The Orissa Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Samhītā

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 kānda of the Paippalāda Samhītā (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.¹

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 Bloomfield² 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

¹ 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.

² 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.
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.4 Up to now, I have been able to collect two or more new manuscript sources for every kānda 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

---

3 These are taken from the mss. 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).

4 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 Anandacandra Paṇḍa (village Jiuḷi, Dt. Mayurbhanj), Aditya Kumār Praharāj (Baripada), Dr. Jagabandhu Mīśra (Puri), Dr. Rāmacandra Mīśra (Puri), Viśvanātha Upādhyāya and Kāśinātha Upādhyāya (village Ekcaliya, Dt. Khordha), and especially Harihara Upādhyāya with his son Candramani Upādhyāya (village Kurumcain, Dt. Cuttack) for giving me access to the manuscripts in their possession.

An Overview of the Manuscripts

The sigla\(^5\) 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 kānda. 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).

---

\(^5\) The system of using the first two letters (or the first *aksara*) 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ja1</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ja2</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ja3</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma1</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma2-a</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma2-b</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma3</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma4</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma5</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mä1</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mä1</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vä</td>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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_e, covering kândas 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, in Griffiths/Lubotsky 1999). Pa_e and Gu, have by now become minimally important, in view of the availability of more reliable mss. from Orissa.

---

6 This ms. has been described (from second generation xeroxes, with reproduction of a facsimile) by Lopez 2000, pp. 105–107.
7 This ms. has been described (from second generation xeroxes, with reproduction of a facsimile) by Lopez 2000, pp. 102–104.
8 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_e's exemplar Pa at the Kañcikāmakōti 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_e 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.
9 The portion of this ms. covering PS 13–15 has been described (with reproduction of a facsimile) by Lopez 2000, pp. 110–111.
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 kāṇḍas for which photographs are in fact available.
The Dating Systems found in the Manuscripts

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 śṛāhi 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, Sukla Dwādaśi 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.

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 16th century, there have, e.g., been several Rāmacandradevas, Mukundadevas, Divyasinghadevas 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 Truhaft 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.

11 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.

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 Diliśvarābdha 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 (śāla), the PS mss. also refer to sna and slā.13 Recent mss. sometimes also use these terms to refer to years in the Christian era, which is otherwise indicated with the term mabīṣā. 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 Pañcaviṃśabṛhmanāṇa) have been produced for the DFG Indoskript project (see 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 in[i]tial ru and r. Non-initial ru and r (kru-kr) too are interchangeable”. This elliptic statement can be clarified in the following terms: the Oriya vowel sign -r- is pronounced /ru/. Hence, the sound /ru/ is mostly written either with the initial r- sign in words like varna- (= varuna-), or with the postconsonantal sign in cakṛ (= cakru). Similarly, /rū/ can be written -ṛ-, as in puṛṇi (= purūṇi), though apparently not often postconsonantally. However, the script does certainly dispose over graphemic means to distinguish -ru/rū- from -ṛṛ-, and certain words seem to have a preferred spelling with the former: e.g. ḍhrvva-, besides ḍhṛva-, s'atṛn not s'atṛn. Our apparatus

13 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 \(-ru\)- are in fact spelt in the Orissa mss.

The script distinguishes the two different lateral phonemes of the Oriya language\(^{14}\) (/\(l\)/ and /\(r\)/: \(-l\)- and \(-l\)-), and the \(-l\)- sign is sometimes – a pattern is not (yet) discernible\(^{15}\) – 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\(^{16}\) which, in accordance with the allophony of the Oriya language, is (almost\(^{17}\)) always used to turn intervocalic \(-d(h)\)- into \(-\(r\)-(h))- (see ZEHNDER 1999, p. 21). Especially this last point is important: while e.g. at 19.1.10a the Kashmir ms. indeed writes \(i\(l\)e agn\(i\)m\) (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 \(i\(r\)e agn\(i\)m\) (not \(i\(d\)e or \(i\(l\)e\)!), 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 \(-r\)-, and would write \(ag\(n\)i\(m\) \(i\(l\)e\)). The correct transcriptions for the 4 signs nicely reproduced by ZEHNDER 1999, p. 21 are: \(\text{S\(\acute{a}r\)\(d\)\(a\)}\) (1) \(\text{\(l\)a}\(^{18}\) – Oriya

---

\(^{14}\) 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 [\(r\)] “remains subphonemic.”

\(^{15}\) Cf. RAU 1983, who also provides references to older literature.

\(^{16}\) Cf. MASICA, p. 146f.: “The favorite diacritic of the “Northern” scripts is the subscript dot (...) . It is used for the near-allophonic intervocalic flaps [\(r\), \(rh\)] corresponding to \(d\), \(dh\) in Hindi, Bengali, and Oriya ...; in Marathi and Gujarati it is ignored; ...”.

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

\(^{18}\) BHATTACHARYA, p. xxi, suggests that it is possible that “\(a\) is intended by the [\(\text{S\(\acute{a}r\)\(d\)\(a\)}\)] letter” in question, which has been reproduced also by GRIERSON 1916, p. 686; it is transcribed there, as here, \(-\(l\)a-\), and is represented by GRIERSON (and BHATTACHARYA) with the (Marathi-)Devanāgarī \(-\(l\)a-\). 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. \(-\(r\)-” (1993, p. 106). Indeed, it is remarkable that the Sārada sign is derived, just as Oriya (and Hindi) \(-\(r\)-, from \(-\(d\)- by means of a simple diacritic (see n. 16). Although MASICA affirms (p. 193) that the retroflex lateral /\(l\)/ (phoneme) is absent in Kashmirī language, GRIERSON also informs us somewhat equivocally (1911, p. 14f.) that “there is no letter in Kāshmirī [\(\text{language or script?}\) 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 \(-\(r\)-.\)
(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).19

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 -ṛ- 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 -ṛ-) 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 -cb-, (almost) never -ccb-, where the Kashmir ms. writes -sch-. 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 (-ḥ) before velar and labial voiceless stops in external sandhi, while the Kashmir ms. follows the typically Kashmiri habit of using jihvāmūliya (-ḥ) and upadhīmāniya (-bḥ). 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 ms., 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 ms., but I have not yet been able to confirm this statement: Witzel's single example (1985a, p. 262) “lokāṇaḥ akalpayan > lokānaḥ akalpayan K, Or (Anunāsika)” is spurious, as the verse in question (9.5.16 of the Orissa mss.) is altogether absent in the Kashmir ms.

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 aṅkṣara(s) vertically above or below the aṅkṣara(s) which is/are to be corrected/

19 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 ms.
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.e. **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).²⁰ 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’²¹). 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 danda (||). 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.²²

These numerals are superscribed in exactly the same way as another sign, the akṣara kā, which is added to the double danda after a verse not written out in full because it repeats one or more words or pādas from the preceding verse.²³ My informants among the Orissa Atharvavedins all explain this syllable as an instruction to the reciter, short-hand for the Oriya word kāṛheni, which would mean ‘repetition’: i.e., the unwritten remainder of the verse is to be recited as written in the preceding one. The word kāṛheni 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*²⁴ (which must be an old part of the tradition because it is used also – and at

---

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

²¹ On this marker, see **Witzel** 1985b, p. 265, and **Lopez** 2000, pp. 128–129.

