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ALCHEMY, on the rare occasions when it has been made the subject of reasonable inquiry, has usually been studied as part of what one may call the pre-history of science. But if, to use a favourite phrase, we are to see in alchemy merely "the cradle of chemistry", are we not likely, whatever its initial charm, to lose patience with an infancy protracted through some fifteen centuries?

It is certain in any case that another aspect of alchemy—its interest as a branch of cultural history—has hitherto been strangely neglected. Mr. Walter Scott, for example, omits alchemistic writings from his great edition of the Hermetica on the odd ground that they are merely "masses of rubbish". But if texts are to be dismissed as rubbish because they contain beliefs that we cannot share, I see no reason why the religious and philosophical parts of the Hermetica (and with them many books which to-day enjoy a far wider popularity) should continue to claim attention. It is a curious fact that if alchemists had been cannibals, instead of civilized town-dwellers, no one at the present day would venture to question the interest and importance of studying their doctrines. For it seems to have been decided that the true anthropology, the "proper study of mankind," is uncivilized man. The reason for this is clear, and in general
adequate. So soon as we reach in the history of the human mind a point where it begins to establish contact with our own ways of thought, objectivity must to some extent begin to recede. For example, no writer has succeeded in viewing minds even so remote from us as those of the early Christian Fathers with the scientific detachment of an anthropologist discussing, say, the religious beliefs of a Melanesian. Fortunately, the Chinese occupy, in this respect, a rather unusual position. Owing to their remotesness and the absence of traditions common with our own, we can follow their mental history with some degree of detachment to a point far beyond what would be possible in Europe. We can apply the methods of anthropology to civilized man, and so at least in one portion of mankind view in continuity processes that in the West are disjointed by our own irony or sympathy. Moreover, in China the continuity is actually far greater than in our own world. The great Aryan invasions that in Europe, the Near East, and India, set a barrier between history and pre-history did not affect China at any rate in such a way as markedly to dissociate her from her past.  

More than any other creators of culture, the Chinese remained in contact with Neolithic mentality, and it is possible in China to see in their proper setting and consequently to understand ideas and customs that elsewhere appear arbitrary and disconnected.

Such, as I shall show,  seems to me to be the case with alchemy.

The subject, particularly at its outset, is a very complicated one, and I have therefore thought it better to present these notes in a rather schematic form. Here is the first text:

1. Han Shu xxv, 12 recto, line 8.

[The wizard Li] Shao-chün said to the Emperor [Wu Ti of Han]: "Sacrifice to the stove [竈 tsao] and you will be able to summon 'things' [i.e. spirits]. Summon spirits and you will be able to change cinnabar powder into yellow gold. With this yellow gold you may make vessels to eat and drink out of. You will then increase your span of life. Having increased your span of life, you will be able to see the hsien 仙 of P'eng-lai that is in the midst of the sea. Then you may perform the sacrifices fēng and shan, and escape death."

1 That the Aryans reached the western fringe of China is, of course, established. Whether they penetrated into the interior and whether any of China's early enemies were Aryans is still uncertain.

2 See particularly p. 18.
Comment

(a) Date of the Passage

This passage also occurs in the History of Ssu-ma Ch’ien (Treatise on the Sacrifices Fêng and Shan, Bk. xxviii, Chavannes, vol. iii, pt. ii, p. 465). But this treatise of Ssu-ma Ch’ien is almost certainly a late addition to the text. We know that even by the first century A.D. many of the original chapters had been lost. What now poses as the Treatise on Fêng and Shan, though it contains some information on this subject, is in reality an account of religion in general. Almost the whole of the treatise occurs practically verbatim in the account of Worship and Sacrifice, 交 祀 志, which forms chap. xxv of the Han Shu. The bulk of the treatise is irrelevant to Ssu-ma Ch’ien’s purpose, but perfectly appropriate to an account of Worship and Sacrifice.

It is safer, therefore, to regard this passage, the earliest reference to alchemy in any literature, as belonging to the first century A.D. rather than the first century B.C.

(b) Literary Form of the Passage

The passage is one of those rhetorical catenae of which early Chinese writers are so fond. They have been discussed by Masson-Oursel and Maspero. Their intention is dramatic rather than logical. Such logical connections as exist are implied rather than expressed. The most difficult step to follow is the statement: “Having increased your span of life, you will be able to see... hsien.” It implies, perhaps, a theory that hsien (Immortals) are only visible to those whose span of life at any rate makes some approach to their own. The whole process leads up to the performance of the sacrifices Fêng and Shan, through which the Emperor will obtain immortality. Alchemy, then, is here regarded as the third in a series of performances, which lead ultimately to an Emperor becoming immortal. Viewed in this light alchemy does not concern people in general, but only the Emperor. It would, however, be pedantic to interpret logically a passage that is essentially rhetorical.

1 The Ssu-ma Ch’ien passage is identical with the Han Shu from f. 3 verso to f. 32 recto of chap. xxviii.

2 Leaving aside the texts published by R. Campbell Thompson in his The Chemistry of the Ancient Assyrians, Luzac, 1925. These do not deal with the manufacture of gold nor of an elixir of life.
(c) Character of the Passage in its Bearing on Alchemy

Those familiar with the literature of Chinese alchemy will admit that this passage is curiously isolated. The idea that drinking from vessels of alchemic gold is a way of increasing longevity is, however, not unknown to the later literature. *Pao P'u Tzu* (iv, 17 recto, l. 2) says: "If with this alchemical gold you make dishes and bowls, and eat and drink out of them, you shall live long." It was indeed accepted that artificial gold 勝於自然者 was superior to the natural. But the "increase in longevity" is in all later literature regarded as an end in itself, attainable by ordinary people, and not merely as a means by which the Emperor might become immortal.

2. The Story of Ch'êng Wei, from Huan T'an's *Hsin Lun* ²

There was once a courtier of the Han dynasty, named Ch'êng Wei 程偉, who was fond of the Yellow and White Art. His wife was the daughter of a magician. He was often obliged to follow the Emperor's chariot, but had no seasonable clothing. This very much vexed him. His wife said: "I will ask [the spirits] to send two strips of strong silk." Whereupon the strong silk appeared in front of him with no apparent reason. Ch'êng Wei tried to make gold 金 according to the directions of the 枕中鸞寶 "Vast treasure in the Pillow." He was unsuccessful, and his wife, going to look at him, found him just fanning the ashes in order to heat the retort. In the retort was some quicksilver. She said: "Just let me see what I can do," and from her pocket produced a drug, a small quantity of which she threw into the retort. A very short while afterwards she took the retort out (of the furnace), and there was solid silver all complete! [The husband then pesters her to teach him the secret, but she refuses to do so and finally, worried into madness, she rushes into the street, smears herself with mud, and shortly afterwards expires.]

¹ *Pao P'u Tzu*, xvi, 6 recto, l. 1. For *Pao P'u Tzu* (the pseudonym of Ko Hung), fourth century a.d., see below, p. 9. The name is often wrongly written "Pao P'o Tzu". The character 朴 is, however, only pronounced P'o when it means a nettle-tree.

² Save for a series of quotations in the Ch'ên Shu Yao Chih, the book is lost. The story is quoted by *Pao P'u Tzu* (xvi, 3 verso, l. 1), who merely introduces it with the words 桓君山言 "Huan Chûn-shan (i.e. Huan T'an 譚) says". But on the next page a similar anecdote is specifically quoted as being from Huan T'an's *Hsin Ch'ên* 新詮, which is evidently the same as the *Hsin Lun* 新論.
Comment on the Story of Ch'êng Wei

Huan T'an, from whose book this story is quoted, died c. A.D. 25, aged about 70. Of Ch'êng Wei himself nothing further is known; but there seems to be no reason to doubt that such a person lived in the first century B.C. or earlier, and was addicted to alchemic experiments. Thus we may assume that alchemy existed under the Han dynasty ¹; but the literature of the period is surprisingly silent on the subject. Wang Ch'ung in his Lun Hêng ² denounces a vast number of other Taoist credulities. It is hard to believe that if alchemy had been at all prominent he would not have singled it out for attack.

Other Han literature (Huai Nan Tzu, for example) is equally silent. ³ But I emphasize the silence of Wang Ch'ung because it was against just such practices that his book was directed.

There seems no reason to doubt (as we shall see presently) that in the second and third centuries alchemy was already under full way. But the biographies of famous magicians and recluse who lived at this period say nothing about it. For example, in the official biographies of Hsi K'ang, 業康 (A.D. 223–62, Chin Shu xlix, 8; San Kuo Chih xxi, 4), there is no mention of alchemy, nor does Hsi K'ang refer to it in his surviving works. Yet it is as an alchemist that he figures in popular tradition.

3. The Ts'ian T'ung Ch'i 参同契

(a) Nature of the Work

This, the most popular of all alchemic books, consists of ninety paragraphs (the division, like that of Lao Tzu's Tao Tê Ching, was made for convenience by a late editor) partly in prose, partly in verse of five, or more often four, words to the line. It is, essentially, an application of the cosmic doctrines of the I Ching 易經 to the principles of alchemy. But the alchemical processes are alluded to in veiled language, and a person unfamiliar with alchemic literature might easily suppose that the book dealt with the theories of the I Ching.

¹ In pre-Han literature there are no references to alchemy.
² Middle of the first century A.D. Translated by Forke.
³ In his surviving works; but possibly he said something about the subject in his lost Chung Pien which dealt with 神仙 (i.e. Taoist divinities and adepts) and 黃白 (gold and silver; i.e. the art of making gold and silver).
(b) The Title

Ts'an T'ung Ch'i means something like "Union of Compared Correspondences". Concerning what these correspondences are, there exist several theories: (a) A series of correspondences between the principles of the I Ching and those of alchemy; (b) A series of correspondences between the processes by which the world came into existence, and the process by which the Elixir comes into existence; (c) Ts'an means strictly "a comparison of three things". These three things, according to a work\(^1\) of c. A.D. 1,000, are lead, mercury, and sulphur, all of which can be reduced to the same prime substance and are therefore essentially identical.

(c) The Author

The book is attributed to a certain Wei Po-yang 魏白陽 or "Po-yang of Wei". This is clearly a pseudonym.

Po-yang is the "style" of Lao Tzu, and it is clear that there has been some confusion between the legend of Lao Tzu and that of Wei Po-yang. Pao P'u Tzu (iii, 6 recto, l. 9) says: 得道之高 莫過伯陽. 有子名宗, 仕魏為將軍 "No one ever got higher tao than Po-yang. He had a son named Tsung, who served the Wei State and became a general."

It is clear that Pao P'u Tzu is not here talking of Lao Tzu (whom he calls Lao, Lao Tzu, Lao Chün, etc.), but of someone less well known. But Lao Tzu had, according to Ssu-ma Ch'ien, "a son named Tsung." Moreover, Pao P'u Tzu elsewhere (viii, f. 1 verso, l. 4) mentions Po-yang as a "keeper of archives". Here again, although there is obvious confusion with Lao Tzu, who was also an archivist, I do not think that Pao P'u Tzu is speaking of Lao Tzu himself.

The author of the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i, however, is generally considered to have flourished c. A.D. 120-50. If we accept this, we must suppose that he took as his pseudonym the name of an ancient sage, a sort of counterpart of Lao Tzu, called Po-yang of the Wei State, in contradistinction to Lao Tzu, who was Po-yang of the Chou State. A confusion between Po-yang, the ancient sage and Po-yang, author of the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i seems to me also to exist in Ko Hung's Shên Hsien Chuan,\(^2\) which gives the longest extant account of Po-yang.

---

\(^1\) The Yün Chi Chi'K'ien 雲笈七籤, chap. 690. This series of Taoist text is No. 1020 in Wiegert's index to the Taoist Canon.

\(^2\) This book is several times quoted in Pei Sung-chih's 裴松之 commentary on the San Kuo Chih (preface dated 429 A.D.). The quotations correspond with the book as it now exists. With regard to its authorship, see below.
It is clear from the position in which Ko Hung places Wei Po-yang that he regards him as an "ancient sage", not as a personage of the Latter Han dynasty; for he puts him in an initial chapter, the other subjects of which are Kuang-ch'êng Tzu (wholly mythical; contemporary with the Yellow Emperor), Lao Tzu and P'êng Tsu the Chinese Methuselah, who "at the end of the Yin dynasty was already 767 years old". Wei Po-yang, says the Shen Hsien Chuan, was a man of Wu; and after a long anecdote which will be found in Giles's Biographical Dictionary and does not here concern us, there follows this information: "Po-yang made the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i and the Wu-hsing hsiang-lei ("That the Five Elements have an [underlying] similarity")\(^1\) in three chapters. Verbally they concern the Book of Changes, but in point of fact they use the symbols of the Book of Changes as a cover for the discussion of alchemy, 作丹. But ordinary Confucians, knowing nothing of alchemy, have commented on the book as though it were a treatise on Yin and Yang (the male and female principle), and in this way completely misunderstood it."

Despite the fact that Ko Hung (reputed author of the Shen Hsien Chuan) certainly regards Wei Po-yang as a sage of remote and shadowy times, he gives a very true and sensible description of the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i which was (according to the usual hypothesis) in reality written by the second century author who used Wei Po-yang as his pseudonym.

One of the "ordinary Confucians" who, not understanding alchemy, mistook the work for a discussion of the Book of Changes, seemed to have been Yü Fan, 處翻 (A.D. 164–233); for in the Ching Tien Shih Wén\(^2\) ("Textual Criticism of the Classics") by Lu Tê-ming, in the section on the Book of Changes with which the work begins, we find: 處翻注參同契云易字從日下月 "Yü Fan in his commentary on the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i says, 'The character I (Changes) is composed of Sun above Moon.'"\(^3\)

The book is therefore referred to by Yü Fan about A.D. 230, and by Ko Hung c. A.D. 320. Henceforward it is mentioned fairly frequently. For example, in the poems of Chiang Yen\(^4\) (end of the fifth century):--

\(^1\) This is an alternative name for chap. iii of the book.
\(^2\) About A.D. 600. I owe this reference to Dr. Hu Shih.
\(^3\) This passage is capable of various interpretations. No commentary by Yü Fan on the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i survives. We might punctuate "Yü Fan [says] the commentary on the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i says ..." But for our purposes the result remains the same: the existence of the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i is already referred to early in the third century.

\(^4\) 江文通集 chap. iii of 5 verso. 蘇 pute Ts'ung K'an edition.
TEXT

方 謂 參 同 契
金 竅 熔 神 丹

"He proved the truth of the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i;
In a golden furnace he melted the Holy Drug."

In the next (the sixth) century, there is a curious hiatus. The book is not mentioned in the bibliography (chap. xxxiv) of the History of the Sui Dynasty. Possibly the author meant to put it in as a treatise on the Five Elements, but realized that this was a mistake, without however, remembering to repair his error by entering it among Taoist books. It duly appears, however, in the bibliography of the old T'ang History as—

周 易 參 同 契 Chapter 2.
周 易 五 相 類 Chapter 1.

"The Ts'an T'ung Ch'i of the Chou dynasty Book of Changes";
"The Five Elements Resembling one Another of the Chou dynasty Book of Changes."

As the heading of the titles implies, the work is here accepted as a study of the Book of Changes, and it is catalogued as a treatise on the Five Elements. Finally, in the tenth century it was divided into ninety sections or paragraphs and commented upon by P'êng Hsiao 彭曉.¹

(d) The Style of the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i

Attempts are sometimes made to date texts of this kind by the rhyme-system used in verse portions. This is dangerous. We know, for example, that in the T'ang dynasty at least three rhyme systems were used concurrently: (1) an intentionally archaic one with an approximation to the rhymes of the Book of Odes; used in eulogies, etc., written in four-syllable verse; (2) the rhymes of "Old Poetry" 古 詩, songs, etc.; (3) the strict rhyme-system of the T'ang dynasty. The opinion of the great Chu Hsi (1130-1200) upon the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i has often been quoted: 參同契文章極好，蓋後漢之能文者房之，其用字皆根據古書，非今人所能解。²

"The Ts'an T'ung Ch'i is from the literary point of view very well written and would actually seem to be by some capable writer of the

¹ Taoist Canon, Wieger No. 993.
² Chu Tzu Yü Lei, Bk. 125.
Latter Han period. It contains frequent allusions to ancient books, and these make it hard for a modern reader to understand."

It is very difficult to know how much value should be attached to this judgment. Chu Hsi was not primarily a literary critic or historian of style. Again, Liu Chên-wêng 劉辰翁,¹ more of a specialist in these matters, says: 古書惟參同契似先秦文 "Of old books only the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i has a style resembling that of pre-Ch'în works." It is not clear whether Liu actually means to imply that the book is a Chou Dynasty work, or merely that it is a successful imitation of Chou style. Against these two views may be set that of the Catalogue of Ch'ien Lung's Four Libraries, which for very inadequate reasons places the book at the end of T'ang.

At the present point in our inquiry there seems no reason to doubt that the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i we now possess was written under the pseudonym Wei Po-yang, in the second century A.D.

But certain difficulties arise when we discuss the next great figure in the history of Chinese alchemy:—

4. Pao P'uo Tzu

(a) This is the pseudonym of Ko Hung (c. A.D. 260-340), and it is by this name that his principal book is known. It is divided into two parts. The "exoteric", which deals with Confucian topics, does not here concern us. The esoteric contains, besides scattered references to alchemy, a whole book (chap. iv) devoted to the Philosopher's Stone 金 丹, and another book (part of chap. xvi) dealing with the manufacture of gold and silver. But before discussing the contents of Ko Hung's book we must deal with its bearing on the problem of the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i.

(b) Pao P'uo Tzu and the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i

In Pao P'uo Tzu the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i is never mentioned. This is a singular fact. As we have seen, Ko Hung knows Wei Po-yang, the supposed author of the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i, as an "ancient sage". In the list of Taoist works at the end of Pao P'uo Tzu (recording over eighty volumes; the earliest bibliography of this kind) Ko Hung (xix, 4 verso) mentions a Nei Ching 內 經, "Inner Book" of Wei Po-yang; but not the Ts'an T'ung Ch'i. Nor is the latter ever mentioned throughout the book.

¹ End of thirteenth century, quoted in Taoist Canon, Wieger, No. 990, preface.
This brings us back to the Shên Hsien Chuan,¹ which work purports to be by the same author as Pao P'ū Tzu. In the preface to the Shên Hsien Chuan Ko Hung says that he wrote it after composing the esoteric chapters 内篇 of Pao P'ū Tzu. At the end of the exoteric chapters (l. f. 10 verso, l. 9) is an autobiography, the fullest document of this kind that early China produced. Here Ko Hung mentions as one of his works a Shên Hsien Chuan in ten chapters. It has been pointed out as an inconsistency that in the preface to the Shên Hsien Chuan Ko Hung should say that he wrote it later than Pao P'ū Tzu; while in Pao P'ū Tzu the Shên Hsien Chuan is already mentioned. A simple solution would be to suppose that Ko Hung wrote first the esoteric chapters, then the Shên Hsien Chuan and then the exoteric chapters.

If we accept that Ko Hung is actually author of both works, we shall have to assume that at the time he wrote the Esoteric chapters he was unacquainted with the Ts'æn T'ung Ch'î; whereas when he wrote the Shên Hsien Chuan he had at last become familiar with it.

But did Ko Hung really write the Shên Hsien Chuan? If we confront similar passages from it and from the undoubtedly authentic Pao P'ū Tzu it becomes hard to believe that both are by the same hand. Take the story of Chi'eng Wei, quoted above.² Not only is the style strangely different, but the Shên Hsien Chuan version is so meagre and so incompetently told that one doubts whether the author of it is even trying to pass himself off as Ko Hung.

It seems indeed likely that the Shên Hsien Chuan, though a work of the fourth century, was merely an anonymous series of Taoist biographies, which some mistaken person labelled as Ko Hung's Shên Hsien Chuan and divided into ten chapters.

But Ko Hung's ignorance of the Ts'æn T'ung Ch'î still remains inexplicable.

It would, of course, be an anachronism to expect in an ancient Chinese author the same bibliographical completeness that we demand in a modern scholar. But that a writer so encyclopaedic should ignore a work of such importance, dealing with a subject in which he was an hereditary specialist,³ is difficult to believe. It becomes necessary,

¹ Biographies of Taoist divinities and adepts.
³ For the line of succession by which Ko Hung claimed to inherit his alchemistic knowledge, see below, p. 12.
therefore, to consider whether it is certain that Yü Fan, writing in the third century, really refers to the *Ts'an T'ung Ch'i* as we know the book to-day. Is it not possible that the work was originally an exposition of the *Book of Changes* and that some time after *Pao P'u Tsu* and before the *Shên Hsien Chuan* (say, in the latter part of the fourth century) someone doctored the text so as to make it serve as a work on alchemy? The actual number of insertions necessary for this purpose would have been very small. The first third of the work is purely cosmological. References to the firing of metal in a furnace are not necessarily concerned with alchemy; the principle that "fire conquers metal" belongs to the speculations of the cosmologists (五行家), as does the identification of the five metals with the five planets. The only one of the 90 sections which is clearly and indubitably concerned with the Elixir is the thirty-second:

If even the herb *chü-shêng* 巨勝 can make one live longer,
Why not try putting the Elixir 遺丹 into the mouth?
Gold (金) by nature does not rot or decay;
Therefore it is of all things most precious.
When the artist 術士 (i.e. alchemist) includes it in his diet
The duration of his life becomes everlasting . . .
When the golden powder enters the five entrails,
A fog is dispelled, like rain-clouds scattered by wind.
Fragrant exhalations pervade the four limbs;
The countenance beams with well-being and joy.
Hairs that were white all turn to black;
Teeth that had fallen grow in their former place.
The old dotard is again a lusty youth;
The decrepit crone is again a young girl.
He whose form is changed and has escaped the perils of life,
Has for his title the name of True ³ Man.

Apart from this paragraph, the number of passages that are incapable of interpretation except as disquisitions on alchemy is very small.

1 The *huan tan* or "returned cinnabar" is the cinnabar that by the process of alchemy has been "returned" or restored to its first nature.
2 I omit a couplet which does not occur in all versions of the text, and seems irrelevant.
3 "True," of course, in the sense of purified, freed from dross. Metals subjected to the purifying processes of alchemy also become "true".
(c) Ko Hung's Line of Transmission

Ko Hung claims to have received the secrets of alchemy from a certain Chêng Yin (鄭隱). Chêng Yin learnt from Ko Hsüan (玄), Ko Hung’s great-uncle. Finally, Ko Hsüan learnt from Tso Tz'u (左慈), about A.D. 220. It is at this point that, mundanely speaking, the line of transmission begins. For Tso Tz'u received his initiation, in the early years of the third century, from a “deity” (神人). To Ko Hung’s great-uncle Tso Tz'u passed on three books: The Alchemy Book of the Great Clear One (太清丹經), The Alchemy Book of the Nine Tripods, and The Gold Juice (金液丹經).

(d) The distinction between Chin Tan (金丹) and 黃白 Huang Po

The fourth book of the esoteric chapters of Pao P’u Tzu treats of two forms of elixir, the “Golden Cinnabar” or Philosopher’s Stone, and the Gold Juice. The first method involves a variety of ingredients which may be procurable in times of peace; but when war interrupts communications, this method becomes impossible (iv, 17 verso, l. 2). The Gold Juice method is much simpler; but it is very expensive. Ko Hung reckons that it costs 50,000 cash to make an Immortal in this manner.

From these two practices Ko Hung sharply distinguishes the art of Huang Po (yellow and white); i.e. the art of transmuting the baser metals into gold and silver, without any ulterior notion of attaining to better health, longevity, immortality or the like. The two branches of alchemy, though apparently so rigidly divided by Ko Hung, do not appear to belong to a different line of transmission. For he tells us that his teacher Chêng Yin practised Huang Po with Tso Tz'u, and that they never had a single case of failure. By this method not only lead but also iron was changed into silver.

All these practices (the exact nature of which, as in all literature of this kind, is most inadequately revealed) were, of course, accompanied by preliminary fasting, sacrifice, driving away of the profane, etc.

“Even a doctor,” says Ko Hung in an interesting passage, when he is compounding a drug or ointment, will avoid being seen by fowls, dogs, children, or women . . . lest his remedies should lose their

---

1 Biography in Hou Han Shu, chap. 112. No mention of alchemy.
2 This expression exactly corresponds to the χρυσοζάμον of Zosimus.
3 iv, 19 recto, l. 3.
efficacy. Or again, a dyer of stuffs is in dread of evil eyes; for he knows that they may ruin his pleasant colours."

(c) Pao P’u Tzu’s attitude towards Alchemy

Nowhere in Pao P’u Tzu’s book do we find the hierophantic tone that pervades most writings on alchemy both in the East and in the West. He uses a certain number of secret terms, such as 金公 “metal-lord” and 河車 “river chariot”, both of which mean lead; and 河上姹女 “the virgin on the river”, which means mercury; 朱兒 “the red boy”, which presumably means cinnabar; and finally 金人 “the golden (?metal) man”, of uncertain meaning. But his attitude is always that of a solidly educated layman examining claims which a narrow-minded orthodoxy had dismissed with contempt. He condemns those who are unwilling to take seriously either “books that do not proceed from the school of the Duke of Chou or facts that Confucius has not tested”. Sometimes, indeed, he is entirely credulous, as when he accepts (iv, f. 2 recto, l, 4) the story that Tso Tz'u received the text of the alchemic work 金丹仙經 from the hands of a divinity 神人. But on the preceding page he is pointing out, quite in the manner of twentieth century sinology, that the Tao Chi Ching道機經 attributed by the Taoists to Yin Hsi (seventh century B.C.) was in reality by Wang Tu, an obscure writer of the third century A.D.

A belief in the possibility of manufacturing gold was, given the circumstances of the time, perfectly sane and reasonable. In many instances products of the West that on their arrival in China were at first mistaken for natural substances, had recently turned out to be manufactured. Thus glass, at first supposed to be a kind of crystal, was now actually being made in Southern China: 外國作水精椀實是合五種灰以作之. 今交廣多有得其法. "The ‘crystal’ bowls from abroad are really made by compounding five sorts of ashes; and to-day this method is being commonly practised in Chiao and Kuang" (i.e. parts of the modern provinces of Kuangtung, Kuanghsi and the neighbouring portion of Annam). Again, seeing the white “foreign powder” 胡粉 used as a cosmetic, the Chinese were at first unaware that it was made from lead. But to ignorant people, says Pao P’u Tzu, the mere fact that gold exists in nature, irrationally suggests that it cannot be artificially compounded.

1 Cf. the χρυσάρηματος of the Greek alchemists.
5. Alchemy from the fifth to the tenth century.

T'ao Hung-ching (Giles, *Biographical Dictionary*, No. 1896) who was born in 451 or 452 and died in 536, was a prolific writer on Taoist subjects, and was in later times regarded as an important alchemist. But in his existing writings there are only fleeting allusions to alchemy. There is, however, in one of his books (the *Têng Chên Yin Chüeh*, Wiegner, No. 418) an interesting reference to foreign astrology: 此 外 法 皆 如 何 种 外 國 訝 意 “These exoteric methods [speaking of certain loose methods of determining a man’s destiny by the date of his birth] are all much the same as the astronomical notions of the Hsiung-nu (Huns) and other foreign countries”. Alchemy in China as elsewhere is closely bound up with astrology, and if the Chinese were in the fifth century in contact with foreign astrology they were, it may be assumed, in a position to be influenced by foreign alchemy.

For the centuries that follow (sixth to ninth, the period covered by the Sui and T'ang dynasties) we have plenty of anecdotes, but an almost complete lack of datable literature. It is, strangely enough, in Buddhist literature (*Takakusu Tripiṭaka*, vol. xlvi, p. 791, col. 3, Nanjio, 1576) that we find our most definite landmark. Hui-ssū (517–77) second patriarch of the T'ien-t'ai Sect, prays that he may succeed in making an elixir that will keep him alive till the coming of Maitreya. He will thus escape the stigma of having lived only in a Buddha-less “between-time”.

The wizard Ssu-ma Chêng-chên, who died at an advanced age c. 720, had a great reputation as an alchemist; but his surviving works deal with other subjects. One of the few works on alchemy which may with certainty be accepted as T'ang is the *Shih Yao Ērh Ya* (Wiegner, No. 894), a dictionary of alchemical terms, by a certain Mei Piao. Internal evidence, such as the mention of Ssu-ma Chêng-chên, shows that the book is at least as late as the eighth century. I should feel rather inclined from the general tone and style, to place it in the ninth. Several obviously foreign terms are given. Thus for 雄 黃 (arsenic sulphide) an alternative name is 迸 利 迦. There is also a reference to an alchemical treatise called 胡 王 治 葛 論 “Treatise of the Hu (Central Asian) King Yakat (Yakaθ or the like) ”.2

1 ख्रेि लि-का = Sanskrit, *Hirika “The Yellow One”.*
2 治 葛 or 野 葛, also called 胡 蔓 草 “the foreign creeper”, is a poisonous plant, identified with *gelsemium elegans*. The sound of the Hu king’s name evidently recalled to the Chinese the sound of this plant-name.
The Problem of Lü Yen (Lü Tung-pin) and his Teacher Chung-li Ch’uan

The second of these two is purely mythical. Lü Tung-pin (as he is usually called) tends to materialize in the ninth century. But of the numerous works attributed to him some are admittedly “spirit-communications”, conveyed to the world by planchette long after his death; others (such as the numerous tractates included in the Taoist Canon) are obviously works of a much later date. It might have been hoped that the Tun-huang finds would have furnished us with datable texts; but so far as I know there are no alchemistic works either in the Stein or in the Pelliot Collection.

It is in the tenth century that we are again on firm ground and from then onwards we can follow the history of Chinese alchemy continuously. Our great landmark is P’êng Hsiao’s commentary on the Ts’ian T’ung Ch’i (Wieger, No. 993). P’êng Hsiao 彭曉 lived during the close of the ninth and the first half of the tenth century. In his works we again meet with the distinction (already made by Hui-ssû) between exoteric alchemy, which uses as its ingredients the tangible substances mercury, lead, cinnabar, and so on, and esoteric alchemy 内丹, which uses only the “souls” of these substances. These “souls”, called the “true” or “purified” mercury, etc., are in the same relation to common metals as is the Taoist Illuminate or 真人 to ordinary people. Presently a fresh step is made. These transcendental metals are identified with various parts of the human body, and alchemy comes to mean in China not an experimentation with chemicals, blow-pipes, furnace, etc. (though these, of course, survived in the popular alchemy of itinerant quacks), but a system of mental and physical re-education, This process is complete in the Treatise on the Dragon and Tiger (Lead and Mercury) of Su Tung-p’o, written c. 1100: “The Dragon is mercury. He is the semen and the blood. He issues from the kidneys and is stored in the liver. His sign is the trigram k’an 火. The tiger is lead. He is bread and bodily strength. He issues from the mind 心 and the lungs bear him. His sign is the trigram li 木. When the mind is moved, then the breath and strength act with it. When the kidneys are flushed then semen and blood flow with them.”

1 Besides Wieger’s No. 993, see also Wieger, No. 1020, vol. 691, a treatise by P’êng entitled 内丹诀法 “Method of Esoteric Alchemy”.
2 T’u Shu encyclopedia, xviii, 300.
In the thirteenth century alchemy (if it may still so be called) no less than Confucianism is permeated by the teachings of the Buddhist Meditation. The chief exponent of this Buddhized Taoism is Ko Ch'ang-kêng 葛長庚, also known as Po Yü-chuan. In his treatise 修仙辨惑論 he describes three methods of esoteric alchemy: (1) the body supplies the element lead; the heart, the element mercury. Concentration supplies the necessary liquid; the sparks of intelligence, the necessary fire. “By this means a gestation usually demanding ten months may be brought to ripeness in the twinkling of an eye.”

The comparison of alchemy to a process of gestation is, of course, common to East and West. The Chinese say that the processes which produce a human child would, if reversed, produce the Philosopher’s Stone.

(2) The second method is: The breath supplies the element lead; the soul 神 supplies the element mercury. The cyclic sign 午 “horse” supplies fire; the cyclic sign 子 “rat” supplies water.

(3) The semen supplies the element lead. The blood supplies mercury; the kidneys supply water; the mind supplies fire.

“To the above it may be objected,” continues Ko Ch'ang-kêng, “that this is practically the same as the method of the Zen Buddhists. To this I reply that under Heaven there are no two Ways, and that the Wise are ever of the same heart.”

There were indeed excellent reasons why Zen Buddhism should have invaded Ko Ch'ang-kêng’s doctrines. His teacher, Ch'èn Ni-wan 陳泥丸, was a pupil of Hsieh Fu-ming 謝復命, who under the name Tao-kuang 道光 had formerly been a Zen monk.

The Hsi yu chi 西遊記 (Wieber, No. 1410) describes the journey of Ch'ang-ch’un, a Taoist of this same transcendental school, to Samarkand and even to a point near Kabul. The journey was made in obedience to the summons of Chingiz Khan, who had at that time conquered only part of northern China. This record is from the hand of Ch’ang-ch’un’s disciple, Li Chih-ch’ang, who was also one of the party. The following conversation between Chingiz and the great alchemist, which took place in the summer of 1222,
is the passage which chiefly concerns us: Chingiz: Have you any elixir of immortality to bestow upon us? The Master: "I have a means of protecting life, but no elixir of immortality."

The Khan, we are told, "was pleased with his frankness."

The interest of this purely mystical phase of Chinese alchemy is that whereas in reading the works of Western alchemists one constantly suspects that the quest with which they are concerned is a purely spiritual one—that they are using the romantic phraseology of alchemy merely to poetize religious experience—in China there is no disguise. Alchemy becomes there openly and avowedly what it almost seems to be in the works of Böhme or Thomas Vaughan.

6. The antiquity of Alchemy in China.

It has been seen that literary references do not carry the history of alchemy in China beyond the first century B.C. This does not, of course, necessarily imply that it was unknown before that date. As a result of the Burning of the Books and of Confucian hostility to rival doctrines we possess only a small fragment of early Chinese literature. But if we are to take the term alchemy in its narrower sense—the attempt to compound gold out of baser substances—then it is certain that no such attempt was at all probable in early China, where gold was not until a comparatively late period regarded as particularly valuable either as a life-giving substance or as a medium of exchange.

Even in the first four centuries after Christ alchemy continues to occupy a very obscure place. This has been explained on the ground that the surviving histories of the period were written under influences that were hostile to Taoism. There is, indeed, a tendency to generalize from the example of later histories (such as the New T'ang History which is frankly anti-Buddhist and anti-Taoist), and to regard the Han histories, the histories of the Three Kingdoms, etc., as rigidly orthodox Confucian works. But these works are, in reality, far from ignoring Taoism and its magicians; and there is no reason to suppose there was any special prejudice against alchemy as opposed to magical practices in general.

1 衛生之道, i.e. means of warding off evil influences.
2 The doctrines of Ch'ang-ch'un and his sect will be discussed in the introduction to a translation of the *Hsi Yu Chi* shortly to be published in the Broadway Travellers Series; for the moment, therefore, I say no more about him.
3 To fix the date is difficult owing to the surprising fact that there is in Chinese writing and vocabulary no word for gold. "Yellow metal," the usual periphrasis can also mean bronze.
4 See above, p. 5.
So far, in this section, I have been considering alchemy in its narrower sense. But it is more easily recognized in China (though everywhere true) that the idea of manufacturing gold is closely associated with a general attitude of early peoples towards life-giving \(^1\) (and therefore commercially valuable) substances. In China, for example, the attempt to make gold went on simultaneously with the attempt to make artificially pearls, jade, and other "talismanic" substances.\(^2\) The theory, stated far more definitely in China than elsewhere, is that these substances are impure when found in nature and need perfecting before their virtue can be assimilated, just as some food needs cooking; it being believed about life-giving materials in general that the most effectual way to utilize their power was to absorb them in the body.

Among the life-giving substances sought after by primitive people one of the earliest to attract the attention of modern observers was the red pigment so often found smeared on bones or deposited in graves. The commonest form of pigment used for such purposes is in Europe red ochre (peroxide of iron). "Among the prehistoric peoples of Kansu," says Dr. Black,\(^3\) "the practice of depositing red pigment with the dead" is widespread. Nor was it confined to prehistoric times. Mr. C. W. Bishop, in his paper \(^4\) on the bronzes of Hsin-chêng 新鄭, records the finding of red pigment both along with the human remains in this interment and on the objects associated with these remains. The Hsin-chêng bronzes are supposed to date from the sixth century B.C.\(^5\) The nature of the pigment used in the Kansu graves has not been investigated; but the Hsin-chêng tomb contained, as Pelliot \(^6\) expresses it, "des véritables boules de vermilion", that is, of cinnabar.\(^7\)

This substance, however, was in China so valuable that it cannot at any time have been used except in the burials of important people. It is interesting also to consider the very common occurrence of the

---

\(^1\) I mean, of course, "life-giving" for purely mystical reasons and when used according to the correct mystical procedure. The fact that cinnabar (for example) is actually a poison, is irrelevant.

\(^2\) See, for example, Wieger, 1920, chap. 71, No. 27, and chap. 75, No. 1 seq.


\(^6\) T'oung Pao, 1924, p. 255.

\(^7\) An article in Shina-gaku, iii, No. 7 (1923), p. 563, uses the term 丹砂, which is equally decisive.
word in Chinese place-names (Tan-yang 丹陽, in Fukhien, Hupeh, Corea, etc.; Tan-lêng 丹陵 in Szechuan; Tan-t’u 丹徒 in Kiangsu). Are these the sites of ancient cinnabar mines, some of them already worked-out in historic times? Or does the word merely mean red? These are questions which are worth investigation. In any case, it is certain that cinnabar was one of the most important “life-giving” substances sought for by the ancient Chinese, and I would suggest that the formulæ of early Chinese alchemy are essentially receipts for compounding cinnabar. The idea that the object of making cinnabar was to use it as a charm for turning base metals into gold seems to me to be an afterthought, and one which was never properly assimilated. The chief object of alchemy remains always (till the art becomes purely abstract and esoteric) the production of the 神丹 “spirit-cinnabar,” “magic cinnabar.” An “alchemy” concerned merely with the fabrication of cinnabar no doubt goes back to very early times. When, towards the middle of the Chou dynasty, gold (under the influence of China’s nomad neighbours to the north and north-west) began to take its place as the most valued medium of exchange, cinnabar could not remain the alchemist’s final objective, and appended to his formulæ we find the statement: “When the cinnabar has been made, the gold will follow without further difficulty.”

Thus alchemy in China is essentially a revival of stone-age notions (the life-giving power of red pigment, etc.) that had sunk to folk-lore level. The craftsman’s magic ¹ that surrounded the working of gold doubtless went back to a time when gold was, like cinnabar among the Chinese, a life-giving substance valuable for its own magic properties. It was natural that the Chinese should add gold to their hierarchy of life-giving substances, appending it to their alchemical processes as a sort of “super-cinnabar”.

If now we go back again to the passage quoted at the beginning of this essay, we may analyze the various stages enumerated by the wizard Li Shao-chün as follows: (1) Sacrifice to the stove. (2) Summon spirits. These are precautions common to all metallurgic operations among primitive peoples. (3) Cinnabar changed into gold. Gold has already usurped the place of cinnabar as the most magical of substances. (4) Make vessels out of this gold and drink

¹ Among early peoples no technical operation is carried on without such magic, which is considered essential to success. The Chinese in learning how to work gold could not have failed at the same time to learn the magic observances with which among their teachers the working of gold was associated.
out of them. This describes how the magic power of the gold is to be absorbed into the system. (5) You will then increase your span of life and see hsien 鬧 in the island of P'ëng-lai. The hsien of P'ëng-lai are always associated with herbal magic, and we are here branching off on to a totally different system of wizardry, familiar to us through early Chinese literature. This herbal magic seems, indeed, to have been the craft of the educated and ruling classes as opposed to the mineral magic that only gradually drifted up out of the realm of folk-lore. (6) You may then perform the sacrifices fêng and shan. Here we have branched off on to yet another line of magic—the mystic ritual of kingship, which is here superimposed on all the rest.

7. Connection with Alchemy Elsewhere

It has already been suggested that the introduction of gold into China involved not merely the importation of the substance itself or the knowledge how to work it, but also of the magical ideas connected with the craft. These ideas were super-imposed on the magical ideas connected with the native precious substances, such as jade and cinnabar. But how far did definitely alchemistic notions from abroad—that is, notions assuming the possibility of changing base metals into gold—affect the history of alchemy in China?

As is well known, the history of alchemy outside China begins with texts written in Greek at Alexandria, none of which seem to be older than the second century A.D. Some of these texts (though not, I think, the earlier of them) indicate that the art was introduced into Egypt by learned Persians, such as Ostanes, whom one may identify, if one will, with the historical person of that name. To the ancients of the classical world Chaldea was the home of astrology and magic; this is a judgment which our vastly greater knowledge of Babylonian literature enables us to confirm, and there is an antecedent probability that alchemy, a form of magic intimately connected with astrology, also had its origin in Babylon, or "Persia" as the ancients freely called the whole cultural realm from Mesopotamia to Turkestan. But until 1925 nothing had come to light in this region which could be interpreted as throwing any light on the origins of alchemy. In that year appeared Campbell Thompson's On the Chemistry of the Ancient Assyrians,¹ and this was immediately followed by an article

¹ The same texts were published almost simultaneously by Zimmern. Dr. Eisler's article in the Chemiker Zeitung was followed by others in the Zeitschrift für Assyriologie and elsewhere. The details of the ensuing controversy do not here concern us.
Der Babylonische Ursprung der Alchimie, published in the Chemiker Zeitung (Nos. 83 and 86) by Dr. R. Eisler. The texts in question are said to date from the seventh century B.C. They are metal worker’s formule, and as such they naturally involve the usual magic procedures. But they are not concerned with the making of gold, and will turn out, I think, when our knowledge of the subject is increased, to be typical of the formule that were inseparable from all primitive technicogy. Whether they have at one point a special connection with what later turned into alchemy depends on the interpretation of the term an-kubu “divine embryo,” and of the sentence in which it occurs. Campbell Thompson translates, “Thou shalt bring in embryos . . . thou shalt make a sacrifice before the embryos”, and Thureau-Dangin explains that the kubu (embryo) is “une sorte de démon”. But according to Dr. Eisler it is the minerals placed in the furnace that are technically referred to as “embryos”, and he invokes the term ἀνθρώπινος of the Greek alchemists, applied by them to the “issue” which proceeds from the mystic fusion of alchemic ingredients. This view has not, so far as I know, been supported by any Assyriologist. But the occurrence of the term “embryo” in connection with a magico-technical process at once recalls the widely-spread use of foetuses, embryos, child-corpses, and the like. I cannot help thinking that the an-kubus were something more particular than “une sorte de démon”. It is likely enough that they were either dried foetuses such as were used by Indian magicians, or carven objects used to represent these. That alchemy was to some extent an atavistic revival of the circle of ideas to which the Campbell Thompson texts belong is undeniable. But I do not think that they can be regarded as belonging to the history of alchemy itself.

Greek Alchemy

I have already referred to the rise of alchemy in Alexandria somewhere about the second century A.D. There is some reason for supposing that it had not been established in Egypt for any considerable time before the appearance of the earliest texts. Ancient Egyptian literature knows nothing of it, and it is wholly lacking in

3 Revue de Synthèse Historique, xli (1926), and elsewhere.
4 Particularly common in India. See Meyer’s translation of the Arthashastra, p. 378, p. 649, etc.
the huge collection of magical texts published by Lexa in 1925. Many of the so-called alchemistic texts are mere craftsman’s formulæ, accompanied by the usual element of magic. The making of gold out of common metals or the giving of a golden appearance to such metals is only one of the topics discussed. The aim of Greek alchemy remains wholly objective. It is the metals, not the practitioner, whose constitution is to be ameliorated. The \( \theta \varepsilon \iota \omicron \varepsilon \omicron \delta \omega \rho \), so far from conferring immortality or even better health, “slays all living things,” \( \tau \alpha \zeta \omega \nu \tau \alpha \nu e \kappa r \alpha \iota \). Where, outside China, do we first meet with the idea of eating the product of alchemic fusion, of using it not merely as a healer of metals but also as a medicine for man? So far as I know this theory makes its first appearance in the Rasaśāstra of Nāgārjuna—the pseudo-Nāgārjuna, as one might say; for the author of the work used the name of the great Buddhist patriarch and reputed wonder-worker, just as Western alchemists used the names of Moses, Aristotle, Roger Bacon, and Thomas Aquinas. Alberuni, writing in 1031, places the alchemist “Nāgārjuna” about a hundred years before his own time. It has hitherto been assumed that alchemistic ideas can at an early period only have reached India from the West. Thus in his recent History of Sanskrit Literature (p. 460), Dr. Berriedale Keith argues that the Arthaśāstra must be as late as the period of Greek influence because of its references to alchemy. It is hard, however, to see what connection there is between the very ill-defined suvarna-pāka (gold-making) of the Arthaśāstra and the complicated network of theories that constitute Greek alchemy. The mere idea that gold might be manufactured was surely not confined to the Greeks. We have already seen that it existed in China in the first century B.C. I do not mean to imply that a Chinese influence on India existed at this early period. When, however, we find Nāgārjuna at a period corresponding to the Sung dynasty regarding quicksilver as an important element in alchemy and believing in the power of the “philosopher’s stone” to protect and prolong life, we may reasonably ask whether at this period a direct influence from China may not be possible.

In 648 the Chinese envoy Wang Hsüan-ts’ē, who between 643 and 665 fulfilled four missions to India, brought back with him to China a Brahmin named Nārāyanavāmin, who won the confidence of the Emperor T’ai Tsung. The Brahmin was a specialist in

---

2. Dating, no doubt, from the preceding T’ang dynasty.
"Prolonging Life". We do not know what his means were, whether herbal or mineral. Some time before 657 he returned to India. But in 657 we find his patron Wang Hsüan-tsê petitioning the new Emperor (T’ai Tsung died in 649) not to let Narayanasvâmin go back to India till his elixir had been given a fair trial. Evidently, then, the magician had visited China for a second time. According to the New T’ang History and the Yu Yang Tsa Tsu, Narayanasvâmin died in Ch’ang-an. But a much earlier authority (the Fang Shih Lun of Li Tê-yü ¹) says that the Emperor Kao Tsung sent him back to India, and this is supported by the Old T’ang History.

In 664–5 the Buddhist monk Hsüan-chao ² was ordered by Kao Tsung to fetch from Kashmir another Indian magician, named Lokâditya (Lu-chia-i-to), who was supposed to possess the drug of Longevity. This Hindu was at the Chinese Court in 668; we do not know whether he stayed in China or returned to India.

Narayanasvâmin, if not Lokâditya, certainly returned at least once to India, and it is certain that while at Ch’ang-an he must have picked up from his Chinese confrères some notions of Chinese alchemy.

But the influence was not all in one direction; for we have seen a Chinese writer, probably of two centuries later, giving a Sanskrit name to the chemical, arsenic sulphide. That reactions of this kind—a definite give and take, went on between China and India during the T’ang dynasty is, I think, beyond doubt. A much more difficult question is the extent to which Chinese alchemy was influenced by that of other countries in the early centuries of the era; and this question is obviously complicated by the fact that we are far from certain whether in Central Asia, the most likely source of influence, alchemy at this time existed at all. We know that An Shih-kao, the famous Parthian translator of Buddhist scriptures, who worked in China in the second century, was also skilled in the magic and astrology of his own country. But whether he may have acted as a “carrier” of Iranian alchemy to China we do not know, for the simple reason that we are still uncertain whether such a thing as Iranian alchemy ever existed. The Central Asian king Yakat (Yakar or the like) to whose treatise I have already referred ³ remains an enigma. It is probable, but not quite certain, that he proves the

¹ Quoted in the T’u Shu encyclopedia, xviii, 289, i, 16.
existence of a pre-Muhammedan alchemy in Central Asia. As to his nationality the name does not, to my knowledge, give us any clue. He may have been Eastern Iranian (Sogdian) or Turk. But after the Arabic Conquest the influence was, I believe, all from East to West. Further examination of Arabic alchemy will show, I am convinced, that it contains a vast element which it owes to China rather than to the Greek world. In particular the idea of the "philosopher's stone" as an elixir of life is a contribution of the Chinese. The second period of their influence was the time of the Mongol conquest. We have seen how the Chinese alchemist Ch'ang-ch'un visited Samarkand in 1221-2. Here he came in contact with the leaders of the Muhammedan community, and we cannot doubt that the teachings of a holy man, summoned from so great a distance by the Khan himself, made a considerable impression on the mysticism of Eastern Persia, just as the artists summoned to Persia by the Mongol Khans had a lasting influence on the pictorial art of the country. How soon this influence is reflected in Arabic literature I do not know. But it is manifest (travelling, no doubt, via the Arabs) in much of the mystic literature of our own Renaissance, in which the quest of the alchemist seems to have become purely subjective and internal.
LA THÉORIE DES GUNA

Par J. PRZYLUJSKI

Dans la plus ancienne cosmologie védique, l'univers est partagé en deux zones : le monde d'en haut lumineux, ou monde des dieux (devaloka) ; le monde d'en bas sombre, ou monde des mânes (pitrloka). Cette conception dualistique, qui remonte sans doute à la période indo-iranienne, s'est développée dans l'Iran et y a pris un aspect théologique et moral : Ohrmazd, qui personnifie la lumière et le bien, s'oppose à Ahriman qui symbolise les ténèbres et le mal.

Dans l'Inde, l'ancienne cosmologie a bientôt été remplacée par une division de l'univers en trois mondes : ciel, atmosphère, terre ; et, comme l'a nettement établi Emile Senart, la théorie des guna est en relation avec cette série de trois mondes.

Le problème que je me propose d'examiner est le suivant : quelles croyances, quelles conceptions ont déterminé une nouvelle segmentation de l'univers et présidé à l'élaboration de la théorie des guna ?

La théorie des guna peut se résumer ainsi : tout être est formé de trois éléments : sattva (ou tejas), rajas, tamas. Quand il a voulu rendre compte de cette conception, Oldenberg n'a pas manqué d'arguments. Il cherche d'abord l'origine du nombre trois dans les trois castes de la société aryenne, dans les mètres des hymnes védiques, dans le nombre des saisons. Il pense aussi aux trois mondes : Ciel, Atmosphère, Terre, dont le second a précisément donné son nom au second guna : rajas. Il rappelle en outre la relation, souvent mentionnée dans les textes, entre les guna et les couleurs : blanc, rouge, noir.


4 Senart a montré que la théorie des trois mondes a dû exercer une influence décisive sur la formation de la théorie des trois guna, mais on doit reconnaître qu'il y a encore un large intervalle entre ces deux conceptions : l'univers est composé de trois mondes et tout être est formé de trois éléments.
Il signale les cosmogonies où s’oppose à l’ātman unique, un monde matériel formé de trois éléments fondamentaux: le Rouge-Eclat lumineux, le Blanc-Eau, le Noir-Nourriture. Qu’à une certaine époque tous ces rapports aient été présents à l’esprit indien, rien n’est moins douteux. Mais, pour sentir un lien entre les trois guna et les autres triades de l’univers, il fallait déjà connaître les guna. C’est là toute la difficulté. Atharva-Veda x, 8, 43, nomme les trois guna. Mais nous n’avons aucune raison de reporter ce texte à une haute antiquité. La théorie des éléments fondamentaux de la matière apparaît brusquement dans l’Inde à la fin de ce qu’on est convenu d’appeler les temps védiques, et rien dans la littérature antérieure ne fait prévoir cette révélation. Il en est de même des cosmogonies: pour les plus anciens Indo-aryens, le monde, les dieux, tous les êtres sont une réalité donnée qu’on accepte sans en rechercher l’origine; encore moins sait-on de quoi ils sont faits.

Oldenberg voulait expliquer l’Upaniṣad par le développement de la pensée indienne autonome. Puisqu’il n’a pas, de cette manière, découvert la source de la théorie des guna, nous devons la chercher ailleurs et par conséquent hors de l’Inde.

Plutarque, dont la documentation provient en partie de Théopompe et peut remonter ainsi au début du IVᵉ siècle avant notre ère, résume, au chapitre 46, la mythologie des Mages. Deux dieux rivaux se partagent le monde: Horomazes et Areimanios. Le premier est né de la Pure Lumière; le second est issu des Ténèbres. Entré eux est Mitres, le Médiateur.

Horomazes, dans ce système, s’oppose à Areimanios, comme la pure lumière aux ténèbres. D’autre part on sait que, dans les religions iraniennes, Mithra est la Lumière du jour divinisée. Dans le système résumé par Plutarque, la Lumière pure étant identifiée à Horomazes, Mitres, le Médiateur, représente sans doute la lumière diffuse dans l’atmosphère. Il est intermédiaire entre la lumière céleste et les ténèbres du monde inférieur.

Ce qui frappe d’abord, c’est la remarquable cohésion du système iranien. Dans l’Upaniṣad, tejas est un éclat lumineux et chaud; rajas désigne les eaux et tamas est la nourriture; ce sont trois notions hétérogènes. Chez les Mages, les trois termes de la Triade se définissent par rapport à la lumière. Ohrmazd et Ahriman sont deux principes absolus et contraires: lumière pure et obscurité totale; le premier

1 Oldenberg n’est pas sans observer la confusion du texte de Chāndogya upan, au sujet duquel je me suis expliqué précédemment (cf. BSOS., vol. v, part. 3, p. 489).
est en haut, le second est en bas. Entre eux s'étend une zone de transition, l'atmosphère, où se succèdent la lumière du jour et l'obscurité.

La Triade des Mages, on le voit sans peine, s'enclave profondément dans le système religieux de l'Iran ; elle est en harmonie avec une mythologie, une cosmogonie¹ et une eschatologie ; elle est le complément d'un dualisme théologique et moral. Dans l'Inde, au contraire, la théorie des guna semble plaquée sur un édifice étranger. Elle n'a guère qu'une signification cosmologique ; elle est étrangère à la mythologie et à la morale, et les cosmogonies où elle s'exprime n'ont pas de racines profondes dans la tradition indienne. On peut donc se demander si les trois guna ne sont pas la transposition dans l'Inde d'une Triade divine analogue à celle de l'Iran.

* * * * *

Si la Triade : Ohrmazd, Mithra, Ahriman est à l'origine des guna indiens, il faut supposer, entre les croyances iraniennes et les conceptions indiennes, un stade intermédiaire où les trois guna se définissaient encore par rapport à la lumière. En d'autres termes, nous devons postuler un état ancien de la théorie où tejas, rajas et tamas ressemblaient encore à la Triade iranienne. Cet état n'est pas entièrement hypothétique ; sa réalité est prouvée par la signification des mots qui désignent les guna.

En ce qui concerne le premier terme, tejas "éclat lumineux et chaud" et le troisième, tamas "obscurité", point n'est besoin de commentaire. Reste rajas, qu'on peut également définir par rapport à la lumière. "Le thème indo-européen *reges*, dit M. Meillet, désigne un espace sombre ; le représentant gr. ἐπεθος a été spécialisé au sens de "espace sombre souterrain", comme arm. erek au sens de "soir", et got. riqis au sens de "ténèbres" (gr. σκότος, σκοτία). Seul, le védique laisse apercevoir le sens ancien, ainsi RV., vi, 7, 7, où rājamsi s'oppose à dīva rocanā. Le rājah est plusieurs fois qualifié de kṛṣṇam, ainsi RV., i, 35, trois fois (2, 4 et 9). Dans l'Atharva-Veda, viii, 2, 9, on lit :

\[
\text{parāyami tvā rājasa}
\]
\[
\text{ut tvā mṛtyor apīdāram}
\]

"je te préserve de l'espace sombre (cette traduction est plus satisfaisante à tous égards que la traduction par "poussière" qui a été proposée), de la mort je t'ai sauvegardé." Pour désigner en grec

¹ Pour la cosmogonie correspondante, cf. infra, p. 32.
les espaces sombres qui avoisinent la terre, le nom d'action 'ανήρ aurait été substitué à ερεβοσ qui avait pris un sens autre et plus restreint.'

Il semble que rajas devait désigner, à l'origine, par opposition à l'empyrée éclatant, le monde d'en bas relativement sombre, mais incomplètement obscur. Cette nuance s'est bien conservée dans arménien երեկ "soir"); elle permet sans doute d'expliquer d'autres sens de skr. rajas "poussière, brouillard, vapeur": la poussière suggère comme le brouillard une demi-obscurité. On conçoit dès lors que les théoriciens des guṇa aient choisi rajas pour désigner le monde intermédiaire où se mêlent la pure lumière et l'obscurité et qui s'oppose à la fois au ciel lumineux et à la terre obscure. A ne considérer que la stricte valeur des mots, les trois termes tejas, rajas, tāmas, forment donc une série étagée comme la Triade iranienne et en opposition avec les guṇa traditionnels : tejas = chaleur—lumière, rajas = eaux, tāmas = nourriture.

Partant de là, nous pouvons déjà expliquer une anomalie assez troublante : rajas, qui désigne un espace sombre en védique, correspond à la couleur blanche et à la clarté (śukla) dans la théorie des guṇa. C'est que l'atmosphère peut être considérée sous deux aspects : d'une part, elle est dépourvue de luminosité propre et s'oppose ainsi à l'empyrée ; d'autre part elle est claire (śukla) lorsqu'elle est éclairée par le soleil et elle s'oppose ainsi à la terre compacte et obscure.

La comparaison que nous avons instituée entre le système religieux décrit par Plutarque et la théorie des guṇa éclaire donc certains aspects de la série tejas, rajas, tāmas. Mais celle-ci ne se laisse pas entièrement ramener à des notions iraniennes. Les guṇa forment deux triades très différentes. Une première série : clarté, clair-obscure, obscurité présente d'évidentes analogies avec le système iranien et s'apparente ainsi à une cosmologie dualistique dont les pôles sont deux principes contraires : Ohrmazd-Lumière et Ahriman-Obscurité, avec au centre une zone intermédiaire où se mêlent ces deux principes et symbolisée par Mithra le Médiateur. La seconde série : éclat, eau, nourriture, traduit de tout autres conceptions : les trois termes qui la composent sont hétérogènes et ne se laissent pas ramener à la Triade iranienne. L'hypothèse d'une influence exercée par l'Iran sur l'Inde est donc insuffisante : elle ne permet tout au plus d'expliquer qu'un aspect de la théorie des guṇa. Il faut maintenant examiner si une influence

*BSL.*, xxvi, p. 10.
extérieure à l'Iran et à l'Inde ne rend pas compte des divergences constatées entre le système des Mages et la théorie des guna.

* * * * *

On sait l'importance de la triade dans les religions sémitiques. Puisque, dès l'époque védique, l'ancien dualisme indo-iranien tend à se modifier sous l'influence d'une cosmologie ternaire, on doit naturellement se demander si ces idées nouvelles n'ont pas une origine sémitique.

Entre accadien assur et indo-iranien asura, l'analogie est évidente. La relation que plusieurs savants avaient supposée entre ces deux termes a été récemment établie par Kretschmer d'une manière qui semble définitive.1 La ressemblance, en effet, n'apparaît pas seulement dans les mots : elle éclate lorsqu'on compare le disque ailé d'Assur et le symbole d'Ahura Mazda tels qu'ils sont figurés sur les monuments. Ce fait capital suffirait à prouver qu'une influence sémitique a dû s'exercer à la fois sur les systèmes religieux de l'Iran et de l'Inde. Dans un mémoire récent La Ville du Cakravartin,2 j'ai indiqué en outre un certain nombre d'arguments qui tendent à faire admettre l'hypothèse d'une influence sémitique sur l'ancienne civilisation indienne.

Ceci posé, l'apparition de la triade sémitique dans la cosmologie indienne paraîtra moins invraisemblable. Voyons si les éléments de la triade sont les mêmes à l'Est et à l'Ouest. Pour les auteurs des Upaniṣad, rajas correspond aux Eaux divinissées. D'autre part l'adage annam prthivilakṣaṇaṃ indique bien que par nourriture (annam) on entendait la Terre qui pourvoit à l'alimentation de l'homme et des animaux. La lumière enfin est l'attribut constant de la zone céleste. La série Eclat lumineux, Eaux, Nourriture, désignait donc trois puissances divinissées : Ciel, Eau, Terre. Ce sont précisément les éléments de la grande triade assyrienne : Sin (Ciel), Enlil (Terre), Ea (Océan).

La coincidence n'est-elle pas fortuite ? On pourrait supposer que l'importance de l'élément eau a été suggérée aux Indo-aryens par le spectacle du monde et que, venus tardivement au contact de la mer, ils ont modifié leur cosmologie pour y faire entrer l'Océan. Je ne crois pas que cette conjecture soit exacte. Si des observations géographiques étaient à la base de la nouvelle cosmologie, l'élément eau

---

1 Cf. WZKM., 1926, p. 15. Données bibliographiques dans Keith, ibid., p. 13 et à l'index, s.v. Assur.
2 Rocznik Orientalistyczny, Tome v, pp. 165–85.

On pourrait encore supposer que la notion de l’atmosphère conçue comme le réceptacle des eaux a été suggérée aux Indiens par le climat de l’Asie des moussons. Toutefois, étant donné le caractère des spéculations sur les guṇa, il semble difficile d’admettre que des considérations d’ordre météorologique aient suffi à détourner les auteurs de l’Upaniṣad de la cosmologie védique. Le spectacle des réalités journalières ne saurait libérer les hommes de croyances séculaires ; la gnose nouvelle devait emprunter son prestige à une civilisation lointaine et fabuleuse. D’ailleurs, entre cette gnose et la science babyloniennne nous n’allons pas tarder à discern er d’autres attaches.

Enfin, si la Triade cosmique s’était élaborée dans l’Inde à l’abri de toute influence étrangère, elle eût sans doute compris le Vent, car Vāyu est un des grands dieux de la mythologie védique et il remplit l’espace intermédiaire entre le Ciel et la Terre. On trouve au contraire l’équation : rajas = eau. Celle-ci a dû être posée, principalement, parce que l’Eau faisait partie de la Triade sémitique, accessoirement, parce que des faits d’observation courante permettaient de localiser au moins une partie des eaux dans l’atmosphère.

Pourquoi le mot guṇa sert-il à désigner la série tejas, rajas, tamas ? Oldenberg, sentant l’insuffisance des étymologies proposées avant lui, suggéra que les trois éléments des êtres avaient pu être comparés à trois fils tordus en un lien unique ; d’où l’emploi du mot guṇa “fil”.

Cette ingénieuse explication n’est probablement qu’un jeu d’esprit ; pour qu’elle fût admise, il faudrait prouver qu’un lien formé de trois fils rouge, blanc, noir était une notion familière à l’esprit indien. Or de ceci nous n’avons pas le moindre indice.

Si la théorie des trois facteurs a passé de l’Iran dans l’Inde, la notion que traduit le mot guṇa peut avoir la même origine. Dans l’Avesta, gaona signifie “poil” et par extension “couleur de poil,

---

1 Oldenberg, Die Lehre . . . . p. 214 et 353, n. 135.
couleur". Or, de même que rouge, blanc, noir sont les trois aspects du feu céleste, de l'espace éclairé et des ténèbres, le pelage des animaux domestiques peut également se ramener à ces trois couleurs fondamentales. Des pasteurs, à qui le bétail était la réalité la plus familière, pouvaient donc aisément comparer l'univers, soit à un troupeau contenant des animaux de tout poil, soit à un animal bigarré. Dans les deux cas, le mot gaōna, "poil, couleur" était susceptible de rendre exactement la diversité des éléments du grand Tout.

Un comparaison de ce genre est d'ailleurs faite explicitement dans le vers bien connu de Śvetāsvatara-upanisad :

ajāṁ ekāṁ lohitāśuklakṛṣṇāṁ . . .

. . . une chèvre rouge-blanche-noire . . .

De l'avis de tous les interprètes, la Chèvre dont il est ici question est la matière, et les trois adjectifs qui désignent le poil de la bête se rapportent aux trois guṇa.

On est ainsi amené à supposer qu'à la fin de l'époque védique, le mot guṇa a été pris, au moins dans la langue philosophique, avec la même valeur qu'avait gaōna en iranien.

* * * * *

Si l'on va au fond de la théorie des guṇa, on découvre le postulat suivant : de même que l'univers est fait de trois parties : tejas, rajas, tamas, chaque objet, chaque individu est respectivement formé de trois éléments : tejas, rajas, tamas. Autrement dit, le microcosme est semblable au macrocosme. Ce postulat est à la base non seulement de la théorie des guṇa, mais de toute une philosophie. C'est un des principes fondamentaux de cette gnose qu'est l'Upanisad. C'est une des vérités majeures qui conduisent à la délivrance, car le salut consiste à rétablir, par la connaissance, l'harmonie entre l'univers et l'individu.

Il ne paraît pas douteux que l'origine de cette conception doive être cherchée dans des croyances étrangères à la plus ancienne religion védique. L'univers et les êtres sont identiques parce qu'ils procèdent également du Créateur. Or, on ne saurait trop insister sur ce point, tandis que le mythe de la création est un élément essentiel dans le système religieux babylonien, la croyance à un dieu créateur occupe

1 Outre son sens originel, poil a aussi en français le sens de "couleur", comme le mot iranien gaōna.

2 J'ai étudié dans un mémoire distinct le rapport skr. guṇa : av. gaōna et les questions qui s'y rattachent. Cf. J. R. S. sous presse.

3 Jeremias, Allorientalische Geisteskultur, 2ème édit., p. 27, veut que ces spéculations remontent à la civilisation sumérienne. Mais je ne vois pas qu'il l'ai démontré.

4 La créature est faite à l'image du Créateur ; cf. Jeremias, ibid., p. 87 et suiv.
une place infime dans la religion védique, et n’atteint son plein développement que dans la doctrine des Upanishad.

Après avoir interprété la théorie des guṇa en fonction de l’univers statique et des représentations cosmologiques, il reste donc à éprouver la solidité de nos hypothèses par l’étude de la cosmogonie et du dynamisme de l’univers.

* * * * *

L’exposé de Plutarque relatif à la cosmogonie des Perses (chapitre 47) contient des éléments divers. On peut y distinguer trois fragments : a) Horomazes et Areimanios produisent le premier six dieux et l’autre six démons. b) Horomazes divise l’univers et place les étoiles sur la voûte céleste. c) Horomazes et Areimanios créent chacun vingt-quatre dieux.

Négligeons a) et c), qui sont proprement des théogonies, et examinons b) qui est une véritable cosmogonie.

Première phase : Horomazes se multiplie par trois ; ce dieu qui était un devient triple. J’entends par là que l’espace lumineux, indéfini, et par conséquent un, se divise en trois zones distinctes.

Deuxième phase : “Horomazes s’écarte du soleil d’une distance égale à celle dont le soleil se trouva écarté de la terre.” Les trois zones de l’univers sont évidemment la région inférieure, souterraine, d’où toute lumière s’est d’abord retirée. Au-dessus, la région éclairée par le soleil est l’atmosphère ; c’est une zone intermédiaire entre la clarté pure du ciel et l’obscurité complète de l’enfer, c’est-à-dire que la Lumière pure s’en est finalement retirée tout comme la clarté du jour s’était retirée de la zone inférieure. Le Ciel est la troisième zone où s’est retiré Horomazes. C’est le séjour de la pure Lumière, de la clarté parfaite.

Troisième phase : Horomazes dispose les étoiles comme un ornement sur la voûte céleste et place Sirius à leur tête.

L’enseignement qu’on peut tirer de ce fragment est d’accord avec ce que nous avions appris le chapitre 46 sur la mythologie des Mages. Puisqu’il existe trois grands dieux : Ohrmazd, dieu de la Pure Lumière, Ahriman, dieu des Ténèbres, Mithra, dieu de la clarté du jour et Médiateur, on pouvait inférer que ces trois Puissances président chacune à une région déterminée : ciel lumineux, terre obscure.

atmosphère intermédiaire entre la pure lumière et l'obscurité. Le
fragment b) du chapitre 47 confirme nettement ces inductions.

La cosmogonie iranienne exposée par Plutarque n'est pas sans
analogie avec celle qui s'exprime dans les hymnes Rohita de l'\textit{Atharva-
Veda} (livre xiii). On admet généralement que Rohita "le Rouge"
désigne le Soleil. Mais rien n'est moins certain. Ce qui est clair,
c'est que le Rouge est le dieu créateur. Il a mesuré les espaces et
produit le ciel et la terre. Dans Atharva-Veda xiii, 1, 25, le Rouge
est distinct d'Agni-Soleil. Rohita ne peut donc être le Soleil. Ce qui
a pu prêter à confusion, c'est que le Rouge et le Soleil sont deux
puissances lumineuses et qu'à l'origine, le Rouge étant monté au ciel,
son ascension est comparable à celle du Soleil. Mais dans la cosmogonie
rémisée par Plutarque, Ohrmazd également se retire au ciel qui
devient son séjour.

Que la cosmogonie des hymnes Rohita soit fondée sur la triade,
c'est ce qui ressort par exemple de xiii, 1, 45, où les trois divisions
de l'univers sont le ciel, la terre et les eaux. Ailleurs (xiii, 1, 7), les
trois termes de la triade sont le ciel, la terre et l'atmosphère. C'est
dans l'espace originel que le Rouge, divin géomètre, a mesuré les
mondes avec son cordeau (\textit{tantu}).\footnote{Cf. xiii, 1, 6. Dans xiii, 1, 11, le Rouge siège au dessus du firmament (\textit{nāka}),
tandis qu'Agni-Soleil est en relation avec la troisième zone (\textit{rajas}).}

De même que, dans le système iranien, l'aménagement du Cosmos
est réalisé par une segmentation de l'espace et par l'ascension du
Soleil et d'Ohrmazd qui s'écartent inégalement de la terre, ainsi, dans
les hymnes Rohita, l'univers est partagé en trois zones : le Soleil et
le Rouge s'élèvent du monde inférieur et Rohita fixe au ciel sa demeure.

S'il est vrai que le mythe de la création est étranger à la plus
ancienne religion védique, ce n'est pas dans la communauté indo-
iranienne que nous devons chercher l'origine des spéculations concer-
nant la création de l'univers par Ohrmazd ou par Rohita. L'idée
d'un dieu unique, architecte de l'univers, paraît s'être développée
hors de l'Inde, probablement dans le monde sémitique. Les cosmo-
gonies babyloniennes sont diverses et incomplètement connues.
On peut du moins dégager l'essentiel : Marduk joue de bonne heure
un rôle capital dans l'aménagement de l'univers ; plus tard, Assur
lui succède. Nous sommes ainsi ramenés à l'équation \textit{Asura = Assur}
qui constitue l'un des pivots de notre recherche ; Ahura Mazda,
L'Horomazes de Plutarque, n'est pas seulement l'homonyme de Assur ;
il est aussi son héritier dans les fonctions de dieu créateur. Et si le
même rôle est assigné dans l'\textit{Atharva-Veda} à Rohita le Rouge, c'est sans
doute parce que la Lumière pure, feu céleste, est doué d’un éclat rougeoyant.

Ainsi l’étude des cosmogonies comme celle des représentations cosmologiques conduit à supposer d’anciennes relations entre les civilisations babylonienne, iranienne et indienne. Cette conclusion serait singulièrement fortifiée si l’on pouvait prouver que les mêmes variations s’observent dans l’Inde et hors de l’Inde. C’est de ce côté qu’il nous faut maintenant orienter notre recherche.

* * * * *

Les religions iraniennes sont encore mal connues ; on entrevoit du moins aujourd’hui leur complexité. Il faut se méfier des solutions trop simples et se garder d’exagérer l’ancienne étendue du Zoroastrisme (Benveniste, The Persian Religion, p. 119). A côté de ce mouvement que nous révèlent les Gâthâs, d’autres courants fort importants restent dans l’ombre. En l’absence de témoignages suffisamment explicites et d’une chronologie sûre, on peut seulement dégager quelques indices positifs. Il semble que, dans les diverses régions de l’Iran, l’ancien polythéisme se soit peu à peu ordonné sous l’autorité, devenue despotique, d’un Dieu suprême. Il est vraisemblable que cette évolution s’est accomplie parallèlement à celle des institutions politiques et que la formation de l’Empire achéménide marque aussi une date dans l’histoire de la pensée religieuse. Ceci suffirait à expliquer l’avance de l’Iran sur l’Inde dans la spéculaation théologique comme dans la réalisation d’un empire centralisé.

Aussi loin que nous pouvions remonter, la foule des divinités iraniennes apparaît déjà subordonnée à quelques dieux supérieurs : groupe de sept dieux mentionnés dans Hérodote, triade de Théopompe et Plutarque, couple de deux principes dans le dualisme pré-zervanite.

A une date qu’il est impossible de préciser, mais qui ne doit pas être éloignée de la réforme zoroastrienne, le monarchisme mythologique est partout en voie de réalisation. On y parvient de deux manières : dans certains systèmes, le dieu suprême est un des anciens grands dieux dont la puissance s’est encore accrue : tels sont Ahura Mazda dans le Mazdéisme et Mithra dans le Mithriaicisme primitif ; ailleurs, la première place est attribuée à un dieu qui est une abstraction personnifiée, tel Zrvan dans le Zervanism. Zvran-akarana est le "Temps infini". Il est surtout caractérisé par le second terme : l’infiniti est son essence ; le temps n’est qu’une de ses modalités. Ainsi considéré, Zrvan est un des noms de l’Infini ; c’est le même dieu qu’Eudemus caractérise par le temps ou l’espace,1 que les Mandéens

1 Cf. Benveniste, ibid., p. 113.
appelleront Roi de Lumière et qui s’introduit dans le Bouddhisme sous les noms de Amitâyus “Durée illimitée” et Amitâbha “Éclat illimité”.

Le dieu infini marque un progrès de la spéculaion par rapport à Ahura Mazda et à Mithra. En effet ces deux derniers ont un pouvoir limité par celui des autres grands dieux.\(^1\) Cette limitation est surtout étroite dans le système dualistique où Ahriman, adversaire du dieu suprême, réussit souvent à lui faire échec. Le Dieu infini, au contraire, n’a ni auxiliaire ni rivaux. Cette conception si épurée pouvait satisfaire les meilleurs esprits et c’est probablement ce qui explique sa diffusion. Les grands systèmes iraniens se sont finalement teintés de Zervanisme, de même que la religion des peuples voisins, Grecs, Indiens, etc.

Nous pouvons, dès lors, suivre la trace des influences iraniennes dans l’Upaniṣad. J’ai montré, en un précédent article sur la Loi de Symétrie dans la Chândogya-Upaniṣad, que l’ancienne théorie indienne des guṇa semble avoir été complétée par l’adjonction d’un principe nouveau, le tapas, superposé à la triade : tejas, rajas, tamas. Or, tandis que les trois guṇa sont des éléments limités et qui s’équilibrerent réciproquement, le tapas leur est extérieur et préexistent ; il est éternel et infini ; il est à la fois Temps, Espace et Énergie créatrice. Le tapas est donc l’équivalent indien de Zravan-akarana. De même que le dieu suprême iranien s’est finalement superposé à la Triade cosmique dont il est la Cause, le tapas, puissance infinie, engendre et contient les trois guṇa qui sont à la fois les trois éléments et les trois mondes.

L’analogie que nous avions constatée entre les trois guṇa indiens et les éléments de la Triade iranienne n’est donc pas une rencontre momentanée. Les variations que nous observons à l’Ouest se reproduisent à l’Est ; les conceptions religieuses de l’Iran et celles de l’Inde évoluent parallèlement ; tout se passe comme si l’influence iranienne s’était exercée sur l’Inde à plusieurs reprises. Si l’on veut comprendre le développement des idées religieuses depuis la rédaction des Brāhmaṇa jusqu’à celle des Upaniṣad, il faut sans doute tenir compte de l’action conjuguée des croyances sémitiques et iraniennes.

\(^1\) J’admets volontiers, avec Maria Wilkins Smith (Studies in the syntax of the Gathas, p. 23 et suiv.) que, dans les Gāthā, les Amōṣa-Sponta sont “des aspects d’Ahura” et rien de plus. Mais il est douteux qu’une doctrine si élevée se soit imposée tout d’abord à un grand nombre d’adeptes. Et d’ailleurs cette doctrine est déjà presque parfaitement monothéiste. Elle est, à mon sens, la première manifestation, avant la lettre, de ce qu’on pourrait appeler la religion de l’Akarana.
THE TONYUKUK INSCRIPTION

Being a Translation of Professor Vilhelm Thomsen’s final Danish rendering

By E. Denison Ross

THIS monument is found somewhat farther to the East than the two foregoing ones, about 48° N. and a little more than 107° W. of Greenwich, near a place said to have the name of Bain Chokto, between the Nalaikha post-station and the right bank of the upper waters of the Tola. The inscription is graven on two pillars that are still standing upright; on the first and larger of these the inscription starts on one of the narrow sides, the one turned to the West, and is continued round towards South, East, and North. On the other one, the inscription, which is a direct continuation of that on the larger stone, likewise begins on the West side, but here this is one of the broad sides. The latter stone is more weathered than the first, and the inscription from the very beginning not being here so carefully incised as on the other. On both stones the inscriptions are written in vertical lines as in the Orkhon inscriptions; but with this difference that while the lines in the latter read from right to left here they read from left to right.

Near the two pillars there is a stone sarcophagus and the foundations of a building; furthermore, there stand around the stones eight figures, evidently made by Chinese stone-masons, whose heads have all been knocked off; lastly, there are signs of the whole having been surrounded by an earth mound, which was open towards the East; and here begins a row of upright flag-stones, running for a length of about 150 metres. It is thus an arrangement like that of the Orkhon stones, only on a somewhat smaller scale.

The whole is clearly a monument over the tomb of the great Turkish statesman and general, Tonyukuk, who was active under the first two kagans after the restoration, and was still alive (at a great age) at the beginning of Bilgä kagan’s government. It may thus probably date from the years round about 720. The very long inscription is drawn up by himself, and he himself speaks all through in the first person.
TRANSLATION OF THE TONYUKUK INSCRIPTION

(T) (T I W)

I, the wise Tonyukuk, was myself born to belong to the Chinese Empire, for the Turkish people at that time was under China; and [thought I] "may I not live to see the Turkish people [but] getting for itself a khan (?)". But they broke away from China, and got themselves a khan. They nevertheless again deposed their khan, and again submitted to China. Then Heaven may well have spoken as follows: "I had given thee a khan; but thou hast forsaken thy khan, and again submitted." As a punishment for this submission Heaven caused them to die; the Turkish people perished or languished and fell to ruin. In the [old] land itself of the united (?) Turkish people there was no longer any ordered community left. But they that had remained independent [literally: in wood and stone] joined together, and they numbered 700. Two-thirds of them were mounted, a [third] part was on foot. He that as chief led the 700 men was the shad. "Join me," said he, and amongst those who joined him was I, the wise Tonyukuk. "Shall I make him [raise himself to be] kagan?" said I, and I thought: "If you want to distinguish afar off between lean bulls and fat bulls, you cannot say for certain whether it [in each case] is a fat bull or a lean bull." Thus did I think. Afterwards when Heaven gave me insight I compelled him [to become] kagan. "Let me then be Elterish kagan, since I have the wise Tonyukuk boyla baga tarkan by my side." To the south he defeated the Chinese, to the East the Kitays, to the North the Oguzes in great strength. His fellow in wisdom and his fellow in renown was I myself. We were dwelling then in Chugay-kuzi and Kara-Kum.

(T I S)

We lived there, nourishing ourselves on big game and hares, and the people's mouth was filled. Our foes were all around like birds of prey (?) This was our situation. While we were dwelling there there came a spy from the Oguzes. These were the words of the spy: "Over the Tokuz-["Nine"]] Oguzes people a kagan has set himself [as lord]," says he; "to the Chinese he is said to have sent Kuni sängün and to the Kitays Tongra Sämig [or Säm]; this is the message he is said to have sent: 'A few Turks would seem to have made a rising; their khan is said to be brave, and his counsellor is said to be wise. If these two men are left alive, they will slay you, Chinese,
say I; to the East they will slay the Kitays, say I, and us the Oguzes they will slay, say I. So ye attack them, Chinese, from the South, and ye, Kitays, attack ye them from the East; I shall attack them from the North. In the united (?) Turk's land no lord must prosper. Let us, if so may be, destroy [such] a lord, say I." When I had heard these words sleep came not to me by night, nor rest by day. Then I made representation to my kagan; thus did I represent it to him: "If these three—the Chinese, the Oguzes, and the Kitays—combine, all will be over with us; we are, as it were, fastened to a stone by the Will (?) of Fate. To bend a thing is easy while it is slender; to tear asunder what is still tender is an easy thing; but if the slender thing becomes thick, it requires a feat of strength to bend it, and if the tender thing coarsens, a feat of strength is required in order to tear it asunder. We must ourselves come to the Kitays in the East, to the Chinese in the South, to the Western [Turks] in the West, and to the Oguzes in the North with our own army of two or three thousand men. How may that be done?" Thus did I put it before him. My kagan deigned to listen to the representation which I myself, the wise Tonyukuk, did make unto him. "Take thou them as you may see fit," said he. We waded up Kök-Öng-[üg ?], and I led them to the Ötükän forest. With cows and beasts of burden the Oguzes came along the Togla. Their army was (three thousand strong ?), we were 2,000; we fought and Heaven favoured us; we cut them up, and they fell into the river or were slain in flight. Then came all the Oguzes [and submitted]. When they heard that I [had led] the Turkish kagan and the Turkish people to the Ötükän land, and that I myself, the wise Tonyukuk, had settled in the Ötükän land, the peoples dwelling in the South, the West, the North, and the East came [to join on to us].

(T I E)

We were 2,000; we had two armies. The Turkish people—to make conquests—and the Turkish kagan—to rule—had come unto the towns of Shantung and unto the sea, but had found destruction. I laid this before my kagan, and got him to take the field and to come unto the Shantung plain and unto the sea. Twenty-three towns did he lay waste, and made his camp in Usin Bundatu (?). The Chinese Emperor was our foe, the kagan of the "Ten Arrows" [that is to say, of the Western Turks] was our foe; further (more) (the Kirghizes' ?) might(y kagan) became (our foe). These three kagans took counsel
together and said: "Let us meet in the mountain-forest of Altun," thus did they take counsel: "Let us move against the kagan of the 21 Eastern Turks," said they; "unless we move against him, he will unfailingly (?)—for (the kagan is brave and) his counsellor is wise—he will unfailingly (?) slay us. Let us all three united go off and destroy him," quoth they. The Türgish kagan spoke thus: "My people shall be there," said he, "(the Turkish people) is in disorder," (said 22 he), "the Oguzes, their vassals, are stirred up," said he. When I heard this, no sleep came to me by night, and no rest came to me [by day]. Then thought I: if first we march against (the Kirghizes ? . . . ), 23 said I. When I heard there is but one road over Kogman, and that is was shut [by snow], I said: "It is no good our going that way." I then sought a guide and found a man from the far-away Az people. ( . . . ) "My land is Az," ( . . . ) there was a resting-place; 24 one can advance along by Ani (?). If you keep to it, you can go on with one horse at a time. When I heard this, I said and thought: "If we go this way, [the thing] is possible."

(T I N)

This laid I before my kagan. I made the army ready for the march, 25 and ordered it to mount on horseback. Beyond Ak-Tärmpäl I bade them gather together. Ordering them to mount their horses, I made a way for us through the snow. Then I bade them ascend on foot, pulling the horses after them, and holding fast by the trees [? or wooden staves ?]. So soon as the foremost men had trampled [the snow] down, I bade [the army] move forward and we crossed [the pass] Ibar (?). So with difficulty we climbed down. For ten nights [i.e. days and nights] we went on through the [snow] barriers on the mountain-side. As the guide had led us astray, he was cut down. While we were suffering want, the kagan said: "Try to ride on. This is the river Ani; [let us] ride [along by it]." We rode thus down along this river. To take our numbers we bade them dismount and [meanwhile] tied the horses to trees. Both day and night we rode on at a gallop and fell on the Kirghizes while they were asleep, 28 and opened [ourselves a way ?] with the lances. The khan and his army gathered together; we fought and won. We slew their khan, and the Kirghiz people submitted to the kagan and gave in, and we went back again. We came over at this side of the Kögan mountain-forest, and turned back from the Kirghizes. From the Turkish kagan there came a spy; these were his words: "Let us go forth with the
army against the Eastern kagan, he [i.e. the Türgish kagan] is reported to have said. 'If we do not go forth, he will—for the kagan is brave, and his counsellor is wise—he will surely (!) slay us', [thus] he said. The Türgish kagan has now gone forth," said he [i.e. the spy]; "the men of the Ten Arrows have marched out to a man," says he, "and the Chinese too, have an army [ready]." Having heard these words, said my kagan: "I will go home in peace," said he; now the katun was dead; "and I will hold her funeral," said he. "Do ye go on with the army," said he; "Stay in the Altun mountain-forest," said he. "Let Inäl kagan and Tardush shad go forth at the head of the army," said he. But me, the wise Tonyukuk, he commanded as follows: "Do thou lead this army," said he; "inflict on them [i.e. the Western Turks] such punishment as thou thyself findest good. What [else] shall I entrust to thee?" said he; "when they are on their way coming, then send [the spy?] [to me]; if they do not come, then stay quietly and collect information and tidings," said he. So we lay in the Altun mountain-forest. There came in haste (?) three spies; their tidings were all alike: "Their kagan has set out with the army, and the army of the Ten Arrows has set out, all to a man," they say; they said, it would seem: "Let us gather together on the Yarish plain." Having heard these words I sent the kagan a message about them. From the khan there came back a message: "Stay there quietly," he had said; "do not ride away, keep a good watch (?), do not let yourselves be taken by surprise." Such was the order Bögü kagan sent me. But to Apa tarkan [i.e. the head-commander] he sent a secret message. "The wise Tonyukuk is fickle and self-willed. He will say: 'Let us march off with the army,' but do not do his will." Having heard these tidings, I ordered the army to march, and I climbed over the Altun mountain-forest where there was no road, and we crossed the River Irtish where there was no ford. We continued [our march] by night, and reached Bolchu well on in the morning.

(T 2 W)

A spy was brought in; his words were as follows: "On Yarish plain there has now gathered an army of 100,000 men," he says. When they heard these words all the begs said: "Let us turn back; for the pure, humility is best." But I say as follows, I the wise Tonyukuk: "We have now come hither after having crossed the Altun mountain-forests, we have come hither after having crossed
the river Irtish. The [foes] who have advanced hither are brave, I have been told; but they have not noticed us. Heaven and Umay and the holy Yer-sub must out of regard for us have struck them [with blindness]. Why should we flee? Why should we be afraid at their being many? Why should we be overwhelmed through being few? Let us attack!" said I. We attacked and plundered [the camp]. The next day they came rushing hotly forward like a steppe fire, and we fought. Their two wings were about half as many again as ourselves. By the favour of Heaven we had no dread at their being many. We fought, and following Tardush shad, we scattered them and took the kagan a prisoner; their yabgu and shad they slew there; we took half a hundred men prisoners. The same night we sent round a message to their peoples. After having heard these tidings the begs and the people of the Ten Arrows came and submitted. Having gathered together and marshalled those of the begs and the people that had come [to join with us], and as a few of the people had fled, I bade the army of the Ten Arrows to march out, and we ourselves marched out, and we followed them up. After crossing Yenchü-ügüz ["the Pearl River"] (—) the mountain Tinäsi-ogli-yatigma-bängligäk (—?).

(T 2 S)

As far as Tämir-kapig ["The Iron Gate"] we followed them up; there we made them turn back. To Inäi kagan ( . . . ) there came the whole Sogd people with Suk (?) as leader and submitted. Our forefathers and the Turkish people had [in their time] reached Tämir-kapig and the Tinäsi-ogli-yatigma mountain, where [at that time] there was no lord. As I now had brought [our army] to this land, it carried home the yellow gold, and the white silver, maidens, and girls, (?) and precious things in profusion. Because of his wisdom and his bravery Eletrish kagan fought seven times with the Chinese, seven times with the Kitays, and five times with the Oguzes. I it was who was there his counsellor, I that was his war-leader. To Elterish kagan, the Turkish Bögii kagan, the Turkish Bilgä kagan (—).

(T 2 E)

Kapagan kagan ( . . . ). Without getting sleep by night or rest by day, and shedding my red blood, and sweating my "black" sweat, I have give up to them by toil and my strength, and so, too, I have sent them forth on far expeditions. The Arkuy-Karagu
[? guard ?] I have made great; a withdrawing foe I have ( . . . ); I have caused my kagan to take the field. By Heaven's grace I have not let any armour-clad foe ride among this Turkish people, or any horse with bearing rein (?) gallop around. If Elterish kagan had not toiled, and if I myself, following him, had not toiled, there would not have been any kingdom or any people. Since he toiled, and since I myself, following him, have toiled, both the kingdom has become a kingdom, and the people a people. Now I myself am grown old, and am far advanced in years. But should a people, ruled by a kagan in any land whatever, have only worthless men [at its head] what a misfortune would it not be for it. For the Turkish Bilgā kagan's people I have had this written. I the wise Tonyukuk.

(T 2 N)

If Elterish kagan had not toiled, or if he had never been, and if I myself the wise Tonyukuk, had not toiled or had never been, in Kapagan kagan's and the united (?) Turkish people's land both community and people and men would have been without a lord. Since Elterish kagan and the wise Tonyukuk have toiled, Kapagan kagan and the united (?) Turkish people have flourished, and this [present] Turkish Bilgā kagan rules for the good of the united (?) Turkish people, and Oguz people.
ETYMOLOGY OF THE JAPANESE WORD FUDE

By S. Yoshitake

In the last fifteen hundred years the Japanese have borrowed thousands of Chinese words and idioms, which have eventually brought the Japanese language into a state of utter confusion. Such borrowing, it would seem, had its beginning some centuries before its remarkable development in the fifth century A.D., which may be called the period of demarcation dividing the Chinese loan-words into two classes, the early loans and the later, each having certain phonetic characteristics.

The early loan-words, which, unlike the vast majority of their later confrères, seem to have been thoroughly naturalized already in the seventh century A.D., attracted the attention of the English sinologist, E. H. Parker, in the 'eighties, but the investigation has since then been discarded almost entirely because of the insufficiency of knowledge possessed of the ancient phonetic values of the Chinese characters.

However, thanks to the untiring labour of Karlgren, Maspero, Simon, and other sinologists, we are now in a more favourable position for an inquiry into the early relationship between the two languages, and the problem has since been taken up afresh by Karlgren himself, who, in his most interesting little book Philology and Ancient China, suggests twenty-two Japanese words as probable early loans from Chinese.1 Of these I need only quote a few that have direct bearing upon the present subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAPANESE</th>
<th>PEKINESE</th>
<th>ANCIENT CHINESE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ie (&lt; ipe) “house” = イ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>irt “town, village”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ine, šine, “rice” = 稲</td>
<td>sien</td>
<td>sian “rice” (of a certain kind).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take “bamboo” = 竹</td>
<td>chu (= tšu)</td>
<td>t’iuk “bamboo”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fune “vessel” = 盆</td>
<td>p’ěn</td>
<td>b’uım “vessel”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The words thus compared by Karlgren show remarkable similarities both phonetically and semasiologically, and hence a high degree of probability of borrowing, but there is, nevertheless, room

for a careful examination. Indeed, the whole problem is not so simple as it appears at first sight. Take, for example, the word ihe (now pronounced iyă, iă) "a house". This Japanese word, the ancient sound of which is given by Karlgren as ipe, but may well have been iβă, could equally be a native word, closely akin to Turkish aβ (or āv ?, Orkhon), āp (Uighur), āv (Osmanli), etc., "a house." 1 There are, therefore, at least three possibilities: (1) that the Japanese word under consideration may be a Chinese loan, as Karlgren suggests; (2) that it may likewise be a native word going back to the same origin as the Turkish āv, etc.; (3) that the Turkish form may be the prototype of the Japanese iβă, or vice versa. However that may be, it is sufficiently clear that the final vowel of the word ihe was originally neither -e nor -ā, but was something resembling ā, which was later changed into -ā through the absorption of the particle i. 2 The original vowel -a has been preserved in the words ihabito "people of the house", ihato "a cave", iharo, ihori "a hut", whilst the word iha has been handed down to us in the sense "rock". To judge from these variants, it is quite possible that the original meaning of the word ihe "a house" is "rock, cave".

As a further example, let us consider the word ine "rice-plant", which Karlgren seems to derive from sine. The peculiar feature of the form sine (we do not know whether this word was actually pronounced sine in the eighth-century Japanese language) is that there is no trace of its independent use; it always occurs as the second element of compound words in exactly the same way as the word ame "rain" is found in the form -same in kosame "drizzle", harusame "the spring rain", and in a few more compounds. Whether there was, as Karlgren seems to suppose, a phonetic change s- > χ- > O in Archaic Japanese we do not know, although a similar change in an intervocalic position, i.e. s- > χ- > O, has actually taken place in historic times (linguistically speaking). If we assume for the moment that the phonetic change from s- to zero did take place in the remote past, we

1 The same argument applies to Karlgren’s etymology of the Japanese word natsu "summer", which he believes to be a Chinese loan: Ancient Chinese ㄗ>jīt < niat 鬆 "hot". But before arriving at a decision we must take into consideration the Common Turkish yav, Osmanli yav, Chuvash ʃu, Yakut sai, Mongol (Buriat) naʃır "summer" and Korean ɡyŏrım "summer, crop". If these terms are truly cognate with the Japanese natsu, the latter is in all probability nearest to their common parent.

are still unable to explain why the older forms have never made their appearance in the attributive position. The only explanation one can offer of this phenomenon appears to be that the -š in -šine and the -s-in -same are in compounds inserted on grounds of euphony for the prevention of two vowels in juxtaposition. On the whole, it would therefore be more appropriate to regard these variant forms as the result of a phonetic expedient than to trace the origin to the Chinese sien “rice” and Turkish yaγmur, Chuvash sănár, Yakut samır “rain” (all of which latter go back to the stem *yaγ) for the Japanese -šine and -same respectively. Whatever the history of -šine and -same, I am convinced on this point that the final vowel of the word ine “rice-plant”, like that of ame “rain”, was originally -a. So it is with the word yone “rice”. It may be pointed out that the comparison put forward by Matsumoto of the words ine, -šine, and yone, with similar terms in the Austroasiatic and Austronesian languages is not very convincing. The same remark is true of his comparison of the Japanese word take “bamboo” with Malay Peninsula diγ, Mon tun “bamboo”; Bahnar, Jarai diγ, Stieng diγ “tube”, etc. The Chinese t’iuk as suggested by Karlgren is certainly much nearer the Japanese take, but here yet once more the final vowel was originally -a. Similarly the word fune “vessel”, which may be a Chinese loan as Karlgren proposes, although other hypotheses are also possible, goes back to *funa.

In these four words which are regarded by Karlgren as Chinese loans, although this source of two at least of them is very doubtful, the final vowel -e regularly goes back to the earlier -a (possibly pronounced ǝ or ə). These, together with other instances, lead me to conclude provisionally that no Chinese loan-words in Archaic

---

1 Yoshitake, op. cit., p. 889.
2 The Wamyŏshō, a Japanese lexicon of the tenth century A.D., gives: 米 - 與祥 (yone) “rice”; 粕 - 與奈久良 (yonakura) “a rice-granary”.
4 Matsumoto, op. cit., p. 61.
5 Yoshitake, op. cit., p. 889. The word take “bamboo” is considered by Kanazawa (The Common Origin of the Japanese and Korean Languages, Tokyō, 1910, English text, p. 17) as composed of *ta-, a cognate of Korean tai “bamboo”, plus ke, a variant of Japanese ki “tree”. It is true that the form ke is found in the word matsu-no-ke “pine-tree” in one of the Sakimori poems (Man-yō-shū, xx), but since the word take goes back to *taka, it remains to be proved that the word ki “tree” was also pronounced ka.
6 Yoshitake, op. cit., p. 889.
Japanese originally had -e as a parasite vowel. Further examples such as *tono “hall, palace” (<Anc. Chinese *dien, tien 殿 “hall, palace”), *ta “paddy-field” (<Anc. Chinese d’ien 田 “cultivated field”), *kane “metal” (<Anc. Chinese kâng 銅 “steel”), and *kinu “silk stuff” (<Anc. Chinese kïän 絹 “silk stuff”) point to the possibility that the speakers of Archaic Japanese preferred back vowels when turning the Chinese final consonants into a Japanese syllable as the genius of the language demands. It is worthy of note that in later loans such parasite vowels are strictly confined to -u and -i.

Now the Japanese word *fude “a writing brush” is considered by the majority of the modern Japanese philologists as a Chinese loan (Pekinese pi 筆 “a writing brush, a writing, to write” <Anc. Chinese piêti), whilst Motoori maintained that it was a compound of *fumi “a writing” plus *te “hand”. Before accepting the first theory we must find satisfactory answers to the following three questions:—

(1) If the word *fude is a Chinese loan, why in this particular case does the parasite vowel appear in the form -e?

(2) What underlying influence was there to change the Chinese -t into -d- in Japanese?

1 That the original form of *ta “paddy-field” is *tana can easily be seen from the compound tana-tsu-mono (paddy field-of-thing) “rice”, which the Japanese philologists have unsuccessfully sought to analyze, without realizing that the -na- in tana- was originally as much a part of the word as the ta (cf. S. Matsuoka, Nihon Kogo Daijiten: Goshiken, Tôkyô, 1929, p. 805).

2 Compare Goldi gang, Negidal gan, Oroche ga “steel”. The Japanese word kane ( <*kana) was apparently borrowed in the sense “iron”. When later it became a generic term for metal, the ancestors of the Japanese prefixed ma- and ara-, both meaning “pure, genuine”, for distinction; thus magane, aragane “iron”. The term kurogane “iron” is a formation of still later date. It may be mentioned in passing that the professional name mara “smith”, which is represented by Ama-tsu-mara in the Kojiki, is considered by Torii, the renowned anthropologist, as related to Mongol temûr “iron” (R. Torii, Jinsuigaku-jô yori mitaru Waga Jôdai no Bunka, i, Tôkyô, 1928, pp. 325-9). That, however, is altogether impossible, for the first syllable in the Mongol temûr, Orkhon lâmûr, etc., cannot disappear so easily as Torii imagines. If one wishes to seek cognates of the Japanese mara in the Altaic languages, attention should be directed to the Mongol bolot (Classical), bolot, bolot (Buriat), Tungus bolot “steel”. These words are usually considered as derived from the New Persian pûldô “steel” (O. Schrader, Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte: Linguistisch-historische Beiträge zur Erforschung des indogermanischen Altertums Jena, 1907, iii, p. 78; B. Lauffer, Iranian Elements in Mongol, Sino-Iranica, Chicago, 1919, p. 575).


(3) Why in this word is the Chinese -iē- replaced by -u-, whilst in the Go-on-version (fifth-sixth centuries A.D.) of the Chinese characters the former appears regularly as -i-?  

We find no particular reasons for the Chinese -t to be changed into -d- in the loan form, since both t and d have always been possible in an intervocalic position in Japanese, whereas the latter seems to have been inadmissible at the beginning of a word in Archaic Japanese, hence the d- in Chinese d’ien “palace” and d’ien “cultivated field” was replaced by t- in Japanese; thus tono “palace” and *tana > ta “paddy-field” as we have seen above. Nor is there any necessity for adopting a front vowel -e, in the articulation of which a greater effort is required than in the case of mixed or back vowels, particularly in a subordinate position of a parasite nature. It is likewise not easy to explain the change in the stem vowel from Chinese iē- into Japanese -u-, even if we admit that there was a mutation between u and i in Archaic Japanese in certain, but hitherto unexplained, circumstances.

The theory advanced by Motoari, on the other hand, is in perfect accord with the normal trend of phonetic changes in the Japanese language: thus fumite > *fumte > *funte > *funde > *fude > fude, just as fumuta “document” > *fumta > *funta > *fundā > *fūda > fuda “label” and fumibako > *fumbako > *fūbako > fubako “document-box”. Moreover, in the Wamyōshō, a Japanese lexicon compiled A.D. 923-30, the word fude (筆) is read fumite (布美天), and warafude (藁筆) “a straw writing-brush”, wara-fumite (和良布美天). We know that the Japanese language suffered certain phonetic changes during the two hundred years preceding the tenth century A.D., but finding no evidence of such an extraordinary change as -de > -mite, we must assume that the form fumite is the older of the two. The question will then be asked: Is it justifiable to assume the priority of the word fumi in the Japanese language as Motoori’s derivation theory implies? There is reason to believe that the Japanese, or the Wo-jên (倭人) of the Chinese Chronicles, were in communication with their continental neighbours already at the beginning of the first century B.C., and that they would in all probability have become acquainted with the Chinese characters by the middle of the third century A.D. But, according to the Japanese

---

1 The date of borrowing of the word fude, if this is a Chinese loan, cannot have been very far removed from the fifth century A.D., which marks the dawn of literary culture among the Japanese.

records, it was not until A.D. 325 (or 385 ?) that the Chinese literature was officially brought over to Japan.\textsuperscript{1} This is, broadly speaking, all that we know and can guess about the introduction of literary culture into Japan. With such scanty and hazy evidence it is impossible either to affirm or to deny Motoori's hypothesis from an historical point of view, and it seems as though we are compelled to accept it on its face value as supported by the Wamyōshō.

There remains, however, one more possibility as to the origin of the word \textit{fude}. As has been said above, the Japanese acquired the knowledge of the Chinese characters possibly before A.D. 250. To learn foreign symbols of writing is one thing, to apply them to recording one's own language is quite another. For this the Japanese had to seek the aid of their naturalized fellow-countrymen from China and Korea. It is highly probable, as Andō maintains, that the latter of these led the Japanese to the ingenious application of the Chinese characters for writing the Japanese language on the "Ritu" method, resulting in the evolution of the system known as the "Mana" or the "Man-yō-gana".\textsuperscript{2} It may be argued then that the Japanese may have borrowed the word \textit{fude} from the Koreans, in whose language the term signifying "a writing brush" is \textit{pud}, undoubtedly of Chinese origin. Further, it will be seen from the Chi-lin-lei-shih (鶉林類事) that the word \textit{pud} was also pronounced \textit{pud} in Ancient Korean.\textsuperscript{3} Thus if the Korean word \textit{pud} or \textit{pud} was brought over to Japan, it may possibly have sounded to the Japanese ears something like \textit{pudo}, which the Japanese turned into \textit{*pude}. This appears a very reasonable argument, but here again it is difficult to explain the final -e in the Japanese form. In the circumstances, therefore, we are disposed to consider the word \textit{fude} as a native product, composed of \textit{fumi} (\textlt; *pumi) "a writing" and \textit{te}, which latter does not mean "hand" as Motoori supposed, but is a substantival suffix, probably akin to Turkish -\textit{dži}, etc., and Mongol -\textit{či}, -\textit{dži}, until further evidence to the contrary is forthcoming. In all probability the word was first pronounced \textit{*pumite}, which afterwards became \textit{*pude} \textsuperscript{4} > \textit{fude}.

Whilst such is the only hypothesis that is acceptable, at least for

\textsuperscript{1} Andō, \textit{Nihon Bunkashi}, op. cit., pp. 311-14.
\textsuperscript{4} This was later handed down to the Luchuans, who now pronounce it \textit{pudi} or \textit{fudi}. 
the present, as regards the etymology of the word *fude*, the question raised here leads incidentally to a very interesting problem of great significance. For the vast majority of the Altaic languages have words which denote the concept of “writing”, and which resemble phonetically very closely the Ancient Chinese *piët* “a writing brush”, etc.: Turkish *bitiɣ* (Orkhon), *bitîg* (Uighur), *bitîk* (Chaghatai) “a writing”, *bitî*- “to write”; Classical Mongol *bitšiq* “a writing”, *bitši*- “to write”; Manchu *bitxe* “a writing”, Dakhur *bitiye*, etc., Solon *bitxe*, Tungus (Ienissei) *bitšik*, etc., “a writing”, Goldi, Olcha, *bitxö*, Oroche *bitihö*, Negidal *bitxö* “to write”. The Yakut borrowed the term *bitšik* “ornament, pattern” from the Mongols, whilst the Samoyed *pâdâu* (Yurak), etc., “to write” are Turkish loans.¹ The word in question is found even in Hungarian in the form *betû* (pronounced *bâtû*) “a writing, letter”, which is a loan from Old Chuvash: *bitiɣ* “a writing”.²

Authorities are divided on the origin of these terms in the Altaic languages. Some believe that they all go back to the common Altaic stem *biti-, since the Mongol -tši- has in some cases developed from -ti-, as has been pointed out by Ramstedt.³ This theory, however, cannot be accepted as final until the exact relationship between Turkish -t- and Tungus -t- has been satisfactorily explained; this remains unknown at present. On the other hand, Georg von der Gabelentz suggested that the Mongol *bitšiq* and Manchu *bitxe* were Greek loans: πιττάχιον (“a tablet for writing on, a billet, label”).⁴ Refuting this theory of Western source, both Ramstedt and K. Donner, following Wassiljew, maintain that the Turkish *biti-, etc., are of Chinese origin; *piët*, “a writing brush”, etc.⁵ This school further considers that the Chinese word in question was borrowed by Turkish prior to 500 B.C., but not before 1000 B.C. (following the words of Szû-ma-ch’ien), on the supposition that the people now known as the Samoyedes borrowed the words *pâdâu*, etc., “to write” from the Turkish-speaking community some time between 500 B.C. and A.D. 400.⁶

⁵ Donner, op. cit., p. 7.
⁶ Donner, op. cit., p. 7 et seq.
these already perplexing controversies, another theory has recently been put forward by P. Schmidt, according to whom the Altaic terms under consideration are decidedly of Western origin, but not from Greek as Gabelentz supposed. "There is," concludes Schmidt, "nothing in the way, if we derive the Altaic words from the Tokharian or Sakian pūde "he has written" and pūdaka "a document". It is entirely outside the scope of the present paper to examine each of these hypotheses in detail, but the fact remains that the words denoting the concept of "writing", undoubtedly of common origin, have spread over the wide tract of Central and North-Eastern Asia.

Here arises a question. If the Japanese language is Altaic in its essential features, as it actually is, and if the substratum of the modern Japanese came from or passed through Central or Northern Asia, as it is so believed by some historians and anthropologists, why does not the Japanese language possess a word homonymous to bīti- with the meaning "to write"? Is it because the ancestors of the Japanese already had the words kaku, širusu, etc., "to write, note", when they came into contact with the speakers of the Altaic languages, and hence it was unnecessary for them to introduce another to express the same notion? But then the Turks, Mongols, and Tungus each have a word meaning "to write" or of kindred signification: Osmanli yaz-, Chuvash šir- "to write, mark"; Classical Mongol dūrū- "to paint, draw a line"; Manchu nīru- "to write", Goldi nīrūri "to dye, draw", Olcha nūri "to write", šīlu "to dye, draw", Oroche nīruyī "to write", Negidal nīyu "to write", all pointing to the common origin. Moreover, the Old Chuvash *šir- "to write, mark", is preserved in Hungarian in the form őr- (pron. őr-) "to write, paint".3

There is little room for doubt that these words are older than bīti-, etc., and that the original word from which they have sprung signified "to dye, paint, mark", but not "to write". Are the Japanese words nuru "to paint", suru (Archaic) "to print", and širu-su "to mark,

1 P. Schmidt, Etymologische Beiträge, JSFOu. xlii, Helsingfors, 1928, p. 3.
2 In his recent article "Explanation of the Mongol words in the Ko-li-shih annals of the Kao-li Dynasty" (The Tōyō Gakuhō, vol. xiii, No. 2, Tōkyō, Dec. 1929, p. 173), Shiratori appears to consider the Japanese word fude as directly related to Turkish bīti-, etc. That, however, is inconceivable, because a semasiological change from "a writing" or "to write" to "a writing brush" is almost impossible, and therefore, if we are to follow Shiratori's view, we must assume that the meaning "a writing, brush" is the older signification of the Altaic terms under consideration, which, as far as we can trace, are of verbal origin.
3 Gombocé, MSFOu. xxx, op. cit., pp. 87-8.
note", together with the Korean sī- (Old Korean), ssi- "to write", directly connected with the Altaic terms considered above, or is this an instance of mere coincidence? If they are of common origin, how is it that the biti-, etc., have come into being in the Altaic languages and not in Japanese? Is it because the forefathers of the Japanese had already been removed far away from the speakers of the Altaic languages when the latter mysteriously adopted the words biti-, etc.? Or, lastly, did Archaic Japanese contain a cognate which has since been lost? These are the problems for the comparative philologists of the future to solve; not by a mere comparison of words as has hitherto been the case, but on sound linguistic principles.
TO THE ZAMASP-NAMAK. I

By H. W. Bailey

I give below a portion of the Pahlavi Žámasp-Nâmak with notes.

The text is easily accessible in J. J. Modi's Jâmâsp, Pahlavi Pâzand and Persian Texts, 1903, Bombay, and, for a part only, in West's edition in Avesta, Pahlavi, and Ancient Persian Studies, 1904. It has, therefore, seemed unnecessary to reprint the Pahlavi. West used a MS., entitled DP., of the late Shams ul Ulama Dastur Dr. Peshotanji Behramji Sanjana (West, loc. cit.), for the other MSS. see Modi's introduction, loc. cit. I have noted the chief discrepancies only (Modi's MSS. are quoted as "MSS.", or separately as MU., DE.).

1. pursišt Vištâsp šâh kū ēn dēn i apēčak ēnd sâl raṭâk bâvēt ut pas haç ân ēc ābām ut žamânak râsēt.
2. guft-š Žâmâsp i bitaxš kū ēn hâzâr sâl raṭâk bâvēt.
3. pas ōēsān martomān i andar ân ābām bâvōnd hamâk ō mîdrān- družân ēstēnd.
4. ēvak apâk das kēn ut arašk ut drōy kunēnd.

Vištâsp asked, saying: How many years will this Pure Religion endure, and afterwards what times and seasons will come?

Žâmâsp, the minister, said: It will endure a thousand years.

Then those men who are at that time will all become covenant-breakers.

One with another they will be revengeful and envious and false.

And for that reason Ėrān šahr will be delivered up to the Tâčâks and the Tâčâks will daily grow stronger and will seize district after district.

Men will turn to unrighteousness and falsehood, and all that they say or do will be the more profitable for themselves.

And from them righteous conduct will be distant.

1 MSS. and DP. apaspârēnd.
2 MSS. and DP.
8. pat apēdātih ēn Ėrān šahr ो dahyupatān bār i garān rasēt.

9. ut āmār i zarēn ut asimēn ut vas-ē¹ ganž ut xvāstak hanbār kunēnd, ut hamāk ažinn ut apaitāk bavēt.

10. ut vas-ē² ganž ut xvāstak i sāyakān ो dost ut pāt,xšāhīh i dušmanān rasēt.
11. ut margīh i apēzamānak vas bavēt.
12. ut hamāk Ėrān šahr ो dost i ēšān dušmanān rasēt.
13. ut Anērān ut Ėrān guźmē-čihēnd ētōn kū ērīh haē anērīh paitāk nē bavēt, ān i ēr apāc (ō) anērīh ēstēnd.

14. ut pat ān i vat ābām ān i tūbānkār ān i driyūš farroxe dārēnd, ān i driyūš xvat farroxe nē bavēt.
15. ut āzātān ut vazurkān ो živandakāhī i apemēcak rasēnd.
16. api-šān margīh ētōn xvaš sahēt čēgōn pit ut māt vēnīn i frazand ut mātar duxtar pat kāpēn bē bavēt.
17. ut duxt ke-š hač-š zāyēt pat vahāk bē fravāxsēt.
18. ut pus pitar ut mātar žanēt, api-š andar živandakāhī haē kata-kvatarīh yut kunēt.

For its lawlessness, this Ėrān šahr will come as a heavy burden to the governors of the provinces. And they will store up the tale of gold and silver, and much treasure and wealth also, and all will disappear and pass out of sight.

And much royal treasure and wealth also will pass into the hands and possession of enemies. And untimely deaths will abound.

And all Ėrān šahr will fall into the hand of those enemies.

And Anērān and Ėrān will be confounded, so that the Iranian will not be distinguished from the foreigner; those who are Iranians will turn back to foreign ways.

And in that evil time rich men will deem the poor fortunate, but the poor man will not himself be fortunate.

And the nobles and the great will come to a savourless life.

And to them death will seem as sweet as to father and mother the sight of children and to a mother a dowered daughter.

The daughter who is born of her she will sell for a price.

And the son will strike father and mother and during his lifetime will deprive him of authority in the family.

¹ MSS. ² MSS. DP. ⁶
19. ut kas brātar mas brātar žanēt, api-š xvāstak hač-š stānēt, api-š xvāstak rād zūr apar gōbēt.

20. ut žan gyān i xvēš pat margaržān bē dahēt.
21. ut avarik ut apaitāk martom ō paitākīh rasēt.
22. ut zūr ut gukāsīh i arāst ut drōy frāxv savēt.

23. šap évak apāk dit nayn ut mač xvarēnd ut pat dostīh raβēnd 1 ut rōc i diūkār pat gyān i évak diūkār čārak sāčēnd ut vat handēšend. 2

24. ut andar ān vat ōβōm ān kē-š frazaṇ nēst pat farrozv dārēnd, ān i kē-š frazaṇ hast pat čāsm xvār dārēnd.

25. ut vas martom ō uzdehikīh ut bēkānīh ut saxīh rasēt.

26. ut andarvāy aōšūftak ut sart vāt ut garm vāt vazēt.

27. ut bar i urvarān kēm bē bavēt ut zamīk hač bare bē 3 savēt.

28. ut būm vižandak 4 ut vinās-kār 5 bē bavēt ut vas avērānīh bē kunēt.

And the younger brother will strike the elder brother, and will take his wealth, and for his wealth will make false statements.

And a woman will commit mortal sin against her own life.

And the inferior and obscure man will come into notice.

And wrong and false witness and lies will abound.

By night one with another they will eat bread and drink wine, and walk in friendship, and next day they will plot one against the life of the other and plan evil.

And in that evil time him who has no children they deem fortunate, but him who has children they hold cheap in their eyes.

And many men will go into exile and foreign lands and fall into distress.

And the atmosphere will be confounded, and cold wind and hot wind will blow.

And the fruit of the plants will become less, and earth will be without fruit.

And the earth will be corrupt and injurious and will cause much desolation.

1 MSS. raβēt (cf. Bthl., SR., 3, 30, No. 2), DP. raβēnd.
2 MSS. hand[ešēnd, DP. handēšend.
3 DP. hač bare bē.
4 MSS. สามาร. DP. 
5 MUS. DE. DP. 
6 MU. DE. S. DP. چورس.
29. ut vārān i apēhangām vārēt \(^1\) ut ān kē vārēt apēsūt ut vat bavēt.
30. ut ašr apar āsmān gartēt.
31. ut dipēr \(^2\) pat nipišt \(^3\) i vat āyēt.
32. ut har kas haē guft ut gōbīn ut past ut patmān apāc ēstēnd.
33. ut har martom kē-š andak vēkēh ā-š ēwanskāh aphemēcaktar ut vattar bavēt.
34. ut katēčak bē kart xānak bavēt.
35. ašbār \(^4\) paḍak ut paḍak \(^5\) ašbār bavēt.
36. bandakān pat rāθ i āzālān raβēnd.
37. bē Yazdān āzātīh pat tan mēhmān nē bavēt.
38. ut martom i ān vis ō afoṣos-karih ut aparōn kunisṅiṅ vartēnd, ut mēcak i xvāstak nē \(^6\) dānēnd.
39. api-śān mīr ut dōsar’n pat dahīk \(^7\) martom.
40. apurnāy zūt pīr śavēt.

And unseasonable rain will fall, and that which falls will be unprofitable and bad.

Clouds will gather over the sky.

And the scribe will come with bad writing.

And everyone will repudiate word and statement, covenant and agreement.

And every man who has little good, for him life becomes more savourless and more evil.

A small house, being built, will pass for a mansion.

A horseman will become a man on foot, and the man on foot a horseman.

Slaves will walk in the path of nobles.

Save through Yazdān, nobility is not a guest in any body.

And the men of that Great House will turn to mockery and iniquity and know not the flavour of wealth.

And for them affection and love will be towards the despised man.

The youth swiftly will become an old man.

---

\(^1\) MSS. 
\(^2\) MU.
\(^3\) DE.
\(^4\) See notes.
\(^5\) MSS. adi.
\(^6\) DP.
\(^7\) MSS. DP.
41. ut har kas kē pat vat kunišñih i xveš šāt bavēt pat aparmand dārēnd.
42. ut šābr šābr ut dēh dēh ut rōtastāk rōtastāk ēvak āpāk dit kōhrīn in kārēcār kunēt.

43. ut hač dūkhar čiş pat apar stānēt.
44. ut sturg ut ruzd ut stahmak mart pat nēv dārēnd, ut fražānak ut vēh dēn martom pat dēv dārēnd.

45. ut kas-ē kas pat apāyast i xveš pat kāmak nē rasēnd.
46. ut martom i pat ān i vat ābām zāyēnd hač ās'n ut rōd i saxt¹ saxtta bavēn bē (ka) ham xōn ut gōst bavēnd ēnyā hač sang saxttar bavēnd.
47. ut afsōs ut riyārīh pairadak bavēt.
48. ut har kas ē bēkānakīh ut [hač] xvešīh in Ahraman druwand rasēnd.
49. ut mōhrānruž vinās andar ān ābām kunēnd.
50. tēz ut zūt dast (ō) passoxv rasēnd, čegov āp tačīn ē drayāp.

51. ut ātaxsān i Ėrān šābr ē hanžāpišn ut apasārišn rasēnd.
52. ut hēr ut xvāstak ē dast i Anērān i druwandān rasēt ut hamāk aydēn ² bē bavēnd.

And everyone who rejoices in his own bad deeds, they will hold it his privilege.
And the several districts and provinces and cultivated tracts one with another will struggle in conflict.
And from another he will take a thing as plunder.
And the contentious and greedy and violent man they will deem good, but wise men of good faith they will hold as dēs.
And the several persons will not attain their desires according to their needs.
And the men who are born in that evil time will be harder than hard iron and brass; save that they are likewise blood and flesh they will be harder than stone.
And mockery and defilement will be an ornament.
And everyone will turn to strange ways and kinship with Ahraman the evil.
And the covenant-breakers will work injury at that time.
Swiftly and speedily their hands will be given to sureties, as the streams of a river flow to the sea.
And the fires of Ėrān šāhr will come to an end and be extinguished.
And treasure and wealth will come into the hands of foreigners, and all will become men of evil faith.

¹ DP. om.
² MSS. aydēn, DP. akēn.
53. ut xvāstak vas gart kunēnd, api-š bar nē xvarēnd.
54. ut hamāk ō dast i sardārān i apēsūtān rasēt.
55. ut har kas kart kunişn i őē dit nē passandēnd.
56. ut saxtīh ut anākkīh i ānšān hač őēšān apar rasēt.
57. ēwandakīh pat apēmēcak ut margīh pat pānākkīh dārēnd.

And they will amass much wealth, but they will not enjoy the fruit of it.
And it will all pass into the hands of unprofitable governors.
And everyone will disapprove the work done by the other.
And the harshness and evil of those men will come upon these.
They will hold life savourless and death a refuge.

1. pursūt “asked”, NPers. pursūdan “to ask”, Av. pērasā “I ask”. The problem of the r vowel in Iranian was fully discussed by Bartholomae (MM., 6, 1925), and is touched upon by Reichelt in Gesch. d. Idg. Sprachwiss., Bd. iv, Iranisch, pp. 34–5. The position of Armenian loanwords has not been clearly recognized. Junker, Wörter u. Sachen, 1929, p. 138, seems to consider that corresponding to NPers. mury “bird” Armenian must have had *mury, not *mary. The case is otherwise. Arm. lw. vard “rose” beside NPers. gul may be explained either as from a dialect in which r > ar, cf. Oss. mard “dead” < *mētā-, maryl “bird”, ard “oath” < *t̥a-, or as from a form with vowel-ar-. Sammānī vāle “rose” (quoted by Reichelt, loc. cit.) has probably compensatory lengthening due to the change -r̥ > l, cf. WPers. sāl < *sarā-. Saka vala “rose, flower”, Saco Doc. 52, 53, and sāli “year”, kamala- “head”, have not developed this long vowel— *vard-, *sard-, *kamard-. Hence, in Arm. lws. -ar- exists beside -u- in the other dialects as representative of the r vowel. Another word of this kind is: Arm. lw. barš, baš “mane”,1 Av. barosā “back of

horse”, Pahl. buš, NPers. buš “neck, mane”, HAG., 118. So, too, *mary “bird” may safely be recognized in siramarg “peacock”. De Lagarde’s connection of it with Pahl. sēn muro is certainly possible: *sēnaramarg may have been altered by assimilation of n to r in accord with the Armenians’ etymology “loving the meadows”, sēr “love”, marg “meadow” = Iran. (Av.) marγā, HAG., 193. The Georgian pharsamangi < *frašamary “peacock” has apparently dissimilated the second r to n, but such a form as varṣamangi “tiara”, from Arm. lw. varṣanak “headband, napkin”, suggests the possibility of analogy in the ending. The same word *marg “bird” is probably the second component in loramarg = lor “quail”, see HAG., 237. Sogd. (Buddh.) mṛγ-, Frag., 3, 38, 44, etc., should also be read *n.ary. The absence of the mater lectionis v is not decisive, but so many examples of mṛγ- without v are fairly convincing. So, too, for Sogd. (Buddh.) mṛγ’yistogram “birds”: Benveniste, Gram. Sogd., ii, 79, reads *murγyist. Arm. lw. ištrimul “ostrich”, HAG., 157, is late, thirteenth century.

Arm. lw. parḥ- is a further example: parhak, pahak, pahak (HAG., 218) occur as part of a geographical name: pahak Čorai near Derbend. Hübschmann renders “Wache von Čor”. The Armenian phrase corresponding is kapan Čorai “the pass of Čor” or drunk: Cotai “Gate of Čor”. Hence a connection with Iran. *ptu-*ptu-, Av. poro-, Pahl. puh-, NPers. pūl, Kurd. pūd “pass, bridge” is likely. I find the same word in taraparḥak and pahak in the phrase taraparḥak varel, pahak varel or onul “angariare” (Ciakciak). In Mt., 27, 32, zna kalan pahak zi barječ zxačn nor “tvōtvon ʏγγάρενσαν _INTERVAL_ 间的 ʏν_tvō tvō σταυρόν αὐτοῦ” : here taraparḥak “beyond the way or passage”. So in čanarparh “way”, though the first part čana- is obscure to me: čana- can come from Iran. *cāyana- to kay-, AIW., 441. Can Sogd. (Buddh.) n’bē’n’y, SCE., 258, be compared? Gauthiot translated “frontière”, Gram. Sogd., 77, but Benveniste, Glossaire, “national”. Cf. n’bē’kh “Länder”, Frag., 3, 6.

Saka vala “rose” has -ar < *vārd, like the Arm. lw. vārd. Cognate with this word is Saka vilakye, Sacu Doc., 65, vilaki, ibid., 69, 73. < *vīδā- “plant”. Cf. Av. vrsīδa- “name of a plant”, AIW., 1369. (On Sacu Doc. 65, see § 27 infra.) The -aka- suffix is a Saka innovation. Old (Iran.) -aka was lost through *-aγα- > -aa- nom. sing. -ai, as kṣundai “husband”, et pass. Both -aka- and -ka are found (perhaps originally diminutive): murka- “(small) bird” beside muraka- “bird”. Pahl. muro, NPers. mury, Sogd. (Buddh.) mṛγ-, Oss. mry;

khevā ni vijyē vilakī brī mīrāraṃ amṛḥi hamari gūśimdi biśi
“as plucked plants they die early, in a short while they all pass away.”


brī “early” < brū “early”, Mait. Sam., 150, for u > ī, see § 27 infra.

amṛḥi hamari “a short moment” : amṛga- is probably < *anta->
-amca and -aṃkya N., 79. 6 f.) with -ka. Cf. Av. huśka- “dry”,
Saka huṣka-, Saka buḷṣya “long” < *brz-ka-, rraṣya- “quick” <
*raṣ-ka, etc. Hence, cf. amṛga- with Pahl. NPers. andak “little, few” <
*antaka to Pahl. and “so much”. The loc. pl. occurs Sacu Doc., 54,
hamarvā vam amṛgā ne paṣṭara “even for a few moments they are not
permanent”.

paṣṭara- adj. to paśimdi, Sacu Doc., 55, “they stay” (pāti + stā)
for the form cf. byātarā “attentive”, Mait. Sam., 277, byāta-
“memory” + ra, and ttarandara- “body”.

gūśimdi “they go, pass away” < *gaḥ-s- to Sogd. (Buddh.)
gβśnt “they advanced”, VJ., 58c, pret. gβt-, VJ., 784, etc., and
MPT. huṣṭm “to assemble”, Pahl. haṃςpiṃ “bringing to an end”,
§ 51 infra—*gap- beside *gam-. For the Saka form cf. hūśme “I
sleep”, Sacu Doc., 71, hūś[t] “he sleeps”, N., 94. 8. < hvaḥ-s-,
Pahl. xvaftan, but Sogd. (Buddh.) wβ’s “he fell asleep”, Frav. 2a, 13,
without h-.

Arm. mah, marh “death”, IIAG., 472, a stem in -u, is also probably
an Iran. loanword to Av. mαρθυς “death”. In genuine Armenian
words -rt- gives -rd (mard “man”, ard “now”, ʔαρ). For -rt-
in Arm. I have no example, but t before r is lost initially (erek’ “three”)
Gram., i, 1, 433, and Hübschmann, Arm. Gr., 472, derive marh < -rτ-
as a genuine Arm. word. It is important that Arm. mah, marh is an
-u stem like the Iranian word. The Gothic word *maurpr* (neut.), which Brugmann and Hübschmann compare, is classed by Brugmann, *Grund. Vgl. Idg. Gram.*, ii, 1, 343, with -*tro*, -*trá*- formantia.


For the Iranian words for "time" see Marquart, *Ādīna*, §§ 1–10. Junker's and Scheftelowitz's derivation of Iran. ūmān from Ass. *sīmānu* (after Zimmerm) is quite unconvincing (see ZII., 4, 333), and is not repeated in Scheftelowitz, *Die Zeit als Schicksalgottheit*, 1929. Marquart's suggestion (from the verb *gām*) is the only possible etymology. To these Iranian words add Saka bāda- "time" < *varta-" the revolving". For the -ā- cf. *kādārna*, N., 9, 15, "with a sword," to Av. karotā-, Pahl. kārt, NPers. kārd, and Av. vāsa- "chariot" < *varta-. On the verbs *vart-" turn" and gart-" turn" see Morg., *Et. Voc. Pashlo*, p. 27.

2. Žāmāsp. Historically certified by the Gothic references Y., 46, 17; 49, 9; 51, 18, and the important "Catalogue of the Community", *Yt.*, 13, 103. He was a member of the wealthy *Hauγava (GA v. Hvō.gea, YAv. Hvōva) family, whence came also Zoroaster's third wife Hvōvi "The Hauγava". Later as a type of omniscient wise minister.

Turkish title: 1. 77 ḥ♭y n *z♭y u, 1. 93 y♭y n *y♭y u equivalent to Indo-Scyth. ZAOOY, yavuša, -jaũa, NPers. y♭y u. There is equal uncertainty in regard to another loanword, the name “Jew”, Heb. יְהוּדָי.

Arab. yahūd, Pahl. yhvd, Paz. zuhudan, MPT. yhvd n, Sal. Nachträge, Christ. Sogd. ēxvd (several times, ST., p. 93), *zahūd *jahūd, but ST., 32. 18, yhv d “Judas”, 32. 22, yhd “Judea”, 30. 6, yhdy γρρ “mountains of Judea”. It is at least clear that the Chinese forms 箕产 *ṣu-hu < *ṣu-hūd and 孑∪u-ṣu, discussed by Laufer, Sino-Iranica, 533–4, need not, as he supposed, have come from NPers. The Sogd. ēxvd could have been the source.

2. bitaxš. This is also Žamāsp’s title in Az., 35, etc. The word has been much discussed, see Herzfeld, Paikuli Gloss., No. 214. On the inscriptions occur (Pahl.) býthš, (Pārs.) blhšy, Grček (fifth century A.D.) [ΠΙΤΑΞΗΣ. It was a title of the margraves of Armenia and Assyria. In Arm. lw. bdeasx, Georg. lw. pitašxi, paitašxi. The bitaxš was an important imperial officer of high rank. For its application to Žamāsp see Herzfeld, Arch. Mitt., i, 171, No. 3. The form of the word is unusual. It is probably *pati-āxša: pit- < pati- is found in Pahl. pityārak beside patyārak, and in the nom. propr. (Arm.) Bakour, b and p vary: Πάκορος, Justi, Iran. Namenbuch, p. 238 f.

2. hazār sāl “millennium”, see now Herzfeld, Arch. Mitt., ii, 38 f. The “thousand years” were to end with the coming (paitākīh, ἐπιφάνεια) of Uxšyat.-art (Hössētar). It was therefore found necessary to extend the period from Zoroaster’s ἐπιφάνεια beyond the thousand years to explain the continued reign of evil.

3. mātrāndrūžān, 4. 6, drōy. Wherever this word is found in Middle Iranian its meaning is “falsehood”, as the corresponding duruxta-, draujana-, drauga- of the Old Persian inscriptions. The forms occurring are:—

Pahl. drōy. S.W. dial. drōb, M.X., 2, 177; Nyberg, Hilfsb., p. 41. Andreas, Facsimile, p. 17, 1. 6, บันเทิง301(616,337),(876,378). The Semitic mask is KDB’ “false”.

Sogd. (Buddh.) 3rav, Gr. Sogd., 137, “mensonge”; 3rav, 1

1 Pahl. y- may stand for y, ž- or j-; cf. 3y giyān, žān “life”, NPers. ʃān, MPT. gy n < *vi-āna, Av. vyāna- (only in loc. sing. vyānayā). To the same verb an-, Saka uyāna- translating Sansk. ātman-, N., 35. 7, 94. 12; cf. L., 74, and vyjš-e-jša “exhaling”, instr. sing., N., 50. 24. The word an- is poorly represented in Iran., see AIW., 112, 358. To Pahl. ʃān “life”, cf. MPT. S.W. gy g and ʃy “place”, NPers. ʃay.
"imposture", SCE., 253, etc.; rty prw  àrym w'n'w w'βt "and in falsehood he so speaks".

Saka drújô hvatándi "they have spoken lies", MAIT. Sam., 235.

Arm. lw. drúzém, držem "transgress, infringe, fail", drúzhan "faithlessness", ouxtadrouz "viator of a vow, transgressor".

The verb drúzhan occurs in Pahl., as MX., 8, 15 (ed. Andreas, p. 24, ll. 10-11): Mídr ut Zurvân i akanârak ut mênôk i dâstân kê pat âê kas nê družê "Mihr and Zrvân the infinite and the spirit of justice whom no one can deceive in aught".

Herodotus noted (i, 138): αἰαχυτόν δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸ ψευδεσθαί νενόμοσαι.

4. arašk "envy". This is the Pahl. translation of Avestan araşko (Y., 9, 5), NPers. arašk, rašk "envy", MPT. ryşkyn adj. "envious" (Sal. Nachtr.), and probably ryşqvr'n "enviers"? Sal. Man. St., p. 124. Pahl., NPers., and MPT. have -šk- over against Avestan -sk-. Sogd. goes with the Avestan: Christ. Sogd. 'rśqny (ST. 33, 18): šm'vn qāt žygrty bêt 'rśqny ('arasqan'), Lk. 6, 15, Σίμωνα τὸν καλομένου Ζηλωτών.


9. zarēn ut ašimēn 㚖. zarēn can be explained from *zarânu(y)a-. It is then distinct from the adj. zarēn < *zarânova (cf. AIW., Sp. 1678). So in zarēn kart, zarēn pēsît, AV. Gloss., 148, 痧. ašimēn is adj. "of silver", but in ašimēn pēsît, AV., 12, 9, is apparently noun. It could be explained as analogic to zarēn. Hence (a)simēn might be kept in Az. 11 and here.

9. āmār "reckoning". Iranian (h)mar- is well represented.

Pahl. marak 亾, Paz. mara, NP. mara "number", Pahl. mar, NPers. mār "number", Pahl. āmār beside ēmār; see Bthl., SR., 1, 21; Junker, FP., 38, 93; āmârēnītan "pay" and "consider", MM., 1, 37, SR., 4, 46. In compounds: pasēmār pasmār "defendant", pēsēmār pēsēmār "plaintiff", hamēnār ¹ "opponent", MX., 1, 37, etc.; Paz. hamōmār hamōmāl (= "Ankläger", MM., 2, 20; MM., 1, 29),

¹ A similar form is found in Arm. lw. hamemat "proportionate" < *ham-āsimūta. Häbschmann, Arm. Gram., 463, has no solution.
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māriśn “memory” (see ZII., 2, 63). MP. Inscription. hmr *ahmār < aḍīmāra in ahmār-kār hmrkr “Minister of Finance”, see Marquart, Ādīna, § 24, Arm. lw. hamarakar, see also Nyberg, “Pahlavi Inscriptions of Derbend,” Bull. de la Société Scientifique d’Azerbaïdjan, 1929, No. 8, part v. ’m’k̪l *amārkar. NPers. hamār “number”, Arm. lw. hamar “calculation, number”, can come from *ham-mār or *adi-māra.1 Av. mar-, AIW., 1147, Pahl. pātmār “judgment”, FP., 122. On the preverb *adi- see Marquart, Ādīna, §§ 21–6, and add Pahl. Psal. ’deyn *aḍ’ven “law”.

Beside forms without h- : š-, are found, with š: Av. hiṣmārəntō aivi-šmarətō partīšmarshnə patišmarshəntəm, Pahl. ोśmurtan, ośmarišn, ोśmurdan “to count”, ोśmār “number”, Sogd. (Buddh.) šmr “he thinks”, Dhuta, 5, 11, etc.; šm’r’kh “thought”, Dhuta, 46, etc.; ptsmryt “he counts”, Frag., 2a, 9; ptsmr “number”, SCE., 3, etc.; Sogd. (Christ.) šm’r’gy “reflective”, šm’r’y “thoughts”. Arm. lw. nšmar “trace”, nšmarem “perceive”. But Pahl. mārīk, which Bartholomae derives from this word, is probably < *manbra-, SR., 1, 21, No. 1; cf. Sogd. (Buddh.) m’r’kh “words of sorcery”, m’r’ky “sorcerers”, Arm. lw. margarē “prophet”, MPT. mhr- “hymn”.

To *hmar- belong also Saka hamara- “moment”, Sacu Doc., 54, 73, N., 6. 40, etc., and ahumāra- “many, countless”, N., 3. 34, 66. 28, 75. 30, etc. Leumann’s derivation *a-sumātra is, as often, too Indian (N., 78. 10).

To ahmār: Beside this M. Iran. ah- < aḍi, the same form of preverb resulted from *atī- > ah-, see Bthl., ZAIW., 63, No. 1, on MPT. ʰhr’myd ʰhr’myšn v’dʰhr’m, Pahl. ahrāmīšn ʰhr’myd Pāz. aharāmīšn “lead to”. I see the same preverb in a Sogdian passage which has been misunderstood, SCE., 27–30. In l. 28 f. occurs:—

rtym ʰsty Zkny čš’yt ʰPny wš’yt rtyms ʰsty Zkny ʰwyh ɣ’n’kh skwyt rty prc rvz ʰwert t ʰw’wnt.

This Benveniste translates: puis il y a celui qui a nourriture et vêtement (?). Puis il y a celui qui demeure dans une maison et a, à sa satisfaction, nourriture et vêtements. But the Chinese text refers only once to food and clothing, in Pelliot’s translation, ll. 10 f.: il y en a qui entrent au palais et vivent à la cour, et ont à leur gré vêtements et

1 Arm. lw. ħastat “established” < aḍīstata beside Pahl. ħastāt, NPers. īstād.
nourriture. This antithesis is preceded in the Chinese ("il y en a qui errent au dehors et que la faim et le froid torturent") and in the Sogdian by the antithesis of hunger and cold and want of lodgment. With this it is possible to take l. 28, rtymn 'st-y Zkny čš'yt 'Pny ṝš'yt. In this the two words čš"yt and ṝš'yt have lacked an explanation. Gauthiot, Gram. Sogd., i, p. 72, clearly connected čš"yt with the word čaš- "to drink", whence Sogd. (Buddh.) čš'nt "boisson", cf. Arm. lw. čaš "meal, feast", and so Benveniste in the Glossaire, S.C.E., 74. For ṝš'y-, also in the Glossaire, "s'habiller" is given. But it seems better to explain both čš"yt and ṝš'yt as compounds of the verb š'y-which occurs also in ṝβš'yt, S.C.E., 457, etc., "il sejourne", the Sogdian cognate of Avestan šay-, Sanskr. kṣetī. Then ṝš'yt is clearly *višašati "dwell apart, or in various places", for the vi-cf. Sanskr. vīvas- "to dwell abroad, to lodge", and Junker's explanation of Mid. Pers. Truf. vy'g, Mid. Pers. Inscript. gyv'k in Wörter und Sachen, 1929, 147–8, as from *vivāhaka-.

The other word čš"yt is rather more disguised. It is *čišāyt from *ati-šāyati. It is a case of assimilation, tiš- > čiš-, of which two other clear cases occur: čštwn "poor", S.C.E., 11, 15, etc., and čšn- "thirst". čštwn is *čuštavān from *duštavān through *tuštavān. The unassimilated form is also found: δštwn "poor", Frag., iia, 3, 9, and in the abstract δšt'wēy "poverty", Frag., iia, 7. For the assimilation cf. further the Arm. lw. tšnami "enemy" from *dušman-. Similarly čšn- *čišn- "thirst" is from *tršna-, New Pers. tišna "thirsty". It should not be connected with čaš- "to drink" (Gauthiot, Gram. Sogd., 163).

The development of čštyk "third" is naturally different and comes from *ṛṛiya-, see Gram. Sogd., ii, 141.

The preverb ati- may also be present in Ossetic in the form -c-. As is clear from aćaš "true" < *haṭya-kā-, ṭi- resulted in -c-. When, therefore, -c- is found in acaunjı̂n "aufhängen", acaomonın "anzeigen", bacamonın "belehren", ācaarajın "zurichten", and other verbs, it can be explained as *aṭi-, the form developed before vowels. This seems better than Miller's explanation, Grundr. d. Iran. Phil., I Anhang, p. 84, of -c- from us-, uz-.

With more hesitation it is possible to derive Oss. čafšin "brennen" from *ati-taftsa-, if it is assumed that *ct- could become *ct- and *c-.

The Saka preverb tea- in tcabaljiši, N., 50. 23, "er zerstückelt", and tcabrīši, N., 50. 34, "er zerbricht", may possibly contain a similar ati- developed either before a vowel or by assimilation and later
transferred to other verbs. For a similar development in the case of 
apati—see Bthl., ZAIW., 179–88.

9. 
apanž “treasure, treasury”. This word is attested for the Old Pers. period by the Aramaic lw. סנה *ganzā, Eleph. Pap. Sachau, 8 (see Schectelowitz, Scripta Universitatis... Hierosolymitanarum, vol. i, 1920). 
apanž “treasure” and 
apādh “rank” are closely associated, hence the simile in Az. 85: ḍēgōn agād ṭu aganž 
martom “like a man without rank and rights and without treasure”.

10. shāyakān “royal”. Cf. 
apanž i 

Here shāhikān may equally well be read, cf. Junker, FP., 114.

11. vas bavēt “abounds”. Cf. Old Pers. drauga dahāyāhuvā vasiy 
(abaca “The Lie abounded in the provinces”, B., 1, 10.

13. Anērān ut Ėrān, ērīh, anērīh, ēr. Pahl. can represent three distinct words: adāra-, aryā-, aya-, each of which resulted in ēr in the S.W. dialect.

(1) adār, ēr, see Bthl., ZAIW., 225, SR., 5, 54, No. 4. It is found in compounds: adār- (ēr-) mēnīn “humility”, etc., haçaḍar “under”, NPers. azēr, zēr “under”.

(2) aryā-. Mid. Iran. N.W. dial. ’ry’n *aryān, Herzfeld, Paikuli, p. 145; S.W. dial. ’yr’n *ērān, ibid.; Pahl. ērān, NPers. ērān; cf. Oss. ēr “an Ossete”, iron “Ossetic”, and Saka ērēnā gari “Iranian Mountains”, N., 158. 5. Both dialects are represented in Arm. lws.: Ari-k’ and Ėrān.

(3) aya-. Pahl. anaγrān, anērān, An. anaγranam roćarham “the 30th day of the month”, cf. Oss. aly “peak”.

With the suffix -āv-: āy it occurs in Pahl. ’kr’y sūlar ayaγrāy “excellent”, MPT. (S.W.) γr’yy ayaγrāy in T., iii, 260d, 1. 4 (Schectelowitz, Orien Christianus, 1927).

Here belongs MPT. ’gr’v (Sal., Man. St., 45, and Sal., Nachtr.). For the treatment of -gr- and -rg- see Bthl., MM., 6, 13–14: these two groups are not confused (by metathesis to -yr-) in Iranian. Cf. NPers. mury, Sogd. ’mrye, Oss. mary “bird”, NPers. mary “meadow”, Sogd. mryh “wood”; but Pahl. anaγrān, NPers. anērān.

Andreas (apud Lentz, Die Stellung Jesu, p. 41, Note) is, therefore,
in error when he connects MPT. 'grv with 'ryv. MPT. 'ryv "precious, dear" is to be connected with argy- "to be worth". This word is well represented: Av. argy-, arjat, Y., 50, 10; arjaiti, Hād. Nask., 1, 6; arjā- "valuable", arjī- "worthy", arjah- "price".

Pahl. arz, aržān, Arm. lw. aržan, NPers. arz, arf, aržān, aržādan.

MPT. 'ryv "dear", 'ryv'yf (l) "dearness", Sogd. (Buddh.) 'ry "price", VN., 38, Oss., argy "price", Arm. lw. y-argy "price", y-argem "to honour", anargem "to dishonour", Skr. arghā "price". Here belongs also Saka alyṣānā, later eysānā, "prince": this is *arzānak- < *arzāna-.

It is necessary to recognize ys (notation of z) < ż palatal development of Iranian -g. Similarly in Saka diysde translating Skr. dhārayati, L., 89, 5, and elsewhere, beside dijs- in dijsāti, 3rd sing conj., dijsāka- "one who holds", L., 89, 15, 97, 36, etc., and drijsāna, N., 107, 28, "to be held", Av. drag- "hold". Alysānā, therefore, does not represent a base (Indo-Iran.) *argh distinct from *argh, as Leumann supposed, L., 63. The form alys- (*arz- or *alz-) with palatal agrees with NPers. and Pahl. aržān "worthy". Two forms, one palatal and one guttural, exist side by side, originally due to the development of gutturals to palatales before front vowels in Indo-Iranian. Examples of the two forms in Pahl. -k and -č are: āmčē beside āmōk "teaching", NPers. gurč beside gurčy "flight", afrčy "rays", rōč "day". For the voiced guttural cf. Pahl. NPers. tanga "constricted", Pahl. vidang, MPT. vidang, Arm. lw. vtańg "peril, distress" beside NPers. tanj "pressing, fixing", tanjādan. In Pahl. occurs Q̄ tanţ "straining" (of gaze), Iranian *tanga- beside *tanjāh-. Hereto probably Sogd. (Buddh.) wytny- "pain", *vitya-, a form without nasal, cf. pšnk- beside pškh "law", Christ. Sogd. pšq'. In this way, too, is to be explained Saka bāysē bāysu "garden", N., 169, 3, 4, loc. sing. bāsa, L., 127, N., 171. 15 (ys = z, ū = ūj), from *brāz(ah)-, over against Sogd. (Christ.) b'gy bāy "garden", Mt., 21, 33 = āµελόva, ST., 19, 15, etc.; Pahl. NPers. bāy "garden", otherwise Leumann, Zvgl. S., 1930, 188.

The Saka word pārsē (Sacu Doc., 63) can be explained in the same way. It may be pā-rāsa- (s = z, or it could be misspelling for -ys- as elsewhere). The pā- 1 < pati- cf. Pahl. pātkōs, pātdahin pāfrās pāzand, Paz. pādāšn, NPers. pāzahr, see Bthl., ZAIW., 179–88, Marquart Ādīna, § 31. -rāsa- *rāza- < *rāza- is the form with palatal which corresponds to NPers. rāy "a verdant meadow".

1 Hereto Arm. lw. pakas "defective", pakasem "to lack", Pahl. kās- (časmkās, MX., 2, 181, ed. Andreas, p. 17, l. 11), kāhēnīan "to diminish".
To return to Pahl. ēr. Paz. anārī, MX., 21, 25, is rendered into Skr. by anādeśacārātā. In anārīh, therefore, is included both the non-Iranian peoples and their habits. Pahl. ēr “Iranian” occurs in Az. 79: ēh ēr āsāt pasoxv nē dāt “no Iranian noble answered”.

Ērān u ā Anērān forms a regular part of the titulary of Sasanian kings, Herzfeld, Paikuli, p. 145. Both Northern (aryān u ā anaryān) and Southern (ērān u ā anērān) forms are known.

Arm. erani, and derivatives, “blessed”, may be from either ary- or ayra, with a development of meaning in ecclesiastical use.

In Saka beside palatal forms, as above, a form with guttural is to be recognized in dau “fire”, Mait. Sam., 297, dai “fire”, N., 58. 16 = dei, N., 102. 10, instr. sing. daina, N., 58. 9, loc. sing. dāna, N., 156. 12, from *dāy-a-, cf. NPers. dāy “brand”, Av. dag- “to burn”, AIW., 675. The palatal forms occur in the Saka verb pa-dajśānī “to be burnt”, N., 101. 41, with part. padīta- padīya- “burnt” < *pa-davya.

14. vat (Nyberg, Hilfsbuch, p. 55, ḫ̣ēm) “bad”, NPers. bād, Arm. lw. vat. In Saka, bata-, bataka- is “small”. It is possible to compare for the semantics Sogd. (Buddh.) ks-, Av. kasu- “small” with Gr. κακὸς “bad”. For the Saka words see N., 13. 41; 93. 42; 76. 27; bataka, 13. 42; Mait. Sam., 286, etc.

14. dāryūšt “poor”. It is here defined by its antithesis tuθāŋkar “rich”. For the reading, Bartholomae (MM., 1, 37) pointed to the Pārsī-Pers. درووشن — درووشنān. In Pāz. daryōś, daryōši, darōši, drioṣi, dryōši, MX. Gloss., p. 55. Y. Av. dāryu-, dārvi f., G. Av. dṛṣgu. The relation of Pāz. daryōś to NPers. darvēš is not clear. Has -yō- been interchanged with -vē-? It is possible to compare Pahl. pērōz < *paryōzh (*pari-ōjah) and aparvēz < *upary-ōzh (?) “victorious”.

15. āzātān “nobles”: epithet of the head of a vis, OPers. viθ, and his family—“nobly born”. Az., 79, ēr āzāt “noble Iranian”, see Herzfeld, Arch. Mitt., i, 183, No. 2, Av. āzāta-. The OPers. passage, B., 1, 3, ailmātā amahy “we are noble” is still disputed. Herzfeld, Arch. Mitt., adopts the conjecture ādāta, which would fit admirably. āzātih “nobility, high birth” is a favour from Yazdān in § 37 infra.

For āzāt in the sense of “free”, NPers. āzād, see Bthl., SR., 1, 47, No. 5: martē kā-s anśaṭrhk . . . āzāt bē karte “when a man has freed the slave”.

16. duxtar pat kāpēn “a daughter with
dowry”. Phrases consisting of *pat with a noun can be used attributively without the relative *i (ē), see Bthl., SR., 5. 9, 33; duxtē *pat ēn adevēn “such a daughter”, xvāstak *pat stūrīh, xvāstak *pat aparmanād ažōn *pat xvēsēh, žanišn *pat ēn adevēnak, dālastān *pat var. The phrases form adjs. patnēčak “savoury”, patnērōk “strong”, cf. Husr., p. 90, No. 558, and frequently in NPers.: bafar “splendid”. For kāpēn “dowry”, NPers. kābēn, Arm. kapēn-*k, see HAG., 165.

18. katak xvatāyīh “authority in the house, patria potestas”. 

katak xvatāy is found in two senses: (1) katak “house”, corresponding to Av. nmāna- (G.Av. demāna-), OPers. māniya- (adj.), the family. 

19. zūr apor gōbēt. zūr § 22, 1, 5, Arm. lw. zour “ächikos”.


In Sogd. (Buddh.) occurs another word for “wrong”, ’rn, Dhuta, 83, Dhyāna, 141, ’rnh, Dhyāna, 144, ’rn ny γυνѣ, VJ., 1450, “tort et péché”, which seems to offer a means of explaining the Avestan arnāt.ēaša-, Yt., 10. 35, ἀπακέ λέγ., epithet of Miēra—it remains unexplained in the latest translation of Yast 10 (Hertel, Die Sonne u. Mithra im Avesta, p. 143, § 35, No. 1). By comparison with this Sogdian word ’rn “wrong”, the Av. is probably “punishing wrong”: *arnā-čaiṣa to kāy-, AIW., 464, Skr. cāyate, etc. Cf. also Miēra’s

The same word is in Saka ārra-, translating Sanskrit aparādha-, L., 88, Mait. Sam., 274, etc. For the form cf. kārma- “deaf”, Sogd. (Buddh.) kn-, Pahl. karr, Av. karmana-. It is found also in the compound ārragađa- < *arna-kṣta-. The Saka form with ā- supports the Avestan vocalization ar- against the Skr. ṛ-.


24. ʾān i kē, ʾān kē “he who”. Pahl. MSS. are of no critical value in deciding on the presence or absence of the relative i (ē) < OPers.-hya. The full relative sense was gradually obscured, and although still frequent in Pahl. (written either ʾ or ʾ ZY), is there, too, sometimes strengthened by the addition of kē, ka, or ēgōn. On i kē see MX., 2. 165, 186; Bthl., SR., 2. 26, No. 3; Pāz. i ka, MX., loc. cit. On i kē, Bthl., Zur Etym., 23 (where the text can be kept). On i ēgōn, cf. Pāz., MX., 41. 11, panź drūz . . . i ēn hast ēz u xašm u varun u nang u aļvarvandā “the five Druž . . . which are avarice and anger and lust and shame and discontent”.


Pahl. bēkānak “foreign”, NPers. bēgānē. Pahl. bē šabrīk

(former). Cf. Bthl., MM., 3, 34, No. 1. It seems hard
to separate from these words Sogd. (Buddh.) ḫyk-: ḫyk’ “outside”,
ḫykprmv “outside”, ḫyks’r “to the outside”, ḫykdyunj “heretic”,
plur. ḫykɒyn’, DS., 5, 11, ḫnk ḫyk, Dhuta, 35, “inside and outside”.
Ḫykpr’, Dhuta, 123, ḫykpr’yēc, Dhuta, 174, 50, etc., “external”.
Christ. Sogd. (ST., 70, 13, 14) (fāṣaq)dārant vīnē bēsā “they drove
him out”. Yaghnobi wīk “outside”, ĉī... wīski “outside of”,
see Benveniste, Gram. Sogd., ii, 155–6. Further, Waxi wīc “outside”,
wīçunq “being outside”, Sariqoli vaē, waçenj, Grund. Iran. Phil.,
ib, 308.

26. aḏṣuṭak (ēṣuṭak) “disordered”. Marquart,
Ādīna, § 24, has dealt with the preverb (Iranian) adī- > ad-, ah-, h-, ē-,
see § 9 supra (also Junker, FP., 38–9, 93; Bthl., SR., 1. 21, No. 1).
This preverb is found often beside forms with ē-, in which one can
recognize either Iranian ē- or adī > ē-. Pahl. Psal. ṭdevīn “law”,
MPT. ṭye’r “helper” assure this adī- for Pahl. With aḏṣuṭak
cf. viṣuṭan “to ruin”, viṣōpiśn, āśōp, Arm. lw. apš opin, aśōp “tumult”,
HAG., 106, NPers. āśōb, āṣuṭan, Sogd. (Buddh.) ṭs’uṇpt, SCE.,
104, “écorcher”.

27. bar (fish). Pahl. bar, NPers. bar “fruit, produce”.
Draxt i Asōrik, § 1 (Pahl. T., 109) bar-, ē māñēt angūr “its fruit resembles
a grape”. barbar (fruit-bearing), “profitable”, Bthl., SR.,
5. 29. Sogd. (Buddh.) brk “fruit”, V.N., 80, (Christ.) brjīt, brīṭy “rōn karpōn”, ST., 19. 18, 21. 14. This is probably the word which
occurs in the Saka (Sacu Document, 65) ma tā ttu pūvai sai bari
vilak ye brre vī “Do not fear so, the fruit of the plants appears in its
(time of) growth.”

brre, *abi-rōdā-. The development will be *birūjī > *brūi >
*brū > brī, (brē), for the loss of u-v- cf. grīcyō, grūīco, grīcyau,
N., 2. 20, and tsīye “he goes”, to rūṭī “grows”, Mait. Sam., 125,
126, 117 < rūi-ī < *rōsāti, Av. rcd- “grow”, AIW., 1492,
NPers. rōstan, rōyad, Pahl. rōdsīn, rōstan, Sogd. (Buddh.) rōst, *rōst “grows”, Dhyāna, 284, etc., rōst “growing”, Frag., 3. 4, rōst “may it grow”, Frag., 3. 5. The Saka compound *abi-rōd- is found in
hambrūṭṭi, Mait. Sam., 128, “grows together”, which also illustrates
the earlier stage -rū-. For -e, cf. bre “dear”, N., 163. 20, beside
brē, N., 119. 6.
With reitti, sai illustrates a tendency in Saka phonetics in the treatment of intervocalic -ə-. For sai “appears” = saitti, seitti, N., 50.24, etc., cf. kei “he thinks”, Mait. Sam., p. 41 (E., xiv, 31) = këiti, N., 22. 33. In Saka -ada- became -a₁da- > a₁ > a₁, ei, ē:—
mad-, maiti “is intoxicated”, N., 127. 8, 15.
band-, baiiti “he binds”, N., 127. 9, 21; baindi, 3rd plur.; basta-, part.
sand-, saitti, seitti “appears”, N., 21. 1, 50. 34, etc.; saindi, 3rd plur.;
sasta-, part.
vad-, *abi-vad- bvaiti “mounts”, Mait. Sam., 150; bvasti, part.,
N., 76. 44; bāyindī “they lead”, bāsta-, part.
*ati-vad-, tvāyāki “a guide”.
*ni-vad-, tvāstai, 2nd sing., “you have escaped”, N., 169. 10.
rōd-, reitti “grows”, rrustai-, part., N., 171. 12; hambrātti “grows
together”.
But from bōd-, butte “he awakes”, L., 129; būtte “it gives
perfume”, L., 129, būvāre, 3rd plur.; and from rōd-, rruye “is
deprived of”, Bhadrak. S., 32.

These verbs in -ad- therefore fall together in the present with -āy-
verbs: daitti “he sees”, daindi “they see”, but with part. dīa-
“seen”; pva’, 2nd sing. imperat. “fear” < *pa-baya-, Av. baya-
AIW., 927.

It accordingly becomes possible to explain the line Mait. Sam., 249:
nyaskya ni hīmīti bihīyu ēttie āhvanā kuṣṭe “humiliation is upon
them exceedingly, whoso looks upon these desirable things”.
āhvanā < *ā-hvādāna-ka- to Pahl. xvāh-, xvād-, xvāstan “desire”;
NPers. xvāh-, xvāstan “desire”, Afg. xwand “taste, pleasure”;
Av. xvandra-ka- “pleasing” (see Morg., Et. Voc. Pashto; AIW.,
1865), xvāsta- “cooked”, AIW., 1878, to Skr. svād-. MPT. xvāst
“desired” to xvāz- and xvāst “desired” to xvād-. For xvaz-, Kurd.
xvaz-, xvāst, Zaza vāz-, xoaz-, vašt, see Bthl., SR., 5. 55, No. 2. In
Sogd. (Buddh.) occurs ɣevz- “beg for” (ɣevzy, 3rd sing., Dhuta,
280, Frag., 2a. 10, etc.), ɣevz’kw “question”, Dhuta, 77, ɣevzy’y k’m
“will seek”, Dhuta, 144. Sogd. (Christ.) ɣevng’ “I will beg”, ST.,
75, 4, etc., n’syrṿevngy (“not wishing well”) “enemies”. Christ.
Sogd. keeps γ distinct from x, although in p̣ẹmγ̣ p̣ẹmγ̣ “answer”
γ may replace x. At least, it is impossible to separate Sogd. ɣẹv-
“seek” from the Western xvaz- “desire”. āhvanā is, therefore,
“desired things”. In kuṣṭe I recognize the verb corresponding to
Sogd. (Buddh.) k’wš- in tkụwš- “contemplate”, tk’wšt “he regards”,

H. W. BAILEY—
Dhuta, 87, etc. < *ati-kōš-: kūšde with śde (phonetically -ḍē) < *-sate as in pyūśde “he hears”, L., 124, < *pa-gōš-ate.

On vilakye see § 1 (on pursūt) supra.


28. būm *vīzandak ut *vīnāskār bē bavēt. All MSS. here are corrupt. The readings are:—

MU. əvəran əris ədisəwsəl əris əris ədisəwsəl
DE. əvəran ədisəwsəl
DP. əvəran ədisəwsəl

and əvəran, būm and pus, are often confused. For əvəran I read əvəran “injured, damaged”, connected with Pahl. vīzand “damage”, MPT. vzyn, NPers. gazand. A similarly corrupt passage seems to occur in AV., 53. 5. əvəran should be read əvəran zamīk vīzandēnd “they injure the earth”. In SBE., 47. 166, (West, gangliato): one can read vīzandēhēt—a passive form of the denominative vīzandēnītan, see Bthl., Mir. St., 5. 35: raštākīhastan, pass. to raštākīnītan. [But see Corr.]

For əvəran I read əvəran “injury, damage, (2) sin”, as in Arm. lw. enas “(1) injury, (2) sin”. Cf. § 74 infra, the complaint of Spandaramat. Pagliaro, Az., 48, translates vinās kunēt by “usando frode”, but a less ethical sense is equally possible: “he causes damage, does injury to”. NPers. gunāh is “sin”. Cf. Bthl., SR., 5. 6, vināskārīh (1) “Verschulden”, (2) “Schädigung”.

avērānīh “desolation” əvəran “desolated, waste” is usually written with γ = v (not β): NPers. verān, Paz. avirān, Jud. Pers. əvəran, Pahl. avērak “waste”, Avir, Arm. lw. averak, see Bthl., ZAIW., p. 110, No. 1.

30. garītēt “turns about”. Two roots vart- and gar- are to be distinguished. They occur together in Matīkān i Čatrang, § 17,
vartīśn ut gartiśn, Sal., Bull. ASP., 1887. Morgenstierne, Et. Voc. Pashto, p. 27, has discussed these words. Pers. gāštān gardīdān has confounded the two words in one, but Auromani g'ăr- “to turn” and other dialect forms prove the existence of gart-

31. dipēr et seqq. There appears to be serious corruption in the MSS. here. DP., often the better MS., has that is, ut dipēr kē pat vat āyēt. On see § 37, iii, 4, infra. Modi’s MSS. give: dipēr hač nipišt vat āyēt. I have tentatively adopted dipēr pat nipišt i vat āyēt. For the reading dipēr cf. Christ. Sogd., ST., 17, 4, dipērt with -ē < -iša- *di-pi-šar, MP. Inscript. dipyr. The -ē < *ia changed early to -i- (before ē < *ai), hence Arm. lw. dpir “scribe”, but Arm. lw. den “religion” < *dainā-, Av. daēnā. In place of āyēt, hast “is” could be read by assuming that the scribe read āyēt as āyēt and substituted the mask Y’TVN-ēt, see Bthl., WZKM., 25, 408.

33. ā-s. ā “then”, frequent as correlative, <*ād, Y.Av. āat, Bthl., SR., 4. 46. It is regularly followed by an enclitic pronoun, ā-s, ā-mān, ā-sān, or -ē, -ē, ā-ē, ā-ē “then also” -ē-ē. For examples see Bthl., SR., 3. 23, 24; SR., 5. 8, 25, 38; MM., 1. 8; MM., 4. 14.

34. katićak bē kart zānak bavēt. For the predicative use of the participle cf. ut hač hamūk ēe vattar kē bē murt xwałūy hač ēe huştūt nēst “He is worst of all with whom being dead God is not satisfied”, Pahl. T., p. 40, l. 17. Katićak, diminutive to katak “house”, see Sal., Grund. Iran. Phil., i, 281; Horn, ibid., ib, 181.

34. kart “made”. For the vocalization cf. NPers. kard, MPT. kyrd, *kerd or *kird, Arm. lw. -kert, HAG., 168. On the vowel r, see § 1 supra. Oss. has -ar-, mard “dead”, ard “oath”, but Sogd. (Buddh.) murtk “dead”, Frag., 2a. 14, etc. Cf. purē “guilt”, Frag., 2a. 10, etc., Pahl. purtak “guilty”. Saka has mūda- “dead” < mṛta-. Hereto also būḍa- “borne” < byṭa- and pūmūḍa- “withered” (cf. pumūḍa-, N., 105. 35, “worn out (?)”) in Sacu Doc., 53-4:

jūḥānai būḍi spyakyi
mām sā’ vala štāka
dyejša širka u būsajsa
mām sā’ vala dištī
štīnī pūmūḍa hamāte
mām ri būḍa yšīrī byājī
kya spyakyi na štāka
In the time of delight (?) the flowers grow. This rose of mine is good to see and sweet-scented. This rose in my hand will fade. But it is carried in my mindful heart when the flowers are no more”.


spyakyi “flowers”, spīta- “flower”, with (diminutive) suffix -ka, see § 1 supra.


būḍa “borne, carried” < *brta-.

pūṃuḍa-1 “withered” < pāṃrt-. mūḍa- “dead” < *mṛta-, for pā-, pi- cf. pāramjīte “diminishes” (to Afg. rangi).

yśīrī byāji “in mindful heart”. byāji is adj to byāta- “memory”: *byāga- < *byāta-kyā. For omission of -t- cf. bāna “with wind”, nāṃdi “they took” beside nāṭi “he took”, dā, nom. acc. sing. “law” = dāta-. The suffix is treated by Leumann, L., 101. The word daji, Sacu Doc., 67, daji gūṇi “of — colour”, is probably an adj. meaning “of fire”: daji < *daga- to dāi, dei “fire”, only one would have expected *dāji, cf. dāṇa, loc. sing., “in the fire” < *dāya-.

In contrast to būḍa mūḍa, where -u- is due to the labial, āysaḍa- “honoured” < *ā-uz-darta, cf. Av. adṛṣṭa-kaṇḍa- “not honouring the teacher”, and, for *ā-, NPers. āzmāyad “he tries”, Pahl. uzmāyēt, and hamāḍa- “favoured” < *ham-dāṛta-, cf. Arm. lw.

1 In Saka a tendency to interchange ἁ and ā is distinctly noticeable. In Sacu Doc., 62, occurs māhāsamūḍhri for Skr. mahāsamudra-. Beside kṣuṇḍai “husband” appears kṣāṇḍai, N., 163. 8: to be connected with Pahl. sā, NPers. śa “husband”. Leumann’s etymology, N., 163. 10, kṣaṇtakus is unsatisfactory. For a derivation of kṣuṇḍai see Morgh., Indo-Iran. Frontier Languages, i. p. 298. Parachi zā “husband” = Yd. ṣfōh to Av. ṣfayant “peasant”. Further, ā beside ā in Saka rruṇḍi = ṛuṇḍi “of the king”, JRAS., 1914, 340, and kṣuṇāi “regnal year”, Sacu Doc., 7, 32, beside kṣuṇāi, JRAS., 1914, 351.
handart "tranquil" have -art- and -ārt-. From yan- "make, do", yida- < *yirta-, in which -i- is due to the y-, beside yuda-.

34. padak or padik "footman". Arm. lw. payik "foot-soldier", NPers. paig "messenger", Arab lw. faiq "courier", Syriac pyg "foot-soldier", HAG., 220. The short -ā- is found also in OPers. napadiy "behind", NPers. pai "foot, track", az pai "behind", Pahl. پادک padē (Nyb., Hilfsb., p. 57), padē, FP., p. 98. Sogd. (Buddh.) pdy pdy, *padē padē "at every step", Dhyāna, 284. Here belongs also Saka nvai, nvi < *nipadi + ahya, nva, nuva < *nipadā, nvaiya < *nipadayā (loc. sing.), cf. dāna < *dāyanayā "in the fire", § 13 supra. References are Mait. Sam., 157 (nvai), 247 (nuva); Sacu Doc., 38, 63 (nvī); Bhadrak S., 18 (nvī), 7 (nvaiya). With long -ā-: Pahl. رست padā, FP., 10. 10, pād regularly written with the Semitic mask RGLH, FP., 107. MPT. p'd "foot", NPers. pāy "foot", and in the derivative Pahl. pādak "station", NPers. pāya, Sogd. (Buddh.) p'dk, p'dy "foot", Dhyāna, 284, Frag., 2a. 11. Christ. Sogd. p'dy vn- "to set up", ST., 22. 22. ət pādē vanēqā "καὶ στῆσαί". p'diy, pādēt "feet", ST., 54. 17, etc. Saka pā "feet", loc. plur. pō, N. 47. 16, padūa pvā.

For the treatment of -ā- in the Saka forms, cf. § 27 supra. In compounds two treatments are found: (1) -d- (= -ā-) is preserved, padīta "burnt" < *pa-dayda. (2) -ā- > -y-, ayiṣtvā, loc. plur., Sacu Doc., 45, *a-diṣṭa- "not built, unwalled", cf. Sogd. (Buddh.) ṭṣṭ-, *diṣṭa- "built", VJ., 11b, to *daiz-, Av. daēz-, AIW., 673; əyāri "they appear", Vajracch., 41b < *a-dāy-.

37. bē Yazdān رز. The Semitic mask BL is the correct representative of bē "without", Syriac بلا b'lā "without". This is but a small part of the functions of رز bē. Semitic masks may be employed as phonetic symbols with the phonetic value of the corresponding Iranian word ("inverse masks"). Of this use are the following types:–

I. (1) رز bē: (a) "but", (b) verbal particle, (c) "God, majesty" = bay, MM., 3. 9, Az., 41; (d) "outside" in رز bētom = رز bēšārik "foreign", see MM., 3, 34, No. 1.

(2) رز xānak "house", Aram. BYT' used for xānak "stream, spring", MM., 1. 39. Note, SBE., 47. 155.

(4) kū “that”, Aram. 'YK, for kū “where”.


(6) mānēt “remains”, Aram. KTRVN for mānēt “resembles”.


(8) uzītan “go out”, Aram. YNPQ “go out” for ozītan “injure”, see MM., l. 35.

(9) ḫīn “that”, Aram. ZK, for an “other”.

(10) ē “this”, Aram. HN”, for ē “optative particle”.

II. The mask forms part of a word.

(1) sīvāp̄arīh “goodness” beside sīvāp̄arīh, SR., 4, 30.

(2) nīst “lowest”, ny + the symbol for sat “hundred”, Nyberg, Hilfsbuch, p. 43 = MX., ed. Andreas, p. 16, l. 6.

(3) nāmxvāst, Aram. ŠM— beside nāmxvāst Az., 4, 6.

(4) Kār ŠMak = Kārnāmak, Nyberg, Hilfsbuch, p. 1, l. 1.

(5) dastkart “a property”, Kn., 4. 19.

(6) passoxv “answer”, MX., 2. 170, for passoxv.

III. Semitic mask with “phonetic complement” prefix or suffix.

(1) nŠM nām “name”, MM., 1. 28; SR., 1. 48, No. 1.

(2) kMNšān = kēšān “who to them”, SR., 5. 48, No. 2.

(3) MNē = haē, SR., 1. 48, No. 1.

(4) With Iranian “mask” ḥād-d-dpyr-r dipēr, after FP., p. 89, was no longer clear.
IV. Confusion due to later pronunciation of the Iranian words.

(1) รก for ภ pat—both pronounced ba.

(2) pas, Aram. 'HR "after", for ษ pus, Aram. BRH, JN., iii, 6: the MSS. vary between the two.

(3) Confusion of گ "when", Aram. 'MT with گ "who", Aram. MNV and with گ "that, where"—all pronounced later (کی, کا) ک.

On Yazdân see Marquart, Ādīna, §§ 45–6.

37. mēhmān "guest". The "guest in the body" is a favourite expression. Pahl. Comm. to Y. 31. 6c (Spiegel, p. 134) /navbar-š Vahanman pat tan mēhmān "as long as Vahanman is a guest in the body". MX., 21. 13, Pāz. vaš har drūz pa tan šīram māmāh bād, kuš hāci vshī d tan nā hūlind "And in his body all the Druž are guests so far that they allow no goodness into the body". Pahl. mēhmān, NPers. mihmān "guest" <*maīdman-, cf. Av. maēdana-, Pahl. mēhan "dwelling-place", Afg. mēna "habitation", Morgenst., Et. Voc., p. 44. The Afg. mēmā "guest", Morgenst., Et. Voc., p. 44, is apparently uncertain. It is possibly <*maīdman- <*maīdman-. The ending -mā (-ma) possibly preserves the old nom. form *-mā. The Sogd. (Buddh.) 'zr\w, (Man.) 'zr\ (Lentz, Die Stellung Isu, p. 71) is, in the same way, from the nom. *zr\vā = "Zurvān" in the Manich., but translating "Brahmā" in the Buddhist texts, Pahl. and MPT. zurvān is from the acc. *zr\vānam. So Bang's question can be answered, Türkische Turfan-Texte, ii, p. 10, No. 1, SBAW., 1929. The Uigur has āsr̩ua, Mongolian āsr̩ua (or āsr̩un). See further § 47 infra on Saka rīman-.

38. vis ภ "the Great House", usually named after a real or fictitious ancestor: the Haxāmanišiya House (Achaemenians) or the Spitama House (Σπितάμας in Ktesias). See Herzfeld, Arch. Mitt., ii, p. 30 f., i, 145, No. 1. Hence the visō-pudra-, AIW., 1455, as title of a member of a vis, already in Aram. Pap. ภ "sons of the house". MPT. vyspvr\n, vysduxt\n, *vyspuhrān, visduxtān, Sal., Man. St., p. 33, ll. 17, 18.

40. dāhīk ภ —?. Freiman on Pandnāmak, § 34, WZKM., 20, 271, has discussed this word, which is known only to Av. and Pahl.
Av. *dahika-, dahaka-*, AIW., 704, āat ahmi nmāne zaydnte dahakāča mūrakāča “and in this house are born—?—and—?— (Daevish creatures)”, Y., 11, 6. *Dahāka- is the name (or epithet) of the Aṣi, a mythological dragon, who plays a great part, in human form, in Iranian saga. In the Pandnāmāk, § 34, Freiman reads dahiṅk, read by Neryosang as dazšak “mark”. Etymologically daha- suggests Saka daha- “man” in contrast to “woman”, N., 127. 5; 125. 38; 131. 29, etc. hudaha- “good man”, and the tribal name Δαος in Herodotus, i, 125, and Avestan dāhīnām dahyānām “Dāhian provinces”, Yt., 13. 144 (AIW., 744), Ind. Bund., 15. 29, dáy (SBE., v, 59), Iran. Bd., p. 107, l. 1, dāh. On the Indian side correspond Skr. dāśa-, dasyu- in form, but with evil connotation “foreigners”, therefore dangerous men. It is clear that daha- could take on a derogatory sense, and in this way it is possible to connect Av. dahaka-, dahāka-, Pahl. *dahāk. Is it possible also to refer to *daha- the Arm. lw. dahič, πράκτωρ, oπεκουλατωρ, ὑπηρέτης, “executioner,” with the Syriac lw. dhš’ “lictor, satelles”, HAG., 133?  


41. apramānd “privilege”, see Bthl., SR., 5. 3 f., 48 f. Pāz. awarmād : apramānd in juristic sense of a special type of inheritance, SR., 5. 19. In JN. Frag., iii (Modi, p. 17), occurs frōtmānd “sin”: hač har vinās ut frōtmānd i vēs pahrēčet “refrain from all injury and sinfulness.”  
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44. sturg ut ruzd, see Sal., Nachträge, s.v. ruzd. sturg < *sturak, cf. Pahl. vastrak “garment”, written (Av. Gloss., 243) vastarg, Paz. vastarg, gastarg, M.X. Gloss., 86, 210, Pahl. margv “death” < *marka, Av. mahrka-, cf. Sogd. (Buddh.) mrēh “death”, but Pahl. marak “number”, written . It therefore appears that -rak, -rk are alike changed to -rg, but with exceptions: whereas -rg remains in N.W. dial., but is -rv in S.W. NPers. margv “bird”, Pahl. margv, see Junker, Wörter u. Sachen, 1929. To sturg < *sturak or *starak, NPers. sartur (si-, su-) “quarrelsone”.


45. pat apāyast i xvēś “for their own needs”: Husr., 5, api-śān hēr pat apāyast i xvēś ēstāt “and they had treasure according to their needs”.

46. bē kā ... ēnyā [] “otherwise”. For the definitive reading of this Pahl. word we are indebted to Herzfeld, Paikuli, p. 132, No. 63: MP. Inscription. (Pārsīk) 'yny' with the final alif certain. Paz. ainā, M.X., 9, 6, etc.: ēnyā, cf. YAv. ainyāt “except”, hence < *anyād, cf. Pahl. ā, § 33 supra, < *ād.

47. riyahrih “defilement”. Paz. riārī, ryārī, M.X., 2, 184, etc., to Pahl. rītan, NPers. rīdan, Bal. riay, Oss. liyun “caceare”, Av. ray-, AIW., 1511, irimant- < *rīma-mant-, AIW., 1529, “mit Unrat angefüllt”, MPT. ryomn, rym, Pahl. rēman (Paz. rīmanī, M.X., 62, 27), NPers. rīm, Bal. rēm, Afg. rima. To the suffix cf. MPT. ṣevhr, *ṣivahr. Pahl. gōhr , Arm. lw. gohar, NPers. gōhar, Arab. lw. jauhar “essence”, are probably < *gavādra, gavāra (the Pahl. spelling with -ah- is naturally not conclusive) to Av. 1 gav-, AIW., 504, gūnaōiti “er. verschaft”. To this word belong Saka gārū “Wesen”, N., 109, 36, gāna- “existing”, huqāna-, Vajracch., 42a, 44a, 41b, and gēra “they exist” in Sacu Doc., 55:

ysāya drīmA mânjśa kyi hva hva gēra “born of such as exist by themselves”.

For hva hva < *hvataḥ hvataḥ cf. hvatī hva, N., 176, 2. Av. xvatō, Pahl. xvat , NPers. xud, Sogd. ytw *xutō (Benveniste, Gram. Sogd., ii, 119). Hence Vedie gotrā- (RV., 2, 23, 18 (214) gavām gotrām) “stall” has probably been influenced by gav- “ox”. To the verb ray- belongs also Saka rriman-, nom. sing. rrimi, acc. plur. rrima,
instr. plur. rrímañyau "impurity", rrímajsa- "blemished", arrímajsa- "blemished" < *rēman-, Pahl. rēman "impurity"; see Leumann, Supplet., 192, whose etymology is too dependent on Sanskrit.\(^1\) With -i- < ē, rríman- is to be kept distinct from tcei'man- "eye" < *cašman-. Nom. sing. rrími is probably < *rríma, neut. nom. sing. of -man "stem", cf. on Pahl. méhmán, § 37 supra.

50. ri₃ "sureties": passoxv < *pati-sahvan(n)- (1) "speaking in reply", (2) "speaking for". Cf. Saka paṭhivāna-, Mait. Sam., 92, "Zuweisung". The converse to the second meaning seems to have been expressed by *abi-sahva(n)- preserved in Arm. lw. osox "litigatore, accusatore, nemico" (Ciakciak), osozem "to be at law" (Bedrossian). This word has not yet apparently been noticed in Pahl. texts. Bartholomae had met this word passoxv, pāsoxv "surety" frequently in the Mātikān i hazār Dātāstān, but failed to recognize it in the unusual spelling. In SR., 4, p. 6, he gave the meaning "Bürge", and on p. 19 the variant forms. These forms contain a scriptio plena of the v: p'suxv, which disguises the word. For this spelling cf. MPT. 'ex, ox "world", Pahl. aex, MPT. pex passox and frex farrox, ZAIW., 47. So in Pāzand oxī, axī = Pahl. ḫūr "world of" beside Pāz. axən, plur.; see Bthl., WZKM., 25, pp. 395-6.

50. āp tačiṣn "stream of river (or of water)". DP. reads ṣāt ma, ṣāt maanān "streams of river" or āp ut tačanān "river and streams". For āp = "river" cf. pat bār i āp i Dātyā "on the bank of the river Dātyā".

51. hanžāpiṣn ut apasāriṣn "bringing to an end and quenching". Modi's MSS. have hanžāpiṣn, but DP. hanžāpiṣn. For hanžāp- cf. MPT. hnzāft, hnzāft "ended, completed", Sal., Man. St., p. 85, but hnzāṃ’y "you will assemble" : žāp- causative to żap- < *gəp- (gəβ-) beside *gan-. NPers. anjām "end", Pahl. hanžām, Jud. Pers. anjāftan "to bring to an end", MP. hanžāftan, hanžāmēnītan (Marquart, Adīna, § 10).

---

\(^1\) Saka itima- "seed" < *tayma-, cf. siya- < *saya- "learnt" is to be connected with Sogd. (Buddh.) tym- "seed", *taym- < *taym- to OPers. tawm-man- [Tolman, Anc. Pers. Lexicon, 91, is wrong in comparing Çitratazma, name of a Sagartian rebel, and hence dialectal form with -zm-. In South-Western Persian -zm- > -hm- > m, cf. NPers. marđum = MPT. mrdvām, Sogd. mṛtyām-], Av. taoxman-, Pahl. tōzm, MPT. tuxm "seed", NPers. tuxm (N.W. dial. form). Leumann's *takšman- is needless, loc. cit., 192.
To apasārīšn, afsārīšn cf. Iran. Bd., 214, 1. 12 (Alaksandar kēsar) 
... vas marak ātāξēs apasārt “Alexander Cæsar ... extinguished a great 
number of fires”. Pahl. Comm. apasārītān to Av. frācayōit “he should 
extinguish”, AIW., 1407. Cf. NPers. afsārdān “press, constrain” 
and Oss. afsārun, afsārīn “auftreten, drängen”, Miller, Grund. 
Iran. Phil., Anhang, p. 57, 31 (otherwise).
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Note of Correction to § 28.—The emendations proposed are unnecessary. The words are from ēōdh- "to agitate", ēōdāk "agitated", ēōdēnand "they agitate", ēōdihēt is agitated, cf. Sanskrit codayati. For the meaning, Iran. Bund. 152, 10, āp . . . pat ēōdīśn ut ēust šaspēt "the water tosses in agitation". Against a pāv = *viżand is also the regular spelling pāv, vīzand.
TWO MALAY LETTERS FROM TERNATE IN THE
MOLUCCAS, WRITTEN IN 1521 AND 1522

Edited and translated by C. O. Blagden

(PATES I AND II)

THE two letters with which this article is concerned were written
in the name of Sultan Abu Hayat of Ternate, when he was about
7 years old, and are of peculiar interest as being, perhaps, the oldest
Malay letters extant. The first, which is catalogued under the
reference Gavetas 15–16–38 in the Lisbon archives known as Torre
do Tombo, appears to have been written between 27th April and
8th November, 1521. The second, preserved in the same archives
under the reference Gavetas 15–15–7, was probably written early in
the following year. These conclusions are based on what is known
from other sources about the history of the Moluccas in this period,
combined with the internal evidence of the letters themselves.
Unfortunately their style betrays the fact that they were not written
by a Malay, but by some scribe (or, as seems more likely, two scribes)
probably indigenous to Ternate and certainly very imperfectly
acquainted with the Malay language. These documents, therefore,
cannot be regarded as typical of the Malay epistolary style of the
period. The handwriting is good, but the plates hardly do it justice,
because the rotographs were produced in a poor light and under
difficulties, aggravated in the case of the second letter by its being
on yellow paper, and therefore the reproductions have not come out
as well as could have been wished. In the first letter part of the lower
left-hand corner is missing, causing the loss of a few words.

The spelling of the letters is, of course, archaic; but it is not very
consistent and is full of irregularities. The style and grammar are
bad, the order of the words appears to have been influenced by the
syntax of the quite alien local language of Ternate, and the meaning
is therefore often ambiguous or obscure. My tentative translations
sometimes conflict with the apparent literal sense of the original,
and represent what, from the known facts of the case, I consider the
writer must have meant to say, though he did not say it correctly or
plainly. But it is only too probable that some of my renderings, being
conjunctural, are also wrong.

For the discovery of these letters, for the photographic copies of
them, for a translation of the Portuguese version of the second letter,
which has been preserved with the Malay original in the Lisbon
archives, and for all the collateral information bearing on the contents of the letters and explaining the circumstances under which they were written, I am indebted to Father G. Schurhammer, S.J., of Bonn. His intimate acquaintance with the Portuguese and other sources for the history of the Moluccas (a list of which will be found at the end of this article) has alone enabled me to make some sort of sense out of these letters; and for his invaluable assistance in all these respects I hereby express my hearty thanks. The following statement of facts is based on notes he has kindly supplied.

The relations of the Portuguese with the Moluccas began almost immediately after their conquest of Malacca in 1511. In fact, this conquest was really a step towards the capture, amongst other things, of the valuable spice trade for which those distant islands had long been celebrated. Soon after the conquest, therefore, Affonso de Albuquerque sent Antonio de Abreu and Francisco Serrão, with the Nakhoda Ismael as their guide, to discover the route to Banda and the other spice islands (Barros, pp. 583–4). On his return from Banda, Serrão was shipwrecked at the island of "Luco Pino", which represents Nusa Pënyu, as Barros says the name means "turtle island" (ibid., pp. 589–90; cf. also Tiele, pp. 356–7; Correa, ii, p. 710; and Gabriel Rebello, pp. 200–1). The island is said by Barros to be not very far from Amboina.

This is the event mentioned at the beginning of the first letter. Barros (pp. 590–2) merely says that pirates came to the turtle island in quest of booty, that people of Veranula (Seran, Ceram) attacked the shipwrecked men, and such of the Amboina people as harboured them, and that Ternate and Tidore vied with one another in trying to get the shipwrecked European soldiers to enter their service. The Sultan of Ternate at this time was Bayan Sirrullah, whom Barros calls Cachil Boleife, "a man advanced in years, of great ability, and regarded by the Muhammadans almost as a prophet." He adds that this Sultan sent about a thousand men, under the leadership of Cachil Coliba, to fetch Serrão. According to Rebello (p. 201), the Sultan sent his brother Cachil Vaidua, who was the chief kasis (that is the principal religious official, possibly the mufti). Barros says that the Sultan of Ternate sent ten ships, and the Sultan of Tidore seven, of the kind known as korakoras. According to Correa, a less reliable authority, Ternate only sent two ships.

It was in 1512 that Serrão, with Nakhoda Ismael, arrived at Ternate. Serrão stayed there, and Ismael sailed with a cargo of cloves
for Malacca, but was shipwrecked in Java. The Captain of Malacca sent João Lopez Alvim to his aid, and after his return despatched Antonio de Miranda d'Azevedo with a fleet to the Moluccas to get cloves. The Sultans of Ternate and Tidore vied with one another in procuring cloves for him; each of them was trying to get the support of the European strangers, and when Azevedo set out on his return journey to Malacca, both gave him letters for King Manuel (Barros, p. 598). Translations of the letter of Sultan Bayan Sirrullah to King Manuel and of another to the Captain of Malacca are preserved in the Lisbon archives (Torre do Tombo, Gavetas 15–4–1 and 15–15–29 respectively), and it seems possible that the Malay original of the former letter may still exist among the "Arabic" manuscripts preserved under the heading "Manuscriptos da Casa dos Tratados" in the same archives. The Portuguese translation of the letter to King Manuel contains the note, "Translation of the red letter." Presumably the original was written on the yellow paper used in the Malayan region by princes, as in the case of our second letter. The translations of Sultan Bayan Sirrullah's letters contain no dates, but internal evidence shows that the letters were written in 1514, as it is mentioned that this was the first time that the Sultan addressed a letter to the Portuguse.

When King Manuel received the Sultan's letter he despatched with the fleet of the year 1517 a letter to the Viceroy of India, directing him to send a competent person to the Moluccas in order to build a fort there. Accordingly D. Tristão de Menezes was sent and in 1519 conveyed King Manuel's replies to the Sultans of Ternate and Tidore. There is a reference to this in the second paragraph of our first letter. As, however, the Sultans of Ternate, Tidore, and Bachian disputed amongst themselves as to which of them should have the privilege of getting the fort built in his territory, Menezes took no further action in that matter, but left with his ship and four junk full of cloves for Banda, in order to ship nutmegs there, and so return to Malacca (first letter, line 8 seq.). Three of the junks, namely those in charge of Francisco Serrão, Simão Correa, and Duarte d'Acosta, were, however, separated from the rest of Menezes' fleet by a storm, and, as on his arrival at Banda in April, 1520, he did not find them there, he turned back to Ternate, where he met Serrão, and was compelled to stay himself on account of the advanced state of the season (Barros, pp. 597–603). Simão Correa's junk had been driven by the storm to Bachian, and he had to stay there (ibid., p. 603).
At this time the Sultan of Jailolo, whose name, according to Pigafetta (p. 133, cf. Koelliker, p. 197) was Jussu, was an old man, and the Sultan of Bachian, Ala-ud-din (Barros, p. 601), was 70 years old (Pigafetta, p. 143). Both of them, being jealous of Ternate, which was an ally of Portugal, eventually sided with Tidore and the Castilians (Pigafetta, loc. cit.). Near the end of the monsoon, Simão Correa begged Menezes to come to Bachian to help him and the six or seven Portuguese who were there with him. Menezes left for Bachian, but as he took the view that the Sultan of Bachian was in the wrong in the matter of his differences with Correa and failed to get the Sultan to surrender some fugitive Muslim slaves, a conflict broke out between the native inhabitants and the Portuguese of Correa's junk, which ended in the death of all the Portuguese save one. A contrary wind that immediately set in made it impossible for Menezes to land, so that he could not avenge the death of his friends and had to go on to Ambon and Malacca (Barros, pp. 603–5). João de Lourousa, who went over to the Castilians, reported to them that the cause of the conflict was the misconduct of the Portuguese towards the wives of the natives, and even those of the Sultan, of Bachian (Pigafetta, p. 132, Koelliker, p. 196).

In the first half of the year 1521 Francisco Serrão and Sultan Bayan Sirrullah of Ternate both died; but as to the manner of their deaths there are several varying accounts. One of these is contained in the ll. 13–15 of our first letter. Pigafetta (p. 127) gives a different version. He writes: "When we arrived here" (that is, at Tidore) "eight months had not elapsed since a certain Portuguese, Francisco Serrano, had died in Tarenate. He was captain-general of the King of Tarenate when he was making war on the King of Tadore; and he acted so strenuously that this king was compelled to give his daughter in marriage to the King of Tarenate, who also received as hostages about all the sons of the chief men of Tadore. Peace was then made. . . . But the King of Tadore never forgave Serrano in his heart; and he having come several years later to Tadore to traffic in cloves, the king had him poisoned with some betel leaves" (presumably some poison was mixed with the betel, the Italian original has "il Re lo fece avvelenare nelle foglie di betel") "so that he survived hardly four days." Barros (p. 610, cf. p. 649) says that Serrão died about the same time as Magellan, who was killed in 24th April, 1521. After mentioning some other matters concerning Serrão, Pigafetta (p. 128) proceeds: "Ten days after the death of Serrano, the King of Tarenate,
named Raja Abuleis, drove out from his kingdom his son-in-law, the King of Bachian, whose wife, the daughter of the King of Ternate, came to Ternate under the pretext of concluding peace and gave him (her father) such a poison that he only survived two days."

According to Rebello (pp. 201, 205; cf. Correa, ii, p. 713), peace was made while Menezes was still at Ternate. At a banquet in connection with that event the Sultan of Tidore poisoned both Serrão and the Sultan of Ternate. Serrão died of the poison, but the Sultan of Ternate, though he became ill, did not die at once. According to Barros (p. 610) the Sultan was poisoned a few days after the death of Serrão by some Muhammadans concerned in the clove trade. He adds (pp. 611–12): "When Cachil Boleife, King of Ternate, felt that his death was nearing, as he was leaving two sons, the elder being Bohaat, aged seven, and another named Dayalo, and seven bastards... he appointed the queen, a daughter of Sultan Almancor of Tidore, to be regent... and in his will he recommended her and his successor and all the chiefs to endeavour to secure our friendship... and he called them to him and recommended them... to value highly the friendship of the Portuguese, for they would defend them against their foes." De Brito (Alguns Documentos, p. 495) says that in 1523 his successor, Abu Hayat, was eight or nine years old.

On 8th November, 1521, the Victoria and Trinidad, two vessels of Magellan's fleet, arrived at Tidore (Pigafetta, p. 124; cf. Koelliker, p. 186). These are the two ships referred to in 1. 4 of the second letter. Al-Mansur, the Sultan of Tidore, who at this time was upwards of 55 years old, visited them and at once proclaimed himself to be for ever a vassal of Castile (Pigafetta, p. 126). On 17th December the Castilians gave him "some pieces of artillery, that is some arquebuses... and some of our swivel guns" [verzi] "with four barrels of gunpowder" (ibid., p. 143). On the following day, when preparations were being made for the departure of the two ships, the three Sultans—of Tidore, Bachian, and Jailolo—were all present (ibid., p. 144). The Victoria actually left on 21st December, leaving the Trinidad, which was leaky, behind at Tidore. On 6th May, 1523, Antonio de Brito wrote from Ternate to King John III of Portugal, that the Castilians had left a gunner with artillery at Tidore in order to help the Sultan against the Portuguese, continuing: "vendiam bombardas, espyngardas, bestas, espadas, dardos e polvora," i.e. they sold (them) mortars, muskets, crossbows, swords, arrows, and gunpowder (Alguns documentos, pp. 464–5). With all this may be compared the
corresponding passage in ll. 8–9 of the second letter. The *Trinidad* eventually left Tidore on 6th April, 1522 (Koelliker, p. 209), from which it is clear that the second letter was written before that date. It mentions the departure of one ship, i.e. the *Victoria*, in the month of Muharram, which began that year on 1st December, 1521. The translation of the letter made at Malacca and dated 28th August, 1522, is another piece of evidence as to its date.

The translator, Alvaro Fernandez, was perhaps the same man who on 30th December, 1520, wrote from Cannanore to King John III (Alguns documentos, pp. 448–54) and was "mestere" of Goa from 1552 (Schurhammer, *Ceylon zur Zeit Bhuvaneka Bahu's*, Leipzig, 1928, p. 620). His translation is a somewhat free one, which is not surprising in view of the peculiarities of the original, but it has seemed worth while to append an English version of it for comparison. This has been made from a German translation supplied by Father Schurhammer. Jorge de Albuquerque, whose signature is under the note at the end of the Portuguese translation, sailed to India in 1512, as captain of a ship, and was at once appointed Captain of Cochin. Subsequently he had two spells of office at Malacca, where he was captain at the time the translation was made.

With regard to the transcripts of the two letters, I must state that I have not attempted in my Romanized versions to reconstruct contemporary pronunciation, which is insufficiently known. Consequently, when no particular vowel is indicated, I have followed modern standards, and therefore frequently written the neutral vowel (ê) in places where it is quite possible that some other sound was used four centuries ago.

I

Raja Sultan Abu Ḥāyat surat datang ka-pada mama Raja Portukal raja (bē) sar al-dunia 'alam (2) sēmuha-nya tuwan basar karana dahulu Raja Portukal manyuroh Frangshisko Sēra datang dari Muluku (3) binasa dari Ambun maka Raja Mēluku sēmuha-nya dēngar Fēringgi ada binasa dari Ambun maka Raja (4) Tēdore dan Jailolo di-suroh Ambun sēmuha-nya bērhimpah mau bunoh pada Frangshisko Sēra (5) maka Raja Tērnateh dēngar di-suroh saudara duwa mēmbawah pērāu hūchoh buah di-ambl Frangshisko Sērra (6) mēmbawah ka-Tērnate maka nagēri Tērnate sapērti nagēri Portukal maka Raja Portukal suroh karawal (7) mēmbawah surat datang pada Raja Tērnate karawal dan hērta dan lashkar asērahkan pada tangan

I

Letter of Sultan Abu Hayat to his uncle the King of Portugal, the (great ?) king of the whole (2) world, the great lord. Because formerly the King of Portugal ordered Francisco Serrão to come to the Moluccas, (3) (and he) came to grief at Amboina, and all the Rajas of the Moluccas heard that Europeans had come to grief at Amboina, the Rajas (4) of Tidore and Jailolo ordered all Amboina (to assemble together ?) in order to slay Francisco Serrão. (5) When the Raja of Ternate heard it, he ordered two brothers (of his) to take seven ships and fetch Francisco Serrão (6) and bring him to Ternate. So the country of Ternate (was) even as the country of Portugal. And the King of Portugal ordered a caravel (7) to bring a letter to the Raja of Ternate, to deliver the caravel, goods and soldiers into the hands of the Raja (8) of Ternate. And the junk (from ?) Ternate and the caravel sailed for Malacca at the close of the monsoon (and) stopped at Bachian. Then (the Rajas of) Tidore and Jailolo ordered (9) the Raja of Bachian to kill the Europeans stopping at Bachian and the goods and soldiers were all seized. (10) When the Raja of
Ternate heard it, he said: "How shall the junk, goods and soldiers of the King of Portugal be delivered into our hands? (11) Come, let us order the junk, goods and soldiers to return to Malacca. If the junk, goods and soldiers of the King (12) of Portugal do not return, there will be war with the Raja of Bachian." The Raja of Bachian too (13) was furnished with weapons. Tidore and Jailolo also, together with Bachian, were all equipped. Tidore, Jailolo, and Bachian (14) quickly gave orders to a young woman, a daughter of the Raja of Bachian, whom the Raja of Ternate loved, and she succeeded in giving him poison, (15) so that the Raja of Ternate died. Previously the Raja of Tidore ordered Francisco Serrão to be invited and brought to Tidore and given drink. On that occasion (16) he was given poison, and going home was sick for four days and died. Some days... the Raja died. (17) At the time of his death he entrusted Raja Abu Hayat to his uncle the King of Portugal. (For?)... Ternate is a port (18) of the King of Portugal, because Tidore, Jailolo and Bachian, for the goods of the King of Portugal, are making war against (Ternate)... (return?). (19) Let my (loving?) uncle speedily help Ternate! This letter is as if we brought good (and bad?)...

Notes on the Text and Translation of the First Letter; the references being to the lines.

1. "Letter of Sultan Abu Hayat," the text, contrary to Malay idiom, but in conformity with the language of Ternate, here puts the possessive before the thing qualified by it. So also in l. 10, and probably l. 11, and likewise in l. 4 of the second letter.

2. 3. The preposition dari, primarily meaning "from", but also sometimes "along, by", is used here for "to" and "at".

4. "Ordered": the Malay di-suroh is in the passive and the sentence, as it stands, literally means "the Rajas of Tidore and Jailolo were ordered by all Amboina", an improbable rendering. Cf. the same word in l. 8, where such a translation would be still more unlikely. I have taken bērhimphā to be intended for bērhimpun. The preposition pada is superfluous after the transitive verb bunoh "to kill"; but this use may be compared with the similar use of sama in modern Bazaar Malay. So, too, in l. 9.

5. The passive di-suroh is ambiguous here; di-suroh-nya would have made it clear that the order was given by the Raja of Ternate to his two brothers, not vice versa. The di, being above the line, may
have been an afterthought. The passive *di-ambil* is awkwardly used instead of *ambil* or *mêngambil*.

6. *Karawal* could be transliterated *karual, karawala,* or *karuala,* so far as the spelling goes, but these would be further from the Portuguese form.

7. The objects (*karawal, etc.*) are put before the verb (*asêrahkan, for *sêrahkan* “to deliver”) in an abnormal way. So, too, in ll. 10, 14, and 17.

8-9. *Dayam* is an error for *diam.* For “and the goods”, etc., “and to seize” (or “plunder”) “all the goods and soldiers” may possibly be intended.

10. The sentence “How . . . hands?” involves an un-Malay order in two respects, as in l. 1 and l. 7 respectively.

11. The phrase “of the King” recurs here, and must, no doubt, be translated in the same way, though at a pinch it could here mean “to the King”. The repetition of *tiada kêmblek* “do not return” must be due to an oversight.

12-13. Perhaps the Raja of Ternate’s statement is meant to continue down to “equipped”, in which case we must read “is” and “are” for “was” and “were”, respectively, in l. 13.

13, seq. What follows is rather obscurely expressed.

14. The first *itu* is out of place if it is to go with *anak pérêmpuan* “young woman”, because she has not been mentioned before. It might be construed with the next three words to mean, parenthetically, “she was a daughter of the Raja of Bachian.” Presumably the meaning of *dalam* here is “while”, and the literal translation is “while the Raja of Ternate loved that woman”. This involves having the object before the verb, as in ll. 7, 10.

16. After “some days” probably a word meaning “later” (possibly *sudah*) has been lost, the paper being torn here.

17. “Entrusted Raja Abu Hayat”: the object again precedes the verb, as in ll. 7, 10, 14. Moreover *dari-pada* should mean “from”, not “to”; but cf. *dari* in ll. 2, 3.

19. The rendering “loving” is uncertain, the sentence might be rendered “let my uncle be so kind as to help Ternate speedily!” The preposition *pada* is superfluous, as in ll. 4, 9.

II

Ini surat kaseh Sultan Abu Ḥayāt surat datang ka-pada ayahanda Sultan Portukal (2) dunia ‘ālam ia-lah yang maha-bēsar kēri mênga-takan hal nēgēri sangkalah sanakdah (3) Sultan Bayān Sirrullah
méninggalkan négéri Ternate sakalian-lah hal (4) négéri Ternate sékaraang Raja Kastila datang dua buah kapal ménagatarkan sénjata-nya (5) dan hërta-nya dan mémêliharakan bandar Raja Tédore bandar Raja (6) Kastila sa-bênàr-nya-lah Sultan Portukal mémêliharakan Sultan (7) Ternate dari karana bandar Sultan Ternate bandar Sultan (8) Portukal sékaraang ini Raja Kastila mbêmêri Raja Tédore bêdil émpat (9) puloh buah bêdil gandi tujoh puloh gandi janchi t(a)un ini kan datang (10) ka-Tédore sa-bu(ah) kapal bêlayar bulan Muharram sa-bu(ah) kapal tinggal nantikan kapal (11) dua puloh bu(ah) taun lagi kan datang ada pun anakdah Sultan (12) Abu Hayat tiada harap lain harap ayandah Sultan (13) Portukal sa-bênàr-nya-lah Sultan Portukal mémêliharakan anakdah pihatú (14) lagi kanak kanak sa-bênàr-nya-lah mémêliharakan négéri Ternate chêndor mata (15) anakdah tiada sapérti-nya wa-s-salam bi-l-khâir.

II

This is a loving letter of Sultan Abu Hayat, a letter to his father, the King of Portugal, (2) he is the greatest in the world. Now to set forth the unfortunate condition of the country, his relative (3) Sultan Bayan Sirrullah having departed from the country of Ternate, the whole condition (4) of the country of Ternate at present. Two ships of the King of Castile have come bringing his weapons (5) and goods and they protect the port of the Raja of Tidore, (now) in very truth a port of the King (6) of Castile, while the King of Portugal protects the Sultan (7) of Ternate, because the port of the Sultan of Ternate is a port of the King (8) of Portugal. At this present time the King of Castile is giving the Raja of Tidore forty (9) guns and promises that seventy crossbows are coming (10) to Tidore this year. One ship sailed in the month of Muharram, one remains behind awaiting (11) twenty ships that are to come next year. Now your son Sultan (12) Abu Hayat has no other hope but his trust in his father the King (13) of Portugal, that in very truth the King of Portugal will protect his son, an orphan (14) and (still) a child, and in very truth will protect the country of Ternate! Your son’s gifts (15) are inadequate. Farewell!

Notes on the Text and Translation of the Second Letter

1. The repetition of the word surat “letter” is curious. In my translation I have taken together all the words that follow the first surat. But perhaps we have here again a case of the possessive preceding the word qualified (as in I, 1, 10 and probably 11, and II, 4). In
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that case the translation would have to be “this is a loving letter, a letter of Sultan Abu Hayat”.

2. I have not found the word kēri (perhaps properly kari) elsewhere, except in a letter given on pp. 140-1 of J. Straits Branch R.A.S. (1898), No. 30, in a passage which follows after some five lines of the usual compliments: ammā ba’du kēmudian dari itu kēri beta mēngatakan ikhlās hati beta ka-pada Sinjor Kapitan Inggēris, “after that we express the sincerity of our heart towards the English captain”. I suspect the word is the Javanese kari “achter, terug, overbliven”, and merely duplicates the preceding phrase kēmudian dari itu “after that”, which in its turn duplicates the two Arabic words at the beginning of the passage. Dr. W. G. Shellabear’s suggestion that it may be an error for kirim “to send” seems unacceptable.

Very doubtfully I have taken sangkalah (or sēngkalah) to be the Javanese sangkala (or sēngkala) in the sense of “misfortune, disaster”, referring to the death of Bayan Sirrullah, father of Abu Hayat, euphemistically called his “departure”.

4. “Two ships of the King of Castile” is another case of the possessive preceding what it qualifies, as in I, 1, 10, and probably 11, and II, 1. The translation “bringing” implies that mēngatarkan is a mistake for mēngchantarkan, or mēngantarkan.

5-7. After “the goods” an alternative rendering would be “and to protect the port of the Raja of Tidore, (as) a port of the King of Castile. Verily may the King of Portugal protect the Sultan of Ternate”.

8. Alternatively, “at this present time,” may be construed with the preceding sentence, and for “is giving” and “promises” we may read “gave” and “promised” respectively.

9. The word kan is short for akan, indicating the future.

11. Father Schurhammer points out that Pigafetta says nothing about these twenty ships.

13. It may be that the first “Portugal” ends the preceding sentence, and that we should go on “Verily may the King of Portugal protect”.

14. The word lagi may mean either “and” or “still”.

Translation of the Portuguese Version of the Second Letter

Letter from Sultan Aabohad to the King of Portugal, the very great king, the mighty, and lord of the world.
Sir! I inform Your Highness, for I know that it will give you pain, to wit that my father has died and I am here in his place. Your Highness will be aware that two ships from Castile have come here, in which there was nothing but goods and weapons, in order to fortify the island of Tudoree, inasmuch as they say that the place is on their side. May Your Highness now cause the country of Tarnatee to be protected, for it is a country of Your Highness. The Castilians give the King of Tudoree forty guns and sixty arquebuses, and promised him that they would come next year with twenty ships. One ship sailed off at once with this news, and the other remained in the harbour, saying that it would wait for the rest till they came. I, Sir, have never obeyed these people and never shall obey them, as long as there are Portuguese on earth, but will live and die for Your Highness's service. Therefore, Sir, I again entreat Your Highness look to your country of Tarnate and defend it, for I am a boy and an orphan. Sir, I say no more to Your Highness, save that I and this country are yours. Sir, if in this letter there should be contained any incivility towards your Highness, forgive me for I am a boy and know no better.

Footnote to the Portuguese Version

This letter was translated by Alvaro Fernandez, interpreter of this fort of Malacca. This letter is a translation of the annexed Malay one, which I opened, as I do not know whether there will be anyone in Portugal who can read it, and therefore I did so. Malacca, 28th August, 1522. Jorge de Albuquerque.

Notes on the Writing and Spelling of the Letters

A comparison between the two letters seems to indicate that they are by different hands; various minor points of writing and spelling, as well as differences in the general aspect of the two documents point to this conclusion. For example, in the name Portugal (which is written throughout with kaf, not ga) the first letter always uses the long variety of kaf (I, 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 17, 18), whereas the second one uses the ordinary kaf in this word (II, 1, 6, 8, 13), though it has the long kind, with a dot below, for ga in nēgréi (spelt nun ga ra, without any indication of vowel, in II, 3, 4, 14), but not elsewhere. The first letter also uses the long kaf in karauval (I, 6–8), and with a dot below it for ga in bagimana (I, 10). Elsewhere ga is represented in these letters by the ordinary kaf (1) without a dot (nēgréi, II, 2), (2) with one dot below (nagéri, I, 6; Feringgi, I, 9; mēninggalkan, II, 3; gandi, II, 9;
tinggal, II, 10; lagi, II, 11, 14), and (3) with three dots below (Feringgi, I, 3; bagi, I, 18; gandi, II, 9). The use of a dot or dots below this letter is archaic and no longer current.

The letter nya when final has the form of nun, with three dots above instead of one, as it normally has to-day. But in other positions than final our letters also put the dots above, thus identifying it in form with tha, in the words manyuroh (I, 2), and sa-bēnar-nya-lah (II, 6, 13, 14). (Also in sēnjatah, I, 13, for sēnjata, where the ordinary usage is to write nun, as I have transliterated, though phonetically nya is correct.) In non-final positions nya should have its dots below to distinguish it from tha, but this rule is often disregarded.

Among archaic spellings may be mentioned the alif in nagēri (I, 6), which represents an older pronunciation than the modern nēgēri, and it may be argued that the same is true of manyuroh (I, 2) and the first alif of balayar (I, 8), as their prefixes formerly had a. It is possible that the initial in asērahkan, instead of the normal sērahkan (I, 7, 10, 17), may be a Javanism. But the superfluous alifs in basar for bēsar (I, 2), dayam, for dīam (I, 8, 9), di-rampas (I, 9), bēparang, for bēpērang (I, 12, 18), and waktu (I, 15, 17), are merely cases of bad spelling.

It is characteristic of most of our older Malay documents to find alif, wau, and ya often omitted where modern usage inserts them, the chief reason being that the old spelling was framed with a lively recollection of the vowel points, though texts were not as a rule vocalized. This principle is illustrated in tuwan (I, 2), duwa (I, 5), dua (II, 4, 11), pēlabuwan (I, 17), buah (II, 4, 9, 11), which last instance wrongly omits ha also, as does sa-buah (II, 10). Sērra, for Serrao, (I, 2, 4, 5), is likewise devoid of an alif. In sēnjatah for sēnjata (I, 13), kēri or kari and sēngkalah, for sēngkala (II, 2), the omission of alif may be archaic spelling, and dalam without alif (I, 14) occurs in other old documents, but taun, written ta wau nun (II, 9), and, of course, 'alam, properly 'ālam (I, 1), are wrong.

Archaic omission of wau occurs in dahulu (I, 1, 15), Muluku (I, 2), Mēluku (I, 3), pihatut (II, 13), and also in Jailolo (I, 4, 8, 13, 18), where it is curious that the second lam is never joined up with the first one (just as in Mēluku the mim is not joined to the lam). The omission of wau in Tēdore in I, 8, 13, 15, 18, seems equally peculiar in view of its presence in I, 4, and II, 5, 8, 10. The use of double wau in tuwan (I, 2), duwa (I, 5) and pēlabuwan (which is fully vocalized, I, 17), is archaic and may be justified phonetically by the glide between u
and a; but wau with a tashdid would have been neater. In the proper name Frangshisko, i.e. Francisco, wau is used in I, 2, but omitted in I, 4, 5, 15.

The omission of ya is archaic in Ternate (written with a final round ta in I, 6–8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 19; but with a long ta in I, 9; II, 3, 4, 7, 14), mari-lah (I, 11), mati (I, 16, 17), bagi (I, 18), Tédore (II, 5, 8, 10; but ya is used in I, 4, 8, 13, 15, 18), mémberi (II, 8), gandi (II, 9), janchi (for janji, II, 9).

The use of ha is archaic in sēmuha-nya (I, 2–4, 9, 13) and probably in pihatu (modern piatu, but Sundanese pihatu, II, 13). It is wrong in Ternateh (I, 5), mēmbawah (I, 5–7, 15, 19), pērau (for pērahu, I, 5), sēnjatah (I, 13), sangkalah and sanakdah (II, 2), anakdah (II, 11, 13 15), and ayandah (II, 12, for ayahanda, but the omission of this medial ha can be phonetically justified). It must, however, be admitted that many modern scribes add a final ha to words which really end in the honorific da. In taun (II, 9), sa-buah (II, 10), and buah (II, 11), ha is wrongly omitted, and in hadir the wrong ha has been used, and the dal is also not the right letter; this is probably phonetic spelling of the unconscious type.

The remaining orthographical peculiarities are minor matters, and mostly mere slips like the tha for ta in tulong (I, 19), cha for jin in tucoh (for tuoh, I, 5) and janchi (for janji II, 9), and the omission of nun in mēngatarkan (for mēnghantarkan, II, 4) and at the end of rachun (I, 14), and of both wau and nun, or, at any rate, the latter, at the end of the same word in I, 16. The omission of ra in the prefixes bēr and pēr of bēparang (for bēpērang, I, 13, 18) and pēlabuwan (I, 17), respectively, is permissible. The spelling kēmbalek (I, 11, 12) is due to a confusion between kēmbali and balek, two words of similar meaning, and wafa‘at (I, 15) is an error for wafāt. The use of hamsah in Jailolo (I, 4, 8, 13, 18) is intelligible, if rather peculiar, and is intended to indicate that the pronunciation was Jailolo, not (as usually spelt) Jilolo. The tashdid in laskhar (I, 7, 10, 11, 12) seems superfluous, but in ṭēkas (I, 14, 19) it symbolizes the neutral vowel of the first syllable, as it often does elsewhere in old Malay documents. Possibly it may be doing the same in Sērra (for Serriio, I, 5, 15), unless it is here performing its proper function of prolonging the ra. In the second letter tashdid is several times used for this purpose, but only in foreign words. Finally, I am not at all sure whether my transcription Bajahan is right. The modern spelling suggests Bajhan or Bajihan, but in the absence of any clear indication of vowels I have let it stand.
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EARTHQUAKES IN PERSIA

By Sir Arnold T. Wilson

(PLATE III)

PERSIA is as a whole less liable than Europe, but more than most Asiatic countries, to catastrophic earthquakes, but the references thereto in printed literature are few and peculiarly difficult to discover as few, if any, indexes to books on Persia so much as mention the word.

Watson (p. 190) remarks that earthquakes are "very frequent in most parts of Persia". Allemagne (i. 3) classes them, with plagues and famines, as Acts of God to which the country is specially liable.

Khurasan.—Hamdallah Mustawfi refers to a cypress at the village of Kishmar near Turshiz (100 miles south of Nishapur): "such was its power that earthquakes which frequently devastated all the surrounding districts never did any harm in Kishmar." This was in A.H. 247 (A.D. 861).

Nassiri Khusrav (A.D. 1340) states that Nishapur was completely destroyed by an earthquake in the reign of Abaqa Khan (A.D. 1267). Wajid ud Din Zangi Fariwandi rebuilt it in A.H. 669 (A.D. 1270). A similar catastrophe overwhelmed the town in A.H. 808 (A.D. 1405), when most of the inhabitants were buried in the ruins.

Rukn-ud Din Khoi (quoted by Barbier de Meynard, p. 132), in his edition of Yaqut's "Mujam ul Baldan", relates that at this time there resided in the city a learned astrologer of Shiraz called Abu Tahir, who foretold that upon the sun's entrance into Scorpio in the year A.H. 235 (A.D. 849), an earthquake would overthrow the whole city. When he found the people would give no credit to this prophecy, he importuned the Governor to force the people out of the city. The Governor . . . did all he could . . . but could not persuade above one-half of the people to stir, which fell out to their destruction, for the earthquake happened at exactly the hour mentioned in the prediction, to the overwhelming of 40,000 persons.

Le Strange quotes Hamdallah Mustawfi and Ibn Battutah in reference to earthquakes in A.D. 1208 and A.H. 679 (A.D. 1280) and Yate refers to one in A.D. 1267.

Kuchan in the same province suffered severely in 1852, when 2,000 persons lost their lives, and again in 1871, 1893 (Nov. 17), and 1895, after which the town was abandoned (Allemagne III, 67).
The year 1830, says Watson (p. 257), "was marked in Persia by the occurrence of a series of shocks of earthquakes. In the month of April the town of Demavend suffered severely; not less than 500 persons are said to have been buried in the ruins."

Morier writes (Second Journey Through Persia, 1818, p. 355), "Very severe earthquakes are sometimes felt at Demavend. We had a strong shock whilst residing there in June (1811) and nine years ago (viz. in 1802) they were so violent and repeated that many villages in Mazandaran were totally destroyed."

The towns of Semnan and Damghan likewise suffered great injury; in all seventy towns and villages are said to have been destroyed. Damghan was destroyed by an earthquake in A.H. 242 (A.D. 856) (Fraser, p. 314).

Azarbaijan.—Of disastrous earthquakes in the Tabriz neighbourhood we have ample evidence.

Le Strange refers to earthquakes which destroyed Tabriz in A.H. 244 (A.D. 858) and A.H. 434 (A.D. 1042), when 40,000 of the inhabitants perished.

Mustawfi (p. 79), writing in A.D. 1340 with regard to the earthquake of A.D. 1042, refers to a prophecy that the city would not again be laid in ruins by an earthquake and adds "up to the present date during the 300 years that have elapsed since this prediction the prophecy has been proved to be perfectly true, for though the city has many times been visited by earthquakes, these have caused no great ruin."

In the spring of 1721, however, Tabriz was destroyed by an earthquake, wherein 80,000 souls perished. To quote Father Krusinski (Du Cerceau's translation), "what most frightened Isfahan was a phenomenon that appeared there in the air during the summer of 1721. The clouds being at that time very thick, the sun appeared through them of a blood colour, which lasted for two months."

Malcolm in his History of Persia, gives the date as A.H. 1134 (A.D. 1721), and says that the city was completely destroyed, 100,000 people losing their lives.

Morier (First Journey, 112, p. 276), writes as follows of Tabriz in 1810: "... close to the walls near the Teheran gate is the complete ruin of a mosque ... built about 600 years ago ... destroyed by an earthquake within thirty years.

"The inhabitants complain ... of frequent and violent earthquakes, which they attribute to the volcanoes in the district, which
throw out smoke but no flame. The smoke is so mephitical that it kills immediately a dog or fowl placed over it. The danger of earthquakes has taught the inhabitants of Tabriz to build their houses generally as low as possible and to employ more wood than brick and plaster in their construction. For the same reason the bazaars have only wooden roofs and are not arched. . . . Yet I am told that in earthquakes the domed buildings have invariably stood, where others, the strongest walls, have been rent asunder.”

Sir H. J. Brydges, writing in 1834, states (p. 306): “Between the camp and Bosmeech, we passed over ground which some years before had been rent by a succession of earthquakes in the most extraordinary manner, and on the left hand of the road I was shown a mountain riven at that time from top to bottom. This terrible calamity took place in the year 1774.”

Of Tasuj (north-west of Tabriz) Morier (First Journey, p. 297) writes in 1810: “It appears once to have been a large place but it is now reduced, by earthquakes, to the denomination of a village. There are remains of domed bazaars and mosques spread in every part of the place.”

Kazvin was described in 1810 by Morier (First Journey, p. 254) as “almost one mass of ruins. An earthquake within no distant period threw down the buildings . . . and made cracks in almost every wall. A large mosque, built by the Abbasids, has been rent in many places in its thick walls and totally ruined”.

Chardin, who visited Tabriz in April, 1672 (p. 382), writes as follows of Kazvin: “The History of Qasvin makes mention of two other fatal disasters that befell it, occasioned by earthquakes. The first in the year A.H. 460 (A.D. 1067) that overthrew all the walls and a third of the buildings, and the second, which did not so much mischief as the first, in the year A.H. 562 (A.D. 1169).”

Chardin, in his description of the Coronation of King Solyman (p. 127 of App. to Travels), writes as follows: “Towards the end of 1667 arrived sad tidings at Isfahan from the provinces adjoining to the Caspian Sea that at Shirwan (the capital city of a province of the same name, and which makes a part of Armenia the greater, near Tiflis, the capital city of Georgia) an earthquake has overturned the greatest part of that city and ruined four villages near adjoining, and that above 30,000 Persians had perished in the ruins. That in another city called Shamakhi in the province of the same name another earthquake has occasioned the loss of 20,000 persons and swallowed
up three-quarters of the city—which two accidents had reduced those two provinces to utter desolation."

Isfahan.—Hamdullah Mustawfi (A.D. 1340) states in reference to this city that "earthquakes very seldom occur here".

Turning now to South Persia we find that though local tradition and the testimony of living men state that earthquakes are of by no means infrequent occurrence, there is little reference thereto in current literature. It is a notable fact that of all the massive bridges built from Sasanian times onwards, often of great beauty, solidity and strength, not a single one remains. The site of some of them precludes the possibility of their being carried away by the most abnormal floods, and the appearance of the ruins in certain cases, notably those across the Kashgan in the Khurramabad plain and in the mouth of the gorge above its confluence with the Said Marreh River, suggests seismic movement rather than the operation of decay and neglect, though the latter was doubtless a powerful feature.

Curzon, vol. ii (p. 219), states that local tradition favours the theory that the colossal statue of Shapur in the Kazrun Valley was thrown down by an earthquake. The steady diminution in the number of pillars noted as standing at Persepolis by successive travellers suggests that earthquakes have been frequent but not excessively severe. The construction of the pillars is so massive as almost to preclude destruction by any other agency. Up to 1670 there were at least 19 pillars standing. In 1677 Fryer saw 18; the number thereafter recorded is uniformly 17, till Franklin in 1787 reports 15, which figure is repeated till De Bode in 1841 reports 13. This figure is likewise recorded by subsequent travellers till 1881, when Stack gives the number as 12. Dr. G. M. Lees has drawn attention to the fact that as a result of earthquakes the topmost stones of certain pillars have been rotated some 30 to 40 degrees and, displaced from their original position, lie askew and overhanging the edge of the parent pillar.

Wills (p. 260) describes in great detail a great earthquake at Shiraz in the Sixties which caused great loss of life, and he mentions that slight earthquakes were very frequent in the neighbourhood during his residence there. The tradition still remains and the light wooden structures in the gardens are still known as earthquake houses (zilzileh khaneh).

Sawyer (pp. 3 and 73) refers to the southern slopes of Shuturun Kuh in the Bakhtiari country as being deserted in 1889 owing to frequent earthquakes.
There were several shocks of earthquake in Fars in 1890 and at Jahrum some thirty lives were lost. Kamarij Khisht and Fasa were also visited by several shocks, but no great damage was done. Towards the end of February, 1894, Shiraz and the neighbourhood were visited by an earthquake which caused some injury to life and property (Administration Reports Persian Gulf Residency).

Sykes makes no reference to earthquakes in his books on Persia, but Le Strange (p. 307) states that the Kubbat-i-Sabz at Kirman was completely ruined by an earthquake in 1896.

Sistan.—Mustawfi (p. 193) refers to a gold mine in Sistan which was laid in ruins by an earthquake in the time of the later Ghaznavids, and became choked so that its very position was hid from sight.

Persian Gulf

Earthquakes are frequent and sometimes severe in the Persian Gulf Proper, especially towards the lower end upon the Persian side. In 1865 an earthquake levelled the villages of Darveh Asuh, near Mugam, with the ground; and its remarkable effects were witnessed by Dr. Colvill of the Bushire Residency.

In August, 1880, an earthquake was said to have destroyed some houses and caused about 120 deaths in Bastak.

On October 16, 1883, a severe shock was experienced at Kangun, 'Asalu and Tahiri and in their neighbourhood, where much damage was done, and tremors continued until the 24th; this shock was felt also at Bushire.

In 1884 a somewhat serious earthquake occurred and was felt most severely on Qishm Island; the shocks continued for several days, the most violent being May 20, when a number of villages were partially destroyed; and 132 deaths were said to have been occasioned. Many of the inhabitants left the island and there was much distress, in consequence of which the annual revenue was remitted and the Shah of Persia subscribed 1,400 Tumans for the relief of the destitute and the repair of mosques. Shocks were experienced at Lingeh also, but did no damage there; and in June one was observed at Ras-al-Khaimah on the Arabian side of the Gulf.

By far the most severe earthquake of recent times in the Persian Gulf area was one which, on the night of January 11, 1897, laid Qishm town in ruins; only two mosques and three or four other buildings
were left standing, and over 1,600 bodies were said to have been afterwards recovered from the ruins. There was some loss of life, on this occasion, on the island of Larak, and vibrations were felt as far to the west as Lingeh.

In June, 1902, Qishm and Bandar 'Abbas were affected by seismic disturbances, which began on June 9 and lasted for several days, and as usual the damage was greater at Qishm town than elsewhere.

In 1905 shocks were experienced on Hanjam Island on April 25 and on Qishm Island on April 27, and at the same time there were movements in the neighbourhood of Bandar 'Abbas which caused landslips and the collapse of houses at the Gīnau mountain and 'Isin village.

**RECENT SHOCKS**

Two severe earthquake shocks occurred in Nabandan and Sistan districts on March 12 and 13, 1928, and on August 22, 1928, a severe earthquake occurred which affected Sabzawar, Nishapur and Shirwan, some ten persons being killed.

A very severe earthquake occurred on May 2, 1929; twelve distinct shocks were felt within twenty-four hours at widely separated points in the province of Khurāsan, running from Bandargaz to Kalat on the frontier between Persia and Russian Turkistan. The towns of Shirwan, Bujnurd and Jajarm were severely damaged, and it is clear from reports received from Moscow that much damage was done across the frontier in the district of Askhabad, telegraphic reports from Moscow stating that 1,000 persons were killed. The earthquake shocks penetrated far into the interior of Persia and it was stated in the *Daily Telegraph* of May 6, 1929, that a cleft three yards wide was opened between the towns of Khaki and Bagham, to the east of the Tehran Isfahan road, the cleft extending to a distance of 18 miles. The towns of Kuchan and Rubat also suffered severely, huge fissures in the ground being opened up, one being, according to a report in *The Times* of May 9, 24 miles long and 9 feet wide. The total casualties were subsequently given in an official report from a Government Inspector at Kuchan as 3,253 persons killed, 1,121 injured, 83 villages destroyed and 6,542 cattle killed.

A disastrous earthquake, in which some 2,000 persons were reported killed, occurred at Salmas on May 9, 1930, and was severe at Tabriz Khoi and the environs of Urmia. Subsidiary shocks continued intermittently till May 29.
GEOLoGYAL Note

I am indebted to Mr. M. W. Strong for the following observations on the relationship to tectonic lines of the earthquakes given in the subjoined list.

The record may be conveniently divided into three portions:—

(1) A.D. 550–1800 in which about forty-five earthquakes are recorded, the main portion being mentioned from A.D. 850–1280. The poor record from 1280–1600 may be due to the disturbed history of the times. The average number recorded is one in thirty years.

(2) A.D. 1800–1908. A steady record of about seventy earthquakes during this period is given, or about ten times as frequently as before, i.e. about one shock in three years.

(3) A.D. 1908–1930. About fifty earthquakes are recorded during this period and their epicentres determined. The frequency is about one shock per six months or about six times as great as during the preceding century.

Statistical

Of about 166 recorded shocks:—

(1) About forty-five are recorded from the tectonic line running from Syria across to near Mosul and thence down the edge of the folded country through eastern Mesopotamia, east of Baghdad, Zorbatia, east of Kut, thence to Bushire and round the coast to Bandar 'Abbas.

(2) Some thirty-six refer to the Tabriz area alone.

(2a) Over forty shocks are associated with the ranges bordering the Caspian Sea, the Elburz and their extension eastward, viz. Astarabad to Meshed.

(3) Some thirteen records are from the Isfahan-Hamadan line, which may extend towards Tabriz.

(4) About ten shocks were in the region round Shiraz.

(5) Some nineteen further shocks in scattered areas mainly in the Median Mass.

Only about one-third of the total record (extending over about 1,500 years), refers to earthquakes during the last thirty years, and although the records during this period are precise, the epicentres

1 Many of the geological concepts and terms employed in this note were introduced into Persian geology by Dr. H. de Böckh. A full explanation can be found in his contribution to the Structure of Asia, Methuen, 1929.
being given, insufficient time has elapsed for a representative distribution to have been recorded and it is only with the aid of the older records that we are able to determine the great seismic zones.

Of the last fifty, about fourteen seem to be duplicate records of the same shock or records of subsidiary shocks and about twenty refer to large earthquakes.

**The Seismic Regions and Geological Structure**

(1) *Syrian–Mesopotamian–Gulf Line*

Nine records are of shocks felt in Mesopotamia and Syria and the record of the disaster south of Diarbekr is an important link.

It is, however, impossible, where epicentres are not given, to correlate these disturbances more exactly than with the depressed edge of the foreland or the western and southern edge of the zone of autochthonous folding, or in other words the edge of the Gulf depression in which folding has continued up to post-Pliocene times.

The neighbourhood near Zorbatiia is not the only one where more intense seismic activity is in evidence where tectonic lines in different directions appear to be present. In this area, however, the evidence of a north-west trend is not considered by some as convincing. We have similar highly seismic centres in northern Palestine, at Tabriz and the Hormuz Straits and Astarabad at tectonic junctions.

At Bushire, again, it appears that the influence of the north-south structural line, possibly connected in some way with the north-south strike of Qatar Peninsula on the south side of the Gulf, and again evident in the neighbourhood of Ahram, Dalaki, and Kamarij, may affect the stability of this region.

At Qishm and Bandar ‘Abbas an association between the seismicity and the intersection of two or more structural lines is clear.

There is evidence here of the movement of salt plugs until very recently, and they may indeed be in process of movement at the present, but it is possible that the movement of the salt is a product of the same factor as that causing the earthquakes.

(2) At Tabriz, the most striking seismic centre, the association with the Armenian volcanic zone extending down through the Elburz and Central Persia is important. The junction here of the Persian strike and the east-west strike of the Armenian folds has rendered the area particularly unstable. Many of the shocks, though severe locally, seem to be associated with volcanic causes rather than with movements along the junctions of the deeper blocks, but movements
along the Hamadan–Isfahan and Saidabad line of depression appear in some cases to be connected with movements at Tabriz. Similarly, movements along the Armenian trends need to be studied in their connection with Tabriz. Of Tabriz shocks some appear to be grouped round the Urmia depression and the association of many shock centres with local depressions in the Median Mass has been noted by Mr. F. D. S. Richardson.

The line of centres, Khoi-Tabriz-Mianeh-Zenjan, following the south side of the Elburz is closely connected tectonically, while its continuation leads to another interesting line running through Kazvin, Tehran, Demavend ?, Semnan ?, Damghan. This in turn continues to the syntaxis of the Elburz and Kupeh Dagh ranges, in which unstable region Bujnurd, Shirwan, Kuchan, Mazinan, Sabzawar, Nishapur and Meshed are affected.

North-east of the Elburz and bordering the Caspian, shocks are recorded from Ardebil, Enzeli, Resht, Bandar-i-Gaz and the Caspian Sea itself where the sea bed goes steeply down from the south coast.

Late Tertiary volcanic activity in the Elburz and existing solfatara action are of interest, but it will need more exact data before the association of the shocks can be worked out, their focal depths estimated and the surface and deep seisms disentangled. The late uplift of the Elburz has left lines of weakness both on the south and north sides, both lines seeming to possess their own foci.

(3) The Hamadan–Isfahan Line and Extension

This line marks the south west side of a long depression coinciding with the back of the nappes and it continues to the south east of Saidabad whence its continuation bends round the south side of the Jaz-Murian-Hamun depression (north of Jask).

It is interesting to note that similar depressions occur behind the nappes as at Van and Mush in Armenia and at Urmia in Persia.

At Saidabad the Oman direction of folding may influence the stability.

(4) Shiraz–Fasa–Persepolis Area

This area, though in the folded zone, is broken down, the frontal partial nappes tend to die out to the north-west towards Niriz and at the same time the main nappe tends to swing back towards Deh Bid. The possible effect of the Oman and Qatar north-south strike on each side of this area should not be overlooked when studying the

(Continued on page 130.)
LIST OF RECORDED EARTHQUAKES IN PERSIA AND IRAQ OR ON ITS BORDERS (EXCLUDING THE U.S.S.R.)

Notes.—(1) An asterisk indicates earthquakes not included in Milne's *Catalogue of Destructive Earthquakes* up to 1899 (British Association, 1911). Two asterisks indicate earthquakes hitherto unrecorded in any technical publication.

(2) On the annexed map the locality of each earthquake is marked as far as practicable by the corresponding serial number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year A.D.</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>**858</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Tabriz</td>
<td>Town destroyed A.H. 244.1 <em>Le Strange. Chardin</em>, p. 359, says A.H. 234.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>*860</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Persia (loc. non cit.), also Syria and Europe</td>
<td><em>Mallet. Collection Academique</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Rukn-ud Din Khoi (quoted by Barbier de Meynard in his edition of Yaqut’s *Muqan al Buldan*, p. 132) relates that at this time there resided in the city a learned astrologer of Shiraz called Abu Tahir, who foretold that the said earthquake should happen upon the sun’s entrance into Scorpio in the year A.H. 235 = A.D. 849, and should overthrow the whole city. To which, when he found the people would give no credit, he went and was importunate with the Governor to force the people out of the city. The Governor ... did all he could ... but could not persuade above one-half of the people to stir, which fell out to their destruction, for the earthquake happened at exactly the hour mentioned in the prediction, to the overwhelming of 40,000 persons.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol. VI.</th>
<th>Part I.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Iraq.</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>Deinar in Iraq.</td>
<td>10,000 persons were buried in the ruins of buildings and many more swallowed up by the earth. At Baghdad great destruction. Mallet. Haji Khalifa. Abulfaraj, p. 219.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Persia.</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>Feb. 2.</td>
<td>Tabriz, also Smyrna and Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>Khuzistan, especially the city Ardschan (?). Iraq-i-Ajami, Khurasan (city of Bihak).</td>
<td>Town destroyed. 40,000 inhabitants perished. See Chardin, p. 359. Le Strange. See also Nuzhat-ul-Qulub, vol. viii, p. 79. Two odes by Qatran on this disaster; one printed by Ch. Schefer in his Chrestomatie Persane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Iraq.</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>Mosul and Mesopotamia.</td>
<td>Mallet. A large mountain in the neighbourhood of the city of Ardschan cleft in two so that one could see into the interior. Abulfida, vol. ii, p. 143.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EARTHQUAKES IN PERSIA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Mesopotamia.¹</td>
<td>And at the Persian town Gansana, which was destroyed, 100,000 persons losing their lives. <em>Haji Khalifa. Abulfida</em>, p. 329. <em>El Makin. Bar Hebraeus</em>, etc.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Hira and Ambar, also Aleppo.¹</td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ These entries may refer to the same event.

² Moirier (First Journey, p. 254) writes: "*Casvin* is almost one mass of ruins. An earthquake within no distant period threw down the buildings ... made cracks in almost every wall. A large mosque built by the *Abbasses* has been rent in many places in its thick walls and totally ruined."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1405</strong></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>Nishapur</td>
<td>Jackson, p. 257; most of the inhabitants buried in the ruins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1549</strong></td>
<td>October</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Bujnurd</td>
<td>On the 3rd day of the month of Safar, A.H. 911. This earthquake which is recorded as having done great damage in India appears from memoirs of Sultan Babar to have been felt in Persia (Erskine’s edition, p. 170). It lasted for a month and was at its worst near Kabul. Oldham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1619</strong></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>1619</td>
<td>Khurasan, Dughbad</td>
<td>33 shocks in one day. <em>Arabic History of Gujarat</em>, Text, p. 934. (Sir E. D. Ross.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1640</strong></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Tabriz, and at the same time in Damascus</td>
<td>3,000 killed. Described in 'Alam Arai Sikandari. <em>Oldham</em>. See also previous items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1641</strong></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>Tabriz, also felt at Baghdad</td>
<td>&quot;At several other places during the whole year there had been earthquakes, but especially in Khurasan. The town of Dughbad . . . looked to be an immense heap of bricks. From 700 to 800 killed. In one house alone about 70 corpses found; there had been a bridal party. The bride alone was saved.&quot; <em>Alam Arai Sikandari. Oldham</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1664</strong></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>Tabriz and the country round</td>
<td>Oldham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1666</strong></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>Mosul and the country round</td>
<td>Very violent; houses thrown down. <em>Mallet. Haji Khalifa</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1666</strong></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>1661 (?</td>
<td>Tabriz, also felt at Baghdad</td>
<td><em>Mallet</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1666</strong></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>Tabriz and the country round</td>
<td>Very violent; did great damage in many places. <em>Mallet. Haji Khalifa</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 towns and 45 villages ruined, and 4 new mountains raised. *Mallet*. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Persia.</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>Khurasan.</td>
<td>Mashhad and Nishapur, and a third, the name of which is not given, were destroyed. <em>Mallet.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Nov. 27.</td>
<td>N.W. Azarbaijan.</td>
<td><em>Mallet.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 40        | ..      | 1721     | .. 26. | Tabriz. | 8,000 lives lost. See Du Cerceau (Krusinski), who states 80,000 killed; Malcolm puts figure at 100,000 and says city was totally ruined. "What most frightened Isfahan was a phenomenon that appeared there in the air during the summer of 1721. The clouds being at that time very thick, the sun appeared through them of a blood colour, which lasted for two months." *Morier* (First Journey, 1812, p. 276) writes as follows of Tabriz in 1810: "... Close to the walls near the Teheran gate is the complete ruin of a mosque... built about 600 years ago... destroyed by an earthquake within thirty years. The inhabitants complain... of frequent and violent earthquakes, which they attribute to the volcanoes in the district which throw out smoke but no flame. The smoke is so mephitical that it kills immediately a dog or fowl placed over it. The danger of earthquakes has taught the inhabitants of Tabriz to build their houses generally as low as possible and to employ more wood than brick and plaster in their construction. For the same reason the bazaars have only wooden roofs, and are not arched. ... Yet I am told that in earthquakes the domed buildings have invariably stood, where others, the strongest walls, have been rent asunder." *Sir H. J. Brydges,* writing in 1834, states (p. 306), "between the camp and Bosmeech, we passed over ground which some
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event ttl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Persia.</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>Nov. 18</td>
<td>Tabriz</td>
<td>City ruined; 77,000 killed. Mallet. Haji Khalifa. (Perrey quotes Huot. Geol., vol. i, p. 112.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tabriz, Kashan, Isfahan</td>
<td>Very violent shocks; in Kashan more than 600 houses thrown down; altogether 40,000 persons perished. (See Ker Porter.) Perrey quotes Gazette de France, 8th Nov., 1755, and Journal Historique, Dec., 1755, p. 462. Mallet. Watson, p. 190, says shocks very frequent at Kashan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iraq.</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>May 1.</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>2,000 or according to others 4,000 houses thrown down; shock was accompanied by a terrible hurricane. Mallet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Persia.</td>
<td><strong>1774</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Azarbaijan</td>
<td>Brydges, p. 306.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Feb. 28-Mar. 3.</td>
<td>Tabriz</td>
<td>&quot;A terrible earthquake a few months ago destroyed every building in the city of Tabriz and its adjacent villages, some of which, it is said, were swallowed up; and as this dreadful calamity happened at night it is computed that 50 to 60,000 people perished.&quot; John Beaumont, Resident Bushire to Governor of Bombay, 15th July, 1780. Saldanha, p. 316. Mallet. Perrey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Omitted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Persia.</td>
<td><strong>1802</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demavend¹ and Mazandaran</td>
<td>Morier, p. 355. In all 70 towns and villages were destroyed; Semnan, Damghan ... received great injury.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Rabino (p. 54) refers to an earthquake of A.H. 1225 = A.D. 1810, which caused much destruction at Sari. An inscription on the Masjid-i-Juma at Barfurush states that it was destroyed by an earthquake in the reign of Fath Ali Shah. For further references to earthquakes see ibid., pp. 40, 44.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year A.D.</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>*1819</td>
<td>Jan. 29.</td>
<td>Tabriz.</td>
<td>Very numerous shocks, extending over several weeks, and including Tasuj. Mallet. (Milne gives Caucasus only.) Of Tasuj (N.W. of Tabriz) Morier (First Journey, p. 297) writes in 1810: &quot;It appears once to have been a large place but it is now reduced, by earthquakes, to the denomination of a village. There are remains of domed bazaars and mosques spread in every part of the place.&quot;</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>**1820</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mazandaran.</td>
<td>Rabino, p. 44.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>June 23 or June 25.</td>
<td>Shiraz and Kazrun.</td>
<td>A violent shock, followed by many slighter ones for six days and nights. The principal damage was done by the first and three others that followed it before 10 a.m. A part of Shiraz was almost completely destroyed and swallowed up. Kazrun also suffered severely and some mountains in the neighbourhood of Kazrun were levelled (27th Shawal, 1239). On the same day there was a renewed eruption on the island of Banda (Dutch E. Indies). Mallet. See also Wills, C. J. Verneur, Journal des Voyages. Curzon, vol. ii, p. 219, states that local tradition favours the theory that the colossal statue of Shapur in the Kazrun Valley was thrown down by an earthquake.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>**18—</td>
<td></td>
<td>Persepolis.</td>
<td>The steady diminution in the number of pillars noted as standing at Persepolis by successive</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>May 9.</td>
<td>Tehran.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>*1843</td>
<td>Apr. 26--May 6.</td>
<td>Tabriz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Feb. 22 (?)</td>
<td>Kuchan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A shock almost as severe as that of the year before; numbers of buildings were reduced to ruins. (Milne classes this as II.) *Mallet.*

The city suffered much. *Mallet.* Demavend suffered severely, not less than 500 persons killed. *Watson,* p. 257, says that the year was marked in Persia by a series of shocks of earthquakes.

Violent shocks; Khoi destroyed. *Perrey.*

Violent shocks. *Perrey.*

Three shocks; several houses destroyed. *Oldham.*

2,000 persons killed. *Allemagne,* vol. iii, p. 67. *(Perrey gives Derbent only.)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year A.D.</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Apr. 21–22.</td>
<td>Shiraz.</td>
<td>12,000 killed, Mosque of Abbas fell. Shock felt at Washington at same time, but Perrey in Supplement gives date as 2nd May. Perrey. For full account see Wills, C. J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>July 11.</td>
<td>Isfahan.</td>
<td>10,000 killed; Perrey. Hamdallah Mustawfi (A.D. 1340) in his account of Isfahan states that &quot;earthquakes very seldom occur here&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Sept. 23.</td>
<td>Tabriz.</td>
<td>4 shocks of which the first and strongest lasted twenty seconds; several villages almost entirely destroyed, as also the town of Khoi. Perrey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>*1856</td>
<td>Oct. 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong shock apparently vertical, but shown by seismometer as having direction E. 23° 16' N. Followed immediately by a second shock in the direction W. 31° 12' S. Perrey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Oct. 27 (?).</td>
<td>Azarbaijan.</td>
<td>Considerable damage done and small town of Tesong (Tasuj ?) completely destroyed. Perrey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Nov. 9</td>
<td>Kirkuk</td>
<td>Strong shock. Perrey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Dec. 21</td>
<td>Shiraz</td>
<td>Perrey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Jan. 1–2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76a</td>
<td></td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Jan. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 slight shocks. Perrey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76b</td>
<td></td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Jan. 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>A very strong shock. Perrey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Jan. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>See also previous entry. Perrey. Mallet. Oldham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Jan. 6</td>
<td>near Ardebil</td>
<td>4 villages destroyed. Perrey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>(No date)</td>
<td>Shiraz</td>
<td>5 shocks of which 3 violent. Perrey. Wills in &quot;Behind an Eastern Veil&quot; refers to the great earthquake of 1853 and mentions that slight earthquakes were very frequent in the neighbourhood during his residence there. The tradition still remains and the light wooden structures in the gardens at Shiraz are still known as earthquake houses (zilzileh khaneh).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Feb. 8</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>Several shocks from E. to W., several houses ruined; hills reported cracked in N. of Kut al Amarah (!). Perrey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>(No date)</td>
<td>Darveh Asuh, near Mugam</td>
<td>&quot;In 1865 an earthquake levelled the villages of Darveh Asuh, near Mugam, with the ground; and its remarkable effects were witnessed by Dr. Colvill of the Bushire Residency.&quot; Persian Gulf Gazetteer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Iraq (?)</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Between Tigris and Euphrates,</td>
<td>Violent shock, cracks in earth over more than 30 leagues, 16 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not far from Diarbekr.</td>
<td>destroyed with all their population. <em>Perrey.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Dec. 31 (?)</td>
<td>Tabriz.</td>
<td><em>Perrey.</em> (Milne gives Caucasus only.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>*1868</td>
<td>Apr. 19.</td>
<td>Bushire.</td>
<td>Several shocks of which two were violent. <em>Perrey.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90a</td>
<td></td>
<td>*1872</td>
<td>Jan. 6.</td>
<td>Kuchan.</td>
<td>A second and more terrible shock. The rest of the town destroyed. Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>forts in the neighbourhood so completely engulfed, wrote the British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consul at Tehran, that no trace remained. <em>Perrey.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>**1872</td>
<td>July 15 (?)</td>
<td>Shirvan in Caucasus and Persian frontier.</td>
<td><em>Bassett.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Mar. 12–Apr. 2.</td>
<td>Tabriz to Miane, and Zenjan.</td>
<td><em>Fuchs.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Aug. 28</td>
<td>Khoi, Tabriz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>May 3</td>
<td>Tabriz and most of Azarbaijan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>**1883</td>
<td>Oct. 16–24</td>
<td>Kangun, Asalu, Tahiri, Bushire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Persia and Persian Gulf</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Persian Gulf, Muscat, Nejd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>May 19–20</td>
<td>Qishm I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Persian Gulf</td>
<td>**1884</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Ras-al Khaimah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>**1887</td>
<td>Nov. 14–24</td>
<td>Bushire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>**1890</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fars, Jahrum, Kamarij, Khisht, Fasa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Nov. 17</td>
<td>Kuchan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td>**1894</td>
<td>End of Feb.</td>
<td>Shiraz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Jan. 7 and 17</td>
<td>Khurasan, Kuchan, Meshed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Jan. 2</td>
<td>Khalkhal, N. of Mianeh. Khoi and Gangabad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>**1896</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kirman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fuchs.*

*Mallet, Oldham. Fuchs.*

*Persian Gulf Gazetteer.*

*Fuchs.*

*Fuchs.* 132 killed; many villages destroyed; Shah gave 1,400 Tomans for relief. Persian Gulf Gazetteer. Annual revenue remitted; many inhabitants left island. No damage. *Persian Gulf Gazetteer.*

*Persian Gulf Gazetteer.*


*Allemagne.*

*P.G. Gazetteer.* Some injury to life and property. See also *Allemagne,* vol. iii, p. 67.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year A.D.</th>
<th>Month.</th>
<th>Place.</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>**1897</td>
<td>Jan. 11</td>
<td>Qishm Is:</td>
<td>Town levelled to ground, 1,600 killed. Only two mosques and three or four other buildings left standing.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(night)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Larak Is.</td>
<td>Loss of life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>**1902</td>
<td>June 9.</td>
<td>Qishm.</td>
<td>Considerable damage. Shocks also felt at Bandar Abbas, where 10 lives lost and many houses destroyed. Shocks continued for several days. <em>Persian Gulf Gazetteer.</em></td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>**1905</td>
<td>Apr. 25.</td>
<td>Bandar Abbas.</td>
<td>Also felt at Qishm and on Hanjam. Landslips and collapse of houses on Kuh-i-Ginao, and at Isin village. <em>Persian Gulf Gazetteer.</em></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Jan. 10–23</td>
<td>94 m. E.S.E. Samnan. Lat. 35° 5’. Long. 55° 0’ E. 100 m. W.N.W. Isfahan. Lat. 33° 3’. Long. 50° 2’ E.</td>
<td>Severe shock.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERNATIONAL SUMMARY.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>June 2.</td>
<td>92 m. E. of Tabriz. Lat. 38° 0’. Long. 48° 5’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>14 m. E.S.E. Badrah. Lat. 33° 5’ N. Long. 46° 5’ E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>July 24</td>
<td>14 m. E.S.E. Badrah. Lat. 33° 5’. Long. 46° 5’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Nov. 23</td>
<td>14 m. E.S.E. Badrah. Lat. 33° 5’. Long. 46° 5’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Nov. 24</td>
<td>14 m. E.S.E. Badrah. Lat. 33° 5’. Long. 46° 5’.</td>
<td>Observed by 23 stations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>1918 Mar. 24</td>
<td>226 m. E.S.E. Samnan. Lat. 34° 5'. Long. 57° 1'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1918 Mar. 24</td>
<td>226 m. E.S.E. Samnan. Lat. 34° 5'. Long. 57° 1'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1918 May 25</td>
<td>120 m. N. of Kirman. Lat. 32° 0'. Long. 57° 0'. (Big.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1919 Oct. 24</td>
<td>48 m. E.S.E. Dizak. Lat. 27° 5'. Long. 63° 6'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>1919 Oct. 24</td>
<td>48 m. E.S.E. Dizak. Lat. 27° 5'. Long. 63° 6'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>1920 May 25</td>
<td>14 m. E.S.E. Badrah. Lat. 33° 5'. Long. 46° 5'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1920 May 25</td>
<td>60 m. W.S.W. Kirmanshah. Lat. 33° 5'. Long. 46° 5'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128a</td>
<td>1921 May 21</td>
<td>Masjid Sulaiman, 30 m. E. of Shushtar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>1922 Mar. 21</td>
<td>102 m. W.N.W. Isfahan. Lat. 33° 0'. Long. 50° 0'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>1922 Mar. 21</td>
<td>102 m. W.N.W. Isfahan. Lat. 33° 0'. Long. 50° 0'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>1923 May 25</td>
<td>120 m. N. of Kirman. Lat. 32° 0'. Long. 57° 0'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>1923 May 25</td>
<td>120 m. N. of Kirman. Lat. 32° 0'. Long. 57° 0'. (Big.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>1923 June 18</td>
<td>20 m. S.E. Kerind. Lat. 34° 8'. Long. 46° 0'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Earthquakes in Persia**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year A.D.</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Sept. 14</td>
<td>44 m. E. of Bam. Lat. 29° 5'. Long. 59° 5'.</td>
<td>Observed by 14 stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Sept. 14</td>
<td>44 m. E. of Bam. Lat. 29° 5'. Long. 59° 5'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Sept. 17</td>
<td>94 m. E.S.E. Semnan. Lat. 35° 5'. Long. 55° 0'.</td>
<td>Observed by 53 stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Sept. 17</td>
<td>94 m. E.S.E. Semnan. Lat. 35° 5'. Long. 55° 0'.</td>
<td>A big shock.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Sept. 22</td>
<td>38 m. S.E. Saidabad-Kirman. Lat. 29° 5'. Long. 56° 0'.</td>
<td>Observed by 74 stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Sept. 23</td>
<td>38 m. S.E. Saidabad-Kirman. Lat. 29° 5'. Long. 56° 0'.</td>
<td>Observed by 13 stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Sept. 22</td>
<td>38 m. S.E. Saidabad.</td>
<td>(Big.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140x</td>
<td></td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Sept. 23</td>
<td>Kirman. Lat. 29° 5'. Long. 56° 0'.</td>
<td>(Small.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Nov. 29</td>
<td>84 m. N. Kuh-i-Malik-i-Siah. Lat. 31° 2'. Long. 61° 6'.</td>
<td>Observed by 16 stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Nov. 29</td>
<td>84 m. N. Kuh-i-Malik-i-Siah. Lat. 31° 2'. Long. 61° 6'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Jan. 18</td>
<td>38 m. S.E. Saidabad-Kirman. Lat. 29° 5'. Long. 56° 0'.</td>
<td>Observed by 15 stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Feb. 19</td>
<td>38 m. N. of Ahar. Lat. 39° 0'. Long. 47° 5'.</td>
<td>A big shock.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caspian Sea, Persia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caspian Sea, Persia</td>
<td>33° 5' 30&quot;</td>
<td>53° 5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caspian Sea, Persia</td>
<td>33° 5' 30&quot;</td>
<td>53° 5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caspian Sea, Persia</td>
<td>36° 30'</td>
<td>50° 30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caspian Sea, Persia</td>
<td>36° 30'</td>
<td>50° 30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caspian Sea, Persia</td>
<td>34° 30'</td>
<td>48° 0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caspian Sea, Persia</td>
<td>34° 30'</td>
<td>48° 0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caspian Sea, Persia</td>
<td>34° 30'</td>
<td>48° 0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Persian Gulf</td>
<td>60° 0'</td>
<td>81° 0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persian Gulf</td>
<td>60° 0'</td>
<td>81° 0'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year A.D.</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>July 11</td>
<td>44 m. E. of Bam. Lat. 29° 5'. Long. 59° 5'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>July 30</td>
<td>50 m. E. Bandar Dilam. Lat. 30° 0'. Long. 51° 0'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Sept. 24</td>
<td>38 m. N. of Lingeh. Lat. 27° 5'. Long. 55° 0'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Dec. 18</td>
<td>50 m. E. of Bandar Dilam. Lat. 30° 0'. Long. 51° 0'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Apr. 23</td>
<td>38 m. N. Lingeh. Lat. 27° 5'. Long. 55° 0'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>May 19</td>
<td>22 m. N.E. Ramishk. Lat. 27° 2'. Long. 59° 5'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>Khurasan.</td>
<td>Twelve distinct shocks were felt within twenty-four hours at widely separated points in the province of Khurasan, running from Bandargaz to Kalat on the frontier between Persia and Russian Turkistan. The towns of Shirvan, Bujnurd, and Jajarm were severely damaged, and it is clear from reports received from Moscow that much damage was done across the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>Masjid Sulaiman, 31 m. E. of Shushtar. 7 distinct shocks in 24 hours, first at 10.47 a.m.; minor tremors felt later. Minor damage to plant and property. Movement S.E.-N.W. Village of Andarkah damaged and nine lives lost. Not yet reported in International Summary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>Salmas. 2,000 killed. Shocks continued intermittently up till 29th May. Severe at Tabriz, Khoi, Urmia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Damarand. Severe shocks; villages destroyed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cause of its instability, but the detailed geology of the area is insufficiently well known at present for conclusions to be reached as to the cause of its high seismicity.

(5) The Scattered Areas in the Median Mass

With regard to the remaining records of the shocks scattered over the Median Mass, it must be remembered that this is an irregular complex of horsts and depressions and it seems as if the movements, which are irregular in direction, have continued since Cretaceous times, accompanied since the Eocene by considerable volcanic action which has gone on until fairly recent times, but the association of the recorded shocks with recently depressed blocks is of interest.

NOTE ON THE RECORDS IN GENERAL

It is not considered safe to analyse the records previous to 1908 much further at present though a study of the broader relations might be continued with advantage.

In a country such as Persia, however, where wide stretches of country are uninhabited, or are inhabited by nomads, and where furthermore a long and disturbed history has had its effect on the completeness of the records, it is inevitable that the main body of the older records should come from the larger towns and that even in these records great gaps should occur.
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DOURA-ERÓPOS

Based on "Fouilles de Doura-Eropos (1922–3) par Franz Cumont, Paris, 1926"

By J. M. UNVALA

THE present article is an analysis of the monumental work of the Belgian archaologist and savant, M. Franz Cumont, which embodies the results of excavations made by him on the site of the ancient Macedonian colony of Doura-Eropos. As it was impossible to give a mere resumé of this work without leaving out some of the important points and erudite suggestions which are scattered in the text and valuable foot-notes, I thought it best to give as clear and as complete an idea as possible of this once important and flourishing Macedonian colony situated in the heart of the Syrian desert. Further, speaking from the purely Iranian standpoint, the excavations at Doura-Eropos have furnished new documents pertaining to the Parthian civilization, which had penetrated into Parapotamia with its Parthian conquest, and which had left its traces not only in the costume of priest and soldiers, but also in fine arts—in sculptures and paintings, in ceramics and jewellery, as can be amply proved by the results of the excavations of 1928 and 1929. A vivid description of the city of Doura-Eropos, its inhabitants and their religion and civic life, etc., is given by M. Rostovtzeff in Bulletin of the Associates in Fine Arts at Yale University, February, 1930, vol. iv, No. 1, pp. 75–85.

INTRODUCTION

The discovery of the ruins of the ancient Macedonian colony of Doura-Eropos, founded by Nicanor at the end of the fourth century B.C. in the midst of the Syrian desert near the modern Salihiyeh on the right bank of the Euphrates, was entirely due to a happy accident, which disclosed to the Englishman Captain Murphey the painted frescos of the temple of the Palmyrene gods in March, 1921. The eminent archaologist, the late Miss Gertrude Bell, suspected at once the importance of this discovery. Mr. Breasted was therefore specially sent to study them, but owing to the unsettled circumstances of Syria in 1921 he could bring back with him nothing but excellent photographs of these frescos taken in May, 1921. He made a report on this subject to the Académie des Inscriptions of Paris. In the meanwhile Syria had come under the French mandate, and General Gouraud, the High
Commissioner for this mandatory country, granted his effective protection to the Mission of M. Franz Cumont, who was sent by the Academy in 1922 to make excavations on this ancient site, by placing at his disposal a party of Spahis. Colonel Eugène Renard had in the meantime studied the frescos and written his very useful report.

NAME

The Semitic name of this fortified place in the heart of the Syrian desert was Doura, derived from Assyrian *dour, douru* "fortress", given by the Assyrians to this strategical place, which commanded from remote antiquity the irrigable region, stretching itself on two sides of the Euphrates south of the mouth of the Khabour. It formed the kingdom of Hana as early as the close of the fourth millennium, which became powerful enough to subjugate Babylon in 2800 B.C. After the fall of the Achæmenian empire Syria fell into the hands of the Macedonians. Alexander the Great followed a policy of reconciliation and fusion of the Greeks and the Persians, but his successor, Seleucus Nicator (312–280), to whose lot Syria fell, seems to have changed this policy and lent himself entirely on the Hellenic element and on the privileged aristocracy. He founded many Greek colonies, which served as a continued line of support along the Euphrates, indispensable for guarding the passage of the river, for asserting his royal authority among the predatory nomads of the desert, and for keeping up the communication with the Mediterranean and the Oriental strategoses of his empire. One of these colonies was, according to Isidor of Kharax, founded by his general Nicanor at Doura, which received its Greek name Europos after the little town of Macedonia, the birth-place of Seleucus Nicator. Other towns of the same name were founded by him in Media and Cyrrhestique on the Euphrates higher up Doura. This Eupropos in Parapotamia was founded probably with the same plan of colonization in view.

FORTRESS

The fortress of Doura-Eropos is mentioned by ancient authors like Polybius, Isidore of Kharax, Lucian, Ptolemaeus, Ammianus Marcellinus, Zosimus the Cosmographer of Ravenna. It is also mentioned in the Acts of the Syrian Martyr Mar Mu‘ain, who lived in the time of Shapur II as follows: *men modhrā da dourā* "from the fortress of Doura"; *mādintā hadā zarābtā melkariā dourā* "the ruined city called Doura". A short description of the position of this ancient fortress of Doura was given in 1872 by the Austrian
engineer, Czernik. Thereupon MM. Sarre and Herzfeld drew up hasty plans of this site when they crossed the Euphrates region several times between 1898 and 1912.

Everything in the method of construction employed at Doura confirms the view that this fortification is the work of engineers of the army of the Seleucids. Doura-Eropos offers thus the type of the fortifications better preserved than elsewhere in Syria with which the Greek engineers furnished the colonies founded on the whole regions of the vast empire of the Seleucids. By a happy chance a sketch of the fortress drawn by a soldier permits us to restore even the upper part of the walls and the crenelled towers which the time has destroyed. This is sufficient to indicate the importance of the data, which the old fortress of Nicanor furnishes us for the history of the military architecture of the epoch of the Diadochi.

The excavations of 1928 and 1929 conducted by M. Maurice Pillet have brought to light the ruins of the citadel, which M. Rostovtzeff describes as follows: "Overhanging the Euphrates stands the skeleton of the oblong rectangular citadel, flanked by two high and straight towers, which protected the two gates of entrance. The plateau of the majestic citadel was occupied by a large and fine palace probably of the military governor of the city." (Rostovtzeff, Bulletin, pp. 78–9.)

INHABITANTS

After the foundation of the Greek colony of Doura-Eropos there must have been an influx of Semitic elements into it, notably from the adjoining desert-capital of Palmyra. This and the local Bedouin elements, which became henceforth sedentary, voluntarily mixed themselves up in course of time with the original Macedonian elements. They were deeply impregnated with the Hellenic culture of the colony of Nicanor.

Doura-Eropos was a small town, but a considerable fortress. As its inhabitants were incapable of guarding it alone, its foreign garrison formed a notable part of the population. An inscription and a graffito proves that it was guarded in the Roman period by a cohort of mounted Palmyrene archers, five hundred or a thousand men strong, but it seems that the Palmyrenians were occupying it long before its annexation by the Roman empire.

COSTUME

Moreover, we know that the organization of the Palmyrene army was imitated from that of the Persians. This is officially proved by
the Iranian title *argapetes* given to its commandant, and the use of the *chibanarii* wearing an armour barded with iron. Again, on the Palmyrene bas-reliefs the heroified dead are represented in banquet-scenes in the Persian festival costume, which they wore during their life-time. It shows nothing more than a necessary change in the warlike costume adopted to suit domestic life. The big fresco-painting of the sacrifice of the Roman tribune provides us with interesting details of the sacrificial costume of the inhabitants of Doura. The officiating personages and the assistants are all men, with the exception of a little girl. They wear a long white robe with sleeves and reaching to the ankles; it is held by a girdle round the waist; their feet are bare; they wear on the head a tall, stiff, conical white cap. Their features are purely Semitic and accentuated by a slightly pointed beard, typical of the modern Bedouins. The costume of the girl is also white; she wears earrings, bracelets, and necklaces undoubtedly of precious stones.

**LANGUAGE**

The Greek language became not only the language of the chancery of Doura-Eropos, but also of that of its epigraphy. It supplanted entirely the Aramaic language, which must have remained restricted only to the sphere of a spoken language of a certain section of its inhabitants. Greek continued to be in use from the very foundation of the city up to its final abandon by its inhabitants in the time of Aurelian in about A.D. 272.

**ONOMASTICS**

Before the discovery of Doura-Eropos the number of Greek inscriptions found in the “Hellenic Far East” was very restricted. The excavations have delivered 134 inscriptions dating from 6 B.C. up to the epoch of the Severi. In the onomastics of Doura the Semitic theophore names are translated into Greek or rather are substituted

1 MidP. *arkpat*, Gr. *Ἄργαπέτας* (G.Ir. Ph.i, 257), *Ἀργαβίθας* (for which *Ἄργαβίθας* in Theophylactus, iii, 8) means originally the military governor of a fortress. Ardašir, the founder of the Sassanian dynasty, was appointed *Argabedh* of Dārābgerd by Gözihr, King of Fars (Nöldeke, *Tabari*, p. 5). On his accession to the throne *Argabedh* became the highest military title, and as such was reserved only for members of the royal family. The family of *Artabides* had, according to Theophylactus (iii, 8), as one of its privileges that of crowning the king (Christensen, *L’Empire des Sassanides*, Copenhagen, 1907, p. 27). This year’s excavations have brought to light a very interesting inscription concerning the *argapetes* of Doura. It will be published in the coming number of the *Comptes-Rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, Paris. (Cumont, *Oral information.*)
by the Greek theophore names, accompanied by the formula ο ἔπικαλούμενος, which is found also on Parthian coins (cf. Warwick Wroth, Catalogue of Greek Coins of the British Museum—Parthia, p. 66, No. 63, cf. pl. xlv), and on the Greek parchments of the Parthian period from Avroman (Ellis H. Minns, The Journal of Hellenic Studies, vol. xxxv, 1915, pp. 28, 29, where τῆς ἔπικαλούμενης). Among these Oriental names many are interesting, several are new, but the majority are found in Palmyrene and Nabataean inscriptions.

Then with the coming of the Parthian Arsacides to power Doura came under the Parthian influence, under which it worked for nearly five centuries. It became a connecting link between big cities of the Parthian empire in their commercial relations with one another. Thus many Iranian elements were introduced into the onomastics of Doura, which, however, are very restricted, as the Parthians were represented mostly by artisans, merchants, and functionaries.

It is interesting to note that before the middle of the second century there is a complete absence of Latin names in the inscriptions of Doura,¹ which are abundant in this period in those of the provinces of Syria. This is a decisive proof that Doura remained for a long time free from the sphere of the Roman influence, which did not extend beyond the desert of Syria after the commencement of the reign of Marcus Aurelius.

**Parchments**

The current use of the Greek language in Doura-Eropos is further proved by the discovery of nine Greek parchments. Parchments Nos. I–IV are the pieces pertaining to the archives of the city, where copies, or rather résumés, of private contracts signed by the respective parties were kept. These archives were called in Doura χρηματιστήριον. It was obligatory on the contracting parties to have their contracts legally registered (ἀναγραφέω) by an official who bore the title probably of χρησφύλαξ as in the cities of the Greek Orient, if they wanted to attach a legal validity to them, as we learn

¹ The series of inscriptions discovered in 1928 at Doura is very interesting. It gives us an idea of the military organization of the city during the period of the Roman occupation. At the head of the garrison there was a tribune. The detachment of guards posted at the Palmyrene gate had probably the duty of keeping a close watch on the road which led from Palmyra to Doura, and also over its traffic. Were not these guards perhaps also customs-officers of Doura? The detachment was commanded by a beneficiarius and a stator of the tribunal—functions which are already known in the Roman provinces. The stator was perhaps a non-commissioned officer of the police (Rostovtzeff, Comptes-Rendus, 1928, p. 230).
from the papyrus of Egypt and from a series of inscriptions. Parchment No. I is the oldest of the whole lot and is dated 195 B.C. or a little later. It is, moreover, the oldest parchment that has been yet discovered. This date throws a serious doubt on the legend reported by the antiquarian Varro, which makes Eumenes II (195–158 B.C.) of Pergamum the discoverer of parchments, as the existence of parchments in 195 B.C. presupposes a somewhat long period of development of its technique. The form of letters of this oldest parchment (No. I) is entirely Ptolemaic, and in many points of details parallels can be found particularly in the parchments dated between about 170–160 B.C. This shows that the style of writing taught in schools of the different centres of the Hellenic world must have been identical. The second parchment is interesting, as it is a remnant of a diptic. The use of diptics of parchments whose collections formed a sort of a register led little by little to the formation of a codex. Another interesting parchment is No. IX. It is properly speaking the hide of a shield, on which a list of stages made by a Roman legionary is written. It can be dated third century B.C.

Organisation of the Family

Very scanty information can be deduced from the inscriptions and parchments discovered in Doura about the organization of the family in this colony. The aristocracy of Doura was divided into genes (γενεῖς, γένεις) or families, which were indicated in the inscriptions by ταύτα, i.e. so-and-so of the family of so-and-so. It is equivalent of benis of so-and-so, descendants of a common ancestor, which are frequently mentioned in Semitic inscriptions of Palmyra. The head of the family was a genearches (γεναιρόχρηστος): this term corresponds to pater familias. These genes practised with preference endogamy, as can be amply proved by inscriptions of the first century, which

1 From time immemorial ἀφθονία have been the natural writing material. This is supported by a leather-roll dating from the twelfth Egyptian dynasty as early as 2000–1800 B.C. pertaining to the British Museum. Again, we learn from Herodotus (v, 58) that the archives of the Achaemenian sovereigns were written on prepared skins. We hear of their use also in Ionia and among the Jews. According to a tradition preserved in the Pahlavi Artāk Vīrūz Nāmak, i, 5 (edition of Jamasp Asa, Bombay, 1902, p. 1) the sacred scriptures of the Zoroastrians were written in golden ink upon prepared cow-skins. The discovery of three parchments in the village of Avroman in Persian Kurdistan made in 1909 is worth mentioning, although they are of a relatively later date than those discovered at Doura-Eropos. The two Greek documents are dated according to Mr. Minns about 94 B.C. and 20 B.C. (JHS., vol. xxxv, pp. 41, 42), whereas the third Pahlavi document is dated 300 of the Arsacide era corresponding to a.D. 53–4.
explicitly state that women married their consanguine brothers (όμοπατρίας αὐτοῦ ἀδελφῆς καὶ γυναῖκος. Inscriptions Nos. 65, 68; cf. also the parchments from Avroman, Minns, JHS. xxxv, pp. 28, 29, and Strassmaier, ZASS. viii, p. 112) and that uncles had their own nieces for wives. This endogamy, which is a contradiction of the whole constitution of the γένος, based on the parentage through male offsprings, is a survival of the matriarchate. This custom of consanguinous marriages which the inhabitants of Doura-Eropos had adopted most probably under the Parthian influence (cf. Unvala, Observations on the Religion of the Parthians, Bombay, 1925, pp. 33, 34) was thoroughly modified with the coming of the Romans and with the conferring on the inhabitants of Doura the citizenship of the Roman Empire under Caracalla.

Calendar

The inhabitants of Doura followed, as we can see from their inscriptions, the luni-solar calendar of the Seleucides, commencing with 312 B.C. The names of the eight out of the twelve months of the year occurring in the inscriptions are Macedonian. It seems that the beginning of the year was fixed on the 1st October at the end of the second century as in the whole of Syria; still this was perhaps not the case before the arrival of the Romans.

Houses

The plan of the town of Doura, as well as those of the houses is characteristic of the Greek houses of the fourth century B.C. The town was built in the form of a chess-board. A broad street, the main street of the city, the continuation of the great caravan-road of the desert divided the city into two wards (Rostovtzeff, Bulletin, p. 78). The celebrated gate of the city was the Palmyrene gate. It was probably the only gate which led to Palmyra across the caravan-road. It was an important monument, a majestic passage with three gates, of which two were vaulted. It was flanked by two square towers. The whole surface of the walls encasing these three gates was covered with about a dozen Greek and Palmyrene inscriptions, some engraved, others painted. None of these inscriptions mention Roman officers, and must therefore be of a later date than the second half of the second century A.D. There are no traces of other gates; if they existed at all they must have been situated to that part of the city-wall which was lying towards the Euphrates (Rostovtzeff, Comptes-Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, Paris, 1928, p. 226). The
walls of the houses had the *soubassement de blocage.* The houses were provided with deep cellars, which were used for habitation in summer, as it is still the case in Persia. There was a central court. The lintels of the doors were of soft stone, decorated with fleurons and surmounted by a capital imitating acanthus leaves. The houses had one storey; their roofs were always in the form of a terrace.

**Poverty of the Finds**

After the taking of Palmyra in A.D. 272 by Aurelian the glorious existence of the desert-city ceased completely. The fall of Doura dates also from this event. "Was it a host of enemies who invaded the city, burnt down the houses and the temples, robbed and pillaged the town, or was it that the masters of the day decided not to use the city any more, to leave it, to evacuate it? Who knows? The fact is that at about A.D. 250 life stopped in Doura; men, women, and children left the city, never to return". (Rostovtzeff, *Bulletin*, p. 85.) It was deliberately and systematically abandoned by its inhabitants, who migrated to the adjoining towns, taking with them all that they could. Thereupon it was pillaged several times by nomads. It is, therefore, that hardly anything of intrinsic value, like jewellery, was discovered in the excavations of 1922-3, with the exception of several bronze coins, some deformed pieces of metal, several pieces of woollen fabric, leather-objects, basket-work, and glass-ware. The coins were struck in Syria, Phœnicia, and Mesopotamia, and as not a single coin with the mint-mark of Doura has been found, it is highly probable that Doura had not got its own coinage. But the excavations near the Palmyrene gate executed in 1929 brought to light by a stroke of good fortune a broken clay pot containing besides a small treasure of about one thousand Parthian silver coins,¹ a set of unique massive silver jewels adorned with coloured stones, in which cornaline predominated: a peculiar pendant, bracelets, earrings, etc. (Rostovtzeff, *Bulletin*, p. 83.) As regards ceramics, all vases found at Doura were imported. Here we find the ancient Oriental glazed ware side by side with dishes of red *sigillata terra*, spread in the whole of the Roman East. The former resembles the well-known Græco-Parthian ceramics found at Susa and Carthage.

¹ These coins are at present in Yale University. Their close examination has shown that they are Roman coins, approximately contemporaneous with the downfall of Doura (M. Cuney, *Oral information*).
NECROPOLIS

The importance and wealth of Doura is still evident from its vast necropolis, situated to the west of the city. The dead were buried richly decorated with their personal ornaments; their faces were covered with a gold mask. The tombs are exactly like those of Palmyra and Zenobia, its colony. They are of two types, funeral towers and rupestral vaults. The funeral towers, whose stories served as sepulchres, are just like those in the valley of the tombs of Palmyra. Rupestral tombs are disseminated in a large number on the necropolis.

CULTS

The inhabitants of Doura indulged in two important cults, which existed among them most probably simultaneously. They were the cult of the great indigenous divinity Nanaia or Artemis-Nanaia, and that of the great Palmyrene triade Yahribol, Aglibol and Bel-Shamin. To all these divinities temples were erected, of which that of Artemis-Nanaia was the most important of the little town. It was built on a Babylonian plan which has left its traces in many other temples of Western Asia. The latter has as its essential character the existence of a central court, which has on its four sides constructions destined either for the celebration of the cult or as houses for priests and hierodules. Sometimes small secondary courts are placed between these irregular constructions. Facing the entrance of the court, there is generally a double hall, the pronaos and the naos, with the socle which supported the statue of the divinity. Before the entrance of the hall, outside the peribol, there is a monumental altar. It is not possible to affirm that this arrangement was actually found at Doura, but it appears quite clear that the models from which the architects of Doura were inspired should not be sought in the West, but rather in the valley of the Euphrates. A portative stone-altar with Palmyrene inscriptions was discovered in 1929 near the Palmyrene gate. It had two coatings of plaster, each bearing inscriptions of two posterior dates. The last coating had engraved figures pertaining undoubtedely to the cults which were prevalent in Doura: the cult of the vexillum and of the Roman emperor; the altar; the cult of the sun and the moon: the eagle and the pyramid; perhaps the cult of the Euphrates: the cantharus and the bird (Rostovtzeff, Comptes-Rendus, p. 236).

Nanaia is mentioned in a short inscription found in her sanctuary, and the theophore names *Biθnavaia*, *Menaknavaia*, and perhaps
Barisbonaia are the signs of the veneration in which she was held. Moreover, the assimilation of Nanaia with the Hellenic Artemis is frequent. The goddess worshipped in the temple of Elymais in Susiana is called Nanaia in Bk. II of Maccabees, Artemis in Josephus, and an inscription of the Roman epoque discovered in Peiræus mentions a vow in the name of 'Aρτρέμιοι Ναναι.

Her cult goes back to remote antiquity. It is the cult of the mother-goddess Ishtar of the East. She was worshipped not only in Mesopotamia, but also in Iran. Her cult was widely spread and was very powerful. The discoveries made at Doura-Eropos correspond to the complex nature of this goddess. She was the great goddess of the whole earth, who was assimilated simultaneously with Artemis and Ishtar as divinity of the fecund nature; she was also a warlike goddess and was, therefore, assimilated with Athena, and as such she was the daughter of Bel-Zeus. She was also identified with Nike, the goddess of victory, as we can judge from two statues of this goddess found in her temple; finally, through the influence of Babylonian astrology which gave to the Semitic deities siderial character, she was identified with Τύχη, and had, therefore, a marble statue of Fortuna (Τυχη) holding a horn of abundance dedicated to her at Doura. Thus like Atargatis who was the Τυχη Παλμυρων and Τυχη Γεράσων, she was the Τυχη of Doura. All these facts go to prove that Artemis, worshipped in the Macedonian city of Doura-Eropos was a divinity much less Greek than Semitic. It is significative that at the bottom of a metal patera employed in her temple she is represented in a thoroughly oriental appearance. As the Τυχη of Doura Artemis-Nanaia had her special shrine or temple, situated in the central part of the monumental gate. It formed perhaps with the two rooms in one of its square towers in the last days of Doura a real sanctuary, roofed, adorned with paintings and altars, a sanctuary of which the walls were literally covered by scores of inscriptions in which men (no women were among them) recommended their names to the memory of the great goddess of the city. (Rostovtzeff, Bulletin, p. 82.)

Hadad is mentioned side by side with Nanaia in an inscription of the temple, and is also represented in theoephore names, e.g. 'Αδαδμαθης, 'Αδ(αδ)μαλαυς, in the onomastics of the city. This shows the prestige which he enjoyed there. Further, we know that the cult of this god in the valley of the Euphrates goes back to the origin of history. He was worshipped in the third century B.C. in Assur in Mesopotamia. He was considered in Syria as the consort of Atargatis,
and as such he had his seat beside her in the temple. It is possible that he formed a couple with Artemis-Nanaia at Doura and the inscription mentioned above would support this statement. Nabu, consort of the Babylonian Nana, and Bel also occur in theophore names of Doura. But we have no proofs to show that they were objects of the cult in Doura. The latter occupies probably the place of honour among the gods represented on the walls of the temple of the Palmyrene gods.

Many indigenous divinities could have thus received the homage of the inhabitants of Doura-Eropos simultaneously with Artemis-Nanaia, but it was she who always remained the queen of the sanctuary. It is to her that the dedications were consecrated, and numerous inscriptions, showing the places which the faithful ones had to occupy, show that women also were admitted to the liturgical acts, which were performed in the hall provided with raised seats à gradins. The majority of them were married, but girls were also admitted, who came there with their mothers and sisters. Still the clergy were always male, and even men were admitted to the temple and could deposit their offerings in the sanctuary. They were spectators of the festivals celebrated in the sacred odeon.

We have no proofs to show whether the cult of this goddess of fecundity preserved in Doura the impudic character, which it had in Babylon. On the contrary the undoubted presence of two halls provided with gradins for the faithful ones to sit on authorizes us to draw important conclusions. The rectangular one is similar to a construction in the temple of Si' (Seeia) to which an inscription gives the name of "theatre". The other semi-circular one reminds us by its disposition of the usual plan of a Greek odeon, because it was covered. Analogous edifices served in the celebration of certain festivals at Gerason and in the temple of the Syrian gods at Delos, about whose nature we are forced to form conjectures. Still it seems that we must not think of the actual performance of real liturgical dramas, reminding the legends of the mythology, but of the performance of dances and the recital of songs accompanied by instrumental music. We can imagine from what Oriental and classical writers say of such festivals among the Syrians, that rapid evolutions of a choir of women, holding crotals and tambourines, sacred songs with the accompaniment of the flute and the harp—these were the rejoicings in which the devotees of Artemis participated in the theatres of her sanctuary of Doura.

We know equally little about the administration of the temple
of Artemis. The analogy with what had happened elsewhere in the Orient would lead us to suppose that this administration was autonomous and independent of that of the city. It is probable that the gazophylax mentioned in the document No. 50 was not a municipal cashier, but the guardian of the sacred treasures.

Side by side with this cult of Artemis-Nanaia the cult of the Palmyrene gods flourished in Doura, as we can judge from the sanctuary dedicated to them by the Palmyrene archers probably from the very beginning of their stay in this desert-city, where their cult was practised till its complete abandon. Among the Palmyrene gods the three chief deities, Yahribol the god of the Sun, Aglibol the god of the Moon, and Bel Shamin or Bel identified with Zeus, who formed the Palmyrene triade, enjoyed a special veneration and cult in Doura. They are represented in military costume in the big fresco discovered in their sanctuary depicting the scene of the sacrifice offered by the Roman tribune, and thus they are considered as the war-gods of the detachment of the Palmyrene archers. Bel Shamin is called in the Latin inscription Cælus aeternus, which appellation corresponds to מארא אלים “lord of eternity” of the Palmyrenians. This Cælus is represented by an eagle, bird of the supreme god, sitting on a starry globe on a stela discovered in a mithraeum of Hedderheim in Germany. The Palmyrene goddess Atargatis also enjoyed a special cult in Doura, as is proved by her temple discovered this year near the temple of Artemis-Nanaia, a little to the left of the halls provided with gradins described above (see p. 143) (Cumont, Oral information).

**Magic**

The twenty-four letters of the Greek alphabet traced in black found on the walls of the sanctuary of the Palmyrene gods were probably intended to serve a magical purpose. The letters are considered to be the symbols of the elements of the world and of the stars of the heaven. They are designated by the name of στοιχεῖα and have a sacred character. They are found frequently employed in magic on phylacteries and in astrology as substitutes of the twelve signs of the zodiac. Similar alphabets were discovered in certain temples of Jupiter Dolichenus. Still it is difficult to determine the precise reason for tracing them on the sanctuary of Doura.

Similarly a sketch intended to avert the influence of the evil eye was also discovered near a painted mural sketch on the south wall of the sanctuary. It is the work certainly of a soldier of the cohors
Palmyrenorum. Below a thick eyebrow there is a big round eye, in whose pupil the points of a poignard and of a harpoon are thrust. The latter is attached to a string unrolling itself from a reel. A bird of prey flies above it on its left, while on each side a serpent is ready to sting it, and a third one whose head is surmounted with a crest hastens towards it. A similar but more complicated sketch was found in Palmyra in a big tomb decorated with paintings. The letters of the Greek alphabet and the sketch averting the nefarious influence of the evil eye prove that the inhabitants of Doura were given to superstitious and magic practices like many other peoples of antiquity.

**Art**

The excavations at Doura-Eropos have delivered a veritable treasure of art—sculptures in marble and plaster, exquisite clay-figurines, fragments of mosaic, and above all very valuable fresco-paintings, which were found nicely preserved, and which are the unique ones of their kind. Most of these works of art appertain to the Graeco-Parthian period, and show that composite character, in which the Oriental—Parthian—element is predominant. Still the statue of Aphrodite discovered in the temple of Artemis in Doura, which is generally known as the Aphrodite of Salihiyeh, is a modified copy of the work of Phidias, perhaps executed by a Greek artist.

Many fragments of sculptures in plaster were found in the temple of Artemis. They are similar to the sculptures appertaining to the same date and discovered in other Oriental towns. They were sometimes coloured like those of Ctesiphon. M. Dieulafoy had already found in a house of the Parthian period two fragments of painted statues and five fragments of a decorated band (Dieulafoy, *L'Art antique de la Perse*, tome v, pp. 31 seq., fig. 29). A small fragment of a sculpture in plaster, rather a portrait in relief representing a young woman with features of a pronounced Greek type, has been discovered by M. de Mecquenem at Susa, as well as numerous fragments of decorations in plaster, pertaining to the Parthian and Sassanian epochs. The recent German Archaeological Mission at Ctesiphon directed by Dr. Reuter found last year a number of decorations in plaster, some of them coloured, in the ruins of a church situated on the other side of the Tigris on the site of ancient Seleucia. This church was built in the third century of the Christian era, and appertained therefore to the Sassanian period. Still these finds are important, as they show
the use of plaster as a sculptural material, preferred to stone in less presumptuous buildings on account of its malleability and cheapness. Even to-day it has not ceased to be employed in royal buildings in Persia and in other Oriental countries.

The cornice of the temple of Artemis in moulded plaster is probably the work of a Persian artist, as we can judge from his name Ὄροβοβαξος Πόρος. It is divided in two registers; in the upper one we have two peacocks face to face surrounded by flowers, cymbals and vases; the latter ornaments are employed only in order to fill up the gap, as the art of this period has a horror of the empty space. As regards the motif of the peacocks drinking from the crater, which we find in the upper register, it has a religious signification in the figurative language of paganism. They were the sacred birds, kept in the temple of Syria, and they are found represented on the tombs of this country. They had perhaps the same signification as in the West, where they were consecrated to Juno and became for the empress the symbol of apotheosis, like the eagle for the emperor. They became the emblem of immortality on funeral monuments, as a few centuries later in Christianity. It seems that the motif of the peacocks face to face was introduced from Syria into Persia, if the contrary is not the case.¹

Besides these big pieces of sculptures in plaster, several idols of Nike moulded in plaster were found in the temple of Artemis. We have seen that this oriental goddess was identified with Nike. She wears the same peculiar headdress, which is attributed to the Oriental deity, on a patera of plumb. This vessel was found in the temple of the goddess with fragments of plaster, and was probably used in her cult.

