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ARTICLE I.

ON THE DATE OF ZOROASTER. 1

BY A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON,

PROFESSOR IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY.

Presented to the Society April 18th, 1895.

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

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

1 This paper forms a companion-piece to the present writer's discussion of 'Zoroaster's Native Place' in J.A.O.S. xv. 231-282.
I. First, those references that assign to Zoroaster the extravagant date B.C. 6000.

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

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

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

SYNOPSIS OF DIVISION A.

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

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

A.III. The native tradition as to Zoroaster's date.
   a. Ardā-i Vitrāf.
   b. Bundahish.
   c. Albrūnī.
   d. Masudi.
   e. Tabari.
   f. The Dabistan.
   g. Firdausi.
   h. The Mudjalal al-Tawārīkh and the Ulema-i Islam.
   i. The Chinese-Parsi era.
   j. Reports connecting Zoroaster and Jeremiah.
   k. Pahlavi Perso-Arabic allusions to Nebuchadnezzar.
   l. Ammianus Marcellinus and Eutychius.
   m. Nicolaus Damascenus, Porphyry, etc.

A. DATA FOR THE AGE OF ZOROASTER.

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

The allusions of the first group comprehend those classical references that assign to Zoroaster the fabulous age of B.C. 6000 or thereabouts. The references are confined chiefly to the classics, and their chief claim to any consideration is that they
purport to be based upon information handed down from Eudoxus, Aristotle, and Hermippus. Such extraordinary figures, however, are presumably due to the Greeks' having misunderstood the statements of the Persians, who place Zoroaster's millennium amid a great world-period of 12,000 years, which they divided into cycles of 3,000 years,¹ and in accordance with which belief Zoroaster's fravashti had in fact existed several thousands of years. The classical material on the subject is here presented.

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

² According to the chronology of the Bundahish 84, 7, Zoroaster appeared at the end of the ninth millennium; compare. West Bundahish text., S. B. E. v. 149-151 notes; Spiegel Ernster. Alterthumskunde i. 500-508; Windischmann Zoroastrische Studien 147-165; also Plutarch Is. et Os. 47, Θεοτόμος δὲ φησί κατὰ τοὺς μάγους ἀνὰ μέρος τραχία τῆς τῶν μέν κρατεῖι, τῶν δὲ κρατεῖσθαι τῶν θεῶν, ἀλλὰ δὲ τραχία μᾶρσθαι καὶ παλεύειν καὶ ἀναλίζειν τὰ τοῦ ἔτερου τοῦ ἔτερον· τέλος δὲ ἀπολειπεῖαι τῶν Λυβῶν.

(a) Pliny the Elder (A. D. 23-79), N. H. 30. 1. 2 [Wn. 279, 288], cites the authority of Eudoxus of Cnidos (B. C. 388), of Aristotle (B. C. 350), and of Hermippus (c. B. C. 250), for placing Zoroaster 6000 years before the death of Plato or 5000 years before the Trojan war: Eudoxus, qui inter sapientiae sectas clarissimam utilissimamque eam (artem magicam) intelligi voluit, Zoroastrem hunc sex milibus annorum ante Platonis mortemuisse prodidit; sic et Aristotelis. Hermippus qui de tota ea arte diligentissime scripsit et viciens centum milia versum a Zoroastre condita indicibus quoque voluminum eius positis explanavit, praeeptorem, a quo institutum dicere, tradidit Agonacen, ipsum vero quinque milibus annorum ante Trojanum bellumuisse. For that reason apparently (N. H. 30. 1. 11) he speaks of Moses as living multis milibus annorum post Zoroastrem. But Pliny also expresses uncertainty as to whether there was one or two Zoroasters, and he mentions a later Proconnesian Zoroaster: N. H. 30. 1. 2 sine dubio illic (ars Magica) oris in Perside a Zoroastre, ut inter auctores convenit. Sed unus hic fuerit, an postea et alius, non satis constat; and after speaking of Othanes, the Magian who accompanied Xerxes to Greece, he adds: (N. H. 30. 2.8) diligentiores paulo ante hunc (Osthanem) ponunt Zoroastrem alium Proconnesium. Pliny's Proconnesian Zoroaster must have flourished about the seventh or sixth century.

(b) Plutarch (A. D. 1st cent.) adopts likewise the same general statement that places the prophet Zoroaster about 5000 years before the Trojan war: Is. et Os. 46 (ed. Parthey, p. 81), Ζωροαστρες (sic) ὁ μάγος, ἐν πετασκηχλίως ἔτοι τῶν τρωκῶν γεγονότα πρισβίτερον ἵστροφον.

(c) The Scholion to the Platonic Alcibiades, 1. 122 (ed. Baiter, Orelli et Winckelmann, p. 918), makes a statement, in substance tantamount to the last one, as follows: Ζωροαστρες ἀρχαίους ἡμερεῖς ἡμερῶν ἦσαν ἐναι λέγεται Πλάτωνος.
(d) Diogenes Laertius (A. D. 2d, 3d century), de Vit. Philos. Proem. 2 (recens. Cobet, Paris, 1850, p. 1), similarly quotes Hermodorus (B. C. 250 ?), the follower of Plato, as authority for placing Zoroaster’s date at 5000 years before the fall of Troy, or, as he adds on the authority of Xanthus of Lydia (B. C. 500–450), Zoroaster lived 6000 years (some MSS. 600) before Xerxes. The text runs: ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν Μάγων, ὑπὸ ἀρχῆς Ζοροαστρης τῶν Πάρηγον, ἦμεροθάργες μὲν ὁ Πλατανικός ἐν τῷ πρὶς μαθημάτων φορτὶν εἰς τὴν Τροιᾶς ἄλωσιν ἐπὶ γεγονοῦσι παντακισιλία. Ἡ δὲ τῶν ἄλωσιν αὐτῆς ἐκαλοῦσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ζοροαστρῆ ξακοκεχλία φορτὶν, καὶ μετὰ αὐτῶν γεγονοῦσιν παλαιὸς τοιαύτης Μάγοις κατὰ διαδοχήν, ὡστάνα καὶ Ἀστραμψίβους καὶ Γαβρίας καὶ Παζάτας, μέχρι τῆς τῶν Περσῶν ὑπ’ Ἀλεξάνδρου καταλύσεως.

(e) Lactantius, Inst. 7. 15, must have entertained some similar opinion regarding Zoroaster; for he speaks of Hystaspes (famous as Zoroaster’s patron) as being an ancient king of Media long before the founding of Rome: Hystaspes quoque, qui fuit Medorum rex antiquissimum ... sublatum iri ex orbe imperium nomencl Romam multo ante praefatum est, quam illa Troiana gens conderetur (cf. Migne Patrolog. vol. vi and Windischmann Zor. Stud. p. 298, 293).

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

(g) Georgius Syncellus1 Chronographia, i., p. 147 ed. Dind., alludes to a Zoroaster as one of the Median rulers over Babylon. Cf. Windischmann Zor. St. p. 302, and Haug A Lecture on Zoroaster, p. 29, Bombay, 1885.

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

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

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

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

(b) Fragments of Kephaliōn (A. D. 130), preserved in the Armenian version of Eusebius, Chron. i. 43, ed. Aucher: a passage describes the defeat of Zoroaster the Magian, king of the Bactrians, by Semiraminis: “Incipio scribere de quibus et alii commemorant atque imprimis Ellanicos Lesbios Ctesiasque Cnidium, deininde Herodotus Alacarnassus. Primum Asiae imperarunt Assyrii, ex quibus erat Ninus Beli (filius), cuius regni aetate res quam plurima celeberrimaque virtutes gestae fuerunt.” Postea his adjiciens profert etiam generationes Semiramidis atque (narrat) de Zoroastro Magi Bactrianorum regis certaine ac debellatione a Semiramide: nec non tempus Nini LII annos fuisse, atque de obitu ejus. Post quem quum regnasset Semiramis, nunc Babylonem circundavit ad tempore formatum, quae a plerisque dictum est: Ctesia nimirum et Zenone Herodotique nec non alis ipsis et posterioris. Deinde etiam apparatum bellic Semiramidis adversus Indos ejusdemque cladem et fugam narrat, etc.

Identical with this is Georgius Syncellus (c. A. D. 800), Chron. ed. Dind. i. p. 315: “’Αρχομει γράφειν, ἀφ’ ὅς ἄλλοι τε ἐμμημόνευσαν, καὶ τὰ πρῶτα Ἑλλανίκου τε ὑπὸ Δέσφου καὶ Κτριγῆς ὑπὸ Κύνδου, ἔτσι Ἡρόδοτος ὑπὸ Ἀλαριζητείς. τὸ παλαιὸν τῆς Ἁσίας ἐβασιλεύοντο Ἀσπίδιος, τῶν δὲ τῷ Βῆλῳ Νίνου.” εἰ ἔτοικα γένεσιν Σιμώμαμος καὶ Σιροδοτοῦ μάγου (Mss. βέτου) ἤταν μήτης Νίνου βασιλέως: μαθὰν δὲ Βαβολῶνα, ἡμῖν, ἡ Σιμώμας ἑτέρως, τρόπον ὡς πολλῶς ἀλέκτως, Κτριγῆς, Ζήνων (Müller Δέσφω), Ἡρόδοτον καὶ τοὺς μετ’ αὐτῶς : στρατεύθη τε αὐτῆς καθ’ τῶν Ἰδιῶν καὶ ἔτοικα κ. τ. λ. Cf. also Windischmann Zor. Stud., p. 303, Spiegel Eran. Alter., i. 676–7; Müller Frag. Hist. Gr. iii. 627.

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

(a) Similarly the reputed work of the Armenian Moses of Khorni, i. 16, makes Zoroaster a contemporary of Semiraminis, and calls him “a Magian, the sovereign of the Medes,” who seizes the government of Assyria and Nineveh, so that she flees from him and is killed in Armenia. Cf. Gilmore Ktesias Persika, p. 30 n, Spiegel Eran. Alterthumskunde, i. 682, Windischmann Zor. Stud., p. 302, 303, Müller Frag. Hist. Gr. iii. 627, v. 328.

A. V. W. Jackson, [1896.]

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

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

(g) Eusebius (A. D. 300), Chron. 4. 35 ed. Aucher, has a like allusion: Zoroastres Magus rex Bactrianorum clarius habetur adversus quem Ninos dimicat; and again (Windischmann, p. 290), Praeparatio Evang. 10. 9, 10, ed. Dind. I. p. 560, Ninos, καθον Ζορωαστρης ὁ Μάγος Βακτρίων ἰδιωτίαν.

(h) Paulus Orosius (5th century A. D.), the Spanish presbyter, of whose chronicle we have also King Alfred’s Anglo-Saxon version, states that Ninus conquered and slew Zoroaster of Bactria, the Magician. See Orosius, Old-English Text and Latin Original, ed. by Henry Sweet (Early Eng. Text Soc. vol. 79), p 30–31: Novissime Zoroastrem Bactrianorum regem, eundemque magicae artis repentorem, pugna oppressum interficit. Or, in Anglo-Saxon, and he Ninos Zoroastrem Bactriana cyning, se cûþ the ærest manna dryçraftas, hē hine oferweann and ofstôh.

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


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

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

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

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

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

| Vishtâsp, after coming of religion | 90 |
| Vohûman Spend-dâd | 112 |
| Hûmûf | 80 |
| Dârûf | 13 |
| Dârûf-î Cîhar-âzûd | 14 |
| Alexander Rûman | 14 |

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reigned years</th>
<th>Reigned date B. C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vishtasp</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>618-408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VohuMAN (Ardashir Dirazdast)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>498-296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAI</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>296-246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DareI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>246-234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DareI-i DareI</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>244-330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| King                  | B. C.  | |
|-----------------------|-------| |
| Cyrus                 | 558-539| |
| Cambyses              | 539-531| |
| Darius I              | 531-485| |
| XERZES               | 485-465| |
| Artaxerxes Longimanus | 465-445| |
| Darius Notos          | 445-405| |
| Artaxerxes Mnemon     | 405-363| |
| Artaxerxes Ochus      | 363-340| |
| [Arses]               | 340-307| |
| Darius Codomannus     | 337-330| |

Comparison may be made, as with West, identifying the long reign of VohuMAN who is called Ardashir (Artaxerxes or Ardashir Dirazdast ‘the long-handed’) with Artaxerxes Longimanus and his successors. Historical grounds throughout seem to favor this. For HUMAI, West suggests Parysatis as a possibility. The last two DAREII answer to Ochus and Codomannus, and the reign of Kai-Vishtasp ‘seems intended to cover the period from Cyrus to XERZES’ (West). There seems every reason to identify VohuMAN Ardashir Dirazdast with Artaxerxes Longimanus, according to the Bahman Yasht (Byt. 2. 17), as this Kayanian king ‘makes the religion current in the whole world.’ One might be possibly tempted to regard the Vishtasp reign as representing the Bactrian rule until Artaxerxes, and assume that Zoroastrianism then became the faith of Persia. This might account for the silence as to the early Achaemenians and shed some light on the
problem concerning the Achaemenians as Zoroastrians; but there seems to be no historic foundation for such assumption. Suffice here to have presented the tradition in regard to the reigns of the Kayanian kings as bearing on Zoroaster’s date and the traditional 258 years before Alexander as the era of ‘the coming of the religion.’


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

1 de Harlez, Avesta traduit, Introduction p. cccxxvi, thinks that the early Achaemenians were intentionally sacrificed. Spiegel, Z.D.M.G., xlvi. 303, identifies the first Dārā with Darius I., and believes that he was misplaced in the kingly list. This I doubt.

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

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

(a) The sum of 258 years is given also by so careful an investigator as Albrūrūnī (A. D. 973–1048). His statements are based on the authority of ‘the scholars of the Persians, the Hērbdhā and Maubdhā of the Zoroastrians.’ In his Chronology of Ancient Nations p. 17 l. 10 (transl. Sachau), is a statement of the Persian view in regard to Zoroaster’s date: ‘from his (i. e. Zoroaster’s) appearance till the beginning of the Ārā Alexander,’ they count 258 years. Several times he gives the received tradition that Zoroaster appeared in the 30th year of the reign of Vishtāsp. In another place, Chron. p. 196 (transl. Sachau), he gives further information in regard to Zoroaster’s time: ‘On the 1st Ramadān A. H. 319 came forward Ibn ‘Abī-Zakarriyyā. . . . If, now, this be the time (i. e. A. H. 319–A. D. 931) which Jamsāp and Zaraduṣṭ meant, they are right as far as chronology is concerned. For this happened at the end of the Ārā Alexander 1242, i.e. 1500 years after Zaraduṣṭ.’ From this statement we may compute back to the year B. C. 569 as a date when a prophecy is supposed to have been made by Zoroaster and Jamsāp. Albrūrūnī is not exhausted yet. In Chron. 121 (transl. Sachau), he says ‘we find the interval between Zoroaster and Yazdajird ben Shāpūr to be nearly 970 years.’ This gives the date about B. C. 571 if we count Yazdajird’s reign as A. D. 399–420. Furthermore the carefully constructed tables which Albrūrūnī gives from various sources are interesting and instructive, owing to their exact agreement with the reigns of the Kayanian kings as recorded in the Bundahish. Thus, Chron. p. 112, 107–114 (transl. Sachau):

| Kai Vishtāsp till the appearance of Zoroaster | 390 |
| The same after that event | 90 |
| Kai Ardashīr Bahman (Vohūman) | 132 |
| Khumān (Hūmān) | 90 |
| Dārā | 13 |
| Dārā ben Dārā | 14 |
On p. 115 he contrasts these dates with those given by early occidental authorities. Finally, Chron. p. 32 (transl. Sachau), the name of Thales is brought into connection with Zoroaster. So much for the information furnished by Albrun.

2 According to Albrun p. 32 (transl. Sachau) the Æra Alexandri would date from the time when Alexander left Greece at the age of twenty-six years, preparing to fight with Darius.

(d) Of somewhat earlier date but identical in purport is the statement found in Masudi’s Meadows of Gold, written in A. D. 948–4 (Masudi died A. D. 951). Like the Bundahish and like Albrun, Masudi reports that ‘the Magians count a period of two hundred and fifty-eight (258) years between their prophet Zoroaster and Alexander.’ He reiterates this assertion in Indicatio et Admonitio by saying ‘between Zoroaster and Alexander there are about three hundred years.’ Nearly the same, but not exactly identical figures, are found as in the Bundahish, regarding the length of the reigns of the various Kayanian kings; Zoroaster is stated, as elsewhere, to have appeared in the thirtieth (80) year of Vishtisp’s reign and he dies at the age of seventy-seven (77) after having taught for thirty-five (35) years. The statement that Zoroaster lived to the age of 77 years is also found elsewhere. What Masudi has to say on the subject of Nebuchadnezzar’s being a lieutenant of Lohrasp (Aryavataspa) and regarding Cyrus as contemporary with Bahman will be mentioned below, as a similar statement occurs in the Dinkart (Bk. 5).


The Date of Zoroaster.

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

(f) The Dabistan (translated by Shea and Troyer, i. 306–309) narrates that the holy cypress which Zoroaster had planted at Kashmir and which was cut down by the order of Mutawakkal, tenth khalif of the Abbasides (reigned A.D. 846–860), had stood ‘fourteen hundred and fifty years (1450) from the time of its being planted, to the year 232 of the Hejirah (A.D. 846).’ If these years be reckoned as solar years, according to the custom of the ancient Persians, and counted from the beginning of Mutawakkal’s reign, the date of the planting of the cypress would be B.C. 604; but if reckoned according to the lunar calendar of the Mohammedans (i.e. equivalent to 1408 solar years), the epoch would be B.C. 582.’ The former date (B.C. 604) recalls the reckoning of Masudi alluded to above, on p. 10. The event of the planting must have been an occasion of special moment; from a reference to the same in Firdausi (translation of Mohl, iv. 291–93, Paris, 1877), the conversion of Vishtasp is perhaps alluded to. If the conversion of Vishtasp really be alluded to, 42 years must be added to give the approximate date of Zoroaster’s birth. Perhaps, however, some other event in the prophet’s life is commemorated.’ In any case the results lead us to the latter part of the seventh century B.C. and the first part of the sixth century.

1 See the calculation of Shea and Troyer, Dabistan, translated i. 308 n, Paris, 1848 and Mirkhond’s History of the Early Kings of
Persia, transl. Shea, p. 231–82, London, 1832. According to E. Röth 'Zoroastrische Glaubenslehre' in Geschichte unserer abendländischen Philosophie i. 350, the era of the cypress is B. C. 500. This is adopted by Floigl Cyrus und Herodot p. 13, 18 (Leipzig, 1861).

1 In case the 1450 years be reckoned back from the date of Mutawakkil's death (A. D. 860) instead of from the beginning of his power, the numbers would be respectively B. C. 590 (if solar), or B. C. 546 (if lunar).

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

1 Firdausi Schahname ed. Vullers-Landauer iii, p. 1495 seq. See also Shea & Troyer's Dabistan Introd. i. p. ix and p. 880. Consult the chapter-headings of the reigns in Mohl's translation of Firdausi vols. iv–v. Observe that Bahman is assigned only 99 years instead of the usual 112; the duration of Vishtasp's reign is given in Mohl, vol. iv. 567 'cent vingt ans' in harmony with the usual tradition.

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

1 See Extrait du Mudjmal al-Tawärīkh, relatifs à l'histoire de la Perse, traduits du persan, par Jules Mohl. (Journal Asiatique, tome xi, pp. 136, 336, 330, Paris, 1841.)

2 Cf. op. cit. p. 330. The author acknowledges indebtedness also to Hamzah of Lafahan, Tabari, and Firdausi. His chronology may be deduced from pp. 390–399 of the work cited; it runs, Pushtasp 120 years, Gusahtasp 120 years, Bahman 112, Hvūmál 30, Darab 13 [or 14], Darā son of Darab 14 [or 16], Alexander 14 [or 28]. Observe the alternative figures in the case of the last three numbers.

According to Röth Geschichte unserer abendländischen Philosophie i. 351 the author of the Mudjmal al-Tawärīkh places Zoroaster 1700 years before his own time; on this ground Röth places the death of Zoroaster at B. C. 532, and is followed by Floigl Cyrus und Herodot p. 18. Cf. Kleuker's Zend-Avesta, Anh. 2, Bd. 1, Theil i. p. 847.

3 See Vullers Fragmente über Zoroaster, p. 58.

(i) Interesting is the fact noticed by Anquetil du Perron, 4 that a certain religious sect that immigrated into China A. D. 600 are evidently Zoroastrian origin and that these believers have an era which dates approximately from B. C. 559; this date Anquetil regards as referring to the time when Zoroaster left his home and entered upon his mission—a sort of Iranian Hejira.


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

1 (c) The Syro-Arabic Lexicon of Bar Bahlul (about A.D. 889) s. v. Kassomah (divinatory): 'Divinatory, like Zoroast, who people say is Baruch the Scribe; and because the gift of prophecy was not accorded to him he went astray, journeyed to [other] nations and learned twelve tongues.' Cf. Payne-Smith Thesaurus Syriacus, col. 8704.

2 (d) Also Bishop Tabodat of Hadatha (about A.D. 889) commentary on Matth. ii. 1. 'Some say that he (Zoroaster) is the same as Baruch the pupil of Eramya (Jeremiah), and that because the gift of prophecy was denied him as [had been] his wish, and because of that bitter exile and the sack of Jerusalem and the Temple, he became offended (or angry) and went away among other nations, learned twelve languages, and in them wrote that vomit of Satan, i.e. the book which is called Abhasta.' Cf. Gotthiel References to Zoroaster, p. 29.

1 (e) Identically, Solomon of Hilat (born about A.D. 1292), Book of the Bee, 'this Zaradast is Baruch the scribe.' p. 81 seq. ed. Budge (Anecdota Oxoniensia), also E. Kuhn Eine zoroastrische Prophezeiung in christlichem Gemunde (Festgruss an R. von Roth, Stuttgart, 1885, p. 219). Consult especially Gotthiel References to Zoroaster (Driessler Classical Studies, New York, 1894).

2 (d) Tabari (died A.D. 923) likewise notices the association of Zoroaster with Jeremiah. According to him 'Zoroaster was of Palestinian origin, a servant to one of the disciples of Jeremiah the prophet, with whom he was a favorite. But he proved treacherous and false to him. Wherefore God cursed him, and he became leprous. He wandered to Adharbaijan, and preached there the Magian religion. From there he went to Bishap (Vishtaepa), who was in Balkh. Now when he (Zoroaster) had come before him, and preached his doctrine to him, it caused him to marvel, and he compelled his people to accept it, and put many people to death on its account. Then they followed it (the religion). Bishappe reigned one hundred and twelve (112) years.' Gotthiel References to Zoroaster, p. 87. See also Chronique de Tabari traduite par H. Zotenbe, i. p. 499.

1 (d) The same general statements of Tabari are repeated by Ibn al-Athir (12th century) in his Kitab al-Kamil fi al-ta'arikh. See Gotthiel References to Zoroaster, p. 89.

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

2 (a) Similarly the Arab historian Abu Mohammed Mustapha calls Zoroaster a disciple of Ezir (Erza), see Hyde Hist. Relig. Veterum Persarum, p. 313.

1 So suggested by de Sacy Notices et Extrait des Manuscrits de la Bibl. du Roi, ii. 319, see Gotthiel References to Zoroaster (Driessler Classical Studies p. 30 note).

2 (k) Pointing to a similar era are the Pahlavi (Dinkart bk. 5, and Mkh.) and Perso-Arabic allusions to Nebuchadnezzar as lieutenant of Vishtasp's predecessor Lohrasp and of Vishtasp himself as well as of his successor Bahman (Vohuman). In the same connection Cyrus's name is joined with Vishtasp and Bahman.
According to Tabari (10th century A.D.) and Masudi, Nebuchadnezzar was lieutenant successively under Lohrasp, Vishtasp and Bahman; the tradition regarding Lohrasp's taking of Jerusalem is found in the Pahlavi Dinkart bk. 5 and Mainóq-i Khirad 27. 66-67, transl. West, S.B.E. xxiv. 64. Tabari (or rather the Persian version of the latter by Bel'am) gives two different versions of the story (see Chronique de Tabari, traduite sur la version Persane de Bel'am par H. Zotenberg, vol. i., pp. 491-507, Paris, 1867), and (Tabari op. cit. p. 503) the return of the Jews to Jerusalem is placed in the 70th year of Bahman. Signs of confusion are evident. So also in Mirkhond (16th century A.D.) who in his history repeats Tabari's statement with reference to Nebuchadnezzar and Lohrasp, and makes Cyrus a son of Lohrasp although he is placed in the reign of Bahman. He regards Bahman (Vohuman) as a contemporary of Hippocrates (B.C. 460-357) and Xenocrates (B.C. 396-314) which would harmonize properly with the traditional dates above given (p. 8-9) for Bahman's reign. See Shea Mirkhond's History, pp. 234, 291, 346.

(3) Masudi is worth consulting on the same point, especially in respect to certain presumed relations between the Persians and the Jews. See Barbi de Meynard Maçoudi Les Prairies d'Or ii. 119-128.

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

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

1 Nicolaus Damascenus Fragm. 65, Müller Fragm. Hist. Gr. iii. 409: θέματα δαμάνων ἐνεπτυκτε, καὶ οἱ τῆς Σιβύλλης χρησιμοί τὰ τῷ Ζωροάρτῳ λέγαν εἰσέρχονται. Κροίον μὲν αὐτὸν ἐξέβλατε ἢ μάλλον ἡ πάλαι σῶζειν... Τὸν γὰρ σῶζοντα Ζωροάρτην Πέρσας ἀλλ’ ἀκεχολοκάτωτα, μὲν λεκτόρος καίετε, ἡμὶ μᾶλλος μαῖνει πῦρ, καὶ πάλαι τοῦτο καθεστώς τὸ νόμων τὸτε βεβαιώμενον. (Latin version) Persas... religio ac metus dievum inesset: Sibyllae quoque divinae aequo Zoroastris praevia in mentem veniebant. Itaque Frimatur, multo, quam anea, contentius, ut Croesus servaretur... At Persae exinde saxeretur iuxta praecepta Zoroastris, ne cadavera cremare neque ignem contaminare posthac liceret, quod quum apud eos ex veteri instituto obtinuisset, tum magis confirmaverunt. Cf. de Harles Avesta traduit, Introdo., xilv., xlvii.

2 The principal references are to be found in Windischmann Zorostrische Studien pp. 260-64, 274, from whose work they are taken. Several of these allusions mention Zoroaster’s name directly; in others we may infer it, since Pythagoras is made a student of the Magi, whom classical antiquity regards as the exponents of Zoroastrian doctrine. Such allusions are: (a) Cicero de Fin. 2, 6. 28: Hanc Pythagor et Aegyptum insuitat et Persarum Magos adiit; (b) Valerius Maximus 8. 7 extern. 2, inde ad Persas proiectus Magorum exactissimae praedentiae se formandum tradit; (c) Pliny N.H. 90. 1.3 Pythagor, Empedocles, Democritus, Plato ad hanc (magicen) discendiam navigaver; (d) Porphyrius vita Pythag. 41 τοι καὶ τοι θεος, ὡς παρα τῶν Μάγων επυρανθητε, δι’ ἑρμοράιου καλούσε εἰκόνα, καὶ Vita Pythag. 12 ἐν τε Βαβυλῶνι ταῖς τ’ ἄλλοις Χαλδαιοὶ συνεγεντο καὶ πρὸς Ζάραταν [Ζάρατος, Nauck] (Zoroaster?) ἀφίκτο; (e) Plutarch de anima procer. in Timaeo 2. 2 Ζαρατάς καὶ Πεδαγόρας διδασκαλοῖς; (f) Clemens Alexandrinus Stromata 1, p. 357 (ed. Poiret) Ζωροάρτην ὡς τῶν Μάγων τοῦ Πέρσαν ὃς Πεδαγόρας ἔγνωσεν (Ms. edhologit.); (g) Cyrilus ad. Jul. 3 p. 87 where Pythagoras is called πανάρτας ζηστήρις of Zoroaster; (h) Suidas s. v. Pythagoras, Πεδαγόρας· οὗτος ἤκοιτ—Ζάρατος τοῦ μάγου (is it Zoroaster?); (i) Apuleius Florid., p. 19 (ed. Atchb.) sunt qui Pythagoram atiunt eo temporis inter captivos Cambyses regis Aegypti cum adeheretur, doctores habuisse Persarum magos ac praecipue Zoroastrem omnis divini arcani antistitem. (i) in Lucian’s Dialogue Menippus, § 6, p. 468, the Babylonian Magi are the pupils and successors of Zoroaster ... διότι ἐν Βαβυλωνί ἠλίσταται τῶν τῶν Μάγων τῶν Ζωροάρτου μαθητῶν καὶ διδαχῶν. Also some others.

4 Bar Ebrayya Arabic Chronicon p. 83, ed. Salpani, Beirut, 1890 (cited by Gotthiell, References to Zoroaster, p. 39). In those days (of Cambyses) came Zaradoht chief of the Magian sect, by birth of Adharbiján, or, as some say, of Adhos (Assyria). It is reported that he was one of Elijah’s disciples, and he informed the Persians of the sign of the birth of Christ. 
B. Discussion of the Data.

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

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

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


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

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

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


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

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

A second objection may be brought on the plea that the traditional date (7th to middle of 6th century B.C.) would not allow of the lapse of sufficient time to account for the difference in language between the Gāthās and the Old Persian inscriptions and for certain apparent developments in the faith. Furthermore, that a longer period of time must be allowed to account for the difference between the fixed title Aurasazda, ᮕᮚᮔᮨᮗᮔᮔᮔ, current in western Persia in Achaemenian times, and the divided form of the divine name Ahura Mazda (or Ahura alone and Mazda alone) as found in the Avesta, especially in the Zoroastrian Gāthās. This point has been noticed in the interesting and instructive paper of Professor Tiele Over de Oudheid van het Avesta, p. 16, who comes to the result that Zoroastrianism must have existed as early as the first half of the 7th century B.C. If we accept, as I believe we should, the theses that Vishtaspa ruled in eastern Iran, and that, although Zoroaster was a native of Azerbaijan, the chief scene of his religious activity was eastern Iran, and that the faith spread from Bactria westwards, I can not see that these arguments militate against the traditional date under discussion. Dialectic differences between the Bactrian region and Persia proper would sufficiently account for arguments based on language alone. This, added to national and individual differences, might well account for the fixed form of the name Aurasazda among the Achaemenians as contrasted with the Avestan form. Who can say how rapidly the creed spread from the east to the west and what changes consequently in a short time may have resulted? New converts in their zeal are often more radical in progressive changes than first reformers. Persia, with
its original difference in dialect, may in short time have developed the single title Auranazed from Ahura Mazda as watchword of church and state. See also note, p. 20, top.

1 Reprinted from the Mededelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, 3de Reeks, Deel xi., 384–386.

2 Tiele’s little work argues admirably for the antiquity of the Avesta as opposed to Darmesteter’s views for the lateness of the Gāthās. I wish I could be convinced by Professor Tiele (p. 19) that the names of the Median kings, Phraortes (hravas), Kyaxares (woshkataro), Delokes (dahyakos) as well as Eparna, Sitiparna of the early Esarhaddon inscription (explained as containing hauranah ‘glory’), are due to concepts originated by Zoroaster and are not merely marks of beliefs which Zoroastrianism inherited directly from existing Magism. The name of Darius’s contemporary Khosrithira (Bh. 3.15, iv. 19, E 9) is not so important for the argument. I confess I should like to place Zoroaster as early as the beginning of the 7th century. The earlier, the better.


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

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

1 Spiegel Eransiche Alterthumskunde i. 506, with Windischmann, regards the data of the Bundahish as ‘unzuverlässig,’ but it must be remembered that his figures, ‘178’ years for the period between Zoroaster and Alexander, now require correction to 233, which alters the condition of affairs. See West, S.B.E. v. 150–151, and Spiegel Z.D.M.G. xlv. 208. Compare especially de Harlez Avesta traduit, Introd. p. cccxviii.

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

1 See note above, p. 8.
2 Cf. Barbier de Meynard in Le Livre de l'Indication et de l'Admonition (Magoudi Prairies d'Or, ix. 327-329).
3 See preceding note. I have since found the passage given by Spiegel in Eran. Alterthumskunde iii. 198; compare also Spiegel Z.D.M.G. xiv. 202.

C. RESULTS.

To draw conclusions,—although open to certain objections, still, in the absence of any more reliable data or until the discovery of some new source of information to overthrow or to substantiate the view, there seems but one decision to make in the case before us. From the actual evidence presented and from the material accessible, one is fairly entitled, at least, upon the present merite of the case, to accept the period between the latter half of the seventh century and the middle of the sixth century B. C., or just before the rise of the Achaemenian power, as the approximate date of Zoroaster's life.
A. V. W. Jackson,

Since the above was written Dr. E. W. West writes me (under date Dec. 19, 1895) the interesting piece of information that his investigations into the history of the Iranian calendar have led him to the date B. C. 505 as the year in which a reform in the Persian calendar must have been instituted. He suggests that Darius, upon the conclusion of his wars and during the organizing of his kingdom and putting in force new acts of legislation, may with the aid and counsel of his priestly advisers have introduced the Zoroastrian names of the months which have supplanted the old Persian names which were given in the inscriptions. If this be so, the point may have a special bearing towards showing that the Achaemenians were Zoroastrians. From Albrüning, Chronology pp. 17, 12; 55, 29; 205, 2; and 290, 19 (tranal. Sachau), we know that Zoroaster himself must have occupied himself with the calendar. Benfey u. Stern, Über die Monatsnamen einiger alter Völker, p. 116, regarded the Medo-Persian year as having been introduced into Cappadocia probably as early as B. C. 750. [Dr. West's paper on the Parsi calendar has just appeared in The Academy for April 23, 1896.]

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

1 Cf. Haug Essays on the Parsis (West's introduction p. xlv); although Haug had previously adopted various earlier eras for Zoroaster, e.g. B. C. 2300 (Lecture on Zoroaster, Bombay, 1863), not later than B. C. 1000 (Essays p. 296, where the subject is discussed; cf. also pp. 15, 186, 364).

2 Personal letter from Professor Justi, dated June 14, 1893.

3 Geldner formerly placed the date of Zoroaster as prior to B. C. 1000 (see article 'Zoroaster' Encyclopaedia Britannica 9th edition).

4 Philosophy of the Mazdaian Religion under the Sassanids, p. ii. 'A bout 600,'

5 The best collections of material on the subject are to be found in de Harlez Avesta traduit, 2e ed. Introduction pp. xx-xxxv, ccxiv, Spiegel E.A. ii. . . . . , and Windischmann Zoroastrische Studien; the latter suggested (Zor. Stud. p. 184) about B. C. 1000 as Zoroaster's date. The present writer (Avesta Grammar p. xi.) once held the opinion that Zoroaster lived 'more than a thousand years before the Christian era.' The date assigned by the Parsi Orientalist K. R. Kama is about B. C. 1000.

6 E. g. Anquetil du Perron Zend-Avesta i. Pt. 2, p. 6, 60-62 assigns B. C. 589-513 as the age of Zoroaster; compare also Kleuker (Foucher) Anhang zum Zend-Avesta, Bd. i. Thl. 1, pp. 327-374; Thl. 2, pp. 51-81. Floegl (Cyrus und Herodot p. 18), following Róth, gives B. C. 599-533 as Zoroaster's era and identifies Vishtasp as the father of Darius. Neither Floegl nor Róth seem to take any account of the difference between the genealogy of Vishtasp's ancestors as given in the Old Persian inscriptions and the lineage given in the Avesta, Pahlavi, and later Persian works. He does not, moreover, sufficiently take into consideration (p. 17) that 45 years (or at least 30) must be added in every instance to the 338 years before Alexander, as that was Zoroaster's age when Vishtasp accepted the faith. This would in any event place the date of Zoroaster's birth before B. C. 600.
The above results, if they be accepted in the light at least of our present information on the subject, seem to be not without importance for the history of early religious thought and of the development of ethical and moral teaching. If one carefully works through the material, it must be acknowledged that the most consistent and the most authoritative of all the actual statements upon the subject place the appearance of the prophet at a period between the closing century of Median rule and the rising wave of Persian power, that is, between the latter half of the seventh century and the middle of the sixth century B.C. It is the sowing of the fallow land that is to bring forth the rich fruits of the harvest. The teaching of Zoroaster must have taken deep root in the soil of Iran at the time when the Jews were carried up into captivity at Babylon (586–536), where they became acquainted with 'the law of the Medes and Persians which altereth not;' the time was not far remote when the sage Confucius should expound to China the national tenets of its people, and the gentle Buddha on Ganges' bank should preach to longing souls the doctrine of redemption through renunciation. How interesting the picture, how full of instruction the contrast! And in this connection, the old question of a possible pre-historic Indo-Iranian religious schism¹ comes perhaps once again into consideration. Certain theological and religious phenomena noticeable in Brahmanism are possibly not so early, after all, as has generally been believed. It may perchance be that Zoroastrianism in Iran was but the religious, social, and ethical culmination of the wave that had been gathering in strength as it moved along, and that was destined in India to spend its breaking force in a different way from its overwhelming course in the plateau land northwest of the mountains of Hindu Kush.

¹ The view strongly upheld by Haug.
² Deductions that might perhaps be made in the light of Hopkins, Religions of India pp. 177, 188, 302, 317. Consult especially the suggestive hints of Geldner, article 'Zoroaster,' Encyclopaedia Britannica, where the much-mooted question of asura-ahura, dæva-deva, 'god-demon,' is discussed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

* The statistics appear in this Journal, vol. xvi., p. 275 ff., and in my
article on Holy Numbers in the Rig-Veda, published in the Oriental
Studies of the Philadelphia Oriental Club.

† The first book is omitted, because, as Lanman says, were it
divided into its family collections each would come before the second
book. With the Vālakhiliya omitted, the proportion is still too great;
books vii., viii., ix., numbering even then 74, 109, 77 pages (of Müller's
text) respectively. See Lanman's article Noun-inflexion in the Veda,
in this Journal, vol. x., p. 578.
The amount of text alone would, therefore, predispose one to think that any general statement in regard to the antiquity of viii. must be restricted by the counter-statement in regard to its bulk, which is out of proportion to its place in the collection. Such general statements are, therefore, to be deprecated, although at present it is possible to operate only with the text as it has been handed down. Neither in postulating extreme age without reservations, as do, for instance, Ludwig on the philological side, and Hirt on the linguistic side,* nor in maintaining the opposite opinion without reservations, can historical truth be approximated. But the work has not yet been done which will enable scholars successfully to segregate the older and the later portions of the eighth book. In adducing, therefore, certain lists of words, which, in my opinion, show affinity with later rather than with earlier literature, I think it is necessary to guard against the notion that such lists prove the date of the first form of the eighth book. It will be enough, for the present, to show that lateness overlays the book in its present form, as shown by its vocabulary. But it must not be supposed that the correspondence between viii. and the General Books is all in vocabulary; or that the statistical results based on analysis of forms must necessarily be interpreted quite as they have been.

In regard to the first point, in not a few instances, viii., from a metrical and grammatical point of view, coincides rather with the General Books than with the other family books. Thus: cases of the resolution of the vowel in genitive plural of ś stems occur only in i., viii., ix., x. (Lanman, loc. cit., p. 384); the only instance in RV. of a notable transition-form, which is common in later literature, is supplied by bhitā (loc. cit., p. 373) in viii. 64. 13; another transition-form, ābhīruam in viii. 46. 6 is paralleled only in x.; auyā in viii. 51. 2 is paralleled only in i.; vistāpā, another transition-form, is paralleled only in x. (pp. 407, 462, 481); the Epic weakening of the perfect stem, found in viii. 66. 10, emusām, is paralleled only in i. and x. (p. 511 ff.); and the only parallel to the accent of parīhdrtā in viii. 47. 6 is found in x. and AV. (p. 477). Moreover, there are certain anomalies in viii. which are far from having the appearance of antiquity, such as the elision of the ending in yājādhvāinam in 2. 37 (the only case of this sort), and the anomalous sandhi of aćvinevā in 9. 9; not to speak of uc ca dva ca in 19. 23 (the only parallel is in x.); and the surely late imāśaya† of 13. 21. Not to be passed as insignifi-

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

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

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

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{ās} & \text{āṣas} & \text{āís} & \text{ebhis} & \text{ānī} & \text{ā} & \text{āu} & \text{ā} \\
13 & 15 & 2 & 5 & 10 & 8 & 0 & 17
\end{array}
\]

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

---

* The cases in viii. are 50. 13, 16; 69. 4; 89. 1; Lanman, loc. cit., p. 457.
† The tendency to revive archaic Vedic forms is not confined to the period immediately following that in which these forms obtained, but characterizes even Sanskrit literature. It might be imagined, indeed, that the preservation of vīrā as neuter plural in Mbhā. i. 3. 57 was due to the real antiquity of this hymn to the Āśvinī (especially as Holtzmann cites ā as neuter plural only for this place, Grammatisches, p. 12). But what shall be said of a Čiva hymn that contains the same ending in the certainly late imitation of the Çatarudriya at the end of the seventh book? Here we find (Mbhā. vii. 201. 77):

bhūtam bhavam bhavītā cāpy adhīpyam
tvatvambhūtā bhurvanāmītha vīrā
bhaktam cānām bhajamānam bhajasva
mā rītī vām ahitākṣitenā.

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

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

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

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

* Lanman, however, by no means postulates the early date of viii. without duly guarding against a too sweeping application of his statistics: “Our result indicates that the eighth is older than the other family books. . . . I will not lay stress on this result until the relations of book viii. to the rest have been more carefully determined” (loc. cit. p. 280). Brunnhofer’s article Über Dialektspuren im Védischen Gebrauch der Infinitivformen is in Kuhn’s Zeitschrift, xxxv., p. 329 ff., 374. It has been criticized by Collitz and defended by its author in Bezzenberger’s Beiträge, vii., p. 188; x., pp. 15, 284.

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

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

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

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

brāhma jīvatam utā jīvatam dhiyāḥ
kṣatriyāḥ jīvatam utā jīvatam niśn
dhenīr jīvatam utā jīvatam viṣah

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

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

---

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

It is distinctly a late view that makes Sūrya or Savitar (‘sun’) an Āditya. In x. 72. 8–9, the name of one of the Ādityas is Mārtanda. This view is recognized elsewhere only in i. 50. 13 (late addition to a Kāṇva hymn), x. 88.11, i. 191.9; and in two passages of viii. (namely 90. 11 and 18.2, 3), where the new identification is made both explicitly and implicitly: bāl mahāh asī sūrya bāl āditya mahāh asī; and further: an arvāṇo hy ēśam pānthā ādityānām . . . tāt sū naḥ savitā bhāgo vārana mitrō aryamā pārma yachantu. This conception is one shared by viii. (as against other family books) with the late hymns of the General Books and with the Atharvans.§

Connection with later literature as against the earlier is seen, further, in the ascription to Indra of that mysterious ‘fourth name,’ which is spoken of elsewhere only in the tenth book and in Brahmanical literature.‖ So purāṇāman, ‘having many names,’ is an epithet of Indra found only in viii. 82. 17; AV. vi. 90.1.

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

---

* See List i. (below).
† viii. 85.9; i. 53.9. Compare also viii. 52. 8; 82. 4. In iv. 81. 4, 6, Indra is only likened to, and paired with, the sun.
‡ In the former paper I showed that the later AV. view of the cardinal points is represented in RV. only in the eighth book (possibly in the first). For references, see Journal, xvi., p. 278 ff.
§ The Atharvan goes a step farther, and while positing eight Ādityas, includes with the sun the moon, as another Āditya; AV. viii. 2. 15; 9. 31.
‖ viii. 60.9; x. 54.4. In Vāl. 4.7 ‘the fourth Āditya;’ though this has been interpreted as ‘mighty’ by Weber. Possibly another of the General Books recognizes the ‘fourth name,’ for such would seem to be the case when x. 54. 4 is compared with ix. 108. 14. The latter reads: bhāratī cāru indrasya nāma yāna viśvāṇi viśvāṇi jagdānaḥ; the former: tvām arog tānī (catvārī nāma) viśvāṇi viśvāṇi yēbhīḥ kārmāṇi maghāvaḥ cakrātāḥ.
A comparison of the vocabulary of this book with that of the General Books will be useful from this point of view. But before instituting this comparison, I shall analyse first the "lone words" of viii., meaning thereby the words of viii. that are not used in other parts of the Rik; in order first to see how homogeneous is viii. in respect of its own exclusive vocabulary; then to see whether the parallels that can be found for these words take us into earlier or later literature; and finally to discover whether the words are in general of such character as to make it probable that they would have lain unused by the authors of the other family books, had they been current in the day those authors composed. For it will be noticed at once that a great many of these lone words are current words in later literature; and it is only by seeing their mass that one can judge fairly whether it is likely that this mass was current vocabulary in an assumed period A (i.e. viii., supposing viii. to be "the eldest of all," as Hirt calls it), unknown or unused in an assumed later period B (ii.—vii.), and current again in period C (AV., Brâhmaṇas, Epic).

List 1.: Words occurring in RV. viii., but not elsewhere in RV.

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

aṅgumânt, thrice in 45.13—15, in the form aṅgumâti; nowhere else in RV.; thrice in AV. (-mânt, etc.).
aṅgumânt, thrice in 45.13—15, in the form aṅgumâti; nowhere else in RV.; thrice in AV. (-mânt, etc.).

aṇāvīyā, 14. 10; lone denominative from aṇāvīyā.
atasi, 13. 3. 13. This appears to be an early word. Compare atásyā, i. 65. 6; ii. 19. 4 (Avestan at?).
ätārta, 88. 7. Compare atārta, i. 126. 1; x. 149. 1; and v. 25. 5; atārta, voc., 126. 1; -panthā, v. 42. 1; x. 64. 5.

* Even apart from the Atri hymns in viii., the vocabulary of the Kârṣṇa maṇḍala often coincides with that of the Atri maṇḍala when it shows no correspondence with that of other family books. This subject deserves special treatment, and I can offer here only an example or two to explain why I have occasionally given a parallel in the fifth book: ydmahā, occurs only viii. 62. 6 and v. 73. 9; ydmahūti, only viii. 8. 18; x. 117. 3; v. 61. 15; hiranyavartani (dual) and pabhāspitī, of the Aṣvins, are found only in viii. and v.; arunāpeu, is used only in viii. 1. 7; 7; 62. 16; v. 90. 1; i. 49. 1 (Kârṣṇa hymn); vīsānā, occurs only viii. 88. 8; v. 38. 6; i. 90. 2; 174. 1; x. 22. 15; dchoktī, occurs only viii. 92. 18; v. 41. 16; i. 61. 8; 184. 3. There are some cases where the hymns in v. that thus correspond are plainly late. Thus in the same way that viii. 8 (ydmahūti) corresponds to v. 61 which is a late hymn, ydmahā is found in viii. 62 and again in v. 78; and in this same hymn, v. 73. 5, is found dātip, elsewhere only in this same viii. 62. 8; but dātap in i. 55. 1 and dātapāna in Smṛti alone show cases of d + tap. So the pruru compounds,
adhapriya, 8. 4, voc. Compare kadhapriya, i. 30. 20; kadhapri, i. 38. 1; viii. 7. 31.
adhivastra, 26. 13. Compare adhivásá, i. 140. 9; 162. 16; x. 5. 4; adhivasá, Bráh.; ádhirétríj, viii. 41. 10; ádhirukma, 46. 33. All the compounds, therefore, are in viii., i., x., or later. The verb adhi-vas does not occur before x. 75. 8; imitation of adhí-dhá.
adhipád, 16. 5; then AV. vi. 13. 2 (with parávádá) and ib. xix. 32. 9. The simple váká occurs in RV. vii. 52. 4; i. 164. 24; AV. (etc.); Epic; but the tendency is to compounds. The only really early case, however, is josavádá, vi. 59. 4. Then come cakraváká, in ii. 39. 3 (late); AV.; Epic, etc.; and dhára-váká, in another late hymn, v. 44. 5 (compare evávádá, ib. 10). In i., vii. -x.: upavádá, i. 164. 8; tvávádá, ix. 113. 2; (adhivádá, above); namovádá, vii. 35. 28; AV. xiii. 4. 26; Bráh., etc.; suktavádá, x. 88. 7, 8; AV. vii. 97. 6; Bráh., etc. Later come a host, anuvádá, acchávádá, amrtavádá, somaprávádá, cárvádá, valivádá, etc. In ii. 23. 8; viii. 85. 20; i. 100. 19, is found adhiévádá in ix. 95. 5, upavádá; in i. 24. 8, opavádá; while vaktá in RV. is found only in vii. 32. 15; ix. 75. 2; x. 61. 12; and the late vii. 104. 8; once in AV.; but frequently in Smrti. The verb adhi-vac occurs twice in all the other family books combined; but in viii. alone, four times. Later than RV. are all other vaktá compounds.
adhagá, 35. 8 (AV. adhagád); Bráh.; Epic word for traveller; Grassmann, as birds, combined with hánádé (‘Like two wayfarers’) is the meaning; compare ii. 39. 3, rathiyéva after cakravákéva as here adhagád éva after hánádé éva.
ánatidbutha, 19. 3; the vicious product of a corrupt age.
anábhaya, 2. 1. No such form in Vedic literature; ábhila (Epic) is the only parallel (á bhl).
anéñtrá (ánéñtrá), 33. 9; then AV. vii. 82. 3.
anéñtré, 82. 8; 57. 7. Compare anusúthah, only in x. 124. 9; 130. 4; anubharé, i. 86. 6; ánuágáyas, viii. 5. 34.* The verb anéñ-stu occurs twice in viii. (8. 9; 15. 8); but only once in the early books, withal in v. 73. 4 (see note above).
[anéñtrád, Ví. 10. 1; Bráh. The hymn is perhaps interpolated.] antarbhárá, 92. 12. The compound antar(ántará) occurs but once in family books, iii. 40. 9; often in other books.
ánnya, only in 1. 10; 27. 11; then AV. xi. 4, 23, etc.
apákacakras, 64. 7; upákacakras, 6. 25. The nearest analogue in family books is vipácacakras, viii. 63. 1 (i. 50. 2, etc.).
apácya, ‘western,’ 28. 3; Bráh. (ápác and apácta, both viii. and early books).

so common in the Epic, occur only in x. (grútás); in viii. (grútákasa; grútáravan, this also in x.; and grútámaghá); in i. (grútáraha); and in v. (grútáraha and grútàva), in v. 38. 6; and 44. 12. But both 86. 6 and 44 are late (vs. and hymn)!

* For anéñtpam see anéñtrád in List v. (below).
Prāgāthikāni, I.

āprahita, 88. 7; AV.

āpravitā, see pravāsē, below.

āpnuṣa, 43. 28 (Agni); then AV, x. 4. 23 (snake); Čat. Brāh.

Compare in family books, abhyād, vii. 34. 16; apnuṣad, iii. 3. 5 (apnuṣkā, i. 139. 11); and in List vii, below, apnuṣit (like pravojit, only in 32. 14).

abhātryā, 21. 13; as in Brāh. Compare ayujā, āv. ārya, 51. 2; and asapatnā, x. 159. 5; 174. 5 (AV, etc.).

ānuṣdān, 19. 26 (ānatī, vii. 1. 19; v. 36. 3; x. 42. 10 etc.).

āṃbara, 8. 14 (where āṃbarā replaces turvāçe in the same verse, i. 47. 7). This is a common word in later literature. As opposed to parāvāti it means the enveloping, surrounding, air, antārikā (which is one of the Epic meanings of āṃbara), as in 10. 6: yād antārikā pātañah purubhuiyā yād venē rōdāri ānu; 9. 2: yād antārikē yād dīvi. The etymology is doubtful, but if it be ānu var it is worth remarking that this combination occurs neither in RV nor AV. But it does occur in the Brahmānic and Epic periods. In i. 100. 17, āṃbartaṣa is a proper name. *

āyahśīrṣa, 90. 3, epithet of the gods’ messenger. Compare (the only parallel) the Epic demon, ayahśīras by name.

ayujā, see abhātryā, above.

arātu, 46. 27. In AV xx. 131. 18 first occurs aratu(parna) or draṭu; later aratu(danda).