²² 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 kānda 17, and the beginning of 18, in **V/122**.

²³ An 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 pratikas 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 pratika 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 nadir iti catasrah refer back to 7.13.11–14. Although the pratika is identical, there is a difference between these two sets of four verses: the difference is indicated by the addition of idam uuluŋulukottarāh (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 (urjā 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”: 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 kāndikā (hymn) and its serial number at the end of the kāndikā”. The mss. use the abbreviation r (for r̥c-) followed by the number of verses in the hymn, but the verse-count is (occasionally) not filled

---

24 On this phrase, of course shorthand for ity ekā r̥k, see already Whitney/Lanman 1905, p. cxix and Witzel 1985a, p. 262. See also Barret (1912, pp. 344ff. and 1915, p. 43) and Edgerton (1915, pp. 376f.).

25 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 anuväka-division 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, anuvä 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 dvitiyakände dvádaso ‘nuvákah” (p. 191), or (starting from the 8th kānda) more briefly “iti dvitiyo ‘nuvákah” (p. 544) are not firmly based in the (Orissa) mss. These almost always simply use the mentioned abbreviation plus a number.\footnote{The textual divisions of the PS, and the ways they are represented in the mss., will be discussed in detail in Griffiths 2003 [2004].}

Similarly, by the way, BHATTACHARYA's kānda-colophons (of the type “navaamo dvádasárcakándah samáptah”, p. 642) are an invention, being a blend of the colophons found in the Kashmir ms. (which numbers the kāndas) and the Orissa mss. which quote only the names of the kāndas\footnote{Occasionally, e.g. in the post-colophons of Ek2 and JM2-5, the Or. mss. do write a full anuväka-colophon, which still however normally contains a name, rather than a numerical indication for the kānda.} and give no numerical indications.\footnote{The names of the kāndas of the PS, part of an old Atharvavedic tradition also reflected in the Saunaka school, have been listed and discussed by Witzel 1985a, p. 269.}

To clarify the above, I can quote as example the colophon of ms. Ku1, reproduced in full below. When it writes “... || 8 || 40 || a 8 || iti aśtarccakándah samáptah ||”, it means: “With the 40th hymn, consisting of 8 verses, and the 8th anuväka, an end has come to the kānda 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 Paippaläda tradition in Orissa: I may simply mention the standardized phrases (in Oriya language) of invocation to various gods (śri ... uddhāra karibe ... adhama ... -(n)ku “Noble [God] ... shall rescue the lowly ... ”); the references to Paippaläda village names (some of which are known to us today,\footnote{Very exceptional, to my knowledge, is the indication ksudrah sodasakándah which we find in the post-colophon to Ji1.} 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 18th kānda is dealt with, etc.

\footnote{Cf. Witzel/Griffiths 2002.}
The Manuscripts

As in table 2 above, I omit here the mss. Pa, and Gu. 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 accordence 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 'MANGALA' 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 copyst.

- Beginning:
[f. 1r] om namo ganeśāya || om śan no devīr ...
- Post-colophon:
[f. 101r] ... īrjaṃ duḥānā (+ ma) anapashhurantam upāsiya sukṛtam yatra lokah || r 8 || 40 (sec. m. + a 8) || śrī || [f. 101v] || śrī || aṣṭā rājakāṇḍaḥ samāptah || MANGALA || śrī SA rāmacandra(4°) devasya ādṛante idāṃ pustakāṃ likhitān || śrī || yathā dṛṣṭaṃ tathā likhitāṃ lekhako nāsti doṣaḥ || jagannāthaKara upādhyāyena idāṃ pustakāṃ likhitān || śrī nārāyaṇa rāksā kara arakṣitajagannāthakau || bhagna-prṣṭhakatigavatulādṛṣṭaḥ adhomukhaḥ | duḥkhena likhitāṃ grantham putravat paripālayet || śriṅkaṇa māṁ pāhi ||
- Date: in the 11th (rdra = rudra) anika (= 9th 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 Deva I (1578–1607), and Rāmacandra Deva II (1623–1628 according to TRUHART: this ruler is not listed by PATTANAIK) did not rule 9 years.

Ek2

- Provenance: in the possession of Kāśinātha Upādhyāya (brother of Viśvānātha 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 Jayākṛṣṇa Misra, 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 ganeśāya namaḥ || avighnam astu || natvā naraharim devaṁ sarvavignahpranāsanaṁ | pippalādprasādāi ca likhyāmy aṭharranah śrutiḥ || || oṁ śaṁ no devī ... 
- Post-colophon:
  [f. 142v] ... ūrjan duhānā anapasphurantam upāśīya sukṛtaṁ yatra lokah || Ṛ 8 || 40 || a 8 || aṣṭarccakānde aṣṭamo 'nūvakah || || ity aṣṭarccakāndah samāptaḥ || bhimasyāpi rañe bhangō muner api matibhramaḥ | yadi sūdhām aśūdhām vā mama doṣo na vidyate || bhagnaprsthakaṭigraśvatihiradhṛṣṭi adhomukhah | duhkheṇa likhitam grantham putravat paripālayet || śrī || jalād rakṣa tailād rakṣa rakṣa tām śleṣabandhanāt | aśubhyaḥ paraḥasteśhyo evam vadaṁ pustakaṁ31 || MĀNGALA || 32vīra śrī gajapati guaṛśvara navakoṭikarṇātakala88śvara vīrādhiśivarna pratāpa śrī rāmacandra deva mahārājāṅka a 43 ŋka tula di 14 ne PAndītavāsare MāNDHā [f. 142v] tāpurasāsana mahājana upādhyāya hariharātmajah jayakṛṣṇamiśreṇa likhitam idaṁ pustakaṁ samāptaṃ || śrī || yathā ṛṣṭaṁ tathā likhitam lekhaka nāsti dosah ... || [extraneous material over 2.5 folio] ... iti śrī agastisamhitāyāṁ vibhīṣaṇaprokta āpadduddhārahanumānstrotamantram Sampūrṇam || śrī ||

31 Cf. the post-colophon to JM4.
32 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 43rd ānka (= 35th 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).

Provenance: in the possession of Ānandacandra Paṇḍa, village Jiuli (= Vīrayadunāthapuraśasanā), in the far west corner of Mayurbhanj Dv., 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 || oṁ satyenottabhitā ...

