

Nominal Compounds in the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti**

Masato KOBAYASHI

0. Introduction

The original sources of the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* range over the Dharma-sūtras, the Gṛhyasūtras, the epics, and texts on Āyurveda (medicine) and Arthaśāstra (government), as well as the foregoing Smṛti literature. Condensation of such extensive literature into a compact code of one thousand ślokas, and the clear-cut policy to rearrange the whole material in three parts of *ācāra* ‘good conduct’, *vyavahāra* ‘procedures’ and *prāyaścitta* ‘expiation’, obtained it an unsurpassed popularity for ages. In order to abridge the source literature without leaving out important details, the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* makes an ample, sometimes even extravagant use of compounds: To view it from the opposite side, we might be able to trace the process of editing by analyzing the compounds. The following study is aimed at explaining why some anomalous or highly artificial compounds were used in the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, attempting thereby to trace the procedure in which the author condensed foregoing literature.

In this paper, I assume the *Manusmṛti* and the *Kauṭīlyārthaśāstra* as the primary source of the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*,¹ and do not treat the *Viṣṇu-smṛti* with close attention on the working hypothesis of its posteriority to the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*.

* I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Yasuke Ikari for his unsparing help and advice. I am grateful to the scholars who kindly read my draft and gave valuable advice, the scholars who participated in the joint seminar at the Institute for Research in Humanities, especially Dr. Masato Fujii, Dr. Werner Knobl (Kyoto), Dr. Peter Schreiner (Zürich), Dr. Ludo Rocher (Pennsylvania), and Dr. George Cardona (Pennsylvania). This paper is partly based on my research in Sanskrit nominal compounds, which was funded by the 1994 Sasakawa Scientific Research Grant from the Japan Science Society.

¹ This might be an oversimplification, especially in the case of the *Kauṭīlyārthaśāstra*. See note 15, for example.

1. Influences of abridgement and versification on the compounds of the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*

a. The style of the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* shows an elaborate condensation of the foregoing literature. To take an example, KAŚ 3.16.30–31 *yat svam dravyam anyair bhujyamānaṃ daśa varṣāṇy upekṣeta, hīyetāsya .../ viṃśati-varṣopekṣitam anavasitam vāstu nānuyuñjīta* “When the owners ... neglect for ten years their property which is under the enjoyment of others, they shall forfeit their title to it. Buildings left for 20 years in the enjoyment of others shall not be reclaimed.” (Shamasastri) is condensed into one śloka, Yājñ. 2.24 *paśyato ’bruvato bhūmer hānir viṃśativārṣikī/pareṇa bhujyamānāyā dhanasya daśavārṣikī* “[If] one, seeing [his own] land deforced by another, does not claim it, [the land right is] annihilated in twenty years. If it is a movable property, [annihilation takes place] in ten years.” by means of a nominal sentence with a Dvigu compound *viṃśati-vārṣikī* ‘vicennial’ and *daśa-vārṣikī* ‘decennial’.²

More often, the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* simply intends to reduce the number of the syllables by forming or reforming compounds: Yājñ. 2.95 uses the trisyllabic Dvandva compound *agny-āpaḥ* for fire and water, which are mentioned as means of an ordeal, instead of longer expressions in Manu 8.114ab *agnim ... apsu*, KAŚ 7.17.7 *agny-udaka-*, Viṣṇu 9.11 *dhatāgny-udaka-*, 9.25–29 *agnih ... udakam* or Nārada 1.218d *agny-ambu-* which would become quadrisyllabic *-ambūni* in plural.

In some cases, however, condensation goes so far that the meaning of the ensuing compound is hardly intelligible or the composition is grammatically questionable:

prati-praṇava-saṃyuktām in Yājñ. 1.23 *gāyatrīṃ śirasā sārḍham japed vyāhṛtipūrvikām/ pratipraṇavasamṃyuktām trir ayaṃ prāṇasamyamah* “[A student] should mutter the Gāyatrī stanza three times together with Śiras, preceded by vyāhṛti [and] accompanied by praṇava for each: this is the control of breath” contains *prati* in the sense ‘for each’, but *prati* just means ‘per’ and is usually followed by its object when it has a distributive meaning, as in Yājñ. *praty-aham* ‘everyday’, *prati-saṃvatsaram* ‘every year’, *prati-vedam* ‘for each Veda’, *prati-māsam* ‘every month’, *prati-daivatam* ‘for each deity’, *praty-ekam* ‘one by one’ and *prati-vāsaram* ‘each day’.

śakty-alamḥkṛtā in Yājñ. 1.58ab *brāhmo vivāha āhūya dīyate śaktyalamḥkṛtā*

² Cf. Aṣṭ. 5.1.79 for the function of the suffix *-ika-* (‘*thānī*’).

NOMINAL COMPOUNDS IN THE YĀJÑĀVALKYASMRĪTI

“The Brāhma marriage: After [the father] invited [the bridegroom], [the girl] adorned according to [the father’s financial] power is given [to him]” seems to presuppose *śaktiviṣayeṇālaṃkṛtya* ‘having adorned [the bride] in the range of [the father’s] power’ in ĀpDhS 2.5.11.17 and HirDhS 27.4.32 (both are rules on the Brāhma marriage like here). It should be noted that an instrumental form *śaktyā* is used a little before this stanza, in Yājñ. 1.45d *śaktyādhīte hi yo ’nvaham* “he who learns [this and that texts] everyday according to his power,” as if it anticipates a similar case function for *śakti-* here.³

naṣṭonmrṣṭe occurs in Yājñ. 2.91ab *deśāntarasthe durlekhye naṣṭonmrṣṭe hr̥te tathā/ bhinne dagdhe ’tha vā chinne lekhyam anyat tu kārayet* “When [a document] is in a foreign country, badly written, damaged, effaced, taken away, split, burnt, or torn asunder, one should have another document made.” Why are only *naṣṭa-* and *unmrṣṭa-* put together among the other simplex verbal adjectives, while they are neither co-referential nor correlated and have no title to form a Karmadhāraya or a collective Dvandva in neuter singular? A parallel passage in Nārada 1.126 *chinnabhinnahr̥tonmrṣṭanaṣṭadurlikhiteṣu ca/ kartavyam anyal lekhyam syād eṣa lekhyavidhiḥ smṛtaḥ* has a Dvandva compound of six verbal adjectives and takes a plural ending, but it does not seem to show any special link between these two adjectives *unmrṣṭa-* and *naṣṭa-*, which are divided by a pāda boundary. Although commentators of the *Yājñāvalkyasmṛti* do not give any variant reading for this expression, I think what the author originally intended was two separate words *naṣṭe* and *unmrṣṭe*, which first became *naṣṭa unmrṣṭe* by a Sandhi rule, which in turn was fed into another Sandhi cycle and ended up as *naṣṭonmrṣṭe*. Explanation by double Sandhi is also possible in the case of Yājñ. 3.284a *kriyamānopakāre tu mṛte vipre na pātakam* ‘even if a Brahmin dies while (medical) care is being done, it is not a degrading sin’, which sounds more natural if *kriyamāne* ‘being done’ and *upakāre* ‘(medical) care’ are separate.⁴

Yājñ. 3.202–203ab ^h*antardhānaṃ* ^f*smṛtiḥ* ^g*kāntir* ^d*dr̥ṣṭiḥ* ^e*śrotra* ^{b?}*jñatā tathā/* ^a*nijaṃ śarīram utsṛjya parakāyapraveśanam//* ^c*arthānāṃ chandataḥ sṛṣṭir yogasiddher hi lakṣaṇam* “The signs of the perfection of Yoga are: Vanishing, remembering, brilliance, vision, aural perception, leaving one’s own

³ Dr. Masato Fujii (p.c.) suggested to me that the author may have originally intended **śaktyālaṃkṛtā*, which was then changed into *śaktyālaṃkṛtā* to make the fifth syllable short as is preferred metrically.

