Nominal Compounds in the Yajñavalkyasmṛti*
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0. Introduction

The original sources of the Yajñavalkyasmṛti range over the Dharma-sūtras, the Grhyasūtras, 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 Yajñavalkyasmṛti 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 Yajñavalkyasmṛti, attempting thereby to trace the procedure in which the author condensed foregoing literature.

In this paper, I assume the Manusmṛti and the Kauṭiliya-ārthaśāstra as the primary source of the Yajñavalkyasmṛti,¹ and do not treat the Viṣṇusmṛti with close attention on the working hypothesis of its posteriority to the Yajñavalkyasmṛti.

---

* 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 Kauṭiliya-ārthaśāstra. See note 15, for example.
1. Influences of abridgement and versification on the compounds of the *Yājñavalkyasmrtyu*

a. The style of the *Yājñavalkyasmrtyu* shows an elaborate condensation of the foregoing literature. To take an example, KAŚ 3.16.30-31yat svm dravyam anyair bhujyāmanāṃ daśa varṣāny upēkṣeta, hīyetāsa .../ viṃśati-varṣopekṣitam anavadētaṃ vāstu naṇuyuṇīta “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.” (Shamasasatra) is condensed into one śloka, Yājñ. 2.24 paśyato ‘bruvato bhūmer hānir viṃśativārṣikī/pareṇa bhujyāmānā- yā dhanasya daśavārṣikī “[If] one, seeing [his own] land deforested 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 Dvīgu compound viṃśatī-vārṣikī ‘vicennial’ and daśa-vārṣikī ‘decennial’.²

More often, the *Yājñavalkyasmrtyu* simply intends to reduce the number of the syllables by forming or reforming compounds: Yājñ. 2.95 uses the trisyllabic Dvandva compound agny-āpah for fire and water, which are mentioned as means of an ordeal, instead of longer expressions in Manu 8.114abagnīm ... apsu, KAŚ 7.17.7 agny-udaka-, Viṣṇu 9.11 dhaṭāgny-udaka-, 9.25-29agnīh ... udakam or Nārada 1.218dagny-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-saṃnyuktam in Yājñ. 1.23 gāyatṛīṃ śirasā sārdham japed vyāhṛtipūrvikām/ pratiprāṇava-saṃnyuktām trīr ayaṃ prāṇasaṃyamaḥ “[A student] should mutter the Gāyatṛī 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-samvatsaram ‘every year’, prati-vedam ‘for each Veda’, prati-māsam ‘every month’, prati-daivatam ‘for each deity’, prati-ekam ‘one by one’ and prati-vāsaram ‘each day’.

śakty-alamkṛtā in Yājñ. 1.58ab brahma vivāha āhūya diyate śaktyalamkṛtā

² Cf. Aṣṭ. 5.1.79 for the function of the suffix -ika- (‘than’).
"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 śaktiviṣayenaṃkṛtya ‘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 śaktya 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 desāntarasthe durlekhye naṣṭonmrṣṭe hrte tathā/ bhinne dāghhe ‘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 simple 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 chinnaḥhinnaḥtonmrṣṭanasṭadurlikhitēṣu ca/ kartavyam anyal lekhyam syad eṣa lekhyavidhiṃ smṛṭiḥ 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 Yājñavalkṣyasmṛti 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 vīpre 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 b antardhānam / smṛṭih g kāntīr d drṣṭīḥ “śrotraḥ” jñātā tathā/ “nījan śarīram utsrjaṇ prakāyapraveśanam// arthānāṃ chandataḥ sṛṣṭi yogāsiddhī hi lakṣaṇaṃ “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 *śaktyāṃkṛtya, which was then changed into śaktyāṃkṛtya to make the fifth syllable short as is preferred metrically. 

4 Another example of irregular Sandhi in the Yājñavalkṣyasmṛti is the absence of the crasis -a r- → -ar- in 1.300c udvadhyaveti ca rce. 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 aśvesa b cetaso jñānam c arthānāṁ chandataḥ kriyā/ dṛṣṭih e śrotāraṁ f śmṛtiṁ g kāntir h āṣṭataś cāpyadarsanam.5 Yājñ. śrotāra-jñatā might have originally meant the same powers as śrotaram ‘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 prakurvita7 daimajñam uditoditam/ daṇḍanitāṁ ca kusalam atharvāṅgirase tathā “[A king] should appoint to family priest one who reads fortune, is —, is skilled in politics and the Atharvaveda,” which is an abridgment of KAŚ 1.9.9 purohitam uditoditakulaśīlam sānge vede daive nimitte daṇḍanityāṁ cābhivinitam āpadāṁ daimamānuśīnām atharvabhīr upāyais ca prātikartāram kurvita. It appears to me too bold as an abridgment, 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 KAŚ uditoditakulaśīlam.8

