

THE UDĀTTA AS KEY-STONE OF THE DECIPHERING CODE
FOR THE ṚGVEDA-SAMHITĀ

I. - THE UDĀTTA'S PROSODICAL VALUE

The attention of ṛgvedic scholars is directed to this writer's previous publications on this topic, especially in *Annals* (B.O.R.I. — Diamond Jubilee Vol.) and to the *references* mentioned therein, besides the article in the *Bombay Univ. Journal* (Arts) which will have already appeared by the time the present essay is published (cf. particularly, *Annals*, loc. cit. pp. 615 ff.). The meaning of this *archaic prosodical* value of the udātta will be made clear by what may be rightly considered as the « shibboleth » of this archaic versifying factor.

Note: for our archaic *Pp-like* (no saṃdhis;!) text-transcription and *conventional signs* (on the right-hand margin at the pāda-end) we use mainly: = (no change), × (changed word-order), + (emendation — given in *italics* in the text), S(substitution), L(length-value for a « hrasva » in the rhythm-scheme), A(length-value for accent), R(resolution of kṣaipras, vowels or saṃdhis), H(haplology), d(deletion), I(insertion). If a saṃdhi is metre-demanded a + between the words concerned is inserted in the *text*. Long vowels: ā, ī, ū, ṛ. A short vowel with length-value appears as ä, i, ü, r; a long vowel with accent as â, î, û, ṛ or ă, ı, ũ, ř. Diphthongs go in archaic form: e=ai, o=au, ai=āi, au=āu; if resolved, they are: ayi, avu... or a-i, a-u...; aai, aau; and long vowels: ā=aa..., Any other details will be clear from the context*.

The staple-references are to Con(ordance, Vedic), Gr(assmann's *Ṛgveda-Wörterbuch*), G(eldner's Translation) O(Idenberg's *Noten*), without further specification, since they are *ad loc.* or *s. v.*, naturally. And mark (as we have often repeated!) that the trenchant strictures passed here (and elsewhere) — on the *editorial Samhitā-Kāra* (=SK)

* For typographic reasons ä, i, ü, r with accent will go as ä, î, û, ṛ (or ř). The same for r with accent = ř. The intelligent reader will easily discern them, it is hoped. A final * in a text-line means: text improvable - which applies to its *commentary* too! See note at this article's end! N.B.

agency and its « traditional » text (or devotees) — are not meant to question their « good intentions », but to awaken ṛgvedic scholarship to the deleterious effect that the said SK-agency's misguided « palimpsesting method » has had on the *original* (and immeasurably *superior!*) ṛṣi-kavis' own *ur-text*, which we are bent on reconstructing — for their own due honour and India's and Indology's benefit — by means of our rational-text-critical approach. — « satyam-eva-jayatai ».

And now for the texts in question.

V, 33, 5

- | | | |
|---|---------------|---|
| a) vayāṃ tay indra táva yá-+iva nāraḥ(!) | (SK!) ×SIA(!) | |
| b) śárdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rātham(!) | (SK!) SA+(!) | |
| c) á+asmān(!) jagamyāḥ ahi-śuṣma sá tvám(!) | (SK!) +S(!) | * |
| d) bhágaḥ ná háv- yāḥ prabhṛthaiṣu āyāuḥ(!) | (SK!) RHS+ | * |

cf. VII, 30, 4

- | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|
| a) vayāṃ tay indra táva yá-+iva nāraḥ(!) | (SK!) (supra) | |
| b) śárdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rātham(!) | (N.B.) (SK!) S+LH | |
| c) yáccḥā sūribhyaḥ utá ná-+várūtham | (N.B.) (SK!) (supra) | |
| d) su-ābhúvaḥ jaraṇām c-+aśnavāma(!) | (N.B.) (S.K!) RHI+(!) | * |

+X, 65, 4

- | | | |
|---|-----------|---|
| c) pṛkṣāḥ iva maháyantā- su-rátayaḥ | (N.B.) LH | * |
| d) daivá- stavantai(!) mánuṣāsa- sūrāyaḥ(!) | (SK!) H+ | * |

+X, 32, 9

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| a) aitām naḥ bhadrā dádataḥ maghāni | (N.B.) (SK!) ×+S | |
| b) kalásam kīru-śravaṇam kriyāta(!) | | |
| | (cf. c!) (N.B.) (SK!) ×A+(!) | |
| c) dánāḥ ít vaḥ, maghavānā-, sá astu | (cf. b!) (SK!) LSH | |
| d) ayāṃ ca sáumaḥ yāṃ hrđi bíbharmi | (N.B.) (SK!) ×L | * |

We had previously used these very texts, centered on the first two, for an accent-length shibboleth proof, yet trying to preserve much more of the SK's palimpsest. We *did* solve the metrical-mechanical difficulties in function of the accent, but not the *total* sense, which comes into its own only with the above restoration, sense+idiom+context-demanded! It should be obvious to an attentive text-critic, that the kavi's intended *main* sense *must* have been: « We are yours, Indra, just-like the maruts are too; (hence) come to our aid ». But the SK's vyākaraṇa prevents him from seeing or expressing *that*, since *he* cannot use the archaic haplology « yá-+iva », which for him can only be « yáy iva » or « yái va », which latter he turns into « yái ca » misled by *his* « ca » in 8b! And he can't see the sense of « tai+táva » in the *same* sentence (thinks *he!*) — hence, misled by the pseudomodel in *his* mishandled 2a (« ná tái tay indra asmád ādhi ṛjráḥ »), he « improves » *his* 5a into « vayāṃ tái tai », where « tái » makes no sense (*pace omnes!*), as against 2a, where it rightly *does* (q.v.). Hence, he confusingly misses-messes the kavi's sense-making: « We are yours, like those men who were born as your troop fellow-riders *on* (your) chariot ». And here again

