y=r

Arab. r resembles the English r rather than the French or German r; only in certain dialects, e. g. in Bagdad, it is sounded like ẓ (JAOS 22, 96. 113; contrast BA 5, viii, l. 7). In Faris ash-Shidyaq’s Arab. Gr. + (London, 1891) p 2 the ẓ is identified with the Northumbrian r. Some Englishmen pronounce r almost like u (BL 104°). We find a similar interchange in Arabic, e. g. yāḍī(a)m-rājam=rājmah, cairn, heap of stones;—yāb(a)š-rabaš, white specks on finger-nails;—yāsam (or yāsim) bundle (of herbs)-rāsam, plur. of rīzmah, bundle, package; cf. rams, bunch of herbs;—yūdā (cf. āyūdā bīti‘-l-nāmu)-rādīja to perish;—yātaba-rātaba, to be stable, firm;—yāxaṣa (with ẓ due to x)-tarāxasa, to be moved (taḥarraka) or agitated;—yājasa-rājasa=ībtāraba;—āju’a-ārja’a, to be disappointed, fail in obtaining one’s desire (privative of rājā-jārjū, to hope)=āxfaga, esp. to hunt without success, return without game.
In a number of cases the y seem to be more original than the r, e.g. ráșana (which is generally combined with Heb. rõzēnim)—yāsana, to weigh > mizān, Heb. mōznām, scales, balances; Eth. lamassāna, to be weighed; cf. Heb. izzēn = Arab. yāsāna,'s-řīn; so too, tarāzana-yādana, to face each other (orig. to counterbalance) < yūsna, opposite; yūsama ( > Ass. simitu, mark, distinction) -rāsama, to mark; cf. gāṣama, to tattoo, and rāšama (< Aram. rēšām) to mark, write < rāsā, to dig, which appears also as rāza; cf. rāžaḥ and rāzaza, to pierce. The z instead of s is due to the r (PAPS 58, 243°); 'ard (or 'ardāl) hard = 'atr, membrum virile = Eth. rētā, erect, upright, right (cf. ḫūfāλλος and ḫūs = ḫūs). See JHUC 348, 48.

We find also rāṣa'-yāṣa'-jāma'a, orig. to tread; cf. yāḏīs, yāṣa, yāṣa, yāṣa, yāṣa, yāṣa, yāṣa, rāmiha-yāmiha, to be very hot, which may be transposition of yāḥima; cf. yāḥi and yāḥar; rāṣa'a-yāṣa'a (cf. nāqā'a > nāq, 'ājjaq, qā'q < sa'q, Heb. qēqāq or zēqāq) to have a rumbling (borborygms) in the bowels; rāṣa-yāṣa = āṣa; rāṣa-yāṣa (ar-rūmā fī l- ārdā). Cf. also ráinah, wine (ZDMG 69, 565). In some cases the r instead of y may be merely a graphic corruption (ZDMG 61, 194, l. 3). In Tigré and Tigrinya we find l for j (VG 139°) and in Sumerian: n for (r <) 3 (ZA 31, 247; Poebel, Sum. Gr. § 83). It is also possible that in some cases Arab. y = n (NBSS 179) and n = r; cf. GB 476; Heb. ẓānâ' (Prov. 11,2; also 13, 10) = Arab. ḍārdâ (see Mic. 105) and Heb. ḍārdâ' (leprosy) = Arab. naqā'ah, whiteness (JAOS 43, 163, c).