⁴ Another example of irregular Sandhi in the *Yājñāvalkyasmṛti* is the absence of the crasis *-a r̥-* → *-ar-* in 1.300c *udbudhyasveti ca ṛco*. For the examples of double sandhi in the Dharmasūtras, see Bharadwaj (1982), pp.57f.

body and entering other's, and creating things at will." is enumeration of superhuman powers. If this passage is an adaptation of the eight ones enumerated in Caraka 4.1.140 ^a *āveśāś* ^b *cetaso jñānam* ^c *arthānām chandataḥ kriyā/* ^d *dr̥ṣṭiḥ* ^e *śrotram* ^f *smṛtiḥ* ^g *kāntir* ^h *iṣṭataś cāpyadarśanam*,⁵ Yājñ. *śrotra-jñatā* might have originally meant the same powers as *śrotram* 'hearing' and *cetaso jñānam* 'mind reading' in the *Carakasamhitā*.⁶

uditoditam occurs as one of the requisites of a family priest in Yājñ. 1.313 *purohitam prakurvīta*⁷ *daivajñam uditoditam/ daṇḍanītyām ca kuśalam atharvāṅgirase tathā* "[A king] should appoint to family priest one who reads fortune, is —, is skilled in politics and the Atharvaveda," which is an abridgement of KĀŚ 1.9.9 *purohitam uditoditakulaśīlam sāṅge vede daive nimitte daṇḍanītyām cābhivinītam āpadām daivamānuṣiṅām atharvabhīr upāyais ca pratikartāram kurvīta*. It appears to me too bold as an abridgement, if *uditoditam* is simply a curtailed form of *uditoditakulaśīlam*. Since *udita-* can be derived both from *ud-ay/i* 'go up, go out' and from *vad* 'say' with *-ta-*, the meaning of *uditoditam* cannot be decided easily, as well as KĀŚ *uditoditakulaśīlam*.⁸

b. The same Dvandva *madhu-sarpīṣ-*, used in Yājñ. 1.303cd *hotavyā madhusarpīrbhyām dadhnā kṣīreṇa vā yutāḥ* "[fuels] mixed with honey, liquid butter, curds or milk [should be offered]" and in Yājñ. 1.44c *pitṛṇś ca madhusarpīrbhyām* "[he can satisfy] the manes with honey and liquid butter" in the dual, appears as a singular in Yājñ. 1.43d and Yājñ. 1.46d *pitṛṇām madhusarpīṣā* "[he can produce satisfaction] of the manes with honey and liquid butter", where a short penultimate is required in the cadence of an even verse of a śloka. Although some Dvandva compounds optionally take

⁵ I owe the reference to Dr. Kimiaki Shōshin.

⁶ In view of Bṛhadyogiyājñavalkyasmṛti 9.195d *dr̥ṣṭiśrotrajñatā parā* (reference given by Dr. Akihiko Akamatsu), *dr̥ṣṭiḥ śrotra-* in the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* might originate from an incorrect Sandhi dissolution of manuscripts in *scriptio continua*, which would have read *dr̥ṣṭiśrotra-* for both *dr̥ṣṭiḥ(/ś) śrotra-* and *dr̥ṣṭi-śrotra-*. For further examples of similar questions on dissolution, see Yājñ. 3.257a *brāhmaṇasvarṇahārī* and Yājñ. 3.277b (Mit.) *daṣṭaśvoṣṭrādivāyasaiḥ*. Shoshin (p.c.) proposes to emend *śrotrajñatā* into ^x *śrotram jñatā*.

⁷ Bāl., Apar. and Vīr. read *ca kurvīta*.

⁸ Shamasastri (1929) "Him whose family and character are highly spoken of"; Kangle (1972) "who is very exalted in family and character" with a note "the repetition of *udita* seems only to emphasize the exalted character of the *kula* and *śīla*." Or a composite of two Bahuvrīhis *udita-kula-* and *udita-śīla-*: "him whose family is noble and whose conduct is lofty."

neuter singular forms according to Pāṇini (Aṣṭ. 2.4.2ff.), Aṣṭ. 2.4.14 *na dādhipayāādīni* rules out a singular form of this particular compound, referring to a gaṇa that includes *madhusarpiṣī* (Ganapāṭha 113.3 in Böhling's edition).

Preference for a short fifth syllable in a śloka verse may not be as strong as for a short penultimate syllable of the even pādas of a śloka, but that preference seems to be the motivation for the following two peculiar compounds.

Instead of *-danta-* in KAŚ 3.19.13 ... *pāṇipādadantabhaṅge karṇanāsācchedane* ... and Viṣṇu 5.68 *karapādadantabhaṅge karṇanāsāvīkartane* ... (both texts are composed in prose), Yājñ. 2.219ab (Mit.) *karapādadata bhaṅge chedane karṇanāsayoḥ*⁹ "When a hand, a foot or a tooth is broken, when an ear or a nose is cut off" gives *karapādadataḥ*, the genitive singular of *kara-pāda-dant-* 'a hand, a foot or a tooth'. The clumsiness of this singular Dvandva¹⁰ can be explained as a result of forcing a typical antispastic cadence on the original word, which occurs in prose texts and hence has no rhythmic restriction.

Another compound peculiar to the text of the *Mitākṣarā* is *asteya-mādhurye* 'abstention from stealing and mild disposition'. All of the ten *yamas* enumerated in Yājñ. 3.312 (Mit.) *brahmācāryaṃ dayā kṣāntir dānaṃ satyam akalkatā/ ahimsāsteyamādhurye damaś ceti yamāḥ smṛtāḥ*¹¹ are traceable to the foregoing literature according to Kane.¹² However, *adroha-* 'abstention from doing harm', which the *Bālakṛdā* reads in the place of Mit. *mādhurya-*, is also grounded on Bhagavadgītā 16.1–3, a list of qualities belonging to

⁹ Bāl. and Apar. read *karapādadantabhaṅge*. Mit. paraphrases *karṇanāsayoḥ* also by the singular form *karṇanāsasya*.

¹⁰ Though Aṣṭ. 2.4.2 *dvaṃdvaś ca prāṇitūryasenāṅgānām* describes that a singular neuter Dvandva is formed from the parts of a body, combination of 'the limbs' and 'the teeth' sounds artificial compared with examples like *śiro-grīvām* 'head and neck' (MaiS, KāthS+). Without this rule, the last member *dant-* m. 'tooth' would mark this compound with masculine.

An example of non-neuter singular Dvandva is Yājñ. 3.37cd (Mit.) *mṛccarmapuṣpakutapakeśatakraviṣakṣitih* (Bāl. °*viśairakān*, Apar. and Vīr. °*kṣitih*).

¹¹ Bāl. *ahimsāsteyam adroho*, Apar. *ahimsāsteyamādhurya- damaś*.

¹² *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. V, pt.2, p.946¹⁵²⁵, pp.1419ff. *ahimsā*, *satya-*, *asteya-* and *brahmācārya-* are traced back to Yogasūtra 2.30, *akalkatā* to Yuktidīpikā p.112, *dama-*, *dāna-* and *dayā* to BĀU 5.2.3. The remaining two, *kṣānti-* and *mādhurya-*, would safely be ascribed to VaikhGS 9.4 (124.9–12), where *kṣamā* and *mādhurya-* rank among the ten *yamas* for a Vānaprastha.

a man born to a divine fortune.¹³ Here as well, the preference for a short fifth syllable seems to underlie the fact that only *asteya-* and *mādhurya-* make a compound in the text of the *Mitākṣarā*. The compound *dhāraṇa-jīvite* ‘maintaining and living’ in Yājñ. 3.174 (Mit.) *aḥaṃkāraḥ smṛtir medhā dveṣo buddhiḥ sukhaṃ dhṛtiḥ/ indriyāntarasamcāra icchā dhāraṇajīvite* also seems to be a Dvandva formed in order to avoid a pāda with a long fifth syllable like **dhāraṇaṃ jīvitaṃ*.¹⁴

c. In the following examples, the author of the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* has changed the order of words in the source texts, presumably to make the text fit the typical cadence of a śloka verse.