ārīya, 50. 11. Compare arīya, of the kanvajāmbhāni, in AV ii. 25. 3. The AV poet says the kāνva is arīya; the Kavya says he is not arīya (retort ?).

aristu, see List iii, (below).

arvākē, 9. 15. The parallel forms āpāke, parākē, upākē, nirekē occur in other family books.

avabhṛthā, 62. 29; AV; Brāh. Late word, and here in its usual meaning.

avārīya (kraṭu), 81. 8. With this sense and accent the word is post-Vedic. For the compound, compare aviharyatakraṭu, only in i. 63. 2. In this sense vārya itself is Epic (compare Epic duryāra).

avśetam, 89. 10, ‘unintelligible’ (vśetana is Epic, but in the same meaning, ‘senseless,’ just as Vedic, vṛśetas, ‘wise,’ becomes ‘foolish’ in Epic. Compare vśmanas in List ii.).

avśēva, 19. 12. This appears to me to be a new form, like av śēva, VS, but it may perhaps be old.

āśyā, 33. 17; in i. 189. 7 (and Epic), pāya.

ācāna (ācana, ‘eating’ occurs in an early passage) =ācana (ācman), 2. 2 (on the other hand, ācman is ‘eating’ in AV. xviii. 4. 54). This ācānis is a late form, parallel with purvānē (which occurs only in x. 84. 11, Brāh., etc.); and with anāsthā, viii. 1. 34. Compare Lanman, loc. cit., p. 527.

* The antithesis (?) of parāvāti and saumarē in 12. 17 might raise the question whether āṃbara could mean water. Compare āmbu in later literature and kiṃāmbu, RV. x. 16. 18.
agvapati (with urvarapati, gopati, somapati), in voc., 21. 3.
Copied perhaps from ii. 21. 1 (avajit, urvarajit, gojit).
agvapṛśtha, 26. 24. Formed like the Epic kūmapṛśhasamā
bhumih, Mbh. xii. 313. 6, 'bare.' So here 'sharp,' with
Pischel, ZDMG. xxxv. 712 (compare kharājru), unless rather
the 'horse' is Soma itself; as in 52. 2, where the press-stones
are 'soma-backed' (somapṛśtha, viii. 43. 11; 52. 2; x. 91.
14; AV.; etc.). Another āraṇī formation of this sort is
prāśkusānu, 17. 15.
āṣṭāpadi, compare nāvasrakti, below.
āśandīna (≡āśandīta), 91. 14.
asnūti (≡āsnunt), 14. 15; but apparently not a late form;* 
compare hinnā, below.
āhāṃsana, voc., 50. 9; compare ahaṃyū, i. 167. 7.
dhita, 51. 3; Brāh.; Smṛti. Chiefly late is hita, 'dear,' 'agree-
able.' See under hita, in List vi., below.
āhnavaiyā (A.F. 3. 20), 45. 27 (hnū only in i., viii.).
ākhandala, voc., 17. 12. This is an Epic epithet of Indra (as
cat ghoram vajram ākhandalanyca ca. AV. merely repeats
RV. (AV. xx. 5. 6). Even the root appears later than
RV., AV.
ājīkrā, 45. 7, of Indra, as in ājītūr, only Vāl. 5. 6; ājipati, only
Vāl. 6. 6.
āttuc, 27. 21; like āpitvā, 4. 3 (20. 22; 21. 13), is perhaps old (it
may be a reduced form of tvūc), but it stands without
parallel.
ātturā, 20. 26; 22. 10; 61. 17. There is no other case in RV.,
and but one in AV., vi. 101. 2, for this is chiefly an Epic
word. The negative is found in vii., i., x. (List iv., below);
and each of the three hymns where it occurs in i. and x. is
late (hymn to press-stones, hymn of physician, x. 94 and
97; hymn to Rudra, i. 114).
āpitvā, see āttuc, above.
ādhagā, Vāl. 5. 6; i. 136. 4; x. 44. 9; AV.
The verbal compound, current in post-Vedic works, occurs
rarely in early family books (once in the third, twice each in
the fourth and sixth, not at all in the second, fifth, and
seventh books),† but often in the eighth book: ā yamat,
11. 7; 81. 3; ā yachānti, 4. 2; ā yachantu, ātu, 32. 23;
34. 2; ā yatās, 81. 7; ā yāmaya, 3. 2; and in further com-
position, abhī ā yaman, 81. 31. In this regard viii. stands
with the later use of ā yam, which is already exemplified in
i., ix., x., where are found ā yamat, ix. 44. 5; x. 14. 14;
ā yachantu, i. 130. 2; ā yatās, x. 130 1; ā yāmayanti, i.

* In early family books are found asinvi, jinva, and inva (in com-
ounds); in i., pāva.
† iii. 6. 9; iv. 25. 8; 32. 15; vi. 23. 8; 59. 9 (ā prā yachatam).
162. 16; saṃd yamuse, x. 94. 6. The noun ayantār is not found elsewhere, but other derivatives are cited, ayamana, ayamya, from Upan, and Epic literature respectively.

āyāna, 22. 18; Epic. Meaning ‘way’ yāna itself is found x. 110. 2, Brāh, and Epic; meaning ‘vehicle,’ iv. 43. 6, and Brāh. Of the other compounds only prayāna and devayāna occur in the family books. There are a number belonging to the first and tenth books, and to AV.: pītryāna, x. 2. 7; AV.; niyāna, i. 164. 47; x. 19. 4; 142. 5; AV.: avayāna, i. 185. 8; AV.; udāna, pūryāna,† rathayāna, AV. (with ratay āvan, RV. viii. 38. 2). Still later come evrayāna, Ait. Brāh., gōyāna, upayāna, Smṛti, etc., etc.

ārakā, 43. 3; Čat. Brāh. In Nr., ārocaana. The verb druc (Avestan) appears in early books, as also do rōka and rokā. The base of ārakā, therefore, is prepared for it early, but the word itself it of the period viii.—Brāh.

ārakā, 57. 16; 63. 4, 13; Epic patronymic.

āṅtvanta, 45. 36 (āṅtvanta x. 19. 4, 5). In the early books, āṅtv.

Compare note on paraśumānt, below.

āṣaṅga, see Note below, at the end of this article, p. 89.

āśava, 92. 10, may be old.

āhā, 32. 19; VS. 24. 38.

uṭṭhāna, 59. 14. Later a very common equivalent of itthā, but only here in RV. (four times in AV.; then Brāh., Smṛti, etc.).

ukthavārdhāna, 14. 11 (with stoma vārdhāna, also āroč). An excellent example for viii. There are forty-seven vārdhāna compounds, of which six are in RV., whence they rapidly increase in number (four new ones in AV.). Two of the six are in this verse ukthavārdhāna (the idea being in i. 10. 5), and stoma vārdhāna, both found only here. Of the four remaining, one, ayumavārdhāna, is in ix. 31. 2; another, nṛmavārdhāna, is in i. 36. 5; another pāṣvārdhāna, is in ix. 94. 1; and the last, pūṣvārdhāna, is in i. 13. 2; 31. 5; 91. 12; vii. 59. 12. That is to say, every instance of this formation, popular in all post-Vedic times, is in non-family books or in late passages of family books; for none will deny that vii. 59. 12 is “ein gar nicht hierher gehöriger Vers,” who considers the whole hymn and the late tryāmbāka of this verse; while ii. 36 contains a list of priests quite unknown to the rest of the Rig-Veda, and is as a whole a late hymn.

uṣṭi, 23. 16; uṣṭiṇyādnā,† 25. 22; uṣṭiṇa, 26. 9.

* The combination with new prefixes grows rapidly. AV. has more than half a dozen d yam forms and adds ut d, nṛ d, ut d; later come upd, abhi sam d. It is of course a matter more of use than of possession.

† xviii. 1. 54 (v. 1. for pūryēbhā); ib. 4. 68 independently.

† With this patronymic compare kāraṇyadā and kāraṇyadāna in 8. 21 and Vāl. 7. 4, respectively.
ukṣāṇa, 43. 11; of Agni, associated with vaņḍana (compare also 드ृ-anna, ii. 7. 6; vi. 12. 4; x. 27. 18), and with the phrase sōmaprśēhaya vēdhēse, which occurs in x. 91. 14 (with which viii. 43. 11 should be compared).

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

uccācakra, 61. 10. Compare uccābudhāna, i. 116. 9 (no other similar compound), and nīcakra, viii. 7. 29.

udayā, 41. 2; meaning 'origin,' post-Vedic.

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

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

upāddāvan, 45. 23. Late Brahmanic combination (upā has).

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

upākācakas, see ápāka, above.

ubhayaṁkārā, 1. 2. Compare abbhayaṁkārā, x. 152. 2; kirikārā, vanāṁkārā, AV. This sort of compound is late. Compare the others: khajāṁkārā, i. 102. 6 and Brāh. (but khajākīt is early); in the Epic, priyāṁkāra; classical forms, rūmikāra, mohanikāra, meghāṁkāra, vaṇāṁkāra.

urvarāpati, in voc., see aprāpati, above.

rākātī, see kāmakātī, below.

ṛṣuyā, see urā, in List ii. (below).

ṛṣapati, 26. 21. This seems to be a late form (by analogy).* The old word is ṛṣapā.

ṛṣiyāvant, 8. 13; 12. 10; 69. 7: see paraśuṁanta (below).

ṛdāpā, 66. 11, of Indra: ṛdāpā cid ṛdāvṛdhā. According to PW., for mṛdāpā, 'sweetness-drinking.' Compare madhūrdā, 22. 17: madhūrīdhā, x. 75. 8. But, as mṛdā never occurs in RV. nor means sweetness, this is probably not the right explanation. In viii. 48. 10; ii. 33. 5; iii. 54. 10 occurs rdādāra,† and this is probably the same word; not, therefore, late.

ṛṣībandhu, 89. 6. Compare devābandhu, i. 162. 18; amṛta-bandhu, x. 72. 5. Viprabandhu is the author of v. 24. 4; x. 57 ff.

ṛśivas, voc., see List ii. (below).

ekārī, 37. 3; AV.; Brāh.; Epic.

* For example, with ṛubhdepāti, a favorite of viii. (s. dūrta above). According to PW. and Grassmann, it is a contraction of ṛtrāya pṛdfī. Compare also rādhaspati, in voc., 50. 14. ṛṛ. ṛy.

† Compare apē dārdar, iv. 18. 5; adādāra ātsam, v. 82. 1. In viii. 82. 18, ḍadārāra caḥ ādārā (see godāri below); but regularly not of general gifts, but of water or its holder as in godāyasantah vi... adādāra, x. 67. 7. So when vāja is the object, it means the water which is to burst out; and Grassmann’s etymology seems correct.
edhatá, 75. 3; twice in AV.; Bräh., etc. Despite LF. ii. 31, edh is probably from ardh. The verb edh occurs but twice (once) in other family books, four times in viii. alone, four times in x., and once in i. (Kāvyā hymn). Its peculiar province is in post-Rîk literature, especially Epic.*
evåthå, 24. 15; unique extension of evå. See final Note, p. 81.
bjasvant, 65. 5; AV. See paraçumánt, below.
ojjådå, 3. 24; 81. 17; Tâitt. S.
odanå, 58. 14; 66. 6, 10; common in AV. and subsequent literature. See nyådana, below.
kanyâna, 35. 5. Old or new formation?
karnagṛhya, 59. 15. Compare TS., karnagṛhådå (PW.).
karnaçöbhana, 67. 3. Important because cöbhana is a Bräh.- Epic word, occurring neither in RV. nor in AV. Moreover, ear-rings are mentioned in no other family book; only in i. 122. 14, and possibly in i. 64. 10. Rings on neck and wrist alone are worn in the earlier period. Compare the árvå
eyóyeçvov subhrakådåyas (voc.) in 20. 4.
kåldå, 47. 17; with çaphå, q. v., below.
kavítvåna, see janítvåna, below.
kåçavåntå, käçapåkâdå; see List iii. (below).
kåmukå, 66. 4. Roth connects with kanukåyåntås, in x. 132. 7.
kåmakåti, 81. 14, compare råkåti, 50. 12; and later kåmakåmin,
Epic; kämakåma, Tâitt. Ar.; Epic. 
kåja and mrkådå, 55. 3. Compare mårakaçtvåna, also árvå, 50. 10,
of Indra. Early, vi. 1. 3; 18. 2, is Indra's by-name tuve-mrakaç.
kunçapåda, 17. 13. Compare (?) kunçranoç, i. 29. 6. The word kunçå is late; and appears only here in RV., though in AV., and common later (Sûtra, Epic).
kumårakaç, 30. 1; 58. 15; AV.; Bräh.; Epic. See putrakaç,
below. That kumårin occurs only in 31. 8 (Bräh., kumårt) is
doubtless chance.
kuhåyåç, 24. 30 (and, voc., kuhåyåkrye), unique extension of kåha,
by false analogy; compare ubhåyåç, etc., pronouns and sub-
stantives. So, later, thåtrå is made in the same fashion.
ktåti, 79. 6; AV.
kåd (kal), 26. 10; Âit. Bräh.
kåla, 47. 11; Bräh.; Epic (‘hill, bank’).
krådåvanå, 31. 9, see pratådåvanå, List iii. (below).
kråpay, see List ii. (below).
kråvårtanå, 23. 19; AV. Compare gåyatråvatranå, 38. 6;
VS.; also råghåvatranå, viii., ix.; and rådåvatranå, viii.,
i., i.†

* One of the two cases in the other family books is in the late vi. 47.
16. The other is in i. 35. 5. The case in i. is i. 41. 2; those in viii. are
27. 16; 46. 5; 63. 4; 73. 9.
† Other compounds are devåvatranå, x. 61. 20; hirånyåvatranå, in both 
early and late books.
kāūrayāna, 3. 21, nom. prop., for kāūraya; related to kāru
as is kānuṣa, Vāl. 7. 4, to kānu (I.
 gambhiracetas, 3. 2, voc. Compare gambhirapana, vii. 87. 6;
vepas in i. 62. 5 (i. 35. 7).
gārgara, 58. 9; gārgarā (apām), AV. iv. 15. 12; ix. 4. 4. In the
 Epic gārgara the original idea lingers faintly. Noise is at the bottom of it, as in the (specially developed?) bārācereh.
Here with pārgā.
gālā, 1. 20. Not an earlier but a later form of gārdā as in
gārdabhā, whose noise (vāc not gālana) Indra dislikes (i. 29.
5). But Pischel, VS. i. 89 ff., unites gāldayā gīrā correctly.
Compare Avestan gared.
gāyatāvartani, see kresna, above.
guspiṭā, 40. 6; AV.; Brāh.
gūrthay, 19. 1; lone development of gur. In Vāl. 2. 5, gūrti is
common to i., ix., x. (in the same verse of Vāl. occurs the
drāk leyōun avadāvan, pun and artificial).
godatra, 21. 16; godari, i. 81. 11; godūth, Vāl. 4. 4; i. 4. 1; 164.
26; AV.; gopayātyam, 25. 13, must be from (Epic) gopay,
not from earlier (RV.) gopay; gōbhanthu, 20. 8. With the
last compare gōmātar, i. 85. 3, of the Maruts. Both are
synonyms of pṛṇimatārat. This last also is apparently not a
very word. At any rate, it occurs only in i., viii., ix.,
and v. 57. 2, 3; 59. 6. With the bandhu part of the
compound, compare the ār. ley, vījabandhavas, voc., 57. 19; ūśi-
bandhū, above; abandhū, List iii. (below).†
caturvyāj, 6. 48. Compare in allegory ii. 18. 1, caturvyuga.
cārmānn, 5. 38; VS. Compare Vāl. 7. 3: cārmāni mātānī. In
ii. 35. 13, ānabhinlātavarna. 5. 38 is dānastūti.
cārathā, 46. 31; cēru, 50. 7 (nīcerū, i. 181. 5). The parallel
(māhi) kera occurs in i. 45. 4, hymn of Prasūtva. The
form cārathā is in a dānastūti; and hymn 50, to judge by
jāthu in vs. 11, is late.‡
cikivād and cikivinmanas, see cikīt in List ii. (below).
cīrddāja, see List ii. (below).
cārdipṭā and jāgaripṭā, 9. 11 (with paraspād and tanūpād). Of the
two, the two first are unique. Like Epic jāgarpati is
jāgarpād, but the idea is old, jāgatah pātik, etc.
jātā, 1. 12; once (again) AV.; also in later literature.
jāthu (see PW.), 50. 11. Like later jaḍā.

* Both voc. Compare pūdāra, which is old and correct; while godari
seems to be an incorrect imitation (see note above, under pūdāp; and
compare purandard).
† Two bandhu compounds are common in the early books, sdbandhu
and subandhu; two are solitary, yājñabandhu, in iv. 1. 9, and pūr-
bandhu, in vi. 67. 4. The other nine, abandhu, amṛtabandhu, tśibandhu,
gōbanthu, dīvbandhu, dvīdbandhu, vījabandhu, samāndbandhu, occur
only in viii. i.; x.; viii., i.; or mṛtyubandhu, viii., x.
‡ Unique but unimportant are cārdvā and cārīṇudāna in 24. 28;
28. 1, respectively.
janitvam, 2. 42 (late verse?). The forms show in viii. a growth of the tva-ná* ending. The list of forms may begin with the Avesta, which, however, furnishes but one parallel, nārīthwāna. Then in vi. 51. 14 occurs sakhitvam (also in viii. 12. 6); in vii. 81. 6, vasutvam (also in viii. 1. 6; 13. 12; Vāl. 2. 6); and in ii., iv., v., vi. there are several occurrences of mahitvam, which is also found once in ix., thrice in i., and twice in viii. (i. 85. 7; 86. 9; 166. 12; ii. 23. 4; iv. 36. 3; 53. 5; v. 54. 5; 55. 4; 81. 3; vi. 16. 20; viii. 24. 13; 57. 2; ix. 100. 9).† The forms in the other family books are, therefore, few; and if sakhitvam at vi. 51. 14 be in an added verse, as seems likely, there would, in fact, be but two examples of this formation in the early books. On the other hand, viii. alone has kavitvam, 40. 3; janitvam, 2. 42; martyatvam, 81. 13; mahitvam (above); vasutvam (above); vṛṣṭatvam, 15. 2;‡ sakhitvam (above). One other new example, patitvam, is found in x. 40. 9. It is further to be remarked that the tvā form of these same words is not found in the family books, with the exception of sakhitvam (iii. 1. 15; iv. 25. 2; viii. 7. 31; 21. 8; once each in i. and x., four times in ix.). Of all the cases, only one, vasutvam, x. 61. 12, has a verbal parallel in the Avesta, vanhuthwāna.§ The tvā form of martyratvam in viii. is not cited from Vedic literature; that of kavitvam and janitvam occur in x. 124. 7; 18. 8, respectively; while patitvam (to patitvam in x.) is found only in i. 119. 5 (and Epic). Against the supposition that viii. shows earlier forms, rather than a revival and imitation of the old, stand the two examples in probably late verses (vi. 51. 14; viii. 2. 42), and the example in x. 40. 9. It is another example of a moribund ending manipulated to give archaic effect by late poets.

jāmātara, see List iii. (below).

jāvant, 83. 5. Compare vijāvant, AV. ix. 3. 13 (vijāvan, in different sense, RV. iii. 1. 28).

takvā, 58. 13. The apparent analogues, tāku, tākvan, takvati, tākvanāna, takvanviya, are all in i., ix., x. The verb occurs once in vi.; otherwise in ix., x.

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

* See on these forms, Whitney, Gr. §1240; Jackson, Gr. §§792, 847.
† In viii. 25. 18, Grassmann proposes to read mahitvā as mahitvam, to get the requisite form syllables. This is effected by Lanman (loc. cit., p. 386) through resolution, mahitṛād.
‡ Why PW. calls this form an instrumental of vṛṣṭāv (i. 54. 2, 91. 2) is not obvious. It is exactly like kavitvam, which, according to PW., is the instrumental of kavitvam. Grassmann erroneously groups satvam with the tvam endings.
§ But the Avesta has five examples of thva as a secondary ending. Since ātātthwana reverts to ātthwā, and this has a primary ending, it is not comparable with nārīthwāna.
tanukrtā, see tanukṛt, in List iii. (below).
tandrayā, 81. 30, from (Brāh.) tandray.
tāmiṣiçi, 48. 11; AV.; tamiṣ=tamas, as mahis (in māhīvantaṃ) =māhas.
tār, Vāl. 7. 2; Epic, tāra.
taraseṇa, 86. 10, 12; VS.; common Epic word.
tarasya, 88. 5 (tāras in iii. 2. 3).
tard, 1. 12. It is perhaps worth mentioning that the combination tard, though not infrequent after RV., occurs in RV. only here; ānu, abhi, pāri, prā, being used elsewhere in RV.
tavāśyā, 7. 2; 23. 11.
tugrivyādh, 1. 15; 45. 29; 88. 7. Compare the ār. lecy. kavi-
vṛdā, 52. 4.
tūryan, see sudastu, below.
tuṣikürmin (for tuṣikūrmī), voc., 55. 12; tuṣikratu (voc.), 57. 2; tuṣikṣa, 66. 11.
tuṣideṇa, 70. 2; tuṣimātrā, ib. with tuṣikūrmī, tuṣimāgha.
tārnāça, 32. 4.
tṛpadā (plural), 2. 5; AV. vii. 56. 3; Brāh. Perhaps synonym of apā (as in AV.), which is used of soma only in vii., i., ix.
tvāṇikāma, 11. 7. Compare tvāṇī, 59. 10; yāḍkāma, x. 121. 10; and AV. māṃ kāmëna.

dadhrśvāṇi, 50. 3. Compare puṣukvāṇi, 23. 5; jugurvāṇi, i. 142. 8; tuturvāṇi, i. 188. 1. These are the only parallels.
dacagvin, 1. 9. Compare sātagvin.
dāmīya (for dasmā), 24. 20.
dātra, 87. 10; Sātra; Epic.
dānavant, 32. 12; Epic.
dācūri, 4. 12; ádācūri, 45. 15. Compare, in early books, jáśuri, sāhuri.
dirgahāprasādman, 10. 1; 25. 20. Compare v. 87. 7 (late), where the idea is given: dirgahāṃ prthū paprathā sādama pārthi-
vam.
dirghāsyo (voc.), 59. 7; ‘transition-form,’ Lanman, loc. cit., p. 573.
duronyā, 49. 19 (early, duronā).
dyugāt, 86. 4; ‘dyumāt’ (PW.).
dviti (with tritā), 47. 18; nom. prop. dharmavant, 35. 13; personification, Dharma in late sense.
dharmakṛt, 87. 1.
nākīm, 67. 4, 5 (mākīm, 45. 23 and vi. 54. 7).
nadda (=narda ?), 1. 33 (half a dozen times in AV.; compare RV. x. 135. 7, nāḍḍ), in a dānastuti.
nābhavant, 25. 6; twice in AV.; and later. The early and late meanings are connected as ‘stormy,’ and again as ‘storm-
wind,’ the Epic meaning (see paraṣumānt, below).
namovākā, see adhivākā, above.
nāryāpas, 82. 1; one of several compounds in vii. that express concisely an old idea, here the idea of e. g. vii. 21. 4; vii.
85. 19–21.
nāvaśracī, 65, 12, with aṣṭpadī (vdc).
nāviṣṭi, 2. 17; an old word?
nānṛta (=nāsatya), 51. 12 (but of Indra). In 26. 8 occurs, as 
dr. lēy., indranāsatya, dual!
nīcakra, see uccōdchakra, above.
nidhānāya, 61. 18.—nidhārayā, 41. 4.—niyantār, 32. 15; the last 
also Epic, etc. Compare āyatār, above.
nirmāj, 4. 20; an old word?
nivarā, 82. 15. Observe that the combination nī var, common in 
the Epic, is really used in RV. only here and in i., x.; for iii. 
29. 6 (āniṃrta) is late.
nīṣṭār, 32. 27; 66. 2.

nṛśā, 16. 1 (nṛśāhyā, vi. 25. 8).
nēd=nā id., emphatic, 5. 39 (dānastuti), and AV. Elsewhere in 
RV. nēd=īva μν. This prohibitive use is found in v. 79. 9; 
x. 16. 7; 51. 4; AV. The use of nēd as in viii. is also 
Brahmanic, but so is the prohibitive.

nyāncana, 27. 18; twice in AV.

patidvīs, 80. 4.

paranājyād, 1. 30; 79. 1. Though not uncommon in later litera-
ture, all other paramō nominal compounds than this are later 
than RV. As a noun, in this sense, jyā occurs only here; 
early in jyādās. Ludwig, RV. iii., p. 159, takes the com-
pound as nom. prop.

parapumānt, 82. 17. New mant and vant adjectives form rather 
a feature of viii. Compare aśūmānt, āvīvant (45. 38), 
śrīvīvant (three times, see above), ājavan, kṣanamānt 
(2. 22), kāpavānt, jāvant, dānavant, dūrānavant (2. 20; 
18. 14), dhārānavant, nāhāsavant, pūṣṭvant (45. 16), bāndh-
umānt, vihamānt, viśmāvant (35. 14), sācasvāvant (22. 2), 
sāravāvant (38. 10), ārṣumānt (16. 4), which makes in all 
nineteen* of these forms found nowhere else in RV., though 
several of them appear in later literature. In this regard 
viii. stands nearer to x. than does any other of the family 
books; much nearer, withal; for of such forms the tenth 
book has thirty-nine; the first book, twenty-four; the eighth 
book, nineteen; the sixth book, eleven; the third, fifth, and 
ninth books, eight each; the fourth and seventh, seven; the 
second, four.† It is reasonable, it seems to me, to suppose 
that such forms, when once used, would be repeated; so that 
those earliest used would stand little chance of remaining 
unimitted. And such appears to be the case, for there are 
nearly three hundred adjectives with this ending in the Rig-

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

Interesting corroborative evidence is furnished from another point of view. If one were asked the reason why so Epic a word as bâlavant occurs in RV. only in x. 145. 1, one would perhaps say that it is mere hap. But why do kakâdmant, kârnavant, cûkhámant, pârasvant, mâhasvani, viâôvani, sônavant, and especially dinnavant, pîspavant, bâlavant, hêstavant, himâvânt, all occur in post-Rik literature, and yet appear nowhere else than here in RV.? Clearly because the tenth book stands nearer than do the other books of RV. to that post-Rik literature. I have remarked above that several of the lone words of this sort in viii. are found also in later literature than RV. That this is true of x., the examples just given will show. In i. also asthavindânt, gârdavindânt, dâvedânt, etc. show that the same relation holds in less degree. On the other hand, the same sort of lone words in ix. and other family books than viii. show scarce a trace of Epic kinship, and in fact few of them appear again at all. Thus, if a scale be made in accordance with the facts stated in the last note, the books of the RV. will stand as follows:

ii. and vii.; iv.; ii., v., ix.; vi.; viii.; i.; x. But iii., iv., v., vi., and ix. have about the same proportion. In the first group: of the four examples in ii., yjasvâvant and çoissmat are not cited from other literature; while kârasvat is possibly in AV.; and mânasvânt is an epithet of Indra in Brâhmaṇas and Sûtras. Of the seven examples in vii., not a single one is cited from later literature (agnimânt occurs

* I have included in vi. the specimens found ib. 47. 24; and 48. 18; and in vii., those ib. 108. 8 and 104. 2. Were these (certainly late) examples omitted, the numbers would stand as follows: for x., 39: i., 34; viii., 19; vi., 9; ii., v., and ix., 8 each; iv., 6 or 7; vii., 8: i., 4. In vii., moreover, mûhâvânt, at 68. 5, may be from mûhîsvânta which would put vii. and ii. on a level. I have not included as unique forms doublets that differ by a quantity or an accent only (e.g. devâvat, devedâvat, sâhâvânt = sahâvânt). The form dhausmanvânt, which appears in PW. for one passage and in Grassmann for another, is really part of a phrase which recurs in several books. Some of the examples in iv. are in "new songs," but this I have not considered. The doubtful form in iv. is tîkvant (elsewhere tîkvan).
instead of the late aṅgivānt. As for iii., iv., vi., ix., which may as well be considered together,—ix. has no form cited from later literature [the vat-forms in ix. are dṛdāvānt, pṛtyāvānt, pṛvāṇāhīvant, mālavant, māṭarāvānt, rāmanvant, vacarāvant, pṛbhravānt]; vi. shows none of the later forms save tvāṭṛīvant, which occurs in VS.; v. has no such later form at all; iv., among its six or seven words, has one, āvinant, which occurs in AV., and one, māydvant, which occurs in Brāh.; and finally, iii., out of its eight cases, has six aṅgā ṭṛayaṇa, one case, tokāvānt, cited again from Bhāg. P., and one, rāṇavānt, cited again, in slightly different sense, from the Epic.*

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

parādkūti, 81. 27. Most of the passages where these double ablative occur are in x.; the two exact parallels, adharākūti, udārākūti, occur only in x.; but papañkūti and ārdūkūti are in vii.

* It will scarcely be necessary to give the long list of examples from x. and i. The others are as follows: ii. has yuvāntavat, cōṣmānt, each dṛ., ṭey.; mānañvānt, hārsavānt, also found in AV. (?) and Brāh., respectively; iii. has ṭvacat, caḍlāvant, māḥinavavant, pāḍhavānt, yuvānt, sūnumant, all dṛ., ṭey., and tokavant, rāṇavant, Puranic and Epic, respectively; iv. has dvimant, also in AV.; acaśmānt, indramant, prakānt, hemydvant, all dṛ., ṭey., and dvimant, AV., māya, Brāh. (with ṭvānt beside ṭvānt); v. has aṇjumant, apūdhanavant, abdumant, udāmnmant, jāṁvant, tāvāsmant, pūjdvant, viṣtavant, all in v. alone, and not cited from elsewhere (jāṁvant is repeated in v.); vi. has tāvāsmant in VS., with all the rest aṅgā ṭṛayaṇva, vi., keṭāvant, dāṛavant, dāḍhavant, prāśimant, nādanumant, pāḍhvant, vṛṣṭavant, vṛṣṭavant, cōṣmānt (compare cōṣmānt in ii.), ṭhāṣavant (dāḍhavant and prāśimant in late hymns); vii. has gāṃvant, gopāvant, pṛṣadvant, māṭhravant (or māṭhravant), vṛṣṭavant (aṅgivivānt and tṛydvant in late hymns), all aṅgā ṭṛayaṇva. For ix., see above.

† The lone indeclinable vat-forms present the same relation. There is (unrepeated) manuvat in ii. 10. 6; vasiṣṭhavat in vii. 96. 3 (with the repeated jāmāṇaṁivat), withal in a hymn which lacks the family stamp. But in vii. alone there are apnavivat and dāvabhrpavat, 91. 4.; kaṇvavat, 6. 11.; ṭväṣṭan, 40. 4. 5.; bhṛgavat, 45. 18.; manadhravat, 40. 12.; ṭkhṛyāṭpavat, 23. 24. I think all other family forms are repeated in different books. The later poets have more new models. One other Kaṇva hymn has virāpavat (i. 45. 8). Thrice in viii. and once in ix. appears ṭpavat. To the list above add mitrārdhrmanant, in vii. 93. 13 (dāṁrvant, ib.), making twenty examples instead of nineteen in viii. (but not a new passage).
páridvesas, 64. 9. This, besides being árač legyómenov, shows quite unique union of pári and dois (so pári + pad is found only in viii., x.). Compare below vidvesas and vidvesana.

parogwiyut, 49. 20 (later in technical sense of gwyúti); and paromátra, 57. 6, árač. All analogous forms (paróksa, paró-rajas, parobahú, etc.) are later than RV.

parjánvakrandya, 91. 5. Compare vii. 103. 1, parjánvajinvita.

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

pádaká, 33. 19; unique till Śruti as ‘quarter.’

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

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

piyatú, 2. 15. The verb píy occurs 21. 14; i. 147. 2; x. 28. 11; 68. 6; AV.; Bráh. In i. 174. 8; ii. 19. 7 (only case in ii.-vii.), occurs píiyú.

putraká, 58. 8; Bráh.; Epic, etc. Compare kumára, above.

puródhrasavana, see prásravana, in List iv. (below).

purástháitá, 46. 13; analogue of early puróhita, puróyávan, puróyodhá; in i., x. occur puróyagá, puróyád.

purúñáman, 82. 17; AV. vi. 89. 1. Compare the árač legyówra purúmán, 2. 38; párutré,* 8. 22; puruñmáq, 45. 21; puru-mantrá, 5. 4; 8. 12; puruvépas, 44. 26; purúsambhértá, 55. 4; 89. 6; and the nom. prop. purumáy, 57. 10, and puru-hanman, voc., 59. 2.f

pújana in pácipájana, 17. 12 (with páciqgu, also árač), both voc. Neither píy nor pújana occurs elsewhere in RV.

púrvapáyya, 34. 5. Compare púrvappás (áyús? cf. Aufrecht, RV.3, p. V.), only 22. 2 (vippapás, only 26. 7); and púrvapáti, only in viii., i., x. (List iv., below).

pífáku (sánu), 17. 15; AV., etc.

pránapá, 17. 13. Compare Śruti prapáutra; classical prati-naptar (pra as in AV. prapitámahá, and praçardha, below).

pratátáva, see List iii. (below).

pratidhá, 66. 4. Compare iv. 27. 5, práti dhat píbadhyái.

pratistítui, 13. 33; Bráh. Compare pratistótar, Sūtra (práti + stú not elsewhere used?).

pratiti, 23. 1; 26. 8; 39. 5. The verb is in early use.

prabhañá, 46. 19, Epic, and prabhágin, 50. 18, with abhipra-bhañgin, 45. 35, the two last being árač legyówra, are unique nominal developments of prá bháñ (vi. 68. 6). The only parallels are cited from the Epic, prabhañjana (later, prá-bhañgura).

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

* Compare cauytrité in i. 117. 12. With the ascription of many names compare 11. 5 (here to Agni) and x. 54. 4.
† In viii., i., v., purumíqvd, nom. prop.
prāśyu, 19. 37; prāyḍ in iii. 29. 15 (late).

pravāsā, 29. 8; āprāsīvāns, 49. 19. The verb prā-vās occurs only in 29. 8 and iii. 7. 3 (late). Both verb and noun are common in Brāh. and Epic respectively.

prāśardha (voc.), 4. 1. Comparing cārdha and cārdhant and the compound atiprāśardhāyat, in 13. 6, it would seem that prā had here a sense common in post-Rik literature but rare in the Rik. In the Epic pravega, for instance, there is no forward movement; the word means simply ‘very rapid.’ So, too, Epic prabala is ‘very strong.’ This is also the meaning of prāvīra in the Epic and in RV. x. 103. 5; possibly of prāśravas, v. 41. 16; probably of ā-pramūra, i. 90. 2; and of prāśardha (to which PW. assigns the meaning keek, troutg), for it is used exactly like cārḍhastara in i. 122. 10. This idea of ‘very’ is found in prāśakīn, which occurs only in 13. 10; 32. 27; Vāl. 1. 8;* in prācū, 32. 16; iv. 25. 6; in prāmāhās, v. 28. 4; vii. 66. 2; viii. 25. 3; and perhaps in one or two words more, though it is doubtful in other cases whether eminence, ‘very,’ or movement, ‘forward,’ is the sense of prā. For this use without verb, compare 9. 19: prā devayāntah (agyinā), “pre-eminent are the worshippers (of the Ayins).”

prāśaṇya, 11. 2; Epic and later (early is prāśaṇya).

prāśakin, see under prāśardha.

prasthāvan,† voc., 20. 1; prahetār (hētar in viii.—ix.), 88. 7; prahōsin, 81. 4 (compare prahosā, i. 150. 2); prācīmanyuṣ, 50. 9 (compare prācīdhāva, i. 140. 3). These are all āraḥ, though prasthāvan occurs in VS., as does prāheti. I believe all prepositional compounds of manyuṣ are late formations. In RV. in the family books, there are ānuttamanyuṣ, vii. 31. 12; viii. 6. 35; 85. 19; twimanyuṣ, voc., vii. 58. 2; sāmanyuṣ, or samanyuṣ (often);‡ but the prepositional compounds occur thus: abhimanyuṣ, Epic; upamanyuṣ, i. 102. 9; nimanyuṣ, AV.; nirmanyuṣ, Epic; parimanyuṣ, i. 39. 10; pramanyuṣ, Epic; vimanyuṣ, i. 25. 4.

prāśvargā, see List iii. (below).

plāyogi, i. 33, dānastuti. Exactly as prāgī becomes plācī in the Brāh. period (may be dialectic), so prāyogī becomes plāyogī (or prāyoga became plāyoga). Prāyoga is itself late, first in x. 7. 5. Compare putī for purī in i. 179. 5; x. 86. 22.

baddā, 69. 1. See Note below, at end of article, p. 80.

* Compare prāṣthi, vi. 17.—, etc. The prāgī here is ‘very quick.’ The other prāgī, meaning ‘eating,’ is found in i. 40. 1 and viii. 31. 6 (prācīvyd), unless the last be āraḥ, and i. 40. 1 goes with viii. 32. 16 (PW.). The form prācīvyd (81. 6), Epic prāṣṭ, has a parallel in v. 41. 20, āruṣṭyad (PW.).

† Compare sansthāvan below.

‡ There is only one lone word of this origin in viii. besides prācīmanyuṣ, the adv. compound, viz. manyuḍaṇī, ‘in wickedness brewing.’
E. W. Hopkins,

bándhumant, 21. 4; Brāh.; Epic. Compare gōbandhu, above; abandhā, in viii., i., etc.; and the note on paraqumánt, above.

bálbajastukhā, Vāl. 7. 3; bálbaja is late; stūkā is early; compare stūkāvin, 63. 13, ār. āey.

bundā, 45. 4; 66. 6, 11.

brādūktha, 32. 10. Compare brūka, x. 27. 23. But the word is perhaps only for brādūktha, as in v. 19. 3; x. 54. 6; 56. 7. Compare brāhātkṣayās, below.

brāhātkṣayās, 15. 9 (one word); later nom. prop.

bekandza, 55. 10. This word for ‘usurer’ is paralleled only by prāṇaganda, in the late verse iii. 53. 14. In a contract tablet of the reign of Nabonnidos (555–538 B. C.) occurs bakatum, which “from the context here seems to be connected with money-lending” (Barton).

brahmanyād, 6. 39; cf. subbrahmanyā, post-Rik.

bhakti, 27. 11. A Brāh. word, here and in Brāh., ‘giving;’ later, ‘faith.’ Perhaps it should be translated like bhakṣā.

bhādraket, 14. 11; later, technically.

bhārabhūṭi, 84. 12; bhārman, āraṇ, 2. 8; viṣa-bharmān (v. l.), āraṇ, 10. 30. Compare bhārabhārīn, TS.; bhūribhārā, RV. i. 164. 13. For arisṭabhārman, 18. 4, see List v. (below).

bhīṣajya, 9. 8; 22. 10 (cf. bhīṣaj, 83. 2, and bhīṣajy, x. 131. 5, both āraṇ). The noun bhīṣaj occurs ii. 33. 4 and vi. 50. 7; else only in viii., i., ix., x., AV., Brāh., etc.; bhīṣajy is both early and late. The interesting fact is that bhīṣajy is almost exclusively Brahmanic, and very common in Brāh. works, while in the RV. it is found only here.*

bhūrigu, see āgu, above.

bhettār, 17. 14; Brāh., Sātra; common Epic word.

makṣurghāṇa, 22. 16. Compare AV. yudhivṛghaṇa. The RV. form is (false analogy) imitative of aravaṇa (PW.).

mand, 67. 2. Babylonian.

manmaṇḍis, 15. 12. See Note at end of article, p. 75.

manyuṣūcin, 32. 21. See prathvāvan, above.

martyatvand, 81. 13. See janitvand, above.

mahāhastā, 70. 1, of Indra. Compare mahāhasta, of Čiva, Mbhā. mahenadī, and mahemate, vocatives, in 63. 15; 13. 11; 34. 7; Vāl. 1. 7.

māk, 2. 42, dānastuti; mākina, 27. 8; mṛksā, see kṣa, above, and mṛkasakātvam, below.

* In AV., bhīṣajy and bhīṣajy are common enough, but there is no verb of this stem. The AV. verb niṣ kar, ‘heal,’ occurs in this sense in RV. at x. 97. 9, and, as iskar, in viii. 1. 12; 30. 26 (though the verb in other meanings recurs elsewhere). But AV. has already the Epic ekītasa.

† Perhaps māk is as S. interprets it; but I suspect it is no more than a form of the possessive, standing to mākina as does māh to māhina, a parallel to asmēka; compare the late Epic svaka (Pāli sakā) for svā. In position, the possessive could stand after its noun, as does māmakā, in x. 105. 10. Compare yakā, below.
mṛgay, 2. 6; AV.; a common Epic verb (mṛgayas, ii. 38. 7, is referred to this stem).
mṛksakātvan, 50. 10. Compare mṛksā, 55. 3.
yakā, see anyakā in List ii. (below).
yajās, 40. 4; an old word?
yajñahotar, voc. 9. 17; in Smṛti as nom. prop.
yayayiti, 67. 9. Compare yāvanant in List vii., below.
yuvajānī, 2. 19. The word jānī does not occur alone. Compare the compounds dvijāni, x. 101. 11; vittajānī, i. 112. 15; sumkajānī, i. 156. 2; ajānī, vijānī, AV. In v. 61. 4, a late hymn, occurs bhadrajānayās, voc. No other case in ii.-vii.
yuśodatta, yuṣmāṇīta, 26. 12.
vāranyakrātu, 43. 12; AV. vi. 23. 1 (khila to x. 9).
rākṣastva, only in 18. 13. Of the 43 times that rākṣas itself occurs, eleven cases are in ii.-vii.; of the 31 times that rākṣas occurs, eight are in ii.-vii., with about the same proportion in the compounds. In viii. alone each word occurs about a third of the number of times it does in ii.-vii. combined.
rājāt, 25. 22, dānastuti. Perhaps ‘silvery’?
rāṇdhra, 7. 26; an Epic word.
rādhī (hiranyādi), 5. 29, with rathacārya in 19, two parts of the car elsewhere unknown. Compare hiranyaprātha (i. 35. 5)?
rāmbhā, 45. 20 (classical in various other senses).
rājakā, 21. 18, dānastut; common in Epic. See virakā, below.
rādhaspati, voc., 50. 14. See note to rtaḥpāta, above.
rūg. Later than RV. rūg is a common verb; especially Epic, but also in AV. and Brāh. In RV. only in viii. 4. 8; 88. 4. vaktar, see adhivaṅka, above.
vāyisya, see svuḍastu, below.
vṣapda, 45. 11. Compare uksanā, above.
vāsuśrōci, see vāsuśrōci, in List vii. (below).
vāsrudā, 88. 4; AV.; Epic, vāsudā. Compare vāsrudvan, vi. 27. 12.
vājadravinas, 78. 6.
vājābandhu, see gābandhu, above, under godatra.
vīrgas, 91. 5. Compare vii. 56. 3, vīrgavanas.
vāpā, 19. 31. Compare vāṛga, used 16 times, and only once outside of i., viii.-x., viz. in the last verse of ii. 34. But PW. takes ‘obedient’ rather than ‘roaring’ as the meaning.
vijōsas, 22. 10 (saśāsas in early books).
vidyāviddāhasta, 7. 25; like iśuhausta, x. 103. 2; but also like the old form vājrahasta (elaborated to vājradaksinā in x.). The word may be regarded as an elaboration, like the last. Were it early, it would be repeated like vājrahasta, which occurs again and again.
vīdvesas, 22. 2; vīdvesaṇa, 1. 2. The former is dr. levy.; the latter, as a noun, is Epic. The combination is late. The first occurrence of vi dve is in AV. iii. 30. 4, where is found also, va. 1, avidvesa, while vidvesā occurs ib. v. 21. 1; and
ávidvis, ib. i. 34. 5. Elsewhere ví deis is eminently Epic and late. Except for these two instances in viii., RV. has no compound, verbal or nominal, of this sort.

viperakis, 3. 4; cited again from classical literature; a significantly late word from its meaning, which is literal, ‘in the sacrifices, the kingdom of the priest.’

vibódha, agetus, 3. 22; actionis, Epic; vibodha (or vibadhá), x. 133. 4; ví budh in causal, only i. 12. 4; 22. 1; Epic, etc.; simple ví budh, first in Epic (?).

vibhumanta, 85. 16; perhaps as later (Bráh.), ‘with vibhus.’ In any case a late word.

vibhuśarati, see List iii. (below).

vimahí, 6. 44. Compare Epic vimahánt. PW. compares vimahas, which is found in i. 86. 1, and in the late passage, v. 87. 4.

viváksana, 1. 25; 21. 5; 35. 23; 45. 11; Vál. 1. 4.

vivatodhí, see vivámanas, List ii. (below).

vivámmanas, see List ii.; vivámanusa, 45. 42; compare saptámánusa, below, and vírvajana, Bráh.

viváparya, 19. 11; 22. 12 (early is vírvávaru). The word várya is early.

vivaká, 80. 2; Epic. Compare kumáráká, púdaká, putráká, rájaká, all for the first time in viii. Perhaps víráhikit, 67. 4, belongs here.

vivatvand, see jánítvand, above. Other unique forms of this sort in viii. are víjanádhí, 20. 10; víjapati, 15. 6; víjapati and víjaprayávan, 20. 9; víjapati, 20. 7, 10; that is, chiefly in one hymn.

véná, Vál. 7. 3; AV., etc.; Epic.

véd, in late sense of wisdom, only in 19. 5; AV., Bráh., etc. In RV., suvédá is from víd, ‘find’; vídyd, only in x. 71. 11.

védistha, 2. 24. Compare védíyáns in vii. 98. 1, perhaps late, as the Vasítha tag appears to be copied. The positive form, véditar, occurs first in AV.

vá_invánam, in the sense ‘complete.’ 30. 4. This meaning is found in AV. and Bráh. In RV., only here; elsewhere vá_invánam is applied to Agni in RV., except in ix. 81. 16, where it is epithet of light. In 30. 4, vijne (devade) vá_invánam utá, the word can have only its later sense.

vyádyana, 67. 2, with abhyádyana, which see in List ii. (below).

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

vratáti, 40. 6; Bráh., etc.

vratyd, 43. 8. Like avratyd, a Bráh. word, but there vraty.

çatábradha, 66. 7. Considering the number of çata compounds strewn through the whole work, those that are here mentioned do not appear to be particularly significant. But it may be of interest to note that some of these are confined to viii. and its group. Thus besides çatábradha, there is çatáparvan (AV., Epic), at i. 80. 6; viii. 6. 6; 85. 2; 78. 3; çatávant, vii. 5. 15; 24. 29; 53. 5; x. 94. 2; 102. 5, 9, and the late hymn (see
Lanman, vi. 47. 9; catávája, viii. 81. 10; ix. 96. 9; 110. 10; catádmaha, viii. 1. 5; 33. 5; 34. 7; ix. 62. 14; catápva, viii. 4. 19; x. 62. 8 (and Sūtras).  

Caturváda, 45. 5. A late word? (Sprüche.)  

Caturádha, 49. 6, and AV.  

Cánaka, 45. 11; 80. 3 (with Cánakáśi); common word in Bräh., Epic.  

Cánakáśi, 80. 3; a Smṛti word, peculiarly Epic, and in (late) Upanishads.  

Cáphá, 47. 17. This word for 1/2 is united with kalá, 1/4. Compare the same, AV. vi. 48. 3; xix. 57. 1; but (not in technical sense) prakátávida, RV. vii. 18. 16. Both cáphá and kalá as fractions are Brahmanic (Smṛti).  

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

Cávasi, 45. 5; 66. 2, Indra’s mother. Compare Cávasáh súñáh, of Indra, iv. 24. 1; viii. 79. 2.  

Cákíntá, 33. 6 (Cákínta, early). Like late rathína (vanína) compared with early rathína (vanína).† Imitation of vi. 45. 22?  

Cácigurú, cácigurújana, in voc., 17. 12; see púj above; and akhanda (in same hymn).  

Cásádha, 33. 16; a Smṛti word. Compare prapásárá, ii. 36. 6 (late); ii. 1. 2 (i. 94. 6; ii. 5. 4, prapására); x. 91. 10.  

Subhrakáddha, see karmasóbhana, above.  

Cévána, 1. 22. With the idea, if certain,† compare x. 73. 4, vásává, late; svedhí, ii. 13. 6 (mystic; late?). The last word occurs in AV., Bräh. etc. Compare also svedhípad, Vál. 3. 9.  

Gráávä, 48. 2. Compare yudhámpráávä, nom. prop., Bräh.  

Grávékkána, 2. 38; pravejít, 32. 14.  

Grávéyatiákáhi, 46. 12. Compare grávéyátpati, v. 25. 5; drávéyátsakha, x. 39. 10; yánvéyátsakha, x. 26. 5; mandáyátsakha, i. 4. 7 (mandádvíra, ák. árya, viii. 58. 1).  

Grásthápadis, see ajirá, List vii., below.  

Vásává, 86. 7; Bräh.  

Svátrádhi, see svátrá, List iv., below; svína, see List iii., below.  

Svaytadvári (river), 26. 18; compare svetá, x. 75. 6. This is the only sveta compound in RV. They abound in later literature, several being in Bräh. The ydvan compounds are found late and early. Compare subhráyaván, viii. 26. 19. It is perhaps worthy of note that subhámydván also is virtually in the later group, as v. 61. 13 is late (elsewhere, i. 89. 7).  

Unique (in viii.) are akámydván, svaydván, ratyahdván.

---

* Catáptra and catárcus are found only in the RV. at vii. 97. 7 and 100. 3, respectively (the former again in the Epic). In Vál. 1. 2; 2. 2, catámká, later nom. prop.  
† The form rathína in late Sk.; vanína appears in early books of RV.; vanína only in RV. x. 66. 9.  
‡ The meaning is doubtful. One is tempted to connect with cédá. But the idea generally assigned is common enough, as in x. 47. 2.
(sa-or) samst hávan, 37. 4; see prast hávan, above. Both forms, árāj ley.
sámśādā, 90. 4; a Brāhmaṇa and Smṛti word. Compare váda, Smṛti.
[sámvid, Vāl. 10. 1; A.V.; Brāh. The hymn is perhaps interpolated.]
satónahant, 30. 1. There is a parallel to this in the late hymn to
the weapons, vi. 75. 9, satóbíra; and a better in the Brahm-
manic satódyánt.
sadhyá, 70. 9. Compare vasújá, 88. 8; adityájáta, 46. 5; all
árv. ley.
sadhástuta, 26. 1; for sadhástuti.
sádharátar, 1. 12; Epic.
sádhí, 1. 12; A.V.; Brāh.
sátpuś, i. 28; TS.
saptápadā, 61. 16; A.V., etc.
saptábudhna, 40. 5.
saptámañúsa, 39. 8. Compare viṣvámañúsa, above, and, in 81. 20,
saptá sahíddh, with 2. 33; must mean seven (many) people.
sáptá, Vāl. 7. 5; 11. 5 (tríbhik sáptébhik).
sádana, 82. 9; A.V.; Epic.
samudrádikas, 91. 4-6; compare Epic samudrávāsin (sea-dwel-
lers).
sáráti, 27. 14, 17; Brāh.
saháranírni, 8. 11, 14, 15; saháraparna, 66. 7, and A.V.; sahas-
rapośin, 92. 4; saháruáhu, 45. 26, Epic. Compare in
vi.-ix., sahároti; in vii.-x., sahárapad. In vii. 34. 15
alone occurs the form sahásrapás, quite common after RV.
See Note, below at end of article, p. 75.
sápyu, voc., 19. 31; an old form?
súatá, 47. 1; an old word?
súkára, 69. 6. This (like the Epic duskāra) is a Smṛti word, for
it means ‘easy to do,’ whereas su in RV. with kr is usually
moral, rarely physical. In 13. 7; 46. 27, this moral side is
apparent in sukítvan (the word is found only here). Compare
suddhu, 67. 8, meaning ‘leicht theilbar’ (PW.). Compare
also the many occurrences of sukét, suktá, sukṛtyd, etc.,
always with the idea of ‘good.’† The word sukára is found
only here in RV., but is common in the Epic. With sukṛta
in 66. 11 is joined the árv. ley., sūmáya, ‘well made.’
sugurá, 18. 2; sujimbha, 49. 13; sutárman, 42. 3; sutírthá,
see tirthá, List vi. (below); sutyáj, 49. 16.
súddákrinka, 33. 5 (with susavyá, árāj); and in vii. 32. 3, the one
late verse of the hymn! The word is Epic, ‘dextrous,’ not
‘generous.’
suddhu, 67. 8; with susú, ib. 4.
suprátá, 29. 29; see prátúrti, List iii., below.