Paul Haury

Johns Hopkins University

Arab. tāhāmāh = ẓānāzāh, Heb. ẓaḥaḥ nā ḥ

Arab. tāhāma, to stink, is not connected with Heb. tēhōm (ZDMG 61, 295, l. 19). Nor can the transposed doublet tāmihā be derived from tm, so that the n in tm > āntana could be explained as being due to partial assimilation of an original m to the l; but tāhīma < lūśima, just as zāhīma, to stink < zāśīma (cf. hāmāda
= xəmda; kira = xirma). The root is $m > xəmma, to stink, and xamija, xamata (‘s-siqd ‘n ida taqlisjarat rihunu). In xənixa the $ instead of $m is due to the $ which represents a partial assimilation of the causative prefix $ to the nasal. The $ is preserved in xənixa and in Eth. naxə, stench (contrast NBSS 187). We have $ also in Arab. istaxatna and in xənixa < xənixa < *saxima. In xəbuza, to be evil-smelling, evil (JAOS 42, 376) the $ appears as $ (cf. kaba $a = kama $a = kaman, abji $a = maja $a, Bakkah = Makkah, Mecca; ZA 2, 268).

Arab. táxima = ittáxama < yáxima, to suffer from indigestion, which means orig. to suffer something which is tainted. In modern Arabic, yám am denotes uncleanliness, dirt, just as góxaxah (= Heb. čañad, stench, Joel 2, 20) signifies dirt. The $ instead of $m is due to the $ (ZDMG 64, 708, 1. 26). Ass. čen $u, evil, cannot be combined with Heb. čañad, because the $ represents an original $ (ZA 19, 254; ZDMG 65, 565, 1.33). In táxina (which Fleischer combined with ləhenn, Dan. 5:2; contrast JBL 35, 323) $ = d = t: táxima became táxina with partial assimilation of the $ to the prefixed t, and t became d under the influence of the nasal as in Eth. dengel, virgin, which is connected with Arab. naj, offspring and Heb. nákd. Also Eth. dəxər, after (SFG 15) < dəxər < dər, hole, anus (Ger. After) > Arab. xari'a (AJSL 23, 256). The $ in Heb. ahor, posterior, is a remnant of the preposition ina (JHUC 341, 47) as it is also in Heb. as, akən, ātməl, āml (JBL 38, 184; JHUC 327, 57; 334, 60; JAOS 42, 374) and Ass. anišala, yesterday (HW 93) = amšula = amšula < ina-mušāti. The original form of ina was imna (= Eg. m) from the root of Arab. ānn, assembly, people, prop. association; āmah, handmaid, prop. associate; āma-ja'īnu, to be unmarried, divorced, widowed, prop. unassociated (JHUC 348, 48).

Arab. dixan means not only stinking, but also uncircumcised. I shall show elsewhere that circumcision of both males and females (tablii égyptien) was originally practised for the purpose of preventing the offensive smell resulting from the accumulation of smegma &c (AJP 42, 165). The $ in Heb. hātan < xatam is infixed (ZDMG 63, 515, 1.11). Heb. hōtam, seal, means orig. cut, incised gem, intaglio (EB 11, 156; 16, 195). The verb xatama, to seal, is denominative.

Paul Haupt

Johns Hopkins University
Wie Šu. Gé.-tum zu lesen ist?


Dass das vielumstrittene Šu. Gé.-tum wirklich esīrūm zu lesen ist, möchte ich durch folgende Gleichung wahrscheinlich machen:


A. David

Budapest
REVIEWS OF BOOKS


This is volume 8 of the series entitled "Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft," established by Brugmann and Sommer, and now edited by Streitberg and Sommer. The book is consciously based, as to method and aim, upon the remarks introductory to the treatment of the semantic groups of nominal stems in Brugmann's Grundriss, II. 1. pp. 594 ff.: the usual distinction between dictionary and grammar, the assignment of the history of the individual word to the former and the classified phenomena to the latter, is unjustified, save for temporary practical purposes, and the proper task of the historical grammar is to include also all lexical treatment of the linguistic material.

Especially is such a procedure indicated in the study of a language like the Albanian, which Gustav Meyer has called the stepchild of the Indo-European family. Meyer estimates that, of the 5140 title-words in his etymological dictionary, 1420 are of Romanic origin, 540 Slavic, 1180 Turkish, 840 modern Greek, 730 uncertain, and only 400 directly Indo-European. The general tendency of Jokl's work is in the direction of ascribing direct Indo-European inheritance to words which were considered loan-words by Miklosich and Meyer. And a number of words are added that were unknown to Jokl's predecessors.