the blundering vidūṣaka-SK, misled by the surrounding *nom. pl.*, misadapts the pāda-end into « yātás ca rāthāḥ », because of « jajñānāḥ », of course (mis-analysing « yātām+s- » as « yātás arātham » and miscorrecting it into « ca rāthāḥ » — to suit « yātāḥ »!) — but look up Gr., s.v. « sa-rātha- » for enlightenment! And now — with *our text!* — the sequel should follow smoothly: « So, as such, you come to us, you impetuous one — who are to be invoked in *human* offerings ». But look at the SK turning it all into a foolish 3rd person address(!) obviously for caviar to the general of the all-gobbling SK-acolytes! (« risum teneatis »?). And look at the text changes and substitutions he makes to save *his* vyākaraṇa and to paper over his rejection or ignorance of archaic haplogologies, etc. — Finally note that here we have, as in numerous supporting cases, as we shall see, the short *a* (in « nārah, sa-rātham ») considered by the *kavi* as *equivalently long* under the influence of *both* the accent *and* the rhythm-position (cf. « yācchā », *without* final accent, but as word-final-syllable: cf. VI, 30, 4c, in a rhythm-protected position). — The SK (=Saṃhitā-Kāra) editor can do nothing about it without ruining the metre (*and* sense) still further with his quantity-only prosody (vs. the archaic kavis' quantity+accent+position one) and, therefore, he has to lump it — as « ārṣa », poor fellow! — forced by the numerous other such cases, of which « jāna- pāñca jānāḥ » are conspicuous examples (in triṣṭubh-ends), cf. Gr. for clever near-miss remarks on those words (q.v.). But the moment our SK gets half a chance, he desperately tries — in pukka « traditional » vidūṣaka-panḍitś style — to dodge that « flaw » (thins *he!*) by somehow varying the *subsequent* parallel texts, especially to avoid trite punar-ukti — as above, in the obvious case of VII, 30, 4 vs. V, 35, 5 even against the natural demands of context and style, with his patchy « deva » vs. the (« unmetrical ») « nārah » of the original. And in this the editor-SK goes much further than might be considered believable otherwise, precisely because of the natural repetitive trend of the *anthological collection* (of closely similar themes, traditional style and common circumstances!) to be memorised and repeated by a *professional* class of reciters, who, besides, need some kind of safeguard against confusing similarity and-or identity of phraseology, especially in the *pratīka*-headings of pādas, stanzas *and* hymns. Naturally, a traditionally-bred *composing* *kavi* will borrow choice phrases or pādas and even hemistichs and take pride in completing or adapting them in an ingenious or unexpected manner; but an SK, in an *anthology*, with many such cases crowded together, will fight shy of such « monotonous poverty-stricken » echo-effect.

A striking case in point is VII, 30, 4 vs. its *preceding* (in the SK-order!) V, 33, 5. The two stanzas being so similarly styled and structured, we naturally expect:

VII, 30, 4

- a) vayām tay indra tāva yá-+iva nārah(!)
- b) sárdhah jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rātham

But we see the obvious SK-hand spiriting away the (for *him!*) *defaulting* « *nāraḥ* » and twisting 4b into a patch-work (cf. X, 65, 4b+32, 9b!) directed towards the *patrons* in 4cd, but callously leaving in the air the correspondent term to the *prominent* « *vayám* » in 4a, while patching the gap with a « *upamám* »(!) *filched brazenly* from the closely-neighbouring 3b! (a gaffe that no self-respecting *kavi* will even dream of committing!). ~~Everything-clamours-for-the-kavi's-original:~~

VII, 30, 4

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| a) <i>vayám</i> (!) <i>tay indra, táva yá+iva nāraḥ</i> | (N.B.) ×+SA |
| b) <i>sárdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rātham</i> (!) | (N.B.) SA+ |
| c) <i>yācchā surībhyaḥ utá nā-(!) várūtham</i> | (N.B.) SHL |
| d) <i>su-ābhúvaḥ jaraṇām c+asnavāma</i> (!) | (N.B.) R+ * |

Here it should be clear that the SK is also dodging the *ā-anuprāsa* in 4d). And we may add here for confirmation of 4b+V, 33, 5b (in our first tentative solution above):

X, 40, 1

- | | |
|---|------------|
| a) <i>rātham yāntam kūha ká- vaam narā</i> | (SK!) dRHL |
| b) <i>prāti dyumāntam suv-itāya bhūṣati</i> | = |

+I, 141, 8

- | | |
|---|----------------|
| a) <i>agnīḥ yān rāthaḥ ná śīkvabhiḥ kṛtāḥ</i> | (SK!) IR× |
| b) <i>ú- dyām āngaibhiḥ aruśāibhiḥ iyatai</i> | (SK!) HI(!) |
| c) <i>āt asya tái kṛṣṇāḥ dakṣi sūrāyaḥ</i> (!) (cf. G.+Gr.) | (?) |
| d) <i>sūrāsya ná tvaishāthāt īṣatai vāyaḥ</i> | (SK!) S(?) |
| = c) <i>āt asya tyái</i> (!) <i>sūriyā+n-+ākṣi kṛṣṇāḥ</i> | (SK!) ×SRHI(!) |
| = d) <i>sūrāsya ná tvaishāthāt vāyaḥ īṣatai</i> (cf. b!) | (SK!) ×SA(!) |

