



HAL
open science

The Orissa Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā

Arlo Griffiths

► **To cite this version:**

Arlo Griffiths. The Orissa Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen 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.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.

1964, p. xlii, and the 7 folio-sides reproduced by ZYSK 1993, p. 6³). 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.⁴ Up to now, I have been able to collect two or more new manuscript sources for every kāṇḍa of the Saṃhitā, 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 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**).

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 Ānandacandra Paṇḍā (village Jiḷi, Dt. Mayurbhanj), Āditya Kumār Praharāj (Baripada), Dr. Jagabandhu Miśra (Puri), Dr. Rāmacandra Miśra (Puri), Viśvanātha Upādhyāya and Kāśīnātha Upādhyāya (village Ekcaliya, Dt. Khordha), and especially Harihara 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 sigla⁵ 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).

⁵ 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 ⁶	Northern						■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■					
Ma3	Northern																■				
Ma4	Northern																	■	▨		
Ma5	Northern																				■
Mā1 ⁷	Northern						■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■					
Mā2	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_c**, 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_c** in GRIFFITHS/LUBOTSKY 1999). **Pa_c**⁸ and **Gu_c**⁹ 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_c**'s exemplar **Pa** at the Kāñcikāmakoti Maṭha in Puri (where it was being used at the time), by permission of the then Veda-teacher/Pūjārī K. B. Upādhyāya, the xeroxes of **Pa_c** 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.

Table 2

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

¹⁰ 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 Manuscripts¹¹

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.¹²

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, Divyasiṃhadevas 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 PATTANAİK 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.

¹² 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*.¹³ 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 Pañcaviṃśabrāhmaṇa) 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 ṛ. Non-initial ru and ṛ (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 *vaṛṇa-* (= *varuṇa-*), or with the postconsonantal sign in *caṛṇr* (= *cakrur*). Similarly, /rū/ can be written *-ṛ-*, as in *puṛṇi* (= *purūṇi*), though apparently not often postconsonantly. However, the script does certainly dispose over graphemic means to distinguish *-ru/rū-* from *-ṛ/ṛ-*, and certain words seem to have a preferred spelling with the former: e.g. *dhruva-*, besides *dhr̥va-*, *śatrūn* not *śatṛn*. 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 *-rū-* are in fact spelt in the Orissa mss.

The script distinguishes the two different lateral phonemes of the Oriya language¹⁴ (*/l/* and */l̥/*: *-l-* and *-l̥-*), and the *-l̥-* sign is sometimes – a pattern is not (yet) discernible¹⁵ – 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 dot¹⁶ which, in accordance with the allophony of the Oriya language, is (almost¹⁷) always used to turn intervocalic *-d̥(h)-* into *-r̥(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 agnim̐* (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 *īre agnim̐* (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 *-r̥-*, and would write *agnim̐ īle*). The correct transcriptions for the 4 signs nicely reproduced by ZEHNDER 1999, p. 21 are: Śāradā (1) *la*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 [*ɽ*] “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 [*ɽ*, *ɽb*] corresponding to */d̥*, *db̥/* 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 R̥”. 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.

¹⁸ 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 */d̥/*”, i.e. *-r̥-* (1993, p. 106). Indeed, it is remarkable that the Śāradā sign is derived, just as Oriya (and Hindi) *-r̥-*, from *-d̥-* by means of a simple diacritic (see n. 16). Although MASICA affirms (p. 193) that the retroflex lateral */l̥/* (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 *r̥*”. Since the sign was probably used only in writing Vedic texts, to render the sign that Vedic scholars are accustomed to transliterate as *-l̥-*, I prefer to retain this interpretation rather than *-r̥-*.

(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 *-r-* as *-ḍ-*, and on the admittedly dubious strength (cf. n. 18) of the Kashmir ms. we will probably decide to accept *-ḷ-* into our edition of the PS. Our crit. app. will differentiate the Oriya *-ḍ-* (for *-r-*) and *-ḷ-*: 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 *-ḷ-*" in the edition of the text.

The Orissa mss. (like the RV) write *-cb-*, (almost) never *-ccb-*, where the Kashmir ms. writes *-ścb-*. 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 upadhmānīya (*-ḥ*). 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 *-ñ* (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) "*lokāñ akalpayan* > *lokāñ 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 akṣara(s) vertically above or below the akṣara(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 *-ḷ-* is used to represent "Vedic *-ḷ-*", as is Marathi *-ḷ-*. 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).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 daṇḍa (||). 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 daṇḍa 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 *kārḥeṇī*, which would mean ‘repetition’: i.e., the unwritten remainder of the verse is to be recited as written in the preceding one. The word *kārḥeṇī* is not attested in Oriya dictionaries, but must be derived from the verb *kārhibā* ‘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 kāṇḍa 17, and the beginning of 18, in **V/122**.

²³ 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 ulūṅgulukottarāḥ* (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”²⁴: 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 *ṛ* (for *ṛc*-) 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 ṛk*, 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.).

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 *anuvāka*-division²⁶ 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 dvitīyakāṇḍe dvādaśo ’nuvākaḥ*” (p. 191), or (starting from the 8th kāṇḍa) more briefly “*iti dvitīyo ’nuvākaḥ*” (p. 544) are not firmly based in the (Orissa) mss. These almost always simply use the mentioned abbreviation plus a number.²⁷

Similarly, by the way, BHATTACHARYA'S kāṇḍa-colophons (of the type “*navamo dvādaśarcakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ*”, p. 642) are an invention, being a blend of the colophons found in the Kashmir ms. (which numbers the kāṇḍas) and the Orissa mss. which quote only the names of the kāṇḍas²⁸ and give no numerical indications.²⁹

To clarify the above, I can quote as example the colophon of ms. **Ku1**, reproduced in full below. When it writes “... || ४ ८ || ४० || अ ८ || *iti aṣṭarccakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ* ||”, it means: “With the 40th hymn, consisting of 8 verses, and the 8th *anuvāka*, an end has come to the kāṇḍa 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 ... -(ṅ)ku* “Noble [God] ... shall rescue the lowly ...”); the references to Paippalāda village names (some of which are known to us today,³⁰ 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 kāṇḍa is dealt with, etc.