The book consists of original and detailed studies of about 100 Albanian words, chosen chiefly for their cultural significance. Etymology naturally plays the leading rôle, but words are closely linked with things, and no source of illumination is neglected: opinions of other philologists, accounts of classical writers, reports of natives and travelers, discussions of social and other institutions, folk-lore, history, ethnology, geography, distribution of flora and fauna. The main semantic groupings are: custom, law, and popular belief; the house, domestic furniture
and implements; vegetation; live stock, breeding, and feral animals. In addition to the words thus classified and discussed, there is more casual mention of nearly 1000 other Albanian words, most of which are indisputably loan-words.

Jokl is likely to find opposition chiefly in his etymologies. Not all of them are so good as *łemere* 'second wife during the lifetime of the first' from an Indo-European *śm-mṛī* 'cowife'. And one feels sometimes that the author is almost too resourceful and too ingenious in carrying his arguments through to his conclusions. But the principles are sound, and the book marks real progress in a poorly mapped region. The author considers it impossible at present to draw many broad generalizations from the material at hand. And for his views as to the relationship of the Albanian to the other Indo-European languages he refers to his publication under that title (in German).

Princeton University

HAROLD H. BENDER

**Vedic Hymns.** Translated from the Rig Veda with introduction and notes. By EDWARD J. THOMAS. [Wisdom of the East Series.] London: JOHN MURRAY, 1923. 128 pp. 3s. 6d.

In this little book 103 pages are devoted to the translation of 61 hymns which are fairly representative of the 1028 hymns in the RV corpus. Except in two pieces the translation is prose, as the translator believes that in general a metrical version does not reproduce the aesthetic effect of the original. In the 15 pages of introduction Mr. Thomas gives brief statements concerning the four Vedas, the time and place of the composition and collection of the hymns of the RV, and the relation of the Vedic peoples to the original Indo-European group: also, since the hymns chosen are "those which illustrate the religious ideas and theological beliefs of the Indian people from the earliest period at which they can be traced," there is discussion of the origin of religion. In connection with the last topic Mr. Thomas suggests that Mitra, Varuṇa, Indra, and the Nāsatyas were borrowed by the Indo-Iranians from the Mittanni; this is a simple explanation of certain difficulties, but that almost com-
plete phonetic equivalence Varuna-Ou̇pavōs still rings loudly in one’s ears.

The translation may be called conservative and conventional: Vedists would differ from Mr. Thomas probably only in minor matters of interpretation. The reviewer, one of Bloomfield’s pupils, would render vidatha by household in 2.12.15; and manas by mind in 10.129.4; and would differ on other similar points.

There is a sort of stiffness (not awkwardness) in this as in other translations of the RV which seems almost inevitable: it probably gives a suggestion of the archaic manner of the original, but it is somewhat forbidding; yet an attempt to eliminate it will almost surely entice the translator into reprehensible fancifulness. The inadequacy of translation is notably evident in renderings of the RV: one can get over into English almost all of a fable from the Sanskrit, but the peculiar flavor and aroma of a RV hymn does not come over so easily if at all; for this and other reasons a RV hymn translated still needs to be interpreted. Now the Wisdom of the East Series has as its object “by means of the best Oriental literature... to bring together West and East in a spirit of mutual sympathy, goodwill, and understanding.” Surely all Orientalists approve that heartily, and of this volume it may be said that Mr. Thomas has done well one of the very difficult portions of the undertaking; Sanskritists will rejoice if this little book should bring to some, as yet unknowing, even a hint of the fineness of the songs of the ancient Indian seers.

