



## Tumburu: A Deified Tree

Arlo Griffiths

### ► To cite this version:

Arlo Griffiths. Tumburu: A Deified Tree. Bulletin d'Études Indiennes, 2007, 22/23, pp.249-264.  
halshs-01914952

**HAL Id: halshs-01914952**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01914952>**

Submitted on 7 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.

Arlo GRIFFITHS

Tumburu: a Deified Tree\*

In his fascinating article on ‘Tumburu and his Sisters’ (1973), GOUDRIAAN has collected a wealth of material on the figure Tumburu. The article is wide-ranging both in terms of geographical provenance of the textual sources, and in terms of their chronology — though no source predates the Mahābhārata. The name Tumburu “is connected with traditions of a different character that describe two different personalities” (p. 74), viz. a Gandharva Tumburu and Tumburu as a manifestation of Śiva. GOUDRIAAN rightly observes:

There seems to be no reason to separate these two traditions altogether, widely divergent though they may seem. *We know too little about Tumburu as an incarnation of Śiva to be able to ascertain his origin*, and also the tradition about Gandharvas is by no means uniform. *There is no clear distinction between Gandharvas and other classes of semidivine beings.* (p. 74f., emphasis added)

In this contribution, I provide a textual source which is likely to predate all of the references to Tumburu that GOUDRIAAN was able to trace, and — though it is not unenigmatic — throws light both on the botanical identification of the tree *tumburu*- and on the Śaiva connection of its deified counterpart Tumburu.<sup>1</sup>

---

\* I am indebted to Diwakar Acharya, Werner Knobl and Alexander Lubotsky who have provided helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper; to Harunaga Isaacson for information concerning the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa and the reference to MATSUNAGA’s article; to Jan Meulenbeld for comments on an earlier draft and incomparable bibliographical assistance; and to Mark Olson for his botanical information and the reference to VERDCOURT’s synopsis. — The editors have kindly allowed me to add at the stage of proofs that a possible solution for the ‘red tree’ problem in Paippalādasamhitā 20.61.8.c (see p. 254 below) may lie in adopting a different word division, where *lohita* would become a voc. sg. addressed to a patient (addressed also in 20.62.1d) who is in some sense ‘red’, or perhaps to Rudra himself (20.62.2a).

1. Cf. GOUDRIAAN, p. 89: “We feel, however, not to have exhausted the Sanskrit sources and perhaps more can be said after the collection of new data.” The Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, a text of the Buddhist Mantrayāna, plays an important role in GOUDRIAAN’s survey, providing the main evidence for the second aspect of

The passage in question is found towards the end of kāṇḍa 20 of the Paippalādasamhitā (PS) of the Atharvaveda, one of the five large kāṇḍas that remain unpublished to this day,<sup>2</sup> as we await the sequel to BHATTACHARYA's 1997 edition of the first 15 of the text's 20 kāṇḍas (covering only about half of the actual size of the text).

In a recent article, I noted in passing that we find a strong divergence between the two branches of PS transmission at the end of kāṇḍa 19 (GRIFFITHS 2003a: 19 n. 144). Such divergence is also found towards the end of kāṇḍa 20. My general impression is that the Orissa mss. (Or) have preserved the correct order and extent of mantras, while the transmission represented by the Kashmir ms. (K) has undergone both shuffling and loss/omission of material.

While attempting to sort out these differences in arrangement for kāṇḍa 20, I chanced upon the following stanzas, which offer Vedic evidence for the history of the deity Tumburu.<sup>3</sup> The connection of the later Tumburu with healing is evident here,<sup>4</sup> while the explicitly mentioned opposition with Rudra's alter egos Bhava and (especially) Śarva is remarkable in view of the later iconographical indication (Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa 3.66.1) that 'God Tumburu, the Lord, should be made between the mothers; he should be made seated upon a bull, and be four-headed, like Śarva',<sup>5</sup> and in view of

Tumburu's character. In recent years (1994, 2001), SANDERSON has been able to demonstrate how Buddhist Mantrayāna scriptures derive most of their material from earlier Śaiva ('Mantramārga') sources. This is specifically demonstrated for the Yoginītantras, but by implication SANDERSON's claims hold also for 'lower' classes of scriptures, such as the Kriyātantras of which the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa is one. It may well hold also for the indications concerning the worship of four female deities and their brother Tumburu in this source: it is a composite text, but even its oldest parts certainly postdate some Śaiva sources (cf. MATSUNAGA 1985). For information from these Śaiva sources, see now SANDERSON 2001: 8 (n. 5), 12-13 (n. 10), 32 (n. 33); 2003-04, pp. 355f., 373f.; 2004: 278, with n. 113). SANDERSON has collected further, still unpublished, evidence that might attest to the Śaiva worship of Tumburu among his sisters, who form the actual focus of the cult, as early as the 6th century CE. I thank him and Somdev Vasudeva for informing me about these sources, and sharing their unpublished material with me. The chronological gap between the Tantric texts and the stanzas presented here unfortunately remains substantial (but see n. 3).

2. I disregard, of course, the edition prepared by L.C. BARRET (1940, for the final two kāṇḍas) on the sole basis of the famous Tübingen Śāradā ms., because this edition has become entirely obsolete after the discovery of the Orissa mss.

3. Contrast GOUDRIAAN, p. 88: "This deity ... does not occur as a god in Vedic or Epic Sanskrit literature". Although the PS is often referred to as the oldest Vedic text after the R̥gveda, the chronological position of its 20th kāṇḍa is unclear; the mantras in this kāṇḍa may belong to the latest part of the Vedic period, as some strong parallels with Gṛhyasūtra material suggest (cf. KAJIHARA 2002).

4. On this trait of Tumburu's character, cf. GOUDRIAAN, pp. 55, 69, 85, 94.

5. *kartavyas tumburur devo mātṛmadhyagataḥ prabhuh | upaviṣṭo* (thus V.: ed. *upaviṣṭe*) *vṛṣe kāryaḥ śarvavat sa caturmukhaḥ ||* (ed. Priyabala SHAH, Oriental Institute Baroda, 1958, reprint 1994 [Gaekwad's Oriental Series 130]). GOUDRIAAN (p. 62) first prints *upaviṣṭo*, then seems to translate a loc., but on p. 63 he uses

Tumburu's apparent identification with the same Śarva in a difficult passage from the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa.<sup>6</sup>

The following table shows how the two branches of transmission correspond for these stanzas from kāṇḍa 20.