These plasters stand probably in connection with the shop of a merchant of plaster-work, discovered by M. Ingholdt in 1924 in

¹ It seems rather certain that the peacock-motive is of Persian origin. A vase of Tepe Ali Abad near Tepe Moussain in Susiana of style No. 1 bis has apparently a decoration of two rows of peacock’s feathers (G. Contenau, Manuel, p. 332, fig. 242). This proves that the peacock was not unknown to the early Elamites. At any rate, we know that the peacock was introduced from India into the West in historic times. Before entering Syria, it must have had to pass through Persia, where especially in north-western Iran, in Media in particular, it must have been considered a very remarkable bird. Thus it is that we have a wide diffusion of the Sassanian and post-Sassanian peacock-motive. They are found from Vladicacas to Birka in Sweden. Further, it is called Mηθαυς (Sidus) “the Median bird”. Moreover, the peacock plays also an important part in the Zoravante theology of north-western Iran and subsequently of the whole of Central Asia. (Junker, Mitzelpers. fraenmure “Pfau”, Wörter und Sachen, Festband xii, Heft 1, Heidelberg, 1929, p. 135).
Palmyra. As we can judge from the name of the artist of the cornice and from the other signature on the stela of Homs Ἄμαισοῦσας ἐξαμάζου, which names seem to be Persian, there was probably a school of Persian sculptors at Palmyra, from whence artists were sent to Doura to work for its aristocracy.

The unique votive chariot of Doura is in terra cotta. It is probably of the Parthian epoch, and is connected with a very ancient tradition. Such chariots are found in excavations of ancient sites of Mesopotamia in layers pertaining to the earliest Sumerian period, about 3000 B.C. (G. Contenau, Manuel de l’Archéologie Orientale, tome i, Paris, 1926, p. 471, fig. 353). A similar votive chariot was also found at Maikop in the Kouban (cf. Rostovtzeff, L’âge du cuivre dans le Caucase Septentrional. Revue Archéologique, juillet-Décembre, 1920, p. 13). A little metal chariot of the temple of Haldi, the great national god of the land of the Urartus was found on the famous Tepah Toprak-Kaleh near Van in 1890. It is described by Rev. Father V. Scheil in Recueil de Travaux Relatifs à la Philologie et à l’Archéologie, tome xxxvi, 1914, p. 179–80.

Jewellery

The patera of plumb mentioned above imitates a precious work of Persian jewellery, whose influence was much spread in the art of the Middle Ages. The phial is embossed in designs showing the imitation of a plate of precious metal studded with gems of variegated colours. The bottom of the patera has a female bust richly decorated with gems, which reminds us of Lucianus, De dea Syria, where he describes the statue of Atargatis at Hieropolis. This statue, wholly sparkling with gems, had on its head a phosphorescent stone, which illuminated the temple during the night, but whose brilliance was diminished in the daylight. The laurel crown reminds us of the warlike character of Artemis-Nanaia. The coiffure is found on other productions of the Parthian period, notably on the coins of Osroes. A text says that a confederation of artisans worked in Palmyra in gold and silver. But the jewellery of the women of Doura was not necessarily made in Palmyra. It must have been fabricated equally sumptuously in Seleucia and other great cities of the Parthian empire. This art of setting jewels was created by those jewellers, who had created the art of fabricating precious vessels, which became the Græco-Parthian art adopted in the Orient. The discovery of the massive silver jewellery of the Parthian period—bracelets, earrings,
and a pendant inlaid with coloured stones in which cornaline predominated—mentioned above (p. 141) remains unique up to date.

**Painting**

As in the mosaic, in the paintings of Doura the influence of the school of Palmyra is easily noticeable. The date of the earliest paintings can be fixed at the second half of the first century A.D., about A.D. 75, i.e. in the time of the Severi. The architecture which frames in the most ancient frescoes different scenes has its inspiration in the decoration of those sarcophagi, representing the funeral heroon, in which sculptural standing figures take the place of columns. Such sarcophagi with columns are found in Greece as early as the sixth century B.C.; they were imported into Syria very early, as is proved by the famous sarcophagus of the weeping women found at Sidon, and the so-called sarcophagus of Sidamara.

The painting representing a sacrifice offered to the Palmyrene gods by the tribune of the Roman legion residing in Doura is dated A.D. 230. It is very interesting, as it illustrates the Roman ensign of the tribune. The subject representing this painting are progressively superposed in bands, and all objects are placed on the same plan. We find this principle of composition first applied to the Egyptian art. It is inherited later on by Assyria. Still in the Hellenic period it approaches the Iranian–Parthian art. The Græco-Syrian painting is connected on the one hand with the ancient Oriental art and on the other with the Byzantine art of the middle ages.

In the sanctuary of Artemis-Nanaia, dedicated to her as the Τύχη—Fortune of Doura “stood a little monument unique in its kind. It is one of the two wings of a door, which belonged to a little shrine, the precursor of medieval and renaissance shrines and triptyches of the same kind. In the shrine stood probably a statuette or picture of the great goddess of the sanctuary. The goddess of the shrine, when its door stood open, was crowned by Νικη—Victories, winged goddesses standing on globes and holding in their hands a crown and a palm-branch, each a sign of victory. The picture is a curious specimen of the Græco-Iranian art of the Parthians, with its slender and delicate figures with a profusion of crude and vulgar colours, with the typical frontality of the head. If Miss North is right in her bold reconstruction of the original colours of the picture, the Parthian painters were especially fond of Tyrian purple tints, of a lively green, and of a bright white.” (Rostovtzeff, Bulletin, pp. 82–3.)
Besides the sketch intended to avert the influence of the evil eye—mentioned above (pp. 144–5), the excavations of 1929 have brought to light three graffito sketches made by a sharp instrument on the plaster of the walls of Parthian houses. They represent a Parthian officer in his embroidered dress on horseback, a Parthian horseman shooting an arrow, and a Parthian foot-soldier with his heavy spear and long sword, typical helmet and leathern armour, standing on the cut-off head of a slain enemy. All these sketches are remarkable for the frontality of the personages (Rostovtzeff, Bulletin, pp. 80–1, figs. 5, 6, 7). The coiffure of the cavalry officer and the horseman is typical of the late Parthian period. It is documented on one of a series of bas-reliefs on an isolated rock near Tengh-i-Saoulek in the Bakhtiari mountains (Rawlinson, The Sixth Oriental Monarchy, London, 1873, p. 393) and on the coins of Chosroës (A.D. 106–29) and Vologeses V (A.D. 209–about 222), whereas it is well known on Sassanian coins (Gardner, The Parthian Coinage, London, 1877, p. 19). The interesting sketch discovered by M. de Mecquenem on one of the window-seals of the palace of Artaxerxes I at Persepolis which pertains to the early Sassanian period—about the first half of the third century A.D. (Allotte de la Fuÿe, Graffitiis relevés en 1928 dans les ruines de Persépolis, Revue d'Assyriologie, vol. xxv, 1929, p. 168) shows the predilection of the Iranian artists for indicating in sharp incised outlines a portrait and not seldom a complicated subject. It is probable that the effect of the sketch of Doura was enhanced by colours.
THE IDEA OF MAN AND KNOWLEDGE IN THE CONCEPTION OF PERSIAN MYSTICS

Translated from the Russian of V. Zhukovski

By L. Bogdanov

THE perplexing enigma of the cosmos and the creation has been from time immemorial a source of fascination for the human mind, and all the peoples of the globe, both those who have passed away and those still in existence, have striven to solve this riddle, either forming themselves into special groups for this purpose, or by mere individual effort. Of these solutions some were distinguished by a greater viability, a greater strength, and a greater ascendency, and are still exercising their sway; whilst others were short-lived and transient, were accepted by few people and, having soon disappeared, constitute now merely dead and cold fragments of human thought. Some of these solutions appealed more to the intellect, others were more felt by the heart.

To the number of such numerous attempts and endeavours to unravel this thrilling mystery belongs Sufism, the teaching of Eastern Muslim "sages", if we take the name ṣūfī to be the Greek ἀορφός, or "Those who wear woollen garments" if we derive this word from the Arabic ʂauf "wool"—a teaching as old as the Islamic religion itself. These sages, who in their lofty and poetical conception of the world, which aims at discovering the mystery of nature, have blended together philosophy and revelation, have built up the doctrine of unity in plurality and plurality in unity—vaḥdat dar kaşrat va kaşrat dar vaḥdat. They tell us that, before the beginning of time, there existed the Absolute Essence—ژāt-i mušlaq—the One Eternal All-perfect Truth (God, the Creator). This further, for Its own purposes, individualized Itself into the Supreme Spirit—rūḥ-i ā'żam or Universal Intellect—'aql-i kull—which limited Itself into the Universal Soul—nafs-i kull. Finally, like a sea dividing itself into drops, It manifested Itsself by all Its names, qualities, and activities in all the visible and imaginable forms and ideas (species) thus producing the manifest

1 The author's sources in the compilation of the present sketch were primarily: Anṣārī's pseudo-Manāzīšu-s-sā'īrin and Abū Bakr Rāzī's Mīrghādu-l-ibād mina-l-mabdā ilā-l-maʿād; to a lesser extent, Jullābī's Karb-fu-l-maḥjūb; Ghazālī's Kimīyā-i Soʿādat; Qushayrī's Risālat, and Muḥammad Lāḥiji’s commentary on Shabistāri’s Gulsan-i rūz.
material world—'ālam-i shahādat—and the hidden spiritual world—'ālam-i ghayb.

Man represents the last drop of this self-manifesting sea, the last particle of this unity resolved into plurality, of the absolute transmuted into ideas. He is the dividing point between the light of manifestation and the darkness of non-existence, the boundary line of existence between the unavoidably-necessary and the merely-possible. Man, as the most perfect manifestation of the Supreme Spirit, in which are united all Its names and qualities, aspires by his very nature, even during his earthly life, towards the Absolute. Having once established himself on the path of meditation, i.e. of mental progress, he is able to transcend form and pass over to the sense concealed therein, and thus to remove plurality and to reach Unity. Unity, however, is the starting point from where began the individualization of the Absolute, and man can emerge into this Unity and disappear in it. In other words, the Truth by manifesting Itself descended into man—this is the descent of the Absolute into the idea, of the Unity into plurality, of the Whole into the part, of the Sea into the drop. And man, by self-annihilation, ascends towards the Truth—this is the ascent of the idea towards the Absolute, of the plurality towards Unity, of the part into the Whole, of the drop into the Sea.

Such, practically, is the philosophical aspect of the doctrine of the Sufis stripped from the teguments of positive religion. A greater or lesser admixture of the latter makes this doctrine a mysticism more orthodox as far as the religion of Muḥammad is concerned and more heretical with regard to its essence, to its original source. Of all the countries of the East which have accepted the Qur'ān the most susceptible to this doctrine proved to be and remains up to our days Persia, as is clearly proved by her literature. Whole galaxies of writers, chiefly poets, in their highly artistic productions not only developed to perfection and inculcated this doctrine in their own country, but have spread it far beyond the frontiers—to the East across the Oxus into Bukhara and Samarcand, to the West across the Tigris and the Euphrates into Asia Minor, and farther beyond the Bosphorus into Europe, that is to say Turkey. A certain, though not so obvious and direct, influence was exercised in this also by certain other countries adjacent to Persia.

Europe has long been acquainted with specimens of such allegorical mystic songs; the mystic man being represented as an atom
temporarily torn off from divinity, from the creative principle, grieving and sorrowing in separation, represented as a lover yearning for his beloved, and seeking to be reunited with her—all this is current and well-known imagery. One cannot but regret that up to quite recent times the specimens of that literature, which became known in Europe, belonged to a comparatively late period (XIII c.) and that whatever few attempts at general or particular studies of Persian Sufiism, tracing its connections with the philosophical views and the theosopies of other peoples were made, they were all based on such late specimens. It would seem to have been more expedient, even for the above-mentioned attempts, to have put in the foreground rather the oldest literary monuments which go as far back as the eleventh, nay even the tenth century of our era.

I shall not speak here of the component factors and of the ways in which Sufiism originated in Persia, in how far, owing to the geographical situation of that country, it became the meeting ground of ideas Western and Eastern, i.e. of the doctrines of the sages of the neoplatonic school of Alexandria and of Indian pantheism. I shall not speak of the reasons, why Sufiism found followers and developed more especially in Persia, in how far that development was furthered either by the koranic teaching imposed on Persia by force, and foreign to the free Aryan spirit of its population, or by the absence of a wider social life stifled by that teaching. I shall not speak either of the practical meaning of Sufiism, or of its influence on man, on the life of the community, on the formation of numerous sects. All these obtrusive and complicated questions have perforce to be left unanswered until the time when the study of Sufiism has been placed on a strictly scientific historical basis. A correct appreciation and comprehension of Sufiism must be based not on mere poetical allegories and isolated verses culled, often without any serious discrimination, from authors of different epochs, but on works expounding in a certain system the views of the Sufis stripped of symbols and allegories, their manner of thinking, and their own argumentation. Such works exist in Arabic and in Persian and are still waiting to be appreciated, published, and studied.

Finally, I shall not speak of the importance and interest attached to the study of Sufiism. This doctrine is important already on account of its having survived amongst a nation for a millennium, preserving the whole time almost the same degree of intensity and brilliancy of colour. And the interest called forth by Sufiism is best
shown, in my opinion, by the enthusiasm and passion with which in our days scholars, poets, and even artists of Europe, including Russia, and America, devote themselves to the work of studying, translating, and illustrating the writings of that most wonderful son of Persia, 'Umar Khayyām. I am fully satisfied with this single example, because, in my firm opinion, 'Umar Khayyām in the shape in which he is accessible to the wider circles of readers is not a single person, but several persons, who, for various reasons easily intelligible on deeper investigation, have flowed together under his name. In fact, a whole series of brilliant and original thoughts attributed to Khayyām are well, and with a great degree of probability, attributable to certain of his predecessors and successors.

Leaving aside the above-mentioned complicated and confused questions, which, in the present state of our information, cannot be duly solved and explained, I have decided to discuss in the present sketch the development of one isolated idea which has been and still is prevalent amongst the orthodox Persian Sufis, namely, the idea of man and his destination. For this purpose I have thought it most convenient to review the history of the creation of man, which our sages, remaining in the limits of the Islamic tradition, were bound to recast in a special mould reflecting the most essential features of their doctrine.

Such a vivid and highly poetical mystic history of man on an Islamic background, which has been preserved in the annals of Ṭabarī, was, it seems, originally composed by 'Abdullāh Ansārī (XI c.), a native of Herat. One century and a half later it was repeated in its entirety without any alterations by Abū-Bakr Rāzī in his work entitled "The Path of mankind from the point of departure to the point of return" (Mīrṣādu-l 'ibād mina-l-mabdā' ḫāl-l ma'ād), and is also encountered in part in the Maṣnawī of the famous Jalālū-d-Dīn Rūmī.

In presenting here that story, I shall follow the ways and means of its author, that is to say, I shall, when expounding mystic thoughts, have sometimes recourse to the poetical imagery of the mystic language.

When, after the six days and nights of creation, the time came for the creation of man, the Creator said: "The body of man from moisture and earth I shall prepare Myself." "Hast Thou not created heaven and earth?" exclaimed the angels in astonishment. "This," replied the Creator, "is an exceptional business: I created all by the simple direction 'be', and it was, but this one I am going to
create directly by My own 'selfness', by My Ego, because I shall deposit in him the treasure of divine knowledge." The angel Gabriel, in conformity with orders received, went to take a handful of earth. The earth said: "What art thou doing, Gabriel?"—"I am taking thee," said Gabriel, "into the presence of the Creator so that He may make out of thee a vicerregent for Himself."

"I adjure thee," said the earth, "by the majesty of the Truth not to take me into the presence of the Creator, because I am unable to bear being near to Him." On hearing such an adjuration, Gabriel returned into the presence of the Creator and reported to Him the unwillingness of the earth. The angels Michael and Israefel were after this sent on the same errand, but the earth addressed to them the same adjurations. Then the Creator had recourse to the angel Azrael and said to him: "Go thou, and if the earth does not come voluntarily, bring it by force." Azrael went and brought by force a handful of dust collected from the surface of the earth—and, lo! Love was already hurrying to meet it halfway and permeated it.

Anṣārī says:—

"The dust of Adam was not yet sifted,
When Love came and permeated it:
Of that Wine (Love) I had tasted, when I was still
feeding on milk . . .
No, no: Wine and milk were mixed together."

khāk-i Ādam hanūz nā-bikhta būd
'ishq ānada būd dar qil ārīkhta būd
īn bāda chu shīr-khāra būdam khurdam
nay, nay, may-u shīr bā-ham āmīkhta būd.

Herein was shown the first distinction of man; his dust was summoned into the presence of the Creator by several messengers. All the angels were filled with astonishment and perplexity. What was this mystery that the contemptible and valueless earth-dust should assume such haughtiness with regard to the call of the Creator, and that the Creator should abide by it with such perseverance and ardour, instead of substituting for it something else? The Creator told them: "Truly I know what you do not know (Qur'ān, II, 28). How could you know what business I have with this handful of dust through eternity? You can well be pardoned; you have not had anything to do with Love; you are dry ascetic hermits and you cannot have any cognizance of Love. Wait a few days; I shall display in
this handful of dust My Almightyness; I shall efface from the mirror of its nature the rust of the darkness of creation, and you shall see in that mirror various forms, and the first form will be such that you all shall bow your heads to the earth before it.”

Then the Creator poured out from the cloud of His grace the rain of Love on the dust of Adam, kneaded it with the hand of His Almightyness, and made from dust in the dust the heart. The cherubs and seraphs looked on in amazement, seeing the Creator working during forty days and nights like a potter on the clay of Adam, putting a heart in its every particle and caressing it with the glance of His mercy. But the Creator said to them: “Do not look at the clay, look at the heart!” According to other traditions, the Creator worked 40,000 years on the dust of Adam and placed outside and inside it signs which were meant to reflect, like a mirror, the thousand and one attributes of the Creator. When there came the turn of the heart, He took from Paradise the dust which was to be used for its making, kneaded it with the water of Eternal Life, and dried it in the sunshine of His glance.

When the heart was brought to perfection, it proved to be a pearl in the treasury of mysteries, which the Creator concealed from all looks and guarded by His majesty, saying: “For such a perfect pearl there is no other treasury but Myself and the body of Adam, because it is the pearl of Love in the shell of knowledge, the heart fondled by the sun of the glance of the Creator, in the body, which during so many thousand years had been warmed by the rays of the light of the attributes of the Creator.”

During the mysterious manifestation of all such tender displays of His attributes on the body and the heart of Adam, the Creator did not enlighten or initiate into the mystery any one of the nearest angels. They did not know Adam, and every and each of them, when passing by, would say: “What wonderful form is it, which is being modelled?” Adam, however, was saying under his breath: “If you do not know me, I know you. Let me only awake from this sweet sleep, and I shall call you by your names; one of the riches concealed in my nature is the knowledge of all names.” As much as the angels examined Adam, they did not understand his nature. Finally the scheming Iblis moved around Adam, noticed that Adam’s mouth was open, and said: “Wait, I have found here the solution of the riddle! I shall enter this aperture and shall see what the place is like.” On having entered and inspected the nature of Adam,
he found it to be a microcosm and detected in him a manifestation of all that he had noticed in the macrocosm. The head was like the heaven with its seven spheres. As there were seven planets in the seven heavens, so also in the seven spheres of the head he noticed the seven faculties inherent in man, viz. reflection, imagination, memory, doubt, etc. As in the heaven there were angels, so also in the head there were the mental senses of sight, of hearing, of smelling, of taste, and of touch. The body was like unto the earth. Just as on the earth there were trees, herbs, rivers, and mountains, so also on and in the body there were hairs, veins, arteries, and bones. As there were four seasons in the macrocosm, so also in Adam there were four humours, viz. heat, cold, moisture, and dryness, inherent respectively in the black and yellow bile, in the phlegm and in the blood. In the macrocosm there were four winds: the vernal, the estival, the autumnal, and the hibernal, of which the vernal fructifies the trees, brings forth leaves and grasses, the estival produces fruits, the autumnal ripens them, and the hibernal scatters them; so also in Adam, the microcosm, there were four winds: attraction, splitting, retention, and expelling. The first one places the food into the mouth and transmits it to the second one to be digested, makes it reach the third one, which extracts from it whatever is useful, and gives it over to the fourth one to be expelled ... And many other similarities did Iblis discover in the nature of Adam, and all that he saw he understood. But he was unable to find any way to the inside of the heart, which appeared to him as a splendid palace. "All that I saw," he said, "was insignificant. The difficult thing is here. If any misfortune ever happens to me from man, it can only arise from this place. And if the Creator has some special purpose with this form and means to place something in it, it will be into this place."

In despair, Iblis retreated from the heart, and coming out, said to the angels: "The form examined by me is hollow. It will be possessed of passions like the animals, and it will be easy to capture it. But I found in it a palace without gates, to which there is no entrance, and I do not know what it is." Being not satisfied with these explanations given by Iblis, the angels went to find the Creator and said: "O Lord! Thou solvest difficulties and Thou givest knowledge. It is a long time that Thou hast been working on that handful of dust. Thou hast created in it a whole second world and hast hidden in it many treasures. But Thou hast not told us anything and hast not initiated into that mystery anyone of us. Do tell us, what is to come
out of that handful of dust?" The answer was: "I am creating a substitute for Myself on earth, but I have not completed him yet. Whatever you see now is merely a place for him, a palace and a throne. When I have completed him, I shall elevate him to the throne, and you all shall bow to him to the earth!" The angels said: "The riddle that was puzzling us has not been solved. The Creator orders us to bow before His creature and calls it His substitute. We never knew that there was anybody besides Him worthy of worship; we considered Him to be the One, who has none equal or similar to Him, and we did not think that there could be anybody worthy of taking His place. Let us go and inspect once more that mysterious temple!" Having inspected it, they said: "Still we do not find here anything beyond water and dust. No beauty of vicegerency can be seen in it nor is there anything to justify our worshipping him on our knees." Then a voice reached them which said: —

"The Beloved cannot be seen by another's eyes: My Darling must be seen through my eyes."

ma'šūqa ba-chasm-i dīгарān natvān did
jānān-i mārā ba-chashm-i man bāyad did.

The angels continued: "Outwardly one does not find anything particular in this creature. Maybe, its rights are founded on its qualities—let us investigate them."

The angels found Adam to be constituted of the four elements, viz. earth, wind, water, and fire. Investigating their qualities, they found that earth is quiescence, wind is movement, and that the former is the opposite of the latter; water and fire were also found to be opposites; the former has a downward, the latter an upward tendency. Further investigation showed that the nature of earth is dry (hard), of wind soft, of water cold, and of fire hot, and that, the natures of these component parts being opposed to each other, nothing except corruption could result therefrom. Returning into the presence of the Creator, the angels said: "Thou art entrusting with the representation of Thyself one from whom there will arise corruption and bloodshed." Thus, the angels inflicted reproach on what was in the thought of the Creator the vessel of Love, and this was the first reproach which arose in the world.

The special distinctions of man at the creation of his outward sheath were as follows: the creation of him alone was distributed over forty days and nights, whereas the creation of all the worlds took only six days and nights. The directness of his creation and
the placing in him of a mystery unsolved by the angels—all this was pointing to the exclusiveness of man's destinies. But matter, as represented by the body of man, was nothing as compared with the boundlessness of the Spirit which it was still lacking. And now the Creator, again by direct action, proceeded to the fusion of body and spirit. He breathed into the matter the spirit by His own breath, and that insufflation (nafkhah) has a deep meaning and is of great importance. The Spirit from the highest celestial spheres was being sent down to the lowest degrees of the material world. On that boundless expanse it was capable of falling in with and making friends with some outside beings, to forget thus the Creator and to lose that affection which was granted to It. Now, that insufflation by the Creator of His own breath was meant to prevent its attaching itself to anybody or anything and to preserve in It the sweetness of the communion with the Creator. Furthermore, as has been said, the Spirit had to descend through an innumerable multitude of spiritual and corporeal worlds, in each of which there were concealed treasures unknown to anybody. The breath of the Creator was to serve here as a guide and interpreter of the meanings of all the treasures, all the blessings, and all the evils of that path in order to facilitate for the Spirit the upward journey back to the Creator. Finally, that breath accompanied the spirit of man in order that he, who was sent down for authority and domination in the world, should appear in that world endowed with marks of a special distinction and honour on the part of the Creator, the more so as it had already been announced to the angels that they would have to worship him on their knees. And in fact, when the Spirit, which had been for so many thousand years fondled in the most precious recesses of divinity and watched over in the world of immediate presence by the eye of the Creator, reached, together with the Creator's own breath, through myriads of worlds with their treasures, the realm of man and blended itself with his form—all the worlds adored him on their knees, except Iblīs. For his pride and arrogance with regard to the greatest of creatures and for his wilful penetration into this temple of Love, he was overtaken by the wrath of the Creator and was unable to make his obeisance to Adam.

The Spirit on entering the body found it to be a dark and narrow prison erected on four mutually opposite pillars, for which no prolonged existence could be expected. It was surrounded by crowds and multitudes of vermin, beasts, and wild animals. The blows and bites
they were inflicting on the body produced painful feelings in the Spirit. Inside of the prison passions became active, and lo! the pure Spirit, which was during so many thousand years brought up in proximity to the Creator in unlimited kindness and tenderness, experienced, in the face of such strange and savage displays, a feeling of loneliness. He became aware of the value of his former intimate association with the Creator, of which he had been unaware until that moment. He recognized the bliss of the union, in which he had been immersed without knowing its delights and without recognizing its essence. The fire of separation broke out in him and the pain of isolation entered his head. He tried to return, but the breath which had brought him down, was no more there. He felt broken-hearted, and then he heard a voice saying: "We are looking for such a state from thee!" Adam emitted a deep sigh, and the voice said: "It was for such sighs that We sent thee down!" Adam gave a start, movement appeared in his limbs, he opened his eyes and perceived the wide world, saw the dazzling sun, and exclaimed: "Praise be to God!" and heard the answer: "May thy Lord have compassion upon thee." These words reminded him of the world of the Spirit and its delights, and he sought vainly to break the corporeal fetters. Nothing in the world had any interest for Adam, the fire of his passion for the Creator did not abate, the unwontedness of his state did not diminish, and he did not make friends with anything. And he heard the voice of the Creator, saying: "O Adam! enter Paradise, eat, sleep, and make friends with whomsoever thou desirest." But Paradise did not soothe the feelings of Adam. Then the Creator produced Eve from the very soul of Adam, so that he should be able to associate with one like himself. Looking at the beauty of Eve, he saw in it a ray of the beauty of the Creator, and he tasted of that human beauty, and became possessed by lust, that lowest animal quality, which constitutes the greatest obstacle between man and the Creator. Other animal passions added themselves to it, such as excessive eating and excessive sleep, and even as Adam's passions increased, his communion with the Creator decreased. He finally gave himself up to his passions to such an extent as to allow Iblis to seduce him. The Creator became disgusted and said: "O Adam! We have not created thee for indulging in passions and animal enjoyments. We left thee for half a day in Paradise, and thou hast forgotten Us to the extent of giving thyself up to another! If We leave thee for a whole day, thou wilt forget Us altogether and wilt
substitute total estrangement for the former close communion with Us! Leave Paradise, and thou Eve, separate thyself from him! Thou, crown of distinction, quit thou his head! Thou, vestment of honour, fall away from his body!"

Having passed several days in a state of depression, Adam returned to his former suffering and was filled with love for the Creator, having been taught that love in pre-eternity. "O Lord!" he said, "I needed that depression in order to know the value of Thy mercy and the meaning of Thy sovereignty, and I recognize that all is perishable, Thou art eternal; all are infirm, Thou art almighty; all are woebegone, Thou art the Comforter!" A voice was heard, saying:—

"Return and be more than thou wert,
And if thou wert not until now, be it now.

bāz āy ki zānchī būdī afzūn bāshī
var to ba-kunūn na-būdī aknūn bāshī.

What do these various actions mean? We brought Adam up for representing Ourselves and, by trials, We brought his love to perfection!" ¹

In the very first words of this story it is quite clearly established that the purpose of the creation of man, of the fusion of the Spirit with the body, is knowledge. The whole mystery of the creation in general lies in knowledge. According to tradition, the prophet David asked the Creator: "Why didst Thou create the creatures?" And the Truth suggested to him: "I was a hidden treasure and I chose to be known, and I created the creatures in order to be known" (kuntu kanzūn makhsūyyan fa-ahbabtu 'an u'rāfa fa khalaqtu-l-khalqa likay u'rāfa).

What is then this knowledge (ma'rifat)? There is intellectual or argumentative knowledge (ma'rifat-i 'aqū or ma'rifat-i istidlālī), which is common to all men of a certain standard of intellect; there is a common agreement of opinion with regard to the existence of the Creative Principle, and the existing disagreement concerns Its attributes, but not Its essence. In knowing by the intellect, perception by the outward senses and the inward powers is necessary. Through the perception of the material world by means of the former and through exercising the intellect with the help of the latter, the intellect comes to the conclusion that what has been created is due to a Creator. Contemplating gradually the different categories of creation, the
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intellect distinguishes the uniqueness, the almightiness, and the beauty of the creation, and draws the conclusion that such a miraculous display must be due to an Almighty, All-knowing, All-seeing Eternal Founder. The clearer the intellect, the more correct is the view, the more reflection is applied, the more numerous become the inferences from the diversity of the creation as to the existence of a Creator, the more clear become also the proofs of His Unity.

But the Spirit has been sent into the body not for this kind of knowledge. This kind of knowledge requires proofs and arguments, of which there exist a great diversity; even the heathen defend their beliefs by arguments. The acceptance of one argument instead of another is based on preference, and were even all these arguments true, they would only result in the inference of the existence of the Creator by means of argumentation. Yet, the position of the Spirit with regard to the knowledge of the Truth before its fusion with the body was entirely different; the Spirit was in immediate contact with the Truth and knew the Truth by direct perception, without any argumentation. After its fusion with the body this direct contact had, so to say, disappeared.

When the Spirit was being sent from the world of mystery and proximity to the Truth to be attached to the world of forms, it was allowed to pass through all the spiritual and material worlds. From each world whatever constituted the best part of that world was added unto the Spirit. At the same time the eyes of the Spirit were directed to witness the good and the evil of each world, because it was being sent into life in order to attract all that is useful and to repel all that is noxious. Thus, when the Spirit entered the body after his journey through all the multiform worlds, he was, so to say, wrapped in thousands of bright and dark spiritual sheets. His every glance on every object in every world, although meant to become a factor in his perfection, constituted, at that given moment, a veil. The sum total of such veils deprived him of the capacity of contemplating the beauty of the Creator, which is Unity, and of feeling the bliss of immediate proximity to Him. On his descent into the nethermost planes of matter, when the Spirit began putting to use the tools and instruments of his corporeal form, every moment of time separated him more and more from the world of mystery and wrapped him up in a new veil, so that the Spirit might well have lost eventually all consciousness of that world of mystery. Thus, one person does not believe at all that at one time he was living
in another world, in another person there remains some trace of the former communion with the Creator; another again remembers all the stages of his passage through the spiritual and material worlds.

Despite the fact that the fusion of the Spirit with the body erected, so to say, a kind of barrier between him and the Truth, that fusion was necessary. When living in the spiritual world and enjoying the proximity of the Truth, the Spirit possessed only such knowledge as was in conformity with the nature of that world. Of a similar kind were also his revelations and contemplations. The perfection of these states and the fulness of bliss had to be reached by the Spirit through his fusion with the body, because it was that fusion that gave him a heart, a soul, and those powers and feelings which he needed in order to attain knowledge. During his stay in the world of mystery he possessed but that spiritual light, through which he perceived the entirety of that world only, but he was devoid of the power to comprehend the entirety and the particularities of the two worlds. Development and perfection were attained by the Spirit only in this world, where everything was meant for his education. Thus the Spirit reached true knowledge, i.e. the knowledge of the essence and of all the attributes of the Creator. “O man! I created everything for thee, and I created thee for me” (yā-bnu Ādama khalaqtu-l-ashyā’a kullahā li-ajlika wa khalaqtuka li-ajlū).

Argumentative knowledge cannot constitute the true destination of man, because it is not the Light Itself, but Its reflection. In explaining this point the ṣūfī mystics take their stand on v. 35 of the XXIV chapter of the Qur’ān, which runs: “God (the Truth) is the light of heaven and earth. The similitude of his light is as a niche in a wall, wherein a lamp is placed, and the lamp enclosed in a case of glass; the glass appears as if it were a shining star. It is lighted with the oil of a blessed tree, an olive neither of the east nor of the west; it wanteth little but that the oil thereof would give light, although no fire touched it. This is light added unto light...” The Spirit, owing to its natural subtlety, is incapable of perceiving the full manifestation of divine attributes. And the extraordinary wisdom displayed in the creation of Adam is manifested in this, that the heart which was created for him was made stout, but transparent like a crystal of unusual purity. The heart was placed in a niche, that is in the compact body, and in that crystal the lamp of mystery was set up, in which there was put the wick of manifestation (of that mystery). The lamp was filled with the oil of the blessed olive-tree
of the Spirit (with the divine breath), which cannot be found either in the East, that is in the spiritual world, nor in the West, that is in the material world. That oil was extremely transparent and luminous, although no fire had touched it. From that oil the whole of the crystal of the heart became illumined, as if it were a shining star. A reflection of the light of the crystal spread over the atmosphere within, symbolized by the niche, and filled it with light. The brilliancy of the crystal is the intellect; the atmosphere, which is the recipient of its reflection, represents the hidden powers and the innate qualities of man, and the rays breaking through the niche of the material body are the five senses. For a perfect manifestation of the divine light which was “a hidden treasure” precisely that kind of lamp was needed. Such a lamp is given to everybody, but it is not in everybody that it shines with divine light. Those who rely for the knowledge of the Truth on their intellect, think that their lamp is illumined by the true light, without suspecting that the light which they find in themselves is a mere reflection of the light of the spiritual oil, and that the fire of the divine light is absent in their lamp, which is not lighted.

In terms of the above exposition, to attain knowledge one needs the Light Itself, the Truth Itself. What then are the paths by which It is reached? How to remove the barrier which has arisen between It and the Spirit in man? How to remove the veils in which the Spirit is wrapped?

Māhmūd Shābistārī (fourteenth century), the author of the “Rose-garden of mysteries” compares the Truth with the almond-nut, which being covered by a thin skin, is, in addition, surrounded by a shell:—

sharī'at pūst maghīz āmad haqīqat
miyān-i ḵn u ḵn bāshad ūqīqat.

Just as an almond, to attain full ripeness, requires both the thin skin and the shell, so for the manifestation of the Truth there are needed the sharī'at and the tariqat, the “law” and the “path”, which are the rules set up for the guidance of all the corporeal and spiritual manifestations in man in accordance with the duality of his nature. The “law” educates the body and the soul, the “path” purifies the heart and enlightens the spirit. As in order to get the pure almond-kernel, one has first to break the shell and then take off the skin, so also in order to attain the Truth, one has first to submit to the “law” and only then to follow the “path”.

The “law” which comprises prayer, fasting, etc., is meant to act
primarily on the five senses, because, when man obeys exclusively the five senses, he descends to the level of the animal, which is attached only to this world. He becomes even worse than these, because the animal, endowed only with the five senses, is not expected to know the other world, and it, therefore, cannot feel any longing for it. To man, however, who has been endowed with spiritual powers as well, such a consciousness has been given and is apt to provoke in him suffering. But a total suppression of all animal needs and inclinations, based on the senses, would naturally cause complete cessation of life and of the development of his organism, which latter is both necessary and useful for him. The "law" is given to man in order that he should not, in his enjoyments and inclinations, surrender himself unconditionally to his animal nature. Every and each of the rules of that "law" speaks to man reminding him, in one way or another, of his original place of abode, of his having come here from another world, and directs him to that other world; thus, prayer diverts him from sensual inclinations, from conversations with men, and directs him towards the bliss of conversing with the Creator; fasting reminds him of his former angelic state, when he did not need any food, and so forth.

Together with the body, the soul (nafs) also has to be educated in the "law". The soul, otherwise called the animal spirit (rūh-i-hayvānī) is the source of negative qualities and lower feelings, and owes its origin to the fusion of the Spirit with the body. It fills all the atoms and parts of the body as oil interpenetrates a nut, but is concentrated in the heart, as has been said: "The most hostile of thy enemies is thy soul, which lies between thy two sides" (ādā 'aduwvika nafsuka-llatī bayna janbayka). At the same time, it is also in the heart that the Spirit resides with its highest spiritual qualities. The above-mentioned animal spirit of man differs from its counterpart in animals only by being eternal and remaining indestructible after its separation from the corporeal sheath, whereas that of the animals, as being constituted of the four elements, is subject to decay, and disappears entirely after death. In that animal spirit two essential qualities are inherent, from which arise all the lower feelings, viz. desire (havā) and wrath (ghazab). These two qualities are necessary for the soul in order that it should be able to attract by means of the former all that is useful and to repel by means of the latter all that is noxious, and thus to maintain itself and subsist in this world.
The education of the soul, given a certain direction, consists in keeping these two qualities in a certain equipoise and proportion, so that the one should not overcome the other, because, if the equilibrium is disturbed by desire, then greed, lust, avidity, hope, dastardliness, etc., are bred. And if the equilibrium is disturbed by wrath, then unrestraint, hostility, arrogance, imperiousness, etc., break out. When both of these qualities lose their balance simultaneously and take possession of the soul, then the latter tends towards corruption and becomes the source of every kind of evil. On the other hand, an excessive weakening of these essential qualities produces derangement and breeds other negative qualities, like weakness, pusillanimity, lack of zeal, etc. The above-mentioned qualities of the soul and their continual equilibrium and proportion must be entirely subjected to the demands of the “law” and of fear, and be in their hands like humble tools; then only will the soul yield positive qualities, like the sense of modesty, humility, generosity, submissiveness, patience, gratitude, etc. Then only does the soul rid itself of the evil of dominativeness, humbles itself in submission to the pure Spirit, and helps the latter to ascend through the “stations” of the lower world into the highest realms of the spiritual spheres, as says Ḍuṣārī:

“When the animal qualities leave thy soul,
The bird of thy spirit will return to (its) nest,
The vulture of thy soul will rush into the heights,
Will perch on the hand of the Sovereign and become a falcon.”

\[khůy-i sabū'ī zi nafsāt ar bāz shavād\]
\[murgh-i rūḥat ba-ashyān bāz shavād\]
\[pas kargas-i nafs rū sūy-i-'ulū nīhad\]
\[bar dast-i malik nishīnād u bāz shavād.\]

The tendency towards the higher and super-animal world turns then into pure love, and passion and wrath become zeal and higher aspirations. Then the soul lovingly rushes towards the Creator: “Were it not for desire, nobody would tread the path (of aspiration) towards God (law la-l-hawā mā salaka ahadun tārīqan ilā-illāhi), and in its zeal does not pay any attention to anything but Him. These two qualities, happily directed and developed, become thus for the Spirit a powerful instrument for reunion with the Creator: such an instrument was unavailable for the Spirit during its sojourn in the realm of the spirits—like the angels, undisturbed by desire and wrath,
it was satisfied with its state and was dispassionately and impassibly contemplating the light of the lamp of the Truth.

Such is the nature of the soul and such is its destination, and it becomes clear, why the Sufis say in this instance: "Whosoever knoweth his own soul, knoweth his Lord" (man 'arafa nafsahu faqad 'arafa rabbahu).

When the man who aspires towards the Truth, or, as the Sufis would put it, "the traveller" (sālik) has humbled under the "law" his body and curbed his soul, then he enters the "path" of the purification of the heart.

The heart in the body of man, in the "microcosm", is the same as the empyrean in the "macrocosp", namely the dividing line between the sensible and the super-sensible. In it is concentrated the quality of spirituality, and it is the recipient and the distributor of the outpourings of the Spirit. With all the members of the body it is connected by delicate veins through which the outpouring of the Spirit reaches all the members of the body. When that outpouring into the heart ceases, the vitality of the whole organism also departs. And the heart is aware of its receiving such an outpouring, because the Spirit flows into the heart with its own peculiar power that gives to the heart life, intellect, and knowledge.

The heart possesses capacity and readiness for accepting purification and submitting to education, owing to which it reaches a certain degree of perfection, and, after first being merely a depository of the quality of spirituality, it may become a place of the manifestation of all the qualities and of the very substance of the Truth, of the Deity.

Purity of heart consists in the integrity and precision of its five abstract senses, through the medium of which it takes cognizance of the world of mystery (the intellect acting as mental sense of touch, by which it derives profit from all that can be known by the intellect). A further condition of the purity of heart is that all the various states, which the heart, as the centre-point of all the higher feelings, may experience, should strictly and exactly correspond to their innate meaning. The heart is the source of deep faith, of the enlightenment of the intellect, of contemplation, of love for the Creator, which excludes all earthly love, of wisdom, etc. The education of the heart consists in directing it by certain means towards the Divine Truth. This implies that man should renounce the world, withdraw from men and whatever is created, abandon his natural inborn habits and
terrestrial joys, and, having reached the "outward separation" (țajrīd), turn with all his being to the Creator, without demanding from the Truth anything except the Truth, in order to attain to the degree of "inner separation" (țafrīd) from all love and desire, except for the Truth Itself. In such a state the outward senses cease their activity; the darkness and the veils, in which the heart was wrapped under their influence, disappear; a heart liberated from all things terrestrial, aware only of the Truth and yearning for It in passionate, lofty love, is the heart, which has reached perfection and complete purity; the barrier has disappeared, and the Spirit flows together with the Truth, which now finds Its full manifestation in man. Says Anšārī:

"If thou givest away all that thou hast,
If thou dissolvest participation in thy own being,
Thou mayest be able to get free from thyself and rush
And find shelter in a ray of His light."

gar harchi turā hast hama dar bāzī
az hastī-yi khud jūdā kunī anbāzī
bāshad ki zi khud bāz rahi dar tāzī
dar partav-i nūr-i ū panāhī sāzī.

In such a state not one of the qualities of man, not one of his members can dispose of its own nature; he is entirely in the power of the Truth, as has been said: "I became for him ear and eye, and tongue and hand. By Me he hears, by Me he sees, by Me he speaks, by Me he touches" (kuntu lahu sam'ān wa bāşarān wa līsānān wa yādan fa-bī yasma'u wa bī yubširu va bī yantiqu wa bī yadīšhu).

Three degrees are distinguished in this manifestation of the Truth. At first the Truth manifests Itself in the "manifestation in actions" (țajallī-i af'āl), when all actions are seen by man as disappearing in the actions of the Truth and when nothing except the Truth is perceived as acting. Then comes the "manifestation of qualities" (țajallī-i șifāt), when man notices all qualities as disappearing in the qualities of the Truth, does not perceive any quality but the Truth, and recognizes himself and everything as being a manifestation of the qualities of the Truth. Finally, the "manifestation of the substance" (țajallī-i ẓāt), when man finds all substances disappearing in the One Substance, when he does not distinguish any other existence except the Truth. This state is the complete disappearance (fanā) of man in the Truth: "which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor
hath it entered into the heart of man” (mā lā ‘aynun ra‘at wa lā uznum sami‘at wa lā khātara ‘alā qalā bi basharin).

Such union with the Truth (tasbīd) is not a union of a body with a body, nor of the accident with the substance, nor of the knowledge with the known, nor of the mind with its conception. Such a union is necessarily preceded by mutual attraction. The Sufi Aḥe l-Ḥasan of Kharaqān used to say that the path to the Truth is a double one—one from man to the Truth, and the other from the Truth to man. Or, as has been said in a tradition: “Whoever approached Me by one span, him I approached by a cubit, and whoever approached Me by a cubit, him I approached by a fathom. And whoever came to Me slowly, to him I came with a fast gait” (man taqarrabu ilayya shibran taqarrabu ilayyi zirā‘an wa man taqarrabu uilayya zirā‘an taqarrabu ilayhi bā‘an wa man atāni bi-mash‘in ataytuha harawdatan).

The above-mentioned disappearance in the Truth, the union of the human spirit with the Deity, the transformation of a seemingly heterogeneous duality into a homogeneous unity, being a phenomenon which cannot be adequately proved by tangible evidence, is explained by the example of two drops of oil. One of them is imprisoned in the mire at the bottom of the sea. Without combining itself with the sea-water, it little by little endeavours to free itself from the mire. Once freed, it speedily, without paying any heed to anything, ascends to the surface of the sea, leaves under itself the whole mass of water, and, having met the other drop, indivisibly melts together with it. On the other hand, if it meets a spark of fire, it ceases to exist independently, giving up its whole being to the being of the fire. Should, however, the sea with all its mass of water be brought into contact with fire, the latter cannot kindle it, and water, on its part, cannot mix with fire. Thus, the human soul, being a drop of the sea of the world, will melt into it, but the spirit, like oil, will rise to its surface, and meeting a spark of the fire of the manifestation of the Truth, will merge all its being into it, will consider as real existence the non-existence of accidental being.

It is hardly necessary to add that this is not a mere revelation, nor a vision, neither a contemplation, nor a consciousness, because all these necessarily involve duality, whereas here we have to do with

1 Cf. also Kashfu-l-mahjūb, Nicholson’s translation, 163; Samarqand edition, 206.—The Translator.
the fullest state of unity. The above described state excludes all idea of divisibility; knowledge, the knower and the known, seeing, the seer, and the seen, love, the lover, and the beloved, become an indivisible whole. Says Anšārī:

"Love came and permeated like blood my skin and veins, It made me empty (of myself) and filled me with the Friend: All the particles of my being were taken by the Friend, Of myself in me there remains only the name, and all the rest is He."

‘ishq āmad u shud chi khūnam andar rag u pūst tā kard marā tihi u pur kard zi dūst ajzā-i vujūdam hama dūst girift nāmīst zi man bar man u bāqī hama āst.

The initial moment of that peaceful bliss, of that complete quietude (sukūnat) is difficult to seize and to define, because the Truth, as Anšārī puts it, "descends unawares into a wary heart" (tajalī-i haqq nāgāh āyad ammā bar dil-i āgāh āyad). It is this quietude that is steadfastly sought for by every "traveller" on the path to the Truth, who is free from any thought of reward or return, because after this state of quietude he attains to direct knowledge (ma‘rifat-i shuhūdī); all obscurity is removed from him, and the perplexing enigma of the "World and the Creation" is solved. "I do not look" says the knower (‘ārif), "at anything, but that I see in it God" (mA nazartu fi shayyin illā wa ra‘aytu-llāha fīhi). Being enlightened, he teaches that from eternity there was, is, and will be only one Substance, manifested under the species of plurality by its attributes, on account of the plurality of these attributes; that the cessation of that manifestation does not entail the disappearance of the Substance Itself. He is persuaded that the innumerable hidden and visible worlds, that the whole totality of the pluralities and diversities perceived by him repose in one Being, like the waves of fantastic shapes and various sizes, which break asunder and are scattered into water-dust on the surface of the ocean; that the innumerable plurality and Unity, the whole and the part, the Absolute ("the Untied") and the individual ("the tied ") are merely different expressions of one and the same Truth.

It is not without interest to compare how this fundamental conception of the Sufi teaching is expressed by its three brilliant exponents in early (eleventh and twelfth centuries) Persian poetry.
Says Abū-Sa‘īd ibn-Abī-l-Khayr of Mahna:

“I said (to the Beautiful One): ‘For whom dost thou appear in such beauty?’
She said: ‘For Myself, because I am Myself Unity,
I am Love, and the Lover, and the Beloved,
I am the Mirror, and the Beauty, and the Seer.’

guştam kirâ tu badîn zîbâyî
guştâ khudrâ ki man khudam yaktâyî
ham ‘îshqam u ham ‘âshîq u ham ma’shûqam
ham âyîna u ham jamâl u ham binâyî.

And again:—

“At the time when these stars and heavens were not,
Nor this water, nor air, nor fire, nor earth,
I was teaching the mysteries of Unity—
And this body, and voice, and intellect were not.”

ân vaqt ki in anjum u aflâk nabûd
vin âb u havâ u âtash u khâk nabûd
asrâr-i yagânâqî sabaq mîguştam
vin qâlib u in navâ u idrâk nabûd

And again:—

“I was never separated from Thee,
This is a proof of the luckiness of my star:
In Thy substance I am unnoticeable, when I am non-existent,
And in Thy light I become visible, when I exist.”

man az tu judâ nabûdâm tâ bûdâm
înast dalîl-i tâli’î mas’ûdam
dar zât-i tu nâ-pa’dûdam ar ma’dûmam
vaz nûr-i tu zâhiram agar mawjûdam.

Says ‘Abdullâh Anşârî:

“Do not think that we are descended from Adam,
Because at the moment when Adam was not, we were:
Without the burden of love, of heart, and of clay,
The Beloved, and We, and Love were breathing the same breath.”

tâ ẓan nabârî ki mâ zi ʿâdâm bûdîm
kân dam ki nabûd ʿâdâm ân dam bûdîm
bî zaḥmat-i ‘âyn u shîn u qâf u dîl u gîl
ma’shûq u mâ u ‘îshq hamdam bûdîm.
Says 'Umar Khayyām:

"That Wine, which by Its substance is capable of taking various forms,
Which becomes now an animal and now a plant,
Do not think that It (therefore) turns into non-being, far from it:
It possesseth a substance, though qualities (outward manifestations) may disappear."

ān bāda ki qābil-i ʿuvarhāst ba-zāt
gāhī ḥayvān mīshavād u gāh nabāt
tā zan nabarī ki nīst gardād hayhāt
māwṣūf ba-zāt ast agar nīst sīfāt.

And again:

"Thou hast asked me, what are those phantom-like forms?
If I tell the truth about them, it will be too long.
These forms have come from a sea,
And again they return to the depths of that sea."

mīpusūdī ki chīst ān naqsh-i majāz
gar bar gūyām ḥaqīqatash hast dīrāz
naqshīst pāḏīd āmada az daryāyī
vāngāh shūda ba-qaʿr-i ān daryā bāz.

And again:

"Sometimes Thou art hidden and dost not show Thy face to anyone.
Sometimes Thou art manifested in forms of being and place.
That splendour Thou showest to Thyself:
Thyself art the essence of Thy contemplation and Thou art the seer."

gah gashta nihān rū ba-kasī nanumāyī
ghah dar ʿuvar-i kawn u makān paydāyī
īn jilvagarī bā-khīștān binumāyī
khud ʿayn-i ʿayān-i khudī u bīnāyī.

The conception, in terms of this teaching, of man as a particle of the all-creating Truth, seems especially bold on the lips of orthodox Sufis, when they resort to the use of the terminology of the Qurʾān and of the Muslim symbol of faith. Thus, Maṣūr Khallāj exclaimed: "I am the Truth!" and, having been misunderstood, paid with his life for such a boldness. Almost the same thing has been said by Anṣārī:
"If thou wishest to hear a word from a wary soul
And the innermost mysteries from the King of Kings,
Lose thyself, so as, being unaware of thy own existence,
To hear only the words: 'I, I am God.'"

(Qur'ān, xx, 14.)

khāhī ki sukun zi jān-i āgāh shinavi
vasrār-i darānī zi shāhinshāh shinavi
gum gard zi khīsh tā tu az hast-i khud
bikhud hama innani anā-illāh shinavi.

Bāyazīd of Bīstām went even farther and altering somewhat the symbol of faith of Muḥammad, exclaimed: "There is no deity, but myself, therefore worship me. To me be praise, and how great is my dignity!" (lā ilāha illā anā fa'budunī wa subhānī mā a'zama sha'nī).

The same symbol was used for the explanation of the meaning of the mystic knowledge by Abū-Sa'īd ibn-Abī-I-Khayr:

"The knower, who is aware of the secret of knowledge,
Is freed from self and has God for his companion.
Deny thyself and affirm the existence of the Truth,
Such is the meaning of the words 'There is no Deity but God'."

'ārif ki zi sirr-i ma'rīfat āgāhast
bikhud zi khudast u bā khudā hamrāhast
naf'-i khud u isbāt-i vujūd-i haq kun
īn ma'nī-i lā ilāha illā-llāhast.

There is hardly any need to say that such utterances express the feelings of "the traveller towards the Truth" not at the very moment of quietude, because at that time he is unable to distinguish either separate names or separate qualities, but at the time when he is accomplishing his return journey, when he is again torn away from the Absolute and regains individuality, when there steps in the state of "separation after union" (farq ba'da-l-jam'), of "being after non-being" (baqā ba'da-l-fanā), when he becomes "a traveller from the Truth, in the Truth, for the Truth".

Our sages point out to us examples of such men, who, by means of a lengthy self-renunciation and self-annihilation have become immersed in the sea of Unity, have reached the desired quietude and have, so to say, disappeared and vanished therein. The light of their intellect is lost in the Light of the Manifestation of the Truth, but for those who surround them and who have no experience of that exclusive
state of bliss, they seem to be "deprived of their reason" (maslību-l-'aql) : they are called "the madmen of the spiritual path" (vālihān-i tariqat). Such a one was, for instance, Luqmān of Sarākhās (eleventh century), who, according to 'Aṭṭār's exposition in the "Conversation of the Birds", used to repeat towards the end of his long life:—

"Now, I do not know who I am—I am not a slave of the Lord (the Truth), so, what am I? My slavery is gone, but no freedom has taken its place. In my heart there is not a drop either of sorrow or of joy. I have become without qualities, but I did not lose them. I have attained knowledge, but I do not possess knowledge. I do not know whether Thou art I, or I am Thou—I have disappeared in Thee and duality has been removed".¹

Such men are no more in need of any deeds; "one does not follow their example, but one does not repudiate them" (lā yuqtaḏā biḥim wa lā yunktaru 'alayhim).

"Those walking in the Truth," i.e. those who have returned into the world of particularities in order to perfect the imperfect ones and to instruct the ignorant ones (jāhil) are, according to the degree of their natural capacities, of various grades of knowledge, which can be reduced to two chief categories. The one consists of those who, when having passed over from Unity to plurality, are temporarily barred from Unity by that plurality, which state, however, by means of the application of ways and means at their disposal, may be quickly changed back into the lost quietude. These are the Sufis, who are called "sons of the time" (aṣ-ṣufiyyu ibnu-l-waqt), because they are in the power of the moment, they are in a state of mutability. These are those knowers, whom the famous Junayd of Baghdaḏ had in view, when, on being asked about the knower, he said: "the colour of the water is the colour of its vessel" (lawnu-l-ma'i lawnu inā'ihi). For such men the above-mentioned "law" and "path" still remain necessary for two reasons—both for their own perfection and for the guidance of the ignorant.

The second group of those "who have attained knowledge" are those who, owing to a special perfection achieved by them, remain permanently in direct communion with the Truth, but contemplate Unity in plurality and plurality in Unity in such a way that the one is in no manner obscured by the other. In spite, however, of their

¹ Tehran edition, 1319, p. 269.—The Translator.
proximity to the Truth and the fact that they permanently experience that proximity, they do not leave by a hair's breadth the paths trodden by them, and continue assiduously to devote themselves to pious practices, which in them are obligatory only as far as they may serve as an example for those whom they have in their guidance. Thus, to "those directed" (murīd) they cede only the overflow of their own abundance, as has been quite clearly stated by ʿAlī in his words addressed to Kumayl ibn-Ziyād: yatarashshāhu ʿalayka mā yafṣahu minnī. They can give them only the great wisdom of the means of purifying the heart which they have acquired by their own experience, but they are unable to give them the Truth Itself, because the Truth is beyond words and cannot be grasped by the intellect. That is why "those who have attained knowledge" are for those who are ignorant "directors of the right path" (murshid).

If we turn now to the words of these spiritual directors, we shall see from them on the one hand, that they are conscious of being unable to formulate all that fills the soul of "the one who has attained", on the other hand, that the only path to knowledge is self-renunciation and internal purity. Such words and thoughts of the oldest spiritual directors (previous to the eleventh century) have been recorded in sufficient numbers in Qushayrī's "Epistle" (Risālat) and in Jullābī's "Revelation of what is veiled" (Kashfu-l-mahjūb).

Here are a few specimens of such sayings:—

Abū-Yazīd (of Bistām?) has said: "Men have different states, but the one who has attained knowledge has no states, because his distinguishing marks are effaced, his passion disappears in the passion of another, and his traces disappear in the traces of another."

Al-Vāṣīṭī has said: "Whoever has perceived God the Almighty, has been cut off, has become dumb, and has disappeared." ¹

Somebody has said: "Whoever has known God, for him life is pure and existence is bright, everything fears him, and in him the fear of creatures disappears, and he joins God."

Al-Ḥusayn ibn-Manṣūr has said: "The distinguishing mark of the one who has attained knowledge is that he is free from this life and the next."

Somebody has said: "Whoever knew God, is overfilled with eternity, and in its wideness is narrow for him."

Said ash-Shibli: "One who has attained knowledge must

not have any attachment, just as the lover has no complaint, the slave has no claim, the fearful no rest.”

Said al-Junayd (of Baghdād): “One who strives after knowledge does not attain it, unless he becomes like the earth which is trampled upon by the pious and the impious, and like the cloud which covers with its shadow everything, and like the rain which waters whatever it likes and whatever it does not like.”

Said Abū-Yazīd: “The one who has attained knowledge does not see anything either in dream or in his waking state, except God, and except Him does not meet anybody or look at anything.” A similar saying of the same spiritual director has been preserved in another source: “... for many years have I been conversing with God, and men think that I am conversing with them.”

Said Zūn-Nūn al-Miṣrī: “I knew my Lord through my Lord, and were it not for my Lord, I should not have known my Lord.”

Somebody has said: “The one who has attained knowledge (‘ārif) is higher than what he says, and the one who knows (‘ālim) is lower than what he says.”

Muḥammad ibn-Vāsī said: “Whoever has attained knowledge of his God, his speech is short, and his amazement is long.”

Such, according to our sages, is the “knower”, and such are his ways. He is led on his path to the Truth not by the intellect, which establishes the existence of the Active Principle by the argument of Its action, but by the wary heart, which denies its own existence in anything, except the Truth. The Truth having created the body of man, animated it by the heart, and, having created the heart, animated the latter by Itself. Thus knowledge is the life of the heart in the Truth and revulsion from everything which is not the Truth.

Now it becomes clear, why in the above-quoted story of the primordial man such an exclusive place is allotted to the heart, why the latter is represented as a brilliant sanctuary, to enter which the spirit of darkness and evil was not fated. It becomes clear, why in mystical literature whole works are devoted to the heart, as, for instance, the work by Ghazālī, entitled “The Wonders of the Heart” (‘Ajā’Brien-l-qalb) and why the mystic poets of Persia call so loudly and persuasively upon “the ignorant” to worship that innermost temple of man.

---

1 Kasifu-l-mahjūb, Nicholson’s translation, 276; Samarqand edition, 329. —The Translator.
Exclaims the Old Man of Herat:—

"On the way to the Truth there are two temples (lit. "two Ka'bas"), One is the outer temple, the other the temple of the heart. As long as thou canst, make pilgrimage to hearts, Because one single heart is more than a thousand temples" (lit. "Ka'bas").

dar rah-i khudā du ka'ba ānad hāsil
yak ka'ba-i šūrast u yak ka'ba-i dil
tā bituwānī ziyārat-i dilhā kun
kufsūn zī hazār ka'ba bāshad yak dil.

To recapitulate: the basic idea of the Persian sages is that "the Truth for the Truth" is the meaning of the whole creation; that the Creator, having reflected Himself in man by His 1001 attributes, having created him by His own action, having united in him the two worlds and distinguished him from all the creatures by an internal spiritual life, made him thus a vessel of purest love and a treasury of knowledge. This latter is a precious, but heavy burden: "We proposed the faith," says the Qur'ān (xxxiii, 72), "unto the heavens and the earth, and the mountains; and they refused to undertake the same, and were afraid thereof; but man undertook it"—because he alone was capable of suppressing vigorously his passions (kāna zalāman), and his little heart was able to hold the Great Truth, which neither the heavens nor the earth were able to accommodate (lā yasa'unī ardi wa lā samā'i- wa wasi'anī qalbu 'abdi). Therefore, to know one's soul, say the Sufis, to purify one's heart of all earthly darkness and to open it for the reception of the One Eternal Truth in which every lie disappears (jā'a-l-haqqu wa zahaqa-l-bātilu, Qur'ān, xvii, 83)—that is the destination of man and in that consists his exalted earthly achievement.
NOTES ON DON JUAN OF PERSIA'S ACCOUNT OF GEORGIA

By W. E. D. Allen

In one of the recently published volumes of the Broadway Travellers Series (Don Juan of Persia; a Shi'ah Catholic, 1560-1604, translated and edited with an introduction by G. Le Strange) is an interesting account of Georgia and of some of the events of the Turko-Persian War which endured between the years 1578 and 1587. The Persian account throws much light on the state of Georgia at the end of the sixteenth century, and it serves as a valuable supplement to von Hammer Purgstall's history of the war, based mainly on Turkish sources, and published as books 38 and 40 of his Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman (in Vol. viii of the French edition).

Neither the historian of Turkey nor the editor of Don Juan appear to have made use of the material from Georgian sources which is available for this period, namely the provincial histories of Kartli, Samtzkhé, Kakheti and Imereti collated by Prince Wakhusht of Kartli during the eighteenth century, and published by Brosset in his Histoire de la Géorgie, 2ième partie, 1ière livraison, Spb. 1856.

While it is a somewhat sterile task to attempt to reconcile and elucidate the Turkish, Persian and Georgian accounts of this protracted war, it may be of interest to identify Georgian proper names and place-names in the light of the Georgian sources.

1. p. 139.—"On the north the Georgian border marches with Albania, which is now called Zuoria." Albania would here seem to be Abkhazia, and the use of the name "Albania" implies a confusion in the author's mind arising from the application of this name by Classic writers to eastern Georgia and 'Aran (the lower reaches of the Kura, now known as Azerbaijan). Again Zuoria would seem to be Circassia (which is called Zicchia by Venetian and Genoese writers).

2. p. 139.—"The Araxes rises . . . in that part of the mountains which is called Periard." Don Juan, like Strabo and other writers on the geography of the Caucasus, confuses the sources of the Araxes and the Kura. It is clear from a further reference to the "Periard" mountains (p. 141) that Don Juan has in mind in the later context the Gurian-Meskhian chain, part of which, to the north-west of Akhaltzikhé, are called by Wakhusht, Persati. The mountains to which Don Juan refers as being at the sources of the Araxes are surely
the Dévé Boyun (in Georgian Devaboina mountains). Mount Aba (or Abus) would be Palantoken Dagh. It is worth noting—in view of the number of Georgians in the Persian army from whom the author must have taken details of his toponymy—that the Karga Bazar mountains, running north of and parallel to the upper Araxes, and at right angles to the Dévé Boyun, are called by the Georgians Irajlus.

3. pp. 139, 144 et seq.—"The city of Eres" and "the Kanak river." The name "Eres" is very puzzling. Mr. le Strange, following literally the text of Don Juan, necessarily places "Eres" below the confluence of the Araxes with the Kura (presumably near the site of the little town of Jevat on modern maps). There is no great historical site in this area, although nearly a hundred miles to the north-west is the village of Barda'a, a place which was famous as the centre of Arab power in the Caucasus in the ninth century, and which in earlier centuries, under the name of Pertav, was the capital of the half-Armenian kingdom of Aghovarq. The text on page 144, when compared with that on page 139, indicates that Don Juan’s knowledge of the location of "Eres" was confused. Lala Mustafa Pasha (p. 144) advanced from Tiflis "to the base of the mountains" of Kakheti, where he was met by ambassadors of the king Iskender Leventoglu (Alexander, son of Levan). After receiving a safe conduct from Alexander, the Turkish army marched for twelve days "through marsh lands and cane-brakes" and at last reached the borders of Shirvan, where they were met by "people from the city of Shaki" who promised obedience of "all the tribes whose abode lay along the banks of the river Kanak". The town of Nukha was the capital of the Khanate of Shaki, and Nukha is therefore presumably "the city of Shaki". The river Alazan was the march between the Mussulmans of the Shirvan province (of which Shaki formed part) and the Georgian principality of Kakheti, and, according to Brosset, who quotes the historians Arakel of Tabriz and Iskandar Munji as authorities, the Alazan was known to the Muslims as the Kanak. (Brosset, H. de la G., 2ième part., lière livr., p. 414.) After a foraging party had been destroyed by the Persians, Lala Mustafa, by a forced march, surprised the main Persian army, and surrounded them in a peninsula lying between the rivers Araxes and Kanak". Here it would seem that Don Juan is again confusing the Araxes with the Kura, and that the action took place on the peninsula formed by the junction of the Alazan (Kanak) with the Kura or, a few miles higher, where the Xora—a stream running parallel with the Kura—falls into the Alazan
before the latter joins the Kura. That this was the location of the battle seems to me beyond doubt. Of the Persian commanders, we read that Imam Quli Khan escaped to Ganja less than thirty miles away; Sharaf Khan to Nakhchevan, in a straight direction south-west of Ganja, and Toqmaq to Erivan, south-east-east of Ganja. The natural line of retreat for a Persian army, defeated at a point below the junction of the Araxes and the Kura, would have been Ardabil.

The identity of the Kanak appears to be clear, but that of "Eres" is not so apparent. There is, however, on Wakhusht's map of Kakheti (published by Brosset in Description Géographique de la Géorgie, Georgian text with French translation, Spb. 1842), a small place about thirty miles to the east of the Alazan, and the same distance to the north of the Kura. Brosset transliterates the name Aréhi—that is Aresh, with the Georgian termination "i" added. This is no doubt the Aresch mentioned by von Hammer (Hist., French ed., viii, 86), although the German historian appears to me to fail to identify the Kanak. von Hammer (vii, p. 391) quotes the Turkish historian Ali as giving a list of fourteen Sanjaks in the province of Shirvan, of which two were Aresh and Kabala. Kabala, near Shamakhi, was an important town in the early Middle Ages, and was sadly pillaged by Tamerlane. Ali is evidence for the survival of Kabala as an important town at the end of the sixteenth century, although in recent times no trace of it remained, and it has only recently been excavated under the auspices of the Society for the Exploration of Azerbaijan (see their Izvestiya (Bulletin) No. 4). It is very probable that Aresch, like Kabala, completely disappeared and ceased to be inhabited during the severe devastation of Shirvan and Kakheti by Shah Abbas I in the first quarter of the seventeenth century. A similar fate overtook a number of important Georgian towns, like Samshvilde in Somkheti and Vardisztikhé in Imereti. During the Turko-Persian War Aresh must have been a point of considerable strategic importance, since it lay on the line of a Turkish march from Tiflis to Shamakhi and Derbend, and when held, would guard the Turkish flank towards Ganja and Erivan. At the same time Aresch in Turkish hands would threaten the flank of a Persian advance from Ardabil to Shamakhi.

4. pp. 140-4.—Don Juan's six princes. The Georgian Kingdom had collapsed over a hundred years before the events recorded by our author, and the country had been divided into three independent kingdoms and a number of smaller principalities. The kingdoms were
Kartli, capital Tiflis; Kakheti, capital Grémi; and Imereti, capital Kutais. These three kingdoms were ruled by branches of the Bagratiani family; in Kakheti and Kartli were established descendants of the last king of all Georgia, Alexander (died 1442). A collateral branch, descended from a bastard of King Giorgi IV (1212–23), ruled in Imereti.

The most powerful principality and rival of the Bagratid kingdoms was Samtshké or Meskhia, comprising the region of the upper Kura and the middle Chorokh, with a capital at Akhaltzikhé. Samtshké was ruled by "atabegs" of the family of Jaqeli, and it was sometimes called Saatabago—i.e. "the atabeg’s country."

Between the territory of the atabegs and Imereti was the small principality of Guria, ruled by the family of Wardanidzé with their seat at Ozurgeti. The Wardanidzés were known by the toponymic of Gurieli, and they were dependent on the Imerian kings.

The north-western part of Imereti—Mingreli—was ruled by the Dadianis, whose seat was at Zugdidi and who were also vassals of the kings of Imereti.

Lastly, the Shamkhal of Tarku, who is often referred to by Don Juan and by the Turkish historians quoted by von Hammer, ruled over a large part of North-East Daghestan, his territory extending along the Caspian coast between the Samur and the Sulak. The family was old-established and powerful, dating back to the early Middle Ages. The Shamkhal of Don Juan played an important part in contemporary Persian politics, and his son, in 1594, was sufficiently strong to annihilate an army of 7,000 Russians on the Sulak (see Baddeley Russian Conquest of the Caucasus, pp. 8–9).

The Georgian notables referred to by Don Juan, may, I think, be identified as follows, from the Georgian provincial histories and from Brosset’s genealogical trees (published in H. de la G., 2ième partie, lière livr.):—

(1) Samtshké-Saatabago.—Dédis-Imédi (Princess Desmit of Don Juan, Dédé Semid of von Hammer), was the widow of Kai-Khusrau II, atabeg of Samtshké (died 1575) and daughter of Bagrat, Prince of Mukhran, an uncle of Luarsab I of Kartli (died 1558). She was, therefore, a cousin and not the widow of Don Juan’s Prince Lavarza. Dédis-Imédi had three sons, who all subsequently became atabegs; (1) Quarquaré V, who died in 1582; (2) Manuchar II (Manuchihr) who married Helen, daughter of Simon I of Kartli and died in 1614; and (3) Béka III, who, after poisoning his nephew Manuchar III,
son of Manuchar II, succeeded in 1625, as a Turkish nominee under the name of Safar Pasha (died 1635). Quarquaré is the Alexander of Don Juan and the Gregory of von Hammer (see Brosset, *H. de la G.*, II, i, Add. II, p. 412, note 2).

(2) *Kartli.*—Luarsab I of Kartli, a great-grandson of Alexander, last king of all Georgia, died in 1558. He is Don Juan’s Lavarza or Labassap. Luarsab had by Tamara, daughter of King Bagrat III of Imereti, amongst several children (1) Simon I of Kartli (b. 1537), who married Nestan Darejan, a daughter of Levan II of Kakheti, by the daughter of an earlier Shamkhal. Simon became a Mussulman under the name of Mahmud (as was the custom of many Georgian princes, cf. Chardin, Tournefort, etc.); was taken prisoner by the Turks in 1600 and died in 1611; (2) Simon’s younger brother David (Dau’d Khan) ruled Kartli in substitution for Simon in 1569. He fled to Constantinople in 1578 and died soon afterwards.

(3) *Kakheti.*—Iskandar Leventoglu, is Alexander II, son of Levan II (Leo), King of Kakheti, and a descendant of Alexander, last king of all Georgia. Alexander was born in 1527, succeeded in 1574, and died in 1605. His younger brother Iészé (Isa Khan) had married a niece of Shah Tahmasp.

(4) *Imereti.*—"The powerful Georgian prince named Bashachuk" was Giorgi II, King of Imereti (1548–85). Brosset, who criticizes von Hammer’s account of the war, indicates that (*H. de la G.*, II, i, p. 411, note 2) the name Bashachuk applied by the Turks to the Imerians meant "Bald Pates" (bash-chuplak), presumably because the Imerians and Mingrelians shaved their heads (cf. Josaphat Barbaro and other travellers).

(5) Don Juan’s Prince Gori is doubtless Giorgi II (Gurieli, i.e. Prince of Guria) who died in 1600, having spent four years in exile in Constantinople (1583–7). He had no son Yusuf, but one who succeeded as Mamia II, and who may have been known by the Mussulman name of Yusuf. Another son, Malakia, became Catholicos of Abkhazia.

5. The *Turkish Invasion of Georgia* (pp. 140–3).—After defeating Toqmaq Khan at Childir (Chaldir) between the lake of that name and Kars,¹ Lala Mustafa Pasha in August, 1578, advanced by Kieder

¹ On the same ground where the great battle was fought between the Byzantine Emperor Basil Bulgaroktonos and King Giorgi II of Kartli-Abkhazia in the autumn of 1021. (See Schlumberger, *L’Epopée Byzantine*, ii, chap. xi.)
Gul (Chaldir Gol) to Arkikelek (Akalkalaki) which had already been occupied by his advance-guard. Here he was joined by Manuchar Jaqeli, and—instead of marching to Akhaltzikhe and following down the Kura through the Borjom defile—the Turkish commander with his Georgian guide passed by Pervana Gul (Lake Toporovan—in Georgian tba-parvana, "butterfly lake") and descended upon Jurji-Qal'ah (Gori) by the paths through the Trieiletian mountains. The reference to the ruins of Triala (i.e. Trieleti—the name of the adjoining mountains) may be to the celebrated town of Samshwilde in the neighbouring valley of the Ktzia. From Gori, Lala Mustafa had an easy march to Tiflis. In his rear the Jaqelis, who had been engaged during the previous two years in a struggle against the Persians, captured and delivered to the Turks the remaining Meskhan fortresses, which were held for the Shah by Kokola Shaliqashvili, a nephew of the late Shah Tahmasp’s Georgian wife (Brosset II, i, p. 216 et seq.).

6. Other Names, pp. 138–75.—(1) p. 140. "The Georgian prince Salmas" may be Kojar Amilakhori, who delivered Ardahan to the Turks. (2) "The Lake of Essekia" may well be Lake Gök Chai, as Mr. Le Strange suggests, since the valleys of the Borchalu and the Akstafa at the northern head of the lake, were always two of the main routes of invasion into Georgia. In the region of the former river were the two fortresses of Tomanis (Dbanis) and Lori, which are mentioned so frequently in Don Juan’s pages. The author’s statement that Lake Essekia was on the marches of the Prince of Bashachuk (Imereti) and Prince Gori (Gurieli) is, of course, wide of the mark. (3) p. 142. The Perekorsks are the Perekop Tatars, a name by which contemporary writers frequently referred to the Tatars of the Crimea. (4) p. 153. The Shamkhal of Tarku was not a Christian, but a Mussulman. (5) pp. 174–5. Altun Qal'ah = Akhaltzikhe. It is difficult to understand Don Juan and the Turkish sources quoted by von Hammer employing this form, particularly as later Turkish writers use the form Ahiska. Qal'ah is a literal translation of "tzikhé". But "akhalı" in Georgian means "new", and "altun" is "gold" in Turkish. The city was wealthy, deriving much profit from the slave-trade, and at the beginning of the nineteenth century the population was estimated at 40,000 (see Lynch, Armenia: Travels and Studies, i, p. 68). Probably the Turkish "altun" is an approach to "akhali". (6) p. 174–5. Kliska, I am unable to identify. It may be Khertvis, a stronghold on the way from Akhalkalaki to
Akhaltzikhé, or possibly a point on the direct way from the latter place to Ardahan.

7. Georgians at the Persian Court.—The presence of large numbers of Georgians at the Persian Court and in the Persian service is a phenomenon which dates from Sassanian times. The Georgian and Persian royal houses frequently intermarried, and Georgian princes held important positions such as the governorships of Isfahan and Herat. Don Juan (p. 209) notes that Shah Abbas soon after his accession "took into his service to form his bodyguard 12,000 Georgians, renegades", and Chardin states that "there is scarce a Gentleman in Persia, whose Mother is not a Georgian or a Circassian Woman; to begin with the King who commonly is a Georgian or a Circassian by the Mother's side" (Chardin, Argonaut ed., pp. 183–4). There is not space here to enquire into the complicated question of the Persian Succession, to which reference is made in Chapter iv of Book II of Don Juan. It is worth noting, however, that the Shamkhal was not "a Georgian noble" as described by Don Juan, but the head of the Turcoman and Sunni party (see von Hammer, French ed., vii, pp. 70 et seq.), and he was opposed at court by the Georgian relations of Shah Tahmasp's wife, the mother of Shah Khudá-banda, who was a daughter of Othar Shaliqashvili, a powerful noble of Samtzkhé. Haydar Mirza was a nominee of the Georgian party, and Isa Khan, his relative, was none other than Iésé, the younger brother of Alexander, and the favourite of the dead Shah Tahmasp (see p. 142). Haydar was murdered at the instance of the Shamkhal, who then raised to the throne Ismail—a youth suspected by his father of Sunni tendencies (cf. also Brosset II, i, p. 34, note 7). Ismail was murdered in 1578, and was succeeded by the blind Shah Khudá-banda, grandson of Othar Shaliqashvili. The influence of the Shaliqashvils at Qazvín had been strong in the declining years of Shah Tahmasp, and it was the execution of his brother-in-law, Waraza Shaliqashvili, by Dédis-Imédi, which caused Shah Tahmasp to ravage Samtzkhé in 1574 (cf. Brosset, H. de la G., II, i, p. 154). Shah Khudá-banda was dominated by his Shaliqashvili mother, and her hostility to the Jaqelis may explain the readiness of Dédis-Imédi and her sons to side with the Turks.

In Kartli king Simon had in 1569 been deposed by Shah Tahmasp in favour of his brother David (Da'ud Khan), a dissipated and futile individual. Simon had been imprisoned at Alamut (Qahqahah) and had been subsequently liberated by Shah Ismail, presumably
because he was considered hostile to the Shaliqashvili faction (1576). After the failure of David to offer effective resistance to the Turks, and with the invasion of Shirvan by Lala Mustafá, the Persian Court decided to profit by the military capacity and courage of Simon. According to the History of Kartli "as Shah Khudá banda was taking no measures, his mother, who was daughter of Othar Shaliqashvili, wrapped a sword in a woman's veil, and sent it to King Simon, according to the Georgian custom, with the message, 'Take which you will of the two, and go into your country to make war against the Turks.'" Simon was given 9,000 tumans and all the Georgian prisoners, and entering Georgia in the autumn of 1578 he recaptured Lori, Gori, and other places from the Turks. His brother David fled to Stambul, where he died soon afterwards (Brosset II, i, pp. 35-7).
ON W. SCHMIDT'S MUNDA-MON-KHMER COMPARISONS.
(DOES AN "AUSTRIC" FAMILY OF LANGUAGES EXIST?)

By W. F. de Hevesy

W. SCHMIDT has established, as is well known, a new family of human speech, termed by him the "Austric" family. It was constituted by joining an "Austronesian" and an "Aurtoasiatic" group of languages; the latter term was coined by Schmidt when he found that the Mon-Khmer and some other languages of the East are kindred to the Munḍa languages of India.

Schmidt's treatise on the matter was declared by some scholars to be "masterly", whereas others, so Przyluski, advised reserve. As a matter of fact, the existence of an "Austric" family of languages—the most widely diffused on earth—is actually uncontested.

That the morphology and the grammar of the Munḍa and the Mon-Khmer languages are quite different, is admitted by W. Schmidt himself. Thus he based the relationship upon some similarities in phonetics, on the use of infixes in both languages, and on the results he obtained by comparing words.

We do not intend to deal here either with the errors Schmidt has made concerning the first point, nor with the fact that the part played by the infixes is somewhat different in the Munḍa and Mon-Khmer groups; at present we shall occupy ourselves only with his word-comparisons.

And even here we shall desist from disclosing the numerous comparisons which have no value, either because he was comparing onomatopoeics, or because the compared Santali words are not original, but borrowed ones. W. Schmidt has undertaken to show that many Santali words are nothing else but some prefixed forms of Mon, Khmer, Bahnar, Stieng, Khasi, and Nicobar bases, and for the Santali ones he used Campbell's dictionary; our exclusive purpose at the present is to show that with no other means but the same dictionary the contrary of his conclusions can be proved just as well, i.e. that the words Schmidt presumed to be prefixed forms are suffixed ones, having absolutely nothing to do with the Khmer, etc., words he quotes.

1 In Meillet's Les Langues du Monde.
2 A notable one, the placing in Munḍa of the genitive in front instead of postponing it, like all the other compared languages, W. Schmidt tried to explain by an influence exercised by the surrounding Dravidian and Tibeto-Burman tongues.
3 A. Campbell, A Santali-English Dictionary, Pokhuria, 1899.
And it will astonish many, just as it has surprised the writer, that at least in some cases this has not occurred to W. Schmidt himself.

The numbers in brackets quoted before the comparisons are the numbers of Schmidt’s word-groups, as they appear in his celebrated work, *Die Mon-Khmer-Völker, ein Bindeglied zwischen Völkern Zentralasiens und Austronesiens* (Braunschweig, 1906). We shall use the same abbreviations as he does there, and shall write for Khmer Khm, Mon M, Bahnar B, Stieng S, Khasi Kha, and Nicobar N. Where he has altered Campbell’s spelling we shall accept Schmidt’s transcription.

1. (288) *milq* concord, harmony, agreement, reconciliation, was connected by W. Schmidt with B *lāp* sufficient, suitable.—But Campbell’s dictionary could show him also *mil* affection, regard, fondness, harmony, agreement, absence of friction, friendship, *milq* to mix, to unite, to reconcile, to cause concord, to get, to receive, *milq* *milq* desire, affection, fondness, regard, *mili misi* concord, harmony, agreement, to consult, to scheme; thus there is no case for a root *lāp*.

2. (256) *gorom* warm, hot was connected with S *ram* hot, tepid, S *mram* tepid, further (on Schmidt’s p. 146) with M *grā*’ overripe, B *dra* to dry on the fire, in the sun, Kha *srah* pink, yellow-brown.—The dictionary shows also *garmo*, *garmo* to become heated, to perspire, to warm to one’s work, to exert oneself, to wake up, as a lazy man to work, *garm* *garm* to become heated, to perspire through exertion, *gorm*, *gorm* gonorrhoea, or any urethral discharge: all pointing towards a root *gor* instead of a root *ram*.

3. (212) *gomok* together, in a body, *gomkao* to assemble, to gather together, all together, in a body || S *māk* much, ? Khm *mak* to come, to approach.—The Santali words have no connection with *mak*, their root is *gom*, as shown by *gām* *gām* all together, in a crowd, with a rush, *gomka* *gumki* all together, in a body, unanimously, *guma* *gumi* together, united, *gāmki* united or grown together, as two fruits, fingers, etc., *gāmka* *gumki* in company, in knots, in a gang, in a party, in a group, *gomm* to assemble, to make into a bunch, *ghumblai* (mente) in a body, in a covey, all together as one.

4. (276) *aloć-paloć* wearied, worn out, exhausted || Kha *loit* to set free, to separate, N *et-loć* the shed skin of a snake, N *et-lać-ha nga*
to shed the skin.—Campbell’s alapala to be wearied, to be tired, to be
worn out, as with illness, work, etc., ala, gli tired, wearied, run down
mentally and physically, alap-alap to be fatigued, to be exhausted,
be worn out, faint, etc., show that we are faced with suffixed forms
of a root which has nothing to do with the “shed skin of a snake”
the et-lōc of Nicobar.

5. (324) husigr intelligent, cautious, smart, sly || Khm sasier to
walk carefully, B šer to advance imperceptibly, S siër to pass before,
Kha siar craftily.—husigr is a suffixed form of hus, hos consciousness,
sense.

6. (55) kecāk to break, to break off a piece, a piece ; to be finished,
to be ended || Khm čēk to let off, to leave.—On the next page of the
dictionary kecēt to break, to break into pieces, to smash, to break off,
makes a root kec evident.

7 (258) sāsprum completely, fully, entirely || M rū enough.—sabar
to finish, to complete, to put the finishing touches on, sabit to be
perfect, to be complete, perfect, complete, excellent, supot good,
excellent, subita well, excellent, opportune, convenient, make any
connection with a root rū more than doubtful.

8. (156) hadui-hadui shaggy, bushy, as hair || Khm kanduy tail,
Kha snañ-lyndui hanging down.—See in the dictionary hodgo hairy,
shaggy. Thus the root is had, no connection existing with a root dui.

9. (303) lever-lewer to shake up and down, to move up and down,
opposite moving from side to side as a pendulum || B vōr to stir
(“herumschütteln”).—A few lines higher the dictionary shows also
leve-lewe to shake, to tremble, to be loose, to be afraid, to bend slightly;
further, we read levak-levak, lawak-lawak and lawañ-lawañ to shake,
to hang dangling, to jerk up and down, to spring, to vibrate. Thus
the connection with vōr does not exist.1

10. (316) qsiñ to die down, as plants in winter, to be exhausted,
to unwind, peset-peset unpalatable, insipid, unappetizing, unreliable,
qsiñ to be exhausted, finished, nothing remaining (as in “the water is
dried up” ) || Khm mesiet valueless, Khm set pale colour, Khm pañsiñ
entirely abandoned.—The root of qsiñ appears also in osōk to become
emaciated, to become lean, and in usqā to be exhausted, as soil, insipid,
as food, faded, as flower, to lose strength ; in ustqā exhausted,

1 No phonetic change of r to k or s is known in Santali. On the other hand a
as terminal sound becomes often k, e.g. man = mak to cut, cañ = cak why, mon =
nok a little, etc.
insipid, faded.—pešet has perhaps the same root as başı stale,usty, baske left over the previous meal,usty, stale, unfinished.—siť is connected with a “drying up”, as shown by sitha tasteless, weak, pithless, dry, juiceless, exhausted, as soil, sílkoč to be over dry. Thus only a connection of siť with Khm set is possible. i.e. the latter may be a loan-word in Khm.

11. (42) diğić to misgive, to doubt, to bode ill, to suspect; to offend || Khm daŋiće to injure (“verletzen”, but the Khm word means “to collide”), B giyek to tickle.—It is regrettable that W. Schmidt has not noticed in the very next line of the dictionary diğića doubt, suspicion, uncertainty; further diğić to be in doubt; doubtful, uncertain; proofs for a root diği instead Schmidt’s gić; gek.

12. (56) loćok one leg injured, to limp on one foot, loćok-loćok to spring up and down, as anything long and pliant if unsupported, to shake; to vibrate, springy || Khm khćak to limp.—For loćok-loćok a second form appears in the dictionary, loće-loće; for loćok we find laćak-lućok not to put the ball of the foot to the ground when walking owing to the presence of a sore, thorn, etc. Thus no connection with a root čak exists.

13. (90) četak to slap || M tak to strike, Khm taṭok “battre la crècelle” (to sound a rattle).—The root is undoubtedly the onomatopoic čet, čat. See čat-, čat-, čet-.čet- noise produced by slippers hitting the heel when walking (imitative), četak-četak sound as of a dog lapping, čet-čet sound of cracking or rending.

14. (342) buhel to flow, to float away, hehel to wear away (as rats eat up a place); to wash or float away, as dirt, dust, froth, etc., on or mixed with, water || Khm hel to swim, M hī to drift, to swim.—At first sight the connection appears as a very convincing one. But the root of buhel is also found in bohi flowing, bohao to be floated away; to blow as wind; to run, as the king’s writ, bahi flowing, running, as opposed to stagnant, buhi dač running water, etc.—hehel (hehelok) seems to be the so-called repetitive form of a Santali her to wear away, to trim, prune.

15. (339) bohor-bohor rippling sound of water || Khm hur, S hor to flow, Kha tüid hur-hur gurgling (of water).—The root is the same which we saw in the preceding group.

16. (115) daṭom to seize with the claws or pincers as crabs, scorpions, etc. || S tam to seize, to hold, M tüm a trap.—Two lines higher one can read in the dictionary daṭo the claws or pincers of crabs. Thus no connection exists with a root tom, the root is daṭ.
17. (82) đaṭo the claws or pincers of crabs, etc. || B bōta instrument for the removing of the grains from cotton.—See the preceding group.

18. (99) koteć to break by striking with something, as a stone with a hammer; to rupture by beating the seminal ducts instead of castration, otec to open, to gape, as a ripe pod, or as roasted grain, with or without a noise, to burst, peteć to snip off, to break off, to break off with the fingers, to nip off, as a twig or small branch, seteć to husk dhan the first time || M tak, to burst, Khm tāc, tēc rent, fracture, B kötek, S tēc to break, N tēk-haṇa to tear (cloth), N tōk-ṇa to break (rope, cane), N et-tāc-haṇa to husk, Kha pētāid to open, to separate.—

All this also looks at first very striking, but koteć is a suffixed form of an onomatopoeic kot as shown by kuṭām to hammer, to drive in or give a blow with a hammer or mallet, to fell as an ox, koṭok to tap a piece of burning wood, to knock off the ashes, koṭapo to rap, to make a rapping or tapping sound, etc.—otec is a suffixed form of the root of, as shown by oṭak to remove, to put out of the way, to uncover, to open, as a book, to remove a covering, lid, etc., to turn over.—peteć has a root pet (probably an onomatopoeic also), as shown by petes applied to any short clicking or cracking sound, poṭak to strip off or remove the outer covering, as the bark of a tree; to break or injure a smooth surface, as a flower, etc.; to rub off, peel off, or remove a portion, as of the skin; to bare, as a field of its crop, grass, etc., phut to separate, to break off from, to be unpaired, to become odd, as one of a pair, the other having died, phat (mente) with a sound as of a tear, split or crack.—seteć is the same as seteć to pierce, to penetrate. Thus nothing remains of Schmidt’s whole group to prove a connection with Khm etc. words.

19. (117) kuṭām to hammer, to drive in or give a blow with a hammer or mallet, to fell, as an ox || Khm tāl to hammer, to forge, S tām to knock oneself (really, to butt, as oxen), B tēm to hammer, to forge, Kha tem to beat. See the preceding group; further koṭa to shake, knock or brush, kuṭasi a hammer; the Santali word has nothing common with a root tam.

20. (31) đakar-ḍakur (Campbell gives ḍakar-ḍukur, ḍakar-ḍukur) ¹ to shake, to jolt, to waddle, ṭakur (Schmidt’s to hang loosely, but I

¹ Rev. P. O. Bodding, the greatest authority for Santali, informs us that Campbell’s dictionary is far from being a safe guide for a separation of the pure dentals and the caccuminals. Further the rendering of the vowels is not always reliable.
could not find the word in Campbell) || B kôkôr to be anxious, S kur to knead, to jostle.—No connection with B and S; the Santali root is the onomatopoeic ḍak, ḍak, ḍuk, ḍuk, as shown by Campbell’s ḍhakar-ḍhokor, ḍhakar-ḍhokor to wobble, to roll or heave when walking, to lift up the whole side with foot, ḍhakor-ḍhakor the sound produced by shaking anything as a door, etc., rattling, ḍhakuć to have sexual intercourse, to copulate; to shake the loins, ḍeket to loosen by shaking, as a post fixed in the ground, ḍhak-ḍhak, ḍhak ḍhakok to palpitate, throb, go pit-a-pat, flutter, etc.

21. (33) ḍakal-ḍakal to move the body, as Santali girls when dancing; to shake, as when sitting in a fast train; to move, as the adipose tissue on the bodies of some fat women || B hōkol strongly heaving waves, N ṣakal-ḥata to dart (snake).—A root kal cannot come into question; the root is probably the same as shown for the preceding group, an interchange of the terminal r and l is as common in Santali as in many other languages.

22. (41) ḍagak-ḍagak by jerks, by switches || Khm guk little cuffs, S gok to give a cuff.—No connection exists with a root guk, gok; as shown by ḍagar-ḍagar by jerks, jerkingly, ḍagmagao to shake, confuse; to be dizzy. (Perhaps the same root as in the two preceding groups.)

23. (269) sorloḳ to run into, to pierce, as a thorn or any other sharp pointed object, to enter craftily || N kalok-ḥata to pierce through the heart, ṭ M luk to run against somebody.—The Santali root is sor, as shown by suruc to insert, to go into or among, to bore his way, suruṅ to bore a hole in a rock for blasting, a hole bored in a rock for blasting, surq a disease affecting cattle, perforation of palate.

24. (240) suruṅ || Khm rūn, to excavate, to hollow, S ruṅ a cavern, S čondruṅ bore-worm, M karōṅ a groove.—The root is sur and not ruṅ, as shown by the previous group.

25. (311) gusuṅ-gusuṅ alone and silent || Kha sūt-suṅ deep solitude.—Campbell’s parallel form gusur-gusur contradicts any such connection.

26. (170) bunum a white ant-hill || Khm bhnā mountain, hill.—The examples in Campbell, such as bunum dhopo an ant-hill (where dhopo is a hillock), and bunum ēnga the queen white ant (where ēnga is mother), prove that bunum does not refer to the “mountain” but to the insect.

27. (166) dulḍul globular, in form like an air-bubble, globular and hollow; swim of fish || B dōḍul float in the air (‘schweben in der
Luft’’).—“Swim of fish” has here nothing to do with “float in the air”, but with the air bubbles which characterize the former.

28. (145) huḍiḥ small, young || Khm déh dwarf, monster (“Missgeburt”), B deh, södeh little finger, little toe, Kha dain to cut off (“abschneiden”).—The entry huḍu huḍuṇ, a very small quantity or piece, points towards huḍ as the root.

29. (229) gayum to finish, all, the whole, stump and rump || B höium to collect, to amass.—But in connection with gayum Campbell also quotes gayup.

30. (29) tulkap short and branchy, as a tree; to bend, as ears of grain when ripe; short, as hair || B kūp to bend the head profoundly, S kūp to overthrow.—A few lines further tulpa, tulpi, having short hair; low and short branched, as a tree, bring the proof for a root tul.

31. (297) lerva to bend over or down, to sink || Khm khwe to alter (“ändern”), Khm painwe to turn oneself away from, B uē to twist, cross-wise.—Campbell quotes lerva, and at the same time also lerwaḳ to incline to one side of the neck, lirwa to bend over, backwards or downwards, larea crooked, applied to trees, lorkoĉ to hang down, as the head of a child who can’t hold its neck stiff, instances which point towards a root ler instead of a root we, uē as supposed by Schmidt.

32. (39) digo-dogo lazy, slothful; a sluggard || B gō to wait.—Campbell’s dogdog, dogdogo heavy, indisposed to move, as one who has gorged himself with food, dogdogo a feeling of want of elasticity in the body, languid, inert, as one gorged with food; to lounge about, prove that no connection with a root gō exists.

33. (225) tomol-daḳ to be wearied, worried, bothered, annoyed || B mōl in a bad temper.—tomol, tumul means marrow and daḳ water; tumul dakentæa his marrow has become water, he has become enfeebled, wearied.

34. (265) tele to gather with the hand and put back into the mortar the rice or other grain which has escaped when being husked, cleaned, or pounded || Khm preleḥ to collect in handfuls, B leh, pleḥ to collect and detach, S pleḥ to collect, N halēgh-haty to search.—Thus tele is in some way “to refill”. Campbell quotes thuḷ to complete, to get ready, entire, complete, undiminished, thele-thele ample, more than sufficient, as food, tuṭulao full to the brim, tolσlao, tiṭilao to be superabundant, to be tense, to be congested, to be more than enough, etc. It is evident that no connection with a root leh exists.

35. (238) laṛun-laṛuṇ, laṛaṇ-laṛaṇ to dangle, to hang loosely, as the tongue of a bell, or the loose coupling of a waggon, to sway back-
wards and forwards, as the tongue of a bell || Khm anrañ, anruñ to dangle, S ēran in suspense, Kha synrañ to move hither and thither.—

As we see, Schmidt takes the Santali words for prefixed forms of the roots rañ, ruñ. But it may be inferred from Campbell’s larkuč to hang loosely, to dangle; to move or bend as a limb, laru the tongue of a bell, liṛg-loro loosely, as well as from many other instances, that lar is the root.

36. (37) dekhit with eyes open, deliberately || Khm khit to fix, to determine.—Compare with dekhense let me see, dekhaok to be seen, to appear, to come into view.

37. (152) lándup to fall in, to collapse || M dúp to get aground, as a ship, Khm dāb low, below.—One line higher stands lánduṛ to fall, to collapse. See further ländhu to cause to lay flat, as growing grain, grass, etc., to lay low, to break or transgress, as a law.

38. (87) ḍatāk to stick to, to adhere, as clay to the feet || B tok to communicate ("sich mitteilen"), Kha tah to besmear, Kha kytaḥ to touch.—No connection whatever with tok, tah; see ġetke adhesive, sticky, as wet clay.

39. (40) tege-tege to pull, to pull at, to pull out, as a piece of elastic || Khm gās to dig up ("aufgraben"), to clear away ("wegräumen"), S gahi outwards.—See in the dictionary taogar elastic, ṭaogar large.

40. (216) hamut to lie down with the arms round, to nestle, as a child in its mother’s bosom || N mut to lie hidden.—With hamut the form hambut is also quoted by the dictionary.

41. (345) (tahas)-nahas to dissipate || Khm huos to pass beyond, M āh to overflow.—As shown by Campbell tahas-nahas is a jingle.

42. (77) ġanjal (joṅgal) anxiety, trouble, embarrassment, difficulty, strain || Khm ġal, ġul hit ("Stoss"), wound (really shock).—That ġanjang is the root appears from ġanje to stagger, faint from hunger, ġanjangati emaciated (through fever), ġanjanghat, ġanjanghot distress, worry, ġonje slim, thin, poor, ġonjroč thin, slim, poor, etc.

43. (142) déč the second ploughing of a field which is across the first || Khm kandēč chips, splinters, Kha dait to bite, to gnaw, to itch.—We find the same déč (with the ġ as usually voiced) in Campbell’s dojā second growth, second brew. The root is the same as in the Aryan desar, desra second, another; it has nothing to do with "splinters" or with a "gnawing".

44. (331) ḍahok envy, spite, malice || Khm kühok anger, B hok easily inclined to anger, N ḍaṅ-natō to scold.—All these connections do not exist, ḍahok is a suffixed form of ḍah envy, enmity, ill-will.
45. (95) kaṭič small, insignificant, young, ēurōtuṛuγ stunted, undersized, butuṛ short, applied to the ears of rice, oats, wheat, etc., pedeγpedeγ, piḍiγ-piḍiγ small, applied to children, kaḍeγ a small twig, a piece of wood about the thickness of a lead pencil, ḍuγ small, dwarfish, ḍaγ-ṭuγ small, young, deγ small || Khm tiγ-tuoγ a little ("wenig"), tiγ doγ, tūγ small ("klein"), M ḍot small, Kha khynđiat small, a little, Kha khynđit a little.—

A large group indeed, and Schmidt does not fail to infer many things from it (see p. 100, footnote). But he overlooked in Campbell many words showing kaṭ as the root for kaṭič, such as koṭlo, kuṭli dwarfish, khaṭo baḍho short and long, small and large, unequal, khaṭo to be short, to be in want, to be insufficient, kaṭār less than sufficient, kheṭra small, dumpy. The root of ēurōtuṛuγ appears in ēoroṭho stunted, puny, blasted, blighted, shrivelled, ? ēuruγ to give, or put down in small quantities, ēura, ēuruγ small, stunted in growth, etc.1—butuṛ has a root but, the same as in butuṛ, butuṛ a child, butṛa, butṛi short in stature, dumpy, dwarfish, botkoṇ a low hill, a large mound, etc.—We find the root of pedeγ and piḍiγ in pedγo short, dwarfish, pedeγ short, dwarfish, low, dumpy, and we also find for piḍiγ-piḍiγ a variant form piḍir-piḍiγ.—kaḍeγ figures in Campbell also in the form of kaḍeγ, therefore the root cannot be deγ.—Finally the connection ḍaγ, ḍuγ, deγ and M ḍot, etc., can be also a fortuitous one; see Magyar ded, which has the same meaning, i.e. little, as a child.

46. (328) mesal to mix, to adulterate || Khm rasal violent ("heftig") movement.—Schmidt has omitted to consider on the same page and in the same column mesao to mix, mesa misi to mix, to mingle, to confuse, and an another page misić, misiţ to be mixed, as two herds of cattle, etc.

47. (219) tirmiț to twist, to squeeze or rub between a finger and the thumb || Khm meć, mić "pincer" (to pinch).—See in the dictionary tirḥol to rub in the hands, to twist by rubbing in the palms of the hand, to rub the eyes. The root is not meć, mić, but tir, the same as in ćerć to anoint with oil and turmeric (i.e. to rub).

48. (266) halak to be ruined, to be destitute, to be in want of the necessaries of life; destruction, ruin, difficulty || Khm lāk to abandon, to reject, N ok-lāk-haŋa to avoid.—Campbell’s hale dale, hale ğan to be destitute, to be in want, to be needy, necessitous, pinched,

1 For an interchange of Santali ē and ě see also ēoro-ćoro = ěoro-ćoro dropping of water, ēumkaŋ = ěomkaṅ to assemble, ěhau-ćhau = ěhau-ćhau in crowds, etc.
straightened, perplexed, and ? hulgr to destroy, to consume, to lay waste, point a root hal and not a root lâk.

49. (178) ĝapit to sleep, to close the eyes, ĝilpit to blink with the eyes, unable to open the eyes to the full, ĝhapit secret || Khm pit to cover, to lay on, Khm pâpit to conceal, S pôt to lime, to lay on, B pit to press on something. The Santali words are not prefixed forms of a root pit, they are all suffixed forms, and it suffices again merely to turn over Campbell’s pages to find the proofs for it. Thus we see there ĝhap-ĝhap very sleepy, drowsy; ĝilip to blink as one who has looked on the sun; ĉhapkao to crouch, to keep out of sight, ĉhapkaote secretly, stealthily.

50. (105) beten-beten talkative, to snap at, to reply testily || Khm kren tain-tain to blab.—As shown in the dictionary by baţa to blab, to blunder, etc., and baţan-baţan to snap at, to reply testily, the root is beţ.

51. (94) tataň (Campbell writes tetaň) thirst, to thirst, to be thirsty || M than thirsty, ? Kha than-an to hunger.—The root is tet and not taň, as shown by teťosas to be thirsty.

52. (292), ĝolom to plaster a wattle wall with clay || B lôm, lüm to roll up (“ollen”), to pack up, S lôm, löm to varnish, to oil, M slô to cover over, to overspread, Khm ĝlû to clothe (“bekleiden”), to cover over.—See ĝalat to stick, to adhere, to press against.

53. (234) ĝiri to rain || M barai to sprinkle (“besprengen”), to scatter abroad (“ausstreuen”), Khm brôy to scatter, to let gush.—Campbell’s dictionary, which was used by Schmidt to show all his connections, is crowded with words attesting the root ĝar:—ĝhar-ĝhar, ĝhar-ĝhar pelting, as rain, ĝhoro-ĝhoro applied to the sound of falling or dripping water, ĝhoro-ĝhoro sound of wind and rain, ĝiri-ĝiri, ĝhiri-ĝhiri to trickle down, ĝoro to drop, to trickle, to leak, ĝorok, ĝorop oozing out of water, as through the embankment of a dam, ĝhar-ĝhar to issue as water from a spring, ĝarna a spring of water, etc.

54. (267) miluk-ĝiluk miserable, woebegone, wretchedly, poor and wasted || Khm ĝhuk, ĝhluk suffocated (“erstickt”).—As stated in the introduction, we shall abstain from inquiring into the semasiological value of Schmidt’s connections and quote exclusively Campbell’s dictionary; thus we find there for miluk: mirlun sad, dejected, pitiable, miserable looking, and for ĝiluk: ĝirlun depressed, having a sad or downcast look, emaciated, worn out, i.e. the two sources of miluk-ĝiluk.

55. (247) ĉerën shrill, discordant, scorching, as the sun’s rays ||
56. (50) raṅgap thin, slim || B ṅāp to sink and fall, Khm raṅāp to become still and to be extinguished, Kha ṇop to sink under. ("Original meaning of all the forms: 'to become lighter, weaker.'"—Schmidt.)—The Santali root is raṅg, the same as in ṛaṅdun tall, high, tall and slim, raṅkar, raṅkūr high, tall.²

57. (61) bačol escape, salvation, rest, respite || Khm ćol to reject ("verwerfen"), to leave in the lurch.—Campbell quotes also bačon. See there further bačlao to preserve, to save, to escape, to depend on, baṅcao to save, to escape.³

58. (146) gadut disobedient, self-willed, obstinate, lazy || B dōt to hold fast, to hinder.—See gador disobedient, obstinate, gandig lazy, sluggish, slow.

59. (199) ḍabot to restrain, to forbid, to keep under; to interdict, ḍobot to attach property under a warrant, to sequestrate || B bōt, bāt to embank, to press together, to hold fast, S bat to close up ("einschliessen"), Kha bat to hold fast.—The root of ḍabot appears in the dictionary in dob, dobon to prohibit, to lay an embargo on, interdict, ḍābri to keep under, check, scold, oppress, despise, threaten, ḍābruć to restrain, to put down, to quiet, etc.—Concerning ḍobot, we find ḍabod to attach, to sequestrate, to restrain, to forbid, to restrain, ḍabo to overpower, to restrain, to set down, to snub, ḍobdo, ḍōbdhao, ḍobdo, ḍabuṅ to overpower, to overcome, to render powerless; as many instances for a root ḍob.

60. (175) ćelpēṅ sunk, subsided, hollow, as the bridge of the nose || Khm pen flat, flattened, S pin to press on something.—The examples brought by Campbell, as ćelpēṅ mū a hollow nose, ēpe mū flat-nosed, ēpe flat, flattened, ēpré, ēpréć pug-nosed, flat-nosed, ēpēl flat, low, as a ridge of a rice field, are as many proofs for a root ćelp, ēp.⁴

61. (326) pasar to open, to unfold, to spread out, to distend, to expand, to increase || M gasow to be sloping.—But what about pasnāo-

---

¹ For the alteration Santali ē = ē see footnote of No. 45.
² For the change of ṅ (ng) to k see footnote of No. 9.
³ baṅc may be the original root; an elision of the nasals from a group of two consonants in the middle or at the end of a word is very frequent in Santali; see ē∂odao = ēdoda to separate, ēndre = ēdre to be angry, ērānad = ērānad rascally, etc.
⁴ For the elision of the l see ēcape = ēpe to float, ēṇdli = ēṇdi bald, sikhlu = sikhgu to teach, etc.
to spread, to disperse, and *pasunte, pasanti* to spread, to scatter, to begin, to have in hand? Thus the root is clearly *pas*.

62. (327) *sisirgu* to start, to shiver, to quake with fear, *pasir* to break up and spread, as water falling on a hard surface, to fly off, as sparks, spray, to spatter, etc. || M *kasī* to tremble, Kha *s’ir* dizzy, Khm *čan’er* to winnow, N *kosī-hâng* to sift grain, N *pośi-nâh* trouble, worry, disturb.—The root of *sisirgu* is *sisi*, see *susu-susu*, *susewgu* to chitter, the sound produced through the teeth when chittering or shivering, *sisi-sisi* to whistle through the teeth. (For the root *pas* in *pasir*, see the preceding group.)

63. (106) *hetet* to annoy, irritate, provoke; means of provoking, etc., *gotet* to touch (“berühren”), *kanjet* (*konjet*) to stick in the throat, to choke, *retet*, *rijet* to crush, to jam, to squeeze || B *pôtit* to ask urgently, S *tit* to press, to lace (“schnüren”), Khm *tit* to touch, to join closely, Khm *pretit* to lace tightly, M *diit* to rub into powder.—Not the slightest connection exists between the Santali words and the ones compared with them: it is enough to consult Campbell’s dictionary to disclose it. We find there for the root of *hetet*, *het*, as shown by *hut-hut* close, oppressive, and *hantaos*, *handkaos*¹ to annoy, to bother, further *hudgu dugur* to annoy, trouble.—*gojet* does not appear at all in the dictionary, but I find *godak* to touch one to call his attention.—*kanjet* is a suffixed form of *kanța* the throat.—The root of *retet*, *rijet* will be disclosed by *ret tepet* chock full, crammed, compact, packed closely, *retepete* packed closely, crowded, pressed together, compact, *rođec* to squeeze out or strain by squeezing, to wring out.

64. (279) *ğelen-ğeleń* long, tall || M *ğaliń* to lengthen, M *gliń*, N *ğliń* long, B *ōrih-hōlin* longevity (ōrih to live).—See *ğhal* long, tall.

65. (298) *ćewak* to break or chop, to cut through by chopping || M *kawak* a half, B *wak* space between two columns, S *uk* to keep open.—Campbell’s *ćewec* to break, to snap shows that the connection does not exist.

66. (89) *sațak-suțuk* sound of nibbling, ripping, dripping or dropping || Khm *tak* sound of trickling drops, N *patâk-su* to fall, to drop, M *qatak-eñ* to tumble.—*sațar-suțur* sound of nibbling, *sațpat* to make a slight noise (imitative) shows the onomatopoeic *saț* as the root.

67. (313) *gusuć, ghusuć* to push oneself in between, to force a way in, to make a way for oneself by pushing into or aside || B *šoc* sting of an insect, S *süič* sting of a scorpion.—See *ghus-ghus* internally, *ghasen*, *gasen* amidst, amongst.

¹ For the elision of the nasal a see the footnote to No. 57.
68. (101) sūtūc to search for by feeling with the fingers or by removing or lifting small objects. (As in "He is fishing out the bits of meat.") || Khm tūōc to touch, to reach, sticky, Khm tānuōc a drop, S atuēc to trickle down, S tuēc-dāk, a drop, Kha tāid to flow, Kha syntūid slippery, sticky.—The root is sūt. See suthni a little, a pinch, a grain, sutrūc small, insignificant, ? sūtk to inquire, ? sutrāgū to inquire, to inquire into, to investigate.

69. (86) čoṭāk, potāk to detach, to peel off ("ablösen, abstreifen") || B tāk to take off, to turn aside, M khatāk to tear away, Khm tāk husks (of rice).—Once more the connection is non-existent; the root of čoṭāk (to peel off, to become detached, to be splintered, to be rubbed off) appears also in čatiē to scale off, to come off in flakes; to open, as the pods of leguminous plants when ripe and the seeds fall out; (-aḵ and -iḵ being most common Santali suffixes).—potāk (the same as seen in our No. 18) figures also in the form potor and no interchange of a k into an r occurs in Santali.

70. (110) letep-letep weak, only able to breathe || Khm tiep "avorté (fruits)", Khm ketip embryonal fruit.—Schmidt could see in Campbell’s dictionary only two lines higher: leteq-peteq weak, emaciated, feeble and lean: further, this immediately in the line following, letep-letep, leteq-peteq weak, feeble and emaciated. Then he could read letrok ill-conditioned, let¹eqt ill-conditioned, līṭir-līṭir weak, emaciated and feeble, latlahā lean, emaciated, feeble, poor; as many proofs for a root le!, because once more no connection whatever exists with the Khmer words adduced by Schmidt.

Only the lack of space prevents us from continuing our demonstration here. Otherwise many more instances could be given of W. Schmidt’s errors.

We do not want to assert that there are no common elements between Santali and Khmer, etc., etc., but they are very few; further, even a part of them relates to terms connected with the manifestations of civilization, thus out; they are probably loan-words.¹

As a matter of fact, W. Schmidt says in his book that he has “established beyond all doubt the intimate connection of the Munḍa languages with Nicobarese, Khasi and the Mon-Khmer languages”,

¹ For instance, Schmidt’s No. 1 aḵ a bow, No. 4 uṅ to plait, No. 10 ara a saw, No. 47 gāt a knot, No. 104 teṅ to weave, etc. (and even some analogous numerals need not be common, but may have been borrowed).
and that this connection is "no longer a hypothesis but a fact which claims the same degree of certainty as the connection of the Indo-Germanic tongues with each other" (page 17).

The proofs for this assertion seem to be lacking.

And since the "Austric" family was inaugurated by Schmidt in consequence of his supposed discovery of connections with the Munđa family, the right of existence for an "Austric" family must also remain in suspense.

Moreover, if the family could be found to which the Munđa languages do belong, the "Austric" one must cease to exist.

*And such is the case, since the Munđa languages belong to the Finno-Ugrian family."

But that is for another time.

*Vienna,*

*July, 1930.*
GLEANINGS FROM EARLY URDU POETS

III. MUHAMMAD QULI QUTB SHAH, KING OF GOLKUNDA, 1580-1611.

By T. GRAHAME BAILEY

THIS remarkable writer, the founder of Haidarabad, and probably the first literary poet in the language, was the fourth king of the Qutb Shahi dynasty which ruled in Golconda, one of the five states into which the Deccan was divided after the break up of the Bahmani kingdom. In the last number of the Bulletin I gave reasons for believing that he was an earlier writer than Vajhi, who in 1609 wrote the masnavi known as Qutb Mushari, in which he related a story having this very monarch for hero. Only five years after Qul Qutb Shahi’s death his works were collected by his nephew and successor. They have never been published, but the beautiful original MS. compiled under the orders of his nephew in 1616 is still in Haidarabad. It consists of 1,800 pages and has perhaps 100,000 lines.

Though he lived so long ago his name is one of the greatest in Urdu. He shows wonderful human interest, for he writes of everyday matters, Hindu and Muhammadan festivals, the customs of the country, life in his palace, the celebration of his birthday, and of natural objects such as fruit, vegetables, and flowers. The only poets who can be compared with him are Sauda and Nazir, both of whom he excels in description of nature, while in his sympathetic account of Hindu life he is superior to all other Muhammadan poets.

I have given here translations of three poems. The first is a charming little lyric, in which he tells of his affection for a nut-brown maid; the second was written on the occasion of his birthday. The third is a love poem rather more general than the first, but not nearly so conventional as most Urdu gazals. There is a directness about it which is very attractive. His Dakni poems were written under the name of Mauani.

The words between brackets in the following text are suggested emendations where the text seems to me to be faulty.

NHAJNI SÂOLI

1. Nhani saval | par kiyä hâ nazâr
   Khabar sab gavâkar huâ be khabar.
2. Tirâ qadd sarv nikle jab chand sô
   Dasan [disan] jot munj kâ disan jyâ qamar.
3. Pavan seti hat rākhī hai āp kamar
   Sūraj cand naman jhamke vū zar kamar.
4. Maï us nur sö lubdyā hū kyā ‘ajab
   Do jag roshnī pāyā kis nē khabar?
5. Tū dūri dārāve munje dūr the
   Vū kyā būjhe mo dil mē hai tū nagar.
6. Mā‘āni ke bātā the jharṭā namak
   Jî cākhē kahe hai namak sō shakar.

(Mahbūb uz Zamān, 759.)

BARAS GÄTH

1. Nabī kī du‘ā the baras gāth pāyā
   Khushyā kī khabar ke damāme bajarāyā
2. Piyā hā mai Ḥazrat ke hat āb i kauṣar
   Tū shāhā āpar mujh kulas kar banāyē.
3. Merā quth tārā hai tāryā mē nājīl [nājīl]
   Tū mujh bar falak rang kā catr chāyā.
4. Sūraj candr pī tāl hokar bajar tab
   Mandāl ho falak ṭamṭamāyā bajarāyā.
5. Kore Mushtārī raqs muj bazm mē nit
   Baras gāth mē Zuhra kalyān gāyā.
6. Merā gulistā tāza is te huā hai
   Mujh is bāg the mevā damdam khilāyā.
7. Dinde dushmanā kū so yak jā milākar
   So ispand ke mātārā karnā cāhā.
8. Khudāyā Ma‘ānī kī ummed bar lyā
   Ki jyā sāt kī mehā te jag sab akhāyā [aghāyā]
9. Khudā kī raṣā sō baras gāth āyā
   Sahi shukr kar tū baras gāth āyā.
10. Du‘ā e imāmā the mujh rūj qāim
    Khudā zindagānī kā pānī pīlāyā.
11. Gul i Muṣṭafā sete serā gundāyā
    Mujh is gul kā serā ḥamail banāyā.

(Mahbūb uz Zamān, p. 752.)

PIYĀ

1. Piyā bāj pyālā piyā jāe nā
   Piyā bāj yaktal jiyā jāe nā.
2. Kahe the piyā bin subūrī karā
   Kahyā jāe ammā kiyā jāe nā.
3. Nahī 'ishq jis voh bārā kūr hai
   Kahi' us se mil baisēō jāē nā.
4. Quṭb Shāh na de muj divāne ko pand
   Divāne ko kuc pand diyā jāē nā.

(Urdu, ii, 5, 22.)

THE LITTLE DARK GIRL

From the Dīvān of Muḥammad Quļī Quṭb Shāh,
King of Golkunḍa 1580-1611

1. Mine eyes have seen a little girl's dark face
   and have become forgetful of all else.
2. Thy cypress form comes out coquettishly
   and lights appear to me like moon rays fair.
3. Swift as the wind her hands surround her waist,
   that golden waist then shines like sun and moon.
4. No wonder that her radiance conquers me,
   the light of earth and heaven: who knows it not?
5. Thy absence drear affrights me from afar;
   how can she know her home is in my heart?
6. Look, salt is dropping from Ma'āni's words,
   but when one tastes, it is not salt, but sweet.

MY BIRTHDAY

Muḥammad Quļī Quṭb Shāh, King of Golkunḍa

1. Through the prayer of the Prophet I've now reached my birthday
   And beaten the drums sounding forth the good news.
2. I have drunk at the hand of Muḥammad sweet nectar;
   God therefore has made me the crown over kings.
3. The Pole star, my name star is nobler than all,
   My canopy coloured expands in the sky.
4. The sun and the moon both are clashing like cymbals
   With sky for arena and tambourines' sound.
5. There Jupiter dances to honour my birthday,
   While Venus is chanting a victory song.
6. My garden is thus overflowing with freshness,
   And furnishes fruit every hour of the day.
7. My enemies all in one place God has gathered
   And wishes to burn them like incense in fire.
8. Fulfil, O my God, all my hope's expectation,
   As Thou gladdenedst the earth with the soft rain of peace.
9. The favour of God has brought me my birthday,
   Give true thanks to Him for thy birthday now reached.
10. Through prayers of the priests my kingdom stands firmly,
    God gives me to drink of the water of life.
11. And weaving a garland of roses from Persia
    Has threaded the garland on me as the cord.

**LIFE IN A LOVE**

By Muḥammad Qulī Quṭb Shāh, King of Golkūnda

1. Without the loved one wine cannot be drunk,
   Nor without her one moment life be lived.
2. They said "Show patience absent from your love";
   This can be said, but surely not be done.
3. The man who knows not love is merciless,
   Never with such a one hold speech or sit.
4. I am distracted, give me no advice,
   Never to such as I is counsel given.

**Notes**

The royal author's fondness for indigenous words should be observed.

*Nhanī Sāōlī*

1. nhanī, U. nannhī : ġāvākar, losing.
3. naman, like : vū, U. voh : quṭb tārā, a play on his own name.
4. lubdyā, connected with lubdh ; nē, U. nahī.
5. tū, U. terā, terī.

*Baraśgāth,* in later U. sālgira

3. nājīl, an obvious mistake. I suggest nājīl.
7. ispand seeds were burnt as incense to drive off evil spirits.
8. sāt for shānti.
11. gul i Muṣṭafā, for gul i Muḥammadī, the ordinary Persian rose. sete for setī ; serā for sihrā.

*Piyā.* p. 203, line 1, kūr, Hindi, not Persian,
EARLY URDU CONVERSATION

By T. Grahame Bailey

It is natural that records of the beginnings of Urdu should be almost entirely confined to literature or quasi literature. Yet there are two classes of books which contain references to conversation; firstly, early lives of holy men (especially in the Deccan and Gujrat), whose followers wrote accounts of their sayings and doings, occasionally quoting actual words; secondly, histories such as those by Firishta and Abu’l Fazl, in which we may find Urdu sentences spoken by emperors or kings. Urdu must often have been employed as the language of conversation in exalted circles even though the official language continued to be Persian.

In works by Maḥmūd Shīrānī, Shams Ullāh Qādri, and the late ‘Abd ul Ḥay Nadvī, a few of these early sayings are given (not always in the same form). Some can be so far verified in printed books, others are taken from MSS. and we cannot be certain of their age. However, in spite of our suspicions they have considerable interest. Exhaustive search would no doubt reveal many more. Regarding the question of date, see my note on the “Date of old Urdu Composition”, in J.R.A.S., October, 1930, under “Miscellanea”.

Before proceeding to the scraps of talk I give two lines, said to be found in Bābur’s Turki Dīvān. It will be seen that a line and a half are Urdu.

\[
\text{muja ka na hu a kuj havas mānāk o moti } \\
\text{fuqārā hālina bas bulgusidur pānī o rūtī} \\
\]

“I have no desire for gems or pearls, for (the state of) poor people sufficient are water and bread”.

The MS. is in the library of the Navāb of Rāmpūr, and was written in 1529.

c. 1260. Shekh Farīd ud Din Ganj i Shakar, d. about 1267, used to call a certain friend bhayyā “brother” (Asrār ul Awliyā, p. 3). On being asked where intelligence dwelt he replied bīc sir ke “in the head” (Malfūzāt, p. 40).

C. 1350. Somewhere between 1325 and 1357 Khvāja Naṣīr ud Din Čirāg, d. 1357, said to his Khalifa, comparing him with another holy man, tum āpar ve tale “you are above, he is below” (Firishta, ii, 399).
c. 1400. A sentence by the famous Khvāja Banda Navāz is reported in 'Ishq Nāma, the work of a disciple 'Abd Ullāh bin Raḥmān Cishti: bhūkō muce sā Khudā kach aparṭā hai Khudā kā aparne kī istīdād hor hai "does one reach God by dying of hunger? It is by other means that one reaches God".

Once a friend said to him: Khvāja Burhān ud Din bālā hai "Burhān ud Din is exalted". He answered: pūnā kā cānd bālā hai "the full moon is exalted".

c. 1362. According to the Tārīkh i Fīrozī, Fīroz Shāh Tuglaq, 1351–88, after his successful attack on Sindh, said: barkat Shekh theā ik mūvā ik nahā "by the blessing of the Shekh one died one did not".

The successors of Fīroz Shāh Tuglaq ordered the expulsion of most of the slaves brought by him from other parts of India. Many hid themselves, and when caught claimed to be inhabitants of Delhi. Like the Ephraimites of old who were asked to say sibolet and said sibole, these men, it is said, were given a test in pronunciation. They were told to say khārī khārī, but were not able to say it in the same way as the true city people.

c. 1430. Quṭb 'Ālam, a famous religious leader in Gujrat, who died between 1446 and 1453, had a son called Sirāj ud Din. Shāh Bārak Allāh Cishti gave Sirāj ud Din the name of Shāh 'Ālam. On hearing this his father remarked Cishtiī ne pakāī aur Bukhārī ne khāī "the Cishtīs cooked it and the Bukhāris ate it" (Tuhfat ul Ikrām, 47, 8). Quṭb 'Ālam and Shāh 'Ālam were Bukhāris.

c. 1430. The Mirāt i Sikandarī records six sentences. Two are reported of Quṭb 'Ālam, who has just been mentioned. We may put their date as about 1430. Once on his way to early morning prayer he hurt his foot against a solid substance lying on the ground and exclaimed: lohe yā lakkār yā patthar yā kyā hai "iron or wood or stone or what is it?". It turned out to be a bit of a meteorite with the qualities of all three. When his son Shāh 'Ālam’s fiancée was taken from him by Muḥammad Shāh, king of Gujrat, and her less well-favoured sister substituted, Shāh 'Ālam complained to his father who replied: beta tussā naṣīb duhū vījh "son your fate is (bound up) in both". Another version makes the last two words duhū baćca fancifully translated as "the buffalo and the young one", or "the buffalo and the calf". This prophecy was fulfilled, for when the king died his widow went to live with her sister, Shāh 'Ālam’s wife. On the death of this sister she married Shāh 'Ālam.
c. 1450. Another sentence is recorded as spoken by Shāh ‘Ālam himself. Sultan Aḥmad Shāh of Gujrat sought the life of one of the boy princes, Maḥmūd Shāh, whom Shāh ‘Ālam was sheltering in his house. The king arrived unexpectedly at the house, but the saint transformed the boy into a venerable man. As the king entered Shāh ‘Ālam said to the boy: padh ḍokre “recite, old man”. Aḥmad Shāh, not finding the boy, went away. This Maḥmūd Shāh was king of Gujrat from 1459 to 1511. Once on being insulted he said: nīcā berī har koī jhore “every one shakes (the fruit off) a low ber tree”.

c. 1510. To Sikandar Shah, heir apparent, and later king of Gujrat for two and a half months, is attributed the saying: pīr muvā murīd jogī hucā “the saint is dead, the disciple has become a jogī”.

c. 1535. Finally, when Bahādur Shāh of Gujrat was betrayed by Rūmī Khā to Humāyūn in 1535, his parrot fell into Humāyūn’s hands. It astonished and no doubt amused him by screaming, upon the announcement of Rūmī Khā’s arrival: phīt Rūmī Khā ḥarāmkhor, phīt Rūmī Khā ḥarāmkhor “a curse on Rūmī Khā, traitor”, a sentiment which he had doubtless many times heard expressed in Bahādur Shāh’s palace.

Sheikh Vajih ud Din ‘Alavi, 1505-90, was another Gujrat saint. His disciples collected his sayings into a book named Bahr ul Haqāiq. The following are some of them:

c. 1570. On hearing that Sheikh Faẓl Ullāh had given up teaching, he said: jab taraqqī pakrēge tab ōpī dars kahēge “when he makes more progress he will of his own initiative give lessons”.

c. 1570. Another saying was: is se hor kyā khūb hai is dunyā mē ki dīl Khudā sā mashqūl hove “what is better in this world than that the heart should be occupied with God?”

c. 1570. Another was: ‘ārif use kahē jo Khudā sā bharyā hove “we may call him a Knower who is full of God”.

c. 1570. Again he said: agar kisi kā thoṛi bhī safā hove jo ḥarām luqma khāve yā ḥarām fīl kare to tabīc pāve, dūje bār bhī pāve “anyone who has even a little purity, if he eats an unlawful morsel or does an unlawful deed, he will immediately find it out, a second time also he will find it out, a third time also he will find it out”.

This Vajih ud Din had a nephew Shāh Ḥāshim ‘Alavi, whose sayings were collected in Maqsūd ul ‘Āshiqīn by a disciple. I quote
three of them. Two are unfortunately in verse, and therefore less conversational.

c. 1600.

dunyā chore shekh kahaē yih hijāb tujh bhule næ
 dinī shekhī sā yak maïdān païle jhûte dûje shaitān

“If anyone leaves the world he is called a shekh; this world is a mere covering, do not forget that. Religiousness and shekh-hood make up a great plain, the former are false, the latter devils.” These lines are capable of many renderings. After considering a number I have chosen the one which expresses what seems to be the most probable meaning.

c. 1600.

Hāshim jī kī sunīc bāt jinne rakkhi bāsī bhāt
uskā jāve hāte hāt

“Listen to what Hāshim says, if anyone keeps stale rice, his wealth will disappear.”

bāp ke utnā deve so pūt, bāp nē deve so supūt, bāp kā dīā chīne, so kupūt “who gives as much as his father, he is a son; if the father does not give (and yet he gives) he is a good son; he who seizes what his father gives, is a bad son”.

In the same book the following is quoted from Shāh Nizām ud Din, a pupil of Vajīh ud Din:

Nizām bandagi kare to kyā hove avval jiskā nē dil şafā
jāma sūnde mē đūb rahā ose khushbū lagāe to kyā nafā

“When a man worships, then what happens, if his heart is not clean? If a garment is steeped in perfume, what is the good of putting scent on it?”
REVIEWS OF BOOKS


In a world where "The best laid schemes o' mice an' men Gang aft a-gley" it is consoling to see a well-designed and meritorious enterprise progressing happily with a good prospect of attaining completion. In nautical phrase, Dr. Sukthankar may be said to have brought his ship into blue water, and we hope and believe that in due course after a prosperous voyage he will steer her into harbour. The present fascicules carry the text from I, xxi, 17 to I, xc, 24; thus it is advanced far enough to enable us to test the critical principles which the editor has followed, and it is satisfactory to observe that they fully justify themselves in the light of experience. On the basis of a careful collation of many MSS. from various regions Dr. Sukthankar has sought with untiring industry and keen critical skill to reconstruct a text which in the main, if not in details, may reasonably be regarded as the parent of the very diverse recensions into which the great epic has been cast at different times in different parts of India. Speaking in general terms, it may be said that the chief recensions are two, the Northern and the Southern. But after these main divisions had arisen, many further changes were made in the text in both areas. Apparently Dr. Sukthankar is right in concluding that "even after its final fixation in the North our epic was subjected in the South to a systematic diaskeuasis, during which the text was altered, amplified and even expurgated on a large scale", while "in all probability the Northern recension likewise contains some flagrant additions and alterations". Hence "only that portion of the text which is documented by both recensions may be considered as wholly certain and authentic; the rest is doubtful, in varying degrees". This modest estimate of the finality of Dr. Sukthankar’s critical reconstruction, however, must not lead us to underestimate the high value of his work: the text which he presents is mainly genuine, and the "doubtful" parts in it are relatively insignificant in quantity and quality.

The researches connected with the work have led to some interesting results, of which perhaps the most notable is the discovery...
of a Śāradā MS. on birch-bark (Ś 1) which originally comprised the Ādi, Sabhā, and Aranya, if not more, and still contains the whole of Sabhā with fragments of the other two books; and this is supplemented by a paper MS. belonging to the India Office which has been copied from a Śāradā codex closely allied to Ś 1. We thus obtain valuable evidence regarding the Kashmiri recension of the Epic, in which, we now learn, the Ādi contained only 7,984 ślokas, as against e.g. 8,479 in the Calcutta edition and 10,889 in the Southern tradition represented by the Kumbakonam edition, a fact which shows up effectively the Southerners' vicious habit of bloating their text with interpolations, to which the present fascicules bear striking testimony. The importance of the Kashmiri recension of the Epic as a whole is emphasised by Professor F. O. Schrader's recent discovery in the British Museum of the only known MS. of the Bhagavad-gitā in the Kashmiri recension, which has several noteworthy features bespeaking for it considerable antiquity. Evidently much light on the criticism of the Epic may be expected from Kashmir.

L. D. BARNETT.


The issue of a new work by Professor Belvalkar is always an event of great importance to his fellow-scholars. His skilful adoption of critical and historical methods current in the Western world, together with his most consummate pañcitship, his critical acumen, wide reading, and excellent style, make him the very paragon of an author busying himself with scientific researches on Indian subjects. And it seems to the present writer that perhaps these, his various faculties, have never risen higher nor produced a more attractive result than in the little work to be reviewed here.

The University of Calcutta is now a giant institution with a worldwide fame. There innumerable lectures are given, from there pour forth books and treatises with a torrent-like rapidity. Of all these publications many are good, some even excellent, while other ones might perhaps in the interest of scientific research just as well have been withheld. There is, however, no doubt that the Calcutta University is to be warmly congratulated upon having had the good luck
to publish under its auspices these excellent lectures by Professor Belvankar.

Of the six lectures so far published, the first is an introductory one. It sets forth with a most praiseworthy terseness and lucidity the general trend of the author's views on philosophy in general and especially on Vedānta; and to a European scholar it is extremely pleasing to find the learned author strongly emphasizing the necessity of establishing a historical outlook on the Vedānta as well as on other philosophical systems. For, admirable as is the Indian philosophy in many of its phases, Hindu research-work has almost totally neglected the historical side of its problems. And when at times we find in Hindu works some attempts at composing a history of the philosophical systems, the outcome of such attempts is often far too fanciful to be seriously taken into consideration. Such objections, however, cannot be raised against the methods of Professor Belvankar, even if we are not always able wholly to accept his theories.

The following five lectures deal with Vedānta in the Upaniṣads, in the Gitā, in the Brahmasūtras, with Gauḍapāda, and with the life and works of the great Śaṅkara. They are all alike pellucid and full of useful information; and the present writer wishes to acknowledge his profound obligation to Professor Belvankar for having granted him the pleasure of perusing these chapters full of interest and useful materials.

Some theories of Professor Belvankar's we might, with great respect and diffidence, look upon as less well established. That the "older" Veda was composed outside India—most probably in Iran—has been contended previously by the late Professor Hillebrandt, whose arguments were, as always, well worth consideration; it has also been contended lately by Professor Hertel, though, from different reasons, we are less willing to take his reasons too seriously. But in spite of this there seems to be but little foundation for these assumptions. In reality, nothing seems to militate against the suggestion that even the "older" Veda was composed within the frontiers of the Punjāb. On the other side it is, however, fairly obvious that the Aryans did possess some sort of sacrificial poetry which perhaps went back to Indo-Iranian times. That the older Vedic hymns are a later offspring of such a very ancient poetical tradition should perhaps not be denied.

We also would fain lodge a mild protest against the dates assigned by Professor Belvankar to the Upaniṣads and the Bhagavadgītā. According to our humble opinion, they are decidedly too early. To
pretend that the Gītā is “pre-Buddhist” could, in the strict sense of the word, only mean that it was composed at a time when Gotama the Buddha had not yet begun his preaching. But of such a date we are mournfully ignorant. For, let us at once admit that the dates of the Nirvāṇa, be they 544 B.C. or about 480 B.C., are nothing but constructions of a very airy nature. All we know is that about 250 B.C. Aśoka knew of the existence of certain canonical scriptures which, according to his idea, had been originally preached by the Buddha (cf. bhagavatā Budhena bhāsitā, Calcutta-Bairat); he also pretended to know that the Buddha Gotama had been born at Rummindī. That, however, is about all, for Aśoka gives us no idea of the date at which the last Buddha led his earthly life—at least not in any definite words. Thus to suggest that the Gītā is “pre-Buddhist” would in reality mean that it was composed at a wholly uncertain date as far as the Buddha himself is concerned; taking it again to mean earlier than the Buddhist canon we might perhaps arrive at a date about 300 B.C. But even that, according to our humble opinion, would be rather early. As, however, we have allowed ourselves a few reflections upon this problem in a paper on the Gītā in the Indian Antiquary we shall abstain from further discussing it here.

It is scarcely possible to point out, amongst all the excellent suggestions of Professor Belvarkar, anything that is of greater interest and value than several other things. But we may perhaps be allowed to quote from p. 74 sq., that “Yoga must all along have been theistic”, and that “we should rather say that Sāṃkhya is the theistic Yoga rendered atheistic”. These utterances, which are in distinct contradiction to the opinions of some leading European authorities, seem to us to contain the full and undeniable truth concerning the origin and interrelations of Sāṃkhya and Yoga.

We take leave of Professor Belvarkar with the assurance that with the utmost eagerness we are waiting for the continuation of his excellent and fascinating lectures.

J. C.

Fragments of the Commentaries of Skandaśvamin and Mahāēśvara on the Nirukta. Edited for the first time from the original palm leaf and paper manuscripts, written in Malayālam and Devanāgari characters, with an Introduction and Critical Notes. By Lakshman Sārup. 15 + 129 pp. Published by the University of the Panjab, n.d. (1928).
Professor Sarup’s introduction, translation, and text of the Nirukta are well known to and much appreciated by all Sanskrit scholars. He has again laid them under an obligation by publishing from four manuscripts the fragments of the Nirukta commentaries of Maheśvara and Skandāsvāmin, together with a collection of those quotations from Skandāsvāmin preserved by Devarāja in his commentary on the Nighaṇṭu. The text seems fairly good and reliable, and the printing appears to be both clear and faultless; only the cover does little honour to the efforts of the printer.

The interrelation between Skandāsvāmin and Maheśvara seems to be a somewhat obscure one, as the manuscripts attribute parts of the commentary to one and parts to the other of these authors. Professor Sarup, however, concludes that a joint authorship is in this case scarcely possible as the two supposed collaborators cannot well have been contemporaries. His solution of the problem is the following: Skandāsvāmin, who is the older author, wrote a Niruktaṭabhāsyā while Maheśvara, at a later date, composed a supercommentary on this work which the Professor prefers to style a Niruktaṭabhāsyafīkā. For this suggestion he adduces proofs by a comparison of one of the fragments preserved by Devarāja with a passage in the present text.

This may be so or may not. But we cannot avoid being slightly astonished that a conscientious scholar like Professor Sarup should apparently have overseen that since 1874 the existence of a Niruktatāfīka by Skandāsvāmin has been known. Such a work was registered by Kielhorn as No. 39 on p. 8 of his Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts existing in the Central Provinces. And we have just now got to know that such a manuscript exists among those bequeathed in 1908 by the widow of Professor Kielhorn to the Goettingen Library.¹ The simplest thing seems to be to compare this manuscript with those made use of by Professor Sarup; that possibly will solve the riddle.

In his work Untersuchungen zur Genesis der altindischen etymologischen Litteratur (Lund, 1928), the late Dr. Hannes Sköld has also dealt with Skandāsvāmin and given a collection of the fragments from Devarāja. This mainly tallies with that of Professor Sarup, though in some passages Dr. Sköld seems to have slightly misunderstood the text. Dr. Sköld availed himself of Kielhorn’s notice just as little as Professor Sarup has.

J. C.


Dr. Surendra Nath Sen, a lecturer in History in the Calcutta University, has already made himself well known to students of Indian history by his various works dealing with Shivaji, with the civil and military policy of the Marathas, etc. He has also published an important and valuable preliminary report on the Historical Records preserved at Goa, a topic concerning which we would eagerly desire some more information. Now he has again presented us with a bulky volume dealing with Shivaji and containing a collection of foreign documents—Portuguese, Dutch, English, and French—dealing with that notable person's life and actions.

Shivaji was the great national hero during that upheaval against Mogul rule which took place in the later half of the seventeenth century, and which led to the short-lived but rather fateful hegemony of the Marathas. It is curious, and in a way symptomatic, that, during these last years, Shivaji should have been revived by native historical research in India. His strong, though not altogether sympathetic, personality again stands forth in literature as the leading hero of the Hindus in their defence of time-honoured national institutions against a system of political and cultural innovations of foreign origin. From a certain point of view this is only natural. But, like nearly all historical reconstructions, Shivaji in his restored shape is not altogether a success.

The introduction of this interesting though rather voluminous work brings us the wanted information concerning the authors of the biographies included here. In a strict sense only one of them could be styled a biography, viz. that written by the Portuguese Cosme da Guarda in 1695, only fifteen years after the death of Shivaji himself, though not published until 1730. The French documents consist of extracts from the works of the Abbé Carré and of the famous François Martin, and, next to the Portuguese biography, undoubtedly present most of value and interest. Less exciting, though, of course, not lacking in historical importance, are the extracts from the well-known Valentine and from Dutch Records. Nor do the various accounts of the English embassies to Shivaji (from unpublished papers in the India Office) inspire us with much enthusiasm, except perhaps as being valuable sources for detailed historical research. However, Dr. Surendra Nath Sen has undoubtedly laid his fellow-students
under a deep obligation by having collected and brought out, in an easily accessible form, these different works dealing with Shivājī.

European contemporaries seem to have looked upon Shivājī with a mixture of admiration and awe. For the latter feeling no special reasons need to be adduced. The former one was, not quite unnaturally, inspired by his military genius, his rapid successes over adversaries who had at their command forces far more numerable than his own, perhaps also by the predilection he at times seems to have shown to European merchants and Capuchine fathers whom he is reported to have looked upon as being "good men". Admiration, however, sometimes appears to have gone to somewhat unexpected lengths. Of this we shall single out only one instance: the Abbé Carré at the beginning of his narrative makes the following statement (p. 187): "In his courage, the rapidity of his conquests and his great qualities he does not ill resemble that great king of Sweden, Gustavus Adolphus." Now, it may well be suggested that a countryman of that great king, and one whose ancestors have fought with some success under his command will be a somewhat partial witness in the case. But apart from that it seems scarcely possible to the present writer that anyone would nowadays try seriously to uphold this parallel drawn up by the good Abbé. Gustavus Adolphus, be it said without entering upon any details, was perceptibly the greatest personality in the whole history of the seventeenth century. Shivājī, again, may have been a hero and a genius of sorts; however, the dastardly murder of Afzal Khān, the sacks of Surat, the reckless plundering of the Carnatic, and the innumerable miseries brought upon wholly innocent people do not fit into the picture of a truly great man.

Space will not admit us to enter upon the many interesting details occurring in a work like this. To mention only one example: on pp. 130 ff. the Portuguese writer tells a grotesque story about Aurungzeb's dealings with what was supposed to be the head of Shivājī. This in a way reminds us of another horrible story concerning Aurungzeb and the head of his decapitated brother Dārā Shikōh. Both stories fortunately seem to be alike without foundation.

J. C.
THE PĀṆḌYAN KINGDOM. From the Earliest Times to the Sixteenth Century. By K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI. iv, 277 pp. London: Luzac & Co., 1929. 8s. 6d. or 6 Rs.

The bewildering state of Indian chronology and history in general is too well known a topic to be dwelt upon here. And the older history of the Dravidian kingdoms in the south of the peninsula, the Choḷas, the Keralas, and the Pāṇḍyas, seems to suffer from the same lack of concise dates and truly historical documents as does that of Northern India during the same period.

To unravel the mysteries of even part of that history at the present moment appears scarcely possible. Much has undoubtedly been achieved in the very vast field of epigraphic research, but infinitely much more seems to be wanted. Dynastic chronologies, regnal years of princes, of whom we possess only the very scantiest knowledge, have been reconstructed, but, alas, the painful work of reconstruction has often collapsed through the discovery of some new and unexpected evidence. In the face of such circumstances, it wants a certain amount of courage to try to reconstruct in its entirety the history even of the Pāṇḍyan kingdom. Mr. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri has given proof of such courage, and has produced a work which undoubtedly reflects credit upon its author. Though the author himself is well aware of the very uncertain foundations upon which rest many of his conclusions, he has not hesitated to present them in a thoughtful and cautious form. And the present writer would fain give it as his humble opinion that he has shown an understanding of historical criticism and a sound appreciation of the value of available sources which are altogether laudable.

To present any detailed criticism of Mr. Nilakanta Sastri’s work is far beyond the scope of the present author. Details certainly lay themselves open to doubt, but of those we shall venture, in a short review like this, only to mention one or two. Thus, e.g., it seems doubtful whether anything can be got out of the tukkiyim mentioned in the Book of Kings, as prominent authorities are inclined to doubt that the word does really mean “peacocks”. However, even if it were admitted that such were the case, it would prove very little concerning commercial interface between South India and the Kingdom of Solomon c. 1000 B.C. For peacocks, which according to the Jātaka were sent to Babylon at a much later time, may well have been fetched at more northern ports such as Broach, etc.

The problem of the age of the Śangam is undoubtedly intimately bound up with the chronology of the Southern kingdoms. But so far
nothing definite seems to have resulted from the endless discussions of this problem; nor does one feel strongly convinced by the argumentation of the learned author on this special point.

The chapters dealing with administrative, social, and religious conditions of the Pāṇḍyan kingdom during various ages present much of uncommon interest. To the present writer it would, however, appear that Mr. Nilakanta Sastri dwells far too cursorily upon the religious intolerance and the spirit of persecution that seem often to have prevailed in the southern realms. That there was a grim persecution of the Jains within the very Pāṇḍyan kingdom during the seventeenth century A.D. can scarcely be doubted, even if the horrible story of the impalement of 8,000 monks be somewhat exaggerated. The unremitting hate of Śaivism towards the Jains seems to have found useful instruments even within the dynasty of the Pāṇḍyas. These events the learned author seems to have passed over (pp. 67, 97) altogether too superficially.

These, on the whole, are unsubstantial objections; and we feel pleased to give all due credit to the courageous and generally successful undertaking of Mr. Nilakanta Sastri.

J. C.


The author of this work has set himself a difficult and partly perhaps insoluble task in trying to establish not only the facts connected with but also the origins underlying Hindu exogamy. It cannot be denied that the reader is on many vital points left in the dark; but it could perhaps scarcely be otherwise. Nor can it well be denied that the book would for the most part have made a more favourable impression if the author had possessed a greater faculty of concentration and had not at times lost himself in too many unnecessary and tiresome phrases. Notwithstanding this, we are quite willing to admit that Mr. Karandikar has succeeded fairly well, and that his book may be considered to contain quite a respectable amount of useful information.

The introductory chapter (pp. 1–21) deals with "Exogamy in Vedic Times", and could, according to our modest opinion, well have been cut down to a couple of pages, as ninety per cent of its contents are neither new nor of any definite value. The following four chapters
(pp. 22–99) deal with the complicated questions of gotra and pravara and of their mutual interrelations. Though it cannot be maintained that the author has succeeded in definitely establishing, or still less in solving all the difficult problems presented by these words, we are still indebted to him for the valuable materials with which he has furnished us here. The uncertainty, however, altogether remains a great one; and it is quite typical that not even the grammatical and etymological conditions of the word gotra have so far been firmly established—topics upon which Mr. Karandikar has not even entered. The polemics against Mr. Vaidya and other authors seem a bit barren—but then polemics often are.

The following chapters (vi–xi) deal with sept and sapinda exogamy and with exogamy within non-Brahminical communities. We also here find quite a number of valuable remarks, and the author is generally well read as well in the Sanskrit sources as in the modern handbooks of anthropology. Chapter xi gives a long list of exogamous divisions, grouped together according to the method inaugurated by Risley, which may be of no small use. The materials are entirely drawn from the well-known works of Risley, Crooke, Thurston, Russell, and Enthoven. The concluding chapter—a rather short one—deals with the "Exogamy of the Hindus in the Light of Eugenics".

Although the book by Mr. Karandikar can scarcely be called a remarkable or very original one, it is mainly a sound piece of work, and as such deserves a certain amount of praise.

J. C.

GEDICHTE AUS DER INDISCHEN LIEBESMYSTIK DES MITTELALTERS
(Krishna und Rādha) herausgegeben von HERMANN GOETZ
und ROSE ILSE-MUNK. xxv + 177 pp., 12 pl. Im Verlag der Asia
Major, Leipzig, 1925.

The joint authors of this little book begin their preface by telling us that "auf vielfache Anregung hin haben die Verfasser sich entschlossen, die vorliegenden Gedichte, die sie zuerst zu ihrer eigenen Erholung zu sammeln und übersetzen begonnen hatten, der Öffentlichkeit in diesem Bande zugänglich zu machen". To the present writer it remains somewhat of a puzzle why they should have ceded to these manifold exhortations; however, the obvious answer may be this, that innumerable books have been printed that are still less apt to entice the
interest of readers or bestow upon them information of any description. Anyhow, we feel fairly safe in contending that the introduction might well have been left out without derogating from the general value of the book.

The plates presented at the end of the work are good; and as one of the authors is a well-known authority upon pictures of these periods we may feel assured that the selection is a happy and representative one.

J. C.


This work, by its somewhat mysterious title, will evoke the high expectations of all prospective readers; and that the more as the sub-title promises to furnish us with "a Survey of Indian Culture and Civilization" from the very dawn of history up to 1707. Everyone who has even the slightest appreciation of what such an undertaking means will admire the courage and apparently immense learning of an author who has ventured out upon this boundless ocean. With his expectations still more raised by a preliminary glance at the numerous and often excellent pictures he will eagerly sit down to study this marvellous work. How far the more casual reader will pursue his studies entirely depends upon his personal taste and previous acquaintance with its topics. The reviewer, however, whose mournful plight it is to peruse with due attention its more than 250 pages will close it with a gesture of disillusion, despairingly telling himself that the brevity of life ought to be a warning against entering upon such undertakings.

Professor K. T. Shah, a professor of Economics at Bombay, and the author of several works upon Indian finance, currency, etc., tells us in the preface that this stupendous book has developed out of a series of lectures on the "Outlines of Indian Civilization" delivered during 1928–9 at St. Xavier's College. Provided that the contents of these lectures were mainly the same as those of the book itself—and such must, of course, have been the case—there can be no answer to the question why such a series should have been delivered in India—
except perhaps the obvious one that it could under no circumstances have been delivered in Europe. There is not in the whole work any single trace of the author's own researches, of his own speculations upon, or solutions of, the vast and weighty problems with which he is dealing. But worse even than that: it also contains an ill-assorted jumble of mistakes pure and simple, which ought less than ever to occur in a work like this, and of assertions for which there exists no other foundation than the Professor's own unacquaintance with the subjects with which he is dealing. That such a work should be published in more than 250 sumptuous quarto pages with a wealth of illustrations and at a price of nearly fifty shillings, is not only stupendous, it is also a depressing indication of the misuses to which the name of scientific research is at times subjected.

To give some reason for this rather grave judgment we shall be content to quote a few examples from the first half of the book. These are in no way exhaustive; they are rather occasional gleanings from a well-nigh inexhaustible field. When we abstain from quoting further examples from Chapters VII–X it is not that they are not found even there; but not claiming any personal authority whatsoever upon the topics dealt with in that part of the work, we find it more fitting to abstain from passing detailed judgment upon it.

First of all the somewhat extensive bibliography is, like those given in many Hindu books, valueless as it simply consists of an enumeration, at various places not even a correct one, of names and titles without any further bibliographical data. Most of the works are well known and can be easily identified by the scholar; but that affords no plausible excuse for this inexcusable habit. To go into some details we ask ourselves in vain what the late Mr. Vincent Smith has got to do with the *Cambridge History of India* (p. xviii), why a world-famed scholar should be styled "A. M. Stein" (ibid.). Or, to keep to the same page, why initials should generally be given but found lacking in cases such as Elliott, Tod, Manucci, or Pope; or, finally, why a most famous scholar of the previous generation should again be introduced as "Max-Müller, F." A headline like this one: "LANMAN Jatakmala" (sic) is worse than senseless. Nor is it from any point of view intelligible in which order the various works have been entered into this "bibliography". To give as authors of the *Abhidhamma-, Vinaya-, and Sutta-Pitaka* respectively Kashyapa, Upali, and Ananda¹ is sheer nonsense, and the same objection applies to "Vyas"¹

¹ The spellings are those of Professor Shah.
as an author of the *Mahābhārata* (p. xxi). The *Saundarananda* is constantly styled *Sundarananda*. On the same page (xxi) Bhāravi is presented as the author of the *Bhattikāvyā*, while later on (p. 80) it is ascribed to Bhartṛhari. On p. xxii Somadeva (just as well as Kṣemendra) is mentioned as author of the *Bṛhatkathā*, while at the bottom of the page the *Kathāsaritsāgara* is introduced as an anonymous work in prose. A few lines above this entry figures that of the *Ghata-Karpana*, which on p. 83 is emended into *Gata-Karpana*. This may be sufficient to give a slight foretaste of Professor Shah’s acquaintance with Sanskrit literature as well as of his bibliographical accuracy.

Passing on to the text itself, we shall only make a cursory note of platitudes like those concerning the “instinctive race-snobbery” of the Aryans (p. 20) \(^1\) or the “sensitive soul” of Akbar (p. 53). If Professor Shah had sufficiently studied the work of the late Mr. Vincent Smith, of which he with every right cherishes a high opinion, he would probably have found out the real nature of that sensitiveness. Chapter IV, “Makers of History and Builders of Empire,” is partly quite amusing; it is only a pity that a great part of it consists simply of the lofty constructions of its author. The standard example is furnished by the paragraph dealing with Candragupta. That Nūr Jahān was the “guardian angel” of Jahāngīr (p. 70) may well be; but we should still like to intercede on behalf of the angels whose name has seldom been more sorely misused than here.

Let us, however, continue our progress. On p. 76 we learn that the *Yajur-Veda* is nothing but a redaction of “the great Rig-Veda”, and on the same page that a “considerable portion” of the *Atharvaveda* is written in prose—all, of course, depends upon what is the use of the word “considerable”. The little paragraph on the Indian alphabets on p. 77 must be read in extenso to be duly appreciated, and need not be quoted here, and the same is the case when we come to the description of the later *Kāvyas* (pp. 80–1). What is meant by the expression that “the *Bhattikāvyā* of Bhartrihari appear (sic) to be tricks in comparison” may well be left open; let us instead listen to the following characterization of Māgha’s poem: “But his

\(^1\) That the “denizens of the Deccan” are not the monkeys of Vālmīki is sufficiently clear. By the way, what “amplest evidence” is there that the Dravidians had at a very early time reached a high degree of civilization. If Professor Shah refers me to Mohenjo-Daro I shall first of all be obliged to him to prove that its inhabitants were mainly identical with what he calls the “denizens of the Deccan”.
Sishupaula-Vadha is a museum of metrical tour de force, in which at least two stanzas (xix, 33 and 34) are so arranged that the succeeding, read backwards, spells exactly the same as the preceding read in the ordinary way.” Punctum finisque. As a full description of one of the greatest amongst Indian poets, delivered in front of an Indian audience, this is inimitable. After this we are less astonished to hear, on p. 82, about “the Mandasor inscription, with its reproduction of the Ritusamhara verses”.

That Kālidāsa was “a rather wild young man” (p. 82) and “a wild, unruly youth” (p. 84) may well be true; but this is a suggestion of Professor Shah, not of the tradition which represents him, during his early years, as a dull and insipid youngster. We should like to believe with the learned author that the Upanishads are “pre-eminently clear” (p. 97), were it not that existent facts prohibit us from doing it.

The enumeration of the Jain canonical scriptures (p. 99) which are said to consist of “32 sutras” ending with “1 Aveshak Sutra” is simply grotesque. The suggestion that the Buddha was born “at Shravathi, or Kapilavastu” gives rather a wide latitude to the place of his birth—unless, of course, S. and K. are meant to be identical. The poor “wandering mendicant Vacchaghatta” has got his name rather misspelt. The dates of Rāmānuja’s earthly life are somewhat uncertain; but it can be ascertained with safety that they were not 1175–1250 A.C. (p. 103); nor does the present Kāmasūtra seem to date from pre-Christian times (p. 107). Natadiyar (p. 89 sq.) and Ramaka-Siddhanta (p. 109) may be misprints, though they are both repeated twice. The paragraph dealing with “Universities in India” (p. 110 sq.) seems to be rather confused and ill-founded; and we admit that this is the very first time we ever heard about the universities of Rājagrha and Kapilvastu (sic).

This, in comparison with the whole material, is not much; for, a really detailed criticism would mean the same as rewriting the main parts of the book. But it may be sufficient to prove that here, if anywhere, there is no reason for leniency.

JARL CHARPENTIER.

1 Sic. The “paula looks as if it were a survival from the age of the Asiatick Researches.

The translation of M. Senart's famous essay on caste must have been peculiarly difficult. A verbatim translation would have been worse than useless—it would have been both unreadable and incomprehensible. But Sir Denison Ross’s pages read easily and clearly. His version is faithful to the intention if not always to the ipsissima verba of his author. Indeed, we think his translation easier to read and understand than the original. From all points of view therefore he is to be congratulated on the completion of what must have been a difficult piece of work, the publication of which is a matter of importance, for while no doubt most Englishmen interested enough in India or in sociology to read M. Senart’s pages can do so in the original, that is far from being the case with Indians, who generally find it burden enough to acquire one Western language. It is an excellent thing that M. Senart’s work should be placed within the reach of every educated Indian.

It is needless to remind readers of this journal of M. Senart’s views and conclusions. But the organization of Hindu society has so close and obvious a bearing on Indian political organization that the appearance of Caste in India in an English dress at the present time appears peculiarly appropriate. It were greatly to be desired that all Indians and Englishmen concerned with the political future of the country should study and meditate on the political implications of the social facts discussed and stated in this classical but still authoritative work.

H. D.


This is the most important study of Indo-Muslim administration that has appeared for years. It is founded on a close and critical study of the Persian authorities, and such a critical study was much needed, for we have been over-apt to interpret Persian revenue terms as if they had borne always and everywhere the same connotation as that with which we are familiar in modern times or that which our early revenue administrators found when they took over the revenue administration. This was far from being the case. The more remote provinces were apt to develop a revenue terminology of their own. “Two centuries ago the agrarian language of Calcutta
differed materially from that of Delhi.” In the fourteenth century *divan* meant a department; in the sixteenth a minister. Perhaps one of the most valuable features of Mr. Moreland’s present work is his careful analysis and definition of the revenue language of Muslim India—a piece of work which has been hitherto scorned by the Persian scholar and which has been beyond the power of the ordinary administrator.

For the early period of Muslim rule materials have proved insufficient to piece out a continuous history of the land revenue administration, but Mr. Moreland has frequently been able to throw a flood of light on passages that have perplexed or misled previous writers. An excellent example is the statement of Barani that Ala-ud-din Khilji drew up “rules and regulations for grinding down the Hindus”. This has usually been interpreted as an attack upon the whole Hindu population. Mr. Moreland, however, places a far more probable interpretation upon the passage. He suggests that the sultan’s measures were directed against the Hindu chiefs and headmen of parganas and villages, and that this was inspired not by the Muslim hatred of the infidel but by the necessity of breaking the power of local leaders always ready to break into rebellion.

The period of the empire provides much more material and offers more occasion for Mr. Moreland’s acute comment. As an illustration of his method we would cite his careful comparison of the statements of the *Ain* and of the *Akbarnama*, employing the one to check, illustrate, or supplement the other, and collating the conclusions thus reached with the opinions of unofficial witnesses. The result is an admirably clear and lucid statement of the revenue system under the great emperor. The same merits attach to the later chapters describing the decay of the system, and especially the rise of the intermediaries between the government and the ryot—zamindars, taluqdaris, etc.—whose existence and claims gave so much perplexity to our early administrators.

H. D.

**Mughal Rule in India.** By the late S. M. Edwardes and H. L. O. Garrett. Milford, 1930.

This volume provides a good and very useful survey of our predecessors in India. It seems to be based on the numerous translations which now exist of original Persian sources, together with the principal
European sources; and while no doubt criticism might be applied here and there, the broad outline is substantially true and just. The volume opens with a historical narrative of the reigns of the Mughals from Babur to Aurangzib, contributed by Mr. Garrett. It is well done, especially the reign of Aurangzib, but demands no special comment. The later chapters, the work of the late Mr. Edwardes, deal with such topics as administration, economic, and social features, and the causes of Mughal decay. These may be warmly and confidently recommended to all who are interested in the origin of our own administrative system and who wish to acquaint themselves with the foundations on which we had to build.

H. D.


The present volumes suggest that M. Grousset has recognized the fact that his former work, Histoire de l'Asie, with its attempt to compress into three volumes the whole history of the eastern world, sought to achieve the impossible. The pages devoted to the near-eastern empires and to the modern period were brief, sketchy, and in many ways inadequate. In his later work the field is more restricted both in historical time and in geographical area. The modern period is dropped; the near east disappears. The two volumes now published are concerned with only two of the great Asiatic civilizations—the Indian and the Chinese—and their interaction in Indo-China. Japan is reserved for a separate volume, and no attempt is made to estimate the influence of western culture with the modern growth of communications. The subject matter is thus much more manageable than it was in the Histoire de l'Asie. This has permitted M. Grousset to display with great effect the surprisingly wide range of his knowledge. He is strongest—as might have been expected from the conservateur-adjoint of the Musée Guimet—in art and archæology; and the reader will find, apart from some excellent maps, well-chosen illustrations from the sculpture and paintings of both Chinese and Indian schools. On the other hand his treatment of literature is cursory and not free from error. However the student will think that M. Grousset's admirable bibliographies more than compensate for his infrequent lapses. The references and lists of works are astonishingly complete, and include periodical articles as well as books. Probably the best, certainly the
most interesting of his chapters, is that which deals with the history of the Mongols; we note with interest that extensive use is made of M. Pelliot’s researches, and the reader will find it an excellent and up-to-date introduction to the subject.

H. D.

Asia: An Economic and Regional Geography. By L. Dudley Stamp. Methuen, 1929. 27s. 6d.

Until now no satisfactory geography of Asia has been available for students. It is true that there were Keane’s two volumes in Stanford’s geographical series, published some thirty years ago; but the most cursory comparison of Dr. Stamp’s work with Keane’s will show how greatly geographical knowledge has increased in the last generation and how greatly our conceptions of geography have been modified. Dr. Stamp provides a far more precise and detailed account of the physical structure of the continent than was till now in existence, and he provides an admirably clear account of the manner in which it came into existence and the causes shaping its outlines and contours. The volume will therefore be equally useful to all students of the east, who have long needed such a guide to the material theatre of the subjects of their study. It is illustrated moreover with admirable diagrams and sketch-maps, such as that of the great mountain wall of India and its passes on p. 171. At first sight the reader may think that India has been treated over-generously. It receives some 200 pages or nearly three times as much as is devoted to China. Considered absolutely, there is probably a considerable disproportion here. But when we recollect how much more is known about India than about China, how much material has been collected by the Indian topographical and geological surveys which are lacking in the case of China, and how much more statistical information is available regarding such matters as the population, the climate, and the cultivation of India, the explanation and indeed the justification of the disproportion become at once apparent. To the student of history the volume will make a special appeal, although it makes not the smallest pretence to be an historical geography. Dr. Stamp limits himself to the present day. But after all the material setting in which the drama of Indian history has been played has changed little enough within historical lines. Coast-lines have varied, rivers have swayed from their courses, and the climate of certain provinces has changed; but the broad outlines, the
general character of regions, and the relations of one region to another remain much as they were. And although Dr. Stamp has not attempted an historical geography of Asia, we are sure that when that comes to be written, his present volume will be found to have been laid under heavy contribution.

H. D.


The author's industry in compiling this large volume has been very great. He uses a large array of documentary material drawn from very diverse sources, and which he often quotes at considerable and commendable length. The most interesting are certainly the letters exchanged between the great pasha and his son Ibrahim, and the extracts drawn from the correspondence of the Austrian Foreign Office, which will be new to all. The volume, therefore, throws much new light upon Muhammad Ali's political career. But the light at times is fitful and uncertain. The volume seems to have been composed under strong prepossessions. It exhibits, for instance, a determined inclination to exalt the talents and character of Ibrahim over those of his father. Muhammad Ali is blamed and strongly blamed for not having suffered Ibrahim to advance on Constantinople after the victory of Konia and again after the victory of Nasib, as if military force could have settled the question in face of the opposition of Russia, France, and Great Britain. Again, the author gives the queerest travesty of English policy at this period. His thesis is that Great Britain feared and therefore stifled Egyptian greatness. He seems to ignore the European considerations which really dominated the policy of Lord Palmerston. He compares the British attitude with that of Rome towards Carthage, without pausing to consider whether the pasha's navy could have carried Ibrahim up the English Channel. To prove his point he at times abuses both his documents and common sense. He speaks of the British "provoking" an incident at Mokha in 1819, and of their having been prevented from occupying Yemen in 1820. We do not know of a scrap of valid evidence in support of either statement. He ascribes to the British consul, Missett, a desire to see Muhammad Ali perish in the wastes of Arabia, whereas what Missett actually says is that, should the pasha so perish, his loss will be irreparable. He declares that Palmerston in 1839 feared that the
union of the Turkish and Egyptian fleets would make the pasha over-powerful in the Red Sea. How they were going to get there does not appear. Another unfortunate inclination is that of ascribing to Muhammad Ali’s contemporaries the views and ideas of the present generation. Popular election, we learn with surprise, was the origin of the pasha’s power; we suspect rather that it lay in his shrewd tact, his vigour, his remorseless use of force, and the divisions of his enemies. On the same lines is the assertion that the pasha’s hopes of reviving national life were shared by his entourage and every enlightened Egyptian. All the evidence goes to show that every one of Muhammad Ali’s reforms was resisted underhand by his entourage, and excited distaste among the people at large. While, then, the present volume contains many new, interesting, and important facts, it can only be used with extreme caution, and cannot be recommended save to those whose knowledge enables them to discount a good many of the author’s opinions and statements.

H. D.


This volume contains a number of papers relating to the attempts made by Raffles, when Lieutenant-Governor of Java, to transfer into English hands the Dutch trade to Japan, which had been brought to a close by Minto’s conquest of Java. A number of the letters included seem hardly to deserve publication, and the attempt itself proved a complete failure. This was largely due to the staunchness of the Dutch factors in Japan, who persuaded the English that they would at once be put to death, were they known for what they were, in revenge for the conduct of H. M. S. Phaeton, in 1808, in forcing her way into Nagasaki harbour. Trade was therefore carried on under the Dutch flag, and so, when Java was restored to the Dutch, English trade remained as impossible as ever. But though a failure, the attempt shows how enterprising and alert a leader Raffles was, eager to lose no opportunity of strengthening the power and credit of his country. In fact, the same spirit presided over the expeditions to Japan as planned and executed the occupation of Singapore.

H. DODWELL.
The empire of the Anatolian Hittites (the Khattic Empire, in Professor Garstang's phrase), as the only historical instance of an extensive imperial organization centred on Asia Minor, had a political and cultural history that differs widely from that of other Oriental empires, and the special merit of this book is that it provides a survey, as complete as the present state of research will allow, of its most fundamental aspects. Ethnologists and philologists, anxious to know whether the Hittites were Aryans or Caucasians, and annalists who seek for dynastic tables and dates, will be disappointed. Professor Garstang's first chapter alone contains a sketch of Hittite history (and of the later history of Anatolia as well), which is both sufficient and admirable as historical prolegomena to the main objects of his enquiry. A geographical exposition of the Hittite world follows, becoming more and more detailed as it approaches Boğaz Köy, the City of Khatti, and the remainder of the book is devoted to a survey of all known Hittite monuments and traces from the Ionian coast to Jerusalem, each being not only described in detail but given its appropriate setting in relation either to Hittite religious beliefs and practices or to Khattic political and cultural influences. Out of this at first sight unpromising material, Professor Garstang has succeeded in giving his readers not only an understanding of, but even a sense of familiarity with the ways of the Hittites, and though much of the reasoning is admittedly tentative, his conclusions are likely to command fairly general assent.

Nor is the student of Eastern history likely to forget that Ankara is only 90 miles from Boğaz Köy, that once again the experiment of a pan-Anatolian state is being tried, and that the geographical factors of 3,000 years ago are the geographical factors of to-day. Professor Garstang's exposition acquires in consequence a modern application which, however accidental and foreign to its purpose, certainly adds to its value and interest.

H. A. R. Gibb.
Le Royaume d’Arda et son Évangélisation au XVIIe siècle. 
Par Henri Labouret, Professeur à l’École des Langues Orientales et 
Paul Rivet, Professeur au Muséum d’Histoire Naturelle. 
(Travaux et Mémoires de l’Institut d’Ethnologie, vii.) 10½ × 6¾, 
pp. 62, 20 plates. Paris : Institut d’Ethnologie, 191 Rue Saint-
Jacques (5e), 1929.

The Library of San Isidro at Madrid contains a curious little work 
etitled Doctrina Christiana y Explicacion de sus Misterios en nuestro 
idioma Español y en Lengua Arda (1658). By a not unnatural confusion, 
since a tribe called Arda was known to exist in the basin of the Amazon, 
this has, for fifty years (since it was discovered by Ludewig in 1858), 
been classified as a text in an American language. It was, however, 
found impossible to connect it with any known American speech, 
and Professor Rivet, after closer examination, suspected an African 
origin and consulted the late Maurice Delafosse, who speedily identified 
the language as Ge or Popo, spoken in the kingdom of Arda (also known 
as Ardra or Allada), on the Slave Coast, between Lagos and Whidah, 
The Catechism, printed in parallel columns, Spanish and “Arda”, 
is reproduced in facsimile. The whole text is also reprinted, with a 
French translation, and lists of words are given, with their equivalents 
in modern Ge. This is prefaced by several interesting essays, dealing 
with the past history of the territory, as gathered from Dapper, 
Bosman and other authorities, including the records of the Capuchin 
mission sent out from Spain in 1658, with which the work in question 
originated.

The kingdom of “Arda” disappears from history in 1724, when 
it was conquered by Agaja Trudo, Paramount Chief of Dahome. 
Previous to that date it seems to have been of considerable importance; 
its Chief (“Alkemy, roy de la Guinée”, described as “un des plus 
puissants Monarques de l’Afrique”) sent an ambassador (called Dom 
Matheo Lopes) to Louis XIV, in 1670, “pour l’établissement du 
commerce avec les Français, et une protection toute particulière pour 
les vaisseaux du Roy.” Portraits of the “Alkemy” and Dom 
Matheo (an interesting type of West Coast native), reproduced from 
contemporary engravings, are included among the plates illustrating 
the volume; also recent photographs of a small temple near Porto 
Novo and a “chapel” within it, containing various “fetish” objects; 
a curious engraving of 1730, representing “the coronation of the 
King of Juda” (Whidah); and two maps—that of Norris (from the 
French edition of 1790) and the French official one of 1922. It seems
to be clear that the "Arda" of the Spanish, "Ardra" of the Portuguese, and "Ardres" of the older French writers is identical with the modern Allada, 37 kilometres from the coast, as the crow flies. Norris, in 1772, reached Great Arda from Whidah in one day's march, representing about 40 kilometres. "Petit Ardres" would appear to be the modern Godomy.

In all the volumes of this series, the print and general get-up leave nothing to be desired, and—a point not always sufficiently considered by publishers—they open so easily that they are a pleasure to handle.

A. Werner.

THE PERSIAN RELIGION ACCORDING TO THE CHIEF GREEK TEXTS.


The author of this interesting little book is a young scholar who has already won considerable distinction within the field of Iranian studies. The book reproduces the four lectures which M. Benveniste gave at the Sorbonne in 1926, having been appointed the first lecturer under the auspices of the Ratanbai Katrak Foundation. His French manuscript has afterwards been rendered into English by the Misses Summers and Berry. And though there are some minor slips which must be obvious even to a non-Englishman, and the proof-reading is not quite above criticism, still the text is not only well understandable, but makes also easy and agreeable reading.

The Greek texts that have been used here are those of Herodotus, of Strabo, and of Plutarch, whose sources were Theopompus and perhaps Eudemus. These texts have no doubt been well-known for a rather long time ¹; but this is the first time that they have been methodically studied and commented upon by a scholar alike well at home in the classical lore and in the various branches of Iranian scholarship. What M. Benveniste has here presented us with is of high value and interest; the chief interest, though, attaches to the highly fascinating chapter on Theopompus and Plutarch with its most important researches on the ideas and history of Zervanism.

It is a fact of some importance, though it has perhaps so far

¹ In this connection the mention of Rapp on p. 12 must perhaps be slightly modified, as already earlier authors have undoubtedly known and made use of these texts.
attracted only scanty interest, that there is a marked difference between the Greek tales concerning Iran and those concerning India. The Indian stories begin with the lost ones of Scylax and Hecataeus and continue with those of Herodotus, Ctesias, Megasthenes and many others. Some of them are at least partly of value; and Megasthenes has since antiquity been looked upon as a paragon of truthfulness, just as Ctesias, from the beginning, became marked down as an inveterate liar. But it is not so much a question of truth or untruth, it is far more a question of the utter impossibility to a Greek of understanding the Hindus. If the present writer be not entirely mistaken, the great Biruni says somewhere that the Hindus are innate perverts who will do everything in the opposite way to other sensible beings. To the Greeks they must have appeared still more so; and sheer curiosity—at times mixed with a good lot of contempt of the "barbarians"—can inspire no trustworthy descriptions of far-away lands and their inhabitants.

Not so with the Persians. Xerxes, who invaded the holy soil of Greece, and was driven away by the Olympians he had offended, was a barbarian; but his doings, though not pardonable, were understandable from a human point of view. Tissafernes, who in cold blood murdered the Greek generals after Kunaxa, was a barbarian too; but his deeds were those of a miscreant, not those of a madman. And in the same way the religious creeds and theological systems of the Iranians though full of superstitions and rather childish myths, attracted the interest and understanding of the Greeks in quite another way than those of the Hindus. Materials too were far more abundant; for since the sixth century B.C. the Greeks of Asia Minor had been in intimate contact with the Persians. And thus it comes that Greek relations of the different phases of Iranian religion are of considerable value.

The difficulties rest with the interpretation. Much of what the Greeks tell us of Iranian religion cannot be immediately confronted with existent Iranian sources. The scholar trying to illuminate the often obscure statements of a writer like Plutarch has to gather his materials for comparison from different and far-fetched texts, the Pahlavi ones, Syriac and Arabian authors, and last but not least the literature of and concerning the Manicheans. This is what M. Benveniste has done to an ample degree, and there can be no doubt that he has succeeded well in throwing light on the obscurities of the Zervanite religion. For this every scholar interested in the
fascinating problems of Iranian religious development must be thoroughly grateful to him.

Zervān in certain Central Asian documents is identified with Brahmā, the piṭāmaha of the Indian pantheon. Now this Zervān is again identified with the Father of Greatness, called by the Greek Manicheans τὸν τετραπρόσωπον πατέρα τοῦ μεγέθους. As Brahmā is the τετραπρόσωπος πατήρ par préférence it would be interesting to know more about the history of these identifications.

Most interesting is the way in which M. Benveniste—partly supporting himself on materials collected by other scholars—proves the high age of the Zervān-religion. "Without undue boldness, therefore," says he, on p. 78, "we may date Zervanism, as a system, from the Achemenid period." The present writer, who can lay claim to no authority on this point, would make bold enough to go much further and suggest that Zervanism does really grow out of Indo-Iranian religious ideas. Zervān is mainly a male deity, but there is no doubt that he is also an androgynous being. We have thus within the Iranian world an old god who is male and female alike, an exact counterpart of the well-known Tuisto of our so-called Teuton forefathers. Such deities, of whom there are quite a number within the primitive religious world, are apt to split up into a male and a female person, and the survival of one or the other may be a case of the purest hazard. Now in India we find the goddess Aditi, a deity of various and uncertain interpretations. But there is no doubt that in some way or other she represents the boundlessness, the eternity, be it of time or space, and in this she is apparently a female counterpart of Zervān. Further on she is the mother of the Ādityas who must in some way or other be connected with the Amōsa Spāntas, and she is constantly associated with Varuṇa and Mitra, who are obviously closely related to Miōra and to the great god called by the ancient Iranians Ahura Mazda.

Zervān, however, did not only procreate Ohrmazd but also his twin-brother and foe, the Arch-devil Ahriman. And for this idea no parallel seems possible in the case of Aditi. Still let us take into

---

2 Tacitus, Germania, ch. ii.
3 Cf. Neisser, Zum Wörterbuch des Rgveda, i, 20 sq., whose conclusions are not acceptable to me, and Hillebrandt, Vedicke Mythologie, 2nd ed., ii, 95 sq. Cf. also Leumann, ZII, vi, 1 sq.
4 In one passage Aditi seems to be a male being (RV. iv, 39, 3; cp. Oldenberg, RV.-Noten i, 300). Everything is, however, very uncertain here.
consideration that the unknown seventh Āditya was sometimes said to be Indra, an idea which appears to me far less impossible than it did once appear to L. von Schroeder. If such were the case, Aditi would have procreated Varuṇa, the great asura, as well as Indra, the head and protagonist of the deiva-clan, just as in Iran Zervân gave birth to the great Ahura as well as to the foremost of the daēva's. For what case the asura's went down in India while in Iran they kept the upper hand remains obscure and does not especially interest us here; nor why the lots of the deva's and daēva's became totally different. What seems to me somewhat plausible, is that Aditi and Zervân form an old pair of gods who have at one time sprung from an original androgynous deity of whom Zervân—and perhaps even Aditi, cf. RV. iv, 39, 3—has preserved some traces, and that Zervanism thus has its root in Indo-Iranian soil.

These, so far, are vague and hazy speculations. Maybe that at some time other and more far-sighted scholars will either corroborate them or present in another form the lineage of Zervân and Aditi.

After this we may permit ourselves to indulge in a few minor remarks.

That Pythagoras (p. 10) should have been inspired by Zoroaster is perhaps possible—just as possible, I should say, as the theory of an Indian influence on this mysterious philosopher. So far it seems impossible to form an idea of whether Pythagoras borrowed some of his ideas from the East or not; and the reason for this is perhaps that the pre-history of Pythagorean ideas in Greece itself still seems pretty obscure. Anyhow, the suggestion that Zoroaster might have influenced Pythagoras would form still another argument against the queer "historical" researches of Professor Hertel, which M. Benveniste (p. 45, n. 2) has rightly rejected.

On p. 60 the learned author seems to reject the suggested connection between atharvan-: āθravan-, abav[ran]- "priest, fire-priest" and ātār- "fire". The present writer formerly was of the same opinion, as were before him very prominent authorities like Bartholomae, Justi, and Zubaty. He now feels less sure of the correctness of such an opinion;

---


2 Cf. e.g. the well-known work of von Schroeder, Pythagoras und die Inder (1884), which sums up the previous discussion on this topic (cf. Garbe, Sāṁkhya-Phil., 1st ed., p. 90 sq.), as well as an article in VOJ., xv, 187 sq. The article by Professor Keith, JRAS. 1909, 569 sq., is as usual purely negative.

3 Cf. Monde Or., xiii, 44 sq.

On p. 62 the "sumptuous cloak of otter skin" should certainly be of "beaver" skin, cf. Bartholome, \textit{Air. Wb}. 925.

On the different forms in which \textit{Vorotdrayna} is said to have appeared (p. 65) the present author has once said something in his \textit{Kleine Beitr. z. indoiran. Mythologie} (1911), p. 25 sq. It still seems probable that these "avatāras" are based on ideas common to Iranians and Indians.

On p. 99 something is mentioned concerning the etymology of the name \textit{Tśtrya-} and related forms. M. Benveniste is quite right in branding the attempt of Herr Götze\footnote{Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachf., iii, 146 sq.} as unsuccessful, as there is certainly no possibility of uniting the different names of the star, which, according to Plutarch \textit{πρὸ πάντων οἶνον ϕύλακα καὶ προόπτην ἐγκατέστησε ὁ Ὑποπάτως}. The whole problem would be well worth a renewed and more thorough research, and cannot be dealt with here. Only this should be said: (1) the Greek \textit{Σεἰρός} probably has got nothing to do with the Iranian words; (2) \textit{tśtrya}, is in some way or other connected with \textit{tisya-}\footnote{The Soghdian \textit{tiś-(fara)} is not quite clear, but probably identical with \textit{tisya-} (which, of course, cannot be derived from \textit{*tieśya-}).}, though the detailed relations so far escape us; (3) \textit{*tīra-, tiri-}, must be wholly separated from \textit{tśtrya}; whether they are really interchangeable with \textit{tīgyra-}, \textit{tīyri-}, must so far be left undecided.

With these scattered and not very important remarks, we take leave of the interesting little work of M. Benveniste, which forms a valuable contribution to our rather scanty knowledge of the ancient Iranian religions. We allow ourselves to congratulate him upon this happy and useful achievement.

J. C.
Zoroastrian scholar, has undertaken to collect into a little volume of pleasant appearance the romantic life-stories of the heroines of Ancient Persia as told in the giant epic of Firdausi. Such an undertaking may certainly not be lacking in interest and may also fill a gap in existent literature, even if its future readers will perhaps be comparatively few.

Miss Pavry has fulfilled her work with enthusiasm, and not without skill. We are here able to pick up in abridgement the somewhat fanciful biographies of the noble dames of Old Irân disposed chronologically according to the not always very scientific chronology of the poet of Tûs. Most of these stories also are accompanied by fine illustrations drawn from Persian manuscripts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. One might almost wish that some of them could have been given in colour to show the admirable tints applied with extraordinary skill by the Persian and Mogul miniaturists. Most of the prints, however, are very clear and convey a good idea of the undoubtedly beautiful originals.

To bring the materials given here to fit into actual history will mostly present insuperable difficulties. And, after all, it will only be the heroines of Sásânian times such as Shirin and others who can lay claim to an ascertained historical existence. That e.g. the "good" queen Humâî should have anything to do with the formidable and awe-inspiring Parysatis—a suggestion of the late Dr. West, taken up p. 53, note 3—is altogether beyond our capacity of imagination. This human monster reigned over her weak husband, Darius II, and for a considerable time also over her none too valiant son, Artaxerxes II; and it seems extremely curious that the Dârâ who is supposed to correspond to Darius II is held up by Firdausi as a paragon of valour and chivalry. This if anything shows the complete breakdown of real Achaemenian tradition in the Persia of later periods.

We take some slight exception to the constant quoting of Vullers-Landauer as Firdusii; this, however, does not materially detract from the value of Miss Pavry's little work, the chief merit of which does not consist in presenting new results of scientific research, but in offering easy and pleasant reading.

Jarl Charpentier.

It is sadly characteristic of the poverty of our instruments in nearly all branches of Eastern study that M. Schwab's *Bibliographie de la Perse*, admittedly imperfect to begin with, and long out of date, has had to wait forty-five years for a successor. Sir Arnold Wilson and his assistants are all the more deserving of our gratitude for this, the first instalment of a much fuller and more catholic bibliography, and it is to be hoped that they will not disappoint the expectations which they have aroused for a second volume of analytical indices. Any criticisms which may be passed upon the material from the technical bibliographical standpoint have been anticipated in an introductory note; apart from these details the achievement invites little but praise. Every reader will doubtless note a few omissions in his special field—I have noted, e.g. Zambaur's *Manuel de Généalogie et de Chronologie* (Hannover, 1927), the important studies of Wellhausen and Lammens touching on Persian history and religion in the first and second centuries of Islam, and the relevant chapters in the *Cambridge Medieval History* (all too few, but worth a reference)—and occasional inaccuracies in the dates of books and articles carry a suggestion of hasty revision. The O.U.P. has bestowed on the publication of the book its usual care and craftsmanship, though at a cost which is more than a little disconcerting to the ordinary student.

H. A. R. GIBB.


I reviewed the first two parts of this publication, covering the first eight months of the Coptic year, in the *Bulletin*, vol. iv (1926), p. 406, and vol. v (1928), p. 172. The present and final instalment covers the months Pachon, Paoni, Epep, and Mesore, and the intercalary days (Nasi = *Epagomenae*). Students of Coptic hagiology and language have every reason to be grateful to Dr. O'Leary for the completion of this valuable work: the hymns are founded on the Arabic of the *Synaxarium*, and not derived from older Coptic sources, but they contain occasional fresh material. Dr. O'Leary points out, for instance, that at Pachon 25 the well-known Colluthus is entirely omitted, and his place taken by Hiroudē, who does not appear at all
in the *Synaxarium* as it has come down to us. (Hiroudé will, however, be found in the Ethiopic *Synaxarium* of the same date—Genbt 25: he was a native of Sebasto who suffered under the Governor Lucianus in the Diocletianic persecution, and “who shall give alms to the poor on the day of thy commemoration shall not have one barren animal among his flocks, and sons shall not be wanting in his house”.) An alphabetical list of saints commemorated in the *Difnar* fitly concludes this part, and those who bind the three together will now have a valuable subsidiary to the Coptic (Arabic) and Ethiopic *Synaxaria*.

In an appendix Dr. O’Leary has edited some fragmentary hymns brought from the Red Monastery in 1886, which are now in the Bristol Museum and Art Gallery. I can help in the identification of most of these:

(1) (Dr. O’Leary’s I) For St. John the Baptist: alphabetical, stanzas p. 20. The whole hymn (beginning αἰνερρῆτε σεν οὐσινομοι | ἵταξο ἄπταιο ἀπιπροδρομοι) may be found in Rylands Copt. 433, f. 9 recto, and Bodl. Marsh. 55, f. 131 recto. It was printed (p. Β) in the *كتاب الإجمالات والظروفات* (Cairo, 1913), which may be abbreviated *K.A.T.*

(2) For St. John the Baptist: alphabetical, complete, beginning ἄκει (read ἄκεικι) ἀλήθος. This is in Rylands 433, f. 13 verso, Rylands 434, f. 84 recto, Bodl. Marsh. 55, f. 134 verso, and *K.A.T.*, p. 21.

(3) For the Archangel Gabriel: alphabetical, stanzas Ἀ-Κ, beginning αἰνερρῆτε ὡς ἱπίστος. This is found complete in B.M. Or. 5285, f. 81 verso, Rylands 430, f. 164 verso, Rylands 431, f. 129 verso, Rylands 433, f. 165 verso, and down to the end of stanza p in Bodl. Marsh. 55, f. 92 recto. In the last only is the first stanza like Dr. O’Leary’s, though otherwise the text is the same, with trifling variants, throughout the hymn; the two forms may be placed side by side:

O’Leary.

Bodl. Marsh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>αἰνερρῆτε ὡς ἱπίστος</th>
<th>αἰνερρῆτε ὡς ἱλενρατά</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἵτενερος ἐκ σεν ὅσιελια</td>
<td>ἵτενερος ἐκ σεν ὅσιελια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅτα ἵταξο ἄπταιο ἀπιπροδρομος</td>
<td>ὅτα ἕτενταιο ἀμάχοιτα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πιπανθενοτη γαβριηλ</td>
<td>ἴς πιπανθενοτη γαβριηλ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(4) (Dr. O’Leary’s II) For St. John the Baptist: alphabetical, stanzas 1-3. Part of this is found in B.M. Or. 3367 (4), but unfortunately no more than is in the Bristol MS. and we cannot give its beginning or end. From the B.M. MS. we can correct the meaningless (stanza π, l. 2) ἄγνως ἤκε πληγείτι into ἄγνως πνεύματι and (stanza π, l. 3) ἄγεκατι ἀπελλάοει into ἄγεκατι ἤκε πεφλάει.

(5) (Dr. O’Leary’s III) For the Archangel Gabriel: alphabetical, stanzas Κ-Ν. This is found complete (beginning ἀνω ζα γερμισταον | ὑτενττουτ ὑτποροεον | ἡκα γεματον | ὑλεοντι πιγκελον) in Rylands 431, f. 135 recto, and Rylands 434, f. 14 verso.

(6) (Dr. O’Leary’s IV) Alphabetical [reversed], stanzas Ζ-Λ. Dr. O’Leary calls it “to various saints”, but I think it is for the Baptism of Christ, when that feast falls on a Thursday. It is found complete (beginning θιακον εποε ἠκτακιη) in Curzon Copt. 19, f. 174 verso.

(7) 5½ stanzas, not alphabetical, beginning ΑΙΚΑΙ ΙΗΝΕΔΛΑ ΤΙΜΩΝ ΣΑΡΟΚ. I have not identified this.

(8) (Dr. O’Leary’s V) Alphabetical, stanzas Ε-Μ. I have not identified this. It is a hymn for Lent or some other fast.

(9) (Dr. O’Leary’s VI) Alphabetical, stanzas Κ-Ω with additional stanzas repeating the Egyptian letters of the Coptic alphabet. This is found complete (beginning ἄκοινα μαρενοτούτ | ὑτοπαία εού | ετε φιοτ ἡκα πιμπρί | ἡκα πιμπ ποντο αοουδι), with considerable variants in Bodl. Copt. e. 1, f. 79 verso, Rylands 430, f. βαγ verso, and Rylands 431, f. 90 recto (the last containing the first alphabet only). It is, as Dr. O’Leary says, “to various saints,” and has an Arabic heading to that effect in the MSS. which I have cited.

S. Gaselee.
Der Herausgeber hat wohl gut getan indem er u. a. Herrn Professor Perles zum Mitarbeiter seiner Ausgabe der Kommentare zum AT. wählte. Prof. Perles’ in hebräischer Sprache verfasster Kommentar zu den Klageliedern ist flüssend und klar geschrieben. Derselbe als Bibelforscher bekannt, hat in diesem seinen Kommentar alles das geleistet, was man von einem modernen Bibelkritiker verlangen kann. Seine Einleitung zu den Klageliedern sagt auf zwei Seiten alles erschöpfend, was hierzu gehört. Die Erklärungen sind zwar etwas knapp gehalten, allein der Verfasser ging gewiss von der richtigen Voraussetzung aus, dass dieselben einem gebildeten hebräisch lesenden Publikum vollständig ausreichend sein werden. Bei all dieser Knappheit hat in der Tat der Kommentar sehr grossen Wert. Oberhalb der Erklärungen befindet sich der masoratische Text der Lamentatio thes so gedruckt, dass der in der Einleitung besprochene Kinâvers hervorgehoben ist. Unterhalb des Textes: der auf der Höhe der Wissenschaft stehende fortlaufende Kommentar, zu dem der Referent nur einige Bemerkungen, die das Ganze nicht tangieren, hinzufügen will.

In 1, 2 wird erklärt: die Israeliten hätten deshalb zur Nachtzeit geweint, weil sie die Feinde nicht merken lassen wollten, dass sie weinen. Allein die Schmerzempfindenden vermögen durchaus nicht ihr Weinen auf spätere Zeit zu verlegen. Entweder steckt in בלעיה ein verschriebenes Wort aus dem Stamme בלעיה oder es ist anzunehmen, es stamme von arab. בלעיה, wovon 열 ינ עם the sound: בלעיה (LA xiii, 73) und die Bedeutung des Verses wäre: sie weinte (laut) seufzend. Der Verf. nimmt an נצח ננחת 1, 4 sei nach LXX ננתה. Hier liegt aber wohl ein St. ננחת zugrunde (vgl. ננחת) heulen, schreien (von Tieren sowohl wie von Menschen), z.B. “demütig, untertänig im Gebet schreien, stöhnen” „; LA iii, 194. Dieses wäre somit eine Parallele

1 Bis nun sind zehn andere bibl. Bücher mit Kommentaren in dieser Ausgabe erschienen.
zu daselbst "ihre Priester seufzen". in 2, 4, wo auch eine alte Lesart angeführt wird, ist hier nicht von 260 Andern 7, 11, 452 in der Rechten wie ein Widersacher. Der Vers wäre zu übersetzen: Er spannt seinen Bogen wie ein Feind, er zieht die Bogensehne an mit seiner Rechten (LA iii, 452 = 2, 14) und ist hier wohl im Sinne von (LA iii, 452 = "die gefährliche") das zu der vom Verf. angenommenen Lesart 2, 16. Wenn dieses = "denn seine" so würde man st. vgl. I Kön. 18, 26 - Ist 3, 56 richtig, so wäre dann dementsprechend st. zu lesen. - In 4, 7 ist statt des unverständlichen zu lesen. Vgl. Am. 2, 12 bezeichnet verschiedene Farben: rot, dunkelbraun, aber auch weiss (vom Kamel; LA xiv, 273 ff.). - Das vom Verf. aus O.L.Z. vi, 244-5; xviii, 179-80 bekannte es sei = Labartu, ist sehr naheliegend. Auch nir dàpini aufgelöst (schon in des Verf. Analekten NF 16-17; mir hier nicht zulässig) wird wohl die allein richtige Erklärung des Wortes sowie des ganzen Satzes sein. Allein muss man dann das von zu herübernehmen und lesen.

Es wäre erwünscht, dass der Herausgeber der Kommentare zum AT. Herrn Prof. Perles, dem wir für seine Erklärung der Klagelieder zu vielem Dank verpflichtet sind, auch zur Kommentierung anderer Bücher des AT. ersuchen möchte.

DAVID KÜNSTLINGER.

THE GEORGE EUMORFOPOULOS COLLECTION: CATALOGUE OF THE CHINESE AND COREAN BRONZES, SCULPTURE, JADES, JEWELLERY, AND MISCELLANEOUS OBJECTS. By W. PERCEVAL YETTS. Vol. II: Bronzes: Bells, Drums, Mirrors, etc. 17½ x 12½, viii + 99 pp., pls. 75 + figs. 44. London: Ernest Benn, 1930. £12 12s.

The appearance of a new volume in the set of Eumorfopoulos catalogues is always a remarkable event. Dr. Yetts' second volume on Chinese bronzes and other metal objects is a mine of useful and interesting information, and all students of Chinese art and archaeology.
will have to devote a careful study to every page in it. In the first place the illustration materials give him without exception good specimens of the best Chinese art, chosen by a master connoisseur, and are therefore particularly well suited for a diligent study. And then another loving and learned connoisseur has taken infinite pains to describe and comment upon these objects, and he shows himself a guide equally well versed in the intricacies of Chinese art technique and in the copious Chinese archaeological literature.

The objects published in the present volume are firstly a few bells and drums (some of which have been reproduced earlier, e.g. in Koop's *Early Chinese Bronzes*); then there is a rich and remarkably fine set of mirrors (sixty-two pieces) from Han to T'ang, and some Korean specimens; follows a richly varied series of belt hooks; and finally various small objects; plaques (some of them in the "animal style"), bits, stirrups, sword pommels, etc.

If all these objects have been minutely described and commented upon in Yetts' catalogue, which forms the fourth part of his text, there are three subjects which he has picked out for a fuller treatment, in three separate chapters; bells, drums, and mirrors. These subjects of course form extremely wide themes, each of which would demand a volume in order to be exhausted, and so the author has limited himself to certain sides of the questions. For the bells he discusses at length the various types which can be determined to have existed in ancient China, their nomenclature and their ritual use. When treating the drums, he takes up the intricate and highly important question of the real origin of the "barbarian" bronze drums of southern China, and after a sagacious criticism of earlier theories he advances an interpretation of his own. In the chapter on mirrors he gives a full and suggestive account of the animal symbolism which plays such an important part in the decoration of mirrors. The first paragraph of the catalogue can almost be said to form a fourth similar independent treatise. It is here a question of a splendid bell and its inscription, and the author shows himself well versed in the modern Chinese archaeological literature. He weighs the different interpretations advanced by various famous scholars against each other, and finally, siding with Wang Kuo-wei, he determines the place and the approximate time for the casting of the bell in question, giving thus a fine example how the archaeologist will have to try, in future, to connect important specimens with a concrete locality and age and so obtain fixed points of departure in determining the various *milieux* styles.
Dr. Yetts' treatise marks a great advance from the earlier European works on ancient Chinese bronzes, in so far as he gives serious attention to the literary side of the question. The authors of the two handbooks most in use hitherto—A. Koop, *Early Chinese Bronzes*, 1924, and E. A. Voretzsch, *Alchinesische Bronzen*, 1924, base themselves nearly exclusively on the Sung catalogues *Po ku t'u lu* and *K'ao ku t'u* and the Ts'ing time imperial catalogues (*Si Ts'ing ku kien*, *Si Ts'ing su kien*, *Ning shou kien ku*), which slavishly follow the pattern of the *Po ku t'u lu*. Koop sometimes inserts quotations of stray remarks in Hamada's *Sumitomo catalogue* and similar data illustrating the ritual use in ancient China of the objects discussed. This is a very unsatisfactory method. The Sung scholars are too late, too far separated in time from the Chou epoch to be of any great use as witnesses to archaeological facts; and, on the other hand, they are much too old to be up-to-date in the archaeological researches. In fact, it is just the same in Chinese archaeology as in the philology of the Chinese classics. Just as Legge is badly antiquated as interpreter because he based himself upon the learned lore of Sung, Yüan, and Ming time (condensed in the "imperial editions" so much praised by him),¹ in spite of the fact that the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had produced a series of great scholars who went back to the Han time commentators and subjected their data to a quite modern philological criticism—imagine what a splendid reader of Chinese like Legge could have produced, if he had followed Kiang Sheng and Sun Sing-yen for the *Shu king*, Ch'en Huan and Ma Juei-ch'en for the *Shih king*, etc.!—in the same way the Western archaeologist who believes implicitly in the literary data and identifications of the *Po ku t'u lu* is hopelessly antiquated. Yetts has realized this, and courageously tackled the works of more modern Chinese archaeological authors, and his thesis has greatly gained by this. The Chinese literature he has perused for the purpose is extensive, and everywhere in the pages of the present volume we find inserted useful fruits of his Chinese readings, information which will be of great service especially to all those archaeologists and collectors who cannot themselves cut their way through the bush of Chinese literature.

But a philologist is never satisfied. I wonder if it is not necessary, now and then, to go even deeper into the Chinese literature than he has done, and by the aid of the discussions of the learned Shuo-wen

¹ Couvreur as a translator and lexicographer gives the views of the orthodox Sung school, and is thus still more antiquated than Legge.
commentators and others to trace the most ancient data which can give us clues to the various types of objects existing in Chou time and their ritual applications. In order to show what I mean I will discuss here some details of Yetts’ first section, the learned and highly instructive study of ancient bells.

Let me first make a general remark. It may seem to be of a purely academic interest to know whether an object in our hands is what the ancient Chinese called a chung bell, or it is a to bell, or a cheng bell, or a cho bell. But such is by no means the case. Just as to a student of European mediaeval archaeology it is certainly not indifferent if a bowl which he studies is a baptizing bowl, or a communion bowl, or a drinking bowl for feasts, etc., in the same way it is of paramount interest to know if a certain type of ancient Chinese bronze bell is a chung or a cheng or a to, etc., for they all had their different and very well-defined ritual and practical uses, as clearly stated by Yetts, who has carefully recorded the data of ancient texts in regard to the role played by the various types. For a concrete and intimate knowledge of Chinese archaeology, therefore, the distinction of the different groups of objects, their nomenclature and the terminology in regard to their elements is of prime importance.

Yetts distinguishes five principal groups of bells:—

1. **Chung.**—“These are essentially hanging bells, characterized by the presence of thirty-six bosses, arranged in rows of three, and by the absence of a clapper” (various sub-types).

2. **Tui.**—A bell with a bulbous upper part and a narrower lower part and with an animal figure as a loop for suspension.

3. **(Yetts:)** “Cheng or Cho.—According to the Shuo wen ‘the cheng is a nao and resembles a ling. Its handle is hollow from top to bottom’. This is followed by the definition of the nao as ‘a small cheng’. But the objects known to us by the term nao are jingles or rattles carrying an enclosed ball as clapper, and therefore they differ essentially from the bells recognized as cheng in the Po ku t’u lu . . . .

The fact that a hollow handle is a characteristic feature encourages the surmise that a pole or haft passed through the central axis of the bell.”

---

1 It is a pity that the author, who gives a rich bibliography with the book-titles and authors’ names beautifully printed in Chinese characters, has not added a reference page of Chinese characters for all these Chinese technical terms, tui, cheng, cho, ling, etc.—a few dozens of words which the serious reader must see in Chinese script, in order to be able to go to the Chinese works of reference (dictionaries, art catalogues). I hope he will see his way to add such a list in the next volume.
(4) "To.—" This class comprises the clapper bells" (three sub-types).
(5) Ling (Yetts:)—"Though the ancient Chinese definitions . . .
that liken both cheng and cho to the ling may not be strictly accurate,
they do, however, lead us to believe that something which answers
to our notion of a bell was known during the Han period as a ling.
Possibly the ancient ling was like the small hanging type which figures
in some catalogues under that name, and may be seen, for example,
as pendants to the big drum in the Han bas-relief of a band of
musicians."

Let us discuss these five types.

(1) To Yetts' full and instructive treatise on the chung there is
little to add. It is, indeed, a matter of taste and a question of space
how far one can go into detail. There is, e.g., the terse and little-saying
Chou-li passage: "The Fu-shih (wild duck clan) are the makers of
chung bells. The two luan are called sien. What is between the sien
is called yü. What is above the yü is called the ku 'drum'. What is
above the drum is called the cheng. What is above the cheng is called
the wu," etc. This Yetts intersperses with the notes of Ch'eng Yao-
t'ien, and obtains the following description illustrated by a nice
diagram: "The Fu-Shih are the makers of bells (chung). [Ancient
bell not being fully round have two side edges which are] the two
luan called hsien. The part between the [two] hsien is called yü,
above the yü is the part called the "drum" (ku) [where the bell is
struck]; above the drum is [the main body of the bell] called chêng;
and above the chêng is [the top of the bell] called wu," etc.

As Yetts points out, it is of no mere academic interest to know
these and similar technical terms, for you meet them everywhere in
Chinese art treatises, and are lost if you do not know them. Yet it
must be said that as they stand there these terms are woefully bare
and insignificant. They gain much in interest if one adds their
explanations, such as you find them brought together from various
authors by the excellent scholar Sun I-jang and amply added to by
himself in his monumental work 周禮正義 Chou-li chêng i.
This work, which appeared long after Biot's translation, is indeed the
final and principal work on the Chou-li, and should always be in the
hand of every student of Chinese archaeology (Yetts' comprehensive
and valuable bibliography includes several works of Sun I-jang, but
not this one). Sun suggests that "small and sharp", i.e. a thin edge, as it is very likely etymologically
the same word as 岳 luan, defined by Shuo wen kie tsî, as 山小而
The term *siyén* (hsien) reference is made to *Shuo wen kie tsii*: 金之澤者 “metal of rich hue (fine quality)” and it must mean “fine-looking, brilliant metal” (so also the *Erya*); hence the two *siyén* are the two “brilliant [points]”. *Yü* means “the curved line” and Sū Yang-yüan is quoted who emphasizes that *yü* is the rim as seen from below (or seen on a lying bell), and the *wu* the top as seen from above, both being invisible on a standing bell (seen from the side). The term 鈦 *chêng* means according to Ch‘eng Yao-t‘ien the 正面 “right side, face” of the bell’s body, but Sun interprets it better as the part having the shape of a *chêng*—an upwards slowly tapering barrel (cf. *chêng* below). The *wu* does not mean “la danse”, as Biot has it, but 舞 is merely a variant for 廊 *wu*. This means “a covered verandah”, the word stem having the fundamental sense of “covered, covering, roof”.

(2) The *tui*.—This is a misnomer. The character 銖 should be read *ch‘un*, not *tui*. The error, which Yetts has taken over from the Sumitomo catalogue, is due to a misunderstanding of an entry in Giles’ dictionary. There we find 銖 *tui* “the butt of a spear”. That is quite correct. But this is only one sense of the character; it is also used in the present sense of “bell”, and is then read *ch‘un*. All sources agree in this. Lu Tê-ming, the absolutely normative author on the readings of characters in the classics (author of the 經典釋文) indicates this reading to *Chou-li* (ti-kuan, ku-jen): “read like 淳” and Kuang-yün gives the fan-ts‘ie 常倫 (anc. *ziuên*), which gives Pekinese *ch‘un*, correctly quoted in the K‘ang-hi dictionary.1 Indeed, it seems likely that this *ch‘un* is etymologically the same word as 淳 “pure”, meaning the “pure-sounding, clear-sounding” instrument, possibly in contradistinction to 錫 *cho*, the 濁 “muddled-sounding” instrument. It is unfortunate that wrong word-readings like this are current in the most-read hand-books on Chinese bronzes. The short Chinese words in transcription are sufficiently difficult to remember and recognize, even when correctly rendered; how can a non-sinologue reader know that what one author (correctly) calls a *ch‘un* is the same thing which another author calls a *tui*? By the way, the *ch‘un* in question is the same kind of bell as the 銖子 *ch‘un-yü* mentioned in the Kuo-yü (*Tsin-yü*). Voretzsch labels all bells (*ch‘un* and to as well) as chung, which is a capital error.

(3-5) Now for the remaining three types. Yetts considers *cheng*
and *cho* to be synonym words for one and the same thing, co-ordinated with the other main types *to* and *ling*. Can we confidently accept this view?

It is true that the *Shuo wen* *kie tsi* says "the *cho* is a *cheng". But identifications like that in the old dictionaries are seldom meant to be absolute; they only mean an approximation, and we can build little on them. This is easily seen from the following florilegium:

鏡 *nao* defined by 銘 *cheng* in the *Shuo-wen*;

nao defined by 銘 *ling* in *Kuang ya* (third century A.D.) and

*I t'sie king yin i*, 6 ("a big *ling";

cheng defined by *nao* in *Shuo wen*;

cheng defined by *ling* in *Kuang ya*;

*ling* defined by *cheng* in Wei Chao's (third century A.D.) commentary to *Kuo yü* (küan 11);

*ling* defined by 丁 銘 *ting-ting*, in *Shuo-wen* (*Yün huei* quotes 銘 丁, *T'ai p'ing yü-lan* 338 quotes 銘 丁);

*ting-ting* defined by *cheng* in Wei Chao, loc. cit. (the actual text is truncated, but in the 宋 康 補音 version we find 丁 容 令 丁 謂 銘 也;

丁 容 *ting-ning* defined by *cheng* in Wei Chao, loc. cit., and in Tu Yü's (third century A.D.) commentary to *Tso chuan*, Süan fourth year.

鏡 *to* defined by *ling* in *Kuang ya*; in *Shuo wen* ("a big *ling";

in Cheng Huan's (second century A.D.) commentary to *Chou-li* (ku-jen) ("a big *ling";

鏡 *cho* defined by *cheng* in *Shuo wen*; cf. *Ts'ien Han shu*, Li Ling chuan, the passus: "When he heard the sound of the 金 'metal'," to which Yen Shih-ku remarks: "kin, that means 銘 the *cheng*—another name being 鏟 *cho".

*cho* defined by *nao* in *Shuo wen* (the actual text has only *cho, cheng ye*; but K'ung Ying-ta's commentary (Cheng-i) to *Shi king* (ode *Ts'ai k'i*) quotes *Shuo wen*: *cho, cheng ye, nao ye*—so the actual text must be abbreviated);

*cho* defined by *ling* in *Kuang ya*.

Thus *nao* and *cheng* and *to* and *cho* are all *ling*; *nao* and *ling* and *ting-ting* and *ting-ning* and *cho* are all *cheng*, etc. In other words, all these seven: *nao, cheng, ling, ling-ting, ting-ning, to, cho*, are defined by each other and thus identified (but for a difference in size in some cases). This cannot possibly mean that all the names are but synonyms
for identical objects, as the various types have different ritual functions, but shows that the definition are only meant as approximations. The *nao* is “something akin to a *ling*,” etc. Hence Yetts’ identification of *cheng* and *cho* as two names for one and the same type may not be allowable.

In order to penetrate the matter further we have to search out such passages in the most ancient commentaries where something is said of the shape of the objects.

We can then start with the *cheng*, and its *Shuo wen* description: 鉦鏡也似鋤柄中上下通. This is translated by Yetts: “It resembles a *ling*. Its handle is hollow from top to bottom.” It is, however, doubtful if this translation is correct. Tuan Yü-ts’ai, Wang Yün, and Chu Tsün-sheng, the three greatest authorities on the *Shuo wen*, all punctuate after 中 *cheng*, and Tuan says: *cho*, *ling*, *cheng*, and *nao* are similar but not identical. *Cho* and *ling* resemble a *cheng* bell, but have a tongue, which produces the sound. *Cheng* has no tongue. The expression *ping chung* means that half of the handle is above and half is below. [The lower part] is slightly wider than the hole, so that it resists (does not slip through). When you hold the handle and shake it, it is caused to beat against the body and makes the sound. This description of Tuan’s tallies very well with Yetts’ surmise of a “pole or haft passed through the central axis of the bell”.

For his interpretation Tuan has the following *points d’appui*. *Shuo wen* says that *nao* is a “small *cheng*”. Now, to the *Chou-li* (ti *kuan*, *ku* *jen*) passage: “By a bronze *nao* one stops the [beating of the] drums,” Cheng Hüan’s commentary says: “The *nao* is like a *ling* but has no tongue; it has a handle grasping which one makes it sound, in order to stop the [beating of the] drums.” This Cheng’s description of a *nao* agrees perfectly with HÜ Shen’s description of a *cheng*. And the use of the two instruments is the same. In his commentary to *Shi king*, ode *Ts’ai k’i* (cf. above), in which ode it is spoken of 鉦 人 *cheng jen* “the men with the *cheng*”, Mao Ch’ang (second century B.C.) says: “By *cheng* bells one quietens (stops) them (the soldiers), by the *ku* drums one sets them in motion

---

1 We cannot even be quite sure that the text here is exactly preserved. T’ai *p’ing yü lan*, k. 584, p. 5 b, quotes *Shuo wen* thus: 鉦鏡也鈴柄中上
下通鉦也. But the reading given above (the actual *Shuo wen* text) re-occurs word by word in Ying Shao’s (second century A.D.) commentary to *Ts’ai’en Han shu*, k. 12, p. 2b, and also in K’ung Ying-ta’s commentary to *Shi king* (ode *Ts’ai k’i*, *Siao-yu* section) and in *I ts’ie king yin* i, k. 4; so it is probable that the T’ai *p’ing yü lan* has corrupted the quotation,
(causes them to advance). Thus we know from two ancient sources that the cheng and the nao both are made to sound by means of a handle which itself (but not a tongue) beats against the body, when the bell is shaken. And we know, equally from ancient sources, that both serve to stop the advancing-signal, the drum. We may, then, be sure that both terms had in view, as Yetts correctly says, the bell with the hollow shaft. Several such bells are reproduced in the Po ku t'u lu, but curiously enough none in the later imperial catalogues. An excellent idea of a true cheng the Western reader can get from the fine plate xxi in Tch'ou Tö-yi, Bronzes antiques de la Chine (1924)—a cheng 0·29 m. in height. And it is but reasonable to accept Shuo wen's statement that the nao is a smaller cheng. But when Yetts (p. 9) says: "The authors seem to evade an explanation of the manner in which the cheng were used, except to state that the spot in which the cheng are struck must have been at a higher level on the bell than that of the sui of the chung." I think he is off the track. When the Po ku t'u lu, followed by later catalogues, gives the name of 舞鋤 wo nao "dancing nao" to rattles—round bells with a ball inside, surrounded by a sun-shaped sphere, the application of the term nao is very arbitrary. The Pei wen yün fu does not know of the term wo-nao earlier than the Po ku t'u lu.

If we pass on to the to, Yetts is certainly right in defining them as clapper bells. It is true that most of the specimens recorded in the catalogues lack the "tongue" (clapper). There are to hand-bells given both in the Po ku t'u lu, the Ning shou kien ku, the Si Ts'ing ku kien, and the Si Ts'ing sii kien, but only in one case in the last one is there mentioned a 舌 "tongue". The probability is that the clappers were applied in various fashions. Yetts gives a to with a clapper duly attached to a bar inside the bell. Koop, pl. lx, gives a to which is clapperless, but he says: "It has the remains of a grating closing its mouth and might very well have had a loose wooden ball within, to act as clapper." That a tongue belongs to the to type seems certain. To Chou-li (t'ien kwan, siao tsai): "The siao tsai goes the announcing round with a 木铎 wooden to," Cheng Hüan says: "mu to means 木舌 wooden tongue," thus "bell with a wooden tongue". The mu to is mentioned in various passages in the classics (e.g. Lun yü), see Yetts, p. 11. There cannot be much doubt that the to of the

1 Ch'en Huan, Hwang Ts'ing king kia sii pien, k. 794, p. 20r, tries to show that cheng is a general name for smaller bells, including both cho, nao, and to, but his arguments are not convincing.
catalogues, hand bells with a good handle, apt to be shaken by hand so as to ring, are correctly identified. Yetts includes under the to another type (p. 10): “The barrel of the third type approximates in height and width the proportions of the chung, and there is a loop in place of a handle. Probably the inclusion of the last type is not justified according to classical usage; for the to is essentially a hand-bell, and this type is a hanging bell. It appears to differ from the ling only as regards its greater size.” As we shall see presently, Yetts is probably right in doubting its classification among the to.

In regard to the ling Yetts is remarkably hesitating. He seems to think that we can come no further than to the probability that in Han time the term was used for “something like our notion of a bell”. I believe we can afford to be more positive, already for Chou time. There can hardly be a doubt that various commentators are right in identifying the ling, the ling-ting and the ting-ling, all three words being imitative of the sound (as Yetts correctly states about the ling). That the ling of Chou time was a small bell follows from the fact that it was placed on top of the banner poles. To the passage ho ling ying ying “the ho and ling bells tinkle”, in the ode Ts’ai kien (Shi king, Chou sung), Mao Ch’ang’s commentary remarks: “Ling are on the top of the banner staff.” And the Erya says: “[Flags] with ling are called k’i,” to which the early commentator Kuo P’o remarks: “They suspend the ling on top of the banner pole.” From this same fact we can conclude that ling were bells with a tongue, as they could not be struck in that position. As to their shape, I know of no earlier testimony than the Ts’ie yün, written in the sixth century A.D. (k. 1, p. 12 a, of a photographic reproduction of a T’ang manuscript, published in 1925 with the title 刻穆補缺切韻), where it is said: “鈴似銃而小 ling is like a chung but smaller.” In later times the term ling has been applied to various kinds of small bells, and the bronze catalogues occasionally use the term for small bells or rattles of ball shape. But the data just quoted confirm Yetts’ opinion that the fundamental sense of ling was a bell of the chung shape shown in the Han relief cited. And the term is applied to such a bell: a chung shape with a loop handle, the body of the bell being only a little more than two Chinese inches high, in the Si Ts’ing ku kien (k. 36, p. 52).

The most intricate question is that of the 鐘 cho. Yetts simply considers it as a synonym for cheng, probably on the strength of the Shuo wen definition cho, cheng ye. But as I have shown, this proves nothing. The Chinese scholars are very uncertain as regards the cho.
None of the imperial catalogues label any bell in the collections as a _cho_, and the _Ku kin t’u shu tsi ch’eng_, which illustrates various types of bells with pictures, gives no illustration for the _cho_—in other words, the compilers of these various works did not know how a _cho_ was shaped. The lexicographers are at variance. A commentator of the _Shuo wen_ 徐　誴 Sū Hao (Ts’ing time) says that _cho_, _ling_, _cheng_, _nao_, and _to_ all had the same shape, the only difference being that _ling_ and _to_ had a tongue, the others not—thus the _cho_ would be tongueless. Tuan Yū-ts’ai, on the contrary (as quoted above), rightly sets the _to_ quite apart, and says the _cho_, _ling_, _cheng_, and _nao_ are similar but not identical, _cho_ and _ling_ resembling a _chung_, but having a tongue which the _chung_ has not. To make a decision between these views is not easy. If Yetts (and Sū Hao) were right, it would mean that the _cho_ would be (identical with the _cheng_ and hence) identical with the _nao_ and differing from it only in size. But in the _Chou-li_ (ku jen) we find: “With the bronze _ch’un_ the pitch of the drums is set; with the bronze _cho_ the time of the drums is regulated; with the bronze _nao_ the drums are signalled to stop” (Yetts, p. 8). Here there is a direct opposition between _cho_ and _nao_: the _cho_ regulates the rhythm of the drums, the _nao_ stops them altogether. It is little likely that the same instrument (only varying in size) should have these somewhat contrary applications. Still more clearly the difference comes out in the _Chou-li, Ta-sí-ma_ section (Yetts, p. 9): “The leader of a company [of soldiers] takes a _nao_; the leader of a platoon takes a _to_; the leader of five men takes a _cho_”. If the _cho_ were equal to a _cheng_ (the _cheng_ being a bigger _nao_ this is quite unreasonable—why should a leader of five men have the same commanding instrument as a company leader, but of a larger size? These passages suggest rather that the _cho_ was a quite different type from a _nao_ (cheng shape).

Thus we have to side with Tuan Yū-ts’ai. This eminent scholar has seized upon the only description of a _cho_ existing in the oldest literature: Cheng Hian in his commentary to _Chou-li_ (ku jen) says: “Its shape is like a small _chung._” This is precisely the definition of a _ling_ in _Ts’ie yün_ (as quoted above), and Tuan logically concludes that _ling_ and _cho_ are closely akin, in fact, they are but two varieties of the same object, and hence the _cho_ ought to have a tongue just as well as the _ling_. Just as in the case of the _cheng_ and the _nao_, the difference between them must reasonably be a difference in size. It stands to reason that a _cho_, serving as signal instrument in the hand of an officer, must be larger than a _ling_, which is placed on top of a banner
pole. It is, indeed, tempting to identify the cho with the bell described by Yetts as the "third type" of the to, and of which he says: "The barrel of the third type approximates in height and width to the proportions of the chung, and there is a loop in place of a handle . . . it appears to differ from the ling only as regards its greater size." I suppose that by this category Yetts has in view a bell like the one represented by Tch'ou Tö-yü in pl. vii (height 0·31 m.)—that is in any case how I imagine a cho to have looked, according to the data just quoted.

If these deductions from data in the classics and in the oldest set of commentaries (Han and Six dynasties) are correct, we have arrived at the following principal groups of bells:

1. Chung—big bells with bosses—as described by Yetts;
2. Ch'un or ch'un-yü—a bulbous upper part with a narrower collar below, and with an animal shape as handle;
3. Bells with a hollow shaft, through which passed a handle that penetrated down into the interior of the bell and struck the sides when shaken: big variety cheng, and small variety nao;
4. To—hand-bells with loose tongues;
5. Bells of chung shape, but smaller and with tongue: big variety cho, and small variety ling.

These remarks of mine are intended less as a criticism of Dr. Yetts' treatise than as a complement to it. Indeed, the author is such an able and sure guide in the wild forest of Chinese archaeology that we can wish for no better, and we can congratulate Mr. Eumorofopoulos that for the task of preparing a scientific account of this collection he has secured this scholar.

Bernhard Karlgren.

1 Yetts says (p. 11) with a certain disesteem: "Legge's translation of 'bells on his horse's foreheads and bits, and those on his carriage pole' merely reflects the explanations of commentators." What are we then to build our studies on, if not the informations given by commentators? I want to emphasize the fact that as valueless as are the speculations of late commentators, who are guessing and reconstructing right and left, without safe foundations, just as valuable are the data given by the earliest commentators (who lived sufficiently early to have seen a lot of Chou objects), if only they are pieced together methodically and carefully sifted. A careful scrutiny of particularly the Han time commentators is the way the great Chinese scholars of the last 150 years have followed—and as far as I can see it is the only way possible. The fault of Legge and others is not that they have followed the Chinese commentators (without them we are helpless) but that they have considered all commentators—early and late—as equally good, believing that one can choose ad libitum between various explanations—if they have only some time been expressed by some Chinese commentator!

This is a new art journal, printed and published in Pei-p'ing (Peking), of which a copy of the first issue dated last July, has just arrived in England.

A portrait of Li Chieh, author of the Ying tsao fa shih, appropriately appears as the frontispiece. This is followed by a note on the founding of the Society and the inaugural address by the President, Chu Chi-ch'ien, the latter being given in English as well as Chinese. The next thirty pages are devoted to a biographical notice in memory of Li Chieh on the 820th anniversary of his death. A large part is occupied by the facsimile reproduction of two articles by W. Perceval Yetts, the first being a long bibliographical study of the Ying tsao fa shih which appeared three years ago in the Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies. A summary of this is given in Chinese. The second of Mr. Yetts' articles, which arrests most attention, is reproduced complete with half-tone illustrations from The Burlington Magazine of March, 1927. This absorbingly interesting and scholarly article is entitled "Writings on Chinese Architecture". It should greatly please Mr. Yetts to find that his patient research work in this subject is so fully appreciated in China itself, even though piratical methods have been employed in order to reproduce it! The article is followed by a translation, English done into Chinese, which adds still further point to the compliment.

A list of errata to the 1925 edition of the Ying tsao fa shih will be useful to those who possess a copy, and to those who do not the announcement will be of interest that the far-seeing Commercial Press has recently published a revised edition of this most celebrated book written by a Chinese on Chinese Architecture.

Arnold Silcock.


This book is very much to be commended. The author quite evidently writes out of wide and long experience. One can gather this apart altogether from what is set down in a forenote, which reveals the fact that the work is the result of a gradual process, covering many years, and tested by personal intercourse with the people. It is evident also from the fact that points are dealt with in a clear,
concise, orderly, and complete fashion, which shows an intimate knowledge of the subject.

It is the only work of its kind in existence and is a most useful book to put into the hands of anyone desiring to obtain a workable everyday knowledge of the Hakka dialect of the Chinese language. The romanization employed is that which is now commonly used by Hakka students, and accords with that adopted in MacIver's (now Mackenzie's) valuable Hakka Dictionary. Although the dialect followed is admittedly "Sin-On", it conforms closely to "Ka-Yin-Chiu" (commonly regarded as standard Hakka), and is remarkably free from localisms. In many cases, where these do occur, alternatives are given. A noteworthy exception to this appears in Section 92, dealing with the suffix "Hoi", denoting the "finishing of an action". A much more common suffix, expressive of this idea and without the specialized meaning of "Hoi", is "Liau". But there does not appear to be any reference to so important a word in the whole course of the book.

The book is commendable for many reasons. Difficult and rather abstruse points are explained in simple, lucid, easily-remembered terms. Idiomatic phrases in daily use are set forth clearly and fully. Each lesson is of very manageable length and finishes with exercises for translation into English and Hakka, to which there is a very useful key at the end of the book. Moreover, the arrangement throughout in paragraphs is most convenient, both for reference and revision purposes. Every here and there helpful cautions are given where the beginner may easily find a pitfall. And the lessons on such complicated subjects as "Potential and Subjunctive Moods", "Family Relationships", "Weights and Measures" are particularly valuable. For those whose interest lies in Borneo (where the writer himself lives), there is a special chapter on "Borneo Chinese words".

It only remains to add that with every lesson there is a vocabulary of words in common use so full in their cumulative effect that the student who masters this volume will find that he already has a very sound working knowledge of the language. Especially will this be so if he has followed the writer's advice to go forth boldly, using, in conversation with a native Hakka, the words and phrases gradually acquired. He who does this will soon discover that it is as the writer himself says in his Introduction, "this language is worthy of serious study and as one progresses becomes more and more fascinating."

W. Bernard Paton.
Once again has the difficult problem of the position of Japanese in relation to other languages been brought to our notice; this time by a Japanese scholar, Dr. N. Matsumoto, who in this extremely interesting volume has compared 113 sets of Japanese words with similar terms in the Austroasiatic and Austronesian languages. The book has been most adequately reviewed by Dr. C. O. Blagden in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland (July, 1930), and this fact should dispense with any further need for remark.

There remain, however, a few points that seem to call for comment. In the first place the author appears to find a linguistic connection between the following sets of Japanese words: *kaho* "face, visage, figure", *ho* "joue" (2, p. 46); *saka* "crête", *ke* "cheveux" (8, p. 48); *-ki, -gi* "mâle", *-kara in u-kara, ya-kara* "clan", *hara-kara* "frère et soeur utérins" (22 p. 51); *kira- in kira-meku* "briller, étinceler" and in *a-kira-ka* "clair" (34, p. 45); *kumo* "nuage", *kabu- in kabu-ru* "se couvrir" (38, p. 56); *ine, šine* "riz en herbe", *yone* "riz décortiqué", *nahe* "jeune pousse d’une plante; on l’emploie surtout pour désigner la jeune pousse du riz", and *neba- in neba-ru* "glutineux" (51, pp. 59–60); *sarù, mašira* "singe" (71, p. 66); *hiku* "tirer", *hiraku* "ouvrir" (88, p. 70); *niru* "cuire", *nuku-in nuku-ši* "tiède, agréablement chaud, etc." (101, p. 73). If each of these sets of words is to be considered as being etymologically related, it is necessary for the author to establish their original form and meaning, before attempting a comparison with other languages. Thus, for example, in the case of *kaho* "face", *ho* "cheek", and *saka* "crest", *ke* "hair", it must first be explained which of the two more faithfully preserves the older form, that is to say, whether the *ka-* and *sa-* are prefixes of some kind or the words *ho* and *ke* have lost their initial stem syllables. Similarly, the nature of the *i-, ši-* and *yo-* of *ine, šine*, and *yone* should be made clear, if these words go back to *neb* or *nep* as the author supposes. So also the *ma-* in *mašira* "ape". As to the pairs of words *hiku* "to pull", *hiraku* "to open", and *niru* "to cook", *nukuši* "is warm", we find little in common, at least in their forms, unless we assume that the *-k-* and *-r-* have both
developed from -kr-, -rk-, or from a uvular consonant such as a rolled श or a fricative छ. Similarly the stem of akiraku “clear” is, in my opinion, aki-, which has nothing to do with kiru-. On the other hand the stem kara- in karada “corps” (16, p. 50) and that in ukara, etc. (22, p. 51) appear to be identical, although Dr. Matsumoto distinguishes the two. The word haši “extrémité, bout, bord” (107, p. 74) may likewise be related to hâte “extrême limite, etc.” (108, p. 74).

Further, the word yubi “doigt” (21, p. 51) goes back, not to *yuži as the author assumes, but to oyobi “finger”, whereas maiçu “venir” (96, p. 72) has always been written maiçu. It is quite possible that in the latter word the syllablic writing wi is nothing more than an orthographic expedient for the prevention of two consecutive vowels, but inasmuch as we have no substantial evidence to the contrary, we must follow the orthography and read the word maiçu, in which case the Japanese word in point can hardly be related to the Cam mai “to come”, and so forth.

As regards the relationship between Japanese and the Austroasiatic and Austronesian languages, we can be almost certain that there are in Japanese many words which have their prototypes in these language groups; the names of reptiles and agricultural terms in particular. But when attempting a comparison of Japanese words with those in a language or a group of languages which is entirely different in its salient features as in the present case, one must carefully avoid such terms as may be found in similar forms in other languages morphologically and syntactically identical or very close to Japanese, or, to say the least, these languages should also be taken into consideration. This, to our regret, appears to have been neglected by the author of the present work. Of the 113 sets of Japanese words quoted by Dr. Matsumoto, well over 20 are found in the Altaic and Finno-Ugrian languages in forms no less resembling the Japanese than those which have been chosen by the author from the Austroasiatic and Austronesian languages. Besides, there are also some words which may be considered to be of Chinese origin, as, for example, kahi (≪*kapi) “endroit étroit, gorge” (63, p. 63) (≪ Anc. Chinese γαπ 陝, 峽, “gorge, mountain pass, defile”) and take “bambou” (56, p. 61); for this latter, see my article contributed in this number of the Bulletin.

When these and other doubtful cases are removed, no more than thirty-five of the entire 113 sets of Japanese words selected by Dr. Matsumoto can be accepted as probably of Austroasiatic or Austro-
nesian origin. This, however, does not mean that the conclusions arrived at by the author are altogether impossible, but it clearly shows that we cannot decide their accuracy for lack of knowledge concerning the Japanese words themselves.

In the circumstances, Dr. Matsumoto's work is undoubtedly one of the most useful contributions of recent years to the comparative study of the Japanese language, and is one that should be read by every student in this line of inquiry.

S. Yoshitake.

SCHRIFTEN DER ARBEITSGEMEINSCHAFT DER AEGYPTOLOGEN UND AFRIKANISTEN IN WIEN. I Band. WALTER TILL: Koptische Chrestomathie für den Fayumischen Dialekt mit grammatischer Skizze und Anmerkungen. Selbstverlag der Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Ae. u. A. in Wien, Augustinerbastei 6. ii + 30 pp. 3s. 3d.

Herr Till, who is already honourably known for his work on the Akhmimic dialect of Coptic, has now put us further in his debt by this useful collection of Fayumic texts. They have all been previously published, but in scattered periodicals, some of them difficult of access, and the student will be glad to find them together.

It is a dialect with what would be called in Greek "Doric" characteristics, a broad a often taking the place of other vowels (there are other vowel-changes too elaborate for enumeration here); and a substitution of l for r easily explicable when we remember that the ancient Egyptians (like the modern Chinese) did not distinguish these two labials. Herr Till gives a short preliminary account of these phonetic and orthograpical peculiarities—just enough to introduce the student to this dialect, which is not difficult to those already familiar with Sa'idic and Bohairic.

He regrets (as do we) that he had not the space to place the same passages in the other dialects side by side with his Fayumic texts. He does, however, give the Lord's Prayer in all three. The Fayumic twice presents a simplification, as compared with the other two, which may mean that the translator found some difficulties in subtlety of expression: "thy will in heaven may it be done on earth," and "thine is the power and the glory".

I naturally take a personal interest in the passages from Acts vii and ix presented by Herr Till, as I first published them in the Journal of Theological Studies, xi (July, 1910): Lefort printed them some years ago.
later in *Muséon*, not aware of my previous publication. In vii, 24 Till follows Lefort in reading ἀρθενοῦτι λάντι ἰετ ἐννιαμή (ἡμύνατο καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐκδικήσων), but λάντι ἰετ is definitely wrong. I printed in its place λάντιι, putting it in brackets because I was not quite certain of it; but a year ago Mr. Crum scrutinised the manuscript anew and told me that he could see . . . ἰετ quite plainly.

Herr Till promises us further instalments of work on this interesting dialect, to which we look forward eagerly, grateful for what he gives us now.

**Stephen Gaselee.**


It is over two years since Mr. Elder’s fascinating book was published, and one hopes that he will publish a further collection of stories as told in the colloquial. Nothing quite so ambitious as part iii of section x, “Some Christian Beliefs,” has been attempted before in the colloquial, and the result is what might be called “Literary Colloquial”. To quote the *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 1928, No. 7, in a review by Prof. A. Schaade, “Die Abhandlungen über theologische Fragen am Schluss des Buches (S. 142–150) können sogar eine gewisse Bedeutung in der Geschichte der ägyptisch-arabischen Literatur beanspruchen, da hier—so viel Ich weiss, zum ersten mal—gezeigt wird, dass sich auch wissenschaftliche Gegenstände sehr wohl in einem Vulgärdialekt behandeln lassen.”

A great deal has been written on Egyptian colloquial, but not many texts have been published on the lines of Spitta Bey’s *Contes Arabes modernes* and the tales in Willmore’s Grammar.

It is true that Green published a collection of stories taken from various sources which are extremely useful to the student of colloquial, but many of these had been published previously and moreover are printed in Arabic characters without vowel points, so that from the point of view of phonetics they are not of great value. Mr. Elder’s work is based strictly on the system evolved by the late Canon Gairdner and is intended to take the place of a Reader for the students of the School of Oriental Studies, Cairo. To quote from the preface: “The subject-matter of this book is largely the product
of Egyptian instructors in the School of Oriental Studies. The Editor makes no claim to originality in the composition of the book, but has aimed throughout to have it represent Egyptian thought and expression. It has been his task to select, suggest, outline, and review, but he has been careful to have all that appears pass the approval of at least two Egyptians, and often many more.

The Reader is divided into ten sections:

No. I. Short anecdotes.

No. II. (a) Tales of Guha, "an apparent simpleton who gets the laugh in the end by some facetious remark or drollery." (b) Tales of Abu Nawwas.

Many of the tales in Nos. I and II have been taken from the first edition of Gairdner's Grammar.

No. III. Short stories, including some concerning Dervish Saints.

All the tales and anecdotes in I, II, and III are excellent and typical. I would specially mention No. III, 13, "The Story of the Fisherman," supplied by Miss Padwick.

No. IV. Tales from the collection of Spitta Bey. Mr. Elder was wise to include these, as though old tales they are full of expressions and idioms, and give one an idea of the life in earlier days when Lane wrote the classic Modern Egyptians.

Part of the dialogue of IV, 1, between the Day-Thief and the Night-Thief when they first meet in the Café is quoted in Orientalische Höflichkei, p. 22, by Østrup. The tales are not only amusing but full of material for the student of colloquial.

No. V. Dialogues and occupations. The authors of these dialogues have sprinkled them with proverbs and neat turns of expression which more than anything else introduce the foreigner to the mentality of the people. Some of the headings will give an idea of their usefulness. For example, "An invitation to dinner," "The experienced buyer," "The tailor and her apprentice," "The eye-doctor and the peasant." There are sixteen of these dialogues and they cover a great deal of ground. No. 17 gives details of the education given at the "Azhar" University in Cairo, and No. 18 gives technicalities connected with the building of a house.

No. VI, "The adventures of Messrs. Long and Short, American tourists in Egypt," is amusing and instructive.

No. VII. (i) Customs and Beliefs. This should be read in connection with Lane's Modern Egyptians and that excellent work by Miss Blackman, The Fallahin of Upper Egypt. (ii) Moslem Feast Days.
No. VIII. Proverbs. This section is invaluable as every proverb is placed in its own setting and explained.

No. IX. Popular songs and rhymes. Some of these are very difficult.

No. X. Bible section. (i) Stories from the history of Israel; (ii) Bible portions; (iii) Some Christian beliefs.

In (ii) the translation of the British and Foreign Bible Society has been adopted, and the attempt to keep literally to the original has made the translation at times ambiguous. For example, p. 142, l. 18, "ṣanḇl ṣalek turfus manaxis" “it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks,” following the classical translation. I note that Wilcock's omits these words in his colloquial rendering of this passage, perhaps following Moffatt. So also p. 126, l. 10, “wi ṣasṭadu muhrīṣa bidaʾil ibnū” “and he offered it up as a burnt offering in the place of his son,” and p. 127, l. 28, “wahṣ rodi” “an evil beast,” both of which are literal translations of the Hebrew. It struck me also that the style of some of the stories of (i) was rather varied, most of it being very colloquial, although here and there one meets literary words such as “qarsal”. I have already remarked on the style of Sect. X (iii), the words used and the construction being nearer the literary language than the colloquial. This is possibly a concession on the part of the editor to meet the demand of the more educated for a more literary form of colloquial, though in point of fact it would be difficult to treat such abstruse themes in any other way without resorting definitely to literary Arabic.

Remarks on Grammar, Syntax, etc.

p. 2, l. 26. I am told that "ṣaxṣax il ganaqgil” “jingled the small bells” is better than "ṣaxṣax fi ʾl ganaqgil".

p. 3, l. 2, “wi ḏda: lu masalan rijaʾ” “he gave him about a riyal”; compare p. 36, l. 22, “fa ʾḏulu lamma duxal il lel liʾs sa:ṣa_rbaṣa masalan min il lel” “they waited until it was about 4 o’clock at night, i.e. 4 in the morning”. The use of “masalan” in these sentences is idiomatic but expressive.

p. 4, l. 20, “kaʾn janaḍi wi ʾjʿu:l” “he was hawking and saying”. This form iii is used in the Sudan for No. 1, “nada” “to call”. For curious uses of “nada” with direct and indirect objects see p. 47, “wi nadahu liʾmḥammad,” and a few lines further on “indah ibnak” and next line “nadahu ibn il malik”. This corresponds to the English “call” and “call out to”.
p. 6. The peasant and the wax figures. Sheikh Hāmid Abdel Kādir tells me that in the original tale, when the Fallah is knocked down by the owner of the shop, he is made to say "eš mašna da illi bi_l lawālib" "why is it that this one has springs?". In the sixth line of this tale note the delightful personification of the colloquial "kullima ṯablú ṯoswira", etc., "every time a figure met him," where we should say "every time he met a figure".

p. 6, last line but three, "ti̱mil li mašruf" which is equivalent to "ti̱mil mašruf" or "i̱mil mašruf" "will you, please" or "please". I do not remember seeing this usage "j" of the negative without "ma—" mentioned in the colloquial grammars.

p. 7, piece No. 20, "The persistent beggar," is very difficult. l. 7, "li ḥānni 'akl il qes jhibb lamm_adan¿din lak j̱uwajja wi_ddini_li fi_ẖ il ḥisma" "for everyone's living requires that (one makes an effort) . . . I am going to play a tune—give me my due". So also the last line of the tale: "ja_ bni sodgi ḥadi:k ṭ̱H̱o: ẖ la_jwarri:k" "Oh, my son, may the pain that I feel be transferred to your enemies. May God not visit (show) you with it".

Section II, Guha and Abu Nawwas, contains some very good stories and some idiomatic colloquial such as p. 15, l. 5: "i̱wi̱ hissik wi qenik il malik jī:u:qak" "Be careful (to control) your voice and your eye that the king does not see you".

p. 16, l. 2, "wi_ nso:ro:fu_j ha:l sabiḻhum" "and they went their own way". I am told there is a subtle difference in usage—"li ha:l sabiḻhum" for past and "fi ha:l sabiḻhum" for present.

p. 21. ḥizzinni, a colloquial corruption of "count that I am", "consider me".

p. 24. "bare:tak bil hā?⃣ wil mistaha⃣⃣⃣" should have been, I am told, "mil hā?⃣". Note also in the literary language the second form of the verb would be required.

p. 26, l. 2, "xudu:hum bi s si:t la j̱gilibukum" "Take them by reputation (bluff through flattery) lest they defeat you". This is a difficult expression.

p. 30, l. 24. Note facetious way of expressing "a few saints" by "a handful of saints" "kabšit ḥawlija".

p. 31, l. 9. "jisabi? ⃣qaleh" "He would race ahead of him" is much more expressive than merely "jisab:bi?u". Compare also p. 25, l. 35, "kaffar il farro:n fi w̱i̱:j̱u" where the preposition "fi"
implies not only that the baker frowned but that he met the hunter with a frown on his face.

p. 34, l. 19, "gaj beti leh ana dilwaṭt" "Why has he come to my house now?" The position of "leh" between "beti" and "ana" is very curious and very ungrammatical, but gives a slightly different nuance to the sentence.

p. 37, last line but six, "abu:ja ma ma'ṭ ba:ya: lu sanat:m." The dialogue of which this is the last sentence is very interesting and typical. "Did not my father die two years ago?" meaning "My father died two years ago".

p. 44, l. 22. "fi ḥizz is siba:ja." This has been copied straight from Spitta Bey's *Contes Arabes Modernes*. It should be "fi ḥizz is siba:ja" "in the strength of my youth". Otherwise it makes no sense. This was pointed out in the critique on Mr. Elder's book in the *Orientalische Literaturzeitung*, 1928, No. 7.

p. 50, last line but three. "bacsulit il muhibbi xaru:f wil mahabba tustur" "The onion of the loved one is a sheep and love conceals (it)" i.e. "love overlooks everything." Compare the Syrian proverb "ḍorb il habib zabi:b" "The blow of the lover is a raisin".

p. 51, l. 9, and p. 53, ll. 24, 25, and 27. "Ṭμyawal," which is a combination of ٍلَبَسْتَ, is a very curious colloquial corruption.

p. 52, l. 24. "rblu: jixzi₂ l ṣe:n ṣanha" "May God put the evil eye to shame (and remove it) from her". Short and concise.

p. 56, last line but three. "di₆bdo:ya wa:rīd biladha" "These are goods imported from the country of their origin". The word "min" is omitted in this expression. One says "wa:rīd Uro:ba" "imported from Europe".

p. 64, last two lines. "da: lli ṭi₃i₃ib min ʤahr id dunja robbina ma: jgallib lakf₁ ṭilija" "That which I have brought forth from the back of the world may God not trouble a woman relative of yours", i.e. "may she not suffer as I have". An idiomatic and difficult sentence.

p. 77, l. 16. "wi naṭṭaf:i:n il m'ейчас lim do:l lamma tinjinitj ัสidu ma jibib₁ wa:xhid minhum" "And as for the painters another contractor, even after all his efforts, will not obtain any like them". "tinjinitj ัสidu" "to make an effort" is very idiomatic and not in Spiro. Should be tinjinitj, see list of misprints below.

p. 82, l. 21. "wi:₇ hisa:b jigmaq₈" "and the accounting will collect", i.e. "we will settle up afterwards".
p. 83, last line but 4. Note the weakening of the meaning of "taṣṣṣub" in modern Arabic from "fanaticism" to mere prejudice.

p. 87, l. 12. "w_ismuhum xamas ʔawʔa:t" should be "w_ismuhum il xamas ʔawʔa:t" "and their name is the five times," i.e. "They are called the five prayers".

p. 93. The first three lines of p. 93 are difficult to understand at first, as "madaʔtu" is a misprint for "madaqtu" and the word "tininn" is a corruption from "taʔinn", meaning "she groans".

p. 123, last line but nine. Surely "ṣabbī", not being a class or species, should not take "waḥid" to make it indefinite. In this connection it is interesting to compare the instances given in the first section of the book (Short Anecdotes); cf. p. 3, l. 2, "kan roːgil", not "kan waḥid roːgil".

One might draw attention to many more curious idioms and expressions, especially in Section VIII (Proverbs) and Section IX (Popular Rhymes and Songs), but space forbids.

The following are a few examples of passives retained in the colloquial. As one might expect, most of these examples are found in religious expressions or proverbs.

p. 4, l. 27. "tufroːg" "may it be eased". The cry of the hawker.

"inn illoːch summi as sattar" "Verily God is named 'The Protector'".

"tikun fi hanakak tiʔsam li ɡerak" for "tuʔsam" "There is many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip". Cf. p. 109, l. 24, where the proverb is given in a slightly different form: "tibʔaː fulfil ak tiʔsam li ɡerak".

p. 21, last line but 4 and 5. "qalaʃaːn il woroːa ma tistaʔmolaʃ tami n urra" "because the postage stamp cannot be used another time".

p. 31, last line. "lamma ɡulbit min il xobiz" "when she was overcome by the baking".

p. 51, l. 14. "juːsol" "it will be delivered".

p. 107, l. 21. "jixlaʔ min ɡoːhr il qaːlim faːsid" "(Sometimes) a corrupt person is created from a learned man": "jixlaʔ" being the colloquial pronunciation of "juxlaʔ", otherwise it would mean "(God) creates sometimes a corrupt person from a learned man". The former rendering is much more probable.
The following are a few examples of second and third forms used where the object is not expressed or understood.

p. 30, l. 15. "la _towwili wala ṭossūri" "Do not make long or short", i.e. "cut your story short".

p. 49, l. 23. "aṭanist" for "aṭanistina" "you have given us the pleasure of your company".

p. 57, l. 25. "di beṣi fiṣrā jizahha?" "this is commerce which disgusts one".

p. 61. lahsan jirā:b wi jʔottοt "let it (the milk) curdle and turn".

p. 109, l. 2. "iđ li wahdaha ma tsaʔaf", which lit. means "a hand alone cannot put on a roof", but is really a corruption of صفق صفق and then by a process of transposition to صفق means "to clap", so the proverb is "One hand alone cannot clap".

Examples of denominatives are, of course, much commoner, as p. 30, last line, "jiʔaffar" "to raise the dust"; p. 31, l. 23, "sammi wi haffodi ẓallajja" "Pronounce the name of God and invoke his protection on my behalf".

p. 29, l. 31. "tifaʔyar" "to nod", which is apparently a denominative from "fiґra" or "faґra" the spinal column, i.e. "to move the spinal column".

Examples of original fourth forms or of apparent first forms where in literary Arabic the fourth form is used.

p. 17, l. 11. "tiʔim is sula" "to conduct the prayer".

p. 23, l. 15. "tolla" for "tolila" (1st form), "kuttī tolla mit toʔa" "I was looking out of the window". Literary Arabic would be "mutilla" (4th form).

p. 62, l. 2. "eč illi bi jūgaʔak" "what is giving you pain?" and the reply "ʔenajja ithuba tiwgaʔnī" "my eye pains me". Both first forms which would be 4v in literary Arabic. Phonetically it is interesting to note the two pronunciations, which are both common.

p. 71, l. 26. "diiru balku fișha" "pay attention to it" and "qiḏ xula:sit id durs" "repeat the gist of the lesson".

So p. 76, l. 7. "jiʔiḏ qulum is sana di nafsaha" "He must repeat the subjects of this particular year".
p. 80, last line but five, "ninji juglina" "we will finish our work".

Literary Arabic  

p. 95, l. 16. "tola?it il buxur" "waved the incense". Literally "let loose the incense", for literary Arabic اطلق.

p. 145, l. 12. "ruxd" for literary "araxd" ( أرآد) "to wish". One should note that this word is used in what I have called literary colloquial, i.e. in Section X (3).

Criticism on Phonetic Points

The following points struck me:—

(1) There are too many hamzas, especially after the definite article. These occur on every page and it is unnecessary to enumerate them; on the other hand, one feels that a hamza would have made the sentence clearer on p. 43, l. 29, after "t?uli: li", and on p. 56, last line, after "ruh ?abla", though in neither case is it essential.

(2) Is "ma?elef" and "zajjima" the best phonetic transcription of these very common words?

(3) It is interesting to note that the expression "Then he said"
"?am ?al" on p. 21, l. 32, varies considerably; the most usual one is as above, but p. 20, l. 23, "?am ya?al," and p. 30, l. 22, "?a:m ?a:l." One would expect this.

(4) "tor" "ox" on p. 32, l. 14, and elsewhere in the book is written with an unvelarized "t", but I note that Willmore writes it with a velarized "t", which is, I think, the more usual pronunciation in Egypt. Etymologically one would have expected "tor".

(5) As one would expect, the word for "want" is not always written "?awiz", though it is the most usual. We get the deeper "?awuz" (p. 7, l. 5) and "?awuz" (p. 13, last line) of the "Fallahin" and the various grades of "?awiz" (?awz), "?ajiz" (?ajz), according to the speaker.

(6) In Egyptian colloquial it is sometimes only possible to discover the original word from the context owing to contractions; cf. p. 92, last line but three, "li haddi s sab?a", which is contracted from "li haddi s sab?i?a" "up to the seventh (time)"; and also on p. 94, last line but six, "?abba" for "?a:bba". In this latter instance colloquial Egyptian is even stricter than the literary language, which
allows a long vowel to stand before a doubled consonant. The word "sabba" (uncontracted) means "a piece of alum", vide p. 100, l. 26.

(7) p. 14, l. 13, "maddi lu." In Cairo the stress would be on the second syllable "mad'di lu", and in some parts, e.g. Mansoura, on the first syllable "'maddi lu". In the Sudan it would be "mad'da: lu".

Remarks on Misprints and Type

The difficulties attending the printing of a book in phonetic type with a variety of types will be seen from the number of misprints that I have noted.

(a) The confusion between ئ (ٍ) and ئ (ع) hamza is the most frequent, because in the speech of Cairo there is no difference in pronunciation.

(b) Occasionally ئ and ئ are confused, as on p. 105, l. 16, "ٍبٍم" for "عبم".

(c) A large number of misprints are due to printing unvelarized consonants for velarized and vice versa.

(d) There are a number of instances where helping vowels have been omitted or printed incorrectly as ordinary vowels.

As regards (a) the recognized phonetic symbol for hamza is ئ, and this must remain, but should not some other symbol be adopted for ئ (ٍ) ئ?

With regard to (b), the confusion between ئ (ٍ) and ئ (ع), I feel that these symbols are not satisfactory. I should prefer to see the actual Arabic letter ع adopted in place of ئ. I still find it difficult not to confuse ئ and ئ. I hope that the phoneticians will be able to solve these points satisfactorily. Misprints are occasionally very confusing, as, for instance, "fu?aad" for "fu?aad" on p. 108, nine lines from the bottom, and "ridn" for "rida" on p. 19, l. 7. This word is printed correctly on p. 108, l. 20.

In conclusion I wish to record my thanks to my colleague Sheikh Hāmid Abdel Kādir for the help I have received from him in solving numerous difficulties.
Misprints

p. 1, l. 7. geir for geir.

l. 19. busītī (بسیطة) for bosītī. I think this must be a misprint, as the word in Gairdner’s Grammar, p. 63, l. 23, is so written “habba bosītī.” Compare also Gairdner’s Phonetics of Arabic, pp. 50 and 51, “Influence of modifying consonants on the vowels of syllables other than those to which they belong.” It is noticeable in this connection that the word ميسوت "pleased" is frequently misspelt مبسوت by the uneducated. Compare also l. 25 below, “fa nbōsot”; l. 23, “wosfa” for “wosfa” as below in last line.

p. 2, l. 15. kullaha: for kul’laha.

l. 18. samn for samn1; otherwise three consonants will come together.

p. 7, l. 7. saʿīl for saʾīl.

l. 13. ʿinnī for ʾinnī.

p. 10, l. 18. ummu ʿweː? for ummu ʿweː?.

p. 13, l. 12. tōḥān for ṭ tōḥām.

p. 15, l. 12. ʿaxīron for ʿaxīron.

p. 16, l. 1. ʿab for ʿabl.

p. 17, l. 9. simṣu taqlab for simṣu t taqlab.


p. 20, l. 34. adfaṣʾhum for adfaṣʾhum, unless this is intentional.

p. 21, l. 31. ʿafa for ʿala.

Last line but four. tistaʾmalī for tistaʾmalī.

p. 23, l. 31. in fa ʾpHo: for in fa ʾpHo:.

p. 25, l. 5. nizil i ʿaṣad for nizil wi ʿaṣad.

p. 28, l. 16. bint for bintī.


p. 30, l. 33. laʾaḥa for laʾaḥa.

p. 31, l. 7. id dasuːʔi for id dasuːʔi.

p. 32, l. 18. kalu for kalu..

p. 33, l. 20. ṣarofuḥaṣ for ṣarofuḥaṣ.

p. 37, last line. xawq: a for xawq:ga.

p. 41, l. 13. ʾī for fa.

l. 33. eh: for eh.
p. 43, l. 23. baʔa: for baʔa.
p. 47, l. 31. ʔaği for ʔaği.
p. 49, last line. kunf for kunf.
p. 51, l. 25. ʔaːxiʔ ajis for ʔaːxi ʔaːjis.
p. 54, fourth line. suː for suː.
p. 59, last line but six. tobaʔ for tobaʔ.
p. 62, l. 16. doξfam for doξfam.
l. 17. ʔosfor for ʔosfor.
p. 65, l. 17. id ʔọna for id ʔọna.
p. 68, last line but five. is subhṭixuff for is subhṭixuff; i.e. two words, not one.
p. 69, last line but five. ʔizzajj for ʔizzajj.
p. 70, last line. waʔi:f for waʔi:f.
p. 73, l. 19. tswrlah for tswrlah.
p. 74, l. 3. soʔottl for soʔottl.
Last line but five. il ṭarbijja for it ṭarbijja.
p. 76, l. 8. ṭamaːn for ṭamaːn.
l. 24. jibʔa.bn xdl for jibʔa.bn xdl.
p. 77, l. 16. tinʔitiː for tinʔitiː.
p. 79, l. 19. masʔil for masʔil.
p. 80, l. 31. ri wajaːt for ri wajaːt in one word; and two lines lower, min nu for minnu in one word.
Last line but four. illi for illi.
p. 81, l. 7. ʔaːjis for ʔaːjis.
Sixth line from bottom. ʔawsətuha for ʔawsətuha.
p. 82, l. 17. jitoʔHoː for jitoʔHoː.
p. 84, l. 1. ʔamaːr for ʔamaːr.
p. 89, l. 16. jistoʔbotna for jistaʔbotna.
p. 90, last line but six. likkum for likkum.
p. 92, last line but six. il ʔawwila for il ʔawwila.
p. 93, l. 2. madaʔtu for madagtu.
l. 7. jitoʔtoʔu for jitoʔtoʔu.
p. 94, last line but one. gaːbu.lha for gaːbu.lha.
p. 97, last line. wallaː ʔʃibb for wallaː ʔʃibb.
p. 98, l. 6. burnettak for burnettak.
p. 100, l. 21. jitoʔHaːʔu for jitoʔHaːʔu.
p. 102, l. 27. kull balad for kulll balad.
p. 104, l. 21. jsuʔil for jsuʔil.
l. 22. The same misprint.
p. 105, l. 16. ʔọtjaːm for ʔọtjaːm.
ill. 23 and 32. min romo:d:n for mir, etc.; literally "min" but phonetically before r "mir".

l. 32. fi ṭa:xir for fi ṭa:xir.
p. 107, l. 6. m:xɔllis for m:xɔllis.
l. 20. ṭabu:h for ṭabu:h.

Last line. jiʔiti llā: for jiʔiti llā:.
p. 108, l. 1. ifri:d inni for ifri:d inn.
p. 110, l. 27. gosbin for gosbin.
p. 122, l. 15. inni for inn.
p. 123, ll. 20 and 24. sɔltɔ for sɔltɔ.
p. 124, l. 12. Same as above; and l. 15. sɔltɔ for sɔltɔ.
l. 19. tsɔlti for tsɔlti.
l. 23. mis sɔɾɔːja for mis sɔɾɔːja.
p. 125, l. 8. ʔɔshː for ʔɔshː.
l. 21. ji ʔaddim for jiʔaddim in one word.
p. 127, l. 2. ma ʔidruːf for ma ʔidruːf.
ll. 9 and 11. ʔɔssu for ʔɔssu.
l. 19. rudd li for rudd li.
l. 24. laʔaːhum for laʔaːhum.

Last line but three. wi_n xɔbbi for wi_nxɔbbi.
p. 128, l. 16. ʔasحا: for ʔasحا:.
p. 129, last line but six. inni for inn.
p. 130, l. 7. gariː for gariː.
p. 139, l. 19. jisɔltu for jisɔltu and jisɔlti for jisɔlti.
p. 140, l. 23. sɔltu for sɔltu.
p. 142, l. 1. ill for illi.
p. 143, l. 22. jiʔni, probably misprint for jaʔni, as below, p. 144, last line but four.
p. 144, l. 7. inn_i masiʔhijːin for ʔinn_il masiʔhijːin.
p. 146, l. 4. jihkum, probably misprint for juhkum as elsewhere printed.
p. 148, last line but 6. ʔinni for ʔinni.
p. 149, l. 1. m gadla for mɔgadla.
l. 5. liʔinnil for li ʔinn_il.

G. E. ILES.


The sum total of Biblical Aramaic is contained in nine moderate sized chapters; including the commonest words and particles and the most frequent repetitions, the number of words found in Biblical Aramaic cannot much exceed four thousand. With laudable thoroughness, on the lines laid down in Brockelmann's Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, Messrs. Bauer and Leander have documented, analysed, and described the characteristics of the tiny literature found in their field of study.

The authors rightly inveigh against the idea that the Jews who returned from the Exile had forgotten Hebrew and spoke only Aramaic; but we think that they go too far when they assume that at the beginning of the Exile the greater part of the Judeans were bi-lingual, and that Aramaic superseded Hebrew as early as the time of Antiochus. Most scholars nowadays are disposed to date many of the later psalms in the Maccabean era. They were written in Hebrew and sung in Hebrew. It is more than probable that the analogy which the authors draw elsewhere (p. 2) between the dominion of Arabic and Aramaic in their several centuries holds good also in the domain of every day use. Thus every good Muslim who is able to read knows something about the classical language; and, despite the existence of the Targums (whenever they may have been improvised or written down), every good Jew must have known not a little classical Hebrew.

The authors' claim, which they also make elsewhere, to have identified "Canaanisms" within the general body of Hebrew literature and within Biblical Aramaic, should not be accepted without searching examination, nor should the "semitische" forms be given more than a hypothetical importance.

Another statement (p. 9) which should be regarded with grave suspicion is "In der Perserzeit wird das Aramäische im ganzen noch einheitlich gewesen". It is all but impossible that Eastern and Western Aramaic can have been the same or similar as late as the Persian period. The great differences between them can only be explained by independent growth through centuries of separate existence,
and though no literature of Eastern Aramaic is extant before the
Christian era this does not indicate that so soon before its emergence
it was identical with Western Aramaic. To draw yet another parallel
from Arabic the same argument would prove that Arabic and Hebrew
in the time of Ezekiel were identical "im ganzen".

But these criticisms are of details which stand outside the main
purpose of the book, which is to furnish the student with a fully
documented description of the characteristics of Biblical Aramaic.
The great merit of this book is that the accidence and syntax of Biblical
Aramaic are abundantly illustrated from the cognate literature of the
Targums and the papyre. As an exhaustive analysis of the dialect
employed in the Aramaic of the Old Testament, Bauer and Leander's
work is likely to remain unrivalled in its own sphere for many years to
come. Whatever doubts may be entertained on the points we have
criticized above, nothing can detract from the value of the authors'
searching examination and explanation of the forms and words of
Biblical Aramaic.

A. Guillaume.


This admirable little work by the Reader in Comparative Philology
and Professor of German in the University of Liverpool deals briefly
with the vast subject of Language. In small compass the author
has contrived to present a very attractive account of his theme.
The main divisions are: language and thought, grammar and logic,
learning to use the mechanism of speech, signs and symbols, physiology,
phonetics, animal cries, infant language, language changes, separation
and union, dialects and standard languages, foreign languages,
language as characteristic of its speakers, structure and genealogy of
languages, bibliography. In spite of the variety of its contents,
it is not a mere catalogue, for it is full of human interest, while those
who desire greater detail in particular subjects are referred to the larger
books mentioned in the brief bibliography.

On p. 90 it is stated that Romani is "apparently derived from the
Dard languages". The author is not an Indianist, and may therefore
be referred to R. L. Turner's monograph, especially the words "all
that can be said with certainty is that Romani belonged to the Central
group".
The book is written in Esperanto, and is a striking tribute to the ability of that youthful but sturdy language to adapt itself to science and literature.

The author may feel legitimate satisfaction in having got so much material into so small a book, and yet having made it readable throughout. He never allows his reader to grow weary.

T. GRAHAME BAILEY.
NOTES AND QUERIES

THE NAME LAHNDI

In the last number of the *Bulletin* Sir George Grierson has written a useful article on the regular method of forming linguistic names in Indian languages. I agree with most, but not all, of it: thus the sentence "it is he who writes Lahndi for Lahndā, the latter having been undisputed for over forty years", contains, it seems to me, five mis-statements of fact. They do not however affect the position.

It is always interesting to reflect on what one would expect words to be and to compare that with what they actually are. English, Urdu, Panjabi, and Hindi swarm with words which have rejected the line of regular development and adopted another. People's attitude to such words varies with their temperament. Some describe them as "atrocious examples of hybridism" or "false analogies" or more briefly as "impossible". Similarly many writers call changed words "corruptions". Others on the other hand find that in linguistic matters what *is* is much more interesting than what *was*, and still more so than what *should be*. To these latter I attach myself; in fact, if I may be permitted to employ two atrocious hybrids and one false analogy or impossible word, I venture to say that many of these words are very *likable* or even *lovable*, and are formed in exercise of the sovereign (sovrann) right of every language to use whatever forms it prefers.

Who would desire to change the name of the fourteenth century Muḥammadan saint Ganj ul 'Ilm (born in Delhi, 1306), or quarrel with the well-known Urdu words *alaihīāt* and *drāmīāt* merely because they are not made after the pattern of *saallāt*?

So it is with Lahndi, a form which Europeans would not have expected, but which Indians like. When I first began to write about the language I found already existing a number of names to choose from, some Indian, some obviously English. Out of these I selected an Indian one, viz. Lahndi. It is not uncommon now. The last instance of it I noticed was in a degree thesis written by an Indian lecturer in an Indian University, a Panjabi who has not been in this country.

T. GRAHAME BAILEY.
Linguistic Survey

Sir George Grierson's statement in the last Bulletin, p. 961, that Colonel Lorimer and I were protagonists in a long discussion on $d$ and $t$ sounds in Şinā is misleading. Colonel Lorimer and I have never written against each other on this or any other subject. During the last fifteen years I have owed to him two periods of quite exceptional mental enjoyment and pleasure. The first was connected with his Pashto Syntax, and the second with our work on Şinā. In 1917 I finished a book on Şinā. In 1924 he wrote an ad interim personal report of his investigations, following it up by an article in which the sounds were more carefully differentiated. I wrote two articles. We finally collaborated in a systematic phonetic account of Şinā sounds (Bull., Vol. III, Pt. IV, p. 799). There are four $t$'s and two $d$'s in Şinā, $t$, $th$, $d$, which are pure dentals, and $t$, $th$, $d$, which very closely resemble the corresponding sounds in Urdu or Panjabi, and are commonly called cerebral.

Sir George has missed the chief point of the objection to the name Brokpā. It is not merely that we do not use for a language the caste name of some who speak it, as Brāhmanī for Avadhī or Khattrī for Panjabi. The graver objection is that Drāsī and Ḍāh Hanū which differ widely which are given the same name, while the almost identical Drāsī and Guresī are called by separate names, as if Avadhī and Southern Panjabi were named alike and Northern Panjabi otherwise. The correct thing is to give the same name to Drāsī and Guresī as Sir George does in the last volume.

T. GRAHAWE BA{1/2}LEY.

'Umar Khayyām and a Relative of the Nizam Al-Mulk

The early account of 'Umar Khayyām published in Vol. V, Part III of the Bulletin contains a reference to his visiting a certain vizier, namely the Shihāb al-Islām 'Abd al-Razzāq, son of the great jurisconsult Abu'l-Qāsim 'Abdallāh ibn 'Ali'. In the text as printed these names are followed by the words بن أخ نظام (trans., ibn Akh Naẓẓām). But we should undoubtedly read instead either بن أخ نظام الملك or بن أخى نظام النظام —"nephew of the Nizām [al-Mulk]", since from other sources we know exactly who this vizier was.

Notices of him are given by al-Bundārī (ed. Houtsma), 267, Ibn al-Athīr (Cairo ed.), x, 226, and Khwānd-amīr (published by Scheferr,
Siasset-Nameh, Supplément, 47), and a reference is made to him in the rāḥat al-ṣudūr (Gibb Trust ed.), 167. He appears to have been called in full Abū’l-Maḥāsin ‘Abd al-Razzāq, the Shihāb al-Īslām, though al-Bundārī gives his name as ‘Abd al-Dawwām and Khwānd-amīr as ‘Abd al-Rāzīq, and the rāḥat al-ṣudūr gives his laqab as Shihāb al-Dīn. He was a son of one of the Nīzām al-Mulk’s two younger brothers, namely the elder, Abū’l-Qāsim ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Alī ibn Ishāq—for whom see, e.g., al-Subkī’s tabaqāt al-shāfi‘iyat al-kubrā, iii, 207, and the ta’rīkh bayhaq, B.M. MS. Or. 3587, fol. 41b.

The Shihāb spent his youth studying law, notably with the Imām al-Ḥaramayn al-Juwaynī, afterwards giving fatwās and signing rulings. He also memorized a vast number of Traditions, and gained a reputation as a theologian. But what stood him in better stead was his relationship to the Nīzām al-Mulk. For it was certainly this that caused Sultan Sinjar in dhūl-hijjah, 511 (March–April, 1118), to take him as vizier after the murder or execution (it is uncertain which) of his, the Shihāb’s, first-cousin-once-removed, the Nīzām’s grandson the Ṣadr al-Dīn, who had then held the office eleven years, having succeeded his father, the Fakhr al-Mulk, in 500 (1106). Indeed Sinjar was so much attached to the Nīzām’s family that for all but twenty years of his sixty-four years’ reign he kept some member of it as his vizier.

The Shihāb remained in office till his death (natural) in al-muḥarram, 515 (March–April, 1121), at Sarakhs. Al-Bundārī has it that his administration was of great advantage to the kingdom and that he duly cultivated such superior company as his training had taught him to appreciate. Khwānd-amīr, on the other hand, maintains that the world went to his head, and that he took to drinking in the sultan’s assembly.

I may note also that the words al-faqīh al-ajall, applied to the Shihāb’s father and translated “the great juristconsult”, are not really descriptive but form his laqab, by which he is generally referred to.

Harold Bowen.

THE DIFFERENTIATION OF GENDER IN THE SEMITIC NUMERALS: A POSTSCRIPT

Since writing my note on the above subject, which was published in Vol. V, Part III, of the Bulletin, I have learned that an exactly similar explanation of the peculiarity of the Semitic numerals was
put forward by Dr. David Künstlinger, first in the *Vienna Oriental Journal*, x, pp. 212–16, and subsequently in a pamphlet entitled *Zur Theorie der Zahlwörter in den semitischen Sprachen*, Berlin, 1897. I hasten to give Dr. Künstlinger all due credit for priority in formulating his theory of the syntax of Semitic numerals. I may add that before putting what I considered a new explanation before the public I had discussed my theory with a number of Semitic scholars. They, like myself, were not acquainted with Dr. Künstlinger’s articles on the subject. It is to be regretted that the Hebrew grammars I have consulted did not even mention Dr. Künstlinger. I hope that this omission will be rectified in future grammars of Hebrew and other Semitic languages. I notice that Dr. Künstlinger, like myself, was indebted to ethnology for his explanation. In his case it was Burckhardt’s travel books which led him to formulate his new theory; in my own it was Frazer’s *Golden Bough*. In ethnology we may perhaps find many a solution for obscure grammatical constructions not only in the Semitic, but in other families of languages.

J. Leveen.

---

THE TEXT OF SARVĀNANDA’S TIKASARVASVA

With reference to Professor Keith’s statement in *BSOS.*, Vol. V, Pt. I, pp. 27 ff., that the Durghaṭa referred to by Sarvānanda in the *Tikāsārvaseva* is the well-known Durghaṭa-vṛtti of Śaṇa-deva, it may be pointed out that Sarvānanda clearly states in the same passage that Puruṣottama-deva is the author of the work in question: *Puruṣottama-devena gurvinītyasya durghaṭeśādāhur vṛttam uktaṁ*. This passage has been quoted in full by Professor Keith himself, but he has apparently missed or ignored the name of the author. The Puruṣottama-deva of Sarvānanda’s citation in this passage is apparently the grammarian Puruṣottama-deva. But it is not known to us whether this Puruṣottama wrote a book on *durghaṭa* also. But Rāyamukuta (Dacca University MSS. No. 985), while explaining the same word *gurvinī*, refers to one Unādi-vṛtti by Puruṣottama: *(gurvinītyauñādi-vṛttam Puruṣottamaḥ)*. Puruṣottama-deva, however, is known to have written an *Unādi-sūtra-vṛtti*, which, as mentioned by Aufrecht (*Catalogus Catalogorum*, vol. i, p. 63a), is quoted by Ujjvala-datta. The purpose of Unādi and Durghaṭa being similar, it may be presumed that Sarvānanda means, by *Puruṣottama-devena...durghaṭe*, the *Unādi-vṛtti* of Puruṣottama, quoted by Rāyamukuta and Ujjvala-
datta. It may, further, be noted that Rāyamukuta refers also to the Durghaṇṭa-vṛtti of Śaraṇa-deva in connection with his comment on the word guṇvini. It may also be added that while Śaraṇa-deva in his Durghaṇṭa apparently defends the sādhutva of the usage of guṇvini, Puruṣottama-deva, as quoted by Sarvānanda, appears to hold a contrary view. The reference, therefore, cannot presumably be to Śaraṇa-deva’s known work.

S. C. Banerjee.
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The word "But" in Iranian

By H. W. Bailey

I

A n important passage which has often\(^1\) been treated, but not so far satisfactorily, is found on page 186 of the Iranian text of the Bundahišn,\(^2\) lines 11–12,

\[
\text{روست گوش کر کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو کو}
\]

that is, but dēv ān kē-ś pat Hindūkūn paristēnd api-ś vāxš pat ān butāhā mēhmān < i > cēgon bōōāsaf paristēt: "the demon But is that which they worship in India and in his images a spirit is resident which is worshipped as Bōōāsaf."

II

Three of these words demand consideration.

1. *bet* But. With the discovery of Sogdian texts the history of the Indian word Buddha outside India was happily made clear, as Gau̇thriot had already recognized in *Journal Asiatisique*, 1911, juillet–août, p. 55 seq. The Sogdian form of the name *puțy* "Buddha" occurs *passim* in the Buddhist texts, beside the adjectival *puțn'k* (＝butānāk) "of Buddha". In Sogdian Indo-Iranian voiced consonants *bdg* had initially become spirants *βδγ*, which required the use of *ptk* for foreign words containing *bdg*. Hence the spelling *puțy* = *But*.

This is the identical form which is found in New Persian *but* بَع, in the sense of "idol". But the meaning of "Buddha" is still clear in many passages of New Persian. Thus we read in Juvainī\(^3\): va dar xītāi but-parastā būḍa ast va rasūli nazdīk i < ū > xūn firistāda

---
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ast va tōyinān rā ɐvāsətə, "In Khitai (Northern China) there was Buddhist worship, and the Khan sent an envoy to him (the Chinese Emperor), and asked for Toyins (Buddhist priests,—an Uigur and Mongolian word)". In Uigur occurs *vet, *but rather than *bud. In Pahlavi the word *vet in the sense of "image" was recognized by all; it was doubted that *vet also meant "Buddha", since the intermediate forms were missing.

The Sogdian word *paet is a transcription from an Indian dialect. But the word "Buddha" reached Central Asia also in another form from China. The pronunciation of Chinese 佛 about the eighth century is given by the Tibetan spelling jbur, cf. JRAS., 1927, p. 296. The ɾr represents the final Chinese consonant developed from final -t. Sogdian has this word in a compound *persnk *bursang "Buddhasangha". From Sogdian the word passed to Uigur bursang, and in the like form to Mongolian. The first part of Uigur (and, as a loan-word, Mongolian) burƣan may be this same bur- "Buddha" (cf. Mironov, Kucheän Studies, p. 74). Then Uigur tāŋri burƣan is "the divine Khan Buddha", but this meaning was not always fully recognized, so that in Manichaean Uigur texts burƣan zuɾʃə is "the Burƣan Zoroaster". Japanese, on the other hand, borrowed the word with -t, Butu (Butsu).

2. vɔχə. A considerable semantic development lies behind this word. In the Turfan manuscripts in Middle Iranian (MPT.) vɔχə *vəχə occurs often in a sense which can be roughly rendered by "spirit". Both the singular vɔχə and the plural vɔχən are found:

"Then appeared the Spirit of the Land of Khorasan."

1 F. W. K. Müller, Uigurica [1], p. 11.
2 In Pahlavi v (vāv) is used as a mater lectionis for ā as well as ā and ē: der = dār "far", gəv = gəš "ear", kəvən = kənšən "deed".
3 Fo: "Buddha" on a Sassanian coin see Herzfeld, Paikuli, p. 45, corrected Arch. Mitt., i, 136, note 2.
4 For Sanskrit in Sogdian transcription see Gauthiot, J.A., 1911, jan.-lévr. p. 94.
6 This has always been the crux of this passage.
7 For the afe compare MPT. *rym a beside *ryma "Aryāmān", a loan-word from Avestan aiyamana-, nom. sg. aiyama, aiyomā.
8 vymnd Pahl. ʃəj is probably *vi-mantu- "dwell, remain", cf. NPers. niṣand "formidable; cast down", *ni-jantu- to gun- "strike", MPT. znd-, Av. zantu- "tribe" in MPT. zndbyd, Av. zantupaiti- to zan- "be born".
THE WORD "BUT" IN IRANIAN

frystgis'net p'y'nd v'x'g'net r'myn'nd
frēstavān-ot pāyānd vāxšān-ot rāmēnānd

"May the Frēstāγ (āγγελοι or āπόστολοι) protect thee, may the vāxšs give thee joy."

But in Sogdian, as Lentz has shown, Christ. Sogd. v'xš, Manich. Sogd. v'h[s] correspond to MPT. szav in the sense of λόγος. It is therefore clear that we have here to do with a technical word from the Avestan (nom. sing.) vāxš and vāxš 3 "a spoken word", which is the meaning also of Sogd. (Buddh.) w'γš. For this use of the nom. sing. we have a parallel in MPT. druχš *druχš "evil one", Av. (nom. sing.) druχš. The Pahlavi has drēc *druž.

In Zoroastrian writings the word vaxš "spirit" is found in the Škand-gumānīk Vičār, a Pāzand text.

In chapter xiii, 7, vaχš corresponds to the Hebrew עִנְיָן in a paraphrase of the beginning of Genesis:—

u vaxš i Yazād aβar rōd i a ḍβ i syāh hamē nyāβesēd.

"And the spirit of God ever had desire upon the face of that black water."

In chapter xiv, 12, quoting also from Jewish Scripture, Is. 30, 28,

u hūsz ěun ātaš i sōzā
u vaxš ěun rōd i arōvīnā

"And his tongue like burning fire
And his spirit like a rushing river."

The word is found also in another passage of the Iran. Bund. in the "Chapter of Opposites", p. 48, l. 14–15: apārik dēvīk vaχš ē yazdīk vaχš ēgōn dēvān družān *yatūkān māzanīkān ē yazd bāyān amahraspandān "and the other dēvian spirits are opposed to the yazdian spirits, as dēvs, družs, sorcerers, Mazanian demons to yazds, bāyās (gods), and Amahraspands."

The word vaχš is, therefore, assured for Pahlavi, beside the MPT. passages. 4

3. but'sp. In this we have clearly to recognize another word received by Pahlavi through Sogdian from India. It is the Sanskrit Bodhisattva. The usual Sogdian form in Buddhist texts is the exact transcription of the Sanskrit word, petystb *Bodisatβs, but a

1 "Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus," p. 85, ABAW., 1926.
2 Cf. Pahl. wχšr *wχšašar "prophet" = *wχša-bara-.
3 Bartholomaeae, AIW., 1334–5.
4 See Salemann, Manichaeische Studien, s.v. ḫwēn.
developed form is found in the "Sūtra of Causes and Effects"1 *petyṣβ
*Bodisaβ, l. 284; petyṣβ *bod(i)saβ, l. 555. The word passed hence
to Uigur, which has petyṣβ *Bodisaβ in Buddhist texts,2 but
petyṣβ *Bodisaβ or *Bodisaf in Manichaean texts.3 From Uigur it
passed to Mongolian petyṣβ, which became by wrong reading
bodisang and bodisug. In the Chinese the word became 僧薩
(modern p'ú sah), which the Japanese read as Bosatu (Bosatsu) and
the Uigurs as pes'r *bosar.

Here, then, we have the source of Pahlavi bet'sp in Manichaean
texts. But it is equally the source of the Arabic بُدَاسِف budāsaf,
and of the Ioasaph of the Western form of the legend of "Barlaam
and Joasaph".4

It is certain, therefore, that the word "Bodhisattva" had reached
Persia, independently of this Bundahīšn passage. Probably the Arabic
form with medial alif budāsaf is due to the Pahlavi which also has
alef: bet'sp Bōdāsaf.

III

But it is clear from the context, which is an enumeration of the names
of dēvās, mostly with Avestan names, that the bet of this Bundahīšn
passage is intended to represent the Būṭi of the Avesta. Here Būṭi
occurs three times,5 each time as nom. sing. in this form Būṭi, which
indicates either an insufficient understanding of an inflected language,
or perhaps more probably a foreign word. It is important to remember
that the Avestan alphabet is derived from an Aramaic alphabet,
in which, as in Pahlavi, the three letters, alef, vāv, and yod, served
as Matres lectionis: Avestan ṭ (u) and ą (ū) are representatives of
vāv. Geldner6 noticed that the manuscripts were undecided in the
use of ṭ and ą. The result is that, in Avestan texts, transcribed u
and ū may both stand for original Indo-Iranian u or ū; cf. ūna-
and una-. Graphically may correspond to an etymological

1 Ed. Gauthiot and Pelliot, Le Sūtra des causes et des effets, 1926.
2 F. W. K. Mäller, Uigurica [1], p. 17 et passim.
3 Von Le Coq, "Ein christl. u. ein manich. MSfragment," ABAW., 1909,
p. 1202 seq.
4 Von Le Coq, loc. cit. Cf. Christensen, Les types du premier homme et du
premier roi, p. 206.
5 Vidévdāt, 19, 1, 2, 43.
6 K. Geldner, Avesta, Prolegomena I, col. 2.
*buti- or *bûti. Decision in such cases can only be obtained from New Iranian dialects ¹ (or Middle Iranian in the early Arabic writers) in comparison with Sanskrit. Here the NPers. but is decisive for *Buti, which is identical with Sogdian puety.² This conclusion agrees with the date of the Viñēvdāt passages, which, as Herzfeld³ has shown, is about the middle of the second century B.C. In substance Darmesteter ⁴ was right, though his details can now be corrected, in recognizing "Buddha" here.

¹ Sakan (in a fully vocalized Indian alphabet) does not help in this particular case, since Buddha and Bodhisattva are simply transcribed from Sanskrit.
² The final -i of the Avestan Bûti probably betrays its Eastern Iranian origin.
³ Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran, i, 79, note 1; 136, note 2.
Pramnai
By L. D. Barnett

I

In the course of a description of India Strabo makes the following statement, apparently drawn from a source other than the Memoirs of Megasthenes (Geogr. xv. C. 719): φιλοσόφους τε τοὺς Βραχμᾶναν ἀντιδιαρωτῶν Πράμνας, ἐρυθαίκοις τινας καὶ ἐλεγκτικοὺς. τοὺς δὲ Βραχμᾶνας φυσιολογίαν καὶ ἀστρονομίαν ἀσκεῖν, γελωμένους ὑπ’ ἐκείνων ὡς ἀλαζόνας καὶ ἀνοήτους, "they mention as philosophers in opposition to the Brahmans the Pramnai, who are addicted to wrangling and refutation; and [they say] the Brahmans study natural science and astronomy, but are derided by the others [i.e. the Pramnai] as impostors and fools."

In the Cambridge History of India, vol. i, p. 421, Mr. E. R. Bevan remarks on the word Pramnai: "This should not be emended to Sramnai, as was once done, on the supposition that it represented gramana. The people intended are undoubtedly the prāmānikas, the followers of the various philosophical systems, each of which has its own view as to what constitutes pramāṇa, a 'means of right knowledge'. These philosophers are, as a rule, orthodox Brahmans, but they view with contempt those Brahmans who put their trust in Vedic ceremonies." With all respect to Mr. Bevan, however, I submit that his interpretation is wholly wrong. Firstly, the word prāmāṇika is palaeographically too unlike pramnai. Secondly, the Vedic Brahmins also have their pramāṇas. Thirdly, prāmāṇika will not bear the meaning which he assigns to it: it means "having authority, authentic, credible (of things), trustworthy (of persons)", and cannot be used to distinguish their opponents from the Brahmins. Fourthly, the idea that Strabo refers to an opposition between Vedic ritualists and non-Vedic Brahmins is fanciful and improbable, for Strabo's informant says nothing about ritualism, and Vedic ritualists also studied "natural science" and "astronomy"—of sorts. His mention of φυσιολογία, however, makes it probable that under the term "Brahman" he included both Vedic ritualists and Apaniṣadās.

The view that by Πράμνας are denoted the sectarian opponents of the Brahmins has thus everything in its favour. But that the word śramaṇa underlies the corruption πράμνας is not so certain. The question suggests itself whether Strabo's informant would have used
the Sanskrit form śramaṇa or the Prakrit samāṇa. True, the Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra Edicts of Asoka write śramaṇa-, and that of Girnar has sramaṇa-; but Megasthenes (Strabo, xv, C. 711) reproduces the word as sarmanes. Hence, if Strabo’s source used the word śramaṇa, it is unlikely that a Greek would have transliterated it as σαμάνου, and still more unlikely that he would have written σράμνος. And a corruption of σ to π, though possible, is not very obvious. On the other hand, if the word intended was samāṇa, it is even more difficult to account for the supposed change of σαμάνας to πράμνας.

Rejecting therefore all these attempts to solve the problem, I would suggest that in πράμνας is concealed some form of πράjnā, “the clever men”. Who were these, and why were they so styled?

II

The Brahman of the Upaniṣads was essentially a mystic. With rapt and eager enthusiasm he sought the intuitive vision of the cosmic Unity, in the radiance and joy of which all thoughts of earthly things vanished, and by the fire of which all bonds fettering his soul to the cycle of births were burned up. He cared, he laboured for nothing else. Rules of conduct interested him little, if at all: he left them for those of his ascetic brethren who belonged to the hermit orders.

In almost direct opposition to these passionate pilgrims, as well as to their ritualistic brethren, there arose early a number of sectaries, mostly of non-brahmanic birth, who for the most part crystallised out in course of time into the schools of Jainism and Buddhism. Like the Brahmans, they sought emancipation from suffering and rebirth; but they sought it by other ways and in another spirit. They had no taste for rapt visions of the Absolute. Their imagination was narrow and realistic, their aims essentially practical. They endeavoured by means of a carefully disciplined and studiously harmless life to attain to prajñā, practical cleverness, skill in grasping the principles of their crude creed, and in adjusting their conduct to its Procrustean demands. They were thus, in antithesis to the

1 "The prominent characteristic of the Arhat is Wisdom, Prajñā. It is by Wisdom that he crosses the ocean of existence" (Kern, Manuel of Indian Buddhism, p. 61). The Pali Text Soc. Diet., s.v., defines paññā (i.e. prajñā) as “intelligence comprising all the higher faculties of cognition”, and points out that “as it... it comprises the highest and last stage as third division in the standard ‘Code of Religious Practice’ which leads to Arahantship or Final Emancipation”. It is hence extremely common, both in the popular and the technical senses. The Jain
Aupaniṣada enthusiasts, “skilful,” “practically clever” (prajña), “men of skill” (prajña); and they rejoiced in the title, glorying in the possession of a wisdom ensuring to them a salvation which they denied to their opponents, the Vedic ritualists and the Aupaniṣada mystics.¹

To many, perhaps most, of the Brahmans the words prajña, prajña, and even the verb pra-jña-, became distasteful, being so often used to denote an intellectual and moral attitude wholly repugnant to them; and perhaps this dislike was strengthened by the fact that popular language invested prajña with the sinister meaning of “trick”, “device,” even among the Buddhists themselves.² This feeling is curiously reflected in their literature. Prajña and its cognates are occasionally, but not frequently, used in the Brāhmaṇas in the sense of ordinary human intelligence applied to practical purposes. The older Aupaniṣadas made some sporadic attempts to use prajña, prajñaṇa, and prajña to express the ideas of pure spirit or mystic vision; but, with the exception of the author or authors of Kauṣ., they soon desisted from them; and in some cases they definitely applied prajña and prajñaṇa to denote an inferior sort of intelligence. From this position it was an easy step for the early Advaitins in framing their system to give the epithet prajña to the soul as bound by limitations of individuality and materiality. On the other hand, the school represented by Kauṣ. boldly applied these terms to all the highest conceptions of spirituality, tacitly asserting thereby that the

scriptures use pannā in very similar meanings; cf. Uttar. xxiii, 25, pannā samikkhāc dhamma-tattam tatta-vinākkhiyam “wisdom perceives the verity of the Law determined in verity” (cf. the scholastic def. in Abhidhāna-rājēndra s.v.)(Uttar. ii, 32, adīsā thāvāc pannam “let him cheerfully confirm himself in wisdom”; and xxiii, 28, 34, etc. See also note 1 below.

¹ For the simple adj. paññā only two examples are quoted by the Pali Text Soc. Dict., viz. Dhp. 208 (where it is glossed by the Aṭṭhakathā as lokiya-lokuttara-pannāya sampanna, “versed in both secular and transcendental wisdom”) and 375. But it is very common in compounds, of which the Dict. quotes 54 examples; most of these are possessive compounds, and so should properly come under the heading paññā. In the Jain scriptures the simple adj. pañña is often applied to sages, from Tīrthaṅkaras downwards, e.g. Sāyagaḍ. I, vi, 4 (of a kevala-jñāni: tata ya jethāvarā jē ya paññē cē niccāniccēhi samikkha pannē dīvē va dhammaṃ samiyam udāhau), and 15; Thān. V, 3; Uttar. I, 28; XV, 2, 215; in composition also it is common, e.g. the possessive compounds mahā-paññā (Uttar. V, 1; XXII, 15, 18, etc.), visuddha-paññā (ib. VIII, 20), ujju-paññā (ib. XXIII, 26), ānuban-paññā (Sāyagaḍ. I, vi, 7; xiv, 4), jaga-bhū-paññā (ib. I, vi, 15), which strictly should be classified under the heading pannā; cf. also pannacāṇaṃ (Uttar. VII, 13). Both Jains and Buddhists are peculiarly fond of the causal stem of pra-jña- and its derivatives, e.g. paññapati, paññatti, paññatta, pannacāṇā.