* But sahasrapoś, -poṣyá are early.
† The physical side appears only in sukírmán, iv. 2. 17; 88. 9.
Prāgāthikāni, I.

supṣāras, 26. 24; subhās, 23. 20; sāyukta, 58. 13; svādhu, 19. 37; utā me prayāyor vayyoh svādhitā ādhi tāvani (five āśraḥ leṣyena), Nīruk., p. 43; sūvidvāṅs, 24. 23; susāmān, 49. 18 (23. 28, etc., suṣūḍman, nom. prop.); susāda, Vāl. 10. 3; susirā, 58. 12 (Brāh., Epic); susūraṇa, 27. 18; Epic (‘escape,’ either ‘from’ or ‘to’); suhārd, 2. 5 (may mean Epic suhārd, sūhārda, as it does in AV., and be the opposite of durhārd, AV.; compare vss. 21, 27).

sādadohas, 58. 3. On sāda see Pischel, VS., i., p. 72.

tyākaraṇa, 32. 10, of Indra. After iii. 18. 5 (tyāk kārdnā dadhīse vyāpāni)?

stūkārin, 63. 13; see balbajastukā, above.

stomavārādhanā, see uktavārādhanā, above.

tyākā, 1. 23; an old word?

srmanā, 48. 5; Brāh.

hariprī, 15. 4; Vāl. 2. 10.

kāśātra, 78. 6. See upahāsava, above, and final Note, p. 78.

hindū, 40. 9; compare amunā, above.

hīranyakṣepa, see List iii., below, and compare the āś. le śyw∂hāpe, 49. 2.

hīranyakṣepa, 8. 2; 31. 8. For zarānyopāsa, see Note, p. 84.

hīranyakṣepa, 5. 28; 22. 5. Compare the āś. le śyw∂hāpe, 57. 16, 18.

hōma, ‘call,’ 52. 4.

By way of convenient survey, I give in this paragraph the following late words (mostly Brahmānic and Epic) culled from the foregoing list, which words, were we to assume that viii. is the oldest book, would be particularly inexplicable.† The words are: adhavā, ānatidbhuta, ānābhyut, apācyā, abhātrvyā, āmbara, avabhṛtha, avāryā, acāsyā, āntiṣā, ākhandala, ayāna, udāya, upahāsava, rtaeṇi, ekardij (AV.), edhatā (AV.), odanā (AV.), karnapādana, kāl, kumārakā, kō, kula, tadādātra, dātra, dānavant, Dūtā, Dhārmanvant, parganyūti, pāpakā, pīṅgā, putrakā, (pācī-putrāna, prabhāṅgā, (in, abhi), bāṃdhamant, bhāṣijyā, mahāhastin, rāndhara, vidyāśana, vīprājyā, vībādhana, vīrakā, vēda, vātivānara (‘complete,’ AV.), vāyāmāna, ārathu, cānā, cānākā, cānākās, cāpā (fraction), āvastā, āśray, dārāhātar, sukāra, srmanā. But the others, in the affinities of their forms and the location of parallel words, will also repay a careful consideration.

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

* Usually rendered ‘having a good hārdi or stomach.’ But the poet perhaps means that bad preparations do not frighten a friendly guest.

† None of these occurs in a dānastuti. The only important dānastuti words in the list above are kuhāya, naḍā, plāygoti, yakā, rajatā, rājakād.
recent growth, but to be such compounds as might be old and remain unimitated or be quite new. They are forms for which I find no analogies either in later or early literature.* It is, however, only fair to give the list, that the reader may not think the proportion of apparently late words to be greater than it is. The forms are: ágorudha, ajúra, ádúna, ádurmakha, ánapasphur, ánargaratī, ánnarmi, apaspur, apákṛtī, ápāvṛtī, apratimāndā, aprāmāsata, ábadhāra, abhydram, amithita, arājin, acesita, asacadvīṣ, ástrīrayajana, ághrīvāsau, ámūri, ácuhēsa, indragāpū, upavid, upārana (\textsuperscript{2}upara,\textsuperscript{3} 82. 21), urāmatī, urāyuga, uruṣyū, uruḍhuti (VS.), rtāvasu, tīhūstha, [chāndyā], jmoyānti, tradā, tripaṣṭāya, tryādusa, divāvasu, dravāccakra, (agni) dāvōdāsa, nādanū, nicumponū, nīdhārayā, parivṛj, pariheṣt, prthupākṣas, bhūryāṣuti, māderagu, manotār,\textsuperscript{1} mahisvāni, mitmedha (Vāl. 5. 5), mče, yonyā, viśesita, rathaśāh, rathādau, rapsūd, vakṣāni, vārvāvahātra, vīpāravad, vībhānū, vībhukrātā, vīvetoṣv, vīvēryāpāvaka (28. 13, doubtful), vīvāvāra, vṛthak (vrthak\textsuperscript{2} 48. 4), cīrācōcī, sūkrapātala, śāneśita, cīkō, sāptya, surūpā, snēhīti (or snāhīti, 85. 13),\textsuperscript{1} smitpurāṇadhi, smādrūtisāc, svādhāīnava, svānādāratha, svābāin, svāyāvan, svāvāyū, hiranyāvai, kīaś (doubtful, 18. 19).

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

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

---

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

\textsuperscript{1} In viii. 8. 12; i. 46. 2. The difference is only the accent of manotār in early books.

\textsuperscript{2} See List v., below.
“But,” some one may object, “any book has late words.” So indeed it has. And, accordingly, before proceeding to the study of these parallelisms, I consider this more closely. Every mandala has its store of words that do not occur again till a later period, and the question may naturally arise whether the words enlisted above do not give a false impression; and whether late words collected from one of the other family books would not give the same result. Anticipating this objection, I have collected all the corresponding words in the seventh mandala, which is next in size to the eighth, and is generally recognized as one of the oldest family collections. I find that the list of ‘Epic’ or of ‘Brahmanic’ words is such as might have been presupposed in accordance with the general theory of this essay. The conditions are not quite the same, for in vii. there are four hymns (88, 50, 103, 104) later than any in viii., and the group beginning with 15 is out of place and later than the first collection. Moreover such hymns as 4, 8, 18, 81, 83, which lack or copy the Vasiṣṭha stamp (or appended formula), are also in all probability later than the marked Vasiṣṭha hymns.

The ‘Epic’ or Sanskrit words, apart from these later hymns, are:

1. 19, dūrvāsas, in the Epic an epithet of Čiva; 3. 2, vrājana, in the Epic a proper name (Sk. ‘wandering; Veda ‘path’); 58. 3, vadaśvanas, ‘noise of wind,’ but in Purāṇa, name of mountain; 64. 2, sindhu-pati, ‘lord of S.’, but in the Epic, ‘lord of Sindhu people’; 66. 10, pūribhūti, ‘power,’ late Sk. ‘harm’; 88. 6, yaksīn, ‘alive’ or ‘holy,’ but in the Epic, yaksinī, ‘a female devil’;* 97. 7, potāpatra (literal), in the Epic, of various unrelated meanings.

It will be seen that the compounds are few and such as might easily be remade, while the uncompounded words are still rarer. The later group of non-Vasiṣṭha and late hymns, adds the late words, 4. 8, anyodārya; 8. 2, rūmahant; 15. 3, amāyā; 18. 20, devaka (in 10, yathākṛtām is a Sūtra phrase); 34. 14, hanyā (Epic hanyā); ib. 19, mahāsena;† 81. 4, ratnabhāj, ‘giving gifts,’ against Epic ‘having jewels’; 83. 2, kṛtadva, late Sk. kṛtadvaj, proper name; 94. 12, abhogā, Epic similar meaning; ‡ 103. 2, saras and vatain (Frog Hymn);§ 104. 10, steyakī; ib. 17, kharṣī. Nor is much gained by adding the ‘Brahmanic’ words, 20. 6, bhres; 50. 1, 4, 2 (late hymn), ajakāvā, anudakā, kulpā; 66. 11, anāpyā; 85. 2, devahāya.

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

* This and the preceding hymn (87. 5; 88. 3) contain preṭkhaḍ. Both appear to be late hymns. On didṛkṣu, in 86. 8, see Gaedike, Acc., p. 189 (perhaps locative).
† This is probably not a Vasiṣṭha hymn, as 22 ff. is a later addition.
‡ In RV. a snake, in Epic the hood of the snake, and in other meanings. This is not a Vasiṣṭha hymn apparently.
§ This hymn has further the late words vrataścārin (Sūtra and Epic); prāvyā. A.V.; dvādaśī in Brahmanic sense; gākṛti, gomāyu, atirūdrā (technical, A.V., Brāh.), parivatsarīga, A.V.
comparison of vii. and viii. comes the important fact that all the hymns of vii. put together contain less than half as many late words as does viii.; including withal the very latest hymns of the former collection. The late words in viii. are so strewn throughout the collection that there is little use in attempting to mark off late and early hymns except very generally, for the difference in age between them is not by any means so marked as in the case of the seventh mandala. There are of course some hymns (such as 17, 33, 46, 47, 58, 67, 80) which are verbally later than others. But on the whole the difference is small.*

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

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

adhaspacá, viii. 5. 38; x. 133. 4; 134. 2; 166. 5; and half a dozen times in AV.

ändhyakṣa, viii. 48. 24; thrice in x. (88. 13; 128. 1; 129. 7) and thrice in AV.; later, a common word.

ánāpi, viii. 21. 13; x. 39. 6 (āpi is early; but āpitvā is only in viii.).

anubāná, viii. 25. 9; x. 53. 6; Brāh. (ūlba, only in x. 51. 1; AV.; Brāh.; ubānā, Brāh.).

anyaká, viii. 21. 18; 39. 1; x. 133. 1.

abhyāñjana, viii. 3. 24; 87. 2; x. 85. 7; twice in AV. Both cases in viii. are late apparently, so that it is questionable whether PW. does well to render ‘adornment’ in distinction from ‘ointment,’ the later meaning. The limited verbal use may indicate the latter as well as the former. In ix. 86. 43 abhyāñjate means ‘anoint,’ and so, in my opinion, does the same verb in ii. 8. 4: ‘(he shines) with his flames when he is anointed’ (as in x. 87. 20, ajára is here a noun).

āyuddha, viii. 45. 3; x. 27. 10 (āyudyá, x. 103. 7; āyuddhásena, x. 138. 5); all used of Indra or his weapons. Compare also āyudhvin, x. 108. 5, and āyodhára,† i. 32. 6 (but not a Kāśyapa hymn); āyudyá, AV.

* The group which seems to contain the oldest hymns, judged from this point of view, is that immediately following the Vālakhilīya (from 49 to 86, with the exception of 58), a fact which, taken in connection with the late character of the first hymns in viii., may tend to show that the Vāl. was prefixed to the original beginning; prior to the addition of the hymns that now precede the Vālakhilīya.

† And in the following hymns in the same refrain. Apparently a late formation, analogous to éka, etc.; comparable with yakt, viii. 31. 18 (unique in RV.). Compare viçvaka, only in viii., i., x.; taká, only in i.; and amuka, asaká, poet-Rik.

† Not ‘schlechter Kampf’; rather ‘not finding any one to fight him,’ or ‘unmatched’ (Whitney, AJF. xiii. 800).
av, in causal as ‘devour,’ only viii. 45. 38; x. 113. 8; but in AV. and Brāh.

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

ādārdirā, viii. 89. 4; x. 78. 6.

ubhayāsinī, vii. 1. 2; x. 87. 3; once in AV.*

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

ārā, vii. 1. 34; 59. 10; x. 85. 37; 90. 11, 12; 162. 4; 163. 4; common in AV.; Brāh., etc. In 59. 10 occurs the only instance where rtāyā, which occurs ten times, becomes rtāyā. r'gya, viii. 4. 10; rgyadā, x. 39. 8; r'gya occurs only here and in AV., Brāh., etc.

ṛśivas, voc. vii. 2. 28; ṛśivā, x. 66. 14; Smṛti.

etādṛ'ī, viii. 91. 19; x. 27. 24 (late verse); Brāh., etc. Compare upadṛ'ī in List vii. (below).

kavitvā, vii. 40. 3; kavitvā, x. 124. 7. The form in viii. is unique; that in x. (‘song-art’) occurs in Smṛti. See janitvān in List i., above.

kṛpay, viii. 46. 16; x. 98. 7; the nearest approach to Epic kṛpāy.

So kṛpay occurs only viii. 39. 4 (x. 74. 3), from kṛpāna, which occurs first in x. 99. 9. The older verb is krop.

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

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

gosā, vii. 73. 7; x. 38. 1. Compare dhānasā in x., dhānasā in ii.; but in other cases the formation with sati is common in early books.

cikit, vii. 86. 14; 91. 2; Vāl. 3. 3; x. 3. 1; cikitā, Vāl. 8. 5; AV.; cikitvān, only viii. 49. 18; cikitvinmanas, viii. 84. 5; v. 22. 3. citrārdhas, viii. 11. 9; x. 65. 3; AV. Compare citrāvājā, only vii. 7. 33.

janitvān, see List i. (above).

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

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

dābhrācetas, vii. 90. 16; x. 61. 8.

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

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

dravītā, viii. 14. 14; 81. 15; x. 11. 9; 49. 9. Compare dravayitā, ix. 69. 6; tanayitā, iv. 3. 1; x. 66. 11; posayitā, iii. 4. 9 (April); iv. 57. 1 (this is a late hymn); stanayitā, v. 83. 6. Compare also mādayitā, ix. 101. 1; sūdayitā,

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

dhūr úttara, viii. 33. 18; x. 28. 6.

nādhamū, viii. 39-42; x. 133. 1; in different form, the verb occurs in AV., Brāh. The noun nādha occurs only in i. 174. 8. The name nādhakā occurs only in viii. But nādhana, -nā, etc. are early parallels.

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

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

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

paripād, viii. 24. 24; x. 28. 10. Compare pūridoṣas in viii. 64. 9. Unique verbal use with pā. Compare also of similar meaning, paripāthā, only in i., x.

pākstāt, viii. 18. 15; x. 2. 5. Compare pākavānt, x. 100. 3; unique; pākṣaṇāsā, viii. 104. 9, late hymn; pākastivaṇ, x. 86. 19; pākasthāman, nom. prop., viii. 3. 21, 22. Early are pākā and pākyā.

purāṇavāt, viii. 40. 6; 62. 11; x. 43. 9. In the family books occur pūrṇavāh, pūrṇavān, pūrṇavātī, pūrṇavāt, but not purāṇavāt, which, however, is not cited from later works.

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

bhīṣ, viii. 8. 2; 91. 6; x. 108. 4.

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

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

mahāmahāḥ: aḥām asmi mahāmahāḥ says Indra, x. 119. 12.

Nowhere else except in viii. 24. 10; 33. 15; 46. 10. Analogous forms are all late: ghanāghanā, x.; carucaṛā, x.; cālakālā, i. 164. 48; sarīspā, x.; vadāvādā, Āit. Brāh. Compare yadvīyād, only viii. 4. 4; x. 61. 9.

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

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

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

valkṛ (vādāte) as dulce, late idiom, found in RV. only in viii. 62. 8; x. 62. 4 (vadāti).
vīmanas, viii. 75. 2; x. 82. 2. A common Epic word, nor is the Epic meaning impossible in viii. The abstract vāimanasyā, which also is Epic, occurs first AV. v. 21. 1. The verb vi man occurs only x. 92. 3.

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

vīpādanaes, nom. prop., viii. 23. 2; 24. 7; adj., x. 55. 8. Compare vīpūmanus, śr. ley., viii. 46. 17 (see 45. 42); and in viii. 34. 6, vīcūtadfī, śr. ley.

vīpādd, viii. 44. 26; x. 16. 6; twice in AV.; also in Brāh.

vīsa, ‘servant,’ viii. 19. 11; x. 109. 5.

pādāvant and pādāpva, see under pādāradhnī, List i. (above).

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

samvādana, viii. 1. 2; x. 93. 12; three times in AV.; also in Epic.

samvārāgam, viii. 64. 12; x. 43. 5 (both with ji); the adj. is Brāh. [sabhā, as ‘assembly hall,’ viii. 4. 9; x. (34. 6); 71. 10. In i. 167. 3; iv. 2. 5, the word appears to be used in an older sense. The late meaning here ascribed rather doubtfully to sabhā may be maintained for vi. 28. 6; but it is to be remarked that this hymn, which holds cows to be more sacred than gods, appears to be late. The word is sometimes translated by ‘houses’ (so by Müller, SBE. xxxii. p. 278). This certainly must be the sense in iv. 2. 5, where at any rate ‘assembly-hall’ will not do. But I bracket the word as a doubtful though probable case.]

sahāsravāja, viii. 81. 10; x. 164. 7; possibly accidental.

sūrāghī, viii. 4. 8; x. 106. 10; twice in AV.

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

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

sūsthā, viii. 22. 18; x. 107. 11 (susthunā), a late word.

sūryāmsā, viii. 83. 2; x. 64. 3; 86. 10; 92. 12; 93. 5.

sōtu, viii. 19. 18; x. 76. 6; 86. 1.

sōmaprātha, viii. 43. 11; 52. 2; x. 91. 14 (with vedhāse, as in viii. 43. 11); thrice in AV.

sudāsetu, viii. 39. 10; x. 61. 16.

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

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

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

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

akṣa in akṣayāvan, viii. 7. 35; akṣayādrāh, i. 122. 9; akṣayā, Brāh.

ādavayas, viii. 18. 6; i. 187. 3.
anasthā(n), viii. 1. 34; i. 164. 4; AV.
abandhā, viii. 21. 4; i. 53. 9; twice in AV.
abudhāna, viii. 66. 5; i. 24. 7.
adhanjant, viii. 1. 6; i. 120. 12. Compare abhūṭa, x. 95. 11.
ari (=tya?) in compounds, only viii. 1. 22 (ariṣṭūḍa); i. 126. 5
(ariśāyās); i. 186. 3 (ariṃśārd).
arka, viii. 90. 18; i. 7. 1; 10. 1; 38. 15 (having arka, songs or beams').
avayātrā, vii. 48. 2; i. 129. 11; AV. ii. 2. 2. Compare āvayātara-helā, i. 171. 6; āvayāvāna, i. 185. 8; AV. viii. 1. 6. The verb occurs in this sense in vi. 66. 5: āva āvād ugrān; iv. 1. 4: devṣavya hēlo 'va yāśīśāh. On āvayātrār in i. 94. 12, see PW.
[āvāta, viii. 68. 7; perhaps with i. 38. 7; 52. 4; 62. 10; but doubtful (PW.)]
avisyū, vii. 45. 28; 56. 9; i. 189. 5; AV. iii. 26. 2; xi. 2. 2. The noun, avisyād, ii. 38. 3.
asadrā, vii. 49. 7; i. 36. 16; 176. 3.
āharvād, vii. 5. 9, 21; i. 2. 2; 156. 4. Compare āharvāč, viii. 55. 10. There is one more compound in RV., āharvāci, ix. 86. 41, and AV. v. 21. 6, but none in the family books; all other compounds being in AV., VS., or later.
āhrutāsa, vii. 20. 7; i. 52. 4.
ādārā, viii. 48. 13; ādārā, i. 46. 5; Brāh. etc. The verb (ādāyā) and the nominal compounds with ād are all of the Brahmanic and Epic age. In iv. 30. 24, āduri is probably, with Sāyana and in a better sense, to be derived from dār, 'break'; but the verse itself seems to be late. Compare ādara, ādṛtya, etc.
āyajī, vii. 23. 17; i. 28. 7.*
ādraṇa, vii. 59. 8; i. 112. 6 (ādraṇa and ādrā are found in family books).
ādrūntv, viii. 84. 7; i. 23. 1; Sūtra.
[āddāhyāni, vii. 27. 7; i. 83. 4; ādāddāhyāni, v. 37. 2; x. 63. 7. Clearly an accident, if v. 37 is early.]
indratvā, vii. 19. 16; i. 132. 1; indraśiṣṭa, only in ix. 73. 5; indragopā, vii. 46. 32 (compare indragupta, AV. xii. 1. 11). The form indratvā may have changed accent and in reality be from indratva, the Epic abstract.†

* But in i. 9. 6, āyajīṣṭha.
† In Mbh. appears indragopaṇa, in the sense of Brāh. indragopa, an insect (Cat. Brāh. xiv. 5. 3. 10). If indratvā be from indra tvāta (i. 11. 18; FW.) the form is bizarre enough to be an unintelligent imitation.
úpastruti, viii. 8. 5; 34. 11; i. 10. 3; twice in AV.; in Çat. Bräh., etc. Compare upaprotá in vii. 23. 1. The verbal combination is common in family books.

upahvará, viii. 6. 38; 58. 6; 85. 14; i. 62. 6; 87. 2; Epic.

úṣṭra, viii. 5. 37; 6. 48; 46. 22, 31; i. 138. 2; compare úṣṭá, x. 106. 2. In viii., only in dánastuti. See final Note, p. 83.

ôdáti (ôd) viii. 58. 2; i. 48. 6.

kakṣyaprá, viii. 3. 22; i. 10. 3. Compare kámaprá, i. 158. 2. For kakṣyá itself, a late word, see final Note, p. 77.

kadháprí, see adhápríya, in List i., above.

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

gáyatrívápas, viii. 10.; i. 142. 12.
gócrita, vii. 21. 5; i. 137. 1.

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

jañjanabhávat, viii. 43. 8; jañjati, i. 168. 7 (only parallel).

jálásabhásaja, vii. 29. 5; i. 43. 4; AV.

jómátar, vijómátar, the former, viii. 2. 20; 26. 21, 22; the latter, i. 109. 2, Āry. λέγ. The former occurs in Smr̥ti, etc.

jñámbára, viii. 40. 5; i. 116. 9. I think the only other form of bára is niñijámbára, v. 85. 3; viii. 61. 10; x. 106. 10; another case of coincidence with v.
tanūkr't, viii. 68. 3; i. 31. 9; Sūtra. Compare tanūkrthā, viii. 75. 1, āy. -lcy.; and final Note, p. 82, on the Avestan form.
tāpurjambha, viii. 23. 4; i. 36. 16; 58. 5; always of Agni.
dīdyagni, Vāl. 9. 2; i. 15. 11.
durnāda, vii. 2. 12; i. 32. 6; 39. 5; VS; colloquial Epic. Compare for meaning surāfā, vii. 21. 14, āy. -lcy.
devātta, viii. 32. 27; i. 37. 4. Compare vāsottti, in List vii., below.
dravātpāni, of Aśvins' steeds, viii. 5. 35; of Aśvins, i. 3. 1. Compare dravāccakra, vii. 34. 18; but also dravādaṭva, iv. 43. 2.
dvīpā, vii. 20. 4; i. 169. 3; dvīpin, AV. Compare nipā, Vāl. 1. 9; 3. 1; and dhānu, only in viii., i., x. But Roth reads dvīyā for dvīpā in viii. 20. 4.
dālitā, as noun, 'intend,' vii. 3. 16; 8. 10; 40. 3; 41. 1; i. 170. 1.
In the last case (with d) the participle is half noun; in viii. it is wholly so.
dhrasanmanas, voc., viii. 78. 4; i. 52. 12.
nādiyār't, viii. 12. 26; i. 52. 2.
namasyū, viii. 27. 11; i. 55. 4; Smṛti. Compare the new forms
manasyū, in x.; apasyū, in i., ix.; makhasyū, in ix., x.;
ghyanaśū, in x.; for dvasyū, see List ii., above; panasyū,
v. 56. 9; urusyū, viii. 48. 5; avisya, i. 169. 5; viii. 48. 23;
56. 9.
nrvāhas, viii. 25. 23; i. 6. 2. In ii. 37. 5, nrvāhana.
pandhyya, Vāl. 9. 3; i. 160. 5; Brāh.
patayīśu, viii. 27. 12; i. 163. 11; patayīśukā, AV. vi. 18. 3.
Causals in -īśu all belong to the later group, if I am not
mistaken. The only early adj. not causal so made is carīśu,
iv. 7. 9; vi. 61. 8; while like patayīśu are mādayīśu, only
i. 14. 4; viii. 71. 2; AV.; the unique namayīśnavas, voc.
ii. 20. 1; pārayīśu, x. 97. 3; AV.; Brāh.; Epic; tāpay-
īśu, x. 34. 7. Compare also the companion-piece to carīśu
in ānāyīśu, x. 94. 11.*
patsudās, vii. 43. 6; i. 32. 8; compare ṭūršāv, but here adv.
from locative. This is the only form of this sort in RV.
Compare hṛtās, pattās, in x.
pāprī, 'saving,' in viii. 16. 11; i. 91. 21; AV.; and Brāh. As
'offering,' 'rich,' in early books.
pratādasu, viii. 13. 27; krātādasu, ib. 31. 9; and patādasu, i.
119. 1, are unique compounds and belong together. Early is
vidādasu, i. 6. 6; iii. 34. 1; v. 39. 1; viii. 55. 1. Compare
rāhādri, viii. 46. 23; rāhādvāra, vi. 3. 2. Of the same form
is the āy. -lcy. mandādvāra, viii. 58. 1. Compare kṣayādvāra,
in List iv., below.

* There are two more forms of this sort, poṣayīśu and coṣayīśu,
both in AV. The observation above holds good only for causals. The
other forms (here without t), ṭīnu, vṛdhahus, carīṇu, appear in family
books. In x., ix., and VS., respectively, are found niṣṭalīnu, vadhahus,
daṅgūnu.
(pratür), supratür, prástüri, are implied in suprătůti in iii. 9. 1. prăbhartar, viii. 2. 35; i. 178. 3 (prabhartanya, Smṛti). The noun prabharman occurs in compound, v. 32. 4; otherwise only in viii., i. x.

praçaśana, viii. 61. 1; i. 112. 3; Brāh.; Epic. In the late hymn of priest's names, ii. 5, occurs praçaśtăr, vs. 4; elsewhere only in i. 94. 6; VS.; Brāh., etc. Compare the use of gāstrā, in RV. only in viii. 33. 16; of the verb prā gās, in i. and x. only; and of praçaś in i., ix., x. only.

prāśti, viii. 7. 28; i. 39. 6 (100. 17); prāśṭimant, vi. 47. 24 (dānakutu, late); further in AV., Brāh., etc.

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

prāvargyā, viii. 4. 6; supravargyā, viii. 22. 18; dāśapravarga, i. 92. 8 (prā as in prāyoga, x. 106. 2).

bāhūtā, viii. 90. 2; i. 41. 2.

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

matṛā, viii. 46. 23; i. 181. 5. Compare Aufrecht*, Preface, p. iv.

mandādevir and mādayiṃtā, see above under prādāvasu, pata-
iṃtā, respectively.

yavṛdhīś, sic, viii. 87. 8; yavṛd, i. 167. 4; 173. 12.

yāhr, (vii. 15. 11; ) viii. 4. 5; 19. 12; 49. 13; 73. 5; i. 28. 10; 74. 5; 79. 4.*

yuvātā, viii. 33. 5; i. 181. 3, 7. The formation, like that of rōmapā, rōman, and ārvaṇa or arvaṇā, arvan, is not found in other family books, unless turvāpa be a case, which, however, probably comes direct from turvā (not from turvān), like ṝtaṇa from ṝtaṇa.

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

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

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

vājādāvan, viii. 2. 34; i. 17. 4. In Brāh., name of a Śāman, vājādāvari.

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

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

vibhūta, in composition, vibhūtarūti, viii. 19. 2; vibhūtadvayumā, viii. 33. 6; i. 156. 1. Common in later literature, to judge by the fact that vibhūtamanas is used to explain vimanas in Nir.

vivāvan, viii. 91. 22; i. 187. 7.

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

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

viśvāpiṣṭa, viii. 26. 7; viśvāpiṭā, i. 162. 22.

viṣṇaṇaṇa, vii. 20. 10; nom. prop., i. 51. 13, Brāh., etc.

viṣṇanuvant, viii. 57. 18; i. 100. 16; 122. 3; 173. 5; 182. 1. 

caṭṭiparan, see under caṭṭbraddha, List i. (above).

caṭṭukvāni, viii. 23. 5; caṭṭukvandā, i. 130. 3 (late).

cavin, cavinyā, viii. 46. 31; i. 100. 18, respectively. The latter appears to be a late verse.

sacānas, (sacānastamā), sacanās, viii. 26. 8; i. 127. 11 (verb, sacanasa, x. 4. 3). In viii. 22. 2, sacandvānt. But in i. 116. 18; vi. 39. 1, sacanā.

sambhṛtāpva, viii. 34. 12; sambhṛtakra, voc., i. 52. 8. These are both of Indra, and the only such compounds before Brāh., except sambhṛtacṛi, AV. xix. 49. 1.

sugāvya, viii. 12. 33; i. 162. 22. Compare i. 116. 25, sugāva.

In Mbh., sugava is a karmadhāraya.

sūgmya, viii. 22. 15; i. 48. 13; 173. 4.

sūdyat, viii. 23. 4; i. 140. 1; 143. 3.

suprāvargā, see prāvargā, above.

sūrupā, viii. 4. 9; sūrupakṛtā, i. 4. 1; common adj. of the later period (not in AV.). The kṛtnā extension is found in the Talavakāra Brāh., vi. 155 (Burnell's MS.), sūrūpakṛtā.

sūryaṃkṛta, viii. 66. 11; i. 56. 12; Epic. Compare sūryaskṛta, viii. 33. 9; v. 76. 2 (kṛtā).

sṛṣṭitānu, viii. 25. 5; i. 93. 3.

sūmakāma, viii. 50. 2; i. 104. 9; AV.

hāridravā, viii. 35. 7; i. 50. 12 (late). See Note, p. 79.

hīranjaya, i. 79. 1; hīranjakeśa, viii. 32. 29=82. 24. Later, Hiṃjakeśa, Hiṃrakeśa. In early form, hārikeśa, of Agni, iii. 2. 13.

Somewhat over one-fifth of the forms here noted as common to viii. and i. alone are found in the hymns of the latter book ascribed to various Kāvyas (12–23, 36–50). Occasionally a word like arŚān helps to show that hymns now placed before the Kāvyas collection of i. may have come from the Kāvyas family; thus this word arŚān, for example, occurs in hymns i. 7 and i. 10 as well as in 38, and would also indicate that viii. 90 comes, like other hymns of viii. ascribed to other than Kāvyas, from the Kāvyas. The hymns placed before the Vālakhilya furnish most of the correspondence with i., but the final hymns of viii. are also well represented. This indicates again (compare the observations on pp. 52, 55) that hymns viii. 1–48 are in general later than the hymns that now follow right after the Vālakhilya.
I take up now the common vocabulary of viii. and i., as it is shared by x. and ix. And first, the common vocabulary of viii., i., and x.

ajá, see note.*

adhvaragñ, viii. 4. 14; i. 44. 3; 47. 8; x. 36. 8; 78. 7.

andúrā, viii. 47. 10; i. 114. 1; x. 94. 11; 97. 20. Compare ātūra, only in viii. Both words occur in AV., and later ātūra is common.

ānvorata, viii. 13. 19; i. 34. 4; 51. 9; x. 34. 2; four times in AV.; in Brāh., Epic, etc. Compare vivrata, below.

āparikṣert, viii. 67. 8; i. 100. 19; 102. 11; x. 63. 5. Compare pariṅert, āt. lex. in viii. 47. 6 (but in viii. 82. 7; ix. 79. 2, pariṅert).

abhikhyād, vii. 23. 5; i. 148. 5; x. 112. 10; but abhikhyātār in iv. 17. 17.

irīna, viii. 4. 3; 76. 1. 4; i. 186. 9; x. 34. 1. 9; once in AV.; also in Brāh., etc.

udāra, viii. 1. 23; 2. 1; 17. 8 (napódara); 67. 7; 80. 5; i. 25. 15; 30. 8; 42. 9; 162. 10; x. 86. 23; AV., Brāh., etc. Both udāra and jāthāra are in use in Smṛti. But in RV., the former is not found in other family books, and the latter is found but once in viii. (81. 23, plural). This coincides with AV., where udāra is used often and jāthāra but thrice. With napódara, compare viii. 1. 23, sphīrd. For the Avestan correspondence, see final Note, p. 81.

keṣayādvāra (compare pratidvāna, in List iii., above), viii. 19. 10; i. 106. 4; 114. 1–3. 10; 125. 3; x. 92. 9.

keṣurā, viii. 4. 18; i. 166. 10; x. 28. 9. The word does not mean a razor, but a blade,—in i. 166 fastened upon a car-wheel (late); and so in viii. 4. 16, not scissors but a rapidly turning blade (AV. xx. 127. 4) is implied. In AV. it is the blade of an arrow. The word is old, but its special application is worked out differently in India and Greece.

[candrámās, late word for ‘moon,’ v. 51. 15 (sūryācandrámās, which, again, occurs only in viii., x.); i. 102. 2; x. 190. 3 (in both cases, sūryācandrámās); and candrámās in viii. 71. 8; i. 24. 10; 84. 15; 105. 1; x. 64. 3; 85. 19; 90. 15].

carītra, viii. 48. 5; i. 116. 15; x. 117. 7; AV. Later as ‘behavior.’

dānsīṣṭha, viii. 22. 1; 24. 25, 26; i. 182. 2; x. 143. 3.

* In viii. 41. 10; i. 87. 5; 164. 6; x. 82. 6, ajá means the ‘unborn.’ As this is a meaning used in later literature, the word deserves a place in the list. But other passages may be so interpreted, though the meaning here is that assigned by PW. and Grassmann to these passages alone.
[durhānā, i. 38. 6; 121. 14; durhanāy, x. 134. 2; durhanāyā, in the late verse iv. 30. 8; durhānāvant, viii. 2. 20; 18. 14.]
drāghyās āyub, vii. 18. 18; the phrase completed by jivāse; in i. 53. 11; x. 18. 2–3; 115. 8, by pratrāṁ dādāhānāḥ. The same phrase in AV., Brāh.; not elsewhere in RV. Even drāghyās happens to occur, in other application, only in x.
Several other late forms occur in the same hymns of viii.
dhānu, viii. 3. 19; i. 33. 4; 144. 5; x. 4. 3; 27. 17. Compare dūpā in vii., i. Compare also ḍhanas in Manu. Both late and early is the related dhāvan.
dhūmaṅketa, viii. 43. 4; 44. 10; i. 27. 11; 44. 3; 94. 10; x. 4. 5; 12. 2. In RV., epithet of Agni. Later, Epic, ‘comet.’* The idea is given (dhūmas te kētuḥ) in v. 11. 3.
nimrūc, viii. 27. 19; i. 151. 5; 161. 10; x. 151. 5; AV.; Brāh. parvaṇas, see final Note, below, p. 75.
pārṣu, viii. 6. 46; i. 105. 8; x. (33. 2); 86. 23; (prathupārṣu, vii. 83. 1). It is questionable whether in the last passage pārṣu is ax or people.
pīy, see pīyati in List i., above.
pūrvāpūti, viii. 3. 7; i. 19. 9; 134. 1; 135. 1; x. 112. 1. With the exception of the last passage, where the nominative is used, always pūrvāpūtya. Compare pūrvāpāyīya only in viii. 34. 5. Early are pūrvapād and pūrvapāyā,†
prāyat, viii. 58. 18; i. 109. 2; 126. 5; x. 129. 5. The corresponding nomen agentis occurs in early books.
prayaṭ, viii. 37. 5; i. 186. 9; x. 33. 1; 77. 5; 96. 12; AV. In the first passage prayaṭ (like prayaṇaka, yāga) is ‘activity,’ as opposed to kṣema; in the other passages, ‘team.’
prāśravana, viii. 33. 1; 54. 2; i. 180. 8; x. 148. 2; common in the Epic. In viii. 89. 9, purāṇaprāśravana, śr. lēy.[phēna, ‘foam,’ in the late verse iii. 53. 22; otherwise only in viii. 14. 13; i. 104. 3; x. 61. 8; AV., etc. Probably, however, the omission is not significant, as the meaning would not often have to be expressed.]
bāhūjas, viii. 20. 6; 82. 2; i. 135. 9; x. 111. 6; adj. except in 82. 2.
bhādbhānu, viii. 78. 2; i. 27. 12; 36. 15; x. 140. 1.
māde-māde, vii. 13. 7; i. 81. 7; x. 120. 4.
mānavas, the plural of mānu occurs only viii. 18. 22; i. 89. 7; 96. 2; x. 66. 12; 91. 9; twice in AV.
mandhātar, vii. 39. 8; 40. 12; i. 112. 13; x. 2. 2; nom. prop., Epic māndhātar.
rudrāvartani, vii. 22. 1, 14; i. 3. 3; x. 39. 11; VS. Compare krṣṇavartani in vii.; rāghavartani in vii., ix.
romapā, vii. 31. 9; 80. 6; i. 126. 7; x. 86. 16; post-Rik (Epic). For rōman is found lōman only in x.

* Compare Weber, Om. Port., p. 897.
† Compare pūrodcitaye in List v. (below).
‡ Here as mandhāṭriṇī. In 48. 18 in one verse occur bhṛguṇā, manuvād, anigrahaṇād.
vivrata, viii. 12. 15; i. 63. 2; x. 23. 1; 49. 2; 105. 2 (all these of hārī); x. 105. 4, of rivers; ib. 55. 3, of light. The only other passage cited is AV. ii. 8. 5. Compare ánuvratā, above.

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

[vrd, in the mystic verse iv. 1. 16; otherwise only viii. 2. 6; i. 124. 8; 196. 5; x. 123. 2; AV.]

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

svātrā, viii. 52. 5; i. 31. 4; x. 88. 4. Compare svātrakāhā, viii. 4. 9, ūr. lēya; and svātrya, x. 49. 10; 108. 2; 160. 2. Not in AV., but in VS.

haviṣkṛt, viii. 49. 15; 91. 13; i. 13. 3; 166. 2; x. 66. 6. Compare -kṛti, i. 18. 8; 93. 3; x. 91. 11; -pati, i. 12. 8; -pd, x. 15. 10; -vāh, i. 72. 7; havirād, x. 15. 10; havirmāthi, vii. 104. 21, late. Also in the family books, havirāda and havirādā.*

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

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

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

Decidedly late is i. 162.

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

[napīt, viii. 2. 42; i. 50. 9 (Kāṇva hymn); ix. 9. 1; 14. 5; 69. 3; three times in AV.; and also in the first verse of the markedly late hymn RV. iii. 31.1]†

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

pārī pū, viii. 2. 2; i. 135. 2; ix. 69. 3; 98. 7. The combination is common in Śk., where paripūtā is colloquial and technical both. In RV., only viii., i., and ix. have the compound.  

* The compounds increase rapidly in subsequent literature; and havīṣkṛt itself occurs four times in AV. alone; though never in RV. ii.—vii.†
† This verse is expunged by Grassmann because of its metre and interference with the strophic arrangement.
‡ In some of these cases, especially in i., where the fingers and hands are called by this name, napīt seems to me to have lost all sense of relationship (‘daughter’) and to be equivalent to ‘girl’ or ‘young woman.’ In the late verse viii. 2. 42 also this seems to be the meaning. The poet praises the gift of two young women (as in 46. 83) whom he calls rānasya napītā, i. e. filles de joie.
pūrvācittaye. As pūrvāpīti occurs only in viii., i., and x. (above), so pūrvācittaye (sic) occurs only in viii. 3. 9; 6. 9; 12. 33; 25. 12; i. 84. 12; 112. 1; 159. 3; ix. 99. 5. The word is not found in RV. in other cases; but later the word (in nom. etc.) is the name of a nymph.
yājana, in the meaning ‘preparation’ (of song, like suṣrūkī), is found only in vii. 79. 3; i. 88. 5; ix. 7. 1; 102. 3. The meaning ‘preparation’ is common in the Epic, and occurs in Sūtra.
vasoṣvīḍ, vii. 90. 16; i. 91. 11; ix. 64. 23; 91. 3.
yāṣṭāṇa(vāḍ). This man and his progeny and imitators are referred to in vii. 9. 10; 23. 23; 24. 22; 26. 9; i. 112. 15; ix. 65. 7 (a Kāṇva hymn). Compare vāṭiyāṇaḥ, in hymns of viii.
ṣyendāśī, viii. 84. 3; i. 80. 2; ix. 87. 6.
sakṣāṇi (from sah), vii. 24. 28; i. 111. 3; ix. 110. 1. In v. 41, 4, occurs sakṣāṇa. In viii. 59. 8, sakṣāṇi (sāc) should be compared with 22. 15.
senēti (v. i. snēhīt), viii. 85. 13; i. 74. 2; verb, in ix. 97. 54. Later, the verb is common. Verb and derivative in RV. appear only here.

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

adās, adv., viii. 10. 1; 26. 17; i. 187. 7; ix. 65. 22; x. 72. 6; 155. 3; 186. 3; AV.; Brāh.
aydoya, viii. 51. 2; i. 62. 7; ix. 44. 1; x. 67. 1; 108. 8; 138. 4; as nom. prop., reputed author of ix. 44–46; x. 67–68; common word in Brāh. Windisch., KZ. xxvii. 171, connects with ātīyās. In the other family books, aydoṣ.
ātmān. This word occurs but twice in the family-books, ii.–vii. In vii. 87. 2, ātmān te vṛtth, the word must mean ‘breath.’* In the mystic Parjanya hymn, vii. 101, a phrase of the sixth verse (= i. 115. 1) makes Parjanya (or, in i. 115, the sun) the ‘self or soul of the world.’ So in i., ix.,† and x., while not entirely losing the more primitive significatio, ātmān has the later meaning of ‘spirit’ or ‘soul.’ In viii., this meaning occurs once, namely, in 3. 24 (ātānastuti). For the other cases, see Grassmann. The form tmān=ātmān occurs in the family books, in the meaning ‘self’ (reflexive—not ‘soul’); but not in viii. I exclude tmānā, as not belonging to tmān.]
ksīrā, vii. 2. 2; i. 104. 3; 164. 7; ix. 67. 32; x. 87. 16: ksīra-)
pākān, viii. 66. 10, common in AV., Brāh., Sīmṭi.

* This, however, does not appear to be an early hymn.
† ix. 2. 10; 6. 8 (74. 4; 88. 8); 118. 1.
gāthā, gāthā. (Compare gāyatrī.) Significant of the relation between viii. and later literature is the fact that gāthā, gāthā, is a common Brahmanic word, that it is used several times in AV., that it occurs quite frequently also in RV. viii. i., ix., and x., and is yet almost unknown to the family books ii.—vii. In fact, save in the late hymn v. 44 (ṛjugāthā, vs. 5), there is not a single occurrence of gāthā, gāthā, in these books. In the group of books now under consideration gāthā occurs at i. 167. 6; ix. 11. 4; gāthāpati, i. 43. 4; gāthāpravacan, viii. 2. 38; gāthā, viii. 32. 1; 60. 14; 87. 9; ix. 99. 4; x. 85. 6 (with nārāyaṇī); gāthānī, i. 190. 1; viii. 81. 2; the Epic gāthin, at i. 7. 1. In view of the revival of the word in AV., Brāh., etc., the total absence of gāthā, gāthā in ii.—vii. (barring the sole exception just mentioned), and the occurrence of the word and its nearest kin in i., viii., ix., and x. is most noteworthy and significant.*

gāyatrī. (Compare gāthā.) The treatment of gāyatrī, -trī, is parallel with that of gāthā barring Iranian relations. gāyatrī is common in the later literature, not uncommon in AV., and not uncommon in RV. viii., i., ix., and x.; while in ii.—vii. it is found only in the notoriously late hymn, ii. 45.† Apart from that passage, the occurrences are: i. 12. 11; 21. 2; 27. 4; 38. 14; 79. 7; 120. 6; 164. 23, 24, 25; 188. 11; viii. 1. 7, 8; 2. 14; 16. 9; 38. 10; ix. 60. 1; x. 71. 11; gāyatrī, x. 14. 16 (AV. xvii. 2. 6) and 130. 4; gāyatrāvaranī, viii. 38. 6; gāyatrādepas, i. 142. 12; viii. 1. 10; gāyatrīnī, i. 10, 1. The word gāyatrī, as a name for RV. iii. 62. 10, is not Vedic.

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

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

tristūbha, see List viii., below.

* Oldenberg, ZDMG. xxxviii. 459-84, seeks to explain the phenomena by the fact that viii. is especially a Sāman-book. But this does not explain, e. g., why gāyatrī occurs in just the latest part of viii.
† In vs. 1, of the bird of evil omen. The hymn is the last of the book, and of distinctly Ṭhārvan character. The words are: ubhē veda yadavidā sāmāgāh tvam gāyatrī na tatraśubhakāh cānu rājati.
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niśa, viii. '43. 10; i. 144. 1; ix. 85. 3; x. 74. 2; 92. 2; 94. 9. The word does not occur in AV., and is not cited from Bräh., but it appears in Pāṇini. The Epic word for 'kiss' occurs in i. 185. 5, ghrā (with abhi, as in Bräh.; but in Epic with ava, á, upā, samā, etc.).

[prtany. In ii. 8. 6, the last verse of the hymn, there is a sudden change of metre from gāyatri to anuṣṭubh. Note also that pāda a has the Epic cadence. If these may be taken as indications that the sixth verse is not part of the original hymn, the rejection of the verse removes the only exception to the rule that prtany occurs in the group i., viii., ix., x., alone. The adjective prtanyú occurs in the early books (iv. 20. 1; vii. 6. 4); but of these at least the latter hymn would seem to be late. The verb occurs as follows: ii. 8. 6 (see above); viii. 40. 7; 75. 5 (both ptc.); i. 8. 4 (ptc.); 32. 7; 54. 4; 132. 1 (ptc.), 6; ix. 35. 3 (ptc.); 55. 3; 61. 29 (ptc.); x. 27. 10; 43. 6 (ptc.); 152. 4 (ptc.); 174. 2 (ptc.) and nine times besides in AV.]

priyā (compounds). A formation common in Śruti. Compare Epic priyakara, priyakāra, priyadarpa, priyadarśana, priyavāda, etc. In AV., VS., and Brähmana, these compounds are also not uncommon. Compare priyādhaman, priyādaman, priyādādin, priyāpati. This is a formation* known in RV. only to books viii., i., ix., x. Compare priyāksatra, voc., viii. 27. 19; priyajata, voc., viii. 60. 2; priyādhamana, i. 140. 1; priyāratha, i. 122. 7; priyārata, x. 150. 3 (and Bräh.); priyāsita, ix. 97. 38; priyāsottata, i. 91. 6; priyāsirya, x. 40. 11. Compare also the name Priyāmedha (author of hymns in viii. and of ix. 28, and, in plural, name of his race): i. 139. 9; viii. 5. 25; plural, i. 45. 4; viii. 2. 37; 3. 16; 4. 20; 6. 45; 8. 18; 58. 8, 18; 76. 3; x. 73. 11; priyāmedhavā, i. 45. 3; priyāmedhastuta, viii. 6. 45; prāi-yāmedha, Brāhmaṇas.

madacayā, viii. 1. 21; 7. 13; 22. 16; 33. 18; 34. 9; 35. 19; 63. 13; 85. 5; 51. 2; 81. 3; 85. 7; 126. 4; ix. 12. 3; 32. 1; 53. 4; 79. 2; 108. 11; x. 30. 9; modalità, ix. 98. 3.

(madunīrata) madunīman, viii. 1. 19; 13. 23; 24. 16 (madunīnara); 58. 11; i. 91. 17; ix. 15. 8; 25. 6; 50. 4, 5; 62. 22; 67. 18; 74. 9; 80. 3; 85. 3; 86. 1, 10; 96. 13; 99. 6; 108. 5, 15; x. 138. 6. With the exception of viii. 13. 23; x. 138. 6; AV. xi. 7. 7; always of soma. The comparative occurs only in vii. 24. 16.

mēṣa, mēṣ, and varūhā. Indra is a ram in viii. 2. 40; 86. 12; Indra or Rudra, i. 51. 1; 52. 1. The Ayvins appear 'like two Rams' in the spiritless similes of x. 106. 5; and their

* That is, with priyā as first member of the compound. For the others, compare adhāpriya, kadhapriya, and kadhapri, only in viii. and i. Līt iii. The two other compounds show the partiality of the Kāṇvas for priyā. The first, harpriya, voc., occurs only in iii. 41. 8; the second, prurupriyā, occurs in iii. 3. 4; v. 18. 1; viii. 5. 4; 12. 10; 18. 4; 81. 14; 48. 31; 63. 1; i. 13. 3; 44. 8; 45. 6 (Kāṇva hymns).
pro tépé offers rams, i. 116. 16; 117. 17, 18. In ix. 8. 5; 86. 47; 107. 11, it is the 'wool of the ewe' (meš) that takes the place of that of the usual āvī. The remaining cases of mešá, meš are i. 43. 6; x. 27. 17; 91. 14.

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

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

viśántápa, viii. 32. 3; 34. 13; 58. 7; 86. 5; i. 46. 3; ix. 12. 6; 34. 5; 41. 6; 107. 14; x. 123. 2; AV. quinquies; Bráh.; Sútra. Compare also viśántápa (Lanman, loc. cit., p. 481), only viii. 80. 5; ix. 113. 10; AV. (viśántápa, viśántapá, each once); Bráh.; Smrṭi. Compare also viśámbhá, in ix.; AV.; Bráh.; Smrṭi; i. 46 is a Kháva hymn.

caryaṇvant (vati), viii. 6. 39; 7. 29; 53. 11; i. 84. 14; ix. 65. 22; 113. 1; x. 35. 2. Compare āṛjáka, in List vii., and āṛjákśya, in List viii., below.

hitá. The surprising use of ṣhitá in viii. 51. 3 (List i., above), a use that is paralleled only in Bráhmaṇas and Smrṭi, leads to the question whether there is a difference between hitá of the early books and hitá of the late. In viii. 43. 25; 49. 4; i. 166. 3; ix. 25. 2; 44. 2; 68. 7; 70. 10; 86. 13; x. 71. 10; 140. 3, hitá comes from hi. Everywhere else it seems to come from dhá.†

* The boar in i. 61. 7 is apparently Vishnu, and possibly viii. 66. 10 has reference to the same obscure legend. That the latter passage is late is attested by kṣirapákri and odánd in the same verse, with súrasmákṣêta in the following, the two making an addition, in different metre, to the original hymn. Possibly in ii. 14. 4 the úraṇa may be identical with the demon elsewhere slain by Indra, but there is nothing to indicate this.
† In the assignment of these forms to hi or dhá, the PW. (an unprejudiced critic) has been followed by me. At ix. 21. 4, the case is doubtful. The later Smrṭi meaning, 'agreeable,' is rare; but is probable at v. 43. 8; in the late iv. 97. 1; perhaps also at viii. 35. 7, and a few places in x.
A comparison of cases of verbal agreement (Lists iii.–vi.) shows that after the sixty-fifth hymn of the first book the parallelism with the eighth suddenly ceases, or almost ceases, to be resumed, with less striking effect than in the first part of the book, with the eightieth hymn of i.; and that a corresponding blank occurs between hymns 145 and 161, when a close parallelism begins again. The last lists bear out the observation made above, that in general the first half and the very last hymns of viii. show closest connection with other late parts of RV.