Or	61.7	61.8	61.9	61.10	62.1	62.2
K	56.9	51.8	—	55.10	56.1	56.2

The stanzas in question, which follow in sequence only in the Or. mss., are now presented in a preliminary edition, for which three Or. mss. were at my disposal (JM, V/122 and Pa), besides the single representative of the Kashmir tradition, our K.<sup>7</sup>

śuddhavālā kṛṣṇaphalā	(8)
kabrūr balāsabheṣajī	(8)
śuktivalgasya nāśanī	(8)
devī dadātu bheṣajam    [7]	(8)
aśvattho devasadanās	(8)
tṛṭiyasyām ito divi	(8)
tatra lohitaṅkṣo jātaḥ	(9)
śigruḥ kṣiptabheṣajaḥ    [8]	(7)

the words "riding on a bull". Cf. the description of Mahādeva (= Śarva) as *vṛṣārūḍha* at 3.44.14.

6. *paścād anyo janaḥ prāhuḥ kalpamantrām pṛthakpṛthak | tumburuḥ* (read: -oḥ) *sārhavāhasya tryambakasya tu dhimateḥ | anantā kalpavistārā śarvasyāsyā kapārdine* (read -aḥ) *| yatprabhāvārtham mantrāṇām* (read: -ni) *siddhiṃ yāsyanti bhūtaḥ* |. Cf. GOUDRIAAN, p. 82 (with n. 61), for an interpretation of this passage; the proposed emendations on the text as printed in the edition (T. GANAPATI SASTRI, Trivandrum 1920-25 — reprint Delhi, Sri Satguru Publications 1989 [Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series Nos. 57-59], part II, p. 523) are his.

Even if we admit that the name Śarva in this passage, and the one quoted in the previous footnote, is merely another name for Śiva (who may in these religious contexts not have been identical with Rudra), the change of Tumburu's hostile relation to Rudra in our Vedic source (see below) into one of identity with Śiva in these post-Vedic sources remains striking.

7. From this same hymn, two stanzas quoted at KauśS 89.13 have already been presented in edition by me elsewhere (GRIFFITHS 2004: 81f.). I would now edit <sup>+</sup>*edhamānāḥ* there, and have come to the conclusion that it is necessary to make a small change in the numbering of the hymn's stanzas. The two stanzas edited as 20.61.4-5 in my earlier publication are now to be numbered 5-6 (after division of what the mss. take together as a 6 pāda stanza 1 [PSK 20.58.1] into two gāyatrīs, 1 and 2). This yields a regular decad hymn, in accordance with the indications of the Or. mss. at its end. I continue here with stanza 7, although the pertinent stanzas start with 8. The use of editorial signs and brackets conforms with the system explained in GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY 2000-01: 196, n. 1. For a description of the Or. mss., see GRIFFITHS 2003b.



na tatra bhavo hanti (7)  
 na śarva iṣum asyati | (8)  
 yatra tvam deva tumburo (8)  
 parvateṣu <sup>+</sup>virohasi || [9] (8)  
 kṛṣyām anyo vi rohati (8)  
 girer anyo <sup>a</sup>dhi pakṣasi | (8)  
 trātārau <sup>+</sup>śaśvatām imāv (8)  
 ā gantām <sup>+</sup>śigrutumburū ||61|| <sup>\*</sup>prapāṭhaka || [10] (8)  
 yāvat parṇam yāvat phalam (8)  
 yāvanto adhyṛkṣarāḥ | (8)  
 tāvantaḥ śuśmās tumburos (8)  
 tad u te viśadūṣaṇam || [1] (8)  
 rudra jalāṣabheṣaja- (8)  
 -imaṇ rogam aśīśamo (8)  
 tjalāṇiti<sup>†</sup> || [2] ( )

61.7: K not available for cd • kabrūr] keyur Pa V/122, keyu JM, kavrūr K balāsa°] Pa V/122 K, basa° JM śuktivalgasya nāṣanī] Or, vikalpakasya K dadātu] V/122 JM, da{va}dātu Pa devasadanā] Or, devassadanā K jātaḥ] Or, jātaś K śigruḥ] Pa, śiśruḥ V/122 JM, śriguru K <sup>o</sup>bheṣajāḥ] JM, <sup>o</sup>bheṣajīḥ Pa V/122, <sup>o</sup>bheṣajī K 61.9: K not available • <sup>+</sup>virohasi] virohati Or rohati] Or, rohasi K girer] Pa V/122 K, śirer JM anyo adhi] K, anyodhi Pa V/122, anyodhi JM <sup>+</sup>śaśvatām imāv] śaśvadāmimāv Pa V/122, śaśvadāmivāv JM, suśrutāmivāv K <sup>+</sup>śigrutumburū] śiśrutumbuṛ Or, sukṛtampuru K ||9|| <sup>\*</sup>prapāṭhaka || || 61 || 10 || o Pa V/122, || 10 || śrī || 61 || JM, | oṃ vāgantām sukṛtampuru | K parṇam] K, parṇam Or yāvanto] Or, yāvanno K adhyṛkṣarāḥ | V/122 || ||], <...>kṣarāḥ | Pa, adhyṛkṣarāḥ | JM, dhyarukṣataḥ [[om. |]] K [[note <sup>o</sup>ḥ t°]] tāvantaḥ] Or, tāvantaś K śuśmās tumburos tad] Pa V/122, śuśmāstumburostad JM, śuśpasthampurostad K viśadūṣaṇam ||] viśadūṣaṇīḥ || Or, viśadūṣaṇa(- na)m. [[om. |]] K [[‘correction’ neglected by Bar.]] jalāṣabheṣajemaṇ] jalāsa° Or, jalāṣabhiṣaja imaṇ K [[Bar. misreads imām]] tjalāṇiti<sup>†</sup> Or, jajvalāṇiti K ||] K, | Pa V/122, ||<sup>1</sup> JM

## TRANSLATION

61.7. With light hair, and a dark fruit, the Kabrū is a cure against *balāsa*: let the heavenly destroyer of *śuktivalga* give the cure.  
 61.8. The Aśvattha is the seat of the gods, in the third heaven from here. There the red tree is born, the Śigru which is the cure for what has been struck (sc., by Rudra’s arrows).  
 61.9. Bhava does not strike, Śarva does not shoot [his] arrow, there where you, o heavenly Tumburu, grow wide on the mountains.  
 61.10. The one grows wide in the field, the other on the flank of a mountain. Let these two saviors of many, Śigru and Tumburu, come here.

