The Vedic dṛti as skin float: AVP 2.19

DIPAK BHATTACHARYA

§**1**: AVP 2.19. §**2.** *Dṛti* in the Vedas and Later **2a**. AVP 2.19.3: Hoffmann's Correction of *dṛtyāṃ* to *dhṛtyāṃ*. **2b**. The Meanings of *dṛti* **2c**. the Irregular Feminine Gender **2d.** The Shape of the *dṛti*. **2e.** Inflated *dṛti*s as Floats. Abbreviations and Bibliography. Picture of a *dṛti* in use.

§1. AVP 2.19

The hymn 2.19 of the Paippalāda-Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda (AVP) is on the whole correctly preserved in the manuscripts, but the third verse of the hymn offers problems. In the latest edition of the AVP (Bhattacharya 1997) the verse runs as follows

yadi yatsu yadi dṛtyāṃ| *yadi samityāṃ nṛpatiḥ sakhā naḥ*/
viśve devāso abhi rakṣatainaṃ| *yathā jīvo vidatham āvadāsi*//

The reconstruction, particularly the reading *dṛtyāṃ* (Bhattacharyya 1970 and Bhattacharya 1997) has been questioned (Hoffmann 1992 (1986)). The present paper aims at discussing the authenticity and correctness of the reconstructed verse that has some variants and apparent obscurity. It will be attempted to show that *dṛti* has some not so well known facts and history associated with it. The problems will be taken up in the second section of the paper. Before going into those a discussion of the contents of the hymn is given below to make things convenient.

The five-verse hymn, found only in the AVP, prays for the safety of a friendly king, who, inferably, is preparing for a journey, most probably for an expedition. The second half of the first four verses is a refrain as given above. The first three verses apprehend various conditions of the king who is mentioned in each as *nṛpatiḥ sakhā naḥ* 'the lord of people, friend of ours'. The refrain praying for his safety follows. While the first three verses pray for general welfare of the liberal patron, the maximum prayer is made in the fourth verse**:** if there is a battle the enemies must be completely defeated. This prayer is further extended and fortified – but in a milder language – in the fifth verse that prays to Death not to harm the patron, meaning – he should not be killed in a battle. The hymn is given below with translation. A German translation of the hymn will be found in Zehnder 1999. Hoffmann 1992 (1986): 822 discusses only the first pāda of the third verse.

Manuscripts The following manuscripts have been consulted: three in the Oriya script marked as Or_1, Or_2 and Or_3 in this paper but as Vā, Ma and Ja in the edition, and K, the

JRAS, *Series 3*, 18, 3 (2008), pp. 311–326
doi:10.1017/S1356186308008535
© The Royal Asiatic Society 2008
Printed in the United Kingdom

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Śāradā-script birch-bark manuscript (see Abbreviations and Bibliography at the end). The Oriya-script manuscripts were discovered by Durgamohan Bhattacharyya in 1959-60. The pāda-marking | occurs in Or only. There are no accent marks in these. They are very rare in K too. Except for some erratic marks in the second half of the fourth verse and the last quarter of the fifth in K the present hymn is without accent marks.

2.19

1. *yadi gādhānāṃ yadi nāvyānāṃ*| *nadīnāṃ pāre nṛpatiḥ sakhā naḥ/*
viśve devāso abhi rakṣatainaṃ| *yathā jīvo vidatham āvadāsi//*

'If the lord of people, the friend of ours, is on the shore of shallow rivers, (or) if of navigable ones, O All Gods, protect him, whereby (you), alive, can address the assembly.'
a *-vyā-* Read disyllabic-*v*$_i$*yā-*. **d** *āvadāsi*: Obviously the addressee is the king himself in the subordinate clause while the primary clause addresses the All Gods – an uncommon sentence pattern.
Variants K * *gādānāṃ . . . rakṣatemaṃ . . . āvidāsi/*

2. *yady apāre yadi vā gha pāre*| *yadi dhanvani nṛpatiḥ sakhā naḥ/etc.*

'If the lord of people etc., is in (waters) without shore (*i.e.* immense expanse of waters?) or if on the shore (or) if on dry soil, O All Gods etc.'
a *-dy a-* Read disyllabic *-d*$_i$*y a-*
Variants **a** *apāre* K *avāre*. The selection *apāre* made in the 1970 edition (D. M. Bhattacharyya) on the basis of uniform Or.-reading has been retained in the 1997 edition. But K's *avāre* too gives a meaning and thus makes it difficult to assert the original reading with absolute certainty. Zehnder selects K's *avāre* 'on this side (of the river)' contrasting it to *pāre* 'on that side (of the river)'. The two meanings are still expressed in dialectal Panjabi around the Sivaliks through *ore* and *pāre* that have exactly the same connotation *i.e.* 'on this side (of so and so)' and 'on that side (of so and so)'. But *ore* should have descended from *ávare* and not from *avāré*. *ávara* and *pára* form pair as antonyms; cf. *páré 'vara ubháyā amítrāḥ* RV 2.12.8b. *avārá* with its irregular *vṛddhi* in the second syllable, as observed by Wackernagel-Debrunner (1954: 112) after Böhtlingk-Roth, is a 'Nachbildung' after *pārá* that is to say an invention made to pair with *pārá* in the manner of *ávara-pára*. But, as mentioned above, traces of an original usage not recorded in literature, *ávara* pairing with *pārá*, seem to have been preserved in the dialects. Though the case for *avāre* is not weak, since *apāre* '(in waters) without shore', too, may pair with *pāre* 'on the shore' as an antonym, I prefer to retain the selected reading as a doubtful case. b K *dhanvini*. The second half is understood in the mss; so also with vs.3.

3. *yadi yatsu yadi dṛtyāṃ*| *yadi samityāṃ nṛpatiḥ etc.*

'If the lord of people, the friend of ours, is among the *yats* or if in a *dṛti* or if in the assembly, O All Gods etc.'
See §2a below for discussion.

4. *adhas padyantāṃ adhare bhavantu* | *ye naḥ sūriṃ maghavānaṃ pṛtanyān** /etc

'Let them fall down, let them be down under, who would like to fight against our liberal patron. . .'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Variants K **a–c** . . .*sparmyatām adhane bhavān ve na sūryaṃ ∗ pṛtanyāṃ víśve devā́so bhi rakṣatemaṃ/ yáthā ∗ vidátham* */b Or_1 . . .*pṛtanyā*, Or_2. . . *pṛtanyāṃ*, Or_3 . . .*suriṃ ∗ pṛtanyāṃ*. Note the accent marks in K. In the text the star mark at the upper corner indicates emendation. The emendation *pṛtanyān** is intended to highlight the meaning (pr.subj.3/pl.) but it may not reflect the actual pronunciation in the current tradition. For, the final *n* of the line is often rendered as *anusvāra* in the mss, (cf., K, Or_2 and Or_3). That might have been a way of pronouncing the final *n* with the Paippalādins but it was not the only way. That means that the final *-n>anusvāra* should better be regarded as a later aberration than as a recensional peculiarity. **c** Or_1 *∗ ∗ ∗ ratainaṃ*.

