



# The Orissa Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Samhitā

Arlo Griffiths

## ► To cite this version:

| Arlo Griffiths. The Orissa Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Samhitā. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morganländischen Gesellschaft, 2003, 153 (2), pp.333-370. halshs-01910033

HAL Id: halshs-01910033

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01910033>

Submitted on 1 Nov 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# The Orissa Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā

By ARLO GRIFFITHS, Leiden

## Introduction

It is now more than 45 years ago that the late DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYYA made his “Announcement of a Rare Find”, i.e. the discovery among certain Orissa-Brahmins of palm-leaf manuscripts of the Atharva Veda in its Paippalāda recension (1957). An edition of the first kāṇḍa of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā (PS) appeared in 1964, and was followed in 1970 by the posthumous publication of kāṇḍas 2–4, seen through the press by DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYYA’s son DIPAK BHATTACHARYA. In 1997, twenty-seven years later, DIPAK BHATTACHARYA was able to continue the task he had inherited from his father by the publication of an edition of the first fifteen kāṇḍas of the text, which also contained a revised edition of the first four kāṇḍas.<sup>1</sup>

To date, the last 5 kāṇḍas of this eminently important Vedic text remain available for study only in the unreliable form of the ‘edited text’ as prepared by BARRET (1936, 1938, 1940) on the basis of the notoriously corrupt Kashmir manuscript. By contrast with this Kashmir ms. of the PS, which one century ago was considered important enough for leading Vedic scholars BLOOMFIELD<sup>2</sup> and GARBE (1901) to have it reproduced in a magnificent facsimile edition (an initiative which up to this point has remained almost unique in Vedic studies), the Orissa mss. of the same text have hardly received any description at all, not to speak of published facsimiles (besides the 2 barely legible folio-sides which have been reproduced in BHATTACHARYYA

---

<sup>1</sup> I am obliged to ABHIJIT GHOSH, HARUNAGA ISAACSON and WALTER SLAJE, who read an earlier draft of this paper, and gave several important suggestions for its improvement.

<sup>2</sup> In 1899, BLOOMFIELD wrote (p. 184): “In the entire domain of Indian manuscript tradition there is no single manuscript which claims so much interest as the unique birch-bark manuscript of the Kashmirian Atharva-Veda ...”. For various details about this manuscript, see ROTH 1875 and 1880; WHITNEY/LANMAN 1905, pp. lxxx ff.; BARRET 1905–1940; and WITZEL 1973–1976.

1964, p. xlii, and the 7 folio-sides reproduced by ZYSK 1993, p. 6<sup>3</sup>). It is regrettable that so little is known about the Orissa mss., their idiosyncrasies, and the (historical) information that can be gleaned from their colophons: almost all such matters are treated as irrelevant (or simply neglected) in the BHATTACHARYA edition.

Following the initiative of MICHAEL WITZEL, who went to Orissa in 1983 (see WITZEL 1985b; now also WITZEL/GRIFFITHS 2002), I have in recent years made a concerted effort to collect as much manuscript material as possible for the PS (and other Paippalāda texts), and with this aim I have made three fieldtrips to Orissa.<sup>4</sup> Up to now, I have been able to collect two or more new manuscript sources for every kāṇḍa of the Samhitā, and it is my hope that they will be helpful towards a re-edition of the text, a better understanding of the Paippalāda Atharvavedic tradition (in Orissa), and Orissa Vedic traditions in general.

The purposes of the present paper are:

- (1) to present to the reader the general characteristics and some specific peculiarities of the Orissa PS mss. (also with respect to how they are dated).
- (2) to offer a survey of all the Orissa PS mss. that are available at present, including those on which the BHATTACHARYA edition (1997– ...) is based, along with information about each specific ms. that might be relevant (provenance, date, relationship to other mss., etc.).
- (3) to provide a fairly comprehensive bibliography of publications relevant for the user of the Orissa mss. of the PS, as well as other (Vedic) manuscripts from Orissa.

In what follows I first provide – for ready reference – an overview of the available mss. and their sigla (in tables 1 and 2). I then give a brief explanation of the to some extent idiosyncratic dating systems which we find in the

---

<sup>3</sup> These are taken from the ms. which I refer to as **Pa** in this paper, and elsewhere. It was previously referred to as **P** by MICHAEL WITZEL. The dating “seventeenth century” quoted by Zysk is incorrect (see below, under **Pa**).

<sup>4</sup> In the winter of 1998–1999, the rainy season of 1999, and again in the winter of 2000–2001. Only right before my second fieldtrip, in July 1999, during a brief stay in Pune, was I informed by Prof. KASHIKAR that he had made a similar fieldtrip (on behalf of the C.A.S.S., Univ. of Pune) to Orissa in the late 1960s. Through the kind services of Prof. BAHULKAR, I had – toward the end of my last field-trip – in January 2001 received a copy of Prof. KASHIKAR’s then still unpublished fieldreport, which has now been made accessible as KASHIKAR 2002.

post-colophons of these mss., and continue with a discussion of the peculiarities (of script, orthography and otherwise) with which the user of these mss. is confronted.

The main part of this paper consists of descriptions of the available mss., with information on where they were found, their relative importance, their date etc., and whatever colophons etc. might be given. An appendix follows with brief descriptions, prepared on site at the Orissa State Museum, of a few more manuscripts of which reproductions are not available at present.

This is the place to thank the authorities of the Orissa State Museum (Bhubaneswar), as well as the individuals Ānandacandra Pañḍā (village Jiuļi, Dt. Mayurbhanj), Āditya Kumār Praharāj (Baripada), Dr. Jagabandhu Miśra (Puri), Dr. Rāmacandra Miśra (Puri), Viśvanātha Upādhyāya and Kāśīnātha Upādhyāya (village Ekkaliya, Dt. Khordha), and especially Hari-hara Upādhyāya with his son Candramaṇi Upādhyāya (village Kurumcaini, Dt. Cuttack) for giving me access to the manuscripts in their possession.

### An Overview of the Manuscripts

The sigla<sup>5</sup> for the various manuscripts are given in the first column of the two tables. Diagonally shaded cells indicate that the available copy is not complete for the given kāṇḍa. I have further, according to my present understanding of the geographical spread of the Paippalāda tradition, given a rough indication of the provenance of the ms., either from Central or from Northern Orissa.

#### *Bhattacharya's Manuscripts (table 1)*

The PS manuscripts collected by DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYYA (see BHATTACHARYYA 1964, pp. xviii–xix), and used by DIPAK BHATTACHARYA for his 1997 edition (see pp. xv–xvii) are most clearly listed by ZEHNDER 1999, pp. 19–20. This table is based on ZEHNDER's (p. 19).

---

<sup>5</sup> The system of using the first two letters (or the first *akṣara*) of the place of provenance of the ms. as its siglum has been taken over from DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYYA, except where the provenance is unknown (JM and RM, the initials of the respective owners), and with the additional exception of the mss. from the Orissa State Museum (often of unknown provenance), which are referred to by their catalog number.

Table 1

Siglum	Provenance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Ja1	Central																				
Ja2	Central																				
Ja3	Central																				
Ma1	Northern																				
Ma2-a	Northern																				
Ma2-b <sup>6</sup>	Northern																				
Ma3	Northern																				
Ma4	Northern																				
Ma5	Northern																				
Ma1 <sup>7</sup>	Northern																				
Ma2	Northern																				
Vā	Central																				

*Manuscripts Available with the Author (table 2)*

Not included in the table are the very carelessly written modern copies of ms. **Pa**, collected by MICHAEL WITZEL in 1983 (**Pa**<sub>c</sub>, covering kāṇḍas 2–15, 17–18). Nor have I included another copy of **Pa**, which covers PS 13–15 and 19.1–42 (and was referred to as **Gu**<sub>c</sub> in GRIFFITHS/LUBOTSKY 1999). **Pa**<sub>c</sub><sup>8</sup> and **Gu**<sub>c</sub><sup>9</sup> have by now become minimally important, in view of the availability of more reliable mss. from Orissa.

<sup>6</sup> This ms. has been described (from second generation xeroxes, with reproduction of a facsimile) by LOPEZ 2000, pp. 105–107.

<sup>7</sup> This ms. has been described (from second generation xeroxes, with reproduction of a facsimile) by LOPEZ 2000, pp. 102–104.

<sup>8</sup> This ms. has been described (with reproduction of a facsimile) by LOPEZ 2000, pp. 108–109. The information given by LOPEZ on the provenance and scribe of this ms. is incorrect. Whereas WITZEL took photographs of (parts of) **Pa**<sub>c</sub>'s exemplar **Pa** at the Kāñcikāmakoti Matha in Puri (where it was being used at the time), by permission of the then Veda-teacher/Pujārī K. B. Upādhyāya, the xeroxes of **Pa**<sub>c</sub> were made by WITZEL in Baripada, the domicile of the scribe of this apograph, schoolteacher A. K. Praharāj. Both apograph and exemplar are currently in the possession of A. K. Praharāj.

<sup>9</sup> The portion of this ms. covering PS 13–15 has been described (with reproduction of a facsimile) by LOPEZ 2000, pp. 110–111.

Table 2

Siglum	Provenance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<b>Ek1</b>	Central																				
<b>Ek2</b>	Central																				
<b>Ji1</b>	Northern																				
<b>Ji2</b>	Northern																				
<b>Ji3</b>	Northern																				
<b>Ji4</b>	Northern																				
<b>JM1</b>	Central																				
<b>JM2</b>	Central																				
<b>JM3</b>	Central																				
<b>JM4</b>	Central																				
<b>JM5</b>	Central																				
<b>Ku1</b>	Central																				
<b>Ku2</b>	Central																				
<b>Ku3</b>	Central																				
<b>Pa<sup>10</sup></b>	Northern																				
<b>RM</b>	Central																				
<b>V/71</b>	Northern																				
<b>V/121</b>	Northern																				
<b>V/122</b>	Northern																				
<b>V/123</b>	Northern																				
<b>V/126</b>	Northern																				
<b>V/153</b>	<i>unknown</i>																				

<sup>10</sup> This is a complete set of several (probably 4 or 5) mss., together offering the whole of PS. The individual parts could be referred to separately as **Pa1**, **Pa2**, etc. For the time being, I lump them together as one manuscript, and mention only those kāndas for which photographs are in fact available.

## The Dating Systems found in the Manuscripts<sup>11</sup>

Regarding dating, it may be noted that most of the mss. use the typically Orissa style of dating mss. by the *aṅka* plus the name of the Puri-king (Khurda dynasty) during whose reign the ms. was written. The technical term *aṅka* refers to a special system of counting used (to my knowledge) only in Orissa. With a simple calculation it directly yields the regnal year of the king in question. In his useful article of 1962, K. N. MAHAPATRA explained (p. 144f.):

The regnal years of the rulers of Orissa were being calculated in *aṅka śrāhi* method in which the numbers 1 and 6 and all numbers ending with (6) and (0) except 10 were omitted at the time of calculation. Thus if the Aṅka year is 50 the actual regnal years will be (41) as the numbers 1, 6, 16, 20, 26, 30, 36, 40, 46 will not be counted. Notable feature of this is the counting of the Aṅka year always from Bhādra, Śukla Dvādaśī of the lunar year, which is called Sunia ... The Aṅka years were so very popular throughout the Oriya speaking tracts, that they were not only being used in the official records of the State, but also by the authors in their works and in the horoscopes prepared by the village astrologers.<sup>12</sup>

Once we have calculated the regnal year from the indicated *aṅka*, we still often have to face the problem that many kings in the Khurda dynasty bore identical names. Since the 16<sup>th</sup> century, there have, e.g., been several Rāmacandra devas, Mukundadevas, Divyasiṁhadevas etc. The regnal years of the Puri (Khurda) kings up to 1871, as well as those of other dynasties of Orissa, are conveniently listed in TRUHART 1985, pp. 1452 and 1455. I have also consulted with profit the history of the Khurda dynasty provided in PATTANAIK 1979.

Often it is only if the scribe has given additional information on the lunar (or solar) date besides the king's *aṅka*, and only if that information is clearly legible and unambiguous, that we can be sure about the dating. In this connection, it is important to point out that (as appears from Prof. YANO's calculations of the dates of several of the new mss.), the mss. sometimes use the Pūrṇimānta-system of month naming, rather than the Amānta.

<sup>11</sup> I extend my thanks to Professors DAVID PINGREE and MICHIO YANO, as well as to my friend MAKOTO FUSHIMI, who have all been most kind in helping me with various dating issues. I have also benefited from a letter written by Prof. CLAUS VOGEL to colleague THOM ZEHNDER (see ZEHNDER 1999, p. 20), of which ZEHNDER has given me a xerox-copy: Prof. VOGEL has kindly given me permission to quote from this letter.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. also SUBRAHMANYAM 1986, p. xxxi, who gives basically the same information but adds: "The *Aṅka* years never exceed fifty-nine." For further details and references, cf. HARDENBERG 2000, pp. 123–124.

There are also mss. which use the era of the Mughal emperor Akbar, which, according to MAHAPATRA (p. 146) “is called Sana or Sal by the common people and Dilīśvarābda in the annual almanacs of Orissa”. Addition of 592 (or 593) to the year of this ‘San’ era yields the year CE. Besides Sana and Sal (*sāla*), the PS mss. also refer to *sna* and *slā*.<sup>13</sup> Recent mss. sometimes also use these terms to refer to years in the Christian era, which is otherwise indicated with the term *mahisā*. On the term *samasta* in the meaning ‘year’, finally, cf. SIRCAR 1965, p. 327.