62.1 For as far as the leaf, for as far as the fruit, for as far as the ones (m.) with thorns on them [extend], so far [do] the odors of Tumburu [extend]: that is a poison-spoiler for you.

62.2 Rudra, whose medicine is urine, you have pacified this disease ...

## COMMENTARY

61.7b. The problem posed here by the difference in reading between the two branches of transmission cannot be solved with any certainty, because the word *keyu-* (Or) is unknown, and a stem *kabrū-* (K) can be compared only with the obscure passage ŚS 11.3.6 *kābru phalikāraṇāḥ śāro bhrām kābru* ‘the hulls, the cloud the stalk’ (WHITNEY). The meaning of *kābru* can only be guessed at, but on the strength of this word alone, I follow the reading of K (substituting *b* for what I hesitantly read as *v*: the two letters are barely distinguishable in this ms.).

61.7cd. I could not trace these pādas in K; at least the pādas that follow the text of ab in K seem to have been perseverated from 20.38.1cd, although it is not clear why this would have happened.

The word *śuktivalga* appears to be attested elsewhere only at PS 1.90.4 *śiṣarogam aṅgarogam śuktivalgam vilohitam | parā te ajñātam yakṣmam adharāñcam suvāmasi* ‘The head-ailment, the limb-ailment, the *śuktivalga*, the *vilohita*: we force away, downward, [even] your unknown affliction’ and 16.74.2<sup>8</sup> *kaṇḍābhyām te kaṇḍūṣebhyaḥ śuktivalgam vilohitam | sarvaṇ śiṣanyaṇ te rogam bahir nir mantrayāmahe* ‘From your two ears, from the *kaṇḍūṣas*, we exorcize the *śuktivalga*, the *vilohita*, every ailment of the head’. Especially the last stanza makes it clear that *śuktivalga-* denoted an ailment of the head. The element *valga-* is a hapax,<sup>9</sup> while *śukti* ‘shell’ (hence ‘ear-shell’?) is attested, e.g., at KauśS 22.7, 71.6. I know of no better than RENOU’s etymologizing proposal (1965: 31): “On pourrait penser à « vertige localisé à l’oreille » ś[aunaka] ayant *kaṇḍūṣulā* 9.8,1 et 2 (à côté de *śiṣanyaṇ rōgam* et de *vilohitā*)”.

61.8ab. This is apparently a stock opening of stanzas introducing medicinal plants, found also at PS 7.10.6 / ŚS 19.39.6 (pādas cd *tātrāmṛtasya cākṣaṇam tātaḥ kūṣṭho ajāyata*), ŚS 5.4.3 = 6.95.1 (... *devāḥ kūṣṭham avanvata*). Cf. also PS 15.15.4 *arundhatī nāmāsi tṛṭiyasyām ito divi | tātrāmṛtasya rohaṇam ....*

8. Text established by collating Ku3 with K, and comparing ŚS 9.8.1.

9. At ŚS 19.9.9 *valgāḥ* must be read as *valagāḥ*.



61.8d. Concerning the tree called *śigru-*, commonly identified as the drumstick tree (*Moringa pterygosperma* Gaertn., an old and invalid name for *M. oleifera* Lam.),<sup>10</sup> cf. ZYSK 1993: 66 and 260. He mentions that there is a red variety called *madhuśigru-* (or *raktaśigru-*) in later sources, and often identified as *M. concanensis* Nimmo by modern authors.<sup>11</sup> However, Mark Olson, a botanist from the Instituto de Biología, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,<sup>12</sup> whom I have consulted about this matter, informs me in email messages of 15 and 17 February, and 3 March 2005:

*M. oleifera* has white to cream flowers. The only red-flowered species in the family are rare species in Somalia, and could never have made their way into Ayurveda. The bark isn't red either. There are plenty of trees that have red bark, but this isn't one of them. So, taken literally, it's hard to say what the passage might be referring to.

... *M. concanensis* definitely doesn't have red flowers.

... the bark of *M. oleifera* has gum ducts under the surface. When the tree is damaged, it exudes this gum which then hardens to a copper color. The fresh gum is the same color but lighter, more of a tan pink. Not blood red, but I would certainly describe it as copper colored.<sup>13</sup>

The tree's qualification as *lohitavṛkṣa-* could theoretically also be interpreted as 'blood-tree' or 'copper-tree', but these would still strongly imply some degree of redness of some part of the organism. It may be that the redness is to be sought in its gum, or in its petals, but it seems safest to leave open the possibility that *śigru-* denotes neither *Moringa oleifera* nor *concanensis* in our context. There are only two other attestations of the word in Vedic, which do not help positively to identify the tree. Both are from the Atharvavedic Kauśikasūtra. At KauśS 29.23, the same word is clearly used to mean either

10. Cf. VERDCOURT 1985: 8.

11. In a message of 23 February 2005, Jan Meulenbeld informs me that Āyurvedic texts distinguish two types of *śigru-*, a *śveta-* 'white' and a *rakta-* 'red'. According to Meulenbeld, the identification gives little problems, because the white one is *Moringa oleifera* Lam. and the one with reddish flowers is *Moringa concanensis* Nimmo. The only problematic name would be *madhuśigru-*, regarded as the red variety by most texts, and by Meulenbeld, who refers to Ḍaḥaṇa ad Suśrutasaṃhitā, Sūtrasthāna 38.10 and 46.221. The slight redness of the flowers of *M. concanensis* is affirmed in many sources, e.g. SIVARAJAN & BALACHANDRAN 1994: 445-447 "yellow flowers streaked with red"; VERDCOURT 1985: 5 refers to yellowish petals "with pink streaks". I see no way to reconcile this information with the botanical facts that have been communicated to me (see below).