² Cf. Kern, ut sup., p. 127, n. 3.
sectaries' interpretation of them was false, and perhaps endeavouring to win more general favour for their own conceptions of spirit by using to denote it the popular terms understood in a higher sense.\footnote{In the older Upaniṣads (Brh., Ch., Taitt., Ait., Kauṣ., Kena, Katha, Īśa, Māṇḍ., Muṇḍ., Praś., Śvet., and Mait.) the subst. praśāṅs at first sight would seem to be common; but most of the examples are in Kauṣ., in which it is remarkably frequent (alone nineteen times; in composition, praśāṅsman nine times, praśāṅśāṇa once, praśāṅśāṇā once, adhirājan once). Elsewhere it is rare: four times it denotes the Cosmic Idea (Ait. V, 3; Brh. IV, i, 2; Śvet. IV, 18; and in comp. praśāṅs-nētra, Ait. V, 3), twice it means vaguely the wisdom which the sage should acquire (Brh. IV, iv, 21; Praś. II, 13), and once it is characteristically used in the comp. strī-praśāṅs, "having only a woman's intelligence", contemptuously contrasted with the knowledge of Brahma-lore (Brh. IV, v, 1). Praśāṅas occurs seven times, viz. Ait. V, 2, 3; Mait. VI, 31; Katha II, 24, and in comp. as praśāṅs-gāhā, Brh. IV, v, 13; Māṇḍ. 5, 7; in Ait. and Mait. it denotes a minor category, in Kauṣ. it is significantly applied to the inferior wisdom which will not enable the man of restless soul to win the divine gnosis; in Brh. and Māṇḍ., however, praśāṅs-gāhā is applied to Brahma. The adj. praśāṅs means merely "conscious", occurring in Ait. V, 4 (of āṭman) and Māṇḍ. 7, with the abstract subst. praśāṅsā in Brh. IV, i, 2; praśāṅsā is used in the same sense in Brh. IV, iii, 21, 25 (of āṭman), Mait. VII, 6 (of āṭman), but signifies the third state of consciousness in Māṇḍ. 5, 11, and a wise man in Kauṣ., 11, 13. The verb praśāṅs appears in about twenty-six passages, but of these twenty-one are in Kauṣ.}

\footnote{In the Kashmir recension the line reads: aśoceya na naśācaus tva praśāṅsā nanābhāsāse (see F. O. Schrader, The Kashmir Recension of the Bhagavadgītā, p. 25). With the utmost respect I differ in regard to this line from Professor Schrader: it seems to me to be one of the cases where Kashmir has altered the old reading preserved in the vulgate because of its difficulty. The latter was the only one known to the author of the Mōksa-dharma (XVII, 19, praśāṅs-prasādam āruha, etc.), and is thus older than any manuscript evidence to the contrary. The lectio difficilior, as usual, is to be preferred.}

\footnote{On the other hand, the author of Mbh. XII, xix, after depicting in lively terms the wrangling heretics who paraded their irreligious arguments in the assemblies (vv. 23–4), contrasts them with the true sages, who are praśāṅs, etc. (v. 25). Is he moved by the same motive as the author of Kauṣ. Up., or is he merely using the word without special point, as e.g. mahāpraśāṅs is used in III, liv, 14?}
We see then that, while the older Aupaniṣadās apply to themselves the term prājñā very rarely indeed—in fact, only once in the earlier Upaniṣads,—their sectarian opponents designated themselves as such very frequently, and with definitive intention; and we may hence conclude that in the centuries before the Christian era prājñā might well have denoted the sectaries, as opposed to Aupaniṣadā Brahmans, and to Brahmans generally. This inference is strongly confirmed, perhaps indeed finally proved, by the passage Bhagavad-gī, XVII, 14, which commends among other practices reverence to gods, Brahmans, (ādvijas), elders (gurus), and prājñās, who must be sectarian teachers. Here we have a fairly close parallel to Aśoka’s teaching, which enjoins “due behaviour to kinsfolk, due behaviour to Brahmans and śramaṇas, obedience to parents, obedience to elders” 2: the Gītā’s ādvija: prājñā corresponds to Aśoka’s brāhmaṇa: śramaṇa. It is the same antithesis as that described in Brh. IV, v, 1, between Maitreyī, who “knew the lore of Brahma”, brahma-vādinī, and Kātyāyanī, who “had but a woman’s understanding”, strī-prajñā.

III

If then Strabo’s source used the word prājñā, how was it spelt in Greek?

The I.E. palatal ǵ normally became in the Indo-Aryan languages j. In taddhāvas the compound ǵn in the Prakrits became nn, nn, or jj (Pischel, § 276). In tatsamas, however, ǵn is represented in modern Northern speech by gy, in the West by ān, and in the South by gān or ān; in all cases the nasal preserved the g from passing into j. Strabo’s informant therefore might have transliterated prājñāḥ accurately enough as prāṇā or prāṇā. But the dialects of the North or North-West with which the Greeks came into contact were strongly influenced by Dardic or “Paisāci” phonetics, which changed voiced

---

1 This passage (Kaṭha III, 13) is Yogic, and hardly fits the context. Yōga is not a part of the spiritual outfit of the Aupaniṣadā, though I am not prepared to assert with Rai Bahadur R. P. Chanda (Survival of Prehist. Civilisation of the Indus Valley, p. 29) that it is of foreign and non-Brahmanic origin.

2 E.g. Dhauli: nātiṣu sampatipati [sa]mama-bhūkhanēva sampatipati mātā-pituv- susūdā vṛđha-susūdā. In Mahābh., Sahā-p. V, 100 (Kaccī jñātin gurūn vṛddhān devatās tāpasān api | caityām ca vṛkṣān kalyāṇān brāhmaṇām ca namasyasi) the same list is given with the difference that for śramaṇas is substituted a more general term for ascetics, and the caitya-trees are added.
into surd consonants (e.g. Σοφύτης = Subhūti, Σοφαγάσηνος = Subhagasena, Σανδρόκοττος = Candragutta or Candragupta); and hence it is most probable that the word was written πράκναι or πράκναι, and that Strabo’s text should be corrected to πράκνας. In Greek minuscules κ and μ are often almost indistinguishable, and confusions between them are notoriously frequent.
Asoka et la Magadhi

Par Jules Bloch

Dans toutes les inscriptions d'Asoka recueillies sur la côte orientale et dans le bassin du Gange, l'équivalence : As. -e = skr. -ah est constante et doit s'interpréter phonétiquement. C'est le cas pour les nominatifs singuliers thématiques masculins comme devanampiya, et accessoirement pour l'ancien neutre dāne ; dans les thèmes en -on a nom. pl. lājāne, gén. sg. piyudasine lājine ; dans les thèmes en -r-, nom. pl. natāle ; dans les pronoms, ne, ve ; il faut ajouter -te adverbiaux exprimant l'origine dans mukhate, Takhasilāte, namate (cf. Woolner, I, p. xxvi ; le verbe kaleti n'a bien entendu rien à faire ici).

La finale -o n'est pas inconnue à la langue ; on la trouve dans la négation no et dans kho, où il s'agit de groupes vocaliques à u ancien (na u, khalu), et dans l'exclamation aho (dans ahodhammaghose, v. Lavallée-Poussin, Bull. Ac. R. de Belgique, 1922, p. 515), qui rappelle hamgho de la vieille māgadhī des drames bouddhiques, skr. hamho. Chose plus étonnante, on rencontre d'une part à Dhauli et Jaugada, de l'autre à Kalsi, des formes à -o où l'on attendrait -e. Senart en avait déjà fait la remarque (II, p. 437), mais n'avait rien osé décider sur ce point. Il peut paraître impropre en effet de prétendre en rien tirer, puisque ces inexactitudes sont particulière aux édits sur rocher, où l'on connaît par ailleurs des mélanges inverses, notamment à Mansehra. A vrai dire, même les lectures ne sont pas toutes sûres : yaso (ou yaso) relevé à Kalsi, Dhauli et Jaugada dans l'édit X se lit fort mal sur les facsimilés de Hultsch : il se devine tout au plus une fois à Dhauli ; même le pi yaso "deutlich erkennbar" de Bühler à Kalsi, ZDMG., XXXVII, p. 574, est discutable ; personne n'ose garantir, et pour cause, abakajaniyo de Kalsi, IX, 24 (cf. Bühler, ib., p. 429). Quant à seto isolé qui suit le VIe édit de Dhauli, il n'appartient pas à la série des édits : Bühler y relevait un s de type Gupta (ASSI., I, p. 119, n. 32). Restent, d'abord Kalsi, II, 4, Satiyaputo et Kelapaputo, le premier au moins tout à fait sûr : on n'ose tirer parti du fait que ce sont des noms propres, d'autant que Jaugada a précisément Satiyapute ; en tout cas ce sont des formes isolées. Ensuite vient lājāno, probable à la ligne suivante de Kalsi : s'il a vraiment été écrit, on n'hésitera

1 De même sur le reliquaire de Piprawa : nom. salilanidhane, gén. bhagavate.
pas à y voir une faute. Mais il y a encore un mot, qui se trouve en plusieurs endroits, dont la lecture ne fait guère de doute (*tate en tout cas y est impossible), et pour lequel il n'y a pas d'autre forme attestée, c'est tato :

IX, 26, tato ubhayesam ladhe hoti "il en résulte un bénéfice double";
XIII, 35, tato pachā "après cela";
XIII, 35, tato gulumatatale "plus pénible que cela";
XIII, 39 tato śate bhāge "de cela (de cette foule) la centième partie".

Aucune autre inscription orientale ne donne les textes correspondants ; mais les exemples sont assez nombreux pour que la forme soit sûre.

Sa présence n'admet, semble-t-il, que deux explications : ou bien il s'agit d'un emprunt au sanskrit (l'emprunt à un dialecte occidental du moyen-indien est tout-à-fait invraisemblable) ; ou la forme est indigène malgré son irrégularité.

La première hypothèse paraît d'abord la plus simple et la plus naturelle ; on trouve en effet chez Asoka une autre forme pronominale archaïque, aksamā (dans le 1er édit séparé) ; mais celle-ci est employée avec un sens technique précis — ce qui se reconnaît à la difficulté qu'on trouve à la traduire — et appartient à la langue du droit ; elle a fourni au sanskrit un adjectif dérivé, āksamika- "accidentel".

On n'en saurait dire autant de tato, surtout employé de façon aussi courante qu'on le voit dans les formes citées. Il faut donc considérer tato comme une forme locale ancienne. Autant dire que le phonème noté -e chez Asoka est issu d'un son de la série -o, le même que nous connaissons par le sanskrit. Ce qui a permis à tato d'échapper à l'évolution normale dans la langue d'Asoka est qu'il faisait nécessairement groupe avec le mot suivant ; il a été isolé de la déclinaison ; aussi bien le suffixe n'y a-t-il plus exactement le sens de -te employé librement pour former des ablatifs d'origine ou des adverbes comme kute ; tato a pris rang parmi les mots accessoires comme no et kho.

Si -o est la forme ancienne de -e, on s'explique du même coup la présence chez Asoka de composés comme mano-atileke Sép. I., Dh. 16, J. 8 — si du moins on adopte les lectures de Hultsch — et en tout cas de vayo-mahālakānam Delhi-Topra, VII, 29, mot de lecture certaine, de sens clair, de contexte correct, enfin d'aspect relativement populaire. L'ancienne finale a été protégée par la composition comme par la proclise.

1 Dans le IVe édit sur piliers, ave s tê reste obscur malgré les efforts des traducteurs.
— Au début du XIIIe édit de Kalsi, "de là" est exprimé par taphā.
Il faut donc se garder de mettre en rapport le double traitement de *az en sanskrit (-e- intérieur, -o final) avec l’opposition dialectale de -o et -e finals en moyen indien. L’histoire doit se résumer ainsi : en sanskrit, *az devient -e- à l’intérieur du mot,1 -o en position finale. Cet -o final est dès le début distinct de o issu de au (cf. mána-püga- : gav-îṣṭi- ; en védique -o final issu de au est en général pragrhyā, -o issu de -as ne l’est pas) ; en moyen indien, il achève de se désarrondir dans les dialectes orientaux et s’y note -e.2

II

On sait que le drame classique comporte à côté du sanskrit plusieurs dialectes moyen-indiens ; l’un d’entre eux, la māgadhī, a trois principaux caractères phonétiques dont deux sont ceux-là même qui distinguent la langue d’Asoka, le roi de Pāṭaliputra, le priyadasi lâjā māgadhē (Calc.-Bairat, éd. Hultzsch, p. 172, n. 7) ; à savoir, l pour r et -e final pour skr. -aḥ (phénomènes du reste indépendants : voyez p. ex. à Brahmagiri et Siddapur Suvamāṅgarīte). La troisième caractéristique, la sifflante palatale, se retrouve dans la courte inscription de Śutanukā, sur les sceaux du Magadha, quelquefois chez Asoka lui-même (Hultzsch, p. lxxii et xi), mais dans des conditions qui font se demander s’il ne s’agit pas sur ce point moins de phonétique que d’orthographe.

Quoi qu’il en soit de ce détail, il y a entre la māgadhī des drames et la langue d’Asoka une différence importante, sur laquelle on n’a pas assez insisté : c’est que -e final n’est plus dans la māgadhī dramatique le substitut normal de tout -aḥ sanskrit ; il y est réservé au nominatif singulier des noms thématiques. Il suffit d’ouvrir les textes pour en être frappé ; et l’on verra en parcourant le livre de Pischel que les grammairiens indigènes ne donnent aucune forme propre à la māgadhī pour les autres désinences nominales et pour la 1e personne du pluriel des verbes ; par exemple puttādo, aṅgīno sont de la saurasenī toute pure ; inversement ne “nous” est māhārāṣṭri. On remarquera du reste que ces formes ambiguës sont employées avec beaucoup de discrétion par les auteurs dans les passages, rares

1 RV. I, 34, 5. śūre duḥhitād ; si śūre est un génitif — ce que conteste Oldenberg, RgVeda Noten, I, p. 36 a. —, on ne peut guère en comprendre la finale que comme résultant d’un traitement intérieur de groupe ; cf. Meillet, MSL. IX, 374.
2 Faut-il déjà reconnaître une trace de la tendance qui a mené -o issu de -as jusqu’à -e dans certaines notations védiques où il se décompose comme -e en -ay, et non en -as dans le sandhi ? V. Oldenberg, Hymnen des Rgveda, p. 457 ; cf. Wackernagel, Altind. Gr., I, p. 338 ; Stchoupak, MSL. XXI, p. 15.
eux-mêmes, où ils se servent de la māgadhī. En outre, ce n’est certainement pas un hasard que dans la scène du pêcheur de Śakuntalā, les désinences en -o se rencontrent exclusivement dans des mots caractérisés comme māgadhī par d’autres moyens, à la seule exception de ido, mot accessoire comme le tato d’Asoka : lāṅa (rājānāh) a l māgadhī, sāminī (svāmināh) a ś ; maścabandhaṇo (matsya-) et maścalisattuno contiennent la même sifflante, et dans le second de ces mots le ś- étymologique du deuxième terme redouble l’effet ; c’est encore ś qui maintient dans la couleur demandée khaṇḍaṇo, sūlādo qui sont les derniers exemples de cette scène.

Dans l’ardhamāgadhī du canon jaina également on trouve -e presque exclusivement au nominatif singulier. Les adverbes comme purē, ahe, cités par Pischel § 345, de même que les adverbes correspondants du pali, se rangent avec les locatifs, ne (skr. nāḥ) va avec me, amhe, etc. ; nom. pl. bahave avec save, etc. Il reste que suivant les textes, tataḥ paraît représenté tantôt par tao, tantôt par tae ; exx. chez Pischel, § 16, 518).

La contradiction qui nous occupe ne comporte pas d’explication phonétique. On n’ose récuser à la fois deux séries de textes aussi indépendantes ; cependant il faut bien rappeler qu’on se trouve ici en présence de traditions littéraires, vieilles de plusieurs siècles déjà quand les œuvres ont été rédigées. En ce qui concerne les textes jainas, on a déjà supposé qu’ils portent la trace d’accommodations aux parlars occidentaux ; les nominatifs en -e sont-ils ce qui reste d’un usage beaucoup plus étendu à l’origine ? Pour la māgadhī dramatique, une observation s’impose : quand la littérature fait appel aux dialectes, il est normal qu’elle en choisisse certains traits caractéristiques, mais peu nombreux ; car la reproduction complète rendrait les œuvres intelligenibles.

Cette limitation de -e final à une seule forme, quelle qu’en soit l’explication exacte, n’a pas été sans conséquence pour l’aspect


2 En tout cas un détail relevé par Pischel § 345 semblerait prouver que cet -e, comme celui d’Asoka, remonte à un ancien -o : le nom. sing. en -o, normal dans les vers, est nécessaire aussi en prose devant ini, comme si l’on avait conservé la forme ancienne pour éviter le conflit entre voyelles palatales.
linguistique du drame sanskrit. La déformation systématique de la liquide et de la sifflante ne faisaient pas obstacle à la compréhension ; le discours en māgadhī ne présentait qu'une vraie irrégularité, cette désinence en -e, à la fois fort répandue et très limitée. L'ensemble restait donc caractérisé phonétiquement, mais au point de vue grammatical, très proche de la śauraseni qui fait le fond du drame ; et c'est du reste ce que les grammairiens indigènes ont reconnu.

Ce que Gawroński a dit des petits dialectes (KZ., XLIV, p. 247 s.) est donc vrai de celui-là également ; en sorte que le dialogue ne comporte en réalité que deux langues : le sanskrit et la śauraseni (cf. S. Lévi, Théâtre indien, p. 332). Considéré ainsi, le drame indien paraît beaucoup moins étrange que si l'on y voit une marqueterie de dialectes hétéroclites, d'importance égale, reproduisant des langues réellement distinctes, et dont la plupart seraient restés incompréhensibles à l'auditeur inexpert. Surtout à l'origine, la différence entre le sanskrit et la śauraseni elle-même ne devait être que celle de la langue polie et de la langue usuelle ou familière. L'introduction, rare du reste, de la māhārāṣṭrī s'explique non par le besoin de reproduire la variété linguistique de la société indienne, mais parce que c'était la langue du genre lyrique. En ce qui concerne la māgadhī, le problème revient à savoir pourquoi, en attribuant à certains personnages parlant śauraseni quelques caractéristiques traditionnelles d'une langue orientale, on a voulu les ridiculiser : car ces personnages sont des gens de peu à l'époque classique, et c'est déjà le duṣṭa dans le drame bouddhique édité par M. Lüders.
Corrections of Eggeling’s Translation of the Satapathabrahmana

By W. Caland

As the Satapathabrahmana is, among Western scholars, Sanskritists as well as non-Sanskritists, the most popular and best-known of the Brähmana, it may be of use to publish a list of corrections of Eggeling’s translation in the Sacred Books of the East, vols. xii, xxvi, xli, xlii, and xliv. For previously proposed corrections the reader may be referred to the Vienna Oriental Journal (W.Z.K.M., vols. xxiii and xxvi) and the German Oriental Journal (Z.D.M.G., vol. lxxii). The accents in the citations have been neglected, except when they are required for understanding the text.

I, 1, 2, 8: uta pātryai gṛhyaṇti “Some do, indeed, take it from a (wooden) jar.” The translation might infer that the author of the Brähmana here, as he does so often, polemizes against the Adhvaryus of the Black Yajurveda, but the translation should run rather: “They take it also from a (wooden) jar.”

I, 2, 1, 22: mahānāṁ payo ’sīti mahya iti ha vā etāsāṁ eke nāma yad gavām “For ‘the great ones’ some (take to be) a name of the cows.” But Weber himself (vol. i, page 134) had emended eke into ekam, and that this is right, is proved by iii, 1, 3, 9. So correct: “For ‘the great ones’ is one name of the cows.”

I, 4, 1, 2: tat etat purastāṁ mithunam prajananaṁ kriyate sāmidheniṇāṁ “A productive union of the sāmidhenis is thereby effected at the outset.” The genitive depends on purastā: “Thereby a pairing, a procreation is effected before the sāmidhenis (at the beginning of the s.).” That this is right is proved by the Kāṇva text: mithunam evait prajananaṁ purastāt sāmidheniṇāṁ kriyate.

I, 4, 1, 22: agna āyāhi vītaya iti tadveti bhavati. The last words have been omitted in the translation. They mean “and this is (the syllable) ā” (tad u ā iti bh.), cf. i, 4, 1, 4.

I, 4, 1, 23: te devā akāmayaṇā kathām nu na ime lokā vitarāṁ syuḥ kathām na idam varṣyaiva syād iti tān eva tribhir aksarair vyanayan vītaya iti “The Gods desired: ‘How could these worlds of ours (read “for us”) become more apart from one another? How could there be more space for us?’ They breathed through (the worlds) with these three syllables: vītaye.” Eggeling translates as
if the text had vyānan, but vyanayan means “they separated them, they shove them asunder” (vyāhan the Kaṇva-recension).

I, 6, 1, 3: te haitāṁ edhāṁ ca kriyā yāṁ eśām etāṁ anuśrṇvanti
“Those (Asuras) then threw in such a manner that they (the Gods) heard of it”. This cannot be right, as the text has the present tense. The meaning is rather: “They reached that prosperity, which they (the men of present times) hear them to possess.”

I, 6, 1, 19: saṅvatsaraṁ ha vai prayājair jayant ājyaṁ jayati “He who gains by means of the fore-offerings, assuredly gains the year”. The text probably is corrupt, and instead of jayan we ought to restore yajan: “He who performs the fore-offerings gains the year.” This emendation is supported by the Kaṇva-recension: saṅvatsaraṁ ha vāva jayati prayājair yajamānāḥ.

I, 6, 2, 4: agnau vā asthād iti tam aṅgav āva parīgṛhyā sarvahutam ajuhavuh “Having enveloped it in fire, knowing, as they did, that it had stopped for Agni, they offered it up entirely”. That the locative aṅgau belongs rather to ajuhavuh (“Having seized it they offered it as a holocaust into the fire”) is proved by the Kaṇva-recension: aṅgav āva sarvahutam ajuhavuh.

II, 1, 1, 5: tasmād enena na dhāvayati “Hence also one should not cleanse oneself with it (with gold)”. The meaning of the verb is not wholly certain, but if we compare Kāth. viii, 5: tasmād brāhmaṇena durvarṇam (= rajatam) na bhartavyam, it seems probable that na dhāvayati means “he does not let someone run with it (i.e. wear it)”.

II, 1, 4, 13: bhūr iti vai prajāpatir ātmānam āsrjata bhuvah iti prajāṁ svam iti paśīṁ eva vā idaṁ sarvaṁ yad ātmā prajā paśavah “With ‘bhū’ Prajāpati generated the Self, with ‘bhuvah’ the (human) race, with ‘svaḥ’ the animals”. It is highly improbable that ātmā is to be taken here in the sense of “the Self”, cf. Pañce. br. iii, 4, 3: etāvāṁ puruṣo yad ātmā prajā jāyā “Man comprises his self, his children, his wife”.

II, 2, 2, 13: atra tṛṇāni dahātra dārūni dāha “Eat grass here, eat wood here!” is a lapsus for: “Burn grass here, burn wood here!”

II, 2, 3, 1: varuṇo hasin rājyakāma ādadhe “Now Varuṇa established this (fire)”. But it is impossible to supply to the neuter enad the masculine aṅnim. Rather understand punarādheyam.

II, 2, 3, 22, 23: tathāḥāgneyo bhavati sōmo vai pāvamanās tād u saumyād ājyabhāgān nāyanti, and tasmād u saumyād ājyabhāgān nāyanti “For, indeed, it becomes of the nature of Agni. Pavamāna
means the Soma, but this (Soma-element) they eliminate from the butter-portion of Soma”. That this is incomprehensible has its cause in the text, which has been printed wrongly by Weber. We must separate: tād u saumyād ājyabhāgān nā yanti “They do not depart from the ājya-portion destined for Soma” (“they do not neglect it”), cf. the Kāṇva-recension: no saumyād ājyabhāgād yanti.

II, 2, 4, 12: apaṅkāraṁ haiva purā tataḥ sāmasya “For heretofore (their song was) without the ‘hiṁ’, but after that it was the real sāman”. Correct: “For heretofore their sāman was without the him”; purā tataḥ belong together; cf. the Kāṇva-recension: tato hārtak saṅkāraṁ sāmasya apaṅkāraṁ haiva tataḥ purā babāhuvaḥ.

II, 6, 1, 18, 24: te ha sarva eva yajnopavītino bhūtvā | itkād yajamānaś ca brahmā ca pascīt parīṇaḥ purastād aṁṅit “All of them, having become sacrificially invested, the Sacrificer and the Brahman (being) thus (invested), walk round to the west side and the Āgnidhra to the east side”. Correct as follows: “All of them, having now become sacrificially invested, the Sacrificer and the Brahman walk around thus behind (the fire), and the Āgnidhra thus, before (the fire).” The word “thus” was accompanied by a gesture of the hand to indicate the direction.

III, 2, 2, 20: ubhayam vā ata ety āpaś ca retaś ca sa etad apa eva muñcati na prajām. Eggeling has only: “for so he does,” either because he did not comprehend the words or for decency’s sake! The words mean: “both come forth from here (from the masculine member, the word ataḥ must have been accompanied by a gesture of the hand!): water (urine) and semen. He, in saying this formula, discharges only water (urine), not progeniture.”

III, 4, 4, 14: sa yat samāṇatra tiṣṭhaṁ jūhoti na yathedaṁ pracarant saṁcaraty abhiṣyā abhiṣayāṅīti “The reason why in offering he remains standing in one and the same place and does not move about as he is wont to do here in performing, is that he thinks: ‘I will conquer for conquest.’” Correct: “... is for conquering, while he thinks: ‘I will conquer.’”

III, 4, 4, 15: saṁvatsaraḥ hi vajraḥ | agnir vā ahaḥ soma rātrir aṭha yad antaraṁ tad viṣṇur etad vai pariplavamānaṁ saṁvatsaram karoṁ “... thus he makes the revolving year”. Rather: “The revolving of all this makes the year.”

IV, 1, 1, 17, 18: tan na sādayati... yudīt te abhicared athaināṁ sādayed amuceya tvā prāṇāṁ sādayāṁīti tathāhā tasmin na punar asti yan nānusṛjati teno adhvaryuṣ ca yajamānaś ca jyog jīvataḥ “He does
not deposit it... Should he, however, desire to exorcise, he may deposit it with: 'I put thee down, the out-breathing of N. N.!' Thus, forsooth, inasmuch as he (the Adhvaryu) does not quit his hold of it, it is not again in that (enemy): and thus both the Adhvaryu and the Sacerificer live long'. Correct: "... the out-breathing of N. N.!" Thus, on the one hand (aṭha), in him (his enemy) there is no "again" (he must die) and, by not quitting his hold of it, thereby, on the other hand (u), the Adhvaryu and the Sacerificer live long." Cf. the Kāṇva-text: tathāha tasya na jīvātur asti yasmai tathā karoty aṭha yat sādayitvā naṃvarjati teno adhvaryuṣ ca yajamāṇaḥ ca jīvataḥ. In the same way § 18.

IV, 1, 3, 5: te devā abhyasrijyanta yathā vittim vetsyamānā evam sa yam eko 'labhata, etc. "The Gods rushed thither—as (those) eager to take possession of their property—so (it fared with) him (VṛtraSoma). What (part of him) one of them seized," etc. The first sentence closes with evam: "The Gods rushed thither just as people who are eager to take possession of their property."

IV, 2, 1, 19: tau jaghanena yūpam aratnī samdhattaḥ | yady agnir nodbādheta yady u agnir udbādheta, etc. Eggeling's translation of yady agnir nodbādheta "unless the fire should blaze up", is somewhat strange; udbādheta has not this meaning. It must be preferable to translate: "if the fire does not press (or 'force') them away," i.e. if the fire leaves room for them in joining their elbows.

IV, 2, 2, 11: aṭha daśāpavītram upagrhyā "having wrapped up (the bowl) in a fringed cloth". Rather: "having put the fringed cloth under (it)."

IV, 2, 4, 22: pratteyam gōyatṛi yajamāṇāya sarvāṃ kāmān doḥaṭā iti and XII, 9, 2, 11: yadā vai vatso mātaram dhayaty aṭha sā prattā sā prattā duhe. In both these passages prattā is wrongly translated: "made over to the Sacerificer," and "when given away". Its equivalent is prasnutā, see on this word my note in the translation of the Pañcavimsābrāhmaṇa, xiii, 9, 17. It is said of the cow, when the calf by taking the udder causes the milk to flow.

IV, 3, 1, 10: na vyayavatsyat "it would never pass away". Read vyayavatsyat and translate: "it would not dawn (for them)."

IV, 3, 3, 8: te hocuḥ | apanidhāyainam oja upāvartamahā iti ta enam apanidhāyaivoja upāvartuḥ "They said: 'Having put aside this one (cup) for our vigour, we will join thee.' Having accordingly put it aside for their vigour, they joined him." That this is wrong is proved by the last sentence of this same §: enam depends on the
verbum finitum and ojah on the gerund. So translate: “They said: ‘Having put aside (our) vigour, we will join him’” etc.

IV, 3, 5, 13: madhyata eva grhiniyat . . . paścād eva te eva grhiniyat
“He should put it right in the centre (of the cup); . . . but let him rather put it in the back part (of the cup)”. This is false. The meaning is that he should take the dadhi in the middle, after first having taken soma and afterwards taking again soma, cf. Āpastamba śrautasūtra, xiii, 9, 5–7.

IV, 5, 3, 7, 8: . . . aitasmāt kālāt upaśete “It reposes apart from that time”; correct: “until that time (for its offering)”.

IV, 6, 8, 3: atha dīkṣīyamānāh samavasyanti “Now those who are about to consecrate themselves should settle (the time and place) between them”. Rather: “they should all of them settle down” (on the place for the sacrifice, the devayajana).

V, 3, 4, 9: etasyai vā esāpachidyaisaiva punar bhavati “now that (flow of water), after separating itself from that (main current), comes to be that again”. So Eggeling has separated apachidyai esā eva, but we ought rather to separate apachid yā esā eva.

V, 4, 1, 9: tam indro nivivyaḍha tasya padā śiro ‘bhisthau sa yad abhiśhita udābādhata sa ucevamakaḥ “Indra knocked him down and trod with his foot on him. And in that he, thus trodden upon, bulged out, that is (the origin of) a rupture”. Perhaps better: “. . . and trod with his foot on his head. And in that he, being trodden upon, went asunder (to wit, his head), that is the (origin of the) suture (in the skull)”.

VI, 6, 1, 1, 13: bhūyānśi havīṃśi bhavanti | agricityāyām yad u cānāgricityāyām “Many are the oblations, in the building up of the fire-altar, as well as any other (special ceremony) than the building of the fire-altar”. Correct: “More numerous are the oblations in a rite of building the fire-altar than in one at which no fire-altar is effected”; cf. Introduction to the Kāṇṭhiya-brāhmaṇa, page 76 fl.

IX, 4, 3, 1: atha pratyetya dhīṣṇyānām kāle dhīṣṇyān nirvapati “Having now returned he, at the proper time, throws up the Dhīṣṇyas”. But kāla is used here, as so often in Baudhāyanas, to denote the place prepared in advance for some end. So dhīṣṇyānām kāle means: “on the place prepared in advance for the Dhīṣṇyas.”

IX, 4, 3, 7. A part of the text, which is easily understood, has been overlooked by the Translator.

X, 1, 3, 11. Here, also, a whole § has been omitted by Eggeling.

XI, 7, 1, 2: pacanti vā anyeṣv agnisu vythāmāṁsam athātesām
nānyo 'nyā māṁsāsā vidyate yasyo caite bhavanti “In other fires people do, indeed, cook any kind of meat, but these (sacrificial fires) have no desire for any other flesh but this (sacrificial animal) and for him to whom they belong”. Translate: “... but these (fires) have no other desire for meat than of that person to whom they belong.” Cf. the remark on VI, 6, 1, 1.

XI, 8, 3, 5. Here a sentence has been overlooked by the Translator.

XII, 3, 5, 2: yady u mriyate svair eva tam aṁśibhir daṁhanty aśavāṁśibhir itare yajamāṇā āśate “but if he dies they burn him by his own (three) fires, without any (ordinary) fire for burning a dead body) and the other Sacrificers sit (through the sacrificial session)”. To me it is probable that aśavāṁśibhir belongs to the last sentence.

XII, 8, 3, 17: purastāḥ dhi pratyag annam adyat “For from the front food is visibly eaten”; “visibly” as translation of pratyak conveys no meaning. Understand: “from the further side back”; the food is conveyed back (: into the mouth). In this same passage three short sentences have been overlooked by the Translator.

XIII, 7, 1, 15: na mā martyah kaścana dātum arhati viśvakarmah bhūcana manda āsitha upamaṅkṣyati syā saṅilasya madhye ... The last words: “she (the earth) will sink into the midst of the water” are wrongly translated; syā here is, as so often in the Jaininiya-brāhmaṇa, nearly equivalent to atham “I will sink ...”

XIII, 8, 1, 19: tad vidhiyāpasalavisṛṣṭabhi spandyābbhiḥ paryātanaty apasalavi pitṛyam hi karma. Translate: “Having attended to this, he encloses it in the non-sunrise way with cords twisted in the non-sunrise way; for it (this act) is a performance connected with the Fathers.” Eggeling had not paid attention to the place of hi.

XIV, 1, 2, 2: kṛṣṇājinaṁ saṁbhūrati. The context and comparison of VI, 4, 1, 6, prove that kṛṣṇājine is the right reading; loṁataḥ in the same passage means “on the hairy side”.

XIV, 1, 2, 12: so braviḍ adīryeva bata ma eṣa raso 'stauṣṭid īti. With the MSS. of the Kāṇva-text we are tempted to correct astauṣṭid into asravṣid; only an aorist of sravati yields a satisfactory sense.
Antiochus, King of the Yavanas

By Jarl Charpentier

It is too well known to need more than a formal repetition here that two of the Rock Edicts of Asoka mention as his contemporaries a number of kings of the West, the foremost of which is a certain Antiochus. The most important passage is that of the Edict XIII (P-Q), which I quote from the only version that is here wholly preserved, viz. that of Shāhābzāgarī:

ayi ca mukhamuta¹ vijaye Devanampriyasa yo dhramavijayo ||
so ca puna ladho Devanampriyasa iha ca sarṣṣa ca amṭeṣu[da] saṣṣu
pi yojanaśateṣu yatra Amtiyoko nama Yonaraja paraṃ ca tena Atyokena
cature 4 rajani Turamaye nama Antikini nama Maka nama Alikasudaro
nama ||²

"Now this conquest, viz. the conquest by (preaching) Buddhism,³ is considered the highest one by the Beloved of the Gods.

"And even this conquest⁴ has been won by the Beloved of the Gods here ⁵ and in all the borderlands as far as six hundred yojanas where (lives) Antiochus, king of the Yavanas (Westerners), and beyond this Antiochus ⁶ four (4) kings, Ptolemy by name, Antigonus by name, Magas by name, Alexander by name."

Less illuminating is the passage in the second Rock Edict (Shāhābzāgarī):

(A) Amtiyoko nama Yonaraja ya ca anĩne tasa Amtiyokasa samanta
rajano ... 

"Antiochus, king of the Yavanas, and those other kings who are the vassals ⁷ of this Antiochus ..."

¹ Bühler read *mute.
² The varia lectiones of the Kālī, Mānsēhrā, and (partly) Girnār versions are unimportant and need not be repeated here.
³ The rendering of dhamma by "morality", etc., is senseless. Dhamma in the Aśoka inscriptions never means anything but "Buddhist doctrine, Buddhism"; with this I propose to deal in another connection.
⁴ It is unintelligible to me why Hultzsch rendered the single punah in this sentence by "repeatedly"", a translation that cannot be upheld.
⁵ This "here" undoubtedly reminds us of Rock Ed. V M, where the other versions have hida (K, M, Dh.) or ia (Sh.) while G has the explanatory Pātaliputē.
⁶ With paraṃ ca tena A. of Rock Ed. V E, paraṃ ca tena (in a temporal sense).
⁷ Bühler, Epigr. Indico, ii, 466, translated sāmanṭhā by "vassal-kings", which is undoubtedly the common meaning of the word. Previously Wilson, JRAS. (O.S.) xii, 169, rendered it: "and those princes who are near to (or allied with) that monarch"; Kern, I.A. v, 272: "his neighbour kings" (with a foot-note: "in the
Now, who is this Antiochus, king of the Yavanas? To this question various replies have been given, and it may not be out of the way shortly to review them here.

Prinsep, *JASB*. vii, 156 sqq., when first interpreting these inscriptions, suggested that we have here a mention of Antiochus III who, during the earlier part of his reign, rightly earned the surname of "the Great". This suggestion was only a natural one; for Antiochus III is the one of all the Seleucids bearing that famous name of whose dealings with the Indians we are aware. As is well known, *Polybius*, xi, 34, tells us that during his Eastern campaign Antiochus accepted the surrender and the tribute offered by Σοφαγασήνος, βασιλεὺς τῶν 'Ινδῶν. But Σοφαγασήνος, or Subhagasena, was not Aśoka, nor is it in any way probable that the "Beloved of the Gods" could have been a contemporary of Antiochus III (223–187 B.C.).

Prinsep, when making the above-mentioned suggestion, was not yet aware of the contents of Rock Edict XIII. A little later on, having deciphered also this edict, he abandoned his former idea and instead of Antiochus III suggested the first or second king of that name: "of whom the former may have the preference from his close family connection with both Ptolemy and Magas, which would readily give him the power of promising free communication between India and Egypt."

first place Baktria"; and Senart, *Inscriptions de Piyadasi*, i, 74: "des rois qui l'avoisinent." Thus Professor D. R. Bhandarkar, *JBBRAS*. xxi, 398, in taking exception to the translation of Bühlér, was not without predecessors; pointing to the various reading sāmipaym of the Girnār version he strongly advocates the translation "neighbours". This view was endorsed by V. Smith, *IA*. xxxiv, 245, who had previously (*Asoka*, 1st ed., p. 115) adopted the translation of Bühlér. According to my humble opinion there can be no doubt that Bühlér was right; it is only natural that Aśoka should think those other princes to have been the vassals of Antiochus, who was, besides himself, the most powerful monarch of the period, and he certainly drew conclusions from the state of his own dominions where there were undoubtedly numbers of half-subdued Sāmanta's. As for sāmipaym (or "pā") cf. the remark of Hultzsch, *CII*. i, p. 3, n. 3 (according to Michelson, *AJPh*. xxx, 183 ff., it is = Skt. sāmipayam).

1 The identification Σοφαγασήνος = Subhagasena was suggested already by A. W. von Schlegel, *Indische Bibliothek*, i, 248; ii, 301. There exists no known Indian prince of that name; cf., however, Subhaga, prince of Gándhāra (with whom cf. *CHI*. i, 512) in the *Mahābhārata*, vii, 6944 (Bombay).

2 To suggest that, we should want the phantasy of Wilford who in *Asiatick Researches*, v, 285 sq., concluded that Σοφαγασήνος rendered an Indian Śivakasena, which would again be = Aśokasena (cf. also Prinsep, loc. cit., p. 162). Already Wilson scoffed at this rather adventurous idea.

3 *JASB*. vii, 225 sqq. (reprinted *Essays*, ii, 20 sqq.).
Wilson, *JRAS.* (O.S.) xii, 244 ff., arrived at the queer conclusion that the five kings mentioned in Rock Edict XIII were not contemporaries. To quote his own words (p. 246): “Under this view I should refer Alexander to Alexander the Great, Antigonus to his successor, Magas to the son-in-law of Ptolemy Philadelphus,\(^1\) Ptolemy to either or all of the four first princes of Egypt, and Antiochus to the only one of the number who we know from classical authors did visit India . . . Antiochus the Great.” Wilson afterwards tells us that it seems highly improbable that Aśoka should still have been alive in the year 205 B.C., upon which he fixed as being that of Antiochus’s Indian campaign; this, consequently, would exclude Antiochus III. And he likewise finds it utterly incredible that the Yavana king could be Antiochus II—this chiefly because of the Bactrian and Parthian rebellions occurring during his reign. As, however, Wilson did not admit the identity of Aśoka and Piyadasī, all his arguments must needs end in a *non liquet.*\(^2\)

We next come to Lassen, who, in his *Ind. Alterthumskunde* \(^2\), ii, 253 sqq., seems to think Antiochus II to be the most probable one, though he finds chronological difficulties connected with the mention of Magas and Alexander. Lassen’s attitude is a little wavering, and he made no very lucky shot in suggesting that Aśoka should have sent embassies to all these princes already at his coronation—which is, anyhow, totally unwarranted by the existing inscriptions.

That it was Antiochus II with whom Aśoka entered into relations was also taken for granted by Senart \(^3\) and V. Smith.\(^4\) Hultzsch, in his edition of the Aśoka inscriptions, p. xxxv sqq., betrays a little undecidedness, but finally fixes upon Antiochus II. Professor Thomas, *CHI.*, i, 502, has taken up no definite position. As far as the present writer is aware—and it seems unnecessary to mention that his information can scarcely be complete on this point—modern classical scholars who have busied themselves with the history of the Seleucids seem to be at one in assuming the king of the Yavanas to have been

---

\(^1\) This sentence contains two rather apparent mistakes: Magas was not the son-in-law but the stepson (and perhaps also the adoptive son) of Ptolemy Soter; his mother, Berenike, was also the mother of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

\(^2\) Wilson’s arguments were criticized by General Cunningham in *The Bihishta Topes,* p. 110 sqq., which was an easy enough task. Cunningham was right in eliminating Antiochus III; but he states, with a slight exaggeration, that Princep had definitely fixed upon Antiochus II (unless we have here possibly a misprint—II for I).

\(^3\) Cf. *Inscriptions de Piyadasī,* ii, 256 sqq.; *IA.* xx, 242.

in reality Antiochus II.\(^1\) Overwhelming consensus of scholarly opinion thus seems to plead the case of this king as having received from his pious neighbour embassies preaching the doctrine of the Enlightened One.

Before we proceed further a few words should be said concerning those other princes mentioned in Rock Edict XIII.

As concerns Turaṃāya there can happily be no doubt. That it denotes one of the Ptolemies has been taken for granted ever since the days of Prinsep; and it seems quite obvious that none but Ptolemy II Philadelphus, whose long reign covered nearly four decenniums (285–247 B.C.), would fit into the chronology of Aśoka’s reign.\(^2\) As for Maka or Maga there existed, no doubt, more than one princelings of the name of Magas; but there can be little doubt that we have to do here with that Magas of Cyrene whose reign years fall between c. 300–250 B.C. Already Bühler\(^3\) remarked that Aṃtekīna (G., K.) or Aṃtikīni (Sh.) would rather render a Greek ‘Ἀντιγένης than ‘Ἀντιγόνος. However, although we know of at least one Antigenes,\(^4\) he, for obvious reasons, cannot come in here. The old Antigonos who met his fate at Ipsus (301 B.C.) seems to be out of the question; and thus there remains only his grandson, surnamed from the place of his birth Gonatas, whose reign extended between 276 and 239 B.C. Finally, Alikasudara (or Alikyasudala, K.) has long been taken to be Alexander of Epirus\(^5\) who was the son of Pyrrhus and Antigone,\(^6\) the daughter of Berenike I and sister of Magas; his reign years are generally given as 272–c. 255 B.C. However, a classical historian of authority has suggested that he should rather be identified with Alexander of Corinth (252–c. 244), the son of Craterus.\(^7\) For such an assumption there exists, as far as I can find out, not the very slightest foundation; and I shall still take it for granted that Alexander of Epirus is the person mentioned here.

The chief interest is, however, concentrated upon the identity

---

\(^1\) Cf. e.g. Bevan, The House of Seleucus, i, 298, etc.

\(^2\) It would, of course, be theoretically possible to think also of Ptolemy III Euergetes (247–221 B.C.). That would, however, seriously dislocate the chronology of the three first Mauryas. Ptolemy III, it is quite true, was not, as a ruler, a contemporary of either Magas or Alexander of Epirus; but that would probably be of little importance in this connection.

\(^3\) Cf. ZDMG. xi, 137.

\(^4\) Cf. CII. i\(^2\), p. xxx, note 2.

\(^5\) Cf. the literature quoted in CII. i\(^4\), p. xxx.

\(^6\) Cf. Plutarch, Pyrrhus, c. 4.

\(^7\) Cf. Beloch, Grießliche Geschichte, iii, 2, p. 105.
of Antiochus. As we have already mentioned above, modern scholar-
ly opinion seems to have fairly unanimously fixed upon the second
monarch of that name. Personally I am inclined gravely to doubt
this conclusion as I shall explain presently. As an introductory
remark I shall only emphasize my opinion that, whoever be this
Antiochus, there is not the slightest reason for assuming that the man
mentioned in Rock Edicts XIII and II would not be the same person.

Antiochus II, surnamed probably by the grateful Milesians ¹
Theos, "the god," was the younger son of Antiochus I Soter, whom
he succeeded between October, 262, and April, 261 B.C.² at the age of
about twenty-four. He died rather suddenly in 246 B.C. (or possibly
late in 247, cf. Cambridge Ancient Hist., vii, 716) at the age of scarcely
more than forty. He, like at least one of his successors, seems to have
been a special favourite with the scandalmongers of the period.
Phylarchus,³ most foul-mouthed perhaps amongst Greek historians,
tells us shocking stories about his drunken bouts and his inclination
towards young men of somewhat dubious accomplishments. Some
or even most of this may be true; but we still may do well in taking
note of the warning uttered by one of the best modern authorities
on the history of the Seleucids.⁴

What interests us in this connection is, however, not so much the
character of Antiochus II as the main events of his reign. He
undoubtedly inherited from his father a war with Egypt, which came
to an end only during his very last years, and an unbroken series of
troubles with the petty despots and quarrelsome city-states of Asia
Minor. As far as the very scanty evidence goes, Antiochus II spent
the whole of his reign in the last-named country and in Syria; and
there is certainly no evidence whatsoever for his having ever proceeded
to the east of the Mesopotamian rivers to visit the outlying provinces
of his vast and loosely-knitted empire. Furthermore, we have the
direct evidence of the historians, above all that of Justin, the
epitomator Pompei Trogi, that during the reign of Antiochus II the
most important provinces of the east rebelled, an event which must
have entirely cut off the connections between Mesopotamia and the
borderlands of India until these were again, for a very short period of
time, restored by Antiochus the Great.

¹ Appianus, Syr. 65.
² Cf. Bevan, The House of Seleucus, i, 168 sq.; the date given here is in accordance
with the Cambridge Ancient Hist. vii, 709.
Obscurity unfortunately veils the events which lead up to the foundation of the Parthian and Bactrian kingdoms at a date not far removed from 250 B.C. We, however, know that Arsakes and Tiridates, whatever may have been their somewhat disputed ancestry, killed the satrap Pherecles 1 and ousted the Seleucid troops from Parthia. And we also know that Diodotus, "governor of the thousand cities of Bactria, 2 revolted and made himself independent of Antiochus II at about the same time. This Diodotus (I) must have reigned for a comparatively short period if the suggestion be correct that his son and successor, Diodotus II, was on the throne during the eastern expedition of Seleucus II. 3

The date 250 B.C. suggested for these important events is, of course, a somewhat arbitrary one, though it cannot be very far from correct. There is, however, scarcely anything to show that just about this date the position of Antiochus II was an especially complicated and dangerous one, a circumstance which would have afforded to the mutinous satraps of the East an easy opportunity for breaking loose. On the contrary, the troubles in Asia Minor during the later years of Antiochus seem rather to have slightly subsided, and a peace with the none too successful ruler of Egypt was concluded on what seems to have been rather favourable terms just about that date. Seleucid kings have been known to have devoted their attention towards Eastern affairs in circumstances far more critical than those prevailing about 250 B.C. However, Antiochus II, wine-sodden and somewhat inefficient as he undoubtedly was, seems totally to have lacked interest in his Eastern provinces and to have devoted all his spare interest to the affairs of Asia Minor, which were always disastrous to the successors of Seleucus. As far as I am able to form an opinion on these obscure events, the revolts of the Parthians and of Diodotus 4 may well have

1 He seems to be known also by at least two other names, viz. Agathocles or Andragoras, cf. CHI. i, 438. It is not quite sure that they all refer to the same man, though, of course, nothing definite can be suggested here.

2 Justin, xli, 4.

3 Cf. CHI. i, 439 sq.

4 As for Diodotus the following circumstances, even if quite hypothetical, may well be taken into consideration. It seems to me fairly probable that Diodotus was really the satrap of Bactria who about 274/73 B.C. furnished Antiochus I with some twenty elephants during his war with Ptolemy (CHI. i, 437). If that were the case it seems quite likely that Diodotus had been appointed satrap of his important province already during the viceroyalty of Antiochus I in the East, which came to an end in 281/80 B.C. Diodotus, whose reign seems to have been rather short (cf. above, p. 308), must then have been a fairly old man in 250 B.C.—at least about or well above sixty. The reasons for his rebellion are, of course, unknown; but they may have ultimately been connected in some way or other with the execution
begun several years earlier than 250 B.C., during the very critical period following upon the death of Antiochus I.¹

What has been summarily put forth here according to my humble opinion decidedly speaks against the suggestion that the Amṭiyoka nama Yonaraja mentioned in the Rock Edicts XIII and II should be Antiochus II Theos. He seems to have devoted no interest to his Eastern provinces; at a probably early date during his reign he was despoiled of the most important one, viz. Bactria (with Sogdiana), by the rebellion of Diodotus, perhaps a little later also of Parthia by the upheaval led by Arsakes and Tiridates. Thus being entirely cut off from connection with the Further Orient and devoting all his energy to the affairs of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, there was little if any opportunity for Antiochus II to have established connections with the Emperor of the Indians, who was no longer his immediate neighbour. And Asoka, provided he was still continuing his missionary activities outside his own borders, would rather have turned to Bactria than to distant and inaccessible Syria.

And now let us turn to the one other Antiochus that would be possible in this connection, viz. Antiochus I Soter, and try to find out whether there are not better reasons for identifying him with Amṭiyoka, king of the Yavanas.

Antiochus was the son of Seleucus, the most prominent of all the successors of Alexander, the greatest man of all next to the world-conqueror himself,² who was cut down by the monstrous Ptolemy Keraunos at the very moment when he seemed able to raise himself into the position of a second and maybe wiser Alexander.³ His mother was Apama, the daughter of Spitamenes, one of the great lords of Eastern Iran, who had fallen during the Oriental campaign of Alexander; she was given to Seleucus at the great marriage festival

of the young Seleucus, the elder son of Antiochus I, who was probably viceroy of Iran, and must have been put to death in the year 263 B.C. (cf. Bevan, loc. cit., i, 150, n. 3, 169; Cambridge Ancient Hist. vii, 709 sq.). What I mean is that Seleucus may have been popular and perhaps even have tried to reign on his own, while Antiochus II was perhaps less well liked throughout the East.

¹ Even if such were the case there is no reason for the remark sometimes put forward about Diodotus (and even Arsaces) not being mentioned by Asoka. For Asoka, even if he had happened to hear about some uprising in Bactria, would scarcely have considered its leader worthy of mention as one of the kings connected with Antiochus.

² Cf. Arrianus, Anabasis, vii, 22, 5.

³ Seleucus, according to the latest available evidence (cf. Cambridge Ancient Hist. vii, 98, n. 1), was murdered some time between 30th November, 281, and March, 280 B.C.
in Susa (324 B.C.). And though most other Macedonian nobles seem
to have repudiated their Persian spouses after the death of the great
conqueror, Seleucus faithfully kept to his Iranian wife. It seems
scarcely improbable that, owing to his Iranian parentage, Antiochus
from an early age did not feel out of touch with his Eastern subjects,
and that they for that same reason clung to him with greater
sympathy than to rulers of unmixed Macedonian or Greek origin.

Antiochus most probably accompanied his father during at least
a part of his great Eastern expedition; for he was with him during the
long march that ended on the battlefield of Ipsus (301 B.C.). In that
battle, as a youth of little more than twenty, Antiochus unshrinkingly
flung himself in the face of the formidable Poliorcetes, his future
father-in-law, and to a great extent bore the brunt of the battle.
Demetrius no doubt routed him; but while this magnificent
condottiere chased his adversary far from the field his aged father,
deserted by his own troops, went down before the lancers of Seleucus,
and the battle ended in the defeat and temporary downfall of the house
of Antigonus.

What we next hear about Antiochus is the romantic story, made up
in the best Greek style, of him and his step-mother, Stratonice, the
daughter of Demetrius. It does not vividly interest us in this
connection. What interests us more is that Antiochus, when once
married to Stratonice, was set up by his father as his co-regent and
as the viceroy of the whole eastern part of the empire from
Mesopotamia to the very frontiers of India. His title was that of
βασιλεύς; and there are even preserved a few coins with the legend
βασιλέων Σελεύκου καὶ 'Αντίοχου, which may most probably
date from this very period. The date of his elevation seems to have

1 Cf. Arrianus, *Anabasis*, vii, 4. Antiochus I thus most probably was born in
323 B.C. and cannot, at the time of his death, have been sixty-four years old (Bevan,
loc. cit., i, 168, quoting Eusebius, i, 259).


3 In this connection let me quote the following passages: "Antiochus ... had
some things to his favour. In the first place, his hold upon the eastern provinces
was firm. His mother, it must be remembered, was of Iranian race, and those peoples
might naturally cleave to a king who, by half his blood, was one of themselves.
Through his mother, many perhaps of the grandees of Iran were his kindred" (Bevan,
loc. cit., i, 74). "Antiochos avait sur son père l'avantage d'être à demi iranien par
sa mère Apama et, peut-être pour cette raison, moins impopulaire dans l'Iran" (Bouché-Leclercq, loc. cit., i, 40).

4 Cf. *CHI*, i, 434, with pl. ii, 1. The *Cambridge Ancient Hist.*, vii, 93, correctly
remarks that the appointment of Antiochus as viceroy of the East was not without
precedence in Achaemenian times.
been somewhere about 293 (292) B.C., and his viceroyalty apparently did not come to an end until he succeeded his murdered father in a still more powerful and responsible position. It thus seems obvious that he must have governed the east of the realm during at least some twelve years. And though next to nothing is known of his activities during this period there seems little doubt that they were manifold. The foundations of many Greek cities throughout Iran seem to be to his credit; and probably he may have done more for the spread of Hellenism throughout the Far East than anyone else, Alexander himself perhaps excepted.

During the time of his eastern viceroyalty Antiochus may have entered into those friendly connections with Bindusara 'Amīrtrākhaṇḍa mentioned by Hegesander. It may have been also during this period (roughly 293–281 B.C.) that he dispatched a certain Dalmachus of Platea as his ambassador to the then capital of India. That Antiochus did really spend most of his time in the East seems clear from the circumstance that some time during the years 285–283 B.C. his father wrote to him about the fate of his father-in-law Demetrius; and at that time Antiochus had taken up his residence in Media. Even long after his ascension of the throne Antiochus seems to have upheld his sway over the far-off Eastern provinces, as in 274/73 B.C. the then governor of Bactria, who may well have been Diodotus, sent him elephants to assist him in the war with Ptolemy Philadelphus. Whether during the last years of his reign his hold upon the Far East became less strong it is impossible to ascertain, though such a condition seems intrinsically not improbable.

From what has been shortly set forth above it is quite obvious that the connections of Antiochus I with the East were of long and solid
standing. By his mother Apama, the daughter of Spitamenes, he was half Iranian. Already in his early youth he had probably visited the East in the train of his great father, and from the age of thirty on he, for about twelve years, held the viceroyalty of all the vast land between Mesopotamia and Afghanistan, between the Jaxartes and the Persian Gulf. Even after having succeeded to the throne he seems to have maintained a firm grip on his eastern provinces. During his term as viceroy he must have entered into relations with his powerful neighbour, the Indian Emperor Bindusāra, and sent envoys to his court. Aśoka, the son of Bindusāra, clearly must have inherited these relations with a friendly and powerful neighbour. Thus there can be little doubt, to the present writer at least, that Antiochus I and no one else is in reality the Anttiyoka, king of the Yavanas, of the Rock Edicts.

The five kings mentioned in Rock Edict XIII would thus most probably be the following ones:—

Antiochus I Soter, end of 281 or beginning of 280—October, 262, or April, 261 B.C.;

Antigonus Gonatas, 276–239 B.C.;
Magas of Cyrene, c. 300–c. 250;
Alexander of Epirus, 272–c. 255,
the two last ones being, for chronological purposes, without any decisive value.¹

If I am right in assuming that Antiochus I is the Yavana king spoken of in the Rock Edicts—and I can scarcely see any reason for doubting this suggestion—this will, of course, have a certain influence upon the fixing of the dates of these edicts. Antiochus I must, as we have already mentioned, have been well known to Bindusāra as well as to Aśoka himself.² There is scarcely any reason for doubting that fairly constant diplomatic connections were upheld between the court of Antiochia and that of Pātaliputra. And if that were the case

¹ Most of these princes were closely related to each other. Berenike (I), the daughter of Lagus and Antigone, daughter of Kassander (cf., however, Beloch, Griech. Geschichte, iii, 2, 128), first married a certain Philippus, the father of Magas and of Antigone, wife of Pyrrhus of Epirus. Berenike then married her half-brother Ptolemy I and became the mother of Ptolemy II. Magas thus was the cousin of this ruler; he himself married Apama, the daughter of Antiochus I. Pyrrhus and Antigone again were the parents of Alexander of Epirus.

² Aśoka, as governor of some of the western provinces of the empire during the lifetime of his father, may already then have entered upon relations with Antiochus, at that time possibly still the viceroy of the East.
the death of Antiochus in the current year 262–261 B.C. could not long have been unknown in India. Whether Magas of Cyrene or Alexander of Epirus, known to Asoka probably only through their relationship and other connections with Antiochus, were alive or dead would be of little or no consequence to the ruler of India; and he would probably have cared little more about the fate of Antigonus Gonatas. Nay, it may even have been fairly indifferent to him which one of the Ptolemies was occupying the throne of Egypt. But with the Seleucid king, the greatest prince of the age besides himself, the one ruler who was striving to uphold the traditions of Alexander, it was otherwise. No doubt Asoka would be well aware of his movements; no doubt the death of a Seleucid king would be looked upon as a momentous affair even in distant Pātaliputra.

The late lamented Senart in his admirable work on the Asoka inscriptions formulated the theory which seems to have been unanimously adopted by later scholars, that all the Rock Edicts were incised at one and the same time. Such a theory seems to be supported by the fairly uniform style of these edicts, as well as by the last one which appears to contain a sort of summing up of the whole code of dharma-lipi’s. Senart, however, was far from blind to certain evidence that seems rather to contradict his own theory, though it was only natural that he should try his best to explain it away. As far as I can understand, it must be quite correct to suggest that the fourteen edicts were really incised at the same time; but this does not at all mean that they were originally composed at the very same date. That this is not the case is my own humble but firm opinion, of which I shall have to say a few words presently.

First of all let us turn to the Rock Edict XIII, in a way the most important one of them all, which we continue to quote from the Shābhāzgarhī version:—

(1) athavaśabhisitasā Devanapriyasa Priadraśisa rāṇo Kaliga vijita || diadhamatre praṇaṣatasahasre ye tato aparudhe satasahasramatre tatra hante bāhutavatake va mute || (2) tato paca adhuna ladheṣu Kaligeṣu tvire dhramasālana dhramakamata dhramanusāsti ca Devanapriyasa || so asti anusocana Devanapriyasa vijiniti 3 Kaligani ||

1 Cf. Les Inscriptions de Piyadāni, ii, 243 sqq.
2 In the following I am not concerned with any inscriptions except the fourteen Rock Edicts and the two separate ones of Dhauli and Jagadā. Of the new Mysore version, the discovery of which was announced in the IHQ. v, I have, unfortunately, not been able to gather even the scantiest information.
3 vijinitu Bühler; but cf. tiḥiti, aloceti (CII. i2, p. xcvii).
(8) ayī ca mukhamuta vijaye Devanaṃpriyasa yo dhramavijayo ||
so ca puna ladho Devanaṃpriyasa iha ca saveṣu ca amteṣu, etc.
(10) . . . . . . . . savatra Devanaṃpriyasa dhramanuṣasti
anuvataṃti ||

(11) . . . . . . . . . etaye ca aṭhaye ayī dhramadipi nipista
kiti putra pāpotra me asu navam vijayaṁ ma vijetavia maṇīsu . . . .
tam ca yo vija maṇaṭu yo dhramavijayo ||

“When the Beloved of the Gods, the King of auspicious
countenance, had been eight years anointed, the Kāliṅgas were
conquered. One hundred and fifty thousand men were deported
thence, one hundred thousand were slain there, many times that
number died. After that, now the Kāliṅgas have been taken possession
of, there is on the side of the Beloved of the Gods zealous study of
Buddhism, love of Buddhism, instruction in Buddhism. This is the
repentance of the Beloved of the Gods having conquered the
Kāliṅgas.”

“Now this conquest, viz. the conquest by (preaching) Buddhism,
is considered the highest one by the Beloved of the Gods. And even
this conquest has been won by the Beloved of the Gods here and in
all the borderlands . . . . everywhere they follow the instruction in
Buddhism by the Beloved of the Gods.”

“And for this purpose has this edict concerning Buddhism been
composed, viz. that those sons and (great) grandsons that may be
born to me should not deem a new conquest fit to be won . . . but that
they should hold the conquest by Buddhism (to be) the (true)
conquest.”

Now what do we learn from this edict? First of all that, having
been anointed for eight years, i.e. in the year 8/9 after his coronation,
Aśoka had conquered the Kāliṅga country where many hundred
thousand people died, were slain, or were carried off into captivity.
Further, that the Beloved of the Gods, repenting this wholesale
slaughter and all the miseries brought upon the innocent population
of Kāliṅga, had now become a zealous Buddhist, who tried to spread

1 Kālīśi correctly vijayaṁ.
2 We are not here deeply concerned with either the date or the mode of Aśoka’s
conversion, which have been much discussed. That the conversion occurred
immediately after the Kāliṅga campaign there cannot be the slightest doubt. And
as even those virtues which Aśoka does elsewhere (cf. Rock Edicts IV, IX, etc.)
praise as the most meritorious ones are said in xiii, J, to have been practised even
among the people of Kāliṅga, it would be a perfectly justifiable conclusion that
Buddhism was at that time widespread in that country, and that the conversion of
Aśoka did really originate from there.
his newly adopted faith not only throughout his own realm but also within those of his western and southern neighbours. He also apparently tells us that he had still got no (great) grandsons born to him—it would be rather an unwise conclusion to apply these words also to his sons—which seems to be the case elsewhere (cf. Rock Edicts IV, V, VI, etc.). Finally, it is to be observed that the usual introductory words (Devānāmpriyāḥ Priyadarśī rājā evam āha) are missing here without any visible reason.

All these circumstances taken together seem to me to prove that this is in reality the oldest of the edicts hitherto known. It was, according to my humble opinion, made public immediately after the conquest of Kālīṅga and the conversion that followed upon it, i.e. it may well belong to the ninth year after the abhiṣeka. And this year must fall several years before the death of Antiochus I for reasons to which we shall return presently. That in the final redaction of the Rock Edicts it came to be counted as the last one—for the fourteenth does not, for obvious reasons, count in the same way as the other ones—seems well explicable as its contents are quite different from those of the previous rescripts.\(^1\)

After this earliest of the preserved edicts there can be little doubt what follows, viz. the two separate edicts of Dhauli and Jaugāḍa. At the latter place they both present introductory words of a slightly simpler trend than the usual formula, viz. Devānāmpīye hevaṁ āhā “thus speaketh the Beloved of the Gods” \(^2\); while at Dhauli even this simple introduction has been neglected and substituted by the simple Devānāmpiyasa vacanena, etc. Which is really the original version cannot now be fully made out, though it seems rather probable that the introductory words at Jaugāḍa may represent a later addition.

The separate edicts apparently contain rules and advices for the peaceful administration of the recently conquered Kālīṅga country and for the pacification of the unconquered border-tribes of that province.\(^3\) From this it seems pretty clear that they must be ascribed

---

\(^1\) The reason why it was not published in Kālīṅga is, of course, quite conspicuous and has been pointed out long ago. It would, however, be still more obvious if the edict was really published immediately after the conquest and not several years afterwards.

\(^2\) It seems peculiar that the epithet Priyadarśin should occur nowhere in the two separate edicts. For this some local reasons unknown to us may account. It is also somewhat remarkable that in the second separate edict Dh. has everywhere Devānāmpriyāḥ where J. uses the word rājā (cf. the parallel conditions prevailing in Rock Edict VIII, A; cf. CII. i\(^2\), p. xxx).

\(^3\) We are strongly reminded of the existence even to this day of uncivilized hill-tribes within the frontier districts of Orissa, etc.
to the period immediately following upon the conquest, i.e. to the ninth year after the coronation. The immediate objection to this argument will be that the mahāmātras mentioned in these edicts as being sent out at fixed times must in all probability be identical with those of whom we hear in the Rock Edict III, which is dated in the year 12/13 after the abhiṣeka (cf. also the dharmamahāmātra’s of Rock Edict V, who were appointed for the first time in the year 12–13 after the abhiṣeka). Such an objection, however, seems to me to be lacking in validity. The separate edicts simply speak of mahāmātra’s resident in Tosali¹ or Samāpā, of whom one was sent out every fifth year on a general tour of inspection, while at Ujjayini (and Taxila ?) every third year was the date of the inspection-tours. The Rock Edict III, again, speaks of yuksa, rājūka (raudjūka), and prādesika (whatever they be) to be sent out as inspectors every fifth year sāratra viṁte mama “in the whole of my empire”. The inference seems to be that such tours of inspection were at first instituted at Ujjayini and Taxila—perhaps even during the time of Asoka’s own viceroyalty or on account of some revolts at those places—and that they were then after the Kāliṅga conquest further instituted at Tosali and Samāpā; finally, under the influence of Buddhism they were extended over the whole of the empire. There need thus be no immediate chronological connection between the two separate edicts and the Rock Edict III.

A further reason for thinking the two separate edicts to have been published separately and not at the same time as all the edicts I–X (XII), XIV seems to be found in the prescription (I Sep. Ed. Dhauli V, Jaugadā W; II Sep. Ed. Dhauli N, Jaugadā O), according to which the edict should be listened to by all on every day of the constellation Tisya.² This means that on these occasions it was publicly recited—apparently preceded by ceremonial drumming—throughout the towns of Tosali and Samāpā; this distinctly points to a date when it was not yet incised on the rocks, but was preserved in the shape of a royal proclamation.

¹ On this place cf. B. S. Deo, Quart. J. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc., iii, 41 sqq.
² It seems somewhat remarkable that several names containing that of the constellation Tisya belong to the Maurya time. There is Asoka’s wicked queen Tisya-rakṣikā, and his brother Tisya (on this name cf. Pāṇini, iv, 3, 34). There is further the contemporary king Tissa of Ceylon (Dīpavamsa), and the great divine Tissa Moggaliputta (cf. Geiger, Mahāvamsa, p. xlvii sq., etc.). Still further there is Pusyagupta, a viceroy of Candragupta (Epigr. Indica, viii, 46 sq.); and there may be even more names of which I am not aware. The fifth Pillar Edict further tells us that on Tisya castration and branding of animals must not be performed. Unfortunately, I cannot suggest any probable connection of the Maurya family with this constellation though there may well be one.
As for the other Rock Edicts, they may well be of the same date all of them—with one possible exception, viz. Edict VIII. In this document we are told that Aśoka, having been anointed ten years, i.e. in the year 10/11 after the coronation, made a pilgrimage to Sambodhi. I am at one with Professor D. R. Bhandarkar\(^1\) that this word must mean the place where supreme enlightenment was reached by the Buddha Gotama, i.e. Bōdh-Gayā.\(^2\) And it seems only natural that Aśoka who, after the bloody conquest of Kāliṅga, had been converted to Buddhism—though most probably a very simple layman’s Buddhism—should as soon as possible set out to visit what must perhaps be considered the most sacred spot by the followers of the Tathāgata’s doctrine.

The eighth edict lacks the usual introductory words, and for that reason may possibly have been given, before it was included in the collection of the fourteen rescripts, in a somewhat different form. But of this we, of course, know nothing. All that can be said is that it seems quite possible that this edict was really of a somewhat older date and was originally published shortly after the (first) pilgrimage to Bōdh-Gayā. In spite of various interpretative efforts\(^3\) it is, unfortunately, far from clear what is meant by the words Devānāmpiyasa Priyadasino rāṇo bhāge amūie of the last sentence.

As for the remaining Rock Edicts (I–VII, IX–XII, XIV), two of them, viz. the third and the fourth, clearly state that they were published when Aśoka had been anointed for twelve years, i.e. in the year 12/13 after the abhiṣeka; and the Sixth Pillar Edict furnishes the information that a “rescript on Buddhism” was composed at this very date (duvādasavasa-abhisiṭena me dhāmmalipi likhāpiṭā). Although it is not, of course, impossible—or perhaps even rather probable—that some of these edicts should have appeared earlier in a somewhat different form, it seems fairly obvious that in their present shape they were all issued at one and the same date.

As concerns their internal arrangement only a few words may be added here. The introductory words of Rock Edict I (iyam dhāmmalipi Devānāṃpiyena Priyadasinā rāṇā lekhāpiṭā, Girnār) recur at the beginning of Edict XIV, and are, of course, a phrase put

---

1 Cf. I.A. xlii, 159 sq.
2 With this use of the word sambodhi cf. Jātaka, iv, 236, 2: mahāyītena sambodhipi (with mahāyītena cf. mahāyite in the Rummindēi and Nigāḷī Sāgar inscriptions). Cf. also Mookerji, Aśoka, p. 105 sq.
3 Cf. e.g. Lüders, Sitz. ber. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., 1914, p. 846.
in by the final redaction. The second edict again lacks every sort of introductory sentence. Hence it seems fairly probable that these two are really meant to form one continuous rescript: the first part tells us that Aśoka had abolished bloody sacrifices as well as the heedless slaughter of animals practised in his own royal kitchens; when this edict was published only two peacocks and one deer were killed for making curries, and even these were to be spared in the future. In the second part Aśoka tells us that in his own realm and in those of his neighbours he had instituted medical treatment of men and animals, planted herbs of medical use and nourishing roots and fruits, caused wells to be dug, and planted trees for the use of cattle and human beings. These two parts seem to fit very well together.

The same seems to be the case with Edicts III and IV. The introductory words of III exactly correspond to the final paragraph of IV; and Edict IV besides lacks the usual introductory sentence. Furthermore, the virtues inculcated in III D are exactly the same ones the absence of which Aśoka is deploring in IV A. On the very remarkable contents of this later edict I shall say nothing here as I hope to return to them in another connection.

Again the Edicts V and VI both begin with the usual phrase (Devāṇām priyaḥ Priyadarśī rājā evam āha); they are both separate rescripts and seem from that point of view to present no difficulties. As for Edict VII it seems indeed very fragmentary and has in any case got nothing to do with the following one (cf. above). Edict IX again, which starts with the usual introductory sentence, is a complete rescript dealing with the different sorts of maṅgala's; unfortunately sufficient explanation has not been forthcoming for the very remarkable fact that in the later part of the edict Kālsi and the North-Western versions differ entirely from Girmār and the two Eastern ones. The tenth edict seems to be only a fragment and can scarcely be connected with the preceding one, while the eleventh—which, by the way, is of a very undefined and hazy nature—seems to form a piece by itself. Finally, Edict XII lacks the introductory formula, but may originally

1 Somewhat similar measures were at times taken by Akbar, cf. Smith, Akbar the Great Mogul, p. 167.

2 To peacock's flesh no doubt magical qualities were ascribed; it was believed to convey immortality, not to decay, etc. Cf. Jātaka, ii, 36 sq.; Johansson, Sölfugeln i Indien, p. 78 sq.; Charpentier, Festschrift E. Kuhn, p. 283, n. 4; Mookerji, Aśoka, p. 62.
have been a rescript not to the subjects in general, but to certain religious sects that were at daggers drawn between each other.¹

Now if the Rock Edict II, which mentions Antiochus, was in its present form published in the year 12/13 after the abhiṣeka, which no doubt was the case, this would give us the means not for fixing its actual date, but for fixing the latest date at which it can possibly have been published. The death of Antiochus I occurred between October, 262, and April, 261 B.C.; and there is little or no doubt that it would have been known in India at least in 261/260 B.C. This consequently marks the latest date possible for a rescript that speaks of Antiochus as being still alive. If the present version of the fourteen Rock Edicts were published at such a date—which is, of course, only a working hypothesis and intrinsically not very probable—the year of the coronation would be calculated by adding 12/13 to 261/260, by which means we would arrive at 274/272 B.C. as the latest possible date of the abhiṣeka. And as tradition unanimously asserts that Aśoka was raised to the throne four years before his coronation the date of his real accession would fall between the years 278 and 276 B.C.

The length of Bindusāra’s reign is given differently in different sources; but perhaps the most probable one is the calculation of the Purāṇas, according to which he reigned for twenty-five years. If, now, we reckon with the accession of Aśoka as having taken place between 278 and 276 B.C., this would bring the beginning of Bindusāra’s reign to a date somewhere between 303 and 301 B.C. Considering the accepted date of Seleucus’ Indian expedition (305 B.C.)²—which is, however, nothing but a not incredible hypothesis—and the assertion of Arrian that Megasthenes did repeatedly (πολλάκις) visit the residence of Candragupta,³ such a date would seem rather early,

¹ It is certainly remarkable that this rescript contains at least two words which strongly remind us of Jain terminology, viz. vaci-guti (vaca-guti) in D and kalāṇḍīgamā in J (this, by the way, must mean “possessed of good scriptures”, not “pure in doctrine” as rendered by Hultzsch). Of the officials mentioned here the dharmamahāmātra is in all probability the special supervisor of the Buddhist sāṅgha (cf. Delhi-Tōpra VII, Z); the iṭṭihakka certainly has got nothing to do with the ganikādhikṣaka of Kaṇṭhiya (thus CII. i, p. 22, n. 4)—he may possibly be some sort of overseer of the nuns; the vaca-hāmika is the supervisor of the holy cows (and probably of the pinjrapols, cf. Rock Ed. II), a purely Brahmīn official.

² Cf. CII. i, 430, 472, 698.

³ It must, however, be observed that these words do not necessarily involve that Candragupta was still alive during all the visits, though the text says παρά Σονδράκαστον τὸν Ἰνδῶν βασιλέα. The successor of Candragupta, as we know, was not even known to the Greeks by his real name.
though of that we can form no fixed opinion.\(^1\) As Candragupta, again, is unanimously told to have reigned for twenty-four years, the period of his reign would have to be placed somewhere between 327–325 B.C. and 303–301 B.C.; the dates 325–301 B.C. would in that case seem to be the more probable ones.\(^2\)

That the reign of Candragupta should have begun as early as 327, or more probably 325, B.C. will perhaps be considered not very probable. But I fail to find real arguments that could be raised against such an assumption. If the passage in Justin, xv, 4, is to be considered the leading one amongst classical scriptures dealing with Candragupta it tells us the following: first of all he by his insolent behaviour fell out with King Nandrus\(^3\) and fled for his life from him. Then: *contractis latronibus Indos ad novitatem regni sollicitavit*; and Indian sources—whatever else may be their value—scarcely contradict the statement that it was with the help of a veritable pack of rascals (*latrones*) that Candragupta did overthrow the throne of the Nandas.\(^4\) And finally: *molienti deinde bellum adversus Alexandri prefectos, etc.*; the *deinde* obviously proves that it was after having assured for himself the realm of the Prācyas that Candragupta turned upon the Punjāb and Sindh. The consolidation of the Eastern empire and the recruiting of armies capable to combat the soldiers of Macedonia and Greece and with the strong men of the North-west will have taken some years. Thus it is nowise impossible that Candragupta may have begun his reign in Pāṭaliputra about 325 B.C., or even perhaps a little earlier.\(^5\)

---

1 There remains the possibility that the four years during which Asoka is said to have reigned before his anointment do in reality mean nothing but a co-regentship with Bindusāra (cf. also CHI. i, 503, n. 1). If such were the case the latter’s regnal years would come in somewhere between 299/97 and 274/72 B.C. But all this is pure guess-work.

2 On the date of Candragupta cf. also the able paper of Dr. O. Stein, *Indologica Pragensia*, i, 354 sqq.

3 It is to be sincerely hoped in the interest of Indian ancient history, which is mainly constructive, that the emendation *Nandrum for Alexandrum* is really the correct one. Otherwise the passage from Justin would tell us an absolutely different tale.

4 Here the *Mudrārākṣasa*, which may be of considerable historical value, is especially illuminative.

5 It seems to have been always taken for granted that *Agrammes or Xandrames* (on whom cf. E. Thomas, *J.R.A.S.* 1885, p. 447 sqq.), the despicable sovereign of the East who had murdered his predecessor, was in reality a Nanda. But we look out in vain for definite proofs of such a suggestion. *Xandrames*, as Professor Thomas has rightly remarked (*CHI. i, 469 sq*.), most probably renders a Sanskrit form *Candramas*, and this is certainly not far from Candragupta. That Candragupta should have visited Alexander while in the Punjāb (Plutarch, *Alexander*, lxii) sounds suspiciously like a myth.
To sum up: I have tried above to make it probable that Antiochus I (281–262/61 B.C.) and not Antiochus II (262/61–246 B.C.) is the Yavana king Āṃtiyōka mentioned in two of the Rock Edicts of Aśoka. Even if such a suggestion cannot, of course, be definitely proved, it still seems fairly probable that such is the case. Certain chronological conclusions may be drawn from this assumption; they are, however, lacking in definiteness and are only apt still further to emphasize the profound uncertainty with which the ancient and in general the pre-Mohammadan chronology of India is beset.

Let me finally express the sincere wish that these modest lines may present some interest to my dear and revered friend Professor Rapson. Without the splendid work performed by him for the elucidation of crucial points within the ancient history of India—especially as an editor and author of most important chapters of the Cambridge History of India—to produce even the above pages would have proved well-nigh an impossible task.
À propos de l'origine des chiffres arabes

Par G. Coëdès

(PLATE IV)

L'ORIGINE des chiffres que nous appelons "arabes" parce qu'ils ont été introduits en Europe par les Arabes, et de la notation arithmétique basée sur leur valeur de position avec l'emploi du symbole zéro, a donné lieu à des recherches qui ont abouti à des résultats opposés : certains auteurs ont affirmé l'origine indienne du système, tandis que d'autres ont voulu y voir une invention occidentale.

Parmi ces derniers, M. G. R. Kaye s'est fait remarquer par son hostilité contre la thèse de l'origine indienne. Il s'exprime ainsi dans son article "Notes on Indian Mathematics : Arithmetical Notation" (JASB., 1907, p. 487) : "On paleographic grounds we are forced to fix the ninth century A.D. as the earliest period in which the modern place-value system of notation may have been in use in India. This earliest period depends on one inscription only. If this inscription, on further light being thrown upon it, proves unreliable (as it possibly will), then we shall have to fix the tenth century as the earliest period. Even for the tenth century there is not an excessive amount of good evidence, and it is within the bounds of possibility that we may have finally to turn to the eleventh century for evidence of the use of our modern system in India."

Dans son récent mémoire intitulé "Hindu-Arabic Numerals" et publié dans Indian Studies in honor of Charles Rockwell Lanman (pp. 217-36), M. W. E. Clark proteste contre l'attitude de M. G. R. Kaye. Laisant résolument de côté l'épigraphie indienne qui peut justifier dans une certaine mesure le scepticisme de ce dernier, il recherche dans la littérature indienne des témoignages anciens de l'emploi du symbole zéro et des chiffres avec valeur de position, et il conclut ainsi son enquête : "It seems to me that the Indian literary evidence proves conclusively the presence of a symbol for zero by A.D. 600. Before this could be referred to in a work of general literature it must have had a considerable history behind it. It also proves the knowledge of nine symbols with place value (with either a blank column on the reckoning board for zero, or a symbol for zero) by the end of the fifth century A.D. at least. Beyond that the present evidence
does not go. But this carries the Indian knowledge of symbols with
place value back at least four hundred years earlier than the date
assigned by Kaye."

Il est à craindre que M. G. R. Kaye ne se laisse pas facilement
couvrir par des arguments tirés d’une littérature dont la chrono-
logie est aussi mal établie que la littérature indienne et dont la tradition
manuscrite est aussi discutable. Sans prendre parti dans un procès
dont je n’ai pas étudié toutes les pièces,1 je voudrais y verser quelques
documents provenant d’un domaine qui m’est familier, en apportant
au débat le témoignage de l’épigraphie indo-chinoise et indonésienne.
Ce témoignage tire une certaine valeur du fait que les textes que je me
propose d’utiliser, au lieu d’être comme dans l’Inde propre des chartes
sur cuivre, c’est-à-dire des documents susceptibles selon M. G. R. Kaye
d’avoir été recopiés, altérés et falsifiés, sont des inscriptions sur pierre
dont tout un ensemble de faits garantit l’authenticité.

La présence, dans les inscriptions sanskrites de l’Indochine et de
l’Insulinde, de mots symboliques présupposant l’emploi des chiffres
avec valeur de position n’a pas échappé aux auteurs précités. Le
fait que ce mode de numération est attesté dans l’épigraphie de ces
pays, avant de l’être d’une façon indiscutable dans l’épigraphie indienne,
a conduit M. G. R. Kaye à supposer qu’il a pu être importé de
partie pour réfuter cette étrange opinion que M. W. E. Clark a
recherché dans la littérature indienne des témoignages de l’usage
ancien des mots symboliques. Mais ni l’un ni l’autre ne se sont
demandés à quelle époque, et dans quelles conditions apparaissent
pour la première fois, dans l’épigraphie de l’Indochine et de l’Insulinde,
les chiffres avec valeur de position et le symbole zéro. C’est sur ce
point particulier que je voudrais apporter quelques précisions, dont
l’importance n’échappera à personne ; car à moins de prétendre que
les chiffres ”arabes” et le zéro sont venus d’Extrême-Orient, leur
emploi dans les colonies indiennes à haute époque est nettement en
faveur de leur existence dans l’Inde à une époque plus haute encore.

Il importe, dans cette enquête, de distinguer entre les inscriptions
en vernaculaire, khmèr, cham, malais ou javanais, et les inscriptions
sanskrites, presque toujours en vers, qui, par ce fait même, n’ont
pas l’occasion d’employer les chiffres pour exprimer les dates.

1 Cf. notamment : Sukumar Ranjan Das, “The origin and development of
numerals,” IHQ., III, 1927, pp. 97, 356; Bhubutibhusan Datta, “The present mode
of expressing numbers,” ibid., p. 530.
Au Cambodge, les premières inscriptions sanskrites datées font usage des mots symboliques. En voici l’exemple le plus ancien :

Stèle de Bâyàn (K. 13, ligne 11 = ISCC., p. 36) 1 : rasadasra-çaraç ācakendravarṣe "dans l’année du roi des Çaka (désignée) par les (cinq) flèches, les (deux) Açvin et les (six) saveurs ", soit 526.

Les inscriptions connues jusqu’à présent fournissent une quinzaine d’ exemples de ce système pour le VIe siècle çaka.

Au Champa, les deux plus anciennes inscriptions sanskrites datées expriment le millésime en toutes lettres, en langue sanskrite :


Au siècle suivant, donc plus tard qu’au Cambodge, apparaissent pour la première fois dans les inscriptions sanskrites du Champa les mots symboliques, seuls ou combinés avec les noms de noms :


S’il n’est pas dû uniquement aux nécessités du mètre, l’emploi de çata pour préciser la valeur de śat semble trahir une certaine inexpertise dans le maniement des mots symboliques remplaçant des chiffres avec valeur de position ; en tout cas, dans une inscription postérieure d’un demi siècle, le même nom de nombre représentant des centaines est donné tout nu :


A Java, la plus ancienne inscription sanskrite datée fait usage des mots symboliques :


Dans les inscriptions en vernaculaire, l'emploi des mots symboliques eût risqué d'être inintelligible pour le public auquel elles étaient destinées. D'autre part, les noms de nombres indigènes, d'un usage courant dans les énumérations d'objets offerts à un temple, dans l'évaluation des distances ou des superficies, etc., semblent frappés d'interdit dans l'énoncé des dates : c'est là un fait dont la raison n'est pas très claire, mais dont il faut cependant tenir compte. Voici comment les Indochinois et les Indonésiens ont résolu la difficulté.

Au Champa, les dates des inscriptions en langue chame sont exprimées par des chiffres avec valeur de position, suivant le système dont l'origine fait précisément l'objet de la controverse. La plus ancienne date attestée est 735 çaka (Pō Nagar, C 37 = *J.A.*, 1891, i, p. 24 ; C 125 = *BEFE-O.*, XV, 2, p. 47).


1 Kern corrige aṅiṅkṛte en aṅkikṛte.
605 Inscription khmère de Sambór.

608 Inscription malaise de Kota Kapur (Banka).

735 Inscription châme de Pô Nagar.
Le Cambodge présente un cas particulièrement intéressant. La numération n’y était pas décimale, et aujourd’hui encore, malgré l’emprunt des numéraux siamois pour les multiples de dix à partir de trente, et pour cent, mille, etc., elle ne l’est pas complètement : les noms de nombres de six à neuf se disent cinq-un, cinq-deux, cinq-trois, cinq-quatre, et des noms spéciaux pour désigner le nombre quatre et plusiures multiples de vingt sont encore d’un usage courant. À l’époque ancienne, les Khmêrs ne disposaient pour exprimer les nombres, de quelque grandeur qu’ils fussent, que des noms pour un, deux, trois, quatre, cinq, dix, vingt, et quelques multiples de vingt, et avaient emprunté au sanskrit le mot ṭata pour cent (cf. BEFE-O., XXIV, p. 347). A chacun de ces noms correspondaient des signes dont les plus anciens exemples sont attestés par les inscriptions de Trapân Thom (K 423 = Corpus,1 LXIII), Lounvêt (K 137 = Corpus, LV), Vât An Khvâv (K 560 = Corpus, XXII) et Sambôr datée 605 ṭaka (K 127 = Corpus, XLVII) : Aymonier en a reproduit quelques-uns, tirés d’inscriptions un peu postérieures, dans ses “Quelques notions sur les inscriptions en vieux khmêr” (J.A., 1883, i, p. 483). Ce système de notation arithmétique est resté en vigueur à travers toute l’épigraphie cambodgienne pour le décompte des esclaves, des animaux, des objets, l’évaluation des longueurs, etc., mais n’a jamais été appliqué aux dates. Les plus anciennes inscriptions khmêres datées donnent le millésime en sanskrit, par exemple :

Prâh Kûhâ Lûōn (K 44, ligne 6 = Corpus, IV): ṣâṇṇavatytuttara-païcaḍa ṭaka pariṇaḥa “(l’année) ṭaka comptant cinq cent quatre-vingt-seize”.

Quelque incertitude a régné jusqu’à présent sur la date la plus ancienne qui ait été exprimée en chiffres dans l’épigraphie khmère. Une inscription de Prasât Nâk Buos (K 341 Sud) contient une date de trois chiffres se terminant par 96, dont les autres données se vérifieraient pour l’année 596 ṭaka (ISCC., p. 380, n. 2), mais qu’Aymonier préférerait restituer 796 (Le Cambodge, vol. II, p. 238) : on ne peut en faire état. D’autre part, Aymonier (ibid., I, p. 292) proposait d’interpréter par 784 la date d’une inscription de Côn An (K 99) qu’il avait lu 7844 (sic). Mais ce que cet auteur a pris pour un 7 n’est qu’un signe ornemental, et la date réelle est 844 ṭaka, postérieure de plus de trente ans à cette date de 801 qui se lit sur plusieurs inscriptions de Bâkô (K 315, 318, 320), qui est confirmée

1 Inscriptions du Cambodge publiées sous les auspices de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Paris, Geuthner (en cours de publication).
par les inscriptions sanskrrites du même monument et qui est peut-être la date la mieux attestée de l'épigraphie préankoréenne.

Mais la publication du Corpus a révélé une date en chiffres qui est plus ancienne de deux siècles, et contemporaine de la plus ancienne inscription de Črīvijaya : c'est une inscription de Sambór (K 127 = Corpus, XLVII) qui donne la date 605 çaka, avec les chiffres en valeur de position et le zéro.

En résumé, dans les inscriptions sanskrrites, l'usage des mots symboliques est attesté pour la première fois au Cambodge en 526 çaka (A.D. 604), au Champa en 609 (A.D. 687) et à Java en 654 (A.D. 732). Dans les inscriptions en vernaculaire, les chiffres avec valeur de position et le zéro apparaissent simultanément en 605 çaka (A.D. 683) à Sumatra et au Cambodge, précédés dans ce dernier pays d'une période pendant laquelle les dates étaient exprimées en langage sanskrit ; au Champa, ils ne sont pas attestés avant 735 (A.D. 813).

Le résultat de cette enquête ne semble pas favorable à la théorie qui assigne une origine indochinoise ou indonésienne à l'emploi de mots symboliques sanskrits, car les plus anciens exemples en sont fournis par le Cambodge où la numération indigène n'était pas décimale ; et au Champa, ce système a été précédé par un autre qui faisait usage des noms de nombres sanskrits. Au Cambodge, l'emploi des chiffres est, de même, précédé par celui des noms de nombres sanskrits. De toute façon l'apparition des chiffres avec valeur de position et du zéro dans l'épigraphie indochinoise et indonésienne est nettement liée à l'expression des dates de l'ère çaka, dont on ne saurait contester l'origine indienne. Quelle que soit l'origine ultime de ce système de notation arithmétique, il n'est pas sans intérêt de le trouver attesté en Indochine et dans l'Insulinde dès le VIIe siècle A.D., c'est-à-dire au moins deux siècles plus tôt que dans l'Inde propre, si l'on adopte les vues pessimistes de M. G. R. Kaye sur les témoignages de l'épigraphie indienne.

Quant à la forme même des chiffres indochinois et indonésiens, elle est pour plusieurs d'entre eux très différente de celle des chiffres indiens : il y a là un nouveau problème dont l'étude contribuerait peut-être à résoudre l'origine exacte des chiffres " arabes ".

Les grands rois du monde
Par Gabriel Ferrand

M. Paul Pelliot a récemment publié dans le T'oung-pao (t. XXII, mai 1923, pp. 97-125), un article intitulé: "La théorie des quatre fils du Ciel," où ont été réunis les informations de source chinoise et quelques textes arabes sur ce sujet. La présente note n’est qu’une addition à son article.

1) Le plus ancien texte chinois qui fasse allusion aux grands rois du monde est le K’ang che wai kouo tchouan, "Relation des pays étrangers par M. K’ang." Ce K’ang, plus exactement K’ang T’ai, fut envoyé, avec Tehou Ying, en ambassade par la cour de Chine, dans l’Océan Indien, vers 245-50 de notre ère. "D’après la Relation des pays étrangers, dit un extrait de ce texte, aujourd’hui perdu, on dit dans les pays étrangers que sous le ciel il y a trois abondances: l’abondance des hommes en Chine, l’abondance des joyaux au Ta-ts’in (Orient méditerranéen), l’abondance des chevaux chez les Yue-tche."

2) Le Che eul yeou king qui a dû être mis en chinois en 392 par un religieux des "constrées occidentales" appelé Kâlodaka, rapporte ce qui suit: "Dans le Yen-feou-t’i (Jambudvîpa), il y a 16 grands royaumes, avec 84.000 villes murées; il y a huit rois (kouo-vang) et quatre Fils du Ciel (t’ien-tseu). A l’Est, il y a le Fils du Ciel des Tsin (= Chine); la population y prospère. Au Sud, il y a le Fils du Ciel du royaume de T’ien-tchou (Inde); la terre y [produit] beaucoup d’éléphants renommés. A l’Ouest, il y a le Fils du Ciel du royaume de Ta-ts’in (Orient Méditerranéen); la terre y abonde en or, argent, joyaux, jade. Au Nord-Ouest, il y a le Fils du Ciel des Yue-tche (Indosciythes); la terre y [produit] beaucoup d’ excellents chevaux."

3) Dans l’introduction de ses Mémoires sur les constrées occidentales achevés en août 646, Hiuan-tsang parle des quatre continents, du Jambudvîpa avec ses quatre fleuves issus du lac Anavatapta, puis continue ainsi:

"L’âge actuel n’ayant pas de ‘roi à la roue’ (cakravartin) qui réponde à l’ordre cosmique, sur le territoire du continent Tchan-pou (Jambudvîpa) il y a quatre souverains. Au Sud-Est [est] le ‘seigneur des éléphants’; [son pays] est chaud et humide, et favorable aux

1 Pelliot, pp. 121-2.
2 Pelliot, p. 98, n. 2: "Le traducteur a dû rendre par jade le nom d’une pierre plus ou moins semblable au jade, mais de toute autre nature, . . . ."
3 Pelliot, pp. 97-8.

"Aussi, dans le royaume du 'seigneur des éléphants', les habitants sont-ils d'une nature impétueuse, diligents à l'étude et spécialement adonnés aux sciences occultes. Comme vêtements, ils [portent] un morceau d'étoffe [enroulé] horizontalement et laissent l'épaule droite découverte; comme coiffure, ils nouent au haut de la tête leurs cheveux, qui retombent de tous côtés. Ils habitent par tribus dans des cités, et leurs maisons sont à étages.

"Dans le territoire du 'seigneur des joyaux', il n'y a ni rites ni justice, et on fait grand cas des richesses. [Les vêtements] y sont taillés courts, et on les y boutonne à gauche. [Les gens] se coupent les cheveux et ont de longues moustaches. Ils habitent dans des villes murées, et tirent profit des transactions commerciales.

"Pour ce qui est des coutumes chez le 'seigneur des chevaux', [les habitants] y ont un naturel cruel et violent; leurs sentiments tolèrent le meurtre. [Ils ont] tentes de feutre et 'huttes à coupole'; ils s'assemblent [et se dispersent] comme des corbeaux en faisant paître [leurs troupeaux].

"Sur le sol du 'seigneur des hommes', les coutumes ont pour mécanisme la sagesse; la bienveillance et la justice brillent avec éclat. [Les gens] y ont le bonnet et la ceinture, et boutonnent [le pan de leur vêtement] à droite; les chars et les vêtements y ont des [distinctions suivant les] rangs. La population y est attachée au sol et difficile à déplacer; les professions y sont classées.

"Dans les coutumes de trois des 'seigneurs', c'est l'Est qui a la prééminence. Les habitations [de leurs peuples] ouvrent leurs portes à l'Est; au soleil levant, on y salue tourné vers l'Est. Sur le territoire du 'seigneur des hommes', c'est le côté Sud qui est honoré. Pour ce qui est des mœurs locales et des coutumes diverses, tel en est l'essentiel. . . . " 1

1 Pelliot, pp. 106-8. M. Pelliot ajoute plus loin (p. 109): "Tao-siuan (voir 4) expose, lui aussi, la théorie des 'quatre seigneurs', en des termes voisins de ceux de Hsuan-tsang, mais bien plus résumés, et insiste ensuite sur la différence entre les Hindous et les Hou. L'originalité de Tao-siuan, en ce qui concerne les 'quatre seigneurs', est qu'il précise les équivalences que Hsuan-tsang avait laissées dans le vague, et dit que le 'seigneur des éléphants' répond à l'Inde (Yin-tou), le 'seigneur des joyaux' répond aux Hou, le 'seigneur des chevaux', aux Turks (T'ou-kiue), le 'seigneur des hommes', à la Chine (Tche-na). . . . "
4) Dans son *Siu kao seng tchouan*, rédigé entre 645 et 667, où le chapitre IV est consacré à la biographie de Hiuian-tsang, Tao-siuan dit : "Dans ce pays-là [= dans l'Inde], on avait la tradition que le seul Jambudvipa est gouverné par quatre rois. L'Est s'appelle Teche-na (Cïna, Chine) ; son seigneur est le roi des hommes. L'Ouest s'appelle Po-sseu (Perse) ; son seigneur est le roi des joyaux. Le Sud s'appelle Yin-tou (Indu, Inde), son seigneur est le roi des éléphants. Le Nord s'appelle Hien-yun (= Hiong-nou, ici Turcos, etc.) ; son seigneur est le roi des chevaux. Tous disent que les quatre royaumes se servent de ces [avantages spéciaux à chacun d'eux] pour gouverner. Aussi en parla-t-on de suite [à Hiuian-tsang]."  

5) Les textes arabes connaissent cette théorie à relativement haute époque. Le marchand Sulaymân dont la relation est de 851, s'exprime ainsi :—

"Les gens de l'Inde et de la Chine sont d'avis unanime sur ce fait que les [grands] rois du monde sont au nombre de quatre. Celui qu'ils citent comme le premier des quatre est le roi des Arabes, [c'est-à-dire le Khalife de Bagdâd]. Indiens et Chinois sont d'accord à cet égard, sans contredit, que le roi des Arabes est le plus grand des rois, le plus riche et le plus magnifique ; que c'est le roi de la grande religion (l'Islâm), au-dessus de laquelle il n'est rien. Le roi de la Chine se place lui-même au second rang, après le roi des Arabes. Viennent ensuite le roi de Rûm (Byzance) et le Ballahrâ, le roi de ceux qui ont les oreilles percées...."  

6) La relation précédente est suivie dans le même manuscrit d'un commentaire qu'y a ajouté, vers 916, un certain Abû Zayd Ḥasan de Sirâf, inconnu par ailleurs. Celui-ci rapporte qu'un koreichite appelé Ibn Wahab fut reçu par l'empereur de la Chine à Si-ngan-fou, vers 872/5. Ibn Wahab raconta que, au cours de l'audience, le roi lui posa certaines questions et lui dit ensuite : "Comment classez-vous les rois [de la terre] ?" L'arabe répondit : "Je ne sais rien à ce sujet. "Le roi dit à l'interprète : "Dis à Ibn Wahab que nous, Chinois, nous comptons cinq rois. Celui qui possède le royaume le plus riche est le roi de l'"Irâk, parce que l'"Irâk est au centre du monde et que les autres royaumes l'entourent. En Chine, on le désigne sous le

---

1 Pelliot, p. 125.  
nom de ‘roi des rois’. Après lui, vient le roi de Chine que nous désignons sous le nom de ‘roi des hommes’, parce qu’il n’y a pas de roi qui, mieux que lui, ait établi les bases de la paix, qui maintienne mieux l’ordre que nous ne le faisons dans notre royaume et dont les sujets soient plus obéissants à leur roi que les nôtres. C’est pour cela que le roi de Chine est le ‘roi des hommes’. Vient ensuite le ‘roi des bêtes féroces’ : c’est le roi des Turks (des Toguz-Oguz), qui sont nos voisins. Puis, c’est le ‘roi des éléphants’, c’est-à-dire le roi de l’Inde. On l’appelle aussi en Chine ‘le roi de la sagesse’ parce que la sagesse est originale de l’Inde. Vient ensuite le roi de Rûm (Byzance) que nous appelons ‘le roi des beaux hommes’ (rex virorum), parce qu’il n’y a pas sur terre un peuple aussi bien fait que celui des Byzantins, ni qui ait plus beau visage. Tels sont les principaux rois de la terre ; les autres rois ne leur sont en rien comparables.”

7) Abûl-Kâsim Sâ’îd bin Ahmad bin Sâ’îd l’Espagnol est né à Almeria en 420/1029 et mourut à Tolède en 462/1070. Il publia de nombreux ouvrages qui sont aujourd’hui perdus ou qu’on n’a pas encore retrouvés. Il ne nous reste d’une production que nous savons avoir été considérable que son Tabâkat al-unam “les catégories des peuples”. Edité par le Père Louis Cheikho (Beyrouth, 1912, in 8°), ce texte arabe, contient une notice sur l’Inde qui, autant que je sache, n’a pas été encore traduite ; je la donne ci-dessous intégralement :

“La Science dans l’Inde

(p. 11). Le premier des peuples dont il est question ici est celui de l’Inde. C’est un peuple qui possède d’abondantes richesses et des ressources considérables, qui comprend de puissants royaumes ; la sagesse lui a été reconnue ; dans toutes les branches de la science, la prééminence lui a été reconnue par tous les peuples anciens et les générations passées.

Les rois de la Chine 2 disaient [sic] que les rois du monde sont au

1 G. Ferrand, Voyage du marchand arabe, p. 87. Egalement cité par M. Pelliot.
nombre de cinq et que le reste des hommes sont leurs sujets. Ils disent que ces cinq rois sont : le roi de la Chine, le roi de l’Inde, le roi des Turcs, le roi des Persans et le roi de Rûm (Byzance). Ils appellent le roi de la Chine ‘le roi des hommes’ parce que les Chinois sont les plus obéissants à l’autorité royale et les mieux disposés à se laisser conduire par le gouvernement. Ils appellent le roi de l’Inde ‘le roi de la sagesse’ à cause de l’extrême application des Indiens pour les sciences et de leur primauté dans toutes les connaissances. Ils appellent le roi des Turcs ‘le roi des bêtes fauves’ à cause de la bravoure des Turcs et de leur grand courage. Ils appellent le roi des Persans ‘le roi des rois’ à cause de la puissance et de la grandeur de son royaume, de la supériorité de sa puissance et de l’énormité de sa force, car ce royaume domine les rois au centre de l’œcumène et s’étend sur le plus beau des climats, à l’exclusion des autres rois. Ils appellent le roi de Byzance ‘le roi des beaux hommes’ parce que les gens de Rûm ont les plus beaux visages humains, les plus beaux corps ¹ et la constitution la plus vigoureuse.

“Parmi tous les peuples, l’Inde est le pays qui, dans la succession des siècles, a été le pays d’origine de la sagesse et la source de la justice et de la science du gouvernement ; pays des gens de pensées supérieures et d’opinions sublimes, des sentences universelles, des produits extraordinaires, des merits merveilleux. Quoique leur couleur les classe dans la première catégorie des Noirs, ils n’en font pas moins partie par là de l’ensemble des Nègres ; mais Allah le Très-Haut les a exemptés des mauvaises qualités des Nègres (p. 12), de la vilenue de leur caractère et de la sottise de leur pensée ; il a donné aux Indiens la supériorité sur bien des peuples parmi les bruns et les blancs.

“Certains savants en astrologie prétendent attribuer cela à une cause : ils prétendent que Saturne et Mercure se partagent l’influence sur le caractère des Indiens. L’influence de Saturne sur leur organisme a consisté à noircir leur couleur ; celle de Mercure a épuré leur

¹ Cf. à ce sujet, Pelliot, pp. 119-20.
intelligence, a adouci leur caractère, tandis que Saturne contribuait à la sûreté de leur raisonnement et à leur éloignement de l'erreur. Et c'est ainsi qu'ils ont à ce point la pureté des vertus et la sûreté du jugement. Ils diffèrent en cela de tous les autres Noirs, c'est-à-dire des Zangs (ou Nègres de la côte orientale d'Afrique), Nubiens, Abyssins et autres. C'est ainsi qu'ils sont adonnés à la science des nombres et à la formation de la géométrie. Ils ont acquis la connaissance la plus parfaite et la plus grande maîtrise dans la connaissance des mouvements des étoiles et des secrets de la sphère, et dans les sciences exactes. En outre, ce sont les plus savants des hommes dans l'art de la médecine, les plus experts dans la connaissance de la force des médicaments, les caractères des éléments et les particularités des choses créées. Leurs rois ont une noble conduite, des principes de gouvernement louables, une administration parfaite.

"Quant à la science divine, ils sont tous d'accord à cet égard pour croire à l'unité divine d'Allah puissant et fort, et à écarter de lui tout associé. Mais ils ont plusieurs espèces de monothéisme : il y a parmi eux des Brahmanes et des Sabéens.\(^1\) Les Brahmanes sont une classe d'hommes peu nombreuse ; ils ont une loi de noblesse héréditaire. Il y en a parmi eux qui professent l'impermanence et d'autres la permanence. Mais ils sont tous d'accord pour déclarer les prophéties inexistantes,\(^2\) interdire les sacrifices d'animaux et défendre qu'on fasse souffrir les animaux. Quant aux Sabéens, c'est la masse des Indiens et ils constituent la plus grande partie de la population de l'Inde. Ils professent la permanence du monde qui a pour cause l'essence de la cause du monde, laquelle est le Créateur puissant et fort, et la prééminence des astres. Les Sabéens donnent aux astres des formes auxquelles ils obéissent et auxquelles ils font toutes sortes d'offrandes en rapport avec ce qu'ils savent de la nature de chacun de ces astres, de façon à se rendre par là leurs forces favorables et à utiliser dans le monde inférieur l'influence de ces astres, selon leurs convenances. Ils donnent des noms à chacune de ces formes. Sur les époques de la précession des équinoxes, sur les circuits et les révolutions des astres.

\(^1\) Sur les Sabéens, cf. Encyclopédie de l'Islam, sub verbo şabi'a. Mais il s'agit ici, d'après une des phrases suivantes, de tous les autres Indiens, en dehors des Brahmanes. Naturellement, les véritables Sabéens sont hors de cause et l'expression est impropre. M. Sylvain Lévi m'infore que les textes grecs, sanskrits et palis emploient fréquemment l'expression : brahmanes et śramanes (śramaṇa) pour désigner les Indiens. C'est cette division à laquelle fait allusion le présent texte, où les śramaṇa sont représentés par les pseudo-sabéens.

et sur la corruption de toutes les choses créées provenant des quatre éléments au moment de chaque réunion qui se produit pour les astres dans le têtu du Bélier et sur le rétablissement des choses créées à chaque révolution, ils ont des opinions nombreuses et des doctrines diverses, ainsi que nous l’avons exposé dans notre Livre sur les doctrines des adeptes des religions (p. 13) et des sectes. L’éloignement de l’Inde de notre pays (l’Espagne) et l’isolement du royaume de l’Inde par rapport à nous rendent rares pour nous les ouvrages qu’ils ont composés. Il ne nous est parvenu que des fragments de leur science ; nous n’avons que des bribes de leurs doctrines et nous n’avons appris que bien peu de chose de leurs savants.


---

1 Ḍàwūf al-maṣālik wa’l-maṣālik
4 Cf. Alberuni’s India, t. II, p. 303.
5 Je lis man na que porte le texte.
7 Le P. Cheikhho a édité fautivement Ḥāshmi pour Ḥāshmi.
10 Cf. Suter Die Mathematiker, p. 44, No. 82.
‘perpétuité absolue’. Ce n’est ainsi que s’exprime Al-Husayn bin al-Ādāmī dans sa table astronomique.

‘Les partisans du Sindhind disent que les sept astres (planètes), leurs aveau et leurs gawzahr se réunissent tous dans la tête du Bélier, particulièrement toutes les 4.320.000.000 années solaires et les Indiens appellent cette durée “durée du monde”; car ils croient que lorsque les astres se réunissent dans la tête du Bélier, toutes les choses créées se corrompent et que le monde inférieur reste à l’état de ruines pendant un long temps, jusqu’à ce que les astres se dissèminent dans les signes du zodiaque. Quand il en est ainsi, la vie recommence et le monde inférieur revient à son état premier. Suivant leur doctrine, il en est ainsi éternellement, sans fin. Chacun de ces astres, leurs aveau et leurs gawzahr ont de certaines révolutions en cette durée qui est, suivant leur doctrine, ‘la durée du monde’. J’ai rapporté cela dans le livre que j’ai composé sur la correction des mouvements des étoiles.


‘Quant aux partisans de l’Arkand, ils diffèrent des deux opinions

1...
précédentes sur les mouvements des astres et sur la durée du monde ; mais la forme exacte de leur divergence ne nous est pas parvenue.

(p. 14) "Parmi celles des sciences indiennes qui nous sont parvenues, il y a, en ce qui concerne la musique un livre appelé en langue indienne biyāfar,\(^1\) ce qui veut dire ‘les fruits de la sagesse’,\(^2\) dans lequel il est question des origines des sons et des recueils de compositions mélodiques.


"Parmi celles des sciences indiennes qui nous sont parvenues, il y a encore le calcul des nombres que Abū Ja‘far Muhammad bin Mūsā al-Ḥuwārizmī a exposé complètement. Cette science, chez lui, est particulièrement condensée, intelligible, accessible et compréhensible ; elle témoigne de la finesse de l’esprit des Indiens, de la beauté de leurs qualités naturelles, de l’excellence de leur faculté d’invention.

"Parmi les fruits, qui sont parvenus jusqu’à nous, de leur intelligence solide, parmi les produits de leur esprit pur et des merveilles de leurs arts excellents, citons le jeu d’échecs. Pour les Indiens, dans les redoublements de nombres qu’ils ont combinés dans les cases de l’échiquier, il y a des règles secrètes qu’ils considèrent comme l’introduction à la connaissance et des mystères dont ils trouvent l’origine dans les forces qui sortent de la nature. Vraiment la belle composition et la merveilleuse ordonnance qui apparaissent dans l’emploi de ces cases suivant l’ordre de leurs parties manifestent un but grandiose et un dessein magnifique ; car tout cela contient un avertissement sur le moyen de se garantir contre ses ennemis et une exhortation à requérir une forme de tempérament qui se purifie des souillures. Il y a là un avantage considérable, un profit éminent.

"Ils nous ont encore communiqué la description qu’ont faite leurs

---

1 M. Sylvain Lévi me suggère comme restitution le skr. vidyāphala qu’appelle sa traduction arabe “les fruits de la sagesse.”

2 مَثَر العِكَّة.

3 Cf. sur ce médecin, la préface de La version arabe de Kalīlah et Dimnah du P. Louis Cheikhbo (Beayroud, 1905, in 8°) et les auteurs cités ; Encyclopédie de l’Islam, t. II, p. 737.

savants de la forme du monde, de l’ordonnance des sphères et des mouvements des astres, par exemple, Kankah l’indien.1 Car Abu Ma’sar bin ‘Omar al-Balḥî a mentionné dans son livre intitulé Les mille, que Kankah est le premier en date (p. 15) dans l’astronomie parmi tous les savants de l’Inde de l’ancien temps et nous ne connaissions pas l’indication précise de l’époque où il a vécu, ni rien de son histoire en dehors de ce que nous en avons dit.”

8) A une date indéterminée, mais relativement récente, l’histoire des grands rois du monde est passée dans le folklore pur : on la retrouve dans Les cent et une nuits.2 Un vieillard, qui avait parcouru le monde, arrive à la cour du roi de Perse, Kesra Anušîrwan. Introduit au palais, “le chambellan me dit que le roi me faisait demander si je connaissais le plus puissant des rois de la terre. Je répondis qu’il y en a cinq : Celui dont les domaines sont les plus étendus est le roi de l’Irâk (= roi des Arabes), car il est au milieu du monde et les autres rois font cercle autour de lui.—Cela est vrai, dit le chambellan, c’est ce que nous trouvons dans nos livres.—Ensuite, continuai-je, vient le roi que voici (le roi de Perse), et qui est surnommé le roi des gens civilisés. Il est suivi du roi des Turks, qui est surnommé le roi des bêtes férocès, c’est-à-dire des bêtes férocès humaines ; vient ensuite le roi de l’Inde, surnommé le roi des éléphants ; puis le roi de la sagesse 3 qui est le souverain de l’Egypte, car c’est de ce pays-là que vient la sagesse ; enfin le roi des Rûms qu’on nomme aussi le roi des hommes, parce que les hommes de son empire sont plus beaux et de plus agréable figure que ceux d’aucun autre pays. Tels sont les principaux rois ; les autres sont au-dessous d’eux.” 4

En résumé, les textes chinois et arabes fournissent les informations suivantes :

1) En 240-250, K’ang T’ai connaît “trois abondances”, c’est-à-dire trois grands pays : la Chine, le Ta-ts’in = Orient méditerranéen et les Yue-tche = Indoseythes.

1 Vide supra, n. 2, p. 332.
3 Variante du manuscrit 3662 : le roi d’Abyssinie.
2) Au IIIe ou IVe siècle, le Che eul yeou king mentionne quatre Fils du Ciel : en Chine, Inde, au Ta-ts’in et chez les Yue-tche.

3) En 646, Huan-tsang cite quatre souverains : en Inde, chez les Hou = Iraniens et Tokhariens, chez les Turks et en Chine.


Qu’il s’agisse de trois, quatre, cinq ou six grands rois du monde, la parenté de ces récits est indéniable : tous les huit énumèrent dans un ordre différent : la Chine, le Ta-ts’in = Hou = Rûm des Arabes, l’Inde, les Yue-tche = Turks = Hiong-nou, le roi des Arabes, le roi de Perse = roi des rois de l’Irâk et le roi d’Egypte. Chacun de ces rois est caractérisé par la richesse ou le produit particulier du pays sur lequel il règne : l’Inde par ses éléphants, le Ta-ts’in par ses joyaux, le pays des Yue-tche par ses chevaux, etc.

K’ang T’ai et les autres textes chinois ne citent pas leurs sources, mais il semble bien qu’ils ont recueilli l’histoire dans l’Océan Indien ou la mer de Chine occidentale ; Huan-tsang, au dire de Tao-siuan, l’aurait recueillie dans l’Inde (cf. 4)). D’après le marchand Sulaymnâan (5)), ce récit est courant dans l’Inde et en Chine ; Ibn Wahab (cf. 6) le tient de l’empereur chinois lui-même et Abû’l-Kâsim en attribue l’origine “aux rois de la Chine” (cf. 7)).

Le désaccord des textes à cet égard est évident, mais nous ne sommes pas en mesure de l’expliquer. L’Inde nous donnera peut-être quelque jour le mot de l’enigme.¹

¹ MM. Gaudefroy-Demombynes et Sylvain Lévi m’ont amicalement aidé pour la rédaction de cette note. Je les en remercie très cordialement.
De Kāpiśi à Pushkarāvati
Par A. FOUCHER

NOUS n’apprendrons à personne que les chapitres XXII-XXIII du tome I de la Cambridge History of India abondent en faits nouveaux et en convaincantes suggestions. M. le Prof. E. J. Rapson a notamment tiré un admirable parti des monnaies sur lesquelles il a été le premier à lire les noms des deux villes de Kāpiśi et de Pushkarāvati. Non content d’y reconnaître les devatā des deux vieilles capitales du Kāpiśa et du Gandhāra, il a su deviner des allusions locales sous les emblèmes qu’elles portent. S’aident des notes de Hiuān-tsang, il a identifié sur les monnaies de Kāpiśi l’éléphant dont un rocher, voisin de la ville, présentait l’image naturelle — ou, comme l’on disait et dit encore dans l’Inde, svayambhū. Avec non moins de sûreté il a rattaché le taureau figuré sur les monnaies de Pushkarāvati au deva dont le grand temple, abritant une image miraculeuse, se dressait en dehors de la porte occidentale de la cité. Du même coup l’animal lui a dénoncé le nom du dieu, que tait Hiuān-tsang, mais qui ne peut être que Śiva, et Śiva apparaît en effet, en même temps que son vahana, sur les monnaies subséquentes des monarques Kushānas. Symétriquement cela nous donne à penser que la divinité de Kāpiśi, à en juger par son vahana l’éléphant, devait être Indra — auquel cas, soit dit en passant, l’image de Zeus ne serait pas si mal choisie pour le représenter, puisque tous deux ont comme attribut le foudre. Désormais la présence sur une monnaie indo-grecque ou “indo-scythe ” soit de Zeus-Indra ou de son éléphant, soit de Śiva ou de son taureau, soit encore du dieu et de son vahana à la fois, soit enfin (pour épuiser tous les cas qui se présentent) la figuration sur l’avers et le revers des deux animaux symboliques nous fournira de précieuses indications sur les capitales où régnaien t les souverains dont ces monnaies portent le portrait ou seulement le nom. Et voilà par quel enchaînement d’observations précises et de déductions ingénieuses qui s’étayent et se renforcent les unes les autres, M. le Prof. E. J. Rapson a pu rebâtir l’histoire des maisons d’Euthydème et d’Eukratidès, et même de leurs barbares successeurs.1

Paulo minora canamus : nous ne voudrions retenir ici que le fait,

1 V. notamment Camb. Hist. of India, t. I, pp. 555-7. Vaut-il la peine de remarquer que le cas des deux villes n’est pas absolument identique ? La monnaie de Kāpiśi représente au revers le dieu-patron de la ville avec son éléphant et sa colline sacrée (cf. J.A., janv.-mars 1929, p. 175); celle de Pushkarāvati figure à l’avers la personnification de la ville et au revers le vahana du grand dieu local; mais chacune à sa manière nous fournit en somme le même genre de renseignements.
confirmé par nombre de témoignages, que les deux villes ci-dessus nommées étaient les capitales des deux régions naturelles entre lesquelles se répartit l’India extra Indum. Pushkarāvati, située au confluent du Suwastu (Swât) et de la Kubhā (ou Kubhānâ ? = Kōphēn) était le chef-lieu du Gandhāra, c’est-à-dire du district actuel de Peshawar. Kāpīsī, située au confluent des rivières Ghorband et Panjšīr, était le chef-lieu de ce qu’on appelait jadis le Kāpīsā et de ce qu’on appelle aujourd’hui le Koh-Dāman (Pied-de-la-Montagne) et Kohistān (Pays-de-Montagne) de Kāboul. Attenantes sur la carte, ces deux contrées sont séparées dans la réalité par une brusque dénivellation de plus de mille mètres. Le Gandhāra n’est que la continuation de la grande plaine indienne, à une élévation d’environ 350 mètres au-dessus du niveau de la mer ; au contraire le Kāpīsā occupe, à une hauteur moyenne de 1600 à 1700 mètres, le premier gradin du plateau iranien. On conçoit ce qu’une telle différence d’altitude entraîne aussitôt de changement dans le climat des deux pays comme dans le tempérament de leurs habitants. Si ces deux moitiés d’un même bassin fluvial ont constamment tendu à s’imposer réciproquement le même régime politique, il n’en est pas moins vrai qu’à plus d’une période de leur histoire le maître de l’une n’a pas été — pas plus qu’il ne l’est aujourd’hui — le maître de l’autre. Ceci aide à comprendre comment, sur ce territoire à population clairsemée et relativement resserré entre l’Hindou-Koush et l’Indus, il peut y avoir place à la fois pour deux grandes villes rivalisant d’importance aussi bien au point de vue politique que commercial : l’une située dans le haut-pays, au débouché des passes de la montagne, et l’autre en contre-bas, dans le vestibule même de l’Inde, dont la frontière “climatique” est marquée vers la mi-route par la cote 600. Mais du même coup deux questions se posent, auxquelles nous voudrions apporter un commencement de réponse. Si l’étape médiane de Nagarahāra est toujours représentée de façon très approchée par Djalālābād, la capitale de la plaine s’appelle à présent Peshawar, tandis que celle du Kohistān a nom Kāboul. Quand cette substitution s’est-elle opérée ? Et subsidiairement quels changements a-t-elle entraînés après elle dans le tracé des grandes voies de communication ?

On sait que le site aujourd’hui ruiné et presque désert de Kāpīsī se laisse repérer dans la plaine de Begrām, au pied de sa colline sainte, à douze kilomètres dans l’Est du gros bourg de Tcharikār 1 : mais sa

1 Qu’on nous permette de renvoyer à la carte reproduite dans les Études asiatiques publiées à l’occasion du 25e anniversaire de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient, I, p. 266.
longue prospérité nous est copieusement attestée. Pline veut qu'elle ait déjà été détruite une fois par Cyrus, ce qui est bien possible. Pâpini la mentionne en même temps que son raisin — produit de ces vignobles qui font encore l’orgueil et la prospérité du Koh-Dāman. En écrivant son nom au revers de ses monnaies, Eukratidès atteste sa primauté. Comme elle était sûrement toute voisine d’Alexandrie du Caucase, c'est très probablement elle qui se cache sous la "Kalasi dans le district d’Alasanda" que, par suite d’une faute de copiste, les manuscrits pâliss nous donnent comme la patrie de Ménandre. Kanishka en fait sa résidence d'été et celle de ses otages chinois. Enfin, au VIIe siècle de notre ère, Hiuan-tsang la trouve plus florissante que jamais et devenue la métropole de toute la région du Nord-Ouest, depuis Bāmiyān jusqu’à l’Indus. Mais à partir de ce moment tout change, et désormais il ne sera plus question de Kāpiši ni même du Kapiša, encore qu’Alberuni paraisse connaître cet ancien nom de ce qui est pour lui le "pays de Kāboul". 1 Kāpiši avait-elle été détruite par les premières incursions musulmanes de 652 et 664 A.D.? Ou simplement avait-elle été jugée trop en l’air, et la capitale ramenée par prudence à 65 kilomètres plus au Sud, derrière un second rempart de collines? Toujours est-il que c’est à Kāboul — le vieux Kāboul sur le Logar, entre les villages de Shevaki et de Kamari — que les envahisseurs musulmans font prisonnier le dernier roi bouddhiste; c’est à Kāboul — le Kāboul actuel, à huit kilomètres au Nord-Ouest du premier, sur la rivière dite depuis le Kāboul-roué — qu’ils établissent leur capitale nouvelle; c’est Kāboul que Timour prend pour base de son expédition dans l’Inde; c’est à Kāboul que Bābour règne et qu’il veut être enterré, etc. Et comme si ce n’était pas assez d’avoir totalement dépossédé dans les temps modernes la vieille capitale, c’est toujours Kāboul qui obsède l’esprit de nos archéologues et, au risque de les embrouiller inextricablement dans leurs recherches, tâche d’éclipser rétrospectivement l’antique gloire de Kāpiši.

Le destin de Pushkaśāvāti, au fond tout pareil, diffère par les circonstances et par la date. Son déclin commença beaucoup plus tôt et fut apparemment l’œuvre d’un caprice royal plutôt que d’une invasion étrangère. Tous les historiens grecs sont d’accord pour faire de Peukelaotis la capitale de la Gandarīsī et la première ville qu’ait rencontrée Héphestion quand, avec le gros de l’armée d’Alexandre, il marchait vers l’Indus avec ordre d’en préparer le passage. De Purushapura, situé à une vingtaine de kilomètres au Sud-Ouest, il n’est

fait, et pour cause, aucune mention. Son emplacement, à en croire la célèbre légende locale rapportée par Hiuan-tsang, n’était encore, quatre siècles plus tard, qu’un terrain de chasse fort marécageux. C’est à Pushkarāvati que règnent les Indo-Grecs, les Scytho-Parthes et les premiers Kushānas. Mais, soit qu’il y ait été conduit, comme l’on nous raconte, par une foi supersticieuse en une prédiction du Bouddha qui était censé le concerner, soit qu’il ait simplement voulu, comme auprès de la seconde Takshaśilā, se bâtir une ville neuve, le shāh-des-shāhs Kanishka décida de transporter sa capitale à Purushapura. Quelle que soit la vraie raison, le transfert est chose certaine : et dès lors, semble-t-il, Pushkarāvati cède le pas à sa rivale. C’est Purushapura qui nous est désormais donné comme la capitale du Gandhāra ; ce sont ses bazars et ses pagodes qui attirent aussi bien les pélerins chinois que les marchands. Au VIIe siècle, quand passe Hiuan-tsang, Pushkarāvati n’existe qu’à titre de bourgade secondaire ; et l’on sait qu’aujourd’hui sa place n’est plus marquée que par de grands tumuli aux abords des villages de Charsadda et de Prang.1 Comme il est arrivé pour Kāpiśi, la déviation de la grand’route lui a porté le coup de grâce.

C’est qu’en effet les “routes royales” (rāja-patha), comme on disait dans l’Inde, passent par les capitales et les suivent par conséquent dans leurs déplacements. Un regard jeté sur le croquis qui accompagne cet article abrègera beaucoup les choses en montrant d’un seul coup d’œil les deux principaux changements de tracé qu’imposa à la vieille route de l’Inde la substitution successive de Peshawar à Pushkarāvati, puis de Kāboul à Kāpiśi. Le premier se dessine à partir de Dakka. Au IIIe siècle avant notre ère, Héphestion 2 dut continuer tout droit à l’Est par la vieille route encore existante dont le fort de Michni surveille actuellement le débouché, exactement comme celui de Jamroûd monte la garde à la porte du Khaiber. Coupant au court à travers la boucle montagneuse du Kōphēn, il lui fallait traverser une seconde fois cette rivière ; mais en revanche elle abordait le Swāt au-dessus de son confluent avec le Kōphēn et se heurtait à l’Indus à Udabhānda (aujourd’hui Und), c’est-à-dire à un endroit où l’immense

1 Voir les cartes publiées dans le BEFE-O., I, 1901, p. 334 et hors texte.
2 On se rappelle que celui-ci, avec le gros de l’armée, passa sur la rive droite du Kōphēn en amont de Djalālābād, tandis qu’Alexandre, resté sur la rive gauche, se lança avec des troupes d’élite à travers le Kounār, le Badjaur, le Swāt et le Bounār jusqu’au fameux Aornos si brillamment identifié par Sir Aurel Stein. On trouvera le meilleur résumé de cette campagne de 327–326 av. J.-C. dans G. Radet, sur les traces d’Alexandre entre le Choès et l’Indus (Journal des Savants, mai 1930).
lit du fleuve était guéable en hiver et ne réclamait de barques qu’en été. C’est le besoin de se rendre à Purushapura qui, à partir du IIe siècle après notre ère, a fait dévier la route vers le Sud-Est, au sortir de Dakka, et a commencé la fortune de la fameuse passe du Khaïber. Les courants établis sont d’ailleurs lents à se détourner. Au VIIe siècle, si Hıuan-tsang passe tout naturellement par Peshawar, il remonte ensuite au Nord-Est pour rejoindre à Pushkarāvatī la vieille route traditionnelle ; et au XVIe siècle Bābour, d’après ses propres Mémoires, suivait encore le même itinéraire à l’aller comme au retour de la plupart de ses expéditions dans l’Inde.1 C’est seulement à partir du règne de son petit-fils Akbar que les facilités exceptionnelles présentées à Attock par l’extrême rétrécissement du fleuve pour l’établissement d’un pont de bateaux, en attendant celui de fer, ont définitivement retenu la grand’route sur la rive droite de la rivière désormais dite “de Kāboul”.

Le changement de tracé nécessité par le transfert de Kāpišī à Kāboul fut dès l’abord beaucoup plus accusé, à cause de la distance plus grande qui séparait les deux villes.2 L’ancienne route, ainsi que le spécifique Hıuan-tsang, prenait la direction du levant : la nouvelle pique droit au Sud pour tourner ensuite à angle droit vers l’Est. Tant qu’à être moderne, mieux vaut l’être jusqu’au bout, et c’est pourquoi nous avons indiqué sur notre croquis le parcours actuel de la route carrossable : il ne diffère d’ailleurs de l’ancien chemin muletier que par quelques sinuosités, dont la plus importante a pour but d’éviter la passe mal famée du Lataband. Ce que nous pouvons affirmer par expérience oculaire, c’est que la descente de Kāboul à Djelalābād à travers le Siyāh-Koh ou Montagne-Noire ne présente pas, comme on l’entend répeter à tort, moins d’obstacles naturels que celle de Kāpišī à Nagarahāra à travers le Lampa ou Lampahan. La preuve que nous ne sommes pas seul de cet avis, c’est que la vieille

1 Il dit en effet (trad. Pavet de Courteille, t. I, p. 286) : “Durant l’hiver on passe à gué le Sind [Indus] au-dessus de son confluent avec la rivière de Kāboul, puis la rivière de Suvad [Swat] et celle de Kāboul. Dans la plupart de mes expéditions contre l’Hindoustan, je me servis des gué...” A la vérité Hıuan-tsang ne signale entre Purushapura et Pushkarāvatī qu’une seule traversée de la Kubbā et du Suvastu réunis, tandis que Bābour paraît dire qu’on traversait successivement ces deux rivières ; en réalité ils suivaient toujours la même route, mais il est probable que dans l’intervalle et le lit de la Kubbā ou Kophān s’était déplacé au Sud et que le confluent se faisait déjà, comme aujourd’hui, beaucoup plus en aval qu’autrefois. Voyez les cartes citées plus haut, p. 345, n. 1.

2 Comme nous l’avons dit plus haut, on compte environ 65 kilomètres entre Kāpišī et Kāboul et seulement 22 entre Pushkarāvatī et Peshawar.
route reste toujours préférée par les tribus nomades à l’époque de leurs transhumances de printemps et d’automne entre les plaines de l’Inde et les hautes pentes de l’Hindou-Koush. En fin de compte, le seul tronçon resté immuable et commun au cours des vingt derniers siècles se compose des 68 kilomètres de sable ou de rocaille qui séparent Djelalâbâd de Dakka.

Ce sont là des constatations de fait comme il est facile d’en relever sur place et qui ne sont pas pour surprendre. Rien de plus banal ni de mieux connu que cette façon qu’ont les villes indiennes de se déplacer ou de se supplanter entre elles. Pour ne pas sortir de la région du Nord-Ouest, le mauvais tour dont Kâpişî pourrait faire reproche à Kâboul et Pushkarâvati à Peshawar est exactement celui que Mazâr-é-Şerîf a joué au dernier avatar de Bactres, Attock à Und et Rawäl-Pindi à la troisième — ou plutôt à la quatrième — Takshaśîlā. Peut-être cependant la connaissance de ces simples données de topographie historique aurait-elle épargné bien des discussions oiseuses et bien des assertions erronées au sujet de l’itinéraire d’Alexandre ou de Huan-tsang. Non que nous nous fassions sur ce point aucune illusion : les vieux préjugés ont la vie tenace ; et l’on aura beau leur brandir sous le nez le texte d’Arrien, les visiteurs du Khaïber continuaront avec la même sérénité à y chercher dans la poussière la trace des pas du conquérant macédonien. Mais nous avons voulu soumettre au contrôle de nos confrères orientalistes un essai de coordination des renseignements que nous possédons sur les deux villes dont les travaux numismatiques de M. le Prof. E. J. Rapson ont achevé de nous révéler l’importance exceptionnelle. Ils nous donnent à penser que nous avons peut-être un peu trop négligé jusqu’ici la part considérable que Pushkarâvati-Peuâkaotis, en sa qualité de capitale ancienne du Gandhâra, a dû prendre à la diffusion de l’influence hellénistique et notamment à l’élaboration de cette école gréco-bouddhique dont les fondations religieuses de Purushapura n’ont fait que re cueillir tardivement les fruits. Surtout ils nous mettent en garde contre une propension trop répandue à parler, dès avant le VIIIe siècle de notre ère — des “rois de Kâboul”, de la “route de Kâboul” ou de la “rivière de Kâboul” : car même en ce dernier cas, c’est encore et toujours “Kâpişî” qu’il faudrait dire. Jetez encore une fois les yeux sur la carte : parmi les multiples branches dont la réunion forme à partir de Djelâlâbâd une rivière enfin navigable, nous n’avons pas le droit — même si nous en avions les moyens — de choisir à notre gré, ou pour des raisons purement physiques de longueur ou de débit, celle
que nous considérerons comme le cours d'eau principal, dont les autres ne sont que des affluents. Que la politique ait ici voix au chapitre, c'est ce que prouve assez le fait qu'au cours des dix derniers siècles le *roûd* de Kāboul a peu à peu étendu son nom à toute la vallée jusqu'à Attock. Anciennement, et pour la même cause, la prééminence devait appartenir au cours d'eau que côtoyait de bout en bout et de plus ou moins près la grand'mer et sur lequel étaient sises les deux capitales, celle du haut comme celle du bas pays, Kāpiṣī sur sa rive droite et Pushkarāvati sur sa rive gauche. Que ceci non plus ne soit pas une supposition purement théorique, nous en avons par bonne chance conservé la preuve dans un passage d'Alberuni 1 qui, sur la foi de ses renseignements indigènes, fait encore du Ghorband, c'est-à-dire de la rivière qui baigne les ruines de Kāpiṣī, l'artère maîtresse de tout le système, depuis sa source dans la montagne jusqu'à sa perte dans *'Indus*.

1 Trad. Sachau, t. I, p. 259 : "Dans les montagnes qui bordent la royaume de Kāyabish, c'est-à-dire Kāboul, naît une rivière qui est appelée Ghorvand à cause de ses multiples branches. Elle est rejointe par plusieurs affluents. . . . Grossi par eux, le Ghorvand est une grande rivière quand il arrive à la hauteur de la ville de Purshāwar [*Peshawar*] et il se jette dans le Sind [*Indus*] . . . en aval de Waihand [*Ohind, Und*]."
Conjunct Consonants in Dardic
By George A. Grierson

The correct affiliation of the Dardic languages is a subject regarding which different opinions have been expressed. Some scholars have described them as Eranian languages that have borrowed freely from Indo-Aryan. Others (and probably the most numerous) maintain that they are Indo-Aryan languages that have borrowed from Eranian, and a third (of which I am an unworthy member) suggests that they are neither of these, but that they are descended from a group of Aryan dialects intermediate between those that developed into Eranian and those that developed into Indo-Aryan languages. The latest opinion is that expressed by Professor Morgenstierne, who divides the Dardic languages into two groups. One of these—the Kāfir—has, he considers, some affinities with Eranian, while the other—the "true Dardic"—is "absolutely and unquestionably Indian". To my mind, at present only one thing is quite certain about them—that they all possess features that remind us of Eranian, and also features that remind us of Indo-Aryan, and that therefore they offer an interesting study to those concerned in the history of Indo-European languages.

In this paper, I do not propose to discuss their origin. My desire is merely to provide a collection of connected facts, the consideration of which, together with other similar collections, may in future times enable scholars once for all to decide the true linguistic history. At present, in spite of the labours of excellent scholars, we have not got together sufficient materials for this. Hitherto investigations have been mostly confined to particular forms of speech. We have accounts of such single languages as Baśgali, Śiṅā, Khōwār, Kāsmīrī, or Aškund, but (except in one work of mine published a quarter of a century ago ¹) no comparative study of all the languages of the group has hitherto appeared. It is true that in some descriptions of isolated languages, such as Professor Morgenstierne's admirable account of Aškund,² or my own account of Tōrwālī,³ comparison has been made with other Dardic forms of speech, but these have each been made

¹ The Piśāca Languages of North-Western India, R.A.S., 1906.
² The Language of the Ashkun Kafirs, in Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap, ii, 1929.
³ Published by the R.A.S. in 1929.
from the point of view of a single language, and not as a general
bird’s-eye view of the whole group. They must, therefore, necessarily
be imperfect, and sometimes even misleading.

What I offer here is a list of such Dardic conjunct consonants as
I have been able to collect in the whole group of Dardic languages.
I have made no attempt to distinguish between original words and
those that I consider to be borrowed from other forms of speech,
for the simple reason that, in the present state of our knowledge, it
is often impossible to decide whether a word is borrowed or not.
The result is that there must always be a tendency (which I myself
have experienced) to look upon any inconvenient word as borrowed,
if it does not tally with a theory based on other grounds. It is generally
impossible to prove that any particular word is borrowed—the fact
can only be asserted. If I am an advocate of the “Eranian” theory,
I am tempted to explain any Indian form that I come across as
borrowed from India, while, if I am an advocate of the “Indian”
theory, I am tempted to quote the very same form as a specimen of
true Dardic, while I claim that forms that remind me of Eranian are
borrowed. In the following pages I therefore avoid the question of
borrowing altogether, and leave it to my readers to decide in the
case of any particular word, each according to his idiosyncracy. This
is not cowardice on my part, or even discretion. It is merely that
limits of space compel me to stick to one thing at a time.

If some other student were to take up Dardic vowels and non-
conjunct consonants on lines similar to those here followed, we should
then have the rough materials for a complete account of Dardic
phonetics, and should be in a position to begin a serious discussion
of the affiliations of the various languages.

We have no Prakrit\(^1\) with which we can compare Dardic, as we
can the modern Indo-Aryan vernaculars. The only languages inter-
mediate between the parent speech and the modern Dardic upon which
we can call for direct help are that of the Shāhībāzgarhī and Manshārā
inscriptions and the “North-Western Prakrit” so admirably dealt

\(^1\) Let me define what I mean by “Prakrit”. I mean only the various Prakrits
described by Sanskrit grammarians, and nothing else. As we shall see, Professor
Konow uses the term “North-Western Prakrit” in his work on the Kharšhī
dscriptions. Here “Prakrit” is used in a different sense, but, as he has so named it,
I follow him in using the term for this particular purpose. But this may not be taken
as an expression of opinion on my part as to whether this North-Western Prakrit
is strictly speaking a Prakrit-like, say, Śaursēnī or Māhārāṣṭrī, or whether we should
look upon it as a form of speech allied to them, but differing from them in important
points. Here I offer no opinion either way.
with by Professor Konow in his volume on the Kharōṣṭhī Inscriptions (vol. ii, part i, of the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum). These, especially the latter, often throw light on obscure Dardic forms, and I shall frequently refer to them. Help can also be found from the Kēkaya Paśīcī of Vararuci, Rāma Tarkavācaspatī, and Mārkaṇḍēya, called Cūlikāpaśīcīka by Hēmacandra, from Lahndā, Sindhī, and Western Pahārī, the three Indo-Aryan languages of North-Western India, and from their predecessors the Vṛacāḍa and Ṭākkī prakrits; but, as a rule, comparison must be made directly between modern Dardic and Sanskrit or Avesta, and this, of course, opens out a long list of conjunct consonants, that it would be impossible to consider here in much detail. I therefore confine myself to typical examples, and these will be sufficient to show that in the Dardic country conjunct consonants have not developed on the same lines as in India.

The following is a list of the Dardic languages, with the contractions used by me for their names:—

I. Kāfir Group.
   Baśgalī (Bš.) (Professor Morgenstierne’s Kati).
   Veron (V.) (Professor Morgenstierne’s Prasun).
   Waigali (Wai.).
   Aškund (Aš.).
   Kalāśa (Kl.).
   Gawarbatī (Gwr.).
   Tirāhī (Tir.).
   Paśai (Paś.).

II. Khōwār (Kh.).

III. Dard Group.²
   Ṣīnā (Ṣ.).
   Kōhistānī dialects, including:—
   Gārwī (Grw.).
   Tōrwālī (Trw.).
   Maiyā (My.).
   Kāśmirī (Kš.).

¹ Professor Konow himself (p. xcv) lays stress on its relationship with Dardic and a perusal of the following pages will show how close it is.
² It may be noted that Ṣīnā and Kōhistānī occasionally agree more closely with Indo-Aryan languages than do the other Dardic forms of speech, e.g. in the change of st to th. This is most evident in Kōhistānī, which is spoken on the Indian frontier, Lahndā being spoken immediately to its south. Kāśmirī is in a different position. For centuries it has been subject to Indian literary influence, and it is now really a mixed language, Dardic and Indian forms appearing side by side.
Other contractions used are:—Skr. = Sanskrit; Av. = Avesta; Pr. = Prakrit (usually Māhārāṣṭrī unless otherwise stated); N.W.Pr. = Professor Konow’s North-Western Prakrit; and Prs. = Persian.

The words quoted from Aṅkund have been taken (with necessary changes of transcription) from Professor Morgenstierne’s work already mentioned. Most of the rest are taken from my own collections. When, in the examples a Sanskrit or Avesta word, or both, precedes one or more Dardic words, I do not suggest that the latter are necessarily derived from the former. All that I intend is to show, for comparison with modern Dardic, what I believe to be the most ancient form obtainable. This may, or may not, be the origin.

A. Conjuncts consisting of two class-consonants (excluding nasals).

In Prakrit, the first member of the conjunct is elided, and the second member doubled, the preceding vowel, if long, being shortened. Thus, Skr. rākt-ā, Pr. ratta-, red; Skr. avāpt-ā, Pr. avatta-, attained. In Dardic, as a rule, the first member is elided as in Prakrit, but the second member is not doubled, and the preceding vowel, if long, is not shortened. Thus, Skr. kukkuta-, Gwr., Aš. kūkur, Paš. kūkūr, Kš. kōkur, Wai. kiukiu (with the common insertion of ĭ before ū), Gwr., Trw. kuqū (with the resultant k voiced, as is common in these two). So Skr. rākt-ā, Pr. ratta-, Kš. rāt-, Trw. žēd (with similar voicing), blood; Skr. avāpt-ā, Pr. avatta-, but Kš. wāta-, arrived; Skr. vīta-(vīd-, lābhē), Kš. vet- (nom. sg. vyotu), possessed of; Skr. bhaktaka-, Kš. bata-, boiled rice; Skr. datta-, Kš. dit- (nom. sg. dyutu), Trw. dit, given; Skr. matta-, Kš. mat-, intoxicated; Skr. udgaṭa-, Trw. uqāt, gone away; and so hundreds of others. It will be remembered that the same rule holds in Sindhī, and, to some extent, in Laḥndā. It did not, however, obtain in N.W. Prakrit, in which the ordinary Indian rule is followed (Konow, xcvi).

Semitatsama words borrowed from Sanskrit or from Indian Prakrit, sometimes follow the déśya Indian custom of inserting a nasal when thus simplifying a double letter. Thus, Skr. sajjā, Kš. sanz, arrangement; Pr. majjha-, Kš. manz, in; Skr. naḍvala-, Kš. nambal, a marsh; Pr. acchā, Paš. anc, My. ainch, an eye. So Skr. nīdrā, Kš. nendo, sleep, apparently through confusion of the Skr. Ts. nīdrā and the Pr. Tbh. nīddā, unless there was some Dardic Prakrit form of which we are ignorant.¹

¹ In regard to this "spontaneous nasalization", see Turner in J.R.A.S. 1921, 381 ff.; J. Bloch in Cingantenaire de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études; and Grierson in J.R.A.S. 1922, 381 ff. Bloch shows that there were traces of a somewhat similar
In a few cases it is apparently the second, not the first, consonant of a conjunct that is elided. Examples are, Skr. kubja-, Pr. khyuja-, but Kš. kōb-, hunchbacked (cf. S. kūbō, L. kūba); Skr., labdha-, Kš. lab- (nom. sg. lāb), received. Neither of these is convincing. The derivations from, and the connections with the Skr. kubja- are very obscure, and the Kš. lāb is evidently formed from the present base lab-, rather than, as we should expect, from the Sanskrit past participle.

B. Conjuncts of a nasal followed by a stop are generally treated as in Prakrit (including that of the N.W., Konow, civ), i.e. they are usually retained, but are liable to be weakened to a nasal alone (cf. Pischel, Pr. Gr. §§272 ff.). Thus:—

ng. This is usually preserved, but is sometimes weakened to n, g, or even g.

Skr. anguri-; Bš. angyur, Kl. angurya-k, Grw. angir, Trw. āngī, Kš. āngi; but Aš. ānur, Wai. āgūr, V. īgi, Ś. āgu, a finger.

Av. angūsta-, toe, Prs. angust-ār, ring; Bš. angūstī, Wai. āgūstō, Kl. angūst-ār, Paš. angōc-āk, Kh. pul-ungūst, Grw. angusir, V. wōg-iṣ, a finger-ring.

Skr. anguliyaka-; Aš. ānūrimāk, a finger-ring. Cf. the preceding.


The weakening to g has not been noted by me in the modern Indo-Aryan vernaculars.

nc. In the one instance in which this has been noticed, Prakrit custom (Pischel, § 273), does not obtain. In Prakrit, when not preserved, nāc > nā or nn; Pāli, ān, nn, nā. In Dardic, this nāc may > c, s (cf. Kuhn, quoted in Pischel, l.c.), and is then liable to syncope.


nt is preserved in Skr. ñvan-, divide; Paš. want-e, a share, Gwr. ñbent-, divide; but > t in Aš. ñmat-, divide, V. but-og, Wai. matini, My. bat-hā, a share.

nasalization in Vedic times. In the only Prakrit work written in Kašmīr with which I am acquainted,— the Mahāratha-maṅjarī of Mahēśvaranānda,— every word that in Indian Prakrit would contain a double consonant has, in this dialect, a single consonant preceded by anusvāra. Thus the Skr. utma- appears as ampa- (not apaa-), Skr. kartā appears as kamṭārō (not kattāro), Skr. niṣga- appears as niṣca- (not nīcā-, and so hundreds of others. Regarding nendar, see, contra, Morgenstierne in "Notes on Torwali" in Acta Orientalia, viii, 296.
\( \text{\textit{nd}, in the only examples available, } > \text{\textit{d}, n, a change unknown in the Indo-Aryan vernaculars not of the North-west. The change to } n \text{ is rare.} \)

\text{Skr. } \text{\textit{danda}-;} \text{ Aś. Wai. } \text{\textit{dōn}, Bš. } \text{\textit{dōn}, Trw. } \text{\textit{dan}, a handle.} \text{Skr. } \text{\textit{randa}-, Kš. } \text{\textit{ṛan}}, \text{ maimed.} \text{Skr. } \text{\textit{palังdu}-, Kš. } \text{\textit{prān}, an onion.} \text{nt, as in Prakrit (Pischel, § 275), tends to become } \text{\textit{nd}. This is liable (as in the modern Indian languages) to be further weakened to } n. \text{ Sometimes, however, } nt \text{ is preserved, and is then (also as in India) weakened to } ^{\text{}}t, \text{ } tt, \text{ } t. \text{Av. } \text{\textit{dantan}-, Skr. } \text{\textit{danta}-, Prs. } \text{\textit{dandān} ; Grw. Kš. } \text{\textit{dand}, Paś. } \text{\textit{dād}, dāt, Kl. } \text{\textit{dand-ōria-k}, Trw. } \text{\textit{dan}, Kh. } \text{\textit{don}, Ś. } \text{\textit{dōn}, My. } \text{\textit{dān}, Wai. } \text{\textit{dāt}, Aš. } \text{\textit{dont}, Bš. } \text{\textit{dutt}, Gwr. } \text{\textit{dāt}, V. } \text{\textit{let-em}, a tooth.} \text{Skr. } \text{\textit{dānta}-, a tamed ox ; Kš. } \text{\textit{dād}, Kl. } \text{\textit{dōn}, Ś. } \text{\textit{dōno}, Sindhi } \text{\textit{dāḍ}}, \text{ a bull. See Turner, Nepali Dictionary, Add., s.v. } \text{\textit{dāunu}.} \text{Av. } \text{\textit{antar}, Skr. } \text{\textit{antar}, Prs. } \text{\textit{andar} ; Kš. } \text{\textit{andar}, Kh. } \text{\textit{andr-ēnī}, Trw. } \text{\textit{andarē}, Kl. } \text{\textit{uōrī-man}, Wai. } \text{\textit{attar}, Bš. } \text{\textit{ātēr}, within ; Kl. (?) } \text{\textit{hāndū-n}, a house.} \text{Skr. } \text{\textit{mantra}-; Kl. } \text{\textit{mondr}, a word ; Kš. } \text{\textit{mātr}, a spell.} \text{nth. This has been noted only in Skr. } \text{\textit{panthan}-, Kl. } \text{\textit{pon}, Ś. } \text{\textit{pōn}, Trw. } \text{\textit{pan}, a path.} \text{nd. This may be retained, or may be cerebralized to } \text{\textit{nd}, which is then weakened to } n \text{ or } ^{\text{}}r, \text{ exactly the reverse of what happened in the case of } \text{\textit{nd}. This well illustrates the facility with which cerebrals (or rather, in Dardic, alveolars) and dentals are interchanged in these languages.} \text{Prs. } \text{\textit{lauṇḍ}; Gwr. } \text{\textit{lauṇḍ}, Bš. } \text{\textit{loṇē}, Wai. } \text{\textit{laver}, a slave. In Paś. } \text{\textit{lauṇṭ}, we have not only cerebralization, but the change of sonant to surd.} \text{Kš. } \text{\textit{phan}, a snare ; cf. Hindi } \text{\textit{phand}.} \text{ndh. This becomes } n \text{ in Skr. } \text{\textit{andhā}, Kš. } \text{\textit{an}}, \text{ Trw. } \text{\textit{an}, blind.} \text{mb. Skr. } \text{\textit{nimbaḥ}, Kš. } \text{\textit{nembe}}, \text{ but in composition } \text{\textit{nem}}, \text{ Azidirachta Indica.} \text{We observe the reverse process of } m \text{ becoming } mb \text{ after a stress-accents in Av. } \text{\textit{kamarā}, Kš. } \text{\textit{kambar}, the loins ; Prs. } \text{\textit{kumak}, Kš. } \text{\textit{kombak}}, \text{ assistance ; Ar. } \text{\textit{ram}, Kš. } \text{\textit{rambal}, geomancy ; Skr. } \text{\textit{padmah}, Kš. } \text{\textit{pamb-}, lotus (cf. C. below) ; Kš. } \text{\textit{bum} or } \text{\textit{bumb}, eyebrow ; Skr. } \text{\textit{samakah}, Kš. } \text{\textit{səmb}}, \text{ equal, and so many others. Cf. } pp \text{ > } mp \text{, in Skr. } \text{\textit{yəpəyənəm}, Kš. } \text{\textit{zəmpənə}, a litter. We find this even in Tatsamas, as in Kš. } \text{\textit{amarnāth} or } \text{\textit{ambarnāth}, a name of Śiva.}
The above are the only conjuncts of nasal preceding mute that I have noted in Dardic.

C. Conjuncts of a nasal following a stop. In Prakrit, the nasal is generally assimilated, but kma > ppa, inma > tta or ppa, dma > mma (Pischel, §§ 276–7). Dardic closely follows Prakrit in the following examples.

Skr. ātman- 1; Aš. Wai. tanu, Trw. tanū, Paš. tani-k, Grw. tanī, Kh. tan, My. tā; Kš. pāna, self. In Ĺ. tomo, we have tm retained with anaptyxis.

Skr. padma-puspa-, Kš. pam-pūs, a lotus (cf. B. above).

In Prakrit, gn > gg; but in Kš., Skr. nagnah > nanu, naked.

In standard Prakrit, jīna > jjā or jīna (nnā), but in Māgadhī Prakrit, in Paśāci Prakrit, and in N.W. Prakrit (Konow, cv), it becomes nīna. So also, Skr. rājāni, a queen, Kš. rāžā. On the other hand, Skr. tajjñānam is represented in Kš. by tagun, to know how.

D. Conjuncts of a consonant (excluding sibilants) with a semivowel.

D 1. If the semivowel is y (cf. Pischel, §§ 279–86), it is in Prakrit usually assimilated, the preceding consonant, if it is a dental, being palatalized (so also N.W. Prakrit, Konow, cvi). In Prakrit a preceding t is very rarely not palatalized. In Dardic, when dentals are palatalized they usually become ts and z (occasionally ś and ž), not c and j respectively.

Skr. nṛtya-ti; Paš. √nāt-, Ś. V. Wai. Kl. Gwr. √nāt-, Grw. √nēt-, Bš. Aš. √nāt-, Kš. √nats-, Trw. √nār-, dance, the cerebrilation of the t and r being due to the preceding ṛ. Cf. Sindhī nū (nītya-), but Prakrit nīcā-, always; ādītu (ādītya-), the sun.

Skr. adya; Trw. aj, Kš. as, Ś. aś, to-day.

Skr. vādyā-, a musical instrument; Kh. baše-ik, singing; Kš. √waz-, sound.

Skr. madhyē becomes Pr. majjhē, which latter has been borrowed by Kš. where it becomes manz, in, with insertion of n (see JRAS. 1922, 381 ff., and p. 352 above).

In standard Prakrit, nya > nña (nnā), but in Paśāci Prakrit and in N.W. Prakrit (Konow, cvi) it > nīna. So Skr. dhānya- -, Kš. dānē, paddy; Skr. punya-, Kš. pōn, a virtuous act, and many others.

Initial ny generally appears in Kš. as ny, as in nyāyukh, quarrel-

1 Morgenstierne (Language of the Ashkun Kafirs, 221) connects tanu, etc., with Sanskrit tanu- self. As shown in my Törwāli Grammar, § 129, I prefer to connect these words with ātman-, Pr. atta-, appa-, sing. gen. attasū, appasa. In N.W. Prakrit, also, this word became appa-, atta-. (Konow, cv).
some (nyāyaka-); nyās, a lintel (*nyāsa-, see JRAS. 1914, 129). But both these may be Tatsamas.

In Prakrit, ry > j. After i or u, ry > ra. It sometimes becomes ria, riya (so in N.W. Prakrit, Konow, cvii). In Māgadhī Prakrit ry > yy (Pischel, § 284). In Dardic, ry becomes ri, with frequent syncope of the r. Thus, Skr. sūrya-; Kl. sūri, Gwr. suri, Ś. sūrī, Paś. sur, My. swīr, Ks. sūrī, Grw. sīr, Wai. sōi, Bš. su, Trw. sī, Aṣ. so. None of these changes are met with in the languages of India Proper.

D 2. If the semivowel is r (Pischel, §§ 287–95), it is in Prakrit assimilated to the preceding or following consonant, which, if a dental, is often cerebralized. In Shāhbazgarhī there was a tendency to preserve the r unchanged, as in parakramati, agra-, avatrapēyu, bramaṇa, etc. So also in Apabhramśa (especially Vṛācāda Ap.) and Sindhi and Lahnda. Similarly (except in Śinā) the r is generally retained in Dardic, which in this respect follows N.W. Prakrit (Konow, cvi, ff.). Thus:—

Skr. kraya-; Kl. kre, purchase.
Skr. kṛdā-; Kl. grō, breast.
Skr. grāma-; Bš. grom, Kl. gröm, Aṣ. glām, My. lām, but Trw. gām, a village. Trw. is a frontier dialect.
Av. fra(pra) + √dā-, Skr. pra + √dā-; Bš. Wai. √prē-, Aṣ. √pré-, give; Kl. prau, Kh. prai, V. aphpē, he gave.
(?) Skr. prēśita-; Bš. √prēś-, but V. √pēz-, go; Wai. prēśya, sent.
Av. brātar-, Prs. birādar, Munjāni werēr, Skr. bhrāty-, Bš. brōh, brā, Wai. brā, Aṣ. bria, Kh. brār, Gwr. biaia, Paś. lāi; but V. way-eh, Kl. bāya, Ks. bōy, Trw. bhā. See also below.

In Ks. the use of r after an initial consonant is often optional, as in brūh or būth (< dvērakōṣṭha-), before; grōndu or gandu, a log; grāgal or gāgal, destruction; śōts-, purity, śrōtsun, to become pure (< svēdha-); svāth or sāth, a sandbank; trām, copper (Sindhi trāmō < tāmra-, ? metathesis); zaḍu or zāḍu, a water-hole, and so many others. For Bš. and others we may quote as examples Bš. trānq (Prs. tang), a girth; √weṛc- (Hindi √beṭ-,) sell; Bš. drōn, Aṣ. drō, Kh. drōn (< dhanu-),¹ a bow. Tessitori ² noted this in Old Western Rājasthāni. One of the examples he quotes is trābū, copper. Similarly, in the Western Pahārī of the Satlaj District of the Panjāb, there is a pleonastic termination tau or trau (= Skr. ta-, Ap. da-), as in utṣau

¹ Morgenstierne derives this from Skr. drunā-, drona- (Lang. of the Ashkun Kafirs, 254).
² Notes on the Grammar of Old Western Rājasthāni, § 30.
or utṣṭrau, high. So in other Western Pahārī dialects we have (Gādi) bhṛukkhā (Hindi bhūkhā), hungry; (Cameāli) bhēḍā or bhrāḍā (Skr. bhēḍa- or bhēḍra-), a sheep; aggē or hāgrē (Skr. agrē), before; √sikkhr- (Skr. √sikṣ-). All these Indian dialects are, of course, allied to Dardic. We may compare with these words the striving for distinct utterance shown in the English “groom” derived from Anglo-Saxon guman.

With dentals, while the r is often preserved, we also find the common Indian change to a cerebral. An interesting example of the preservation is the Greek δραχύ, which has survived to the present day in the Kh. droxum, silver. Other examples of a dental followed or preceded by r are:

Skr. putra-, Av. putra-; Wai. piutr, Kl. pūtr, Bš. pūṛ, Gwr. pult, Grw. puṭ, Paś. puthlē, My. pūth, compared with Sindhī pǔṭṛ, a son. Lahndā pūṭr. See also below.

Skr. trayaḥ, Av. ṛṣayō; Bš. Kl. Kš. treh, Wai. trē, Aš. trā, Kh. troi, Gwr. ālē, Paś. hlē, Grw. ṭhā (compared with Sindhī trē), Lahndā trāe, three. See also below.

Skr. trika-, Kš. trak-, the backbone. Cf. Skr. mantra-, Kl. mondṛ, a word; Kš. mātr-, Sindhī manṭr, Lahndā manṭar, a charm.

Skr. *āndra- (āṇḍa-, aṇḍa-), Kl. oandra-k, an egg.

In Kš. hērat-, for śivarātrī, it is the dental that has been preserved.

As seen above, the change of tr to tr also occurs in Sindhī. The Indian change to tt has not been noted.


Av. kṛṣṭa-, Skr. kṛṭa-, done; Bš. kaṛā, he did.

Skr. gardabha-; Kl. gardō-k, Kh. gardō-y, but Wai. Gwr. Grw. gadā, Trw. gadhō (for *gadahō), an ass.

Skr. ḥṛḍaya- (for *ḥardaya-), Av. zorād, Sarikōlī zārd; Kš. reda, Kh. ārdi, Gwr. heṛā, Paś. haṛā, heart.

The conjunct rṇ sometimes becomes r, and sometimes, after the Indian fashion, becomes n. Thus:—

Skr. karna-; Bš. kōr, Wai. Kh. kār, Paś. kār, Kl. kūrō, krō; My. kān, Ś. kōn, Grw. kyan, Kš. Trw. kan, the ear. The n-words all belong to the Dard Group.

Skr. svāṇa-; Kh. sor-m, V. śīu; Kl. sūra (i.e. sūnā), Bš. sūn, sōn, Wai. Gwr. Ś. Aš. son, Paś. sōnā, Kš. sūn, gold.

For the conjunct rv, see below (D 5).
D 3. A still more peculiar treatment of the letter *r* in Dardic is probably due to non-Aryan Burušaskī influence.¹ This is the frequent interchange in writing of *r* with a palatal letter, especially with *č* or *š* or with *j* or *ž*. This is found not only in Dardic, but also in the Baltī form of Tibetan spoken close to the Burušaskī country. Thus, the standard Tibetan *mgrom*, Purik Tibetan *grun*, becomes the Baltī *žun*, a feast. This change, so far as Dardic languages are concerned, is most often to be found in Šinā, spoken immediately south of the Burušaskī country and immediately to the west of Baltistān, but traces of it are met with in other Dardic languages also. It is well known that the speakers of Dardic formerly extended over an area much wider than their present habitat. There are, at the present day, isolated Dard colonies in Tibet and in Northern and Eastern Afghanistan, and at least one Eranian language—the Örmurī of Wazirīstān (LSI. x, 123 and Grierson, Memoirs ASB. vii (1918), 1 ff.)—has been strongly influenced by an old Dardic language now extinct. The Western Pahārī of the Northern Panjāb, although in its basis Indo-Aryan, also shows many traces of an early Dardic substratum. In all these localities we find examples of this exceptional treatment of the letter *r*. The change is probably in all cases, at least originally, to a cerebral *č* or *j*, but these sounds have themselves been identified only in Burušaskī, in Šinā, and (by Morgenstierne) in Tōrwālī, and, as there is no character corresponding to them either in the Persian or in the Nāgarī alphabet, they (or their variants) are represented in different ways in different languages. Thus, *č* is represented by *tör*, by *tr*, by *š*, by *sr* and so forth, and *j* (or *ž*, with which, in Šinā, it is interchangeable) by *jr*, *dž*, *ž*, and so on. Moreover, in Šinā itself, *c* and *č*, and *j* and *ž* are sometimes dialectically interchangeable, and this adds to the uncertainty. Thus, in the standard Šinā of Gilgit, the word for "woman" is *čāi*, but in Gups and Darel it is *čāi*.

Taking the letter *r* standing alone, we find it occasionally interchanged with *ž*, or even with *c*. Thus, standard Šinā *ro*, he, becomes *zo* in the Dras dialect (LSI. VIII, ii, 193). Similarly, we may compare the Lahnda *dhī*, a daughter, with Šinā *di*. In the former, the pl. nom. is *dhür-ī*, and in the latter, the declensional base is *di-j*. So,

¹ There does not appear to be any trace of this treatment in N.W. Prakrit. We may perhaps, however, note the fact that, in it, intervocalic *d*, *gh*, *t*, and *d* are often written *dr*, *dhṛ*, *tr*, and *dr*, respectively. Konow (page c) suggests that this was done to indicate a fricative sound.
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Lahnda \( \sqrt{r\text{\text-}} \), cry out, Bš. rāră, or žăř, noise; H índi talēwar, Bš. tarwāj, a sword; Skr. madhurā-, Ś. mōro, Bš. macī, sweet.

Here, however, we are directly concerned with conjunct consonants, and in them we observe the same phenomenon. Thus:

Skr. putra-; Ś. Trw. pūç, Grw. puc (probably puç), a son, in addition to the forms given above.

Skr. strī, Waxī strēći; Aš. istrī, Kš. trīy, but Ś. cāi or cāi, as above, Trw. cē, Grw. ši-gāli, Paš. mā-sē, a woman.

Skr. trayaḥ, Av. ṛrāyō, Munjānī ṣarai; Ś. cā, Trw. cā, My. cā, V. cī, Ōrmurī sṛē, three, in addition to the forms given above.

Skr. kṣētra-; Ś. cēc a field.

Skr. jāmāṭr-, Av. zāmātar-; Ś. jāmūco, a son-in-law.

Kh. drō, Bš. dru, źu, Aš. dro, V. zu, hair.

Skr. drīgha-; Ś. jīgo (through *drīgha-), Trw. jīk. Ōrmurī cīg, long.

Skr. dravya-; Ś. jap, property.

Skr. drāksā; Ś. jaç, Trw. daṣ, a grape.

Skr. ārdra-; Ś. ājo, Trw. ož (? ož), wet.

Skr. haridrā, Pr. halidā, turmeric; Ś. halijo, yellow.

Skr. udra-; Ś. úju, Buruśaskī uju, an otter.

Skr. bhrāṭr-, Av. brātar-; Ś. jā, My. zā, Grw. jā, a brother, in addition to the forms given above.

In Śinā and Tôrwālī these changes, so far as examples have been identified, are confined to tr, dr, and br, but, in Ōrmurī, the corresponding sound, written sr, represents not only tr and dr, but also kr, xr, gr, pr, mr, and sr. In that language, it does not seem to represent br.

It must be remembered that c and j represent other originals besides conjuncts containing r. Thus c also represents an original kṣ, as in cēc, jaç, above (see E 4), and j may also represent an intervocalic s, as in Ś. manūjo, for Skr. mānuṣa-, a man.

It will be observed that this change, so far as observed, is most common in Śinā, which is geographically situated in the immediate neighbourhood of both Baltī and Buruśaskī. A similar change is also found in Western Pahārī, which also immediately adjoins the tract in which Dardic is spoken. Thus, WPh. caun or cīn, three (trīni); cāmbā, copper (cf. Kš. trām); cīs, water (Kš. trēs, thirst, a drink of water); pīcia, a paternal uncle (pitrēyā-); khēc or khēts,

---

1 It is perhaps worth noting that, in Chinese, the sound which in Southern Mandarin is pronounced like an English r, is in Pekin pronounced as ʂ (Mateer, xviii).
a field (kṣetra-); rāc, night (rātri); √joc-, plough (Hindi √jot-, cf. Skr. yoktra-); caurā (? cf. Hindi thōrā), a little.

Two Dardic languages substitute ðhl, ðl, lt, or hl for tr. Thus, Gwr. ðhle (? ðle), Paś. ðle (? ðlē), three; Gwr. putl, Paś. puθhle (? puθlē), a son. The exact spelling of these words is, however, doubtful. There is a similar change to ðh, etc. in the Bhadrawāhī and connected dialects of Western Pahārī. Here bhr and dr > ðh or ðh, gr > ðl, and tr > tl, ðhl or ðl. Bhadrawāhī is on the eastern border of the Dard country, and not far to its North-East there are dialects of Western Tibetan. The following are examples:

Hindi bhūkhā; Gā. bhrukkhṇā, Bhad. ðhlukkhō, Pan. ðhukhā, hungry.

Bhad. bhrā or ðhā, a brother.

Skr. babhrā, Pan. bhrabbū, Bhad. ðhlabbū, a red bear.

Skr. bhēḍa-, bhēdra ; Cur. bhēḍḍa or bhraḍḍ, Bhal. ðhleṭḍ, a sheep.

Skr. vyāghra-; Kul. barag ; Bhad. ðhlāgy, Bhal. ðlāg, a leopard.

Bhad. Bhaḍḍhā, Bhadrawāhī.

Skr. grāma-; Bhad. ðlau, Bhal. ðlau, a village.

Skr. trayah ; Bhad. trāi or tlāi, Pan. tlāi, three.

Skr. kṣētra- ; Bhad. tshēṭhī, a field.

Skr. trika-, Kš. trak- ; Bhad. thīggō, the back.

Skr. strī ; Bhad. ðhī, a woman.

Bhad. ketrī or keṭī, how many ?

The change of bhr to ðh, and of gr to ðl has parallels in the dialects of Western Tibetan (which lies directly to the North-East of Pangī). In them, the change of br and gr to dr and thence to d is common (LSI. II, ii, pp. 54 and 70), so that these changes of bhr > ðh, and of gr > ðl are probably due to Burūšaskī, conveyed to Western Pahārī, through Western Tibetan. The geographical line from Burūšaskī to Western Tibetan, and thence to Pangī is direct, and there are no other intervening languages.

D 4. If the semivowel is l, in Prakrit it is usually assimilated (Pischel, § 296). Similarly in Dardic we have Skr. phālguna-, Kš. phāgūn, the name of a month. But sometimes it is the l that assimilates the other consonant, as in Skr. (Vedic) gald-, speech ; Kš. gal, a

1 These are Bhadrawāhī (Bhad.), Bhalēṣī (Bhal.), and Pangī (Pan.). Other Western Pahārī dialects which do not fall under this group are Curāhī, Gādī, and Kulū (Cur., Gā., Kul.). These are quoted for purposes of comparison. It will be noted in these the letter ī is inserted, as in other Dardic languages mentioned above.
shout, Bš. gijž, a word, speech (with regular change of l to j before i), Trw. gal, abuse, cf. Panjābi and Lahnda gall, a word; Skr. bīla-, Kš. bel (so Ardhamāgadhī Prakrit billa- or bella-), Aegle Marmelos; Prs. šalīyam, Bš. šalam, a turnip.

D 5. If the semivowel is v, in Prakrit it is generally assimilated, but tev and dev tend to become ppa and bba, respectively (Pischel, §§ 298–300, and J. Bloch, F. L. Marathe, 133 ff.). In Dardic we occasionally come across, in the Dard group, instances of assimilation, as in Skr. sāve-, general, Kš. sār" (but Pr. savva-), but Kh. sauf, all; Skr. pūve-, Kš. pūr" east. But far more often the conjunct becomes p (cf. Cūlikāpāisācika change of b > p, the Girnar Pāli tv > tp, and the similar change tv > pp in N.W. Prakrit, Konow, 66).

Thus:—

Skr. pakva-; Kš. pap", but Bš. pagž, ripe. Kh. pōč is from the Skr. √pac-.

Av. evant-, V. pseh (for *cpeh), what?
Skr. cātvāraḥ, Girnar catpārō; Av. cātvārō, Wai. tsābūr, Ossetic čippar; V. cipu, four. Others štō, štā, cār, cau, etc.

Skr. dravya-; Š. jap, property.
Skr. √carv-; Kš. √tāp-, chew.

But:—

Skr. Av. dvar-, a door; Bš. bār, V. be. Aš. bēkā, Wai. ber, Kh. bērī, etc. outside, but V. tar-ekh, a house; Kš. bar or dar, Trw. der, a door.
In Skr. nādeva-, Kš. nambal, a marsh, ēv has become b, with inserted nasal (see above, p. 352).

In Prakrit, hv > (b)bh, but in Dardic we have b or p, as in Skr. jihvā; Kl. Paš. Trw. jib, Š. jip. Wai. jip. Kš. has zēv, and only the semi-Indian Grw. has the Indian jībh.

It will be noticed that the change to p is most common in the Kāñjīr group, and especially in the case of V. So also, in V., v and b standing alone tend to become p. Cf. Bš. ev, V. ip-in, one. Cf. also Śāhbbāzgarhī padham (bāḍham).

E. Conjuncts containing a sibilant.

E 1. Sibilant plus tenuis. In Prakrit, the sibilant is generally assimilated, and the tenuis aspirated (Pischel, § 301). This occurs only sometimes in Dardic, as in Skr. śuṣka-, śuṣkala-, Av. ṛuṣka-, Kš. hōkh", dry; but in Kh. we have cucū, in which šk > c, and in Trw. šugil, it has become g. Again, in Skr. bhāskarī, Kš. bāṣi, a kind of almanac, šk > s.
sp perhaps > š, not pph as in Prakrit, in Skr. puṣpa- or (?) puṣya-, a flower; Kš. pōś, Bš. piś, Trw. paśū, but Aš. pasup.¹

But sph > sva (sō) in Skr. sphaṭika-, Kš. sōṭhak", crystal, in which the aspiration has been transferred to the t. Generally, however, initial sph > Š. Kš. ph, as in √ phuṭ-, burst (Skr. √ sphuṭ-).

As regards sibilants with dentals, Eranian št and Indian Št both generally follow Eranian custom; usually either preserving both conjuncts as št or Št, or else (rarely) weakening the conjunct to kh, x, k. Occasionally, especially in the Dard, or western, group, the Indian change to (t)th is observed, but this is rare. Thus:—

Av. aṅguṣṭa-, toe; Prs. anguṣṭ-ar, a finger-ring; Bš. anguṣṭi, Wai. āguṣṭō, Kh. pulunguṣṭ, V. wōgix; but Paš. angōc-k, Grw. (Drd.) angusir, a finger-ring. Cf. Trw. (Drd.) angut, thumb.

Av. aṣṭa-, Skr. aṣṭa-; Bš. Wai. ošt, Kh. oṣt, Aš. ōšt, Kl. Gwr. aśt, Paš. ašt, V. aste, Š. āš, ašt, ažt; Grw. ath, Trw. aṭ, My. āṭh, Kš. āṭ (all Dard), eight.

Skr. druṣṭa-, seen; Grw. (Drd.) √ liṭh-, see; Kš. ḍīṭh-, Trw. ḍīṭ- (both Drd.), seen.

Av. uṣṭa-; Bš. štyur, V. iṣtiur, Gwr. My. āx, Wai. āk, a camel.

Skr. uṣṭra-; Grw. uṭh, Kš. wūṭh, K.Kh. ut, Ś. ūṭ, Trw. uṭ (all, except Kh., belonging to the Dard Group), a camel. Possibly all borrowed from India.

Av. parṣṭi-, Prs. puṣṭ, Kurdish piṣṭ, Balōcī phut, Skr. pṛṣṭha-; Aš. piṣṭi, Gwr. piṣṭi, Kš. puṣṭ, Kl. piṣṭō; Bš. piš, kši, Wai. (yā-)pafi, Ś. piṭu, phatū, Gwr. Kš. pata, My. patō, Grw. patā, Trw. pat, behind. It will be noticed that the change ṛṣt > t already occurs in the Eranian Balōcī.

Similarly, st as a rule either remains unchanged or becomes Št (št, Št). This is sometimes weakened to θ, s, or k, and may then suffer apocope, but the Indian change to (t)th is rare, and hardly occurs except in the Dard Group. Similarly, str is either preserved, or is weakened to st, ts, š, etc. With the preservation of st we may compare the Paisācī Prakrit kasatā- for kṣatā-, the N.W. Prakrit preservation of intervocalic st (Konow, cxi), and Shāhbażgarhi preservation of st (saṃstuta-) and str (striyaka-, ıstri-).

Av. ast-(GNPE. 81); Kh. astī, bone.
Av. zasta-, O.Prs. dasta-; V. lust, Bš. dušt, dui, Aš. dōst, Wai. došt, hand.

¹ This form would exclude the derivation from puṣya-, as has been suggested above. Cf. N.W. Prakrit puṣa- (Konow, cx).
Skr. hasta; Gwr. hast. Kh. host, Kl. Paś. hāst, Paś. also hās; (Dard) Ś. hat, KŚ. aha, My. hā, Trw. hat, had, hand.

Av. staora; Kh. istōr, horse.

Skr. vistṛta-; BŚ. viśtr, AŚ. vistarā, Paś. vastār, V. vištar, great.

Skr. nasta-; KŚ. nast, Paś. nāst; (Dard) Ś. natu, Trw. nat, My. nath-ūr, nose.

Av. star-; Kh. istārī, BŚ. raśā (metathesis), V. iśī-kh; (Dard) Ś. tārū, KŚ. tārak-, Grw. tār, Trw. tā, a star.

O. Prs. *ava + √stā- (cf. GNPE. 84), or Skr. ut + √sthā-, Śr. Pr. utthadā; AŚ. √ōst- Wai. √ōst-, BŚ. √uśt-, Kl. Gwr. √uṣt-; but Ś. My. √uth-, KŚ. √wōṭh-, Paś. √ur-, arise.

O. Prs. *adī + √stā- (GNPE. 84), Skr. adhī + √sthā-; V. √iṣt-, Grw. (Dard) √iṭ-, arise.

O. Prs. √stā-, Skr. √sthā-, stand; Gwr. banaīn, Trw. thū, Ś. (? hanus, I am.

Skr. strī; Kl. istrī, AŚ. istrī, BŚ. Wai. īstrī, V. westī, KŚ. trīy, Paś. śī-kā, hī-kā, Gwr. ści-gālī, Ś. cāī, cāi, Trw. cī (see above p. 359), Grw. ṣā, a woman.

In KŚ. the word hastu, an elephant, when it is the first member of a compound word, regularly becomes āṣt, as in āhast-gan, N. of a place (hasti-karṇa-). Similarly, Skr. prāṣasta- > KŚ. phṛṣṭu (through *prahasta-,*prāyatasta-), sg. obl. phṛṣi, excellent.

E 2. Sibilant plus nasal.

If the sibilant precedes a nasal, in Prakrit the latter is aspirated, and the sibilant disappears (Pischel, § 312). Thus, śm > mh. But in N.W. Prakrit (Konow, cxi), and in Dardic, on the contrary, it is the sibilant that is preserved.

Thus:—


Waxī, spā, our (cf. Skr. asmākam, *asvākam); Kh. ispā, we, our; V. asē, we, as, our; KŚ. qṣi, we; Ś. asei, our; My. zd, our.

V. esmo, aso, I am. Cf. Lahndā kōsā, lukewarm (kavvōṣṇah).

In Māgadhī Prakrit, the s is also retained (Pischel, § 314).

So, for a sibilant following a nasal. Arabic inṣāf, Bs. esop, justice.


When a sibilant is united with a semivowel, in Prakrit the semivowel is assimilated (Pischel, § 315), so that ṭṣ, ṭy, sy, ṭṛ, sr, śv, sv, all > ss or Māgadhī Prakrit ṭ ś. In Dardic and N.W. Prakrit (Konow,
cxii), following the general rule of the languages, the sibilant is retained.
Cf. Sindhī vaishæ, a Vaiśya. Thus:

Skr. śirṣa; Ś. śiṣ, Kl. My. śiṣ, śiṣ, a head.
Skr. naṣyati, he is being destroyed; Kl. √nāṣ-, die.
Skr. paṣyati, he sees; Kh. √poṣ-, Ś. My. Trw. Kš. √paṣ-, see.
Skr. āṣya; Kš. āṣ, Gwr. hāṣi, Wai. āṣ, Bš. Kl. aṣ, V. āṣ, Bš. also āṣi, Ś. (dial.) āṣi; but My. Grw. āi, Trw. aī, Ś. āi, mouth.
Skr. manuṣya; Wai. manaš, Gwr. manuš, V. muš, Ś. muša, Kh. mōš, My. māš, Trw. māš, Grw. mēš; but Bš. manči, Aš. mat, Kl. mōc, a man. Ś. manujo and Kš. mahanja are from mānuṣa-.
Skr. aśru- (Pr. aṃsu-); Kh. aśru, Ś. āṣ, Kš. āṣ, Bš. acu, tear.
Av. √svra-, Prs. sūnūdan, Skr. √śrū-; Kl. √sah, V. √nus (metathesis), My. √sun-, hear.
Skr. śvēta; Kš. chyayu, white.
Skr. śvāpada; Kš. *śāpat > hāpat-, a bear.
Skr. svarma; Bš. Aš. són, Ś. Wai. Gwr. son, Paš. sōnā, Kh. sōr-m, Kš. sōn, V. sū, gold.
Av. span-, Skr. śvan-; Gwr. śunā, Kš. hūnu, Ś. śū, Wai. śū, Kl. śr, Paš. śür-ing, a dog.

But, as in the case of asmākaṃ, *asvākaṃ and Ptolemy’s Kaspeira, above, and also of kv, cv, dv, the v often becomes p (D 5). So also Shahbāzgarhi spasunām and sparga- (= svarga-). Thus:

Av. aspa-; Skr. aśva-; Bš. uṣp, Ś. āṣpo or (dial.) apṣ, Kl. hāṣ, a horse.

E 4. The conjuncts kṣ, xṣ.

Regarding kṣ in Prakrit, see Pischel, §§ 317 ff. It sometimes becomes cch and sometimes kkh. Pischel believed that when kṣ goes back to original śs, Av. ś, it generally becomes cch, and that when it is an original kṣ, Av. xṣ, it generally becomes kkh, but he admitted that there are many exceptions to these rules. I believe that there is also a cross division, according to which in all Prakrit semi-tatsamas every kṣ is pronounced cch, irrespective of its derivation. This is certainly the case in the modern Indo-Aryan vernaculars.

In Dardic, Av. xṣ does not become (k)kh, but ch, ś, i.e. exactly contrary to Pischel’s rule. As regards kṣ, so far as I have noted in

1 Cf. the doubtful sign for this conjunct, a modification of that for ch, in N.W. Prakrit (Konow, cx).
Dardic, it always follows the example of ṇ. I have met only one certain instance of ks > (k)kh, viz. Ks. pākhī, a bird. This rests solely on the authority of Elmslie’s vocabulary, and I have never met it elsewhere. If it is used in Kashmir, the long ā shows that it is a word borrowed from India. Two other words are proper names, Lākh’mī for Lakṣmī, and Lākh’man for Lakṣmaṇa. These both occur in the Kāśmirī Rāmāyana, which was originally written in the Persian character, and really represent transliterations of the words Laxmī and Lacxman as they are there spelt. The words Lākh’mī and Lākh’man occur only in Nāgāri MSS. transliterated from the original.

Skr. pākṣin-; Kl. pachiyek, Gwr. pici-n, Grw. paśi-n; but Ks. pākhī (see above), a bird.

Skr. aksi-, Av. aṣī; Ś. aći, (dial.) atshē, Ks. ach, Bā. Wai. acē, AŚ. acē, Kl. Kh. ec, Gwr. ātsi-n, Paś. anē,1 My. ainch, V. āśi, Trw. aṣi, Grw. āṭh, an eye.

Skr. kṣudhā; Ks. chōḍ, Kh. chū, hunger.

Skr. bubhukṣā; Trw. buṣ, My. būcha, Grw. būṭhō (bubhukṣu-), hunger, hungry.

Skr. ḍkṣa-; Kh. orts, AŚ. Bā. īts, Wai. īts, Ś. īc, a bear.

Av. xšwaš, Wai, šād, Skr. ṛṣa-; Kh. choi, Ś. sā, Ks. sah, Kl. śōh, Gwr. My. šōh, Grw. šō, Bā. šo, Wai. šū, Paś. šē, xē, V. uśū, six.

Skr. kṣīra-, Av. ? xēṃra- (GNPE. 802), milk; Kh. chīr, milk-white; Trw. chhī, milk; Bā. kāṣīr (with anaptyxis), white. This last is a truly interesting survival of a very old form.

It will be observed that, in the case of Av. xšwaš, Skr. ṛṣa, the Av. xš, Skr. ṇ is represented in Śinā by ṇ. In all other cases, Skr. ks becomes c in Śinā. Other Śinā examples2 are cēc (kṣētra-, see also p. 359 ab.), a field; con (kṣaṇa-), leisure; daci (dakṣaṇa-), right (hand); maći (makṣika-), a fly; taçon (takṣan-), a carpenter. To this Lorimer adds that some people pronounce a final c like t, and with this we may compare Grw. ṛh (akṣi-) and būṭhō (bubhukṣu-), given above.

To sum up.—The following table shows in a convenient form the results of the preceding investigation into conjunct consonants in Dardic. It shows how widely Dardic differs from the literary Prakrits of India Proper in this respect. Especial notice may be taken of the treatment of v (which tends to become p), of r (which is either

---

1 For the inserted n see p. 352.
2 Taken from D. L. R. Lorimer’s Phonetics of the Gilgit dialect of Shina, § 65; JRAS. 1924, p. 182.
preserved or becomes a palatal), and of sibilants (in which the conjunct is preserved), when each is a member of a conjunct. Nothing of this sort is observed in Prakrit or in the modern Indo-Aryan Vernaculars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skr. or Av.</th>
<th>Prakrit.</th>
<th>Dardic.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kk (A)</td>
<td>kk</td>
<td>k, (once) g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kt (A)</td>
<td>tt</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ċ (A)</td>
<td>ċj</td>
<td>(Kṣ.) nz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tt (A)</td>
<td>tt</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pt (A)</td>
<td>tt</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d ċ (A)</td>
<td>gg</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b ċ (A)</td>
<td>j ċ</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bd ċ (A)</td>
<td>d ċh</td>
<td>(once) b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n ċ (B)</td>
<td>n ċ</td>
<td>ng, ñ, ẹ, g, g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n ċ (B)</td>
<td>n ċ</td>
<td>nts, nj, ẹ, z, c, š, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n ċ (B)</td>
<td>n ċ</td>
<td>n ċ, t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n ċ (B)</td>
<td>n ċ</td>
<td>n, (?), ẹ, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n ċ (ndr) (D 2)</td>
<td>n ċ</td>
<td>ndr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n ċ (B)</td>
<td>n ċ nd</td>
<td>nd, ẹ, ẹ, t, t, n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n ċ (B)</td>
<td>n ċh</td>
<td>(once) n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n ċ (B)</td>
<td>n ċh</td>
<td>nd, ẹ, n, n, (once) n ċ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m ċ (B)</td>
<td>m ċ</td>
<td>m ċ, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m ċ (B)</td>
<td>m ċ</td>
<td>m, mb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tm (C)</td>
<td>tt, pp</td>
<td>t, p, t-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dm (B, C)</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>m, mb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g ċ (C)</td>
<td>g ċ</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j ċ (C)</td>
<td>j ċ, n ċ</td>
<td>n ċ, (once) g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ ċ (D 1)</td>
<td>ṭ ċ</td>
<td>t ; (with ṭ) t, t ; (Kṣ.) t or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ ċ (D 1)</td>
<td>ṭ ċ</td>
<td>(Kṣ.) z, (Kh.Ś.) Š, (Trw.) j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ ċ (D 1)</td>
<td>ṭ ċ</td>
<td>(Kṣ.) nz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭ ċ (D 1)</td>
<td>ṭ ċ</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ny (D 1)</td>
<td>ny</td>
<td>mp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>py (B)</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>ri, r, i, or elided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ry (D 1)</td>
<td>ry (N.W. Pr. r ċ)</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vy (D 5)</td>
<td>vy</td>
<td>kr, (once) gr (initial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kr (D 2)</td>
<td>kk (N.W. Pr. kr)</td>
<td>gr, g, (once) gl, (once) l (all initial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr (D 2)</td>
<td>gg (N.W. Pr. gr)</td>
<td>h-r, h-r, r (all initial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z-r (D 2)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skr. or Av.</td>
<td>Prakrit.</td>
<td>Dardic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr (fr) (D 2)</td>
<td>pp (N.W. Pr. pr)</td>
<td>pr, (once, initial) p, once, (non-initial) phl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>br, bhr (D 2)</td>
<td>bb (N.W. Pr. br), bhh</td>
<td>br, bl, l, br, b, (once) w ; (Ś.) j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr (D 2, D 3)</td>
<td>tt, tt (N.W. Pr. tr)</td>
<td>tr, (once) t, tr, lt, θl, θl, hl, t, th ; c, c, ch, sr, (Ś.) j ; z, z ; (Ks.) ndvr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dr (D 3, D 5, A)</td>
<td>dd (N.W. Pr. dr)</td>
<td>ntr, ndr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntr (B, D 2)</td>
<td>nt</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntr, see nd</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rt (D 2)</td>
<td>tt, tt (N.W. Pr. rt)</td>
<td>r, r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd (D 2)</td>
<td>dd, dd (N.W. Pr. rd, d) rd, d, r</td>
<td>(Ś.) j, (Trw.) ž (± ž)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdr (D 3)</td>
<td>dd, ll</td>
<td>n, ĭr, r, r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rṇ (D 2)</td>
<td>ṇṇ</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lg (D 4)</td>
<td>gg</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lγ (D 4)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>l, jj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ld (D 4)</td>
<td>dd</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lv (D 4)</td>
<td>ll</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rv (D 5)</td>
<td>vv (N.W. Pr. rv)</td>
<td>r, (once, Kh.) f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kv (D 5)</td>
<td>kk</td>
<td>p, (once) g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cv (D 5)</td>
<td>cc</td>
<td>ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tv, ṭv (D 5)</td>
<td>pp (N.W. Pr. pp)</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ċv (A, D 5)</td>
<td>dd</td>
<td>(once) mb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dv (D 5)</td>
<td>bb</td>
<td>b, d, (once) t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hv (D 5)</td>
<td>bhh</td>
<td>p, b, v, (once) bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ś (D 3)</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>(Ś.) j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śk, sk (E 1)</td>
<td>kkh (N.W. Pr. śk.)</td>
<td>c, kh, g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sk (E 1)</td>
<td>kkh</td>
<td>(Ks.) s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp (E 1)</td>
<td>pph (N.W. Pr. ś)</td>
<td>ś (initial) ph, (once, Ks.) só (sva)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sph (E 1)</td>
<td>pph</td>
<td>ṝt, ṭt (E 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ċśt (E 1)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śṛ (E 1)</td>
<td>ṭṭh</td>
<td>śt, ṭṭ, (once) śṭ, st, (Ś.) śṭ, or ś, (once) s, (once) x, (once) c, (Ś. dial.) ṭṭ ; (both Dard group) ṭḥ, t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭṣ (E 1)</td>
<td>ṭṭh</td>
<td>ṭḥ, ṭ, ṭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st (E 1)</td>
<td>ṭṭh (N.W. Pr. -st-)</td>
<td>st, s, ṭṭ ; (Dard group) ṭḥ, ṭ, t, elided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skr. or Av.</td>
<td>Prakrit.</td>
<td>Dardic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>str (D 3, E 1)</td>
<td>tth</td>
<td>str, śtr, st, tr, śl, hl, (Ś., Trw.) ç, (Ś.) c, ś, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śm (E 2)</td>
<td>mh</td>
<td>ś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sm (E 2)</td>
<td>mh (N.W. Pr. sv, s, m)</td>
<td>s, sm, (once) z, (Kh.) sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śy (E 3)</td>
<td>ss (N.W. Pr. śś)</td>
<td>ś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sy (E 3)</td>
<td>ss (N.W. Pr. ss, z)</td>
<td>ś', ś, ž, (Ś. dial.) z, (Ś. Grw. Trw. My.) (final) elided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śr (E 3)</td>
<td>ss (N.W. Pr. ś)</td>
<td>śr, ś, (once) c, (Ś.) ś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĺr (D 2)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>śr or ś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sr (E 3)</td>
<td>ss</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śv (E 3)</td>
<td>ss (N.W. Pr. śp)</td>
<td>ś, chy, s, sp, śp, h, ts, (once) pś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv (E 3)</td>
<td>ss</td>
<td>sō, so, su, siu, s, sp, śp, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ns (E 2)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(once) s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rś (E 3)</td>
<td>ss (N.W. Pr. ṣ)</td>
<td>ś, (Ś.) ṣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kṣ (E 4)</td>
<td>kkh, cch</td>
<td>ch, c, (once) kh, ś, ts, (Ś.) ç, (Kōhistānī) th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kṣ, ś (E 4)</td>
<td>kkh, cch</td>
<td>ch, c, ts, nch, nc, ž, (Ś.) ç, (Ś. dial.) tśh, (Kōhistānī) th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kṣ, xś (E 4)</td>
<td>kkh, cch (N.W. Pr. ? kṣ)</td>
<td>ch, (Trw.) ch, (Bā.) k-ś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xśv (Skr. ṣ) (E 4)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ś, ch, x, (Ś.) ṣ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hindu Salutations

By E. Washburn Hopkins

According to the description in the *Land of the Lamas*, the Tibetan salutation consists in sticking out the tongue, pulling the right ear, and rubbing the left hip, while making a slight bow at the same time. Nothing quite so picturesque is to be found in India, but the etiquette of salutation is nevertheless not without interest. Moreover, the subject is treated gravely by the native law-makers and deserves more attention than it has hitherto received. The matter too is not unsuitable for a volume dedicated to the salutation of one who is *lokāprapūjita*, and to whom, in common with many, I extend herewith the greeting:

*balaṁ tava'yus ca cirāya vardhatām.*

But because of the limitation of space I shall confine myself to epic data and give but an outline of approved ceremonial.

The simplest and oldest form of salutation between men seems to have been that expressing "reverence" in its literal sense of fear, instinctively exhibited by shrinking and bending, which becomes the formal bow, for which there is no general Indo-European word, though this *namas* is familiar from the earliest Vedic period, and *fra-nam* in Avestan indicates that the bow was still earlier. In the epic this bow is united so closely with the later *aṅjali* that they make one gesture. The *aṅjali*, also called *udagranaka*, is formed by placing the cupped hands, with fingers up, against the forehead, while the head at the same time is bent, sometimes even to the feet of the revered person. The cupping of the hand is implied not only by the earlier use (drinking water with the *aṅjali*, Manu 4.63, etc.) but by the phraseology employed in describing the *aṅjali*, *kṛtāṅjalipuṭa*, *baddhāṅjalipuṭa*, *baddhvā karapuṭāṅjālim*, *kṛtvā* (or *ādhāya*) *śirasy aṅjālim* (R. 5.33.2; 36.32; 64.5). As an attitude of propitiation it is assumed to avert wrath, *sā ca prahvāṅjalir bhūtvā śirasā caranāu gata* (R. 7.25.39)¹; or in desperate entreaty, as when Dame Death bows to Brahman, *kāyena vinayopetā mūrdhno’dagranakhe ca* (7.54.6; cf. 3.64.68, *vinayāvanatā sthitā*, followed by *kuṣalam*, etc.); or to win a favour, as when a husband wishes something from his wife, *raktāṅguliprabhaḥ*.

¹ In K. (South Indian recension) 4.18.3 (not in B.), *sa tu mūrdhny aṅjālim kṛtvā bhagīnyāṅ caranāv ubhāru*, the accusative is governed by the verbal idea = *aṅjālikṛtya "put his hands to his brow (to) his sister’s feet".*
padmapatranibhāḥ ... prasādārthaṃ mayā te'yāṃ śirasā abhyudyato-
'ujalīḥ (1.122.29 f.); or merely to show respect before speaking to a
superior, kṛtānjaliśā rāva (Śakram abhuvan, 5.9.18). So the
distressed Fowler begs for protection from the tree-spirits, sānjaliḥ
prāṇatiṃ kṛtvā (12.143.32). The humility of the bow is explicit, as
Arjuna, after meeting and greeting Indra, “stood before him bent
like a servant,” abhivādyā pādāv prānjaliḥ ... bhṛtyavat prāṇatas
tasthāu (3.166.9; cf. 163.2 f.). Indra, in turn, as a sign of approval
as well as of farewell, “ touches him, Arjuna, on the head with his
two hands” (ibid. 168.62). In epic descriptions, either bow or aṅjali
may be ignored, though both are implied, prāṇamya śirasā Rāmam
evat ity abhuvan and tato'ham abhuvam devīm abhivāyā kṛtānjaliḥ
(5.178.71 and 90, respectively).

The abhivāda (na) has so far lost its derivative meaning of speech
that like the verb it is used of greeting with or without words, thus
interchanging with abhivandana in usage and occasionally in a varied
reading (cf. K. 12.140.17, śirasā pādābhivandanan as v. 1.), ubhayor
eva śirasā cakre pādābhivādanam (3.294.3). Compare the verbal use,
abhivādyā tasya pādāv prāṇamya ca (3.100.20); upasprṣya ...
abhivādyā guroh pādāv, kṛtvā cā'pi pradaśāṇam (R. 6.85.25 and 29).
Lakṣmaṇa, on leaving Sītā, both being rather angry, “bows somewhat”
on making the aṅjali, Sitām abhivāyā ... kṛtānjaliḥ kīṃcid abhi-
prāṇamya (R. 3.45.40). This greeting is in itself a wordless gesture.
Ambā tells her uncle her tale, tam abhivādayiivā śirasā, and he lifted
her to his lap (an expression sometimes used metaphorically, as in
5.64.27, aṅke kuruṣva rājānam) and consoles her, telling her to go to
Rāma with an obeisance, abhivādyā ca tam mūrdhā (5.176.28 and 32).
The motion of the head may imply acceptance, as it is said in the next
section, “If Bhīma had not taken you to Nagpur, Śālva would have
taken you with his head,” tvām śirasā gṛṇāyat (as his bride). On
Rāma’s appearance, Ambā “stood before him, after revering his feet
with her head and touching them with her lotus-hands”, tato'bhivādyā
caraṇāu Rāmasya śirasā sūbhāv sprṣṭvā ... pānībhyaṃ agrataḥ
sthitā (5.177.10 and 24). The “fair feet” are sometimes pressed
with the head, murāhna caraṇāu pratypādāyat (R. 5.62.39), instead of
with the hand (nipīḍya pādāv in 1.191.20, etc.). Instead of “take

1 B. has śirasā (for K.’s śirasā), which Nil. explains as the two excellent (feet),
śrṣṭāu (puṃśeṣu ārṣam). Compare 7.112.10, tava jśuḥ śirasā gṛhya, “ taking
thy orders on my head (I go).” The phrase caraṇāv abhivādya is so constant (5.132.1,
etc.) that the dual is used even of a quadruped (1.140.29), though the plural pādas
follows.
thee”, the phrase “take thy feet with his head”, te caraṇāv ubhāu śirasā grahīyatī, is used in the same meaning, perhaps indicating added respect, as the speaker grimly adds girā mama, “because I tell him” (to do so; 5.178.6).

Incidentally, with the unusual respect paid to a girl in this ballad may be compared the unusual mark of affection shown a daughter, when Mātali on leaving home walks the desail around his wife and “kisses his daughter on the head”, kanyāṁ śirasā upāghrāya (5.97.21). Usually, in law and epic, a male relation is thus saluted by the sniff that passes for a kiss, as in R. 1.77.5; 2.20.21 and 25.40, where a father and mother kiss (so to speak) their son’s head. Compare R. 7.71.12, where Śatrughna is addressed: upāghrāyāmi te mūrdhni, snehasyāvaśa parā gatiḥ, and (Mbh.) 8.71.32 f., where Arjuna bows his head, śirasā prañataḥ, and takes Yudhiṣṭhira’s feet in his hands and Yudhisthira raises him, embracing and sniffing at his head, and 12.55.21 f., where Yudhiṣṭhira takes Bhīma’s feet and Bhīma sniffs at the former’s head and says niśita. As I have already published a paper (JAOS. 28.120) on this form of greeting, these examples may here suffice. It is naturally accompanied by other forms, as when Yudhiṣṭhira gives Bhima, his favourite brother, this greeting and with it his good wishes, āghrātaṣ ca tathā mūrdhni śrāvitaḥ caśīsāḥ subhāḥ (7.127.13). The verb appears to have lost its original meaning, for even fishes “kiss the lips” of half-drowned Cyavana, upājīghranta tasyaṣṭham (13.50.10). The later word cumb is used in H. 8745 of a real kiss but in Mbh. itself only of heroes “kissing” or touching the conch-shells they are blowing: “the two best of men with their two best mouths touched the two best conch-shells and blew together” (8.94.59). The pari-cumb of R. Gorr. 3.79.17 is not in the Bombay edition.

To continue with the silent greeting involving hand and foot, the bow alone when offered to Kṛṣṇa ensures salvation, Kṛṣṇapranāmi na punarbhavāya (12.47.91). Reverence is shown also by a simple touch of the hand, as when the parivṛt ascetic meets the great seers and abhīgaṃya yathā nyāyaṃ pānisparśam atha’ca rat, greeted them with the hand-touch (13.93.72). One is left to imagine whose hand, but presumably the ascetic’s hand touched the seers’ feet, as in nipidya pādāu, but in other cases the hands meet as if in a hand-shake, like that of 3.262.25, kareṇa ca karam grhya Kārṣṇasya mudito bhrīram, “greatly delighted he seized Kṛṣṇa’s hand with his own,” indicating joy, as again in 3.238.24, tataḥ prahārītāḥ sarve ‘nyonyasya talān daduḥ, “they shook hands in their delight,” or in 9.32.44, te’nonyasya
talān dadūh, all shook hands in their joy. The same gesture under the name of pāni-pradāna and pāni-simaṇgraṇa is used in giving a pledge or promise, as in friendship, R. 4.5.11 (agnisāksikam) or marriage, pāni-bandha, 12.267.36; cf. in joy, H. 15741, talān dattvā parasparam...hāṣāya samavasthitāḥ). The king is told to wait and "seize the arms", plural; but bāhū must be read, "extend his two arms." He should also "extend an arm" and cry out 'the enemy are beaten', praghṛṣya bāhuṁ krośeta bhagnā bhagnā 'pare iti (12.100.48; 102.38, v.l. hanta bhagā). These are royal tricks. Compare the somewhat incoherent advice of 12.140.17, aṅjālien śapathām sāntvām śirasā pāda-vandannam, aśruprapātanam cāi'va kartavyām bhūtiṁ icchatā, with the v.l. aśrumārjanam and pranāmya śirasā vadet. To touch "hand with hand" is customary when one comes as a guest, though social rank may determine this. When Rāma visits Yudhishṭhira, "all rose and saluted Rāma and Y. touched R.'s hand with his own hand," abhyāvacdayan... tam kare pasparśa pāniṇā (5.157.22).

When two courteous wrestlers meet before actually embracing, samāśāṣya, limb to limb, they "seize each other's hands and make obeisance" to each other, karagrahaṇa-pūrvaṁ tu kṛtvā pāda-bhivandanam (2.23.11; in 4.22.58 the samāśāṣa is without this preliminary courtesy). A voiceless applause, called "speaking by hand", is the equivalent of our hand-clapping, which appears on occasion to have been a more or less artificial exhibition by those called pāṇivādakas and pāni-svāmyakas. Compare vijahruḥ... utkṛṣṭatalanādiūtāḥ (mahānā-dāiḥ, 1.221.60). Wringing the hands is of course a sign of anger or grief, vidhūrvānā karāu muhuḥ, of an angry woman (3.278.41). One form of greeting is noteworthy, since apparently it is like the salute of the American Indian and the Fascist, namely that given by raising the right arm: ūṣīn abhayarayām āsuḥ karān udyanya daksinān, "(the kings) saluted the seers by raising aloft their right hands" (12.53.26). When "the righteous king" heads a procession, he "receives the salute of joined hands, raised on all sides, by bringing out (elevating ?) from time to time his right arm", daksinām daksināh kāle sambhṛtya svabhujam tadā...śaikṣam... praghṛṣ̄ṇān aṅjālien nṛṇām udyanān sarvato disāḥ (6.97.28; Nil. sambhṛtya = samuddhṛtya śaikṣam). The expression daksinām pāṇim uddharet means extend in such a rule as that of 12.193.20: "In a temple, among cows, in Brahmanic rites, kriyāpathe, and in studying, one should extend the right hand." In wrath one seizes the left hand, R. 3.57.16.

In most of the scenes of greeting and parting, words are exchanged
as well as these unvoiced salutations. But Kṛṣṇa’s visit to Pṛthā is pathetic in its simplicity. When he called upon her, his paternal aunt, pītvrsvasṛ, “she began to lament, putting her arm about his neck, remembering her children,” kaṇṭhe gṛhīte (5.90.1 f.), even before he was kṛtātithya, that is, had received the rites of hospitality. The parting benediction of 5.126.12-16 gives a good picture of the courtesies of royal life. It is addressed to one going to see the king: “May the king receive thee with his two hands as thou greatest him with thy head, abhivādayamānaṁ tvāṁ sīrasāḥ; may the righteous (king) put around thy shoulder his right arm marked with standard, hook, and banner, dvajāṅkuśapatākāṅkam, and as thou sittest beside him may he stroke thy back, pṛṣṭham te pāṇinā parimārjatu, with his hand ornamented with rings and dyed red on palm and fingers, and when saluted by the king’s brothers do thou, kissing their heads, greet them with affection,” mūrdhni tān samupāghrāya premnābhiṣvada.

When Duryodhana is exorted to go and greet Yudhiṣṭhira, he is told to “embrace him with both hands”, after greeting him; then the king, “out of goodness of heart shall seize thee with both hands” (parīṣvajā; pratigṛhnātu, 5.138.14 f.). Apropos of the embrace, it is somewhat remarkable that when a herald is sent to give a belligerent but courtly message (5.30.14 and 35 f.), he is told to “touch with the hand the feet” of this and that man, to make kindly inquiries as to the welfare of each member of the family visited, to give special messages to the servants, to salute the old ladies and other ladies, saying “are you blameless in conduct, do you behave properly toward your fathers-in-law?” and finally to “embrace the girls”, kanyāḥ svajethāḥ, asking after their health and wishing them handsome husbands, jewellery, etc. The herald’s farewell is here couched in stereotyped form: āmantraye tvāṁ, naradevadeva, gacchāmy aham Pāṇḍava, svasti te’stu, to which the “god of the gods of men” replies, anujñātaḥ . . . svasti gaccha, and, in response to a hint given by the herald that the king and his brothers should look with “kindly eye” on the message he has been forced to deliver (śivam sukham vah, sāmyyena mām paśyata caksusā nṛpāḥ), the King says na naḥ smarasya aprīyaṃ jātu, vidvan. An eye that is not kindly, sāmya, is dangerous, for in 3.263.35 we read: Vāsudevaparāyaṇāḥ krudhdhā te nirdaheyar vāi tūlārasmim ica’nalaḥ, and just before (32), mā’mān adhaksur drṣṭvāi-vā Pāṇḍavāḥ krūracaksusā. Consuming wrath was believed in literally, and it will be remembered that Gāndhāri’s anger burned Yudhiṣṭhira’s toe. A preceding passage also illustrates the politeness of special
inquiry as to the health of every member of the guest’s family, after
the host has stated that he himself is in good health: “Welcome!
I am very glad to see you and know you are well. I am very well, too,
as are my brothers. And how are all the family? Are they free from
illness and pain?” (kaccid ete ’py arogāh (and avyalīkāh, 5.23.6 f., 14).

But before passing on to the conventional verbal salutations,
already illustrated by the svāgatam, priyāmahe te vayaṃ darśanena,
svasti, and kuśalam of these scenes, there are still a few remarks to make
concerning the feet. The deep bow of respect ends with “falling with the
head at the feet” of the respected person, in 3.217.7, for example,
of parents. But to be “at one’s feet” may imply more. Urvaśī
is requested to let Arjuna be “at her feet”, that is, be her lover,
tava pādāv adya prapadyatām, but Arjuna, full of guru-pūjā, says to her
abhivādaye tvāṃ siraśa presyas te ’ham upasthitāḥ, gaccha mūrdhā
prapanno ’smi pādāu te, “it is as thy slave I greet thee with my head,”
tvāṃ hi me mātravat pūjya (3.45.13 and 46.20 and 47). A saint will
put Viṣṇu’s feet on his head (3.188.13; cf. 204.4). Viṣṇu himself
says that “priests and one’s own feet should be revered” as a daily
rite (13.126.3, nītāḥ ’bhivādyā vipreṇdrā, bhūktvā, pādāu tathā’lmānāḥ).

To “see the feet” is to get audience (cf. pādamūlaṃ). Thus: “Sire,
Vidura has arrived and wishes to see thy feet. Tell me what he is to do,”
draṣṭum icchati te pādāu, kiṃ karotu prasādhi mām (5.33.4; the king
replies that he is “not indisposed to see him”, expressed by asya
nā’kalpo jātu darśane, ibid. 5). A peculiar situation, in view of the
characters, is revealed by Saṅjaya’s report as to his visit on Kṛṣṇa
and Arjuna: “I saw K.’s feet on A.’s lap and A.’s feet held up from
the foot-stool, pādadiptha, in the laps of Kṛṣṇa and Satyabhāmā”
(the heroes were both drunk, madhvāsavakṣībāu, 5.59.5 and 7).

The armed soldier, who acts as warden at the palace door, on
announcing a visitor, first “bows with the head”, and then “on his
two knees” gives his message, jānuḥhyāṃ, bhūtale sthitāḥ siraśa vana-
danīyaṃ tam abhivādaya jāneśvaram (7.82.31). But the complete
prostration seems to belong only to the later epic. Thus Nārada says
to Samaṅga (12.287.3): urase’va pranamase, bāhubhyāṃ taraśi’va ca,
“thou bowest as if (prone) on thy chest; with two arms (alone) thou
crossest (life’s river), as it were.”

Other allusions to the feet are, so to speak, the converse of those
above. Thus the foot to the head is the opposite of pādabhivādana:
tvāṃ ākramiṣye padā mūrdhā, “I will trample on thy head with
my foot” (5.163.36); mā vo mūrdhni Dhanaṅjayaḥ pādaṁ kṛtvā
*'punyāḥ lakṣyam,* “may A. not attain his object by putting his foot on thy head” (7.75.15). “Kicking the head” of a decapitated enemy (K. 7.77.21, *padbhyāṁ pramathiaṁ śi tvam*) is a varied reading adding to Subhadrā’s anticipated pleasure; the B text has “you shall hear that his head has been taken off and cast out”. To touch with the left foot aggravates an insult, as Bhima touched Duryodhana *vāmena padā* (9.59.5; also R. 5.26.8). Compare, as to the left, 2.71.12: *Drāupadyāḥ prekṣamāṇāyāḥ savyam ārum adarśayat,* and 16.3.20, *nirdiśāṇaṁ iva sāvajñāṁ tadā savyena pāṇinā, “indicating disrespect by pointing with the left hand.” To be on tip-toe is to be eager: *agrapāḍāśthitaṁ ceṁmaṁ viddhi rājan vadhūjanam,* “Know that all the women-folk are eager to go” (15.22.17). Finally, foot-washing, though performed as worship by a devotee, is ordinarily a sign of servitude: *na kuryāṁ pādadhāvanam,* says Damayanti (3.65.68). It is also for that reason a sign of defeat, like eating grass, so that Sudhanvan grants Virocana his life only on condition that the latter, “in the presence of the girl (who made the trouble) shall wash S.’s feet,” *pāḍaprakṣalanaṁ kuryāt kumāryāḥ saṁnidhāu mama* (5.35.38).

The whole subject of the silent salutation given by bowing is brusquely disposed of by Duryodhana, when he refuses to bow to the king. He says that for himself he is willing to bow to Law and to the priests, but as to bowing to a mere man (such as a king), he will not; citing in defence of this view an old warrior-precept: “One should strive upwards and not bend downwards; manliness is in up-striving alone.” Up-striving is exertion and the meaning is merely that one should not bow to misfortune but meet it bravely, though the angry prince chooses to take it in the sense that a brave man should not bow to a king (*udaccheda eva na namad udyamo hy eva pauruṣam*, 5.127.19). There is also an equally futile discussion of the use of the word “thou”, which may be mentioned here before turning to verbal courtesies. It seems that the theory of “thou” being an insult is well established, as a theory, since it is referred to more than once, although in practice the two methods of addressing a superior (only superiors are involved in the discussion) are used interchangeably and even the same sentence confuses the two. But on one occasion the ever-fiery Bhima said he would kill his brother the king and when he repented immediately afterwards he found himself in a dilemma. If he killed Yudhiṣṭhira

1 The washing of the feet (of priests) is as religiously fruitful as is the gift of a cow; “it pleases the Manes, as the word ‘welcome’ pleases Agni, and a seat for a guest pleases Indra, and as food given the guest pleases Prajāpati” (3.200.66 f.).
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he would sin and if he broke his word he would sin. It was then suggested to him that by calling his brother "thou", instead of saying "your honour", he would escape from his dilemma, since "thou" is equivalent, being an insult, to slaying, without its practical disadvantage. It is (it is argued) an Atharvan Śruti that "thou" is equal to killing, vadha, when applied to a superior (guru; 8.69.83 and 70.51). This precept, gurūṇām avamāno hi vadhaḥ, is found again in 13.163.53, na jātu tvam iti bruyād āpanno 'pi mahattaram, tvamkāro vā vadho ve'ti vidvatsu na viśisyate; avarāṇām samānānāṁ sisyāṇāṁ ca samācare; and also in 12.193.25, tvamkāraṁ nāmadheyam ca jyeṣṭhānāṁ parivarjyāt, avarāṇāṁ samānānāṁ ubhayesāṁ na dusyati, a variant which makes the use of the proper name, as well as that of "thou", applied to superiors, a misdemeanour rather than a "deadly" insult. But examples given in this paper will show that this was a precept rather than an observance. Compare, for a good example, R. 3.7.6: Rāmaḥam asmi bhagavan bhavantaṁ draṣṭum āgataḥ, tvam mābhivāda, and ibid. 8.6, bhavān gacchatu, āgantavyaṁ tvayā tāta punar evaśramaṁ mama, "may your honour go and do thou return again to my asylum" (varied readings change tvam in the first sentence to tan and substitute, for tvayā tāta ... mama, the words ca te drṣṭvā ... práti). In an earlier scene than that above, Bhīma uses the second person (but without using the word tvam) along with bhavat, while Yudhiṣṭhira uses tvam (na tvāṁ vīgarhe, as contrasted with Bhīma's kim rājan duhkheṣu pariṣṭiṣyase, bhavato'nvadhanena, "why sufferest thou? because of your honour's recklessness," 3.33.5 f. and 34.2). Tvam is not really tabooed. Compare 5.23.3 f., where a messenger says to the king: diṣṭyā rājanś tvāṁ arogaṁ prapaśye; gives his master's greeting in the words: anāmayam prchati tvāṁvikeyaḥ; and receives the reply: anāmayam pratijñe tavāham. The seer says to the god, jñātum icchāmi deva tvām; icchāmi jñātum tvāḥam (3.188.135 and 139; on the acc., see below).

The verbal greeting is usually an inquiry as to health. Manu and Suvarṇa met each other and "made mutual inquiries as to health, kuśolapraśnam . . . cakratuḥ (13.98.5). The courteous man doing this is sukhapraśnada (12.116.7). The commonest formula is either with anāmayam or kuśalam, sometimes with both, as both are also parting benedictions. Kunti's farewell to Karna is anāmayam svasti ca (5.146.27). But epic usage is not in conformity with legal prescription in this regard. Manu (2.127) says that anāmayam is a greeting used to a warrior, in distinction from kuśalam addressed to a priest, while
ärogyam should be addressed to a Śūdra. But Āṅgada on dying (R. 4.55.12 f.) sends this greeting: abhivādanapūrvam tu rājā kuśalam eva ca vācyāḥ . . . ärogyapūrvam kuśalam vācyā mātā. To women in general, avādhyāśīṣaḥ śubhāḥ, “here is hoping you will not become a widow,” is spoken of as a casual morning greeting (perhaps with tragic irony, as Sāvitri, soon widowed, receives it, 3.296.12). To a king, special greetings with hopes of long life and victory are of course conventional: kṛtvā jayāśīṣaḥ (1.146.3); jayāśīṣaḥ pravijya (1.149.14); āsirbhīr jayayuktābhīr ānarcus tam (Rāmam, 3.291.2); dīstīyā jayasi . . . satrūn, bhava nas tvaṃ mahārajan rāje'ha śaradāṃ śatam (notice tvaṃ, 12.38.11); jīvatu dharmaṁ rājā, “long live our noble king” (R. 2.6.24), etc. His uninvited guests greet Jarāsandha with svasty āstu kuśalam rājan, and he politely welcomes them with svāgataṃ vo'stu . . . āsyatām (2.21.32–9). More emphatic is susvāgataṃ te'stu (1.76.21). Drona visits Rāma and touches with his head the feet of Rāma, bowing to the ground, śirasā bhumāu pādāu cāi'va'bhyavādayat, as well as giving his own name and lineage, and Rāma says svāgataṃ te . . . yad icchāsi vadasva me, without the roundabout approach to be expected (both use the second person here, 1.130.56 f.). As farewell, svasti te'stu appears in 1.183.4, and in 2.1.4 it is associated with a phrase which is more conventional than it appears, kṛtam eva tvayā sarvam, svasti gaccha, addressed to Maya, on the completion of his work; but the identical phrase occurs again when Hanumat is bid farewell by Bhīma, who accepts an offer to do something for him as done: “I accept it as if done for me; farewell,” kṛtam eva tvayā sarvam mama . . . svasti te'stu . . . kāmaye 1 tvām (I beg of you) prasīda me (3.151.13). One thus accosted goes “with a benediction”, kṛtvāvyānah (2.39.9), as contrasted with svāgatāreīitas (tayā, sukhāśinas sukhāśīāṃ smitāpūrvāṃ va'ovārvā, 3.45.5). As a slight change in form sukhaśītām interchanges with svāgataṃ as “welcome”, and “au revoir” is often said to the departing guest, gaccha te'stu śivaḥ panthāḥ, śīghram āgamanam kuru (RG. 6.82.62 and 70); punar draksyāvah (Mbh. 5.115.15); svasti vo'stu śivaḥ panthāḥ, draksyāmi punarāgataṃ, “a pleasant journey! I shall look forward to seeing you again” (K. 4.5.86); agadam vo'stu, bhadrāṃ vo, draṣṭā' smi punarāgataṃ . . . svasti śaṇuhi . . . āprṣto'si'ha . . . svasti śaṇuhi (2.78.21 f.; cf. 2.3.1 āprche te'vām gamiṣyāmi, punar esyāmi cā'py aham, “good-bye, I'm going, but I shall return”); tat svasti

1 Probably, like āprche te'vām (below), “I beg your permission to go, be gracious,” a conventional good-bye.
vo’stu yāṣyāmi svagṛham (7.74.5). Besides such more or less stereotyped formulas, the most frequent of which are ciraṃ jīva, sukhī bhava, kuśalam pitaram bṛuhī, svasti te’stu, svāgataṃ te’stu, vardhāsa (R. 7.103.8 as greeting; cf. diṣṭyā vardhāmahe, diṣṭyā vardhase, 3.262.26), svasti prāpuṇa gamyataṃ (“you may go,” 3.149.40); śivas te’dhvā and avighnaṃ (aṁśaṭam) gaccha panthānām (R. 5.40.24 and 3.8.11), there are the occasional “good-morning” and “good-night” salutations; sukhena vajanaṁ vyuṣṭā . . . kaccij jñānāni sarvāṇi prasannāni tava, “I hope you passed a pleasant night and your mind is clear” (7.83.2), both clauses being formulaic (12.45.17, sukhena te niśā kaccid vyuṣṭā, kaccij jñānāni, etc.); svapa sukham or suṣyataṃ . . . bhadrāṃ te (7.79.6); viṣramasva tvam avyagraḥ svapa ce’māṁ niśāṁ sukham, “rest in peace and sleep well this night” (10.4.12). Cf. R. 2.89.5.

But ceremonious benedictions are in order when extraordinary events take place; one might almost say, extraordinary benedictions. An example or two will illustrate this phase of hyperbole. A traveller is going across the Ganges and into the mountains. The Occidental “good-bye and good luck” appears thus expanded (svasti te Varuṇo rājā Yamaś ca samitaṁjayaḥ, etc., 3.139.14 f.): “May king Varuṇa and Yama, winner of conflicts (an odd epithet), and Ganges and Jumna and the mountains give you weal, and the Maruts and Aśvins and streams and lakes; weal to you on the part of gods and demons and Vasus; O Ganges, daughter of the mountains, shepherd him, gopāyane’nam, and give thy protection to this king who is about to penetrate into the mountains” (pravivikṣato’sya sāiḷān imān ca chāilasute nṛpasya); to which is cannily added to the traveller, “take care of yourself,” yatō bhavasva. A benediction for a hero going into battle (7.94.41 f.) begins with invoking protection from Brahma and proceeds with a long list of potential aiders in a rather curious medley, namely, priests, the best serpents, sarīṣyaḥ, royal sages (enumerated by name, Yayāti and others, acting as protecting saints), “creatures with one foot, those with many feet and those with no feet,” apāḍakas, Svāhā and Svadhā and Śaći (svasti kuruṇṭu te sadā); Lakṣmīs, Arundhati, Asita Devala, Viśvamitra, Angiras, Vasiṣṭha, Kaśyapa, Dhāṛ, Vidhāṭr lokeśa, the Directions and their lords, digūṣivarāḥ, the six-faced Kārtikeya, Vivasvat, the four elephants of the quarters, earth, sky, and planets, and finally the great serpent that supports the earth, adhastāḥ dharaṇīṃ yo ‘sāv sadā dhārayate nṛpa ṣeṣāḥ ca pannagasrēṣṭhāh svasti tukhyṇaḥ prayacchatu. In the opening clause, K. has (karoto svasti te) Brahma, svasti kuruṇṭu brāhmaṇāḥ; C. 3449, Brahma,
Brahma ca’pi dvi-jātayaḥ; and B., Brahma, Brahma (sic) ca’pi dvi-jātayaḥ (also tava for te after svasti kurvantu).

Such blessings, however, though formal are casual and flexible. The ritual connected with the reception of a guest, on the other hand, is rigid and of almost religious significance. It was stereotyped at a very early period in a verse that is preserved complete in the epic and in mutilated prose (obviously reduced from verse and still halfmetrical) in the legal Sūtras, thus: ṭṛṇāni bhūmir udakam vāk caturthi ca sunṛtā, in both Manu and epic, with a varied reading, without difference of meaning, following, thus, in Manu, etānī api satāṁ gehe no’cchidyante kadācanā (3.101); in the epic, satāṁ etānī geheṣu no’cchidyante kadācanā (5.36.34); in Vas., with the verse (though not marked as such by Bühler) still apparent, ṭṛṇabhūmy-agny-udakavāk sunṛtā-nasūya satāṁ grhe no’cchidyante kadācanā (Vas. Dh. 13.61); in Āpast., [abhāve, scil. annasya] bhūmir udakam ṭṛṇāni kalyāṇi vāg iti, etānī vai sato’gāre na kṣiyante kadācanā (Āp. 2.4.14, where Bühler keeps abhāve as part of a corrupt vs. and reads ṭṛṇā); in Gāut., merely ṭṛṇodaka-bhūmisvāgatam (Gaut. 5.35), with the addition of antataḥ, that is, the “welcome” should be given, if nothing more. The legal distinction of guests according to caste, learning, and virtue, and of foods to be given of different quality according to the guest, the generous epic ignores, both in the verse cited above and in what follows, where the same verse is repeated, in 3.2.54, with this addition: “To the suffering should be given a couch; to him weary with standing, a seat; to the thirsty, water; to the hungry, food; (to the guest) one should give an eye, give his mind, give kind words, rise up and give a seat; this is the eternal law; arise and approach the guest and honour him according to rule” (caksur dadyān mano dadyāt, etc., 3.2.55–6).

So much for the law and the general epic rule. The epic scenes show how strictly the rule is followed, always in spirit and generally in detail. An adventurer stumbles on a palace in the northern mountains and calls out “let the people here know that a guest has come”, atithiṃ samanuprāptam abhijānantu ye’ta vai. Out come seven fair maidens (“whichever he looked at, stole away his mind”) and said “Enter, my lord”. He went in and found an old woman there to whom he said svasti and she rose up and said “Take a seat”, afterwards offering him more. So when Dusyanta calls at the hermitage and cries in a loud voice, “Who is here?” Śakuntalā, “sweetly speaking, kindly smiling,” madurabhāṣīṇī cāruhāśīṇī, appears and says svāgataṃ te and welcomes him with a seat, water for the feet, and the
arghya (honey-mixture), and inquires after his health, anāmayam kuśalam ca papracche, and, smiling a little, said kim kāryam kuryatam, "what may I do for you?" He replies "I have come to wait upon, upāsitum, Kānva. Who art thou and whose (daughter)? I wish to know thee" (1.71.4–13). With icchāmi tvām aham jñātum, cf. the same tvām above, as contrasted with Damayanti's jñātum icchāmi te (Nala 3.20) and tvām jñātum in 3.188.135, 139, R.G. 3.23.34.

Instead of water alone, the weary guest may be presented with water and also with butter for his feet, pādodakam and pādaṅgṛtām, as well as a light, food, and a resting-place, together with a shampoo (in its literal sense of rubbing), which is, in fact, said to be a more acceptable attention than the gift of a cow, which was also an early form of gift to a guest. No one ever slays a cow for a guest (as goghna), in law or in epic narrative, though beef-eating is not unknown. But the tradition of giving a cow to a guest has survived and the gesture is still made, so that when Bhīṣma hears that Rāma has entered his territory, he goes to meet him with a retinue of priests headed by a cow (gām puraskṛtya, 5.178.26), which Rāma (Jāmadagnya) accepts as an expression of honour or worship, pūjā. Śalya visited the Pāṇḍus and "accepted pādyam, arghyam, and a cow" (5.8.26), with the customary kuśalam (said twice). Even Indra as host, after the guest Agastya has said disyā vai vardhate bhavān, says "Welcome, I am pleased to see you; accept water for the feet and for rinsing the mouth, a cow and the arghyam" (pādyam ācamanīyaṁ ca gām arghyam ca pratīccha me, 5.17.4). The shampoo, which goes with the pādaṅgṛta in the passage above (3.200.23 and 25), is called gātrasamvāhana and does not necessarily imply the use of water or butter; most of the passages indeed exclude any meaning save that of a gentle rubbing of the feet or legs, as when, for example, the servitude of Devayāni’s rival is manifested by the pādasamvāhana she gives her mistress (1.81.7). The irritable ascetic Cyavana demands this attention from the king and queen, who are his unwilling but servile hosts, and they perform this office in person, although, on the guest’s first appearance, the king merely brought a golden jug of water for Cyavana’s feet “and caused (others) to perform the rites” (pragrhyam bhṛṅgāram pādyam nyavedayat, kārayam āsa kriyāh). But Cyavana said samvāhitavāyau me pāddu, and then the king and queen rubbed him (13.52.14 and 31).

Something must always be offered to a guest. “There is nothing worse than to say I have nothing. One who goes away thus dis-
appointed, hatāśah, destroys the family" (5.115.9). Especially is this true if the guest be a poor man; it is better to give to the poor than to those who are well-off:

śrotriyaḥ daridrasya ċrasthāya 'gnihotriṇe
putradārābhībhūtāya tathā hy anupakāreṇe
evam viddheṣu dātavyā na samṛddheṣu, Bhārata (3.200.27).

If this passage be compared with Hit. 1.10, daridrān bhara, Kāunteya, mā prayacche'svare dhanam . . . dātavyam iti yad dānam diyate
'nupakāreṇe, where Kāunteya alone suggests the epic, it will be seen that it is a reflex from the Mbh., which is probably the dharmasūtra from which this group of Hit. verses is ostensibly cited. The first of these has Pāṇḍumandana, whereas Kāuravanandana appears in the epic verse advocating the same pity for others (13.116.20); then Hit. prānā yathā'tmano'bhiṣṭā bhūtānam api te tathā is identical with 5.39.72; and Hit. prayākhyāne ca dāne ca . . . ātmāupamyena
purusāḥ pramāṇam adhigaccati is identical with 13.113.8–9; not to speak of Hit. na samśayam anāruhya being identical with 1.140.73, in the earlier part of this same Hit. section, and ījyādhyayanadānāni identical with 5.35.56 f. This by the way; but it suggests that the expression anyasmād granthād ākṛṣya likhyate, in the Hit. prelude, refers to Mbh.

References, by way of similes, to the guest-law merely indicate its universality, adding nothing new: "like guests delighted getting to a hospitable house," ātityeṣam ġrhāṃ prāpya (7.110.23 f.); "smiling he welcomed his foes, as one receives guests with water and a seat," (7.110.23 and 24). The "best food" is to be offered a guest after the foot-water and rinsing-water, which follow the svaīgatam te'stu
(the verb is often omitted); but probably this is in the case of a very respected guest only, as in 3.260.14, which of course usually means a priest, who is called "the guest of all creatures", sarvebhūtānām atithih (13.63.22, an expression used also of Agni, 3.313.66) and prāṣṭāgrahbuk, especially in the didactic passages devoted to the gift of food to priests, where "food is (said to be) life, all depends on food", and the giver of food, as life, to a priest receives eternal life as his reward (Anuś. ibid.). Elsewhere it is said that a priest by caste, even if not by occupation, should still be treated "as a dear guest", although he may really be living an evil life, and be unchaste, a thief, a cruel man, a drinker, a causer of miscarriage, a seller of the Veda, śruti-vikrayakaḥ, or be by profession an arrow-maker or a physician. Moreover a guest of the third estate should be cared for
by one's servants. If the guest is a sādhu, the master of the house must bow, offer a seat, pīṭha, āsana, bring water, and have his guest's feet washed; and then ask about the guest's welfare, sukham prṛṣṭvā, and having done so, speak of his own state of health; after which comes the offer of refreshments and of a cow, which the guest must accept. The youthful householder, who is instructed in these matters, is told that his life-breath is liable to leave him if he fails to rise and greet his guest, and when a guest leaves the house the host should follow behind him (instructions in 5.38.1 f., the same verse in 13.104.64 and Manu 2.20). Much stress is laid on the rising. "Because of his devotion and love, Arjuna never neglected to rise in the presence of Kṛṣṇa, offering him a seat; but he did not himself think of sitting" (till told to do so, bhaktyā premnā ca... na ca'śane svayaṃ buddhiṃ vyadadāt (7.80.3 f.). But if the guest be the superior and is calling on his inferior, then it is the guest who says "take a seat" to his host (2.46.3 f., diṣṭyā vardhāsi āsyatām is said by the guest after the pādyā and āsana are offered). The formula of departure is āpycche tvām gamisyāmi (pūjito'smi, ibid., repeated in 17 as svasti te'stu gamisyāmi), to which in this case the host responds by a respectful salutation and the upasamgraha or touching of the feet offered to a Guru, abhivādyo-pasamgrhyā pitāmahām athā'bravīt (ibid. 7). This is the gesture of Manu 2.72 (cf. Gaut. 1.46; the person as object instead of caraṇāu, 1.139.15, etc., here a gesture of farewell). The phrase pratipūjya tām pūjām interchanges with pratigrhyā as a v.l. in the scene of 3.214.14-16, where the son of the family receives a visitor and announces him to the parents waiting within. It is they who "honoured the priest with welcome", svāgatam (vipram) arcaśyām āsatuḥ. The priest returns the compliment, asks if all is well at home with sons and servants, and if all are in good health. They reply "All is well with us; and has your honour had a comfortable journey?" "Quite so," said the priest (kaccit tvam api avighnena samprāpto bhagavann iti, bāḍham iti). The reading of K. adds sukham to B.'s kusalam grhe anāmayam ca vām, which is unnecessary (vām is dative; usually the object is gen.). It must be added in conclusion that often the only attention a guest is said to receive consists in pādyam and arghyam, foot-water and a drink of scented or sweetened water (3.183.48); but the greeting and other attentions are probably to be understood, as far as circumstances permit. The farewell in RG. 4.10.34 is siddhārtho gaccha.

A few ejaculations serve as salutations of a religious nature, svāhā-kārāḥ... dvijān daivatāni sevase (3.30.11); and sādhu, sādhu
answers to bravo!, a general shout of approval in battle. Also there are some universal salutations, which are found outside of India and need only be mentioned here, such as the āyusām abhinandanam or greeting to those who are ill (expressing the hope of recovery), with which are joined "a blessing in the case of those who have sneezed" kṣute or kṣutānām abhinandanam, which the commentator says is in the form śataṃ jīva, "live a hundred" (years), and a "luck-bringing" expression used when one has been shaved, which is quaint if not unique, śmaṣrurkarmanī (samprāpte) maṅgalyam (13.163.52 and 12.193.23, which latter adds "on bathing and eating also one should use the āyusām abhinandanam," the "long life to you" formula, which, in epic phrase and elsewhere, is āyusmān bhava). The same passage in Śānti says that priests should be greeted "evening and morning," and "one should ask about health every time one meets another", darśane darśane nityāṃ sukhapraśnam udāharet (ibid. 19). As well known, Buddha objected to the superstition involved in a blessing upon sneezing, which only shows that it was a common practice in India, as it was in Persia (SBE. 24.265, etc.). Compare on this point, Cullavagga, 5.33 (a dukkata), the Contemporary Review, May, 1881, and Proceed. Am. Or. Soc., May, 1885.

Note: With kroṣed bāhū(ṇ) pragṛhya, cf. R. 3.61.2, prākrūṣya pragṛhya bhujāu and ibid. 3.18.24. In R. 2.45.27 and 62.12 the Commentator understands an aṣṭāṅgapraṇāma, but the suppliant merely falls or kneels, with the usual śirasā yāce of R. 4.10.10; 26, 20; G. 5.89.21, etc. An unusual farewell is "go to hell," narakam gaccha, R. 2.74.4.
Sind nach dem Sāṅkhya-Lehrer Pañcaśikha die Puruṣas von Atomgrösse?

Von Hermann Jacobi

In Yogabhāṣya zu i, 36 findet sich ein anonymes Zitat, das nach Vācaspatimiśra von Pancaśikha stammt: (yatṛ'dam uktam):

,,tam anumātram ātmānam anuvidyā'smī'ty evaṁ tāvat sampražānīte."

Garbe hat in seinem Beitrag zum Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth (Stuttgart, 1893) ,,Pancaśikha und seine Fragmente" folgendermassen übersetzt: ,,Wenn er dieses atomgrosse (anu-mātra) Selbst erkannt hat, so ist er sich dessen bewusst, was es heisst ,Ich bin ; und er bemerkt dazu: ,,Alle Lehrer von Īśvarakṛṣṇa (s. Kārikā 10, 11) an erklären den Ātman (i.e. puruṣa) für alldurchdringend, allgegenwärtig, unendlich gross (vibhu, vyāpaka, parama-mahānti), und es wird von ihnen geradezu gegen die Theorie, dass die Seele ein Atom sei, polemisirt. Hierin (i.e. in Pañcaśikha's Lehre) ist ein offenbarer Einfluss der Vedānta-Philosophie auf das Sāṅkhya zu erkennen." Der Ansicht Garbe's stimmt A. B. Keith (The Sāṅkhya System, p. 43) vollkommen bei. J. H. Woods im Yoga-System of Patanjali, p. 74, note, scheint Bedenken gegen Garbe's Deutung des Fragments zu haben. Er sagt: ,,might it not however refer to a particular state only of the self ? " Da der puruṣa keine verschiedenen Zustände haben kann, so scheint Woods unter ,,self" nicht den puruṣa, sondern das antaḥkaraṇam verstanden zu haben. Er war, wie sich zeigen wird, der Wahrheit auf der Spur.

Wenn man sich nämlich Pancaśikha's Ausspruch im Geiste des Sāṅkhya überlegt, so leuchtet ein, dass er mit seinem ātman nicht den puruṣa gemeint haben können.1 Denn das Ichbewusstsein beruht auf dem ahamkāra und wird nicht durch die Erkenntnis des puruṣa (ātmasākyātkāra) oder ein Nachdenken über ihn (anuvidyā = anucintya, Vācaspati), erzeugt. Durch letzteres könnte allenfalls die sattvapurūṣānyatākhyāti, die Ursache des kaivalya, zustande kommen; jedoch wird dadurch das Ichbewusstsein endgültig aufgehoben.—Wie ausdrücklich, worauf mich Prof. O. Schrader aufmerksam macht, in Kār. 64 gesagt wird: evaṁ tattvābhyāsān 'nā' smī, na me, nā 'ham' ity aparīṣēsam | aviparyayād viśuddham kevalam utpadyate jñānam ||—Die Erörterung von anumātra stelle ich vorläufig zurück.

1 Vācaspati erklärt hier ātmānam mit ahaṃkārdopadam.
Die Richtigkeit unserer theoretischen Überlegung wird durch die Erwägung des Zusammenhangs, in dem Pancaṣikha's Ausspruch im Yogabhāṣya erscheint, vollends bestätigt. Es sei vorab daran erinnert, dass im Yoga es nicht drei antaḥkaraṇa: buddhi, ahaṃkāra und manas gibt, sondern nur eins, das einheitliche citta, welches die Funktionen jener je nach der Sachlage ausübt, und dann im Śūtra oder Bhāṣya bald buddhi, bald manas genannt wird.1 Ahaṃkāra kommt im Śūtra nicht vor, zum Ersatz dient asmitā, das im Sāṇkhya unbekannt ist. Asmitā, ein reiner Yogabegriff, ist der zweite kleśa (avidyāsmitāragadvesābhinniveśāḥ panca kleśāḥ, ii, 3) und wird erklärt als die scheinbare Identität von puruṣa (dyākṣakti) und citta (darśanaśakti) (द्वैताध्यात्मक ekātmate 'vā 'smitā, ii, 6). Der im Sāṃsāra Befindliche hält sein citta für eins mit dem puruṣa, und so entsteht in ihm die irrige Vorstellung, dass er ein selbständiges Ich sei. Es handelt sich nun im Bhāṣya zu i, 36, um eine echte Yogalehre, zu deren sachlichem Verständnis uns Vācaspati's Erklärungen verhelfen. Doch auch hier werden zum Teil Sāṇkhya-Termine statt der dem Yoga angemessenen gebraucht. Der Yogin soll sein citta in dem mystischen Herzelotus lokalisieren, der sich beim Ausatmen (recaka) aufwärts wendet. Dort verharrend, wird das citta von der Vorstellung des Glanzes von Sonne, Mond, Sternen oder Edelsteinen erfüllt, d.h. es wandelt sich in der Form je des einen oder anderen um. Wenn aber das citta sich vereinzelbigt (samāpanna) mit der asmitā, dann ist es wie die glatte Oberfläche des Ozeans, ruhig, unendlich, es ist asmitāmātra. Zu dieser Vorstellung von asmitāmātra, die dem Sāṇkhya fremd ist, wird nun aus ihm als Parallele (weil es dazu kein genau entsprechendes Gegenstück geben kann) der obige Ausspruch Pancaṣikha's angeführt. Wenn man auch asmitā mit ahaṃkāra paralleлизieren könnte, so kann mit asmitāmātra, dem damit vereinzelbigten citta, nur der innere Sinn, das manas, das aus dem ahaṃkāra hervorgegangen ist, auf eine Linie gestellt werden. Zur Funktion des inneren Sinnes gehören die Vorstellungen. Hier handelt es sich aber um eine Vorstellung ohne jeden objektiven Inhalt (wie Glanz der Sonne etc.). Die allgemeinste Vorstellung, die über allen inhaltlich bestimmten steht, ist das „ich bin“. Die Reflexion über das Denken (anuvṛtti), so könnte man sagen, führt also zu dem Satze: cogito ergo sum. In dieser Konsequenz des Sāṇkhya, dem „asmi“ findet das Bhāṣya eine Parallele zum asmitāmātra. Pancaṣikha meint also das manas mit dem anumātra atmā.

1 Siehe meine Abhandlung „Über das ursprüngliche Yogasystem“: SPAW. 1929, p. 587.
Das manas wird nämlich ausdrücklich im Sānkhya Sūtra, iii, 14, als anuparimāṇa bezeichnet (anuparimāṇam tat, kṛtiśrutēh). Zwar ist dem Sānkhya die Atomistik fremd, aber die Vorstellung von paramāṇu und paramamahat ist Sānkhya- und Yoga-Autoren geläufig, so spricht Gauḍapāda zu Kār. 7 und 22 anstandslos von paramāṇus, und im Yogasūtra, i, 40, werden paramāṇu und paramamahat nebeneinander genannt. Allerdings gilt im Sānkhya Sūtra anu (= paramāṇu) nicht als unteilbar: na nirbhāgatvaṁ, tadyogād ghaṭādivat, v, 71. Aniruddha beruft sich, zu dieser Stelle, darauf, dass auch die Atome aus Teilen bestehen: śatkena yugapad yogūtḥ paramāṇunāṁ sabhāgatvāt. Also konnte Pancaśikha das manas mit anumātra ātmā bezeichnen. Wahrscheinlich gebraucht er die Bezeichnung anumātra ātmā für das manas im Gegensatz zur buddhi als dem mahān ātmā. Denn dass der Name Mahān, masc., aus mahān ātmā entstanden oder dazu zu ergänzen ist, steht wohl fest: die Bezeichnung mahān ātmā im Sinne der buddhi des Sānkhya ist mehrfach belegt im Mahābhārata, xiv, 40, 1 ff.

Nach unserer Erklärung des fraglichen Ausspruches Pancaśikha's darf man sich auf ihn nicht dafür berufen, dass auch im Sānkhya die Seelen als unendlich klein angesehen worden seien. An sich wäre das nicht unmöglich, jedenfalls wäre es verständlicher als Iśvarakṛṣṇa's Lehre und die aller folgenden Sānkhyalehrer, dass alle puruṣas unendlich gross (vibhu) seien. So sagt auch A. B. Keith an der oben genannten Stelle: "it is clear that with an infinity of spirits the doctrine of their infinite extent is difficult." Wenn er aber diese Lehre für ein Zeichen von Vedānta-Einfluss halten möchte, so ist mir dies nicht wahrscheinlich. Denn im Vedānta ist die Seele zwar unendlich gross (vibhu), insofern sie identisch mit brahma ist (Śankara zu BS., ii, 3, 29); es gibt aber nicht unendlich viele Seelen von unendlicher Ausdehnung, die zugleich denselben Raum einnehmen. Dagegen stimmt die Lehre des Sānkhya genau überein mit der des Vaiśeṣika, wonach der ātman (wie der ākāśa) unendlich gross ist, weil er mit allen materiellen Dingen in Verbindung steht (vibhavat).

Da nämlich das adṛṣṭa (dharma und adharma) eine Eigenschaft des ātman ist, so könnte es nicht in äusseren Dingen eine Tätigkeit hervorrufen, wenn der ātman nicht mit ihnen in Verbindung stände,

2 VD., vii, 1, 22: vibhavāṁ mahān ākāsas, tathātāṁ.

1 V.D., iii, 2, 20 f.: vyavasthāto nānā; śāstrasāmarthyāc ca.
2 Über das ursprüngliche Yogasystem, p. 588, n. 3.
3 A.a.O., p. 620.
Note sur l'inscription Andhra de China
By G. JOUVEAU-DUBREUIL

L'INSCRIPTION de China est d'une importance extrême pour l'histoire du pays des Andhras et de la dynastie des Śatavāhānas. Cette inscription se trouve au Musée de Madras ; mais d'où vient-elle ?
de China.

Je crois que personne n'a eu jusqu'à présent la curiosité de chercher China sur une carte. Ce serait inutile : China n'existe pas.

Au Musée de Madras, on ne possède aucun renseignement, et la pierre est présentée comme venant de China.

Dans *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. i, page 95, Bühler, éditant cette inscription de Gotamiputa Sirīyāṇa Satakāṇi écrivait :

"The subjoined inscription is incised on a stone, which was originally found on the sea-shore, south of the Krishna river close to the village of China in the Kistna district, and is now deposited in the Madras Museum."

Les indications "near the sea" et "south of the Kistna river" sont très vagues.

J'ai donc fait des recherches dans des publications datant de l'époque de la découverte de cette pierre. Il n'est pas douteux d'après ces documents que le nom du village ne doive être écrit : Chinn Ganjām.

Voici ces textes :

*List of the Antiquarian Remains in the Presidency of Madras*, by Robert Sewell, vol. i, Madras, 1882, pages 82 et 83 :

"Chinna Gañzām.—24 miles south-west of Bāpaṭla. A salt station. Part of an inscribed marble from a Buddhist tope was lately found here (see Kollitippa)."

"Kollitippa.—20 miles south-west of Bāpaṭla, a piece of high ground between Kadavakuduru and Chinna Gañzām, east of the Kadavakuduru swamp, and to the west of the old coast road. Here was lately found half of an inscribed marble, presumably from the Buddhist Tope at Amarāvati. The inscription is in the Amarāvati character and is in Pāli. The other portion of the inscription was found lying near a temple in the village of Chinna Gañzām."

A *Manuel of the Krishna District*, by Gordon Mackenzie, Madras, 1883, page 206 :

"Fragments of stone with Buddhist carvings and Pāli inscriptions
lie near Chinna Ganzâm and in the Kollitippa swamp. On the coast is Môtupalle, now an insignificant fishing village, but identified as the port where Marco Polo landed in A.D. 1290 (see Yule’s *Marco Polo*, ii, 295, 272, 357). It was much used as a landing place for stores for the French troops at Guntûr a hundred years ago.”

From Mr. A. Rea, M.R.A.S., First Assistant to the Director-General, Archæological Survey of India, dated Camp, Amarâvati, 3rd April, 1888, No. 160 (G.O. No. 703, Public, 14th July, 1888, page 11):

“The Chidambarasvami temple in Chinna Ganjam is that in which had been placed the inscription stone from Kollitippa. The people are very suspicious of the marble, and will say nothing as to where it came from, asserting that it has been there from time immemorial. I heard, however, from another source, that it was found at Kollitippa along with the inscribed stone now in the Bežvâda library.

“Mr. Streynshan Master, in the journal of his journey along the coast in 1679, mentions some stones with inscriptions which lay in the way to Franguludinme. These would probably be those then at Kollitippa. The pillar just dug up is partly rubbed on one side, as if it had been exposed for long time, and then covered up. It may have been one of those referred to by Mr. Master, and the other lately removed—one portion to Bežvâda and the other to Madras—may have been another.”

From Dr. E. Hultzsch, Epigraphist, Archæological Survey of Southern India. Dated Bangalore, the 26th May, 1888, No. 128 (G.O. No. 745, Public, 27th July, 1888, page 4):

“At Madras where I stayed from the 19th to 24th April, I drew up a list of the copper plate grants at the Government Central Museum and copied a fragment of an Andhra inscription, to which Mr. R. Sewell had kindly drawn my attention. This inscription is engraved on a marble slab, which must have formed part of a pillar and which was found south of the Kistna river near the sea some years ago. It is dated in the 27th regnal year of the Andhra King Gotamîpûta Sirîyâña Satakani, who receives here the epithet Araka, i.e. Arhat, while he is called Sâmi, i.e. Svâmin, in other inscriptions. The inscription seems to have recorded a dedication by some ‘chief of saints’ (Araka-Mahataraka), whose name is lost together with all further details through the mutilation of the pillar at the bottom.”

De ces textes il ressort qu’une pierre, ayant des inscriptions analogues à celles d’Amarâvati, se trouvait près du temple de Chinna Ganjam, vers 1882, et avait attiré l’attention de Sewell.
Cette pierre avait été transportée au Musée de Madras avant le mois d’avril 1888.

C’est donc très certainement cette même pierre que Sewell a indiquée à Hultzsch et dont l’inscription fut copiée en Avril 1888, sous le nom mutilé de China, le véritable nom étant Chinna Ganjâm.

Dans ces documents on laisse supposer que la pierre de Chinna Ganjâm venait de Kollitippa. Ce n’est pas certain : peut-être a-t-il existé un stûpa à Chinna Ganjâm, car le pays était fort riche en monuments bouddhiques. Mr. Rea a découvert les restes de 3 stûpas en trois endroits situés à deux ou trois milles seulement de Chinna Ganjâm : Bogandanidibba, Sakaladanidibba et Kollitippa.

Ces monuments étaient à peu de distance de la mer et on peut en conclure qu’un riche port se trouvait sur cet endroit de la côte, à l’époque de Gotamîputa Siriyâña Satakanî.

De nos jours il n’y a plus qu’un petit port qui est situé à 2 miles de Kollitippa et Chinna Ganjâm, c’est Môtupalle.

Les noms anciens de cette ville sont Mukûla et Vêlanagara. Une importante inscription (n° 600, de 1909) se rapporte aux commerçants étrangers du port de Môtupalle en Ś. 1166.

Au XVIIIᵉ siècle c’est à Môtupalle que les Français débarquaient pour aller à Kondavidu qui est sur la route d’Amarâvati. Il est probable qu’au IIᵉ siècle de notre ère, Môtupalle était le port d’Amarâvati, parce que l’embouchure de la Krishna est généralement pleine de sables mouvants. Les bateaux, dans le port de Môtupalle étaient à l’abri des courants marins.

Il est intéressant de trouver le nom de Siriyaña, à la fois au bord du golfe du Bengale et, au bord de la mer d’Arabie, dans le chaitya de Kaňhêri. Ces Sâtavâhanas qui régnaient sur les bords de deux mers devaient avoir une flotte puissante qui avait la maîtrise de l’océan. C’est ce que nous prouvent les monnaies ayant comme emblèmes “Ujjain symbol on the reverse” et “ship with two masts on the obverse” qui ont été étudiés par le Professeur E. J. Rapson dans son célèbre ouvrage (Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, page 22).

En résumé, l’inscription de Siriyâña Satakanî provient de Chinna Ganjâm, c’est-à-dire des environs de Môtupalle qui était probablement le plus grand port du pays des Andhras au IIᵉ siècle de notre ère.
The Doctrine of the Buddha

By A. Berriedale Keith

WHEN we contemplate the extraordinary diversity of doctrine which has developed from the teaching in the sixth century B.C. of the Buddha, it is perhaps the most natural conclusion that it is really impracticable to discover with any precision the doctrine which in fact he expounded. This view, however, is naturally disappointing, and it is easy to sympathize with the energetic efforts of Professor Stcherbatsky in his works on The Central Conception of Buddhism and The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa to ascribe to the founder of the faith a definite system, inspired by an intelligible philosophy, which again can be regarded as arising naturally from the spiritual ferment of his time among the non-brahmanical\(^1\) classes of India. Incidentally we may doubt the restriction of the ferment to these classes and believe that the Brahmans played, as they have normally and regularly done, a leading part of this activity, though we need not claim that their speculations powerfully affected the Buddha. In fact, Professor Stcherbatsky elsewhere\(^2\) admits that in the Buddha’s time the Brahmanical community was mentally alert. True the most orthodox retained a belief in the performance of sacrifice and in reward in heaven, but others had come to favour a monistic view of the universe and interpreted the reward of supreme bliss as the dissolution of the personality in an impersonal all-embracing Absolute, while later on some Brahmanical circles developed the idea of an eternal individual soul which, after having been bound up in many existences, would return to its genuine condition as a pure spirit as a reward for accumulated merit. Side by side with these thinkers were others, apparently non-brahmanical, who preached the doctrine of materialism, denying any survival after death and retribution or reward for evil or good deeds. We need not doubt the existence of this materialism, but there seems no reason to hold that it was necessarily non-brahmanical.\(^3\)

The Buddha, we are to believe, was eagerly seeking for a theoretical basis on which to establish morality, and he was willing to accept from the Eternalists the doctrine of a gradual accumulation of spiritual merit through a series of progressing existences, but he was averse to

---

\(^1\) Nirvāṇa, p. 60.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 2.
\(^3\) Cf. L. de la Vallée Poussin, Nirvāṇa, p. 16.
their doctrine of an eternal spiritual principle. He was, it seems, deeply impressed by the contradiction of assuming an eternal principle which must have been, for incomprehensible reasons, polluted by all the filth of mundane existence in order later on to revert to its original purity. He was thus led to the denial of any permanent principle and to regard matter and mind as split in an infinite process of evanescent elements (dharmas), the only ultimate realities, besides space and annihilation. The idea of an impersonal world process was probably prepared by the conception in the Upaniṣads of an impersonal unique substance of the world, and the analysis of the world into its elements of matter and mind may be due to Sāmkhya influence. His originality consisted in denying substantiality altogether and converting the world process into a concerted appearance of discrete evanescent elements. He thus established a system of the most radical Pluralism as opposed to the Monism of the Upaniṣads and the Dualism of the Sāmkhya. Such a metaphysical construction, however, offered serious difficulties, as a basis of a theory of morals, and the Buddha could reconcile his ideas only by the adoption of the view that quiescence was the highest bliss, the universe thus appearing as an infinite number of separate evanescent entities in a state of beginningless commotion, but gradually steering to quiescence and to annihilation of all life. This condition of annihilation he styled Nirvāṇa, borrowing a term which in the Brahmanical philosophy denoted the dissolution of the individual in the universal whole. The idea of the Buddha, therefore, differed from that of the materialist in effect only in that the final annihilation, the sumnum bonum, was to be attained only after a long series of efforts in virtue and concentrated meditation. It is, therefore, not surprising that even Indian minds did not regard the solution as satisfactory, and that five hundred years later there evolved from the dissatisfaction felt in the faith itself a quite new religion, reposing on a quite different philosophic foundation.

It is significant that the theory compels us to believe that the Mahāyāna represents a complete change of philosophical outlook,¹ and a deliberate desertion of the Buddha’s own point of view. That is by no means fatal to the theory, but it would be more natural to find that the Mahāyāna was really less vehemently in opposition to

¹ Op. cit., p. 61; emphasized p. 36, where the very implausible view is asserted that the absence of the image of the Buddha is explained as showing the annihilation of the saint in Nirvāṇa. Cf. Poussin, L’Inde aux temps des Mauryas, pp. 252 ff.
the founder of the faith, and the question inevitably arises whether
the doctrine ascribed to the Buddha can fairly be extracted from our
evidence, and whether in itself it is plausible. It must be seriously
doubted whether the position ascribed to the Buddha is intelligible.
We are to believe that he was deeply concerned to find a theoretic
basis for morality, which was doubtless menaced by the materialism
which denied retribution, thus running counter to the doctrine of
Karman; but it is difficult to imagine a more completely unsatisfactory
basis than he is held to have devised. The popular religion offered
as an incentive to a virtuous life and obedience to the rules of religion
a blissful existence in heaven, the Eternalist doctrine promised
merger in the Absolute for the individual spirit, both intelligible ends.
The Buddha, however, offered annihilation as a reward of virtue and
concentrated meditation in a long series of efforts. It is difficult to
see what cogency such an offer could have in comparison with
materialism which assured its adherents of annihilation at the close
of life, and thus saved them from the tedium of the practice of virtue
or of meditation. It seems impossible to explain the appeal supposed
to have been made by a doctrine of this kind. Nor certainly is it
easy to suppose that the metaphysical doctrines believed to have
been held by the Buddha would secure wide appreciation. To reduce
the world into the concerted appearance of discrete evanescent elements
regarded, together with space and annihilation, as the ultimate realities
is clearly no great intellectual feat. The fact of concerted appearance
renders the description of the elements as discrete and evanescent
illogical, and the discussions of the Buddhist schools affords abundant
evidence of the difficulty of attaching any intelligible meaning to such
a construction.

If a priori the hypothetic philosophy of the Buddha presents
such an unattractive incoherence as hardly to be that actually held
by him, the impression is strengthened by consideration of the texts.
There are two points here to be distinguished. In the first place,
what assurance have we that the Pāli Canon, on which Professor
Stcherbatsky relies for his conception of the views of the Buddha,
really presents these views with any approach at accuracy? If it
were his view that the Canon was drawn up shortly after the Buddha,
the case would be different, but he appears ¹ to acquiesce in accepting
the third or the second century b.c. for the Canon, which allows more
than ample time for the teaching of the Buddha to have been changed

in vital matters. We need only remember the difficulties presented by the Aristotelian view of the doctrine of Plato to realize how hopeless it is to expect that oral views of, say, 500 B.C. would be faithfully reproduced in 200 B.C., even if, for the sake of argument, we concede that the Pāli Canon can claim so much antiquity. We may, if we will, overlook this fundamental obstacle to any certain knowledge of the doctrines of the Buddha, but it exists. In the second place, even when we accept the Pāli Canon as authoritative, it is not only possible, but probable, that it suggests a very different doctrine of the evolution of the Buddhist doctrine, and justifies us in ascribing to the Buddha views more simple, more in accord with the trend of opinion in his day, and more calculated to secure the adherence of a large circle of followers.

The first and most obvious point which arises is the nature of the Nirvāṇa which the Buddha offered as the end of human strivings. We need not doubt that the term was taken over from older speculation, and on Professor Stcherbatsky's view in Buddhism the dissolution of the individual in the Absolute becomes a complete dissolution, since there is no absolute reality. The divergence between these two points of view from the ethical standpoint is greatly diminished by the view of Professor Stcherbatsky that the absolute of the Brahmánical view is impersonal,¹ for it may not unfairly be held that there is not much practical difference between offering a man annihilation and absorption into what is impersonal. Thus the Nyāya-Vaiñcśika doctrine, which in his view is old, frankly admits that its Nirvāṇa is nothing better than the condition of space, or, as some would insist, than that of a stone. But whatever the view really held by the original school of Nyāya or the Vaiñcśikas,² it is not seriously possible to regard these schools as representing opinion of a period contemporary with the Buddha, and the essential point is the view taken of the Absolute in the Upaniṣads. There is not the slightest ground for describing that as impersonal as is claimed by the author. Whatever we may think of their consistency in so holding, the fact is clear that the Absolute to the Upaniṣads was not merely existent but was thought and, what is vital, bliss. To describe such a substance as impersonal can have no meaning. The dissolution of the individual soul in the Absolute was not a destruction of personal existence on merger in an impersonal. It was the attaining by a finite individual

² Keith, Indian Logic and Atomism, pp. 263-6.
of a full expansion of personality by the departure of the fetters which bound the pure spirit; these removed, the spirit expands into the nature of perpetual thought and bliss and true being.\(^1\) The Nirvāṇa, therefore, of the Upaniṣads was something very much more attractive than the negation of the Buddhist doctrine on the theory set out. It was a state of beatitude, and it is most important to remember that the Brahmanical schools were not alone in promising beatitude to those who consented to follow their directions and strive after virtue and mental concentration. The Jains, whose views, though like those of the Buddhists attested long after the death of Mahāvīra, are clear, insist that the end of the soul when liberated is bliss,\(^2\) and it is extremely dubious whether we can really suppose that the Buddha promises annihilation in lieu of the bliss which the rival schools so generously held out as an incentive.

Moreover, apart from probability, there is the fact that the Canon uses terms freely which promise as the end immortality. Thus, when Čākyamuni becomes enlightened, he declares that he has attained immortality and opened the gates therefor,\(^3\) and Čāriputra and Maudgalayāyana, dissatisfied with the teaching of Saṅjāya, make compact that he who first discovers the immortal will declare it to his friend.\(^4\) This reminds us of the anxiety of the Brahmanas in the later Brāhmaṇa texts and in the Upaniṣads to avoid the constant repetition of death and to find something abiding. We may well believe that it was this desire of the Indian mind that the Buddha was deeply concerned to meet. So again, when the Buddha pronounces on the disappearance of Dabba, the son of Malla, he says nothing of annihilation\(^5\); one knows not whither goes the fire which slowly dies, nor can one say where go those saints who have won deliverance and attained abiding bliss. The simile adduced is inconsistent with the conception of extinction; the thought of the Upaniṣads\(^6\) recognizes that the disappearance of flame is not its destruction, but its return to an invisible condition. The saint passes away from all contact with mortality, but that does not mean that he is annihilated absolutely. On the most important occasion of all, the passing away of the master himself, the texts are silent as to any declaration by him

---

2 Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, i, 332.
3 *Mahāvagya*, i, 6, 12.
4 Ibid., i, 23.
5 *Udāna*, viii, 10.
that he passes into annihilation; what we are told is that he passes from the sight of gods and men alike, and ceases to be in touch with them.\(^1\) Again, just as the aim of the Brahman is to avoid a return to earth, the formula on attaining the rank of Arhat is "Birth is exhausted for me; my duties are performed; I have done what was to be done; there is no return here" or "There is no further birth". This carries us absolutely no further than the Brahmanical doctrine, and is sufficient evidence to prove that the Buddha, if he taught annihilation, was extremely careful to conceal the fact from those desiring to become Arhants. Nirvāṇa again, precisely like the Brahmanical Absolute, is happiness (sukha), though there is absence of ideation and sensation (svamijñā-vedita-nirodha). In the Brahmanical Absolute also there disappears all trace of empirical thought, the distinction of subject and object, and therewith the possibility of ideation and sensation. But the Absolute is not on that account annihilation. There is abundant evidence\(^2\) of the reality of Nirvāṇa; it is the immortal abode of the Dhammapada, the place without age or death or suffering, where there is supreme rest and peace, and so forth. Whatever the secret thoughts of the Buddha, it is abundantly clear that he promised something eternal to his disciples, something not born, not made, not conditioned. But it is also clear that the Buddha differed from the Brahmanical conception by regarding Nirvāṇa as the end of striving, and not as the foundation of existence, the Absolute. In his teaching the conception thus took on a definite tinge, which accords with the specialization of the term.

The refusal of the Buddha to deal with matters of metaphysics as not essential to his purpose is sufficiently attested by the famous list of issues upon which he is recorded as having refused to give any answer to inquiries.\(^3\) The issues involved include the question whether the world has or has not a beginning in time, whether it is or is not infinite in dimension, and above all whether the Tathāgata exists after death. Or again is the vital principle (jīva) the same as the body or is it not? Various reasons have been given in the scholastic texts and in modern criticism for his attitude of negation. We cannot, of course, be certain that he actually declared his refusal to deal with these points; this assertion may be a product of later speculation. One point, however, in the traditional enumeration suggests strongly

---

2. Ibid., pp. 150 ff.; La morale bouddhique, pp. 15-21.
that the list is later than the Buddha himself. The question as to survival is posed, not, as one would expect, regarding the monk in whom the roots of desire are extirpated, but regarding the Tathāgata himself, which suggests that the question was framed after the Buddha had passed away, and when in the congregation the issue arose as to whether he was absolutely extinct, or still remained in existence. This need not preclude us from the belief, in itself perfectly probable, that the Buddha was not a metaphysician, and that he was content with teaching a way of salvation which would lead to the cessation of rebirth with its attendant certainty of misery.

Professor Stcherbatsky's view of the silence of the Buddha is very different. We are invited to remember that we are not dealing with a period of thought in which obscure magic alone could exist, but one in which was produced the grammar of Pāṇini, one of the greatest productions of the human mind. With all respect to Pāṇini, and accepting the date implied, for the sake of the argument, it is wholly impossible thus to rate his grammar, and still more impossible to argue to achievements in philosophy from what was attained in grammar. Moreover, even those who value highly the philosophy of the Upaniṣads may point out that the Buddha was not a Brahman, and, even discounting the suggestion that he was a Mongol, may have lacked the subtle intelligence of the Brahmans, among whom the great Pāṇini was numbered. One might on this line of reasoning suggest that the confused and popular character of the thought of the Buddha is reflected in the inferior character of his language as compared with the Brahmanical Sanskrit, while from living in the eastern lands he failed to come into contact with the best type of Brahmanical mind. It is impossible on the strength of the milieu to postulate that the Buddha's silence can only be explained by the fact that he regarded the pith of reality as incognisable, a doctrine which doubtless is often found later as in the Vimalakīrti Sūtra of the Mahāyāna and the Upaniṣad tradition of the answer of silence thrice repeated to the inquirer after the nature of the Absolute. The difficulty of this theory is obvious. It is doubtless impossible to express in any sense an Absolute, whether Buddhist or Brahmanical, but on the view accepted the nature of Nirvāṇa could easily enough

---

2 Poussin, op. cit., p. 56, rightly insists on the Brahmanical milieu of Buddhism, but that is not to say that the best forms of Brahmanical activity prevailed in Magadha.
be explained as annihilation. Nor is it at all convincing to find the
description of Nirvāṇa as the "immortal place" explained\(^1\) as
meaning a place where there is neither birth (i.e. rebirth) nor death
(i.e. repeated death), that is a changeless, lifeless, and deathless
condition. People, it is added, disappear for ever in Nirvāṇa by
being extinct. It means a place where there is no death; it does
not mean a place where there is eternal life. But there is adduced
no authority for this version, and it seems clearly illegitimate. The
Brahmans feared that after death they would again die and be born
again; the immortal place is one in which this fear is ended; in it
one neither dies nor is born again. We know that in the time of
Asoka\(^2\) the Buddhist teaching of the day impressed on the average
man the duty of piety for a reward in heaven; the higher doctrine
of the Buddha seems clearly to have been a discipline which secured
for the disciple something above the temporary joys of heaven, an
immortality which did not pass away.

We cannot doubt that the Buddha held the doctrine of retribution,
and, this being admitted, it becomes impossible logically\(^3\) to believe
that he held the doctrine of the denial of the Ātman as it is presented
in the Pāli texts. Had he adopted this doctrine he could not with
the least consistency have remained silent on the fate of the Tathāgata
after death, and the history of the schools confirms the view that
he was not the author of the creed of Nairātmya. Had he evolved it,
he must have at the same time set forth some doctrine, however
unsatisfactory, for the purpose of reconciling the denial of the self
with the doctrine that the doer of the deed reaps the fruit, a principle
which the Buddhists doggedly accept, and we should not find in the
early schools the two very distinct doctrines of the Pudgalavāda\(^4\)
and the Santāna. The former seems much more probably in the
line of the thought of the Buddha than the other, though it has been
evolved under the influence of the doctrine of Nairātmya. It recognizes
in the Pudgala something, an entity (dravya), but the relations between
it and the Skandhas, which make up empirical life, is inexpressible.
It is not other than the Skandhas, for it is not known apart from
them, but it is not identical with them, for then it would be subject
to birth and death. In fact, it accomplishes deeds, transmigrates,

---

\(^1\) Op. cit., p. 120.

\(^2\) Poussin, L’Inde aux temps des Mauryas, pp. 120 ff.; V. Smith, Asoka, pp. 63 ff.

\(^3\) Poussin, Nirvāṇa, pp. 30 ff., 131 ff.

\(^4\) Walleser, Die Sektien des alten Buddhismus, pp. 60 ff.
eats the fruit of its acts, and enters Nirvāṇa. This suggests to us very strongly that the Buddha simply accepted the doctrine of transmigration, and that it was only later that the school began to develop the view that the self must be negated. The motive for such negation is not difficult to guess. The Buddha was certainly anxious to check human desire as the source of misery, and there can be little doubt that it came to be felt that nothing was so hostile to the extinction of desire as the belief in the existence of a permanent self. In a famous passage of the Bhadāranyaka Upaniṣad 1 Yājñavalkya instructs Maitreyī in the doctrine that the love of wife and child, of Brahmanical honour or warrior state, of wealth, of heaven, of gods, and other creatures, is ultimately nothing but self-love. We may admit that the apparent egoistic character of this pronouncement is to be mitigated by remembering that the individual self is ultimately identical with the absolute, but it can hardly be said that such a doctrine is well adapted to extinguish desire. More simply the Sāṁyutta Nikāya 2 declares that nothing is dearer to one than one’s own self, and we may justly suspect that the Buddhists came to feel that the belief in a permanent self opposed a grave barrier to the effort to extinguish desire, and that accordingly they came to stress the doctrine that the self was unreal. More logical than the Pudgalavādins, who endeavoured to retain the traditional Pudgala, the Pāli Canon adopts the doctrine of the series 3 self, which accords excellently with the analysis which it also accomplished of the individual into the Skandhas. This scholastic doctrine of the Skandhas and the Dharmas we have no ground for ascribing to the Buddha himself. It is neither naïve nor truly philosophical, nor even moderately intelligible, and, as noted already, it ignores the essential problem of explaining the movement to quiescence of discrete evanescent entities which have existed in a beginningless commotion. The doctrine of the Santāna is an endeavour to rescue from utter shipwreck the scheme of retribution, but, if it succeeds at all, it is at the cost of the general conception of the Dharmas. That early Buddhism could have been built up on such foundations as a living religion is clearly incredible.

---

2 1, 75.
In the same way we cannot accept as representing primitive Buddhism the doctrine of an extinct Buddha corresponding to a lifeless Nirvāṇa. Professor Stcherbatsky himself admits that the tendency to convert the Buddha into a superhuman eternally living principle manifested itself early among his followers and led to a schism. We have, in fact, no reason whatever to hold that the Buddha believed that on death he was extinct or that Nirvāṇa was lifeless. What we do know is that the Buddha appears to have given clear instructions for the paying of veneration to his relics, and the Pāli Canon represents him as claiming for himself more than mere humanity. How far he felt himself to be the embodiment of the Mahāpuruṣa, heir of a long line of Buddhas, we cannot say. It is possible that it was later tradition which invested him with a legendary divinity, and that he himself claimed to be no more than a teacher who had achieved enlightenment on the needs of suffering mortals. But in this light he is not revealed even in the Pāli Canon, and it may be that the Mahāyāna preserves more of the original doctrine than it is usual to believe.

It may be added that a primitive Buddhism of the kind indicated accords well with the character of Jainism as a doctrine produced in the same region and at the same time. Here we find the defiling elements of illusion, desire, aversion, etc., represented as a kind of subtle matter which flows into the body through the pores of the skin and fills it up as does medicine when absorbed, or as sand fills a bag. By taking vows, by meditative and ascetic practices, the entrance to the body is shut off, the influx ceases, and the individual is purified. This primitive doctrine remained long current in Jain circles, and the only excuse for its maintenance must be that it was believed to represent, and probably did represent, the actual views of the master, as its primitive character suggests. It is practically incredible to ascribe to a contemporary of Mahāvīra the refined, if unsatisfactory and complex, doctrine of Dharmas; the two conceptions belong to totally different milieus, and we are without any evidence that at this early date the Śāmkhya had evolved a satisfactory analysis of elements of body and mind. Indeed to the last the Śāmkhya treatment of the whole issue of Puruṣa and Prakṛti remains extremely obscure and largely unintelligible. There is, therefore, every reason

3 Stcherbatsky, o. cit., p. 57; Glasenapp, Der Jainismus, pp. 158 f.
to hold that the doctrines assigned by Professor Stcherbatsky to the Buddha are the product of later scholasticism, and that they were in large measure far removed from his mode of thought. This view receives confirmation when we examine the philosophical doctrines which the Pāli texts themselves represent as contemporary with the Buddha as in the Brahmajāla Sutta. They lack entirely the metaphysical subtlety which would be expected in the milieu of the doctrine of the Dharmas as interpreted by Professor Stcherbatsky and Rosenberg. On the other hand, there is sufficient evidence in the texts of the existence of that system which manifestly permeates the practice of Buddhism, the Yoga. When all is said, it is clear that there is in Buddhism the fundamental principle of Yoga, the practice of ecstasy induced by something in the nature of the hypnotic trance, as well as the belief in transmigration. The Buddha's way is a mean course in which the excesses of asceticism are normally checked; but there is clearly no essential difference between Brahmanical and Buddhist Yoga; nor can the latter claim superiority of intellectual foundation over the former.

Professor Stcherbatsky contends that within the plane of Hinayāna Buddhism there is no place for trivial sorcery, and he objects to the description of the Buddha as a magician of a trivial and a vulgar kind. But his objection is based on ignoring the actual statement, which is not that the Buddha was of the character mentioned but that the intellectual standard of the milieu in which the Dīgha Nikāya was composed was indicated "by the admission into the Canon of the Pāṭika Suttanta in which the Buddha appears as a magician of a trivial and vulgar kind." It seems impossible to negate this judgment of the character of that text, and it is hardly satisfactory to treat all forms of mysticism alike; the Tantras illustrate this point adequately, and the Pāli Canon itself has some appreciation of the divergence between higher and lower forms. But what is important is that the Nikāyas exhibit so slight a development of philosophical insight as to render it impossible to accept the suggestions of Professors Rosenberg and Stcherbatsky as to the

1 Die Probleme der buddhistischer Philosophie, 1924.
2 Poussin, Nirvāṇa, pp. 10 ff.; Senart, Origines bouddhiques; Das Gupta, Yoga Philosophy, 1930.
5 Keith, Buddhist Philosophy, p. 19.
significance of the doctrine of Dharmas. As Professor Walleser points out,¹ the treatment of this issue in the Sarvāstivādin school is utterly naïve; the fifty-seven categories are enunciated without any real attempt to discriminate between content of consciousness, form of consciousness, and subject, and to explain their interrelation, and the Kathāvatthu, which post-dates the Buddha by several centuries,² shows a complete inability to develop an intelligent dialectical method. If we ascribe to the Buddha the doctrine of the transitory character of existence, which serves as an incentive to seek Nirvāṇa, we cannot attempt to father on him the later efforts to expound a theory of momentary being. How far we may regard his view of the world as pessimistic ³ is uncertain; the history of the schools suggests that his view was not that pleasures per se were painful, but that they were to be disregarded as temptations to refrain from seeking the abiding happiness which consisted in Nirvāṇa.

The picture we can thus form of the doctrines of the Buddha himself must be conjectural and uncertain, but it has the merit of being in accord with the probability that his doctrines were far removed from the refinements of the scholastic philosophy as preserved in the Pāli Canon, which presents the appearance of being the product of much discussion by contending schools whose existence tradition emphatically asserts.

¹ Die Sekten des alten Buddhismus, p. 75.
³ Poussin, Nirvāṇa, pp. viii, 123.
Note on a Kharoṣṭhī Aṅkṣara

By Sten Konow

In his admirable introduction to the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan, Professor Rapson has analysed the various compound letters of the Kharoṣṭhī alphabet in such a way that his results will generally be accepted as final. It will no doubt in future be possible to throw fresh light on some minor details, but it is hardly conceivable that any serious objection will be raised against his deductions.

My object in writing these lines is, in the first place, to join those fellow students who wish to give expression to their sincere admiration of Professor Rapson’s scholarship and work, and then to bring together some additional material which, in my opinion, will have to be considered in connection with one small detail dealt with in the said introduction, viz. the interpretation of the sign which has been variously transcribed as tsa and tsā.

After quoting the opinion of Bühler, Professor Rapson, l.c., p. 314, says: “It must be admitted that the form of this character, as it appears in some of the stone inscriptions, is most naturally explained as consisting of t superimposed on sa. But there can be no doubt that in the Niya documents the reading tsa is correct, since the aṅkṣara tsu is found in the word utsuka in the Buddhist Sanskrit verses of No. 511, the language of which, although containing a few Prakrit forms, is predominantly Sanskritic in its phonology. We may conclude, then, that the same sign has the same value when it occurs in other documents in such words as samvatsare (passim) and savatsi (inser. No. 7); and we must suppose that the lower portion represents sa written cursively in a manner which effectually disguises its origin, as in the very similar aṅkṣara ṅsa which M. Senart has identified in the MS. D. de Rh.”

It will be seen that the words mentioned by Professor Rapson are all tatasmas or pure Sanskrit, and as Sanskrit was certainly to some extent known to the Turkestan scribes, it is a priori likely that the sign in question has the same value as in Sanskrit.

If we abstract from the many names and some non-Indian terms, which cannot, at the present stage of our knowledge, be utilized for ascertaining the actual sound, it will be seen that the aṅkṣara is not often used. In addition to the words quoted above, we have
mātsaritayā in No. 523, piṃtsāmanā in No. 510, and māṃtsa, māṃtsa in Nos. 252, 358, 514, 635, and 676. Of these mātsaritayā is Sanskrit, standing for matsaritayā, and does not prove anything for the Prakrit of the records. Piṃtsāmanā occurs in a stanza which, according to Professor Lüders, is taken from the Prātimokṣasūtra. If it stands for piṃtsamānah it must probably be derived from the base pāms, to hurt, as proposed by Professor Rapson. Māṃtsa, māṃtsa, finally, stands for Sanskrit māṃsa, flesh, meat.

The two last words accordingly show a peculiar development of mās to māts, which may represent a phonetic feature of the north-western Prakrit from which the document language is derived. But it is hardly possible to arrive at any certain results with regard to the actual sound from the inscriptions themselves. The use of ts in the word utsuka is not conclusive. From forms such as osuka, Skr. autsukya, we can infer that the dialect form was ussua or uswa, and it is quite conceivable that utsuka represents an attempt at noting the Sanskrit sound by means of an akṣara which was used with a similar, but not necessarily identical, value in writing genuine dialect words.

Since the document language is a Prakrit it may be of interest to recall the fact that ts regularly becomes och in all other Prakrits, with the exception of Māgadhī, where the grammarians enjoin the change to eceğini; cf. the examples in Pischel’s Grammatik der Prākritsprachen, § 327. A priori it might be maintained that a similar state of things would be likely in the document dialect, and that ts might represent a somewhat intermediate stage of development. The dialect, however, differs from other Prakrits in so many features that we are not justified in drawing any such conclusion.

On the other hand, it is in its base practically identical with the north-western Prakrit which we know from the Dutreuil de Rhins manuscript and from Indian Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, and it becomes incumbent on us to examine the state of things in that form of speech.

In the MS. Dutreuil de Rhins, which I shall henceforth quote as Dhp., retaining M. Senart’s numbering of the folios and lines, Professor Rapson accepts M. Senart’s reading of a “very similar” akṣara, which I take to be identical with the letter now under discussion, as ṇs. It occurs in the following words: saṁsāra, Skr. saṁsāra, A 2b; saṁsana, Skr. saṁsanna, A 3a; ahiṁsai, Skr. ahiṁsāyām, A 4b; bhameśu, Buddhist Skr. bhramayinṣu, B 34; bhėṅsīti, Skr. bhėtsyāti, C 39; maṁsana, Skr. mātsyānām, C 39 xvi 2 = C 39 6.
It will be seen that the akṣara is used both where the corresponding Skr. forms have ṇs, in which case it would be conceivable that something like ēś might have developed, though the document language, as we have seen, has ṇts in similar cases, and also where we have Skr. ts, or rather tṣy, and here it seems difficult to understand how ēś could have developed. M. Senart’s comparison of forms such as bhimsana for bhīṣaṇa, with the not infrequent “nasalization before a sibilant”, does not help to elucidate the development, because we should then have to make the unwarranted supposition that ts might become ss, s, even where t is not final in a prefix, such as is the case in ussuṇa, Skr. utsuṇa.

Now M. Senart himself remarks, in commenting on the form bheṁsiti, that it might be thought proper to read ts, and his reason for not doing so was that he could not see how the reading ts was possible in saṁsāra. Now that such forms have been found in the Kharoṣṭhī documents, it seems necessary to transliterate the akṣara as ts throughout in Dhp., i.e. to read satsara, satsana, ahīṭai, bhāmetsu, bhetsiḍi, matsana.

In Indian Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions the same akṣara is used in the word saṁvatsara, which occurs in various slightly differing forms, and perhaps in saṁtsare, Skr. saṁsāre.

In all these sources we accordingly find the same state of things: the akṣara denotes a sound corresponding to Skr. ts or tṣy and also to s after old ṇ. But we have not so far found any indication of the nature of the sound.

The use of the akṣara for old tṣy in bhetsiḍi, Skr. bhetsyati; matsa, Skr. mattyā, might a priori be taken as an indication that the s was slightly palatalized, and I have already mentioned that the akṣara looks like t superimposed on ē. There is also another detail which seems to point in a similar direction. A 3\textsuperscript{17} and B 2\textsuperscript{1} we find prakṣajhadi, i.e. praśamjhamdi, for Skr. praśamṣanti. In both places ā is written as ja, surmounted by a horizontal stroke, and this same sign is elsewhere used were Skr. has dhya, e.g. in jhāṇa, Skr. dhyāṇa, B 16. The akṣara, as well as the ordinary ā, always seems to denote a voiced palatal and never a voiced s in Dhp. We have no right to assume a different sound in prakṣajhadi; and it seems necessary to assume that here we have to do with a voicing of ts after a nasal, in

---

1 For the distinction between t and ṇ, ṇ and ṇ, see my remarks in Festschrift für Ernst Windisch, pp. 85 ff.
the same way as \( t \) has become \( d \) after \( n \) in the final syllable of the word, and this would point to the conclusion that our akṣara was actually pronounced \( tsa \) or almost \( ca \). But it is, of course, possible that \( jha \) is used to denote \( dz \).

There still remains one source which might possibly throw some light on the question about the value of the akṣara \( ts \), viz. the Khotanī Saka language. It can be shown that the north-western Prakrit of the Turkestan documents has exercised considerable influence on this form of speech, and I hope to do so in another place. Saka is written in Brāhmī, and the corresponding akṣara is a distinct \( ts \) and not \( tś \). It is used in loanwards such as avātsara, Skr. apsaras, and saṁtsāra, Skr. saṁsāra, and in some few indigenous words, viz. an unidentified katsira (Maitreyasamiti); ggamtsa, loc. ggamcha, hole, hollow; pyamtsa, which is used to translate Skr. pratimukha; hadtsa, together with; tsu, to go; tśa, rich, and tśaṭa, peaceful, at rest.

A priori the Brāhmī \( ts \) seems to decide the question: we have actually to do with \( ts \) and not with \( tś \). After having discussed the matter with my friend Professor Georg Morgenstierne, who knows much more about Iranian languages than I do, I have, however, arrived at the conclusion that the matter is not quite so simple as it would appear at first sight.

The etymology of words such as ggamtsa, hadtsa, pyamtsa is not known to me. Tsu represents an Aryan cyu, Avestan šyu; tsāta corresponds to Avestan šyāta, and tsāṭa is the past participle of the inchoative of the same base, cf. Latin quietus. Here we accordingly have a regular development of Aryan cy to ts, and, in order to arrive at some result regarding the actual sound, it seems advisable to start from such words, where the etymology is perfectly clear.

In Saka Aryan \( c \) regularly becomes \( tc \), just as \( j \) becomes \( js \), and the only question is how these akṣaras should be read. Professor Morgenstierne has pointed out to me that a comparison of the state of things in modern Iranian languages related with Saka, such as Pashto and the Pamir languages, leads to the conclusion that \( tc \) stands for \( ts \) and \( js \) for \( dz \); cf. Saka tcahaure, Pashtu tshalor, four; Saka pamoja, Pashto pinzda, five, etc. And a consideration of the akṣaras themselves would naturally lead us to think of some combination of a dental and an s-sound. Moreover, some features point to the conclusion that such was actually the case.

It is a well-known fact that in Saka several consonants are
palatalized through the influence of an ensuing y, and in the case of tc and jc the results of this palatalization are c and j, respectively; cf. ūca, loc. of ūtca, water; paṁjyaun, instr. abl. of paṁjṣa, five. C and j, for which we also find ky, gy, respectively, certainly have the same sound as in Sanskrit, and it is not easy to understand what depalatalized c and j could be else than ts, dz, respectively.

If, now, Aryan c becomes Saka ts, we should certainly expect cy to become a palatalized ts, i.e. some sound approaching c, and it is evident that Saka ts cannot be the affricate ts with a dental s, but rather tš. When this sound is further palatalized, as in ggamcha, loc. of ggamtsa, ch is written, but we have no means of ascertaining what is meant with this ch.

From the viewpoint of Saka it, therefore, seems as if the Brâhmī ts is an adaptation of Kharoṣṭhī ts, and that this āksara cannot well have been a ts, but rather, as the shape of the āksara would seem to imply, tš.

The details drawn attention to above are not conclusive, but I have thought it advisable to put them together, because they may prove of interest for the question about the value of the Kharoṣṭhī āksara.
À propos du Cittavīśuddhiprakaraṇa d’Āryadeva

Par Louis de la Vallée Poussin


L’auteur est habile à établir des ponts entre le Tantrisme et le Bouddhisme authentique. Les pratiques les plus osées sont justifiées par des considérations morales et philosophiques puisées aux meilleures sources, décalquées des meilleurs traités.

1. D’une part, le Mahāyāna croit que la charité autorise tous les manquements aux règles. Sur ce point, le schéma du Vinaya des Bodhisattvas qu’établit Asanga dans Bodhisattvabhūmi (deuxième partie du Yogaśāstra) apporte toute la clarté désirable : les casuistes du Grand Véhicule précisent les cas où le futur saint doit commettre vol, assassinat, mensonge (Voir Le Vinaya et la pureté d’intention, Ac. de Belgique, juin, 1929). On ne peut donc contester l’orthodoxie mahāyānisthe d’une formule comme la suivante :

\[
bodhicittam samutpādyāṃ sambodhau kṛtacetasā \\
tan nāsti yan na kartavyaṃ jagaduddharanāsayaḥ ||
\]
"Celui qui a produit le vœu de devenir un Bouddha, dont la pensée est fixée sur l'Illumination, il n’est rien qu’il ne doive faire dans l’intention de sauver le monde."

C'est l'intention qui fait la moralité de l'acte : nāpattipīḥ subhācetasāṁ, "Point de péché quand l'intention est bonne." Et même, na stūpakhalane doṣāḥ, "Aucun mal à détruire un Stūpa." On sait que ce sacrilège est un des cinq upānantaryas, un des cinq péchés quasi mortels : c'est détruire le corps même du Bouddha.