(For the SK's metrical mess and messy *vidūṣaka*-text, especially in 8c, cf. Gr.+G., all at sea! The above text-critical reconstruction *alone* can make sensible style, sense *and* metre! For further SK-manhandlings cf. the « fillers » in X, 40, 1a and the metrical butchery in X, 141, 8a (to « pair » *his* messed 8b), and in 8c to match 8d! But the SK-acolytes *will* gobble up anything without wincing, of course. Note too the above X, 65, 4c, where the SK dodges *his* faulty *pāda-final main* rhythm by intruding *his odd* « *mānuṣāya* » (*pace* G!). But there was no metrical flaw for the *kavi* who used a normal-archaic haplology (which alone makes sense, q.v.). Let us add here the SK's mis-*śruti*+mis-analysis+mis-correction causing further errors in V, 33, 5a (« *tai* » for « *táva* », « *yai ca* » for « *yá+iva* »), 5b (« *yātás ca rāthāḥ* » for « *yaatām sa-rātham* » — how the Maruts, or anyone, can be « *yātás ca rāthāḥ* » is nobody's business!), 5c (« *ahi-śuṣma-satvā* »! — for « *sá tvām* », cf. 5ab, and « *jagamyāt* » for « *jagamyāḥ* », which is *the* right form=*2nd. p.* optative, as context-demanded, cf. *ab* too), 5d (mis-analysis of the hapl. « *háv- yāḥ* », context-indicated, and the *odd* « *cāruḥ* » for « *āyauḥ* » to save *his* verse+vyākaraṇa vs. V, 41, 19d!).

The same can be said of the parallel, VII, 30 4a (as above, and

« daiva » filched from X, 65, 4d for rhythm+variety), 4b (« śárdhaḥ » vs. the SK's « śūra » from 1d+2c(!) against the context) of 4a for variety, as said; 4c (to save his 4b context+verse — wrongly), 4d (pseudo-kṣaipra, verse-ruining, and *full* subject missing, by SK's mis-correction of « aśnavāma », cf. « Gr., s.v. « aś » in *parasm.*!). In X, 65, 4c with rhythm-lengthening of the final word-hrasva together with haplology as in VII, 30, 4c!, in the cases of « maháyantā- » and « utá nā- »); in 4d (as said) an outrageous case-change by our SK vidūṣaka-pañḍit — who is simply averse to or ignorant of the kavi's haplology. — to get *his* end-rhythm! — But cf. Gr. for parallels+sense vs. the SK's foolish filching from I, 117, 21b! (context!).

The result is a typically *representative specimen* of the Saṃhitā-text as *SK-palimpsested distortion* of the ṛṣi-kavis' genuine *and* far-superior *and* perfectly metrical *and* sense-making Ṛgveda in its pristine form of quantity-cum-accent-cum-position metre, prosody and language-idiom.

And now the irrefragable testimony of those *bisyllabic* words is solidly confirmed by that of *tri-syllabic* ones in their serried battallions of « āvasai, āvasaḥ, āvasā », and similar nouns (« sāhas, śāvas... » together with « ātithiḥ », etc., which had already led the master=mind of an Oldenberg (in his excellent « Prolegomena » — too woefully neglected by Indian ṛgvedic scholarhip, alas!) to the clever near-miss of postulating a *special way* of *pronunciation*, though *not* of *formation* (as « āvas », etc.) for « those words », *all* of them marked by the one *single common* characteristic of the « *udātta* » *accent!*, which is what forced the present writer to the *only* possible logical conclusion (the crown of fifty years of text-critical ṛgvedic research) of the *prosodical length-equivalent value* of that accent under the influence of the *metrical rhythm-scheme*.

And this showed that the Ṛgveda *kavis* were in an archaic-linguistic stage of accent+quantity-prosody, while the trend of the living language was beginning to develop into the *post-vedic, pre-classic* and finally *classic* style of *quantity-only* metrical prosody, where accent simply does not *count* or even any more *exist*. And this was the linguistic-prosodical stage in which the SK-agency (about five-hundred years later!) lived and gave the final shape to the « traditional » Saṃhitā in what Oldenberg (with Arnold, « Vedic Metre ») calls its « orthoepic diaskeuasis ». Hence came the SK's « love's labour lost » of *transposing* the *archaic* text-state into the *new* one by steering a midway course between the two, preserving as far as possible the characteristics of the *ancient* « chandas » while incorporating the *later* standards of *his* own « vyākaraṇa » as *paramount*, even *against* the kavi's own archaic vyākaraṇa, saṃdhi and chandas *in case of conflict!* But that swap *had to* mislead the SK far beyond the mere orthoepy, since the change in « pronunciation only » often altered and ruined the very soul of a « ṛg » — its *rhythm!* Hence comes Arnold's justified remark that even alone the indiscriminate

kṣaipra-value of *y*, *v* turns the *Ṛgveda* into a « *padya-veda* » as far as its metrical value is concerned, not to speak of other values, which is bad enough!