### Peculiarities of the Manuscripts

On the modern printed form of the Oriya script, cf. FRIEDRICH 2002 (chapter V), and especially MCPHERSON 1924. Extensive character sets for 5 dated PS mss. (plus one dated Orissa ms. of the Pañcavimśabrahmana) have been produced for the DFG Indoskript project (see [www.indoskript.de](http://www.indoskript.de)) and are also available with the author. Certain peculiarities of orthography, and certain common errors in the Orissa mss., mostly due to the local pronunciation of Sanskrit, have been listed by WITZEL 1985b, pp. 267 and 282–284, and BHATTACHARYA too has mentioned a few (1997, pp. xx–xxi and xxxii–xxxiv).

Differently from Śāradā, the Oriya script does not distinguish between *-b-* and *-v-* (see BHATTACHARYA, p. xxxiii). When quoting readings from Orissa mss., one may thus choose the appropriate phoneme. The Orissa mss. cannot be used as evidence for establishing the spelling, with *-b-* or *-v-*, of rare words with uncertain etymology (cf. BLOOMFIELD/EDGERTON 1932 §208, p. 110).

BHATTACHARYA states (p. xxxiii): “Or does not distinguish between [i]nitial ru and ḡ. Non-initial ru and ḡ (kru-kṛ) too are interchangeable”. This elliptic statement can be clarified in the following terms: the Oriya vowel sign *-ṛ-* is pronounced /ru/. Hence, the sound /ru/ is mostly written either with the initial *ṛ-* sign in words like *vṛṇa-* (= *varuṇa-*), or with the postconsonantal sign in *cakṛr* (= *cakrur*). Similarly, /rū/ can be written *-ṝ-*, as in *pūṇi* (= *purūṇi*), though apparently not often postconsonantly. However, the script does certainly dispose over graphemic means to distinguish *-ru/rū-* from *-ṛ/ṝ-*, and certain words seem to have a preferred spelling with the former: e.g. *dhruva-*, besides *dhṛva-*, *śatrūn* not *śatṛn*. Our apparatus

<sup>13</sup> In the mss. V/122 and V/123, we find *sna* and *sāla* used to refer to two separate unidentified eras.

will therefore consistently report precisely how words edited with *-ru-* or *-rū-* are in fact spelt in the Orissa mss.

The script distinguishes the two different lateral phonemes of the Oriya language<sup>14</sup> (*/l/* and */ɿ/*: *-l-* and *-ɿ-*), and the *-l-* sign is sometimes – a pattern is not (yet) discernible<sup>15</sup> – used in the PS mss. for *-l-*. Now, entirely separate from the fact that the Oriya language (and its script) has two lateral phonemes, is the fact that the script has a diacritic subscript dot<sup>16</sup> which, in accordance with the allophony of the Oriya language, is (almost<sup>17</sup>) always used to turn intervocalic *-d(b)-* into *-ṛ(h)-* (see ZEHNDER 1999, p. 21). Especially this last point is important: while e.g. at 19.1.10a the Kashmir ms. indeed writes *īle agnim* (and thus seems to preserve a possibly old Vedic allophony, if we follow WITZEL 1989, p. 167 and MASICA 1991, p. 146 – but see n. 18 below), the Orissa mss. read *īṛe agnim* (not *īde* or *īle!*), thus introducing the allophony of the Oriya language (intervocalic voiced retroflex stop becomes flap) into the orthography for Vedic. This point seems not to have been understood by ZEHNDER, and was certainly misrepresented by WITZEL 1989, p. 165, who wrongly equates the orthographies of Oriya and Marathi (which has no *-ṛ-*, and would write *agnim īle*). The correct transcriptions for the 4 signs nicely reproduced by ZEHNDER 1999, p. 21 are: Śāradā (1) *la*<sup>18</sup> – Oriya

<sup>14</sup> For the pertinent points of Oriya phonology in the following discussion, cf. MASICA 1991 §5.3.3, p. 97f. It seems to me that Oriya ought to be added to those languages (Marathi, Gujarati, Eastern Hindi etc.), listed by MASICA, p. 97, where the retroflex flap [ṛ] “remains subphonemic”.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. RAU 1983, who also provides references to older literature.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. MASICA, p. 146f.: “The favorite diacritic of the “Northern” scripts is the *subscript dot* (...) It is used for the near-allophonic intervocalic flaps [ṛ, ṛb] corresponding to /d, db/ in Hindi, Bengali, and Oriya ...; in Marathi and Gujarati it is ignored; ...”.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. MASICA, p. 147 note 4 (p. 470): “There is some inconsistency about writing Oriya R”. Indeed, a very few of the mss. available to me do not, or not consistently, place the subscript dot. By contrast, BHATTACHARYA, p. xx, suggests that his mss. only “rarely” place the dot.

<sup>18</sup> BHATTACHARYA, p. xxi, suggests that it is possible that “ṛa is intended by the [Śāradā] letter” in question, which has been reproduced also by GRIERSON 1916, p. 686; it is transcribed there, as here, *-la-*, and is represented by GRIERSON (and BHATTACHARYA) with the (Marathi-)Devanāgarī *-la-*. BHATTACHARYA’s 1993 publication offers a convenient collection of occurrences of the sign in the Kashmir ms., and BHATTACHARYA in this earlier publication too is inclined to infer that it represents the “trilled variety of /d/”, i.e. *-ṛ-* (1993, p. 106). Indeed, it is remarkable that the Śāradā sign is derived, just as Oriya (and Hindi) *-ṛ-*, from *-d-* by means of a simple diacritic (see n. 16). Although MASICA affirms (p. 193) that the retroflex lateral */ɿ/* (phoneme) is absent in Kashmiri *language*, GRIERSON also informs us somewhat equivocally (1911, p. 14f.) that “there is no letter in Kāshmīrī [*language or script?*] possessing the sound of the Hindostānī *r*”. Since the sign was probably used only in writing Vedic texts, to render the sign that Vedic scholars are accustomed to transliterate as *-l-*, I prefer to retain this interpretation rather than *-ṛ-*.

(2) *ra*, (3) *la*, (4) *la*, and it is my point that the distribution of Śāradā (1) (and the equivalent sign in Marathi-Devanāgarī) and Oriya (3) does not match, contrary to what is suggested by WITZEL (and by LOPEZ 2000, p. 135).<sup>19</sup>

Now, since the Oriya writing habit is predictable (as is the ostensible Vedic allophony), we will as a matter of convenience everywhere in our edition's crit. app. transcribe Oriya -*r*- as -*d*-, and on the admittedly dubious strength (cf. n. 18) of the Kashmir ms. we will probably decide to accept -*l*- into our edition of the PS. Our crit. app. will differentiate the Oriya -*d*- (for -*r*-) and -*l*: the latter sign will thus have to be interpreted as an Oriya lateral phoneme in readings quoted from the Orissa mss., but as the "Vedic -*l*" in the edition of the text.

The Orissa mss. (like the RV) write -*ch*-, (almost) never -*ccb*-, where the Kashmir ms. writes -*śch*-. For the time being, I must refrain from expressing an opinion on the relative authenticity and originality in this matter of the Orissa and Kashmir orthographies, and simply refer to WITZEL 1989, pp. 161–163.

Another difference between the Orissa and Kashmir mss. lies in the fact that the Orissa mss. use only visarga (-*h*) before velar and labial voiceless stops in external sandhi, while the Kashmir mss. follows the typically Kashmiri habit of using jihvāmūlīya (-*h*) and upadhmānīya (-*h*). I agree with LOPEZ 2000, p. 132, that we cannot, as yet, be sure which branch of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā transmission has preserved the authentic (and original) way of dealing with this sandhi.

A sign for avagraha (') is frequently – but not reliably – used in the Orissa mss.; never in the Kashmir mss., to my knowledge. On the use of -*ṅ* (plus virāma) for anunāsika in the Orissa mss., see WITZEL 1983. WITZEL there states (without any specific reference) that cases of the same usage are also to be found in the Kashmir mss., but I have not yet been able to confirm this statement: WITZEL's single example (1985a, p. 262) "*lokāṁ akalpayan > lokāṁ akalpayan K, Or (Anunāsika)*" is spurious, as the verse in question (9.5.16 of the Orissa mss.) is altogether absent in the Kashmir mss.

There are additional differences of sandhi-treatment between the Kashmir and Orissa transmissions (see LOPEZ 2000, pp. 130–134), but they need not be detailed in the present discussion of peculiarities confronting the user of the Orissa mss.

Marginal corrections (or additions) are marked most often by the correct akṣara(s) vertically above or below the akṣara(s) which is/are to be corrected/

<sup>19</sup> From MASICA's ambiguous formulation (p. 147: of course not dealing with Vedic orthography), one might also get the impression that Oriya -*l*- is used to represent "Vedic -*l*", as is Marathi -*l*- . This is not the case, at least not in the PS mss.

added, plus an indication of the line where the correction/addition is to be made. Small dots sometimes mark the place where the correction/addition is to be inserted.

In several mss. (i.a. **Ku3**, **Pa** and **V/123**) I have noticed the occurrence of the akṣara *sa* plus a superscribed roughly m-shaped sign to mark the correction of *sa* to *śa* (see e.g. in the opening of **Ku3**, quoted below).<sup>20</sup> I transcribe it as *śa*, e.g. in the opening of **Ku3**, and in the post-colophon of **V/123**, given below.

BHATTACHARYA 1997, p. xxix, has pointed out that the Orissa mss. indicate half-verses (|) and verses (||), and that most of them indicate pāda-ends as well. This indication of the uneven verse-quarters, or pādas, which we do not find in all mss., is done by means of an apostrophe-like raised stroke (which I call ‘pāda-marker’<sup>21</sup>). Whenever the meter is not based on octosyllabic feet, the placement of these markers tends to go astray.

As BHATTACHARYA also reports (p. xxi), “for a two-pāda or six-pāda verse the number of half-verses is given at the end of the verse or some indication is made”. I may state here what I have seen: the markers consist of a numeral (1, 3, or even 4) superscribed over (or sometimes subscribed under) a regular double dāṇḍa (||). The 1 is marked for single ‘hemistich’-verses (2 pādas), the 3 for verses with 3 ‘hemistichs’ (6 pādas), and the 4 for verses with 4 ‘hemistichs’, or 8 pādas.<sup>22</sup>

These numerals are superscribed in exactly the same way as another sign, the akṣara *kā*, which is added to the double dāṇḍa after a verse not written out in full because it repeats one or more words or pādas from the preceding verse.<sup>23</sup> My informants among the Orissa Atharvavedins all explain this syllable as an instruction to the reciter, short-hand for the Oriya word *kāṛhenī*, which would mean ‘repetition’: i.e., the unwritten remainder of the verse is to be recited as written in the preceding one. The word *kāṛhenī* is not attested in Oriya dictionaries, but must be derived from the verb *kāṛhibā* ‘to draw out, extract’.

Different is the situation in which the Orissa mss. use the phrase *ity ekā*<sup>24</sup> (which must be an old part of the tradition because it is used also – and at

<sup>20</sup> An example is to be found in the character-set for **V/123** contributed to the Indoskript project.

<sup>21</sup> On this marker, see WITZEL 1985b, p. 265, and LOPEZ 2000, pp. 128–129.

<sup>22</sup> An example has been included in the character-set for **V/123** contributed to the Indoskript project. Below, this marking is to be found in the colophon between the end of kāṇḍa 17, and the beginning of 18, in **V/122**.

<sup>23</sup> A good example of this sign is to be found in the character-set for **V/125** contributed to the Indoskript project.

exactly the same places – in the Kashmir ms.): this is used after *pratīkas* for verses which are identical in their entirety to a verse which has occurred already earlier in the text (not immediately preceding), and which thus need not be written out in full. LOPEZ 2000, p. 123, reports a case (PS 14.1.2–5) where the mss. write a *pratīka* plus *iti catasrah*, and 4 verses are left unwritten which had already occurred 1.25.1–4. Another example is found PS 15.19.9–12 where the words *yā nadīr iti catasrah* refer back to 7.13.11–14. Although the *pratīka* is identical, there is a difference between these two sets of four verses: the difference is indicated by the addition of *idam uluṅgulukottarāḥ* (cf. BHATTACHARYA, p. 830).

Another common type of abbreviation, i.e. the omission of *identical* beginnings in at least three consecutive verses, remains unmarked in the mss. This is also an old part of the tradition, and examples can be found i.a. at 6.11.8–6.13.3 (*yo 'smān ...* written in full for 6.11.8 and 6.13.3, but – in most mss. – abbreviated to *asmān ...* in the intervening four mantras); at 6.15.5–7 (*ūrjā yā te ...* written in full for 6.15.5 and 6.15.7, but abbreviated to *te ...* in the intervening mantra, where the final words ... *ta ā dade* are also abbreviated to ... *te* in the Kashmir ms. and most Or. mss.); and at 13.1.7 ([*antarhitā*], which case has been misinterpreted by WITZEL 1985a, p. 263 and 1985b, p. 264 with n. 18, and following him by LOPEZ 2000, pp. 124–126 and 219, as a transmissional *error*, namely a “lacuna”<sup>25</sup>: the abbreviation is applied only at 13.1.7, because only 13.1.6–7–8 have an identical beginning *antarhitā me*, sandhi *me → ma* in the abbreviated verse apparently not being judged an infringement upon the rule). This mode of abbreviation, and the rules pertaining to it, were already clearly stated by EDGERTON 1915, p. 377, and nicely exemplified by BARRET 1921b.

BHATTACHARYA further informs us (p. xxi): “The Or. MSS give the total number of verse[s] in the kāṇḍikā (hymn) and its serial number at the end of the kāṇḍikā”. The mss. use the abbreviation *r* (for *rc-*) followed by the number of verses in the hymn, but the verse-count is (occasionally) not filled

<sup>24</sup> On this phrase, of course shorthand for *ity ekā rk*, see already WHITNEY/LANMAN 1905, p. cxix and WITZEL 1985a, p. 262. See also BARRET (1912, pp. 344f. and 1915, p. 43) and EDGERTON (1915, pp. 376f.).