5. *yama mṛtyo mainaṃ hiṃsīr| yam ahaṃ hṛdā manasā jugopa/*
yo māṃ piparti yam ahaṃ piparmi| sa prajāvān maghavān sūrir astu//

'O Yama, death! Do not harm him whom I have protected with heart and mind. He who ferries me across, whom I ferry across, let him, the liberal patron, be endowed with progeny.'

bc The patron is setting out. So the speaker's ferrying him across may be literal and current while his ferrying the speaker across seems figurative. The protection of the king by the speaker on the other hand is explicitly figurative – *hṛdā manasā*. For 'ferrying across' as the original sense of *píparti* Narten 1995: 110 (1969: 141).

Note below the accent in d. K has signs for the udātta, anudātta and the svarita. Unlike in the previous verse the svarita sign is missing here. The sign '*z*' is the verse-ending virāma sign in K. It is often missed. The number *4* is that of the hymn in the current anuvāka that too is the fourth of the second kāṇḍa. The usual number of verses in an anuvāka is five. Unlike Or. K usually does not give the serial number of the hymn in the Kāṇḍa nor the total number of verses in the hymn. Normally and when it is not missed one may find the serial number of the anuvāka at its end and also that of the hymn in the anuvāka. Or. gives the total number of verses of the hymn, the serial number of the hymn and also of the anuvāka at its end. The verse end is shown with two vertical strokes. In K at the end of this hymn one reads on the right margin of the page (34a) *anyapustake maghavā sūri vāsū* '(The reading is) *maghavā sūri vāsū* in the other manuscript.' There are other places where the copyist speaks of a second *pustaka*. See Bhattacharya 1984: 177 for the possible nature of the manuscript or manuscripts used by K's copyist.
Variants K *imaṃ mṛtyu . . . . . hiṁsīr yo māṃ ∗ manusā cagopā/∗ mahaṃ pipanti yomahaṃ ∗ su prajasāyāṃ maghavā́ṃ sūrír astu z4z* b Or_3 *yugopa*

§2. *Dṛti* IN THE VEDAS

2a. AVP 2.19.3: Hoffmann's Correction of *dṛtyāṃ* to *dhṛtyāṃ*

The general tone and style and the physical environment of the hymn having been given we come to the left out third verse with its *dṛti*.

yadi yatsu yadi dṛtyāṃ| *yadi samityāṃ nṛpatiḥ sakhā naḥ/*
víśve devāso etc. understood

The quarter division of the verse is obviously 8 11 11 11 without any fault in the number of syllables. The last three are regular triṣṭubh pādas. In the eight-syllable pāda, however, the normal iambic ending is missing. The combination too is rare. Ṛk-Prātiśākhya 16.46 terms the pāda-combination virāḍrūpā triṣṭubh. Nothing is said of any possible defect in the syllable arrangement. A *vai* after the first *yadi* and *vā gha* after the second will make it a regular triṣṭubh pāda. But there is no indication in the mss of any loss of syllables.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Variants: K *yadyatsu dṛtyāṃ* ∗ *samṛtyāṃ* . . . , a Or_1 and Or_2 ∗ ∗ ∗ *ghṛtyāṃ* . . .//Or_3 The part of the leaf with the last two words is broken. The second *yadi* is missing in K; barring *dṛtyāṃ* all the three K variations had to be rejected as obvious misreadings.

Without going into *yatsu* and *dṛtyāṃ* on which difference of opinion exists the verse may be literally translated as 'If the lord of people, the friend of ours is in *yat*s (or) if in a *dṛti* (or) if in the assembly, O All Gods, protect him whereby (you), alive, can address the assembly.'

Durgamohan Bhattacharyya (1970) reads *yady apsu yadi dṛtyāṃ* etc. *apsu* is an emendation on *yatsu*. When the 1970 volume came out it was not possible to know from the first editor (1899–1965) what had prompted him to effect an emendation. The following is my guess. Of the eight hypothetical conditions of the king envisaged in the first three verses *dhanvan*(vs.2) and *samiti*(3) are on land while the five – *gādhānāṃ . . . nāvyānāṃ nadīnāṃ pāre*, *apā*(*vā*)*re*, *pāre* and *dṛtyāṃ* (below) – relate to waters. That might have been the rationale behind the emendation *apsu*. *yatsu* 'among the marching ones' ('unter den Gehenden' Hoffmann, 1992/1986: 822) does not occur elsewhere. Again, if we go backward from the K reading *yadyatsu* a faint possibility of *yady apsu* being the original reading may show itself. Dissimilation occurs in the declension of *ap-* (*ab-*) 'water' between the stem-final-*b-* and the ending-initial *bh-* as *ad-bh-*. This occurs in the instrumental, dative and ablative duals and plurals. The dissimilation could have been extended by analogy to the locative. That would result in *yady apsu*> *yady atsu*. This is in consonance with the king's five other placings in or around water. However, going by the manuscripts Or. *yadi yatsu* has to be retained for the edition.

Hoffmann discussed and suggested corrections on the 1970 reading *yadyapsu yadi dṛtyāṃ* (1992/1986: 822/460 read at the fourth WSC, Weimar, 1979) in two paragraphs. The first one runs as follows, "Das müβte wohl bedeuten: ‚sei es, daβ er (der König sich) im Wasser, sei es daβ er sich in einem Schlauch (befindet, ihn sollen die Götter schützen)'. Über die Frage, was ein König in einem Schlauch tut, braucht man nicht nachzudenken, bevor man sich die Überlieferung angesehen hat. *dṛtyāṃ* steht tatsächlich in dem korrupten Schriftbild des K.-Ms. : *yadyatsu dṛtyāṃ*. Die Or.- Mss aber lesen: *yadi yatsu yadi dhṛtyāṃ*."

On this ground the new reading *dhṛtyāṃ* was suggested for the *dṛtyāṃ* of the 1970 edition. The selected reading *dṛtyāṃ* that is taken from K was retained in the 1997 edition. This selection was criticised by J. C. Wright (2002: 195), 'At 2.19.3a the inscrutable K *dṛtyāṃ* is retained in preference to the impossible Or. *ghṛtyāṃ* without mention of Hoffmann's support for *dhṛtyāṃ* (p. 822).' It is natural that not mentioning Hoffmann's suggestion, in spite of the fact that it differs from the edition, has appeared improper to Wright. But the reason was personal. As told in the Introduction to Vol.II (p. 26, in press), the discussion of my difference with any decision of Durgamohan Bhattacharyya and Karl Hoffmann had been avoided in the 1997 edition. That, however, has given rise to some misunderstanding. So it has been attempted here to show that *dṛtyāṃ* is not really inscrutable and that it suits the context.

Hoffmann's suggestion for the correction of *dṛtyāṃ* to *dhṛtyāṃ* proceeded from the assumption that *dhṛtyāṃ* is the Or. reading. The critical apparatus in both the editions (1970 and 1997) clearly notes that the Or. mss read *ghṛtyāṃ*. His idea that the Or. mss read *yadi yatsu yadi dhṛtyāṃ* indicates that Hoffmann took the syllable *ghṛ-* of *ghṛtyāṃ* as a printing error for *dhṛ-*.