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

²⁷ 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 kāṇḍa.

²⁸ The names of the kāṇḍas 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.

²⁹ Very exceptional, to my knowledge, is the indication *kṣudraḥ ṣoḍaśakāṇḍaḥ* which we find in the post-colophon to **Ji1**.

³⁰ Cf. WITZEL/GRIFFITHS 2002.

The Manuscripts

As in table 2 above, I omit here the mss. **Pa_c** and **Gu_c**. 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 BHATTACHARYA 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 ‘*MANĠALA*’ 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] om̐ namo gaṇeśāya || || om̐ śan no devīr ...
- Post-colophon:
[f. 101r] ... ūrjaṃ duhānā (+ ma) anapasphurantam upāsīya sukṛtām yatra lokah ||
ṛ 8 || 40 (sec. m. + a 8) || śrī || [f. 101v] || śrī || aṣṭā ṛcakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ || *MANĠALA*
|| śrī SA rāmacandra{*}devasya ṛdrānke idaṃ pustakaṃ likhitam || śrī || yathā
dṛṣṭam tathā likhitam lekhako nāsti doṣaḥ || jagannāthaKArā upādhyāyena idaṃ
pustakaṃ likhitam || śrī nārāyaṇa rakṣā kara arakṣitajagannāthaku || bhagna-
pṛṣṭhakatigrīvatulādṛṣṭir adhomukhaḥ | duḥkhena likhitam granthaṃ putrat
paripālayet || śrīkṛṣṇa māṃ pāhi ||
- Date: in the 11th (*ṛdra* = *rudra*) *aṅka* (= 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 Rāmacandradeva I (1578–1607), and Rāmacandradeva II (1623–1628 according to TRUHART: this ruler is not listed by PATTANAİK) 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 Jayakṣṇa 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 namaḥ || avighnam astu || || natvā narahariṃ devaṃ sarvavighnapraṇāśanam | pippalādaprasādāc ca likhyāmy ā'tharvaṇaḥ śrutiḥ || || om̐ śan no devīr ...
- Post-colophon:
[f. 142r] ... ūrjaṃ duhānā anapasphurantam upāsīya sukṛtām yatra lokaḥ || १ 8 || 40 || a 8 || aṣṭarccakāṇḍe aṣṭamo 'nuvākaḥ || || ity aṣṭarccakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ || bhimasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhramah | yadi śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || bhagnapṛṣṭhakaṭigrivasthīradṛṣṭir adhomukhaḥ | duḥkhena likhitam grantham putravat paripālayet || śrī || jalād rakṣa tailād rakṣa rakṣa tām śleṣabandhanāt | āśubhyaḥ parahastebhyo evaṃ vadati pustakam³¹ || *MAṄGALA* || ³²vīra śrī gajapati gauṣeśvara navakoṭikarṇṇāṭakala***śvara vīrādhivīravara pratāpa śrī rāmacandradeva mahārājānka a 43 nka tula di 14 ne PAṅḍitavāsare MāNDHā [f. 142v] tāpuraśāsana mahājana upādhyāya hariharātmajaḥ jayakṣṇamiśreṇa likhitam idaṃ pustakam samāptaṃ || śrī || yathā dṛṣṭam tathā likhitam lekhako nāsti doṣaḥ || ... [extraneous material over 2.5 folio] ... iti śrī agastisaṃhitāyāṃ vibhīṣaṇaprokta āpaduddhārahanumānstromtra-mantraṃ saṃpūrṇaṃ || 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 *aṅka* (= 35th regnal year) of Rāmacandradeva 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 Jiuḷi (= Vīrayadunāthapuraśāsana), 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 siddhavināyākāya namaḥ || avighnam astu || oṃ satyenottabhitā ...
- Colophon after kāṇḍa 18.56, beginning of 16:

[f. 31v] ... mṛtyupāśān. sahasraṃ prāṇā mayi te ramantāṃ || 56 || a 9 || mahata-kāṇḍasya dvitīyaḥ [!] khaṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ || (sec. m. + sa 4) || śrī śubham astu || 0 || o cit sakhāyaṃ sakhyā vavṛhīyān tiraḥ puṣ cid aravaṃ jagānvān. || 0 || śrī baḷabhadra uddhāra karibe adhama baḷabhadrarathaku || śrī bhuvaneśvari śaraṇaṃ || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo {YA}muner api mativbhrama Yadi śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || *MAṄGALA* || (sec. m.: ****rathā** | mantra || 4sa ||) [f. 32r] oṃ namo gaṇapataye || || oṃ antakāya mṛtyave ...
- Post-colophon:

[f. 113v] ... || kṣudraḥ ṣoḍaśakāṇḍaḥ samāpto 'yaṃ || 0 || *MAṄGALA* (sec. m. + mantrasya 12 kṣiḥ [?]) || 0 (sec. m. + mantra 1 dajjāradurusasa aṇasi [?]) || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhramaḥ | yadi śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || 0 || [f.114r] sana 1229 sāle dhanu di 25 [?] ne pauṣaśukladaśamyāṃ paṇḍitavāsare aśvAnīnakṣatre meṣacandre baḷabhadrarath{e}a śarmaṇe likhitam idam pustakaṃ || lekhako nāsti doṣaḥ || śrībaḷabhadra uddhāra karibe adhamabaḷabhadrarathaku || || śrī bhuvaneśvarī śaraṇaṃ || *MAṄGALA* || (sec. m.: dvādaśaśatasya Gaṇasi(+ ṛpa)[?])mantraḥ samāptaḥ || [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 Bharanī.