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

ániškta, see List viii., below.
apaivá, viii. 13, 2; 36, 1; ix. 106, 3. Compare apaivá, viii.; 
apamuká, i. 139, 11.
asrta, viii. 71, 9; ix. 3, 8; of Soma.
ařiká, compare aričtya, in List viii., below.
apadá, viii. 91, 15; ix. 54, 2.
urácára, viii. 1, 10; 82, 3; ix. 68, 1; Sútra.
krakṣa, avakráksán, viii. 1, 2; krákśamána, viii. 65, 11; vana-
krakṣá, ix. 108, 7.
tátá, viii. 80, 5, 6; ix. 112, 3; AV., etc.
tápti, viii. 71, 6; ix. 113, 10; AV. Later this is a common word.
duróasa, late form for duróasa, viii. 1, 13; ix. 101, 3.
dhva (dhaba), viii. 18, 14, 15; ix. 104, 6; 105, 6.
dhuívana, viii. 5, 35; ix. 88, 3; 97, 49; dhívá, ix. 86, 1, 4.
nává, viii. 25, 11; ix. 45, 5.
parisrá, viii. 39, 10; ix. 1, 6; 68, 1; VS.; later, name of a drink
(AV., Bráh.).
bhandáná, bhandánáy; the noun, in viii. 24, 15, 17; ix. 86, 41;
the verb, in ix. 86, 2. Early is bhand.
mádvan, viii. 81, 19; ix. 86, 35.
mándv ádhí, a phrase (accent!) that occurs only in viii. 81, 2;
ix. 63, 5; 65, 16.
rghívartani, viii. 9, 8; ix. 81, 2. Compare rudrívartani, in
List iv.
raśin, viii. 1, 26; 3, 1; ix. 113, 5; VS. As in Smrti, 'tasteful.'
vásutá, vii. 50, 7; ix. 44, 6. So deváta (List iii.) occurs only in
vii. and i.; and bhágati only once, in ix. 65, 17; while
mahánttí occurs in viii. 24, 10; 45, 15; 59, 9; x. 156, 2;
but also in iv. 42, 8 and v. 79, 5. The former of the two
last passages is late. The latter remains a lone parallel in v.
to the usage of the later group, as often.
vanurá, ix. 110, 6; vásuroći, viii. 34, 16. In AV., viii. 10, 27,
vánurucí, name of a Gandharva.
vádra, as 'sieve.' viii. 2, 2; ix., passim; perhaps in i. 132, 3; in
Bráh., váda.
Virayá, viii. 81. 28; ix. 36. 6. The substantive, vii. 90. 1 (virayá); ix. 64. 4. The verb, viray, i. 116. 5; x. 103. 6; 128. 5; Bráh.

catāvája, catámañgha, see List i. (above).

sánvasa, viii. 39. 7; AV.; sánvásana, ix. 86. 17.

sámgírañ, in phrase, viii. 58. 11 = ix. 61. 14. Compare i. 65. 4, súcíva.

sahárodi, viii. 34. 7; ix. 62. 14 (in i. 52. 2, sahásaramúti).

svárpati, viii. 44. 18; 86. 11; ix. 10. 2; Smrti.

svásta, vii. 66. 6; ix. 74. 2.

hétar [compare prahetá in List i. above], viii. 88. 7; ix. 62. 6; hetá, ix. 13. 6; 84. 29.

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

[ánisktra, etc. With the exception of īsktra at vii. 76. 2 (where the poet alludes to the ‘poets of old’ as if he himself were a later one), all cases of the late and misbegotten īskr-forms occur where we should expect them, in viii., i., ix., and x. They are plainly due to the misapprehended a-nísktra forms, felt as if made up of the elements an- and īsktra. The occurrences—of every sort—are worth locating. Most notable is the collocation īskartára anísktram, viii. 88. 8; less so, (parískryuvám) anísktram, ix. 39. 2, the only form of this ilk in ix. Further, we find: īskartár, x. 140. 5; īskartar, viii. 1. 12; 20. 28; īsktra, vii. 78. 2; īskryudhram, x. 55. 7; 101. 2; īskam, x. 48. 8; īskrta, x. 97. 9; īsktháva, x. 101. 6.]

asatihán, viii. 78. 2; 88. 5; ix. 62. 11; 87. 2; x. 55. 8.

ārjiká, vii. 7. 29; ix. 65. 23; 113. 2; ārjikáya, viii. 53. 11; x. 75. 5. See Hillebrandt, Ved. Myth., p. 137.

tristábh, vii. 7. 1; 58. 1; ix. 97. 35; x. 14. 16; 130. 5. Tráśtubha occurs in i. 164. 23, 24 and ii. 45. 1 (both hymns are indubitably late), and in v. 29. 6.

durmásá, vii. 45. 18; ix. 97. 8; x. 45. 8; Puranic in the sense ‘unendurable.’

yávamant, viii. 82. 3; ix. 69. 8; x. 42. 7; 131. 2. Compare yavayá, only in vii. 67. 9.

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

* Compare Lanman, loc. cit., p. 475; Bloomfield, PAOS., March. 1894, =Journal, xvi., p. cxxvi; and Scott, Transactions of the Am. Philol. Assoc., xxiii. 179 ff, who gives a mass of examples, for instance, an adder = a nadder.

† In either case, viii. shows a distinct advance toward classical usage. The old Bhága worshipper says: bhágam ánuyro ádha yáti rágna (viii. 86. 6); the later ánugra says rather: ké ádhanam ná yácipt (viii. 1. 30).
yāthyā, Vāl. 8. 4; ix. 15. 4; x. 23. 4; Brāh., Epic.

rathary, viii. 90. 2; ix. 3. 5; x. 37. 3. Compare vadhay, only i. 161. 9, grathary, only x. 77. 4. The only old parallel is sapary.

lokā. With the exception of the late hymn, vi. 47 (Lanman, loc. cit., p. 578), no hymn of the early books has the form lokā (vi. 47. 8). But lokā is the form in viii. 89. 12; ix. 113. 7, 9; x. 14. 9; 85. 20, 24; 90. 14; AV.; Brāh.; Smṛti. The compounds vary according to the position of the word: ulokakṛt, ix. 86. 21; x. 133. 1; ulokakṛtmā, viii. 15. 4; ix. 2. 8; urā-loka, x. 128. 2; jivaloka, x. 18. 8; patiloka, x. 85. 43. The AV. has the last three, and six more such compounds; changing ulokakṛt to lokakṛt, and having also one more compound like it, lokajīt.* As ix. 113. 7, 9 and x. 90 are certainly late, the supposition must arise that viii. 89. 12 and x. 14. 9 belong to the same period. x. 85 has such a mixture of old and new that it has no weight in the scale. In sense, ulokakṛt is like urukṣṛd urū pas kṛthi, viii. 64. 11 (compare urū-loka, x. 128. 2).

A comparison of the words in viii. and ix. shows that the group beginning with ix. 107 exhibits the closest resemblance to viii. The long hymn ix. 86 shows more correspondence than all the dozen preceding it, perhaps merely on account of its length. The cut-up hymns beginning with ix. 90 show very marked similarity. This hymn is ascribed to a Kāyva, and has signs of the relation; yet the Priyamedha of ix. 28 leaves no verbal sign; but he has the phraseology, which reappears, though not exclusively there, in viii. 15. Nor does the Medhyāṭā of ix. 42 and 43 use the special vocabulary of viii., though there is one token in 41, also ascribed to him. The Kāyapa of ix. 53 has something in common with viii.; but even more has the Brugu of ix. 63. In ix. 94 and 95, Kāyva hymns, there is a remarkable absence of similarity. In fact the latter is marked by an older use (jāthāra) as against that of viii.; and it is quite possible that these are earlier hymns of the Kāyva family. Suggestive is the fact that in general the latter half of ix. has a much closer verbal correspondence with viii. than has the prior portion; probably because this latter half is the later, especially in the group, ix. 107 ff.

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

* The modern explanation that ur is a Tamil-like prefix, before l, does not seem to be supported by the evidence. But it is not a question of derivation; it is merely a question of historical literary form. And here it is evident, since lokā is used in late literature and only ulokā (fifteen times) in the early books ii.-vii., that ulokā, whether the original or only a contraction of two words, is the earlier form in Vedic phraseology. This older ulokā survives in i. 98. 6; ix. 92. 5; x. 18. 2; 16. 4; 30. 7; 104. 10; 180. 8. For the form, see IF. ii. 10; ZDMG. xii. 499; xiii. 102.
rather desperately: "pūṣana did not fall from heaven;" meaning apparently that it must have been always in existence, and that it is folly to reject a verse of the RV. because it appears from its vocabulary to be late.

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

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

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

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

In viii. 58. 14 occurs śūṭham, and only here in the Rig. But it comes up again in AV., SV., Brāh., and Smṛti. Is it not more probable that the verse belongs nearer to the period where it is generally found than that the word has skipped the Rig period to reappear later?

Striking is the correspondence between viii. and ix. in respect of soma-epithets—see List vi., above. To what cause is to be attributed the fact that madacyāt(a) occurs eight times in viii., six times in ix., four times in i., once in x., and in no other passage? Is there congruence here between viii. and the family books or between viii. and the General Books? And its companion madintara, madintama? It occurs fifteen times in ix.; four times in viii.; once each in i. and x.; both of the latter being late (for the verse i. 91. 17 is later than the venerable hymn in which it is found, and x. 136 is as a whole a late hymn). The word occurs also in AV. xi. 7. 7 :

rājaśayan vājaśayan agniśomās tād adhvarāh
arākṣvamedāhī vāchāṁ śrīvānāh madintamaḥ.

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

**Final Note.**

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

There are quite a number of such cases, and some of them I have reserved for this Final Note. There are others, however, which do not, indeed, show the late stamp in the exceptions; but yet these exceptions are enough to raise an interest in the character and history of the word. Thus, neither v. 33. 6 nor vi. 20. 10 is to be marked as late; yet both verses occur in hymns of the same character, two triśūdh hymns to Indra, each more or less obviously “entastelt,” as Grassmann says of both. The first of
these verses contains vásavāna, a word that occurs in i., viii., and x., but not elsewhere in family books; the second contains púrah cāradīhit, an expression found elsewhere only in i., and mentions Purukutsa, who is known only to i., and to the late dānastuti of iv. 42 ("strife between Varuṇa and Indra"), if purukūtsāni, ib., imply the same person. Now this is not enough to show that these verses are late, but it is enough to make interesting the fact that they are the only places in the Rig-Veda where pra stū occurs in the family books. For pra stū is a very important word in a liturgical sense; and it is one of the commonest of words in late literature, being current as early as the Brāhmaṇas. Looking back, it is found five times in the Atharvan (apart from one Rik example); then, in x. 67. 3 of the Rik, and in x. 105. 6; both of them late among the late. And further, in i. 154. 2 and i. 159. 1, the former of which, by the way, seems to be an echo of x. 180. 2 (or perhaps is borrowed). Then prātatū occurs in i. 153. 2, to rise to light again in the Upanishads. All these hymns, it will be noticed, belong to the same Dirghatamas collection. Then pra stū occurs four times more, viii. 16. 1; 22. 6; 35. 11; 70. 5; and nowhere else in the Rik. Whether this sudden concentration of pra stū in viii. be the result of the prastotar's added importance, or whether it be a new word working its way into literature, the result is interesting. It occurs in viii. and AV. about the same number of times. It does not occur at all in four out of the six remaining family books; it does occur in two late hymns of the late tenth book, and in the Dirghatamas hymns of the first (whose Epic name stands in RV. only in i. and viii.).* Whatever age is assigned to the two hymns of the family books where pra stū occurs, the marked difference between this twofold occurrence in six family books as against double that number in viii. alone, and the agreement of the latter with the General Books and later usage is noteworthy. That the same combination occurs in Avestan fəra stū, which might have been separately developed, leads to the question in how many other instances viii. with the General Books and post-Rik literature agrees with Avestan as against the early family books.

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

* But Māmateyā in iv. 4. 18.
word.* Now the contact with ix. is here wholly on the surface. The verse where the word occurs is the last of the hymn, in reference to which with its fellow (the penultimate verse) Grassmann says: "Added by a later hand and refers to the whole collection; found again in S.V. increased by four verses." And the benedictory character of the verse supports this view ("who reads these hymns gets milk and honey," etc.).

In this instance the end of ix. is in touch with viii.; and viii. joins the later Avesta to post-Rik literature and the other General Books. The word, with misplaced accent, is related to kār as is tīra to tar; withal not in Rik but in Epic application. Compare Epic tathā kīram kśaranty etāh (gāvah); cited with other illustrations by PW. Significant, however, is the fact that kār, though often employed in RV., is not there used of milk. In ii.–vii., pūyāh, gāvah, etc., do duty for 'milk.' But gō remains, of course, as equivalent throughout the Rik. While the gō compounds predominate in the later group,† the mixture called ' sour-milk mixture,' dāūthyačīr, does not occur in viii. at all (dadāhān itself, only in viii. 2. 9), whereas the sweetening of the soma is a pronounced feature of this book: svadanti gāvah, ix. 82. 5; gōbhīṁ svādāṁ akarma grīndatāḥ; gavyād vāśtraṇa vāsāyantah, viii. 2. 3; 1. 17 (compare i. 135. 2; ix. 3. 5; 75. 5, etc.).§ The root kār is used chiefly of soma, as in ix. 85. 5: gōbhīr aṣyaṣe. ... indraṣya jāthāre śām akṣarad; viii. 13. 4: iyān to indra rātiḥ kṣarati sumvatāḥ; sometimes of rivers, as in i. 72. 10. A good example of the way it is not used of milk is furnished by i. 90. 6 and 8: mādhun kṣaranti śāṅkavah ... māṭhivā rāve bhavantu nah. In the Vāśakhilya it is used of prayers (i. 6; 2. 4). In the family books it is used four times, once of a ship, twice of rivers, and once in a sense not obvious (v. 86. 5); never here of soma (as in viii. and ix.).

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

---

* As also varāhī (see below). The verse reads viṣṇu tā viṣṇur dhāra-rad urukranda toṣṭāḥ pātāṁ mahiṣāṁ kṣirāpākām odandāṁ varāhāṁ ināta emūsdī. The metre of this, the penultimate, as of the ultimate stanza, differs from that of the preceding; and emūsīn is a late form (Lanman, loc. cit., p. 511).
† Compare gāl, 'drop,' and ṭāka.
§ gōmant (soma, sudā), viii. 8. 1; 18. 14; 71. 6; 81. 80; 88. 6; ix. 88. 2 (107. 9?); gōṛita, viii. 21. 5; i. 137. 1; gōparina, viii. 45. 84; x. 82. 10; gōśakhi, v. 37. 4, but in viii. 14. 1 gōnākhiṣṭa śāṅkā (atotā me); in the family books, further, gōṛita (i.ii. 58. 4; vi. 23. 7; vii. 21. 1).
§ Compare Hillebrandt, loc. cit.
as good a right to its place as any, but they can scarcely deny the particularly mystic character of the production, which sets it on a par with the hymns of like sort in the General Books.* It is, therefore, not unimportant, to say the least, that in just such a hymn of the family books, and in no other, should be found a word used in viii., i., x., AV., Bräh., and particularly in (Epic) Sanskrit—in short, a word peculiarly post-Vedic in its province.

Curious is it to find two exceptions of this sort, both suspicious. Such is the case in the *ārīṣṭa* compounds. In AV. are found two compounds not in RV., viz., *ārīṣṭagū and ārīṣṭāsu*. In AV., and in RV. x. 60. 8; 97. 7; 137. 4 appears *ārīṣṭāti*, with the compound *ārīṣṭaratho* in x. 6. 3. In i. 166. 6 is found *ārīṣṭagrāma*; in i. 114. 3, *ārīṣṭavirā* (also in AV.); in viii. 18. 4, *ārīṣṭabharman*, voc.; in i. 89. 6; 180. 10; x. 178. 1; iii. 53. 17, *ārīṣṭanemi* (later as n. prop.); in v. 44. 3, *ārīṣṭagātu*. Now there is every reason for regarding v. 44 as a late hymn; and iii. 53. 17 is apparently the beginning of an after-hymn added to the original, and presumably later. These, however, are the only cases of *ārīṣṭa* compounds in the family books.

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

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

---

* This view of iii. 81 is supported by Lanman, loc. cit., p. 498.
† Words compounded with the ending *ga* offer a curious study, though the cases in the early books preclude the use of them in argument. But the facts may be worth presenting. There are no less than ten such words. The only cases which occur in family books (other than viii.) are in the probably late verse ii. 88. 8 (*ṣaṭapāda*); in the late hymn (to the sacrificial post) iii. 8. 9 (*preṇgaḍā*; also in i. 168. 10); in iii. 21. 5, of very modern tone (*devgaḍā*); and in vi. 82. 12 (*vagunaḍā*). On the other hand, *ṛcgaḍā* occurs only in i. 162. 4; x. 2. 5; 55. 8; 98. 11; AV.; *dhaṃgaḍa* and *rāphaḍa* occur only in i. 164. 15; *parvaḍa*, only in viii. 5. 18; 7. 22, 38; i. 37. 6; x. 79. 6; *manmaḍa*, only in viii. 15. 12; and *khaḍaṇgaḍa*, so common in the Epic, only in viii. 84. 15. The root, if it be *ga*, is found in i. 188. 19; iv. 87. 8, as verb; i. 193. 12; x. 89. 14; 85. 35; and i. 162. 5, 19, 30, as noun.
But the ancient Āpri ending runs as follows: *svāhā* (devā amṛtā mādayantām), which is found not only in the oldest Āpri, vii. 2. 11 (compare āśura of Agni in verse 3), but also in iii. 4. 11, and (the whole phrase) in x. 70. 11. Further, the only other instance of Āpri in family books, v. 5. 11, also has the *svāhā* alone (*svāhāḥ* añjñā, etc.). On the other hand, in the General Books the formula, save where the whole old formula is preserved intact (in x. 70. 11), contains *svāhākṛtiḥ* or *svāhākṛtaḥ* in the parallel verse of their Āpri hymns. Thus *svāhākṛtāṇyāḥ gāhy āpa havyāni vītāye, i. 142. 13; svāhākṛtāṇu rocate, i. 188. 11; svāhākṛtāṁ pāvamānasyā gata* (imitation of Āpri in majorem gloriam Somasya), ix. 5. 11; *svāhākṛtaṁ hāvīr adantu devāḥ, x. 110. 11.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So śūpārṇa, in use after RV., occurs in RV. vi. 48. 19; viii. 2.
1, 8. But the first verse is a late addition.

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

A very good example is furnished by citipṛthā in vii. 1. 25.
In the later literature piti compounds are very familiar. In RV.
there are, however, but two such compounds, citipād in i. 35. 6
(Kāvya), and citipṛthā in vii. 1. 25; iii. 7. 1. The latter is a
notoriously late hymn. The word itself is common after RV., in
Brahmanic literature. The passage in vii. goes with the late iii.
7 in giving it its sole support. Is one of these thus early and the
other later, with no examples between? Rather are they both
late, and approximate to the period where flourishes the piti
words.

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

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

There may even be cases where an example in a family book is
still usable, though it is unsuspected and unimpeachable, to offset
the unique appearance of a late word in viii. Who, for instance,
can really believe that viii. 45. 23 actually belongs to the older
part of the Rig-Veda? In iv. 7. 3 stands āhaskártár, and so it
may be said that has has a certain antiquity. But the root is else
unknown in the family books. It crops out again in i. 124. 7
(hasrá); in ix. 112. 4 (hasand); in x. 18. 3 (hása); and three times
in Kánya hymns, once, in i. 23. 12 (haskárd), and twice in viii.,
hásérti, 78. 6, and upahásvan, 45. 23. They are all lone forms.

But when we consider the Epic character of upa has, and the
fact that before the latest Brahmanic period (upahásó in Čat.
Br. xiv.) not one other case of the combination is cited, it becomes
impossible to believe that upa has has skipped from the early
Vedic period almost into the Epic (where it flourishes like a weed)
without leaving a trace. The root itself in other combinations,
as shown above, is barely represented in the family books of the
Rik. This Epic combination is known only in this verse (repeated
in AV. xx.). The only reasonable way to state the case is that
upahásvan belongs to the end of the Rik period, not to the early
period. There is mockery enough in the RV. to have brought
the word into use, if it had been current then as it is in the Epic.

Under the head of stylistic peculiarities should be ranged the
introduction into Vedic poetry of víšváçandra, as embodying
more emphatic laudation than the puruścandró of the old family
books. This weightier víšváçandra occurs only in i. 106. 8; viii.
70. 9; ix. 93. 5; x. 134. 3; and also in the late hymn (Lanman,
loc. cit., p. 457), iii. 31. 16.

Under the same category belongs the pronounced preference in
viii. and the General Books for superlatives and comparatives,
a preference which doubtless is to be explained by the later taste.
Thus: ádáçúṣṭara, abhitáḥatara, aváddatara, uruvycastama,
ojóditama, gátvítama, códíṣtha, júṣṭatra, mákṣútama, madhu-
pítama, varóvodátra, védíṣṭha, gíciovatatama, sacinastamá
(PW.), sáníṣṭha, sukétara, supárástama. Not one of these
occurs in the group ii.–vii.; but every one of them is found in
viii. alone or in viii. and the group i., ix., x. I may add from
the Valakhilya, párbbhitama, 5. 1, and maghavattama, voc.

* Compare “inclination,” in the sense ‘affection, love’ (Beattie).
6. 5; while a Kāṇva effusion in i. 42. 6 furnishes the mushy superlative *hiranyāvācimattama,* fitly invented for Pūshan. A good example of what a tasteless late poet will do in the way of heaping up laudation is given by viii. 81, where sāṇītha, dyumṇitama, citrāgravastama, vṛtrohāntama, and ojodātama occur in the space of three verses (15–17).*

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

A stylistic peculiarity, again, is the affectation of such alliteration as *cikād paccivadd pācibhiḥ,* found only in viii., i., x.; while perhaps in the alteration of *mahān mahābhīr utibhiḥ,* of the other family books, to the twice repeated *mahān mahābhīr pācibhiḥ* of viii. there lies nothing but a wish to strengthen the expression.

It may indeed well happen that a genuinely old word should occur only in viii. and the General Books. But compared with the lists of words common at once to this group and the following literature, such words are few. Perhaps *aydṣya* is *ādṣya* (List vi.); and *āri- in arisūtra, etc., may be the *āre- or ṭre- of ṭreṣṭro, ṭreṣṭro.* But, again, this may not be the case. Nor are *udāra* and *uterus* (I. ii. 15) to be equated with certainty. And *kṣurā,* though phonetically equivalent to *kṣura,* is not the same thing, but rather a developed 'blade,' for chariots, etc.† With ḍevaṇḍoḥ has been equated *hāridravā* (viii. 35. 7; i. 50. 12), but the case does not seem to be important. So *himū* chances to occur only viii. 32. 26; 62. 3; i. 116. 8; 119. 6 (x. 37. 10; 68. 10); himāvanta, x. 121. 4. But *himā* is found in the family books, so that this too is unimportant. As for *hyās,* which occurs only in viii. 55. 7; 88. 1; x. 55. 5, it is *χθος,* but as the latter does not occur till after Homer, so the word is not needed by the Vedic poets, and its absence in ii.–vii. has no especial weight. I have noticed no other examples like these.

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

---

* Some of these are noteworthy as illustrating the style and age of viii. Thus *vṛtrophāntama* occurs once in vi. (at 16. 48); once in vii. (at 94. 11); twice in v. (at 40. 1; and 85. 6=viii. 6. 37); but twelve times in viii. So *dyumkṣṭa* and its positive occur eighteen times, but only in i., viii., ix., and x., barring a single instance at vs. 8 of ili. 87, a hymn with divers marks of lateness.

† In viii. 4. 16, dhūrtaj or eva (as in A.V. xx. 127. 4), not the sharpness but the speed is the thought. So sāṅgita is 'active,' as in A.V. xii. 1. 21. triṣaṅmantāḥ sāṅgitaṁ ma kṛṇatu; and 'activity' is the general notion conveyed by *dhūrtaj,* as in ix. 26. 4 (dhāyan). Here, as said above, p. 61, it is not a pair of scissors, but an axle-blade rapidly moving, that gives the comparison.
so far as they go, would make against the view that viii. is not early; for in vii. there are 27 occurrences of adha to about half as many of atha. But both forms are used in x.; and both atha and adha are Avestan. Probably one is as old as the other.* But in running over the foregoing lists, the reader will doubtless have noticed quite a number of other words of Avestan belongings: such are udāra, uṣṭra, evātha, gāthā, jmdātar, takvā, tanu-keś, meṣā, varāhā, and one or two more. In the RV., all of these are confined to viii. alone, or else to the group, viii., i., ix., x.

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

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

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

---

* Somewhat similar is the case of bāqī (viii. 69. 1) as against bāqī of ii.–vii. Avestan bāf and bādha show the variableness of the expletive. The Epic has bādha. Compare also RV. x. 86. 28; AV. vii. 56. 1, bhātā (with bhātārī, as if cognate); and Alkman, 5(12): bātā tē bātē expētēr eitē.
literature until a time posterior to the composition of ii.--vii. Milk, cattle, and the like lay very near to the hearts of the Vedic poets. Had such words as kśirā or meṣā or úṣṭra been current in the time or place of the poets of ii.--vii., they would surely be found in those books occasionally, in place of a pāyās or an āvi or a mahiṣā.

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

The following List contains:

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

evāthā, viii. 24. 15; Avestan, aevatha. The hymn is not marked by unique late words; but the correspondences with i. and x. (see Lists iii. and iv., above) include nīrṛti (as pl.), paripād and dānāṣṭha, all lacking in ii.--vii.

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

úṣṭra, Avestan uṣṭra, viii. 5. 37; 6. 48; 46. 22. 31 (all these are dānāṣṭutis); i. 138. 2. See under meṣā, below.

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

gāthā, viii. 1. 20, may be connected with Avestan gared.

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

* Or unused. But its synonyms are used so often in ii.--vii. as to make it unlikely that it would have been unused if known.
† See above, p. 61. There may be a choice here (jathāra occurring only once in viii., and uddāra never in ii.--vii.), rather than a lack. It is interesting to notice that the Praskāṇva of ix. 95 not only uses the word regularly employed in ii.--vii., but also uses vihi in its original sense of water ("Trīta holds the water in the sea," ib. 4; cf. 94. 8, for the idea). In general the Kānya of ix. make a more venerable impression than do those of viii. or i.
jāmātār, viii. 2. 20; 26. 21-22; vī., i. 109. 2 (p. 57); Avestan zāmātār. From the meaning of this word it might pass without literary employment for a long while, and the example, therefore, does not seem important. Yet it is to be noticed that it also occurs in 2, which has udāra, kārā, and gāthā. Hymn 26 is not marked by words unique in viii. (List i.), nor has it important correspondence with x. and i.

takvā (taku, etc.), viii. 58. 13. Compare Avestan takhma, taka. This hymn contains odanā, not apparently in an added verse (14), and has correspondence with x. and i.

tanukṛt, viii. 68. 3; i. 31. 9 (tanukṛthā, viii. 75. 1); Avestan, tanucērtē. The Kāncy Soma hymn 68 is without very late words, and remarkably free from correspondence with i. and x. The meaning of the Vedic word is one with that of the Avestan, though it is applied in RV. to self-made sin or hurt; in the Avesta, to sons. Compare prakṛthā in v. 61. 3 (late hymn), and x. 63. 15. Above, p. 58.

[ādītra, viii. 67. 10 (Kāncy hymn), Persian dūs; and nadā, viii. 1. 33, dānastuti, Persian nardat (?).]

prabhārstr, viii. 2. 35; i. 178. 3. Though this is also in hymn 2, I regard it as purely fortuitous that prabhārstr corresponds to frabāstēr, for the latter is a priest; and the compound verb may easily have been developed independently, as in Greek and Latin, whence an independently made nomen agentis.

mēsā, Avestan māṣēha. This word occurs only in viii., i., ix., x.

In viii., in the same second Kāncy hymn (2. 40), and in 86. 12 (ascribed to Rebbha Kācyapa). Hymn 86 has scarcely any correspondence with i. and x., and contains very few unique words (of List i.). In 2, the word occurs in a verse introducing a dānastutē, but in the interesting form mēsā bhūtō 'bhū yām āyuḥ; for here is close touch with the Avestan “incorporate ram” god (maēshtē kēhrpa), and RV. i. 51. 1 (compared by Justi). This seems to be the case also with 86. 12, which is addressed to “the ram.” But, as will be seen by the analysis above on p. 66, mēsā, mēṣē is also the sheep as provider of the wool-sieve, and as a sacrificial beast. In iv. 2. 5 occurs the only early reference to the sacrifice of sheep* (ādi); and it is only in viii. 86. 2 that the forray gives sheep (āryayam bhōgam). In the dānastutēs there is but a single instance where sheep are given, and that is in Yāl. 8. 3, āṉavatīnām, one hundred (along with one hundred asses and slaves). This can scarcely be because the gift of sheep was forbidden at this time, for in that case they would not have been given and publicly received for.† There seems,

* Perhaps “the sacrifice which has sheep” means rather “wins sheep.”
† Compare also ēṛṣī, “ram,” only in i. 10; ārd, only in viii. and x. Cases of mēṣē other than in divine work are i. 49. 8 (Kāncy hymn), where there is a rare blessing on sheep and horses. Doubtful allegory rules in x. 27. 17. In x. 91. 14 there occurs one of the four instances of sacrificial rams (also i. 116 and 117 and iv. 3. 5, the last questionable, as above). I forget who has suggested that sheep were forbidden.
indeed, to be a striking coincidence here between the occurrences of *uṣṭra* and of *mesā*, which cannot be accounted for on any accepted historical ground. It is assumed by most scholars that *uṣṭra* generally means a camel in the Brāhmaṇas, a bull in the Rig-Veda, and a camel again in the Avesta. But camels as wagon-haulers cannot have been unknown, since even in Manu the ‘camel-wagon’ is spoken of (uṣṭrayāna), and in the Epic people journey on rathāir uṣṭrayutāth, Mbh. xvi. 7. 33, so that the passage which speaks of ‘four-yoked’ *uṣṭra* may be taken to mean camels (not ‘with four yokes’ but four harnessed together), since it was no uncommon thing to have four horses or even eight to a team, and if camels were used for draught at all it was easy enough to harness four together. The only weighty passage that has been thought to indicate cattle instead of camels is i. 138. 2. Here the sole reason given is that to compare Puṣan in his fury to a bull is more reasonable than to compare him to a camel. But a male camel is a most vicious and dangerous beast when he gets angry, and the objection has no more force than the still weaker one that in viii. 46. 31 *krad* is used to describe the noise of this *uṣṭra*, a verb that is applied to horses as well as to bulls, and in fact to a variety of noisy things. Against these weak reasons I would set the historical improbability of *uṣṭra* being used either indifferently for camel or for bull, or for camel first, then for bull, and then again for camel. The humped steer is known as such, kakūdmān vṛṣabhaḥ (in x.); kakābhakha (gāvām), viii. 20. 21; kakuhō mrghāḥ, v. 75. 4, etc. Buffaloes, and wild kine, under the name of maḥisā, gavayā, gūrād, are also known to the family books. They serve as beef and give milk. But not a word of *uṣṭra* till i. and vii.†

*yahū*, Avestan *yazū*. This word occurs in vii. 15. 11; but this is a late hymn, and it is the only passage in ii.–vii. where the word occurs. Elsewhere it is found in viii. 4. 5; 19. 12; 49. 13; 73. 5; i. 26. 10; 74. 5; 79. 4. Excepting 73, all

---

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

† Apropos of *mesā*, it may be noticed how very rare is in any case the mention of sheep in the family books. The animal was known of course, but evidently not much attention was paid to it. The words for wool and weave do not necessarily imply sheep, as goats’ hair was woven, and drūd, wool, means only covering. The dō (ovis, šic) is mentioned but twice in the family books, i. 98. 1 (soma passes through ‘sheep’ and several stones), and iv. 2. 5: gōmā aṃgaḥ ’vimānāḥ acer yājñāḥ. In the eighth book alone sheep, as dō and mesā (the latter not in family books), are mentioned four times (see above). On the weaving of goats’ hair see Geiger, Östiron. Kultur, p. 224, note. It would seem, from i. 128. 7, that sheep-raising was especially successful to the west of the Indus (in Kandahar), which (see below) may account for the greater familiarity of the Kāṇyas with this branch of farming.
these hymns of viii. contain late words, and correspondences with i., x. But after all, the equating of yau with yahû is not phonetically certain.

rajetá, Avestan erezeta (?), viii. 25. 22 (ascribed to a Vâïśyaçaça). The hymn is very free of late words and correspondence with i., x. The word occurs in a dânavatutu.

varâhû, Avestan, varâza, viii. 66. 10 (Kânva hymn), and i., ix., x. The verse is late. See above, under mezhâ, p. 66.

vâka in adhivaâka, etc., List i., above. The Avestan correspondence, fravâka, is only with the Brahmânca prâvâka probably specially developed, as in the case of frâvâretar, above.

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

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

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

Kăranyapeçaus, viii. 8. 2; 31. 8; Avestan zaranypaâsa.

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

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

I have spoken above of the rarity of sheep in ii.–vii., and the comparatively frequent allusions in viii. The similes bear out the difference. The 'lamb-shaker,' as a descriptive name of the wolf (55. 8), is paralleled by the passage in 34. 3, urâhi ná dhânume yákah. It is significant that these two passages occur in viii., and that there is nothing like them in ii.–vii.

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

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

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

---

* This late hymn, iv. 57, is specially marked as such by its use of sūmā for year, elsewhere found only in x.
† i. 23. 15; 117. 7; 21: 140. 4; 176. 2; viii. 20. 19; 22. 6; x. 84. 13; 101. 3-4; 117. 7; 146. 6.
‡ In the Avesta, aiva-vāres, to plough, and gēdra, the plough, have no Vedic representatives; and yao kāres, as stated above, is paralleled in RV. only in i., viii., x. That kārman means furrow (in RV. i. and ix.) is far from certain. It is merely the line drawn. This sense of kārṣ is certainly the more primitive, and it is shown in the Avestan dāndōkarsha, not ‘corn-ploughing’ but ‘dragging corn;’ as well as in kārṣhōrāca, ‘making a collection’ (draught) of people. It is, therefore, by no means certain that kṛṣṭī means a ploughing people. Like tscñca, it may revert to movement simply. In RV., kārṣ is used of a water-bag (dhūth śū kārṣa, v. 88. 7), of a foot, and of Indra’s body (x. 28. 10-11; 119. 11); in all of which cases ‘drag’ is the meaning. That raising yēva does not imply ploughing has long been recognized (Hehn: and Schrader, p. 413). In RV. the only grain mentioned is yēva. Not till AV. are beans and rice alluded to. The Vedic people lived on pumpkins (urvdruka), wild fruit, yēva, meat, game, and intoxicating liquors.
§ Compare RV. viii. 9. 10; AV. viii. 10. 24: tāṁ pṛthi vāinyaḥ ’dhok tāṁ kṛṣṭḥ ca sasyān ca ’dhok. The passage of AV. is referred to by Zimmer, AIL., p. 285.
|| Not unimportant is the little circumstance that the only passages in RV. where the poets beg for (dvāvad gōmad) yēvamah are viii. 89. 3; ix. 69. 8; x. 42. 7; 181. 2; while yavayū occurs only in viii. 67. 9.
the same difference, in degree at least, obtains between the Iranian Gāthās and the Vendidad, the agricultural life barely represented in the former being conspicuous in the latter.*

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

* Compare Geiger, Ostiran. Kultur, p. 403 ff. It is perhaps proper to specify in what particulars the agricultural words are found in the latter part of RV. and not in the earlier part. The late hymn, iv. 57, mentioned above, contains the words for plough, ploughman, and furrow. Elsewhere, the term, 'ploughing' is, as I have remarked in x. 44, in i. 117. 21, viii. 22. 6; īdāga, plough, in iv. 57. 4; sīrā, plough, only in the same late hymn and x. 101. 3-4; pādvivart, of the plough, only in post-Rāk literature; phāla, ploughshare, only in iv. 57. 8: x. 117. 7; rāhā, the beast that drags the plough, only in iv. 57. 4, 8; kṛṣa, agriculture, only in i. 34. 13; 148. 6 (dāryānā); kīnāpa, ploughman, only in iv. 57. 8; ātā, furrow, only in iv. 57. 6-7; i. 140. 4. It is generally assumed that ploughing was an Indo-European accomplishment; but the facts are that ṣρग fa and arare have only Keltic, Slavic, Teutonic representatives; and other farm-words, such as harrow and sickle, show no Indo-Iranian kinship. The old connection of urvrā and ṣrpa is now discarded, and the equation hirse, karś is admitted to be a guess (Schrader, pp. 410, 411, 424). In truth, the assumption, as a historical fact, rests only on the equations ṛṣa, kṛṣa, kṛṣman; ātāka, ṣrka: and ṛṣa, lāri, lāruka, lānuṣaka. In the last group, ātāu means first grain cut, then the cutter; so, not to speak of the fact that all the Sanskrit words are preposterously late, it is evidently the root only and not the developed words which may be compared, and this robs the words of all value. The negative ṛték shows in RV. so plainly that ṣrka is still a mere adjective noun, that it is quite uncertain whether the 'piercer' is not an independently developed noun in ṣrka and nīka: just as in Avestan, cūtra comes from cīf, 'piercer.' Finally ṛṣa is like kṛṣman (see above) in this, that it is the line drawn, and by no means the furrow of the ploughed land, but the limit beyond the furrows (implied in ṣrp). It is noteworthy also that in RV. the word for sickle, ṣṛp, occurs only in i. and x., except for iv. 20. 5, and in this last passage it is quite impossible to render it 'sickle,' but it must be the conqueror's hook (i. 58. 4; x. 101. 3: 106. 6; in iv. 20. 5, ṣṛgya ud jēla may be, as PW. suggests, a late adaptation of i. 66. 3; but the words can mean only 'victor with hook,' as in aṅka and ārya te āstu aṅkuṣa, viii. 17. 10; āryatāna ṣṭ aṅkuṣa, gathā, etc., x. 134. 6). If it is the gambler's hook, to rake in winnings (ii. 12. 4. 5; viii. 45. 88; AV. iv. 16. 3), the word jēla is used in a very late sense. On the other hand, the word for sickle which is in touch with post-Rāk literature (for ṣṛp is not long preserved in that meaning) is dātra (Persian Ṗādā), and this is found only in viii. 67. 10, till Sūtra and Epic (compare x. 181. 2). The modern wild tribes of India as well as the Indian tribes in U. S. show that mere scratching is for ages the only ploughing, and is all that really is necessary till the land is worked over to any purpose. It is thus that settled people. It is further settled people. It is the further settled people. It is the mill-stone, ṛṣādd, is mentioned only in viii. 61. 4, and in the late passage, vii. 104. 23. The only passage that mentions ṛṣāḍ is x. 112. 3 (also late); the nether mill-stone, Ṛpar, is mentioned at i. 79. 8; x. 94. 8; 175. 3. Ere mill-stones pressed, loose 'stones' pounded soma.
jâb (whereas in ii.–vii. the converse is the case, viz., the geographical data refer little to the West but often to the Puñjâb); and that in viii. especially many proper names seem to find their explanation in the West. These points I will now discuss briefly in their order.

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

In regard to the Five Peoples, I have before this expressed doubt whether they are identical with those Vedic peoples who are supposed to be the Five, and as I hold still to this opinion, I do not refer the Five Peoples necessarily to the Puñjâb or to Turvaça, Yadu, etc., wherever they may have been located. But in regard to the relation between the poets of vii. and the Five Peoples, it is clear that while the poet of viii. 52. 7 speaks as if he belonged to the Five Peoples, those of viii. 32. 21–22 (Medhâtithi Kâșva) and viii. 9. 2 (Çaçašâna Kâșva) speak as if the Five Peoples were remote. In the passage of viii. 32, the poet begs Indra to pass over the Five Peoples and come to him: dāthi manyusâvīnam ... uđârame ... ithi pâñca jînâh āti. Just as the poet says “pass over the sinful presser,” so he adds “and over the Five Peoples.”* In the passage, viii. 9. 2, again, the Five Peoples are correlated with two other words expressing remiteness: “whatever is in mid-air, in the sky, or among the Five Peoples;” just as in 10. 1 it is said “if ye are on the far stretch of earth, or yonder in the gleam of the sky, or on the sea.”

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

* Compare the use of āti in āti kyiṣaṭam, viii. 62. 15, and in 54. 9, with the idea of 64. 15. Similar is the use of tiras, in 33. 14; 55. 12.
† The Ganges is mentioned in x. 75. 5; vi. 45. 81; the Dṛṣadvatî, in iii. 28. 4; the Jumna, in v. 32. 17 and vii. 18. 19.
that Indra slew "beyond the Sarayu." There is also a vague allusion to 'Drdbhika,' so vague as to show that the Derbiker people were already a myth, ii. 14. 3.† In viii., one poet alludes to the Asiknî and the Indus; and another apostrophizes the Parunî, but the latter hymn is not by a Kânya, but by a member of the Atri family; while the former hymn alludes not only to ploughing but at the same time to the Pûñcâlas (Krîvis); so that it seems to be later than most of the hymns in the eighth book. The Sarasvatî is mentioned in one hymn of the Vâlakhilya and in a dûnastuti; but otherwise only in an Atri hymn.†

In conformity with the intermediate character of v., between vii. and the other family books, stands the geographical agreement; for it is only in the Atri collection, v. 53. 9, that the Kabul and Kurum are mentioned (along with the mythical Rasâ, the unknown Anitabî, the Sarayu, and the Indus). On the other hand it is a Kânya poet who gives us the only reference in RV. to the Swat river, northwest of the Puñjâb; and Viçyamanas Vâlîya, who apparently belongs to the Kânya family, gives us what is the only allusion, apart from the General Books, to the Gomati, on the west of the Indus (viii. 18. 37; 24. 30). It is, further, worth mentioning that what may perhaps be the connecting links, geographically speaking, between the Kabul and the Puñjâb, viz., the Çaryaçâvatî and the Arijkas, appear nowhere in other family books, but several times in the eighth.‡

The proper names in viii. afford a good parallel to the common vocabulary. The correspondence is such as to show a marked rapport between vii. and v., the General Books, and late literature. With the names of the other family books there is little contact save in the case of two or three seers and the people's names Turvaça, Yadu, Anû (Anava), Druhyu and perhaps Pûru (53. 10).§ Jamadagni is cited once, and Divodâsa appears, but only as dâsodâsa (agnî). Of poet's names, Kâṣîvânṭ is about the only one that connects viii. with other family books than v. (Æuçja, Pajriya; in viii. alone Varo-Pajra Sûman; Susamân in viii. and Epie).† Thus Apnavîna is early; but in viii. only his method, as that of one of old, is known (apnavînavîṭ).

* Not only is the interpretation of the name Prûthuârça, in vii. 88, doubtful, but the date is impaired by the fact that the hymn lacks the Vâsiṣṭha stamp.
† Indus and Asiknî, viii. 20. 25; Parûṣpî, 68. 15; Sarasvatî, 21. 17, 18; 88. 10; Vâlî. 8. 4. That the first passage is late is indicated further by its vocabulary (drûpî). The only certain allusion to the Puñjâb among the Kâvyas is in this late hymn!
‡ Hillebrandt, Fëd. Myth., pp. 137-148. It is of course still doubtful whether the locality is N. W. of the Puñjâb.
§ Ayu, Manu, the Bûrgus and Úçasas Kâvyas are early as well as in viii. But the Yatis appear only in viii., x. Kûsa Arjuneya appears (with Bûrgu) both early and late.
‖ Compare Çrûta-kâkṣa, only in viii. Kâṣîvânṭ, iv. 96. 1; viii. 9. 10. Ekadîyû (once in viii.), said to be son of Nodhas, is perhaps connected, as the latter is called Kâṣîvânṭ as well as Gâtama in later literature. The protégés of the Aĉvîna, Babhru and Paktha, also occur in viii. and early books. For the others, and the demons, see below.
A good test is afforded by the patronymics. In one case only, and that is in \textit{v.}, does \textit{viii.} have the original name and the earlier book have the patronymic; viz., Rūçaṇa in \textit{vii.} (\textit{Pāvira in Vāl.}), Rūçaṇaṁ in \textit{v.}. But observe the difference. While \textit{Atithigya occurs} in other family books, \textit{Atithiṣṭya occurs only in \textit{vii.}}; while \textit{Āvamedha occurs in \textit{v.}, Āvamedha occurs only in \textit{vii.}}; while \textit{Tugra, and Bhujyū, his son, are early, the forms Tugra and Tāugra are found only in \textit{vii.}}.\textsuperscript{*} while \textit{Trasadasya occurs early, Trasadasya occurs only in \textit{x.} and \textit{viii.}}.

But it is from the names that occur both in \textit{vii.} and in \textit{viii.} and in subsequent literature that one sees how large a proportion of all the names in this book is late. Some of these are of Epic fame. Thus the saint Agastya, so well known in the Epic, is mentioned in \textit{RV.} only in \textit{vii.}, \textit{i.}, \textit{x.}, and the late hymns \textit{vii.} 33. \textit{Prthī Vāinya} is known only to \textit{vii.} and \textit{x.}, but is well known to \textit{AV.}\ With him stands Dirghatamas, known as such only in \textit{vii.}, \textit{i.}, and the Brāhmaṇas (\.Aucathya in \textit{i.}; Ucathya, perhaps as \textit{adj.}, in \textit{vii.} 46. 28; Māmata in \textit{i.}; perhaps Mamata in \textit{vii.}); and, again, Vyaśva, Vāyaśva, \textit{vii.}, \textit{i.} (\textit{ix.} and \textit{vii.}, \textit{vyāṣvavādī}, and \textit{vīṣya- manas (adj. and name)}, \textit{x.}, \textit{viii.}}. Other examples are Sobhari, \textit{vii.} and \textit{AV.} (\.Sūbhara in Brāh. and Epic); perhaps Ruma, \textit{vii.}, with Rumanvant, Epic; Črut-arvan Ārkiṇa, \textit{vii.}, \textit{x.}, Epic; Čara (\.called Arcatka in \textit{i.}, and also by the late name Čauradevy in \textit{vii.}), occurring in \textit{vii.}, \textit{i.}, and Epic; Kali, in \textit{i.}, \textit{x.}, and (\textit{in pl.}) \textit{vii.}; Mandhatār in \textit{vii.}, Māndhatār in Epic (as father of Purukutsa); Upastuta in \textit{vii.}, \textit{i.}, \textit{x.}; Viśṇāpat (\.son of Viśyaka, \textit{vii.}), in \textit{i.}, \textit{x.}; Nabākha (\.Nābhāka), \textit{vii.} and Brāh.; Cīṇāra, \textit{vii.}, \textit{x.}; Aṅgul, \textit{vii.} and \textit{VP.}; Trīḍoka, \textit{vii.}, \textit{i.}

Evidences of special rapport between \textit{vii.} and \textit{v.} are: first the Atreyan hymns in \textit{vii.}; the \textit{Kaṇvaḥotar} of \textit{v.} 41. 4; the Gopavana of \textit{vii.}, 63. 11, to whose name the Anukramaṇī adds the patronymic Atreyā; and Čyāvaśya, mentioned in \textit{vii.}, and author of hymns in \textit{v.}. In an Atri hymn, Saptavadhri, known in \textit{vii.}, \textit{v.}, \textit{x.}, appears. The Atris are mentioned by the Kāṇvas in \textit{vii.}§

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

\footnote{\textit{So Saṅhvaraṇa occurs in early books, while Saṅhvarṣaṇi occurs only in Vāl. Pārśadvaṇa in Vāl. has no Pārśadvaṇa beside it.} \textit{† But Pārśurākṣya (\textit{Kutsa}) occurs in early books, as does Purukutsa.\ Compare Pāura (early), and Trāṣi, in \textit{vii.} and \textit{vi.}} 46.\ † Lāmaṇa, \textit{loc. cit.}, p. 578. In \textit{i.} and \textit{vii.} is mentioned Virūpa, who appears also in \textit{iii.} 53. 7, apparently a late verse. § The Gāutaṃs (\.Gotamas) also are mentioned, but only in their own hymn (\textit{vii.} 77. 4). Only \textit{i.}, \textit{v.}, \textit{x.} mention the Kāṇva. The Priyamedhas and Medhyātiṣṭha appear only in \textit{vii.}, \textit{i.}, \textit{x.} and \textit{vii.}, \textit{i.}, \textit{ix.}, respectively. Kāṇva's father, Medhāti (Epic, but see \textit{RV.} \textit{x.} 81. 11; \textit{i.} 117. 8, \textit{Nyāda}), appears only in \textit{vii.}}
Plāyogi, which is used only in vii., and is either late or dialectic, like Talukṣa for Tarukṣa; vibhindū, as adj. in i., but as name in viii. and in Brāh. (Vibhinduka); dūrgāha, adj. and common noun in early books, but a name in viii. 54, 12 (where are mentioned the nāpāto dūrgāhasya), and recurring in the patronymic form dūrgahā, in the notoriously late addition to iv. 42, and in the Brāh.; svarṇara and pāvīṣṭha, as adjectives in early books, and then in viii. as names; and the late name Kṛṣṇa, a poet. Tiracchī, another poet, has a name of late look; it occurs only in vii. and Brāh. The value of Nāhuṣa and Vāvātār is doubtful. Another of these words which appear early as adjectives and later as names is adhrigau (as name, in vii. and i.); so probably prapathin, an adj. in vi., a name in viii.

Other late names are Āurva, in āurvavād, in viii., Brāh., and Epic; Čaṛabha, viii. and Epic; and Kuṇḍa-pāyya, descendant of Črīga-Βγ. Compare the Epic Črīgin, name of a seer, and the Epic Kurus names Kūṇḍaka, Kūṇḍadharma, Kūṇḍaśīna, etc.

The Kurus, Krivis, and Cedis, all of Epic fame, appear in viii., but not in i.–vii. The Cedi king, Kaų, is praised in viii. as a giver of uṣṭra, etc. The Kuru-name appears in Pākasthānum Kāruṣyāna and Kuṃṅga.*

The āsya-names, Vaṭa Ācyya (viii., i.), Vyaśva (p. 94), Ninditāya, Ātreya Čyāvāya (compare Čyāva and Čyāvaka in vii.), might suggest that Iranian āspa-names are here reproduced; and such may be the case. But it is worthy of note that the best district in India for horses is the Pūṇjab. The Saindhava breed is famous through Sanskrit and Pāli literature. The prince who "gives more horses than any other mortal" lives in the Pūṇjab on the Paruṣani (viii. 83, 16).† But Čyāva lives on the Swat. The gifts of Vaṭa Ācyya come from Prathuqravas Kānta, who has been credited with cias-Indic origin, as have been also Balbatha, Paru, Tirindira, and Tarukṣa. All these are known only in (i.) viii. Pārāvata, once in viii., may be the name of a western prince. With him is mentioned Vasyocis.

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

A few more names remain to be noted. Daṇacṛaja and Goçaryya, otherwise unknown, occur in vii. and Vāl.‡ Narya and Sthūrāyūpa occur only in viii., the latter perhaps as a reminiscence. Prakṣanva (above, p. 59) is mentioned only in i., viii., and

---

* Kāruṣyāna, Vāl., Ukaṇyayana, and Harṣyāna are lone nom. prop. in vii.; but probably the form is for Kāruṣyāna. Kuru appears in x. (Śṛuna).

† In Am. Journ. Phil. xv., p. 156, I have shown that India was not so badly off for horses as Roth and Brunnhofer supposed.

‡ The Vāl. abounds in names not elsewhere known: Rjūna, Dirghanlītha, Dacāpira, Daçoṣya, Dasyave Vrka, Nipāṭithi, Puṣṭigu, Čruṣṭigu, Ṛṣadha, Chiṣṭa, Sālīvarta. The Vāl. contains Kṛṣṇa (also in x.), Sūr-maraśīni (also in i.), and Śīṅvan (also in early books).
Vāl. The young woman, Apālā, is mentioned in a hymn not very old. Of the demons, Namuci, Arbuda, Pipru, and Čuṇa (and Mrgaya?) are old names; much less old are Sṛbinda and Anārcani (neither found till vii.—compare the sr. λνγ. ṣnārpa-rāt, also in vii.), and Ahīcuva Āurnavābha, which last occurs in viii. and x. Both the Kāνvas and the Pūras are occasionally regarded as devils in late works (so AV.; RV. x. 61. 13; RV. vii. 8. 4 as interpreted by Brāh.).