apatitānyonyatyāgī occurs in Yājñ. 2.237 *pitṛputrasvasṛbhrātrḍampaty-ācāryaśiṣyakāḥ/ eṣāṃ apatitānyonyatyāgī ca śatadaṇḍabhāk* “Moreover, father and son, sister and brother, wife and husband, teacher and pupil — one who, among them, *abandons his undegraded partner* is charged with a penalty of one hundred [paṇas],” which is an abridgement¹⁵ of KĀŚ 3.20.18 *pitāputrayor dampatyor bhrātrbhaginyor mātulabhagineyayoḥ śiṣyācāryayor vā parasparam apatitaṃ tyajataḥ ...* “[The penalty for violence is imposed on] one who abandons one’s partner, though he or she is not degraded, between father and son, wife and husband, brother and sister, maternal uncle and sister’s son, or pupil and teacher.” The order of the words in the *Kauṭilyārthasāstra* was changed when the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* packed them into a compound (KĀŚ *parasparam apatitaṃ tyajataḥ* → Yājñ. *apatit[a-a]nyonya-tyāgī*), probably with an intention to avoid metrical awkwardness of pāda c **eṣāṃ anyonyāpatita-* with a long fifth syllable. Though Viṣṇu 5.113 *anyonyāpatitatyāgī* is also considered to be made from KĀŚ *parasparam apatitaṃ tyajataḥ*, it does not side with the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* in the order of these members, in a similar way as is observed in Yājñ. 2.219a (Mit.) *karapādadata bhaṅge :: Viṣṇu 5.68*

¹³ Bhagavadgītā 16.1–3 *abhayaṃ sattvasaṃśuddhir jñānayogavyavasthitih/ dānaṃ damaś ca yajñas ca svādhyāyas tapa ārjavam// ahimsāsatyam akrodhas tyāgaḥ śāntir apaiśunam/ dayā bhūteṣv aloluptvaṃ mardavaṃ hrīr acāpalam// tejaḥ kṣamā dhṛtiḥ śaucam adroho nātimānitā/ bhavanti sampadaṃ daivīm abhijātasya bhārata.*

¹⁴ Though *anivedita-vijñātaḥ* in Yājñ. 2.35cd *aniveditavijñāto dāpyas taṃ daṇḍam eva ca* “if one is found out [to have found a treasure] that was not announced [to the king], he should be made give it (the treasure) and fine” has a short fifth syllable similar to this, compounds of this type are attested already in MānavaŚS 3.1.25 *naṣṭādhigatam* and described by Pāṇini in Aṣṭ. 2.1.49. (See Wackernagel, *AiGr* II-1, p.172, §74cβ.)

¹⁵ This assumption might be wrong, for here the *Kauṭilyārthasāstra* looks as if it paraphrased the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* into prose.

karapādadantabhaṅge, in Manu and Yājñ. *vāg-yata-* :: Viṣṇu 61.16 *yata-vāc-*, and in Yājñ. 2.210a *patanīyakṛte kṣepe* :: Viṣṇu 5.29 *patanīyakṣepe kṛte*.

Yājñ. 2.267d *śuṣka-bhinna-mukha-svarāḥ* “those whose mouth and voice are [respectively] dry and changed [should be captured]” has a different order of members from that in KĀŚ 4.6.2 *śuṣka-bhinna-svara-mukha-varṇaṃ* “[one who] has his voice and complexion of the face dry and changed” (Kangle), evidently to make the sixth syllable long.

The order of *kṛte* and (*ā*)*kṣepe* is different between Yājñ. 2.210a *patanīyakṛte kṣepe* “in the case of a [false] reproach made with a degrading crime” and Viṣṇu 5.29 *parasya patanīyākṣepe kṛte* “when a (false) accusation of a degrading crime is made to another.” Though I am not sure which the source of the other is, the reading of the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* fits the meter, while that of the *Viṣṇusmṛti* is free from the ambiguity inherent in Yājñ. *patanīyakṛte*.

2. Position of the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* in philological history

a. Tracing the nominal compounds in the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* to the foregoing literature reveals that it was not composed simply on the principle of summarizing foregoing literature faithfully. Among those compounds in the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* which look unshapely at first sight, some reflect an enterprising policy to cover the preceding literature as extensively as possible, and at the same time to develop a more advanced legal system. Especially, the special heed of the author to the Dharmasūtras must have made him conscious of the discrepancies between them and the *Manusmṛti*.

Compare, for example, Manu *kṛcchrātikṛcchrau* with Yājñ. *kṛcchrātikṛcchrah*. These two names of expiatory rites have different endings (masculine dual and masculine singular), though they are provided for the same sin according to Manu 11.208cd *kṛcchrātikṛcchrau kurvīta viprasyotpādya śoṇitam* “When one spills the blood of a Brahmin, he should practice *kṛcchra*- and *atikṛcchra*-” and Yājñ. 3.292c *kṛcchrātikṛcchro ’sṛkpāte* “*kṛcchrātikṛcchra*- [should be practiced] in the case of bloodshed (of a Brahmin).” Since the *Manusmṛti* gives no special definition of *kṛcchrātikṛcchrau*, it must be a combination of (*prājāpatya-*)*kṛcchra-* and *atikṛcchra-*, each explained in Manu 11.211 *tryahaṃ prātas tryahaṃ sāyaṃ tryahaṃ adyād ayācitam/ tryahaṃ paraṃ ca nāśnīyāt prājāpatyaṃ caran dvijaḥ* “A twice-born man who performs (the *Krikkhra* penance), revealed by Pragāpati, shall eat during three days in the morning (only), during (the next) three days in the evening (only), during the (following) three days (food given) unasked, and shall

fast during another period of three days” (Bühler) and in Manu 11.213 *ekaikaṃ grāsam aśnīyāt tryahāṇi trīṇi pūrvavat/ tryahaṃ copavased antyam atikṛcchraṃ caran dvijaḥ* “A twice-born man who performs an Atikṛcchra (penance), must take his food during three periods of three days in the manner described above, (but) one mouthful only at each meal, and fast during the last three days” (Bühler). Yājñ. *kr̥cchrātikṛcchra-* is explicitly laid down in Yājñ. 3.320ab *kr̥cchrātikṛcchraḥ payasā divasān ekaviṃśatim* “*kr̥cchrātikṛcchra-* [is to live only] on *payas* for twenty-one days.” Here I left the word *payas* open because, in spite of the prevalent meaning ‘milk’ (Yājñ. 1.41a, 1.170b, 1.214a, 3.40c, 3.214c, 3.253b, 3.265c, 3.289b), a small room is left to take it as ‘water’ on the ground of Yājñ. 1.230 *yavair anvavakīryātha bhājane sapavitrake/ śaṃ no devyā payaḥ kṣiptvā yavo ’sīti yavāṃs tathā* “Having scattered barley to [the invited Brahmins], having put water in a vessel equipped with *pavitra* with [the mantra] ‘*śaṃ no devīr abhiṣṭaya āpo bhavantu pitāye śaṃ yor abhi sravantu nah*’ (RV 10.9.4)], and having put barley saying ‘You are barley’.”

The two durations, twenty-one days (Yājñ.) and (12+12=) twenty-four days (Manu), are compatible, if the final fast of the former is performed not twice but only once at the end of the period (9+9+3=21). *kr̥cchrātikṛcchra-*, like *kr̥cchra-* or *atikṛcchra-*, lasts only twelve days in the *Sāmaavidhānabrāhmaṇa*, the *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra*, the *Gautamadharmasūtra* and the *Vāsiṣṭhadharmasūtra*. On the other hand, the source of the dietary prescription in the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* is to be sought outside the *Manusmṛti*, probably in SVB 1.2.8, BDhS 2.1.2.41, GDhS 26.20 and VāDhS 24.3, where *kr̥cchrātikṛcchra-* is an expiation to live only on water (*ab-bhakṣa-*). *kr̥cchrātikṛcchra-* in the Dharmasūtras is singular, because it is a severer kind of *kr̥cchra-* in its content, and means ‘the *Kṛcchra* which is above other *Kṛcchras* [in its severity]’, with the same semantic structure as MBh. *devātideva-* ‘ein über alle Götter hervorragender Gott’ (*pw*).¹⁶ It does not share the same meaning as in the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* though it has the same singular ending.