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 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 Haḷadhara Paṇḍā, who lives in Vīrayadunāthapuraśāsana (or Jiulī) 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 Bodapaḷasā, 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 Harekṛṣṇa Paṇḍā of Bodāpaḷasā, Keonjhar.³³

³³ *bhagnapṛṣṭhakaṭīgrīvātulāmagram adhomukhaṃ | duḥkheṇa likhitaṃ granthaḥ
[] putravat pariṭālayet | yeṣu mahāpuṣa ehi ślokaṭi lekhichanti tāhā akṣare akṣare
sata | ājaku daśabaraṣa heba khaṇḍie pothi lekhithibi | sebi dina paru muṃ ādau pothi
lekhināhiṃ | mora lekhibāra abhyāsa madhya nāhiṃ | epari barsa pare barsa gaṛi cālithilā
| Bīrayadunāthapuraśāsana (bā Jiulī) moḃā nibāsi śrī Haḷadharapaṇḍānka khabāsate
ehi pothiṭi lekhā ārambha koli | anekadinara puruṇā pothi yoguṃ lekhibāra aneka ḍeri
belā | eba kīpari ṣeṣa karibi mora ādau biśbāsa nathilā | kintu Bodāpaḷasā bīje śrī śrī śrī
Candraśekhara Maheśānka kṛpāru caitramāsa tā 7 | 4 | 1973 masihā śukrabāradina gha 4
ṇṭā samayare ṣeṣa koli | yadi kauṇasi bhul thāe pariḃā beḷe saṃśodhana kari pariḃe | doṣa
dharibe nāhiṃ || iti || lekhakah – śrī Harekṛṣṇa Paṇḍā sā: Bodāpaḷasā 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 (*lekhithibi*), 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: **Ji4** (see below).

- Colophon at the end of kāṇḍa 16, beginning of kāṇḍa 18:
[f. 124r] lohitaṃ udaram tāni kalpaṃ | brahmacārī salilasya pṛṣṭhe tapo tiṣṭhat
tapyamānaḥ samudre || ṛ || 89 || kṣudrakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ || pāhi māṃ daityasūdanaḥ
|| bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhramaḥ | yadi śuddham aśuddham vā
mama doṣo na vidyate || yathā dṛṣṭaṃ tathā likhitaṃ lekhako nāsti doṣaḥ || ||
vīra śrī gadādharanārāyaṇa bhañjadeva mahārājāṅka vije śubharājye samasta
sana 1254 sāla tūlamāsa di 23 ne mārگاśīracaturthyāṃ śukravāre śrī bhagavān
ratha śarmaṇā lekhithile || <<śrī harekṛṣṇa paṇḍā mahārājā śrī nṛsiṃhanārāyaṇa
bhañjadeva kendujhara bodāpaḥasā lekhile sna 1370 sāla sna 1973 masihā>> om
śrīśiddha{*}vināyākāya namaḥ || avighnam astu || 0 || om satyenottabhitā bhūmiḥ
sūryenottabhitā dyauḥ | ṛtenādityās tiṣṭhanti 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 **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 Nṛsiṃha 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 126th folio; the folio nr. 107 seems to be miswritten 17.
- Beginning:
[f. 1r] om lakṣmiṅsiṃhāya namaḥ || natvā naraharim devaṃ sarvavighnapraṇā-
śanaṃ | pippalādaprasādāc ca paṭhītvām ātharvaṇasmṛtiḥ || śrī gaṇeśāya namaḥ ||
om śan no devir ...
- Post-colophon:
[f. 121r] ... urjaṃ duhānā anapasphurantaṃ upāsīya sukṛtāṃ yatra lokaḥ ||
8 ṛ || 40 || a 8 || aṣṭarccakāṇḍa mamāptaḥ || bhimasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner
api mati{*}bhramaḥ (+ mantra 3 sya 40 Śalisi ||) || ma || *MANĠALA* || yadi
śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || [f. 121v] *MANĠALA* ||

bhagnapṛṣṭhakaṭīgrīvasthiradṛṣṭir adhomukhaḥ || *MAṄGALA* || duḥkhena likhitaṃ grantha putravat parip*layet || *MAṄGALA* || (+ aṣṭadaśasyantaṃ aṇacāḷisa mantrasamāpto yaṃ Ṛpa*) sana 1256 sāla mina 13 dine caitra kṛṣṇa amā vai śaurivāsare e dina me* la 14 ghaRi pare harasapuragrāmare (+ yidaṃ pustakaṃ sampūrṇaṃ ||) sampūrṇaṃ || samāsāpto yaṃ grantha || śrīlakṣmīṅśimha uddhāra karibe adhama piṇḍīka vedabhūṣaṇaṅku || namo lakṣmīṅśimhāya names te sthambhaṛpīṇe | a*te jātarpāya 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 (amāvāsya) and solar Mīna 13th”.

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 Miśraṅka ghaṛ puthi khejā lekhā belā* ‘the manuscript bundle has been copied, from Rāmacandra Miśra’s house’.

- Beginning:
[f. 1r] śrī bhuvaneśvari śaraṇaṃ || śrī gaṇeśāya namaḥ || oṃ doṣo gāya bṛhad gāya ...
- Colophon after kāṇḍa 19, beginning of 16:
[f. 40r] ... viśvebhīr devair anu saṃdadetāṃ || 56 || ॐ || iti tryṅcakāṇḍe caturdaśo ’nuvākaḥ || 0 || tryṅcakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ || 0 || || śrī || śrī || śrī bhuvaneśvari śaraṇaṃ || śrī || || *MAṄGALA* || || śrī baḷabhadraḥ śaraṇaṃ bhagavāna ratha śarmmaṇā || || imāṃ pustakaṃ banamāli upādhyāyaḥ || 0 || *MAṄGALA* || 0 || śrī || [f. 40v] [f. 41r] oṃ namo gaṇeśāya || || oṃ antakāya mṛtyave ...