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

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

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

The eighth book is not without other correspondence with the Avesta. The only cases of adt for āt, which in form at least is Avestan, are cited from viii. 5. 31; 11. 7; 40. 5; i. 30. 21; x. 22. 6; 158. 1. The short thematic a in āṇm of the genitive plural is Avestan, and this too is found only in i. 44. 2—viii. 11. 2; i. 188. 11; x. 136. 6; 174. 5.† If this were an old license, one would expect to see it imitated in other family books. But apparently

---

† Compare viii. 66. 5: abhi gandharvām atpyat.
‡ I may here refer again to the fact, brought out in my last paper, that the (Iranian) sacrosanct number 33 is employed in RV. almost exclusively in viii., among family books (i. 34. 11; 45. 2—both Kāṇva hymns; 130. 11; iii. 6. 9; viii. 28. 1; 30. 2; 35. 3; 39. 9; ix. 92. 4; Vāl. 9. 2). It is quite inconceivable that, if viii. were the oldest book, such a designation of the gods should so pass the other family books to reappear subsequently (in AV. and all later literature) as the regular number of gods.
§ Compare viii. 20. 34; 22. 12; Vāl. 3. 8; viii. 5. 39.
† Lanman, loc. cit., pp. 337, 352.
it is introduced by the poets of viii. and imitated by the later hymnists of i. and x. All three hymns of viii. are assigned to Kānya.

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

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

---
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ARTICLE III.

THE MALAYAN WORDS IN ENGLISH.

BY CHARLES PAYSON GURLEY SCOTT.

Presented to the Society, April, 1896.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indeed, in one version, it is the same region; for in Heber's hymn, in one edition (1827), the breezes "Blow soft o'er Java's isle" (Julian, *Dict. of hynmology*, 1892, p. 399).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On the Malayan side my investigations have been wholly etymological. Every word in my lists I have sought to find and to trace through all the Malayan dictionaries at my disposal — Marsden (1812), Elout, translation of Marsden (1825), Roorda van Eysinga (1825), Crawford (1852), Pijnappel (1863), with Klinkert’s Supplement (1869), Favre (1873), Wall and Tuuk (1877–1884), Badings (1884), Swettenham (1881, 1887), Klinkert (1893), Clifford and Swettenham (A 1894, B 1895, the rest to come), and other works cited in the quotations. Of the above named works, Elout (1825) and Badings (1884) are but seldom cited, being of little independent value. Then I sought the same or related words in dictionaries of the related or adjacent languages, as Archinese (Arriens 1880, Bikkers 1882, Langen 1889), Lampoon (Helfrich 1891), Nias (Thompson and Weber 1887), Javanese (Roorda van Eysinga 1835, Groot and T. Roorda 1843, Favre 1870), Sundanese (Higg 1862), Balinese (Eck 1876), Dayak (Hardeland 1859), Macassar (Matthes 1859), Bugis (Thomsen 1833), together with many minor glossaries and wordlists of the languages of the same and other parts of the Archipelago, including some regarded as ‘dialects’ of the general Malay, and some allied only as members of the broad Polynesian group.

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

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

1. The English form with a brief identifying definition, and with variant spellings, present or past, if any. In some cases, other European forms ar added.
2. The Malay form, in the Malay character, with transliteration; and explanation of formation, if known.
3. Form in other Malayan languages, if any.
4. Citations from various Malay dictionaries, in chronologic order, showing the actual form and definition assigned.
5. Citations for other Malayan languages, if any ar concernd.
6. Citations from English works in chronologic order, showing the actual use of the word in English.

All Malay words, that is, all words enterd as real or nominal Malay words in Malay dictionaries, ar given, in the first instance, in the Malay character (which is Arabic with a few additional letters distinguishht by three dots), and also in English transliteration, according to the noble "Roman" system, to which I hav made the Dutch and French conform. It beats the Dutch and the French both. I note here that Dutch ðj answers to English ch, the establishd infelicity for th, Malay ñ in one letter chā. Favre uses for this the otherwise unused infelicity z. Dutch ðj in like manner answers to English j, Malay ñjim.
Dutch oe answers to English u or ū, Malay wāu. The rest is obvious.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Arnout, W., *Een woordenlijstje der Tidoensche taal* [Borneo]. Amsterdam, 1885. Large 8vo. (In:...Deel I. 1885, p. 536–559, Amsterdam.)

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

See Schlegel.


BATAVIAASCH GENOTSCHAP VAN KUNSTEN EN WETENSCHAPPEN. 
Verhandelingen: Deel XXIX., 1862 (see Rigot). Deel XLV., 1891 (see Heffrich). See also Tijdschrift, etc.


Bulletin de la Société académique indo-chinoise. 2e série, 1882 +. See Blumentritt, 1884.

Bikker, Dr. A. J. W., Malay, Acheinese, French and English vocabulary, alphabetically arranged under each of the four languages. With a concise Malay grammar. London, 1882. 8vo, 14 + 352 p.


Brooke, James. See Mundy.


ECK, R. van, Eerste proeve van een Balinesesch-Hollandsch woordenboek. Utrecht, 1876. 8vo, 60 + 260 p.

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


Ekris, A. van, Woordenlijst van enige dialecten der landtaal op de Aombonsche eilanden. Rotterdam, 1864-65. 12mo. (In: ..., p. 61-134.)


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


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


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

Pijnappel, Dr. J., Gz., *Maleisch-Nederduitsch woordenboek, naar het werk van Dr. W. Marsden en andere bronnen bewerkt*. Haarlem, 1863. Large 8vo. 12 + 272 p.


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

Roorda van Eysinga, P. P., *Maleisch en Nederduitsch woordenboek, onder goedkeuring en begunstiging der hooghe regering van Nederlandsech Indië vervaardigd en uitgegeven...Batavia, 1835. 8vo, 6 + 432 + 44 p.*


Roorda van Eysinga. See Grashuis.


Serrano, Don Rosalio, *Diccionario de términos comunes Tagalo-Castellano, sacado de graves autores*. Manila, 1854. 12mo, 154 p.
SWETTENHAM, Frank A. See CLIFFORD, H.
TENDELING, H. J. E., Maleische verba en nomina verbalia.
Leyden, 1895. 8vo, 7+177 p.
THOMAS, J. W., and WEBER, E. A. TAYLOR, Niasch-Maleisch-
Nederlandsch woordenboek. Batavia, 1887. Large 8vo, 16+186 p.
[THOMSEN], A vocabulary of the English, Bugis, and Malay
languages, containing about 2000 words. Singapore, 1833. 8vo,
66 p.
TIEDETK, K. W., Woordenlijst der Sambaansche en Katingansche
taal. Batavia, 1872. 8vo, 94 p.
Tijdschrift voor Indische taal, land- en volkenkunde. Uitge-
gen door het Bataviaasch genootschap van kunsten en weten-
schappen. Batavia, 1852+. 8vo. See DIAS 1879, EIJSBERGEN
1884, RIEDEL 1860, VORDERMAN 1889, WALLAND 1863.
VORDERMAN, A. G., Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Billiton-
Maleisch. Batavia, 1889. (In: Tijdschrift voor Indische taal,
land- en volkenkunde, deel XXXIV., 1889, p. 373-400.)
WALL, H. von de. Lijst van enige in 't Maleisch gebruikelijke
woorden van Sanskrit-oorsprong, waarvan die afstamming in
de Maleische woordenboeken van Roorda van Elsingga (1825),
Elout (Marsden, 1825), Roorda van Elsingga (manuscript, 1847),
Crawford (1852) en Pijnappel (1863) niet aangetoond is. (In:
...Batavia, 1867.)
WALL, H. von de, and TUUK, H. N. van der, Maleisch-Neder-
landsch woordenboek op last van het gouvernement van Neder-
landsch-Indie samengesteld door wijlen H. von de Wall, en, met
weglatening van al het overtollige, uitgegeven door H. N. van der
Tuuk. Batavia, 1877-1884. Deel I, 1877, 10+504 p. Deel II,
WALLACE, Alfred Russel, The Malay Archipelago, the land of
the orang-utan and the bird of paradise; a narrative of travel,
with studies of man and nature. London, 1869, 2 vols. cr. 8vo,
24+478 p., and 524 p.; new ed. 1 vol. extra cr. 8vo, 1890, 17+515 p.
WALLAND, J., Het eiland Engano [including: Eene woorden-
lijst van de taal, die op het noordelijk gedeelte van Engano
gesproken wordt, p. 116-124]. Batavia, 1863, 8vo, 32 p. (In:
Tijdschrift voor Indische taal-, land- en volkenkunde, deel XIV.,
p. 93 124. Batavia, 1863.)
In the same, p. 330-339.
WEBER, E. A. T. See THOMAS.
YULE, Henry, and BURNELL, Arthur Coke. Hobson-Jobson: a
geography of Anglo-Indian colloquial words and phrases,
and of kindred terms; etymological, historical, geographical and
Abada, a rhinoceros, a word frequent in the Hakluyt period; also abado, and once abath. It is a transfer of Portuguese abada (a. 1598), Spanish abada (a. 1585), New Latin abada (1631). This is a mistaken form, arising probably by attraction of the vowel of the article la (la bada taken as l'abada), of what was also used in the proper form bada, Portuguese bada (1541), Spanish bada (1611), Italian bada (c. 1606), (not noted in English or New Latin). See the quotations in Yule. Bada seem to be feminin, and hence was by some thought to be “the female Unicorne.”

The word is found in all the principal languages of the Malayan Archipelago. Bada is from Malay بادن د, a rhinoceros. Achehese badak, badék, badukh, Batak badak, Lampung badak, Javanese warak, Sundanese badak, Balinese warak, Dayak badak, Macassar bada, Bugis badak. The final ك in Malay pronunciation is faint, and often silent. It does not appear in the Macassar form, from which, indeed, the Portuguese and Spanish bada may hav been derived. It is absent in the English rendering of several Malay names of places, as in Aua, Malay آو, Batta beside Bata, Malay باتي, Sulu, Soo-loo, Malay سولوق Sulu. So Perak فیرق Perałk, Dayak دایک Dâyak or usually pronounced without the ك.

The pronunciation of the form abada must hav been, of course, a-bâ'da. An erroneous accentuation аба-da may hav been in use also; the form abath implies this. But the form abda, which if genuin, would prove the latter accentuation, is a mistake (see below).

Badac. Rinoceros.

badak the rhinoceros. Tandok bâdak or chûla bâ-
dak the rhinoceros horn.

bâdak the rhinoceros. Bâdak rhinoceros met keen horn. Bâdak karbau rhinoceros met twee
hoornen.

Badak (J. warak). The rhinoceros.

badak, neushoorn; gadjah, n. met een, karbau n.
twee hoorns; lidah — cochenille-cactus. (Bat. id. Jav. warak.
Mak bada.)

badak, le rhinocéros...Jav... wadak [read... warak].
Sund. ... badak. Bat. ... bada. Mak. ... bada. Day. badak.

1875 FAYRÉ, 2:164.

badak, neushoorn: tjœla b., het hoorn van den neus-
hoorn: lidah b. (neushoorn tong), naam der cactusachtige gewassen,
inz. van den cochenille-cactus....

1877 WALL and TUUK, 1:184.

Badak a rhinoceros.

1881 SWETTENHAM (1887), 2:7.
Badaq, rhinoceros, het neushoorn, dat eenc en b. körb, die twee neushoren heeft.... 1893 KLINKERT, p. 80.

Badaq, rhinoceros; Badaq gadjah, eenhoornige rinoceros; Badaq kérbau, tweehoornige rinoceros; Tjoela badaq, hoorn van een rinoceros; Lidah badaq, opuntia cochinillifera, een hoester, vele aangekewekt voor de cochenillecultuur. 1895 MAYER, p. 27.

Badaq, The rinoceros....

1895 CLIFFORD and SWETTENHAM, p. 106.

Badaq neushoorn. 1879 DIAS, Lijste van Atjeheche woorden, p. 160.
Badaq rinoceros, badoe-th.


Badaq, neushoorn; rinoceros; soenboek —, de hoorn van den rinoceros. 1889 LANGEN, Woordenboek der Atjeheche taal, p. 26.

Badaq (ook Ab[eengsch]. v. H.), rhinoceros.

1891 HELFRICH, Lampongsch-Holl. woordenlijst, p. 33.
Warak, neushoorn, renoceros. 1835 ROORDA van EVSINGA, Algemeen Javansch en Nederduitsch woordenboeck, p. 641.
... [warak] N[goro et] K[rama], rinoceros.

1870 FAYRE, Dictionnaire javanais-français, p. 290.

Badaq, the rinoceros, Rhinoceros Sumatrensis....

1862 RIGG, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 29.
Warak rinoceros. 1876 ECK, Balinesech-Holl. woerdb., p. 149.

Badaq, d. Nashorn.

Badaq rinoceros.

1885 AERNOUT, Woordenlijstje der Tidoengsche taal, p. 541.

... Bada, b. Bada. 't Mal. b add ak h rinoceros.

1859 MATTHES, Makassarisch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 173.
Rhinoceros... badaq badaq.

1833 [THOMSEN], Vocab. of the Eng., Bugis and Malay lang., p. 20.

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

It is a very fertile country, with great stores of provision; there are elephants in great number and abadas, which is a kind of beast so big as two great bulls, and hath upon his snow a little horn. 1588 R. PARKE, tr. Mendoza (orig. 1585), Historie of the great and mighty kingdome of China, etc. (Hakluyt soc., 1853), 2:311. (Y.)

We sent commodities to their king to barter for Amber-grce, and for the hornes of Abath, whereof the Kinge onely hath the traffique in his hands. Now this Abath is a beast which hath one horne only in her forehead, and is thought to be the female Unicorn, and is highly esteemed of all the Moores in those parts as a most sovereign remedy against poison. 1592 BARKER in Hakluyt (1807), 2:591. (Y.)
The Abada, or Rhinoceros is not in India, but only in Bengal and Patane. 1598 tr. Linschoten, Discourse of voyages into ye easte & weste Indies, p. 88 (Y.); repr. Hakluyt soc. (1885), 2:8.

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

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

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

(This passage is quoted, with the unmarked omission of some words (from "nowt," to "is good"), and with the reference "(1864) 2," in the N. E. D.; and the word Abadas is erroneously printed Abdas.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

For the principal forms of kâyù, see the quotations under CAJUPUTI in this paper. The Moluccan and other 'dialectal' forms of kâyù hav in great part lost the initial consonant, becoming ayo, aya, ai, aai, aoi, etc.

1864-65 A. Van Eckis, Woordenlijst....Ambonseche eilanden, p. 69.
Hout | Maba, Gotowassi aai | Boeli, Waijamli, Bitjoli oai | Inglis aai.
1873 Cambier, Beknopte woordenlijst van talen op Tidoreesch-Halmahera, p. 1 (265).
Sago-boom | Maba, Gotowassi pipe ayo | Boeli, Waijamli-Bitjoli poepie ayo | Inglis pipi aya.
1873 Cambier, Beknopte woordenlijst van talen op Tidoreesch-Halmahera, p. 1 (265).
Hout, | Maleisch kaijoe | Aroe-eilanden—Wokam kai, Oedjir kai | Kelj-eilanden—Ell Elliat kaijoe, Oorspronk aai.
Kaijoe koe.
1874 Jellesma, Woordenlijst van de taal der Alifoeren op het eiland Boeroe, p. 15.
Some Burusee words....tree, kaun.

Wallace (Malay Archipelago, 1869, ed. 1890, App. p. 490) gives the equivalents of kâyù, wood, in 33 languages, or rather 33 localities, kâyu in 4, kaju in 1, kalu in 2, kâyu in 1, kâo in 3, kai in 1, aii or a'i in 9 (chiefly in and near Ambon), awe in 1, ow in 1, with other forms gagi, gahi, gota, etc.
The word langit is found in nearly all the languages of the Malayan group: Malay /langit/, Achinese langit, Batak langit, Lampang langik, langit, Javanese langit, Sundanese langit, Balinese langit, Dayak langit, Macassar langi, Bugis langi, Bareh jangi, Sangi-Manganitu langi, Jilolo langit, langat, Tagala langit, Bisaya langit, Malagasi lanitra, the sky, the firmament. It is a general Polynesian word, Maori rangi, raki, Samoan lagi, Tahitian rai, Hawaiian lani, Tongan lāti, Rarotangan rangi, Marquesan aki, anī, etc. "the sky, heaven." See Tregear, Maori-Polynesian comparative dictionary, p. 392–394.


1631 Haex, p. 23.

/langit/ the sky, visible heavens, firmament. Būmi dan langit earth and sky....

1812 Marsden, p. 296.

/langit/ de lucht, het uitspansel, de zichtbare hemel....

1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 349.


1875 Favre, 2:499.

/langit/ langit, uitspansel boven iets, bv. boven een ledikant; hemel, hemelgewelf.

1884 Wall and Tuuk, 3:51.

/langit/ langit, hemel, uitspansel.

1899 Langen, Woordenboek der Aziehche taal, p. 234.

Langik, heuvel, uitspansel; talangik, hemel van een bed; langik-langik, verhemelte. Langit = langik.

1891 Helpfrich, Lampongsch-Hollandsch woordenlijst, p. 83.

Langgit, A. hemel, firmament, uitspansel, gehemelte....

1835 Roorda van Eysinga, Javaansch en Nederduitsch woordenboek, p. 292.

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

1870 Favre, Dict. javanais-français, p. 336.

Lang'it, the sky, the heavens. (Jav. Mal. idem.)

1862 Rigo, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 244.

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

1876 R. van Eck, Balineesch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 164.

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


... langi, h. langika, uitspansel, firmament, hemel. Boeg. Sund. Mal. Jav. idem....

1859 Matthes, Makassarech-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 474.

Sky .... langi langit.

1833 [Thomsen], Vocab. of the Eng., Bugis, and Malay lang., p. 2.

1894 Kruit, Woordentijst van de Barel-zaal [Celebes], p. 28. 
Hemels blauw, lângi bîrûh.

Hemel | Maba, Gotowessl langit | Boeli, Waijamli, Biťoji langit | Ingli langat.

1873 Cambier, Beknopte woordentijst van talen op Tidoreesch-Halmahera, p. 1 (265).

The English use of *ailanthus* or *ailanthus* began sixty years or more ago.

*Ailanthus*. An immense tree, a native of the interior of Coromandel.

1832 James Roxburgh, Flora Indica (1874), p. 386.
O'er me let a green *Ailanthus* grow....the Tree of Heaven.

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


1847 Craig.

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

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


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

The Malay word is *âmûk, ämûk* (pronounced â’muk, ä’mok, or â’mu, â’mo); Lampang *amig*, Javanese *hamük*, Sundanese *amuk*, Dayak *amok*. It means "furious, frenzied, raging, attacking with blind frenzy"; as a noun, "rage, homicidal frenzy, a course of indiscriminate murder"; as a verb, *mengâ-mu k*, ‘to run amuck,’ ‘to make amok’ (Dutch *amok maken*, or *amokken*).

*Amôc*. Est in usu. Si quando quis non sanès mentís, vel omnino desperatus, in interitum se praecipitât. Item significat opprimere, occidere, inaudere, oppugnare, &c.

1631 Haex, p. 2.

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

1812 Mardsen, p. 16.
Amuk (J). An a-muck; to run a-muck; to tilt, to run furiously and desperately at every one; to make a furious onset or charge in combat. 1852 Crawford, p. 5.

Amok, woede, razernij, moord in arren moede: Mëngamök, in razende woede alles overhoop loopen of steken (ook van dieren), een verwoedend aanval doen, amok maken, in woede moorden, enz.; Pëngamök, de persoon die, of het dier, dat amok maakt; het amok-maken, enz. 1895 Meyer, p. 13.

Also 1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 21; 1863 Plukenet, p. 13; 1869 Klinkert, p. 13; 1875 Favre, 1:108; 1877 Wall and Tuuk, 1:105; 1881 Swettenham (1857) 2:3; 1894 Clifford and Swettenham, 1:47; 1893 Klinkert, p. 42.

'Amoeg, het in razernij rondloopen en zonder aanzien des persoons worden. 1891 Helpfrich, Lampongisch-Hollandsche voorduistin, p. 72.


... [hamuk] N. K. furieux, un furieux, une attaque furieuse. ... [ngamuk] attaquer avec fureur, attaquer avec courage; courir avec fureur pour tuer tous ceux qui se présentent.... 1870 Favre, Dict. javanais-français, p. 51.

Amouk, to fight furiously, to attack indiscriminately, to smash and destroy. Said of any animal unmanageable from rage.... 1862 Ridg, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 13.


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

'Ājer 'angawr 'itūlah penjindir, dān 'ārāk 'itūlah penggangguw ['water of grape, that (is a) mockor, and arrack, that (is a) brawler']. 1822 'Elkitāb, 'īja 'itu, sagala sūrat perjandjī' an lāma dān baḥārūw tersālīn kapada baḥāsa Ma-lājuw, Tjālsi [Chelsea], p. 754.

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

There are some of them [the Javanese] who...go out into the streets, and kill as many persons as they meet....These are called Amuco. c. 1516 Barbosa, tr. Hakluyt soc. (1866), p. 194. (N. E. D.)
The corresponding Portuguese amouco is found:

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

1663 COGAN, tr. Finto’s Travels, l. 199. (N. E. D.)

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

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

1613 PURCHASE, Pilgrimage, p. 425.

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

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

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

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

1772 COOK, Voyages (1790), i:288. (N. E. D.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1698 FRYER, A new account of East India and Persia, p. 91. (Y. p. 15. See other quota. in Y.)
Macassar is the most celebrated place in the East for "running a muck." 1869 WALLACE, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 134.

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

1896 LOCKER-LAMPSON, My confidences. (In The Athenæum, April 11, 1896, p. 470.)

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

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

1687 DRYDEN, The hind and the panther, l. 2477.

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

1784 MARSDEN, Hist. of Sumatra, p. 239. (Y.)

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

1817 RAFFLES, Hist. of Java, 1:250.

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


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

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

1869 WALLACE, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 134.

Hence it is simply said—they made "amok." 1869 Id., p. 134.

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

1885 FORBES, _A naturalist’s wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago_, p. 16.

It appears that “the desperate spirit of amok” is utilized sometime as a social hint at a dance in Sumatra, much as a knife or a revolver at a dance in Kentucky.

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


_Amok_ is also used as an English verb, ‘to run amuck.’ So Dutch _amokken_.

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

1842 BROOKE, _Journal, in Mundy, Narrative of events in Borneo and Celebes_ (1848), i:309.

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


_Babirusa_, also spelled _babirussa_, and, badly, _babirousa_, and, worse, _babyrousia_, _babirousia_, the so-called “hog-deer” of the Malayan islands. New Latin _babirussa_, Sp. _babirusa_.

The Malay name is _babí rúśa_ meaning, not as usually translated, according to the order of the words, “hog-deer” or “pig-deer,” but, according to Malay syntax, “hog (like) deer,” that is “deer-hog”: _babí_, hog, _rúśa_, deer.

_Babí_. Porcus. 1831 HARR, p. 4.

_Babí_ and _babí_ a hog, _pig_; pork. _Bábí útan_ the wild _hog_. _Bábí rúśa_ an animal of the hog kind with peculiar tusks resembling horns, from whence it is named the hog-deer. (See Valentyn, vol. iii. plate, fig. C.) 1812 MARSDEN, p. 30.

The Malayan Words in English.


babī, cochon, porc.... — bābī rūsa, le sanglier ou cochon-cerf (sus susus).

1875 FAVRE, 2:166.

Also 1877 WALL and TUUK, 2:178; 1893 KLINKERT, p. 76; 1895 MAYER, p. 27; 1895 CLIFFORD and SWETTENHAM, 2:103. SWETTENHAM 1881 gives only rūsa bābī (2:94).

The word bābī is in use throughout the Archipelago, in a great variety of forms: Malay bābī, Lampong baboi (C.), Javanese and Sundanese babi, Balinese bahui (C.), Madurese babi (C.), Biajak bawoi (C.), Dayak bawoi, Macassar bawi, Bugis bawi (C.), Buru fafu, Aru and Ke islands fawu, waawu, waaf, jef, Timor fahi (C.), Tetu (Timor) fahi, Kaladi (Timor) pahi, Rotti baf (C.), Tagal (Philippine islands) babay, baboy, all ‘pig.’ The forms markt “C.” ar in Crawford’s History, 1820, 2:144.

Babi, L. zwijn, varken. 1835 ROORDA VAN EYSINGA, Javanisch en Nederduitsch woordenboek, p. 3.

... [babī] N. cochon, porc.


Babi, a pig, a hog, a swine.

1862 ROG, Dict. of the Sunda Lang., p. 29.

Bawoi, Schwein....

1859 HARDELAND, Dajacksch-deutsches wörterbuch, p. 60.


1864 EILBERG, Korte woordenlijst van de taal der Aroe- en Kei-eilanden, p. 567.

Babi, faoe.

1874 JELLESMA, Woordenlijst van de taal der Alitoeren op het eiland Boeroe, p. 3.

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

1866 FORBES, A naturalist’s wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago, p. 194.

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

The head of a Babirussa... it hath two long Tushes on the lower jaw, and on the upper two Horns [the canine teeth] that come out a little above the Teeth and turn up towards the Eyes.

1673 RAY, Observ. made in a journey through part of the Low Countries, etc., p. 29. (S. D.)

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

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

1869 WALLACE, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 211. (See also p. 213, 202, 209, 300.)

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

1885 FORBES, A naturalist’s wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago, p. 407 (Buru).

Balachan, blachan, also balachong, blachang, blachong, formerly also balachan, balachoung, balilchang, a fish condiment of a very pronounced nature, the same as the Javanese trassi (trasi).

Malay بالچن بالاخن, البLatin بالافان, Achinese بالافان, Sundanese بالافان, also spread into various dialects of Borneo, and other islands.

بالچن بالافن balachan, caviare; small fish, prawns or shrimps, pounded in a mortar, and preserved with spices. Balachan ikan caviare of fish. Balachan udang kechil, caviare of shrimps.

1812 Marsden, p. 44.

بالچن بالافن بالافن balatifjan, toespij bestaande uit gezouten en dan gestampte en gedroogde vischjes of dergelijke, 't Jav. mal. trasi.

1863 PiJnAppel, p. 38.

Klinkert is more emphatic:

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

1869 Klinkert, p. 36.

بالچن بالافن balaxan, du caviar, petits poissons ou chevrettes séchés au soleil, broyés dans un mortier et formant une conserve que l'on mèle au carry, aux épices etc., pour servir d'assaisonnement au riz... Sund. . . balaxung.

1875 Favre, 2:202.

Also 1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 48; 1852 Crawford, p. 20; 1887 Lim Hiong Seng, 1:57; 1893 Klinkert, p. 112; 1895 Mayer, p. 43; 1895 Clifford and Swettenham, 2:189, 350.
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بلطيس belatjan trassi, gesouten en fijn gestampte kleine garnalen, die met kerrie, sambal enz. worden vermengd.

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

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

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

Maleisch belatjan, Sampitsch balatjan, Katingansch balatjan, ka-

viar (trassie).

1872 Tiedtke, Woordenlijst der Sam-
pitsche en Katingansche taal, p. 12.

The composition is first described by Dampier:

Balachan is a composition of a strong savour, yet a very delightsom dish to the natives of this country. To make it, they throw the mixture of shrimps and small fish into a sort of weak pickle, made with salt and water, and put it into a tight earthen vessel or jar. The pickle being thus weak, it keeps not the fish firm and hard, neither is it probably so designed, for the fish are never gutted. Therefore, in a short time they turn all to a mash in the vessel; and when they have lain thus a good while, so that the fish is reduced to a pap, they then draw off the liquor into fresh jars, and preserve it for use. The masht fish that remains behind is called balachan, and the liquor poured off is called nuk-

mum. The poor people eat the balachan with their rice. 'Tis rank scented, yet the taste is not altogether unpleasant, but rather savory, after one is a little used to it. The nuke-mum is of a pale brown colour, inclining to grey, and pretty clear. It is also very savory, and used as a good sauce for fowls, not only by the natives, but also by many Europeans, who esteem it equal with soy.

1697–1709 Dampier, Voyages, 2:28. (1820 Craw-

ford, Hist. of the Indian Archipelago, i:197.)

There is one mode of preparing and using fish, of so peculiar a nature, but so universally in use, that it is worth a detailed description. This preparation, called by the Malays blachang, and by the Javanese trassi, is a mass composed of small fish, chiefly prawns, which has been fer-

mented, and then dried in the sun. This fetid preparation, so nauseous to a stranger, is the universal sauce of the Indian islanders, more general than soy with the Japanese. No food is deemed palatable without

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

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

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

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


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

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

Banting wild koebeest. 1825 *Roorda van Eysinga*, p. 52.

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


Banteng, Jav. e. s. v. wild rund, zie séi adang. 1893 *Klinkert*, p. 122.

These ar the Javanese and other entries:


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


Banting, eine Art sehr wildes auf Borneo lebendes Rindvieh. 1859 *Härderland, Dajo-jacht-deutsches wörterbuch*, p. 42.

The banteng has his share in English mention:

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

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

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


Not much less than the rhinoceros is the banting or *Bos sundacicus*, to be found in all the uninhabited districts between 2000 and 7000 feet of elevation. 1881 *Encyc. Brit.*, 15:602, s. v. *Java*.
In the forests on the southern slopes of the Malawar and the Wayang [Java], the banteng (Bos banteng) lived in considerable herds. The full-grown animal has a magnificent head of horns... No more bellicose and dangerous inhabitant of the forest than a wounded bull need hunter care to encounter. 1885 Forbes, A naturalist’s wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago, p. 116.

See also Bickmore (1889), p. 72; and Riverside nat. hist. (1884-1888), 5:321.

Bohon upas, the poison-tree of the East Indies, of which fabulous stories were told, and which thus became a favorite matter of allusion in literature and rhetoric. The name also appears as bohon upas and bon upas. The initial b is a blunder. The proper form would be *pohon or *puhun upas; Malay قُرْحَسْ أوتُسٌ pohon or pahan upas, ‘tree of poison’. See further under Upas.

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

أوتُسُ أوتُس, I. vergiftig plantensap, plantaardig vergift: pohon —, vergiftboom, inzond. antiaris toxicaria en strychnos tieute, Béroupas. (Jav. —, Mal. أيقتفا iposh.) 1863 Pinappel, p. 20.

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

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

The following description of the Bohon Upas, or Poison Tree, which grows in the Island of Java, and renders it unwholesome by its noxious vapours, has been procured for the London Magazine, from Mr. Heydinger, who was employed to translate it from the original Dutch, by the author, Mr. Foersch, who, we are informed, is at present abroad, in the capacity of surgeon on board an English vessel.... ‘In the year 1774, I was stationed at Batavia, as a surgeon, in the service of the Dutch East India Company. During my residence there I received several different accounts of the Bohon-Upas, and the violent effects of its poison.’ [Etc., etc.] 1783 London magazine, Dec., p. 512-517. (Y. p. 731.)

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

C'est au fond des sombres forêts de l'île de Java que la nature a caché le pohon upas, l'arbre le plus dangereux du règne végétal, pour le poison mortel qu'il renferme, et plus célèbre encore par les fables dont on l'a rendu le sujet.... 1808 (?) Annales des voyages, 1:69. (Y.)
Antiàris, Lech. Antiar or Antschar, its Javanese name. Linn. 21, Or. 4, Nat. Or. Artocarpácæae. This is the far-famed Upas poison-tree of Java—the Boom [Boon †] or Ron Upas of the Javanese.


The name is found used, by error, for the poison itself.

While the juice of some ["of the Artocarpus tribe"] is nutritive, that of others is highly poisonous. Thus Antiàris toxicaria is the source of the famous poison called Bohun-Upas, or Upas-Antiar, by the Javanese, and which is said to owe its properties to the presence of Strychnia.


Emerson makes a characteristic use of the Bohon Upas; and many other writers mention it.

They [the English] stoutly carry into every nook and corner of the earth their turbulent sense; leaving no lie uncontradicted, no pretension unexamined. They chew hashish; cut themselves with poisoned creases; swing their hammock in the boughs of the Bohon Upas; taste every poison; buy every secret.

1856 Emerson, English traits, ch. 3. (Wks. 1876, p. 103.)

Bruang, the Malayen bear, Ursus or Helarctos malayanus, called also the honey-bear and the sun-bear.

The Malay name is StreamReader text is not legible.

[Not in the Malay-Eng. part.]

Streamer text is not legible.

1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 45.

Bruwang (J.). A bear, Ursus malayanus of Horsfield.

1852 Crawford, p. 31.

Streamer text is not legible.

1863 Pijnappel, p. 34.

Streamer text is not legible.

1889 Langen, Woordenboek der Altsche taal, p. 33.
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Baruang, Poison. The bear of Sumatra and Borneo.
1862 RUGG, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 42.

Brueang, a bear. Not known on Java, except as brought from Sumatra or Borneo as a rarity. Ursus Malayanus.
1862 RUGG, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 65.

Bahuang, Bär.—Degedenden bahuang, etwas taub (so taub als ein Bär) sein. 1859 HARDLAND, Dajacksch-deutsches wörterbuch, p. 30.
Beroewang, Sampitsch bahunwang, Katingansch oenda, beer.
1872 TIEDTKE, Woordenlijst der Sampitsche en Katingansche taal, p. 11.

Bear... buruang bruang.
See also RAFFLES, Hist. of Java (1817), 2: App. 89.

The English use of the name is recent.

Here is also a small bear (bruangh) found elsewhere only in Borneo.
1883 Encyc. Brit., 15:322, art. MALAY PENINSULA.

The genus Helarctos, meaning Sun Bear, strictly embraces but one species, Helarctos malayanus. The Malayan Bear or Bruang, is confined to the Indo-Malayan sub-region, that is, to the Malayan peninsula and the neighboring islands, Borneo, Sumatra and Java. It is much smaller than the Himalayan bear, not exceeding four feet and a half in length.

The Bruang has a smallish head and a short neck which is very strong, enabling it to tear up the great plantains... When tamed it shows so much affection and has so many droll ways as to make it an amusing and prized pet.
1888 Id., 5:372.

Bruh, a Malayan monkey, Macacus nemestrinus. Malay bur, bērû, also with the weak final -k, bur, bēruh, brok; Achinese bērok, Balinese brug, Sampit and Katingan beruk.

1812 MARSDEN, p. 39.

Beroekh, eene apensoort gelijs aan een bairaan, met eenen rooden en kleinen staart.
1825 ROORDA VAN EYSINGA, p. 44.

Bruk. Name of a species of ape.
1852 CRAWFURD, p. 31.

Berê, bru, bru, v. berê, beruk. 1875 FAVRE, 2:291.

Berê, bruê, bruê, nom d'une espèce de singe (magot, R. V.) (simius nemestrinus) (Pij.)... On trouve aussi bruê.
1875 FAVRE, 2:292.

Beroek, naam eener soort van apen—de zoogenaamde lampongsche aap; simius nemestrinus.... 1877 WALL and TUK, 1:222.
Brok, a large monkey with a short tail, often trained to gather cocoanuts and duriens. 1881 SWETTENHAM (1887), 2:19. (See also 1895 CLIFFORD and SWETTENHAM, 2:273.)

Béroq, naam van een groot soort Lampongsche aap.

1889 LANGEN, Woordenboek der Atjehische taal, p. 33.
B'roeg, ben. van eene thans onbekende aapsoort.

1876 R. VAN ECK, Batineesch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 198.
Maleisch broeke, Sampitisch beroek, Katingansch beroek, zeker soort van aap.

1872 TIEDTKE, Woordenlijst der Sampitsche en Katingansche taal, p. 11.

See also RAFFLES, Hist. of Java (1817), 2: App. 89.

The bruah is not so well known in English as his brethren the kahau, the siamang, and the orang-utan.

In length of tail Macacus nemestrinus and M. rhesus hold a median position. The former species, remarkable for the length of the legs and the thinness of the short tail, is of the two the more terrestrial. It is a native of the Malay Archipelago, and is the Bruh of the Malays. The coat is brownish washed with yellow, the hair on the crown longer, and forming a radiating tuft behind. M. rhesus is, on the other hand, a native of India.... The tail is proportionally longer, thicker, and does not have the pig-like twirl of that of the bruah.

1884-88 Riverside nat. hist., 5:517.

Cajuput, also cajeput, kajuput, kaajput, caajput, an East Indian tree, and an oil derived from it (and other trees).

Cajuput is more commonly, but less correctly, speld cajeput.

Cajeput, pronounced in the dictionaries "ka'jé-cut" or "ka'jé-pút," that is, czdjh'j-pút, -pút, is, like the Portuguese cajeput, a copy of the French cajeput, a bad form of cajuput. Cajuput or kaajput is an adapted form of cajputi, which is also found: see CAJUPUTI. The j is the Dutch spelling of what is in English y, and in cajuput, at least, it should be pronounced as y (that is, like j in hallelujah). Webster (1890) gives cajuput with an alternative pronunciation rendering j as y.

(1) Cajeput or Cajeput tree.

Kayu-putih. The cajeput myrtle, Melaleuca caejputi.

1852 CRAWFORD, p. 70.

Prominent for their straight and shapely pillar-like stems stand out the Lakka (Myristica inera), the Rasamala (Liquidambar altingiana), and the white-stemmed Kajput trees (Melaleuca leucadendron), all of them rising with imposing columns, without a branch often for 80 and sometimes 100 feet.

1885 FORBES, A naturalist’s wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago, p. 74.

The road led over numerous small hills, from the top of which we got many pretty peeps of Haruka and Ceram, through Gum-tree—the famous Kajput—forest and Kussu-grass fields. 1885 Id., p. 996.
(2) Cajeput oil, often reduced to cajeput. The Malay name is miniat kāyū pūtīh. But in Java kāyū pūtīh is used also as the name of the oil (Rigg).


The leaf of the smaller [Cayuputi trees], [affords] by distillation, the fragrant essential oil which has been used for medical purposes, sometimes internally as a powerful sudorific, but more frequently externally as an useful embrocation, under the ignorant and corrupt denomination of Cajeput. 1820 Crawfurd, Hist. of the Indian Archipelago, I:513.

The leaves of Melaleuca minor (Cajuputi of some), a native of the Moluccas, yield the volatile oil of Cajeput. It is a very liquid oil, of a grass-green colour, having a pungent camphoraceous odour, and capable of dissolving caoutchouc. It is used medcically as a stimulant and antispasmodic. 1855 Balfour, Manual of botany (3d ed.), p. 428.

Doors all shut
On hinges oil'd with cajeput.

a. 1845 Hood, To Mr. Malthus (N. E. D.).

Its [Kajeli] great items of export are fish... and the famous Kajuput oil, distilled by the natives from the leaves of the gum trees (Melaleuca Cajuputi) which form a large part of the vegetation of the shores of the Bay. 1835 Forbes, A naturalist's wanderings in the Eastern Archipelago, p. 391.

Cajeput. The name of a fragrant essential oil produced especially in Celebes and the neighbouring island of Bouro. The drug and tree were first described by Rumphius, who died 1693. (See Hanbury and Fläckiger, p. 247.) 1886 Yule and Burnell, Hobson-Jobson, p. 109.

Cajuputi, also cayuputi, kayuputi, an East Indian tree, Melaleuca leucadendron, L. So in New Latin, cajuputi. Adanson used caju-puti as the generic name (1763, Fam. ii. 84); see Index Reversis i:372. Caju-puti should be pronounced as it is spelt, Romanly că-yu-pu’ti, not "kaj-joo-pyo-ty." Spanish cayuputi, Dutch kajoe-poeti.

The Malay name is кэйу pútih. It means 'white tree' or 'white wood.' The bark is white, like the bark of the birch. The name appears also in other languages, Javanese and Sundanese kayu putih, Macassar kayu puti. In Bali kayu putih, 'White Tree,' is the name of a village (1876 Eck, p. 80).

... Kayû pútih a species of tree which yields a medicinal oil, melaleuca-leucadendron, L. 1812 Marsden, p. 235.

... Kajoe poeti, e. s. v. boom, uit welks bladeren de aetherische olie, minja kajoe poeti, wordt getrokken.

1893 Klinkert, p. 479.

Also 1852 Crawfurd, p. 70; 1863 Pilnappel, p. 173; 1875 Favre, 1:231.
Kayu-putih, literally—white wood. The tree grows in the Moluccas; and on Java, the words kayu-putih, as in Europe, mean the essential oil derived from the tree. It is the Cajeput of Europe. Melaleuca Cajeputi.

1862 Rigo, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 211.

... Kāyoe poeti, soort van boom, Melaleuca Cajuputi, vooral bekend om zijn olie.

1859 MATTHES, Makassaarsch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 35.

Kāyū is the general Malay term for 'wood' or 'tree':

Cayou. Lignum. 1631: HAYX, p. 11.

kāyū wood, timber; a tree; an idiomatic term used in counting certain substances.... 1812 MARSDEN, p. 251.

Kayu (J). Wood, timber; a tree; an idiomatic term in the enumeration of some objects, and equivalent to "a roll" or "piece" in English.

1852 CRAWFURD, p. 70. Also 1863 Pijnappel, p. 173; 1875 FAVRE, 1:231; 1880 WALL and TOUR, 2:486; 1893 KLINKERT, p. 475; 1895 MAYER, p. 120; etc.

The word is found throughout the Archipelago; Achinese kai, kai, Batak kau, Lampong kau, Javanese, Sundanese, Balinese, kau, Dayak kau, Macassar kau, Bugis aju, Sangi-Manganiitu kahuh, Buru kau, Aru kai, Kei kau, etc. In many of the eastern isles, as in Bugis, it is found without the initial consonant, ayo, aya, ai, aai, aow, ov, etc. In the Moluccan form at, it has emerged in English use as the unrecognized first element of the word atlantis. See Atlantis, where the decapitate Malayan forms are given. The word also appears in the Philippine islands, Spanish cdhuy, Tagala and Bisaya kahong, and in Madagascar, Malagasi hazu (hazou), and throughout Polynesia, Fiji kau, Marquesan kau, akau, Tongan akau, Tahitian rau, Maori raka, etc. (See Tregear, Maori-Polynesian compar. dict., 1891, p. 387-8.)

Kajoe hout kajih.

1880 ARRIENS, Maleisch-Hollandsch-Afjeheche woordenlijst, p. 45.

Kayè, hout. 1889 LANGEN, Woordenboek der Afjeheche taal, p. 201.

Kajoe, boom, hout... [Many kinds of trees are mentioned].

1891 HELFRICH, Lampangsche-Hollandsche woordenlijst, p. 3-4.

... [kayu] N.... [kajeng] K. bois, arbre...

1870 FAVRE, Dict. javanais-français, p. 165.

Kaju, wood, timber: sometimes used for a tree in general. Kha appears to be wood in Burmese. [A fanciful etym. follows.]

1862 Rigo, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 211.

Kaju, Holz, Baum... Kajuan, Gehölz (Wald)....

1859 HARDELAND, Dajacksch-deutches wörterbuch, p. 204.

... kāyoe, b. kayoeua, vzw. kayoenkoe, hout....

1869 MATTHES, Makassaarsch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 35.

Boomstam, m. kālūh.

1860 RieDEl, Sangi-Manganiitusch woordenlijst, p. 381.

Hout, o. kālūh. 1860 Id., p. 389.
Malay پُتِّی is the ordinary word for 'white.' It is found in many languages. I omit quotations.

In English use Cajuputi, Cayuputi, Kayuputi all appear.

A remarkable example of this is afforded in the Cayuputi trees (Melia-leuca leucadendron) of the Indian islands, which are gigantic myrtles. These trees are easily distinguished in the forest by the whiteness of their bark, which has some resemblance in structure and appearance to that of the birch. This white colour gives to the tree its commercial and vulgar name of Kayu-puti, which means literally "white wood."

1820 Crawford, Hist. of the Indian Archipelago, 1:513.

The far famed Kayu Putih.

1842 Brooke, Journal, in Mundy, Narrative, etc. (1848), 1:283.

There was a little brush and trees along the beach, and hills inland covered with high grass and Cajuputi trees—my dread and abhorrence.


Next day we took a westward course through fields of tall Kussu grass dotted with Kayu-puti trees, and through swamps full of sago palms.


So Cajuputi-oil, Cayu-puti oil, Kayu-puti oil.

Cayu-puti oil.

1820 Crawford, Hist. of the Indian Archipelago, 3:413, 414.

Rattans from Borneo, sandal-wood and bees'-wax from Flores and Timor, tripan from the Gulf of Carpentaria, Cajuputi-oil from Borneo, wild nutmegs and mussol-bark from New Guinea, are all to be found in the stores of the Chinese and Bugis merchants of Macassar.

1869 Wallace, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 309.

Kayu-puti oil.

1869 Bickmore, Travels in the East Indian Archipelago, p. 249.

Campong, also kampong, a Malayan village, a district or quarter of a city; an inclosure; the source of the Anglo-Indian term Compound, which see.

Malay كَمَپْنُونْ, kampung, 'an inclosure, district, village,' (see quotations); also adjectiv, 'collected, assembled, inclosed'; with verb formativ, 'to assemble'; Batak tampung, Lampong kampung, Javanese kampung, Sundanese kampung, Dayak kampung, Macassar kampong, Tagal kampun, 'an inclosure,' etc.; Malagasie kambound, 'inclosed.'


1631 Haex, p. 11.

كَمَپْنُونْ kampung an inclosure, a place surrounded with a paling; a fenced or fortified village; a quarter, district, or suburb of a city; a collection of buildings. . . .

1812 Marshden, p. 257.
kampung, eene buurt of menigte huizen, die alle door eenen
algemeenen of ieder derzelve door eenen bijzonderen heining omgeven
wordt. Eene wijk, buurt of kwartier in eene stad. Een omheind stuk
land, eene befloten plaat, afheining; buurt, wijk....

1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 320.
Also 1852 Crawford, p. 66; 1863 Pijnappel, p. 182; 1875 Favre, i: 345;
1880 Wall and Tuuk, 2:543; 1881 Swettenham (1887), 2:45; 1893
Klinkert, p. 539.

Kampung, I. erf, wijk, aanplant; II. vereeniging van gezinnen
Kampung, a village; is properly Malay....

1862 Rigg, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 194.

Hardeland does not give a Dayak kampung, 'an inclosure,' but he
gives the adjective kampeng 'closed,' 'obstructed' (as a door,
a river, and figuratively, the heart or mind), with numerous
derivatives.

Kampeng, versperrt [etc.].

1859 Hardeland, Dajackisch-deutsches wörterbuch, p. 222.
... kampong, Mal. een kampung, een omheinde plaats.

1859 Matthaeus, Makassarsch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 7.

In Malagasi the word (kambound) has only the original sense
'collected,' 'enclosed' (1896 Marre, p. 32).

Campung, kampung is common in English books of Eastern
travel.

His campong was at Singi.

1844 Brooke, Journal, in Mundy, Narrative, etc. (1848), i:371.
I obtained the use of a good-sized house in the Campong Sirani (or

Like all the cities and larger settlements in the Dutch possessions,
Amboina is divided into a native kampong or quarter, a Chinese kampong,
and a quarter where foreigners reside.

1869 Bickmore, Travels in the East Indian Archipelago, p. 132.

There are Malay campongs (villages) scattered over the island, made
up of a few rude bamboo huts, and two or three clusters of fruit-trees.
1875 Thomson, The Straits of Malacca, Indo-China, and China, p. 18
All islands are liable to the linguistic difficulty of their littoral being
occupied by a superior seafaring and commercial race, either continuously
or in detached "campongs," while the interior and unexplored
mountains become the refuge of shy and uncivilized indigenes.

1878 Cust, Sketch of the mod. languages of the East Indies, p. 132.
The great coco-groves are by no means solitary, for they contain the
kampongs, or small raised villages of the Malays.... In the neighbor-
hood of Malacca these kampongs are scattered through the perpetual
twilight of the forest....

1883 Miss Bird, The Golden Chersonese, p. 137.
Cassowary, a large bird related to the emu and the ostrich. This name came into English use early in the seventeenth century, and went through various spellings, cassowary (1673), cassawarea (1611), cassawaraway (1630), cassiovery (1690), cassuarry, also with a Latinized termination cassuarius (1705), and sometimes cassuware (1651), and (as a poetic truncation) cassower (1800 Southey); also in other languages, French casoar, Spanish casuaires (1705 Stevens), casobar, casoar (1878 Dominguez), casuel ("cassowary, large bird of prey"), 1879 Meadows), Portuguese casuar (Michaelis), Italian casuario, Dutch casuari, kasuari, German casuabre (1672 in Yule), kaswari (1682 in Yule), casuar, kasuari (1848); Swedish and Danish kasuar, Russian kazuari, New Latin casuarius (1631 Bontius), casuarius.

The word cassowary has been generally refered to a Malay origin, but the statements have been more or less inexact. Bontius (1631) says the bird, which he calls emu, is "vulgo Casoaria," that is, as he implies, the native name in Ceram is casoaris. Other statements followed; see forms and dates cited. From these earlier European mentions, the native name has been variously inferred and stated.

Worcester (1860) gives Malay cassuvaris. "Webster" (1864) gives "Hindost. cassuvaris." Littré (1877) gives Malay cassuvaris. Skeat (1879) quotes Littré for kassuvaris. Yule (1886) gives Malay kasuvari or kasuari. The earlier forms cited as nominal English, Spanish, German, or Dutch, ar of course all intended to reflect the Malayon name.

The correct European reflex would be casuvari, casuari, or kasuvari, kasevari. The Malay word is كاسوراي, less exactly transliterated kasuari. But it is worthy of note that no Malay dictionary records the word until the year 1863. No form kasuari or one like it appears in Marsden (1812) or in Roorda van Eysinga (1825). Nor is kasuari in Crawford (1852). The first entry of kasuwari in a Malay dictionary appears to be in Pijnappel (1863), where it is not given in alphabetic place, but is mentioned as an earlier form of suwari (soewari). In Macassar the word is recorded, as kassoari, in 1859.

سواري, de casuari (van een vorm kasoewari). 1863 Pijnappel, p. 143.
Klinkert, in his Supplement to Pijnappel (1869), takes no notice of either form.

The next dictionary entry, like Pijnappel's, is indirect, in the name *pohon kasuāri*, 'cassowary tree' (1864–5 Van E ترك). See under *Casuarina*. Then there are entries in 1875 Favre, 1880 Wall and Tuuk, 1895 Mayer.


Beside the name *kasuwāri*, there is an other name *suwāri*, first mentioned so far as the quotations show, by Crawfurd, 1852. This appears also in Pijnappel 1863 (*soewari*), in Favre 1875 (*suāri*), and Wall 1880 (*soewari*); and it is also recorded in Macassar (1859), as *sowāri*.

The two forms *kasuwāri* and *suwāri* are no doubt connected. Compare *kapūyū* and *pūyū*, a quail; *lingking* and *kelingking*, a fruit, the lichi. The office of the apparent prefix *ka-* is not clear. It does not seem to be the prefix *ka-* as used in connection with the suffix *-an*, to form certain verbal nouns or participles.

*Suwāri* appears in most of the dictionaries from Crawfurd (1852) down:


Cassowary, Suwari. 1852 Crawfurd, Eng. and Malay dict., p. 25.

*soewari*, de casuaris (van een vorm *kasoewari*). 1863 Pijnappel, p. 143.

*suwari* = *kasuawari*. 1875 Favre, 2:640.


... *sowāri* = *ka-soewari*, casuaris. 1859 Matthew, Makassaurusch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 608.

The bird is mentioned, under a name now current as *emu*, in the following passage:

...
In Banda and other Islands, the bird called Emia or Eme, is admirable. It is foure foot high, somewhat resembling an Ostrich, but having three claws on the feet, and the same exceeding strong: it hath two wings rather to helpe it running, then serviceable for flight: the legges great and long.

1613 Purchas, Pilgrimage, p. 430.

The first English mention of the name cassowary appears to refer to a bird brought to England:

St. James his Ginny Hens, the Cassawarway moreover. (Note by Coryat. An East Indian bird at St. James in the keeping of Mr. Walker, that will carry no coales, but eat them as what you will.)

1611 Peacham, in Paneg. verses on Coryat's Crudities, sig. l. 3 r° (1776). (S. D.)

A Cassawaries or Emeus Egg.

1673 J. Ray, Journ. Low Countr., p. 28. (S. D.)

(See other quotations in S. D. and N. E. D.)