Colophon after kāṇḍa 18.56, beginning of 16:
[f. 31v] ... mrtyupāśān. sahasrām prānā mayi te ramantām || 56 || a 9 || mahatā- kāṇḍasya dvitiyāh ||] kāṇḍah samāptah || (sec. m. + sa 4) || śrī subham astu || 0 || o cit sakhāyam sankhyā vavṛtyān tīrah puṁ cid arnavān jaganvān. || 0 || śrī balabhadrā uddhāra karibe adhama balabhadrarathaku || śrī bhuvaneśvari saraṇam || bhīmasyāpi rañe bhango [YA]muner api mativyibhra Yadi suddham asuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || MANGALA || (sec. m.: ***rathā***) || mantra || 4sa ||) [f. 32r] oṁ namo gaṇapateye || || oṁ antakāya mṛtyave ...

Post-colophon:
[f. 113v] ... || kṣudraḥ ṣoḍaśaṅkāṇḍaḥ samāpto ʻyam || 0 || MANGALA (sec. m. + mantrasya 12 kṣiḥ[?])||0|| (sec. m. + mantra I daḷāraḍurasa aṇasi[?])||bhīmasyāpi rañe bhango muner api matibhramah || yadi suddham asuddhaṁ vā mama doṣo na vidyate || 0 || [f.114r] sana 1229 śāle dhanu dī 25 [?] ne pausāskuladaśamāṁ paṇḍitavāsare aśvAnīṅkāṣṭre meṣacakandre balabhadrarathē[a] sārmaṇe likhitam idam pustakam || lekhāko nāsti doṣah || śrībalabhadra uddhāra karibe adhamabalabhadrarathaku || || śrī bhuvaneśvari saraṇam || MANGALA || (sec. m.: dvādaśaṅkāṣṭra Gaṇasim+ [rpa]/[?]mantraḥ samāptah || [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 pausāskuladaśamī, a Thursday, corresponds to CE January 3, 1822 (Thursday), with the caveat that his program indicates the Nakṣatra to be BhaRaṇī.
Ji2

- Provenance: see Ji1.
- Contents: the ms. contains PS kāṇḍas 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 kāṇḍa 16. Instead of 155, it indicates a total of 89 hymns in its colophon at the end of kāṇḍa 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 Sloka, 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 aksara by aksara. 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 Ḥaladhara Paṇḍā, who lives in Viṣṇavapuraśāsanā (or Jiuli) 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 Candrasekharā Mahēśā of Bodapalasā, 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 Ḥarekṛṣṇa Paṇḍā of Bodapalasā, Keonjhār.33

33 bhagnapṛṣṭhabhatigrivatulāmagram adhomukham | dhūkheṇa likhitam granthab | ([]) putratat paripālayet | yem mahāpūraśa ehi slokati lekhibhantī tābā aksāre aksāre sata | ājaku daśārśa beha khandie pothī lekhithiḥbhi | sehi dina paru mām ādau pothī lekhinābhim | mora lekhibāra abhyāsa madhyā nābim | epaśi barśa pare barśa gari caityābhi | Viṣṇavapuraśāsanā (bā Jiuli) mojā nibhāṇa śrī Ḥaladharaśāparantāka kaḥibāsatbe | ehi pothī jābā abhāmbha koli | anekadina purunā pothī yogum lekhibāra aneka deri belā | eha kipari śesā karibi mora ādau biśāsa nathālā | kintu Bodapalasā bije śrī śrī śrī Candraśēkharā Mahēśānka kipāra caitramāsa tā 7 | 4 1973 maśīhā sukrobāradina ghā 4 niśā samayere śesā koli | yadi kaṁasa bhul thāe paribā bele samśódhana kari paribhe | doṣa dharibē nābim | sti || lekhakhāḥ – śrī Ḥarekṛṣṇa Paṇḍā sa: Bodapalasā Keonjhāra.

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 (lekhibhī), 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 Harekṛṣṇa Paṇḍā 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: Jī4 (see below).

- Colophon at the end of kānda 16, beginning of kānda 18:
  [f. 124r] lohitam udaram tāni kalpam | brahmacārī sañilasya pṛṣṭhe tapo tiṣṭhat tapyamāṇah samudre || r || 89 || kṣudrakāṇḍah samāptah || pahi māṁ daityasūdanaḥ || bhimasyāpi rane bhango muner api matibhramah | yadi sūddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || yathā dṛṣṭam tathā likhitam lekhako nāsti doṣāḥ || || vīra śri gādādharaṇārāyaṇa bhaṇjadeva mahārājaḥ vijে śubharājye samasta sana 1254 sāla tūlamāsā di 23 ne mārgaśīrṣacaturthyāṁ sukraṇāre śri bhagavān ratha śarmanā lekhithile || <<<śri harekṛṣṇa paṇḍā mahārāja śri nṛṣimhanārāyaṇa bhaṇjadeva kendujhara bodāpalāsā lekhiśe sna 1370 sāla sna 1973 masiḥā>> oṁ śrīśiddha[“]vināyakāya namah || avighnam astu || 0 || oṁ satyenottabhitā bhūmih sūryenottabhitā dyauḥ || tenādityās tiṣṭhati divi somo adhi śritaḥ || ...

- 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 Jī4, 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 1389. (Truhart’s list of Keonjhar kings ends in 1947, and does not contain a Nṛṣimha Nārāyaṇa Bhaṇjadeva.)

Jī3

- Provenance: see Jī1.
- 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 Jī1. 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 126th folio; the folio nr. 107 seems to be miswritten 17.

- Beginning:
  [f. 1r] oṁ lakṣminṛṣimhāya namah || natvā naraharim devam sarvavighnapraṇāśanam | pippalādaprāśāc ca paṭḥitvām āṭharvaṇasāṃśīrthī || śri gāṇeśāya nīmaḥ || oṁ śan no devir ...

- Post-colophon:
  [f. 121r] ... urjau duḥhāna anapashphurantam upāśya suktām yatra lokah || 8 r || 40 || a 8 || aṣṭarcaṅkāṇḍa mamāptah || bhimasyāpi rane bhaṅgo muner api mati(“)bhramah (+ mantra 3 sya 40 Śālisi ||) || ma || MANGALA || yadi sūddham aśuddham vā mama doṣa na vidyate || [f. 121v] MANGALA ||
bhagnapṛṣṭhakaṁgrīvavasthiradṛṣṭir adhomukhah || MANGALA || duḥkheṇa likhitam grantha putravat pariṇayet || MANGALA || (+ aṣṭadāsasyantam aṅcāliṣa mantrasamāpto yaṁ Rpa) sana 1256 sāla mīna 13 dine caitra kṛṣṇa amā vai saurīvāsare e dina me || la 14 ghaRi pare harasapuragrāmare (+ yidāṁ pustakam sampūrṇam || sampūrṇam || samāśāpto yaṁ grantha || śrīlakṣminrṣimha uddhāra karibe adhama pīṇḍika vedabhūṣanāniku || namo lakṣminrṣimhāya names te sthambhārpiṇe | aṭe jāṭarpāya 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 (purṇimānta) kṛṣṇa 15 (amāvāśya) and solar Mina 13th”.

Jī4

- Provenance: see Jī1.
- 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 Miśraṅka ghaṛ putṭi khejā lekbā helā ‘the manuscript bundle has been copied, from Rāmacandra Miśra’s house’.