- Colophon after kāṇḍa 16, beginning of 18:
[f. 96v] ... brahmacārī salilasya pṛṣṭhe tapo tiṣṭhat tapyamānaḥ samudre || ṛ || 155 || a 22 || kṣudrakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ || pāhi mām daityasūdanaḥ || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhramaḥ | yadi śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || || yathā dṛṣṭaṃ tathā likhitaṃ | lekhako nāsti doṣaḥ || || vīra śrī gadādharanārāyaṇa bhañjadeva mahārājāṅka vije śubharājye samasta sana 1254 sāla tuḷamāsa di 23 ne mārگاśiracaturthyāṃ śukravāre || ** || bhagavāna ratha śarmaṇā likhitaṃ | [f. 97r] śrī śiddhavināyakāya namaḥ || avighnam astu || 0 || oṃ satyenottabhitā ...
- Colophon after 18.56, before 18.57:
[f. 125v] ... prāṇā ma i te ramantām || ṛ || 56 || a 9 || iti mahakāṇḍo dvitīyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ samāptā || *MAṄGALA* || 0 || [f. 126r] oṃ namo lakṣmīṅṣimhāya || o cit sakhāyaṃ sakhya ...
- Colophon after kāṇḍa 18, beginning of 17³⁴:
[f. 140v] ... vidyuto vittaṃ me asya rodasī || 82 || ṛ 10 || a 12 || mahatkāṇḍaḥ samāptāḥ || *MAṄGALA* || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo munir api matibhrama yadi śudham aśudham vā mama doso na vidyate || 1 || bhagnapṛṣṭakaṭigrīvatulādṛṣṭir adhomukha duḥkhena likṣate gra{stha}nthaṃ putravat paripālayet || 2 || [f. 141r] pustakaṃ harate yas tu kāṇo dukhi bhava naraḥ mṛtā svargaṃ na gachanti pitaro nakaṃ vrajaTi || śrī rāma ścaraṇaṃ || mahatkāṇḍo 'vaśeṣo 'pi śadviṃśatyeti kaṇḍike || ekarcāvaseseṇa vilikṣa puṣṣottamaṃ || 1 || namo lakṣmīṅṣimhāya kṣīrodārṇavaśā inaṃ || śvetasiṃ{ma}hāsanārḍo taṃ namāmi punaḥpunaḥ || namas tubhyaṃ namas tubhyaṃ namas tubhyaṃ namo namaḥ || namas tubhyaṃ hṛṣīkeśa govindāya namo namaḥ || 3 || vaśram ājyaṃ kusaṃ gandhaṃ puṣPaṃ durvākṣantaṃ tilān | suvarṇṇanārikelo ca purṇṇāhutim iti smṛtaḥ || 1 || nāsti tilā nāsti jalā nāsti *Īddha śucīkuśaṃ || svadhā na kurvīta svāhākāraṃ niyojayet || 2 || oṃ bhūḥ tat savitur vareṇīyaṃ || oṃ bhūvaḥ bhargo devasya dhimahi || oṃ svaḥ dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt || oṃ bhūḥ tat savitur vareṇīyaṃ bhargo devasya dhimahi || oṃ bhūva dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt || oṃ bhūḥ tat savitur vareṇīyaṃ bhūvaḥ bhargo devasya dhimahi | dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt | oṃ svaḥ oṃ āpo jyoti raso 'mṛtaṃ brahma bhū bhūvaḥ svar oṃ paro rajase sāvad oṃ so 'haṃ ha saḥ || pādayorddhañ ca mṛtañ ca saśiraskaṃ ca || *MAṄGALA* || [f. 141v] na ṛṣipaṭhitā vedā apsarā sahaḡāmini ajārajapitṛdoṣi na dāTā devaTājanA || 1 || japādo sūtaḡaṃ caiva || japānte mṛtikaḡaṃ tathā || ubhayaor * apyayaḡaḥ śaucaḡaṃ || kathaḡaṃ suddhAVArānane || 1 || brahmabījaḡaṃ anodatā | ādyante parameśvari | saptavāra japen mantraḡaṃ | sūtaḡaṃ dvayam uktayo || 3 || agre pṚṣṭhe tathā vāme | samīpe garbham arVVare | japahomanamaskāra | na kuryāt kesabāliyaḡaṃ || 1 || kimarthaḡaṃ arddhaca{*}ndreṇa | kalaśaḡaṃ bhṛḡum aṅgirā || catupañcāśadevena | kimarthena ghaṭaḡaṃ tyajet || 1 || mātṛgarbhetaḡaṃ yat pāpaḡaṃ | stanapānaḡaṃ VAGĀhAnaḡaṃ || eṣārthaḡaṃ uDDHARAṇārthaya madhupākīm vidhiyate || 1 || āpo bhṛḡum a{*}ṅgiro ṛpaḡaṃ iti smṛtinidarśanaḡaṃ || [f. 143r (!)] śrī gaṇeśāya namaḡaḥ || satyaḡaṃ brhad ṛtaḡaṃ ...

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 saṃ bhavema || 55 || ity akāṅcakāṅḍe aṣṭamo ’nuvākaḥ || 8 || ity ekāṅcakāṅḍ{e}aḥ samāptaḥ || *MAṆḠALA*
- Date: the colophon after kāṅḍa 16 (belonging to scribe ‘A’) in this ms., which is taken over directly in **Ji2**, 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 Mārgaśīrṣamāsa 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-saṃkramaṇa occurred on October 15 in CE 1846, 23 days later being the expected 6th 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 Mīśra, teacher in the Vedakarmakāṅḍamahāvidyālaya, Puri. The post-colophon to **JM4** mentions Divyasiṃhapura as the village of scribe Jagannātha Upādhyāya, but Jagabandhu Mīśra informed me that he had obtained the ms. in Kapileśvarapura (both villages are close to Puri).
- Contents: PS kāṅḍas 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] śrīgaṇeśāya namaḥ || om̐ natvā narahariṃ devaṃ sarvaviḡnapraṇāśanaṃ | pippalādaprasādāc ca likhyāmy ātharvaṇaśrutim̐ || || om̐ tad id āsa ...
- Post-colophon:
[f. 150r] ... || hariḥ om̐ utsara || śrīḥ || aṣṭādaśarcakāṅḍa samāptaḥ || śrī om̐ || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhramaḥ | yadi śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || bhagnapṛṣṭhakaṭigrivatulādṛṣṭir adhomukhaṃ || dukhena likhitaṃ granthaṃ putravat pā{pā}ripālayet || X || 0 || vīra śrī mukundadeva mahārājāṅka a 38 ṅka sna 1319 slā kārttikamāsa kṛṣṇapakṣa tṛtīyā maṅGA [f. 150v] lavāra diṣeṣa e grantha likhita madhusudana upādhyāyasya putra jagannātha upādhyāyena{*} likhitaṃ idaṃ pustakaṃ || 0 || || 0 ||
- Date: according to Prof. YANO’s calculation, the *kārttikamāsakṛṣṇapakṣatṛtīyā*³⁵ (being a Tuesday) meant here corresponds to CE October 10, 1911 (= 1319