But the SK is concerned with more than mere pronunciation: he wants — as already indicated — to produce a « *rg-veda* », as far as his traditional material permits, with as *few* as possible but as *many* as *required* changes, within rather broad limits of sense-preserving and even « improving » (according to *his* lights) — and to present to the *śiṣṭās* of *his* time a text worthy of the *ṛṣis* and of *his* cultured audience and *its* younger literary taste and standards. The very fact of the SK's systematic « updating » of the *whole* *Ṛgveda* text in function of *his* younger « *vyākaraṇa* », rough-shod trampling not only on the old one but, what is more, on the *rg's* *vital-essential metre and rhythm*, evidently proves that the SK *is not* and *will not be* a mere *echo-transmitter* (as the *post-Saṃhitā* tradition, exceptionally for India, did become as a sort of literary « *tour de force* »!) but an *editor-redactor* with *extra-textual* objectives and standards, *besides* and *beyond* and even *against* the *mere* literal fidelity, more in the line of the incorrigibly correcting-improving trends of the *Mahābh.* + *Rāmāy.* text-transmission — the typically Indian one, even in the age of manuscriptal handing down! Hence the transpositions, substitutions modifications and changes of all sorts that we observe in the three texts above — besides misinterpretations of the oral-auricular *śruti!* — are the natural result of *misguided care that loved its object only too well but disastrously unwisely!* Add to this (as already pointed out) that the SK was the *compiler-editor* of a *collection* of hymns (of traditionally conventionally repetitive themes and bards!) to be memorised with their treacherously memory-confusing similar+identical *pratīkas* and phraseology and often boring sameness (the decried « *punar-ukti* » of the « *śiṣṭāḥ* »!) — and you have all the ingredients that go to make a « *Saṃhitā-Palimpsest* » as typified by the above sample-texts, particularly with the aggravating circumstance of the SK's « *salto mortale* » from the *archaic* accent-quantity prosody to *his* own *quantity-only* classical one. And as for seeing parallelisms and possibilities of patching one text with shreds of another (as bits of one all-embracing *śruti!*) — *that* is child's play for memorising virtuosi who had the *whole* *Ṛgveda* at their memory's finger-tips!

II. - CONFIRMATION FROM ALL SIMILAR CASES

With the above findings and principles in mind we can now proceed to give a full confirmation from all parallel cases noted by Grassmann concerning in particular the three key-words: « *nāraḥ*, *rātha- jāna* » spread through the *whole* *Ṛgveda* and thereby showing that this prosodic factor, is part of the *basic* versifying system of the *ṛṣi-kavis* excep-

tionally preserved as « āṛṣa » by the palimpsesting SK, precisely because of the impossibility of effacing it, given the multiplicity of its occurrences, and in spite of his vidūṣaka-tricks to evade its *verse-wrecking* consequences from the angle of *his* quantity-only orthoepic prosody as against the kavis' archaic one, including accent and rhythmical length, besides other stylistic devices, especially *haplology*. The following are the texts, given with the accompanying conventional signs of the *archaic* features which the SK's « editorial dynamism » had to eliminate in order to achieve the « quantum leap » of *his* prosodical-linguistic *transposition!* This will be crowned by the *complete reconstruction* of the *two hymns* where our « shibboleth » stanza recurs in order to give proof palmary that our system and principles *do* work and apply *fully* and satisfactorily to *entire* textual-literary units as legitimate representatives of the *entire* Rgveda of the ṛṣi-kavis and *against* the SK's disfiguring-distorting Saṃhitā-Palimpsest, which is one!

V, 33, 5

- a) vyaṃ tay indra tāva yá-+iva(!) nāraḥ
(vs. 3ab) (SK!) X + × SA(!)
- b) śárdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rāthaṃ (infra!) (SK!) RSA +
- c) á+asmān jagamyāḥ ahi-śuṣma sá tvám(!) (N.B.) (SK!) +S *
- d) bhágaḥ ná háv- yáḥ prabhṛtháṣu āyáuh(!)
(V, 41, 19d) (SK!) RHS + *
- (For 5d cf. III, 50, 2d+V, 33, 7d!+VII, 29, 3c)

VII, 30, 4

- a) vyaṃ tay indra tāva yá-+iva(!) nāraḥ
(cf. supra) (SK!) S × +A
- b) śárdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rāthaṃ (supra!) (SK!) S + A
- c) yácchā sūrībhyaḥ utá nā- várūtham (N.B.) (SK!) × LH
- d) su-ābhúvaḥ jaraṇām c-+aśnavāma(!) (N.B.) (SK!) R + IH *
- (In 4ab SK for variety vs. V, 33, 5ab; cf. X, 32, 2b+65, 4cd)

cf. X, 32, 9

- a) aitam naḥ bhadrá dádataḥ magháni (N.B.) (SK!) X + S *
- b) kalāśam kúru-śravaṇam kriyāta(!)
(cf. c!) (N.B.) (SK!) XA + (!) *
- c) dānāḥ ít vaḥ, maghavānā-, sá astu (cf. b!) (SK!) LSH
- d) ayám ca sáumaḥ yám hrđi bíbharmi (SK!) × L *

+65, 4

- c) prkśáḥ iva maháyantā- su-rátáyaḥ (SK!) HL *
- d) daivā- stavantai(!) mánuṣāsa- sūráyāḥ (N.B.) (SK!) H + (!) *
- (For V, 33, 5a+VII, 30, 4a above — cf.):

II, 19, 1

- a) ápāyi asyá ándhasaḥ mādāya (SK!) R
- b) mánīṣiṇaḥ svaanásyā práyaḥ yát(!) (SK!) R + I
- c) yásmīn indraḥ pra-dívi vāvṛdhānāḥ +L
- d) áukaḥ dadhái daivayántas ca nāraḥ(!) (N.B.) (SK!) SA(!)