- Beginning:
  [f. 1r] śrī bhuvaneśvari śāraṇam || śrī ganeśāya namah || oṁ doṣo gāya bṛhad gāya ...
- Colophon after kāṇḍa 19, beginning of 16:
  [f. 40r] ... viśvebhir devvar anu saṁdadeṇām || 56 || || iti tryṣṭakāṇḍe caturdaśo ūvākāb || 0 || tryṣṭakāṇḍaṁ saṁpāṭha || 0 || || śrī || śrī bhuvaneśvari śāraṇaṁ || śrī || || MANGALA || || śrī balabhadraḥ śāraṇam bhagavāna ratha śarmanān || || imāṁ pustakaṁ banamāli upādhyāyaḥ || 0 || MANGALA || 0 || || śrī || [f. 40v] [f. 41r] oṁ namo ganeśāya || || oṁ antakāya mṛtyave ...
Colophon after kanda 16, beginning of 18:
[f. 96v] ... brahmacāri salisasya pṛṣṭhe tapo tiṣṭhat tapyamānāḥ samudre || f || 155 || a 22 || kṣudrakāṇḍaḥ samāptāḥ || pāhi maṃ dāityyasūdāṇāḥ || bhimaśyāpi rane bhaṅgo muner api matibhramaḥ || yadi suddham asūḍdham vā mama doso na vidyate || || yathā dṛṣṭaṃ tathā likhitam || lekhako nāsti dosah || || vīra śrī gadādharanārāyaṇa bhaṅjadeva mahārājaṃka vije subharājye samasta sana 1254 sāla tulamāsa dī 23 ne mārgaśīracaturthyāṃ śukravāre || ** | bhagavāna ratha śārmanā likhitam || [f. 97r] śrī śiddhavināyakaṇa namaḥ || avighnam astu || oṃ satyenottabhitā ... 
Colophon after 18.56, before 18.57:
[f. 125v] ... prāṇa ma i te ramantām || f || 56 || a 9 || iti mahakāndo dvitīyāḥ khaṇḍāḥ samāptāḥ || MANGALA || bhimasyāpi rane bhaṅgo munir api matibhrama yadi suddham asūḍdham vā mama dose na vidyate || 1 | bhagnarpṛṣṭakatāṅgirvatulādṛṣṭir adhomukha duḥkhena likṣate gra(ṣṭha)nthaṃ putravat pariṇāyayet || 2 || [f. 141r] pustakam harate yas tu kāño dukhi bhave naraḥ mṛta svargaṃ na gachanti pitaro nakaṁ vrajaTī || śrī rāma ścaranāṁ || mahatkāndo 'vaśeṣo 'pi saḍvimsāyete kaṇḍike || ekarecāvasesaṇa vilikṣa pūṣottamaṃ || 1 | namo lakṣmīṃśimīḥāya kṣīrodāṃṇavaśā ināṁ || svetāśīṃ[ma]ḥāsanādo tathā tathā mamā punahpunaḥ || namas tubhyaṃ namas tubhyaṃ namas tubhyaṃ namo namah || namas tubhyaṃ hṛṣīkeśa govindāya namo namah || 3 | vaśram ājyaṃ kusam gandham puṣṭaṃ durvākṣantaṃ tilān || suvarṇpāṇārikelo ca purṇaḥḥutim iti sṛṃtaḥ || 1 || nāsti tilā nāsti jāla nāsti *Iddha śucikusāṃ || svadhā na kurvita svaḥākaraṃ niyojaya || 2 || oṃ bhūḥ tat savitur vareṇiyaṃ || oṃ bhuvaḥ bhargo devasya dhimahi || oṃ svah dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt || oṃ bhūḥ tat savitur vareṇiyaṃ bhargo devasya dhimahi || oṃ bhuva dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt || oṃ bhūḥ tat savitur vareṇiyaṃ bhuvah bhargo devasya dhimahi || dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt || oṃ svah oṃ āpo jyoti raso ‘mṛtaṃ brahma bhū bhuvahsvar oṃ pah rajase śavad oṃ so ‘ham ha saḥ || pādayorddhāna ca mṛtaḥ ca saśirakaṃ ca || MANGALA || [f. 141v] na rśpāthitā vedā apṣara sahaṛaṇājī ṣaṇaḥapāṭipṛthoṇi da Ṛa devaṬājanA || 1 || jāpadō sūtakaṃ caiva || japante mṛtikam tathā || ubhayor * apyayah śaucaṃ || kathām suddhAVArāṇane || 1 || brahmabājām anodatā || ādyante parameśvari | saptavāra japa mantram || sūtakaṃ dvayam uktayo || 3 || āgra pRṣṭhe tathā vāne | samipe gorbham arVāre | japaḥomanamaskāra | na kuryāt kesabāliyaṃ || 1 || kimarthām arddhacā(verbs)ndreṇa || kalaśaṃ bhṛgum aṅgirā || castupaṇcaśadevena || kimartheṇa ghaṭaṃ tyajet || 1 || maṭtgarbheti yat pāpaṃ || stanapānaṃ VAGĀhaṇaṃ || esārthenm uDDHARanārthaya mahdhipākīṃ vidhiyate || 1 || āpo bhṛgum aṅgiro ṣpam iti śrīmanīḍarsanaṃ || [f. 143r (!)] śrī gaṇeṣāya namaḥ || satyaṃ bhṛhad ṭtam ... 

34 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 akāṅcakānde aṣṭamo 'nuvākah || 8 || ity ekāṅcakāndelah samāptaḥ || MANGALA

Date: the colophon after kāṇḍa 16 (belonging to scribe 'A') in this ms., which is taken over directly in JII, gives a precise date, a Friday the 23rd day in the solar tulamāsa which corresponds to the 4th day of Mārgaśīrṣa. According to Prof. YANO, the 23rd day of (solar) Tulamāsa can by definition not fall in the lunar Mārgaśīrṣaṇāma in the Amānta system of month-naming. He concludes that the colophon must be interpreted as 'the 4th day of (the kṛṣṇapakṣa of) Mārgaśīrṣa (in the Pūrṇimānta system)'. Prof. YANO calculates accordingly: CE 1846 (= 1254 + 592), November 6 (Friday), and informs me that the Tula-saṅkramaṇa occurred on October 15 in CE 1846, 23 days later being the expected 6th of November. All this corresponds perfectly with the reign of Gādādhara Nārāyana Bhaṇjadeva of Keonjhar, 1825–1861, as listed in Truhart 1985, p. 1455.

JM1

Provenance: in the possession of Dr. Jagabandhu Miśra, teacher in the Vedakarmakāndaṇāmāvaṇḍīyālaya, Puri. The post-colophon to JM4 mentions Divyāsīṃhapura 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 kāṇḍas 6–15 complete.

Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.