It would naturally follow from these, that Yājñ. *kr̥cchrātikṛcchra-* is a compromise of the Dharmasūtras and the *Manusmṛti*.¹⁷ The masculine sin-

¹⁶ MBh. 8.24.45a, 12.278.23c, 13.17.143a, 14.93.50c, 15.38.1c.

¹⁷ The *Viṣṇusmṛti* made a similar compromise in Viṣṇu 54.30cd *kr̥cchrātikṛcchraṃ kurvīta viprasotyopādya śoṇitam*, by copying Manu 11.208cd and simply replacing *kr̥cchrātikṛcchrau* with a singular form which had been used more widely.

gular ending *-ah*, quite unusual for a Dvandva, might be a maneuver to cause the application of the Sandhi rule ⟨*-ah + a- → -o ’-*⟩ and to push the words into a verse of eight syllables.¹⁸ But by mentioning the duration as twenty-one days, two nine-days’ terms of prescribed diet concluded by one final fast of three days, the author might well have emphasized the oneness of this expiation, justifying his own choice of the singular form. And when the author gave the compromised description of this rite in Yājñ. 3.320ab, he has virtually mitigated it into a more practicable one, by changing the wording from *ap-(bhakṣa-)* ‘(living on) water’ to slightly ambiguous *payas-* ‘milk (or water)’.

b. In the following three cases, the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* takes over the wording of the *Manusmṛti*, but also modifies it slightly.

Manu *suvarṇasteyakṛd vipro* :: Yājñ. *brāhmaṇasvarṇahārī*.¹⁹ Manu 11.99-100 *suvarṇasteyakṛd vipro rājānam abhigamya tu/ svakarma khyāpayan brūyān māṃ bhavān anuśāstv iti// grhītvā musalaṃ rājā sakṛd dhanyāt tu taṃ svayam/ vadhena śudhyati steno brāhmaṇas tapasaiva tu* “A Brāhmaṇa who has stolen the gold (of a *Brāhmaṇa*) shall go to the king and, confessing his deed, say, ‘Lord, punish me!’ Taking (from him) the club (which he must carry), the king himself shall strike him once, by his death the thief becomes pure; or a Brāhmaṇa (may purify himself) by austerities” (Bühler) and Yājñ. 3.257ab *brāhmaṇasvarṇahārī tu rājñe musalam arpayet/ svakarma vyākhyāyaṃs tena hato mukto ’pi vā śuciḥ* “And a stealer of a Brahmin’s gold should hand a club to the king. He confesses his own deed, and when he is beaten by him (the king), or when he is released as well, he becomes guiltless.” The Brahmin’s status as a thief in the *Manusmṛti* is changed into a victim of the theft in the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, unless we read [×]*brāhmaṇas svarṇahārī* for *brāhmaṇasvarṇahārī* as discussed above s.v. *dr̥ṣṭiḥ śrotrajñatā*. The *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* amalgamates Manu 11.99–100 with Manu 8.316ab *śāsanād vā vimokṣād vā stenaḥ steyād vimucyate* “Whether he be punished or pardoned, the thief is freed from the (guilt of) theft” (Bühler) and modified them into a rule for gold-robbers in general, probably in order to avoid imposing a capital penalty just on a Brahmin.

¹⁸ Cf. Meyer (1927), p.244: “Wohl schon weil *kṛicchrātīkṛicchrau* nicht in seinen Vers gepaßt hätte, und weil sein *kṛicchrātīkṛicchra*, sintemalen dieser 21 Tage Fasten bedeutet, etwa gleich schlimm ist, wie beide zusammen”

¹⁹ *svarṇa-* comes from *su-varṇa-* by syncope. Another example of syncope is Yājñ. 3.300b *parṣadaḥ for pariṣadaḥ* (*AiGr* I, p.60 §53c “Hypersanskritismus”).

Manu *dāsī ghaṭam* :: Yājñ. *dāsīkumbham*. Manu 11.183ab *dāsī ghaṭam apāṃ pūrṇaṃ paryasyet pretavat padā* “A female slave shall upset with her foot a pot filled with water, as if it were for a dead person” (Bühler) and Yājñ. 3.294ab *dāsīkumbhaṃ bahir grāmān ninayeran svabāndhavāḥ*²⁰ “His own relatives should pour down the jar of a slave girl outside the village.” By putting *dāsī* and *kumbha-* together, the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* creates a difference from the *Manusmṛti*, that *dāsī* ‘a female slave’, who overturned the pot in the latter, becomes its mere possessor in the former. In this case, the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* presumably intended to reconcile the *Manusmṛti* with, or revert to, an older stage of regulation, which is shown in GDhS 3.2.4 *dāsaḥ karmakaro vāvakarād amedhyapātram ānīya dāsighaṭāt pūrayitvā dakṣiṇāmukho yadā viparyasyed amukam anudakaṃ karomīti nāmagrāham* “A slave or a labourer brings a dirty vessel from a dump, fills it from the pot of a female slave, and when he, facing south, turns it over, the name [of the patita] is mentioned with the formula ‘I make So-and-so without water.’”

varṇāśrametarāṇām (Mit.) in Yājñ. 1.1cd *varṇāśrametarāṇāṃ no brūhi dharmān aśeṣataḥ* “Tell us completely the duties of the castes, the periods of life, and other [phases of life]”²¹ reflects an effort to be more strict about the range of dharma than Manu 1.2 *bhagavan sarvavarṇānāṃ yathāvad anupūrvaśaḥ/ antaraprabhavānāṃ ca dharmān no vaktum arhasi* “Deign, divine one, to declare to us precisely and in due order the sacred laws of each of the (four chief) castes (varna) and of the intermediate ones” (Bühler). What the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* means here by *itara-*, I think, is to comprise those dharmas which are not covered by *varṇa-* or *āśrama-*, i.e. the dharmas of a woman, a king, a couple, an area, a family or a guild, which the *Manusmṛti* enumerates in 1.114–118 as its topics.

c. In the following two examples, the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* enlarges compounds of the foregoing literature, probably in order to eliminate ambiguity inherent in them.

sahoḍha- :: Yājñ. *sahoḍha-ja-* in Yājñ. 2.131d *garbhe vinnāḥ sahoḍhajāḥ*

²⁰ Bāl. *dāsīghaṭam apāṃ pūrṇaṃ*.

²¹ Although *itara-* usually means ‘other than, different from’ when used as the last member of a compound, a Dvandva of the same makeup is also attested in ŚvetU 1.1 *kiṃ kāraṇaṃ brahma kutaḥ sma jātā jīvāmaḥ kena kva ca sampratiṣṭhāḥ/ adhiṣṭhitāḥ kena sukhetareṣu vartāmahe brahmavido vyavasthām*. See also Stenzler (1849), p.1 “die pflichten der kasten, der orden und der anderen”; *PW* I col. 785 s.v. *itara-* 1 “hier bezeichnet *itara-* nur etwas vom Vorangehenden Verschiedenes”; G. Nakano (1950), p.3 “種姓住期その他の法.”

‘*sahodha-ja-* is [a son] found in the womb [already at marriage].’ Since the definitions of *sahodha-* in BDhS 2.2.3.25, VDhS 17.27, KĀŚ 3.7.11, Manu 9.173 and Viṣṇu 15.16 agree with that of *sahodha-ja-*, these two words must refer to the same kind of son. *ja-* of *sahodha-ja-* should therefore be translated not as ‘born from’, but as ‘born as’, which is an explanatory pleonasm. By attaching the redundant syllable *ja-*, the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* probably intends to distinguish this word clearly from its homonym *sahodha-* ‘[a thief] having stolen goods’ which appears in VDhS 19.39, Nārada 14.17a, 19.13c and Manu 9.270c.

sahāsana- :: *sahaikāsana-* (Mit.) in Yājñ. 2.284cd (Mit.) *adeśakālasambhāṣaṃ sahaikāsanam eva ca*²² “Conversation in improper place or time, and sharing one seat together [are counted as adultery].” The second member *eka-* ‘one’ is redundant, for *sahāsana-* would be enough for the meaning of sitting together, even if the place is not expressly mentioned in it like in Manu 8.357c *saha khaṭvāsanam* “sitting on a couch together.” The *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* (or possibly the *Mitākṣarā*) seems to suggest by *eka-* intimacy between the man and the woman in question, and thereby to emphasize immorality of the action; for the word *sahāsana-* is used in different context as well, e.g. in Manu 8.281a (sitting with a man of a higher caste), Manu 11.184b (sitting with a degraded man) and MBh 3.1.27 (sitting with a wicked man), and even if the context is on adultery, it includes innocent cases, e.g. BDhS 1.2.3.34.