(For 1d cf. 8c+Gr.+):

I, 115, 2

- c) yātrā nárah daivayántaḥ yugāni (N.B.) =
 d) vi-tanvatāi bhadarā prāti bhadram (cf. G.) (SK!) ×R+A(!)

II, 19, 8

- a) aivā tai grtsa-madā- sūra mánmā (SK!) (cf. c!) +A×I(!)
 b) vayünā ná avasyávaḥ tatakṣuḥ(!) (N.B.) (SK!) +A×I(!)
 c) brahmaṇyántaḥ indara tái návīyah

(N.B.) (SK!) (cf. a!) R+

- d) ūrjām iṣaṃ su-kṣitīm sumnám aśyuh (SK!) ×L
 (There is *no unredupl. perf.* of « takṣ » — vs. Gr!). Cf.:

X, 39, 4

- a) yuvam cyāvānam sanāyam ná rāth- narā (SK!) HIS(!)
 b) púnar yúvānam caráthāi(!) tatakṣathuḥ (SK!) +I(!)

+III, 8, 6

- a) yān vaḥ nárah daivayántaḥ ni-mimiyūḥ =
 b) vānas-patai svádhitih vā tatakṣa(!) (N.B.) =

+VI, 1, 2

- c) tám tvā nárah prathamam daivayántaḥ =
 d) mahāi raay- citáyantāḥ ánu gman (N.B.) (SK!) H+RL

II, 34, 11

- c) yatásrucaḥ hiraṇya-varṇaan kakuh- (SK!) ×H(!)
 d) brahmaṇyántaḥ śamsīyam rādhaḥ imahai (N.B.) R

+I, 62, 3

- a) índrasya ca ángirasam ca iṣṭāu (SK!) IR(!)
 b) dhāsīm sarāmā tánayāi vivaida(!) (cf. c!) (SK!) ×A+S(!)
 c) bḥhas-pātiḥ bhinat ádrim vidát gāḥ (SK! vs. b!) =
 d) sám usriyābhiḥ vāvāsanta nārah(!) (SK!) SA(!)

+IV, 38, 9

- a) utá smā asya panayanti jñāḥ(!) (SK!) RA(!)
 b) jūtīm kṣṭiprāḥ abhi-bhūtim āśāuḥ =

+I, 89, 10

- c) vísvai daivāḥ áditiḥ páñca jñāḥ(!) (SK!) A(!)

cf.

- a) áditiḥ(!) dyāuḥ áditiḥ antárikṣam (N.B.) (SK!) L(!)
 b) áditiḥ(!) mātá sá pitá sá putráḥ (N.B.) (SK!) L(!)
 d) áditiḥ(!) jātām áditiḥ janitvám (N.B.) (SK!) L(!)

+VI, 11, 4

- c) ayūm ná yām námasa rātá-havyāḥ =
 d) añjānti su-prayāsam páñca jñāḥ(!) (SK!) A(!)

+51, 11

- a) tái nāḥ dyāvā- pṛthiví índra-+vardhan (SK!) ×HS(!)
 b) pūṣā bhágaḥ áditiḥ páñca jñāḥ(!) (SK!) A(!)
 d) bhāvantu naḥ su-*traatrāḥ*(!) su-gaupāḥ (SK!) +R(!)

+II, 20, 2

- a) *tuvām naḥ indra ūtibhīḥ tuvābhiḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) R × + (!) *
 b) *abhiṣṭi-pāḥ tuvāyat- āsi jānān(!)* (N.B.) (SK!) × HRLA(!)*
 c) *tuvām ināḥ daasūṣā- + varūtā* (SK!) RLH(!)
 d) *itthā-dhīḥ yāḥ(!) abhi-nákṣati tvā* (SK!) × + R

+III, 46, 2

- a) *mahān asi mahiṣa vṣṣṇiyaibhiḥ* R
 b) *dhana-spṛt ugra sáhamānaḥ anyān* =
 c) *áikā- + víśvasya bhúvan- ūsi rájā* (SK!) HIS(!)
 d) *sá yaudháyā ca kṣayáyā ca jānān(!)* (SK!) A(!)

+VI, 10, 5

- a) *nú naḥ citráṃ puru-vājābhiḥ ūti-* (N.B.) (SK!) HAR(!)
 b) *ágnai rayīm maghāvadhbhya- + utá dhaihi* (SK!) + RA
 c) *yái rádhāsā śrávasā c- + āti anyān* (SK!) + H(!)
 d) *su-vīriyāiḥ ca abhi-sánti jānān(!)* (SK!) (cf. c!) H + I
 (G.'s comment on 5cd wrong!!) — cf.:

VII, 16, 10

- a) *yái rádhāmsi áśvíyā dādatī maghá* (SK!) RAL(!)
 b) *kāmaina śrávasaḥ maháḥ* =

N.B. — The kavis do *not* feel bound to use words like « *jána- rátha-náraḥ* » in a particular verse-position. This is evident from the way they can use them in any other metrically correct setting but it is particularly made clear by the freedom they — or the SK? — show in the employment of even composite phrases like « *pāñca jánāḥ* » (cf. Gr.):

I, 89, 10

- c) (cf. supra: *pāda-end*)

III, 59, 8

- a) *mitráya pāñca yaimirai* (SK!) = (?)
 b) *jánāḥ abhiṣṭi-śávasai* (SK!) A(?)
 c) *daivān víśvān bibharti sá* (SK!) × (?)
 = a) *mitrāy- abhiṣṭi-śávasai* (SK!) XHA(!)
 = *c) *daivān víśvān bibharti yāḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) XAR(!)
 = *b) *yaimirái pāñca jānaaḥ(!)* (N.B.) (SK!) + XS(!)