External description (from photos): this, like the other JM ms., is a very recent and unreliable ms., which has been written by a sloppy hand. The JM ms. 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] śrīgaṃeṣāya namah || oṁ natvā naraharīṁ devaṁ saravighnapraṇāśanāṁ | pippalādaprāśāda ca likhyāmy ātharvāṇāsṛutim || || oṁ tad id āsa ...

Post-colophon:
[f. 150r] ... || hariḥ oṁ utsara || śrīḥ || aṣṭādaśarca kāṇḍa samāptah || śrī oṁ || bhūmasyāpi raṣe bhāṅgo muner api matibhrāmah | yadi śuddham asuddham vā mama doso na vidyate || bhagapratṛṭhatākakrtigratulādṛṣṭir adhomukham || dukhena likhitam grantham putravat pāḷipāḷipālay | X || O || vīra śrī || mukundadeva mahārājānka a 38 nka sn 1319 slā kārttikamāsa kṛṣṇapakṣa śrītyā maṅG(ā [f. 150r] lavāra diśēga e granta likhita madhhusudana upādhyāyasya putra jagannātha upādhyāyenā("]) likhitam idam pustakam || O || O ||

Date: according to Prof. YANO's calculation, the kārttikamāsa kṛṣṇapakṣa śrītyā yā5 (being a Tuesday) meant here corresponds to CE October 10, 1911 (= 1319
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+ 592), which can be correct only in the Pūrṇimānta 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] śrīganesāya namah | om namo brahmavedāya || om antakāya mṛtyave ...
- Post-colophon:
  [f. 74v] ... || ity anuvāke dvāviśati samāptah | a 22 || kṣudrakāṇḍa samāptah || 0
  || pāhi mām narakesārī || bhimasyāpi rañe bhango muner api matibhramah | yadi
  śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || MANGALA ... || 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] om namo brahmavedāya || śrī śubham astu || om satyam bhṛhad ...
- Post-colophon:
  [f. 71v] ... || ityṛcakāṇḍe caturdaśo 'nuvākah || || ityṛcakāṇḍaḥ samāptah ||
  MANGALA || śrī || śrīṛṣimha uddhara adhamajagnāthānku || || 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] om satyennottābhītā ...
Between 18.56 and 18.57:
[f. 27r] ... mayi te ramantām || 56 || iti matkānde navamo 'nuvākah || a 9 || mahatakāndadvitiya[kā]khandah samāptaḥ ... [f. 27v] oṁ pippleṭād uvāca || || oṁ o cīt sakhāyaṃ sakhyā ...  

Post-colophon:
[f. 43v] ... vittam me asya rodasi || hariḥ oṁ || r 10 || 82 || 27 || iti mahatkānde trayodaśo 'nuvākah||X||mahatkānda samāpto yam||X||śadvimśatikānduṃtīmāḷā iti khyātā || || bhīmasya'pi raṇe bhāno muner api matibhranaḥ || yādi śuddham asuddham vā mama doṣo na vidy[e]ate || 0 || jalād rakṣa tailād rakṣa māṃ ślathabandhanāt | āśubhyaḥ parahastebhya evaṃ vadati pustakāṃ[36] || || śrīṇṛṣimha uddhara adhamajagannā[9]thā[9]ṃ upādhyāyaṅku || śrīmukundadeva māhārājāṅka a 41 sna 1321 slā tulasamkramanadīvase pustakasamāptāṃ || jagannāthā upādhyāyaṃ lekhitāṃ || asuddham na doṣo || [f. 44r] bhagnapṛṣṭhakaṭi- 

grivatulādṛśir adhomukhah duḥkhena likhitāṃ granthāṃ putravat paripālayet || jagannāthopāNCE svatanuṛcikandarpasahaṃ sabhāyaṃ vāgīṣapratimavaca- 
notāmaraṃkṣaṇāṃ || sadhaTHARVOJJĀṭtrapāṇaḥyaṃ vāyaḥ sudhīr vamśaṅrnyo jayati vaṬTavanāṃ jyakaram || 1 || śrīdvīyasimhapuṛṣṭasaṇa mahājanamadhusūḍadevasya putra jagannātha upādhyāyaṃ likhitāṃ pustakaṃ || śrī śubham astu || śrī śubham astu || śrī śubham astu

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

JM5

- Provenance: see JM1.
- Contents: PS kāṇḍa 20.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External description (from photos): see JM1.
- Beginning:
[f. 1r] śrīganesāya namah || śrīṇṛṣimhasaraṇaṃ || oṁ namo brahmaśeṣaya || oṁ dhīti vā ye ...
- Post-colophon
[f. 33v] ... ity ekarccakānde daśamo a[9]nuvākah || || ity ekarccakāṇḍa samāptaḥ || MANGALA || lekhakasya nāsti doṣaḥ || || śrī

Ku1[37]

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

[36] Cf. the post-colophon to Ek2.
[37] 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 kāṣṭhas 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] om namo ganeśāya || om śan no devīr ...

Post-colophon:
[f. 110bis(=111)v] ... r 8 || 40 || a 8 || iti aśṭarccakāṇḍah samāptah ||
[f. 120(=112)r] MAŅGALA || śrī vīra śrī mukundadevasya vasavadādasāṅke idam pustakāṁ likhitam || yathā dṛṣṭam tathā likhitam lekhako nāsti doṣah || || parāśaragotrasrīmāṇa bālu(‘)ṇakara upādhyāyena idam pustakāṁ likhitam || 0 || śrīmaṁ nārāyaṇa raksā kara arāksita (ka) bāluṇkakaraku || || śrī lakṣmīṃśimha rakṣā karibe || ugrapṛṣṭhakaṭigrivatulāḍīṣṭir adhomukhab || duḥkhena likhitam granthaṁ putravat paripālayet || || pustakāṁ harateTPAs tu kāno duḥkhī bhaven nara || mṛtā svargam na gachanti pitaram narakam vrajet || śrī lakṣmīṃśimha mām pāhi || ||

Date: since the indication vasava (‘8’) is problematic in combination with deva-
dasāṅke, 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 Dhanīṣṭhā, but this does not lead us much further either. If we ignore vasava, the likely chronologica- parameters are the years 1791–1810, the reign of Mukundadeva II. The 12th aṅka, i.e. the 10th 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 brāhmaṇaṁ r̥chatī 'jāmi haṁty acityā | mitrāya <[f. 36r] satye druhyati yam devā ghnanti puṇr̥ṣaṁ ... yo naḥ> [f. 46r] (10.11.1a) sv[ o] jo arāno 'bhr̥tvyaṁ ca jighāṁsatī] ...

- Beginning: 
[f. 1v] śrīlakṣaṁśimhaśāraṇaṁ || avighnam astu || oṁ tad id āsa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭhaṁ yato yaṅa (+ ugra 1)s tveṣuṁśmaḥ || ...