<sup>25</sup> Notwithstanding his misinterpretation, uncritically followed by LOPEZ, of what we find at 13.1.7 as an error, cases such as this may still perhaps be used to support WITZEL’s 1985 hypothesis of a *written* archetype \**G*, underlying both the Kashmir and the Orissa traditions: they are not to be taken as lacunae, but can be seen as conscious abbreviations on the part of the scribe(s) who wrote the PS down (for the first time) in the first millennium CE.

in, in particular mss., especially the more recent ones. In several mss., the verse-count follows the hymn's serial number, instead of preceding it.

As far as I can see, BHATTACHARYA does not mention the *anuvāka*-division<sup>26</sup> in his Introduction, although it is prominently present in his edition, and is clearly marked by both the Kashmir ms. (where we find i.a. the abbreviations *anu*, *anuvā* plus a number), and the Orissa mss. (where the abbreviation is simply *a* plus a number). It is to be noted that BHATTACHARYA's regularized colophons of the type "iti dvitīyakāñde dvādaśo 'nuvākah" (p. 191), or (starting from the 8<sup>th</sup> kāñḍa) more briefly "iti dvitīyo 'nuvākah" (p. 544) are not firmly based in the (Orissa) mss. These almost always simply use the mentioned abbreviation plus a number.<sup>27</sup>

Similarly, by the way, BHATTACHARYA's kāñḍa-colophons (of the type "navamo dvādaśarcakāñḍah samāptab", p. 642) are an invention, being a blend of the colophons found in the Kashmir ms. (which numbers the kāñḍas) and the Orissa mss. which quote only the names of the kāñḍas<sup>28</sup> and give no numerical indications.<sup>29</sup>

To clarify the above, I can quote as example the colophon of ms. Ku1, reproduced in full below. When it writes "... || γ 8 || 40 || a 8 || iti aṣṭarcakāñḍah samāptab ||", it means: "With the 40<sup>th</sup> hymn, consisting of 8 verses, and the 8<sup>th</sup> anuvāka, an end has come to the kāñḍa of 8-verse-hymns [i.e., PS 5]."

I must forego here a discussion of the often very carelessly written colophons presented below, which are of considerable value as sources of information about the Paippalāda tradition in Orissa: I may simply mention the standardized phrases (in Oriya language) of invocation to various gods (śrī ... uddhāra karibe ... adhama ... -(i)ku "Noble [God] ... shall rescue the lowly ..."); the references to Paippalāda village names (some of which are known to us today,<sup>30</sup> while the modern location of others may yet be identified); the family and *gotra* names of mentioned scribes and manuscript owners; the verses used in self-defense by the scribe; the interesting way in which the 18<sup>th</sup> kāñḍa is dealt with, etc.

<sup>26</sup> The textual divisions of the PS, and the ways they are represented in the mss., will be discussed in detail in GRIFFITHS 2003 [2004].

<sup>27</sup> Occasionally, e.g. in the post-colophons of Ek2 and JM2–5, the Or. mss. do write a full anuvāka-colophon, which still however normally contains a name, rather than a numerical indication for the kāñḍa.

<sup>28</sup> The names of the kāñḍas of the PS, part of an old Atharvavedic tradition also reflected in the Śaunaka school, have been listed and discussed by WITZEL 1985a, p. 269.

<sup>29</sup> Very exceptional, to my knowledge, is the indication *kṣudraḥ ṣoḍaśakāñḍah* which we find in the post-colophon to JI1.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. WITZEL/GRIFFITHS 2002.

## The Manuscripts

As in table 2 above, I omit here the mss. **Pa<sub>c</sub>** and **Gu<sub>c</sub>**. The very poor mss. **JM1–5** and **RM** have been described only summarily. Only those mss. from the BHATTACHARYA collection (**Ma3**, **Ma4**) about which any further information is given in BHATTACHARYYA 1964 are mentioned in the list below. The mss. are listed in the (Roman) alphabetical order of their sigla.

In the following descriptions, I transcribe the colophons in a diplomatic manner, i.e. in strict accordance with the orthography and (wrong) spellings as they are found in the mss. In post-colophons, around transitions between kāṇḍas, and at other textual divisions, the Or. mss. use often elaborate floral or geometric decorations, which I have taken as ‘auspicious’ signs and therefore rendered *‘MANĀGALA’* in the descriptions of mss. below.

*	an illegible akṣara
CAPITALS	akṣaras (or parts thereof) whose reading is uncertain
<...>	the enclosed material is damaged or broken off
{...}	the enclosed material has been crossed out by the scribe
(...)	the enclosed material is given in the margin or interlinearly, or by a second hand
.	after a consonant represents explicit virāma

### Ek1

- Provenance: in the possession of Viśvanātha Upādhyāya. Village Ekcaliya, 20 km South of Bhubaneswar.
- Contents: PS kāṇḍas 1–5 complete.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from photos): numbering on right margin of verso. 101 folios (f. 101 numbered 1001). In good condition. The writing is nice and legible, but the scribe was perhaps not a very careful copyist.
- Beginning:  
[f. 1r] om̄ namo gaṇeśāya || || om̄ śan no devīr ...
- Post-colophon:  
[f. 101r] ... ūṛjaṁ duhānā (+ ma) anapasphurantam upāśīya sukṛtām yatra lokah ||  
|| 8 || 40 (sec. m. + a 8) || śrī || [f. 101v] || śrī || aṣṭā ṛcakāṇḍah samāptah || *MĀNGALA* ||  
|| śrī SA rāmacandra{\*}devasya ṛdrāṅke idam pustakam likhitam || śrī || yathā  
dṛṣṭam tathā likhitam lekhako nāsti doṣah || jagannāthaK Ara upādhyāyena idam  
pustakam likhitam || śrī nārāyaṇa raksā kara arakṣitajagannāthaku || bhagna-  
prsthakaṭigrīvatulādṛṣṭir adhomukhah | duḥkhena likhitam grantham putravat  
paripālayet || śrīkṛṣṇa mām pāhi ||
- Date: in the 11<sup>th</sup> (*ydra = rudra*) *añka* (= 9<sup>th</sup> regnal year) of Rāmacandradeva, i.e. probably Rāmacandradeva IV (1810–1857), thus ca. 1818. Earlier, Rāmacandradeva

III reigned between 1726/7 and 1736, so 1734–1735 is a possible (but unlikely) alternative dating, while this ms. can certainly not be so old as to belong to the reign of Rāmacandra I (1578–1607), and Rāmacandra II (1623–1628 according to TRUHART; this ruler is not listed by PATTNAIK) did not rule 9 years.

## Ek2

- Provenance: in the possession of Kāśīnātha Upādhyāya (brother of Viśvanātha Upādhyāya, the owner of Ek1). Village Ekcaliya, 20 km South of Bhubaneswar.
- Contents: PS kāṇḍas 1–5 complete.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from photos): numbering on right margin of verso (*sec. m.* on left margin of recto). In the *pr. m.* numbering, there is no f. 124 (but there is no lacuna). The *pr. m.* and *sec. m.* numbering here start to diverge by one. The recto of the first folio is empty except for a brief line in the top left, which is illegible on my photos. 144 folios. In good condition. The writing is rather sloppy, but it is my preliminary impression that this ms. is slightly more reliable than Ek1.

The same Jayakṛṣṇa Miśra, son of Harihara, residing in Māndhātā who is mentioned in the post-colophon, is also mentioned in V/130 (see the appendix, below), a ms. that may be about 30 years older.

- Beginning:  
[f. 1v] śrī gaṇeśāya namah || avighnam astu || || natvā narahariṁ devam  
sarvavighnapraṇāśanam | pippalādaprasādāc ca likhyāmy ā'tharvaṇah śrutiḥ || ||  
om̃ śān no devīr ...
- Post-colophon:  
[f. 142r] ... ūrjaṁ duhānā anapasphurantam upāśīya sukṛtām yatra lokaḥ || 8  
|| 40 || a 8 || aştarccakānde aştamo 'nuvākah || || ity aştarccakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ  
|| bhimasyāpi raṇe bhaingo muner api matibhramah | yadi śuddham asūddham  
vā mama doṣo na vidyate || bhagnapṛṣṭhakatigrīvasthīradṛṣṭir adhomukhaḥ |  
duḥkhena likhitam grantham putravat paripālayet || śrī || jalād rakṣa tailād rakṣa  
rakṣa tām śleśabandhanāt | āśubhyaḥ parahastebhyo evam vadati pustakam<sup>31</sup>  
|| MAṄGALA || <sup>32</sup>vīra śrī gajapati gauṛeśvara navakoṭikarṇṇāṭakala\*\*\*śvara  
vīraḍhivīravara pratāpa śrī rāmacandra deva mahārājānka a 43 ika tula di 14  
ne PAṇḍitavāsare MāNDHĀ [f. 142v] tāpuraśāsana mahājana upādhyāya  
hariharātmajaḥ jayakṛṣṇamiśreṇa likhitam idam pustakam samāptam || śrī ||  
yathā dṛṣṭam tathā likhitam lekhako nāsti doṣaḥ || ... [extraneous material over 2.5  
folio] ... iti śrī agastisamhitāyām vibhīṣaṇaprokta āpaduddhārahanumānstotra-  
mantram sampūrṇam || śrī ||

<sup>31</sup> Cf. the post-colophon to JM4.

<sup>32</sup> On the following formula, still standard in referring to regnal years of kings of the Khurda *Gajapati* dynasty, see GRIFFITHS 2002, pp. 42f.

- Date: in the 43<sup>rd</sup> *anika* (= 35<sup>th</sup> regnal year) of Rāmacandra Deva IV (1810–1857), thus apparently ca. 1844 (see also under ms. **Ek1**). However, Prof. YANO informs me that “Solar date 14 Tula usually falls on 28 October around this year, but 28 October 1844 is Monday, not Thursday” (and in 1843 it is a Saturday, in 1845 a Tuesday).

## Ji1

- Provenance: in the possession of Ānandacandra Paṇḍā, village Jiuli (= Vīrayadū-nāthapuraśāsana), in the far west corner of Mayurbhanj Dt., 27 km North-east of Keonjhar town (ca. 4 km off the highway).
- Contents: PS kāṇḍas 18.1–56+16 (in that order).
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from photos): kāṇḍa 18.1–56 (ff. 1–31) precedes kāṇḍa 16 (ff. 32–113). The writing is nice and legible, but there are marginalia by a second hand, probably the writer of **Ji3**, which is almost illegibly sloppy. Numbering on the right side of the verso. Text begins on f. 1v (1r is empty); f. 114r is only half-full, while 114v is almost entirely empty, except for some unrelated writing on the left.
- Beginning:  
[f. 1v] śrī siddhavināyakāya namah || avighnam astu || om̄ satyenottabhitā ...
- Colophon after kāṇḍa 18.56, beginning of 16:  
[f. 31v] ... mr̄tyupāśān sahasram prāṇā mayi te ramantām || 56 || a 9 || mahata-kāṇḍasya dvitīyah [!] khaṇḍah samāptah || (sec. m. + sa 4) || śrī śubham astu || 0 || o cit sakhyām sakhyā vavṛhīyān tiraḥ puṣ cid arṇavam jaganvān. || 0 || śrī baṭabhadra uddhāra karibe adhama baṭabhadrarathaku || śrī bhuvaneśvari śaraṇam || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo {YA}muner api mativibhrama Yadi śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || MĀNGALA || (sec. m.: \*\*\*\*rathā\*\* | mantra || 4sa ||) [f. 32r] om̄ namo gaṇapataye || || om̄ antakāya mr̄tyave ...
- Post-colophon:  
[f. 113v] ... || kṣudraḥ ṣodaśakāṇḍah samāpto 'yam || 0 || MĀNGALA (sec. m. + mantrasya 12 kṣih [?]) || 0 (sec. m. + mantra 1 dajjāradururasā aṇasi [?]) || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhramah | yadi śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || 0 || [f. 114r] sana 1229 sāle dhanu di 25 [?] ne pauṣaśukladaśamyām paṇḍitavāsare aśvAnīnakṣatre meṣacandre baṭabhadrarath[e]a śarmane likhitaṁ idam pustakam || lekhako nāsti doṣah || śrībaṭabhadra uddhāra karibe adhamabaṭabhadrarathaku || || śrī bhuvaneśvarī śaraṇam || MĀNGALA || (sec. m.: dvādaśaśatasya Gaṇasi(+ ḥpa)[?]mantraḥ samāptāḥ || [f. 114v] ...)
- Date: addition of 593 to the year 1229 in the Akbar era yields 1822. This dating is nicely confirmed by Prof. YANO’s calculation that the *pauṣaśukladaśamī*, a Thursday, corresponds to CE January 3, 1822 (Thursday), with the *caveat* that his program indicates the Nakṣatra to be Bharāṇī.

## Ji2

- Provenance: see Ji1.
- Contents: the ms. contains PS kāñdas 19, 16, 18, and 17 complete (in that order).
- Photographs: only photographs of ff. 103–124 (PS 16.108–16.155 + 18.1.1–18.2.2) were taken.
- External description (from photos): this manuscript is written by a very nice and legible hand, and is of very recent date. The total nr. of folios is not known. The numbering is on the right margin of the recto.

It is to be noted that this ms. uses an alternative hymn numbering for kāñda 16. Instead of 155, it indicates a total of 89 hymns in its colophon at the end of kāñda 16. Since my photographs do not span the entire ms., I cannot yet follow up this interesting point.