+ 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 PATTANAİK 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 | oṃ namo brahmavedāya || oṃ antakāya mṛtyave ...
- Post-colophon
[f. 74v] ... || ity anuvāke dvāviṣati samāptaḥ | a 22 || 0 || kṣudrakāṇḍa samāptaḥ || 0
|| pāhi māṃ narakeśarī || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhramaḥ | yadi
śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || MAṄGALA ... || 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] oṃ namo brahmavedāya || śrī śubham astu || oṃ satyaṃ bṛhad ...
- Post-colophon:
[f. 71v] ... || ityṛcakāṇḍe caturdaśo ’nuvākaḥ || || ityṛcakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ ||
MAṄGALA || śrī || śrīnṛṣiṃha uddhara adhamajagannāthaṅku || || 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] oṃ satyenottābhitā ...

³⁵ 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 matkāṇḍe navamo ’nuvākaḥ || a 9 || mahata-
kāṇḍadvitīya{kā}khaṇḍaḥ samāptāḥ ... [f. 27v] om̐ pippalāda uvāca || || om̐ o cit
sakhāyaṃ sakhyā ...
- Post-colophon:
[f. 43v] ... vittam me asya rodasī || hariḥ om̐ || r̥ 10 || 82 || 27 || iti mahatkāṇḍe
trayodaśo ’nuvākaḥ || X || mahatkāṇḍa samāpto yam || X || ṣaḍviṃśatikāṇḍimaṅgalā
iti khyātā || || bhīmasyā’pi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhramah | yadi śuddham
aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidy{e}ate || 0 || jalād rakṣa tailād rakṣa māṃ
ślathabandhanāt | āśubhyaḥ parahastebhya evaṃ vadati pustakaṃ³⁶ || || ||
śrīṅṣiṃha uddhara adhamajagannā{*}tha {*} upādhyāyaṅku || śrīmukundadeva
māhārājāṅka a 41 sna 1321 slā tuḷasaṃkramaṇadivase pustakasamāptaṃ ||
jagannātha upādhyāyena likhitam || aśuddham na do* || [f. 44r] bhagnapr̥ṣṭhakaṭi-
grīvatulādṛṣṭir adhomukhaḥ duḥkhena likhitam grantham putravat paripālayet
|| jagannāthopāÑCE svatanuṛcikandarpasahaśam sabhāyāṃ vāgīśapratimavaca-
notāmarakṣaṇām | sadāTHARVOJJĀtapratīsamītasarvāghani ca yaḥ sudhīr
vaṃśāgraṇyo jayati vaTTavānām jayakaram || 1 || śrīdivyasīṃhapuṛṣāsana
mahājanamadhusūdadevasya putra jagannātha upādhyāyena likhitam 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] śrīganeśāya namaḥ || śrīṅṣiṃhaśaraṇam || om̐ namo brahmavedāya || om̐
dhīti vā ye ...
- Post-colophon
[f. 33v] ... || ity ekarccakāṇḍe daśamo a{*}nuvākaḥ || || ity ekarccakāṇḍa samāptaḥ
|| MAṄGALA || lekhakasya nāsti doṣaḥ || || || śrī ||

Ku1³⁷

- Provenance: in the possession of Harihara Upādhyāya, village Kuruṃcaini, 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 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] om̐ namo gaṇeśāya || om̐ śan no devīr ...
- Post-colophon:
[f. 110bis(=111)v] ... || ṛ 8 || 40 || a 8 || iti aṣṭarccakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ ||
[f. 120(=112)r] *MANĠALA* || śrī vira śrī mukundadevasya vasavadvādasānke idaṃ pustakaṃ likhitaṃ || || yathā dṛṣṭaṃ tathā likhitaṃ lekhako nāsti doṣaḥ || || parāśaragotraśrīmāna bāLU{*}ṅkakara upādhyāyena idaṃ pustakaṃ likhitaṃ || 0 || śrīmaṃ nārāyaṇa rakṣā kara arakṣita {ka} bālūnkakaraku || || śrī lakṣmīṅṣiṃha rakṣā karibe || ugraprṣṭhakaṭigṛivatulādṛṣṭir adhomukhaḥ || duḥkhena likhitaṃ granthaṃ putravat paripālayet || || pustakaṃ harateTPAs tu kāṇo duḥkhi bhaven nara | mṛtā svargaṃ na gachanti pitaraṃ narakaṃ vrajet || śrī lakṣmīṅṣiṃha māṃ pāhi || ||
- Date: since the indication *vasava* ('8') is problematic in combination with *dvā-daśānke*, 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 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 brāhmaṇam ṛchati ' jāmi haṃty acityā | mitrāya <[f. 36r] satye druhyati yaṃ devā ghnanti pūruṣam ... yo naḥ> [f. 46r] (10.11.1a) sv[o] jo araṇo ' bhrātṛvyas ca jighāṃsati | ...