- Post-colophon: 
[f. 78r] ... atyantaḥ sarpo vaidyuto śaṁiṁ yāvayād itah || 13 || 23 || a 6 || (sec. m. 23) || aṣṭādaśarccakāndaḥ samāptah || MANGALA hari him oṁ śri || MANGALA || [hence sec. m.] śrī lakṣaṁśimhaṁ uddhara adhamavipravīnāyakaku || 0 || śrī lakṣaṁśimhaṁ śāraṇaṁ || 0 || śrī gopināṭhāḥ śāraṇaṁ ... [2 folios of unrelated material follow]

Ku3

- Provenance: see Ku1
- Contents: PS kānda 16,38 incomplete. Several folios are missing at the end.
- Photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.
- External photographs: the entire ms. is available with the author.

Numbering (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 aksāras> nṛtyanti ...) 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 || śiṣṭāntv asmā abhiśunvanta ...) to 16.152.3a ([f. 91v] ... maṇiṣ triṣutro niḥitaḥ 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] oṁnam ganeśāya namaḥ || oṁ natvā naraharim devaṁ sarvavighnāpra¬nāsaṁ || pippalādaprasādāc ca likhyāmy āṭharvaṇaḥ śrutih || || oṁ antakāya mṛtyave nama iḥāyam astu puṣṭaḥ sahāsunaḥ | ...

- Post-colophon: not available because the final folios are missing. A possibly once present dating for this ms. is thus also not available.

38 References to numbering in the description of this ms. are to the numbering of BAR¬RET’s (1936) ‘edited text’ of the Kashmir ms.
39 For the -ś-, see my section on the peculiarities of the Orissa manuscripts.
Ma3

- Provenance: according to DURGAMOHAN BHATTACHARYYA, the ms. was found in Mahantipura, which is probably a mistaken reference to the village Mahāntiparā 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 Mahāntiparā ms. from a Yadunātha Paṇḍā. The ms. is in the possession of D. BHATTACHARYYA.

- Contents: PS kānda 16.

- Post-colophon:

... || vīra śrī mukundadeva mahārājāṅkara viśe⁴¹ subharājye samasta a 10 ŋka vaisākhaśukladvitiyā budhavāre vīrapuruṣottamapuraśasanara mahājana jagannātha upādhyāyena likhitāṃ idāṃ pustakaṃ |

- 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:


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

---

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

⁴¹ This may be a misreading or misprint for the word više (< vijāya) 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 BHATTACHARYYA’s Ma mss.) also seems to write više.

⁴² For example, PATTANAIK 1979, p. 37, quotes the years 1659–1688. More precisely than VOGEL’s reference, TRUHART lists that Mukundaveda 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 ańka-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 Mahāntipaṇḍa close to Balasore in North Orissa. The ms. is in the possession of D. Bhattacharyya.
- Contents: PS kāṇḍas 17 and 18, the latter kāṇḍa only up to 18.56.
- Post-colophon: ... [Śrīmad-bala-baladharma-mahāraja a 9 ańca vicchā di 29 na raviśāra]
- 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:


Again, I must point out that the 9th ăngka 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 Kūmar Praharāj, Baripada (Dt. Mayurbhanj). The colophon after kāṇḍa 16 mentions that the scribe hails from Mārakapāṇḍapura, which must be the modern Paippalāḍa village Mākanda 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 Kāṇcikāmakotī Maṭha in Puri (where it was then being used), by permission of K. B. Upādhyāya (see n. 8). Mr. Upādhyāya has

43 Note that Pattanaik, p. 36, gives 1648–1659 as regnal years.
informed me that the ms. had come to Puri from a Vedapāthaśālā in Baisinga (Maur̄bhanj Dt.), where it had been used by the teacher Dāmodara Paṇḍā, who had in turn collected it from the village Parikuḷa (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, (for kāṇḍas 2–12, 14–15, 17–18), and Gu, 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 Saṁhitā. 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) Bhatta-chārya's Ma2-b. Numbering is written on the right margin of the 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] oṁ namo lakṣminirṇāhaye || natvā rāghunātha-devaṁ sarvaviṁna-pranā-śanaṁ | pippalādāprasādac ca likhyaṁ atarvānāsrutīṁ || oṁ tad āśa ...
- Beginning of kāṇḍa 16:
  [f. 1r] oṁ namo ganeśāya || || oṁ antakāya mṛtyave ...
- Beginning of kāṇḍa 19:
  [f. 1r] oṁ namo aṭharvavedāya || || oṁ doṣo gāya bhṛhad ...
- Post-colophon at the end of kāṇḍa 16:
  [f. 81v, ln. 4] ... brahma-ca(rā)ṁ salilasya pratyhe tapo tiṣṭhat tapyamāna samudre || r || 155 || a 22 || kṣudrakāṇḍaṁ samāptaḥ || pāhi māṁ daityasūdanaḥ || || śrī gane uddhara rāghunāthaṅkuru || || śrī || || bhīmasyāpi rane bhaṅgo muner api maitibhramab | yadi suddham vāṁ asu [f. 82r] ddham vā mama do(sa)ṇo na vidate || || yathā drṣṭam tathā likhitam lekhako nāsti dosaḥ || || vīra śrī divyasīngheva mahārājaṅkika viSe44 subhārājye samasta a 18 śka vaisākhaśukladvitīya budha-vāre mārakandapurasāsannara mahājana rāghunāthaḥ upāddhyāyena l(e)jikhitam idaṁ pustakam || || subham astu || śrī | MANGALA | granthakarTTĀ munIR VYāso lekhakas tu vināyakaḥ | tathāpi CATA VRddhir manusyaṇāṁ ca kā kathā45 || || śrī | MANGALA
- Post-colophon at the end of kāṇḍa 20:
  [f. 104v] ... a mṛtyor a parāvataḥ || 65 || r || a 10 || ekarccakāṇḍe daśamo 'nuvākaḥ || ekarccakāṇḍaṁ samāptaḥ || || X || pippalādaśākhāyāṁ mantrasya caturthbhāṁ pādi(→ da 4)h46 samāptaḥ || X || X || idaṁ mantram likhitam rāghunāthaṁ mānasāḥ || MANGALA

44 See n. 41, under Ma3.
45 The same verse is also found in the colophon to OSM ms. V/94 (see the appendix, below).
46 On the division of the PS into four pādas, see GRIFFITHS 2003 [2004].
Date: the ms. thus dates from the 18th anka (= 15th regnal year) of either Divyasimhadeva I (1689–1715, hence ca. 1704, but the ms. doesn’t seem that old), or Divyasimhadeva II (1773–1791, hence ca. 1788). Divyasimhadeva III (1857–1871) seems impossible as his reign did not last for 15 years. According to the calculation of Prof. YANO, the required vaisākhasukladvitiya, 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 ganeśāya namah || natvā naraharim devam sarvavignapraṇāsanaṃ || pippalādāprasādāc ca likhāmy ātharvānasrutiḥ || oṁ tad id āsa ...