b. The same Dvandva madhu-sarpis-, used in Yājñ. 1.303cd hotavyā maḥhusarpīrhyām dadhā ksīreṇa vā yutāḥ “[fuels] mixed with honey, liquid butter, curds or milk [should be offered]” and in Yājñ. 1.44c pitṛṇām ca maḥhusarpīrhyām “[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 pitṛṇāṁ madhusarpīsā “[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 Bṛhadāyāvamkavākyanṛṣī 9.195d dṛṣṭiśrotāraṇiṣṭhā parā (reference given by Dr. Akihiko Akamatsu). dṛṣṭih śrotara- in the Yājñavalkyaśrīṣṭi might originate from an incorrect Sandhi dissolution of manuscripts in scriptio continua, which would have read dṛṣṭiśrotara- for both dṛṣṭiḥ(ś) śrotara- and dṛṣṭi-śrotara-. For further examples of similar questions on dissolution, see Yājñ. 3.257a brāhmaṇasvarṇahāri and Yājñ. 3.277b (Mit.) daṁśṭāśvīrdāvīvasiṣṭ. Shoshin (p.c.) proposes to emend śrotāraṇiṣṭhā into śrotaraṁ jñatā.
7 Bāl., Apar. and Vīr. read ca kurvita.
8 Shamasastry (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 Bahuurāhis udita-kula- and udita-śīla-: “him whose family is noble and whose conduct is lofty.”
neuter singular forms according to Pāṇini (Aśṭ. 2.4.2ff.), Aśṭ. 2.4.14 na dāhipayaādāḍīṇi rules out a singular form of this particular compound, referring to a gana that includes madhusarpipī (Ganapāṭha 113.3 in Böhtlingk’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 ... pānipādadantabhanīe karṇanāśā- cchedane ... and Viṣṇu 5.68 karapādadantabhanīe karṇanāśāvikartane ... (both texts are composed in prose), Yājñ. 2.219ab (Mit.) karapādadatobhanīe chedane karṇanāśayoh9 “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.) brahmacaryam dayā kṣāntir dānam satyam akalkatā/ ahimsāsteyamādhurye damaś ceti yamāḥ smrtīḥ11 are traceable to the foregoing literature according to Kane.12 However, adroha- ‘abstention from doing harm’, which the Bālakṛṣṇā 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 karapādadantabhanīe. Mit. paraphrases karṇanāśayoh also by the singular form karṇanāsya.

10 Though Aśṭ. 2.4.2 dvandvās ca prāṇītyasenaṁgānāṁ 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’ (MaïS, KāṭhS+). 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.) mṛcchnapuspamukapakesatakravisaṣitiḥ (Bāl. viṣairakān, Apar. and Vir. kṣitiḥ).

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

a man born to a divine fortune. 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 dhāraṇajīvite ‘maintaining and living’ in Yajñ. 3.174 (Mit.) ahaṃkāraḥ smṛtir medhā
dveṣo buddhiḥ sukhaṁ dhṛtih/ indriyāntarasamcāra icchā dhāraṇajīvite also seems to be a Dvandva formed in order to avoid a pāda with a long fifth syllable like *dhāraṇam jīvitaṁ.

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.

apatīṇyonyatyāṇa occurs in Yajñ. 2.237 pitṛputrasvasyābhṛṭrdampatyā-
cāryaśisyakāḥ/ ēṣām apatīṇyonyatyāṇa ca śataḍandabhaṅk “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 [pañás],” which is an abridgement15 of KAŚ 3.20.18 pitāpuroṣor dāmpatyor bhṛṭṛbhaginyor mātulabhagineyayoḥ śisyācāryeyor vā parasparam āpatitaṁ 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 Kauṭilyāyathaśāstra was changed when the Yājñavalkyasmṛti packed them into a compound (KAŚ parasparam āpatitaṁ tyajataḥ → Yajñ. apatī/-a/nyonya-tyāṇa), probably with an intention to avoid metrical awkwardness of pāda c ēṣām any-
onyāpatisita- with a long fifth syllable. Though Viṣṇu 5.113 anonyapatisitayāṇa is also considered to be made from KAŚ parasparam āpatitaṁ tyajataḥ, it does not side with the Yājñavalkyasmṛti in the order of these members, in a similar way as is observed in Yajñ. 2.219a (Mit.) karapādadaṅ khaṅge :: Viṣṇu 5.68