12. Cf. his laboratory's website <www.explorelifeonearth.org>, and specifically the Moringa Home Page <www.explorelifeonearth.org/moringahome.html>.

13. Cf. also *The Wealth of India: Raw Materials*, vol. VI (New Delhi 1962), p. 429.

'seed of Śigru' or possibly 'fruit of Śigru'.<sup>14</sup> At KauśS 38.5,<sup>15</sup> it may denote the tree's leaves.<sup>16</sup> Cf. LUBOTSKY 2002: 199 for a hypothesis about the origin of the word *śigru-*.

Since the Rudra-names Bhava and Śarva are used in the next stanza, we must compare PS 15.16.6-15.17.3, where in the formula *X-ena ca kṣiptasyāghasyāghaviṣā ca yā | arundhati tvam tasyāsi viśasya viśadūṣaṇī* 'Both for him who has been struck by X, and of the ill which is the ill-poisonous [arrow]: o Arundhati, you are the poison-spoiler of its/his poison', the name X is consecutively filled in with Vātikāra, Bhava, Śarva, Rudra, Paśupati, Ugra Deva, Mahādeva, Īśāna. The compound *kṣiptabheṣajī-* is found also at ŚS 6.109.1 *pippalī kṣiptabheṣajy ūtātividhabheṣajī | tāṃ devāḥ sām akalpayann iyām jīvitavā ālam* 'Pepper is a cure for him who has been struck, and a cure for him who[se skin] has been pierced through: the gods have concocted it, it is conducive to life'.

61.9cd. It is clear from the context (repeated *vi-roh*) that the deity Tumburu must have been a tree- or plant-spirit, and stanza 10 again suggests that the species in question grew at higher altitudes. The word *tumburu-* was not previously registered as attested in Vedic literature. At KauśS 76.2-3, BLOOMFIELD's edition reads *yad duṣkṛtam iti vāsasāṅgāni pramṛjya kumārīpālāya prayachati | tumbaradaṇḍena pratipādyā nirvrajet | tad vana āsajati*,<sup>17</sup> but his ms. Bū reads *tumburu*, and — in view of the fact that this ms. often

14. *śigrubhirnavanūtamīśraih pradegdhi* 'Mit Samen der Moringa pterygosperma (*śigru*), vermischt mit frischer Butter ... beschmiert er (die kranke Stelle)' (CALAND 1900), '(he) anoints (the palate) with fruits of *śigru* ... mixed with butter' (BAHULKAR 1994). The latter interpretation is based on the commentator Dārila's *śigruḥphalair* (DIWEKAR et al. 1972: 96).

15. *utsādyā bāhyato 'ṅgārakapāle śigruśarkarā juhoti* 'Nachdem er entfernt hat, opfert er draussen in eine mit Kohlen gefüllte Scherbe (Blätter der) Moringa pterygosperma (*śigru*) und Kiesel (, während er das Lied dazu hersagt)' (CALAND, partly adopting Dārila's interpretation *śigruḥpatrāṇi juhoti | śarkarā vā |*).

16. In the post-Vedic Pāriśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda (26.5.3), then, the wood of this tree is recommended for use in a rite aiming at the 'eradication' of the enemy: *kakubhaṃ kaṭabhaṃ vṛkṣaṃ kavirālaṃ tu kauhakam | vaṃśaṃ vibhītakam śigruṃ vidyād uccāṭane hitān*. In view of the pairing of Śigru and Tumburu in stanza 10 of the PS hymn under discussion, the use of *tumburu*-wood for the same purpose at AVPāriś 36.4.2, cited below (n. 20), is striking.

Cases such as this limitation of *śigru-* (as also *tumburu-*, to be discussed just below) to PS on the one hand, and the KauśS (and its dependent texts) on the other, contribute to my impression that the layer of Śaunaka veneer under which ancillary texts such as KauśS and AVPāriś have reached us is only a thin one, and that these were originally not śākhā-specific, but closely connected with the Paippalāda tradition as well as with the Śaunaka.

17. Cf. WEBER's translation, appended to HAAS 1862 (p. 385): 'Nachdem er (der die Braut badende Verwandte) die Glieder (derselben) unter Recitirung des verses: "Was Böses und Unreines bei der Hochzeit und bei der Fahrt begangen wird, das Ueble schütteln wir ab auf die Decke des Brautwerbers" [ŚS 14.] 2,66 mit ihrem Kleide abgewischt (getrocknet) hat, übergiebt er dasselbe dem Brautwächter. Dieser nimmt es entgegen mit einem Stock von Tumbara, geht damit hinaus und befestigt es [an einem Baume] im Walde'.



preserves good readings against all other mss. used for his edition<sup>18</sup> — it is very likely that this is the authentic reading here.<sup>19</sup> In that case, the passage provides a second Vedic attestation of *tumburu-*, and clearly underlines that we are dealing with a kind of wood: a *daṇḍa-* can be made from it. The meaning ‘coriander’, which is sometimes quoted for *tumburu-* on the basis of later sources (EMENEAU 1988: 187), can certainly be excluded.

Under the lemma *tumbara-*, which we have thus demonstrated very likely to be a ghost-word, MAYRHOFER states (EWAia I, 655): “Es ist unerweislich, daß *t*° mit *tumburu-* n. ‘fruit of *Diospyros embryopteris*’ (Kāśikā zu Pāṇ. 6,1,143 Suśr) und anderen Pflanzennamen der Jü[nger] Sprache (dazu Tu[rner, CDIAL] 5872, mit Verweisen; Em[eneau] Lg. 33 [1957] 601 = Sel[ected Papers, Sanskrit Studies] 187f.) zu verbinden sei” — *tumburu-* can now confidently be attributed to the ‘ältere Sprache’. Its identification as *Diospyros embryopteris* (= *D. peregrina* Gaertn.) seems to go back to the Petropolitan *Sanskrit Wörterbuch* (III, 361): while it may be correct in some cases,<sup>20</sup> most species of *Diospyros* are reported to thrive “in the evergreen forests of the Deccan,