(This whole *unique hymn* — cf. G. — in its 3 *parts* is a « *shibboleth* » of SK-palimpsesting, esp. in (I) 1acd + 2abd(!) + 3a; (II) 5(!)a(!)d + 4(!)b; (III) 6abs(!) + 7abc + 8abc + 9abc(!) — Would-be-critic « *jāgrhi* »! You stand or fall by *this* test!).

VI, 11, 4

- a) (cf. supra: *pāda-end*)

VII, 51, 11

- b) (cf. supra: *pāda-end*)

X, 45, 6

- d) *jánāḥ yát agním áyajanta pāñca* (N.B.) (SK!) (?)
 = *yát agním á-yajanta pāñca jánāḥ(!)* (kavi vs. SK!) XA(!)
 = *yát pāñca jánāḥ áyajanta agním* (SK!) + HI(?)

- = yát páñca agním áyajanta jänāḥ (SK!) ×A(?)
 = yát agním páñca áyajanta jänāḥ (SK!) ×A(?)
 lc) vidūṃ cit s-+ádrim abhinat parā-yán (SK!) ×R(?)

(The *kavis* could use any alternative *d*-form here; but *not* the SK! —
 For the SK only the *first* was «regular» — pāda-order *dc*!)

X, 53, 4

- c) *úurja-ādaḥ utá yajñiyāsaḥ* (cf. 5b) (SK!) L(!)
 d) *pāñcā janāḥ máma hautrám juṣadhvam* (SK!) L(!)

X, 53, 5

- a) *pāñcā jänāḥ máma hautrám juṣantām* (SK!)
 b) *gáu-jātaaḥ utá yái yajñiyāsaḥ* (cf. 4c!) (SK!) R

VIII, 32, 22

- b) *ihí páñca jänān áti* (SK!) (?)
 = *ihí páñc- áti jänān(!)* (SK!) ×ra(!)

IX, 92, 3

- d) *dhīrāḥ ānu yatatai páñca jänān* (SK!) ×LA(!)

The SK *has* to twist to try, if possible, to get *his* quantity-*only* rhythm vs. the *kavis*' ample choice with quantity-+*accent* prosody! But they also had *conventional* trends, like *final* «jänāḥ+*páñca* jänāḥ», as above, especially the latter, mostly in spite of the SK's twists!

V, 33

- 1 a) *máhī mahái nar -dīdhiyai tavāsai(!)* (N.B.) L×HRA(!)
 b) *īndrāy-+ahám távyasa-+itthā átavyān* (N.B.) ×RHI
 c) *yáḥ asmaḍai(!) samariyaḥ cikaitta* (N.B.) (cf. Gr.) SA×+(!)
 d) *jánāi(!) stutáḥ sumatīm vāja-sānim* (cf. 7d!) (cf. Gr.) S+A(!)

cf. X, 91

- 15 c) *asmái suvīraṃ rayīm vāja-sānim* (SK!) ×A(!)
 2 a) *sá tvám naḥ indra dhiyasānāḥ arkāiḥ* =
 b) *háriṇaam yáuktaram vṛṣaṃ aśraiḥ* (N.B.) +RLA(!)
 c) *itthā yaaḥ maghavan ānu jáuṣam* (N.B.) +RA×(!)
 d) *vákṣāḥ abhi aryá- sakṣi prá jänān(!)* (N.B.) ×LHRA(!)
 3 a) *ná tái tay indra háray-+asmát ādhi(!)* (cf. c+5a!) ASH+×(!)
 b) *áyuktāsaḥ a-brahmātā yáth-+āsan* (N.B.) ASR
 c) *ā- tiṣṭha tám ráth- ádhi vajra-hasta* (cf. a!) (N.B.) +HI×
 d) *raśmīnā+iva yāmasay ā suv-áśvam* (N.B.) S+ARH×
 4 a) *purú yá tai indara sánti tá ukth-* (N.B.) +RHI
 b) *urvārāsu gáuṣu cakartha yúdhyan* (N.B.) ×+AH
 d) *tuvám samātsu dáasasya vādhāḥ(!)* (N.B.) dSRA(!)
 lc) *tatákṣiṣai ḍriyāy áukasi svái* (N.B.) S+R(!)