- Beginning:
[f. 1v] śrīlakṣmīṅṣiṃhaśaraṇam || avighnam astu || || om̐ tad id āsa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham yato yajña (+ ugra 1)s tveṣunṛmṇaḥ | ...
- Post-colophon:
[f. 78r] ... | atyantaḥ sarpo vaidyuto śaniṃ yāvayād itaḥ || ṛ 13 || 23 || a 6 || (*sec. m.* 23) || aṣṭādaśarccakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ || *MAṄGALA* hari hiṃ om̐ śrī || *MAṄGALA* || [hence *sec. m.*] śrī lakṣmīṅṣiṃha uddhara adhamavipraṇvāyakaḥ || 0 || śrī lakṣmīṅṣiṃhaḥ śaraṇam | 0 || śrī gopīnāthaḥ śaraṇam ... [2 folios of unrelated material follow]

Ku3

- Provenance: see **Ku1**
- Contents: PS kāṇḍa 16,³⁸ 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 | śikṣantv asmā abhiṣunvanta ...) to 16.152.3a ([f. 91v] ... maṇis triṣtro nihitaḥ 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] om̐ namo gaṇeśāya namaḥ || om̐ natvā narahariṃ devaṃ sarvavighnapra-ṇāśanaṃ³⁹ | pippalādaprasādāc ca likhyāmy ātharvaṇaḥ śrutih || || om̐ antakāya mṛtyave nama ihāyam astu puṛṣaḥ sahāsunā | ...
- 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 BARRET'S (1936) 'edited text' of the Kashmir ms.

³⁹ For the -ś-, see my section on the peculiarities of the Orissa manuscripts.

Ma3⁴⁰

- Provenance: according to DURGAMOĦAN 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 Paṇḍā. The ms. is in the possession of D. BHATTACHARYA.
- Contents: PS kāṇḍa 16.
- Post-colophon:

... || vīra śrī mukundadeva mahārājāṅkara viśe⁴¹ śubharājye samasta a 10 nka vaiśakhaśukladvitīyā budhavāre vīrapuruṣottamapuraśāsanara mahājana jagannātha upādhyāyena likhitaṃ idaṃ pustakaṃ |
- Date: According to K.N. MAĦAPATRA, 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.⁴² 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 angenommene 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 *anika* 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 *anika* 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 BHATTACHARYA 1997, p. xvi, plus some extra information collected by myself.

⁴¹ This may be a misreading or misprint for the word *vije* (< *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*.

⁴² For example, PATTANAİK 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 *anika*-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. BHATTACHARYYA.
- Contents: PS kāṇḍas 17 and 18, the latter kāṇḍa only up to 18.56.
- Post-colophon:
... || śrīmadbalabhadramahārājā a 9 ṅka 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-samkrānti*, 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;⁴³ 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 9th *anika* 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 Māra-kaṇḍapura, 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 Kāñcīkāmakoṭi Maṭha in Puri (where it was then being used), by permission of K. B. Upādhyāya (see n. 8). Mr. Upādhyāya has

⁴³ Note that PATTANAİK, p. 36, gives 1648–1659 as regnal years.

- informed me that the ms. had come to Puri from a Vedapāṭhaśālā in Baisinga (Ma-yurbhanj 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**_c (for kāṇḍas 2–12, 14–15, 17–18), and **Gu**_c 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] om̐ namo lakṣmīṅṣimhāya || || natvā raghunāthadevaṃ sarvaviḡhnapraṇāśanam | pippalādaprasādāc ca likhyāmy ātharvaṇasrutim̐ || om̐ tad id āsa ...
 - Beginning of kāṇḍa 16:
[f. 1r] om̐ namo gaṇeśāya || || om̐ antakāya mṛtyave ...
 - Beginning of kāṇḍa 19:
[f. 1r] om̐ namo atharvavedāya || || om̐ doṣo gāya bṛhad ...
 - Post-colophon at the end of kāṇḍa 16:
[f. 81v, ln. 4] ... brahmacā[*]rī salilasya pṛṣṭhe tapo tiṣṭhat tapyamāna samudre || ṛ || 155 || a 22 || || kṣudrakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ || pāhi māṃ daityasūdanaḥ || || || śrī gaṇe uddhara raghunāthaku || || śrī || || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhramah | yadi śuddham vām aśu [f. 82r] ddham vā mama do{sa}ṣo na vidate || || || yathā dṛṣṭam tathā likhitaṃ lekhako nāsti doṣaḥ || || vīra śrī dīvyasiṅhadeva mahārājāṅkara viṢe⁴⁴ śubharājye samasta a 18 ṅka vaiśākhaśukladvitīyā budhavāre mārakaṇḍapuraśāsannara mahājana raghunātha upādhyāyena l{e}ikhitaṃ idaṃ pustakaṃ || || śubham astu || śrī | *MANĠALA* || granthakarITĀ munIR VYāso lekhakas tu vināyakaḥ | tathāpi CATĀ VṚddhir manuṣyāṅam ca kā kathā⁴⁵ || || śrī || *MANĠALA*
 - Post-colophon at the end of kāṇḍa 20:
[f. 104v] ... ā mṛtyor ā parāvataḥ || 65 || ṛ || a 10 || ekarccakāṇḍe daṣamo 'nūvākaḥ || ekarccakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ || || X || pippalādaśākhāyāṃ mantrasya caturthaḥ pādi(→ da 4)h⁴⁶ samāptaḥ || X || X || idaṃ mantraṃ likhitaṃ raghunāthamajāḥ sarmāham || *MANĠALA*

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 *vaiśākhaśukladvītīyā*, a Wednesday, must correspond to 1788, May 7.

RM

- Provenance: in the possession of Dr. Rāmacandra Mīśra, 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 namaḥ || || natvā narahariṃ devaṃ sarvavighnapraṇāśanaṃ ||
pippalādaprasādāc ca likhāmy ātharvaṇaśrutiḥ || || om̐ tad id āsa ...
- Post-colophon:
[f. 101v] ... 'śani yāvayād itaḥ || || ṛ || || 23 || [f. 102r] aṣṭādaśārccakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ
|| || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhramaḥ | yadi śuddham aśuddhaṃ
vā mama doṣo na vidyate | *MAṄGALA*

V/71

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 2, “atharvavedaḥ (ekaṅṇa *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

śadvimśatikāṇḍimaṅgalāḥ 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 pothiḥ lekḥā helā* ‘The writing has been done from a manuscript [belonging to] Dāmodara Upādhyāya’.