13 Bhagavadgītā 16.1–3 abhayaṁ satvasamśuddhir jñānayogyavavyasthitih/ dānam damaś ca yajñaś ca svādhīyasya tapa ārvam/ // ahimsāsasyam akrodhas tyāgaḥ śāntir apaśunam/ dayā bhuteṣo alolokvam mārdavaṁ hrīr acāpalam/ // tejaḥ kṣamaḥ dhṛtih śaucaṁ adroho nātmānātī/ bhavanti sampadaṁ daivam abhiyātasya bhārata.

14 Though anivedita-vijñātaḥ in Yajñ. 2.35cd aniveditavijñāto dāpyas tāṁ daṇḍaṁ 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 MānavaŚ 3.1.25 naṣṭādhiḥkataṁ 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 Kauṭilyāyathaśāstra looks as if it para-
phrased the Yājñavalkyasmṛti into prose.
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karapādadantatabhān̄ge, in Manu and Yājū. vāg-yata- :: Viṣṇu 61.16 yata-vāc-, and in Yājū. 2.210a pataniyakṛte kṣepe :: Viṣṇu 5.29 pataniyakṣepe kṛte.

Yājū. 2.267d śuṣka-bhinna-mukha-suvarāḥ “those whose mouth and voice are [respectively] dry and changed [should be captured]” has a different order of members from that in KAŚ 4.6.2 śuṣka-bhinna-svara-mukha-varṇam “[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 Yājū. 2.210a pataniyakṛte kṣepe “in the case of a [false] reproach made with a degrading crime” and Viṣṇu 5.29 parasya pataniyākṣepe 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 Yājñavalkyasmr蒂 fits the meter, while that of the Viṣṇusmr蒂 is free from the ambiguity inherent in Yājū. pataniyakṛte.

2. Position of the Yājñavalkyasmr蒂 in philological history

a. Tracing the nominal compounds in the Yājñavalkyasmr蒂 to the foregoing literature reveals that it was not composed simply on the principle of summarizing foregoing literature faithfully. Among those compounds in the Yājñavalkyasmr蒂 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 Manusmr蒂.

Compare, for example, Manu kṛcchrātikṛcchrau with Yājū. kṛcchrātikṛcchraḥ. 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 kurvita viprasyotpādyā stonitam “When one spills the blood of a Brahmin, he should practice kṛcchra- and atikṛcchra-” and Yājū. 3.292c kṛcchrātikṛcchro 'ṣykpāte “kṛcchātikṛcchra-[should be practiced] in the case of bloodshed (of a Brahmin).” Since the Manusmr蒂 gives no special definition of kṛcchrātikṛcchrau, it must be a combination of (prājāpatya-)kṛcchra- and atikṛcchra-, each explained in Manu 11.211 tryahāmaḥ prātas tryahāmaḥ sāyaṃ tryahāmaḥ adyād ayaścitam/ tryahāmaḥ para as ca nāśniyāt prājāpatyaṃ caran dvijāḥ “A twice-born man who performs (the Krikhrha 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) unmasked, and shall
fast during another period of three days” (Bühler) and in Manu 11.213 ekaikam grham asmiyam tryahami trini purvavat/ tryaham copavased antyam atikrcca ca ran dvijah “A twice-born man who performs an Atikrckhra (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). Yajû. krcbratikrcchra- is explicitly laid down in Yajû. 3.320ab krcbratikrcchra payasa dvasan ekavinasatim “krcbratikrcchra-[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’ (Yajû. 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 Yajû. 1.230 yavair avvakityatha bhajane sapavitrape/ sâm no devyâ payah kșiptâ vâvo ‘siti yavâns tathâ “Having scattered barley to [the invited Brahmâns], having put water in a vessel equipped with pavitra with [the mantra] ‘sâm no devâr abhîta ya âpo bhavantu pitaye sâm yor abhi srawantu na’h’ (RV 10.9.4)], and having put barley saying ‘You are barley’.”