18. See CALAND 1899: 207 = 1990: 46. Cf. also GRIFFITHS 2004: 53 and 59, 77, 85, 89.

19. Of my additional mss. listed GRIFFITHS 2004: 53 n. 16, *M*<sub>1</sub> *M*<sub>3</sub> *M*<sub>4</sub> are available for this part of the text; they read *tumbara*° (*M*<sub>1</sub> *M*<sub>4</sub>) and *tumvara*° (*M*<sub>3</sub>) respectively. In 2003, Peter Bisschop obtained 4 more mss. for me at the Oriental Institute, Vadodara: acc. nos 379 [*B*<sub>2</sub>], 889, 6854 [*B*<sub>3</sub>], 7596 [*B*<sub>1</sub>] (the sigla given in brackets follow BAHULKAR 1990: 117, except that 379 is there quoted as 397, and that 889 [not available for this part of the text] and my *B*<sub>3</sub> were not used there). The readings are: *ḍumvra*° *B*<sub>1</sub>, *tumbara*° *B*<sub>2</sub>, and *tumburu*° (!) *B*<sub>3</sub>.

At AVParīś 36.4.2, BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN read *ghṛtena tejaskāmasya āyuhkāmasya dūrvayā* | *kukusaṃ tumbaraṃ vāpi vidyād uccātakarmaṇi*, but the reading *tumbara-* in this late Atharvavedic text is likely to be based on the KauśS passage, and cannot be seen independently from the readings of all but two of the (collated) mss. of the latter text (note the use also of *ṣigru-* in *uccāṭana-* according to AVParīś 26.5.3 cited above, n. 16). The same holds for the reading *tumbaradaṇḍa*, referred to by WEBER in his note to HAAS 1862: 383, at Śāntikalpa 22.1 (edited by BOLLING 1904: 107 from the single ms. that WEBER also used). The misreading in the vast majority of the KauśS mss., and thence in AVParīś and Śāntikalpa, can be compared with variants *tumbaru-* for *tumburu-* in other texts: the critical edition of the MBh, e.g., at 13.151.9ab chooses *tumbaruś* (some mss. *tumburuś*) *citrasenaś ca devadūtaś ca viśrutaḥ*, while at 15.36.9cd it chooses *viśvāvasuḥ tumburuś* (*K*<sub>4</sub>, *D*<sub>5</sub> *tumbaraś*) *ca citrasenaś ca bhārata*. Cf. also the *a* vowel in Pali *timbaru-* (on the irregular sound correspondences, see GEIGER 1994: 25, § 34), and forms in other Indo-Aryan languages (CDIAL 5872).

20. It seems next to impossible not to connect *tumburu-* with the various words assembled under DEDR 3329 (see also EMENEAU 1988: 187f.), apparently denoting a total of 5 *Diospyros* species: since there is no cognate from North-Dravidian, this etymon cannot be attributed to the Dravidian proto-language with certainty, and it may therefore have been borrowed into Indo-Aryan and Dravidian from a third language family (cf. n. 22).

KERN 1916: 92 states: “*Timbaru*: naam van een boomgewas, de Tinduka, onzeker of *Diospyros* dan wel hier *Strychnos nux vomica*; °*ruatṭhi*, pit van de T. (zeker wel *Strychnos*), J. VI, 336”. Presumably on this authority, PED, 303 glosses “a certain tree (*Strychnos nux vomica* or *Diospyros*)”, and this was copied under CDIAL 5872.

Assam and Bengal” while “only a few are found in north India”,<sup>21</sup> and other sources not reflected in our Sanskrit dictionaries point rather to a species of *Zanthoxylum* as identification of *tumburu-*. For instance, in *The Wealth of India: Raw Materials*, vol. XI (New Delhi 1976), p. 18, s.v. *Z. armatum*, *tumburu-* is given as the first Sanskrit equivalent (besides cognates in NIA languages), and we find the following description:

An armed, scandent or erect shrub or small tree, 6 m. tall or more, with dense foliage, found in the hot valleys of the Himalayas from Jammu to Bhutan at altitudes of 1,000-2,100 m., ... . Branches armed, the prickles flattened, ...

Under *Z. acanthopodium*, on the same page, we read in that source:

A thorny, dioecious shrub or small tree, up to 6 m. tall, with dense foliage and prickly trunk and branches, found in the hot valleys of the Himalayas from Kumaun to Sikkim ..., at altitudes of 600-1,800 m. ... . Various parts of the plant, including the wood, have a pungent taste and odour. The fruits are very similar to those of *Z. armatum* and possess the peculiar flavor of coriander.

SARIN 1996: 284 explicitly identifies ‘tumburu phal’ as *Zanthoxylum armatum* DC. syn., speaks of a characteristic odour “reminiscent of coriander”, and adds a photograph (fig. 170) of the tree’s fruits: these also show a striking physical resemblance with the fruits of *Coriandrum sativum* Linn. (‘dhanyaka’) shown on his fig. 133. These similarities between *Zanthoxylum* and *Coriandrum* explain the evident linguistic connection between *tumburu-* and *kustumburu-* ‘coriander’ (both words with phonological variants),<sup>22</sup> in a way that no species of *Diospyros* could do, and the habitat of the *Zanthoxylum* species referred to is a perfect match with the indications of our text. The botanical identification of Vedic *tumburu-* seems, therefore, beyond doubt.

62.1ab. The Or. mss. point to the compound *adhyṛkṣara-*, with a second member *ṛkṣara-* from *ṛkṣarā-*, as in the traditional interpretation of ṚV *anṛkṣarā-* as *an-ṛkṣarā-* and as meaning ‘thornless’. Although it is uncertain which masculine word is to be supplied, reading such a Bahuvrīhi compound with *adhi-* (of the type *ādhi-rukma-*, ṚV 8.46.33c)

21. Cf. *The Wealth of India: Raw Materials*, vol. III (New Delhi 1952), p. 76. This source describes a wide range of *Diospyros* species (pp. 76-87), only *D. lotus* Linn., one of the rarer varieties, being “found in north-western Himalayas at altitudes of 2,000-6,000 ft.” (p. 81). None of the better known species, such as *D. melanoxylon* Roxb. (the Beedi-leaf tree or Coromandel Ebony) and *D. ebenum* Koen. (True Ebony), agree with any of our text’s indications.

