Nominal Compounds in the Yajñavalkyasmṛti*
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0. Introduction

The original sources of the Yajñavalkyasmṛti range over the Dharma-sūtras, the Gṛhya-sūtras, the epics, and texts on Ayurveda (medicine) and Artha śāstra (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 prāyaścittā ‘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 Manusmrṭi and the Kautilyaarthaśāstra as the primary source of the Yajñavalkyasmṛti, and do not treat the Viṣṇusmrṭi 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 Kautilyaarthaśāstra. See note 15, for example.
1. Influences of abridgement and versification on the compounds of the Yājñavalkyasūtra

a. The style of the Yājñavalkyasūtra shows an elaborate condensation of the foregoing literature. To take an example, KAŚ 3.16.30-31 यत् स्वम् द्रव्यम् अन्यायं भुज्यमानं दशा वर्षायं उपेक्षता, हियेतास्य.../ विन्यातिवर्षोपेक्षितम् आनवसितं वृष्टि नृनृयोष्टि। “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.” (Shamasastry) is condensed into one sloka, Yājñ. 2.24 पाश्यतो 'ब्रुवातो भूर्मर हृदिर विन्यातिवर्षिकी/पारेण भुज्यमानायाः धनाया दशवर्षिकी। “[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 विन्याति-वर्षिकी ‘vicennial’ and दशा-वर्षिकी ‘decennial’.

More often, the Yājñavalkyasūtra simply intends to reduce the number of the syllables by forming or reforming compounds: Yājñ. 2.95 uses the trisyllabic Dvandva compound अग्न्य-आपाः for fire and water, which are mentioned as means of an ordeal, instead of longer expressions in Manu 8.114 आग्निम... अपसु, KAŚ 7.17.7 अग्न्य-उदका-, Viṣṇu 9.11 द्वात्गान्य-उदका-, 9.25-29 अग्निः... उदकाम or Nārada 1.218 अग्न्य-अंबु- which would become quadrisyllabic -अंबुः 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:

प्रति-प्राणवा-साम्युक्तम् in Yājñ. 1.23 गायत्रिम् शिरसाः सार्धम् जापेद व्याहृतिपुर्विकम्/ प्रतिप्राणवासाम्युक्तां त्रिः अयम् प्राणसाम्यमाह। “[A student] should mutter the Gāyatṛi stanza three times together with Śiras, preceded by vyāhṛti [and] accompanied by prāṇava 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. प्रत्य-अहम ‘everyday’, प्रति-सम्वतसरम् ‘every year’, प्रति-vedam ‘for each Veda’, प्रति-मासम ‘every month’, प्रति-दायवतम् ‘for each deity’, प्रति-ेकम् ‘one by one’ and प्रति-वसारम् ‘each day’.

śākty-ālarṇक्यं in Yājñ. 1.58ab ब्राह्मो विवाहा आहूया दियाते śāktyālarṇक्यं

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 śaktiṣayayenaṁkṛtya ‘having adorned [the bride] in the range of [the father’s] power’ in ApDhŚ 2.5.11.17 and HirDhŚ 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 Yājñā. 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

naśtonmrṛste occurs in Yājñā. 2.91ab desāntarasthe durlekhya naśtonmrṛste hrte 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 umṛṛṣṭa- 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 chinnavhinnaḥtonmrṛstanāṣṭadurlekhiteṣu ca/ kartavyam anyal lekhyam syad eṣa lekhyavidhiḥ smṛṛṭaḥ 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 umṛṛṣṭa- and naṣṭa-, which are divided by a pāda boundary. Although commentators of the Yājñāvalkyasṛṭī do not give any variant reading for this expression, I think what the author originally intended was two separate words naṣṭe and umṛṛṣte, which first became naṣṭa umṛṛṣte by a Sandhi rule, which in turn was fed into another Sandhi cycle and ended up as naśtonmrṛste. Explanation by double Sandhi is also possible in the case of Yājñā. 3.284a kriyāmanopakāre tu mṛṛṣte 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 kriyāmāne ‘being done’ and upakāre ‘(medical) care’ are separate.4

Yājñā. 3.202–203ab hantadhānāṃ j smṛṛṭiḥ g kāntir d drṣṭiḥ “śrotṛb” jñātā tathā/ “niṣṇaṃ śārīram uṣrīya parakīyapraveśanam//” arthānāṃ chandataḥ srṣṭir 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 *śaktiṣayenaṁkṛtya, which was then changed into śaktiṣayenaṁkṛtya to make the fifth syllable short as is preferred metrically.