Post-colophon:
[f. 101v] ... 'sānī yāvayād itaḥ || || 23 || [f. 102r] aṣṭādaśārcakāṇḍaḥ samāptāḥ || bhāmasyāpi rāṇe bhāngo muner api matibhramāh | yadi śuddham aṣuddhaṃ vā mama doṣo na vidyate | MANGALA

V/71

Ser. nr. and caption in Mishra 1973: 2, “atharvavedah (ekaṇṭha 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
sadvimsatikāṇḍamangalāh 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 pohīr lekhhā belā “The writing has been done from a manuscript [belonging to] Dāmodara Upādhyāya’.

OSM hand-written cat.: “Purchased from Banamali Upadhyay, Vill. Malkanda,48 PO Alada, Dt. Balasore, 30-3-63”. The ms. thus hails from Northern Orissa.

V/121

- Ser. nr. and caption in Mishra 1973: 3, “artharvavedah (kṣudra kāṇḍa)”.
- Contains, by the same scribe as V/122, V/123 and V/126,49 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 om at the beginning of the text.

OSM hand-written cat.: “Purchased from K.C. Kar, Vill. Talanga,50 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 sakhāyaṃ sakhyā...
- Post-colophon51:
  [f. 73v] ...mahatkāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ || MAṅGALĀ || [f. 73v] om namo lakṣmīṁśim-
  āḥ kṣirāŚAyanam prabhō || TVATGAdamujayugmē ca trāḥi nārāyane prabhō
  || 1 || 1 || [f. 74v] ... vilikhyā nārāyaṇaṁ sarmanā || 3 || vedavratavidhīṁ cādau ekānāccasya kāṇḍakāṁ
  || mahatkāṇḍaviśeṣēṇa etā likhyāmi pustakaṁ || kimarthaṁ ardhdhacandrēga
  || kalaśaṁ bhṛgvangirā || saptapaṇīcāśadevena kimarthena ghatam tyajet
  (+ brahmavede dhikāṁrisyā bhṛgvangīrāM udāghytau jasya pāṅktau gaTE dure
  trīsUṬAbhevdīm mukhān || 1) || 2 || nāsti tilā nāsti jala nāsti “NTI śucikuśaṁ

---

47 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.

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

49 The description of this scribe’s hand for the Indoskript project is based on V/123.

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

51 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.
svadhākāram na kurvita svāhākāram niyojayet || 1 || na ṛṣiṣpaṭhitā vedā apsarā sahagāmini || ajārajapiṭḍoṣi na datā devatājaṣa || 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, "ātharvavedaḥ (paippalāda śākhā)".
- Contains, in this order, on 131 folios PS kāndas 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 kānda's first part; otherwise, the ms. is complete and in good shape; by same scribe as V/121, V/123 and V/126. 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, tṛṭiya, 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] om namo lakṣmīṃśimāḥ śāyā namah || om doṣo gāya bṛṛhaD Gāya ... 
- End of kānda 19, beginning of 20:
[f. 46v] ... anu samadetām || f. 47r ptaḥ || MANGALA || om dhīti vā ye ... 
- End of kānda 20, beginning of 17:
[f. 80v] ... ā ṛṭyor ā parāvataḥ || f. 10 || a 10 || ekarccakāndah samāptah || śrī || pippalādaśākhāyāṁ mantrasya caturthāḥ pādaḥ samāptah || MANGALA [f. 81r] || śrī ganeśāya namah || om satyaṁ bhṛhad ... 
- End of kānda 17, beginning of 18:
[f. 104v] ... pakvena saha saṁ bhavena || 55 || f. 10 || ity ekāṇēcakānde aṣṭamo nūvākaḥ || 8 || ity ekāṇēcakāndah samāptah || pippalādaśākhāyāṁ ekāṇēcakāndah samāptō yaṁ || idam postaka likhitam viprānāryaṇa upādhyā kuṇiṣya sāsana arasosaRĀhāra || virakīṣoravyo a 12 nīa saṁ 112 saṁBata 67 saḷa vrṣamāśa DI 12 ne saptam [f. 105r] om satyenottabhitā ... 
- End:
[f. 131v] ... 55 || saptabhiḥ parāṇ. tapasy ekayārvān. aṣṭāṁ eşi sudine bādhamānah || taṁ śṛṭtaṁ tvāṁ <[f. 132r] ... >

- Date: the 12th aitika, i.e. the 10th regnal year of Virakīṣoradeva. The only Virakīṣoradeva reigned 1739–1751 (according to Truhart), when he was deposed by the Marathas, but Pattanaik, p. 50, gives as regnal years 1739–1793. His 10th 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-

52 The description of this scribe's hand for the Indoskript project is based on V/123.
bers of the year in the sala era are reversed: 67 ↔ 76. It is unclear which eras are meant here. See further under V/123.

V/123

- Ser. nr. and caption in Mishra 1973: 5, “atharvavedah (aṣṭarccā 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] oṁ laksmanaṁśiṁfiḥya namaḥ || śrī durge śāraṇaṁ || oṁ śaṁ no devīr abhiṣṭaya ...
- Post-colophon:
  [f. 100r] ... sukṛtāṁ yatra lokāḥ || 40 || 8 || 0 || aṣṭarccakāṇḍhaṁ samāptāḥ || 0 || bhīmasyāpi rane bhaṅga muner api mattrihramaḥ | yādi śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vyāyate || 1 || pustakāṁ harate yas tu kāṇo duḥkhī bhaven naraḥ || mṛtāḥ svarggāṁ na gachchati pitaram naraṅkar nayet || 1 || śrī virakiṣorādyo a 11 ni'la śna 112 (?') sā 76 la makaramāśa di 24 viṁśādivase likhitam viprānārāṇa devaśarmanal ( + mantrasya 4) prathamapāda samāptāḥ || MANGALA || śrī durge śāraṇaṁ || [f. 100v] śrī virakiṣorārājyasya ādram ānkasya ucyaṭe | mṛgarāsīsthite sūrye naṣṭhe candragate tithi | arkayē candramā bhūkte vāsare sūryasunave prahārantu samārabhya pātraṅkāle samāptīvāṃ || śāṅdilyagotre samyāto sākhāyāṁ paipalādaka caturasrakāṇḍāṇi vilikṣā || śrīnārāyaṇa devaśarmanal | jātam brahmakuleNDutulya savitāśuddham budhham vidviṣo gotrāṁ śuddhaparāsare pi mahtā grāmyā talāṅga sthitā || nāma nāmā mārakaṇḍāḥ mama pathanakṛtā brahmavede ca mantrānā | mām vandye rakṣa rakṣa tava padakamale pārthāniyaṃ nṛsīṃhāṃ | kṣirasāramadhyastham svarṇasīṁhīsahaponi nāma || laksmanaṁśiṁfiḥya trāhī mām sarvāda kur || sāṅdilyagotre cotopana śrīnārāyaṇaśarmanal kūrṇiyā śāsanāṁ sthitvā likṣitam pustakām idam || MANGALA || śrī hariḥ ||
- Date: the 11th anka, i.e. the 9th regnal year of Virakiṣorādeva, on whom, see under V/122. His 9th 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 sala era are reversed: 76 ↔ 67. It is not clear which eras are meant here. Prof. Yano remarks that “makaramāśa di 24 may be a solar date, but this cannot be compatible with viṁśādivase nor with mṛgarāsīstīute sūrye”.