- 5 a) vayāṃ tay indra tāva yá-+iva nārah (SK: 3a!) ×A+(!)
- b) śárdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rātham(!) (N.B.) +RA(!)
- c) á+asmān jagamyāḥ ahi-śuṣma sá tvām(!) (N.B.) +S(!) *
- d) bhágaḥ na háv- yáḥ prabhṛtháišu āyáuḥ
(V, 41, 19b) (N.B.) +HISAd *
- 6 a) pṛkṣáiniyam indara tvái hí áujah (N.B.) (SK!) SR+
- b) utá nṛmṇám nṛtama nār amṛta(!) (N.B.) (SK!) ×SL+A(!)
- c) sá áiniṃ ná vasav ā- nah rayim dāḥ (SK!) +SHI
- d) prá tai stuṣai tuvi-magh- arya dānam
(cf. Gr.) (N.B.) ×+I(!)
- 7 a) aivá indra uutibhiḥ nah āva (N.B.) RA×(?)
- b) utá sūra gṛṇatāḥ páhi kārūn (N.B.) ×LHI
- c) utá piprihi su-sutásya cārauḥ (cf. 5d) (N.B.) ×L
- d) mádhvaḥ tvácam dádata- vāja-sātāu (cf. 1cd!) (N.B.) ×H(!)
- 8 a) utá tyái pāuru-kutsiyásya sūrāiḥ dR
- b) trasā-dasyauḥ hiraṇináḥ rárānāḥ L
- c) dása śyáitasaḥ mā vahantu áśvāḥ(!) (SK!) (cf. G.) ×LR+
(V, 41, 19d) (N.B.) +HISAd
- d) gāiri-kṣitásya krátubhiḥ nú saścai =
- 9 a) utá tyái mā mārutá+ásvasya śáuṇāḥ(!) (cf. 8c!) =
- b) krátvā-maghāsaḥ vidáthasya rātāu =
- c) sahasra- mai cyávātānaḥ dádānaḥ (N.B.) +H
- d) ānūkám aryáḥ vápuṣai ná ārcat R
- 10 a) utá tyái mā dhuvaníyasya júṣtāḥ (cf. 8c!) R
- b) su-rūcaḥ ca lakṣmaníyas- yátānāḥ(!) (N.B.) IHA 2
- c) mahná rāyáḥ saṃváraṇasya řśaiḥ RA(!)
- d) vrajām ápi gman prá-yatāḥ ná gávaḥ (SK!) XL
- (For special samples of accent+rhythm-value+archaism cf.: 1ad+2bcd+3abcd+4ac+5ab+6b+7abc+10bcd).

VII, 30

- 1 a) á nah patai śavasaḥ indra yāhi (SK!) S+×(!)
- *c) mahái nṛmṇāya nr-manā- su-vajra (SK!) SL
- *b) bhávā vṛdháḥ raayá- śuṣmīn asyá (SK!) ×RH+(!)
- d) mahái ksatrāya sūra páuṃsiyái ca (SK!) R×I+
- 2 a) tuvām havantai háviyaṃ ví-vāci (cf. Co.) (SK!) +R×d(!)
- b) sūrāḥ tanūnām sūuraś ca sātāu (N.B.) (SK!) S+RI
- c) tuvām vísvaiṣu sáiniyaḥ jánaiṣu R
- d) tuvām vṛtrā randhayā ná- su-hántū (SK!) S+×HL
- 3 a) áhā yát indra sudinā vi-ucchān R
- b) dádhaḥ yát kaitúm upamáṃ samátso =
- c) ní agní- sidat ásurah ná háutā (N.B.) (SK!) (cf. G.) HR(!)
- d) huvānāḥ átra yajáthāya daivān (SK vs. kavi!) +(!)

(3d=SK's *var.* vs. VII, 11, 3+17, 3=h.l.!)

- | | |
|---|---------------------|
| 4 a) vayam̐ tay indra táva yá+iva nāraḥ | (c. V, 33, 5) S×+ |
| b) sárdhaḥ jajñānāḥ yáatām̐ sa-rāthaḥ | (X, 32, 9b) SR+A(!) |
| c) yáčchā sūrībhyaḥ utá nā- várūtham̐ | (N.B.) (SK!) SL+(!) |
| d) su-ābhúvaḥ jaraṇām̐ c-+aśnavāma(!) | (N.B.) (SK!) ×R * |

(For 4b cf. X, 65, 4d+32, 9b=SK!)

- | | |
|---|----------------------|
| 5 a) vaucāima indram̐ maghāvānam̐ ainam̐(!) | (cf. bc!) ×R(?) |
| = ainam̐ vaucāima maghāvānam̐ indar- | (SK!) ×+HR(!) |
| b) mahāḥ raay- ráadhaḥ sá(!) dáda- naḥ | (SK!) SHR+L(!) |
| c) yáḥ(!) árcataḥ bráhma-kr̥tīm̐ áviṣṭhaḥ | (SK!) HIL(!) |
| d) yūyam̐ daivāḥ pāt-+abhísī sádā naḥ | (N.B.) (SK!) SI+H(!) |

(For special samples, as in V, 33, cf.: 1abcd+4abc+5abd(!) — Would-be-critic, « jāgr̥hi »!).

III. - RESULTS

The *chief result* of the above study is the fact of the prosodical *accent-value as equivalently long*. The *archaic metrical prosody* had a whole series of *factors*: *number* of syllables, *rhythm-pattern*, *yati* or *yati-like position*, *archaic sam̐dhi-system*, *words and forms*, *accent* (actual or potential) and, *syllable-quantity* (in the traditional sense). Of all these, the SK has at his unchanged disposal — besides the *main* rhythm pattern — *only* (like the *post-vedic prosody*) *quantity*, while having practically *lost* also another wide-ranging and (for him) disturbing factor: *haplogy*. This is a problem not of his own making but born of the linguistic-philological evolution. His « vidūṣaka-pan̐ditry » is rooted not in his (well-meant) « intentions » or on any ignorance of *his own* language-stage, but in his naive presumption that *he* can do justice to his « salto mortale » *transposition with quantity alone as rhythm-builder* within a vastly younger+different cast-iron sam̐dhi-system and language-stage. No wonder his product is (as it was bound to be) so palimpsestingly catastrophic for his « dynamic editorialism », sitting between the *two incompatible stools* of *preservation* and *reformation* of a hymn-collection, as described further up. Hence the « *rule of thumb* » for a ṛgvedic text-critic (who is aware of the SK's *all-pervading* « love's labour lost! ») is: try to build, with the SK's wording, verses that are *perfectly rhythmical, sense-making and idiomatic, but archaic* (that is, of a type that the SK, with *his* vyākaraṇa and sam̐dhis and vocabulary, could not possibly stomach), then scrutinise the parallels — and you are on the right way (if not already there!) to the ṛṣi-kavis own text *behind* the Sam̐hitā-Palimpsest. In our texts above, on the right-hand margin, we give the *symbols* of the *re-archaisation* steps demanded by the SK's frantic efforts to dodge the (for him) unbearable offences against *his* vyākaraṇa and other « editorial » preconceptions which for