An extra leaf is added at the beginning of this ms., on which it is stated in Oriya:

That great man who has written this Śloka, namely “He should guard like a son this book, written with anguish, with bent back, hips and neck, with the stylus ... [?], with the face down”, is right *akṣara* by *akṣara*. It is 10 years ago (?) that I will (?) have (?) written one manuscript. Since that day I have not written any manuscript at all. And I don’t even have a habit of writing. In this way, year after year passed. I made a start with writing this manuscript, because Śrī Haḍhara Pāṇḍā, who lives in Vīrayadunāthapuraśāsana (or Jiuḍi) said so. Because the manuscript was many years [lit. days] old, the writing has taken a long time. At first I had no confidence that I could bring it to an end. But, by the grace of the victorious Śrī Śrī Śrī Candraśekhara Maheśa of Bodapaṭasā, I have brought it to an end on Friday 7-4-1973 CE, in the month Caitra, at 4 o’ clock. If there is any mistake, please correct it when you come across it. Please don’t mind my mistakes. Thus, the scribe – Śrī Harekr̄ṣṇa Pāṇḍā of Bodapaṭasā, Keonjhar.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>33</sup> *bhagnapṛṣṭhakaṭīgrīvātulāmagram adhomukham | duḥkhena likhitam granthah*  
*[ ] putravat paripālayet | yeum mahāpurṣa ebi ślokati lekhichanti tāhā akṣare akṣare*  
*sata | ājaku daśabarṣa heba khandie pothi lekhibhibi | sebi dina paru mūm ādau pothi*  
*lekhināhim | mora lekhibāra abhyāsa madhya nāhim | epari barṣa pare barṣa gāṛi cālithilā*  
*| Bīrayadunāthapuraśāsana (bā Jiuḍi) mojā nibāśi śrī Haḍhara pāṇḍāṅka kabibāsatbe*  
*ehi pothi li lekhā ārambha koli | anekadinara purunā pothi yogum lekhibāra aneka deri*  
*belā | eha kipari śeṣa karibi mora ādau biśbāsa nāthilā | kintu Bodāpalasā bije śrī śrī śrī*  
*Candraśekhara Maheśāṅka kṛpāru caitramāsa tā 7 | 4 | 1973 masihā śukrabāradina gha 4*  
*nṭā samayare śeṣa koli | yadi kauṇasi bhul thāe paribā bele samśodhana kari paribe | doṣa*  
*dharibe nāhim || iti || lekhakah – śrī Harekr̄ṣṇa Pāṇḍā sā: Bodāpalasā Kendujhara.*

The text of this leaf was transcribed on the spot in November 2000, and is unfortunately not available in photographs. The Oriya has a grammatical oddity (*lekhibhibi*), which makes it unclear whether the scribe intends to say that he has been writing this ms. for 10 years, or that it has been 10 years since he last copied a ms., which latter interpretation seems more likely.

This ms. is a copy prepared by Harekr̄ṣṇa Pandā in the year CE 1973 of a ms. which had been written CE 1846, with repetition of the date of the exemplar's colophon. As it turns out, the exemplar is also available to us: **Ji4** (see below).

- Colophon at the end of kāṇḍa 16, beginning of kāṇḍa 18:  
[f. 124r] lohitam udaram tāni kalpaṁ | brahmacārī salilasya pr̄ṣṭhe tapo tiṣṭhat  
tapyamānah samudre || ४९ || kṣudrakāṇḍah samāptah || pāhi mām daityasūdanah  
|| bhīmasyāpi rāṇe bhañgo muner api matibhramah | yadi śuddham aśuddham vā  
mama doṣo na vidyate || yathā dṛṣṭam tathā likhitam lekhako nāsti doṣah || ||  
vīra śrī gadādharanārāyaṇa bhañjadeva mahārājānka vije śubharājye samasta  
sana 1254 sāla tūlamāsa di 23 ne mārgaśīracaturthyām śukravāre śrī bhagavān  
ratha śarmaṇā lekhithile || <<śrī harekr̄ṣṇa paṇḍā mahārājā śrī nṛsiṁhanārāyaṇa  
bhañjadeva kendujhara bodāpalasā lekhile sna 1370 sāla sna 1973 masihā>> om̄  
śrīśiddha{\*}vināyakāya namah || avighnam astu || ० || om̄ satyenottabhitā bhūmiḥ  
sūryeṇottabhitā dyauḥ | ḥtenādityās tiṣṭhanti divi somo adhi śritah || ...
- Date: the colophon to this ms., which is rather oddly continued from the main body of the text into two small columns on the right margin (indicated by <<...>> in my transcription), contains two dates in the Akbar era, and one which gives again (as in the pre-colophon quoted above) the year 1973 CE.

For the first date, which is copied directly from the exemplar **Ji4**, see below under that ms. The second date, Akbar era 1370, corresponds (with addition of 592 or 593) to CE 1962 or 1963, which does not correspond with the CE date, and may thus be a mis-writing for 1380. (TRUHART's list of Keonjhar kings ends in 1947, and does not contain a Nṛsiṁha Nārāyaṇa Bhañjadeva.)

### Ji3

- Provenance: see **Ji1**.
- Contents: the ms. contains PS kāṇḍas 1–5 complete.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from photos): the writing is very sloppy and often hard to read, and the scribe seems to be the same as the second hand found in **Ji1**. Numbering on the left side of the recto. There are two each of the folios numbered 85, 93, 103, 113 and 117; the last folio is numbered 121, but is thus in fact the 126<sup>th</sup> folio; the folio nr. 107 seems to be miswritten 17.
- Beginning:  
[f. 1r] om̄ lakṣmiṇṛsiṁhāya namah || natvā naraharim devam sarvavighnapraṇā-  
śanam | pippalādaprasādāc ca paṭhītvām ātharvaṇasmṛtiḥ || śrī gaṇeśāya nImah ||  
om̄ śān no devīr ...
- Post-colophon:  
[f. 121r] ... urjaṁ duhānā anapasphurantam upāsīya sukṛtām yatra lokah ||  
8 ḥ || ४० || a ८ || aṣṭarccakāṇḍa mamāptah || bhīmasyāpi rāṇe bhañgo muner  
api mati{\*}bhramah (+ mantra 3 sya ४० Śalisi ||) || ma || *MANĀGALA* || yadi  
śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || [f. 121v] *MANĀGALA* ||

bhagnapṛṣṭhakaṭīgrīvasthiradṛṣṭir adhomukhaḥ || *MAṄGALA* || duḥkhena likhitam grantha putravat parip\*layet || *MAṄGALA* || (+ aṣṭadaśasyantaṁ aṇacālisa mantrasamāpto yam Ṛpa\*) sana 1256 sāla mina 13 dine caitra kṛṣṇa amā vai śaurivāsare e dina me\* la 14 ghaRi pare harasapuragrāmāre (+ yidam pustakam sampūrṇam ||) sampūrṇam || samāśāpto yam grantha || śrīlakṣminṛsiṁha uddhāra karibe adhamā piṇḍika vedabhūṣaṇāku || namo lakṣminṛsiṁhāya names te sthambhaṛpiṇe | a\*te jātarṣpāya śrī

- Date: the year of the Akbar era yields a CE date of (1256 + 592 or 593 =) 1848 or 1849. Prof. YANO informs me that “the date is most likely March 24 (Saturday), AD 1849, which corresponds to Caitra (pūrṇimānta) kṛṣṇa 15 (amāvāsyā) and solar Mīna 13<sup>th</sup>”.

#### Ji4

- Provenance: see Ji1.
- Contents: the ms. contains PS kāṇḍas 19, 16, 18, and 17 complete (in that order).
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from photos): note the order in which the four kāṇḍas are presented. The writing is nice and legible. Numbering on the right side of the verso, f. 41v is blank, and there is no f. 142 (without lacuna): after f. 141, the folios containing kāṇḍa 17 have a *pr. manu* numbering 126–154 which is everywhere crossed out and changed into *sec. manu* 143–171. The verso of the last folio, 171 (= 154) is again blank.

This ms. seems to consist of two parts ('A' and 'B'), written either by different scribes or on different types of palm-leaf, which results in a noticeably different ductus. All of kāṇḍa 19 (ff. 1–41) is written by 'A', and so is all of 16 (42–96). The first part of kāṇḍa 18 (PS 18.1–18.56, ff. 97–125) is written by 'B'), while the second part (18.57–18.82, ff. 126–141) again belongs to 'A'. All of kāṇḍa 17 (ff. 143–171), finally, with its conspicuous *pr. manu* folio numbering is again written by 'B' (126–141, which fits directly after the first part of kāṇḍa 18, also by 'B' [!]). It would appear that parts of two separate mss. have been conflated.

On the left margin of f. 5r, it is written in Oriya: *Rāmacandra Miśraṇka ghay puthi khejā lekhā helā* ‘the manuscript bundle has been copied, from Rāmacandra Miśra’s house’.

- Beginning:  
[f. 1r] śrī bhuvaneśvari śaraṇam || śrī gaṇeśāya namaḥ || om̄ doṣo gāya bṛhad gāya ...
- Colophon after kāṇḍa 19, beginning of 16:  
[f. 40r] ... viśvebhīr devair anu samādadeśām || 56 || ḥ || || iti tryṛcakāṇḍe caturdaśo 'nuvākaḥ || 0 || tṛycakāṇḍaḥ samāptah || 0 || || śrī || śrī || śrī bhuvaneśvari śaraṇam || śrī || || *MAṄGALA* || || śrī baṭabhadraḥ śaraṇam bhagavāna ratha śarmmaṇā || || imām pustakam banamāli upādhyāyah || 0 || *MAṄGALA* || 0 || śrī || [f. 40v] [f. 41r] om̄ namo gaṇeśāya || || om̄ antakāya mr̄tyave ...

- Colophon after kāṇḍa 16, beginning of 18:

[f. 96v] ... brahmacārī salilasya pṛṣṭhe tapo tiṣṭhat tapyamānah samudre || ९ ||  
 155 || a 22 || kṣudrakāṇḍah samāptah || pāhi mām daityasūdanah || bhīmasyāpi  
 raṇe bhaṇgo muner api matibhrāmaḥ | yadi śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo  
 na vidyate || || yathā dṛṣṭam tathā likhitam | lekhako nāsti doṣah || || vīra śrī  
 gadādharaṇārāyaṇa bhañjadeva mahārājānka vije śubharājye samasta sana 1254  
 sāla tulamāsa di 23 ne mārgaśīracaturthyām śukravāre || \*\* || bhagavāna ratha  
 śarmaṇā likhitam | [f. 97r] śrī śiddhavināyakāya namah || avighnam astu || ० || om̄  
 satyenottabhitā ...

- Colophon after 18.56, before 18.57:

[f. 125v] ... prāṇā ma i te ramantām || १ || 56 || a 9 || iti mahakāndo dvitīyah  
 khaṇḍah samāptā || MĀNGALA || ० || [f. 126r] om̄ namo lakṣmīnṛsiṁhāya || o cit  
 sakhyām sakhyā ...

- Colophon after kāṇḍa 18, beginning of 17<sup>34</sup>:

[f. 140v] ... vidyuto vittam me asya rodasi || 82 || १ 10 || a 12 || mahatkāṇḍah  
 samāptah || MĀNGALA || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṇgo munir api matibhrāma yadi  
 śudham aśudham vā mama doso na vidyate || 1 || bhagnapṛṣṭakatigrīvatulādṛṣṭir  
 adhomukha duḥkhena likṣate gra{stha}ntham putravat paripālayet || 2 || [f. 141r]  
 pustakam harate yas tu kāṇo dukhi bhave narah mṛtā svargam na gachanti pitaro  
 nakam vrajaTi || śrī rāma ścaranam || mahatkāṇḍo 'vašeṣo 'pi ṣaḍvimśatyeti  
 kāṇḍike || ekarccāvasesena vilikṣa puṛṣottamam || 1 || namo lakṣmīnṛsiṁhāya  
 kṣīrodārṇavaśā inam || śvetasim{ma}hāsanār̥do tam namāmi punahpunah ||  
 namas tubhyam namas tubhyam namas tubhyam namo namah || namas tubhyam  
 hṛṣīkeśa govindāya namo namah || 3 || vaśram ājyam kusam gandham puṣPam  
 durvākṣantam tilān | suvarnnanārikelo ca purṇāhutim iti smṛtaḥ || 1 || nāsti  
 tilā nāsti jalā nāsti "Iddha śucikuśam || svadhā na kurvīta svāhākāram niyojayet  
 || 2 || om̄ bhūḥ tat savitvareṇiyam || om̄ bhuvaḥ bhargo devasya dhimahi || om̄  
 svāḥ dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt || om̄ bhūḥ tat savitvareṇiyam bhargo devasya  
 dhimahi || om̄ bhuva dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt || om̄ bhūḥ tat savitvareṇiyam  
 bhuvaḥ bhargo devasya dhimahi | dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt | om̄ svāḥ om̄ āpo  
 jyoti raso 'mṛtam brahma bhū bhuvaḥ svar om̄ paro rajase sāvad om̄ so 'ham  
 ha saḥ || pādayorddhān ca mṛtañ ca saśiraskam ca || MĀNGALA || [f. 141v]  
 na ḥipathtā vedā apsarā sahagāmini ajārajapitṛdoṣi na dāTā devaTājanA || 1 ||  
 japādo sūtakam caiva || japānte mṛtikam tathā || ubhayor \* apyayaḥ śaucam ||  
 katham suddhAVArānane || 1 || brahmabijam anodatā | ādyante parameśvari |  
 saptavāra jaben mantram | sūtakam dvayam uktayo || 3 || agre pṛṣṭhe tathā vāme  
 | samipe garbhām arVVare | japaḥomanamaskāra | na kuryāt kesabāliyam || 1 ||  
 kimartham arddhaca{\*}ndreṇa | kalaśam bhṛgum aṅgirā || catupañcāśadevena  
 | kimarthena ghaṭam tyajet || 1 || māṭṛgarbheti yat pāpaṁ | stanapānam  
 VAGĀhAnam || esārthaṁ uDDHArānārthaya madhupākīm vidhiyate || 1 ||  
 āpo bhṛgum a{\*}ngiro ḥpam iti smṛtinidarśanāt || [f. 143r (!)] śrī gaṇeśāya namah  
 || satyam br̥had ḥtam ...