4 Another example of irregular Sandhi in the Yājñāvalkyasṛṭī is the absense of the crasis -a r- → -ar- in 1.300c ubdhyāvasveti ca rco. For the examples of double sandhi in the Dhārmasūtras, see Bharadvaj (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 \( \text{āvēsa} \) \( \text{cetaso} \) \( \text{jñānam} \) arthānāṁ chandataḥ kriyā/ \( dṛṣṭih \) \( śrotraṇā \) \( śmṛtiḥ \) \( kāntir \) \( īṣṭataś cāpyadarsanam} \. \( Yājñ. \) śrotra-jñatā might have originally meant the same powers as śrotram ‘hearing’ and cetaso jñānam ‘mind reading’ in the Carakasamhitā.\(^6\)

\( \text{uditoditam} \) occurs as one of the requisites of a family priest in Yājñ. 1.313 purohitam prakurvita\(^7\) daivajñam uditoditam/ daṇḍanitīyam ca kṣalam 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 sāṅge vede daive nimitte daṇḍanitīyam cābhivinītam āpadāṁ daivamānuśīnām atharvāhīr upāyaiś ca pratikartāram kurvita. It appears to me too bold as an abridgement, if uditoditam is simply a curtailed form of uditoditakulaśīlam. Since uditā- 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 ma-
dhusarpīrbyāṁ daśinā kṣīreṇa vā yutāḥ “[fuels] mixed with honey, liquid butter, curds or milk [should be offered]” and in Yājñ. 1.44c pitṛṁś ca ma-
dhusarpīrbyāṁ “[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 pitṛṁṁ ma
dhusarpisā “[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 Brhadāyāvīśavalkyaparī 9.195d \( dṛṣṭiḥ śrotājñātā\) parā (reference given by Dr. Akikiko Akamatsu), \( dṛṣṭiḥ śrotra\) in the Yājñāvalkyaparī might originate from an incorrect Sandhi dissolution of manuscripts in scriptio continua, which would have read \( dṛṣṭiḥ śrotra\) for both \( dṛṣṭiḥ(ś) śrotra\) and \( dṛṣṭi-śrotra\). For further examples of similar questions on dissolution, see Yājñ. 3.257a brāhmaṇasvarṇahāri and Yājñ. 3.277b (Mit.) daśaśvaśrūvidāyasaṁ. Shoshin (p.c.) proposes to emend śrotājñātā into \( śrotram jñatā\).

\(^{7}\) Bāl., Apar. and Vi. 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 Bahuvrīhis \( udita-kula\) and \( udita-śīla\): “him whose family is noble and whose conduct is lofty.”
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neuter singular forms according to Pāṇini (Aṣṭ. 2.4.2ff.), Aṣṭ. 2.4.14 na dadhīpayaādīni rules out a singular form of this particular compound, referring to a gāna that includes madhusarpīṣi (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 -dαntα- in KĀŚ 3.19.13 ... pānipādadantabhanīge kārṇanāsā- cchedane ... and Viṣṇu 5.68 karapādadantabhanīge kārṇanāsāvāvikartane ... (both texts are composed in prose), Yājñ. 2.219ab (Mit.) karapādadato bharīge chedane kārṇanāsāyoh9 “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 Mitāḵsara 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/ ahiṃsāsteyamādhurye damaś ceti yamāḥ smṛtāḥ11 are traceable to the foregoing literature according to Kane.12 However, adroha- ‘abstention from doing harm’, which the Bālakṛṣṇa 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 karapādadantabhanīge. Mit. paraphrases kārṇanāsāyoh also by the singular form kārṇanāsasya.