The two durations, twenty-one days (Yajû.) 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). krcbratikrcchra-, like krcchra- or atikrcchra-, lasts only twelve days in the Sâmaviddhänabrâhma, the Baudhâyanadharma, the Gautamadharma, and the Vâsiśthadharmasûtra. On the other hand, the source of the dietary prescription in the Yajûnavalkyasmrî is to be sought outside the Manusmrî, probably in SVB 1.2.8, BDhS 2.1.2.41, GDhS 26.20 and VâDhS 24.3, where krcbratikrcchra- is an expiation to live only on water (ab-bhakṣa-). krcbratikrcchra- in the Dharmasûtras is singular, because it is a severer kind of krcchra- in its content, and means ‘the Krcchra which is above other Krccras [in its severity]’, with the same semantic structure as MBh. devâtideva- ‘ein über alle Götter hervorragender Gott’ (pw).16 It does not share the same meaning as in the Yajûnavalkyasmrî though it has the same singular ending.

It would naturally follow from these, that Yajû. krcbratikrcchra- is a compromise of the Dharmasûtras and the Manusmrî.17 The masculine sin-

16 MBh. 8.24.45a, 12.278.23c, 13.17.143a, 14.93.50c, 15.38.1c.
17 The Viśnusmrî made a similar compromise in Viśnu 54.30cd krcbratikrcchra- kurvita viprasyo tpäda sonitam, by copying Manu 11.208cd and simply replacing krcbratikrcchra with a singular form which had been used more widely.
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gular ending -aḥ, quite unusual for a Dvandva, might be a maneuver to cause the application of the Sandhi rule (aḥ + a- → a-') and to push the words into a verse of eight syllables. 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 1.99-100 swaṁrṣagakṛd viprō :: Yājñ. brāhmaṇasvarṇahāri. Manu 1.99-100 swaṁrṣagakṛd viprō rājānam abhikamya tu/ svakarma khyāpayan brāyaṁ māṁ bhavān anuśāstu iti// gṛhitvā musalam rājā sakṛd dhanyā' tu tam svayam/ vadhena śudhyati steno brāhmaṇas tapasaivu 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 brāhmaṇasvarṇahāri tu rājne musalam arpayet/ svakarma vyākhyaṁs 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 svarṇahāri for brāhmaṇasvarṇahāri as discussed above s.v. dṛṣṭih śrotrañjātā. The Yājñavalkyasmṛti amalgamates Manu 1.99–100 with Manu 8.316ab sāsanād vā vimoksād 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.


19 svarṇa- comes from su-vārṇa- by syncope. Another example of syncope is Yājñ. 3.300b pārṣadāḥ for pārīṣadāḥ (AiGr I, p.60 §53c “Hypersanskritismus”).
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Manu dāsī ghaṭam :: Yājñ. dāsikumbham. Manu 11.183ab dāsī ghaṭam apāṃ pūrṇam 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 dāsikumbham bahir grāmān ninayeran svabāndhavaḥ20 “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 GDḥS 3.2.4 dāsāḥ karmakaro vāvakarād amedhyapātram āniya dāśīghaṭat pūrayitvā daksināmukho yadā viparyasyed amukam anudakaṃ karomiti nāmagraḥam “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 aṣeṣataḥ “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 anupārvaśah/ antaraprabhavanāṃ ca dharmān no vaktum arhāsi “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 vinnah sahoḍhajah

---

20 Bāl. dāśīghaṭam apāṃ pūrṇam.
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 kim kāraṇaṃ brahma kutah jāta jīvamah keṇa ca sampratiṣṭhāhy/ adhiṣṭhītah keṇa sukhetaresu 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.”
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'sahodha-ja- is [a son] found in the womb [already at marriage].” Since the definitions of Sahodha- in BDhS 2.2.3.25, V DhS 17.27, KAV 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 V DhS 19.39, Nārada 14.17a, 19.13c and Manu 9.270c.