<sup>34</sup> This colophon is to be compared with the one found at the end of V/121.

- Post-colophon:  
[f. 171(= pr. m. 154)r] ... pakvena saha sam bhavema || 55 || ity akānçacakāñde  
aṣṭamo 'nuvākah || 8 || ity ekānçacakāñd{e}ah samāptah || *MAÑGALA*
- Date: the colophon after kāñda 16 (belonging to scribe 'A') in this ms., which is taken over directly in **Ji2**, gives a precise date, a Friday the 23<sup>rd</sup> day in the solar *tulamāsa* which corresponds to the 4<sup>th</sup> day of Mārgaśīrṣa. According to Prof. YANO, the 23<sup>rd</sup> day of (solar) *Tulamāsa* can by definition not fall in the lunar Mārgaśīrṣamāsa in the Amānta system of month-naming. He concludes that the colophon must be interpreted as 'the 4<sup>th</sup> day of (the *kṛṣṇapakṣa* of) Mārgaśīrṣa (in the Pūrnimānta system)'. Prof. YANO calculates accordingly: CE 1846 (= 1254 + 592), November 6 (Friday), and informs me that the Tula-saṃkrāmaṇa occurred on October 15 in CE 1846, 23 days later being the expected 6<sup>th</sup> of November. All this corresponds perfectly with the reign of Gadādhara Nārāyaṇa Bhañjadeva of Keonjhar, 1825–1861, as listed in TRUHART 1985, p. 1455.

## JM1

- Provenance: in the possession of Dr. Jagabandhu Miśra, teacher in the Vedakarmakāñḍamahāvidyālaya, Puri. The post-colophon to **JM4** mentions Divyasiṁhapura as the village of scribe Jagannātha Upādhyāya, but Jagabandhu Miśra informed me that he had obtained the ms. in Kapileśvarapura (both villages are close to Puri).
- Contents: PS kāñḍas 6–15 complete.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from photos): this, like the other **JM** mss., is a very recent and unreliable ms., which has been written by a sloppy hand. The **JM** mss. are only summarily described here.

Oriya numbering is found on the right margin of the verso. Roman numbering has been added before photographing in the left margin of the recto, by the author.

- Beginning:  
[f. 1r] śrīganeśāya namah || om̄ natvā naraharim devam̄ sarvavighnapraṇāśanam̄ |  
pippalādaprasādāc ca likhyāmy ātharvanaśrutim̄ || || om̄ tad id āsa ...
- Post-colophon:  
[f. 150r] ... || hariḥ om̄ utsara || śrīḥ || aṣṭādaśarcakāñḍa samāptah || śrī om̄ ||  
bhīmasyāpi rāṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibrahmaḥ | yadi śuddham aśuddham  
vā mama doṣo na vidyate || bhagnapṛṣṭhakatigrivatulādṛṣṭir adhomukham̄  
|| dukhena likhitam̄ grantham̄ putravat pā{pā}ripālayet || X || 0 || vīra śrī  
mukundadeva mahārājāṅka a 38 īka sna 1319 slā kārttikamāsa kṛṣṇapakṣa tṛtīyā  
maṇGA [f. 150v] lavāra dišeṣa e grantha likhita madhusudana upādhyāyasya  
putra jagannātha upādhyāyena{\*} likhitam̄ idam̄ pustakam̄ || 0 || || 0 ||
- Date: according to Prof. YANO's calculation, the *kārttikamāsa kṛṣṇapakṣatṛtīyā* (being a Tuesday) meant here corresponds to CE October 10, 1911 (= 1319

+ 592), which can be correct only in the Pūrnimānta system. The reign of the Mukundadeva in question falls after the periods covered by TRUHART 1985, and PATTANAIK 1979.

## JM2

- Provenance: see JM1.
- Contents: PS kāṇḍa 16.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from photos): see JM1.
- Beginning:  
[f. 1r] śrīgaṇeśāya namaḥ | om̄ namo brahmavedāya || om̄ antakāya mṛtyave ...
- Post-colophon  
[f. 74v] ... || ity anuvāke dvāviśati samāptah | a 22 || 0 || kṣudrakāṇḍa samāptah || 0  
|| pāhi māṁ narakeśarī || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhramah | yadi  
śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || *MANĀGALA* ... || śrī ||

## JM3

- Provenance: see JM1.
- Contents: PS kāṇḍas 17 + 19.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from photos): see JM1.
- Beginning:  
[f. 1r] om̄ namo brahmavedāya || śrī śubham astu || om̄ satyam bṛhad ...
- Post-colophon:  
[f. 71v] ... || ityṛcakāṇḍe caturdaśo 'nuvākah || || ityṛcakāṇḍah samāptah ||  
*MANĀGALA* || śrī || śrīnṛsiṁha uddhara adhamajagannāthañku || || śrī ||

## JM4

- Provenance: see JM1.
- Contents: PS kāṇḍa 18.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from photos): see JM1.
- Beginning:  
[f. 1r] om̄ satyenottābhītā ...

---

<sup>35</sup> Prof. YANO adds a note that according to his computer-program for calculating Indian dates, the third day of this *pakṣa* is *kṣaya* (omitted). Prof. YANO suggests, however, that the *kṣayadina* may fall on another day.

– Between 18.56 and 18.57:

[f. 27r] ... mayi te ramantām || 56 || iti matkānde navamo 'nuvākah || a 9 || mahata-kāñḍadvitīya{kā}khañḍah samāptāḥ ... [f. 27v] om̄ pippalāda uvāca || || om̄ o cit sakhāyam sakhyā ...

– Post-colophon:

[f. 43v] ... vittam me asya rodasī || hariḥ om̄ || ḡ 10 || 82 || 27 || iti mahatkānde trayodaśo 'nuvākah || X || mahatkānda samāpto yam || X || ṣaḍviṁśatikāñḍimaṅgalā iti khyātā || || bhīmasayā'pi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhramāḥ | yadi śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidy{e}ate || 0 || jalād rakṣa tailād rakṣa mām ślathabandhanāt | āśubhyāḥ parahastebhya evam vadati pustakam<sup>36</sup> || || || śrīnṛsiṁha uddhara adhamajagannā{\*}tha {\*} upādhīyāyaṅku || śrīmukundadeva māhārājāṅka a 41 sna 1321 slā tulasaṁkramaṇadivase pustakasamāptam || jagannātha upādhīyāya lekhitaṁ || aśuddham na do\* || [f. 44r] bhagnapṛṣṭhakaṭi-grīvatulādṛṣṭir adhomukhaḥ duḥkhenā likhitam grantham putravat paripālayet || jagannāthopāÑCE svatanurūcikandarpasahaśam sabhāyām vāgīśapratimavaca-notāmarakṣaṇām | sadāTHARVOJJĀtapratiśamitasarvāghani ca yaḥ sudhīr vāṁśāgraṇyo jayati vaTTavānām jayakaram || 1 || śrīdivyasiṁhapurśāsana mahājanamadhusūdadevasya putra jagannātha upādhīyāya likhitam pustakam || śrī śubham astu || śrī śubham astu | śrī śubham astu ||

– Date: in the year 1321 of the Akbar era, being the 41<sup>st</sup> *an̄ka* of Mukundadeva who was also mentioned in the colophon to JM1, where his *an̄ka* 38 corresponded to 1911. The 41<sup>st</sup> *an̄ka* is two years later than the 38<sup>th</sup>, and our ms. thus dates from (1321 + 592 =) 1913. The *tulasāṁkramaṇa*-day fell on October 17 in that year.

## JM5

- Provenance: see JM1.
- Contents: PS kāñḍa 20.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from photos): see JM1.
- Beginning:
 

[f. 1r] śrīganeśāya namah || śrīnṛsiṁhaśaraṇam || om̄ namo brahmavedāya || om̄ dhītī vā ye ...
- Post-colophon
 

[f. 33v] .... || ity ekarcacakāñḍe daśamo a{\*}nuvākah || || ity ekarcacakāñḍa samāptah || MĀNGALA || lekhakasya nāsti doṣah || || || śrī ||

## Ku1<sup>37</sup>

- Provenance: in the possession of Harihara Upādhīyā, village Kurumcaini, Dt. Cuttack, Orissa.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. the post-colophon to Ek2.

<sup>37</sup> A character-set for this scribe's hand has been contributed to the Indoskript project.

- Contents: PS kāṇḍas 1–5 complete.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from original): not the same scribe as **Ku2** and **Ku3**, which are mss. from the same collection. 112 folios, numbered 1–110, once more 110, and 120. The numbering is on the right margin of the recto. The numbering of the concluding two folios is erroneous (there is no apparent reason why they should not have been numbered 111 and 112 consecutively). There are some damaged folios, but nowhere is the damage serious; in almost each case the damaged akṣaras can at least be read in part. The recto side of f. 1 contains extraneous material (un-inked).

The writing is generally nice (with occasional lapses for a few lines, almost giving the impression that a different hand has temporarily taken over), although the scribe does not seem to have been a very faithful copyist.

- Beginning:  
[f. 1r] om̄ namo gaṇeśāya || om̄ śan no devīr ...
- Post-colophon:  
[f. 110bis(=111)v] ... || ḡ 8 || 40 || a 8 || iti aṣṭarcakāṇḍah samāptah ||  
[f. 120(=112)r] MANGALA || śrī vira śrī mukundadevasya vasavadvādaśāṅke  
idam pustakam̄ likhitam̄ || || yathā dṛṣṭam̄ tathā likhitam̄ lekhako nāsti doṣah  
|| || parāśaragotraśrīmāna bāLU{\*}ṅkakara upādhyāyena idam pustakam̄  
likhitam̄ || 0 || śrīmām̄ nārāyaṇa rakṣā kara araksita {ka} bāluṅkakaraku || ||  
śrī lakṣmīnṛsingha rakṣā karibe || ugrapṛṣṭhakaṭigrīvatulādṛṣṭir adhomukhaḥ ||  
duḥkhena likhitam̄ grantham̄ putravat paripālayet || || pustakam̄ harateTPAs tu  
kāṇo duḥkhi bhaven nara | mr̄tā svargam̄ na gachanti pitaram̄ narakam̄ vrajet ||  
śrī lakṣmīnṛsingha mām̄ pāhi || ||
- Date: since the indication *vasava* ('8') is problematic in combination with *dvādaśāṅke*, we may have to take it as standing for *vāsava*. In a letter d.d. 15-10-1999, Prof. PINGREE suggests to me that this might refer to the Nakṣatra Dhaniṣṭhā, but this does not lead us much further either. If we ignore *vasava*, the likely chronological parameters are the years 1791–1810, the reign of Mukundadeva II. The 12<sup>th</sup> *aṅka*, i.e. the 10<sup>th</sup> regnal year, in that period would thus point to ca. 1800, which seems quite possible taking into account the appearance and hand of the manuscript.

## Ku2

- Provenance: see **Ku1**.
- Contents: PS kāṇḍas 6–15, with a lacuna stretching 9.17.7–10.11.1, because of missing folios.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from original): numbering on right margin of verso. 80 folios (ff. 36–45 are lacking), 2½ of which (at the beginning and end) contain extraneous material in mixed Sanskrit/Oriya; there is slight damage to a number of folios, some of which due to worm-eating. Written by the same good hand as **Ku3**.

The lacuna spans the following stretch of text: [f. 35v] ... (9.17.7a) vācā brāhmaṇam ḥchatī ' jāmi hamty acityā | mitrāya <[f. 36r] satye druhiyati yam devā ghnanti pūruṣam ... yo naḥ> [f. 46r] (10.11.1a) sv[o] jo araṇo ' bhrāṭṛvyāś ca jīghāṁsatī | ...

- Beginning:  
[f. 1v] śrīlakṣmīṅśimhaśaraṇam || avighnam astu || || om̄ tad id āsa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham yato yajña (+ ugra 1)s tveṣunṛṁṇah | ...
- Post-colophon:  
[f. 78r] ... | atyantah sarpo vaidyuto śanīm yāvayād itaḥ || १३ || २३ || a ६ || (sec. m. 23) || aṣṭādaśarcacakāṇḍah samāptah || *MAṄGALA* hari him om̄ śrī || *MAṄGALA* || [hence sec. m.] śrī lakṣmīṅśimha uddhara adhamavipravināyakaku || ० || śrī lakṣmīṅśimhaḥ śaraṇam | ० || śrī gopīnāthah śaraṇam ... [2 folios of unrelated material follow]

### Ku3

- Provenance: see **Ku1**
- Contents: PS kānda 16,<sup>38</sup> incomplete. Several folios are missing at the end.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from original): written by the same good hand as **Ku2**. Numbering on right margin of verso-sides. There is one unrelated cover leaf (numbered “2”) in front, with various writings on it (largely un-inked). There are several damaged folios. Missing are ff. 81–87 (except for one small fragment, whose folio nr. is lost, with parts of 16.139–142): 16.132.9a (vaiśvānara <[f. 81r] sya...> up to 16.145.9a (... tasyādaha> [f. 88r] ne). After this lacuna follow two partly damaged leaves, f. 88–89, with 16.145.9a ([f. 88r] ne <20 missing akṣaras> nṛtyantī ...) to 16.150.2a ([f. 89v] ... ity ekā || brahma bhrāja <[f. 90r] jad>), another missing folio (90), and then a last and well-preserved folio (91) containing 16.151.1b ([f. 91r] jāḥ | śikṣanty asmā abhiṣunvanta ...) to 16.152.3a ([f. 91v] ... maṇis triṣṭutro nihitah svarvad ū<[f. 92r] rddhvā ...>). The last 3 (?) folios are entirely lost.

There are thus 84 folios of PS text (some of which severely damaged), out of an estimated original total of 94 (i.e. 10 entirely missing folios).