10 Though Aṣṭ. 2.4.2 dvandvās ca prāṇitīryasanāṅgānām 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 śira-grīvām ‘head and neck’ (MaiS, 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.) mṛcchnapūṣpa- kutapakeśatakraṇvīṣakṣitiḥ (Bāl. viṣairakān, Apar. and Vīr. kṣitiḥ).

11 Bāl. ahiṃsāsteyam adroho, Apar. ahiṃsāsteyamādhurya- damaś.
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a man born to a divine fortune. Here as well, the preference for a short fifth syllable seems to underlie the fact that only asṭeyā- and mādhurya-
make a compound in the text of the *Mitākṣarā*. The compound dhāraṇajīvite ‘maintaining and living’ in Yājñ. 3.174 (Mit.) ahaṃkāraḥ sūmṭir medhā
dveṣo buddhiḥ sukham dhṛtih/ indriyāntarasamcāra icchā dhāraṇajīvite also seems to be a Dvandva formed in order to avoid a pāda with a long fifth syllable like *dhāraṇaṃ jīvitam*.

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

apatīnyonyatāyāṅi occurs in Yājñ. 2.237 pitṛputrasvasyaḥḥṛtadampaty-
ācāryasyacyākāḥ/ eṣāṃ apatīnyonyatāyāṅi 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 abridgement of KAŚ 3.20.18
pitṛputrayor dampatyōḥ bhrāṭṛbhaginyor mātulabhagineyoh śiṣyācāryayo
rā parasparam apatītaṃ 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 Kauṭiliyaśāstra was changed when the Yājñāvalkyasmṛti packed them into a compound
(KAŚ parasparam apatītaṃ tyajataḥ → Yājñ. apatīta/anyonyata–tyāṅi), prob-
ably with an intention to avoid metrical awkwardness of pāda c *eṣāṃ any-
onyāpatitā– with a long fifth syllable. Though Viṣṇu 5.113 anyonyāpatitāyāṅi
is also considered to be made from KAŚ parasparam apatītaṃ tyajataḥ, it does
not side with the Yājñāvalkyasmṛti in the order of these members, in a similar
way as is observed in Yājñ. 2.219a (Mit.) karapāda ātato bhange :: Viṣṇu 5.68

13 Bhagavadgītā 16.1-3 abhayāṃ sattvasamāuddhir jñānayogavyavasthitih/ dānam damaś
ea yājñāḥ ca svādhīṇasya tapa ājñavam// ahimsāsātyam akrodhas tyāgah śāntir
apaisunanam/ dayā bhūteṣo aloloktyaḥ mārdavaṃ hirv acāpalam// tejaḥ kṣamā dhṛtih
saucaṃ adroho nātmānaḥ/ bhavanti sampadaṃ daivām abhyātasya bhārata.

14 Though anivedita-vijñātāḥ in Yājñ. 2.35cd aniveditaviṃśitādāpyas 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 Māñavasū 3.1.25 naṣṭādhigatam
and described by Pāṇini in Ast. 2.1.49. (See Wackernagel, AiGr II-1, p.172, §74cβ.)

15 This assumption might be wrong, for here the Kauṭiliyaśāstra looks as if it para-
phrased the Yājñāvalkyasmrty into prose.
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karapādadantabhaṅge, in Manu and Yājñū. vāg-yata- :: Viśṇu 61.16 yata-vāc-, and in Yājñū. 2.210a pataniyakṛte kṣepe :: Viśṇu 5.29 pataniyakṣepe kṛte.

Yājñū. 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-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 Yājñū. 2.210a pataniyakṛte kṣepe “in the case of a [false] reproach made with a degrading crime” and Viśṇu 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 Yājñavalkyasmṛṭi fits the meter, while that of the Viśnusmṛṭi is free from the ambiguity inherent in Yājñū. pataniyakṛte.