3. Position of the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* in linguistic history

a. *cvi*-formation

When *kr̥ta-* in the last position means “that which was made X”, X is always expressed by the *cvi*-formation in the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*: Yājñ. 2.182a *balād dāsīkr̥taḥ* “one who was made a slave by force,” Yājñ. 2.301d *tad evāṣṭagunīkr̥tam* “it (the penalty) is made eight times as much,” Yājñ. 2.307d *triṃśadgunīkr̥tam* “made thirty times as much”. While no compound ending in *kr̥ta-* “that which was made (something)” is found in the *Manusmṛti*, it shows several cases where *bhūta-* is combined with a nominal stem as the first member: Manu 3.97c *bhasmabhūteṣu vipreṣu* (Kullūka: *bhasmībhūteṣu*) “to Brahmins who are as good as ashes,”²³ Manu 5.93d *brahmabhūtā* “like Brahman,” (Bühler) Manu 7.217ab *ātmabhūtaiḥ...paricārakaiḥ* “a servant as faith-

²² Bāl. *sahāvasthānam*, Apar. and Vīr. *sahaikasthānam*.

²³ For the examples of *bhasma-* as a symbol of uselessness see Hara (1967), pp.414-409.

ful as [the king] himself,” Manu 9.33a *kṣetrabhūtā* “like a field,” b *bījabhūtaḥ* “like seeds,” Manu 10.91c *kṛmībhūtaḥ* “who has become a worm.” The function of *bhūta-* seems to be comparison or approximation in all cases except the last, where the original meaning of *bhavⁱ/bhū* ‘to become’ might still be alive, with the first member *kṛmi-* functioning as its complement. Since it is the class beginning with *śreṇi-* that can be compounded with *bhūta-* to form Karmadhārayas according to Pāṇini, Aṣṭ. 2.1.59 *śreṇyādayaḥ kṛtādibhiḥ*, **kṛmībhūta-*, a *cvi*-formation, would rather be expected.²⁴

The *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* uses *bhūta-* as the last member four times together with *cvi*-forms: Yājñ. 2.17c *pūrvapakṣe dharībhūte* “when the statement of plaintiff is turned down”, 2.64a *dviguṇībhūtam* “which has become twice”, 2.100c *pratimānasamībhūto* “who has become the same in weight”, 3.218a *niṣkalmaṣībhūtaḥ* “who has become sinless”. And when such a compound is split up by a pāda border three times, the first pāda ends in a bare *-a*-stem, apparently because a *cvi*-form is too closely connected with *bhūta-* to admit a pause in between: Yājñ. 3.75ab *saṃkleda- bhūtaḥ* “which has become moisture” Yājñ. 3.186cd *bīja- bhūtāḥ* “who have become seeds” Yājñ. 3.248ab *lakṣya- bhūtaḥ*²⁵ “who has become a target”. Pāda borders are not crossed by a word in the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* except the one between 1.79c and d: *brahmacāry eva parvāṇy ādyāś catasras tu varjayet*. We have already seen above in 1b the tendency that metrical conditions outweigh a consistent use of one form in the arbitrary change between *madhu-sarpiṣā* and *madhu-sarpīrbhyām*.

b. Position of verbal adjectives in *-ta-*

The following compounds, which have verbal adjectives ending in *-ta-* as their last members, admit of question as to the order of, or the government relationship among, their members. This is not a problem specific to the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*: For example, *vāg-yata-* ‘one who has restrained his speech, of restrained speech’ is found not only in Yājñ. 1.31b, 1.239d, 3.5b, 3.55b or Manu 3.236b, 3.258b (Kullūka), 9.60b, but also widely in the Sūtras. While the order of the members in *vāg-yata-* is acceptable when we consider *yata-* as actively governing *vāc-* as its object,²⁶ as is suggested by the established

²⁴ The *Manusmṛti* has very few *cvi*-forms: 3.97c according to Kullūka *bhasmībhūteṣu*; 4.188d *bhasmībhavati*.

²⁵ Bāl. *lakṣābhūtaḥ*. According to Stenzler, Kullūka on Manu 11.13 reads *lakṣyī-*, which is not supported by Aṣṭ. 6.4.152. His taste for *cvi* is shown in his reading *bhasmībhūteṣu* for Manu 3.97c *bhasmābhūteṣu* as well.

²⁶ Wackernägel, *AiGr* II-1, p.195 §83b and Debrunner’s *Nachträge*, p.58. Cf. Pāli

use of *vācam* with *yam* or the compound *vācaṃyamā-* in the Brāhmaṇas, it seems to have struck even the old writers as strange, for MaiUp 6.9 and Viṣṇu 61.16 uses *yata-vāc-*, a Bahuvrīhi in the regular order.²⁷

karma-duṣṭaḥ in Yājñ. 1.224cd *parapūrvāpatih stenaḥ karmaduṣṭās ca ninditāḥ*²⁸ “The husband of a remarried woman, a thief, and *people of degraded conduct* are blamed.” The usage in the *Manusmṛti* indicates both possibilities in the position of *duṣṭa-* in compounds: Manu 3.225d *duṣṭa-cetasah*, 8.386b *duṣṭa-vāk* :: 5.108c *mano-duṣṭā*, 3.156d *vāg-duṣṭaḥ*, 8.345a *vāg-duṣṭāt*.

vr̥ddha-sevitaḥ (Bāl.) in Yājñ. 1.309ab (Bāl.) *mahotsāhaḥ sthūlalakṣaḥ kṛtajño vr̥ddhasevitaḥ*²⁹ “Of great spirit, ambitious, grateful, *attentive to the seniors*” (Tokunaga 1993, p.5). *sevita-*, a verbal adjective in *-ta-* with an active meaning, governs *vr̥ddha-* as its object, as is obvious from the established teaching of devotion to the elders, and from the use of the same compound in MBh 1.45.14 and 3.261.3.³⁰

lakṣaṇa-bhraṣṭāḥ in Yājñ. 3.217cd *jāyante lakṣaṇabhraṣṭā daridrāḥ puruṣādhamāḥ* “They are born as the meanest of men, poor and *with any auspicious marks fallen.*” Since the verb *bhrās/ bhrāś* is used with the ablative, as in TS 1.6.11.1 *prāti yajñéna tiṣṭhati ná yajñád bhrāśate*, an ablative case relationship can be considered as the basis of this compound, though Aṣṭ. 2.1.38 does not include *bhraṣṭa-* in the verbal adjectives which form compounds with nouns in the ablative. Mit. *duṣṭalakṣaṇāḥ* and Apar. *bhraṣṭasubhalakṣaṇāḥ* paraphrase this compound as an inverted Bahuvrīhi, which is described by Pāṇini in Aṣṭ. 2.2.37.

dhātu-vimūrchitaḥ in Yājñ. 3.75ab *prathame māsi samkledabhūto dhātu-vimūrchitaḥ*³¹ “In the first month [after conception, the ātman] is as it were moisture, *congelation of the elements.*” If *vimūrchita-* ‘congealed’ qualifies *dhātu-* as an adjective, it should rather precede *dhātu-* according to the general order of the members of a Karmadhāraya compound (Aṣṭ. 2.1.57).

kūṭacihna-kṛtād (Bāl.) in Yājñ. 2.212cd (Bāl.) *draṣṭavyo vyavahāras tu*

vācāyata- (Davane 1956, p.193), however.

²⁷ Or an Upapada compound with an adjectival first member like RV. *raṇyavāc-*. Cf. Reuter (1892) pp.202f. with notes.