- Beginning:  
[f. 1r] om̄ namo gaṇeśāya namaḥ || om̄ natvā naraharim devam sarvavighnapra-nāśanam<sup>39</sup> | pippalādaprasādāc ca likhyāmy ātharvanah śrutiḥ || || om̄ antakāya mr̄tyave nama ihāyam astu purṣah sahāsunā | ...
- Post-colophon: not available because the final folios are missing. A possibly once present dating for this ms. is thus also not available.

<sup>38</sup> References to numbering in the description of this ms. are to the numbering of BARRET's (1936) 'edited text' of the Kashmir ms.

<sup>39</sup> For the -ś-, see my section on the peculiarities of the Orissa manuscripts.

**Ma3<sup>40</sup>**

- Provenance: according to DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYYA, the ms. was found in Mahantipura, which is probably a mistaken reference to the village Mahāntipaṛā close to Balasore in North Orissa. The colophon states that the ms. was written by Jagannātha Upādhyāya from Vīrapuruṣottamapura. According to information given to me 17-11-2000 in the village Āldā (also near Balasore), BHATTACHARYYA got his Mahāntipaṛā mss. from a Yadunātha Pandā. The ms. is in the possession of D. BHATTACHARYA.
- Contents: PS kāṇḍa 16.
- Post-colophon:  
... || vīra śrī mukundadeva mahārājāṅkara viśe<sup>41</sup> śubharājye samasta a 10 ḡnka  
vaiśākhaśukladvitīyā budhavāre vīrapuruṣottamapuraśāsanara mahājana  
jagannātha upādhyāyena likhitam idam pustakam |
- Date: According to K. N. MAHAPATRA, cited by BHATTACHARYYA, the ms. dates from 1666. ZEHNDER 1999, p. 20, quotes as authoritative an alternative dating proposed by Prof. CLAUS VOGEL, viz. 15 April 1676. In his letter to ZEHNDER (d.d. 14 June 1993), VOGEL writes:

Der Mahārājā Mukundadeva I von Khurdā regierte nach P. Truhart (...) 1985, S. 1452, von 1662/3 bis 1689, während andere Autoritäten z. T. abweichende Daten ansetzen.<sup>42</sup> Sein zehntes Regierungsjahr müsste also um 1672 gewesen sein. Berechnet man obiges Datum für dieses Jahr, so gelangt man jedoch zu einem untauglichen Ergebnis, da der fragliche Tag ein Freitag und nicht – wie erforderlich – ein Mittwoch war. Ein brauchbares Ergebnis bekommt man dagegen für das Jahr 1676, nämlich Mittwoch, den 5. bzw. 15. April (alten resp. neuen Stils). Ich bin mir sicher, dass dies das wirkliche Datum der Handschrift ist. Für das von K. Mahapatra angenommne Jahr 1666 ergibt sich übrigens als Wochentag ein Donnerstag, weshalb es als Möglichkeit ausscheidet.

Besides the fact that VOGEL is unaware of the correct interpretation of *an̍ka* 10 as the 8<sup>th</sup> regnal year (not: the “zehntes Regierungsjahr”), I also cannot follow him in looking for a fitting lunar date, while neglecting the given *an̍ka* indication (although BHATTACHARYYA may have misread the numbers, which are often hard

<sup>40</sup> I repeat here the data as given by BHATTACHARYYA 1964, p. xviii, with some corrections taken over from BHATTACHARYA 1997, p. xvi, plus some extra information collected by myself.

<sup>41</sup> This may be a misreading or missprint for the word *vīje* (< *vijaya*) which is a standard element of the dating formula found in Orissa mss., as is clear from numerous other post-colophons reproduced here. But note that our **Pa** (a ms. closely related to BHATTACHARYA’s **Ma** mss.) also seems to write *viśe*.

<sup>42</sup> For example, PATTANAIK 1979, p. 37, quotes the years 1659–1688. More precisely than VOGEL’s reference, TRUHART lists that Mukundadeva ascended the throne already in 1659, only to be deposed in 1661, and to be reinstated in 1662/1663.

to decipher in post-colophons). Since K.N. MAHAPATRA's suggestion must be wrong, and since (according to Prof. YANO's calculation) none of the years 1667 (= 1659 + 8), or 1670/1 (= 1662/3 + 8) yield a fitting date, I must conclude that the exact dating of this ms. is not yet certain. In any case it is clear that BHATTACHARYYA's reading of the *aṅka*-number has to be re-checked.

#### Ma4

- Provenance: according to BHATTACHARYYA, the ms. was found in Mahantipura, which is – as mentioned under Ma3 – a mistaken reference to the village Mahāntipaṛā close to Balasore in North Orissa. The ms. is in the possession of D. BHATTACHARYA.
- Contents: PS kāṇḍas 17 and 18, the latter kāṇḍa only up to 18.56.
- Post-colophon:  
... || śrīmadbalabhadramahārājā a 9 ḡṅka vicchā di 29 na ravivāra |
- Date: According to K.N. MAHAPATRA, cited again by BHATTACHARYYA, the ms. dates from 1656. In the same letter as quoted under Ma3, VOGEL writes:

Hinter *vicchā* steckt offensichtlich *bichā*, die Bengali- und Oriya-Form für Skr. *vṛścika* "Skorpion"; gemeint ist der 29. Tag nach der *vṛścika-saṃkrānti*, d.h. nach dem Eintritt der Sonne in das Tierkreiszeichen Skorpion, der den Anfang des Sonnenmonats Mārgaśīrṣa bildet. Der Mahārājā Balabhadradeva von Khurdā regierte nach Truhart a.a.O. von 1649 bis 1659;<sup>43</sup> sein neuntes Regierungsjahr müsste also auf 1657 fallen, und die Berechnung führt für dieses Jahr sofort zu einem befriedigenden Ergebnis, da die Wochentage übereinstimmen, nämlich Sonntag, 29. November bzw. 9. Dezember (alten resp. neuen Stils). In dem von K. Mahapatra angenommenen Jahr 1656 fiel der 29. Mārgaśīrṣa dagegen auf einen Samstag, weshalb es nicht im Frage kommt."

Again, I must point out that the 9<sup>th</sup> *aṅka* does not mean the "neuntes Regierungsjahr", but rather the seventh regnal year, as K.N. MAHAPATRA must also have calculated. Since this year does not fit with the indicated solar date, I must again conclude that a certain dating has not yet been established.

#### Pa

- Provenance: in the possession of Āditya Kumār Praharāj, Baripada (Dt. Ma-yurbhanj). The colophon after kāṇḍa 16 mentions that the scribe hails from Mārakaṇḍapura, which must be the modern Paippalāda village Mākaṇḍa near Balasore (see also under V/71). In January 1999, I was able to photograph one kāṇḍa (6), by kind permission of the owner. The available photos for kāṇḍas 16 and 19–20 were made in 1983 by WITZEL, at the Kāñcikāmakoṭī Maṭha in Puri (where it was then being used), by permission of K.B. Upādhyāya (see n. 8). Mr. Upādhyāya has

---

<sup>43</sup> Note that PATTANAIK, p. 36, gives 1648–1659 as regnal years.

informed me that the ms. had come to Puri from a Vedapāṭhaśālā in Baisinga (Māyurbhanj Dt.), where it had been used by the teacher Dāmodara Paṇḍā, who had in turn collected it from the village Parikuṇḍa (near Balasore), quite close to Mākaṇḍa.

- Contents: PS kāṇḍas 1–20 complete.
- Photographs: kāṇḍas 6, 16, 19 and 20 are available with the author, as are xerox-copies of the poor apographs **Pa<sub>c</sub>** (for kāṇḍas 2–12, 14–15, 17–18), and **Gu<sub>c</sub>** for 13–15 and 19.1–42.
- External description (from photos): as mentioned above (n. 10), this siglum actually represents several separate mss. (my fieldnotes are unclear as to whether there are 4 or 5 or more), which together make up the entire Saṃhitā. They are all written by the same rather nice hand. Since I do not have access to the entire set of mss., my description must for the moment remain superficial. At least in kāṇḍas 6–15, the ms. appears to be closely related to (if not copied from) BHATTACHARYA's **Ma2-b**. Numbering is written on the right margin of recto-sides in the ms. for kāṇḍas 6–15 and 16, while the ms. covering 19–20 writes the numbering on the left margin of the recto.
- Beginning of kāṇḍa 6:  
[f. 1r] om̄ namo lakṣmīngśimhāya || || natvā raghunāthadevam̄ sarvavighnapraṇāśanam | pippalādaprasādāc ca likhyāmy ātharvaṇāśrutīm || om̄ tad id āsa ...
- Beginning of kāṇḍa 16:  
[f. 1r] om̄ namo gaṇeśāya || || om̄ antakāya mr̄tyave ...
- Beginning of kāṇḍa 19:  
[f. 1r] om̄ namo atharvavedāya || || om̄ doṣo gāya bṛhad ...
- Post-colophon at the end of kāṇḍa 16:  
[f. 81v, ln. 4] ... brahmacā{\*}rī salilasya prṣṭhe tapo tiṣṭhat tapyamāna samudre || ḥ || 155 || a 22 || || kṣudrakāṇḍah samāptaḥ || pāhi mām daityasūdanaḥ || || śrī gaṇe uddhara raghunnāthaku || || śrī || || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhrāmaḥ | yadi śuddham̄ vām aśu [f. 82r] ddham̄ vā mama do{sa}ṣo na vidate || || yathā dr̄ṣṭam̄ tathā likhitam̄ lekhako nāsti doṣah || || vīra śrī dīvyasiṅghadeva mahārajāṇikara viśe<sup>44</sup> śubharājye samasta a 18 n̄ka vaiśākhaśukladvitīyā budhavāre mārakaṇḍapuraśāsannara mahājana raghunnātha upāddhyāyena l{e}ikhitaṁ idam̄ pustakam̄ || || śubham̄ astu || śrī | **MAṄGALA** || granthakarTTĀ munīR VYāśo lekhakas tu vināyakah | tathāpi CATĀ VR̄ddhir manuṣyāṇām̄ ca kākathā<sup>45</sup> || || śrī || **MAṄGALA**
- Post-colophon at the end of kāṇḍa 20:  
[f. 104v] ... ā mr̄tyor ā parāvataḥ || 65 || ḥ || a 10 || ekarcakāṇḍe daṣamo 'nuvākah || || ekarcakāṇḍah samāptaḥ || || X || pippalādaśākhāyām̄ mantrasya caturthaḥ pādi(→ da 4)b<sup>46</sup> samāptaḥ || X || X || idam̄ mantram̄ likhitam̄ raghunāthmajah̄ sarmāham̄ || **MAṄGALA**

<sup>44</sup> See n. 41, under **Ma3**.

<sup>45</sup> The same verse is also found in the colophon to OSM ms. **V/94** (see the appendix, below).

<sup>46</sup> On the division of the PS into four *pādas*, see GRIFFITHS 2003 [2004].

- Date: the ms. thus dates from the 18<sup>th</sup> *anika* (= 15<sup>th</sup> regnal year) of either Divyasiṁhadeva I (1689–1715, hence ca. 1704, but the ms. doesn't seem that old), or Divyasiṁhadeva II (1773–1791, hence ca. 1788). Divyasiṁhadeva III (1857–1871) seems impossible as his reign did not last for 15 years. According to the calculation of Prof. YANO, the required *vaiśākhaśukladvitiyā*, a Wednesday, must correspond to 1788, May 7.

## RM

- Provenance: in the possession of Dr. Rāmacandra Miśra, lecturer at Ravenshaw College, Cuttack (residing in Puri). He was not able to give me any information as to where he had obtained this ms. The ms. seems to share many errors with JM, and thus probably hails from the Puri area as well.
- Contents: PS kāṇḍas 6–15 complete.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from photos): this, like the JM mss., is a clearly very recent (although undated) and unreliable ms., which has been written by a sloppy hand. One often has the impression that the JM mss. and RM were copied by the same scribe, so similar is the ductus of both (note also that the beginnings of JM1 and RM are nearly identical).
- Oriya numbering is found on the left margin of the recto on 1–9, and on the right margin of the verso throughout. 102 folios. There is one almost blank (and unnumbered) leaf in front of the ms.
- Beginning:  
[f. 1r] śrī gaṇeśāya namah || || natvā naraharim devam sarvavighnapraṇāśanam ||  
pippalādaprasādāc ca likhāmy ātharvaṇaśrutih || || om̄ tad id āsa ...
- Post-colophon:  
[f. 101v] ... śani yāvayād itaḥ || || ṛ || || 23 || [f. 102r] aṣṭādaśārcacakāṇḍah samāptah  
|| || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaingo muner api matibhramah | yadi śuddham aśuddham  
vā mama doṣo na vidyate | *MANGLA*

## V/71

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 2, “atharvavedah (ekançca kāṇḍa, mahat kāṇḍa)”.
- A rather badly preserved but seemingly quite old ms. for PS kāṇḍas 20, 17, 19, 18 (in that order). 120 folios. The right margin with numbering (on the recto) is broken off in the first part of this ms. The numbering becomes visible only from f. 55 (PS 19.11). The preceding folios have been put in order by me. Photos were taken of kāṇḍas 17, 19, 18 (but not of 20, ff. 1–23 [?], where the leaves are too damaged). The photos are unfortunately illegible at most places. The hand shows some similarity to that of V/153.

There are no colophons giving any additional information. The division of kāṇḍa 18 in two parts, the colophons between 18.56–18.57, and the reference to

*sadvimśatikāñdimāngalāḥ* at the end of 18 are identical with what is found in JM4. On an otherwise empty leaf accompanying the ms. is written *Dāmodara Upādhyāya potbir lekhā helā* ‘The writing has been done from a manuscript [belonging to] Dāmodara Upādhyāya’.

OSM hand-written cat.<sup>47</sup>: “Purchased from Banamali Upadhyay, Vill. Ma-kanda,<sup>48</sup> PO Alada, Dt. Balasore, 30-3-63”. The ms. thus hails from Northern Orissa.