sahasana- :: sahaikasauna- (Mit.) in Yājñ. 2.284cd (Mit.) adesakalasambhisam. sahaikasamana eva ca “Conversation in improper place or time, and sharing one seat together [are counted as adultery].” The second member eka- ‘one’ is redundant, for sahasana- 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 Mitakṣarā) 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 sahasana- 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 human), 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 kṛta- in the last position means “that which was made X”, X is always expressed by the cvi-formation in the Yājñavalkyasmṛti: Yājñ. 2.182a balūd dāśikṛtaḥ “one who was made a slave by force,” Yājñ. 2.301d tad evaśṭagunīkṛtam “it (the penalty) is made eight times as much,” Yājñ. 2.302d trimśadgudūkrītam “made thirty times as much”. While no compound ending in kṛta- “that which was made (something)” is found in the Manusmrīti, 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. sahāvasṭhānam, Apar. and Viṣ. 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 bījabhūtāh “like seeds,” Manu 10.91c kṛmibhūtāh “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 bhavā/bhū ‘to become’ might still be alive, with the first member kṛmi- functioning as its complement. Since it is the class beginning with śreṇī- that can be compounded with bhūta- to form Karmadhārayas according to Pāṇini, Aṣṭ. 2.1.59 śreṇyādayāh kṛtādibhīḥ, *kṛmibhūta-, a cvi-formation, would rather be expected.24

The Yājñavalkyāsmṛti uses bhūta- as the last member four times together with cvi-forms: Yājñ. 2.17c pūrvapakṣe 'dhāribhūte “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 niṣkalmaśībhūtāḥ “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- bhūtāḥ “which has become moisture” Yājñ. 3.186ed bīja- bhūtāḥ “who have become seeds” Yājñ. 3.248ab lakṣya- bhūtāḥ25 “who has become a target”. Pāda borders are not crossed by a word in the Yājñavalkyāsmṛti except the one between 1.79c and d: brahmaḥcārya eva parvāny ādhyā catāsras 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-sarpisā and madhu-sarpirbhyaṁ.

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 Yājñavalkyāsmṛti: 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 Manusmr̥ti has very few cvi-forms: 3.97c according to Kullūka bhasmibhūteṣu; 4.188d bhasmibhavati.

25 Bāl. lakṣabhūtāḥ. According to Stenzler, Kullūka on Manu 11.13 reads lakṣyā-, which is not supported by Aṣṭ. 6.4.152. His taste for cvi is shown in his reading bhasmibhūteṣu for Manu 3.97c bhasmabhūteṣu as well.

26 Wackernagel, AiGr II-1, p.195 §83b and Debrunner’s Nachträge, p.58. Cf. Pāli
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use of vācam with yam or the compound vācamyamā- 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 Bahuvrihi in the regular order.27

karma-duṣṭāḥ in Yājñ. 1.224cd parapūrvātih stenaḥ karmaduṣṭāś 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-cetasaḥ, 8.386b duṣṭa-vāk :: 5.108e mano-duṣṭā, 3.156d vāg-duṣṭāḥ, 8.345a vāg-duṣṭāt.

vṛddha-sevitah (Bāl.) in Yājñ. 1.309ab (Bāl.) mahotsāhāḥ sthūlalakṣaṇāḥ krtajñā vṛddhasevitaḥ.29 “Of great spirit, ambitious, grateful, attentive to the seniors” (Tokunaga 1993, p.5). sevita-, a verbal adjective in -ta- with an active meaning, governors vṛddha- 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 bhraṣ/ bhraṃ is used with the ablative, as in TS 1.6.11.1 prāti yajñēna tiṣṭhati nā yajñād bhraṃśate, 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. bhraṣṭaśubhalakṣaṇāḥ paraphrase this compound as an inverted Bahuvrihi, which is described by Pāṇini in Aṣṭ. 2.2.37.

dhātu-vimūrccaitaḥ in Yājñ. 3.75ab prathame māsi saṃkledabhūto dhātu-vimūrccaitaḥ31 “In the first month [after conception, the ātman] is as it were moisture, congelation of the elements.” If vimūrccita- ‘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).

kūṭacīhna-kṛtā (Bāl.) in Yājñ. 2.212cd (Bāl.) dṛṣṭavyo vyavahāras tu

27 Or an Upapada compound with an adjectival first member like RV. rāpyavāc-. Cf. Reuter (1892) pp.202f. with notes.
28 Bāl. karmadūṣṭāḥ.
29 Mit. and Apar. vṛddhasevakaḥ.
31 Dr. Tsutomu Yamashita pointed out to me that Caraka 4.4.9 prathame māsi saṃmūrccaitaḥ sarvadhātukalyukṣaṃ kṛtāḥ khetabhūto bhavaty ... provides source for this passage.
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kūṭacihnakṛtād bhāyāt\(^\text{32}\) “But a case should be examined for fear of one who made false signs.”