In view of this uncertainty, and in view of the good state of preservation of the

53 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.

54 See n. 50 under V/121.
ms., I feel obliged to leave open the possibility that the anka-dating is spurious (copied from the exemplar).

V/126

- Ser. nr. and caption in Mishra 1973: 7, “atharvavedah (daśarca kāṇḍa–aśṭādaśarca 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) prajäpateh parastaro brahaspatēh kesāh || adabdham ca<f[f. 56r] ksuḥ suśrutau ... [f. 56v] ... (10.11.5c) indraś ca tasyāgniś ca> [f. 57r] mūrdhdānam prati vidhayatām ...

2. [f. 64v] ... (11.13.5a) darbhena tvam kṛṇu vīryāni <[f. 65r] darbhām bibhrad ... [f. 65v] ... (11.16.2a) praskadvarir vai nā> [f. 66r] maitā āpo yat prṣVās 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] śrīlakṣmīnṛṣimhāya nama || śrīganeśāya namah || 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. 35v] útibhih || yavaJāvayāmsadveśāmsi ...) to 5.39.5b ([f. 88v] ... varṇo mitro aryamā ṛdrām ma <[f. 89r] rudhir ugraṁ 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\(^{55}\), 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, “ātharvanaśrutih”.
- Contains not PS, but the standard set of Atharvanic Upaniṣads, on which, see Griffiths 2002, pp. 38f.

V/74
- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 14, “aṣṭarccakāṇḍaḥ (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 ṭkse sihe* NDE savitā ape aṣṭāṣṭhi addhe bhṛgulayām sampūrṇam likṣita bhagavan ātmaja devānanda sarmanā || lakṣmīṃśimhaśaraṇaṃ mama ||
- Date: the colophon seems to give a date, but it is not decipherable.

V/75
- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 27, “ekanrccāndah, kṣudrakāndah (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.

---

\(^{55}\) This ms. Dh/903, which is listed in MISHRA 1973 (ser. nr. 1077) as containing Śrīdhara’s Karmapaṇijīkā (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, “ātharvaṇaśrutih (aṣṭārccakaṇḍa)”.  
- 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 || pustakaṁ harate  
  VY as tu kāṇo duḥkhī bhaven narah || mṛtāḥ svargāṁ na gachanti pitaram narakam  
  nayet || || granthakarttā munir vyāso lehakas tu vināyakah || tathāpi calītā  
  buddhir manuṣyaṇāṁ ca kā kathāḥ || śrī viśvanātha adhamaviprajayakṛṣṇaku ||  
  pātu māṁ hariharatmajaḥ || MANGALA

V/125

- Ser. nr. and caption in Mishra 1973: 6, “ātharvavedah (aṣṭārccakaṇḍa)”.  
- 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 Indoskript project.

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

  Post-colophon:
  [f. 93r] ... bhīmasyāpi ... vidyate || 1 || pustakaṁ harate  
  yas tu kāṇo duḥkhī bhaven narah || mṛtāḥ svargāṁ na gachanti pitaram narakam nayet || 1 ||  
  gopināthaśya devasya navānke kārtyte budhau | dvijaṁ gaṅgādharaśarmaṇāṁ  
  rakṣa māṁ sarvāḍa prabhō || śrīḥ || [f. 93v] pātu māṁ yaśodātmajaḥ ||

- Date: the ninth anka (= 7th regnal year) of Gopināthadeva (1719–1726/7), thus ca. 1725, on a Wednesday in Kārttiika.

V/130

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

  OSM hand-written cat.: “Complete up to aṣṭārccakāṇḍa. Purchased from Narasimha Mishra, Manikarnika Sahi, Puri”.36 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.

36 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 || MANGALA || śrī lakṣmīṁśiṁsa uddharibe adhamabipra jayakṛṣṇaku || samasta rāmacandradevamahārājāṅkara vijaya subharājye a 3 ŋka meṣa di 22 neṅka vaiśākhāsuklasaṅapti śanivāre veḷapahā 3 ra pare nuāgarājya māṅḍhātāpuraśāsannara mahājana hariharātmajāḥ [f. #r] jayakṛṣṇa TA miśreṇam idam pustakam samāptam || śrī bhūmasyāpi ... vidyate || O || bhāgnapṛṣṭha ... paripālayet || pustakam harated yas tu kāṇo duḥkhī bhaven naraḥ || mṛtāḥ ... nayet || śrīlakśmīṁśiṁsa raksā karibe jayakṛṣṇaku || śrī sarasvatyai namah || pātu māṁ narasimhātmajāḥ || MANGALA || śrī jagannātha śaṅam || śrī lakṣmīṁśiṁsa śaṅam ||

Date: on a Saturday, the 7th day of the bright half of lunar month Vaiśākha, the 22nd day of the solar month Meṣa, in the 3rd aṅka (= 2nd 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 19th century.

V/135
- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 9, “atharvavedah (mantra bhāga)”.
- Contains not PS, but Purānic material such as matsyapurāṇoktagṛhpravesavadi etc.

V/150
- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 171, “mantra samgrahaḥ (atharvaveda-dokta)”.
- 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.
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The Craft of Citation? Eine Entgegnung*

Von Thomas Oberlies, Göttingen


1 Erstaunt hat mich auch, daß Herr Gründer Dahl auf unsere private Korrespondenz Bezug nimmt, ohne zuvor meine Einwilligung einzuholen. Wäre dies geschehen, hätte ich ihn darauf aufmerksam gemacht, daß er nicht alles korrekt wiedergegeben hat.


3 Es ist gewiß nicht überflüssig, daran zu erinnern, daß Peter Schreiner und ich es waren, die das Närāyānīya-Projekt ins Leben riefen, so geschehen, als ich Herrn Schreiner eine längere Studie zur Zweiteilung des Närāyānīya mit der Bitte um Durchsicht vorlegte und dieser mir daraufhin die von ihm erstellten Textdateien zur Mitveröffentlichung anbot. Ein wichtiger Hinweis auf zwei deutlich geschiedene Teile des Närāyānīya war für mich die (einer Erklärung bedürftige) Einblendung der Sūta-Sannaka-Dialogebene in Kapitel 12,327. Deshalb hatte ich mich eingehend mit der Frage zu beschäftigen, wie und wo die Dialogebenen im Mahābhārata ein- und ausgeblendet werden. Wenn nun Herr Gründer Dahl meint, behaupten zu müssen, „(that) in his only pertinent reference to the epic’s dialogue levels in the Närāyānīya-Studien, Oberlies acknowledges his dependence on my observation“ (loc. cit. S. 335), werden nicht nur – leicht nachweisbar – chronologische Tatsachen geradewegs auf den Kopf gestellt, sondern es wird auch großzügig verschwiegen, daß ich besagte Einblendung in den Närāyānīya-Studien (Wiesbaden