The suggestion of *dhtṛyāṃ*, then, is a conjecture not based on any ms reading. Now, *ghṛ*, *dṛ* and *dhṛ* are written as Oó,]ó and ˆó in Or. It appears to me that Oó is more similar to]ó than to ˆó**.** That was one of the reasons, a minor one, for choosing *dṛ*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the next paragraph of the discussion HOFFMANN follows up the query 'was ein König in einem Schlauch tut'(above) with an explanation of what *dhṛtyāṃ* might mean. His own words are "Das zu *dhṛ* ‚halten' gehörige Abstraktum *dhṛ́ti* bedeutet:, das Festhalten', aber auch:, das Sich-Aufhalten, das Verweihen'. Es steht z.B. in *VS* neben anderen Wörtern für ruhiges Wohnen: *ráti-* (VIII, 51) *kṣéma-* (XVIII, 7), *ránti-* (XXII, 19). Das in den Or.-Mss richtig überlieferte *yadi yatsu yadi dhṛtyāṃ* bedeutet also: ‚sei es, daβ (der König sich) unter Gehenden, sei es, daβ er (sich) in ruhigem Verweilen, d. h. in seinem festen Aufenthaltsort (befindet)'."

The meaning sought to be derived from the suggested reading is 'halting abode'. The Vājasaneyi(Mādhyandina)-Saṃhitā passages referred to for illustrating similar usage of *dhṛti* and other *-ti*-ending words run as follows. 8.51: *ihá rátir ihá ramadhvam ihá dhṛ́tir iha svádhṛtiḥ svā́hā* "Here is your pleasure, please yourself here, here is your support, here is self support, well-said". 18.7 *yantā́ ca me dhartā́ ca me kṣémaś ca me dhṛ́tiś ca me. . .yajñéna kalpantām* "My regulator and my supporter, my preservation and my support (*i.e.* sustaining,) . . . may shape themselves through the sacrifice". 22.19 *ihá rántir ihá ramatām ihá dhṛ́tir iha svádhṛtiḥ svā́hā*. This is for all practical purpose the same as 8.51.

One does not find here the meaning of a concrete resting place as one would expect for a king among a marching army (*yatsu* 'unter Gehenden' HOFFMANN). The meaning of the suffix *-ti* in the cited Yajurvedic passages verges more on some abstract action noun than on a concrete locative as the context would have demanded. The suggested meaning is attractive but hard to defend in the light of the cited verses.

The historical position of the word too does not speak for the suggested meaning. The original employment of the *-ti* suffix ending words was, by all probability, for denoting concrete things related to the verb. And this is an inherited Indo-European feature (WACKERNAGEL-DEBRUNNER 1954: 636,637). But eventually denoting action nouns, a feature met with in the Ṛgveda itself, became a regular feature. The Mādhyandina-Saṃhitā being the latest among the Saṃhitās, the appearance of *dhṛ́ti* as an abstract noun is natural for it. The word *dhṛ́ti* itself too is not found in the Ṛgveda.

There is another point. It is not that the change of an original *dhṛ́ti* to *dṛ́ti* has not been suspected elsewhere. Caland (1900: 130) suggests *dhṛ́tikarmāṇi* for *dṛ́ti*(v.l. *drati-*, *dati-*, *iti-*) *karmāṇi* of the manuscripts in Kauśika-S. 38.12. But the meaning he suggests is 'Befestigung' that is 'strengthening', the usual meaning of *dhṛti*, but not a fortified resting place.

One objection that could have looked plausible was not raised by HOFFMANN. *dṛ́ti* occurs in the Vedas with the masculine gender while *dhṛ́ti* has the normal feminine gender of words with the *-ti* suffix. The ending may raise the suspicion if it is a corruption of *dhṛ́tyām*. This point has been fully discussed in 2c below.

All things considered, the employment of the word *dhṛti* in the Mādhyandina-Samhitā does not seem to support the new interpretation. Under these conditions it is not advisable that the editor of the AVP should opt for *dhṛti* in violation of manuscript readings.[1]

[1] It will not be out of place here to mention that, as noted by WRIGHT (2002:194), the 1997 edition incorporates the "minimum of conjectural restoration". In the body of the text of the edition there are not many readings that have no manuscript support. Sometimes unsupported conjectures, that is to say conjectures that have no phonemic elements gathered from the ms readings or that are beyond certain parameters determined by manuscript trends (Introd.Vol.1, pp. xxix-xxxviii), could not be avoided. But they occur mainly in the critical apparatus of the edition.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2b. The Meanings of *dṛti*

Equally important are some positive arguments in favour of *dṛti* as the correct and authentic reading. It is accepted by all that *dṛti* means a leather bag or a bellow. So Grassmann (Wb.z.R) 'Schlauch oder Balg von Leder', Wackernagel-Debrunner (1954: 623) 'Lederschlauch'. All scholars speak of some meaning that refers to a tool or a container that is to say to a second-generation production starting from the hide. As discussed below, this requires, some clarification.

The available evidences show *dṛti* to be a word of Indo-European origin. The comparable Greek words relate to the verb δέρω- (δερ-, δαρ-) 'to skin, to flay'. Two prominent derivative words are δέρρις 'Lederdecke' (Wackernagel-Debrunner 1954: 623), δάρσις (ibid, 'Abhäuten' Brugmann I: 463). The words relate exclusively to skinning and to the skinned material, that is the hide. The meaning 'flaying' seems to have stabilised the connotation of hide or skin. Thus, δάρσις 'the skinned leather' is most probably an exact equivalent of the Vedic *dṛtiḥ*. Since 'the radical vowel in these formations, in Greek as in Sanskrit, appears always in the weak grade' (Burrow 1955: 168), -άρ- should be the weak form of -έρ-.

As for the Sanskrit root of *dṛti*, according to existing opinions both the aniṭ root √*dṛ* that appears in the root-stem and the -s-ending stem in aorist (Narten 1964:145) and the relatively late -seṭ root appearing in the -nā-stem (ninth class) of the present mean 'to pierce, to split'. But the above equation indicates the original meaning to be 'to skin'. The meanings 'splitting' and 'piercing' could have developed secondarily and stabilised with the -seṭ form.[2] *-ti* (Gk. mostly -σι) was a productive suffix in both Sanskrit and Greek (Burrow 1955: 167, 168; Buck 1952:337=§485). Still, the striking similarity makes one think that it is not impossible that *dṛti* is a very ancient word, current since Primitive Indo-European antiquity and meaning some leather implement or implements with the hide not so radically processed as to necessitate a new name for it.[3]

Indian commentators and lexicographers highlight the container aspect of *dṛti*. So Sāyaṇa on RV 1.191.10**:** *Carmamayaṃ surāpātram*; on 4.45.1**:** *rasadravyādhāraḥ padārthaś carmamayo dṛtir ity ucyate*; Medinīkośa**:** *dṛtiś carmaputre*; Bālamanoramā on Siddhānta-Kaumudī 2929 =

[2]See the following note.

[3]Differently Mayrhofer (1992:I.741 with reference) who speaks of the productivity of the *-ti* suffix in maintaining that *dṛti*, derived from an aniṭ root and its formal Greek cognate δάρσις 'das Abhäuten' (also the semantically nearer δέρρις) are not 'ursprungsgleich' ie not inherited from the same PIE word that is to say the Greek word is independently formed with the same inherited suffix at a later date.