kāla-kṛtaḥ in Yājñī. 2.58c kāle kālakṛto naśyet “[A pawn] — will be forfeited at [the expiration of the] term.” The Mitāksāra understands this as a Bahuvrihi with an inverted order, ascribing it to the ākṛti-gaṇa referred to by Pāṇini in Aṣṭ. 2.2.37. Judging from the usage of kālam kṛt ‘eine Zeit festsetzen’ noted in PW II, col. 249, s.v. 2 kāla 1, with a quotation from Rām. 6.38.29 kālaś ca kriyatāṁ 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 Bahuvrihi, 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 Kiratārjunīya\(^\text{33}\). The Yājñāvalyakṣmrī 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 baḷānāṁ darṣanaṁ kṛtvā, 2.204c kṣepaṁ karoti ced, 3.8b-c sāramārgaṇaṁ karoti yaḥ, 3.56a kṛtveśtim. This root is also used as a substitute for other verbs, e.g. Yājñī. 1.147c kṛte 'ntare (cf. Manu 4.126c antaraṇagame), 1.287a kṛtākṛtāṃs taṇḍulān and 2.164d kṛtvetanaḥ.

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 Yājñāvalyakṣmrī.

a. We have seen above s.v. karupādadataḥ that the text of the Mitāksāra looks as if it manipulates Pāṇini’s grammar skillfully compared with that given by the Bālakṛṣṭa. varṇāśrametarānām in Yājñī. 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 kṛt- le nom d’action est presque seul en usage, l’abstrait proprement dit est rare. ... Avec les noms verbaux, notamment avec kṛtā”
similar attitude of the Mitākṣarā. Finding in this stanza an influence of Manu 1.2 bhagavan sarvarvarṇānām yathāvad anupūrvaśah/ antaraprabhavānām ca dharmān no vaktum arhasi, the Bālakṛṣṇa 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].” While the Mitākṣarā agrees with the interpretation of the Bālakṛṣṇa, it gives a different inflection -i/atarāṇām, seeking its authority from Aṣṭ. 1.1.31 dvandve ca, which excludes the title as a pronoun from the group of stems comprising itarā- when they are used as the last members of Dvandva compounds. The un-Pāṇinian ending of Bāl. varṇāśrametāreśām, is however not necessarily to be rejected, for Yājñ. 2.199d uses another itarā- 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 vrddha-sevakaḥ for Bāl. vrddha-sevitaḥ in Yājñ. 1.309b. The word vrddha-sevakaḥ, a formation from the root sev with the agent suffix -aka- (‘vaul’) sounds an innovation of vrddha-sevita-, for it suggests an intention to shut out the possibility to take vrddha- as the agent of sevita- with a passive meaning, and vrddha-sevita- is attested in the Mahābhārata.

kūṭacihna-kṛtāḥ (Mit.) :: kūṭacihna-kṛtād (Bāl., Apar.) in Yājñ. 2.212d. Judging from its paraphrase kūṭacihnakārīdusṭapuruṣabhayat ‘for fear of a wicked person making a false sign,’ the Bālakṛṣṇa understands kṛta- as actively governing kūṭa-ci[hna-. In the reading of Mit. kūṭacihna-kṛtāḥ ‘[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 vrddhasevita- :: vrddhasevaka-. 