2. D’autre part, du point de vue du "vide" ou de la tathatā, les distinctions apparaissent comme des créations de l'imagination erronée. Notre auteur dit :

samsāraṁ caiva nirvāṇaṁ manyante tattvadarśinaḥ |
na samsāraṁ na nirvāṇaṁ manyante tattvadarśinaḥ ||

"Ceux qui ne voient pas la Vérité distinguent le Sāṃsāra et le Nirvāṇa ; ceux qui voient la Vérité n'ont idée ni du Sāṃsāra ni du Nirvāṇa."

Ils possèdent en effet le samatājñāna, le savoir de l'égalité ou de l'identité, qui est un des quatre savoirs constitutifs de l'Illumination.


yathāiva rajako vastraṁ malenaiva tu nirmalam |
kuryād viṇās tathātmanam malenaiva tu nirmalam ||
yathā bhavati saṃsuddho rajonighṛśradarśanāḥ |
sevitas tu tathā viṇair doṣo doṣavināśanāḥ | ...
karnāj jalaṁ jalaṇaiva kaṇṭakenaiva kaṇṭakam |
rāgaṇaiva tathā rāgam uddharanti maniśīnaḥ ||

"On nettoie un vêtement avec des choses sales, un miroir avec de la poussière ; on enlève une épine avec une épine. ... De même le sage chasse l'ordure par l'ordure, pratique le mal pour détruire le mal, déracine la convoitise par la convoitise. ...

L'intention et le savoir-faire :

lohapindo jale kṣipto mājjaty eva tu kevalam |
pātrikṛtam tad evānām tārayet tarati svayam ||
tadvat pātrikṛtam cittaṁ prajñopāyavidhānaṁ |
bhuñjāno muciye kāmān 1 mocayate aparāṇ api ||

"Une masse de fer, jetée dans l’eau, coule aussitôt. Modelez-la en vaisselle ; elle flotte, traverse l’eau, et transporte. De même, lorsque la pensée est modelée en vaisselle par la possession de la

1 Le texte porte kāmān.
Science et de l’Intention, on peut jouir du plaisir : on se délivre et on délivre les autres du désir.”

Les modernes étudiants du Tantrisme n’ont pas remarqué que le Sūtrālaṅkāra de Maitreya-Asāṅga (XIII, 11–13, éd. S. Lévi, p. 87) enseigne le klesa eva klesamihārasanam, “C’est par le klesa, passion ou souillure, qu’on peut sortir du klesa.” Le commentaire (Asāṅga) cite des fragments de Sūtra : nāham anyatra rāgād rāgasya niḥsaraṇam vadāmi, “Je le dis : c’est seulement par le désir qu’on peut sortir du désir,” 1 et encore : avidyā ca bodhiś caikam, “Ignorance (ou vue fausse) et Bodhi (parfaite intuition), c’est la même chose.”

À vrai dire, Maitreya n’ordonne pas la pratique du désir en vue de l’expulsion du désir, en vue de la “sortie du désir”. Lorsque le Bouddha enseigne : “On ne sort du Désir que par le Désir,” il veut dire : “On se délivre du désir lorsqu’on connaît la vraie nature du désir ; lorsqu’on sait que le désir n’existe pas en dehors de la nature même du désir : la nature transcendante (dharmatā ou tathatā) du mal (akuśala) est la nature transcendante du bien (kuśala).” Celui qui connaît en vérité le désir et les autres klesas, est délivré des klesas ; par conséquent les klesas, connus, sont la sortie des klesas : pariṇātās ta eva teṣāṃ niḥsaraṇam bhavanti.

C’est une vieille comparaison : le poison, mangé suivant les règles, devient de l’ambroisie (viṣam amṛtāyate) ; tandis que le dadhi, mangé contre les règles, devient du poison (viṣāyate). Je manque, toutefois, à la rencontrer dans les sources bouddhiques. Mais la comparaison de la masse de fer et du vaisseau de fer est bien connue. Vasubandhu (Kośa, VI, p. 205) cite une gāthā :

kṛtvābuddho ’lpam api pāpam adhaḥ prayāti kṛtvā budho mahad api praśajhytā anāriham  
lohām jale ’lpam api maṛjati piṇḍarāpañam pāṭrikṛtaṃ mahad api plavate tad eva ||

Il faut rapprocher Milinda, sur le caillou qui coule et les grandes pierres qui flottent lorsqu’elles sont placées sur un bateau (Demiéville, “Versions chinoises du Milinda,” BÉFEO, 1924, p. 166) ; Si un homme

1 Ce Sūtra m’est d’ailleurs inconnu. Voir les références de Rhys Davids-Stede s. voc. niṣvaraṇā, niṣvaraṇīyadāhu ; en outre Udāna, III, 10 ; Kośa, II, p. 200 ; III, p. 10 ; VI, p. 239 ; VII, pp. 32, 33, 37 ; et surtout VIII, pp. 140–1. La doctrine est qu’on sort des Rāpas par les Ārāpyas ; qu’on ne sort pas du bhava par le bhava. Notons toutefois que, d’après les sources de Nettippakaraṇa, p. 87 (voir les Sūtras cités Kośa, III, p. 115), on s’appuie sur le māna pour expulser le māna, sur la trśṇā pour expulser la trśṇā : le māna peut être bon (kuśala).
foncièrement mauvais pense une seule fois au Bouddha, il n'entrera pas dans l'enfer, il naîtra en haut dans le ciel. Le petit caillou qui coule est pareil à un homme faisant le mal et ne connaissant pas les Sūtras du Bouddha : après sa mort, il entrera en enfer.

Pour Vasubandhu, il n'est pas question du grave péché que commettrait un sage, budha, un homme qui est entré dans le chemin et qui est incapable de grave péché : il est question du grave péché que le sage a commis avant de devenir un sage : son âme est devenue réfractaire à la fructification du péché.

Dans le même ordre d'idées, un morceau de sel sale un verre d'eau mais ne sale pas le Gange (Anguttara, I, p. 280).

4. La différence de style est grande entre les diverses parties de ce petit ouvrage. Des stances bien frappées à côté de slokas que soutiennent mal des chevilles entassées. L'auteur a pris son bien dans des Tantras et dans des Śāstras. La chose, du moins, est certaine pour le vers 83 :

\[
yathā prākṛtako loko yogilokena bādhyaṭe |
   bādhyaṭante dhīviṣeśeṇa yogino 'py uttarottaraiḥ ||
\]


Il y a une fausse samyñī : ce que voit l'homme atteint d'ophthalmie, une vraie samyñī : ce que voit l'homme aux bons yeux. À l'eau du mirage s'oppose l'eau véritable. La vraie samyñī est la lokasamyñī, le lokasamyñī satyā : ce qui est admis pour vrai dans le monde, ce que l'expérience (vyavahāra) ne contredit (bādhate) pas.

Cette vérité commune ou des hommes vulgaires (prākṛtaka) est contredite par la vérité des Yogins : celle-ci est multiple. Certain Yogin reconnaît que la femme est impure ; certain Yogin reconnaît que la femme n'existe pas comme femme, mais n'est qu'un assemblage de dharmas (Petit Véhicule) ; certain Yogin reconnaît l'insubstantialité des dharmas, qui ne sont que des fantômes irréels, qui n'existent pas en dehors de la pensée qui les imagine, qui ne sont que des aspects temporaires et fictifs d'une immuable et ineffable réalité. C'est ainsi que les Yogins se contredisent les uns et les autres.

Toute buddhi, toute pensée intelligible, est, par définition fausse ; mais, pour sortir de la buddhi et arriver à l'ineffable réalité, il faut se
servir de l’illusion, de la \textit{buddhi}. Les écoles orthodoxes enseignent un long chemin de l’illumination par l’ascèse morale (\textit{śrāmanya}) et l’effort intellectuel (\textit{sāṃkhya}, dirait la Gitā). Le “tantricisant” Āryadeva de notre texte veut que le Yogi, le vrai Yogin, dédaigne la contemplation de la \textit{tathatā}, méprise les vieilles règles d’ascétisme. Sa pensée est bien exprimée dans une ligne des Tantras:

\textit{sarvāsām eva māyānāṃ strīmāyaiva viśiṣyate}

“La meilleure des illusions est l’illusion qui s’appelle femme.”

L’Upaniṣad, on s’en souvient, compare l’homme identifié à l’Ātman à l’homme qui, embrassé par une femme, ne sait plus rien ni du dedans ni du dehors. L’antiquité des rites tantriques ne fait pas de doute : sur ce point, un récent article de Chintaparan Chakravarti, \textit{Indian Historical Quarterly}, VI, p. 114, est à remarquer. Mais nous sommes mal renseignés sur la date où rites et spéculations de la main gauche furent organisés en Vajrayāna.

On sait que le Sūtrālāmākāra d’Asaṅga condamne la doctrine du “Bouddha sans commencement”, plusieurs siècles avant toute référence positive à cette doctrine. Faut-il penser que la théorie du \textit{rāga} “échappatoire du \textit{rāga}”, comme Asaṅga la formule, vise à corriger, dans le sens de l’orthodoxe ascétisme, une théorie tantrique, la théorie du “lavage dans l’eau sale” que préconise notre Āryadeva ?
Un nouveau document sur le bouddhisme de basse époque dans l'Inde

Par Sylvain Lévi

LORS de mon court passage au Népal dans l'été de 1928, le Général Kaisar Shum Shere, un des fils du maharaja Chandra Shum Shere, m'avait invité à examiner la belle collection de manuscrits qu'il a formée avec autant de goût que de zèle. C'est là que j'ai eu l'occasion de trouver les fragments que je publie ici. Le successeur de Chandra Shum Shere, le maharaja Bhim Shum Shere, qui porte aux recherches scientifiques le même intérêt que son frère aîné, a bien voulu m'envoyer la copie de ces feuilllets. L'original, autant qu'il me souvient, est tracé sur des feuilles de palmier de petit format, en belle écriture du moyen âge népalais; la langue en est généralement assez correcte. Je n'ai corrigé que les erreurs évidentes; mais j'ai respecté les irrégularités qui peuvent être dues à l'auteur lui-même, et laissé tels quels les passages de sens obscur ou douteux.

L'ensemble se rapporte au culte tantrique de Vajrayogini, une divinité encore populaire au Népal; le village de Sanku, à l'amorce de la route qui mène au Tibet—route qui reste fermée aux Européens depuis près de deux siècles—possède un temple fameux consacré à cette déesse. L'ouvrage dont nous avons ici un fragment donnait l'historique, naturellement légendaire, de ce culte, la transmission de maîtres à disciples, et le rituel. C'est un spécimen curieux des documents qui ont dû servir de base au lama Taranātha pour ses précieuses compilations en tibétain. Il ne sera pas inutile, en vue des recherches ultérieures, de dresser ici les tables de succession spirituelle fournies par ce texte. (Voir au verso, page 418.)

Ces diverses listes se différencient des deux listes de succession spirituelle reproduites par l'éditeur de la Sādhanamālā (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, n° XLI), p. xli, l'une d'après le Catalogue du Tandjou (Cordier, II, p. 211; Rgyud, XLVI, n° 1–8), l'autre d'après l'éditeur du Cakrasambhara tantra. Toutes contiennent pourtant un certain nombre d'éléments communs. Les noms nouveaux, autant que je sache, sont: Dhyāyī, Amoghaśrī, Vijayaghośa, Biso, Vinayagupta, Vāgīśvara, Sudhanaśrī. Viruvā peut être Wirūpa, qui est l'auteur (entre autres œuvres) d'un Uḍḍiyāṇaśriyoginīsavayamabhūsambho-gaśmaśanakalpa Rgyud, XXVI, 63. Đīṅgāra peut être le personnage connu par ailleurs sous le nom de Ćenki (84 Siddhas) ou Ćenggi (Tāra-
I. Siddhamāṇāya

A
  Nāgārjuna
  Śavaranaṭha
  Indrabhūti
  (Udinī Vajrayogini [Uḍḍīyāṇī ?])
  Tilo-pā
  Nāro-pā
  Advayavajra
  Dhyāyi-pā
  Amoghaśrī (mahāpanḍita)

II. Vajrayogini Gurus Paramparā

A
  Śavaranaṭha
    Maitrīgupta
      (élève de Ratnākaraśānti, Nāro, Rāgavajra, Jñānaśrīmitra)
      Lūyi-pā

B
  Śavaranaṭha
    Sāgaradatta
      Vijayaghoṣa
      Anāṅgavajra
      Biso
    Painḍapāṭika
      Vinayagupta (panḍita)
      Vāgīśvara (mahāpanḍita)
      Sudhanaśrī (avadhūta)
      Lilāvajra
      Lalitavajra
      Kovihārapanḍita

Abhayākaragupta : S. xc, n° 1 ; G. 109 ; T. 250–2.
Advayavajra : V. inf. à la suite de cette liste.
Indrabhūti : S. xli et xcviıı, n° 12 ; G. 40 et pass. ; cf. Two Vajrayāna Works, Intr. p. xii ; Z. 185.
Kukuri : S. ciı, n° 18 ; G. 104 ; B. 32, n° 23 ; Z. 179.
Jñānaśrīmitra : G. 104 ; T. 241 (son prakaraṇa mentionné ici est probablement le Vajrayānāntadvayavivṛti, Tandjour Rgyud LXXII, n° 10).
Lakṣmīkārā : S. liıı ; G. 51 ; Z. 219.
Lalitavajra : G. 104 et 73 ; T. 189.
Līlāvajra : G. 104 ; T. 214–5.
Lūyī-pā : G. 20 ; B. 21, n° 1 ; Sh. 18–19 ; Z. 143.
Maitrīgupta ou Maitrīpādāḥ : G. 23 ; T. 248 ; Sh. 30–1.
Naro-pā : G. 74–5, 79 ; T. 239 ; Z. 168.
Ratnākaraśānti : S. cxı, n° 32 ; G. 105 ; T. 235 ; Z. 156.
Śavaranātha (Śavari) : S. xlvı et cxiv n° 36 (“he seems to have been the originator of the Vajrayoginī cult”) ; cf. ib. p. 456, n° 235, colophon : evam nandyāvartena Siddha Śabarapādiyamata Vajrayoginyārdhahana vidhiḥ) ; G. 19 sqq. ; T. 88 ; Z. 148.
Sāgara (datta) ; G. 24.
Tilo-pā : G. 20 ; T. 226 et n° 5 ; Z. 170.
Vajrapāṇi : G. 27 (un des quatre grands disciples de Maitrī( gupta). Le nom d’Advayavajra est trop banal pour qu’on puisse identifier avec certitude les deux personnages de nos listes (et de plus un troisième qui paraît être Maitrīgupta lui-même). Mais l’un d’entre eux est bien certainement le même que l’auteur du “Vajrayogini sukhottarasaṃvaranirṇayasvarthaka maṇḍala” dans le Tandjour Rgyud XIV,

Le récit, souvent obscur, par la faute ou par la volonté de l’auteur, s’éclaircit sur quelques points par une comparaison avec le Bka’ babs bdun ldan traduit par Grünwedel sous le titre de : Edelsteinmine ; p. ex. l’épisode de : “Ratnamati montré (dans un miroir)” ib., p. 19. Mais dans ces cas-là même, Tāranātha s’écarte notablement de notre texte. Ainsi Śāvaranātha est ici le fils d’un danseur (nata) nommé Loka et de sa femme appelée Gaurā ; chez Tāranātha Logi et Guni sont les noms des deux sœurs de Śāvari, dont le père est bien un “Tanzmeister”. Tāranātha ne nomme parmi les gurus de Maitrīgupta que Ratnākaraśānti, mais il connaît sa visite à Vikramaśila, où il est, selon notre texte, l’élève de Jñānaśrīmitra. Le voyage de Maitrīgupta en compagnie de Sāgara, à la recherche de Śāvaranātha, se retrouve de part et d’autre ; mais Tāranātha a ici un récit beaucoup plus détaillé.

Le détail le plus important fourni par notre texte semble être l’indication du berceau de Nāgārjuna. Tandis que le plupart des sources se contentent de désigner comme son origine l’Inde du sud ou le pays de Vidarbha, ici c’est la ville de Karahāṭaka qui est nommément désignée comme sa patrie. Karahāṭaka est connu par d’autres textes ; son nom, à peine altéré, survit sous la forme Karhād, officiellement Karād ; la ville est située dans le district de Satara, au sud de Bombay, par 17° 7’ N. et 74° 11’ E. Elle a donné son nom à une
subdivision de la caste brahmanique. À 3 milles S.O. de la ville se trouve un groupe de grottes bouddhiques "d’un type simple et très primitif". Si Karhad est le berceau de Nāgārjuna, il pourrait être intéressant de reprendre l’étude des grottes de ce point de vue.

À propos de Nāgārjuna, je crois utile de signaler ici une indication fournie par la Rasopanīṣad ; le texte est édité dans la Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, n° XCII, par K. Sambasiva Sastri, qui a recueilli l’héritage lourd à porter du glorieux Ganapati Sastri et qui a réussi à maintenir le niveau de cette belle collection ; il a commencé cette année la publication du précieux commentaire de Skandavāmin sur le Ṛgveda et rend par là un service capital aux études védiques. La Rasopanīṣad qui risque de passer inaperçue contient nombre d’informations précieuses. J’extrait du 16e adhyāya les vers suivants (10 sqq.) sur la transmutation à la manière de Nāgārjuna.

Nāgārjunamuniḥ śrīmān dṛṣṭayogam idam param
dakṣiṇe Keralendrasya rāṣṭre vanasamākule
nātidūre samudrasya grāme Pritisamāhvaṣe
tataḥ pippalisaṃsthamāh pāsānaḥ hemadhātavaḥ
tān ādāya prayaṇena . . . . . .

"Le muni Nāgārjuna a vu ce procédé : dans le royaume méridional du prince de Kerala (le Malabar) où il y a beaucoup de forêts, non loin de l’Océan dans le village qui porte le nom de Priti, il y a des pierres en forme de pippali qui contiennent de l’or ; on les prend et . . . . . ." Suit le détail du procédé que je signale à l’attention des alchimistes de bonne volonté, mais qui n’entre pas dans le plan de ce mémoire ; je sais que mon confrère et ami Rapson, à qui je suis heureux de le dédier, me pardonnera de m’arrêter là.

NAMO MAṆJUVAJRĀYA
Maṇjuvajram prañamyādau Nāthapādam anantaram
amanasikārāmāyām vākyate sumahodayam (1)
Sambuddho Bodhisatvāḥ ca siddhās tair anuśāsitāḥ
abhiśiktās tathety eṣām āmnāyakrama āṣyate (2)
tatrādau dharmaçakre ’śmin śrāvakaiḥ parivāritaḥ
upastatha sa Bhaṅgavān diśān pāramitādikam (3)
tatas taṁ samparītyajya gatavān dakṣināpathe
nirmāya dharmadhātvākhyam maṇḍalaṁ sumanoramam (4)
Niṣayaḥ svayam eva tra Bodhisatvāḥ ca sṛṣaṇa
nāyakāś cābhavann aśṭau tathāṣṭāv upanāyakāḥ (5)
bāhyā vātitā vākārā rākāravarjitaḥ. hetvanupalabdhi hikāro vārāhi vajrapūrviketi paramārthavāsuddhiḥ. kāyavākcittavāsuddhyā trikośam. hetupalalayor abhedatvā trikośam tulyata dharmodayeti.

NAMAḤ ŚRĪ VAJRAYOGINYAI

prathamam bāhyapūjā sindureṇa. asambhavamamreṇa. svahṛdi sūryasthahūnkarārasāmibhir ākṛṣya pravesya puspādbhiḥ sampūjya. tadanantaram jagacchūnyākṛtya. śūnyatānantaram jhaṭiti. ātmānam Bhagavatīm bhāyayet. parvataśiropari nānāpupopetām. sūryasthahūnkarārasāmiṁ saṁspārya svāsavatā yathādarsavad yogāḥ. amṛtāsvadānam vaśikaraṇe parvataǔdikam pādaraśadrśam bhāvayan vāmanāsāportena pibet. trikālaṃ balibhāvanā kartavyā. yathādityo bālataruṇādyanapekṣaṃ svakīranaḥ parvatam ākrāmati. tatha Bhagavatīm parvataākrāntām bhāyayet. amṛtāṃ śvādayet. siddhyanugraha jihvāyām mantram abhilikhya. svahṛdāsminādham pravesya āvesayet.


NAMAḤ SARVAJŚĀYA.

NAMAḤ ŚRĪ SAVĀRESVARĀYA
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Tārāṃnāyena mantrajāpaṃ kṛtvā koṭim ekāṃ caturmudrārthasa- 
hitena Bhaṭṭāraka svapne gaditam. gaccha tvam Khasarpaṇam.
tatra vihāram parītyajya Khasarpēṇa gatvā varṣam ekāṃ yāvan 
nisidati. punar api svapne gaditam. gaccha tvam kulaputra Dakṣi-
ṇāpathe Manobhaṅga Cittaviśrāmanau parvatau tatra Śavareśvāras 
tiṣṭhati. sa ca tatrāṇugrahaka bhaviṣyati. tatra ca mārga Sāgara-
nāmo milisyati. sa ca Raṭadesāvāsi rājaputras tenāpi sārdham gaccha. 
pāscād gate sati Sāgareṇa militam. uttaradesāparīyantena Mano-
bhaṅga Cittaviśrāmayor vārtāṃ na śrutavān. śrīDhānyam gatvā 
varṣam ekāṃ sthitaḥ pāscād vāyavya uttaradeśe so dhiṣṭhānaTārām 
sādhayitum ārabdhavān. māsaikena svapno 'bhūt. gaccha tvam 
kulaputra vāyavyadeśe parvatau tiṣṭhantu. paṅcadaśadīnena 
prāpyate. Bhaṭṭārikāyā vākyena vāyavyām diśam saṁghātaiḥ 
sārdham gacchati prāptiparyante puruṣeṇaikenoktaḥ. parame 
dine Manobhaṅga Cittaviśrāmanau prāpayete lagnau. tatra sukheṇa 
vāṣṭavyam. iti śrutvā paṇḍitapādo hrṣto 'bhūt. aparadinam prāptaḥ. tatra 
parvate dine dine dāsa dāsa maṇḍalāni kṛtvāṃ kandamulaphalā-
hāram kṛtvā dinādasāparīyantam sīlātalaparyāṅkām āruhya ekāgra-
cittena upavāsaṃ kartum ārabhdaḥ. saṃtāme divase svapanadārasanam 
ghavati. daśame divase grīvām chettum ārabdhāḥ. tatkṣāne 
sākṣādārāsanam ghavati. sevāṃ dadāti. Advayavajra no 'bhūt. 
Paṇcakramacaturmudrādvībhāgyānām kṛtam dvādasadīnapa-
riyantam. punar apya upadeśena paṅcadinaṃ yāvat. sarvadharmā-
dṛṣṭāntena viṇāṃ vādayati. tatra padmāvalī. jñānāvalī. Śava-
reśvareṇa ājñāṃ datvā. prāṇātipātādimāyāṃ darsiya tvam. Tadā-
taram Śāgarāḥ kāyavyūham varṣaya te paṇḍitapādenoktaḥ. bhagavan 
kim ayye (')ham kāyavyūhaṁ nirmāpitum aṣākyaḥ. Śavareśvara 
āha. vikalpasambhūtatvāt. paṇḍita āha. tarhi kiṃ kartavyam 
maṃjñāpayantu pādāḥ. Śavarādhippa āha. taveha janmani 
siddhir nāmī darsanapraķāśānāṃ kuru. Advayavajra āha. aṣākto 
'tham Bhagavan kartum katham kariṣyāmy aham. āha. iha Vajrayo-
ginypadeśāt karisyasi tvam. phalaṁ ca phalisyaytī. ihopadeśam 
ity uktvā Bhaṭṭārakapādāntardhāno 'bhūt.

nedāṁ vanasṭya ca mrgo na varāhapotaḥ 
sampūrṇacandravadanā vanasundarīyaṃ. 
nirmanāparimitatayārthinaṣya hetoḥ 
samtiṣṭhate giritale Śavardhirājaḥ. 
amanasiṁāra yathāśrutakramaṁ samāptaḥ.
pūrvavad akārādickenām sampūjya vihitaBhagavatīyogaḥ prāṇavapiṣṭhād āgatavadanaḥ kāṇḍapaṭṭād bahir gatvā kyātpaṅca-
manḍalo dattadakṣiṇāḥ prāṇavapiṣṭhāgatavadana upāyacakram
liṅkhitvā tataḥ pravesyā Nāthāṅkitaśiraske svahṛdi cakram saṃ-
śphārya vaktreṇā ktraṃ datvā tad[dh]ṛdi dhyānam mukham āpūrya
vajrabhrto 'stottarāsatamanteiś tam kṛtvā muhe muham dāimala
tataḥ upāyacakram atibhramanantām vicintya mantritapuspe tādanan
ḍamarūṃ ghaṇṭāṃ vā saṁvādyā sātopamantrām uccārayet. dhūpaṃ
dadyād yadi tasya prakampādinimittam upajāyate tadaiva katha-
niyam anyathā naiva. tadanu cakṛād uddhṛtya mantradāṅgurupar-
paramparākathanaṃ kartavyam iti sampradāyavidhiḥ. etad abhi-
dhāya gunaparvakramāṁsayasampradāyaiṅkagocaram iti. tatkathā
cakathāvṛtā śraddhotpādanāḥ śisyajñānakṛṣṭir abhidhiyate.
iha janmani yadi na siddhyati tadā maraṇasamaye cakram tanmukhe
svamukhe praviṣāya svasthāna eva īnam. iti Lūyipādādēṣāt Sam-
baraṃvatantram ānetum Odiyānaṃ gatau. tatra Yoginipārśve
dinacatuṣṭayam yāvat sthitau. cauryeṇa tantram ānītam. nadipāre
tayā dṛṣṭa ētāt sādhanaṃ sarvam api vāyunā nītaṃ Vairāṅganāsakāṣe.
Kukuripādaiḥ śrutam Indrabhūtipādai Lakṣmikarā’Viruvāpādaiḥ
Paṅḍapātikā Īṅgara Paṅḍapātikā(i)ḥ.

NAMAṆ ŚRĪ VAJRAYOGINYAI

prathama(m) yathāsambhava(m) pūjopakaraṇām kuryāt. agre
baliṃ sthāpya vāme madyapātram pañcapiyūṣa[m] saṁvyuktam.
vānakare candrāh daksinakare sūryaḥ. hrdrasminādena nāsāputena
niścārya kare viliya karaśodhanam tatkare madyapātram piddhāya
mantraṃśanām pujādravyam ca prokṣayet. manḍalikaraṇām ca
trikoṇakāraṇa madhye varṇ upari yathāvidhiśodhitadivyodaka-
saṃyuktasinduṣrapuṣṭā. abhāve puspādhibhir bījapuṣṭā. tadanantaram
triviśuddhim anusmaret. āṭmānaṃ traidhātukuśuddhikīṭāgarām
vicintayet. jhāṭiti nābhimandale Bhagavatīm bhāvayet. mumrādvaya-
yogao vāgjāpaḥ. tadanantaram agre niścārya pūjā stutir anmṛta-
svādanam. sarvabhaitikām dikipālebhyaḥ ṣeṣāmṛtadāhaukam.
Bhagavatīm saṃhāryabhyomnāya . . .

HOMMAGE À MAṆJUVAJRA

À MaṆjuvajra d’abord hommage, et ensuite à (Loka)nātha ! On
va énoncer la tradition de l’Amanasikāra qui a une si grande origine.
Le Bouddha, les Bodhisattvas, les Siddhas qu’ils ont instruits et
consacrés par l’onction, voilà l’ordre de succession de la doctrine.
Au début, le Très Saint, entouré des Auditeurs, se tenait sur l’emplacement—
ment (de la prédication) de la Roue de la Loi, enseignant la Pāramitā etc. Puis il quitta ce lieu et s’en alla dans le Dekkhan, agençant magiquement un Cercle ravissant appelé le Plan de la Loi. Il s’y trouvait le Chef lui-même, et aussi seize Bodhisattvas, et huit Chefs et huit Sous-Chefs. On va dire dans leur ordre leurs noms, tels qu’ils étaient placés dans le Cercle ; ce Cercle, enseigné par les Maitres, est d’accord avec la tradition. C’était Maitreya, et Kṣitigarbha, Vajrapāni, Khagarbha, et Lokesvara, Manjuśrī, et aussi Sarvanivāraṇa, Samantabhadra, Candrabha, Sūryābha, Amalakīrti, Vimalaprabha, aussi Dharmodgata, aussi Ratnamati, et Vyomagaṇja, Sudhana ; tel était leur ordre dans le Cercle. Puis quand il leur eut donné l’onction, qu’il leur eût remis la Pāramitā etc., Śākyasimha fit une prophétie sur la religion : Il y aura, dit il, le saint Nāgārjuna, de grande intelligence, qui, lui aussi, mettra en branle la Roue de la Loi. Dans ce pays-ci du Dekkhan, dans la ville de Karahāṭaka, le brahmane Trivikrama sera son père, et sa mère s’appellera Savitta (?). Ce qui suit n’est pas de la prophétie. Un certain Dāmodara, entré en religion sous le nom de Śākyamitra, s’appliquait à gagner la faveur de Ratnamati (Bodhisattva). Et un certain Advayavajra, que Vajrayogini avait pris sous son patronage, jouissait en secret pour cette raison des pouvoirs magiques ; aussi [Ratnamati] le prit en faveur, et à cause de cette faveur, on lui donna aussi ce nom (de Ratnamati). Puis vint le bruit de Hayagrīva aux cinq visions (?) . . . Et alors en compagnie de Ratnamati (II) il (Dāmodara) partit pour Varendri (= le Rarh, au Bengale). Nāgārjuna y demeurait ; il avait tracé une (image ?) du sage Bodhisattva et il lui rendait un culte quotidien. Or, dans un village du nom de (Daṣa ?) pura vivait à l’écart, dans le recueillement, un acteur nommé Loka et sa femme nommée Gaurā. Leur fils est Triśaraṇa. Il (Nāgārjuna) leur montre à eux deux l’autre Ratnamati (le Bodhisattva) au milieu des saints. Il dit au (fils) : Tu ne le vois pas ? Comment pourrais-tu le voir à l’instant, puisqu’il te manque l’instant de connaissance (nécessaire) ? Triśaraṇa lui répliqua : Eh bien, favorise-moi que je puisse voir ce Protecteur avec l’œil de la connaissance, dépassant les sens. Avec l’autorisation du saint Nāgārjuna il devint alors un Siddha ; dès lors il reçut les faveurs du Bodhisattva à chaque occasion. Il se retira pour ses pratiques au Manobhaṅga et au Cittavisrāma, et là, prenant l’aspect d’un Śavara, il s’installa en résidence.

Telle est la Tradition des Bouddhas, des Bodhisattvas, des Siddhas et la Tradition des noms.


Va, c’est la compassion. Ja, c’est la vacuité. Ra, c’est l’un des deux : morphènes du dehors ou du passé qui n’ont pas la lettre ra. Le son hi, c’est la non-perception des causes (h-etànupalabdhi-). Ainsi Vārāhi précédée de Vajra (Vajra Vārāhi), c’est la purification au Sens Ultime. Le triangle, c’est la purification du corps, de la parole, de la pensée. Comme la cause et l’effet sont indivisibles, le triangle (exprime) l’égalité dharmodayā.

(Suit la description d’un rite pour évoquer Vajrayogīni.)


HOMMAGE À ŚAVAREŚVARA

Or ici-bas, dans la Contrée du Milieu, il y a une grande ville appelée “Kapilavastu des Lotus” ; tout près, il y a une bourgade du nom de Jhāṭakaraṇi. En cet endroit réside un brahmane nommé Nānukā et sa femme de caste brahmanique nommée Sādhvī. Dans le cours du temps ils eurent un fils appelé Dāmodara. Quand le garçon eut environ onze ans, et qu’il connut la moitié du Sāmaveda, il quitta sa famille et devint ascète ekadaṇḍa sous le nom de Martabodha (?). Ensuite il apprit la grammaire de Pāṇini ; au bout de sept ans il possédait tout sāstra. Pendant vingt ans il apprit chez le vénérable Nāro les traités de logique, de philosophie Mādhyamika (?), du Pāramitānaya etc. Ensuite il demeura cinq ans avec Rāgavajra qui connaissait les textes du Mantranaya. Après cela il s’attacha pendant un an au vénérable et saint maître Ratnākaraśānti pour apprendre l’état d’esprit du sans-Morphe. Puis il se rendit à Vikramāsilā près du grand savant Jñānaśrimitra pour étudier son traité pendant deux ans. De là il partit à Vikramapura où il devint moine sous le nom de Maitrigupta dans l’école Sammatiṣya. Il étudia les Trois Corbeilles du Sūtra, de l’Abhidharma, du Vinaya pendant quatre (ans) ; il pratiqua la récitation murmurée des Formules selon la tradition de Pañcakrama-Tārā, et cela dix millions de fois, avec le sens des quatre sceaux (mahā°, samaya°, dharma°, karma°). La
Sainte (?) lui dit en songe : Va-t-en à Khasarpaṇa. Il quitta son couvent, alla à Khasarpaṇa, y resta un an. Et de nouveau la voix lui dit en songe : Va-t-en, fils de la Famille, dans le Dekkhan, où sont les deux montagnes Manobhaṅga et Cittaviśrāma, c'est là que demeure le prince des Śavaras. Il te traitera avec faveur. Et là le nommé Sāgara te rencontrera sur ta route. Ce prince de sang royal habite maintenant le pays de Rāṭaḥ (Rāḍha = Râh); marche en compagnie avec lui. Il partit, rencontra Sāgara, et tant qu’il fut dans le Pays du Nord, il ne put rien savoir du Manobhaṅga et du Cittaviśrāma. Il alla à Śrī Dhānya(kaṭaka), y resta un an ; ensuite dans la région Nord du Nord-Ouest il se mit à évoquer la Tārā du lieu (?). Au bout d’un mois il eut un songe : Va-t-en, fils de la Famille; dans le pays au Nord-Ouest il y a les deux montagnes accolées ; on y arrive en quinze jours. Sur l’indication de la Sainte il part vers le pays du Nord-Ouest avec des ....; au bout de la route ils rencontrent un homme qui leur dit : Demain vous atteindrez le Manobhaṅga et le Cittaviśrāma ; vous y aurez un heureux séjour. À l’entendre, le docteur fut très content, et le lendemain il était arrivé. Sur la montagne il faisait tous les jours dix dizaines de Circles ; il commença par se nourrir de bulbes, de racines, de fruits ; au bout de dix jours, il s’installa sur le plat d’un rocher et l’esprit unifié il se mit à observer le jeûne. Le septième jour il a une vision en songe. Le dixième jour, il se mettait à se trancher le cou quand il eut soudain la vision directe ; il lui rend hommage. Advayavajra ... pendant douze jours fit le commentaire merveilleux des quatre Sceaux du Paṅcakrama, et puis encore pendant cinq jours l’Instruction. Il joua de la vīṇā en prenant pour modèle tous les Dharmas. Padmāvalī ... Jñānāvalī ... sur l’ordre du prince des Śavaras, montra l’illusion de l’attentat à la vie etc. À ce moment Sāgara fait voir l’Arrangement du corps. Le docteur lui dit : Très Saint, comment se fait-il que je ne puisse pas, moi, agencer magiquement l’Arrangement du corps ? Le prince des Śavaras lui dit : C’est à cause de l’Imagination différenciée. Le docteur lui dit : Alors que dois-je faire ? Que votre Révérence me donne ses ordres ! Le souverain des Śavaras lui dit : Tu y réussiras dès cette vie-ci ; fais la clarté de la vision sur le nom. Advayavajra dit : Très Saint, je suis incapable de le faire ; comment le ferai-je ? Il [Śavaresvara] lui dit : Tu le feras ici même grâce à l’Instruction de Vajrayogini, et le fruit en fructifiéra. Ayant énoncé l’Instruction, le Saint disparut.

Ce n’est pas un animal des bois ni un petit de sanglier ; c’est une
belle des bois qui est là avec son visage de pleine lune. Grâce aux agencements magiques agencés pour rendre service à celui qui en a besoin, (elle) se tient sur le rocher (en prenant la forme d’un) prince des Šavaras.

Tel est, dans l’Amanasikāra, l’ordre de succession tel qu’il a été entendu.

(Suit l’indication des rites à accomplir; à la fin du rite, il est prescrit de réciter comment la Formule fut donnée et comment se sont succédé les Maîtres et aussi leur histoire; cette récitation a pour objet de provoquer la foi et d’attirer les disciples vers l’étude.)

Sur l’indication du vénérable Lūyī, ils allèrent tous les deux en Odīyāna pour en rapporter le Sambarārṇava tantra. Ils y restèrent quatre jours auprès d’une Yogini, dérobèrent le tantra et l’emportèrent par delà le fleuve . . . (Le tantra ?) a été entendu par Ku-kuri, par Indrabhūti, par Lakṣmīkarā (et Virūpa ?) Painḍapātika, Ďīṅgara Painḍapātika.

(Suit le rituel du culte de Vajrayogini, dont le début seul est conservé dans le manuscrit.)
Griechische Militärische Wörter Im Indischen

Von B. LIEBICH


Wer die Sorgfalt kennt, mit der alle irgendwie bemerkenswerten Wörter der indischen Sprache von den einheimischen Wörterbüchern registriert werden, darunter vielfach solche, die in der sonstigen Literatur nicht einmal belegt sind, wird das Fehlen dieses Wortes z.B. unter den elf Synonymen von „Heer“, die der Amarakośa im Kṣatriya-Kapitel (ii, 8) aufzählt, ebenso in der Vaijayanti und den zahlreichen sonstigen Wörterbüchern merkwürdig genug finden, und es ist in der Tat eigentlich nur so zu verstehen, dass es sich hier um ein Wort handelt, das nur beschränkte Verbreitung, eben im Nordwesten, besass, im übrigen Indien dagegen unbekannt geblieben ist. Das erweckt wieder den Verdacht auf Entlehnung, und da für ein Wort in dieser Bedeutung die kulturlosen Aboriginer nicht in Frage kommen, auf Entlehnung aus der Sprache einer Militärmacht, mit der der Nordwesten in der fraglichen Zeit in Berührung kam.

Die Form des indischen Wortes würde, wenn die oben vermutete Entlehnung aus lat. campus zutrifft, auf Durchgang durchs Griechische weisen, da das n des indischen Wortes den griechischen Akkusativ καμπόν (kāmpōn) als unmittelbare Quelle erkennen lässt. Es wurde gezeigt, dass kāmpos als Lehnwort im Griechischen seit etwa 100 n.Chr. in der Literatur und in Papyrusfunden bezeugt ist.


Wenn auch eine Entlehnung durch Klarstellung der lautlichen und Bedeutungsverhältnisse als möglich erwiesen ist, so gelangt man zur
Überzeugung von ihrer Richtigkeit doch gewöhnlich erst dann, wenn sie nicht ganz vereinzelt bleibt, sondern wenn sich herausstellt, dass eine Gruppe von mehreren Wörtern der gleichen Begriffssphäre in der gleichen Epoche denselben Weg genommen hat. Man denke z.B. an die Entlehnungen des Indischen aus der griechischen Astronomie, wobei jeder Zweifel ausgeschlossen ist. Da mir 1924 noch kein ähnlich gelageter Fall bekannt war, hielt ich es für angezeigt, auf diesen schwachen Punkt durch das dem Titel beigefügte Fragezeichen hinzuweisen.

Schon im folgenden Jahre kam ein zweiter Fall hinzu, indem O. Stein in der Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik Bd. III in einem ausführlichen Aufsatz nachwies, dass das indische Wort surūngā „Mine, unterirdischer Gang“ auf das griechische Wort σῶρος (sōrinx) zurückgeführt werden müsse, das neben seiner Hauptbedeutung „Flöte“ die gleiche übertragene Bedeutung entwickelt hat. Seine gelehrten und scharfsinnigen Ausführungen haben, soviel ich sehe, allgemeine Zustimmung gefunden.¹


Wie die Sprachgeschichte allerorten zeigt, treten neue Namen für Haustiere gewöhnlich in Zusammenhang mit neuen Rassen in die Erscheinung, und so ist es offenbar auch hier gewesen. Wenn neben

¹ [Vgl. Winternitz, IHQ. i, 429 sq.; Zeitschr. f. Indol. iv, 345 sq.—Ed.]
die uralte, schon aus indo-iranischer Zeit stammende Benennung uṣṭra für Camelus bactrianus, das grosse zweihöckrige ¹ Kamel, dessen Heimat Zentralasien ist, um den Beginn unserer Zeitrechnung der Name kramēla tritt, so bezieht sich dieser jedenfalls auf das kleinere und flinkere einhöckrige Kamel, mit dem die Inder zuerst durch die vorderasiatischen Kamelreiterkorps der griechischen Heere in der Diadochenzeit bekannt wurden, da nur dieses sich zur Verwendung im Kriege eignet. Und wie für diese Art oder Abart ² die Griechen etwas später die Namen δρομᾶς κάμηλος (dromás kāmēlos), δρομεδάριος (dromedários) einführten, die, von δρόμος (drómo) „Lauf“ abgeleitet, auf die wichtigste Eigenschaft der neuen Tierform hinwiesen, ebenso verfuhrten unbewusst die Inder, wenn sie das für sie nichtssagende Fremdwort kāmēlos mit ihrer W. kram „schreiten“ in Verbindung brachten, sodass es nun für sie die von Kṣirasvāmin angegebene Bedeutung gewann.

Da aber die Kamelreitertruppe sich im indischen Heere nicht einbürgerte, wie ihre Verwendung sich auch heut auf Vorderasien und Nordafrika beschränkt, so blieb auch das alte Wort uṣṭra zugleich mit der alten zweihöckrigen Form in Indien herrschend und wurde nicht, wie wir das in solchen Fällen oft sehen,³ zusammen mit der alten Rasse verdrängt.


¹ Vgl. z.B. Mahābhārata xii, 177, 12: maṇiṇoṣṭrasya lambete priyau vatsatarau mama „wie die beiden Hocker des uṣṭra hängen herunter meine lieben Stiere“. Der Vers ist alt, denn er wird schon in der Kāśīkā (i, 1, 11, siebentes Jh.) zitiert. Er steht in der Geschichte des armen Maṅki, der für sein letztes Geld zwei junge Stiere gekauft hatte. Als sich dieselben einst zusammen gekoppelt auf dem Felde befanden, stürzten sie sich auf ein dort liegendes Kamel, sodass sie zu beiden Seiten von dessen Halse waren. Das Kamel erhob sich und rannte mit den Rindern davon, die in der Luft baumelnd krepiereten.

² Da das Dromedar im embryonalen Zustand auch zwei Hocker besitzt, aus deren Zusammenwachsen erst sekundär der spätere eine Höcker hervorgeht, so besteht die Möglichkeit, dass Camelus dromedarius nicht als eigene Art, sondern als eine durch den Menschen gezüchtete Kulturart aus C. bactrianus aufzufassen ist.

³ Man denke z.B. an den altgermanischen Namen des Pferdes, gotisch aīhun-, altsächsisch ehu, angelsächsisch eoh, verwandt mit lat. equus usw.

Sollte nicht auch die Einteilung des Tages und der Nacht, namentlich der letzteren, in vier *yāma* oder *prahara* zu je drei Stunden, die etwa um dieselbe Zeit in der indischen Literatur auftritt und mit der altindischen Einteilung des Tages in dreissig *muhāra* (= 48 Minuten) in keinem organischen Zusammenhang steht, letzten Endes auf die vier *vigiliae* des römischen Heeres zu je drei Stunden zurückgehen? Auch hier dürfte das griechische Heerwesen wohl am wahrscheinlichsten die Vermittlerrolle gespielt haben.

In diesem Zusammenhang wäre schliesslich, als an das militärische Gebiet streifend, die in der indischen Literatur oft erwähnte Leibgarde der indischen Fürsten aus griechischen Sklavinnen (*Yavani*) zu erwähnen, die aber wegen ihrer sonstigen kulturhistorischen Beziehungen eine gesonderte Betrachtung erheischt.
Sur le génitif sanskrit "máma"

Par A. Meillet

Le génitif du pronom personnel sanskrit de première personne máma est isolé en indo-européen ; aucune autre langue n'en offre le correspondant. Au contraire, la forme iranienne mana a un correspondant exact dans mene du vieux slave, dont l'antiquité est confirmée par les formes des langues balto-iraniennes. Il est naturel de conclure de là que máma est une forme altérée, et mana la forme ancienne de l'indo-iranien.

Dans le volume III de la belle Altindische Grammatik qu'il vient de publier en collaboration avec M. Debrunner, M. Wackernagel, § 228a, p. 461, maintient cependant une opinion contraire : skr. máma continuait l'ancienne forme indo-iranienne ; iran. mana et sl. mene en seraient des formes altérées par dissimulation ; l'indo-iranien mama représenterait un ancien ama reposant sur eme que supposeraient les formes grecques et arméniennes ; et m- y serait rétabli d'après d'autres formes du pronom. Hypothèses compliquées ; mais les développements linguistiques ne sont pas toujours simples. Il en faut examiner le détail pour faire la critique de l'explication ; le problème est menu en apparence ; mais il touche à des questions capitales pour l'étude des langues indo-européennes.

Voici quelques-unes des objections qui se présentent contre l'explication admise comme possible par M. Wackernagel.

D'abord la dissimulation de *meme en *mene qu'il faudrait admettre pour l'iranien, le slave et le baltique est insolite : faute de trouver des mots comparables, on ne saurait prouver que m-m... a subsisté ; mais on n'observe pas de dissimulation pareille dans les langues considérées. Tant qu'il n'aura pas été indiqué de cas comparables, l'hypothèse est gratuite. — M. Wackernagel enseigne, il est vrai, que h du skr. máhyam en face de túḥyam résulterait aussi d'une dissimilation ; mais les formes italiques, lat. mihi, etc., montrent que la guttulare de máhyam est ancienne ; le datif arménien inj en fournit la preuve décisive, avec son j qui ne peut sortir que de ĝh.

L'hypothèse a, d'autre part, l'inconvénient de rompre des concordances dialectales remarquables. Pour le pronom de seconde personne, l'indo-iranien a une forme táva (skr. táva, iran. tava), qui concorde avec la forme *tewe du slave et du baltique ; au contraire,
l’arménien s’accorde avec le grec à offrir des formes reposant sur *twe, gr. σέ arm. k'o ( issu de *two), donc des formes à vocalisme radical zéro.

La structure de iran. tava est toute pareille à celle de mana, et ce parallélisme est significatif.

Il reste à interpréter les formes commençant par *em- sur lesquelles reposent gr. ēµé, arm. im. À en juger par le génitif *twe de 2e personne, on attend ici des formes à vocalisme zéro *me. C’est ce qu’indique l’adjectif possessif où gr. ēµós, σós et arm. im, k'o concordent avec iran. ma-θva-. La voyelle initiale de gr. ēµé et arm. im n’a pas de valeur organique : le grec et l’arménien, entre autres particularités communes, offrent des voyelles prothétiques régulièrement devant r-, sporadiquement devant m-, n-, l-. Et, en effet, tandis que le védiq accentue táva, sur la première syllabe, l’attique a ēµé, ēµoθ comme σé, σοθ. Le hittite ammug “me, mihi” ne prouve pas que la voyelle initiale de gr. ēµé, arm. im soit organique ; le timbre ne concorde pas avec celui des formes grecques et arméniennes ; l’hypothèse d’une prothèse n’est d’ailleurs pas exclue en hittite ; il faut en réserver la possibilité.

On n’a donc pas le droit d’affirmer que l’indo-iranien ait pu hériter de la forme *ama sur laquelle est construite l’hypothèse de M. Wackernagel.

Dès l’instant que skr. máma est reconnu pour une forme secondaire, on est amené à poser une opposition dialectale de indo-iranien *mána, táva, baltique et slave *mene, *tewe et de grec *(e)mé, *(e)wé (σέ), arménien *(e)mơ, *(e)wơ (historiquement k'o).

L’m intérieure de skr. máma résulte d’un effort pour donner un sens étymologique à la forme *mána qui n’était pas analysable. Le pronom de 2e personne offre une innovation de type différent, mais qui aboutit aussi à rapprocher des autres formes une forme aberrante : au datif la forme gáthique taιbyā est ancienne, à en juger par v. sl. tebe, v. pruss. tebbei, ombr. tefe (lat. tibi) ; d’après d’autres formes qui, toutes, avaient tu- ou te-, le sanskrit a changé *tábhya(m) en tábhya(m). L’innovation d’où résulte máma et celle d’où résulte tábhyaam proviennent d’une même tendance à normaliser les formes du pronom personnel, à les rendre intelligibles ; le sanskrit opère en effet avec des formes qui souvent sont ainsi analysables ; or, *mána, *tábhya(m) entraient mal dans le système. Si le sanskrit a, mieux que l’iranien, gardé la consonne intérieure dans máhya(m), c’est, en partie du moins, parce que, après le passage de *tábhya(m) à
tūbhya(m), la ressemblance de structure avec le pronom de 2e personne était diminuée ; en iranien, il a été facile de faire *mabya d’après *tabya.

Tous les faits s’accordent donc pour établir le caractère secondaire de skr. māma.

Les concordances dialectales qu’on a été amené à poser entre l’indo-iranien, le slave et le baltique, d’une part, le grec et l’arménien, de l’autre, sont remarquables et concordent avec beaucoup d’autres. Il y a un troisième type de concordances, qui elles aussi ne sont pas isolées, entre le latin et le germanique qui, l’un et l’autre, emploient pour le génitif du pronom personnel des formes de l’adjectif possessif.
The Name *Munjān* and Some Other Names of Places and Peoples in the Hindu Kush

By G. Morgenstierne

At present Munjān is the name of the upper part of the Kokcha valley, above the place where the Anjuman-Kurān stream joins the main river. According to Yule 1 the district formerly extended towards the north-west, right up to the neighbourhood of Khānābād and Tālikān. However this may be, some place-names seem to indicate that Munjī was once spoken further north than is the case at present.2

The inhabitants call the district Munjān, themselves Munjī(y) (plur. Munjī(y)i), and their Ir. language Munjī’roī. The name Munjān is used also by most of their neighbours, such as the Persian-speaking Tajiks, the Kati and the Kalasha Kafirs, with slightly varying pronunciation.

Munjān is apparently an arabized Prs. form of Mungān,3 Hūan Tsang’s (acc. to Karlgren’s restitution) Mun-γ’im (= *Mungān). Accordingly the present form of the name cannot be considered as being of genuine Munji origin.

Marquart 4 mentions from Ya’qūbī the form مندجان, and from Bērūni’s Canon مندجان, which he identifies with Hūan Tsang’s Mung-kien (Munγ’im). This word *Mund(a)γān, *Mund(a)jān, used by the Arab geographers, is nearly identical with Mandel’zān, the name for Munjān in the Ir. dialect of Sangléch.

Evidently this word is connected with Mungān, Munjān; but I am not in a position to explain the origin of the pronunciation -δγ-, -dez-... At any rate, the Sangl. word must have been borrowed from Prs., as in Sangl. an Ir. -ān- results in -ān, -ōn.5 In loanwords Sangl. sometimes substitutes i for ĭ.

Of greater interest is the name for Munjān used in Yidgāh, an Ir.

1 Quoted by Marquart, Eränsahr, pp. 226, 231.
2 V. Morgenstierne, An Etymological Vocabulary of Pashto, s.v. waryāmai.
3 Eränsahr, p. 226; Barkhan-ud-Din-khan-i-Kushkeki, Kattagan i Badakhshan, Tashkund, 1926, p. 134.
4 Loc. cit.
5 e.g. potān "thigh" < Av. paitišana-, zūrēg "knee". Cf. also the treatment of ā in a local name, such as Izi’eük = Prs. Zēbak, with that in the word Cu’trāz "Chitrāl".
dialect spoken in the Lutkoh valley of Chitral, and very closely related to Munji. Here Munján is called Bre'γeyo (Brα'γeyo, Brα'γayo), a word which has the appearance of being native to Yidgaha, and very possibly once used by the Munjis themselves.

Yd. br- cannot represent an ancient br-, which regularly results in er.¹ The only other Yd. word with br- known to me is 'br¿yiko, Mj. 'br¿yiko “a sparrow”. The corresponding Sangl. word is mœrγyγ < *m¿γakâ, and similar words are found in many Ir. dialects.

If we assume that *m¿γa- in Mj.-Yd. in the first instance resulted in *m¿γ-, the further development into *mbr- > br- would be quite regular; cf. e.g. abrúo “pear”, Prs. amrúu,² and the general transition of mb > b.

There seems to me to be no doubt that this derivation of 'br¿yiko must be correct (regarding Bre'γeyo v. below), although I am not able to adduce any other certain instances of a similar treatment of r.³ On the other hand, there is no word known to me which disproves this treatment of *m¿γ- in Yd. m¿rγ(ik)ə “meadow”, Mj. mœrγo, mœrγa, Sangl. mœrγ are probably derived from *margyâ-, Av. mar añã-, cf. Kurd. m¿rγ.—Yd. mœrγo, Mj. mœrgiko, etc., “ant” < *mœrγyγ < *mar¿kâ-; Yd. mœr, Mj. mœr “man” < *margyâ-. We find *m¿γ- in Yd. mu¿ρo, Mj. mu¿r “dead”, and in Yd. mœlýo, etc., “clay” < *mœl¿ka- (?). In these words, however, the r was followed by a dental with which the r may have come into close contact and have been partly assimilated before the group *m¿γ- developed into *m¿γ-.

The initial part of Bre'γeyo must likewise be derived from *M¿γo.⁴ Theoretically *M¿k- might be possible, as -g- and -k- both result in

---

¹ e.g. vraγ ‘brother’. Mj. brüpt “moustache” is a loanword, Yd. svraï being adapted to the phonetical system of the dialect.
² Yd. mœ¿γ “mulberry” is a recent loanword from Khowar. Khow. bronzo “meadow”, Kalâsha brun(s), Damel brás, Palola brhãszu, Kati brúz(s), Prasun mœn all appear to be derived from *mœrγon < *m(a)râ-. This looks like an Ir. word; but Prs. marz “border, field with raised borders” does not suit the meaning.
³ Generally r results in Mj.-Yd. ir, when influential by labials in ur, the r being exposed to assimilation with some types of following consonants.—Before groups of consonants: Yd. xirâ-: xirâ “to shave”, Mj. xrod-: xrest “to scratch” prob. < *xrint-: *xrista-, cf. Paht. xriγol; a derivation from *kœnt- would not account for the x.—Yd. tuñæ “thirsty” and triγo “sour” are difficult words, which present phonetical irregularities in several Ir. dialects.—Yd. pañke-drı “dung of goats and sheep” seems, however, to be derived from *dri-, cf. Sangl. wəd̪i “dung of cows”, Sghb. dïd “dung”, Wakhī (Zarubin) ìàrt, Sarik. (Belëw) ñiγ (written thiγ), Wershikwar (Zar.) dêl (prob. borr. from Ir.).
⁴ One informant pronounced ‘brayiko, Brα'γayo, another ‘brayiko, Bre'γayo. The unstressed e may easily correspond to the stressed à. LSI. gives Yd. breyiko.
-γ- in Yd. and parts of Munjān; but I think *Mfg- is the more probable form.

With the ending -eγo, -ayo we may compare the Yd. place-names Či'tr-éγo, -āγo "Chitral", and Šo'γ-yo "Shoghor, n. of a village in Lutkhoh, in Khwarar territory".

Šo'γ-yo corresponds to Khow. Šo'γor, Tajik-Prs. and Sangl. Šo'γot. The Yd. and Prs. words have been borrowed from an earlier Khow. form *Šoγoδ. In Tajiki -d (> -t, cf. bāt "was") was substituted for -δ; the Sangl. word was taken over from Prs.

In a similar way the name of Chitral has been borrowed into Yd. at an early date, before the loss of intervocalic dentals.

The indigenous Khwarar name of this country and its capital is Če'trār (or Čhe'trār ?), while the northern Kalasha form is Čhe'trāu, gen. Čhe'trālas. Khow. -r, N. Kal. -u (-l-) point to ancient *-δ < *-t-. The forms in -l which appear in most neighbouring dialects have either been borrowed from Kal. or are due to dissimilation. Such forms are e.g. S. Kalasha Čā'tral, Dameli Ča'tral, Palola Če'trāl, Bashkarik Ča'laλa, Shina Čācāl f., Kati iŠtōl. In Sangl. we find the recently borrowed form Če'trāl, and the more ancient designation of the whole country Šām-Čatāδ.3

Sangl. Ča'trāδ is probably borrowed from an archaic Khow. *Č(h)etraδ, rather than from a still older form *Čhetraṭ-. In that case we should expect ā to have developed into ō, ū, and possibly also ĉ into c (ts).

Yd. Či'trēyo may have been borrowed from an ancient form in t, intervocalic -t- resulting in Yd. -γ-. But on its way towards -γ- the

---

1 As in Khow. dril "inflated skin" < *drir < dṛti.
2 The original Kati name is Bīlgō, possibly connected with Kal. Balalik, the name of a people inhabiting Chitral before the arrival of Khos and Kalashas. This people is called Jāš in Kati.
3 In Sangl. the country is often simply called Kō'stān "Kohistan". Šām probably originally denotes Upper Chitral, cf. Prasun Kafir Šim-gol, Sīnai-gul "Chitral", and Chinese Šang-mi (anc. Šaŋ-mi). The Sangl. name for the Kho tribe is Kūrī, cf. Yd. Kūa, Chinese K'o-wei, and Elphinstone's Kobi "the distinctive name of the people of Kāshkār or Chitral" (v. Erānsahr, p. 244).—The Kalashas call the Khos Pātū, a name which might phonetically be derived from *Pārt(h)ava-, and taken as referring to a Parthian group of invaders, to whom is possibly due the introduction of a certain number of middle Ir. words into Khwarar. In a similar way the Gawar-Bati name of Chitral, Mongul, is said to refer to the Moghul descent of the present reigning family.—Among the Palola speaking Dangariks of Southern Chitral the Khos are called Gā'kā, a name related to Gēk, the Bashkarik designation for the country of Chitral.
original -t- passed through the stage -s- (ancient -s- having already become -l-), and it is more likely that the word was adopted into Yd. at a time when this language as well as Khow. had both reached the stage -s- < -t-.

The -e- in Či'trej is of doubtful origin. Usually an ancient ā results in Yd. ā, ī, e.g. vūi (some Mj. diall. wiy) "wind", lī- "gave", etc. ē < ā is found in Mj. zšēnā "supper", Yd.-Mj. vēri "brother's son", wulēyo "span" (*widā-ī, cf. Sangl. wūdu, Shgh. wīdēd). In these cases the ē is due to epenthesis, and from a strictly phonological point of view we should expect that the Yd. form had been borrowed from *Cheṭrād < *Kšērād- (cf. the fem. gender in Shina). But it must be admitted that such a form appears strange, and, besides, we should perhaps expect the epenthesis to have affected the Khow. form, too. Cf. kimēri "woman" < kumārikā-. The fem. -o has been added in Mj.-Yd.

In any case it is probable that Bre'yejo, too, contains an original -t-, and the original form would be something like *Mṛgatā.

Now the genuine Kati name of Munjān is Mṛgul. gul means "valley, country", and with mṛā (or mṛūsa), cf. mṛōn "female markhor" (Waigeli mrena, etc.) < *mṛga/i, and mṛōnec "sparrow" < *mṛga-či (?). Regarding the secondary nasal after initial nasal v.

An Etymol. Voc. of Pashto, s.v. mōr, and cf. e.g. Nāngar "Nagar", a village in Chitrāl.

Thus the Kati name, too, appears to be derived from a stem Mṛga-, and one is led to consider the possibility of explaining the name Munjān, Munjān in a similar way. In several Ir. dialects of the Hindu-Kush and Pamir m results in n, and a development *Mṛg- > *Mun- > Mun- does not seem impossible.

Regarding the original meaning of the name it is worth noticing that the Prasun Kafirs call Munjān Šabol, a word which seems to be connected with Skr. śāvala- "grass, grassy spot".

According to Robertson, the only European who has visited Munjān, this valley is "practically treeless, but is noted for its good grazing". And it seems probable that the name of the valley is either

1 *-t- is phonetically possible, but not probable.
2 In myths and legends Kāmor is used, cf. Pomor = Munjān on the map in Robertson's The Kafirs of the Hindu-Kush?
3 Cf. Mj. amingo "apple", Psh. mana, etc. < -marn-.
4 Pras.-b- < -de- ; cf. -p- < -te- in ėpā "4", Yūpo "Kati, Ktiv" < *Katvi (-?).
5 Op. cit., p. 320. [In 1924 Vavilov passed through the valley.]
originally connected with the group of words represented by Av. mārayā- "meadow", or has secondarily been interpreted as meaning "meadow". It is not probable that this name has anything to do with Meru, Anc. Prs. Manguś.

The Yidgah language, a comparatively recent offshoot of Munjī, is called in Mj. and Yd. Yed'ya, Mj. also Yūd'gāna roī. A man from Lutkoh is called Yd. 'Idγ, plur. Idγē, Mj. Yidγ, plur. Yūd'gī. The Yidgah-speaking part of Lutkoh is called Yd. 'Idγ, also used in the obl. pl. Idγef, Mj. Yūd'yūn, Prs. and Khow. Injīgūn.

All these forms are derived from a base *(h)ind'i/ka-, or possibly *wind-. It is not probable that the word has anything to do with "Hind", etc., and originally denoted the part of the Munjī tribe settling on the Indian side of the passes. Chitral has not, till quite recently, been considered as a part of India.

A number of other names of places and peoples current among the tribes of the Hindu-Kush appear to be ancient, and may perhaps one day be traced in literary sources. I shall mention a few instances only.

The Kalashas call themselves Ka'laša, but the Kati name is Kas'wo, Prasun 'Kaswo, -wo, -wa being a usual adjective suffix.

Kafiristan is called Čatruma-dēš in Kalasha, while Pa'rōγ in Sangl. means a Kafir. Waigel, Wai'ghāu, gen. Wai'ghālas in Kal., is called Ḡ'mā, Ḡ'mā (=*Katruma-?) by the Prasuns. This curious and isolated Kafir tribe use the name Wasi (<*Pasūn) for themselves. This word is certainly connected with Kati Prasū, Psīwul (<*Prasūgul), and possibly also with Prs. Pa'rūn, Sangl. Pō'rūn. The original form may have been something like *Parsūn. Cf. also Ashkun Pāδ, Waig. Piē. A different name for Prasun is Yd. Wīrōn, Prs. Wīrōn (-r- possibly <*θr), cf. Kal. Wetr and We-dēś (<*Wetr-dēś).

The imposing mountain, visible from afar, which dominates Chitral and the surrounding districts, is known by a number of names. In Khow. it is called Terīč Mēr, a name which I, following a suggestion of Professor Konow's, have ventured to derive from Skr. *tirica-, and Meru.1 Sangl. Tālaš Mīr and Kal. Taraś Mīr are simply borrowed from Khow. But other Kal. forms, Tarič and Tarzič Mīu would seem to indicate a derivation from *Mēr-, *Mēl-, not *Mēr.-2 It is, however, possible that Kal. -u, -l- has been substituted for Khow. -r, according to the usual scheme of phonetical correspondences between the two languages.

One Kati name is Māksārakṣtu, another, used in Urtsun, is Mezirī Min; cf. Maisur Mun, which, according to the Military Report on Chitrāl, is said to be the Kafir name of Terich Mer. Another Kati name is Dego-nos (nos "nose": Kati nasur, Waig. nas). The Sanglechis, finally, use a modern Muslim designation: Xośa Nīmkū Sarvār.¹

Additional Note.—In his posthumous work, Das erste Kapitel des Gāthā uśtavatī, p. 42 (cf. also Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran, pp. 86, 137 sqq.), Markwart (Marquart) for historical and geographical reasons, identifies Munjān with the country of the sakā haumavṛgā.—It is tempting to compare M.Ir. *(h)oṃwuy- with *Mrg- (v. above, p. 442). But, although an initial (h)a- seems to have been elided in Mj. in a few words, no instance is known of a long vowel or diphthong being lost. Note, however, Greek Αὐργοῦ, and other forms which suggest the possibility of an early shortening of the initial part of this word. Besides, the development does not necessarily belong to Mj. itself.

The suffix -eyo in Bre'gyeyo (v. p. 442) may be a later addition, due to the influence of such names as Čityeyo, So'gyeyo.

¹ Cf. "Tiraj Mir or Sarowar": Raverty, Notes on Afghanistan, p. 188; Stein, Serindia, i, p. 51.
A Khāroṣṭhī Inscription from Endere

By Peter S. Noble

Among the numerous Khāroṣṭhī documents recovered from Chinese Turkestan and transcribed and edited by A. M. Boyer, E. J. Rapson, and E. Senart, is one which is in many ways unique. This is the oblong wooden tablet which is numbered 661 in the second volume of these scholars' Khāroṣṭhī Inscriptions, where there is given on plate xii a photographic reproduction of the document in question. It is one of the few documents discovered at Endere, which seems in ancient times to have been a sort of military fort situated about half-way between Charchan (Calmadanā of the inscriptions) and Nina or Niya (Caḍ'ota). Not only does it show some marked peculiarities of alphabet, dialect, and general style of composition, but as can be seen from the reproduction the form of writing also is quite unusual. It is written in a very stiff and archaic form of script, but the ink is fresh and the writing is very well preserved and clear and Konow is probably right when he says in his paper on "The Names of the Kings in the Niya documents", published in Acta Orientalia, that "it does not seem possible to ascribe a late date to E. vi, ii, i, which is probably not an original but a copy from an old tablet". Various indications supporting this view of a very early date for the original of this document will be noticed in the course of the following commentary. For the sake of convenience of reference, I repeat the text of the inscription here.

samvatsare 10 maṣ. e 3 dhivajha 10 4 4 ija ch'unami khotana maharaya rayatiraya hinajhasya avij'idasimhasya ta kali asti manus'a nag'arag'a khvarnarase nama tatha madra(di asti mayi uatha tanuva'g'ah so uatha aphiña'nu haradi dhahi aghita drij'u VAS'O ta idani so uño vikrinámi mulyána maṣā sahasra aṣṭi 4 4 1000 sulig'a vaga'iti vadhag'asya sag'aj'i tasya uṭasya kida vag'iti vadhag'a niravas'iso mulyo maṣā dhitu khvarnarasya grahidy s'udhi uvag'adu aji uvadayi so utha vag'iti vadhag'asya tanuva'g'ah samvritaḥ yatha g'ama g'araniyaḥ sarva kica karaniyaḥ yo pacema kali tasya uṭasya kidá cudiyadi vidiyadi vivadu uthaviyadi tāna tatha dhādu dhinadi yatha rajadhatu syadi maya dhavala'g'u bahudhivā likhidu khvarnarasya ajiṣanayi puradu SPA S'A NA.

nani vadhag'a sach'i, s'as'ivaka sach'i, spaniyaka sach'i.
Though I am unable to offer, even tentatively, a complete translation of this inscription, yet, inasmuch as it is more free from common words which are clearly of non-Indian origin than practically all the other inscriptions in the collection, leaving aside the four words dhahi aghita drij’u VAS’O, one may translate the remainder as follows:—

"On the eighteenth day of the third month of the tenth year of this regnal period of the great king of Khotan, the supreme lord Hinajha Avijitasimha, at this time there is a man of the city who is called Khvarnarse. He makes the following statement. I possess a camel which is my own property. This camel Aph’iinanu carries off ... Therefore I now sell this camel at the price of one thousand and eight 1008 māsā to the Tibetan Vag’iti Vadhaq’a. In regard to this camel Vag’iti Vadhaq’a has paid the full price in māsā and Khvarnarsa has received it and a quittance has been reached. From this time henceforth the camel has become the property of Vag’iti Vadhaq’a to do with it as he pleases and to use it for all purposes. If anyone at a later time regarding this camel shall enter any objection or make any report or a dispute arises, by so doing he shall pay such fine as the law of the realm shall decree.

"This was written by me Dhavalagu Bahudhiva for the instruction of Khvarnarse in the presence of SPA S’A NA (that is the initials of the witnesses).

"The witnesses were Nani Vadhaq’a, S‘as’ivaka Spaniyaka."

Comment

mas. e. As can be seen in the reproduction on plate xiii, there is at the foot of the letter s in this word a sweeping curve from left to right, and their inability to account for this curve the editors have signified by a blank. Konow in his version transcribes this sign as sy and we must then assume that masya is the adjectival form used in the same sense as the regular māsā as is found in the inscription on the Wardak Vase. Against this rendering, sy, it is to be observed that we find the regular sign for sy frequently elsewhere in the inscription as in simhasya, vadhaj’asya, tasya, utasya, and it is clearly quite different in appearance from the sign used in mas. e. It will be further observed on reading the inscription through that one of the most characteristic signs of this Kharoṣṭhī alphabet—as used in Central Asia seems to be lacking altogether from this document, namely the sign which is transcribed s in the other documents. It seems highly probable,
moreover, from what is known of the development of the Kharoṣṭhī alphabet and of the phonetic history of the Niya dialect that the sound represented by the sign written ʂ and therefore the sign itself developed late, and if, as Konow has suggested, the document as we have it now is merely a copy of a much older original, the latter may then belong to a time prior to the development of the sound which is represented by ʂ. It may be that the later scribe when he began to copy this ancient document with its archaic script, accustomed as he would be to the form maṣe, which we regularly find elsewhere in the date-formula of these inscriptions, was forgetful that the ʂ sound had not then developed, and wrote maṣe when he should really have written mase with simple s. After examining the photograph I cannot but think that the curve under consideration is nothing more than an ornamental form of what in other documents is simply a more or less straight line.

The form maṣe, however, assuming that it is right here, brings us face to face with the problem of the sound represented by this new sign ʂ. The problem has been very fully discussed on pp. 310–13 of Professor Rapson’s edition, where it is held that the origin of this ʂ, which is so characteristic of the documents from Niya, is probably to be found in the sign read ssa on a copper coin of Kujula Kadphises. It most commonly represents original sy, as in the termination of the genitive singular, e.g. maharayaṣa, but it also represents what cannot be other than single s, as in divaṣe, maṣe. It may be that in such instances it is carelessly used by the scribes without any original phonetic justification, and when its origin and true value were forgotten, but at the same time such instances are strongly in favour of Professor Turner’s theory that ʂ represents “Middle Indian intervocalic single s”, which probably tended to become a z sound, just as the intervocalic surds became sonants and then spirants. Additional support for this view may be found perhaps in the sign for ʂ, the lower part of which shows the same base-line from left to right which is so characteristic of signs such as g’, j’, d’, where it marks the change from surd to sonant spirant pronunciation.

In connection with this sign ʂ some of the proper names found in the Niya documents are interesting. That intervocalic s was written with the sign ʂ while otherwise ordinary s is retained, can be seen in such names as s’araṣena, budhaṣena by the side of s’arsena, butsena (for budhsena; though this, of course, is probably due to convenience in writing). Dr. Thomas in his paper on “Names of Places and Persons in Ancient Khotan” has suggested that the shorter forms were the
original names, and the longer forms are attempts to Indianize them. "Buddhaghoṣa," he says, "is unimpeachable as a Buddhist name; but its popularity may have been due partly to the unmistakably native Bugosa, the Anglus becoming an Angelus." There is no evidence, however, as far as I am aware, that Buddhaghoṣa has any connection whatsoever with Bugosa for they may very well be quite independent of each other. It is more probable, in my opinion, that the Angelus became the Anglus, as it were, and that the original forms of the names were budhaṣena and s'araśena—the latter has a very good Indian appearance as a name, even though it may not give very good sense as a compound—while butsena and s'arsena are merely popular abbreviated forms or what in German are called Kosenamen. If the shorter forms, as Dr. Thomas suggests, were the original forms, remembering the connection between intervocalic s, j, or jh (cf. dhivajha in this inscription), so common in Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, I do not see how one can explain forms like bujhmojika and namarajhma, beside which we also find busmojika and namarasma. But the key to the mystery is given at once when we find bujhmojika, although one would expect to find the full s form in No. 611 buşimoyika, and not as we do find busimoyika. As has been said above, however, the scribes are not consistent and that the tendency was to make the s a sonant is supported by the form bujhmojika. Just as bujhmojika, busimoyika, have lost a vowel, to become bujhmojika, busmojika, so s'arsena, butsena, by a similar loss of a syllable must be derived from s'araśena, budhaṣena, while for namarajhna we must likewise assume an original form namarajhima, though it does not occur in the existing documents. A similar loss of a syllable in such pairs of names is very common, as, for example, ramṣoṅka, tsuṅešlā, bhugel'ga (note the g'), apcira, and budhas'ra by the side of ramaṣoṅka, tsuṅešlā, bhugel'ga, apacira, and budhas'ira. One name shows two reduced forms, and is otherwise interesting, as showing the interchange between ph' and p namely tirap'h'ara (No. 582), which appears as dirpara (584) and dirpira (637). The lp' which we find at the beginning of so many names in these documents, such as lp'ipeya (cf. lipe) lp'ipāŋ'ga, lp'ipita (cf. lp'ipta) lp'imisu (cf. the feminine name lp'imisaoa), probably originates in the same way. Some vowel, perhaps an a or i has probably fallen out between the l and p'. In one proper name, jha'amoja, jha'imoja side by side with saq'amo, saq'amoya, we find unexpectedly the sonant form initially. It is possible that this and a very few more instances, e.g. jheniq'ga, if it means "soldier", and is connected with Skt. sena
are due to mistakes on the part of the scribes, but it is more likely, especially in the case of the proper names, that the initial sound was pronounced with voice just as we find, for instance, in the name written by Lüders ysamotika, where the ys definitely represents a sonant sibilant.

dhivajha: for the usual divuṣe with omission of the usual case termination. The jh, like the s, in maṣe, shows the tendency to sonantize intervocalic s and like it, too, is confined in this inscription to the date formula. The initial dh, instead of d, may indicate the same tendency that has been noticed already for intervocalic surds to become sonant spirants, wrongly used here initially, or it may simply be carelessness on the part of the scribe. Aspiration seems to be in a very chaotic condition in these inscriptions, and practically every single stop is found where we would expect the corresponding aspirate or vice versa. Thus samghalidag’a < √kal-, bhich’usamga = bhikṣusamgha, paribhuchamnae < √bhuj, daridavo = causative of √dhṛ, and in this inscription dhaḍu = daṇḍam and dhinadi < √dā.

iṣ’a: corresponds to the is’a (cf. koj’alya—kos’alya), which we find elsewhere in the Niya documents and in many Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions from India.

ch’unami: elsewhere this word shows the superscript line over the first letter but this omission cannot be regarded as accidental for it is omitted three times also in the word sach’i. Perhaps the use of the superscript line denoting a compound aksara, in this case ks, had not yet been developed. There are two other instances of ch’ in this word sach’i in these inscriptions, namely in Nos. 186 and 358, but as all the other instances show ḍh’, these two are doubtless merely slips in the writing. ch’unami itself is probably as Konow has suggested, “the same word which occurs as kṣāna in certain Saka documents from the Khotan country, and as kṣuṇ in Tocharian documents from Kuci, where it means ‘rule’, ‘term’”. That the kingdom of Kuci or Kucha was known to the writers of the Niya documents can be seen in the frequent references to kuci rajaṃmi in Nos. 621, 629, 632.

khotana maharaya: This tablet (661) is the only place in the Niya documents where we find mentioned the name of “the great king of Khotan.” In No. 214 one of the subordinate “kings”, or, as we should perhaps say, “rulers of a district”, informs his officers that he is sending a horse as a present to the great king of Khotan, but no name is given. The name of this king in No. 661 seems to be Hinajha Avijitasimha, who does not seem to be elsewhere known, for though in
his list in *Ancient Khotan*, pp. 582–3, Dr. Thomas mentions three kings of Khotan, called Vijayasimha, which can, of course, have much the same meaning as Avijitasimha, he gives none who has this actual name. The name Hinajha is probably a native Central Asian word for the nearest Sanskrit form, hināja (low born), could obviously not be applied to a rajadhiraja. The first part, however, recalls Khotanī hina (army), which is connected with Iranian haena and so Skt. senā. If the second part could then be connected with vṛjī, giving the meaning “conqueror of armies” or with aja, so as to mean “leader of armies”, the name might then be a title having much the same meaning as Avijitasimha.

*ta kali* = tat-kāle. It is characteristic of this inscription that there is a marked tendency towards confusion in the use of a, i, e, the last being sometimes retained as in samevatsare, mase, pacema, though we more commonly find pačima in the other documents, sometimes replaced by i as twice in kali, saq'aj'i, niravas'iso, but most frequently represented by a modified by a single dot above the sign. This modified a derived in some instances from ē seems to represent an e sound tending towards an a sound rather than i. It may be represented perhaps by ā just as in German. This sign is found in manus'ā, nag'arag'ā, madrādi, mulyāna, maṣā, tana, and so on.

*nag'arag'a*: The g' doubtless signifies a guttural sonant spirant sound, just as the j' in saq'aj'i (= sakāse) represents a palatal spirant.

*khvarnarse*: The same suffix -arsa is seen in other proper names such as samarsa, koltarsa, maṃtarsa, caḍiyarsa, and so on. How far this type of name is connected with the type which we have seen to end in -sena is not yet clear. In his paper on the “Names of Persons and Places in Ancient Khotan”, Dr. Thomas has suggested that very few of these names are really Sanskrit compounds, and that the majority have been made from place-names by the addition of suffixes, such as sa, na, and such like, meaning “belonging to” or “coming from”. Thus from Bhima (Phye-ma) he thinks is formed first Bhimasa and then Bhimasena, but we must wait until we know more definitely what Bhima and others such as Cikra, Yipiga, and so on really mean.

*uṭaḥ tanuvag'ah*: There can be no doubt now that uṭa means “camel”, representing Skt. uṣṭra.

*tanuvag'ah* is the same word as we find in the Taxila Silver Scroll as *tanuvae* and *tanuvakammi* in the Kurram Casket. A comparison of the passages in which it occurs in the documents establishes its
meaning to be "own", "belonging to" or, as it sometimes seems to be used as a noun, "property". Konow says, it is evidently the same word, which became the common genitive suffix in Gujarāti and Mārwāri, and is doubtless ultimately derived from some Prakrit form of Skt. ātman, e.g. attano (Pischel, p. 281) (but Professor Turner informs me that this suffix is -no, whereas Skt. -n- always becomes n in these languages. It would seem better then to derive tanuvaq'ā from Skt. tanū-). The camel in the case was first the "property" of the citizen Khvarnarsa, who sold it to be the "property" of Vag'iti Vadhaq'ā.

madrādi: Corresponding to the usual matreti, mamtreti, and with the same meaning as the very common matra or mamtra deti. The corresponding Sanskrit form is mantrayate, and as is usual in Prakrit, the middle termination is replaced by the active and the denominative suffix by e. In this peculiar dialect of Endere the regular Niya e is here replaced by the modified a, while in the similar forms cudiyadi, vidiyadi (unless they are passives), the same original sound appears as i just as original e appears as i in kali, saq'aj'i, miravās'iso, dhinadi.

so uṭah: If aph'īnānu is a proper name and subject of the verb haradi, as would seem to be confirmed by the order of the words, then we have a clear nominative form so uṭah as the object of a verb. As a rule, in the Niya documents the bare stem is used both for the nominative and the accusative cases, but this is the only example I know of a nominative in place of an accusative. A single example of this kind is probably to be ascribed to carelessness.

The declension of nouns in the dialect of these inscriptions reminds one strongly of Prakrit and Pali. The case system is very much broken down, and there is a great deal of confusion in the use of the cases. In the more formal documents the cases are kept fairly distinct, but in the ordinary language of every-day business the most frequently used case is that which is in form a genitive singular, but which may also be used indifferently as a dative or an instrumental. Thus, beside the genitive maharayasa we find maya maharayasa, where it clearly has the force of an instrumental and mayi maharayasa, where it must be a dative. Indeed, the dialect is fast approaching the stage where the noun shows only two forms, one which serves for nominative and accusative, and is usually the bare stem, and the other which serves for genitive, dative, and instrumental, and is in form the old genitive. The locative remains, but is chiefly used for purposes of dating, and
there are occasional examples of the ablative, which has however been
usually replaced by a suffix -de, e.g. ninade = "from Niya".

Apart from the peculiur use of the dative, as, for instance, in
No. 437, muli s'esā vithidac huati, meaning "part of the price is kept
back" or "is to be kept back", a dative which recalls the final dative
of Latin, the most striking instance of the transference of case value
is that whereby the instrumental case can take the place of the
nominative as the subject of the sentence, a use which is found in
Avestan, and, I believe, in modern Nepali and some other Modern Indo-
Aryan languages. Thus in No. 283 we find aham maharayena . . . hodemi
and in No. 622 maharayaputra kala punnyabalena lihati, as compared
with No. 635, kala punñabalala mahi maharayasa viñavita. The explanation
may be as follows. The commonest part of the verb in actual use is
the past participle passive. In transitive verbs the past participle
is construed with the instrumental of the agent, but in a neuter verb
such as √gam, the past participle is used actively, and ahu gata
means "I have gone". Transitive verbs were then modelled on this
use, and gīḍ'a from meaning "has been received" came to mean
"has received". From agata is formed a first person singular indicative
agatemī, and modelled on the same pattern we find gīḍ'emī (I have
received), and the instrumental which had properly accompanied
gīḍ'a was still retained with gīḍ'emī, having changed from the case of
the agent to that of the subject. This process was further helped by
the fact that in groups of words forming one syntactical whole only
the final member was inflected. Thus, in No. 575 we find ṁp'ihiḍa
maya raja divira s'ramamna dhānapriyena, where the proper name
is in the instrumental case, while divira and s'ramamna remain un-
inflected. It may be, too, that the so-called genitive which can, so
far as meaning is concerned, replace both dative and instrumental,
sometimes acts the part of the nominative. Thus, in this inscription
from Endere, No. 661, after the camel has been sold to Vag'iti Vadhag'a,
we read that "Vag'iti Vadhag'a has paid the full price in māsa and
Khvarnsarse has accepted it". If dhiṭu, then, stands for datta, and is
used actively, so also grahīdu = grahīta (usually in the Niya documents
ɡīḍ'a, and so either a definite Sanskritism or a further proof of the
antiquity of the original document), may be used actively, in which
case Khvarnsasya would be a genitive-instrumental used nominatively.

dhahi aghita driṭ'u VAS'O : I am unable to deal with these four
words the last of which is written much larger than the remainder of
the inscription, and is enclosed within a ring.
dhahi may represent what usually appears as taha (= tatha), even although tatha does occur above. The dh instead of t is no more uncommon then the t instead of dh in rayatiraya, while the final i instead of a is parallel to the i in aji uvadayi. aghita may be the same as the usual form ag'eta, which seems to be some kind of official title, while so far as form goes drij'u may be the same as Skt. trimšat. It is possible that aghita may be connected with Skt. argha "price" and so = "paid".

idani is Skt. idānīm, while maṣa is doubtless Skt. māṣa, and sulīq'a is perhaps as Dr. Thomas has suggested, "a native of Kashgar," from Tibetan S'u-lig. aṣṭi, observe, retains its original st, whereas elsewhere in these inscriptions we find aṭa, aṭha, but the a has changed to i.

saq'aj'i is, of course, the Skt. sakāse, literally "in the presence of", used post-positively in these inscriptions to signify the recipient. The commonest word used with the same meaning and in the same way in the documents from Niya is vanṭi, which represents the Skt. upānte, e.g. No. 3, taya striae vanṭi.

s'uddhi uvag'adu = "a quittance of the debt was reached" just as we find in Sanskrit s'uddhim √i, and so on.

aji uvadayi: Show the same i for a that is so common in this inscription. The usual Niya form is aja uvadae or aju uvadae, ajuvadaye, and a blend of the last two ajuvadayoe. It corresponds to the Sanskrit adya upādāya, where upādāya is used in the same sense as ārabhya, that is "beginning from to-day", "from this day henceforth." Cf. idovadæ, ito uvadæ, idovadayoe "from that time forward."

yatha g'ama g'aranīyah: It is strange to find immediately after this phrase the same word g'aranīyah appearing as karanīyah. The explanation may be that yatha g'ama, corresponding to the Skt. yathākāma(m), is a compound word, and so the intervocalic medial k changes to the sonant spirant g'. In the next phrase, which seems to correspond to Skt. sarva kṛtya karanīyah, and may be rendered "to be used for all purposes", the words are evidently looked upon as separate units.

pacema: As has been noted above, we have here e instead of the usual i, but we have also e without the usual superscript line, just as we saw in ch'unami. This superscript line denotes a compound letter, as in viṣa (= vighna), niḥ'atra (= nakṣatra), kriṣa'ga (= kṛṣṇaka), dha'na (= dharma), and so ē represents s'c, as in pa'ca (= paś'cāt),
niče (= nis'caya), kači (= kas'cit), and nači in No. 675, which seems to represent na kas'cīt. The omission of the superscript line in pacaṁa, together with the same omission in ch'unami, and three times in sač'ī may be further proof of the very early date of the original document.

kidā = Skt. krte “on account of”, “in respect of.” The modified ā represents Skt. ē, as has been already noted, but more striking is the ā instead of ə, as is most common in this word in the Niya documents. Thus we frequently find kaṭavo, kač'avo (= kartavaya) and kiṭa, kiḍ'ā, kiḍ'ae, kiḍ'aq'ā, kiḍ'atī, all representing some form of Skt. krta. The development seems to have been first from krto kaṭ- and then to kač', where ə represents a lingual spirant. So we find Skt. grhita > gita > gida, Skt. prabhita > prahuta, Skt. ghata > gada, Skt. markata > makađa, Skt. kukkuta > kukud'a, Skt. vaḍavā > vaḍ'avi, Pkt. paḍhana > paḍ ama, and from the present stem ich- of the verb v is we find a past participle paḍ'ichita corresponding to Skt. pratiṣṭa. Perhaps the retention of the ə instead of the usual ə, which does not occur in the inscription, is further evidence that the document is an early one.

cudiyaḍi: This and the following words are part of the general formula clinching a sale of property, which appears in many of the documents relating to such transactions. As a typical example may be taken part of inscription No. 437, Cov.-tablet, 1. 2: “ajuvadaye tāya kuḍ'iyae prace maśdhig'eyasa esvarya siyati yathā kāma karamṇi siyāti śarva karamṇena prabhaveyāti yo ca koci pačima kalamṇi tāya kuḍ'iyae kridena caṁkura kaqp'eya ni bhratere bhratu putro va prapatru va ṃatiyo aṁna kilme ci v'asu aq'etana sa ca bitivara manṭra nikheyaṇṭi aṁṇaṭa icheyaṇṭi taha rayadvaramṇi muho codaṁṇa apramaṇṇa ca bhayeṣṭi tamaṇḍa praptam ca deyaṇṭi...” which may be tentatively translated: “And from this time henceforth Maśdhigeya is to have full authority in regard to this woman to do with her whatsoever he pleases and to be master of her in every way. And with regard to this woman whosoever at any later time whether the brothers of Caṁkura of Kap'eya or a brother’s son or grandson or other kinsman belonging to Kilmē shall on a second occasion seek to cancel this decision of the V'asu Ag'etas or shall desire to alter it, then at the royal court any oral demurrer shall be without effect and they shall pay the fine incurred...”

The only part included in No. 661 and omitted in the otherwise comprehensive formula from No. 437 are the words vivadu uthaviyaḍi, which clearly represent Skt. vivāda uthāpyate “a dispute is stirred up”,
cudiyadi and vidiyadi with the change of e to i, which is so characteristic of this document represent Skt. codhayate and vedhayate, while dhaḍu is Skt. daṇḍam with dh for d, as in dhivajha, and also in dhinadi, if it is the same as the more usual Niya form denati < √/dā. Professor Turner, to whose kindness I owe several valuable corrections and suggestions, thinks that dhinadi does not represent the usual denati, but is a denominative verb formed from the past partic. dinna- (with i from dita- in Hi. deyā < *dō- : or possibly from gin- “take” < gṛhṇ- since the verbs “take” and “give” mutually affect each other everywhere in Indo-Aryan).

The remainder of the inscription is clear. rajadhaṇu represents rājyadharma(m), with Skt. dharma changed over to the neuter class; dhavaḷag'u bahudhivā is the scribe’s name, where the final ā may recall the common e or i termination of proper names as Khvarnarse or Vaj’īti; likhidu retaining the original kh, as might be expected in an early document, instead of the more usual h and representing Skt. likhitam; ajiṣanayi twice shows i where in the second syllable we regularly find e and in the last usually a, sometimes e, and represents Skt. adhyeṣañaya = “for the instruction of”; while puradu represents Skt. purataḥ, with the final -aḥ replaced by -aṇi, and so appearing as -u and meaning “in the presence of” followed by the initials of the witnesses (sach’i = sākṣin), Spaniyakā, S’as’ivakā, and Nani Vadhagā, all showing in their final the modified ā sound.
Deux Noms Indiens du Dieu Soleil

Par Jean Przyluski

I. Aja ekapād


L'opinion de V. Henry touchant la nature solaire de ce monstre est conforme à la tradition indienne (Durga, sur Nir., xii, 29) et s'accorde avec un passage du Taītiṛiṣya-brāhmaṇa, iii, 1, 2, 8, suivant lequel Aja ekapād naît à l'est.


Ce dernier mythe a pu être suggéré aux populations de l'Asie des moussons par le spectacle des trombes. Pour expliquer ce phénomène, ainsi que les aversees continues de la saison pluvieuse, on disait que les eaux d'en bas étaient aspirées vers le ciel, par l'animal solaire, pendant les mois de la saison sèche, et cette croyance

1 A. B. Keith, The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads, p. 137.
trouvait d’ailleurs confirmation dans un fait périodiquement observé : c’est dans le temps où le soleil brille avec le plus d’éclat que réservoirs, étangs, cours d’eau décroissent et tarissent comme si l’astre pompait l’élément humide.

Que le bouc, animal chaleureux, et ses congénères (gazelle, cerf, antilope) 1 aient été de bonne heure identifiés avec le Soleil, c’est ce que V. Henry n’avait pas manqué d’observer (cf. “Physique védique”, J.A., 1905, ii, p. 404). J’ai, d’autre part, amorcé l’étude d’une série de récits indiens où un animal couleur d’or (oiseau ou cerf volant), qui n’est autre que le Soleil, prend chaque jour son essor pour atteindre la cime d’un grand arbre. C’est ainsi que, dans un conte tiré du Vīnaya des Mahāsāṃghika, un chasseur voit le roi des cerfs qui vient à travers l’espace se poser sur un nyagrodha. “Son corps répandait une clarté qui illuminait les gorges de la montagne.” 2

On avait donc, d’une part, le mythe du Soleil qui aspire les eaux et, d’autre part, celui de l’animal solaire placé à la cime de l’arbre qui s’élève au centre du monde. Le monstre védique Aja ekapād paraît dû à la superposition de ces deux images. Pāda signifiant “pied” et “support” convenait bien pour désigner le perchoir de l’animal solaire et le pédoncule par où le soleil aspire les eaux terrestres. D’autres circonstances ont dû contribuer au choix du mot pād(a). L’arbre est appelé en sanskrit pādapa “qui boit par le pied” parce que ce végétal absorbe l’eau de la terre et la fait monter dans son tronc. C’est précisément en petit la fonction de l’arbre cosmique, support ou pied du Soleil.

En somme, diverses représentations réelles ou mythiques s’accordaient à suggérer l’image monstrueuse d’Aja ekapād : trombe, décrue pendant la saison sèche, bouc solaire, arbre cosmique. Sans le témoignage des contes et de l’épopée, on n’arriverait pas à comprendre que le soleil éclatant a un long support obscur parce que l’animal solaire est perché sur l’arbre du monde. Les textes védiques ne suffisent pas à distinguer les éléments de cette combinaison ; ils permettent du moins d’affirmer qu’elle est ancienne. 3

3 Dans le mythe chinois de la trombe, l’eau est aspirée par le dragon et l’on vient de voir que, dans la littérature védique, Aja ekapād est en relation avec le “Serpent du fond”. Je crois que Ahi budhnya est l’équivalent, le double marin de l’animal solaire, mais l’examen de cette question ne peut trouver place ici.
II. PAJJUNNA

Parjanya est le dieu védique de la pluie. On l’a depuis longtemps rattaché au dieu lithuanien Perkūnas et même à la déesse scandinave Fyörgynn (Hirt, Indog. Forschungen, i, 481 ; Oldenberg, Religion du Vėda, trad. Henry, 190, note ; von Schröder, Arische Religion, ii, 602 et suiv.).

Récemment, M. Meillet rappelait “ que le nom slave de la ‘ foudre ’, qui est celui du grand dieu Perunǔ, est inséparable de lit. perkūnas, v. pruss. percunis, qui est aussi le nom de la ‘ foudre ’ et a un emploi religieux, et du dieu védique Parjānyaḥ qui personnifie la ‘ pluie d’orage ’ ” (Revue des études slaves, vi, 171).

En pali, Parjanya est remplacé par Pajjunna où W. Geiger a tenté d’expliquer l’u de la seconde syllabe par une “ modification qualitative (réduction) de la voyelle ” due au fait que l’accent est reporté sur la première syllabe (Gram. des Pāli, § 23). Cette explication est sans valeur. Le nom pali Pajjunna ne recouvre pas skr. Parjanya, mais correspond phonétiquement à Pradyumna.

Comment Parjanya s’est-il identifié avec Pradyumna dans la mythologie bouddhique ? On vient de voir que le Soleil est le distributeur des eaux qu’il pompe pendant la saison sèche et répand en pluie pendant la mousson pluvieuse. Pradyumna/Pajjunna, dérivé de la racine dyu, est un nom qui lui convient bien. Grâce à l’analogie entre Parjanya et Pajjunna, la forme moyenne-indienne de Pradyumna a pu remplacer le nom védique Parjanya et le dieu Soleil s’est confondu avec l’ancien dieu de la pluie.

Dans le très ancien Mahāsamaya-suttaṇa (Dīgha, ii, p. 260⁴⁵), Pajjunna est encore un dieu qui tonne et fait pleuvoir :

Thanayam aqa Pajjunno yo disā abhivassati.

De même, dans la 1ᵉʳᵉ stance du Jātaka nᵒ 75, il fait retentir le tonnerre. Dans l’Apadāṇa tardif (ii, 468, st. 4), il est toujours le dieu de la pluie :

Pajjunno pi va bhūtāṇi dhammameghena vassati.

En suivant la transformation du nom de ce dieu, on ne peut manquer de discerner, dans les spéculations qui le concernent, l’origine d’un courant d’idées qui conflue de bonne heure dans le krishnaïsme. À une époque qui ne doit pas être très postérieure au 1ᵉʳ siècle avant le Christ, on distinguait quatre manifestations (eyūha) de l’Être suprême : Vāsudeva, Saṃkārṣaṇa, Pradyumna et Aniruddha (cf. Bhandarkar, Vaishnavism, La Vallée Poussin, L’Inde au temps des

En somme, le mythe du Soleil, agent et régulateur des pluies, intéresse les principales religions de l'Inde. Profondément enclavé dans les croyances populaires, il affleure successivement dans les hymnes védiques, dans le bouddhisme et dans l'épopée.
Professor Cowell and his Pupils

By C. M. Ridding

It is now more than a hundred years since the birth, in 1826, of Edward Byles Cowell, the guru of perhaps the greater number of English Sanskrit scholars. His story is well known. The son of an Ipswich merchant, he was called at 16, by his father’s death, to leave school and carry on his father’s business. His heart was set on learning. He was already widely read in classics, Statius, Lucian, and Greek romances being added to his school reading, and he was destined, while yet in his 'teens, to publish articles on Rabelais, Longus, and the Persian poets.

In 1841, at the age of 15, he had been introduced to Sir W. Jones’ works, and in the early morning (called, it was said, by the milkman pulling a string attached to his foot) he had studied in them the Asiaticae Poeseos Commentarii (on Persian and Arabic poetry) and the Persian grammar, working by himself at the extracts from Hafiz and the Shâhnâmâh. Soon, however, help came to him from an old Bombay officer, Major Hockley, whom Professor Cowell cited in 1898, when receiving the gold medal of the Royal Asiatic Society, as a proof of the power which "enthusiasm and sympathy can always exercise on others, wherever we may be placed."

This work bore fruit in translations of Hafiz published in the Asiatic Journal, beginning in January, 1842 (before his sixteenth birthday). He had also, in 1841, read Jones’ translation of Šakuntalâ, and bought with his pocket money Wilson’s Sanskrit Grammar, but found it too difficult, and laid it aside to be “an incitement and a hope.”

It might seem his hope was crushed; but he went often to Mark Lane on his business, and he went to see Professor Wilson at the India Office. He was not, however, a regular pupil of Wilson’s till his Oxford days, when his first lesson from Wilson preceded their both going to hear Max Müller’s first lecture on philology. Meanwhile, his Sanskrit grammar had come out again, and his first Sanskrit pupil was soon to follow.

Edward Fitzgerald, who between 1842 and 1845, had become a friend, exchanging translations of Lucretius and other classical authors, thought the combination of the counting house by day
and Sanskrit by night an excellent one. But Professor Cowell was to have a better guide. In 1843 he met Miss Charlesworth, whose gracious nature and great gifts of mind and soul left a tender memory in all who knew her. In spite of her greater age which made her hesitate, they married in 1847, and began an ideal life. Till her death in 1899 she was his perfect companion, upholder, and inspirer. During their engagement he shared with her the delights of his first studies in Sanskrit. The alphabet and declensions and verbs were doled out in each letter in due course, till the Rāmāyāna was reached. "We have all our lives to learn Sanskrit, let us therefore ground ourselves well." "Let us fancy ourselves two Hindoos of the olden days under the banyan tree, or palms, before Alexander invaded India." "The Rāmāyāna and Kāliḍāsa ought not to be read by everybody—only by those who, like us, hope to spend life in a quiet, silent, unknown study, and live over again the silent years of the once so busy and loud past." Hebrew, too, they learnt together, and read till near the end of Mrs. Cowell’s life.

By 1847 Professor Cowell’s next brother was fitted to take the business, and Mrs. Cowell saw her husband’s great gifts and "the unknown power the discipline [of a University] may elicit"; and, in spite of opposition (especially FitzGerald’s!) she carried him to Oxford to win his First Class, to work with Professor Wilson, and to take his place among his peers. His Sanskrit work bore fruit in the translation of the Vikramorvaśī in 1851, and in the edition and translation of Vararuci’s Prākyta-prakāśa in 1854. He then felt that India itself was necessary for his further progress, and in 1856 he was appointed Professor of History and Political Economy in the Presidency College, Calcutta, and later became President of the Sanskrit College.

I have dwelt long on the details of his preparation, for it shows the making of his character in its strength and quiet enthusiasm; never changing, but always unfolding; and it is this character which in different ways and degrees he impressed on all his pupils.

The remaining outer facts—his return to England owing to ill-health in 1863, and his coming to Cambridge as Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in 1867, are only the outer facts of a life passed among us in unwearied self-spending, and in setting high the lamp of goodness and of knowledge.

To return now to his pupils. His first Sanskrit pupil has taken her place. At Oxford he did some coaching formally after his degree; but he had also two distinguished, but informal, pupils:
first, the one always associated with his name, Edward FitzGerald, who, leaving the classics of earlier days, began to read Spanish and Persian under his guidance, and looked on him through life as his master in all the work that brought him fame. The second was Alfred Tennyson, who was stirred to begin Persian with him, but quickly fell back, though he was always a friend.

His Indian pupils loved him for his serenity, his kindness, his gracious respect for their old pandits; his power of entering into their thoughts; his delight in their philosophy, their poetry, their literature; and his realization of their past. He gave freely of his time and money; and though not well-off, gave scholarships and published books at his own expense. “This is not the time to save; we must manifest our interest.” He helped many privately, and especially those who from the sight of him wanted to learn about Christianity, and whom in his unofficial moments of leisure he was allowed to teach. Many called him “Father” and Mrs. Cowell “Mother”. Though I speak of pupils, I must be allowed to mention his special friend and guide in Sanskrit, Mahesh Chandra Nyayaratna, as well as Premchand Tarkavāgīśa and Jayanārāyanā Tarkapaṅcānana, whose portraits he kept in his room. I excuse myself that it would have been impossible for anyone to teach him without learning from him. Among names of his pupils taken at random are Bhagavan C. Chatterji (a life-long correspondent), Guru Das Banerji (Judge of the High Court of Calcutta), Pandit S. N. Sastri, who tells a charming story of his college days, and had in Cambridge in 1888 “that blessed half-hour in the company of a saint I shall ever remember”. Babu Nilmanni Mukerji, Principal of the Sanskrit College in 1895, whose career was determined by Cowell’s telling him he would never make a good pleader; and many others—did space allow—whose memory is still honoured, I hope, in their own country; and who, in their different spheres, formed part of a band making for righteousness. Professor Cowell’s appointment as Sanskrit Professor at Cambridge in 1867 was the fulfilment of his dream of being a Sanskrit Professor in an English university, and he rejoiced at being at Cambridge, like his master, Professor Wilson, at Oxford, the first holder of the Chair. Throughout life many of his dreams came true, not from direct effort, but from always doing his very best, and leaving the issues.

At Cambridge he won the hearts and enriched the minds of generations of students till his death in 1903. His Professorship, which was of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology, brought him at first many
of the older classical scholars for the latter subject. Dr. Peile, of Christ's, whose genial simplicity and kindness are still remembered, and Dr. Fennell, the editor of *Pindar*, were his pupils; and he had a succession of men who learned enough for their present needs, greater or less, and then passed on to their own work. Among these were Dr. F. T. Jenkinson, the late University Librarian, who left a gracious memory; Professor T. P. Postgate, whose eager brilliant mind and varying moods recalled to his pupils Professor Paul of *Vilette*; Mr. Darbishire, greatly loved by his friends; Dr. Strong, whose driving power turned in another direction; Professor Strachan and Sir Martin Conway, who need no praise. Philology led also to Zend, which attracted Professor Cowell increasingly in his later years. In it his chief pupil was Professor James Hope Moulton, and another distinguished one was Professor Chadwick, whose experience of the three Sanskrit Professors of Cambridge enables him to say that "kindness is the special quality of Sanskrit Professors".

His old love of Persian was revived in contact with scholars like Professor Browne, Sir Thomas Arnold, and Professor Nicholson, though Persian was not an official duty; Mr. Charles Moule, speaking of Italian and Spanish, said; "I was not his pupil, yet always his pupil."

In his new capacity his first Sanskrit pupil at Cambridge and for some time his only one, Sir Frederick Pollock, became twenty-five years later his pupil in Persian, and his last letter on Persian reached Professor Cowell on his death-bed. Dearest to him of all his pupils was Mr. R. A. Neil, of Pembroke, like-minded in quiet strength, keen enthusiasm, and unfailing kindness, and a fine scholar. He later took the elementary Sanskrit work for Professor Cowell. They were co-editors of the *Divyāvadāna*, and formed with Lord Chalmers, Mr. Francis, and Dr. Rouse, the Guild of Translators, who, with Professor Cowell as their editor, rendered the *Jātaka* into English; the Cambridge resident members meeting regularly to go through the translation. The work needs no commendation from me, but Professor Cowell took special pleasure in the spirit with which Mr. Francis translated his Pāli verses, showing a gift unsuspected before, unless by his friends at Caius, where he was a loved senior fellow. Dr. Rouse's Pāli work on the *Jātaka* developed into Sanskrit work in the translation of the *Sikṣāsamuccaya*, and it is to be hoped that his newly gained leisure will be given to the East. The versatile gifts of Sir E. Denison Ross, would have created sympathy on many sides between him and Professor
Cowell, but his special contact with him was in Persian. We must always regret that Dr. Peter Giles turned from philology and Sanskrit to the care of a college. Professor E. V. Arnold, of Bangor, worked at the dryest parts of metrical statistics, and hid under a quiet and precise manner a keen enthusiasm. Dr. L. D. Barnett also read in the 'nineties at some of the same lectures as myself, and has since combined the austere but invaluable work of the bibliographer with editions and translations that throw light on the history, the literature, and the thought of India. Professor Cowell was greatly pleased at the coming of a few foreign students. He only wished it had been in the time of his full vigour, for he considered it a work specially worth doing. Chief of these was M. A. Foucher, a charming and sympathetic pupil, whose work on Indian art takes a high place, and who then joined in the reading of Kādambarī. Another was the son of M. Barth, the great writer on comparative religion, who was equipping himself to study the religions of India.

Indian students also came, perhaps many, but of them I only saw a few, and did not hear their names or know their careers.

Professor Cowell had few women pupils. He and Mrs. Cowell were afraid of a less sheltered life than the very noble women of their own youth had had, and Professor Cowell had promised her to take no women pupils. But their large heart conquered prejudice when they came to know Miss Constance Maynard, late Principal of Westfield College, and Miss Burgess (Mrs. Arnold Wallis), and they welcomed from time to time Girtonians to their house. I was one of those happy mortals, and I wish I could tell the charming story of my first introduction. I did not, however, venture to ask Professor Cowell to teach me Sanskrit, and my elementary work was done with Mr. Neil. But in 1892, when I came back to do a short piece of work at Girton, I asked leave to go to the public lectures, and received a charming letter from Mrs. Cowell saying: "We have not the heart to keep you from anything." Thenceforth I worked with him steadily till just before his death, coming most of the time once a week from London (part of the later years with Professor Bendall, sometimes with Professor Thomas) to receive a three hours' lecture and spend delightful hours with Mrs. Cowell, in a happy friendship with them both for nearly nineteen years.

I was sorry not to meet his next pupil, Miss Purdie of Newnham, nor to know her career. Another, Miss Lucy Peacock, of Girton, now Mrs. Boyce Gibson, was the first to take the Sanskrit part of the
Oriental Tripos. Her marriage soon afterwards led her to a different, but not less strenuous, mental life. A much older woman, Miss Arundale came to deepen what she had learned in theosophy by a serious study of Sanskrit philosophy; she worked with thoroughness and her high character and thoughtful mind must have made their mark when she became head of the Theosophic College at Benares.

I have kept the Sanskrit Professors till last. The first, in 1903, was Professor Cecil Bendall, an affectionate and loyal pupil, inheriting the gift of kindness with a special gift of setting people to work, even to the point of aggrieved surprise when he did not find them willing to follow his advice. His brain teemed with good suggestions, which burst forth almost simultaneously from his lips.

The present owner of the Chair, Professor Rapson, and Professor F. W. Thomas, Boden Professor of Sanskrit at Oxford, are like the two sons of a fairy story between whom their father divides his property. Both have a large share of the common inheritance of what Professor Cowell was to his pupils. All value their kindness, their scholarship, their unwearying willingness to help other scholars. But the former has taken for his special sphere that which Professor Cowell in his address to the International Congress of Orientalists, in London, in 1892, spoke of as among the greatest achievements of Western Orientalists—the making a firm foundation of knowledge by the study of history and inscriptions; the latter inherits those interests which turn more on philosophy and literature. But in making these distinctions we find each has also a share of the other's special gifts. We honour the par nobile fratum who represent our guru's glorious tradition, and especially we offer our homage on this occasion to the good work done at Cambridge.

It remains, after speaking of Professor Cowell's pupils, to speak also of his teaching. Its two special characteristics are seen in his earliest letters to Mrs. Cowell (already quoted). "We have all our lives to learn Sanskrit, let us therefore ground ourselves well." He deprecated the system of setting people to write theses before mastering the elements, as this system sometimes leaves permanent gaps in the scholar's armour. The second characteristic is his keen realization of scene, social condition, and history. "Let us fancy ourselves two Hindoos of the olden days, under the banyan tree... before Alexander invaded India." This is a perfectly definite picture which added knowledge enabled him to fill in and enrich.

This firmness of foundation gave confidence to his pupils; as their
interest was kindled by the vivid pictures his knowledge suggested, when he used hints from a word or phrase that revealed a hidden life, or brought treasures from the stores of proverbial wisdom or deep philosophy learned from the pandits. His wide knowledge of poetry found parallels in Spanish or Welsh or late Greek. And he could compare Sanskrit philosophy with Aristotle and Plato. Sometimes the parallels were not quite absolute, but the Eastern and Western thoughts thus brought together were like two friends of his own that he delighted to introduce to each other. He did not spend time on verbal criticism unless it was obviously necessary or shiningly true. When he saw the rightness of an emendation he delighted in it, though he did not go out to seek it. In the same way he did not lay stress on style. Beginning in childhood with writing a magazine called The Radical, he wrote without effort and clearly, not aiming at anything beyond. But if a sudden image or phrase struck him as appropriate and beautiful, he would repeat it several times over with delight, "Yes, that's exactly it!" FitzGerald unwittingly gave a wrong impression of him as shy and inarticulate. He shrank indeed from strangers who needed small talk, and would rather listen if others were willing to talk; but to his pupils and all he felt would receive with simplicity what he had to give, he would pour forth, almost at first sight, a rich store of knowledge and interest; and he both spoke and wrote with perfect ease and freedom from hesitation either in words or in matter.

His method with older students was to do the reading and translation himself, adding his own comments and references, and willing to hear and discuss any suggestions offered. His pupils took such notes as they wished, but he never tested their knowledge. He only gave them his own, and left them to absorb it and be educated by it. Sir F. Pollock thinks his only defect was that he did not realize the ignorance of a pupil; but perhaps that mattered little for those stimulated by him to increase their knowledge, and perhaps also he realized more than some pupils would think. No trouble was too great to hunt up a difficult allusion, or a hard piece of commentary or of Pāṇini, and his hearers would afterwards receive postcards to clear up a difficulty that could not be solved in class.

In India the reverence felt for him made the discipline of the College easy; but he was never wanting in quiet firmness, and the power to rebuke wilful carelessness. "He was something sacred," says one of his Indian pupils, and that was, though it might here be
differently expressed, at the bottom of the feeling all his pupils, however different in character, had for him.

It is good to have had the friendship and the teaching of such a man; and we are happy to have in our midst those who can still carry on his work in the same spirit of self-sacrifice and disinterested devotion.\(^1\)

\(^1\) If by inadvertence I have left out some names with special claim to mention, I hope their owners will forgive me, as memory is not a safe guide.—C. M. R.
Viśvarūpa

By Kasten Rönnow

VIŚVARŪPA TVĀṢṬRA, the son of Tvaṣṭar, is the name of a certain demon of whom we hear in the Rig-Veda and elsewhere. Indra, the demon-hunter par préférence, fought with him and killed him; but his chief adversary no doubt was originally Trita Āptya, an old Aryan water-god, whose deeds and fame have slowly been usurped by the all-overshadowing Indra.¹ Reasons which cannot here be dwelt upon, as I have already explained them elsewhere,² make it probable that Viśvarūpa was originally a serpent deity of the class which was later on generally styled nāgas. We shall here try to find out something more definite concerning his original surroundings and sphere of activity.

It seems obvious that Viśvarūpa has many characteristics in common with other demons of the Vedas; but he differs from them in various ways. Thus he is more closely connected with the gods, which is expressed by his surname “Son of Tvaṣṭar”, a name met with already in the Rig-Veda. The Yajus-texts tell us that he was the domestic chaplain (purohiṭa) of the gods, but this detail is unknown to the composers of the hymns. Brhaspati, the famous purohiṭa of the gods, is also called a son of Tvaṣṭar (RV., ii, 23, 17), but we hear very little concerning their mutual relations; the Yajus-texts, on the other hand, tell us that Tvaṣṭar flew into a mighty rage over the murder of Viśvarūpa (cf. e.g. ŚBr., i, 6, 3, 6). Anyhow, he had well deserved his fate, for in secrecy he favoured his own relatives, the Asuras.³

As for Tvaṣṭar, he is rather a suspicious member of the Vedic pantheon. He has been connected with Indra, he has got his proper share of the sacrifices; still already in the Rig-Veda he is at times an open adversary of Indra. Such conditions are still more prevalent in the Yajur-Vedas; and this is only natural, as they are no doubt based on conflicts connected with the ritual. Tvaṣṭar is clearly described as a possessor of Soma, and to this dignity he has an older

¹ Cf. my thesis Trita Āptya, eine vedische Gottheit, i (Uppsala, 1927), passim.
² Cf. loc. cit., pp. 12 sq., 17 sq., 41, 75 sq.
³ He is called asurāṇāṁ svastiyāb, TS. ii, 5, 1, 1; KS. xii, 10. Tvaṣṭar had thus married a female Asura.
claim than even Indra. Probably he belongs to another set of gods, viz. the Asuras, just like Varuṇa, with whom he shares the quality of being a cosmogonic deity, a creator god. We do not hear that Indra killed Tvaṣṭar; but he violently robbed him of his Soma (cf. RV., iii, 48, 4, etc.), being the stronger of the two. It is at this point that Tvaṣṭar procreates Indra’s mortal enemy Vṛtra.

According to my opinion, the Devas very probably took over the Soma sacrifice from the Asuras. The strife between these two sets of deities is easily intelligible—but how can we then explain the relationship between Viśvarūpa and Tvaṣṭar? The solution might possibly be found in Viśvarūpa’s purohitaship, for, just as Agni and Bṛhaspati, the two great purohitas of the gods, were sons of Tvaṣṭar, Viśvarūpa also came to be looked upon as such. However, in the Rig-Veda Viśvarūpa Tvaṣṭra is not a purohita, though he is once mentioned as an authority on sacrifice (x, 76, 3c-d; cf. JB. 2, 153, 1). The Rig-Veda, always intent upon justifying the deeds of Indra, sees in Viśvarūpa chiefly the demon doomed to destruction. And the reason for his being killed is the usual one: like other demons he is the possessor of cows coveted by Indra, who appropriates them after having slain his foe. To admit that Viśvarūpa was a purohita would also be to admit of his being a Brahmin. Thus his murder would in reality be the murder of a Brahmin; and the Yajur-Vedas which are less partial to Indra, actually accuse him of this gruesome crime.

As far as I can see—and I shall give some reasons for my opinion presently—Viśvarūpa was originally a serpent deity closely connected with a “pre-Vedic” sacrifice. The nature of this connection seems to have been that the cult of which he was himself the centre became absorbed by the Asura cult; and thus he became an authority upon sacrifice, a sort of purohita of the gods. However, though a son of Tvaṣṭar—with whom he may even previously have had some connection—and a servant of the Vedic gods, he was still suspect as being an object of Indra’s enmity. The whole ended in a catastrophe; and the books of ritual not incorrectly explained his fate by telling that he carried on an intrigue with the Asuras, the old foes of the Devas.

Various observations may present themselves concerning Viśvarūpa.

1 Cf. RV. x, 49, 10, where Indra says: abhyām tad ānān dhārāyaṃ yad ānā na devān cauva tevaṣṭādhañayadya ruṣati spārbaṁ gavāṃ uddhasu vakṣaṇāse ā madhor madhu śvātryaṁ somam āśīram ||. Cf. Hillebrandt, Ved. Mythologie, i, 519.
2 Cf. RV. iv, 18, 12, where, however, according to Sieg Vyaṇnara is meant.
As for his name, it seems far too abstract and colourless to be that of a real demon. Like other names, as e.g. Vṛtra, Vala, or Śusna, it was probably only an appellative meaning "possessed of all forms"; and the same was probably the case with his other name, Trisīrṣan "the three-headed one". One might easily suggest that his name was altered when introduced into the Vedic hymns. The heavenly Gandharvas: Svāna, Bhrāja, etc., had to take up other names as Vibhu, etc., in order to be allowed into the sacrificial enclosures, TS., 1, 2, 7, h; VŚ., 4, 27; ŚB., 3, 6, 2, 24. A similar instance seems to be that of the Rbhu's (cf. RV., i, 161, 5–6).

Under these circumstances, there can be little doubt concerning the origin of the name Viṣvarūpa. It undoubtedly seems unsuitable for a serpent deity; however, it excellently suited Tvaṣṭar, who is the creator of all (animal) forms. Thus, in RV., iii, 55, 19, we find the following line: devas tvāṣṭā savītā viṣvarūpaḥ punoṣa prajāḥ purudhā jovāna, and in the Yama-Yami-hymn (x, 10, 5) this janitā devas tvāṣṭā savītā viṣvarūpaḥ has, according to the opinion of Yami, created the twins as dāmpati already in the womb. With i, 13, 10a–b: iha tvāṣṭāram agrīraṁ viṣvarūpam upa huye, cf. ix, 5, 9: tvāṣṭāram agrajāṁ gopāṁ puruṣāvānāṁ ā huye.¹ From such passages it is quite obvious that Tvaṣṭar is a cosmogonic deity; thence the identification with Savitar and the epithets agrīya and agraja. And we may further remember that he has brought forth the "two great twin cups", i.e. Heaven and Earth, and filled them with āsuras.

However, ere I go further into this matter, I should like to point out that Tvaṣṭar, who within ritual appears mainly as a god of fertility ²—whether of crops or of living beings—has really gone through a long development. We are aware, in Ancient India, of two main phases of cosmogonic speculation. The later one only becomes visible in the later parts of the Rig-Veda and in the Atharva-Veda and ends in the well-known brahman-ātman-speculation. The earlier one, again, which is found in the older parts of the Rig-Veda, attaches itself to the highest conceptions of that religion, the greatest deity of which is Varuṇa; it has already developed the conception of one single primal God (cf. RV., i, 164, 6. 10; iii, 56, 2), who represents the

¹ PW. no doubt correctly renders agrīya by "first-born", while Geldner translates it "as the first one". Cf. also AV. xi, 6, 3: tvāṣṭāram agrīram brūnas "we address Tvaṣṭar at the head" (Whitney-Lanman).

² In this connection I cannot enter further upon these and others of his characteristics and myths (on which cf. Hillebrandt, Ved. Mythologie, i, 513 sq.; Oldenberg, Rel. d. Veda, ² 237 sq.; Macdonell, Vedic Mythology, 116 sq.).
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mahad devānām asuratvam ekam of RV., iii, 55, and is only faintly to be observed. This religion, which for the sake of shortness we may call the Asurian, has, through high moral conceptions and through its unlimited faculty of cosmogonic speculation, reached a height comparable to that of the great religions of Babylonia and Egypt—and that at a time when the Devas still devoted all their time to fighting and revelries in Soma.

To come back to Tvāṣṭar, he scarcely developed into a majestic moral censor like Varuṇa. He is, however, undoubtedly an old god of procreation and fertility—witness even his name—and he slowly developed into a sort of demiurge, a Viśvakarman of the Asuras. That he was an Asura is obvious from RV., i, 110, 3c–d (cf. 5): tyāṃ cic camasam asurasya bhaksāṇam ekam santam akṛṣṭāt caturvayam. Those addressed here are the Rbhus, who, amongst other tricks during their rivalry with Tvāṣṭar knew how to make one drinking-cup into four.¹ That asurasya in this verse really means Tvāṣṭar is quite obvious from RV., i, 20, 6: uta tyāṃ camasam navam tvāṣṭur devasya niṣkṛtam | akarta caturah punaḥ || (cf. i, 161, 4. 5; iv, 33, 5).² We again meet with this Asura as a divine figure in a couple of mystic verses, where he appears as a sort of hermaphrodite, half bull, half cow. This being partly is active as a creator, partly represents the fertilizing power of the heavenly waters. The latter quality the bull Tvāṣṭar has in common with Parjanya, who is also thought of in the shape of a bull.

If, now, we turn to the verse RV., iii, 38, 4:—

ātiṣṭhantam pari viścē abhūṣanān chriyo vasānaś carati svarocih ā mahat tadd viśno asurasya nāma viśvarūpo amṛtām tasthau ||

we find this Asura in the shape of a bull styled viśvarūpa. The verse is a mystic one. Probably its first half means something like this: the sun ³ rises ⁴ (on the firmament) welcomed by the whole creation; resplendent, wrapt in glory he starts his wandering. Then the situation changes; let us, however, remember that the sun itself is a young bull surrounded by cows, i.e. the heavenly waters, cf. v, 45, 9d. Thus the second half would mean: “This is the great name of

¹ Cf. RV., i, 20, 6; 110, 5, 6; 161, 1. 2. 9; iii, 60, 2; iv, 33, 5; 35, 2; 36 4; AV., vi, 47, 3; Geldner, RV. Übersetzung, i, 129, who adopts the interpretation of Sāyaṇa according to which the Asura is Tvāṣṭar.
² Sāyaṇa in his commentary on RV., iii, 48, 4c, also calls Tvāṣṭar an Asura.
³ Cf. verse 8a, where the god is Savitar.
⁴ Geldner translates ātiṣṭhantam by: “als er (den Wagen) bestieg”.

the Asura-bull; as Viṣvarūpa he has ascended to the immortals (i.e. the heavenly waters)."  

The creative activity of the primeval bull is mentioned in verse 5 (cf. 7). His creation is administered by the "two grandsons of Heaven" (dīvo napātā), probably Varuṇa and Mitra. Also both Rodasī are administrators if we be allowed to refer the yuvam in verse 9a (yuvam pratnasya sādhato maho) to them.

An adequate expression of this creative power of the primeval bull is found in his fertilizing the waters from which the universe springs. As is well known, they first of all brought forth Agni in the shape of Hiranyakagarbha; and this may well be connected with the myth of Agni being procreated by Tvaṣṭar and the waters. We meet with the bull in the Asura hymn, iiii, 55 (17), where it is said of his making the cows fertile: yad anyāsu vṛṣabho roraviti so anyasmin yīthe ni dadhāti retaḥ. As far as I can see, his name was mentioned in the verse 19, quoted above (devas tvastā savitā viṣvarūpaḥ), with the characteristic addition that he "hat den Nachwuchs vermehrt und in grosser Zahl erzeugt und alle diese sind seine Geschöpfe" (Geldner). RV., iii, 56, too, is a Viṣvedevāḥ-hymn of the same character as the preceding one, and especially remarkable for its numerous triads, cf. verse 3:—

tripājasyo vṛṣabho viṣvarūpa uta tryudhā purudha prajāvān
tryanīkāh patyate māhināvānt sa retodhā vṛṣabhaḥ saśvatīnām ||

The bull Viṣvarūpa possesses three bellies, three udders, and three faces—features resembling those found in the Parjanya hymn, RV., viii, 101; and d is 6a there. That the word gaṃ must form a supplement to saśvatīnām, and that this expression denotes the heavenly waters is quite obvious from the following lines. Verse 4a, c-d, describes, according to my humble opinion, the meeting of the bull with the cows: abhīka āśām padvīr abodhi . . . . | āpaś cid asmā aramanans devaḥ prthaq vrajaṃtī pari śīm avṛjyān ||. What is

1 Sāyaṇa explains quite well: varunatmanāṃrtāni jalāni. Geldner translates: "Als Viṣvarūpa (allgestaltet) hat er unsterbliche (Namen) angenommen," and adds in a footnote: "Die unsterblichen Namen sind die Namen, d.h. Einzelwesen der Unsterblichen, die einzelnen Götter, vgl. 1, 68, 4."
2 On this being cf. RV., iii, 56, 3; iv, 3, 10; x, 5, 7; 129, 5; AV., ix, 4, 3; xi, 1, 34; Geldner, RV. Übersetzung, i, 342, note.
3 Cf. iv, 56, 7, where even the sacrifice is the centre of their activity.
4 Cf. RV., x, 2, 7; 46, 9; and further, i, 95, 2; iii, 29, 11 (Agni as garbhasura) and 14 (Agni born asurasya jātharāt).
5 Cf. vii, 101, 1 c-d. Geldner suggests that the bull is Parjanya.
6 I am unable here to follow Geldner, who finds in this verse "eine Reminiscenz an die Geschichte vom Durchmarsch durch die Flüsse" (RV., iii, 33), cf. RV. Übersetzung 1, 363, note.
meant by *abhīka āsām* is better understood by a comparison with *RV.*, i, 71, 8: *ānaṭ śuci reto niṣiktam dyaur abhīke*, where *abhīka* undoubtedly refers to the act of cohabitation. *padavī* again means “guide, leader.”¹ Consequently, I translate iii, 56, 4a thus: “At the meeting (cohabitation) with them (the cows) he appeared as the leader.”² In c–d the description is continued thus: “The divine waters were in love with him, going separate ways they slipped away from him.”³ To the female beings mentioned here belong the three “mermaids” in verse 5c: *ṛūvāvarī yosaṇās tisro aperyāḥ*, cf. also verse 2c. These are perhaps the triad Īlā, Sarasvati, and Bharatī, with whom we frequently meet; and it seems highly probable that they should be identical with the three *dhiṣanāḥ* in *RV.*, v, 69, to whom correspond the three prolific bulls, cf. verse 2:—

irāvātīr varuṇa dhenavo vāṃ madhumad vāṃ sindhavo mitra duhre
trayas tathur vyabhāsas tisṛṇōṃ dhiṣanāṇāṃ retodhā vi dyumantah

When praising a real bull one calls him Tvasṭar. The hymn *AV.*, ix, 4, is an *āṛṣabha*, and a difficult and mythologically very important one.⁴ What mainly interests us here is this. The unintelligible parts of the first ten lines are chiefly a result of the complete intermixture of the cosmologic primeval bull, a bisexual being at once fertilizing and procreating, with Tvasṭar as well as with the earthly bull. The individual features of these three are mixed together in a bewildering way, cf. e.g. verse 3: *pumān antarvān sthavirāḥ pavyasvān vasoḥ kābandham ṣabho bibharti | tam indrāya . . . hutam agnir vahatu jātavedah* where in c–d we hear of the bull sacrificed to Indra, while a–b speak of the primeval bull as identified with Tvasṭar. For the expression *vasoḥ kābandha* reminds us altogether too much of Tvasṭar’s Soma-vessel not to allude to that. We again find this vessel in verse 6a–b:

somena pāṇam kulaśam bibharsi tvasṭa rūpāṇāṃ janiṭā paśūnāṃ

“Thou carriest a brimful cup of Soma, Tvasṭar, creator of forms, of cattle.” From what has been said above it seems obvious that *tvasṭṭa* is here a proper name, and not a substantive meaning “creator” (Whitney-Lanman). And what creator in bull-shape would carry a Soma-cup except Tvasṭar, conceived as the primeval bull ?

¹ Cf. *puropāra*.
² Geldner translates: “Im entscheidenden Augenblick wurde ihr Pfadfinder erweckt.” The reference to iii, 33, 5 sq., and iii, 53, 9, affords us no considerable help.
It exactly fits the cosmogonic aspect of Tvaṣṭar (or the primeval bull) that during the period of creation he was active in the primeval waters; he is even called their father, cf. verse 4b; *pitā mahatāṁ gargarāṇāṁ* “the father of the great ocean depths”. In this quality—and prominently in that of a cosmic creator—he became, of course, connected with other deities whom the philosophers of a later Vedic age honoured with the attributes of world-creators. Especially the Sun (Āditya or Savitar), when identified with the Agni of the sacrifice, is raised to that place of honour; and amongst other names we are reminded of those of Viśvakarman, Puruṣa, and Prajāpati, with whom Tvaṣṭar shares the character of a sexual procreator. In the speculative Yajus-texts Tvaṣṭar simply is the Sun viewed as a creative power. The Kauśika Sūtra identifies him with Savitar and with Prajāpati. Consequently, one might feel inclined to bring the line AV., ix, 4, 2a: *apāṁ yo agre pratīmā babhūva* into connection with VS., xiii, 41a–b: *ādityāṁ garbham āyasyā samaññhi sahasrasya pratīmāṁ viśvarūpaṁ*. This passage refers to that part of the Agnicayana when the human head is deposited in the ukhā, the fire-pot which, amongst other things, also contains milk. Pratīmā obviously means “coincidence with, equivalent of something” and sahasrasya signifies sarvasya, as is shown by the preceding verses and ŚBr., vii, 5, 2, 13; viii, 7, 4, 9. The bull is the “equivalent” of the primeval waters, i.e. of the universe (cf. agre), just as is the āditya garbha. The correspondence perhaps is a little bit unclear, but it is still there.

Thus it is not in the least astonishing that the speculation busying itself with Tvaṣṭar should have formulated the thesis: *tvaṣṭedāṁ viśvam bhuvanam jajāṇa*, while at the same time it emphasizes that the *vīra devakāmaḥ* is a creation of his, VS., 29, 9c; TS., 5, 1, 11, 4. The whole universe thus is his rūpa. And, when he is combined with that other form of the Primeval Being, viz., Puruṣa, he is said to have given him his rūpa. This seems to be the meaning of VS., xxi, 17, a verse following upon the puruṣa-hymn (vv. 1–16):—

```
adbhyāṁ sambhṛtaḥ prthivyai rasāc ca viśvakarmanas samavartatāgre |
tasya tvāṣṭā vidadhad rūpam eti tan martyasya devatvam ājānam agre ||
```

The subject is puruṣa. With b cf. verse 18, and RV., x, 121, 1: *hiranyagarbhaḥ samavartatāgre*. In c we learn that “Tvaṣṭar moves

---

1 Cf. Weber, Omina und Portenta, 391 sq.
2 The PW., to suit this passage and VS., xv, 65, has introduced a special meaning of pratīmā, viz. “creator”. This is, no doubt, wholly unnecessary.
on, creating his form". According to AV., xi, 8, 18, the gods then entered into puruṣa.

Tvaṣṭar's activity generally consists in providing Heaven and Earth with rūpa's. In RV., x, 110, 9, the hotar iṣito yaḍyān, i.e. Agni, is asked to convey to the sacrificial enclosure the one (i.e. Tvaṣṭar) who ime dujavāprthivi janitri rūpur aprīp"u bhuvanāni viśvā. Heaven and Earth, or both Rodasi, are here described as two prolific women (viśvasya janayitrav), and the rūpa's are their offspring. Tvaṣṭar's special activity consists in creating them inside the womb; and RV., x, 184, describes, from a cosmic point of view, his activity amongst men and animals. The act of procreating has called into existence certain "Sondergötter", cf. x, 184, 11:

viṣṇur yoniṁ kalpaṇatu tvaṣṭa rūpāṇi pinśatu |
ā siṇcatu praṇapatir dhātā garbham dadhātu te ||

and Tvaṣṭar is one of these gods. While, however, the activities of these other deities are quite obvious, his field of action is not quite clearly defined. Sāyaṇa's explanation may be correct: tvaṣṭa tanūkarta-tatamājiko devaś ca rūpāṇi nirūpāṇi strīyapatmavabhi-vyanjakāni cihūni pinśatu | avayaśikarotu || Sāyaṇa consequently suggests that Tvaṣṭar provides the embryo with the characteristic marks of sex, and further develops them. In this connection the translation "form" is rather colourless, just as in AV., v, 25, 10 sqq.: dhātaḥ ² sreṣṭhena rūpenaṣya nāryā gavṇyoḥ | pumānamsam putram ā dhehi, etc. The expression sreṣṭhena rūpena is rendered by Whitney-Lanman, "with best forms." However, it rather means: "with the best sex characteristics," i.e. a child of male sex.³ For the "best" of these characteristics are even those which denote a male child. The birth of a daughter is a mahād duḥkkham.

In literature Tvaṣṭar is known as the creator of cattle as well as of rūpa's. And it is quite interesting to observe how these two aspects of his activity are often united in a remarkable way. Such is the case already in RV., i, 188, 9: tvaṣṭā rūpāṇi hi prabhuḥ paśuṁ viśvānt samānaye.³ Cf. further AV., ii, 26, 1: eha yantu paśavo ... tvaṣṭā yeṣāṃ rūpadehyāṇi veda, where Whitney-Lanman translate rūpadehyāṇi by "form-givings", while in a note they remark that it might

---

1 Cf. AV., v, 25, 5.
2 In verses 11–13 instead of this tvaṣṭah, savitah, and praṇapate.
4 Cf. TS., vi, 1, 8, 5; 3, 6, 2 (cf. ii, 1, 8, 3); ŚBr., xi, 4, 3, 17; xiii, 1, 8, 7; TBr., i, 4, 2, 1; PBr., ix, 10, 3.
as well be a synonym of rūpāṇi “forms”. AV., ix, 4, 6, has already been quoted above.\(^1\) The suggestion that in these passages there exists a direct connection between pāśu and rūpa is further corroborated by the expression: tvastā vai paśūnāṁ mithunānāṁ rūpakṛt.\(^2\) Eggeling translates these words (in ŚBr., xiii, 1, 8, 7) thus: “Tvāṣṭar, doubtless, is the fashioner of the couples of animals”; Professor Keith again renders TS., vi, 1, 8, 5, thus: “Tvāṣṭar is the maker of the forms of offspring, of pairings”, and TS., vi, 3, 6, 2, thus: “Tvāṣṭar is the form-maker of the pairings of cattle.” Such translations, however, do not meet the real sense of these passages. Rūpa, according to my view, here has a more realistic sense, closely related to the one we thought probable in RV., x, 184, 1. In ŚBr., xiii, 1, 8, 7, the words in question are made clear with the help of the preceding mantra: tvāṣṭre turīpāya svāhā tvāṣṭre pururūpāya svāheta “to Tvāṣṭar rich in semen svāhā, to Tvāṣṭar possessed of many rūpa’s svāhā!” We find the same thing in TS., vi, 1, 8, 5, where the yajamāna says to his wife: tvāṣṭimati te sapēya whereupon follows tvāṣṭā vai, etc. (cf. above). In both passages Tvāṣṭar is the god of sexual life.

However, the most important passage for defining the sense of rūpakṛt is PBṛ., ix, 10, 2, sq. (with which cf. the shorter version in TBr., i, 4, 7, 1), which deals with the prāyaścitta to be imposed upon the sacrificer whose sacrificial stake (yūpa) has brought forth saplings: asuryaṃ vai etasmād varṇaṃ kṛtvā teja indriyaṃ viryaṃ anādyam praṣāh pāsavo ’pakrāmanti yasya yāpo virohati sa iśvarā pāpiyān bhavitoḥ || 2 || tvāṣṭram paśum bahurūpam abheta tvāṣṭa vai paśūnāṁ rūpānām vikartā tam eva tad upadāvati sa enam tejasendriyena viryanānādyena praṣāya paśubhiḥ punah samaridhayati saiva tasya prāyaścittih || 3 ||. According to the opinion of the commentary the sacrificial animal which is called bahurūpa is in reality a ram (chōga). This is meant to symbolize the words of the TBr.: tvāṣṭā vai rūpānām īše “Tvāṣṭar rules over the rūpa’s”. The commentary on the PBṛ. explains this in the following way: nānārūpasya tvāṣṭas ca sambandhayogatāṃ āha | tvāṣṭā khalu paśūnāṁ gavānāṁ yāṁ parasparam vibhinānāṁ rūpāni teṣāṁ vikartā vividhaṃ kartā. tathā ca taittiriyakam yāvac chero vai retasah sikṣasya tvāṣṭā rūpāṇi vikuroti tāvac chero vai prajāyate iti tat tena bahurūpeṇa paśūnaṁ taṁ tvāṣṭāram upadāvati, etc. From this\(^3\) it is sufficiently clear that Tvāṣṭar develops

\(^1\) Cf. p. 474.
\(^2\) Cf. RV., i, 142, 10; iii, 4, 9; vii, 2, 9; FS., xxvii, 20; KS., 5, 4, 4.
\(^3\) The quotation from the Saṁhitā of the Taittirīya’s is TS., i, 5, 9, 1.
the semen poured into the womb\(^1\); without his working on it (avikṛtam), the retas would not prove fruitful. So many rūpa's will be born, as he produces (vi-karoti) out of it. In this connection, thus, the word rūpa simply means "creator of the embryos (of men or animals)". No doubt Tvaṣṭar was originally a deity of agricultural tribes, to whom was attributed the important function of superintending the creative activities of the herds. The expression paśūnāṁ mithunānām rūpakṛt I would consequently translate by "creator of the embryos of animal couples" or—if mithuna were a synonym of maithuna—"creator of the embryos at the pairings of animals." Because Tvaṣṭar's rūpa's denoted above all the embryos of cattle, the word rūpa also came to mean simply "cattle, domestic animal". This is the case in ŚBr., ii, 2, 3, 2 (cf. TS., i, 5, 1). We are told here that the gods once (the TS. says at a battle with the Asuras) deposited their valuables\(^2\) with Agni. And these precious things consisted in sarvāṇi rūpāṇi yāni ca grāmyāṇi yāni cāraṇyāṇi. Eggeling translates this by "all forms, both domestic and wild"; it is, however, more correct to render it by "all their cattle, domesticated as well as undomesticated". Agni, however, disappeared together with all these rūpa's. Thanks to the circumstance that Tvaṣṭar beheld the punarādheya, he succeeded in finding Agni, who handed them over to him: tasmād ēhus tvāṣṭrāṇi vai rūpāṇi tvaṣṭur hy eva sarvāṇi rūpam upa ha teevāṇyāḥ prajā yāvat so yāvat sa iva tiṣṭhante.

Having thus tried to ascertain the true nature of the rūpa's of Tvaṣṭar, we shall proceed to explain why his son, the demon Viśvarūpa, was known just by that name. This name, robbed of its cosmogonic majesty, exactly fits a god of the herds such as was originally Tvaṣṭar. It is also to be observed that in RV., iii, 55, 19, the tvaṣṭā savitā viśvarūpāḥ is a person of whom it is said: puroṣa prajāḥ purudhā jajāna. And it need not be especially emphasized that in RV., x, 10, 5, the act of procreation forms the main topic.

Concerning the demon Viśvarūpa, we have to observe that he, like Tvaṣṭar, is a possessor of cow-herds, cf. RV., x, 8, 8–9; 76, 3.\(^3\) One can scarcely avoid associating him with the crowd of demons in the Rig-Veda, Vṛtra above all, but also Śuṣṇa, Kuyava, Namuci, etc., who are often said to be possessors of cattle-herds. Moreover, he appears to

---

1 Cf. ŚBr., i, 9, 2, 10: tvaṣṭā vai siktam reto vikaroti; 4, 4, 2, 16; Kau. Śū. 124, 133, 135.
2 TS. has rāmaṁ vasu.
3 We are reminded of the dragon Python as a possessor of cows, cf. Sir J. G. Frazer on Pausanias, x, 6, 6.
be identical with the three-headed dragon Aśi Dahāka in the Avesta, whom Ṣraētaona killed just as Trita killed Viśvarūpa. If this suggestion be correct, he is a native local deity of the type of the Nāgas. As such he was above all a deity of fertility of procreation to whom one turned to obtain human as well as animal offspring. As is well known, this is still done. Childless women in India still with confidence approach the Nāgas, believing them to be able to satisfy their ardent desire for children. Such an idea is closely connected with the superstition, common all over the world, according to which serpents are mystically related to sexual life. Perhaps we need only remember the snakes coiling around the liṅga of Śiva. As for North-western India in special, we are reminded of the following words concerning the Singhs, or serpent deities of the Punjāb: “They have a great power over milch cattle. The milk of the eleventh day after calving is sacred to them, and libations of milk are always acceptable.”

In the mountainous tracts it is common custom that after calving the milk is for a shorter or longer time (a couple of days up to a whole month) taboo to human beings; during that period it is sacred to the deotā, who as a rule is a Nāg. No doubt the Nāg cult is a sort of original religion of these parts; in many places, however, it has been more or less overshadowed by the worship of Hindu gods, above all Śiva and his spouse Devī. The milk is collected and made into butter and ghee, which on certain days is sacrificed to the deity. At the end of the stipulated period a festival with animal sacrifices is celebrated, and after that the milk is no more tabooed. We further know that in the valley of the Rāvi a goat is sacrificed when a cow calves for the first time. After that it is considered sufficient to smear the face of the deotā with milk, butter, etc. This seems to prove that the sacrifice is simply one of gratitude for the successful calving. Generally, the Nāga is the guardian of cattle and of water-springs. People think that if he is not propitiated, the calves will die and the cows dry up.

1 Sir Denzil Ibbetson, Census Report for the Punjab, 1883, § 218; H. G. Rose, A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Panjāb and North-West Frontier Province, i, 143 sq.
3 Cf. Rose, loc. cit., i, 233. It is scarcely possible to agree with the following words of his: “I am inclined to agree with what seems to be the general belief of the people around us that the custom is practised for the profit only.” For, this problem cannot be solved with a simple reference to “the trade practices in these hills”. We must not forget how deep in the soul of the people sits the belief in the power of the Nāg; and this makes it highly improbable that the tribes on the Rāvi should—even in our days—perform such rites for economic purposes only.
In summing up let us return to Vedic conditions. From what has been said above it appears to me obvious that the name Viśvarūpa, an appellative of Tvaṣṭar and of certain serpent demons alike, must allude to their power over the cattle and its procreative activities. For there is not the slightest reason for suggesting that Viśvarūpa had originally a somewhat hazy abstract sense; nor does it seem credible that the serpent demon was thought of as "possessing all forms". Viśvarūpa, according to my humble opinion, can mean nothing but "presiding over, procreating the whole animal creation, all animal shapes".
A Curious Case of Idiomatic Sanskrit

By F. Otto Schrader

In the Introduction to his translation of the *Vaikhānasa-smārtasūtra* (p. xiii ff.) Professor Caland has called attention to certain Tamilisms in the said work, such as *anyām vivāham kuryāt* (= *vēru peññai vivākam ceytu-kolḷa-vēṉṭum*), *vedān . . . adhyayanaṁ karoti*, etc. In a work like the *Vaikhānasa-sūtra*, which is obviously not written in the best Sanskrit, this is not very surprising, nor can it be said that these irregularities render the text unintelligible anywhere. But there seem to be, even in the works of well-known Sanskrit authors, cases of Sanskrit influenced by the vernacular which actually embarrass the reader. One such case is the following one which I came across recently in Śaṅkarānanda’s *Bhagavadgītā-vyākhya*. *Bhag. Gītā* xvi, 19–20 is the passage from which Madhva, though he does not comment upon it or refer to it elsewhere so far as I know,¹ must have derived his dogma of the eternity of the two lowest hells (*tāmisra* and *andha-tāmisra*). All the remaining commentators, Smārtta or not, do not understand the passage as the Mādhvas do, but think of some sort of lowest existence, not in hell but in some of the lower kingdoms of nature, continued for ever, i.e., presumably, until the end of the Kalpa.² Śaṅkarānanda thinks of quickly repeated existences, without intervals, in the form of plants, stones, or Piśācas, and he says of those who have earned for themselves this unfortunate lot: *teśām punahpunar-jananamarāṇe vinā na kadācid api mat-prāptir asti* (introduction to śloka 20), and again (summing up his comment): *adhoḍhaḥ-patanāṁ vinā kadācid api śreyāḥ-prāptir yasmān nāsti tasmād buddhimān sadā . . . yateta.*

Now, what does this mean? Reading the avataraṇa only and unaware yet of what follows, the reader is bound to understand the first sentence about as follows: “Not without having been born and died again and again is there any hope for them ever to reach me,” and he will wonder what need there was for emphasizing that those worst of villains sunk down (according to the comment on the preceding śloka) into the animal kingdom want many reboirths for attaining Liberation. But, coming to the second sentence, he will hardly be able to believe that this goal can be reached by “falling down lower and lower!” He may then try to understand this

¹ His followers do explain and quote it.
² Brahma-Purāṇa (cxv, 103 ff.) declares the tortures of Mahā-tāmisra to last "as long as the earth exists", and similarly some other Purāṇas speak of some particularly terrible hell.
expression as a mere inconsiderate variation of the corresponding compound in the first sentence, but even so will find it very strange that Ś. should even twice hold out a hope to the arch-sinner to which there is no hint whatever in the śloka concerned.

The solution of the riddle is simply this that Ś., while writing Sanskrit, has been thinking in Kanarese. The first sentence must have been present to his mind in about the following form: averīge tiri-tirigi janamāranaṁgaḷ allade endigu mat-prāptī illavē illa, i.e.: “To-them again-and-again births-and-deaths not-being-true ever obtaining-me certainly-is-not (will-not-be).” The crux is allade, the so-called negative verbal participle of the defective verb al “to be true, right, proper, valid”. It is declared to be vinārtham in the Śabdānuśāsana and translated accordingly by Ś., as we have seen. As a matter of fact, however, it has developed a variety of meanings most of which cannot be correctly rendered by vinā. This is evident from Kittel’s many examples of the employment of allade in his Grammar of the Kannada Language (p. 360 fl.). E.g., in avan allade matte kelavaru bandaru “besides him some others came” (K.) allade means, indeed, “without counting,” but in the sense of “in addition to”, while vinā is merely exclusive. Only in certain negative statements (or rhetorical questions) allade approaches the meaning of vinā, as, e.g., in jinan allade dēvar oḷarē, which K. renders by “are [there any] gods except Jina?” As against this, however, compare the following sentences composed of the affirmation of a fact and negation of its opposite: ādiśiva-bhaktamge maduveyan ādaradi nā mālpen allade duhiteyam bhavige koden “Ādiśiva-devotee-to marriage reverently I shall-give not-being-true daughter worldling-to shall-not-give” (K.: “except I reverently marry [her] to a devotee of Ādiśiva, I do not give this [my] daughter to a worldling”); hālu mosarē āguvād allade mosaru hālē ādīvēś “Milk curds becoming not-being-true curds milk may-become?” (K.: “Except that milk becomes curds, could curds become milk?”). Here allade is “inversely” or “as against”, and, in Sanskrit, perhaps anyathā or pratyuta, but certainly not vinā.

There can be no doubt, then, that Ś.’s vinā is nothing but a wrong translation, while he really meant to say: teśām punahpuṇar-janana-marane eeva [vihite], na tu kadācid api matprāptir asti. Whether his mother-tongue was Kanarese or Tamil I am not quite sure. I took it to be Kanarese, because he was a teacher of Vidyāraṇya’s. If it was Tamil, his vinā is a translation of allāmaḷ which is used in the very same way as Kanarese allade.
Udana-varga-Uebersetzungen in „Kucischer Sprache“

aus den Sammlungen des India Office in London

Von E. Sieg und W. Siegling

Die im britischen Besitz befindlichen Handschriftenschatze in Tocharischer Sprache gehoren bis auf ganz verschwindende Reste 1 der Mundart B an, die in England nach dem Vorgang von Prof. Sylvain Lévi 2 als „Kuchean Language“ bezeichnet zu werden pflegt. Den Grundstock bildet die „Hoernle Collection“, die nach Prof. Hoernle’s Tod dem India Office iiberwiesen wurde. Ihr hatte urspriinglich auch die 42 Blatter umfassende Handschrift medizinischen Inhalts angehört, die unter dem Namen „Weber MSS. Part ix and Macartney MSS. Set I“ geht, von der Hoernle bereits 1901 im JASB. 70, Part ii, Extra-Nr. 1, Appendix (p. 1–31) einen TransliterationsVersuch gemacht und die er auch in „Facsimile-Reproduction“, Calcutta, 1902, veroffentlicht hat. Aber von diesen Blattern liegt jetzt die eine Halfte (Bl. 1–12 und 30–42) in der Bodleiana in Oxford, die andere (Bl. 13–29) im British Museum in London. In der India Office Library befinden sich indessen ausser der Hoernle Collection auch noch die allerdings wenigen Blatter in Kucischer Sprache, die aus den spateren Funden Sir Aurel Stein’s stammen. Es sei jedoch bei dieser Gelegenheit darauf hingewiesen, dass auch das British Museum in seinem bisher nicht als „Kucisch“ 4 erkannten MS. Or. 8212 (163) [Or. 52] ein Blattfragment besitzt, das der gleichen Handschrift angehört wie die Blatter St. 42. 2 Nr. 1 und 2 der Stein Collection im India Office.

S. Lévi hat bereits in seinen zusammen mit A. Meillet verfassten „Remarques sur les formes grammaticales de quelques textes en

1 Es kommt eigentlich nur ein einziges Fragment des India Office, namlich AN. 533, Mi xiii, 006, in Betracht, in dem wenigstens einige zusammenhängende Worte in Toch. A erhalten sind:

a. (1) ॥ ṣ par ku ॥
(2) ॥ [rjyp trankus basu šām] ॥
(3) ॥ koṇāktes mandal ॥

b. (1) ॥ st mainkāt nu rohinīṃ sokyō ॥
(2) ॥ nā kṣaī ueraske egūk ·ā] ॥
Rest zerstört.


Da die Liste der India Office Library weit über 200 Nummern Kucischen Schriftentums aufführt, ist also bisher nur ein recht kleiner Teil davon bekannt geworden. Aber es handelt sich bei diesen Nummern fast ausschließlich um mehr oder minder zerstörte Blattreste aus Einzelhandschriften, deren Herausgabe bei dem bisherigen Stand unseres Wissens grösstenteils noch nicht opportun wäre. Für die Feststellung des Wortschatzes und seiner Bedeutung, sowie für die Grammatik kann aber auch das kleinste Stück von Wichtigkeit werden, und wir sind daher dem India Office, insbesondere dem Librarian Mr. Storey und seinem Assistant Librarian Mr. Randle zu grossem Dank verpflichtet, dass uns diese Fragmente auf längere Zeit zur Durchsicht und Kollationierung nach Berlin entliehen wurden.

Beider Gelegenheit haben wir u. a. auch zwölf kleinere Bruchstücke als Übersetzungen aus Dharmatrāta’s Udānavarga identifiziert, und wir freuen uns, eine Auswahl derselben zu Ehren Prof. Rapson’s, der den zentralasiatischen Funden sein besonderes Interesse zugewendet hat, hier vorlegen zu können.—Prof. Lüders, der uns seine Udānavarga-Abschriften bereitwilligst zur Verfügung stellte, hat uns dadurch die Identifizierung teils wesentlich erleichtert, teils erst ermöglicht; ihm sei auch unser herzlicher Dank dafür ausgesprochen, dass er uns die Verwertung seines Textes für diese Publikation gestattet hat.

2 S. die Facsimiles a.a.O. Pl. XI, Nr. 2, und XIX, Nr. 2 und 3 (vgl. auch die Note p. 11).
3 Facsimiles Serindia, iv, Pl. CLII.
4 Facsimiles Innermost Asia, iii, Pl. CXXIII.
Vorweg sei nochmals bemerkt, dass die von uns festgestellten Bruchstücke sämtlich verschiedener Handschriften angehören und damit schon äußerlich die Beliebtheit des Udānavarga im Gebiet von Kuca bezeugen.—In unserer Transskription haben wir zur Erleichterung des Druckes die „Fremdbuchstaben“ nicht besonders bezeichnet, sondern den ihnen inährerenden Vokal durch ā wiedergegeben.


Z. 2 || tāyinā • po aiśintsa ||
3 || anityā bata saṃskārāh • ||
4 || [tka]ntrā • teṣām vyupāsamaḥ ||
5 || ma[n]ene • andhakāraṇa pra ||
6 || ni (d)iś[ō] diśam • kāskau[w]· ||
7 || [pā]ruveṣa yaś[ō]r[ī] ||


2. H. 149. 329 ist das Anfangsstück eines als Nr. 4 gezählten Blattes einer vierzeiligen Handschrift. Das Fragment ist etwa 5½ × 6 cm. gross. Wie wir feststellen konnten, bildet der Text die Übersetzung des Udānavarga, diesmal ohne Beifügung des Sanskrit-Originals, und zwar enthält unser Bruchstück Reste der Strophen 19–25 des i. (anitya-)vargā:

Vorderseite

1 pārkarāya no ākṣāse ||| 1 lēke āke tāprauñē[nta] |||
2 mā aikemanetse [10] 1 ||| 2 srukalīe āke śpā |||
3 uṃmanṣe mā nesām • ke ||| 3 lo yamorcci • yēmo |||
4 ekaṇīñenta ka[krau] ||| 4 mīecci 24 ma nta |||


1 Ergänze zu 19.
na asti. Das folgende abgeborechene ke.. lässt sich nur zu ke(te) oder ke(ta), dem Gen. des Fragepronomens, ergänzen, setzt also eine Lesung kasya des Sanskritoriginals voraus. In den Berliner Udānavarga-Handschriften liegt zwar nur die Lesart kuto (in Übereinstimmung mit Pāli Dhp. 62) vor, aber auch die tibetische Übersetzung (vgl. Beckh, Udānavarga, i, 18) hat in su-yi den Genetiv des Interrogativums.

Die Z. 4 entsprechenden Sanskritworte aus Ud. i, 21 heissen bhogān vai samudāniya. ekaññē (für -ñē), auch ekñiñē (vgl. Lévi-Meillet, MSL., xviii, pp. 4 und 393) „Geld, Besitz “ = Skt. bhoga, ist eine Weiterbildung aus ekaññi, ekñi, das selbst schon die gleiche Bedeutung hat, denn es gibt auf dem unter Nr. 3 zu behandelnden Stück dieser Hoernle-Sammlung Skt. vița wieder. Aus dem gleichen Stamme scheint das entsprechende Wort in A: akāṁśune gebildet zu sein. — Dem Absolutivum samudāniya muss ein B-Absolutivum kakrauparmen gegenüberstehen, das wir wohl hier zu ergänzen haben werden, von der bekannten Wurzel kraup „sammeln“.


srukalē āke spā Z. 2 ist gleich Skt. maranāntam hi aus Ud. i, 23. srukalē ist das Verbalsubstantiv der Wurzel sruk „sterben “, es dient anderwärts auch zur Übersetzung von Skt. mṛtyu (vgl. z.B. J. As., x, 17, p. 441). Die Partikel spā „und “ ist hier für Skt. hi gebraucht, wofür wir oben die Partikel no fanden.

In Z. 3 haben wir (yo)lo yamorci zu lesen für Skt. pāpakarmāṇah Ud. i, 24. Das Adjektiv yolo „, böse, schlecht “ ist bekannt, also ohne weiteres zu ergänzen. yamorci, besser ist wohl yāmorci zu lesen, ist Nom. pl. masc. auf -i eines aus yāmor „, Tat “ (von Wz. yām „, machen “) weitergebildeten possessiven Adjektivums yāmor-tstse (oder -tse), mit Erweichung des tsts zu cc, die für den Obl. und Gen. sg. m. und den maskulinen Plural dieser Adjektiva die Regel ist.— Das folgende abgeborechene yāmo.. (vielleicht zu yāmos = Nom. pl. des Partic. præt. yāmu zu ergänzen) gibt kṛta- aus kṛtapunyāḥ wieder.

Der Schluss der Strophe 24 heisset im Sanskrit nirasravāḥ. Da die Gleichung tsnamñenta = āsravāḥ in unseren B-Texten vorliegt, können wir hier in Z. 4 mit Sicherheit das Aequivalent snaī
tsnamēccē einsetzen. Über die Endung -cci ist eben gesprochen.—
Die Worte ma nta endlich übersetzen Skt. naiwa des Anfangs von
Ud. i, 25.

Höhe und 6–10 cm. Breite. Durch die starken Beschädigungen ist
auch die Schrift schwer mitgenommen worden und bereitet der sicheren
Entzifferung mehrfach Schwierigkeiten. Der Text ist wieder
zweisprachig und bietet die Reste von Udānavarga ii (Kānavarga),
12–20. Wir lesen:

Vorderseite

1 (sar)[va]kā |||
2 saraṃ (↑) ka[na] |||
3 [t·]mem [-l aut]k·[l]n[e] |||
4 yasī prajña–[trp·] |||
5 yā pu[rus]am t[p]ta(m) : [aišam]ñe |||
6 ādhā hi kā[m]e[s]u naru[ā] |||
7 vīna [y·m·]ś antarāy. |||
8 || hanti bhogā : yakte [ai] |||
9 || : yā[k·]ai[śa]m(ū)et·e |||

Rückseite

1 ||| [rś·]na–k·rś. |||
2 ||| [m·:] yakte svāralīne [s·] |||
3 spek ra[no] nākcyenne yśelme[nn]e |||
4 na yāmu [nāske]trā • buddh[ā] |||
5 no ysā[tś·] (↑) [samo] hima[v·] |||
6 ekañī śe[mp]i • [eta] |||
7 lakle no kā[r·]se [kārs·] |||
8 lyam iti |||
9 (ganz zerstört).

Dem ka[na].. (oder kata.. ?) auf Z. 2 der Vorderseite entspricht
Skt. yāvat, der Anfang von Ud. ii, 13. Über diesen Wortrest und seine
mögliche Vervollständigung vermögen wir nichts auszusagen. —
Die in Z. 3 zu lesende Buchstabenfolge dürfte aus den beiden Wörtern
tumēm klautkalīne bestehen, die Skt. tato nīṛttim derselben Strophe 13
gleichzusetzen sind. tumēm ist der Ablativ des neutralen Demonstrativpronomens tu, klautkalīne das Verbalsubstantiv der Wurzel
klautk „,umkehren“ (vgl. z.B. J. As., x, 17, p. 434, wo Skt. nīṛttaḥ
durch das reduplizierte Partizipium kāklau(tkau) übersetzt ist). — In Z. 5 ist der Instrumental aisamū(e(sa) als Entsprechung für Skt. prajñāyā aus Str. 14 anzusetzen.


Den Worten api swarṇasasya aus Ud. ii, 19 entsprechend werden wir Z. 5 zu rano yṣātse zu ergänzen haben, denn yṣātse ist der Gen. von ysā „Gold“, das auch in der Form yasa erscheint. — Über ekāṇi = vittam vgl. oben, Nr. 2. semepi in derselben Zeile 6 ist das Aequivalent für Skt. ekasya. Das Zahlwort „eins“ flektiert in B: Sg. masc.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vorderseite</th>
<th>Rückseite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Z. 4 gibt dieselbe Stelle *vittam tan nālam ekasya* aus Ud. ii, 19 wieder, wie schon Nr. 3, R. 6. In der Übersetzung erscheinen die Worte in anderer Reihenfolge: *tu = tad*, *mā = na*, *eka(ni) = vittam*.


5. H. 149. 315. Rest der linken Seite eines Blattes, das als das 23. der Handschrift gezählt ist. Die Blatthöhe beträgt 7 cm., die erhaltene Länge des Bruchstückes schwankt zwischen 4 und 9 cm.
Obwohl der Text nur in der Sprache B abgefasst ist, konnten wir ihn als zum Udānavarga gehörig feststellen. Unser Blatt enthält die Übersetzung der Verse x, 6–14, wovon folgendes erhalten ist:

Vorderseite
1 ṛṇe va·e [ś·] |||
2 pavaśṣorūṇe śāp sn[ai m·] |||
3 sa kekeu rilyṇetstse yai |||
4 śśāṃ takarśkāṇṇī aisamnē śāp |||
5 pi pelaiknentstse klyauṣalyēnēe |||

Rückseite
1 yarpō lykanṣtsa olyapotstse waimē·e |||
2 tste kātkem aisamymi : aiskem śemi |||
3 śvātsine : mā sū iṅkaun kā |||
4 k karuor : sū iṅ(k)aum |||
5 snaiv var |||

Das zehnte Kapitel des Udānavarga ist der śraddhāvarga. Das B-Wort für śraddhā heisst takarśkīne, takarśkāṇṇe, was wir auf unserem Fragment, Z. 4 der Vorderseite, bestätigt finden. Daneben kennen wir das Wort auch aus mehreren Belegen unserer Sammlung als Wiedergabe von Skt. pvasāda. Zu Grunde liegt dieser Abstraktbildung auf -nē (-ānē) ein adjektivisches takarśke, für das auf einem Fragment dieser Hoernle-Sammlung das Äquivalent prasanna „gläubig“ gegeben wird. Aus dem Abstraktum ist andererseits wieder ein Adjektivum takarśkīnetse weitergebildet worden, das einmal in unseren Texten Skt. śraddha übersetzt. — Dieses takarśkāṇṇe haben wir nun auch gleich auf Z. 1 der Vorderseite unseres Bruchstückes zu ergänzen, die dem Anfange der Strophe x, 6 śraddhā dvīyā puruṣasya entspricht, d. i. in der Sprache B takarśkāṇṇe wate saumontse. wate heisst, wie bekannt, „der zweite“, und śavumo hatten wir schon im vorigen Stück, Nr. 4, dem synonymen Skt. jantu gleichgesetzt.—Z. 2 entspricht den Worten aus Ud. x, 7 śilam caivaṁśīṣā. Das hier mit w für p geschriebene pāpaśṣorūṇe stellt ein mit der Endung -rūṇe gebildetes Abstraktum aus dem Partizipium papāṣṣu (von Wz. pāsk „hüten, üben“) dar, sein Gebrauch für Skt. śīla ist auch sonst bezeugt. śāp (spā) ist die bekannte Partikel „und“. Für Skt. ahiṁśā haben wir nach Parallelen B snai miyāśūlīne anzusetzen, das durch snai „ohne“ negierte Verbalsubstantiv der tocharischen Wurzel mi (Praes. miyāśāṃ) = Skt. hiṁs. — Für Z. 3 kommen die Sanskritworte
aus Ud. x, 8 . . . sampannas tyāgavām viṭa-(matsaraḥ) in Betracht. kekenu ist das Part. pract. der Wz. kōn, kōn „zu Stande kommen“, Skt. sam-pad; rilyṇētstse = tyāgavan ein possessives Adjektivum, mit dem schon aus Nr. 2 bekannten Suffix -tstse (-tse) aus dem Verbalabstraktum rilyṇe (Wz. ri „aufgeben, verlassen“) gebildet. Das folgende, Skt. viṭa entsprechende Wort war ohne Zweifel yaiku, denn wir haben dieses zur Wz. wïk „schwinden, vergehen“ gehörende Praeteritalpartizip anderwärts für Skt. kśīna gefunden. — Die Worte labhate śraddhām projñān ca, Ud. x, 9, liegen der Z. 4 zu Grunde, wo wir dem labhate entsprechendes kālpāṣām am Anfange ergänzen können. Die Verschmelzung der beiden folgenden Wörter unter Ausfall des auslautenden e von takarṣkāṇe erweist, dass die Übersetzung trotz ihrer wörtlichen Treue metrisch abgefasst ist. — Z. 5 ist zu übersetzen „,beim Hören des (guten) Gesetzes “ und gibt das Kompositum saddharmasāraṇane aus Ud. x, 10 wieder. „,Gut“ heisst Nom. sg. kartse, kārtse, Obl. krent; den mehrfach bezeugten Gen. kreṇcepi haben wir am Anfange der Zeile zu ergänzen.


Vorderseite

1 ||| kete no te kā[r]st • r • tā |||
2 ||| (sa)mādhīm adhigacchati • ompalkoññe yānmāsāṃ |||
3 ||| ramt snai va(r) • sacet khanel (la)bhet tatra • krāj rāpo |||

Rückseite

1 ||| my • n no lā[r • y • ]mītrā • hr — yadvaj jalārthi |||
2 ||| (a)nāvīlam • kroše war snai mārkarccē 15 n • |||
3 ||| onolmi • aprasannāṃ |||

Die verstümmelte Übersetzung des ersten Pāda von Ud. x, 15 (srāddhaṃ) prājñāṃ tu seveta ist auf Z. 1 der Rückseite als ...aia numyen no lāre yamitrā wiederherzustellen. Die sehr häufige Verbindung lāre yam (med.), wörtlich „, sich lieb machen “, begegnet uns noch öfter als Übersetzung von Skt. sev (daneben auch für bhaj).
**UDĀNAVARGA-UEBERSETZUNGEN IN „KUCISCHER SPRACHE“**


7. H. 149. 331. Ein nur 5 × 6 cm. grosses, an allen Seiten beschädigtes Fragment, auf dem noch vier Zeilenreste erhalten sind. An den Sanskritworten erkannten wir die Zugehörigkeit zu Udānavarga xii, 8–13. Der Text lautet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vorderseite</th>
<th>Rückseite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In Z. 1 der Rückseite entsprechen die unvollkommen erhaltenen B-Worte dem Anfange von Ud. xii, 12 eṣo ’njaso hy eṣa ca. Das Skt. aṇjasa übersetzende Wort ist empreṃtsa zu lesen. Die femininische Form dieses Adjektivums (vom Mask. auf -tse) beruht darauf, dass das dazu zu denkende Bezugswort „Weg“ = ytārye in B Femininum ist, wie wir oben sahen. Zu Grunde liegt dieser Ableitung ein bekanntes empreṃ „gerade, wahr“ auch substantivisch „Wahrheit“,
welche Bedeutungen durch die in unseren Texten erhaltenen Sanskritaequivalente *samyak* und *satya* gesichert werden. Danach müssen wir natürlich auch für das dem ersten *esa* entsprechende Demonstrativum die femininische Form *sā* am Anfange der Zeile ergänzen. Das zweite *esa* gibt der Übersetzer durch das mask. *se* wieder, indem er es offenbar auf das folgende Skt. *parākrama* bezieht, als dessen B-Aquivalent wir etwa ein maskulines *spelke* vermuten dürfen. — Das letzte Wort der Strophe xii, 12, *abhāṣyaśāh*, finden wir auf Z. 3 durch *
*sek* *sekā* ,,immer und immer wieder“ sinngemäss übersetzt. — Z. 4 endlich haben wir *(yatā)*ri *wessām* se genau entsprechend den Sanskritworten *māgam* *vadaty* *esa* aus Ud. xii, 13 zu lesen.


Vorderseite

1 ||| *k* · *mane* · *cā[ra]*** |||
2 ||| *[y ·]eva* *śarvari* · *al* · |||
3 ||| *sphutam* · *y[ai]pormem* *orkamn[ai]* |||
4 ||| *śanestse* *no mā* *lkāssām* 3 ta |||
5 ||| ·*[o] k̄*se* *tākoy* · *ākṛtvā* [na] |||
6 ||| *rū[pā]ni* · *[c]o*** |||
7 (zerstört)

Rückseite

1 (zerstört)

2 ||| *[m · ] y(ā)m̄n̄[ssā](m̄) [ks · ]|||
3 ||| *pā[so](r)ū(e)ntan(e) no a[ve]lā |||
4 ||| *[t]o[tā]r keklyauṣor* · *7 alpaśru* |||
5 ||| *[n]tane* *anaiśai* *wavelāwau* · *śila[t · ]|||
6 ||| *ś ca* *bhavati* · *yek[t·]e ke* |||
7 ||| · *e naksentrā* · *nā* |||

die beiden Zeilen 3 und 4. Auf 3 entsprechen sich yaipormem und Skt. praviṣya, orkam[ai] ... und Skt. tamasā. Das Absolutivum yaipormem gehört zu der bekannten Wurzel yap yop „eintreten“. „Dunkelheit, Finsternis“ heisst in B orkamāne, was uns ein Stück aus der Hoernle-Sammlung als Parallele für Skt. timira bezeugt. Dieses Abstraktum ist aus dem Adjektivum orkmo (m., f. orkāmāna) „dunkel“ abgeleitet; sein hier zu erwähnender Instrumental kann nach unserem Wissen nicht anders als orkamānesa angesetzt werden. Vielleicht ist das von uns unsicher gelesene ai nur eine durch die Zerstörung der Handschrift an dieser Stelle bedingte Täuschung.—Skt. ca(kṣuṣmān vā 1) na paśyati finden wir Z. 4 durch (e)ṣanetstse no mā ikāsṣām wiedergegeben. Aus dem Dual esane „die Augen“ (Sing. ek) ist mittels des schon wiederholt angetroffenen possessiven Suffixes -stse ein dem ca(kṣuṣmān) gleiches Adjektivum gebildet. Vgl. das Zitat bei Lévi-Meillet, MSL., xviii, p. 24, wo esanic- für esane- verdruckt ist. Über die Partikel no s. oben, Nr. 2, V. 1.— Auf Z. 5 haben wir als Übersetzung der Worte api yo bhavet aus Ud. xxii, 4 wohl rano kāse tākoy zu lesen, denn die Gleichung rano = api ist häufig genug in unseren Texten belegt. Der Optativ tākoy gehört zum Paradigma des Verbem substantivum, das in beiden Mundarten des Tocharischen aus den beiden Stämmen nes (A nas) für das Praesens und ṭāk für Praeteritum, Conjunctiv, Optativ sich zusammensetzt. Als dritter Stamm tritt hinzu saī sēy (in A sē) für das Imperfect. Folgende Formenreihenstellung mag einen Überblick über den Aufbau dieses Paradigmas gewähren, wozu bemerkt sei, dass die Bildung des Infinitivs und des Verbalsubstantivs aus dem Praesensstamme eine nur in diesem Paradigma auftretende Unregelmässigkeit darstellt.

Praes. act. 3. Sg. nesām; Part. (medial l) nesamane; Inf. nestṣi, nesși; Verbaladj. nesalye, nesalle; Verbalsubst. nesalīc.

Imperfect Sg. saim (seym), sait, sai (sey); Pl. seyem, seycer (saicer), seyc (seym).

Praet. 3. Sg. tāka (mit enklitischen Pronomina takānī, takās, takāne).

Co. 3. Sg. tākaṃ (gleichlautend auch die 3. Pl.).

Opt. 3. Sg. tākoy.

Imperativ Sg. ptāka, Pl. ptākas.

Part. præt. tatākau; Absol. tatākarmem.

1 So ist der unvollständig überlieferte Text von Lüders ergänzt. Die tibetische Übersetzung bietet mig-lidan (= ca(kṣuṣ-mān) bzin-du „though he has eyes“ (Rockhill).

Der Schluss von Ud. xxii, 7 heisst im Sanskrit sampadyate šrutam. Dem substantivisch gebrauchten šrutam entspricht in Z. 4 genau das Verbalabstraktum kkeklyausor der Wurzel klyaus, "hören" (vgl. dazu karnor und kārstor in Nr. 5 und 6), während sich zur Ergänzung der verstümmelten Wiedergabe von sampadyate nur das in einigen Formen bezeugte Verbum yot aus unserem Wortschatz darbietet, dessen Bedeutung "zu Stande kommen" wir aus dieser Stelle erfahren. Die hier zu erschliessende 3. Sg. yototār stimmt vollkommen zu der anderwärts belegten 3. Pl. yotontra. — Von der
schon oben, Z. 3, angezogenen Z. 5 ist nur noch auf das Indeclinabile anaisai hinzuweisen, das hier Skt. su wiedergibt, an anderen Stellen dagegen zur Übersetzung der indischen Praepositionen pari und anu verwendet wird. Im Tocharischen (in der A-Mundart lautet das Wort āneinci — wofür eine Handschrift auch ānemśi schreibt —) müssen wir es wohl eher als Adverb ansehen. — Über yekte Z. 6 als Wiedergabe von Skt. alpa aus Ud. xxii, 9 ist bereits in Nr. 3 gehandelt. — Die bekannte Form naksentrā Z. 7 (Praes. med. der Wurzel nak nāk „tadeln“), die hier für Skt. vigarhanti (ebenfalls aus Strophe 9) steht, bedarf keiner weiteren Erläuterung.
On the Ephedra, the Hūm Plant, and the Soma

By Aurel Stein

In choosing the subject for this short paper I am guided not solely by the fact that the archaeological observations which first drew my attention to it were gathered in that field of my Central-Asian explorations with which I have fortunately been able to associate my old friend Professor Rapson as one of the earliest and most helpful of my collaborators. What invests certain curious finds among modest burial remains of the Lop desert with a special quasi-personal interest for me is the distant and puzzling relation they bear to a much discussed question of Vedic and Avestic research, that of the sacred Soma and Haoma.

It is a question which was often touched upon in his lectures by that great scholar and teacher, Professor Rudolf von Roth, during the years 1881–4, when I had the good fortune, figuratively, to sit at his feet as an eager devoted pupil. The question as to the identity of the original Soma plant and its home which he had discussed just at that time in two short papers of masterly clearness,¹ was not to be solved then, and still remains undecided.² But Roth’s main contention still holds good that a solution for it could be hoped for only by the study of relevant physical facts, if possible, on the ground of early Aryan occupation.

The archæological “finds” to which I have alluded above were curiously enough made in a most desolate part of Central Asia, on ground which is far from likely ever to have served as the habitat of an early population speaking the Aryan, i.e. common Indo-Iranian, tongue, and practising that cult of the Soma: Haoma as the hymns of the Rigveda or Avestic texts represent it. In Innermost Asia, the

¹ See Roth, “Über den Soma”, ZDMG. 1881, pp. 681–92; and “Wo wächst der Soma?” ZDMG. 1884, pp. 134–9. Excellent English translations of both papers were furnished by Mr. C. J. (subsequently Sir Charles) Lyall, I.C.S., with a letter dated 22nd July, 1884, to the Hon. Sir Stewart Bayley, then Member of the Governor-General’s Council. Together with notes of Dr. G. Watt they were supplied in print to officers employed on the Afghan Delimitation Commission. I owe a type-written copy of those translations to the courtesy of the officer in charge, Governmentt of India Records.

² Cf. Macdonell-Keith, Vedic Index, ii, pp. 475, under the head Soma, for a succinct survey of the numerous widely different opinions recorded by Indologists and others about the identity of the plant figuring in Vedic hymns and later texts.
detailed report on my third Central-Asian expedition, I have given a full account how in February, 1914, in the course of my search for the ancient Chinese route once leading during the centuries immediately before and after the commencement of our era through the now utterly waterless Lop desert, I came upon the remains of a ruined watch-post, L.F., and just outside it of a small cemetery.¹

Their position on a steep "Mesa" or eroded ridge of clay, rising over a hundred feet above the bare plain around, had, together with the utter aridity of the climate, helped to protect the remains from damage both by moisture and by wind-erosion, a most destructive force in this forbidding region. The finds brought to light by clearing the rooms of the little stronghold definitely proved that it had been occupied as a station to keep watch over the route once leading across the absolute desert beyond towards Tun-huang, on the westernmost border of China proper. This route, as proved by plentiful documentary evidence from the ruins of the fortified Chinese station of Lou-lan farther to the south-west, had finally been abandoned early in the fourth century A.D.

The question as to the occupants of the watch-post was answered with full clearness by the exploration of the little cemetery outside. Several of the graves opened proved to contain bodies in a surprising state of preservation, as seen from the photographs reproduced in Innermost Asia.² Looking down on figures which, but for the parched skin and the deep sunk eye-cavities seemed like those of men asleep, I could not doubt that the dead belonged to the autochthone seminomadic people whom the Chinese Annals describe as the inhabitants of this territory of ancient Lou-lan.

The appearance of heads and faces clearly suggested the Homo Alpinus type, which, as Mr. T. A. Joyce's analysis of the anthropometric materials collected by me has shown,³ is best represented nowadays among the Iranian-speaking hillmen of the valleys adjoining the Pāmīrs. It forms a very conspicuous element also in the racial composition of the present population of the Tārīm basin. The look of the dead, their dress and buried belongings, clearly indicated that they and their people had lived the semi-nomadic life of herdsmen, fishermen, and hunters, just as the Lopliks, now to be found on the lower Tārīm river, did down to our times. That these modern

¹ See Innermost Asia, i, pp. 263 sqq.
² See ibid., figs. 171, 172.
³ Cf. his Appendices, in Serindia, iii, pp. 1351 sq.; Innermost Asia, ii, pp. 996 sq.
successors of the ancient Lou- lan people are of Turkish speech and unmistakably Mongolian stock need not concern us here.

The bodies were enveloped in a shroud of coarse canvas. The shroud in the case of the two best preserved burials, both of middle-aged men, had its edge near the head or where it lay across the breast tied up into two little bunches. One of these proved to contain grains of wheat, and the other a quantity of small broken twigs.¹ There could be little doubt about the contents being meant to represent provisions for the dead in another life.

Similar little packets of broken twigs placed in an exactly corresponding fashion were found also in four more graves, including that of a female, at other small burial grounds of the same type but less well preserved, which were subsequently discovered by us in two widely distant localities (L.Q. and L.S.) of the Lop desert.² In most of the other graves at these cemeteries the bodies and their belongings were found in a badly decayed state not permitting of close examination of details. But it may be safely assumed that the provision of such small packets of twigs formed part of the regular funeral practice among the indigenous people who in a more or less nomadic fashion inhabited the Lop tract during the first few centuries of our era before it became a wholly waterless desert.

Specimens of this particular burial-deposit from all the six graves mentioned were submitted by me to Dr. A. B. Rendle, F.R.S., Keeper of the Department of Botany, British Museum, who in a letter dated 4th August, 1925, kindly informed me as follows:—

"The specimens (they are all the same) are undoubtedly fragments of the twigs of Ephedra, a low-growing shrub with slender green branches devoid of leaves except for a small membranous sheath at the nodes. It is abundant in the drier regions of the Himalayas and Tibet, and generally in Central and Western Asia."

In the same letter Dr. Rendle was good enough to refer me to an interesting notice in Sir George Watt's Dictionary of the Economic Products of India, which records the identification of the plant now used as the sacred Homa in the Zoroastrian ritual of the Parsís of India with an Ephedra. This notice ³ describes the Ephedra as "a genus of erect or sub-scendent rigid shrubs comprising some eight or ten species... met with in Europe, temperate Asia, and South America".

¹ Cf. Innermost Asia, i, pp. 265, 268 (L.F. 05, L.F. i, 03).
² Cf. ibid., ii, pp. 736 sq., 740 sq. (for graves L.S. 2, 3, 6); 743, 748 (L.Q. iii).
³ Cf. Dictionary of Economic Products of India, iii, pp. 246 sq.
Of one species in India (Ephedra vulgaris, Rich.) it is mentioned that it occurs throughout the Himālayas, but is also distributed in Central and Western Asia. Two other Indian species are said to have a more westerly distribution (E. pachyclada, Boiss.), extending from Garhwal to Afghānistān and Persia, and the other, E. peduncularis, Boiss., being met with from the Panjāb, Rājputānā, and Sind to Afghānistān and Syria.

What however directly concerns us here is the statement furnished by the subsequent passage of the notice: "Interest has recently been taken in these curious plants from the observation that the dried twigs of an Ephedra imported from Persia into Bombay constitute the sacred Homa of the Parsis. A sample of the Homa obtained in Bombay was at first determined as Periploca aphylla, an erect leafless perennial with twigs as thick as a goose-quill or less, and possessing a milky sap. Subsequent examination of other samples, however, revealed the fact that the Homa of the Parsis was in reality an Ephedra, and this determination has since received support from the information recorded by Dr. Aitchison in his botanical report in connection with the Afghan Delimitation Commission, where it is stated that Ephedra pachyclada, Boiss., bears, in the Hari-rud valley, the names of hum, huma, yehma. Dr. Aitchison states of that plant that it was found 'a very common shrub, from Northern Baluchistan along our whole route, in the Hari-rud valley, the Badghis district and Persia, growing in stony gravelly soil'. Of Ephedra foliata, Boiss., Dr. Aitchison further affirms that it is known as Hum-i-bandak."\(^1\)

Dr. Rendle in the same communication drew my attention to a note of Dr. Dymock (late Surgeon-General, Indian Medical Service), quoted in Sir G. Watt's Dictionary,\(^2\) and stating: "The Parsi priests say that the Homa never decays, and they always keep it for a considerable time before they use it." This observation seemed at first to suggest a possibility that the depositing of Ephedra twigs with those ancient Lou-lan people might have been meant merely as a symbolic provision to prevent decay of their bodies, and thus to assure their full enjoyment of a future life.

---

\(^1\) It fully agrees with Dr. Aitchison’s observation about the distribution of the Ephedra that I found a low scrub, known locally by the name of Hūm and closely corresponding in appearance to the above description of the genus, growing plentifully on the gravelly wastes crossed on my journey of 1915 along the Perso-Afghan border between Mūnjābād and Durōh. I well remember how bitter the taste was when I tried to chew a little of the green twigs.

\(^2\) See loc. cit., iii, p. 250.
But this interpretation of the curious burial practice has lost much of its force since it has come to my knowledge that an alkaloid isolated from a species of Ephedra, known to the Chinese as *Ma-huang*, has apparently for a long time past been widely used as a powerful drug. Preparations of this alkaloid under the name of Ephedrine have on account of their very valuable pharmacological action on bronchial muscles, mucous membranes, blood-pressure, ophthalmic affections, etc., entered largely into recent medical practice.¹

I have had no opportunity to ascertain how far back and over what parts of Asia this medical use of the bitter principle obtained from Ephedra plants can be traced. But on general grounds it appears to me probable that this effective therapeutical use of a plant widely spread in Central Asia may have been practised from early times in the region of the Tārīm basin. If to this is added the evident ease with which the dry twigs of Ephedra can be preserved for such use, their provision in those ancient burial deposits of the Lop tract can well be accounted for.

Far more difficult it is to explain how the Ephedra plant came to be used for supplying the juice which in the Zoroastrian ritual practice of the present day, both among the "Gabar" communities of Yezd and Kirmān and the Pārsīs of India, figures as the representative of the ancient Haoma. That this use is not recent can be safely concluded from the popular application to an Ephedra of the name Hūm, as already referred to, in the border tracts of Persia and Afghanistān. Yet it is obviously impossible to reconcile the character of the juice obtained from this Hūm or Ephedra plant, extremely bitter and far from palatable even as a medicine, with what Rigveda hymns and Avesta often indicate as to the exhilarating and exciting effects of both Soma and Haoma.² It is clear enough that on Iranian ground, too, a substitution for the original plant must have taken place such as Sanskrit texts directly attest for India in the case of the original Soma of the Vedic hymns. But the very limited extent of the materials available bearing on the history of the realia of the Zoroastrian cult leaves little hope of direct evidence being ever obtained on the point.

¹ I take my information on this point from Wellcome's *Excerpta Therapeutica*, 1930, pp. 72 sqq.
² Cf. e.g. *RV* viii, 48, 1, where the Soma is called the drink "to which all the gods and men together stream calling it ‘sweetness’ self ‘”, as quoted by Roth, *ZDMG*. 1881, p. 683.
There can be no doubt that the Haoma of the Avesta was identical with the original Soma plant of the Vedic hymns. Abundant as are the references in the latter to the sacred Soma which served as the libation to the gods at the most important of sacrifices, yet such definite data as we can gather from them regarding the plant itself are very scanty.\(^1\) This vagueness of indications, characteristic of so much else that the earliest poetic literature of India supplies, is duly reflected, as already mentioned, by the widely divergent opinions of scholars as to the identity of the plant.

It would not fall within the scope of this paper systematically to take up afresh this much-discussed question, even if I commanded the time needed for studying it in all its aspects and had access to the whole literature which has accumulated concerning it. But in the course of my Indian service, and especially during the archaeological explorations conducted by me along the North-West Frontier of India in the years 1926–8, I was able to acquaint myself with much of the ground where the areas of early Indo-Aryan and Iranian occupation meet, and this fact may justify my briefly recording here some quasi-geographical observations which deserve to be considered in relation to that question.

One of the few definite data furnished by the texts about the famous plant is that it grew on the mountains. The special importance of this indication is emphasized by the fact that it is supplied by numerous passages of the Rigveda and by the Avesta alike.\(^2\) This ought to suffice to exclude from the range of consideration both the Hûm plant of Persia and any of the order of the Asclepiadæ to which the species of Sarcostemma, the modern representative of the Soma plant in the ritual practice of Brahmanic India, belongs. For as Sir George Watt, in his notes on the above-mentioned translation of Professor von Roth’s papers, has justly pointed out, the very numerous species of Asclepiadæ to be found in India are for the most part confined to the tropical and sub-tropical plains, the drier tracts like the Panjâb and Sind “which most resemble Afghânistân containing fewest species.” An equally strong argument against any of the Asclepiadæ is raised by Sir George Watt’s question: “Can any one who has examined the bitter milky sap of the Asclepiadæ (such as

---

\(^1\) For a lucid analysis of such data and of the references bearing in general on the cult-practices connected with the Soma, cf. Macdonell-Keith, *Vedic Index*, ii, pp. 474 sqq.

Calotropis gigantea, the Akenda, or Madar) suppose that such a liquid could ever be used for more than a medicinal purpose?"

Now it is curious to note that in view of the Rigveda’s and Avesta’s uniform mention of the mountains as the home of the plant an interesting passage of the Avesta has not received more attention. It is found in Yasna x, 11, a text known as the Höm-yasht. Though classed with the "Younger Avesta", it yet undoubtedly contains much early traditional lore. The passage, Yasna x, 11, claims to describe the distribution of the sacred Haoma plant, and runs as follows:—¹

\[
\text{āat ývá athra spenta fradaysta}
\text{mr̥yā viśvaña vibarm}
\text{avi iškata upāiri-saëna}
\text{avi staéra staro-sára}
\text{avi kusrāða kusrō-patāða}
\text{avi pawrāna viśpāða}
\text{avi spita-gaona gaiiri.}
\text{āat áhva paurvatāhva}
\text{pauru-sarādo viroḍahē}
\text{haomō gaomo zairi-gaonom.}
\]

In keeping with Darmesteter’s translation (Zendavesta, i, pp. 101 sq.), it may be rendered as follows:—

"From there [the Haraiti barva, i.e. the Elburz range of Persia] the divine birds have carried you in all directions to the iškata Upāirisaëna, to Staéra which has the stars on its head, to Kusrāða Kusrō-patāða, to the pass (?) of Pawrāna, to the 'White Mountains'. And in all those places you flourish manifold, oh succulent (?), golden-coloured Haoma."

The distinct references made in two preceding passages of the same text (Yasna x, 3, 4) to the mountains as the home of the Haoma is a very valuable confirmation of what passages of the Rigveda tell us of the Soma. The same applies also to the description of the Haoma as zairi-gaona, "golden-coloured"; for it agrees exactly with the colour hari ascribed to the Soma plant in the Rigveda. But still more useful for our investigation are the definite topographical indications to be gathered from the Avesta passage I have quoted.

As long ago as 1886 I had occasion in a brief communication to the Seventh International Congress of Orientalists at Vienna to point out that the localities enumerated in this passage must all be looked

¹ See Yasna x, 11, in Geldner’s edition.
for in that mountainous north-eastern portion of the present Afgānīstān which extends from the Oxus to the south of the Kābul river.¹ I then showed that the Mount Upāirisaēna "the mountain above the eagles' [flight], the Aparsīn of the Bundahish, is identical with the Paropanisus of the Greeks, the Hindukush range north of Kābul²; and that Kusrāda and Kusrā-patāda correspond in all probability to the mountain-tracts of Ghōr and Ghōrband situated to the north and south of that range.³ In Pavrāna it is easy to recognize the modern local name Parvān borne by the pass and valley through which a well-known route across the central portion of the Hindukush range due north of Kābul descends to the meeting-point of Ghōrband and Panjshīr. The spita-gaona gairi, the "White Mountains", correspond to the high range called Spūn-ghar by the Pashtu-speaking Pathāns along the Peshawar and Kohāt border, and more generally known by its Persian designation of Safēd-kōh. In Staēra we have perhaps an older Iranian form of the well-known modern name Tirāh, the mountain-tract held by the Afīrids west of the Peshawar valley. The phonetic derivation of the present name Tirāh can now be more readily accounted for since we know that the tongue once spoken in Tirāh and still surviving in a few villages north of the Safēd-kōh belongs to that Dardic branch of the Aryan language group which, like the Indian branch, knows the change of st to s.⁴

¹ This communication was, I regret to confess, through my fault, not printed in the Proceedings of the Congress. The identifications then proposed were mentioned by me in 1887 to my lamented friend Professor James Darmesteter and readily accepted by him; see his Zend-Avesta, i, pp. 102 sq., with notes 30–4. For an independent reference to that communication, cf. Geiger-Kuhn, Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie, ii, p. 393, note 2.

² The Pahlavi commentary renders the ḍaŋa-yomaēnov iškata by shikuft "cave". Can this interpretation be connected in any way with the legend of Alexander's Greeks which looked for Prometheus' cave in the Indian Caucasus, i.e. the Paropanisus?

³ Here, too, as in the case of the phonetic derivation of Tirāh (see below) account may have, perhaps, to be taken of the influence exercised by a local population speaking a Dardic tongue. For the change of initial k > kh > gh cf. Grierson, Pišāca Languages, p. 93. The change of initial k into kh is regular also in certain East Iranian languages: see ibid.

The Ghōrband valley lies very close to the area where certainly in later times Pashai, a Dard language, was spoken.

It deserves to be noted that the name Ghōrband occurs also as the name of a considerable valley which descends to the right bank of the Indus from the watershed towards Upper Swāt. The valley belongs to a hill-tract where until the Pathān conquest of late mediaeval times a Dardic language, akin to those still prevailing in the adjacent Indus Kohistān, was spoken.

The Vedic texts have nothing to offer that in point of geographical definition could compare with the guidance which this passage of the Avesta affords for the location of the sacred plant. But on closer examination it is yet possible to discern in them some indications of quasi-geographical bearing which justify our looking to the hill-ranges due south of the mountain-area marked in the Avesta passage as a likely habitat of the elusive plant that provided the Soma relished by gods and men.

When dealing with the results of the archaeological tour which in the winter of 1927 took me through the whole length of Wazīristān and Northern Balūchistān, I had already occasion to point out that these border territories between the Indus valley and Eastern Irān were likely to have been for some length of time in the occupation of Vedic tribes, before they descended from those hills, a poor arid land, though perhaps then not quite so barren as now, to the conquest of the fertile Indus-valley and the Panjāb plains. The rivers Krumu and Gomati mentioned in a famous hymn of the Rigveda, x, 75, have long ago been recognized as identical with the present Kurram and Gumal, in which the whole drainage of Wazīristān and the Afghan uplands adjoining westwards finds its way to the Indus. The mention of these two rivers, both comparatively small except when sudden spates fill their beds, distinctly points to such acquaintance with Wazīristān as only prolonged Aryan occupation in early Vedic times can adequately account for.

This conclusion is strongly supported by the reference made in another hymn of the Rigveda, vi, 27, to the river Yavvāvati and to Hariyūpiyā, by which may be meant either a locality or a river. The Yavvāvati has been rightly identified by Professor Hillebrandt with the Gumal’s main southern tributary, the Zhōb, the modern name of which, as I have shown elsewhere, can easily be accounted for as the direct phonetic derivative of the Vedic form. In Hariyūpiyā we may safely recognize the name Hariōb borne by the hill-tract which comprises the western headwaters of the Kurram river and is situated beyond the British border to the south-west of the Safed-kōh.

1 See An Archaeological tour in Wazīristān and Northern Balūchistān (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, 1929, No. 37), pp. 2 sq.
2 Cf. ibid., p. 2, note 3. For Professor Hillebrandt’s identification, see Vedische Mythologie, iii, p. 268.
3 Professor Hillebrandt’s identification, Vedische Mythologie, iii, p. 268, note 3, seems to have been suggested first by Dr. Brunnhofer (Iran und Turan, p. 41). The close phonetic relation between the Vedic and the modern form of this local name is too clear to require specific demonstration.
The mountainous border territories between the Kābul and Kurram rivers in the north and the headwaters of the Zhōb in the south, to which these indications take us, are nowadays held by Pathān tribes. Their inroads have ever been directed towards the fertile plains by the Indus, and their control constitutes a particularly difficult task for the British "Rāj" keeping watch and ward on the North-west Frontier of India. There is good reason to believe that conditions similar to those prevailing now, due to the scantiness of cultivable ground and the adverse conditions in general of a barren mountain land, must at all times have forced the valiant if far less civilized tribes holding those arid hills to look upon the fertile tracts eastwards as their natural raiding ground. Thus in Vedic times, too, I believe the great belt comprising the present Wazīristān and the hill-tracts to the north and south must have witnessed occupation at first and then advance, whether slow or rapid, by Aryan tribes which harried and in the end conquered the riverine plains of the Panjāb.

My purpose here is not to trace what indications might be gathered on this ground about the phase preceding the earliest known great invasion of India from the north-west, but to try and examine whether some knowledge of its physical conditions could help us in the search for the original Soma plant. With regard to the general geographical character of this region, it must be pointed out in the first place that it consists both within and outside the British border of a succession of ranges, more or less parallel, striking as a whole from north-east to south-west, but throwing out minor branches westwards. From one of its easternmost portions, the very conspicuous Takht-i-Sulaimān, rising wall-like above Dera Ismail Khan district by the Indus, the whole of these ranges has been conveniently designated as the Sulaiman system. South of the snowy Safēd-kōh these ranges at several points attain maximum heights up to more than 11,000 feet. But the average height of their crest-lines does not rise much above 8,000 feet; and in great parts of the area, especially south nearer to the Indus, it is still lower. Between these ranges lie long-stretched valleys with average elevations from 3,000 to 5,000 feet. In spite of the width and open nature of great parts of these valleys, the cultivated area is very limited, owing to the arid climate and the scanty supply

1 For the orographic configuration of this region, the sheets: Afghanistan, Baluchistan, of the Survey of India's Southern Series maps on the 1 : 2,000,000 scale may be conveniently consulted.
of water available for irrigation. This accounts for the semi-nomadic character of most of the present population; combined with the economic pressure resulting from such conditions, it helps to explain its unsettled, largely predatory habits.

In a region which in spite of its rather unattractive character has become fairly well-known in consequence of frequent military operations and in parts through prolonged British occupation, it would have been rather supererogatory for me, who am not a botanist, to look out for the chance of discovering a plant as yet unknown that might solve the riddle of the Soma. But all the same, I used such opportunities as offered during my various tours along this far stretched portion of the Frontier from the Kurram down to Pishīn and Kalāt, to inquire about any plant growing on its mountains and known to the people for properties that might possibly suggest some connection with the ancient use of the Soma.

The only result of these inquiries has been to direct my attention more closely to a plant of which I had thought more than once before while travelling in distant Central-Asian mountains from the Nan-shan to the ranges west of the Pāmirs. I mean the wild rhubarb. It grows plentifully on the highest portions of the ranges which stretch along the border between Northern Balūchestān and the Afghān provinces of Kandahār and Ghazni. That it is to be found in abundance also at corresponding elevations in many parts of Afghānistān is shown by a notice of Sir George Watt concerning the species known as Rheum spiciforme or Rheum moorecroftianum.¹ Like the closely allied Rheum emodi, Wall., which, as shown by the same authority, is a widely spread Himālayan and Central-Asiatic species of the wild rhubarb, it is used medicinally everywhere by the local people.

According to the information collected by me about the headwaters of the Zhōb as well as in the Pishīn tract, the juice from the succulent stalks of the plant is prepared into a kind of sweet sherbet, which is said to be on sale in the bazaars of Kandahār and Quetta

¹ See Dictionary of Economic Products, vi, pt. i, p. 487: "This species is found on the drier ranges of the Western Himālaya from Kumāon (altitude 14,000 to 16,000 feet) to Western Tibet (altitude 9,000 to 14,000 feet) and is distributed to Afghanistan...."

Food.—"In Afghānistān, the plant is always wild, and appears to grow abundantly in many parts. When green, the leaf stalks are rawaž, and when blanched by heaping up stones and gravel around them, they are called chukri; when fresh (in which state they are sometimes brought to Peshawar in spring) they are eaten either raw or cooked. They are also dried for use, to be eaten with other food, and are sometimes made into a preserve." (Stewart.)
during most of the year. Of the wild rhubarb of the Afghān border being used for an intoxicating drink I could learn nothing; nor is such use of the plant to be expected in a region where the Islamic prohibition against wine and spirits of any sort is strictly adhered to. But that the juice pressed from the wild rhubarb can be turned into wine by means of fermentation is adequately proved by the rhubarb wine, the preparation of which from the cultivated rhubarb is still well known and practised in certain parts of England and probably elsewhere also.

Since the above conjectural idea occurred to me of the wild rhubarb from the mountains of the Afghān frontier having possibly served for the Soma drink of the ancient Āryas of those parts, I have noticed the following significant reference in the report which Dr. A. Regel, the botanist employed by the Russian Government during the years 1882–4 on the exploration of the mountain territories north of the Oxus, had furnished to Professor von Roth.¹ The instructions communicated to him through the Russian Academy of Sciences had caused Dr. Regel specifically to look for an Asclepiad corresponding to the description which Roth believed could be deduced from certain passages of the Rigveda regarding the appearance and character of the plant. In the passage which Roth quotes, from a letter dated 17th January, 1884, Dr. Regel states that he had failed to discover such a plant in the wide region explored by him, and then continues: “The plant which comes nearest to the description is the rhubarb; the more so since the Tajik tribes connect the idea of sugar with it, calling it Shuguri. But the plant naturally and by itself alone yields no intoxicating beverage, and nothing is known of any admixture in the preparation of the Soma juice by the Āryans. There are here no true Asclepiads, though there are some plants resembling the Sarcostemma.”

It is not necessary for us here to examine in detail the hints which Roth believed to be furnished by certain passages in the Rigveda as regards the appearance of the Soma plant, and which together with the substitutes used in the late ritual practice of Southern India induced him to look for it among the Asclepiadē. Those notices have since been rightly declared to be “inadequate to identify the plant.”² The various terms (aṁśu, kṣip, etc.) used for the shoots of the Soma

¹ I quote the relevant passage from Sir Charles Lyall’s translation of Roth’s paper, *ZDMG.* 1884, pp. 134 sqq.
² See Macdonall-Keith, *Vedic Index*, ii, p. 475.
plant (andhas) may have been applied by the Vedic poets as well to the shoots of the wild rhubarb as to those of an Asclepiad. The description given of the soma-shoots as "ruddy" (araṇa) or "tawny" (hari) would certainly well suit the colour of the rhubarb. "It is not possible to describe exactly the details of the process of pressing the Soma as practised in the Rigveda." 1 But the description of the juice obtained thereby as brown (babhru), tawny (hari), or ruddy (araṇa), and as having a fragrant smell is quite in keeping with what we should have to expect in the case of the juice of the rhubarb. Finally it might well be that the mixing of Soma with milk, curd, or grain which is repeatedly mentioned 2 was meant to facilitate that fermentation which alone could endow a juice like that obtained from the rhubarb with the exhilarating and exciting effect so clearly indicated in the Vedic hymns.

If our surmise is right as to the wild rhubarb, in one or another of its closely allied species, having been the plant from which the Soma of early Vedic times and the Haoma sung in the Yasna was obtained, it will help to confirm the belief that the border territories indicated above, where nowadays the North-west Frontier of India meets Afghānistān, were at an early period held by tribes who called themselves Āryas, and spoke Vedic Sanskrit. But that hypothesis—and I cannot call it more at this stage—will not help us, as Roth had hoped from an eventual identification of the plant, definitely to determine the area which had served as the common home of Indians and Iranians before their languages separated. The very wide distribution of the wild rhubarb in its closely allied species from the Himālayas into the mountains of Central Asia and Eastern Irān would preclude such a conclusion.

But on the other hand this wide distribution of the plant would allow us to explain how the cherished drink could be obtained in places both for men's enjoyment and for sacrificial libation also at a period when we must assume those conquering Āryas to have penetrated far into the plains of the Panjāb, if not beyond; for from the heights of the outer Himālayan ranges it might have been possible to carry the shoots of the plant down even there within limited distances and at certain seasons.

In the Rigveda a number of localities are mentioned where Soma

1 Cf. ibid., ii, p. 477.
2 See ibid., ii, p. 477, and Hillebrandt, Vediche Mythologie, i, pp. 219 sqq., there quoted.
was consumed. Among these there is only one which can with reasonable assurance be identified. It is the *Suṣomā*. Its identity with the Soān river in the Rawalpindi District of the Panjāb appears to me highly probable in view of the position which the name occupies in the list of Panjāb rivers recorded in the "Nadistuti" hymn of the Rigveda (x, 75). As the Soān has its origin in the "Murree Hills", a Himalayan spur which rises to heights over 9,000 feet comparatively near to the open plain of the Rawalpindi District, transport of the plant to parts of the latter for sacrificial or other use would not have been very difficult.

The inquiry, started by a grave-find in the waterless waste of the Lop desert, has carried us from ground where absolute dryness preserves all remains of human existence, far away to a region where climatic conditions leave little or no hope of antiquarian evidence ever throwing light on the question how the bitter liquid pressed from a Sarcostemma came to take the place of the Vedic Soma. But even where after the passing of thousands of years all other evidence of human activities has vanished, in essential aspects their geographical scene remains unchanged. Thus if our examination of such scant indications as Vedic texts afford has helped to determine more closely that scene from which the Aryan conquest of India started, our diversion from a purely antiquarian quest may be held to have brought some advantage in the form of a modest historical gain.

1 Cf. Macdonell-Keith, *Vedic Index*, ii, p. 478. Their names are Ārjika, Pastyāvant, Šaryanāvant, Suṣomā, the territory of the Pañcajanāḥ.

Apart from Suṣomā the only other locality for which a likely identification might be proposed, is Šaryanāvant. Its mention in RV. viii, 7, 29, along with the Suṣomā has suggested to me that its name might perhaps be connected with that of the Harro river, which drains the main portion of the Hazāra District, to the west of Rawalpindi. The phonetic derivation of the modern name would offer no serious difficulty, as the change Š > h is regular in the Indo-Aryan languages of the Indian North-West.

Gandhayuktì in the Lalitavistara

By E. J. Thomas

SINCE the investigations of Oldenberg on the language of the Lalitavistara, it is no longer a useful question to ask whether the prose portions or the verses are the older. There is more than one layer of verse as well as of prose. Still less is it sufficient to describe it as "a poem of unknown date and authorship, but probably composed in Nepāl, by some Buddhist poet who lived some time between six hundred and a thousand years after the birth of Buddha". As Oldenberg has shown, there is an older layer of verse in fairly good Sanskrit, which rests on passages in a dialect closely related to Pāli, and which was hence easily sanskritized. There are also the poems in so-called mixed Sanskrit, mixed just because they were once in a dialect that resisted all efforts to fit them with a proper Sanskrit dress, and still later are the verses which may have been originally composed in Sanskrit.

When prose portions were turned into Sanskrit, any Prākrit features could be easily effaced, whatever the dialect happened to be. There are the evidently older passages, to be distinguished not only by their canonical style, but also by the fact that their parallels appear in Pāli and the Mahāvastu. There are those in the freer avadāna style, and further the portions which no doubt the compiler himself added, or, rather, into which he fitted the rest, when to the best of his ability he made the work a unity. We find one passage, however, which can scarcely have originated with the compiler, and which shows no relation to anything properly Buddhistic, but which has parallels in the classical prose romances, Kādambarī and the Daśakumāracarita. This is the list of arts in which the youthful Bodhisattva excelled. In Lalitavistara and Kādambarī both lists appear to have the intention of giving the traditional number of the sixty-four arts, and nearly twenty of the items in the two lists essentially correspond. Similar but shorter lists occur in the Daśakumāracarita and the Divyāvadāna.¹

In both Lalitavistara and Kādambarī there is the word patracchedya, which Kale, in his English notes to the latter, interprets as "the art

¹ Lal. 178 (Lefmann 156); Kād. 125 (ed. M. R. Kāle); Daś. end of chap. i (p. 12, ed. Bāhler, p. 25, Nir. ed.); Div. 58, 100, 391. The Pāli appears to have no such list, but the commentator on Aṅgut, i, 145, describes about a dozen feats with the bow, and then adds mahāsatto loke vattamāne sippaṇ sabbam eva sandassesi (ed. Siam, ii, 165).
of painting figures on walls or the ground”, but his interpretation in his Sanskrit commentary appears more to the point, *patrabhaṅgacchedana*. The breaking and cutting of leaves would naturally be the preparation of palm-leaves for making a book. This is the interpretation of Cowell, as I find from notes on *Lalitavistara* made by his pupil, H. T. Francis. The next item on the list is *gandhayukti*, and here Cowell says “odour-mixing”. There is no doubt that the combining of scents must be the meaning if the word is Sanskrit, but there appears to be no point in odour-mixing coming immediately after cutting leaves for a book. The next thing after cutting the leaves is book-making, and if *gandhayukti* is a half-sanskritized Prākrit form representing *granthayukti*, we get the exact word wanted, the fitting together of the leaves to make a book. *Gandha = grantha* actually occurs in Pāli. When we turn to the parallel passage in *Kādambari* we find a quite different word. It is *pustakavyāpāra*, a word which might almost be taken to be a commentator’s explanation of *granthayukti*. The word preceding these two in *Kādambari* is *citrakarma*, painting or illumination, and immediately following is *lekhya+karma*, both of them words that appear to apply to different stages of book-making.

There is no need to think that one author depended directly on the other. The list rather belongs to a work on the instruction of princes, and as the lists in *Dīvyā* and *Daśā* show, it appears to have been extended in various ways. The word *gandhayukti* occurs in several other places, but they do not add to our knowledge, since they occur as items in lists without any real contexts. It is given by Böhtlingk and Roth on the authority of the *Mahāvyutpatti*, with the meaning that it must have if it is Sanskrit, “die Verbindung wohliechender Stoffe,” but this work has merely adopted the word from *Lalitavistara*, as is shown by the fact that it has included most of the other names of the list, together with one or two that look like corrupt readings in the text of *Lalitavistara*. The word also occurs in two lists in the *Brhatatsamhitā* of Varāhamihira. The first (xv, 12) is a list of persons skilled in certain arts, who are under the nakshatra Citrā. The second (xvi, 17, 18) is of persons under the planet Budha. The first passage gives:—

*Tvāṣṭre bhūṣana-maniprāga-lekha+gaṇḍharva-gaṇḍhayukti+jñāh gaṇitapaṭu-tantuvāyāh śālākyāḥ rājadhānyāni.*

Kern’s translation, which is given in accordance with the commentary, is: “To citrā (are assigned) persons skilled in the art of attire, jewelry, dyeing, painting, music, and perfumery, as well as arithemicians, weavers, ouclists, and king’s corn.” The second passage
is very similar, and the words maṇīrāga, gandhayukti, sābda(-vedhitva), gaṇanā (gaṇīta), kavi (kāvya), hāsya, occurring in these two passages, are also in the Lalitavistara, and gāndharvav(-veda), lekhyav(-karma), indrajāla, and kāvya are in Kādambarī. The commentator naturally takes gandhayukti to mean combining of scents, but if the names are taken from an earlier list, his interpretation, probably drawn from an analysis of the word, is of no weight in deciding the earlier meaning. He certainly appears to have wrongly divided maṇīrāga, knowledge of the colour of jewels, which is one word in Lalitavistara, by taking it to mean the knowledge of jewels and of dyeing.

There is another place where gandhayukti is mentioned as an art to be practised (sevītā). The king’s brother-in-law in the Mṛcchakaṭīka (viii, v. 13) says:—

_Hinguujale jilakabhadamuṣte,
vacāha gaṇṭhī, saṅguṭṭa saṅṭhī:
ese mae sevīda gandhajuttī,
kadham na hagge madhulaṛṣṭale tti._

Ryder translates the last two lines thus:—

That’s the mixture of perfumes I eagerly eat:
Why shouldn’t my voice be remarkably sweet?

It may be that it is implied that these aromatic substances, the asa-footida (hīngu), the cumin (jiraka), the bhadramusta, the bunch of orris (?) root (vacā), and the ginger with treacle (saṅguṭṭa ca saṅṭhī), are eaten, but what he actually says is that this (art of) gandhajuttī has been practised by him. One would be quite willing to admit that the Pākrit meaning of gandha has become lost here, especially since it is not the normal Pākrit of the verse, as is shown by gaṇṭhī = granṭhī in the second line; and yet we have the fact that the commentator Pṛthvīdhara¹ takes gandha = grantha. He interprets the last two lines as: _eṣā maṇā sevītā granṭhayuktiḥ, kutham nāham madhurasvarā iti._ A possible explanation would be that he took the interpretation from a commentary on some work where the meaning really was the making of books. This, if it does not throw much light on the use in the Lalitavistara, makes it doubtful if there ever was a recognized art of scent-mixing apart from the traditional lists.²

¹ In the edition of the play by N. B. Godabole, Bombay S.S., 1896.
² The word also occurs in the list of the Kāmasūtra, i. 3, where it is preceded by karnapatrabhāṅga. This is said to mean different ways of adorning the ears, but it looks more like a corruption of a word with the same meaning as patracchedya, in which case the meaning here suggested for gandhayukti would be supported.
Two Terms Employed in Kharoṣṭhi Documents from Chinese Turkestan

By F. W. Thomas

In the Kharoṣṭhi records from Chinese Turkestan, of which the edition commenced by the Abbé Boyer, Professor Rapson, and Monsieur Senart, has recently been completed with important dissertations and index by Professor Rapson and Mr. P. S. Noble (Kharoṣṭhi Inscriptions, i–iii, Oxford, 1920–9), the vocabulary is composed in the main of recognizably Indian terms or of personal or topographical designations belonging to the locality; but we can discriminate a relatively small number of words having other traceable origin or obscure signification. To the last mentioned group we may assign the words mukeṣi and lote (loteya, lode).

These two terms, although they do occur apart, are apt to be found in more or less close conjunction; and the general sphere of their meaning may be ascertained by considering one of the passages where they are associated. We may take document No. 474 (p. 171) of the edition, which, except as regards spacing, majuscules, and some added punctuation, is followed in all respects.

In the following, preliminary, English translations the words printed in italics will be reconsidered infra:

\[\textbf{Śothamga} \text{ L̄āpeyaṣa} \text{ dadavya.}\]


\textit{Yapgu.}

"To be given to the \textbf{Śothamga} L̄āpe.

The exalted Great King writes. He instructs the \textbf{Śothamga} L̄āpe:

"Here now (the) Suveṭha Bhimaśena reports that a sister of Yapgu, of Kilma, of the Yave Bazar (or, Quarter), wife of the śramaṇa, Saṃgāpal, of Kilma, of the Catiṣa Devi Bazar, of (or, to) that woman neither mukeṣi nor loteya has been taken over (or, rendered)."

When this wedge tablet arrives there (sc. in Niya), the person designated (āṇaṭṛr or ṭa) is to be questioned. If delivery by the father.
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(jān̄ātrīyena = janayitrā) has taken place, the sons and daughter are to be made equal sharers according to the law. If mukeṣi lote has not been sold, a decision (niścaya) will be made here."

For the present purpose it is unnecessary to discuss any of the various syntactical questions which arise in regard to this document (they are common to others, and in part they reflect the syntax of the underlying vernacular) or to investigate what exactly were Kilma and the Yave and Catisa Devi Bazar (āpana) : the places are frequently mentioned in the Niya documents, and clearly they belonged to that district—often instead of the adjectival derivative avanemci we have the locative avanammi used for the same purpose of furnishing an address (cf. the Ablative in Latin Publius Velina, "Publius of the Veline Tribe"). We may also abstain from discussing the exact force of ahuno, ahona (whether aha nu, aho nu, adho nu or adhunā) the equation svasu = svasar rather than svasarā (cf. pito matu, dhitu, etc.), and the designation Svētha, Svēsta, which would be interesting if not a family or clan name or an official title (which is improbable in conjunction with Ogu, Vasu, etc., Nos. 38, 317, etc.), but = Sanskrit svāsta, svesta, "our well-beloved".

As regards the transaction itself, there is considerable difficulty in realizing the situation. The question relates obviously to property belonging, or accruing, to the wife of Samgapala. But who is the person questioned (pruchitavo)? And what has been delivered (aniti)? What has been taken over or rendered (nitae), and what may have been bought (kritae), is clearly the loteya, with, or without, mukeṣi. For light upon these matters we may turn to some other documents wherein the terms occur.

The case recorded in No. 279 presents several similarities. Here the Vasu Suvaṇṇa Masuγa reports:—


"A sister, by name Cakuvaic, of Kala Acuṇi, of Kilma, of the Yave Bazar, is delivered (aniti) wife to Pṛena, of Kilma, of the Ajiyama Bazar; of (or, to) that woman the lote [mukeṣi] in the Yave Bazar
has not been taken over (or, rendered) : to her there sons and daughters have been born. A daughter of P'gena is delivered (anita) wife to Çamçä, of Kilma, of the Yaye Bazar; the rest of them (tatah avasistäh) are all in the Ajiyama Bazar on their own (property or side): in place of (bhaçena) the mother is Sarpina, the wife of Çamçä, of (or, in) the Yaye Bazar. What the father P'gena has given on loan (namamnaqä) to the daughter Sarpina, in regard to that . . .”.

Here, as concerns the grammar, we may remark that Cakuveae, the genitive, is used in place of the nominative Cakuveae, a phenomenon not rare in the documents; but perhaps here, as in another passage to be cited (and probably in a number of other passages, or as a rule), due to the word näma following, as in vulgar English is said “name of Jones”. The forms aniti and anita, which certainly appear to be used indifferently, may perhaps be discriminated, if we understand aniti as a noun, abstract for concrete. In the defective conclusion of the document, which we have left untranslated, the word parihasina offers a pleasing variety of possibilities, whether from pari-has-, or from paridhars-, or from pari-bhäs-, or from pari-bhas-(a synonym for pari-bharts-).

It is, however, clear that what is anita or aniti is the wife, the bhärvä. The like appears from a third document, No. 555 (p. 203) 1:—

Soṭhamga Lpîpeyaśa dadavo.


“To be given to the Soṭhamga Lpîpe.

“With Kopemna is a woman Koparsanie. If this woman's mukeśi has not been given, if with this woman it has not been independently agreed (samraṇijitaka), the matter is to be decided (or discussed, vibhasidavo) by procedure according to law. But, if she should have been delivered by her father (jaṃṭatryenä), inquiry must be made by procedure according to law.”

Here, again, it is clear that “delivery by the father” was a recognized and independent method of “conveying” a woman;

1 In No. 334 (pp. 121–2) also there are several references to women who are anita (in the Catīga Devi Bazar or elsewhere); further, in No. 573 (p. 210) “the mother of Aralpi is aniti from the Ajiyama bazar” (taṣa Aralpiyasa matu Ajiyama aśanae aniti huti). In Pali also (e.g. Petavatthu, i, 77, Sutta-nipāta 110 Dīghanikāya, ii, 245) aneti is similarly used of women.
and in regard to this point we need only cite the further instance in No. 621 (p. 234), where Supriya, daughter of the śramaṇa Sundara, is wife of Cato, anita caṃṇātrena "delivered by her father".

In connection with this passage we need not discuss the meanings assigned to the vibhasidavo and sarajidae; they may be confirmed by references to the other occurrences of the two words. Nor need we say anything further concerning the genitive Koparṣaniæ (from Koparṣani or Koparṣanie), which, in fact, might be correct as meaning "In regard to Koparṣanie". But the form striyana requires consideration. The word for "woman" has ordinarily the forms stri and striya, whereof the latter may also be the accusative, instrumental, genitive, etc. Striyana is always a genitive plural. Since in this case only one woman is concerned, the plural is inappropriate; nor can we here understand "the mukeşi of women", since the word "woman" is required with the ede, (1) on the general ground of style, (2) because of the parallelism with the following clause with striyana. Therefore, since we may neglect the possibility of ana = ājñā here, for reason (2) among others, we must necessarily read striya na, with the negative. In both clauses there must be a negative, since otherwise no legal question would have arisen; but there is no room for two negatives in each of them. Therefore the correct reading must be:—

\[
yati \text{ ede striya na mukeśina ditaṅga syati,}
\]
\[
yati \text{ ede striya na sadha svacchaṇḍina sarajidae siyati.}
\]

And this is confirmed by the circumstance that the Sanskrit for "of one's own accord" is not svacchande (svachāndi), but svacchandena (svacchaṇḍina). Accordingly the correct rendering is:—

"If this woman have not been given by the mukeşi, if with this woman an agreement have not been made of her own accord."

We might have expected in the dialect the form mukeśiyena in the Instrumental; but there are possible parallels to mukeśina, such as Kośimaṇḍhina in No. 272.

We see, therefore, that in the bestowal of women there might be intervention of a person other than the father, an official called mukeşi: and this, in fact, we find directly stated in No. 338 (p. 123):—

maatra mamtra śrumidavya: yo asmahu Kilm(e)ciyana parasya mulade striyana mukeşi kīḍaṅga, sa Camaka janati, tasya mamtra śrumidavya.

"Let no counsel be heard there: he who for us Kilma people
has been made mukeşī of women from outside estates, he, Camaka, knows; let his counsel be heard."

Returning now to Nos. 474 and 279, we shall emend the readings and translations as follows:

474:  taya striya na mukešina loteya nitae.
      "the lote of that woman has not been taken over by the mukeşī."

It was for this omission that the mukeşī, as person designated (ājñāptṛ or "ta), was to be interrogated (pruchitavo).
      yati mukeşī lote na sa kritaē siyati,
      "if the mukeşī should not have bought the lote."

279:  lote (mukešīna nitaya
      "the lote has been taken over by the mukeşī."

It accordingly appears that the bestowal of a woman might take place in at least three different ways: she might either be delivered (ānītā) by her father, or make (no doubt, if independent) her own agreement, or be handed over by a mukeşī, who would take over (nīta) and perhaps buy (kṛita) her lote. This may point to a rather independent position of grown women, whose property would have the security of a public guardian, a situation not at all unnatural in unadvanced communities; but it may have been due to the special character of the lote.

What, then, was the lote? Was it a bride-price paid by the bridegroom? There is no indication whatever of that: moreover, there would be no reason for its omission in the case of a woman bestowed by her father, and no strong reason for the intervention of a mukeşī. Furthermore, we shall find the word lote used without reference to women.

We do not learn anything from No. 481 (p. 174), where Yapāgu reports that—

edāsa śvasu Suñnumae nama Dhain(rm)apri Sumadatasā ca matu
na loti mukešī diti (na lote mukešī deti).

"The mukeşī does not hand over the lote of his (Yapāgu's) sister Suggnume (or, "ma), mother of Dharmapri and Sumadata."

or, again, from No. 30 (p. 32), where Asu Lípio reports that—Opaiv peta-avaneṇci Sağapeyasā dhitu Ciṅga Opaiv peta-avana Kilmeyāṃmi anita: taya lode śvasu Ciṅga Sağapeyasā ichita deyānnāe; eda śvasu anīnēsa dita, na kimci Sağapeyasā dita.

"A daughter, Ciṅga, of Sağape, of the Opaiv peta ('sheep' = petvan ?) bazar was brought to the Opaiv peta-bazar in Kilmeya:
a sister Ciṅga was desired (or intended) to give her lode to Sāgape: the sister gave it to others, and nothing was given to Sāgape.”

where the syntax and the relations of the persons are both somewhat doubtful.

But in No. 621 the man Sagamovi, son of Camčā, who had run away to Kuci with Supriya, the wife of Cato, and after a long residence there was allowed by the Mahārāja to re-enter the kingdom, was, nevertheless, persecuted by Supriya’s father and friends, who

\[ \text{stri Supriyae prace viheṭa kareṇti lode pruchamti,} \]

“make trouble on account of the woman Supriya and demand lode.”

This the royal letter forbids them to do further.

In a flight to Kuci with the wife of Cato not much property can have been carried away by Sagamovi. Consequently what was demanded by Sundara must have been some equivalent for the services of the lost wife.

In No. 585 (p. 219) Kulavardhana, in a letter to Mahā-cojhbo Soṃjaṅga, makes a statement as follows:—


“Furthermore, there (sc. in Niya) I had a slave, a Kilma man named Āṃṣīya: he arose and gave (as) the lote of his own (tanu) life a man named Cimgeya (and) 6 beasts: these beasts have become 12: this matter has not my approval; the man is alive; I have now given orders for Āṃṣīya to bring him (them) here; the lote has not been impounded (!?): if there (in Niya) the mukeṣi shall impound them (!?), Kalpotsa there will write for a decision at law (ničiya).”

In this passage there are problems in addition to that of the word lote. The phrase lamaṇā da- is a compound expression which may have a second object; but what is the exact sense of lamaṇā is not clear. The frequent occurrence of the phrase lamaṇā paripaḷ-

(Nos. 283, 358, 362, 475) suggests the meaning “keep impounded”; but, on the other hand, paripaḷ- may mean “await”, and there are some passages where the opposite sense of “give up”, “hand over”, is more attractive, and we may think of the word lāṅcā,\(^1\) for which the Sanskrit Koṣas give the meaning “gift”. While on the whole preferring

\(^1\) We can hardly here introduce Tokhari lāṅcā, “king” (quasi “confiscated”).
the sense of "impounding", we may concede the possibility of the opposite. In any case the phrase is a legal technicality.

Again, in the phrase—

"Amāgniya has given (as) the lote of his own life a man..."

are we to understand—

(a) "has given as a ransom or price (lote) of his life a man...", or
(b) "has given [as ransom] for his life his earnings or possessions (lote), namely a man..."?

In other words, does lote denote a value or procedure, or, rather, a material object? Inasmuch as we have found it designating something which could be bought (kriatae, No. 474), or could remain behind when the owner moved to another quarter (No. 279), and inasmuch as here it is something which can be impounded or released (lancaca da-), the second rendering seems to deserve the preference. In any case we see that not only women, but also slaves could possess lote.

What, then, is the outcome of these considerations? It seems that women and slaves, and perhaps other persons as well, could possess lote, their own property or earnings. The transference of these usually required the intervention of an official designated mukesi, who in some cases would buy them, i.e. take them over on payment, while in other cases he might detain (temporarily) or transfer them. Why? A probable reason is that these possessions or earnings were often of a semi-communal nature, as in the case of common tillage, washing for jade, or other water-rights, rearing of cattle on common land, and so forth, or industries such as weaving, silk-making, shop-keeping, which were not transportable. Among other occasions there was, as we have seen, the case of women from outside districts working in the fields. As regards methods of group cultivation, we may refer to the Tibetan document translated in JRAS., 1928, pp. 572-3. A married woman could have her personal earnings or gains, and it was perhaps the profits or earnings of the last years that (in No. 621) Sundara demanded from the truant Sagamovi and Supriya, when they returned from Kuci. Upon the death of the woman her lote, or its value, if sold, would pass to her sons and daughters; and naturally there were disputes.

Can anything be said concerning the origin of these terms lote or mukesi? The field of inquiry would seem to be a wide one. It would not be unnatural if they belonged to the local language of the region, which for the present is scarcely within our ken. Or they might be Chinese. Nor is even an Iranian or Aramaic origin excluded,
since in the Shan-shan kingdom, to which these documents belong, we have in connection with legal transactions evidence of prominence of persons with Persian names (**JRAS.**, 1928, p. 399); with the Persians might come Aramaic business men and their terminology. To suggest a possibility of even Greek would be, no doubt, a luxury. But in the case of *lote* an Indian source is perhaps not undiscoverable. There exists an old word *lota* or *lotra* (**Mahā-Bhārata**, etc.), which has been derived from *loptra*, and for which, among other meanings, is given the sense of "booty" or "goods obtained by robbery". This word should, no doubt, be derived simply from the √lū without the intervention of *lup*. As to the words connected with the Greek λησ, λῆστής, ἀνομαι, etc., Latin *Laverna*, *lucrum*, etc., German *Lohn*, etc., it is sufficient to refer to the etymological dictionaries, some of which (Whitley Stokes, **Urkeltischer Sprachschatz**, p. 237; Uhlenbeck, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*) actually cite the Sanskrit *lota*, *lotra* under this head. In view of the exact equivalent in Latin *lucrum* we might perhaps claim for *lautlom*, *lūltom*, an Ur-Indo-European status. The transition to the sense of "gains" or "earnings" is sufficiently illustrated by the Latin word itself and the German *Lohn*.

With this same word *lote* or *lode* we may reasonably connect the *alota*, *aloṭa*, and *viloṭa* of Nos. 56, 357, and 494. In No. 56 we read:—

avi Saṅgapeyaṣa Cīmga taḍita alota graḥida.

"also he has beaten Saṅgape’s [daughter] Cīmga and plundered her."

In No. 357—

*taṁ kala pruchidavo yo raja viloṭa*

may mean:—

"at that time may be investigated any plunderings from the realm" (during the mentioned troubles with Khotan).

In No. 494—

*Khotamṇiṣyana aloṭa viloṭade purva*

may mean:—

"before the plunderings from or by the Khotaniṣ", with the prepositions ā and vi as in āvāha and vivāha.

In this sense the √lū seems to have been generally replaced in Sanskrit by *lūt* (stye or *vilotane*), *lūṇth*, *lūnda*, or *lup*. The words *āloṭana* and *viloṭana* are there usually connected in sense with *luṭ* "mix". But we should take note of *viloṭa* "thief", and *loṭana*, and of *vilotana* where it is given in the various Dhātupāṭhas as the sense of √bāḍh and √luṭ.
For the word mukesí we may probably exclude a Chinese origin. For in one of the Chinese documents from the Lop-Nor region, a document dated in A.D. 263 and therefore more or less contemporaneous with our Kharoṣṭhī records, Chavannes has found (Documents Chinois, No. 738, p. 160) a title which he transliterates mou-hia-che (she). The Chinese syllables 摹下史 had, according to Karlgren’s Analytical Dictionary (Nos. 638, 134, 885), an old pronunciation māk-‘ya-śi, Cantonese mok-ha-sī, Japanese mak(u)-ka(ge)-śi. In view of the frequent equivalence of ya and e in the Kharoṣṭhī and other documents (also sometimes in India, as noted JRAS., 1915, p. 96), it seems highly possible that Chavannes’ mou-hia-che (she) is identifiable with mukesí; in that case a Chinese origin is out of the question. The possibility of a Western source I must leave to others to investigate. But it is interesting to note that the word may be present in a well known Indian inscription of the Sakas. The longest record on the Mathurā Lion Capital contains the difficult line which has been read (Epigraphia Indica, ix, p. 141)—

ma(mra)kite(hi)ra(?),ya sa‘sra bhusaveti (?)

and which Professor Konow now (Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, p. 48) proposes to read—

Muki(śri)raya saśpa (a)bhusavi(ta)

If we could read—

mukesí (or śri) raya saśpa ahbusavi(ta)

and understand—

mukesí-rāya saśva abhyucchrāpita

as meaning “all my guardianship wealth was set up”, i.e. devoted to the religious donation (comparing the usapāpita = ucchrāpāpita, from ud and śri, in the Lumbini inscription (Bühler in Epigraphica Indica, vol. v, p. 5)), the sense would be most appropriate. We might then understand that the custom of having a guardian of woman’s property had actually been brought into India by the Sakas along with the word mukesí.

It is quite credible that they should have introduced it into Western India also. But, considering the distance in time which separates the word from the Marāṭhī mokāśā “village land assigned to an individual either rent-free or at a low quit-rent on condition of service”, mokāś or mokāśi “holder of a mokāśā” (Wilson’s Glossary and Molesworth’s Dictionary)—the word has also penetrated into the Dravidian languages of Southern India and from India into (Indian)
Persian *mukāsa* "an Indian term for a village held free by the Poligar on condition of protecting property of travellers" (Steingass)—I am not prepared to take any responsibility for such a suggestion. The form could hardly have survived, except in literary language (where we do not find it) or in the Dravidian, where I understand that the Marāṭhī word has no *correct* Arabic etymology; but it may, nevertheless, be of that or other Semitic origin.

It must be confessed, however, that the reading *mukiṣi* or *mukiṣri* is by no means certain: the third *akṣara* has more resemblance to the *ḍi* of Professor Rapson’s plate than to any other Kharoṣṭhī sign, and we might think of a connection with *makuṭa, mukuta* (*makaṭa*), and establish some appropriate sense; which is not unimaginable in connection with the *rāya* (*rai*) of a queen. To pursue the matter further might take us too far from Central Asia.
The Future Stem in Asoka

By R. L. Turner

The normal suffix of the future in Sanskrit was -syā-. The root had full grade, e.g. kartasyāti, jēsyāti. It follows that in the futures of dissyllabic (sef) roots the suffix was preceded by i (< IE. *e), e.g. jani-ṣyāti, bhavi-ṣyāti. Even monosyllabic (anit) roots ending in -r (-r) had an i between the root and the suffix, e.g. mar-i-ṣyāti. The Rgveda adheres to this division except for one apparent exception, asiṣyat-, fut. part. of āsyati. But, despite āstra- and astā-, āsyati perhaps contains a dissyllabic root **esi(i) (cf. āsira- 'ray'). Of this āsyati (which, as a transitive verb, probably does not contain the suffix -ye- of the intransitives of the type tāp-yati) and āsira- show full grade in the first syllable; ā-sāt 'he has slain' and sāy-aka-'javelin' show full grade in the second syllable. In that case asi-ṣyā- should be analysed like jani-ṣyā-.

The future stem of the causative of which RV. has two examples—dhārayiṣyā-, vāsaiṣyā—shows two tendencies at work in the development of this tense: firstly the extension of the suffix -isyā-, secondly its addition to a present stem. The gradual extension of the -isyā- suffix can be observed in Sanskrit itself. Beside RV. vartisyā- and kramaṣyā- AV. has vartisyā- and gamisyā-.

In the Inscriptions of Asoka these two tendencies are seen further developed. In all, future forms of twenty-one different verbal roots are found.

Of these, eight are futures of the causative present stem (as in RV.): Shah. Man. likhapesāti, anapesānti, pravaṭhiśaṇti, hapesāti; Gir. likhāpayisati, ānapayisati, vaḍhayisati, hāpesāti; Kal. lekhāpesāti, anapayisānti, vaṭhyisāti, hāpayisāti; Dhaun. likhiyisāmi, ānapayisāti, vaṭhayisāti, nikhāmayiṣāmi and atikāmayisāti, ālaḍhayisātha; Pill. palibhāsayisām, nijhāpayisānti.

Among the futures of simple roots five set roots and one ending

1 Perhaps of IE. origin (< o): cf. Greek futures in -eō of roots ending in a sonant, e.g. φθερό, μενό. The same vowel appears in the desiderative suffix -o-so- (beside -so-) of roots ending in -r in Sanskrit, e.g. mūmṛṣati < *m₇*-m₇r-o-so- (see Meillet, Introduction, p. 192).

2 On the other hand, if āsyati was from the outset an anit root, asiṣyatí may be the first example of the tendency to create a new general future suffix -isyā-, the addition of which to a consonant-ending root avoided any change of the final consonant: *atsyati 'will throw' (< *as-syāti) collides with aṭayāti 'will eat', and is replaced by as-isyāti.

3 -iṣi- < -ayi-, see p. 532.
in -r have old -i-sama, namely Pill. *pavithralaṁati (Brāh. stariṣyati), Dhau. Jaug. nikhamisati (Sk. kramiṣyati and kramasyati), khamisati (Sk. kṣaṃiṣyati and kṣamsyati); Pill. paliyovadisamti (AV. vadisyati), Maski hesati 1 (RV. bhaviṣyati).

Four anīt roots have -isya-, namely Shah. anuvatīsamti, Gir. anuvatisare, Kal. anuvatīsamti, Dhau. Jaug. anuvatisamti (RV. vartisyati, but AV. vartisyati); Shah. vadhisati, Pill. vadhisati, Rup. Mys. vadhisiti (Sk. vartisyati and vardhisyati); Shah. anuśaśiṣamti, Gir. anuśasiṣamti, Kal. Dhau. Jaug. anusasisamti (Brāh. śasiṣyati); Pill. abhyuinamisati (Brāh. namisyati, but Class. namisyati).

Of these it may be remarked that the replacement of -syā- by -isya- avoids the ambiguity of vartisyati as future of both vartate and vardhate, and the differentiation from the present stem of namisyati and *śātsyati (< *śās-syati).

The identification of the root-form of the future with that of the present stem is fully carried out in Dhau. Jaug. Pill. jānisamti (Sk. 3rd pl. pres. jānánti, but fut. jnāsyati).

The future of the passive is similarly formed by the addition of the suffix -isya- to the passive present stem: Shah. arabhiṣamti, Gir. ārabhisare (with -bhi- in each case from Sk. pres. ārabhyate), Kal. alābhīyaṁsamti (perhaps a mistake for ālabhiṣamti, the reading of Dhau. Jaug.); Shah. anuvadhiṣamti, Kal. anuvadhiṣamti (Sk. pres. pass. dhīyate); Pill. anupatiṣajisati 2 and sampatiṣajisati (Sk. pres. padjate); Dhau. Jaug. yuṣjisamti 3 (with -jj- from Sk. pres. pass. yujjyate).

---

1 The reading is very doubtful. Hultzsch prefers hevaṁti. Woolner (Āsoka Text, p. xxxv) supports hesati with Pa. hessati. The development avi > e at this early period is peculiar to another class of words, which like the verb ‘to be’ show other special phonetic developments: thus sthāvira- as a word of address > Aś thāira-, Pa. thera-; similarly at a much later period the words of address svāmin-, svāminī- became Mar. sāi with unexpected loss of -i-, and Kash. sučenā with unexpected u < -m- (see Turner, Nep. Dict., p. 621 b 50). Among the numerals (notably a class of words in which special phonetic developments are found) *tryada > troidasa, tredasa, teadasa with unexpected ai or e < aye.

2 The long i of -apajisati does not indicate compensatory lengthening of i before s < ss, but rather a confusion of both long and short i (cf. paṣi-, kachati) which was characteristic of Eastern dialects. The tendency was persistent; and centuries later i and a due to compensatory lengthening were again shortened in Nepali, Assamese, Bengali, and Oriya. In the spelling of the inscription the scribe perhaps noted the fact that final -i was shorter than interior -i-.

3 Hultzsch (Inscr. of Aś., p. cx) wrongly takes this as an active future. There would be no starting-point for an active future with stem-form yuṣya-, since the present active stem is yuṣij. (Sk. 3rd pl. yuṣijanti, Pa. yuṣjati). On the other hand, Sk. yuṣjate 'is fit, ought' is attested also in Pa. yuṣjati, Pk. yuṣjai.
Five verbs form the future with -syā- instead of expected -iṣya-.

In Dhau. Jaug. hosati, Pill. hosanti, hohanti, Calc. hosati the root syllables of Sk. bhavi-syāti (cf. hesati above) have been remodelled on the present hoti (< bhāvati). In the Delhi-Topra Pillar Edict VII hosanti and hohanti stand side by side. There is perhaps a slight difference of meaning. In l. 23 chāyopagāni hosanti pasumunīṣānain it has a fuller verbal force: 'in order that there may be shade for men and animals.' In ll. 25, 26 in the three times repeated viyāpatā tahanti it is simply an auxiliary: 'that they may be employed.'

I have shown elsewhere (JRAS., 1927, pp. 232 ff.) that MI.-ss- as a component of a suffix or termination might have, and in most dialects did have, a special development into -s- and -h-. It is possible that in all the futures we should read -s- (-ś-), and not -ss- (-śś-); but we have no criterion of judgment. In one, however, hohanti, this special development is certainly displayed, just where it might earliest be expected, namely in the simple auxiliary.

Two other futures show the same development: beside Jaug. esatha (Sk. esyātha) Dhau. has ehatra. It may be noted that the same verb has a special early opening of -dh- in RV. 2nd sg. imperat. ihi beside, e.g., śrudhi (Turner, JRAS., 1927, p. 228).

The Pillar Edicts all have dāhanti. In the language of these the normal development of Sk. dāsyāti would be dassati as in Pali; but, as will be shown below, ā was introduced for a from other forms of the verb and, the Eastern dialects not tolerating the group long vowel + two consonants, the consonant was shortened (as in Pa. dāsati and dāhāti). The early development of -s- > -h- in this verb may be due to the fact that it forms a group with dānāṃ (cf. the accentuation of Latin donó dedit, see E. Fraenkel, Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers, p. 44).

One other verb in Pali, namely kāhati, shows the same development. The verb 'to do' is liable in other languages to special phonetic development, e.g. Nepali garmu < *karnu; Syrian Romani kerār < *karār; OPers. kunautiy < *kynauti (see Meillet, Vieux Perse, p. 50); Sakha yindī 'does', yida- 'done' < křta- (cf. E. Leumann, Zur nordar. Spr. u. Lit., p. 132, who explains unexpected y- < k- as due to the frequent use of this verb as an auxiliary, e.g. dītu yindī 'he sees'); Eng. does [das] < *dāz; and perhaps Sk. kurmāh < *kurumah (cf. kurvánti) with complete loss of -u-.

In some of the modern dialects of E. Hindi and Bihari, where the old future still survives, the change of the suffix -iṣya- to -iha- or
-ihi- has affected all verbs. It is of importance to general linguistic theory to note that this change in its first incidence affected certain verbs only.

It is fitting to note here also other special phonetic changes affecting the future suffix. For Prakrit Pischel (Pk. Gr., p. 362 ff.) has noted the forms -issi- and -ihi- beside -issa- and -iha-. The reality of these forms is attested not only in the modern languages (as, e.g., Lah. marśi 'he will die', Bhojpuri pīhī 'he will drink'), but also in one Eastern form of Aśoka, Rup. Mys. vaḍhisiti. The longer the word, the shorter is each of its component sounds. It is therefore not surprising to find vaḍḍhissati > vaḍḍhis(s)iti (the more readily in that the a has an i both before and after it), while vaḍḍhati remained unchanged. For the same reason -āmi, which remained in the present stem, became -ām in the future. In Kal. IV 11 the reading vaḍḍhiisati and in Dhau. XIV 2 the reading likhiyi- are fairly certain. But the verbs are active. They appear to have a special development of the suffixal element in which -ayi- > -iyi-. Such a form may have given rise to the Prakrit futures in -īhi- (Pischel, Pk. Gr., p. 363), in which the long vowel would be explained by an earlier -iyihi- < -ayissa-.

In All. Kauś. 3, Sām. 5, Sār. 4, Bühler and Boyer read bhokhati; for this Hultzsch reads bhākhati. Both Kauś. and Sām. are here almost illegible, but on Sār. the letter is quite clear. There appears to me to be no trace whatsoever of the stroke denoting ā; the word is bhākhati. This may possibly be read bhaṅkhati < Sk. bhaṅksyati 'will break'; but forms of this verb without the nasal have survived in most IA. languages (of the type Sindi bhajaru 'to be broken' < bhajyate, Hindi bhāṅgā 'to flee' < bhagnā-), and we may be justified in reading bhaṅkhati < *bhaṅksyati, which was replaced in Sanskrit by bhaṅksyati with the nasal from the present, as in bhaṅktvā beside bhaktvā, abhaṅji beside abhājī, by which confusion with the corresponding forms of bhājati 'shares' was avoided.

Hultzsch (Inscr. of Aś,. p. ex) derives DhaU. Jaug. caghatha and Pill. caghati from saksyati. Leaving aside the question of initial c-,1 the form is rather that of Sk. saṅhnōti, and in form is not a future, but a present. The Pa. saṅghasi (quoted by Hultzsch) also has nothing to do with saṅhnōti, but is similarly derived from saṅhnōti, which further survives in WPah. poguli hagnū 'to be able', Lah. saggan,  

1 Perhaps due to contamination with Sk. caks-. Woolner, Aśoka Glossary, p. 85, suggests Hindi etc. cāhnū 'to desire', which is probably ultimately related with caks- (Turner, Nep. Dict., p. 173 b 10).
Si. saqhaṇu; Nep. saqhāunu 'to help' (see Nep. Dict., p. 579 a 20). Beside the desiderative of sak- in Sk. śikṣati (surviving in Shina kohistanī śicēi 'teaches', Bhadrawahi śikhṇū, etc.), a desiderative of saq- (or sah-) existed in sīkṣati (surviving in Shina śicēi). The use of the present of the verb 'to be able' for the future is paralleled in English: I can go to-morrow = I shall be able to go to-morrow; I will arrange matters so that you can watch.

Shah. vrakṣaṇīti < *vraksyaṇīti may represent an older form than Sk. vrajiṣyaṭi; or, in face of vrajita-, it may be an analogical formation of the same type as RV. kraṁsyāti (after namasyāti) for kramaśyāti.

Lastly, for the future of the verb 'to do' the Inscriptions of Asoka present three different forms:—

Shah. Man. kaṣa- in kaṣam, kaṣami (Man.), kaṣati, kaṣaṇīti.

Gir. kāsa- in kāsati, kāsāṇīti.¹


In each case the written single intervocalic consonant may represent an actual double consonant; and the three stems may in consequence be read as kaṣa-, kāsa-, kaccha-. Also, as far as writing goes, the root vowel of Shah. Man. kaṣa- may be either short or long; but in the absence of any evidence to the contrary I have assumed it to be short.

In addition to the Asokan forms, we have RV. kariṣyā- whence Pk. karissa-; Pa. kassa-, kāsa-, kāha-; Pk. kāhaṃ (M. JM. AMg.), karissān and kalīṣādi. The forms with ai or e (karaīsaṃ, karessaṃ, kalehi, etc.) are modelled after the present karedī.

As indicated above, -s- and -h- of these forms represent earlier -ss-. Thus Pk. karihiī rests on earlier karissāi and Pa. kāhati on earlier kāsati.

Pa. kassati may represent earlier kassati or kāssati.

We are left then with five forms of this future in Indo-Aryan: kariṣyāti, kaṣ(s)ati, kāṣ(s)ati, kāsati, ku(c)chati.

All other roots ending in -r have in Sanskrit the suffix -iṣya- for the future. And this is the suffix presented by RV. kariṣyāti. The antiquity of this is further attested by the suffix *a-so- in the desiderative cikīrṣati. Nevertheless the form *karyayati has been

¹ Gir. also has kasaṇīti in one passage, vii, 2, te sarvāṃ na kasaṇīti ekadesāṃ na kasaṇīti. The reading appears to be quite certain. There are three possible explanations. Either it is a mistake of the engraver or a 'Magadhist' or it represents an actual shorter pronunciation of the repeated verb. That it is the older kassa- (<< *kareyati, see below) not yet wholly displaced by kasa, is unlikely.
rightly assumed as the origin of Aś. kaś(ṣ)ati (Michelson, A. J. Phil., 1909, p. 289) and Pa. kassati (W. Geiger, Gram. Pali, § 153). It is possible that *kāryaṭi is a new formation which replaced kārisyāti. But more probably, since this verb alone of those roots in -r presents such a form, it is another instance of abnormal phonetic development associated with the verb 'to do', i.e. kārisyāti > *kāryaṭi, as *kūrumah > kūrmāḥ.

Except in the North-West (Shah. and Man.), ʂ was not preserved, but became ss (*kāryaṭi > kassati). A future of the type kassati is, however, ambiguous. Not only has it the same form as the present kassati < kārṣati 'draws, ploughs', but it is not distinguished in suffix from many presents ending in -assati, e.g. passati < pāṣyati, hassati 'laughs' < *hāṣyati or hāṛṣati, nassati < nāṣyati, etc.

Forms of the few, but frequently used, roots in -ā (dā-, dhā-, sṛḥā-, pā-, mā- and a few others) have profoundly affected the whole Indo-Aryan conjugation. The suffix of their causatives, -āpaya-, early replaced -aya-, and to-day in nearly all IA. languages provides the normal form of causative (Guj. -āv-vū, Hi. -ānā, Mar. -āvi-ṇē, etc.; see J. Bloch, La Langue marathe, p. 230). Their passives in -īya- provided a model, which everywhere took the place of -ya- (of which y, either being assimilated to a preceding consonant or being altogether lost after a vowel, left no clearly discernible sign of passive form); and where the passive survives in Mod.IA. it is formed with this suffix -īya- for all verbal stems (Shina -iṣ-, Si. -iṣ-, Lah. -i-, Mar. -iṣ-, Hi. -iṣ-, OBg. -i-, Nep. -i-, etc.).

In their futures -āṣya- (dāṣyāti, etc.) became -āssa- In the West and North-West the groups short vowel + two consonants and long vowel + two consonants remained distinct, and so still remain in the North-West to-day: e.g. in Sindhi ass > as, but āss > ās (Turner, Proc. Second Or. Congr. Calcutta, 1922, p. 493; Bull. SOS., v, p. 132). These futures therefore were not confused with the common presents in -assati. At the same time there were few presents ending in -āssati, such as vāṣyate > *vāṣati > Si. vāṣaṇu, or causative passives such as nāṣyate > *nāssati, which doubtless tended to be replaced by the simple present nassati < nāṣyati or by the passive of the new causative stem *nāṣāvadi. A future in -āssati, then, in distinction to one in -assati, might retain its sense of futurity comparatively unimpaired.

It was this form -āssati which was employed to replace -assati of the ambiguous kassati, and a new kāssati was created. In somewhat
the same way the separate survival of -ass- and -āss- in the language of the Girnar Inscription served to distinguish vāsa- 'year' (i.e. vāssa- < vārṣā-) from a presumed *vassā- 'rain' (cf. Kash. wośa m. 'shower' < vārṣa-, Si. vasa f. 'rain' < vārṣā-).

In Pali and Prakrit the infinitive and the gerundive (which normally have the same vocalization as the future) of the verb kar- were similarly affected by the verbs in -ā: under the influence of dātum, dātavya-, etc., Pa. kattuṅ, kattabba-, Pk. kattuṅ, kattavva- were replaced by Pa. kātun, kātabba-, Pk. kāduṇ, kādavva-.

In the North-West presents ending in -aṣati (resting only on Sk. -aṛṣati, e.g. kāṛṣati, ghāṛṣati, dhāṛṣati, vāṛṣati) were rare. It is precisely in this area that *karsyati > kassati remains a future.

If the roots in -ā provided a new future for kar- in the Girnar area, why not also in all those other areas in which rś > ss? Yet this was not so: for we find here another form, kuccha-.

We have seen that in the West and North-West the groups ass and āss remained distinct. Further East, however, both Pali and the literary Prakrits attest their confusion; both appear as ass, which irrespective of its origin at a much later period became ās in Central Pahari, Nepali, Assamese, Bengali, Oriya, Bihari, Hindi, Gujarati, and Marathi, remaining ass only in that dialect, probably in the neighbourhood of Ambala, from which Hindi obtains such words as anḍā < ānḍā-, kaṇṭhā < kaṇṭhaka-. Here, then, futures of the type dāṣyati became dassati and were as indistinguishable from presents as we have already seen kassati to have been in the Girnar area. For a time they were maintained as futures: Pa. dassati, ṭhassati, hassati, passati. But eventually they were replaced in two ways: either -assati was replaced by -issati or -essati < -isya- or -ayisyati (Pa. pissati 'will drink', hessati 'will leave'), or ā was reintroduced from verb forms in which it had been phonetically maintained (e.g. dātuṅ, dātabba-, dāpeti, etc.), and the new syllable -āss- shortened by the loss of one s (Pa. dāsati, dāhati). This phonetic process has a frequent parallel in the re-establishment of the prefix ā before a word beginning with two consonants, e.g. ājṅā > anṅā, which was replaced by āṅā, with ā after ā-jāṅāti, etc.

In this area, then, it was to another type of future suffix that recourse was had to overcome the ambiguity of kassati. Sanskrit futures ending in -t-sya-, -p-sya-, and over part of the area in question those ending in -k-sya-, would all become -echa-: Pa. checchati < chetyati, bhecchati < bhetsyati, vacchati < vatsyati, lacchati < lapsyati;
Pk. checchaṁ, bhecchaṁ, rocchaṁ < *rotsyati, vecchaṁ < vetsyati, dacchaṁ < draksyati, vacchaṁ < vakṣyati, bhocchaṁ < bhokṣyati. It is to the influence of this future in -ccha- that Woolner (Āsoka Text, p. xxxv, footnote) rightly ascribes the formation of kacchati.¹ This supposition is supported by the appearance in Prakrit of similar analogical forms, viz. socchaṁ ‘will hear’, which is much more probably a replacement of sossaṁ < śroṣyāmi than a development of *śroksyāmi future of śrus-. (Pischel, Pk. Gr., § 531). So much indeed was -ccha-felt to denote futurity that the present stem gacchati becomes a future in Pk. AMg. gacchaṁ (‘I will go’); Pischel’s hypothesis (ib., § 523) of an early *gaksyāmi is unlikely.

On the other hand in those areas in which futures in -k-ṣya- became -kṛha-, there was a tendency for the forms, if they remained, to lose their future meaning and to become presents. Pa. dakkhati (< Sk. draksyāti) is still a future, but already in Pali it is being used as a present to fill the awkward gap in the paradigm of this root (for Sanskrit has not a present stem, but uses another root altogether), and contaminated with pekkhati (< pṛēkṣate) provides most Mod.IA. languages with the verb ‘to see’: Hi. dekhnā, etc. (see J. Bloch, Festschrift für Wackernagel, p. 143). There are others. Sk. yojāti or yojāyati survives in Shina yuwa ‘wins’; Pj. jōnā ‘to yoke’, Lah. jovan; Mar. jovē ‘to swarm thickly’; Sgh. yodanu ‘to unite’. It is the future yoksyaţā > MI. *yokkhati which provides Mod.IA with a verb ‘to consider, weigh in the mind, weigh’: Ku. jokkho, Ass. zokhiba, Bg. jokhā, jokā, Or. jokhibā (also ‘to unite’), Hi. jokhnā, Pj. jokhnā, Si. jokhau, Guj. jokhvā, Mar. jokhnē (loanword with kh, not s). The etymology is confirmed by WHi. jonā ‘to weigh’.

Sk. druh-, droh- would not be distinguished over most of the Mod.IA. area from Sk. duh-, doh- (Hi. dohnā, etc. ‘to milk’). Thus while Sk. droha- or drōgha- survives in Si. drohu m. ‘injury’, WPj. dhroh m. (beside Si. ḍoho m. ‘milker’, Pj. dohā m.), it is perhaps the future stem dhroksyati which has furnished Ku. dhoko ‘deceit’, Nep. Bg. Or. dhokā, Hi. dhok(h)ā m., Pj. dhokkhā m.; Guj. dhoko m. ‘fear’, Mar. dhokā m.

¹ In the Glossary (p. 77), however, he suggests a form *karṣyati, for which there appears to be no justification. Johansson’s explanation (Shāh., § 7, b, quoted by Hultsch, Inscr. of Aś., p. lxxxiiii), that kacchati < *kajjati < *karyati, has nothing to recommend it. Moreover, the AMg. passive kajjai, with which comparison is made, is not from *karyati, but either from kijjai affected by the vowel of the active karedi, or from the passive causative kāryate.
Already in AV. *nakṣyāti, the expected future of naṣyati, has been replaced by naṣisyati although it crops up again in naṅkṣyati of MBh. (perhaps contaminated with naṣ- 'to reach' or with later futures of the type bhaṅkṣyati discussed above). But *nakṣyati survives as a present stem in Guj. nākhvā 'to throw away' (OGuj. nāṃkhaṇa-ḥāra 'one who throws away'), Kash. nōcharun 'to ruin'.

1 In both the OGuj. (which I owe to Mr. T. N. Dave) and the Kash. forms the nasalization is probably secondarily derived from the initial nasal.
The Head-offering to the Goddess in Pallava Sculpture

By J. Ph. Vogel

(Plates V-VIII)

The remarkable group of five rock-cut temples at Māmallapuram or Māvalivaram, to the south of Madras, has often been described. Popular imagination has associated these wonderful shrines with the Pāṇḍavas; thus it has happened that the one which is smallest in size has become known as the rath of Draupadi. Evidently this temple was in reality dedicated to some form of the goddess Durgā, whose effigy, standing on the severed head of the Buffalo-demon, is found carved upon the outer wall, whereas her vehicle in the form of a well-conceived but unfinished lion-statue may be seen at no great distance.

The back wall of the cella shows a relief, the centre of which is occupied by a four-armed goddess holding a cakra and a śāṅkha; her second right hand is raised in the attitude of protection, whilst the second left hand is placed on the hip (Plate I). The well-known French archæologist, M. Jouveau-Dubreuil, maintains that this figure represents the terrible goddess Cāmuṇḍā "qui est représentée partout : dans le sanctuaire et sur les façades, notamment sur la façade de l'Est où Kāli se tient debout sur la tête de buffle".1

I do not, however, wish to discuss the identity of this divinity. The object of the present paper is not the goddess worshipped in the so-called rath of Draupadi, but one of her attendants. At her feet are two kneeling figures, both apparently male personages. The one to the proper right of the central figure is shown in a very striking attitude. With his left hand he grasps his tuft of hair, which apparently he is in the act of cutting with a sword held in his right hand. This, at least, was the explanation which occurred to me as the most probable after a happy visit to the "Seven Pagodas" about Christmas of the year 1910. In my Iconographical Notes on the Seven Pagodas,2 I proposed this interpretation, while referring to the well-known practice of the hair-offering found among various nations.

Mr. A. H. Longhurst, of the Archæological Survey, who in recent years has published a very full and accurate description of Pallava

2 ASIAR. 1910-11, p. 53, pl. xxviiic.
Architecture, has adopted my suggestion. "The kneeling worshipper on Durgā's proper right," Mr. Longhurst says, ¹ "is portrayed cutting off his long tresses with his sword as an offering to the goddess, a custom still in vogue in Southern India and performed by both men and women. It is a rather striking figure and occurs again in a panel representing the same goddess in the so-called Varāha-Manḍapa."

The panel in the Varāha-Manḍapa ² (one of the cave-temples of Māmallapuram), to which Mr. Longhurst refers, shows a group of figures, of which the four-armed goddess occupies the centre (Plate II). As in the case of the so-called Draupadi, she is attended by four flying Gaṇas, whereas in the two upper corners a lion and a gazelle are partly visible. Of the two male figures kneeling at the feet of the goddess, the one on her right-hand side is turned with his back to the spectator. With his left hand he holds his long hair and with his right his sword. Here again the representation might suggest that the personage in question is about to cut off his hair, although it will be noticed that the sword is held at a level considerably lower than the tuft of hair.

The lower cave of Trichinopoly affords a third example of the same motif (Plate III), but here we find it impossible to maintain the explanation first suggested. The personage who is shown kneeling at the feet of the four-armed goddess, while seizing his hair-tuft exactly as in the two instances already quoted, clearly applies the sword held in his right hand not to his hair, but to his neck. The question may, therefore, legitimately be asked: is not it a head-offering instead of a hair-offering that the unknown sculptor intended to represent?

The question here formulated may, I believe, be answered in the affirmative if we adduce a fourth example of this curious subject. It occurs on a Śiva temple at Pulḷamangai, near the village of Paśupati-koyil, which is situated at a distance of 10 miles to the south of Tanjore. ³ The back wall of the central shrine is decorated with a very graceful figure of the eight-armed Durgā standing on a severed buffalo-head with magnificent horns. The goddess is placed in a niche surmounted by an elaborately carved makara-torana. The two spaces intervening between this niche and the two outer pilasters supporting the stone eaves show two groups of figures which evidently are intended

for attendants of the dreaded goddess. First of all we notice the same two animals, the lion and the deer, which occupy the upper corners of the panel in the Varāha-Maṇḍapa at Māmallapuram. The latter animal, which has forked horns, is preceded by a gana. Under each of the two animals there is a male person kneeling. The one to the right of Durgā is shown in the same position as the corresponding figures discussed above, but in the present case there can be no doubt that he is represented in the action of cutting off his own head as an offering to the goddess. In the same way the kneeling person on the left hand side of the goddess appears to be cutting a piece of flesh from his thigh.

The Śiva temple of Puḷḷamangai bears several Tamil inscriptions recording various donations to the temple and dated in the reign of Parakesarivarman and other rulers of the Cola dynasty. The sculptural decoration lacks the dignified simplicity and strength of Pallava art, but excels by a richness and gracefulness which is free from the exaggerations of later Dravidian architecture. It is evident that the group of the goddess Durgā and her attendants is a later form of what we have seen on the earlier monuments of the Pallavas. We may, therefore, safely conclude that in each of the examples which we have been able to quote the person kneeling to the right-hand side of the goddess is shown in the act of offering his own head as an offering. In all probability the devotee of the goddess represented in this manner was one of the founders of the temple in question and thus gave expression to his supreme devotion to the deity and to his readiness to bring her even the greatest sacrifice—that of his own head.

We do not wish here to discuss the question whether it would be physically possible to decapitate oneself in the fashion portrayed in the sculptures. It would be an act at any rate requiring not only a high degree of self-determination but also an unusual dexterity. This much is certain, that in ancient India this mode of self-sacrifice was considered to lie within the range of possibility. This we may infer from the occurrence of the same motif in Sanskrit literature. I may be allowed to quote a few instances from Somadeva’s Kathāsaritsāgara.

First of all we have the well known story of the hero Viravara, which is found in two slightly different versions in that great collection of stories. In the second version it is the fourth tale of the Vetāla. It forms, therefore, also part of other redactions of that highly popular

---

1 Annual Report on Epigraphy for the year 1921–22, Madras, 1923, pp. 48 f.
collection *Vetālapaṅcavimśati*. Moreover, the same pathetic story is also included in the *Hitopadeśa*.\(^1\)

The story, according to the second version of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* (*Vetāla*, iv), may be summarized as follows. In order to prolong the life of his master, king Śūdraka, the hero Viravara, who here is called a Brāhman, offers the head of his son Sattvavara to the goddess Caṇḍi. His daughter thereupon dies from grief, and his wife resolves to throw herself on the funeral pyre on which the bodies of her two children have been laid. Then Viravara resolves to gratify Ambikā by sacrificing himself. After a hymn of praise addressed to the goddess Kāli Mahiśāsura-māriṇi, he cuts off his own head with a stroke of the sword. King Śūdraka, touched by so great devotion, is about to follow the example of his faithful servant, but a voice from heaven prevents him from doing so. Finally all are brought back to life.

The other version of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* presents certain points of difference. Here, too, the hero of the story is a Brāhman called Viravara. But the king, his master, is Vikramatūṅga residing at Vikramapura. When Viravara, after uttering a hymn of praise to the goddess Caṇḍikā-devi is ready to sever his head from his body, a heavenly voice (*bharati ... aśavirā*) commands him not to act rashly, and offers him a boon. Thereupon Viravara begs from her the life of king Vikramatūṅga as well as the lives of his wife and children.

The version of the *Hitopadeśa* agrees with that of the *Vetāla* story of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. That the prose version calls Viravara a Rājaputra seems natural and more original. The king is Śūdraka. The weeping woman who warns the hero of the fate threatening the king is not the Earth-goddess, but the Lākṣmi of king Śūdraka. After offering the head of his son to the goddess, who here is called Bhagavatī Sarvamaṅgalā, the Rājpūt Viravara cuts off his own head and his wife does the same. Then the king, who has witnessed the scene, seizes his sword to cut off his own head, but the goddess appears in person and holds him back. All are revived.

The sixth *Vetāla* tale of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* affords another very curious example of the head-offering to the goddess.\(^2\) The hero of the story is a washerman, named Dhavala, who, after having taken wife, has entered a famous shrine of Gaurī at Śobhavatī, and in his fervent desire to please the deity, cuts off his head, which first he has

---

\(^1\) Hit. iii, kathā 8.

Image of Durgā in "Rath of Draupadi", Māmallapuram or "Seven Pagodas".

To face p. 542.
Rock-cut Temples at Trichinopoly. Image of Durgā in Lower Cave.
Sculpture in relief of Durgā, on the North Wall of the Central Shrine of the Śiva Temple at Pulḷamaṅgai, Paśupatikōvīl.
fastened to the chain of the bell, evidently to make the procedure somewhat easier. His brother-in-law who together with the newly married bride is waiting outside, at last goes inside the temple, and seeing what has happened, he follows the example of so noble a sacrifice. When the bride becomes aware of the suicide of both her spouse and her brother, she is seized by despair and wishes to hang herself from an *aśoka*-tree. She is prevented from this self-chosen death by a heavenly voice which offers her a boon. It goes without saying that she asks the life of her husband and brother, but being told to replace the two heads on the trunks of those two beloved persons, in her confusion she interchanges the heads. The story ends with the query: who of the two men is now to be her husband?

The examples quoted will suffice to show that the sacrifice of one’s own head was a well-known *motif*. The deity to whom this supreme sacrifice is made is always a goddess. This is a point of great interest, because the same is the case with the sculptural representations which we have been able to adduce above. That the offering of one’s own head is known to have been actually practised in India appears from an interesting paper by Mr. Hira Lal, who speaks of certain sects “who used to cut off their heads and tongues in a maṇḍapa especially erected for the purpose with a religious fervour worthy of a better cause.”

---

On the Etymology and Interpretation of Certain Words and Phrases in the Aśoka Edicts

By M. de Z. Wickremasinghe

In the course of my tutorial work on the Palæography and Epigraphy of India and Ceylon, I have had to read the Aśoka inscriptions with some of my pupils. As a result, I have come across the following words and phrases which to my mind seem to demand an interpretation other than that already supplied by scholars interested in the subject.

(1) Rock Edict III. Girnār. Parisā pi yute āṇapayisati gaṇanāyam hetuto ca vyauṇjanato ca.

This sentence, which occurs with dialectic differences in other versions of the third rock edict, has already been discussed by previous writers. I would, nevertheless, translate it thus:—"The Council (of Mahāmātras) shall also give orders to the yuktas (in respect of these rules) in detail [i.e. item by item] regard being had to (their) raison d'être and to the letter (of the law)."

Here gaṇanāyam (loc. of gaṇanā) is used adverbially to mean "numerically" or "item by item", just as in Sinhalese gaṇan-vasayen (Skt. gaṇanā-viṣayena) is used with the same idea to emphasize the details of a statement. The expression hetuto ca atthato ca vyauṇjanato ca is used in Pali to mean "according to the raison d'être, the spirit and the letter (of the law)". This seems to me to give a better sense than the translation "to register (these rules) both with (the addition of) reasons and according to the letter".


This gives a true picture of a Hindu religious procession, exhibiting divine emblems such as the vimānas of the planetary gods, the thrones or vāhanas of gods (here hasti stands for Airāvatā of Indra), pots containing burning matter (incense) in honour of Agni, images of Viṣṇu, Śiva, and other gods of the Hindu pantheon. All these are
carried even at the present day to the accompaniment of tom-tom beatings. This is exactly what is meant here. I would, therefore, take dosayitpā as an adjunct of bheri-ghoso, especially as these emblems are absolutely non-Buddhistic and would translate the passage thus:—

"But now, in consequence of the practice of morality on the part of 1 King Devānāmpriya Priyadarśin, the sound of drums (accompanied by) exhibiting to the people the representations of celestial chariots (of the planetary gods) and of elephants (as the seat of Indra), masses of fire (in honour of Agni) and other divine figures (of the Hindu pantheon, all this) has become the sound of morality."

Āsoka wanted perhaps to say that all these tumultuous Hindu processions have now turned into processions or peaceful assemblies proclaiming his moral code and holding discourses thereon. This is probably the sort of harmless and meritorious samājās referred to in Rock Edict I, 6. In the Neville collection of the British Museum Library there is a large and valuable collection of Pali and Sinhalese Manuscripts containing sermons delivered at such gatherings.

(3) Rock Edict VI. Girnăr. śa[ve kule bhunj[a]mānasā me orodha-namhi gabhāgāramhi vacamhi va vinītamhi ca uṣṇesu ca savatra pañvedakā śītā athe me [ja]nasa pañvedetha iti.

To understand the real meaning of this passage, it would, in my opinion, be necessary to try and get an idea of Āsoka’s position when he had his sixth edict issued. He had just completed the conquest of Kaliṅga which he annexed to his empire. So he was naturally fully satisfied with the vast territories he was then in possession of, and it might be presumed that he thought the next best thing he should do was to follow the advice given in Hitopadesa, namely “one should preserve what one has acquired”, and the best way of doing this was to devote all his time henceforth to the welfare of his subjects. In addition to this there is no doubt that the horrors of the Kaliṅga war caused a complete revolution in the character of Āsoka. He was seized with remorse, and became absolutely penitent, with the result that he determined to be an adherent to the principles of ahiṃsā, mettā, karunā, muditā, as well as dāna—all of which covered more or less common ground, not only with Buddhism, to which he was especially inclined, but also with the doctrines of other contemporary schools of thought. From his many records we see that he acted

1 Possibly the genitive here has the signification “instituted by”.


upon his convictions, not only to gain merit with a view to have a happy after-life, but also because the exercise of these principles would go a great way to make himself popular and give satisfaction to his subjects.

So he declared, like many an Indian and Ceylon king in later times, that in the past kings had not attended to public business at all times, but in the future he would be accessible to every one of his subjects.

In stating this he practically ignored his grandfather’s declaration to the same effect. Thus we see that during Aśoka’s time kings attended to public affairs only at special times, and this is confirmed by the time-table given by Kauṭilya in his Arthaśāstra in respect of duties of kings. On certain occasions when the king is in certain places no one is allowed to disturb his privacy, and this is mostly in connection with his domestic matters, or, rather, with his private life in his various palaces. Emperor Aśoka had many palaces with harems, parks, and other adjuncts which go to complete the establishments of great Indian potentates.

Hence in the interpretation of the technical words used by Aśoka as places of seclusion in his sixth edict, we should bear in mind that they were all situated within the grounds of his various palaces. The places in question as shown in the foregoing passage are:—(a) orodhanāṁ, (b) gabhāgāraṁ, (c) vacaṁ, (d) vinītaṁ, and finally (e) uyaṁāni.

All scholars agree as to the meaning of (a) and (b), the latter was probably a suite of rooms in close proximity to the former. But as regards vaca and vinīta opinions differ.

Some time ago my attention was drawn to the word vaca or vraca used in the sixth edict as an unsatisfactory explanation in connecting it with Skt. vraja “cow-pen” for Skt. -ja seldom becomes Pkt. -ca.¹ In this my colleague agrees with Michelson who also pointed out this phonetic difficulty. The late lamented Dr. Hultsch equated vraca or vaca with Skt. vraja, no doubt on the authority of Hemacandra and of the Shāhbażgārī record where the form vracantī is used for vrajantī. The Prakrit lexicon, Abhidhānaratājendra, also gives vraja as one of the three meanings of vaca, the other two meanings being nṛta and mada; but in spite of all these suggested etymologies, vaca or vraca can also, phonetically speaking, be a derivative of Skt.

vratya or vrātya\(^1\) (cf. Skt. satya, P. sacca, Skt. Kātyāyana, P. Kaccāyana). The neuter vrātyam may be taken to mean a place where certain religious rites are performed, most probably a temple of the Vṛātya\(^2\) cult. It is possible that in the time of Aśoka this cult which was most likely an indigenous one was observed in strict privacy by Indian kings and their household in common with the ordinary people in the country. So vacamhi or vracaspi, whatever the derivation might be should be rendered by "in the chapel (or temple)." Even in the present day ruling princes in India have their own private places of worship attached to their respective establishments. The addition of va or eva gives emphasis to the secrecy of vrātya worship.

Vinūtā. The etymology is quite clear, though the signification is somewhat obscure. But if we take into consideration the arrangement of the technical words, we notice that vinītamhi comes between vacamhi and the final uyānesu as if it was a place between or rather linking the latter two. We may, therefore, not be far wrong if we take it to mean a path leading to the various parks—a sort of well-constructed and decorated path along which the king either alone or with his queens and their attendants goes to amuse himself in the parks of which there were many kinds. Naturally no king or ruling prince would like to be disturbed with public business at this time. I would, therefore, translate the above passage thus:—“Reporters are posted everywhere (with instructions) to report to me the affairs of the people at all times whether I be eating (or be) in the harem, (or) in the inner apartments (or) even in the temple (or) on the (adorned) pathway (or finally) in the parks.”

\(^1\) It is true that if we take the form rānō (Ginār, IV) to represent rānō (Skt. rājñāḥ) and regard it as typical of the Ginār dialect, then Skt. vrātya can be in Ginār dialect only vrācca, i.e. vaca or vrāca and not vaca or vaca. But there are no instances to my knowledge of the retention of the Skt. medial ṛ before a double consonant without either reducing the latter in Pkt. and Pāli to a single consonant or shortening the vowel and allowing it to remain long only by position (cf. Pischel’s Prakrit Grammar, par. 87). So Skt. lokāgra can in Pkt. and Pāli be either lokagga or lokāga, but never lokāga, except perhaps in modern Indo-Āryan dialects through the later influence of Sanskrit.

\(^2\) See Professor Winternitz’s interesting contribution to Die Zeitschrift für Buddhismus on the Vṛāyas, where he has summarized the views of previous writers on the subject.
The Rgveda and the Panjab

By A. C. Woolner

Speaking of the materials furnished by the Rgveda, Dr. A. B. Keith has rightly said that "conclusions can be drawn only with much caution. It is easy to frame and support by plausible evidence various hypotheses, to which the only effective objection is that other hypotheses are equally legitimate, and that facts are too imperfect to allow of conclusions being drawn". (The Cambridge History of India, vol. i, p. 78, 1922.)

That position seems to be sound, but in the same paragraph the writer commits himself to an evident acceptance of the view that "the bulk at least" of the hymns of the Rgveda were composed "south of the modern Ambala".

The revelations of Harappa and Mohen-jo-daro and the possibility of finding archaeological strata contemporary with the beginning of the Vedic age in the Panjab lend a new interest to evidence of the Veda and it is reasonable to challenge the bases of any prevailing belief with regard to the location of the main settlements of the Vedic Aryans. The belief that the principal settlements of the Aryans were in the country of the Sarasvati south of Ambala is based in the first instance on certain ideas about the Panjab, i.e. that there are no mountains visible except "in the north-west corner at Rawalpindi" or "south of the modern Ambala", that the Panjab has little share in the phenomena of thunder and lightning, and that the seasonal phenomena of the country of the Five Rivers are so regular and the phenomena of dawn so glorious that we may seek there the origin of hymns to Dawn and of the concept of the laws of Varuna.

To this is to be added the evidence of one or two hymns as adduced by Pischel and Geldner (Vedische Studien, vol. ii, p. 218; vol. iii, p. 152).

Now, anyone who has been familiar with the Panjab for a number of years and has travelled all over it at different times of the year, must admit that the ideas about it that have just been quoted are not accurate. The mountains are visible all the way from Rawalpindi to Ambala, if you are near enough and the air is clear. Though the average rainfall is small, storms are often violent and rain irregular.

1 A. A. Macdonell, Sanskrit Literature, p. 145, 1900.
While it is true that sunrise is generally more beautiful in the west of the Panjab than in the east and north, yet when the air is dry wonderful dawns can be seen south of Ambala. These ideas in fact can be traced to Professor Hopkins, who visited India for one cold weather and described the Panjab in 1888 (JAOS, vol. xix, second half, p. 19 ff.). He was very disappointed in the Panjab and wrote a spritely article which is very far from being accurate, but has been quoted by others who have not visited the Panjab or even, one would suppose, studied a large scale map.

Professor Hopkins wrote: “And from the Sutlej to the Ravi what a view of unbounded flatness.” “The student goes still further west,¹ and what does he see? A veritable desert, green only by the river’s bank; a level land, from which no mountains are visible; . . . and not till he reaches the very north-western corner of the Panjab does he see mountains, at a distance.”

As a matter of fact the mountains are quite evident on a clear day (without cloud or haze) from Jalandhar, Amritsar, and Gujrat, and dominate the landscape at Hoshiarpur, Gurdaspur, and Sialkot.² For 100 miles along the road from Gujrat to Rawalpindi the snow mountains are obvious, and at Jhelum one runs into hill country the east end of the Salt Range.

Along the line of the foothills of the Himalayas there is a strip of country say 50 miles wide, well in view of the mountains, very fertile, with a rainfall distinctly greater than in the west of the Panjab. This is where population is densest, and contains historical sites like Jalandhar and Sialkot. If by way of hypothesis the width of the strip be doubled, adding a strip of drier land ³ but still all near enough

¹ He meant north-west.
² They are practically invisible at Lahore, though the gleam of distant snow mountains can be seen about dawn from a tower on an exceptionally clear morning.
³ The use of wells indicates that the water-line was not very deep. The word dhánavaa usually translated “desert” need not always mean a sandy desert devoid of plants.

Vide Macedonell and Keith, Vedic Index, sub voce). The dhánavaa are flooded, iv, 17, 2; 19, 7; they are rained on, v, 33, 6; plants grown on them, iv, 33, 7; they are made easy to cross evidently because ájíjana óṣadhir, v, 83, 10; and there is something for horses and cattle to eat. Again dhánavaa iv ac prapd if translated “like a spring in a desert” suggests an oasis as in the Rajputána desert, but perhaps “like a waterhole in a dry tract” may be nearer the truth.

The Dhánava has been derived from dhan “to run”, the idea being of running sand (Walde, Lateinisches Elym, Wörterbuch, sub fons). It does not seem necessary to separate it from dhanu, dhánava meaning “bow”. The original meaning may have been curved land—so applied to a sandbank or island (dhanu) or to land not flat enough for irrigation (dhánava) and so to flatter waste land.
to the mountains for a knowledge of them and for the use of stone,\(^1\) we have a range of country about the size of Portugal, which apparently would account for the geographical data of the Rgveda as well as the district south of Ambala. That is no proof that the Aryan settlers occupied this area, but if we are to suppose they neglected the greater part of it, we may ask what the reason could have been.

Regularity of seasonal phenomena is not characteristic of the Panjab. We have no regular rains in the monsoon season, though we generally have one or two violent storms with heavy rain and often floods during that period. That is why the University of the Panjab works through the heat of May and June and has no rains’ term July to September like the Universities of the United Provinces. A study of Panjab finance would show how sorely we are tried by the irregularity of seasonal phenomena; by absence of rain at the right time, by heavy rain at the wrong time, by hail, and by floods. A powerful but incalculable Storm God needs more propitiation in the Panjab than the deity which brings the warm, beneficent rain to the rest of India. In the Panjab we are more at the mercy of “depressions from Persia” during the winter and spring, and also of the sudden spates in the spring. Even to-day, when so much water is drawn out of the rivers by the huge canal system, there are sudden rises which often do enormous damage. Somewhere about the beginning of April the boat-bridges across sections of the Indus are broken and instead of driving 10 or 12 miles across the silt with an occasional boat-bridge over a channel, one has to cross in a steamer to get to Dera Ismail Khan or Dera Ghazi Khan. It takes some hours’ fighting against the current. This is the Indus of which the American pilgrim wrote: “So he goes on till he arrives at the Indus—the mighty Indus and sadly wades across it!”

The phenomena of dawn being more subjective are not so definitely recorded. The present writer has seen some thousands of dawns in the Panjab, but they vary so with the weather that it is difficult to make any sharp distinction between the Panjab and the north

---

\(^1\) The Vedic Aryans made regular use of stone. So in ii, 24, 4, ádáisyám avatám “well with mouth of stone”; cf. x, 101, 7, áámacakra “stone-wheel” rather perhaps “circle of stone”; x, 101, 10, áámanmayábhīḥ | vááshhít “axes made of stone” and so on.

A hundred fortresses of stone (iv, 30, 20) suggest hill country, so do the “stony barriers” of x, 67, 3. In the west and centre of the Panjab there are no rocks and no stones. To throw something at a dog one must find a piece of brick or potsherid or be content with a lump of earth.
of the United Provinces or between the east and west of the Panjab. On the whole, it appears that the finest colour effects are seen in the drier regions and in dry weather before the season of dust storms and heat haze. A great many dawns are very grey affairs.

Are we not inclined to exaggerate the aesthetic aspect of Uṣas? Professor Hopkins speaks of the colours of sunrise and sunset. Now the Vedic hymns say very little about sunset. The Dawn is the propitious time, the end of the terrors of night and the beginning of the auspicious rites and of the activities of man. She is beautiful, of course, like a dancing girl, with her bright raiment and her kine are red, but her constancy and the regularity of her appearance, and all the blessings connected with her, not forgetting her Lover the Sun, are more important than the varying colour schemes of the dawn. There is, however, no need to press this point, as it is generally supposed that the Dawn hymns as a whole developed further west or north-west than the region of the Sarasvatī.

Pischel (Vedische Studien, vol. ii, p. 218, 1892) identified the Āpayā of R.V. iii, 23, 4, with the Āpagā assigned by the Mahābhārata to Kurukṣetra. Thus he had very reasonably the Sarasvatī, the Drṣadvatī and the Āpayā as the three principal rivers of that region. Now the rṣis of iii, 23 are two Bhāratas. Hence Pischel concluded the Bharatas were settled in Kurukṣetra, and that when the Bharatas are said (iii, 33, 10) to have come to the Vipāṣ and Śutudrī from a distance, we should understand that they had come from the east. Some at least of the Vedic poets, he says, were well acquainted with Kurukṣetra.

Geldner (Vedische Studien, vol. iii, p. 152, 1901), discussing the traditions about Gotama the son of Rahūgaṇa, the rṣi of i, 74.93, accepts as probable the story of the Satapatha that he was the purohitā of King Māthava of Videgha who lived on the Sarasvatī. This presence of a rṣi (though presumably a late one) on the Sarasvatī leads him to say that the evidence of the Brāhmaṇa confirms the correctness of what Hopkins and Pischel have said, and that the Sarasvatī region was the proper home of the Ṛgveda. The Aryans he thought could not have settled long in the Panjab. "In den weiten, meist dünren und wüsten Ebenen des Panjab, die zwischen Indus und Sarasvatī liegen, war das R.V.-Volk nicht ansässig, weil dort überhaupt kein Volk sich dauernd ansiedeln konnte." Geldner was doubtless thinking of the western Panjab, or of the dry bārs between rivers inhabited till recently by a sparse population of jungly tribes. Of the eastern
Panjab he seems to ignore all but the south-east corner. We might admit that the Bharatas settled on the Sarasvati. Their dominance of what came to be called Madhyadeśa might help to explain the survival of the Bharata name. But that does not compel us to locate all the Vedic tribes and all their poets on the same river. To say with Pischel some at least of the Vedic poets were well acquainted with Kurukṣetra is one thing, but to say the bulk of the Vedic hymns were composed in that region is quite another.

As a matter of fact the bulk of the hymns afford no geographical indications whatever. The indications of many others are ambiguous. There are, however, some points which seem to indicate that the poets were not confined to the district south of Ambala, but familiar with a wider area.

There are two references to hail, one where the Maruts are described as violent, shaking mountains, roaring and covered with hail (ḥrādunī-vīta, v, 54, 3), the other in a description of a fight between Indra and the Serpent, with thunder and lightning, mist and hail (i, 32, 13).

Hail is more frequent in the north Panjab and more destructive, but it occurs in the south also as well as in the hills. So these passages cannot help us much. A phrase that does seem to indicate real wintry conditions is that of x, 68, 10, himēva parṇā muṣitā vāmāni “like woods robbed of their leaves by the cold”; Indian trees further south may shed dead leaves in the late winter or early spring, but they are never bare. Trees that are bare in winter suggest the hills or the north Panjab.

The knowledge shown of rivers in the north and on the west of the Indus would be surprising if the bulk of the hymns were composed in Kurukṣetra. Whatever be the exact meaning of Indra’s attack on Uśas and his smashing of her wagon, the statement that her broken car lay in the Beas would seem to indicate a poet to the west of that river (iv, 30, ii). Again the rivers are sometime described as roaring. That is true rather of their upper courses before they reach the level plains. Not only the Sarasvatī roars (vi, 61, 8) and bursts the ridges of the hills (vi, 61, 2), but also the Indus, which goes roaring like a bull.

1 Geiger indeed (loc. cit.) allows the Vedic poets a knowledge of the Panjab, but thinks the Bharatas invaded it in a series of digeijayas. But they would not raid an empty desert. Who then were the settlers in districts worth raiding? If they were not Aryans, were they non-Aryan tribes strong enough to hold their own against the Aryans? That would be very interesting if there was any evidence to support it. Geiger offered none beyond the fact that two Bharata poets belonged to the Sarasvatī country.

2 Zimmer took this to be the Indus.
(x, 75, 3). In ii, 25, 5 all the rivers are said to resound—dhunayanta.
In iv, 26, 2 Indra says, “I guided forth the loudly roaring waters”
(vāvasānd).

In a number of passages describing the activities of Indra, when
he burst the mountains to bring out the rivers or the kine, it is quite
unnecessary to resort to the later explanations in terms of monsoon
clouds. A phrase like i, 32, 1—prā vakṣānā abhinat pārvatānām—
has much force if taken in its natural meaning. So in the next verse
he slew the serpent “lying on the mountain”, then the waters came
out towards the sea like lowing kine. Similarly, ii, 15, 8—vi pārvatasya
drśhitāny airat “he burst apart the fastnesses of the mountain”,
conveys an idea quite different to that of a thundercloud at the
beginning of the monsoon. When Indra cut (aradat) the channels
for the rivers (as for the Beas and Sutlej, iii, 33, 6) are we to under-
stand the shallow shifting courses in the middle plains with occasional
floods, when these channels are hidden, or the ways cut for them
out of the mountains? In x, 75, 2 Varuna cut the channels for the
Indus, which goes bhūmyā ādhi pravātā—sāmunā “over the steep
ridges of the earth”. Such passages suggest that the Vedic poets
were aware that the great rivers cut their way out from the mountains.
That phenomenon is more striking than the origin of the Kurukṣetra
rivers, and the withholding of the waters during the winter is more
mysterious than the drying up of local streams when there is no rain.
Such indications may be far from conclusive. Nevertheless, it may
be remembered that the Vedic Aryans were a virile enterprising
people who subsequently imposed their language on most of India.
They possessed horses, asses, and camels, and used chariots and wagons.