²⁸ Bāl. *karmaduṣṭāś*.

²⁹ Mit. and Apar. *vr̥ddhasevakaḥ*.

³⁰ See Tokunaga (1993), p.4, footnote 13, for further information.

³¹ Dr. Tsutomu Yamashita pointed out to me that Caraka 4.4.9 *prathame māsi sammūrchitaḥ sarvadhātukaluṣīkṛtaḥ khetabhūto bhavaty ...* provides source for this passage.

*kūṭacihnakṛtād bhayāt*³² “But a case should be examined for fear of one who made false signs.”

kāla-kṛtaḥ in Yājñ. 2.58c *kāle kālakṛto naśyēt* “[A pawn] — will be forfeited at [the expiration of the] term.” The *Mitākṣarā* understands this as a Bahuvrīhi with an inverted order, ascribing it to the ākṛti-gaṇa referred to by Pāṇini in Aṣṭ. 2.2.37. Judging from the usage of *kālaṃ kṛ* ‘eine Zeit festsetzen’ noted in *PW* II, col. 249, s.v. 2 *kāla* 1, with a quotation from Rām. 6.38.29 *kālaś ca kriyatām asya svapne jāgaraṇe tathā*, interpreting *kāla-kṛta* as ‘[a pawn] for which a term is set’ sounds convincing. By inverting the usual order of a Bahuvrīhi, *kāla-* is put side by side with *kāle*, probably to make the logic of this proverbial phrase more evident and convincing.

c. Louis Renou points out that the verb *kar/kṛ* and its derivatives like *kṛta* are often used in combination with action nouns in Bhāravi’s *Kirātārjunīya*.³³ The *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* is also characterized by a similar dependence on this verb: Although the author employs every possible means to make the text short, he uses this verb with various action nouns merely to simplify inflections, e.g. 1.155c *na nindātādane kuryāt*, 1.329c *balānām darśanaṃ kṛtvā*, 2.204c *kṣepaṃ karoti ced*, 3.8b-c *sāramārgaṇaṃ karoti yaḥ*, 3.56a *kṛtveṣṭim*. This root is also used as a substitute for other verbs, e.g. Yājñ. 1.147c *kṛte ’ntare* (cf. Manu 4.126c *antarāgamane*), 1.287a *kṛtākṛtāṃs taṇḍulān* and 2.164d *kṛtavetanaḥ*.

4. Different readings

The differences among the readings given by the commentators reveal their academic and philosophical background, and also help us understand the history of the transmission of the text of the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*.

a. We have seen above s.v. *karapādadataḥ* that the text of the *Mitākṣarā* looks as if it manipulates Pāṇini’s grammar skillfully compared with that given by the *Bālakṛīḍā. varṇāśrametarāṇām* in Yājñ. 1.1cd (Mit.) shows a

³² Mit. *kūṭacihnakṛto*. Meyer’s translation ‘[die (Gerichtssache)] eines solchen, der aus Furcht (vor Entdeckung und Strafe) falsche Zeichen angebracht hat’ (Meyer 1927, p.135), which takes this reading as a genitive of *-kṛt-*, does not apply to the unequivocal ablative of Bāl. *-kṛtād*.

³³ Renou (1959), p.39 with note 167: “Avec la racine *kṛ-* le nom d’action est presque seul en usage, l’abstrait proprement dit est rare. ... Avec les noms verbaux, notamment avec *kṛta* ”

similar attitude of the *Mitākṣarā*. Finding in this stanza an influence of Manu 1.2 *bhagavan sarvavarṇānām yathāvad anupūrvaśaḥ/ antaraprabhavānām ca dharmān no vaktum arhasi*, the *Bālakṛīḍā* interprets this compound as a Dvandva, “[the duties] of the [four] castes, of the [four] periods of life, of the classes other than the [four] castes [like the mixed castes], and of the lifestyles other than the [four] periods of life [like the heretics].”³⁴ While the *Mitākṣarā* agrees with the interpretation of the *Bālakṛīḍā*, it gives a different inflection *-iṣṭarānām*, seeking its authority from Aṣṭ. 1.1.31 *dvandve ca*,³⁵ which excludes the title as a pronoun from the group of stems comprising *itara-* when they are used as the last members of Dvandva compounds. The un-Pāṇinian ending of Bāl. *varṇāśrametareṣām*, is however not necessarily to be rejected, for Yājñ. 2.199d uses another *itara-* with an adjectival ending *-ād*, i.e. an anomaly in the opposite direction.

The following two cases could be adduced as reinforcing arguments for the inclination of the *Mitākṣarā* toward grammatical strictness: The *Mitākṣarā* reads *vr̥ddha-sevakaḥ* for Bāl. *vr̥ddha-sevitaḥ* in Yājñ. 1.309b. The word *vr̥ddha-sevakaḥ*, a formation from the root *sev* with the agent suffix *-aka-* (‘*ṅvul*’) sounds an innovation of *vr̥ddha-sevita-*, for it suggests an intention to shut out the possibility to take *vr̥ddha-* as the agent of *sevita-* with a passive meaning, and *vr̥ddha-sevita-* is attested in the *Mahābhārata*.

kūṭacihna-kṛtaḥ (Mit.) :: *kūṭacihna-kṛtād* (Bāl., Apar.³⁶) in Yājñ. 2.212d. Judging from its paraphrase *kūṭacihnakāriduṣṭapurūṣabhayāt* ‘for fear of a wicked person making a false sign,’ the *Bālakṛīḍā* understands *kṛta-* as actively governing *kūṭa-cihna-*. In the reading of Mit. *kūṭacihna-kṛtaḥ* ‘[for fear] of one who makes a false sign’, *kṛt-*, a root noun with the augment *t*, is used for *kṛta-*, probably in order to exclude the possibility that it is understood in passive meaning like in *vr̥ddhasevita-* :: *vr̥ddhasevaka-*.³⁷

³⁴ Bāl. *varṇā brāhmaṇādayaḥ/ āśramā brahmacāryādayaḥ/ varṇetarā antaraprabhavā anulomādayaḥ/ āśrametarāḥ pāṣaṇḍādayaḥ/ teṣāṃ varṇāśrametareṣām/ .../ anyāḥ pāṭhaḥ* — ‘*varṇānām sāsramānām*’ *iti*.

³⁵ Mit. ‘*itara*’*śabdasya ‘dvandve ca’ iti sarvanāmasaṃjñāpratiṣedhaḥ*. The *Bālakṛīḍā* might have been conscious of this sūtra when it offered an optional reading *varṇānām sāsramānām*.

³⁶ *kūṭacihnakṛtād ṛte*.

³⁷ The commentary part of the *Mitākṣarā*, however, seems to explain not *kūṭacihna-kṛt-* but *kūṭacihna-kṛta-*, and that differently from the *Bālakṛīḍā*: *kūṭacihnakṛtasambhāvanābhayāt* ‘for the fear, which feeling is caused by a false sign’. The difficulty with this interpretation is the redundancy of *kṛta-*, for *kūṭacihnād bhayāt* or *kūṭacihna-bhayāt* would be enough for this meaning.