There should not be any confusion about that whether coming into being independently or not, the Greek and the Sanskrit words are not heterogeneous and derive themselves from the same root that carried the same meaning in both languages.

The earlier existence of an aniṭ root means that there are two different roots for *dṛti* and *dīryate* ((Narten 1964:145; cf.also *dīrṇa*), the second and later root being an extension with a laryngeal to *dar*H. Such occurrences have been noted but no clear mechanism has yet been spelt out. But the extension with a new element among the radical phonemes would have been unnecessary without some modification involving semantic nuances being the aim. In many cases the difference between the simple and the extended root may not be very clear but that *should be* there. One may take the case of *śas* and *kṣaṇ*. A clear difference has not been admitted by Burrow and that comes almost theoretically (1955:289). But see Hoffmann 1992 (1985): pp. 815–816 for the exact meaning of *kṣaṇ*. With *dṛ-*/*dṛ*H- if the original root had been the simple one the sense of cracking or bursting, as against the original one of skinning, should be the new meaning. The meanings of the Greek words reflect this position.

I should mention here that I was provided with the information from Mayrhofer 1992:I.741 by Dr Abhijit Ghosh, Jadavpur University, Calcutta.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pāṇini 3.2.25: *dṛtiḥ carmabhastrikā*. All these mean leather container. Nighaṇṭu 1.10.25 reads *dṛti* among *meghnāmāni*. On this Devarājayajvan comments *dṛtitivat syandamānādhāratvāt* '(The cloud is called) *dṛti* as it contains fluid like a *dṛti*.' This interpretation – it has exerted some influence on modern scholars too – misses two major elements of a *dṛti*, the primary meaning of *dṛti* that is 'a hide intact' and the fact that such a full skin may be filled with both liquid and air. This we shall revert to later.

Of course, it is not denied that *dṛti* came to mean also leather bag for water. A few decades ago leather bags could be occasionally seen being used for watering roads in India. The practice should have existed in the Manusaṃhitā's time which (2.99, below) speaks of a *dṛti* leaking water through its 'foot' (*pāda*, see below). Even earlier Kauṭilya (Arthaśāstra 56=2.36) rules a fine of a quarter *paṇa* on those who do not make arrangement for *dṛti*s (*dṛtīnām akaraṇe*) in summer as a step against an outbreak of fire. Obviously, this *dṛti* is a water container. But a leather bag filled with water is not the only meaning of *dṛti* in Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra(below). In the early Saṃhitās it is not even a prominent meaning.

Visva Bandhu's *A Vedic Word Concordance* records nine instances of the occurrence of the word in the Ṛgveda and of one in the Khilas. None of them refers to a leather bag of water used by humans. In three the meaning of container is explicit. (1) 4.45.1 *dṛ́tis turī́yo mádhuno ví rapśate* 'the fourth, the leather bag is filled with honey', (2) 4.45.3 [d] *dṛ́tiṃ vahethe mádhumantam aśvinā* '(You), the two Aśvins, carry a leather bag filled with honey.' Similarly (3)8.5.19 too speaks of a *mádhuno dṛ́tiḥ* 'a leather bag for honey' of the Aśvins. The same meaning of container is implied also in (4) 5.83.7 [c] (TS 3.1.11.6, Kāṭhaka-S 11.13=11.58)*dṛ́tiṃ sú karṣa víṣitaṃ nyṣ́ñcaṃ* 'Drag well downward the untied leather-bag'. The addressee is the rain god Parjanya. So *dṛti* means cloud, but only as a metaphor. The secondary meaning of cloud will be found also in TS 2.4.8.2(rep. 3.5.5.2; Kāṭhaka-S. 11.9=11.27)cd *udnó divyásya no dehi ́śāno ví sṛjā* (KS *vi ṣyā*) *dṛ́tim* 'Give to us of the divine water, Ruling loosen the water bag.' Keith (1914: 182). (AVŚ 7.19.1 *udhnó divyásya no dhātar ́śāno ví ṣyā dṛ́tim*, Maitrāyaṇī S.1.3.26 . . .*dhṛ́tim*!AVP 20.8.3 * * * *dhātur* * * * *bilam*,) This as well as the Aśvin's *dṛ́ti* of mead may be mythical that is to say it may not stand as an evidence for the actual use of *dṛti* as a container of water or honey. But the following simile refers to the actual use of *dṛ́ti* by man as a container (5) 1.191.10 [ab] *sū́rye viṣám ā́ sajāmi dṛ́tiṃ súrāvato gṛhé/* (AVP 4.19.2 [ab] * * * *srjāmi*. . .) 'I attach the poison to the sun (like) a leather bag in the house of a spirituous liquor producer.' This should be the *surādṛ́ti* of the Tāṇḍya-Mahābrāhmaṇa(14.11.27). A *dṛti* as a container of liquids finds mention in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa and elsewhere too (below). In (6)RV 7.103.2 the coming of the first rains (lit. 'heavenly waters') to the hoard of frogs lying in the lake have been likened to drenching a dry hide: *divyā́ ā́po abhí yád énam ā́yan dṛ́tiṃ ná śúṣkaṃ sarasī́ śáyānam/*. The utility of the hide is not clear.

The meaning of a container is missing in the remaining three Ṛgvedic instances of *dṛ́ti*. Two seem to have explicitly spoken of an inflated *dṛti*.[4]

(7) 9.1.8 *dhámanti bākuráṃ dṛ́tiṃ* '(The fingers) inflate (blow?) the *bākurá* (*i.e.* 'made of *bákura*') bagpipe (?)'. Sāyaṇa understands *dṛ́ti* as the soma-twig and paraphrases *bākurá* as *bhāsamānam* 'shining'. But this explanation of *bākurá* does not seem to have found wide acceptance with modern scholars. *bākurá dṛ́ti* was interpreted as a bagpipe (Dudelsack) in

[4]In Macdonell-Keith's *Vedic Index of names and subjects*.s.v.the inflated *dṛti* is mentioned but not discussed.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Böhtlingk-Roth's *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. In that case *dṛti* should be the windbag and *bākurá* should pertain to the pipe.

Though later scholars mostly follow Böhtlingk-Roth's explanation, as far as I know, no satisfactory explanation has been offered for the word *bākurá*. Bhawe (1957: 8-9) relates *bākurá* to **vákvar*<*vákvan* in the manner of *aruṇa*<*árvan* with the meaning 'singing, murmuring.' He comments on the implied *v*>*b* change, "For this also, though it may appear surprising, evidence is available in the Vedic language" with a further note "A full fledged linguistic treatment of the subject, however, is necessary". In Bhawe's (*ibid* 78) English rendering of Renou 1947 (not available to me), the word appears as 'frog-trumpet' with the comment, "The twig of *soma* which sings while it is being pressed and is compared with a sort of bagpipe". So everyone agrees that the sound of the soma-twig is the object of description of the metaphor. But this concerns only one aspect. About the thing with which the comparison is made – the *upamāna* side of the metaphor – namely the *bākurá dṛti*, not much has been said excepting what Bhawe has guessed.[5]

The proliferation of partial explanations (also Geldner below) is an indicator of the continuing enigma with the *bākurá dṛti*. What is common to most of the explanations is that it is a musical instrument. On this it should be noted that in 1.117.21 a *bákura* is mentioned as the instrument of the Aśvins for scaring away Dasyu, *abhí dásyuṃ bákureṇā dhámantā* '(ihr) mit dem Bakura den Dasyu anblieset'(Geldner 1951:159). The analogy is of scaring away animals. But in practice this is done more by beating drums than by blowing pipes. Geldner just says that *bákura* is something from which a leather-bag was made "*bákura* ist etwas woraus ein Schlauch gefertigt wird" and refers to 9.1.8 and also to the three instances (above) of the Aśvin's *dṛti* of mead. But the relation between these is not stated.