22. See EWAia III, 115, under the lemma *kustumbarī-*: “Hängt (wohl auf Grund einer au[stro]a[satischen] Variation) mit *tumburu-* zusammen” (cf. KUIPER 1991: 53, 60).



is supported by the identification of *tumburu-* as a species of the thorny genus *Zanthoxylum*, and casts serious doubt on JAMISON's re-analysis (1993) of the mentioned compound *anṛkṣarā-* as *a-nṛ-kṣarā-* 'not sweeping men off course'.

If one wants to try to salvage JAMISON's proposal,<sup>23</sup> one might alternatively restore here a 3rd person du. aor. ind. form of *roh*, the verb that occurs also in 61.9-10: cf. e.g. PS 1.79.1cd, 2a *atho varcasvinam kṛdhi yam aśvatthādhirohasi || yam aśvattho adhyarukṣat* and 16.150.10e *ādityo dyām adhyarukṣad vipāscit*.<sup>24</sup> If such a conjecture were adopted, perseveration would have to be invoked to explain the errors found in the Or. mss.: the word *anṛkṣarā* (without *-h*, through sandhi) occurs in PS at 18.4.3 and 18.65.2. And as a corollary, one would have to adopt the K reading *yāvan no*, rather than *yāvanto* as found in the Or. mss. But all this seems quite evidently to be a less attractive scenario.

62.1cd. The reading of these pādas is uncertain. All mss. point to *tad u*, but only K shows the necessary agreement with its °*dūṣaṇam*. It may be better to conjecture *tā u* and to adopt °*dūṣaṇīh* from the Or. mss. (cf. PS 9.11.5cd *āpaḥ puru sravanṭis tā u te viṣadūṣaṇīh*). In that case, one might assume that both branches of transmission have, to varying degrees, suffered perseveration from 9.11.8d+9d *tad u te viṣadūṣaṇam*. A conjecture *yāvantaḥ* may arguably lead to smoother syntax, but I am not sure that a *yāvanta-* relative can be taken up by *tad/tās*.

62.2. This stanza in fact seems to belong with the following stanzas, no longer relevant to Tumburu, and I include it here only to take this opportunity to bring forward a tentative solution to the crux posed by the stanza's sudden lapse into incomprehensibility. The only conjecture that has occurred to me is to restore the stanza's end as *jalāṣam iti*, an unusual kind of abbreviation for a hemistich found earlier in the same kāṇḍa, 20.39.6cd [PSK 20.38.5cd] *jalāṣam it pra siṅcati tad viṣasyāpa siṅcatu*, or for a variant of that hemistich (*siṅcasi* for *siṅcati*?). On *jalāṣa-* see EMENEAU 1988: 195; the compound *jālāṣabheṣaja-* occurs at RV 1.43.4, 8.29.5, PS 2.16.4 (ŚS 2.27.6), 5.22.9, 14.3.3b (ed. °*bheṣajī*).

23. The proposal was enthusiastically endorsed in a recent publication by PUHVEL (2004).

24. Reading *aruṣatam*, the corresponding 2nd person du. form, would imply that Śigru and Tumburu are addressed, but in that case it remains unclear why the *śuṣmāḥ* in the second hemistich are only Tumburu's, not also Śigru's.

## POSTSCRIPT

After the manuscript for this article had been submitted, I went to India to work on an edition of a Paddhati belonging to the Paippalāda ritual tradition, Śrīdhara's Karmapañjikā, the Vedavratavidhi section of which I have published elsewhere (see GRIFFITHS 2003a). In its Vivāhakarmapañcaka section, I now find three passages that seem worth quoting by way of postscript.<sup>25</sup> Let me first give the list of *vaivāhika sambhāras*:

tatrādaṁ methiprabhṛtīn sambhārān upakalpayet | ta ucyante | audumbarī methiḥ  
audumbarakāṣṭhasya methiḥ sā ca khalake (?) metir (?) iti prasiddhā |  
tumburudaṇḍaḥ tindukadaṇḍaḥ sa ca hastamātrapramāṇam iti | aślilam  
kṛṣṇavastrayugam | śāntivṛkṣam aśvatthaśākhā | yugālīh (?) prasiddhaḥ |  
yoktram dvihastaparimāṇam kuśamayī rajjūḥ | saśaram dhanuḥ prasiddhaḥ |  
kumbho mṛṇmaya iti | śuklavastram | suvarṇam | darbhaḥ | samidhaḥ  
śāntivṛkṣāyāḥ | śūrpaḥ prasiddham | lājāḥ śamīpatracūrṇamiśrāḥ |  
kanyāṅguṣṭhaparvamātraḥ madhughamaṇiḥ | yaṣṭimadhur iti loke prasiddhā |  
lohitasūtram maṇibandhanārtham | śayanam khaṭvādi | kampillapalāśāni |  
rohinīpatrāṇi | āyutapātrārthe sugandhidravyaḥ ghṛtatailodakāni | madhu  
prasiddham | vimalāñjanam | ājyam prasiddham | śilākhaṇḍam | gomayam |  
dūrvā prasiddhā | lohitaḥ carma gocarmakhaṇḍam | balbajāḥ bobo iti loke  
tṛṇaviśeṣaḥ | kumāraḥ | phalam | kaṅkataḥ | vadhvaudanaḥ vadhūsādhita odana  
iti | sambhalavāsaḥ kṣaumavasanaḥ | śālmalidaṇḍa etair upakalpya ||

In the actual description of the rite, we first read (in fact before the list of *sambhāras* has been given):

tadanantaram dāraka *anṛkṣarā rjava* ity ṛcam [PS 18.4.3] paṭhitvā *tindukadaṇḍam*  
kṛṣṇavastrasahitam varamitrāya prayacchet | tato dārakasya varayātrikā  
utsāhavanto nānāvādyapuraḥsaram gītanṛtyādibhir maṅgalāni gāyanto bahiḥ-  
śālāntikam āgatya | tataḥ kanyādātā kanyām yathā vibhavānusāreṇālamkṛtām haste  
nārikelādiphalam dattvā | kumārīm varasya samṃukham nītvā | kumārī varam  
dṛṣṭvā nārikelaphalam bhūmau sthāpayitvā dārakam namaskuryāt | etasmin kāle