2. Position of the YĀJṆAVALKYASMṚṬI in philological history

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

Compare, for example, Manu kṛcchṛatikṛcchrau with Yājñū. kṛcchṛatikṛcchraḥ. 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 kṛcchṛatikṛcchrau kurvita viprasyotpādyā śoṇitam “When one spills the blood of a Brahmin, he should practice kṛcchṛa- and atikṛcchra-” and Yājñū. 3.292c kṛcchṛatikṛcchro 'ṣṛkpate “kṛcchṛatikṛcchra-[should be practiced] in the case of bloodshed (of a Brahmin).” Since the Manusmṛṭi gives no special definition of kṛcchṛatikṛcchrau, it must be a combination of (prājāpatya-)kṛcchra- and atikṛcchra-, each explained in Manu 11.211 tryahaham prātās tryahaham sāyam tryahaham adyād aścitam/ tryahaham paraṁ ca nāśnīyāt prājāpatyaṁ caran dvijah “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) unmasked, and shall
fast during another period of three days” (Bühler) and in Manu 11.213 ekaikam grāsam aśnīyāt tryahāṇi tṛimi pūrvaṇa/ tryahāṃ copavaṇeṣaḥ antyam atikṛcchṛṃ caran dvijaḥ “A twice-born man who performs an Atikrikkhra (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. kṛcchṛātikṛcchra- is explicitly laid down in Yājñ. 3.320ab kṛcchṛātikṛcchraḥ payasā divasān ekaviṃśatim “kṛcchṛātikṛcchra- [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 sapavitrape/ sām no devyā payah kṣiptava yavo ‘sīti yavāṁs tathā “Having scattered barley to [the invited Brahmins], having put water in a vessel equipped with pavitra with [the mantra] ‘sām no devṛ bhūṣṭaya āpo bhavantu pūtaye sām yor abhi srawantu naḥ’ (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). kṛcchṛātikṛcchra-, like kṛcchra- or atikṛcchra-, lasts only twelve days in the Śaṁavidhānabrāhmaṇa, the Baudhāyanadharmaśūtra, the Gautama-dharmaśūtra and the Vāsiṣṭhadharmaśūtra. On the other hand, the source of the dietary prescription in the Yājñavalkya-smṛti is to be sought outside the Manusmrṭi, probably in SVB 1.2.8, BDhS 2.1.2.41, G DhS 26.20 and VaDhS 24.3, where kṛcchṛātikṛcchra- is an expiation to live only on water (ab-bhakṣa-). kṛcchṛātikṛcchra- in the Dharmasūtras is singular, because it is a severer kind of kṛcchra- in its content, and means ‘the Kṛcchra which is above other Kṛchras [in its severity]’, with the same semantic structure as MBh. devātideva- ‘ein über alle Götter hervorragender Gott’ (pw). It does not share the same meaning as in the Yājñavalkya-smṛti though it has the same singular ending.

It would naturally follow from these, that Yājñ. kṛcchṛātikṛcchra- is a compromise of the Dharmasūtras and the Manusmrṭi. The masculine sin-

---

16 MBh. 8.24.45a, 12.278.23c, 13.17.143a, 14.93.50c, 15.38.1c.
17 The Viṣṇusmrṭi made a similar compromise in Viṣṇu 54.30cd kṛcchṛātikṛcchraṃ kurvāta viprasyaotpādyā śonitam, by copying Manu 11.208cd and simply replacing kṛcchṛātikṛcchrau with a singular form which had been used more widely.
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gular ending -\(a\hat{h}i\), quite unusual for a Dvandva, might be a maneuver to cause the application of the Sandhi rule \((-a\hat{h}i + a- \rightarrow -o-\)) 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 Yājñī. 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 svargaṇasteyakrd vipro :: Yājñī. brāhmaṇasvarṇahāri.\(^{19}\) Manu 11.99 -100 svargaṇasteyakrd vipro rājānam abhigamyā tu/ svakarma khyāpayan brā­yān mām bhavān anuśāstvu iti/ gṛhitā musalam rājā sakrd dhanyāt 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 Yājñī. 3.257ab brāhmaṇasvarṇahāri tu rājñe 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 \(\times\) brāhmaṇas svarṇahāri for brāhmaṇasvarṇahāri as discussed above s.v. dṛṣṭih śrotraṇātā.