The unavoidable part of the meaning of *bākurá dṛti* is a leather bag endowed with *bákura*, that is to say the *bákura* is the extra thing added to a *dṛti* making it a *bākurá dṛti*. Nobody has spoken of any possible connection with the post-Vedic *bakula* (Mimusops Elengi) whose wood is sometimes used for making the hollow cylinder or hemisphere of a small drum. The possibility of such an instrument made of bakula-wood being meant should not be ruled out. A hide will be necessary for a drum, so that it may be conceived as a *dṛti*. But if a percussion instrument is meant then the meaning of *dham* here should be 'to beat'. Though, as far as is known to me, that is not attested, the fact remains that the fingers are understood as the agents of the verb *dhámanti*. They do not blow but play on the reeds or holes. There is another possibility, the greater one, of a small *dṛti* being made into a bagpipe with pipes made of bakula-wood. Such instruments will be found with snake-charmers in India.

What is important is that a container is not meant by the term *dṛti*.

A tossing inflated skin finds mention in (8)7.89.2 *yád émi prasphuránn iva dṛtir ná dhmātó adrivaḥ* "When I go tossing about as it were like an inflated hide, O one furnished

[5]I express my deep gratitude to Professor J. C. Wright for the following information that clarifies Renou's undestanding of *bākurá dṛti*, "Renou 1947 (not available to the author), p. 19, translates as 'soufflent l'outre à grenouilles'. Since 'outre' is the French for *dṛti*, Renou must mean 'blow the frog-skin' [bagpipe]', so no 'trumpet' is involved". This, of course, takes *bākurá* as related to *bheka*, perhaps via *bhékuri* ŚB 9.4.1.9, while we like to relate it (see infra) to *bakula*. But Wright continues, informing that Renou had changed his stance "In *EVP* 1961, p. 48, Renou sensibly ignored this association with *bheka*, adopting instead (as referring to a plant) Geldner's 'made of *bakura*'". It will be clear (infra) that our investigation continues from where Geldner (also Renou 1961; Tome VIII?) leaves it, by trying to identify the plant their translations imply. Wright himself prefers onomatopoeic explanations for both *bākurá* 'noise-making' and *bheka*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with stone!" (9) 6.48.18 *dṛter iva te 'vṛkám astu sakhyám/ácchidrasya dadhanvátaḥ súpūrṇasya dadhanvátaḥ//*"Let your friendship be benevolent (lit. wolfless) like that of a *dṛti*, without leak and holding, well filled up and holding". It is difficult to decide if an inflated skin or a skin containing liquid is meant. A tightly inflated skin comes handy for keeping afloat in water if it has no leak. Cf. AVP 2.20.1ab *imāṃ nāvam ārohatācchidrāṃ pārayaṣṇavam* (K. *pārayiṣṇúvaṃ*, T.S.1.5.11(19) *pārayiṣṇúm*, Chāndogya Br.2.5.14 *pārayaṣṇvīm*). "Mount on this ship, without leak, able to carry across!" That will be a friend then. Both *ácchidrasya* and *súpūrṇasya* are appropriate for it.

An inflated *dṛti* finds mention also in Taittirīya-Saṃhitā 7.5.6.2 *yád áhar nótsṛjéyur yáthā dṛtir úpanaddho vipátaty eváṃ saṃvatsaró ví pated, ārtim ārcheyur.* "If they did not leave out a day, then the year would fall asunder, as falls asunder a skin bag tied tight, and they would be ruined". (Keith 1914: 623). The passage tells of the ill effect of not omitting a day from the month in the course of performing ṣaḍahas during the gavām ayana sacrifice. The idea of the passage is that with each day of the month occupied it becomes like an inflated skinbag. Keith (*ibid*, n.4) adds the note "The point is presumably that the bag is tied so tight that it bursts". That too should mean that the bag is inflated. However, it is not clear from the passage itself that vi √pat means 'to fall asunder'. Tāṇḍya-Mahābrāhmaṇa 5.10.1-2(referred to by Keith, ibid. p. 624, n.1) understands the matter a bit differently *yathā vai dṛtir ādhmāta evaṃ saṁvatsaro 'nutsṛṣṭo, yan notsṛjet amehena pramāyukāḥ syuḥ* "As the skinbag is when inflated, so is the year without the omission (of a day); should they not leave out a day they will be ill with retention". Sāyaṇa explains that the analogy is that of a distended bladder. The idea is one of the year becoming overfilled up without an outlet and an analogical illness afflicting the sacrificer as a consequence. There is no hint of falling asunder in the TMB passage. One wonders if the TS vi √pat could mean something else than falling asunder. Etymologically vi √pat may mean 'to fly away'. An inflated bag tosses about itself, an idea found in RV 7.89.2 (above). The verb used there is pra √sphur. If the idea is the same in the TS, the passage will mean the year slipping out of the control of the sacrificer and the latter becoming ill as a consequence. But this interpretation cannot be too much stressed upon.

Among the remaining Saṃhitā instances RV Khila.5.15.15 (AVŚ 20.131.20) speaks of *hastíno dṛtī́* 'a pair of *dṛti*s of elephant'. This may mean some mythical pair of bellows. AVŚ 6.18.3 (=AVP 19.7.14; 15 according to K), *tátas ta īṛṣyā́ṃ muñcāmi nír ūṣmā́ṇaṃ dṛter* (so AVP:Or, *Sāyaṇa;* AVŚ mss *nṛter;* K *triter*) *iva*, according to Sāyaṇa, speaks of blowing hot air from a *dṛti* by the smith. That would mean a bellow. But Whitney (1905: 294) translates "from it I set free thy jealousy, like the vapor from a bag of skin". and remarks "the result of fermentation, escaping when the vessel is opened, is apparently intended". Whitney's idea must have been influenced by RV 1.191.10 (above).

TMB 16.13.13 speaks of chariots with *dṛti*s containing milk with cream gathering on its surface. Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 5.3.2.6 mentions *vināṭa* instead of *dṛti* while the Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra(22.17) allows option to choose among the two that do not seem to be essentially different. Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 1.6.3.16 describes the defeated Vṛtra as "shrunk like a squeezed out *dṛti*, shrunk like a *bhastrā* emptied of ground barley".