25. I do so in a preliminary edition constituted on the basis of the three mss. used also in my earlier publication, though now without giving any variant readings. The text of the three passages to be quoted is found respectively on the folios Ni 63v1-5, Ku 61v2-62r2, Gu<sub>1</sub> 65r4-65v2; Ni 48v4-49r2, Ku 55v2-4, Gu<sub>1</sub> 58v3-59r2; Ni 55r2-3, Ku 63r5-63v1, Gu<sub>1</sub> 67r3-4 (there seems to be some difference in arrangement of the constituents of the Vivāha rite in the three mss.). Several grammatical irregularities are retained as typical for the style of this author.



varamaitraḥ pūrvadattatindukadaṇḍam kanyādakṣiṇapārśve dattvā taṃ  
śālāmaṇḍapasyopari sthāpayati ||

And finally:

tato hotā yad duṣkṛtaṃ yac chamalaṃ vivāha ity ṛgbhyāṃ [PS 18.13.5-6]  
kanyāṅgasammarjitakuśali(?)yugottariyavastraṃ varamitrāya prayacchet | tataḥ  
pūrvasthāpitaśālāmaṇḍapasyopari kṣṇavastrasahitaṃ tinduka-daṇḍam āniya tad  
vastraṃ utkṣipyā tatkṣṇavastrasahitaṃ tindukadaṇḍam [veder] nairṛtakone  
parityajet ||

From this newly discovered material we can draw the following conclusions:

1. The semantic shift, or rather expansion of *tumburu-* to denote also species of *Diospyros* (*tinduka-*), the only meaning registered in our dictionaries, had also taken place in Orissa, the native land of Śrīdhara (where neither of the species of *Zanthoxylum* mentioned above, p. 260, would have been easily available).
2. Śrīdhara knew the association of *tumburu-* with thorns or at least with the word *ṛkṣarā-* (whether generally, or merely because he knew PS 20.62.1), as is clear from the application of the mantra RV 10.85.23 = PS 18.4.3. This despite the fact that *tinduka-* is not a thorny tree.
3. The Karmapañjikā preserves clear traces of the authentic Atharvavedic ritual tradition as known from the Kauśikasūtra (cf. pp. 258-259 above).
4. If there was still any doubt about the proposal to read *tumburudaṇḍena* at KauśS 76.2, this matter is now definitely settled.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

AVPariś	<i>Atharvavedapariśiṣṭas</i> , ed. Bolling & von Negelein 1909-1910.
CDIAL	A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages. TURNER 1966.
DEDR	A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary. Second Edition. BURROW & EMENEAU 1984.
EWAia	Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen. 3 vols. MAYRHOFER 1992-1996, 1997-2001.

KauśS	<i>Kauśikasūtra</i> , ed. BLOOMFIELD 1890.
PED	The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary. RHYS DAVIDS & STEDE 1921-24.
PS	(Atharvaveda) <i>Paippalādasamhitā</i> , ed. BHATTACHARYA 1997 (kāṇḍas 1-15); for kāṇḍas 16-20, I use and generally follow the numbering of the Orissa manuscripts available to me (GRIFFITHS 2003b); for K, I use the reproduction by BLOOMFIELD & GARBE (1901), and occasionally cite (as PSK) the numbering established by BARRET (1940).
RV	<i>Rgvedasamhitā</i> , ed. AUFRECHT <sup>2</sup> 1877.
ŚS	(Atharvaveda) <i>Śaunakasamhitā</i> , ed. VISHVA BANDHU 1960.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aufrecht, Theodor <sup>2</sup>1877. *Die Hymnen des Rgveda*. 2 parts. Bonn.
- Bahulkar, S.S. 1990. Kauśikasūtra. In: T.N. Dharmadhikari, R.S. Shastri, N.P. Jain, S.S. Bahulkar (eds.), *Vedic Texts: A Revision. Professor C.G. Kashikar Felicitation Volume* (Delhi), 115-134.
- Bahulkar, S.S. 1994. *Medical Ritual in the Atharvaveda Tradition*. Pune: Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth [Shri Balmukund Sanskrit Mahavidyalaya Research Series, No. 8].
- Barret, Leroy Carr 1940. *The Kashmirian Atharva Veda. Books nineteen and twenty*. New Haven [AOS 18].
- Bhattacharya, Dipak 1997. *The Paippalāda-Samhitā of the Atharvaveda*. Volume One, Consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas. Calcutta: Asiatic Society [Bibliotheca Indica Series No. 318].
- Bloomfield, Maurice 1890. *The Kauṣika Sūtra of the Atharva Veda*. With Extracts from the Commentaries of Dārila and Keçava. New Haven [= JAOS 14 (1889)].
- Bloomfield, Maurice & Richard Garbe 1901. *The Kashmirian Atharva-Veda (School of the Pāippalādas)*. Reproduced by Chromatography from the Manuscript in the University Library at Tübingen. 3 parts. Baltimore.
- Bolling, George Melville 1904. The Čāntikalpa of the Atharva-Veda. In: *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 35, 77-127.
- Bolling, George Melville & Julius von Negelein 1909-10. *The Pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda*. Volume 1: Text and Critical Apparatus, in 2 Parts. Leipzig.
- Burrow, T. & M.B. Emeneau 1984. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. Second Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press [reprint 1986].
- Caland, Willem 1899. Zur Exegese und Kritik der rituellen Sūtras, XVIII-XXVII, XXVIII-XXXII. In: *ZDMG* 53, 205-230, 696-702.