L. C. BARRET

Trinity College, Hartford


This series is designed “to bring the best out of the ancient treasures” of India for the benefit primarily of dwellers in India. Professor Macdonell has selected forty hymns and translated them “in verse corresponding as nearly as is possible in English to the original metres.” The Introduction “supplies a brief sketch
of the form and contents of the *Rigveda*, enabling the reader to understand more fully the early thought of which these hymns are the outcome. There is, moreover, prefixed to each hymn a short account of the deity addressed or the subject dealt with."

The fine accomplishments of Professor Macdonell in Vedic scholarship give assurance that this is a good piece of work; the limitations imposed must always be considered in judging such a book. The imitation of the Vedic metres is an interesting feature. That such a performance in translating Greek or Latin lyrics has almost never been successful may be safely said; but the less rigid fixity of quantities in Vedic metres offers hope of greater success, and the reviewer believes that metrical renderings (not even necessarily in the original metres) do reproduce something of the spirit of the original, that they do help the reader to get a certain appreciation of the regulated form of the somewhat ruggedly naive hymns. These Vedic hymns do not have the elusive easy grace that makes Catullus's hendecasyllabics so charming; they are generally simple in style, sometimes turgid, occasionally elevated, and their poetic qualities seem to be such as can be suggested by metrical renderings, whereas prose translation of them is usually less flexible and less coherent stylistically than the original. Such are some of the reasons for the reviewer's opinion that Professor Macdonell has attained a large measure of success in this little book.

Trinity College, Hartford.


The well-known historian of Egyptian art presents us with a new book about the architecture of Ancient Egypt, done in a way similar to his other excellent books previously published on different parts of Egyptian art. Capart intends to make his books useful also for practical purposes. Therefore he gives, after an introduction, bibliographical notes on all the
pictures on the 200 splendid plates, in chronological order (so that everything is easy to find), from the first dynasty through Graeco-Roman times. On page 48 is a concordance of the 1st and 2d edition. The pictures on the plates are carefully selected and very instructive.

NATHANIEL REICH

University Museum, Philadelphia


These are four very useful essays about Egyptian bees of ancient and modern times. The first article about the Egyptian bee (apis mellifera var. fasciata Latr.) is written by Egon Rotter (pp. 1–8 and plate I). This is followed by an essay of Dr. Lewis Gough (translated from English into German by Egon Rotter [pages 9–18]). The third part by v. Buttel-Reepen deals with the modes and habits of life and with the history of apiculture (pages 19–67, 1 plate and 3 pictures), especially with the importance of bee-lore, systemology, building of the honey-combs, swarms, management, mellification and production of wax, apiculture in Palestine, keeping of bees in Abyssinia, wandering, climate, sicknesses of bees, diligence of the apis fasciata and its malice, their queens, the Carthaginian bee, the egg-laying working bee, the drone, their enemies, the oldest record about bees and individual observations. The last article (pages 68–80), written by Armbruster, contains a study on “apiculture 5000 years ago” based on an ancient Egyptian relief of 2600 B.C. in the Berlin Egyptian Museum, a present of Baron von Bissing from the excavations of the temple of Neuserre in Abusir. An appendix on natural pipes used by bees for dwelling (1 page) by H. Nachtsheim completes this brochure, which is very useful and interesting for the Egyptologist.