So the hypothesis that they knew the whole Panjab and occupied
the best parts of it seems quite as possible as others. There would
then be no need to suppose the bulk of the Vedic hymns were composed
in Ambala district.1

1 It has been assumed above that the Panjab climate was much the same as it
is now, or some forty years ago before the great extension of irrigation. There may
have been periods of progressive desiccation. The Bār or waste land between the
Ravi and the Chenab, now irrigated and colonized, does not seem to have been always
such a barren waste as it was recently. The area contains a large number of “thehs”
mounds strewn with pottery which indicate the sites of well-populated villages.
(Deva Singh, Colonization in the Rechau Doab, p. 6, Monograph No. 7, Panjab
Government Record Office Publications.) The study of “Indo-Sumerian” or
“Indus Valley” sites like Harappa may throw some light on this question. Supposing
that the Vedic Panjab had more rain and more pasture with less desert, the con-
tention expressed in this article would not be affected.
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“ANTHROPOPOS” ADMINISTRATION,
MODLING b/WIEN, ST. GABRIEL, AUSTRIA.
Les Formes turques et mongoles dans la nomenclature zoologique du Nuzhatu-l-ḵulūb

Par Paul Pelliot


On savait depuis longtemps que Ḥamdullāh al-Mustaufī al-Qazwīnī, dans la partie d'histoire naturelle de son Nuzhatu-l-ḵulūb de 1339, avait donné les noms de beaucoup d'animaux, et parfois de minéraux et de plantes, en turc et en mongol, mais le texte n'était accessible qu'en manuscrit ou dans une médiocre édition lithographique de Bombay parue en 1893-4.1 On doit donc savoir gré au Colonel Stephenson qui nous donne aujourd'hui le texte persan de la section zoologique, avec une traduction annotée ; cette édition a été établie, outre l'édition de Bombay, sur six manuscrits de Londres, de Paris et de Vienne. Le meilleur des manuscrits est, paraît-il, celui de Paris (Bibl. Nat., Anc. fonds persan 139) ; après examen, j'estime d'ailleurs que ce n'est pas beaucoup dire.

1 C'est par un lapus que E. G. Browne (A History of Persian Literature under Tartar Dominion, p. 99) parle de l'édition donnée par M. G. Le Strange en 1915 dans la "E. J. W. Gibb Memorial" Series comme si elle renfermait l'œuvre entière ; cette édition n'en contient que la section géographique. Je n'ai pas eu accès à l'édition de Bombay.
En tout cas, pour les noms d'animaux donnés en turc et en mongol, les résultats obtenus par l'éditeur ne sont guère satisfaisants. Il a adopté plus ou moins arbitrairement telle ou telle leçon sans indiquer les variantes des manuscrits, a sauté un certain nombre de noms ou omis d'indiquer qu'ils avaient existé mais étaient laissés en blanc dans ses textes, a négligé de consulter un turcissant ou un mongolisant, et enfin a ignoré deux articles qui lui auraient évité nombre de méprises, l'un dû à M. N. N. Poppe et précisément consacré aux noms mongols et turcs de Kazwîn,1 l'autre où j'ai étudié la liste parallèle d'Evliyâ-Čelebi.2 Mais M. Poppe ne disposait que d'une liste relevée sur un seul texte de Kazwîn par Barthold, d'autre part la liste d'Evliyâ-Čelebi est moins riche que celle de Kazwîn. Je crois donc bon de reprendre ici toute cette nomenclature, après avoir collationné les noms turcs et mongols sur le ms. de la Bibliothèque Nationale (= P) et en m'arrêtant surtout à ce qu'il reste à préciser dans les travaux antérieurs.3

1° (pp. 2-3).—“Chameau”; t. "devê", mo. "tamkun" (St.). Lire mo. tâmâqân. Cf. Po., 195; Pe., 287; compte rendu Po., 577 (je maintiens la remarque qui y est relevée). Kazwîn ajoute (cette phrase manque dans P) qu'en turc on appelle le mâle "baqar" (St.) et la femelle "inkân" (St.). Ces deux mots ne sont pas dans Po. Je ne doute guère qu'il faille lire le premier mot (bûqa) (bûqua), buqra, chameau mâle.4 Le second mot est tu. "inhân" (mo. inhân), "chamele" (la transcription inhan de M. Brockelmann, Kâşyâri, 62, ne paraît pas justifiée).

2° (pp. 3-4).—“Mule”; t. "qâtîr" (P "qâter"), mo. "lấusa" (St.). Cf. Po., 196 et 207; Pe., 287. Le t. qâtîr ne fait pas difficulté. Il est surprenant que M. St., d'accord avec P., ait la forme mo. correcte lausa, sans indication de variantes, alors que le ms. utilisé par Po. écrivait lausa, dont la leçon semble appuyée par Evliyâ-Čelebi.

3 J'indique d'abord, sous chaque numéro, la page de la traduction de M. Stephenson, puis sa lecture et sa transcription suivies de "St."; Po. désigne l'article de M. Poppe; Pe. désigne le mien; t. = turc; mo. = mongol.
4 Les ms. auraient-ils subi la contamination de l'arabe baqar, "bœuf" ?
3° (p. 3).—"Bœuf"; t. سقر "saqar (?)", mo. هوكر "hökar" (St.). Cf. Po., 196 et 207; Pe., 288. Il faut lire t. شقر = سقر "ṣṣiṣr" et mo. هككر (> mo. écrit class. ʿukár).

4° (p. 5).—"Buffle"; mo. أو "ي" (St.). Le mot n'est pas dans Evliyâ-ʻCelebrî. Dans Po., p. 197 et 206, il est indiqué (par erreur de sa source ?) comme mo. selon Қазвînî, mais est écrit ৯ (=أوي) et correctement identifié à t. ৯ (=< cultivating "bœuf" et non "buffle"); le nom turc du buffle est su-ṣṣiṣr, "bœuf d'eau," dans Codex Coman., p. 129; le nom mo. moderne est ʿusun-ʿukár, "bœuf d'eau." Dans P 121b, le nom turc du buffle est laissé en blanc, et son nom mongol est simplement donné sous la forme ҳукár.

5° (p. 6).—"Ane"; t. ايش "išak", mo. أقلاط "ilchakan" (St.). Cf. Po., 197 et 207 (où on a [par erreur !] ايلكن comme forme mo. de Қазвînî). Pas dans Evliyâ-ʻCelebrî. Lire t. ēsāk, mo. ālīgān (P a bien - Ef- et non - ē-, mais il en est d'ailleurs ainsi même quand il faut - ē- vraiment).

6° (p. 6).—"Chat"; t. جال "jatak", mo. ملغون "malghûn" (St.). Cf. Po., 197 et 207; Pe., 288. Lire t. جال "jatâk"; cf. ğatāk dans Brockelmann, Kâşyârî, 53; aussi dans Houtsma, Ein türk.-arab. Glossar., 69; le mot semble omis accidentellement dans le dictionnaire de Radlov; Ibn Munanâ le donne pour le turc comme pour le mongol. D'après Po., Қазвînî indiquerait t. pišik; Evliyâ-ʻCelebrî a t. kädi, ce qui est la forme osmanlie. Pišik est également un nom de chat en osm. et en jaγ; mais on voit mal comment M. St. a "jatak" sans variante si le ms. sur lequel s'appuie la liste de M. Po. a pišîk (cf. ici infra, n° 21b); les noms "altaïques" du chat mèriteront d'ailleurs tout un article. Pour le mo., la forme de Қазвînî chez Po. est miyû, mais P 122b a معنî et Evliyâ-ʻCelebrî écrit miyûn; il faut presque sûrement rétablir معنî miyû dans les deux textes.

7° (p. 7).—"Mouton"; t. قورین "qoyun" (St.). Po., 207, a t. قوي, et à bon droit; car P 122b dit en réalité que les Turcs appellent le mouton قوي et les Mongols قورین qobin (à corriger en قورین qonin).

8° (pp. 8-9).—"Cheval"; t. آت "āt", mo. "mûri" (St.). Cf. Po., 197 et 207; Pe., 280. Lire mo. mori (sur ce mot, cf. Polivanov, dans Izv. Ak. Nauk, 1927, 1202-3). Selon M. St., Қазвînî ajoute
qu’un “étalon” se dit en t. إْغِر "aighir" et en mo. أَرْغَه "ahra‘a". Ces mots ne sont pas dans Po., mais cf. Evliyâ-Čelebi dans Pe., 280. T. āiyēr est correct ; pour le mo., il faut lire أَرْعِه "afirya", mais la faute du ‘a’in pour le γαίn se retrouve dans Evliyâ-Čelebi. D’après Қазвînî, “jument” se dit قُسَرَق "qīsrāq" en turc, "kûn" en mo. (St.). Pour ces mots, omis dans la liste Po., cf. Pe., 280. Sur t. qīsrāq, cf. T’oudg Pao, 1930, 301; le mot mo. est à lire γαίn. Un “poulain”, selon Қазвînî, se dit قُولُون "qûlûn" en turc, أُتْغَان "ūtghân" en mongol (St.). Ces mots ne sont pas dans la liste Po., mais on les retrouve, sous une forme identique, chez Evliyâ-Čelebi (Pe., 281, et compte rendu Po., 578; aussi Izv. Ak. Nauk, 1927, 1258); t. qulun est correct, mais il faut corriger le mo. en أَجْتَت أَحْن َأ ِن (ou انَعَّيَان, انْعَّيَان). Le “cheval hongre” se dit ٲَقْتَا en turc selon Қазвînî, qui ajoute que ce terme est bien connu en persan ; on sait qu’il existe aussi en mongol (aqta, aqta). Қазвînî dit encore qu’en turc un “cheval lent” se dit نَاشِيْق "nâshiqa"; un “ambleur”, پُرْقَة "yûrqâ”; un “cheval de course”, قُورُدُونِه "qûrdûna"; un “trotteur”, قَتْرَال "qûtarâk" (St.). Ces mots sont en réalité mongols. Le premier est à lire nasiqa (= nasiya); cf. Ibn Muḥammad ُناْسِيْق نَاْسِيْق نَاْسِيْق نَاْسِيْق (Melioranski, Arab-filolog o tureckom yazcke, 151), ms. arabo-mongol de Leide نَاشِقَةِ Našiqai (Poppe, dans Izv. Ak. Nauk, 1928, 71), mo. écrit nažayai. Yorqa (= yorqa; cf. Kâşyari, yorîya, dans Brockelmann, 94) est turc, au sens d’“ambleur”, mais le ms. P 123b n’a yorqa que par une correction, sous laquelle on reconnaît جُوُرٍيْعَة joriya, c’est-à-dire le جُوُرٍيْعَة joriya (=<*joriya), “ambleur”, du ms. arabo-mongol de Leide, mo. écrit jirîya (cf. Poppe, dans Izv. Ak. Nauk, 1927, 1273). Qurdûna se relie à qurdun, qui, en mo., signifie “vite”, et est précisément donné dans le ms. arabo-mongol de Leide au sens de “coureur” (cf. Poppe, ibid., 63). “Qatarak” (orthographe anormale) est à rapprocher de mo. qatarî-, “trotter” (mais qatarâ dans Hist. secr. des Mongols, § 64), qatarîâ, “trotteur”; t. jay. (emprunté ?) qatra-, “chevaucher rapidement.” Il n’est pas exclu que Қазвînî ait aussi donné primitivement les noms vraiment turcs qui manquent aujourd’hui à nos manuscrits.
(St.). Cf. Po., 197 et 207; pas dans Evliyâ-Çelebî. Lire t. kâčî (en osm. et jay. ; tar. kâčî), mo. imân (< imâ'ân).

10° (p. 10).—"Chacal" ; t. چغال " chaghâl" (St.). Cf. Poppe, 207 (fâyâl). Je crois qu’il faut lire āyâl, comme l’a fait M. St. (cf. osm. âqaâl ; qîpîqâq āyâl dans Houtsma, 71) ; le t. tar. a šâyâl (< pers. šâyâl). Après la mention du nom turc du chacal, il y avait la mention d’un nom mongol, omis dans P 124a, et sans que sa place ait été laissée en blanc comme à l’ordinaire. M. St. a supprimé tacitement et systématiquement toutes les indications de noms turcs ou mongols quand ces noms eux-mêmes manquaient dans les mss. ; on a déjà vu qu’il les a parfois même omis quand ils y figuraient.

[10a (p. 11).—"Belette" (dalaq). M. St. n’indique que les noms arabes et persans. Mais P 124b ajoute que les Turcs appellent la belette... (le nom est laissé en blanc) et les Mongols susar (ces mots ne sont pas dans les listes de Po.). Nous avons donc ici la source d’un des seuls mots vraiment mongols prêtés aux Kaitak par Evliyâ-Çelebî et qui semblaient manquer dans Kazwinî (cf. Pe., 282). Vu la dépendance étrangère des deux textes, il est possible — mais non certain — qu’Evliyâ-Çelebî ait également copié le nom turc de la "belette" (osm. gâlinîj) et qu’il ait par suite connu un ms. de Kazwinî où le nom turc n’était pas laissé en blanc. Aux indications de Pe. 282 sur les formes susar, sausar, etc., ajouter Kâšyâri (Brockelmann, 173, traduisant dalaq), سرسال sarsal (lire savsal ?)].

11° (p. 11).—"Lièvre" ; t. طوشقان " tâushqân" (mss. de Paris) et توشقان " taushqân" (autres mss.), mo. تولای " tâvalai" (St.). Cf. Po., 198 et 207 ; Pe., 282. Lire t. tâushqan ou tawîshqan, mo. taulai.

12° (p. 12).—"Bouquetin" ; t. "teké", mo. اوونا "aqûnâ" (St.). Cf. Po., 198 ; le mot n’est pas dans Evliyâ-Çelebî. Tâkâ existe dans presque tous les dialectes turcs et a même passé en persan (cf. Ccd. Coman., p. 128). M. Po., qui n’indique pas tâkâ, prête à Kazwinî, pour "bouquetin" (p. 208), un prétendu mot "turo" تсрî qui résulte d’une méprise ; le texte dit que les Turcs appellent "son mâle" (تسرî du nom de tâkâ. La forme mo. de Kazwinî recueillie par Po., 198, est اووگینا uqyanî, que M. Po. rétablit en *uqyan, mo. écrit uqana et uguna. La forme mo. écrite
attestée au xiv\textsuperscript{e} siècle est en réalité déjà uquna, et est probablement à corriger en uquna ; en tout cas, il faut lire uquna dans St. ; P 125a écrit uqna. P a ensuite une série de mots se rapportant aux bouquetins, mais dont les formes turques et mongoles sont laissées en blanc ; M. St. ne dit rien de ce passage.

13\textdegree{} (p. 13).—"Renard" ; t. تِلَکَ "tilkū", mo. هنک "hankan" (St.). Cf. Po., 198 et 208, et mes remarques de J.A., 1925, I, 235–6 ; le mot n’est pas dans Evliyâ-Čelebi. Tilkû est correct ; lire mo. hünâgân.\(^1\)

14\textdegree{} (p. 14).—Sur le χυτά, il fallait surtout se référer aux articles de M. Laufer dans le Toung Pao de 1913 (315–70) et de 1916 (348–389) ; le χυτά ou χυτάq apparaît aussi dans Kâşyari, mais M. Brockelmann (p. 112 ; et plus précis dans Asia Major, II, 112) a gardé la leçon چتِنَق qatuaq et pensé à tort que χυτά ou χυτάq en était altéré.

15\textdegree{} (p. 14).—"Porc" ; t. طَنْقُز "tanquz", mo. قَا ظ "qâfá". Cf. Po., 198–9 et 208 ; Pe., 282. Il faut lire t. tonquz (= toñuz) et mo. qaga (= mo. écrit yaqui).

16\textdegree{} (p. 15).—"Hérisson" ; t. كِرْبَي "kirpi", mo. حَارِيّ "jariya" (St.). Cf. Po., 199, 206 et 207. Pour le nom turc, la transcription kirpi de M. St. est plus correcte que celle de kirbi suivie par M. Po. Quant à l’autre nom turc "kirbi tâgân" de Po., 207, il paraît sorti de quelque faute de texte ou de quelque méprise, et je ne crois ni à l’explication qu’en donne M. Po. dans son texte, ni à celle de sa note 2. Pour le nom mo., Barthold l’avait recueilli sous la forme جَارِيّ "jarba", et M. Po. a bâti un raisonnement sur cette forme qu’il lit *jaraba, en l’opposant à mo. écrit jaraqa, jara’a (cf. aussi Izv. Ak. Nauk, 1927, 1271). Mais il est certain que جَارِيّ "jarba" est seulement une mauvaise leçon pour le جَارِيّ "jariya

---

1 A cette même p. 13, le "parfâ" de M. St. doit être primitivement un nom de peuple (= Bartas, Burta ; cf. les diverses formes chez Vullers).

2 En arabe, ortedul ; M. St. le traduit par "porc-épic", et rend par "hérisson" le mot قنفُد qunfūd de la p. 24 (cf. infra, n° 28a) ; mais ortedul signifie aussi parfois "hérisson", et c’est le sens des équivalents qui en sont donnés en turc et en mongol par Kazwini. Toutefois Kazwini spécifie que son ortedul est plus grand que le چَرْپُد (nom persan usuel du "hérisson") ; il a donc dû confondre les noms ici.
(<<server>>) correctement donné par M. St.; c'est en effet ĵariya qu'on a au xiv° siècle dans le Houa-yi yi-yu. P 126a laisse le mot mo. en blanc.

17° (p. 16).—"Blaireau ?"; t. pursq. "pursaq" (St.). Le mot que j'ai traduit hypothétiquement par "blaireau" est le pers. rūdák, de sens assez incertain. Mais "pursaq", qui a passé aussi en persan (Vullers le rend par mustela, "fouine," "belette"), est sûrement le t. pursaq, borsuq (> russe barsuk), "blaireau" (cf. aussi bursumaq [lire borsumaq ?], "blaireau," de Brockelmann, Kāṣ-yari, 44). Le mot n'est pas dans Po. Par contre, P 126b, après le nom türk, parle d'un nom mongol et d'un nom arabe (celui-ci laissé en blanc). Le nom mongol est écrit دریان; je ne doute pas qu'il faille lire دریان doriyan, = mo. écrit dorɔyan, doryon (ma. dorgon), "blaireau"; on a درقان dorqan, "blaireau," dans le vocabulaire arabo-mongol de Leide (IAN, 1928, 56). En fin de liste mongole, Po. 206 a un mot دارکویه laissé sans traduction; on pourrait être tenté d'y voir une mauvaise leçon du nom mo. du blaireau; mais je crois plutôt qu'il s'agit du n° 61d, infra.

18° (p. 17).—"Tortue"; persan کنف "kashaf" et "bakha"; türk قاوارجا قلیق "qāvarjâ quliq" et "bāqa" (St.). Cf. Po., 199, 206, 208. La liste communiquée à M. Po. indiquait à tort que Kâzwînî citait bāqa comme un mot mongol; d'autre part, M. Po. fait des formes turques des noms de la "grenouille," au lieu que, malgré les confusions qui se sont parfois produites entre les noms de ces deux animaux en türk et en mongol, le texte de Kâzwînî montre clairement qu'il s'agit ici de la tortue; la grenouille reparaitra d'ailleurs plus loin. Baqa ou bâya, avec le double sens, est bien connu en türk. Quant au premier nom türk, M. Po. l'a eu sous la forme خاور باقلیq et l'a coupé en "xaar"?" + "baqaliq", "baqaliq" étant "l'endroit où il y a des grenouilles". Mais il me paraît clair qu'il faut lire en un seul mot qaurêcaqliq ou qauwêcaqliq (< gaburêcaqliy), "[l'animal] à écaille"; cf. Kâş-yari, qabêcaq, "caisse" (Brockelmann, 139); jay. gaburêcaq, tel. qabêcaq, kirg. qabêsaq, "écaille." Il doit même s'agir d'un seul terme qaurêcaqliq baqa, mot à mot "grenouille à écaille" = "tortue". C'est là le qīpçaq ٷبرچاقو بغا gaburêcaqlu bâya, "tortue," de Houtsma, 87 (mais Houtsma transcrit à tort bōya, au lieu de bâya,
de même qu'il a à tort qurboya, p. 88, pour qurbayya, "grenouille"). Les noms t. et mo. sont laissés en blanc dans P 127a.


20° (p. 18).—"Zibeline"; t. كيش "kiš", mo. بلغان "balghän" (St.). Cf. Po., 199 et 207 ; Pe., 283. T. kiš est correct ; lire mo. بولگعان (mo. écrit bulğyan).

21° (p. 18).—"Écureuil"; mo. كرمان "karmän" (St.). Cf. Po., 199 ; Pe., 283. Lire کرماين. Le mot arabo-persan employé par Kazwini est سینب (aussi connu en osm.), qui désigne bien l'"écureuil" (cf. aussi Cod. Coman., p. 97). Kazwini n'a donc pas commis la confusion avec l'"hermine" que la traduction qui avait été remise à M. Po. lui avait fait croire, et dont j'ai parlé d'après lui.

[21a (p. 19).—"Lézard" (ar. ِةبَدَب ; pers. سیمانر [= scr. سیمَارا, avec différenciations sémantiques]). Kazwini donnait aussi un nom turc et un nom mongol, qui sont laissés en blanc dans le ms. de Paris. Je suppose que c'est ce mot turc qui est représenté par le mystérieux اوچکي ايم "őčki imr," "lézard", de Po. 208.]

[21b (p. 19).—"Chat sauvage." P 128a indique un nom turc et un nom mongol. Le nom turc est laissé en blanc ; le nom mo. est donné comme موشول müšük. Müşük est inconnu en mo., mais bien attesté en jay. et en turki, où c'est un nom usuel du "chat" domestique, alors qu'en turkî le "chat sauvage" est molun (cf. ? mo. مالور, ma. malaḥi, id.); toutefois von Le Coq (Sprichwörter und Lieder, 98) a noté à Turfan فيلün müšük comme désignation de "kleinere Wildkatzen jeder Art". Je suppose que le müšük est ici en réalité le mot turc, et que c'est le mot mongol qui aurait dû être laissé en blanc. Le pišik, "chat", de la liste de M. Poppe est peut-être à rapporter ici (variante de müšük), et non au paragraphe du "chat" domestique (cf. supra, n° 6). Le "muš", "chat", de Brockelmann (Kâşyari, 123) est probablement à transcrire müš.

22° (p. 19).—"Antilope"; t. كيل "গেয়িক", mo. جير "jairan" (St.). Cf. Po., 199–200 et 207 ; Pe., 284–5. Lire kiık et jērān.

23° (p. 21).—"Putois"; t. مدق "مادق" et كوسان "kusân" (St.). Le sens est garanti par le nom arabe (زاربان) ; le persan مزکل m'est obscur. Le premier mot turc, écrit بهدو dans P 128b, ne me rappelle rien. Quant au second, il est certainement à lire کوسان et est identique à t. tel., kob. کوزان, "putois," qara-kusân
et qara-kūzān dans Cod. Coman., 98 et 128 ; cf. aussi Kāşyari (dans Brockelmann, 119), kūzān (corr. kūzān ?). M. Po., 208, donne parmi les mots turcs de Kazwini un mot "tersaq" qu’il traduit par "taupe" (= t. alt. tārsāk) ; on pourrait songer à une équivalence inexacte et une mauvaise leçon pour kūsān ; mais peut-être s’agit-il d’un tout autre mot. P 128b mentionne aussi un nom mongol, qui est laissé en blanc.

24° (p. 21).—"Rat" ; t. sīchān, mo. nūlqluna "thūlqinā" (St.). Cf. pour la forme turque, Po., 207, et Pe., 283 ; sīcan est turkmène selon Houtsma, 76. Le mot mo. n’est pas dans la liste de M. Po. ; mais il faut évidemment le lire quulqūna (mo. écrit qulwquna et quluyana) ; la forme du Hova-yi yi-yu est qulugana. Comme mot mo. correspondant à t. sīcan, Evliyā-Çelebi indique qomāran, "marmotte," dont certaines formes dialectales signifient "taupe" et même "grosse souris" (cf. Pe., 283-4). Si le mot d’Evliyā-Çelebi était vraiment mongol, ce serait le seul mot vraiment mongol qu’on ne trouve pas avant lui chez Kazwini ; mais peut-être qomāran était-il donné dans certains mss. de Kazwini (à propos d’un autre animal ?), ou encore Evliyā-Çelebi le doit-il à quelque dialecte ture de prononciation "kirghize". Aux indications données dans Pe. sur qumāran, j’hésite à joindre yamlan de Kāşyari (Brockelmann, p. 76), "espèce de souris" ; yālmān [lire yalman] de Houtsma, 108, "gerboise" ; tel. yalman, "petit animal" (Radlov, III, 189) ; yalman d’Ibn Muhannā, "souris de campagne" (Vār al-ṣarū) ; cf. Melioranski, Arab filolog o tureckom yazykе, 062).


26° (p. 23).—"Éléphant" ; mo. jāhūn "jāhūn" et "la’an" (St.). Cf. Po., 200 et 207 ; Pe., 285-6. Pour le second terme, lire yāyan (P 129b a laan) ; le premier représente le même mot, sous la forme dialectale fa’un (issue de [ou fautive pour] fa’an > fān). Cf. aussi compte rendu de M. Po. dans Zap. Koll. Vost., III, 579 (la remarque qui l’a surpris veut simplement dire qu’on ne doit pas rapprocher le h de faḥūn du -i- de adu’usun sans signaler au lecteur qu’ils ne sont pas phonétiquement équivalents). Kāşyari donne en ture yāyan et yańa (Brockelmann, 73 et 77).

27° (p. 24).—"Hermine" ; mo. aṭām "autam" (St.). La liste
fournie à M. Po., 206, indiquait utm comme le mot mo. pour "castor" chez Kazwinî. Bien que n'ayant alors accès à cette liste que par M. Po., j'ai supposé déjà (Pe., 286) que le mo. ʿumstûm (?) indiqué par Evliyâ-Čelebî pour [pelisse d'] "hermine" était le même que le utm de Kazwinî ; l'édition de M. St. montre qu'on avait fourni à M. Po. une traduction inexacte et que, chez Kazwinî également, il s'agit bien de l'hermine (qāqum) et non du "castor". Le mot pour "pelisse de" (kırkî) employé en turc par Evliyâ-Čelebî est une addition qui n'implique pas la présence d'un second élément dans son ʿumstûm (il dit de même en turc "pelisse d'écureuil" pour le seul mot mo. ʿârâmûn, "écureuil"). Le nom mo. écrit de l'hermine est Ŀuɣûn (cf. Pe., 286, et la correction justifiée de M. Po. dans Zap. Koll. Vost., III, 577-8, qui écarte i.unû, i.unân). Vu l'accord des mss. de Kazwinî, je ne doute pas que l'ʿumstûm d'Evliyâ-Čelebî ne soit une forme altérée, où, en particulier, l's est une mauvaise restitution d'une ligne horizontale un peu allongée. Par ailleurs, je crois que, dans Kazwinî lui-même, il faut corriger ʿumûm *uɣûm, forme secondaire de Ŀuɣûn (et *uɣûn).

28° (p. 24).—"Singe" ; pers. بوژیه "bûzîna", turc "bûhan" (St.). Cf. Po., 200. Lire pour le second mot ینچین beçin. M. Po. dit que le mot est donné comme turc par Kazwinî, mais qu'il est en réalité mongol, et il suppose en outre que Kazwinî a voulu le noter sous la prononciation beçin ; je n'en vois pas de raison suffisante, car les mss. confondent souvent ج et چ, le Houa-yî yî-yû a bien bûçîn, et d'autre part bàçîn est attesté en turc dès l'épigraphie de l'Orkhon. Les formes persanes et mongolo-turques sont apparentées, de même que le russe obez'yan (le Cod. Coman., p. 128, écrit "abursîna" [= *abuzîna?] pour le persan). Le mot mériterait une monographie. Cf. aussi Laufer, dans T'oung Pao, 1916, 74. Une forme mo. est laissée en blanc dans P 130b.

[28a (p. 24).—"Hérisson" (qunfuş) ; cf. supra, n° 16. M. St. n'indique pas ici de noms turc ou mongol ; toutefois P 130b dit que le qunfuş est appelé کرپگ kirbi (lire kirpî) par les "Persans" (lire "Turcs"), bien que kirpû apparaîsse dialectalement dans Vullers, II, 812), et laisse en blanc un nom mongol.]

29° (p. 25).—"Cerf" 1 ; le mâle est t. سقون "saqûn", la femelle

1 Le mot arabe est مهابة makât ; M. St. l'a pris dans son autre sens de "bœuf sauvage", qui est exclu ici.
t. مارال "mārāl" (St.). Po., 207, indique "buyu soyun" et "maral", comme mâle et femelle du cerf chez Kazwini, en ajoutant que ces termes existent aussi en mongol. Le mot buyu, "cerf," n’est pas dans le texte imprimé de Kazwini, et il y aurait lieu de vérifier s’il figurait bien dans le ms. qui est à la base de la liste de M. Po. Lire sīqun = sīyun (cf. Kāšyari, sīyun, dans Brockelmann, 178; t. jay. soyun; osm. etc., sīyīn) et maral.


31° (p. 28).—"Tigre" (babr); t. پولارس "yolbars" (St.). Cf. Po., 207 ("yulbars"); P 132 laisse en blanc un nom mongol.


33° (p. 29).—"Loup"; t. قورت "qurt", mo. جینه "hīna" (St.). Cf. Po., 200-201 et 207; Pe., 286. La liste fournie à M. Po. donne pour le turc "qurt bōrī", c’est-à-dire qu’elle juxtapose les deux mots turcs signifiant "loup"; mais si bōrī a figuré dans le texte primitif de Kazwini, il faudra probablement lire "qurt et bōrī". Quant au mot mo., lire جینه ēina (= mo. écrit ēinou). La même faute "hīna" est copiée dans Evliyā-Čelebi; elle se trouve en fait dans tous les mss. connus de Kazwini.

34° (p. 31).—"Hyène"; t. دیلت "dīltū" (St.). C’est évidemment là le mot "ture" transcrit tlu et laissé sans traduction dans Po., 208. Les noms arabe (dabū') et persan (kāštār) ne laissent pas de doute sur le sens. Le nom ordinaire de l’hyène en turc est sīrtlan, mais le mot donné par Kazwini n’est pas inexplicable; seulement, il n’est pas turc, mais mongol. Aussi bien dans le vocabulaire arabo-
mongol d'Ibn Muhannâ que dans le vocabulaire arabo-mongol de Leide, l’"hyène" est appelée ديلتو جا deltû ēna (= deltu ēna), "loup à crinière" (cf. Poppe, dans Izv. Ak. Nauk, 1928, 56), et la même expression pour "hyène" se retrouve dans l’osmanli ğallâ qurt, "loup à crinière" (cf. Young Pax, 1930, 309). C’est le mongol deltû, "à crinière," qui est devenu chez Ŷazwînî le nom "ture" de l’hyène. Les noms turc et mo. de l’hyène sont laissés en blanc dans P 133b ; c’est probablement le mot mongol qui, dans d’autres mss., a pris indûment la place du mot ture.

35° (p. 32).—"Lynx" ; t. قرا قولاق qara qulâq ; mo. سیلادسون "silâdâsun" (St.). Cf. Po., 201, 206, 207. Le nom turc qara-qulaq, mot à mot, "oreille noire", est bien connu (P 134a a à tort قرا کوز qara-köz, "œil noir"), et je compte consacrer un jour une note spéciale aux noms asiatiques du lynx. Pour le mo., la liste remise à M. Po. portait شیرلاسون šîrîласûn, et M. Po. suppose que mo. écrit "šilîgüsün" est issu d’un šîrîgüsûn. Mais j’ai montré (Pe., 287) qu’Evliya-Čelebi ayant شیرلاسون šîrîласûn, c’est également la forme qu’il faut lire au lieu de "šîrîласûn". Mais par ailleurs P 134a écrit شیلاووسون ｓîlâsusîn, dont le "silâdasûn" de M. St. n’est qu’une altération graphique ; et ce doit être là la leçon primitive de Ŷazwînî.

36° (p. 33).—"Once" ; t. پارس "pars" (St.). Cf. Po., 201, 206, 207. Ce mot est plus probablement à lire ici bars que pars. P 134b mentionne un nom mo., laissé en blanc.

37° (p. 34).—"Chien" ; t. إن "în" ; mo. نوکا "nuqa" (St.). Po., 201, 206, 207 ; Pe., 282. Le mot mo. est noyai. D’après l’édition de M. St., Ŷazwînî aurait donc noqa, et non le noqai fourni à M. Po. et que j’ai indiqué d’après lui. Dans ces conditions, il n’est plus évident que le نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکا نوکa. P 134b mentionne un nom mo., laissé en blanc.

38° (p. 35).—"Léopard", "panthère" ; t. قادلا "qaplûn" (St.). M. Po., 207, lit qâblan et traduit par "tigre" ; mais ar. namîr, pers. pâlîng, désignent le "léopard" ou la "panthère" et non le "tigre", et par ailleurs c’est qâplûn qui est la forme turque normale ; qâblan est la forme empruntée en mongol (cf. Hist. secrète des Mongols,

39° (p. 36).—"Puce" ; t. كرك "barka". Lire bürğa ; le sens est garanti par ar. būrgāth, pers. كرک, et c'est par inadvertance que M. Po., 207, traduit t. bürğa par "pou". Le mot bürğa a passé en mongol ; bien qu'il manque à nos dictionnaires du mo. écrit, il est donné tel quel dans le Hova-ji yi-yu et M. Po., 206, l'a signalé en kalmouk sous la forme bürük. Ibn Muhannâ (Melioranskii, ZVOIRAO, XV, 110) donne pour le mo. پریک birik, évidemment apparenté à bürük, bürğa (cf. t. osm. pirâ). La liste fournie à M. Po. préte en outre à Қазвинî un mot mo. رُجان bryân, signifiant "puce" ; il n'y a rien de tel dans l'édition de M. St., mais P 136a indique une forme mo., laissée en blanc ; peut-être faut-il lire رُجان *bürücân. Pour turc bürçâ emprunté en mongol, cf. Poppe dans Izw. Ak. Nauk, 1927, 1264.

40° (p. 36).—"Dragon" ; t. لو "lû" ; mo. موغور "moghûr" (St.). Cf. Po., 201, 206, 207. Le mot lu, lû, "dragon," est bien connu en turc et en mongol (cf. infra, n° 50). Pour le mot mo., la liste fournie à M. Po. écrit moï, où M. Po. a vu très naturellement mo. moï, "serpent." Mais il y a des difficultés, parce que moï reparaîtra ensuite plus loin pour le serpent sous la forme moqâ, parce que les noms arabe et persan montrent qu'il s'agit bien ici du dragon, enfin parce que le "moïur" de l'éd. St. (il est bien dans P 136a) introduit ici un nouvel élément d'incertitude. La solution de M. Po. est cependant la seule qui s'offre jusqu'ici, et dans le Cod. Coman., 128 et 129, on a le même mot turc sazyân ou saza-yân pour "serpent" et pour "dragon".


42° (p. 38).—"Serpent" ; t. پیلالان "yîlân" ; mo. موق "müqâ" (St.). Cf. Po., 202, 206. Lire moqâ (= mo. écrit moï) ; la liste fournie à M. Po. écrivait moya.

43° (p. 40).—"Scarabée" ; t. قنقو "qanqûr" (St.). Lire قنقو qonquz (= qonuz). Cf. Po., 207, qui a la forme correcte. P 138a mentionne une forme mo., laissée en blanc.
44° (p. 44).—“Scorpion”; t. جَيْن “jīyān” (St.). Lire čayan, et cf. Po., 208. P 139b indique fautivement en ture, جَيْن حات en mo.

45° (p. 44).—“Araignée”; t. ارْجُول “urumjûk”; mo. آهِمِن “āhamîn” (St.). N’est pas dans Po. Lire t. örumjûk. La forme mo. est fautive pour hâlîn ou hâlfîn (mo. écrit a’llîn), et a été copiée sous la forme ahîn par Evliyâ-Čelebi. Cf. J.A., 1925, I, 207-9, et Pe., 288. P 139b, qui a aussi ahîn, confirme l’emprunt par Evliyâ-Čelebi.

46° (p. 45).—“Tique”; t. كَنِه “gênê” (St.). Cf. Po., 207. Lire käni. P 140a indique un nom mongol, laissé en blanc.

47° (p. 45).—“Aspic (?)”; t. كَلَّر “kalras” (St.). Pas dans Po. Le sens de l’ar. قَرْنِي qarnî m’est inconnu (le mot est-il correct ?); mais le sens résulte du nom pers. mār-i-bâlîn, évidemment identique au mār-i-bâlîn de Vullers. Le mot ture est peut-être altéré, mais je ne sais comment le corriger. Peut-être lire *kâlârs, qui serait à la base de t. kâlâr et kâlâs, “lézard” (cf. Kâšyarî, dans Brockelmann, 103, et Radlov, II, 1113, 1114). P 140a mentionne aussi un nom mo., laissé en blanc.

48° (p. 45).—“Pou”; t. بِئْت “bûl”; mo. بُسْن “bûsn” (St.). Lire mo. bûsûn. Cf. Po., 202, 207; Pe., 288.

49° (p. 46).—“Fourmi”; t. جُمَلٌ “jumâlî”, mo. قَوْرِيْغا “qûrîya”. Cf. Po., 202, 206, 208; Pe., 289. La liste fournie à M. Po. donnait āmâlî pour le ture, ābâlî pour le mongol, mais ābâlî est une forme dialectale ture (pas attestée telle quelle)2; par ailleurs, Evliyâ-Čelebi indiquait t. qarinîa (cf. Kâšyarî, qarinîa, qarinîa, dans Brockelmann, 148), mo. قَوْرِيْغا qûrîya; dans

1 Cf. aussi Houtsma, Ein türk.-arab. Glossar., p. 98, où kâlîz kâlîz est une mauvaise correction de Houtsma pour kâlîr que le texte donne justement. Voir aussi Ibn Muhannâ, كُلْسِنِكْ kûlsîn (Malov, dans ZKV., III, 244). J’ai entendu kela à Korla, kellâ à Kuča. Il faut toutefois se rappeler que le sens de “lézard” ne va guère avec le terme persan, et qu’il y a un autre paragraphe pour le “lézard” (supra, n° 21a); mon hypothèse sur le sens de Kâsînî est donc faite sous toutes réserves.

2 Je crois que mieux vaudrait transcrire la première forme āmâlî; cf. āmâlî dans F. W. K. Müller, Uygarica, II, 353, suivi par Brockelmann, Kâšyarî, 58 (mais à lire vraisemblablement āmâlî dans les deux cas); dans Radlov, tar. āmâlî, jay. āmâlî (7), bar. āmûldâ; seuls des dialectes septentrionaux ont des formes non palatalisées: tel. āmâlî, leb., tub. ābâlî, kmd. ābâlîyî.
les deux cas, il faut lire pour le soi-disant mot mongol qumurtqa, qui est turc, et la faute commune, aussi bien que l'attribution aux Mongols de ce mot turc, établissent une fois de plus qu'Evliya-Čelebi dépend bien de Kazwinî pour ses mots "mongols". Par ailleurs, cette nouvelle divergence entre la liste fournie à M. Po. et l'édition de M. St. rend bien désirable l'étude minutieuse du ms. utilisé par Barthold.

50° (p. 51).—"Crocodile"; t. *ol*; mo. *öl*; "pîlqasûn" (St.). Cf. Po., 202 et 208; Pe., 289. Le mot t. "ol" ou "ut" est peut-être identique au t. *bû* que j'ai indiqué dans Pe., 289, mais en ce cas l'un de ces deux mots inconnus serait altéré de l'autre. Mais il y a une autre possibilité. Dans P 143a, le nom turc, laissé d'abord en blanc, a été complété ultérieurement d'une autre main en *olu* tü, transcription très admissible (et d'ailleurs attestée en t. jay.) de t. et mo. *lu* (ou *lü*), "dragon" (< ch. 龍 long, *li*」ong), écrit plus haut *lu* sous le n° 40. Précisément, nous voyons dans Kâşyâri (Brockelmann, 123) le mot pers. *nâk* (< scr. *nâga*, et qui a pris en persan le sens de "crocodile") employé en turc pour désigner l'année du "dragon". Quant au mo. "pîlqasûn", la leçon de l'édition de M. St. apporte une nouvelle complication au blqsun بلاقسون de la liste fournie à M. Po., سلاقسون "bîlqasun" de celle d'Evliya-Čelebi (cf. aussi T'oung Pao, 1930, 18, où j'ai prêté par inadvertance à M. Po., sur une métathèse *baqlaqun < *balqasun, un raisonnement qu'il n'a pas eu à tenir, puisqu'il croyait avoir blqsun aussi bien dans Evliya-Čelebi que dans Kazwinî). En outre, P 143a semble avoir سلاقسون *slqsun* presque plutôt que سلاقسون سلاقسون "bîlqasun", et en tout cas, même en n'admettant que deux crochets au début du mot, le second serait celui d'un *i* et il faudrait donc lire *bîlqasun*, ce qui ne cadre plus avec l'étymologie par *baliq* que M. Po. a proposée. Je note à tout

1 Contrairement à cette étymologie, admise après d'autres par M. Rudnev, M. Vladimirov (Izv. Ak. Nauk, 1917, 1490) a dit que mo. écrit *lu* (pron. *lû* ou *lû*) était emprunté au lib. klu, qui traduit le sanscr. *nâga*. Je ne crois pas que ce soit juste, quelque opinion qu'on puisse avoir sur l'étymologie même de klu. Les Mongols doivent certainement leur *lu* aux Ouïgours (*lu* = *lû* en ouigour ancien, *lu* en ouigour tardif), et, avant les Ouïgours, on a déjà deux fois *lû* en turc runique pour l'année du "dragon" (*lû* yîl, dans Radlov, Die alttürk. Inscrh. der Mongolen, 3e livr., 251 et 252) ; à cette date, un emprunt au tibétain est pratiquement hors de question. Nous connaissions aujourd'hui nombre d'autres mots chinois transcrits au Moyen Âge dans des écritures d'Asie Centrale et où les nasales gutturales finales du chinois ne sont pas notées. Par ailleurs long (*li*」ong) comportait une mouillure qui justifie une prononciation *lû* ou *lû* dans le mot emprunté.
hasard, pour l’hypothèse de M. Po., que le vocabulaire arabo-mongol de Leide a une expression بُلَسْغُون دِرَا (balsayun dirâ), où *dirâ signifierait "toit" (cf. Poppe, dans Izv. Ak. Nauk, 1928, 57 ; mais ce balsayun n’est pas relevé à son ordre alphabétique, ibid., 1927, 1265–6). Si ce balsayun se confirmait et provenait d’une métathèse de balayasun > balyasun en *balasayun > *balsayun (avec une nuance sémantique analogue à celle qui fait expliquer balayaâ, dans le Yuan che, par "gardien des greniers [impériaux]")?, l’explication du nom de la ville de Balasayun par le mo. balyasun en serait singulièrement renforcée.

[50a (p. 53).—“Crabe”. P 143b mentionne un nom turc et un nom mongol, laissés en blanc.]

51° (p. 53).—“Poisson” ; t. بالق “bâliq”, mo. حیغاسون "jighäsün". Cf. Po., 202 et 207 ; bâliq et fîyasun sont corrects.

52° (p. 59).—“Grenouille” ; t. قوربقا "qûrbaqâ" ; mo. رغو "bazghaugh" (St.). Ce doivent être là les mots qui ont été fournis à M. Po. (206 et 207) sous les formes de t. qurmag, "grenouille," et mo. رغو bryu, “amphibie.” Qurbaqa et qurmag sont connus tous les deux en turc comme nom de la "grenouille" ; P 146b a bien qurbaqa. Le nom mongol ordinaire de la "grenouille" est manâgâî. Quant au prétendu mo. bzyuy (ou bryu ?), j’hésite d’autant plus à en faire usage qu’il est peut-être contaminé par رغو bûzây, un des noms persans de la grenouille.

[52a (p. 60).—“Castor” (kadâ’at). P 147a mentionne un nom turc et un nom mongol, laissés en blanc.]

53° (p. 61).—“Castor” (kunduz) (ici "loutre") ; mo. قالیون "qaliün" (St.). Cf. Po., 202-3 ; = mo. écrit qali’un ; mais qali’un est en principe la "martre" ou la "loutre", non le "castor". P 147a mentionne un nom turc, laissé en blanc.

54° (p. 62).—“Oie” (iveazz) ; t. اوردک "ârdék", mo. نوقا و سون "nûqû et sûn" (St.). Cf. Po., 203 et 207. Lire t. ârdûk et mo. نوقوسن (= mo. écrit noyosun) ; mais ces mots signifient "canard" et non "oie". P 147b orthographie noqosun comme les autres mss.

55° (p. 63).—“Plongeon,” "grèbe" ; t. قشقلداق "qashqaldâq” (St.) ; cf. Po., 207. Le sens est déterminé par celui du turc qasqaldaq (en turki qâşqaldaq et qalqašdaq ; Kâşyari [p. 150], qâşylaq) ; le mot "arabe" [ou persan plutôt ?] ابکون, que M. St. lit bâbagûn,
m’est inconnu. En outre, M. Po., 206, indique un mot “mongol” inconnu سماغ “sMay” pour “plongeon” (un nom arabe et un nom mo. sont laissés en blanc dans P 148a). Il a dû se produire là quelque confusion, car une note de M. St. signale que l’édition de Bombay ajoute que le “bābaqūn” est appelé en persan “samāgh”, donc سماغ. Il me paraît vraisemblable que ce mot, sur lequel M. St. n’a rien trouvé, soit celui que Vullers a enregistré sous la forme سمانی samānī, comme le nom d’un “oiseau qui surgit de la mer [ou du fleuve]”.

56° (p. 63).—“Faucon” (bāz); t. قرنقفا “qārījqa” (St.). Cf. Po., 207. Lire qarēqa (= qarēqayī), “vautour”; le mot est également connu en mongol. Un nom mo. est laissé en blanc dans P 148a.

57° (p. 63).—“Épervier”; t. قرانقو “qaranq” (St.). Pas dans Po. Lire qirqu = qiruyī (cf. qiruyī dans Kāşyāri, 148, 155, et qaryuī [à lire qiruyī], ibid., 55). Ce peut être là aussi le mot non identifié “cheegey” (“épervier”) du Codex Coman., p. 129. Le mot qiruyī se trouve également en mongol (kiruyī [= kiryuyī] dans le Houa-yi yi-yu).

58° (p. 63).—“Canard”; t. غاز “ghāz”; mo. فلانون “qalāwvan” (St.). Pas dans Po. Lire mo. qalaun (= mo. écrit yala’un). En persan et en mongol respectivement, yāz et yala’un signifient “oie”; il semble donc, si on se rappelle la confusion précédente du n° 54, que Kāzwīnī ait confondu les mots persans et mongols pour “canard” et pour “oie”. Toutefois Quatremerèse (Hist. des sult. maml., II, 1), en expliquant le nom du sultan mamlūk Qa’laun, de race qipčaq, dit que son nom signifie “canard”; le changement du sens n’est donc pas le fait du seul Kāzwīnī. En fait la confusion entre les deux mots est déjà constante chez Kāşyāri (cf. Brockelmann, 135 et 152), et ceci méritera l’examen.

59° (p. 63).—“Moustique”; mo. حرد “harad” (St.).1 Cf. Po., 204, 206. La forme de la liste fournie à M. Po. est جر و جرو جرو س ‘‘ suru

1 La note 6 de la p. 63 ne me paraît pas justifiée. Kāzwīnī mentionne le “grand moustique”, puis passe au “moustique ordinaire”. C’est à ce dernier que la suite me semble se rapporter. P 148b mentionne un nom ture et un nom mongol, laissés en blanc; seul le nom mo. est donné jusqu’ici par d’autres mss. Dans le Houa-yi yi-yu, le nom mo. du “moustique” est bokō’unā = mo. écrit bokō’unā, bökōnā.
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cibin” (= sūrū cibīn, zūrū cibīn?) qui traduit činzare dans Cod. Coman., p. 129.

60° (p. 65).—“Rossignol” ; mo. Sanduraj “sandūrāj” (St.). Cf. Po., 204. P 149 mentionne un nom turc, laissé en blanc. La liste remise à M. Po. portait Sanduqa, que M. Po. a rapproché à bon droit du t. sandiyač, etc. Vu la forme de l’édition de M. St., la vraie leçon de Kāzwīnī ne peut être que Sanduvač turc d’origine et inconnu par ailleurs en mongol. Ajouter en turc Sanduvač chez Kāşıyari (Brockelmann, p. 170), Sanduac (Sanduvač) chez Ibn Muhannā (Malov, dans Zap. Koll. Vost., III, 240).

61° (p. 65).—“Hibou” ; t. Sarīquš “sarīquš” ; mo. Shirashibūn “shirashibūn” (St.). Cf. Po., 204, 206, 207. Le turc Sarī-quis (= sarī-quis) est le nom d’un oiseau en osmauli et le mo. Sīra-šibūn (= mo. écrit Sīra-šiba’un) est connu comme nom du “hibou” ; ils signifient tous deux “oiseau jaune”. Mais P 149 a en turc Baiyūs (= bai-quis), qui est un nom turc usuel du “hibou” (cf. Radlov, IV, 1423 ; Shaw, Vocab., 210 ; et même “persan” “baygis” dans Cod. Coman., 129) ; ce pourrait être là la vraie leçon de Kāzwīnī pour le turc ; cf. toutefois n° 85. Saru-quis (= sarī-quis) est donné en mo. pour “hibou” ou “chouette” dans Ibn Muhannā (cf. Melioranskii, dans ZVOIRAO, XV, 136). La liste remise à M. Po. portait, pour le mot mongol, Sīra-sīum (cf. aussi Izv. Ak. Nauk, 1928, 60) ; mais les leçons de l’édition de M. St. montrent que la forme est fautive, et il faut donc renoncer à certaines des conséquences que M. Po. avait cru en pouvoir tirer. Par ailleurs, l’altération de -n en -m appuie la correction de “utm” en inān que j’ai proposée sous le n° 27.

[61a (p. 66).—“Perroquet.”—61b (p. 66).—“Faisan.”—61c (p. 67).—“Sauterelle”]. P 149b mentionne pour ces trois oiseaux des noms turcs et mongols, laissés en blanc.]

[61d (p. 66).—“Tunaxviıt.” Cet oiseau n’est pas identifié, et ses noms persans sont incertains. Mais en tenant compte du Tīnu “tīну” de M. St. (avec ses variantes) et du nom de ḏārgūna dārkūn že lui donnent les gens de Kāzwīn, il est assez tentant d’y voir le dārkūn ou de Vullers (I, 784, 786), c’est-à-dire un “pic”. Ce doit être ce mot des gens de Kāzwīn qui a été indiqué à M. Po. comme un mot mo. sous la forme Dārkūn (cf. supra, n° 17).]
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62° (p. 67).—“Outarde” 1 ; t. دقا دری “daqdarî”, mo. دقا دق “daqdaq” (St.). Cf. Po. 203, 208. La liste fournie à M. Po. donnait تغدری “tuydri” comme mot mo., et تغداق “toydaq” comme mot turc ; M. Po. a rétabli pour le mo. un original *tuyduri, qu’il a rapproché du turk “duhduri”, “cygne sauvage”, de D. Ross, A polyglot list of birds, n° 36 ; et pour le “turc” “toydaq”, il a fait remarquer qu’on le retrouvait dans mo. écrit doyudaday. En réalité, l’édition de M. St. montre que les formes t. et mo. de کازکیی ont dû être interverties dans la liste remise à M. Po., et d’autre part les initiales en d- (et non en t-) doivent bien être celles de کازکیی, tout au moins pour le mo. ; il faut donc lire t. doqdiri (= doyhduri) ou toyduri (= toyduri), mo. doq’daq (= doyudaq). Pour la forme turque, cf. t. osm. tuydari (Radlov, III, 1168) ; t. تغدری تودارا “tuydari et todara dans Vullers ; turkî “tughdarra” de Shaw cité par E. D. Ross, n° 36 ; تکدیر, nom ordinaire de l’outarde dans l’Inde selon Ross, n° 36 ; turki “duhduri” (lire doyhduri ?) au sens douteux de “cygne sauvage” (t’ien-ngo), dans Ross, n° 36. Pour mo. doq’daq (= mo. écrit doyudaq [doyudaq]), cf. t. kirg. dudaq (> russe dudak), t. jay. toydaq (Radlov, III, 1168, mais transcript tuydag dans III, 1434), t. kkirg., sag. koib., kč. tódaq ; mandchou todo. Peut-être le t. jay. تغدوری “tuyduri” de Pavet de Courteille et de Radlov est-il en outre une mauvaise lecture pour tuyduri ou toydari.


64° (p. 68).—“Pigeon” ; t. کوکچي “gûzhârchi” (St.). Po., 207. Lire kóqârci. P 150b mentionne aussi un nom turc, laissé en blanc. [64a (p. 69).—“Pélican” (î hawâsil). P 150b mentionne des noms turc et mongol, laissés en blanc.]

65° (p. 69).—“Hirondelle” ; t. قږلوج “qirlaqûj” (St.). Pas dans Po. Les formes turques vont de jay. qarlayâq à osm. qirlâyîcê ;

1 M. St. hésite sur le nom persan de لر Share (ou fjard) ; mais c’est là une orthographe déjà relevée pour لر (ou jur) et même لر, “outarde.”
il faut probablement lire ici qarlaquê = qarlayuê. Cf. mo. qariyuça. P 150b mentionne en outre un nom mongol, laissé en blanc.

66° (p. 69).—“Chauve-souris”; t. ٨٧١ "yalâsa" (St.). P 150a mentionne en outre un nom mo., laissé en blanc. La liste remise à M. Po. (p. 207) donnait en ture "yalaqana", qu'il rapproche de yarqanat. L'histoire de turki yarqanat, kaz. jarganat, kirg. jaryanat, n'est pas claire; mais la leçon de St. ne laisse guère de doute qu'il faille plutôt relier yalasa à Kâṣyârî yarîsa (Brockelmann, 85), osm. yarasa, osm. et jay. yarasîq. Cf. aussi turkmène yarasâ, que Houtsma (p. 105) me paraît avoir tort de lire yârasâ.  

67° (pp. 70 et 89).—“Petit aigle” (dâl) et “vautour” (nasr); t. ٨٧٢ “qâjûr” (St.). P 151b mentionne en outre un nom mo., laissé en blanc. Lire qâjîr. Cf. Po., 203 [et 206], qui dit que Kazwinî le range parmi les mots tures, mais que c'est un mot mongol, qu'il rend par “griffon”. En réalité qâjîr (< qadîr) est aussi bien turc que mongol. Cf. en dernier lieu sur ce mot T'ourcing Pao, 1930, 53. Je ne sais si les mots turkî غیجی “ghijî” [pour غیجی qâjîr?] de Shaw, Vocabulary, 213, Gypaetous barbarus, et غیجی “ghâchîr” de Ross, n° 40 et 41, “outarde,” ont rien à faire ici.  

68° (p. 70).—“Poule”; t. ٨٧٣ داقَع “daqûq”; mo. ٨٧٤ داقَع “daqâqû” (St.). Cf. Po., 203 et 207; Pe., 290; Po. dans Izv. Ak. Nauk, 1927, 1023 et 1033, et dans ZKV., III, 579. Le mo. “daquaqu” est vraisemblablement à lire soit en valeur de daqayû (= daqanû), soit à corriger en داقٰع daqowû. Kâṣyârî (Brockelmann, 196) indique en ture aussi bien taqayû que taqowî, mais en spécifiant que cette seconde forme est turkmène. P 151b écrit pour le mo. دقاوٰ daqow. Cf. aussi n° 686.

[68a (p. 71).—“Francolin.” P 152a indique un nom ture et un nom mongol, laissés en blanc.]  

[686 (p. 71).—“Coq.”—P 152a indique un nom ture, laissé en blanc, et un nom mo. دقاوٰ daqawn, simple variante du nom de la "poule" du n° 68. La liste remise à M. Poppe (p. 207) comportait en outre un nom ture du “coq”, ٨٧٥ ãtačî, qui est connu en ture de Kazan; peut-être est-ce là le nom ture qui est laissé en blanc dans le ms. de Paris, mais il restera à établir s'il figurait bien dans le texte primitif de Kazwinî. Evliyâ-Çelebî a copié dans Kazwinî les noms mongols
du "coq" et de la "poule" ; mais son nom turc du "coq" *süri (*?), ne peut se ramener graphiquement à āţāc (cf. Pe. 290).]

69° (p. 72).—"Mouche" ; t. ħyān "jībān" (St.). Cf. Po., 208, dont la liste paraît avoir eu "cībīn". La forme turque correcte est en effet cībīn, cībin. P 152b mentionne en outre un nom mo., laissé en blanc.

[69a (p. 73).—"Humāy".—69b (p. 74).—"Freux." P 153a mentionne des noms turcs et mongols, laissés en blanc.]

70° (p. 74).—"Étouneau" (pers. sār) ; mo. سمارج "sagharjih" (St.). P 153b mentionne en outre un nom turc, laissé en blanc. Cf. Po., 206, à qui on a donné le mot mo. sous la forme سمرجا sqrra, et avec le sens inexact de "merle" ; M. Po. en a rapproché justement t. kaz. šiyürcaq, cuvaš śīngirč, "étouneau" ; mais il faut ajouter surtout osm. sīyırşiq, "étouneau" ; t. coman "segercie" (= sīyırşiq), de sens incertain (cf. Cod. Coman., 130, et W. Bang, Vom Köktürk. zum Osman., II—III, p. 10) ; jay. sīyır quş et sīyırşiq, sīyıršin (?) sīyırşuq (Radlov, IV, 680) ; t. صمرقة sīyırşiq de Vullers, II, 184.

Le prêtendu jay. sīyır "šaračaq", "faucon", de Radlov, IV, 263, me semble à lire également sīyırşiq et à traduire par "étouneau" ; la traduction de "faucon" repose sur une faute du dictionnaire de Calcutta (ساز au lieu de سار sār). Le mot "mongol" de Kazwini est probablement à lire sīyırša ou sīyırša, et à considérer comme un emprunt au turc ; cf. Pe., 290.

71° (p. 75).—"Guêpe" (ar. zanbūr) ; t. ārū "ārū" (St.). P 153b mentionne un nom turc et un nom mo., tous deux laissés en blanc. Pas dans Po. Le mot ar. zanbūr signifie "abeille" et "guêpe" (c'est lui qui est altéré graphiquement en زنبود zanpūd et en زبود zībūd, "abeille", dans Vullers, II, 141 et 166), mais le contexte implique bien ici qu'il s'agisse de la "guêpe" (je ne sais pourquoi M. St. a préféré "frelon"). Le mot turc est arū, arū, qui signifie aussi au propre "abeille".

[71a (p. 75).—"Pélican" (saqa).—P 154a mentionne un nom turc et un nom mo., laissés en blanc.]

72° (p. 75).—"Caille" ; t. بالدرچین "buldurchin", mo. بدنة "badana" (St.). Pas dans Po. Cf. Pe., 291. Lire t. bilārčin, mo. bödānā (t. jay. bödānā, turkî bödānā [Shaw, bödānā], kirg. bödönö, kaz. büdānā).
73° (p. 76).—"Faucon pérégrin"; t. لاجین "lājīn" (St.). Lire lācīn. Cf. Po., 203 ; Pe., 290-1. P 154a mentionne un nom turc, laissé en blanc.

[73a (p. 76).]—"Pivert." P 154a mentionne un nom turc et un nom mo., laissés en blanc.]

74° (p. 76).—"Gerfaud"; t., mo. et pers. شنقار "shungār" (St.). Pas dans Po. La forme attestée au xive siècle en mo. est šinggor.

[74a (p. 76).]—"Säf". P 154b mentionne un nom turc et un nom mongol, laissés en blanc.]

75° (p. 77).—"Faucon sacre"; t. اتکو "atalkū", mo. mo. تلقان "talqān". Cf. Po., 203-4, 207; Pe., 291. Lire t. ītalqū. Pour le mo., la liste remise à M. Po. donnait بلقان bīqān, que M. Po. a proposé de résoudre en *balaqan (= *balayan) et de rapprocher du turc coman balaban, "épervier" (sur lequel cf. Bang, Türkolog. Briefe, II, dans Ungar. Jahrbücher, V [1925], 247). C'est en partie à cette solution que je me range (et il faut alors tout au moins lire chez Kaz invit mo. balagan et non talqan), puisque balaban désigne encore de nos jours le "faucon sacre" (cf. von Le Coq, Bemerk. über türk. Falknerei, extr. de Baessler-Archiv, IV [1913], p. 10). Mais, tout en admettant l'identité de sens des deux mots ītalqū et balaban, j'incline à prendre autrement que M. Po. le texte de Kaz invit. Dans le vocabulaire arabo-mongol de Leide (cf. Poppe, dans Izv. Ak. Nauk, 1927, 1252), ītalqū est donné comme l'équivalent mongol du turc balaban. Je pense que, chez Kaz invit, les mots turc et mongol ont été intervertis. Mais si c'est ītalqū qui est le mot mongol, on devrait avoir en turc balaban et non *balaqan; je crois donc que le بلقان de nos mss. est une simple faute de texte pour ʾīlqān balaban. Dans P 154b, le nom turc est omis, et ītalqū est correctement indiqué comme le nom mongol. 

[75a (p. 77).]—"Paon."—75b (p. 77).—"Tihū." P 154b et 155a indique des noms turcs et mongols, laissés en blanc.]

76° (p. 78).—"Moineau"; t. سارچه "sārcha" (St.). La liste remise à M. Po. avait ساربا sārba (p. 208). Lire sārčā; cf. Houtsma, p. 76, et t. osm., krm. sārčā, "moineau." Ne se confond pas avec persan sārčā si celui-ci est bien formé de sār, "étourneau," + čā. P 155a mentionne en outre un nom mo., laissé en blanc.
77° (p. 78).—“Aigle” ; t. كركوت “ barkūt ” (St.). Cf. Po., 207, dont la liste semble avoir eu " būrkūt ". Le mot est également attesté en mongol au xive siècle sous la forme бургут. La forme turkî " borgut " de Ross, n° 52-4, reproduite en note par M. St., ne répond pas à la prononciation turkî, qui est бургут, биргүт. L’aître d’expansion de ce mot est très étendue. P 155a mentionne en outre un nom mo., laissé en blanc.

78° (p. 79).—“Pie” ; mo. ساغسغان “ sāghsaghān ” (St.). Cf. Po., 204, 206, 207. La liste remise à M. Po. avait la même orthographe que celle de M. St., mais M. Po. l’a résolue en sayīsyan, et a ajouté que c’était là une forme turque, la forme du mo. écrit étant sāyaʃaʃai. Tout cela est vrai, mais les formes du nom de la “ pie ” sont assez variées. Sans entrer ici dans le détail, je signalerais qu’au xive siècle, la forme mongole du Houa-yi yi-yu est saʃiʃai, et la lecture de M. St. a pour elle le mandchou saksaha. M. Po. prête en outre à Kazwînî une forme turque sausqan ; peut-être est-ce là le nom turc laissé en blanc dans P 155b.

[78a (p. 79).—“Rôkh” (sīmūry). P 155b mentionne un nom turc et un nom mo., laissés en blanc.]

79° (p. 81).—“Corbeau”; t. قارنا “ qārghā ” ; mo. كرير “ garîr ” (St.). Cf. Po., 204, 207. La forme turque est bien qaryā. Quant à *kărir, il faut vraisemblablement, comme l’a supposé M. Po., le corriger en كریییر, nom usuel du “ corbeau ” en mongol.

[79a (p. 81).—“Cigogne noire ?” (yurnaiq).—79b (p. 82).—“[Espèce de] plongeon” (γαυνικός). P 156b et 157a mentionne pour eux des noms turcs, laissés en blanc.]

80° (p. 82).—“Palombe” ; mo. كوك “ kākū ” (St.). Pas dans Po. Doit s’apparenter à mo. کاغغه, ma. kekuhe, turkî köğân, mais qui désignent des oiseaux assez variés, tourterelle, coucou, huppe. P 157a mentionne en outre un nom turc, laissé en blanc.

[80a (p. 82).—“Phalène.”—80b (p. 83).—“Farîsa (?)”.” P 157a mentionne pour le premier un nom turc et un nom mo., pour le second un nom turc, tous laissés en blanc.]

81° (p. 83).—“Perdrix”; t. ککلک “ keklık ”, mo. إتاشان (?) (St.). Cf. Po., 204, 207 ; Pe., 291. Au lieu de keklık, la liste de M. Po. donne à tort “ kelek ”. Pour le nom mo., lire ītaun, mo. écrit ita’un, ita’u. Cf. aussi Poppe dans Izv. Ak. Nauk, 1927, 1254.
[81a (p. 84).—"Alouette."—81b (p. 86).—"Tourterelle." P 157b et 158a mentionne des noms turcs, laissés en blanc.]


[82a (p. 87).—"Karwân."—82b (p. 87).—"Cigogne" (laqlaq). P 158b mentionne un nom turc pour le premier, un nom turc et un nom mongol pour le second, tous laissés en blanc.]

83° (p. 87).—"Héron"; t. اوخار "ôkhâr (?)" (St.). Pas dans Po. Lire peut-être oxar, = oqar, mais, malgré Radlov, je n’écarte pas uqar; oqar (ou uqar ?) est connu comme nom du héron en turc. Cf. Radlov, s.v. auqar (mal vocalisé ?) et oxar; Shaw, 209; Ross, n° 13. Les Persans l’orthographient عَقَّار. Le vocabulaire sino-mongol de Pozdneév, qui est de circa 1600, donne en mongol uqařiñan šibau, qui n’est pas attesté par ailleurs.

84° (p. 89).—"Vautour"; t. شَجَر "yûrtajar" et "qâjar", mo. تُوْقْچِين "tanûqêñ" (St.). Cf. Po., 206; Pe., 291–2. M. Po. n’a pas donné le mot turc. Quant au mot mo., sa liste l’écrivait تُوْقْچِين "toghên", et on a تُوْقْچِين batugêñ dans Evliyâ-Čelebi. Le premier mot turc est presque sûrement à lire شَجَر, qui n’est donc pas le nom d’un "hibou" comme il est supposé, non sans hésitations, dans Ross, n° 65, ni une "corneille" comme chez Pavet de Courteille, mais un "vautour", conformément d’ailleurs à ce que suggère son nom chinois de 鳥鷹 fong-ying (son nom mongol actuel est kârâmiçi, le "chasseur d’écureuils"). Sur le second mot turc, à lire qaqir, cf. supra, n° 67. Quant au nom mongol, il demeure mystérieux; sa finale est soit -qêñ, soit à la rigueur -quêñ en valeur de -qaçin.

[84a (p. 90).—"Abeille."—84b (p. 91).—"Autruche." P 159a et b mentionne un nom turc et un nom mo. pour la première, un nom turc pour la seconde, tous laissés en blanc.]

85° (p. 91).—"Grand hibou"; mo. بَيْيْغُش "bâygûsh". Pas dans Po. Bai-quš est en réalité turc; l’identification au "snowy owl",
Nyctea nivea, est celle que J. Scully a indiquée dans Shaw, 211. Cf. supra, n° 61.

[85a (p. 91).—“Huppe.”—85b (p. 93).—“Yaha.” P. 160a et b mentionne un nom turc et un nom mo. pour la première, un nom arabe et un nom turc pour le second, tous laissés en blanc.]

Tels sont les noms turcs et mongols de la section zoologique de Ḫazwiniz, du moins dans l'édition de M. St. Il y a en outre quelques formes mongoles et turques laissées sans identification dans la liste de M. Po. et qui ne figurent pas chez M. St. Plusieurs provenaient de méprises, et on peut les écarter. Mais il reste chez M. Po. des formes “turques” (p. 208) "büküsân", "glouton"; "ńrķrk", "crocodile" (cf. pers. nāk ?); "őcki imr", "lézard" (cf. supra, n° 21a; le bālūr du ms. de Leide, Izv. Ak. Nauk, 1927, 1264, est également inconnu), dont je ne vois pas de quel passage elles ont pu sortir.

Enfin il est un nom d'oiseau que la liste fournie à M. Po. donne en turc et en mongol, et dont la présence semble bien indiquer qu'un paragrasphe au moins doit manquer dans l'édition de M. St., c'est celui que M. Po. (pp. 204, 208) traduit en russe par turpan, “macreuse.” Cet oiseau est le anggir (forme du mo. écrit). La liste de M. Po. l'appelle en turc اوچان očan, nom inconnu et peut-être altéré; mais son nom mongol, écrit par Ḫazwiniz أنغر angr, c'est-à-dire anggir = anyūr, est bien connu et M. Po. ne s'y est pas trompé. On aimerait toutefois à savoir quels sont les noms arabe et persan placés en tête de la rubrique, car l'identification du anggir au turpan, prise probablement par M. Po. dans les dictionnaires de Kovalevskii et de Golstunskii, ne me semble pas pouvoir être juste si le nom russe de turpan désigne bien essentiellement la macreuse, Anas nigr. L'anggir est certainement l'oiseau aux couleurs éclatantes, assez voisin du “canard mandarin”, qu'on désigne sous le nom de “canard brahme”, Casarca rutila. Le nom se trouve déjà sous la forme anggir dans l'Histoire secrète des Mongols, et M. Po. en signale d'autres formes dialectales mongoles qui sont également à finale -r. De même on a ańīr en yakout; ańar en turc de l'Altaï; kirg. et k. kirg. anýar; jav. ańgir, ańqur (cf. le dictionnaire de Radlov). Mais il y a aussi des formes à finale -t et -r: t. ańīr chez Kašyari (Brockelmann, p. 9); jav. ańqu (chez Pavet de Courteille; non recueilli par Radlov); turkî hāńyut chez Shaw, et que j'ai entendu à Kašy et à Kuča; hāńyūt à Turfan (noté par von Le Coq);  “Hang Ghirta” chez Ross,
n° 157, évidemment à lire حانة غيرت hausyirt ; cf. aussi peut-être چوغاš ömrött [dans ömrött-kajök, "aigle"], selon Katona (Körösi Csoma-Arkh., II [1930], 385–7).

Quand je ne connaissais la section zoologique de Kazwini que par l’article de M. Poppe, j’avais été déjà frappé par tout ce qu’Evliya-Čelebi me paraissait lui avoir emprunté, fautes comprises, pour son prétendu vocabulaire mongol des Kaitak. L’étude de l’ouvrage complet a fortifié cette opinion en montrant que c’est également là qu’Evliya-Čelebi a copié certains mots que la liste de M. Po. ne signalait pas, comme unγan (n° 8), susar (n° 10α), qumurqa (n° 49), ḥaliyya (n° 63). Tout compte fait, dans la partie vraiment mongole du texte d’Evliya-Čelebi, il ne reste qu’un mot mongol, fumrən (supra, n° 24), que l’édition de Kazwini due à M. St. ou le ms. de Paris ne donnent pas. Evliya-Čelebi a pu évidemment le prendre ailleurs, mais, puisque nous venons de voir qu’une rubrique sur le "canard brahme" doit manquer à l’édition de M. St., et puisque tant de noms turcs et mongols de Kazwini manquent à nos manuscrits, il est bien plus probable qu’Evliya-Čelebi a recueilli fumrən dans un ms. de Kazwini que nous n’avons plus. Peut-être pourrait-on également rapporter à ce ms. inconnu quelques vocalisations intéressantes d’Evliya-Čelebi (Pe., 288, bó̄casiin ; 291, itaneun). Dès à présent, je considère qu’Evliya-Čelebi a froidement pillé Kazwini et que le prétendu dialecte mongol des Kaitak est une mystification.

Par ailleurs, puisque soit le ms. de Paris, soit le texte qui est à la base de la liste de M. Poppe indiquent un certain nombre de mots turcs et mongols que l’édition de M. St. ne contient pas, il est clair qu’une étude de nouveaux manuscrits est hautement désirable.1

1 Je ne considère pas acquis que Kazwini ait vraiment donné dans son texte original tous les mots turcs et mongols que les ms. accessibles laissent en blanc. Et par ailleurs, certaines de ces omissions ont pu être comblées par des copistes postérieurs, en particulier pour le turc, et même des mots remplacés par d’autres plus familiers. Mais lorsque nous voyons dans la liste utilisée par M. Po. quelques mots vraiment mongols qu’un savant musulman postérieur à Kazwini n’a guère pu introduire ou rétablir, il faut bien admettre que, même avec certains mots laissés en blanc, la nomenclature zoologique de Kazwini en turc et en mongol était beaucoup plus riche que soit l’édition de M. St., soit les ms. connus ne le laissaient supposer. Et par ailleurs la mention respective de noms persans, turcs ou mongols se rapporte presque toujours à des animaux qui pouvaient en effet être connus de ceux qui parlaient ces idiomes. Nous devons donc conclure que toutes ces mentions de noms étrangers remontent bien à Kazwini lui-même, même s’il a dû laisser quelques uns des noms en blanc, et on doit dès lors regretter que M. St. ait si peu respecté sur ce point le texte qu’il édithait. C’est pourquoi j’ai relevé toutes ces indications, telles que le ms. de Paris me les fournissait.
To the Zamasp Namak II

By H. W. Bailey

THE apocalypse proceeds to describe three episodes of rulers who are to appear respectively in Xvarásán, Némróć, and Patašχvárgar and to be followed by the coming of Pišyōθn, son of Vištásp. The language touches that of the Bahman Yašt at many points. Religious views are closely interwoven. The “χvarr of Patašχvárgar” is of interest, as are also the revelation of many mysteries by Mihr Yazd, and Mihr’s conflict with Ėśm. The druž Vat-yavakân seems not to be known elsewhere.

58. pas āχēzet andar χvarásân zamīk χvarlak ut apaitāk mart-ē i vas 邠omand šavēt i vas martōm ut asp *apāk ut nēzak i tēz, ut šadr pat čerakēh ut pat pātaχšāhēh av χeēs kart baṿēt.

59. χvat miyān i pātaχšāhēh aṣinn ut apaitāk baṿēt.

60. pātaχšāhēh hamāk hoĉ Ėrānakân šavēt av Anērān rasēt.

61. ut vas kēs ut dāt ut *raβišn bavēnd.

62. ut 邠atan i ēvāk avē dit pat karpak dārēnd, martōm 邠atan χvār bē baṿēt.

63. api-t ēn-iċ göbēm ku andar ān ē baṿēt, avē i aparvēz χvatay andar zamīk i Ḥrōm vas šādr ut vas šatrastān gīrēt ut vas χūṣtak pat ē-bār haĉ zamīk i Ḥrōm āβarēt.

Then will arise in the land of Khorasan an insignificant and obscure man who will go forth in great power, and with him many men and horses, and sharp lances, and the land will be made his own by violence and dominion.

He himself in the midst of his dominion will fail and pass out of sight.

The whole sovereignty will pass from the men of Ėrān and will go to foreigners.

And doctrines and laws and ways of life will abound.

The slaying of one by the other they will consider a merit and the slaying of men will be a slight thing.

And this too I will tell you that it will be at that time: that victorious king will seize in the land of Ḥrōm much territory and many cities and will carry off much treasure at one time from the land of Ḥrōm.
64. pas avē i aparvež χvatāy mūrēt ut hoč ān frāc frazandān i avē pat χvatāyih nīšinēnd ut șabr pat ēṛīh pāyēnd.
65. ut vas stahmbak ut apēdāt pat martōm i Ėrān șahr kunēnd.
66. ut vas hēr i hamōkēn bē av dast i avēśān rasēt.
67. ut pas-ič av apasihān ut ābīnn būtakīh rasēnd.
68. andar ān vat őbām mitr ut āzarm nē bavēnd.
69. api-śān mas hač kas ut kas hač mas nē paitāk, api-śān ham-
puṣtakīh nē bavēt.
70. api-t ēn-ič gōṣēm ku avē vēh kē hač mūtar nē zāyēt avāp kā zāyēt bē mūrēt ut nē vēnēt ēn and vat ut drōśak,
71. pat hazārak sar i Zartuṣṭān nē vēnēnd ān vazurk kārēcār i ā apāyēt būtān.
72. ut ān and ẙīn-rečišnīh andar ān őbām apāyēt būtān pat *3 bahr ē* bahr martōm bē nē mānēnd.
73. avēśān Tāčikān apāk Hrōmīkān ut Tūrakān andar gumēcēnd ut kisvar bē višōpēnd.
74. ut pas Spand-Ārmat av Ohormazd vāng kunēt ku man ēn vat ut anākīh nē vitācōm.
75. hačādar hačapar bē bavom
ut ēn martōm hačapar hačādar bē kunom.

Then that victorious king will die, and thenceforth his sons will sit in sovereignty and will guard the land with violence.
And they will deal very fiercely and lawlessly with the men of Ėrān șahr.
And much wealth of all kinds will pass into their hands.
Afterwards they too will perish and have no success.
In that evil time affection and reverence will not exist.
Among them the great will not be distinct from the small nor the small from the great, and they will not assist one another.
This too I will tell you that it is better for him who is not born from his mother, or if he is born, dies and does not see so much evil and oppression,
At the end of the millennium of Zartuṣṭ they will not see the great conflict which must take place.
So much bloodshed must occur at that time, of mankind one part in three parts will not survive.

Those Arabs will be confounded with Romans and Turks and they will desolate the world.
Then Spand Ārmad will cry aloud to Ohormazd saying: I cannot melt away this evil and badness.
I am turned upside down and I turn mankind here upside down.
76. vāt ut ātaχš martom bē āzärēnd hač vas must ut *adātīh i-šān pati-š kunēnd.
77. ut pas Miθr ut Esīm āknēn bē patkōpēnd andar ān patkōpīsīn.
78. druž-e i Vat-yavakān χvānīhēt pat χvatakāīh i Yam bāst ēstāt, pat χvatakih i Bēvarasp hač band bē rist.

79. Bēvarasp pat ān druž ham-pursakīh ādāst.
80. ut ān druž kār ēn ku bar i yortākān bē kāhēnēt.

81. ut hakar nē ān druž rād būt hēh har kē-š grīv-e bē kīst hēh 400 grīv bar apar grīf hēh.

82. sūl 496 Miθr ān druž bē zanēt ut pas har kē grīv-e kārēt 400 grīv hanbār kunēt.

83. ut andar ān zamān Spand-Armat dahān apāc kunēt, vas gohr ut ayōsust av paitākih ābārēt.

84. pas āχēzēt hač kust i Nēmrōc mart-e kē χvatakāīh χvāhēt ut spāh ut gund ārāst dārēt ut šatrīhā pat ērīh gīrēt ut vas χōn-rečīsnīh kunēt tāk-ās kār pat kāmāk i χvēs bē bavēt.

85. ut pas apadom hač dast i dušmanān virečēt av Zāvulasān ut ān kust šavēt.
86. ut hač oō spāh ārāst apāc vartēt ut hač ān frāc martom i Wind and fire injure men, by reason of the great grief and wrong they do to them.

Then Mihr and Eṣm will fight together in that conflict.

An evil spirit who is called Vat-yavakān (“causer of bad crops”) was bound during the reign of Yam, but escaped from his bonds in the reign of Bēvarasp.

Bēvarasp had conferences with that evil spirit.

Now the work of that evil spirit is this: he diminishes the crop of corn.

Had it not been for that evil spirit, whosoever had sown one bushel would have received 400 bushels of corn.

Four hundred and ninety-six years Mihr attacks that evil spirit, and thereafter whosoever sows one bushel, puts four hundred bushels in his granary.

At that time Spand Armad will open her mouth, and will bring abundant jewels and metals to the light.

Afterwards a man will arise from the Southern quarter who will seek dominion and will have an army and troops equipped and will seize lands by violence and cause much bloodshed until his affairs satisfy his desires.

Then at last he will flee from the hand of his enemies to Zābul and go to that district.

Thence, an army being equipped, he will return and
Erân šahr av anômêthi in garân rasênd.

87. ut mas ut kas <av> čärack-chvâstârh rasênd ut pânakîh i jân in chvîs nikirend.

88. ut pas haç an Patašçvârgar hâc nazdîkîh i drâyâp bâr mart Miôr Yazd bê vênet.

89. ut Miôr Yazd vas râz i nihân av ân mart göbêt.

90. pat patgâm av Patašçvârgar sâh frestî ku ên chvatay karr ut kör çim dârêh. ut tô-iç chvatayîh eton kun cêgon pitarân ut nyâkân i tô ut smâk kart.

91. avê mart göbêt ku man ên chvatayîh cêgon şayêm kartan ka-mân gund ut spûh ut ganj ut spûh-sardâr nêst cêgon pitarân ut nyâkân i man bût.

92. ân patgâmbar göbêt ku bê âvar tâk-at ganj ut chvâstak i pitarân ut nyâkân i tô aðîs apaspârom.

93. api-s ganj i vazurt in Frâsyâp aðîs nimâyêt.

94. cêgon ganj av dast aßarêt, spûh ut gund in Zâvul ârâdêt, av duşmanân savêt.

95. ut ka <av> duşmanân akâshîh rasêt, Türâk ut Tâcîk ut Hromîk av ham ayênd ku girom Patašçvârgar sâh ut stânom ân ganj ut chvâstak haç avê mart.

thenceforward the men of Erân šahr will fall into grievous despair.

Great and small will fall to seeking remedies and will look to a refuge for their own soul.

Afterwards in Patašçvârgar near the shore of the sea a man will see Mihr Yazd.

And Mihr Yazd will reveal many hidden secrets to that man.

He will send him with a message to the King of Patašçvârgar, saying: Why do you support that King, deaf and blind? Now do you too act as King even as the fathers and forefathers of you and yours have done.

That man will say: How should I be able to exercise dominion, since I have not the troops and army and treasure and generals such as my father and forefathers had?

The messenger will say: Come, that I may deliver up to you the treasure and wealth of your fathers and forefathers.

And he will show him the vast treasure of Frâsyâp.

When he brings the treasure into his hand, he prepares the army and troops of Zâbul, and advances against his enemies.

When the news reaches his enemies, Turk and Arab and Roman will come together, saying: I will seize the King of Patašçvârgar and I will take that treasure and wealth from that man.
96. ut pas avē mart ku ān ākāsāh āsāvēt apāk vas spāh ut gund i Zāvul av miyān i Erān šābr āyēt ut apāk avēšān martōmān pat ān dašt, i tō Vištāsp apāk spēt *χιχονān pat spēt-rzur karl, apāk Patašχvārgar sāh kōχīśīn i kārēcār frāc kunēnd.

97. ut pat nērōk i Yazdān ut Erān ut Kayān χvarr ut dēn i Māzdēsmān ut χvarr i Patašχvārgar ut Mihr ut Srōs ut Rašn ut Āpān ut Āturān ut Ātaχśān apēr ūkūft kārēcār kunēnd.

98. ut hač avēšān vēh āyēt, hač dušmanān ĉand be ēžanēt kē marak nē tuβān grift.

99. ut pas Srōs ut Nēryōsang Pišyōdhan i šmāk pus hač framān i dātār Ohormaad hač Kangdīz i Kayān bē hangēzēnd.

100. ut bē āyēt Pišyōdhan i šmāk pus apāk 150 *hāvīšt kē-śān patmōčan spēt ut siyā,

101. ut dašt i man pat drafs tāk av Pārs av ād ku ātaχš ut āpān nišāst ēstēnd.

102. ād yašt kunēt.

103. ka yašt sar bavēt zōhr av āp rēcēnd ut <av> ān ātaχš zōhr dahēnd.

Then that man when he hears the news, with a large army and troops of Zābul will come to the centre of Erān šābr and with those men on that plain, where you, O Vištāsp, fought with the White Hyons in the White Forest, they will struggle in battle with the King of Patašχvārgar.

By the might of Yazdān and the Splendour of the Aryans and the Kayān and the Faith of the Mazda-worshippers and the splendour of Patašχvārgar, and Mihr and Srōs and Rašn and the waters and the sacred and domestic Fires they will wage furious battle.

And he will prove better than them; he will slay so many of the enemies, that their number cannot be counted.

Then Srōs and Nēryōsang will stir up your son Pišyōdhan by command of Ohormazd the Creator from the Kang fortress of the Kayān.

Your son Pišyōdhan will come with 150 disciples, whose raiment is white and black,

And my hand will hold the banner as far as Pārs to the place where the fires and waters are established.

There he will perform the Yašt.

When the Yašt is finished, they will pour the libation into the water and will give the libation to the fire.
The wicked and the dévs and the Hyōns will perish as in a cold winter the leaves of trees wither.

The time of the wolves will pass away, and the time of the sheep will enter in.

Uχşyat-art son of Zartušt will appear to reveal the Faith, and evil will be at an end, joy and gladness and happiness will have come.

58. (1) χvarāsān zamīk is the “land of the sunrise”. The meaning of āš- was given by Bal. āşag “to rise”, rōşāsān “sunrise”, and is confirmed by MPT. āşēh giyānan ő im nār rōśn, M 4 b 5, “Go up, O souls, into this shining boat.” This etymology was known to Al-Jurjānī, Vis u Rāmīn, p. 119, 1-4 :—

χvāśā jāyā bad-ān šahr ī χorāsān
dar-ō bās u jahān-rā mē-χvār āsān
ba-lafz ī Pahlāvī har kas sarāyad
χorāsān ān buvad kaz vai χor āmad
χorāsān Pahlāvī bāsad χor āmad
‘Irāq u Pārs rā zō χor bar āmad
χorāsān ast ma‘nī ī χor āyān
kuşā zō χor bar āyad sūy ī Ėrān.

χvarāsān is the regular Pahl. word for “east”, cf. Pahl. Texts, ii, 118, § 77, χvärāsān ut χvárbarān ut nēmrōc ut apāχtar “east and west and south and north”. MPT., χvār’s’n p’yqvs, hrv’s’n vymnd.

(2) χvartak “insignificant”: on § 21 I had overlooked Mx. 2122, ed. Andreas, 124-5, ut ān i χvatāy ut dahypat rat apāk ān i χvartaktom martōm pat dātastān rāst dārēt “The judge in judgment holds equal that of the Ruler and Governor and that of the humblest man”.

(3) vas ŏzōmand šavēt, Predic. adj. “being most powerful”, so in 65, vas stahmbak ut apēdāt ... kunēnd “being very tyrannical and lawless ... they act”.

(4) *apāk. MSS. have r’yšh = sar “head, end”. I have read reth = apāk, here adverb: i ... apāk = “with whom”. For asp ... nēzak, cf. Zatsp. 52 aspaβārak ut nēzak-dast.

59. afṣīn “not-finding”, see Nyberg, Gloss., avīn.

61. DP for ḏayr; caet. ḏayr. rafišn “manner of life, conduct”, NP., raviš. Cf. varišn (Nyb., Gloss., čem u hok u varišn “Charakter, Gesinnung und Lebenswandel”) and barišn, Paz. barešn (with Sanskr. pračāra-). barišn translates Av. -bifra in astā.bifra- = hašt barišn “of eight characters”. Av. bifra- is probably a reduplicated form from bar- *bi-bra- > bifra- with the same development as in jafra- beside javi-, cf. also Pahl. āfrītan “create” from *ā-brītan and NPers. afrōz-, Av. aiwi.raočaya-. Then Av. abifra (only Y., 3313) is perhaps *ā-bībra- “perpetual” in agreement with the Pahl. Comm. pat pattūkīh “in perpetuity”. We should then recognize in Av. -er- beside -fr- as two separate developments of -br-, the voiceless -fr- being parallel to the voiceless group -st- beside -zd- cf. busti-, and buzdi- (in apaiti.busti and duḏuvi.buzdi-).

62. (1) pat karpak dārēnd. Cf. nasāy nikānītan ut nasāy šustan ut nasāy soḵtan av ṣā ṣeḵh burtan ut nasāy čwartan pat dāt kunēnd ut nē pahrēčēd pat kār ut karpak i vazurgy hangārēnd, Bahman, Yt., 33-35, “burying the corpse, washing the corpse, burning the corpse, bringing it to water and fire, eating the corpse, they do by law and refrain not, they account it a great work and merit.”

(2) ʾezatan written ’vēnn, FP., 223 ’vṭnn, elsewhere also ’pzttn, Paz. afzadān, OP. ava-jan “kill”.

(3) čvār. Cf. Bahman Yt., 250, ka mart-ē in nēvak ʾezānēd <ut> makas-ē pat čām <i> avēsān har 2 čvak bavēt “when they kill a good man and a fly both are one in their eyes”.

63. ʾe “time”, see Bartholomae, SR., iii, 27, here written ʾe.

67. apasīhān written ’psh’n “perished” Part. pass. in -āna to *apa- sa, cf. nīhān nyh’n “hidden” Part. pass. to *ni-dā.

69. mas ḫaḥ ḫas “the greater from the smaller”. Cf. MX., 21,

1 Note the pres. in MPT. ’fer’m (Bartholomae, ZII. iv, 173 ff.) and cf. Sogd. (Chr.) sbrny “creator”.
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än i hač tó kas pat hamtāk ut hamtāk pat mas ut hača-š mas pat sardār ut sardār pat xvaṭāy dār “He who is your inferior treat as an equal, and an equal as a superior, and his superior as a lord and a lord as a ruler”. Bartholomae has further examples M.M., i, 28 f. Infra 87. mas ut kas.

70. (1) ēn-iē göbēm. Cf. the more precise Bahman Yt., 263, ēn ān i pēš göbēm “this is what I shall foretell”.

(2) drušak. This word may be connected with društ “harsh”, NPers. durušt (cf. Hübs., Pers. St. 61). In Bal. drušag, društa “to grind” is possibly the same verb. It will be necessary to keep this verb apart from drušitan discussed below, Iranian notes No. 1.

71. (1) The end of the millennium of Zartušt is elaborated in Bahman Yt., I4, 224 f.

(2) o bavēt = Av. avā . . . bavaiti, Y., 3010, “takes place”. Cf. Nyb., Gloss., 164, ë(h).

72. pat *3 bahr ë *bahr. Uncertain. The text has DE. and. I have supposed the corruption of a numeral after so that possibly stands for “3”.

Cf. Bartholomae, SR., i, 47, note 5: “one part in ten parts, i.e. one-tenth”, “one part in three parts, i.e. one-third”.

For the expression “one-third” cf. Bahman Yt., 328, pas hač ān be škanēt patiyrāk 3 ēvak-ē “then he destroys one-third of the assailants”. Bahman Yt., 357, apārēk dām <i> Ohormazd pat 3 ēvak-ē apāc ēpārēt “he swallows again the other creatures of Ohormazd to the extent of one-third”.

74. (1) vat “evil” subst., as in 70.

(2) anākīh nē vīdāvom “I cannot melt away the evil”. Cf. GrBd., 1737-8: anākīh <i> av Spand-Ārmat zamūk rasēt, hamāk bē gukanēt “the evil which comes to Spand-Ārmad the earth, she destroys it all.”

77. The conflict of Mihr and Ėšm is described in Bahman Yt., 324-5. (This explains the use of ān “that” in the present passage referring to a well-known conflict.) The Bahman Yt. passage appears to be in part a translation from Avestan by the test of syntax. It reads:—
34. pas Māh i frāxy-gōyūl vāng kunēt ku ēn 9,000 sāl paštē i-š kart tāk nun Dahāk dušdēn ut Frāsyaḵ i Tūr ut Alaksandar in Hrōmāyīḵ ut avēšān dušāl kustākān dévān in vičār-vārs 1,000 sālān ʻēmbān vēs hāc patmān xvātāyīḵ kart. 35. start bavēt ān druvand Anrāk Mēnūḵ ka ētōn aqsnūt. Māh i frāxy-gōyūt bē zanēt Ėṣm i *xruvidruḵ, pat staʃiẖ duʃārēt. ān druvand Anrāk Mēnūḵ apāk xīšūtakān vat-tōxmakān apāc av tār ut tom i dōṣaʃ xe duʃārēt. "Then Mihr of wide pastures cries aloud, saying: These 9,000 years of the Compact which was made, even until now Dahāk of evil faith and Frāsyaḵ the Tūr and Alexander the Roman and those with leather belts and the dēvs with disordered hair have held dominion a period of 1,000 years beyond the covenant. 35. That wicked Anrāk Mēnūḵ was amazed when he heard that. Mihr of wide pastures attacks Ėṣm of the bloodstained weapon. Without power he flees. That wicked Anrāk Mēnūḵ flees with the misbegotten ones of evil seed back to the darkness and gloom of the evil existence."

78. (1) "A druž called Vat-yavakān". Cf. yavak translating Av. yav- in compounds. NP. jāv "barley" Pahl. yav. Named after his activity defined in 80, where yortākān, cf. yortāk Pahl. transl. of Av. yava-.

(2) Bēvarasp epithet of Dahāk, see Justi, Iran. Namenbuch, p. 60, GrBd 1986 Dahāk kē Bēvarasp-ič xvānēnd. Old Oss. Beorparpos. Av. baḵvar- "10,000", Pahl. bēvar, Arm. loanword biur, Georg. bevori, has survived as bevrā bērā bɪrā (= "many") in Ossetic. Arm. biur shows the same treatment of -ar as in zaur "forces", MPT. zāvar "power" and in kaisr "Kāṣpar". The apparent loss of -a- in čmnrīt "true", Pahl. čamndīt "visible to the eye" is due to a form *čsim- as in Pahl. čyšm beside čšm "fountain".

81. giriw "a measure". This word has long been known in the Arm. loanword giriw "a measure for corn". Here written ḫ13 HAG., 131, had no Mid. Iran. form but quoted NPers. girīb, Syr. gryb', Arab. ʃarīb.

83. (1) It is apparently intended as a blessing when Spand Ārmad opens her mouth to reveal the jewels and metals hidden in the earth. But in Bahman Yt., 248, it is in times of confusion: pat avēšān dušxvātāyīḵ has čiw nēstīḵ ut ačаrākīḵ ut sapūkīḵ ut nystākīḵ rasēt. Spand-Ārmat zamīk dahān apāč visāyēt hār gōhr <ut> ayikštīst av paʃtākīḵ rasēt čēgōn zarr asēm ut rōd ut arčīc ut sūrp. ut xvātāyīḵ ut pātawšākīḵ av Anērān bandakān rasēt. "During their accursed rule everything will pass into nothingness, helplessness, contempt, and
decay. Spand Ärmad will open her mouth, all jewels and metals will be disclosed, such as gold, silver, and copper and tin and lead. The dominion and sovereignty will pass to foreign slaves." [sapûkîh, cf. sapûk mënît “thought contemptible”, DkM., 813\textsuperscript{20}. nyastakîh to nyastak “cast down”, cf. Nyb., Gloss., 163, niyastan, and MO., xxiii, 349, \*nêsttar. Add GrBd., 214\textsuperscript{4}-4, apâk Aržâsp kûrêcûr \(<i>\) skîft kart, Ėrân \(<ut>\) Anêrân vasihâ \*apâjast hênd ] (With Aržâsp he fought a hard battle, Aryans and non-Aryans perished in multitudes”).

(2) ayôşust, often spelt ayôşust with the usual ɘ1 to express Avestan ē or ū. Av. ayôşûsta- “molten metal” as in Yt., 17\textsuperscript{20}, tôpayêiti mam aśa vahiṣṭa maṇayon ahe yata ayaoîşustom : (Ahriman speaks) “he heats me with the Aśa Vahiṣṭa as it were molten metal” became in Pahl. equivalent simply to “metal” and appears also in the Gabri dial. ayûxûst (AIW., 162). It seems to be Oss. (Digor.) ēvêestâ, (Irons.) ēvêist “silver”, whence came the Hungarian ezûst “silver”, see Sköld, ZII., iii, 185.

84. (1) Kust i Nêmrōc. According to Ananias Širak (ed. Marquart Ėrânšahr) the Kust i Nêmrōc comprised nineteen provinces. Pârs counted as the chief province. In particular Sâgistân (Sîstân) was often intended by Nêmrōc (Marquart, loc. cit., p. 25). Here it is impossible to decide if a special province was thought of. When the ruler takes to flight, however, he goes to Zâvulastan, which also formed part of Nêmrōc.

(2) spâh ut gund, 94, 96; gund ut spâh, 91. Arm. loanward gound. Written -animate, to be kept sharply distinct from \*gurt “warrior”.


88. Patašxvârgar, see Marquart Ėrânšahr, p. 129 f., is Tapurastân, Arm. Taprstan, the land of the Tânuțoi, Arab.-Pers. Tabaristân.
It was first conquered by the Arabs in A.D. 758. In A.D. 783 Vīndāḥ-Hormizzd founded a new dynasty as Spāḥpet of Khorāsān.

90. (1) \textit{pātām} with variant \textit{paitām} “message”, cf. Arm. loanward \textit{patgam} “message”, MPT. (S.W.) \textit{pyg’m} (N.W.) \textit{p’dg’m}, N.Pers. \textit{pàyām}, \textit{pāyām}, Syr. \textit{ptgm} “sententia”. In \textit{Gr Bd.}, 177\textsuperscript{a}, *\textit{pātāk} “messenger”: \textit{Yazd Neryōsang}

*\textit{patāk yazdān ku pat hamāk paitām avē frastēt} “The Yazd Neryōsang is messenger of the Yazds, that is, he is sent on all messages” [In -ēt of frastēt “is sent”, I am inclined to recognize the old Pass. 3 Sg. -\textit{yatai} > -ēt. Hence for the frequent read \textit{gōzet} “it is said” as pass. Cf. Nyb., \textit{Gloss.}, \textit{apasiḥēt} “is destroyed” pass. to \textit{apa-sīh-}]. In 92 \textit{pātāmašār} with variant \textit{pātāmašār} “messenger” Arm. loanword \textit{patgamausor} N.Pers. \textit{pāyāmbar}, \textit{pāyāmbar}.

(2) \textit{karr ut kōr} “deaf and blind”. This is the traditional Pahl. translation of Avestan \textit{kaoyam karānamā}, \textit{AIW.}, 455, “of Kavis and Karapans”: \textit{pat čiś i Yazdān karr ut kōr} “in affairs of the Yazds deaf and blind”; in the Sanskr. version \textit{adaršākā aśrotāraśca}. It is proved to be more than a learned comment by the letter ascribed by Elišē to Mihnerseh, see Meillet, \textit{REA.}, vi, 1–3: or . . . oč ouni zaurēns deni mazdezn, na čoul ē eu koir eu <i> diuac Haranomoi xabeal “He who holds not the law of the Mazdezn faith, is deaf and blind (koir loanword from Iran. kōr) and deceived by the dēvēs of Haraman (= Ahriman)”. Cf. the Manichean hymn to Jesus: \textit{ē xēd bed čmynr 'v kōrn 'snv'g 'v qrn, uđ χvad būd čāśmvar ė kōrān, aśnavīr ė karrān} “And he himself is seer for the blind, hearer for the deaf” (Lentz, \textit{Die Stellung Jesu}, p. 121).


96. (1) \textit{pat ān dāst . . . pat spēt-rasur}. On \textit{spēt-rasur}, Av. \textit{spēt-ītām rāzurām} we have now Herzfeld’s investigations, \textit{Archaeol. Mitteil.}, ii, 72–4. In this forest Haosravah overthrew Aurvasāra. \textit{pat ān dāst} suggests Aṣīyāṭkār i Zarērān 19: \textit{pat ān dāst i hāmōn}, that is, Sistān. For \textit{dāst} cf. Herzfeld, loc. cit., p. 60–1. The \textit{dāst} is a place of fear as appears in \textit{Gr Bd.}, 172\textsuperscript{a} (explaining the epithets of Mhr)
api-s frāχyōyūt <ih>  ēt ku [ka] pat dašt apēbīmīh <ā > bē śāyēt āmātan šutan pat rās i Miθr. “His having wide pastures is this that in the desert it is possible to go to and fro without fear in the care of Mihr”. It is interesting that var interchanges with dašt in the geographical name dašt i Tāčkān (Ṣahrihā i Èrān, 50), var i Tāčkān (Ṣahrihā i Èrān, 25, 52). According to Markwart, Das Reich Zābul, p. 266, vari-(Av. vairi-) survived in Kābul as = bar. In Yt., 527, varōīš piśinaoḥō (Gen. Sg.) “the vari- of Pišinah” is the Pahl. dašt i Pišan-sēḥ (cf. infra, Iranian notes No. 7 on M.X., 620, where in the later development of the saga this dašt is placed near Mt. Damāvand).


98. hač dušmanān čand bē ēzanēt kē . . . “he slays so many of the enemies that . . .”. For čand = and, cf. GrBd., 206, pat čand mōd-kuniśnīh “with so great lamentation”. Cf. NPers. va čandānī dar maṣāf kūštā šudand kī “and so many were killed in the battle that . . .” where, however, the demonstrative is suffixed to čand. kē (if kept, but confusion of ḫ with ḫ is common), will mean “that their”.


huṣyaodnahe aṣaṇō fravašīm yazamaide, piṣiṣyaodnahe aṣaṇō fravašīm yazamaide, ταχμαhe spintoōtahe aṣaṇō fravašīm yazamaide, contains the names of three sons of Vištāspa, of whom two are known to the GrBd., 232, hač vištāsp Spandād ūt Pišyōn zāt hēnd. The Greeks wrote the name Πισουσαννας.

(2) framān i dātār Ohormazd. For the vocalization -mazd cf. Ὠρμαζνας and the nom. prop. Ἀρμαζνας (Avroman Doc.) which is probably the North-Western form, Arm. Aramazd. framān “commandment” is found already in Old Pers. (NRa., 56-7) Ahuramazdāhā framānā, and is used to translate Avestan mātra. So in Buddh. Sogd. pm’y- is used of the Buddha.

100. (1) 150 *hāvišt (hévst for h’všt). Similarly Bahman Yt., 327, apāk 150 mart i ahrāf kē hāvišt i Pišyōn hēnd, but here with different
rayment: pat siyā samūr yāmak "with garments of the black sable". It is possible that patmōcasan i *samūr i siyā should be read here.

(2) patmōcasan. The suffix -ana expresses the three ideas of (1) verbal action, (2) instrument, as in patmōcasan, (3) place. There are interesting examples of the "noun of place". OP. āvahana "dwelling-place" specialized as "stronghold", Pahl. ābahan "stronghold" (see Herzfeld, Archael. Mitt., ii, 54), Arm. loanword āvan "village", Syr. 'en', Saka vāna- (Sacu Doc. 45). Arm. loanword vank" "abitazione, casa", cf. vank' hōtic "stalla di pecore". NPers. aivān is probably *aivāhana (cf. Sanskr. adhi- vas- "to dwell in") with specialized meaning. It is used of the hall in which Vis and Virō are wedded. Vis u Rāmin, p. 25, l. 17, ba- aivān i Kayānī.

Arm. xoran "tent, tabernacle", is Pahl. xvaran "banquet-hall, banquet", cf. Freiman, BASP., 1918, 761 f. For the development "tent" cf. Herzfeld, Clio, 1908, 57 f., on the royal Persian tents. NPers. xvarangdīh "palace of Bahram; portico", also xavorna, and (Arabicized) xavarnaq.

Other examples are OP. āyadanā pl. "places of worship", Av. šayana- "dwelling-place", Sogd. şyn. Arm. loanword šen. NPers. āstān "palace; threshold".

Arm. avazan "pool", cf. HAG., 111, Syr. 'ven' "font" is perhaps to be explained by comparing Sogd. (Chr.) 'v'zy "Schaar", (Buddh.), 'w'z'p "flowing water", Reichelt, Soghd. Handschr., ii, p. vi.

101. (1) dast i man. man indicates that the text has formed part of another context.

(2) pat drafs "holding the banner". In GrBd., 1706-7, Varahhrān Yazd drafš-dār i mēnōkān yazdān "Varahhrān (written vr'hr'n) Yazd is the standard-bearer of the Spiritual Yazds".

104. (1) Zimastān i sart. A like simile in Bahman Yt., 323, čēgōn draxtē bun ka [pat ēt] šap i zimastān i sart apar raste, pat ēt šap valg apakanēt, "as the trunk of a tree when the night of a cold winter comes upon it, in that night the leaves are destroyed" [apakanēt written қәләә, which supports Nyberg, Gloss., p. 13, and proves Arm. apakanem "I destroy", HAG., 413, to be from Iranian. But Oss. āveqānum "pour in, heap up" beside nīganum "bury" both have kan- (not kand-, cf. bādtun "to bind"). These are the two meanings indicated by Herzfeld, Arch. Mitt., iii, 54. Old Pers. a v a k n m has also kan- "place". For kand- we have Pahl. ākand "filled", NPers.
āgandan “to stuff, cram”, and Arm. loan word *vkandem “put to flight”

(2) *valg MSS. due to NPers. barg. For -l- cf. Bahman Yt., valg ʒ, and Nyb., Gloss., 232, Av. varaka-. With this, Saka -vargya in ysāravargya “having a thousand leaves”, see Leumann, Zeits. für vgl. Sprachforschung, 1930, p. 199, who suggested *patra = Sanskr. patra- “leaf”.

105. gurg țbām . . . āyēt. An identical phrase in Bahman Yt., 340, describing the purified earth: āz ut niyāzak āz ut ēsm ut varan arāsk ut druwardih hač gehān be rafset gurg țbām be šavēt ut mēš țbām andar āyēt ut ātūr Farnbay ātūr Gušnasp ut ātūr i Burzēn Mihr apāc av gūs i yēš nišind “Lust and want, lust and violence and desire, envy and wickedness will pass from the world. The time of the wolves will pass away and the time of the sheep will enter in. And the fires Farnbay and Gušnasp and Burzēn Mihr will be established again in their own seats”. Under gurg all violent beings can be included (cf. Av. vaḥkrōm yim bizangrōm daēvaŋwem “the wolf which is two-legged, worshipper of dēvs”). The mēš țbām is evidently a period of tranquillity. [rafset is inchoative, -s- form, to rap- “go”, cf. gufsišnīk vācik and gufsišn from gōβ- “speak”, see Nyberg, MO., xxiii, 350. For Av., Reichelt, Av. Elementarbuch, p. 111. Arm. loanword yausem “to violate” to yaβ- cf. Sogd. (Buddh.) ḫyŋ-part. ḫyβ- (Ganthiot, Gram. Sogd., 116 = SCE., 130, 434). Sanskr. yabhati. Fr. Müller had seen the connection before an Iranian cognate was known. It is not in HAG.]

IRANIAN NOTES

1. Avestan draoša.

The Armenian loanword drošm “a mark cut or burnt in”, χάργαμα, (Ciakejak) “marca, impronta, stampa, cautero,” with derivatives drošmēl “engrave, cut in, burn in”, drošomn “inscription”, drošmakan “marcato, segnato”, cf. HAG., 147, have not hitherto been brought into connection with the corresponding Pahlavi word drōšom 𐭫𐭭𐭍. The consonant group šm appears in Pahl. as either šm (aprēšm GrBd., 146½) or śm (aprēšom GrBd., 144½, cf. baršom). The word drōšom is found in DkM., 764×5, pat sraxtak gōn ut drōšom “in kind, colour, and markings” and in DkM., 765½, ḫav gōn i mātar zāt, ḫav drōšom gōsēt “one states the colour which the
mother bore, the other states the markings”. With this we gain a satisfactory explanation of the Avestan word *draọṣa-. Bartholomae discussed the word at length, *WZKM*, 27, 352 f., giving further references in his *Zur Etymologie und Wortbildung der indogerm. Sprachen* (1919), p. 42, note 5. His conclusion that the word indicated a punishment for theft was correct, but he could not give a satisfactory meaning to the word. The Avestan passage is: *spayeiti . . . daena māzdayasniš . . . bandom, spayeiti draọṣom*. “The Dēn Māzdayasniš gets rid of fetters, gets rid of branding,” *Vid.*, 3, 41. In Pahlavi the word *dṛọs* and the phrase *band ut dṛọs* are frequent (references are given by Bartholomae). A passage not noticed by Bartholomae occurs in the Mēnōkē *χrat*, 4031, ed. Andreas, p. 444, *ut puḥl ut dṛọs ut pādafrāh i dρuvaṇḍān pat dōṣaχv tāk ham-e ut ham-e rāfišnīh* “And expiation and branding and punishment of the wicked in the evil existence for ever”, *Paz.* *u dṛus u pādafrāh i daraṇa pa dōzαχ, andā hamē u hamē ravošnī, with the Sanskrit rendering chedο nigrhahāca durgatinatān narake yāvat sadāca sadāca pαvṛttim*. To the Pāzandist the word *dṛus* meant “cutting off”. Used of marking cattle we have *dṛọṣītan*, *DkM.*, 7633, *apar dṛọṣītan i *gospand añ <i> *apētak, vinās i hać *nē dṛọṣītan*. This punishment of branding suits the passage *MḤD.*, p. 733, *ka 4 bār dṛos kart ut pas-ic an vinās i pat ān adivēnak kunẹnd *hakurc hać zīndān bē nē hilişn* “When branding has been four times inflicted and afterwards they commit another crime of that kind, they are never to be let out of prison”.

That the word *dṛos* was verbal could be further seen from *dṛọsišnīh*, beside which *dṛọsīh* is also found. *Sanjana, Dk.*, vol. viii, Glossary, under *dṛọsišnīh*, was quite right to translate “brand” and to compare the NPers. *darọs* “mark of cautery” (Steingass).

The poem of Farrukhī quoted by Browne in *JRAS*, 1899, pp. 767–9, from the Čahār Maqāla gives a poetic view of Persian cattle-branding.

On the other hand, for beating, of which Bartholomae had thought as the meaning of *dṛos*, we have the phrase *pat ēp zanēnd* (Gujastak Abā-Laiš, Cap. iv) coupled with another punishment *dast burrēnd* “they cut off the hand”.

2. Avestan *frāšma-.*

In a passage of the Zartuχšt-nāmāk (*DkM.*, 6109 f.) describing the marvels at the birth of Zartušt it is stated: *ēvak ēt i paudākīhast av vasān ka mānd ēstāt avi-ś zāyišn 3 rōc pat adivēnak i χαρζēt pat
ul vaxšīnīh₁ nazd<īk>īh ka-š frāšm vistarīhēt, pas tan paitākīhēt "One (marvel) is this which was revealed to many. When there remained three days till his birth, in appearance like the sun at the nearness of its blazing forth, when its first beams are spread abroad, then his body was revealed ".

The word frāšm is here clearly the first light of the sun before the ball of the sun itself is visible, and as this passage claims to be Dēn, that is, based on the Sacred Scriptures, and in the immediately succeeding paragraphs proves these statements by a quotation of which the syntax attests its origin in Avestan, we may fairly safely conclude that frāšm represents a frāšma- of the original text. This word is well known in the Avestan compound frāšmō.dāiti-which in the phrase hū₂ frāšmō.dāiti- means "sunset". It is transcribed in Pahlavi (Vid., 7, 58) ﯼر. We thus have a word fraš- in the sense of "shining". To this haomō frāšmiš can be related as "the bright Haoma", cf. RV., 2, 41, 2, ayām šukrō ayāmī te (Soma speaks).

This frāšma- accordingly suggests the problem of Av. fraša-, OP. fraša-, MPT. frā-, Arm. loanword hraš-, on which so much has been written (the latest in Herzfeld, Archæologische Mitteil. aus Iran., iii, 1). Hertel's etymology fra-čšā- (Beiträge zur Erklärung des Avestas und des Vedas, p. 181), which is adopted by Herzfeld, would, however, be excluded by connecting frāšma- with fraša-. There would remain, in any case, the difficulty of xš and š which is not removed by Hertel's solution (loc. cit., p. 61, note 3), since the clear distinction in Iranian (parallel to a distinction in Greek) between the palatal k's and the velar q's is supported by the Sogdian for Middle Iranian and by Ossetic for New Iranian, both of which have kept k's distinct from q's, cf. Sogd. ʾγϕ广泛的 "night", Av. χσϕ广泛的; Sogd. ᵜ锖广泛的 "dwelling-place", Av. šayana-; Oss. ʾχσʾ广泛的 "milk", Pahl. šyr., Sanskr. kṣira-; Oss. sud "hunger", Av. šud- "hunger", Sanskr. kṣudh-. We may safely recognize the same in Avestan, without ignoring serious deficiencies in the scribes of Avestan MSS.

It is perhaps possible to distinguish a second fraš-, the Av. paršu-, paršat-, Sanskr. prṣant-. We have in Av. parśwanika as

₁ vaxš- "to flame, blaze"; cf. DkM., 602₁, '63' ku ʿataxē burz *vaxšēnēt 'hač rōšh iḥhač 'im tan 'be tāphēt, and Nyberg, Glossar, 232.

₂ Of the many attempts to explain this form the best is to take hū as *hevan < Gen. sg. *svanes Gath.Av. χᾲν.
epithet of the boar (varāza) and the proper name Paršat gaev- which naturally recalls Sanskr. prṣad-aśva- "having horses of prṣant-colour". In Pahl. GrBd., 962, we have the gāv *parš or *fraš (Paz. fraš, Ind. Bd. parš). In classical Sanskr. prṣata- is "the spotted antelope", in the Šat. Brah., v, 3, 1\textsuperscript{st}: prṣadgaur daksīṇā bhūmā vā etad rūpāṇam yat prṣato gor "the sacrificial fee is a spotted bullock for in such a spotted bullock there is abundance of colours" (Eggeling's transl.). The relation of fraš- to parš- can be compared to OP., Av. frašta- "asked", beside Av. parosā "I will ask", OP. aprsam "I asked", and to Av. razišta- superlative to ərazu- "straight", but especially Pahl. frah "wide", with Av. frābak- "width". Av. paršu- can naturally represent the reduced vowel *pršu- or the full grade *paršu-.

Now the spotted tail of the peacock is its most noticeable characteristic. The Georgian loanword pharšamangī "peacock" may easily have preserved an Iranian *parś- in contrast to MPT, frōymvur *frašēmvr "peacock". Pahl. (Husrav, § 25, ed. Unvala) allows of either parś- or fraš-.

3. Avestan duždazōdara-.

Vid., 943, zauro duždazōdoro kərməwiti (there is a variant duždarm. fədrō) is translated by Bartholomaeae, AIW., 757, "Das Alter macht die Väter unverständlich (?)", reading dužda fədrō as two separate words. Darmesteter had rendered (ZA., ii, 275) by "la Vieillesse, qui maltraite les pères". The word occurs only here and neither of these renderings is convincing, even if they could be considered possible.

Help is afforded by the Pahlavi. The dēv Zarmān is mentioned in lists of demons (DkM., 810\textsuperscript{d}, GrBd., 671\textsuperscript{d}) and in GrBd., 185\textsuperscript{d}, we have zarmān ān dēv kē 132 kūnēt kē pīrūh ɐtəmənd "Old age is the dēv which makes ... which they call agedness". The epithet is constant and is clearly to be read dušdāft "whose breath is bad, i.e. short-breathed" (ג and ג are frequently confused). The verb dam- "breathe, blow" is common in Iranian: Saha, padama "winds", N., 691, nas'idamīd, N., 588, "möchten weblasen", Sogd. dəm'yn'k "venteux", SCE., 153; Oss. dumun "blasen, rauchen", NPers. damidan, cf. Sanskr. dhamati. The Pahl. daftan, Paz. daftan, illustrates the frequent alternation of m and ft (from m + it), cf. nam, namb
“moist”, naft “moistened”, gam- “go”, Sogd. γβενυμ “they went”. In the translation of a lost passage of the Avesta (DkM., 814*), from verses on Freōn, we have api-š venīk ən fravel (X) i.e. transcription of Avestan fraavaya-) ku-š bē daft ut hač dašn venīk i avē snīxt patū hēnd “And his nose blew forth, that is, he breathed out, and from his right nostril snows fell down”.

In duōlašdōra- it is accordingly possible to recognize *damatra <*dam-tra “breathing” with the normal spellings, cf. fọrōi = *ptō “to the father”, vaχ̣dōra- = *vaktra-. Bartholomae recognized dam- in the Av. dāṃmainga- “puffing up” (used of frogs). The words in Vid., δ, are then to be translated “Old age makes short of breath”.

4. In the Susa Palace Inscription, 41–2 (Charte de fondation, ed. Scheil, Les inscriptions achéménides à Suse, 1929) is read, a r j n m tyānā didā [p]īstā avu hačā Yaunā [ab]ariy, with Benveniste’s reading [p]īstā “the decoration with which the Palace is decorated, that was brought from the Greeks”. In the Babylonian version simannu “decoration” (asamu “to decorate”) corresponds to a r j n m which at once suggests a connection with NPers. ārang “colour, form”, ārang-ārang “variegated”, rang “colour”, ranj “colour”, abaranjan, avaranjan, abaranjan, baranjan “bracelet, anklet”, aurang “beauty, glory, throne”, Pahl. ašran “splendour” (Pahl. Texts, ii, 133, § 3, rāj ut χarr ut visp ašrang) huašran “having glorious splendour”, MPT. brng (zāvar uš ašran) Sogd. (Buddh.) rnk “colour”, rnk’n adj. “coloured”, Arm. loan-word aparōjan “ψέλλων, armband”, HAG., 104. In accordance with these words the Old Pers. a r j n m may be read āranjānām. The proposal to read, as Scheil did, arjanam was based on a translation “precious things”, which is vague for the passage “the decoration with which the palace was ornamented (pīstā- = ‘painted ’?)”.1

5. The meaning of the Pahl. adj. 919 can be determined from the passage in the GrBD., 637 f.

ān viš hač zamīk bē burtan rād, Tištr pat asp-karpīh spēt i drāž-dumb andar zreḥ frōt šut. api-š Apaōš dēv pat hamānākīv av asp siyā i kūk 919 dūmb patīrak bē tačī.

“To carry away this poison from the earth Tištr descended into the sea in the form of a horse white and long-tailed. And Apaōš the Dēv sped to oppose him in likeness of a horse black and short-tailed.”

1 [A new suggestion, with doubtful philology, is given by Herzfeld, Arch. Mitt., iii, 52. Corr. note.]
The same meaning will fit the other passages where the word is found—

*Gr Bd.*, 143\textsuperscript{12}, *Karbuk i dambak siyā ut kūk* “the lizard whose tail is black and short”.

*Gr Bd.*, 146\textsuperscript{1}, *ka av niśem i kapot riyët pëlak i mər i kūk hakaš *hanbavët* “when it defecates into the nest of a dove the cocoon of a small snake is produced from it”.

*Gr Bd.*, 147\textsuperscript{1}, *gōșēt pat dēn ku Anrāk Mēnûk ān yavaz gurg dät kūk ut tam-arţanûk, tom-zahak, tom tōγmak, tom-karp, siyā* “It is stated in the Sacred Books that Anrāk Mēnûk created that panther small and suiting the darkness, emanating from darkness, of the seed of darkness, with a body of darkness, black”.

*Gr Bd.*, 14711-12, *api-s pat 15 sarāk frāc karrē nút nazdist gurg i siyā ut kūk ut sturg sarāk* “And he created fifteen species of the Wolf and first the species of the black wolf small and ravenous”.

To these passages can be added the Pahl. Comm. to *Vid.*, 147, which translates Av. *atavvaγam hikaranam* by *ātēχ vaxšēnīlar girt kūk-e* “a fire-blower round and small”, hence correct *AIW.*, Pū, s.v. *hikarana*. The word *kūk* is accordingly to be connected with Pahl. 167 kūc “small”.

Zatspram, ix, 15 (ed. West, *Avestan . . . studies*), *eōgōn mart kē yortāy ham-e *kārēt*, ut fratam stafbr song frāc parkënet ut pas ān i miyānak, pas ān i kūc “As a man who sows corn, and first he gathers out large stones, then those of medium size, then those which are small”.


6. Pahlavi mūγ.

In the Frahang i Pahlavik 4\textsuperscript{3} we have: 1. dlъ. mūγ to which the traditional readings are (*FP.*, ed. Junker, p. 79) mōγ, murg, NPers. mūγ “date-palm”. Variant readings give دوaurus, درس, درس, all standing for the Aramaic dlъ, cf. Syr. سَدَس “palm-tree”. The Pāzandists have tended to misunderstand this word and to confuse the passages where it is found.

*MX.*, 62\textsuperscript{20} f. (ed. Andreas, p. 6912 f.), *ut tan i Sām pat dašt i Pișan-sēh nazdik av kōf i Damāvand ut pat ān dašt bē yortāy ut χarišnīk āis \textlangle i\textrangle kārēnd ut drūndēnd \textlangle ut\textrangle pati-š zvēnd tāk han mūγ ut draht ut urvar nēst “And the body of Sām lies in the Plain of Pișan-sēh near the
Mountain of Damāvand and in that plain save corn and edible things which they sow and reap and live thereon do not exist, of all the rest, date-palm and tree and plant". But the Pāzand and Sanskrit versions have mūrd (Sansk. mūrdha-) "myrtle", for which, however, the Frah. Pahl., 44, gives the word 

The same confusion appears in Ind. Bd., 593 (ed. Justi), hac urvarān mūrt χωρμᾶ, for which the GrBd., 1227, has correctly hac urvarān χωρμᾶ in mūr "of plants the date of the palm-tree".

GrBd., 10313, pēš i mūr "branch of the palm-tree", appears in Ind. Bd., 3515 (in Avestan letters), as pēši χωρμᾶ murt. It is one of the fuels with which Mardē and Mardānē light their first fire.

7. dāśn.

In MPT. d'syn, d'śn (dāšen, dāsn) are common in the sense of "gift". M., 74, v. 14, dāšen bayānīy tuḫsāy bavāy "May you be eager for the divine gift". M., 47c, dāsn padīrīft "he received the gift".

In the Bahman Yašt, 2933, andar ān i vathom ōbām mure-ē āzarm vēš dārēt ku hēr i dēn-burtār martom api-sān *dāsn pādad na pat kār kam "In that most evil time a bird will have more respect than the wealth of men who maintain the faith, and gifts will be less in their acts". It would seem that pādad "gift" should be dāśn, but "creation", as in bun-dahišn, should be dahišn and this is supported by the form with preverb: MPT. p'd'syn pādāšen, Paz. pādāšn pādāšni "recompense". So Pahl. pādāšn. NPers. pādāš, pādāšn, pādāšt. Arm. dāsn "treaty, alliance" may belong here. DkM., 7889 (referred to by Salemann), has dāsnān i vēh apāyīshn oshmurišn "the rewards of the good and excellent recitation", cf. West, SBE., 37, 174, § 17.

To B.S.O.S., VI, part I.

p. 62, l. 18, read: Saka balysqa "high" < *barz-ka-.
p. 64, note, read: uysīne-ja.
p. 78, § 37, read: Syriac יִּשָּׁם, Aram. אָשָׁם.

IN connection with an invitation I had received to make a supplement to Steingass's Persian dictionary I happened to ask a young Persian friend of mine who was staying in London if he would go through Steingass and note any important omissions. The name of my friend was Mr. M. A. Maliki, and when I made this request I knew very little about his linguistic attainments. By good fortune he turned out to have a really astonishing feeling for language and a very special knowledge of his mother tongue. In the course of two weeks he produced over 300 words and expressions in common use in Persia to-day which are not to be found in our Persian dictionaries. The most remarkable feature about these words and expressions is that most of them convey ideas for which there is no exact equivalent in English. It is evident that many of them border on what is known as slang, but they are none the less valuable on this account, and they represent a form of speech which Persians use with each other but do not as a rule employ when talking to Europeans.

āpārđī exceedingly clever; "too clever by half."

akhm kardan to look disagreeable.

akhm u takhm kardan to grouse.

akhmū dour.

ada adā petulance.

ada dar āvardan to refuse to make up a quarrel; to irritate.

ādābar (≡ kasānat) idbār slovenliness; neglect.

urdang kardan to kick out; ūrū urdangi kardand = they have fired him.

or qe or 'argé a jockey.

arvārē the lower jaw.
E. DENISON ROSS—

از ما بهتران
az mā behtarān ghosts.

آسās "bridge" (the game).

آشغالāshghāl refuse (of streets).

ااطفأر=ااطفور=اطرار
اتفر, اتفر, اترر rudeness; shyness.

اعانه
i’āshē living expenses.

آکبر
ikbīr dirt; ikbīr ūrū girifé ast = he is in a filthy (unwashed) state.

آکبری
ikbīrī dirty.

الدنک
aldanq gullible; rustic; a gawk.

الش دگش کردن
alash digash kardan to swap.

الگو
olgū a model.

النک انداختن
ang andākhtan to take careful aim.

النک شدن
angūl shūdan to be importunate.

آنکوک کردن
angūlak kardan to mess about with anything.

اهن توئمب
ahen u tulomb clearing the throat.

ب

باباغوری (T) bābāghūrī a man whose eyes have been cut out.

باج سیل خواستن
lāj-i-salīl khāstan to blackmail.

بازی گوش
bāzī gūsh careless; inattentive.

بازی گوشی
bāzī gūshī carelessness.

بامب
bāmb a bomb, a shock.

باببول زدن (E) bāmbūl zadān

باببول سوار کردن
bāmbūl savār kardan to bamboozle.

بکح شکلکه حوالی
bokhū shackles for the feet.

بزدن
bor zadān to shuffle (cards).

براگان
barāyagān gratis; for next to nothing.

بزل (T) bezek decoration.
besh andākhtan to choose by chance; besh bi u uftād = he was selected by drawing lots, or by show of fingers.

bogh kardan to pout.

balbashū inartistic.

bonjol “remainders”; what is not required, but still has some value.

pātūq a haunt (such as a club or café).

pārs kardan to bark.

pā'īdan to watch; to take care of; to look after.

papé soft; silly.

patī naked.

pach pach kardan to talk aside.

pakhsh kardan to scatter.

pakhmē narrow-minded; gullible; soft; daft.

pur rū too big for his boots; won’t take “no” for an answer.

part far away; havās-i-fulān kas khālī part ast = his thoughts are very far away.

pur sūresh rū dar āvardan to be spoilt, i.e. a beggar from being given too much; a child from not being corrected.

par-i-shāl guzāshtan hidden trickery; (to put money) under the cloak.

pashm ālū, pur pashm hairy; hirsute.

pafyūz stupid; thickheaded.

pak u pūz appearanceé (looks).

pakar kardan to bore (as with a long lecture).
pentī very careless.

pīchē a short veil.

pūr dar āvardān; surmā pūr marā dar āvard = 
the cold nearly did for me.

pīsī bi sur-i-kaśī dar āvardān to "learn" some 
one; to be avenged.

pīš qarā'ūl a pioneer.

pīshekā in advance.

pīle kardān to be importunate in asking for 
something (like children crying), said also of 
an illness which returns after cure.

shīlē pīlē a trick; cheating.

ت

tārāndān to exile; to shoo away (e.g. pigeons).

tās andākhtān to throw dice.

tā kardān to treat a person well or badly.

tabrīk congratulation.

tabrīk gufān to congratulate.

tapq a slip (of the tongue). (A? (A) خَّتَاقَقِ.

taht jildī hypodermic.

tokhīs "méchant".

takhliyē kardān to vacate.

(ter or) tord (or tɔrt) brittle.

tar u chāb quick in the uptake.

taṛīdān to show off.

tasār zarād to threaten.

tasāduf a collision.

tufālē what remains after liquid or essence has 
been removed (e.g. almonds, coal, etc.).

tak alone.
تک و پوز tak u pūz personal appearance.
takāmul evolution.
تنک و تالبان رفتان talān raftan to stalk; to strut.
talangūr zadan to drum or tap with the fingers.
telau khurda to tumble; to stagger.
tang u tā assuming false dignity or knowledge.
tū khurden to receive a shock.
tūp zadand to give a bad reception to anyone.
tūpīdan تو هوا دن تویولد (دووقولی) tūghūlī (dūqūlī) twins.
تیپا (تیپ) ūpā (tīpū) a blow, kick.
tīpā zadan to kick.
نیک کردان tīr kardan to instigate,
نیف آفتاب tīgh āftāb sunrise.

ج

جخت jakht already; just.
جر پژه jur buzé general fitness (as of a mother to bring up children, of a man to be a policeman).
جر دادان to tear.
جر زدان jar zadan to be a defaulter in gambling debts.
جرت و قوز jert u qūz spick and span.
جغله jēghelé on the small side.
جغمر و بقوور jaghūr u baghūr; olla podrida; a mix up (of people).
جفت زدن بالا just zadan bālā to mount; to jump up.
جفت زدن پایین just zadan pā'īn to alight; to jump down.
جلات jullat very shrewd.
جلوز ولز کردان jelez u velez kardan to be at the last gasp; to be in a hopeless condition.
جلنبر julumbur worn out; "junk."
jelaš dar āmadan to treat well.
jangūlak bāzī dar āvardan to annoy a man, but in such a way that he cannot help being amused.
jūr kind; sort.
Jim shulan to vanish; to leave a place unperceived; to slip or sneak away.

chāq kardan to get a qalīyān ready.
churūk a wrinkle; a crease.
chilauzé one sprig of a bunch of grapes.
chi kāré what profession (are you in?).

hāli shudan to understand.
hashal "offal"; the inside of animals not ordinarily eaten.

khepelé stocky.
khert u pert small things; useless junk.
khirift dense; unable to grasp what he hears.
kharakē a donkey-driver.
khafē khūn-i-marg bi-guzār for God's sake go to sleep.
khing dense; unable to grasp what he hears.
khudrā az tang u tā andākhtan to keep up the pretence.
khīt kardan to give a person away; to show up.
د
داداش dādāsh a brother.
داغدن شدن dāghūn shudan to be destroyed.
داغدن کردن dāghūn kardan to destroy.
دیش debsh pleasantly bitter to the taste.
دبیه دار آوردند debbe dar āvardan to go back on a bargain; to ask for more.
در رفتند dadar raftan to take French leave; to go without permission.
دزدکی نگاه زدن duzdakī nigāh zadan to cast eyes; to look out of the side of one’s eyes when talking to anyone.
دست پاچه شدن dast pāchē shudan to become nervous; dast pācheği = showing embarrassment when caught doing something; losing one’s head in an examination.
دست و با کردن dast u pā kardan to try very hard.
دک شدن dak shudan to flee; to take French leave.
دکیسه dakīse impossible! (interjection).
دل جوش زدن dil jūsh zadān to be distraught with anxiety.
دله dalē covetous.
دنج dēng “Liberty Hall”.
دک و فَک dāk u fang spick and span.
دور قلم گرفتن dūr qalam girfstan to cross out; to leave out.
دول دادن daval dādan to delay; to put off.
دلاق dailāq tall and thin (of a man).

ر
ریچار (لیچار) rīchār (līchār) abusive language; sarcasm.
ریچار گفتتن rīchār guftan to abuse; to speak sarcastically or ironically.
ز

زبان بسته zabān bastē an animal.
زهر و زرنگ zabr u zarang active; vivacious.
زرق zaparī cheap stuff.
زرت zert a setback.
زلف زل نگاه کردن zal zal nigāh karden to fix the eyes on; to gaze.
زنام زیمبū in attendance on (e.g. courtiers, etc.).

س

سدرمه sedermē the binding of rag shoes; sedermē-ye īn khāndān dar raft = the stuffing has been knocked out of this family.
سخردن sar khrūdan to take a lesson from; to "bore"
stiff.
سحید سن sar shu’dan to understand. in harf-ha sar-i mā na-mīshavād = I don’t accept these words;
sar-i shumā mīshavīd? = do you understand?
سرومور surūmūr healthy (like a country girl).
سقیرمه saqīrmē tough.
سقلمه suqulmē a blow; a punch.
سک زدن suk zadan to be too insistent and importunate.
سکرمه sigirmē a wrinkle.
سلنان رفتین salānē raftān to stalk; to strut.
سمل کردن sambal karden to improvise; to provide a substitute.
سوت کردن sūt karden to throw over (a wall).
سورچی sūrčī a driver.

ش

شتلگ فتن shetelī giriftān to get something for nothing.
شر و ور sharr u var irrelevant.
shaqq u raqq smart (of soldiers).
shaltāq a cheat.
shelakhtē inexpert.
shalambūr untidy and dishevelled.
shulūgh a big crowd.

saf u pūst kandé without prevarication.

tās bald.
tepāndan to stuff.

zālim sly.

alam shangé a disturbance.
alam shangé dar āvardan to kick up a row (also written ālm).

ghāl guzāshtan to disappoint.
ghal khurđan to roll.
ghulghul kardan to bubble.
ghulghuluk a pot; a goblet.
ghanj zadān to yearn; to desire earnestly.
فر

فر زدن (F) fer tongs.
فر زدان to wave the hair.
فاکستانی jerry-built; cheap and bad.
فِن بالا کشیدن fin bālā kushīdan to snuffle.
فِن کردن fin kardan to blow the nose on the fingers.
فیس کردن fis kardan to show off.

ق

قابلی qāpāchī (T) a janitor.
قابل qāpādan to snatch
قِش qāch a slice (as of a melon).
قِجاچاق کردن qāchāq kardan to smuggle.
قِجاچاقچی qāchāqchī a smuggler.
قاطی qāṭī mixed.
قَلَب زدن qālib zadān to overcharge.
قَیام qāyam hard; loud. qāyantar harf bi-zan = speak louder!
قد بودن qod būdan to be very proud, haughty, or arrogant.
قدما qudamā ancestors.
قَرچی قَرچی qirichī birichī gristle; a cartilage.
قیریشمال بودن qirishmāl būdan to kick up a row.
قِر qar kardan to grumble.
قل خوردن gel khurādan to roll.
قلا کردن qulā kardan to watch (as a cat for a mouse).
قلیِم qulīmáq powerful; rough; strong; one
قلدیر quldīr who does not fear anything.
قِلَفی زدان qilīftī zadān
قِلَفی سوار کردن qilīftī savār kardan to overreach.
قلنک دادن qalqalak dādan to tickle.
قلبه qulumbé a swelling.
قصور شدن qamsūr shudan to strain to breaking point.
zert-i fulān chīz qamsūr ast = a thing is destroyed. zert-i fulān kas qamsūr ast = he is dead.
قورت دادن qūrt dādan to swallow.
قهوة qahvé-i brown.
قیب qīp exactly right.
قیر qīr the finishing touches in toilet. qīr-ash durust ast = she is well turned out.

کارپرداز kūrpardez a commissary.
کاس کردان kās kardan to bore; to weary.
کبره kaprē dirt, visible on the body or clothes.
کهپه keppé a heap.
کهپه کردان keppé kardan
کهپه گذاشتن keppé guzāshtan to sleep.
کپیدان kepūdan
کچلیک در آوردِن kchālik dar āvordan to cry and shout without purpose.
کره شدان kerē shudan to fall senseless.
کاش, یک کاش, do kash a time; once; twice.
kashūde a slap.
کلافه شدن kalāfe shudan to become faint (with heat).
کلک زدان kelk zadan to sell at a high price (by concealing defects).
کله kulē clipped; docked; broken-bladed.
kund handcuffs.
kund u kū an extreme effort.
kinis a miser; miserly.
kūm kardan to crave earnestly (for a drink, or an accustomed drug).

kikāhū'at old age.

kip full; well-fitting.

kīs uneven sowing.

kīs shudan to shrink (as of cloth); to be creased.

gar without hair; mangy.

gas a taste which is not very bitter.

gundeli abnormally large or gross (گندلی).

gαudāl a grave; a pit; a trench.

lās a flirt.

lās zadān to begin to love; to flirt.

lāsh gūsāhtan to exaggerate.

lubb u lubāb ready to eat (as a skinned peach, etc.).

labū cooked beet; rape.

lap cheek.

laj kardan to do something with impunity.

laj u bāz immune.

lochak a handkerchief or scarf (worn on the head).

lakht paralysed; limp.

lokhm filleted.

lash (F) a coward.

lak lak kardan to carry on; to continue.

lakshē broken instruments.

lagad lagad a kick.
lagad zadān to kick.

lam dādan to enjoy sitting.

lu dādan to make known one’s secret.

lauché the corner of the mouth.

lus self-satisfied.

lul būdan to be unconscious; to be dead drunk.

lul zadan to probe.

lulīdan to wriggle.

lé kardan to smash.

līz khurdan to slip.

līz dādan to cause to slip.

ma‘āb manner. farangī ma‘āb = westernized.

masūndan to importune successfully.

mālīde a “washout”.

mutārké abandonment (ترل).

majrūhī soreness.

mahal naghūshtan to jilt.

mukhābiré sending a telegram.

makhdal zadān to estimate.

masbūq to be informed; above mentioned.

mufangī a barbarian.

malandūgh “méchant”.

man man kardan to jabber.

mūzī harmful.

mūs mūs kardan to solicitate.

mahār kardan to lead by a string through the nose (like a camel).
nāṭū a snake in the grass (sign ناحق).
nārū zadān to deceive.
nāqūlā cute.
nakharāshīdē rough.
nashgūn pinching.
nonor selfish.
navā dar āvardān to mimic.
naizē zadān to pay compliments with an ulterior motive.

vā raftān to astonish; to forget oneself; to become perplexed.
vā zadān to return (what is not wanted).
vāzādā refuse (subs.); what is rejected.
vālamādān to laze around; dolce far niente.
vā māndān to be done up (as an over-loaded horse).

var a way.
var parīdān to die accidentally.
var rājī kardān to chatter; to babble.
var chelauzīdān to become corrugated, or rippled.
var raftān to touch or play with forbidden things.
var zadān to chatter; to babble.
var golombīdān to protrude unnaturally (as a pocket).

var kashīdān to force open.
vul vul kardān to wriggle.

vilarm tepid (of water); of mean temperature.
velengār a “bore”.
ولنگاری کردن velengārī kardan to bore (a person).
ولو کردن velau kardan to disarrange; (to chuck about).

هاج و واج شدن hāj u vāj shudan to become astonished.
هار hār rabid; afflicted with rabies.
حق هق زاری کردن haq haq zārī kardan to sob desperately; to weep.
هو ha'ū a co-wife.
هوار havār the sudden collapse of a building.
هلو دادن haul dādan to push or throw a person away or aside.
هلو زدن haul zadān to show abnormal greed.
هلو شدن haul shudān to be nervous (as before an examiner).
هلو کردن haul kardan to be overcome with fear.
هولداتی hauldānī a prison cell.

ی
yakhé a collar.
یکه خوردن yakké khurđan "to be struck of a heap"; "to be struck breathless."
یلی دادن (کردن) yelleli dādan (kardan) to let an opportunity slip by indifference.
Einiges über die Namen und die Freuden des kurānischen Paradieses

Von David Künstlinger


3 S. I. Targ. Jerusalem zu Num. 26, 46.
5 Die römischen Ziffern I., II., III., IV. bezeichnen vor Angabe der Sūra die erste, zweite, dritte makkānische, die vierte, d.i. die madīnīche Periode nach Noldeke-Schwally’s, Gesch. d. Qorān.
gebraucht hier jedoch immer — wohl im Sinne eines Kollektivs —
die Pluralform ّعَذَّنٌ. Die Rabbinen wissen uns mitzuteilen,
dass ein jeder der Frommen einen „Eden“ für sich selbst im Jenseits
haben wird. 1 Aber auf grund dieser Agada, wenn sie dem Muḥammad
bekannt gewesen wäre, würde man eher einen Plural des Wortes ّعَذَّنٌ
erwarten.

Im eschatologischen Sinne verwenden die Juden nur ausserst
selten das Wort ّنَرٍّ (s. zuvor) für ّنَرٍّ. So z. B. Pes. 94a = Ta'anit 10a:
Die Welt ist ein 60. Teil des ّنَرٍّ (= Gan Eden), der ّنَرٍّ ist ein 60.
Teil des ّنَرٍّ; der Eden ist ein 60. Teil des Gehinnom (Hölle).
Midras Schir ha-Schirim ed. Grünhut, Jerusalem, 1897, 42a zu H.L.
6, 2 ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ : ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ. Auch ّنَرٍّ ohne ّنَرٍّ (s. zuvor)
wird nur selten in diesem Sinne gebraucht.  

z. B. Berak. 34b = Sanh. 99a mit Bezug
auf Jes. 64, 3: „kein Auge sah dies“ darunter sei der ّنَرٍّ zu
verstehen. In Lev. r. 34, 15 zu Jes. 58, 11: „Du wirst sein wie ein
bewässerter Garten“, d.i. ّنَرٍّ; „wie ein Quellort von Wassern“, 
d.i. ّنَرٍّ. 2 Die bisher erwähnten Stellen sind aber eher Deutungen
als gebrauchliche Namen. Denn stereotyp lautet der eschatologische
Ausdruck ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ؛ er wird fast wie ein Eigennamen gebraucht,
so dass Targum zu Hiob 38, 18 ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ sagt konnte ; s. Levy,
Targ. WB. I, 146. Dagegen verwendet die christliche oder die von
Christen häufig gebrauchte, wenn auch ursprünglich jüdische, allerdings
nicht offiziell jüdische Literatur bloss das Wort „Garten“ für „Garten
Eden“. So das aethiopische Henochbuch (ed. Flemming) 32, 6
ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ؛ 60, 8 ّنَرٍّ. Das christliche Adambuch des Morgen-
landes (Der Kampf Adams), aethiop. Text (ed. Trumpp) hat das
Wort ّنَرٍّ fast auf jeder Seite. Ebenso haben die apokryphen
gnostischen Adlischen von Pseudo aus dem Armenischen

Im eschatologischen Sinne gebraucht Muḥammad das Wort
ّنَرٍّ (ohne ّعَذَّنٌ) ungemein oft. So I. 81, 13; 89, 30; II. 76, 12;
20, 115 u.s.; III. 41, 30; 16, 34 u.s.; IV. 2, 33 u.s.; 2, 105 u.s.

1 Lev. r. 27, 1 zu Ps. 36, 9: ّنَرٍّ (Pl.) zeigt an, dass ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ
In Ber. 34b wird zwischen ّنَرٍّ und ّنَرٍّ ein Unterschied
2 S. die vorige Anm.
3 Dieselbe Lesart im Jalk. Simeoni z. St. sowie zu 64, 3. Dagegen liest Jalk. 
ha-Maḥfiz zu 58, 11: ّنَرٍّ ّنَرٍّ und zum zweiten Teil des Verses ّنَرٍّ

(ohne ّنَرٍّ) im Gegensatz zu ّنَرٍّ findet sich bei Umajja ibn Abī 8
Salt xil, 1 vor.
Die Namen und Freuden des Kurānishen Paradieses


In I. (od. IV. ?) 102, 3, wo zuvor von der Pleione gesprochen und behauptet wird: Die Ungläubigen werden wohl die Hölle sehen,

---

1 Schürer, Geschichte, III (1909), 397.
sehen mit dem Auge der Gewissheit, heisst es ferner: 

تم أُثِنِى على النعيم


Von der Wonne in den Gärten handelt IV. 9, 21: Und Gärten sind für sie (die Frommen), in denselben bestehende Wonne. 

Im Gegensatz zu den Ungläubigen, welche in der Hölle verbleiben, heisst es I. 82, 13 und 83, 22, was zu übersetzen sei „Siehe, die Reinen sind wahrlich im Paradiese“. An dieser Stelle ist نعيم = جنة. Erkennen wirst du auf ihren (d. Gläubigen) Angesichtern — lautet in I. 83, 24 — den Glanz der Wonne (des Paradieses); vgl. Henoch 108, 14-15.


1 Baba mez. 83b in bezug auf Ps. 104, 22: Es gibt keinen Gerechten, der keine Wohnung 

1 L.A. xxviii, 55: جنة المأوى = جنة المأوى.
(im Garten Eden) hätte, wo zuvor gesagt wird: Die Bösewichter werden in die Gehenna „eingesammelt“. Genau wie heisst es in III. 32, 19: Ja, sie (die Gläubigen) haben die Gärten der Wohnung "جنَّاتِ الْمَلَّوٰى" 2 Baidawi z. St. II. 262 (gedruckt 1317) 

1 Zumahārī II. 202, erwähnt eine Lesart "جنَّة".
2 S. m. Kommentar zur 53 Sūre des Kurān in Mémoires de la Commission orientale de l’Académie Polonaise des Sciences et Lettres No. 8, 23 (polnisch).
3 In II. 38, 49 werden Edens Gärten „eine schöne Einkehr“ حسن مأب genannt.
nicht nur „Wonne,“ sondern auch „Ort, Wohnung“ heraus, daher ־לֶאְבָּדֵר und dann ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מָלֵאָר und dann ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מָלֵאָר.

Im Zusammenhange mit dem oben Gesagten steht der Terminus ־לֶאְבָּדֵר, welcher im gewöhnlichen Gebrauch „Haus, Wohnung“ bedeutet, z. B. 7, 142; 11, 68 u.s., im eschatologischen Sinne aber „Wohnung des Jenseits“, „Paradies“. II. 38, 46 ־לֶאְבָּדֵר נְצִיקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר שֵׁעָר; Abraham, Isak und Jakob gedachten bereits der Wohnung des Jenseits. III. 28, 37; 6, 136 ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb

im Gegensatz zu das. Vers 25 u.s. ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb oder der Aufenthaltsort im Jenseits: III. 16, 32; 28, 83 u.s. Im Vers 32 der erstgenannten Sūre findet man neben der obigen Phrase ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb; und ja womöglich ist die Wohnung (des Paradieses) der Gottesfürchtigen. Unter III. 40, 42 ־לֶאְבָּדֵר מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb; versteht Ṭabari xxiv, 40: Die ־לֶאְb behält dauernd ihre Leute, wie das Höllenfeuer die ihren; vgl. 21, 102, 99. Eine andere Benennung des Paradieses lautet III. 10, 26; 6, 127 ־לֶאְb מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb מַעֲch


1 L.A. xvii, 150: Das Nomen ־לֶאְb מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb מַעֲch (von ־לֶאְb מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb מַעֲch abgeleitet) bedeutet den Ort, an welchem die Kamele verweilen, sich füttern, ohne davonzulaufen. ־לֶאְb מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb מַעֲch ist die Stelle, wo die Leute ständig, Winter wie Sommer, sich aufhalten. Die Wohnung der Hölle wäre dann ein Pendant zur Wohnung des Paradieses. S. Sprenger, Moh. II. 507, 1, aber auch Horovitz a.a.O. 7.

2 Ṭab. ix, 37–8, führt allerdings eine Deutung dieses ־לֶאְb מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb מַעֲch an, eine andere jedoch, wo darunter ein gewöhnliches Haus zu verstehen sei.

3 Ṭab. xxiii, 98–9, ־לֶאְb מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb מַעֲch = ־לֶאְb מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb מַעֲch = ־לֶאְb מַעֲch = ־לֶאְb מַעֲch.

4 Dieses nennt eine Agada in Gen. r. 53, 12, zu Gen. 21, 12, ־לֶאְb מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb מַעֲch. Bemerkt ־לֶאְb מַעֲch.


6 Zam. I. 67 zu 2, 88 = ־לֶאְb מַעֲחַקֵי ־לֶאְb מַעֲch.

teilte ihm (Abr.) die frohe Kunde mit, dass sein Vater an der künftigen Welt, am Gan Eden, teilhaben wird.\(^1\)

In III. 35, 32 lautet der Name des Paradieses im Gegensatz zu das. Vers 33: **",Wohnung des Standortes\(^2\)**. II. 44, 51: Siehe, die Frommen (befinden sich) am festen Ort **, worauf Vers 52 folgt**. Tab. xxv, 74 bemerkt dazu, dass die letzten Worte seien eine Übersetzung, Erklärung der ersteren. Vgl. II. 25, 26 im Paradies einen festen, sicheren Wohnplatz haben. Im Paradies haben die Gläubigen eine schöne Mittagsruhe das, und befinden sich die Gefährten der Rechten (= die Gläubigen) unter dornenlosen Lotosbäumen I. 56, 27.—Ob auch II. 17, 81 **, hierher gehört, soll unentschieden bleiben.**—Sanh. 99a; Berach. 34b\(^3\): An dem Ort **, wo die Reuigen sich aufhalten, halten sich selbst die Frommsten nicht auf.** Sifré zu Deut. 1, 10; Jalkút ha-Machirí zu Ps. 15, 1 heisst es: Es gibt sieben Abteilungen von Gerechten im Gan Eden, die eine höher als die andere; . . . die siebente Abteilung gemäss Ps. 24, 3 „und wer darf an seiner heiligen Stätte bleiben ?“\(^5\) Vielleicht ist auch mit Rühling\(^6\) anzunehmen, dass II. 54, 55 **, eine Benennung des Paradieses sei. Gen. r, 15, 4 zu Ps. 139, 2 deutet**.—Das Paradies ist auch \(^7\) II. 76, 20 genannt, was wohl mit Macht, Ansehen wiedergegeben werden soll wie 20, 118. Im Garten sollen auch Gebäude mit **, Oberzimmer, Speisezimmer sein III. 39, 21 u.s.

An drei Stellen spricht der Kurân von Doppelgärten in einer und derselben Sûre, I. 55, 46 : Und für den, der fürchtet **, ist ein (Dual), Doppelgarten (vorbereitet). Das. 54 **(Ựَجَّانَ);bِنَبَتْطَهَا**

\(^1\) Lekach tov und Sechel tov z. St. lesen **.**
\(^2\) Tab. xxii, 82 = ** jelâ**.
\(^3\) S. Jalk. ha-Machirí zu Jes. 57, 19.
\(^4\) **(bسمك) (sibawla shawaba šamk) (od. šibawla šamk) (sibawla šamk).**
\(^5\) **(bسمك) (sibawla šamk) (od. šibawla šamk).**
\(^6\) Beiträge zur Eschatologie des Islam 32 f.
\(^7\) Zam. II, 423, führt eine Lesart **.**
\(^8\) Frauenkel, Aram. Fremdw. 21. Tab. xxii, 7, **غُرَف.**
\(^9\) Horovitz a.a.O. 3, 1. S. Nielsen, Neue katabanische Inschriften (MVG. xi) 11 ; **(bسمك) (sibawla šamk) in der Macht seines Herrn. **
und die Früchte des Doppelgartens sind nahe (zum Pflücken). Das 62
und ausser jenen (noch) ein Doppelgarten. Man
braucht sich aber über diesen Doppelgarten den Kopf nicht zu
zerbrechen, was derselbe im Verhältnis zur oder bedeuten
möge. Denn mit Recht behauptet Nöldeke, „dass hier die Duaie
dem Reime zu Liebe gebraucht sind.“ — Allein auch die Juden
wissen von einem kleinen Garten im Gan Eden; s. oben.

In II. 23, 11 wird der Gan Eden mittelst eines Fremdwortes
Paradies, bezeichnet, aber II. (?). 18, 107 wird
gebraucht. Im Zusammenhange mit diesem gehört hierher
wiederum ein anderer Namen für: „Garten“, der im Kurän III. 30, 14
vorkommt, nämlich „Au“, die Aue. Er gehört zu den echten
arabischen Namen für „grüne (bunte) Plätze“. Im
eschatologischen Sinne, wie es hier verwendet wird, kann nur eine
Übersetzung von „Garten“ sein, etwa wie das oben erwähnte
Übersetzung von „Garten“ ist. Muhammad gebraucht jedoch in
III. 42, 21 „Au“, die Auens des Paradieses. Vgl. Sibyllinen,
Proömium 86 „der grüende Garten des Paradieses“. Noch ein
anderes Wort für Paradies verwendet Umajja xxiv, 4 „Paradies“; der
Garten; dieses ist sicherlich nicht kuränisch. — Die talmudisch-
miträsische Literatur kennt nicht das Wort „Paradies“ im eschatologischen
Sinne für Paradies. Auch in Chag. 14b: Vier traten in den
ein, bedeutet nicht „sie traten in den Garten Eden ein“, sondern
„Paradies“ ist hier eine Bezeichnung für die Beschäftigung mit einem
mystischen Studium über den Tronwagen Ezechiel (Ez. Anf.).
Dagegen ist in der von Christen benutzten Literatur das Wort
„Paradies“ = Gan Eden allgemein gebraucht; s. oben.

Da es für die Gläubigen im Paradiese viel Freude und Glück gibt,
I. 85, 11; (in III. 42, 21 „Paradies“), so ist das Paradies ein
wunderbarer Ort, I. 78, 31; die Gefährten
desselben heissen somit „Paradies“ II. 23, 113 u.s.

Der Raum, den das Paradies einnimmt, ist unendlich wie die
Breite der Himmel und der Erde: IV. 3, 127; 57, 21.
Vgl. die oben angeführte Stelle aus Pes. 94a: Die Welt ist ein 60. Teil

1 Gesch. d. Qorän 31.
2 Über die Herkunft dieses Wortes s. Jennings, Lexicon to the Syr. N.T., 1926, 178.
3 Fraenkel, Aram. Fremdw. 149.
des Gan u.s.w. Syr. Baruchapokalypse 51, 11 spricht von den weiten Räumen des Paradieses; 59, 8 von der Grösse desselben. In 48, 50 befindet sich das Paradies „in jener endlosen Welt“.


Den Gläubigen stehen die Tore des Paradieses offen: II. 38, 50; III. 39, 73. Durch alle Tore treten zu ihnen Engel ein: III. 13, 23. Vgl. IV, Ezra 8, 52 „Für euch ist das Paradies eröffnet“.


Ketub. 104c: Wenn der Fromme vom Diesseits scheidet, kommen ihm drei Reihen von Dienstengeln entgegen, wovon die eine ihm sagt (Jes. 57, 2) „komme in Frieden“ (ins Paradies) usw.


Was die Freuden im Paradiese anbetrifft sagt Horovitz a.a.O. 8: „Dass in einem arabischen Paradies die Flüsse, der Schatten und die Früchte nicht fehlen dürfen, versteht sich von selbst, und dafür nach fremden Vorbildern Ausschau zu halten, wäre geschmacklos“. Es ist aber nicht einzusehen, weshalb dieses geschmacklos oder sagen wir geschmackloser sein sollte als die Ausschau zu halten nach fremden Vorbildern betreffs der Paradiesesweiber oder der Schmuckgegenstände im Paradiese, denen er selbst die letzten Seiten seiner inhaltsvollen Abhandlung widmet.

Früchte, Flüsse, etc., sind nicht nur bei den Arabern, sondern auch bei den Juden in ihrem Paradiese vorhanden, was hier gleich besprochen sein soll. Rut r. 5, 14 zu 2, 14: Das Essen, von dem dort die Rede ist, beziehe sich auf die diesseitige Welt, auf die messianische Zeit und auf das Jenseits. Toseftā Sōtā x, 5; Şanh. 1086; Abot de R. Natan (ed. Schechter) 93 lautet eine Stelle mit bezug auf Gen. 7, 10:
Gott habe Noe und den Seinen zu essen und trinken gegeben nach der Art (des Essens und Trinkens) des Jenseits, damit sie erfahren, was sie verloren haben. Vgl. außerdem B. Batra 15b f.; Pes. rabb. (ed. Friedmann) 16 f., 28b u.s. zum materiellen Sinn dieses Ausdrucks. Lev. r. 13, 3: Dereinst wird der Heilige, gelobt sei er, eine Mahlzeit für die Frommen im Gan Eden veranstalten. Tanh. (Ende Lev.): Ich werde euch vor dem Aufenthalt in der Hölle retten, werde euch aber (im Gan Eden) den Tisch decken mit Beziehung auf Ps. 23, 5. Ex. r. 45, 6: Die Propheten haben die Mahlzeit gesehen ... S. auch Erub. 54a; Sabb. 153a. Targ. zu Koh. 9, 7: Der Herr der Welt wird einst jedem Frommen besonders sagen, geh, geniesse in Freude deine Speise, welche dir wiedergegeben wird für die Speise, die du dem hungrigen Armen und Unglücklichen verabreicht hast; und trinke guten Mutes den Wein, der für dich im Gan Eden aufbewahrt ist für den Wein usw. Ex. r. 25, 8: ... zu sehen den gedeckten Tisch im Gan Eden ... Er bringt ihnen Früchte vom Gan Eden und speist sie vom Lebensbaum. Test. Levi 18 „und wird den Heiligen zu essen geben vom Holze des Lebens“.


Die Freuden, die der Gläubigen im Paradiese harren, sind natürlich nach der Hoffnung, dem Verlangen, auch der übertriebenen phantastischen Sehnsucht des im Diesseits geplagten Menschen gezeichnet. Im heissen, wasserarmen Klima ist vor allem Schatten

und keine Weinberge حدائق وأعان I. 78, 32. Die Trauben hängen über den Frommen zum leichten Auflesen II. 76, 14. Man verabreicht ihnen in Schüsseln und Bechern von Gold, die was der Mensch begehrt und die Augen ergötzt erhalten: صحا ف من ذهب وكوب وفيا ما تستهبه اللناس وملأ العين II. 43, 71. Im Paradies gibt’s gefüllte Becher كأس دهان يتنازون فيها كأس I. 78, 34; man reicht sie einander يب شاء وكأس من معين I. 56, 17–18. Der Trunk ist weiss und süß: لا فيها غول ولا حم عنها ينفوذ II. 37, 44–6. Die Masse der silbernen Becher und Flaschen bestimmen die Gläubigen selbst: قدرينها قدرين II. 76, 15–21.


er denselben bis an seinen Hals unter Rosen sitzend; nackt
Buhlerinnen standen um ihn herum. Da sagte (B. Šešák) zu ihm:
Habt ihr (Juden) etwas derartiges in der künftigen Welt? . . .
Darauf sagte Rab Pápa, er hätte ihm doch sagen sollen (ja, wir haben
derartiges), sich auf Ps. 45, 10 berufend, „Königstöchter sind unter
deinen Haremsfrauen, es steht die Beischläferin zu deiner Rechten
in Ophirgold“. 

Es soll hier noch die merkwürdige Agada Jerúš. Megilla II (73b)
u. Parall. angeführt werden: Dereinst wird der Heilige, gelobt sei er,
ein Reigenführer רמיה מיר for die Frommen sein.1 Es wird auf
Ps. 48, 14 רמיה מיר, verwiesen, wo ein Ketib רמיה מיר erwähnt
wird. Die Frommen zeigen auf ihn (Gott) mit dem Finger und sagen
(das. Vers 15): „denn er ist Gott, unser Gott, er führt uns רמיה מיר
. . .“ Dieses Wort wird verschiedentlich gedeutet; darunter erhielt
sich noch eine Deutung רמיה מיר, wie diese Mädchen. Der
ursprüngliche Text wusste also von einem Tanz der Frommen mit
Mädchen im Jenseits unter Mitwirkung Gottes als Dirigenten. Die
späteren Talmudisten, denen dieses zu heidnisch klang, bemühten
sich dem Worte רמיה מיר andere Deutungen zu geben. Den ursprüng-
lichen Text hat man wohl mit Absicht verworren und eine sinnlose
Wiederholung (s. das. die ganze Stelle) zustandegebracht, um den
schlechten Eindruck, den er hervorrufen musste, zu dämpfen.

Horovitz, Jacob folgend,2 behauptet, Muhammed habe das
Freudenleben, wie es die altarabischen Dichter schildern, mitsamt
den bei ihnen verwendeten Ausdrücken für die Paradiesesfreuden
benutzt. Allein es ist bekannt, wie auch Horovitz selbst zugibt, dass
diese Dichter durchaus keine Kenntnis von der Existenz eines Paradieses
hatten. Soviel wir Muhammed kennen, wissen wir, dass trotz seiner
Schwächen, er ein überaus ernster Mann gewesen ist. Es zielt sich
daher kaum anzunehmen, er habe von „Bänkelsänger-Bildern“ sein
Paradies sich ausgemalt. Auch die oben erwähnten rabbinischen
Stellen, welche viel Ähnlichkeit mit denen Muhammads verraten,
sprechen offensichtlich dagegen. Diese sind gewiss von „Bänkelsä-
gern“ ganz unabhängig gewesen. Wenn Muhammed dieselben
Fremdwörter gebraucht, die die vorislamischen Dichter verwenden,
so muss er sie nicht diesen entlehnt haben, sondern diese waren

1 Midr. Ps. 48 fügt hinzu ה东莞市 יולן לולן der Heilige, gelobt sei er, tanzt
mit ihnen.
2 S. den Aufsatz von Georg Jacob, Zur Gesch. des Bänkelsangs in O. Harrassowitz,
bereits beim arabischen Volke heimisch gewesen. Da nun Muḥammad die Freuden des Diesseits auf das Jenseits übertrug, musste er selbstverständlich einer solchen Redeweise sich bedienen.

Das Vorhandensein eines Paradieses überhaupt sowie die verschiedenen Namen desselben hat Muḥammad von Christen und Juden entnommen; was die Freuden, welche in ihm verteilt werden, anbetrifft, hat er — wie auch die Juden in älterer Zeit — dem Volke entnommen, um seinen Gläubigen ein sinnlich-fröhliches Bild vom Leben im Jenseits zu entwerfen. Eine theologisch-sittliche Vorstellung, wie sie bei Juden und Christen sich kristallisiert hatte, war ihm — oder vielleicht auch seinen Informatoren — unzugänglich.
Notes on the Miscellanea of I-Shan

By LIONEL GILES

All students of Chinese must be grateful to Miss Edwards for introducing them to this quaint and little-known work of the poet Li Shang-yin (see Bull. S.O.S., vol. v, pp. 757–85). Not only has she given a vigorous and idiomatic rendering of the sayings, but she has also had the courage to include the Chinese text, transcribed from the T'ang tai ts'ung shu, a work which is not likely to be in every reader’s library. I cannot agree, however, with her remark that “the meaning of the sayings seems clear enough.” There are quite a number which appear to me decidedly obscure, and in some cases (though not many in proportion to the whole) I would venture to question the translation offered by Miss Edwards. Hence the following notes, which have been made purely in the interests of scholarship and are not, I hope, chargeable to that “stupidity” (癡頑) which according to Li Shang-yin leads one to 見人文字強評譭 “go out of one’s way to assail another person’s work”. I may add that the translator herself has kindly written to assure me that she would welcome the discussion of any doubtful points.

I. 必不來 “Never Again!”

This does not suit any of the sayings grouped under the heading so well as the literal translation, “Won’t come!” The intoxicated guest and the kleptomaniac obviously won’t come to say good-bye to their host. Miss Edwards must take the words to mean “won’t be invited again”, but this is straining them too far.

3. 追王侯家人 “Noblemen’s servants being dunned.” This, I think, should be: “Noblemen’s servants when sent for.” They are too haughty to obey the summons.

II. 不相稱 “Incongruities”

3. 不解飲弟子 “A (Buddhist) disciple addicted to drink.” Comparison with IX, 3: 僧解飲則犯戒 “When a priest takes to drink he breaks his vows”, shows that the above must mean “A Buddhist disciple not addicted to drink.” The cynicism of this saying is paralleled by that of XXXV, 12 (to be discussed later).

7. 屠家念經 “A pork butcher reciting scriptures.” Here the point is missed if 經 is taken to mean “Classics” (see Miss Edwards’
footnote) instead of "Buddhist sūtras". The incongruity, of course, arises from the Buddhist prohibition against the taking of life.

8. 社長乘凉轎 "A village elder riding in an open chair." Miss Edwards says that 凉轎 is "peculiar to military officials", thereby identifying it, apparently, with 亮轎 (see Giles Dict. 1341). The former, but not the latter phrase is given in the P'ei wên yün fu. It seems to me that a "cool chair" should be one protected against the sun by an awning, as opposed to the ordinary open chair. But on such a point I must defer to those with greater experience of the country.

III. 羞不出 "Shameful"

Surely this corresponds rather to our "shameless".

1. 新婦失禮 "The newly-wed careless of the proprieties." Here and in VI, 1 read "a bride" instead of "the newly-wed", which would include both husband and wife.

4. 處子犯物議 "A virgin forgetting the conventions." This should rather be: "A virgin giving rise to gossip," that is, getting herself talked about.

VII. 不得已 "Against the Grain"

Better, perhaps, "Things that can't be helped." The Museum text has 不得 "not permissible", which does not seem so good.

7. 呈暑迎謁 "Exchanging visits in the heat." This should be: "Receiving visitors in hot weather." Chinese etiquette makes it necessary to go out to meet one's visitors.

VIII. 相似 "Resemblances"

2. 雅似措大饑寒則吟 "A raven, like a hard-up scholar, croaks when hungry and cold." To make the meaning clear, it should be explained that 吟 denotes not only the cry of birds but the humming over of verses in the act of composition.

IX. 不如不解 "Better Left Alone"

In all the sentences under this heading 解 must be taken to mean something like "understand", "be familiar with": 明 is one of the definitions given in K'ang Hsi. Cf. XXXV, 6: 奴婢解耕織 "hinds who can plough and maids who can weave.”

6. 士人解手藝則卑污 "When a scholar takes to trade he demeans himself."
Handicraft is not "trade" in the sense of buying and selling, but "a trade", that is to say, an occupation involving manual labour, a handicraft.

XI. 惣人 "Tantalizing"

"Vexatious" is a closer rendering, and at the same time it covers the sentences better, e.g. "inability to get rid of a worthless poor relation".

1. 遇佳味脾家不和 "Happening upon a delicious odour when one's liver is out of order."

佳味 is "a tasty dish". There is no reference to the sense of smell.

XII. 失本體 "The Name without the Reality"

Miss Edwards is very felicitous in her rendering of this difficult heading, but the sayings that follow would be improved by the insertion of the word "real", e.g. "A host who escorts a guest no further than the door is not a real host."

XV. 謊人語 "Exaggerations"

Better, "Misleading Statements."

3. 說在官課績 "To say that an official's service-record is taken into consideration."

My father suggests a simpler and more accurate rendering: "To say that official work gets its reward."

4. 說主上見知 "To say that the king understands." Miss Edwards was evidently puzzled as to the meaning of this sentence, and it is one of her few bad mistakes. My version would be: "To boast that one is on intimate terms with one's master."

6. 說愛寵年紀小 "To say that one's concubine is too young." "Too" tends to obscure the sense, which seems to be that a man will always try to make his mistress out younger than she really is.

XVI. 酸寒 "Incongruities"

This rendering has already been used, quite appropriately, for II, but is not so suitable here. "Sour-cold" usually stands for privation and poverty, but it is the humorous aspect of humble folk and their doings that is emphasized in these sayings. "Humours of Low Life" would fairly cover the instances given.
8. 乞兒駄雛 “A beggar shambling along.” The real meaning seems to be: “A beggar driving out the demon of pestilence,” that is, taking part in one of the processions organized to that end which are nowadays called 賽會. The spectacle of a Chinese beggar, whose filthy rags are a vehicle of infection, sharing in a spiritual campaign against pestilence, is one full of ironic humour.

XIX. 毀風景 “Desecration”

This is a particular form of desecration, namely, “spoiling the scenery” or the enjoyment of the beauties of nature. In this country we should have to add another example: “To leave litter about after a picnic”; but perhaps they were too civilized for that sort of thing in ancient China.

7. 石筍繫馬 “To tether a horse to a conical rock.” That does not sound a very reprehensible act, and one is driven to seek a more exact meaning for 石筍. According to Tz’ü Yüan, it denotes in the first place a natural pillar of stone much used as a decorative feature in laying out gardens and parks. These stones, varying in length from about one to three feet, are said to be found lying horizontally in the earth on the 黃山 Huang Mountains in southern Anhwei and other places. The 蜀志 Shu chih (quoted in Pei wen yün fu) speaks of specimens as much as thirty feet long and weighing 1,000 釧 chün (250 stone), erected as tombstones on the occasion of a royal funeral. A secondary meaning of shih hsün is “stalagmite”, which is less acceptable here because stalagmites are found only in caves, where there is no 風景 “landscape” to spoil.

XXI. 虚度 “Waste”

6. 貧家好花樹 “A poverty-stricken family with beautiful flowers.” This is hardly an example of “waste”. 好 is surely a verb here, so that the sentence would mean: “Poverty-stricken people who are fond of flowers”—but are unable to gratify their aesthetic tastes.

XXII. 不可過 “Unendurable”

2. 入舍妻惡 “To go home to a hating wife.” It seems better to read 恶 o, not 蠕: “To go home to an ill-tempered wife.”

4. 惡俗同僚 “Hatred for one’s everyday colleagues.” The same mistake occurs here. What is unendurable is not hatred for one’s colleagues but “evilly disposed colleagues” themselves.
XXIII. 難容 "Not Permissible"

Or, "Hard to put up with."

2. 僕人學措大體段 "Servants imitating scholars." The last character is not 側 shia but 舊 tuan, as given above: "Servants imitating the demeanour of scholars."

XXV. 惡模樣 "Bad Form"

3. 對大僚食吸 "To eat or smoke in the presence of superiors."

食吸 is simply "to smoke."

XXVI. 不達時宜 "Inopportune"

7. 誇男女伎能 "To flatter skill in children." "Cleverness" rather than skill is the word required: "To boast of one’s children’s cleverness."

8. 樂男女僨駢 "To encourage children to be petted and proud."

The translator seems to have been thinking of 駢, composed of the phonetic and radical, respectively, of the last two characters. "To encourage one’s children to be silly and spoilt."

9. 宴上包弾品味 "To monopolize the tit-bits at a banquet."

The phrase 包弾 means "to criticize (like) Pao (揚 Ch’êng)". For this worthy, better known as 龍圖 Lung-t’u, see Giles, Biog. Dict., 1621. He is said to have been a terrible martinet in matters of Court ceremonial. Translate, therefore, "To find fault with the dishes at a banquet."

16. 入人房窺取人物 "To enter private apartments or pick up another’s things to look at." I do not think that entering private apartments is to be treated here as a separate offence: "To pick up things and examine them in another person’s rooms." Cf. XXXI, 6.

XXVIII. 癡頽 "Stupidities"

7. 家貧強作富貴相 "Insolently to pose as wealthy when poor."

強 is here to be read in the third tone: "Trying hard to pose as wealthy when poor."

XXX. 時人漸頽狂 "Present-day Idiosyncrasies"

This is not forcible enough. Literally, the phrase means, "People of the day tinged with madness"; hence it might be rendered "Contemporary Crazes".
10. 將田宅與人作保 “Mortgaging one’s real estate on behalf of another.”
與人 must surely be “to another”, not “on behalf of another”. Translate simply: “Mortgaging house and land.”

XXXI. 非禮 “Improper”
2. 母在呼舅作渭陽 “To send a maternal uncle away during one’s mother’s lifetime.” This makes no sense. There is an allusion to Odes, 1, xi, 9: 我送舅氏日至渭陽 “I escorted my mother’s nephew to the north of the Wei”. Hence wei yang came to stand for the relationship between maternal uncle and nephew or, as here, maternal cousins. The sentence then means: “During one’s mother’s lifetime to hail her brother as a cousin”—thus showing scant respect to one of an elder generation.

XXXII. 枉屈 “Things Gone Agley”
12. 家藏書不解讀 “Having a library and not reading.” As we have already seen, 读 is equivalent to 聞: “not knowing how to read.” Cf. II, 3, IX passim, and XXXV, 6.
18. 有美質懶惰廢業 “Having a good constitution and wasting one’s patrimony by idling.”
質 refers not to physical but to intellectual endowments: “Possessing good natural gifts,” etc.

XXXIV. 須貧 “Poverty is inevitable when one . . .”
4. 作債追陪 “Borrows money in order to give entertainments.”
追 is very obscure. My father suggests that 賠 should be substituted for it: ”Incurs debts and duns debtors.”

XXXV. 必富 “Wealth is assured when one . . .”
4. 不迷酒色 “Is not self-indulgent.” This needs a little expansion, because there are many forms of self-indulgence: “Is not infatuated with wine and women.”
5. 不欠債負 “Does not borrow.”
We have here three words all of which can mean “to owe money”. 債 is a common locution, but a concatenation of three does not seem possible, so we are left with an unattached 負. I would suggest, therefore, that 負 is to be taken in its more usual sense of
"turn the back on"; and that the translation should run: "Does not repudiate debts." (See the entry 負欠 in Giles Dict. 1750; it is true that under 3743 the same phrase is said to mean "to owe money".)

11. 子弟一心 "Has children who are harmonious."
子弟 cannot very well mean children. "Has apprentices who work in harmony."

12. 主母不信佛 "Has not a mistress who believes in Buddha."

There is no need to transpose the negative; and 主母 is "the mistress of the household", not a concubine. Translate, therefore: "Has a wife who does not believe in Buddha"—and consequently does not waste her time at temples or the family substance in offerings.

18. 物料不作践 "Does not trample on goods." This might be expressed more clearly. The sentence seems to mean, "Does not maltreat his property," but the use of 物料 is certainly puzzling.

XXXVI. 有智能 "They are capable who . . ."

智 is the important member of the clause, and should not be omitted: "They are wise and capable who . . ."

7. 博古知今 "Judge the present from the past." I doubt if this sense can be got out of the words, which appear simply to mean: "Know the past and the present as well"—"are well versed in antiquity, but also know the world as it is."

13. 入門問諺 "Inquire what to avoid." This is much too vague. The phrase is given in Giles Dict. 5217: "When going into a family, inquire what are its tabooed words, etc."—so as to be able to avoid them.

17. 不共愚人爭是非 "Do not argue with every chance comer."

"Do not argue with fools" is both terser and more correct. Miss Edwards seems to have read 遇 instead of 愚.

XXXIX. 失去就 "Lapses"

1. 卸起卌共人言語 "Trying to be a Jack-of-all-trades."
Is not this a "lapse" on the part of the translator herself? I can see no objection to the obvious "Talking to people with one's hat off."

5. 席面上不擅沸唾 "Being careless about spitting."
"At table" should be added.
7. 開人家盤盒書敗 "Opening [other people's] boxes and letters." The words in brackets should be inserted.

XLI. 無見識 "Ignorance"

"Lack of Judgment" would be more suitable as a heading.

5. 縱兒子學樂藝 "To allow a son to indulge in dancing."

This is an indulgence not common enough in China to be the subject of a special admonition. But it is only a slip of the pen, for the text is clear: "To allow a son to take up music."
An Analytical Study of the Conjugations of Japanese Verbs and Adjectives

By S. Yoshitake

The morphology of the Japanese language has been explored most thoroughly within the confines of the language itself, as can be seen from the *Nihon Bunpōron*, one of the admirable publications of Professor T. Yamada's, and Mr. G. B. Sansom's excellent treatise, *An Historical Grammar of Japanese*. There are, nevertheless, various difficulties to be overcome, and many problems to be solved, if the ancient Japanese literature is to be better understood. Some of these obstacles have recently been pointed out by Professor J. L. Pierson in his scholarly work *The Manyōshū*, in which the author has submitted many a plausible theory based on materials offered by the Japanese language alone.

Very thorough though these studies are, the structure of the various bases of the Japanese verbs has never been explained. Moreover, the inter-relationship between the bases and their suffixes has always been treated as a matter of course, without arousing the least curiosity as to its causes. These intricate yet fundamental problems will never be solved so long as the Japanese language is studied independently. The reason for this is not far to seek.

It is universally recognized that Japanese is a mixed language wherein Turkish, Mongol, Manchu-Tungus and Austronesian elements present themselves. If these languages admit of independent consonants, as they actually do, what reason have we to assume that the Japanese consonants have always been inseparable from the vowels? Both the roots and the stems of many Japanese words may at one time have ended in a consonant. But once we separate the consonants from the vowels the Japanese language ceases to be Japanese as we know it. We must also acknowledge that the Japanese verbs and adjectives, as well as some of their suffixes, were formed many centuries or even millennia before the language came to be recorded in the Manyō period. In order, therefore, to explain the structure of the Japanese verbs and adjectives, we must perforce leave the domain of the Japanese language and grope in the black darkness. For this an assumption of some kind is inevitable.

Thus in the present inquiry I have assumed that the Japanese
language is genetically related to Turkish and Mongol, but has
developed along its own course preserving but a shadow of its identity.
Though tentative and admittedly crude, the present study may serve
as a working basis for a more extensive investigation with both Korean
and Luchuan taken into account, which languages I have been com-
pelled to disregard almost entirely for lack of space.

The following are the books and the articles quoted in the present
paper:

\textit{H.} = G. B. Sansom, \textit{An Historical Grammar of Japanese}. Oxford,
1928.


\textit{KKM.} = G. J. Ramstedt, \textit{Über die Konjugation des Khalkha-
Mongolischen}, MSFOu. xix. Helsingfors, 1903.

\textit{M.} = J. L. Pierson, jun., \textit{The Manyōšū}, translated and annotated,
Books i and ii. Leyden, 1929, 1931.

\textit{N.} = N. Poppe, \textit{Die Nominalstammbildungssuffixe im Mongolischen},

\textit{V.} = G. J. Ramstedt, \textit{Zur Verbstammbildungslehre der mongolisch-
türkischen Sprachen}, JSFOu. xxviii. Helsingfors, 1912.

I have adopted Professor Pierson’s transcription \textit{v} (bilabial voiced
fricative) for the current \textit{h} when in an intervocalic position, but have
used \textit{f} (bilabial voiceless fricative) in an initial position (cf. \textit{M.}, i,
pp. 38–43, 60–3).

\section{Conjugations of Verbs}

The Japanese verbs are usually divided into nine classes in
accordance with their conjugations: (1) Yodan, (2) Kami-nidan,
(3) Shimo-nidan, (4) Kami-ichidan, (5) Shimo-ichidan, (6) Kagyō-
henkaku, (7) Sagyō-henkaku, (8) Nagyō-henkaku, and (9) Ragyō-
henkaku. All these verbs have six different bases, some of which may
assume the same form. They are (1) Mizenkei, (2) Renyōkei, (3)
Shūshikei, (4) Rentaikei, (5) Izenkei, and (6) Meireikei. For
convenience of reference Sansom’s English versions (with certain
modifications) of these grammatical terms are here given within
parentheses.

1. Yodan (Quadrigrade) Verbs

The primary stem of these verbs regularly ends in a consonant,
to which the following vowels are added to form various bases. This
is called the first conjugation by Sansom.
(1) Mizenkei (Imperfect Form) -a Ex. yuk-a
(2) Renyōkei ( Conjunctive Form) -i yuk-i
(3) Shūshikei ( Predicative Form) -u yuk-u "to go"
(4) Rentaikai ( Attributive Form) -u yuk-u
(5) Izenkei ( Perfect Form) -e yuk-e
(6) Meireikei (—) -e yuk-e

Note that the Shūshikei and the Rentaikai are identical; so also the Izenkei and the Meireikei.

(1) The Mizenkei or the Imperfect Form is used, together with various suffixes, to indicate (i) the indicative future, (ii) hypothesis, (iii) the potential mood, (iv) the passive voice, (v) the causative mood, (vi) the optative mood, and (vii) negation. Of these different usages (i) and (ii) denote probability, whereas (iii), (iv), (v), and (vi) express potentiality. The seventh use must be treated independently as will be explained later (see ii, 1 f.). Thus it is clear that the final vowel -a of this base signifies possibility in the broadest sense of the word, but for lack of a better term I shall call it a "potential vowel". This vowel -a corresponds to Turkish -a- and Mongol -*ya- which are used in the formation of Ramstedt's "präskriptiv", "optativ", and "potential" (KKM., pp. 62-4, 70-3, 75-8). It may be added that Dr. Pierson considers the Japanese vowel -a to signify "being" (M., i, pp. 215-16).

(2) The Renyōkei or the Conjunctive Form is used, according to Sansom, "when it is desired to bring the idea expressed by the verb into the closest possible association with the idea expressed by another word." "Consequently," continues the grammarian, "its most specialized use is in the formation of compound words" (H., p. 137). The duties performed by the Renyōkei could be fulfilled by a nomen actionis, and hence the final vowel -i may be called a nomen actionis vowel. This vowel seems to have come from the same origin as the "Urtürkisch" -*γamas-*ge, from which Turkish -*γamas-*ge, Orkhonturkish -*γamas-*g, Altai -u, Osmanli -i, Yakut -i, (nomen actionis), Mongol -*γamas-*ge (nomen imperfecti), etc., have sprung (N., pp. 94-5, 118-19).

(3), (4) The Shūshikei or the Predicative Form may be treated together with the Rentaikai or the Attributive Form, since the two forms are marked by the same vowel -u. According to Sansom, the former is "the true verb form, used in principal sentences to predicate an action, property, or state of the subject" (H., p. 130). This,
however, is a later development of the function of the Shūshikei, which is nothing more than a noun in the broad sense of the word. In the expression, for example, misubeki kimi ga masu to ivanaku ni, which Professor Pierson has skillfully translated "this does not imply that my lord is still alive, to whom I could show it" (M., ii, p. 128), the word masu "to exist, be alive" can only be considered as a substantive since it immediately follows the genitive case of kimi "lord". The function of the Rentaikei or the Attributive Form is "to place a verb in an attributive relation to a substantive" and "it takes a position immediately preceding the substantive or substantival group which it qualifies" (H., p. 133). Thus the duties of the Shūshikei and the Rentaikei are those of a nomen futuri, and hence we may consider these two forms of this conjugation as identical. The final vowel -u and the suffix -ku (with which we shall meet in later paragraphs) appear to have come from -γu, from which also Uighur -γu ~ -gü, Turkish-Tatar "infinitive" suffix -γu ~ -gü, Mongol substantival suffix -γu ~ -gü, nomen futuri -qu ~ -kü, etc., have been derived (KKM., pp. 91-3; N., pp. 95, 119).

(5), (6) The Izenkei or the Perfect Form and the Meireikei, which is the Imperative Form, are marked by the same vowel -e. The Izenkei, which is used to form the conditional and the concessive moods, does not include a fragment of "tense-significance" as Sansom suspects (H., pp. 142-3). Both conditional and concessive concepts may be expressed by the imperative mood as, for example, "Love me, love my dog" and "Be that as it may,...". This is the reason why the Izenkei and the Meireikei are identical in form. The final vowel -e is a composite one, and comes from an earlier -a-*yi > -ai > -ä < -e, of which the -a is the potential vowel, as we have seen above, and -yi is the imperative suffix. Thus the vowel -e corresponds to -ayi-, -ayi- of the optative suffix -ayin, -ayin in Orkhonturkish, whereas the Mongol volitional suffixes -yu, -ya, etc. contain the same -y as in -a-*yi, from which the Japanese -e has been evolved (KKM., pp. 10-11, 73-5).

2. Kami-nidan (Upper Bigrade) Verbs

These verbs follow Sansom’s third conjugation, which is given, in the grammar, as follows:

(1) Mizenkei -i Ex. otši
(2) Renyōkei -i otši
(3) Shūshikei -u  ots-u "to fall"
(4) Rentaikei -uru  ots-uru
(5) Izenkei -ure  ots-ure
(6) Meireikei -i  otši

(1) The Mizenkei vowel -i is not a suffix, but is part of the primary stem of the verb. It has probably developed from the palatalization of the final consonant of the stem. The word otsu "to fall", for example, seems to have developed from the root *oᵗ, which gave rise to the secondary roots *ot, *ot', *or, *or', *oz, *os, etc. The secondary root *ot', after a series of changes *ot' > *oty > *otʃ, finally gave birth to the stem *otʃi ≥ otši. It is to be noted that in this class of verbs the Mizenkei does not take the potential vowel -a. But the Mizenkei never stands alone; it is always followed by a suffix or a particle. The absence of this all-important vowel -a for the Mizenkei is compensated for by the suffixes, as will be shown in later paragraphs.

(2) The Renyōkei is formed in exactly the same way from the primary stem ending in -i as in the case of Yodan verbs, thus -i + *i > -i. Or it may be that this base, like the Mizenkei, is the primary stem itself.

(3) The Shūshikei is derived from the primary stem by adding the nomen futuri vowel -*u, as in Yodan verbs, thus -i + *u > -u. (Compare: u = 见 anc. Chin. jiu.)

(4) The Rentaikei consists of the Shūshikei and the suffix -ru. The -u in this suffix is the nomen futuri vowel, whereas the -r- is a participial suffix corresponding to the -r in Osmanli "aorist" termination -r, -ir, -er, present-future participial termination -ir, -ur, -ar, Yakut nomen praesentis -ar, Khalkha Mongol "präskriptiv" -ārdā, -ārdā, Manchu present participial termination -ra, -re, -ro, etc. (KKM., pp. 62-4; N., pp. 121-2).

(5) The Izenkei differs from the Rentaikei in that the final -u is here replaced by -e, which has come from -*a-*yi as in the case of Yodan verbs. The probable reason for the insertion of the participial suffix -r- is that, in the case of the Rentaikei, it served to impart an adjectival force to the stem, while in the construction of the Izenkei it carried the concept of the perfect. But why was not the same distinction made in the formation of the Rentaikei and the Izenkei of the Yodan verb? The only answer seems to be that the two
conjugations are due to different linguistic habits, or that one of them, be it the Yodan or the Kami-nidan, is a later evolution.

(6) The Meireikei is composed of the stem ending in -i plus -*yi, without the potential vowel -*a, thus -i + *yi > -i.

3. Shimo-nidan (Lower Bigrade) Verbs

The conjugation of these verbs, called the second conjugation by Sansom, is given as follows:

(1) Mizenkei -e Ex. are
(2) Renyōkei -e are
(3) Shūshikei -u ar-u “to be born, be produced”
(4) Rentaikei -uru ar-uru
(5) Izenkei -ure ar-ure
(6) Meireikei -e are

This conjugation differs from the Kami-nidan, discussed above, only in that the -i in the Mizenkei, Renyōkei, and Meireikei is here replaced by -e. There are at least three possibilities as to the history of this vowel. It may have come from an open variety of -i, in which case the present conjugation can be regarded as a variant of the Kami-nidan conjugation. It is equally possible that the Mizenkei vowel -e was originally a back vowel, which, under the influence of the palatalization of the preceding consonant, became -ā = -e. Thus, for example, the verb aru “to be born” may have been derived from the primary root *ar, which gave rise to two secondary roots *ar and *arā. From the former, it would seem, developed the primary stem ara which is found in the adjective ara-ta-ši “fresh, new”, whilst the latter formed the stem *arā, which soon became *arā under the influence of -t. It may be argued then that in the Manyō period the Japanese ē resembled ēā, as is shown by the Manyō-gana (e.g. 列 re = anc. Chin. līā). But on the strength of such Manyō-gana as 家 (anc. Chin. ka), 價 (anc. Chin. ka), for ke, 霸 (anc. Chin. pa, p'ok) for fe, 駱 (anc. Chin. ma) for me, we must assume the existence of a very open variety of e, i.e. ē. If this supposition be accepted, we may consider the Mizenkei to be the stem itself. The remaining forms would then be derived as follows: Renyōkei -*ā + *i > -e (cf. 介 anc. Chin. kai for ke; 愛 anc. Chin. *ā for e), Shūshikei -*ā + *u > -u (cf. 豆, 頭 d'eu for dzu) and Meireikei -*ā + *yi > -e. The Rentaikei and the Izenkei consist of the Shūshikei plus the suffixes -ru and -re respectively, as in the Kami-nidan verbs. The third possibility is
that the stem ara had a parallel form *ara'i which became the stem are of the verb aru "to be born". The presence of the form tsugi as in imo ni tsugi koso "Pray, tell my love (that . . .)", besides tsuge as in ive ni tsuge koso "Pray, tell my family (that . . .)" (Manyō, xx), seems to speak for the first possibility, though the form tsugi may be purely dialectal.

4. Kami-ichidan (Upper Unigrade) Verbs

These verbs follow what is called the fourth conjugation by Sansom:

(1) Mizenkei -i Ex. mi
(2) Renyōkei -i mi
(3) Shūshikei -i-ru mi-ru "to see, look"
(4) Rentaikei -i-ru mi-ru
(5) Izenkei -i-re mi-re
(6) Meireikei -i mi

The conjugation may be treated in the same way as that of the Kami-nidan verbs, with the exception of the Shūshikei, which in the present case is marked by -ru instead of -u. The function of the -r- in the Shūshikei is not clear; it is quite possible that the Shūshikei suffix -ru is a later development, since the forms without this suffix also occur in the Manyōshū, e.g. mibeşi (xvii) and miramu (v) where mi is the Shūshikei of miru "to see, look" (cf. K., p. 241). However, that may be, the -i in this conjugation is not a suffix, but is part of the stem. Thus, in the case of miru "to see, look" its stem is mi, which appears to have evolved from *mu'i (or *muy), but not *mu as Sansom considers (II., p. 155).

5. Shimo-ichidan (Lower Unigrade) Verbs

The conjugation of these verbs seems to have originated in the Heian period. Ex. —

(1) Mizenkei ke (4) Rentaikei ke-ru
(2) Renyōkei ke (5) Izenkei ke-re
(3) Shūshikei ke-ru "to kick" (6) Meireikei ke

¹ In my article entitled "The History of the Japanese Particle i" (BSOS. Vol. V, Part IV) I stated that the final vowel -a, -o, and -u of certain substantives became -e and -i under the influence of the particle i which followed. This, however, is not the only possibility. It may be that in early Japanese many substantives ending in -a, -o, and -u had a parallel form ending in -*ai, -*oi, and -*uij respectively. The final -*j in these latter forms seems to intensify the substantival meaning, and thus the forms ending in -*j have been handed down as front vocalic varieties ending in -e and -i, whilst the shorter forms are preserved only in the attributive position. This, however, does not affect my views on the history of the particle i.
The conjugation is identical with the Kami-ichidan, the only difference being that the stem ends in -e in the present case. The stem of the verb keru "to kick" has come from *koy, which is preserved in the word akyoe "a spur (of a cock)", though Andō thinks that the ke of keru "to kick" was also pronounced ku and ko on the ground that the word kuwe "to kick" appears in the Nihongi (K., pp. 247–8). From reasons I cannot go into here, I definitely consider that the kuw of kuwe is a variant of *koy. The root *koy would give rise to ke inasmuch as the character 階 (anc. Chin. b'ūái) was used for transcribing be, and 梅, 味 (anc. Chin. muái) for me. Thus the earlier form of the verb keru "to kick" would certainly have been *koyu, which belonged to the Shimo-идан conjugation, although its conjugated forms are not preserved in literature. As an analogous case we may consider the Shimo-идан verb u "to get, be able". The root of this verb is *ey (or *āy), but not *ur as suggested by Kanazawa (cf. K., p. 236.). From the root *ey (or *āy) has been derived the stem e, which forms the Mizenkei of the verb u "to get, be able". The derivation of the remaining conjugated forms needs no explanation. Thus there is no material difference in the formation of the two verbs *koyu "to kick" (stem *koy) and u "to get, be able" (stem e < *ey or *āy).

6. Kagyō-henkaku Verb: ku "to come"

This verb conjugates as follows:—

(1) Mizenkei ko (4) Rentaikei kuru
(2) Renyōkei ki (5) Izenkei kure
(3) Shūshikei ku (6) Meireikei ko

The stem of this verb is probably *ku (or *kju), which would give rise to ko (< *ku + *u) for the Mizenkei, ki (< *ku + *i) for the Renyōkei, and ku (< *ku + *u) for the Shūshikei. The Rentaikei and the Izenkei are built on the Shūshikei with the additional suffixes -ru and -re as in some other conjugations. The Meireikei may be identical with the Mizenkei in its structure; or it may include the imperative suffix -yi, thus *ku + *a + *yi > *kuai > ko (cf. fo = 佇 anc. Chin. puái, b'ūái).

7. Sagyō-henkaku Verb: su "to do"

(1) Mizenkei se (4) Rentaikei suru
(2) Renyōkei shi (5) Izenkei sure
(3) Shūshikei su (6) Meireikei se
The stem of this verb appears to be *suĩ, which would give rise to the following forms: (1) Mizenkei *suĩ + *a > *sia > *sū > se, (2) Remyōkei *suĩ + *i > *sii > *si > ši, (3) Shūshikei *suĩ + *u > *siu > su (cf. su = 順 anc. Chin. siu), (4) Rentaikei *suĩ + *uru > *siuru > suru, (5) Izenkei *suĩ + *ure > *siure > sure, and (6) Meireikei *suĩ + *ayi > *siai > se (cf. se = 势 anc. Chin. šiai).

8. Nagyō-henkaku Verbs: šiū “to die” and inu “to go away”.

(1) Mizenkei šin-a in-a
(2) Remyōkei šin-i in-i
(3) Shūshikei šin-u in-u
(4) Rentaikei šin-uru in-uru
(5) Izenkei šin-ure in-ure
(6) Meireikei šin-e in-e

The conjugation calls for no comment, for it is a combination of the Yodan and the Nidan (or the Ichidan) conjugations. It may be noted, however, that all the disyllabic verbs whose stem ends in an n plus the vowel e belong to the Shimo-nidan conjugation. We may therefore suppose that the final stem consonant -n of śinu “to die” and inu “to go away” was never palatalized; otherwise these verbs would also have followed the Shimo-nidan conjugation.

9. Nagyō-henkaku Verb: aru “to exist”

(1) Mizenkei ar-a (4) Rentaikei ar-u
(2) Remyōkei ar-i (5) Izenkei ar-e
(3) Shūshikei ar-i (6) Meireikei ar-e

If the stem of this verb is *ar, then the conjugation differs from that of the Yodan verbs only in the Shūshikei, which in the present case is marked by the nomen actionis vowel -i, instead of the nomen futuri vowel -u as in the Yodan conjugation. This may be accounted for by the fact that there was a sporadic mutation between i and u in ancient Japanese. It is equally possible that the nomen futuri -*γu, from which -u and -ku have evolved, had a parallel form -*γu, which became -i, and was used to form the Shūshikei of aru “to exist”, whereas the usual nomen futuri vowel -u, which had a weaker substantival force, served to form the Rentaikei. This conjecture seems justifiable in the light of the mutation -a ~ -ai and -u ~ -ui in various suffixes both in Turkish and Mongol (KKM., pp. 68, 71, 83; in particular p. 89). It may be added that the verbs wori “to exist” and u “to exist” are related to aru “to exist”. The root of
the verb *ari seems to be *al, and that of *wor and *u is in all probability *wol. The latter, i.e. *wol, may have given birth to two secondary roots *wor and *wuy. The root *wor served as the stem of the Rahen verb *wor “to exist”, whilst the stem *wi of the defective Kami-

nidan verb *u (= *wu) “to exist” has been derived from *wuy. Thus I hold the usual explanation that *wor “to exist” is a compound of *wi (the Ren’yōkei of *u “to exist”) and *ari “to exist” as inaccurate.

II. Suffixes

1. Suffixes used with the Mizenkei

(a) -mu, -maši, -maku. The suffix -mu denotes probability of occurrence, and hence often serves to form the indicative future. It is composed of -m and the nomen futuri vowel -u. The suffix -m is used to form a nomen possibilitatis, and corresponds to the -m of the following suffixes in Khalkha Mongol:

(i) -mdzd ~ -ms, used to impart the signification “can, may, can be, etc.”, to the verb to which it is suffixed (KKM., pp. 12, 75–8).

(ii) -md (< -ma), -m, used to form a nomen descriptionis with the meaning “so (great, small, etc.) that . . . ” (KKM., pp. 37, 77, 94–5).

(iii) -mār ~ -mar, which forms a nomen agendi (or acturi) with the meaning “should be, can be” (KKM., pp. 38, 95–7).

(iv) -mχe ~ -mχi (< *maqai ~ *mekei), used in the formation of a nomen cupiditatis indicating proneness, inclination, or ability.

Although only the Mongol suffixes are here quoted, the suffix -m is common also to Turkish and Manchu-Tungus, as Dr. Ramstedt has shown.

The Japanese suffix -mu conjugates as follows:

(1) Mizenkei -ma
(2) Renyōkei —
(3) Shūshikei -mu
(4) Rentaikei -mu
(5) Izenkei -me
(6) Meireikei —

Of these the Mizenkei -ma is usually treated independently by the Japanese grammarians for some reason beyond my comprehension. It is used with -ši to indicate a desire. The suffix -ši (≤ *ši) in -maši is indivisible and, together with the preceding -a- (of -ma-), corresponds to the nomen possibilitatis -a-ši ~ -e-ši in Turkish (KKM., pp. 100–101, 75). The suffix -maši has three forms: Mizenkei -mase (< *masi + *a), Shūshikei and Rentaikei -maši (≤ *masi), and Izenkei -mašika, which last is a later development, possibly formed on the analogy of the Izenkei -šika of the preterite suffix -ši (cf. ii, 2, c.).
The suffix -maku is also used to form a nomen possibilitatis, consisting of the Mizenkei -ma of -mu and the nomen futuri -ku (cf. i, 1 (3), (4)). It corresponds to the Mongol nomen cupiditatis suffix cited above (iv).

The Izenkei -me of -mu undoubtedly consists of -m and -e (<-*a + *yi). Thus it is evident that the suffix -mu, as far as we can at present trace it back, has no connection with the verb miru "to see, look", as usually supposed (H., pp. 187–8).

(b) -yu, -ru. These suffixes were used to form passive and potential verbs in the Manyō period. Used with the Yodan verbs they were conjugated as follows:—

(1) Mizenkei -ye -re
(2) Renyokei -ye -re
(3) Shushikei -yu -ru
(4) Rentakei -yuru -ru
(5) Izenkei -yure -rure
(6) Meireikei -ye -re

In the earliest literature the forms in -y- occur much more frequently than those in -r-, although in later times the former fell out of general use. Both -y- and -r- appear to have come from the same origin as the Turkish suffix -l-, used in the formation of the passive verbs and the Mongol -l-, which serves to impart an intensive or iterative signification to the verb to which it is suffixed (V., §§ 4–7). It seems quite possible that both -y- and -r- in Japanese go back to an earlier -*l-, which gave rise to -l'- and -r-. The new stems with these suffixes followed the Shimo-nidan conjugation, as did the verb aru "to be born", which has been derived from the stem *ar (cf. i, 3). The form in -l'- would have then given rise to -*l'â (<-*l' + *a) for the Mizenkei, -*l'i (<-*l' + *i) for the Renyokei, -*l'e (<-*l' + *a + *yi) for the Shushikei, and -*l'u (<-*l' + *u) for the Meireikei, of which the three former were later reduced to -ye, whilst the -*l'u became -yu. The forms in -r- may be explained in a similar manner.

In the case of the Nidan and the Ichidan verbs, the suffix -ra- is inserted between the stem of the verb and the passive-potential suffix. It will be remembered that in the formation of the Mizenkei of the verbs whose stem ends in -i or -e the potential vowel -a is not used. It is to compensate for this loss, which is vital for the function of the Mizenkei, that the vowel -a is here inserted preceded by a binding consonant -r-.
Thus I consider that the -r- forms are equally as old as the -y-forms, although it is usually conjectured that the latter are the older of the two, apparently without any foundation. Nor can I agree with those grammarians who maintain that these suffixes and the Nidan and the Ichidan verbs contain arī "to exist" and u "to get, be able" (H., p. 160). Those who advance such a theory ought to explain (1) the reason why the -yu is suffixed to the Mizenkei, and not to the Renyōkei, and (2) the exact force of the assumed verbal elements in the Nidan and the Ichidan conjugations.

(c) -su, -šimu. These suffixes are used to form the causative mood. Suffixed to the Mizenkei of the Yodan verbs they follow the Shimonidan conjugation as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mizenkei</th>
<th>Renyōkei</th>
<th>Shūshikei</th>
<th>Rentaikei</th>
<th>Izenkei</th>
<th>Meireikei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-se</td>
<td>-šime</td>
<td>-šime</td>
<td>-šimu</td>
<td>-šimu</td>
<td>-šime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>su</td>
<td>-šime</td>
<td>-šime</td>
<td>-šimu</td>
<td>-šimu</td>
<td>-šimu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>su</td>
<td>-šime</td>
<td>-šime</td>
<td>-šimu</td>
<td>-šimu</td>
<td>-šime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>su</td>
<td>-šimu</td>
<td>-šimu</td>
<td>-šimu</td>
<td>-šimu</td>
<td>-šimu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td>-šimure</td>
<td>-šimure</td>
<td>-šimure</td>
<td>-šimure</td>
<td>-šimure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>su</td>
<td>-šime</td>
<td>-šime</td>
<td>-šime</td>
<td>-šime</td>
<td>-šime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The suffix -su is usually identified with the verb su "to do" (H., p. 164), but no attempt seems to have been made to explain why this suffix should be used with the Mizenkei of the verb. If -su is really of verbal origin, it should certainly be joined to the Renyōkei, but not to the Mizenkei. In my opinion the causative suffix -su has no relationship with su "to do". Both the -s- in this suffix and the -ši- of -šimu appear to have come from an earlier -*š or -*ši, which probably corresponds to the Mongol -tši- (<-*ti-) and the factitive suffix -t- in Turkish (V., §§ 24–6).

The hypothetical earlier form -*š, when followed by the potential vowel -*a, would give rise to the Mizenkei -se (≤ -*ša < -*š + *a) and, when followed by -*ayi, the Meireikei -se, whilst the formation of the Shūshikei, Rentaikei, and Izenkei can easily be explained. The Renyōkei -se, however, cannot be derived from -*š plus the nomen actionis vowel -*i, unless we suppose that the Renyōkei -se was pronounced at one time very like -si, which is not impossible.

There is a difficulty in determining the exact nature of the -m-in -šimu. If it is identical with the possibilitatis suffix -m discussed under ii, 1a, it must have been palatalized in the present case to have followed the Shimo-nidan conjugation. This conjecture seems to be supported by the fact that the suffix -šimu may be used with the
Mizenkei of all verbs, whereas the causative -su, when used with the
Nidan and the Ichidan verbs, must be preceded by -sa-, which consists
of the potential vowel -a and the binding consonant -s-. Thus we may
consider that the -m- in the former suffix plays the part of the -a-
in the latter.

(d) -su. This suffix differs from the causative -su in that it follows
the Yodan conjugation: Mizenkei -sa, Renyōkei -shi, Shūshikei and
Rentakei -su, Ikenkei and Meireikei -se. Modern native scholars
style it as "honorable" suffix, replacing the older term "honorable
causative". It is used for all persons, as the following clearly show.

(1) 1st person: wa ga tatasereba "while I am standing" (H.,
p. 164).

(2) 2nd person: na tsumasu ko "O girl picking (gathering) herbs"
(M., i, pp. 75–6).

(3) 3rd person: asobašiti šiši "the wild boar which he was pleased
to shoot" (H., p. 165).

Giving ten examples on the suffix -su, all taken from the earliest
literature, Mr. Sansom states that in them "one can trace no causative
meaning, but only an honorific sense, and that (e.g. in 2) is sometimes
doubtful". On this ground he concludes that "it is possible that the
verbs in -su had originally no causative meaning, but were merely
slightly emphatic, so that na tsumasu ko would perhaps correspond
to "maiden who dost pluck herbs" (H., p. 165). Professor Pierson,
on the other hand, admits the existence of the "honorable causative"
form, but prefers to consider tsumasu quoted above "to be tsuma,
a kind of nomen actionis, and su to do (or to be), 'to do a picking' or
'to do a handling'". (M., i, p. 76.)

Rather different is my interpretation, according to which the -s-
in this so-called honorific suffix is connected neither with su "to do"
nor with the causative suffix -su. It is a volitive-optative suffix
indicating willingness or eagerness for the action described by the verb,
without implying causation. It is probably of the same origin as the
-s in the Mongol optative suffixes -asd, etc. (Khalkha), -su, -suyai,
-yasuyai (Classical), the Turkish imperative (3rd pers.) -sun, etc., and
the conditional -so, as well as the Manchu imperative -su ~ -so
(KKM., pp. 9–10, 70–3, 114). Note that the -ā in -āsad and the -yā-
in -yasuyai are akin to the potential vowel -a in Japanese.

Thus the expression wa ga tatasereba, cited above, would mean
"while I am standing intently (or eagerly)" and na tsumasu ko "O
girl eagerly picking (or anxious to pick) herbs”. In this respect my interpretation somewhat resembles that of Mr. Sansom.

The last example quoted above is perhaps not appropriate for explaining my point, but the expression a wo matasuramu tšitšivavara va mo (Manyo, v) may be translated “O my father and mother who will be anxiously waiting for me” or “O my father and mother who will be pleased to wait for me”. It is from this latter meaning “to be pleased to . . .” that the honorific sense seems to have sprung.

The optative mood was indicated by the Mizenkei -sa plus -ne, thus -sane, as in na norasane “O and let me know your name” (M., i, pp. 75-6). The suffix -ne is in all probability identical with the Meireikei of -nu, which usually follows the Renyōkei, as will be explained later (ii, 2b). It is interesting to note that the optative use of the suffix -su is preserved in the Omorososhi (a Luchuan anthology dating from c. A.D. 1150-1650). The anthology, containing 1,551 songs, has but one love-song. In this we find the expressions ikiya šiyu and ikiya šiyo (written in the Kana), which have been translated by Mr. F. Ifa, the great Luchuan scholar, into Japanese ika ba ya “I should like to go” or ikôka “Shall I go?” Judging from the fact that in the same anthology the phrase iši ga “of the stone” is also written iši giya, I consider the two expressions under consideration to be the palatalized varieties (*ikya-šu and *ikya-šo) of *ika-su and *ika-so, which correspond to the Mizenkei ika of the Japanese verb iku “to go” and the volitive-optative suffix -su. In the light of the Luchuan parallel we may suspect that the suffix -su may also have been applied to the 1st person with an optative meaning in early Japanese, although such a use is not found in literature.

When the concept of desire was strongly felt, the Mizenkei which did not contain the potential vowel was deemed insufficient, and hence the vowel -a was added before suffixing the volitive-optative suffix -su. It is in this way that the so-called honorific verbs such as mesu (< mi + *asu) “to be pleased to see, rule”, and kesu (< ki + *asu) “to be pleased to put on (clothes)” have sprung, where mi and ki are the Mizenkei of miru “to see, look” and kiru “to put on (clothes)”. It must, however, be pointed out that in the expression wa ga keseru “my wearing” (Kojiki) the volitional force of -a which is contained in keseru (< ki + *asī + *aru) is so weak that this word hardly differs in meaning from keru (< ki + *aru). The fact that this is the only example where the signification of -su is completely obliterated leads us to suspect that the form keseru was
deliberately chosen in answer to the na ga keseru "thy wearing" in the preceding poem.

(e) -ku. This is a parallel form of the nomen futuri suffix -u (i, 1 (3), (4)). In the Manyo period it was used to form a modal participle, indicating (1) the possibility of occurrence, or (2) the mode of an action, or the state described by the word to which it was suffixed. It is for this reason that -ku was joined to the Mizenkei of the verbs and suffixes. Thus, for example, ume no vana tširaku va idzuku šikasuga ni kono Ki no yama ni yuki va furitsutsu (Manyo, v)—where tširaku is the modal participle of tširu "to be scattered"—may be translated "Wherever it be that the plum blossoms may be scattered, the snow is falling on this mountain of Ki." I consider, therefore, that Mr. Sansom's translation "have scattered" for tširaku is not appropriate, whilst Professor Yamada's interpretation as "scatter-place" is entirely unfounded (H., p. 149). The very common usage of the suffix under consideration is to indicate exactly how utterance is about to be (or was) made, thus introducing a direct quotation, e.g. itsuvarite mawosaku "..." to mawosu "what (he) told (Yamatotakeru) in pretence (was) '... ', thus (he) said" (Kojiki).

When used with the verbs other than the Yodan and the Rago- henkaku -ku was preceded by -ra-, as will be explained under ii, 3a. For the suffix -maku see ii, 1e above.

(f) -nu, -zu, -ži. According to the grammar these negative suffixes conjugate as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mizenkei</th>
<th>-nu</th>
<th>-zu</th>
<th>-ži</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Renyōkei</td>
<td>-ni</td>
<td>-zu</td>
<td>-ži</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Shūshikei</td>
<td>-zu</td>
<td>-ži</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Rentaikei</td>
<td>-nu</td>
<td>-ži</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Izenkei</td>
<td>-ne</td>
<td>-ži</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Meireikei</td>
<td>-ne</td>
<td>-ži</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The history of these suffixes is not at all clear. The -n may be related to Chuvash an "do not", Goldi and Olcha ana "not, without", Korean ani "do not!" etc. If so, we may assume that the -n has developed from -*an, taking into consideration na "do not", ina "No!" and ani "how should (could) . . . !" which last is used in an ironical construction. It would seem then that the -*a in -*an was of secondary nature, so that when the suffix -*an was used with a stem ending in a vowel the -*a was dropped, but when used with a stem ending in a consonant it was retained. Thus the Mizenkei
vowel -a of the Yodan verbs followed by -n may be part of the negative suffix *-an. This leads us to suppose that the negative adjective naši has been derived from *anaši, whose initial vowel *a was later dropped, probably due to the stress-shift. If this supposition be correct, the form nakenaku “the fact of not-being is not” (M., i, p. 219) would once have been *anakenaku, which may be analyzed as follows: *ana + ki + *ana + ku, where -ki and -ku are the Rentaireki and the Renyōkei of the adjective suffix -ki (cf. iii; iv, 1, below).

Still more puzzling is the identity of -zu and -ži. Although there may be some relationship between these suffixes and Osmanli dâyîl “is not”, Chaghataï tûigail “is not”, etc., whose initial consonants appear to go back to an earlier *δ, it is not easy to explain the birth of the two forms -zu and -ži in Japanese. Besides, the Mizenkei vowel is entirely unaccountable in this particular case. I would therefore reserve all these three negative suffixes for further consideration.

2. Suffixes used with the Renyōkei

(a) -tsu, -tari. The suffix -tsu indicates perfection of an action described by the verb, and follows the Shimo-nidan conjugation as shown below:

(1) Mizenkei -te  (4) Rentaireki -tsuru
(2) Renyōkei -te  (5) Izenkei -tsure
(3) Shûshikei -tsu  (6) Meireikei -te

This suffix has apparently come from an earlier -*ti or -*t', which would give rise to the above conjugation; the Renyōkei would once have been -*ti, which we can safely assume to have become -te. The assumed earlier form -*ti (or -*t') may be of the same origin as the Turkish preterite -di (-dî, -dü, -du), and the Mongol converbum perfecti -dzu (<- *dži), which latter occurs also in the preterite imperfect -džuquī in Classical Mongol (KKM., pp. 81-3, 106-7).

The Renyōkei -te, together with the verb arī “to exist”, formed a descriptive perfect suffix -tari (< -te + arī). From this formation we learn that when -te + arī became -tari the vowel -e must already have been -e or -a; otherwise -te + arī would have become -*teri in much the same way as -ki + arī > -keri and -si + arī > -seri (cf. H., pp. 185-7, 212-13).

(b) -nu. According to Mr. Sansom this suffix and -tsu, discussed above, “seem to have been used indifferently, even in the earliest
known practice.” He considers that “-tsu is rather more emphatic than -nu” (H., pp. 179–80). The suffix -nu is usually identified with the verb inu “to go away”, probably because both the suffix and the verb, besides having similar meanings, follow the Nagyő-henkakaku conjugation. Thus:

1. Mizenkei -na
2. Renyōkei -ni
3. Shūshikei -nu
4. Rentaikei -nuru
5. Izenkei -nure
6. Meireikei -ne

However, I am of opinion that the -n of -nu is related to the Mongol -n which was once used in the formation of verbal nouns, but which serves now to form the *converbum modale* (only indicated by the nasalization of the preceding vowel), and the imperfect present in the forms -n, -na, etc. (K.K.M., pp. 15–16, 48–9, 78–80, 108–10; N., pp. 97–8). In Turkish also -n was once used to form verbal nouns, but is now employed, together with -ya ~ -gā, to form the preterite participial suffix -yan ~ -gān (N., pp. 119–20). A comparative study of the Japanese suffix -nu with the copulative verb nari “to be” and the “archaic verb” nu “to be”, an ingenious invention due to the late Dr. Aston, is beyond the scope of the present paper, interesting though it would be.

(c) -ki, -ši. These preterite suffixes are conjugated as follows:

1. Mizenkei -ke *se
2. Renyōkei -ki
3. Shūshikei -ki *ši
4. Rentaikei -ki *ši
5. Izenkei -šika
6. Meireikei -ši

In the case of the verbs ku “to come” and su “to do”, -ki and -ši may also be suffixed to the Mizenkei, apparently to avoid the reduplication of ki and ši (cf. i, 6, 7 above).

The suffix -ki appears to go back to the same origin as the *nomen imperfecti* *-ya* (~ *-ge*) in Mongol, the preterite -ča (-če, -čo) or -ka (-ke, -ko) in Manchu, and probably also the Turkish imperfect gerundial suffix -a (K.K.M., pp. 25–7, 85–7).

Although not generally recognized, I think that -ke is the Mizenkei of -ki, as Mr. Sansom considers (H., pp. 183–4, 148–9). The -ke would then have been composed of -ki and the potential vowel *a*, thus -ki + *a > *ka = -ke. The usual contraction theory -ki + ara + ba > -keraba > -keba can only be regarded as highly improbable,
if not phonetically impossible, though -keri would in all probability be a compound of the Renyōkei of -ki and ari “to exist” (cf. H., p. 184). The form -keba and the compound suffixes -kemu and -kemashi are composed of the Mizenkei of -ki plus the particle ba and the suffixes -mu and -mashi respectively. These latter have already been explained under ii, 1a.

The suffix -ši is probably related to the nomen perfecti -sp (~ -sg) in Khalkha Mongol, which, together with the Classical Mongol form -ysan, goes back to -*γsαn. The preterite gerundial suffix -ksa, -ha in Tungus is said to have the same origin. The suffix -*γsα is also preserved in the converbum abtemporale -s̄r in Khalkha Mongol, denoting the idea “since, from the time when . . .” (KKM., pp. 27–9, 88–9; 54, 117–18). The earlier form of the Japanese -ši would have been -*ši, from which the Mizenkei -se was formed by the addition of the potential vowel -*a, thus -*ši + -*a > -*s̄a ≥ -se (cf. H., p. 183).

The modal participial suffix -šiku is composed of -ši and the nomen futuri -ku (cf. H., 147–8). The probable reason for choosing the Shūshikei in preference to the Mizenkei is that the form under consideration was chiefly used for indicating the mode of a past action, and hence the concept of potentiality was not strongly felt, e.g. wagimoko ga omoverišiku-ši omokage ni miyu “that sorrowful attitude of my sweetheart (towards our parting) appears in my vision of her” (Manyō, iv).

But in the formation of the Izenkei the potential vowel was deemed necessary, hence the evolution of -šika (< -*šiku + -*a). For examples see H., pp. 184–5.

3. Suffixes used with the Shūshikei

(a) -ramu, -raši; -raku. The suffixes -ramu and -raši are used in a conjectural description, and conjugate as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mizenkei</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renyōkei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shūshikei</td>
<td>-ramu</td>
<td>-raši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rentaikei</td>
<td>-ramu</td>
<td>-rašiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Izenkei</td>
<td>-rame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meireikei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“There can be little doubt,” says Mr. Sansom, “that -ramu is compounded of aru and the future suffix -mu” (H., p. 189). This, however, is not only very doubtful, but is almost impossible, because
-ramu is suffixed to the Shūshikei of a verb, which base is hardly ever followed by another verb. On the other hand, the Shūshikei does admit of suffixes in spite of Sansom’s statement that “Unlike the other forms of the simple conjugation, the Predicative cannot serve as a base for the construction of compound conjugational forms by the addition of suffixes, . . .” (H., p. 130.)

In fact the -r- in -ramu and -raši is the participial suffix, as we find in the Rentaikei and the Izenkei of the Nidan and the Ichidan verbs (cf. i, 2–5). The -a- in these suffixes is the potential vowel which we have frequently met, whereas the -mu is identical with that treated under ii, 1a, and -ši is the suffix used to form a nomen possibilitatis, also explained under ii, 1a. The suffix -ki in -rašiki appears to have evolved from -*kui, and to correspond to the Mongol -qai (〜-yai 〜-gei), which is used to form both adjectives and substantives (N., pp. 108–9). The corresponding Turkish -qai is considered by Mr. Poppe as a Mongol loan (N., p. 122).

The suffix -raku is used to form the modal participle of verbs, where the Mizenkei does not include the potential vowel -a (cf. ii, 1e). It consists of the participial suffix -r-, the potential vowel -a, and the nomen futuri -ku. Ex.: wotomera ga ime ni tsuguraku “what the girls told me in my dream is as follows” (Manyō, xvii). The suffix -raku may also follow the Shūshikei of -tsu and -nu (ii, 2a, b), i.e. -tsuraku and -nuraku, both of which are used to form a modal participle. Exs.: aššitsuraku mo nagaki kono yo wo “the possibility of my passing this long night” (Manyō, iv), yo no fukunuraku “the possibility of the advancing of the night” (Manyō, x).

(b) -meri, -beši. These two suffixes conjugate as follows:

1. Mizenkei — —
2. Renyōkei -meri -beku
3. Shūshikei -meri -beši
4. Rentaikei -meru -beki
5. Izenkei -mere -bekere
6. Meireikei — —

It will be seen from the above that -meri follows the conjugation of ari “to exist”, save the Mizenkei and the Meireikei, in which the suffix is lacking. This has led some grammarians to think that it includes the verb ari “to exist”. Indeed, Mr. Sansom states: “It is doubtless a compound of -mu, the future suffix, and ari, analogous in formation with -keri” (H., p. 188). This, on the contrary, is
extremely doubtful, and can even be considered impossible for two reasons. First, the suffix -mu is wanting in the Renyōkei, and hence cannot be followed directly by another verb. Secondly, the form -mu, when followed by ari, can hardly become -meri.

However, it is evident that the -m of -meri is identical with that in the suffix -mu (ii, 1a). It seems that -me- goes back to an earlier -*maį*, where -āį- is a secondary suffix, with a specialized function of indicating appearance. The -ri is probably composed of the participial suffix -r- and the nomen actionis vowel -i. Both the Rentaikei and the Izenkei contain the same -r- which, in the case of the former, is followed by the nomen futuri vowel -u, and in the latter by the Izenkei vowel -e (< -*a* + -*yi*).

The suffix -beši consists of -be- and -ši. The former appears to be a variant of the -me- in -meri and to have evolved from -*baį* (≈ -*maį*). It serves to indicate expectation, propriety, or reasonableness with the meaning “should, ought to, must”. The component suffixes -ši and -ki are identical with those in -raši and -rašiki (ii, 3a), whereas -ku is formed of the -ki and the nomen futuri vowel -u.

The Izenkei -bekere is composed of the Rentaikei -beki and the Izenkei vowel -e (< -*a* + -*yi*), thus -beki + -*a* + -*yi* > -*bekiai* > -beke, followed by the intensifying suffix -re. This sign of intensification corresponds to the Mongol ele (la, le) which, together with the preterite -be (< -ba), forms the converbum conditionale -bele (≈ -bala) (KKM., pp. 44–5, 104–5). Of the same origin as the suffix -re are the -re in kore “this”, etc., the intensifying -ra (-ro) in yo-ra “the night”, Okura-ra “Okura, indeed”, etc., in Japanese, the enclitic -l in Osmanli șol “that”, ol “that (yonder)”, Chuvash leța (< -*ele-si*) “that”, and so forth. For the various usages of the Japanese intensifying suffixes -re, -ra, -ro, see K., pp. 268–70. Thus I consider the suffix -re in -bekere to be of different origin from the -re in the Izenkei of some verbs and verbal suffixes (cf. i, 2 (5); ii, 1b, c; ii, 2a, b).

(c) -maži. This negative suffix conjugates as follows:—

(1) Mizenkei —
(2) Renyōkei -mažiku
(3) Shūshikei -maži
(4) Rentaikei -mažiki
(5) Izenkei -mažikere
(6) Meireikei —

The -ma- is the Mizenkei of the suffix -mu (ii, 1a), whilst the -ži is the Shūshikei of -ži (ii, 1f). The -ki in the Rentaikei is identical with the -ki in -rašiki (ii, 3a), and the -ku in the Renyōkei has been
derived from the same -ki and the nomen futuri -u. The Izenkei consists of the Rentaikei plus the Izenkei vowel -e (<-*a + *yi) and the intensifying suffix -re, as in the case of -bekere (ii, 3b).

III. Conjugation of Adjectives

Japanese adjectives are usually divided into two classes according as their stem does or does not end in -si. In the grammars the conjugation of the adjectives whose stem does not end in -si is given as follows:

(1) Mizenkei —
(2) Renyōkei -ku
(3) Shūshikei -ši
(4) Rentaikei -ki
(5) Izenkei -kere
(6) Meireikei —

The adjectives whose stem ends in -ši do not take -ši in the Shūshikei, the remaining forms being identical.

The Shūshikei suffix -ši is nothing else than the -ši in -maši (ii, 1a) and -raši (ii, 3a), i.e. a nomen possibilitatis suffix. It goes back to an earlier -*si and corresponds to the Manchu adjectival suffix -su (KKM., p. 101). The transition from the basic meaning of possibility to that of qualification or quality can be easily explained by an intermediate concept of capacity, and hence the application of the nomen possibilitatis suffix -*si in the formation of an adjective should excite no wonder.

The suffix -ki can likewise be identified with the -ki in rašiki and, as we have already seen, goes back to an earlier -*kuij (ii, 3a). The presence of the form in -ke as in kokoda kanašike “I love her so” (besides kokoda kovišiki “I long for her so”) and nagake kono yo wo “this long night”, the former in the Adzuma-uta (Manyō, xiv), and the latter in the Sakimori-uta (Manyō, xx), leads us to suppose that the suffix -ki had a variant -ke, which would have come from -*kaij. We may therefore assume the mutation -*kaij ~ -*kaij in early Japanese.

The Renyōkei -ku is formed of the Rentaikei and the nomen futuri vowel -u. Together with the verb ari “to exist”, it forms the suffix -kari, which follows the conjugation of ari.

The Izenkei suffix -kere is identical with that in -bekere and -mažikere (ii, 3b, c), that is to say, the final -re is an intensifying suffix, and is not derived from the verb ari “to exist”, as Sanssom considers (H., pp. 97, 108). That the suffix -re is not an essential part of the Izenkei -kere can be seen from such usages as tovoke
ba "as (the way) is long" (Manyō, xvii) and sagašike do "though precipitous" (Kojiki), where the intensifying suffix -re is not used (cf. K., p. 273).

IV. SUFFIXES USED WITH STEMS OF ADJECTIVES

1. -keku, -kemu

Mr. Sansom considers that the Mizenkei of adjectives was indicated by the suffix -ku, e.g. kowe naku ba "were it not for the voice", kašikoku tomo "although fearfully", and remarks that "the existence of an Imperfect Form is denied by many authorities, who state that samuku ba, for instance, is an elided form of samuku araba, where samuku is the usual conjunctive form" (H., pp. 107–8).

In my judgment Mr. Sansom is right in considering the Mizenkei to have been marked by -ku. But this is a comparatively later development. The Mizenkei was at one time indicated by -ke, which is formed of the Rentaikai -ki and the potential vowel -*a, thus -ki + -*a > -*kā ≥ -ke. The final vowel -e may once have been -*ā, as can be inferred from such examples as masaka șī yoka ba "if only the present is well" (Manyō, xiv), where -ke is replaced by -ka, although this latter form may be purely dialectal (cf. K., pp. 268, 271; H., p. 205). The -ke (≤ -*kā, or -ka) as the Mizenkei suffix became regularly weakened to -ku, leaving a few such instances as kovišike ba "if you yearn for me" (Manyō, xiv) (cf. iii, above).

Moreover, the earlier form -ke was preserved in the Manyō period in the suffixes -keku and -kemu, where -ku is the nomen futuri suffix and -mu is identical with the nomen possibilitatis -mu (ii, 1a). It has been considered that the form, for instance, yokeku "good result, effect" has been derived from yoku aru koto, which cannot become anything shorter than yokaruko(to). The entire disappearance of -ru- and the change from -a- to -e- are then unaccountable. To overcome this difficulty Professor Pierson has suggested that the -ke in the cases under consideration may just as well have been -*ka or -*kā, since it is often written with the character 家 (Kan-on ka, Go-on ke, anc. Chin. ka) (M. i, pp. 33–4; ii, pp. 80–1, 224–5, etc.). This does not explain the falling off of the syllable -ru-, but it incidentally supports my derivation of the suffix -ke as put forward above.

The exact force of the suffix -keku, like that of -(a)ku, has never been understood properly. The -keku stands in the same relation to the modal participial suffix -(a)ku as does -kemu to the nomen
possibilitatis suffix -(a)mu. Thus, for example, mi no ovokeku wo (Kojiki) does not mean "one that is fleshy", as usually interpreted, but signifies "one that appears fleshy". For further examples with inaccurate renderings see H., pp. 147, 149, 205; for the contraction theory see H., pp. 204–5.

2. -mi

This suffix is considered by Mr. Sansom as "the conjunctive form of a termination, mu, of certain derived verbs", such as ayašimu "to suspect" (ayaši "suspicious") and itamu "to be painful" (itaši "painful") (H., pp. 294–5). Both Professor Andō and Professor Yamada hold a similar view (K., pp. 205–8). Dr. Pierson, on the other hand, after a very thorough study of the suffix -mi, has arrived at the conclusion that it is the Renyōkei of an obsolete verb *mu "to see as, regard as, consider as", from which the verb miru "to see" has developed, giving an exceedingly interesting psychological interpretation of this suffix (M., i, pp. 86–7; ii, pp. 13–16). The explanation thus offered by Professor Pierson is, indeed, an admirable one, and on the whole entails no contradiction.

However, before we accept either theory the following questions must be answered:—

(1) If this -mi is of verbal origin or related to the verb-formative suffix -mu, how is it that we invariably find it in this particular form? There is nothing to show that it has ever been conjugated.

(2) Is there any material difference between naši in ito mo sube naši "Indeed there is no means (to stop him from going away)" (Manyō, xx) and nami in ito mo sube nami yatabi sode furu "There is nothing for it but to keep on waving my sleeves" (Manyō, xx)?

(3) In the example wagimoko wo aviširašimeši fito wo koso kovi no masare ba uramešimi move "My love has grown intense; for this I feel resentment against the person who first introduced the girl to me" (Manyō, iv), can we not replace uramešimi by uramešiku?

It is certainly very strange that we do not come across any other conjugated forms of -mi, if this is really of verbal origin or the Renyōkei of the formative suffix -mu. Further, there is not the slightest difference in the actual meaning between naši and nami, except that the latter is dependent on what follows it. Thirdly, the word uramešimi does not contain the meaning "considering, regarding"; if it does the word move "I consider" would be a tautology. Even if such a reduplication be admissible, there is no doubt that the word
uramešimi in the present context can be replaced by the ordinary Renyökei uramešiku.

From these reasons I consider -mi as a pure suffix with the meaning "(it) being . . ., because (it) is . . ., so . . . (that . . .)". This suffix seems to have come from an earlier -*mi which corresponds to the nomen descriptionis -ma, -m in Khalkha Mongol, and Osmanli nomen actionis -ma ~ -mā (N., pp. 102, 120–1). Thus for the sake of convenience -mi may be called the descriptive gerundial suffix. Although Mr. Poppe treats some of the Mongol suffixes quoted under ii, 1a as indivisible, I am inclined to think that they all contain the same -m- as found in the Japanese nomen possibilitatis -mu and the suffix -mi under consideration.

On the other hand, the suffix -mi must be clearly distinguished from the verb-formative suffix -mu, although both Professor Andō and Professor Yamada find a close relationship between them (K., pp. 205–8). The latter suffix seems to have been derived from an earlier -*β, from which -bu, -buru, -gu, and -garu have also sprung.

It must be pointed out that the form in -mi is often preceded by the particle wo, which is considered as the sign of the objective case by those scholars who maintain that this form is a transitive verb (H., p. 294; M., i, p. 86). This, I think, is a great mistake. For example, in the poem aki no yo wo nagami ni ka aramu nazo kokoba i no nerayenu mo fitori nureba ka (Manyō, xv), if nagami is a transitive verb, it can only mean "lengthening", or "considering . . . as long" (as Professor Pierson would interpret it), but neither makes any sense. If, on the other hand, we translate the poem "Why can I not sleep like this; is it because I am lying down alone, or perhaps because the autumn night is long?" the meaning is perfectly clear. Accordingly, the present usage of wo must be held as one of those already multifarious functions of this strange particle, but not as the sign of the objective case.

It may also be added that although the suffix -mi seems to have evolved from an earlier -*mi, and the stem of the verb miru "to see, look" from *mi, the two have no connection with one another, since -mi consists of the two suffixes -m and -i (< -*mi), whereas the mi of miru is the indivisible stem.

V. CONCLUSION

It has been suggested by some scholars that the oldest conjugation of the Japanese verbs is the Yodan. The chief reasons for this
conclusion appear to be (1) that there are many Nidan verbs which once followed the Yodan conjugation, and (2) that the Nidan and the Ichidan conjugations are formed from the Yodan by the addition of the verbs ari "to exist" and u "to get" (cf. K., pp. 232–7). Mr. Sansom, on the other hand, after tracing the development of the conjugations, has concluded that "the original conjugation of most, if not all, Japanese verbs was of the type shinu, shinuru, shini, shina"., i.e. the Nagyō-henkaku conjugation (H., p. 153). Somewhat different are the views expressed by Professor Andō, who maintains that all the words that describe an action or a state in Japanese have developed from open monosyllabic roots, (1) by the vocalic changes in the root, (2) by the combination of two or more roots, (3) by the addition of some formative elements, and (4) by changing the final vowels (K., p. 242). He has also suggested in one of his recent articles that the Renyōkei is the basic form from which the remaining conjugated forms of verbs and adjectives have been derived.¹

Our analysis tends to show that there were at least two distinct conjugations of verbs in early Japanese: one for those whose stem ended in an unpalatalized consonant and another for those whose stem ended in a palatalized consonant or a vowel. With our present knowledge of the language it is absolutely impossible to reduce them to a single conjugation, be it the Yodan or the one suggested by Sansom. Nor is it possible to trace all the Japanese verbs and adjectives to an open monosyllabic root. To illustrate this latter point we may consider the verb otsu "to fall". When examining the Kami-nidan conjugation I assumed the root of this verb to be *ot', which, together with other roots *ot, *or, *or', *oz, *os, etc., has developed from the primary root *oDia (cf. i, 3). These secondary roots may have given birth to the following words:—

(1) *ot: oto-ru "to be inferior", oto- "small, younger", etc.
(2) *ot': otsu "to fall".
(3) *or: oru "a little", oro-ka "stupidity", oro-ku "to become stupid".
(4) *or': oru "to descend", oru "to be (become) stupid".
(5) *oz: ozo "dullness, stupidity".
(6) *os: oso-ši "dull, slow".

It is quite easy to say that all these go back to *o, but when even the relationship between these secondary roots is disputable, as at present, it would be more appropriate, though equally uncertain, to consider the primary root of these words to be *o plus a certain dental consonant, e.g. *δ.

It is also doubtful whether the Renyōkei served as the basic form of all the conjugations, in spite of Professor Andō's opinion quoted above. In the case at least of the Yodan conjugation the Renyōkei seems to have nothing to do with the remaining forms.

The most interesting of all the bases is perhaps the Izenkei which, together with the word koso, formed a linguistic convention known as the Kakari-musubi. Under this convention, when the grammatical subject is followed by koso, the Shūshikei is replaced by the Izenkei. Although in later times this practice became universal, both with verbs and adjectives, it was strictly limited to the verbs in the Manyō period. According to our analysis the final vowel -e of the Izenkei suffix consists of the potential vowel -*a and the imperative -*yi. This at once leads us to suppose that the word koso in this construction is related to the verb kusu "to wish, desire", but not of demonstrative origin, because both -*a and -*yi, of which the Izenkei vowel -e is composed, fulfil the functions demanded by the optative mood.

The inter-relationship between the bases and their suffixes may be summed up by saying (1) that the Mizenkei, which is a potential base, is used with various suffixes to denote potentiality or possibility, (2) that the Shūshikei, being a nomen futuri, is employed with various suffixes to indicate probability, and (3) that the Renyōkei, which is a nomen actionis, is the only suitable base for building perfect and preterite forms.
The Number “A Hundred” in Sino-Tibetan

By J. Przyluski and G. H. Luce

In their Notes d’Etymologie Taî, published in 1926 in the Journal of the Siam Society, vol. xx, pt. i, MM. J. Burnay and G. Cœdès have compared the various Taî words meaning “a hundred”. Ahom pāk, Shan pāk₁, Khamti pāk₁, White Taî pāk₁, Thô pāk₁, Nùng pāk₁, Diôi pā₁—all go back to a form *pāk, which is very close to the sixth century Chinese (pōk).¹ MM. Burnay and Cœdès draw this just conclusion (I translate): “As for the basic form on which Ahom pāk, etc., rest, it seems impossible—in view of its wide extension in Taî, and, in addition, the exact correspondence of the tones—not to assign it to the original Taî language or, at least, to the period of Taî union; it seems also impossible to separate it from Old Chinese pak. It remains to determine if we have here a borrowing by original Taî from Chinese, or a form common alike to Taî and to Chinese: this question remains untouched.”

The next step, it seems, should be to compare, with Chinese and Taî, some forms at least of Tibeto-Burman.

Side by side with classical Tibetan brgya, we have Balti rgyā, Purik rjā, Ladakhi rgya. The other Tibetan dialects have gya.²

In Burmese, on the other hand, we have twelfth century ryā,³ modern rā (pronounced ŋā).⁴

We see that the final guttural, which is conserved both in Chinese and in Taî, has disappeared in Old Burmese and in the Tibetan dialects. As for the initial labial, which appears as a surd p in Chinese and in Taî, it reappears in classical Tibetan as a sonant, but is absent in Old Burmese and in the Tibetan dialects. The medial group, so complex in the classical Tibetan -rgya, becomes ryā in Old Burmese, and is reduced to a single vowel in Chinese and in Taî.

Various Southern Chin dialects still keep a trace of the initial

---

² Grierson, Linguistic Survey of India, vol. iii, pt. i.
³ Epigraphia Birmanica, vol. i, pt. i, p. 23 (Myazedi Inscr., Pillar A, l. 2).
⁴ We can hardly question the common origin of the Tibeto-Burman and Tai-Chinese forms, in view of the closely similar series for the number “eight”, which is in classical Tibetan brgyad; in eleventh-twelfth century Burmese het, qhat, hyat, or rhac; in sixth century Chinese p'at, in Siamese from the thirteenth century pêt.
labial: in Yawdwin it is a surd as in Chinese -pra; Chinbok has p'ya. We can compare also Gyarung paryé and Mikir p'dró.¹

In the Northern Chin dialects the medial group appears to be contracted into zā, jā, jhā, or reduced merely to ya. In the Kuki dialects the same medial group gives Pūrūm riyāḥ; Hirōi, Lamgāng arja; Rāngkhōl and Langrong rajā. Compare also Pānkhū rajā (Central Chin sub-group).²

Finally, in two Aka forms cited by Hodson ³: phogua and purrua, a vocalic element is inserted between the initial labial and the medial group. These forms are particularly instructive because, classical Tibetan bragya being practically unpronounceable, we must probably assume the existence of an old vowel after the initial. Compare Gyarung paryé and Mikir p'dró.

In the light of all these indications it seems possible to reconstruct for original Sino-Tibetan some such form as *pargyak.⁴ The final and the initial are well conserved in Chinese and in Taī, while the Tibeto-Burman languages preserve better, in general, the medial element.

We are thus led to suppose, at the base of some modern words, a complex of at least two syllables. Neither Taī nor Chinese permit us to guess it. It is thus apparent that the mere comparison of Chinese and Taī does not carry us very far back.

¹ Houghton, Essay on the Language of the Southern Chins, p. 86, s.v. p'ydā.
⁴ Or *parugyak; for in view of such forms as Mikir p'dró, Aka phogua, purrua, E. Daña lāy, Chulikata Mishmi matū, it still seems doubtful if Siamese rôy, Laotian and Black Taī hón, do not themselves go back to the same common origin as pak.
Bhāgavatism and Sun-Worship

By S. K. De

In his article on The Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas published in the Indian Antiquary, September, 1908, Grierson put forward a somewhat remarkable hypothesis (pp. 253–4) of the solar origin of Bhāgavatism. The view does not appear to have attracted much notice from scholars competent to pronounce an opinion on the subject; but it has neither been directly approved nor directly discredited. Since the theory has been repeated by Grierson in his article on Bhakti-mārga in Hastings’ Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics ii, p. 540, where he practically reproduces his previous statements and arguments, a few remarks on the question may be offered.

Grierson very clearly states his position when he says: “We have no literary evidence as to the train of reasoning by which this doctrine (i.e. the monotheistic bhakti-doctrine of the Bhāgavata religion) was reached, but to me it appears more than probable that it was a development of the Sun-worship that was the common heritage of both branches of the Aryan people—the Eranian and the Indian.” His relevant arguments may be summarised thus: (i) All the legends dealing with the origins of the Bhāgavata religion are connected in some way or other with the sun. (ii) Some of the exponents, incarnations, or devotees of the cult are either descendants of the sun or connected therewith. (iii) The Bhāgavata eschatology lays down that the liberated souls first of all pass through the sun on its way to the Bhagavat. (iv) The Bhagavat is identified with Viṣṇu, who was originally a sun-god.

One wishes that most of the obscure ideas in Indian religious history could be traced back so clearly and definitely; but, unfortunately, the available data forbid us to make such a summary reconstruction. It is not necessary to trace here the development of bhakti-ideas, whether monotheistic or otherwise, in early Indian literature; for competent scholars have already brought forward enough evidence to show that these ideas can be traced back to remote antiquity and that they had no connection, in their origin or development, with sun-worship. The inchoate bhakti-ideas in Vedic literature are not connected with any of its five or six solar deities, not even with Viṣṇu; but centre chiefly round the more ethical Varuṇa, who is associated indeed with the solar Mitra, but whose origin is admittedly
obscure. Not even Mitra could attain the supreme eminence of his Iranian double, but merged his Vedic individuality in that of his greater associate Varuṇa. The Iranian cult may have developed as sun-worship, but no such cult centred round the Vedic Mitra. If some hymns of a devotional character are addressed to Aditi and the Ādityas, it is done chiefly through their connection with Varuṇa and through their more pronounced ethical character as deities of grace and benevolence. In the only Upaniṣad in which theistic devotionalism of a somewhat sectarian character is prominent and unmistakable, and which directly employs the term bhakti, it is connected not with a solar god but with Rudra-Śiva, a deity of entirely different origin. Our data may not be enough to determine the exact train of ideas through which the bhakti- doctrine developed in Bhāgavatism; but it is clear that the traces of the idea in early Indian literature are independent of any original or developed trait of sun-worship.

It is likewise unnecessary for us to trace in detail the early history of monotheistic ideas in Indian religious history. We have enough evidence now to show that it is too hasty a generalisation to regard Indian monotheism as a development of sun-worship. Heliolatry is very ancient in India, and no one would deny that certain mythological figures are perhaps solar in origin. Solar myths can also be traced in some of the Indian religious cults and legends of admittedly independent origin. Some elements even of the Buddha legend, as Senart has demonstrated, can be derived from solar cults. All this may be admitted; but they cannot prove any direct or inner connection of Indian monotheism, which has a long and independent history, with any form of sun-worship. Indeed, no student of Indian religion will seriously maintain to-day that Indian monotheism, the history of which can be traced back to Vedic times, where it cannot be shown to have any connection with any of the Vedic sun-gods, is a form of heliolatry, either in its origin or in its development, even assuming the influence or contamination of solar legends and solar cults.

1 Whether bhakti in its earlier historical stages was at all monotheistic is a question which, as Miss Mrinal Das Gupta (IHQ. vi, 1930, pp. 331–3) has already shown, is extremely debatable. Early Indian monotheism need not have been a purely ethical doctrine, centring round devotional ideas; it was also speculative and ritualistic, as evidenced by the Agni-Brahmaṇaspati-Hiranyagarbha-Prajāpati hymns and by later Brāhmaṇic and theosophic theories. The idea of the All-god and the One-god must, however, be distinguished.
Even the earliest traces of Bhāgavatism as a popular cult of Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa-Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva do not betray any such connection. While the legendary, euhemeristic, and Brāhmaṇic elements in the frankly obscure histories of Nārāyaṇa, Kṛṣṇa and Vāsudeva do not involve any reference to a solar deity, the generally accepted solar origin of Viṣṇu proves nothing. Though his original solar character and his cosmic association with light, life, and blessedness may have helped to raise him to his later eminence, it has yet scarcely anything to do with his epic character as a sectarian god of Viṣṇuism, Nārāyaṇism or Bhāgavatism. Even if strong traces of his solar origin are still retained in the epic conception of this deity in his many epithets, adventures, and direct identification with the sun, he is still not a solar god in the epic, but an entirely new mythological being, transformed by new myths and legends, and re-shaped by philosophy, mysticism, and practice of piety, as well as by a complex body of superstition, custom, and sentiment.

Nor is epic Viṣṇuism anywhere a form of sun-worship. There are Sauras or sun-worshippers in the epic itself, but these stand apart from the Viṣṇuites, Nārāyaṇīyas, or Bhāgavatas. If bhākti for the Sun-god is described (in special connection with the story of Karna) in MBh. iii, 301, 1 f., the epic sectarianism was elastic enough to admit, as occasion arises, bhākti for Śiva or Brahmā, as well as for a host of other deities. Not much capital need be made out of the myths or traditions which declare that the Sātvatas or Pāncaarātras derive their doctrine from the Sun himself (xii, 335, 19; 339, 119f.; 348, 59), or that they have a faith (curiously connected with what is called Sāṃkhya-Yoga) taught to Sarasvatī by the Sun (xii, 318, 3–6), or that the emancipated souls pass through the sun-door to Nārāyaṇa (xii, 344, 14f.). These stories or statements are somewhat qualified in the epic itself; for all the different mythical accounts of the origin of the Pāncaarātra-Nārāyaṇīya-Sātvata-Bhāgavata religion agree in deriving the doctrine directly from Nārāyaṇa himself or from the Bhagavat; the Sun in the form of Sūrya or Vivasvat being only one of the secondary recipients and promulgators (339, 110–12 and 118–21; 348, 44f.). These statements, however, are on a par with those made in the Bhagavadvadgītā itself (iv, 1–3) that the doctrine was

1 The antiquity and the indigenous character of the worship of the Saura cult must be admitted; but foreign influence, chiefly from Iranian sources, on the later development of the cult is also probable (see R. G. Bhandarkar, Vaishnavism, etc., §§ 114–16).
originally communicated to Vivasvat, or that those who die while the sun is in his uttarāyanā go to Brahman (ix, 24). These legends and beliefs undoubtedly show the influence of solar myths or solar cults on Pāñcarātra or Bhāgavatism, but they do not prove that its monotheistic doctrine of bhakti was derived from sun-worship. The same remarks must also apply to Vaiṣṇava hagiology, which connects its saints and incarnations with solar myths. The sources of an Acta Sanctorum are always diverse and polygenous. By a curious process of religious syncretism, the epic Viṣṇu as the supreme deity, as well as Viṣṇuism, absorbed older myths and legends (e.g. the cosmogonic myths of Prajāpati) and put on newer mythical identifications. The influence of independent Saura sects or Saura cults, as well as the residues of the original conception of Viṣṇu as a solar god, must have something to do with all this; and the easy-going religious attitude of the epic, with its theory of manifestations or incarnations and with its accommodating philosophical doctrine, which believed in unity but allowed its temporary personifications as diversity, did not disdain conscious or unconscious contaminations.

Barth would go a step further and regard Kṛṣṇa himself (independently, and not as identified with Viṣṇu) as a solar deity. H. Ray Chaudhuri ¹ is right in rejecting such an opinion with the remark that the hypothesis is of a piece with those brilliant theories which would resolve the figure of the Buddha into a solar type and the history of Buddhism into a solar myth.

Notes on Gujarāti Phonology

By T. N. Dave

I

-ḍ-, -ṛ-, -ḍḥ-

Modern Gujarāti has three phonemes in the group of voiced cerebrals: viz. the unaspirated stop ḍ, the unaspirated tapped ṛ, and the aspirated stop ḍḥ, there being no corresponding aspirated tapped in the standard language. In Gujarāti script ḍ and ṛ are written with the same symbol, while ḍḥ has a different symbol. In the interior of the word all the three appear quite frequently. Professor R. L. Turner has shown in Festgabe Hermann Jacobi (1925), p. 35, that Gujarāti has the same sound for M.I. -ḍ- and -ḍ-, and on p. 40 he has grouped Gujarāti among those Mod.I. languages which have obliterated the distinction between M.I. -ḍ- and -ḍḍ-, and has shown that M.I. -ḍ- or -ḍḍ- > Mod.G. -ḍ- (see JRAS. 1921, pp. 525, 531, 534, for the illustrations). But Mod.G. seems to present the following correspondences:—

M.I. -ḍ- > Mod.G. -ṛ-;
M.I. -ḍḍ- > Mod.G. -ḍ-; and

The existence of the phoneme ṛ- can easily be seen in the accompanying kymograph tracings of the words spoken by the writer (who mainly represents the standard Kāthiāwār dialect) and taken at the phonetic laboratory at University College, London, under the supervision of Mr. Stephen Jones. It is seen in the word ḍhoṛī < Pkt. ḍhoḍīā < Skt. ḍhoṭiśā, and in ṛaṛū < Pkt. maḍa-, and may be contrasted with -ḍ- in the tracings of the Mod.G. words koḍī < Pkt. kauḍḍīā, kauḍḍīā < Skt. kapardikā; jāḍū < Pkt. jaḍḍa- extension of Skt. jāḍya- and maḍḍo < Pkt. maṇḍa < Skt. maṇḍakah. The

1 This is true in a general way only. For, dialectically, the phoneme ṛh is very common. Following is the probable isogloss for this sound: ḍh for the whole of Kāthiāwār and probably the whole of Pāṭaṇwārā, northern parts of Gujarat including the part from Mount Ābu to Palaṇpur: for ṛh, Ahmedabad, Cairā, Brooch and Surat and the south of Gujarat. It is represented by the same symbol as ḍh in Gujarāti script.
relation, M.I. -ḍh-, -ḍḍh- > Mod.G. -ḍh-, in the speech of the writer is shown in the kymograph tracings of Mod.G. kaḍhe < Pkt. kaḍhai “boils” and in kāḍhe < Pkt. kaḍḍhai “takes out”.

```
m A ṛ ū
(k) g h o: ṛ i
k o ő i
q ḗ a: ő ū
m ā ő o
k e ṛ h e ʧ e
k a: ṛ h ū
```
The following lists of words illustrate the three correspondences stated above.

(1) M.I. -ḍ- > Mod.G. -ṛ-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.I.</th>
<th>Mod.G.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kaḍaṇa-</td>
<td>karaṇ bracelet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaḍacchu</td>
<td>karcho ladle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaḍappa-</td>
<td>karapla bundle of grass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaḍahu</td>
<td>karā a vegetable medicine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaḍāha- m</td>
<td>karāi f. saucepan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaḍi</td>
<td>kar (dialectically), keri (standard) waist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaḍua</td>
<td>karaṇa bitter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kūḍaya-</td>
<td>kiri worm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kūḍiyā</td>
<td>kiri ant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kūḍa-</td>
<td>kuri fraud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koḍia-</td>
<td>korīa earthen bowl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khaḍa-</td>
<td>kara grass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khaḍakkai</td>
<td>kharke arranges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khaḍakkāra-</td>
<td>kharāra a noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khaḍiā</td>
<td>kari white earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaḍa-</td>
<td>gar swelling on the body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaḍai</td>
<td>gara fashion, makes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaḍa-</td>
<td>gara pot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaḍāvai</td>
<td>garave causes to make.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaḍiā</td>
<td>gari moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaḍau</td>
<td>gari horse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caḍai</td>
<td>caret mounts, rises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaḍai</td>
<td>chař clears the grain from chaff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaḍā</td>
<td>jari peg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaḍai</td>
<td>jari fixes, fits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jhaḍi</td>
<td>jari rain storm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jhāḍa-</td>
<td>jhar tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jhāḍai</td>
<td>jhāre cleans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naḍai</td>
<td>nare obstructs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāḍi</td>
<td>nari pulse of the arm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taḍi</td>
<td>tar (from the extended form) the toddy tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*troḍai</td>
<td>trore cuts, breaks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thaḍa-</td>
<td>thar a trunk of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhāḍa-</td>
<td>dhāre a body without a head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhāḍi</td>
<td>dhārī gang of robbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paḍai</td>
<td>pari falls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paḍaha-</td>
<td>parpa a declaration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### M.I.  |  Mod.G.
---|---
pādāiyā :  | pārāi kite.
padikkamma- :  | pārkaṃṇū a Jaina religious ceremony.
padičchanda- :  | pārchaṇḍo an echo.
padičchāya- :  | pārchāyo a shadow.
pūḍai :  | pāre tells.
pāḍaya- :  | pāre vicinity.
pāḍösia- :  | pārośī neighbour.
pūḍai :  | pūre gives pain.
pūḍā :  | pūr pain.
puḍa- :  | pūr cover.
phāḍai :  | phāre splits.
phḍai :  | phere destroys.
phoḷai :  | phore breaks.
phoḍi- :  | phoṛi breakage.
barua- :  | barvo (extended) the boy who undergoes the sacred thread ceremony.
būḍiā :  | būri a wrapping of leaf.
bedaya- :  | bero boat.
boḍa- :  | boro bald-headed.
bhāḍa- :  | bhāṛ brave man.
bhāḍakka- :  | bhāṛko blaze of fire.
bhāḍaya- :  | bhāṛū rent.
amuḍa- :  | muṛ a head-dress.
amḍaya- :  | maṛū a corpse.
mūḍa- :  | mūṛo (extended) a measure for corn.
medaya- :  | mero upper storey.
moḍai :  | mero cuts.
raḍai :  | raṛe cries.
raḍi- :  | raṛi cry.
vaḍa- :  | vaṛ banyan-tree.
vaḍi- :  | vaṛi hedge, fence.
vāḍiā :  | vāṛi a garden.
saḍai :  | saṛe rots.

(2) M.I. -ḍ- > Mod.G. -d- :

---|---
adḍa- :  | aḍū (extended) cross.
uddai :  | uḍe flies.
uddāvai :  | uḍāve squanders.
oddā- :  | oḍ builder of clay houses.
koḍḍa- :  | koḍ curiosity, eagerness.
NOTES ON GUJRĀTI PHONOLOGY

M.I. Mod. G.
khāḍā : khāḍj (prob. from khāḍā) ditch.
gaddārā : gāḍar sheep.
gaddiyyā : gāḍī carriage.
jāḍāa : jāḍū thick.
tīḍā : tīḍ a grasshopper.
pāḍāyā : pāḍo buffalo-calf.
pāḍīyyā : pāḍī buffalo-heifer.
būḍāi : būḍe sinks.
lāḍāi vb. : lāḍ n. (prob. from lāḍā-) showing off.
lāḍīva : lāḍ̪əvə a sweetmeat.
hāḍ̪ēa : hāḍ bone.

(3) M.I. -ḍh- > Mod.G. (standard) -ḍh- and dialectically > -ṛh-
āḍhāi : āḍhe starts to go out (used for cattle
when they go out to graze) :
kaḍhāi : kaḍhe boils :
kaḍhīa : kaḍhī soup :
gaḍhā : gāḍh fort :
ḍāḍhā : ḍāḍh tooth :
ḍāḍhīa : ḍāḍhī or ḍāḍhī beard :
pīḍhī : pīḍhī a beam in the roof.
pokhā : pokh (extended) plump :
maḍhā : maḍh small house.
maḍhīa : maḍhīya set jewels, etc. :
loḍhāi : loḍhe gins the cotton.

(4) M.I. -ḍḍh- > Mod.G. -ḍh- (standard) and -ṛh- dialectically
aḍḍhāiya : aḍḍhī two and a half :
oḍḍhāna : oḍḍhaṅ upper covering :
kaḍḍhāi : kāḍhe takes out :
kōḍhā : kōḍh leprosy :
ḍāḍhā- drum : ḍāḍhī a cast of drum-beaters.
būḍhā : būḍhə old :
vāḍhāi : vāḍhe cuts :
vāḍhāmāṇaya- : vāḍhvaṇ a city in Kāthiāwār.

II

WHISPERED -i or THE PALATALIZATION OF THE PRECEDING CONSONANT

M.I. -i or -e > -i (i.e. the whispered -i which is heard in some words,
while in others it merely remains in palatalizing the previous
consonant). The influence of a M.I. or O.G. final -i on the preceding consonant or on the vowel of the preceding syllable has already been noticed. N. B. Divatia (Wilson Philological Lectures, pp. 224–5) has noted in his spelling of छांब, etc., what is really a palatalization of the consonant. Professor R. L. Turner (Gujrāṭi Phonology, p. 365) has noticed the fact that a M.I. -i changes a of the preceding syllable to e, e.g. kaḍi > keṛi. The full facts appear to be as follows:—


(2) Imperative 2nd sing.: M.I. -hi. OldG. -i > Mod.G. -i. Examples: lakhi, uthi, besi, ramī, karī, bolī, cālī, vācī, mārī, āvī, ughārī, ramā-ṛi, and so on for all the verbs ending in consonants. For the vowel-ending monosyllabic verbs, the forms are free from any trace of the palatalization, e.g. khā, pī, jā, gā, thā, etc.

(3) Loc. sing. of nouns in -a, ending in -e in M.I., in -i in OldG., and in -i in Mod.G.:—

The normal locative ending in such words in Mod.G. is -e, which is transferred to this type from the ghōṭaka-type. But in a few stereotyped expressions the old loc. sing. ending still remains M.I. -e having the same development as M.I. -i dealt with above. The stereotyped expressions: gāmī gayā “went to a village”, OldG. gāmī gayau; kāṭhi āvī “was found”, OldG. kāṭhi āvīu; pētī parū “was carried in the womb”, OldG. pēti paḍi; kāmī āvī “was useful”, OldG. kāmī āvīu; hēṭhī āvī “came down”, OldG. hēṭhī āvīu; b-hāṛī jau “see outside”, OldG. bāhiri jau; gherī beṭho “was suspended (from work, service, etc.)”, OldG. ghari baiṭhau (as already explained for this word by Professor Turner (Guj. Phon., p. 365).

Note.—The pronunciation of this -i varies in quality in various dialects of Gujarāt, and it is practically absent in the dialect spoken round about Surat.
A Grammar of the Language of Kwara 'Ae, North Mala, Solomon Islands

By W. G. Ivens, Litt.D.

The Kwara 'Ae language is spoken by a hill people who live in the neighbourhood of the mountain called Ala Saa, North-West Alite Mountain, on North Mala, Solomon Islands. The present grammar has been compiled from a translation of the Gospel according to St. Matthew (1930), the translator being Mr. N. C. Deck, of the South Sea Evangelical Mission on North Mala, and the publishers the British and Foreign Bible Society. Use has been made also of a booklet of 32 pp. entitled "Kwara 'Ae Questions", and notes kindly supplied by Mr. Deck have been used in the compilation of this grammar.

At Fiu, on the west coast of North Mala, there are Christian villages inhabited by people gathered from both Kwara 'Ae and Fata Leka peoples, and the language spoken is presumably not pure Kwara 'Ae or pure Fata Leka. The missionaries of the Melanesian Mission at Fiu have provided the following books for the use of their people: (1) A translation of the Gospel according to St. Matthew (1912); (2) a Catechism (1910); (3) a translation of the Book of Common Prayer (1923). Using these as a basis, Mr. S. H. Ray compiled a grammar of the language of Fiu which appears in his *Melanesian Island Languages*, Cambridge Press, p. 487.

The Kwara 'Ae language is sufficiently akin to the Lau language of the coastal people of North-East Mala for a comparison to be made between them. A Lau grammar by the present compiler was published in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, Vol. V, Part II, 1929. The Malu'u language, a grammar of which appears in Mr. Ray's *Melanesian Island Languages*, p. 498, is closely allied to the Kwara 'Ae language, both being hill languages of North Mala.

1. Alphabet

(1) Vowels: a, e, i, o, u.
   Diphthongs: ae, ai, ao, au.
   Consonants: f, k, ngg; d, t, b; kw(q), gw; l, r; s; m, ngw; n, ng.

(2) Sounds. The vowels have the Italian sounds. They may be short or long in sound; a double vowel indicates a long sound.
Closed syllables do not occur. There is no indication of the occurrence of "Umlaut". The sounds ei, eu, ou do not occur.

The sound of k is hard; ngg is printed in the texts as g; d is pronounced nd, except when it begins a word; l and r are differentiated; b is pronounced as mb. The ngw sound is printed in the texts as w. That it represents the Sa'a, Mala, mw may be seen by comparing any word in which it occurs with the similar word in Sa'a. In one case Sa'a mw, muela "child", appears as ng in Kwara 'Ae ngela "child". Dr. Codrington, Melanesian Languages, p. 214, compares Fiji linga "hand" and the common Melanesian limua "hand". Ulawa has nima "hand". This gives an interchange of mw, m, ng, and Codrington says that the nasal m is the oldest of the three sounds used in this connection. The island of Mala itself bears three names, in three different parts, viz. Mala, Mwala, Ngwala, showing an interchange of m, mw, and ngv. In the Kwara 'Ae texts "ng", i.e. the "ng" of English "sing", is printed as n. To pronounce the t the tongue is pressed against the teeth, and then released.

The "Melanesian g" is not heard in Kwara 'Ae; it has been dropped in certain words, e.g. s'a "fish", and its loss is marked by a "break" in the sound which is represented in this grammar by the sign '. In certain other words the "Melanesian g" is represented in Kwara 'Ae by k: kami "we", Florida igami. Other consonants dropped in Kwara 'Ae are k, l, t, and their loss is generally denoted by the presence of a "break" in the sound: la'u "to be whole", Sa'a laku; fata'a "speech" for fataala; ta'a "bad", Mota tatas. The "break" is far more noticeable in Kwara 'Ae than in Lau.

The only use of w in Kwara 'Ae is in the compound sounds kw(q), gw, ngw. A kw in Kwara 'Ae may represent a w in Sa'a: kwakwa "mouth", Sa'a wawa; kwalu "eight", Sa'a walu. The gw sound in Kwara 'Ae may represent pw in Sa'a, q in Mota: gweau "head", Sa'a pweau, Mota qatu. The loss of initial t may result in the lengthening of the initial vowel: Florida tambu "holy", Kwara 'Ae aambu. A g in Florida may be dropped in Kwara 'Ae, and a "break" then occurs: Florida gambu "blood", Kwara 'Ae 'ambu. A k in Kwara 'Ae may stand for ngg in Florida, the island Florida or Nggela being known on Mala as Kela. The adjectival ending 'a in Kwara 'Ae is for ka or ga.

Interchange of vowels: o in Lau may become u in Kwara 'Ae: Lau tofu "to chop", Kwara 'Ae tufu; again Lau fanaa "land", is Kwara 'Ae fanoa; Sa'a lio "to see", Kwara 'Ae lia; Lau tabulo
“to act”, Kwara ‘Ae ‘abula. In certain words an i is added for
euphonic reasons; saloi “heavens”, talei “path”, utai “rain”,
igoi “flood”.

The English word “corn” has become koli in Kwara ‘Ae, showing
a change from n to l, the “r” of “korn” not being sounded.

2. Article

(3) (a) Demonstrative:—

Singular: na; ta, ta’i; gwai, fai; mae.
Plural: ki, kiri, ri; ti; ngweai; rai.

(b) Personal: sa, i.

Na is the definite article “the”, and is used with nouns both in
the singular and in the plural: na maa “the eye”; na afamanu ki
“the lilies”. It is used with numerals: na akwala “ten”; na ro
alako “the two sons”; it forms a plural with ki or kiri following the
noun: na fasarongo ki “the disciples”; na salo loo kiri “the
heavens”. Ordinarily nouns may be used without na: fasanga’a
ana arainga “the wedding feast”. The use of na with the noun
denotes a particular object: na’ai “a tree”, “the tree”.

Ta and ta’i are forms of the numeral for “one”. Ta denotes
“a, any, another, a certain one”; ta’i “a fish”; reduplicated
ta ai ta ai, etc., it denotes “the one, the other”. Ta may be used
with numbers: ta fulu “ten”; ta lima “one five”, “five”; ta ro
ru “two things”. It is used compounded with ta’i, mae, and fai:
ana ta ta’i kula “in a certain place”; ta ta’i ada “one of them”;
ta mae fata’a “one word”; ta fita fai ngali “how many years?”;
ta’i ngweae “a man”; ta’i fai nguù “a song”.

Gwai denotes “a”: gwai ‘uru “a widow”; gwai ua “a hill”;
gwai mata’inga “sickness”. By comparison with Malu’u gwea, with
similar use, gwai would seem to be compounded of gwea, a noun, and
the preposition i, used as a genitive.

Fai is used of things spherical in shape, or of one of a series: fai
bubulu “a star”; fai ua “a hill”; fai rade “a reed”; fai ‘u’u “a
finger”; fai nguù “a song”; ro fai ngali’a “two carryings”. Fai
may be the same as Lau fe with the genitive i added, or it may be
a contraction of fau “time”, “occurrence”, and i genitive.

Mae is a contraction of maa “eye”, “one”, and e genitive, and
denotes “one, a unit”: mae dangi “a day”; mae rodo “a
night”; ta mae fata’a “one word”; mae taelo “a gate”.
The word *afu* in *afu berede* “a loaf”, may be the Lau *fua* “fruit”, etc., by metathesis. Kwara ‘Ae is very fond of changing the order of syllables, e.g. *leak* “to go”, for *leka*.

*Ki, kiri, ri*, follow the noun and indicate plurality; *ri* (cf. *ri* in Roviana. Ray, *Melanesian Island Languages*, p. 544): *i salo loo ri* “in the heavens”; *ana kaidai loo kiri* “in those days”; *ru ki things*; *ru nee kiri* “these things”; *ruu nee kiri* “the things”; *mae fata’a nee kiri* “these words”; *gwata ki* “pigs”. *Ki* may be separated from its noun, and placed at the end of the sentence: *fata’a nee sakatafa mai faasia kwakwana sa God ki* “the words that proceed out of the mouth of God”. (With *ki* may be compared Lau *gi*, Sa’a ‘*i*, used as plural of things.)

*Ti* is used of the plural “any”: *ti ngela* “what children”; *ti ai whoever”; *ti ai kira soea* “some people say”.

*Nguai* is a prefix denoting reciprocity of relationship: *ro nguai asina* “two brothers”; *fiu nguai asina* “seven brothers”; it is also used before the word *nguue* “male”, with the suffix *na* added, to denote “sister of a man, brother of a woman”: *nguai nguaena inau* “my sister”, etc.

*Rai* appears in the phrase *rai nguane uria* “a multitude”. This is probably the Malu’u *ila in toa ila nguane ki* “husbands”; *ai ila ai ki* “wives”. By comparison with Marau Sound *rai, lai*, Florida *lei*, Ulawa *alai*, this *rai* is shown to be a plural sign.

(4) The personal article with names of males is *sa*: *sa Pita* “Peter”. (Cf. Roviana *sa* article. Ray, *Melanesian Island Languages*, p. 544.) It is used with *ru* “thing” to denote “person”: *sa ru So-and-so*; *sa ro ta’i* “what two people?” *sa ta’i* “who (male)?” *Sa* is not used with the plural. The personal article used with names of females is *i*: *i Meri* “Mary”. This article is not used with *afe* “wife” or *kini* “woman”, nor is it used with the plural. (Cf. Inakona, Guadalcanal, *ki*, Lau *ni*, feminine articles.)

3. Nouns

(5) There are two classes of nouns, those which take the suffixed pronoun and those which do not. The first class denotes parts of the body, positions, actions or conditions, the word for “brother-sister” relationship. These are all used with suffixed pronouns. Other words denoting relationships use the personal pronoun to denote possession.

(6) Verbal Nouns. These are formed by the addition of the
suffixes 'a, nga, 'anga, fa, la, ta: mae "to die", ma'e, maela "death"; fata "to speak"; fata'a, fatala "speech, word"; fatalamua "your words"; 'a may be added to a noun: ngwae "man", bara ngwae'a "a company of men". The termination 'a is evidently for la. 'O'o "to work", 'o'onga "work"; mata'i "to be sick", mata'inga "sickness"; saunga'i "to work", saunga'inga "work"; ta'a "to be bad", ta'anga'a "evil" shows 'a added to nga; oga "to desire", kwaioga'anga "desire". The termination la is used by itself as a noun ending: gwa"u "head", gwa"ula ni luma "head of the house"; tafi "to flee", tafila "flight"; or as a gerundive with the pronouns always suffixed: loge "to loose", logelana "the loosing of it", where logela has no separate existence as a noun. Fa appears in the noun tatala"fa "honour", from tala "to proclaim"; tatala"anga "kingdom" has probably a triple noun ending, fa, 'a, nga; i na'o "before", i na'ofano "before him". Ta is seen in fikuta "company", fiku "to gather together"; oli "to return", olita "heir"; ore "to be left", oretana "the remainder". The endings fa, ta, la, may all take a suffixed pronoun.

Compound nouns may be formed by the suffixing of 'a, la, nga, to the last member: ala ngginggiri "to gnash the teeth", ala ngginggiri'a "gnashing of teeth"; fi tala "to disbelieve", fi talala "doubt"; sasi le'a "to do good", sasi le'anga "goodness".

Independent Nouns. These are formed by suffixing na to (a) certain terms of relationship; (b) to the cardinal numerals to form the ordinals.

(a) The nouns so formed are always preceded by the prefix ngwai which denotes reciprocity of relationship: ro ngwai asina "two brothers, two sisters"; ngwai ngwaena "sister, brother".

(b) Numerals: rwa "two", ru"ana "second"; fa'i "four", faina "fourth". The words for "third" and "eighth", ula, kwaiula, show la as a termination, and also show the loss of the letter l. La in these instances is a change from na.

(7) Construct form. A construct form appears in a few words with the use of the genitive e and maa "eye", used as meaning "one": mae dangi "a day"; ta mae fata'a "one word".

(8) Genitive relation. The genitive relation of nouns to one another is effected by the use of the prepositions ni, i, li, e; of these ni is used mainly in construction: ngwae ni kwai i'a "a fisherman";

1. 'anga appears to be a double noun ending 'a + nga.
to'oa ni rao "fishermen"; i is in common use as expressing "of, belonging to": linga i ru "sound of thing, voice"; noni i ngwae "body of man"; i is possibly ni with n dropped; li appears in the words maa-li-mae "enemy"; maa-li-tako "market-place"; li would appear to be a variant of ni; e is seen in mole (mola e) talede "a thousand talents"; botele e fau "jar of stone"; and also in faelangi (faa-e-langi) "storehouse". The genitive i is commonly used (as in Sa'a) to express purpose: nau ku i saea fuamu "I am about to tell thee of it".

The word doe "thing" is added to nouns and verbs: uunu doe "a torch thing"; doe liu "very much".

Juxtaposition of two nouns conveys the idea of genitive relationship: to'oa sa God "the people of God". A genitive relationship is also shown by the use of the suffixed pronoun, third person singular, in agreement with the idea expressed in the second noun of the pair: 'aena ngwane "a man's leg".

The ordinary personal pronouns are used as possessives in cases where the pronoun cannot be suffixed: afe nau "my wife"; ma'a nau "my father".

(9) Number. The plural is indicated by ki, kiri, ri, following the noun or noun phrase. These plural signs are not used with numerals: ro ngwae "two men". The words oro "to be many", sui "to be finished, all" may be added: ngwae oro, ngwae 'oro ki "many men"; to'oa oro "many people"; to'oa nau ki "my people"; ru ki sui "all things"; ru nee ki sui go'o "all these things".

Totality is shown by the words sui "to be finished", ta'i fau "one time, completely", kwalu "all" (eight): kwalu sui fanoa "all lands"; na fafarongo nee kiri ta'i fau "all the disciples".

The personal pronoun, third person plural, kira, is not used as a collective pronoun like ira "the" in Mota; it may be preceded by the noun to'oa "people" in order to express a collective idea: to'oa nee kira fi'olo "the hungry".

The possessive pronoun, third person singular, na, is suffixed to a noun form afuta in order to express totality: afutana aba i kula neeri "every part of that place". Bara "a company" expresses the idea "a number of, some": bara ngwae'a "many men".

(10) Gender. There is no grammatical gender. The words ngwane "male", kini "female", are added when the noun does not carry a sex distinction: funga kini "mother-in-law"; kakarai kini "hen".
Ma’a, ma’asi (vocative) “father”; tea “mother”; aarai “husband”; afe “wife”; alako “boy, son”; sarii “maiden, daughter”; defo “daughter, girl”; ngwaen fue “brother”; ngwai ngwaena “sister, brother”; ngela “child”, are all followed by the personal pronoun, and not by the suffixed pronoun, to indicate possession: ma’a nau “my father”. Asi “brother-sister” is always used with a suffixed pronoun: asiku “my brother” etc.; asina sa ru “So-and-so’s brother”.

Ngwane “male” appears in a few phrases, but ngwae is in common use for “male” or “man” (homo).

The noun ai is used for both “thing” and “person”: ai ngwane “a male”; ta ro ai “two things”; ai fa’a’uda “what thing?” Ru “thing” is used as meaning “certainly, in that case”: ru nia ke ada maasia “certainly he would have watched” (cf. use of doo in Lau, ola in Sa’a).

The word kala “little” is used to denote something young: kala ngela, a little child. A further form kaela is used: kaela ngela ti’iti’i ki “little children”.

(11) Vocative. This is shown by the use of ‘ae, ‘o, of which ‘o is the personal pronoun, second personal singular. ‘ Ae may precede or follow, and both may be used together preceding the noun: ‘ae ‘o ngwae ni rao “thou servant”; ma’asi ‘ae “Oh my father!”

4. Pronouns

(12) Personal. Pronouns used as the subject of a verb.

Sing. 1. inau, nau, nau’a, ne.
2. ‘oe, ‘o.
3. inia, nia, nia’a, ni.

Plur. 1 incl. kia, kia’a, ki; ku; kulu, kulu’a.
1 exclu. kami, kami’a, mi; kaimili, kaimili’a, kaili, mili.
2. kamu, kamu’a, kamu’i; kaumulu, kaumula’a, kamulu, kaulu; mu; mulu.
3. kira, kira’a, ki, kiki; kirulu.

Dual 1 incl. koro, koro’a, ko.
1 excl. kero, keroo, keo, ke; kamere, mere, me; kamiroo.
2. kamoro, moro, mo; kamuroo; koroo.
3. kera, kera’a; kero, kero’a, ke.

It will be noticed that dual 1 incl. koro is identical with dual 2 koroo except for the lengthened final syllable; note also dual 3 kero
and dual 1 excl. *kero*; also plural 1 incl. *ki* and plural 3 *ki*; also
dual 3 *ke* and 1 excl. *ke*.

The form *inau* of the first person singular is not in common use;
the form *nau* may be followed by the verbal particle *ku*, and *nau'a*
*'aku* "for my part", *ku* being added as well: *nau nau'a 'aku nee ku*;
*ne* is only used with *i* expressing purpose: *nau kwa ne i leka* "as for me
I shall go"; *ne i si dao to'ona ta ru* "there is nothing that I find;
ne i lisi fuli 'aemau* "let me see thy footmark."

In the second person singular *'oe* may be strengthened by *'o*. The
adding of *'a* to certain forms, *nau'a, kamu'a, kira'a*, etc., is done for
emphasis.

The shorter forms may be used alone as subject in the past tense:
*nia nana'i* "he rested"; *sa Jone nia dao* "John came"; the longer
forms in the singular may be followed by the shorter: *nia ni*; the
longer forms in the plural require the use of the shorter forms as well,
or of a verbal particle: *to'a nee kira fi'olo ma ki ka silikwau* "they
that hunger and thirst". The forms in *lu, li, li'a* denote fewer
persons. The form *kirulu* is of rare occurrence and generally denotes
a trial.

These pronouns are used to denote possession when the suffixed
pronouns of possession cannot be used.

*Ro, roo* of the dual endings is the numeral *ro, roo*, "two", and
*lu* is a variant.

The pronouns of the third person singular and plural may be used
of impersonal or inanimate things: *ni fa'auto nee* "how is it?"; *ni uto*
"why?" (it how?).

Pronouns following verbs and prepositions as object:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sing.</th>
<th>Plur. 1 incl. <em>kia; kulu</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>nau</em></td>
<td>1 excl. <em>kami; kaimili, kaili</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>'oe, o, 'u</em></td>
<td>2. <em>kamu; mulu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>a, nia</em></td>
<td>3. <em>da; kira; 'i</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dual 1 incl. *koro*.

1 excl. *mere, miroo; keroo*.

2. *moro, muroo; kamoro*.

3. *daroo*.

The form *'u* of the second person singular appears to be a variant of
*'o*, and it is used as object when the verb ends in *u*: *dau'u* "hold you";
*oga liu'u* "like you much". The longer form of the third person
singular, *nia*, is used with the verb *toda* "to meet", with *sae filo* "to
question" : kero toda nia "they two met him" ; also with ta'ifili "alone, singly" ; ta'ifili nia "he by himself". The preposition fa' i" with ", takes both forms of the second person singular : fa' i 'oe, fa'ini'o "with thee ".

A second object of the verb always appears in the suffixed pronoun third person singular and plural : kami lilisia fai bubulu "we saw (it) the star ".

All prepositions governing pronouns have the pronoun suffixed as an anticipatory object in agreement with the object itself : fuafia ru nee "on account of (it) that thing ". If the object is in the plural the suffixed pronoun of the anticipatory object may be in the singular. The forms in lu, li denote fewer persons. The form a, third person singular, is used of things as well as of persons. The form 'i is used, as in Sa'a, of inanimate or impersonal things : ru ki sui kulu ka sasi sulis'i "all the things will we do ".

Pronouns suffixed to nouns or to verbal nouns :—

Sing. 1. ku. Plur. 1 incl. ka ; kulu.
2. mu.
3. na.

Dual 1 incl. koro.
1 excl. mere, miroo.
2. moro, moroo, muroo.
3. daroo.

These are the pronouns denoting possession, and they are suffixed to nouns of the first class only. The forms in lu, li, denote fewer persons ; dulu is euphonic for dalu.

The third person singular na is added to certain nouns : sarrii "girl", alako "boy, son" ; sarinya Sion "daughter of Sion" ; to'oana fanoa "people of the land" ; tafana kulu "what sort of a place ? "

Several words which are employed as prepositions have these pronouns attached, proving them to be nouns : fua "to" ; kvatea fuaku "give it to me" ; fuana "in order that" ; sia "to, towards, at the house of" : siana safitana "into the midst of it". Certain words which show a noun termination, but which have no independent existence as nouns, also have these pronouns attached : afutana "all of it" ; orolana "many ". The verb to' o "to hit, to try", used in
compounds, sama to'o "to touch", takes these suffixed pronouns of the object: sama to'ona "touch it".

The third person plural ni is used, as in Sa'a, of things only: noni "body, shape", nomini "the shape of them"; sasi "to do", sasilanì "the doing of them".

(13) Demonstrative. Na, nee, "this"; nee kiri "these"; ni, ninì, ninia "this, here"; neeri "that, those"; neeria, nena "that"; bania "that one mentioned before"; funia "that one down there"; nai, neana "that"; loo, loonia "that yonder"; loobania "that one over there"; loo ri, loo kiri "those yonder"; loko, lokonia "that up there".

The demonstratives follow the noun or pronoun: kuela ngela ngwane na "all the young children".

Nee is in very frequent use, and serves almost as an article. It has a use at the beginning of a sentence closely allied to the use of nge, explanatory, in Sa'a, "it is that, therefore, thereupon, well then". Nee is added to nau'a, nia'a: nau'a nee "I here"; uita nee "why?" sulia nee "therefore".

(14) Interrogatives. Tai "who?" used of the singular with the personal article prefixed: sa tai "what man? who?" i tai "what woman? who?" sa tai 'amulu'a "what man of you?" For the plural there is a use of the singular form sa tai with faida "with them" added: sa tai faida etaeta ki'e lisia sa Jesus "who were the first to see Jesus?" Nee may be added to tai: tai nee "what?" ai tai nee "which?"

Tae "what?" the article na may precede: na tae "what?" ani tae "with what?" ta, tata and tafa also occur: ta fita "how many?" tafana kulu "what place?" tae nee "what then!" ta ngwae fa'aota "what man?" ta ru bore nee "whatever things"; tata le'a nee nau ki i sasia "what good thing shall I do?" ru ta ki "what things?"

(15) Indefinite. The articles ta, t'ai, forms of the numeral for "one", are used indefinitely for "one, the other, any": ta ngwae bore ke kwatea ta mae titiu i kafou "whosoever shall give a cup of cold water"; ta ru "anything, something"; ta ai ki ke ngalia, ma ta ai ke ore "one shall be taken and another left". Ti is used of the plural with fu'ida: ti fu'ida "who of them?" ti god matamata "other gods"; ti ngwae kiri tua go'oo "there are some men standing"; ti ai "some things"; in the phrase 'aku ti 'aku "I by myself", ti appears as singular.
(16) Relative. There are no relative pronouns; their place is supplied by the use of the suffixed pronoun with the demonstrative nee: *gwaia fai nee kira aila ania* "the stone which they rejected".

(17) Emphatic. The noun *tala* is used with the suffixed pronouns and means "self, selves": *kira bore 'ada talada* "they themselves". *Talito'o* is used for "alone", the pronouns being suffixed: *nguaeval kasi mauri ana berete talito'ona* "man shall not live by bread alone".

5. The Genitive

(18) Nouns of the first class may take a suffixed pronoun of the third person singular when governing another noun: *abena 'ai* "a plank of wood".

The gerundives in *la* always have the suffixed pronoun: *saungilana* "the killing of him". A noun in the genitive follows the governing noun: *to'oa sa God* "the people of God"; *na Alako nguaev* "the Son of Man". The construct form is made by adding the genitive *e* to the first of two nouns: *ta maev (maev e) titiu i kafo* "a cup of water"; *maev utu* "a war band"; *botele e fai* "a stone jar".

Nouns of the second class may use the preposition *ana* "of, belonging to": *goulu ana tebolo* "the gold of the temple". The preposition *ni* is used in construction: *Ai ni ilito'onga* "the Tempter". The preposition *i* is used also in construction and denotes purpose as well: *lia i nguaev* "man's heart"; *bata i uliuli* "skins"; *i ke duu usikia* "in order to cover over us": *to'oa i Juda* "the people of Judea".

(19) Possessives. There are two possessive nouns, 'a and *na*. The suffixed pronouns are added to these. The only forms of the second possessive which I have found are *nana*, third person singular, *nani*, third person plural; *nana* means "belonging to", and may be compared with *nana* in Ulawa and Sa'a, and *nani* also occurs in Sa'a: *kaumulu nana ta'i Ma'a* "ye belong to one Father"; *kaumulu nani maetui ni fuanga'a* "you have a guard"; *fokosi ki kira nani kilu* "the foxes have holes". The form *nina* also occurs: it means "belonging to", and may be compared with the Florida *nina* "his": *noa nina ngela* "no son belonging to him".

1 There seems to be good evidence of the existence of a third possessive noun *a* (without a "break") as in Sa'a. If this is the case, the possessive 'a is used only of things to eat and drink, and the rest of the subjoined usages, (b), (c), (d), are referable to the form in *a*. 
The forms of the possessive with 'a are as follows:

Sing. 1. 'aku.
2. 'amu.
3. 'ana.

Plur. 1. incl. 'akulu.
2. excl. 'ami'a; 'aimili.
3. 'amu'a; 'amulu'a, 'aumulu.
3. 'ada; 'adulu; 'ani.

Dual 1. incl. 'akoro.
1. excl. 'amere.
2. 'amoro.
3. 'adaroo.

This possessive is used:

(a) Of things to eat and drink: fanga 'ada "food for them to eat"; ro i'a go'o ninia 'aimili "we have only two fishes". With food in general the ordinary personal pronouns may be used: fanga nau "my food".

(b) As meaning "for me, for my part", etc.: nia maliu 'ana "he was asleep"; nau'a 'aku nee ku faarongo ania "As for me I declare it"; 'aku ti 'aku "I by myself"; lea na'a 'amu "go thy way"; sa tae 'amulu'a "what man of you?"

(c) As the object of an intransitive verb: kwau 'ana fuana faene "to drink the fruit of the vine"; ka oto 'ana ani fai rade "struck him with a reed"; nia ka arefo 'ana "he wonders at it". The verb to'o "to have, to be possessed of", is used with the possessive, also dao "to reach", karangi "to be near", o'o "to work", tasa "to exceed", sai "to know"; si mulu to'o'ana fi to'onga "if you have faith"; leleka ka dao 'ana "reaching up to, until".

(d) When a verb is separated from its object by an adverb: ka sae filonga'i 'ada "asks them definitely".

'Ani, third person plural, is used of things only: nau ku i duu taifu 'ani "I repay them all"; nee noa kasi gilo taifu 'ani "which shall not be cast down".

In certain constructions the preposition i is prefixed: saele'anga i'ada "blessed are they".

6. ADJECTIVES

(20) The adjective follows the noun. Words which are actually verbs may be used as adjectives and without verbal particles: ru 'oro "many things"; ngwele'a "a good man".

(21) Certain words have a form of termination or of prefix which is used only of adjectives:
(a) Adjectival terminations added to verbs or nouns to form adjectives are 'a and la: rodo "to be dark", rodo'a "black, dark"; nafo "surf", nafo'a "stormy, white"; ku "leprosy"; ku'a "lepros"; bili' "to be black", bili'a "black, dirty"; susu "breast", ngela susula "a sucking child"; sau "rock", sau'a "stony".

(b) Adjectival prefixes are 'a, ma, ngwa; these are used with verbs; the forms in ngwa are used with a reduplication of the verb to which they are prefixed: liki "to pour", 'aliki "spilt"; loge "to loose", 'aloge "loosed"; fola "to spread", 'afola "wide"; ngisi "to divide", mangisingisi "in pieces"; 'o'i "to break", ma'o'i "broken", asu "to shake", ngwaasuasu "shaky"; sina "to shine", ngwa-sinasina "brilliant".