The employment of hide as a container (*dṛti* or *bhastrā*) of barley or any type of grains, eg. gravel, cf., *dṛti-vastyor opya śarkarāḥ* Kauśika-Sūtra 14.5, was natural at that stage. Weaving was quite well known in Vedic times but there is no evidence of sacks being made of cultivated plant material in the early first millennium BC. Archaelogical excavation has yielded only

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the "evidence of the use of bark fibres for twine" in that period.[6] That might have been used for *dū́ṛśa* "a kind of woven cloth or vesture" of the Atharvaveda (AVŚ.4.7.6, 8.6.11, AVP *durṛśa, duṛśa, duruśa* etc.; corrupt?). For liquids, earthen jars were the normal containers. In fact BŚS 22.17 speaks of an option of carrying milk in a newly made jar instead of in a *dṛti* or *vināṭa* in a chariot (above). The *dṛti*, thus, must have been an alternative, occasionally available to farmers and meant for special drinks – termed *vipāna* in TMB 14.11.27 or for special occasions eg. when being transported.

The *vasti* mentioned in the Kauśika-Sūtra 14.5 has been interpreted by Dārila as *anuvāsanā* (ed.-*nīyaṃ*)*carma*. This means some processed hide, perhaps a sheet of leather. It is difficult to say if this, also cf. *bhastrā* above, is related to NIA *bastā* 'sack made of jute', 'bundle'. These are kindred of *dṛti* but different.

It has been attempted above to make the information comprehensive. Locations in some later Vedāṅga texts may be missing but they will not materially change the conclusions to be drawn from the findings.

The foregoing discussion shows that at least three major types of *dṛti*s had been in use**:** as a container, as an inflated skin bag that includes the bagpipe too, and also as a bellow or bellows. The use as a container of special drinks is most prominent in the early period but the inflated *dṛti* also was very well known.

The early Vedic *dṛti* 'hide intact', then, was on the way to gaining the character of a polysemous noun denoting things of varied utility – things that might have been produced through appropriate modification of the raw material. The polysemic trend continued giving rise to further semantic ramification in post-Vedic Indo-Aryan languages that inherited the word (below).

2c. The Irregular Feminine Gender

The feminine gender of *dṛti* in our verse is exceptional. The word has the masculine gender in the Vedas so that *dṛtau* was expected. There may be several explanations for the feminine gender. It is likely that the form was influenced by *samityāṃ* of the second pāda. Secondly, the Dardic and Gujarati words for inflated skinbag (2d below) point to the existence of such *dṛti*s of various sizes. The gender may have to do with the size. Apart from that there has been something like a double deviation here. The masculine gender of *dṛti* is itself an unexplained deviation. Cf. Wackernagel-Debrunner (1954:636) 'Sicher maskulinisch ist v.-kl. *dṛ́ti*, "Schlauch" (aber gr.*δέρρις* "Lederdecke" ist Fem.)', also *ibid*, p. 631. Usually the *-ti* suffix ending words have the feminine gender (Burrow 1955: 187). The AVP just corrects the aberration. This may be an instance of hyper-Sanskritisation or just an archaic feature preserved in some dialect.[7]

This last possibility in general ie. the possibility of archaic features surfacing up from unknown Vedic dialects is not a widely discussed subject. Though a discussion of this

[6]R. C. Gaur 1983: 459

[7]Wright thinks that the AVP and Greek have independently normalised the gender and that 'the jingle *dṛtyām/ samityām* is so thoroughly convincing'. That is not impossible, but the similar 'abnormal' masculine gender at the initial stage as implied in Wright's theory – in two words originating under different circumstances in different languages according to Mayrhofer – in both the languages will require attention. Also see nn. 2, 3 above.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

phenomenon may look like a digression, one cannot neglect it in Atharvavedic text-study. Burrow (1955: 42) lays great stress on this phenomenon in Classical Sanskrit. But the Atharvaveda, both by the evidence of its mantras and also by the nature of its ritual, was closer to the ordinary householder – the trader and the farmer – than the other three Vedas. Surfacing up of dialectal forms should have started from this Veda.[8] Also traces of unattested but apparently archaic forms may be found elsewhere in the AVP. Cf. AVP. 5.9.5 *dadau* presumably from √*du*/*dū*-' to burn' (Bhattacharya 2002: 113-119), with hysterodynamic effect on an unattested **dadūva* (cf. *babhūva*) that removes the irregularity of a weak-grade root in perfect singular active, and an inferable $^{+}$*yuyuta* 'Separate!'(impv. second person pl.) for the normal but irregular *yuyota* in 2.70.5. The last reconstruction is made on the basis of a comparison (termed compromise by Wright 2002: 194) of manuscript readings taking phonemic components from more than one reading.[9] Or. has *yuyut* while K reads *yūyata*. The first two akṣaras of Or. and the last one of K make $^{+}$*yuyuta*.[10] The weak grade of the stem makes the conjugation a regular one.

So there are various possible explanations for the occurrence of the feminine *dṛtyām*. For this reason that the AVP 'corrects' the gender should not be an argument against the word being authentic.

2d. The Shape of the *dṛti*

The literary sources give hints that the four feet of the animal were retained with the *dṛti*. AVP 9.6.5ab reads *apinahyam adṛṣṭānāṃ mukhaṃ pādā dṛter iva* "The mouth of the unseen (worms) should be tied tight like the feet of a skin". Manu-Saṃhitā 2.99: *tenāsya kṣarati prajnā dṛteḥ pādād ivodakam* "By that (single slipping sense-organ) his wisdom slips away like water through (a single leaking) foot of a *dṛti*". The simile tries to compare the harm done by a single unrestrained sense organ among many restrained ones with water emptying through a single leaking foot of a *dṛti*. Only one foot has been mentioned, but "even when the other feet are not leaking" is obviously understood to complete the simile. The image is that of a many-footed skin.

About the head of the *dṛti* see below.

2e. Inflated *dṛti*s as Floats

As has been shown above, the Ṛgveda and the Taittirīya-Saṃhitā know of the inflated *dṛti*. But there is not much in those Vedas to show its utility. Now, an inflated *dṛti* can be used for keeping oneself floating in water. An early direct evidence for its actual use for floating is found in Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra §78 = 4.3. Instruction on rescue operations to be carried out during flood is given in the following language: *ūhyamānam alābu-dṛtiplava-gaṇḍikā-veṇikābhis tārayeyuḥ* "They should rescue (a person) being carried away (by the flood) by means of gourds, skin-bags (-*dṛti*-), canoes, tree-stems and rope-braids". (Kangle 1963: 304). The instruction is repeated in §148-149 = 10.2 in a more elaborate statement on crossing water

[8]For the surfacing up of dialectal features also see Bhattacharya 2004: p. 202 and the Introduction to the second volume of the AVP, p. 40 (in press).

[9]See Introduction Vol.1, pp. xxix–xxxviii.

[10]The matter has been discussed in the Introduction to the second volume, p. 44.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by the army: *hasti-stambhasaṅkrama-setubandha-nau-kāṣṭhaveṇusaṅghātaih alābu-carmakaraṇḍa-dṛtiplava-gaṇḍikā-veṇikābhiś codakāni tārayet* "He should make the army cross waters with (the help of) elephants, pillar-bridges, embankments, boats, rafts of wood and bamboos and by means of gourds, leather baskets, skins, canoes, tree-stems and ropes". (KANGLE 1963: 505). KANGLE translates *dṛti* as 'skin' and *plava* as 'canoe'. But *dṛtiplava* should be a single word meaning 'skin-float'. This seems to be indicated by the sentence occurring in §78 just after the instruction on rescue operations advising the imposition of fines on those who do not come to the rescue of others during flood: *anabhisaratāṃ dvādaśapaṇo daṇḍaḥ, anyatra plavahīnebhyaḥ*. Kangle translates "For those who do not go to the rescue, the fine is twelve paṇas, except in the case of those without canoes". Why should Kauṭilya exempt those who have tree-stems and rope-braids but no canoe? Only those who have no floating material at all deserve exemption. So *plavahīnebhyaḥ* should mean "those without any floating implement". Then *plava* cannot be taken as a separate word in *dṛtiplava*, for *gaṇḍikā*s 'tree-stems' and, in the present context, *dṛti*s too are *plava*s. *Dṛtiplava* thus should be taken as a single word, the second member of the word signifying the type of *dṛti*s that are to be kept ready. A skin may have different uses. So a skin-float is specified by adding the word *plava* to *dṛti*.