The Yājñavalkyasmṛti amalgamates Manu 11.99-100 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.

\(^{18}\) Cf. Meyer (1927), p.244: “Wohl schon weil kriechrātikriechrau nicht in seinen Vers gepaßt hätte, und weil sein kriechrātikriechra, sintemal ein 21 Tag Fasten bedeuten, etwa gleich schlimm ist, wie beide zusammen”

\(^{19}\) svarṇa- comes from su-varṇa- by syncope. Another example of syncope is Yājñī. 3.300b parṣadāḥ for pariṣadāḥ (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 svabāndhavah20 “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 dāsah karma karakaro vāvakarād amedhyapatram āniyā dāśihaṭat pūrayita daksīnāmukho yadā vīparyayad amukam anudakaṃ karomīti nāmagrāham “A slave or a labouror 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 varṇāśrametarāṇām no brūhi dharmān aśeṣatah “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 sarvavarṇānāṁ yathāvad anupūrvaśah/ antaraprabhavānāṁ 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.

sahọḍha- :: Yājñ. saḥoḍha-ja- in Yājñ. 2.131d garbhe vinnah saḥoḍhajah

---

20 Bāl. dāśihaṭam 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 kāraṇam brahma kutah jāta jīvavaḥ kena kva ca saṃpratiśṭhāḥ/ adhiśṭhitah 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, KAŚ 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.) adesakālasam- bhāsām sahaikāsānam eva ca22 “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 khaṭvāsānam “sitting on a couch together.” The Yājñavalkyasmṛti (or possibly the Mitakṣara) 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 krta- 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 dāśikṛtaḥ “one who was made a slave by force,” Yājñ. 2.301d tad evaśtagunikṛtam “it (the penalty) is made eight times as much,” Yājñ. 2.307d triṃśadgunikṛtam “made thirty times as much”. While no compound ending in krta- “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 bhasmahūteśu vipreṣu (Kullūka: bhasmībhūteṣu) “to Brahmins who are as good as ashes.”23 Manu 5.93d brahmabhūtā “like Brahman,” (Bühler) Manu 7.217ab ātmabhūtaḥ... 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 būjabhūtāh “like seeds,” Manu 10.91c krmiḥbhūtāh “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 bhavī/bhū ‘to become’ might still be alive, with the first member krmi- 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. 2.159 śreṇyādayaḥ kṛtādibhīḥ, *krmiḥbhūta-, a cvi-formation, would rather be expected.24

The Yājñavalkyasmrṛti uses bhūta- as the last member four times together with cvi-forms: Yājñ. 2.17c pūrvapakṣe 'dharibhūte “when the statement of plaintiff is turned down”, 2.64a dviguṇibhūtam “which has become twice”, 2.100c pratimānasamibhūto “who has become the same in weight”, 3.218a niṣkalmaśibhūtāḥ “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. 3.186d būja- bhūtāḥ “who have become seeds” Yājñ. 3.248ab lakṣyā- bhūtāḥ25 “who has become a target”. Pāda borders are not crossed by a word in the Yājñavalkyasmrṛti except the one between 1.79c and d: brahmaçārya eva parvāṇy ādyāś cataśras 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-sarpibrhyām.

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 Yājñavalkyasmrṛti: 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 Manusmrṛti has very few cvi-forms: 3.97c according to Kullūka bhasmibhūteṣu; 4.188d bhasmiḥbhavati.