(22) Comparison. Comparison is made by the verbs tasa "to exceed", used with the possessive, and liu "to pass", used with 'ana: nia noa kasi tasa 'ana "he is not greater than he"; nee doe liu ana nia'a "he is greater than he".

A positive statement carries comparison by implication: ru nee le'a "this one is good", i.e. is best.

7. Verbs

(23) The transitive verb is followed by the pronoun of the object suffixed; this pronoun is always retained in addition to the ordinary object.

Words may be used as verbs by prefixing a verbal particle, but some words are naturally verbs as being the names of actions. There are also verbs which have special forms as such by means of a prefix or a termination. The terminations which when added to verbs make them definitely transitive or determine their action upon some object are: i, fi, li, mi, ngi, ri, si.

i: manata "to think", manatai "to pity".
fi: liu "to go", liufi "to go about".
li: mae "to die", maeli "to die of".
mi: ono "to drink", onomi "to drink of".
ngi: ma'u "to be afraid", ma'ungi "to fear".
ri: dau "to lodge", dauiri "to stay in".
si: oli "to return", olisi "to exchange".

The termination a'i, to which the consonants ng, m, t, are prefixed, with the addition in some cases of ni, is also used to convey a transitive force: ano "to bury", anoma'ini "to lay a foundation"; sau,
sauunga'ini “to do”; goni, gonita'ini “to collect”. In the case of likitani “to pour”, the i of the suffix ta'i has been dropped. Certain forms occur without ni suffixed: luka, lukata'i “to loose”; fo'o, fo'ota'i “to pray”; these forms are used both transitively and intransitively; muta'i “only, solé”, from mu “to cease”, is used participially; taunga'i, taunga'ini “to persecute”, are both used transitively.

Ani is also used as a transitive suffix, as in Lau: ui “to throw”, ui ania “throw it”; ma'u “to fear”, ma'u ania “to fear it”; ala “to permit”, ala ania “permit it”.

(24) Causative. The causative prefix is fa'a, which may be reduplicated: fa'akwaeufi “to give drink to”.

(25) Reciprocal. The reciprocal prefix is kwai used with verbs expressing the action of one upon another: kwai'ana amanata'i “to teach”, kwaimaasi “to be ready”, kwaimaani fa'ini “to be in agreement with”.

The word liu “to move”, with the prefix kwai, is used to denote reciprocal action: kike kwate kwailiui ada “they will deliver up one another”.

A verbal prefix fa'i (Sa'a hai) is seen in faifolo “across”.

'A is a prefix of condition: bula “to turn”, 'abula “turned”.

(26) Reflexive. A noun form tala “of one’s own accord, by one’s self”, is used following the verb to denote reflexive action, the pronoun being suffixed, and ‘ana prefixed when dealing with the third person singular: nia'ana talana “he by himself”: kira uri i manatala talada “they said within themselves”; ni'a'ana talana kasi fa'amanir nia “he cannot save himself”. Tala may be used by itself preceding the verb: 'oke tala ui toli ani 'oe “cast thyself down”.

(27) Passive. The passive is formed by the indefinite use of the personal pronoun third person plural ki with the verb: ta ai kike ngalia “one shall be taken”; na fa'arongo'u le'a neke kike ba'a fa'atalo ania “the gospel shall be preached”.

(28) Compound. Compound verbs are: ilito'o(ona) “to tempt”, manata to'o(ona) “to remember”.

(29) Auxiliary Verbs. The verb alu “to put”, is used as meaning “to become, to be”; sau “to make”, with the possessive ‘ana, means “to become, to turn into”.

(30) Reduplication of Verbs. Verbs are reduplicated in two ways:

(a) By reduplication of the first syllable: rongo “to hear”, rorongo; 'ani “to eat”, 'a'ani; tua “to stay”, tutua.
(b) By repetition of the whole word: tua "to stay", tuatua; fata "to speak", fatafata.

Two verbs 'abula "to act", ili "to do", show irregular reduplication: 'abula, 'abubula; ili, iliili.

(31) Conjugation. The Kwara 'Ae verb may be conjugated by the short pronouns with or without the longer forms, or by means of the verbal particles.

The verbal particles are ka, ku, kutu, ko, koto, ta, kata, e, ke, 'e, i.

The particles coalesce with the governing pronouns. Ka is used of general time. The action is viewed in the historic present, and consequently ka appears to be used of past time or of future time. Ku is used only with nau "I", and serves to strengthen it; ku may be used alone without nau. In my Lau grammar ku was treated as a pronoun, but the presence of the compound particle kutu in Kwara 'Ae makes it clear that ku is a particle and not a pronoun. Ko is used only in the second person singular: 'oe ko si ala ani kami mike leka kwau "allow us to go"; ko may replace 'oe, 'o: tatae, ko tikia iifitai 'oe "arise, take up thy bed".

Kutu is used only in the first person singular: ma nau kutu gurada "and I should heal them". Koto is used only in the second person singular: sasi koto fa'afa'arongoa ta ngvae "see thou tell no man". Ta, kata, are used indifferently with singular or plural, and with all the persons except first and second singular. The particles kutu, koto, may be compared with the Florida verbal particles ku, tu, and ko, to, used separately with the pronouns of the first and second persons singular, and ta, kata, with ta, ka, used separately of the first person plural inclusive, in Florida, but compounded with i, u, ra, otherwise. See Codrington's Melanesian Languages, p. 530.

E follows ni "he": ni e fata "he said; asi daudau ni e maliu 'ana "the deep sea where he was asleep". There is a similar use of e in Sa'a, where it is treated as a pronoun, third person singular.

Ke, 'e are used of the future or of consequent time, and ke is also used of the imperative: mika leka mai mike lisia "we are coming to see it"; tatae, ko'e ngalia "arise, take it"; 'oke leka "begone"! ni 'e aofia "that he should be king"; mu 'e si ma'u "fear ye not"; or 'e may be added to the verbal particle ko: 'oe ko'e ('oe 'oke), used of future time, etc. It seems probable that 'e is the same word as ke, the k being dropped. See ke, 'e in Sa'a and Ulawa.

I is used of purpose or of indefinite future time; it is not as definite as ke: fasi nau kui leka "that I may go"; fasi nau'a la'u go'o kui
leka “that I may go also”; kui lisioe “that I may see thee”; i ‘oke dao siana sa God “that you should reach God”. I and ke may be compounded: ike duu usikia “that he might act on our behalf”; sato ike roro‘o’a “the sun will be darkened”. This i is probably the same as i used as a genitive.

(32) Negative Verbal Particles. The negative particle is si: nau kusi leka “I am not going”; mu kasi leka “do not you go”; na madama i kasi madako “the moon shall not shine”. The verbs no, noa, noa’a “not to be” may be added: nia noa kasia sasia “he did not do it”; noa ta ru kasi ore “nothing shall be left”; noa liu kasi fungu “certainly does not bear fruit”. Iri is also used (cf. Sa’a ili): nau ku iri saea fuamu “I say not unto you”; so Jone ka iri fanga, ma kasi kwau “John did not eat or drink”.

(33) Negative. The negative forms used are no, noa, noa’a. These are verbs: no noa’a ka noa liu “not at all”; kira no ‘ada “they were not, they ceased to be”; ta ngweae fasi ke maui noa’a “that any one should be saved, no; no ta ru si idu kulu “nothing shall move us”.

(34) Dehortative. The dehortative is sasi, but si also serves: sasi koto faarongoa ta ngweae “do not tell any man”; ‘oe kosi bili “do not steal”; mu kasi leka “do not go”. Sasi also denotes “lest, so that not”: sasi bata i uili ki busu “lest the skins burst”. Kata (Lau ata) has the same use: mu kata leka kwau “go not forth”.

(35) Times and Moods. The preterite is shown by the use of na’a, sui na’a “finished”, ua go’o “long ago” following the verb: nia leka na’a “he has gone”; nia leka sui na’a “he has gone finished”; nia olo ‘ana ua go’o “whom he appointed”. When no particle is used the time is past. The verb tuatua, tutua “to stay, by and bye”, is used to strengthen the future: tutua ke ba’a dao “will come to pass”.

For the imperative the simple verb is used, with or without the verbal particles ke, ko; basi may be added for politeness: ‘oe leka “go!” leka mai “come here!” kaumulu muke leka “go ye!” idu kwau, ma ko leka uana kula loo ba “be thou removed, and go yonder”.

(36) Subjunctive. The subjunctive is formed by the use of fasi, iri (Lau eeri), fasi iri preceding the verb: fasi nau kui leka “that I may go”; fasi iri kike rao fuana “that they should work for him”; iri ke oi ana i Eve “in order to deceive Eve”; mu kata qaijji fasi nau ku dao mai “think not that I am come”. Fasi also denotes
"supposing that, as if": fasi nau ku i leka, noa’a "the idea that I should go, never!"

(37) Conditional. Si "if, as if, supposing that"; fasi may be added or may be used by itself with the same meanings: ma si fasi di’ia nee nia ngwaluda "supposing that it were possible"; si kaumulu bore to’oa ta’a "if ye then being evil". Di’ia "like it, supposing", may be used alone: di’ia nee ‘oe ‘o Alako sa God "if thou art the Son of God."

(38) Illative. The illative is fi (fii) "thereupon, in consequence, then": ma bata i uliuli neeri ka fi ta’aa naa "and the skins are spoiled in consequence."

(40) Potential. Tala ‘ana is used for "can, be able": ai nee tala’ana ngusilana ru neeri "he that can receive this."

(41) Gerundive. A gerundive is formed by the addition of the suffix la to the verb with the suffixing of the pronouns of the object: loge "to loose", logelana "the loosing of it"; mauri "to live"; fa’amaurilana "the making well of him"; sui "to finish", suilana "the finishing of it, its end"; luka "to loose", lukata’i "to be loosed", lukata’inilana "the loosing of it"; te’et’e "to be small"; i te’et’elaku "during my youth"; sasi "to do", sasilani "the doing of them (neuter)"; doe "thing", doelana "the doing of it". The gerundival suffix la is also used with personal pronoun suffixed on the lines of nouns of the first class: foo "to pray", fowlaku "my prayer."

INTERROGATIVES

(42) Interrogative. Uta, "why, how?" fa’auta, fa’auta mo, mo fa’auta "how, in what manner, how much?" uita la’u "how?" fuana ta, una tae "why?" angita, i angita, "when, at what time?" fita "how many?" fita fau "how many times?" ta fita nguva e "how many men?" Ifai, nifai "where?" ifai mai, ita mai ifai "whence?"

(43) Time. Kaidai "when"; ‘ana kaidai nee “now”; kadi "place, time"; na, nee "now"; i niniari "now"; ka dao uri niniari "up till now"; tau "a long time"; la’u, la’u go’o "again"; dao ‘ana, leleka ka dao ‘ana "until"; maasla "while"; maakwalia ‘until”; i na’o, ua i na’o "of old, formerly"; ua, ua go’o "of old, before"; firi, suli kudi "for over"; ua "yet"; tutua "hereafter, bye and bye"; 'isi "last"; i buri, i buri ‘ana "after"; sui, sui na "finished, afterwards".
I ta'ena “to-day” (Florida i taeni “now”); rorodo “to-morrow”; sa rodo “by night”; ofodangi “early morning, to-morrow morning”; asoa, i asoa “by day”; tofungana asoa “midday”; tofungana rodo “midnight” (Sa’a toohungana); saulafi, saulafia “evening”.

(44) Place. Mai “here, either”; mai ana, ita mai ana “from”; i see “here, now”; i nee “here”; i kula neeri “there”; loo, loo ko, loo ba, loo ri, loo kiri “there”; i neeri “there”, to’o i neeri “thence”; i neana “there”; kwau “away”; bali “side”, bali loo ba “the other side”; sa, sana, saena, i saena “in, at”; sa rodo “in the night, last night”; ‘alaa “up”; i ano “down”; ila “within, inside”; i maa “outside”; karangi “near”; tau “far off”; i safitana “in the middle (of it)”; i olofana “under (it)”; i nunufana “under, under the shadow of”.

The adverb mai “hither, here, ‘place whence’,” is also used, as in Lau, with the locative i to denote “place at”: Ma’a nau mai i Hefen “My Father in heaven”; ifai nee sa Jesus tuatua mai ana i na’o “where did Jesus live before?” na porofete mai i Nasarete “the prophet from Nasareth” na porofete ki mai i na’omu’a “the prophets which were before you”; mai sana gua’i salo “from the cloud”.

Loo ri, loo kiri “there, those”, are used of plurals. For sa, sana, saena compare Sa’a saa, saana, Ulawa sie, sieku, etc.

(45) Manner. Ilinga’i, ilinga’ina “like, like it”; alafana, saea, mala “as, like”; una “thus”; uma eri, una eri la’u go’o “thus”; di’i, di’a “supposing that”; uri “thus, to speak thus”; usulia “thus, like, following”; uira, ira “thus”; uri i ta “therefore”; si “if, supposing that”; tasa “too much, very”; liu, doe liu “very much, excessive”; ta’ifau “‘one time’, altogether”; na’a denotes the preterite; ru “thing” is used as meaning “certainly”; ru nia ke ada maasia “certainly he would have watched for him”; sui “thereupon”; talinga’i “completely”; talito’ona, ta’ifili “only”; bore, bore ma “haply” ; kata “haply”; sasi ki kata rongo “lest haply they should hear”; ‘o’o “at all”.

Bore, bore ma introduce a note of indefiniteness or of qualification; go’o qualifies the preceding word, and is added to la’u “again”; la’u go’o “again, also”; baera “is emphatic”: aarai faolu baera “the bridegroom cometh!” kua is used like Mota qa: nau kwa nei leka “as for me I shall go”; ba’al is used before the verb with a future sense, by and bye (cf. Sa’a haro): kike ba’al tamai kamu “they shall lead you”; sulia “because”; ba is explanatory, as in Lau, and follows a noun or a verb: ‘oe o ngwae ba ‘oke leka mai “art thou he
that should come?" sakonga'i "for no reason, gratuitously"; uri ma "well, then!" basi (Lau fasi) conveys a polite request: lia basi "behold?" ko ado basi fa'inia ngwae futa o'e "be reconciled to thy brother".

9. PREPOSITIONS

(46) Simple Prepositions:—

Locative: i, sa, i sa.

Motion to: sia, sie, suli, ua.

Motion from: faasi, ita.

Causation: suli.

Position: faafi, fafo, suusii.

Dative: fu, fua, funi.

Instrumental: ani.

Relation: ana, ani, fa'i, fa'ini, osi, ua, usi.

Purpose: fuana.

Genitive: i, ni, e.

With the exception of the locative, the instrumental, the genitive, and also ana, ani, fuana, osi, ita, all the foregoing prepositions are used with a suffixed pronoun. The locative i is used with all place names, and with adverbs of time and place. It appears in ifai "where?". It is also used with la, lala "in".

Sa is used with na, pronoun, suffixed: sa rodo, sana rodo "in the night"; mai sana guai solo "from the cloud"; sia is used with the pronouns ku, da, suffixed: daodao siaku "reach me"; sie is used with the rest of the suffixed pronouns (cf. Sa'a saa, see) and denotes "after, following, because, beside". Suli means "to follow"; ruu sulia "follow it". Ua denotes "to, for": leka uana "go to him"; ifi mai uamia "open the door for us". Faasi is used as a verb meaning "to leave" and denotes "from". Ita is used of "place whence" and is followed by ana. Faafi, fafo mean "over, above"; faafi also means "against, because". Suusi means "against, opposing, opposite to". Both classes of pronouns are suffixed to the dative, third singular: funa, funia, fuana "to him".

Ani denotes the instrument (as in Sa'a): ani abada "with their hands"; ani fuada "by their fruits".

Ana denotes "of, belonging to, from, during, in" (as in Sa'a); the article is not used following it: ana kaidai nee 'oke fo'o "when, at the time when, thou prayest"; gegegeo ana ano "dust of the

1 Possibly Florida sia by metathesis.

ta ro ru "two things"; ta ulu babala "three huts". Ta, ta'i, tae also denote "a, any".

Ro is used in composition for "two": ro ngwae "two men"; ta ro ai "two things".

Kwalu "eight" is used (as in Sa'a) for an indefinite number; kwalu kaela mata'inga "all kinds of sicknesses"; kwalu sui fanoa "all lands, the world".

The ta of tafulu is ta "one". For fulu of tafulu, tanggafulu, see Codrington, Melanesian Languages, p. 247.

Akewala is used for "ten" denoting a unit. To express the units above ten ma is used: akewala ma tae "eleven"; akewala ma ro ngwane "twelve men"; ma may be omitted.

A number short of ten is tarenqa, a verb: akewala ka tarenqa "a number over the ten"; fiu tafulu fiu fau "seventy times seven"; tafulu ma ro "twelve".

"One hundred" is talanga: talanga i fau (faua) "a hundred times".

"Thousand" is tooni: fai tooni ngwane "four thousand males".
"Ten thousand" is mola: molai ngwane "ten thousand men"; mola also denotes "very many".

Ada is "ten", used of coconuts, as in Sa'a; "ten", of birds, is lama: ta'i lama "one ten"; ai is used of ten bamboos filled with almonds, or of a thousand taros, expressing a unit in each case. "One hundred and twenty-three men" is talangai ngwane ma ro akewala ma ulu.

(51) Ordinals. The cardinals with a noun ending na form the ordinals. In the case of the words for "third" and "eighth" (as in Lau) na is changed to la and l is dropped: kwaula.

Elana "first", ruana "second"; ula "third"; faina "fourth"; limana "fifth"; onona "sixth"; fiuna "seventh"; kwaula "eighth"; sikona "ninth"; tanggafula "tenth".

The ordinals precede the noun: ruana ngwae "the second man"; the article na may precede. To express "first", i na'o "before" is used: ai i na'o "the first".

(52) Multiplicatives. The noun fau "time" is used. Fita fau "how many times?" ta'i fau "once"; ulu fau "thrice"; ruana fai oli'a "the second time of returning"; ulu fai kudi fo'onga'a "three times of prayer".

The causative fa'a is not used with numerals.

(53) Distributive: to'o (as in Sa'a).
(54) Interrogative. The interrogative is *fita* "how many?" *fita fau* "how many times?"

12. Exclamations.

(55) *Ae* 'o signs of the vocative; these may either precede or follow the noun; 'o is the personal pronoun, second singular. *Iu* "yes" of assent. *No, noa, noa'a* "no". *Kwa* follows personal names: *Aofia kwa* "O King!" *Ne* is used in questions: *ma ka uri fuana* sa *Pita, Ne!* "and he says to Peter, What!" *mamana ne* "is it true?" *Re* expresses surprise, and has more or less of an interrogative force.
Mabale Stories

By J. TANGHE

(Continued from Vol. V, p. 586.)

ŋkoi na ŋkumba

THE LEOPARD AND THE TORTOISE

bakendêke (1) dğibôngo, bakomi (2) o molako.
They went (to) the river-bank, they arrived in a fishing-camp.

na ŋkoi le ba'aki (2) mweti. (3) ŋkumba jo tr: (4)
In the morning they cut down a tree. The tortoise he so:

"jainda (5) biu, ŋkoi, oindaka (6) bo; (7) ŋgai
"We shall cut down we, leopard, cut down first, I

namotamba (8) na bontolọ;
mokakwaka, (9)
shall catch it on the breast; as soon as it will be falling.

naboŋgwa." (10) ŋkoi a'ambi (2).
I shall turn round." The leopard agreed.

baindi (2) mweti. te mokabêngga (11) nekakwa, (12)
They cut down a tree. When it was going to fall down,

ŋkumba amotambi, (13) aboŋgoi, (14) mwaŋgo (15) mokwei (16)
the tortoise caught it up, he turned round, it fell

o nse. baindi (2) mosu: (17) ŋkoi
on the ground. They cut down another, the leopard

atambi, (2) mowomokwedgi, (18) awei. (16)
caught it up, it fell upon him, he died.

ŋkumba amokwei, (18) amosesi, (18) akei (16) o
The tortoise took him, he cut him to pieces, he went to

mboka, akɔdgi (19) na bamboka (20) tr: "ŋkoko-
the village, he said to the village-people so: "grandfather-

ŋkoi (21) akɔdgi kí (22) tr bamatomela (23)
leopard just said so that they should send to him

dɡikemba ɗda ndɡidgi na mokwa na mom Fut: (24)
a plantain of taboo and salt and a big jug."
bawkwedzi (25) o bwato. nkumba adzongi (2) o
They shipped in the canoe. The tortoise went back to
molako, alambi (2) nkoi na dzikemba
the fishing-camp, he cooked the leopard with the plantain
na mokwa o momfu, akatodzi, (26) alei, (16)
and the salt in the jug, he took off the fire, he ate,
aidadza (27) akwei (16) nkua insa, abeidza (28) na
he finished. He took the bones all, he gathered in
esika jawi; (29) aikangzi (30) na mbeto, akwedzida (25)
place one; he bound them in a mat, he embarked
o bwato; anakalela, (31) mpiodzi inakabima, (31)
in the canoe, he starts weeping, the tears start coming out.

nkumba akomi (2) o mboka, bamotuni (32)
The tortoise arrived in the village, they asked him
bango tr: “okedzi (19) ndi?” nkumba jo tr:
they so: “Thou hast done what?” The tortoise, he so:
“modzika-nkoi (21) aindiki (22) mweti, mpir (33) mwmokwedzi, (19)
“Uncle-leopard (had) cut down a tree and it fell on him,
awe; (16) akodzi (22) tr: “jakoma (5) je o
he died; he has said so: “When wilt arrive thou in
mboka, bwamfulolaka, (34) bolelaka (5) bolele boledzi,” (35)
the village, do not unroll me, mourn only (to) mourn.”
balubodzi (36) nkoi, bolele (35) nkua mpamba, (37)
They put ashore the leopard, only bones
aidzingi (38) na mbeto. baledzi, (19)
he had bound them in a mat. They mourned,
balelaka (1) banso, nkumba akwei (16)
ythey had been mourning all, the tortoise took
monduri, (39) audgi (19) jo tr: “namolei (40) na
a tooter, he tooled he so: “I have eaten him with
mokwa na madzi, namolei (40) na mokwa na
salt and palm-oil, I have eaten him with salt and
madzi, a. s. o.” batuni (2) bango tr: nkumba, je
palm-oil.” they asked they so: “Tortoise, thou
onakolo (41) tr ndr? " ŋkumba jo tr: "nanalela (42) sayest so what?" The tortoise he so: "I am mourning modgika." baledgi (19) boba (43) banso. ŋkumba audgi (19) the uncle." They mourned again all. The tortoise tooted mondlul: "namolei na mokwa na madgi, the tooter: "I have eaten him with salt and palm-oil." a. s. o." babobi (43) netuna baggo tr: "ŋkumba, They began again to ask they so: "Tortoise, onalela (44) tr ndr?" nanalela bobele modgika-ŋkoi." thou criest so what?" I am mourning only uncle-leopard." baggo tr: "ŋkako! le nainu biu toFulola." (45) baeni They so: "A lie! let yet we that we unroll." They saw bobele ŋkua mpamba. ŋkumba akwei (16) o mai, only bones. The tortoise fell in the water, akuki (2) na mondlul mwand, (46) jo tr: "namolei (40) he escaped with tooter his, he so: "I have eaten him na ŋkandga, na mokwa na madgi." bakundi (2) with slynness, with salt and palm-oil." They buried ŋkoi, batonqi (2) ŋkasa, (47) baikala. (48) mwana the leopard, they twisted leaves, they put them. Child moko (49) wa mangala (50) jo tr: "le mpr ŋga nala." (51) a certain of yaws he so: "Let also I that I put." bango bamolemedgi, (52) bamobeti (53) mpr They were angry with him, they beat him and bamomanidza. (54) atonqi (2) mokasa (47) mwandr they put him out of the way. He twisted basket his mpendera, (55) aikala (56) o nsungga ja mai. own, and he put it on the edge of the water. baikakeka (57) na ŋkele: ŋkasa ja They went and looked in the morning: the baskets of bakolo nto. jo aikakeka (57) adgi (58) the older people empty. He went and looked, he had got ŋkumba. ŋkumba amosisi: (59) "ndqongia (60) the tortoise. The tortoise threatened him: "Put me back
noki, ndenakotumbodgi (61) mangala, nenawei (62) quickly. I shall tear open to you the wounds, I shall die
wantwana, (63) nenaFodgi. (64) asimbi (2) mondgika mwana immediately, I shall rot. He blew a wind. The child
onamei (65) aoki (2) nsolo, jo tr: "aFodgi." (20) that one noticed the stench, he so: "He is rotten."
amobwaki (66) o mai, aikalela (67) bakolo He threw him into the water, and he cried to the old people
jo tr: "nadgiki (58) nkumba, mbia jo tr: "ombwaka, (68) he so: "I had got the tortoise, then he so: "Throw me back,
enajei (69) nsolo." mbia aFodgi, (19) ajie (16) I shall become stench." Then he rottened, he became
nsolo, namobwaki." (70) bakolo bangglo tr: stench, I have thrown him back." The older ones they so:
"nkakao!" bakomi (2) na nkale, bakie (16) elango, (71) "A lie!" They arrived in the morning, they went together,
bangglo bamimbombi. (72) mwana akeki (2) mokasa, they hid themselves. The child looked (at) the basket,
adj (58) nkumba. nkumba jo tr: "ombwaka (68) he had got the tortoise. The tortoise he so: "Throw me back
noki, nenajei (69) nsolo." bakolo babimi (2) quickly, I shall become stench." The old ones came out
na mbangg (73) bamolubodgi (74) o mokidgi, bakie (16) with haste they took him ashore on the ground, they went
na ndi (46) o mboka. nkumba jo tr: with him to the village. The tortoise he so:
"jamboma (75) binu, bobekaka (5) mwadga wa nkondi, (76) "If you will kill me you, do call the woman favourite,
bonykweteke (77) nga o nsingga ja mai, nananola (78) cut me me on the edge of the water, that I may rest
nkingu janga o ebelo ja mwadga.
neck my on the thigh of the woman.
bakedzi (19) bonamei (79) nkumba ananodzi (78) nkingu
They did so. The tortoise rested the neck

on the thigh, they cut. The tortoise drew back himself;

The thigh of the woman was cut, the woman died.

The tortoise escaped in the water, he tooted the tooter:

"bosisoi, bosisoi!" (59)
"Caught, caught!"

balei (16) nkasa boba, baikakeka (57)
They put the baskets again, and they went and looked

na nkela. eingle ja mangala amodzi, (81)
in the morning. The boy of the yaws had got him,
bamokangi, (82) bakei (16) bonganga (1) o mboka
they bound him, they went (to fetch) medicine at

monsoso. (83) monsoso jo ti: "ce, ce, cerrr! (84)
the king-fisher's he so: "kj, kj, krrrr!

bolamba mai, ce, ce, cerrr! matoke, (85) ce, ce, cerrr!
boil water, kj, kj, kjrrr! bubbling, kj, kj, kjrrr!

mai ma mweja, (86) ce, ce, cerrr! bomomelaka (87) o
water hot kj, kj, kjrrr! put him in

mai, ce, ce, cerrr! neboeni, (88) wamirwa awei. (16)
the water, kj, kj, kjrrr! You will see, immediately he is dead.

bakedzi (19) bo (89) enakoloko (90) jo, baizangi (2) o
When they had done as had said he, they returned to

mboka, bakangi (2) nkumba, balambi (2) mai. nkumba
the village, they tied the tortoise, they boiled water. The tortoise

jo ti: "bomwamoka (91) o nsunga ja ebale. ba'ambi (2)
he so: "kill me on the edge of the river. They agreed

mpamba. mai matoki, (2) bamokwei, (82) bamomedzi (82)
. The water bubbled, they seized him, they put him

o mai, awei. dzibanda dz'idzi (92) bonamei.
into the water, he died. The story ends so.
Notes

(1) bakendeke < ba-a-kende-ke, remote definite past tense of kende, to go. ba-, personal pronoun prefix referring to nkoi and nkumba; a-, tense-prefix; kende, verb-stem and -ke tense-suffix. Verbs in a have suffix -ka, those in o, suffix -ko: balelaka, they have twisted; basanko, they have sewn. Note: The final object of kende, to go, and ja, to come, immediately follows the verb: akendeke ndunda, he went (to fetch) vegetables, ajei dgiikambo, he has come (for) a palaver, bakei bonganga, they went (to fetch) medicines.

(2) bakomi, indef. past tense of koma, to arrive. Likewise, ba‘aki, a’ambi, baindi, atambi, adzongi, alambi, akomi, batuni, akuki, bakuki, batongi, atongi, asombi, auki, a-fodgi, akeki, babimi, badzongi, bakanzi, balambi, ba’ambi, indef. past tenses of ake, amba, inda, tamba, and so on, all verbs in a; baemi, bakweti from ene, kwete, verbs in e; ba-fodgi, matoki from fo lo, toko, verbs in o.

(3) In unstressed syllables r and e often alternate; also o and u: e.g. bwato, canoe, besides bwatu and bwato. Attention should be paid to the suffixes -elr and -ele, when the final vowel is significant, -elr being suffix to nouns of instruments and -ele, suffix to nouns indicating the place where something is done, e.g. ebaelr, a ladder but etukele, a sleeping-room, from ba, to mount, and tuka, to sleep.

(4) The citative adverb tr has been sufficiently discussed in Mabale Stories, Bulletin, Vol. V, Part II, p. 361, note (3), and Part III, p. 584, note (15).

(5) yainda < e-a-inda, immediate future of inda, to fell. a-, tense-prefix; e-, personal pronoun ref. to a noun esika meaning (i) place, (ii) moment, (iii) when, if. The real subject is biau, we, and follows the verb. Compare further jakoma je and jamboma binu.

(6) oindaka, 2nd pers. singular of the imperative of inda, to cut down; o- is the pers. pron. prefix and -ka the continuative suffix, added to the imperative to express emphasis. Further, bolelaka and bobekaka from lela, to mourn and beka, to call.

(7) bo: < boso, properly a substantive meaning forehead, front, and used as an adverb and a preposition in the sense of: in front, first, formerly, in front of, before; bo: is also used as an adverb meaning as: tena makaya bo mateni ngai, cut the tobacco-leaf as I did. Note: A certain number of names of villages on or near the Congo are introduced by bo-, e.g. Bomangi, Bo, Bokatulaka, Bobeka, Bondgingili and Bomana (officially and wrongly Umangi, Upoto, Ukaturaka, Mobeka, Mondingiri). Here bo is not prefix 14, but the
substantive bo < boso, which clearly appears from the pronunciation of bomana, where bo- bears the stress as well as -mana.

(8) namotamba, simple tense of tamba, to catch; mo- pron. prefix direct-object ref. to mweti.

(9) mokakwaka, immediate past future of kwa, to fall.
(10) nabongwa, immediate future of bongwa, to turn round.
(11) mokabenga, immediate future of benga, to be going to.
(12) nekakwa, future infinitive of kwa, to fall; neka-, prefix.
(13) amotambi, indef. past tense of tamba, to catch up; mo- refers to mweti.

(14) abongoi, indef. past tense of bongwa, to turn round, neuter form; the active form is bongola, to make to turn round. The primitive form bonga, is no longer to be found; secondary derivatives are bongolela or bongwela (bongo-ela < bongo-l-ela) to make to turn to, and bongolisa or bongwisa (bongo-isa < bongo-l-isa) to make to turn.

(15) mwango < mo-anggo, independent personal pronoun, ref. to mweti.


(18) mowomokwedgi, indef. past tense of kwela, to fall upon, applicative of kwa, to fall. (1 + i > digi, cf. note (19)). mo- refers to mweti, mo- to nokoi. Also in a-mo-kwei (from kwa, to take) and in a-mo-sesi (from sesse, to cut to pieces).

(19) akodgi, indef. past tense of kolo, to say, to speak. Likewise okedgi, baledgi, audgi, a fodgi, bakedgi, indef. past tenses of kela, lela, ula, folo.

(20) bamboka, the village-people, abbreviated from butu ba mboka.

(21) nokoko-nkoi, nokoko (pl. bokoko) properly means ancestor, just as modigìka in modigìka-nkoi properly uncle, i.e. mother's brother.

(22) akodgiki, near definite past tense of kolo, to say. In Ngala, the near def. past tense is as a rule made by adding -ki to the verb-stem, though in Mabale, through assimilation, the end-vowel of the stem becomes i; so in ain dikiki, he has cut down, from ina, to cut down. With monosyllabic verbs -ki is added, not to the verb-stem, but to the indef. past tense; so in nakei-ki, I went, dginoi-ki, it was raining, awei-ki, he was dead, near def. past tenses of ke, no, and wa, the
indef. past tenses of the same verbs being: nakei, dżinói, and awei. N. dżi-, in dżinói refers to dżikolo, heaven, which substantive is always expressed with the verb.

(23) bamotomela, conjunctive of tomela, to send to, applicative of toma, to send. bo- refers to people understood, equals French "on", German "man"; mo- is the objective personal pronoun prefix referring to ŋkoi.

(24) mënku. The unvoiced bilabial fricative is a very widespread sound. We found it not only in the Ngala-group, but also in the Mongo, Luba, and Kongo dialects. Ngala-group: Mabale: dżifoli, basket, emfamfa, an incapable and awkward fellow, bofo, seed; Iboko: mantofi, rubber, o nta fi, near; Ndobo: fwatow, canoe; Likoka: efekke, wind, wafo?, where?; Eleku: eliforo, door, koforo, cup, futa, to pay; Mbenga: momفقد, wind, folo, to rotten; Motembo: sofuta, sharp, keen-edged, sfoodi, black; Loseno: ifulu, bird, ifose skin; Lifoto: ifulu, bird, etafi, branch, ifojfoj, wind. Mongo: ifelo, wall, lofofos, skin; Luba: ifumu, chief, kafoja, fire, maruka, shield. The Tschwapa and Lopori rivers should be pronounced Lwafa and Lofoji. The native name of Charleston is dżoko fundi. Lemfu, a Bakongo town, is pronounced lemfo.

The voiced variety v is rather less commonly met with. Ngala group: Ndobo: mva, dog; Mbunji: vatú, canoe, mwa, dog, buel, male, dibue, stone, diboa, nine. Luba: mumu, hippopotamus, vula, rain, lwuva (place-name, commonly Lwebo); Kongo: muula, rain, vundula (place-name, commonly Vundula).

(25) bakwedgidga, indef. past tense of kwedgidga, to embark (active), causative of kwela, to embark (neuter), to go aboard, applicative of kwa, to take. The indef. past tense of all verbs ends in -i: tena, to cut, ateni, he cut, kolo, to say, akodgi, he said, bëte, to beat, abeti, he beat; the indef. past tense of the causative ends in a: tenidga, to cause to cut, atenidga, he caused to cut; cf. akwedgidga, aidgidga, bamomanidga, indef. past tenses of kwedgidga, idgidga, and manidga.

(26) akatodgi, indef. past tense of katola, to take off.

(27) aidgidga, indef. past tense of idgidga, causative of ila, to finish.

(28) abeitiga, indef. past tense of beitiga, to put.

(29) jawi < e-a wi, one; e- refers to esika; ja is the genitive particle, always used to indicate the concord between the numeral one, and the noun determined: one man, motu wawi (o-a-wi); one day, mokolo mwawi (mo-a-wi). The numerals 2–5 simply take the
prefix: two men, *batu 'babe*, three days, *mikolo mi'atu*, four islands, *bianga binei*, five spears, *makongo matanu*. The numerals 6–10 *motoba, nsambo, mwambi, ḏgibwa, ḏgomi* are substantives and, of course, unvariable.

(30) aikangi, indef. past tense of *ka nga*, to bind; prefix i- refers to *ŋkua*.

(31) anakalela, present continuative of *lela*, to weep, to mourn, to cry. Also *inakabima*, pres. cont. of *bima*, to come out; prefix i- refers to *mpiɔdgi*.

(32) bamotuni, indef. past tense of *tuna*, to ask. *mo-* refers to *ŋkumba*.

(33) *mpr*, sometimes *mfr*, conjunction used to connect two sentences or parts of sentences. The other conjunction *na*, which also signifies “and”, is used to connect two substantives or pronouns, e.g. *amopei nsu mpr adʒungi*, he gave him the fish and he went back; *mama na mwana wandi*, the mother and (with) her child.

(34) *bwam* ꞌululaka < *bo-a-m- ꞌulolaka-kə*; 2nd pers. plural, negative imperative of *Fulola*. *bo-*, pref. subject; *a-* negative tense-prefix; *m-* pers. pron. pref. object; *-ka*, continuative tense-suffix, indicating emphasis. *Fulola*, to unroll, is the inversive of *Fula*, to roll up.

(35) *bolelaka bobele boledği*. *bolelaka*, hortative imperative of *lela*, to cry; *boledği*, absolute infinitive of *lele*, depending from *bolelaka*; *bobele*, adverb, meaning “only, simply”, when preceding the verb and “definitely” when following the verb.

(36) *balubodʒi*, indef. past tense of *lubola*, to put ashore; the neuter form is *lubwa*, to go ashore.

(37) *mpamba*, properly a substantive, meaning “naught, nothing”, and used as an adverb and an adjective, with various meanings: *ameki tɔ nebuka ndʒete mpamba*, he vainly attempted to crack the stick; *bakeiki bokila na ŋkele, mpr badʒungi mpamba*, they went hunting in the morning and they came back without game; *motu (wa) mpamba*, an insignificant fellow, *dʒi ꞌołi (dga) mpamba*, an empty basket.

(38) *aidʒiŋgi*, indef. past tense of *dʒiŋga*, to gather; i-, prefix referring to *ŋkua*, bones.

(39) *mondulə*, tooter, made from the horn of a buffalo.

(40) *namolei*, indef. past tense of *le*, to eat; *mo-* refers to *ŋkoi*.

(41) *onakolo*, present indicative tense of *kolo*, to say, to speak.

(42) *nanalela*, present indicative tense of *lela*, to cry, to mourn.
(43) bo'ba, again, is an infinitive used here as an adverb. Cf. balei ƞkasa bobo, they again put the baskets. An equivalent construction, with bobo conjugated is found in: babobi netuna bango tr, they again began to ask, and we could say as well: babobi netuna bano and babobi nele ƞkasa.

(44) onalela, present indicative tense of lela, to mourn.
(45) to muchula, present conjunctive of Fulola, to unroll.
(46) mwandi, possessive pronoun; mwa (mo-a) refers to monduli and ndi (or jo) to ƞkumba.
(47) ƞkasa, collective of mokasa, a leaf, pl. mikasa.
(48) baikala, successive tense of la, to put; the tense-prefix is ika-; possibly < ba-i-ika-la; then i-, prefix would refer to ƞkasa.
(49) moko < mo-okko; -oko, indefinite adjective = a certain, some.
(50) mangala, plural of ƞgingala, yaw. The co-operation or even the presence of diseased or infirm people is looked upon as prejudicial to the success of an undertaking. They therefore are not admitted.
(51) nala, present conjunctive of la, to put.
(52) bamolemoledgi, indef. past tense of lemola, to be angry with; mo- refers to mwana; lemoa, to be angry.
(53) bamobe, indef. past tense of bete, to beat; mo- refers to mwana.
(54) bamemanidga, indef. past tense of manidga (see note 25), remove, to put out of the way, causative of mana, to be off; amani, he is off.
(55) mpungu, alone, adjective and adverb, probably originally a substantive of the n-n class: ƞgai mpungu, I alone, I in truth; bafaranka ba mpungu, one franc coins; mpo ja mpungu, an exception.
(56) aikala, successive tense of la, to put; ika-, tense prefix.
(57) baikakeka, successive tense of keka. Likewise aikakeka.
(58) adgi, for adgwei, indef. past tense of dgo, to get, to meet; the reciprocal form is dgo wana, to meet each other.
(59) amosisi, indef. past tense of sisa, to threaten; mo-, pers. pron. object, referring to ƞkoi. The intensive form is sisola and means "to dupe"; neuter form, sisa, to be deceived; cf. bosisoi! you are caught! indef. past tense of sisoa.
(60) ondungan, imperative of dungan, to put back, causative of dunga, to return; n-, pers. pron. prefix 1st pers. singular, object.
(61) ndenakotumbodi, future indicative of tumbo, to open (a wound); ko-, pers. pron.-prefix, 2nd pers. singular, object; tumboa,
reversive of tumble, to burn?; neuter form tumbo, to be opened: mpota etumboi, the wound is opened.

(62) nenawe, near future of wa, to die.

(63) wantwa, immediately; literally: on the spot (wa-nse-wa); nti = nse, ground. The locative prefixes have not been preserved in the Ngala-group, nor has the infinitive prefix (ku-); remnants of the 16th class (B. pa-, Ngala-Mabale wa-) are found in a few words as wantwa, immediately, walo? where? wabo (mei), here, wana (mei), yonder; remnants of the 17th class (B ku-, Ngala-Mabale o) are found in the quasi-preposition o as in onse, on the ground, ontei, in the middle, and in owo, there.

(64) nenafozi, immediate future of folo, to rot.

(65) onamei, demonstrative of the second form (with -na); mei (mei, mi, mr) is enclytic emphatic suffix.

(66) amobwaki, indef. past tense of bwaka, to throw; a-, pers. pron. pref. subject, ref. to mwana; mo-, pers. pron. pref. object, ref. to nkumba.

(67) aikalela, successive tense of lela, to cry; ika-, tense prefix.

(68) onbwaka, imperative singular, 2nd person of bwaka, to throw; m- pers. pron. pref., 1st person sing. object, ref. to nkumba.

(69) nenajei, near future of ja, to come, here: to become.

(70) namobwaki, indef. past tense of bwaka, to throw; mo-, pers. pron. pref., 3rd person sing. object.

(71) elango, together, properly a substantive of the e-class, meaning a series; in other dialects, molongo; in the dialect of Bonkula, lilongo, family, village.


(73) na mbangu, with haste; mbangu, substantive = fear (+ bang, to fear). na mbangu is also used to express the superlative: motu monene na mbangu, a very great man (cf. German: fürchterlich gross).

(74) bamolubodgi, indef. past tense of lubola, to take ashore; mo- ref. to nkumba.

(75) jamboma < e-a-m-boma, near future of boma, to kill; m- ref. to nkumba. For e-, cf. note (5).

(76) nkondi, favourite women of the ndongo, harem.
(77) bonkweteke, hortative imperative of kwete, to cut. η < m-, pers. pron. pref. object; ke- continuative suffix expressing emphasis.

(78) nananola, present conjunctive of nanola, to rest; ananodgi, indef. past tense of the same verb.

(79) bonamei, properly the demonstrative pronoun of the bo- class (second form, in -na). For -mei, see note (65).

(80) etenidga, indef. past tense of tenidga, to cut off, causative of tena, to cut, and used here in a passive sense.

(81) amodgi for amodgwei, indef. past tense of dgwa, to get; mo- refers to ŋkumba.

(82) bamokanga, indef. past tense of kanga, to catch; mo- refers to ŋkumba; bamokwei, ind. past tense of kwa, to take.

(83) o mboka monsoso, at the kingfisher's; mboka, substantive = village. Cf. o mboka ya monsoso, in the village of the kingfisher.

(84) çc, çç, ççrrr is the call of the kingfisher, which we represented by the palatal çç, on behalf of its strong i- resonance.

(85) bolamba, imperative plural, 2nd person of lamba, to boil.

(86) matoka, simple tense of toko, to bubble, here used as an adjective. mai ma mweja, hot water, literally, water of fire.

(87) bomomelaka, hortative imperative, 2nd pers. pl. of mela, to put in; -ka, emphatic suffix. mo-, ref. to ŋkumba.

(88) neboën, near future of eñe, to see.

(89) bo, cf. note (7).

(90) enakolokoko, habitual tense of kolo, to say; na- tense prefix, -ko, suffix. In subordinate sentences the real subject follows the verb, which is then introduced by the impersonal pronoun e-.

(91) bombomakaka, hortative imperative of boma, to kill; m- refers to ŋkumba.

(92) dgi'idgi, indef. past tense of ila, to finish.

Connected Translation

They went to the bank of the river and arrived at a fishing-camp. The following morning they cut down a tree. The tortoise said: "If we cut now, will you, leopard, cut first, and I shall catch the tree on my breast; as soon as it will be falling down, I shall turn round." The leopard agreed. They cut down a tree, and, when it was falling down, the tortoise caught it up and he turned round; as to the tree, it fell to the ground. They cut down another, the leopard caught it up, but it fell upon him and he died.
The tortoise took the leopard and cut him to pieces; he went to the village and said to the inhabitants: "Friend-leopard asked that a taboo-plantain should be sent to him and salt and a big jug as well." So they shipped those things and the tortoise went back to the fishing-camp. He boiled the leopard with the salt in the jug, he took the dish off the fire, he ate it and cleaned it up. He took all the bones and gathered them, he bound them in a mat, and embarked them into the canoe. He started weeping and tears started running down.

The tortoise arrived in the village and the people asked him: "What have you done?" The tortoise said: "Our friend, the leopard, cut down a tree and it fell on him and he died. He asked that, on his arrival at the village, people should not unroll him but just only mourn him." They put ashore the leopard, in fact only bones, which the tortoise had bound in a mat. They started weeping, and when all of them had done so the tortoise took his tooter and he tooted: "I have eaten him with salt and palm-oil, I have eaten him with salt and palm-oil, a.s.o." The people asked him: "What are you saying, you?" The tortoise answered: "I am mourning uncle-leopard." Again they all mourned, and the tortoise blew his tooter: "I have eaten him with salt and palm-oil, a.s.o." Again they asked him: "Tortoise, what are you crying?" "Well," the tortoise answered, "I am simply mourning uncle-leopard." But, the people replied: "You are a liar, just a moment and we unroll the mat ourselves." And what did they behold? A lot of bones and there was the end of it.

The tortoise fell in the water, he escaped with his tooter and tooted: "I have eaten him on the sly with salt and palm-oil." They buried the leopard, and twisted palm-leaves, which they put in the water. Thereupon a child, covered with yaws said: "Let me also put my basket in the water. But they were angry with him, beat him and put him out of the way. Nevertheless, he twisted his basket and placed it on the edge of the water. In the morning they went and looked at their baskets, but the ones belonging to the older people were empty. The child went and looked and he had got the tortoise. The tortoise threatened him saying: "Put me back, quickly, or I shall tear open your wounds, I should die immediately and rot." The tortoise then exploded. The child noticed the stench and said: "He is rotten." He threw him into the water and cried to the old people: "I had got the tortoise and he said, 'throw me back or I shall rot,' and, in fact, he began stinking, and I threw him back." The older ones called him a liar. They came back in the morning, went on together,
and hid themselves. The child also went and looked at his basket, and he had got the tortoise. The tortoise said: "Throw me away, immediately, or I shall rot." The old ones came out quickly, they took him ashore and went with him to the village. The tortoise said: "In case you people should kill me, please call my favourite, cut my head on the edge of the water and let me rest my neck on the thigh of the woman.

They did so. The tortoise rested his neck on the thigh of his favourite, they cut, but the tortoise drew back his head and the thigh of the woman was cut off and she died. The tortoise escaped in the water, and he blew on his tooter: "Caught, caught!"

They placed their baskets once more, and went and looked in the morning. The boy with the yaws had got the tortoise. They fettered him, they went and fetched medicines at the kingfisher's. The kingfisher said: "Kj, kj, kjrrr, boil water, kj, kj, kjrrr, bubbling, kj, kj, kjrrr, hot water, put the tortoise in it, kj, kj, kjrrr, and you will see, he will be dead in a second.

When they had done what he had told them to, they returned to the village, tied the tortoise and warmed water. The tortoise said: "Kill me on the edge of the water." "All right," they retorted. The water bubbled, they seized him, and put him into the water, he died. That's the end of the story.
A Chinese Vocabulary of Malacca Malay Words and Phrases collected between A.D. 1403 and 1511 (?)

Transcribed, translated, and edited by E. D. Edwards and C. O. Blagden

The list of words and phrases contained in this article is one of ten manuscript vocabularies bound up in a volume lettered Kō Kwō Yi Yū which forms part of the collection of Chinese books made by the well-known missionary, Morrison (who lived from 1782–1834), and has been deposited on permanent loan by University College, London, in the Library of the School of Oriental Studies.

All its contents are in Chinese characters, some of which are used in their proper senses to indicate the meanings, and others to serve as phonetic transcriptions, of the foreign words explained. Owing to the limitations of the Chinese phonetic system, these transcriptions are often imperfect and ambiguous, and that is one source of uncertainty in the identification of the Malay words in the list here published. Another is that the Chinese collector and his informants may sometimes have misunderstood each other, and the former may have misheard a word given to him even if it was the right one. Besides all this, there may also have been mistakes made by copyists.

For the manuscript is not an original. The colophon says that it was revised, and the reviser may well have added a few errors of his own. Certainly someone did. From internal evidence it seems probable that the words and phrases, or at any rate some of them, were collected half a century or more before the list was revised. The earliest historical date connected with Malacca is 1403, when a mission was sent from China to visit it and open up diplomatic relations. That mission returned to China in 1405, and the record of it contains the earliest certain mention of the existence of Malacca that is known to us; nor is there any clear indication as to how long the place may have been in existence before that time. In 1511 it was conquered by the Portuguese, and the Malay Sultan and chiefs, together with a considerable part of the Malay population, fled and abandoned it.

But in Parts VIII, IX, and XIV of our vocabulary there are words and phrases which seem to imply the existence of a Malay government. Moreover, in the whole vocabulary no European loanwords at all have been found; and there would almost inevitably have been
some if any considerable part of it had been made after the time of the Portuguese conquest.

It appears to be practically certain, therefore, that the vocabulary was compiled from lists of words collected within the period indicated above, and that it is the oldest Malay vocabulary known to us, the next oldest being the one made by Pigafetta in 1521.

That it was derived from several different sources is made highly probable by the fact that the same word is often transcribed in quite distinct ways, sometimes even in the same section (cf. 61 (with 67–9), 73–4, and 89–90; 63 (with 208), 64 (with 195), and 79–82; 192 and 206; 212 (with 433), 216 and 434; 278 and 469; 284 and 384). From the number of such cases it may reasonably be inferred that several independent collectors had been at work, and that their various word lists were afterwards consolidated into one and roughly subdivided into parts by a compiler, possibly by the reviser who added the colophon in the middle of the sixteenth century.

Owing to the peculiarities of Chinese transcription the vocabulary can teach us very little about the phonetics of the fifteenth century Malay. Nor does it give us much new material for Malay lexicography. This is hardly surprising when one considers how extraordinarily conservative the language has shown itself to be in these respects. In the Sumatran inscriptions of Śri Vijaya dating from A.D. 683–6, there are numerous words that are absolutely identical with their modern forms. (Cf. the vocabulary in BEFEO. xxx, 65–80.)

Nevertheless, it seemed worth while to rescue this old vocabulary from the obscurity in which it has rested so long. Malay documents older than the seventeenth century are decidedly rare, and very little indeed has come down to us from still earlier times; so that anything that can be discovered has a certain value. Besides, this document tells us something about the things that interested the Chinese collectors. Most of the words contained in it are substantives (and principally the names of things); then come adjectives; verbs are poorly represented, and other parts of speech are almost entirely wanting.

The greater part of the 482 entries could be identified at first sight. But others were not so obvious, and a few have resisted our best efforts. It is to be hoped, therefore, that other scholars will be more successful in dealing with them. When the Malay equivalents were not found in the usual dictionaries (such as those of Favre, Wilkinson, and Winstedt) an authority for them has been given,
unless, being loanwords, they are recorded in the ordinary dictionaries of the languages from which they were borrowed. Not all loanwords have been noted as being such, particularly when they are in common use in Malay; and they are generally given in their Malay, not their original foreign, forms. The titles of certain works of reference are given at the end of this paper. For the explanation of some of the botanical names we are also specially indebted to the personal assistance of Mr. H. N. Ridley, C.M.G.

It might have been expected that the Chinese transcription would indicate what kind of Chinese the collector used as a basis. But an examination shows that no single systematic method was in use, which confirms the conclusion already indicated above that several collectors, each with his own method, have been at work. The latitude they allowed themselves may be illustrated, for example, by the use of the character chên, which does duty for the Malay sounds chên, chêng, jê(r), jing, ching, and chin.

Accordingly the romanization adopted has been that of Pekinese, as found in Giles's dictionary, which though under the circumstances often conventional, has at least the merit of uniformity and facilitates reference. For the Malay, the ordinary system of romanization used by English scholars has been followed.

A literal translation of the Chinese catchwords has been given in most cases, in order to assist in determining the Malay equivalents.

For convenience of reference the entries have been numbered and an asterisk has been added to those which are discussed in the notes, such notes being numbered identically. In certain cases, where the reference is to another number, the latter has been added to the asterisk.

It is rather remarkable that Malay is not one of the languages recorded by Hirth in his article mentioned at the end of this paper, as having been officially studied during the period at which this vocabulary was compiled. Yet from internal evidence it seems likely that it was in fact compiled under official auspices, and a priori that would seem most probable. A Chinese-Japanese vocabulary, bound up in the same volume as our Chinese-Malay one, has a colophon indicating that it was revised in the same year, though not by the same person.
| 1 | 天 | 天 | 空 | 安利 | an la | Allah* |
| 2 | 日 | 日 | sun, day | 哈利 | ha li | matahari* |
| 3 | 月 | 月 | moon, month | 補蓝 | pu lan | bulan |
| 4 | 風 | 風 | wind | 安因 | an yin | angin |
| 5 | 雲 | 雲 | cloud | 亞湾 | ya wan | awan |
| 6 | 雷 | 雷 | thunder | 孤路 | ku lu | guroh |
| 7 | 雨 | 雨 | rain | 鳥占 | wu chan | hujan |
| 8 | 天晴 | 天晴 | sky clear | 安利得都 | an la tē tu (tou) | — tēdoh* |
| 9 | 露 | 露 | dew | 安奔 | an pên | ēmbun |
| 10 | 星 | 星 | star | 兵因當 | ping yin tang | bintang* |
| 11 | 煙 | 煙 | smoke | 哈撒 | ha sa | asap |
| 12 | 斗 | 斗 | dipper, Dipper | 兵當都竹 | ping tang tu chu | bintang tujoh* |
| 13 | 霧 | 霧 | mist, fog, vapour | 干必答 | kan pi ta | gempita* |
| 14 | 霞 | 霞 | red clouds, vapour, obscurity | 邦孤寧 | pang ku ning | mambang kunning* |
| 15 | 天陰 | 天陰 | sky (day) cloudy | 安利格藍 | an la ko lan | — kēlam* |
| 16 | 天黑 | 天黑 | sky (day) black | 安利希丹 | an la hsi tan | — hitam* |
| 17 | 天寒 | 天寒 | day (weather) cold | 安利定因 | an la ting yin | — dingin* |
| 18 | 天熱 | 天熱 | day (weather) hot | 巴納恩安利 | pa na ssū an la | — panas* |
| 19 | 天旱 | 天旱 | day (weather) dry | 麻淤 | ma lao | kēmarau* |
| 20 | 刮風 | 刮風 | blow wind (It is windy) | 立安因 | li an yin | — angin* |
| 21 | 狂風 | 狂風 | violent wind | 安因到販 | an yin tao fan | angin tofan* |
| 22 | 大風 | 大風 | big wind, gale | 安因補撤 | an yin pu sa | angin bēsar |
| 23 | 小風 | 小風 | small wind, breeze | 安因格只 | an yin ko chih | angin kēchil |
| 24 | 冷風 | 冷風 | cool (chill) wind | 色菊安因 | sē chū an yin | angin séjok* |
| 25 | 好風 | 好風 | (a) pleasant wind | 安因拜 | an yin pai | angin baik* |
| 26 | (b) enjoy the breeze | | | | | |
| 27 | 停風 | 停風 | stop blowing | 安因不論的 | an yin pu lun ti | angin bērhenäti |
| 28 | 阻風 | 阻風 | hindering wind | 安因刺布 | an yin la pu | angin laboh* |
| 29 | 恶風 | 恶風 | (a) unpleasant wind | 安因者下 | an yin chē hsia | angin jahat* |
29 無風  (There is) no wind
安因骨都  an yin ku tu  angin têdoh*?
30 風響  wind sound, i.e. the sound of wind
安因布宜  an yin pu i  bunyi angin*
31 雷響  thunder sound =
狐路布宜  ku lu pu i  bunyi guroh*
32 大雨  heavy rain
烏古布撒  wu chan pu sa  hujan bessar
33 小雨  small (gentle) rain
烏古格只  wu chan ko chih  hujan kêchih
34 細雨  fine rain
烏古信你  wu chan hsin ni  hujan sêni
35 下雨  to rain
烏古都論  wu chan tu lun  hujan turun
36 雨久  continued rain
烏古刺麻  wu chan la ma  hujan lama
37 雲散  clouds scatter
亞灣得即  ya wan te lang  awan têrang*
(disperse)
38 雲開  clouds open
亞灣得即  ya wan te lang  awan têrang*
(disperse)
39 雲飛  clouds flying
亞灣得力邦  ya wan te li pang  awan têrbang*
40 月上  moon rise(s)
補藍巴路奈  pu lan pa lu nai  bulan baharu
41 月落  moon set(s)
麻速補藍  ma su pu lan  bulan masok*
42 月明  moon (is) bright or moonlight
得浪補藍  té lang pu lan  têrang bulan*
43 月光  moonlight
得吟補藍  té yin pu lan  — bulan*
44 月半  moon half
登加補藍  teng chia pu lan  tengah bulan*
45 日出  sunrise
哈利格祿  ha li ko lu  matahari
46 日落  sunset
哈利麻速  ha li ma su  matahari
47 日午  midday
哈利登加  ha li teng chia  tengah hari*
48 日晚  late in the day
哈利麻速  ha li ma su  matahari
49 星出  (when the) stars come out
兵因當格祿  ping yin tang ko bintang
40 白日  during the day
哈利西洋  ha li hsi yang  siang hari*
51 電  lightning
肌藍  chi lan  kilat*

1. *Allah (= "God") is appropriate here, but quite inadmissible in 8, 15–18, where the proper word is hari.
2. *hari = "day", cf. 47, 50, 97, 100; *matahari = "sun", cf. 45, 46, 48; for *mata, cf. 64, 352.
8. Cf. 1, 29, 88, and 100.
10. For the transcription, cf. 49.
16. hari hitam would be an unusual expression; literally "black day".
17. Cf. 94, 105.
18. The Malay order is inverted by the transcription, unless the meaning is to be "the heat of the day" or "the day is hot". Cf. 1.
19. = "drought". For the omission of the first syllable, cf. 14, 144, 228, 312, 313, 321, 328, 348, 415, and 441.
20. li makes no sense, unless it is for di, which might mean "in (the wind)". Or it might represent the first syllable of ribut "storm" (in which case the Malay order is inverted). Or cf. 166.
21. tofān is the Arabic tufān, but the transcription suggests a pronunciation taufān.
24. The Malay order is inverted, unless it means "the coldness of the wind" or "the wind is cold".
25. = "favourable wind".
27. Literally "an anchoring wind", an expression unknown to us, but conveying the sense of the Chinese.
28. = "bad wind".
29. Cf. 8, 88, and 100. The second word is doubtful; perhaps ku should be t'i.
30, 31. The Malay order is inverted, unless these are sentences, e.g. "the wind sounds", in which case bērbunyi would be better than bunyi.
37, 38. The words seem certain, but the sense should be "bright (or clear) clouds".
39. The transcription suggests that the word was pronounced tērēbang.
40. = "moon just rising" (or "risen").
41. The Malay order is normally the opposite.
42. The Malay order is not necessarily wrong, but somewhat unusual, unless the meaning is "moonlight".
43. The first word should be the same as in 42.
44. Normally this should mean "the middle of the month".
45, 46. The first word should be matahari. Cf. 2 and 48. The last syllable of kēluar is also omitted in 49 and 316.
47. The Malay order is inverted.
48. Cf. 46, which gives the true sense.
49. For the transcription, cf. 10 and 45.
50. The Malay order is inverted.
51. lan is presumably a case of mishearing.

**Part II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>地</td>
<td>earth, ground, world</td>
<td>布迷</td>
<td>pu mi</td>
<td>bumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>石</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td>巴都</td>
<td>pa tu</td>
<td>batu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>路</td>
<td>road</td>
<td>達達</td>
<td>chē lan</td>
<td>jalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>土</td>
<td>earth, soil</td>
<td>答那</td>
<td>ta na</td>
<td>tanah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>磚</td>
<td>brick</td>
<td>巴答</td>
<td>pa ta</td>
<td>bata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>城</td>
<td>city, city wall</td>
<td>谷達</td>
<td>ku ta</td>
<td>kota*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>村</td>
<td>village</td>
<td>路孫</td>
<td>lu sun</td>
<td>dusun*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>园</td>
<td>garden</td>
<td>鸚奔</td>
<td>ko pēn</td>
<td>kēbu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>泥</td>
<td>mud, mire</td>
<td>答那</td>
<td>ta na</td>
<td>tanah*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>河</td>
<td>river</td>
<td>松喝</td>
<td>sung ho</td>
<td>sungai*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>山</td>
<td>hill</td>
<td>步吉</td>
<td>pu chi</td>
<td>bukit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>水</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>亞亦兒</td>
<td>ya i īrh</td>
<td>ayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>泉</td>
<td>a spring</td>
<td>媽答亞兒</td>
<td>ma ta ya īrh</td>
<td>mata ayer*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>井</td>
<td>a well</td>
<td>蘇木兒</td>
<td>su mu īrh</td>
<td>sumor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>瓦</td>
<td>tile</td>
<td>亞答根丁</td>
<td>ya ta yēn ting</td>
<td>atap gênting*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>大河</td>
<td>large river</td>
<td>松喝補撤</td>
<td>sung ho pu sa</td>
<td>sungai bēsar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>小河</td>
<td>small river</td>
<td>松喝格只</td>
<td>sung ho ko chih</td>
<td>sungai kēchil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>河寬</td>
<td>river wide</td>
<td>漣摚思</td>
<td>sung ho to ssū</td>
<td>sungai luas*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>大海</td>
<td>large sea</td>
<td>漣補撤</td>
<td>lao pu sa</td>
<td>laut bēsar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>小海</td>
<td>small sea</td>
<td>漣格只</td>
<td>lao ko chih</td>
<td>laut kēchil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>大湖</td>
<td>large lake</td>
<td>巴也補撤</td>
<td>pa yeh pu sa</td>
<td>paya bēsar*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>大港</td>
<td>large lagoon, harbour</td>
<td>松岩補撤</td>
<td>sung yen pu sa</td>
<td>sungai bēsar*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>小港</td>
<td>small lagoon, harbour</td>
<td>松岩格只</td>
<td>sung yen ko chih</td>
<td>sungai kēchil*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Sound Equivalent</td>
<td>Malay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大山</td>
<td>large hill</td>
<td>pu chi pu sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小山</td>
<td>small hill</td>
<td>pu chi ko chih</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大浪</td>
<td>large waves</td>
<td>an pa pu sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小浪</td>
<td>small waves</td>
<td>an pa ko chih</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>水大</td>
<td>the water (is) big</td>
<td>ya i pu sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>水小</td>
<td>water small</td>
<td>ya i ko chih</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>潮落</td>
<td>tide fall</td>
<td>ya i ma su</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>潮起</td>
<td>tide rise</td>
<td>ya i pa sang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>東海</td>
<td>eastern sea</td>
<td>lao pu sa ti mën</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>南海</td>
<td>southern sea</td>
<td>lao pu sa hsi la tan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>北海</td>
<td>northern sea</td>
<td>lao pu sa wu ta la</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>山嵐</td>
<td>mountain mist</td>
<td>san pa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>嶺下</td>
<td>mountain range</td>
<td>pa wa pu chi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>息浪</td>
<td>still the waves</td>
<td>an pa ku tu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大江</td>
<td>large river</td>
<td>su ai pu sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小江</td>
<td>small river</td>
<td>su ai ko chih</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. also = "fort".
58. also = "orchard, grove of fruit-trees" in the jungle.
60. = 55. The Malay word means "earth, ground", not "mud, mire".
61, 67, and 69. *ho* is a curious substitute for the *ai* that is required here (cf. the *ko* for *kai* in 114). Some Chinese dialects have *hap*, *hak*, *ah* here and it seems possible that the transcription represents a dialect of Malay differing from the Malacca standard.
64. Literally, "eye of water" = 63 and 352.
66. = "tiled roof". Cf. 235.
69. Presumably the Chinese collector heard the initial *l* as a *d*.
72. *paya* = "swamp".
73 and 74. For *yen* some Chinese dialects have *ngang*, *nga*, others *yai*, *yei*, which latter would be more suitable here. The meaning "lagoon, harbour" is not quite correct, as the Malay word means
“river” (61), but the connection is evident, the reference being to the broad lower part of a river near its mouth.

81. The Malay means “water enters”, not the falling tide (which is ayer surut). This is no doubt a case of misunderstanding.

86. “fleecy clouds, indistinct masses of vapour in the sky”.

87. “(at) the foot of the hill”.

88. The second half is doubtful: perhaps ku should be t’i and tu should be lang. The meaning would be “the waves (become) calm”.

89, 90. For ai some Chinese dialects have the more suitable ngai.

**Part III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning.</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent.</th>
<th>Malay.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>春</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>mén tung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>夏</td>
<td>summer</td>
<td>pa tu ssū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>秋</td>
<td>autumn</td>
<td>wēn pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>冬</td>
<td>winter</td>
<td>ti yin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>年</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>kēng na ta wēn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>時</td>
<td>time, season</td>
<td>chan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>ha li ting chia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>夜</td>
<td>night</td>
<td>ma lan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>昏</td>
<td>dusk, twilight</td>
<td>ko lan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>晴</td>
<td>clear, blue sky</td>
<td>ha li tē tu (tou)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>早</td>
<td>early (morning)</td>
<td>pa chi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>歲</td>
<td>year (of age)</td>
<td>ta wēn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>晚</td>
<td>late (evening)</td>
<td>ma lan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>凉</td>
<td>cool, chill</td>
<td>sē chū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>冷</td>
<td>cold</td>
<td>ting yin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92. The second character of the transcription is wrong. Cf. 18.

94. There is no doubt as to the identification, but the transcription is not very good (cf. 105). For ti some Chinese dialects have tik, tit, tih. On the above four words it may be remarked that as in Malay there are no seasons (in the Chinese sense of the word, and our own) the translations are only conventional.

95. Assuming the identification to be correct, the Malay order is inverted and the meaning would be “a full year”. Cf. 102.

96. jam = “time, hour” (not “season”).

97. The Malay order is inverted and the true sense is “midday” (= 47).
### Part IV

**Flowers and Trees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flower</td>
<td>布亞 pu ya</td>
<td>bunga*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grass</td>
<td>蘆布 lung pu</td>
<td>rumput</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bamboo</td>
<td>布魯 pu lu</td>
<td>buloh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jujube</td>
<td>柯羅麻 ko lo ma</td>
<td>khurma (P.)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plum, prune</td>
<td>亞三淡利亞 ya san tan li ya</td>
<td>asam ? — *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mulberry</td>
<td>蘇及 su chi</td>
<td>[unidentified]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garlic</td>
<td>堡旺布的 pa wang pu ti</td>
<td>bawang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wood, tree</td>
<td>加右 chia yu</td>
<td>kayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water-melon</td>
<td>閱的格 mën ti ko</td>
<td>méndikai*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet melon</td>
<td>不的 pu ti</td>
<td>bitthik (Ar.)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cucumber</td>
<td>的閑 ti mën</td>
<td>timun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweet cane</td>
<td>得步 té pu</td>
<td>tébu*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hirneola polytricha,</em></td>
<td>真答溫 chên ta wên</td>
<td>chêndawan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an edible fungus</td>
<td>the lungan —</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nephelium longana</em></td>
<td>必答納知南 pi ta na chih nan</td>
<td>bêdara China*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lichee</td>
<td>剃謨丹 la mo tan</td>
<td>rambutan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandarin orange</td>
<td>利毛 li mao</td>
<td>limau*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Citrus nobilis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coconut</td>
<td>牛兒 niu êrh</td>
<td>nior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persimmon</td>
<td>柯參麻 ko ts’an ma</td>
<td>kêsêmak*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egg-plant, brinjal</td>
<td>木茄子 mu chia</td>
<td>— *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paddy</td>
<td>巴的 pa ti</td>
<td>padi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walnut</td>
<td>市哇格刺思 shih wa ko la sâ</td>
<td>buah kéras*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making wood for</td>
<td>刺布 la pu</td>
<td>rabun *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“tree incense”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garoo wood, <em>Aquilaria</em></td>
<td>答麻兒 ta ma êrh</td>
<td>damar*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>agallochum</em></td>
<td>加魯丁加藍 chia lu ting chia</td>
<td>gaharu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lan</td>
<td>tênggêlam*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Sound Equivalent.</td>
<td>Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 cloves</td>
<td>真皆</td>
<td>chén chieh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 putchuck (root of a</td>
<td>布竹</td>
<td>chêngkêh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>species of Cashmere thistle)</td>
<td></td>
<td>puchêk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 sandalwood</td>
<td>真答那</td>
<td>chên ta na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 frankincense, gum</td>
<td>更地鲁干</td>
<td>kêng ti lu kan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>olibanum</td>
<td></td>
<td>—*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 a fragrant seed like</td>
<td>正丹</td>
<td>chêng tan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dill (Fannlicum</td>
<td></td>
<td>jintan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dulce)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 perfumes, scent</td>
<td>巴巴灣</td>
<td>pa pa wan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 laka wood</td>
<td>加右剌加</td>
<td>kayu laka*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 benzoin</td>
<td>魯干</td>
<td>—*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 rose malo*s or liquid</td>
<td>木剌</td>
<td>rasamala ?*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 asafetida</td>
<td>烏孤</td>
<td>ying ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 sapan or sappan wood</td>
<td>習邦</td>
<td>hsi pang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 pepper</td>
<td>那答</td>
<td>na ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 myrrh</td>
<td>磨兒</td>
<td>mo êrh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 Urdnorsia strychni-</td>
<td>烏般衣丹</td>
<td>wu pan i tan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>folia (lit. black</td>
<td></td>
<td>ubat hitam*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medicine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 gum-lac</td>
<td>巴涝</td>
<td>pa lao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 rattan</td>
<td>澗丹布的</td>
<td>(ém)balau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146 betel-nut</td>
<td>連安別</td>
<td>rotan puteh*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 a tree grown in S. China from which a pungent incense is made. Its root resembles the willow root and is white</td>
<td>弄布亞葉兒</td>
<td>lien an pieh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 dragon’s blood (resin from Daemonorops draco)</td>
<td>真兒那</td>
<td>lung pu ya yeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>êrh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149 gamboge</td>
<td>亞答</td>
<td>chên êrh na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 ginger leaves</td>
<td>西亦</td>
<td>jèrnang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>artal, hortal*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[unidentified]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meaning. | Sound Equivalent. | Malay.
---|---|---
151 蘿蔔 (turnip) | 羅巴 lo pa | lobak*
152 片腦 camphor | 加不兒 chia pu érh | kapur*
153 蔷薇露 rose water | 亞亦兒麻亞 ya i érh ma ya | ayer mawar
154 硬澄茄 cubes | 千謨骨思 kan mò ku ssū | kēmukus*
155 檜榔木 Caryota ochlandra | 蘇利飢 su li chi | [unidentified]*
156 花梨木 Chinese rosewood | 加由不懾 chia yu pu o | kayu
157 鐵梨木 iron wood | 加由不息 chia yu pu hai | bongor ?* kayu bēsi*

106. The transcription seems to represent buah “fruit”, rather than bunuh “flower”.
109. = “date”.
110. asam (literally “sour”) is the first part of several plant names. The rest is not certain, but Mr. H. N. Ridley suggests rēmēnia, “the plum mango” (Bouca microphylla).
112. Literally “white onion (or bulb)”, the usual name for garlic.
114. For ko some Chinese dialects have kak, kaik, kah. Cf. 61.
115. Other variant Arabic forms are batākh and bitāikh. This word appears to be the original of the Malay bētek, which the Chinese transcription is meant to represent. In our time it means the papaya (or papaw), a fruit first introduced by Europeans from America, to which about a dozen different names have been applied in as many (and more) Indonesian languages. Cf. Eneycl. v. N.-I., s.v. papaja.
118. The Malay word means “fungus”, in general.
119. The Malay word (literally “Chinese plum”) = “jujube”, Zizyphus jujuba Lam. (Rhamnæa).
120. rambutan is Nepheleum lappaceum L. (Sapindaceæ). The Chinese name refers to N. litchi Camb.
121. limau = any citrus, big or small.
123. The persimmon is not a local fruit, and is now usually known in Malaya by its Japanese name kaki (often preceded by the word pisang “banana, plantain”).
124. The transcription seems to give the Chinese name preceded by the Chinese word for “tree”. If it is to be read muka, we know of no such name for the egg-plant (brinjal, aubergine), which in Malay is called tērong.
125. = "rice in the husk".

126. The first character of the Chinese transcription must be meant for pu not shih. The Malay means, literally, "hard fruit," and is really the name of the "candle-nut", *Aleurites moluccanus* L. (*Euphorbiaceae*).

127. The identification is not quite certain. The Malay word means "a drug for fumigation", or the smoke of it, and "to fumigate". There is also a word *rubok" "tinder".

128. *damar* is "tree resin" (not necessarily incense).


133 and 137. These entries are puzzling. By a slight alteration of the last character in the transcription it could be made into *f pan*, so that 137 and the second half of 133 would represent the Arabic *lubān" "incense". In that case the first half of 133 might conceivably (though very doubtfully) stand for the Arabic *kundur*, which has a similar meaning, or even the Sanskrit *gandha" "perfume". Cf. Chau, pp. 195 seq., 199. There are, however, other possibilities. There is recorded in Wilkinson's dictionary (s.v. *kēmēnnyan*) a "sweet smelling gum" named *k. sērani*, literally "Christian benzoin" (i.e. of foreign origin) that has a synonym *gētah rokam*, which might be the origin of our transcription.

134. The Malay word means "caraway seed", an imported product (*Carum Carvi* L. *Umbelliferae*) and other similar things, such as cumin and anise. Cf. Ridley, s.v. Jintan.

136. Cf. Chau, 211. According to the *Encycl. v. Ned.-Indië*, this is *Lawsonia inermis* L. (*Lythraceae*), but Favre makes it *Myristica iners*. It does not, however, appear under either name in Ridley’s list of Malay plant names, but Mr. Ridley in a personal communication writes that it is a shrubby climber, *Dalbergia parviflora* Roxb., found in Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula, the wood of which is valued as incense.

137. Probably this is for *lubān*. See 133.

138. Cf. Chau, pp. 200–1, where the following are distinguished, viz. (1) the storax of the ancients, apparently a product of *Styrax officinalis*, still common in Syria, (2) storax oil, a product of *Liquidambar orientalis* L., of Asia Minor, and (3) a liquid storax produced (probably) from the *Liquidambar altingiana* L., of Java, the native name of which is *rasamala*. This latter name seems to have been
applied ultimately in the Malayan region to (2) as well. Cf. Hobson-Jobson, s.v. *rose-mallows*. The *Encycl. v. N.-I.* considers the name *rasamala* to be derived from *ros melleus* “honey dew”, but Hobson-Jobson and the Oxford Dictionary treat *rasamala* as the original word; and it seems very unlikely that a local tree would be named after the foreign name either of a foreign product or even of its own. Another *liquidambar* is also found in America (cf. Garcia da Orta, part i, bk. i, chap. 1, *ad fin.*, bk. 3, chap. 6).

The Chinese transcription, however, is not entirely convincing and the matter is complicated by the fact that *molō* is said to be one of the foreign (i.e. non-Chinese) names for frankincense (Chau, p. 196).

143. The Malay name also means “black medicine”, and is the name of several species of *Goniothalamus*, particularly *Giganteus* and *Ridleyi*, the latter having also the variant name *banitan*, which is possibly the origin of the form in the transcription.

145. Literally “white rattan”. Cf. 445. The transcription suggests an archaic (and etymologically justifiable) pronunciation *rautan*.

146. The transcription has not been interpreted. It may be corrupt, and the order of the characters may have been changed. The proper Malay word is *pinang*, from which the Chinese name (attested by I Tsing in the seventh century) is derived.

147. Literally “water grass”.

149. The Malay means “orpiment”.

150. Perhaps *sirch* “the betel leaf”, *sērai*, Citronella grass (*Andropogon Cymbopogon*), or the Javanese *jañi* “ginger”?

151. The Malay name applies to *Raphanus caudatus* L. (*Cruciferae*).

152. This is the camphor from *Dryobalanops*, found in Sumatra, Borneo, and the Malay Peninsula.

154. The transcription indicates the Malay form, the original Javanese being *kumuku*.

155. Possibly there has been misunderstanding here. The word in transcription looks like *sēligi* “javelin”, a weapon made from the nibong palm (*Onosperma tugillaria*).

156. *bongor* is *Lagerstroemia regina* or some allied species.

157. The Malay name also means “iron wood” and according to the *Encycl. v. Ned.-Indie* it includes a variety of hard, dark woods. Cf. 424.
### Part V

**Birds and Beasts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>dragon</td>
<td>龍</td>
<td>那加 (nà jiā)</td>
<td>nga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>tiger</td>
<td>虎</td>
<td>亚利毛 (yà lì máo)</td>
<td>harimau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>serpent, snake</td>
<td>蛇</td>
<td>動刺兒 (dòng cì ér)</td>
<td>ular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>elephant</td>
<td>象</td>
<td>加扎 (jiā zā)</td>
<td>gajah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>camel</td>
<td>羊</td>
<td>安答 (ān dā)</td>
<td>onta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>ox</td>
<td>牛</td>
<td>凌布 (líng bù)</td>
<td>lēmbu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>sheep, goat</td>
<td>羊</td>
<td>干兵 (gān bīng)</td>
<td>kambing*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>horse</td>
<td>馬</td>
<td>谷達 (gǔ dá)</td>
<td>kuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>fish</td>
<td>魚</td>
<td>利干 (lì gàn)</td>
<td>ikan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>cat</td>
<td>猫</td>
<td>孤貞 (gū zhēn)</td>
<td>kuching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>dog</td>
<td>獅</td>
<td>安貞 (ān zhēn)</td>
<td>anjing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>pig</td>
<td>猪</td>
<td>革刺歹 (jié cì dài)</td>
<td>babi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>goose</td>
<td>鵝</td>
<td>昂撒 (áng sā)</td>
<td>angles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>duck</td>
<td>鴨</td>
<td>易的 (yì de)</td>
<td>itek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>chicken</td>
<td>雞</td>
<td>亞脈 (yà mài)</td>
<td>ayam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>donkey</td>
<td>驴</td>
<td>革刺歹 (jié cì dài)</td>
<td>kalalai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>deer</td>
<td>麋</td>
<td>撒鹿 (sā lù)</td>
<td>rusa*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>river deer, roebuck</td>
<td>狩 (shòu)</td>
<td>犬 (quǎn)</td>
<td>kijang*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>tortoise (turtle)</td>
<td>龟 (guī)</td>
<td>奔牛 (bèn niú)</td>
<td>pênyu*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>shrimp, prawn</td>
<td>蝦 (xiā)</td>
<td>鳜（wū tāng）</td>
<td>udang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>crab</td>
<td>螃</td>
<td>格當必 (gē dàng bì)</td>
<td>kêtam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>turtle</td>
<td>鱗</td>
<td>布通（bù tōng）</td>
<td>labi-labi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>hare, rabbit</td>
<td>免 (miǎn)</td>
<td>布通吉雅 (bù tōng jí yà)</td>
<td>pêlandok*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>leopard, panther</td>
<td>豹 (biāo)</td>
<td>亞加兒 (yà jiā ér)</td>
<td>harimau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>insect</td>
<td>昆</td>
<td>wu la (wu là)</td>
<td>ulat*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>ant</td>
<td>蟲</td>
<td>西阿（xī ā）</td>
<td>sêmut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>bee</td>
<td>蜂</td>
<td>hsi mo (hsì mó)</td>
<td>sialang*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>phœnix</td>
<td>凤</td>
<td>hsiēf lang (hsìēf láng)</td>
<td>puehong *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>parrot</td>
<td>鷲</td>
<td>布通加加都哇 (bù tōng jiā jiā dú wā)</td>
<td>kakatua*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>the “ch'i-lin” or “unicorn”</td>
<td>麒麟 (qí lín)</td>
<td>吉嶺 (jí líng)</td>
<td>—*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>lion</td>
<td>狮</td>
<td>西阿（xī ā）</td>
<td>singa*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>peacock</td>
<td>孔雀 (kǒng què)</td>
<td>布龍木刺（bù lóng mù cì）</td>
<td>burong mèrak*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>frog, toad</td>
<td>蝌蚪 (kē duò)</td>
<td>丁加答え (dīng jiā dá dí)</td>
<td>katak*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>spider</td>
<td>蜘蛛 (zhī zhū)</td>
<td>刺巴 （cì bā）</td>
<td>labah-labah*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192 麻鹊</td>
<td>193 鹧鸪</td>
<td>194 老鼠</td>
<td>195 水鸭</td>
<td>196 海马</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>麻鹊 (=? 雀) sparrow</td>
<td>鹧鸪</td>
<td>老鼠</td>
<td>水鸭</td>
<td>海马</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>布籵必閉</td>
<td>奴力</td>
<td>的孤思</td>
<td>易的亞兒</td>
<td>谷達勞不撒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| pu lung pi pi | nu li | ti ku ssu | i ti ya érh | ku ta lao pu sa | lung pa lung pa | pu lang lao pu sa | ko la pao | ya yen ya na | pu lung ku érh | pu lung ku ning | pu lung pu i | pu lung pa ao | pu lung chia chia | pu lung pi pi | chia ting | i té ya i érh | ya yen ya pi | pa tu pu lung | pa tu pu lung | pa tu pu lung | hsi hsi | tsu la | an chên sha la | ku chên pu i | to (= hsi hsi) na chia | tu lang na chia | tan tu na chia | ku ku na chia | ku ti ya li mao | batok burong* | burong pipit* | nurí | tikus | itek ayer* | kuda laut | bēsar* | lomba-lomba* | bērang-bērang | laut bēsar* | kērbau* | ayam alas* | burong | tékukur ?* | burong kuning* | burong bunyi* | burong | bangau* | burong gagak* | burong pipit* | gading | itek ayer* | ayam api* | burong batu ?* | sisek* | chula* | anjing salak* | kueching bunyi* | sisek naga* | tulang naga | tandok naga | kuku naga | kulit harimau | Malay.

Meaning.

Sound Equivalent.

Malay.
### Chinese Vocabulary of Malacca Malay Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tiger whiskers</td>
<td>章骨亞利毛</td>
<td>chang ku ya li mao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiger paw</td>
<td>者的亞利毛</td>
<td>chè ti ya li mao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiger claws</td>
<td>孤孤亞利毛</td>
<td>ku ku ya li mao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiger hair</td>
<td>必祿亞利毛</td>
<td>pi lu ya li mao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ride a horse</td>
<td>奈谷達</td>
<td>nai ku ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a riding-horse</td>
<td>谷達剌利</td>
<td>ku ta la li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kill an ox</td>
<td>凌布卜奴</td>
<td>ling pu pu nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wasp (lit. yellow bee)</td>
<td>i ya</td>
<td>pênyêngat ?*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

164. Primarily "goat", but also applied to sheep.
166. *li kan* for *ikan* seems to be a case of mishearing. Cf. 20.
174. = "stag". The two characters of the transcription are inverted.
175. = "the barking deer". The first character has been rectified, as the identification is practically certain.
176. = "sea turtle" (the one that produces tortoiseshell).
179. = "a river turtle". The transcription does not indicate the reduplication. It may be that the word was at that time used in its simple form.
180. = "mousedeer", a very small antelope, *Tragulus kanchil*.
181. *akar* = (1) "root", (2) "climbing rattan". The prefixing of 159 gives the meaning "leopard".
182. = "maggot", and the like.
184. The usual word for "bee" is *lêbuah; bêrsialang* = "swarming", *pokok sialang* = "a tree where bees nest".
185. = "heron". The identification is doubtful, resting merely on resemblance of sound.
186. = "cockatoo", imported from the eastern part of the Archipelago.
187. The transcription merely reproduces the Chinese name, which may possibly have been known to some Malays, though it does not seem to have gained a footing in the language.
188. The character *ah* is sometimes pronounced *ngah*.
189. Here and in 192, 201–6, and 210–1 we have the generic word *burong* "bird".
190. The first syllable of the transcription remains unexplained.
191. As in 179, the word is now reduplicated. The variant *laba-laba* is also recorded.
192. = 206. *pipit* is applied also to some finches and some weaver birds.

195. The Malay also means "water duck", and is applied to the cotton teal, *Nettopus coronundianus*. Cf. 63, 171, and 208.

196. Literally "horse of the big sea". It is not clear what animal is intended by the Malay, which may be merely a translation of the Chinese.

197. = "porpoise".

198. Literally "otter of the big sea". Another case of omitted duplication, cf. 179, 191. As for the meaning, cf. 196.

199. The transcription suggests a pronunciation *kērebau* (or even *karabau*).

200. = "jungle fowl", in Javanese and probably in Malay also, though not found recorded with that meaning. The two words *ayam* and *alas* are, each of them, in use; but the ordinary word for "jungle" is *hutan*.

201. The identification seems reasonably certain though only a part of the specific name is given in the transcription.

202. Literally "yellow bird". The oriole is now styled *burong kunyit-kunyit*, "the turmeric-coloured bird."

203. If a sentence, it means "a bird calls", and *bērbunyi* would be better (cf. 30, 31). If the meaning is to be "the sound of a bird", the order must be inverted.

204. A white bird, rather like a stork, the egret *Herodias alba*, and other allied species. (Cf. Winstedt, s.v. *bird*.)

205. = "Malayan crow".

206. = 192, q.v.

208. = 195, q.v.

209. Literally "fire fowl", which is a translation of the Chinese name, and does not appear to be recorded elsewhere in Malay. In mediaeval Chinese it also applied to the cassowary, a Moluccan bird (Groen., pp. 198, 262), which is probably what is meant here.

210. Doubtless this was what Groeneveldt calls a "crane crest", which, as he explains (p. 198) was really the horny crest of the hornbill (*buceros*), from which buttons, etc., are carved. *batok* = "crown of the head", often confused with *batu* "stone".

211. The Malay order is inverted in the transcription. As rectified, it means "stone (or rock) bird", unidentified, and is a literal version of the Chinese name.

212. = "scale, shell (of tortoise)". Cf. 216, 433, and 434.
213. To complete the sense, badak “rhinoceros”, should come after this.

214, 215. As they stand these entries are sentences: “the dog barks,” “the cat makes a noise” (where bērbunyi would be better, cf. 30, 31, 203). If they are to mean “the dog’s bark” and “the cat’s noise” the animal names must come last.

216. Cf. 158, 212. Here the transcription has the character to wrongly for hsi hsi.

221. Literally “tiger’s beard”. Cf. 365.

226. Can mean either (1) “a running horse” or (2) “the horse runs”. Presumably the former is intended.

227. The Malay order is inverted. Cf. 163.

228. Though the identification is not quite certain, one Chinese dialect would read this ngi nga; cf. 346. For the omission of an unstressed first syllable, cf. 19, 144, 312, 313, 321, 328, 348, 415, and 441.

**PART VI**

**宮室 Houses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>229 殿</th>
<th>Meaning.</th>
<th>路麻剌扎不弄罕</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent.</th>
<th>番</th>
<th>Malay.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>230 屋</td>
<td>hall, temple</td>
<td>lu ma la cha pu lung pan</td>
<td>rumah raja</td>
<td>pērēmpuan*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231 門</td>
<td>room (N.), house (S.)</td>
<td>lu ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 懈</td>
<td>door, gate</td>
<td>ping tu</td>
<td>rumah*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233 大房</td>
<td>window</td>
<td>chē lan cha an</td>
<td>pintu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234 小房</td>
<td>large house</td>
<td>ch'i ma pu sa</td>
<td>jala-jala ?*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235 瓦屋</td>
<td>small house</td>
<td>lu ma ko chih</td>
<td>rumah bēsar*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a tiled house</td>
<td>lu ma ya ta kēn ting</td>
<td>rumah kēchil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rumah atap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gēnting*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


230. = “house” (not “room”).

232. = “lattice”. The identification is doubtful.

233. The first character ch'i should be lu, as in 229, 230, 234, and 235.

235. Cf. 66.
### Part VII

**Implement, etc.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>卓</td>
<td>table</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>— *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>椅</td>
<td>chair</td>
<td>ku lu hsi</td>
<td>kērusi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>凳</td>
<td>stool, bench</td>
<td>ku ta</td>
<td>gēta*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>碗</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>man ku</td>
<td>mangkok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>盽</td>
<td>tea-cup, wine-cup</td>
<td>cha wan</td>
<td>chawan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>碟</td>
<td>saucer, small plate,</td>
<td>pi ling</td>
<td>piring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or dish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>鍋</td>
<td>saucepan</td>
<td>ko wa li</td>
<td>kuali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>弓</td>
<td>bow</td>
<td>pa na</td>
<td>panah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>箭</td>
<td>arrow</td>
<td>ya na pa na</td>
<td>anak panah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>火</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>ya pi</td>
<td>api</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>灰</td>
<td>ashes</td>
<td>ya pu</td>
<td>abu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>柴</td>
<td>fuel, brushwood</td>
<td>chia yu</td>
<td>kayu*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>筆</td>
<td>pen</td>
<td>chia lan</td>
<td>kalam (Ar.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>墨</td>
<td>ink</td>
<td>mang hsi</td>
<td>mangai (Sans.)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>砧</td>
<td>ink-slab</td>
<td>pa tu</td>
<td>batu*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>筷</td>
<td>chopsticks</td>
<td>sun pi</td>
<td>sumpit*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>紙</td>
<td>paper</td>
<td>ko lu la ta ssū</td>
<td>kērta (Ar.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>傘</td>
<td>umbrella</td>
<td>pa yung</td>
<td>payong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>鎖</td>
<td>a lock</td>
<td>k'un chih</td>
<td>kunchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>船</td>
<td>boat</td>
<td>yung</td>
<td>jong*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>扇</td>
<td>fan</td>
<td>ch'i pa ssū</td>
<td>kipas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>棋</td>
<td>chess, etc.</td>
<td>chu chi</td>
<td>chēkí*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>槌</td>
<td>a scull, large oar</td>
<td>ko ling</td>
<td>[unidentified]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>簿</td>
<td>boat-pole</td>
<td>chia yu pan chang</td>
<td>kayu panjang*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>梆</td>
<td>mast</td>
<td>ti yang</td>
<td>tiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>間</td>
<td>spear</td>
<td>su tu (tou)</td>
<td>suda ?*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>直</td>
<td>sail, awning</td>
<td>la ya ērh</td>
<td>layar*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>炳</td>
<td>cord, string</td>
<td>ta li ma</td>
<td>tali — *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>琴</td>
<td>&quot;lute&quot;</td>
<td>tē wa sa</td>
<td>[unidentified]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>斧</td>
<td>axe</td>
<td>chia pa</td>
<td>kapak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>甲</td>
<td>armour</td>
<td>chi la i</td>
<td>kērai, kēre (Jav.)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>床</td>
<td>bed</td>
<td>ku la</td>
<td>killat (Ar.) ?*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>斗</td>
<td>a peck, dipper, 10 pints</td>
<td>tu chin</td>
<td>— *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Sound Equivalent</td>
<td>Malay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269 升</td>
<td>pint</td>
<td>谷剌</td>
<td>ku la</td>
<td>kulak*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270 盆</td>
<td>basin</td>
<td>打颜</td>
<td>ta yen</td>
<td>_*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271 鍋</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>札灣</td>
<td>cha wan</td>
<td>chawan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272 鞭子</td>
<td>a whip</td>
<td>斬沒的</td>
<td>chên mei ti</td>
<td>chêmêti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273 灯台</td>
<td>lamp-stand</td>
<td>加及顔</td>
<td>chia chi tien</td>
<td>kaki dian*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274 刀子</td>
<td>knife</td>
<td>必殺鳥</td>
<td>pi sha wu</td>
<td>pisau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275 算盤</td>
<td>abacus</td>
<td>卜記那</td>
<td>pu chi na</td>
<td>bêrkira ?*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276 枕頭</td>
<td>pillow</td>
<td>八安丹</td>
<td>pa an tan</td>
<td>bantal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277 筷子</td>
<td>comb</td>
<td>西昔兒格刺</td>
<td>hai hsi êrh ko la</td>
<td>sisir _*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278 鏡子</td>
<td>mirror</td>
<td>遮飾面</td>
<td>chê la miên</td>
<td>chêrmin*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279 藤子</td>
<td>mat</td>
<td>地加</td>
<td>ti chia</td>
<td>tikar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280 鐵竈</td>
<td>iron stove</td>
<td>大卜兒</td>
<td>ta pu êrh</td>
<td>dapur*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281 盒子</td>
<td>small box</td>
<td>只布</td>
<td>chih pu</td>
<td>chêpu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282 袜條</td>
<td>carpet strip</td>
<td>八弄黑達泥</td>
<td>pa lung ma ta ni</td>
<td>pêrmadani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283 匣子</td>
<td>case, casket</td>
<td>加刺思</td>
<td>chia la ssû</td>
<td>karas*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284 頭盔</td>
<td>helmet, hat-block</td>
<td>吉刺</td>
<td>chi la</td>
<td>kulah (P.)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285 靴子</td>
<td>saddle</td>
<td>不刺那</td>
<td>pu la na</td>
<td>pêlana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286 鏟子</td>
<td>? pot, jar, jug, pitcher</td>
<td>布的</td>
<td>pu ti</td>
<td>buli-buli*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287 盤</td>
<td>dish, plate, tray</td>
<td>兵干</td>
<td>ping kan</td>
<td>pinggan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288 秤</td>
<td>steel-yard</td>
<td>大秤</td>
<td>ta ch'êng</td>
<td>daching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

236. Unidentified. The transcription seems to be corrupt.

237. From the Arabic kursi. The transcription suggests (but does not necessitate) a pronunciation kurusi, which may well have existed.
238. "a sleeping platform, divan, broad sofa, or couch."
240. = 271. The expression means "tea-cup" and is of Chinese origin.
247. = 113.
249. "A black compound of burnt tamarind bast used at Batavia for staining the teeth." Modern Malay uses, for "ink", dawat (Ar.) and tinta (Portuguese); Minangkabau has mansi in the sense of "indigo" (Van der Toorn).
250. = 53, "stone."
251. Recorded by Shellabear in his article on "Baba Malay";
JSBRAS., No. 65, p. 62.
255. = "junk."
257. A card game, believed to be of Chinese origin.
259. = "long piece of wood". The proper word is galah.
261. Doubtful identification: *suda* is a "caltrop".
262. "sail".
263. *tali* = "cord, string". The syllable *ma* is unexplained and probably corrupt.
266. Recorded for Javanese in the sense of "armour of plaited (or interwoven) copper or iron wire" and "blind of bamboo", but for Malay only in the second sense. The Javanese forms are *kēre*, *kre*, the corresponding Malay form is *kērai* (Van Ronkel).
267. = "mosquito curtain, bed curtains". The identification is doubtful.
268. The transcription seems to represent two Chinese words.
269. = "a measure (for rice and oil)". In the early part of the fifteenth century it is described (for Java) thus: "A joint of bamboo is cut off and made into a measure which is called *kulak* and is equal to 1.8 *shēng* or pint, official measure." (Groen., p. 178, adds that this is about 1.86 litres.) Minangkabau has the same word under the form *kula'*(Van der Toorn).
270. Unidentified. If we could make it *tēpayan* it would mean "a large jar".
271. = 240, q.v.
273. = "candlestick".
275. = "to count". Cf. 343. The identification is very doubtful.
277. *sisir* = "comb", but the last two syllables of the transcription are unexplained.
278. Cf. 469. The two transcriptions suggest that the pronunciation was *chērēmin*, as it often is to-day.
280. = "cooking place, hearth".
283. = "box" (apparently for the betel chewing outfit, see *J. Malayan BRAS.*, vol. iii, pt. i, pp. 37, and vol. vi, pt. iv, p. 37). It does not seem to be recorded in the dictionaries in this sense.
284. Also *kulāh*: "helmet, tiara" = 384.
286. = a rounded bottle or flask with a long narrow neck; in modern Malay the word is reduplicated.

**PART VIII**

**Persons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>皇帝</td>
<td>Emperor</td>
<td>su tuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>太子</td>
<td>Heir-apparent</td>
<td>ya na la cha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>皇后</td>
<td>Empress</td>
<td>la cha pu lun pan raja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>皇 妃</td>
<td>Imperial concubine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>大 人</td>
<td>your Excellency (great person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>老 爺</td>
<td>&quot;old gentleman&quot; (a title)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>頭 目</td>
<td>head-man, chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>男 子</td>
<td>man, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>女 人</td>
<td>woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>父</td>
<td>father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>母</td>
<td>mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>兄</td>
<td>elder brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>弟</td>
<td>younger brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>娘</td>
<td>woman, wife, mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>妻</td>
<td>wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>爺</td>
<td>father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>子</td>
<td>son, child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>孫</td>
<td>grandson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>公</td>
<td>duke, gentleman, sir, Mr., male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>婆</td>
<td>old woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>伯</td>
<td>father’s elder brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>叔</td>
<td>father’s younger brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>嫂</td>
<td>elder brother’s wife, married woman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

290. = "child of a raja", not necessarily heir apparent.
291. Literally "female raja". Cf. 229.
292. Literally "small female raja".
293. Literally "great person" (like the Chinese term).
294. Literally "rich man", but also used as a title.
295. = "minister (of state)".
296. The first character of the transcription should be la and the whole should be doubled, to mean "male"; laki = "husband".
299. Not recorded as Malay in the usual dictionaries, but found in Van der Toorn.
300. Usually "elder sister", "elder brother" being *abang*.
302. Apparently the character is written in error for *ju* ("to enter"), *ngip* in Hakka, *yép* in Cantonese. The Malay word means "mother". Alternatively it might be *èmbok*, which has the same sense.
303. Apparently a case of mishearing.
304. = 298.
307. The last half of the transcription must be doubled. But the expression means "grandfather", and is not used nowadays as a title, though its more usual equivalent *dato* is both "grandfather" and "chief". Cf. 296.
308. = "grandmother".
309. Literally "elder father".
310. Literally "younger father" = 304 + 482.
311. = "elder sister". Cf. 300.

**PART IX**

**Human Affairs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>312 拜</td>
<td>希八</td>
<td>yin pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worship, bow obeisance, honour, visit</td>
<td>ménnyémbah*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 跪</td>
<td></td>
<td>tu lu ērh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kneel</td>
<td></td>
<td>bértēlok*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314 你</td>
<td></td>
<td>tuan nan pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td></td>
<td>tuan hamba*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 我</td>
<td></td>
<td>pi ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>beta*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 出</td>
<td></td>
<td>ko lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(go) out</td>
<td></td>
<td>kēluar*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 入</td>
<td></td>
<td>ma su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enter</td>
<td></td>
<td>masok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318 進</td>
<td></td>
<td>ma su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enter</td>
<td></td>
<td>masok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 退</td>
<td>retire, withdraw</td>
<td>wèn tung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>undor ?*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 行</td>
<td>walk</td>
<td>chè lan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>jalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 立</td>
<td>stand</td>
<td>ti ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bérdiri*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322 坐</td>
<td>sit</td>
<td>tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dudok*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323 看</td>
<td>look, see</td>
<td>lièh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lihat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324 見</td>
<td>perceive, see, apprehend</td>
<td>su ta lièh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mén néng ya ērh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325 聽</td>
<td>listen</td>
<td>mén(d)ēngar*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

人 事
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning.</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent.</th>
<th>Malay.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arrange the service (of underlings)?</td>
<td>cha an ku tien</td>
<td>[unexplained]*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go along Imperial highway</td>
<td>nai ya hsi ta na</td>
<td>naik astana*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have audience with emperor</td>
<td>ya ta</td>
<td>mënghadap*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repeatedly bow</td>
<td>la chi yin pa</td>
<td>lagi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get up, arise</td>
<td>pa wên</td>
<td>bangun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceremony ends</td>
<td>su ta</td>
<td>sudah*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bestow</td>
<td>chung chung nu</td>
<td>junjong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bow</td>
<td>seû lan</td>
<td>salam (Ar.)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“kowtow”</td>
<td>su chu</td>
<td>sujud (Ar.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thank for kindness</td>
<td>yi a su tuan</td>
<td>hai Sultan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rise from kneeling</td>
<td>pa wên ti ti</td>
<td>bangun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall prostrate, make obeisance</td>
<td>ma li pu chi an</td>
<td>béribi kian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long live the Emperor!</td>
<td>ta wên hsi la sha</td>
<td>pênganugérâh*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>congratulate</td>
<td>hsi la</td>
<td>sila*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional products</td>
<td>pa lang</td>
<td>barang*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>hu lang pan ta</td>
<td>orang pandai*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deliberate upon, consult</td>
<td>chi la</td>
<td>kira*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banquet</td>
<td>la chê ch'a mu</td>
<td>raja jamu*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respond, reply</td>
<td>mu (mo) yeh wu</td>
<td>mënuyabut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minutely, carefully</td>
<td>i ya</td>
<td>ingat*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not agree, not permit</td>
<td>ti ta ko ti</td>
<td>tidak —*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

312. In this and 313 the unstressed prefixes seem to have been overlooked. Cf. 321, 328, 329, 336, and 441.
313. Or bértélut, which is the normal form.
314. Literally "master of the slave", an honorific serving as a pronoun.
315. Rather a literary word, used chiefly in correspondence.
316. For the transcription, cf. 45 and 49.
319. A somewhat doubtful identification.
322. The transcription character ought to have been doubled.
324. Literally "has seen".
325. = "hear". The d is optional.
326. The transcription seems to represent two or three Malay phrases embodying instructions or orders in connection with arranging persons according to rank or precedence or the like. It seems possible that the first two characters (cha an) = jangan "do not!"
327. = "go up into (i.e. enter) the palace".
328. Cf. 312. The sense is correct, though literally the word means "to face".
329. Cf. 312.
331. = "finished".
332. = "humbly accept" (literally "put on one's head") "the princely bounty".
333. = Arabic salām, the usual salutation and accompanying gesture, though the transcription would fit sēlam "to dive". Possibly the Chinese gesture of bowing was misunderstood by the informant who gave the Malay equivalent.
335. = "O Sultan", which is not the usual courtly mode of address.
337. A probable interpretation, which would mean "thousands of bounties", though the form with the prefix pēng- does not seem to be recorded.
338. = "bow".
339. = "10,000 years". Cf. 459. The expression is a literal version of the Chinese.
340. = "please".
341. = "things".
342. = "a clever (or competent) person".
343. = "reckon". Cf. 275.
344. = "the raja entertains (at a feast)".
346. = (1) "to remember", (2) "remember!", i.e. "be careful!"
347. The second half is unidentified. Cf. 480.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>head</td>
<td>pa la</td>
<td>kēpala*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body, person</td>
<td>yeh wa ērh</td>
<td>awk ?*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face</td>
<td>mu chia</td>
<td>muka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chest</td>
<td>ta ta</td>
<td>dada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye</td>
<td>ma ta</td>
<td>mata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>pu lu</td>
<td>pērut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mouth</td>
<td>mu lu</td>
<td>mulut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abdomen</td>
<td>t’u o (wu)</td>
<td>tubah *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foot</td>
<td>chia chi</td>
<td>kaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nose</td>
<td>i tung</td>
<td>hidong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ear</td>
<td>ti li ya</td>
<td>tēlinga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liver</td>
<td>ya ti</td>
<td>hati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eyebrow</td>
<td>kēng ning</td>
<td>kēning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kidneys</td>
<td>ta ta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heart</td>
<td>ya ti</td>
<td>hati*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hair</td>
<td>lan kung</td>
<td>[unidentified]*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waist</td>
<td>ping kang</td>
<td>pinggang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beard</td>
<td>chang ku</td>
<td>janggut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teeth</td>
<td>chi chi</td>
<td>gīgi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lungs</td>
<td>ya ti</td>
<td>hati*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand</td>
<td>tang an</td>
<td>tangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>throat</td>
<td>li hei</td>
<td>leher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hair</td>
<td>pu lu</td>
<td>bulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nerves</td>
<td>wu la</td>
<td>urat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forehead</td>
<td>tai</td>
<td>dahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bones</td>
<td>to lang</td>
<td>tulang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tongue</td>
<td>pu chi ta</td>
<td>[unidentified]*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leg, thigh</td>
<td>pa hsiu</td>
<td>paha*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lips</td>
<td>pi pi</td>
<td>bibir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milk, breast</td>
<td>su su</td>
<td>susu*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navel</td>
<td>pu sa</td>
<td>pusat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspiration</td>
<td>pu lu</td>
<td>pēloh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palm, sole of foot</td>
<td>chē ti</td>
<td>jari*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skin</td>
<td>ku ti</td>
<td>kulit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>claws, nails</td>
<td>ku ku</td>
<td>kuku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
348. For the omission of the first syllable, cf. 14, 19, 144, 228, 312, 313, 321, 328, 415, and 441.

349. The identification is doubtful and the word awak, though formerly meaning “body”, is now generally used as a substitute for the 2nd personal pronoun, singular. Perhaps, however, nyawa “soul, life” is intended. This is supported by the spelling of 345.

355. = “body”.

361. Unidentified. There has probably been some misunderstanding here.

362. = 359. For “heart” jantong (hati) would be better.

363. “Hair of the head” is rambut.


374. The Malay word should be lidah.

375. = “thigh”.

377. Cf. 412, 413. The word is primarily “breast (female)”, and then through (ayer) susu, literally “water (i.e. liquid) of the breast”, “milk”, the word ayer being omitted.


**PART XI**

**Clothes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>383 員領</td>
<td>official collar</td>
<td>baju leher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384 紗帽</td>
<td>gauze hat (of officials)</td>
<td>buntar*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385 金帶</td>
<td>gold girdle</td>
<td>kulah (Pers.)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386 小帽</td>
<td>“small” hat</td>
<td>kamar (o)mas*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387 帽子</td>
<td>satin</td>
<td>kopiah (Ar.)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388 布袍</td>
<td>cloth shirt</td>
<td>kimkha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389 裙子</td>
<td>skirt</td>
<td>(Pers.)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390 裤子</td>
<td>trousers</td>
<td>baju (Pers.)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391 絲子</td>
<td>thin silk, pongee</td>
<td>—*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392 竹布</td>
<td>bamboo cloth</td>
<td>sèluar (Pers.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393 夾衣</td>
<td>lined clothes</td>
<td>kain rawa *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394 撒鞋</td>
<td>slippers</td>
<td>[unidentified]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395 帳子</td>
<td>curtains</td>
<td>baju tèbal*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kaus (Ar.)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>këlambu*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Meaning | Sound Equivalent | Malay
--- | --- | ---
396 椅子 | mattress ? | chia su [unidentified]
397 靴子 | boots | mo cho mozah (Pers.)
398 楼服 | "narrow fabric," | so [unidentified]

**383.** Literally "round neck-coat". Cf. 388.
**384.** = 284, q.v.
**385.** From Persian kamar "waist, girdle, belt" and 419.
**386.** The transcription seems to represent the Arabic pronunciation kufiyyah.
**387.** The Persian kimkhā is said to mean "damask silk of different colours".
**388.** = "coat" (Persian bazu).
**389.** Probably meant for kain, a character having been omitted, which means (1) "cloth", (2) "clothes", and in particular (3) "skirt", i.e. the sarong.
**391.** = "rainbow silk", a doubtful identification.
**393.** Literally "thick coat", 388 + 473.
**394.** = Arabic kauth "shoes".
**395.** = "mosquito curtain".

### Part XII

#### 飲食 Food and Drink

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>399 米</td>
<td>rice</td>
<td>pu la ssù beras*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 酒</td>
<td>&quot;wine&quot;, distilled spirits</td>
<td>ya la arak*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 飯</td>
<td>cooked grain</td>
<td>na hsi nasi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 茶</td>
<td>tea</td>
<td>ya i ch'a ayer cha(h)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403 肉</td>
<td>meat</td>
<td>ta ching daging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404 油</td>
<td>oil</td>
<td>mi niang minyak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 酱</td>
<td>sauce</td>
<td>chiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406 麵粉</td>
<td>flour</td>
<td>k'un tung gandum (Pers.)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407 飲酒</td>
<td>drink spirits</td>
<td>mi nung ya la minum arak*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408 吃飯</td>
<td>eat food</td>
<td>ma kén na hsi makan nasi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409 羊羔</td>
<td>lamb</td>
<td>ya na kan ping anak kambing*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 好酒</td>
<td>good wine, to like wine</td>
<td>ya li pail arak baik*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
411 酥油 butter
412 牛乳 cow’s milk
413 羊乳 goat’s milk
414 燒酒 samshoo (lit. ardent spirits)
415 粽子 dumplings
416 沙糖 fine sugar
417 下呈 [unidentified]
418 盐 salt

Meaning. Sound Equivalent. Malay.
mi niang sa pi
su su ling pu
su su kan ping
ya la ya pi
tu pa
ma ni shan te pu
na hsi
chia lan
mi niang sa pi
su su ling pu
su su kan ping
ya la ya pi
tu pa
ma ni shan te pu
na hsi
chia lan
minyak sapi*
susu lembu*
susu kambing*
arak api*
ketupat*
manisan tebu*
nasi*
garam

399. = “rice with the husk removed”.
400. = “distilled spirits (arrack)”.
401. = “boiled rice”.
402. The second word is Chinese. The first is 63 (= “liquid of a watery kind”).
405. = the Chinese word. The usual Malay is kuah.
407. Cf. 400.
408. Cf. 401.
409. Also = “kid”, 305 + 164.
410. = “good spirits” or “spirits are good”. The character li should be la.
411. = “ghee” (clarified butter), cf. 404.
412, 413. Cf. 377, 163, and 164.
414. Literally “fire spirit”. Cf. 400.
415. = “glutinous rice cooked in a wrapper of (plaited) leaves”.
For the omission of the first syllable, cf. 19 and 348.
416. Literally “sugarcane sweets”. The usual word is gula.
Cf. 117.
417. Apparently = 401, q.v. But the Chinese characters, as they stand, do not make sense in this context. It is thought that they represent phonetically some expression in colloquial Chinese which has not been identified.

Part XIII

珍寶 Jewels

Meaning. Sound Equivalent. Malay.
419 金 gold ma ssu (e)mas
420 銀 silver pi la perak
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>copper</td>
<td></td>
<td>tēmbaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>lead</td>
<td></td>
<td>— hitam*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>tin</td>
<td></td>
<td>timah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td></td>
<td>bēsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>“cat’s eye”</td>
<td></td>
<td>mata kuching*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>coral</td>
<td></td>
<td>pualam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pa wan lan</td>
<td>(Tam.)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>quartz crystal</td>
<td></td>
<td>batu puteh*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>pearl</td>
<td></td>
<td>mutiara*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>ring</td>
<td></td>
<td>chënn chënn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>cornelian</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘akek (Ar.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>kacha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>precious stone, jewel</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>tortoiseshell</td>
<td></td>
<td>hsi hsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>“tortoise wine-cup”</td>
<td></td>
<td>hsi hsi pa ning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>diamond-pointed awl</td>
<td></td>
<td>sisek baning*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>mother-of-pearl girdle</td>
<td></td>
<td>kan ma êrh li pei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

422. The first half is unidentified; hitam = “black” and the usual term for “lead” is timah hitam, cf. 423.

425. = “cat’s eye” (like the Chinese). It may be possibly the jewel so called, or the amber-like resin known as damar mata kuching.

426. Though Malay dictionaries render this by “marble” (and only by “coral” when the adjective merah “red” is added to it), its original sense was “coral”, coming as it does from the Tamil pavalam (Sanskrit prabala, pravāla, pravāda) “coral”. The transcription suggests an archaic Malay pronunciation, pavalam.


428. The first Chinese character wei is evidently a copyist’s error for mo.

432. This might be pēlumban “crystal”, but in view of 438 it seems possible that it may represent pērmata “jewel”, the final ta having been inadvertently omitted. For the transcription, cf. 282.

433. Cf. 212, 216, and 434.
434. = "shell of *testudo emys*", a species of tortoise.
435. = "diamond".
436. Cf. 385. The rest is unidentified.

**Part XIV**

**Literature and History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>437 勅書</td>
<td>credentials</td>
<td>su la la chê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438 玉玺</td>
<td>State seal</td>
<td>pu lun ma chê la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439 金印</td>
<td>gold seal</td>
<td>ma saû chê la (e)mas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440 読書</td>
<td>read books</td>
<td>ya chih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441 寫字</td>
<td>write characters</td>
<td>niu la</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

437. = "raja's letter".
438. = 432, q.v., followed perhaps by *chara raja*, i.e. "of the princely sort". But more probably chê la stands for têra "royal seal".
439. = "gold", followed by the same words as in 438. The same remarks apply. Cf. 419.
440. Nowadays, usually in the form *mêngaji*, applied chiefly to the reading of the Koran.
441. For the omission of the prefix, cf. 312, 313, 328, 329, and 336.

**Part XV**

**Colours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>442 青</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>hsi tan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443 紅</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>mi la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444 黃</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>ku ning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445 白</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>pu ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446 綠</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>hsi chao</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part XVI**

**Numerals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>447 一</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sa tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448 二</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>tu wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449 三</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ti chia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part XVII

**通用 Current Words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>large</td>
<td>pu sa</td>
<td>bēsar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>ko chih</td>
<td>kēchil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>pan chang</td>
<td>panjang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>pan ta</td>
<td>pandak*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>ting chi</td>
<td>tinggi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>èn ta</td>
<td>rèndah*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep</td>
<td>ta lan</td>
<td>dalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shallow</td>
<td>to ho</td>
<td>tohor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to blow</td>
<td>pi yu (ʔ hsin pu)</td>
<td>sēmbor ?*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shine</td>
<td>cha li mien</td>
<td>chérmin*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>pai</td>
<td>baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant, far</td>
<td></td>
<td>jauh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>chao</td>
<td>hampir*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thick</td>
<td>an ping</td>
<td>tébal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9 mace</td>
<td>hsi k’un ti li</td>
<td>sa-këndéri*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

454. The transcription may indicate an archaic pronunciation dulapan (from the still older dualapan). Modern Malay often reduces the word to lapan, simply.

456, 458, 459. The transcription suggests that the pronunciation of the first syllable was already sē (reduced from an original so). The romanized spelling reproduces this older and etymologically correct form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sound Equivalent</th>
<th>Malay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>475 兩</td>
<td>tael</td>
<td>hsi ta yin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476 多</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>pa niang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477 少</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>ku lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478 不敢</td>
<td>How should I dare?</td>
<td>an pén</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479 不准</td>
<td>not allowed (to be filed, as a petition)</td>
<td>li ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480 不依</td>
<td>[meaning doubtful]</td>
<td>ti ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481 不好</td>
<td>not good</td>
<td>ti ta pai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482 小的</td>
<td>small one</td>
<td>mu ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

嘉靖二十八年一月 日通事楊林校正
Revised by the interpreter Yang Lin on the . . . day of the first month of the 28th year of the Chia Ching period (1522–67).

463. Except in certain expressions, the variant form pendek is now more usual.
465. It is curious that the transcription fails to represent the initial r.
468. = "to eject (especially liquid) from the mouth", a doubtful identification.
469. = 278, q.v. The translation is based on a misunderstanding.
472. Or damping "close to"?
474. = "candareen".
477. = "less, fewer".
478. = "pardon".
479. This may be intended for the same word as 480.
480. = "no, not".
481. = 480 + 470.
482. = "young". Cf. 310.

CHIEF AUTHORITIES CONSULTED
P. Favre, Dictionnaire Malais-Français, Vienne, 1875.
P. Favre, Dictionnaire Français-Malais, Vienne, 1880.
Ph. S. van Ronkel, Maleisch Woordenboek, den Haag, 1930.


*Journal of the Straits Branch, Royal Asiatic Society* (especially on Malay plant names in No. 30, by H. N. Ridley, and No. 38 by the same and C. Curtis).


Garcia da Orta: the edition consulted was Annibale Briganti’s Italian version entitled *Dell’ Historia de i Semplici Aromati*, etc., *di Don Garzia dall’ Horto . . . in Venetia*, 1616.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS


(Abbreviations: Ps., Pers. = Persian; Ar. = Arabic; N. = Nepali; H. = Hindi; P., Pj. = Panjâbî; K., Ks. = Kaśmîrî; lw. = loanword. Isolated numbers indicate pages.)

“Little streams of pure water sparkled among the grass, and trees laden with fruit grew here and there with spreading boughs.”

I cannot think of better words than these to describe the remarkable work brought out this year by the Professor of Sanskrit in the University of London. No similar work, comparable in size, has been published before, though we had a forerunner on a smaller scale in the vocabulary (146 8vo pp.) of Jules Bloch’s splendid monograph La Langue Marathe.

I do not profess to have studied every entry in the book, or read every page, but I have travelled extensively over the country to which it introduces us, wandered at will along the banks of its rivulets, and plucked luscious fruit off the overhanging branches, and this gives me a title to express the gratitude and admiration which I feel.

One does not know whether to admire most the author’s industry or his learning or his intuition. It is hard to believe that one man has single-handed ransacked the dictionaries and vocabularies of forty or fifty languages in order to discover parallels to 26,000 entries, and has, in addition, sent innumerable letters and countless slips to scholars in the hope of obtaining information to make his dictionary complete. Yet this is what Professor Turner has done.

His original aim was to make a practical dictionary (a book, shall we say, of 100 pp., giving words and meanings), but he tells us with happy meiosis that the work has “somewhat outgrown” the first intention. It now weighs 9 lb. 3 oz., exactly the weight of the service rifle and bayonet carried by the Gurkha soldiers to whom he dedicates the result of his labour.

There is a valuable introduction of 7 pp., in which we see the principles which guided him in his etymologies, above all the principle which he, more than any other Indianist, has impressed upon us, that in tracing linguistic relationship we must take note of common innovations, not of common conservations. This truth, to the
illustration of which he has devoted so much of his time, will render necessary the rewriting of many pages on Indian languages and the re-formulation of many theories about them.

Next to the etymologies, the most useful single feature of the dictionary is the series of indexes (correctly so called; the incorrect form, indices, is not used). These indexes, which we owe to the labour of Mrs. Turner, give us, language by language, connected words from other tongues. Beginning with Indo-European and Indo-Aryan reconstructions, Mrs. Turner goes on to Sanskrit and its descendants, such as the ancient Pali and Prakrit, and the modern Romani, Šinā, Kaśmīrī, Hindī, Panjābī, Lahndī, Singhalese, etc. These occupy 271 pp. Other language-groups, such as Kāfirī, Munḍā, Dravidian, and European, take up five pp.

In these Professor Turner appears to have rejected mere loanwords. This limitation is useful for Sanskrit, because there is no clear boundary to possible words, but one would have been glad to see a list of loanwords from European languages, especially English and Portuguese. Such a list would serve a very useful purpose and it would be well worth while to make one even now and print it separately.

I would draw special attention to the astonishing collection on pp. 637–60 of over 400 words whose origin is in most cases unknown. Among them are a number of the commonest words in north India.

It is difficult to exaggerate the value of these indexes. Anyone possessing a knowledge of any of the better-known Indo-European languages, and desirous of ascertaining the comparative development of a word, can now look it up in the list containing the words of the language he knows. He is there referred to the Nep. word under which the forms in other languages are given. Without the index he would not know where to look.

Romani is referred to in three dialects. No such full use of Romani in connection with other Indian languages can be found anywhere except in Miklosich's Mundarten, which is over fifty years old. Professor Turner's monograph establishing Romani as a Central Indian language is in the mind of all scholars.

A work like this which aims at completeness and correctness must fall short in at least some details. This is inevitable in all human effort. There must be occasional words forgotten, meanings inaccurately given, analogies missed, etymologies mistaken or untraced, and errors of printing unnoticed. The marvel to my mind is that there are so few.
Feeling sure that Professor Turner is already at work on a supplement, with a list of errata, I venture to mention a few points which he may be good enough to consider.

**Meanings.**

The compiler usefully gives the fem. of occupational and caste terms; but what is the meaning of these fems.? Sometimes, as for *damini, guruvini*, the meaning given is "woman of damāi, guruṅ, caste". This seems to me correct ("female" would be better still, so as to include little girls); but for other words, such as *khardārni, ojhī, dhobīni, pāṇḍītīni, ghartīni, kāmini*, the words are said to mean "wife" of khardār, etc., and again for others, as *panerni, mālini, "female water-carrier", etc. I think it would be better in all of them to give the meaning "female" of the caste. If, e.g., a *khardārni* were to be educated, and enter the House of Commons, she would remain a *khardārni*, whoever her husband might be.

One or two further points: "thor bahut, something, no matter how little"; does it not mean "a smallish amount of"?

*kāpi*, copy: add "notebook, copybook".

*kānūn*, military law: add "ordinary law, cf. kānagoi".

*kārnu*: six meanings given, but have not the essential meanings "take out, eject" been overlooked?

203 *chori mari ṭhulā ghar pari*: the meaning given strikes me as a mild libel on the cheery Gorkhāli. It is not difficult to get another.

**Etymologies.**

Dr. Turner is at his best in etymologies; examples of his research and remarkable power of seizing on the relevant facts may be seen on almost every page. I mention in particular *gachnu, jokhnu, khelnu, nibhāunu, celo, līf, hotro, choro, sarunu, cālnu, bhutte, dhasnu, sīri, kero.*

In a spirit of deep appreciation I make a few suggestions aiming at further perfection.

European words. These at present are given in different ways: (a) lw. H.; (b) lw. Eng.; (c) lw. H. fr. Eng. or Port.; (d) lw. H. fr. Pers. I think that the Eur. origin should always be referred to. Some said to be Eng. seem to me Port. The following changes suggest themselves.


These two words are more likely to have gone to Persia from India, than come to India from Persia. In any case they are Port.


pistaul, botal, said to be Eng., are probably Port. pistola, botelha; so perhaps kārtus, said to be Fr. (Port. kartucho).

Further, there are many entered simply as "lw. Eng." The question arises whether they should not be "lw. H. fr. Eng." In only a few cases does it appear likely that they came directly into N. from Eng.

For words at present left undervived a few etyms. occur to me. khavās, liberated slave; lw. H. khavāṣṣ, servant; fr. Pers. khaṭārī, tambourine, lw. H. khanjīrī, fr. Pers. id.
thāhā, information; P. thauh, recollection (the Nep. also has this meaning).

jun, jūn, delay; H. jū jū, jū tū.
jista, dista, quire of paper; H. dasta, m. id. fr. Pers.

Corrections.


422 barānda, verandah, is twice said to be Pers. It is not a Ps. word at all, but Urdu.

bāphre, bāphrebāph, not fr. baburo, but lw. H. bāpre, bāprebāp, id. piche, per: omit H. and P. words given, and insert H. piche, P. piche, id., as bīgha piche, vighe piche, per acre (or half acre).
khatāra, fraud; not H. khātra, but H. khacrā, wicked; P. khacrā, deceitful.

bāre mā, concerning; not as stated, but lw. H. bāre mē, id.
bālwar: bāl, not conn. w. bāl, hair, which in Pj. would yield vālbar, whereas Pj. is bālbar. The l is mere change of r; cf. N. leter, writer; Pj. bālištar, barrister; pippalmint, peppermint; faīl, fire; lūl, rule; pāli, party.

halkāro, messenger, is said to be a form of ahalkār. There is no connection between the two words, beyond similarity of meaning. ahalkār is correctly derived, p. 29, lw. H. ahlkār (Ps. ahl. and kār) halkāro is lw. H. halkārā, harkārā fr. Ps. harkāra, man who does all or any work (har-kār).

kuli, not fr. Ar. but from Turkish.

Minor Corrections.

113 H. khatt, not whiskers, beard, but incipient hair on face.
300 P. thok, not "heap", but "thing".
311 "P. deh, f. sun", read "dēh, m."
491 P. mana, mf. ; omit ft.
494 P. marca, read marc; marca is pl. of marc.
513 P. munḍ, m. not f.; for L. munda, f., head of canal, read mūḍh, m.
520 P. mūrnā, not "twist", trans., but "turn", intr.
554 H.P. lām, not "line, brigade", but "war, expedition".
552 P. sārnā, not "rot", but "be burnt".
309 dābi, H. da'vi. da'vi, a form given by Platts, has no existence.
It should be da'vā.

Suggested additions to etymologies.

"khasnu, fall; Shina gur kha'tonā" : add "z only in infin.;
Inv. sing. has s (khas), otherwise z, (except past -t-).

tako, money; add P. tagā, half anna.

jiraha, jirāha, H. jarā, fr. Ar. jarā is translated once "objection",
and once "denial". The word is jirah in H., and means "cross-
examination" or "surgical incision". In P. it is jarāha. The conn.
of N. jirāha seems doubtful.

jjāsti, jasti, excessive; add lw. H. jāsti (fr. ziyādati, Ps.).

thurnu, stumble; add P. thuddā (not th-), stumbling-block.

dāgnu, aim at; add H.P. dagnā, be fired (of top, cannon).

nāghnu, jump over; add P. nanghṇa, pass by.

bariyā, very good; add P. vadhiā, with the note that barhiyā,
vadhiā, and doubtless N. bariyā, have no fem. form.

phāltā, superfluous; add H. phālti, coolie who waits for odd jobs.

phīṭe, separate; add H. phāṭke, separate; H.P. phīṭe mūh!
your face be cursed! P. phīṭ, f., phīṭak, f., curse.

mutnu; add P. mūtarnā.

raṇḍi; add P. raṇḍi, widow.

karāi, cauldron; add P. karāhī.

lāro; add P. laurā.


chamchamnu, c.-garnu; add P. chan chan, jingling, tinkling.

Professor Turner derives kāphar, coward, fr. kāfīr, but hesitates
about kābu, cowed, fr. qābū, on account of "difference of meaning."
The difference seems less in the latter case than in the former, and
the derivation may surely be accepted.

katā-ho-katā, adv. expressing emphasis; add Cf. H. kahi, anywhere,
much (more than); thus, to put the N. sentences into H.; Siligurī se
Dārjiling kahi acchā hai (much better than); sārā shahr ghūmā, us
ghar kā kahi patā nā lagā. Professor Turner asks if this is derived from
katā. No doubt it is. Might we not say that katā here means “anywhere”, like kahī, and that katā-ho-katā is the emphatic form?

The following P. words are mere lws. fr. H. The forms which I add in parenthesis are the real ones: khelnā (khednā) hillnā (hallyā) shake, phārnā (pārnā) split, jotnā (jōnā) yoke.

The accuracy of the proof-reading is extraordinary, and reflects the utmost credit on the compiler and his wife. Very little has escaped them. I have noticed the following errors. Some of them are probably quite correctly copied from the source consulted, and the proof-readers have no responsibility.

111 kāghārnā and -ūrnā, read kh- and -nā.
111 khāgāñā; better hāgāñā.
125 kullhnā, read khullhnā.
137 gardī, read garmī.
209 jamʿāt, read jamāʿat.
246 P. ṭekan, read ṭekkan.
360 P. paṭnā, better puṭnā.
494 H. marhāte, read marhaṭe, marhaṭe.
513 P. munnā, read munmnā.
555 Lāhor, read Lāhaur.
558 P. luknā, read lukknā.

Read ș for ş, s, s in the following H. words: 116 khalaṣi, 117 khaṣm, khaṣi, 272 tafsīl, 539 rukhsat, 609 şirf, 640 hiṣsa, hiṣsadār; and z for ž in 635 hāzīrī, 642 haīza; and l for l in the Lahndi words 402 phal, 405 phalā, 436 bālan (the verb; the noun would be bāłan), 632 hal, pair of oxen.

We are told on p. xxiii that the Pj. words are taken from Mayā Singh’s Dict. That useful, if somewhat loosely arranged, volume ignores the sound ʃ, and confuses n with ñ. Consequently, many P. words containing ʃ appear in it with the south P. form in l, and infins. which have roots ending in r or r are printed now with n and now with ñ. This is a pity, for the distinction between ʃ and l, and between n and ñ is well worth preserving. In the Nep. Dict. there was no choice but to print as the original source did. The best rule is to make all P. infins. end in -nā, except those with roots in -r, -rh, -r, -ṛh, which should end in -nā. The difference between ṅnā and ṇnā in rapid speech is negligible, but ṇnā differs widely from ṅnā.

A few P. words taken at random which should have ʃ are ubalnā, boil; phal, fruit; phal, blade; paḷnā, be nourished; mīḷnā, meet.
A little point, illustrating the care which the compiler has everywhere exercised, is the use of $v$ instead of the customary $w$ in Pj. words. The amount of avoidable mispronunciation among Europeans which has been caused by the use of $w$ for $v$ in other books (including some of mine) is distressing to contemplate. $w$ occurs in Pj. only as an alternative to $u$ in such words as $adw'ānā$, water-melon; $dweṇā$, cause to be given.

The $i$ dialect of Ko. This interesting village dialect is referred to twice (see ghāro, 157; sarṇu, 582). Under moro, 520, a village word $mor^u$ is given for the town dialect along with the real town word $mor^a$. Under larṇu, fight, K. lādun is said to be "prob. lw. H.P."; I prefer to say "lw. vill. K. larun". In many other places I should recommend reference to the vill. dialect. Thus, to mention a few: caro, bird, K. tsīr$^u$; carṇu, ascend, K. tsārṇu; bhīṛ, crowd, K. bīṛ; birālo, cat, K. brōr$^u$, byōr$^u$; char, basket, K. tshar; char, bar, K. chīṛ$^u$; charṇu, sprinkle, K. chiṅkāwun; chorr̥u, leave, K. chorr̥u; jārṇu, set, K. jārṇu; jor, pair, K. jōrā; jori, pair, K. jūṛ; guliyo, sugar, K. gor; larāi, strike, add K. lādōṛ, lw. vill. K. larōṛ; parṇu, read, add K. paḍun, lw. vill. K. parṇu; kāṛnu, eject, add vill. K. karṇu, lw. H. (for here the vill. form should be kaḍun). Such references would elucidate a matter of importance.

There is a large class of onomatopoetic words, and Dr. Turner often mentions that a word belongs to it. It might be too much to ask that he should always do this, yet sometimes it is not clear that a word is onomatopoetic (e.g. khatākhat, without interruption; kharkhar, without stopping; khuskhus, whispering). One might not realize that these are merely imitative words or derived from such words, and it would be well to say it in each case.

-bāj, 431. Through an oversight it is stated simply that -bāj is a suffix in naśebāj, nothing being said about other words, such as botal-bāj, dagābāj, etc. In the case of -dār many examples are given.

Great praise must be given for the careful differentiation of causal verbs, which breaks new ground in dictionaries, for this is the first in which the distinction has been consistently made. I made it for Urdu and Pj. (Bull. S.O.S., V, iii, 519, 1929). Here it is made for Nepali. It applies doubtless to other Indo-Aryan languages. The rule is briefly this: causals of intr. verbs mean to cause to do; of trans. verbs to cause to be done. Thus jokhāunu, cause to be weighed, have weighed; but dugurāunu, cause to run.

Another feature of the dictionary is the occasional comparison of
meanings (as distinct from forms). Thus for lekh, mountain-chain, we are referred to Eng. "line of mountains"; and for Pk. thunna-, proud, lit. stopped, to Eng. "stuck up", 298. There are only a few of these comparisons; it would be difficult to increase their number, for a systematic attempt to discuss comparative semantics would entail the compilation of a second dictionary.

And so we come to the end of this wonderful volume. I have mentioned above a few things for consideration in the forthcoming Supplement, but I feel almost as if I should be ashamed of myself for doing so. It is as if passing through undulating fields of the richest mellow corn, I had taken note of a half-ripe or over-ripe grain, here and there, among thousands of the best. Professor Turner's colleagues in the University of London, and his alma mater, the University of Cambridge, which has given him the degree of Litt.D. in recognition of his labours, will be proud to remember their association with one who has produced a work of such outstanding ability and learning.

I, too, bring my tribute of admiration, gratitude, and thanks.

T. GrahaM Bailey.

STUDIEN ZUR EIGENART INDISCHEN DENKENS. VON BETTY HEIMANN.
RM. 26.

In Studien zur Eigenart indischen Denkens Dr. Betty Heimann has collected a number of papers contributed to various publications since 1922 together with other essays, all devoted to the attempt to bring out the salient features which mark out Indian thought as a system sui generis, whose similarities with other systems rests on accidental convergence. The topic is an interesting one, and has received able and intelligent handling, even if much of what Miss Heimann has to say is widely current doctrine. She rightly insists on the fundamental fact of the continuity and syncretism of Indian thought, and the tendency to preserve the oldest and most primitive ideas side by side with the new. The Upaniṣads richly illustrate this thesis, and, of course, it reaches the most complete expression in the system of Čaṅkara in which room is found for the illogicalities of the Indian popular religion and the caste system with all its defects. The same principle is easily illustrated from Indian society and Indian law, its most enduring product (pp. 258-74). A refined jurisprudence has been based on primitive social customs, largely permeated by magic, nor
has Western influence availed wholly to extirpate infanticide and the
immolation of widows. In literature the spirit of Bande Mātaram
can be traced to the religious lyric of the Rgveda. Again Indian
thought essentially rejects individuality; man is not something
superior to the rest of the world, animate or inanimate; he recognizes
himself to be only one part of a complex whole, whence we find that
Indian literature excels in feeling for nature and in the beast fable.
But on the other hand we are denied the possibility of tragedy (pp.
282–4), for that rests essentially on the struggle of the individual
against opposing forces, and there is no place in the scheme of Indian
thought for such a conflict; the world system is a harmonious complex
which assigns to each person his due place. Such a system leaves no
room (pp. 105–9) for the conception of a God of the type familiar to
Western thought, who is omnipotent, who determines the laws of
righteousness, who never deceives, who loves his creatures, bestows
his grace upon them, and leads them to salvation, sacrificing himself
for them. There can be no mediator between God and mankind,
and no true prayer to God. As the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika show,
it is impossible logically to introduce the deity into the operations of a
system of Karman which works with automatic certainty.

While there is much truth in these contentions, there is some risk
of failing to admit the extent of Indian progress in thought. It is
perfectly obvious that it was a slow process by which India arrived
at the conception of a soul, but one must not exaggerate the material
character of early speculation. Rather the primitive standpoint is
hylozoist; matter is not regarded as lifeless, but combines what
later are regarded as spirit and matter. The advance, therefore, lies not
in passing from the material to the spiritual but in differentiating the
two, a process which is carried to the furthest in the Sāṁkhya, which
Miss Heimann quite rightly (p. 49) recognizes to be a logical develop-
ment from the conceptions of the Upaniṣads. How far the thinkers of
the Upaniṣads had advanced in appreciation of the spiritual is doubtless
a matter of difficulty to determine, but perhaps Miss Heimann is
inclined with Professor Jacobi to underestimate the depth of their
insight; reaction from Deussen has tended too far in the opposite
sense. But it is well to have it made clear how impregnated Indian
thought is with the material as well as with the spiritual side of
existence.

Brahman in Miss Heimann’s view (pp. 42, 43) denotes initially the
prayer which strengthens the gods, who therefore come willingly to the
sacrifice, and then the prayer of power which controls even the gods, and thus comes to mean the power which pervades the world; later it becomes devoid of concrete implication and can denote the absolute without implication of its character. Ātman, on the other hand, starts (p. 56) from the idea of das Wesentliche, which in man is first conceived as the body, and gradually is refined to a psychological conception. Both views are possible, but neither can be proved from our texts. Varuṇa again is regarded (p. 27) as the guardian of the Rta, and doubtless this he comes to be, but for his origin we must rather look to the Aryan religion brought into India, in which he figured as the sky god, who was also concerned with the moral order and to whom real prayers might be addressed. The Rgveda doubtless already knows the principle of do ut des, but the gradual decline in importance of Varuṇa is significant that his personality represents a phase of religious belief which the new society created in India by the contact of Aryans and non-Aryans (whether Dravidians, as Miss Heimann assumes, or pre-Dravidians, or both) did not develop. Similarly Miss Heimann suspects (p. 106) external influence in the Rgveda (ii, 13, 12) when Indra is described as making the blind to see, the lame to walk, but here again we have a remnant of the worship of the Aryans. Their faith doubtless did not wholly pass away; we have in later religion more evidence that Miss Heimann is inclined to admit of a real belief in a personal deity who is a veritable saviour. Mahāyāna Buddhism no doubt is suspect of being under foreign influences, but we may well admit that the logical implications of the Karman doctrine were far from generally accepted outside the philosophical schools. The theistic affiliations of the Nyāya and Vaiṣeṣika most probably attest an effort to accommodate these systems to the popular mind.

On minor points also it is possible to differ from Miss Heimann's views, but such divergences of opinion do not diminish appreciation of a stimulating and suggestive study.

A. Berriedale Keith.

THE BHāRATA-EYA SANGIT VIDYĀNA SERIES. By D. D. BHATE.
Bombay: Modavritta Press, Wai Satara. Rs. 1 each.

1. "The Shruti Theory of Indian Music (more from the point of view of European music)." Two pamphlets so far have been published, one with the title "Shruti Theory", while the other is a chart. The
author, while engaged in studying the Swarādhyāya of the Sangit Ratnākar, came to the conclusion that Indian music contains three tones, the major-tone, the minor-tone, and the semi-tone. His conclusion was confirmed by a study of the problem from a different point of view based upon harmonic theory and arithmetical calculations and these are fully expounded in the above-mentioned pamphlet. He points out that the tonic note, the Shadja, as it is called, is but an extension of the major-chord (G.E.D.) and the minor chord (F.E.D.\(^1\)), the major-chord being the harmonic mean, while the minor-chord is the arithmetical mean. The minor-chord contains some intervals of those of the major-chord. The intervals of the minor-chord inverted will form the major-chord; and this process explains the four diminutions mentioned in the Ratnākar. By Shadja-Panchamabhāv (the string of fifths) twenty-six shrutis are obtained in an octave (two tetrachords); but the shrutis, from 22 to 26, are the same as from 0 to 4, only an octave higher, and that is why it is called a science of twenty-two shrutis instead of twenty-six. The twenty-six shrutis require two shadja-panchamabhāvas.

Mr. Bhate points out the reason which occasioned the grāma-theory. In the Shuddha (just) scale we have the three shruti ri, the two shruti ga, and four shruti ma. To obtain different shruti intervals the grāma-theory was devised.

The three grāmas put together are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Shadja grāma} & : \begin{cases} 
\text{sa} & 0 \\
\text{ri} & 3 \\
\text{ga} & 2 \\
\text{ma} & 9 \\
\text{pa} & 13 \\
\text{dha} & 16 \\
\text{ni} & 18 \\
\text{sa} & 22 \\
\end{cases} \\
\text{Madhyama grāma} & : \begin{cases} 
\text{sa} & 9 \\
\text{ri} & 12 \\
\text{ga} & 14 \\
\text{ma} & 18 \\
\text{ga} & 3 \\
\text{ma} & 5 \\
\text{pa} & 9 \\
\end{cases} \\
\text{Gandhāra grāma} & : \begin{cases} 
\text{ni} & 6 \\
\text{sa} & 9 \\
\text{ri} & 11 \\
\text{ga} & 15 \\
\text{ni} & 19 \\
\text{sa} & 2 \\
\text{ri} & 6 \\
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

Here we get a two-shruti ri (a semi-tone), etc., etc.

\(^1\) The E, D in the minor-chord should be understood E½, D½. The symbols ½, 3 represent a difference of ½ and 3½ or cents 70 and 22 respectively.
In the arrangement of different grāmas we have the tonic (sa) at different points, that is, on shruti zero in the shadja grāma, on shruti four in the madhyama grāma, and on shruti seven in the gandhāra grāma.

The exposition is based on the twenty-fifth verse of the twenty-eighth chapter of the Bharata Nāṭya Shāstra.

The constituent elements are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pramāṇa shruti</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>81/80</th>
<th>80/81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comma of Didymus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small semi-tone</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25/24</td>
<td>24/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima (Pythagorian)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>256/243</td>
<td>243/256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three shuddha (just) tones are:

| Major | 204 | 9/8 | 8/9 |
| Minor | 182 | 10/9 | 9/10 |
| Semi | 112 | 16/15 | 15/16 |

In the Appendix I to the pamphlet of the shruti-theory, it is made clear why the tonic note (the shadja) should be fixed at 480 single vibrations or 240 double vibrations, and adopted as a standard note for the reeds of the Indian harmonium.

If the author’s view should be adopted, it will obviously be of considerable importance to the manufacturers of musical keyed instruments for the Indian market, besides opening up a new field of research for students of musical theory.

2. The second pamphlet contains a chart of the Shadja and Madhyama grāma scales according to Bharata Nāṭya Shāstra. The three tones are indicated by different colours; the major tone by red, the minor tone by blue, and the semi-tone by yellow; and the chart indicates the method by which the one scale can be changed to the other. The last paragraph of the chart is devoted to explaining the four diminutions mentioned in the Ratnākara. The pamphlet ends with the two basic principles, called by the author “mottos” of the shruti nidarshana.

The author has been at considerable pains to deal with and explain the theory formulated in the Bharata-Nāṭya Shāstra, a work dating from the fifth century A.D. Throughout the pamphlet he has developed his argument in a manner which is strictly logical and mathematically
accurate. The series forms a noteworthy addition to the literature of Indian music, and is fully entitled to the serious consideration of European scientists who are interested in the subject.

S. G. K.

GACHCHIVARIL GAPPA. By NARAYAN GOVIND CHAMPEKAR.

This book has gone into a second edition, which fact proves its great popularity. It is a kind of tea-table-talk, but gradually it leads to a serious discussion on several social subjects. No fewer than twenty-three social problems are subjected to a critical analysis; several conventions which pass under the name of so-called rites and ritual are severely attacked; several ideas imported from the Western world have been taking root in the minds of so-called English-educated Indian youths which in the end would be disastrous, as they are not congenial to the tradition and climatic conditions of the Indian continent. The author’s slashing criticism and his views on na stri swatantryam arhati (the natural subordination of woman), Hakka kiin kartavya (right or duty), Grihiini Griham Uchchate (wife is the queen of the home) are quite original and of absorbing interest. The chapters on “Woman in 1945”, “The Pleasures of Married Life”, “Physical Degeneration”, “Economic Competition”, will open the eyes of deluded young men and women whose present views, if unmodified, will lead to serious disaster. The talk ends with essays on saakā samāj (degenerated society) and shivāshīv (don’t touchism) which are informative and provocative. The author points out that the cult of “don’t touchism” is unauthorized by Manu and other law-givers, and is merely based upon misguided views and superstitions, the foundation of which is rather unsound.

The author has administered a strong dose of a very powerful medicine to these young people of both sexes who have been influenced by the modern tendencies which he attacks, but deep-rooted diseases require drastic treatment.

The style is excellent, and is a model of polished and up-to-date Marāṭhi.

S. G. KANHERE.

The first part of this book is devoted to a sketch of the history of kāla “Time” as revealed in Sanskrit literature. Of astrology it is claimed that it reached India from Babylon at the latest with Alexander the Great. (We should, however, not forget the nakṣatradarśa of the Yajurveda.) From the Buddhist books onwards, in Gṛhya and Dharma Śūtras astrology was largely developed. Planets became recipients of sacrifice. From astrology the author derives the conception of an unescapable fate, which appears abundantly in the Epics, under a great number of synonymous names. It was soon necessary to define the position of Fate in relation to Karma, of which fate was said to be the fruit.

A philosophy of Time is to be traced from the Rigveda onwards. Time and Timelessness were identified with Brahma. It was inevitable that Time (kāla) should be brought into connection with Fate (daiva) and Death. Time appears accordingly either as superior to or as identical with Fate. Then Time could be identified with Karma. Only Brahma remained above Time. In the synergetic Śiva doctrine, Time is one of Śiva’s forms. In the later ritual books Time is identified with Yama.

The abundant Sanskrit literature enables the author to give a mass of confirmatory quotations. But in the second part, which treats of “Time” in Iran there is far less certainty attainable.

The author disputes the hypothesis that Zruvan was the supreme god in the pre-Zoroastrian Iranian religion. Accordingly the texts from the Avesta to Firdausi are examined. The word zruvan is absent from the Gathas, an argumentum ex silentio which naturally has little weight. In the later Avesta, Zruvan is associated with the stars and the celestial sphere, which suggest astrological influence. The Greater Bundahišn makes Zruvan a creation of Ohormazd. The author stresses the point that, in taking over the Babylonian planet names, Ohormazd not Zruvan took the place of Bel. Here, however, it has evidently been overlooked that Zrouan is found as a name of the planet Saturn, that is ᾲπόνος, to which Zrouan rightly corresponds, as is further indicated by the use in Armenian of Zrouanean to translate Greek ᾲπονίας. The connection of Zruvan and Fate is attested in Armenian and in Pahlavi, and is again associated with the stars. Many passages
from Firdausi are quoted to show the importance of Time as the bringer of destiny to man. It is claimed that Zarvanism grew up under the influence of astrology, when Zruvan as Fate and Time encroached upon Ohormazd’s power.

Early texts are very few from which to gain certain results. The passage of Eudemos is found only in late authors, and the Avestan passages show no trace of a supreme Zruvan. It is clear that Zruvan is associated with the planets, and the whole mythus of Zruvan and his sons Ohormazd and Ahriman suggests learned speculation and may well be late. But for the age of Zarvanism we lack sufficient data.

H. W. B.


In these Mitteilungen Professor Herzfeld has begun the publication of the results of his most important researches in the archeology of Iran in its widest sense. We find here valuable information on Pasargadæ, contributions to the exegesis of the Avesta, and to the elucidation of Pahlavi texts, a critique of Herodotus’ list of satrapies, an elaborate treatment of Avestan topography, a new discussion of the ever-recurring problem of the date of Zoroaster, and the publication of new Old Persian inscriptions. In view of the difficulty of this whole field of investigation, arising largely from defective texts and too scanty sources, it is natural that all the statements should not command universal acceptance. In particular one finds a tendency to somewhat dogmatic statement, which testifies to the firm convictions of the author, but is liable to awaken some distrust.

In vol. i, part i, is published the translation (but not the original text) of a new inscription of Cyrus, in which not only does the title “Great King” occur, but Cyrus is called “Achaemenian”, thus finally setting at rest the disputes both as to his being a descendant of Achaemenes and as to the use of cuneiform before Darius. A notice is also given of the discovery of a new trilingual inscription of Cyrus at Pasargadæ, in a fragmentary condition. These notices occur in a report of excavations at Pasargadæ in 1928. In regard to the art of Pasargadæ the author points to its importance as a genuine product of Iranian artists, from which the art of Persepolis developed naturally. There are three plates and a map of Pasargadæ. The remainder of
part i is occupied by a report on the present ruins of Persepolis, in French and Persian, written at the request of the Persian Government, with thirty plates of splendid photographs of Persepolis and a map.

Part ii, 65-75, with six plates, contains a report on archaeological observations in south Kurdistan and Luristan, including the inscription of the Pul i Kalhur.

On p. 76 begins the discussion of the date of Zoroaster, which is full of acute and valuable criticism. Professor Herzfeld approaches the problem from the geographical point of view. The study is divided into four parts: the historical Vištāspa, father of Darius; the Heroogony; the Avestan Vištāspa; Zarafšātra and the Community (vol. i, parts ii, iii; vol. ii, part i). Vištāspa, father of Darius, is known not only from Greek authors, but especially from Darius's own inscriptions. From the inscription it is certain that he was a ūṣāyaṭīya (and that, too, during his father's, Aršāma's, lifetime, since both Aršāma and Vištāspa were alive when Darius ascended the throne, as we know from the Susa Palace inscription), and a careful examination of the historical information contained in the inscriptions proves that Vištāspa was a ūṣāyaṭīya in Paršāva and Zranke. From p. 79–105 we find a criticism of the satrapy lists in the inscriptions and in Herodotus, which makes possible an understanding of the disposition of satrapies before and after Darius's accession. In this section the immense geographical knowledge of the author leads to certain results, much of the information being conveyed in the many important footnotes. Paršāva being thus defined, its towns are discussed, and particularly Tēs, the capital. It is next possible to discuss the Achaemenid genealogy in its two branches, elder and younger. Anšān is identified with the later Pārsa, which is confirmed by the extension of Elamite remains. The Achaemenid royal titles are shown to be of Median origin, and the throne-names are interpreted as religious names in contrast to the earlier type, such as Vištāspa. For the date of the death of Vištāspa we get c. 500 B.C.

A critical study of the age of the Yašts is offered on pp. 125 f., in which an attempt is made to separate early and later parts of the older Yašts. The system to be observed in the mythical chronology permits the conclusion that a fixed Heroogony existed before the composition of these Yašts. Ardvisūr Yašt (v) is put in the time of Artaxerxes II. Yašt, xiii, contains the catalogue of names, and is distinguished by its mythologic system which gives the form of the legends in the period before the fourth century B.C., with Yama
(Yima) at the head of the list. These results may be considered reasonably certain.

With the Heroogony we enter upon more debatable ground. The chief results to which the author attains are, for the legends, the persistence of motifs of Indo-European tales, the Median tales, and the legends of Cyrus, and the legend of Zarivariš. The whole subject is thoroughly explored, but the very nature of the subject makes it impossible to regard all the conclusions as certain. The sources are not abundant: the tales in Greek authors and the legends of the Avesta. By excluding all the mythical traits in the Kavi legends, it is claimed that the residue represents Median history. Cyrus is identified with the figure which appears in the legends as Kavi Haosravah. All this is very possible.

On pp. 162 f. the existence of Old Persian records, both official archives and chronicles more or less legendary, is discussed. Mention by Greek and Hebrew writers attests the reality of both these types of records. Professor Herzfeld feels able to claim a written source for the Heroogony which appears in fixed form, both in Greek authors and in the Avesta.

With part iii we reach the Vištāspa of the Avesta. Here, too, certain mythic features of the Zarivariš legend are first excluded as due to a Druvāspla legend. In this way an explanation is found for the Avestan statement that Vištāspa was son of Aurvāt-aspa, which is usually an epithet of the sun.

According to the non-mythical information given about Vištāspa in the Avesta, he appears as a kavi, that is “king”, and his place is Zranka, while his residence is the capital of Parthava, the Avestan vis naotaranam. In the legendary chronology he follows Kavi Haosravah. All this makes an identification of the father of Darius and the patron of Zoroaster very likely, and seems best to fit what scanty information we possess of that period in eastern Persian history.

Vol. ii, part i, deals with the Prophet and his community on the basis of the names scattered through the Avesta, and especially of the “Catalogue of Names” in Yašt xiii, and defines the place of the prophet’s activity as Zranka, on the evidence of the verses of Yašt xix. From p. 30 onwards we have a valuable discussion of the cultural position of the Avesta and the Old Persian inscriptions, treating of the words nmāna, vis, zantu, dahyu, gābu, kāra, and including a new translation of Beh. 14. An examination of the traditional date of
Zoroaster leads to the conclusion that we have a dating which was preserved from a period when the Seleucid era was still in use. An oversight seems to have led to the statement, p. 42: "Bei 12,000 Jahren Leben der Welt konnte man zu Beginn des 4. Jahrtausends keine Ängste haben." It is clear from Alberuni's own summation that these 3,000 years were counted from the time of Gayomart's earthly life, not from the beginning of the 12,000 year period.

Vol. ii, part ii, treats of Avestan topography, with a wealth of geographical detail. Some identifications can naturally be disputed, as, for example, on p. 69, Sirāk is more probable than Sirāf, and "Andarkangistān" is wrongly read into several passages. On p. 76 a new reading is offered of a part of the Old Persian inscription NR6. This section must be the basis for all further study of Avestan geography.

In vol. ii, part iii, is published the important inscription beginning with the name Āriyāramna. Internal evidence seems to be against dating it in Āriyāramna's own life-time. If this is so, the historical conclusions which Professor Herzfeld draws, cannot be sustained. A second short bowl inscription, probably of Xerxes, is also here published for the first time. Pp. 128–31 deal with a Sasanian representation of the chariot of the moon, which supplements the author's work Thron des Khosrō. The rest of vol. ii is devoted to the problems of Hittite art.

These Archäologische Mitteilungen are therefore to be looked upon as invaluable for the study of Ancient Persia, and the Avesta.

H. W. B.


Professor Morgenstierne has here presented us with a further valuable contribution to Iranian Studies, consisting of his materials on the hitherto unknown language of the Parachis and an addition to our information about Ormuri. Pages 1–304 are devoted to Parachi, followed by 110 pages on Ormuri. An elaborate phonology and morphology is given for each language. For Parachi we are offered forty-two pieces of prose and verse, accompanied by a translation. It is shown in the introduction that Parachi occupies a central position between the western and the eastern Iranian dialects, and probably represents one of the original languages of Afghanistan. The material
here published was obtained from five Parachis of whom one, Tabakkál Shāh, was the poet laureate of his people. Differences of dialect were noticeable in the case of each speaker, and accordingly the sources of the texts are noted. The number of loan-words is very large, both Persian and Indian, and from its geographical position it is natural that Persian should exert an overwhelming influence. The vocabulary gives not only the meanings but full etymological notes, in which it was inevitable that a good deal should remain obscure but on the basis of an exact phonology the most probable forms from which the Parachi words could be derived are indicated in all cases. One point of interest is the different treatment in Parachi of original Iranian xš and š: xawān “night” from xšapān-, γaξ “word” probably from *vaχša, but théem “I shave” from tāš-. The texts themselves are of very considerable cultural interest.

For the Ormuri, dealt with in the second and shorter part, material had already been collected and discussed, especially by Sir G. Grierson. Here all the available material has been utilized for a careful sketch of the phonology and morphology. Six pieces of prose texts are given. The vocabulary, as for Parachi, contains valuable etymologies. It is natural that here, too, some points of morphology should be still not clear.

Both parts of the book are of great value both for the material so laboriously gathered and for the philological treatment of it. Two more important Iranian dialects can now be used for philological purposes with full confidence. To the scholar interested in the earlier periods of Iranian studies, it must be allowed to express a regret that these dialects are known only in the form they have reached in the twentieth century. Even so, they afford considerable material for the development of meanings. Parachi dhōr “seen” from *dṛṣṭa- beside Ormuri dēk “seen” from *dītaka- is a most interesting survival, compared with Sogdian wyn-: wyt- and Saka day-: diya- and Persian bīn-: dīd. With Parachi dhamān “wind” one could compare Saka padama- “winds”. The meaning of γān “oak” is interesting in comparison with Pašto wana, Avestan vanā “tree”. The old vis-, in Old Persian viθ- “the palace”, appears as γus with the meaning “house”.

H. W. B.
This fasciculus contains three monographs. The first is by N. Jakovlev: "Kurze Übersicht über die Tscherkessischen (Adygheischen) Dialekte und Sprachen," translated from the Russian by A. Dirr. It is the result of over ten years' study of the Čerkes languages, and sets out the relationship of these dialects. Two main divisions are recognized, Kabard and Kyax, with a transition dialect Besleney, on the basis of consonant changes (one sub-dialect, Šapsug, has sixty-seven consonants but only three vowels!) Kabard and Kyax are then subdivided into a number of dialects, Kabard into Terek-Kabard and Kuban-Kabard, and Kyax into (eastern) Abadzeax and Temirgoi, (western) Bžeduax, Šapsug, and Xakuć. The places where these are spoken and the number of speakers are then given, pp. 11-14, with the result: Kabard-speakers about 152,079, Kyax-speakers about 45,250, for the Caucasus a very large group. It is next shown that the linguistic conditions (Kabard more a unity than Kyax) is due to the economic history of the region. The Kabards appear to have developed a feudal system before the Kyax, among whom there are still to be found the remains of a tribal system. Five tables are added which give the Čerkes consonants with physiological definition and five other tables give the correspondences of consonants in the Čerkes dialects.

Fr. Baumhauer has contributed a short paper on an anonymous writing, containing a brief life of Irakli II of Georgia, and has shown reasons for concluding that this is the work of Jacob Reineggs.

The third monograph is by the late Professor Markwart: "Woher stammt der Name Kaukasus?" It is usual to find an immense amount of learning in the work of Markwart, resulting often in somewhat incoherent treatment. In dealing with the name Caucasus the author starts from the often-discussed passage of Pliny Croucasim hoc est nive candidum, attempting, as Vasmer (Die Iranier in Südrussland, p. 14) and Kretschmer (Zeits. f. vgl. Sprachforschung, lv, p. 100, 1929) had done, to trace a meaning snow or ice in the first part, and in the second component the verb kas- with the meaning of shining. But whereas Kretschmer finds this meaning of shining only in Indian, Markwart confidently claims it for Iranian, without, however, adducing any proof. Kaspion and the Kāσmνoi (a Kaspische Urrasse is denied, p. 29, note 6) are treated of, pp. 27-9, in connection with Eratosthenes' assertion that the natives called the Caucasus Kaspion. From p. 36
on, the etymology of Chorsari is investigated, involving a full and valuable discussion of گرکسار and سکسار, which embraces also some Pahl. and Pázand texts dealing with human monsters. Chorsari is explained as *Xvarsār "resembling the sun". Etymologies are also attempted of Saka, p. 36, of Κκωθης, p. 56 f. (= "scalp-hunters"), Κκόλοστος, p. 59 f. (= "hunters"), and Ԧպակուտ, p. 61 f (= "head-⟨hunters⟩"). On p. 63 f., Gr. Bd. 80, 15 f., is interpreted of the Ԧպակութ in Hyrcania of Ptolemy, and is more probably correct than Herzfeld's connection of this passage with Siráf (Archacol. Mitteil. aus Iran, ii, 69). On p. 66 Afg. șwol and Orm. syōk are needlessly declared to be loan-words from Persian, the same is the case with *dasta-, (on p. 66, l. 4, cue is misprinted for cue). There is an abundance of side remarks which contain much of value. The origin of Kaukasos itself does not seem satisfactorily explained by taking Croucasim as a variant.

The remainder of the fasciculus, pp. 70-7, contains reviews of Russian works on the Caucasus by the late Adolf Dirr.


The fasciculus begins with an "In Memoriam" for the regretted editor of Caucasica, Adolf Dirr, to which the new editor, G. Deeters, has added a bibliography of Dirr's published works. Dirr's death is a serious blow for Caucasian studies, to whose encouragement he has very largely contributed.

Pages 10-77 are taken up with a work of the late Professor Markwart, in which his intimate familiarity with the Armenian, Byzantine, and Arabic historians and geographers is abundantly attested. The article is entitled "Die Genealogie der Bagratiden und das Zeitalter des Mar Abas und Ps. Moses Xorenaci", in which Professor Markwart has attacked the problem of the genealogy of the Bagratouni ascribed to Mar Abas. The oldest references to the Bagratouni are first assembled, then, beginning on pp. 14-16 with a translation of the genealogy, the names Zareh, Bagam, and Šavaš are reasonably shown to be taken from the place-names Zarehavan, Bagavan, and Šavarsan. In the course of this exposition, a number of Iranian names are discussed, as Pharasmanes, p. 22, note 3; Sāma, p. 27, note 3; Šyavaršan, p. 27; Xerxes, p. 29, and others on p. 28. Next the relation of Angel toun to the Bagratouni (p. 31 f.) is investigated. It is shown that the Prince of Angel toun was distinct from the Hair Mardpet
(p. 33). The district of Mardpetakan, p. 35 f., is discussed with the references in Armenian and Greek authors. The result is summed up by the statement (p. 56) that the early history of Armenia according to Mar Abas was composed at the court of Bagarat of Taraun, Prince of Princes.

On pp. 56–68 the manner in which Moses Xorenaci used Mar Abas is illustrated and Šmbat Bagarat in Moses's history is recognized as a prototype of Šmbat Abu'l 'Abbās, father of Ašot, at whose court, therefore, Moses composed his work (p. 67).

As a result of these inferences, the author is inclined to believe that the first to attempt a sketch of old Armenian history was probably Anania Širakaci, on whom later writers based their work (p. 77).

The article is full of important reconstructions and boldly argued theories, as is usual in Professor Markwart's work.


G. Deeters, pp. 1–9, has contributed a paper on the names of the days of the week: "Die Namen der Wochentage im Südkauskasischen." He shows that, of the two systems of naming the days, the Georgians employed that of numbers (using also kwirake and paraskevi), whereas the Mingrelians had adopted the planet-names, of which, however, all have not been explained. This difference is due to the fact that Mingrelia received Christianity from Byzantium, not from Georgia and Armenia. A table of the names is given, for Georgian, Mingrelian, Western, and Eastern Lazian, Swanetian, together with the list from Orbeliani.

Two articles are from the pen of the late Professor Markwart. The first is "Historische Data zur Chronologie der Vokalgesetze im Armenischen". The following data for the phonology of Armenian are proposed: (1) vowel of final syllable lost after 400 B.C., as proved by Táοxos and Fᾶανος in Xenophon; (2) the first Arm. consonant-shift before the settlement east of the Ephrates is proved by the names Gamirk' and Kordouk'; (3) a further shift appears in Xaltik' and Tayk' only; (4) the first stage of the West Arm. consonant-shift is found in Μακραβανδόν (k < g), vi saec. A.D.; (5) final vowels preserved in loan-words of the Achaemenid period, as in axti-, gahu-; (6) final -n from the same period in paštaun, barsmunk'; (7) -d- became either -r- (as in many Iranian words), or -y- (as in Xaltoyarič beside -darićza); (8) Chorasmian influence in the name Φαραομάνης, and the
month-name Hrotic; (9) unstressed Indo-Eur. o > a, in 'Avapíaγη "dream-oracle", hence an Arm. *anorjak. This last example indicates with what uncertain material Markwart was prepared to operate. A number of doubtful statements are thrown out by the way. Thus, on p. 20, we find the assumption that xw > f is an Old Pers. development, and p. 13, Ezra iv, 7, is marked as a forgery by the use of nšen in the sense of "letter".

We have, on p. 19, the remark that Zaza represents the old Ādari dialect, but unfortunately no proofs are offered. A large number of geographical problems are elucidated, such as those of the Udini and Πράσιος, with various suggested textual emendations. Included is also a discussion of the name 'Apragmaïas (p. 14 f.), here derived from *Arta-xšiyant-

The second article of Professor Markwart treats of the conversion of Iberia: "Die Bekehrung Iberiens und die beiden ältesten Dokumente der iberischen Kirche," pp. 111–67. As the editor indicates in a preliminary note, this subject has been discussed by various Georgian scholars with whose work Markwart was unacquainted. Of the sources Rufinus is first criticized (without, however, any mention of the work of A. Glas on the problem of the relationship of Gelasios of Caesarea to the work of Rufinus), in which it is proved that the conversion took place under Constantius II, and not under Constantine as stated by Rufinus. Moses Xorenaci has the same account with additions, especially the king’s name Mihran, and that of the Arakekouhi Nounë (possibly a Cappadocian name). Later there was invented a long romance of Nouni (Nino), which appears in the Kart’lis C’xovreba. Rufinus quotes Bacurius (gentis ipsius rex) as the authority for his account, and accordingly Markwart, p. 123 f., examines the historical relations of that period. The Coptic legend, agreeing in essentials with Rufinus, is noticed on p. 136 f. A second Coptic legend connects the story with Eustathios of Antioch (p. 138 f.), implying Antiochene claims over the Iberian church. The list of Iberian bishops at the Synod of Bapgeën in 505 is examined and their sees identified. The article is concluded with a table of the dates proposed, whereby the conversion of Iberia is placed between 350 and 360. We have here a most important critical treatment of Iberian church history from about 350 to 505 based upon the Byzantine, Latin, Syriac, Armenian, and to some extent (in translation) Georgian texts.

H. Jensen has devoted fourteen pages to the Armenian conjunction et’e (t’e), in which, with examples from the Arm. Bible and Eznik,
he supplements Meillet’s short account of the syntax of this word. The various combinations in which et'e and t'e appear are illustrated, such as t'e oč, bayc et'e, orpēs t'e, ibreu t'e, k'an t'e, manauand t'e, miayn t'e. It forms a useful addition to the knowledge of Arm. syntax.

The article of N. Martirosian, “Ein Erklärungsversuch der hethitischen Kasusendung -az,” attempts to prove a connection of Hittite abl. sing. -az with Arm. -c (Old Arm. gen. dat. abl. plur., East. New Arm. abl. sing.). It would have been natural to find an examination of the original value of Arm. c (g), as, for instance, in harcânam, before any comparison were made between two symbols separated by some 1500 years. The article cannot be considered illuminating.

In “Beiträge zu Grammatik und Lexicon des Chaldischen”, J. Friedrich has discussed the morphology of object and subject cases, recognizing a different treatment with the preterite of transitive and intransitive verbs. The nominal sentence is noticed on p. 59. For preterite endings the author keeps to trans. 1st sing. -bi, 3rd sing. -mi, 3rd plur. -(i)tu; intrans. 1st sing. -di, 3rd sing. -bi, 3rd plur. -(a)li, against Tseretheli’s suggestion that -bi and -mi are object suffixes. P. 71 -me is briefly treated and p. 72 the form of the plur. accusative object. On p. 74 f. a-li-e is emphatically claimed as meaning “he says” against the theory that a-li-e is the same as a-li the relative pronoun. The meanings of šeri, p. 82 (“apart”) and of manu, p. 83 (“be to hand”) with obscure form, are established. In the still so uncertain sphere of Chaldian all contributions are very welcome.

R. Bleichstein’s “Beiträge zur Sprach- und Volkskunde des Georgischen Stammes der Gurier” (I. Hälfte) contain Gurian texts of peasant folklore taken down from the dictation of Dat’ik’o Lomadze. This first part gives the texts themselves and the translation of the first tale, forming a contribution of considerable interest.

H. W. B.


These contributions to Iranian studies form an important and distinguished addition to our knowledge of the Achaemenid period, both in the main thesis and in the many important notes. Of the five theses the first provides the long-wanted sachlich explanation of the use of the word uezârišn “explanation, interpretation”, in reference
to the system of writing which is known to us in Sogdian, the Sasanian inscriptions, the Zoroastrian Pahlavi books, and the Pahlavi Psalter: a system derived from the time when the Aramaic language, hitherto exclusively written, was gradually replaced by Iranian words in the writing, as it had always been in reading, leaving large traces in the "ideograms". It is here proved that the origin lay in the custom of Persian governmental secretaries, who wrote and received documents in Aramaic, but read them before the king, or his officials, in Persian. The Aram., Heb., mprs, and Pahl. uzvišn, supply the proofs. Aram. mprs in Ezra, iv, 18, by its technical meaning, soon misunderstood among the Jews, suggested a defence of the document in Ezra, 4–6, which the second contribution discusses in detail. The analysis justifies the genuineness of these chapters by a skilful criticism of the document of Tab'el, from which the chronicler has preserved large excerpts.

Imperial Aramaic (Reichsaramäisch) is next treated in reference to the three phonological and orthographical peculiarities, A. ṣ and >window-network> for final -ā̄, and also the absence of these letters; B. ʿ ʿ as makeshifts borrowed from Canaanite, but ʿ ʿ proving preservation of š in Aramaic; C. caus. ha- and a-; refl. hit- and it-; jussive; pronouns. Aramaic in the Sasanian inscriptions is largely called into use, and at the same time is itself interpreted, as in the case of the inscriptive ʿarm. (For Mahāmār, p. 42, note 2, pr'm is probably the north-western equivalent.) Sogd. RNY = pr'm'y is proved to be RY, p. 37, 95; and Sogd. KZNH instead of the incorrect KTH, p. 45, note 1. All these observations are of great value.

Turning to the Iranian element in Aramaic, the author is able to establish that, as should hardly have been doubted, the loan-words in Aramaic do not allow any conclusion as to the final vowels of Old Persian. Lists of Iranian words in Eg. Aram. Papyri are given, p. 66 f., with etymological notes. Some points remain uncertain, as, for example, ʿarav, which does not prove ʿ < rt (cf. Markwart, Gatha Uṣṭavati, p. 30 f.).

In the discussion of Zandik-Zindiq, Professor Schaedler proves its origin to be from zand in the sense of "allegorical interpretation" (Masʿūdi ʿاَللر َوْلا َةَلَذِي ُهَو َالْزَّنَد), and from its occurrence in Eznik and Elišē infers that it could have been used in Mānī's time of Mānī himself. Pahl. zandīk in Mx., 36, 16; Šnš, 6, 7; Guj. Ab., and Av. zanda- have a more general meaning (Av. zanda- being considered a Mid. Iran. Rückbildung from zandīk).

On p. 90 f., DkM 828 f., a commentary on Yasna 30, is translated
whence the conclusion is drawn that the Zurvanists began their μονομοια with Yasna 30, 3.

On pp. 12 and 94 an attempt is made to explain Bh. § 70 (only Elamite preserved): Dareios expressed himself “In Aryan”, but his commands were written down in Aramaic.

It may, however, be noted that Sogd. prβr, p. 97, does not prove original b for Hebr. דַּבֵּא beside דַּבֶּא (cf. Av. pairi vāra-), since Sogd. -β- can represent -v-, as in Man. Sogd. ptβylyy “command” (apud Lentz, Die Stellung Jesu . . ., p. 42) =*pati vacida-, Arm. loan-word patouer.

It would be interesting, if it were not incredible, to have an Avestan word in Aramaic, but hmenyt, p. 57, will doubtless find a better explanation. We have probably to think of *hamavan- (cf. for the suffix Pahl. hāmōn, Paz. hamāvan), and a connection with Pahl. hamist “together”, where -ist appears to be the same as the -ist of naxvist, harvist, and in double superlatives -tomist.

It will be clear from these remarks that the book is full of valuable observations.


This Abhandlung is the result of studies in connection with the Yaghnobí language and people, which were made possible by a journey of the author and Robert Gauhtiot to the valley of Yaghnob in 1913. A report was published by Professor Junker in Indog. Jahrb., ii. and an important contribution to the knowledge of Yaghnobí was made in the publication of three tales in Yaghnobí (Junker, Drei Erzählungen auf Yaghnobí, Sb. d. Heid. Akad. d. Wiss., 1914), translated from the Persian.

The present book is devoted to the geography of the Yaghnobí valley in relation to the dialectology of the language. The name in the form Iagnaube was mentioned by de Ujfalvy in 1877, the Russians used Ягнайубъ and Ягнай, Junker recorded Яγνοβъ. The valley lies to the east of Samarkand in the Köhistan, between the Zarafshan and Hisâr ranges. The importance of the Yaghnobí language lies in its close relationship to the Sogdian dialects.

Professor Junker has carefully worked over the linguistic material
of de Ujfaly (published before W. Geiger's work in the *Grundr. d. iran. Phil.*, which was based mainly on the unpublished Yaghnābī studies of Salemann), and also the contribution of Mallitskii which appeared after Junker's *Drei Erzählungen*.

The situation of the Yaghnābī valley is described, pp. 29 ff., with two sketch-maps of importance. Pages 33–107 are devoted to earlier reports concerning the valley, those of G. von Meyendorff, 1820, A. Lehmann, 1841–2, L. N. Sobolev, 1874, E. de Ujfaly, 1878, A. L. Kuhn, 1881, Sh. Akimbetev, 1881, Capus and Bonvalot, 1883, W. I. Lipskii, 1896, N. G. Mallitskii, 1906 (publ. 1924), and official literature. All these reports are carefully analysed and annotated with many corrections, the result of Professor Junker's own observations. We thus have a clear view of the whole geographical area, including the names of all the Yaghnābī settlements, however small. The information of these travellers is further enlarged and confirmed by a text recorded by Kuhn, here given in phonetic transcription and translation, containing the Yaghnābīs' views of the extent of their district. On pp. 120 f. we have a list of the settlements whose mother speech is Yaghnābī. The remainder of the book sets out the dialects within Yaghnābī itself with a valuable dialect map, p. 127.

The whole is of great importance and rouses a keen desire for the further contributions which are promised. It is unfortunate that the hard conditions of life among the Yaghnābīs choked any interest in literary effort, but what we have of the language is invaluable for Iranian philology.

H. W. B.

**DER URSPRUNG DER MAGIER UND DIE ZARATHUSTRISCHE RELIGION.**


The difficult problem of the relationship of the Magians to Zarathushtra and his community is here once more made the subject of an elaborate study by Professor Messina, a pupil of the late Professor Markwart. It must reluctantly be confessed that the question cannot be considered settled. From a careful study of the passage of Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, 30, 1 f., compared with other Greek authors, Professor Messina has shown that the Greeks of the fourth cent. B.C. knew of Magians in the strict sense whose μαγεία was a philosophy and a theology, beside the Magians wrongly so-called, whose correct
designation was Chaldeans, the practisers of *artes mathematicas*. From the Greek and Latin accounts, the author passes to the Avesta to define the meaning of the Gothic words *maga*- and *magavan*-. For *maga*- he claims the meaning “gift” in the sense of the “doctrine of Zoroaster”, and for *magavan*- the “possessor of the gift”, that is, a follower of Zoroaster. The later Avestan *moyu*-, Old Persian *magu*-, are explained as later formations for *magavan*-. Thus the Magoi of the Greeks would be Zoroastrians in the strictest sense.

It is clear that these results meet with serious obstacles. That to the Greeks Zoroaster was founder of Magianism could only prove that he was so claimed by the Magians. The record of Herodotos (i, 101), which has to many seemed the basis of our knowledge of the Magoi is unconvincingly interpreted, p. 76 f. The well-known Xanthos passage (discussed, p. 41) is in its present context not of great value whatever be the original number.\(^1\) It is not sufficient to set aside the date 258 before the Seleucid era, which is recorded by Alberuni for the date of Zoroaster, without a sufficient justification. The “6,000 years” of the Greek writers demands explanation. It seems, too, most reasonable to place the activity of Zoroaster at most two generations before the commentator, Ostanes, as is suggested by the succession in the Greek lists. *Ma-as-da-ku* (p. 79) is not so surely explained that it can be used as proof of Mazda-worship. The common assumption that Zoroaster is genetically connected with the name Ahura Mazda has never been proved.

There are several passages on which another opinion is permissible. On p. 34, the inference of Professor Marquart as to *Δαθοῦς* and *daθušo* has no cogency in the present state of our knowledge of the Avestan alphabet. It is surprising to find *ΩΜΑΝΟΥ*, p. 97 (only the gen. sing. is found), and *ΩΜΟΜΛ*, p. 98, both identified with Haoma. The Dēnkart tradition of Alexander, p. 34 f., must be otherwise estimated. Alexander the Byzantine (Hrōmāyik) is derived from the Alexander Romance. Ignoring of the Achæmenids (p. 91) can as easily be due to lack of historical interest. On p. 89 f. the episode of Gaumāta is interpreted on the assumption that he is a strict Zoroastrian. It is noteworthy that in the Achæmenian inscriptions *Maguš* is used only of this Median. The whole episode is confused by the divergent accounts preserved by the Greeks and in the inscription of Dareios. The sketch of the development of the Magian religion, p. 92 f., is not

---

\(^1\) I understand that Professor Messina proposes to treat the problem of this context shortly.
the only possible one, and runs, for instance, directly opposed to the theory that a thorough dualism of good and bad is the foundation of Zoroastrian Weltanschauung.

Professor Messina's book is a skilful reconstruction which makes large use of available Greek and Latin sources. The Iranian traditions are less critically used, and it is disconcerting to find speculations treated as proved facts. The identification of magu- with magavan-in meaning remains an etymological speculation.

H. W. B.


One is accustomed to learn much from any work of the late Professor Markwart. It is therefore a fortunate event that in the book before us one more of his writings has been posthumously published, while others have appeared in Caucasia. We have here the same immense learning and brilliant combination, the same bold use of etymologies of proper names of peoples and places with the inseparable elements of uncertainty, which we find in all his works. The present book falls into two parts, an essay on Avestan transcription, pp. 1–51, and a translation with commentary of Yasna 43. The absence of reference to Junker's work on the Avestan alphabet (Caucasia ii and iii) seems to imply that the work was mainly written before this investigation of Junker's was known, certainly we find on p. 2 the explanation of ū in hyat as y y ć(j). The "etymological glosses" of pp. 1–2 are not likely: beside daēnā we have šayana, and -voh- may easily indicate nasal and h. Neither x nor ξ is satisfactorily explained (pp. 8, 11) by a + n.

There are other points which seem to be too confidently stated. Pp. 4–5 ṣagyanaḍau is derived from *ṭṣhant- in the sense of "verkündigend"; it may perhaps be from sang- "to measure, weigh". Pp. 6–7, Cāpaṟyana suggests a *sṛanga rather than *sṛangā. P. 9, Māraḵanḍa: Sogd. knḍ- and Saka kanthā- indicate something other than -nt-. P. 13 'Orbokorupavtio as "die Angehörigen der rechtschaffenen Kuru" is incredible. P. 15, the proposal that the Avesta was written in cuneiform does not help to explain final ḥ = YAv. ḥ, and Professor Markwart realized that Aramaic was the
official language of the Imperial government (p. 32). P. 16, the treatment of Old Persian -a and -ā in Aramaic appears not to be clearly realized; the words, whether proper names or not, are treated like Aramaic words without inflexion, and therefore do not show how Old Persian was written in the Aramaic alphabet.

The proposed explanations of the names Zarathuštra and Zoroaster as *Zarat-uštra- "having yellow camels", and *Zrvat-vāstra "having green pastures" respectively, throw light upon this problem and are very probable.

P. 38 Saka baṣṭarđa is probably from *abi-starn-ta- with rr (= rn) from the present stem. The discussion of Av. āvā is important. That we have here न in seems very likely. It must then be supposed that in kṣa beside krota-, amuṣa-, mωma- beside mrota-, and others similarly, is a middle Iranian development beside the old Iranian rt. When the sound s began first to be used for hr is not yet established. In the problem of ΑΡΟΟΑΣΠΟ the divinity Druvaspā has probably some rôle.

In the translation of Yasna 43 some new suggestions are made. In v. 1 manarōhō is “Wohnstatt”, a meaning Bartholomae had adopted in one passage without securing a following. In v. 2 āstī “Hausgenossen” is an illustration of the greater latitude secured by the recognition of matres lectionis in the Avestan alphabet. In v. 3 husmentus “wohlwollend” instead of “knowing well” is not an improvement. Ārmaitiś appears as four syllables Aramatiś, a treatment which has yet to be justified, since Armenian S(p)andaramet cannot be used as proof (probably it was looked upon as sandar + met), if we remember Arm. zarāē with -a- between the components. In v. 12 rānōibhō is given as *rneiβjō “für die Dienste”, after the Sanskr. rna-, but Sogd. 'rn and Saka ārra- mean “wrong” and so are opposed to this Indian meaning. The composition of the Gatha has been carefully analysed and the notes contain much of value.

The indexes will prove of great use as a guide to the many names quoted throughout an important book.

H. W. B.


It has been a great pleasure to read this balanced and courageous survey of civilization. The optimism of the author appears at every
point where he sums up the achievements of man. His standpoint is universal, which enables him to see the defects and merits of the various stages of man's growth. Chapter xxiii, on East and West, is particularly interesting. The early pre-history of mankind is sketched with great imagination, though it could not be supposed that all details would approve themselves, as, for example, the sketch of religious evolution could be disputed. The book is full of a broad humanitarian spirit, which seeks to make use of all progress to further progress; and the abundant optimism is based upon the essentially optimistic Zoroastrian attitude to life. The subject-matter is naturally familiar and is not perhaps treated profoundly, but the massing of details has a great effect. Progress is traced to the present time and becomes the basis of further expectation, though the grim chapter on war is perhaps slightly sensational. There is a discussion of the difficult question of the colour bias with the firm belief that colour should be no bar to equality. Dr. Dhallä's works are well known, and this book forms a most interesting continuation. It is of value to have this impartial survey from an Eastern scholar.

H. W. B.


It is a matter for congratulation that this important work from the papers of the late Professor Markwart should have been published. The subject was peculiarly Markwart's own. It has been fortunate, too, in its editor, Professor Messina, who has here followed the precedent of his edition of Markwart's Gatha Uštavatī in publishing this work also in hand-written form. The language chosen was English, which necessarily involved the author in difficulties, though the meaning is not often obscured by linguistic uncertainty.

The importance of this short Pahlavi text has long been recognized, and earlier editions and translations were given by Blochet and Jamasp-Asana. Markwart's wonderful familiarity with the geographical works of Greeks, Romans, Byzantines, Syrians, Armenians, Arabs, and Persians, enabled him to explain many obscurities in a text which has suffered in an especial degree from scribal errors, inevitable in a list of foreign names.
The book is excellently arranged. We are offered first the text in the Pahlavi character, with an elaborate transcription facing it in a second column. Below is given the translation. The larger part, however, is occupied by the commentary, p. 24 ff. Here Markwart has heaped up information on all the places in the catalogue, supplying the many and various forms of the names and also reproducing abundantly the old local traditions recorded in early books, Syriac, Arabic, and Persian. It could not be expected that the translation should be perfect in every respect. Thus, for example, in § 39, pērōzān is almost certainly a patronymic before which a name has dropped out. Nor are the translations from Pahlavi Texts given in the commentary always right, in particular, on p. 69, the translation of Bahman Yašt 2, 49, is seriously wrong, with the almost grotesque Gayōpetik. ḫaṣṣūk is Suṣṭāk, that is "Sogdian", as rightly given in the Pāzand sūdī. Etymologies of proper names in which Markwart always indulged freely are not wanting here, too, some being of the most doubtful kind.

There is much very disputable matter in this book, but the wealth of important information is too great to allow these less sound judgments to affect the value of the work. It should receive a very hearty welcome among Iranian scholars.

H. W. B.


Mr. Kazemzadeh-Iranschāhr has selected and re-arranged a large number of verses from the Gathas of Zarathushtra with the purpose of making these "sermons in verse" comprehensible to a larger class than philologists and specialists in religion. His plan has been to set these verses in the order which seems to him to be demanded by the sequence of thought. It is obviously a proceeding of some delicacy, and has been exemplified in the study of all old texts. The re-arranger rarely satisfies anyone but himself. The verses are set out in ten chapters, of which Chapter I, for example, is entitled "The Lament of the World-soul and its prayer for a judge and deliverer". This is based on Yasna 29. It is at once evident that we have before us an attempt to interpret Zarathushtra in such a way as to suit modern ways of thinking. This is, of course, a common way of treating ancient
documents which seems always to provide great satisfaction to the interpreter. It requires great caution to discover what an ancient author actually meant and it is obviously easier to suppose he meant what the interpreter wishes. If we add a conviction that the ancient author must have meant certain things, it is rarely hard to find them.

Yasna 29 is here interpreted in terms of a World-soul, a meaning which may be said to be certainly not intended by Zarathushtra, nor is it the view held by the earlier (Sasanian) Zoroastrians.

The author has had before him Poure Daoud’s translation into Persian, from the German of Bartholome. But the translation offered is not to be taken as a close rendering. Yasna 29, 1a (p. 11) is given as: “O Ahura Mazda, die Weltseele klagt vor Deinem Thron und fragt . . . ,” which corresponds to xémaibyā gōus urvā gorōzdā. Yasna 50, 1a (not 51, 1), p. 77, is “Kann meine Seele nach dem Tode auf Schutz hoffen?” in the original: kat mōi urvā ise cahyā avarohō.

Each chapter is preceded by an introduction in which the author has interpreted the verses according to his view of Zarathushtra’s teaching.

It is interesting to note this interest in things Zoroastrian, which appears, too, in the poems of Poure Daoud. There is much in the Gathas to attract attention and the task of interpreting them is far from finished.

H. W. Bailey.
Dr. Siassi, though a Persian, has been long employed in the French Legation at Tehran, and his views on the relations of his country with foreign powers should not have been tinged with the bias that they display. The allegation that Britain was proved to have been by treaty bound to aid Persia in arms in her war with Russia in 1825, the suggestion that the British Legation at Tehran sold its favours, and the statement that Britain, in whom the constitutionalists found a warm sympathizer, systematically opposed every attempt of Persia to gain greater political or economic freedom, do not commend themselves as just comments on British policy in Persia, and British readers, at least, will not readily believe that their officials deliberately imperilled their trade in Persia by arming and encouraging predatory tribes. The author of such a slander should study the history of the control of the arms traffic in the Persian Gulf.

The account of the reactions of the Persians, as Aryans, to a Semitic religion which was forced upon them, and of the effects, political as well as economic, of European civilization on Persia, are interesting and informative, but the author is unduly optimistic regarding the progress of railway construction in Persia.

Wolseley Haig.


There is no need to insist on the importance of a traveller like J.-B. Tavernier who between 1632 and 1668 visited Persia six times and frequented the court of the Şafavid shâhs Şâfi, ‘Abbâs II and Sulaimân. Tavernier had not the education of his great contemporary Chardin, but being like the latter a sober Huguenot and a keen jeweller, he was an excellent observer well acquainted with what was passing behind the scenes.

The Şafavid epoch is still very little known. Even the ‘Alam-ârâ, the great chronicle of Shâh ‘Abbâs I, which is a real mine of information, has never been duly exploited by the historians. But a final synthesis will be only possible when the Persian sources have been studied alongside with the works of the whole pleiad of great European travellers who visited Persia in the seventeenth century.

If Tavernier has been less quoted than Chardin, the reason is in a great measure attributable to the absence of a modern edition of his-
Voyages, comparable to the one Langlès gave of Chardin (10 volumes, Paris, 1811).

The present handsome volume is an attempt at repairing this omission. It is very well printed and adorned with thirty-eight contemporary illustrations. It is a matter for regret, however, that the book does not give a complete text of Tavernier, containing as it does only Books iv (less five chapters on the Armenians) and v.

As is known, Book i contains the description of the roads from Paris to Isfahān, through the northern provinces of Turkey; Book ii, ditto, through the southern provinces of Turkey; Book iii, ditto, through the northern provinces of Europe, with a description of the Caspian provinces.

Voltaire was very unjust to Tavernier when he wrote about him: "qu'il n'apprend guère qu'à connaître les grandes routes et les diamants." Our standards have considerably changed and we now think that perhaps the omitted part of Tavernier's travels is particularly interesting. Precisely as an explorer he had more merits than even Chardin, who gives uncomparably fewer march-routes. To quote an example, Tavernier was the first European who visited Persian Kurdistan and its capital Senna (Sneire, as he calls it in his usual phonetically imperfect way).

The editor has well done to add in footnotes some of the passages of the omitted part to which Tavernier alludes in Books iv and v, but it would be highly desirable to possess a full text of those books in another additional volume; in the complete edition of 1692, the text edited now forms 265 pages, and the part omitted 424 pages.

It is regrettable that such important texts on an Oriental country are edited without the help of an Orientalist. One cannot respect such mistakes as Neozonze (p. 279, instead of Naurūz "New Year"), chaté (p. 280, instead of tchāchta), Degdar (p. 292, instead of dadjdāl "Antichrist"), etc., etc., so as to leave them without corrections, be it only in footnotes.

V. Minorsky.
he has inherited the latter's independence of judgment and audacity in face of conservative opinion, but has struck out along new lines of his own and does not hesitate to criticize upon occasion the methods and conclusions of his teacher. His earlier studies were mainly directed to specific problems, extending from his doctoral dissertation on the ethics of al-Ghazzâlî (Al-Akhlaq 'inda'l-Ghazâlî, published in 1924) to the love-poetry of 'Umar b. Abî Rabî'a (Hubb ibn abî Rabî'a washi'ruhu, Aṣ-Ṣabāh Press, n.d.), but in the most ambitious of his Arabic writings hitherto, al-Muwâzana baina 'Sh-Shu'arâ (Muqtâtaf and Muqtaţtam Press, Cairo, n.d. [1926]), his exposition of the principles of poetic criticism ranges over the entire field of Arabic poetry. Meanwhile, he had undertaken an edition of the Zahr al-Âdâb of al-Ḥuṣri of Qairawan, which inspired him to take up the literature of the fourth/tenth century as the subject of his researches for the doctorate of the University of Paris, of which the present volume is the outcome.

This collaboration of Egyptian and other Arabic-speaking scholars with Western orientalists in the investigation of the many problems of classical and medieval Arabic literature is a development which cannot be too much encouraged. They bring to the task a fineness of aesthetic feeling and an immediacy of linguistic sense which are beyond all but the exceptionally gifted of European scholars, and thereby they greatly enrich our understanding of the artistic qualities of the Arabic writers. These qualifications Dr. Zakî Mubâarak possesses in full measure, and the outstanding feature of his work is the brilliant psychological characterization which he gives of the principal literary figures of the century. It is true that not all of them are of equal value—in some instances (e.g. his accounts of Ibn Fâris and Ibn Nubâta) one feels that the writer lacks that element of historical perspective which should put him in full sympathy with them, and is looking at them with the detached interest which a superior person displays in the mentality of an inferior. Yet the sense of shock which we experience on these occasions is itself the best tribute to the insight and artistic realism of the majority of his portraits, and to that accuracy of observation, a good example of which is given in his brief study of the Aghâni of Abu'l-Faraj (though his argument does not invalidate the conclusions of Dr. Ṭâhâ Ḥusain to the extent which he claims).

With these native virtues in its favour, it is perhaps too much to demand of the book an equal standard in applying a foreign technique to its subject. It lacks the discipline to which we are accustomed in
works of this kind, and halts between the methods of the text-book and the informal causerie. Were it the work of an orientalist, one would be entitled to criticize its vagueness in general statement, its looseness of texture, its imprecision in points of detail, and transcription, and the presence of such rapid and superficial summaries as that devoted to the development of the maqāmāt literature on pp. 93–4. But there is one criticism which must be more seriously pressed. One of the main features of the book is a strong theorizing tendency—not in itself a matter for blame, providing that the theorizing is based upon a thorough survey of the facts. It is this which to the reviewer sometimes appears open to doubt, more especially in a matter to the discussion of which Dr. Zaki Mubārak attaches, perhaps, undue importance, namely the existence of a pre-Islamic Arabic prose literature. His arguments in favour of this are weakened by the failure to discriminate between prose literature and rhetoric, and for that matter between rhetoric itself and the learned study of rhetoric. Even the mainstay of his argument—the Qur‘ān—by its style and the history of its redaction disproves rather than supports his contention, while, as another Egyptian critic, al-'Aqqād, has pointed out, Arabic literary style never lost the marks of its rhetorical origin. Dr. Zaki Mubārak carries this theoretical tendency even into details, as when he remarks (p. 64) that the greater part of the poetry of Ibn al-Mu‘tazz must have perished, since the remaining “fragments” do not bear out his great reputation.

On the other hand, his analysis of the character and general motives of fourth century prose as a whole, and of special aspects of it in detail, is excellent. Of special interest are the sections which he devotes to investigating the origin of the maqāma. The generative influence of Ibn Duraid’s Ahādīth is well brought out, but it is open to question whether Ibn Duraid is for that reason to be credited with the invention of the maqāma. After all, the characteristic feature of the maqāmāt is their uniform setting; here, as elsewhere, a new genre has been created, not by invention ex novo, but by the artistic concentration of earlier literary motives in a fixed framework, and this seems undoubtedly to have been due to Badi‘ as-Zamān. But why, when space is so generously allotted to others, have the Ikhwān as-Ṣafā been dismissed with a bare half-dozen lines?

Finally, Dr. Zakī Mubārak has taken some liberties in his translations, doubtless with the excellent intention of preserving their vivid quality. But on occasion the looseness goes too far and mutilates the
sense. To take one or two examples: on p. 173, "preserve our self-respect" (sun wujūhanā) is rendered by "éclairre notre visage", and, on p. 177, the omission of an "only" in the passage quoted from the Muqābasāt of at-Tauḥīdī weakens very considerably the force of the writer’s observation. Similarly, on p. 139, at-Tauḥīdī is represented as declaring that Ibn ‘Abbād and Ibn al-‘Amīd have no equals "parmi les écrivains de cette époque"; in the original text, however, the remark is in the much less sweeping form: "amongst all those who have served the Jīlīṣ and Dailamites as secretaries (fi jamāʾī man kataba liljīlī wad-dailami) down to this time".

H. A. R. G.


M. Audisio has gone to good original sources for his study of Harun, which appears in the series of "Vies des hommes illustres". The historical basis is therefore sound on the whole, and his argumentation and presentation of the historical events of Harun's reign have a real value. It is the more necessary to make this clear since it might otherwise be overlooked owing to the author’s preoccupation with the picturesque. The romantic colouring of the background, obtained by exaggerating more especially the economic and artistic culture of the period, has had the result that the historical figure of Harun is enveloped in an Arabian-Nights-like glamour and his personality generalized into the type of the later Oriental monarchs. Needless to say, this idealization has more than once carried the author off his feet, as when he asserts that the Arabs "could, if they had wished, have anticipated 1453 twenty times", and no small number of his statements and his portraits of other characters in the story are equally open to question.

Professor Buckler’s monograph, on the other hand, is a copiously documented and closely-reasoned argument on the character of the relations between the Carolingians and the Abbasid Caliphs. He not only rebuts—and that with complete success—the scepticism of Barthold in regard to the embassies which passed between them, but also seeks to elucidate the exact objects and nature of their negotiations, and comes to the following conclusions: (1) That the initiative
was due to the Carolingians and the Popes with the object of forming a Franco-Papal-Muslim alliance against the Byzantine Emperors and the Umayyads of Spain; (2) that for the furtherance of their operations in Spain, Pippin and Charles sought and obtained formal authorization from the Caliphs to act as their deputies in the West; (3) that Charles, on the pretext of eliminating Byzantine influence from the Holy Places, was invested with the governorship of Jerusalem, which was, however, exercised on his behalf by the Caliph; (4) that in consequence of these appointments the status of Charles became that of a feudal vassal of Harun.

Direct evidence in support of each or any of these four theses is scarcely to be found, but Professor Buckler has been able to put together a very ingenious chain of arguments as a result of his thorough scrutiny of the western sources. Since these, unfortunately, are the only sources, it must be left to the medievalists to decide whether the indirect evidence on which he relies is sufficient to bear the weight of his conclusions; the first of them, at least, seems to be well established. When, however, he appeals to Arabic sources to supply confirmatory material for the remaining three, he is on exceedingly dangerous ground. To cite as “evidence” for the second a romantic novel published in 1888 can only be called a singular lapse of judgment. Nor is the case much better in regard to the third. The argument that Charles was recognized as wāli (the book always has wali—a rather different thing!) of Jerusalem rests upon the meaning and value to be attached to the gift from the Patriarch of the “claves civitatis et montis cum vexillo”, while the other sources explicitly refer to jurisdiction over the Sanctuary only.

However that may be, the suggestion that Charles was actually invested with the amirate of Spain and the wilāyat of Jerusalem—already at that time a Muslim Holy Place—seems to verge on the fantastic. The attempt to justify it by dragging in Māwardī and his “imārat of conquest” is totally irrelevant. There is no question of “conquest” in the case, and that this office “may devolve on a non-Muslim” is an addition of Professor Buckler’s own, to which the exposition of Māwardī lends no countenance. The claim that Māwardī represents “contemporary legal opinion” on the ground that he belonged to the school of Shāfi‘i is one which no student of Islam would admit.

As regards the fourth thesis, it is indeed possible that the ‘Abbāsid Caliphs should have regarded Charles as a vassal, but whether his
acceptance of their "friendship" and gifts of robes "implied the acknowledgment of that suzerainty" is another matter. Throughout the book, indeed, Professor Buckler is a little too preoccupied with theoretical questions of vassalage and suzerainty. The constant insistence on the claim of the Abbasids to overlordship of the Byzantine Emperors (pp. 10, 14, 32) rests upon a forcing of the meaning of "obedience" in a fourteenth century compilation and the mistaken view that the exaction of a tribute for a specified term of years "was apparently regarded as a mark of vassaldom by the Abbasids", whereas the Muslim jurists clearly regard it as a price paid for an armistice by the weaker side for the time being, whether Muslim or Byzantine.

No; on the whole it appears to me that M. Audisio's rendering of the negotiations, "romanced" and jesting though it be, gets much closer to the spirit of Baghdad. "En sômme, se dit Haroun, ce Karlé ne m'intéresse pas autrement, mais on peut lui donner quelques témoignages de sympathie. On lui fera quelques petits cadeaux ... Et il fìt quelques petits cadeaux. Qu'est-ce pour lui qui a l'habitude des splendeurs orientales? Une bête à tromper, quelques chiffons, une pendule. Misères! Et l'on comprendrait fort bien que l'événement ne se soit transmit aux chroniqueurs arabes qui écrivaient un siècle plus tard. Mais dans une Europe peu fastueuse, voilà qui vaut les plus fabuleux trésors de Golconde et qui fait travailler les cervelles."

H. A. R. G.


An excellent pocket-guide to the mosques of Cairo, and especially valuable on account of the chronological arrangement adopted. The facts and dates, features of artistic importance, and particulars of restorations supply precisely and concisely just that information which the average visitor requires and which he can only with difficulty find elsewhere.

H. A. R. G.


Facts, masses of facts, piled relentlessly one upon another, facts political, ethnographical, social, artistic, economic, literary, technical—an Encyclopaedia Hispanica in little, from the Stone Age to 1914. In
this place, however, it falls to deal only with portions of the fifth and sixth chapters, which relate to the place of the Spanish Muslims and of Muslim culture in the development of Spain. If for the historian of Spain the thrusting of a Muslim political system into a Latin Christian ambience raises difficulties enough, how much more must the intervention of Arabic culture trouble the historian of Spanish civilization! Former writers have viewed the Islamic element as an intrusion to be minimized or ignored, and it is a conspicuous merit of Professor Altamira's book in these chapters that he rejects this attitude. The cultural achievements of the Spanish Muslims and Jews are given full recognition and their contribution to the growth of a national Spanish culture in the later Middle Ages is duly noted. Yet one misses something—something that may be summed up by saying that the author speaks always of Spanish Muslims, never of Muslim Spaniards. In neglecting the interaction between Muslim Spain and the Eastern Muslim world, Professor Altamira also overlooks the distinctively "national" characteristics of the Muslim community in Spain. This in turn brings out the defects of the method which constitutes the special strength of his book, namely the insistence on material cultural facts. Just as in dealing with the Romans and with Christianity he passes over in silence their effects upon the character of the Spanish people, so here he lays a like emphasis on the purely external elements of culture transmitted by the Spanish Muslims, to the exclusion of any deeper and more enduring impress. This aspect of Spanish civilization is simply left on one side, and even in the admirable bibliographical appendix is entirely omitted.

The paragraphs devoted to the culture of the Spanish Muslims are, for the rest, models of lucid compression. There are, however, one or two errors in Arabic terms which might be put right. The council of state was not termed mashūra but shūrā; the word mashwar, properly the location of the council, was sometimes employed by metathesis for shūrā, hence the Spanish mexuar. The term given for police officer, mustasař, is an impossible formation in Arabic and perhaps stands for muḥ'asib. The Muvatta' (which means "The Levelled Path") is not the most copious work on Mālikite Sunna, but the first authoritative statement of it. To render Almoravids by "The Marabouts" is misleading, in view of the modern associations of the term, which should rather have been brought into relation with the meaning of ribāt as explained on p. 49. It need only be added that the translation and editing alike are in keeping with the outstanding quality of the book.

H. A. R. G.
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The paragraphs devoted to the culture of the Spanish Muslims are, for the rest, models of lucid compression. There are, however, one or two errors in Arabic terms which might be put right. The council of state was not termed mashwāra but šūrā; the word mashwar, properly the location of the council, was sometimes employed by metathesis for šūrā, hence the Spanish mezwar. The term given for police officer, mustasāf, is an impossible formation in Arabic and perhaps stands for muḥ’tasib. The Munwatta’ (which means “The Levelled Path”) is not the most copious work on Mālikite Sunna, but the first authoritative statement of it. To render Almoravids by “The Marabouts” is misleading, in view of the modern associations of the term, which should rather have been brought into relation with the meaning of ribāṭ as explained on p. 49. It need only be added that the translation and editing alike are in keeping with the outstanding quality of the book.

H. A. R. G.

Mr. Philby’s volume on Arabia in the “Modern World” series gives for the first time a connected and detailed account of Arabian history from the rise of the Wahhābī movement. The sources which he has utilized are of unequal value, though perhaps the best that were available without access to the archives of the various states concerned. For the early decades he has summarized the contemporary chronicle of Ibn Ghannâm (of which there is an excellent MS. in the British Museum, Add. 23345), with its continuation by Ibn Bishr. The history of the latter half of the nineteenth century has been compiled from various materials, including the narratives of Doughty and other travellers. From the opening of the career of the present King, Mr. Philby invokes his authority, sometimes at first hand, sometimes through the medium of the Arabic history of Najd recently published by Mr. Amin Riḥānī (Taʾrīkh Najḍ al-ḥadīth, Bairut, 1928), down to the point where he is able to draw upon his own first-hand knowledge.

The predominance of Wahhābī sources would naturally give the book a Wahhābī tinge, even were it not accentuated by the author’s own leanings in that direction. But the importance of the Wahhābī movement for the modern history of Arabia is so great that this scarcely detracts from its value, except for a tendency to depreciate those whom he regards as the enemies of the house of Ṣaʿūd. A more serious criticism is that the mere chronicling of events has occupied his attention at the expense of the more general aspects of the recent and contemporary history of Arabia—social organization, administration, economic movements, and the like—the absence of which gives a certain unreality to the monotonous record of wars and raids. Among the points thus overlooked are, for example, the economic factors which contributed to the weakening and downfall of the first Wahhābī empire, and the part played by the opening of the Suez Canal in the recovery of Ottoman sovereignty in Western Arabia and consequent ambitions of Ottoman statesmen to extend it over the entire peninsula.

For absolute accuracy of fact and inference it is impossible to hold Mr. Philby responsible; since any research on Arabian problems is as good as non-existent, he has had to take the statements of his sources much as he found them. The difficulties of his task may be illustrated from the fact that even in dealing with the events of 1927–9 his exposition is frequently at variance with the semi-official
narrative subsequently published in the Meccan journal *Umm al-Qurā*. But although his survey may not answer all the questions we should like to put on the modern history of Arabia, it is exceedingly welcome, both as a first step towards filling a conspicuous gap, and as a foretaste of that *magnum opus* which he hopefully foreshadows in the Preface.

H. A. R. G.


The primary object of Dr. Hirschberg’s publication appears to be exegetical rather than literary, i.e. to serve as a contribution to the problem of the background and sources of the Qur’ān. The view which he puts forward is that Muḥammad’s knowledge of biblical history, eschatology, and so forth was derived from the religious poetry of Arabian Jews (“da es ja wahrscheinlich ist, dass M. alle seine Bibel- und Agadakenntnisse aus solchen Gedichten geschöpft hat,” p. 15), and, accepting the poems attributed to as-Sama’u’al, the Jewish shaikh of Taimā in the middle of the sixth century, as genuine remains of this pre-Islamic religious poetry, he illustrates and expands the religious allusions which they contain with a wealth of citation from Haggadic sources. The value of this collection of materials is very great, and they undoubtedly support the view “that the Jews of Arabia were well at home in the Bible and Rabbinic literature” (p. 20). On the other hand, it cannot be said that they are strong enough to carry the weight of his conclusions, especially as his arguments as to the authorship and date of the religious poems, and their independence of the Qur’ān, are unconvincing. For the full discussion of these issues it may be permitted to call attention here to the illuminating investigation published by Professor Levi della Vida, in the *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* (xiii, 53–72), in which he confirms the accepted view that they are post-Islamic, though preserving indications of their Jewish origin. The somewhat numerous inaccuracies in Dr. Hirschberg’s translations have been corrected in an appendix by Professor Kowalski.

H. A. R. G.


Editions of Marco Polo follow on one another’s heels in such variety of get-up and range of price, that it may cause some surprise to find
so hackneyed a classic in the fastidious company of Broadway Travellers. But to all who have ever dipped into the "irksome detail" of Yule’s classification of Polian texts and have followed up, however cursorily, more recent investigations into the MSS., this edition is something a great deal more than a mere reprint, more even than a new edition of "Yule". To have brought "Benedetto" at last within the range and comprehension of everyone is an achievement worthy of the series. Professor Benedetto’s great edition, based upon the famous Paris "Geographic Text" and carefully collated with all other early versions (including some hitherto unknown), is probably the nearest approach to Marco Polo’s own narrative which we are ever likely to get, unless some MS. of the lost prototype itself should be discovered. Nor is this a matter for congratulation to bibliophiles only, for this text itself reads better in every way than those of Marco’s later editors and revisers, including even Yule: it is fuller, more direct, and much more natural. Moreover, it prints the whole of Marco Polo, without the abridgments and suppressions (particularly of the later chapters), which nearly all his editors have been tempted—and have succumbed to the temptation—to make; and, as Sir Denison Ross has pointed out in his Introduction, it contains a number of important additional chapters derived from the recently recovered version represented by MS. "Z".

It is abundantly clear that henceforth those who wish to consult Marco Polo in connection with their Oriental studies must use "Benedetto", either in the original or in this version. Considerations of space, time, and cost have, on the other hand, prevented the inclusion of a full apparatus of notes and maps, leaving us in the unsatisfactory position of requiring to use Yule’s edition for notes, Mr. Penzer’s reprint of Frampton’s Elizabethan version for maps, and this for text. Sir Denison Ross’s annotated index, however, is an invaluable supplement to Yule’s notes, and the attractive reproductions of medieval maps have an interest of their own. Most curious of all is the section of the Catalan Map containing a miniature of the Polo brothers setting out with their caravan. The painting cannot be dissociated from the style of contemporary Islamic art, and might well have come straight out of an illuminated oriental manuscript.

H. A. R. Gibb.

Mr. S. Lane Poole's famous work The Mohammadan Dynasties, the only one to come into range with the present book, was published first in 1894 and for over thirty years enjoyed an uncontested and well-merited authority, but when a few years ago it was photographically reproduced everybody felt that further progress of historical researches was greatly hampered by the absence of an abstract, completing Mr. Lane Poole's information by data ascertained since 1894. This has now been done by the eminent Viennese numismatist Dr. Zambaur.

His book represents a tremendous amount of work. Its index contains 6,000 names, to say nothing of as many more mentioned only in the charts of the second part. The Mohammadan Dynasties enumerates 118 houses of Moslem rulers. The Manuel counts 283 of them and, under each heading, introduces numerous new details. Even under the 'Abbāsid caliphs, their exact titles and dates of accession (month and day) greatly enhance the value of the table. Most useful are the lists of the vazirs to the caliphs (pp. 6–9) and to the Ottoman Sultāns (pp. 161–6), as well as the lists of the governors of such cities as Mekka, Damascus, Baghdad, Rayy, Nishāpūr, etc. Useful, too, will be Dr. Zambaur's short bibliographical notes, often reminding of the existence of some numismatic articles apt to be overlooked even by specialists. Equally welcome are the particular signs showing that there are coins or inscriptions extant of the given prince.

The author says that at the basis of the Manuel lies a translation of Ibn al-Athīr's History which he made for his own use while pursuing his numismatic studies. He could not evidently enter into the discussion of discrepancies of dates given by different authors. In the present state of our sources, Dr. Zambaur's book had to be or not to be. It could not replace monographic studies of a host of specialists; it had to depend on their results, when available, and to reserve final judgment, when such researches are non-existent. However a

---

1 Though it would be unjust not to mention the numerous and very detailed charts in Justi's Iranisches Namenbuch, 1895, pp. 390–479, which were worked out independently.

2 Unfortunately even without the additions and corrections made by Barthold in his Russian translation of it (St. Petersburg, 1899).
visible difference exists between the parts of the book based on Lane Poole, or the direct study of the sources, and those simply reproducing the data of sources of different descriptions.

The following are some occasional corrections and suggestions with regard to some Turkish and Persian ruling houses.

"The Seljuks of Asia Minor" (p. 144). Tughril shāh b. Qylyjaarslan’s name is unaccompanied by the sign indicating inscriptions, but an inscription of his exists on the walls of Baiburt, see van Berchem in Lehmann-Haupt’s Materialien z. älter. Gesch. Armeniens, p. 159. This Tughril shāh is the ruler who allowed his son to become a Christian in order to marry the Georgian queen Rusudan, see Ibn al-Athīr, xii, 270: ḥadīthatun gharībatun lam yūjad mithluhā. This event ought to be mentioned in Dr. Zambaur’s table. According to Huart, J.A., 1901, xvii, p. 343–6, Rukan al-dīn Mas‘ūd I was still reigning in 560; his grandson Aḥmad b. Suleimān built a mosque in Divrizi in 626/1229.


"Qādī Burhaneddin of Sivas" (p. 156). See now his complete history in Bazm-u-razm (written in Persian 800-1398), ed. Istanbul, 1928.

Very confused still are the dynasties of "Māzandarān" and "Dailam", owing, chiefly, to the similarity of the names recurring in different branches of the same family. The best lists are still those of Justi utilized by Dr. Zambaur with certain misunderstandings. Such is a very regrettable confusion (p. 189, note 1) of the last fighter against the Arabs Māzyār with the little known Bāwandid Māzyār. The famous Māzyār b. Qārin b. Vandāhurmuz belonged to the cadet branch of the Qārin family, who claimed as their ancestor the legendary smith Kāwa, while the Bāwandids were said to descend from the Sāsānian prince Kayūs.

As regards the Dailamits (the Jastanides, p. 192, the Sallarids, p. 180), see now the detailed studies of Sayid Ahmad Kasravi, Pādshahān-i gum-nām, i–iii, Tehran, 1307–9. Dr. Zambaur confuses the Dailamits with the Rawwādī Kurds who ruled in Tabriz and were most likely related to the old rulers of Tabriz of the Arab tribe Azd. On the other hand he says almost nothing of the atābeks of Marāgha, descendants of the Rawwādites. The founder of their branch was Aḥmadīl b. Ibrāhīm b. Wahsūdān. Dr. Zambaur confused him with
his son Aq-Sunqur (p. 180, note 6). See Enc. of Islam: Tabriz and Maragha.

"The khans of Shakkî" (p. 184). Previously to the four khans named, there was a long series of local rulers, see Enc. of Islam. The four khans named were the last offspring of the Dumbuli dynasty (Khoi, Persia), about which see the Sharaf-nâma. Before the final triumph of the Qâjârs the Dumbulis played an important part in Tabriz.

"The kings of 'Qarabâgh'" (p. 194) must now completely disappear from the lists of Moslem dynasties after M. Pakhomov, Izvestiya Azerbajianskago... Instituta, i, 2, 1930, pp. 1–12, has ingeniously proved that the coins of Mużaffar b. Muḥammad b. Khalîfa, Bekbars b. Mużaffar, and 'Abd al-Malik b. Bekbars belong to a special dynasty of Darband. Abû Ḥâmil al-Gharnatî, who was in Darband towards 524–45, mentions precisely the local ruler Saif al-dîn Muḥammad b. Khalîfa al-Sulami.

"The princes of Ahar" (p. 191). The name Pîshtekîn b. Muḥammad must be read Pîshkîn (*Bēshgēn). Already Dorn, Caspi, 1875, p. 104, had discovered in Yaʿqūt that the name of the prince of Ahar was Ibn Bîshkîn. Cf. also the Nuzhat al-ḵulûb, p. 85, where Ahar is mentioned among the districts of the tuman Pîshkîn (now Meshkîn) surnamed after "Pîshkîn the Georgian". Beshken was a descendant of the Orbelian family, see Brosset, Hist. de la Géorgie, i, Add. p. 530, and Justi, Iran. Namenbuch, p. 445.

"The Ziyârids" (p. 210) were of Dailamite, and more exactly of Gil, origin, Ibn al-Atîrî, viii, 182, and had nothing in common with the Al-i Qârîn, native of Tabaristân.

"The Atâbeks of Yazd" (p. 231). The table borrowed from Barthold's additions to Lane Poole (p. 298) does not reproduce his remark that the atâbeks were connected with the Kâkoyïds. Instead of Saltyq read, with Barthold, Salghur.

"The Ildeğizides" (p. 271): omitted Mir-mîrân (already mentioned by Justi), the fourth son of Muhammad Pahlavân, born of the same mother as Qutlugh-Inanj. It is not exact to say that the capital of the Ildeğizides was at Ardabil. Most of their constructions are at Nakhichevan. Özbeg lived in Tabriz.

"The rulers of Bitlis" (p. 231 and 264). The second dynasty never pretended to the title "shâh". It existed a long time after 1009. Evliyâ Chelebi, iv, 81–128, gives in 1065–1655 a detailed account of Abdâl khan. The last hereditary ruler of Bitlis Sharaf-beg (probably
of the same dynasty, where this name is frequent) was deposed by the Ottomans in 1849, *vide* Lynch, *Armenia*, ii, 149.

"The Qutlugh-khans" (p. 237) Qutb al-dīn shown as Burāq Ḫājib’s grandson, was the son of Burāq Ḫājib’s brother Tayāngū, which latter name also means "chamberlain" (ḥājib), see al-Kāshghari, *Divān lughat al-turk*, iii, 281. See *Encyclopedia of Islam*.

"The atābeks of the Lur-i kūchik" (p. 235) have nothing to do with the Ḥazāraspids of the Lur-i buzurg. See *Enc. of Islam*. Nothing is said on the Vālis of Pusht-i kūh who claim descent from Shāh-verdi, see now Edmonds, *J. Central As. Soc.*, 1929, xvi, part iii, pp. 350–8.

"The Shaibanids" (p. 252). No mention is made of Shaibanī’s brother and immediate successor in Tashkand Suyunij-khoja (d. between 930–2), and of the latter’s son Abul-ghanārī Sultān Muḥammad, see Barthold, *Zap. Vost. Otd.*, xv, 903, p. 188–205.

"The Tughatimurids" (p. 256). It is inexact to say that Luqmān succeeded to Tughba Timur in 754 and not to mention the usurper Amīr Wali who ruled in Astārābād till 786.

"The Qara-qoyunlu" (p. 257). A mistaken reference makes Aspān the murderer of his father Qara-Yūsuf. The parricide was Qubād who killed Iskandar. See Thomas of Metsoph in Nève, *Exposé des guerres etc.*, Bruxelles, 1860, p. 137.

"The Aq-qoyunlu" (p. 259). The mention of Diyārbakr under Yaʿqūb concerns only the beginning of his reign.

"The princes of Lār" (p. 260). Lār is not an island ("île de Lār") but an inland region north-west of Bandar-Abbāsi. Instead of Karkīn-shāh read Gurgīn-shāh, the name Gurgīn having been hereditary in the dynasty which claimed descent from the hero Gurgīn, son of Milād. Dates borrowed from Muneejim bashi are certainly doubtful. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in 748–1347 mentions a Turcoman (!) sultan of Lār called Jalāl al-dīn, while according to Jīhānārā Bākālinjār II (731–53) was the ruler. In 818 an Amīr Gurgīn of Lār came to Shāhrukh’s court (father of the ruling Mubāriz al-dīn ?), see *Matla’ al-sa’dain*, tr. Quatremère, p. 280. The dynasty existed some time after 975; the last representative of it disappeared only in 1010–1601 under Shāh ‘Abbās.

"The Qutb-shāhī" (p. 298). Nothing is said of their interesting connexion with the Qara-qoyunlu (p. 257).

"The Safavids" (p. 262). In the lateral line under Mīrzā Muḥammad, is omitted his second name Dā’ūd, after which the whole of the line was called Āl-i Dāʾūd. Nothing is said about the pretender,

"Rulers of Ardālân" (p. 265). The table stops with the Sharafnama in 1005 but the historical list of the Wālis of Kurdistan goes till 1284–1867, see *Revue du Monde Musulman*, 1922, xlix, pp. 70–104.


It is the privilege of the books of such a large scope as the *Manuel* to excite the interests of the specialists on different branches of Moslem history. The result can be only beneficial for a further edition of the book or the publication of a supplement to it. But no living authority would be equally at home in all the branches of Dr. Zambaur’s book. Each critic of the chapters under his jurisdiction,1 for the dynasties next door, will have to depend on the *Manuel*.

The late Professor Barthold—and he was no complacent judge—in his review of the *Manuel* (Zap. Kollegii vostok., lll, 2, pp. 583–6) calls it "a precious handbook which will long be used by all the interested in the history of the Moslem world." Mr. Lane Poole’s

Dynasties remains a more congruous book, made of one block, but the Manuel covers a much larger field and in many ways represents more adequately the state of our knowledge with regard to the world of Islam.

V. M.

THE LANDS OF THE EASTERN CALIPHATE. By G. LE STRANGE. Cambridge University Press. 1930. (Reprint.)

Mr. Le Strange's excellent work published in 1905 had long become extremely scarce and its editors must be thanked for having reprinted it at a normal price and, thereby, for having put again into the hands of the students an indispensable manual.

The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate was the first attempt 1 to resume all the mass of information contained in Arabic and Persian geographical works, and to fill the gap "between Strabo and Marco Polo".

Mr. Le Strange's book represented a formidable advance on his predecessor, Barbier de Meynard (Dictionnaire de la Perse . . . extrait de Yaqout, Paris, 1861), not only by the incomparably greater number of sources utilized, but also by a vaster area described (Turkestan, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor, in addition to Persia).

It would be vain to deny that in 1931 we stand a long way further in advance than in 1905. With regard to Turkestan, Barthold's great work lies now before us in English translation; for Anatolia, Taeschner's Der Anatolische Wegenzit is a very thorough study. Finally, for the knowledge of Persia, Schwarz's Iran im Mittelalter is a capital contribution; its Part I, recently completed (1896–1929), comprises a most detailed survey of the South and West of Persia. The Encyclopedia of Islam also contains epitomes of historical and geographical data on a good many localities.

In a revised edition of Mr. Le Strange's book, occasional corrections would be necessary here and there, especially in portions dealing with the North-Western provinces:

p. 166. Tasuj on the Northern bank of the Urmiya Lake is still known by that name.

1. Barthold's Historico-geographical survey of Persia, St. Petersburg, 1903, short but based on a still unsurpassed number of sources, was written in Russian and has not been properly appreciated outside Russia.
p. 167. Marand (Yaqqūt) was ruined by the Georgians not by Kurds; its rivers are Zunūz and Zīlbīr.

p. 168. Town Kaleibar, not Kalantar.

p. 179. The Kur river rises in the country of the Georgians (not of the Khazars).

p. 188. Saḥna is on the highway Kirmānshāh-Hamadān; the capital of Kirdistan, north of it, is called Sinna, or Sinandij.

p. 192. Sulaimānshāh Iba (Iwa) was a Turcoman chief and not Sultān Sanjar’s nephew.

p. 205. Shāh ‘Abbās transferred his capital to Isfahān not from Ardabil but from Qazvin.

p. 220. Kurdān-rūd (not Kardān) as opposed to Turkān-rūd.

p. 226. The Tārūm river is a left-bank tributary of the Safīd-rūd.

p. 371. The pre-islamic ruler of Ustūnavand was not Ispahhād but Mas-mughān.

p. 373. Barthold’s surmise on the identity of the ancient Rūbanj with later Rūyān must be true. On the other hand Rūyān is practically identical with Rustamīdār, as shown by Vasmer.

p. 383. The old name of Nīshāpūr Abar-shahr means "Uppercity", not "Cloud-city" (Abrashahr?).

Such remarks cannot in the least affect the value of Mr. Le Strange’s work. It does not pretend to be exhaustive, but as a general presentation of the Near-Eastern and Middle-Eastern geography it will long keep all its utility, for its author is no dry compiler of bookish evidence. His skill in discriminating between the essential and unessential cannot be too highly praised, and above all he possesses a clear vision of geographical realities. The book is a masterpiece of measure and proportion; therefore it will ever be appreciated as a most convenient guide, even in the presence of more detailed works.

V. MINORSKY.

SIEGEL UND CHARAKTERE IN DER MUHAMMEDANISCHEN ZAUBEREI.

This book based on a thesis written for the author's doctorate, is an interesting addition to the literature already in existence, which deals with Islamic Magic.

That magic should have a well-established position in both the practice and the literature of the Islamic world is not surprising when
we consider that to the Muslim, the supernatural is as real as the natural, and that he is constantly aware of the spiritual world behind this phenomenal world, a spiritual world with which he is brought into lawful contact by his religion, and unlawful contact by means of magic. From the animism of the pagan peoples whom they conquered, as from the Qabbalah of the Jews and the superstitions of the Copts, the Muslims found material to their hand, on which to build up a belief in the need for the exercise of magic, and in the means by which the magical powers could be acquired and brought to bear. This belief is as widely held to-day as in mediaeval times, and among Muslims almost everywhere is found the conviction that the powers of evil, represented by the jinn, the Evil Eye, and the Qarina or double possessed by every human being—which is possibly a survival of the ancient Egyptian Kā—threaten existence and happiness on every hand, and must be placated or hoodwinked by every possible means. Such means include the wearing of amulets or charms: e.g. in Hebron to-day, bracelets and necklaces, consisting of eyes made of coloured glass, are sold to wear against the Evil Eye, or a blue bead is tied to a child's forelock (for the Evil Eye is generally blue, because the Greeks, the invaders of the Near East, were blue-eyed, and the evil is averted by its like), or a bit of alum, in a bag, is suspended round a camel's neck, to keep sickness away, while to cure a sick person, a verse of the Qur'ān is written on paper and soaked in water, which is drunk by the patient.

Dr. Winkler's book deals in its introduction with the powers of the magician and the means by which he exercises his influence over those who are bewitched, or on behalf of those who wish to work evil to their enemies. The author proceeds to investigate the history of two kinds of magic, the use of the Seven Seals, and the Brillenbuchstäben, so-called because of their resemblance to a pair of spectacles. The former he finds to be the sequel of the syncretism of Christianity and Judaism with Islām, the latter he traces back to its origin in antiquity and finds that it is to be recognized as distorted cuneiform writing. Dr. Winkler has made good use of the very considerable store of Muslim literature on the subject, and he proves that Babylonian, Egyptian, and Judaistic elements are to be found in it.

Here and there the practice and beliefs of Muslim magic are seen to be in close relation to those of Islamic mysticism. Such is the belief in the mystic power of the Greatest Name of God (cf. pp. 10, 11, 68, etc.). One of the earliest of the Șūfis, Ibrāhīm b. Adham
(ob. A.D. 777), tells how he met the prophet Khidr in the desert, and by him was taught the Most Exalted Name of God, by which he could find help and strength at all times,\(^1\) and Dr. Winkler mentions the Şûfi Dhu al-Nûn (who knew something of magic and alchemy) in this connection. The prayer for light given here (p. 17) quoted as from al-Bûnî, is to be found in a much earlier writer, the Şûfi Abû Talîb al-Makkî (ob. A.D. 996), and is almost certainly of Şûfi origin.\(^2\) The identification of light with the mystic gnostics (ma‘rifâ) is constantly found among the Şûfis. Islamic writers on magic have followed in the steps of the mystics also in the derivation of their symbols and the significance of these symbols, from religions other than Islâm, and chiefly from Christianity and Judaism, in which they found much material available.

In dealing with the Seven Seals, the author upholds the view that they really represent the Greatest Name of God. He devotes a chapter to Hâ (ه ) and wâw (و ), the last two of the seven symbols, and develops the interesting theory that these were not really the Arabic letters which they appear to be, but that the peculiar manner in which they are written denotes some other significance, and with great ingenuity he proceeds to show that they might well be the Greek letters Alpha (α) and Omega (ω), known to Muslims as the Christian designation of the Godhead. Yet, in view of the fact that these two signs are most frequently found together, it would seem at least as probable that they do actually represent ḥuwa (هْو ), the name by which the Şûfi mystics indicated the inner consciousness of God (sîr Allah). “All mysteries,” says the Şûfi writer al-Sarrâj, “are contained in Hâ, for its meaning is Ḥuwa,” and the modern Dervish mystic says “هْو is written with a circle, for thus does Allah compass the soul about ”.

The magician, in common with the mystic, must prepare by ascetic purification for the work which he has in hand. Dr. Winkler points out that he must be ceremonially pure, and preparatory to entering upon the exercise of his powers he must undergo a forty days’ fast, practised in seclusion, during which he sleeps on a mat spread on the ground, sleeps as little as possible, and speaks little. This is almost identical with the discipline imposed up to the present day on the Şûfi novice, who must also go into retreat for forty days,

\(^1\) al-Sulamî Ṭabaqât al-Şûfîyya, fol. 4b.
\(^2\) Cf. Qût al-Qulûb, i, 6.
fast, sleep little, and keep silence. Then the magician, after meditation upon the Names of God, rises through the spheres of Light (نورانية), of Divinity (ربانية), of Intelligence (ملكوتية), of Eternity (سمدانة), of Supreme Power (حقوتي), and finally of Unicity (وحدانة), until he passes into the abode of the all-Glorious Majesty of God. So, too, the mystic passes onward and upward through the stages of spiritual development, the Path, until at last he reaches Reality (حقيقة) and becomes one with the Divine.

The book is well illustrated and fully annotated, though a full bibliography might have been added with advantage. It may be recommended as of very considerable interest and value to all students of Islamic Magic.

MARGARET SMITH.

BIBLE CHARACTERS IN THE KORAN. By JOHN WALKER. pp. 136. Paisley: Gardner, 1931. 6s. 6d. net.

This book is meant for an apologetic purpose, to give missionaries a clear and up-to-date account of the connection between the Bible and the Koran. The characters are arranged in alphabetical order. All the passages in the Koran referring to a man are translated or a sample is given if there is much repetition. The translations are linked together by brief but sufficient explanations. Variations from the Bible story are noted. Abraham is a good example of the treatment. In the earlier part of the Koran he is a typical prophet who turned from the idolatry of his people, broke their idols, and exhorted them to worship the one God. Nimrod tried to burn him but God saved him from the fire. The visit of the angels on their way to Lot is recorded more than once in a form that owes something to the Talmud. In later sections he has become the first Muslim and is set up in opposition to Moses and Jesus. He is associated with Mecca and has to break completely with his past as he is not allowed to intercede for his pagan father. All this is a reflex of what was passing in Muhammad's mind when he found that he could count on no help from the Jews and Christians. In this part there is less story and more preaching. The connection of Agabus and Ebedmelech with the Koran is rather far-fetched.

Mr. Walker has read the Koran and his subject carefully and has stated his results clearly. The translation is his own but it is hardly
satisfactory. Granted that it is very hard to translate Arabic into good English that shall at all resemble the original. Words like "cabal" and "figment" are out of place in the Koran. In detail there are mistakes though they do not seriously affect the sense. To take some examples from the story of Joseph. "We are in the majority"; literally "we are a band". "Majority" is too suggestive of a political meeting. On one side Joseph and Benjamin are only two, on the other is a whole crowd; the antithesis is between the individual and the tribe. "Why don't you entrust Joseph to us?"; literally "Why are you not easy in your mind about us in regard to Joseph?" This is impossible as English, but a good translation should be more like it than Mr. Walker's paraphrase. The translation "patience is becoming" violates a rule of syntax. "Play himself" is out of place in standard English. These phrases all come within a few verses; but the fault-finding critic was happy in his choice of a passage. On the whole the version reads well and the minor inaccuracies will not lead a reader ignorant astray.

There are indices to quotations from the Koran and the Bible.

A. S. T.

Studies in Early Mysticism in the Near and Middle East. By Dr. Margaret Smith. pp. 276. Sheldon Press. 12s. 6d. net.

Books on mysticism ought not to be reviewed, but kept for devotional use. This is a counsel of perfection and a reviewer has to justify his existence. In this book Dr. Smith describes the ascetic practices and ideals of the Eastern church, particularly in Egypt, then the mystical teaching of the Greek fathers, and of the Syrians. The second part of the book begins with an account of the social relations between Muslims and Christians during the first two centuries of the Hijra, to show that exchange of ideas took place and that the Muslims were the recipients. The ascetic teaching of the Koran and traditions follows, with sayings that have a mystic import. As in Christianity, ascetics preceded mystics, practice came before theory. Short accounts of individual teachers follow with a summary of early doctrine. In this connection one must say that it is doubtful if Hasan of Basra said all that is ascribed to him. If he did, his loquacity was most unascetic. He is also reported to have said: "To spend one night in Alexandria is dearer to me than seventy spent in worship, each equal to the night of destiny in value." The author has made out
a strong case for her belief that Muslim mysticism is largely a development of Christian. In the concluding chapter she mentions Neoplatonism and dismisses it briefly as having exerted its influence only through a Christian form. The substitution of the animal soul for the Pauline flesh as the seat of evil desire is surely a sign of Neoplatonism. Also there is some ground common to the Theology of Aristotle and Muslim theologians, so it is reasonable to suppose that Neoplatonism had some effect on the mystics; probably because it was part of the common stock of an educated man’s outfit, and not because of any special book. While the likeness between Christians and Muslims is remarkable, including doctrine, practice, history, and forms of expression, one feels that not enough weight has been allowed to the nature of the mystic consciousness. David Brainerd, who was far enough from the east, might be quoted on “light”.

The book is carefully documented, though one would like to know the source of the statement that Ma’mun founded a girls’ school with teachers from Byzantium. There has been so much loose talk about that age that chapter and verse are wanted for everything said of it. (In the immediate context Dr. Smith was not interested in girls’ schools.) The transliteration of proper names, especially Arabic, is careless: ‘Amrū and ‘Amr do not look like the same name. The one pious Umayyad caliph is disguised as ‘Amr b. ‘Abd ul ‘Azīz. Misprints are very few; there seems to be only one of consequence, Bisāmi for Bistāmi (p. 242). Commas are too common; many might have been avoided by a slight rearrangement of the text. Amid the intense feeling which is the subject of the book, the words “a prayer which he states was taught by Gabriel to the prophet, but which is more probably of Sufi origin” come as a welcome relief.

A. S. Tritton.

(Reprinted from The Journal of the Society of Public Teachers of Law, by courtesy of the Editor.)


Books in English on Muhammadan Law have naturally tended to deal principally with the Hanafi school of the Sunni division of the followers of Islam, as that school is adhered to by the very great majority of Muslims in India. Sir William Markby’s article on
Muhammadan Law in former editions of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, for instance, said scarcely anything about the other Sunni schools, and very little about the law of the Shiias, the other principal division of Islam, as against the Sunnis. And that, although Shiias count for a good deal in some parts of India. Other authors of works on Muhammadan Law, as administered in India, have dealt adequately with Shia law. But the Maliki, Shafi, and Hanbali schools of Sunni law have at best received some passing notice, while writers on Muhammadan Law, as administered in India, have scarcely so much as mentioned the Ibadi Sunnis or the Zaidis. These latter are politically Shiias, yet they mainly follow Sunni law. Shafi law is prevalent in Malaya, as in the Dutch East Indies, and Van den Bergh's translation of the principal Arabic work of that school into French, has been translated into English by Mr. Howard, who was a judge in Malaya, and similarly Colonel Ruxton, lately a lieutenant-governor in Nigeria, published under the title of *Maliki Law*, a translation into English of a French work on that subject. Maliki law is followed by most of the Muslims in North and West Africa, and Shafi law is the law of most of the Muslims in East Africa, there also being a good many Ibadiis, and a good many Shiias in Kenya, Zanzibar, and Tanganyika. In Egypt, while the official code follows the Hanafi school, which was that of the Turkish conquerors, the people are mostly Shafiites. With the rapid growth in the present century of British interests in Malaya, West Africa, and East Africa, there was ample need for such a work as this present one of Mr. FitzGerald's, which does not unduly exalt the school of Abu Hanifa over the other Sunni schools, and further supplies interesting information on what may be called the minor Shia schools.

In British India the ordinary courts administer what may be classed as "family law" to Muslims, with some special branches of Muhammadan Law which have been left in force, such as gifts, Wakfs (trusts or charities which do not quite conform to our ideas of either of those things), and pre-emption, while such things as sales, contracts in general, ownership, and possession no longer are administered according to the law of the defendant, but have been enacted in codes of general application to all and sundry. French administrations have been apt to take quite a different line, and to administer the Muhammadan law of sales and so on through the ordinary courts, in cases to which Muslims are parties, and to leave purely family matters, such as marriage, to be dealt with by special Muslim tribunals. In
Nigeria, so, at least, the present reviewer understands, Muslim Law in its entirety is administered to Muslims, in the courts of the Sultanates or other Nigerian States, but these courts in their turn are subject to the superintendence of the British courts.

Mr. FitzGerald in his Preface states that the book is primarily for the use of probationers entering the Civil Service of the tropical African dependencies. The book, therefore, contains chapters on all the topics of Islamic Law administered by the courts in those dependencies, including among them subjects usually omitted in books intended for use in India, where the Islamic Law on those subjects has been superseded by general codified statute law. But this does not imply that the book will not be useful in India. It should be most useful there, for the vexed and complex subject of inheritance is treated both fully and clearly, and as Hanafi law is followed by many immigrants from India and elsewhere in East Africa, the law of that school is set out in as full detail as are the laws of the other schools. One who carefully studies this book will go some way towards escaping the censure which, on p. 129, the author quotes as having been pronounced by the Caliphs Omar and Ali, who remarked that the man who thought he understood *muqasama* (the division of an estate in cases where among the heirs there are a paternal grandfather and agnate brethren of the deceased) was in danger of hell-fire for his arrogance. In fact, the subject of inheritance is treated so systematically and with such clarity that the book should become a standard authority on the subject. The comparisons and contrasts of the Sunni schools *inter se* and of the Sunni and Shia schools are set out in a way which enables the student to grasp the reasons for them without being in any danger of confusing the various systems.

The opening chapters on Muslim Jurisprudence, the Schools of Law, and Jurisprudence—General Questions, are an excellent introduction to the subject. A possible criticism is that had Mr. Fitzgerald been able to give us more of his knowledge and his views on those topics it would undoubtedly have been to our advantage. The differences between the general theories of Muslim Jurisprudence and those of European Jurisprudence are well set out, and some of us may even be inclined to think that on one or two points Muslim Jurisprudence takes the sounder position.

Where legislation in the African dependencies has affected Muhammadan law, or has, for instance, rendered registration or something of the sort necessary to secure full recognition of a marriage,
the relevant enactments are referred to in the text of the book. There is also a complete list of all cases and enactments referred to in the text, and an admirable glossary. Should the authors of a certain class of "best sellers" in present-day fiction happen to look at that glossary, they may be shocked to find that the primary meaning of "shaikh", i.e. "sheikh", is "an old man, a venerable person".

To all who desire to get a general knowledge of the principal topics of Muhammadan Law in civil, as apart from religious, life, whether because it is their duty to study that law, or because they are attracted by it in the study of Comparative Law, this book can be confidently recommended.

A. Sabonadierre.


An acquaintance of some months' duration with the Model English-Chinese Dictionary suggests that the writer of the foreword, Monlin Chiang, of the Ministry of Education, Nanking, might have ventured to express a conviction, and not merely a pious hope that "with the publication of this dictionary a stride will be made toward better understanding of the manifold and subtle problems of lexicography". Intended in the first instance for the use of Chinese students of English, it cannot fail to be of value also to the English student of Chinese. The necessity for the explanation of a large number of English idiomatic phrases will readily be appreciated; Chinese teems with idioms which cannot be understood by knowing the meaning of each word. A Chinese may well feel confidence in using the phrases he gleans, while the English student of modern Chinese will learn from every page how differently must similar and even identical English idiomatic expressions be translated into Chinese in different contexts.

Archaic and obsolete words and phrases have been excluded as far as possible, and the 35,000 entries include a large number of post-war new words and new meanings of old words. Its size adds materially to its usefulness, and although the Chinese type is rather indistinct, students will be ready to overlook this defect in return for an efficient and reliable pocket English-Chinese Dictionary.

E. E.
LEHRGANG DER CHINESISCHEN SCHRIFTSPRACHE. VON E. HAENISCH.

The scarcity of textbooks which may claim to be introductions to the Chinese written language may be due, in part, to the difficulty of making suitable selections from the extensive field of Chinese literature. Professor H. A. Giles' Gems of Chinese Literature is not intended to be introductory and the selections are progressive only in that they are arranged in chronological order. Bullock's Written Language comprises short sentences and few notes; Summers' handbook, though extremely useful, is difficult to obtain; Julien, Brandt, and others have their excellences. But in order to acquire a satisfactory series of progressive lessons in the literary language many teachers and students of Chinese turn, at some time or other, to the text-books in use in Chinese schools. This is what Professor Haenisch has done in his Lehrgang der chinesischen Schriftsprache, the text of which, in 150 lessons, appeared in 1929. The second volume, now published, contains the vocabularies and the German translations of these lessons with notes which are a model of precise and efficient instruction.

E. E.

HAN WÉN TS'UI CHÉN. Edited by Sir JAMES H. STEWART-LOCKHART.
Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1931.

Professor Giles' Gems of Chinese Literature, the first edition of which appeared in 1883, and the second in 1922, is probably the most comprehensive selection of translations from the Chinese that has appeared in any European language. Its aim was to give English readers an acquaintanceship with the general literature of China, and this Professor Giles may justly claim to have done.

Thanks are now due to Sir James Stewart-Lockhart for the compilation of the text of the two hundred extracts from famous Chinese writers which comprise the prose Gems. Covering a period extending from 550 B.C. to the Revolution, these extracts have now been made easily accessible to the student, and with the English version they form a most useful key to a diversity of literary styles and themes.

E. E.

The practice, originated by M. Marcel Granet, of interpreting the phenomena of primitive Chinese society in terms of Western anthropology and folklore, must have come as a shock to many. The method has been severely criticized, and it may be long before it finds favour either with the upholders of the traditional interpretation of the Classics or with those to whom the unique character of Chinese civilization and social origins is a fetish. It is not in the least surprising, therefore, that criticisms of the present work, as unfavourable as forcible, have appeared in both Chinese and European journals. M. Granet is the scientist, displaying the hitherto unsuspected uniformity of two apparently dissimilar organisms. Astonishment and protest must presently give place to honest attempts on the part of the critics of his method to "borrow his light" and investigate further before finally condemning a system which has, at least, the merit of making living beings out of the puppets of traditional interpretation.

As recently as 1927, referring to the constitution and growth of social classes in China,¹ Professor Schneider wrote: "The Chinese rationalists that followed Lao Tzü... and those that followed Confucius... destroyed or utterly distorted all genuine information concerning the constitution and classes of primitive times, together with historical tradition... It is very difficult to discover the true conditions from the medley of some few memories, many surviving relics, and claims, and the dominant idealism of the Shu Ching, the Shih Ching, and Ssu-ma Ch'ien. One thing only is certain: the ancient times were not as they are represented in the Canon. It is necessary to eliminate all that Lao Tzü and Confucius contributed in the way of ideals and suggested in the way of idealist theories and what remains even then is open to the suspicion of being invention... or of having undergone transformation; and so there is hardly anything that can be used with confidence." In the face of these and other obstacles M. Granet's Civilization is certainly an "astonishing reconstruction" of Chinese society.

The book has suffered somewhat in translation. A work entirely dependent upon the niceties of Chinese texts demands in its translator some acquaintance with the Chinese language, as well as with the subject-matter. A number of inaccuracies might thus have been

¹ The History of World Civilization, p. 795.
avoided, e.g. p. 154, l. 5 ff., where a less confusing translation would be: "Immediately after marriage, one of the partners must say farewell to her family, and go and live in a strange village"; p. 164, l. 19: the wild goose was sent by the man to his betrothed.

In a work for the general reader almost any system of transliterating Chinese names may be accepted, provided it be consistent, but it is the general reader, rather than the specialist, who is confused by the appearance of Chêng and Cheng on the same page (182), and Yu kong and Tribute of Yü on the same line (p. 71); neither can he be expected to know that Ngan-huai is the province commonly spelt Anhui in English, nor that Lü (p. 42) and Liu (p. 419) represent the same sound.

M. Granet purposes to follow this history of political and social facts by a history of Chinese thought—a complementary volume awaited with interest.

E. Edwards.


In his preface M. Grousset plainly states "Comme les précédents volumes, celui-ci ne veut être qu’une introduction à l’esthétique de l’Orient." With this aim in view he has set forth the development of sculpture and pictorial art in Japan during the nine epochs into which Japanese history is usually divided.

It is clear that a treatise of this nature would not be complete without some mention of the political and social conditions as well as the ethos of the masses which form the background of aesthetics. Stimulated by this necessity, it would seem, M. Grousset has made an attempt to outline in the present volume the whole history of Japan, which he was compelled to set aside in his earlier work, Histoire de l’ Extrême-Orient. This the author has achieved only by omitting any historical study of music and ceramic art in Japan. How much more interesting and instructive it would be, to the student of Japanese arts, if the gap between the crude prehistoric pottery and the delicate porcelain of the seventeenth century, as cited in pp. 8–9 and 241 respectively, had been bridged over by a short account of the protohistoric Iwaihe-doki and the Setoyaki of the twelfth century together
with their subsequent developments. Are the sentimental traits common to the Greeks and the Japanese, as frequently noted in this volume, elsewhere more strongly marked than in the world of music, which, however, the author has made no attempt to discuss?

A brief survey of these two omitted subjects does not seem impossible even in a book of humble size as the one under review, provided the historical treatment of political events is restricted to enable the reader to appreciate their influence upon the social conditions and contemporary thought which control the flow of the aesthetic tide. The unnecessarily long description, for example of the vicissitudes of various military families during the Kamakura epoch, to which approximately ten pages are devoted, could easily have been reduced to half.

On the other hand, the relation between Korea and Japan prior to the introduction of Buddhism into the latter country is, to our regret, dismissed in three lines (p. 8). The significance of what took place between these lands during the fourth to the sixth centuries is so grave that without a general knowledge of it the Asuka-Nara civilization cannot be fully understood. The curtain of mist, behind which the protohistory of Japan has long been hidden, is being gradually lifted, so that we are no longer constrained to believe the doubtful dates dictated by the traditional history, although M. Grousset has accepted them readily.

Apart from this, one mistake is to be noted here. The author has apparently confused Katsugawa Shunchō with his master Katsugawa Shunshō (pp. 222–3). The two colour-prints, of which Figs. 124 and 125 are the reproductions, are those of Shunshō as his signature clearly shows. This artist seems to have flourished during the Kwansei period (1789–1800) when the prime of Shunshō’s career was already past. While appropriating the name Katsugawa, Shunchō followed the great Kiyonaga rather than Shunshō. This he did so successfully that his unsigned prints are frequently passed as the works of the celebrated artist.

Whatever the shortcomings, we are greatly indebted to M. Grousset for his effort in providing us with this useful book written in lucid language and accompanied by copious illustrations not easily accessible. Not only does it serve as an excellent introduction to the history of the pictorial art and sculpture in Japan, but it also traces the development of Japanese Buddhism, and in almost every page the author’s profound knowledge of the subject-matter manifests itself.
The reader will also find a fascinating chapter on the arts in Bengal, Nepal, and Tibet, to which forty-three pages are devoted. At the end of the book is provided a general index to the set of volumes of which this is the fourth and last.

S. Yoshitake.


The author of this Chronicle was of comparatively humble origin, but rose by his learning first to be secretary to Menelik's first wife, then historiographer royal, and finally “Ministre de la Plume”. He died full of honours in 1912, about sixty years of age. M. de Coppet has been French Minister at Addis Ababa, and is therefore well qualified for his editorial task.

At present only the first of the two volumes has appeared. The work is a little more than its title implies, for the first seventy-five pages contain a résumé of Ethiopian history (mostly taken from the Kebra Nagast) from the earliest times until the rise of Menelik to power. The first volume takes us to the beginning of the war with Italy; and the account of the battle of Adowa, with which the next volume will open, should be of great interest as a presentation of the Abyssinian point of view.

The author knows or cares little of external affairs and writes in a manner consistent with national pride, which means that anything unfavourable to his country is modified out of all existence, or perhaps not mentioned at all. Who, for instance, could believe that the reign of the Emperor Theodore could be thus chronicled ?—“L’année suivante, 1860, le 6 de miazia, Atié Théodoros mourut à Magdala.” Not a word about Napier and his successful campaign! It is rather in domestic matters that the author excels, affording material for close study of the way in which Menelik, first ruler of Shoa alone, gathered with his own hands wider and deeper powers until he could proclaim himself Negus Nagast, “King of Kings” of Ethiopia.

The illustrations, plentiful and well executed, add much pleasure to the reading of the book.

S. Gaselee.
NOTES AND QUERIES

DE LAHNDĀ, BROKPA, ET QUIBUSDAM ALIIS

On pages 273–4 above, Dr. Grahame Bailey has done me the honour of criticizing some arguments of mine that have appeared in previous pages of the Bulletin. I must ask him to excuse me from carrying on the controversy regarding Lahndā and Lahndī; for I fear that neither he nor I can succeed in convincing the other. In this respect I would, in no controversial spirit whatever, nevertheless make one request. He says that when he first began to write about the language he found already existing a number of names to choose from, some Indian, and some obviously English. Out of these he selected one, viz. "Lahndī". For the sake of fellow-students, will he kindly give us the name or names of one or more books dealing seriously with Indian languages, and published say, before 1919, in which he found the language spoken in the Lahndā called by this name. Such a reference will, I at once admit, greatly weaken my own preference for "Lahndā", and will also fill a gap in the bibliography of Indian languages of which I, and perhaps others, were previously unaware.

As regards Dr. Bailey's second note on p. 274, I much regret that my use of the expression "protagonists in a discussion" has been found misleading. There certainly was a discussion, and in that I also took a humble part; but, in the passage he finds misleading, all that I intended to convey was that he and Colonel Lorimer were (to quote the OED.) "the chief personages in the plot of the story". It was their contributions that were important. No one has derived greater pleasure or profit from the writings of these two scholars than I, nor does the mention of a discussion necessarily imply any vital difference of opinion.

As for "Brokpā" being the name of a language, so far as I can remember, I have never used the word, by itself, to mean any language or dialect. I have used the phrases "Brokpā of Drās", and "Brokpā of Җāh Hanū" after carefully explaining that Brokpā means a Dard Highlander who lives in contact with Baltīs or Tibetans, so that "Brokpā of Drās" means "the dialect used by the Dard Highlanders of Drās", and "Brokpā of Җāh Hanū" means "the dialect used by the Dard Highlanders of Җāh and Hanū". The Dard (or Şīnā) dialects of Gurēs and of Astōr are, I agree, linguistically close relations
of Drāsī, but they are not Brokpa dialects, for the speakers are not in contact with Baltis or Tibetans, and are not Highlanders in the sense explained by Shaw or Drew. I hope therefore that Dr. Bailey will in future pardon me if, as occasion requires it, I continue to employ such expressions to indicate the various forms of Šīnā used by the Highlanders of Little Tibet.

G. A. Grierson.

THE RULERS OF HARAR

Harar became the seat of government of the Arab state of Zaila in 1521, but it had been previously ruled by descendants of Arab immigrants from the Yemen in the seventh century.

It continued in Arab possession until 1875, when it was occupied by an Egyptian force: this was withdrawn ten years later, a son of the ruler deposed by the Egyptians being reinstated as Emir. In 1887 the country and capital were conquered by Menelik, and the Abyssinians have remained in possession ever since.

The following list of rulers of Harar, compiled from Egyptian and Harari sources, was recently drawn up by the British Consul, Mr. Plowman, and may be of use to historians of this part of Africa, though it is possibly not completely accurate. For instance, Muhammad Grayn or Grañ ("the left-handed") was certainly killed in 1541 at the end of his invasion and occupation of Abyssinia; was he succeeded at once by the Amir Nur, the date of whose accession is given in this list as 1559? We know from Abyssinian sources that in that year Nur was engaged in a battle with King Claudius, in which the latter was killed.

The last Arab Emir, Abdillahi, who was driven from his throne by the Abyssinians, died on 11th August, 1930, at the age of eighty.

S. Gaselee.

LIST OF THE RULERS OF HARAR

A.D. 1778. Amir Muhammad.

NANDI—A NOTE

I have on a previous occasion mentioned that the particular mode of opening the dramas, as found in the so-called Bhāsa-nāṭaka-cakra of the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, does not constitute a peculiar dramatic technique which could be used as an argument in favour of the Bhāsa-theory. In making this statement, I have so far been guided only by the manuscript traditions of the land. Recently, however, I have been able to secure two unpublished commentaries,
one on Mālavikāgnimitra and the other on Vikramorvaśiya, and the opening passages in both alike very clearly bear out the local manuscript tradition.

(a) Mālavikāgnimitra

praṇamya ramyam paramesvarasya
prasādālayaṁ caraṇāraṇvindam
yathāmati vyākriyate mayedam
sunāmakam mālavikāgnimitram ||
atha nāndyante sutradhāro raṅgam praviṣyāha "ekaiśvare" iti ||

(b) Vikramorvaśiya

praṇamya varadam devaṁ vallavījanavallavam |
śrīvikramorvaśiyākhyam nātyam vyākriyate mayā ||
atha raṅgapūjānandikasyāvasāne sutradhāraḥ praviṣyāha
"vedāṅgeti" |

These quotations very clearly bear out that the reading "nāndyante tataḥ praviṣati sutradhāraḥ" is the dramatic technique accepted in Kerala, and is naturally found in all dramas that can be included in the Kerala-nāṭaka-cakra. This appears to be an alternate dramatic form, sanctioned by Bharata and preserved only in Kerala. It is, therefore, wrong to characterise this as a Bhāṣa Tradition, as Professor Keith has done, and to adduce it as an argument in favour of the Bhāṣa-theory.

It will be clear from the second quotation that the Nāndī does not consist merely of a benedictory verse or verses, as is assumed by Professor Keith. As I have repeatedly emphasised, it is a long process of religious ceremony to be conducted in the green-room and on the stage behind the curtain. After all the items of the Nāndī are over, the Sūtradhāra comes on the stage and utters the so-called Nāndī-verse, which is not so much benedictory in character as designed to introduce the audience to the story to be staged. From this point of view, such an opening is much more rational than the other. This correct tradition was preserved only in Kerala, because the stage was living there.

In conclusion, I wish to also point out that the Nāndī verses, as found in these dramas, need not necessarily be the introductory verses to the drama; they may as well be introductory verses to the first act only. I have already pointed out in my notes to my translation of Dūtaghatotkaca that the Nāndī verse introducing the Śepṭhālikāṇka,
or Act V of *Swapna-nāṭakam*, was quite different from the printed Nāndī verse. Similarly, the introductory verse announcing the Mantrakāṇka, or Act III of *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa*, is quite different from the printed Nāndī verse; it runs as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{avvāt kapardakaliṣṭovatsarājam} \\
\text{veṣam vasantakamanīyataram dodhānah} \\
\text{vīrtau rūmāṇvati tanūkṛtakālādarpa-} \\
\text{bāhāyugandharasuto vasataḥ śīvo vah} ||
\end{align*}
\]

This verse, like others, is technically called "Araṅgu taḷippaṇa uḷa ślokaṃ", that is, the verse to be recited when the stage is sprinkled with holy waters. This is a point which will throw some more light on the Bhāsa-problem.

K. R. Pisharoti.

---

We have been asked to print the following letter:

**University College,**

**Colombo,**

**15th September, 1931.**

To the Editor, Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London.

Sir,—The Government of Ceylon has recently appointed a Commission for the purpose of inquiring into the existence of hitherto unknown documents relating to the history of the island, which are extant in the hands of private individuals and of institutions. Many important documents have been removed from the island, and have found their way into private collections; there are others among the private papers of those who have had official or semi-official connection with the affairs of Ceylon, or who have at various times had occasion to visit its shores. To illustrate this point, the most important original authority for the period of the Portuguese occupation came to light in Rio de Janeiro, and of recent years much light has been thrown on the taking over of Ceylon by the British, by papers in private hands in Scotland.

The majority of such papers will be concerned with the history of the island during the last four centuries, but it is possible that there may be also some "sannases" (engraved copper plates) and "olas" (inscribed palm leaves) dating perhaps from pre-European times, preserved as curiosities in private or even public
collections. We are anxious to ascertain the whereabouts of such
documents, and therefore ask you to allow this letter to appear
in your valuable columns. If any of your readers are in a position
to afford us any information, we shall be most grateful if they will
put it at our disposal by writing to the Secretary of the Ceylon
Historical Manuscripts Commission, Government Archives,
Colombo, or to me.

Thanking you for your courtesy in inserting this letter, I am,
Sir, Your obedient servant,

S. A. Pakeman,
Chairman,
Ceylon Historical Manuscripts Commission.

BŪM-ČANDAK

A passage of the Zāmāsp Nāmak which I tried unsuccessfully to
translate in BSOS. vi, 1, 57, § 28, and which Markwart also failed to
read (Caucasica, vi, 1, 48, note 3), contains two words which can now,
I think, be explained. The passage reads in West’s edition (Avesta,
Pahlavi, and Ancient Persian Studies, p. 113, ll. 8–9)
اراک چود

اراک چود

اراک چود

This I now
read: ut būm-čandak vasīkār bē bavēt ut vas averānīh bē kunēt.

and (čandak) permit also the reading čūdak. But the
scribe here doubtless intended čandak, since for չ, become ոչ, չ
would be written rather than չ. In Pahlavi the two verbs čūd- and
čand- cannot be distinguished graphically either in the present stem
or in the infinitive (custan, čanditan). We are therefore forced to
interpret according to the Pāzand and New Persian. Pāzand recognizes
čūd- in the compound vicustan; and nicustan is also probable (see
Bartholomae, Zum Altir. Wörterb., 212). New Pers. has čust “quick,
active”, Sanskrit codayati. For čand- we have support in Balūči
čandag “move” and Judaico-Pers. čandān “sich regen” (see Horn,
the Škand Gumānīk Vičār čandišni is explained by Sanskrit čancā
and cancālatā.
In the Bahman Yašt, 3, 4, we have an exact parallel to our passage:

*Cand-* is used of the earth in *Gr. Bd.*, 66, 6, also: *pas hač ān zamīk pat škaftiḥ candēnītān nē šāyast “thereafter the earth could not quake fiercely” (Ind. Bd., 18, 19, etc.). In the corresponding passage, *Gr. Bd.*, 65, 13, *is* probably *vizanbiśn “quaking” and ibid. *zambīt “shook”, although the Ind. Bd. has for *candēnīt*. For the form cf. in place of *zamb- or zamb occurs in zamb i zamīk (Dastur Hoshang Memorial Volume, p. 201, l. 6) “quaking of the earth”.

In Zātspram (*SBE.*, 47, 166) occurs the passage *pas dēn āsōpūhēt ut x̑aṭāyīh candūḥēt “thereafter the Religion will be confounded and the sovereignty will be shaken”.

In the Ardāy Virāz Nānak, 53, 5, *cand-* is used of earth-quakings:

*hač ān givāk garzišn ut vāng ān āyēt i-m pat ēt dāst ku haft kišvar zamīk candēnand “from that place came such wailing and crying that I thought that they made the earth of the seven climes to quake”*. Šāyast nē Šāyast (ed. Tavadia, 2, 71) has: *ka pat dast i mart-e nasāy be candēnēt “when a corpse is moved by the hand of one man”.*

In *Gr. Bd.*, 152, 10, we should perhaps read *hamāk āp i zrēh i Frāy-xkart pat candīsān ut candūt(an) be ṣaspēt “the whole water of the sea Varkart tosses in agitation and confusion”. But here we might read *pat ādīsān ut ēst-*.

In *Pahl. Riv. Dd.*, 205, § 30, we have *ān kē dārēt ut manišn i martomān dānēt (cūstān or candītan) “he who holds it and knows how to agitate the thoughts of men”.*

The second word is *vasīkār*.* It is found in Mēnōkē *xarat*

---

1 *myē* could also be read *mē-ē*, but is perhaps to be considered only as a ligature of *f* and *ē*: cf. also the ligature *fē mē*. A similar spelling is found in *Gr. Bd.* 208, to which corresponds *mē* in the Pahl. Comm. to Vid. i, 16. It is Mazūn (Arm. Mazoun, Syr. Arab. Mazūn), representing the Old Pers. *Mačiyā*, the people of ‘Omān. Mazūn is identified in the Commentary with Avestan *Cāhra* (not noticed by Marquart, *Erāmshāh*, p. 43, on *Mazoun*, nor by Bartholomae, *AIW*, s.v. *Cāhra*).
44, 22 (ed. Andreas, p. 48, l. 7), *ut mār patiš vasīkār* "and snakes therein abundant describing Ėrānvēž). The Pāzand gives vasyār (with var. lect. vas), that is, the NPers. bisyār; see Nyberg, Glossar, s.v. vasīkār.

We have, therefore, to translate Zāmāsp Nāmak, § 28: "And earthquakes will abound and cause much desolation."

This same vasīkār occurs again in the Zāmāsp Nāmak, where Markwart (Caucasica, vi, 1, 48) read *vīskār*. It is evidently necessary to read (West, loc. cit., p. 107, l. 19) api-šān frazand-zāyišnīh vasīkār bavēt "and among them the bearing of children abounds".

H. W. Bailey.

ERRATUM IN VOL. VI, PART 2

p. 465, line 15, for "M. Barth, the great writer on comparative religion" read "M. Bréal, the great writer on semantics".
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A Chinese Geographical Text of the Ninth Century
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(PLATES IX-XIL)

THE Stein Collection of MSS. from Tun-huang at the British Museum, so rich in other respects, includes very few documents of a purely topographical nature. The two most interesting texts belonging to this class are the Tun huang lu (S. 5448), which was published with translation and notes in the JRAS. for July, 1914, and the present roll (S. 367), which is unfortunately imperfect at the beginning and lacks a title. The Tun huang lu deals with the district immediately surrounding Tun-huang itself, but the other treatise goes farther afield, and follows the "southern route" as far as Charchan, after which it doubles back to the oasis of Hâmi and the neighbouring territory. If Sha Chou was the starting-point, it is not likely that much has been lost at the beginning, since the first paragraphs are concerned with the Nan-hu oasis, which is only some 30 miles distant from that centre.

A few extracts from the MS. (then numbered Ch. 917) were published by Professor Pelliot in the Journal Asiatique for 1916 (ser. ii, tom. 7, pp. 111–23), and so long ago as the summer of 1920, I myself had made a rough translation of the whole, to which Sir Aurel Stein was kind enough to add some notes on points of topographical interest. These will be found interspersed among my own notes, and placed in inverted commas.

VOL. VI. PART 4.
The set of Dynastic Histories which I have used is that printed by the 金陵書局 in Nanking between 1871 and 1887.

[Hsi liang i wu] chih says: The Han ثقة shih General . . . colt and returned. He had pity and released it.

The fourth character in the column seems to be an irregular form of 感.

Coming to . . . taking it to be the Lung-lo Spring . . . drinking this water, spirted it out noisily, and finally turning round went back again. On this account . . . fire-signal beacon like a dragon’s head, whence the name.

Though half torn away, the character before 志 chih is certainly 物, from which we may conclude that the work quoted is 西梁異物志 Record of Marvels in Western Liang. Cf. Sha chou chih, f. 3 r°, where the story of the 信任 shih General making water gush from the mountain-side is recounted from the same source. See also Tun huang lu ad init. The 信任 shih General was 李廣利 Li Kuang li, who assumed this title just before his first expedition to 信任 shih, or rather Ni-shih (Nisaea), as it was pronounced in ancient times, the capital of Ferghana.—Lung-lo was the ancient name of the district of Shou-ch'ang in the Nan-hu oasis: see Han shu, xxviii B, 3 r°.

Shou-ch'ang Lake . . . [Yo-wa] River. Winds round and curves back for more than a 里. Its depth has not been measured. This is the spot where the Hans got the celestial horse.

According to Sir Aurel Stein, this is the spring-fed reservoir which gives its name to the Nan-hu (Southern Lake) Oasis. See Serindia, p. 612 and map 79; Desert Cathay, ii, 75. A passage in Shih chi, xxiv, 2 r°, enables us to restore the name of the river 湼注 Yo-wa, which is a branch of the 岩 Tang River of Tun-huang. For the story of the celestial horse (天 or 神 马), see Chavannes, Mémoires Historiques, iii, 236, note 3.


Stein thinks that “the springs are meant which, rising in the dry flood beds south of Nan-hu, collect in small streams which pass through the oasis and supply its irrigation”. The word 渠, however, seems rather to suggest an artificial canal.

Long [ ] Watercourse . . . 10 里.
Shih-mên (Stone-gate) Brook. Rises 3 里 south of the hsien.
Wu-lu (No-salt) Brook. Rises 10 里 south-west of the hsien.
Shih-ch'êng (Stone-city) Chên is 1,580 里 west of Sha Chou, and
6,100 li from Shang-tu [the "superior capital", i.e. Ch’ang-an]. This was the kingdom of Lou-lan of the Han dynasty.

Identified by Stein with the modern Charkhlik; see Serindia, pp. 320 seq. According to T’ang shu, xxxvii, 2 r, 上都 Shang-tu was originally called 京城 "capital city"; in 742 it became 西京 "the western capital"; in 757 中京 "the central capital"; in 761 it was again called the western capital. In 756 (the year of An Lu-shan’s usurpation) it was Shang-tu.

The Account of the Western Regions in the Han History says: "The land is sandy and salt, with few cultivated fields. It produces jade. When Fu Chieh-tzu slew the king of this country, the Hans put his younger brother on the throne, and changed its name to the kingdom of Shan-shan.”

Cf. Han shu, xcvi A, 3 r—4 r. 第 should be 弟. Pelliot misreads 地 and translates: "Les Han érigèrent [à nouveau] ce pays [en royaume]."

The Sui dynasty established Shan-shan Chên, but when the dynasty was overthrown, the city was abandoned. In the Chêng-kuan period [627–49], K’ang Yen-tien, a great chieftain from the kingdom of K’ang [Samarkand], came east and settled in this town. A number of barbarians (hu) accompanied him, so that it became a populous place: it was also called the city of Tien-ho. The city was surrounded on every side by a sandy desert.

The general term 胡 hu is here to be taken as Soghdians or natives of Samarkand. "Tien-ho" apparently means "brought together by [K’ang Yen-tien]."

In the 2nd year of Shang-yüan [675] its name was changed to Shih-ch’êng Chên, and it was made dependent on Sha Chou.

There were two reign-periods called Shang-yüan, but during the second [760–1] the Western Regions were no longer under Chinese rule. The character translated "dependent" is an unauthorized form of 隸.

T’un Ch’êng (Military Camp City) is 180 li east of Shih-ch’êng Chên.

It has been identified by Stein with the site of Mirân, which he also shows to have been the same as "the old eastern town" of 扪泥 Yü-ni, the capital of Lou-lan before 77 B.C.

When Wei-t’u-ch’i, the hostage given by Shan-shan [to China], was returning weak and single-handed [to his kingdom], he made this appeal to the Son of Heaven: "In our country there is the city of I-hsiu, where the land is fair and fertile. My prayer is that you should send a general to plant a military colony there and harvest the grain,
so that I may have his prestige to back me." Accordingly, the Hans sent a ssū-ma (commandant) with officers and men to colonize I-hsiu by way of protection.

For 依 read 依. This passage is taken almost word for word from Han shu, xcvi A, 4 r° and v°: "The King himself petitioned the Son of Heaven as follows: 'I have lived a long time in the land of Han, and am now returning to my country weak and unsupported. The late King has a son still living, and I am afraid lest he should kill me. Now in my kingdom there is the city of 伊循 I-hsün, where the soil is fair and fertile. My prayer is that the House of Han may send two leaders to plant a military colony there and harvest the grain, so that your servant may have their prestige to back me.' Accordingly, the Han Emperor sent one ssū-ma with forty officers and men to colonize I-hsün and act as support for the ruler." Professor Pelliot has already shown how easily the characters 影 and 循 can be confused in manuscript, and I-hsün may therefore be considered identical with I-hsün. It is rather curious, however, that the T'ang shu should have adopted the form I-hsün in preference to the I-hsün of the Han shu. The vexed question of the situation of this town has, I think, been satisfactorily settled by Stein (Serindia, pp. 325 seq.). Everything points to its having occupied the site of the modern Charkhlik. Yet we find the T'ang shu (xlii B, 19 r°) making exactly the same mistake in placing I-hsün east of Shih-ch'eng Chên: "Starting from the southern shore of the P'u-ch'ang Lake [Lop-nor] and going west, one passes Ch'i-t'un Ch'eng (the City of the Seven Military Colonies), which is the city of I-hsün of the Han dynasty. Eighty li further west one comes to Shih-ch'eng Chên, the kingdom of Lou-lan under the Han, also called Shan-shan. It is 300 li south of the P'uch'ang Lake. This is where K'ang Yen-tien became Commissioner of the chên in order to establish communications with the Western Regions." "Eighty li" is clearly a graphic error for "180 li", as Stein has pointed out. But how did the other mistake arise? From a certain ambiguity, I think, in the passage from the Han shu which was quoted above. At first sight, it might appear that the King Wei-t'ung-ch'i, when about to return to his kingdom, is offering to allot another city to the Chinese colonists, whereas he is really suggesting a change of capital. Chavannes, in commenting on this passage (T'oung Pao, 1905, p. 533), says: "... le nouveau roi de Chanchan, craignant que ses sujets ne le fissent péri, demanda aux Chinois d'établir une garnison dans la ville de Yi-siun, afin de le protéger; pour que cette protection fût efficace, il est nécessaire d'admettre que la ville de Yi-siun était assez proche de la résidence du roi." I would go a step further, and say that the obvious course for the Chinese Government would be to station their guards in the same town as the King. Now, according to Han shu, xcvi A, 2 v°, "the kingdom of Shan-shan was originally called Lou-lan. Its capital was the city of
Yü-ni, 1,600 里 distant from the Yang Barrier.” This city the King is naturally anxious to avoid, so he proposes that a Chinese force shall accompany him to another place altogether, which shall be his future residence, and where the presence of these military colonists will be a safeguard. This new capital, then, is fixed further west at I-hsün, the modern Charkhlık.

All this agrees with the statement in Shui ching chu, ii, 5 行 (whose author died in 527): “The capital [of Shan-shan] is the city of I-hsün, in the territory of the ancient Lou-lan.” Further on in the same work (f. 5 页) we read: “The river [Chu-pin] flows east into the lake, which is situated north of the kingdom of Lou-lan. Here is the town of Yü-ni, commonly known as the old eastern town.” This makes it quite clear that the old capital of Lou-lan was Yü-ni (now identified with Mirán), and that the new capital of the same kingdom, when its name was changed to Shan-shan in 77 B.C., was I-hsün. The mistake made by the T'ang writers was in assuming that the King went back to the old capital instead of creating a new one with the help of the Chinese.

This (I-hsün) is the town in question. Because the large city of Shan-shan lies to the west, the barbarians speak of it as Little Shan-shan. It is the modern T'un Ch'êng.

Here, as in many of the Stein MSS., 爲 is used as a homophone for 謂. The author of our present text makes the same mistake as the compilers of the T'ang history nearly 200 years later. He appears to have been misled by the name T'un Ch'êng (Camp City), and to have thought that it was derived from the military colonists who accompanied Wei-t'u-ch'i. This is certainly not the case: Pelliot is wrong in accepting this derivation, and Stein does not seem to see that it is really fatal to his own theory. (See Serindia, p. 327.) A more probable explanation is that the name was derived from the thousand colonists who according to Shui ching chu, ii, 5, were subsequently brought to Lou-lan by 索勳 So Mai (not So Man: this mistake was first made by Chavannes in Toung Pao, vi, 567, and afterwards copied by Stein).

Hsin Ch'êng (New City). 240 里 west of Shih-ch'êng Chên. When K'ang Yen-tien settled in Shan-shan, he began by rebuilding this town: hence the name New City. Under the Hans it was Nu-chih Chêng.

The 之 in Nu-chih Chêng is only a homophone variant of 支 in T'ang shu, loc. cit., which incidentally makes the distance from Shih-ch'êng Chên 200 里. Herrmann, and after him Stein, both identify the place with Vâsh-shahri: see Seidenstrassen, p. 100; Serindia, p. 306. But Herrmann wrongly places I-hsün here on his map.

P'u-t'ao Chêng (Grape-vine City). Four 里 north of Shih-ch'êng
Chén. Founded by K'ang Yen-tien, who planted vines within the town walls; hence its name, Grape-vine City.

This place has not yet been identified. Assuming a mistake in the bearing, as Stein suggests (Innermost Asia, p. 165), its remains may possibly be located at Koyumal, south of Charkhlik.

Sa-p’i Ch’êng is 480 li south-east of Shih-ch’êng Chén. It was founded by K’ang Yen-tien. This city is near the Sa-p’i Lake, where the mountains are steep and difficult. An endless stream of Tibetans and T’u-yü-hun is constantly passing to and fro.

Stein thinks that this is “likely to be some grazing and camping ground near the defiles of the Chimen-tâgh, through which routes pass to Charkhlik and Vâsh-shahri”. But in T’ang times at least it was evidently a city of considerable importance. There is a reference to the place in T’ang shu, ex, 11 v⁰, where the King of Khotan 胡 遙勝 Wei-ch’ih Shêng is said to have joined forces with Kao Hsien-chih in attacking and subduing Sa-p’i and Po-hsien. This must have been in 747, when Kao Hsien-chih was starting on his punitive expedition over the Pamirs.

The City of Shan-shan is 1,640 paces in circumference, being twenty paces east of Shih-ch’êng Chén. This Shan-shan of the Han period is now in ruins.

This paragraph, referring to the actual site of the ancient I-hsûn, seems out of place here. Stein notes that “the extant remains of an oblong circumvallation at Charkhlik probably date from T’ang or later times”.

Po-hsien [Banished Immortal] Chén. The ancient kingdom of Chü-mo. The Account of the Western Regions in the Han History says it is 6,820 li from the superior capital [Ch’ang-an]. The Sui dynasty established Chü-mo Chùn. In the third year of Shang-yüan [676] the name was changed to Po-hsien Chên.

幡 is a mistake for 撫. Cf. T’ang shu, xliii B, 19 r⁰: “After crossing the Chü-mo River, and proceeding 500 li, one arrives at Po-hsien Chên, the old city of Chü-mo. The name was changed by Kao Tsung in the Shang-yüan period [674–6].” The identity of the place with Charchan is certain: see Seidenstrassen, pp. 99–100; Serindia, pp. 298–9. The account of Chü-mo is in Han shu, xcvi A, 4 v⁰.

The ancient T’un Ch’êng is north-west of T’un Ch’êng.

“Evidently the ancient portion of the Mirân site is meant, lying W.N.W. of the Tibetan fort of the T’ang period.” [Stein.] See Serindia, iii, plans 29, 30.

The Chü-mo River [Charchan-daryâ] takes its rise in the Nan Shan, flowing out through a large valley. The source of this river is 500 li
distant from the chên city [i.e. Po-hsien]. It passes under the walls of Chū-mo, hence its name.

涅 is therefore an obvious mistake for H.

All the cities and garrisons mentioned above fell into the hands of the Tibetans.

In consequence of the general upheaval following the rebellion of An Lu-shan. From about 766 onwards, most of Eastern Turkestan was overrun by the Tibetans; see Ancient Khotan, i, 63, 533 seq.

The P‘u-ch’ang Lake [Lop-nōr] is 320 li north-east of Shih-ch‘eng Chên. This lake is 400 li in circumference.

“The bearing and comparatively small circumference clearly indicate that the lake meant is identical with the Kara-koshun Marshes. The 320 li correspond exactly to the distance from Charkhlik to the west end of Kara-koshun at Kumchaghan (below Abdal). The circumference indicated (400 li = ca. 80 miles) agrees closely with that of Kara-koshun as shown in the 1906-8 map in Desert Cathay. The notice of our text is important in view of the confusing speculations to which the so-called ‘Lop-nōr problem’ has given rise; for it definitely proves that the terminal marshes of the Târim River occupied in the ninth century much the same position and were of approximately the same extent as at present—a conclusion to which other evidence also pointed (see Serindia, pp. 327 seq.), but not quite so clearly.” [Stein.]

The account of the Western Regions in the Han History says:

"The Yellow River has two sources:—

西 here is a mistake for 兩. Cf. Han shu, xcvi A, 1 r°.
One branch comes from the Ts‘ung Ling (Onion Range) Mountains, another comes from Khotan at the foot of the Nan Shan. This latter stream flows north and, joining the Ts‘ung-ling River, pours its waters eastward into the P‘u-ch‘ang Lake, another name for which is Yen-tsê [Salt Marsh]. This is over 300 li distant from the Yü-mên (Jade Gate) and Yang Barriers. Here it disappears and flows underground, emerging again towards the south from the Chi-shih (Piled-up Rocks) Mountain as the great river of China."

It is hardly necessary to remark that this theory is not accepted by modern geographers.

I Chou.

For a summary of historical notices of the oasis of Hâmi, see Serindia, pp. 1147 seq.; Innermost Asia, pp. 539 seq.

Houses built by the Government, 730.

Such I take to be the meaning of 公廨, a phrase which occurs
four times in this MS., once in S. 788, and again in S. 2472 v o (3). That it should denote “public buildings” in the ordinary sense of the term is out of the question. It would seem rather to indicate the huts or shacks built for Chinese colonists out of public funds. The word 千 which follows here and in two of the other passages is a puzzle which I have not yet succeeded in solving; but it appears to be a sort of numerative referring to the houses.

Households, 1729. Hsiang (Country districts), 7.

For the meaning of 鄉, see “A Census of Tun-huang” (T’oung Pao, ser. ii, vol. xvi, p. 473, note 5).

The above was the territory of the Western Jung tribe in the ancient kingdom of K’un-wu. When King Mu of the Chou dynasty smote the Western Jung, K’un-wu presented him with a red sword.

The allusion is to the following passage in Lieh tsú, v, 20 ad fin.: “When King Mu of Chou made his great expedition against the Western Jung, the latter offered him as a present a K’un-wu sword which was 1 ft. 8 in. in length, had a red blade made of tempered steel, and could cut through jade like so much putty.” The incident is also mentioned in 十洲記 Shih chou chi (鳳麟洲), f. 5 v o: “In the time of King Mu of Chou, the Western barbarians presented a K’un-wu sword that would cut jade.”

This is the kingdom in question. Later usage erroneously turned the name into I-wu Chün.

That is to say, the character 郢 was substituted for 晉.

The account of the Western Regions in the Han History says: “During the decline of the Chou dynasty, the Jung and the Ti tribes dwelt intermixed north of the Ching and Wei Rivers.”

In Northern Kansu and Shensi. See Han Shu, xcvi A, 1 v o.

The territory of I-wu was subsequently taken by the Hsiung-nu, but when Wu Ti of the Han smote the Hsiung-nu, he annexed it.

This is not expressly stated in the Histories, though some have thought that the oasis may have been temporarily occupied during 霍去病 Ho chü-ping’s brilliant campaign of 121 B.C. In Han shu, lv, 5 v o, he is said to have reached the 鄯連山 Ch’i-i- [or Shih-] lien Mountains, which the commentator Yen Shih-ku identifies with the T’ien Shan because Ch’i-lien was the Hsiung-nu word for “Heaven.” Chavannes has shown, however, that these mountains were in all probability the Nan Shan, south of Su Chou and Kan Chou: see Tures Occidentaux, pp. 133-4. Moreover, Ta ch’ing i t’ung chih, cccli, 1 r o, definitely places the first Chinese occupation of Hāmi in a.d. 73. Afterwards it was again abandoned. In the 16th year of Yung-p’ing [a.d. 73], the Later Hans attacked the Hsiung-nu in the north and took
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the territory of I-wu-lu, where they set up an I-ho Tu-wei ("Military Superintendent for the benefit of the Crops").

In the text is a mistake for 宜: see *Hou han shu*, cxviii, 1 v°, col. 2.

Communication was again established with the Western Regions, after which I-wu was three times lost and three times recovered.

This appears to be an echo of *Hou han shu*, cxviii, 3 v°: "From the Chien-wei period [25–55] to the Yen-kuang period [122–5], the Western Regions were three times cut off from the Empire and three times brought into communication with it." The dates for I-wu in particular are: 77, lost; 90, recovered; 107, lost; 119, recovered; 120, lost. In 127 the "Western Regions" submitted once more, but I-wu does not seem to have been re-colonized until 131. The date of its final severance from the Han Empire is not exactly known. In 151 the oasis was ravaged by the Hsiung-nu, and though they retreated before a Chinese relieving force, the latter, too, is ominously said to have "retired without achieving any success" (無功而還): see *Hou han shu*, cxviii, 14 r°.

Shun Ti [126–44] appointed a ssū-ma of I-wu.

Cf. *Hou han shu*, loc. cit.: "In the 6th year of Yung-chien [131] the Emperor, considering that I-wu had from time immemorial been a rich and fertile country adjoining the Western Regions, and that the Hsiung-nu were in the habit of raiding it for purposes of plunder, accordingly gave orders for a new military colony to be planted there, as was done in the Yung-yaoan period [89–104], and appointed a ssū-ma of I-wu."

Under the Wei and Chin dynasties nothing is heard of either chün or hsien.

Cf. *Ta ch'ing i t'ung chih*, loc. cit.: "The Wei established I-wu Hsien, the Chin appointed an I-wu Tu-wei (Military Superintendent of I-wu), but both of these were concerned with the northern territory of Tun-huang, not with the ancient I-wu. [Note: The I-wu of the Wei and the Chin lay north of the modern An-hsi Chên and Sha Chou, but was separated from Hâmi by a long stretch of desert; it was not the same as the I-wu of the Han period.]

Under the Sui dynasty, in the 6th year of *Ta-yeh* [610], land east of the city was purchased, and I-wu Chên established. On the downfall of Sui it reverted to the barbarians.

"It fell into the hands of the Jung tribes and became part of the T'ü-chüeh Empire." [*I t'ung chih.*]

In the 4th year of *Chêng-kuan* [630] the chieftain Shih Wan-nien, at the head of seven cities, came and made his submission.
This is evidently the personage mentioned in T'ang shu, ccxvi B, 10 r°: "In 630 the head of the city [of I-wu] came to render homage at Court. After the defeat of Hsieh-li [Khan of the Eastern T'u-ch'üeh], he brought in the submission of seven cities, and the territory was registered as Western I Chou." What these seven cities were is not stated. Nor have I been able to find the name Shih Wan-nien in any other text.

I Chou was established for the first time under our own T'ang dynasty, but in Pao-ying [762] it was conquered by the Tibetans.

In 630, according to I t'ung chih, "it was absorbed by China under the name of Western I Chou, which in 632 was changed to I Chou. In the first year of T'ien-pao [742] it was re-named I-wu Chüan. In the first year of Ch'i'en-yuan [758] it again became I Chou, comprising the three sub-prefectures of I-wu, Na-chih, and Jou-yüan." The irruption of the Tibetans does not appear to have much affected the administration of the region, which remained in the hands of the Ch'ên family from 714 to about 984, when the oasis was incorporated in the Uighur dominions. During the Wu Tai period it was known as the Hulun Gourd Oasis.

In the 4th year of Ta-chung [850] it was regained by Chang I-ch'ao, and forty families from Sha Chou were settled there.

Some information about Chang I-ch'ao will be found in the translation by Chavannes of two inscriptions dated 851 and 894: see Serindia, p. 1333; Dix Inscriptions, p. 80. He notes that in the inscription of 851 the first part of the personal name is written 譮, not 義, as in T'ang shu, ccxvi B, 13 r°. Since our present MS. (the next earliest in date) has the same form, we may plausibly assume 譮 to be correct. The passage in T'ang shu, whence most of our knowledge concerning this Governor of Tun-huang is derived, runs as follows: "The next year [850], the ruler of Sha Chou, Chang I-ch'ao, presented to the Throne maps of eleven chou, including Kua Chou, Sha Chou, I Chou, Su Chou, and Kan Chou. He had previously banded together a number of resolute men with the object of restoring Chinese rule. On the appointed day they armed themselves and started a revolt at the gates of Sha Chou, in which they were abetted by all the Chinese inhabitants. The Tibetan garrison was alarmed and fled, whereupon Chang I-ch'ao took over the local administration. He prepared weapons and armour, and by means of fighting combined with agricultural operations regained all the other chou. Officers from each of the other ten cities, bearing dispatches inserted in staves, were sent in haste to T'ien-tê Ch'êng [Marco Polo's Tenduc] in the north-east. The Fang-yû-shih (Military Governor) of this place, Li P'ei, reported to the Emperor, who warmly commended Chang for his loyalty, sent a message acknowledging his services and bidding him be of good cheer, and appointed him Fang-yû-shih of Sha Chou. Soon after, the
title of Kuei-i Chên (Military district returning to Allegiance) was bestowed on the chou, and Chang I-ch’ao was made Chieh-tu-shih (Governor). . . . In the 2nd year of Hsien-t’ung [861], I-ch’ao announced the submission of Liang Chou. . . . In the 8th year [867], I-ch’ao visited the Chinese Court, and was made Commandant of the Right Division of the Shên-wu Imperial Guards. He was presented with a house and land, and it was decreed that his cousin Huai-shên should be placed in charge of the territory that had returned to allegiance. In the 13th year [872] he [Chang I-ch’ao] died, and Sha Chou elected the Chang-shih Ts’ai I-chin to administer the affairs of the chou. Subsequently, the title of Kuei-i Chieh-tu-shih was conferred on him. Later on, China became involved in many troubles, and the Imperial authority was no longer effective. Kan Chou was absorbed by the Uighurs, and most of the cities that had returned to allegiance succumbed.”