## V/121

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 3, “atharvavedah (kṣudra kāṇḍa)”.
- Contains, by the same scribe as V/122, V/123 and V/126,<sup>49</sup> the complete text of the second part of book 18 of PS (i.e. PS 18.57ff.). The numbering (on the right margin of the recto) starts at f. 59 (running up to 75), and the leaves are of different size than those of V/122, so this ms. does not belong together with V/122 (which gives only the first part of PS 18). Note that there is no invocation, or even an *om̄* at the beginning of the text.

OSM hand-written cat.: “Purchased from K.C. Kar, Vill. Talanga,<sup>50</sup> PO Bandhagan, Dt. Balasore”. This cat. nr. presently also contains another much smaller, seemingly complete (although the numbering starts only on f. “11”) ms. by a different scribe, apparently a sort of anthology of PS verses, some from each kāṇḍa. This second ms. requires further study.

- Beginning:  
[f. 1r] o cit sakhyām sakhyā ...
- Post-colophon<sup>51</sup>:  
[f. 73r] ... mahatkāṇḍah samāptah || *MAṄGALA* || [f. 73v] om̄ namo lakṣmīnṛsiṁ-hāya kṣirā\*ŚAyanam prabho || TVATGAdāmujayugme ca trāhi nārāyaṇe prabho || 1 || sāṇḍilyagotravikhyāto pippalādasya sākhayā | maṅgalākāṇḍamahatkāṇḍa vilikhya nārāyaṇa śarmaṇa || 3 || vedavratavidhim cādau ekānarccasya kāṇḍakam | mahatkāṇḍaviśeṣena eta likhyāmi pustakam | kimartham arddhacandreṇa kalaśam bhṛgvaṅgirā | saptapañcāśadevena kimarthena ghaṭam tyajet (+ brahmavede dhikāmriṣyā bhṛgvaṅgiraM udāghṛtau | jasya pañktau gaTE dure tRisŪTAbhavedim mukhān | 1) || 2 || nāsti tilā nāsti jalā nāsti \*NTI śucikuśam

<sup>47</sup> This large hand-written register was kindly made available to me by the curator of mss. in the Orissa State Museum. It contains information in addition to what is provided in MISHRA 1973.

<sup>48</sup> This must be the village Mārakāṇḍa referred to in colophons to Pa and V/123 (see also the OSM hand-written cat. on V/74 in the appendix).

<sup>49</sup> The description of this scribe’s hand for the Indoskrift project is based on V/123.

<sup>50</sup> This village is mentioned in the colophon to V/123. According to KASHIKAR 2002, the village is near the town Bhadrak.

<sup>51</sup> The extensive colophon (ff. 73v–75r), of which only the beginning is transcribed here, is to be compared with the one found after kāṇḍa 18 in JI4.

|| svadhākāraṁ na kurvīta svāhākāraṁ nīyojayet || 1 || na ṛṣipāṭhitā vedā apsarā sahagāminī || ajārajapitṛdoṣi na dātā devatājaSA || 1 || ...

- Date: The provenance of this ms. can fortunately be ascertained from the colophons of V/122 and V/123, written by the same hand. The datings which those colophons provide are not quoted here, because they appear to be problematic.

## V/122

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 4, “atharvavedaḥ (paippalāda sākhā)”.  
- Contains, in this order, on 131 folios PS kāṇḍas 19, 20, 17, and part of 18, breaking off after f. 131 with the beginning of 18.56, i.e. right before the end of that kāṇḍa’s first part; otherwise, the ms. is complete and in good shape; by same scribe as V/121, V/123 and V/126.<sup>52</sup> Numbering on right margin of recto. There are two folios numbered 18 (18bis adds *dutiya*, and its second side is nearly blank); 93v is blank; there are 4 folios numbered 100 (with added *dutiya*, *trtiya*, *caturtha* respectively), but no 101; 100caturthav is blank, as is 104v.

OSM hand-written cat.: “Incomplete, no colophon”; rest same as V/121.

- Beginning:  
[f. 1r] om̄ namo lakṣmīnṛsiṁhāya namah || || om̄ doṣo gāya bṛhmaD Gāya ...
- End of kāṇḍa 19, beginning of 20:  
[f. 46v] ... anu samḍadetām || 56 || ḥ || ṭṛcakāṇḍaḥ samā [f. 47r] ptah || MAṄGALA || om̄ dhītī vā ye ...
- End of kāṇḍa 20, beginning of 17:  
[f. 80v] ... ā mṛtyor ā parāvataḥ || 65 || ḥ 10 || a 10 || ekarcakāṇḍaḥ samāptah || śrī || pippalādaśākhāyām mantrasya caturthaḥ pādāḥ samāptah || MAṄGALA [f. 81r] || śrī gaṇesāya namah || || om̄ satyam bṛhad ...
- End of kāṇḍa 17, beginning of 18:  
[f. 104r] ... pakvena saha sam bhavema 3| 55 || ḥ 10 || ity ekāṇḍcakāṇḍe aṣṭamo ‘nuvākah || 8 || ity ekāṇḍcakāṇḍaḥ samāptah || pippalādaśākhāyām ekāṇḍcakāṇḍaḥ samāpto yam || || idam postaka likhitam vipranārāyaṇa upādhyā kuṇḍiya sāsana arasosaRĀhāra || virakiśoravyo a 12 īka sna 112 samBata 67 sālā vṛṣamāsā DI 12 ne saptam | [f. 105r] om̄ satyenottabhitā ...
- End:  
[f. 131v] ... || 55 || saptabhiḥ parāñ. tapasy ekayārvāñ. aśastim eṣi sudine bādhamaṇah || tam ṭṛtam tvam <[f. 132r] ... >
- Date: the 12<sup>th</sup> *ānika*, i.e. the 10<sup>th</sup> regnal year of Vīrakiśoradeva. The only Vīrakiśoradeva reigned 1739–1751 (according to TRUHART), when he was deposed by the Marathas, but PATTANAIK, p. 50, gives as regnal years 1739–1793. His 10<sup>th</sup> regnal years thus points to ca. 1748. Compare the dating given in the colophon to V/123, where an identical year in the *sna* era is given, and the num-

<sup>52</sup> The description of this scribe’s hand for the Indoskript project is based on V/123.

bers of the year in the *sāla* era are reversed: 67 ↔ 76. It is unclear which eras are meant here. See further under V/123.

### V/123<sup>53</sup>

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 5, “atharvavedah (aṣṭarcā kāṇḍa)”.
- Contains, by the same scribe as V/121, V/122 and V/126, the complete text of PS 1–5, in well-preserved state. Numbering on right margin of recto. 100 folios. There is an unnumbered folio with writing on the verso before f. 1, but the writing is unfortunately not legible on my photos.  
OSM hand-written cat.: “complete”; rest same as preceding.
- Beginning:  
[f. 1] om̄ lakṣmīṅśimhāya namah || || śrī durge śaraṇam || || om̄ śan no devīr abhiṣṭaya ...
- Post-colophon:  
[f. 100r] ... suktām yatra lokah || 40 || ṛ 8 || 0 || aṣṭarcakāṇḍah samāptah || 0 || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibrahmaḥ | yadi śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || 1 || pustakam harate yas tu kāṇo duḥkhī bhaven narah | mṛtāḥ svargam na gacchanti pitaram narakaṁ nayet || 1 || śrī virakiśoradvyo a 11 īka \* sna 112 {\*} sā 76 la makaramāsa di 24 vimśadivase likhitam vipranārāṇa devaśarmaṇah (+ mantrasya 4) prathamapāda samāptah || MAṄGALA || śrī dūrge śaraṇam || [f. 100v] śrī virakiśorarājñasya ḡdram aṅkasya ucyate | mṛgarāsisthite sūrye naṣṭhe candragate tithi | arkaye candraṁ bhūkte vāsare sūryasunave praharantu samārabhyā pīṭrakale samāptivam | sāṇḍilyagotro samyāto sākhāyām paipalādaka caturasrakāṇḍāni vilikṣa {\*} śrīnārāyaṇa devaśarmaṇa | jātam brahmakuleNDutulya savitāśuddham budham vidviṣo gotram śuddhaparāśare pi mahatā grāmyā talāṅga<sup>54</sup> sthitā | nāmno yam mārakaṇḍah mama paṭhanakṛtā brahmavede ca mantram | mām vandye rakṣa rakṣa tava padakamale pārthanīyam nṛśimhām | kṣirasāramadhyastham svarṇṇasimhāsanopari namo {\*} lakṣmīṅśimhāya trāhi mām sarvadā kur || sāṇḍilyagotre cotpanam śrīnārāyaṇaśarmaṇam kurṇiyā sāsanam sthitvā likṣitam pustakam idam || MAṄGALA || śrī hariḥ ||
- Date: the 11<sup>th</sup> īka, i.e. the 9<sup>th</sup> regnal year of Vīrakiśoradeva, on whom, see under V/122. His 9<sup>th</sup> regnal years thus points to ca. 1747. Compare the dating given in the colophon to V/122, where an identical year in the *sna* era is given, and the numbers of the year in the *sāla* era are reversed: 76 ↔ 67. It is not clear which eras are meant here. Prof. YANO remarks that “makaramāsa di 24 may be a solar date, but this cannot be compatible with vimśadivase nor with mṛgarāsisthite sūrye”. In view of this uncertainty, and in view of the good state of preservation of the

<sup>53</sup> A character-set for this scribe’s hand (the same as that of V/121, V/122 and V/126) has been contributed to the Indoskript project.

<sup>54</sup> See n. 50 under V/121.

ms., I feel obliged to leave open the possibility that the *an̄ka*-dating is spurious (copied from the exemplar?).

## V/126

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 7, “*atharvavedah* (daśarcca kāṇḍa – aṣṭādaśarcca kāṇḍa)”.  
– Contains, by the same scribe as V/121, V/122 and V/123, the text of PS 6 up to 14.9.4, in fairly well-preserved state. Numbering on right margin of recto. The ms. is incomplete: there are 83 folios, numbered 1–85, two folios (56 and 65) being missing. There is a blank cover-leaf at the back. The two missing folios result in the following lacunae:

(1) [f. 55v] ... (10.9.2c) prajāpateḥ parastaro bṛhaspateḥ keśāḥ || adabdhāṁ ca<[f. 56r] kṣuḥ suśrutau ... [f. 56v] ... (10.11.5c) indraś ca tasyāgniś ca> [f. 57r] mūrddhānam̄ prati vidhyatām̄ ...  
(2) [f. 64v] ... (11.13.5a) darbhena tvam̄ kṛṇu vīryāṇi <[f. 65r] darbhaṁ bibhrad ... [f. 65v] ... (11.16.2a) praskadvarīr vai nā> [f. 66r] maitā āpo yat prśVās tāsām ...

The text ends abruptly after f. 85v, which ends with ... (14.9.4a) prapatan predivān nānu vidyate | e<[f. 86r] vā rātri pra pātaya...>. Leaves from an unrelated ms. with Purānic contents follow.

OSM hand-written cat.: “There are some folia containing Kartika Vrata according to Padmapurāṇa towards the ends of the manuscript. No colophon”. Rest same as preceding.

- Beginning:  
[f. 1r] śrīlakṣmīnṛsiṁhāya nama || || śrīgaṇeśāya namaḥ || || oṁ tad id āsa ...
- Date: a colophon for this ms. is not available, and its dating can unfortunately also not be ascertained from the colophons of V/122 and V/123, written by the same hand, because these appear to be problematic.

## V/153

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 11, “*atharvavedah* (mantrabhāga)”.
- Rather nice, somewhat damaged and seemingly old ms., which begins and ends abruptly, running – with some lacunae in kāṇḍas 2 and 3 – from 2.37.1 (... [f. 35r] ūtibhiḥ || yavaJāvayāsmadveśāṁsi ...) to 5.39.5b ([f. 88v] ... varṇo mitro aryamā ṛdram ma <[f. 89r] rudbhīr ugram huvemendram ...>). The folios are numbered on the right side of the verso, with a strange lapse in the numbering around 48–49–50: 35, 38–50, again (?) 48, 49, 50, 51–53, 55–88.

The hand shows some similarity to that of V/71: the post-colophon is lost, nor does the OSM hand-written cat. give any more useful information (“Incomplete,

no colophon, separated from Dh/903<sup>55</sup>), so a possible common (Northern) provenance for this ms. and V/71 cannot be ascertained at the moment.

### Appendix: Additional MSS. from the OSM

During my stay in Bhubaneswar, October/November 2000, I went through all mss. in the Orissa State Museum for which the column “Name of the manuscripts” in MISHRA 1973 suggested that the manuscript might contain parts of PS. This turned out not to be the case for V/67 and V/135. It was not possible (or useful) to photograph all mss., except for some selected parts on behalf of the Indoskript project. Those mss. which were not (fully) photographed are listed and briefly described here.

#### V/67

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 15, “āṭharvaṇaśrutiḥ”.
- Contains not PS, but the standard set of Atharvaṇic Upaniṣads, on which, see GRIFFITHS 2002, pp. 38f.

#### V/74

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 14, “aṣṭarccakāṇḍah (atharvaveda)”.
- A rather badly preserved and incomplete ms. for PS 1-5. It starts with f. 75 (PS 3.22) up to the end of PS 5 at f. 126.  
OSM hand-written cat.: “Purchased from Banamali Up., vill. Makanda, PO Alada, Dt. Balasore, 4.2.64”.
- Post-Colophon:  
... vārebhyo me tithipūrṇā ḍkṣe sihe\* NDE savitā ape aṣṭāṣṭhī addhe bhṛguvelāyāṁ sampūrṇām likṣita bhagavān ātmaja devānanda śarmaṇa || lakṣminṛsiṁhaśaraṇām mama ||
- Date: the colophon seems to give a date, but it is not decipherable.