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
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 parapūrvāpatiḥ stenaḥ karmaduṣṭās ca ninditāḥ28 “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-cetasāḥ, 8.386b duṣṭa-vāk : 5.108c mano-duṣṭāḥ, 3.156d vāg-duṣṭāḥ, 8.345a vāg-duṣṭāt.

vṛddha-sevitaḥ (Bāl.) in Yājñ. 1.309ab (Bāl.) mahotsāhaḥ sthūlalakṣaṇaḥ krtaṇo vṛddhasevitaḥ29 “Of great spirit, ambitious, grateful, attentive to the seniors” (Tokunaga 1993, p.5). sevita-, a verbal adjective in -ta- with an active meaning, governs 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-bhraṣṭaḥ in Yājñ. 3.217cd jāyante lakṣaṇabhraṣṭā daridrāḥ puruṣādhamaḥ “They are born as the meanest of men, poor and with any auspicious marks fallen.” Since the verb bhraṣ/ bhraṃś is used with the ablative, as in TS 1.6.11.1 prātī yajñēna tiṣṭhati nā yajñād bhraṃśate, an ablative case relationship can be considered as the basis of this compound, though Aśṭ. 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 Aśṭ. 2.2.37.

dhātu-vimūrccitaḥ in Yājñ. 3.75ab prathame māsi saṁkledabhūto dhātu-vimūrccitaḥ31 “In the first month [after conception, the ātman] is as it were moisture, congelaion 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 (Aśṭ. 2.1.57).

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

---

27 Or an Upapada compound with an adjectival first member like RV. rāṇyavāc-. Cf. Reuter (1892) pp.202f. with notes.
28 Bāl. karmaduṣṭās.
29 Mit. and Apar. vṛddhasevakāḥ.
31 Dr. Tsutomu Yamashita pointed out to me that Caraka 4.4.9 prathame māsi saṁmūrccitaḥ sarvadhātikalasikṛtāḥ kheṭabhūto bhavaty ... provides source for this passage.
kūṭacihnakṛtād bhayāt32 “But a case should be examined for fear of one who made false signs.”

kāla-kṛtaḥ in Yājñ. 2.58c kāle kālakṛto naṣyet “[A pawn] — will be forfeited at [the expiration of the] term.” The Mitāksarā understands this as a Bahuvrihi with an inverted order, ascribing it to the ākṛtī-gaṇa referred to by Pāṇini in Aṣṭ. 2.2.37. Judging from the usage of kālāṃ 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 kriyātām 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 Kirātārjuniya.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 mīndātādane kuryāt, 1.329c balānāṃ dārśanāṃ kṛtvā, 2.204c kṣepaṇā karoṭi ced, 3.8b-c sāramārgaṇaṃ karoṭi yah, 3.56a kṛtvēṣṭim. 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 kṛtakṛtāms 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. karaṇadadataḥ that the text of the Mitāksarā looks as if it manipulates Pāṇini’s grammar skillfully compared with that given by the Bālakriḍā. varṇāśramaṇātm 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 -kṛ-, 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 sarva-varnānam yathāvad anupūrvaśaḥ/ antaraprabhavānām ca dharmān na vaktum arhasi, the Bālakṛṣṇā 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 Bālakṛṣṇā, it gives a different inflection -i/ta-raṇāṁ, seeking its authority from Aṣṭ. 1.1.31 dvandve ca, 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. varṇaśrametareśām, 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 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- (‘ννν’), 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-kṛtaḥ (Mit.) :: kūṭacihna-kṛta (Bāl., Apar.) in Yājñ. 2.212d. Judging from its paraphrase kūṭacihnakāriḍuṭapuruṣabhayāt ‘for fear of a wicked person making a false sign,’ the Bālakṛṣṇā understands kṛta- as actively governing kūṭa-ciḥna-. 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 vrddhasevita- :: vrddhasevaka-.37