OSM hand-written cat.⁴⁷: “Purchased from Banamali Upadhyay, Vill. Makanda,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, “atharvavedaḥ (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 *oṃ* 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. 73r] ... mahatkāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ || *MAṄGALA* || [f. 73v] oṃ namo lakṣmīṅśiṃhāya kṣirā*ŚAyanam prabho || TVATGAdāmujaugme ca trāhi nārāyaṇe prabho || 1 || śāṇḍilyagotravikhyāto pippalādasya śākhayā | maṅgalākāṇḍamahatkāṇḍa vilikhya nārāyaṇa śarmaṇa || 3 || vedavratavidhiṃ cādu ekānarccasya kāṇḍakaṃ | mahatkāṇḍaviśeṣeṇa eta likhyāmi pustakaṃ | kimarthaṃ arddhacandreṇa kalaśaṃ bhṛgvaṅgirā | saptapañcāsadevena kimarthaṃ ghaṭaṃ tyajet (+ brahmavede dhikāmriṣyā bhṛgvaṅgiraM udāghṛtau | jasya paṅktau gaTE dure rīśŪTAbhevadiṃ mukhān | 1) || 2 || nāsti tilā nāsti jalā nāsti *NTI śucīkuśaṃ

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 Mārakaṇḍa 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**.

|| svadhākāraṃ na kurvīta svāhākāraṃ nīyojayet || 1 || na ṛṣipāṭhitā vedā apsarā sahaḡāminī || ajārajapitrdoṣi 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, “atharvavedaḡ (paippalāda śākhā)”.
- Contains, in this order, on 131 folios PS kāṇḡas 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 kāṇḡa’s first part; otherwise, the ms. is complete and in good shape; by same scribe as **V/121**, **V/123** and **V/126**.⁵² 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*, *ṛṭiya*, *caturtha* respectively), but no 101; 100*caturthav* is blank, as is 104v.

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

- Beginning:
[f. 1r] oṃ namo lakṣmīṛṣiṃhāya namaḡ || || oṃ doṣo ḡāya bṛhaD ḡāya ...
- End of kāṇḡa 19, beginning of 20:
[f. 46v] ... anu saṃdadetāṃ || 56 || ṛ || ṛcakāṇḡaḡ samā [f. 47r] ptaḡ || *MAṄGALA* || oṃ dhītī vā ye ...
- End of kāṇḡa 20, beginning of 17:
[f. 80v] ... ā mṛtyor ā parāvataḡ || 65 || ṛ 10 || a 10 || ekarccakāṇḡaḡ samāptaḡ || śrī || pippalādaśākhāyāṃ mantrasya caturthaḡ pādaḡ samāptaḡ || *MAṄGALA* [f. 81r] || śrī gaṇesāya namaḡ || || oṃ satyaṃ bṛhad ...
- End of kāṇḡa 17, beginning of 18:
[f. 104r] ... pakvena saha saṃ bhavema |³ 55 || ṛ 10 || ity ekāṇṛcakāṇḡe aṣṡamo ’nuvākaḡ || 8 || ity ekāṇṛcakāṇḡaḡ samāptaḡ || pippalādaśākhāyāṃ ekāṇṛcakāṇḡaḡ samāpto yaṃ || || idaṃ postaka likhitaṃ vipranārāyaṇa upādhyā kuṇṇiya sāsana arasosaRĀhāra || virakiśoravyo a 12 ṅka sna 112 samBata 67 sāla vṛṣamāsā DI 12 ne saptam | [f. 105r] oṃ satyenottabhitā ...
- End:
[f. 131v] ... || 55 || saptabhiḡ parān. tapasy ekayārvān. aśastim eṣi sudine bādhamānaḡ || taṃ ṛtaṃ tvam <[f. 132r] ... >
- Date: the 12th *aṅka*, i.e. the 10th regnal year of Vīrakiśoradeva. The only Vīrakiśoradeva reigned 1739–1751 (according to TRUHART), when he was deposed by the Marathas, but PATTANAİK, 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 *sāla* era are reversed: 67 ↔ 76. It is unclear which eras are meant here. See further under V/123.

V/123⁵³

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 5, “atharvavedaḥ (aṣṭarcca 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] om̐ lakṣmīṅṣimhāya namaḥ || || śrī durge śaraṇaṃ || || om̐ śan no devīr abhiṣṭaya ...
- Post-colophon:
[f. 100r] ... sukṛtām yatra lokaḥ || 40 || ṛ 8 || 0 || aṣṭarccakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ || 0 || bhīmasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo muner api matibhramaḥ | yadī śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na vidyate || 1 || pustakaṃ harate yas tu kāṇo duḥkhī bhaven naraḥ | mṛtāḥ svarggaṃ na gacchanti pitaraṃ naraḥ nayet || 1 || śrī virakiśoradvyo a 11 nka * sna 112 {*} s̄a 76 la makaramāsa di 24 viṃśadivase likhitaṃ vipranārāṇa devaśarmaṇaḥ (+ mantrasya 4) prathamapāda samāptaḥ || *MAṄGALA* || śrī dūrge śaraṇaṃ || [f. 100v] śrī virakiśorarājñasya ṛdram aṅkasya ucyaṭe | mḡgarāsisthite sūrye naṣṭhe candragate tithi | arkaye candramā bhūkte vāsare sūryasunave praharantu samārabhya pītrakāle samāptivaṃ | śāṇḍilyagotro saṃyāto śākhāyāṃ paipalādaka caturarakāṇḍāni vilikṣa {*} śrīnārāyaṇa devaśarmaṇa | jātaṃ brahmakuleNDutulya savitāsuddham budham vidviṣo gotraṃ śuddhaparāśare pi mahatā grāmyā taḷāṅga⁵⁴ sthitā | nāmno yaṃ mārakaṇḍaḥ mama paṭhanakṛtā brahmavede ca mantraṃ | mām vandyē rakṣa rakṣa tava padakamale pārthanīyaṃ ṅṣimhaṃ | kṣirasāramadhyasthaṃ svarṇṇasimhāsanopari namo {*} lakṣmīṅṣimhāya trāhi mām sarvadā kuṛ || śāṇḍilyagotre cotpanaṃ śrīnārāyaṇaśarmaṇaṃ kuṛṇiyā sāsanaṃ sthitvā likṣitaṃ pustakaṃ idam || *MAṄGALA* || śrī hariḥ ||
- Date: the 11th *anka*, i.e. the 9th regnal year of Vīrakiśoradeva, 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 *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 *viṃśadivase* nor with *mḡgarāsisthite 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, “atharvavedaḥ (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 || adabdhama ca<[f. 56r] kṣuḥ suśrutau ... [f. 56v] ... (10.11.5c) indraś ca tasyāgniś ca> [f. 57r] mūrddhānaṃ prati vidhyatām ...