#### V/75

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 27, “ekanṄckāṇḍah, kṣudrakāṇḍah (atharvavedokta)”.
- A very badly preserved and seemingly incomplete (*pace* the hand-written cat.) ms., with entirely mixed up folios, for books 16 and 17.  
OSM hand-written cat.: “complete”, rest same as V/74.

---

<sup>55</sup> This ms. Dh/903, which is listed in MISHRA 1973 (ser. nr. 1077) as containing Śrīdhara’s Karmapañjikā (on which, see GRIFFITHS 2002, pp. 39, 46 and GRIFFITHS, 2003 [2004]), was – upon request – claimed to be unavailable.

## V/94

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 16, “ātharvaṇaśrutiḥ (aṣṭārcca kāṇḍa)”.  
– This is a relatively well preserved ms. (albeit with a good number of broken-off leaves), covering PS 1–5, almost complete.

OSM hand-written cat.: “Purchased from Damodar Dash, Bhubaneshwar Dt., Puri, 23.3.65”.

- Post-colophon:

... bhīmasyāpi ... vidyate || bhagnapṛṣṭha ... paripālayet || śrī || pustakam haratē  
VYas tu kāṇo duḥkhi bhaven naraḥ || mṛtāḥ svargam na gachanti pitaram narakam  
naet || || granthakarttā munir vyāso lekhakas tu vināyakah || tathāpi calitā  
buddhir manusyāṇām ca kā kathāḥ || śrī viśvanātha adhamaviprajayakṛṣṇaku ||  
pātu mām hariharātmajah || *MANGLA*

## V/125

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 6, “atharvavedah (aṣṭarcca kāṇḍa)”.  
– This badly preserved, worm-eaten ms., contains books 1–5, and also some extraneous material. It seems to be somewhat old. A character-set for this scribe’s hand has been contributed to the Indoscript project.

OSM hand-written cat.: “Complete, Badly worm eaten”, rest same as V/121.

- Post-colophon:

[f. 93r] ... bhīmasyāpi ... vidyate || 1 || pustakam harate yas tu kāṇo duḥkhī  
bhaven naraḥ | mṛtāḥ svargam na gacchanti pitaram narakam nayet || 1 ||  
gopināthasya devasya navānke kārttike budhau | dvijam gaṅgādharaśarmaṇām  
rakṣa mām sarvadā prabho || śrīḥ || [f. 93v] pātu mām yaśodātmajah ||

- Date: the ninth *aṅka* (= 7<sup>th</sup> regnal year) of Gopināthadeva (1719–1726/7), thus ca. 1725, on a Wednesday in Kārttika.

## V/130

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 8, “atharvavedah (mantra bhāga)”.  
– This is a well-preserved ms., not everywhere entirely inked and not numbered throughout, covering kāṇḍas 1–5. Folios somewhat mixed up, but mostly in right order. A character-set for this scribe’s hand has been contributed to the Indoscript project.

OSM hand-written cat.: “Complete up to aṣṭarcakāṇḍa. Purchased from Narasimha Mishra, Manikarnika Sahi, Puri”.<sup>56</sup> Note that the same Jayakṛṣṇa Miśra, son of Harihara, from the village Māndhātā who is mentioned in the post-colophon, is also mentioned in the ms. **Ek2**.

---

<sup>56</sup> Under V/133, the hand-written cat. gives “At/PO Gadamanitri, Dt. Puri” as address for a man of the same name: Narasimha Mishra.

## – Post-colophon:

[f. #v] ... yathā dṛṣṭam ... doṣah || *MANĀGALA* || śrī lakṣmīnṛsiṁha uddharibe adhamabipra jayakṛṣṇaku || samasta rāmacandradevamahārājāṅkara vijaya śubharājye a 3 ḡika meṣa di 22 neṅka vaisākhaśuklasaptami śanivāre velapaha 3 ra pare nuāgaṛarājya māndhātāpurasāsannara mahājana hariharātmajah [f. #r] jayakṛṣṇa TA miśrenam idam pustakam samāptam || śrī bhīmasayāpi ... vidyate || O || bhagnapṛṣṭha ... paripālayet || pustakam harated yas tu kāṇo duḥkhi bhaven naraḥ || mr̄tāḥ ... nayet || śrīlakṣmīnṛsiṁha rakṣā karibe jayakṛṣṇaku || śrī sarasvatyai namah || pātu mām narasiṁhātmajah || *MANĀGALA* || śrī jagannātha śaraṇam | śrī lakṣmīnṛsiṁha śaraṇam ||

- Date: on a Saturday, the 7<sup>th</sup> day of the bright half of lunar month Vaiśākha, the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of the solar month Meṣa, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> *aṅka* (= 2<sup>nd</sup> regnal year) of a king Rāmacandradeva (see under *Ek1*): of Rāmacandradeva I (1578–1607), Rāmacandradeva II (1623–1628), Rāmacandradeva III (1726/1727–1736), or Rāmacandradeva IV (1810–1857). According to Prof. YANO, the given indication of the lunar and solar date unfortunately yields no match with any of the years ca. 1579, 1624, 1728 or 1811. Since, however, the same Jayakṛṣṇa Miśra is mentioned in the ms. *Ek2* (probably dating to ca. 1844), it seems most likely that Rāmacandradeva IV is meant here, and that this ms. dates to the beginning of the second decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

**V/135**

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 9, “atharvavedah (mantra bhāga)”.
- Contains not PS, but Purāṇic material such as *matsyapurāṇoktagṛhapraveśavidhi* etc.

**V/150**

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 171 , “mantra samgrahaḥ (atharvavedokta)”.
- This rather well preserved, seemingly modern ms., contains (in this order) kāṇḍas 16, 19, 20 (final leaves missing after 20.53.5). Post-colophon seems to be lost.

OSM hand-written cat.: “Purchased from N. Mishra, Manikarnika Sahi”.

**V/151**

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 10, “atharvavedah (mantrabhāga)”.
- This is a jumbled ms., in good state of preservation, seemingly recent, covering most of books 1–5.

OSM hand-written cat.: “Incomplete, no colophon”; rest same as preceding.

## References

- BARRET, LEROY CARR: "The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Book One. Edited, with critical notes." In: JAOS 26 (1905), pp. 197–295. "Book Two." In: JAOS 30 (1910), 187–258. "Book Three." In: JAOS 32 (1912), 343–390. "Book Four." In: JAOS 35 (1915), 42–101. "Book Five." In: JAOS 37 (1917), 257–308. [FRANKLIN EDGERTON: "Book Six." In: JAOS 34 (1915), 374–411.] "Book Seven." In: JAOS 40 (1920), 145–169. "Book Eight." In: JAOS 41 (1921), 264–289. "Book Nine." In: JAOS 42 (1922), 105–146. "Book Ten." In: JAOS 43 (1923), 96–115. "Book Eleven." In: JAOS 44 (1924), 258–269. "Book Twelve." In: JAOS 46 (1926), 34–48. "Book Fourteen." In: JAOS 47 (1927), 238–249. "Book Thirteen." In: JAOS 48 (1928), 36–65. "Book Fifteen." In: JAOS 50 (1930), 43–73. *The Kashmirian Atharva Veda. Books Sixteen and Seventeen.* New Haven 1936 (AOS. 9). "Book Eighteen." In: JAOS 58 (1938), 571–614. *The Kashmirian Atharva Veda. Books Nineteen and Twenty.* New Haven 1940 (AOS. 18).
- : "Note on Paippalāda 6.18." In: JAOS 41 (1921), pp. 318–319.
- BHATTACHARYA, DIPAK: "A Problem in the Transcription of the Kashmir Manuscript of the Atharvaveda Paippalāda." In: Journal of the Oriental Institute Baroda 42 (1993), pp. 101–106.
- : *The Paippalāda-Samhitā of the Atharvaveda. Volume one, consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas.* Calcutta 1997.
- BHATTACHARYYA, DURGAMOHAN: "A Palm-Leaf Manuscript of the Paippalādasamhitā: Announcement of a Rare Find." In: *Our Heritage* 5 (1957), pp. 81–86.
- : *Paippalāda Samhitā of the Atharvaveda. First Kāṇḍa. Edited from original manuscripts with critical notes.* Calcutta 1964.
- : *Paippalāda Samhitā of the Atharvaveda. Volume Two. Edited from original manuscripts with critical notes.* Calcutta 1970.
- BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE: "A proposed photographic reproduction of the Tübingen Manuscript of the Kashmirian Atharva-Veda, the so-called Pāippalāda-Çākhā." In: JAOS 20 (1899), pp. 184–185.
- BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE/FRANKLIN EDGERTON: *Vedic Variants. A Study of the Variant Readings in the Repeated Mantras of the Veda.* Volume II: Phonetics. Philadelphia 1932.
- BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE/RICHARD GARBE: *The Kashmirian Atharva-Veda (School of the Pāippalādas).* Reproduced by Chromatography from the Manuscript in the University Library at Tübingen. Baltimore 1901.
- EDGERTON, FRANKLIN: "The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Book Six. – Edited, with critical notes." JAOS 34 (1915), pp. 374–411.
- FRIEDRICH, ELVIRA: *Einführung in die indischen Schriften. Teil II: Gujarātī, Gurmukhī, Bengālī, Oriā.* Hamburg 2002.
- GRIERSON, GEORGE: *Standard Manual of the Kāshmīrī Language.* Vol. 1: Grammar and Phrase-Book. Oxford 1911.
- : "On the Sarada Alphabet." In: JRAS 1916, pp. 677–708.

- GRIFFITHS, ARLO: "Aspects of the Study of the Paippalāda AtharvaVedic Tradition." In: ABHIJIT GHOSH (ed.): *Ātharvanā (a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition)*. Kolkata 2002, pp. 35–54.
- : "The Textual Divisions of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā." In: WZKS 47 (2003 [2004]).
- GRIFFITHS, ARLO/ALEXANDER M. LUBOTSKY: "Postscript on vedic *jāngabe*." In: JAOS 119 (1999), pp. 480–481.
- HARDENBERG, ROLAND: *Ideologie eines Hindu-Königtums: Struktur und Bedeutung der Rituale des "Königs von Puri" (Orissa/Indien)*. Berlin 2000.
- KASHIKAR, C.G.: "A Tour in Orissa in Search of Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Literature." In: ABHIJIT GHOSH (ed.): *Ātharvanā (a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition)*. Kolkata 2002, pp. 156–166.
- LOPEZ, CARLOS ALFREDO: *The Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda: A Critical Edition, Translation, and Study of Books 13 and 14*. Harvard University 2000 [Ph.D. Thesis].
- MAHAPATRA, K. N.: "Recokoning [sic] of Chāturmāsi, Lunar and Solar Months and Different Eras in Orissa." In: *Orissa Historical Research Journal* 11 (1962), pp. 135–146.
- MASICA, COLIN P.: *The Indo-Aryan languages*. Cambridge 1991.
- MC PHERSON, HUGH: "The Oriya Alphabet." In: *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 10 (1924), pp. 168–170.
- MISHRA, NILAMANI: *An Alphabetical Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Collection of the Orissa State Museum, Bhubaneswar. Part-1*. Bhubaneswar 1973.
- PATTANAIK, P. K.: *A Forgotten Chapter of Orissan History (with special reference to the Rajas of Khurda and Puri), 1568–1828*. Calcutta 1979.
- RAU, WILHELM: "Notiz zum cerebralen / in südindischen Sanskrit-Handschriften." In: MSS 42 (1983), pp. 187–189.
- RENOU, LOUIS/JEAN FILLIOZAT: *L'Inde classique: Manuel des études indiennes*. Paris/Hanoi 1953.
- ROTH, R.: *Der Atharvaveda in Kaschmir*. Tübingen 1875.
- : "Un Manuscrit de l'Atharvaveda." In: *Atti del IV Congresso degli Orientalisti tenuto in Firenze nel Settembre 1878*. Vol. II. Firenze 1880, pp. 89–96.
- SIRCAR, D. C.: *Indian Epigraphy*. Delhi 1965 [reprint: Delhi 1996].
- SUBRAHMANYAM, R.: *Inscriptions of the Sūryavāṇī Gajapatis of Orissa*. Delhi 1986.
- TRUHART, PETER: *The Regents of Nations. Systematic Chronology of States and Their Political Representatives in Past and Present. A Biographical Reference Book*. Part II: *Asia / Australia-Oceania*. München/New York/London/Paris 1985.
- WHITNEY W.D./C.R. LANMAN: *Atharva-Veda-Saṃhitā*. 2 Vols. Cambridge (Mass.) 1905.
- WITZEL, MICHAEL: "On the Reconstruction of the Authentic Paippalāda-Saṃhitā." In: *Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha* 29 (1973), pp. 463–488, 32 (1976), pp. 137–168.
- : "Anunāśika in Medieval Veda Tradition." In: IIJ 25 (1983), p. 180.

- : "Die Atharvaveda-Tradition und die Paippalāda-Saṃhitā." In: ZDMG-Supplement VI (1985), pp. 256–271.
  - : "Die mündliche Tradition der Paippalādins von Orissa." In: MSS 44 (1985), pp. 259–289.
  - : "Tracing the Vedic Dialects." In: COLETTE CAILLAT (ed.): *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes. Actes du Colloque International (Paris 1986)*. Paris 1989, pp. 97–264.
- WITZEL, MICHAEL/ARLO GRIFFITHS: "A List of Paippalāda-AtharvaVedin Settlements." In: ABHIJIT GHOSH (ed.): *Ātharvaṇā (a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition)*. Kolkata 2002, pp. 167–179.
- ZEHNDER, THOMAS: *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Buch 2, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Eine Sammlung altindischer Zaubersprüche vom Beginn des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.* Idstein 1999.
- ZYSK, KENNETH: *Religious Medicine. The History & Evolution of Indian Medicine*. New Brunswick 1993.