34 Bāl. varṇā brāhmaṇādayaḥ/ aśramā brahma-caryādayaḥ/ varṇetārā antaraprabhavā anulomādayaḥ/ aśrametāraḥ pāṣaṇādayaḥ/ teṣāṁ varṇāśrametareśām/ .../ anyāḥ pāpaḥ — ‘varṇānāṃ sāśramānāṃ’ iti.
35 Mit. ‘itaraśabdasya ‘dvandve ca’ iti sarvanāmasaṃjñāpratisedhāḥ. The Bālakṛṣṇā might have been conscious of this sūtra when it offered an optional reading varṇānāṁ sāśramānāṁ.
36 kūṭacihnakṛtaḥ ōte.
37 The commentary part of the Mitākṣarā, however, seems to explain not kūṭacihna-kṛt- but kūṭacihna-kṛta-, and that different from the Bālakṛṣṇā: kūṭacihnakṛtasambhāvanāḥhayāt ‘for the fear, which feeling is caused by a false sign’. The difficulty with this interpretation is the redundancy of kṛta-, for kūṭacihnaḥ bhayāt or kūṭacihna-bhayāt would be enough for this meaning.
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b. Some readings of the *Bālakṛīḍā*, which the *Mitākṣarā* does not follow, are grounded on the *Mahābhārata*, just as the above-mentioned form, Bāl. *vṛddha-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.) :: *sahasra-saḥ* (Bāl.) in Yājñ. 3.119 (Mit.) *mohajalam apāsyeha puruṣo dṛṣyate hi yah/ 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 *kaṇḍhaṇārā* is used in Yājñ. 2.220c, which might be a compound having this word as the first member (*kaṃ-dhaṇārā 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. *sahasra-saḥ* ‘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 *Bālakṛīḍā* has sometimes a philosophical rather than a practical bent. For example, the *Mitākṣarā* on Yājñ. 3.174 (Mit.) *icchā dhāraṇa-jīvite* 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. *icchādhāraṇa-jīvite* 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 *paramātman-* in Caraka 4.1.70–72. This does not mean,

\(^{38}\) I owe the reference to Mr. Makoto Fushimi.

\(^{39}\) *sahasra-saḥ* occupies this position in 349 out of the 366 passages which I looked up in Tokunaga’s electronic text.

\(^{40}\) *icchāya yad adhāraṇam sarīrasya tatparityāgah tad icchādhāraṇam.*
of course, that the reading of the Bālakṛiḍā is more interpolated than that of the Mitākṣarā: In Yājñ. 3.154ab (Bāl.) jñē jñē ca prakṛtau caiva vikāre cāviṣeṣavān “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. jñēyajñē ‘about ātman which knows what is to be known,’ and it agrees with Caraka 4.5.12.\textsuperscript{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 pākhaṇḍyanāsritāh (Mit.) in Yājñ. 3.6 (Mit.) \textsuperscript{a} pākhaṇḍyanāsritāh \textsuperscript{b} stenā \textsuperscript{c} bhartrgyhnyaḥ \textsuperscript{d} kāmāgādikāḥ\textsuperscript{42}/ \textsuperscript{e} surāpya \textsuperscript{f} ātmatyāginyo\textsuperscript{43} nāsaucodakabhājanāh “—, 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 \textsuperscript{g} ātmanas tyāgināṃ caiva nivarteto-dakāriyā/\textsuperscript{h} pāṣaṇḍam āsritānāṃ ca \textsuperscript{i} carantīnāṃ ca kāmataḥ/ garbhābhṛtar dhruhāṃ caiva \textsuperscript{j} surāpīnāṃ ca yoṣītām. The expressions carantīnāṃ ‘[women] who through lust live (with many men),’ garbhābhṛtar dhruhāṃ ‘[women] who have caused an abortion, have killed their husbands,’ surāpīnāṃ ca yoṣītām ‘to women ... [who] drink spirituous liquor (Bühl)’ in Manu 5.90 support the interpretation to take pāṣaṇḍam āsritānāṃ also as women: “[to women] who have joined a heretical sect” (Bühl). The Yājñavalkyasmṛti has three different readings according to the three commentators: Mit. pākhaṇḍyanāsritāh, Bāl. pāṣaṇḍam āsritāh and Apar. pāṣaṇḍan āsritāh. The Bālakṛiḍā follows the Manusmrī not only in its reading but also in commenting b kāmāgās tathā as tathāśabdaḥ smṛtyantaroktvṛthasāṅkarājatādyaarthāḥ “The word tathā means ‘those born in vain or from mixture [of castes] etc.’ mentioned in another law book (i.e. Manu 5.89)”\textsuperscript{44} The reading of the Mitākṣarā

\textsuperscript{41} I thank Professor Kyō Kanō for the reference.