b. Some readings of the *Bālakrīdā*, which the *Mitākṣarā* does not follow, are grounded on the *Mahābhārata*, just as the above-mentioned form, Bāl. *vr̥ddha-sevitaḥ*, has its source in the *Mahābhārata*, and Yājñ. 3.312c (Bāl.) *adroho* in Bhagavadgītā 16.3b. Another example of the same sort is *sahasra-kaḥ* (Mit., Apar.) :: *sahasraśaḥ* (Bāl.) in Yājñ. 3.119 (Mit.) *mohajālam apāsyeha puruṣo dr̥śyate hi yaḥ/ sahasrakarapannetraḥ sūryavarcāḥ sahasra-kaḥ* “If one cast off the net of delusion, Puruṣa, who has a thousand hands, feet and eyes, whose lustre is like the sun, and who has a thousand heads, becomes visible [to him].” Puruṣa of a thousand heads, eyes and feet must have been widely known by the famous verses of RV 10.90.1ab (=VS 31.1ab etc.). *sahasra-kara-* ‘thousand-handed’ and *sūrya-varcas-* ‘of lustre like the sun’ can be traced back respectively to AV 19.6.1a *sahāsrabāhuḥ* and to VS 31.18b *ādityāvārṇam*.³⁸ Though *ka-* ‘head’ as a single word sounds like lexicographer’s invention, it is not necessarily to be rejected here as such, for *kaṇḍharā* is used in Yājñ. 2.220c, which might be a compound having this word as the first member (*kaṇḍharā* ‘holding the head → neck’), or from which this word might have been abstracted through such interpretation. While the reading of the *Mitākṣarā* is in accordance with the ambitious attitude of the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* to cover as many sources as possible, Bāl. *sahasraśaḥ* ‘by thousands’ agrees with the frequent use of this word in the cadence of the even pādas of the ślokas in the *Mahābhārata*.³⁹

c. When a difference in reading seems to have its origin in the background of each commentator, it makes us hesitate to arrange the readings in one linear genealogical order. The *Bālakrīdā* has sometimes a philosophical rather than a practical bent. For example, the *Mitākṣarā* on Yājñ. 3.174 (Mit.) *icchā dhāraṇajīvite* considers the latter two of *icchā*, *dhāraṇa-* and *jīvita-* as forming a Dvandva *dhāraṇa-jīvite* ‘sustaining [the body] and [supporting] the life’. Though isolation of the first word *icchā* ‘wish’ is avoided in Bāl. *icchādhāraṇajīvite* which joins *icchā* with *a-dhāraṇa-*, its interpretation ‘non-sustaining (i.e. renouncement) of a body at will’⁴⁰ together with its paraphrase of b *dhṛtiḥ* by *dhāraṇā* ‘concentration’ sounds too spiritualistic, and is also unlikely judging from the enumeration of *icchā* and *dhāraṇa-* in the similar list of the signs of *paramātmān-* in Caraka 4.1.70–72. This does not mean,

³⁸ I owe the reference to Mr. Makoto Fushimi.

³⁹ *sahasraśaḥ* occupies this position in 349 out of the 366 passages which I looked up in Tokunaga’s electronic text.

⁴⁰ *icchayā yad adhāraṇaṃ śarīrasya tatparityāgaḥ tad icchādhāraṇam*.

of course, that the reading of the *Bālakrīḍā* is more interpolated than that of the *Mitākṣarā*: In Yājñ. 3.154ab (Bāl.) *jñe 'jñe ca prakṛtau caiva vikāre cāvīśeṣavān* “not discriminating between one who knows and one who does not know, and between an original and a modification,” the logic of the *Bālakrīḍā* is more transparent than that of Mit. *jñeyajñe* ‘about *ātman* which knows what is to be known,’ and it agrees with Caraka 4.5.12.⁴¹

d. The fact that the text of the *Aparārka* does not agree uniformly either with that of the *Bālakrīḍā* or with the *Mitākṣarā* might mean that it had assumed editorship on the texts of preceding commentators and worked them up into its own text through selection and emendation; the following example is interesting in this respect. The word *pākhaṇḍyanāsritāḥ* (Mit.) in Yājñ. 3.6 (Mit.) ^a*pākhaṇḍyanāsritāḥ* ^b*stenā* ^c*bhartr̥ghnyaḥ* ^d*kāmagādikāḥ*⁴² / ^e*surāpya* ^f*ātmatyāginyo*⁴³ *nāśaucodakabhājanāḥ* “—, lady thieves, husband-killers, wanton women etc., liquor-drinking women, women who have committed suicide, do not deserve water libation for impurity” should be understood in the light of Manu 5.89cd-90 ^f*ātmanas tyāginām caiva nivartetodakakriyā* / ^a*pāṣaṇḍam āsritānām ca* ^d*carantīnām ca kāmataḥ* / *garbhā*^c*bhartr̥druhām caiva* ^e*surāpīnām ca yoṣitām*. The expressions *carantīnām* ‘[women] who through lust live (with many men),’ *garbhābhartr̥druhām* ‘[women] who have caused an abortion, have killed their husbands,’ *surāpīnām ca yoṣitām* ‘to women ... [who] drink spirituous liquor (Bühler)’ in Manu 5.90 support the interpretation to take *pāṣaṇḍam āsritānām* also as women: “[to women] who have joined a heretical sect” (Bühler). The *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* has three different readings according to the three commentators: Mit. *pākhaṇḍyanāsritāḥ*, Bāl. *pāṣaṇḍam āsritāḥ* and Apar. *pāṣaṇḍān āsritāḥ*. The *Bālakrīḍā* follows the *Manusmṛti* not only in its reading but also in commenting b *kāmagās tathā* as *tathāśabdaḥ smṛtyantaroktavṛthāsāṅkarajātādyarthaḥ* “The word *tathā* means ‘those born in vain or from mixture [of castes] etc.’ mentioned in another law book (i.e. Manu 5.89)”.⁴⁴ The reading of the *Mitākṣarā*

⁴¹ I thank Professor Kyô Kanô for the reference.

⁴² Bāl. *kāmagās tathā*.

⁴³ Apar. *ātmaḥātinyo*. The reading of the *Mitākṣarā* and the *Bālakrīḍā* seems to be taken from Manu *ātmanas tyāginām*, whereas that of the *Aparārka* goes with *ātmaḥātīn-* m. in Yājñ. 3.21b *anvakṣaṃ cātmaḥātīnām*.

⁴⁴ Agreement with the *Manusmṛti* is not particular to the *Bālakrīḍā*. Take for example *vratālopaḥ...vratālopanam* (Mit., Apar.) :: *vratālopaḥ...brahmalopanam* (Bāl.) in Yājñ. 3.236c–238d *nāstikiyaṃ vratālopaś ca ... kauṭilyaṃ vratālopanam* or *brahmalopanam* “..., atheism and violation of a vow, ... fraud, violation of a vow (or chastity), ...”

shows a tendency to load the text with much meaning as in *sahasrakah*, and interprets this as a Dvandva of ‘heretics’ and ‘those who have not undergone proper modes of life’. Though the *Aparārka* agrees with the *Bālakrīḍā* in its interpretation, its reading *pāṣaṇḍānāśritāḥ* can also be divided as *pāṣaṇḍ/a-a/nāśritāḥ*, i.e. a Dvandva like Mit. *pākhaṇḍy-anāśritāḥ*. The reading of the *Aparārka* is compatible with both the *Mitākṣarā* and the *Bālakrīḍā* in this case.

5. Conclusion

The tendency of the *Yājñavalkyaśmṛti* to incorporate as much foregoing literature as possible is reflected in the frequent deviation of its nominal compounds from phonological and morphological rules of traditional grammar. Grammatical irregularities of its compounds are also caused by the effort to fit as many words as possible in the śloka meter. On the other hand, some of the modest revisions made to the compounds in the foregoing literature, such as the singular form *kṛcchrātīkṛcchraḥ* compared to the dual form *kṛcchrātīkṛcchrau* in the *Manuśmṛti*, might suggest an enterprising policy of the author to integrate the ordinances of the foregoing literature into a more self-consistent legal system. Among the original texts cited in the commentaries, the one in the *Mitākṣarā* shows less grammatical irregularities than that of the *Bālakrīḍā*, but it might be a result of correction of the original text.

List of Abbreviations

AiGr: Altindische Grammatik. *Apar.*, *Aparārka*: Aparārka-yājñavalkīyadharmasāstranibandha, Aparārka’s commentary on Yājñ. *ĀpDhS*: Āpastambadharmasūtra. *Aṣṭ.*: Aṣṭādhyāyī. *Bāl.*: Bālakrīḍā, Viśvarūpa’s commentary on the *Yājñavalkyaśmṛti*. *BDhS*: Baudhāyanadharmasūtra. *Caraka*: Carakasamhitā. *GDhS*: Gautamadharmasūtra. *HirDhS*: Hiraṇyakeśidharmasūtra. *KAŚ*: Kauṭīliyārthasāstra. *KāṭhS*: Kāṭhakasamhitā. *KŚS*: Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra. *MaiS*: Maitrāyaṇi-

These two synonymous action nouns *vratalopaḥ* and *vratalopanam*, formed from the root *lup/lop*: *lumpāti* ‘break’ respectively with suffixes *-a-* (‘*ghañ’*) and *-ana-*, appear in the list of upapātakas (234–242). Choice of the two different formations in the same context seems to be simply for filling meter. The reading of Bāl. *brahmalopanam* ‘violation of abstinence’ saves the senselessness of repeating the same offense *vratalopa-* and *vratalopana-* in Mit., but it is not grounded on the foregoing literature. Mit. *vratalopanam* agrees with Manu 11.61b *vratalopanam*.