---

34 Bāl. varṇā brāhmaṇādayah/ āśramā brahmācāryādayah/ varṇetārā antaraprabhavā anulomādayah/ āśrametārāḥ pāṇḍādayah/ teṣām varṇāśrametāreśām/ .../ anyaḥ pāthāḥ — ‘varṇānām sāśramāṇām’ iti.
35 Mit. ‘itarā ’abdasya ‘dvandve ca’ iti sarvanāmasāmānyapratishedhah. The Bālakṛṣṇa might have been conscious of this sūtra when it offered an optional reading varṇānām sāśramāṇām.
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 Bālakṛṣṇa: kūṭacihnakṛtasambhāvanāḥbhayat ‘for the fear, which feeling is caused by a false sign’. The difficulty with this interpretation is the redundancy of kṛta-, for kūṭacihnaḥ bhayat or kūṭacihna-bhayat would be enough for this meaning.
b. Some readings of the *Bālakṛiḍā*, which the *Mitākṣarā* does not follow, are grounded on the *Mahābhārata*, just as the above-mentioned form, Bāl. *vyṛddha-sevitaḥ*, has its source in the *Mahābhārata*, and Yājñ. 3.312c (Bāl.) *adroho* in Bhagavadgītā 16.3b. Another example of the same sort is *sahasrakaḥ* (Mit., Apar.) :: *sahasrasaḥ* (Bāl.) in Yājñ. 3.119 (Mit.) *mohajālam apiṣyeha puruṣo dṛṣyate hi yaḥ/ sahasrakarapannetraḥ sūryavarcāḥ sahasrakaḥ* “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-varcasa- ‘of lustre like the sun’* can be traced back respectively to AV 19.6.1a *sahāṣrabāhuḥ* and to VS 31.18b *ādityāvarṇam*.38 Though *ka- ‘head’* as a single word sounds like lexicographer’s invention, it is not necessarily to be rejected here as such, for *kaṇḍhaḥ* is used in Yājñ. 2.220c, which might be a compound having this word as the first member (*kaṃ-dhaḥ* ‘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 *Yājñavalikya-mṛti* to cover as many sources as possible, Bāl. *sahasrasaḥ ‘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 *Bālakṛiḍā* has sometimes a philosophical rather than a practical bent. For example, the *Mitākṣarā* on Yājñ. 3.174 (Mit.) *icchā dharmaṇajīvite* considers the latter two of *icchā, dharmaṇa-* and *jīvita-* as forming a Dvandva *dharmaṇa-jīvite* ‘sustaining [the body] and [supporting] the life’. Though isolation of the first word *icchā ‘wish’* is avoided in Bāl. *icchādharmāṇajīvite* which joins *icchā* with *a-dharmaṇa-*, its interpretation ‘non-sustaining (i.e. renouncement) of a body at will’40 together with its paraphrase of b *dṛṣṭiḥ* by *dharmaṇa* ‘concentration’ sounds too spiritualistic, and is also unlikely judging from the enumeration of *icchā* and *dharmaṇa* in the similar list of the signs of *paramātman- in Caraka 4.1.70–72*. This does not mean,

---

38 I owe the reference to Mr. Makoto Fushimi.
39 *sahasrasaḥ* occupies this position in 349 out of the 366 passages which I looked up in Tokunaga’s electronic text.
40 *icchāyā yad adhāraṇaṃ sarīrasya tatparityāgaḥ tad icchādharmaṇa*. 
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of course, that the reading of the Bālakṛiḍā is more interpolated than that of the Mitākṣarā: In Yājñ. 3.154ab (Bāl.) jñē 'jñē ca prakṛtav ca vikāra cāviśeṣavān “not discriminating between one who knows and one who does not know, and between an original and a modification,” the logic of the Bālakṛiḍā is more transparent than that of Mit. jñeyajñē ‘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 Bālakṛiḍā 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 pākhaṇḍyaṇāsritāḥ (Mit.) in Yājñ. 3.6 (Mit.) a pākhaṇḍyaṇāsritāḥ b stenā c bhartrgyhīnyāh d kāmagādikāh32/ e surāpya f ātmatyāgīnayo33 nāsaucodakabhājanāḥ “— 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 tyāgināṁ caiva nivartetodakaśriyā/ a pāṣaṇḍam āsritānāṁ ca d carantināṁ ca kāmaṭāḥ/ garbhāḥ bhartr- druhaṁ caiva e surāpinaṁ ca yōṣītāṁ. The expressions carantināṁ ‘[women] who through lust live (with many men),’ garbhahartṛdruhāṁ ‘[women] who have caused an abortion, have killed their husbands,’ surāpinaṁ ca yōṣītāṁ ‘to women ... [who] drink spirituous liquor (Bührer)’ in Manu 5.90 support the interpretation to take pāṣaṇḍam āsritānāṁ also as women: “[to women] who have joined a heretical sect” (Bührer). The Yājñavalkyaśmiṁti has three different readings according to the three commentators: Mit. pākhaṇḍyaṇāsritāḥ, Bāl. pāṣaṇḍam āsritāḥ and Apar. pāṣaṇḍān āsritāḥ. The Bālakṛiḍā follows the Manusmṛti not only in its reading but also in commenting b kāmagās tathā as tathāsabdaḥ smṛtyantaroktvṛthāsangarjātādyarthāḥ “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 Kyō Kanō for the reference.
42 Bāl. kāmagās tathā.
43 Apar. ātmaghātīnyo. The reading of the Mitākṣarā and the Bālakṛiḍā seems to be taken from Manu ātmanaḥ tyāgināṁ, whereas that of the Aparārka goes with ātmaghaṁ- m. in Yājñ. 3.21b anvākṣaṃ cātmaghātīnāṁ.
44 Agreement with the Manusmṛti is not particular to the Bālakṛiḍā. Take for example vratalopāḥ...vratalopanam (Mit., Apar.) :: vratalopāḥ...brahmaṇopanam (Bāl.) in Yājñ. 3.236c–238d nāstikyaṁ vratalopāḥ ca ... kauṭilyaṁ vratalopanam or brahmaṇopanam “... , 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 sahasrakaḥ, and
interprets this as a Dvandva of ‘heretics’ and ‘those who have not undergone
proper modes of life’. Though the Aparārka agrees with the Bālakriḍā in its
interpretation, its reading paśāndānāśritāḥ can also be divided as paśāndā/a-
naśritāḥ, i.e. a Dvandva like Mit. pākhaṇḍy-anāśritāḥ. The reading of the
Aparārka is compatible with both the Mitākṣarā and the Bālakriḍā in this
case.