NATHANIEL REICH

University Museum, Philadelphia

The appearance of a Thesis on the text of the Syriac Bible is to be welcomed. American scholarship in Syriac is all too rare, while on the other hand the detailed study of the Syriac Bible is required both to "prevent" (in the double sense of the word) the haphazard methods of would-be revisers of the Hebrew text, as also to help lay the foundations for a scientific textual criticism. Dr. Hawley is to be congratulated on a very careful piece of work, which appears in happy coincidence with his preceptor, Professor Bewer's book, Der Text des Buches Ezra. (In both cases, it is to be noted, "Ezra" is the Ezra of the Western Canon and does not include Nehemiah.) The bulk of the present work, pp. 20–69, consists of a full analysis of the peculiar readings of $\aleph$ as against $\aleph$. In the Introduction the writer gives certain summary results. As to the relation of $\aleph$ with $\aleph$ (in which term he appears to sum up all the Greek forms of text) he comes to the interesting positive judgment that "the Peshitta version was not influenced by $\aleph$" (p. 4), as against the view inaugurated by Siegfried, and that it is "the work of a most careful biblical scholar". If this is the case, $\aleph$ becomes of prime importance for the text of the Hebrew, at the age when $\aleph$ was translated (this caution should be observed!), whereas in other books Greek influence and carelessness of translation appear in variant degrees. As to the origin of the translation he simply states that "no interpretations in Ezra indicate the hand of a Christian"; he does not pronounce upon the date. A list of scribal errors is given (pp. 8 ff.), and he notes certain peculiarities of the translator, p. 11. Pp. 12 ff. he presents the relation of $\aleph$ to Ktlb and Krē respectively, but he starts from the false assumption that Kt. and Kr. always existed as we find them now in $\aleph$. If he had pursued this special subject farther, he would have found that the other VSS. similarly read, now the Kr., now the Kr., a fact which points to actual textual variants in many cases. Here is an avenue of exploration, to discover what was the relation of the Heb. exemplar of $\aleph$ to those of the other VSS. and the several Greek revisions. For instance $\tau\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron$ Kt. 2,46 so appears in B $\upsilon$,
Kr. in A. Lu(cian). In 3.3 חָלָה Kr. is supported by יָדָאָה vs. קָרָה = Kr. In 10.44 Lu. alone has קָרָה, the rest theKr. קָרָה. A number of the instances cited are fallacious, e.g. cases where Kr. gives merely a pronunciation which has no bearing on a translation, e.g. 4.11 יָדָאָה, Kr. יָדָאָה; 5.1 יָדָאָה, Kr. יָדָאָה; 7.25 יָדָאָה, Kr. יָדָאָה; etc. His summary of these statistics is accordingly without point. In general the relation of Kr. and Kr. is a very delicate problem. What judgment are we to draw from 4.9 Kr. אֲדֹנָי supported by ב alone and the Kr. אֲדֹנָי supported by all the others? Dr. Hawley finds (pp. 15ff.) 42 cases where, with or without another witness of the VSS. ש"ב preserves the original reading. Of course, such decisions must often depend upon subjective judgment, and we should know critically the order and priority of the VSS. in order to ascertain, first of all, the earliest conditions of the text. Thus the plus in ש"ב and Lu אָבָא הָעָלִיל [תְּדוּמָה] 4.23 is actually vouched for only by these two late authorities, not even by יָדָאָה the latest; is it necessarily original? That ש"ב preserves "the original form of the Persian word" in מֹסָר vs. Heb. מֹסָר does not prove that "Ezra" did not write the latter, any more than that in writing רָמָנָה 2.1 ש"ב ignored the interesting Kr. רָמָנָה (p. 12). In a forthcoming note in this JOURNAL I defend and explain רָמָנָה 7.12, where ש"ב of ש"ב is an (intelligent or ignorant?) paraphrase; we may not easily elide a word found in the oldest Greek. The apparent sing. רְמָנָה 4.10 is rendered "cities" by ש"ב with the collective pl. רְמָנָה. But ש"ב may have understood רְמָנָה as = his own pl. (Is the B. Aram. רְמָנָה identical with the Syriac pl.?) The duty lay beyond the purpose of the present excellent thesis, but a further construction upon its foundation would be to relate ש"ב with the other VSS. and revisions. It may be noted that it is quite insufficient to cite only Greek uncials. They may in any case be merely considered as members of groups, and these groups must be discovered and classified before we can obtain an orderly and chronological view of the several Greek revisions. Thus, to the reviewer's mind, Cod. A is a most depraved text, and can be bettered by many minuscules of its group. The Old Latin must be used in the criticism of B and its group. And so forth.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY

University of Pennsylvania

The rapid spread of Muhammedan civilization in Central Asia belongs to the most fascinating events in the history of the human race. After a series of brilliant military achievements the Khalifate was firmly established in that vast stretch of territory. The Arab historians, like al-Baladhuri, al-Ya'kubi, al-Tabari, and Ibn al-Athir, dwell at great length on the events of the first century of the Muhammedan era. But, as might be expected, their versions conflict in many important details. To add to the perplexity of the modern historian, the non-Arabic writings, particularly the Chinese documents, offer different accounts of these events. Mr. Gibb has undertaken the difficult task of sifting the evidence, and has acquitted himself very creditably. By his minute and searching examination of the various sources he is able to correct the statements of modern scholars. As this subject has engaged the attention of the foremost scholars, like Wellhausen in his Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz, Mr. Gibb does not present a complete account of the Arab conquests in Central Asia. His aim is rather to give a critical study of the authorities. Nevertheless the author has succeeded in drawing a vivid picture of the growth and development of Muslim civilization in Central Asia. He has preserved the continuity of the narrative, despite the fact that he frequently enters into discussion with Wellhausen, Houtsma, Marquart, and others.

Though of small compass for so important a subject, the book teems with valuable information and discussions. It is divided into five chapters: I. The Oxus Basin; II. The Early Raids; III. The Conquests of Qutayba; IV. The Turkish Counterstroke; V. The Reconquest of Transoxania. Of particular interest is the third chapter, where the achievements of Kutaibah are graphically described. Mr. Gibb gives due credit to the directive genius of Hajjaj and to the military ability of Kutaibah, though he is of the opinion that the latter was somewhat overrated by the historians.

It is to be regretted that, in order to keep down the cost of publication, Mr. Gibb has omitted the extensive references which
he originally prepared. The notes which accompany every chapter are meagre and scanty.

B. Halper

Dropsie College


In his introduction, which is presented in both Arabic and French, M. Hobeika discusses the authorship of two works which he attributes to the supposed founder of the Maronite community. One is entitled "The Book of Priesthood", which M. Hobeika published in 1912, and the other is "The Exposition of Syriac Liturgy", of which he gives an Arabic translation. When the former volume appeared, the editor of Al-Mashrik attempted to prove that that work was written by Moses bar Kēfa who died in 913 or 914. M. Hobeika therefore takes the opportunity to rebut that writer and to prove that his ascription is justified. His arguments are, however, not very convincing since nothing is known about St. John Maron and the origin of the Maronite community is still shrouded in obscurity. One argument is particularly specious. In refuting the ascription of the editor of Al-Mashrik, M. Hobeika refers to Wright's Syriac Literature (he wrongly transliterates the name in Arabic as ܣܝܘܪ, and in the Roman letters the name is misprinted VO-RIGHT), where the works of Moses bar Kēfa are enumerated, but no mention is made of "The Book of Priesthood". He, however, overlooks the fact that this very argument may be used with greater cogency against his own position, since Wright entirely ignores John Maron (see Wright, Syriac Literature, p. 223, n. 3).

The Arabic translation of "The Exposition of Syriac Liturgy" reads very smoothly, M. Hobeika evidently being a master of
Arabic style. The book contains fifty chapters which ought to be of great interest to students of the history of Catholic liturgy.

B. HALPER

Dropsie College


The pre-Islamic prince Bišṭām ibn Ḥaiṣ plays an important rôle in the Ayyām al-‘Arab (descriptions of the Arab battles). He has even entered into the domain of proverbs. The Arabs say: Afrasu min Bišṭām (he is a better rider than Bišṭām). This is additional proof of the popularity he enjoyed. And yet little is known of the actual facts of his brief but extremely active life. Even the earliest Arabic historians record very little about his personality. They are, as a rule, more interested in his achievements than in the man. And even the few details recorded about him are full of confusion and contradictions. The list of his ancestors, a point upon which Arab historians are fond of dwelling, is given differently by the different authors. Modern scholars can hardly hope to derive any definite conclusions out of the vast material scattered in numerous books. Some of the earlier poets refer to Bišṭām, but their statements must be taken with the greatest caution, as they are usually hyperbolical in their praise and blame.