The other six chou reconquered by Chang were Shan, Hsi, Ho, Lan, Min, and K’u. I have extracted a few more precise details from the T’ung chien: 851, 1st (or 2nd) moon: Chang I-ch’ao sends in his submission to China. 10th moon: he subdues the ten chou, and sends his elder brother I-tsé to the Court with maps and lists of population. 11th moon: the title of Kuei-i Chên is conferred on Sha Chou, and Chieh-tu-shih on I-ch’ao. 863, 3rd moon: I-ch’ao announces that, acting with a mixed force of 7,000 Tibetans and Chinese, he has regained Liang Chou for China. 867: the name of I-ch’ao’s cousin is given as Wei-shên. 872, 8th moon, is definitely stated to be the date of I-ch’ao’s death. Chavannes, following the 西域水道記 Hsi yü shui tao chi, iii, 19 v°, is wrong in thinking that the T’ang shu makes Huai-shên, and not I-ch’ao, die in that year.

Any one reading the above extract from the T’ang shu would imagine that Chang I-ch’ao was succeeded immediately by Ts’ai I-chin. So far from that being so, there was an interval of forty years or more between the two. The Sung shih, cccxc, 15 v°, translated in Serindia, pp. 1338–9, tells us that the line of succession in the Chang family only came to an end during the Liang dynasty (907–22). It is also stated that Ts’ai I-chin was succeeded by his son Ts’ai Yuan-chung. But on the strength of a passage translated by Rémuasat (from Wu tai shih, lxxiv, 7 v°, though this reference is not given), Chavannes concludes that another reign comes in between, and that Yuan-shên, the elder brother of Yuan-chung, was actually King of Kua Chou and Sha Chou in 939. That the latter assumption is not correct may be gathered from another passage coming a little earlier (f. 5 v°) which deserves to be translated in full: “Liang Chou was thus cut off from China, and only Kua Chou and Sha Chou continued to have regular intercourse with her until the end of the Five Dynasties. At Sha Chou, in the K’ai-p’ing period of the Liang [907–10], there was a governor 張奉 Chang Feng, who called himself 金山白衣天子.
"The White-robed Son of Heaven of the Golden Mountain". In the reign of Chuang Tsung of the Later T'ang [923–5], the Uighurs sent envoys to the Chinese Court. Ts'ao I-chin, descendant of the Chinese left in Sha Chou [after the collapse of the T'ang], also sent an embassy which came together with the Uighurs. Chuang Tsung appointed I-chin Kuei-i Chün Chieh-tu-shih, Kuan-ch'ü-shih (Inspector), Ch'ü-chih-shih (Legal Commissioner), etc., of Kua, Sha, and the other chou. During the Chin dynasty, in the 5th year of T'ien-fu [940], I-chin died, and his son 元德 Yüan-tê came to the throne. In the 7th year [942] Ts'ao Yüan-chung of Sha Chou and Ts'ao Yüan-shén of Kua Chou both sent envoys to China. In the reign of Shih Tsung of the Chou [954–9], Yüan-chung was made Kuei-i Chün Chieh-tu-shih, and 元恪 Yüan-kung was made Commissioner of Train-bands in Kua Chou."

It is evident from the above that a member of Chang I-ch'ao's family was still ruling Sha Chou at the close of the T'ang dynasty, and was succeeded by Ts'ao I-chin, who was the first of his line, somewhere between 910 and 923. Ts'ao Yüan-chung seems to have succeeded his brother Yüan-tê in 942, but was not made Chieh-tu-shih until 955. Yüan-kung may be yet another brother, unless we adopt the emendation 延恭 Yen-kung, a son of Yüan-chung, who according to Sung shih, loc. cit., was made Fang-yü-shih of Kua Chou in 962, and from whom two letters are preserved in S. 5973. Ts'ao Yüan-shén was prefect of Kua Chou in 942 (as he had been in 939), but he never became Chieh-tu-shih or Governor of Sha Chou. In the Stein Collection (S. 707) there is a fragmentary copy of the Filial Piety Classic which was made by Yüan-shén in 925, when he was a lay student attached to the 三界寺 San-chieh Monastery; and in S. 1286 v° is the end of a letter from him (without a date), when he had already attained high official rank.

Its mixed population includes Ch'iang [Tangutans] and Lung, amounting to about 1,300 people.

We were told above that the number of households in I Chou was 1,729, which, allowing an average of five persons to each household, yields a total population of 8,645. It seems to be implied that the majority of the inhabitants were Chinese, but doubtless other races were represented. (See Serindia, p. 1150.) In T'ang shu, xl, 11 v°, the households are said to have numbered 2,467, and the individuals 10,157. This would make the ratio of individuals to a household a little over 4:1—greater than that for Tun-huang, but considerably less than that for the Empire as a whole. See "A Censuses of Tun-huang", Toung Pao, Oct., 1915, pp. 479–80. In the eighteenth century the population was estimated at about 12,000.

Revenue.

Or tribute paid to the Imperial Court. Nothing further is stated in the text.
Subordinate sub-prefectures (hsien), 3: I-wu, Na-chih, Jou-yüan.

I Chou seems to have included a great deal more territory than the single oasis of Hāmi, though most of it was desert. Ta ch'ing i t'ung chih gives the following dimensions for the chou when it was first established in 630: east to west, 1,015 li; north to south, 490 li. One would naturally suppose that the extent of the chou coincided with that of the three hsien put together; but that does not appear to have been the case, for the sum of the households in the three hsien (2,634) is much greater than the figure given for the chou (1,729). They also comprise twelve country districts as opposed to seven only in the chou.


Here the problem of 叚 is complicated by the fact that it is followed by another numeral.

The above was originally the I-wu T'un [Camp] of the Later Han. The city walls are stated to have been built by Tou Ku.

For Tou Ku, see Giles, Biog. Dict., 1959, and below. He led an expedition into Central Asia, and took Hāmi from the Hsiung-nu in A.D. 73, thus laying the foundation for Pan Ch'ao's victorious campaigns.

Under the Wei it was made a hsien.

See Wei shu, vii B, 3 r: "In the 12th moon of the 12th year of Tai-ho [Jan.–Feb., 489], the Juan-juan commander of the frontier garrison at I-wu, Kao Kao-tzu, at the head of an army of 3,000 men, surrendered the city [to the Wei]." Also I t'ung chih, lxxxix, 19 r: "the Hans established I-wu T'un, and the Later Wei made it a hsien."

The Han History says: "I-wu-lu is only an old name for the I and Ti tribes."

I have not been able to find this statement in our present text of the Han shu.

Buddhist monasteries, 2: Hsüan-fêng (Diffused influence), Anhua (Peaceful civilization). Taoist monasteries, 2: Hsiang-mou (Auspicious barley), Ta-lo (Great net). Signal stations, 7: Shui-yüan (River source); Mao-érh (Hairy ear);

The second character might be 瓦 wa, a tile; but "Hairy ear" seems a better name than "Hairy tile".

Lang-chüan (Wolf spring); Hsiang-tsao (Fragrant jujube); P'ian-lan-chüan (Twining orchid spring); Su-tu-ku (Quick cross valley); I-ti-chü (I territory implement ?). Frontier garrisons, 3:
Chi-t’ing (Unbaked brick station); Ch’ih-yai (Red cliff); Mao-kan (Lance shaft).

**Manners and customs.** The inhabitants, consisting of husbandmen and traders, possess a written script.

No doubt Turki is meant. Sir Aurel Stein writes: “The present population of Hāmi comprises a considerable proportion of true Turkish stock, which in the valleys of the Karlik-tāgh has preserved much of the old nomadic ways of life; in the oasis to the south, these have been lost through mixture with Chinese elements.”

The peasants and traders only have flat iron plates which they use as griddles; the cakes [which they bake on these] are their usual food, winter and summer. They have no cooking-pots or pans; cups and bowls, spoons and chopsticks form no part of their belongings. When they are thirsty, they simply squat on the ground and drink. The old phrase, “A hole made in the ground served them for a jug, and they drank out of their hands,” pictures their rude simplicity.

Reading 拗, which is another form of 撹. The quotation is from *Li chi*, vii, 1 (6).

It is also their custom to set no store by dress, and to make wealth the only criterion of rank.

Sixty li south of the hsien is a dry salt lake, ten li in circumference.

“Probably an old dried-up lagoon of Hāmi drainage which further to the south-west loses itself in the salt basins of Shona-nör.” [Stein.]

In the desert there is no water, but the dry soil yields salt, which has a sweet taste when the moon is full, and is bitter when the moon is waning. Though the salt has been collected for ages past, it still shows no sign of diminution.

**The town of Little I-wu,** 20 li south of the hsien, was the original I-wu Hsien. Because in the neighbourhood of this town there was formerly water to irrigate the fields, the people [of I-wu] were attracted to this district and built a walled city; hence it is called Little I-wu.

**Shih-lo-man Mountains.** Partly in the administrative area of Jou-yüan Hsien.

These mountains are the Karlik-tāgh, the easternmost portion of the T’ien Shan range. See below, p. 842.

**Yüan-ch’üan [Source spring] River.** Ten li north of the hsien.

“The Hāmi oasis receives its irrigation water from springs which issue at short distances north and north-east of it in the rubble-filled beds of three river-courses, ordinarily dry. These river-beds all descend from the snowy Karlik-tāgh, but carry no surface water after
leaving their debouchures at Törük, Karakupchin, and Aradam. Cf. Serindia, p. 1148, maps 72, 73.” [Stein.]  

River No. 2. Five li north-east of the hsien.  

River No. 3. Nine li north-east of the hsien.  

All these three rivers gush forth from a steep mountain-side and flow southwards into the desert, where they are swallowed up. In the Huo-t'ien [Zoroastrian] Temple there are countless images, both plain and painted. One Ti-p'an-t'ō was the head priest of the Fire-worshipping Sect.  

Mazdeism, or the religion of Zoroaster, was widely spread throughout Central Asia in T'ang times, as we may infer from numerous references in the Chinese histories. “Ti-p'an-t'o” (or “Chai-p'an-t'ō”) may be the name of a country rather than that of an individual. In T'ang shu, xliii B, 18 v°, we read that “600 li south-west of Kashgar one reaches the military post of Ts'ung-ling, which is the ancient kingdom of 羲 盤 陀 Chieh-p'an-t'ō.” The name occurs again in T'ang shu, ccxxi A, 16 r°, and in Hsüan-tsing's Hsi yü chi, with slight modifications of the first character.  

Before Kao-ch'ang was conquered, P'an-t'ō visited the [Chinese] Court.  

Kao-ch'ang was the kingdom occupying the Turfan oasis in the sixth and seventh centuries. Under the Later Han dynasty it was known as 車師前王庭 the Anterior Royal Court of Chü-shih. In 335 it was conquered by 張騫 Chang Chün, the ruler of 涼 Liang, and called Kao-ch'ang Chün. In 442 it was seized by one of the 灰 Chü clan of Northern Liang, but in 460 fell into the hands of the Juan-juan, who made 關伯周 K'ān Po-chou king of Kao-ch'ang. In 500 the inhabitants raised 麗嘉 Chü Chia to the throne, and the Chü family continued to rule the kingdom until it was annexed to the T'ang Empire by 侯君集 Hou Chün-chi in 640, and given the name of 西州 Hsi Chou.  

On arriving at the capital [Ch'ang-an], he called down the Fire-god, [who took possession of his body]. Then he pierced his belly with a sharp sword, so that it went right through him and protruded on each side. Cutting away [from his entrails?] what was superfluous, and tying up the main portion with his hair,  

This is hardly intelligible, and leads one to suspect some omission or corruption in the text.  

he grasped the two ends of the sword in his hands and twisted it round and round and up and down [in his body], exclaiming the while:  

“All the enterprises undertaken by the State are in accordance with the will of Heaven; with divine aid nothing will remain unfulfilled.”
The prophecy seems to refer more particularly to the impending expedition against Kao-ch'ang.

After the god had withdrawn [from his body], he fell rigid and prostrate on the ground, and drew no breath for seven days, when he recovered and returned to his normal condition. This occurrence was reported to the Throne by the authorities, and by Imperial decree he was invested with the title of "Yōgi General".


This is the present oasis of Lapchuk. For the derivation of the name, see Pelliot, *Journal Asiatique*, 1916, p. 118. Unfortunately, he has wrongly quoted the distance as 320 li, and the mistake has been transferred to *Serindia*, p. 1157, note 14.

At the beginning of the T'ang period, a native of this place, Shan Fu-t'o, belonging to the Eastern T'u-chüeh, on account of the oppressive taxation led his fellow-burghers into the desert, and took refuge in Shan-shan, where they dwelt awhile side by side with the T'u-[yü-]hun. Then, passing through Yen-ch'i [Karashahr], they migrated to Kao-ch'ang. Not being comfortable there, they returned home [to Na-chih]. The barbarians call Shan-shan Na-chih, so when these people came back from Shan-shan, they gave this name to their city.

Professor Pelliot has translated this passage, and explains it as follows: Na-chih was founded in the sixth century by natives of Shan-shan, and called Na-chih because that was their name for Shan-shan. Shan Fu-t'o (whose surname proves that he came of a Shan-shan family) tried to lead the colony back to its old home, but finding the T'u-yü-hun settled there, returned to Na-chih. Thus interpreted, our text certainly throws some light on a puzzling passage in *T'ang shu*, xl, 11 v°, which informs us that "Na-chih was established as a hsien on the site of the old city of Shan-shan in 630". Pelliot, however, assumes that Na-chih was so called from the time of its foundation, whereas it is here clearly indicated that this was a new name, given to it only on the return of Shan Fu-t'o. Previously, we must suppose, it had been called Shan-shan after the Chinese name of its parent city. In 718 it lost the status of hsien, but regained it in 727.

Buddhist convent, 1: Hsiang-mou (for nuns). Frontier garrison, 1: Po-ch’üian (Hundred springs). Signal stations, 8: Po-ch’ih (Hundred feet); Pu-tao-ch’üan (Not arrive spring); Yung-an (Lasting peace); Tung-ché-chieh (Eastern Ché-chüeh tree?); Hua-ch’üan (Flower spring); Yen-mo (Protracted end).

It may be noted that Hsiang-mou was the name of a Taoist convent
(monastery or nunnery) at I-wu Hsien, above. "Eight" signal stations is apparently a mistake for "six". The name 柘威 關 Chê-chüeh Pass or Barrier occurs in T'ang shu, xliii, 17 v°: "Westward from An-hsi one goes through the Chê-chüeh Pass."

The spring north of the city is 20 li from the hsien. It wells up from a pit and forms a torrent which flows into the P'û-ch'ang Lake.

"Probably the springs of Toghucha or Ili-kul are meant, five to six miles north and north-east of Lapchuk, which supply the irrigation of the oasis. See Serindia, v, map 69. But "P'û-ch'ang Lake" is obviously an error. The water of Lapchuk loses itself in a dry basin adjoining the Shona-nôr depression, about twenty miles to the south-west. Lop-nôr is separated from it by some 250 miles across the Kuruk-tâgh!" [Stein.]


公廨 has been added in somewhat fainter ink, without any number.

"Distance and bearing prove Jou-yüan Hsien to be identical with the modern Tâsh-bulak, with some adjacent patches of cultivation, about fifty miles E.N.E. of Hâmi. See Innermost Asia, iv, map 37. Tâsh-bulak is garrisoned as a small post guarding the approaches to Hâmi from the eastern Dzungarian plateaus and Mongolia." [Stein.] According to Chiu t'ang shu, xl, 47 r°, it was founded in 630, and took its name from the old city of Jou-yüan, east of the hsien. Hsin t'ang shu, xl, 11 v°, further informs us that in 697 it lost its separate status and was merged into I-wu Hsien.

This city is said to have been built, and the adjoining fields laid out, with the co-operation of barbarians (hu) from I-wu, in the 12th year of Ta-yeh [616]. In the 4th year of Chêng-kuan [630] the Hu returned to their own country. On account of this [act of kindness], when it was made a hsien, it took its name from the chên.

This paragraph is evidently intended to explain the unusual name Jou-yüan (literally "soft-far"), but it is not put at all clearly. The name is derived from a passage in the Canon of Shun (Shu ching, ii, 1, v. 16), which is repeated in the Testamentary Charge (ib., v, 22, viii): 柟達能遍 "Be kind to those who are far off, and help those who are near" (see Legge, Classics, iii, pp. 42, 548). As applied here to the action of the Hu, the meaning must be, "Be kind to those from afar." But it would appear, not only from our present text, but from the Chiu t'ang shu, xl, 47 r°, and the 元和志 Yüan ho chih as well, that the name of the hsien was taken from that of the chên, which must therefore have been built at an earlier date. Perhaps we may reconstruct the sequence of events as follows: When I-wu Chên was established by the Sui in 610, the need of a fortifed post in the north-east was felt in order to protect it, and Jou-yüan Chên

VOL. VI. PART 4. 55
was built about 616 with the aid of the Hu. After a short interval, during which I-wu was in the hands of the Jung Tribes, the T'ang dynasty regained possession of the oasis, and Jou-yüan Hsien was founded in 630, taking its name from the older Jou-yüan Chên.

Taoist monasteries, 1: T'ien-shang (In heaven). Signal stations, 4: Pai-wang (Clear prospect); Pai-yang-shan (White poplar hill); I-ti-chü; Tu-tui (Lonely pile).

"I-ti-chü" is also the name of a signal station in I-wu Hsien, above.

Jou-yüan Chên. Seven li east of the hsien.

鎭 in the text is evidently a mistake for 縣. This is the "old city of Jou-yüan" of Chiu t'ang shu, loc. cit.

Under the Sui dynasty, in the 12th year of Ta-yeh [616], I-wu Chên was established, which was followed by the establishment of this chên.

Above (under I Chou, p. 833) the date was given as 610, which seems preferable to the other, because the foundation of the chên was certainly the result of the brilliant feat of arms accomplished by 謝世雄 Hsieh Shih-hsiung in 608, and described thus in Sui shu, lv, 9 r°: "Having been made Commander-in-chief at the Jade Gate, Hsieh Shih-hsiung planned an attack on I-wu in conjunction with Ch'i-min, Khan of the Northern T'u-chüeh. His army proceeded to the Jade Gate, but Ch'i-min broke his promise and did not appear. Thereupon Shih-hsiung set out across the desert unsupported. The people of I-wu never thought that the Sui army could arrive, and made no preparations; so when they heard that it had already crossed the desert, they were terror-stricken and made haste to surrender, flocking to the Military Gate and offering beef and wine. Subsequently, Shih-hsiung built a walled city east of the old Han city of I-wu, which was called New I-wu. He left behind the Silver-and-blue Kuang-lu Ta-fu 王威 Wang Wei with over a thousand armed men to garrison the place, and returned."


"The Karlik-tägh ("Snowy Mountains"), of which the eastern end rises due north of Täsh-bulak, its southern spurs approaching within about eight miles of that town." [Stein.] Cf. Tures Occidentaux, pp. 18, 305; Innermost Asia, pp. 532 seq.

According to the Account of the Western Regions, these are the T'ien Shan, which stretch in a continuous chain for several thousand li.

The reference is not to ch. 96 of the Han shu as we have it, but possibly to some independent treatise which was afterwards incorporated in the geographical section of the T'ang shu; for in the
latter work (ch. xl, p. 11 v°), it is stated that “in this district (I-wu) are the 折羅漫 Chê-lo-man Mountains, also called T’ien Shan”. The commentary on Hou han shu, ii, 11 r°, says: “The T’ien Shan are the same as the 祁連山 Shih-lien Shan [this is the pronunciation given]. Another name is ‘Snowy Mountains’, and at the present day they are called the 折羅漢 Chê-lo-han Mountains.” This mistake is probably derived from Yen Shih-ku who, as we have seen above (p. 832), also confused the T’ien Shan and the Nan Shan.

On them is an inscribed stone tablet which commemorated the exploit of the Han general Tou Ku in defeating the Prince of the Hu-yan Clan.

This victory was gained in A.D. 73. From the biography of Tou Ku in Hou han shu, liii, 8 v°, we learn that “when he and [his lieutenant] 趙忠 Kêng Chung reached the Tien Shan, they attacked the Hu-yan Prince and cut off more than a thousand heads. The Hu-yan Prince fled, and was pursued as far as 蒲類海 Lake Barkul. Tou Ku left some officers and men encamped in the town of I-wu-lu”. See also, op. cit., ii, 11 r°. The commentary there states that Hu-yan was the name (號) of a Hsiung-nu prince; but this is somewhat misleading. In Shih chi, ex, 4 v°, where the earliest mention of the name occurs, it is clearly recognized to be that of a Hsiung-nu clan: “All the great ministers (of the Hsiung-nu) hold hereditary office, being selected from the 呼衍 Hu-yan, the 蘭 Lan, and at a later date the 須卜 Hsü-pu clan. These three families constitute the nobility.” The commentary adds that the first and last enjoyed the privilege of intermarrying with the Shan-yü’s family, while the Hsü-pu also exercised judicial functions. For other passages in which the Hu-yan princes are mentioned, see Dix Inscriptions, pp. 19–24. Another possible reference is Han shu, xciv A, 19 v°, where it is related how a Hsiung-nu prince succeeded to the throne in 85 B.C. with the style 壹衍鞮 Hu-yan-ti Shan-yü.

Chiang Hsing-pên erased the ancient inscription and engraved a new one in its place, extolling the merits of the T’ang.

This inscription, dated 19th July, 640, is to be found in Hsi yü shui tao chi, iii, 26 v°, and has been translated by Chavannes in Dix Inscriptions, pp. 25 seq. Hsing-pên was the style (字) of 姜確 Chiang Ch’io, whose biography is given in Tang shu, xci, 8 r°. It contains the following passage: “On the expedition against Kao-ch’ang, he was appointed second in command. Going forth from I Chou, he halted in the mountains at a distance of 100 li from Liu-ku and constructed engines of war in which the ancient methods were modified and the engines themselves greatly improved. In that place there stood an inscribed tablet commemorating the exploits of Pan Ch’ao of the Han. Hsing-pên erased the old inscription, and engraved a new encomium on the majesty and supernatural power of the reigning dynasty.” This is clearly the same episode, though Pan Ch’ao is
substituted for Tou Ku. Our present text is more likely to be correct, as Pan Ch'ao was only a junior officer in A.D. 73.

These mountains are 60 li in height.

Not, of course, in a vertical sense. The Chinese measure the height of mountains along the slope, from foot to summit. Chapels for prayer have been placed on them, and below, in the chou city itself, a temple has been erected to the spirit of the mountains, who is named A-lan.

I do not feel quite sure about this sentence. One is tempted to make the emendation 其山下 "at the foot of the mountains".

I-wu Chün (Military Station of I-wei). 4,800 li north-west of the superior capital (Ch'ang-an).

"Evidently a designation of Barkul, the P'u-lei of Han times, about 90 miles to the north-west of Hāmi. It is still garrisoned at the present day for the protection of the high road from Kansu to Chinese Turkestan." [Stein.] See Innermost Asia, map 34. This place is not to be confused, of course, with the I-wu Chün (郡) above.

The above was established on receipt of an Imperial command in the 5th moon of the 4th year of Ching-lung [June, 710]. In the 6th year of K'ai-yüan [718], the garrison consisting of 3,000 soldiers and 1,040 horses, was transferred to Kan-lu Chên.

The second 月 may be a mistake for 日, or simply a dittography of the preceding 月. The date 710 is confirmed by T'ang shu, xl, 11 v, where we are further told that I-wu Chün was situated on the 甘露 Kan-lu River, 300 li to the north-west of Hāmi. This agrees very closely with Stein's estimate. Kan-lu Chên has not been identified, but it was probably in the same district.

Four Ways: To the south-east, I Chou is 300 li distant; to the south-west, Hsi Chou is 800 li distant; to the west, T'ing Chou is 780 li distant; adjacent on the north-east is the brigand country.

Hsi Chou to-day is represented by the ruined site of Yār-khoto, formerly 安河 Chiao-ho, the ancient capital of Turfân. "By T'ing Chou is meant 北庭 Pei-t'ing, marked by ruins north of Jimasa and west of Guchen. This was the seat of a Chinese protectorate in T'ang times. The distances are approximately correct in relation to each other." [Stein.] See Innermost Asia, pp. 555, 563.

The Lung (Dragon) tribe came originally from Yen-ch'i [Karashahr], but now their chieftains are to be found in Kan Chou, Su Chou, and I Chou.

See T'ang shu, cxxi A, 12 r° and 13 r°, for the names of two kings of Karashahr in the seventh century: 龍突騎支 Lung T'u-ch'i-chih
and 龍爛突 Lung Lai-t’u, in which “Lung” is obviously the name of the clan or tribe mentioned in this paragraph.

These people are fierce and unprincipled, hardy and pugnacious, but their character has been modified by the civilizing influence of our Imperial House.

South-east of Sha Chou is the Yao-yüeh Mountain, 180 里 distant, south-west is the Tzü-t’ing (Purple Pavilion) Mountain, 190 里 distant. The rocks on this mountain being all of a purple hue, it was re-named Tzü-t’ing.

Instead of 復 we should perhaps read 故 (“it was on that account named”), since we hear of no previous name.

_T’ing Chou:_ Han-hai Chün (Military Station of Han-hai).

The character in the text is certainly meant for 澜. Han-hai (翰 or 澜海) is often used generally for the desert of Gobi. The place mentioned here seems to have been in the district inhabited by the Uighurs, which in the reign of T’ai Tsung was made into a prefecture: see _Chiu t’ang shu_, excv, 2 r°: 以絳紆部為瀚海府.


We hear of a T’ien-shan Chün 郡 being created when Kao-ch’ang was conquered in 640; see _T’ang shu_, cxxxii A, 8 r°.

_I Chou:_ I-wu Chün (Military Station of I-wu). Jou-yüan Hsien.

The nomenclature of places in Turkestan is often found confusing because of the changes arising from the intermittent nature of Chinese rule in those parts. It may be useful, therefore, to recapitulate by giving the names borne by the principal cities mentioned in this account at different periods of their history:—

1. _Yu-ni_, old capital of Lou-lan [Former Han].
   “Old Eastern Town”; “Little Shan-shan” [Later Han].
   Ch’i-t’un Ch‘eng; T‘un Ch‘eng [T‘ang].
   Little Nob [Tibetan records].
   Miran [modern name].

2. _I-hsün_, or I-hsiu, capital of Shan-shan after 77 B.C. [Former Han].
   Shan-shan Chên [Sui].
   Na-fu-po (納縛波) [Hsüan-tsang].
   Tien-ho [T‘ang].
   Shih-ch‘eng Chên [T‘ang, after A.D. 675].
   Great Nob [Tibetan records].
   City of Lop [Marco Polo].
   Charkhlik [modern name].
(3) **Nu-chih Ch'êng** [Han].
Hsin Ch'êng (New City) [T'ang].
Vâsh-shahri [modern name].

(4) **Chü-mo** [Han].
Tso-mo (Lv. 末) [Sung-yün].
Chü-mo Chên [Sui].
Chê-mo-t'ō-na (折摩鸵那) [Hsüan-tsang].
Po-hsien Chên [T'ang, after A.D. 674].
Jurjân [Mîrzâ Haidar, sixteenth century].
Charchan [modern name].

(5) **K'un-wu** [Chou].
I-wu or I-wu-lu [Han].
I-wu Chün [Sui].
I Chou [T'ang].
Kumul, Kamul, Camul [Turkî].
Khamil [Mongol].
Hâmi [modern name].

(6) **Chiao-ho**, ancient capital of Turfan [Han].
Chü-shih Ch'ien-wang-t'îng (Anterior Royal Court of Chü-shih) [Later Han].
Kao-ch'ang Chün [Chin].
Hsi Chou [T'ang].
Yâr-khoto [modern name].

(7) Chin-man (金滿) [Former Han].
Chü-shih Hou-wang-t'îng (Posterior Royal Court of Chü-shih) [Later Han].
Kâgan-stûpa [Hsüan-tsang's Life].
'ting TC'hou [T'ang, after 640].
Pei-t'îng Tu-hu Fu (Protectorate of Pei-t'îng) [T'ang, after 702].
Bêsh-balîk ("Five Towns") [Turkî].
Hu-pao-tzû (護堡子), near Jimasa [modern name].

On the 25th day of the 12th moon of the 1st year of Kuang-ch'i [2nd February, 886], when the An-wei-shih-fu (Assistant Commissioner) of Ling Chou, Minister of State, arrived with his suite at the chou, Chang Ta-ch'îng, in attendance on the Assistant Commissioner, made a copy of this document to serve as a record.

Professor Pelliot, not allowing for the difference of the Chinese lunar calendar, makes the year 885. Ling Chou is a little south of Ning-hsia Fu in north-east Kansu. The last character is written 記, but 記 may be intended, in which case the translation will be: "completed the copying of this document."
On Mubarakshah Ghuri

By AHMET-ZEKI VALIDI


The situations of and are defined by Alberuni more accurately: in the second zone (أقيم), in the extreme East ينجلو مستقر فغتو ور صين (that is, Yang-chou, cf. G. Ferrand, Textes relatifs à l’extrême Orient, 132), 125 long., 22 lat.; أوقين في بلاد الترك (that is, Ötügen on the Orkhon, in central Mongolia, see Barthold, Hist. Bed. d. alttürk. Inschr. 25), 136 long., 26 lat.; قتنا في شرق الصين وشالها وساحبه قطانه [من] الترك (that is, the capital of the Khitans, Peking) 136 long., 21 lat., in the third zone، تكسين في أرض الترك خانون سين أي مقبرة الترك 120° 15’ long., 32° 50’ lat., الا على [من بلاد] الترك 129° 45’ long., 31° 15’ lat.; in the fifth zone, the Uighur cities of eastern Tien-shan and north-west China، سانجيو ينشب الطريق منه جنوبا إلى الصين (that is, Sa-chou = Tun-huang, cf. in Mahmud Kashghari, i, 349, سانجيو بادة على طريق الصين الا على، 113 long., 43 lat.; قامجو من بلاد الصين (that is, Kan-chou) 116° 5’ long., 39 lat.)
From this it could be inferred that Kükêsin is situated somewhere to the east of it on the northern frontiers of the provinces of Shen-si and Shan-si, let us say, on the line Tai-juen—Kwei-hwa-chong. is also mentioned by Mahmud Kashghari (3, 101). The city was earlier mentioned by him in the fragments of a poem on the war between the ruler (Amir—bek) of that city and the emperor (ملك—خان) of Tangut (3, 240, 242 خانوئن سيني). Although on this author’s map the city (خانوئن سيني) is placed together with the Uighur cities of eastern Turkestan, in the text (3, 101, 240) it is clearly stated that it is situated between Tangut and “Sin”, that is, the country of the Khitans, as he usually opposes this term to الصين العلاى or الصين الماسي. Thus the statements of Mahmud Kashghari fully agree with those of Alberuni. As is well known, the Shato Turks after the fall of the dynasties founded by them in the tenth century, still maintained themselves in some parts of the north in the province of Shan-si, and their descendants appear as the Onguts—White Tatars (Po-ta-ta). Khatun-sini is undoubtedly one of those many K'o-tonen-teh'eng, to whom, according to Pelliot (Journ. Asiat., 1920, avr.—juin, p. 174), M. Matsui has dedicated a paper inaccessible to us. It may refer to just our Khatun-sini, when Lao-shi speaks of a K'o-tun in connection with the Old Hun “Ordu” (Marquart Komnen, 195) and Kin-shi speaks of Kutun in the province of Si-king to the north of Shan-si (Breitschneider, Med. Res., i, 212). But the K'o-tun, through which the Kara-Khitai Ye-lin-ta-che passed in 1123 on his way to Beshbalik and which is to the west of Etsin-gol (Breitschneider, ibid.), in all probability is identical with the city Khatun of the Uighur princess of the period of the Tang, situated on the site of modern Khatun. There it is to the east of Khami (Breitschneider, Med. Res., ii, 178–9; Grum Grjimaylo, Opisanie Severo-Zapadnago Kitaya, i, 484), and has evidently nothing to do with our خاتون سيني.

The Kükêsin of Alberuni and Mubarakshah ought perhaps to be read as the MS. of Veliettin-Efendi permits, then it may signify the name of the Tangut capital Ning-hsia; the reading is also permissible, then it could be identified with the Mongolian name of South China نكياس in Rashid-uddin and Hamdullah Qazvinî and
Nangkiassun in the letter of the Ilkhan Öljeitü to the French king Philippe le Bel. According to Rashid-uddin (Berezin T., 3 text, p. 147, Blochet, 324) this province bordered on the countries of the Tanguts and Jurjens in the Liupan Shan mountains, to the east of Lan-chou, that is, precisely there where نكسين must be sought. Perhaps the Mongolian term meant originally only the upper part of the river Huang-ho, that is the north-eastern provinces, bordering on the Tangut, in the present Tibet, where once some Turks lived, such as these same Shato (see Yakinf-Bichurin, Sobranie T., i, p. 456).

I am on the whole more inclined to read نكسين and to identify it with the name of the second capital of the contemporary Tangut Nang-hsia, although this city in the time of Alberuni was known to the Chinese under the name of Sing-chou. For the scholars of the Musulman world at that time the remote Tanguts and Chinese (Khitans) could appear only as Turks.

The statements of Mubarakshah Ghuri on the country Yure (pp. 39–40) are taken, evidently, from a common source with that used by Alberuni (in his book تحديد نهایات الاماكن, a unique MS. of which exists in the Fatih Library, in Constantinople, No. 3386, fol. 67b), and Muhammad Auni (Markwart, “Die arktische Länder,” in Ungarisches Jahrbuch, iv, 3–4, pp. 263–5), perhaps from the geography of Ibn Khordadbih or Al-Jaihani; but Mubarakshah has somewhat confused the statements concerning these, Yure and Isu, with the statements of the same common source on the tribes of the Kimaks living more to the north, that is, Altaians and Kirghi-Yenissei Kirghizes, quoted in Auni (Markwart in Festschrift für Hirth, p. 296) and Gardizi (ed. Barthold, pp. 86–7). From the same source he borrowed (p. 41) the information about the cold winter and sultry summer of the region, of which he uses almost the same expressions (chaque année dans la saison la plus chaude les habitants se retirent dans des souterrains) as the Chinese envoy Wang-yen-ti (in Journ. Asiat., 1847, t. ix, p. 56). This information is contained also in the Ta’khırv of Maqdisi (MS. of Damad Ibrahim Pasha, No. 918, fol. 122a), in Gardizi (ed. Barthold, p. 92), and in some others.

The golden tent (in the Ta’khırv of Maqdisi خيمة من ذهب مركزه كالأكاس) of the Toghuqghuz Khakan mentioned by various authors (e.g. Ibn Khordadbih, p. 31, Yaqut, Geography, t. i, p. 840) is called by our author not at all rightly توره زرين.
In the list of Turkish tribes (p. 47) must evidently be read سالور, which is identical with the سالور mentioned in the same place.

کچی, that is, the Turkish tribe Kumiji, mentioned by Ptolemy, by the Chinese and various Musulman authors (Maqdisi, Baihaqi, Nasiri Khusrau, وجده ين, p. 53, see also Barthold, Turkestan, pp. 70, 248, 297–8, 301).

اوران, a branch of the tribe Kipchak, mentioned by various authors, as Juwaini (t. 2, p. 35, 109) and Muhammad ibn Muaiyid al-Baghdadi (MS. Nuri Osmaniye, No. 4300, fol. 305, السالور تاريخ الجموعي); remains of this branch exist in Anatolia in different places. The point between the words كچاات and اغول is neglected in the printed text, perhaps originally the author had placed the word اغول after the word كچاات and it was the copyists who transposed these words.

The tribe Altiul, that is, Alti Oghul, in the chronicles of Khiva, forming part of the large Nogai Horde, until their immigration to the West, to the northern Caucasus and the Crimea, thence partly into Turkey, always lived as nomads around the Aral Sea and in Khvarizm, that is, in the very place where the Kujats lived, mentioned also by Baihaqi (Calcutta edition, pp. 91, 368), and till the ninth century the Pechenegs; thus the location of the tribe Alti in our author with the tribes of Kujat and Pecheneg, is perhaps not accidental.


should perhaps be read Alp-أريك, the name of the same Kipchak tribe, in Rashid-uddin, ed. Blochet, p. 45. The correct reading of the name of this tribe is difficult: Markwart (Komanen p. 171) read Alp-أري, but this is clearly unsuccessful. In Abu Khaiyan,
in Damashqi, ed. Mehren, in the Aya-Sophia MS. No. 2945

The most correct of these may be considered to be that which
is given by Abu Khaiyan, Al-Nuvaieri, and Rashid-uddin; the name
of the tribe was evidently Berli or Berlik al لیک also; but there would be subdivisions
of the tribe, of these are known to us only the Ulu-Berli
أولیک Berlik or Ulu-Berlik or Ulu-Berlik اولیک
— or Ulu-Berlik اولیک. It might evidently have also the
pronunciation Barli, Borli, and Borlu. The latter forms can be seen
in the geographical names of Asia Minor Uluborlu and Kichiborlu
(in Ibn Bibi برگلو, in the historians of Timur يلع, and
Brugno). However, the form Berli is met with more frequently; to the
same is referred in the Arabic redaction of the history
of Rashid-uddin, MS. Aya-Sophia, No. 303, fol. 603, and the Nisba
of one Kipchak scholar at the end of an Aya-Sophia MS. of the book
of Shams-uddin Damashqi, where is clearly written الپویي
الپویي, that is, Al-Uluberli.

As to دوجیان and جیران, the only thing like it in Aristov
(Zamecki, 480) is Juzhaik, but it has hardly anything in common
with دوجیان. In this word it is possible to suspect the name of the
Kipchak tribe in Ibn Khaldun or جیران in Al-Nuvaieri, in the
excerpt of Tiesenhausen, but in the Aya-Sophia autograph of Al-
Nuvaieri the word is written جیران, and in Damashqi جیران, which
must be read Chortan. Generally in Mubarakshah subdivisions of
the Oghuzes and Kipchaks are counted greater than subdivisions
of other tribes, from which it is possible to realize the constitution
of the Turks of the Afghanistan and northern India of that time.

The word تغریق is rightly compared by Sir Denison Ross with
the نغریق of Mahmud Kashghari; in my opinion تغریق should
be read تغریق. Now Saif-uddin Ugrak was one of the principal
generals of the army of the Khvarizmshahs in Afghanistan (see
Juvaini, 2, 135, et seq.).
By the inhabitants of Khvarizm in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the Kara-Kalpaks living on the islands in the Amu-darya delta, were called Aral Khalki آرال خلاقی, as they are called in all the Khivan chronicles. This word is perhaps also used by Mubarakshah; then the word آرال must be read آرل لغزترا and اتفوق remain obscure to me.

The fragments of a Turkish epic poem on Afrasiyab-Tunga Alp, quoted in Mahmud Kashghari (see Brockelmann, Asia Major, Hirth, Anniversary Volume, p. 15) have shown that an epic poem on this legendary hero, known hitherto chiefly in the Iranian version, not only existed among the Turks but that among the latter there existed also a cult of lamentation over Afrasiyab. Meantime we knew from the Orkhon Inscriptions (i, N. 7; ii, E. 31) that Prince Kül-tegin on his fifth expedition against the Oghuzes in the year 714 won a victory over them “having slain them at the time of the funeral of Tunga-Tegin” (tunga tigin yoghinda kiri öldürtimiz). In Markwart’s opinion this event took place in Beshbalik. But everyone, including Markwart, has explained this passage of the inscription in his own way. Here obviously it has in view the cult of lamentation over Tunga-Alp, among the Kök-Turk “Oghuzes”. Perhaps we should refer to the same the blood-stained portrait of the Turkish prince on the walls of the Buddhist temple No. 19 in Bezeklik. The late Von Le Coq recognized this portrait as a Stifterbild, as a Bild eines uigurischen Wirdenträgers and as a Porträtbildnis eines Angehörigen der uigurischen Königsfamilie (Die buddhistische Spätantike, iii, 46-7, Tafel xviii). Further he especially stressed the fact that the artists of the period of the “dawn of Turkish art” gave more significance to drawing a person’s features, that is, to portrait work (see ibid., p. 47, and Auf Hellas Spuren in Ost-Turkestan, p. 74). Professor Grünwedel directed attention to the blood-stained mouth and costume of the prince, and found that the portrait represented a martyr (Altbuddhistische Kultstätten in Chinesisch-Turkestan, p. 271). The name of the prince is to be read in the badly preserved red line Tonga and at the beginning of the second red line clearly tigin, on the left-hand black line Tonga ol. Afrasiyab in the belief of the pre-Islamic inhabitants of Bukhara, presented by Narshakhi, appeared as the representative of Eastern,

1 In Abdul-Karim Bukhari, ed. Schefer.
Chinese, and Buddhist culture over against the West-Asiatic Iranian. As capital of Afrasiyab and the centre of Buddhism was considered the city of Ramitan (now a settlement twelve miles to the north of the city of Bukhara), whither the objects of the Buddhist cult were brought from China, by the daughter of the Chinese emperor, the wife of Afrasiyab; Kai Khusrau, as a centre of Mazdeism built over against Ramitan the city of Ramush, a temple of the fire-worshippers which the tradition cited considers to be more ancient than those of Bukhara (Narshakhi, ed. Schefer, p. 6, see also the essay of Barthold, “Places of pre-Musulman Culture in Bukhara and its Environs,” in Vostochnia Zametki, Leningrad, 1926, p. 20–1). As is well known, here, that is, in the plain of the Zarafshan, till the time of the Sasanians, Buddhist culture was predominant, but in Sasanian times the Irano-Mazdean; and the Bukharan citadel became a centre of the cult of Siyavush. The discovery of a good portrait of the prince and martyr Tunga-Tegin (?) on the walls of a Buddhist temple of the Uighur Turks could be fully explained by the tradition of the Buddhist Afrasiyab in Ramitan.

The cult of Afrasiyab-Tunga Tegin and the epic of that hero were doubtless widely spread among the Turkish population of Central Asia. In this connection the fragment recently discovered in Constantinople of the Oghuz Epic on the son of Afrasiyab Alp-Ariz, existing among the fragments of the songs and utterances of other Oghuz epic heroes, is significant. These fragments are preserved in an addition to the beginning of a very early MS. of the history of the Seljukids of Yaziji Oghlu, existing in the Palace Library at Topkapi-Serai in the section Revan-Köskü, No. 1390. The fragments significantly supplement the list of epic heroes of the Oghuzes, well-known in the Kitabi Dede Kurkut and in the Oghuz-name, descending to us in Rashid-uddin (in the second part of the history of Rashid-uddin, devoted to universal history) and in Abul-Ghazi (in his book, Shejerei Terakime, edited so far only in the Russian translation of Tumanskii). In addition to those well known in the work just mentioned, Bayander-Khan, Uruj oghlu Salur Kazan, Kian-Seljuk, Kanglu-Khoja oghlu Kan-Turalu, Kian-Busat (Bisat), Tokush-Khoja oghlu Toghrul, the names and characteristics of the following heroes are given: Kara Küinek brother of Salur-Kazan, Bagrikchi oghlu Yazi-Kondaz, Kian-Üchen oghlu Amin-Bek, and his slayer Ekki-Koja oghlu Okchi Kuran, Allarish oghlu Etil-Alp, Baibura oghlu Baribek, Urulmish-Khan, slayer of the Turkish Cyclops Tepe-Küza,
Kian-Seljuk oghlu Deli-Dundar and Afrasiyab oghlu Alp-Ariz. The metrical characterizations of the heroes are very brief; very interesting is the characterization of the Oghuz tribe as a whole. Like the Oghuz tribe, its chiefs Salur-Kazan and Kan-Turalu are described as inhabiting the Kara-Tagh or Karachik-Tagh, which is north of the Sir-darya, and as champions of Islam against the infidel Kanlu, that is, the Kangli tribe, who remained as is well-known heathens up to the epoch of the Khvarizmshahs. Alp-Ariz son of Afrasiyab is depicted as a giant, for whom a fur-cloak of ninety skins could not cover his legs, a cap of nine skins could not cover his head (?), (ears ?), for whom are needed (as food) ninety sheep as . . . (dwughalik ?), and ten sheep as . . . (öönlük ?), a warrior, with one swing hurling away a nine-year-old . . . (jung ?), holding in the heavens . . ., swallowing a horse’s head in one gulp:—

طقصن دريدن كورك اولي طبونين اوتشين
طقوز دريدن شكلاده اولي قلوتين (قلا كين ?) اورشين
طقوس قيون دعوالق اون قيون ايونلك يتمن
طقوز ياشور كويكن سكلوب آتان
قيناغنده كورده دوتنان (دوتان ؟ آت باشين يالميرب برگن بودان
أفرسياپ اوغلي آلب آريس بك

Besides this it is said in a blessing (آلكشي) : Let your prophet be Muhammad, may you have wisdom seven times greater than Dede-Kurkut, be fortunate as Emir Suleiman, may you have good luck seven times greater than Salur-Kazan, wealth seven times greater than Bayandur Khan and . . .(?)(?) seven times greater than Alp-Ariz, be a thousand times greater, more terrible, more majestic than Begdüz-Amin with blood-stained beard.

As to what Mubarakshah has handed down (pp. 36-7) from “the sayings and tales of Afrasiyab, ruler of the Turks, a man exceedingly clever and wise”

ورز مثل و سخان افرسياپ كه پادشاه ترکان بوده است وزد حد يرون
كامل عقل وصاحب راه وبسيار دان بوده است اينست كه . . .

that “A Turk may be compared to a pearl which, when it is in the oyster-shell and at the bottom of the sea has no value, but when
they drag it from the sea's bottom and take it from the shell it becomes precious, an ornament on the crown of Kings, on the neck and in the ears of brides”, such an enraptured opinion of the Turks in the sayings of Afrasiyab can have place only in sayings current among the Turks, contemporaries of the author. We know what great importance the Turkish song had in the army of Mahmud of Ghazni and in the army of the Karakhanids (Barthold, Turkestan, p. 273), and that Alberuni according to his own words collected at the court of Mahmud of Ghazni information on Turkish culture and the Turkish calendar.¹

If the Turkish traditions about Afrasiyab were known to the Turks of Afghanistan, contemporaries of Mubarakshah Ghuri, then it must be assumed that they knew these traditions already in the time of Mahmud of Ghazni. In a MS. of the Shahnama of Firdusi, belonging in 1923 to an inhabitant of Meshhed, a chemist Ghulam, the preface of Baisunkur contained the phrase that Mahmud of Ghazni loved to hear tales from Persian and Turkish antiquity. We must assume that among these Turkish tales was also an epic about Afrasiyab. It appears to me, that Daqiqi and Firdusi took some details in the part of the Shahnama which treats of Afrasiyab, precisely from the Turks in the dominions of the Samanids and the Ghaznevids. By this is perhaps explained the important rôle which Daqiqi and Firdusi give to the Khalaj and the Khallukh (that is, Karluk), who were predominant in the army of Mahmud and his descendants, as also the form in those writers of the name of the companion-in-arms of Afrasiyab “Demur” in accord with the pronunciation of Oghuz-Turkomans, of which the Khalaj and Khallukh formed part (according to the pronunciation, e.g. of the Jikils the word must have been written “Timur”).

The statements of Mubarakshah about the script of the Turks (pp. 44–6) although in agreement with the statements of Al-Nadim (Fihrist, 17–20), must have been taken from another source. The Sogdian script is also the Uighur, but that of the Toghuzghuz, in which were written their sacred books (in Mubarakshah كتاب بنام زدان, in Al-Nadim وهذا الفلم كتبون انجيلهم وكتب شرائعهم واهل ما وراء)

¹ These words are found in Mir Chelebi (MS. Topkapi-Sera, Enderun, No. 3502, fol. 10–11) from the no longer extant book of Nasiri Tusi on the Turkish calendar. Nasiri Tusi in his sketch took these words from the book of Alberuni, which has not come down to us.
النهر وسهرقند بهذا الفلم يكتبون كتب الدين ويسمى ثم قلم الدين, was Manichean. Al-Nadim, on the script of the Turks, mentions only the script used by the Turkish Great Kaans (ملك الترك الاعظم) and the Turkish aristocracy (أفضل الترك), which, contrary to the opinion of the late Professor Markwart (WZKM., xii, 167, 170), undoubtedly was identical with the Orkhon runic alphabet which was known also to the Arabs, but seemed to them perhaps at the beginning of their acquaintance with the culture of the residence of the Turkish Khakans, not an alphabet, but simple signs. Of this Orkhon alphabet Mubarakshah evidently knew nothing. Al-Nadim says of the Khazars that they used the Hebrew script which is now proved by documents. The statements of Mubarakshah that the Khazars used the Graeco-Russian script, has also perhaps some foundation. Although the Khazars as also the Bolghars on the Danube could well have used the Cyrillic alphabet, I incline on the whole to read the word بروسیان as بروسیان and to refer the word بروسیان بدهیشان not to بروسیان but to خریان, since I think the statement refers only to the Greek colonies of the Black Sea coast and the Crimea, called by our author “Rum i Rus” . It may well be that the statement refers only to the Greek script which was used on the golden vases of Nagy Szent Miklós, ascribed to the Avar-Bolghars. The study of the Turkish phrases and words on these vases was taken up after Thomsen by the Bulgarian scholar Stifan Mladenev (in Memoirs of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1923-5), and by the Russians, G. Ilyinskii (in Vestnik Nauchnago Obshchestva Tatarovedenia, No. 8, Kazan, 1928) and A. Sobolevskii (in Dokladi Akademii Nauk, No. 6, 1929).

In the Aya-Sophia Library, in the collection No. 4792, completed in a.H. 816 (see fol. 795a) in Shiraz, by a certain As'ad ibn Muhammad al-Katib, is contained (fol. 767b-788a) a moral compilation of our author in verse. The book is entitled رحيق التحقیق من كلام فخر الدين مباركشاه غوري نور قبره and begins with the verses:

بادعة عشق در ده اي ساق
يكرماني مرا زمن بستان
وز تقاداري آب وكل برهان
زر مفسوش ما جو نيبن پسند
درکلین دیش آتى درند
نا شود لاف عقل در باقی
I have restricted myself to giving a synopsis of chapter-headings:

- Fol. 770b
  حكاية از أحياء علم غزالي

- Fol. 771b
  سؤال السالك عن القرآن وجواب القرطاس له

- Fol. 772a
  سؤال السالك عن الحبر وجواب الحبر له

- Fol. 773a
  سؤال السالك عن قلم وجواب القلم له

- Fol. 774a
  سؤال السالك عن اليد وجواب اليد له

- Fol. 774b
  سؤال السالك عن القدرة وجواب القدرة له

- Fol. 776a
  سؤال السالك عن الارادة وجواب الارادة له

- Fol. 776b
  سؤال السالك عن العلم وجواب العلم له
  حكايات

- Fol. 777a
  تعلم العلم للسالك and تردد السالك

- Fol. 777b
  الآثارات

- Fol. 778b
  حكايات

- Fol. 779a
  فصل

- Fol. 779b
  اعتراف الرجل تصديعة للعلم

- Fol. 780a
  حكايات

- Fol. 781a
  حكايات

- Fol. 781b
  سؤاله عن القدر

- Fol. 782a
  جواب القدر له

- Fol. 782b
  حيرة السالك وجواب اليمين له

- Fol. 783b
  حكايات

- Fol. 784a
  سؤال عن القدرة وجواب القدرة له

- Fol. 784b
  نهاية السالك

- Fol. 784b
  حكايات

- Fol. 785a
  حكايات

- Fol. 785b
  حكايات

- Fol. 786a
  حكايات

- Fol. 786b
  حكايات

VOL. VI. PART 4.
Fol. 786b

Fol. 787a

Fol. 787b

Fol. 788b

The MS. ends with the following words of the author:

اين رسالت بکمتر از يک ماه کفته از فضل حق مبارکشاه
نام کردم رحیق تحقیق ش
طبع چون کرد عزم تعلیق ش
سال هجرت بجرف ثا فا دال

= ٥٨٤

that is, the book was finished at the beginning of February, A.D. 1188.
Mahāvīra and the Buddha
By A. Berriedale Keith

IN a very interesting article,¹ Professor Jacobi has arrived at the conclusion that, contrary to the Buddhist tradition, we must hold that Mahāvīra outlived the Buddha, probably by some seven years. In point of fact, of course, it may seem of very little consequence whether we accept this view or that of Buddhist tradition, but the issue involves a very important question affecting the value of our authorities, and on this point it seems to me clear that the position adopted by Professor Jacobi involves serious difficulties.

Professor Jacobi treats as the assured foundations for his investigations the dates of the Nirvāṇas of the Buddha and of Mahāvīra as 484 and 477 B.C. But it must be admitted that both these dates rest on very unsatisfactory and late evidence. The question of the date of the Buddha has been set out, with his usual acumen and precision, recently by Professor de La Vallée Poussin,² and he has shown how utterly uncertain is the date 483 or 484 B.C. for the Nirvāṇa. From a very different point of view the late Professor Rhys Davids confessed ³ that the date was purely conjectural. We may readily believe that the Buddha died sometime in the fifth century B.C., but to lay any stress on the exact date is completely impossible with the evidence available. What is perfectly clear is that knowledge of the early period of Buddhism was imperfect,⁴ and the same remark applies even more strikingly to the traditions of Jainism. In the case of Mahāvīra the earlier tradition—of uncertain date—is emphatic in allowing 470 years between his Nirvāṇa and the beginning of the Vikrama era, which places the date in 528 or 527 B.C. The later tradition, given in Hemacandra’s Parićīṣṭaparvan, viii, 339, and somewhat earlier in Bhadreçvara’s Kahāvali, ascribes 155 years as the period between the death of Mahāvīra and Candragupta’s accession to the throne of Magadha, which gives 477 B.C. as the probable date of Mahāvīra’s death. Here again we are on utterly uncertain ground. We are obliged to treat the earlier Jain tradition as of minimal value

¹ SBA. 1930, pp. 557-68.
² Indo-européens et Indo-iraniens, pp. 238-48; L’Inde aux Temps des Mauryas, p. 50.
³ CHI. i, pp. 171, 172.
⁴ Keith, Buddhist Philosophy, chap. i.
and there seems every ground for so doing; but the tradition accepted by Hemacandra rests equally on no assured foundation. The only possible conclusion regarding it is that it cannot be trusted to be accurate within a few years, and it seems wholly impossible to base on two dates so acquired the view that we must believe that the Buddha predeceased Mahāvīra. Nor is it irrelevant to note that Professor Jacobi¹ himself has adopted slightly different dates, namely 477 and 467 B.C. in other contributions; but what is more important is that the Jaina tradition contains one certain error which, if rectified, destroys the value of its testimony for 477 B.C. By that tradition, apparently accepted by Hemacandra as well as the rest of Jain opinion, the date of the accession of Candragupta is placed at 255 years before the Vikrama era, i.e., in 313 or 312 B.C. This date is obviously too late; if we take 322, as does Professor Jacobi, as a probable date,² then we must admit a clear error in the Jain tradition of about ten years in respect of this interval; admitting a like error regarding the earlier interval, that between the accession of Candragupta and the death of Mahāvīra, we would arrive at 487 B.C. for the death of the latter, and this would place that event before the death of the Buddha, and confirm the Buddhists tradition. This shows clearly with what inadequate data we have to reckon, and leaves the conviction that the supposed dates of the deaths of the two great teachers are of too uncertain character to afford any conclusion as to the priority of these events.

On the other hand, we have the clear and distinct tradition of the Buddhist Canon which asserts that Mahāvīra died before the Buddha and does so, not incidentally, but as giving rise to allocations of the Master regarding the tenets of his teaching, recorded in the Pāśādika Suttanta of the Dīgha Nikāya and the Sāmagāma Suttanta of the Majjhima Nikāya, and of Sāriputta, at the Master’s bidding, in the Saṅgīti Suttanta of the Dīgha Nikāya. How are we to discredit this definite tradition recorded in canonical texts?³ That these texts belong to the period immediately after the death of the Buddha, I confess I do not believe, but they far outrank in age the traditions of the dates of the deaths of the Buddha and Mahāvīra, and give us

¹ Introduction to Kalpa Sūtra, p. 9; Introduction to Pariśiṣṭaparāsna, p. 6.
² In CHI. i, pp. 471-3, 321 is suggested as plausible. For other dates see L. de La Vallée Poussin, L’Inde aux Temps des Mauryas, pp. 51, 52.
³ The Upāli Suttanta clearly asserts an illness, if not the death, of Mahāvīra; Chalmers, SBB. v, p. 278, n. 2.
authentic views of the belief held in Buddhist circles at some period considerably before the Christian era. If we are to discredit their account, we must be prepared to accept the consequences, which involve acceptance of a scepticism as to the value of the Buddhist and Indian traditions in general, which is quite inconsistent with the faith placed by Professor Jacobi in the tradition as to the dates of the Nirvānas, or his acceptance of the view that the Kautiliya Arthaśāstra is the work of a minister of the Emperor Candragupta. If we are on any logical ground to discredit the Buddhist tradition, very strong arguments are necessary, and those adduced seem quite inadequate.

It is contended by Professor Jacobi that the evidence of the three Suttantas is destroyed by the fact that, while all agree in making the occasion of Mahāvīra's death and consequent unrest in his community the cause of the dissertations on the Buddhist tenets, the divergence of the form of argument in the three Suttas shows that that cannot represent what the Buddha actually said. This may, of course, be conceded at once by those who believe ¹ that we have little or nothing of the ipsissima verba of the Master. The view which seems natural is that the Buddhists believed that there was difficulty in the Jain community on the death of their leader, and that this took place before the Buddha's death, eliciting from him comments, which were probably not preserved in any authentic form, leaving it open for the composers of the Suttantas to present the teachings each in his own way. The essential point is really that different Buddhist authors held the same tradition, which shows that it was a belief handed down by tradition and widely spread in Buddhist circles.

In the second place, Professor Jacobi argues that the account in these Suttantas is contradicted by the account in the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, the oldest account of the proceedings of the Buddha's last year up to his Nirvāṇa. This text does not refer to any special anxiety of the Buddha as to the fate of his community after his death as having been elicited by the report of the dissensions in the community of Mahāvīra, whence it is deduced that this report is a later invention. But this reasoning rests on several unproved assumptions. (1) That the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta is older than the other three Suttantas is assumed without any arguments being adduced, and its age certainly is far from obvious. On the contrary,

¹ See Winternitz, Geschichte der Indischen Litteratur, ii, pp. 360 f.
it appears to be a very sophisticated and worked up account of the last days of the Buddha, and in fact it is not open to Professor Jacobi to contend for its early date. He himself shortly afterwards (p. 562) refers to the account given in that text of the plans of Ajātaçatru for the subjection of the Vṛjīs, and points out that the undertaking was one demanding careful planning. He adds: "Über die von ihm getroffenen Massnahmen enthält das M. P. S. Angaben, die aber in viel späterer Zeit entstanden und darum so gut wie wertlos sind." Very probably Professor Jacobi's view of the statements of the Suttanta is correct; but it is quite impossible to hold this view of it, and then to ask us to accept the silence of the Suttanta as entitling us to negate the evidence of three Suttantas, two of which at least may well be older than the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta. (2) Moreover, the argument is essentially one ex silentio and there is no form of contention more dangerous. It would be necessary, in order to give it weight, to show that the omission of the episode of the Buddha's views on hearing of Mahāvīra's death is inexplicable, if its occurrence were widely believed in Buddhist circles. No such proof, however, is possible. Professor Jacobi's view appears to be that the episode of the hearing of the death of Mahāvīra took place during the last journey of the Buddha en route to Kusinārā, and that, therefore, any full account of his last days must necessarily include the episode in question. If this view were sound, there might be something to say for his contention, though the argument would be far from conclusive. But there seems no ground whatever to assume that the Buddhists thought that the news of Mahāvīra's death came to the Buddha just before his own Nirvāṇa. The Sāmagāma Suttanta has nothing to suggest such a conclusion. On the contrary the Buddha is at Sāmagāma when he hears of the death of Mahāvīra at Pāvā,¹ and equally in the other two Suttantas the Buddha's utterances are not connected with his own last stay at Pāvā.² The fact that the death of Mahāvīra evokes the mention

¹ Cunda here appears as a novice, and so also in the Pāśādika Suttanta, which marks him out from his description in the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta. The Saṅgīti Suttanta does not use this term of him, and seems to have been influenced by the Mahāparinibbāṇa in this point; compare Franke, ḍīgha Nikāya, p. 229. Two Cundas can hardly be admitted, though the Mahāparinibbāṇa is certainly confused.
² The Saṅgīti sets the scene in Pāvā, but under quite other circumstances than those of the Mahāparinibbāṇa, namely the consecration of the new Mote-Hall of the Mallas. This indicates that the author had no desire to connect the episode recorded with the death of the Buddha also. The location at Sāmagāma seems the more accurate account. The fact that Cunda of Pāvā brought the news to Ānanda no doubt encouraged the idea that the declaration of views took place at that town.
of the possibility of the effect on the order of the Buddha’s death does not indicate that that death was then imminent. It may be noted also that in the Upāli Suttanta the Buddha was at Nālandā when the episode of the defection of Upāli had so evil an effect on Mahāvīra that it brought about, according to the tradition followed by Buddhaghosa, his death at Pāvā. At any rate, it is clear that we have no reason to assert that Buddhist tradition placed the death of Mahāvīra close to that of the Buddha, and it is then obvious that the silence of the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta is inevitable. If the tradition placed the episode as to Mahāvīra before the short period covered by that Suttanta, it could not possibly include it in its narrative. So far, therefore, from correcting the version of the other Suttantas, the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta accords excellently with them. Nor (3) can it be admitted that the Buddha, according to tradition, shows no concern for the future of his order after his death. This runs counter to the fact, recorded in the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta itself, that he assured Ānanda that the place of himself as teacher would be taken by his doctrine. This assurance is significant of the position. It accords exactly with the frame of mind asserted in the other Suttantas to have been engendered by the news of the dissensions in the Jain community on Mahāvīra’s death. In the three Suttantas alike, the result of the news is to make the Buddha insist that his doctrines provided a definite system which would prevent schisms in the community. In the Mahāparinibbāṇa the Buddha gives the same advice; his doctrine is to serve as the norm. So far, therefore, from the Mahāparinibbāṇa contradicting the testimony of the three Suttantas, it is perfectly consistent with it, while there is no evidence whatever that it is earlier in date that the other three Suttantas, or at least two of them.

Thirdly, to strengthen his view that the Buddha could not have known of strain in the Jain community on Mahāvīra’s death, Professor Jacobi insists that there is no record in the Jain tradition of such a catastrophe in the Jain community at the death of Mahāvīra as is suggested by the Buddhist tradition. No schism, it can be asserted, was occasioned by the death of Mahāvīra. Indeed sects among the Jains developed relatively late, save in the case of the division into Ėvetāmbaras and Digambaras which was not the result of a single period of conflict. The Buddhists, on the other hand, knew of schisms in their own community, arising soon after the Master’s death and resulting in the development of the new religion of the Mahāyāna. They did not realize that Mahāvīra was not the founder
of a new religion, but merely the reformer of that of Pārśva, so that on Mahāvīra's death no catastrophe was possible. The Buddhist account, therefore, in the three Suttantās is based on erroneous assumptions and was evoked by dogmatic needs.

This interesting suggestion rests on a very unsound basis. It assumes that the Buddhists believed that a formal schism or a catastrophe afflicted the Jain congregation on the death of Mahāvīra. But this is much more than we can justly deduce from the Buddhist statements. All that is said is that there arose disputes, division, and a wordy warfare in the community and that the lay followers were disgusted with the monks. Not a suggestion is made of a real schism or catastrophe, and there seems no reason whatever to suppose that the Suttantās intended to assert that such a schism occurred. Moreover, it seems hard to accept the view of the paucity and lateness of schisms in the Jain community. The evidence is that Mahāvīra was much troubled by the rivalry of Goṇḍa, whether we regard him as strictly within the Jain community or not,¹ that in his fourteenth year of power his son-in-law, Jamālī, raised opposition to him, and persisted in opposition to his death, while two years after Jamālī's revolt, Tisagutta stood out in opposition.² Moreover, the divergence between Cvetāmbara and Digambara is fundamental, as is fully recognized by Jains at the present day,³ so that it was certainly unnecessary for Buddhists to go to their own experience to find justification for the belief in divergence within the Jain community. There is, in fact, nothing whatever to suggest that Buddhist tradition was wrong in asserting that Mahāvīra's death caused commotions in the Jain community. To judge from the bitter feud between Mahāvīra and Goṇḍa and from the revolts of Jamālī and Tisagutta, not to mention the defection of Upāli, we may take it as certain that the community was far from being in ideal unity of heart. The argument that there could be no schism, because (1) Mahāvīra was the child of parents who were adherents of Pārśvanātha, as he perhaps also was, and (2) as a Kevalin, Mahāvīra was above all worldly interests, cannot be accepted. Apart from the fact that we are not told of anything so serious as a definite schism or catastrophe, it is clear that Mahāvīra was no mere follower of Pārśvanātha. The Jain tradition

¹ Hoernle, *ERE.* i, pp. 267 ff., held that the Jain division into Digambara and Cvetāmbara may be traced back to the beginning of Jainism, being due to the antagonism of Mahāvīra and Goṇḍa, the representatives of two hostile sects.


³ Chimanlāl J. Shah, op. cit., p. 78.
does not even assert that he was an adherent, but, on the contrary, tells us distinctly that he departed in an essential from the doctrines of his predecessor, as was long ago stressed by Professor Jacobi himself, who held that the innovation postulated a decline in the morality of the community between Pāryāva and Mahāvīra. Moreover, even if, as a Kevalin, Mahāvīra was superior to worldly considerations, what has that to do with the effect of his death on the community? The disappearance of a great teacher is always a time of trial for his adherents, and, so far from doubting the truth of the assertions of the Buddhist texts, we may treat them as representing the normal result as in the case of Pūrṇa Kassapa, and common sense invites us to believe that what is normal really happens.

Still less satisfactory is the explanation offered by Professor Jacobi of the cause of the alleged Buddhist error. The Buddhists, he holds, confused the place of Mahāvīra's death, which is now identified with a village, Pāpapuri (Pāvāpuri) in the Bihar part of the Patna district, with the town ² Pāvā in which the Buddha stayed in the house of Cunda on the way to Kusinārā. The correctness of the Jain identification, Professor Jacobi holds, cannot be doubted. This seems a strange assertion, for he holds that the three Suttantas fall in the second or third century after the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha, and he does not give any indication of the age of the Jain identification.³ To assert an error on the part of the Buddhists demands support by adduction of proof of the early date of the Jain view, which appears to be lacking and, at any rate, is urgently required. But, apart from this minor consideration, what ground is there for holding that a mistake as to a place was sufficient to cause the invention of an assertion of the death of Mahāvīra in the lifetime of the Buddha? It is perfectly legitimate to suppose that the Buddhists were right in placing the death of the rival teacher before that of Buddha, even if they confused the two places. But that they were wrong in their identification is so far quite unproved, though possible.

It must be added that the tradition that the Buddha died after Mahāvīra, thus asserted with particularity in the Buddhist texts, recorded within two or three centuries after his death, according to

¹ IA. ix, p. 160.
² Jacobi (p. 561) ascribes Pāvā to the Čākyas, but it is clear that it was a Malla town.
³ The Kalpa Sūtra ascribed to Bhadrabāhu is clearly not by that author, and is wholly uncertain in date; see Winternitz, Geschichte der Indischen Litteratur, ii, pp. 309 f.
Professor Jacobi’s own dating, is not contradicted by anything expressed in the Jain tradition, and that the contradiction rests on the strength of a deduction from two late and unsatisfactory traditions fixing the date of the deaths of the two teachers. If the Jain tradition contradicted the Buddhist by asserting that Mahāvīra died after the Buddha, the case for Professor Jacobi’s view would assume a different aspect; but, though the Jains must for many centuries have been aware of the Buddhist assertion, there has been adduced no passage in which they negatived it. The obvious conclusion is that no doubt existed in either community on this point.

Professor Jacobi has endeavoured on the basis of the Jain and Buddhist traditions to throw some light on the political development of Magadha in the time of the great teachers, but it may seriously be doubted if we can make anything very satisfactory out of these confused and obviously biased records. There is no independent control available, and combinations thus become subjective to the highest degree. But one point with which he deals elsewhere should be noted, his belief that Pāryya can be assigned confidently to a period 250 years before Mahāvīra, a view which is utilized by him as assigning to the early part of the eighth century B.C. that influence of popular religious belief on Indian philosophy, which led to the innovations of the Yoga and Sāṃkhya systems, involving (1) belief in the personal immortality of souls, and (2) the recognition of moral principles, and thus advancing beyond the monistic tendency of the older Upaniṣads with their intellectual disdain for morals: We really cannot accept, as in any sense valid, the date assigned to Pāryvanātha. If Jain tradition was wrong, as Professor Jacobi holds it was, in dating the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra, how can we trust its assertions for a period 250 years earlier? The mere figure is suspicious, and why should we give it any greater credence than we do to the figures equally afforded by tradition for the number of his adherents? All that we can possibly rescue from the tradition is the belief in the existence of Pāryya at some time before Mahāvīra; to claim more is misleading. There are other objections to certain features of Professor Jacobi’s most interesting reconstruction of the early Yoga, but these must be dealt with on another occasion.

1 S.B.A. 1930, pp. 326, 327.
2 See Kalpa Sūtra, sections 161–4.
3 It is dubious if the Bhagavatī, vii, 0, 2, can be understood, as by Professor Jacobi (p. 584), as meaning that the Mallakis and Liechavis were the chiefs of the Kāčis and Kosalas.
The Doctrine of the Buddha

By TH. STCHEBATSKY

We must be thankful to Professor Berriedale Keith for once more calling attention to the problem of the doctrine preached by the Buddha. The problem is indeed important for the history of Indian civilization, as well as for the comparative history of philosophy. Was there or was there not a real philosophy, or, to use an expression of the late M. Émile Senart, “une pensée maîtresse d’elle-même,” in the sixth century B.C. in India? Professor Keith thinks it “really impracticable to discover with any precision the doctrine which Buddha in fact expounded”. The reasons for this despair are several. First of all, an extraordinary diversity of doctrine has developed from the teaching of the Buddha in the sixth century B.C. Professor Keith apparently thinks that if a doctrine has much developed, it becomes “undiscoverable”. I rather feel inclined to disbelieve such an axiom. A rotten seed will have no growth; but a seed strong and healthy may produce luxuriant vegetation. The other reason is more plausible. “What assurance have we that the Pali Canon really represents the views of the Buddha with any approach to accuracy?” But, even if it contained the records of contemporary eyewitnesses, the scepticism of Professor Keith would not be shaken, for “we need”, he says, “only remember the difficulties presented by the Aristotelian view of the doctrine of Plato”—in order to disbelieve an eyewitness of the highest authority. The position is really desperate. Even if the Buddha had been surrounded by a host of Aristotles, and we possessed their authentic records, we should never believe them!

Such a radical scepticism evidently makes all history impossible, and there must have been very cogent reasons to induce Professor Keith to entrench himself in this position. These reasons, I hope, will clearly emerge at the end of my article.

That the final redaction of the Pali Canon is late, was first established by Professor Minayeff a generation ago. It is besides a well-known fact that an Indian text is reliable only from the time that it gets a good commentary. These facts have become truisms.¹

But, nevertheless, the Pali Canon remains our main source for establishing the early form of Buddhism. Professor Keith himself does not really believe that the doctrine of the Buddha is "undiscoverable"; in fact, no one has ever spoken with more assurance of what this doctrine really was, and even of what it necessarily must have been. But as a dialectical preparation to introduce his preconceived opinion he feels it incumbent upon him to condemn all sources of real knowledge.

Another line of argument of the same kind is to require impossible "precision" and "accuracy" from a hostile opinion and to condemn the highest degree of precision attainable on the pretext that it is not mathematical precision. Accuracy, indeed, is not to be found at all in the Pali Canon. Accuracy is not its aim. It is misleading to seek accuracy there. Accuracy is found in later works, in works belonging to the śāstra class. All Buddhist literature is divided into a sūtra class and a śāstra class. The first is popular, the second is scientific. The first is propaganda, the second is precision. What an Indian śāstra is can best be judged by the example of the Indian grammatical śāstras. Who will say that the grammatical śāstras of Paññini and Patañjali want precision? 1 Precision and its companion laconicism are here carried to the utmost pitch of perfection. It is an incomparable monument of precision. It is only natural that the habits of scientific precision which were acquired in one branch of knowledge were transferred into, and imitated in, other departments. We are in possession of a śāstra work which aims at rendering the teachings of early Buddhism with precision and laconicism. That is the Abhidharmakośa of Vasubandhu. It was preceded by a voluminous collective work of a conclave of the highest authorities of the time, where all the fundamental teachings, as well as all the dissensions which had separated early Buddhism into eighteen schools, were carefully recorded and expounded en regard. Vasubandhu's work is a mahā-śāstra, a great śāstra. Now what is an Indian "great śāstra"? It is a work which in its methods, its style, and its thoroughness aims at imitating the mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. This was for the Indian scholar of those times the ideal of irreproachable, painstaking precision applied to a vast subject. It must be noticed that the title of "great scientist", like the title of "great poet", is very sparingly bestowed. Of great

---

1 Professor Keith, op. cit., p. 399, seems to have misunderstood my reference to Pañini (in my book on Nirvāṇa, p. 23, note), as if it implied that he was a contemporary of Buddha—an Ignoratio Elenchi, I fear.
poets, says Ānandavardhana, there were in India "only two or three, perhaps five or six"!

The knowledge of Buddhist philosophy has made comparatively slow progress in Europe because the śāstra-literature has been neglected and precision was sought where it is never to be found. For the educated Buddhist as well as for his opponent in India, Buddhism has always been considered a śāstra. My exposition of Buddhism, in the two works already issued, and in a third which is in the press, is exclusively founded on śāstra works. I have sufficiently emphasized this fact, and I have promised to consider in a prospective separate work the relation between the exposition of Vasubandhu and the original teaching of the Buddha, so far as it is discoverable. This position of mine is so clear that I should have thought it could not have been misunderstood. My astonishment was therefore great when I saw that in an article under the title of "The Doctrine of the Buddha", which is exclusively devoted to a refutation of my views, I am represented by Professor Berriedale Keith as endeavouring, in my two books already issued, to discover the undiscoverable doctrine of the Buddha and to do it on the basis of the Pali Canon! I leave it to every impartial reader to characterize the procedure of Professor Keith as it deserves. In ancient Greece such a method was called Ignoratio Elenchi, and provoked the censure of Aristotle. Professor Keith does not scruple to resort to the Pali Canon, which has been so severely condemned by him, as his unique source for discovering the real doctrine of the Buddha. For it appears that the doctrine is not in the least undiscoverable; it was declared to be undiscoverable only by way of a preparation to announce its discovery. Nor does he scruple, on the one hand, quietly to brush aside the data of the Canon as often as these do not fall in with his preconceived opinions, and on the other to appeal to its late date as an irrefutable argument against every hostile view.

But be this as it may be, I accept the challenge. I am prepared to follow Professor Keith on to the field where he invites me to meet him, and where he evidently feels that his position is particularly strong. I propose now to examine "the precision" and "the accuracy" with which he himself establishes the doctrine of the Buddha by the methods recommended by him.

TH. STCHERBATSKY—

TWO METHODS CONTRASTED

These methods are not complicated. They consist of three principles. The views we are justified in ascribing to the Buddha must, according to him, be (1) simple, (2) in accord with the trend of opinion in his day, and (3) more calculated to secure the adherence of a large circle of followers.\(^1\) Everything refined, or above the primitive, and every unattractive idea must be rejected. In these three principles we are invited to believe, without a shade of that scepticism which is legitimate only in regard to the Pali Canon.

I must confess that I feel much more sceptical in regard to the efficacy of these three principles than in regard to the Pali Canon. Professor Minayeff, who was the first to establish the late origin of the Pali Canon, has also pointed to the way in which it must be supplemented. The dissensions which arose in the community soon after the death of Buddha, and the doctrines professed by his contemporaries, afford valuable supplementary information. We are indebted to the late Dr. Hoernle for an excellent account of the doctrine professed by one of Buddha’s contemporaries, of whom no direct tradition at all has survived. The doctrine of Gosāla Makkhaliputta is neither very simple nor is it peculiarly attractive, but it starts from a definite conception of the stability of the world and attempts to explain its composition and destinies by logical deduction from that principle. It is an illuminating contrast to the Buddhist system, which is contemporaneous and starts from the opposite view of the world’s instability. In his work of reconstruction Dr. Hoernle did not rely on \textit{a priori} principles, but on a careful study of texts whose late final redaction was no secret for him. It hardly needs to be mentioned that Professor H. Jacobi, in reconstructing the early period of Jaina philosophy, did not rely upon general views of the sort recommended by Professor Keith. In reconstructing the doctrine of the Buddha we must proceed in a similar way; we must compare the records of the Pali Canon with what we know about the condition of Indian philosophy in the time preceding the age of Buddha, with what followed it, and with what was contemporaneous with it. The Sāṅkhya system is known to us from evidence much later than the Pali Canon; we nevertheless know that in some fundamental form it preceded Buddhism, and indeed bears witness to the trend of philosophic opinion

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 396.
of the day. In thus attacking the position from the rear and from
the front we shall establish the trend of philosophic opinion in his
days, not of course with mathematical precision, but, I hope, much
better than by a blind belief in gratuitous a priori principles established
on no one knows what evidence.

I now beg leave in a short summary to recall that system of
philosophic Pluralism which in my opinion clearly emerges, albeit
through later evidence, as the initial form of Buddhism.

The General Features of all Buddhism

If we confine ourselves to the historically ascertained forms of
Buddhism, we must distinguish between three main phases of that
philosophical religion. Each of them has its central conception; they
are respectively Pluralism, Monism, and Idealism. The Sanskrit
terms designating them are pudgala-śūnyatā, sarva-dharma-śūnyatā,
and bāhya-artha-śūnyatā. These are negative definitions meaning:
(1) Unreality of the Ego, (2) Unreality of all Elements of Existence,
(3) Unreality of the External World. Their implied positive meaning
is respectively, (1) Plurality of interrelated and ultimate Elements of
the Personality, (2) Relativity and consequent Unreality of all these
Elements, and the unique Reality of the Immutable Whole, (3) Ideality
of these Elements and of all cognizable things.

But if the leading principles of these three Buddhisms are so
different and even so contradictory, as Pluralism and Monism, as
Realism and Idealism, is there anything general at all which can be
predicated of Buddhism?

Yes, there is. Disregarding the pluralism, relativity, and ideality
of the elements of existence, there are these elements themselves, the
"elementariness" of Existence, the denial of a permanent substantial
Ego, and the splitting of it into separate elements—that is the central
conception out of which all the subsequent diversity of doctrine
developed. These elements are classified from different points of
view, according to the requirements of the system, as five groups of
elements in the life of an individual, as twelve bases of all cognition,

---

1 In order to avoid all misunderstanding I must repeat that I assume that the
metrical Upanishads were either preceded by, or were contemporaneous with, the
Sāṁkhya system; and that both preceded, or were contemporaneous with, the rise
of the Dharma-theory. Under early Buddhism I understand this theory, not all its
details, of course, but its very definite essence as expressed in the Buddhist Credo.
There are no precise dates. In the following short summary I omit all references to
texts, since they will be found in my two works mentioned above.

2 dharmatā.
and as eighteen, or less, component principles of life in the different spheres of existence. The elements are "dependently originating", that is, interrelated according to causal laws. They are not stable elements, but impermanent energies. Their beginningless unrest is produced by the influence of the forces of ignorance and desire. By restraint, by knowledge, and by the mystic power of Meditation they are gradually reduced and finally brought to a standstill in Nirvāṇa. The theory, which denies the existence of an eternal Soul, and which replaces it by a plurality of interrelated non-eternal Elements, is established only in order to teach their gradual reduction and final rest.

These are the general features of Buddhism in all the above-mentioned three aspects which it presents to us in its historical development. To recapitulate, they are: (1) denial of a Soul, (2) its replacement by separate Elements, (3) their classification into groups, bases, and components, (4) the law of their dependent origination, (5) their impermanence, (6) their moral unrest produced by ignorance, (7) their purification produced by the element of transcendent knowledge, (8) the mystical powers produced by the element of trance, (9) rebirth in higher realms or paradises, and, after that, (10) Nirvāṇa.

Is there any other, fourth, kind of Buddhism? Is there any simple Buddhism without this complication of soul-deny and without a system of energies, scientifically constructed, interrelated and steering towards final quiescence? No, there is no such form!—except in the imagination of some European scholars. For example, a Buddhism without Nirvāṇa has been recently invented, but the reason of that is only the fact that the Mahāyāna doctrine of the equipollency of Samsāra and Nirvāṇa—quite logical in a monistic system—has been utterly misunderstood by the inventor. Another Buddhism, without a denial of soul and, consequently, without the theory of elements, has been discovered by Professor Keith. That is a Buddhism without a trace of Buddhism in it. But it is, we are told, the Buddhism of Buddha himself! ¹

THE FEATURES OF THE EARLY PERIOD

(1) Denial of Soul

The starting-point of Buddhism is the denial of a permanent Ego. There is in the life of the individual no abiding principle, no ego, no

¹ According to M. Jean Przybucki (Le Concile de Rājagṛha, p. 369) primitive Buddhism was a religion of joy (une religion de joie). This is established on the authority (very feeble!) of the Chinese patriarch Tsong-mi!
soul, no concrete personality. The Spirit is even much less permanent than the body. Every sensation, every thought, every mental phenomenon is instantaneous. It disappears as soon as it appears, in order to be followed by a next moment. Buddhism is called the theory of No-Soul. Whosoever wishes to understand Buddhism must fully realize the decision and the vigour with which this doctrine is professed and defended. In this respect Buddhism stands alone among the great philosophies and religions of mankind. It professes a psychology without a Soul at a very early date in the history of human thought. The question naturally arises: What induced the founder or the founders of Buddhism to adopt this position—a position purely philosophical, which clearly indicates that philosophy had already parted company with religion. An explanation can be found in the following direction. The Sāṅkhya system of philosophy which preceded Buddhism had a Soul-theory which provoked the criticism of the Buddhists. It assumed an individual Soul as a pure spirit, a motionless, changeless, eternal light of pure consciousness. All mental phenomena, sensations, feelings, volitions were separated from it and relegated to the sphere of physiology.

This pure Soul was nevertheless somehow contaminated by a connection with Matter, from which connection it becomes delivered in a mystic way by a transcendental intuition of the Superman. This Soul-theory the founder of Buddhism is reported to have called a doctrine of fools. It is a known fact that philosophy develops not only by gradual progress in the same direction, but also dialectically, by contrasts. The union of the motionless eternal Soul with matter and its final deliverance is indeed a weak point in the Sāṅkhya theory, and the unfavourable view of it held in the Pali records may be an echo of spirited discussions which raged upon that problem at the time of Buddha.

(2) Reality of Separate Elements

The positive corollary from denial of Soul is the theory of the Elements of Existence. The principle is laid down that every composite thing contains nothing real over and above the parts of which it is composed. Real are only the parts, that is, the ultimate parts, the Elements. Element and Reality are synonymous. An Element is defined as a "bearer of one's own (separate) essence". It is a separate Element, a separate Unity, a Thing as it is strictly in itself, shorn of

1 anātma-rāda.
2 sva-laksana-dhārayād dharmah.
all extensions. The Individual, the Personality is nothing over and above the ultimate Elements of Matter and Mind of which it is composed. All these Elements, although separate unities, are held together in the formation of the life of an Individual, not by any spiritual substance, but by causal laws. The idea that there can be a real unity between the Elements, that they inhere in a pervasive whole with which they are identical, this idea is the first cardinal error, and sin,\(^1\) of which the aspiring Buddhist must rid himself at all costs.

(3) Classifications of the Elements

The classification of the Elements of existence is a most important part of the Buddhist theory. It is mainly owing to the neglect of it that Buddhist philosophy has been so long misunderstood in Europe. The classifications are numerous, and undertaken from different standpoints. This alone shows the care that has been bestowed on the theory of separate Elements as ultimate realities. The most important classifications are the following:—

(1) By a first broad dichotomy all Elements are divided into Caused and Uncaused.\(^2\) The Uncaused or eternal are Space, i.e. empty Space, and Nirvāṇa, as a place where all causes are brought to a standstill. Notwithstanding their negative character, these eternal Elements are assumed as real. All the other Elements are Caused, i.e. impermanent.

(2) By another broad dichotomy all Elements are divided into those “influenced” by Ignorance and those “uninfluenced” by it.\(^3\) In the first group the life of the “individual” is in full swing; it is shaped under the influence of an egoistic Will,\(^4\) unappeased by higher Knowledge,\(^5\) and it produces the ordinary man.\(^6\) The second group produces Individuals in whom the interest in life is on the wane and approaches to a standstill.\(^7\) They are the Saint \(^8\) and the Buddha.

(3) By another division all Elements are classified as physical, mental, and pure forces,\(^9\) i.e. such forces as are neither physical nor mental, e.g. the forces of Production and Destruction.\(^10\)

---

\(^1\) sāt-kāya-dṛṣṭi.

\(^2\) samśkṛta and āsaṃskṛta.

\(^3\) sāsra and nāsra.

\(^4\) prthay-jana.

\(^5\) praṇā and amalā.

\(^6\) ārya.

\(^7\) Nirvāṇa.

\(^8\) ārya.

\(^9\) rūpa-citta-viprayuktasamāskāra.

\(^10\) utpāda-sthiti-jarā-anityatā.
(4) From the standpoint of the subject-to-object relation, the Elements represent all things cognizable, and are divided into six subjective and six corresponding objective groups; they thus make twelve "bases" of cognition. They are:

1. Faculty of vision.
2. Audition.
3. Smell.
4. Taste.
5. Touch.
6. Introspective faculty (vijñāna).
7. Colour and shape.
8. Sounds.
10. Tastes.
11. Tactiles.
12. Mental phenomena (dharmāh).

Of these, ten items (Nos. 1–5 and 7–11) are physical, while Nos. 6 and 12 are mental. The mental group thus contains only one subjective element, the Element of pure sensation or pure undifferentiated consciousness. All other mental Elements, feelings, ideas, volitions, moral and immoral forces, are classified as objects with regard to the Element of pure consciousness. The mental phenomena, ideas, etc., are related to the Element of pure consciousness as sense-data to their corresponding sense-organs. They are the special objects of this faculty, the faculty No. 6. But for the apprehension of sense-data the participation of this faculty is likewise needed, because the sense-organs are by themselves unconscious and can, when alone, produce no conscious apprehension. Consciousness is thus introspective; it is pure consciousness or pure sensation respectively. It is extremely important to notice this character of the fundamental Element of pure, undifferentiated, so to speak, empty consciousness. The neglect of it cannot but conduce to confusion.

(5) There is another classification into eighteen, or less, component principles of individual life in the different realms of existence. It is but slightly different from the preceding one. It divides the component principles of an individual into six subjective organs of cognition, six corresponding cognized kinds of objective reality, and six corresponding kinds of sensation.

1. The five senses.
2. The five kinds of sense-data.
3. The (pure) Intellect.
4. Five kinds of sensuous consciousness.
5. Mental Phenomena.

The first twelve items of this division are but a repetition of the preceding division. The six additional items, Nos. 13–18, represent

1. indriya-vidaya.
2. devadāsa-āyatānāni.
a differentiation of one and the same Element of pure sensation (No. 6), not, however, by itself—for being pure sensation it cannot be differentiated—but according to its participation with one or another sense-faculty.

The question naturally arises: why is this double classification needed? Is it not superfluous scholasticism? Was it not added by a later philosophy whose inventive force has not found its proper field of action? The new classification is in fact needed for the formulation of an individual life in the different realms of existence. Only in the lower realms of gross flesh are all the eighteen principles co-operating in the production of the life of an individual. In higher realms, among the denizens of heavens, the principles Nos. 9–10 and 15–16 are absent; the life of an Individual contains only fourteen principles. In still higher heavens, in purely spiritual realms, it consists of only three principles (Nos. 6, 12, and 18). Thus this new division is an indispensable part of the system. The preceding one is probably an inheritance from the Sāṅkhya, just as the Element of pure consciousness is evidently nothing but the dethroned Soul of the Sāṅkhya-s, whose characteristic is also pure sensation or empty consciousness.

(6) The last classification which we will here mention is the most natural and popular one, it divides the Elements of an individual into five groups:—

(i) Its body, the physical group, corresponding to ten items of the preceding two classifications;
(ii) its feelings, pleasant or unpleasant;
(iii) its ideas, or ideation in general;
(iv) its volitions and other faculties, moral and immoral;
(v) its pure consciousness.

The last is the same as No. 6 of the two preceding classifications. The items (ii), (iii), and (iv) are included in No. 12 of both preceding classifications.

This last classification is probably the original production of Buddhism, while the subject-object classification seems to be a possession of the Sāṅkhya, whence it was borrowed with modifications.

(4) Causation

The Buddhist Theory of Causation is a direct corollary from the denial of a permanent Ego. When there is no abiding Spiritual Substance in which the mental phenomena can inhere as qualities
apportaining to it, nor any real personality representing the common receptacle for the physical and mental elements of an individual; when there are only detached elements; something there must be to hold these elements together in order to constitute a concerted individual life. This tie between the elements is simply the Causal Laws. The elements constituting a personality are like a bundle of reeds tied by a cord. But even this simile is not quite adequate, since the Causal Laws do not represent any separate unit corresponding to the cord. These laws are contained in the elements themselves; the elements are, so to speak, intrinsically law-abiding. This circumstance lies at the bottom of the fact that so many European scholars have failed to discriminate between the meaning of Law and Element. In fact, the conceptions of law, of quality, and of element are designated by the same term.¹

The elements are interdependent. As impermanent elements they constantly originate, but they originate in mutual interdependence. The causal laws are called the Laws of Dependent Origination.

If we were called upon to determine to which of the modern theories of causation the Buddhist idea comes nearest, we should answer that it is a theory of causation as functional interdependence. We may then remember the words of the initiator of that theory, that when the interest of philosophy for a real ego is extinct, and Reality reduced to separate sensations, nothing remains but the laws of causation as functional interdependence, to explain the regularity in the process of life. The Buddhist theory cancelled the Ego, and was eo ipso obliged to resort to the laws of causality, there being no other issue. It is of the highest importance clearly to realize this part of the Buddhist doctrine. The elements are interdependent; they do not produce anything, they are strictly speaking no causes at all, they "do nothing",² they are "unemployed"³; but given the presence of such and such elements, another one necessarily arises in functional dependence on them. The connection between mind and body is accordingly explained in the following manner. Being given a moment of pure consciousness,⁴ a patch of colour,⁵ and a moment of the faculty of vision,⁶ a visual sensation necessarily arises in the next moment. The element called sensation ⁷ originates in functional dependence on

¹ dhārma.
² nirodhi-pāra.
³ rūpa.
⁴ akāśī-pāra.
⁵ caśur-indriya.
the presence of these three Elements in association; they being present, the visual sensation necessarily appears. The one element is mental and internal (consciousness), another is physical and external (colour), the third is physical and internal (organ). Their presence in association is followed by a new element which is mental and external (sensation). For sensation is an objective element (viṣaya) in regard to the Mind, which has an introspective function. Consciousness does not produce sensation out of itself, neither does the physical element of the sense of vision produce it, but it arises by itself in strict functional dependence on the presence of three elements in association. The formula expressive of Causation is therefore the following: "this being, that appears"; being given the presence of such and such elements in association, a new element necessarily appears. Students of philosophy will at once notice that the idea of causation is here brought in line with the form of the hypothetical judgment, and they will know exactly who has taken the same step in European philosophy. How the fact is to be explained and what are its implications is another question, but the fact itself is too obvious to be denied.

Is it possible to explain the origin of life, the roots of a present existence in pre-natal conditions, and its consequences in a future one, without assuming any permanent Soul? Are the causal laws sufficient to establish a future life without the survival of an uncaused Soul in a blissful paradise and without the resurrection of the flesh? Yes, they are, answers Buddhism. The life of the ordinary man, who is bereft of the knowledge of the Absolute, is a revolving wheel which can be divided into twelve parts connected by the laws of dependent origination. Life is dominated by a transcendent illusion (1), in dependence on which pre-natal forces (2) produce the first germ of life (3) in a matrix. Then in the embryo (4) the sense-organs, (5) sensations, (6) and feelings (7) are gradually developed. In dependence on them in the grown-up man sexual desire (8), the attachment to life (9) and the

---

1 trayāṇāṃ sanātipātaḥ sparśaḥ.
2 asmin sati idam bhavati.
3 avidyā.
4 sāṃskāra = karma.
5 viśnāna.
6 nāma-rūpa pañca-skandha in the embryonic condition.
7 sad-āyuṭana.
8 sparśa, it is not at all "contact", it is a caitasika-dharma, one of the 46; this fact alone must have suggested looking in the tables of the Elements for the meaning of all the terms.
9 vedanā.
10 trāṇā.
11 upādāna.
fully developed life \(^1\) (10) with its moral and unmoral deeds arise in due order. In dependence on the deeds of this life comes rebirth \(^2\) (11) and the tribulations of a new life, which is again followed by a new death \(^3\) (12), and so on. The rotation of this twelve-spoked wheel has no beginning, but it will have an end when the element of transcendental illusion, which is at its root, is removed and absolute knowledge, inseparable from final deliverance, is attained. There is absolutely no need for an eternal soul. Causal laws explain the process of the beginningless toil of life much better than the hypothesis of an uncaused eternal spiritual substance. Such is the answer of early Buddhism. It assumes survival in blissful paradises as a reward for virtuous deeds, but it imagines life there as subject to causal laws without assuming any uncaused element. The only uncaused element is Nirvāṇa, which is a complete cessation of all life. It is the element of extinction, defined negatively, but it nevertheless is in early Buddhism an element, a reality, a unity.

Now, is this theory of causation, of which some aspects are so formidably modern, something quite impossible in the moral atmosphere of the sixth century B.C. in Hindustan, or is it to a certain degree prepared by preceding developments and capable of being regarded as agreeing with the trend of philosophic opinion of the day? It is indeed a direct answer to the corresponding theory of the Śāṅkhya school, it is allied to the Śāṅkhya theory of causation by the filiation of contrast. I need not repeat that descent by contrast in philosophy is as legitimate as the descent by similarity or repetition. It is also an answer to two other theories which probably were already in vogue in those days in India. Śāṅkhya assumed an eternal pervasive matter which only changed its manifestations; it is causation "out of oneself". Another theory denied causal uniformity altogether; it was a theory of "causation at random". A third theory, the precursor of the later Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, assumed the real production of one thing by the obtruding activity of other things; this is called causation "out of another self". To all these three theories the Buddhist reply was: "not out of one's own self, not out of another's self, neither at random does causation proceed, there is no real causation (in the sense of production), there is only dependent origination."

\(^1\) bhava.  
\(^2\) jāti.  
\(^3\) jarā-marāṇa.
But first of all the Buddhist theory was an answer to Sāṅkhya, just as its denial of soul was an answer to the Sāṅkhya soul-theory. If an exceedingly ingenious suggestion of the late M. Émile Senart is accepted, the technical term expressing the Sāṅkhya theory of causation is a contamination of the one used by the Buddhists to designate what from their standpoint is the cardinal error of ordinary mankind, an error of which the aspiring Buddhist must at the outset rid himself irrevocably.

5. The Forces

A common feature of all Indian religions and all Indian systems, except that of the Materialists, is the belief in the law of Karma, that is, the belief in the influence of past deeds upon present events and of present deeds upon future life. It is the foundation of morality, because it teaches that retribution for one’s deeds will come necessarily, either in this life or in a future one, either at once or in a very remote future, and neither virtue nor crime will remain unrequired. The popular, crude form of this belief is metempsychosis. In philosophy the belief takes different shapes according to the system. In Buddhism the belief is of course fitted into the theory of elements. Karma is an element, it is identified with the will. Indeed, what is Karma? The earliest definition answers: "Karma is the Will and the Wilful Action." Its function consists in the arrangement of the separate interrelated elements into the shape of an individual life. Life is shaped through Karma, that is, according to one’s own deserts.

Since the universe represents the sum-total of individual lives, of their subjective as well as their objective parts, the universe, i.e. this world, as well as the heavens, is shaped by Karma. The will is thus the central force in the life of the individual, as well as in the formation of worlds. But it is not the only force; there are others besides. It follows from the definition of Karma that all moral and immoral faculties or tendencies of the individual are also Forces. Nay, even feelings and ideas are included in the list of elements as Forces. The forces are called co-operating forces, for the evident reason that a force never produces something alone, but, as we have seen, while

1 sat-kārya-vāda = sat-kāya-drṣṭi.
2 There is a difference between the elaboration of the theory in the Abhidharma and its simple form in the Sūtras, but the idea is quite the same.
3 cetanā ca cetayitvā ca karmaṃ.
4 dharma-viśeṣatvā.
5 saṃskāra.
examining the law of causation, the presence of several elements in
association is always needed in order that another element may arise
in functional dependence upon them. Since there are no forces other
than co-operating forces, we may, for simplicity’s sake, call them
forces shortly; the real meaning will remain the same. Thus all
mental faculties are regarded as companions of the faculty of the will
and included in the class of elements called forces. There are the
general forces besides, the forces of production, decay and destruction,
which accompany the appearance and disappearance of every element
in life. They are not mental forces, neither are they matter, they are
energies simply.

We have seen in examining the law of causation that every element
is a cause, with the exception of empty space and of Nirvāṇa. It is
a co-operating cause in the sense of dependent origination, since when
definite elements are present in association, a new element necessarily
arises in functional dependence. All these elements are “caused”,
i.e. non-eternal, impermanent, and distinguished by this broad division
from the “uncaused” or eternal ones. But they are also, in their
turn, causes in respect of those elements which will arise after them.
Thus in a broad sense all elements, except the eternally motionless
ones, are forces. The term force refers directly to (1) the will, (2) all
mental faculties, except the mind itself, regarded as the element of
pure consciousness, (3) general forces, and, in a metaphorical sense,
(4) all the elements except space and Nirvāṇa. I must again repeat
that it is of the highest importance fully to realize the precise meaning
of the term saṃskāra in Buddhist philosophy. The term has also a
wide application in religion and in common life. But in Buddhism it
has a special sense; it is a technical term of the theory of elements.
A force in Buddhism, first of all, eo ipso, is a unit, an ultimate reality,
an element, an uncompounded element. It is never a compound;
it is the negation of composite being. The term “co-operating force”
(saṃskāra) and the term “co-operatingly caused” (saṃskṛta) have
often been mistranslated as meaning something “compound”, but
the real meaning is “taking part in composition”, hence “un-
compound”. Nirvāṇa and empty space, which are neither causes nor
caused, which are eternal and unchangeable like a “mountain peak”.

1 saṃskāra = saṃbhūya-lārīn.
2 utpāda-sthiti-anityatā = utpāda-nirodha.
3 rūpa-citta-viprayuktā.
4 saṃskṛta.
5 saṃskāra.
never take part in the composition of anything (asaṃskṛta). This has been mistranslated as meaning "uncompound", whereas all elements are uncompound. To be an element means to be an element of a compound, but not to be compound oneself. A product is for our habits of thought always a compound, whereas the Buddhist theory considers the simple element as produced with respect to its antecedents. Nirvāṇa and empty space do not actively take part in the composition of anything. All other Elements of Matter and Mind do so take part. The term saṃskāra is very common in Buddhist scriptures. Not a page of the Pali Canon can be translated correctly without realizing its precise meaning, but this is only possible in the light of the theory of elements. The terms "produced by cooperating forces" and "dependently originating element", or simply "element" are convertible terms.

6. Dissensions about the Theory of Elements

We need here examine the chief tenets of only two schools, because they are directly concerned with the theory of elements. The school of the Sarvāstivādins, according to Professor Keith, maintained that "everything exists". Such a tenet is, of course, meaningless, as long as we are not told what "everything" means. Everything means all the Elements. And that they exist means that the past and the future also exist, the past because it has an influence on the present, and the future because it is foreshadowed by the present. The Element thus consists of a permanent "essence" and a momentary "manifestation" in the present. Such a theory was in danger of shifting into Sāṅkhya, with its permanent matter and its momentary manifestations. The Sarvāstivādins protested, maintaining their belief in the instantaneous character of existence, but they could not agree that the past and the future were absolute blanks. The origin of the dissension is traced by tradition to the time of the founder of Buddhism, and his utterances are adduced by both parties in support of their respective views. That these utterances need not be strictly authentic is very clear from the fact that the schools accuse one another of introducing spurious texts into their canonical collections. However, the dissension itself is an historical fact, and since it was concerned with the theory of Elements, it clearly proves that the theory existed at the time of the origin of the sect and even before, whenever the schism may have taken place.

The other dissension which we will here mention is the chief tenet
of the Vātsiputriya school (Vajjians). They maintained that the personality, although not a real unit, not a real Element, was nevertheless something conditionally real. They did not admit any eternal Soul. This would have been quite impossible for a Buddhist. But they at the same time maintained that the interconnection of the units of which the personality consists was not merely imaginary. Not only did they not admit any permanent Soul, but they did not allow to personality full reality, because reality, according to the system means a unit, and a unit is an Element. The personality is not an Element; it has no place in the list of them. It appears neither among the non-eternal nor among the eternal Elements. But it nevertheless, was something which held together the separate Elements constituting the personality and survived in a future existence. The opponents answered that this personality was nothing but a soul in disguise, and rejected it. Neglecting the law of contradiction, the Vātsiputriyas retorted that their personality was something both existing and non-existing at the same time. Such a neglect of the law of contradiction us not uncommon among the early philosophic schools in India; it is analogous to a very well-known feature of the pre-Platonic philosophy in Greece.

Now what does the character of this dissension mean? Is it not a clear indication that the conception of an Element as a unit, as an ultimate reality, was firmly established in the habits of thought of the contending parties? The trend of the philosophic opinion of that time, as the Sāṅkhya system clearly shows, was to seek behind the cover of phenomenal reality its subtlest ultimate elements, and to conceive phenomena as collocations of these elements or as the co-operation of subtlest forces. The Sāṅkhya system included these infinitesimal elements in a pervasive and eternal Matter. The Buddhists cancelled this Matter, and difficulties at once arose. It is a natural difficulty for a philosophic mind to imagine a reality absolutely discontinuous. Hence the doubts of the Vajjians and of the Sarvāstivādins. But the doubts could not have arisen, if the system of pluralism was not already present in its main lines, containing denial of soul and its replacement by ultimate elements, not inhering in any permanent substance, but holding together exclusively through the laws of dependent origination. Buddhism means no Soul, pluralism, existence of elements, co-operation, dependent origination, instantaneousness of being, its unrest, moral progress, appeasement, and Final Quiescence.

1 *pudgala.*
7. Salvation

These are the main lines of the ontology and psychology of early Buddhism. But they do not contain the chief aim of the system. Like all other Indian systems, Buddhism is a doctrine of salvation. There are three ways of reaching final deliverance: the path of religion, consisting in minute observance of sacrificial rites; the path of knowledge, consisting in philosophy; and the path of devotion, consisting in a mystical union with the adored deity. Buddhism, as well as its neighbour, the Sāṅkhya system, belong to the path of knowledge. The system of elements aims at explaining the gradual evolution from the unquiet life of an ordinary man through the appeased life of the Saint towards final quiescence of the Buddha in Nirvāṇa. It is important to realize that the supreme bliss is Quiescence, and that it is always contrasted with the movement of life, which is suffering. It is quite misleading, and leads to grave confusion, when the term duḥkha is translated as "misery". Even the blissful existence in the highest heaven contains a portion of attachment to life, albeit infinitesimal, and only in this sense, only because it is not Nirvāṇa, is it duḥkha. Life is an evil, but it contains in itself the germs of deliverance from pain. These germs are also elements or forces, forces of moral perfection, the so-called Bright Elements conducive to Saintliness and Buddhahood. By a natural process of evolution they will gradually predominate and gradually reduce the evil and disturbing elements of life. The full number of all the elements partake in the formation of individual lives only in the lowest spheres of existence, where their working is in full swing. But this world is not the only one among existing worlds; there are other, higher realms, there are the Buddhist heavens. Buddhism is not only analytically destructive it is also poetically constructive. It offers us magnificent views of the appeased life of the saints in paradise, which, theoretically regarded, is but another way of co-operation between the same elements which were active in the lower planes of existence, although they are now reduced in number and changed in character. The central element in the lower planes was will, the central element in the higher realms is wisdom. It exercises a purifying and pacifying influence upon the whole complex of the forces which constitute the individual life. There are in the human mind, even in its lowest manifestations, two faculties which are exceedingly precious, because they contain the germ of future perfection. These are the faculty of appreciating an object and analysing it into its elements,¹ and the faculty of concentrating

¹ mati = prajñā.
attention upon something to the exclusion of other thoughts. The element of appreciative analysis develops into the element of sublime wisdom; and the element of concentration develops into the element of sublime ecstasy. This last element when fully developed confers on the individual some mystic powers. With the exception of the Mīmāṁsāsaka system, no Indian system of philosophy is completely free from mysticism. The mystical part can be insignificant, as e.g. in the Nyāya system; it may be predominant, as in the Yoga system; it may be comparatively moderate, as in the Sāṅkhya, the Buddhist, and the Jaina systems. It is impossible to understand Buddhism without realizing that the whole system of the elements of the universe is controlled by the central element of will in the lower spheres of existence and by the central elements of wisdom and ecstasy in the higher realms. All elements are from this point of view divided into those which become appeased by wisdom, and those which are excluded by trance. By wisdom wrong views, the ignorance of the truths of Buddhism, are first of all brought to a standstill. But it is only through the mystic power of trance that the number of physical elements can be gradually reduced and finally extinguished altogether in the purely spiritual realms. The mind of the saint living in these lofty regions is always concentrated, it is in a condition of continual trance. His body is transparent, light, and radiant, his movements are swift without effort; his housing, his clothing, and his food, which is entirely spiritual, are provided by nature; there is no manual work; there is no gross sensuality, no sexual love; there is no hatred and no envy; there is full equality, there are no crimes, no government is needed. The duration of life is enormous, but it is nevertheless not eternal. The saint will die, and may be reborn in a still higher, purely spiritual realm, where he will have no body at all, or a spiritual body. His condition of mind in these realms will be complete rapture in a single idea either of the infinity of space, or of the infinity of pure consciousness, or of the infinity of the idea of naught; it can be in a dreaming half-conscious state, it will be near complete extinction, but still it will not be eternity; he will die, and only in Nirvāṇa will eternal rest be attained. This is the kind of bliss which Buddha has promised to his followers. It is not a resurrection of the flesh in a sensual paradise, it is a rebirth in a pure land of bliss, and, after that, extinction of life in Final Quiescence.

1 samādhi.
2 prajūśa amalā.
3 dṛṣṭi-heya.
4 bhāvanā-heya.
Here again Buddhism does not stand alone with its idea of salvation. Like the Sāṅkhya and Jainism, it is a path to salvation through knowledge and trance and after an existence of bliss in meditative heavens. Its originality lies in the analysing spirit which conceives these higher existences also as a co-operation of separate elements linked together into individual lives through causal laws. Just as in the lower spheres of gross desire the individual life is composed of elements of eighteen different kinds, so in the realms of transparent bodies it is composed of elements of only fourteen kinds, and in the purely spiritual realms of only three kinds. In the Sāṅkhya system deliverance through knowledge comes at once. As soon as the liberating intuition comes, matter, although eternal, has ceased to exist for the delivered soul. In Buddhism, since there are no eternal substances, deliverance is reached gradually through the gradual extinction of the separate elements.

It would take us too far if we were to expound here the Buddhist and the Sāṅkhya theories of instantaneous being. Notwithstanding their fundamental difference, they belong to the same "trend of opinion".

Such is in its essence this theory of elements, which constitutes the theoretical part in the first period of historical Buddhism. Its central conception is one of a plurality of separate elements connected by the laws of functional interdependence. The whole system is deduced with irrefutable logic out of this conception. There is only one point where the solid ground of logic is forsaken and Buddhism appeals to mysticism: that is, its theory of final deliverance, which is attained partly through mystic powers. We have endeavoured everywhere to show that this Buddhist system is a legal heir to the Sāṅkhya, and consequently it is well established chronologically in India at the time when we know the Buddha to have lived. It is so established by its predecessor the Sāṅkhya, by its contemporaries, the six heretical teachers, and by its successors, the schools of the Hinayāna, in which it was controversially discussed.

Now, who is the author of this system? It is not Buddha, answers resolutely Professor Keith. But why? The doctrine of the Buddha is undiscoverable, we have no evidence! But is not the system itself a very eloquent evidence? If Buddha is not responsible for it, who then is? If we really know nothing of the preaching of the Buddha, let us call this unknown author the Buddha, as all the Buddhist world
THE DOEATRN OF THE BUDDHA

in fact calls him. But now Professor Keith discards his scepticism! He knows very well what the Buddha Gautama could and what he did preach. He does not want the evidence of the Pali Canon, or if he wants it, he will correct it in accordance with his three general principles. The system described above is "refined", it is not simple; being refined, it is far above the trend of opinion in Buddha's time; and it is not attractive enough for the masses. Therefore another must have composed it, not Buddha. But who? It is "the product of later scholasticism". Professor Keith firmly believes that the intellectual and moral value of Buddha's teaching must have been very low. He was "a commanding personality", but a feeble philosopher. He lived in a "barbarous age". We must "lay aside our natural desire to find reason prevailing in a barbarous age". Then we shall see that Buddha obtained his commanding position not by philosophy, but by far simpler means. He had claims to a place as high as the rank of the greatest of the gods". He evidently had no need to deny the existence of a soul, and he certainly knew nothing about "elements", and such things. In fact, "the crudities of Buddha's views become painful to modern rationalism." But they are "simple", and therefore attractive to the masses. If the Buddha had preached Nirvāṇa as annihilation of life, the least his audience, living in a barbarous age, could have done would have been to clear off. He therefore promised them blissful residence in a paradise called Nirvāṇa. Professor Keith does not give any details of this blissful existence, but since he insists that it was very attractive to barbarians, one may easily imagine what it must have been.

Such is the simple way in which Professor Keith explains the immensely powerful appeal of the doctrine of the Buddha to all the nations of the world, an appeal which is by no means limited to the civilized nations of the East, but has found a strong echo among the educated classes of modern Europe! And if we ask on what evidence Professor Keith establishes his account of the "trend of opinion" in Buddha's days, we shall see that there is absolutely no other evidence than the rejected Pali Canon. Thus the Canon must be interpreted on the strength of our knowledge of the trend of opinion, and the trend of opinion is to be established on the authority of the Pali

1 Ibid., p. 396.  
2 Ibid., p. 402.  
3 Ibid., p. 403.  
4 Buddha. Phil., p. 147.  
7 Ibid., p. 29.
Canon! When it is needed, Professor Keith becomes a firm believer in the authority of the Pali Canon.  

But let us, for the sake of argument, concede the point and assume that the Buddha believed in an eternal soul and its blissful survival in a paradise called Nirvāṇa, and that he declared himself to be "a great god". We must then assume that in the time between Buddha's death and the final redaction of the Pali Canon some obscure reformer whose name has not been preserved, dethroned Buddha from the dignity of a great god, cancelled the soul, and replaced it by a pluralistic system of philosophy. This obscure man evidently did not care to be attractive and did not mind complications. In answer to this, Professor Keith delivers himself in the following way: "The Nikāyas," says he, "exhibit so slight a development of philosophical insight as to render it impossible to accept the suggestions of Professors Rosenberg and Stecherbatsky as to the significance of the doctrine of the Dharmas."  

What is then the meaning of the term dharma, and of all the terms directly connected with it in the Nikāyas? This terminology, we must not forget, is specifically Buddhist: it has been framed for the expression of Buddhist ideas, and is inseparable from them. In Professor Keith's work, Buddhist Philosophy in India and Ceylon, we find sufficient evidence that, if the explanations there given are admitted as accurate, the development of philosophic insight is, to say the least of it, very slight. There is apparently no development at all. "Dharma means object or thing without any metaphysical implication of a far-reaching nature,"  

"a sense which unquestionably is common in the extreme in Buddhism." However, "ideas" are dharmas; are they "things"? The "feelings" are dharmas, and "consciousness" is also a dharma; are they "things"? May

---

1 In his account of the Vinaya (pp. 119 ff.), Professor Keith does not scruple to ascribe to the Buddha himself the rules of conduct of the monastic order and of the layman. However, if he had had an opportunity to look into the review of the Vinayas of all other schools compiled by the late Professor Wassilieff from Chinese sources (the MS. is preserved in our library, and has never been published), he would have seen that the vinaya was much more shifting ground than the dharma. This is also easy to understand a priori. A consistent philosophical doctrine is a much more solid basis than the rules of conduct, which are supplemented according to circumstances.


3 Buddh. Phil., p. 73.  

4 samjñā.  

5 vedanā.  

6 viśuddha = citta = manas; the equation is emphasized evidently in contrast to the Sāṅkhya triplet buddhi, abhinirvāṇa, manas, which are different faculties. The Nyāya later on answered by the equation buddhir = upa-labhir = jñānam, N.S., I, i, 15.
even the physical elements, colour, shape, sound, odour, taste, touch, etc., properly be called "things"? Is it then not more proper to call them elements, since the term equally applies to physical and mental items? That is what Professors Rosenberg and Steherbatsky have suggested. There is, of course, the danger of metaphysical implications, which must be faced, but otherwise the term element seems more appropriate.

We have seen that one of the twelve "bases of cognition" in the classification of all elements according to the subject-object principle is called dharmāḥ (in the plural) simply.1 This item contains non-sensuous elements only, i.e. all elements exclusive of all sense-organs, of all sense-data and of the element of consciousness itself. Professor Keith suggests that "the plural of the term (dharma), which is presumably the older, as it is by far the most frequent, arises from things being regarded as manifestations of the natural and spiritual law which underlies reality." 2 This long definition is, of course, not found in the texts, but is his own elaboration. Does it mean that in the singular the "thing" is not a manifestation of the law, but in the plural it becomes so? Had not the classification in twelve āyatanas escaped his attention, Professor Keith would have known that the plural dharmāḥ is used as a technical term to designate āyatana No. 12.3 If he then looks into the passages of the Nikāyas where this term is used in the plural, these passages will at once be clear to him, and he will be able to produce an intelligible translation of them. But then he will at once be obliged to accept the whole system. The doctrine is so logically compact that as soon as you accept a bit of it, you needs must accept the whole.

Another term, which is "common in the extreme" is saṃskāra. The terms dharma and saṃskāra, says Professor Keith, "come to be used practically as identical." 4 Consequently, saṃskāra must also mean a "thing". But it does not mean a "thing" at all. It means "dispositions" or "impressions resulting in dispositions". However, the predominant saṃskāra is the will. 5 It is also "an Element", and "a mental Element"; 6 but is it really a "thing" or a "disposition"? Nor is it very easy to understand what it does mean when we are told that these dispositions are "without self, evanescent, and full of

---

1 It is the dharma-āyatana, the āyatana No. 12.  
2 Buddh. Phil., p. 73.  
3 Buddh. Phil., p. 60.  
4 Cf. above, p. 875.  
5 saṃskāra.  
6 cetanā = karma = saṃskāra.
misery”!1 Why should the will be “an impression resulting in a disposition full of misery”? Fancy you happen to have a disposition which is “without self” (i.e. which is no disposition at all?), but nevertheless evanescent and full of misery, you may then be sure that you have had a saṃskāra! The appearance and disappearance of every element is accompanied by the forces of production and destruction.2 These forces are saṃskāras, but are they indeed “dispositions, full of misery”? The meaning of saṃskāra is “consistent and intelligible”, says Professor Keith in one case,3 but in another context he complains of its “vagueness”.4 However, if he had looked into the tables appended to my Central Conception, the vagueness would have disappeared. He would then have known exactly which dharma are never saṃskāras, which are always saṃskāras, which may be and may not be saṃskāras, which are mental,5 and which are “non-mental”.6 But then he would also have seen that the system of dharmas is present on every page of the Pali Canon in the meaning suggested by Professors O. Rosenberg and Th. Stcherbatsky.7

A very important term is viṣṇāna, “pure consciousness” or “pure sensation”. Its meaning becomes at once clear when its position in the subject-object classification of the elements is considered. Feelings, ideas, volitions are situated in the objective part. The corresponding subjective part, the introspective faculty which apprehends them, is pure consciousness, formless consciousness. Just as in the systems of Mīmāṃsā and Nyāya, consciousness is in Hinayāna formless (nirākāra), whereas in later Buddhism it contains forms (it is sākāra). In this meaning the term appears as the third member in the chain of causation, as the fifth group in the skandha classification, as the sixth item in the āyatana classification, as the

1 Ibid., p. 60. 2 utpāda-svāhitā-jarā-anityatā. 3 Ibid., p. 50. 4 Ibid., p. 86. 5 citta-samprayukta. 6 citta-viprayukta. 7 It is curious that, pp. 201–2, the Sarvāstivādin classification of the seventy-five dharmas is called “a not very happy attempt at an objective description”, whereas the redistribution of exactly the same seventy-five dharmas in skandha-āyatana-dhātu’s is called a “subjective” [sic] classification! This is accompanied by the remark “in the whole scheme we find little of philosophic insight or importance in this, clearly a very important side, in its own eyes, of the activity of the school”. The sarcasm would have been more effective if it had been better grounded. Professor Keith ascribes to the Sarvāstivādin school what is common to all schools, and the āyatana and dhātu divisions, which are found everywhere in the Pali Canon, he ascribes to the Abhidharma of the Sarvāstivādins! If we add to this the double account of the “chain of causation” and the double account of the “skandha-division, we see how the “history” of Buddhism is written by him.
sixth and thirteenth to eighteenth items in the dhātu classification. It is present in every living organism from the first moment of its being engendered. That is its position as the third member of the twelve-membered chain. The moment of conception means already the presence of the element viññāna, it is the primordial element of pure consciousness, the life-principle of a living organism and in this respect the central among all the elements of a personality, the Buddhist substitute for the soul. All differentiation of cognition, all content of cognition, all ideation, every cognition capable of coalescing with a name, is relegated to the group of ideas, under the term samjñā. The contrast between viññāna and samjñā is fundamental; it corresponds to a certain extent to the contrast between sensation and ideation of modern psychologists, and is very drastically put forward by the Buddhists in their classification of the elements of a living personality, where pure consciousness, which is here the same as pure sensation, is separated from ideation as a separate and fundamental item in the complex of Elements forming a personality (pudgala).

Now all this, as Professor Keith remarks on another occasion, is "too coherent and logical to be primitive". He accordingly says: "the mention of saññā along with viññāna is otiose and a decisive proof of the lack of psychological interest or acumen of the observers." He translates viññāna sometimes by Intellect, sometimes by Consciousness, sometimes by both, and remarks that it "comprehensively covers mental phenomena in the Canon". It has escaped his attention that the comprehensive term for mental phenomena or mental faculties is saṃskāra. Viññāna is the only mental Element which is not saṃskāra, it is not a mental phenomenon, but the mind itself. This again is "too coherent and logical to be primitive". Of all the terms of the fivefold division (in Skandha), Professor Keith has understood only the term vedanā "feeling".

1 Ibid., p. 107.
2 Ibid., p. 86.
3 Ibid., p. 84.
4 viz., citta-saṃprayukta-saṃskāra.
5 citta.
6 In order to appreciate this classification of mental phenomena in the Buddhist
7 "Psychology without a Soul" into Feelings, Ideas, Volitions, and Pure Sensation, it is sufficient to follow the ever-changing and inconclusive attempts which manifest themselves in European psychology, beginning from the times when the Soul was divided into "parts" up to modern times, when the greatest indecision continues to reign regarding the places to be assigned to some important items. Bain's division into Feeling, Volition, and Intellect (vedanā, cetanā = saṃskāra, samjñā) has no place for sensation (viññāna); he says sensations are partly feelings and partly intellectual states. On the contrary, Warren and a number of other psychologists declare "sensation and ideation" to be the fundamental types of experience. This would
Professor Keith declares that it is "absurd to assign to Buddhism faith in the uniformity of the causal process or of nature. Why should it be absurd? Because "universal causation is an idea wholly foreign to the Canon" and the Chain of Causation "is intended to explain the coming into being of misery". The origin of misery is then very curiously explained. The explanation starts by positing the element of ignorance, which is but the ignorance of the four "noble truths". Forgetting his scepticism, Professor Keith declares that in these truths "we may, indeed, for once believe to have reached a doctrine, which goes back in form to the Buddha himself, his central teaching". Why is it the central teaching, and what does it teach? The "truths" are just the same and just as fundamental in the Sāṅkhya, the Yoga, the Nyāya systems and in medical science! There is therefore either nothing or very little Buddhistic in them. However, the neglect of these "noble truths" has, as interpreted by Professor Keith, very grave consequences. It produces . . . what?—"Dispositions"! These "dispositions" are of a peculiar kind—they produce . . . consciousness! It follows evidently that the preceding "dispositions" and ignorance of the truths were unconscious! Consciousness which is "visible" (?) does not remain idle. It produces "name and correspond to the difference of vijnāna- and samjñā-skandha (it is the same as nirvikalpaka and savikalpaka-pratyaksa). But this classification has no separate place for feeling and will; and besides, what is most important is this: when I divide consciousness into sensation and ideation I should not mix them up. I should have a sensation without ideation, i.e. pure sensation, i.e. sensation without the slightest ideation. Brentano's division into representation, judgment and emotional phenomena, distributes the intellect into two items and has no separate place either for sensation, or for will. It comes near to the Buddhist division in this respect, that the will is united in the same item with all emotional phenomena of hatred and love (samskāra-skandha). No European classification has any separate place for pure sensation (vijnāna-skandha), although W. James discusses its possibility. Thus the Buddhist classification into (1) pure sensation, (2) feeling, (3) intellect, and (4) will, compares not unfavourably with the indecision of European psychology. The critique which Professor Keith applies to samskāra-skandha is quite unintelligible. samskāra-skandha means, just as in Brentano's classification, "Phänomene von Hass und Liebe," including the will as the chief phenomenon or force (cetanā, rūga, dveṣa, etc.).

1 Ibid., p. 113.

2 Cf. my Conception of Nirvāna, p. 17.

3 Professor Keith, Buddh. Phil., p. 100, gives vent to his "amazement" at "the creation of two curious bodily complexes alone by ignorance" (! ?). He remarks that "the confusion is significant of the lack of skill of the interpreters". It has escaped his attention that the element of ignorance means in this context the counterpart of Nirvāna. When Nirvāna is attained, there is no ignorance and no rebirth; the samskāras, and among them ignorance, are brought to a standstill. The doctrine is by no means exclusively Buddhistic.

4 I.e., belongs to the class of sanidāraṇa-elements (! ?).
form”, i.e. it unites “with matter to form the individual”, and then the senses are developed. After that, “contact” arises which, according to the “scholiasts”, means consciousness again, but “consciousness arising from contact”. The preceding existence was evidently contactless. Contact produces feeling and from feeling “thirst”, “grasping”, and “becoming”. There was evidently no becoming before, and even “grasping” managed to exist without becoming. Birth, misery, and death come after “becoming”! We can believe Professor Keith when he says that “the coherence of the whole is not effective and we can hardly suppose that even to its compilers the construction had much demonstrative force”.¹ Such is the “explanation of misery”, the central teaching of Buddha!

Professor Keith treats of the twelve-membered pratiṣṭhāna-samutpāda doctrine twice, pp. 96 ff. and 179 ff., as if it were two different doctrines. He does the same in respect of the skandha doctrine, pp. 85 ff. and 200 ff. The exposition is such that the same doctrine could have been repeated five or six times, without any possibility of recognizing it as the same. When we come across a term like “the assumption groups” (upādāna-skandha),² we naturally think “what on earth may these assumption groups mean? How absurd!” But when we look into the tables of the Elements and begin to realize that the “assumption groups” simply mean the ordinary man as contrasted with the Saint, we then see that the translator is alone responsible for the absurdity.

It is useless to accumulate further examples. With the single exception of the term vedanā “feeling”, Professor Keith has not translated correctly a single one of the multitude of terms specially framed for the expression of Buddhist ideas. The characteristics of “absurd”, “ludicrous”, “ridiculous”, “otiose”, etc., which he pours upon these ideas, do not in the least affect real Buddhism. His failure is an eloquent proof in favour of the theory of Dharmas. Without this clue to Buddhist terminology, Buddhism is incomprehensible. Nay, the Buddhist Credo, this short Credo which is so different from the Credos of all other religions, which simply says that “Buddha has taught the causal origin of the elements of existence and their extinction in Nirvāṇa” — this Credo remains a riddle as long as we do not know what the elements are. Neither is it possible to extract a genuine doctrine of the Buddha by applying the a priori

¹ Buddh. Phil., p. 109.
² Ibid., p. 47.
principle that he must be personally responsible for the most absurd among all absurdities. I apologize for representing some current explanations of Buddhistic ideas in a ridiculous shape. But their thoughtlessness cannot be better shown. They are thoughtlessly dragged from one book into another, and their absurdity is a disgrace to European science. We must make an end of all these "misery", "assumption groups", "things", "dispositions", "contacts", "grasplings", "becomings", "noble truths", "compounds", etc. Before making conjectures about the history and prehistory of Buddhism, it seems indispensable to know what its terminology means, or else we shall be writing not the history of Buddhism, but the history of our "dispositions" and "assumption groups"!

In conclusion, I must add some remarks on the puzzling problem of Nirvāṇa. Professor Keith insists that it necessarily must be something "real". The reason is that it must be "simple", in accord with a "barbarous" age, etc. But this is evidently begging the question. It has apparently escaped his attention that there is no deficiency of paradises in Buddhism. There is no resurrection of the flesh—this idea seems absurd to the Buddhist—but a new and radiant body, a new and purified consciousness are created in blissful paradises as a continuation of a virtuous life, according to the laws of dependent origination. Life in the paradise is of enormous duration, but it is not eternity. Real eternity is absence of change, and that means absence of life. Eternity means extinction (nīrodha) of all energies (samskāras), Entropy. It is curious that Professor Keith insists upon the necessary "reality" of Nirvāṇa in opposition to my views, whereas if anything is clear to the reader of my two books, it must be that in Hīnayāna Nirvāṇa is a Dharma, consequently, a reality, a separate reality, an ultimate reality, an element. This has

1 *Buddh. Phil.*, p. 63—it is suggested that Buddha's agnosticism means that he really knew nothing about Nirvāṇa, "he allowed men to frame their own conceptions." "From the general poverty of philosophical constructive power exhibited by such parts of the system as appear essentially Buddha's (? !), one is inclined to prefer this explanation."

2 Cf. article in the *Bulletin*, p. 398.

3 Professor Keith, op. cit., p. 92 ff., apparently confounds the meaning of rūpa, by throwing into the same bag the rūpas or rūpa-skandha, rūpa-ayatana, and rūpādhātu. That the meaning of rūpa is quite different in all the three combinations is clearly seen from the table appended to my Central Conception. To what confusion this want of discrimination leads is seen from the fact that the Buddhist heavens are thus converted, p. 92, into a "world of Matter" (1).
been changed in Mahāyāna, but in Hinayāna no one denies that Nirvāṇa is real, just as no one denies that a long future life in a paradise is promised to virtue.

What is the definition of Nirvāṇa as an Element? It is an “uncaused” element.1 “Uncaused” means eternal, never changing. Are there other eternal elements? Yes, there are. The element of empty space is eternal and never changing, not living, but real. Thus Nirvāṇa in the system is brought into line with eternal and empty space. Are both these negative elements unreal? Professor Keith seems to be naively convinced that there can be no real naught, that annihilation cannot be real! We have arrived at the core of the problem. Was there or was there not a real philosophy at the time of the Buddha, “une pensée maîtresse d’elle-même”? For in philosophy the reality of the naught is a very familiar idea. Omitting all realistic schools in India, and beginning with Democritus, who believed in the reality of empty space and all pre-Aristotelian philosophy in Greece; beginning with N. Cusanus in Europe up to Hegel and Bergson, the reality of the naught has been treated from many different sides. Bergson maintains even that the naught contains much more than the something, and Bradley (Logic, p. 666) insists that “the negative is more real than what is taken as merely positive”.

Now there are unmistakable signs that the idea of naught occupied the minds of early Indian philosophers intensely. They practised concentration of the mind upon this idea in the state of trance. The constructive poetical imagination of the Buddhists has created worlds, the denizens of which are for ever merged in a motionless contemplation of that unique idea. There are worlds whose denizens are for ever merged in the intuition of infinite empty space, others are motionlessly contemplating the boundless realms of pure consciousness, others are eternally staring at the boundless naught. These poetical pictures are again analytically constructed in accord with the theory of the elements. Life consists here of three elements only.2 They are non-eternal, changing, living, causally produced3 elements. Therefore they produce life which is non-quiescent4 still. It is a contemplation of the naught, not its realization. Its realization is Nirvāṇa. To

---

1 Professor Keith translates avasāskṛta as “uncompound” Element. This is quite wrong. All elements are uncompound; not a single one is compound. The term “element” and the term “uncompound” are convertible.

2 The dhātus, Nos. 6, 12, and 18.

3 avasāskṛta.

4 dukkha.
construct a Buddhism without a Nirvāṇa and without the theory of elements is a hopeless undertaking. And if it is so, Professor Keith will be obliged to change his pre-conceived idea of the simplicity, attractiveness, and absurdity of Buddhism and look for another explanation of the appeal of these ideas to the noblest instincts of civilized humanity.

That his estimate of Buddhism is preconceived appears clearly from the fact that he has two theories concerning it, a special and a general one. The special one affects Buddhism only; Buddhism is absurd. The general one affects all things Indian—nothing can be absurd enough for " Indian minds".¹ Taking his stand on these two theories, Professor Keith declares ² that even if the Buddha was the author of the theory of elements, "it is clearly no great intellectual feat to reduce the world into the concerted appearance of discrete evanescent Elements regarded, together with Space and Annihilation, as the ultimate realities." Professor Keith deals lightly with philosophy! Adopting the same supercilious attitude of nonchalance we might also say, "is it after all a great intellectual feat to have reduced the world to two substances with two attributes as Descartes has done, or to only one substance with two attributes as Spinoza has done"? However, in a spirit of justice to all nations, and of a true appreciation of great intellectual feats, we will rank the founder of Buddhism with Descartes and Spinoza among great men. They all were Mahā-puruṣas and Mahā-paṇḍitas.

¹ Bulletin, i.e., p. 394. Cf. Religion and Philosophy of the Veda by the same author, on p. 494 the characteristic utterance "... even for India such a thought is absurd" (viz. that Ksatriyas gave instruction on Brahman)!
² Ibid., p. 395.
Tulu Prose Texts in Two Dialects

By L. V. RAMASWAMI AYYAR

I. Tuluva, a Dravidian speech spoken by about 400,000 people within a comparatively small area in the district of south Kanara, on the west coast of Madras Presidency, has preserved its individuality from a very early time, despite its being an uncultivated dialect with no literature of its own. The Mangalore missionaries were the first to reduce this unwritten language to writing, and they published in the closing decades of the last century a grammar and a dictionary of this speech, besides a few scriptural texts. An attempt is now being made by educated Tuluvas to cultivate their mother tongue as a literary speech through the composition of essays, stories, and poems.

II. From the standpoint of the student of Dravidian this dialect offers very interesting material:—

(a) Its sound system, though in the main characteristically Dravidian, presents features like the following:—

(i) The occurrence of the sound æ as a distinct phoneme in final positions of certain noun-bases and tense-forms, e.g.:

- ta:lae, coco-nut
- bu:lae, plantain
- gu:ddæ, hill
- su:jae, I saw
- ke:ndæ, I heard

(ii) The presence of an initial half-voiced fi in certain sub-dialectal varieties of Tulu, e.g. flu:pas, to see; flōj̄is, to appear; fi:paæ, sweetness.

(iii) The occurrence of voiceless plosives as short sounds in intervocal positions and in consonant groups formed of nasals and plosives, e.g. ka:tmæ, wild, jungly; po:kæ, profligate; ta:ŋkæ, to take care of.

(b) Its phonology (when examined with comparative reference to other Dravidian speeches) reveals a number of instructive phenomena like the following:—

(i) The apheisis of initial syllables of words as the result of accent-shift, e.g. lambe:, to wash; leppæ, to call, etc.

(ii) The occurrence of sub-dialectal ð, s, fi, in initial positions, beside t, e.g. ta:rae, ðurae, coco-nut-palm; te:li, seli, fieli, clear.

(iii) The correspondence of Tulu ŋ or d to r of other southern Dravidian speeches, e.g. na:dræ, to stink; pa:ðæ, rock; ka:ŋæ, stain, etc.

(c) Morphology.

(i) The presence of what has been called the "communicative" case with the affix *du*, e.g. *amme:du pa:de*, *said to father*.

(ii) The frequency of interrogatives on an o- basis, e.g. *odae*, *whither*? *olu*, *in which place*? *ojiku*, *why*?

(iii) Separate "crystallized" stems for the present, perfect, pluperfect, and future perfect tenses.

(iv) A frequentative stem formed of the verb-base *plus -e*, and an intensive stem formed of the past stem *plus -r*.

(v) The reflexive or middle verb-base formed of the past stem *plus* the particle *-on*.

(vi) Different infinitives (with unique syntactical functions) corresponding to the primary tenses, e.g. *ampune*, *to make*; *aptune*, *to have made*; *aptudittu:pe*, *to have made* (in an anterior past).

(d) Dialectology.

The Tuluva speech, though confined within a comparatively small area, is characterized by sub-dialectal divergences which vary more often with communities than with localities. Among all these sub-dialects the widest cleavage is met with between the form of speech used by the Brahmins and that employed by the masses who are chiefly cultivators. Though the Tuluva Brahmins are now found all over Tuluva nādu, their stronghold is Udipi (called Oḍupę by the Tuluvas), noted as a centre of Sanskrit learning and as the seat of eight religious maṭhas following the cult of Madhvaṭhār. The communal character of the inter-dialectal divergences is not peculiar to Tulu; such differences on a communal basis are found in the other Dravidian dialects of the south of India, though not to the same extent as in Tulu. Nothing in this part of the country perhaps better illustrates the cultural aloofness of the Brahmin community than the existence of these dialectal divergences in their speech.

III. Brigel’s grammar of Tulu—the only one that we have now for this speech—gives a good descriptive account of the morphological and syntactical peculiarities of the folk-speech. Neither the inter-dialectal variations nor the details of the phonetics and the phonology of Tulu have been treated by Brigel in his grammar, which, written as it was several decades ago, was primarily intended for the use of missionaries working among the masses.

The present writer was able to collect materials regarding these
particular features while he was on a visit a few years ago to Tuluva nādu. He has since been able to confirm his observations and verify them by references to educated Tuluvas resident in Cochin State and elsewhere. The data thus collected about the phonetic and the phonological aspects of Tulu have already been embodied by him in a contribution to the Grierson Commemoration Volume.

The present paper aims at putting together in a schematic way the main differences between the Tuluva folk-speech and the sub-dialect used by the Brahmins, and to illustrate these by phonetic transcriptions of a few texts in both sub-dialects.

IV. The script used here is that of the International Phonetic Association, which the present writer has already adapted for use in his "Brief Account of Malayālam Phonetics" (Calcutta University Phonetic Studies, i, 1929).

So far as the present paper is concerned, a few remarks explaining some of the symbols may be necessary.

 ⟨a⟩ is slightly more open than the sound in English cat. Similarly ⟨o⟩ is slightly more open than the sound in English boat. The centralized vowels ⟨i⟩, ⟨ē⟩, and ⟨ō⟩ are represented by symbols recommended by the pamphlet L'Écriture phonétique internationale (1921), published by the I.P.A.; similarly the symbol ⟨v⟩ standing for a more open variety of the neutral ⟨a⟩ has been used in this essay in accordance with the suggestion made by the same pamphlet on page 7.

 ⟨ʧ⟩ and ⟨ʤ⟩ represent affricates, as in the other south Dravidian speeches. The plosives, both voiced and voiceless, have a slight aspiration which does not exist in similar sounds of other Dravidian speeches of the south, except Kannada. ⟨k⟩ and ⟨ɡ⟩ of Tulu—generally velar in value—possess a slightly more forward articulation in the neighbourhood of front vowels. The retroflex or caucuminal sounds are here represented by ⟨t⟩, ⟨d⟩, ⟨l⟩, ⟨n⟩, ⟨r⟩, instead of by the ligatural monotypes ⟨t⟩, ⟨d⟩, ⟨l⟩, ⟨n⟩, ⟨r⟩, for the sake of uniformity with other systems of transliteration. ⟨n⟩ represents the dental nasal, while ⟨n⟩ is an alveolar. ⟨r⟩ is usually alveolar, but among some communities it tends to assume very nearly a cerebral value. ⟨ʃ⟩ stands for the sibilant produced with the tip of the tongue on the alveolar region; ⟨s⟩ for the sibilant with the cerebral value, and ⟨s⟩ for the inter-dental "hisser". ⟨f⟩ is a half-voiced sound initially, while it is fully voiced in medial positions. ⟨v⟩ and ⟨j⟩ are frictionless glide-sounds which crop up in breath-groups between the final vowel of a word and the initial vowel of the following word.
V. The annotations to the texts given below are purely explanatory, with particular reference to the inter-dialectal divergences. No comparative references to other Dravidian speeches are given here. Brigel's grammar (Br. Gr.) is an excellent guide to the morphological peculiarities of the folk-dialect and therefore wherever necessary references are made to this grammar in connection with the folk-speech.

MAIN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BRAHMIN'S TULU AND FOLK TULU

I. Phonetics

(i) Medial 1 in the Brahmins' dialect stands for r of the folk-speech:

- bu:l-, bur-, to fall
- ko:l-, kor-, to give
- ta:læ, ta:ræ, coco-nut-tree
- ba:læ, ba:ræ, plantain-tree

(ii) s in the Brahmins' dialect stands often for t of the folk-speech, in initial positions:

- su:p-, tu:p-, to see
- saip-, taip-, to die
- so:j3-, to:j3-, to appear
- sik-, tik-, to get

(iii) j3 corresponds to d of the folk-speech in the following:

- j3a:næ, what? which?
- j3a:læ, anything
- j3a:jægu, j3e:jægu, why?
- j3i:j3-, to be full
- j3epj3i, crab
- da:næ
- da:læ
- da:jægu
- di:j3-
- de:j3i

In one common instance the converse is the case:

iddi, not

- j3j3i

(iv) While aphesized words are found in both forms of speech, in certain instances the Brahmins' dialect evidences the non-aphesized forms:

- (u)olépp-, to call
- adépp-, to plough
- adékka, to cast off
- eræðv, two
- lepp-
- dapp-
- dakk-
- radæv

II. Morphology

(a) Inflexions.

The singular genitive "post-positional" affix in native words of the Brahmins' dialect is generally -to, -do, corresponding to -tv, -dv, of the folk-speech:
maroto, of the tree
kurito, of the sheep
nirudo, of the water

The Brahmins’ dialect occasionally has -no in the genitive singular of words denoting the humans:

aṇūno, of the boy
appaṇu, of the mother

Sanskrit words with final -u, like the following, take on, in the Brahmins’ dialect, the genitive ending -ṇu, while corresponding forms of the folk-dialect fail to show the nasal n:

įjaṇau (a)ṇaṇu, of the people
kastaṇu, of the trouble
graṃaṇu, of the village

Instead of -to, -do, for native words in the Brahmins’ dialect, occasionally one hears -tu, -de, also, especially when the final vowel of the noun-base is a “front” vowel, e.g.:

aritu, of the rice
kuritu, of the sheep

(ii) The accusative singular ending is always -ni in the Brahmins’ speech corresponding to -nu, nun, of the folk-dialect:

maṇeni su:je, he saw the son
pustakani gette, he took the book

It may be noted here that in the folk-speech the value of the final vowel of the accusative ending depends upon the character of the terminal vowel of the noun-base: if the latter is -u (i.e. the value of a appearing in final positions of words), -o or -u, the accusative ending is -nu; but if the final vowel of the noun-base is -u or a front vowel, then the accusative termination is always -nu, e.g.:

arinu unp-, to eat rice
be:lenu mālp-, to do the work
u:runu tu:p-, to see the country
na:du:nunu bud-, to leave the land

This rule of harmonic change of u and w applies also to the locative and the dative endings of both the dialects.

1 The appearance of the nasal in the genitive, locative, and dative endings of certain words of the Brahmins’ dialect is, as I have sought to explain it in my contribution to the Grierson Commemoration Volume, to be connected with a final -m, which the bases of cognate words show in the allied Dravidian dialects, but which the Tulu words to-day appear to have dropped altogether.
(iii) The Brahmins’ dialect shows -(ō)ṇṭu for the locative singular of “neuter” nouns, corresponding to -ṭu or ċu of the folk-speech, when the final vowel of the noun-base is -u; this -u changes to -ō very often in the locative in both dialects:

marōṇṭu, at the tree

Folk-speech marōḍu
dinōṇṭu, at the day
dinōḍu

If the terminal vowel of the noun-base is other than -u, then the locative termination lacks the nasal, and the final vowel is -u or -u according as the preceding vowel of the noun-base is dorsal or front (cf. the harmonic change mentioned above).

gellu, branch

ari, rice

ta:rae, ta:lae, coco-nut-palm
taraṇḍu, talaṇḍu, at the coco-nut-palm
urũu, country

uruḍu, at the country

guru, teacher
guruṭu, guruḍu, at or near the teacher

Note that this is common to both dialects and that the interchange of the voiced and the voiceless plosive of these endings depends on sentence-accent and euphony (cf. Br. Gr., § 17).

(iv) The singular ablative ending in the Brahmins’ dialect is always -tu, or -ttu, corresponding to -ḍuḍu of the folk-speech, whatever the final vowel of the noun-base may be, e.g.:

me:ʒ̄ittu, from or with the table

be:ḷettu, from or with the work

marōttu, from the tree

Folk-speech me:ʒ̄iduḍu

be:ḷeḍuḍu

marōḍuḍu

(v) The singular dative ending in the Brahmins’ dialect is -(ō)ṇku when the noun-base has final -u, whereas the folk-speech lacks the nasal but shows -ku or -gu, e.g.:

marōṇku, to the tree

dinōṇku, to the day

Folk-speech marōk(g)u

dinōgu

If, however, the final vowel of the noun-base is other than -u, then the Brahmins’ dialect does not show the nasal in the dative ending, and both dialects show -ku or -gu and -ku or -gu according as the final vowel of the noun-base is dorsal on the one hand or is one of the front vowels (or -u) on the other, e.g.:

urugu, to the village

karugu, to the foot

devērgu, to the god

kuriku, to the sheep

guruku, to the teacher
(b) Demonstratives, Interrogatives, and Pronouns.

(i) ḫa and ḫa both meaning this are equally common in the folk-dialect; the Brahmins' speech favours ḫa.

(ii) The singular feminine proximate pronoun in the Brahmins' dialect is imböl, she (here), while the folk-speech shows the aphesized mo:lu. We may also note that the proximate masculine singular pronoun in the Brahmins' dialect is always imbje, while the folk-speech has imbe.

(iii) The second person plural pronoun in the Brahmins' dialect is inkül or niku, while the folk-speech generally shows iru, you.

(iv) The folk-speech has an honorific third person proximate plural meru, he (honorific) here; the Brahmins' dialect uses the remote honorific earu only.

(v) The first person singular pronoun in the Brahmins' dialect is emu, I, while the folk-dialect has janu (with the frictionless on-glide being conspicuously heard in the folk-enunciation of this word).

(vi) While epa, when? epja, how? etu, how many? epji, in what way? are common to both dialects, the following differences are observable in respect of the other interrogatives:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahmins' dialect</th>
<th>Folk-speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḫa:nae, what?</td>
<td>da:nae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫa:je:gu</td>
<td>da:je:gu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫe:je:gu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e:jku, what for?</td>
<td>not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e:ru, who?</td>
<td>janu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

da:, which? and daw, what? of the folk-dialect are not heard commonly in the Brahmins' dialect.

(c) Verb-forms

(i) The first person plural ending of all tenses in the Brahmins' dialect is os, while the folk-speech has u:—ampu:u:; we make; folk-speech, malpu:u.

The termination of the simple infinitive is -su or occasionally -nu in the Brahmins' dialect, while in the folk-speech it is usually -ni.

(ii) The third person neuter ending of the primary tenses is in the Brahmins' dialect umu or umu, while in the folk-speech it is always umu:—
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahmins’ Dialect</th>
<th>Folk-speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अम्पन, it makes</td>
<td>मालपन,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अतन, it made</td>
<td>मालतन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अतुदान, it has made</td>
<td>मालतुदान</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अतुदित्त, it had made</td>
<td>मालतुदित्त</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third person singular neuter ending of the negative of the future and future perfect tenses is in the Brahmins’ dialect -अनु, corresponding to -अद्व of the folk-speech. — Brahmins’ अम्पन, it will not make, beside folk-speech मालपन.

(iii) One type of causatives is formed in the folk-speech with the addition of -a: to the verb-base; in the Brahmins’ dialect the corresponding particle is always -a, e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahmins’ Dialect</th>
<th>Folk-speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अम्रो-, to cause to make</td>
<td>मालपा-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कोल्पो-, to cause to give</td>
<td>कोरपा-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पानपो-, to cause to say</td>
<td>पानपा-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) There are a few divergences among the negative verb-forms:

(1) While the folk-speech uses the verb-base plus ज्ञात, the negative meaning not, plus pronominal endings, the Brahmins’ dialect commonly employs for all tenses (except the future and the future perfect where the two dialects agree in employing the negative particle अ to the base to form the negative tense-stem) the simple infinitive of the particular tense-stem plus इत्त, not, plus pronominal endings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahmins’ dialect</th>
<th>Folk-speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>जो बार्पुन (ज)ईद्जः, thou has not come</td>
<td>जो बार्पुन (ज)ईद्जः, thou has not come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जो बार्पुन (ज)ईद्जः, he did not come</td>
<td>जो बार्पुन (ज)ईद्जः, he did not come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Certain popular negative verb-forms are found exclusively in the Brahmins’ dialect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahmins’ Dialect</th>
<th>Folk-speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>बोस्तृ, not wanted</td>
<td>बोस्तृ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अत्र, it was not, did not exist</td>
<td>अत्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>के निरी, it does not become</td>
<td>के निरी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बारप्री, it will not hear</td>
<td>बारप्री</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पापुरी, not enough</td>
<td>पापुरी</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Folk-speech not found at all in folk-speech.
The negative ending (i)r is sometimes fully conjugated for gender, number and person in a few negative tenses in the Brahmins’ dialect.

(v) The present relative participle always ends in -i in the Brahmins’ dialect, while the folk-speech has -u, e.g.:—

ke:ni, that hears
bu:li, that falls

ke:nu
bu:ru

(vi) Among other minor differences, we may single out here the tendency favoured by the Brahmins’ dialect to use voiceless plosives in the endings of certain tense-forms: po:tu, having gone; su:tu, having seen corresponding to po:du, tu:du of the folk-speech.

III. Vocabulary

Apart from the structural variations involved in the instances we have noted above in the section on Phonology, a few other prominent differences in vocabulary between the Brahmins’ dialect and the folk-speech may be recorded here.

(1) The following are some of the most conspicuous among the words which have been separately popularized in the sub-dialects:—

**Brahmins’ Dialect**

to take, gepp-
young, kinni
all, ma:tu
like, la:k
strength, gha:tii, beside jgo:ru

to catch, pass-
to stand up, end-
to begin, suru:vamp-, beside to:an:
therefore, an:ita:vore or an:etavere

coconut, ten:si
scorpion, eje:lu
boy, ma:n
girl, jse:vu
enough, pa:pu

no, atu

to scratch, gi:r-

**Folk-speech**
depp-, beside gepp-
eliu
ma:tu
lekk
jgo:ru, only
patt-
upt-
toa:ng-
ainad:ude or apoca:jinaad:ude
taru:ji
se:lu or te:lu
a:nu
po:nu
i:vu
at:u
jgi:r-
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(2) Though the folk-dialect does possess a fairly large element of loan-words, chiefly Indo-Aryan in origin, the Brahmans' speech, as is only to be expected from the fact that the Brahmans in and around Udipli are the custodians of Sanskrit learning from a very early period, employs a larger proportion of words directly borrowed from Sanskrit. Words borrowed or adapted from Middle Indo-Aryan (particularly Jaina Prakrit and Pāli) appear to be largely common to both the sub-dialects; but direct borrowings from Sanskrit or old Indo-Aryan are far more numerous in the Brahmans' dialect than in the folk-speech. Many of these Sanskrit loans have not been naturalized, but a few like the following have become exceedingly popular in the Brahmans' dialect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahmins' Dialect</th>
<th>Folk-speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>marriage, kaljane</td>
<td>madaumae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear, bhajae</td>
<td>po:digae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food, ahrare</td>
<td>umpu, nuppu, ti:nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast, upo:asae</td>
<td>nompu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man, manusjue</td>
<td>narama:ni, mar:dae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>niri:ru or niri:ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>marja:lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>baccjirae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of adaptations from Indo-Aryan, common to both sub-dialects, we find different modifications of the same word:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>thousand, sa:ve</th>
<th>sa:ve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahm, bera:ae</td>
<td>bra:ae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bra:pti, Brahmin woman is heard in both dialects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trade, uja:pare, be:pare</td>
<td>bja:re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trouble, upedreue, upedre</td>
<td>upedre:re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twilight, sapdaju</td>
<td>tapiju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earth, prithvi</td>
<td>podewi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This passage was read out to me by Mr. Śridhar Sarma of Udipli

1 Word-accent and sentence-accent exist in the enunciation of Tuḷu, as in the other south Dravidian speeches, though the precise character of this accent (i.e. whether it is dynamic stress or tonal pitch or a combination of the two) remains to be determined with the help of scientific instruments. Acoustic impression suggests that "accent" in south Dravidian is far less "strong" than what has been postulated as "stress" (?!) in
from a recently printed version of a legend current in Tuluva nādu. I have verified Mr. Sarma’s dictation carefully.

 Indo-Aryan speeches like Benares Hindi; nevertheless, one has to recognize the existence of “accent” in south Dravidian, as testified to by the varying degrees of “vigour” with which the different syllables of a word and the different words in a sentence are uttered.

So far as single words of two or more syllables are concerned, the primary accent generally falls on the root-syllable. The rules of sentence-accent, i.e. the accentuation of the words in a sentence, are governed by the psychological importance of the particular word or words in each breath-group.

In our texts given here, a bar on the top, immediately preceding the syllable, indicates primary accent on that syllable; and a similar bar below stands for secondary accent.

Breath-groups are marked off by vertical lines, the single line indicating a half-pause and the double line a full pause.

ō and j are frictionless glide-sounds which, in our texts, are indicated as cropping up in non-Dandhi positions, between two words within a breath-group, between the final vowel of the first word and the initial vowel of the second. These glide-sounds occur only when the vowels of different words come into proximity within a breath-group. If the vowels are both “front” in character, the glide-sound is invariably j; and if they are both dorsal the glide is invariably ō. If one of the vowels is “front” and the other dorsal, the character of the glide generally depends, as a rule, upon “accentual” factors: i.e. if the dorsal vowel is affected by greater accent, the glide is ō; while if it happens that the “front” vowel has stronger accent, the glide is j. Very often where the degrees of accent show no appreciable difference, one hears j or ō used indiscriminately. A word like Tulu kai(j)oppu “signature (= hand-impression) is heard very often alternating with kai(ō)oppu according to the fancy of the speaker.
the direction of) 'po:je'ptum | 'erwla | panna:kula
went-so | anyone-even | they-who-said
(Past participial noun.)

not | ruler | necessary | effort | made | messengers (Acc.)
'duradurw | 'kadebudije | de:varagw | 'patte patre
far-off | sent | god-to | vow

'pa:ndonde | 'jkanae (j) apta:ndela | 'magasuddai (j) 'iddi | 'ori
promised | whatever-his-did-get | son-finding | not | single
mag (j) itna:ja:la (j) 'idjept, andu | enku 'ra:jjw
son existed-his-even | not-thus-if | me-to | land

'jjeguir | badukur 'ba:jjw (b) 'ojiku | 'manae | marja:de (b)
what-for | life prosperity | what-for | honour | respect

'ojiku-ptum | 'mape:itula | 'be:jjara:re pasutum
what-for-thus | with-everything-there-and | disgust-having-caught (= becoming
coming disgusted with) "ittae | 'jhabbe (j) ati: (j) 'ene:
"now | aged that-became | I-indeed

diksw patte,upte (j)
initiation-without-catching (= without becoming initiated as an ascetic)

ipnagu | a (j) ene 'mage (j) 'a:ndela | i
remaining-while | that my son | as-for-him | this

'samsrepnta 'mape suskohnkulienla 'budrije | a:ndji
world-of | all happiness-even | left-off-for-good | of-this-type
(Acc.)
mage ne' mage | 'en- ampiureg- itti keloseni
son-indeed son | I for-doing-to | that-remained work

aje ne (j) a:trije | a:de mage | 'ita:ndela
he-indeed | accomplished | he-indeed | son | so-much-get

enku 'buddhi (j) 'iddi | 'jani! enk- 'opjaa:la | bo:tri
me-to | wisdom | not | fie | me-to one-thing-even-not-required

'e:nlula 'po:pe'-ptum | pida:die | a:ndela | 'brahmahnekule
I-too go-shall-thus | started | yet | Brahmins-of

leptum | ojji patare ke:ndruva:pe'tum | tan (b) urugulu (j)
hand-a | one word | shall-ask-I-thus | his country-in

itti (j) odiper:na:kuleni (v) 'olepodije
that-were (a sub-sect among Brahmins)
sent-for-

(1)
a:kulē

"niŋkula (j) 'e:ra:ndə,la' | enə (ö) a: (ö) ori

them-to | "you-of who-ever-yet | my that single

(Communicative case)

magoni 'na'dəmtəw 'kondətərməde | niŋkulegəw | enə

son having-searched having-brought-to-give-if | you-to | my

(ö) 'a:rdə 'ra:jənu 'kolpə | u:ru 'tirigjaaraqwa, bo:da:ji

half kingdom shall-give-I | lands for-wandering-to necessary

'du:ddula' kolpə | mage, siknu (j) 'idja:də | en:e: (j) u:ru

money-too shall-give-I | son finding not-if | I-also land

'budəmtəw 'po:pæe'-'nde

having-left go-shall-I'-'said


this that-heard Brahmins | King-matter-in great

,du:ku bu:dijənu | 'enə:ra:ndəla' | nəmə (ö) a:res:țəgu suk-

sorrow-felt | whatever-yet | our king-to happiness

'a:vədə-ntəw | enjənu | u:ru 'tirigjaaraqwa | 'dumbuttə

must-be-thus | thought-they | lands for-wandering-to formerly

'la:ga:mtəw la' | 'bra:mmənəkulu: | 'gattigu:vədə

early-times-from-even | Brahmins-actually clever-people-actually

'na:də patja:re | nə:nəla' buddhaimantərəw | a:kulə

land-for-catchings | now-even wise-are-they | them-to

'o:degu, po:vərəgəməla' | 'ta:da (j) 'itri | ,appənæ

wherever-to going-for-even | hindrance existed-not | permission

'daŋta,ne | 'ra:pi:va:sokkule'gəməla' | po:tu | su:tu

without | queen-residences-to-even | having-gone | having-seen

'pa:tertu battοnə-dət- itteru | a:po:ne

having-conversed having-come remained-they | thus-actually

i:'bra:mmənəkələlu: | a:resu panənəik-

these Brahmins-even | king what-said-to having-agreed


some started-they | "money give-he-will | us-to pilgrimage

(j) a: la:kə (ö) a:pu:nu | a:res:țiməgənə (ö) 'olfo:tətu | 'battı

that-like become-will | king-son having-called having come

(Acc.)

lakə,la: (ö) anu | nametə | a:res:țəgəu 'ba:lə (j) 'e:de (j)

thus-also became | us-to | king-to great pleasure
will-be "-so | rose-up-they | went-they | how-many
'tirigijérw | a:je ,siknu (j) | 'iddje | 
'sirigijérw | 'tirigijérw | a:je, ,siknu (j) | 'iddje | 
'assemblage-at-and | wandered-they | he to-find not |
'bairaugi 'ra:si | 'ra:si | a:ulña | 'ra:sí | 'ra:si | 'ra:si | 'ra:si |
'vent-they | there-and to-find not-if | afterwards back-only to-come-thus | resolve made-they | there-of | 
'bairaugi 'chattrôgkulèdúw | ascetics-resting-places-at | 'niśōjaj -a:tongjérw | 'niśōjaj | 'niśōjaj | 'niśōjaj | a:lit | a:lit | sulijöngdút | 
'sualpú 'samjôj- a:nú | | i:jèjē (b) | a:kòjégw | e:to: | slight doubt became | thus them-to | how-many | 
'dikkwûdú samjôj- a:tnú | | 'pra:jôjëgn- a:tri | | places-at doubt became | use did-not-become |
'samjój- a:ji 'ka:ñètú 'mànta | 'mànta | mok:lu o:lji kelôd- | doubt having-become place-at all | they one work |
'ampetèrúm | | a: (b) ãrësúmages (b) | urüdú (j) | ipnègù | 
'bedwàr- | 'àdi-npi | ,kañôgitarîw (b) | umpûnîjî (b) | (a name) that is-called field-of-rice-of meal-only |
'unüpuñu | | a: (b) o:lji | kañôgèt- | aritü (b) umpu | | to-eat | that one field-of rice-of meal |
'bàñálu 'parimàlë | | a:jègu | a: (b) aritü | 'ba:ñu 'rujì |
'remarkable | very fragrant | him-to | that rice-at | great taste |
muninnàrèw therefore | | 'ku:dùnàtú | a: kañôgatarîni |
'parimàlë | | | as-far-as-possible | that field-of rice
'pasôndûrûm | | a: (b) umpu bâipi 'parimàlëñk'ë | a:je (j) | taken-had-they | that meal that-cooked fragrance-to-only | he
aít-ittéde | bhattutu tānkulēdu 'pa:tēr,упте (j) there remained-if having-come them-to speaking-without
ipplejē-mitu teritum | samsojic so:zi ,i,gamudur remain-would-not-so having-known doubt arising place-at-all
i: (j) ariu (ö) umplüni (j) ,antōndtút-ittéru this rice-of meal having-prepared remained-they
'nila- ,aŋpoe (j) antērum a:parimālē 'barpoonan to-day-too thus-even did-they that fragrance-to-arise-at-that-time
ori bhattutu | 'hindustan:ndūm 'pa:tērpo:je a-man having-come Hindustani-in started-conversing
'ni:nu,ja:ra:ngdbrum | 'samaskrutu 'kannédu 'malaj:i:lē 'tulu (ö) you-who-said-he Sanskrit Canarese Malayalam Tulu
a:vptē | 'be:te bhā:se | mo:kli:gu becoming-without (except) other language them-to
'barpri | 'fa:di naddapungus | samaskrutgku does-not-come way while-walking Sanskrit-of
kaitolatatti | 'mara:thi near-having-become-that-remained (= that was related) Marathi
bhā:se | 'svalpēsvalpē | terit- | itnu | aítu language little-little having-known remained-it it-in
pa:tērpo:jeru | a:je kaitolu 'tana:tu bhattutu started-conversing-they he near himself-by having-come
pa:tērpo:vecere to:ngm:n'aitavesvur | 'sun:egu (ö) urüdo for-conversing started-because-and seeing-while land-of
i:zana:nta lak:so:zi:un'aitave:rla | samsoju 'ficèjinnu man-of-like appears-because doubt increased
a:nde | 'ga:tgu,siknu (j) iddi | 'bu:djere,maness- iddi yet secret to-find not for-leaving mind not
yet | secret to-find not | for-leaving mind not
íg:orampedere ,dhirjic (j) 'iddi | mo:re morae force-making courage not face-face
'su:pöndérum | 'tul:tu 'karna:tkontu 'mellamellé observed-for-themselves-they Tulu-in-Canarese-in in-low-tones
pa:teröndérum | aítu | ori 'gättige bra:mfiané conversed-among-themselves-they there a clever Brahmin
"i:z:abu ,parēbu (ö) appæ (j) 'ammae (j) ippinégu "old aged mother father remaining-while
The only son of the ruler of that land went away with the Jaina ascetics with a view to becoming an ascetic himself. Nobody could say whither he had gone. The king made all necessary efforts to trace him, dispatched messengers to distant places and made vows to god; but all was in vain, the prince could not be traced. "If my only son has thus left me for good, of what use to me are my kingdom and my home, life and fortune, honour and respect?" said the king, who became disgusted with everything. "Old man though I am, I have not even thought of becoming an ascetic; but my son has renounced all worldly happiness and accomplished what it was my duty to have done. He indeed is a worthy son! And still I remain without a sense of my duty. No! I need nothing, I too shall go!" So saying the king made up his mind to go; but, thinking that he would, before taking such a step, summon the Brahmins and put to them a question, he sent for them and said: "If anyone among you could trace my only
son and bring him to me, I shall give him half my land and also the expenses of the journey. If my son is not found, I too shall renounce the world like him and go." On hearing this the Brahmins felt great sorrow, and thought that the king must remain happy at all costs. From very early times in the past the Brahmins have been first-class travellers. Even now, they are enterprising in this line. Nothing prevented them from going wherever they liked to go. Even without express permission they used to go to the apartments of queens and to converse with them; and so these Brahmins readily agreed to the king's proposal and some among them immediately started on their journey, saying: "He will give us money, we will have an opportunity for pilgrimage, and have the privilege of fetching back the prince also; the king indeed will be pleased with us."

And they roamed through many a hill and jungle, many a sacred place of pilgrimage, and mingled with many an assemblage of ascetics; but there was no tracing the prince. They did not, however, give up their attempt, but proceeded even as far as Benares. Large bodies of ascetics congregate at Benares, and if the prince were not found there, they thought they had only to return. They began to roam about the Chattras (resting-places) of the Bairagis in search of the prince. One among them roused their suspicion. Such suspicions had occurred to them before at many another place, but to no purpose. On such occasions they had been adopting a device. The prince, while in his native land, was in the habit of eating meals cooked with the rice yielded by a particular field. The meal thus prepared was extraordinarily fragrant, and it used to be a favourite with the prince. They had therefore taken with them as much of that rice as possible. Knowing that the fragrance arising from that rice when cooked would not fail to attract the prince and make him converse with them, they used to cook that rice at all those places where they happened to suspect that the prince might be present. That day, too, they did so; and when the fragrance spread around, a man came to them and started conversing with them by putting the question "Who are you?" Now, these Brahmins understood no other language than Sanskrit, Kannada, Malayalam, and Tulu. During the course of their journey, however, they had managed to pick up a little knowledge of Marathi, which is allied to Sanskrit. They now conversed with him in Marathi. As he voluntarily approached them and conversed with them, and as in appearance he looked like a man of their own native province, their suspicions were strengthened. Yet the secret was not easily divulged,
and they had no mind to give up the idea of probing it further, though all the while they were never bold enough to confront him with his identity straightway. They therefore observed him closely and for a time conversed among themselves in Kannada and Tulu in low tones. A clever Brahmin soon clinched the point by crying out: “O! young prince, is it proper for one to do thus when one’s aged parents are living? Has not God blessed our attempts now? We Brahmins have been seeking you for ever so long. It is time for you, young prince, to start back homewards!” That was a time when truth was supreme; and the young prince not audacious to practise deception on Brahmins, thereupon spoke to them in Tulu and in Kannada. Recognition followed, and he that day took the meal which they had prepared with his favourite rice and which they now served to him. Finally he returned to his native land.

Annotations 1

The comparative references made to other south Dravidian speeches are in no way exhaustive; the scope of this essay precludes elaborate comparisons of this type.

p. 1.
907, 1. arasu, king.—This word, with its immediate relatives found in all the other south Dravidian speeches, is a very early adaptation from Indo-Aryan.

The question of the foreign element in the vocabulary of Tulu is closely bound up with the same problem in connection with the other south Dravidian speeches, particularly Kannada. The question has not yet been tackled at all; but we may outline here the different sources:

(a) One of the main foreign sources is Old Indo-Aryan or Sanskrit, which has exercised on the “culture” of Tuluva nadu a profound influence from an early past, particularly through the instrumentality of Brahmins; and loans from this source are of two types:

(i) Words borrowed without any appreciable modification in structure: these have remained unassimilated by the popular folk-speech.

1 The annotations given here are aimed at explaining only those features regarding which Brigel’s Grammar of Tulu fails to afford help to the student.
(ii) Words "vulgarized" and modified by a process of assimilation.

(b) Words borrowed, or adapted, from that variety of Middle Indo-Aryan which was current in the south of India in or about the first centuries of the Christian era. The Jainas (of whom a large number exist in Tuluva nādu, speaking Tulu as their mother tongue) were chiefly responsible for the introduction and popularization of this group of words which are common to most of the south Dravidian dialects.

(c) Borrowings by Tulu (jointly with Kannada) from new Indo-Aryan speeches, particularly the neighbouring Marathi.

(d) Legal terms, of ultimate Persian and Arabic origin, which are the relics of the time when parts of south India were under Moslem rule.

(e) Borrowings by Tulu from Kannada, most of which could be distinguished as such by their unique Kannada peculiarities of structure.

In our text quite a number of direct borrowings from Sanskrit could be marked off: sanjāsi, prajētne, mana, marjađu, ra:ʒju, etc.

As for words belonging to Group (b), it is not always easy to distinguish them from "vulgarized" modifications of direct borrowings from Sanskrit. The test to be employed in such cases is to institute a close comparison of such words with MIA. forms current in the south. This work has not yet been taken up by any scholar, though it is important both from the Indo-Aryanist and the Dravidist points of view.

It is probable that the following words in our text are borrowings of MIA. forms. It will be noted that all of them are found to occur not only in Tulu, but in many other south Dravidian speeches as well. Exactly when and in what part of the south these words may have been borrowed are matters requiring inquiry.

appane, permission, found in all south Dravidian speeches except Malāyaḷam—probably a borrowing of a MIA. representative of OIA. ājñāpana-. ra:ni (cf.
OIA. rājāti), ga:vuda, distance (cf. Kannada, Telugu ga:vuda, a league of ten or twelve miles, Tamil ka:dem and OIA. ga:vutti); dāore, master (cf. OIA. dāurja); mo:sv, deception (cf. Tamil, Malayālam mo:sv and OIA. base mu:st, to steal) are all probably similar borrowings from MIA. instead of directly from OIA.

To Group (c) belong the following:

suddā, news, intelligence, found in Kannada also, but not in the other south Dravidian dialects with this meaning. The particular meaning of searching, explaining, news, exists in Marathi.


sāi, assent, accord, found in Tulu and in Kannada; cf. Marathi sāi, assent.

Words belonging to Group (d) will be found in our third text below.

The following are borrowings by Tulu from Kannada:

kela:su, work, a very old Kannada adaption from a MIA. form based on OIA. kri:ja; cf. Tamil kirijai, work, Brāhūi giras, work.

ba:sēlu, baːlu, abundant.—Tulu may have borrowed this word from Kannada, or direct from Marathi, which uses ba:sēla, baːla with the special meanings copious, abundant.

reccju-, to increase, is taken from Kannada, as the initial fl here is typically characteristic of the modern variety of that speech, having been derived from Old and Middle Kannada p. Tulu sub-dialectally does have initial fl, but this fl is connected with t and not p. This word is cognate with Tamil perug-, to increase, and derived from Old Kannada peccju-, to increase.

bolis-, to serve, shows the typically Kannada causative affix -is- not found in Tulu. bolisu or bolisu in Kannada means to cause to go round, as in serving food to a company of people.

2. ōṭṭu:gu, literally joining (total, addition)-to, i.e. together with.—
The form, originally the dative of ōṭṭu is a common
post-position now, bringing out clearly the idea of "joining", "merging".

3. **auverē(ə)gatum**, *for becoming*.—Constituted of **auverē(ə)gw**, the dative of the infinitive of purpose aŭverē (from aŭp, to become), and aŭtm the past perfect adverbial participle of aŭp, to become. aŭtm in such contexts strengthens the idea of "purpose".

4. **poje:trije**, *went away "for good"*.—A combination of **poje, went** and **itrije**, the intensive past third person singular of the intensive base itr- formed from ip-, to remain.

The intensive is used here for specifically conveying the idea that the prince left his province (and worldly happiness) "for good".

The intensive itr- is formed from the ordinary past stem it- of ip-, to remain, with the addition of the particle -r-.

As these intensives are unique in Tuğu, being met with nowhere in the other Dravidian speeches with similar structural peculiarities, it would be useful to summarize here the rules governing the formation of the intensive bases:

(a) Verbs of the first, second, and fifth conjugations (Br. Gr., § 88) are converted into the intensives by the addition of the particle -r- to the past stem of the respective verbs. The intensive base so formed is conjugated separately for all tenses and moods in detail, exactly like the ordinary base of the third conjugation [Br. Gr., p. 72].

**aptr**- is the intensive base from **amp**, to make of the Brahmins’ dialect; in the folk-dialect we have **maltr**- corresponding to this **aptr**-.

itr-, pāndr-, kēndr-, geṭr-, are similar intensive bases formed respectively with the addition of the particle -r- to the respective past stems of ip-, pāṇ-p-, kēṇ-, ge-pp-.

(b) In the case of the other conjugations where the past stem of the ordinary verb-bases does not end in -t, but in the vowel -i-, the intensive bases are formed usually with the addition of itr-, (the regular intensive of ip-, to remain) to the base of the verb instead of the past stem.
Thus saitr-, buḷḍr-, suṭr- are the intensive bases from saip-, to die, buḷ-, to fall, suṇ-, to see.

Normally, then, the intensive base of poḷp-, to go is poṭr-, but in the singular tense-forms sometimes the fully conjugated form of the base poḷp- is combined with ītr-.

Thus in our text instead of poṭrije, we have poṭjeṭrije.

The intensives are usually employed in the present and the past tenses only; occasionally we hear of other intensive forms like keṇḍrödu, one must listen, alternating with a strange keṇḍrödu with the same meaning. I have heard Vaidik Brahmins often plead nāṅku dāṇe koḷḍröḍappa', gifts should certainly be given to us, my good sir!

4. moṛae (j) aṭu, literally face-having-become, but used always to mean in the direction of.

908. 1. poṭjeṇṭu, poṭe, he went, plus the expletive -uṭtuv of the Brahmins' dialect corresponding to -ṇḍuḍuv of the folk-speech. These expletives are old adverbial past participles of the verbs an-p-, in-p-, to speak. Their original meaning having said is now completely lost through discoloration and they are now used only as expletives. The idea of having said is now conveyed by the form -ṇḍuṭuv of the Brahmins' dialect and -ṇḍuḍuv of the folk-speech.

Corresponding expletives formed from cognate verb-bases with the same meaning, to speak, exist with similar functions in most Dravidian dialects.

boḍaći, literally to want that became, i.e. necessary.—

An old combination used with an adjectival force commonly in both dialects.

paṇḍaḍu.—A participial noun formed of paṇḍi, that said, the past relative participle of paṇḍ-, to say, plus the hiatus-filler -n- plus a:kuḷu, they. Owing to assimilation, -ṇḍin- has become -ṇu- in the Brahmins' dialect.

For other instances of assimilation in the Brahmins' dialect cf. keṇne, hear ye! corresponding to keṇile of the folk-speech.

2. iddi, not.—The corresponding form in the folk-speech is ijjī.
The construction: participial noun plus negative particle instead of a finite verb is characteristic of south Dravidian speeches in general.

ἀγε, he did.—This past form is based upon ἀμπ-, to make, of the Brahmins' dialect corresponding to maḻp- of the folk-speech. I have heard certain Brahmins use the base maḻmp-, to make, also, but ἀμπ- is more common.

4. pāṇḍōṇḍē.—This is the third person singular past form of the reflexive base pāṇdōn- based on the ordinary base pāṇp-, to say. The so-called reflexive base in Tulu is usually derived from the past stem of the ordinary verb-base plus the particle -on-.

Wherever the action of the verb enures in some manner to the subject, the reflexive base is always used in preference to the ordinary base. The nuance suggested is often very subtle; all the same the native Tuluva speaker is conscious of it and would regard as uniidiomatic any attempt to substitute the ordinary verb-base in such contexts. Cf. in this same text nicįjw(v) āntōndērm, they resolved (line 4, p. 13); su:ponđērm, they observed for themselves (line 8, p. 15).

4. magəsuddāi, literally son-nevis, i.e. news or information about the son.

suddāi, news, is an old adaptation, in Tulu and Kannada, of the Marathi word suddāi, with the meaning restricted specifically to news.

4. ori mage (j) itnajela', one son remained-even-he. itnajela', is composed of itnu, the third person neuter past of ip:-, up:-, to remain, plus a:je, he, plus la', and, even.

itnu of the Brahmins' dialect regularly corresponds to ittunqum of the folk-speech.

The use of the neuter form with reference to the subject mage, son, is to be explained as being due to the exceedingly affectionate and intimate terms in which the king refers to the topic; cf. Tamil oru pillōjijirupqādm | avēnum pc:iviitame', a son there was, and he too has gone, where the neuter irupqādm, remained-it, follows pillōi, son, child.

6. jē:gm, why?—An alternative form in the Brahmins' dialect is jē:ja:jē:gm, which corresponds to da:jē:gm of the
folk-speech. The base of the latter form, da:, occurs in the folk-speech with the meanings *which? what?*

The dative ending -\textit{gu}, as in other south Dravidian speeches implies “purpose”.

\textit{oji\text{\textsc{k}}}u, *what for?*—An interrogative found only in the Brahmins’ dialect. It is formed on an o- basis with the dative ending -\textit{ku} added.

In meaning, while \textit{j\text{\textsc{g}}}e:gu, \textit{j\text{\textsc{g}}}a:j\text{\textsc{g}}u, have the general sense of *why?* this word \textit{oji\text{\textsc{k}}}u is associated with the more specific conception: *for what particular purpose?*

10. \textit{ipna\text{\textsc{g}}}u, literally *to-remain-while*, i.e. *while (I) remain.*—ip- the base meaning *to remain*, plus -\textit{n}-, the hiatus-filler, plus the particle \textit{agu}, *while.*

11. \textit{s\text{\textsc{m}}a}s\text{\textsc{r}}\text{\textsc{a}}\text{\textsc{nt}}e, *of the world.*—The genitive singular of the Sanskrit adaptation \textit{s\text{\textsc{m}}a}s\text{\textsc{r}}\text{\textsc{om}}; the final -\textit{m} of the old noun-base in combination with -\textit{t} of the genitive ending -\textit{tw} becomes changed to the dental p by assimilation.

\textit{m\text{\textsc{a}}\text{\textsc{nt}}e, all.*—The folk-speech shows \textit{ma:te}.*

\textit{bud\text{\textsc{ri}}je, left off for ever.*—Third person past singular of the intensive base \textit{bud\text{\textsc{r}}}— (formed from the ordinary \textit{bud-p-, to leave}). The intensive base connotes the idea of *permanent* renunciation on the part of the prince.

12. \textit{amp\text{\textsc{je}}}(@)\text{\textsc{r}}\text{\textsc{gu}}, *for making.*—The infinitive of purpose from \textit{amp-}, *to make*, plus the dative ending -\textit{gu} which in such contexts reinforces the idea of purpose.

The sound -\textit{j-} is an ex cresc ent growth connected with the front vowel coming immediately after; this ex cresc ent -\textit{j-} (cf. the form in this text: \textit{tirigj\text{\textsc{a}}r\text{\textsc{gu}}}) is only occasionally heard, the form \textit{amp\text{\textsc{je}}}(@)\text{\textsc{r}}\text{\textsc{gu}} also being common in the Brahmins’ dialect.

The folk-speech never shows this ex cresc ent -\textit{j-}.

14. \textit{b\text{\textsc{ot}}ri, not wanted.*—Exclusively a Brahmins’ form—the folk-speech having \textit{b\text{\textsc{d}}i\text{\textsc{cj}}i} or \textit{b\text{\textsc{d}}i\text{\textsc{j}}j\text{\textsc{ji}}—cf. other words of this type given above on p. 906.

16. \textit{k\text{\textsc{e}}ndru\text{\textsc{w}}, I shall certainly ask.*—First person singular present of the intensive base \textit{k\text{\textsc{e}}nd\text{\textsc{r}}-} from \textit{k\text{\textsc{e}}n-n-, to ask. Note the idea of “certainty” implied in the use of the intensive base.
908, 17. odipecrnanakulu.—A group or sub-sect of Tuluva Brahmins who appear to have ruled over certain parts of Tuluva nadu in the past.

olepidijke, he caused to be called.—The folk-speech shows the aphesized form lepidije.

909, 3. kolpe, I shall give.—korpae is the form in the folk-speech; for other instances of the correspondence of Brahmins' -l- and folk-speech -r- see p. 906 above.

6. visajontu, in the matter.—Locative of Sanskrit-borrowed visajem; the nasal -n- of the locative ending -ntu is due to the influence of final -m of the word. The corresponding locative in the folk-speech is visajodu.

8. avoduintu, literally must-be-it-so.—avodu, it must be, from a:p, to become (fourth conjugation, cf. Br. Gr., page 93) plus the expletive -ntu.

9. gattigerrude, clever people indeed.—The particle de' confers the idea of indeed. (Cf. Br. Gr., § 146, which mentions other emphatic particles. -de' is very common in the dialect of the Brahmins.)

10. napsana, literally still-and i.e. even now.—The folk-form shows medi ally the alveolar -n- instead of the cerebral.

11. odigw, wherever.—ode, where, whither, is common to both dialects.

12. daptune, even without.—daptae, da:petae, mean not being, without, except; ne' (Br. Gr., § 146) is an emphatic particle.

da:petae, da:petae, occurring in both dialects appear to be the aphesied forms of iddapetae, not being.

potu, having gone.—In both dialects the final vowel of the adverbial past participle is -u when the basal vowel is dorsal and lip-rounded, while if the basal vowel is unrounded the form ends in -ur instead of -u e.g. salutu, having died, sertu, having joined, etc.

14. resu pannoiiku, to what the king said.—pannoiiku is composed of panni [< pandi, that said, being the relative past participle from panp, to say] plus hiatus-filler -n- plus aiku, to it, the dative of ai, it.

910, 3. a:je sikne idje, literally he to-find not-he i.e. he was not to be found.
The use of the infinitive in such constructions where in other Dravidian speeches finite verbs would be normally employed, is characteristic of Tulu. The idea of time has to be inferred from the contexts in such cases. For other illustrations of this use of the infinitive, cf. the following:

\[ \text{aje pāṇḍini: "e:nu barpe," he said: "I shall come"; } \]
\[ i: āḍa:nae (j) eneni nerns? why dost thou abuse me? \]

5. Aulla sikne idjađe bettm. piranne bārpuṇṇam, literally there-and to-find not-if, then back-only to-come-so, i.e. that they have only to return if he [the prince] were not found there also. Note the use of the infinitives sikne and bārpuṇṇam.

6. Aptondeṛu, they made (for themselves).—The reflexive verb is here used to convey the nuance that the resolve was full of importance to them.

9. Samjaj- anu, suspicion became, i.e. (they) felt suspicion.—
anu corresponds to anu of the folk-speech.

10. Prajo:gyene atri, use not, i.e. there was no use.—Note the form atri, did not become, corresponding to aṭṭiṣi of the folk-dialect; cf. bō:tri, not wanted (folk-dialect bō:diṣi) mentioned above.

12. Ampe:tēru, they made often, i.e. they used to do.—This is the third person plural past of the frequentative (cf. Br. Gr., p. 60) base ampe:- from amp-, to make. These frequentatives, unique in Tulu, are formed of the simple verb-base plus the particle e: as in the following: bu:le:- from bu:le-, to fall; ke:ne: from ke:nu-, to hear, etc.

13. -inpi, literally that says, this being the present relative participle of inp-, to say. This form is commonly used for named.

15. Bāṣa:le parime:le; 2. bu:le rufi.—Bō:le, Bāṣa:le, are very common words in Kannada and Tulu, meaning copious, abundant. None of the other south Dravidian speeches usually show the adjectival usage with this particular meaning; in colloquial Malayalam, for instance, the Sanskrit loan bōṣa:lem means noise, crowd. The use of Bāṣa:le as an adjective with the meaning copious appears in Marathi.

16. Anita:were, therefore.—This belongs exclusively to the
910, 16. Brahmins' dialect, the folk-speech having anṣiḍuṇa in its place. The word is an old compound of ā, that, plus -u-, the hiatus-filler + aitū, the ablative of aī, it, plus avarē. kuḍuṇaṭū, literally to mingle-that-much, i.e. as much as they could (take with them). kuḍuṇu is the simple infinitive meaning to be joined, mingled, and aṭu means that much.

17. uṇpu baiḍi parilmolōṅke aje bāttatūr ...—The idea here conveyed is that the prince, attracted by the fragrance of that rice when cooked would come to them (i.e. the Brahmins). baiḍi, that is cooked or that will be cooked is a relative participle of baiḍ-, to be cooked; and in this sentence it qualifies the word parilmolōṅke—The construction has a "pregnant" meaning: (on account of) the fragrance arising from the rice when cooked. Such "pregnant" constructions with the relative participles are not unusual in other Dravidian dialects of the south; cf. Malayālam a: (ō) ari vaikkūṅga manōṭtinē.

Note the meaning on account of for the dative ending of parilmolōṅke; and note also that the final e- is the emphatic particle implying certainty.

911, 1. pataṭeṇte (j) ippaṭatūr, literally conversing-without remain-will-not-so, i.e. that he will not fail to converse.

ippaṭe is the third person singular future negative of ip-, to remain; the negative particle for the future and the future perfect tenses is -a- in both the dialects. (Cf. for the folk-dialect, Br. Gr., p. 106.) The folk-dialect generally uses upp- instead of ipp-, to remain.

8. barpri, (it) will or does not come.—This is a popular form of the Brahmins’ dialect corresponding to barpiṭji of the folk-dialect.

18. ḍhabbu, parōbu (ū) appe ...—The prince is a non-Brahmin, and therefore the Brahmin addresses him in the folk-dialect, as shown by the use of the characteristic forms: malpolju? may it be done? which in the Brahmins' speech would be ampōḷja. berenēru is a popular adaptation in the folk-speech of braumāṇēru. devaṇu sai buḍḍiṭjji? should not God have blessed? contains the folk-form iṭṭi, not.
912, 5. paṇḍrije, _he cried out._—Note that the intensive form (base paṇḍr from paṇ-p-, _to say_) is used here to convey the idea of exclaiming excitedly or crying out.

6. mo:s-ampēre, _for practising deception._—mo:su, as we have already noted, appears to be an old borrowing from Indo-Aryan in the south Dravidian speeches.