NOMINAL COMPOUNDS IN THE YĀJÑAVALKYASMRĪTI

saṃhitā. MānavaŚS: Mānavaśrautasūtra. Manu: Manusmṛti. MBh.: Mahābhārata. Mit.: Mitākṣarā, Vijñāneśvara's commentary on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*. Nārada: Nāradaśmṛti. PārGS: Pāraskaraḡhyasūtra. *PW*: *Sanskrit Wörterbuch* by O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth. *pw*: *Sanskrit Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung* by O. Böhtlingk. Rām: Rāmāyaṇa. RV: Ṛgveda. SVB: Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa. ŚvetU: Śvetāśvataropaniṣad. TS: Taittirīya-Saṃhitā. VāDhS: Vāsiṣṭhadharmasūtra. VaikhGS: Vaikhānasagrhyasūtra. Vīr.: Vīramitrodaya, Mitramiśra's commentary on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*. Viṣṇu: Viṣṇusmṛti. Yājñ.: Yājñavalkyasmṛti.

Index of Sanskrit Words

<i>agnyāpaḥ</i>	1a	<i>naṣṭonmrṣṭe</i>	1a
<i>aniveditavijñātaḥ</i>	1b	<i>patanvīyakṛte kṣepe</i>	1c
<i>apatitānyonyatyāgī</i>	1c	<i>payas</i>	2a
<i>asteyamādhurye</i>	1b	<i>parṣad-</i>	2b
<i>ātmatyāginyah</i>	4d	<i>pākhaṇḍyanāśritāḥ</i>	4d
<i>icchā(-)dhāraṇajīvite</i>	1b	<i>pratipraṇavasamyuktām</i>	1a
<i>uditoditam</i>	1a	<i>brahmalopanam</i>	4d
<i>kaṃdharā</i>	4b	<i>brāhmaṇasvarṇahārī</i>	2b
<i>karapādadataḥ</i>	1b	<i>madhusarpiṣ-</i>	1b
<i>karmaduṣṭaḥ</i>	3b	<i>varṇāśrametarāṇām, -eṣām</i>	2b, 4a
<i>kālakṛtaḥ</i>	3b	<i>viṃśativārṣikī</i>	1a
<i>kūṭacihnakṛtād</i>	3b	<i>vāgyata-</i>	1c
<i>kṛcchrātīkṛcchraḥ</i>	2a	<i>vṛddhasevitaḥ</i>	3b
<i>kriyamānopakāre</i>	1a	<i>vṛddhasevakaḥ</i>	3b
<i>cvi-formation</i>	3a	<i>vratalopanam</i>	4d
<i>jñe 'jñe, jñeyajñe</i>	4c	<i>lakṣaṇabhraṣṭāḥ</i>	3b
<i>daśavārṣikī</i>	1a	<i>śaktyalamkṛtā</i>	1a
<i>daṣṭaśvoṣṭrādivāyasaiḥ</i>	1a	<i>śuṣkabhinnamukhasvarāḥ</i>	1c
<i>dhātuvimūrccitaḥ</i>	3b	<i>(dṛṣṭi)śrotrajñatā</i>	2b
<i>dhāraṇajīvite</i>	1b	<i>sahasrakaḥ</i>	4b
<i>dāsikumbham</i>	2b	<i>sahodhaja-</i>	2c
<i>devātideva-</i>	2a	<i>sahaikāsanam</i>	2c

Bibliography

- Bharadwaj, Sudhi Kant. 1982. *Linguistic Study of Dharmasūtras*. Rohtak (Manthan Publications).
- Bühler, Georg. 1886. *The Laws of Manu, translated with extracts from seven commentaries*, Sacred Books of the East, Vol. 25. Oxford.
- Davane, Gulab V. 1956. *Nominal Composition in Middle Indo-Aryan*, Deccan College Dissertation Series 11. Poona (Deccan College).
- Gampert, Wilhelm. 1939. *Die Sühnenzeremonien in der altindischen Rechtsliteratur*, Monografie Archivu Orientálního, Vol. VI. Prag (Orientalisches Institut).
- Hara, Minoru. 1967. *Hai*. Tōkyō Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū Hōkoku Dai San, Tetsugaku Ronbunshū, 450–384. Tokyo. (: 原実. 灰. 東京大学文学部研究報告第三 哲学論文集. 東京.)
- Hartmann, Peter. 1955. *Nominale Ausdrucksformen im wissenschaftlichen Sanskrit*. Heidelberg (Carl Winter).
- Kane, P. V. 1930–1962. *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Government Oriental Series, Class B, No. 6, 5 vols. Poona (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute).
- . Dharma-Sūtra of Śaṅkha-Likhita. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, vols. 7 and 8.
- Kangle, R. P. 1972. *The Kauṭīlīya Arthaśāstra, Part II, An English translation with critical and explanatory notes* (2nd ed.), Bombay (University of Bombay).
- Kirfel, Willibald. 1908. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Nominalkomposition in den Upaniṣads und im Epos*. Bonn (Carl Georgi).
- Meyer, Johann Jakob. 1927. *Über das Wesen der altindischen Rechtschriften und ihr Verhältnis zu einander und zu Kauṭīlya*. Leipzig (Otto Harrassowitz).
- Nakano, Gishō. 1950. *Yādjunyavarukīya Hōten*. Kōya (Nakano Kyōju Kanreki Kinen Kai). (: 中野義照. ヤーヂュニャブルキヤ法典. 高野, 中野教授還暦記念会.)
- Renou, Louis. 1959. Sur la structure du Kāvya. *Journal Asiatique* 247, 1–113.
- Reuter, R. N. 1892. Die altindischen nominalkomposita, ihrer betonung nach untersucht, *KZ* 31, 157–232.
- Richter, Oswald. 1898. Die unechten Nominalkomposita des Altindischen und Altiranischen, 2 pts. (Leipzig, Phil. Diss 1897). *Indogermanische*

NOMINAL COMPOUNDS IN THE YĀJÑAVALKYASMRITI

- Forschungen* 9, 1–62, 183–251.
- Shamasastry, R (tr.). 1929. *Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra*, Mysore (Wesleyan Mission Press).
- Stenzler, Adolf Friedrich. 1849. *Yājñavalkya's Gesetzbuch. Sanskrit und Deutsch*. Berlin–London (F. Dümmler's, Williams & Norgate).
- Tokunaga, Muneo. 1993. Structure of the *Rājadharmā* Section in the Yājñavalkyasmṛti (i.309-368). *Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University*, No. 32, 1–42.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1905. *Altindische Grammatik, Band II, 1, Einleitung zur Wortlehre, Nominalkomposita*. Göttingen (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Watase, Nobuyuki. 1991. *Sansukuritto Genten Zen'yaku Manu Hōten*. Tokyo (Chūōkōronsha). (: 渡瀬信之. サンスクリット原典全訳 マヌ法典. 中央公論社.)
- Willman-Grabowska, Helena. 1927–28. *Les composés nominaux dans le Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*, 2 pts. Krakow.

Electronic Texts

- Ikari, Yasuke, org. The Dharma Files by the joint research seminar “Law and Society in Classical India” at the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University. <ftp://ccftp.kyoto-su.ac.jp/pub/doc/sanskrit/dharmas>
- Tokunaga, Muneo. The Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa. <ftp://ccftp.kyoto-su.ac.jp/pub/doc/sanskrit/mahabharata, /ramayana>