\textsuperscript{42} Bāl. kāmāgās tathā.

\textsuperscript{43} Apar. ātmaḥgātino. The reading of the Mitākṣarā and the Bālakṛiḍā seems to be taken from Manu ātmanas tyāgināṃ, whereas that of the Aparārka goes with ātma-gāhātm- m. in Yājñ. 3.21b anvākṣam cātmaḥgātīnāṃ.

\textsuperscript{44} Agreement with the Manusmrī is not particular to the Bālakṛiḍā. Take for example vratalopaḥ...vratalopanam (Mit., Apar.) :: vratalopaḥ...brahma-lopanam (Bāl.) in Yājñ. 3.236c–238d nāstikyam vrata-lopaḥ ca ... kaūṣṭhyam vrata-lopanam or brahma-lopanam “..., atheism and violation of a vow, ... fraud, violation of a vow (or chastity), ...”
show 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 Bālaṅkriḍā in its interpretation, its reading paśaṅdānaśritāḥ can also be divided as paśaṅḍa/ā/naśritāḥ, i.e. a Dvandva like Mit. pākhaṇḍy-anāśritāḥ. The reading of the Aparārka is compatible with both the Mitākṣarā and the Bālaṅkriḍā in this case.

5. Conclusion

The tendency of the Yājñavalkyasmrī 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 kṛcchātikṛcchāḥ compared to the dual form kṛcchāṭikṛcchāvau in the Manusmrī, 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 Bālaṅkriḍā, but it might be a result of correction of the original text.

List of Abbreviations


These two synonymous action nouns vratalopāḥ and vratalopanam, formed from the root lupa/lupa: 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. brahmaṇalopanam ‘violation of abstinence’ saves the senselessness of repeating the same offense vrata-lopa- and vratalopana- 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

| agnyāpāḥ          | 1a naṣṭonmrṣte | 1a |
| aniveditaviṃśātāḥ | 1b pataniyakṛte kṣepe | 1c |
| apatitānyonyatyāgī | 1c payas | 2a |
| asteyamādhubhure | 1b parṣad- | 2b |
| ātmatīgīnyāḥ     | 1b pratipraṇavasāṃyuktām | 1a |
| icchā(-)dhāraṇajāvīte | 1a brahmaṇapanaṁ | 4d |
| uditoditam       | 1b madhusarpiś- | 1b |
| kaṇḍhārā         | 4b brahmaṇasvarṇahārī | 2b |
| karapāḍadatāḥ   | 3b varṇāṣraṃetarāṇām, -eṣām | 2b, 4a |
| karmaduṣṭāḥ      | 3b viṃśātivārśikī | 1a |
| kālakṛtāḥ        | 3b vāyata- | 1c |
| kūṭacīnkapṛtād  | 3a vrataṇopāṇam | 4d |
| kruṣṭāṭiṣṭrēcchraḥ | 2b vṛddhasevitaḥ | 3b |
| kriyāmāṇopakāre | 1a vṛddhasevakaḥ | 3b |
| cvi-formation    | 1a śaktyalanākrī | 1a |
| jñē 'jñē, jiṇyayājñē | 4c lakṣaṇabhṛṣṭāḥ | 3b |
| daśavārṣikī      | 1a śuṣṭiṣṭaḥ | 1a |
| daśṭaśvastrādivyāsaiḥ | 1a śuṣṭiṣṭaḥ | 1c |
| dhātuvimūrčchitaḥ | 3b (draṣṭi)śrotajñātā | 2b |
| dhāraṇajāvīte    | 1b sahasrakaḥ | 4b |
| dasikumbham      | 2b sahaḍhaja- | 2c |
| devātideva-      | 2a sahaikāsanam | 2c |
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