(2) [f. 64v] ... (11.13.5a) darbheṇa tvam kṛṇu vīryāni <[f. 65r] darbham bibhrad ... [f. 65v] ... (11.16.2a) praskadvarīr vai nā> [f. 66r] maitā āpo yat pṛṣṭvās 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 Purāṇic 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 || || śrīgaṇeśāya namaḥ || || om̐ 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, “atharvavedaḥ (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 || yavaJāvayāsmadveṣāmsi ...) to 5.39.5b ([f. 88v] ... vaṛṇo mitro aryamā ṛdraṃ ma <[f. 89r] rudbhir ugraṃ 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/903⁵⁵), 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, “ātharvaṇaśrutih̄”.
- 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, “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 tithipūrṇṇā ṛkṣe sihe*NDE savitā ape aṣṭāṣaṣṭhī addhe
bhṛḡuvelāyāṃ sampaṇṇaṃ likṣita bhagavān ātmaja devānanda śarmaṇa ||
lakṣminṛṣiṃhaśaraṇaṃ mama ||
- Date: the colophon seems to give a date, but it is not decipherable.

V/75

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 27, “ekarṅckāṇḍaḥ, kṣudrakāṇḍaḥ (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 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 || bhagnaprṣṭha ... paripālayet || śrī || pustakaṃ harateD
VYas tu kāṇo duḥkhi bhaven naraḥ || mṛtāḥ svargaṃ na gachanti pitaraṃ naraḥ
naet || || granthakarttā munir vyāso lekhakas tu vināyakaḥ || tathāpi calitā
buddhir manuṣyānām ca kā kathāḥ || śrī viśvanātha adhamaviprajayakṛṣṇaku ||
pātu mām hariharātmajaḥ || *MAṄGALA*

V/125

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 6, “atharvavedaḥ (aṣṭārcca 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 Indoskript project.
OSM hand-written cat.: “Complete, Badly worm eaten”, rest same as V/121.
- Post-colophon:
[f. 93r] ... bhīmasyāpi ... vidyate || 1 || pustakaṃ harate yas tu kāṇo duḥkhi
bhaven naraḥ | mṛtāḥ svargaṃ na gacchanti pitaraṃ naraḥ nayet || 1 ||
gopināthasya devasya navānke kārṭtike budhau | dvijaṃ gaṅgādharasārmaṇām
rakṣa mām sarvadā prabho || śrīḥ || [f. 93v] pātu mām yaśodātmaḥ ||
- Date: the ninth *aṅka* (= 7th regnal year) of Gopīnāthadeva (1719–1726/7), thus ca. 1725, on a Wednesday in Kārttika.

V/130

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 8, “atharvavedaḥ (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 Indoskript project.
OSM hand-written cat.: “Complete up to aṣṭārccakāṇḍa. Purchased from Narasimha Mishra, Manikarnika Sahi, Puri”.⁵⁶ 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**.

⁵⁶ 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 dṛṣṭaṃ ... doṣaḥ || *MANĠALA* || śrī lakṣmīṅṣiṃha uddharibe adhamabipra jayakṛṣṇaku || samasta rāmacandradevamahārājāṅkara vijaya śubharājye a 3 űka meṣa di 22 neṅka vaiśākhaśuklasaptami śanivāre veḷapaha 3 ra pare nuāgaṛarājya māndhātāpuraśāsannara mahājana hariharātmajaḥ [f. #r] jayakṛṣṇa TA miśreṇam idaṃ pustakaṃ samāptaṃ || śrī bhīmasyāpi ... vidyate || O || bhagnapṛṣṭha ... paripālayet || pustakaṃ harated yas tu kāṇo duḥkhi bhaven naraḥ || mṛtāḥ ... nayet || śrīlakṣmīṅṣiṃha rakṣā karibe jayakṛṣṇaku || śrī sarasvatyai namaḥ || pātu mām narasiṃhātmajaḥ || *MANĠALA* || śrī jagannātha śaraṇaṃ | śrī lakṣmīṅṣiṃha śaraṇaṃ ||

- 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 *aiṅka* (= 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, “atharvavedaḥ (mantra bhāga)”.
- Contains not PS, but Purāṅic material such as *matsyapurāṅoktagyhapraveśavidhi* etc.

V/150

- Ser. nr. and caption in MISHRA 1973: 171 , “mantra saṃgrahaḥ (atharvavedokta)”.
- This rather well preserved, seemingly modern ms., contains (in this order) kāṅḍas 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, “atharvavedaḥ (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 Pāippalāda 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-Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Volume one, consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas*. Calcutta 1997.
- BHATTACHARYYA, DURGAMOCHAN: "A Palm-Leaf Manuscript of the Paippalādasamhitā: Announcement of a Rare Find." In: *Our Heritage* 5 (1957), pp. 81–86.
- : *Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. First Kāṇḍa. Edited from original manuscripts with critical notes*. Calcutta 1964.
- : *Paippalāda Saṃhitā 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-Çākḥā." 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, Oṛiā*. Hamburg 2002.
- GRIERSON, GEORGE: *Standard Manual of the Kāshmirī 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.): *Ātharvaṇā (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 *jaṅgabe*." 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.): *Ātharvaṇā (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 Chāturmāsī, 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.
- MCPHERSON, 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.
- PATTANAİK, 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 *l* 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 Sūryavamśi 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.
- : "Anunāsika in Medieval Veda Tradition." In: IJ 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.