Such *dṛti*s or *dṛtiplava*s were in actual use in Panjab till recently. TURNER 1965: 371(Fasc.5) (under *dṛti*) speaks of their use in Panjab. The entry records "*daraĩ* m. 'inflated buffalo-skin used as a float'".[11] The dialect belongs to Kangri, the language of a large part of the Himachal Pradesh, particularly the sub-Himalayan region around the Sivaliks.

Long before Turner Baron Karl von Hügel recorded (1845: 27)[12] the early nineteenth century use of such vessels in the very region noted by Turner.

"The natives swim across the stream with the help of an ox's skin, inflated with wind, in an ingenious way. Having carried this on their shoulders to the shore, they spread themselves upon it on the water, laying fast hold with one hand, while they strike the water with a

[11] *Daraĩ*, the name recorded by Turner, does not sound like a direct descendant of *dṛti*. It has the same root, may be or may not be in its full grade, but the suffix *aĩ*, is of late origin. It may equivalent to the Bengali suffix *–āni*, expressing agent or action nouns. Cf. *jālāni* 'fuel' < √*jālā-* (Skt. *jvāl-* causative of *jval-* 'to burn', 'to shine') 'to kindle', 'to ignite'. The *-āi* suffix prevalent in North Indian Indo-Aryan languages including Bengali also may come into consideration. It can be added to verbs as well as to nominals in the sense of abstract and common nouns. Cf. Bengali *caḍāi* 'upward slope' < √*caḍ* 'to climb'; Hindi *gah$_a$rāi* 'depth' < *gah$_a$r* 'deep'. But Wright likes to relate it to the word *dṛti-* itself : "Turner would probably have suspected *dṛti-matī* to account for the nasal (cf. in 3,700 and 3,697 his explanation of Bengali *khirai/khirā*)."

[12] Since Hügel's work (see Bibliography at the end of the paper) is of prime importance for the arguments produced in the paper, I should state how I used it. I know of the original German book of Hügel from Roth's *Der Atharveveda in Kaschmir* (Tübingen, 1875), p. 11 which reports of the 'Notiz des Freiherrn Karl von Hügel (Kaschmir und der Reich der Siek II, 364)' 'dass die Brahmanen Kaschmir's "alle dem Atterwan oder wie sie sagen Atterman Veda angehören."' and from Louis Renou's *Bibliographie védique* (49.21 on p. 63) that gives the dates (1840–48) of publication. The work I used is a single volume (pp. xvi, 423) English translation by Major T. B. Jervis of the 'first and third parts' (Jervis' 'The Editor's Preface', p. iv, footnote) of Hügel's *Kaschmir und das Reich der Siek*, (Stuttgart, 1840–48), published in four volumes. I owe it to young philologist Dr Abhijit Majumdar, University of Calcutta, that I could refer to Jervis' translation. He procured for me a copy of this little known English translation that has not been mentioned in Renou's *Bibliographie védique* which enters the name of the German original only.

There is some apparent discrepancy in the dates given by Renou and Jervis. As reported by Renou, the four volumes of the German work were published between 1844 and 1848. Now, at the end of the 'The Editor's Preface'(p. vii) Jervis gives the date 1st November, 1844. But he speaks of the German original in four parts in the footnote mentioned above, "The German edition was published at Stuttgart, in four parts, 8vo., at distant intervals, and is procurable in this country at the high price of 2*l*. 16*s*. unbound". Renou must have correctly reported the publication dates. It appears that unbound fascicules of the German work had been in the market before all the bound volumes were finally out in 1848.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

piece of timber in the other. The sight of a number of these skins, with the head and feet of the beast left on them as in life, constantly floating across the river, is very amusing".

There is a picture too on p. 247 of Hügel's book that has been reproduced at the end of this paper.

The appended picture shows that the skin was that of buffalo. Almost every part of the animal as it appears when living is kept intact, a fact noted with an element of surprise by Hügel. But that is an ancient inheritance.

Hügel was in Bilaspur, headquarters of the district of the same name in the southwestern part of the Himachal Pradesh (then Panjab), among the lower slopes of the Sivaliks about 31° north and 77° east crossing the river Sutlej from its left bank. But it will no more be possible to relive the experience of Hügel. At present a large part of the region remains submerged by the huge reservoir Govind Sagar created by the Bhakra-Nangal dam system that has also changed the course of the river. It is not surprising that though I lived nearby for over a year, about thirty years ago, and also later I often travelled there, the vessel did not come to my notice. The green revolution and development must have changed much of the former way of living by the late seventies.

It may be of some interest that almost all the terms related to *dṛti* and at the same time meaning 'inflated skin', as recorded by TURNER, belong to the extreme north or northwestern region of the subcontinent. Cf. *drī* 'inflated goatskin': Dameli – a Dardic language; *dril* 'inflated goatskin': Kalasha – Dardic. Here one finds the verb in its weak grade.

Among the other words recorded under the same entry, *daïḍaü* 'leather ball' belongs to Old Gujarati and *deṛɔ* is a modern form with the same meaning. On this M. L. Wadekar, Acting Director, Oriental Institute, who knows Gujarati, kindly informed me that the *dado* or *daido* – the corrupt form of it in colloquial language – 'both originally meant a small ball like structure prepared from waste papers or rags etc., used for some games, in which the other players were beaten by throwing it. But it is nowadays being used also for rubber or tennis ball, used by the children for cricket or some such games. It is also used for big balls like the football or basketball. The ball, presently used for cricket can also be called *dado*.'

The same impression is made by what S. S. Dange, formerly of the Department of Sanskrit, University of Bombay wrote on the word to me. She enquired into the matter and said that the Gujarati word *dero* "simply means a 'ball'". For Turner's *daïḍaü* she mentions "*daḍau* or some word sounding like that" adding "for 'leather ball' it could be *carma daḍau*. This addition of the qualifying word *carma-* is found also in Sāyaṇa's introductory lines on AVŚ.2.3 *carmadṛtimukhena . . .dhamanaṃ ca kāryam*. A bellow is meant.

The third phoneme varies between the trilled *ḍ* that is *ṛ* and normal trilled sonant *r* but it is not difficult to see that Turner meant the same word as current in Gujarat. From the information so kindly made available to me by the two Indologists it becomes apparent that currently there is no idea about the connection of the thing with leather.