II

The following text was composed and dictated to me by my pupil Mr. Gururāya, a Tuḷua Brahmin of Udipi studying at the local college. His enunciation has been verified by two other Tuḷua Brahmins of the locality.

```
| edula | cējna:jila |
| Sheep-and | wolf-and |

| onjji | dine | 'maddājana | 'dembūdēgē | tiruṣē |
| One | day | noon-sunshine-white | | thirst |

| 'jōrafōnditti | (j) | onjji | cējna:ji | tūdēttu | nīru |
| strong-becoming-that-was | one | wolf | river-at | water |

| 'parōndittuwn | | apanēga | a: jotōnd-'a:kkoṛēttu |
| drinking-was | then | him-from-somewhat-on-the-other-side |

| onjji | (j) | edudo | kippīla |
| one sheep-of young-one-also | nīrūdu | (ō) | ēndōndittuwn |
| water-at | standing-was-he |

| auni | su:tu | cējna:ji | " ,ēnkuri | parijāre (j) |
| it | having-seen | wolf | " me-to | for-drinking |

(Inc.)

| itti | nīru | 'jā:na: (j) | i: 'ʃia:ḷampūna | "ptu kē:ndē |
| that-remained | water | why thou | to-spoil" | thus | asked |

" māra:ja: | 'i:parpini:ru | enu | 'ʃia:ḷampun'iddi:de |
| " lord | you-drinking-water | I spoil-to-make-not-indeed |

| inu | kaitōltu | iņējīg 'etta: | nīrūdu | 'ojilūptu | su:la | "ptu |
| your direction-from hither-not | water-of flow-so see-you "-so |

| edu | ken:de | " avōdu | 'aņja:nēdu | 'kali | (ō) | orsōntu | opjgīdīnu |
| sheep asked | " let-it-be | yet | last | year-at | one-day |

| 'kandā:batte | enēni | (j) | i: | 'nerēn | 'ojiku | "ptu | cējna:ji |
| irresponsibly me thou | to-abuse | why" | -so | wolf |

| ke:ndē | " ,enu | 'kali | (ō) | orsōntu | 'putātūnu | ku:du | (j) |
| asked | " I last | year-at | | to-have-been-born even |

(Present perfect infinitive.)
Translation

One hot afternoon, a wolf overcome with thirst was drinking water from a river. At that time a kid was standing on the other bank somewhat down the river. The wolf eyed the kid and asked: "Why dost thou spoil the water that I am drinking?" The kid replied: "I am not doing it, great lord! On the other hand, don't you see that the flow of the water is from you to me." "May be," cried out the wolf, "but why didst thou revile me once last year?" "I had not even been born last year; why then, great lord, do you accuse me?" "If it was not thou it should have been thy mother," said the wolf who jumped upon the kid, ate it up and went its way. The evil-minded oppress the helpless on flimsy pretexts.

p. 1.
924, 2. dembudagu, literally *hot sunshine-while*, i.e. *when it was hot*—
dembu, sunshine, appears as dembu in the folk-dialect.
dembudagu is formed of dembudo the genitive of dembu and agu, the particle meaning *while*.
tirusa J30:ra:vonditti, literally *thirst strong-becoming-that-was*,
i.e. (a wolf) that was very thirsty.—J30:rm, plus a:vond-
adverbial present participle of a:p-, to become, plus itti,
the relative past participle of ip-, to remain.

Note the Sanskrit adaptation tirusa from trsha.
p. 1.
924, 4. parönditte, was drinking.—The “continuous” tenses are formed of the adverbial present participle combined with the conjugated forms of ip-, to remain.

apanēgə, then.—The folk-speech uses apēgə or apēgə only.

5. eipönditīnə, was standing.—Endöqd, standing, the adverbial present participle of the Brahmans’ dialect epd-, to stand, corresponding to the folk-form āpt.

7. jāmānə (j) i: fi:lampu:n-iptu ke:nəde, asked “why dost thou spoil?” —The use of the infinitive fi:lampu:n, waste-to-make, to spoil, instead of the finite verb fi:lampu:n dost-spoil-thou, may be noted. fi:li:n, waste (cf. old Kannada pa:rm; Tamil pa:rm) is a borrowing from new Kannada, which has regularly changed older initial p to f and older -r- to i.

The idiomatic use of jāmānə, what? for why? in this construction is also noteworthy as something characteristic of the Tuḷu colloquial.

8. mara:ja:, great lord.—A modified adaptation of the Sanskrit ma:ya: ra:jgu. Other instances of this kind in this text are—

line tiru:sə, thirst,
(u)orəntu, in the year.

pəu:nküləni, the helpless (Acc.).

11. enəni (j) i: nernu o(j)iku, why didst thou abuse me?

12. enu putṭūdūnə ku:du (j)iddide’, I had not been born even.

925, 1. bet-ikuu enu mittu du:ru pa:rpuna, why then do you accuse me?

Note in these the use of the infinitives nernu, to abuse; putṭūdūnə, to have been born, du:ru pa:rpuna, to accuse, in the stead of finite verbs.

Other peculiarities of the Brahmans’ dialect observable in this passage, but not referred to above, are:

e:dudo kippila’.—Note the genitive ending -do of e:dudo.

Folk-dialect du.

su:tu, having seen.—Folk-form tu:du.

o(j)iku, why?—Folk-form da:jgəu.

-iptu, the expletive appearing here and in other places in this text would correspond to apdūm of the folk-dialect.

beto(j)iku, then why?—The folk-form would be bokku da:jgəu.

pasūtu, having caught.—pattudu of the folk-dialect.
III

The following story is taken from a Tuluva reader printed by the Mangalore Basel Mission. It is composed in the folk-speech. The transcription given below was made by me to the dictation by an educated member of the Bantu community at Kasargode. The transcription has been verified subsequently with the help of other Tuluva non-Brahmins.

ori 'saukare | 'patṭeṇu:lude 'pinḍilēnu | 'bokkōpīzi (J)
One trader | silk-of bundles | another

'urūgu 'sa:gu:vere | 'oṇṭaeļēnu | ba:da:jīgu | pattije | 'pa:ku
place-to for-carrying | camels | hire-to caught | short
gavūde po:ji | bokku | i: sauқarēgəw | 'jārəw battudu
distance having-gone after | this trader-to fever having-come

naḍepēre 'ti:rūpīji | a:peːge (J) | imbe | oṇṭaeļēnu
for-walking able-not | then this-man | camels
derūnjēda pändini | "i: 'dumu po:du | īnējiti (J)
driving-person-to to-have-said | "thou forward having-gone | thus-being
(Past infinitive)

'urūdu 'ku:li:le | a:nu | 'jārə | 'suməru | maḷṭoṛdu
place-at remain-thou | I | fever | better | having-made

'sauka:soḍu barpae:|= pade | a:je | 'a:u:- 'pūmdu
leisure-at come-shall-I said | he | yes | having-said

oṇṭaeļēnu derōndu po:je | a:da∴ | muṭṭūdu | pa:ku
camels driving went-he | there | having-reached | some

'tingōlu muṭṭe:la: | i: sauқar:re | 'baɾuṇdineṛdu | a:je
months till-even | this trader | not-coming-from | he

'taitu po:je: 'puṃdu | a: patṭeṇu:lude pinḍilēnu
having-died went | so | that | silk-thread-of bundles

'maɾuṇdu | paṇeu | maḷōṭpu | 'be:- opīji | keleśōnu
having-sold | money | making | other | one | work

pattije | a:iddu | bokku | sauқar:re | a:daegu | battudu
caught | that-from after | trader | thither | having-come

a:janu 'na:dije | kaḍækəu | opīji | dinōtu | 'tu:vēre
him searched | finally | one | day-at | for-finding

'tikumṇegu | " enu | 'paṭṭeṇu:lude | 'pindilu | 'o:ḷūndu |
obtaining-while | " my silk-thread-of | bundles | where-remain" |
apduđu ke:ndë | a:pegu | imbe | a:je 'gurte 'da:pti lekke
so asked | then | this-man | his acquaintiance-without-like


'pinujæ | niṇe|w:la: | 'pinujæ | a:nu | I-do-not-at-all-know | thee-even | I-do-not-at-all-know | I

(ō) oṇṭe de:rūna:jela: (ō) 'attu | -pde | a:pegu | i: | camel-driving-person-even | not | said | then | this

sauka:re | a:je mittu | 'phiri:ja:di korije | 'kalēkṭēru dūre | trader | him over | complaint gave | collector-sahib

a:jēnu | 'leppōḍudu | 'viṛja:reṇe malpūnēgu | are | him | having-sent-for | trial | making-while | him

edu:ula: | "a:nu (j) i: saṅgṛēnu | 'pinujæ | 'ini muṭṭe | before-and | "I this matter do-not-at-all-know | to-day-till

I: anu | oṇṭājēnu de:rīdūna:jelā: (ō) 'attu | ipde | I camels | driver-even | not | said

a:pegu | 'dūre sauka:ređe | "imbe'ne nikku | mo:se māltūna:re | then | sahib | trader-to | "this-man thee-to deception that-made-he

-gudu: | i: (j) epēju 'ruṣṣvētu malpūnu: | (j) | thus | thou in-what-manner | proof | shalt-make-thou"

innēgu | "enśōppa:la: | 'ē:ra: (j) ittu: pērū | saying-while | "me-with-and | anybody-even remained-not

'a:jōōppa:la: | (j) 'ē:ra: | (j) ittu: pērū | enkīla: (ō) | him-with-and | anybody-even | remained | not | we

'irve: (j) | ittu:d- | a:jinavu: | "ipde | a:pegu

two-only | having-remained | became-that | "said | then

'dūre | "nikkū | 'irve:la: | 'śeśdēru | nikula:gu | 'buddhi | (j) sahib | "you two-and | dolts | you-to | wisdom

'iṣi | nikku | muṭṭu | 'po:le | (j) ipdudu | a:kūlēnu | not | you here-from | go | having-said | them


'marpū du:ru po:na:gu | 'kalēkṭēru dūre | 'kandi ba:ki:la:deptu
yards distance | having-gone-while | collector-sahib | window-door-from

(ō) 'nūṭūdu | "o: oṇṭājēnu de:rūna:j:ā: | opt īpcia | having-stood-up | "o-camels-driving-person | just hither
Having come, thou said, then he walked backwards.

Turning, having-said he responded, from that indeed.

Trader-to deception that made, this man truly indeed.

So sahib knowing him-to punishment having made.

Silk-of price-and that trader-to caused-to-give.

A trader hired camels for transporting his silk bundles to another place and accompanied the driver of the camels on the journey. Proceeding a short distance, the trader felt feverish and found himself unable to walk. He thereupon said to the camel-driver: "Go thou in advance and remain at a certain place, I shall come and join thee at leisure when I have recovered from my fever." The camel driver said "yes" and went away driving the camels. Having reached his destination, he waited for the trader for a few months; but not finding him turn up he thought that the trader had died and so he sold away the silk bundles, pocketed the proceeds and changed his profession. Sometime after, the trader came up and made a search for the camel-driver. Finally meeting him one day, the trader demanded his bundles. The camel-driver thereupon, pretending not to know him, said: "What dost thou speak of? I know of no silk bundles, nor am I acquainted with thee, and I have never been a driver of camels!" Then the trader filed a complaint against the fellow. When the Collector Sahib called up the driver and tried the case, he deposed: "I do not know of this affair, and I have never been a camel driver till now." Turning to the trader, the Collector asked, "What proof canst thou give for showing that this fellow deceived thee?" The trader replied: "There was no one with me or with him; we two alone were there." The Collector said: "Both of you are dolts, get away from here," and sent them away. When they had got down the steps of the cutchery and gone a few yards, the Collector stood up at the window and called out: "You camel-driver, come here for a few minutes." The fellow turned back and responded to the call.
Knowing from this that he had really practised deception on the trader, the Collector imposed a penalty on him and made him give the cost of the silk bundles to the trader.

**Annotations**

927, 5. de:runa:jēdu paṇḍini, said to the driver.—Note the use of the simple infinitive of the past stem paṇḍ- (from paṇḍō, to say), instead of the finite verb paṇḍē (he) said.

928, 3. pinu:jē, literally I shall not know, but idiomatically used here for I do not at all know (cf. Br. Gr., § 111, 3). The form is the first person future negative singular of pin-p-, to know.

5. phirija:di, complaint.—Persian and Hindustani were the languages used formerly in courts of law in several parts of south India which had come under Moslem rule. These old law-terms are now being gradually replaced by other forms, particularly adaptations of English words; but there still persist a few like phirija:di, complaint; ruggōtu, proof; kacē:jē, court; šuluma:n, penalty; all of which occur in this text.

6. viča:ra:ne, trial.—An adaptation from Sanskrit. The folk-dialect has numerous such adaptations from Indo-Aryan. Some of these appear to have been directly borrowed from OIA., but others are probably from MIA. (Pali and Jaina Prakrit).

sa:ku:jē and viča:ra:ne belong to the former category, while

šara, fever,
kaṇdi, window, hole,
mota, deception,
are probably from MIA.

A list of the folk-speech peculiarities in this text, as distinguished from the corresponding features in the Brahmins’ dialect, is given below:—

**Folk-speech**

paṭṭōnu:lūde, of silk-thread (genitive)  
piṇḍilēnu, bundles (Acc.)  
bokkōpiŋjī, another  
tiru:ji, (was) not able

**Brahmins’ dialect.**

paṭṭōnu:lūdo  
piṇḍilēni  
betōpiŋjī  
tirun (J) iddi
Folk-speech

imbe, this man
mal'tondu, making (reflexive present participle)
taittu, having died
ai'dum, ablative of ai, it
dinoutu, locative of dine, day
tu:vre ti:kna:ge, happening to see
ai'dum, expletive
lekku, like
korije, he gave
leppudum, having called
(j)a:nu, I
itijijeru, remained not (they)

Brahmins' dialect.
imbje
a'tondu
saittu
ai'ttu
dinonstu
su:vre: siknagu
u:rttu
lage
kolije
(o)leppudumtu
(j)enu
itnu 1ddjeru or

kaccej:ridum, from the cutchery
uptudu, having stood up
korpa:jervu, caused to give

kaccej:rittu
enpitu
kolpo:jervu
Phonetic Notes on Urdu Records Nos. 6825 AK and 6826 AK

By T. Grahame Bailey

These records were made in 1920 to the dictation of a well-known professional story-teller, Bāqir Ālī, who belonged to Delhi.

A phonetic transcript which has been published is of great value for the study of Urdu sounds. I made the original transcript of both records and had two proofs printed. Professor Daniel Jones, Professor of Phonetics in the University of London, who has to take responsibility for the publication of all transcripts in this series, went over my second proof, made some alterations, and prepared the final proof, which was ultimately printed. He is, therefore, responsible for the transcripts in their present form. I have, however, my proofs before me. The differences between his final print and my proofs are slight, and this article gives our joint views. Where there is any necessity for distinguishing them they are marked with the initials J. for his views and B. for mine.

The importance of these transcripts consists in the fact that the records still exist, and may be heard by any one who wishes to test the statements made. It is one thing to claim to have listened to a particular speaker and taken down his sounds. The speaker disappears, and beyond the author's reputation for accurate recording, there is no certainty that the transcription is correct. It is a very different thing when, as in this case, the speaker cannot disappear, and, what is equally important, cannot alter his pronunciation.

The records afford me much pleasure, for they support, in almost every detail, views which I have long held as to Urdu sounds, and taught my students. They were given ten years ago in the Bulletin, Vol. II, iii, 539 ff. Practically all that article expresses my views to-day.

Cerebral Sounds, called also retroflex. The transcriptions do not indicate the exact point on the palate touched by the tip of the tongue, but the introductory remarks make it clear. "t, d, ṇ, r: point of contact not far behind the teeth ridge, in a few instances on the teeth ridge." This is what we should expect. Similarly Dr. Mohiuddin Qadri in Hindustani Phonetics says of t and d: "their point of articulation is just behind the teeth ridge" (p. 73), and of r: "the tip of the tongue strikes against the teeth ridge" (p. 92).
For the benefit of those who wish to study Urdu cerebrials, I indicate here those which in these records are specially far forward. I make the statement on my own responsibility. I have not consulted anyone else. The Nos. refer to page and line.

\( t \) in eitiha 2.8, lutai 3.18. \( r \) in bara 1.1, larke 1.6, thori 3.3, bare 7.1. \( d \) in khand 5.15, dub 6.4, bodha 6.24, 7.2, (but not in 7.3).

In khatar for kat 5.16, and latakne for latakne 6.12 the \( t \) is dental. These are mere slips.

In the following instances the \( r \) is rather fricative:—bara 1.1, thore 1.5, dora 3.6, larke 3.8, barhae 3.16, bare 7.1, pakra 7.12.

\( v \) is either a faint labio-dental \( v \) or a \( u \). J. printed them all as \( v \) (except one \( vo \) 5.4, i.e. \( uo \)). In my proof I marked several as \( w \), meaning \( u \). It is always safe to advise English speakers to say \( v \), and not \( w \). An English \( w \) always sounds wrong.

\( y \) between vowels is often \( c \). Thus the ending \( ay\bar{a} \) occurs 13 times. B. records a\( \bar{a} \) every time; J. a\( \bar{a} \) 12 times, aja once. English people greatly exaggerate the \( y \) quality of the sound. Similarly the ending -iy\( \bar{a} \) occurs 8 times. Both B. and J. transcribed ia every time.

'Ain. I unhesitatingly teach my students to ignore 'ain, in accordance with the usual practice of educated Delhi men in ordinary conversation. In the records there are eleven words containing 'ain when written in Urdu script. J. has recorded it in two out of the eleven. I did not consider it strong enough to be worth recording in any. This means that in the records the 'ain of the grammars does not exist, and all descriptions of how to pronounce it go for nothing. Even in words like a'mal, mu'taf, 'arse, 'ayy\( \bar{a} \)shi, where it would be easy to pronounce 'ain there is no trace of it. The other day a Delhi man, who is himself a lecturer on Urdu, told me that there was no difference at all between \( b\bar{a}d \), wind, and \( ba\bar{d} \), after.

I will, however, add this. I have heard Urdu speakers, when speaking rather self-consciously, pronounce, with a slight restriction of throat muscles, vowels which immediately precede or follow the letter 'ain.

Hamza, which is only another name for glottal stop, is not recorded at all. It is important to note this in view of statements sometimes made. Hamza exists solely in writing.

\( n \) is generally not an independent sound, but occurs before \( t \) and \( d \). The word s\( \ddot{a}dn\bar{e} \) occurs four times, and every time is pronounced san\( \ddot{n} \). c\( \ddot{a}dn\bar{e} \) is once can\( \ddot{n} \)i and once c\( \ddot{a}dn \).
h is sonant except in the combinations kh, ch, th, th, and ph. We may consider it under two main headings: (1) h initial or immediately following a vowel; (2) h immediately following a consonant, to which it is more or less closely attached. The chief point which concerns us is to what extent is it omitted. In our records we have the following instances. (The word "unpronounced" must be understood as qualified by the addition "or at least inaudible").

(1) (a) Initial, as ħissa, hālat, hai, 56 times pronounced; 6 unpronounced (in hai 4; hū, hue, once each; hue appears as ūe, printed ve).

(b) After vowel before cs. (including the combinations rah-gue, rah-namūnī, kah-suṇācā), e.g. guṇāḥgīr, bahne, pahlvān; pron. 12, unpron. 0.

(c) After vowel: pron. only in the word tarāh 3 times; unpron. 17: viz. yēh je 14; voh ūo, mūh, jagah once each. The h of yēh is never heard in these records, even though twice it is followed by a vowel. voh occurs once and is followed by a vowel, but the h is not sounded. The phrase jagah hai is pronounced jagā ñ.

(d) Between vowels: as kāhā, mahallat, sarohī, sahāre, together with the words shahr, rahm, qaht, which like other similar words are invariably disyllables. h pron. 31; unpron. 16. All these 16 are in the second record, which is more conversational than the first. They are kāhā 8, nahī 5, suhānā 2, yahā 1.

(2) cs. + h: (a) Initial; examples: choṭā, thora, phirnā, jhukā; pron. 57; unpron. 0.

(b) Between vowels; either with single cs. as cārho, inhā, ādhā, dekhā; or with double cs. as acchā, bicche, buḏhā, samjhā, barchi, khalkhalahāṭ; pron. 26, unpron. 8 (muje 4, all in more solemn first record; hāṭā 4, all in second).

Of the 26, 17 are with single cs. and 9 with double. There is no instance of h omitted after double cs.

(c) Final; never pron.; unpron. 14, viz. samajh 3, mujh 2, hāṭh 4, kucch, sidh 2, dekh, bojh, kucch 1 each. h is not pronounced in any of these. In 7 the h follows a sonant sound, and in 7 a surd. We should, however, notice that there is no instance of -th or -ph.

(d) Followed by cs. pron. 2, nikhrī twice; unpron. 1, hathyār.

VOWELS. The two most interesting vowels are those written in Roman script -ai and -au. We are almost always told that they are pronounced like ai in English aisle, and like -au in German Haus or auf, or ow in English how. Actually they are like a in "man" and
$au$ in "maul". In both cases they may be either single vowels or
diphthongs. When $ai$ is a diphthong the second vowel is a variety of
$e$ ($e$ or $e$), and for $au$ the second part is $o$.

The records confirm these statements.

The sound $ai$ occurs 52 times and every time both of us have
transcribed it $ae$ with or without a second $e$ or $e$. Actually J. recorded
it 26 times as simple $ae$, and 26 as a diphthong $ae$ or $ae$. B. 28 times
as $ae$ and 24 as $ee$, $ee$. The important point is that neither of us
ever recorded the vowel in "aisle".

The following are details:—

$ai$ or $ai$ final, as in $hai$, $ai$, $hai$, $mai$, 28, of which 22 are $ee$ or $ee$
and 6 $ae$.

Not final, as in $maidan$, $naiza$, $aisa$, $paida$, $saif$ 6 times. Here
B. had a majority of simple $ae$ and J. a majority of $ee$.

$ai$ for -$a$ followed by $h$, as in $shahr$, $pahlan$, $bahna$, $rahm$, $qaht$,
$kah$, $rah$. This occurred 18 times, and every time B.J. transcribed $ae$.
Therefore stressed -$ah$, final, or followed by $cs.$, is always pronounced $ae$.

$au$ occurs in $aur$ 21 times; $dualat$ 2; and once each in $daurfa$, $aulad$,
$fualadi$, $qaruli$, $aubash$, $muhtaj$. (This last word is often prn. $mohtaj$)
29 altogether. The records show almost always the sound of English
-$au$ in $maul$. J. records 28 out of 29 as $o$ or $oo$; in the 21 cases of
$aur$ he has $or$ 20 times and $ar$ once. I have marked one $aur$ as $or$, and
in other words have twice transcribed the vowel as $o$; elsewhere
always with $o$ or $oo$.

In the remaining words J. has $o$ 5 times and $oo$ 3 times. Thus,
altogether, out of the 29, J. has a simple vowel $o$ 25 times, $o$ once, and
the diphthong 3 times. B. had the diphthong only twice.

Conclusion. The normal pron. of the vowel is always either $o$
or $oo$, and the simple $o$ is much the commoner of the two.

The vowel $a$, stressed or unstressed, usually tends towards $o$.

The influence of $h$ on preceding short vowels. I explained this in
detail in the article referred to. The records before us confirm the
statements there made.

Stressed -$ah$. When -$ah$ is either followed by a $cs.$, or final (and
stressed), it is not $afi$ but $sefi$. There are 18 instances here, and in every
case the vowel is $ae$. There is not a single case of $a$.

It should also be noted that $rahm$, $qaht$, $shahr$, $hukm$, written as
monosyllables, of which there are 8 instances, are always disyllables.
Students should be made to pronounce them so, and plainly told that
to pronounce them as monosyllables is wrong.
'ahā, e.g. rahā, kahā (so too yahā, vahā), i.e. 'āh followed by a, is always 'āhā 'aha.

The preliminary notes say that the first vowel in words like kahā (sometimes transcribed ʌ) is a-like. This may be seen also from the transcription. Of words of this type there are 18. J. has the a in 13 cases and ʌ in 5 (it being understood that this ʌ is a-like). B. transcribes it in every case -a.

Few examples occur of the other cases mentioned loc. cit., p. 545. 'īh and 'ūh final or before cs. become e and o. Here we see it in the word yih, which is always je and in the one case of uwh which is wo or ūo. 'ah followed by ɪ, o, ū is unchanged, see kāhi, kāhu, nāhi, nāi.

No conclusion can be drawn from the word nahi, for it is unique, with several common pronunciations. One may hear nāhi, nāi, ni, nehi, nei, nāhi, nāi.

h followed by u (not u) tends towards o, e.g. bahut, pohunca (in the record the v has become absorbed in the h).

In connection with the English habit of reducing final unstressed a and e to a, and i to i it is worthy of note that in these records we have final unstressed -a 168 times, all of which are pure -a; final unstressed -e 110 times, every time correctly uttered -e; final unstressed -i 98 times, every time correctly uttered -i, never i. Bāqir 'Ali, when reciting, was apt to heighten final e to i or i, o to u or u. Thus the word kī usually pronounced ke or ki, is sometimes as high as kī in the records, and is rarely ke.

The izāfat occurs 8 times, as in ulfat e padarī, nān e shabīna. It is always e, never i. This is the more remarkable in view of the speaker's frequent use of high vowels, but it is correct.

Nasal Vowels. Apart from recognized nasal vowels, there is a tendency to nasalize all vowels in contact with nasal consonants. Thus ne may become nē, and gulāmō gulāmdō.

In words usually written with a final cs. + r there is always a vowel before the final r; e.g. fakhr, shahr, become faxēr, ʃeher.

The negative na is often joined to the following word and pronounced na or ne.

The most important conclusions from the records are:

1. ai, au are pronounced æ (sometimes æe) and o; thus paidā is pæda (or pæeda), and tauba is toba.

2. The point of contact for the cerebral sounds ɪ, ɻ, r is slightly behind the teeth ridge.

3. 'ain may be ignored.

4. qāf is very weak, often not distinguishable from kāf.
APPENDIX

6794 AK. Prodigal Son
Recited by Maulānā Saifi, of Lucknow, May 16, 1920
Transcribed from the record by T. Grahame Bailey

In order to complete these notes, I add a few remarks on a Lucknow record of the "Prodigal Son". So far as I know, Professor Jones has not heard it. It does not differ much from the two Delhi ones, and for conversation, as distinct from recitation, it is a safer guide. This is specially noticeable in its pronunciation of au, ai, final -e, and final -o.

ek fəxə ke do larke the; choṭe ne bap se kaha "abba jān, mal mata mē mera hṛssa mojhe de diji. us ne apna sarmaēa donō ko bāt diā. thore hi dinō mē choṭa beṭa apni cizē samēt samaēt ek dur daraz maqam par calta hua, or vahā apna mal badalni mē uṭra diā. jāb vo kul dolāt barbad kar cuga, to us mulk mē sāxt kal pāra, or vo nan e jābina ko mohtāj ho gea. us vāqt ek ra'īs ke dārvāze ja pāra, mēs ne use apne khetō par suar carane bhej diā; faqa kāʃi se je nēbat pohnci thi ki joo ki bhūsi jo suarō ko di jāti ae, agar use koi deta, to usi se bāxūʃi apna peṭ bhār leta; lekm koi itna bhi rāvadar nā'tha.

jāb vo apne hof mē aēa to socne laga ki mere bap ke krtne hi māzdur bafaragāt khate pite hā, koch andaz bhi karte hē, or mē bhukō mar raha hū; bap si jakar kū na kōhū ki mē xuda ka or ap ka gunahgar hū, Ab mē ap ka farzdān kāhē jāne ke laq nehi, mojhe apne māzdūrō ke zumre mē rakh lijie. pas uṭkār sidha apne bap ke pas cala. abhi fasile par tha ki bāp ne use ate dekha, dōrkār gale laga dia or pjar karne laga. beṭe ne kaha "abba, mē xudavand e karim ki or ap ki naṣāro mē mujrīm hū, or Ab is kābīl nehi ki ap ka beṭa kēhlaū". lekm bāp ne apne mulaẓīmō ko hukōm dia "acchi se acchi poṣak, ngūṭhi, juta isē prinhao, or ek farbeh bachra lakar kabab lagao ki sab mēze se khaē or xuʃi mane, is lie ki mera beṭa mārkār zinda hua hē, khokār phir mīla hē."

vo log tēhī pēhlī mē māsruf hūe; bāra beṭa us vāqt khetō par tha; palaṭkar jāb māka maqan ke karib pohnci to raks o fāroh ki avāz kan mē ai; ek mulaẓīm ko bulaḳār darjaft kīa ki jī jīa ho raha hāe?" us ne arz kia "ap ke bhāi sab ae hūe hāe, or ap ke abba jān ne unē sahi salamat pakar ek farbeh bachre ki kurbāni karai hē." je sunkar vo nazar hua or ghar ke andar na gea. us vāqt bāp niklā or use mānane laga. asna e jāvāb mē bap se us ne kaha "gazāb xuda ka, rtnī muḍḍat se mē ap ki xidmat kar raha hū or kīsi vāqt
ap ki hukum uduli nehi ki, lekin kabhī ap ne ek bakri ka bacca bhi mujhe na dia ki mē apne dostō ki davat karta. magar āb ap ka je laṛka aēa jis ne ap ki dōlāt ajjaśī mē ura dāli to ap ne us ke lie moṭā taza bachra zāba karaēa hē." us ne kaha "beṭa, tum to hameśa se mere sat ho, or mere pas jo kuc hi hē vo sab tumara hē, lekin jāśān karne or xoj hone ka jehi mahāl hē, ki tumhara bhai mārkaṛ zinda hua hē, khokar phir mīla hē".

Notes

*a* and *ai* are single vowels *a* and *æ* respectively; thus *dōlāt* is *dolāt* and *mai* is *mē*.

Final -e and -o are not so high as in the Delhi records.

*ā* is almost always *ə*; when very markedly so, it has been transcribed *ə*, otherwise *a*. For this vowel the Delhi records are preferable.

*e* is nearly always *ū*.

*ṭ* and *ṭ* have point of contact generally just behind teeth ridge; in a few cases a little further back.

*r* tends to be fricative; point of contact not far from teeth ridge. In the record it occurs eleven times; of these nine or ten are rather fricative, and only one or two have a real strike. The strike pronunciation is to be recommended.

*h* is *f* except in *kh, th, th, ch, ph*.

‘*ain*’. Words written with ‘*ain*’ occur five times, but the ‘*ain*’ is never pronounced.

*qāf*. There are eleven instances of *qāf*. The pronunciation varies from *q* to a back variety of *k*, on the whole nearer *q* than *k*.

§ 1, l. 5. *cuga* for *cuka*.

§ 3, l. 2. *maka magan* is a reciter’s slip for *makan*. 
Early Hindi and Urdu Poetry No. IV
By T. Grahame Bailey

Pen Pictures by Banarsi Das and Za'talli

Banarsi Das of Jaunpur belonged to the Jain community and was born in 1586. The following charming extracts are taken from his most famous work, Arddh Kathanak, an autobiography completed in 1641.

His wonderful power of word painting is exemplified in these passages. The first describes the commotion in Jaunpur when the news of Akbar's death was received in 1605. We feel the spell of the description, and tremble with the frightened populace. This picture should be compared with Za'talli's account of the turmoil after the death of Aurangzeb. (See below.)

The second tells of the Black Death, bubonic plague, in Agra during 1616, the first time the city was visited by that pestilence. Anyone who has been in India during a plague epidemic will realize the force of his words, the rats dying, the spread of the disease among the people, the glandular swellings, the sudden deaths, the mortality among the physicians, the despair and flight of the townsfolk afraid even to partake of food.

The third relates an experience of the author, when he and his friends were caught in torrential rain, the street doors were shut, no one would ask them in, and the caravanserai was full. One woman was prepared to take pity on them, but her husband sternly refused them.

I. The Death of Akbar, 1605

1. Is hī bīc nagar mē sor
2. Bhayo udangal cārihu or
3. Ghar ghar dar dar diye kapāṭ
4. Ḥatevēni nahi baithē hāṭ
5. Bhole bastr aru bhūṣan bhale
6. Te sab gāre dharti tale.
7. Ghar ghar sabani visāhe sastr
8. Logan pahire mote bastr.
9. Tārhou kambal athvā khes
10. Nārin pahire mote bes.
11. Ūc nīc koū na pahīcān
12. *Dhanī daridrī bhaye samān.*
13. *Corī dhārī disai kauh nāhī*
14. *Yōhī apabhāy log ḍarāhī.*

*Kavitā Kaumūdī, 36*

II. Plague in Agra, 1616

1. *Is āī samay iti bistāri, parī Āgre pahīli mari*
2. *Jahā tahā sab bhāge log pargaṭ bhayā gāth kū rog.*
3. *Nikasai gāthi marai chin māhī, kāhū kī basāy kachu nāhī ;*
4. *Cūhe marai vaidya mari jāhī, bhay so lōg ann nāhī khāhī.*

*Id., 35*

III. The Rain

1. *Phirat phirat phāvā bhaye, bairho kahai na koi ;*
2. *Talai kic sō pag bhare, ūpar barsat toi.*
3. *Andhkār rajnī vīṣā himātu agahan mās*
4. *Nārī ek bāīhan kahyo, puruṣ uṭhyo lai bās.*

*Id., 36*

I. The Death of Akbar

*(The news of Akbar’s death comes to Jaunpūr)*

1. A cry was heard throughout the town :
2. On every side a tumult rose,
3. In every house the doors were locked.
4. No more sat traders in their shops,
5. But garments fine and jewels fine
6. Were buried all beneath the earth.
7. In every house they brought out arms ;
8. Rough were the garments they put on.
9. Men stood in blanket or in shawl ;
10. Women were clad in raiment coarse.
11. Twixt high and low, was difference none,
12. For rich and poor were now the same.
13. Though theft and robbery were not seen,
14. Through causeless fear men were afraid.

II. Plague in Āgra

1. Then spread distress around, plague first on Agra fell.
2. The folk fled forth all ways (the gland-disease had come).
3. The swellings rise, the stricken people helpless die.
4. First rats, then doctors die ; through fear the people fast.
III. The Rain

1. Walking, walking, worn and weary; none invites to sit;
2. Feet are clothed with mud beneath, overhead the rain descends:
3. In the murkiest night of winter season's black November;
4. "Pray be seated" said one woman, but her man rose with a staff.

The word thāṛhau in I, 9, means standing. It is used in the Simla hills to-day in the form thāṛhū for a kind of servant, a man who brings wood or water for travellers, and does other unskilled menial jobs.

III, 1, phāvā is hard to understand. I connect it with Panjabi phāvd “weary”.

The Death of Aurangzeb by Mīr Ja'far Zaṭallī 1659–1713

This poem describing the state of things which prevailed after Aurangzeb's death, should be compared with Banārsī Dās's Brāj poem written nearly seventy years earlier, in which he tells of the excitement produced among the people of Agra by the receipt of the news of Akbar's death in 1605.

Zaṭallī was a notorious satirist and jester, sparing no one except the Emperor. Even the princes were not immune. He seems to have had a great respect for Aurangzeb. It is said, but without complete proof, that he was executed by orders of Farrukh Siyar.

The Death of Aurangzeb

1. Kahā ab pāiye aisā Shahanshāh
2. Mukammal akmal va kāmil dil āgāh ?
3. Rakat ke āsūō jag rotā hai
4. Na mīthī nīd koi sotā hai.
5. Ṣadā ē top o bandūq ast har sū
6. Basar asbāb o bandūq ast har sū
7. Davūdav har taraf bhāq parī hai
8. Bacca dar god sar khaṭyā dharī hai.
9. Kaṭākaṭ o laṭālaṭ hast har sū
10. Jhaṭā jhaṭ o pḥaṭṭhaṭ hast har sū
11. Bahar sū mār mār o dhār dhār ast
12. Ocalcāl o tabar khanjar kāṭār ast
13. Az ā A'ẓam vāzi sūe Mu'azzam
14. Jhaṛā jhaṛī o dharādhār har do pāyam
15. Bibīnam tā Khudā az kist rāzi
16. Bikhvānad khufba bar nām kih qāzi.

Panjāb mē Urdu.
1. Where shall we find so excellent a king,
2. Complete, consummate, perfect, knowing hearts?
3. The world is weeping tears of blood,
4. And gentle sleep to no one comes.
5. On all sides noise of cannon and of gun
6. Men carrying goods and guns upon their heads.
7. And fleeing here and there on every side,
8. Beds on their heads, and children in their arms.
9. Cutting and smiting on all sides,
10. Wrenching and splitting on all sides,
11. On all sides death and violence.
12. Turmoil, axes, daggers, poniards.
13. That side A’zam, this Mu’azzam,
14. Fighting, struggling, both I find,
15. But let me see whom God approves,
16. For whom the priest on Fridays prays.

The last four lines refer to the internecine war between Aurangzeb’s sons A’zam and Mu’azzam. The author wonders whom God will favour and who as Emperor will be mentioned in the Friday prayers. It was Mu’azzam who was successful and came to the throne. He is known to history as Bahadur Sháh.

L. 15 may have two meanings: (1) whom God makes King, and (2) whom God takes to Himself; in other words who is defeated and dies. In the first case it is parallel to line 16, in the second case 16 is the reverse of 15, the meaning being “let me see which is defeated, and which becomes Emperor”. L. 16 refers to the fact that the ruling sovereign is prayed for in the Friday prayers.

The author freely uses Persian words; the second, fifth, sixth, thirteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth lines are pure Persian.

l. 9, latálat might be read luṭāluṭ “robbery”.

l. 12, ocalcál is probably for calacal or calcaloo.

In l. 14 the ṛ of jhar is doubled for metrical reasons. This is specially interesting because it is not possible to pronounce a double ğ, and it looks as if the author was satisfied so long as his eye saw a double ğ, even though his tongue could not say it.

For double ğ compare the following sentence from Mirā Ji Khudānumā, c. a.d. 1600, quoted in Urdu, April, 1928, p. 158, e sab Qur’ān kā chīṟīcā deke vāle magz nahi cākhe, these all see the husk of the Qur’ān, but do not taste the marrow.
Iranian Studies
By H. W. Bailey

I. Suβdastān

In the Bahman Yašt, ii, 49, there is an interesting list of geographical names. The readings of two MSS. of the Pahlavi Text as well as the Pāzand version (unhappily Pāzand far inferior to that of the Mēnōkē χρατ) are available, the Pahlavi in the facsimile of K 20 (fol. 135 recto, l. 4 et seq.) published by the University of Copenhagen, 1931, and the edition of Dastūr Noshervān Kaikobād Ādarbād, The Pahlvi Zand i Vohūman Yasht, 1899, a copy of a MS. dated 554 A.Y., and the Pāzand in Antia, Pazend Texts, p. 339 seq. Translations of ii, 49, have been attempted by West, SBE., v, p. 209, by Dastūr Noshervān in his edition, and also by Markwart in Caucasica, vi, 1, 54, and in A Catalogue of the Provincial Capitals of Eranshahr, p. 69, an edition of the Šahrīhā i Ḫrān. But as finality in the translation of Pahlavi texts is hard to attain, yet another attempt is here offered. The text is as follows:—

Pahlavi
χατāγη ut pātaχsāhīh av An-ērān
bandakān rasēt čegōn Xyōn
Turk *Hēftar ut Tubīt
čegōn andarak Kösfār ut
čenīk ut Kāpulīk ut
Suβdīk ut Hrōmāyīk ut
*Karmīr Xyōn Spēt Xyōn
pat Erān dēhān i man
pātaχsāh[yh] bavēnd framān
ut kāmāk i avēšān pat
gēhān raβāk bē bavēt.

Pāzand
[i] bandagō rasiā avā čan Hayūn
Turk *azarat. afś*
Čiṇī *Kāsūrī* u
Sūdī u . . . .
χarmēra Hayūn u Spiḍ Hayūn
. . . . sahar
pādaşāhā raβā framā bēnd.

Čenīk and Kāpulīk are written with final -yh for -īk, a mistake doubtless due to scribes, who confuse -yk, -yh, and -y owing to the changed pronunciation -ī for all three. Andarak is here spelt سلما in place of the usual سلم. The names call for more consideration. I give first a translation. "Kingdom and Sovereignty will pass to slaves who are not Iranians, such as the Khyōn, Turk, Heftal, and Tibetans, who are among the mountain-dwellers, and the Chinese and
Kābulis and Sogdians and Byzantines and Red Khyōn and White Khyōn. They will become Kings in my countries of Eran. Their commandments and desires will prevail in the world."

1. χυόν. This name is familiar in Pahlavi and Avestan texts. It would appear to be a name of an enemy of the Iranian people in Avestan times, transferred later to the Huns owing to similarity of sound, as Türk was adapted to Turk in Pahlavi. Herzfeld has read O'ONO on coins (Mem. Arch. Survey of India, No. 38, p. 19), and to the Romans they were known as Chionitae; both forms are apparently due to a Persian source (cf. Markwart, Über das Volkstum der Komanen, p. 70). In the present passage three divisions of this people seem to be recognized, the Xyōn with the Turks, the Karmīr Xyōn, and the White Xyōn.

2. Karmīr χυόν. The Pahlavi text has 𐭬𐭬𐭬, which has been read Kirmak-raχxt "having red garments" by Nyberg, MO., xxii, 350, and Karmī <r>-raχxt by Markwart, loc. cit. But apart from the somewhat unusual position for an epithet, the Byzantines knew of Turks from the Altai and Oxus regions whom they called Kερμικίβενες and Еρμικίβενες (Tomaschek, Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Chionitae). For this second form Markwart suggested <K>ερμικίβενον, see WZKM., xii, 197, and Eranšahr, p. 51, note. This surely justifies us in recognizing in the Pahlavi a simple confusion of ρ and ρ, which in fact occurs not infrequently. The Pāzand has then the correct reading Karmēra (k here written 𐭪) hayūn "Red Huns". On the White Huns, cf. the passage of Procopius quoted by Christensen, Le règne du roi Kauwādh I et le communisme mazdakite, p. 8.

3. Hēstar. The name of the Hephthalites is known under various forms, which are given by Markwart, Eranšahr, p. 58 et seq., and Festschrift Sachau, p. 257, note: Gr. Ἑ flattened; Aβδάλλαι; Syr. ܐܒܕܐ; and (in a Persian phrase) 𐭠𐭬‎ Hestārān ḥodāi; Arm. Hēptʿat, Tʿētalkʿ; Arab. هِطَّالْ ئ‎, pl. هِئْطَالْ ئ‎; Chin. Ye-ta (Yē-pa). The reading here proposed, Hēstar, is an attempt to interpret Pahl. 𐭬𐭬. The Pāzand here has azara-, which implies a variant reading. The original Pahl. was perhaps 𐭬‎ (certainly in other places 𐭬‎ is sometimes misspelt 𐭬‎ to be read Hēstar,

1 For Ṣ in place of Ṣ see e.g. GrBd., 23012, Ayrēraθ.
in accord with the Persian phrase in the Syriac hifr. This requires the assumption that the name of the Hephthalites was early corrupted in Pahlavi, and was no longer recognized by the Pāzandist. So in Dk.M., 438\textsuperscript{12}.

\begin{align*}
\text{pat ham šn} & \text{ān ĕryn xârr vēhēh andar ŏbēm ŏbēm vićtakōhā pat mātiyān ham patvand raft ut *Hestar ṣmā kuṣṭakān spōṭāēhē.}
\end{align*}

In the Greater Bundahišn a new form is introduced with -ā-. Firdausī has Ḥētāl. The short vowel in the second syllable is assured for the Sasanian period by Greek, Syriac, and Arabic transcriptions, hence influence from later Persian is probable in GrBd., 215\textsuperscript{7} Ṣmānn nā Ṣalmān Ḥēstālān (in GrBd., 215\textsuperscript{9}).

4. Tubit. This word written トル is not known to me elsewhere in Pahlavi. But in Arabic writers the Tubbāt are associated with Haital and Turk, as by Tabari, ii, 1153, year 85 = 704 خرِجَت: }:{وَالسَّيِّدَةُ البَيْطَلِيَةِ وَالنَّبِيَّةُ وَالنَّرْسِ، and Yaʿqūbī, Taʿrīkh, ii, 528 in the attack on Rāfī whose reinforcements were from the East.

جمع رافع واستعمال اهل الشاش وفرغة واهل خجندة وأشرنوسة والصغانيان وجُلُبُو وخارزم وجُلُبُو وخارزم ومَا وراء النهر والترك والأخزنج والحفر وناخ وغَرَّةَ ونحو الثعَّب وثُمَّه

Masʿūdī, Kitāb al-Tanbīh ٦٤, 7 seq., speaks of settled and nomad Tubbat, whom he calls Turkish:—

وذَا الرَّبَّاطِ {بِدخِشُان} thinkers اجتَنَاسٍ من الترك يقال لهم أو خان

وتَبَتَ وأينغان حضور وبدو

There is therefore nothing improbable in the appearance of Tubit here in the company of Turks.

5. Čegōn andarake kōfdār "who are among the mountain-dwellers". [For čegōn and i čegōn with relativa function, see BSOS., vi, 72, and GrBd., 232\textsuperscript{3}, 236\textsuperscript{3}, 225\textsuperscript{3} and 4.] Kōfdār is found also as the title of the lords of Armāil, see Herzfeld, AMI., 4, 83. Here the Kōhistān beyond Samarkand is probably intended.

\textsuperscript{1} šn < *šavana- "way of acting", Paz. šn, šnīk "customary", cf. Av. šavaṇa- "act" and Y., 29\textsuperscript{9}, yā šavaitē ādrōng orācāndho "how the lofty behave towards the lowly".}
6. Čenık. The Chinese are said to have sent ambassadors to the Court of Khusrau Anošarvān, Ṭabarī, i, 899:

[Cipher text]

Čenastān “China” is familiar in Pahlavi. In GrBd., 106 seq. Avestan sāínū- is interpreted by this word: ān i pat Sēn dēh hast i Čenastān. Arm. čenastān, čenik, čenbakur “Emperor of China”, čenik, HAG., 49. It is described in the Pāzand and Pārši-Persian Žamāsp-Nāmak (ed. Modi, p. 76 Pāzand; ed. West, Avestan . . . Studies, p. 104, Pārši-Persian). From these two texts, both to some extent corrupt, it is possible to restore the Pahlavi somewhat as follows:—

ut Čenastān sāhrīhā i vazurg vas zarr vas mušk vas gōhr vas an čiš andar bavēnd. ka *dil i avē<śān> nē čimān bārīk vēnišn ēstāt bavēnd but paristēnd. ka mūrēnd druvand hand.

“And China has large cities, much gold, much musk, many jewels, and many other things. Since their heart has not keen perception of causes, they worship Buddha (or ‘idols’). When they die they are druvand” (that is, they suffer the fate of the wicked).

China is also introduced into other prophecies of the Bahman Yašt (Čenastān, iii, 14, *čenik čynyh, iii, 17). Its situation is given in the passage quoted below, GrBd., 198. In the old Sogdian letters occurs čyynsn (Reichelt, Die soghd. Hands. des Brit. Mus., ii, letter ii, 18, 30).


8. Suβāik. This word is the most interesting in the list. It happens that we are particularly well informed about the name of the Sogdians from the sixth century B.C. onwards. It has therefore been often treated, although this form with -βā- has not been noticed hitherto. The name appears in various dialect forms as follows:—

1. ugd, ugd: OPers. s u g” d
   s u g” “d
   s u g d (Hamadān tablet).
   Elam. śu-ug-da, śu-uk-taš-be.
Bab. su-ug-du
Greek Σύγνοι (Herodotus).
Avestan Vid., 14, suγνοš.ṣayaṇa-“dwelling in Suγda”
Yt., 1014, suχ đəm (var. ll. soaχ đəm, sauχ đəm, suđəm).
Orkhon Turk. soγduq.
Pāzand soγ IndBd. (= GrBd., 8714).
NPers. سد suγd.
Sogd. (Buddh.) soγδy’ν’k (Reichelt, loc. cit., ii, p. 70), “Sogdian.”
(In the old letters) soγδyк, soγδyк’нв.

2. uβδ. Pahl. د grille.1
Arm. Սութկ = Soudik’.
3. uδ, úd: Syr. sōđ ڪﺳڪ. Marquart, Ėrānsahr, p. 88, n. 7,
sōδyqayē “Sogdians”.
Pahl. یک ڪ InBd., 8714 sūδ.
GrBd., 8710.
Pāz. sūdā here in Bahman Yašt, ii, 49, for Pahl.

sudā ڪ IndBd. (= GB., 8710).

GrBd., 8611 InBd. = InBd.

Chin. Su-li.2
Tib. ษุ-Lik.
Possibly also Kharoṣṭhī inscription sulija, Konow, Acta Orient., x, 74.

The establishing of the reading of د grille as suβδík has an important consequence. It becomes possible to understand a much

1 For the voiced spirants indicated by d, cf. aδδađąt = Av.
2 For other Chinese transcriptions, see Shiratori, “A Study on Su-t’e 窦特 or
aδδađaṭ- “exposure” (DkM., 76118, etc.); ٣ bioδšaṭ. DkM., 43415, beside
GrBd., 23611 = Pāz., دو ث “Duyšav”; ٣ ו jihadist, DkM., 8197.

Possibly also Kharoṣṭhī inscription sulija, Konow, Acta Orient., x, 74.

The establishing of the reading of د grille as suβδík has an important consequence. It becomes possible to understand a much

1 For the voiced spirants indicated by d, cf. aδδađąt = Av.
2 For other Chinese transcriptions, see Shiratori, “A Study on Su-t’e 窦特 or
aδδađaṭ- “exposure” (DkM., 76118, etc.); ٣ bioδšaṭ. DkM., 43415, beside
GrBd., 23611 = Pāz., دو ث “Duyšav”; ٣ ו jihadist, DkM., 8197.
misunderstood passage of the Bundahišn in *GrBd.*, 198\textsuperscript{14}. *DH.* has ־ן, ־ף, ־ק. ־ן. This is *Suβdastän* "Sogdiana" with א = ū and א = βδ. The Pāzand reading of the *IndBd.* sāvkavastā indicates that the word was no longer understood, but mechanically transcribed. But with the reading Suβdastän, the whole passage is clear: Zamīk in Suβdastän pat rās i haē Turkastān av Čēnastān pat kustak i dūr av apāxṭar rōn "the land of Sogdiana is on the way from Turkestan to China in the region far to the north".

Turning to *GrBd.*, 197\textsuperscript{5}, we have the passage of which this one is an amplification: Αγρεάθ ι Πασάŋαŋ pat zamīk <i> *Suβdastän apί-ʂ Gōpat sāh x'āněnd "Αγρεάθ son of Pašang in the land of Sogdiana and him they call Gōpat the King". Here both MSS. are corrupt, *TD.* has ־ף, ־ם and *DH.* ־ף, ־ם, but happily the *IndBd.* reads in Avestan letters, as before, sākvastā. With this reading, Herzfeld's conjecture Andarkangistān, *AMI.*, ii, 59, can be dispensed with. Following from this, it is now possible to discover the meaning of Gōpat. Αγρεάθ is the chief (rat) of Sogdiana. His name is often cited. In the Avesta (Yašt, 13, 131, Yašt, 9, 18), Αγρεάθa is brother of Frārasyan. In Pahlavi the name is variously spelt: ֶסֹדָלָרָד, ֶסֹדָלָרָד, ֶסֹדָלָרָד, ֶסֹדָלָרָד. All are transcriptions of the Avestan name. He is here brother of Frāṣyāp and *Karsvasp, *IndBd.* (in Avestan letters) Karsevaz, and is slain by Frāṣyāp, just as Αγρεάθa is zūrō.jātā- "slain by violence" in the Avesta (Yašt, 918). In *GrBd.*, 197\textsuperscript{5}, Αγρεάθ receives the title Gōpat Šāh, evidently because he is rat of Sogdiana. The word is variously spelt: *Dd.* pursiš,\textsuperscript{1} 89 ֶסֹדָלָרָד, *GrBd.*, 231 ֶסֹדָלָרָד, Bahman Yašt, ii, 1 ֶסֹדָלָרָד, Mēnōkē xraτ, 62 ֶסֹדָלָרָד, Rivāyat i Dārāb Hormuzyār, ii, 70 ֶסֹדָלָרָד, ֶסֹדָלָרָד, ֶסֹדָלָרָד. The spelling with ֶסֹדָלָרָד suggests a name foreign to Pahlavi. If we remember that the abode of Αγρεάθ is in

\textsuperscript{1} I am indebted to the courtesy of the University of Copenhagen for a photograph of this folio of K. 35.
Sogdiana, it is but natural to explain the word as gava-pati-"Lord of Gava". This Gava is the "Heart of Sogdiana".

It is twice mentioned in the Avesta. In Vid., i, 4:—

**bīhīm asanhaṃca sōihraṃmca vahiṣṭam frāhevēṃ azēm yō Ahurō Mazdā**

\[gānum yim suydō, sayanōm.\]


The corresponding commentary of the GrBd., 205\textsuperscript{10-12}, has: **diūkhar pahlom dāt daēst i Sūlīk-māniṣn ku-ś sūlīk patiś mānēnd. hast baydāt i bayāndāt.** (Here the assonance has caused confusion with Sūrāk = Syria, as elsewhere.)

The second passage is Yaēś, 10\textsuperscript{14}, most recently treated by Herzfeld, AMI., 2, 3 seq. In the vulgata: **mourum hārōy yum gaoṃcā suydoṃ χ'āirizmēa.** Gava survived as qai (= yai) in the Arabic geographers and as Ho in Chinese (Herzfeld, loc. cit., p. 5, note 1). When the word was no longer clear sāh could be added, as if "King of Göpat". In Dd. 89 we find gōpat būm "land of the Lord of Gō". This tendency to pleonasm is well-known. An extreme case is GrBd., 231\textsuperscript{1}, gar i Pataş'x'ārgar kōf. Kai Vištāsp sāh is regular. Other cases are the ayōx'ūst vitāyta, GrBd., 225\textsuperscript{10}, and ariśvang i vēh, GrBd., 14\textsuperscript{14}. Kāus, Av. Kava Usaṇa, receives the addition of Kai, in the Greater Bundahiṣn: Kai Kāūṣ. It is normal in the later Persian epic.

This has all the appearance of old tradition misinterpreted by later times. It becomes of importance, therefore, to learn what is said about Göpatśāh. It would appear that GrBd., 197\textsuperscript{5}, has the oldest traits, as quoted above: **Ayērēraθ i Paṣangān pat zamīk i Suṣbāstān api-ś Göpatśāh χ'ānēnd.** Here gōpatśāh is simply a title of Ayērēraθ. But in GrBd., 231\textsuperscript{1}, Göpatśāh is son of Ayērēraθ: ut haē Ayērēraθ Göpatśāh zāt ut ka Frāṣyāp Manuścēhr apāk Ėrānakān andar gar i Pataş'x'ārgar kōf <vi>tēr kart sēz ut nēvāh apār hīst. Ayērēraθ haē Yazdān āyāft χ'ūst api-ś ēn nēvakāh vindāt ku-ś ēn spāēh ut gund haē an saṃśīh bōyē. Frāṣyāp pat ēn āhōk Ayērēraθ ōzāt. Ayērēraθ pat ēn pāṭdān frāzand ēgōn Göpatśāh zāt. "And from Ayērēraθ was born Göpatśāh. And when Frāṣyāp drove Manuścēhr with the Iranians into the mountains of Pataš'x'ārgar, ruin and want was left. Ayērēraθ besought Yazdān for a boon. And he received

\[1\text{ Cf. also the Pahl. transcription of Av. gava- in aēvō. gava- as gek.}\]
this favour that he delivered the army and company from this distress. Frāsyāp slew Ayrēraθ for this crime. To Ayrēraθ as a recompense for this a son was born who was Gōpatšāh."

Here then the title has been turned into the personal name of a son, as happened also with Bēzan in the Shāhnāma, see Herzfeld, AMI., 4, 108.

To this stage of the legend belongs the statement in Dl. 89, in which is given a list of the immortal chiefs (rat): Gōpatšāh χ'aratāyīh apar Gōpat būm (written ﬂ as often) ham<v>īmand i av Ėrānv<e>ž pat bār i Āp i Dāityā apar nikās dārēt gāv (Avestan letter) Hašayaš kē-s patiš bavēt spurrīh i hamist martōm. "Gōpatšāh’s rule is over the land of the Gōpat whose frontiers are the same as Ėrānvēz on the bank of the River Dāityā. He watches over the ox Hašayaš, through which is achieved the perfect perfection of all mankind.” Here Gōpatšāh has overshadowed Ayrēraθ, but is still probably thought of as a šāh. In Pahl. Riv. Dl., 164, Gōpatšāh is one of the fraštart kartār (producers of Fraštart).

But Gōpatšāh appears elsewhere as a monster, half man and half bull. This aspect of Gōpatšāh has been much discussed, as by Junker, Bibliothek Warburg, 1922, Unvala, BSOS., v, 505, Herzfeld, AMI., i, 143, 157, iv, 62, cf. Nyberg, Glossar s.v. Gopet.

A full description is given in Mēmākē χrat, 62, 11.

Gōpetšāh pat Ėrānvēz andar kišvar i χaniras. ut hač pād ut tāk nēm tan gāv ut hač nēm tan hačapar martōm ut hamvār pat drayā-bār nišīnēt ut ʿizišn i Yazdān ham-e kunēt. "Gōpatšāh is in Ėrānvēz in the division of χaniras. And from foot and to the middle of the body he is an ox, and from the middle of the body above he is a man and he sits ever on the seashore and makes offering to Yazdān.”

Can any conclusions be drawn from the geography of this legend? Ayrēraθ is in Sogdiana, as "Lord of Gava", Gōpat. Gōpatšāh rules in the land of Gōpat, which adjoins Ėrānvēz. In the later form of the legend Gōpatšāh dwells in Ėrānvēz itself. If old traditions have survived here, Sogdiana is represented as adjoining Ėrānvēz. On other grounds, Marquart (in Eransahr, p. 155) Andreas, and Herzfeld (AMI., i, 104, note 2; ii, 4) have identified Av. Airyanēm Vaējō with Chorasmia. If hamēimand i av Ėrānvēz is trustworthy tradition, this was probably also the view of early Commentators. The later view is expressed in GrBd., 19813-14, Ėrānvēz pat kustak i Āturpātakān "Ērānvēz is in the region of Ādarbāijān”. Geographical names are exposed to transference. One of the best examples of such transference
is given by the name of the mountain *Upari-saina*, which, as Herzfeld, *AMI.*, i, 84, note 1, has pointed out is found in the Babylonian version *māṭ-pa.ar.ú.paa-ra.e.saa.na* (as also probably in the Elamite version, see Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften der Achaemeniden*, p. 152) corresponding to OPers. *Gandāra*. In Pahlavi texts this earlier meaning is lost, so that it was even connected with Pars., cf. *GrBd.*, 797, kāf i Vas *Škift ān i Pars hač ham kāf i Apursēn, and *GrBd.*, 803, hamāk kāc Apursēn kē-ś apārīk kōfīhā ośmurt ēstēt rust ēstēt.

In any case a reminiscence of the situation of Erānvēž in the northeast is not impossible.

2. *āzāt* and *āzn*

The meaning of Pahlavi *āzāt* (*azat*) “noble, free” can be fully realized only by reference to the Iranian social system. It is the designation of a member of a *vis* (*vis*) or “Great House”, which has in many Pahlavi passages retained the full meaning of “Princely House”, found in the OPers. inscriptions and the Avesta. Av. *visō puθra*, Pahl. *vispuhr*, *vāspuhr* (*vēispuhr*), MPT. *vispuhr* and *visduxt*, NPers. *visduxtān* (Vis u Rámun, 7712) all express the importance of this relationship. The *ā-zāta*- is one born into such a family with all its social privileges. In the Avesta the word is already more general in the passage, *Yašt*, 5, 127, *hvāzāta ardeθi sūra*. But when Hutaosā is called *āzātum* Hutaosām in *Yašt*, 9, 26, it clearly describes her as member of a *vis*. Similarly in Pahlavi, *sahrdār kōfār ut āzāt* “Prince and Mountain Chief and Noble”, Draθt Asōrkā, 45; Žāmāsp Nāmak (*BSOS.*, vi, 56, § 15) *āzātān ut vazurkān*. From “noble, *ebγerθs*” to “free” is an easy transition already found in Pahlavi, as *anṣahrīk* . . . *āzāt bē kart* “he freed the slave”. NPers. *āzād* is “free, manumitted”, but *āzādagān* “high-born men”, *āzāda* “free, excellent, noble”. In Avestan *āzāta* is one of the epithets applied to the Daēnā in form of a maiden, *Hāθāč Nask*, 2, 9. In Armenian *azat* is both “free” and “noble”, *HAG.*, 91, and in Georgian *azati* “free”, *azatoba* “liberty”.

The meaning of *ā-zan-* is therefore quite certain in the technical meaning “to be born a member of a princely house, to be born noble, free”.1

It accordingly becomes possible to understand certain other Iranian

1 If Herzfeld has correctly interpreted the nom. pr. Dātōēh, *AMI.*, iii, 86, this meaning may also belong to the uncompounded *zūta*.
words. In the Dâtastân i Dênîk, 36, 17, āznāvar gurtak are "noble warriors" on the side of the Amahraspands and Ohormazd. Here we have the word which appears in Georgian, to translate oî πρῶτοι, Mark vi, 21, seri umzada mt'avart'a mist'a da at'asist'avn'a mist'a da aznaur't'a Galileast'a deîpνυν ἐποίησεν τοῖς μεγαστάνων αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς χιλιάρχοις καὶ τοῖς πρῶτοις τῆς Αλιλαίας. According to Brosset, in his edition of Vaxušt's Geography, p. 7, the aznauri are the fifth class "de race noble ordinaire". A corresponding word does not occur in Ciakeciak's Armenian dictionary and in the Armenian version of Mark vi, 21, τοῖς πρῶτοις is rendered by meccamecaç. Pahlavi āznāvar is *āzn + ābar. But azn appears in Armenian in the meaning of "nation, people, generation". Here we probably have *ā-zni-from Iranian (for the suffix cf. Av. sti-), which with the suffix -va(n)-gives *ā-znī-vā(n)-, in Armenian azniu "noble, great, excellent". So again ā-zan- in the sense of "be noble".

It can hardly be doubted in view of Pahlavi āznāvar and Arm. azniu that Avestan āsna- as epithet of frazanti- "children", and of manah-"mind" has this same meaning of "noble". Thus in the blessing Yašt, 10, 3: Așaōn̓ m vanuhsu sur̓ ā dašātīt āsna̓ m frazaintim "The Good Powerful Fravartis givers of increase bestow noble progeny".

The Armenian azniu is further useful in supplying the explanation of MPT. b'myv, Salemann, Man. St., 554, v. 5:—

merv'n b'myv'n 'vy n'yznd s'dy̱h'
murvan bāmivān őy nāzend šādīhā

"Brilliant birds are there sporting happily."

The word bāmiv can be explained as *bāmī-va(n-) from bāmi-"shining", cf. Av. bāmanīva- in vāstrāsca . . . bāmanivā "and brilliant . . . garments". The long -i- is further supported by the Sanskrit forms (Rgveda) śrūṣṭīvan-, arātīvan-. With the same suffix we have Av. āiniva, Yašt, 15, 46, where Vayu says: āiniva nāma ahmi "I am named āiniva". This can be explained as *āni- (for the form, cf. Old Persian bāji- "tribute") with -va from an- "breathe, blow", cf. Greek ēvēmos "wind", Sanskrit anila- "wind". Similarly, Iran. dam- means both "breathe" and "blow", NPers. damīdan "breathe", Saka padama "winds".

1 Hertel's translation in the Glossary to Die awest. Herrschafts- und Siegesfeuer, 1931, has not reached beyond an etymology.
The Pahlavi commentators translate āsnaça mana āsnaça by ān i mēnišn i ahrašbān (Visprat, 11, 3 = Spiegel, 12, 16), and āsnaça frażaintim by frażand in Yasna, 62, 5 (= Spiegel, 61, 13). This is āsnātak (āsnātak), adjectival participle to āsnītan which appears in the nomen agentis āsnītār: DkM., 822, pareartār ut āsnītār i driṣṭān “nourisher and sustainer of the poor”. In Dātastān i Dēnīk, 1610, pit1 i pēramōn ast kē pat āsnītārīh i zāvēnāk jān tarr-vāxšišīn k bavēt “the flesh around the bone which for the sustenance of the vivifying soul is freshly-growing”. Hence āsnītak is probably “sustained, brought up, nourished”. AIW. s.v. āšna- should be altered accordingly.

Naḥhānaḥ Tittha Maṅgala, The River-bathing Ceremony in Siam

By H. G. Quaritch Wales

According to Manu the samskāras, or Hindu initiation rites, are twelve in number, but by other early Indian writers the list is variously estimated as from ten to sixteen or even more. In the Siamese Brahmanical books the number laid down is ten, and these rites are known as “the ten auspicious ceremonies” (bidhi daśamaṅgala), but there are in addition some ceremonies in connection with conception and birth which would bring the number up to sixteen or more. The latter remain in force, but of “the ten auspicious ceremonies” most are obsolete and the only ones that are still in general favour are the shaving of the first hair of the newborn, the giving of the first name to the child, and the tonsure; while the ceremony which we are about to consider has been performed up to modern times, but for princes and princesses of the highest (Cḍu Fāś) rank only. With the exception of the tonsure, which was made the subject of a scholarly monograph by the late Colonel Gerini, none of these ceremonies has ever been seriously studied by European scholars. This is perhaps in the main due to the difficulty of obtaining information on account of their private or domestic nature and the fact that there is little mention of them in Siamese literature. But since the river-bathing ceremony of Cḍu Fāś, like their tonsure, is of a semi-public and very spectacular nature, some interesting official records of it have been preserved.

Naḥhānaḥ tittha maṅgalaṃ (Pāli, tittha = landing-place, naḥānam = bathing, maṅgala = auspicious) is the classic term applied to the river-bathing ceremony in Siam, but the popular form of the ceremony was formerly known as bidhi maṅgala laṅ dā sōn vāy nām “auspicious rite of taking the child out to bathe at a river (or sea) landing and teaching him to swim”. The name of the popular form of the ceremony is interesting as showing that in former times the ceremony retained its early function of marking a definite stage in the development of the child, an occasion on which it was taught to swim, and after which

1 The system of transliteration used in this article is that of M. G. Coedès, for which see Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam, pt. i, p. 10.

2 Chāḷaṅkantamaṅgala, by Colonel G. E. Gerini, Bangkok, 1895. On pages 2 and 3 the author gives a list of “the ten auspicious ceremonies”.
it would be regarded as more independent and capable of taking care of itself. This stage of initiation was immediately antecedent to that marked by the tonsure, after which the initiate was regarded as having definitely bid farewell to childhood days. The importance of the river-bathing ceremony in the social life of a people like the Siamese, whose welfare largely depended on their being amphibious at an early age, is evident. But like most of the other samskāras, probably as a result of the influence of Buddhism, the popular ceremony lost its hold on the people and died out about a hundred years ago, after which the ceremony as performed for Cāu Fā princes and princesses alone remained in favour. This royal ceremony was performed in the ninth, eleventh, or thirteenth year of age, and is called simply bidhī laṁ sraṁ “the bathing ceremony”. It will be seen from the account which follows, that the observance has lost its early function and degenerated into a rather meaningless ceremonial bath and abhiseka, in analogy to many other royal ceremonies.

I am not aware of the existence of any record of the manner in which the popular form of the ceremony was performed, but there is material for a fairly detailed description of the river-bathing ceremony of Cāu Fās. The following account refers to the first occasion on which the laṁ sraṁ was revived at Bangkok, after the destruction in A.D. 1767 of the old capital, Ayudhya, and it became the model for all future royal ceremonies of the kind.

In the year A.D. 1812 the eldest son of King Rāma II by a royal mother attained the age of nine years, and his father reflected that, whereas in the first reign royal tonsures had been performed in the style of those of Ayudhya, the river-bathing ceremony of Cāu Fās had not yet been carried out. The older people who had seen this ceremony at Ayudhya had nearly all died, and the knowledge of the way in which it should be carried out would soon be lost. Accordingly, at the coming of the fourth month (Phālguna), Prince Cāu Fā Kram Hlavāna Maṅkṣa Maṅtri and Cāu Brahyā Śrīdharmaṅdhirāja were appointed superintendents of the arrangements for the river-bathing ceremony of the young prince.

The preparations for the laṁ sraṁ resembled those for the sokānta (tonsure of Cāu Fās) except that instead of a Kailāsa mountain being built within the Grand Palace enclosure, a four-sided spire-roofed

---

1 My chief authority is Brahmārāja bhāgavatāra krūrā rājanakosindra rājakul diśāna (History of the Second Reign), pp. 144 to 149, by H.R.H. Prince Damrong, who bases his account on the contemporary Bangkok annals by Cāu Brahyā Dibākravanṣa, together with the official regulations for the carrying out of the ceremony.
shrine (maṇḍapa) was erected on a pontoon, similar to those used for Siamese floating houses. The pontoon was moored at the royal landing, and the maṇḍapa, which stood on the central part of the pontoon, was built of figwood (udumbara) covered with white cloth, and had carved doors at each of the four sides. Beneath the maṇḍapa, the pontoon was cut away to make a bathing pool, with a floor beneath the water-level made of a trellis of strong bamboo laths, protected on the outside by the meshes of a net, while the inside of the floor and walls of the bathing pool was covered with cloth. Thus a safe artificial bathing place was constructed, into which the river water was admitted but from which noxious aquatic animals were excluded. Running round the edge of the bathing pool, at the water-level, was a foot-board on which people could stand, and to which access was obtained from the floor of the pontoon by means of three ladders, a silver one on the north, a gilded one on the south, and a so-called "crystal" one on the eastern side, which was nearest to the landing-place. On the western edge of the pool, within the maṇḍapa, was placed a seat of two stages for the mūrdhābhiṣeka (anointment of the head), while three artificial prawns, of gold, red-gold, and silver respectively, three fish of similar materials, a pair of gilded coco-nuts, and a pair of silvered ones, were also placed at hand. Possibly the artificial prawns and fish were meant to represent the wonderful aquatic fauna of the Anotatta lake in the Himalayan fairyland, while it may be presumed, on the analogy of the bundle of coco-nuts carried on royal barges in lieu of life-belts, that the gilded and silvered coco-nuts used in this ceremony were intended to be used as floats by the young prince.

The maṇḍapa was surrounded by three concentric rows of rājavāt fences, decorated with gold, red-gold, and silver umbrellas respectively.\(^1\)

At the four corners of the maṇḍapa the Brahmans placed tables to support the chank-shell water, and the consecrated water called nāṃ krat "sharp or powerful water", for sacrificing for victory. During the ceremony, soldiers armed with lances, the handles of which were wrapped in gold, stood within the middle fence, ten men to each of the three exposed sides. Between the middle and outer fences stood soldiers armed with iron swords, fifteen to each of the three sides. Outside the outer fence there were soldiers armed with

---

\(^1\) The rājavāt fence is made of lattice, with gaps for ingress and egress, and is decorated at intervals with small tiered paper umbrellas. It is erected around the area in which ceremonies are performed, when these take place in the open air, in order to exclude evil influences.
swords, sixteen to each of the three sides, while in the water near to the raft there were soldiers similarly armed, to the number of sixteen on each of the three sides. On the north side of the pontoon, outside the fences, stood soldiers armed with flint-locks. Throne-barges were moored alongside the landing, while monkey barges, garuda barges, guard boats, and war barges with figure-heads representing various animals, the paddlers wearing red hats and coats, cast anchor in a circle to the number of thirty-nine boats. There were boats with crocodile figure-heads, and boats casting nets in order to catch any malignant beasts which might enter the protected circle, and endanger the safety of the young prince during the ceremony. Inside the Grand Palace enclosure, a pavilion was erected for the Brahmanic rites and a hallowed circle (brahdeśā manḍala) was prepared in the Tusita Mahā Prāsāda (throne hall) for the recitation of auspicious stanzas by the Buddhist monks. Protective threads (sāy siṅcana) of unspun cotton were passed round each of the places at which rites were to be performed in order to preserve them from evil influences, as in the sokānta ceremony.

On Friday, the fourth day of the waxing of the fourth month, the young prince was attired in white in the Baiśala Dakṣina section of the Royal Residence, whence, in the afternoon, he proceeded in state accompanied by a procession similar to that of sokānta,1 by a circuitous route partly outside the palace wall, to the Tusita Mahā Prāsāda, where the king, who had gone there by a more direct route, was waiting to assist him from his palanquin. The palace ladies led him by the hand and invited him to have his feet washed by the pages in a silver basin. When this had been done he entered the throne hall, sat down within the hallowed circle, and listened to the recitation of paritta suttas (protective stanzas). Afterwards the king entered and lit candles of worship, repeated the sīla precepts, and remained to listen to the paritta recitations until they were finished. The palace ladies then led the prince to the mounting stairs, and the king assisted him to mount his palanquin, after which he returned with the procession to the Royal Residence. Similarly, on the

1 The sokānta procession is headed by military units, behind which march pages dressed as devatas, and groups of boys dressed in the costumes of various countries, red and green drummers of victory, Brahmans scattering parched rice or playing ceremonial instruments, and damsels bearing peacock standards; then comes the prince’s palanquin accompanied by royal umbrella, sunshade, and fan, and the procession is closed by officials impersonating devas of the Indra and Brahmat heavens, maids of honour carrying the prince’s insignia, and pages leading caparisoned chargers.
following two evenings, the prince went in state to listen to the Buddhist recitations, but this is to be regarded merely as the preparation which is the prelude to most important royal ceremonies.

On Monday, the seventh of the waxing, in the morning, fifteen monks went to recite auspicious stanzas at the bathing place. When the prince arrived in state, the king assisted him from his palanquin, and the palace ladies led him to the landing where he removed his shoes and ornaments. As the auspicious time drew near, the king led the prince by the hand from the landing to the "raft of scented water". Then Prince Bidakṣa Manṭrī took the young prince by the hand and, following the king, they went to the maṇḍapā. The king sat upon a chair within the rājavēṭi fences, and the prince sat on a cushion near the chair. The Brahma Mahā Rāja Grū (High Priest of Śiva) floated the gold, red-gold, and silver prawns and fish, and the two pairs of gilded and silvered coco-nuts in the bathing pool; and the horā (astrologer) made an oblation to the water at the auspicious time of 7.18 a.m. Officials beat the Gong of Victory, sounded the conches and other musical instruments, and fired signal guns in the bows of the barges, all at the same time. The king carried the young prince to the "crystal ladder" and Prince Cāu Fā Kram Khun Ṣārāṇurākṣa received him in his arms and carried him down to the bathing pool. He let him seize the coco-nuts and bathe in the river water in the pool. Then he brought him up and placed him on the anointment seat, where the young prince was sprinkled by the king with water from a dextrose chank. The Sāṅgharājo sprinkled him with water which had been consecrated by means of the recitation of Buddhist mantras, the senior members of the royal family sprinkled him with water from sacred lotus gourds, and lastly, the Brahmans offered chank-water and nām krat. When this bathing in scented waters was finished and the young prince had changed his wet robes and was dressed in Indian style, he was accompanied by Prince Bidakṣa Manṭrī to the landing, where the procession was already drawn up, and the members of which had now donned red garments. The king having assisted the prince to mount his palanquin, the procession returned in state to the Royal Residence via the circuitous route outside the walls, but the king proceeded to the Tusiṭa Mahā Prāśāda and made offerings to the monks who had officiated. Later, the prince, having removed his Indian dress and attired himself as usual, went by the short inner route to the Tusiṭa Mahā Prāśāda and made offerings to the monks, afterwards returning by the same way.
Meanwhile, in the Cākrabartibimān section of the Royal Residence officials had set up three pai-śrīś of gold, silver, and crystal respectively, bearing offerings of food; and in front of these they had placed the young prince’s throne. In the afternoon, the young Cāu Fâ, dressed in the attire of a prince of the highest rank, went in state procession to the Cākrabartibimān, where the king received him and escorted him to the golden throne prepared for him. He was now about to relinquish the personal name that had been given him at the naming ceremony a month after birth. At the auspicious time of 2.36 p.m. the ceremonial instruments were sounded, and a golden plate (subarna-pāṭa) was presented to the prince, on which were inscribed his new style and title, as follows: Cāu Fâ Maṅkuṭ Sammuṭidevāvaṉa Baṇaṣa Iṣrakṣāṭriya Khāṭiya Rājakumāra. Then the taper-waving rite (vian dian) was performed by the Brahmans, for the benefit of the prince. This rite, which is a form of pradaksīna intended to ward off evil influences, is frequently performed in Siamese ceremonies. The Brahmans and others pass from hand to hand lighted tapers, three of which are fixed in a lenticular holder, around the person or thing it is desired to honour, fanning the smoke towards that person or thing. The final rite of the laṅ sraṅ, as of the sokānta, was the sambhoj, or feast, in which the young prince partook of a small quantity of coconut milk mixed with food from the pai-śrīś, as nourishment for the khvaṅ, or spirit of the child. This rite was repeated twice again, on the eighth and ninth days of the waxing, being thus performed thrice in all.

It should be remarked that it was more usual and proper in Siam to change the names and titles of persons of the royal family after they had undergone the tonsure, for not only does that ceremony symbolize a more complete break with childhood, but there is also the classical Indian precedent of the god Khandhakumāra, whose name was changed to Mahā Vighneṣa after tonsure.

1 The pai-śrī, of whichever material, consists of superimposed trays on stands (bāśa) of decreasing dimensions, so that the whole has an auspicious tapering appearance.
A Vocabulary of the Language of Marau Sound, Guadalcanal, Solomon Islands

Compiled by W. G. Ivens, M.A., Litt.D., Research Fellow of the University of Melbourne

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

adj., adjective.

decl., adverb.

decl., article.
demonstr., demonstrative.
excl., exclusive (of personal pronouns, excluding the person or persons addressed).

incl., inclusive (of personal pronouns, including the person or persons addressed).

interrog., interrogative.

(ku) marks a noun as taking the suffixed pronouns ku, mu, na, denoting possession.

n., noun.

v.n., verbal noun.

(na, ni) marks a noun as taking the suffixed pronoun na in the third person singular, and the plural suffix ni in the third person plural.

neg., negative.

obj., object.

onomatopo., onomatopoetic.

partic., participle.
pers., person.

pl., plur., plural.

possess., possessive pronoun.
sing., singular.

subj., subject.

suff., suffix, suffixed.

t., tr., transitive.

v.i., verb intransitive, i.e. a verb to which the pronoun of the object cannot be suffixed.

v.n., verbal noun.

 voc., vocative.

v.t., verb transitive, i.e. a verb to which the pronoun of the object may be suffixed.

LANGUAGES QUOTED

Fl., Florida, Solomon Islands.

IN., Indonesia.

Langalanga, Mala, Solomon Islands.

Lau, North-East Mala, Solomon Islands.

Malu'au, North Mala, Solomon Islands.

Mota, Banks Islands, New Hebrides.

Oroka, Little Mala, Solomon Islands.

Pol., Polynesia.

S., Sa'a, Little Mala, Solomon Islands.

U., Ulawa, Solomon Islands.

NOTES

1. The use of diresis over the vowel a, e.g. āsi "sea", denotes the "Umlaut", ā changing to e after a preceding i or u and with i or u also following. The Marau Sound people do not always observe this change in the particular words, and also they make the change in an arbitrary fashion.

2. The sign ' denotes a dropped consonant, and in the spoken language there is a break in the pronunciation when such a sign is employed in the written language. The consonants thus dropped are "the Melanesian g", k, l, n, s, t.

3. The accent, if any, falls on the last syllable. There is no movement of the upper lip on the part of the people when speaking, and the speech is thrust forward as it were, the lips being parted but slightly. Little stress is put on the words: there is little rise and fall of sound, and the result is a running and unvaried stream of sound.

4. Words spelt with a hyphen, e.g. maeta-, are not used without the suffixed pronouns ku, mu, na, etc., which denote possession.

5. The letters employed are a, e, i, k, l, m, n, o, p, r, s, t, u, w. The vowels have the Italian sounds. The doubling of a vowel, except where a "break" occurs, indicates a long vowel sound. No nasal sounds occur in the language.
MARAU SOUND lies at the south-east end of the island called Guadalcanal in the Solomon Islands. There is no native name for the Sound as a whole, and it received its present name owing to the fact that the island which lies at the eastern entrance to the Sound is called Marau, i.e., Island. Other islands in the Sound are named Peura, Sinamairuka (Sinamailuka), Tawaihi, Marapa. The last-named island, Marapa (Malapa), is the "home of the dead" for the peoples of the South-East Solomons. The local native name for the hill districts above the Sound is Kera. The name which was given both to the Sound, and to the coastal districts of the mainland near, by the first white visitors in modern days, Bishops G. A. Selwyn and J. C. Patteson, is Gera, which is the name used of the Sound by the people of San Cristoval. The people of the Sound are immigrants from Wairokai, Waisisi, Wairoha, and Uhu on the west coast of Big Mala, and their language is closely allied to that of Oroha, Little Mala, and Areare, the language spoken at Wairokai, etc. It is probable that the first migration from Mala to the Sound settled at Marau, the island at the eastern entrance. There is a ghost called Huu ni nima connected with Marau Island, who is said to have led the migration. War and fighting are said to have been the reasons which led to the migration. The present Mala people were already occupying the islands in the Sound at the time of the visit of the Spanish explorers in 1568, as is shown by the fact that they acted as guides and took the Spaniards to the neighbourhood of Wairokai and Waisisi.

Bishop G. A. Selwyn first visited the Sound in 1856, with San Cristoval men as guides. There was regular intercourse between the peoples of the Sound and those of the north-west end of San Cristoval, and Kekeo, the wife of Stephen Taroaniara, the San Cristoval man who was killed in 1871 with Bishop Patteson, came from Peura Island in the Sound. Bishop Patteson obtained men from several of the islands in the Sound, and took them to Kohimarama, Auckland, New Zealand, where one of them, Porasi by name, died. In 1857 the Bishop slept ashore at Peura Island.

At Kohimarama Bishop Patteson compiled and printed grammatical notes of the language of Marau Sound, with a short catechism, a translation of the Apostles' Creed and of the Lord's Prayer, and a list of words. I do not know whether any copy of this is extant, but H. C. von der Gabelentz published some of the material in *Die melanesischen Sprachen*, Leipzig, 1873. The influence of San Cristoval
words and grammar is plainly to be seen in Bishop Patteson’s material. Taroaniara probably served as his interpreter, and it is owing to him that *inter alia* “Kauraha” has been used as the equivalent of “God” in the translation of the Creed. Kauraha has been shown by Dr. C. E. Fox to be a female snake ghost belonging to Santa Ana Island off San Cristooval. The local people of Marau Sound were ignorant of Kauraha when I questioned them, and said that Kauraha was a “school ghost” whom Porasi had told them of during the divination of his ghost.

As an instance of the way in which mistakes are made in first translations, even by an experienced scholar like Bishop Patteson, one may quote the word *labegumatai*, used in the Creed as a translation of “suffered.” I was puzzled by the word till I split it into two parts, *labegu mata’i* “my body is ill”. Evidently the Bishop gave an instance of “suffer” by saying “my body is ill”, and was furnished with a literal rendering of this, which then passed into the Creed.

I have been able to verify most of the words which appear in von der Gabelentz, but have failed to find any proof of the use of *ni* as an article, as stated by him. The use of *ni* as an article in Arosi, San Cristooval, is probably the reason for its insertion in the grammar of Marau Sound.

The present vocabulary was compiled from words collected during my stay at Sinamairuka Island, Marau Sound, in October and November, 1927, during the course of my work as Research Fellow for the University of Melbourne. From the materials available I have also compiled a grammar of the language, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London Institution*, Vol. V, Part II, 1929.

**Vocabulary of the Language of Marau Sound**

A

There is an interchange of *a* and *o* in certain words: *paina*, *poina*, big.

*a* 1, personal article used with all proper names both male and female: *a Mouria*; used to denote specific relatives: *a maamaa*, father, *a teite*, mother; used with *are*, thing: *a are*, So-and-so; *ikira a are*, So-and-so and those with him; *a huka*, Such-and-such a woman; *a poona*, Such-and-such a man; *a mareho*, So-and-so; seen in *atei*, who. S. a.

*a* 2, noun ending: *hatarea*, sea-coast; *riuriua maeraa*, epidemic of sickness; *rorotoa*, darkness. S. a.
a 3, personal pronoun 3 sing.; suffixed to verbs and prep. as obj.
S. ā.
a 4, passive ending: napota, broken, sikihia.
'a 5, article: 'a mera mane inau neena, that is my boy; 'a taa, what
(thing)? 'a are nau neena, that is mine; 'a keu, a cockle;
'a taa noko horoia a'i, what shall I kill it with? na 1.
'a 6, adjectival suffix: porapora'a, black, dark blue; mato'a, earthy.
S. 'ā.
'a 7, possessive stem: āku, etc. S. ā.
'a 8, suffix to possessive: aku'a, amu'a, etc. S. ā.
'a 9, prefix forming participles: apuo. S. ā.
'a'a 1, exclamation of assent.
'a'a 2, article, used as plural of 'a 5: 'a'a are nau neena, those things
are mine.
Aapu v.i., to be sacred, holy, to be tabu. Lau aabu.
aara v.i., to bite.
aarai v.t. S. aal.
'a e (ku) n., foot, leg: tare 'ae, to begin. S. 'ae.
aha v.i., to incise.
ahasi v.t. S. aha.
aha v.i., to be bitter. S. ahaa.
ahe v.i., to flow, of current or tide.
ahesi v.t., to carry along in flood, S. ahe.
ahi, a woman's waist dress of fibre.
ahu 1, v.i., to wrap up.
ahuni v.t., S. āhu.
ahu 2, v.i., to be complete: avara e ahu, a full ten.
ahusi v.t., to make a complete round of: e ahusia hanua, it has
gone all round the country.
ahuta- (ku) n., all: ahutana taana are, everything. S. āhu.
aí 1: ai rao, exclam., oh then! ai rao i'o o hura na, so it is you who
have come! hai 5.
'ái 2, negative, no, not; used with e, it, there is: 'o iria e'áí, did you
think it wasn't so? Malu'u 'ái.
'ái 3, a tree: noko i tohua na 'ái, I am for chopping a tree; wawasu
'ái, tip of tree; to'o 'erena 'ái, top of tree. S. 'ái.
'ái, 'ēi 4, person, thing: 'āi utaa, what person? are noo na 'ei noo,
this one and that. Malu'u 'ái.
'ái 5, adverb, prep., therein, thereat, thereby, thereof, thereon,
therewith; kira piipii e'i, used for stone-boiling; 'au raai rata
ä'i 'ana taa, how do you name it? 'au tau sieni e'i, you have
done right therein; i hiru ä'i, on top of it; 'ani hori e'i, to
buy therewith; hana 'ani ä'i, for the eating of it; sisiho ä'i,
to blow on, of wind. S. äni; Lau ani.
ä'i 6, trans. suff. to verb, partic.: ha'aratoä'i; ponie'i.
ä'ini trans. suff. to verb: sihoä'ini. S. ä'i.
'ai'ara v.i., to be missing, not found. 'äi 2. 'ei'ara.
'aka poss. pl. 1, ours, for us; used also as obj. of intransitive
verb.
'akaikura poss. dual 1; used of things to eat. 'aka; 'ataikura.
'akaoru, 'akaoru'a poss. pl. 1, ours; used of things to eat.
akaro (ku) n., the ghost of ordinary people, soul. hi'ona. S. akalo.
akauri v.i., to be possessed of. S. akauri.
akeake v.i., to be dry. a.teate.
'aku poss. sing. 1, mine, for me, for me to eat; used also as obj. of
intransitive verb: e hana ta'a 'aku, he shot and wounded me
badly; kai ui 'eku, my right hand; totohu 'aku, of my own
accord.
'aku'a, mine, of things to eat.
'aku'i, as 'aku'a, but used of many things. S. 'aku.
'ama'arua poss. dual 2, yours.
amai v.t., to carry on the shoulder.
amami poss. pl. 1, excl., ours; used also as obj. of intransitive verb,
us. S. 'amami.
'ama'auru poss. pl. 2, yours.
amasi 1, v.t., to pity, to be sorry for. S. amasi.
amasi 2, v.i., to eat a relish with vegetable food. S. amadi.
ameru, 'ameru'a poss. pl. 1, excl., ours, for us.
amere'u, 'ame'reua poss. pl. 1, excl., ours.
ami pers. pron. pl. 1, excl., we, us. U. 'ami.
amire'i v.i., to be startled. S. äsire'i.
amiu poss. pl. 2, yours; used also as obj. of intransitive verb, you.
amu poss. sing. 2, yours, for you; used also as obj. of intransitive
verb, you.
amu'i poss. sing. 2, yours, of many things to eat.
'ana 1, poss. sing. 3, his, hers, its, for him, etc.: kai ui 'ana, his right
hand; mera 'ana a God, God's Son; used also as obj. of
intransitive verb: to'o 'ana, to own it, to hit it. S. ana.
'ana 2, prep., about it, concerning: taa wou 'ana, it doesn't matter.
'ana 1.
'ana 3, prep., at, by, about: 'ani to'i 'ana hana, to work at a hana
garden; 'ana taetaena horo'a, at some time; 'au raai rata
ā'i 'ana taa, you call its name after what? how do you name
it? 'ana au neena, at that clump of bamboos. 'ana 1.

'ana 4, conjunctive, if, when. S. ana.

'ana 5: tangahuru 'ana, the tenth. S. ana.

āni 1, in order to, for the purpose of: 'ani to'i 'ana hana, to work
at a hana garden; āni hori e'i, to buy with; kai ēni ui, hand
for throwing, right hand. S. āni.

'ani 2, of: rua mane 'ani kira, two men of them. S. āni.

'ani 3, v.t., to eat: 'ani hanaraa, to eat food; hana 'ani ā'i, for its
eating. Lau 'ani.

'ani 4, pron. 3 sing., it: ka to'o i 'ani, hits it. 'ana 1.

ano, garden ground.

ano'a adj., dirty, covered with earth. S. ano.

aorai v.t., to expose a body for burial: aorai lukasi. U. oora.

apa 1, side, part: apa mai, this side; apa mauri, the weather side of
the island; apa oro, the right side; i apa ni asi na weou, that
part of the sea over there. S. apa.

apa 2, leaf of tree: Apai siri tora raka, a ghost at Marapa. S. apa.

apa 3, v.i., to crouch.

apata'i v.t., to lie in wait for. S. aapua.

apai niu, 10,000 coconuts. S. id.

āpi (ku) n., beside, alongside, in the house of: horia keni i epina, to
buy a wife for him; i āpi. S. āpi.

'āpu (ku) n., blood.

'apura adj., bloody. S. 'āpu.

'apuo partic., returned; v.i., to return. puo.

'apuro v.i., partic., as 'apuo. S. 'apulo.

araha n., a chief; v.i., to be a chief.

arahana v.n., kingdom. S. alaha.

'arahu partic., come apart, of axe-head, etc. S. 'alangu.

arahuu v.i., to talk in a parable.

arahuuta v.n., a parabolic saying. S. alahuu.

ara 1, v.i., to answer.

arami v.t. S. ala.

'ara 2: 'āi 'ara, to be missing. S. tala.

araka, a coleus. S. asaka.

aratana: i aratana, in the middle.

are, areare 1, n., thing: are inau, my thing; used of persons, with
or without a personal article: *are na, a are*, So-and-so, who do you mean? *mani are*, a thing; *rua mani are*, two things; *are mora'i*, only things; may be replaced by ‘āi 4; *are noo na ‘ei noo*, this and that.

*are* 2, v.t., to call upon, to summon to one's aid: *are hi'ona*, to pray, to invoke a ghost. S. *are*.

Areare, the name of a people occupying the south end of Big Mala from whence the Marau Sound people came. *are* 1.

*ari*: *ari noro*, to hear; *ari ponosi*, to forget.

ārina *(ku)* n., ear. S. ālinge.

arisi v.t., to awake. U. tālisi.

arite, a sea journey. S. ālide.

aro, taro. Lau alo.

aru 1, v.i., to become, to turn into: *nia aru pa'ewa*, he turned into a shark. U. alu.

aru, arua 2, pers. pron. dual 2, you two; used as subject.

arurae, aruarurae v.i., to think, to meditate upon. aru 1. S. ālusae.

'aru'a, black magic. S. sāru'e.

āsi 1, sea: wai esi, at sea. S. āsi.

asi *(ku)* 2, brother, sister, ortho-cousin. S. āsi.

asi 3, v.t., to throw down, to throw away: *ui asi*, to throw down, a tabu, a leaf thrown at the root of a tree. S. asi.

asi'a adv., very, used of a superlative: *warita no'o asi'a*, long ago. S. asi'e.

'asihe v.i., onomatop., to sneeze. S. 'āsihe.

asisi v.i., to be lost, to wander.

asu, asasu 1, v.i., to shake, to quake, to be moved.

asuasu n., earthquake.

asui v.t. S. āsu.

asu 2, v.i., to make a thing, to build a canoe.

asumi v.t. S. ādu.

asuhe, rat. S. āsuhe.

ata 1, n., specific numeral, ten: *atai niu*, ten coconuts. S. ada.

'ata 2, poss. pl. 3, their: *reho 'ata*, their words; used also as obj. of intransitive verb, them. S. ada.

'ataikura, see ‘akaikura.

ataru v.i., to be odd in number, to be over ten: *awara kai atara moa*, haply more than ten. S. daadala.

'atarua poss. pl. 3, theirs.

'atauru poss. pl. 3, theirs, of limited number of people.
ate n., different, another: ate mani iri a'i ro'u, another way of saying it. S. eta, one.
ateate v.i., to be dry. akeake.
'ato v.i., to be difficult, scarce. Lau 'ato.
atowaa, broad day: pui eni atowaa, broad day to-day, 10 a.m.–2 p.m. S. atowaa.
au 1, bamboo: pe au, bamboo water-carrier. S. āu.
'au 2, pers. pron. pl. 2, you; used as subject: 'au tau sieni e'i, you have done right in that.
'auru pers. pron. pl. 2, us; suff. to verbs and prep. as obj., or used as subj., we.
awa, awaawa v.i., to roar, to buzz: sime ko awaawa i erinaka, mosquitoes buzz in our ears.
awai v.t., to draw in the breath.
avasi v.t., to affect a person, of ghostly action: hau ni avasi, the rock at the ghost's landing-place at Marapa. S. avā.
avoa v.i., to be convalescent after an attack of malaria, to be in good health. S. awoa.
avara 1, v.i., to cry out, to yell. S. awara.
avara 2, n., ten, used of a full ten, not used in counting a series:
avara mana rua, twelve. S. awala.

E

e 1, pers. pron. sing. 3, he, she, it; follows the noun as a second subject, or is used by itself as subject; used with a collective noun: tani e makata, the daylight lightened, it is daylight; e dani no'o, it is daylight; e maii komu i'ami, it is not in our country; uhi e pito, hasi raona mato, the yam has sprouted, plant it in the ground; follows neiia, he: neiia e rauia, he knows it. S. e.
e 2, used before numerals: e rua, two; e hīta, how many? S. e.
e 3, particle expressing purpose: kura kai rae 'e waiwa, let us two go for a walk. U. 'e.
ei 1, a person, a thing: 'ei mai ha'ini'o, is no one with you? 'ei utaa, what person? what one? 'a 'ei, the person; taa'i rua 'ei, taa'i olu 'ei, two or three things; haru 'ei e una, some things are like that; are noo na 'ei noo, this and that; 'ei i'era, many things; 'ei nei e uriha'lining 'ei nei, this one is like that. 'āi 4.
ei 2, negative, no, not. 'āi 2.
e'ini tr. suff. to verb. a'ini.
e'ira, see 'āi'ara.
eni demonstr., this: pui eni, this day, to-day; tei (kai, kei) eni, here. nei.

eno, enoeno v.i., to lie down. S. eno.

eo exclam. of assent, yes! Fl. eo.

‘ere, ‘ere’ere (na, ni) n., tip: ‘erena ‘āi, the top of a tree; to’o ‘erena, its tip; ‘ere’ere ni Mara, the tip of Mala, south cape. S. ‘ele. ‘ere’ere v.i., to be round, of moon at full. S. ‘ere.

eru pers. pron. pl. 1 incl., we, of limited number; used as subj. by itself, or follows ieru.

erua pers. pron. dual 1 excl., us two; suff. to verbs and prep. as obj.

eta numeral, one; used in a series.

etana n., first. ta 3, taa‘i.

eva, evaeva, eva, evaeva 1, v.i., to walk about: noko rae evaeva, I am going for a walk. uaiwa.

‘eva, ‘e’eva 2, v.i., to be tall, long. teva.

H

In certain words h is heard only indistinctly: i hiru, i huru; mahusi.

ha 1, ending of verbal noun: rae, raeha; mauru, mauruha; suuha. S. hā.

ha-(ku) 2, n., to, for; haku, to me, for me; hakaoru, to us; noro haku, listen to me; mane i sii haku, my elder brother.

ha’a causative prefix, used with verbs or nouns. S. ha‘a.

ha‘enohi v.t., to lay down, to cause to recline. eno.

haahi prep., about, concerning, round about; adv., around. S. haahi.

ha‘ahuta v.t., to generate. huta.

haa‘i v.t., to call, to name. S. soa‘i.

ha‘akarahini v.t., to cause to come near. karahini.

ha‘amae v.t., to pound in a mortar. mae.

ha‘amakata v.t., to make light, to enlighten. makata.

ha‘amasi v.t., to laugh at. masi.

ha‘anoro v.t., to cause to hear. noro.

ha‘aoho v.i., to make an offering to an ancestral ghost after returning from overseas. U. ha‘aoho.

ha‘apuo v.t., to restore. puo.

ha‘arato v.i., to expose to the sun’s rays, to dry.

ha‘arataoa‘i v.t. rato.

ha‘asieni v.t., to make good, to rectify. sieni.
ha'asiko v.t., to finish. siko.
ha'ata'i v.i., to appear; used with poss. 'aku, etc.: hi'ona e ha'ata'i 'ana, a ghost appeared to him.
ha'ata'ini v.t., to show. S. ha'ata'i.
ha'atanora v.t., to enable, to confer spiritual power on. tanora.
ha'ateke v.i., to drop crumbs when eating. teke.
ha'atoto v.t., to bury a corpse at sea. toto.
ha'ausuri v.t., to teach, to instruct. usuri.
ha'a v.t., to carry a person on one's back. S. haha.
ha'hi, haihahi v.t., to cook in an oven; hahi poo, to roast a pig.
ha'hina v.n., roasting. S. háhi.
ha'ho (ku) n., on, above; used with loc. i: i hahona, above it.
ha'hoi v.t.: horo'a hahoa na poni, two days ago. S. haho.
ha'hune-(ku) n., brother, sister.
ha'hu'una n.: rua mai ha'hunena, two brothers, two sisters.
hai 1, numeral, four: e hai; poni hai, the fourth day.
ha'ina n., fourth. S. hai.
hai 2, v.t., to weed. S. hái, to scratch the ground.
hai 3, v.i., to rise, of moon.
hai 4, reflexive prefix to verbs: hairiu. S. hái.
hai 5, exclamation: hai una, that's the way! thus! ai 1.
hai 6, for hau i: hai nima, in the house.
hai, hei 7, article, a: hai horo'a, a day; hai rato, a spell of sunshine; rua hai li poni, rua hai rato, two days. S. hái.
ha'i 8, a man's sister: kei ha'i nau, my sister.
ha'i 9, suffix to verb: uriha'i. S. hái.
ha'ini 1, trans. suff. to verb: kokoro ha'ini.
ha'ini 2, prep., with: ha'ini'o, with thee. S. pe'ini.
haiore v.i., to be quick; exclam., quick! hurry!
hairaa, to spoil.
hairuka v.i., to expose a body for burial. ruka.
hairiu adv.: raah airiu, to walk about. riu.
haisoe v.i., to question: haisoe 'ohi, to question about. soe.
haitce v.i., to be whole-skinned: niu hai'tce. te'e.
ha'ka, ship. S. haka.
ha'na 1, prep., for; expresses purpose: ha'na taa, what for? why?
ha'na 'oko i ta, for you to do it; ha'na ha'hina, for cooking.
ha- 2.
ha'na 2, to it: nau siho mai hana i hu'a, I came down to the ground.
ha- 2.
hana 3, a yam with a prickly vine. S. hana.
hana, hanahana 4, v.i., to eat: e hana ta’a ‘aku, it eats bad for me.
hanarau v.n., vegetable food: ‘ani hanarau, to eat food; te hanarau, one meal. Mota gana; Lau fanga.
hane, hanchehane v.i., to climb, to jump, of bonito. S. hane.
hani, pron., for them, pl. of things only: kuki niu hani tapaiso, to make copra for tobacco. ha-2.
hanua, land, island, people: hanua i are, such-and-such a place;
hanua to’o, the mainland; ikira hanua, the people; e iweria hanua, a crowd of people; waru hanua, all the islands. S. hänue.
hanuhanua n., people.
haoru adj., new, clean; raanau haoru, young man, unmarried man.
U. haolu.
harak, hahaka n., fruit, a growing coconut, the fruit of barringtonia edulis; v.i., to sprout, of coconut.
hare, hut: to’o i hare, to be in separation, of women. pisi.
harisi, yam, crop, grass, a year (late use). S. hälisi.
haro adv., consequent upon, thereupon; precedes verb: e haro iria,
thereupon he said; noko haro simouka ku’u, when I have had
a smoke; gently: ‘oko haro ra, go gently. raro. S. haro.
haru 1, n., some: haru i ‘ei e una, some things are like that. S. hålu.
haru 2: rau i haru, ten thousand, of coconuts. rau. S. hålu.
hasi v.t., to plant.
hasina v.n. S. häsi.
hata: suri hata, forty, of dogs’ teeth. suri. S. hata.
hatara- (a) prep., alongside, beside.
hatara v.i., to coast along.
hataroa v.n., coast. S. hatale.
hau 1, rock: hau ni awasi. S. håu.
hau 2, adv., of direction, down, north: hai (hau i) nima, in the house.
hou. S. hou.
ha’u 3, pandanus, pandanus mat. S. hā’u.
hauhau (na) n., the shell beads which serve as money. S. hāuhāu.
hausuu, a pudding made of pounded taro or hana with coconut cream
added. U. hausuu.
he’a v.i., to defecate.
he’asi v.t., to dirt upon.
he’ata’ini v.t., to pass in the faeces. S. he’a.
he’eta adv., alone, entirely: inau mora he’eta. Cf. Lau fala’ete.
heheo v.i., to be silly, foolish. peo.
hei n., place of: ihei, where? Mota vea.
hena, a gourd, lime box, lime for eating. S. hena.
heoheo (na) n., cuttle-fish bone, sepia.
herohero v.i., to be weak.
hi trans. suff. to verb: sikihi. S. hi.
hiina’ini v.t., to feel, to perceive. S. hiinge’ini.
hike- (na) n., of, from among: hikemiu, of you. S. hike.
hina interrogative, is that so?
hinasu (ku) n., flesh. S. hinesu.
h’olo, hi’oro v.i., to be hungry.
   hi’oloa v.n., hunger. S. hi’olo.
hi’ona, the ghost of an important person: tara ni hi’ona, the ghost track at Marapa. akaro. U. hi’ona.
hiru, hiruhiru 1, v.i., to revolve, to be tangled. taihiruhiru.
   S. hiru.
hiru 2, up, on top; used with loc. i: i hiru; na’ia i hiru, put it on top.
huru 2.
hiita 1, interrog. adv., how many? used with e 2: e hiita?
   Lau fita.
hiita, hitahita 2, v.i., to hit: rourou e hita, it thundered. S. hite.
hiu numeral, seven: poni hiu, seven days hence.
   hiuna n., seventh. S. hiu.
hiute’ini v.t., to move in a circle about: kari hiute’ini, to encircle.
   S. hiute’i.
ho’asi v.t., to worship: ho’asi hi’ona, to worship ghosts. S. ho’asi.
hoè v.t., to call: rua mai hoè, grandparent and grandchild, the two who bear the same name. U. soè.
hohoro v.i., to barter. S. holoholo.
hoke v.i., to be torn. S. hoka, to burst.
hoko, a bundle, a faggot: hoko i rao, a bundle of sago palm leaves.
holi, holiholi v.t., to buy. S. holi.
hono: rerehono v.i., to disturb by chattering.
   honosi v.t., to be against. S. honosi; Pol. fono.
honu 1, a turtle. S. honu.
honu 2, v.i., to be full.
   honuraa v.n., a feast. S. honu.
horo 1, v.i., to kill.
horoi v.t. S. horo.
horo 2, v.i., to be across, cross-wise: 'āi horo, a cross. S. holo.
horo 3: see mahorohoro.
horo'a 1, adj. used as noun, a day: horo'a hahoa na poni, the day before yesterday. S. holo.
horo'a 2, occasion, time; used as multiplicative: taa'i horo'a, once; rua horo'a, twice. horo'a 1.
hote v.i., to paddle.
hotena v.n. S. hote.
hou 1, v.i., to be famous, renowned: Hou i Marapa, name of a hi'ona.
houraa v.n., a feast. S. hou; Pol. sau, high chief.
hou 2, adv. of direction, north. hau 2. S. hou.
hou 3, v.t., to bring, to take.
houhou, a stage, a platform. S. houhou, bier.
hua 1, noun used as plural: hua ni keni na, hua ni mane na, hua ni haka na, women, men, ships.
hu'a 2, wife, lady: Hu'a toru i hau ni avasi; hu'a inau, my wife.
hu'a hua v.i., to be wife to. huka. S. hu'e.
huaa, ground, earth: i huaa, on the ground; nau siho mai hana i huaa, I descended to the ground.
huasa, a crocodile. S. huasa.
huka, woman, wife: a huka, such-and-such a woman. hu'a 2.
huna v.i., to anchor a canoe. S. hune.
huni: liihuni, raihuni, to hide. Lau hau-fin; S. mumumi.
huno (ku) n., relatives-at-law.
hunona n.: rua mai hunona, mother-in-law and daughter-in-law, etc. S. hungao-
hura, hurahura 1, v.i., to arrive, to reach. S. hule.
hura 2, moon, month. Mota vula.
huri, bedplace. U. huli.
huru, huruhuru 1, v.i., to run. S. huru.
huru 2, up, on top; used with loc. i: i huru, on top. hiru 2.
huta, hutahuta v.i., to be born: mane huta i sii, elder brother; huta i taa'i, born of the same parents.
hutahutana v.n., a generation of men. S. hute.
huu 1, v.i., to fall down. Mota sus.
huu 2, a tree, barringtonia. S. huu.
huu 3, real, permanent: to'ohuu, to be real; Huu ni nima, Founder of the house. S. huu.
huu 4, v.i., to cough: hu'u poepoe, to have a racking cough; n., cough. S. hu'u.
I

1, locative, at: i Marau, Marau Sound. S. i.

2, genitive, of: huta i ta 'ia, born of the same parents; mane i sii, eldest son; pera i niu, a thousand coconuts; uku i raia, line of putty; vari i niu, a coconut. ni. S. i.

3, expresses purpose: hana 'oko i ta, for you to do it; noko i tohua na 'ai, I am going to chop a tree; ieru taunaha i eru i raaia i o, we want to know you. S. i.

4, prefix to pronouns: inau, etc. S. i.

5, trans. suff. to verbs: horo, horoi. S. i.

6, suffix used of place or position added to nouns: i marui, underneath; i matorai, in amongst; i raoi, by the side of.

7, prefix forming nouns: kau to hook; ikau, a crook. S. i.

8, plural suffix, used of things only: are mora'i, ordinary things; are i o'i ni nei, these are yours; are i o'i i nei, these are yours; na taa'i, what things? ni 4. S. 'i.

'9, suffixed to poss., used of many things to eat: are 'aku'i, things for me to eat. S. i.

ia (ku) 1, n., womb. S. ie.

ia 2, fish: na i a, a fish. S. i'e.

i api- (ku) n., in the house of, beside. api.

i'ami pron. pl. 1, excl., we, us, ours. U. i'ami.

i'amu pron. pl. 2, you, yours. U. i'amu.

i aratana, in the middle.

iauru pron. dual 2, you, yours.

iauru pron. pl. 2, you, yours.

ieru pron. dual 1, excl., we, our.

ierua pron. dual 2, excl., you two, yours.

i haho, on top, above. haho.

ihei adv., where, whence: 'o ike ihei, where have you come from?

U. ihei.

ihi, tapa cloth. Fl. tivi.

i huru, above, on the top of. huru.

'i'i, a bird, the land kingfisher.

iia exclamation of doubt or ignorance, I can't say, I don't know.

U. iio.

ikau n., a crook. kau.

ikara pron. dual 2, incl., we two, ours. ikura.

ike, adv. of motion, from, out of. U. kei.

ikia pron. pl. 1 incl., we, ours. U. ikia.
ikira pron. pl. 3, they, theirs; used as plural article, of people only:
   ikira a are, So-and-so and those with him; ikira hanua, the
   people; ikira Sa'a, the Sa'a people. U. ikira.

ikiraoru pron. pl. 3, they, theirs.

ikoru pron. pl. 1, incl., we, ours; used of limited number.

ikura pron. dual 1, incl., we two, ours. ikara.

ilu v.t., to sup: ilu piina, to sup vegetable soup. U. ilu.

i maru- (ku) n., underneath, under, in the shadow of.

   i marui, under them, of things. maru.

i matora- (ka) n., amongst.

   i matorai, amongst them, in the middle of, of things. matora.

imo v.t., to deceive.

imoha v.n., deceit.

inaia pers. pron. sing. 3, he, his. U. inge'ia.

inamae v.i., to be an orphan. S. inemae.

inanita interrogative, when? nanita.

inau pron. sing. 1, I, mine. U. inau.

ine 1, v.i., to have a pitted sore under the foot: 'ake hu ka ine; n., a
   pitted sore under the foot. S. ine.

ine (na) 2, n., seed, kernel. U. ine.

ini 1, transitive suffix to verb: nanamaini. S. ini.

'ini, 'ini'ini 2, v.t., to pinch with the fingers, to pluck leaves: ini
   rau, to pluck leaves for cooking. S. 'ini.

inoni, man, a man. S. inoni.

i'o pers. pron. sing. 2, thou, thy. S. i'oe.

iora, a canoe. S. iola.

ipora v.i., to be black, blue. pora.

i raoi, i raoni, inside them, of things. rao.

ire, a polished stone adze, a steel axe. S. ile.

ire suna v.i., to make fire with a fire-plough.
   ire sunaa v.n., fire-making with a fire-plough. S. ile.

iri v.t., to say, to think, to assume: 'o iria e a'i, did you think it
   wasn't so? ate mani iri a'i ro'u, a different way of saying it.

iro, iiroiro 1, v.t., to look for, to search.

irohi v.t., to search for. S. iro.

iro 2, a mangrove oyster. The r of iro is heard almost as d.
   S. iilo.

iru, wind; v.i., to blow, of the wind. S. iru.

i sihani, outside. S. i sihana.

i sio- (ku) n., following, after, along. i 1.
isu v.i., to count, to enumerate.

isumi v.t.

isuna v.n., numeration. S. idu. The ordinary decimal numeration is eta, rua, oru, hai, nina, ono, hiu, varu, siwa, tanahuru. A system invented by a Marau hi'ona is as follows: eta'a'i, ruka'i, toru'i, waka'i, reresia, ta'ai tavi, ro pui, tari mai, siki pani, tumasi.

isu tate v.i., to be numerous, beyond count. tate.

i upuna, the waist, in the middle of. upu.

iweera, all; generally follows the noun or pronoun, but may precede:

e iweera hanua, a crowd of people; hanua ka iweera, many people.

K

ka 1, pronoun pl. 1, incl., our; suff. to nouns and to certain prepositions.

ka 2, verbal particle, used of indefinite time; not used with no, 'o, pers. pron. 1 and 2 pers. sing.: ka totoria raurahi kira si kukia, it will wait till evening and then they will cook it; kura ka raa, let us two go! kai. U. 'o.

kae v.i., to deceive, to lie.

kaesi v.t. U. kae.

kai 1, verbal particle, used of a definite future: mane kai ma'e, men will die. ka 2. S. kei.

kai 2, place: kai eni, here. kei; tei.

kai, kaikai (ku) 3 n., hand, arm, fingers: kai 'eni ui, the throwing hand, right hand.

kaka'i, superlative, very: kaka'i no'o, too much! an exclamation of wonder.

kakake, wild, swamp, taro.

kakaru, a well of water. S. kakalu.

kako v.t., to husk coconuts.

kami, the sheath of the coconut flower. S. kāmu.

kamu v.i., to eat the betel-mixture.

kamuha v.n.: maa ni kamuha, one eating of the betel-mixture.

Lau kamu.

kaokao, a half-shell of the coconut. S. kaokao.

kapi, tongs made of bamboo.

kapisi v.t., to grasp with the tongs. S. āpisi, to hold under the arm.

kara pron. dual 1, incl., we two, ours. U. kara.

karahini v.t., to be near; adv., near. S. karaini.
karai adv., nearly; precedes verb: nau karai mae, I nearly died
S. karai.
karaini v.t., to be near; adv., near.
kare (ku) n., son, daughter, child; mane, male, keni, female, are added
to distinguish sex. S. kale.
kari, karikari v.t., to go round, to encircle. S. kāli.
kari awara, a shell-money of ten strings each a fathom long. S.
kāli awala.
kari hiute'ini v.t., to encircle.
karu v.i., to grasp with the hand: karu pasi, to take a bow to shoot.
S. kāru.
karu arurae v.i., to meditate. arurae.
karuru, the coconut-crab, Birgus latro. S. āsusu.
kasia exclamation, wait a bit! one minute!
kasu v.i., to be rotten. S. kāsu.
kau 1, v.t., to grasp with a hook or tentacle. ikau. S. kāu.
ka'u 2, adv., denotes a preterite, follows verb; makes the speech
less abrupt. S. kā'u.
ke adj., little; precedes noun: ke mera (manate), a little child; adv.,
a little: e ke nara'i, the rain is lifting a little; uta ka ke mimi'i,
it is raining a little.
ke'e, ke'eke'e 1, v.i., to bite: e ke'eke'e 'amu, it bit you.
ke'e 2, a bivalve, the shell used for making money discs. Lau ke.
kei 1, woman: kei tu'a, poor lady! kei ha'i nau, my sister; a keina,
the woman, such-and-such a woman. teite. S. kei.
kei 2, place: kei eni, here. kai, tei.
keni, woman, wife; used with nouns to denote gender. S. keni.
Kera, the hill district at the south end of Guadalcanal. S. Kela.
ke'u, a mud cockle, edible.
kia pers. pron. pl. 1, we, us. nikia. S. kie.
kihi, hat. ? English "cap".
ki'iki'i (ku) n., arm. S. ki'iki'i, finger.
kira pron. pl. 3, they, theirs; used as plural article with persons
only: kira Sa'a, the Sa'a people; bokus kira waiti mani,
white men's boxes; used to form passive. U. kira.
kiraatei interrog. pron. pl. 3, who?
kiraoru pron. pl. 3, they, theirs; used of limited number.
kiraruua pers. pron. dual 3, them.
kiru (na) n., hole; v.t. to make a hole for: kirua aro, to plant taro
in a hole. S. kilu.
ko verbal particle of indefinite time; used only with personal pronouns
no, 'o: noko, 'oko; nokoi, 'okoi. S. ko.
ko e 2: va'i koe, to make fun, to joke. U. koe.
koilo, a tree, Calophyllum inophyllum. Lau. koilo.
koka, a sore, an ulcer.
koko'o, old man. Lau ko'o.
kokoro 1, the coenobite crab: pota kokoro, crack the kokoro, a bird, curlew. S. kokolo.
kokoro 2, v.i., to be deep.
kokoroha'i ni v.t., to sink, to cover up deep. S. kokoro.
kolu 1, a variant of koru, we, us, our: noko haro simouka ku'u kolu si raa. S. kolu.
kolu (ku) 2, n., back. S. kolu.
komu, village. S. komu, family; Lau komukomua.
koni v.t., to collect, to gather, to adopt a child: konia mera, to mind a child; 'oni koni, to dwell together. S. koni.
ko'o, grandparent, grandchild. koko'o. Lau ko'o; Mota tupui.
kora, ashes. S. ora.
kore, korekore v.i., to sweep with a broom; n., a broom. U. kore.
kori 1, v.i., to be lazy: kori raramea, very lazy.
kori 2, v.t., to scrape: kori niu, to scrape and eat a coconut.
S. kori.
korokoro v.t., to be ignorant of. U. kolokolo.
koru 1, pron. pl. 1, incl., we, us, our. kolu.
koru 2, v.t., to heap up.
korua v.n., a crowd: korua ni inoni. S. koru.
kou v.i., to drink.
kouhi v.t. Lau guou.
koukoura v.i., to be short in stature. S. koukoule.
kua, the domestic fowl: kua keni, hen; kua mane, cock. U. kua.
kui, kukui, a dog. Lau kui.
kumu 1, v.i., to be blunted, of axe. S. komu.
kumu 2, v.i., to punch: kumu tekera'i ni, to hit with the hand and knock down. S. kumu.
kura 1, v.t., to heal by magic. S. kure.
kura 2, pron. dual 1, incl., we two, us two, ours: kura, come on, let us go! S. kure.
kuru, a canoe decorated with cone-shell.
kuru'a adj., heavy, enceinte. Lau gulua.
In certain words l and r are used interchangeably and the people
know no difference in the two sounds in these particular words and use
them indifferently.

lae l, v.i., to go. raa. S. lae.

lae, rae 2, v.t., to make an oration: laea wara, to make a speech.

laeli v.t.: laeli wara. S. laeli.

lai, rai plural article, precedes noun; used with the nouns inoni,
man, keni, woman, mane, male, meri, child: lai meri, children.

Fl. lei; S. alei.

lale, rare v.t., to singe with coconut leaf, to roast: lale poo, to roast,
to sacrifice pigs. S. rare.

lalisi, morning, 7–9 a.m.: puieni lalisi, this morning.

lape (ku), rape (ku) n., body. S. sape.

lapi v.i., to change into, to become incarnate in: e lapi ‘ana pa’eva,
he turned into a shark. S. lapi.

laru, raru, a tree, the casuarina. S. sálu.

lasu, rasu n., smoke of fire; v.i., to smoke. S. sasu.

lata, climbing fern. S. sata.

lato, rato, sun: lato rete’a, lato tanora, strong sunlight.

lato’a, rato’a adj., used as n., day: hai rato’a, a day.

latoa’i v.t., to dry in the sun. S. sato.

lau, rau 1, leaf: ‘ini lau, to pluck edible leaves. S. rau.

lahuta- (na) n.: lahutana mausu, the leaves of forest trees. rahuta.

lau 2, v.t., to wrest. S. láu 1.

laurahi, raurahi n., evening: i laurahi, in the evening; puieni laurahi,
this evening. S. sáulchi.

leho v.i., to speak; leho (ku) n., speech, word. reho.

li, genitive: hai li poni, a day. ni. S. li.

liihiuni v.t., to hide; to be hidden. raihuni.

lio v.i., to see, to look.

lioha- (na) n., appearance.

liohi v.t., to look at. S. lio.

líoa n.: loía ni mae, a war ghost. S. li’oa.

loko v.t., to gather up; v.i., to be gathered together. S. loko.

loosi v.t., to await, to expect. U. loosi.

lopo, deep water inside a lagoon. S. lopo.

loto v.i., to bathe.

lotohi v.t., to bathe, to wash oneself. S. loto.

lui v.t., to forbid, to grudge. U. lui.
luka 1, v.i., to open the oven when the food is cooked.
luka, ruka 2, v.i., to leave.
lukasi v.t., to leave behind: aorai lukasi, to expose a dead body.
  Lau luka.

M

ma 1, prefix of reciprocity, used with rua, two: rua maasina, two brothers. S. mua.
ma 2, adjectival prefix: mahorohoro. S. ma.
maa (ku) 1, n., eye, face. S. maa.
maa 2, n., one, a, piece; used with genit. i, ni; maa ni kamuka, one eating of the betel-mixture; maanitawa, a landing-place; rua maani are, two things; maa misi, the rib of the coconut-leaf; maai rade, a reed; maai tapaiso, a piece of tobacco. maa 1.

maa 3, snake. S. muaa.
maa 4, v.i., to be dried in the smoke, of canarium almonds: nari maa. S. maa.
ma'a 5, v.i., to be extinct, gone out, of fire or torch. S. mua'a.
maakure adv., merely, for no reason. S. muaakule.
maamaa 1, worm: maamaa koe, intestinal worm. S. muaamuaa.
ma'a'ma'a (ku) 2, n., father: a ma'a'ma'a, father, used of a specific person; used as voc. of parent or child. S. mama'a.
maani 1, prep., from: paina maania, bigger than it. S. muaani.
maania prep., with, and.
maanitawa, a landing-place. tawa. S. maalitawa.
maaru, maarua pron. dual 2, your; suffixed to nouns and prepositions.
ma'asi v.t., to be unwilling to do: nau ma'asi raa, I don't want to go;
  nau ma'asia ani'i, I don't want to eat them.
ma'asite'ini v.t.
maasina: rua maasina, rua mai maasina, two brothers, two sisters, brother and sister. asi 2.
mavuru pron. pl. 2, your; suffixed to nouns and prepositions.
mae 1, v.i., to die.
maeraa v.n., sickness.
maeta- (ku) n., death feast: 'ania maetana a are, to eat So-and-so's death feast. mae 1.
mae 2, war: tau mae, to make war. S. mae.
mae 3, man, male person: mae noo, that person, you, voc. S. mea.
maea v.i., to be sacred, holy. U. maea.
maero v.i., to be ripe, of fruits. S. maelo.
mahorohoro v.i., to appear from time to time, to visit, to appear.
   horo 2. S. mahoro.
mahusi v.i., to be broken; pai mahusi v.t., to break.
mai 1, adv., hither, here: rua mai, come here. S. māi.
mai 2, negative, no, not, used with verbs.
mai 3, v.i., to ebb, of tide; n., the ebb. S. māi.
mai 4, prefix of reciprocity. ma 1.
mana 1, the unit above ten: awara mana rua, twelve.
mana 2, dehortative, don't.
manata (ku) n., thought, mind, intention.
   manatai v.i., to know.
   manataimi v.t., to think, to have sense, to be taught. matai 1. S.
   manataimi.
mane 1, male; added to nouns to denote sex: mane i sii, elder son;
   mane i puri, younger son; mane i tou, second son, of three;
   ro mane, rua mane, exclam. of surprise or wonder. S. mwane.
mane 2, adv., est: mai reesia mane ka wa'inia mane mora mane kira
   mac siko, no man was found who could deliver men from death.
   S. mwane.
mani 1, article, a: mani are, a thing; rua mani are, two things;
   mani wara, a word, a saying; mani rehona e uri'i, his words
   were to this effect; ate mani iri ā'i ro'u, another way of saying
   it. U. mani.
mani 2: waiti mani, white man; English words.
mano, manomano v.i., to breathe: mano poe, to gasp.
   mano (ku) n., breath. S. mango.
manora v.i., to be clear, free from impurity: wai manora, fresh water.
   S. manola.
manore, a fish, the large garfish. S. mwanole.
manu 1, bird. S. mānu.
manu 2, v.i., to float. S. mānu.
mao 1, v.i., no, negative: mao, e mao neena, no, it's not so.
   mao, maomao 2, v.i., to dance. S. mao.
mara 1, v.i., to be ashamed. S. masa.
mara 2, adv., as, like, as if, just as. S. mala.
Mara 3, Mala Island: Mara masike; Mara paina. S. Mwala.
maraa- (ku) n., alone, self: inau maraaku, I by myself. S. maraa-
maraaha, sweat. S. madara'a.
maraahu-, malahu- (ku) n., friend, namesake.
marahuna n.: rua mai marahuna, grandparent and grandchild, 
mane and keni being added to distinguish sex. S. malahu.
mara ohonai v.i., to attempt, to try, to tempt; mara ohonaina v.n. 
S. ohongai.
Marapa, the island of the dead, Hades, in Marau Sound. S. Malapa.
marau 1, island.
mara'u 2, v.i., to be easy, soft, pliable. S. mveadau.
maraeva v.i., to be raw, uncooked; used of an unmarried lad. S. arawa.
mareho: a mareho, So-and-so; probably a San Cristooval word.
mari'a adj., cooked. S. mali'e.
marimari v.i., to be sweet. S. mai meli.
maru, marumaru v.i., to shade, to cast a shade.

maru- (na) n., used with loc. i: i maruna, underneath it.

marui: i marui, underneath. S. mulu.
masi v.i., to laugh. S. mwasi.
masi'e adj., little: masike.
masike adj., little: Mara masike, Little Mala. masi'e.
matai, matei 1, v.t., to know. S. manata'i. Lau. haietana.
mata'i 2, v.i., to have an attack of malaria, to be ill.
mata'iha v.n., malaria, sickness. S. mata'i.
matauva, the open sea: i matauva. S. matauva.
mato, the ground, earth, dirt: i mato, on the ground; uhi e pito, 
hasi raona mato, the yam has sprouted, plant it in the ground.
mato'a adj., covered with earth, dirty. U. mveado.
matora- (na) n., midst, among; used with loc. i; i matoraka, in the 
midst of us; i matora-. S. matola.
mau, maunau v.i., to fear.

mauni v.t., to be in fear of. mou. S. mahu.
mauri v.i., to live.

mauria v.n., life, salvation.

maurisi v.t., to survive a thing. mouri. S. mauri.
mauru v.i., to sleep: mauru suiri, to employ magic sleep in order to 
find out about a thing.

mauruva v.n., sleep.

maurusu v.t., to dream of. U. mauru.
mausu, forest: rahutana mausu, leaves of the forest. U. mausu.
mauta'a v.i., to be hard, firm, not soft. S. mauta'a.
mea (ku) n., tongue: raramea. S. mea.
me'e: me'etani, night; i me'etani, in the night; pui eni me'etani, 
to-night. tani.
meeru, meerua pron. dual 1, excl., our; suffixed to nouns and prepositions.
mera, meramera 1, v.i., to be red.
memera'a, meramera'a adj., red. Lau. mela.
mera 2, child: mera keni, girl, unmarried girl; mera mane, boy;
mera viiivi (viiivi), baby; memera, pl., children. S. muela.
meru pron. pl. 1, excl., our; suffixed to nouns and prepositions.
mimi v.i., to urinate. S. mimi.
mimi'i v.i., to drizzle, of rain: uta ka ke mimi'i, it is drizzling. mimi.
misi, midrib of coconut leaf: maai misi. S. muvidi.
moa, momoa 1, v.i., to vomit, to be seasick. S. moa.
moa 2, adv., haply, perhaps; introduces doubt; placed at end of sentence: ka raa tori moa, haply it is going north.
moi v.t., to scratch the body.
momota v.i., to have a rash on the body. S. mota.
mora 1, adv., only, merely, for no reason; follows the word qualified. S. mola.
mora 2, ten thousand, numerous; denotes totality: mora ni mane, many men; waru mora ni are, countless numbers of things.
moramora n., numerous: moramora ni are, very many things. S. mola.
mora na, mora neena, now, immediately. S. molana.
moru, morumoru v.i., to be small, unimportant, of people. S. moru.
mou 1, v.i., to be broken: mou no'o, broken.
moutei partic., one only. S. mou.
mou, moumou 2, v.i., to fear.
mouni v.t., mau.
mouri, moumouri v.i., to live, to be alive.
mouriha v.n., life, salvation. mauri.
mu pron. sing. 2, thy; suffixed to nouns and prepositions.
muu 1, v.i., to be broken. mou. Lau muu.
muu 2, boy: muu na, you boy there! S. muau.
muumuu 1, v.i., to make inarticulate sounds.
Muumuu 2, a fabulous people living in holes and caves on the south end of Guadalcanal, at war with the ordinary people.

N

na 1, article, demonstrative, a, the: na 'ai, a tree; na mora ni mane,
a thousand men; na poni, yesterday; na taa'i, what things?
'a 5. Lau na.
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na 2, pers. pron. sing. 1, I; used as subject of verb: *na suu'i raa,* I won't go. U. *na.*

*na 3,* demonstrative, this, here, that, there: *inau na mai to'o are,* as for me I have nothing; *i apani asi na wou,* in that part of the sea over there; *mane wou, that man there; a keina,* the woman; *a porona,* the man, So-and-so; *na noo,* there it is! *naia na,* that's it! *ai rao i'o hura na,* it is you, then, that have come! *are na,* the person, So-and-so; *mora na,* now immediately; *muu na,* you boy there! *neena.* S. *na.*

*na 4,* suff. pron. sing. 3, his, hers, its; suff. to nouns: *pauna,* his head; *i apina,* beside him. S. *nā.*

*na 5,* copulative, and: *are noo na 'e'i noo,* this and that; used in numeration: *hua ni keni na, hua ni mane na,* women and, men and.

*na 6,* ending of verbal noun: *hahi,* to roast, *hahina,* roasting; *waiasi,* to go fishing, *waiasina,* fishing. S. *nga.*

*na 7,* noun ending added to names of relationship: *hahunena,* *maasina.* S. *nā.*

*na 8,* prefix to verb: *pota,* *napotari.*

*naanau,* see *raanau.*

*nahu,* *naunahu* v.i., to speak; an Oroha, Mala, word.

*na'i* v.t., to put, to place, to bury. S. *ne'i.*

*naia* pers. pron. sing. 3, he, she, it. *neia.* S. *nge'ie.*

*na'ini* trans. suff. to verb: *hiina'ini.* S. *na'ini.*

*naku* v.i., to sit, to be seated.

*nakuha* v.n. U. *naku.*

*nanama* v.i., to be magically powerful.

*nanamaini* v.t., to empower, of ghostly action. *tanora.* U. *nanama.*

*nanita* interrogative, when? *i nanita.* S. *ngānite.*

*na'o,* *na'ona'o* v.i., to lead.

*na'o* (ku) n., front; *i na'oku,* in front of me. S. *na'o.*

*na'otara* (ku) n., forehead. *tara.*

*napotaa* passive, broken, smashed: *pauna e napotaa,* his head is broken.

*napotari* v.t., to break. *pota.*

*nara,* *naranara* v.i., to cry. S. *ngara.*

*nara'i* v.i., to lift, of rain: *e ke nara'i,* the rain is lifting a little.

*nari,* the canarium nut. S. *ngāli.*

*nasi* v.i., to be hard in texture, tough: *e nasi ni tohua,* it is hard to chop. S. *ngāsi.*
nato v.i., to fall out, of teeth, to be toothless.
nau pron. sing. 1, I, me, mine. inau.
ne pers. pron. sing. 3, he; used with personal article a: nea are,
So-and-so.
nee demonstrative: nee na, this, that, those.
uri'i nee na, that's the way! neia neena, that's it; nee nei, this,
that. S. ngee-na.
nei demonstrative, this, these; ni nei, this; are nau ni nei, this is
mine; 'ei nei, this thing, these things; 'ei nei e uriha'inia 'ei nei,
this is like this. eni.
neia pers. pron. sing. 3, he, she, it: neia ka raa, he is going; neia e
raaia, he knows. nei 2.
ni 1, genitive, of: hau ni avasi, the rock of spiritual power; poro ni
haka, man of the ship, a white man; oha ni iora, canoe-house.
S. ni.
ni 2, expresses purpose: nasi ni tohua, hard to chop. S. ni.
ni 3, demonstrative, precedes nei, noo: ni nei, this, these; ni noo,
that, those; are i'o'i ni nei, these are yours. U. ni.
ni 4, plural, used of things only: 'a'a are nau ni, these, those, things
of mine; hu'u ni i'amuru, we have colds; added to ha-2: kuki
niu hani tapaiso, cook coconuts for tobacco; used of
situation: i raoni, beside. 'i 8.
ni 5, transitive suffix to verb: suu, suuni. S. ni.
ni 6, to set out, to incline: ni rau; ni toli. S. ni.
nike (ku) n., mother, aunt, etc. S. nike.
nikia voc., mother. Lau ni, feminine article.
nima 1, numeral, five.
nimana n., fifth. U. lima.
nima 2, house, married quarters: nima nau, my house; hai nima,
tei nima, in the house. oha. U. nima.
nini, nodule, round object: nini pua, an areca nut. U. nini.
ni rau v.i., to ornament the body with shell ornaments. rau.
ni toli v.i., to be head downwards, to descend. S. ni toli.
niu, coconut: pera i niu, one thousand coconuts. S. niu.
niui (na) n., nest: tora niui, to build a nest. S. niui.
no pers. pron. sing. 1, I; used as subject followed by ko: noko raa,
I am going; noko mai raa, I am not going; i 3 may be added
to noko: nokoi tohua na 'ai, I am chopping a tree. S. no.
onororo, swamp. S. lolongo.
noo 1, demonstrative, this, these, that, thus: ni noo, this; uri'i
noo, like this! mae noo, that man, voc. you! are noo warita, formerly; kaka'i noo, what a monster of a thing!

no'o 2, mark of preterite: e siko no'o, it is finished; taa wou 'ana, e siena no'o, it makes no difference, that will do.

nora, noranora, cape, point of land. S. ngorangora.
noro, nonoro v.t., to hear, to obey: noro haku, listen to, obey, me; ari noro, to hear, to obey. S. rongo.
nunu (ku) n., shadow, soul, ghost of person: nunuku e tatare, my soul journeys. akaro. S. nunu.

O

'o 1, pers. pron. sing. 2, thou; used as subject by itself or following
'i'o: 'o ike ihei, where have you come from? used with the
particle ko: 'oko raa ihei, where are you going? S. 'o.

'o 2, as 'o 1, but suffixed to verbs and prep. as obj.
'oa, 'o'oa v.i., to be in agreement, to be level. S. 'oa.
oha 1, canoe house on beach, men's club: oha ni iora. S. taoha.
oha 2, betel pepper. S. oha.
ohi prep., after, about, to fetch: raa 'ohia, go and fetch it; haisoe
'ohi, to ask about. S. 'ohi.
oho 1, v.i., to fight.
ohota v.n., a fight. S. ooho.
oho 2: ha'aoho, to make an offering to a ghost on returning from a
voyage. U. ha'aoho.
ohonai v.i., to attempt: mara ohonai, to try, to tempt; mara ohonaina
v.n. S. ohonga.
oka, okaoka v.i., to eat raw. S. oku.
oke v.t., to drag, to pull. S. oke.
oku, the palolo worm: tarusi oku, to catch oku with a net. S. ooku.
olia n., return. ori. S. oli.
omo, arrow. S. ono.
'oni, 'oni'oni v.i., to dwell, to stay, to be, to live: 'oni 'ana, to live
in it; 'oni koni, to dwell in harmony.
'onite'ini v.t., to dwell in. S. oni.
ono, numeral, six: poni ono, the sixth day on.
onona n., sixth. S. ono.
ono 2, mangrove. S. ongo.
ooto, arrow with human bone. Mota toto.
ootomi v.t., to transfix, to pierce. S. ootomi.
opu (ku) n., belly. S. opua.
ore 1, v.t., to scrape, of food. S. ole.
ore 2, v.i., to be left, to be a remainder.
    oreta- (na) n., remainder. S. ore.
ori v.i., to return.
orisi v.t., to replace. -olía. S. oli.
oro 1, v.i., to come to land, of canoe. S. olo.
ororo v.i., to swim. S. olo.
oru, numeral, three: poni oru, the third day on.
oruna n., third. S. olu.
osi v.t., to cut, to score.
osiisi'a adj., striped. S. osi.
ota, wild areca nut palm. Lau 'ota, areca nut palm.
oto, otooto v.i., to be straight: na'ia raa i siona tara oto, he went along
    the straight track.
ottoi v.t., to meet. S. odo.

P

pa'a v.i., to rise, of moon. S. puua.
paapa'a (ku) n., grandparents, grandchildren, mane or keni is added to
distinguish the sex. S. puapuua, grandmother, etc.
paarahe v.t., to sing the praises of a place, to apostrophize. S. pualahe.
pa'ewa, shark. S. pa'ewa.
pai 1, to hit: pai mahusi, to break in pieces. Lau kwai.
pai 2, v.t., to prise. S. pu'ai.
paina, paipaina, poina, poipoina v.i., to be big. S. päine.
pana, bark cloth, English cloth. S. puana.
pano (ku) n., nose, mucus.
pano'a adj. S. puangano.
papa'a v.i., to hold one's tongue, to be quiet. S. paangwu, dumb.
papare'a adj., clean. Lau kwakwafare're'a.
para v.i., to fence; n., a fence. S. para.
parapara (na) n., a sign, a portent. S. palapala.
pari n., side, back, of things or places. Lau bali.
paru, a large sea-going canoe. Lau baru.
pasa, the stern hook for bonito fishing. S. pasa.
pasi, bow: tau pasi, to divine with a bow. S. pāsi.
pasu v.t., to tie, to fasten. S. puāsu.
pata, shell money. S. ha'a; Langalanga, bata.
pau (ku) n., head; pau ni wara, to consent, to take counsel. S. pueâu.
pau roiroi, larva of mosquito. pau.
pautou v.i., to bend, to bow, to incline. S. pueautou.
pe au, bamboo water-carrier. au.
peo v.i., to be silly, foolish. ?hekeo. S. pueu.
pera specific numeral, one thousand, of coconuts or taro: pera ni niu. S. pueela.
pe'u 1, v.i., to be uninhabited, empty, of village site. ? Mota wou.
pe'u 2, spider. S. pe'u.
pia 1, v.i., to well out, of water from a rock; n., a cascade. S. pie.
pia 2, v.i., to be fat. S. pue'e.
piata v.i., to be calm at sea; n., a calm. Inakona, Guadalcanal, beata. ? Mota wia, S. diana, good.
piii v.i., to boil with hot stones.
piina n., yam vegetable or soup. S. pii.
piri v.i., to be dirty.
piri'a, piripiri'a adj., dirty. Lau bili.
piru v.t., to thread beads, etc., for ornaments: piru kui, a necklet of dogs' teeth. S. piru.
pirupiru, a burial place at sea consecrated to shark ghosts. S. pirupiru.
pisi v.i., to be in separation, of women. Lau bisi.
pito v.i., to sprout, of yams. S. pwoitu.
poe 1, an altar on the beach.
poe 2: mano poe, to gasp. S. poe.
poi: poi rua, the second day on. U. poi dani ta'e, next morning.
poni, day: na poni, yesterday; horo'a hahoa na poni, the day before yesterday; poni oru, third day on; poni hai, poni nima, poni ono, poni hiu, poni waru, poni siva, poni tanahuru, fourth day on, etc.
ponie'i partic.; now and again; nau mata'i ponie'i, I wasagueish on intermittent days. Mota qong.
pono v.t., to be closed over, overgrown.
ponosi v.t.: ari ponosi, to forget. S. pono.
poo 1, a pig. S. poo.
po'o 2, side, of position: po'o mai, on this side; po'o weau, on that side. S. po'o.
pora, porapora 1, v.i., to jump. S. pola.
pora 2, v.i., to be black.
porapora'a adj. ipora. Lau bora.
pore: mauru pore, to dream. S. pueole.
poro, a male, husband: poro ni haka, man of the ship, a white man; a porona, So-and-so. S. poro.
pota v.i., to break with a blow: pota niu, to crack a coconut; pota kokoro, the curlew.
potali, potari v.t. napotari, to break. S. pota.
pua 1, areca palm, areca nut: wari i pua, an areca nut. 'ota. U. pua.
pua 2, v.i., to rise, of the sun: rato e pua. Lau buara, to rise.
pui, day: pui eni, pui noo, this day, to-day; pui eni lalisi, this morning; pui eni rato'a, midday to-day; pui eni laurahi, this evening; pui eni me'etani, to-night.
punu v.i., to be deaf. S. pungi.
puo v.i., to turn back.
ha'apuo v.i., to return. S. puo.
puri v.i., to be behind, after: mane i puri, younger son.
puri (ku) n., back, behind: i purina hanua, in the rear of the island. S. puri.
purui v.t., to caulk a canoe with raia, putty nut. U. pului.
purupuru, star. Lau bubulu.
puu, puupuu v.i., to tread.
puuri v.t. S. puu.

R

In several words r is heard as n, and at first it is hard to distinguish between the two: e.g. raanau, naanau, youth; tonu, toru. In iro, mangrove oyster, the r was heard as d.
ra adj. suff.: apu, apura. S. lā.
raa, raaraa 1, v.i., to go, to come: noko raa wou, I am going; raa mai, come here. S. la.
raa 2, noun ending: honu, honuraa; hou, houraa. Lau laa.
raahure, to-morrow: i raahure. U. ha'ahulee.
raai v.t., to know. S. saai.
raanau, young man, unmarried man: raanau haoru. naanau. S. saanau.
rae (ku) 1, n., corpse. S. rae.
rae (ku) 2, n., heart, mind: arurae v.i., to meditate, think. S. sae.
rae, raerae 3, v.i., to come, to go: rae mai, rae wou.
raeha v.n., journey: raeha naia kai hura ñ'i, the trip on which he will arrive. S. lae.
rae 4, v.t. : raea wara, to make an oration. lae 2.
raha adj., big. S. laha.
rahi, rairahi v.i., to lay eggs. S. láhi.
rahuta, leaves of trees: 'ini rahuta, to pluck edible leaves.
rahuta- (na) n.: rahutana mausu, leaves of the forest. lau 1, rau 3.
S. rähute.
rai, lai 1, pl. article, precedes noun; used with the nouns inoni
man, keni, women, mane, male, mera, child: rai mane, the men.
Fl. lei; S. alei.
ra'i, ra'ini 2, verbal suffix. sikira'ini, ukura'i.
raia, the putty nut, Parinarium laurinum. purui. U. saia.
raihuni v.i., to be hidden. liihuni.
raka, rakaraka v.i., to be hot, of fire, pungent, of leaves, etc.: tora
raka, to be magically powerful; Apai siri tora raka, a hi'ona
living on Marapa. S. raka.
rami v.i., to spawn, of crabs. S. lámi.
rami n., sky: i rani. S. langi.
rao 1, the sago palm: tapa rao, to cut sago leaves for thatch; ura rao,
to sew sago leaves for thatch; hoko i rao, a bundle of sago
leaves. S. sao.
rao (na, ni) 2, n., inside: i raona, the inside; i roi, i raoni, inside,
within them, of things. S. rao.
rape (ku) n., body: rape wea'wea'i, to suffer. lape. S. sape.
rapu v.i., to hit, to strike.
rapusi v.t.
rapute'i, rapute'ini v.t., to hit and knock down. S. rāpu.
rara v.i., to be hot, of condiments: raramea, to burn the tongue, of
condiments. S. rara.
raramea, too much, excess: kori raramea, very lazy. rara 1.
rarahu'a adj., old, worn out. S. láhu.
raramoa, a person killed by violence. S. lalamoa.
rarawa v.i., to be lazy, unwilling. S. lalaуa.
rare 1, dry coconut leaf; v.i., to singe with a coconut leaf: rare poo,
to sacrifice pigs. lale. S. rare.
rare 2, v.t., to outline, to draw.
rarihe, a centipede. S. àlihe.
raro 1, the sky: i raro. S. salo.
raro 2, adv., precedes verb, to do gently. haro. S. raro.
raroa, used of indefinite future time, for the future: raroa, for ever;
may be reduplicated.
raru, a tree, casuarina. laru. S. sālu.
rasu v.i., to smoke, of fire; n. smoke. lasu.
rata (ku) n., name. S. sata.
rato, sun. lato. S. sato.
rato'a, a day: hai rato'a. lato'a.
rau 1, the bonito. S. sau.
rau 2, v.i., to kill: rau mane, to commit homicide.
   rauini v.t. S. sau.
rau 3, leaf: 'ini rau, to pluck edible leaves. S. rāu.
rau 4: rau i haru, ten thousand, of coconuts. S. rau i helu.
rau 5, body ornaments: ni rau, to put one's ornaments on. S. lāuni.
rau 6, v.i., to get shell fish and crabs.
   rauhi v.t. U. rau.
rauman'ini v.t., to make, to manufacture. L. haungeini.
rauva, fibre for lines and nets. S. lauva 2.
reesi v.t., to see. S. leesi.
reho, rereho v.i., to speak; reho tare, to speak to.
   reho (ku) n., speech: mani rehona e uri'i, this is what he said;
   reho'ata, their speech. leho.
reko, the edible hibiscus, native cabbage. S. reko.
rerehono v.i., to chatter, disturb with chattering: mana 'o rerehono,
   don't make a disturbance by chattering.
   rerehonosi v.t. hono.
retea adj., strong, powerful: lato retea, strong sunlight.
ri trans. suff. to verb: tapa, tapari. S. ri.
rihu n., place. Lau lifu.
rihue'ini v.t., to carry about, to disperse. S. lihue'ini.
rīi demonstration, used in questions or in exclamations: 'a taa 'oko
   reesia rīi, what is it then you can see?
rikimaana, certainly, assuredly. S. likimaana.
riri kari v.t., all round, encircling. S. lili keli.
riri'i v.i., to be far off.
riu, riuriu v.i., to travel about.
   riuriua v.n.: riuriua maeraa, an epidemic. hairiu. S. liu.
ro numeral, two: only used in the exclamation ro mane. rua.
roho, roroho v.i., to fly. S. loho.
roiroi: pau roiroi, mosquito larvae.
roohi v.t., to search for. S. loohi.
roroto v.i., to be dark, to be night, to be overcast.
   rorotoa n., darkness. S. rorodo'a.
ro'u, also, again. S. lo'u.
rourou, thunder: rourou e hita, thunder-clap. S. lou lou.
ru 1, numeral, two, added to the pron. to form dual and pl. rua.
ru 2, numeral, two: ru mai hoe, two namesakes, grandparent and grandchild; ru mani are, two things.
rua 1, numeral, two; ruua awara, twenty; used of pairs of relatives: rua maasina; rua mai maasina; rua mai ulana, etc.; used in the exclamation, rua mane; added to pron. to form dual.
ruana n., second. U. rua.
rua 2, v.i., to flow, of tide; n., flood tide. U. lua.
ruha v.i., to loose. takaruha. S. luhe.
ruka v.i., to leave, let go. hairuka. Lau luka.
rumu, moss. S. lumu.
ruru v.t., to gather together: rurua suna, to make a fire. S. ruru.
ruta v.i., to carry as cargo: haka ruta niu, a copra ship.
rutani v.t. U. luda.

sahu n., lime used in enchantments and in magic. hena. S. sāhu.
sapiri v.t., to trade.
sapiria v.n., trade, market. Fl. sambiri.
sara v.i., to run aground, of a canoe.
sasa (ku) n., name. rata.
si 1, illative: kolu si raa, thereupon we went; noko haro simouka ka’u kolu si raa, when I have had a smoke we shall go. S. si.
si 2, trans. suff. to verb: rapu, rapusi. S. si.
sieni, siena v.i., to be good: sieni no’o, that will do! adj. good: mane sieni.
sienina v.n. U. diena.
sihani: i sihani, outside, out of doors. S. siheni.
siho, sisihone v.i., to go down, descend.
sihoa’ini v.t., to descend upon: iru ka sihoa’ini kia, the wind blows on us.
sisihoa’i v.t., to descend upon. S. siho.
sii, elder, first; used with i 2: huta i sii, to be the elder by birth; mane i sii haku, my elder brother; adv. first: tare’ae e’i sii, to be the first to do.
siini v.i., to smell.
siki v.i., to be clear of, to be detached from.
sikihi v.t.
sikihia passive, clear: e sikhia, the sky is clear, the rain is over.
sikira’ini v.t., of distance, as far away as. S. siki.
siko, sisiko v.i., to be finished: e siko no'o, it is finished, that is all.
sime, mosquito, sandfly. vo'u. Lau sime.
simouka, to smoke tobacco. English "smoke".
sinora, thousand; used of people, of yams and taros. S. sinola.
sio-(na) 1, n.; with loc. i: i siona, along, following; naia raa i siona tara oto, he went along the ghost track. U. sia-, S. sie-
sio' o 2, v.i., to collect, to pick up; to practise black magic. S. si'o.
si'okoni v.t., to gather up, to collect. koni.
siri 1, v.i., to enter. S. sili.
siri 2, dracæna: Apai siri tora raka, Dracæna leaf working powerfully, a hi'ona on Marapa. S. dili.
sisiho, breeze, rain, wet.
sisiki (ku) n., finger nail, toe nail.
siu v.t., to break: siua niu neena 'aku'a, break that coconut for me to eat.
siusiua' adj., cold.
siua 1, blood-money. U. siua.
siua 2, numeral, nine: e siua; poni siua, the ninth day on.
siucana n., ninth. U. siua.
ssohi v.t., to pick up, to find by chance. S. soohi.
suka, susuka v.t., to ask for. U. suka.
suna, fire: ire suna, to make fire with a fire-plough; ire sunaa v.n.
U. dunga.
sura v.t., to roast on the coals. U. sula.
suri, susuri (ku) 1, n., a bone. S. suli.
suri 2, v.t., to follow: raa suria, follow him; suria wai, suria su'u, along the stream, along the harbour; mauru suri, to divine by sleep. S. suli.
suri hata, a specific numeral, forty, of dogs' teeth: suri hata ni kui.
S. suli hata.
suru (na) 1, n., coconut oil. S. sulu, liquid.
suru 2, v.i., to lift. S. sulu.
suruta'e v.i., to rise up, to depart, to remove. U. suluta'e.
susu 1, v.i., to set, of moon. S. susu.
susu 2, v.i., to be fixed, to be firm. S. susu.
susurua, a generation of men.
susuto'o v.i., to be firmly fixed: 'oni susuto'o, to dwell permanently.
susu 2.
suu 1, v.i., to set, of sun, of moon in dark sphere, to sink: rato e suu, the sun has set.
suuha v.n., setting of sun. S. suu.
suu, suusuu 2, v.i., to burn.
suuni v.t., to roast on the coals. U. suu.
su'u 3, harbour, bay, passage, passage in mangroves. S. su'u.
suu'i dehortative, don't! used of strong negative, certainly not:
a suu'i rae, I won't go. S. su'uri.
su'usu'u (ku) n., elbow.
su'usu'ua n., corner. S. su'usu'u.

Ta 1, ending of verbal noun: arahuu, arahuta; ahu, ahuta-
ta 2, pron. pl. 3, them, suff. to verbs and prep. as obj. Lau da.
ta 3, v.i., to give, to do: ta mai, give it to me; hana 'okoi ta, for you
to do. U. ta.
taa 1, numeral, one: taa wou 'ana, it is one and the same, it is no
matter. eto; taa'i 2.
what for? S. taa.
ta'a 3, v.i., to be bad: e hana ta'a 'aku, I don't like it to eat.
ta'araa v.n., evil. S. ta'a.
ta'a 4, adversative, but. U. ta'a.
taa'i 1, what, pl. neut. interrog.: na taa'i, what things? taa 1. 'i 8.
taa'i 2, numeral, one, only: taa'i hanua, one village; taa'i are
mouta'i, one thing only; taa'i rua 'ei, taa'i olu are, two or three
things; taa'i ono are, only six things; taa'i horo'a, "one
time," once; aware mana taa'i, eleven; ta'a taa'i, a one-man
canoe. eta, taa 1. S. taa'i.
ta'ana 1, adv., certainly, assuredly, follows verb. S. ta'ane.
taa- (na) n. 2, every: ahutana taana are, all and sundry things.
taataana.
ta'aru, shoal water. S. ta'alu.
taasi v.t., to throw away: taasi'i, throw them away. S. taasi.
taataa- (na) n., every: taataana hanua, every village. taana.
ta'au adv. of direction, east, south. S. ta'au.
tahera'i v.i., to thatch a house.
tahera'ini v.t. S. tahera'i.
ta'e 1, v.i., to get up: ta'e ro'u, to rise again; v.t., to lift up. S. ta'e.
ta'e 2, v.i., to go on board: ta'e taa'i, one-man canoe; ta'e oru, three-
man canoe.
ta'eri v.t.: ta'eria iora, to go on board a canoe. S. ta'e.
taetae- (na) n., one, some: 'ana taetaena horo'a, at some time. S. taetae.
taha v.i., out, open: warutaha. S. taha.
tahana, fathom. S. tahanga.
tahi v.i., to flee.
tahina v.n., flight. S. tāhi.
tai 1, v.t., to sew. Lau tai.
tai 2, adjectival prefix: tahirhiriru.
tai' i 3, the bow hook for bonito. S. te'i.
tai' i 4, participial ending: moute'i.
tahirhiriru adj., tangled, revolving. S. tahirhiriru.
tai' ini transitive suffix to verb: maasit'ini. S. tā'ini.
takomai v.i., to collect: takomai hanaraa, to get food-stuffs.
takomaini v.t. Lau tago.
taka adjectival prefix. S. taka.
takaruru adj., unloosed, undone. S. takaluhe.
tamatama rere, a boat; old-fashioned name for boat.
tanahuru numeral, ten, used of a series: poni tanahuru, the tenth
day on; tanahuru 'ana, the tenth. avara. S. tangahulu.
tanarau numeral, one hundred. S. tangalau.
tani 1, v.i., to be daylight: e tani paina no'o, it is broad day.
S. dangi.
tani 2: me'e tani, night. U. dani, day.
tanora v.i., to be powerful, to be strong, of magical power.
tapa v.i., to cut with a blow.
tapali, tapari v.t. S. tapa.
tapaiso, tobacco: maai tapaiso, a piece of tobacco. English
"tobacco".
tapi, tapitapi v.t., to chop.
tapo v.i., to catch hold.
tapori v.t. S. tapi.
tara 1, path: tara oto, tara ni hi'ona, the ghost track on the island of
Marapa.
tarai v.t., to lead, to take a person. S. tala.
tara 2, forehead: naotara. S. dara.
taraha, regularly: hura taraha, to keep coming regularly.
tarama'ini v.t., to light a torch.
tarauere'i partic., constantly. S. id.
tare- (a), tale (a), to, towards: reho tarea, speak to him. U. tale.
tare'ae v.i., to begin: tare 'ae e'i sii, to be the first to do. S. tala'ae.
tari 1, for no reason, anyhow, just; precedes verb: ka tari raaraa raona asi, just goes about in the sea. S. tale'i.
tari 2, hand net, a net on two cross-sticks for catching buma fish.
taro v.i., to spread, of news.
tataroha v.n., news. S. talo.
taru, tautaru v.i., to bail, to dip out: taru oku, to catch the palolo worm.
tarusi v.t.: tarusi oku. S. dānu.
tarua pron. dual 3, their; suffixed to nouns and prepositions.
tasi, taitei v.t., to remove the skin in strips, to husk: karuru ka taitei niu, the coconut crab strips off the skin of a coconut. S. tāsi.
tatare v.i., to travel, to walk about: nunuku e tatare, my soul journeys.
U. tales; Mota tatale.
tate: isu tate, to be beyond count.
tau, tatau v.i., to do: ka tau 'ohi rihu, he is looking for a place; tau ma'ae, to make war; tau pasi, to divine with a bow; tau uru'i, to speak thus, of reported speech. U. tau.
taukai, a coconut scraper. S. saukai.
tauna v.i., to want.
taunaha'i v.t., to want, to like.
tauru pron. pl. 3, their; suffixed to nouns and prepositions.
te, numeral, one, a: te aro, one taro; te hanaraa, one meal. Lau te.
te'e, tete'e (ku) n., skin: haite'e, unskinned, with whole skin. S. te'e.
tei 1, place: tei eni, this place, here; tei na, that place, there; tei nima, in the house. tei 2.
te'i, numeral, one, a.
teite voc., mother: a teite, mother, of a specific person. S. teitei.
teitora adj., mixed. tora.
tekte v.i., to fall down; to drop.
tekela'ini, tekena'ini v.t.; kumu tekela'ini, to punch and knock down. ha'ateke. U. teke.
tete, a stone fence. S. tetu.
teva v.i., to be long, tall. 'ewa 2. S. teva.
to- (ku) n., mate, companion, address used to a child: 'o raa mai, toku, come here, mate. Mota ta-k, etc.
tohu specific numeral, ten, of shell-moneys: tohu ni pata.
to'i v.t., to work at, of work in gardens: to'i 'ana hana, to work at a hana garden.
to'iha, toina v.n.
toli, tori, adv. of direction, down, west: ni toli, to descend, to be head downwards. S. toli.
to'o (ku) 1, v.t., to come into contact with, to hit; used with loc. i: to'o i pau, to hit one's head; ka to'o i 'ani, hits it; uta ka to'o mora, the rain keeps on. S. to'o.
to'o 2, distributive, at a time: to'o oru are, three things at a time.
S. to'o.
to'o 3: to'o 'erena 'āi, the tops of the tree. S. to'o 'elena.
to'ohuu v.i., to be real. S. to'ohuu.
to'oni 1, v.i., to store, to pack. S. to'oni.
to'oni 2, clothes. S. to'oni.
to'oru v.i., to sit.
to'orua v.n.
tora 1, v.i., to affect, to come upon, of sickness; tora niui, to build a nest.
torahi v.t. S. tola.
tora 2, v.i., to be mixed, various: teitora.
torari v.t., among, mixed. S. dola.
tore, tole v.t., to take, to chase, to drive. S. tole.
tori, toli v.i., to divide food, to distribute food. S. tolingi.
toro (na) 1, n., hill: torona hanua, the hill country. S. tolo.
toro 2, lady, of person of distinction, used of female ghosts. S. toro.
toru v.t., to carry: Hu'a toru i Kera, a Marapa ghost. Lau tolu.
toto v.i., to sink. ha'atoto. S. dodo.
totohu n., of own accord: totohu 'aku, of my own accord. S. tohu-
totono v.i., to smart. S. totongo.
totori v.t., to wait for.
totorisi v.t. U. totori.
tou (na) n., middle, used with loc. i: mane i tou, the younger brother; i tou na hanua, in the middle of the island. U. tou.

U

ua 1, adv., yet, still: e mao ua, not yet. S. ue.
ua 2, of old: are ua warita, a thing of old time. Mota tuai.
'ua' a 3, a sand crab. S. 'ue.
uhi 1, yam: uhi e pito, the yam has sprouted. S. uhi.
uhi 2, v.t., to blow with the mouth: uhi uu, to blow a conch. S. uhi.
uku 1, v.t., to draw, drag.
uku'uri v.t., to draw, to deliver.
uku 2, line, row: uku i reia, a line of putty. S. uku.
ui v.t., to throw: ui asi, to throw away; kai 'eni ui, the throwing hand, right hand.
uile'ini v.t. S. ui.
una v.i., to work at a yam garden. Mota umua.

umu, oven. S. umu.

una adv., thus: hai una, that's the way! haru 'ei e uma, some are like that. Malu'u una.

unus i v.t., to come loose.

upu v.i., to swell.

 upu (ku) n., waist: i upuna. S. upu.

ura-, ula- (ku) 1, n., cross-cousin.

urana n.: rua mai urana, two cross-cousins. U. ula-, brother, sister.

ura, uraura 2, v.i., to stand. U. ura.

ura 3, v.i. to sew: ura rao, to sew thatch. S. use.

uraura (ku) n., skin. S. uleule, muscle, vein.

uri adv., thus, in the compounds: uriha'i, etc. uri'i. S. uri.

uri'i adv., thus; used of reported speech; the demonstratives na, ni, neena, noo, are added: uri'i na, uri'i ni, uri'i neena, uri'i noo. Lau urii, Malu'u uri'i.

uriha'i v.i., to be as if.

uriha'iini v.t.: 'ei nei e uriha'inia 'ei nei, this one is like this one.

urihana, like: e urihama taa, what is it like? S. urihama.


uru 1, v.i., to be old, to be getting soft, of taro. S. ulu.

uru 2, v.i., to wade. S. ulu.

uru 3, cloud. S. uru.

uruha n., relatives by birth, the bilateral family: uruha ni inoni ieru, our family.

usu v.i., to wipe.

usuri v.t. S. usu.

usuri v.t., to follow. S. usuli.

uta 1, rain; v.i., to rain. Lau uta.

uta 2, v.t., to rub-on stones. S. ute.

utaa interrogative adv., how? e utaa, how is it? what's the matter?

'ei utaa, which person? what thing? Lau utaa.

utu, utututu v.i., to drip.

utuhi v.t., to drip on. S. udu.

uu 1, a shell conch.

'u'u (ku) 2, n., finger.

uaa, exclam. of assent, that is so! yes! Lau uaa.

uunu, uunuunu 1, v.t., to tell, to recount.

uunuunuha v.n., folk-lore story, an account. S. uunu.
uumu 2, a torch of coconut leaves. Lau uunu.

uuru, uururu v.i., to thread.

uuruki v.t. Lau usu.

W

In one or two words u changes to v: weewe, weevve.

ua'i v.t., to pay. S. wa'a'i.

waara'o, a strong creeper used for tying canoe planks, a nail. S. waara'o.

wa'ari'iri'i n., lightning. S. wa'ari'iri'i.

waato, a digging stick. S. waato.

waawaa v.i., to have holes in, of solids. S. waawaa.

wai 1, water. S. wāi.

wai 2, a compound of wau i: wai es, at sea.

wai, wa'iwai'3, v.i., to pull, to drag, to pain; rape wa'iwai', to suffer.

wa'ini v.t., to pull, to deliver. S. wā'i.

waiesi, wa'iwailesi v.i., to go fishing.

waiasina v.n., fishing. S. weesi.

waiwa, contraction for wau i eua: noko raa wa'wa'a, I am going for a walk.

wāpū, virgin forest. S. wāpū.

wara (ku) n., word: mani wara, a word; laea wara, to make an oration; pau ni wara, to consult. S. wala.

waraimori v.i., to be true; exclam., true, it is so. U. walaimoli.

warauhu (ku) n., hair. U. warauhu.

wari (ku) 1, n., mother's brother or sister's son.

warina n.: rua mai warina, mother's brother and sister's son. S. weli.

wari 2, used of things spherical in shape, fruit, stones: vari i hau, a ceremonial club with a nodule of iron pyrites on top, worn hanging from neck between the shoulders; vari i niu, a coconut.

wari 3, v.t., to cut.

warita, adv., formerly of old time: i warita, formerly; warita no'o, in past days; are noo warita, it was from of old. S. wāte, wālīte.

waro, a creeper, rope. S. walo.

waru 1, numeral, eight: poni waru, the eighth day on; used of an indefinite number: waru hanua, all the lands; with mora: waru mora ni hanua, every land.
waru 2, v.i., to burn. S. wāru.

waruna n.; eighth. S. walu.

warutaha v.i., to emerge. U. warutaha.

wasi v.i., to be wild, of pigs, to be unowned, of ghosts. S. wāsi.

wasu, a bird whose nest is stolen by the land kingfisher, 'i'i. S. wadu.

wate v.t., to distribute, to apportion food, to give. S. wate.

wau adv. of direction, there: po'o wau, po'o mai, over there, over here;

wai (wau i) esi, out at sea. wou. S. wāu.

wawasu (na) n., tip: wawasu āi, tip of leaf. S. wadu.

wee wee, vee ee, a baby. S. wee wee.

wete, wetewete v.t., to come into contact with, to strike: e wetewete 'ana, it struck him. S. wete.

wi wi, vi vi, a baby: mera wi wi. wee wee.

wou 1, adv. of direction, there, away, onwards: rau wou, go on;

e apa ni asi na wou, it was in the sea over there; taa wou ana, it is all one and the same; the demonstrative na may be added:

mana wouna, that man there. wau.

wo'u, wa'u onomatop., 2, a mosquito.

wo wo (ku) n., mouth. S. wawa.
REVIEWS OF BOOKS


The Memoirs of Usāma form, to the Western reader, probably the most fascinating book in Arabic literature, and it is instructive to recall that, but for a battered manuscript in Spain, its existence might scarcely have been known. To Derenbourg belongs the honour of having re-discovered and identified this work, of having undertaken with a very substantial measure of success the labour of rendering the ill-written and often unpunctuated text into a readable form, and of having not only translated but also analysed and annotated it with a precision derived from a thorough grasp of the historical background. That misreadings and errors of detail should have remained was inevitable, and it was to be hoped that subsequent revisers would gradually reduce their number and clear up the rather numerous points of obscurity. Unfortunately, neither the German translation issued by Schumann in 1905 nor Dr. Potter’s English translation issued in 1929 have in any way fulfilled this hope, since the former is in reality, and the latter confessedly, translated from Derenbourg. It is to this task that Dr. Hitti has applied himself, after a substantial previous experience of translation and publication. His new version, under the rather clumsy title at the head of this review, rests upon a thorough and independent examination of a photostat of the manuscript, and the revised text on which it is based was issued by the Princeton University Press in 1930.

It can be said at once that both text and translation show a very great improvement upon Derenbourg’s editions. In dealing with a Syrian author, the Syrian scholar has a natural advantage, of which Dr. Hitti has made the most. Though we are still very far from a perfect text, he has smoothed out many knots, and has given us a foretaste of the progress which should be realized in oriental studies when such a combination of direct knowledge with modern method becomes more general among scholars from the Eastern lands themselves. His appreciation of Derenbourg’s work in the introduction to the translation sounds, perhaps, a little curt after the lengthy analysis
of his mistakes; fortunately, however, in the introduction to the Arabic text he speaks more warmly of his predecessor and acknowledges his debt to him in both text and translation, and, it may be added, annotation.

The introduction contains a brief, but on the whole sufficient, account of the author and his literary activities. Possibly the character-sketch may be criticized as a little superficial; Dr. Hitti stresses his hero's chivalry, and rightly, yet this is clearly not the whole truth. There is a danger, which he has not escaped, of blurring some of the differences between medieval and modern standards to which we apply the same label. So in the case of Usâma, it is the complexity of his character, not its uniformity, that makes him so interesting a problem. "The wholesome atmosphere of gallant and aristocratic behaviour" in which he was brought up had its limitations, and nothing is served by turning a blind eye to them. The man who can relate unemotionally and without a word of comment how, as a boy of ten, he stabbed and killed one of his father's retainers for a mere nothing (p. 174), had evidently more than a common share of hardness in his make-up. But while this may be explained by the manners of the time, it is impossible to overlook the fact that to his contemporaries Usâma was known chiefly as an inveterate intriguer. There are hints of this even in his own narratives, as, for example, his mission to the wazîr Ruďwân (p. 56). It can scarcely have been merely his "intrepidity", as Dr. Hitti suggests, that led his uncle to desire his absence from Shaizar. However that may have been, Usâma himself makes it clear (pp. 27–8) that his service with his next master, Zankî, ended in 1138 in circumstances which made it necessary for him to seek a refuge at Damascus. Here he was received with high honours, but was forced to leave six years later. In this case we have the direct evidence of an eye-witness. Ibn al-Qalânisî (ed. Amedroz, pp. 277–8) relates that in 1144 the ra'iš of Damascus retired to Şarkhad on account of the intrigues of Usâma and the wazîr, and refused to return until the ruler of the city, Mu'in al-Dîn Unur, had them removed to Egypt. Usâma's own account of his departure (p. 28) has the look of an attempt to exculpate himself, but even so he confesses that the bulk of the population was hostile to him.

The apologetic note is still more perceptible in his account of the intrigues in which he played a part in Egypt. Here, too, we possess a full narrative in the work of Jamâl al-Dîn 'Ali b. Zâfir al-Ḥalabî
(B.M. Or. 3685, foll. 85\textsuperscript{b} ff.; Gotha Ar. 1555, foll. 169\textsuperscript{a} ff.), who, though not himself a contemporary, was born in Egypt in 1170 and educated there, and so had access to contemporary local tradition. Ibn \textsc{zafir} not only charges him with the blame in bringing about the murder of his patron Ibn al-Sall\textsc{ar}, but also with instigating the subsequent murder of the Caliph al-\textsc{zafir}, owing to the latter's hostility towards him. Even if the details of this story are to be discounted, it is certain at all events that Us\textsc{ama} was so deeply compromised that he found it necessary (in spite of the assurances which he claims to have received from the Caliph's avenger Ibn Ruzzik) to fly from Egypt with the partisans of the chief conspirator 'Abb\textsc{as}. Finally, that Saladin as well, after befriending him, fell out with him, seems to show that even in his extreme old age Us\textsc{ama} was still something of a mischief-maker. Even if the reason, as suggested by Dr. Hitti, was that Us\textsc{ama} retained some sort of sympathy with the Shi'ite cause (and this is perhaps borne out by Ibn \textsc{zafir}'s statement that it was the Sunni party which led the opposition to him in Egypt), it must not be forgotten that the nursing of Shi'ite sympathies implied not merely a platonic attachment to certain doctrines, but involved also an active political partisanship.

The fascination of Us\textsc{ama}'s book lies mainly, no doubt, in the human appeal and intimacy of its contents, but to the student of Arabic it is given additional charm by its vivacious and informal style, which it owes largely to that very colloquialism that Dr. Hitti (with true Arab pedantry) seeks to excuse in the author, or to lay somewhat gratuitously to the charge of a copyist. Had Us\textsc{ama} himself written down these recollections, he would certainly have clothed them in more conventional literary garb; but we have every cause to be grateful to the scribe who so faithfully recorded those clipped and "ungrammatical" sentences that we can actually hear the man talking. There is nothing else quite so vivid or so lifelike in medieval Arabic literature. But what a task for the translator to present Us\textsc{ama} in a manner that retains anything of the flavour of the original! It is no reflection upon Dr. Hitti that precisely the same factors which give him exceptional qualifications as an editor of the text render him but an indifferent translator of it. To steer as happily and as surely as Us\textsc{ama} does between the stilted and the slangy demands a trained ear for English and a pen that instinctively recoils from such sentences as "I told thee that there wasn't a thing I could do for thee".
These details apart, however, Dr. Hitti has rendered a service to scholarship which it would be ungrateful to deny. It need hardly be stressed after these many years that Usâma's memoirs are the most valuable single source we possess for the social history of Syria at the time of the early Crusades, and this translation will long remain the standard English version. For this reason, and in view of the importance of the work to students of the Crusades, it has seemed worth while to make a fairly full list of corrections and suggestions, omitting minor details. If the list seems a long one, let those who are without sin cast the first stone—and in justice to Dr. Hitti there ought to be a second (and much longer) list of passages in which, with rare patience and skill, he has brought order out of chaos, and sense out of nonsense. It should be said that these suggestions are based chiefly on the text as it stands, since, though many passages are obviously corrupt, it would be hazardous to attempt any extensive emendations without access to the manuscript and to a local knowledge equal to that of the editor.

p. 25: "the massacre" read "the number of the killed", and below "On the other hand, a great host of the Franks were killed".

p. 26: Şalâh al-Dîn, i.e. al-Yâghûsîyânî, not the famous Saladin.

p. 27: The more natural meaning seems to be that when Usâma went to Shaizar, Şalâh al-Dîn seized all his possessions, etc. There is no mention of "the enemy", i.e. the Greeks, as the cause of the calamity, and it links on to the following sentence (p. 28) explaining why Usâma fled to Damascus.

p. 28: "In this another calamity befell me in my possessions," read "and what I lost on my estates amounted to a second catastrophe". Note 2: Mu'in al-Dîn was not wazîr, but commander-in-chief and atâbek.

p. 30: Add after "carpets, furniture", "a great reception-room".

p. 32: "foiling the enemy", read either (with Derenbourg) "the night of their surprise attack" or "the night when they deserted him".

p. 34: "counterfeit official signatures", read "issue forged documents" (for tawâqi' cf. below, p. 206). After "fixes the hour of death" add "In this rising a number of Egyptians and Sudanese were killed".

p. 35: "certain members of the caravan", read "some travelling merchants".

p. 40: "greeted our eyes", read "made an attack on us".

p. 41: Bait Jibril (Jibelin) was twelve miles from Ascalon.
p. 42: The castle of Yubnā (Ibelin) was built between 1140 and 1143.

p. 43: "curiosity", read "distraction".

p. 49: "saddle mules", read "baggage mules".

p. 56: Read "Amin al-Dawlah Gumushtagin al-Atābaki". "But he counted on me" is not in the text (though also in Derenbourg's translation).

p. 57: "He will send thee before him", read "He will make much parade of thee". Note 91: The term 'aziz mišr "the mighty one of Egypt", is a traditional phrase derived from Qur'ān xii, 30, and has no connection with the Caliph al-'Aziz.

p. 58: "When I returned to Cairo", read "My arrival in Cairo happened at the time when . . . ."

p. 60: "Thou wert so glad . . . that thou didst hardly believe", Usāma's use of mā šaddaqta (hattā) is almost equivalent to "You have scarcely" (cf. p. 87, etc.). "with the cross on it", perhaps "on the oath of the cross" or read possibly wasalibiyīni "and his crusaders".

pp. 60-1: This episode is to be dated in the autumn of 1155, during a truce between Nur al-Dīn and Baldwin III.

p. 64: "at the head of", read "among".

p. 68: "The Franks raised a violent uproar", read "They (the Muslim plunderers) were greatly alarmed".

p. 69: "a green mare", al-Khaḍrā', either "the iron-grey mare" or else a proper name.

p. 72: These incidents are probably to be dated about 1136.

p. 74: "without a visor", read "without a lower piece (protecting the neck)". "a jagged arrow," kashmā (?) here and on p. 227 seems to imply that the arrow hit sideways.

p. 76: After "three ribs on his left side" add "and three on his right side".

p. 77: "If only thou wilt keep to thy mosque . . . as long as thou keepest to thy mosque", the meaning is rather "Cleave to your mosque (i.e. give up active military service) . . . and nevertheless you shall receive . . . ."

p. 78: "I was rejuvenated", read "I dealt it as though I were in the vigour of youth".

p. 82: "put him in jail", read "kept him in confinement".

p. 86: "The castle stood on an elevation", read "(the road) which overlooked . . . ."

p. 89: "Bāsahrā", in the text the reading "Bāshamrā" is
adopted. After "flown at a francolin" add "and dashed into the coverts".

p. 90: "displaying his colours", perhaps "conspicuously dressed" (cf. p. 76 at foot).

p. 91: "the footman recovered", read "the foot-soldiers took (as booty)".

p. 92: "By thy benevolence", al-ṣanī‘ah seems to mean "(I put myself under) thy protection"; cf. taštāni‘unī, text, p. 66, l. 7.

p. 97: "to deal successive blows", read "to drive home the thrust".

p. 105: "and whose army was dispersed", read "and the army (operating under Bursuq) dispersed". Note 199: Lu‘lu’ ruled Aleppo from the time of Rudwān’s death in December, 1113, as atabek of his sons Alp-Arsālān and Sulṭān-Shāh, till his murder in April, 1118.


p. 108, n. 116: The correct date is 1130.

p. 110, n. 124: The dates given are those of Jamāl al-Dīn; Tāj al-Mulūk Būrī reigned 1128–32.

p. 112: "who was in charge of the register", read "who was in receipt of a dīwān", i.e. enrolled in the army. Note 130: To be dated probably between 1163 and 1167.

p. 115: "what he wishes to do, etc.", read "what he is about to do and the risks which he is about to encounter". "a band of robbers", granted; but harāmīyah seems often to have the technical sense of "irregulars".

p. 119, n. 155: To be dated probably in 1120 or 1121.

p. 120: "When the days are over", read "When the allotted time comes to an end".

p. 123: "Abdallāh al-Mushrif", read "Abdallāh the intendant", and on the following page "This man was an intendant of . . . ."

p. 125: Fakhr al-Mulk succeeded to Tripoli about 1100 and occupied Jabala in 1101.

p. 128: "The infantry of the enemy are in battle formation", read "Our foot-soldiers are all over the place". "No cavaliers of our company remained, etc.", read "There was not a single horseman outside . . . Some (of our foot-soldiers) fled into the city, thinking it a certainty that they would be captured, others were walking beside my stirrup". "march behind them stealthily", read "cautiously" (cf. p. 93, l. 1: "kept at some distance behind them"). "and took
possession of the town”, read “and had taken possession of the town. Fighting was then going on between them and his brother”. “He entered al-Raqqa with the horse”, read “The horse carried him into al-R.”

p. 129: “mount and meet the enemy”, read “ride out to meet Jamâl al-Dîn”. Note 184: The correct date is 529 = 1135.

p. 143: After “toppled over” add “and turned upside down”.

p. 144, n. 2: This relates to the expedition against Damascus under Baldwin II in 1129. Kafr-Ṭâb had been captured by Bohemond II of Antioch in 1127.

p. 146: “belts of the horses”, read “saddle-strap”. After “the Franks” add “(may God Most High forsake them)”. Note 9: The correct date is 1114. The date 1109 is due to an error in Ibn al-Athîr.

p. 147: “The sword cut through the outfit, the silver sandal, etc.”, read “The (blade of the) sword cut through the scabbard and its silver shoe”. For jahâz = “scabbard” cf. below, p. 154 (text, p. 125, l. 2.)

p. 148, n. 13: al-bruns = “the prince” is unlikely, as Baldwin does not seem to have been called by this title. In Ibn al-Qalânîsî, ed. Amedroz, the word is written al-ru‘âyyis “the lesser chief.”

p. 152: “Taking up my sword, etc.”, read “I put down my sword, etc.”

p. 153: “May Allah do this and that with thee” (fa‘ala‘llâhu bikâ wa‘fa‘ala) is curiously reminiscent of the Hebrew “May God do so to thee and more also”. Note 28: See above, on p. 146, n. 9.

p. 154: “joined her”, read “climbed up”.

p. 156: “almsgiving”. The text (p. 126, last line) has diqqah, which is probably to be read riqqa, “piety.”

p. 157: “used to rise”, read “used to go out raiding”. “two spotted horses”, read perhaps mu‘abbayîn “loaded up” or “caparisoned”.

p. 167: “discussion of their treatment of the orifices of the body” is rather far-fetched; read probably makhâzihim “their disgraceful customs”.

p. 169: “pierced his eyeballs”, read “blinded him”. The operation did not involve any actual bodily injury, see Dozy, s.v. kaḥala.

p. 172: “without letting them go through”, read probably “without fastening them firmly”. Note 2: Sawâr was governor of Ḥamâh for Tâj al-Mulûk Bûrî of Damascus in 1128–9.
p. 174: "to the ditch below", read "to the surface of the ground".

p. 176: "became so old", read "grew so stout".

p. 179: "everyone he met every day", omit "every day".

p. 182: "on the hill", read "at the Pass", i.e. 'Aqabat Dummar, north-west of the city (Dussaud, Topographie, p. 291). "After we got tired of searching", read "Shortly before noon". "Sūnūj", read "Sawinj".

p. 186: "Abū Bakr made him an officer, bestowed on him a robe of honour, etc.", read "Abū Bakr presented him (before Zankī) who bestowed, etc." There is no evidence that a subordinate officer could bestow a khil'a, nor had he a corps of Jandāriya. Note 30: Zankī besieged and captured Ba'rīn in 1137.

p. 187: "although he had committed no crime except that he was insistent", read "Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn had no fault but obstinacy".

p. 188: "Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn after that came to the door, etc.", read "Qafjaq then came... along with a troop of his men, and Ş. al-D. captured him and gave him into the keeping of". "the watchman of the castle", read "the intendant".

p. 193: After "this is a ruse" add "As if a raid were made during the night!"

p. 206: "What is this building material?" in the text (p. 174, l. 2) hadrah. The rendering "building material" smacks of the lexicon; one would expect rather something on the lines of "residence" or "manifestation" ("Is not this the...?") , but I find it difficult to assign a precise meaning to the word in this context. "I once more approached him", read "I tried to gain his goodwill". "Written by al-Muqtāfi", Derenbourg's version: "in the handwriting of al-Muqtāfi, 'Had he demanded more...'", seems preferable.

p. 207: "with a green robe", read "with a jurist's hood (tailasān)".

p. 210: "forgive him [and me] our sins", the text has only "forgive him", the rest being anticipated from p. 212.

p. 216: "the tiresome weight", perhaps "the suffocating heat".

p. 218: "We reverse his exterior form", rather "We invert him in form". In the text (p. 187, ll. 1-2) the quotation from the Qur'ān is wrongly vocalized.

p. 222: "satisfaction of his curiosity", read "enjoyment".

p. 225: "the fords of the Nile", perhaps "watercourses derived from the Nile".
p. 226: "cannot live except in a pool", read "are always to be found in a pool".

p. 228: "took special pains", perhaps "used to spend a great deal in sending..." (cf. p. 222, at the beginning).

p. 229: "Most of the falcons Ghanā'im would order...", read "He (my father) used to send for and buy most of the falcons".

p. 230: "masters of hounds", properly "whippers-in" (according to p. 252 they were unmounted).

p. 231: Tarūs is the Rupenid Thoros I, prince of Cilicia. "accumulated", read "had with us at one and the same time".

p. 232: "with the rest of the falcons as they attack", omit the last three words and read (p. 203, l. 12) biljumlati.

p. 233: "a large wooden perch", read "a wooden perch in the shape of a large hawking-glove".

p. 236: "tamed it", perhaps "taught it to fetch".

p. 238: "The latter's system of calligraphy, etc.", probably "He was a calligrapher of the school of Ibn al-Bawwāb and separated from the master by no more than one or two generations of pupils".

pp. 238–9: "because he possessed so many of them and could select...and most rapacious", read "as may be seen from the fact that he had a good many, though the skilful hunter is not often found amongst them".

p. 250: "peashooter", read "blowpipe".

p. 251: "tumbled it over", add "and threw her rider". "pursued the bull", the groom's remark at the end of the incident (p. 252) shows that it was the boar which was pursued.

It should be added that the dates provisionally assigned to many minor events are uncertain.

H. A. R. Gibb.


Following in the footsteps of Horovitz, and more recently of Schacht and others, Dr. Spies has made a search through the still only half-known manuscript collections at Stambul for works of Arabic biography and history, the results of which are published in this pamphlet. Of particular interest are some rare or missing early biographies of the Imāms of Islamic jurisprudence, including
aş-Saimari’s (d. 436) *Manāqib Abī Hanīfa*, Baihaqi’s (d. 478) *Manāqib ash-Shāfi‘i*, and a fragment of al-Āburi’s (d. 363) earlier work on the same imām, as well as a copy of a third (al-Wādiḥ an-Nafīs) hitherto attributed to Ibn Kathir, but which proves to be the work of a certain ‘Abd al-Muḥsin b. ‘Othmān in the fifth century. The historical works cited are of the sixth century or later, among them being complete series of Ibn al-Jauzi’s *Muntaẓam*, Ibn Shākir al-Kutubi’s *‘Uyūn at-Tawārīkh*, no fewer than three complete sets of Ibn ‘Asākir’s *Ta’rīkh Dimashq*, and a large quantity of MSS. of al-‘Ainī’s *Iqd al-Jumān*. In the third section are listed MSS. of al-Maqdisī’s *Kamāl fī ma‘rifat ar-rījāl* and its numerous abridgments, supplements, and rivals. Except for the mention in a footnote on p. 49 of a *risāla* (K. mulāsabat an-nafs) of Ibn Abī Dunyā, Dr. Spies has confined himself to these three sections of Arabic literature, to each of which he supplies a compact technical introduction. Both for the data furnished by his researches and for the admirable manner of their presentation, his brochure is of considerable value to all students of Arabic literature and jurisprudence.

H. A. R. G.

---


The immense volume of the Arabic literature dealing with the Qur’ān, its interpretation, variant readings, orthography, recitation, obscurities, etc., is familiar to every student of Islām, and it is not surprising to find no fewer than 167 entries on these departments of study listed in this Catalogue. A large proportion of the entries are treatises by Indian scholars, many of them autographs, but interesting though they may be as a survey of Indian Qur’anic study, it could hardly be expected that much new material of any special value should come to light amongst them. The most important item in the Catalogue is probably the MS. of the first half of an early (fourth century) Shi‘ite Commentary (No. 1076) by as-Sulami, better known as al-‘Ayyāshi, of which, though copies are known to exist in India, no other copy has found its way into western libraries. Among other interesting MSS. are two fragmentary commentaries ascribed to al-Ghazālī (Nos. 1086 and 1087), commentaries on Sūra exii and Sura x, 90, by Jalāl ad-Dīn ad-Dawānī (Nos. 1145 and 1146), a treatise
by Ibn al-‘Arabi (No. 1216), of which only one other copy is known, and an autograph of Muḥibb ad-Dīn al-Ḥamawi (No. 1101). A curiosity is a volume of selections from the Qur’ān, with a Chinese translation (No. 1062), from Amoy. On the technical side, Mr. Storey’s cataloguing is beyond criticism; not only the description of the manuscripts themselves, but also the biographical and bibliographical notes which he append to each are models of thorough and exact scholarship.

H. A. R. G.


Under Professor Massignon’s inspiring direction, the Revue des Études Islamiques has now definitely established itself as the leading journal in modern Islamic sociology. It would be difficult in a short space to do justice to each contribution in these two volumes individually, and a brief analysis of their contents will suffice to show the range of interests which they cover.

About seven-eighths of the whole is taken up by a variety of studies on social questions. Achille Sékaly Bey contributes a lengthy series of articles (1929, i, 75–126; ii, 277–337; iii, 395–454; iv, 601–59) on the difficult economic problem posed by the multiplication of private or family Waqfs in Egypt, including translations of the controversy recently engaged on this subject by Muḥammad ʿAlī Pasha and Shaikh Muḥammad Bakḥīt, and of the rescripts, laws, and parliamentary debates relating to it. M. Castagné deals with the family customary-law of the Circassians (1929, ii, 245–75) and magical practices among the Eastern Turks (1930, i, 53–156). M. Paul Marty has three articles, one on the efforts of the Makhzen to control the ṣāwiyas in Morocco during recent years (1929, iv, 575–600), another on the institutions of the Jews of Morocco (1930, iii, 297–332), while the third and most important, in a field which he has made peculiarly his own, summarizes the present situation of Islām among the Niger tribes (1930, iii, 333–432). The ṭifāqāt or "unanimous decisions" of the Jamāʾa of the Berbers of the M’zab are reproduced and translated by MM. Milliot and Jacobetti (1930, ii, 171–230). Following on Sékaly Bey’s study on the educational reforms in al-Azhar, published
in the two preceding volumes, "al-Mushrif" describes the stages by which a similar reform has been brought about in the Zaitüniya at Tunis (1930, iv, 441–515). Most interesting of all is the editor's short survey of the distribution and social conditions of the immigrant Kabyle workers in the district of Paris (1930, ii, 161–70), which supplements the earlier study of Lieut.-Colonel Justinard on the settlement of Shluḥ workers from south-east Morocco.

Three articles are devoted to the women of North Africa and the East. Mlle A. M. Goichon writes on the women of the "moyenne bourgeoisie" of Fez (1929, i, 1–74), and supplements her earlier book on *La vie féminine au Mzab* with a series of additional notes and observations (1930, ii, 231–87; iv, 517–95), while M. Castagné gives details of the emancipation movement among the women of Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan, and Central Asia (1929, ii, 162–226).

Of the remaining articles, the sole historical contribution, "L'œuvre des étrangers dans l'empire soudanais du Mali" (1929, ii, 227–35), by M. C. Monteil, contains an appreciation of the influence exerted by Muslim immigrants on the mediaeval Sudanic civilization. Literature is represented by an investigation into the popularity enjoyed by the poetry of al-Mutanabbi in the Islamic West (1929, i, 127–35), by M. R. Blachère, and a useful collection of Moroccan proverbs in text and translation by M. J. Beyries (1930, i, 1–51). M. R. Tresse supplies a valuable technical account of the irrigation system of the Ghūţa of Damascus (1929, iv, 459–573), together with a full description of the local customs and legislation relating to its utilization.

The shorter articles relating to current events include a translation of the recent Egyptian decree-laws on personal status (1929, i, 137–53), an account of the "Eastern League" (*ar-Rābiṭa ash-Shaqrīya*), founded in Cairo in 1921, and its journal of the same name (1930, iii, 289–96), and an analytical list of school books published in Kurdish (1930, i, 157–60), contributed by M. Minorsky, who omits however, the very interesting attempt to produce a Kurdish grammar in a reformed Arabic script made by Tawfīq Wahbī (توضيح وعهد رماني كوردی - حیثی به کلم) and published at Baghdād in 1929.

Finally, Professor Massignon continues to furnish his invaluable *Abstracta Islamica* (1929, iii, 341–94) of recent publications in all fields of Islamic studies, which, it may safely be asserted, is the most
widely appreciated feature of the *Revue des Études Islamiques*. The burdens imposed upon him by his other duties doubtless explain its absence in the fourth volume, but one may express the hope that he will find it possible to resume a series for which all students of Islamic subjects owe him a special debt of gratitude.

H. A. R. G.

**History of Palestine and Syria to the Macedonian Conquest.**


Professor Olmstead’s handsome volume is uniform with the series of historical textbooks issued under the general direction of Professor Breasted at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, to which the author has already contributed the *History of Assyria*. It represents a stupendous undertaking—nothing less than the attempt to present a complete survey of the provisional results of modern archaeology and research in so far as they bear on Palestine and Syria from the earliest ages. This is not to say that it is mere compilation; on the contrary, for Professor Olmstead has passed all his material through the crucible of his own judgment, and asserts his own conclusions with confidence, even where they disagree with more generally accepted views. Yet in a sense it is a collection of historical materials rather than a history. To a great extent, the actual sources, including not only written records, but also monuments, architectural remains, pottery, burial customs, and the like, are set out in summarized form, and left to tell their own story with the briefest possible linking up and exposition. The method has undoubted advantages, but sometimes entangles the reader in a bewildering maze of detail, which he is left to sort out as best he may (for example, in the abstract of the Tell el-Amarna letters, summarized in chapter xii). Strict adherence to chronological order also involves a good deal of jumping about and
sandwiching of paragraphs of Samaria, say, between others about Phœnicia, Moab, Assyria, and the rest. The result is a book that is not easy to read, but that most emphatically ought to be read, and carefully, by all students of western Asiatic and more especially Old Testament history. It will not please the conservatives and fundamentalists, nor all the "advanced" critics, but by placing the Hebrews in their proper setting it throws much valuable light on their development, and on such difficult problems as their establishment in Palestine and the growth of Judaism. Some questions are left unanswered—the historical basis of Genesis xiv, for instance, and the relations between the deity Jacob and the "hero" Abraham, and how Jacob's tomb came to be shown at Hebron—and there are very many statements and conclusions which will not be accepted without discussion. There are, however, few omissions to be detected; the most surprising is the absence of any reference to the Scythian invasion of 626, even in a footnote, since, even if it is argued that the opening chapters of Jeremiah do not refer to this, it played none the less a part in the fortunes of Syria and Palestine.

The first two of the Schweich Lectures for 1926 cover the same ground in outline as Professor Olmstead's book; Professor Robinson carries the story to the fall of Nineveh, and Mr. Hunkin from that point to Titus. The two books supplement one another admirably, since the lectures not only clarify the detail of the sources summarized in the larger work, but also, where they conflict with it, enable the reader who is not familiar with the technical literature to appreciate the main divergencies in critical opinion. Mr. Hunkin's narrative of the Hellenistic and Roman periods is especially welcome, in view of the few critical accounts available for the general reader, although the extensions of the Maccabean dominions attributed by the map on p. 75 to John Hyrcanus and Alexander Janæus are a little generous. The third lecture, by Professor Burkitt, begins with a lucid explanation of the importance of Palestine as a centre of land communications before passing on to sketch the history of the two Arab states of Petra and Palmyra.

Professor Burkitt's subject is rehandled in much fuller detail in M. Kammerer's work, which bears much the same relation to the latter half of the second and the third of the Schweich Lectures that Professor Olmstead's book bears to the first part. Though the author in this case has admittedly compiled his material from secondary sources, he has nevertheless succeeded in putting together a most
valuable piece of work, supplemented by a very fine "atlas" of plates. The greater part of his book is naturally devoted to the Nabateans, but it traces also the history of Petra from Israelitish times and down through Palmyra and the Ghassanids to the Muslim and Crusading periods. In these outlying portions of his task, M. Kammerer is less at home with his material and his detail is not so good. The Jewish legends regarding the Exodus can naturally be utilized only with due attention to the results of critical study, which he largely ignores; for the later periods he is somewhat at sea with the Kinda (for whom he suggests a Nabatean origin, connecting the name of Ḥujr with al-Hiijr) and with the Muslims generally. As far as the main part of the work is concerned, however, his exposition is not likely to be bettered until fresh discoveries and investigations bring a material increase in our sources of information. The weakest section is that on the religion of the Nabateans, for which direct evidence is as yet relatively scanty. Both Professor Burkitt and M. Kammerer have overlooked the fact that the worship of Dhu’l-Sharā continued in Arabia down to the time of Muḥammad (Wellhausen, Reste arabischen Heidentums², 48–51), and that the name has as little connection with the supposed name of the mountain of Petra (being in fact only a vague appellation meaning "Lord of the Holy Place") as that of his Ka‘abū has with Mecca.

Dr. Rappoport’s book is also a compilation from secondary sources, but has been too hurriedly and unevenly put together to have much value, except as a brief summary for those who wish to know something, but not too much, of the chequered fortunes of Palestine.

H. A. R. Gibb.


It has taken thirteen men to write this book so one cannot be expected to review it adequately. Indeed, the English language tends to divide into jargons which are only understood of the initiate. The sentence, "We Europeans conceive music vertically whilst the Arabs apprehend it horizontally," was double Dutch till it was explained to mean that Arab music is built up of single sounds and European of groups. One of the writers says that the word legacy in the title is hardly suitable, and suggests annuity; this is better, for Christendom might still learn much from Islam. Where all is good
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" comparisons are odorous ", but probably the sections on the Minor Arts, the Crusades, and Spain and Portugal will most attract the general reader. The illustrations must not be forgotten; one only, a drawing in the text of a glass lamp, seems quite unworthy of its subject.

Methods vary. The chapter on the Crusades says very little about the wars, but is a survey of their effects on Europe; they encouraged trade, found employment for younger sons, foreshadowed the League of Nations, started taxes on personal property, and furthered the study of Eastern languages. Their share in helping the transfer of land to the Church is only hinted at. The chapter on literature also says nothing about the Arabs, but tells of queer, mixed products in Spain, hints at influence on the troubadours, and puts famous books like Valdek in their right place. One wants to complain of the omission of Ernest Bramah; for, though Kai Lung came from China, he is a descendant of Sheherezade, and a bosom friend of al Hariri.

The chapters on geography and commerce and on theology and philosophy are elaborate statements of Arab knowledge and achievement. In his sketch of philosophy Mr. Guillaume was handicapped because a chapter on the same subject is in the Legacy of Israel; without undue repetition he has given an admirable summary of Muslim thought with its repercussions on Europe in general and Thomas of Aquinas in particular. The file might have been used with advantage at times; the phrase "paid for their opinions with their lives or the loss of their liberty" is three words too long. The paragraph about the Mu'tazila on p. 264 is unfortunately worded; it suggests that they invented the doctrine of the uncreated Koran, whereas they found it already existing and condemned it.

In the chapter on domestic arts, letterpress and pictures bring out clearly the unity of Muslim design; with slight changes the same scheme will decorate a jug or a wall. The interactions of East and West are strange; the Near East exported pigments to China and passed Chinese fabrics on to the West. Craftsmen in Italy and Spain copied Muslim processes and stirred up their teachers to new triumphs. It is a glaring injustice not to say anything about the articles on mysticism and society, but a reviewer is confined within narrower limits than an Eastern scholar.

Misprints are commoner than is expected in a book published by the Clarendon Press. One man appears as Fulcher and Fülcher; note C on p. 175 should be Soleto in south, instead of Spoleto in
central, Italy. Where so many hands are at work some repetition is to be expected; once it is funny, when Avicenna shares the fate of Herbert Spencer, the scientist admiring his philosophy and the philosopher his science. A few statements provoke questions. Surely "niches carved in the semblance of a scallop shell" are older than Islam; do they not occur in the great temple at Baalbek? Is there no truth in the story that the architect of Ibn Tulûn's mosque was a Christian and apparently an Egyptian? One wonders if the early mosques were as plain as they are made out to have been. We read in the Sahîh of Bukhârî that Muslims decorated their mosques as the Jews and Christians did their churches and synagogues. While most of this book will appeal to anyone, parts can be understood only by specialists. Many of the suggested conclusions are far from certain; in some chapters one wonders that the printer did not run out of the words "may be".

A. S. T.

**Summa Philosophiæ. Al-Shahrastani. Edited by A. Guillaume.**


It is not easy to review this book, as the first part ends in the middle of a chapter, and the promised summary translation is still to come. Considering that it had to be printed in Beirut the misprints are remarkably few. The text is based on three manuscripts, and the editor, following distinguished leading, has not corrected them where they wander slightly from the straight path of grammatical rectitude. That being so, it is not necessary to record the variations of the manuscripts on matters where the text is not consistent. The arrangement of the notes is clumsy, presumably due to the conditions of printing. In some places one would like a little more editing. A paragraph may contain the statement of a doctrine, an argument for it, and a criticism of it, and the unfortunate reader is left to disentangle the muddle for himself. The editor has sorted out the mess once, and should pass on the fruits of his labour by marking the breaks in the sense. To give one example: on p. 249 a paragraph ends:

The will gives individuality to existence and is related to fresh phenomena. The connection of the will of the eternal with two contraries at once.

The second sentence belongs to the following section.

The author begins by arguing that the world and all in it is created, using the classical arguments to prove that infinite bodies and numbers
cannot exist. He then treats of the unity of God, his unlikeness to all else, and the existence of his attributes. He discusses universal ideas and whether the non-existent is a thing. Next he deals with the divine knowledge, will, and word or speech. He is careful to say that in his treatment of this question he departs from the traditional arrangement. His method is to define the problem, set forth the opinions of the various schools, answer them or propound their objections to one another, and end with an exposition of his own view. It is a hard book to read, but in his summing up the author becomes at times almost eloquent. The end of the chapter on universals is a fair sample of his method and standpoint.

The truth in this question is that man finds an image of things, universal, general, absolute, apart from the consideration of words and individuals; he also finds intellectual relations to one thing. These might be reduced to defined words—but we have proved that they cannot, or to existing individuals—but we have shown that this is wrong. So it only remains to say that they are concepts, existing, established in the mind, apprehended by reason. So far as they are universal, they have no being in individuals, are not things, accidents, colours in individuals; but they are individuals so far as the reason forms from them a universal concept. An expression is coined to suit and denote this, so that, if the expression were abolished or changed, the concept established by the mind would not perish. Those who deny universals are wrong in making them bare expressions and right in saying that what exists as an individual has no universality. Those who affirm them are wrong in making them qualities of individuals and right in making them concepts of reason over and above the expressions. They might say that they are figures of the mind instead of saying that they are neither existent nor non-existent. No reasonable man denies them. Some call them figures of the mind; some suppositions of the reason; some facts and concepts denoted by words; and some qualities of species. So long as the idea is clear, call them what you like. These facts and concepts are in three relations, to their essence, to individuals, and to the mind. In individuals they are particular, in the mind they are general, in essence they are neither general nor particular. To know these relations removes all difficulties. (Slightly abridged.)

At times the author indulges in special pleading. He claims that there is no contradiction between the belief of the early Muslims in an uncreated word of God, that of the Mu'tazila in a created word, and Al-Ash'ari's doctrine that the word is uncreated but the reading of it created, being the word only indirectly; for the first refers to
the word in heaven, the second to the word in the mouths of men, and the third to both. In the middle of the very abstruse arguments it is refreshing to meet the human idea that the best proof of the existence of God is man's need of him.

Though not a history of philosophy the book contains much historical material, philosophers taking a bigger place than divines. The author claims to be a disciple of Al-Ash'ari and quotes many of his arguments at length, though he does not hesitate to criticise him. He notes that some of the school looked to Ibn Kullâb as their spiritual father. He uses some material from his earlier book; he quotes the Najât of Avicenna (though not by name) and his statements are reliable so far as they can be tested. This book is a valuable addition to the philosophical literature of the Arabs. A few corrections to the text may be suggested.

p. 31, l. 9, for  احالتهم read  مسلمه. p. 40, l. 6, for read مسألة مام  يتحقق. p. 165, l. 8, read  يحكم. p. 184, l. 9, for read  فيكون. p. 187, l. 7, read مقتضا للعلاقة or مقتضي العلماء. p. 225, l. 11, something is omitted after مقارنة الجسم. p. 240, l. 2, omit على (1). p. 254, l. 15, the text may stand and be rendered: "It is excluded by the fundamental principle. Their argument from knowledge is admissible." p. 294, l. 15, omit ولا ولا وللا  والتعلق. p. 298, l. 11, for read للا  واللط ع. p. 305, l. 9, for read للا  واللط ع. p. 316, l. 3, omit للام. A. S. Tritton.


This important book is written in a very earnest style devoid of any superfluous embellishments, and yet one is obliged to distinguish between its twofold contents: the strictly scientific and the sentimental or rather "romantic", in the sense that Sultan Mahmûd is presented as a hero, and his epoch as a kind of golden age.

"As a man," says the author in his conclusion (p. 170), "he was affectionate, just, pure, kind, generous, devout and religious—a truly great and admirable character." He stands among the greatest
warriors of the world. He encouraged learning and "did more than any other sovereign before him towards forming and developing a national Persian literature." He was a good administrator, for even during his absences good order prevailed in his empire. "He was the first sovereign to give practical shape to the idea of a Muslim empire in India" (p. xiii). The only drawback which the author allows to be recognized in Sultan Mahmud is his failure as the founder of a dynasty, because "he extended the area of the empire beyond the capacity of one person to control and keep intact".

Such is the guiding thread of the book, which, at least to the present writer, looks certainly exaggerated.

Son of the rude Middle Ages, Mahmud of Ghazna is undoubtedly a remarkable figure, and it is right to protest against the simplified viewpoint of Firdausi's satire, but the presentation of Mahmud as a paragon of virtue (especially if we are to understand it according to the standards of 1932) is equally unsupported.

Let us take the most obvious point: Mahmud's patronage to Persian letters. It had certainly nothing to do with the interests of the Persian "national" literature. Dr. M. N. says (p. 131) that the Sultan felt sometimes annoyed that "the diligent and obsequious Persians" invaded his administration. But, the Persians in Ghazna themselves did not seem animated by the feelings of Persian renaissance (as formerly under the Iranian Samanids) for one of them replaced Persian by Arabic in official correspondence, and the other wrote the history of the reign in the same language. Such small courts as those of Ghur, Gurgan, and especially Rayy were great centres of learning, but most of them were swept away or weakened by Mahmud. This loss could hardly be compensated by the liberalities at Ghazna, where one hears of mouths filled with jewels, of elephant-loads of presents, etc., so far as the official singers of the Sultan's victories are concerned. But, on the other hand, the fact is that two greatest names of the epoch, Firdausi and Biruni, owe nothing to Sultan Mahmud. Firdausi's satire in its present form may be spurious, but even the Chahār maqāla (p. 50) confirms its existence and quotes from it six verses. Biruni rarely mentions even the name of "amir Mahmud" (without any additions!).

It is certainly wrong to explain Mahmud's activities by "fanaticism", but perhaps in general "piety and devotion" as political factors ought to cede place to more prosaic impulses. Dr. M. N. himself, speaking of the merciless persecution of dissenters (p. 161)
says: "The Caliph was thus a useful ally for a warrior who was burning with a desire for expansion, and to maintain and strengthen the alliance with him, the Sultan placed the resources of his empire at the service of the Caliph in his war against the Carmathians." To exculpate Sultan Mahmūd from the accusations of "wanton bloodshed and reckless spoliation of Hindu temples", our author (p. 63) writes that "these so-called barbarities were committed in the course of legitimate warfare, when such acts are sanctioned by the practice of all the great conquerors of the world. Spoils captured from a defeated enemy have always been considered the lawful property of victorious armies. In India, however, wealth was accumulated not only in the coffers of kings... but also in the vaults of the temples". As Mahmūd's campaigns in India were exclusively aggressive, one can hardly deny that the war (legitimate only on account of the heterodoxy of the Hindus) was a very profitable operation for the treasury of Ghazna.

Mahmūd's policy towards his Muslim neighbours may be styled able, but one fails to discover in it anything edifying. Especially characteristic is the story of the occupation of Khwārazm, see Birānī quoted in Baihaqī, p. 844, cf. Barthold's dispassionate narrative, Turkestan, p. 275. The relations with the friendly Ziyārids on Mahmūd's side are always associated with pecuniary demands.

One cannot share Dr. M. N.'s enthusiasm for his hero, but very happily his abstract views do not impair the value of his purely historical researches.

His book appeals to sober minds undaunted by the detail and dryness of the material. But in the present state of our sources, we particularly desire the general overhauling of the machine of facts and dates. Most meritorious is the list of Oriental sources and the system of references enabling the control of the statements in the text.

There are three parts in the book. The first speaks of Mahmūd's predecessors in Ghazna and of his own early years. Owing to the brevity of narration some details are not clear. For example, the rôles of the original king of Kābul and of the "ruler" Abū Bakr Lawik, who suddenly emerge on pp. 25 and 27, remain obscure till the end. See now on them, H. C. Ray, The Dynastic History of Northern India, i, 1931, p. 79. The term "reign" (p. 28) seems somewhat excessive with regard to such rulers as Bilga-tagīn and Piri-tagīn whose relation to the Sāmānids is not explained.

Part ii groups under three chapters the military events on the three
principal fronts, in Turkestan, in Persia, and in India. The system is
graphical and renders clear the consistency of the conqueror’s efforts
in each case, but the chronological sequence suffers thereby to a
certain extent. As regards Central Asia, the events are told with
more detail in Barthold’s classical *Turkestan*. On Persia, the author
has not evidently had the occasion of seeing Huart’s *Les Ziyārides,*
and especially Sayyid Aḥmad Kasravi’s *Pādshāhān-i g Mumān,*
i–iii, Tehran, 1928–30, which would throw light on the “Marzubān
of Dailam” (p. 83) who will now remain enigmatic to many readers.

Of particular interest are the paragraphs on Maḥmūd’s campaign
in the present-day Afghanistān and India, where many details seem
to be new, such as the identification of Bhāṭiya with Bhatinda (p. 201).
Very new is the attempt to utilize the positive dates contained in
Farrukhī’s *qaṣidas,* which, e.g., enable to trace Maḥmūd’s itinerary to
Somnāth.

Part iii is devoted to the interior organization of Maḥmūd’s
empire. The paragraphs have been built up from a mass of separate
mentions in different authors (though many of them belong to much
later times). This is a valuable piece of reconstitution of the
administrative machinery under Maḥmūd, but we learn nothing on
such important questions as revenues, assessment, situation of the
civil population, especially the peasants, to say nothing of the
conquered races. Whatever the lacunae of our sources, Dr. M. N.
could find in Barthold, *Turkestan,* pp. 287–9, some facts to show how
heavily Maḥmūd’s reign weighed on his subjects. The most striking
illustration of Maḥmūd’s views on his subjects is perhaps the censure
which he addressed to the inhabitants of Balkh who tried to protect
their native town against an attack of the Transoxanian Qara-
khānids: “What have subjects to do with war? It is natural that
your town was destroyed and that they burnt the property belonging
to me, which had brought in such revenues. You should have been
required to pay an indemnity for the losses, but we pardoned you;
(only) see to it that it does not happen again; if any king (at a given
moment) proves himself the stronger, and requires taxes from you
and protects you, you must pay taxes and thereby save yourselves,”
(see Barthold, *Turkestan,* p. 291). Some discrepancies between the
theories and the facts are noticeable in this part too (p. 128): “The
Sultān was not bound to consult his ministers in state affairs, but in
practice he followed the divine commandment which bids Muslims
consult each other in all matters. Whenever he was confronted with
a serious situation, he called a council of all the important civil and military officers to hear their opinion and advice." Thereupon follows the rather unexpected illustration: "The proceedings of the council which he called to consider the situation created by the assassination of... the Khwarizmshah have been preserved and furnish an excellent specimen of the arbitrary [sic!] ways of the Sultan."

Thirteen appendices (pp. 171–237) contain many valuable matters on the details of Maḥmūd's reign and on other dynasties of his time. Mr. M. N. preferably quotes from the Oriental sources, but it must be borne in mind what we owe to Barthold who has most minutely utilized Gardizi, Bayhaqī, and other authors. Even Dr. M. N., who quotes his European predecessors only in the cases where they committed some error, seems to have found no fault with Barthold's references and dates.

On the whole, Dr. M. N.'s book forms a useful Encyclopædia Maḥmūdiana. The best parts of it are those which bear on the facts, dates, details. But notwithstanding all this mass of honestly and laboriously collected details, the general picture of Sultān Maḥmūd's epoch remains not very clear. As regards the personality of the great conqueror, the author seems to balance between his piety towards the memory of his hero and the conclusions suggested by an excellent knowledge of the sources.

The map at the end of the book is very welcome.

Minor Remarks.—The pages of the Enc. of Islam differ in each of the parallel editions (English, French, and German), and it is preferable to give every time the title of the article quoted. p. 2, Tawārīkh banū (read banī) Subuktigin. p. 50, Dīwān Lughatu't (read Lughati't) turk. p. 15, Tarikh-i khairiāt is not anonymous. Barthold has shown, Bull. de l'Acad. d. Sciences, 1915, pp. 1365–70, that this work is identical with Asaḥh al-tawārīkh, of which the author is Muḥammad b. Amīr Faḍl allāh al-Mūsavi (Rieu, Catalogue, p. 1062, Supplément, p. 270). p. 16, Sultān Maḥmūd's monuments and inscriptions receive a very brief attention. Dr. M. N. does not even quote in full the title of Dr. Flury's very interesting article, "Le décor épigraphique des monuments de Ghazna," Syria, 1925 (especially pp. 65–8, on the tower of Maḥmūd). p. 23, Jurjāniyyah, why not Gurgānj? p. 25, Khulam, read Khulum. p. 27, Bilkatigin, read Bilgā-t. p. 48, Chaghartigin, read Chaghir-t. p. 56, Īghur, perhaps simply Ayghur ("stallion")-khan? p. 83, "Marzbān of Dailam certainly could not possess Shahrazūr (west of the Zagros). Very probably
stands here for Suhravard. p. 130, why the uncommon mamlukat instead of the usual mamlakat given in the dictionaries at the first place. p. 152, Minuchahr b. Qabūs, ruler of Gurgān, rather than of Tabaristan. p. 160, the term “Carmathian” seems to be improper with regard to the Ismā‘īlites, if used as a historical, and not as a current opprobrious term. p. 177, on the Farighūnids see more details in the Hudūd al-‘ālam (written in 372/982), published by Barthold, Leningrad, 1930 (Dr. M. N. could not possibly consult the book, which was in fact brought out in 1931). p. 190, Kayā Kālish read Kiyā K. liš (Kalāya?). p. 216, to suit the metre, instead of Chikūdar (— — — ), we want something like *Chikuldra (— — — ), cf. the original name, Chiklodar Mātā. In the bibliography several European predecessors of the author ought to be named. Kazimirski in his edition of Minūchihri resumed most of Baihaqi’s history. Wilken gave a very creditable edition of Mirkhwān’s section on the Ghaznavids.

All these little remarks are mentioned here only for completeness sake, while it is clearly felt with what care the book has been written.

V. MINORSKY.

A Persian Journey, being an Etcher’s Impressions of the Middle East, with forty-eight drawings. By Fred Richards, R.E. 10 in., pp. 240. London: Jonathan Cape, 1931. 15s.

Seldom has a more beautiful tribute been paid to any Eastern country than this delightful book on Persia by the late Mr. Fred Richards, whose untimely death occurred soon after its appearance.

In recent years Persia has been much exploited by the camera—not in the hands of the professional photographer, but in those of the discriminating archaeologist. Thus practically all that remains of the former masterpieces of Persian architecture is accessible in detail to the student. Even the finest of these photographs fails to convey anything of the subtle beauty of the half-ruined cities of ancient and mediaeval Persia. These photographs usually seem to fail as interpretations of Persian scenery, which has inspired the writings of so many who have travelled in this land of romance.

The forty-eight drawings by Mr. Fred Richards seem to give us exactly what was wanted, for, in spite of their accurate architectural drawing, every sketch possesses a lightness of touch and a suggestion
of mystery which no other artist, we believe, has achieved so success-
fully, and which are certainly absent from even the best photographs.
As is only right, Ispahan, the beautiful city of Abbas the Great, is
represented by a large majority of these pictures, and next in order
comes Shiraz. In the bazaar-scenes the Pahlevi cap, which is now worn
by every male Persian throughout the land, of course predominates,
and it is a high tribute to Mr. Richards' genius that he has not allowed
these singularly unpicturesque hats to mar the poetry of his pictures.
Where the standard is throughout so uniformly high it is hard to
discriminate, but it may be safely claimed that no book can possibly
convey a better idea of Persian scenery to the general public nor a
more charming recollection of the country to those who have been
fortunate enough to travel there.
Of the letterpress it need only be said that it is written with charm
and such good taste as we should expect from this artist, and merely
as a vivid description of the country, with a suitable modicum of history
thrown in here and there, it would deserve to rank among the best
books on Persia. As a record of what Ispahan and Shiraz still looked
like in 1931 it must have a permanent value.

E. D. R.

Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī. By Yaḥyā bin Aḥmad bin 'Abdullāh
as-Sīhrindī. Edited by Shamsu-ʾl-ʾUlāmā M. Hīdāyat Ḥosain,
Ph.D., F.A.S.B., Khān Bahādur. Printed at the Baptist Mission
Press; published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal. (Bibliotheca
Indica Series.) Calcutta, 1931.

The editor of this most useful addition to the Bibliotheca Indica
series, published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, acknowledges his
indebtedness to Sir E. Denison Ross, whose suggestions encouraged
him to undertake the work. MSS. of the Tārīkh-i Mubārak Shāhī
are extremely rare, and the work is a contemporary record of the
reigns of Firūz Shāh, the later Tughluqs, and the first two kings of the
Sayyid Dynasty, and is our only original authority for the later part
of the period with which it deals. Extracts from the work, translated
into English, have already appeared in vol. iv of Elliot and Dowson's
History of India as told by its own Historians, but the MS. used for that
work was so erroneous and defective that the editor was obliged to
supplement it with extracts from Nizām-ʾd-dīn Aḥmad. This
historian, Firishta, and Badāonī used the work as their authority for
the period of which it is a contemporary record, and the first two plagiarized it so shamelessly that it might have been suspected that little was to be gained by the publication of the complete text, but this suspicion was ill-founded, for there is much that the two plagiarists have not copied, and the author’s history of the earlier Muslim dynasties which reigned in Delhi, though not a contemporary record, is evidently based partly on authorities which are now lost to us, for it contains much information which is new. For instance, the account of the reign of Balban, of the early days of the Khalji Dynasty, and the chronological record of the important reign of Muḥammad bin Tughluq, a record which we find nowhere else, are interesting and valuable. The present writer is gratified to find that this record endorses his view, expressed in vol. iii of the Cambridge History of India, but since questioned, that Muḥammad bin Tughluq directed two migrations from Delhi to Daulatabad, one in A.D. 1327–8, voluntary for all but courtiers and officials, and the other in 1329, when all the citizens of Delhi were driven across India, and the city was left desolate. Of the author’s contemporary record of the reigns of Firūz, the later kings of the Tughluq dynasty, and the first two Sayyids little need be said. Professor Dowson has admitted that he is “a careful, and apparently an honest chronicler”, but refuses to admit his claim to be ranked as an historian. This is hardly just. Yaḥyā bin Ahmad may not be in the same rank as historians of these days, but he has certainly a claim to rank with those of his own age. Professor Dowson was perhaps affected by the quality of the manuscript with which he had to deal, and it is probable that he neglected all of it save the author’s record of events which happened in his own life-time. The present learned editor has had the use of three manuscripts, one supplied by a friend, and rotograph copies of MSS. in the British Museum and Bodleian Libraries, and he has earned the gratitude of students of Indian history.

The style of the author is distinctly Indian. He often omits the izāfa where a Persian would certainly use it, as on page 93, l. 5. He also uses expressions not in general use, as محدود for “defeated”, and برادر اودری for “cousin german”. There are a few misprints, for instance بعث for بیعت, which occurs more than once, but the text has been, on the whole, very carefully edited.

Wolseley Haig.

These two volumes are intended to serve as a self-contained primer, the first consisting of an outline of the grammar, the second of graded exercises with vocabularies. European script alone is used, the characters of the Nāgarī alphabet being merely given in an appendix; the pronunciation is scarcely considered; nor is there any account of accent or other historical feature of the language. Within these limits the work is well-planned, clear, and practical. The author goes straight for salient features: after setting out the alphabet in transliteration he gives the names and uses of the cases, illustrating these by literally translated Sanskrit sentences; then the declensions of -a and -ā stems, followed by a page about verbs, with the distinction between thematic and non-thematic well to the fore and illustrated by the present tenses of asmi and bhārāmi. This leads to an explanation of roots, stems, and vowel gradation. Participles, from their frequent occurrence in the texts, next claim attention, and their formation and uses are excellently stated. The same section prepares the reader for three other characteristics of the language, viz. omission of the verb “to be”, fondness for passive constructions, and the use of compounds. Compounds are from the first regarded not as a rather disreputable subterfuge but as an elegance and a convenience, and the sentence Sa krodhakanāryo gatah is chosen for our initiation. All this is achieved in the first sixteen pages, at which stage the student, although the hard work is still before him, will feel that he knows something about Sanskrit and may even be emboldened to read some of the passages in the second volume.

With apologies for their complexity, the Sandhi rules are next taught, then the usual course of the declensions, conjugations, compounds, and derivative verbs and nouns. Brevity and clearness prevail; four pages suffice for the perfect, three for the aorists. Yet space is spared for plenty of paradigms, e.g. the present tenses of both dā and dhā are given in full; we are not left to deduce the one from the other. Participles also are treated better than in some books. The end of the volume has a section on the correlative clauses (yathā... tathā, etc.) which are another feature of the literature.

Volume ii contains, still in transliteration, first five pages of easy descriptive Sanskrit with interlinear resolution of Sandhis and compounds, and copious footnotes; then about 130 verses chosen from Böhtlingk’s Indische Sprüche; eighteen pages of extracts from
Pâñcatantra and from Lacôte’s edition of the Bṛhatkathāślokasamgraha; Sanskrit-French vocabulary (helpful and complete, I think); and lastly five pages of French sentences for retranslation, with the necessary vocabulary.

The book is reproduced by photolithography from MS., but thanks to careful script and a judicious use of underlining and tabular arrangement it is almost as easy to read as type. Mistakes noted are: page 6, omission of “dative of purpose”; p. 71, stā for sthā; p. 30, prapanna for prapanna; p. 77, abravim for abraxam.

And surely something should have been said about the use of adverbial particles and about the Śloka metre.

C. A. Rylands.


In the centre of the higher religious development of India stand the Upanishads. Since time well-nigh immemorial they have been looked upon by the very cream of Hindu intelligentsia as the loftiest outcome of theological and philosophical speculation; and it seems as if in certain quarters a religious renaissance were still expected to rise out of the intimate study of these works. In Europe Schopenhauer, though he knew the Upanishads only from Anquetil’s terrifying Latin version of the Persian translation prepared by Dārā Shikoh’s pandits, considered them the solace of his life and death. And there are no signs of their diminishing glory amongst people of the Western world who take a serious interest in India up to this day. Texts of such a reverend character may well claim our most serious attention.

And still it might be suggested that amongst the thirteen texts translated by Professor Hume there is much which would afford us scanty solace in life, and a still scantier in the hour of the mahāprasthāna. What has always been to the present writer a subject of stupefaction so far as Indian literature is concerned, viz. its unbroken series of sublimities and nonsense, certainly also applies to the Upanishads. Parts of the Bṛhadāranyaka and the Chāndogya as
well as the whole of the Kāṭhaka stand out as something of the most sublime ever conceived by human spirit, while other of these texts present a most curious jumble of senseless and unedifying matters. Still, through their age and the profound reverence shown them by untold generations of Hindu scholars they command our respect and interest even if they do not always attract our admiration and devotion. It is undoubtedly well that they should again have been presented to the public interested in other things than the mere lokayātrā in a readable and attractive form. We are deeply obliged to Professor Hume for his performance; that his work has now appeared in a second and revised edition is a proof that it has been a welcome gift to scholars and laymen alike.

Professor Hume apparently is a scholar of a somewhat conservative trend, and we look in vain for innovations or new interpretations within his bulky work. It has been impossible to the present writer, out of sheer lack of time, to go through all the translations carefully comparing them with the Sanskrit texts, and he has had to limit himself to those two amongst them which are perhaps slightly more familiar to him, viz. the Kāṭhaka and the Chāṇḍogya. Of the former one he himself some years ago ventured to publish a translation together with some notes in volumes Ivii and Iviii of the Indian Antiquary. This translation has been duly annotated in the careful bibliography of Professor Hume (p. 468); but of a few rather obvious emendations suggested in that modest little paper there is not the faintest trace to be met with within his own rendering of the text. As for the Chāṇḍogya there is not the slightest doubt that as a rule the text with the help of the native commentators, of Deussen, etc., has been faithfully rendered. Still we have observed a few minor slips which do not always inspire confidence, and of which one or two will be brought to notice here.

No doubt, Chāṇḍ. Up. i, 12, 1–5 called “the Udāṭha of the Dogs” makes a somewhat bewildering impression. No doubt also, the Śāman-chanting is perhaps not distinctly unlike the barking of dogs. Still there can be no reason for believing that this chapter is meant for “a satire on the performances of the priests”. What the dogs want to obtain by their Śāman-singing is food; and food is said in i, 11, 9, to be the divinity connected with the pratihāra. Thus there is a quite obvious connection between this chapter and the preceding one, and to a latitudinarian mind it seems scarcely more wonderful that dogs should obtain food by performing Śāman-chanting than
that officiating priests should do so. One would like to know what reason induced Professor Hume to translate the word bhallākṣa in iv, 1, 2 (p. 215) with "short-sight", unless of course that expression contains a sense unknown to the present writer. Professor Lüders some years ago translated it by "Bäreauge", which seems equally impossible. Undoubtedly bhallākṣa is nothing but bhadrākṣa, a fact that has been pointed out long ago. For the chapters dealing with Satyakāma Jābāla (iv, 4, 1 sqq., p. 218 sqq.) the paper by Professor Lüders, Sitz. ber. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., 1922, p. 227 sqq., has apparently not been consulted as it is not mentioned in the bibliography. Hamsa, of course, means "goose" not "swan" (p. 220); the goose—in modern times for reasons unexplained looked upon as a paragon of stupidity—to the Hindus is the wise bird par préférence. On p. 226 the words lohena dāru dārunā carma (saṃdahyāt) are rendered by "wood with brass or with leather" which is apparently a lapsus calami. The translation on p. 234 of the words svairiṇī kutāh by "no wife unchaste" is decidedly too weak; nor does etad-ātmakam (p. 246) really mean "has... as its soul" but rather "by that (the whole universe) is enlivened". In vi, 13, 1 (p. 248) upaśīda is generally rendered as here by "come unto me"; it, however, means "(come and) sit near me" and forms an invitation to the secret sitting, the Upaniṣad. That āmalaka in vii, 3, 1 should be rendered by "acorn" may rightly be doubted as it denotes the fruit of the Emblic myrobalan, Phyllanthus emblica.

There is one other question of translation which seems to form a constant crux to the interpreters of the Upanishads. Brahma (or its equivalent Ātman) is often expressed by the words neti (nauiti) which are even here rendered by the senseless "not thus". However, neti neti means nothing but "No, no!", denoting Brahma (or Ātman) as the pure negations just as some schoolmen have used Non as a fit expression for the Very Highest.

To the present writer it seems doubtful whether there is any use in repeating, as does Professor Hume (p. 6), that the "usual date".

---

1 We are reminded in this connection of the fact that several older scholars like Max Müller, Muir, and others liked to look upon the frog-hymn (RV. vii, 103) as being a huge joke with the Brahmins (cf. von Schroeder, Myst. und Minus. p. 396). That this is decidedly not the case is now beyond any doubt.


3 It still less means "flamman" as it is rendered by the late Senart in his translation of the passage.

4 Emblica undoubtedly is nothing but a more modern form of āmalaka.
of the Upanishads "is around 600 B.C., just prior to the rise of Buddhism". We had better avow once for all that so far we know nothing at all about the exact date of "the rise of Buddhism"; to assert that an Upanishadic text is of pre-Buddhist origin thus, unfortunately, gives no date at all. On the Udgīthavidyā (Chānd. Up., i, 1, 1 sqq.) there has just appeared an extensive paper by Professor Strauss¹ which seems to contain a great quantity of very useful material.

J. C.


On p. 379 of the work mentioned above, Professor Randle remarks that, according to intelligence received by Professor Tucci, Mr. Ramaswamy Iyengar was working upon the Pramānasamuccaya of Diśnāga. Of this work only scanty fragments in Sanskrit were known which had been collected by Professor Randle himself; and our knowledge of Diśnāga had so far been further increased by some articles in the JRAS. and in the Indian Historical Quarterly.

Just as some works of Aristotle have been lost but were retrieved during the Middle Ages through Arabic translations, several writings of famous Buddhist authors have only been preserved to us only in Chinese or Tibetan versions. Such has been the fate of the Pramānasamuccaya, a handbook of logic by Diśnāga, the fame of which according to Mr. Ramaswamy Iyengar vies with or even surpasses that of the logical treatises of Aristotle. This may be a mild exaggeration; still, there is no doubt that the work of Diśnāga contains the very amṛta of Indian logic. Mr. Ramaswamy Iyengar, with most laudable zeal, has transposed the Tibetan text into Sanskrit and has thus restored into its original one of the most famous of Indian scientific treatises. Of the merits or demerits of this restoration the present writer can form no opinion; as, however, the Tibetan translations seem to be most carefully prepared, it must be quite possible to a scholar equally well versed in Sanskrit and Tibetan to restore a text like this into what was well-nigh its original shape. The introduction is short but clear and interesting.

J. C.


This little book has scarcely any claim upon being considered a piece of scientific research. It is rather a sort of propaganda pamphlet setting forth the superiority of Hindu medical treatment over the European one, and especially singing the praise of the late S. M. Mitra (d. 1925), a Hindu physician who is said to have worked various wonderful cures upon patients of long-standing sufferings.

It may be quite true that Hindu Medicine is in possession of various valuable secrets which, cultivated through centuries, may be even superior to some of the treatments applied by European doctors. Notwithstanding that, there is undoubtedly much in Hindu medical science which strikes us as being wholly unscientific; nor do we learn to appreciate and esteem its merits better with the help of the crude and often seriously mistaken praise heaped upon it by Miss Chaplin. With the scientific knowledge of Hindu medicine her work has got nothing to do. The reviewer has also failed to account for the presence, within the covers of this little book, of the first of the two tales beginning on page 59.

J. C.

Studies in Indian History. By Surendranath Sen. pp. viii + 266. Published by the University of Calcutta, 1930.

Dr. Surendranath Sen, a Lecturer in History in the University of Calcutta, has already made himself favourably known to his fellow-scholars by his various works on Shivají and the Maráthás. His last book—this one, of course, excepted—dealt with foreign biographies of Shivají. There as elsewhere Dr. Sen has shown himself thoroughly at home in the various European sources dealing with the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries India; especially he seems to have made himself well acquainted with Portuguese papers, and most of all with the collections of State documents at Goa, which are undoubtedly concealing more than one precious secret.

The new book of Dr. Sen is undoubtedly a very useful one upon the preparation of which its author has spent much painstaking labour and much learning. It would scarcely be correct to pretend that it makes any very exciting reading; however, the reader who puts it away after having perused it must tell himself that he has gathered a certain amount of very useful information, even if the events dealt with here are neither very important nor of any very great interest.
The first and most extensive of the chapters deals with "Historical
Records at Goa". The Portuguese power in India, after a rapid and
wonderful rise, soon set the standard of a most spectacular downfall;
and since the seventeenth century it has lingered on in the shape of
some crumbling ruins of what was once a great and magnificent colonial
empire. Unfortunately, documents concerning the period of decay are
far more numerous than those concerned with the period of grandeur.
Dr. Sen has ransacked the archives at Goa, and they have given up
a series of rather mournful tales of fallen splendour and pettifogging
dealings with native rulers of smaller or lesser fame and power. No
doubt, some of the Viceroyals even during the eighteenth century were
men of bravery and capacity—an example is furnished by the Marquis
of Alorna with whom the last chapter of the book deals—but their
means were too small and the power of Portugal too irretrievably
lost to enable them to take up colonial schemes on a vast scale.
Portugal had already long ago had to cede her position in India to
other European powers—Holland, France, and above all, England.

Of the other chapters, which are mostly rather short, the most
interesting, no doubt, are those dealing with Hydar Ali. It is not
obvious—at least not to the present writer—what purpose is served
by inserting here the short paper on "Hinduism and Muhammadan
Heretics during the Pathan Period" (p. 118 sqq.). It had already
been published in the Visva-Bharati Quarterly, and it seems that
even a single publication would do more than justice to its very meagre
contents.

J. C.

Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra, one of the most important
Texts of Mahayana Buddhism, in which almost all its principal
Tenets are presented, including the Teaching of Zen. By Daisetz
and Sons, Ltd., 1930.

Professor Suzuki some years ago published a very interesting
collection of Essays on Zen Buddhism, and with vivid pleasure we now
perceive that he is contemplating the publication, within no very
distant future, of a second collection of these essays. He has, however,
found it desirable to go somewhat deeper into that all-important
text, the Laṅkāvatārasūtra, and the result is now laid before us in
the shape of this bulky but fascinating volume.

Japanese Buddhism, through the activities of the late Professor
Rosenberg and his Guru, Professor Stcherbatsky, has yielded invaluable assistance towards unravelling the secrets of the Tathāgata’s mysterious doctrine. Professor Suzuki, who may claim a most intimate acquaintance with that form of Buddhism, has furnished us with further precious materials for acquiring knowledge of the Buddha’s doctrines in their Japanese dress. Still it must be avowed that at least partly the things dealt with in this and the previous volume are of too complicated a nature to be thoroughly grasped by scholars who are not themselves specialists in this field of research. The present writer thus willingly admits that it is far beyond his scope to pass any detailed opinion on the learned work produced by Professor Suzuki; still, he has read the book with most vivid interest and found it a storehouse of useful information.

It is interesting to observe that in the Laṅkāvatāra the Enlightened One preaches his doctrine to Rāvaṇa who is described not only as reverently listening to it, but also as making good progress along the path of Righteousness. In Brahmanical literature Rāvaṇa is nothing but an incarnation of an evil power that has already previously (in the shape of Hiranyakāśipu) menaced god and men:—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vinodam} & \quad \text{ichann} \quad \text{atha} \quad \text{darpajanmano} \\
\text{raṇena} & \quad \text{kaṇḍvās} \quad \text{tridaśaṁ} \quad \text{samam} \quad \text{punaḥ} \\
\text{sa} & \quad \text{Rāvaṇo} \quad \text{nāma} \quad \text{nikāmabhīṣaṇam} \\
\text{bhūva} & \quad \text{raṅgāḥ} \quad \text{kṣatarakṣaṇaṁ} \quad \text{divaḥ} 
\end{align*}
\]

Because of his evil deeds and especially because of his limitless arrogance and conceit, he is doomed to destruction; and though we may feel just a puncture of compassion with one who meets heroically his predestined fate the Brahmin poets, devoted to the sweet and pious Rāma, seem to feel nothing of this. Here it is otherwise: Rāvaṇa presents himself to us as a fervent and inquisitive disciple of the Buddha. In somewhat the same way the Pampa Rāmāyaṇa depicts him as an ascetic and a pious adorer of the Jina Śāntiśvara.\footnote{Cf. Rice, Kanarese Literature, 2nd ed., p. 38 sq.} And some castes in Southern India are said to worship Rāvaṇa whilst they heap abuse and imprecations on Rāma.

The cannibal king called Simhasandāsa (p. 370) apparently is the same one as Kalmāṣapāda and the anthropophagous ruler of the Sutasomajātaka, etc. On p. 125, n., there is a minor slip when the learned author ascribes the translation of the Śūtrālaṃkāra to M. Sylvain Lévi instead of to Huber.

J. C.

This is a catalogue of manuscripts belonging to the Nepāl Durbar which were several years ago sent to England to be photographed; the photographic copies are now preserved at Oxford. Though most of these manuscripts have previously been dealt with by the late MM. Haraprasād Śāstri, this is undoubtedly a useful little book which ought to be welcome to all Sanskrit scholars busying themselves with the edition of unpublished texts or with such ones in need of revision.

J. C.

TAINTIRĪYA-PRĀTIŚĀKHYA, with the Bhashya Padakramaśadana by Māhiṣeya. Critically edited with appendices for the first time from an original Manuscript by MAHOPADHYAYA PANDIT V. VENKATARAMA SHARMA VIDYABHUSHANA. (Madras University Sanskrit Series No. 1.) pp. iv + 4 + iii + 188 + xxx + 9. University of Madras, 1930.

The Taittirīya Prātiśākhya, which was first edited by Whitney,¹ has recently appeared in the Mysore Sanskrit Series with the commentaries of Somayārya and Gopālayajvan. The Madras University has now inaugurated its new series of Sanskrit texts with an edition of this important text, together with another commentary, the Padakramaśadana of Māhiṣeya. As the text had to be based on one single manuscript, copied from a palm-leaf one in early Malayālam script, it is needs in want of emendation in several passages. Still, it mostly looks quite readable and useful. Unfortunately, the learned editor has had to postpone to another volume of the series his discussion of the commentary, its author, etc, so that all the very scanty information we get here is chiefly concerned with the manuscript itself. The indices of words and of quotations are quite useful.

The Madras University Sanskrit Series has thus made a very good start, and we eagerly look forward to other works to be published there by the eminent pandits of South India.

JARL CHARPENTIER.

¹ JAOs. ix, 1 sqq.
THE BODHISATTVA DOCTRINE IN BUDDHIST Sanskrit LITERATURE.

Dr. Dayal has undertaken to discuss the Bodhisattva doctrine as it is expounded in the principal Buddhist Sanskrit treatises. The chapters include the Bodhisattva doctrine, its origin and development, the thought of Enlightenment, the thirty-seven Dharmas, the Pàramitàs, the Bhûmis, the last life and Enlightenment. Within the limits he has imposed on himself he gives a well-documented account, remarkable for the thoroughness with which the work of previous investigators has been examined. This especially comes out in the treatment of technical terms, and as many as twelve or even twenty modern authorities are quoted in the course of discussions. The author has every right to limit himself to Sanskrit treatises, if he chooses, but unless he can show that the doctrine originated in Sanskrit schools, he cannot claim to have settled its origin. It is not enough to offer speculations about Hindu and Persian influence without considering what sort of Buddhism was influenced. Whether its presence in the earlier schools was a borrowing from Mahàyàna or vice versa is never discussed, nor does Maitreya put in an appearance.

A more serious matter than the exclusion of Pàli, if we are to speak of origins, is the fact that the author has never clearly distinguished non-Mahàyàna schools that used Sanskrit from those of Mahàyàna. Yet in Sarvàstivàdin documents we find Buddha awakening in some of his hearers the thought of attaining anuttarà samyaksambodhi along with other hearers attaining arhatship. It is evading the question to say that they are Mahàyàna in spirit. However, the work is really devoted to Mahàyàna doctrine. The author passes immediately from the phases of development of the doctrine to the etymology of the names Mañjuśrî and Avalokiteśvara. The latter he declares to be "a puzzling compound", which cannot be interpreted with any degree of certainty. What there is that puzzles him in the nature of the compound he does not say, but concluding that all other interpretations are unsatisfactory, he resorts to the second Avalokita-sùtra of the Mahàvastu, and invents for the word avalokita the meaning "wisdom". He admits that this view is tentative, but he does not strengthen it by the mere assertion that it is neither better nor worse than those which he rejects.

There are other instances which suggest that rival views have been rejected rather too curtly. He gives an analysis of the Pratìtya-
samutpāda, and finds the "traditional interpretation" unconvincing and unsatisfactory. J. H. Beckh's interpretation cannot solve it. L. de la Vallée Poussin's explanation is "repugnant to good taste, unconvincing, and far-fetched". Oldenberg and Oltramare are merely set aside, and so on. Not once has he examined the interpretations which the Buddhists themselves put on it. Had he done so, he would have found that de la Vallée Poussin's explanation, which he so unceremoniously rejects, is actually one of these interpretations. His own conclusion is to follow what he calls "the Indian tradition as it has been preserved and interpreted by the Tibetan priests, who explained to L. A. Waddell ", on the ground that it at least makes sense of the series. But even if he were sure that it is an Indian tradition, and that it has been preserved, it is quite beside the point. The only reason for introducing the formula at all is that it has a part in the training of the bodhisattvas, and then we want to know not its supposed primitive meaning, but how those actually in training understood it. It does not matter what sense they made of it, but it is only their sense that has any relevance.

He passes to the discussion of śūnyatā. Here rival scholars are ignored, but for the Buddhist philosophers he cannot conceal his scorn. They "revel in a veritable orgy of negation ". They are "not deterred by the difficulties inherent in absurdity ", and they descend to "puerile logomachy ", though they "deviate into sense " by the subtle theory of the two kinds of truth. This is merely how it looks to Dr. Dayal. Other Indian schools treated the śūnyatā doctrine as worthy of refutation, and the author is doubtless aware that Professors Stecherbatsky and Schayer have expounded it as a rational theory of relativity. Whether their view can be justified is another question, but it remains for Dr. Dayal to justify his own dogmatic conclusions against it.

The Bodhisattva doctrine may be considered as a new ideal opening up new conceptions of the duty and destiny of man and new revelations for the yearnings of religion, or with Rhys Davids as a birana weed warmed by a tropical sun in marsh and muddy soil, and smothering the nobler and simpler lessons of the founder. It is the former aspect which Dr. Dayal discusses in his two most important chapters on the Pāramitās and Bhumīs. The problem of the number of the Pāramitās is a complicated one. Why do we find ten in the Pāli and six in Mahāyāna? The author thinks that they were raised from six to ten as a consequence of the invention of the decimal
system in the third and fourth centuries A.D. Apparently he means the invention of the so-called Arabic numerals. But this is hardly conclusive. Does he think that no one counted by tens before that date?

This chapter gives the opportunity for a refreshingly independent study of Buddhist ethics. The early Buddhists, we are told, forgot that man was essentially what Aristotle called a social animal. But in Mahāyāna the layman gets adequate recognition, especially in the pāramitās of liberality, morality, and forbearance. Yet the conclusion drawn is sufficiently severe. "Pure hedonism thus seems to be the ruling theory of Buddhist ethics. But it sometimes degenerates into spiritual terrorism of the worst sort." The Mahāyānist teachers are charged with violent misogyny and unalloyed cynicism, and they appear to have formulated "a regular philosophy of degeneracy".

The chapter on the ten Bhūmis is very systematic and full. Four different systems are analysed, which are really summaries of the stages of the whole career of the Bodhisattva, till he obtains omniscience, acquires a glorious body, and emits rays which destroy the pain and misery of all living beings. After this the final chapter on the last life and Enlightenment comes rather as an anticlimax, as it is the story of the life of Gautama Buddha, described for the most part from works which know nothing of these elaborate developments of the Bhūmis. The author describes each stage of Gautama’s life, and gives the thirty-two marks in great detail, but the eighty minor marks are dismissed as being due to the "fussy fatuity of the Buddhist writers, who could not leave well alone". The Māra legend also receives full discussion. It is said to be an amalgam of allegory and myth, and the author is able to tell exactly where the allegory ends and the myth begins, and where the two are intertwined. The myth itself is probably a replica of the struggle between Indra and Vṛtra, with some echoes of the war between Rāma and Rāvana. This section will be of great interest to all students of comparative mythology. There is no doubt that the whole work forms the most systematic and extensive study that we possess in English on this important development of religion.

E. J. Thomas.
Indian Logic in the Early Schools. By H. N. Randle, M.A.,
D.Phil., Indian Educational Service (retired). pp. xii + 404.
Oxford University Press, 1930. 12s.

We are all indebted to the United Provinces Government for its
wise generosity in granting Dr. Randle the leisure which enabled
him to produce this work and in aiding in the cost of publication.
The task undertaken by the author is one demanding close concen-
tration and prolonged consideration of exceptionally obscure problems,
and it is most gratifying to have available the results of this research
in an effective form. Indian logic has, of late years, been fortunate
in the measure of attention which it has received; the absolute
necessity of translations of the essential texts has at last been fully
recognized, and the task of attempting to appreciate Indian achieve-
ment in this field is immeasurably facilitated by the fact that we have
before us efforts by experts to make clear the lucubrations both of the
Buddhists and the Brahmans in this field.

Even with the aid afforded, it is extremely difficult to arrive at
a satisfactory understanding of Indian logic. Much of this difficulty
arises from the fact that the texts which have been made accessible
are written by authors who are constantly engaged in attacking views
of other schools or teachers, and who assume that the tenets they oppose
will be understood by those who use their works. At any rate they
never attempt dispassionately to consider opposing views, to expound
them intelligently, and to attempt to understand the point of view
which they embody. The result is that it is extremely difficult to
grasp the real force of the arguments on either side, and one is often
left with a hazy idea of the theory criticized and that actually adopted.
There must be added to this source of obscurity the difficulties inherent
in the Sanskrit language; the use of compounds which can be differently
interpreted is an ever-present problem, and the text of our treatises
can hardly be said to be presented in really scientific editions, while
much of the earlier logic depends still on Chinese or Tibetan trans-
lations. In the face of these facts the very divergent views taken
by writers on the theme are inevitable, and it will be long before
any certainty can be achieved on the essential issues in dispute.
Moreover, it is clear that much further information as to the develop-
ment of logic will ultimately be afforded by the researches of
Professor Tucci among others, so that it is hopeless for the moment
to expect to achieve certainty on fundamental issues. But Dr. Randle’s
work will be of real service in all discussions on these topics.
The historical introduction by itself serves to show how disputed is the issue of the emergence of the schools and their interrelations. Here and there Dr. Randle seems needlessly sceptical. It is really incredible that, when in the Milindapañha we find reference made to the fact that Milinda was versed in the Sāmkhya, Yoga, Niti, and Vaiçeṣika, we are to believe that there is no reason to take Niti in any other than the usual sense of Nitiçāstra (p. 12). On the contrary, there is the most cogent reason; for any author to interrupt a list of philosophical sciences in which the king excelled by interpolating Nitiçāstra before Vaiçeṣika would be amazing, and the one defence of such a view would be that the Nyāya could not be styled Niti in a Pāli text or that the Nyāya could not have been known to the person who inserted these references in the Milindapañha. But neither view is tenable; we have not the slightest ground for placing the Milindapañha at a date before the evolution of the Nyāya philosophy, and we must certainly admit that the Nyāya is here referred to. Equally clear is it that the Medhātīther Nyāyaçāstram of the Pratimāṇātaka is a reference to the Nyāya proper, and not to the Manubhāṣya of Medhātithi in the ninth century A.D. Not the slightest evidence has ever been adduced that the Manubhāṣya could be so completely misdescribed, apart altogether from the absurdity of the Pratimāṇātaka, whatever its date, referring to a modern work in the context. We must accept the fact that for some reason by the time of the didactic portions of the epic Medhātithi had been associated with Gautama as the name of the authority on Nyāya, who, of course may have flourished long before our Nyāya Sūtra came into being. Nor, it seems to me, is it at all safe to infer (p. 17) from the lack of logical conceptions as the Nyāya understands logic in the Milindapañha that at the time, when the bulk of the work was written, logic did not yet exist in India. This assumes that the merits of Nyāya ideas must have been accepted by all Buddhists, and that a work which shows no trace of Nyāya influence can be dated by that fact. But for this assumption no evidence is suggested. Early argument, we are told (p. 14), is incredibly irrelevant and tautologous, but, if this implies that later argument does not bear the same stamp, the proposition is misleading. The terms applied seem to me to fit excellently a very large amount of the logical argumentations of the school of logicians who deal with the Tattecintāmaṇi of Gañgeça, and even in the earlier texts there is much that seems unprofitable and irrelevant. In this

1 Keith, History of Sanskrit Literature, p. xiii; BSOS. iii, 623-5.
connection it is instructive to consider the case of the Kathāvatthu; Dr. Randle holds that, if this work is ascribed to the third century B.C., it is an indication that logic did not then exist, "for, if it had existed, this cumbersome methodology could hardly have remained in use" (p. 14). But are we to understand that, when logic came into existence, this methodology ceased to be adopted in the Buddhist circles which held the Kathāvatthu in honour? Is there any evidence of this? The preservation of the text tells strongly against any such theory, which indeed is far too optimistic in its view of human intelligence. In circles bound fast by religious or philosophical tradition, there may be no entry for new ideas, a fact sufficiently borne out by the history of European religious thought. We cannot, I am certain, derive any argument of value from the state of thought revealed in the Kathāvatthu. Dr. Randle again seems to me to be needlessly venturesome in seeking (p. 16, n. 4) to reinterpret the term Yoga when joined with Sāmkhya in the Kautiliya Arthaśāstra as denoting the Vaiśeṣika system. This complete divergence from the normal sense of the word when following the Sāmkhya is certainly not justified because in the Nyāyabhāṣya Vātsyāyana ascribes to the Yogas specifically Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika doctrines (p. 3). Moreover the conjecture is wholly needless; there is not the slightest ground for ascribing the Arthaśāstra to any date at which it would be unnatural for its author to know the existence of the Sāmkhya and the Yoga. When a work contains in immediate contiguity two terms with a regular sense, to ascribe to one of them an artificial sense without any justification runs counter to all sound methodology, and merely adds to the difficulties inherent in any subject a needless perplexity. Whatever the age of the definition that includes Sāmkhya, Yoga, and Lokāyata as Ānvīkṣikī—and that it is old is a mere assumption—it is perfectly clear that a mind which would regard Sāmkhya as Ānvīkṣikī could have no objection to classing Yoga with it in that category. Nor does Dr. Randle suggest that the Sāmkhya and Yoga known to Nāgārjuna were other than the recognized systems, and Nāgārjuna is probably older than our Arthaśāstra.

On the very interesting issue of the priority of Dignāga to Pṛaçastapāda, Dr. Randle cites (pp. 29–32) the reversal of Stecherbatsky's views and his acceptance of the doctrine that

---

1 It must be noted that Jacobi (SBA. 1929, pp. 608–16) has thrown grave doubts on this assertion, and rendered it most improbable.

2 Keith, op. cit., pp. 460, 461.
Praçastapāda was a contemporary of Vasubandhu, and thus a predecessor of Dignāga. I confess that this view appears to me unsatisfactory, and without attempting to discuss the issue at length it may suffice to note the very definite argument of Professor Tucci drawn from his translation of the Nyāyamukha: "The passage referring to the viruddha avyabhicārin is of a very great importance as regards the chronological relation between Dīnāga and Praṣastapāda. In fact it is almost verbatim quoted and refuted in the Praṣastapādabhāṣya," the passage being (p. 342): ekasmin ca devyor hetvor yathoktalakṣanayor viruddhayoh samnipāte sati samcanyadarṣanād ayaṁ anyah samidgāha iti kecit. It seems still preferable to assume that Praçastapāda follows Dignāga, as suits best the development of logical doctrine. Incidentally, it may be noted that Dr. Randle's acceptance of the attribution to Vasubandhu of a Vādavidhi seems untenable; Dignāga in his Pramāṇasamuccaya definitely denies that this text which he condemns as unsound was the work of the Ācārya, and probably Dignāga knew what he was talking about. On Vasubandhu's date we are still in doubt, for recent expositions have not advanced matters to any definite conclusion. But the figure of Maitreyanātha as a historical personage, who has been recently revived by Professor Tucci, should, I think, clearly be banished from the connection, and Asaṅga should be left to the enjoyment of his works, as Professor Louis de La Vallée Poussin has cogently observed in the latest part of his great work on the Abhidharmakośa. He has there made it clear that we have an older Vasubandhu to reckon with. As regards the Nyāyapraveśa, which Dr. Randle inclines to ascribe to Čaṇkarasvāmin, it may be well to refer to the evidence adduced by Dr. Mironow, which suggests that Haribhadra, the author of the Saḍdarṣanasamuccaya regarded Dignāga as the author; he suggests that Čaṇkarasvāmin of whom we know nothing may have issued a revised edition of the text.

For the priority of the Mimāṃśa Sūtra to the Vaiśeṣika, which I accepted on internal evidence, there is now additional confirmation

---

1 The Nyāyamukha of Dignāga, p. 31, note 58.
2 See the restored text by H. R. Rangaswamy Iyengar (Mysore, 1930), i, 14.
6 Nyāyapraveśa (from T'oung Pao), pp. 7–9.
7 Indian Logic and Atomism, p. 25; The Karma-Mimāṃśa, pp. 5–7.
in the researches of Professor Jacobi, who has stressed the parallelism of the Mimāṃsā Sūtra with certain grammatical theories current in the time of Kātyāyana’s work on Pāṇini. Without unduly stressing this evidence, which I shall discuss elsewhere, or accepting the date before 200 B.C. as proved for the Sūtra, we may regard it as certain that the Mimāṃsā Sūtra precedes the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra.

As is doubtless inevitable, Dr. Randle’s interest in his researches probably inclines him to overestimate the value of Indian logic. To call (p. 35) Uddyotakara’s Nyāyavārttika “one of the world’s great treatises on logic” seems to me a very serious overestimate, even though the assertion is qualified by reference to “the atmosphere of incessant and often hyper-critical polemic in which it has its being, and which makes it a matter of considerable difficulty to discover what its author’s positive doctrine is”. The difficulty in fact is often insuperable, and it is often probably best to admit that Uddyotakara was simply inconsistent. If this is deemed impossible, a defender is driven to difficult expedients. Thus in dealing with Uddyotakara’s treatment of the probandum, Dr. Randle has to disagree with Vācaspati Miśra and Dr. Gaṅgānāth Jhā (p. 279); to adopt a conjectural rendering, which seems to me to be quite impossible (p. 280); to admit that one point of the argument is baffling because the author ignores any kind of causation except material causation—surely a hopeless omission (p. 281); to give (p. 283, n. 3) an explanation of Uddyotakara’s assertion that smoke and fire are not always combined, which is hardly possible; and to admit after all (p. 285) that misunderstanding of Uddyotakara’s view is easy. What is much easier is to assume that Uddyotakara’s obvious meaning is what he actually meant, and to conclude that Uddyotakara is a logician of very moderate value, a conclusion which seems to me borne out by his discussions when any difficult points arise. The restatement of Uddyotakara’s position (p. 265) is really not an explanation of what Uddyotakara says, but a modern refinements which he shows not the slightest trace of achieving. The temptation to read our ideas into Indian logic is strong in all of us, but historically it is rather confusing.

In the same way it seems to me difficult to ascertain what real merit is to be ascribed to Vātsyāyana as a logician. It appears to me that his reasoning is merely from analogy, and that he provides no basis for discriminating between arguments from unsound and from

1 Indian Studies, pp. 145-165.
sound analogies. The view (p. 180) that Gautama hated sophistry and devoted so much space in his Sûtra to the consideration of jāti because he desired by true logic to counter the sophistical dialectic of Çûnâyavâdins like Nâgârjuna hardly appears to be supported by any facts. Without entering at length into the vexed question of the meaning of anumeya, in the trairûpya, it suffices to point out, as to the unsatisfactory character of the discussions which were based on it, that the authorities are at hopeless odds. Dr. Randle rules (p. 185) that we can safely discard on principle the interpretation given by Dharmakîrti of Dignâga's meaning, because later authorities always interpret older writers in the light of the notions prevalent in their own time, to which it is legitimate to reply that, a priori, a competent follower of Buddhist views like Dharmakîrti should have known what Dignâga meant. He equally rejects Çridhara's rendering of Praçastapâda as authoritative, but the cases are hardly in pari materia, for Çridhara 1 is far further removed from Praçastapâda than Dharmakîrti from Dignâga, even apart from the impossibility of arguing from one individual to another. But it must be remembered that not Dharmakîrti only ascribes to Dignâga the meaning in question (viz. that anumye suddhavah denotes that S must be M), but the same view is taken by Uddyotakara, and Dr. Randle does not believe (p. 34) that Uddyotakara knew Dharmakîrti; he must admit therefore that Buddhist tradition in general accepted the position as Dignâga's, and indeed he himself seems to accept finally the view as correct (p. 187), which renders it illogical to ignore the attitude of Dharmakîrti. As regards Praçastapâda, Dr. Randle rejects finally Çridhara's view 2 that anumeyena sambaddham means that S must be P, which indeed seems to be nonsense, but he insists that Praçastapâda meant that S must be M, as did Dignâga. At the same time, he expressly admits that other passages in the Bhâsya of Praçastapâda make it sufficiently clear that his logic embodies a doctrine of universal connection between abstract terms M and P (anumeyasamânya, liîgasamânya), for which the trairûpya seems to find no place when its first clause is interpreted as a statement that S must be M. It is, therefore, necessary for him to hold that neither Dignâga nor Praçastapâda was able to work into the traditional

1 He wrote in a.d. 991; Indian Logic and Atomism, p. 32, and there is no evidence of a consistent tradition, while as regards the Nyâya a break is attested after Uddyotakara.

trairūpya, which they took over from earlier logic, the doctrine of universal connection which both held. I confess I prefer to take the more obvious course \(^1\) of supposing that Praçastapāda was consistent in his view, and that he meant by the first clause that \(M\) must be \(P\). Why one should assume that he could not make this sensible adjustment of the trairūpya is not clear, and it must be remembered that he does not adopt the same wording as Dignāga.\(^2\) In the second place, the next words of the trairūpya, prasiddham ca tadanvite seem conclusive in favour of my rendering, for the sentence is meaningless unless \(tad\) denotes anumeyadharma, and this seems conclusive as to the sense of anumeye; indeed Dr. Randle is driven to contend that it is reasonable to use a term in two senses at once in the same sentence, which seems to me incredible even for Indian logic. In the third place, the exposition by Praçastapāda himself seems to suit best my version; Dr. Randle's objection that the reference to concomitance deśaviçeṣe kālaviçeṣe vā, "at any particular time or at any particular place," seems to be altogether inappropriate to the statement of a universal concomitance, but appropriate to a statement that this or that particular \(S\) is \(M\), ignores my rendering of these terms,\(^3\) which I refer to concomitance "in respect of time" or "in respect of space", a very different thing. The more interesting question of universals I have discussed elsewhere,\(^4\) and it must suffice to add in conclusion that I doubt the validity of Faddegon's objection\(^5\) to the current derivation of the name of the Vaiçeṣika school from the Viçeṣa doctrine, and his own suggestion that it is derived from the school's method of proceeding sādharmyavaidharmyābhyām, for which there seems no ground of value. Nor do I think that there is any difference of sense (p. 160) between svārtha and svaniçcitārtha as applied to anumāna; both mean inference for oneself, the longer phrase denoting inference "in which the sense is determined for oneself"; naturally in either case the activity which determines is oneself, but the essential point is that the term is opposed to parārtha, and it is the fact that it is for oneself that is in point.

A. Berriedale Keith.

\(^1\) Indian Logic and Atomism, pp. 137 ff.
\(^2\) It must also be remembered that to Dignāga the probandum is neither \(P\) nor \(S\), but \(P\) as related to \(S\), which explains his sense of anumeye sadbhāvaḥ. See Tucci, Nyāyamukha, p. 15; Stecherbatsky, Logic, ii, 58, n. 1.
\(^4\) \(IHQ\). iv, 19-22.
\(^5\) Accepted by Dr. Randle, p. 136.

Once more we owe to Professor Caland a deep debt of gratitude for the unremitting labour which he devotes to the exposition of the Brāhmanical literature. These texts have interest, no doubt, in high measure for the student of grammar and lexicography, but they are without attraction of style, and the Paścaviṃśa in special is in substance of a most repellent aridity. The legends which lend interest and variety to most of the other great texts are in it reduced to brief allusions, and, as it assumes an understanding of the ritual, it presents grave difficulties of interpretation. To these inherent causes of trouble must be added the most unsatisfactory character of the text of the edition of Ānandacandra Vedāntavāgīcā (1870–4). The editor did not even take the trouble to correct his text in the light of the commentary, and the latter is full of impossibilities. It is, therefore, of the greatest advantage that we can substitute for it a most careful and accurate translation, accompanied by the explanations of the ritual use of the stanzas referred to in the text without which any rendering is practically unintelligible.

In his introduction Professor Caland briefly reviews the literature of the Sāmaveda, and develops certain points of special importance. He now definitely accepts the theory of Oldenberg that the Pūrāṇaṇa of the Sāmaveda is older than the Uttarāṇaṇa, a result which appears to me to be absolutely certain. But he goes perhaps too far in the opposite sense when he advances the view that the Brāhmaṇa is prior to the Uttarāṇaṇa and that the chanters still relied on the Rgveda for their verses. This, a priori, is decidedly improbable, and the evidence, all of which is very fairly set out by Dr. Caland, tells definitely in favour of the view which seems natural, namely that the author of the Brāhmaṇa knew both the Rgveda and the Uttarāṇaṇa, much as we have it to-day. That really follows from the fact that the Brāhmaṇa clearly was familiar with the order in which verses are grouped there as contrasted with the grouping in the Rgveda, and that he freely talks of tristichs, pentastichs, and so on, which are given in the Uttarāṇaṇa. We really cannot accept the view that he contemplated that the chanters could select any verses they pleased and that the Uttarāṇaṇa came later, and borrowed the specification of the verses from the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa which adopts the plan of denoting what verses are to be used by quoting as usual the initial words.
Nor does it appear to me that the claim that the *Pañcaviniça* is younger than the *Jaiminiya* can be made out. The fact that the *Jaiminiya* accepts barbaric rites such as the Gosava, which the *Pañcaviniça* omits, is irrelevant for purposes of date. Different schools naturally varied in their views on these matters, and it is impossible to lay it down that greater refinement has marked the course of evolution of Indian religion. What is far more to the point is the fact that in the *Jaiminiya*, ii, 112, we have ascribed to Tāṇḍya a myth which is actually on record in *Pañcaviniça*, xx, 3, 2, while the *Āpastamba Črautasūtra*, xxi, 16, 5, 14, already knows our Brāhmaṇa as Tāṇḍyaka. To claim that the *Jaiminiya* passage is in some way the source of the *Pañcaviniça* involves a needless and really impossible paradox. The linguistic evidence on the whole is not in favour of the priority of the *Jaiminiya*. There are certain forms which are divergent from the classical model, and are more freely used in the *Jaiminiya* than in the *Pañcaviniça*; such are the locatives in *an*, but the *Pañcaviniça* has *ātman dhatte*, xii, 10, 18, and the *Jaiminiya* also varies its use.1 Again the *Jaiminiya* has plurals of *i* stems in *īs* as opposed to *yas*; *tanwam* for *tanīm*; *asthāni* for *asthīni*; *yuwam* for *yuwām*; *duhe* and *duhre* for *duqdhe* and *duhate*; and *ōsam* for *kṣipram*, but none of these minutiae is of much importance. It would be of greater value if we accepted the view that in *Pañcaviniça* iv, 1, 2, the words *tāsāṁ tvevābruvaṁ* the irregularity is due to the failure of the author of the Brāhmaṇa to recognize (presumably in the traditional story which he used) the form of the pronoun *tva*, because it had become obsolete in his time. It is far easier to assume irregularity of Sandhi or a defective text, for the text of the Brāhmaṇa is exceedingly far from impeccable. On the other hand must be set a very solid fact, the use by the *Jaiminiya* of the imperfect and the perfect indiscriminately as narrative tenses. No one doubts that the use of the perfect for narrative grows steadily in the Brāhmaṇas, and it is a distinctive mark which far outweighs any other linguistic considerations yet adduced. The *Jaiminiya* in fact seems far from an early text; I have indicated its probable posteriority to the Mādhyandina version of the Ćatapatha Brāhmaṇa. Its archaisms are best explained by the fact that it seems to preserve a very large amount of old material, especially in the shape

---

1 This is a frequent phenomenon in that curious text, the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*; see F. J. Meier, ZII., viii, 77. It has also locatives in *an*, *tanvam*, and *sauçeṣyaire* (x, 66, 25).

2 BSOS. iv, 619, 620.
of legends, in which grammatical forms survive of older character than
the text of the Brāhmaṇa in general. Noteworthy is the use of ātman in the plural as a reflexive, as opposed to the earlier singular.

On the other hand, Dr. Caland has quite satisfactorily established
the priority to the Pañcaviṃśa of the Maitrāyaṇī Śaṁhitā and probably
of the Kāthaka. That is established quite clearly by xxiii, 16, 12,
while xviii, 6, 9, seems simply to cite Maitrāyaṇī, i, 11, 9.1 This, it
should be noted, accords with the evidence of the use of tenses; both
these texts belong to the type which eschews narrative perfects.

On one other point of chronology it is difficult to accept the views
put forward. The view that the Puspasūtra is prior to the Üha- and
Ühyagānas seems impossible to reconcile with the text of the
Puspasūtra, viii, 234, for it is contrary to normal construction to render
etena pradeçenohyaḥ sāmagnañah kalpavyatavyah “by means of this
indication the group of sāmans must be adapted (and) made ready
(for practical purposes)”. The position of the word ühyah is so odd
that Simon’s rendering: “die Gesammtheit der zum Uhagāna
ehörenden sāmans” seems to be right.

A text so unsatisfactory and difficult offers many points of doubt;
of these a few may be noted. Dr. Caland has suggested in iv, 1, 2, a
new sense for the troublesome prāvarṭanta of the legend of the cows
and their horns. He now believes that the legend means that the cows
which performed the session for ten months all secured horns, while those which continued for two more had their horns turn inwards,
a sense suggested by pravarta, “a circular ornament,” and pravṛttta,
“round.” This, however, is a very serious strain to put on the word,
and, what is decisive, as I have before pointed out,2 is the action
ascribed to the human counterparts of the cows; they cut off (pra-vap)
their topknots at the close, and this corresponds exactly to the loss
by the cows of their horns. Thus language and sense demand accept-
ance of the meaning “fell off” for prāvarṭanta. In xii, 6, 8, Dr. Caland
has undoubtedly improved on Hopkins’ rendering of the interesting
passage regarding Indra and Namuci: the treacherous god slays
his foe with the foam of the waters at dawn before sunrise; of the
severed head it is said tad enam pāpiyaṁ vadad anuvartata virahann
adruto ‘druha iti. Caland renders: “This head, a greater evil (than
the slain himself had been), rolled after him (calling out): ‘Man-
slayer, thou hast cheated, thou hast cheated!’ ” But there are two

1 For sa niruktassāmeti Caland with justice suggests san in both texts.
2 BSOS. I, iv, 178, commenting on Caland’s earlier view of this word.
objections to this rendering; there is no obvious reason why the head should thus be denounced; Namuci is not denounced in the text, and the form is hopelessly irregular. The commentator finds in pāpiyam an epithet of the speech addressed to the peccant deity. It seems far more natural to accept the view that we should read pāpiyam, virtually no change. The head rolled after him calling out: “O sinner, O hero-slayer, thou hast cheated.” The position of pāpiyam is dramatic and effective.\(^1\) In v, 5, 9, Dr. Caland renders mahas as “merriment” and in 10 on this basis we are given a pleasant glimpse into Indian child life; “when merriment seizes children, then they mount swings.” It is sad to banish from the arid Brāhmaṇa this touch of simple human things, but the commentator no doubt is nearer the mark with his version of tejás. The swinging in the ritual is a sun spell; men imitate the movement of the sun and thus acquire its strength, while conversely they give it renewed power. The use of the verb mahayanti in 21 is quite inconsistent with mahas as “merriment.” In 15, on the other hand, Caland must be right is restoring vyāyacchanta for the vyāyacchantas of the edition; the defence of Oertel would avail as far as the case goes, but it is incredible that the active should be used when just before we have the form vyāyacchete in the same sense. In xiii, 4, 17, there are difficulties; it is probable that putrān is not predicative so much as descriptive; we may suppose the Yatis who were spared delivery to the hānas were young; they ask: “Who will support us boys?” Indra perhaps places them on his chariot rather than on his back. The words paricārya caran vardhayan Caland emends to paricārocarad vardhayan with the Leyden MSS. The comment, however, suggests that it read paryacarat only and this may well be the original, for the edition and the Leyden MSS. alike afford a very odd sentence. The participle here might be defended, but it does not seem to have any real authority; the commentator evidently did not know it, though as usual it is misprinted to read paryacaran. Oertel prefers paricārī, “He went as their caretaker, tending them”. In ix, 4, 18, mithunat is rendered “from the pair” and explained as “probably from sons and daughters, or from cows and horses”, but the term has doubtless its normal sense, “from pairing,” i.e. from propagation. In xii, 6, 12, the correction of yantas to yatatas is easy but unnecessary; this sort of construction has sufficient parallels to justify it, and it is remarkable, if it is not original, that

---

\(^1\) In the Mahābhārata, ix, 43, 37, the accuser’s cry is mitruhan pāpa.
the MSS. should have the nominative. In xiii, 3, 12, the reading dhāvyan of the Leyden MS. would be easier, but dhāvyat may be sound; the comment in the edition is ambiguous, for cīghram gamyat suggests a participle, but adhāvyat is given in full. In xiii, 12, 5, Caland reads Kirātākulyau and renders "two crafty Asuras, (called) Kirāta and Akluli" without citing Oertel's rendering "two Kirāta clansmen, illusions of the Asuras", the latter rendering suitimg better asuramāye of the text; Oertel with Hopkins gives the comment as reading kirātā mlechcās tatkulyarūpe, but in fact it has tattulyarūpe, though this cannot be trusted. In xiii, 6, 9, Caland emends çuṣrwa to çuṣrve, making Dirghajhāví say: "This truly is unheard by me," i.e. she had never before received an invitation, but a much more obvious correction is çuṣrava, a rare use,¹ but one which would give the necessary sense. In xxiii, 4, 2, the distinction of talpe and vivāhe may refer to admission to sharing the same couch with one, and on the other hand marriage, association amongst men in the former case being meant. The locative in this passage used with mīmāns is regular, but the dative in xii, 10, 15, is not a variant of this usage; it is really a datīvus commodi, and as such regular.

The number of grammatical irregularities which might be cited is not negligible, and they might be added as signs of date to counter those brought forward in favour of the Jaiminiya. But isolated usages are not important. We have hypersandhi in trevūbrwan cited above and in xiv, 4, 7, kva tarsayo, but in x, 4, 2, antara agniśtomāv atirātrābhāyāṃ cannot be taken seriously as intended for antaraāv; the editor evidently held, with apparently the comment, that antara was adverbial. Occasionally s is lingualized in sentence Sandhi and so also n (bahir nirādadhāti). But it is difficult to take viciechidivām in viii, 9, 21, as a Rgvedic Sandhi; it is much more probably a mere blunder of the MSS. and cakrus as a nominative masculine in xxi, 1, 8, seems impossible, being quite inadequately supported by RV. x, 137, 1, which has only the accusative cakrāsam. jyotau, xvi, 10, 2, and aharbhīḥ and vīlomānāḥ, xxiii, 19, 11, are typical abnormalities. This can be said of adhīnevīt, iv, 10, 1, while abhyartihvam in vii, 8, 2, which Böhtlingk alters to abhyarthidhvam, is referred by the translator to abhyartiyate; ajjāsītāṃ in xxi, 1, 1, has a Jaiminiya parallel. To the subjunctives cited,² may be added rdhnava, viii, 9, 21,

¹ Compare Macedonnell, Vedic Grammar, p. 344; Renou, Grammaire Sanscrite, § 337.
² dhīnava is; of course, to be substituted for dhīnayat, and mā duṣat, viii, 2, 10, is an injunctive, not a subjunctive, as the negative mā proves.
and *nayāt*, xviii, 9, 13. In xi, 6, 5, *anurūpa enam* is due to the force of the *anu-*; as in *Damayanīṃ anuvrata*; it is hardly to be described as an instance of a noun governing an accusative. In xviii, 5, 9, it is really impossible to accept *alam praṇāyaḥ* as possible. The fact that the comment is silent suggests that it had the normal *praṇāyai*. In xvi, 16, 2, *esāṁ lokānāṁ udabhīnāt* is difficult, but the idea may be “became master of”, and the genitive may be on the analogy of *iṣּ*. In xxiii, 1, 5, we have a curious present followed by an imperfect; it seems better to take the present as purely historic and not as indicating past custom; in xxv, 3, 6, there are two presents, both best taken as historic. This is confirmed by the use in iv, 10, 7, where the present is used to represent a purely historic fact, duly represented in iv, 10, 1, by an imperfect. The imperfects in xii, 10, 15, and xviii, 9, 8, are doubtless narrative tenses proper, though the same facts might have been equally well envisaged as generic truths and put in the present. The perfect, normally with heavy reduplication (*ānaçe, didāya*), has regularly the characteristic present sense, and this as noted above is significant of early date. Very strange and doubtless a mere misreading is the well-known ix, 10, 2, *sa içevarā pāpiyān bhavitoḥ; içevarēmā bhavitoḥ* in iv, 2, 10, is easily explained as hypersandhi. Noteworthy is the suggestion in xi, 1, 6, to read *yataḥ praṛpyasya cāmyā avadādhyāt* for *praṛthasya*, and to adopt the same course in the *Athaśvaveda* crux v, 22, 8, *ābhūd u praṛpiyas takmā śa gamīṣyati Bādāhikān*. The *Jaiminīya* (ii, 12) has *naddhayaqasya*, and it is possible that *praṛpyasya* could denote the cart that was to be set in motion, while the Atharvan passage would read well. Yet in neither case is the change certain, and it would hardly suit *Taîtreīya Brāhmaṇa*, ii, 1, 2, 12. But this must suffice to indicate the many interesting points of scholarship, suggested by this admirable version, as regards even texts other than the Brāhmaṇa.

On certain points Dr. Caland differs from Hopkins without assigning cause. In xii, 11, 10, he holds that *īyām* said by the Gandharva Āūṇāyu in selecting an Apsaras is really *iyam*, the lengthening being due to that representing the sāman form. This is attractive, for, apart from the rare form, the sense “I would go” is not very much in point. An ingenious version is also given of the difficult passage, xxi, 10, 5, 6: *na vā Āurēvau (text Āurēvau)* *paliṭau samjānāte*, it being suggested that the passage means that Jamadagni’s progeny were so numerous that, when aged, none of his descendants know each other. But it is very difficult to accept this interpretation;
it must be held that the dual denotes "no pair of descendants know each other", and the reasoning of the Brāhmaṇa is made rather absurd; it is not a reasonable outcome of there being a large family that in old age all its members are such strangers that they do not know one another. Hopkins naturally holds that the reference is to two definite people, and he suggests that the prosperity of the family is typified by their having no grey hairs, i.e. they retain their youth, and this, of course, is the sort of thing which the opinion of the Brāhmaṇas admired. But in any event it is really impossible to make the text yield the sense suggested by Dr. Caland. Curiously enough, the translator, like Hopkins, passes without comment the amazing reading adicchatām in xiii, 7, 12, which is repeated in the comment as adicchatātām datum aicchatam, and this clear intrusion of a Prakritism into the text seems to have escaped general notice.¹ In viii, 3, 1, the translator deals summarily with the kālayispadham iti of the text, for which the comment has kālayisyaddham, by substituting kālayisyadhva iti. It is however clear that the comment and the text really read kālayisyadhvan iti, and it is hardly possible to ignore the form, which the comment glosses by the indicative apanayatha, doubtless a misprint for the imperative apanayata.² No doubt a future imperative is anomalous, but it has epic parallels and it seems risky to eject it from the text, unless there is MS. evidence in favour of its disappearance.

A. Berriedale Keith.


Herr Piper has two main hypotheses. One is that the history of mankind evolves in accordance with definite biological laws analogous to those governing the life of the individual; the other is that he possesses the ability to write this history. The present book does not seem to us to justify either of these postulates. A German critic has roused Herr Piper to great wrath by charging him with Analogienkrankheit, a morbid passion for discovering analogies between things

¹ For later examples, see Wackernagel, Althindische Grammatik, i, 158.
² See Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, § 938; Renou, op. cit., § 340.
that are different, and building his theories upon these rickety sub-
structures. The present work is brimful of examples of this misapplied
ingenuity. Phases of history are labelled with highly dubious titles;
and persons who have comparatively little similarity are copiously
equated. Thus Aśvaghoṣa is styled "der indische Dante", Yaśō-
dharman "der indische Wallenstein", Dignāga "der indische Des-
cartes", Dharmakīrti "der indische Hume", Kālidāsa "der indische
Tasso", Śūdraka "der indische Shakspeare", Kalhana "der indische
Tacitus", Nānak "der indische Calvin", Tagore "der indische
Goethe", Kabir "der indische Luther", etc. Arbitrary tickets of
this sort only darken counsel.

Furthermore, Herr Piper has a Tendenz. Feeling acutely the
painful conditions to which Germany is condemned by the Treaty of
Versailles, he looks round for comfort and hope, and finds them in the
lessons which he believes he can educe by his method of "folk-biology"
from history. Ex Oriente lux. Unfortunately a political Tendenz is
an untrustworthy lamp to guide the steps of the student who embarks
on the study of cultural history, particularly that of India. Sie
strahlt ihm nicht, sie kann nur zünden; and, as might be expected,
we find a lively blaze in the third part of the book, where Herr Piper
professes to describe modern developments in India, and lashes himself
into a furious paroxysm of Anglophobia over the alleged crimes of the
British Government. It is not unfair to say the book is a laborious
perversion of Kulturgeschichte.

L. D. Barnett.

Tocharische Grammatik, im Auftrage der Preussischen Akademie
der Wissenschaften bearbeitet in Gemeinschaft mit W. Schulze
von E. Sieg und W. Siegling. pp. 4 + 518. Göttingen:
Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1931. RM. 33.

The Oriental studies of the twentieth century have been deeply
influenced by the striking discoveries made in Chinese Turkestan
by several missions of different nations. In the linguistic field the most
prominent discovery has been that of several hitherto unknown Indo-
European languages, among which the first place belongs, no doubt,
to the so-called "Tocharian".

Various documents, written in Brāhmī characters, purchased by
consular agents or missionaries, found their way into the libraries
of Calcutta and Petrograd in the nineties of the last century. Some
proved to be in a more or less correct Sanskrit, others in "unknown languages". The latter defied the attempts of scholars to decipher them, partly because they contained several "special" characters, at first considered to be mere variants of the usual Indian ones. Such readings could naturally give but distorted forms. Hoernle succeeded in distinguishing two languages, called "Language I" and "Language II". While the latter showed unmistakable affinities with the Aryan branch (later called by E. Leumann "North Aryan"), by S. Konow "Khotanese", and determined as a form of Iranian speech, identified by Lüders with the language of the Seythians, "Sacaean"), the "Language I", apart from a few Indian names and (chiefly Buddhist) terms, remained a riddle.

The merit of solving this riddle belongs to the two last-named authors, Messrs. Sieg and Siegling, whose short paper in the Proceedings of the Prussian Academy of Sciences in 1908 marked the beginning of the scientific study of the language in question.

Sieg and Siegling determined the following points: (1) the real value of the "special" characters ("Fremdzeichen", i.e. k, l/dh, p, m, n, l, r, w, s, g, s)—a discovery that made the reading of the texts possible; (2) the Indo-European character of the language, it being an independent member of the family, belonging to the Western group (centum, the word for 100—kant); (3) the discrimination between two rather distant dialects, or languages, noted as "A" and "B". A rapid grammatical sketch, a list of a few words, and a short text (in A) gave a striking proof of the above.

The name "Tocharian" that the authors would confine to the dialect A (which seems to have been named by the speakers "Ārši"-Ārši-kantu, "the Ārši language"), though generally accepted, seems debatable; its being the language of the Indo-Seythians is still more questionable. It would seem more prudent to follow Professor S. Lévi, who names the dialect A "Karashahrian", and the dialect B "Kučean", from the probable centres of these forms of speech, Karashahr and Kucha.

Several libraries possessed, as mentioned above, MSS. in the "unknown" Language I, which now became at least knowable; that was the case at Calcutta, London (Stein), Paris (Fonds Pelliot),

Petrograd (collections of Berezovsky and Petrovsky). But, by some chance, all these texts were in the dialect B (Kuechean)—not to speak of a very few minute fragments in A, while it was only Berlin (Groenwedel and Le Coq) who, beside a considerable collection of Kuechean documents, possesses MSS. in A (Karashahrian).

Thus the further development of these studies had to proceed on two lines: any new material concerning the dialect A (or "Tocharian" proper) could be directly studied by the two discoverers or by persons connected with them, all other scholars being confined to commenting on this material from linguistic or other points of view. The documents in the dialect B ("Kuechean"), being more accessible, could be published and investigated in other countries as well as in Germany.

Messrs. Sieg and Siegling untiringly pursued their studies even during the war; not to speak of several smaller papers, they published in 1921 the capital work Tocharische Sprachreste, a complete edition of the whole available material (save a few minute fragments), both romanized and in the original script (Tables).

The work we have to review forms a considerable progress on the way of Tocharian studies; the authors are fulfilling the engagement taken in editing the Tocharian Remains, which, as Professor Pedersen rightly remarks,¹ are far from being accessible to linguists who are no specialists in Indian philology (we may add, even to those who are familiar with the latter as well as with what is known about Kuechean), until a grammar and a glossary have appeared.

Every work should be reviewed or criticized with reference to the task the author has put before him. We have, therefore, to keep in mind the limitations the authors of the Tocharian grammar have clearly developed in their preface. These limitations can be briefly summed up as follows: (1) a purely descriptive treatment of all the linguistic facts of the dialect A; (2) a complete exclusion of the historical and comparative methods, such problems admitting no treatment, until all the documents in Kuechean (B) are published and grammatically analysed; (3) for the same reason any discussion of Tocharian phonology is eliminated.

Admitting the full liberty of any author to treat his subject as he finds better, we cannot abstain from expressing a regret as to these limitations.

A grammar of a new Indo-European language can hardly dismiss any comparison with other members of the family; grammatical facts would, in the light of the comparative treatment, be easier to grasp for any linguist. The insufficiency of the Kuechian documentation did not prevent M. Meillet \(^1\) or M. Pedersen from the comparison. A complete edition and grammatical analysis of all Kuechian documents, scattered over so many public and private collections, is hardly likely to take place at any time we can foresee; this seems to us very like the "Greek Calends". The authors possess a reasonably complete documentation concerning Kuechian: beside the printed (French, by Messrs. S. Lévi and Meillet) material, they have the rich Berlin collection, as well as that of the India Office, at their disposal, which makes possible to quote, at every page, Kuechian forms in order to elucidate such Tocharian as would otherwise be difficult to understand (as the authors state in the preface).

The last limitation, i.e. the elimination of the phonology, is still more to be regretted, especially as it is more difficult to explain. If a purely descriptive morphology of Tocharian is possible, why should a phonology of the same kind be left aside? The number of sounds is, after all, strictly limited in every language, while the abundance of forms and morphological combinations may practically have no limits.

Then it is difficult to conceive a modern grammar leaving out the phonology; it is nearly impossible, especially for a language where a phonetic process (the "softening" of consonants, "Konsonanten-erweichung" \(^2\)) serves as a token of grammatical categories (p. 349, § 433) or the verbs show a regular "Ablaut" (ibid., § 434). The morphology compels the authors to let fall a few remarks on the phonology here and there (e.g. the reduplication of final consonants, p. 83, n. 1, the *regular* change of an *s* to *š* in the participles, p. 337, § 421a, etc.).

As to the transliteration, the authors give a short remark in the preface to the effect that they have stuck to the transliteration used in their edition of the texts, save that they replaced the "doublets" (\(k, p, t\), etc.), initial and medial, with the corresponding simple consonants with \(\check{a}\), the doublet denoting nothing else but a simple

\(^1\) Mémoires Soc. Linguist. de Paris, t. xvii, pp. 281 sqq.; t. xviii, pp. 1 sqq. and 381 sqq.

\(^2\) \(k, ts > s, t > e, n > ň, l > ly, s > š\); cf. Sitzber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss., 1924, pp. 167 sqq.
consonant with an inherent ā, while the final doublets are represented by the simple consonants alone.

This proceeding seems to us to mingle the transliteration with an interpretation which, however, is not universally accepted: while M. Pederssen ¹ shares this view, M. Reuter ² and the reviewer ³ consider the doublets to represent palatalized consonants.

The reader is supposed to be familiar with Sanskrit and with the former works of the authors: no hint is given at the real value of the symbols used. What is meant by the sign ā? One is naturally inclined to read it as in German (e.g. "Männer," the sound of English a in "man"), but p. 328, § 414, the reader learns an alternation between ā and i; if he consults *Tocharische Sprachreste*, p. viii, n. 1, he will find the suggestion of the authors that ā represents a sound very near to i.

Still more ambiguous is the sign ů, which even a competent reader is inclined to regard as the nasal element of a nasalized vowel (e.g. am = a, as French an) ⁴; fortunately, p. 133, the authors state the purely graphical alternation between the final ů and a medial n; p. 148, § 209, am is said to have been pronounced an.⁵

The reader unfamiliar with the *Tocharische Sprachreste* might expect a brief note concerning the value of the symbols, say, at the end of the preface.

The authors seem to address themselves only to those who have perused their previous publications: the grammar is presented in such a way that it is to be regarded not as an independent work, but as a grammatical commentary to the Tocharian texts. Otherwise one cannot explain the tendency of the authors to interpret (or, at least, to mention) every form met with in the texts. This abundance of details may be precious to one who is, as a specialist, studying those texts, but it impairs, I am afraid, the value of the book for a competent reader, say, a linguist. Such a reader will be lost in these endless details where the main lines are rather difficult to trace. A distinction

---

² *Bemerkungen über die neuen Lautzeichen im Tocharischen*, Helsingfors, 1925, §§ 4–7 sqq.
⁵ Cf. *Toch. Sprachr.*, p. viii and n. 2.—The medial ů may, of course, represent ā before palatals.
between the principal and the subordinate points might have been
easily attained by the use of characters of different sizes (as it is done
by Whitney in his Sanskrit Grammar and by Geiger in that of Pali);
Messrs. Sieg and Siegling, using but one size of characters, have
imitated Pischel’s proceeding, whose Prakrit Grammar has been rightly
styled “a virgin forest” (“Urwald”).

If the task of the authors was far from being easy, since they had
to treat a subject that was practically quite new, that of a reviewer
is neither; he has not only to characterize the manner of treatment,
but to refer to the points treated. A complete review of a book of
over 500 pages is obviously impossible: the reader interested in
Tocharian as such hardly needs a review, he had better peruse
the volume in question. The reviewer’s space being necessarily limited,
he has to undergo a limitation and to stress a few points of general
interest, such as may be of special value to a scholar of neighbouring
domains, chiefly to a linguist or to an historian.

The first of the five chapters is devoted to the word formation;
a great mass of facts are grouped on thirty-two pages, of facts chiefly
valuable to Tocharian lexicology, many words being accompanied
by their Kucheian equivalents. Beside a few root-words the various
suffixal formations are reviewed.

One fact deserves special notice from the historical point of view,
viz. the occurrence of several Iranian loan-words that seem to have
been borrowed from Middle-Persian: so, amok “art”, amokātis
“artist”, cf. Mid.-Pers. hamog “teaching” (p. 12, n. 1), kātāk
“house-master” (= Skt. grhīn, grhastha), Mod.-Pers. kat-χudā (p. 13,
§ 22); parno “brilliant”, from paran (i.e. paran, Kuch. perne),
corresponding to Skt. pada “position”, “dignity”, cf. Buddh.-
Soghdian prn, Avest. χvārōno, to which one has to add Old-Pers.
farvān6 (p. 18, § 34).

In the declension Tocharian, like other Indo-European languages,
distinguishes three genders: while the masculine and the feminine
are distinctly marked in the pronouns and in the adjectives (e.g.
m. āstār, f. āstī “clear”, § 106), the substantives are either masculine
or feminine; some substantives show masculine forms in the singular
and feminine in the plural. Such words are called by the authors
neuter (a term that is, in our opinion, rather misleading). In general
the gender of a substantive is, unless it be determined by the sex,
revealed by the accompanying pronoun or adjective (pp. 32–3, § 58).

Very interesting are the traces of an older distinction (§ 60) between
the nouns denoting reasonable beings (men, gods) and those of inanimate objects or abstracts: only the first can have certain forms. Thus the names of animals have but one form for the nominative and the oblique (= accusative) singular. We have to infer that, e.g. yuk, "horse", stands for the two cases. Kucheans seems to distinguish between the names of animate beings and inanimate things—as the reviewer has proved inferring from the different treatment of Indian loan-words; the names of animals are treated as those of men. So yakwë "horse" (= Tokh. yuk) forms oblique singular yakwëm, as well as Nande-Nadem.2 This distinction, so important in Slavonic languages, seems to be the original.

Tocharian has two numbers—the singular and the plural—besides some vestiges of the dual, chiefly preserved in the names of double parts of the body, like kanwëm "knees", tsarám "hands", etc. (pp. 35, 127, §§ 61, 184).

The nominal flexion of Tocharian has hardly anything in common with the old Indo-European, owing to phonetic reasons—the disappearance of the end of the word.3

The authors divide the nine Tocharian cases into two groups—the primary and the secondary; to the first group belong the nominative (= vocative), the oblique, corresponding to the accusative, and the genitive; to the second—all other cases, i.e. the instrumental, the comitative, the á-case (as to the meaning, a combination of the locative with the instrumental), the dative, the ablative, and the locative.

The nominative sing. represents the pure stem; the nom. plur. has various endings (mostly -ntu, cf. Kuch. -nta); the oblique has endings in -n (m),4 in plur. it mostly falls together with the nominative. The genitive sing. is formed by adding various endings (-āp, -s). The secondary cases are formed from the oblique by means of postpositions,5 going back to still older prepositions, identical in sing. and in plur.—a process similar to those of agglutinative languages. Thus

1 Op. cit., §§ 2, 5: the names of animate beings ending in Skt. in -ā and -ā assume -e, -a in Kucheans, those of inanimates drop the final vowel (v. infra).
2 Lévi-Meillet, MSL. xviii. p. 385, l. 2.
3 Lévi-Meillet, ibid., pp. 381–2, a process that, in our opinion, has gone in Tocharian farther than in Kucheans (i.e. *eKwës, Kuch. yakwë, Toch. yuè).
4 This case might go back to the i.e. acc. sing. in -m.
5 This principle was first recognized by E. Smith, Tocharisch, etc., p. 31, Christiania, 1911, and later confirmed, for Kucheans, by M. Meillet, cf. MSL. xviii, p. 403.
the ending of the comitative -āssāl is obviously related to the preposition śla "with", that of the locative -an, to the independent postposition ane. This method of flexion must have been comparatively recent, since the endings (or postpositions) of Tocharian are not the same as in Kuchean (though some are related, like loc. Toch. -an, Kuch. -ne, dat. T. -ac, K. -ś, -sc).

In order to make the process clear let us quote an example (p. 153, § 224, the forms in square brackets being supplied by the reviewer):

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{Sing.} & \text{Plur.} \\
N. & kāṣṣī & kāṣṣiṅ \\
Obl. & kāṣṣiṁ & kāṣṣis \\
Gen. & kāṣṣiṇā & kāṣṣīsiṅ \\
Instr. & [kāṣṣiṇo] & [kāṣṣisyo] \\
a-case & kāṣṣinā & [kāṣṣisā] \\
Dat. & kāṣṣinac & [kāṣṣisac] \\
Abl. & kāṣṣināṅ & kāṣṣisāṅ \\
Loc. & kāṣṣinam & [kāṣṣisam] \\
\end{array} \]

The combination of the stem with the ending is not mechanical, since it often involves phonetic changes, called by the authors (pp. 42–43, § 78) "Ablaut": thus the vowel a of the final syllable of the stem is dropped or changed to ā before an ending beginning with a vowel. So we have, from pācar "father", gen. sing. pācri, dat. pācrač; from pekant\(^1\) "painter", gen. sing. pekāntāp.

A special notice deserves the treatment of the numerous Sanskrit (or, rather, Indian) loan-words which we find discussed under the nominative case (pp. 55–62, §§ 86–97). This treatment is, in general, very near to that those words undergo in Kuchean; the authors arrive, therefore, at conclusions almost identical with those the reviewer expressed a few years ago in his paper referred to.\(^2\)

It would be idle to enter into details; the main point seems to be the tendency of Tocharian, still more marked in Kuchean, to distinguish between the names of animate (or reasonable) beings, and those of inanimates. This tendency is keenly felt in the treatment of Indian words ending in -ā (m.) or in -ā (f.).

The authors admit it (§ 89) for personal names in -ā which in Tocharian mostly have the nom. sing. in -e (Devadatte, Nande, etc.),

\(^1\) From ṣpik, pek "to write, paint", cf. Lat. pi-n-go, pictus, etc.
\(^2\) The paper in question is not mentioned in the work we are reviewing where similar references are by no means scarce.
as well as for many adjectives (tāpase, traıvidye, etc.), while the names of lands, places, and mountains drop the final vowel altogether (Jetavaṃ = Jetavana, Ratnadvip = odevpa, etc.).

But in Tocharian many Indian personal names in -ā also drop the final vowel, without any apparent reason: thus Anand, Arjun (read Arjun), Mahiśvar, Kāśyap, whereas Kuchean always forms the names of animates in -e¹; we could find but one or two exceptions.² The same tendency shows itself in the names in -ā (f.) and, less markedly, in those in -i and in -u.

These facts are, in our opinion, interesting as such, in so far as they point to the tendency of Tocharian to distinguish between the names of animates and inanimates (already referred to), but they may have an historical importance.

Some twenty years ago³ Professor Staël-Holstein found that Uighur had, in Indian names of animates, i for Skt. ā, a or i for Skt. ā, while the final vowel was dropped in the names of inanimates—a practice partly followed by Mongol. The reviewer ascribed this treatment to the influence of Kuchean.⁴

Very interesting and useful are, no doubt, the paradigms of declension (pp. 149–62); the wide range of variation shows the complexity of the phenomena the authors had to deal with.

The Tocharian pronouns (pp. 162–93), though having lost the peculiarities of the old declension, have preserved much of Indo-European in their roots. The personal pronouns are, in spite of some peculiarities, easily recognizable: that of the 1st person sing., showing the remarkable feature of the distinction of genders—masc. ūnas and fem. ūnuk, may be related, as Professor Meillet suggests,⁵ to the stem of the (enclitic) forms like Skt. nau (dual), nas (plur.), Lat. nos, Slav. ny, nasū (plur.). The plural was reminds of Skt. nom. plur. vayam. The 2nd person tu (oblique cu) in sing. is obvious; the plural yas is related to Skt. yūyam, yusmān. As evident is the reflexive śūi.

The demonstrative sām, sāṃ, tām shows the well-known alternation

---

¹ Cf. Kuchean Studies, Table 1 (p. 113), and § 2.
² Mār (= Skt. Māra), usually in a compound, Mārākте = “the god M.”, and Metrīk (Toch. Metrāk), quoted by Sieg and Siegling, § 22.
⁴ Kuch. St., pp. 160–1, § 36. The reviewer believed that the fluctuation of Karashahrian (= Tocharian, v.s.) prevented this language from being regarded as the source; still the Mongol use of some names in -a without any vowel, like Kaśip = Kāśyapa reminds of Karashahrian (Kāśyap).
⁵ MSL. xviii, p. 420.
of the stems (like Skt. saḥ, sā, tad) and all the three genders (p. 168, §§ 278 sqq.). The interrogative ku (m. f. kus, n. kuc) serves, with a particle (ne) as the relative pronoun.

The numerals, treated in detail in §§ 327–37, reveal their Indo-European character; we can but refer to the masterful discussion of the subject (concerning Kucheian, but taking note of Tocharian, too) in MM. Lévi and Meillet’s “Les noms de nombre en Tokharian B”.¹

Very interesting for the comprehension of the Tocharian inflexion is the chapter on the group declension (pp. 205–28): if several nouns are syntactically associated, e.g. the attributes with the substantive, it is the latter that, coming last, assumes the case ending, while the attributes are used in the nom. or in the oblique, whatever the case of the substantive (nominative excepted) may be. The apposition, following a proper name in the nom. obl. or gen., is declined; so Sāgarem (obl.) lāntāṣ (ablat.), “from king Sāgara.” The same is the case of a juxtaposition of several independent nouns, which may, however, all assume the respective case endings.

While in the group declension we have to do with syntactically associated independent words, in composition the noun, being the first component, undergoes certain phonetic changes and the last member may assume special case endings or suffixes (pp. 228–51). Thus some words, when entering a compound as its first member, assume a final a: atrā “hero” + tampe “power”, form atratampe “hero’s power”. A possessive compound may have the suffix -um: śka-tampeyum “endowed with the ten powers” (= Skt. daśabala).

The compounds are divided into determinative, possessive, and copulative (less frequent).

The contents of the chapter on the indeclinables (pp. 251–323) are fairly variegated: the unchangeable adjectives, the adverbs, prepositions, postpositions, preverbs, etc., are passed in review; this material belongs rather to the domain of lexicology.

The occurrence of indeclinable adjectives, as well as the facts of the group inflexion, seem to suggest that the Tocharian nominal inflexion was on the decline, that the language was passing from the synthetical to the analytical stage.

Very complete and exhaustive is the treatment of the verb (pp. 323–484), that has, contrary to the noun, preserved very much of Indo-European.

¹ MSL. xvii, pp. 281–94.
The authors consider the paradigm as divided into two parts: the principal verb and the causative, the latter being distinguished by the suffix -s, by the reduplication in the preterit and sometimes by the softening of the consonant (§ 404). Thus the root *ritve, "to be united," forms in the first category the present (3rd plur. med.) *ritveintra, in the causative *ritve-euc, past participle *ritweo and *raritweu.

The Tocharian verb possesses two voices—active and middle, three tenses—the present, the preterit, and the imperfect, four moods—indicative, subjunctive (acting as the future, too), optative, and imperative. Two numbers, singular and plural, are distinguished, a few traces of the dual being found. The personal endings—apart from those of the imperative—fall into two groups that may be, to a certain extent, compared to the primary and secondary endings of Sanskrit and Greek. The middle endings (-mār, -tār, -tār, -mēr, -cār, -ntār), all terminating in r, are obviously akin to those of Latin and Celtic.

The very abundant infinite verbal forms include the two present participles, a past participle, two verbal adjectives (ending in -l), an infinitive and a verbal noun (in -lune).

Three stems (and systems) may be distinguished, i.e. the present, the preterit, and the subjunctive stems.

From the preterit stem are formed the preterit, the imperative (mostly), and partly the past participle; the subjunctive stem is the base of the subjunctive, the optative, the second verbal adjective, and the verbal noun. But practically, in the most verbs, the preterit and the subjunctive stems fall together.

The imperfect is sometimes (even mostly) formed from the present stem, sometimes from the root; as this tense may have the present endings, one feels inclined to ask whether this term is really appropriate (§§ 460–5).

The authors distinguish twelve present classes that may be partially compared to those of the Indian or of the Indo-European grammar: classes i–v add a vowel to the root (ā or a), classes vi–viii use a nasal suffix (-na, -nā, or -nūs), to which the tenth class may be added (-nāy), the ninth and eleventh are sigmatic (-s, -sis); the twelfth class comprises the denominative verbs.

Thus the old distinction between the thematic and athematic conjugations seems to survive in Tocharian.

We have to note the formation of the imperative by means of the prefix p- (§ 431), which the authors seem to connect with Mod.-Pers. bi-, often used before the imperative; let us recall the opinion of
MM. Lévi and Meillet,\(^1\) who compare Slav. *po* (Lithuan. *pa*) "involving the perfective character of the imperative".

The authors have found that the very frequent forms in -s (corresponding to Kuchean -sk, -sq), which constitute, in many verbs, a second paradigm, represent the causative; the examples quoted (§§ 473 sqq.) seem to corroborate this view. In Kuchean, however, the similar forms appear to express the durative action.\(^2\)

An appendix (pp. 421–84) contains a list of verbs recording all the forms met with in the texts, as well as the meaning, when known; unfortunately, of 336 verbs a quarter (78) lack the translation.

A complete *index verborum* on thirty pages (pp. 488–518) closes the volume.

The authors—I mean especially Messrs. Sieg and Siegling—have given to science a remarkable instrument by completing their work of the discovery of the Tocharian language that is now made accessible to all scholars. Still much remains to be done—that will be—we may hope, before long, achieved by these distinguished scholars; but whatever the future development of Tocharian philology may be, its base shall be the book we have been reviewing.

N. MIKONOV.

---

**AN ACCOUNT OF TIBET: THE TRAVELS OF IPPOLITO DESIDERI OF PISTOLA, S.J., 1712–27.** Edited by FILIPPO DE FILIPPI, with an Introduction by C. WESSELS, S.J. pp. xviii + 475, xvii plates of illustrations + 1 map. 8\(\frac{1}{2}\) × 5\(\frac{1}{2}\). Broadway Travellers. London: George Routledge, 1932. 25s.

"Wide in his learning and keen in his study of all things Tibetan, Ippolito Desideri was among the most brilliant Europeans who have ever travelled in the country." Such is Sir Charles Bell's just tribute in his recent book, *The Religion of Tibet*, to the Italian Jesuit scholar who, during a residence in central Tibet between 1716 and 1721, mastered the language and religion, as has no European since, except Csoma de Körös, who studied in western Tibet a century later.

Desideri and Csoma, alike in scholarly zeal, "devoured" the contents of the Tibetan canon both alone and under the guidance of learned lamas. The Jesuit had the support not only of his powerful

\(^1\) _MSL_. xviii, p. 18.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 27.
order, which in 1624 had entered Tibet, later to be followed by the Capuchins, but of Latsang Khan—Desideri's Cinghes-Khang—ruler of central Tibet till his overthrow in December, 1717 (Bell gives 1718), an event fatal to the success of the Christian mission. As an Orientalist, Desideri laboured too early, and his unrivalled account of the Tibetan religion remained buried in ill-merited obscurity till 1875, when one manuscript of the Relazione was found. Not till 1904 was this in an incomplete form made available to Italian readers by Carlo Puini. When William Moorcroft encouraged Csoma to turn to Tibetan and, we may recall, gave him Giorgi's Alphabetum Thibetanum, published at Rome in 1762, Eastern religions and culture had captured the attention of the learned West. So, unlike the Relazione, Csoma's works were soon printed and became the foundation of later research in that field.

Father Wessels' introduction briefly surveys the remarkable chapter of Jesuit enterprise in Tibet, commencing with the Tsaparang mission in 1624, and ending with the recall of Desideri in 1721, when Rome handed that field over to the Capuchins, who were themselves soon compelled to withdraw to Nepal. This survey appropriately comes from the author of Early Jesuit Travellers in Central Asia, who there in 1924 announced the discovery of two new Desideri manuscripts, referred to here as MSS. A and B, in addition to that now in the Florence Library, which Puini used. The present free translation in easy and flowing English is based on all three MSS., as the preface describes. MS. A seems to have been prepared for publication from the other two, but omits the all-important section on religion, mentioned as the third book in the author's prefatory remarks or "Foreword" to this manuscript. In the narrative the editor has indicated whence he has supplied gaps in his leading manuscript, or where he has thought fit to omit any passages. A full descriptive bibliography of Desideri, including his own four Tibetan treatises, has been provided after the tables of contents and illustrations. The last 125 pages contain the author's elderly travelling companion, Freyre's, Report, copious notes to the introduction and to the four books of the text, a bibliographical index of works quoted, and, besides a general index, also one of Tibetan words. While both the notes and Tibetan index might, perhaps, be amplified with advantage in places and the notes pruned in others, all these 190 pages or so of supplementary matter are invaluable to elucidate Desideri's story and to render this volume admirably complete in itself.
Not only are the general scheme and detail of this well-illustrated volume unusually satisfying but, "at the suggestion of Sir E. Denison Ross," the original spelling of Indian and Tibetan names has been very wisely preserved intact. The modern forms are usually appended in brackets. That "Desideri's spelling is by no means always uniform" (p. 45) is no reflection on his scholarship. For not only does the pronunciation of an uniformly spelt Tibetan word vary "in the different provinces" (p. 102), but even with different speakers in one locality, and in Tibetan many place-names have several alternative spellings. Desideri's Italian spelling is surprisingly correct phonetically, though, like English, it, as he realized, cannot convey certain consonantal or modified vowel-sounds. But even "Trussi" or "Trescij" are better than Tashi (bkra-shis), and Göring than Chering (tšhe-ring). Chapter xv of Book ii, concerning the language, etc., is provocatively brief. It is, indeed, true that "Thibettan orthography is in some ways less complete, in others more complete than ours", but "far more difficult to learn". Also that "there are many other inversions, so that one has to read the whole period to understand it and sometimes re-read it from bottom to top to get its construction clear" (p. 185). All that he writes here, as on religion and history, reveals his mastery of his subject.

Perhaps the titles of Wessels' Early Jesuit Travellers and of this series, the Broadway Travellers, give undue prominence to the travel element in the Relazione. As a travel diarist, Desideri's record of places visited is disappointingly meagre, when compared even with Azevedo and above all with that model traveller, William Moorcroft, as the reviewer can testify from his familiarity with parts of the routes they followed. But what little he does tell us is accurate; and is the editor wise in his preference of Freyre's account of the passage of the Zoji La or "Kantel" against Desideri's briefer but explicit statement that "in the evening we arrived at the first inhabited spot of First or Lesser Thibet at the foot of the other side of Mount Kantel"? And here we decline to be convinced by the statement on p. 378, in note 18, that they "could not possibly have done the distance from Baltal (to Mutayun) in a day", a distance that many, including the old and young, and even women, have done or exceeded under equally bad conditions. On p. 74 is not "Khoval (Kalan) Thibet" doubly inaccurate? The sequel indicates that "Khoval" is an error, possibly textual, for "avval", the "First or Little Tibet", i.e. Baltistan, whereas Thibet Kalan, Great Tibet,
is, of course, Ladak, as we see on p. 75. On p. 351 a similar editorial error occurs, where the Punjab "Guzarat" is indicated as being "(Lesser Guzarat, Ahmahabad)", whereas presumably Ahmadabad should follow (Gujarat the Great), which comes in the next lines. But scanty as his topographical information may often be, let us remember that Desideri realized the continuity of the Tsang-po with the Brahmaputra, and was the first European to visit Kailas and Lake Manasarowar. Of central Tibet he gives an accurate general account, restrained and well-informed; while no one could ask for better than his first-hand description of the capital and contemporary events.

As in topography, so in ordinary matters the author often misses small points. He did not note that the fine material used for the Kashmir "scial" was pashm, the secondary or inner coat of the "tus" goat (also sometimes of sheep and other wild or domesticated animals of the high plateaux). And the note 17 (p. 377) has not fully elucidated this. Among Tibetan animals, the kiang, wolf, snow leopard, and hare are not noticed in chapter iii of Book ii. The "pparà" of p. 125 may be the _phyi-wa_ or marmot, a very common animal, though hardly describable as "noxious". Are the "very rare beasts said to be like cats" not the lynx family? But here again we must pause, for Desideri is essentially a humanist, not a natural historian, and his true field was the understanding of men, and his profession the salvation of their souls.

From secular rulers, from the laity, and even from many monks, these "whitehead" lamas from the West met with a kindly and honourable welcome, which may have induced over-optimism, as it also had a century earlier with Andrade at Tsaparang. Even at the Ladak frontier fort, which was probably Shimsha Kharbu, rather than Dras (as discussed in note 18, Book i), the Muhammadan "Kinglet", who was subject to the sovereign of Ladak, "received us with much honour and many compliments." The King of Leh (Nyi-ma Nam-gyal) pressed them to stay and at Lhasa the ruler arranged for the author's study of the holy books. Of the two canonical collections Desideri gives an admirable pioneer account in chapter xiv, Book i, where also he stresses the importance of the central doctrine of the "Tongba-gni", or _Sunyata_. There is an unfortunate slip on p. 382, where the note describes the Kahgyur as "translated from the Chinese". Desideri on p. 253 mentions the Indian origin of these scriptures, "translated long ago from the ancient scientific language
of the Empire of Hindustan,” as elsewhere he does of the religion and its founder under his Tibetan name “Sciaccia-Thubbá”. The name Buddha does not occur in Desideri.

The whole of Book iii describes “the False and Peculiar Religion Prevailing in Thibet”, “a religion unlike, as far as I know, any other in the world.” Desideri’s visit followed the death of that poetical libertine, the sixth Dalai Lama, successor of the “Great Fifth”, whose period Sir Charles Bell states “marks a turning point in Tibetan history”. For “Now at last the priest is enthroned, a living Buddha, holding the twofold power”. But Desideri arrived during a brief interregnum, when the Mongol Latsang Khan’s nominee Dalai Lama was not accepted generally by laity or clergy. The choice of an infant “incarnation” is well described. Our author accepts the phenomenon of the child’s familiarity with intimate details of its previous existence. But he will have none of the rationalist explanation of human fraud, advanced by some Tibetan friends who “deny that the Devil could have so much power”. He finds here “a machination of the Devil”, whom he holds responsible also for other features of this “false religion”, a view we have heard from Christian workers not of the Roman Church. It was not till after 1720 that China manipulated the election.

Naturally the writer attacks “the abominable belief in metempsychosis”, which is “source of all the errors of the false Thibetan Religion”, once a Christian heresy, too, we may recall. Here, as with the Sunyata, his keen mind at once selects and attacks fundamentals. However, he does not conceal his sympathy and admiration for much that he saw. And he witnessed piety, learning, and discipline not inferior to that of Rome. His account of that “idol Cen-ree-zij”, for example, is tender, as is that of Mi-la-ras-pa, whose name he had forgotten. Typical, too, is his conclusion of his full story of the “malignant demon, Urghien” (Padma Sambhava), first introducer of the religion; “I confess that I blamed myself, and was ashamed to have a heart so hard, that I did not honour, love, and serve Jesus, sole Master, sole and true Redeemer, as this people did a traitor, their deceiver.” And one of his most intimate friends was the red-cap abbot of Langur, “a fat man, very courteous and kindly by nature . . . universally loved and respected.” The editor has happily selected as frontispiece a beautiful reproduction in colour of a Tibetan banner of Urghien.

To-day we often find Padma Sambhava’s representation in
Gelugpa temples, and occasionally Tsong-kha-pa’s in those of the old sect. In some monasteries we see monks of several sects living in harmony. Sectarian differences in Tibet are in the main differences of discipline, not doctrinal. And Buddhist toleration extends to the Bon, not mentioned by name by our author. But for a brief period prior to 1720 the temporary religious and political situation, detailed in the text, resulted in an intense persecution and despoilment of the old sect by the “bitterly envious” Gelugpas with Mongol aid. So we have lost many of the early artistic and literary treasures of Tibetan Buddhism. And in Tibet the name Sog-po is to-day synonymous with incendiarism and destruction.

Desideri is too sane and critical an observer to attach the importance to superficial resemblances of Lamaism to Christianity, which other authors have before and after him. Book iii concludes with a caution as to this on the matter of the Trinity, and a short way back (p. 302) we read: “I must, however, confess that in none of the Thibettan histories, memories, or traditions, have I found any hint that our Holy Faith has at any time been known, or that any Apostle or evangelical preacher has ever lived here.” Mistakes and omissions are surprisingly few; fewer, indeed, than in some modern accounts considered as authoritative. Only Father Desideri’s penetrating intellect, pertinacity of purpose, tranquil judgment, and deep affection for his “beloved Thibettans” could yield so well balanced a picture of Lamaism and Tibet. Still unexcelled in this respect, the Relazione, together with the rich and scholarly explanatory material now supplied and in its present compact and attractive dress, may be warmly recommended to all classes of readers and as a model to other writers and commentators.

The author in his preface modestly writes, “Whether I succeed or not the Reader need not fear a lack of truth”, and “Who brings new and rare fruits from a foreign land need not make excuses if their flavour is not perfect, or they are presented in a rustic basket. Their quality and their rarity must be their excuse”. Indeed, no excuse is needed. In this edition Desideri has after two centuries at last come into his own.

H. L. S.

We welcome this volume on The Religion of Tibet, on account both of the material used and of its treatment. For Sir Charles Bell has based his historical chapters in the main on trustworthy native chronicles collected by him in Tibet, and has presented his story of the rise and many-sided developments of Buddhism in Tibet (also in Mongolia) with unusual feeling for his subject and with conspicuous fairness. On the working of that complex and strange system of religious government, presided over and cleverly controlled by his official and personal friend, His Holiness the present Dalai Lama, with which subject the last three chapters of this book deal, Sir Charles is, of course, an authority without peer. Indeed, his three volumes—Tibet: Past and Present, The People of Tibet, and this one before us—together give a complete and vivid picture of church, government, and people in true perspective. And this volume, like the others, is enriched with a splendid array of the author’s own fine photographs. Here at last is something definitely authoritative and easily comprehensible for the general reader, sated with travellers’ tales and suspicious of the fare offered by western adapters of oriental cults.

Instead of repeating previous European writers, Sir Charles has either expounded his largely first-hand information in his own easy and strongly individual style or allowed his well-chosen Tibetan authorities, whether they be old-time chroniclers or clerics and statesmen of to-day, to tell their own story.

In the final article on “Sources” we find a detailed review of the native writers relied on. Among them, of course, Pü-ton (Bu-ston) stands out as pre-eminent on account of the almost modern scientific method in his compilation and analysis of the voluminous literature on the history of religion, even then available. It would not be difficult to add to the list as, despite Chinese and Mongol incendiaryism, the literary material existing in Tibet to-day is, we are told, enormous, quite apart from the canonical collections and religious or philosophical treatises in the monastic libraries. Histories, lives of saints, official archives of statistical value, biographies of the Dalai Lamas, and, as we here learn, contemporary chronicles recorded by them or their instructors abound. And in a country, where religion is overwhelmingly predominant, there is no well-marked line of demarcation between secular and religious history. When we recall the victorious inroads
into China of the early Tibetans under their warrior kings, and the expulsion of the Chinese officials and army from Tibet in the present century, it is amusing to read the not-undeserved rebuke which the Chinese emperor had carved on stone at Lhasa at the close of the eighteenth century: "The people of central Tibet, abandoning military pursuits, devote themselves solely to literature. Thus they have become like a body bereft of vigour."

After Pû-ton (1290–1364) Sir Charles relies largely on the historian Gô, who completed his "Blue Treasury of Records", the Tep-ter Ngön-po, in 1476. Gô's reputation for trustworthiness is, we are told, deservedly high. Indeed, his countrymen honoured him by according him the titles of "Great Translator" (Lo-chen) and "Glorious young man", the attribute frequently applied to the Bodhisattva of Wisdom. His history has been freely quoted in this work. That A.D. 1476 has been correctly taken by the author as the equivalent of the Tibetan Fire-Monkey year, 848 years after Song-tsen Gam-po's birth, given by Gô, is corroborated by M. Pelliot's Tables. Apparently, independently of M. Pelliot, Sir Charles has found A.D. 1027 to be the start of the first Tibetan sixty years' cycle, and has seen Csomá's dates to be consistently two years too early. But on p. 94 should not Tsong-ka-pa's birth-year be 1357 instead of 1358?

Chapter iii supplies a good outline of the interaction of Bon and Buddhist religions, and of how the Bon, which borrowed wholesale the Buddhist monastic system and scheme of saints and teachers, made a present of its demons to Buddhism in return. Sacrificial ritual, oracles, astrology, and dances in the main come from the Bon. But till far more research is done on Tibetan Bon scriptures and Indian Tantra, it will be impossible to say definitely whence certain features of Lamaism are derived. For next to nothing is yet known of the vast Bon literature, e.g. the 140 volumes of the Bon Kanjur and the 160 volumes of its Tanjur, the existence of which we have only just heard about. On p. 17 it is merely mentioned that the books in a Chumbi valley Bon monastery "appeared to be Buddhist", with different titles and somewhat altered contents. On this matter Sir Charles has cautiously risked nothing beyond a tentative surmise.

The author is undoubtedly correct where, in chapter iv, he maintains that the Hinayâna Buddhism of the Sarvastivadins, though introduced at an early date, failed to root itself firmly in Tibetan soil, as the Tantric Mahâyâna succeeded in doing, because the former contained within it nothing and the latter so much akin to the old
religion, which the mass of Tibetans was not prepared to surrender. Indeed, both the old native religion and demonology, much the same in pre-Aryan India and in Tibet, is the common foundation of the Bon and the more elaborated Tantra. Even the lhas or devatas, now localized in Tibet or the Hinduized Himalaya, had no respect for frontiers. For instance, to the reviewer's knowledge, one important Kulu deity, according to popular belief and temple records, came from Ta-shi Lhün-po, and is still worshipped by Tibetans at his halting-places on the way. Other legends show this not to be an isolated case. Probably Sir Charles could parallel this from Sikkim and Bhutan.

Chapters v and vi present a vivid account of the surprising Buddhist renaissance of the eleventh century, with its unparalleled and varied activities and achievements in devotion, learning, building, and art. And we are even told that "as knowledge spread in Tibet, Indian Buddhists used to come to Tibetans for instruction". And from that tale of missionary enterprise and ascetic devotion we next turn to watch the gradual building up of the complex and highly developed hierarchical system that even to-day shows no sign of disintegration, perhaps because the Tibetans combine a strong strain of robust individualism with their ability for organization and respect for authority. In Chapter xi on Christian Missionaries in Lhasa, two significant reasons are suggested for these missionaries' failure. "Firstly the wide range and complicated structure of Tibetan Buddhism, and the long, sustained study which its cleverer priests devoted to it," and secondly, "the piety and stern asceticism of many Tibetan priests." Indeed, without this Lamaism would only be an imposing, but worn-out, anachronism. After reading Sir Charles' book, one comes to realize that something of the pure flame of Buddhism still lights up the Tibetan Church, and that Lamaism is more than a museum of dead, grotesque monstrosities, that serves no purpose except to provide a livelihood for its priestly custodians.

H. L. S.

TRAILS TO INMOST ASIA. By George N. Roerich. 9½ + 6½, pp. xx + 504, 151 illustrations and map. Yale University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, 1931. 45s. 6d.

This large volume of some 500 pages is the record, mostly in diary form, of the Roerich family's amazingly long trail, starting in August,
1925, from Kashmir, whence it led through Ladakh, Chinese Turkestan, and Dzungaria into Russia at Zaïsan; and after a mighty detour, not described, back from Russia into Mongolia to Urga; thence across the Gobi and Tsaidam through Tibet, by an enforced circuitous route west of the holy cities, to Darjeeling, which was reached in May, 1928. Other Europeans joined the Roerichs for parts of the journey after Urga.

The author, Mr. George N. Roerich, an expert in the language and art of Tibet, and acquainted with other oriental tongues, was a well-equipped investigator. M. Louis Marin’s preface duly mentions his studies in Tibetan, Persian, Sanscrit and Chinese, and fairly sums up the expedition’s scientific achievements. But is the over-emphasis of M. Marin’s peroration expected to impress the public and silence the critic? For it asserts “The book . . . marks an important date in the history of Orientalism and represents a contribution of the first order to the conquests of civilization”.

But apparently the preface, and also the book, are primarily addressed to a trans-Atlantic public, for the place of publication is in the States. Phrasing and spelling are also trans-Atlantic. And, though the Roerichs are Russian, the Roerich museum, which now houses the expedition’s pictorial record, is in New York. Few countries but the States could finance exploration for so long on so generous a scale. Less fortunate travellers will read, not without envy, of the purchase of forty-two camels, of droves of mules and ponies, and the hiring of an armed escort of retainers, necessary to repel robbers, and useful to intimidate obstructive officials.

With so large a caravan, progress was slow and halts frequent, and useful for study, when transport problems were not overwhelming, as they often were in Tibet. The expedition met its full share of peril and difficulties with local officers, whose efforts to meet, or to avoid meeting, the by no means modest calls made on their limited resources, will at times excite the reader’s sympathy. At one stage, 260 yaks were collected, but for once the requirements of the party had been over-estimated. Application had been duly made to the central authorities for permission to enter Tibet, also the other countries on the itinerary. So the Roerichs fared better than other central Asiatic travellers have done on occasion. But the reader must be left to follow for himself in the text, with the help of the general map supplied, the course of the journey, stage by stage. Geographically, its importance was not considerable. Previous travellers had visited most
of the places described, though no one expedition had traversed all the same ground. Some of it, however, was new to Europeans. On recent political events much light is thrown.

The illustrations, 151 in number, are unfortunate in their unworthy reproduction. This is disappointing when "the chief object of the expedition was to create a pictorial record of lands and peoples of inner Asia" (p. xi). Of "the five hundred paintings by Professor Roerich, brought back by the expedition", we cannot judge whether the eight examples given are fairly representative. In black and white, at least, they convey less of the charm of the distinctive landscape and fantastic architecture of Tibet than do the splendid photos, for example, of Messrs. F. S. Smythe, Kingdon Ward, and Sir Charles Bell. Anyhow, what is painting without colour; and is it wise in this case to rely on composition, line and tone in the absence of the colour, size, and texture of the originals? This we leave other critics to decide. But is Tibet "a country never before visited by an artist" (p. 167)? The author seems to have forgotten that Sven Hedin was no mean performer with pencil and brush. Also, soon after the early attempt on Everest, Mr. F. Help's portraits of Tibetan types were shown at the Alpine Club gallery, and a little later a Russian exhibited his Mongolian and Tibetan studies in Bond Street.

But this sort of statement, though a blemish in a scientific treatise, is excusable, perhaps, in a travel diary, coloured by the diarist's filial piety towards his expedition leader. In this volume the transition from personal impressions and adventure to important investigation and discovery is frequent, and not a little disturbing. Much the same experiences tend to befall every traveller in high Asia, be he explorer, missionary, or invader. Natural obstacles and the habits of man, strictly determined by a ruthless climate, vary little, even though now motors run in Mongolia and brigands carry modern arms. So, often memories of Deasy, Aurel Stein and Sven Hedin recur as we read. But we feel that the lone European traveller's narrative often bears the imprint of an intimacy with nature and the people met of a quality denied to any large band of Europeans. Usual in modern times and necessary as large organized travel parties are, their records inevitably miss the distinction of a Trans-Himalaya, not to mention an Arabia Deserta.

All the same, Mr. George Roerich has proved a worthy and modest successor of the great explorers of inner Asia. On him fell the brunt of the hard work and the research that justified this mighty trek.
His linguistic ability, tact and enthusiasm successfully steered the whole party, that included his mother, through a fair measure of danger to their goal. Whether their Russian origin helped or hindered the party, we are not told. But due thanks are rendered for the British consul-general's effective intervention against irresponsible Chinese obstinacy in Turkestan. We wonder how a Soviet agent would treat English in a similar plight?

Among the author's contributions to oriental research are the following: his excellent detailed description in Chapter XVI (entitled "The Hor-pas and their country") of the life and art, with its widespread "animal style" motifs, of the hardy nomad Chang-pas, economically the most important and ethnologically the most interesting element of the Tibetan population; and of the Bön worship still practised in these northern uplands in its ancient pre-Buddhist form. In this chapter, perhaps the best in the book, the author, while admitting that "our knowledge of the Bön religion is still very imperfect", admirably sums up the little as yet known of both its primitive and later "Buddhcieised" forms, and also adds his own valuable contribution, his discovery of the voluminous Bön sacred literature in some 300 large volumes, named after and presumably modelled on the two divisions of the Tibetan Buddhist canonical collections. And thanks to the inquiries of A. H. Francke and now of Mr. Roerich, our knowledge has made some real advance since Sarat Chandra Das' Brief Sketch in 1903, and Millouë's Bod-yul in 1906.

"The Bön-po terminology," we read, "presents insurmountable difficulties, for it is hard to obtain the services of a well-read Bön-po priest, who will agree to part with his knowledge of the doctrine." But though "the Bön-po adepts are recalcitrant in giving information to foreigners. They usually profess utter ignorance about the tenets of their faith and deny the existence of manuscripts or printed texts (p. 354)", Mr. George Roerich in three months' stay at the modern Bön Sharugön monastery, gained their confidence and access to their libraries. He promises publication of further studies of their "almost untranslatable" treatises. Hesitatingly, we wonder if the book title, Ye-shes ni-ma lha'i-rgyud will prove to mean "Tantras of the Gods of the Sun of Wisdom". In our ignorance of the terminology "Tantras of the Wisdom sun-deity" suggests itself, for in the early Bön the sun and the sun-bird were predominant. The Bön manuscripts, we are told on p. 358, show an orthography which "is as a rule antiquated and reveals many of the peculiarities common in Tibetan manuscripts
discovered by Sir Aurel Stein and Paul Pelliot in . . . Tun-huang". This corroborates the impression given by other known features of the later Bön, notably its dhyāna and shakti elements, that it assumed its present form under the influences of the earlier Mahāyāna sects prior to the twelfth century. We know that in Mi-la-ras-pa’s time it co-existed with them, and that a Tibetan could without difficulty pass from a study of Bön to Mahāyāna and probably vice versa.

Indeed, it is not too much to say that the history of Buddhism in Tibet must be unfolded against a background of indigenous Bönism, and that domestic religion among the laity even to-day is more Bön than Buddhist. In the west, at least, in noble families, no less than in villages, the worship of the private tutelary, often an earth goddess, still continues and the more ancient Buddhist temples often preserve as their holy of holies a primitive lha’s shrine not shown to the ordinary visitor.

In Chapter XVIII the brief notes with photos of megalithic monuments in the great lake region, said to resemble in alignment, etc., those of Carnac, merit attention. The author considers "A large figure in the shape of an arrow laid out with stone slabs" at Do-ring (meaning "Long Stone", not "Lone Stone" as printed) shows some connection with the sun cult. With Mr. Roerich’s lines of stones one is tempted to compare the simpler stone alignments sometimes found in association with certain eleventh century Vairocana temples in the west. These, too, run from the east to the west, where the rectangular temple enclosure has taken the place of the older circle of stones. Such shrines, too, face east. Both forms of alignment may well be the predecessors of the later mā-ni wall.

A dictionary, phonetic studies and songs in the Ded-Mongol dialect of Tsaidam are promised. We hear with surprise that "Mongols very seldom sing" (Chapter XII). Chapter III contains a vivid account of the ruthless terrorism of the life and the terrible end in 1924 of Ma Ti-tai, the Kashgar military governor; and Chapter XI the life story of that singular warrior-priest, the Ja Lama, whom we met in Ossendowski’s Men, Beasts, and Gods, a mysterious personage, who "for some thirty-five years hypnotised the whole of greater Mongolia" till 1923, when he was murdered. These two accounts indicate the turmoil in the heart of Asia shortly before the Roerich expedition set out.

Lastly, the student will regret that the more permanent matter in this book could not have been documented either with much fuller
footnotes or by means of appendices. Indeed, the author was in an unusually good position to do this, also to compile for each section of his book bibliographical notes, for he is at home with the extensive Russian literature on Central Asia. One may ascribe these omissions to the popular diary form of publication. But, no doubt, the author himself must be more conscious than others of these shortcomings. As it is, his ability as a scientific worker is apparent from this book. But neither the conditions of the expedition nor the type of publication have allowed him sufficient individual scope as investigator and writer. We await with interest his forthcoming scientific works on the Bön religion and the Ded-Mongol language.

H. Lee Shuttleworth.

**Europe and China: A Survey of their Relations from the Earliest Times to 1800.** By G. F. Hudson. Edwin Arnold, 1931. 15s. net.

Mr. Hudson's subject demands wide knowledge and historical imagination. Few can range in time from the classical to the modern world, and in space from London to Canton. Nor, indeed, would Mr. Hudson claim an equal familiarity with the whole mass of original documents on which his narrative ultimately rests. But his acute mind constantly offers new and interesting points of view, and, even when he is drawing in the main from secondary sources, his comment is fresh, original, and striking. He is, perhaps, over-disposed to uphold the traditional as against the attacks of modern critics; but even where he is most disposed to do this, he does so temperately, without adopting the controversialist's favourite practice of misrepresenting his opponent's views. Among various matters which the reader will find of special interest is Mr. Hudson's account of the classical silk trade, of the endeavours made by Persian merchants and others to control it, and the political use to which it was put by the Byzantine empire. Along with this may be mentioned an admirably clear account of the development of geographical knowledge and exploration which produced the voyages of Vasco da Gama by one route and of Magellan by another, leading to the establishment of direct sea-communication between China and the West. The development of the tea trade follows, and that curious interchange of ideas fostered by Jesuit influence, in which Europe received more than she gave. Mr. Hudson's work, at once brilliant and well-balanced, merits a warm welcome at the present time.

H. D.

This complete survey which Mr. Baker has prepared must have been a work of great labour. He ranges through the whole period of history from the early Greek exploration of the Mediterranean down to the recent Polar expeditions, and he surveys the whole world from Europe outwards. To compress all this into a volume of under 600 pages has demanded a severity of method which frequently renders anything but the barest narrative impossible. Lively description and adventure is obviously excluded. But the student, for whose use after all Mr. Baker's volume is designed, will find this compendium a most handy book of reference and guide to the main literature of exploration. It is divided into two parts. The first, which comes down to the end of the eighteenth century, contains five chapters of special interest to us here. Three are good, though brief—one dealing with the mediaeval travellers, one with the Portuguese discovery of the Cape route to India, and one with Magellan and the early exploration of the Pacific. The second is a particularly lucid statement of the stages by which the Portuguese succeeded in rounding the Cape. But the pages devoted to the Arab travellers is based mainly on unauthoritative secondary material, while the twenty pages given to the exploration of Asia from 1500 to 1800 is so compressed as to be hardly more than a catalogue of the principal events. In the second part, dealing with the nineteenth century and after, Asia gets nearly 70 pages. But again the space is much too brief to do justice to the numerous travels which have to be chronicled. We should add that we indicate this in order to save intending readers from possible disappointment, not because we think Mr. Baker could have made a better use of his limited pages. His footnotes will, at all events, enable his readers to follow out the story in all its detail.

H. D.

Indian Islam. By Murray T. Titus. Milford, 1930. 12s. 6d. net.

This very interesting volume is concerned neither with the manners and customs of Muslims in India, nor with the theological aspects of Islam itself. The first, as the author points out, has been excellently dealt with in Crooke's edition of Herklot's Customs of the Musalmans of India. The second may very naturally be taken for granted, or if necessary be studied in the works specially devoted to that subject.
Mr. Titus sets out, first, to describe the methods by which Islam established itself in the country, then to discuss the influences which have been exercised by their Hindu environment on Muslims in India, and thirdly, to provide an account of the modern movements which have taken place in the Indian Muslim community. The first of these topics is dealt with mainly on the authority of such works as the late Sir Thomas Arnold’s Preaching of Islam, supplemented by reference to a number of translated texts. While the narrative is clear and accurate, it naturally provides nothing new. The second affords a very valuable and compact account of the effects of Hindu influences, whether exhibited by the adoption of Hindu saints for worship, or resulting from the retention of customary observances by converts, or produced by the inheritance of caste. Though much here is borrowed from previous writers, the author reinforces his statements by his own observations over a considerable number of years. The last section however, has the most originality. Mr. Titus has evidently studied the modern movements of Islam in India closely and persistently, and the fifty pages which he devotes to this subject gives within a short compass a valuable survey ranging from the Wahabi movement with its ramifications down to the writings of Sir Muhammad Iqbal and the Ahmadiyah movement, the followers of which have in recent years been persecuted in Afghanistan with the hearty approval of leading Muslims in India. The latter may, however, draw comfort from the conclusion that the appearance of heresies, distressing as they are to the orthodox, are a far better proof of the vitality of the religion in which they occur than any unthinking acquiescence in the traditions of the past.

H. D.

The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant, 1584–1602.

This interesting volume is based on the Lansdowne MS. 241 at the British Museum, which now makes its first appearance in print. It comprises Sanderson’s autobiography, accounts of his travels to and from Constantinople and in the Levant, and selections from his letters. The editorial work is done with that thorough care and exact knowledge of which Sir William Foster never disappoints his readers. Sanderson himself is a racy person. His vigorous likes and his still more vigorous dislikes reflect themselves in the strong, picturesque,
and, at times, indelicate language of his period. As a Levant merchant he was much mixed up with the group of men who were intimately associated with the foundation of the East India Company, and he himself in 1590–1 set out on a voyage destined for the East Indies, although the vessel in fact never got beyond Madeira. Most of his time in the East was spent under the Grand Turk, of whose administration he has much to say. Sometimes his remarks throw a curious light on matters farther east. He states, for instance, that the customary punishment of officers of the Topkhana convicted of theft was to be blown from a cannon. This is the earliest reference which we remember to this form of punishment. Is it possible that the Mughals introduced it into India, where it was certainly in use for a long period? At Constantinople, Sanderson saw some singular sights of which he took careful note. Outbreaks among the soldiers, mostly due to the depreciation of the currency in which they were paid, afford him some examples, and he watched the nineteen brothers of the new sultan, Mehmet III, being carried out to burial after they had been strangled to ensure the quietude of Mehmet’s reign. He visited Jerusalem, where he got into serious trouble with the Turkish authorities by entering the city girt with a sword, a thing forbidden to all Christians. Being associated with Jews and members of the Greek Church, Sanderson also was attacked by the Roman Catholics, who alleged that he was at heart a Jew, and afterwards, at Tripoli in Syria, he fancied that he was deliberately fired at by a friar. This, however, was probably no more than the usual Puritan readiness to believe all evil of the Roman Church. Altogether, with his diatribes against Catholics, against fellow-countrymen with whom he quarrelled, and against Turkish functionaries by whom he or his friends were fleeced, his travels make an entertaining account of life at Constantinople and the chief Levantine ports at the close of the sixteenth century.

H. D.

Relations of Golconda in the Early Seventeenth Century.
Edited by W. H. Moreland. Hakluyt Society, 1931. Bernhard Quaritch. 31s. 6d.

This volume is edited with the precise scholarship which we associate with Mr. Moreland’s work. It comprises three narratives written by European traders in the early years of the seventeenth century. One was the work of an Englishman, William Methwold, who rose to be
President of the English factory at Surat. His narrative appeared only in the appendix to Purchas, and so escaped being reprinted in the Glasgow edition of 1905. The other two have been translated by the editor from the Dutch. One was written by Antony Schorer, who served in the Dutch factory at Masulipatam, the other probably by another servant of the Dutch East India Company, van Ravesteyn by name, who served as chief of the factory at Nizampatam. The first has not previously been published; the second was inserted in a collection of early Dutch travels. Incidentally, Mr. Moreland’s conjectural identification of the author of the latter with van Ravesteyn is an example of his careful and thorough methods of work. Of the three narratives, Methwold’s is the fullest and most valuable. As was to be expected, none has much to say touching political affairs; but all are concerned with the methods and system of trade, the mode of local administration, and occasionally with such religious practices as sati or hook-swinging, which would specially strike a European mind.

One or two statements made by Mr. Moreland in his introduction seem to us uncertain. Surely it is scarcely true to say that till the sixteenth century Europeans took no part in the commerce of the Asiatic seas. The Venetians, for instance, traded with Basra, though in country ships. Nor are we satisfied of the accuracy of Mr. Moreland’s account of the piece-goods trade. He classifies it under two heads—plain cloths, either white or dyed, bought mainly at Masulipatam and its neighbourhood, and patterned goods bought mainly to the southward. We suspect this classification is over-simplified. There were three main types of cloth—plain, stamped and painted (or chintz), and patterned goods woven of dyed yarn. The southern coast rather specialized in the last of these; but Masulipatam was a famous market for chintzes, as well as for plain cloths.

H. D.

Travels in India, Ceylon, and Borneo. By Captain Basil Hall. Edited by Professor H. G. Rawlinson. (Broadway Travellers.) Routledge, 1931.

This volume contains a selection from the well-known travels originally published in nine duodecimo volumes in the ‘thirties of the last century. The author served in the navy on the East India Station between 1812 and 1817, on the Illustrious, the flag-ship of Sir Samuel
Hood, and on the Minden under the same officer. Of him Hall gives his readers an enthusiastic portrait, which may, as the editor suggests, be set against the darker aspects of naval life to be found in Smollett and Marryat. Hood was, it seems, always inspired by "a boyish hilarity". At Trincomalee, where the Illustrious lay for a while, he dug out white ants, hunted crocodiles, and partook of every other sport that presented itself to his restless mind. In 1813, Hall was ordered to proceed to Bombay to take charge of the Theban frigate. He was then at Madras, and Hood permitted him to travel overland to Bombay. He travelled by Mysore, arriving there in time to witness the Dasara festivities. One of the chief shows was intended to be an animal fight. A tiger, which had been well starved, was turned out into a netted arena. Alarmed by the noise of the great crowd, at first he did nothing but attempt to escape. He tore to pieces the mock figures of two men, was baited by dogs, and after receiving numerous arrows fired from the safe side of the netting, he was at last killed by a musket-shot. This brutal and futile exhibition as described by Hall corresponds closely enough in spirit, if not in detail, with the narratives of earlier travellers to convince the modern reader that he has missed little by the disappearance of such shows. The maharajah himself received the traveller seated on a throne which was made of gold, silver, and ivory, with a canopy of pearls, surmounted by the sacred peacock set with precious stones. He wore a crown of gold so heavy that he could not hold his head upright, and his person was hung all over with jewels. The whole affair gives a strong impression of barbaric display, marked by the same lack of taste (in European eyes) which Roe had noticed at the Mughal court two hundred years earlier. At Coorg, whither Hall then went, the raja amused himself and the traveller by the exhibition of his tamed tigers, which were led in by men with slender ropes attached to the collars which they wore; then came lionesses and buffaloes; and last of all an attempt was made to match a bear against a tiger. With such queer incidents to relate, Hall makes an entertaining writer. His style is not the racy style of Marryat, and is inclined to be pretentious; but his subject-matter provides us with many odd, characteristic vignettes of the naval life of his time, and of the southern courts and capitals of India just before the Company had begun to assume the paramount authority over the sub-continent.

H. D.
GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM; DEPARTMENT OF HISTORICAL AND ANTQUARIAN STUDIES; BULLETIN No. 1 (Compiled by S. K. BHUYAN, M.A., B.L., Honorary Assistant Director. 1932.

In the preface to this admirable publication it is modestly admitted that Assam has not hitherto been classed, in popular estimation, among the most progressive of the provinces of India. Other provinces would, however, do well to follow in its footsteps in pursuing the objects, with which the Government Department which publishes this, its first Bulletin, is concerned. The origin and objects of the Department are set forth at length in Part i of the Bulletin, and may be briefly epitomized as the preservation of what is perishable and the careful classification and study of everything perishable or imperishable, which can throw any light on the history, the archaeology, and the anthropology of a most interesting and certainly no longer "benighted" province. The report in this section of the Bulletin covers the period from July, 1929 to December, 1931. It is excellent and encouraging reading, for it recounts what valuable work the Department has already done, and makes it clear that it is but at the beginning of its labours. Much that is perishable and has too often in the past been regarded as negligible has been preserved, and much material for the history of Assam has been collected, and the efforts of the Local Government in this direction will be gratefully appreciated by all scholars and students.

The Department is organized on the most economical principles. The work of those who conduct its activities is a labour of love, and it has a list of distinguished honorary correspondents, ex-officials, and others, many of whom are known far beyond the limits of Assam for their scholarship.

The Bulletin has been compiled by Prof. S. K. Bhuyan, M.A., B.L., Honorary Assistant Director of the Department, whose illuminating preface throws much light on the antecedents and origin of the Department, and is preceded by a foreword contributed by the Governor of the Province, Sir Laurie Hammond, K.C.S.I., C.B.E., whose hope, that this first Bulletin will be followed by many more, all interested in the history of India will share.

WOLSELEY HAIG.
INDEX TO THE TSO CHUAN. By EVERARD D. H. FRASER, K.C.M.G.

James Legge’s translation of the Chinese classics is fitly deemed the greatest achievement of British sinology. While still the standard version for Western readers, till now it has lacked an index to that most fascinating human document, the Tso Commentary. Legge stated that he was unable to command the time and labour involved in this task, beyond the giving of bare lists of characters found in the text. Couvréur left the omission unremedied. The fact that this necessary adjunct to the student’s repertory was long overdue must have moved many to contemplate the arduous undertaking. Alone Sir Everard Fraser with public-spirited devotion carried it through and finished it some years before his death in 1922, when Consul-General at Shanghai.

To us in this country, Fraser’s painstaking feat is a matter of peculiar satisfaction. Scotchemen will take special pride in this work of a fellow-countryman of Legge, and also in the successful revision and proof-reading carried out in spite of ill-health by another fellow-countryman. Sir James Stewart Lockhart’s part must have made a most exacting claim on his energies, and only those who have attempted some such task can appreciate fully the long and tiresome attention to detail involved.

So far as may be judged from the checking of a number of references taken at random, the text is a marvel of accuracy. The only misprints found occur in the radicals 64, 95, and 96 and 爻. Radical 95 remains with the last stroke omitted out of respect for the first character in the personal name of the Emperor of the K’ang-hsi period. If usage under the late Manchu dynasty had been followed strictly, this incomplete form should have appeared also in the character 爻. But this character is given as printed in Legge’s text, and therefore it is justified. The anomaly in placing a form written with four strokes among the five-stroke radicals has been corrected in most dictionaries, published since the fall of the Manchus, by restoring the original 爻, though in some a compromise has been effected with the modification 爻. The question arises whether lexicographers should now revert to the earlier order which was altered in the K’ang-hsi tzü tien. For the purpose of honouring the reigning Emperor’s name, the positions of 爻 and 爻 were interchanged
so that $ķ$ might stand at the head of the section. In his *Dictionnaire classique* Couvreur entered $ϰ$ before $ķ$ in accordance with the *Tsū hui* and the *Chêng tsū t'ung*. Legge naturally followed the *K'ang-hsi tsū tien*, and of course the index under review retains this sequence, but the $ϰ$ is erroneously written $ƙ$.

W. PERCEVAL YETTS.


This is the third volume of Professor Boerschmann's elaborate and scholarly work *Die Baukunst und Religiöse Kultur der Chinesen*. The first volume, that on Putoschan or Pootoo (the island near Ningpo dedicated to Kuan-yin Bodhisattva), appeared as long ago as January, 1914, and was soon followed by the second volume, *Gedächtnistempel*. The publication of the third volume, though much delayed, has been awaited with pleasant anticipation by the many admirers of the two first, and they will not be disappointed. It is devoted to a full and scrupulously careful description—architectural, historical, artistic, literary, and religious—of over 550 of the most famous or most characteristic pagodas in China, and to a study of the evolution of their types and their internal and external structure. The illustrations which accompany the text are well chosen and beautifully reproduced. A praiseworthy feature of the book is the fact that Chinese characters, where needed, are plentifully supplied. In view of the lack of uniformity in the transliteration of Chinese sounds in European languages, Chinese characters should always be supplied in the case of books which are intended to attract the attention of serious students of Chinese. In omitting to supply them, English publishers (they are the worst offenders) are presumably actuated by considerations of expense, and in some cases they are perhaps afraid of repelling the average reader by an apparently pedantic display of learning. But if the Chinese characters were given in a special index placed unobtrusively at the end of the book, the average reader would have no just cause for irritation and the expense would be reduced to a minimum. A certain author of an English book on Buddhism in China once spent much time and trouble over the preparation of such an index, and sent it to his publisher with an offer to pay, if necessary, for the expense of setting up the Chinese type. The publisher in question brought out the book with the index omitted, and did not even take the trouble to inform the author beforehand that it was his intention to do so!
The frontispiece of Dr. Boerschmann's book is a coloured illustration of the famous Porcelain Pagoda of Nanking (報恩寺琉璃寶塔), which was destroyed by the T'ai-p'ing rebels in the sixth decade of the nineteenth century. Further illustrations of it, taken from woodcuts, together with a full account of the pagoda and of the monastery to which it belonged, are given on pp. 230–77, and will be studied with special interest by all to whom this vanished glory of Old China may have been little more than a legend. These descriptions are followed by illustrated accounts of other liu-li pagodas (glasurpagoden) which still exist in other parts of China and from which we may form some conception of what the Nanking pagoda looked like before the T'ai-p'ing thundercloud burst upon the Yangtse Valley. Among such structures are the small lui-li pagodas of the Old and New Summer Palaces, the Jade Fountain Park and the so-called Hunting Park at the edge of the Western Hills near Peiping (Peking), and the old imperial summer-resort at Jehol.

Dr. Boerschmann might have done well to include in his account of the Porcelain Pagoda an interesting description by a European who visited it during the last quarter of the seventeenth century. This was the Jesuit missionary Le Comte, whose book was translated into English and published under the title of Memoirs and Remarks made in above ten years travels through the Empire of China. His description reveals something of the once too common European contempt for the products of an alien and "heathen" culture, and he refers condescendingly to "that medley of beams, joints, rafters, and pinions" which, though a surprising "singularity", merely "proceeds from the ignorance of their workmen, who never could find out that noble simplicity in which consists both the strength and beauty of our buildings". He is also contemptuous of the internal frescoes and writes of "the ceiling of each room being beautified with paintings, if such painting as theirs can be called a beauty". Yet he was evidently impressed by the building as a whole, and concludes: "Whatever it be made of, it is undoubtedly the best contrived and noblest structure of all the East."

It is possible that many readers of Dr. Boerschmann's book will be surprised to learn from it how great is the variety of architectural forms in the pagodas of different periods and localities. There is, indeed, much less uniformity about these graceful structures than even those who have travelled in China with their eyes and minds open might have expected to find. A mere glance through the
illustrations in this book will show that the designing of pagodas gave ample scope to Chinese architects for the employment of their gifts of originality and imagination.

The technique of pagoda-building is a subject on which Dr. Boerschmann is an expert, and he has provided many valuable measurements, with plans, showing details of both external and internal construction. A full account, with photographs and plans, is given of the pagoda at the Ling-yen monastery near T'ai-shan in Shantung (靈巖寺辟支塔), which fortunately happens to be one of those of which the internal staircase is still serviceable. One of the photographs gives some idea, necessarily inadequate, of its beautiful situation amid cliffs and forest. Probably few of the travellers on the Tientsin-Pukow Railway pay much attention to a certain little wayside station between T'ai-An and Tsinan, a station at which the express trains never deign to stop; yet it is possible at that point to catch a glimpse from the train of the wooded cliffs that overlook the monastery of Ling-yen and its pagoda. Those who are willing to travel by a slow train and break their journey at Wan-Tê for the purpose of spending a day or two at Ling-yen are not likely to reproach themselves afterwards with having wasted their time.

A section of the book deals with the special subject of the Pagoda in landscape and art, and the illustrations will give those who have never been in China an excellent idea of what pagodas look like in their appropriate settings of hills, ravines, cities, rivers, and plains. Some of the illustrations are taken from Dutch and other European books written during the early days of Western intercourse with China, and were obviously the work of European, not of Chinese, artists; but most of them are from good photographs. Pagodas situated in close proximity to mountain-monasteries are nearly always found amid charming scenery—for the founders of Buddhist monasteries and hermitages chose sites not only for their tranquillity and distance from the "dusty world", but also for their beauty. The sites of other pagodas were often selected for reasons connected with geomancy (feng-shui), but in the majority even of those cases we find that picturesque scenery and good geomantic influences had a strong tendency to intermingle.

In view of the great importance of the province of Chehkiang as the favourite home of Buddhism in China, it is not surprising to find many pages of the book devoted to accounts of the pagodas of Hangchow and those in the vicinity of Ningpo and other parts
of that lovely province. Full justice is done (on pp. 159 f.) to the Pao-Shu T'a (保叔 塔), a familiar object to all who know the famous Western Lake; to the pagodas of Ling-Yin (靈 險) and other monasteries; and to the Thunder-Peak Pagoda (雷 峯 塔), which, to the great regret of all who knew the Hangchow of an earlier date, collapsed into a shapeless mass of bricks less than eight years ago. When we realize (as the photograph on p. 156 should help us to do) what the state of the building was during the last years (probably during the last two or three centuries) of its existence, we may well wonder not how it came to collapse but how it lasted so long.

The little Mongol-dynasty pagoda of the "Prince Imperial" (太子 塔) of Pootoo, which has been restored in recent years, is illustrated and described, along with some other architectural treasures of that delectable isle.

Even the miniature pagodas which stand in rows outside the Kuo-ch'ing-ssü (國 清 寺) at the foot of the T'ien-t'ai mountain (天 台 山), and in front of the T'ien T'ung-ssü (天 童 寺)—the "Monastery of the Heavenly Messenger"—near Ningpo, have not been forgotten by Dr. Boerschmann; and the account of the pagoda-shaped relic-chamber of the great Ayü-Wang monastery (阿 育 王 寺), also near Ningpo, leads to an interesting discussion of the pious act of that Prince of Wu, who, emulating the legendary achievement of the great Buddhist emperor Asoka, made at least a beginning of the hopeless task of building 84,000 pagodas to enshrine as many relics of the Buddha.

The new pagoda which stands on the top of the pass leading to the monastery of the Heavenly Messenger seems to have escaped Dr. Boerschmann's attention, or perhaps it had not been completed when he visited the locality. Like all modern Chinese structures of the kind, it leaves a good deal to be desired in design and execution. It might have been worth while to include some account of that other recently-built pagoda in the grounds of the well-known Buddhist monastery near Penang, in the Straits Settlements, if only to show how sadly the art of pagoda-building has deteriorated in modern times. The Penang monastery, though a long way from China, was founded by Chinese and is in fact a branch of the well-known monastic house of Yung-ch'üan-ssü on the mountain of Ku-shan (鼓 山 湯 泉 寺), near Foochow, and might therefore be regarded as having some claim to recognition in Dr. Boerschmann's survey. The Yung-ch'üan monastery itself receives adequate treatment.
The book is suitably embellished with some typical examples of Chinese poetry, mostly on the subject of pilgrimages made to various pagodas by poetical Buddhists or Buddhistic poets, and the German translations are in all cases accompanied by the Chinese text. Among the poets represented are some of the great writers of the T'ang period, such as Li T'ai-po (李太白), Shen Ch'üan-ch'i (沈佺期), Ts'ên Ts'ân (岑参), and Li Shih-chih (李適之)—one of the “Eight Immortals of the Wine Cup”.

Besides the structures commonly known to us as pagodas, Dr. Boerschmann describes many types of the pagoda-shaped tombs which we find in many parts of China. He might have added to his collection of illustrations some of the so-called “Beehive Tombs” of the Yuan and early Ming dynasties which exist in the former British Leased Territory of Weihaiwei. He also tells us about the little pagodas—relief-chambers and tombs—sometimes to be found in roofed buildings or in mortuary chapels connected with monasteries. A modern example of the type (not included in the book) is the tomb of the “Eight-fingered Ascetic” (八指頭陀) close to the monastery of the Heavenly Messenger.

The book is handsomely bound and well printed on good paper. All public and private libraries in which an attempt is made to keep abreast of recent sinological study and research, especially in the domains of Chinese architecture, Buddhism, and religious symbolism, should be provided with copies of this admirable work.

R. F. Johnston.


The original French edition of this book was published as long ago as 1919, and it was recognized at once as a critical study of the first importance. The judgment then passed on it in the sinological world is not likely to be reversed to-day; it has come to be regarded as the standard exposition of the Shih ching, or of that part of it, at any rate, which deals with the ritual of love-making and the relations of the sexes in ancient China. The serious study of the classic by Westerners began about sixty years ago, when Legge published his epoch-making translation, to which M. Granet does something less than justice.
To have been the first to grapple with an archaic text of acknowledged difficulty (for Père Lacharme's very defective Latin version need hardly be taken into account) was in itself no mean feat; and the soundness and accuracy of Legge's scholarship were such that in spite of its rather ponderous style his translation still holds the field. He faithfully recorded the opinions of the Chinese commentators, but did not slavishly follow them. More could not be expected at a time when the intensive study of folk-lore and sex-psychology had hardly begun. Yet M. Granet has no word of praise for this great pioneer, and concludes a catalogue of his faults with the astonishing assertion that his work was "done under the most favourable material conditions". Couvreur's French translation is treated with much greater indulgence, though it came later and for all-round scholarship cannot compare with Legge's.

Refusing, however, to be biased by this strangely jealous attitude, we cannot but own that M. Granet's achievement is a very notable one. For the light which he has thrown on this old anthology has opened a new chapter in the history of Chinese religion, and shows how much can be done with what appears at first sight to be very scanty material. It is indeed remarkable that such a revolution in our ideas about the Shih ching should have been brought about by a foreign scholar. Though industrious students of this classic from time immemorial, the Chinese have never been able to pierce through the thick crust of tradition and consider it with an open mind.

M. Granet's cardinal rule is to pay no attention to the classical interpretation, but to find the meaning of the Shih ching in the Shih ching itself. This method has helped him to discover facts which have hitherto been passed over, and he is able to give a coherent explanation of the work as a whole. In detail, he often follows Legge almost word for word, or where there is a divergence, does not always improve upon him. In No. 39, for instance, the latter had already rejected the generally accepted but pedantic interpretation of line 2: a beautiful girl guarding herself as by a high wall; whereas the natural meaning is that she is waiting for her lover at a corner of the wall. In No. 61, liang jén is much more likely to be a husband (our "goodman") than a wife. And it is surely unnecessary to treat this poem as a sorrowful strain simply because all the commentators regard it as an expression of joy.

The simple yet poignant emotion of the love-songs comes out very well in the English translation—even better, perhaps, than in the
French. Dr. Edwards has indeed acquitted herself of a formidable task with wonderful success, but one cannot help grudging the time which she must have spent on it. For Chinese scholars do not grow on every bush, and it is a pity that one who has devoted years of labour to the most difficult language in the world should be tempted to engage in second-hand work of this kind.

Though the absence of Chinese characters—freely used in the original work—is a matter for regret, one can well understand that their inclusion would have made the book too costly. The other reasons given—that they would have been "disconcerting" to the general reader, and that every serious student of Chinese already possesses the French edition—are not so convincing. The book is attractively printed, except that the type used for the footnotes is rather too small. An index of some sort ought surely to have been added, although the nature of the work would have made it by no means easy to compile.

LIONEL GILES.

AUSGEWÄHLTE KOPTISCHE ZAUBERTEXTE. Von P. Dr. Angelicus M. Kropp, O.P. Sm. 4to, 3 vols., pp. xx + 124, xvi + 286, xiv + 256. Brussels, 1930-1. 60 Belgas.

It has always been the complaint of Coptic scholars that they are dealing with what is largely a translation literature; nine-tenths of Coptic literature has a Greek original, and Shenute seems to have been almost the only original composer in the language. We therefore grasp eagerly at everything of native origin, such as inscriptions, letters, and certain liturgical hymns; and we feel that Dr. Kropp has done us a great service by this collection of texts and his elaborate and illuminating commentary. Such a publication can never pay its way, and we must therefore add our thanks to those who made it possible—the actual publishers, the Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elizabeth of Brussels, and the patrons, the Byzantine Institute of America and Yassa Bey Andraos Bichara.

Vol. i contains Coptic texts (Dr. Kropp only prints inedita, giving references to what has been published elsewhere); vol. ii, translations (of all—both of the texts in vol. i, and of the rest indicated), while vol. iii consists of a general introduction to the subject; its contents may be conveniently indicated in tabular form:—
The Higher Powers

Gods of Ancient Egypt.
Syncretism.
Gnosis.
Christianity. (The Godhead—angels—four-and-twenty Elders—demons—the B. V. M. and the Saints.)

The Instruments of Magic

Animals, vegetables, minerals.

ὁμοία (of living, dead, animals).
Images and dolls.
Human speech ("Abracadabra" is our modern analogy).
Magical ritual.

Magical Operations and Prayers

Their objects (revelation, love, power, curses).
Medicine. (i) Heathen; (ii) Christian (exorcism, blessing, amulets).

Prayer. (i) Syncretic and gnostic; (ii) Christian, relation to liturgy and individual.

It will be seen from this brief analysis that we have here a very full investigation of the lessons that can be drawn from these texts, and vol. iii can be consulted with profit by people who do not know Coptic but are interested either in magic or in the strange amalgam of paganism and Christianity which seems to have flourished more richly in Egypt than elsewhere, and has the Pistis Sophia as its literary monument.

I have tested the printed texts to the best of my ability, and come to the conclusion that Dr. Kropp has produced from them about all the sense that can be extracted (magical formulæ often fade away into unintelligibility). I will give one passage of only moderate obscurity, showing strongly Fayoumic tendency in dialect (it is rather late in date), and then follow it by Dr. Kropp's translation, turning the latter from German into English:—

C (vol. i, p. 20) = xlvi (vol. ii, p. 204)

120

τίταλκα λατει ἡεθελεν ἄν ἡεθελᾶκ

λα ὡσσα επιούτι παντοκρατορ

ετσαλε λα λατει

πλει διεπεί ἄνεε πενακα

λα τενυεκ λει πνεοτακα
I conjure you by your names and your powers and the power of God almighty which resteth in the place of peace (?) watch and protect the four sides of the body and the soul and the spirit of Soura, the daughter of Pelga, and her child, she and her child, with whom she is pregnant, whether it be male or female, that they live the year long without sickness.

Mr. Crum contributes a valuable paleographical introduction, showing probabilities (we cannot reach certainty) of date and provenance. He rightly warns us not to put too much dependence on language; the composers of these texts are deliberate archaizers, choosing a moribund dialect as most suitable to their purpose.¹

S. Gaselee.

---

KOPTISCHE DIALEKTGRAMMATIK, MIT LESESTÜCKEN UND WÖRTERBUCH.


"La méthode pratique pour apprendre la langue copte," says Mallon, "est de se familliariser d'abord avec un dialecte et d'aborder ensuite l'étude des autres en les comparant avec celui qu'on connaît déjà," and most of us have in fact begun with Mallon's Bohairic or Steindorff's Sa'îdic grammar, but Till in this book returns to the older method of Stern, and attempts to show all the dialectical forms at once.

These have now reached a considerable degree of complexity. We have:—

Sa'îdic (formerly called Thebaic)  
Akhmimic  
Subakhmimic

¹ I wonder if QADIM, where there was a temple of Isis (vol. i, p. 13), modern Hafneh, gives us the origin of the name of the freedman in Petronius, Habinnas? Etruscan and Umbrian have been suggested as possibilities, but "es klingt afrikanisch", said Hüblner.
Fayoumic (formerly called Bashmuric 1); or, with a greater or less admixture of Sa‘idic, from Middle Egypt, commonly now called Memphitic Bohairic (formerly called Memphitic) from Lower Egypt.

I think that anyone trying to learn all at once would be liable to a bad headache; most of Till’s readers will probably use the present work for reference when dealing with a text in one of the minor dialects, rather than as their main grammar. His abbreviations (which are many) once mastered, his arrangement is clear and orderly; and he makes good use of the close knowledge of Akhmimic and Fayoumic to which his previous publications have testified.

He adds a useful little chrestomathy, containing specimens of all dialects, explaining a few difficulties in notes and including a vocabulary of Coptic and Greek words. I could only wish that in these he had not confined himself entirely to literary texts, but had given a few inscriptions or other non-literary matter, as Coptic (other than Sa‘idic) is rather under suspicion of being somewhat factitious—a written jargon contrived for purposes of edification. Fayoumic inscriptions can be found, though there are not many of them; a good example is from Harageh (British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1923) on the south-western side of the Gebel Abusir, a piece of desert entirely surrounded by cultivation, lying at the entrance to the Fayoum. The text is Ἡττ ἀλε 2 πεκνει ταρα τεβχη ἀπανα φιδαλοιν στ ἵματι ἀπαλοιν, which would be in Sa‘idic πινοτε λαρε πεκιντα ταρε τεβχη άπανα φιδαλοντι σον άκαλον ἀπαλοιν.

S. Gaselee.

1 This obscure name is here and too often given without the necessary explanation. The eleventh-century grammarian Athanasius of Qōs alleged a dialect of Coptic with this name, but no specimen of it was in existence: when, very early in the nineteenth century, some Middle-Egyptian texts came to light, with strange changes both in consonants and vowels (Ἄλαποι, ἄλε ον for πολαποι, παλ), it was too hastily assumed that they were in the missing Bashmuric.

2 A mistake for ἄλε.

The object of this book written by the well-known lecturer in Bantu philology in Witwatersrand (S.A.) is to recommend "a uniform orthography and a possible unification of dialects for the standardization of an official language for that part of Rhodesia inhabited by the Shona-speaking people". As the complex nature of this object demands, for its proper understanding, rather a great amount of preliminary information, the author has included in his book (1) an outline of the language situation in Southern Rhodesia, (2) an explanation of his methods of investigation, (3) an analysis of the populations of the native districts, (4) a description of the different language-groups and dialects, (5) a careful analysis of the speech-sounds in the more important dialects. Finally, from p. 76 to p. 104, the author gives his "recommendations for language-unification".

(1) Of the dialects spoken in Mashonaland, four have, by missionary work, been pushed into prominence, viz. Karanga, Zezuru, Manyika, Ndau; the differences between them have, however, been greatly exaggerated. Divergent systems of orthography and methods of dividing the words have disguised their inherent unity, which was laid stress upon as early as 1905 by Springer in his Handbook of Chikaranga. The recognition of the practical advantages of a "unification of the dialects" led to the formation of a Language Committee of three local missionaries by the Government in 1928. It was in close touch with the members of that committee that Doke took up his work in order to collect linguistic data and to explore the field.

(2) The perusal of Chapter II shows that Mr. Doke's methods of collecting his linguistic material in the field can be qualified as accurate and reliable. (3) This chapter furnishes us with reliable figures as to the number of speakers of the different dialects as well as of the inhabitants of the different districts, while the fourth chapter deals with the linguistic classification of the Shona dialects in particular. In spite of six main groups, viz. Korekore Group, Zezuru Group, Karanga Group, Manyika Group, Ndau Group, Kalanga Group, and a great many sub-dialects, the Shona language may without hesitation be considered as a unity because of not a few common features which are summarized on p. 29 as follows:—(a) Underlying unity of vocabulary. (b) Common sharing of particular phonetic features,
viz. (i) Five vowel system; (ii) Use of three significant tones; (iii) Employment of "whistling" fricatives; (iv) Phenomenon of velarization; (v) Employment of implosives. (c) Common sharing of particular grammatical features, viz. (i) Monosyllabic noun prefixes; (ii) Significant super-addition of prefixes to nouns; (iii) Uniform tense-system; (iv) Single forms for "father" and "mother"; (v) Decimal numeration; (vi) Form of relative construction; (vii) Vocalization of initial consonants of Stems in Class v singular; (viii) Locative formation, esp. the noun-inflection of place-names.

(5) This chapter contains an outline of Shona phonetics. Exact phonetic investigations must be the basis for setting up a standard orthography, and this aim may be more attainable than the artificial making of a standard language out of two or more dialects. In general the author avails himself of the script of the "Association phonétique internationale", which is not very fit for rendering the sounds of African languages. The author has, therefore, been compelled to add several signs of his own invention, especially in the comparative vocabularies in Appendix IV, where he has used a "narrower" transcription than in the text itself. Taken as a whole, the phonetic part of the book means a very valuable contribution to Bantu Phonetics in general, as the description of the sounds is exact and accurate. It is only to be regretted that the author does not base his investigations on the "Urbantu" forms instead of choosing the Zezuru dialect as starting-point; his statements and comparisons would then undoubtedly have got a still greater scientific value. Nevertheless the material collected in this chapter is a most gratifying starting-point for further investigations.

We now come to the "Recommendations for Language Unification". As I already have emphasized, all such efforts as tend to bring about unity in orthography appear possible and are to be welcomed (cf. Recommendations 6 and 7, "... that the conjunctive method of word-division be used in writing Shona; that there be a unified orthography ..."). In Recommendation 7a, b, c, the author proposes an alphabet containing thirty-two single letters (for the written forms see Appendix XI). This "practical" (not scientific) alphabet is recommended by the principle followed that "no one character has more than one value in any one dialect," and "that the underscored letters have given place to new characters." But it seems to me that the introducing of some single, but little differentiated, forms would not outweigh the use of some digraphs widespread in
rendering the sounds of African languages (e.g. sh, zh, ng). Much more
doubtful seems the possibility of creating a "unified grammar
standardized on the basis of Karanga and Zezuru" (Recommendation
IV). That is what Doke too does not ignore. For he himself remarks
on p. 104: "The first (sc. thing to be emphasized) is that the spirit of
the proposed unification should be that of natural development, and
not that of artificial creation. . . . I have a great faith in the
potentialities of Bantu literature. But I have an equal fear of the
non-success of any artificial unification." The book possesses a very
complete bibliography of Shona publications, a most valuable com-
parative vocabulary of about 100 words in thirty-seven Shona dialects,
specimens of Shona texts in the proposed practical orthography,
and four maps.

H. JENSEN.
NOTES AND QUERIES
SHAMS UD-DIN ILTUTMISH

The correct Turkish name of the third of the Slave Kings of Delhi, Shams ud-Din Iltutmish, so long read as Altamish or Altamsh, has been finally decided as Iltutmish, i.e. one who has seized and holds the country, corresponding more or less to the Persian Jahāngīr. This name was also borne by the Uighur Khan who introduced the Manichaean religion among his people about 760 A.D. (see F. W. K. Müller, Uigurica, ii, p. 95. See also an interesting note by Horovitz, Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, 1911–12, p. 21). This name occurs on at least one coin in Nagari script, where it seems to read Lititimi (see The Coins of the Sultans of Delhi in the British Museum, 1884, p. 15). This, while disposing of the misreadings Altamsh and Altamish, does not quite suit the reading Iltutmish. The Nagari inscription according to this catalogue reads: Sri Sultān Lititimi, (Sameat) 1283. I have always doubted the correctness of this reading, and recently I asked Mr. Allan, of the British Museum, to look into the matter, and he was good enough to send me the following note: “I think the form Altamsh owes its origin to a careless reading of a coin like Brit. Mus. Catalogue Sultans of Delhi, pl. ii, No. 37, in which the engraver was a little cramped for space. Two ways of writing the name in Arabic characters occur on the coins, التميش and التميش; there is no doubt about the two t’s. The only point is the length of the first syllable. Unfortunately, the Nagari form does not occur completely on any one coin. The full reading completed from several coins is Srī Sultāna Ilititimisi Sam 1283. Unfortunately the initial i is not very clear on the only coin on which it survives and I am not absolutely certain that it is long.”

In the text of the Tabaqātī Nāsiri the name occurs in two verses where the correct reading التميش is required by the metre, although in both cases the Calcutta editors have read التميش. On p. 191 of the text in a qasida addressed to Mu’izz ud-Din we read—

آَكَرُ سَلَطَانِي هَنْدَاسَتِ ارْثِ دُودَةُ شَمْسِي
بِمَعْلُومِ اللَّهُ زِفْرَزَنْدَانَ تَوْئِي التَّمِيشِ ثَانِي

بِمَعْلُومِ اللَّهُ زِفْرَزَنْدَانَ تَوْئِي التَّمِيشِ ثَانِي
If the sovereignty of India is the heritage of the Shamsi family—
By the grace of God thou art among these sons a second Il-tutmish.

On p. 202 of the text in a qasida addressed to Nāsir ud-Din we read—

آن شهنشاهی کہ حاكم بدل ورستم کو مشقت است
ناصر دینا ودین محمود بن التمش است

That king of kings who is a Ḥātim in generosity and a Rustam in fight—Nāsir ud-Din Mahmūd son of Il-tutmish.

E. D. R.

REFERENCES TO ALCHEMY IN BUDDHIST SCRIPTURES

"There is a drug-juice 柒汁 called Hataka. One liang of it will turn a thousand liangs of bronze into pure gold." Taishō Tripitaka, vol. x, p. 432, col. 2.

(2) Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa (Chih Tu Lun). Nanjio 1169. Translated by Kumārajīva in A.D. 402–5.
(a) "By drugs and incantations 咒術 one can change bronze into gold." Taishō Trip., vol. xxv, p. 178, col. 1.
(b) "By skilful use of drugs silver can be changed into gold, and gold into silver." Ibid., p. 195, col. 3.
(c) "By spiritual power a man can change pottery or stone into gold." Ibid., p. 298, col. 2, end.
(d) "One measure of stone-juice 石汁 can change a thousand measures of bronze into gold." Ibid., p. 401, col. 1.

"They can turn earth into gold or other precious substances just as they please." Taishō Trip., vol. xxi, p. 358, col. 2.


"It took Śāṇaka and the minister Huai-yüeh (moon-lover) twelve years to learn to make gold. At last they were able to produce a speck of it, not larger than a grain of corn; but they said at once 'There is nothing now to prevent us making a mountain of gold.'" Śāṇaka was a disciple of Ānanda.

None of these four works can be dated with certainty. The passage from the Acatāṁśaka occurs in a chapter which was lacking in the early version (c. 420), and may be later than that date. The Chih Tu Lun \(^1\) is attributed to Nagarjuna, which does not help matters, as his date is a matter of controversy. If it is his, it can presumably be placed roughly between A.D. 150 and 350.

The Mahāyāna-samgraha is a commentary on a work by Asaṅga, whose date is also a matter of controversy. Roughly we may perhaps put the work between A.D. 300 and 400.

The Mahāvibhāṣā is more than three times as long as the similar work translated in the fifth century, and may contain much matter which was comparatively recent when Hsüan-tsang produced his version.

I have thought these references worth collecting as they are not likely to be known to scholars working at the history of alchemy from the Indian side.

A. Waley.

---

ON THE GREEK BIRD-NAME Σέλενκής

Al-Kazwīnī, in the Nuzhat, gives sagharjih, سْفْرَخْ, as the "mongolian" equivalent of Al-zurzur, the starling; and in the last number of this Bulletin (VI, p. 575), M. Paul Pelliot discusses the Mongolian word. He cites (quoting M. N. N. Poppe) Osm. sigrča, also sīyīrṣq, čuvaš sīngīrč (both = "starling"), etc., and suggests that Al-Kazwīnī's Mongolian word should read sīyīrča, or sīyērja, and be looked on as "un emprunt au turc". To these forms we may add Turki zākarči, زَآَكرْچَي, which Sir E. Denison Ross mentions in his Polyglot List (Mem. As. Soc. Bengal, 1909, p. 297).

\(^1\) We possess what is in the main only an abstract of the original. The Chinese text is in a corrupt and confused state. Light on its successive stages of development is thrown by a number of T'ang MSS. of the text found at T'un-huang. See Prof. Honda, in Sōkyō Kenkyū, March, 1929.
I imagine that this curious bird-name carries us still further. We have it also in Armen. *sartjak* (= "starling"); and a very slight change of this into *saljak*—or of Osm. *sqrča* into *s-rqča*, *s-lqča*—would bring us within easy reach of the Greek *σέλευκος*, the rose-coloured starling or "pastor", the famous enemy of the locust! This latter bird-name I have long suspected to be a corruption by Volksetymologie of some Eastern word, rather than a mere cognomen drawn from *Seleucus* or *Seleucia*.

The "Seleucid birds" are mentioned by Pliny (x, 39, 1), Aelian (xvii, 19), Zozimus (i, 57), Photius, and Suidas. It was Cuvier who first recognized them as the "rose-coloured pastor", a bird like to our own starling in gait and habit, but more beautiful in its plumage of black and rose. It is a migratory bird, common in Asia Minor and the Near East; it arrives in great flocks when a swarm of locusts is on the land; and was, and is, respected and worshipped accordingly. To this day in Greece it is hailed in springtime as *ἀγαλματική*; but it is λαβυριστής when it comes in autumn to eat the grapes. Sir Denison Ross, by the way, identifies his Turki *zukarči* not with this bird, but with the Chinese mynah (*Acridotheres cristatellus*); it is a different, but not very dissimilar bird.

I find no mention of the locust-eating starling in Al-Damiri, and Al-Kazwini has nothing to say about locusts when he mentions briefly its Mongolian name. If some scholar could point out an Osmanli, Persian, or Armenian reference to the *sqrča*, *siyıršiq*, etc., as a destroyer of locusts, it would be an extremely interesting thing, and would go far towards confirming the Eastern origin of the Greek name.

D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson.

——

THE WORD HINDUSTĀN

It has sometimes been said that the only correct spelling of the word is *Hindostān*, and that this is proved by its being made to rhyme with *bostān*. The fact of its so rhyming can prove only that such a form exists in verse. It does not disprove the correctness of other forms. Some confusion arises from our not knowing exactly which spelling is objected to, whether it is *Hindūstān* or *Hindūstān* or both. There is abundant evidence to show that in Urdu *Hindūstān* is well known and correct. The following points should be noted.

(1) The spelling without *vāo* is both Turkish and Persian. This is
not important, for we are concerned with Hindi and Urdu, not with foreign languages. Turkish generally omits the vəo, indeed the word is usually pronounced hindistān. Ahmad Vahid’s English-Turkish Dictionary and Redhouse’s smaller Turkish Dictionary give only this form. Steingass for Persian gives hindusān, hindūstān, and hindūstān. Phillott in his English-Persian gives only hindūstān. Hindostān is, of course, impossible in Persian. As I have said, however, all this is irrelevant. Urdu has nothing to do with the forms of other languages.

(2) In speaking Urdu, whether literary or colloquial, people almost always say -ūs-. Occasionally one hears -o- in pedantic speech, but -ūs- is practically universal.

Professor ‘Abd us Sattār Siddiqi, of Allahabad, writes: Urdu bolnevala ‘am ta‘ur par is lafz kā talaffuz maḥz pesh ke sāth karte hai aur fuṣahā kī zābān par bhi hindūstān aur hindūstānih hai go ki hindostān aur hindūstānī bhi galah nahi; “Urdu speakers usually pronounce this word simply with pesh (i.e. -ūs-), and correct speakers, too, say hindūstān and hindūstānī, although hindostān and hindostānī are not wrong.” (Hindustani, 1931, p. 453.)

Nūr ul Lugāt, iv, 992, under “Hind”, uses both forms.

(3) In a matter like this Urdu books have no more claim to be considered than those in Hindi. The latter almost invariably spell the word hindūstān (rarely hindustān); -o- sometimes occurs when an author is referring to an Urdu or English work which has that spelling. Even if it were the case that the -o- form was the only one in Urdu books and that people trying to speak high-flown Urdu always said -o-, there would still be no reason for ignoring the Hindi spelling, and writing -o- in English to the exclusion of -ū-.

(4) With the approval and active support of the local Governments, two language academies have recently been formed in north India, one for Hindi and one for Urdu. Both of these bodies have chosen the name “Hindustānī Academy”, and each of them has a quarterly magazine of considerable interest, one in Hindi, the other in Urdu. The magazines have no connection with one another, the editors, writers, and contents being entirely different; but in both cases the title of the magazine is Hindūstānī. The choice of name for the two academies and two magazines gives quadruple support to my thesis.

(5) In verse the form depends on the metre. The mutaqārib metre of the Būstān, the Shāhnāme, and many Urdu maqnavīs,
such as the Magnavi e Mir Hasan, does not permit the form Hindustan; in place of it we must have Hindustan in Persian and Hindostan in Urdu; but in metres which permit both forms both are found.

(6) Professor Siddiqi has collected a number of instances of the use of Hindustan in Persian, Urdu, and Arabic literature (Hindustan, July, Oct., 1931). He quotes the following authors who write in Persian: Mas’ud Sa’d Salman, five quotations; Amir Khusrau, twelve quotations; Muhammad Ibn ‘Umr Fargadi, one; Sheikh Farid ud Din ‘Attar, one; Jalal ud Din Rumi, four; ‘Abd ur Rahmam Jami, one; Salim Tehrani, three; Mir Raza Danish Mashhadi, one; ‘Abd ur Razzag Fayyaz, one; Nasir ‘Ali Sarhindi, one; Amin Razi, one; Nizami Ganjavi, four; Ashraf Mazandarani, two; Mir ‘Abd ul Jalil Bilgrami, one; Gulam ‘Ali Azad Bilgrami, one; ‘Anand Ram Mukhalla, one; and the Arabic writer Abu ‘Abdullah Muhammad Anarsi (d. A.D. 1327), one.

I take a few quotations at random.

(i) The last-named writer: baladu Hindustan wa ma’nahu baladu Hind, “Hindustan, i.e. Hind” (p. 634).

(ii) Jalal ud Din Rumi: salha mighasht aqasid az u gird i Hindustan barae just u jum “for years that messenger from him wandered round India for the purpose of investigation” (p. 625).

(iii) Amir Khusrau: Turk i Hindustanim man Hindavi gujam jivab “I am a Hindustani Turk, I reply in Hindavi” (p. 627).

(iv) Mas’ud Sa’d Salman: ki man baqil’ a a Suh manam, u ba Hindustan “(that) I live in the fort of Suh (or fort of unhappiness), he in Hindustan” (p. 623).

Professor Siddiqi quotes the Farhang i Anjuman Aras i Nasiri of the time of Nasir ud Din Shah as saying hamcuni Bagdad az Bagdad u paristan az paristan ... u Hindustan az Hindustan; “so Bagdad is from Bagdad, paristan from paristan, and Hindustan from Hindustan”.

He complains that because certain mustis of Urdu preferred to write Hindostani this spelling became fashionable among copyists, sometimes with disastrous results. Thus Nasikh wrote a tariikh on the death of Jurat:

hak Hindustan ka shair muah

and one on the death of Sauda:

shair i Hindustan vacaila.

But the copyist, like the shopkeeper who put up the sign “Mens
and womens conscia recti"., wanted to improve on other people's work. In both lines he wrote Hindostān, thus adding six years to the life of each of the two poets.

Finally he points out that while in Part I of Azād's lectures the copyist has nearly always written Hindūstān, in Part II another copyist has, after the first page or two, always used Hindūstān, which the author himself preferred.

This form Hindūstān, so well supported by the evidence of literature, almost invariably heard in speech, adopted by both Hindūstānī Academies, is surely the form which we should employ in English.

T. GRAHAME BAILEY.

SinoLOGICAL STUDIES

The following notice appeared in the Deutsche Wacht, published in Batavia, and has been sent to me by the writer, Herr E. von Zach. Feeling that, in justice to Dr. Edwards, it should be made accessible to readers of the Bulletin, I have translated it from the German and added a few further remarks of my own:

Arthur Waley, in his Pillow-book of Sei Shōnagon (1928), was the first to draw attention to the Tsa tsuan of Li Shang-yin; and Miss E. D. Edwards afterwards undertook the task of publishing the complete text, with translation, in the above-named periodical (1930, pp. 757–85). Her translation is not wholly irreproachable, and the mistakes are corrected in the article under review. Unfortunately, there are several passages that still remain obscure. Thus, for example, chu-shang (xv, 4) is not "one's master", but the emperor (cf. Tz'ū yüan), and the sentence must run: "It is an exaggeration, if any one declares that he is a friend of the emperor's." Or, xvi, 8: "It is a deplorable sight, when a beggar organizes a (costly) expulsion of demons" (eine (kostspielige) Dämonenvertreibung veranstaltet). Or, xxxi, 2, where Lionel Giles makes the correction: "During one's mother's lifetime to hail her brother as a cousin." The explanation of the Chinese sentence may be found in Legge, vol. iv, Prolegomena, p. 58: K'ang Kung, while accompanying his mother's brother (Ch'ung Ėrh, Biog. Dict., 523) to the north bank of the River Wei, is reminded of his dead mother. To allude to this event in the lifetime of one's mother, by saying: "I have the same feeling for my maternal uncle as K'ang Kung had for Ch'ung Ėrh," is a discourtesy (fei li)
towards one's own mother. Legge's explanation (iv, p. 203) is very faulty. Or, xxxiv, 4: "Poverty is inevitable when one incurs debts in order to join in recreation with one's friends." The expression chui-p'ei (cf. Tzü-yüan) is found in one of Han Yü's poems (c. vii, 11), and was rendered by me (in Deutsche Wacht, 8th April, 1930) "to spend the day in the company of friends". Herbert Giles's emendation of the text and his rendering, "incurs debts and duns debtors," are certainly wrong. Far preferable here is Miss Edwards' translation: "Poverty is inevitable when one borrows money in order to give entertainments." The same is true of xxxv, 5 ("wealth is assured when one incurs no debts"), and xxxv, 11 ("wealth is assured when the young people of the family (Legge, ii, 2, 404) have the same objects in view, or are harmonious in spirit"). Lionel Giles has here confused ti-tzü (apprentice) with tzü-tí (youths). Or, xxxv, 18: "Wealth is assured when one is not extravagant with writing-materials" (paper, pencils, and the like). Lionel Giles's correction: "when one does not maltreat his property," can hardly be considered satisfactory.

Although we must be grateful to the writer of the article for many of his remarks, others are so little justified that the accusation which is commonly brought against Paul Pelliot of "going out of his way to assail another person's work" fits the present case as well.

In conclusion, I would like to point out, in regard to Miss Edwards' Chinese-Malay Vocabularly, in the same number of the Bulletin (pp. 723 seq.), that No. 392 chu-pu is not bamboo cloth but linen, and is rendered by the Malay word pakaian; and that No. 398, so-fu, corresponds to the Arabic sūf, being translated by Watters in his Essays, p. 355, as a kind of thread camlet; cf. my Addenda to Sacharow's "Mandzsuro-Russki Slowarz" in the Mitteilungen der Deutschen Gesellschaft fur Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens, Tōkyō, 1911, Bd. xiv, p. 14.

E. von Zach.

xv, 4. Herr von Zach is right about chu-shang being the "master above", i.e. the emperor himself; but I note that he accepts my major correction without comment.

xvi, 8. This, I submit, is no improvement at all on my "beggar driving out the demon of pestilence".

xxxii, 2. Legge's explanation may or may not be "korrekturbedürftig", but Herr von Zach fails to provide an alternative translation for the sentence as it stands.
4. Here he has certainly hit the right nail on the head.

5. The real difficulty is left untouched, and Herr von Zach has evidently nothing to suggest.

11. My critic does not seem to know that the primary meaning of ti-tzu is "the young" in general (as in Lun yü, ii, 8), while in Giles' Dict., 12317, col. 3, "apprentices" is actually one of the meanings given for tzü-ti. There seems to be no sharp distinction between the two terms. In the passage from Mencius referred to, tzü-ti is translated by Legge "the children of the people". I am now inclined to think, however, that in the present sentence it may denote the younger members of a family, so that Dr. Edwards would be substantially right.

18. Herr von Zach's explanation is also "hardly satisfactory". Why should wu-liao be limited to writing-materials?

His final remark about me seems to have been made for the sole purpose of dragging in Professor Pelliot. The accusation would have caused me real concern had I not known that Dr. Edwards agreed with me in holding free discussion to be essential for the advancement of Chinese studies.

LIONEL GILES.
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