The Cassawaries is about the bigness of a large Virginia Turkey. His head is the same as a Turkey's; and he has a long stiff hairy Beard upon his Breast before, like a Turkey.

1705 Funnel, in Dampier's Voyages, 4:266 (1720). (Y.)

Cassowary, or Emeu, a large Fowl, with Feathers resembling Camels-Hair.

1708 and 1715 Kersey.

Another large and extraordinary bird is the Cassowary, which inhabits the island of Ceram only. It is a stout and strong bird, standing five or six feet high, and covered with long coarse black hair-like feathers. The head is ornamented with a large horny casque or helmet, and the bare skin of the neck is conspicuous with bright blue and red colours. The wings are quite absent, and are replaced by a group of horny black spines like blunt porcupine quills.... This bird is the helmeted cassowary (Casuarius galeatus) of naturalists, and was for a long time the only species known.

1869 Wallace, Malay Archipelago (1890) p. 305.

See also 1774 Goldsmith, Hist. of the earth (1790), 5:6, p. 67, 73 (Jodrell); 1856 Crawfurd, Descriptive dict., p. 84; 1869 Bickmore, Travels in the East Indian Archipelago, p. 150; 1889 Wallace, Darwinism, p. 115.

The unreflecting voracity of the bird appears in the quotation in which he eats coals "as whot as you will." In the "experience," or at least in the travels, of a warlike German, quoted by Yule (1644–1659) he, the cassowary, swallowed 50 bullets, of a size not stated. According to a popular rime, the cassowaries of Timbuctoo, which are ignored by the leading ornithologists, make light of a still heavier diet:

If I were a cassowary,
Far away in Timbuctoo,
I would eat a missionary,
Hat and boots and hymn-book, too.

a. 1880 Auctor incert., loc. non cit.
C. P. G. Scott, [1896.]

Casuarina, an East Indian and Australian tree.
It is an Anglicized form of New Latin casuarina (Linnaeus, Amoen. Acad., 1759, iv. 143, cited in Index Kewensis, 1893, 1: 457; Adanson, Fâm. ii. 481, 1763, cited l. c.), a genus of trees of which many species are named.

This appears to be based on a Malayan name associating the tree with the cassowary. In Van Eekhout 1864 the Malay name pohon kasuari 'cassowary tree' is given as the synonym of several names of the tree in the Ambon region,—laveur, leveur, lweur, kweule, lehua. An other Malay name is ḋṟũ ḋṟũ (1893 Klinkert, p. 14). In Bareë (central Celebes) the tree is named ḋogu.

Laveur, zekere boom (pohon kasuari) (P.)—leveur (H. W. K.)—lweur (T. E.)—kweule (A.)—lehua (Kr.).
Opâ (T. Ogô), casuarisboom.

1894 Kruyt, Woordenlijst van de Bareë-taal, p. 47.
Casuarina, kas-u-a-rin's, s. (from the supposed likeness of the branches to the plumes of the Cassowary). A genus of plants, constituting the type and only genus of the order Casuarinae. 1847 Craig.
The Casuarinæ [in Timur], especially, remind the observer of the Australian vegetation.

1856 Crawford, Dict. of the Indian islands, p. 433.

Surrounding Elie House, near Colombo, in which I resided, were a number of tall casuarinas and India-rubber trees, whose branches almost touched the lattices of the window of the room in which I usually sat. These were the favorite resort of the tree-snarls, and in the early morning the numbers which clung to them were sometimes quite remarkable.

1861 Tennent, Sketches of the nat. hist. of Ceylon, p. 305.
It was lovely in the white moonlight with the curving shadows of palms on the dewy grass, the grace of the drooping casuarinas, the shining water, and the long drift of surf.


Cockatoo, an East Indian parrot. The word has had many forms in English, cockato, cokatoe, kokatu, kakatu, cockatoo, and corruptly cockatooon, cocadore, crockadore, jecatoo, etc. Other European forms ar French cacatoës, kakatoës, cacatoës, Spanish cacatua, Portuguese cacatou, Dutch kakatoe, kaketoë, kakato, German kakadu, Swedish kakadu, cacatu, etc.

The Malay word is kâkâtuwa, kâkatâua, kàkatuwa, kàkatuha; Javanese kokotuwa, Achinese kakatuwa; Sundanese kakatuwa; in the Ambon region lakatuwa, or without the terminal syllables, lâka, lâki, lâa, also with only the terminal syllables, reduplicated, tau-tau.
The name is imitative of the parrot’s utterance. This is indicated not only by the common belief (see the English quotations dated 1662, 1705, and 1884–8), but by the ‘dialectal’ forms, and by the existence of other similar imitative names for parrots, as Malay kekē, Sunda eks, a parroquet, Bugis chakōlek, a cockatoo, Maori kaka, a parrot, kakapo, the owl-parrot.

Another notion is that the bird derives its name from the Malay kakatūwa, ‘a vise or grip’; but this is obviously a transfer from the name of the bird, in allusion to the grip of its claws or its beak. Compare crane, crane, cock, goose, English names of implements transferred from names of birds.

Wall and Tuuk declare that kakatūwa, which they write also in a form corresponding to kakatūha, is a compound of kāka and tuēha (tuāh), meaning, I suppose, ‘old brother’ or ‘deeply colored brother’! This is not convincing.

1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 314.
1852 Crawford, p. 65.
1853 Piunappel, p. 179.
1875 Fayer, 1:302.
1880 Wall and Tuuk, 2:524.
1887 Lim Hiong Seng, Manual of the Malay colloquial, p. 128, 149.
Also 1881 Swettenham (1887) 2:44; 1893 Klinkert, p. 526; 1895 Mayer, p. 120.

The name appears in Sundanese kakatuwa, Achinese kakatuwa, kakaktua. In the Ambonese islands it is lakatua, lakā, lākā, lāa, and tautau.

Kakatuwa, a cockatoo; used as applied to parrots imported from countries beyond Java, as the parrots of the Moluccos.

1882 Rico, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 187.

1889 Langen, Woordenboek der Atpjezche taal, p. 208.
Laka, witte kakatoe (R. Kr.)—lakatua (T. H. W. K. P.)—lau' [=tau-tau] (P.)—lāki (A.)—laa (Ht.).
The cockatoo enter'd English, according to the first quotation, with an evil reputation and a worse etymology.

Sparrowes, Robbins, Herons, (white and beautifull) Cacatoes (Birds like Parrots, fierce, and indomitable: and may properly be so called from the Greeke Κακός ὑδεύ proceeding from an euill egge).

1634 Sir T. Herbert, Trave's, p. 212. (S. D., p. 254.)
Some rarities of naturall things, but nothing extraordinary save the skin of a jaccall, a rarely colour'd jacatoo or prodigious parrot....

1654 Evelyn, Diary, July 11. (Y., p. 175.)
An infinite number of Parrots, whereof there are several kinds.... Some are all white, or of a Pearl colour, having on their Crowns a tuft of Feathers of a Carnation red, and they are called Khatatou, from that word which in their chattering they pronounce very distinctly.

1662 J. Davies, tr. Mandelso (1669), 1:26. (S. D.)
The Crockadore is a Bird of various Sizes, some being as big as a Hen, and others no bigger than a Pidgeon. They are in all Parts exactly of the shape of a Parrot. When they fly wild up and down the Woods they will call Crockadore, Crockadore; for which reason they go by that name. 1705 Funnel, in Dampier, Voyages, 4:265-6. (Y. p. 174.)
See other quotations in Yule and S. D., 1638, 1698, 1719, 1750, 1775; also 1840 Brooke (1848), 1:53.
Small white cockatoos were abundant, and their loud screams, conspicuous white colour, and pretty yellow crests, rendered them a very important feature in the landscape. This [Lombock] is the most westerly point on the globe where any of the family are to be found.

1869 Wallace, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 119, 120.
Cockatoos [in the Aru islands]. [Their habits described at length.]
1869 Wallace, Id. (1890), p. 341-343.
The true cockatoos belong to the genus Cacatu or Pictolophus. With two exceptions, the fifteen species are white.... They make very interesting pets, crying now "cockatoo," now "pretty cocky," or screaming with a voice far from musical.


Compound, an inclosure, a yard.
This is an Anglo-Indian sophistication of the Anglo-Indian campong, representing the Malay word kampong, kampung, in early mention (1631 Hax) also written campon. The sophistication is like that which appears in godown, sometimes, godon, for godong, gadong, a Malayan word which is excluded from this paper as being of Indian origin. The other proposed etymologies of compound (see Yule, p. 186-8) are not tenable. For the Malay form, see under Campong, which is now established in English use.

It is a curious coincidence that the Malay word which means literally 'brought together,' 'assembled,' has acquired an English form which assimilates it to a word which means 'put together.'
The Malayan Words in English.

There [at Pollicull near Madapollam] the Dutch have a Factory of a large Compound, where they dye much blew cloth, having above 800 jars set in the ground for that work; also they make many of their best paintings there.

1679 Fort St. George Consuls. (on Tour), April 14. In Notes and Extracts, Madras, 1871. (Y., p. 782.)

The houses [at Madras] are usually surrounded by a field or compound, with a few trees or shrubs, but it is with incredible pains that flowers or fruit are raised.

1812 Maria Graham, Journal of a residence in India, p. 124. (Y.)

See other quotations (1606, 1772, 1781, 1788, etc.) in Yule, p. 186, 782.

At the entrance to the Rajah's compound...I was startled by suddenly coming on a tall pole with a fringed triangle near its summit.


Coracora, a Malayan galley. Also kora-kora (1869 Wallace), corocoro (1774 Forrest) (= G. korreskorre 1659, in Yule); also (2) caracora (as New Latin, 1606, 1613), (3) caracore (1784), (4) caracole, caracolle (1622 Cocks, 1606 Middleton), and korkollen (a mere Dutch spelling) (1613 Purchas); (5) caracoa (from Spanish caracoa). The most correct form is coracora, derived, through the Portuguese coracora, corocora, from the Malay كورة kora-kora or كور koor, kura-kura, Macassar korra-korra, a kind of galley (see the quotations).

....Kóra-kóra, a large rowing boat or praw used by the people of the eastern islands. (See plates in Forrest's Voyage to N. Guinea.)

1812 Marsden, p. 273.

Kura-kura. Name of a large kind of sailing vessel.

1852 Crawfurd, p. 82.

Kóra koéra.... II. koera-koera, soort van oorlogspraauwen in de Molukken. (Liever kóra-kóra. Port. carraca?)

1803 Plinapfel, p. 186.


Also 1880 Wall and Tuuk, 2:561; 1893 Klinkert, p. 554.

....1° kóra.... 2° kóra-kóra, bap. korra-korráya, soort van vaartuigen, vroeger, vooral bij de heenggi-togen in de Molukko's gebruikt.

1859 Matthes, Makassaarsch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 43.

The origin of the Malay kóra-kóra or kura-kura has been variously stated.

(1) In one view it is a transferd use of the Malay كور kóra-kóra, also كور ku-kura, a tortoise. The allusion would be,
one would suppose, either to the pace or to the shape; but the vessel is described as a “barque à marche rapide” (see quotation 1882 under Caracoa below), and nothing is said of its likeness in shape to a tortoise. It would seem more likely that the tortoise was named from the boat; but the words appear to be independent. The word for the tortoise is mentioned in all the dictionaries.

(2) In another view the Malay kōra-kōra, kura-kūra, a vessel, is from the Arabic قرقر qurqūr, qorqūr, qurqūr, plural qarāqīr, qarāqīr, a large merchant vessel.

According to Arabic scholars, this Arabic term is not nativ, but was borrowed at an early date, from the Greek κύρως (whence Lat. cercūrus, cercūrus), a kind of vessel invented by the Cyprians. The Greek name itself is perhaps ultimately of Semitic origin (18. Fraenkel, Fremdwörter, p. 217; 1895 Lewy, Die semitischen fremdwörter im Griechischen, p. 152). The Arabic word, in the plural qarāqīr, is asserted, by most writers, to be the source of the Romance word, Spanish carraca, Italian caracca, French caraque, whence the English carrack, carrick of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; but this view is without warrant.

In the absence of proof to the contrary, we may assume kōra-kōra to be nativ Malayan.

I give the English and other European quotations in the order of the five forms above discriminated.

(1) Coracora, kora-kora, corocoro.

A corocoro is a vessel generally fitted with outriggers, having a high arched stem and stern, like the points of a half moon.... The Dutch have fleets of them at Amboyna, which they employ as guardacostas.

1774 Forrest, Voyage to New Guinea, 23. (Y. p. 122.)

The boat was one of the kind called "Kora-kora," quite open, very low, and about four tons burthen. It had outriggers of bamboo about five feet off each side, which supported a bamboo platform extending the whole length of the vessel. On the extreme outside of this sat the twenty rowers, while within was a convenient passage fore and aft. The middle portion of the boat was covered with a thatch-house, in which baggage and passengers are stowed; the gunwale was not more than a foot above water, and from the great top and side weight, and general clumsiness, these boats are dangerous in heavy weather, and are not unfrequently lost.

1869 Wallace, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 266.

I add two French statements:

"The Malay kora-kora is a great row-boat; still in use in the Molucas. Many measure 100 feet long and 10 wide. Some have as many as 90 rowers." 18... tr. Marre, Kata-Kata Malayou, 87. (Y.)
The Malayan Words in English.

Le sculpture des korokoro malais... annonce autant d'intelligence que de goût. 18. RENZI, Océanie, 1:84. (Devic, p. 84.)

(2) Caracora:

... Nave conscensâ, quam linguâ patriâ caracora nuncupant. Navigi genus est oblongum; et angustum, triremis instar, velis simul et remis impellitur. 1606 JARRIC, Thesaurus, 1:192. (Y.)

They exercice Sea-fights in their Caracore, or Galeots, with great Dexteritie. 1613 PURCHAS, Pilgrimage, p. 453.

(3) Caracore:

Caracores are light vessels used by the natives of Borneo... and by the Dutch as guarda costas in those latitudes. 1794 Rigging and seamanship, 1:240. (N. E. D.)

(4) Caracole, caracolle (karkollen).

The foremost of these Galleys or Caracoles recovered our Shippe, wherein was the King of Tarnata. 1606 Last East-Indian voyage to Bantam and the Maluco islands, E 2. (Y. p. 122.)

They haue [in Amboina] Gallies after their manner, formed like Dragons, which they row very swifly: they call them Karkollen. 1613 PURCHAS, Pilgrimage, p. 453.

7 or 8 caracoles (or boates). 1622 ROCKS, Diary (1888), 1:279. (S.D.)

(5) Caracoa.

Caracoa is a Spanish form, a modification of the Malay korakora.

Caracoa, a sort of large Indian Boat. 1706 STEVENS, Spanish and Eng. dict.

Les Phillipines nomment ces batimens caracoas. C'est vne espèce de petite galère à rames et à voiles. 1711 in Lettres édifiantes et curieuses (1780-83), 4:27. (Y.)

Caracoa (la).—Barque à marche rapide qui se construit principalement dans le Sud de l’archipel. 1882 BLUMENTRITT, Vocab. de l’espagnol des Philippines, tr. Hugot (1884), p. 22.

Yule enters caracoa as a nominal English word, but I hav found no true English examples. Caracoa occurs 17 times in one of the Hakluyt society’s publications, an edition, publisht in 1855, of “The last East-Indian voyage” (1606), but there is no telling whether caracoa occurs even once in the original (a quotation with caracoles is given above, from Yule). The editor indeed says that in editing the text, he has brutally mutilated the orthography, has starch and ironed the punctuation, and has destroyd the proper names, substituting other names out of his own head. His exact words ar:
In editing the text, I have modernized the orthography and punctuation, and have restored the proper names to uniformity.

1855 ——, *The voyage of Sir Henry Middleton to Bantam and the Maluco islands* (Hakluyt soc. 1855), Advertisement, p. viii.

And in a note to his first mention of *caracoa* in the text, he says:

The word occurs near twenty times, and is variously spelt. I have given it the Spanish form.

Yet there is no statement in the preface or on the title-page that the text was intended for kindergarten use.

**Cuscus**, an East Indian opossum. Sometimes Frenchified *couscouz*; Dutch *coescoes*, F. *couscous*, N. L. *cucus*; from Malay *kuskus* كوسكس, in Amboina *kusu*, in Manado *kusé*, in Timor *kui*.

(See Valentyn, vol. iii., p. 272, and pl. fig. D.)

1812 *Marsden*, p. 274.

**Kuskus**. Name of a didelphine animal, Didelphis orientalis.

1852 *Crawfurd*, p. 83.

**Kuskes** كوسكس, soort van buideldier, didelphys, in de Molukken.

1863 *Piijappel*, p. 178.

**Kusxs** كوسكس, nom d’un animal de la famille des marsupiaux (didelphe), dans les Moluques.

1875 *Favre*, i:382.

**Koei. T[imor], een buideldier, coescoes. (A[mbon] koeso; M[anado] koest.)**

1876 *Clercq*, *Het Maleisch der Molukken*, p. 23.

*Cuscus* was made familiar in English by Wallace and Forbes, but it is found earlier.

*Cuscus maculatus*.... This species, which is named *Coescoes* at the Moluccas, according to Valentyn, varies much in its colouring. At Wagiou....the natives call it *Schaamscham*.

1839 *Penny Cyclo.*, 14:460a.

The naked-tailed and strictly prehensile *Couscous* of the Moluccas.

1839 *Id.*, 460b.

Just as we had cleared away and packed up for the night, a strange beast was brought, which had been shot by the natives. It resembled in size, and in its white woolly covering, a small fat lamb, but had short legs, hand-like feet with large claws, and a long prehensile tail. It was a *Cuscus* (*C. maculatus*), one of the curious marsupial animals of the Papuan region. 1869 *Wallace*, *Malay Archipelago* (1890), p. 350.

[Also mentioned on pp. 104, 223, 301 and 324.]

The Marsupial species of *Cuscus* [italics in original] also, of which we have obtained three species, have interested us. They are very plenti-
ful, and at this season [May 21] the females all seem to have a little one in their pouch. One of these was a tiny creature about two inches long, quite hidden in its pouch, fixed by its lips formed into a simple round orifice to its mother's teat. They are much eaten by the natives, by whom they are caught in nooses set in the trees, or by artifice. In moonlight nights creeping stealthily to the foot of a tree where they have observed one sleeping, taking care not to lift their heads so that the light flash in their eyes, they imitate at short intervals its cry, by placing the fingers in the nose; the Cuscus descends, and is fallen on by the watchers below. The python is their greatest enemy, and devours large numbers of them as they cling to the branches during the day in a semi-torpid condition.


Dugong, a large sirenian of the Eastern seas, Halicore dugong, also known in two other species, H. tabernaculi, of the Red Sea, and H. australis, of the Australian waters. It is allied to the American manatee.

The form dugong follows the French and New Latin dugong of Cuvier, dugon of Buffon, a blunder for dugong. The Malay word is درويڠ، درويڠ، درويڠ، درويڠ; Achinese درويڠ، درويڠ، درويڠ، درويڠ, Javanese درويڠ، درويڠ, Macassar درويڠ, Bugis درويڠ, Ambonina درويڠ. In Bugis the name is applied to the dolphin.

In درويڠ a very large sea-animal of the order of mammals, vulgarly called the sea-cow, and by naturalists, the dugong (from the Malay word), which has given occasion to the stories of mermaids in the tropical seas.

1812 Marsden, p. 139.

doejong een groot zeedier, gewoonlijk de zeehoe genaamd.

Humba pön ter-kedjut-lah me-lichat doejong jang ámat basar doedokh di pantej, ik vereschichte op het zien van eene zeer groote zeehoo, welke op het strand zat.

1825 Roorda van Eysinga, p. 166.

Doeyung (J). The lamantin or dugong. 1852 Crawfurd, p. 45.


Doeyung, nom d’un animal marin (vache marine M. Pij.). Jav.

... doeyung. Mak. ... ruyung et Bug. ... ruyung dauphin.

1875 Favre, 1:859.

Also 1886 Wall and Tuuk, 2:186; 1893 Klinkert, p. 312; 1895 Mayer, p. 90.

Lêloemba zeehoo. Doejoeen zeevarken.

1879 Dias, Lijst van Antehsche woorden, p. 159.

[These entries should be transposed, as to the Dutch words.]
doejoen, de zeekoe.


1891 VORDERMAN, Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Billiton-Maleisich, p. 392.

In Macassar it is rūyung, and its tears hav the property of calling the ladies’ attention to one’s merits:

... royoeng, soort van dolfijn, Boegin roedjoeng, idem. De tranen van dezen visch opgevangen, en daaraan het vermogen toegeschreven, om het hart eener schoone aan zich te verbinden.

1899 MATTHES, Makassarsch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 453. Rukun, zekere visch (Mi. doejong) (T. R. Kr.)

1864-65 A. van EERIS, Woordenlijst ... Ambonische eilanden, p. 336.

In the first English mention of the animal which I hav noted, the name is not given:

They have no Kine, but a Fifh of like lineaments, which they take in their Nets.

1613 PURCHAS, Pilgrimage, p. 436.

Pennant calls it the “Indian walrus”:

Indian [Walrus]. Le Dugon de Buffon ... W[alrus] with two short canine teeth, or tufks, placed in the upper jaw ... [etc.] ... It is said by one [traveller], that it goes upon land to feed on the green mofs, and that it is called in the Philippines, the Dugung.* [Note: *De Buffon xiii. 377, the note.] 1771 Pennant, Synopsis of quadrupeds, p. 338.

It was probably aquatic, like the Dugong and Manatee.

1845 C. Darwin, Journ. Beagle, ch. 5: p. 82. (S. D., p. 339.)

Dugong. The Halicore dugong of naturalists is an inhabitant of the shallow seas of the Archipelago, but it is not numerous, or at least is not often caught by the fisherman. It is the duyong of the Malays, which naturalists mistaking a j or y for a g, have corrupted into dugong. During my residence in Singapore, a few were taken in the neighboring shallow seas, and I can testify that the flesh of this herbivorous mammifer is greatly superior to that of the green turtle.

1856 Crawfurd, Descriptive dict. of the Indian islands, p. 125.

Tennent mentions the dugong as frequenting the shores of Ceylon, and discourses pleasantly of the mermaid myths for which the dugong is supposed to be responsible. He quotes Megasthenes, Aelian, and Valentyn.

Of this family, one of the most remarkable animals on the coast is the dugong, a phytophagous cetacean, numbers of which are attracted to the inlets, from the bay of Calpenty to Adam’s Bridge, by the still water, and the abundance of marine algae in these parts of the gulf. ... 1861 Tennent, Sketches of the nat. hist. of Ceylon, p. 68. (See the whole account, p. 68-73.)
The mermaid, of the genus Halicore, connects the inhabitants of the land and water. This Duyong, described as a creature seven or eight feet long, with a head like that of an elephant deprived of its proboscis, and the body and tail of a fish, frequents the Sumatran and Malayan shores, and its flesh is held in great estimation at the tables of sultans and rajahs.


Once the dugongs were very numerous. The early traveller, Leguat, tells of seeing schools of several hundred, grazing like sheep on the sea-weeds a few fathoms deep, in the Mascarene islands. The flesh is regarded as a special delicacy, and the Malay king claims, as royal property, all that are taken in his domains. The flesh of the young is compared to pork, beef, and veal; but the old dugongs are tougher and not so highly prized.

1884-88 Riverside nat. hist., 5:211.

See also 1869 Bickmore, p. 244; 1883 Encyc. Brit., 15:390; 1885 Forbes, p. 313; 1886 Yule, p. 254.

Durian, a rich East Indian fruit; also the tree on which it grows, Durio zibethinus. Also spelt durion, durien, durean, dorian, droyen; Dutch doerian, French dourian, Italian duri-ano (c. 1440), Middle Latin durianus (c. 1440), N. L. durio(n); representing Malay durian, literally 'thorny (fruit)' formed with the suffix -an, from duri, a thorn, spine. The fruit has a thick rind set with short stout spines. It is in Achi-

nese durian, derryan, Lampong derryan, Javanese duren, Ambina
torian, toliran, tureno, tureno, tolane.

1812 Marsden, p. 132.

duri, épine, piquant, pointe.... Durian duri-an, nom d'un fruit ainsi nommé parce qu'il est hérisse d'épines, le durian (durio zibethinus).... Hentnor - duri-an hantu, dauer - duri-an dawm, deux espèces de durian. Jav. duri, épine, durén, le dourian. Bat. duri, épine.

1875 FAVRE, 1:864-5.

... Doerijan (gew. uitspraak derriyan), naam eener, voor velen, inz. Europeanen, walgelijke, doch door de ind. volken hooggeschatte
The durian is mentioned by Italian writers as early as the middle of the fifteenth century. See Yule.

The English mentions begin in the latter end of the sixteenth century, and, as usual, in translations of Spanish and Dutch writers.

There is one that is called in the Malacca tongue durion, and is so good that I have heard it affirmed by manie that have gone about the worlde, that it doth exceede in savour all others that ever they had seene or tasted.... Some do say that have seen it that it seemeth to be that wherewith Adam did transgress, being carried away by the singular savour.

1583 Parke, tr. Mendoza, Historie of the great and mightie kingdom of China (etc.), (Hakluyt soc., 1853) 2:318. (Y. p. 256.)

See other quotations 1598, 1662, 1665, 1727, 1855, 1878, in YULE and S. D.

The highest rank among the indigenous fruits, in the opinion of the natives, is given to the Durian (Durio Zibethinus), not at excepting even the Mangustin, but most of strangers, from its peculiar and offensive odour, have at first a violent aversion to it.

1820 Crawfurd, Hist. of the Indian Archipelago, 1:119.

The Mangosteen, Lansat, Rambutan, Jack, Jambou, and Blimbing, are all abundant; but most abundant and most esteemed is the Durian, a fruit about which very little is known in England, but which both by natives and Europeans in the Malay Archipelago is reckoned superior to all others.

1869 Wallace, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 56.

The Durian grows on a large and lotty forest tree, somewhat resembling an elm in its general character, but with a more smooth and
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scaly bark. The fruit is round or slightly oval, about the size of a large cocoanut, of a green colour, and covered all over with short stout spines, the bases of which touch each other, and are consequently somewhat hexagonal, while the points are very strong and sharp. It is so completely armed, that if the stalk is broken off it is a difficult matter to lift one from the ground. The outer rind is so thick and tough, that from whatever height it may fall it is never broken.

If I had to fix on two only, as representing the perfection of the two classes, I should certainly choose the Durian and the Orange as the king and queen of fruits. 1869 Id., p. 58. (Also p. 41, 107, 256.)

From Muara-Rupit I proceeded to Surulangun, along a good road following the Rawas river, under a continuous shade of tall Durian trees from thirty-five to forty feet high—a growth of ten years. The road was carpeted throughout its length with their flowers, which were dropping off in vast numbers. In the flowering time it was a most pleasant shady road; but later in the season the chance of a fruit now and then descending on one's head would be less agreeable.


Mr. Wallace draws from the fall of the durian an uncomplacent moral:

Poets and moralists, judging from our English trees and fruits, have thought that small fruits always grow on lofty trees, so that their fall should be harmless to man, while the large ones trailed on the ground. Two of the largest and heaviest fruits known, however, the Brazil-nut fruit (Bertholletia) and Durian, grow on lofty forest trees, from which they fall as soon as ripe, and often wound or kill the native inhabitants. From this we may learn two things: first, not to draw general conclusions from a very partial view of nature; and secondly, that trees and fruits, no less than the varied productions of the animal kingdom, do not appear to be organized with exclusive reference to the use and convenience of man. 1869 WALLACE, Malay Archipelago (1890), p. 58.

But perhaps the falling durian and Brazil-nut are a crude effort of Nature, looking toward an extinction of savagery. If the savages would not dodge! So ineffectiv ar the “intentions” of Nature. The weighted fruits of the tropics and the stones of the towers of Siloam continue to fall, upon the just and the unjust. When gravity dispenses justice, the just must dodge, or be crushed.

Gecko, a sprightly lizard of interesting nature and domestic habits. Also speld gecco, gekko; French gecko, German gekko, Dutch gekko.

Malay gekok (Favre), gekok (Pijnappel), gekko (Marsden 1812, who says he has not found the Malayan orthog-
rhapsody). The final ق is faiut, and is omitted in the European form, as it was in abada for bada, Malay بادئ، and as it is in bruł from Malay bruł for bruk, in Ava for Awak, in Batta for Bataž, and so on. See Abada and Bruł.

The Malay گوک is one of several different Malay names for the same animal, all within a small area of variation, and all evidently of an imitative nature, suggestive of the creature's peculiar cry. The other forms are کوک, که, کیکی, 가고, 각, گوک, گوک, گوک, گوک, گوک, گوک, گوک; in Lampang گوگ, Katingan (Borneo) گوگ.

Tōke, takē, takek, are reflected in an occasional English form Tokay. From one of these forms, or from an Indian or other name of similar form because of imitative nature, we have drawn two forms which appear in English use of the eighteenth century, chacco and jacco.

gaguh a large species of house-lizard which makes a very loud and peculiar noise; (also named کوک, گوک, گوک, گوک, گوک, گوک, گوک).

Lizard... (great, noisy, house-) نک گاغ. (It, or other species nearly like it, is also named کوک, گوک, گوک, گوک, گوک, گوک, گوک; the Malayan orthography of which words has not occurred.)

gokej, (gekko) huishaagdis die een bijzonder geluid geeft.

gagob, a groote huishaagdis, die om deszelfs geluid gekko, gekko, gago, gokej en tōkej genoemd wordt.

gekko, bijname van de tekei, om het geluid dat zij maakt.

gekko, klanknaabootsend woord, door de Europeenen gebruikt om het beest aan te duiden, dat in 't Mal. en Jav. tōkej heet. Een hagedis, die aldus roept.

gekko, le gecko, petit lézard ainsi nommé par imitation de son cri. On le nomme aussi en Mal. تويکي tōke.

The form گوک is also well establisht.

goké, koké, and toké [read ő in each form] a species of lizard that haunts old buildings, and makes a loud and peculiar noise.

(Vid. کوک gaguh.)

gokey, (gekko) huishaagdis die een bijzonder geluid geeft.

Goke. A name for the tokey, or noisy lizard; v. Tākeh [read Tākek].
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1877 Wall and Tuuk, 1:425.
1884 Wall and Tuuk, 3:40.

The form kekè appears in the Bornean dialect of Katingan:

Maleisch tjitjak, Sampitsch tasakh, Katingansch kekè, hagedis.
1872 Tiedke, Woordenlijst der Sampitsche en Katingansche taal, p. 27.

Maleisch tjitjak, Sampitsch tasakh, Katingansch djonjoe kekè, hagedis.
1872 Id., p. 29.

In the Lampong language it is gēgag.

Gēgag, gekko. 1891 Helfrich, Proeve van een Lamongsch-Hollandsche woordenlijst, p. 16.

An other name for this lizard, or some of its varieties is chīchah or or chien chieck, or chin chïck, Achinese chiechak, Javanese chëchak, Balinese chëchhek, Sundanese chakchak, Lampong kiechak, probably also imitative. There are similar Indian names. In Marathi chukchak is the cry of the lizard (1847 Molesworth, p. 409). In quotations below (1864, 1883), the Indian gecko says "chuck, chuck, chuck;" in an other (1861), "chic, chic, chit."

The gecko became known first as a venomous and malicious creature. The later accounts make it a harmless, cheerful little reptile, with interesting habits, as the quotations show:

Of all animals the gekko is the most notorious for its powers of mischief; yet we are told by those who load it with that calumni, that it is very friendly to man; and, though supplied with the most deadly virulence, is yet never known to bite.

1774 Goldsmith, Hist. of the earth (1790), 7:142 (in Jodrell, 1820).

Tennent give an interesting account of the geckoes of Ceylon:

The most familiar and attractive of the lizard class are the Geckoes, that frequent the sitting-rooms, and being furnished with pads to each toe, they are enabled to ascend perpendicular walls and adhere to glass and ceilings. Being nocturnal in their habits, the pupil of the eye, instead of being circular as in the diurnal species, is linear and vertical like that of the cat. As soon as evening arrives, the geckoes are to be seen in every house in keen and crafty pursuit of their prey; emerging from the chinks and recesses where they conceal themselves during the day, to search for insects that then retire to settle for the night. In a boudoir where the ladies of my family spent their evenings, one of these familiar and amusing little creatures had its hiding-place behind a gilt picture frame. Punctually as the candles were lighted, it made its appearance on the wall to be fed with its accustomed crumbs; and
if neglected, it reiterated it[s] sharp, quick call of chic, chic, chit, till attended to. ... 1861 Tennent, Sketches of nat. hist. of Ceylon, p. 281-2.

We saw several sorts of lizards, of which the only dangerous one was that called by the Egyptians Gecko.

1792 Herron, tr. Niebuhr, Travels through Arabia and other countries in the East. 2:332.

[That in the Arabic of Egypt this lizard is called Gecko is asserted only by Heron, not by Niebuhr; and is apparently an error due to a misunderstanding of Forskål, Description Animantium, 1775, p. 13. Ed.]

Gecko, n. A species of salamander. [With quot. from Goldsmith 1774, above.] 1820 Jodrell, Philology on (sic) the English language. [Marked with a star, as a new entry. I find no earlier dictionary entry.]

The Gecko occasionally utters a curious cry, which has been compared to that peculiar clucking sound employed by riders to stimulate their horses, and in some species the cry is very distinct, and said to resemble the word "Geck-o," the last syllable being given smartly and sharply. On account of this cry, the Geckoes are variously called Spitters, Postillons and Ciaquers.

18... Wood, New illustrated nat. hist., p. 504. (See also Riverside nat. hist. (1885), 3:406.)

This was one of those little house lizards called geckos, which have pellets at the end of their toes. They are not repulsive brutes like the garden lizard, and I am always on good terms with them. They have full liberty to make use of my house, for which they seem grateful, and say chuck, chuck, chuck.

1883 Tribes on my frontier, p. 38. (Y. p. 280.)

The form chacco apparently arose from some Indian reflection of the Malay name, or from a confusion with the other name chichak (compare Sundanese chakchak).

Chacoos, as Cuckoos, receive their Names from the Noise they make. They are much like Lizards but larger.

1711 Lockyer, An account of the trade in India, p. 84. (Y. p. 280.)

Jacko, found but once, and then speld jackoa, appears to be an other phase of chacco.

They have one dangerous little Animal called a Jackoa, in shape almost like a Lizard. It is very malicious ... and wherever the Liquor lights on an Animal Body, it presently cankers the Flesh.


Gingham, a cotton fabric woven of dyed yarn, in stripes, checks, and other figures.
The origin of this word has been much debated, and has remained undetermined. It has been derived from Guingamp, a town in France where gingham was alleged to be made; from an unidentified North Indian gingham; from a Tamil word, *kindan*; and from a Javanese word *ginggang*, to which no etymological sense, or a wrong one, has been assigned. It has even been sought in Egypt; and in the air.

The word is Malayan; it is found in Malay, Achinese, Lampang, Javanese, Sundanese, Balinese, Macassar, in the precise sense of ‘gingham.’ Its etymological meaning is ‘striped.’ It is probably original in Javanese.


It is in Malay *ginggang*, Achinese *ginggang*, Lampang *ginggang*, Javanese *ginggang*, Sundanese *ginggang*, Balinese *genggang*, Dayak *ginggang*, *genggang*, Macassar *ginggang*, a striped or checkered cotton fabric known to Europeans in the east as ‘gingham.’ As an adjective, the word means, both in Malay and in Javanese, where it seems to be original, ‘striped.’ The full expression is kain *ginggang*, ‘striped cloth’ (Grashuirs).

The Tamil ‘*kindan*, a kind of coarse cotton cloth striped or chequered’ (quoted in Yule) can not be the source of the European forms, nor, I think, of the Malayan forms. It must be an independent word, or a perversion of the Malayan term.

1863 PIJNAPPEL, p. 195.
1869 KLINKERT, p. 212.
1875 FAYRE, 1:424.
1878 ROORDA VAN EYSHIPS, ed. Grashuis, p. 259.
1884 WALL and TUUK, 3:18.
1882 BIKKERS, Malayan, Achinese, Fr. and Eng. vocab., p. 33.
1884 BADINGS, p. 264.
1892 KLINKERT, p. 579.
1893 KLINKERT, p. 281.
1895 MAYER, p. 106.
The forms outside of Malay are entered as follows:

\[ \text{ginggang}, \text{ geruit goed.} \]

1889 Langen, Woordenboek der Atehche taal, p. 232.


**Ginggang**, A. gestreept. 1835 ROORDA VAN EYSINGA, Jav. etc., p. 107.

... [ginggang] N. K. s'écarter; chanceler. (aussi, nom d'une sorte de
toile), guingamp.

1870 Fayre, Dict. javanais-français, p. 486.

"Ginggang, a sort of striped or chequered East Indian linnenand."

1876 JANSZ, Jav. dict. (Tr. in Y.)

**Ginggang**, Gingham, a variety of coloured cloth with pattern in
stripes.

1862 Rigg, Dict. of the Sunda lang., p. 131.

**Gengang** ben. van eenen kainstof.

1876 R. Van Eck, Balineesch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 190.

**Genggang**, i. q. ginggang. [But ginggang has been accidentally
omitted.] 1859 Hardeland, Dajacksch-deutsches wörterbuch, p. 132.

... ginggang, soort van gestreepd, of ook wel geruit Oost-Indisch
lijnwaad, ginggang. Mal. en Jav. idem.

1859 Matthes, Makasaarsch-Hollandsch woordenboek, p. 68.

In the Spanish of the Philippine Islands it is guingon.

**Guingon** (el).—Espèce d'étoffe de coton, ordinairement bleue.

1882 Blumentritt, p. 38.

European mentions of gingham begin about the middle of the
sixteenth century. Italian, Portuguese and Dutch instances are
given by Yule. The English use begins with the seventeenth
century.

Captain Cock is of opinion that the **ginghams** both white and browne,
which you sent will prove a good commodity in the Kings of Shashma-
his country, who is a King of certaine of the most westernmost ilandes
of Japon... and hath conquered the islandes called the Leques.

1615 Letter app. to Cock’s Diary, 2:272. (Y.)

The trade of Fort St. David’s consists in longcloths of different col-
ours, sailamporees, morees, dimities, **ginghams**, and saccotoons.

1781 Carraccioli, Life of Clive, 1:5. (Y.)

Even the **gingham** waistcoats, which striped or plain have so long
stood their ground, must, I hear, ultimately give way to the stronger
kerseymere.

1793 Hugh Boyd, Indian Observer, 77. (Y.)

**Gingham.** A kind of striped cotton cloth.

1828 Webster, Amer. dict. of the Eng. lang.

Such is the simple form in which the word appears, for the first
time, in an English dictionary; but now gingham of all sorts
constitute a part of the happiness of millions of English and
American homes. Let me make the gingham of a nation, and I
care not who writes its songs.

[For the rest of this article, see volume xviii.]
PROCEDINGS
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
AT ITS
MEETING IN ANDOVER, MASSACHUSETTS,
April 9th, 10th, and 11th, 1896.

The Society assembled at Andover, in Bartlet Chapel of
Andover Theological Seminary, on Thursday of Easter Week,
April 9th, at 3 P. M., and was called to order by its President,
President Daniel Coit Gilman, of the Johns Hopkins University.
The following members were in attendance at one or more of
the sessions:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td>Hicks</td>
<td>Moore, G. F.</td>
<td>Torrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, Miss</td>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>Orne</td>
<td>Toy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickerman</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Robinson, G. L.</td>
<td>Ward, W. H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dike</td>
<td>Kellner</td>
<td>Ropes</td>
<td>Webb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilman</td>
<td>Lanman</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Wilcox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottheil</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>Winslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haupt</td>
<td>Macdonald</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Wright, T. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>Merrill</td>
<td>Thayer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Total, 31.]

Professor John Phelps Taylor, of Andover, for the Committee
of Arrangements, presented a report in the form of a printed
program. The opening of the sessions was thereby set for half
past nine o'clock mornings and for three o'clock afternoons.
Professor Taylor extended to the Society an invitation from
Professor George Harris, for Thursday evening from eight to
nine, to meet at his house the Faculty of the Theological Semi-
nary and the Teachers in Phillips Academy; and also an invita-
tion from Professor Moore for Thursday and Friday evenings.
The report was adopted and the invitations accepted with the
thanks of the Society. The business session was deferred to
Friday morning; and the presentation of papers was begun.
The President appointed as a Committee to nominate officers for
the ensuing year Professors Moore, Haupt, and Gottheil. At
five o'clock the session was adjourned.
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The second session began at 9.30 Friday morning, President Gilman in the chair. The first hour or two were devoted to matters of business. The minutes of the last meeting, at New Haven, Conn., April 18th and 19th, 1895, were approved as printed. Reports of outgoing officers were then in order.

The Corresponding Secretary, Professor Lanman, of Harvard University, laid before the Society some of the correspondence of the year.

This included letters of regret from the Bishop of Cairo, from Professors I. H. Hall and Henry Preserved Smith, and from Mr. Witton.—From S. E. Peal, Rajmai P. O., Sibsagar, Assam, came a letter stating that he was at work upon the languages of the Naga Hills, and asking for a certain publication of our Society thereupon by Rev. Nathan Brown, a missionary of the American Baptist Union in Assam. It is pleasant to state that Mr. Van Name was able to send Mr. Peal more than he asked for, namely vol. iv. as well as vol. ii. of our Journal, since both contained pertinent material. “Its value to us here,” says Mr. Peal, “is much greater than you might suppose. Dr. B. was a real genius.”—The Venerable Subhuti, a Buddhist High Priest, of Waskaduwa, Ceylon, whose kind offices were mentioned in our last Proceedings (see Journal, vol. xvi., page cciv), in response to Professor Lanman’s request for the transcript of a Sinhalese manuscript of a Pali text, replies in a most obliging and efficient way.—Mr. Charles Johnston, of Ballykilbeg, County Down, of the Bengal Civil Service, retired, sends a dainty little volume of translations from the Upanishads (Dublin, Whaley); and with it, the welcome announcement that he has translated into English Denssen’s “System des Vedânta.” This translation is to run through the “Calcutta Review” and is then to appear in book-form.—Dr. Burgess of Edinburgh reports satisfactory progress upon his portfolios of collotype plates of ancient monuments in India to be issued by Griggs of London.—Professor Leumann of Strassburg writes about his Jaina studies, especially about his elaborate work on Sîlâṅka and the Āvâśyaka literature and the biography of Haribhadra.—Professor Bühler sends from Vienna a copy of vol. ii. of the “Sources of Indian Lexicography,” published by the Austrian Academy, and dedicated to Weber and to the memory of Whitney; and writes of the progress of the “Grundriss der indischen Philologie,” and expresses the hope that nearly a third part of the whole will be issued before the end of 1896.—A recent

* The omission of the reading and of the approval of the Recording Secretary’s minutes is at variance with the usage of the Society and the advisability of the innovation is questionable. These minutes are intended to give a full and precise record of the actual doings of the sessions and to give them in their actual order. The printed “Proceedings,” on the other hand, contain only such matters as it seems worth while to publish; but they do not constitute so full and sufficient a record as it may well prove desirable to have. May it not become a matter of regret if the control of the Recording Secretary’s record is allowed to lapse?
letter, bearing the signature, still clear and firm, of our oldest Honorary Member, Böhtlingk (he was elected in 1844), pleasantly attests the unexhausted vitality of our Sanskrit Nestor.—Professor Weber sends some of the documents (among them, the address of the Berlin Academy and that of the Philosophical Faculty) relating to his recent fifty-year jubilee, which was saddened by the death, only a week before, of Mrs. Weber.—Professor Hermann Vierordt of Tübingen sends some interesting papers concerning the life and death of his father-in-law, Professor Roth.—Pandit Lāla Chandra Vidyā Bhāskara, of Jodhpur, Marvar, Rajputana, sends a copy* of a Sanskrit poem narrating the life and achievements of the late Professor Whitney, and entitled Vītyam-Dvāt-Vitani-viduo jivana-carita-kāvyam. It is a beautifully written manuscript of 33 pages in folio. The author says it is a version of the obituary notice of Mr. Whitney which appeared in the New York Nation of June 14, 1894. A reprint of this notice had been sent to him.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the names of recently deceased members. The record is as follows:

HONORARY MEMBERS.
Professor Rudolf von Roth, of Tübingen;
Dr. Reinhold Rost, of London.

CORPORATE MEMBERS.
Rev. Talbot W. Chambers, of New York City;
Hon. Charles Theodore Russell, of Cambridge, Mass.;
Dr. Henry Martyn Scudder, formerly of Niigata, Japan.

CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.†
Sir James Redhouse:
Rev. Dr. William Waterbury Scudder, formerly Missionary at Madanapalli, Madras;
Rev. Dr. Cornelius V. A. Van Dyck, of Beyrout, Syria.

The Treasurer, Mr. Henry C. Warren, of Cambridge, Mass., presented to the Society, by the hand of Professor Lanman, his accounts and statements for the year ending April, 1896. President Gilman had already appointed, before the meeting, Professors Toy and Lanman as an Auditing Committee to examine the Treasurer’s funds and accounts. The Committee reported to the

* He has since then sent a copy for the Society’s library and one for Mrs. Whitney.
† The names of the following, several years deceased, had for some reason not been reported to the Society:
Rev. Cephas Bennett, Missionary at Rangoon, Burma, died Nov. 16, 1885; Rev. Dr. Nathan Brown, Missionary at Yokohama, Japan, died Jan. 1, 1886; Dr. George Rosen, Detmold, Germany, died 1891; Rev. Dr. John H. Shedd, Missionary at Oromiah, Persia.
Society during the meeting that on the 6th of April, 1896, they had examined the accounts and vouchers of the Treasurer and his evidences of actual possession of the Society’s property and had found all to be in a satisfactory condition. Their report was duly accepted by the Society. The usual analytical summary of the General Account follows:

**RECEIPTS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance from old account, April 18, 1895</td>
<td>$1,578.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments (179) for 1895–96</td>
<td>$895.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments (30) for other years</td>
<td>130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of publications</td>
<td>173.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from funds (other than Bradley Fund)</td>
<td>188.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income of the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,957.15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total receipts for the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,935.54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal, xvi. 2</td>
<td>$618.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job printing</td>
<td>80.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books for Library</td>
<td>29.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage, etc.</td>
<td>59.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total disbursements for the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>988.89</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit balance on Gen’l Account, April 6, 1896</td>
<td><strong>1,947.15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,935.54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Treasurer adds several general statements: The account, so far as receipts are concerned, is an almost precise repetition of the one for 1894–95; and the similarity holds also in respect of the three several principal sources of revenue, to wit, assessments, sale of publications, and interest. As was the case in 1894–95, the Society’s outlays for 1895–96 were well within its income.

The state of the funds is as follows:

**A. PRINCIPAL OF SPECIAL FUNDS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 18, 1895:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1482.76 I. Bradley Type Fund (deposited in New Haven Savings Bank)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000.00 II. Cotheal Publication Fund (deposited in the Provident Institution for Savings, Boston)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000.00 III. Whitney Publication Fund (invested in eight shares of State National Bank stock)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.00 IV. Life Membership Fund (deposited in the Suffolk Savings Bank, Boston)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1542.64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. BALANCES BELONGING TO GENERAL ACCOUNT.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 6, 1896:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1498.38 I. Cash in Cambridge Savings Bank</td>
<td>$1827.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.84 II. Cash in Provident Inst. for Savings, Boston</td>
<td>109.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.17 III. Cash in Suffolk Savings Bank</td>
<td>9.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5564.79</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Librarian, Mr. Addison Van Name, of Yale University, presented his report for 1895–96. It is as follows:

The accessions of the past year have been 67 volumes, 64 parts of volumes, and 136 pamphlets. All received up to the middle of March are included in the list of “Additions” printed in the Society’s Journal, vol. xvi., No. 2, just distributed. The most important single contribution is a series of twelve volumes of the publications of the *École des langues orientales vivantes*, Paris, sent in exchange for a set of our Journal. One noteworthy gift, received too late for entry there, deserves special mention—“The Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great,” Ethiopic text and English translation, by Dr. E. A. Wallis Budge of the British Museum, London, 1896. These two sumptuous volumes, on large paper, “two hundred and fifty copies only printed for private circulation,” are the gift of Lady Meux, of Theobald’s Park, Hertfordshire, who bore the expense of publication and to whom the work is dedicated.

The current number of titles in the library is now 4881.

For the Committee of Publication, its Chairman, Professor Lanman, reported as follows: Number 2 of volume xvi. of the Journal had been issued March 31, 1896. It contains Articles V., VI., and VII. of the Journal proper, with the Arabic paging 261–317; and as an Appendix, in Roman paging from cxii–ccxxiii., the Proceedings for Dec. 1894, and for April, 1895, the Additions to the Library, and the List of Members.—Concerning the size of the last few volumes, the following figures may be of interest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>1892–5</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv.</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sum total for the six volumes is 3444 pages; and the average is 574 pages per volume. For the fifteen years, the average is about 230 pages per year.

The Directors reported by their Scribe, Professor Lanman, as follows:

They had appointed the next meeting of the Society to be held at Baltimore, Md., Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of Easter Week, April 22d, 23d, and 24th, 1897: the Corresponding Secre-

* Number 1 of vol. xvi. of the Journal was issued (without Proceedings) in April, 1894. The Proceedings for April, 1893, were issued separately in June, 1893; and the Proceedings for March, 1894, were issued separately in September, 1894. Volume xvi. complete consists therefore of No. 1, of these two pamphlets and of No. 2.
tary, *ex officio*, and Professors Bloomfield and Haupt, to serve as a Committee of Arrangements. [Note that in 1896, Easter falls April 10th.]

The Corresponding Secretary, Professor Lanman, had already in his circular letter to the members issued just before the meeting said in his own name as follows:

It is quite true that the By-Laws of this Society do not in any way charge the Corresponding Secretary with the duty of editing its publications. On the other hand, it cannot be said that in recent years the Committee of Publication have charged themselves with that duty. As a matter of fact, since the beginning, the work has been, for the most part, in two or three pairs of hands. Perhaps the function of the Committee has latterly been held to be consultative and appellate; although the acting-editor would certainly not refer a doubtful paper to the Committee in a case where the judgment of an expert more competent on that particular subject chanced to be available outside of the Committee. The Committee has now been increased to six, and is so large that, as a matter of course, there is no sense whatever of individual responsibility among its members.

We may well rejoice in the healthy growth of the Society during the last decade, and in its greatly increased activity and power of achievement. This growth and activity, however, has greatly increased the burdens of the office of Corresponding Secretary. It is manifest that a redistribution of the labor which, whether legally or prescriptively, attaches to that post, has become imperatively and immediately necessary. The most natural division is into the legitimate duties of the office on the one hand and its adscitious editorial functions on the other. I suggest that the Directors appoint one or two persons to edit the Journal, and hold him or them responsible for the proper conduct of that work. Such appointees need not be regarded as officers of the Society, and this change would accordingly involve no alteration of our laws; and the Committee might continue as before.

Even with this change in the incidence of duties, the place of Corresponding Secretary will remain—just as it has been, and like that of the Editors—a laborious one, with much clerical work; and upon the efficient administration of its duties will depend in no small measure the prosperity of the Society. Inasmuch as the transfer of the office with its duties and traditions from one man to another is at best a very wasteful proceeding, it is clear that no one ought to accept the place who is not willing to serve for, say, at least a decade. And finally, since the Society refused to consider this matter last year on the ground of the lack of time, it seems proper to ask now, before the meeting, for any suggestions upon this subject, and for expressions of willingness to undertake this serious responsibility and heavy labor from any member of the Society who will be kind enough to make them.

The Directors reported by their Chairman, President Gilman, as follows:
The Directors recommended that the Society rescind Supplementary By-Law Number II.

Whereupon, a vote being taken, the By-Law was rescinded by the Society.

In the last printed form, that By-Law read as follows: "The Committee of Publication shall consist of five members: they shall be appointed by the Directors, and shall report to the Society at every regular meeting respecting the matters committed to their charge." And it was amended in April, 1895, so as to read as follows: "The Committee of Publication shall consist of six members, of whom the Corresponding Secretary shall be one. The Committee shall be appointed annually by the Board of Directors, and shall report to the Society at every regular meeting concerning the matters committed to its charge. The Corresponding Secretary shall be the Chairman of the Committee."