5. Conclusion

The tendency of the Yājñāvalkyāsaṃṛti to incorporate as much foregoing
literature as possible is reflected in the frequent deviation of its nominal com-
pounds 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 litera-
ture, such as the singular form kṛcchātikṛcchraḥ compared to the dual form
kṛcchātikṛcchrau in the Manusmṛti, 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 comment-
taries, the one in the Mitākṣarā shows less grammatical irregularities than
that of the Bālakriḍā, but it might be a result of correction of the original
text.

List of Abbreviations

AiGr: Altindische Grammatik. Apar., Aparārka: Aparārkyājñāvalkṣyadharma-
śāstraibandha, Aparārka’s commentary on Yājñī. ĀpDhS: Āpastambhadvardhama-
sūtra. Aṣṭ.: Aṣṭādhyāyī. Bāl.: Bālakriḍā, Viśvarūpa’s commentary on the Yājñā-
valkyāsaṃṛti. BDhS: Baudhāyanadharmasūtra. Caraka: Carakasaṃhitā. GDhS:
KāthS: Kāṭhakasamaṇhitā. KŚS: Kāṭyāyanasrautasūtra. MaiS: Maitrayaṇi-

These two synonymous action nouns vratalopaḥ and vratalopanam, formed from
the root lop/lop: lompāt ‘break’ respectively with suffixes -a- (‘gāṇ’ ) 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. brahma-
lopanam ‘violation of abstinence’ saves the senselessness of repeating the same offense vrat-
lopa- and vratalopanam in Mit., but it is not grounded on the foregoing literature. Mit.
vratalopanam agrees with Manu 11.61b vratalopanam.
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Index of Sanskrit Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>1a naṣṭonmṛṣte</th>
<th>1b pataniyakṛte kṣpe</th>
<th>1c payas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aniveditavijnātah</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apatitānyonyatyāgī</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astejamādhurye</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>4c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ātmatajāginyāh</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>5c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>icchā(-)dhāraṇaḥjāvīte</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td>6b</td>
<td>6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uditoditam</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>7b</td>
<td>7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāṇḍhara</td>
<td>8a</td>
<td>8b</td>
<td>8c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karapāḍadatāḥ</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>9b</td>
<td>9c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karmaduṣṭāḥ</td>
<td>10a</td>
<td>10b</td>
<td>10c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kālakṛtah</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>11b</td>
<td>11c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kūṭacīnaktād</td>
<td>12a</td>
<td>12b</td>
<td>12c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kṛcchrātiṛcechraḥ</td>
<td>13a</td>
<td>13b</td>
<td>13c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kriyāmānopakāre</td>
<td>14a</td>
<td>14b</td>
<td>14c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cvi-formation</td>
<td>15a</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>15c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jñe 'jñe, jñeyajñē</td>
<td>16a</td>
<td>16b</td>
<td>16c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daśāvārṣikī</td>
<td>17a</td>
<td>17b</td>
<td>17c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daśaṭaśvośtrādivyaśaśaḥ</td>
<td>18a</td>
<td>18b</td>
<td>18c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhātuvimūrcchitaḥ</td>
<td>19a</td>
<td>19b</td>
<td>19c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhāraṇaḥjāvīte</td>
<td>20a</td>
<td>20b</td>
<td>20c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāsikumbham</td>
<td>21a</td>
<td>21b</td>
<td>21c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devātideva-</td>
<td>22a</td>
<td>22b</td>
<td>22c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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