It is obvious that even if these words are descended from *dṛti*, that is very likely, the ancient skin-float was no more associated with it. This also makes it look possible that the Vedic *dṛti* was native to the Himalayan regions and the nearby regions around Kashmir where the skin-float survived as a mode of conveyance. At least one may like to infer that the *dṛti* had been in use in these regions before it spread to other regions of India.

Now it has been shown elsewhere[13] that the Atharvaveda had close Western Himalayan connections. The mention of *dṛti* as skin float in the Paippalāda-Saṃhitā agrees with that.

[13]Bhattacharya 1905: pp. 24–27.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

One question remains to be answered. A king of the later historical period was not expected to use a *dṛti* in normal conditions. But the king here does not belong to the later historical period nor is a normal condition envisaged in the hymn. It is easy to note that he is a *samiti-* and *vidatha*-attending Vedic community 'king', 'friendly' 'lord of people' of the type called by Kauṭilya (§160) *rājaśabdopajīvinaḥ* "those who use the word king as a means of livelihood" that is to say who are not real kings. That was a far cry from the all-powerful Magadhan monarch of later days. The verse under discussion obviously envisages an emergency condition compelling such a king to take to a *dṛti*. Boats might not be available everywhere and under all circumstances. A *dṛti* could be readily available. As Hügel reports it was easy to carry.[14]

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Manuscripts

K The Kashmirian Atharva-Veda (school of the Pappalādas). Reproduced by chromophotography from the ms. in the University Library at Tübingen. Ed. Maurice Bloomfield and Richard Garbe, 3 volumes Baltimpore, 1901. Rep. New York, 1979.
A Xerox copy has been used for this paper.
Or AVP mss discovered by Durgamohan Bhattacharyya.

For description of the manuscripts see the Introductions in Bhattacharyya 1964 and Bhattacharya 1997

Publications

AVP *The Paippalāda-Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda*. See under Bhattacharyya/Bhattacharya
AVŚ *The Śaunakīya-Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda*. Ed. Visva Bandhu and others, VVRI, Hosiarpur. 1960-64

Durgamohan Bhattacharyya. 1970 *Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda*, *Volume Two* (=Kāṇḍas 2–4). Edited from original manuscripts with critical notes. Sanskrit College, Calcutta.

Dipak Bhattacharya 1984 'On the new material in the Atharvaveda Paippalāda' *Indo-Iranian Journal 27* Dordrecht pp. 173–188.

— 1997 *The Paippalāda-Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda Volume One* (Kāṇḍas 1–15) Ed with Introduction. Bibliotheca Indica Series No. 318. Asiatic Society, Calcutta.

— 2002 'Notes on conjugational vowel-gradation in the Paippalāda-Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda.' *Ātharvaṇa* (a collection of essays on the Atharvaveda), ed. Abhijit Ghosh, Sanskrit Book Depot, Kolkata, pp. 111–121.

— 2004 'On yāt tāt uttarāt and similar forms' *The Vedas: Texts, Language and Ritual*, ed. A. Griffiths & J. E. M. Houben. Groningen, 2004, pp. 181–215.

— 2005 Atharvaveda – Notes on History and Text-History' *Indische Kultur im Kontext*: *Rituale*, *Texte und Ideen aus Indien und der Welt*: *Festschrift für Klaus Mylius*, ed. Lars Göhler, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, pp. 9–29.

[14]The help I received from various scholars has been indicated in the footnotes. I additionally thank Professor J. C. Wright here for the various useful suggestions he made for a better presentation of the matter in the paper.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press

S. S. Bhawe 1957 *The Soma-hymns of the Ṛgveda*: *A fresh interpretation Part I* (*RV 9.1–15*) Oriental Institute, Baroda.

C. D. Buck 1952 *Comparative grammar of Greek and Latin*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

T. Burrow 1955 *Sanskrit language*. Faber and Faber, London.

Willem Caland 1900 *Altindisches Zauberritual*, Amsterdam.

H. R. Diwekar, V. P. Limaye and others 1972 *Kauśikasūtra-Dārilabhāṣya* TMV, Poona.

R. C. Gaur 1983 *Excavations at Atranjīkherā*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

Karl Hoffmann 1992 (1986) 'Textkritisches zur Paippalāda-Saṃhitā' *Aufsätze zur Indo Iranistik Band 3*. Eds. Sonia Glauch, Robert Plath, Sabine Ziegler. Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden: 819–823. From *Sanskrit and world Culture*= Proceedings of the Fourth World Sanskrit Conference of I. A. S. S., Weimar, pp. 23–30. May 1979. Ed. Wolfgang Morgenroth in *Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients 18*, Berlin 1986: pp. 457–461.

Baron Karl von Hügel 1845 *Travels in Kashmir and the Panjab containing a particular account of the government and character of the Sikhs*: *From the German of Baron Charles Hügel with notes* by Major T. B. Jervis, F. R. S, London.

R. P. Kangle 1963 *The Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra Part II*: An English translation with critical and explanatory notes. University of Bombay.

A. B. Keith 1914 *The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittiriya Sanhita*. HOS pp. 18–19.

A. A. Macdonell 1910 *Vedic Grammar* Strassburg.

Manfred Mayrhofer 1992 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* Erster Teil: ältere Sprache, Bd. 1. Carl Winter, Heidelberg.

Johanna Narten 1964 *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*, Wiesbaden.

— 1995 (1969) 'Griech. *πίμπλημι* und RV. *ápiprata*' *Kleine Schriften Band 1*. Ed. Marcos Albino and Matthias Fritz, Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden: pp. 108–124. From *Studia classica et orientalia: Fs A. Pagliaro*, 1969, Vol. 3: pp. 139–155.

Louis Renou 1947 'Anthologie Sanskrite', *Textes de L'inde Ancienne*, *traduits du Sanskrit*, Libraire Larousse, Payot, Paris p. 18f (as reported by Bhawe).

— 1961 *Études védiques et Pāṇinéennes: Hymnes à Soma* (as informed by Wright) Tome VIII.

R. L. Turner 1965 Fascicule 5–7 of *A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages* OUP, London, 1962–1969.

N. S. Venkatanathacharya Ed. *Kauṭalīyārthaśāstram*. Oriental Research Institute, University of Mysore, Mysore, 1986.

Visva Bandhu 1942–63 *A Vedic Word-Concordance*. Vols. 1–6. VVRI, Hosiarpur.

Jacob Wackernagel-Albert Debrunner 1930 *Altindische Grammatik Band III*. Göttingen.

— 1954 *Do Band II.2*. Göttingen.

W. D. Whitney 1905 *Atharva-veda Saṃhitā. Translated into English* . . . HOS 7–8.

J. C. Wright 2002 Review of Bhattacharya 1997. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies LXV(2002):* pp. 194–196.

Thomas Zehnder 1999 *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda*, *Buch 2*, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Schulz-Kirchner Verlag, Idstein.

Some well-known old works like O. Böhtlingk-R. Roth's *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, H. Grassmann's *Wörterbuch zum Rig-veda*, K. Brugmann-B. Delbrück's *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik etc*, Macdonell-Keith's *Vedic Index of names and subjects*, editons of the Ṛgveda, Yajurveda, Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa etc are not included in the Bibliography.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press



Engraving depicting a *dṛti* in use, from von Hügel's *'Travels in kashmir. . .'*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186308008535 Published online by Cambridge University Press