President Gilman announced that a Committee of the Directors had considered various questions relating to the Society's method of publication, and had made a written report to the Directors; and that, by authority of the Directors, Professor Charles R. Lanman, of Harvard University, and Professor George F. Moore, of Andover Theological Seminary, had been appointed to serve as Responsible Editors of the Journal.

In the manuscript Records of the Directors, vol. i., pages 23 and 24 (compare Journal, vol. i., page xlviii), we read, under date of May 30, 1848, as follows:

"We have been led by some experience to believe that it would be well to distinguish three classes of members, namely, Corporate, Corresponding, and Honorary. The reasons in favor of creating a class of Corresponding Members are, that the Society will often find it for its advantage to seek communication with persons in Europe and in the East, not Americans, by attaching them to itself in this character, without going so far as to name them Honorary Members; and that those Americans resident in the East, who are elected into the Society, sustain to it in fact the important relation of Corresponding Members, and might feel a stronger obligation to act for the Society, if placed formally in that position, while it is quite out of their power either to exercise the rights or to discharge the duties of Corporate Members."

The changes in the times—notably the vastly increased facilities for communication with the Orient through the Universal Postal Union and otherwise, and the presence in the East of many scholars besides those devoted to the work of Christian Missions—have brought it about as an incidental result that the category of Corresponding Members has lapsed into practical desuetude. It is desirable that this fact should be formally recognized by the Society.
It was accordingly recommended by the Directors that Article III. of the Constitution be changed so as to read as follows:

Article III. The members of this Society shall be distinguished as Corporate and Honorary.

Whereupon, a vote being taken, the amendment was adopted by the Society. [Note, however, that the class of Corresponding Members will continue to appear in our printed lists until extinguished by transfers or by deaths.]

By the vote of October, 1897 (Records of the Directors, vol. i., page 51; Journal, vol. vi., p. 579), it was provided

"That the Directors may, at their discretion, and in view of the circumstances of each case, transfer to the list of Corresponding Members persons elected as Corporate Members, but who may have since permanently left this country, and to the list of Corporate Members persons chosen as Corresponding Members, but who may have since transferred their residence to this country."

In view of the above facts and as a corollary to the above changes, it was provided

That members who have, by vote of the Directors, been transferred from the list of Corresponding Members to that of Corporate Members be restored to the list of Corresponding Members, unless they desire to remain Corporate Members, paying the annual assessment.

By-Law Number VII. in its last printed form read as follows:

VII. Corporate members shall be entitled to a copy of all the publications of the Society issued during their membership, and shall also have the privilege of taking a copy of those previously published, so far as the Society can supply them, at half the ordinary selling price. Corresponding and honorary members shall be entitled to the Society's publications only in return for services rendered,—for communications to the Society, or donations to its library or cabinet.

Upon recommendation of the Directors, the Society voted to amend it: first, by adding the words "and Honorary" after the word "Corporate" at the beginning; and, secondly, by striking out the second sentence. [Note that the "membership" of a new member shall be construed to begin with the calendar year in which that new member was elected.]

Upon recommendation of the Directors, it was voted to add the following two paragraphs to By-Law Number III.:

III. b. After December 31, 1896, the fiscal year of the Society shall correspond with the calendar year.

III. c. At each annual business meeting in Easter week, the President shall appoint an auditing committee of two men—preferably men residing in or near the town where the Treasurer lives—to examine the Treasurer's accounts and vouchers, and to inspect the evidences of the
Society's property, and to see that the funds called for by his balances are in his hands. The Committee shall perform this duty as soon as possible after the New Year's day succeeding their appointment, and shall report their findings to the Society at the next annual business meeting thereafter. If these findings are satisfactory, the Treasurer shall receive his acquaintance by a certificate to that effect, which shall be recorded in the Treasurer's book, and published in the Proceedings.

The President appointed Professors Toy and Lanman to serve as Auditing Committee for the fiscal year ending Dec. 31, 1896, with Professor Lyon as a substitute in case of the inability of one of the above-named gentlemen so to serve.

Reported—That the Directors had voted that, in case of the adoption of the proposed By-Laws III. b and III. c, the assessment for the fiscal year extending from April 7, 1896 to December 31, 1896 shall be three dollars.

Next in order of business was the report of the Committee on the Nomination of Officers, consisting of Professors Moore, Haupt, and Gottheil. The Corresponding Secretary, Professor Lanman, after nearly twenty years* of such labor in the service of the American Philological Association and of the American Oriental Society, desired once more to be relieved of his secretarial duties; and accordingly Professor Hopkins, the successor of Professor Whitney at Yale University, was nominated in his stead. No other changes in the administrative offices were proposed. The nominees of the Committee were duly elected by the Society. The names of the Board of Officers for 1896-97 are as follows:

President—President Daniel Coit Gilman, of Baltimore.
Vice-Presidents—Dr. William Hayes Ward, of New York; Prof. C. H. Toy, of Cambridge; Prof. Isaac H. Hall, of New York.
Corresponding Secretary—Prof. Edward W. Hopkins, of New Haven.†
Recording Secretary—Prof. George F. Moore, of Andover.
Treasurer—Mr. Henry C. Warren, of Cambridge.
Librarian—Mr. Addison Van Name, of New Haven.
Directors—The officers above named: and Prof. Lanman, of Cambridge; Professors Gottheil and Jackson, of New York; Prof. Jastrow, of Philadelphia; Professors Bloomfield and Haupt, of Baltimore; Prof. Hyvernat, of Washington.

With a view to avoiding much useless duplication of labor, Professor Lanman had urged the Board of Directors to recommend that the two different offices of Treasurer and of Corresponding Secretary be borne by the same person, as is virtually the case in the American Philological Association‡ and as was the

* More, namely, than the years of incumbency in the offices concerned.
† With Professor Hans Oertel, of New Haven, to serve as his Deputy during the absence of Professor Hopkins in Europe and India.
case in the Oriental Society in the year 1891–92. It is highly important that both the Corresponding Secretary and the Treasurer should have—so far as is possible—some personal knowledge of the members. This is a difficult matter at best. The results of the inquiries of the one officer have to be communicated, with accurate dates and details, to the other, and vice versa. The plan of putting both offices into the hands of one man has resulted in a very clear saving of time and labor both in the case of the Philological Association and in that of the Oriental Society.

It did not appear feasible to carry out the above suggestion at present.

The Directors further reported by their scribe, Professor Lanman, that they had voted to recommend to the Society for election to membership the following persons:

**AS CORPORATE MEMBERS:**

Edward V. Arnold, Professor of Latin, University College of North Wales, (Bryn Seiriol) Bangor, Great Britain.
George M. Bolling, Instructor in Comparative Philology and Sanskrit, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.
Miss Sarah W. Brooks (Graduate of Radcliffe College), 38 Inman st., Cambridgeport, Mass.
Rev. Prof. Joseph Bruneau, S. T. L., St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.
Rev. John Campbell, Church of the Incarnation, 4 West 104th street, New York, N. Y.
Miss Elizabeth S. Colton (Student of Semitic languages, and teacher at Miss Porter's School at Farmington), Easthampton, Mass.
Rev. Adolph Guttmacher, 1888 Linden ave., Baltimore, Md.
Ralph B. C. Hicks (Harvard University), 65 Hammond st., Cambridge, Mass.
Leonard Keene Hirshberg (Johns Hopkins University), 581 Gay st., Baltimore, Md.
Miss Eliza H. Kendrick, Ph.D. (Radcliffe College), Hunnewell ave., Newton, Mass.
Rev. Clifton Hady Levy, 728 Lennox st., Baltimore, Md.
Henry F. Linscott, Instructor in Sanskrit and Philology, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Rev. George Palmer Pardington, 104 Park Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Hugo Radau, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Prof. J. H. Stevenson, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

[Total, 18.]
Whereupon, ballot being had, the above-named ladies and gentlemen were duly elected Corporate Members of the Society.

Professor Gottheil, on behalf of the Committee appointed to make a Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts existing in American Libraries, reported progress and added that new manuscripts were coming in. The Committee was continued and requested to report at the next meeting.

Professor Morris Jastrow having laid before the Society a scheme for an "Association for the Historical Study of Religions," to be organized, possibly, under the auspices of the American Oriental Society,—President Gilman reported that the Directors recommended the appointment of a Committee to consider what measures may be taken to promote the study of the History of Religions.

The recommendation was adopted; and the Chair appointed as this Committee the following gentlemen: Professor Gottheil, Chairman; and Professors Lanman, Toy, Jastrow, Hyvernat, G. F. Moore, and Jackson; President W. R. Harper; Professor Haupt; Dr. Cyrus Adler; Dr. W. Hayes Ward; and Mr. Talcott Williams.

Incidentally, President Gilman suggested that in the conduct of our future meetings it would be desirable if one of the sessions were reserved for papers of a non-technical character and of general interest, in order that such friends of the Society as are not professional Orientalists may with pleasure and profit take part in its proceedings.

Professors Toy and Haupt were appointed a Committee to present to Professor Green upon his coming anniversary the felicitations of the Society, and therewith the following minute:

The American Oriental Society desires to extend to Professor William Henry Green, the Nestor of teachers of Hebrew in this country, its very hearty congratulations on the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of his appointment as instructor in Hebrew in Princeton Theological Seminary, and to wish him yet many years of fruitful work.

At the meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, held in New York City, Dec. 27, 1895, it was "Voted to inform the American Oriental Society that we are engaged in the effort to establish at some point in Bible Lands a School of Oriental Study and Research; and to invite the cooperation of the Oriental Society." This vote was duly communicated to the Oriental Society; and Professor Thayer, the President of the Biblical Society, presented the draft of an interesting plan.* Thereupon, on motion of Professor Lyon, the following resolution was adopted:

---

* This may be found in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, at the end of volume xv.
The American Oriental Society has received with great pleasure the communication of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis regarding an "effort to establish at some point in Bible Lands a School of Oriental Study and Research."

The Oriental Society cannot express too warmly its approval of this enterprise, believing that the existence of such a School would give a new impulse to Biblical and Oriental scholarship.

With the promise of such coöperation as may become practicable, the Oriental Society wishes the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis all possible success in the development of their plan and the establishment of the proposed School.

The business thus dispatched, a brief recess was taken. At 11.30 the reading of papers was resumed at the point where it stopped on Thursday afternoon. The sessions of Friday afternoon and of Saturday morning were devoted almost exclusively to the presentation of papers. The social gatherings of Thursday evening at the houses of Professors Harris and Moore and of Friday evening at the house of Professor Moore were exceedingly pleasant and satisfactory. This was the first meeting of the Society at Andover. The place is in every way so convenient and suitable, and the expressions of pleasure and satisfaction on the part of the visiting members were so cordial, that it is to be hoped that the Society may meet again there at some not distant time.

After the Society had passed a vote of thanks to the Authorities of Andover Theological Seminary for the use of Bartlet Chapel, to Professors Harris and Moore for their kind and most acceptable hospitalities, and to the Committee of Arrangements (Professor Taylor, Chairman) for its efficient services, a final adjournment was had at 11.30 Saturday morning.

The following communications were announced in the Program of the meeting. Number 2, however, was not presented. Numbers 4, 11, 13, 26, 27, and 34 were presented by title. Parts of numbers 9 and 20 were presented informally at the social gathering at Professor Moore’s.

1. Professor E. V. Arnold, University College of North Wales, Bangor; Grammatical development in the five epochs of the Rig-Veda and in the Atharva-Veda.

2. Rev. Dr. Blodget, of Peking; Ancestral worship in the Shu King.

3. Professor Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University; The meaning of the compound atharvângirasas, the ancient name of the fourth Veda.

4. Professor Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University; On the “Frog-hymn,” Rig-Veda, vii. 103.
5. Dr. Casanowicz, United States National Museum; Alexander legends in Talmud and Midrash, with reference to Greek and Assyrian parallels.

6. Mr. Edmunds, Historical Society of Pennsylvania; On the compilation of the Pāli Canon.

7. Professor Gottheil, Columbia University; Further references to Zoroaster in Syriac literature.

8. Professor Haupt, Johns Hopkins University; On usahānā, Ezra v. 3, 9.

9. Professor Haupt, Johns Hopkins University; Notes on Genesis ii. 6 and iv. 1.

10. Professor Haupt, Johns Hopkins University; Strack's Abriss des Biblischen Aramäisch.

11. Professor Hopkins, Yale University; Prāgāthikāni, I. The vocabulary.

12. Professor Hopkins, Yale University; The root ēkar.

13. Professor Hopkins, Yale University; Conversion-tables for the references to the Calcutta and Bombay editions of the Mahā-Bhārata.

14. Professor Jackson, Columbia University; On Mahā-Bhārata iii. 142. 35–45, or an echo of an old Hindu-Persian legend.

15. Professor Jackson, Columbia University; Some Persian names in the Book of Esther.

16. Professor Jackson, Columbia University; The iterative optative in the Avesta.

17. Dr. Johnston, Johns Hopkins University; Epistolary literature of the Assyro-Babylonians.

18. Professor Lanman, Harvard University; Professor Whitney's translation of the Atharva-Veda.

19. Professor Lanman, Harvard University; Pāli miscellanies.

20. Professor Lanman, Harvard University; Sanskrit epigrams.

21. Professor Lyon, Harvard University; The distinctive feature of Babylonian poetry.

22. Professor Lyon, Harvard University; The argument from silence in discussions of Hebrew poetry and literature.

23. Professor Macdonald, Hartford Theological Seminary; A table exhibiting in a new form the interchange of sibilants and dentals in Semitic.

24. Professor Macdonald, Hartford Theological Seminary; The place of al-Ghazālī in the development of the theology of Islam.

26. Professor Oertel, Yale University; The Çâtyâyana Brâhmaṇa and its relation to the Jâjimî accessible Brâhmaṇa.

27. Rev. Dr. Peters, St. Michael's Church, N. Y.; The original site of civilization in Babylonia and the date of the same.

28. Dr. Scott, Radnor, Pa.; The Malayan words in English.

29. Dr. Scott, Radnor, Pa.; "Universal" qualities in the Malay language.

30. Mr. Skinner, Harvard University; The plural termination ū, ūnî in Assyrian verbs.

31. Dr. Torrey, Andover Theological Seminary; Announcement of an edition of Ibn Abd el-Hakam's "Futûh Mîr." 

32. Dr. Torrey, Andover Theological Seminary; The meaning of the term "Mpharrshî" as applied to books of the Syriac Bible.

33. Dr. Torrey, Andover Theological Seminary; The origin of the Old Testament Apocryphon called "I. Esdras."

34. Professor Wright, New Church School, Cambridge; Note on a Greek inscription at Kolonieh, Palestine.

1. The Beginning of the Judaic Account of Creation; by Professor Paul Haupt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

We read at the beginning of the second account of creation in the Book of Genesis (2, 4): When JHVH made heaven and earth, and formed man out of the dust of the ground, breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, so that man became a living being—at that time there were yet even no wild plants of the desert, much less plants cultivated for food,* because JHVH had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was no man to cultivate the ground, but Fv used to go up from the earth, watering the whole surface of the ground.

The Hebrew word Fv, which I have here left untranslated, is rendered by most scholars, mist, vapor.; We find the translation, "a mist


† This would have produced at least the wild plants.

‡ Cf. Vogel in his edition (Halae, 1775) of Hugonia Grotii Annotationes in V. T. (Fv vapores significat, qui de terra adscenderunt); Bohlen (1856); Böhmier (1862); Schrader (1863); Tuch (1871); Kell (1878); Delitzsch (1887); Fripp (1892); Ad- dis (1893); Dillmann (1892); Spurrell (1896). If Fv meant mist or vapor, it would be better to take Fv as Hif'il as in Jer. 10, 13 (= 51, 16; quoted in
used to go up,"* without a query,† even in the new German Version, edited by Professor Kautzsch, of Halle. In the second edition of Kautzsch and Socin's critical translation of the Book of Genesis, however, which appeared one year after the publication of the Book of Genesis in Kautzsch's AT, the word מַעַלָּה is left untranslated, and in a footnote the editors state that the traditional rendering mist or vapor is very doubtful. They call attention to Friedrich Delitzsch's remarks in his great Assyrisches Wörterbuch (Leipzig, 1888), p. 125, where מַעַלָּה is included in our passage, as well as in Job 86, 27, is combined with the Assyrian edā "flood." ‡ The reference to the Assyrisches Wörterbuch is also given in the last edition of Dillmann's Commentary on Genesis, p. 52, and in Gesenius-Buhl's Hebrew Dictionary. § The notes on מַעַלָּה in Friedrich Delitzsch's Hebrew Dictionary (Assyrisches Wörterbuch, p. 130) are, unfortunately, still in store for us.

The rendering flood was suggested a hundred years ago by the Scottish Roman Catholic Biblical critic Dr. Alexander Geddes,† who published a new version of the Bible "faithfully translated from Corrected Texts of the Originals, with Various Readings, Explanatory Notes, and Critical Remarks." The work appeared in 1792, and was followed in 1800 by "Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures." Geddes says, like Friedrich Delitzsch, that מַעַלָּה means flood, and that even in Job 86, 27 it does not mean mist or cloud; perhaps we should read in the passage of Job, with Houbigant, מַעַלָּה. His remarks are also given, in German, in J. S. Vater's Commentar zum Pentateuch, vol. i, p. 18 (Halle, 1802).

ψ 25, 7) יִשָּׁלָּח מַעַלָּה מֵאַרְבַּא יְהֹוָה = He causes the vapors to ascend from the ends of the earth, i.e. probably from the universal sea encircling the disc of the earth. Cf. Am. Or. Soc. Proc., March, 1894, p. civ.

* This is the translation given by Rabbi Saadya (692-942) in his Arabic Version of the Pentateuch. But Saadya inserts the negative: וְלֹא יְחַלָּק מַעַלָּה. Cf. Lagarde, Materialien zum Pentateuch, i, p. 5 (Leipzig, 1867). Grotius (who, however, translates spring) thinks that Saadya read the negative in the Hebrew MS. he used. But Houbigant (1777) is no doubt right in remarking that the negative was merely supplied by Saadya suo Marte. After all, the insertion of the negative is more sensible than the traditional rendering.

† Wellhausen has queried the rendering Nebel in all his editions of his Prolegomena; cf. fourth edition, p. 304; first edition (1878), p. 342.

‡ Delitzsch's father, in his commentary on Job (1876), compared מַעַלָּה with the Assyrisches Wörterbuch edā "asphalt," which in the Assyrisches Wörterbuch is derived from the same stem as edā.

§ See also Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos (Göttingen, 1895), p. 15.

† Geddes was the priest of a Roman Catholic congregation near Aberdeen, and he received the honorary LL. D. degree from Aberdeen. He is said to have resembled Herder. Cf. Cheyne, Founders of Old Test. Criticism (London, 1893), pp. 4-12; Holzinger, Bemerkungen zu den Hebraeischen (Freiburg, 1893), p. 43.
If we adopt Geddes' suggestion, the translation of v. 6 would be: a flood used to come up from the earth, watering the whole surface of the ground. Kautzsch and Socin refer to Gen. 7, 11 in the priestly account of the Deluge, where we read that in the 600th year of Noah's life all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven opened. Assyr. edd., however, is never used of underground water. In all the passages I know of, it refers to the water of seas and rivers. I believe that we should read נַחֲלָה כְּלָלָה לֹּא מִצְרַיִם instead of נַחֲלָה כְּלָלָה מִצְרַיִם. This would mean: The water used to come over the land, and flood the ground.

We must remember in this connection that the Biblical accounts of Creation, both the priestly and the prophetic,* go back to Babylonia,† just as the story of Paradise points to Babylonia. † Babylonia is not like Palestine, as we read in Deut. 11, 11, a land of hills and valleys that drinks water from the rain of heaven, a land which Jehovah cares for, whereon His eyes are from the beginning of the year to the end of the year; Babylonia was, like Egypt, a land where it was necessary to water the seed that was sown, with the foot, like a garden of vegetables. Without artificial irrigation Babylonia is a desert; the higher regions dry up, and the lower districts become swamps. ‡ Many a part of Babylonia that was a land of gardens a thousand years ago, during the reign of the Abbaside Caliphs, is now covered with water. The overflowing of the Euphrates and Tigris is not, like the annual inundation of the Nile, a blessing, but it inflicts incalculable damage. In Babylonia not only the fertility of the soil, but the soil itself is, just as in Holland, the product of human labor. ¶ Without drainage and irrigation, cultivation of the ground is impossible. The Babylonians forced the Tigris to flow along the eastern boundary of the alluvial plain, and the Euphrates was made to take its course to the sea through Lake Najaf, instead of losing itself in the swamps of Southern Babylonia. §

From this point of view, the words, And man was not there to cultivate the ground, but the water of the sea and the rivers used to come over the

---

* For the past fourteen years I have always stated in my classes that the Judaic accounts of Creation, the Deluge, etc., were of course pre-exilic, but that they had afterwards been retouched in some passages.
† Cf. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos, p. 169.
‡ See my paper in Über Land und Meer, vol. 73, no. 15, p. 349.
§ Literally according to.
¶ I. e. either by water-wheels turned by men pressing upon them with the foot in the same way that water is still often drawn from wells in Palestine; or the reference may be to the mode of distributing water from the canals over a field, by making or breaking down the foot with the small ridge which regulates its flow, or by using the foot for the purpose of opening and closing sluices.” Cf. Driver's Commentary on Deuteronomy, p. 129 (Edinburgh, 1885).
†‡ See Sprenger, Babylonien (Heidelberg, 1886), pp. 19, 27, 22, 23, 73.
land flooding the whole surface of the ground, appear in a new light. The Biblical idea of Chaos, the whole earth submerged, with no separation between land and water, is specifically Babylonian. Wellhausen supplies at the beginning of the second account of creation: Es war alles trockene Waste, it was all an arid waste. He should have substituted Wasserdichte, a watery waste.†

The reading instead of אֲנָא שֻׁלַךְ שָׂדֶה אָבוֹ דָּהַרְתָּן אֵלֹהִים עַל יָרָאֵר is found in a manuscript of the Targum on the Pentateuch (Cod. Mus. Brit. Or. 2228) of which Merz has published some extracts in his Osterrathion Targumica (Berlin, 1888), p. 61: וָעֲנָא הוֹהָו הָלִיךְ אֵל. Most editions of the Targum have מ, including the Edition Ulyssenoponis, quoted by Merz in the footnotes, i.e., the Lisbon edition of 1491.† The Samaritan Targum also read: וָעֲנָא מִן חַלֹךְ הָאָלֶּךְ אֶל. The Targum, on the other hand, renders cloud, נַעֲנָא, both the Targum Onkelos and the Targum Jerusalem. In the same way the LXX translates θήνα in Job 38, 27 νεφέλη. The rendering νεφέλη is also found in the translation of our passage, Gen. 2, 6, in the Græcus Venetus: νεφέλη δ’ ἀναβαινει πρὸς τῆς γῆς καὶ ἀρχῆ ἁμμαν τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς. And J. D. Michaelis, 1775, translated: Es stiegen aber Wolken von der Erde auf und tränkten die ganze Oberfläche des Landes.

ונא is not found in any other passage of the O. T. except in Job 38, 27, at the beginning of the second half of the last discourse of Elihu.

* L. 6 of the first fragment of the cuneiform Creation Tablets reads: giparu ld gipuru, āša ld šē’ta "no ground had yet been diked (i.e. surrounded and protected with dikes or embankments to prevent inundations), no fields were to be seen." Cf. Delitzsch, Das babyl. Weltschöpfungsens (Leipzig, 1886), p. 120. Giparu is a synonym of šēr in l. 135 of the Deluge Tablet: kima šāri mizurat usalli, "then land had become like the diked fields," i.e. everything was covered with water.

† Cf. Berosus' σάλας καὶ θεόπ (Gunkel, op. cit., p. 17). Several Jewish scholars propose to read in the first verse of the Bible: In the beginning God created the water and the earth, מים instead of ים (Grätz, Emendationes, ad loc.).


The Authorized Version renders:

He maketh small the drops of water;
They pour down rain according to the vapor thereof,
Which the clouds do drop,
And distil upon man abundantly.

The rendering abundantly would require the emendation מים = רַב, adopted by Siegfried in his edition of the Hebrew text. Delitzsch translates: sie sichern als Regen bei seinem Nebeldunst (they oose as rain at His misty vapor); Hitzig: sie seinem zu Regen seinen Dunst (they filter His vapor into rain); Siegfried-Stade: lösen den Regen in Nebel auf (they dissolve the rain into vapor); Hoffmann: er sieht Wassertropfen heran, die von seinem Nebel zu Regen gesehrt werden, welche der Wolkenhimmel herabrinnt lässt, sodass sie auf viele Menschen nieder (He attracts drops of water which are filtered into rain by His mist, which the welkin causes to flow down, so that they drip on many men). According to Hoffmann the mist or vapor is the strainer through which the drops of water are filtered, and become rain. He reads מים instead of מים. Dillmann translates: in consequence of His mist (auf seinen Nebel hin, in Folge desselben).

The suffix occasions some difficulty. I am inclined to think, with Geddes and Friedrich Delitzsch, that מים is in the line of Job means flooding, watering, irrigation, just as in our passage of Genesis, but the final י is probably not the suffix, but a trace of the old vocalic case-ending, as we have it in the Assyry. edâ and in Hebrew forms like חָבָל מים בָּוָל מים יָוָל (König, Lehrgebude, ii, 1, p. 483, 8). *

The combination of Hebrew מים with Assyrian edâ is all the more probable as the ideogram of edâ shows that it means water of irrigation, the ideogram for edâ is explained in the vocabulary if R. 30, 15 by דַּבְּאַ דַּבְּאַ (Ḥabbeq) "irrigation of the field," and edâ is also used in connection with the Shaf‘el ḫaqû, the Assyry. equivalent of חַּשְׁבַּ, in the Cylinder Inscription of Sargon II, commented on by

Vol. xvii.] Peters, Civilization in Babylonia. 163

Professor Lyon, l. 37: "*gibis edit me nuxh* suag (cf. Lyon's Sargon, p. 67; Schrader's KB. ii. 45, 37) "to irrigate the land with abundant water like the flood of the sea." The word *nim calamity* may be a differentiation of *nim* flood. Flood or high water is a common metaphor in Hebrew for affliction, calamity, distress.† In Assyrian we have for *nim distress* the Pael form uddâ, plur. uddâti.§ The comparison of *nim calamity* with Arabic *Jarawir* to bend, to trouble, is just as doubtful as the combination of *nim mist* (?) with Arabic *mâyad.*

2. The seat of the earliest civilization in Babylonia, and the date of its beginnings; by Dr. John P. Peters, New York, N. Y.

One of the conspicuous and unpleasant features of travel in Babylonia are the mortuary caravans which one meets conveying the dead from Persia to the sacred city of Nejef. All travelers in this region refer to their experience in encountering these caravans, and especially to the unpleasantness of spending the night at the khan with one of them. The Persians believe that the man who is buried in the sacred soil of Nejef will find a quick and more certain entrance into paradise. Not unfrequently, persons approaching death, if they are able, come down to Nejef to die. I recall an instance of my own experience. I was awakened very early in the morning in the khan at Nejef by the request that I would get up, as my next-door neighbor had died during the night and they wished to carry out the corpse. He had come down for the purpose of dying there. In other cases, a man having died at home, his pious friends bring the body to Nejef to be buried; a journey, it may be, of a month or more. When one considers the way in which the coffins are made and the heat of the climate, it may be imagined that it is exceedingly unpleasant to spend a night in a khan close to a family bent on such a pious errand. Families coming down to Nejef for such a purpose frequently bring with them handsome rugs, one of which will be used as a pall for the dead at the funeral, while afterwards all will be sold to pay the expenses of the journey. I have one such rug—and I prize it highly—which served, before I bought it, as a pall at the funeral of a man in Nejef. It is a dated Persian rug, about eighty-five years old.

Ordinarily several families bent upon such an errand unite together to form a caravan. One of the common routes of travel is through Baghdad, across Kerbela, which is itself a sacred burial city, although of

* For nuxh, see my remark in Die akkadische Sprache (Berlin, 1888), p. xiii.
† Cf. e. g. Prov. 1, 27: *nimeh mishad* nim *vay*m your calamity comes like a whirlwind.
‡ Isa. 6, 7, 8; *vay* 18, 17; 124, 4, 5, etc.; cf. Dr. Stevens' Commentary on the Songs of Degrees (Johns Hopkins thesis) in Hebraica, xi, 77.
§ See Delitzsch's Handwörterbuch, p. 22*.
a sanctity in that regard much inferior to Nejef, and so down to Nejef. Another route is from the south. I do not know at what point pilgrims by this route enter Babylonia. I have met them first on the Ateshan canal above Samawa. They ascend this canal, cross a portion of the Bahri-Nejef, and go up the continuation of the Hindieh Canal above the sea to a point opposite Nejef, called Seheir, about three hours by donkey caravan from Nejef. Pilgrims carrying their dead to Nejef frequently place a coin in the mouth of the deceased for payment of expenses. Robbers infest the road and plunder smaller caravans, even stealing the coin from the mouth of the corpse. Between Samawa and Nejef some of these robbers fell upon us, as we were making the journey after dark, mistaking us for pious pilgrims carrying their dead to the sacred city. We were better armed than the brigands, and the consequence of their attempt to plunder us was that we captured them.

But not only do relatives bring the bodies of their dead to be buried in holy ground; there are also contractors who make it their business to go about from place to place and collect bodies of persons whose relatives wish to have them interred in Nejef but are unable or unwilling to incur the expense of the journey to that city. Bodies are dug out of the ground and consigned to the care of these contractors, who engage to transport them to Nejef and secure them proper burial there. The coffins used for this purpose at the present time are ordinary plain boxes of rough board. The Arabs of Babylonia use, instead of coffins made of boards, reeds, in which they encase the body, binding the two ends of the roll together with palm cords. Formerly it was the practice to bury the dead in the city of Nejef itself; and travelers tell us that caravans camped outside of the walls of the city, haggling with the Imāms of Ali's shrine with regard to the price, while the air was polluted by the terrible stench arising from the decomposing bodies. Under Turkish rule a stop has finally been put to this practice, and interments within the walls of Nejef are now either no longer made, or only made on special occasions by the payment of a great price. The whole plain about the city is, however, one vast cemetery.

The reason why Shiite Moslems have chosen Nejef as a place of interment is because it is the burial place of their prophet, Ali. But Nejef and Kerbela are not the only sacred burial sites. Half way between Diwanieh and Hillah, on the west shore of the Euphrates, lies a little være, known as Imām Jasim, surrounded by a few miserable mud hovels. The neighborhood of this være is reputed sacred, and many acres of ground are covered with the graves of the Shites. There are also other similar burial places in lower Babylonia. The interesting fact to notice is, that while the particular locality in which interments take place may be new, the general practice of burial in this region is of the greatest antiquity. From time immemorial it has been the custom to bring the dead from great distances to be buried in the sacred soil of Babylonia. Such is the practice to-day; and excavations in the burial fields of Erech, Zergial, and other places, have shown that the same practice was in existence in the Persian period, in the Parthian
period, and in the Babylonian period. Age after age, the dead have
been brought from distant countries to be buried here.

It is evident, when we compare the modern use with the ancient and
observe the persistence of the custom, that for some reason, at a very
early period, the soil of a certain part of Babylonia came to be regarded
as sacred for purposes of interment. With the change of races and the
change of religions in Babylonia, the original causes which led to the
interment of the dead in that country passed away; nevertheless the
custom still continued, being inherited as a fact by each new religion
and each new race, and incorporated in its practice in precisely the
same way in which old sacred sites and ceremonies are taken over from
their predecessors by new nations and new religions, even where from
the point of view of logical consistency such adoption would seem to
be utterly out of the question. In the matter of sacred sites and cere-
monies, every one who has read history is familiar with the phenom-
enon. The sacred sites of Aphrodite have been inherited by the Virgin
Mary; and the liquefaction of blood, practiced as a heathen miracle in
the time of Horace, is continued under the Christian religion with a
different name. So also the custom of burying the dead in Babylonia,
having been once established, was continued from age to age and from
religion to religion under substantially the same forms. The question
is, How did the practice of bringing the dead from distant countries to
bury them in certain parts of Babylonia originate?

I do not think that we shall have to search long for the answer to
this question. Everyone familiar with the records of the Hebrew reli-
gion will remember the indications of a similar practice among the
Hebrews, in connection, primarily, with the cave of Machpelah at
Hebron. We are told in the twenty-third chapter of Genesis that
Abraham bought "the field of Ephron which was in Machpelah, which
was before Mamre," and that he buried there Sarah his wife. After-
wards Isaac and Rebecca his wife were buried there. There Jacob bur-
ied Leah. Later Jacob himself died during the sojourn of the Israel-
etes in Egypt; and it was considered necessary to bring his body back to
his own land, and bury it with his ancestors in Machpelah. Not only
that; we are told also that, although Joseph died in Egypt, it was con-
sidered necessary, when the Israelites came up to Canaan, to carry his
body with them and bury it there. Now, while this may not represent
history in a literal sense, certainly it is history in a broader sense. It
gives us a picture of the Hebrews carrying their dead from distant
places to be buried in the sacred soil of Canaan, and tells us that they
did so because that was their ancestral home. Hebron became a burial
place to them, not because it was originally sacred in itself, but because
their forefathers had lived and were buried there. We have enough
similar examples among uncivilized and half-civilized peoples to estab-
lish the general principle that there is a tendency to carry the dead for
burial to the ancestral home.

Inversely, we may argue, where we find people carrying their dead
a long distance for interment, that they do so because they count as
their ancestral home that place to which they are now carrying back their dead. Of course, the custom once established, a religious sanction of a new description may be given to it, so that the place becomes holy in and for itself, and peoples who have no ancestral connection with the place may ultimately come to bring their dead to be buried there by the side of the people to whose ancestors it belonged. In the custom existing at the present day of bringing bodies from distant parts of Babylonia, from Persia, and even from India to be buried in Nejef or some other similar sacred site in Babylonia, we have this secondary development, in which the practice of interment, having been once established, has received a religious sanction, and the place itself has come to be regarded as holy. The same was true, presumably, with reference to the practice of burial in Babylonia by the Persians and the Parthians; but there must have been behind all these a period when people brought their dead to be buried in Lower Babylonia because that was the place from which their ancestors had gone forth; and the origin of the practice of burying in Babylonia persons who have died in distant lands is to be sought in the fact that the region in which those burials have always taken place was the ancestral home of some people who originated that custom by bringing back their dead to Babylonia from the new homes to which they had migrated.

To just what portion of Babylonia do we find this practice of burial attaching itself? One of the most famous and largest of the necropoleis of Babylonia is that at Erech, which was partially explored by Loftus and is described by him in his "Chaldea and Susiana." The heading of the eighteenth chapter in that volume is in itself suggestive; "The absence of Tombs in the Mounds of Assyria.—Their abundance in Chaldea.—Warka a vast Cemetery," etc. The opening part of the chapter is worth quoting in this connection: "It is a remarkable fact that, in spite of the long succession of years during which excavations have been carried on by the English and French governments in the mounds of Assyria, not a single instance has been recorded of undoubted Assyrian sepulture... The natural inference therefore is, that the Assyrians either made away with their dead by some other method than by burial, or else that they conveyed them to some distant locality. If, however, Assyria be without its cemeteries, Chaldea is full of them; every mound is an ancient burial-place between Nisfar and Mugeyer! It would be too much, with our present knowledge, to say positively that Chaldea was the necropolis of Assyria, but it is by no means improbable that such was the case. Arrian, the Greek historian, in describing Alexander's sail into the marshes south of Babylon, distinctly states that most of the sepulchres of the Assyrian kings were there constructed, and the same position is assigned them in the Peutingerian tables. The term Assyria, however, in the old geographers, is frequently applied to Babylonia, and the tombs alluded to may therefore be those only of the ancient kings of Babylonia. Still, it is likely that the Assyrians regarded with peculiar reverence that land out of which Assur went forth and builded Nineveh, and that they interred their dead around the original seats of their forefathers.
Whether this were so or not, the whole region of Lower Chaldea abounds in sepulchral cities of immense extent. By far the most important of these is Warka, where the enormous accumulation of human remains proves that it was a peculiarly sacred spot, and that it was so esteemed for many centuries. It is difficult to convey anything like a correct notion of the piles upon piles of human relics which there utterly astound the beholder. Excepting only the triangular space between the three principal ruins, the whole remainder of the platform, the whole space between the walls, and an unknown extent of desert beyond them, are everywhere filled with the bones and sepulchres of the dead. There is probably no other site in the world which can compare with Warka in this respect; even the tombs of ancient Thebes do not contain such an aggregate amount of mortality. From its foundation by Urukh until finally abandoned by the Parthians—a period of probably 2500 years—Warka appears to have been a sacred burial-place. In the same manner as the Persians at the present day convey their dead from the most remote corners of the Shah’s dominions, and even from India itself, to the holy shrines of Kerbella and Meshed Ali, so, doubtless, it was the custom of the ancient people of Babylonia to transport the bones of their deceased relatives and friends to the necropolis of Warka and other sites in the dread solitude of the Chaldean marshes. The two great rivers, the Tigris and Euphrates, would, like the Nile in Egypt, afford an admirable means of conveying them from a distance, even from the upper plains of Assyria.

I was nowhere enabled to ascertain how deep in the mounds the funereal remains extend, although in several instances trenches were driven to the depth of thirty feet, beyond which the extreme looseness of the soil prevented my continuing the excavations with safety to the workmen; but I have every reason to believe that the same continuous mass of dead reaches to the very base of the highest portion of the platform—a depth of sixty feet. On this account there is considerable difficulty in obtaining information concerning the most ancient mode of disposing of the dead at Warka. It is only at the edges of the mounds where least built upon that the undoubted primitive tombs and their accompaniments occur."

Not far from Erec or Warka, perhaps a day’s journey away, lies the mound of Umm-el-Aqarib. This was visited by de Sarzec, who found there one of the heads of statues now in the Louvre. He does not seem to have recognized the character of the place, which he calls by the name of Moulagareb. It was visited by Dr. Ward on the Wolfe expedition, and recognized by him as a necropolis. At the time of my visit, in 1890, I had the advantage of the report of the Germans of the work of their expedition at Zergul and Hibba. I found at Umm-el-Aqarib a cemetery regularly laid out. There were recognizable streets, on which abutted the places of burial proper. I dug out some of these sufficiently to ascertain their general character as tombs, and also that one tier was built upon another, so that presumably the whole mound is one vast
accumulation of burials. In those portions of the mound which I excavated there were no burials of the later period, as at Erech, but every thing belonged to the old Babylonian period, presumably 2000 B. C. and earlier. There was one structure of considerable size, which may have been a temple, but I found no evidence of the existence of a city of the living in connection with this necropolis, although there was, a few miles away, a very large and important group of cities, represented by the ruin-mounds of Yokha, Ferwa, and Abu-Adham. It will be seen that this necropolis is in many respects similar to the one which the Germans excavated at Zerghul south of the Shatt-el-Haf.

Not far from Nippur, about a dozen miles south-south-east, lies the ruin-mound of Delehem. I was unable to conduct excavations at this point, but from my experience I think I may safely say, after an examination without excavation, that Delehem is a necropolis of a similar character, although smaller than Umm-el-Aqarib. In the immediate neighborhood of Nippur there are, further, a considerable number of small mounds, such as Derehem, about four or five miles away to the south-east, and Abu-Jowan, about the same distance to the north-east, as well as some still smaller unnamed mounds closer to the actual ruins of Nippur, which appear to have been burial mounds. I was able to examine these only slightly, but such examination as I made revealed nothing but graves; so that I concluded that in all probability these mounds represented places of burial at the time of the prosperity of Nippur. Delehem is too far from Nippur to have been the necropolis for that city only, and it is equally remote from the large ruins of Bismya. I have assumed that it was an independent necropolis like Zerghul and Umm-el-Aqarib. Taylor, in excavating at Mughair and Abu-Shahrein (which, by the way, is no longer known, as far as I can ascertain, by that name, but is now called Nowawis), found frequent interments, although he seems to have found no separate necropolis.

Similarly, I found at Nippur interments in all parts of the ruins, among the houses and temples or under them, just as we find at the present day in some of the more remote Turkish and Arab towns. As Loftus has pointed out in the passage quoted above, these are the conditions prevailing everywhere, from Nippur southward, where excavations have been conducted. On the other hand, north of Nippur, in Babylonia as in Assyria, we find no necropoleis, and comparatively few interments in or about the cities and ruins which have been explored. In exploring Babylonia from Nippur southward the question which arises is, Whence have we so many burials? Whereas from Nippur northward the question which arises is, What did they do with their dead? From our present knowledge it would seem that it was the practice to bring the dead out of both northern Babylonia and Assyria, to be interred in the region of Lower Babylonia, from Nippur southward. The suggestion to be derived from this fact, if it be a fact, and I am inclined to think that it is, is that the region mentioned above was the original home of the ancestors of both the people of northern Babylonia and of Assyria, to which the inhabitants of those
countries looked back as a sacred spot because their ancestors had come from there. This view is further supported by the fact that there existed at the northern limit of that region, at Nippur, a temple looked upon as the most ancient and sacred in the Babylonian world, namely, E-Kur, the temple of En-lil, or the great Bel. At a later date the land of burials was extended a little to the northward.

And now, assuming this original land of burials to be the home of Babylonian civilization, what was the date of the origin of that civilization? The southern limits of the region above mentioned differ greatly according to the date at which you consider it. The natural boundary on the south is the Persian Gulf. At the present time that is some 220 miles south-east of Nippur, in a direct line, and about 180 miles below Mughair, the ancient Ur. According to the calculations of Ainsworth (see Ainsworth's "Researches in Assyria, Babylonia and Chaldæa," London, 1888, pp. 181 ff.), there is added each year at the mouth of the Shatt-el-Arab ninety feet of land. That is, the land encroaches upon the sea that much each year. Using Arrian's narrative of the voyage of Nearchus, and Pliny's account of the country at the head of the Persian gulf, largely derived therefrom, Ainsworth endeavors to determine the position of the head of that gulf in the time of Alexander the Great. He observes that "Alexander called by his name the Arabian colony of Tospasinus, Spasinus Charax, or Charax, and that this was situated a little less than one mile from the sea." Pliny, N. H. vi. c. 27, describes the situation of Charax: "Charax . . . . habitatur in colle manu facto inter confluentes, dextra Tigrim, isva Eulaeum." From the fact that it was at the confluence of the two rivers, this site can be readily determined. It is occupied by the modern town Mo'ammerah, which is situated at the junction of the Shatt-el-Arab and the Karoun. But Mo'ammerah was forty-seven miles away from the Persian gulf at the time of Ainsworth's measurements. Between the time of Nearchus, 323 B. C., and the time of Ainsworth, 1885 A. D., a period of 2100 years, forty-six miles of new land had therefore been formed at the head of the Persian gulf. According to my calculations this would make the average deposit from Alexander's time to our own about 114½ feet a year, but Ainsworth makes it 90.

Ainsworth further attempts to locate the Teredon or Tridotus, said to have been founded by Nebuchadrezzar at the mouth of the Euphrates. For the location of this place, however, we have not the same data; and Ainsworth's location of it at Jebel Sinam, some ten miles below Zobefir, and therefore about that distance below the modern Bassorah, must be accepted with caution. If it were situated at the place named, it must have been about nine miles from the sea in Nebuchadrezzar's time, and not upon the sea, as Ainsworth seems to suppose; unless Ainsworth's calculations are quite untrustworthy and the rate of deposit between Mo'ammerah and Bassorah was more than twice as rapid as between Mo'ammerah and the sea. I fancy, however, that a site for Teredon even as far as nine miles from the coast in Nebuchadrezzar's time would in reality quite suit the requirements of the situation as actually described.
But this is a side question. The fact of a large alluvial deposit, measurable at least by average over a long period of years, at the head of the Persian gulf is obtained by the determination of the fact that the site of the modern Mo'ammerah was one mile from the sea in 825 B.C. Now from the gulf up to about the parallel of Baghdad the entire Babylonian plain is an alluvial deposit, mainly from the rivers Tigris and Euphrates; and from the general configuration of the region we may, I think, fairly argue that the rate of deposit is likely to have been always approximately the same. Having thus fixed the rate of deposit for the section from Mo'ammerah to the gulf, we may reckon back from this to obtain the date of formation of any given part of Babylonia. On the basis of Ainsworth's figure of 90 feet a year, we find that the sea would have reached up to the site of Ur about 7550 B.C. Taking my figures derived from Ainsworth's measurements, 114½ feet a year, we find that the seacoast would have been at that point about 5500 B.C. I believe that Ainsworth's figure is based not entirely upon calculation from the site of Mo'ammerah, but partly at least upon measurements of the present rate of increase. Possibly a middle rate would more nearly represent the actual average, giving us, say 6000 B.C. as the date required. I have no way of determining this matter, however; and while I believe that we can place reliance for the determination of the earliest possible date of Ur upon the measurement of the rate of alluvial deposit, I fancy that we must regard the date obtained by such measurements as only approximate and liable to vary a few hundred years from exactitude.

In old Babylonian tradition there is but one city further south than Ur and Eridu (Eridu stood on the solid plateau of the Arabian desert on the edge of the alluvial deposit, just within sight of Ur), and that is Surippak, the city of the ark. Whether this was a mythical place or not I do not know, but at least the site of Surippak has not yet been identified. Assyriologists regard Ur as having been originally a coast-city from the references in the inscriptions. This condition might, however, be fulfilled by a location a dozen miles or so from the actual coast on a navigable river or canal; but at least, if not on the sea, a city to be regarded as a coast-city must have been within a very few miles of the coast. As situated, not in the middle of the alluvial tract, but close to the western edge of the same, it is possible, and I suppose probable, that the land on which Ur stood was formed before that in the middle of the plain. The gulf might have extended further northward for some time after this strip of land along the shore had already become habitable.

Judging from the references in ancient Babylonian inscriptions, Ur must have been, as already stated, about the most southerly city of Babylonia in the earliest period. It was also at the southern limit of the burial-region, so far as we know. At the northern limit of that region apparently lies Nippur. Now, in the inscriptions, Sin of Ur is mentioned as the son of En-Lil or Bel of Nippur. This suggests an earlier date for Nippur, or at least for its temple and worship, than for Ur or its temple and worship, but establishes a close relationship
between the two. Our excavations at Nippur, if we accept the date of Sargon of Agare as fixed, as all Assyriologists assume that it is, at 3900 B.C., compel us to relegate the founding of that city to a period considerably antedating 6000 B.C., and perhaps antedating 7000 B.C.

My suggestion, from the various facts here marshalled, would be that the original home of civilization in Babylonia was the strip of land from Nippur southward to the neighborhood of Ur, and not, as has sometimes been argued, the region about Babylon and northward to Sippa. While the latter region is in itself older, it does not seem to have been older as the home of civilized man. The ancestors of the civilization of Babylonia seem to have come from the region between Nippur and what was then the coast of the Persian gulf. This would accord also with the tradition preserved to us in later sources that civilization came to Babylonia out of the Persian gulf. Possibly Eridu, on the Arabian plateau near the western shore and not far from the head of what was then the Persian gulf, may represent the oldest seat of that civilization. However that may be, at a very early period Nippur became the center of civilization and religion, being founded at a time when everything below Ur probably, and possibly some part of the region to the north of it, was still under water. As early as the close, if not the beginning, of the seventh millennium B.C., this strip of land at the head of the then Persian gulf seems to have been the home of civilized men, and from here civilization spread northward.

3. The termination ū, ēnī in Assyrian verbs; by Macy M. Skinner, Assistant in Semitic Languages in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

The third masculine plural of the present, preterite, and permansive of Assyrian verbs, which usually ends in ū, is frequently found with the longer form in ēnī.* An examination of prose texts extending over a period from Hammurabi to Cyrus, as well as of some poetic material, has yielded the following results.†

* The feminine in ēnī is of very rare occurrence and we shall accordingly confine ourselves to the masculine.

† The texts consulted were: for Hammurabi, the Louvre inscript., in Méring's Inscript. de Hammourabi, pp. 13-20; for Aqī-akkrīrim, VR33; for Ramman-nirari I, Harvard Semitic Museum tablet; for Nābu-kadnāzzar II, VR55-57; for Tiglath-pileser I, Prism inscript., IR9-16; for Nābu-apal-iddin, VR60-61; for Assur-nasirpal, Annals, IR7-26; for Shalmanesar II, Bl. Ob., in Abel und Winckler's Keilschriftexte, pp. 7-12, also Monolith, II117-8; for Sāmāš-ramman, IR32-34; for Ramman-nirari III, IR35 Nos. 1 and 3; the Synchronous Hist., in Winckler's Untersuchungen, p. 146 and ff.; for Tiglath-pileser III, II1167 and II1192; for Sargon, Winckler's Keilschriftexte Sargons, vol. 2, pp. 30-36; for Šennacherib, Prism inscript., IR37-42; for Esarhaddon, IR45-47 and IR50; for Assurbanipal, Rassam cyl., VR1-10; for Šamaš-sumkin, Cyl. Biling., and Letter

1. The longer form in ānī is employed almost exclusively in the first stem (I. 1 Pe‘al). The total number of cases found of the form in ānī was 140. Of these, 118 were of stem I. 1; for example, iš-šu-u-ni, VR2,118; iš-bat-u (var. ba-tu)-nim-ma, VR1,129.

2. The verbs occurring with this longer form are mainly weak verbs. Of the 140 occurrences of the form in ānī, 109 were weak verbs: for example, iš-li-iu-šu-nim-ma, VR2,57; id-su-ni, IR24,35; iš-bu-ni-im-ma, No. 7, Rev. 7, in Thontafelfund von El Amarna.

3. The form in ānī is seldom used with suffixes. Of the third masculine plural, 87 cases with suffix were found; 10 of these were in ānī, and 77 in  yıllarda. Examples of the longer form with suffix are: ā-tir-rândi-su, VR5,34; ā-ti-ta-ni-su, IR16,78.

4. The use of the form in ānī does not appear to be influenced by syntactical considerations.

It is possible that the termination ānī had an old rhetorical function which has survived in certain verbs. We have seen that it occurs most frequently with stem I. 1 (Pe‘al). As this is the light stem, and the other stems are increased in various other ways, may this not have been a method of strengthening the stem? Moreover the form in ānī has been retained mainly in weak verbs. This fact leads to the conjecture that one of the functions of the ānī termination was to preserve more nearly the normal number of syllables or to compensate for the loss of a weak letter. Naturally in the course of time the original force and significance of the ending was lost, and we find such forms as ipparisadānī as well as numerous other strong roots with the termination ānī.

A point of some interest in this connection is the relation of the Assyrian ending ānī to the plural termination ān in Hebrew, Aramaic, etc. In the perfect, ān occurs more or less frequently in Samaritan, Syriac, and later Targumic,* but only three times in Hebrew.† In the imperfect, the Arabic (ānā) and Aramaic have retained it regularly; the

---

* See Böttcher’s Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Heb. Sprache, §§390.
† See Driver’s Tanzea (3d ed.), p. 6, Note 1. |מ|, Dt. viii. 3, 16, and |כ| Is. xxvi. 16. This last, Stade, Gram., §411a, rejects as suspicious. It is apparently a textual error. |כ|, Is. xxix. 21, is evidently an imperfect.
Hebrew, some 313 times.* In Hebrew prose, the form in ān is more common in the pre-exilic literature, the general principle being as follows: the older the book, the more frequent is its use; and the absence of the form is a mark of later date.† There does not seem to be any defined law of growth or degradation traceable in the history of the form in Assyrian. In the El-Amarna tablets examined, the forms in ān were in predominance over those in ā, and a further investigation of this material from so early a period (15th century B.C.) might yield some significant results. The use of the termination ānī in Assyrian and that of ān in Hebrew have this in common, that they occur mainly with the first stem, and seldom with suffixes.

The following is a list of verbs which occur most frequently in the texts examined with the termination ānī, in the order of their frequency: ḥābtu, ṭibū (14 times in ānī); ālāku (13 times); ārādu, ūāru (9); nasā, šābātu (7); āsū, kho, lihū (5); parṣadu (4); ūū, irību, dakhū, ṭakānu, šarāku (3).