- Caland, Willem 1900. *Altindisches Zauberritual. Probe einer Uebersetzung der wichtigsten Theile des Kauśika Sūtra*. Amsterdam.
- Caland, Willem 1990. *Kleine Schriften*. Herausgegeben von Michael Witzel. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Diwekar, H.R., V.P. Limaye, R.N. Dandekar, C.G. Kashikar & V.V. Bhide 1972. *Kauśikasūtra-Dārīlabhāṣya*. Poona.
- Emeneau, Murray Barnson 1988. *Sanskrit Studies of M.B. Emeneau. Selected Papers*. Edited by B.A. van Nooten. Berkeley.
- Geiger, Wilhelm 1994. *A Pāli Grammar*. Translated into English by Batakrishna Ghosh. Revised and edited by K.R. Norman. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Goudriaan, Teun 1973. Tumburu and his Sisters. In: *WZKS* 17, 49-95.
- Griffiths, Arlo 2003a. The Textual Divisions of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā. In: *WZKS* 47, 5-35.
- Griffiths, Arlo 2003b. The Orissa Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā. In: *ZDMG* 153, 333-370.
- Griffiths, Arlo 2004. Paippalāda Mantras in the Kauśikasūtra. In: A. Griffiths & J.E.M. Houben (eds.), *The Vedas: Texts, Language and Ritual* (Proceedings of the Third International Vedic Workshop). Groningen: Egbert Forsten [Groningen Oriental Studies XX], 49-99.
- Griffiths, Arlo & Alexander Lubotsky 2000-01. Paippalāda Saṃhitā 4.15. To heal an open fracture: with a plant. In: *Die Sprache* 42/1-2 [appeared 2003], 196-210.
- Haas, E. 1862. Die Heiratsgebräuche der Alten Inder, nach den Gṛīhyasūtra. In: *Indische Studien* 5, 267-412.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. 1993. Thornless Paths and Others: Vedic *anṛkṣarā* / Greek *φθεῖρω*. In: Gerhard Meiser (ed.), *Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift für H. Rix zum 65. Geburtstag* (Innsbruck), 237-251.
- Kajihara, Mieko 2002. *The brahmācārīn in the Veda: The Evolution of the "Vedic Student" and the Dynamics of Texts, Rituals, and Society in Ancient India*. Thesis Harvard University.
- Kern, H. 1916. Toevoegselen op 't Woordenboek van Childers, II. *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afd. Letterkunde*, n.r., XVI.5.
- Kuiper, F.B.J. 1991. *Aryans in the Rigveda*. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Lubotsky, Alexander 2002. Scythian elements in Old Iranian. In: N. Sims-Williams (ed.), *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples / Proceedings of the British Academy* 116, 189-202.
- Matsunaga, Yūkei 1985. On the Date of the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*. In: M. Strickmann (ed.), *Tantric and Taoist Studies in Honour of R.A. Stein*, vol. 3 [Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques XXII]. Bruxelles: Institut belge des hautes études chinoises, 882-894.

- Mayrhofer, Manfred 1992-96. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. I. & II. Band. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred 1997-2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. III. Band. Zweiter Teil: Jüngere Sprache. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Puhvel, Jaan 2004. Once more Greek *φθεῖρω*. In: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 109, 232-234.
- Renou, Louis 1965. Notes sur la version "paippalāda" de l'Atharvaveda (deuxième série). In: *JA* 253, 15-42.
- Rhys Davids, T.W. & William Stede 1921-25. *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*. Reprint 1995. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Sanderson, Alexis 1994. Vajrayāna: Origin and Function. In: *Buddhism Into the Year 2000. International Conference Proceedings*. Bangkok and Los Angeles: Dhammakaya Foundation, 87-102.
- Sanderson, Alexis 2001. History through Textual Criticism in the study of Śaivism, the Pāñcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras. In: François Grimal (ed.), *Les Sources et le Temps. Sources and Time. A Colloquium*. Pondicherry 11-13 January 1997 (Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO [PDI 91]), 1-47.
- Sanderson, Alexis 2003-04. The Śaiva Religion among the Khmers, Part I. In: *BEFEO* 90-91, 349-462.
- Sanderson, Alexis 2004. Religion and the State: Śaiva Officials in the Territory of the King's Brahmanical Chaplain. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47, 229-300.
- Sarin, Y.K. 1996. *Illustrated Manual of Herbal Drugs Used in Ayurveda*. New Delhi: Council of Scientific & Industrial Research / Indian Council of Medical Research.
- Sivarajan, V.V. & Indira Balachandran 1994. *Ayurvedic Drugs and their Plant Sources*. New Delhi/Bombay/Calcutta: Oxford & IBH Publishing.
- Turner, R.L. 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Verdcourt, B. 1985. A synopsis of the *Moringaceae*. In: *Kew Bulletin* 40.1, 1-23.
- Vishva Bandhu 1960. *Atharvaveda (Śaunaka) with the Pada-pāṭha and Sāyaṇācārya's Commentary*. 4 parts. Hoshiarpur [Second edition: 1990].
- Whitney, William Dwight 1905. *Atharva-Veda Saṃhitā*: translated with a critical and exegetical Commentary. Revised and brought nearer to completion and edited by Charles Rockwell Lanman. 2 vols. Cambridge (Mass.).
- Zysk, Kenneth G. 1993. *Religious Medicine. The History and Evolution of Indian Medicine*. New Brunswick-London: Transaction Publishers [Reprint of *Religious healing in the Veda*, Philadelphia 1985].

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article fournit le premier témoignage qui montre que Tumburu, une forme d'udra-Śiva dans les traditions tantriques de l'hindouisme comme du bouddhisme et *indharva* dans le Mahābhārata, existait aussi comme divinité dans la religion atharvavédique. C'est ce qu'atteste la Paippalādasamhitā de l'Atharvaveda. En contexte atharvavédique, ce Tumburu est clairement la déification d'un épineux apparemment vu de vertus médicinales et poussant à des altitudes élevées. Cet arbre appelé *tumburu-* peut être identifié comme une espèce du genre *Zanthoxylum*, plutôt que *pyros* (sk. *tinduka-*), en dépit des indications figurant dans les dictionnaires sanskrits en référence. La discussion des strophes de l'Atharvaveda Paippalāda où apparaît Tumburu donne aussi l'occasion d'examiner l'identification botanique de l'arbre appelé *tumburu-*, de reconnaître une attestation assez certaine du mot *ṛkṣarā-* « épine », dont l'existence a été mise en doute, et d'attirer l'attention sur les importantes relations textuelles entre la littérature de mantra et les manuels de rituels atharvavédiques.



only.

# BULLETIN D'ÉTUDES INDIENNES

N° 22-23

2004-2005



Ouvrage publié avec le concours  
de l'Université de Paris-III

ASSOCIATION FRANÇAISE  
POUR LES ÉTUDES INDIENNES