Dr. Bräunlich’s monograph is devoted to the task of elucidating, as far as possible, the facts about Bišṭām’s life and activities. There is sufficient evidence to warrant the assumption that Bišṭām was born towards the end of sixth century A. D., or to be more precise, about 590. He died at a very tender age, probably in the year 615. This date may be inferred from the statement found in Al-Mubarrad al-Kāmil that Bišṭām was slain after “the Prophet’s mission”. Although this remark is rather indefinite, Dr. Bräunlich seems to be right in accepting this date, which is warranted by other considerations.

Of special interest is the third section of the monograph giving a description of Bišṭām as the leader of the Banū Bakr b. Wa’il.
The various Arabic historians mention eight battles (Ayyām) in which Biṣṭām figured as hero, and Dr. Bräunlich discusses them at full length. As an appendix to this section Dr. Bräunlich gives a translation of an Arabic description of one of the battles. This is a characteristic specimen.

Dr. Bräunlich has made a distinct contribution to pre-Islamic history of the Arab tribes. He deserves high praise for his industry in accumulating the material which is scattered in the vast Arabic literature, both in prose and poetry. He has treated his subject critically and exhaustively.

B. Halper

Dropsie College
NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

An appeal has been issued to humanistic societies in this country to supply the University of Tokio with sets of their publications, to make good the losses sustained by that university in the recent earthquake. The Executive Committee of our Society has passed the following resolution: "Resolved, that the Acting Librarian of the Society be authorized to send as a contribution to the University of Tokio, for its Library, such of the publications of the Society, including the Journal, as in his judgment can be spared from the stock on hand."

Mr. Andrew Keogh, the Librarian of Yale University, has generously offered to complete the preparation of the catalog of the Society's Library, if the Library is to remain with Yale University; and the Executive Committee has voted that this offer be accepted and that the Editors be instructed to take the publication of the catalog under consideration.

The Executive Committee has voted that a sum not to exceed $500 be appropriated towards the publication of Dr. Frank R. Blake's Tagalog Grammar and that a sum not to exceed $100 be appropriated for special work to be undertaken by the Committee on Enlargement of Membership and Resources.

NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES, ETC.

A Swedish Oriental Society (Svenska Orientalskaps) was founded on March 6, 1921. According to its first Yearbook (Stockholm, 1923) it began to hold meetings in Stockholm, in March 1922 and held eleven meetings, at which one or more scientific communications were presented, between that time and May, 1923. In the Yearbook are printed (besides an account of the organisation of the Society, its constitution, a list of its first meetings, and its list of members) five articles, in whole or in part. The entire contents of the book are in Swedish, except a French translation of the table of contents.

The K. R. Cama Oriental Institute (172, Sukhadvaja Building, Hornby Road, Raveling Street, Fort, Bombay, India) invites competitive essays for the Sarosh K. R. Cama Prize of the value of Rs. 225 on the following subject: "A lucid and thoroughly intelligible translation in English of the 43d, 44th, 45th, and 46th chapters of the Yasma, the four chapters of the Ushavtavat Gatha, in due accordance with grammar and philology, with notes and comments, whereon necessary; and with the substance of the whole at the end." The essay should be designated by a motto and should be accompanied by a sealed cover containing the name of the competitor and his post office address, and should reach the Honorary Secretaries of the Institute on or before the 5th of July, 1924. The competition is open to all.

The (British) Society for Old Testament Study held a very successful Winter Meeting on January 1-3, 1924, with forty members present out of about one hundred. Its Secretary is the Rev. T. H. Robinson, M.A., D.D., Lynwood, Llanishen, Cardiff, Wales.
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Professor B. L. Gildersleeve of Johns Hopkins University died on January 9, 1924. He was the most distinguished classical scholar of this country, and the senior member of our Society.
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