him (as a later « śiṣṭa ») are inviolably sacrosanct. And how shrewdly acrobatic those dodges often are — but how vidūṣaka-like vis-à-vis of the ṛṣi-kavis' own genuine words! Just tinsel vs. gold!

(Here we would like to honour our late guru, Prof. Dr. W. Schulze, who, with his « Quaestiones Epicae », inspired us, he, the successful pioneer of a similar *text-critical re-archaisation of Homer's archaic epic verses*, showing that « *non dormitat Homerus* ». — « *ná u muhyanti ṛṣayaḥ* ». — « *námaḥ gurúbhyaḥ* »!).

The *total convergent and mutually supporting* witness of the texts above from the *whole* R̥gveda is ample proof positive that points to the *one SK-agency* as the palimpsesting source of the « traditional » Saṃhitā-text. The ideal would be to have the Saṃhitā-version side by side for comparison, but for obvious editorial reasons, that task will have to be left to the interested reader with the aid of our transcript which indicates all the *non-Saṃhitā* details.

As for *special text-critical results*, we can point out — besides the two « shibboleth » stanzas (which fairly bristle with « new »-archaic readings) and the two riddle test-texts, X, 32, 9ab+I, 141, 8 (for would-be-critics!) the texts: X, 65, 4d+II, 19, 1b+I, 115, 2d+II, 19, 8ab+X, 39, 4b+VI, 1, 2d+II, 34, 11cd+I, 62, 3ab+VI, 51, 11acd+II, 20, 2ab+III, 59, 8+X, 45, 6d+X, 53, 4c+5a — hence practically in *every* text examined, and that not only in the mere *scanning* of the verses, but also in their contents and sense. (Hence neo-lexicographer « jāgṛhi »!). The above *depalimpsested* text-form is the *ṛṣi-kavis' own* on the *whole* and in *essentials*, at times in *all* details too, but in other cases it is open to further improvement in the light of eventual new parallel or convergent factors rediscovered — yet *always along the same method and principles here advocated!* We are constantly seeking and finding such new aids in a deeper and more comprehensive insight into the SK's multi-faceted and multi-layered « method-in-madness and madness-in-method ». The *asterisk*-marked texts (above) indicate our *new* findings, which are also in the process of publication.

And we urgently request the constructive cooperation of all earnest and competent ṛgvedic scholars and text-critical specialists. It is a glorious task, both facilitated and hindered by the SK's palimpsested bamboo-curtain of *his* Saṃhitā-text — *behind* and *through* and *beyond* which shimmers *the* radiant « darśana » of the long-suffering ṛṣi-kavis' own UR-R̥gveda « śivāḥ santu pánthāḥ »!

APPENDIX

For a token-specimen of the *text-critical progress* possible and actual we reproduce our « shibboleth »-texts (*supra*) in the *definitive* form attained since the above essay was given to the press, while time and other editorial and technical considerations prevent us, to our regret, from doing it *here*.

V, 33, 5

a) vyaṃ tay indra táva yá-+iva nāraḥ (N.B.) (SK!) ×+SHA(!)

- b) *sárdhāḥ jajñānāḥ yaatām sa-rātham* (N.B.) (SK!) S+RIA(!)
 c) *sá tvám naḥ āhi-śuṣma ā jagamyāḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) ×S+RA(!)
 d) *pitūḥ ná nāma prabhṛthái-+su-hāvaḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) (i)VHS×
- VII, 30, 4
 a) *vayām tay indra táva yá-+iva nārah* (SK!) S+HA(!)
 b) *sárdhāḥ jajñāndḥ yaatām sa-rātham* (N.B.) (SK!) S+RIA(!)
 c) *yácchā sūribhyaḥ utá-nā-+várūtham* (N.B.) (SK!) HS+L(!)
 d) *ā-+jāraṇām su-ābhúv-+aśnavāma* (N.B.) (SK!) R×IH+L(!)
- X, 65, 4
 a) *súvar-ṇaram antárikṣā+ut-+āraucayan* (N.B.) (SK!) RS+HS(!)
 b) *dyāvā-bhūmī áujasā cāskabhúḥ ca yái* (N.B.) (SK!) d+×I(!)
 c) *tá-+ivā pṛkṣāḥ maháyantā-+su-rātáyāḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) ×LHI(!)
 d) *daivá-+stavantai mánuṣāsa-+sūráyāḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) +H(!)
- X, 32, 9
 a) *aitām naḥ kūru-śraṇam kriyāta* (N.B.) (SK!) +SIA(!)
 b) *kalāśam bhadrá dádataḥ maghāni* (N.B.) (SK!) ×A(!)
 c) *dānāḥ it vaḥ maghavānā-+sá astu* (SK!) LH
 d) *ayām ca sáumaḥ hṛtsú yām bibhṛmāḥ* (N.B.) (SK!) +L(!)