4. On the 'Frog-hymn,' Rig-Veda vii. 103, together with some remarks on the composition of the Vedic hymns; by Professor M. Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

At the meeting of the A. O. S. in October, 1890, the writer presented a paper entitled, 'On a Vedic group of charms for extinguishing fire by means of water-plants and a frog;' an abstract of which appeared in the Proceedings of that meeting: the subject was afterwards treated more fully in the second series of 'Contributions to the interpretation of the Vedas,' Amer. Journ. Phil. xi. 343 ff.† The primary object of the article was the interpretation of RV. x. 16. 13. 14, and sundry related stanzas, but incidentally there came to light a wide-spread custom of employing a frog and certain water-plants as symbols of water, as instruments for quenching fire, and as a means of producing water where formerly there was none. Ethnologically speaking, this is the simplest kind of folk-lore, and it would have required no special emphasis but for the fact that it helped us to discover in a considerable number of more or less vaguely understood Vedic passages the plainest kind of ordinary meaning.

An interesting modulation of this theme is the employment of the frog as a cure for fever. Stanza 3 of AV. vii. 116, a charm against takman or fever, reads: 'May (the takman) that returns on the morrow, he that returns on two (successive) days, the impious one, pass into this

---

† Ibidem, p. 34.
‡ The following additional passages, illustrating the matters there treated, may be noted: Ts. v. 4. 2. 1; vii. 4. 18. 2; TB. iii. 9. 5. 4; MS. iii. 3. 3. 6; 12. 19; VS. xxiii. 10; Qb. xiii. 8. 3. 13; ĀC. ii. 12. 2; x. 9. 2; LÇ. iii. 6. 13; Rigvīdhāna iv. 11. 1.
frog. This prayer is supported symbolically at Kāuṣ. 22. 17 by fastening a frog beneath the bed of the patient and rinsing the patient off, so that the water shall wash the fever down upon the frog; cf. especially Keśava to the passage, and see the treatment of the hymn in our forthcoming translation of the AV. in the Sacred Books of the East.

Aside from these uses the frog occurs in the accessible Vedic literature, barring casual mention, only in the so-called frog-hymn, RV. vii. 108, and a few scattered but closely related stanzas in the Khila of the RV. itself, in AV. iv. 15. 18 ff., and in the Suparṇākhyāna ix. 8. A literal translation of RV. vii. 108 is as follows:

1. The frogs that have lain (quiet) during the year, (like) Brāhmaṇas devoted to a vow (of silence), have uttered their voice that has been quickened by Parjanya (the god of rain).

2. When the celestial waters came upon them,* lying like a dry (water-) skin in the pool, then the voice of the frogs rises in concert, as the lowing of cows with calves.

3. When at the arrival of the rainy season it hath rained upon them plagued by thirst and longing, then uttering (the sound) akkhal,† as a son to his father one approaches the other croaking.

4. One of them takes hold of the other when they have rejoiced at the pouring forth of the waters, when the frogs sprinkled by the rain did skip, when they mingle their voices, the speckled and the green.

5. When they reply to one another's shouts as a pupil (repeats the words) of his teacher, then all that with them is like a paṭṭ lesson, when with loud croaking they shout upon the water.

6. One bleats like a cow, the other like a goat; one of them is speckled, the other is green; though of different shapes they own the same name, in many ways they modulate their voice when they speak.

7. Like Brāhmaṇas at the all-night soma-sacrifice (atirātra), chanting round about the full bowl (of soma), ye are about on that day of the year when the rainy season has set in.§

---En.

* The text reads samam 'him.' The slight change removes the anacoluthon.
† βραχακά. In Pañc. br. xii. 4. 16 the croaking of the frogs is described by the verb atkarōti 'to utter the sound āt (Scholiast, maṇḍāko vṛṣṭyanantarām ātāt iṣṭ ekaṁ pādaṁ karoti). Cf. also the Sāmans bearing the title dekārāmādhana (pādhana), Pañc. br. viii. 1. 1; 2. 1; Ind. Stud. iii. 306; and see Weber, Festgr. an Rudolf von Roth, p. 136, note 4. [Cf. also the names of sounds (some onomatopoetic) of various creatures and things, ZDMG. xxxii. 734.

† samyāda is to be taken as an adverbial instrumental from samyāda 'accomplishment, success.' The assumption for this one place of a stem samyāda (Pet. Lex., Grassmann, and Hillebrandt, Vedachrestomathie) is uncalled for. We have avoided the anacoluthon between eṣam and eṇāthana by rendering the latter as a third person.

§ There is no fun and no conviviality in all this. The Brāhmaṇas do not drink the soma at the atirātra; it is sacrificed at regular intervals, each libation being preceded by the chanting of holy hymns. Four libations are poured at three dif-
8. As Brāhmaṇas over the soma they have raised their voices, performing their annual song; as Adhvaryus (serving priests) that have sweated over the pots of hot milk (gharma) they are (all) in evidence, none of them are hidden.

9. The divine order of the twelve-month† they observed: these men do not disregard the season. Each year when the rainy season has arrived the heated pots (of heaven) are emptied out.‡

10. He that bleats like a cow, he that bleats like a goat; the speckled and the green one have bestowed upon us wealth; the frogs bestowing hundreds of cows shall extend (our) life at the thousand-fold pressing (of the soma).§

The hymn is ‘late.’† It is the only hymn outside of the first and tenth books of the RV. in which occurs the word brāhmaṇa; the combination akkali-kiśya represents the only instance in the RV. of the change of final a to i in composition with the verb kar (and bhū); cf. Whitney, Sk. Gr. 1 1091a, 1098a. Ritual words are common: atirātra, gharma, adhvarya in addition to brāhmaṇa. The expression vrata-cārīn (st. 1 = AV. iv. 15. 18), common in the later literature, occurs nowhere else in the Rik or Atharvan.

Stylistically and from a literary point of view the composition is mediocre. Not that it does not lose somewhat, by a prose rendering, in what we at least feel to be a certain naïveté, directness, and quick-

---

Different points of the night, and silence reigns between these points. As the chants of the Brāhmaṇas indicate that the bowl has been filled anew, thus the croaking of the frogs indicates that the pool has been filled by the rains of the monsoon. See Haug, Brahma und die Brahmanen, p. 41 (cf. Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, Translation, pp. 263 ff.). The word śāras is a vox media ‘pool,’ and ‘bowl.’

*Sāyaṇa, gharmino gharmena pravargya carantaḥ ‘performing the pravargya-ceremony.’ At the pravargya-ceremony the priests empty pots of milk which are heated before they are emptied. Similarly the frogs have sweated during the hot season. The word gharma thus harbors a double entente: ‘heated by the pots of milk’ (in relation to the priests), and ‘affected by the hot season’ (in relation to the frogs). Cf. Haug, l. c., p. 42; Hillebrandt’s Vedachrestomathie, under gharma and gharma; Oldenberg, Die Religion des Veda, p. 450, note.

† Sāyaṇa, dvadāsamāṣṭāmakaṇya saivātavārasya. Jacobi, Festgrus an Rudolf von Roth, ‘of the twelfth month.’

‡ The simile between the heated pots of the priests and the hot season is continued: the heated pots are the heated heavens which pour forth their rain.

§ Doubtless again with double meaning: ‘the generating of thousands of plants.’ Thus Sāyaṇa, saharā-saṅkhyākā saṣadhyākṣa sāyanē.

† The Pāṭa. Lex., s. v. atirātra: ‘Das lied ist zu den jüngsten zu zählen.’ What is meant by late is, that a given hymn does not accord with the stereotyped, hieratic language of the family-books, the books of the soma-sacrifice, but approaches the less esoteric more popular diction of the A.V., the Brāhmaṇas, and the classical language. The distinction exists, but it is one of dialect and style, rather than chronology. Many of the criteria employed for chronological purposes are obviously dialectic, e. g. ‘late’ hūyāmi = Āvest. šayemī; sārva = Āvest. haurva; káromā; taruṭi, etc. Of this another time.
ness of movement in the original. As to that, different readers will differ in accordance with their individuality and the scope of their observations of matters Hindu. The hymn is in our view thoroughly conventional: it is full of repetitions, and extreme in its employment of the catenary arrangement of its stanzas. The very opening in the livelier anūṣṭubh metre, continuing with the more stately triṣṭubh-jagati, is one of the standard devices of the AV.* Two clumsy anacrases in sts. 2 and 5 contribute to the characterization of the literary standard of the hymn, which is no higher than that of scores of Atharvyan hymns. It has been suggested frequently and denied just as frequently that there is in the composition humor, nay that it is a satire on the Brāhmaṇas to compare their doings with those of frogs. As regards the latter point, we must regard it as extremely unlikely, in view of the attitude of the Vedas as a whole towards their priesthood. What is more to the point, however, is that the hymn obviously breathes the spirit of anxious conciliation: the frog, the symbol of eagerly craved water, is no joking matter, and the comparisons with the Brahmans and the sacred rites are begotten of the desire to praise, and not to disparage.

But aside from and above these considerations stands the broad question that must be asked for every Vedic hymn, namely, whether its composition was utilitarian or belles-lettres. Shall we conceive this poetry as the product of the mildly frenzied rhapsodist among the people, or, perhaps, as the child of the muse of some Bāja's poet laureate 'given to infinite tobacco,' as he walks along the jungle in the cool of the evening, at the opening of the rainy season, eager to bag some good subject for the delectation of the court of his patron? Or shall we let the Vedic writings continue their tale of a literature, practical, tendential, everywhere 'on the make'? The Vedic Hindus, to judge by their literature, were the most practical people of ancient times. This literature of a hundred works more or less, the Upanishads not excepted, has positively no aim in view except personal advantage, the favor of the gods, the granting of wishes, the destruction of enemies, and that continues clear down to the pessimistic Upanishads which pander to the desire for emancipation from the round of existences. The Rig-Veda is confessedly in part made of the same stuff. Apart from other parts there are those whose literary feeling does not permit them to follow out the consequences of all that part of Vedic history which is clear. Here and there the sordid mass appears leavened by true beauty of conception, fineness of observation, good style, and all the other paraphernalia of literary composition which we of modern times are accustomed to see at work more or less divorced from any practical consideration. Why not? As if a hieratic literature excluded by its very terms the operations of literary taste and literary canons. The Vedic poets themselves boast that their poems are 'well-hewn,' and so they are in many cases. After

* Of. AV. i. 29; iv. 16; vi. 49. The same effect is produced by introducing an anūṣṭubh-hymn with a gāyatrī, ii. 32; iv. 12, and probably also by placing a stanza in long metre at the head of one in short metre, e.g. ii. 4; vi. 111.
all the crust of priestly conventionalism has been pared off, there remains in the Vedic mantras enough beauty to make them attractive as a phase of the world's literature. But this incidental merit has nothing whatever to do with the prime object of their composition, the pursuit of some priestly object, not necessarily sordid, not necessarily devoid of true elevation of spirit. All preachers are not Peters of Amiens nor Savonarolas, but must be content to serve their religions, while maintaining that the laborer is worthy of his hire; and all scientists are not Galileos, but demand salaries as high as the market allows: and yet, after all, the spiritual guidance of civilized peoples and the great bulk of scientific advance are on the whole safe in the hands of people who are no less dependent upon baksheesh than the poet-priests of India.

The finikin literary non possumus, born of modern sensitiveness, of any one who feels that somehow he is individually incapable of imagining so good a literature—good in his eye, not necessarily in the eye of others—to be composed by priests for priestly purposes, may be respected as a personal frame of mind, but it is wholly otiose as an historical argument. The literary quality of the RV. might have been infinitely higher than it appears to its most enraged admirer, and yet be a purely hieratic performance, provided only that the priests themselves had risen to a correspondingly high plane of literary perception. To deny peremptorily that they could have so risen, though at the same time having an eye to the practical side of their calling, and the practical applicability of the products of their muse, is a dictatorial machtepruch which may inspire awe for a moment, but will not cause any one to flinch in his endeavors to fix more clearly the outline of Hindu antiquity in the light of those of its data which are already clear. This is the homespun method which has finally commended itself in all philologies, and Hindu philology, too, is, on the whole, in good hands. The burden is now on the other shoulder, and he that assumes for a given Vedic hymn a purely literary origin, he who denies that a given hymn was composed with reference to some definite occasion (gelegenheitsdichtung) and for some practical purpose, may no longer be allowed to fortify himself behind shifting aesthetic estimates.

That is begging the question. It may be difficult, yes impossible—though that can be decided only in the future of Vedic philology—to point out the precise occasion in the case of one or another hymn. The great mass of the hymns are obviously practical, not only in their application but by the evidence of their innermost structure, and until it is proved that a given hymn is not so we shall be repaid by searching every time for the occasion and the purpose to which its origin is due.

This oratio pro domo on the part of the expounder of the frog-hymn will seem in the end unnecessarily fervent, and it would indeed be altogether superfluous if it were not still very necessary to draw the moral from what is simple and plain for the future usufruct of those Vedic hymns that are vague and nebulous, or do not at any rate betray on the face of them the exact motive of their composition. The frog-hymn is a
rain-charm, in style and purpose no better than many other productions of the medicine-man and the weather-maker. The chief interest of the hymn is to be found in the fact that it completes the chain of folk-lore beliefs and practices elaborated in the article quoted above. The frog in his character of water-animal par excellence quenches fire, produces water where previously there was none, is the proper repository for fever, and finally is associated with the annual appearance of rain in the rainy season. One will look in vain in the accessible Vedic literature for any mention of frogs—and they are mentioned quite frequently—which fails to suggest or state outright this practical view of the animal.* The frogs, too, are everywhere taken seriously; their comparison with the Brāhmaṇas in vii. 108 is a bit of nice diplomacy, intended as a captatio benevolentiae of the frogs, not as a satire upon the priests engaged in the difficult performance of the all-night sacrifice (ātīrātrā), or the still more arduous manipulation of the heated pots (gharma). That this is so, we may gather from Harivaṇa, Viṣṇuparvan 95. 23 = 8808, a passage which is clearly modelled after sta. 7 ff. of our hymn, and which by its very terms cannot be intended as a satire upon the Brahmans: 'The frog having lain asleep eight months croaks with his wives, as a Brahman devoted to the precious and true law recites hymns surrounded by his pupils.' Langlois in his translation remarks aptly, that according to our customs nothing would be quite as impertinent as the comparison of a respectable ecclesiastic with a frog, but the Hindus were not conscious of any taint of impiousness in this rapprochement. This attitude seems to us queer, but the Hindu is practical, and the frogs have water to give. The Hindu's worship of the to us intensely repulsive animal with forked tongue, 'the toothed rope' as he himself at times calls the serpent, is still more grotesque. And yet even the modern Hindu housewife does not attack an intruding serpent with the broom-handle, but places milk before him, her hands folded in the attitude of a supplicant.

The present hymn betrays its purpose most plainly in its last stanza, which contains, as in hosts of other charms, the true point, the knall-effect, of the hymn. The statement is made in the so-called prophetic aorist, the things desired are stated as having already taken place; that the frogs are able to bestow wealth, cattle, and long life by no other inherent virtue than that of rain-making, needs hardly to be pointed out. Aside from the evidence from within, the charm is immediately preceded in the RV. itself by two hymns that are rain-charms. They are addressed directly as prayers to Parjanya, the rain-god, and their char-

* Cf. especially the familiar passage, RV. ix. 112. 4, where the natural affinities of various kinds of men, animals, and things are described graphically; the poet winds up with the statement, pāpo rāmaṇvāntiḥ hheṭā, vār in maṇḍāka iḥasti. See also Maitr. Up. i. 4; vi. 22.

† The commentators feel this: in all such cases they render the aorist by the imperative. Thus Śāyaṇa here. add, i.e. dadātu. Cf. also Dolbrück, Syntaktische Forschungen ii. 87.
acter may be understood from stanza vii. 101. 5 as a specimen: 'May this prayer penetrate into the heart of the self-sovereign Parjanya, may he take delight in it: refreshing rains shall be ours and plants with goodly fruit protected by the gods.' The only difference between these hymns and the frog-hymn is that in the latter the frogs in their capacity as producers of water, are, as it were, the agents of the rain-god upon earth, and the prayer is shifted to them.

The khaññkāni sūktāni contain a later addendum to the hymn which shows how clearly it was understood at that time in the sense of a rain-charm: 'Join the chorus, O female frog: announce the rain, O tadpole; stretch out thy four feet, and paddle in the middle of the pool.' This stanza appears in A.V. iv. 15. 14, a very lengthy and conglomerate rain-charm, preceded by the first stanza of the frog-hymn, and followed by another stanza in which khanačhā and khaññmakāh, two fanciful frog-females, are again implored to produce rain (varṣaṁ varṇadhvam). Again both the first stanza and the khila of our hymn occur in Yāsaka's Nīruktā ix. 6, 7, and Yāsaka explains, 'Vasiṣṭha desiring rain praised Parjanya, the frogs acclaimed him. He perceiving the acclaiming frogs praised them with song. That is what this stanza means.'

Clearest of all is a passage in the Suparnākhyāna ix. 8, not concerned directly with the frogs at all, and certainly serious. It describes the conjuring of a great storm in vivid language: 'Shout, thunder, reach the clouds; these waters of thine shall be level with the mountain-tops. . . . Undefined, wholly water, the shore shall be: the frog-female shall croak all the night. (The winds) shall milk the cloud (cow) whose trail drips with milk, the wild beast shall come seeking firm land.' The Suparnākhyāna is a very interesting composition, a kind of an addendum (khila) to the RV., at any rate, so strongly reminiscent of the RV. as to leave one in doubt not infrequently whether a certain passage of it is to be regarded as a Vedic mantra or not. The fact that it weaves two of the main ideas of the frog-hymn, the croaking frog, and the all-night performances, into a highly poetic account of a storm, shows at any rate what its composer conceived that composition to be. Finally the hymn was still in use in India in 1871, when the late Professor Haug reported that 'in times of great drought, when the eagerly expected rain will not come, twenty or thirty Brāhmaṇa go to a river, and recite this and the preceding hymn.'

Vol. xvii.] Bloomfield, Rig-Veda, vii. 103.

---

* Cf. Kāp. 103. 3, sam ut patantu (A.V. iv. 15) pra nabhava (vii. 18) iti varṣṭr āhuti.

† Obviously personifications of another of the many onomatopoetic attempts to render the croak of the frog. It is worth noticing that throughout the varied frog-charms with which we have dealt, the female (māṛḍākī, māṛḍākā) rather than the masculine (māṛḍāka) is often chosen as the emblem of moisture. This is sound physiology as well as folk-lore.

‡ Cf. Sādghurucīyā, p. 130; Śāyaṇa in the introduction to RV. vii. 103.

§ Brahma und die Brahmanen, p. 12 (cf. also the note, p. 40).
5. The meaning of the compound atharvângirasaḥ, the ancient name of the fourth Veda; by Professor Bloomfield.

In general the fourth Veda is designated in ancient times by the compound atharvângirasaḥ. Quite frequently, however, the two members of the compound are separated, so that each is mentioned by itself, but always in more or less close conjunction with the other. This shows that the compound is not a concealed formula, but that the texts are conscious of the fact that each has a distinct individuality, and a right to separate existence. In other words, the AV. consists of atharv-va and ângira matter, and the question arises what elements in the make-up of this Veda these terms refer to. The answer may be given with a considerable degree of certainty: the term atharvan refers to the auspicious practices of the Veda, the bheṣajāṇi (AV. xi. 6. 14), those parts of the Veda which are recognized by the Atharvan ritual and the orthodox Brahmanical writings as cānta ‘holy,’ and pāusṭika ‘confering prosperity’; the term ângira refers to the hostile sorcery practices of the Veda, the yātu (Cat. Br. x. 5. 2. 30), or abhicāra which is terrible (ghora).

In J.A.O.S. xi. 387 the writer pointed to the existence of this distinction at Vāït. Sū. 5. 10 (cf. also Gop. Br. i. 2. 18), where two lists of plants are differentiated, one as atharvanah, the other as ângirasyah. The former refers to a list of plants catalogued at Kāuç. 8. 16 and described as cāntab ‘holy’; the second list is stated at Vāït. Sū. 5. 10 itself, and described as ângirasah: the name of the last of the list, nir-dahantā ‘burning forth,’ proves that they were employed in unholy sorcery practices (abhicārika).* The adjective ângirmā is in general in the ritualistic texts of the AV. a synonym of abhicārika (Kāuç. 14. 30; 47. 2, 12; Ath. Parić. 3. 1); hence the fifth kalpa of the AV., usually known as ângirasakalpa, bears also the names abhicāraka-kalpa, and vidhāna-kalpa; see ibid. 376 ff.

Of non-Atharvanic texts, the Rig-viṣṇava iv. 6. 4 has the following gōlka: ‘He against whom those are skilled in the ângirasakalpas practice sorcery repels them all with the Pratyângirasakalpa.† The term pratyângirasa is the exact equivalent of pratyabhācióra ‘counter-witchcraft’ (AV. ii. 11. 2), and the kṛtyāpratiharana, Ath. Parić. 32. 2 (cf. Kāuç. 39. 7, note). The texts of the sort called atharvanapra-tyāngirikalpa (see Ind. Stud. i. 449), pratyāngirāvatva, pratyāngirā-paśiçda, and pratyāngirāsūkta (Böhtlingk’s Lexicon), probably deal with the same theme; at any rate we may regard it as certain that the words ângira and ângirasa are reflected by the ceremonial literature in the sense of abhicāra and abhicārika.

Far more important is the evidence of certain texts of greater antiquity and higher dignity, which have occasion to mention the Atharvan incidentally, and enunciate clearly this two-fold character of the Veda.

* Cf. AV. iii. 2. 5; vii. 108. 2; ix. 2. 4; 5. 31; xiv. 2. 48.
† Cf. also the following gōlka, and iv. 8. 3; see Rudolf Meyer’s preface to his edition of the Rig-viṣṇava, p. xxxi.
They make the very same distinction between atharvan and aṅgiras that appeared above, Vāit. Sū. 5. 10. At Čāṇkh. Čṛ., the fourth Veda figures in its double character as atharvan and aṅgiras; here we find bheṣajaṁ, i.e. ‘remedial charms,’ recited from the atharvan; and ghoram, i.e. ābhicārīkam ‘sorcery,’ from the aṅgiras. Similarly in Āśv. Čṛ. the atharvavedaḥ and aṅgirasaḥ vedas are treated individually, and again the former is correlated with bheṣajaḥ, the latter with ghoram; cf. also Čaṭ. Br. xiii. 4. 8. 3 ff. Indirect, yet significant testimony that this double character of the A.V. was clearly established in Brahmanical times may be deduced from the formation of the names of two apocryphal teachers. One is Bhisaj Ātharvaṇa, Kāṭh. S. xvi. 8 (Ind. Stud. iii. 459); the other is Ghora Aṅgirasa, Kauṣ. Br. xxx. 6, etc. The formation Bhisaj Ātharvaṇa is illustrated further by Čaṇḍu Ātharvaṇa, Gop. Br. i. 2. 18; by Paṇc. Br. xii. 9. 10, bheṣajaṁ vād ātharvanāī, and xvi. 10. 10, bheṣajaṁ vād devānām atharvāṇo bheṣa-

:flex:2*

These names never, as far as is known, occur in inverted order: there is no Ghora Ātharvaṇa, and no Bhisaj Aṅgirasa; they reflect perfectly the individual character and the individual function of the two members of the compound atharvāṅgirasaḥ.

It seems now, further, that the texts of the Atharva-saṁhitā mark this same distinction with no uncertain touch. At A.V. xi. 6. 14 four Vedic mantra-classes are indicated by the expressions yācaḥ, sāmāni, bheṣajāṁ (ni) and yuḻjam. The choice of the word bheṣajā is certainly one-sided and eclectic. The passage appeals to the auspicious aspect of the holy texts, and naturally chooses the auspicious side of the Atharvan also. Its precise complement is Čaṭ. Br. x. 5. 2. 20 where yātu ‘sorcery’ and the yātuvidāḥ ‘those skilled in sorcery’ are the representatives of the fourth Veda. The bheṣajā of the Atharvan passage and the yātu of the present passage make up together what is embraced in the name atharvāṅgirasaḥ (A.V. x. 7. 20). Moreover the Saṁhitā exhibits a decided predilection, bordering on rigorous distinction, for associating the term aṅgirasa with aggressive witchcraft, or the practice of spells (kṛtyā). Thus viii. 5. 9 (kṛtyā aṅgirasth): x. 1. 6; xii. 5. 53; cf. also vi. 45. 3 =RV. x. 164. 4. In xi. 4. 16 (cf. also viii. 7. 17) the distinction between Atharvanic and Āṅgirasic plants appears again, not, however, in a connection which conveys of necessity the contrast between ‘holy’ and ‘witchcraft’ plants. But it may do so, precisely as in the case in Vāit. Sū. 5. 10. Cf. also A.V. xix. 22. 1, 18; 23. 1; Gop. Br. i. 1. 5, 8; 3. 4; Pāṇini v. 2. 37.

As regards the chronology and cause of this differentiation of atharvan and aṅgiras the texts are apparently wholly silent. The association of both names (and in the ritual texts of the A.V. of the name bṛgu also) with the texts and practices of the fourth Veda may be sought in the character of these mythic beings. They are fire-priests, fire-churners, and the Atharvanic rites as well as the house-ceremonies

in general center about the fire, the oblations are into the fire. Fire-priests, in distinction from soma-priests, may have had in their keeping these homelier practices of common life. But whence the terrible aspect of the Aṅgiras in contrast with the suspicious Atharvans? In RV. x. 108. 10 Saramā threatens the Pāpis with the terrible Aṅgiras (āṅgiraṣaḥ ca gordaḥ). This statement, wholly incidental as it seems to be, is, of course, not to be entirely discarded. More important is the fact that Bṛhaspati, the divine Purohitas, is distinctly āṅgiraṣa. In Kāṇ. 185. 9 Bṛhaspati Aṅgirasas appears distinctly as the representative or the divinity of witchcraft performances. In the Mahābhārata he is frequently called āṅgiraṣaḥ gṛṣṭhaḥ. In his function of body-priest of the gods it behooves him to exercise those fiercer qualities which are later in a broader sense regarded as Aṅgirasic. Thus RV. x. 184. 4 = AV. vi. 45. 8 certainly exhibits this function of the divine purohitas. The composer of AV. x. 1. 6, when he exclaims, 'Pratícina ('Back-hurler'), the descendant of Aṅgiras, is our overseer and chaplain (purohitas): do thou drive back again (praftécit) the spells, and slay yonder fashioners of spells,' has also in mind the divine purohitas. The stanza foreshadows the later formation pratyāṅgiruṣas, discussed above. We look in vain, however, for statements of the reason why the word atharvan should be especially associated with cānta and bhesaja, and must assume for the present that this was accomplished by secondarily contrasting it with āṅgira, after the sense of ghora, abhicārika had incrusted itself over it. The uncertainty of all this does not endanger the result that at a comparatively early time the terms atharvōṣaḥ in the sense of 'holy charms,' and āṅgiraṣaḥ in the sense of 'witchcraft charms,' joined the more distinctively hieratic terms reaḥ, gujūṛiśi, and sāmāniś as characteristic types of Brahmanical literary performances. But this distinction was at a later period again abandoned: in the end, the name atharvan and its derivatives prevail as designations of the charms and practices of the fourth Veda, without reference to their strongly diversified character.

6. The root kar, 'skar; by Professor E. W. Hopkins, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The supposititious root skar is accepted rather doubtfully by philologist and etymologist alike.† There is good reason for the suspicion with which this form of the root is regarded. From a comparative point of view, the root would be quite unique in showing sk in Sanskrit and in no other language. Other roots with assured initial sk all show the sibilant somewhere, as in the case of skand, scando, scinnim; skabh, skoba, scabellum; skar (Avestan), oxalō; skū, sktō, scutum,

* A dash of popular etymology may have helped on the process: a-tharvan 'not injuring'; cf. the root tharv in the sense of 'injure' Dhatup. 15. 62, and perhaps Mās. ii. 10. 1. Also the roots tār and dhār with similar meanings.

† Whitney, Grammar, § 1087 d; Fick, Wörterbuch, i 4, p. 24.
obscures, sky. But skar has not even an Avestan parallel. To be sure, Fick attributes skarana in garemô-skaranat (Vd. 14. 7) to kār, herein following Justi; but Professor Jackson calls my attention to the fact that skarana is now identified with the Persian suka, ‘coal’—so by Horn, Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie, p. 168; Geldner, KZ. xxv., p. 566.

On the other hand the rapid growth of skar at the expense of kār in the post-Vedic language naturally raises the question whether this encroachment cannot be traced to its beginning. Such forms as sahmashkara, apaskara, upaskara, vishkara (vīskara = vikara) are plainly an extension of the earlier use of skar (almost confined to cases where the root is combined with pārī or sām) and suggest of themselves that s is a parasitic growth.

We can summarize this spread of the sibilant very easily. Till the period of the Rig-Veda no s is found (Latin creo, cerus, ludicum; Greek spaoi; Slavic kruçi; Lithuanian kurti; Avestan kār, hakeret = sakfē). In the Rig-Veda, there are but two cases of skar in books ii.–vii., and these are not in the oldest part of this group (iii. 28. 2; v. 76. 3). In the ninth book is one repeated word which occurs always in the same application, seven times as passive participle (pārīskṛta), once as active participle, pārīskṛśvinn dhiṃskṛtam, 39. 2, and twice as a third plural with the same preposition (pārīskṛśvanti), 14. 2; 64. 23. It is here a stereotyped phrase. In the tenth book there are four occurrences in the participle, and the application is varied, though the combination with pārī is preserved. Three of these four cases are quite certainly in late hymns or verses. In x. 32. 3 (a late verse), the vahatūs is thus ‘adorned’; in x. 85. 6, the viśas; in x. 107. 10 (praise of dākipa), the viṃa; in x. 185. 7, aśīm (Yama). The only case where the verb is used freely occurs in this tenth book, withal in the hymn to Night, where (after a preceding nīr) is found askṛta, x. 127. 3.

The tenth book, excluding this last form, has the same number of cases as has the eighth. The latter has pārīskṛta, of sōma, 1. 26; and of viśra (Agni), 39. 9; sāṅskṛta, of Indra, 33. 9; and sūṣahskṛta, 66. 11 (a late verse). The last form occurs also i. 88. 13 (a Kāpya hymn). There are thus twice as many cases in the tenth book as in ii.–vii.; and the Kāpya collection has as many cases as has the tenth book.]

* The palatal of ānd, cande, is not in the same category and probably the sibilant is not original (see below). The lost s of kṛdhā (dṛdhāvyu) is kept by the Greek and Lithuanian parallels. Compare Fick, loc. cit., p. 142.
† Fick, l.c., p. 184. Compare the other compounds (without s) zaranyākereta, bahkarai; and see Geldner, KZ. xxv., p. 566; Horn, Grundriss d. neupers. Etym. § 142.
‡ In the former case pārīskṛta is used (of the purod̐ās); in the latter, sāṅskṛta (of sharman).
§ The seven cases of the participle occur in ix. 43. 3; 61. 13; 86. 24; 99. 2; 105. 2; 113. 4 (all pārīskṛta); and 46. 2 (pārīskṛṭaśas). The application in every case of participle and verb is to sōma (indu, hāri, etc.).
¶ It is to show this point that the data are here collected. If viii. is late there is historical progression in the spread of the form.
Brahmanic and later literature add abhisamhkar, upasamhkar, pratimasahkar, parvaskarot (Pâñini), etc.

A perfect parallel to the gradual growth of skar, as opposed to kar, is supplied by skir, upaskirati, which comes to light after the Rig-Veda; and perhaps by skart (= kart?) in sanskritatrad. The former root (es)kir like (es)kar shows no sign of an s in Slavic, Lithuanian, or Teutonic parallels; * yet after the Rig-Veda, which also shows no s, the sibilant is found. The identity of skart and kart is doubtful. † Other parallels are to be found in some palatal roots. Parallel to the older car (colo, stelvós, kelys) of the Rig-Veda, stands çcar in the later Mâit. Sanshitâ (not noticed by Fick, s. v., i., p. 35). Even in RV. çam, i. 104. 2, the metre shows that the preceding vowel is short and cam or çam (çâmu?) must be the form. In the case of çand (candeo, kadrú), despite cânicçadat and çeandrâ, strong evidence for the priority of the form çand is given by the fact that in the old compounds, purucçandrâ and vîçvçandara, the preceding syllables have to be read short in almost every case.

The cause of the origin of skar may be more or less theoretical, but it is easy to see how the new form spread. The verb is compounded with special frequency with ávis, purdos, mahás, and also very commonly with niśis. An early case is duskereta, duskritâ in Avestan and Vedie: so later we may compare the frequent nominal combinations, namaskâra, etc. An example may be taken from (Sanskrit) avaskara = avas kara. The temporal relation between the two forms is illustrated by Vedie (Sûtra) upakarañà, but Epic upakara (upaskara). It is noteworthy that, despite the regular RV. sanaskar, the form sâskrit still holds its own in Tâ. and later (see P.W., s. v.).

The form áskra, referred to this root by the lexicographers, has nothing to do with it. In each of the three instances where the word occurs it means 'united' (i. 186. 2; iii. 6. 4; vii. 43. 5). Now kar + á never has this meaning. In Avestan, the combination means simply 'make.' In the Rig-Veda (âkrte ghré, viii. 10. 1, etc.), it has either this meaning or, commonly, that of 'bring hither.' We cite as a typical example, x. 156. 2, gayá gá ákâramahe sénayâgne, etc. There are half-a-dozen examples of á kar in x. used in the same way. In the family books, compare viii. 77. 4: dâçuñé 'vâññeash rayim á khrás. So too in x. 8. 9, where gónâm âkàrâyâs, means only 'bringing to himself the cows'; while ándkṛta, i. 141. 7, is 'what one cannot bring to himself.' The meanings 'make,' 'form,' and 'bring hither' are still shown in Sanskrit ákâra, ákârayâ (compare ákṛti, RV. x. 85. 5). As kar + á never makes áskar in RV. and never means 'unite,' áskra 'united' cannot be from this root.

* Fick, loc cit., p. 25.
† Avestan kareta, Greek eisphór, Latin curtus, render the identity more than questionable. The meaning (RV. vi. 28. 4) is quite uncertain.
‡ It is discussed in Professor Hopkins's article above, page 69.—Ed's.
7. On Mahâ-Bhârata iii. 142. 35–45, an echo of an old Hindu-Persian legend; by Professor A. V. Williams Jackson, Columbia University, New York City.

The subject of the Yama-Yima legend has always been a fruitful field of study in the department of Indo-Iranian research. Parallels and resemblances, as well as contrasts and differences, between the Hindu Yama and the Persian Yima, or Jamshid, have often enough been discussed. The figure of the Vedic Yama, that mortal, the first to go the way of death and to point out the path for departed souls to follow, or, again, of that potent sovereign of the south, the stern judge hereafter, as found in the later Sanskrit literature, is familiar to every student of Indian antiquity. Consult, for example, Hopkins *Religions of India* pp. 128–133, 150 (Yama bibliography); Kaegi *Rig-Veda* (translation by Arrowsmith) pp. 67–70; and Spiegel *Ariache Periode* pp. 248–250.

In Iranian legend the most marked feature of Yima’s personality is that of the kingly ruler in whose reign the Golden Age of the world prevailed. Under his princely sway, as is described in the Avesta (Vd. ii. 4–19), the earth flourished and brought forth in abundance, the flocks and herds multiplied, mankind increased; for it was from Ahura Mazda himself that Yima received the command to ‘further and increase the world’ (Vd. ii. 4 daŋ mē gāthāo frādhya, daŋ mē gāthāo varedhaya). The Vendidad further portrays the scene (cf. Geldner *K. Z.* xxxv. 189):

‘Then the earth became abounding.
Full of flocks and herds of cattle.
Full of men, of birds, dogs likewise,
Full of fires all bright and blazing.
Nor did men, flocks, herds of cattle,
Longer find them places on it.’

So overcrowded had the earth thus become! This excessive plenitude was due to the sovereignty of Yima, for neither sickness nor misery, disease nor death, existed as long as princely Yima ruled (Ys. ix. 4–5; Yt. v. 25–26, xx. 15, xvii. 28, xix. 31). Ferdowsî’s picture of royal Jamshid’s reign, as drawn in the Shâh-Nâmah, is worth placing beside this particular description in the present connection (cf. *Schahname*, ed. Vullers, i. p. 28 seq.; cf. Mohl *Le Livre des Rois*, i. p. 38–36 and especially p. 37, ‘ainsi s’étaient passés trois cents ans, pendant lesquels la mort était inconnue parmi les hommes. Ils ne connaissaient ni la peine, ni le malheur, etc.’ One of the Iranian characteristics, therefore, of Yima’s reign was this plenitude of life and increase on earth.

In Indian literature, so far as I recall, special attention seems not to have been drawn to the increase of mankind and the over-population of the earth under Yama’s beneficent sway. For this reason I call up to notice a passage in the Mahâ-Bhârata that seems to show an Indian likeness to the Iranian idea. This will be but a point to add to others, in which, as has been shown for example by Darmesteter, Persia may serve to throw a side light upon the Mahâ-Bhârata.
The passage in the Mahā-Bhārata (iii. 142. 35 ff = 10938 ff), to which I should like to direct attention, narrates the unprecedented deed of Vishnu, who, in his incarnation as a Boar, rescued the earth that had sunk into the nether regions in consequence of over-population. But how did this over-population come to pass? The text here rendered has the answer:

'In times gone by, the Krita Age, fearful, prevailed upon the earth, And (Vishnu,) Primal God Eterne, acted the part that Yama played; And when the all-wise God of gods acted the part that Yama played, No creature any longer died, but only births occurred on earth. Accordingly the birds began to multiply, and beasts, and kine, The cows and horses, and the deer, and all carnivorous animals; Likewise the human race began increasing, and to multiply By thousands and by myriads, just as a stream of water grows. Now, when on earth had come to pass this overcrowding terrible, The earth o'erburdened by the weight sank down a hundred leagues in depth, Suffering dire pain in all her limbs, and by the pressing weight distraught; The earth distracted then sought help of Vishnu, best of all the gods.'

Thereupon, as the story goes on to narrate, the divine Vishnu gives ear to the appeal uttered by suppliant earth; he becomes incarnate in the form of a Boar, and upon his shining tusk, as is recorded also elsewhere in Hindu mythology, he raises the trembling and afflicted earth out of the depths and saves her from disaster.

The point of resemblance to the Iranian legend, so far as relates to the increase of life under Yima, is patent. As soon as the God Supreme in the Mahā-Bhārata begins to play the rôle of Yama (yamatvan kṛ), death ceases, 'while the births are as usual' (thus jāyate vā is rendered in Roy's version—vā = eva); the flocks, the herds, the fowls of the air, and the whole race of man increase and multiply in numbers in the Mahā-Bhārata, precisely as the pasu, staora, maṇḍyaka, sva, vā are augmented in the Avesta; the earth becomes overburdened in the Mahā-Bhārata, exactly as the crowded throng in Yima's day no longer find for themselves places on the earth in the Avesta (naī hīn gātvā vīhden). The means of relieving the difficulty, however, differ of course in the Mahā-Bhārata and in the Avesta, as the attendant circumstances themselves are somewhat different; but that the characteristic feature of the yamatva is plenitude, increase, augmentation, is evident enough.

A somewhat kindred idea of the nature of Yama's realm is preserved in his sābhā described in Mbh. ii. 8. 2-4, which bears a certain likeness to the Avestan vara of Yima, since 'neither cold nor heat, grief nor old age, hunger nor thirst ' exist in it. Cf. Hopkins Proceedings A. O. S. May 1891, p. xciv, and April 1893, p. clxxix, on ārya; see also Lanman Sanskrit Reader p. 378. Fairly certain, however, it seems that the word yamatva above discussed, with all its association of increase and plenitude, receives new light when brought into connection with the Avesta, and the passage is of value because it preserves a reminiscence
of Yama’s character, which, though familiar in Persia, seems otherwise to have been lost in Sanskrit literature, and thus the Mahā-Bhārata with its yamatuṁ kṛ etc. keeps for us an echo of an old Hindu-Persian legend, a bit of antique lore from the days of Indo-Iranian community.

8. On the iterative optative in Avestan; by Professor Jackson.

In a limited number of instances in the Avesta the optative mode is used iteratively to express a customary, repeated, wonted, or general action. Its employment is like that of the subjunctive of typical action which occurs quite commonly in Avestan. This iterative use of the optative is doubtless a development out of the potential force inherent in the mode; the optative, thus employed, assumes a significance almost like a present or a preterite. To English ears, a usage precisely parallel to this modal phase is familiar in such a periphrastic form as ‘she would sit the livelong day and weep.’

The instances in the Avesta which I have been able thus far to collect are here presented. Some of them have already been noted by Bartholomaeae Das altiranische Verbum, p. 212. Other additions to the list may later be made. It will be observed that I have not been able as yet to quote for the list a positive occurrence of an iterative optative in the metrical Gāthās. Most of the examples cited are from later texts, but it will be noticed that half the instances are from metrical portions of the Avesta. It will likewise be observed in several of the occurrences that the optative stands in a relative or subordinate clause. The number of these latter might have been increased. Two of the instances of the iterative optative occur in sentences which denote a comparison. The material follows:

1. Av. (Gāthic prose) athā athā cōīt ahurō mazdāo zarathuṣṭrem adakhāya eta—athā athā cōīt daēndā sarem vāmrviṭa—athā asemtē daēndā sarem viṁrye ‘just as Ahura Mazda taught Zarathushtra and as Zarathushtra renounced connection with the Demons, so do I renounce connection with the Demons’ (i.e. ‘as Ormazd was wont to teach, etc.’) vādakhē, cf. Ye. xili. 15). Ye. xii. 5. But note that Caland, KZ. xxxii. 302, takes vādmrviṭa as preterite indicative.

2. Av. (prose) zarathuṣṭrō ahunem vairim frasrāvayaṭ (w. l. optative frasravayōra)—dhō vanuhē frāyazēta—daēndā māzdayasnum frasorenaēta ‘Zarathushtra repeatedly chanted the Ahuna Vairya formula and worshipped the good waters and professed the law of the worshippers of Mazda.’ Vd. xix. 2.

3. Av. yō anu aekēm baresma frastareṇti yatha akava jamāspa frastareṇta rautrīṣ ‘whoso forms the bundle of barsom as the righteous Jamsapa was wont to form it (or would form it, if living), such a one is satisfactory to the priest’ (Nirangistan 88, cf. Darmester Le Zend-Avesta iii. 186; also ed. by Darab Dastur Peshotan Sanjana p. . . .).
4. Av. (metrical) mithrem vouru-gaoyaatim yó bádhha ustána-zástó | urvasemndó avaroilt vácim 'Mithra, the lord of wide pastures, who constantly raises (opt.) his voice joyously and with uplifted hands.' Yt. x. 78.

5. Av. (metrical) karnahe—fravašim yazamaide—yehe nháne ašiš vanuhi | sríra khíittini fraca-rañta 'we worship the Fraveshi of Karsna in whose house tarried (i.e. was wont to abide) Aši Vanuhi. Yt. xiii. 107. So also Caland.

6. Av. (metrical) tám zemargúzó akerañavó | viepe daēna zarathuṣtra | yóh para ahamá vöróraddha | apatayen paiteit āya zemá 'thou, O Zarathushtra, didst banish under the earth all the Demons that formerly in human shape were wont to fly upon this earth.' Ys. ix. 15.

7-10. Likewise in these general relative clauses: YAv. (metrical) reñjaiti haomahe madhó | yó yatha puthrem taurunem | haomem vañ-dañtana mañyó | 'the intoxication of Haoma makes lively the man who greets (whosoever is wont to greet—opt.) Haoma like a young son.' Ys. x. 8;—Av. yaf tám ainim avarñóis saocayaca kerenavañlem—dañ tám niśidhóis gátho-sráväyo—frataríre gátvó ādhñanam fratarótaire gátvó niśádhayóis 'as often as thou didst see another causing annoyance, then thou wouldst sit chanting the Psalms, and thou didst make me (thereby) to sit in a foremost place, who was already sitting in a forward place.' Hādhokht Nask ii. 18-14 (Yt. xxii. 18-14).


9. "Universal" qualities in the Malayan language; by Dr. C. P. G. Scott, Radnor, Pa.

This paper set forth some of the characteristic phonetic, lexical, and syntactic features of the Malayan tongue, the general language of the Eastern Archipelago; pointed out their remarkable fundamental likeness in these respects to Latin and English; and sought to find the bases for the approximately "universal" use to which each of the three languages has attained within its historical and commercial sphere, in certain fundamental characteristics which concern universal grammar and logic, and in anthropology. There was also a skit at "Volapük" and "Spelin."
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Leipzig: Königlich Sächsische Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.


(22 Albermarle st., W.)

Library of the India Office. (Whitehall, SW.)

Society of Biblical Archæology. (37 Great Russell st., Bloomsbury, WC.)

Philological Society.

Italy, Florence: Società Asiatica Italiana.

Rome: Reale Accademia dei Lincei.

Netherlands, Amsterdam: Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen.


Leiden: Curatorium of the University.

Norway, Christiania: Videnskabs-Selskab.

Sweden, Upsala: Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet.

Russia, St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija Nauk. Archeologii Institut.

III. Asia.

Ceylon, Colombo: Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

China, Peking: Peking Oriental Society.

Shanghai: North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

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

Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal.

The Buddhist Text Society.

Lahore: Oriental College.

Japan, Tokio: The Asiatic Society of Japan.

Java, Batavia: Bataviasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen.

Turkey, Constantinople: Imperial Ottoman Museum.

IV. Africa.

Egypt, Cairo: The Khedivial Library.

V. EDITORS OF THE FOLLOWING PERIODICALS.

The Indian Antiquary (care of the Education Society's Press, Bombay, India).

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

Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung (care of Prof. E. Kuhn, 8 Hess-str., Munich, Bavaria).
Indogermanische Forschungen (care of Prof. W. Streitberg, Freiburg, Switzerland).
Revue des Études Juives.
Revue Archéologique. (Rue de Lille, 2, Paris, France.)
Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (care of Prof. Bernhard Stade, Giessen, Germany).
Beiträge zur Assyriologie und Semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.
Orientalische Bibliographie (care of Dr. Lucian Scherman, Munich, Bavaria).

RECIPIENTS: 279 (Members) + 58 (Gifts and Exchanges) = 337.

REQUEST.

The Editors request the Librarians of any Institutions or Libraries, not already mentioned, to which this Journal may regularly come, to notify them of the fact. It is the intention of the Editors to print a list, as complete as may be, of regular subscribers for the Journal or of recipients thereof.
CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS

OF THE

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

Revised, 1880.

CONSTITUTION.

ARTICLE I. This Society shall be called the AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

ARTICLE II. The objects contemplated by this Society shall be:—

1. The cultivation of learning in the Asiatic, African, and Polynesian languages, as well as the encouragement of researches of any sort by which the knowledge of the East may be promoted.

2. The cultivation of a taste for oriental studies in this country.

3. The publication of memoirs, translations, vocabularies, and other communications, presented to the Society, which may be valuable with reference to the before mentioned objects.

4. The collection of a library and cabinet.

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

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

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

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

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

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

ARTICLE IX. An Annual meeting of the Society shall be held during Easter week, the days and place of the meeting to be determined by the Directors, said meeting to be held in Massachusetts at least once in three
years. One or more other meetings, at the discretion of the Directors, may also be held each year at such place and time as the Directors shall determine.

Article X. This Constitution may be amended, on a recommendation of the Directors, by a vote of three-fourths of the members present at an annual meeting.

By-Laws.

I. The Corresponding Secretary shall conduct the correspondence of the Society, and it shall be his duty to keep, in a book provided for the purpose, a copy of his letters; and he shall notify the meetings in such manner as the President or the Board of Directors shall direct.

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

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

III. b. After December 31, 1896, the fiscal year of the Society shall correspond with the calendar year.

III. c. At each annual business meeting in Easter week, the President shall appoint an auditing committee of two men—preferably men residing in or near the town where the Treasurer lives—to examine the Treasurer's accounts and vouchers, and to inspect the evidences of the Society's property, and to see that the funds called for by his balances are in his hands. The Committee shall perform this duty as soon as possible after the New Year's day succeeding their appointment, and shall report their findings to the Society at the next annual business meeting thereafter. If these findings are satisfactory, the Treasurer shall receive his acquittance by a certificate to that effect, which shall be recorded in the Treasurer's book, and published in the Proceedings.

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

V. All papers read before the Society, and all manuscripts deposited by authors for publication, or for other purposes, shall be at the disposal of the Board of Directors.

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

VII. Corporate and Honorary members shall be entitled to a copy of all the publications of the Society issued during their membership, and shall also have the privilege of taking a copy of those previously published, so far as the Society can supply them, at half the ordinary selling price.

VIII. If any corporate member shall for two years fail to pay his assessments, his name may, at the discretion of the Directors, be dropped from the list of members of the Society.
IX. Six members shall form a quorum for doing business, and three to adjourn.

SUPPLEMENTARY BY-LAW.

I. FOR THE LIBRARY.

1. The Library shall be accessible for consultation to all members of the Society, at such times as the Library of Yale College, with which it is deposited, shall be open for a similar purpose; farther, to such persons as shall receive the permission of the Librarian, or of the Librarian or Assistant Librarian of Yale College.

2. Any member shall be allowed to draw books from the Library upon the following conditions: he shall give his receipt for them to the Librarian, pledging himself to make good any detriment the Library may suffer from their loss or injury, the amount of said detriment to be determined by the Librarian, with the assistance of the President, or of a Vice-President; and he shall return them within a time not exceeding three months from that of their reception, unless by special agreement with the Librarian this term shall be extended.

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

PRICE OF THE JOURNAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol. I (1843–1849), No. 1 (Nos. 2–4 out of print)</td>
<td>$ .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II (1851)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. III (1852–1853)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. IV (1853–1854)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. V (1855–1858)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. VI (1860)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. VII (1862)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. VIII (1866)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. IX (1871)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. X (1872–1880)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XI (1882–1885)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XII (1881)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XIII (1889)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XIV (1890)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XV (1893)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XVI (1894–1896)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. XVII (1896)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whitney’s Tāittirīya-Prātiṣākhya (vol. ix.), $5.00
Avery’s Sanskrit Verb-Inflection (from vol. x.), .75
Whitney’s Index Verborum to the Atharva-Veda (vol. xii.), 4.00
The same (vol. xii.) on large paper, 5.00
Bloomfield’s Kāuṇḍika-Sūtra of the Atharva-Veda (vol. xiv.), 5.00
Oertel’s Jāminiya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa (from vol. xvi.), 1.75
Volume xvi., number 2, 1.85

For any of the above, address the Librarian of the Society, Mr. Addison Van Name, New Haven, Connecticut. Members can have the series at half price. To public libraries or those of educational institutions, Vol. I. No. 1, and Vols. II. to V. will be given free, and the rest (price $58.50) sold at a discount of twenty per cent.
American Oriental Society.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

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

Arabic, Persian, Syriac (Jacobite and Nestorian), Armenian, Sanskrit, Tamil, Chinese, and Japanese fonts of type are provided for the printing of the Journal, and others will be procured from time to time, as they are needed.

GENERAL NOTICES.

1. Members are requested to give immediate notice of changes of address to the Treasurer, Mr. Henry C. Warren, 12 Quincy Street, Cambridge, Mass.


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

4. Communications for the Journal should be sent to Prof. C. R. Lanman, 9 Farrar Street, Cambridge, Mass.

CONCERNING MEMBERSHIP.

It is not necessary for any one to be a professed Orientalist in order to become a member of the Society. All persons—men or women—who are in sympathy with the objects of the Society and willing to further its work are invited to give it their help. This help may be rendered by the payment of the annual assessments, by gifts to its library, or by scientific contributions to its Journal, or in all of these ways. Persons desiring to become members are requested to apply to the Treasurer, whose address is given above. Members receive the Journal free. The annual assessment is $5. The fee for Life-Membership is $75.