

LEONID KULIKOV

SKT. VRDH_2 ‘HURT, DAMAGE, CUT’ **Abstract:*

The present paper deals with the origin of the late Sanskrit root $\text{vr}dh_2$ ‘hurt, cut’, which is explained as extracted from the compound $\text{vy-r}dh_2$ ‘be deprived of smth., be precluded from smth., lose’, with the subsequent simplification of the difficult sequence $\text{vyr-} \rightarrow \text{vr-}$.

The late root $\text{vr}dh_2$, homonymous with $\text{vr}dh_1$ ‘grow, increase’, is registered in Dhātupāṭha (X 112, ‘chedana-pūraṇayoh’) and located by Sanskritists in the Epics and some classical texts (cf. BÖHTLINGK/ROTH PW VI, 790ff.). The meaning of this root is usually rendered, apparently after BÖHTLINGK (‘abschneiden’), as ‘cut’. The *-ta-*participle of $\text{vr}dh_2$ occurs in the Mahā-Bhārata (see OBERLIES 2003: 517, where this verb is translated as ‘cut, hurt’):

(Mbh. 12.74.8ab)

vrddham (v.ll. *viddham*, *dvidhā*, crit.ed. $^+\text{vyrddham}$) *rāṣṭraṃ bhavati kṣatriyasya, brahma kṣatraṃ yatra virudhyate ha*

‘The kingdom of the Kṣatriya, where the Brahmaṇa is opposed to the Kṣatriya, **becomes ruined.**’

* I am much indebted to A. Lubotsky, N. Nicholas and T. Oberlies for valuable comments on earlier drafts of this paper. I acknowledge grant 275-70-009 (VENI-project) received from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), and financial support from the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung.

The same root is said to appear in a few nominal derivatives: *vardhaka-*, *vardhaki(n)-* ‘carpenter’ (Ep., Cl.), *śmaśru-wardhaka-* ‘barber’ [= ‘beard-cutter’] (Rām.) and *nābhi-wardhana-* ‘cutting of the navel-string’ (ManuSmr. 2.29).

The etymology of *vr̥dh₂* has not received satisfactory explanation thus far (see MAYRHOFER, KEWA III, 157; EWAia II, 521).¹ The meaning hardly allows for connection with *vr̥dh₁* ‘grow, increase’.²

First let it be noted that the translation ‘cut’, which opens the list of meanings of *vr̥dh₂*, seems to belong to the periphery of its semantics. The Mbh. passage quoted above rather suggests the translation ‘hurt, damage, destroy, ruin’. A carpenter (*vardhaka-*, *vardhaki(n)-*, on the assumption that these nouns belong here) not only cuts, but also (or even predominantly) trims and joins (pieces of wood), creating new objects. In any case, the meanings ‘hurt, destroy’ (which are present, for instance, in *vr̥ddha-*, attested in the Mbh.) and ‘do carpenter’s work’ can hardly be reconciled within one single lexeme. Cutting underlies the basic meaning of *wardhana-* in *nābhi-wardhana-*, but even here a possibility for an alternative interpretation remains open: ‘cutting of the navel-string’ suggests in fact its removal and destruction. Note also that *chedana-* in the Indian lexicographic description of the meaning of this root (*‘chedana-pūranayoh’*) refers not only to cutting, but also to splitting, breaking, destruction. Thus, *vr̥dh₂* rather denotes hurting, damaging activities, usually violating the physical integrity of the object.

It seems that the editors of the Poona critical edition of the Mahā-Bhārata were on the right way towards the explanation of the origin of *vr̥dh₂* when conjecturing ⁺*vyṛddham* for *vr̥ddham*. Specifically, *vr̥dh₂* may originate in the compounded root *vy-r̥dh*, meaning ‘be deprived of smth., be precluded from smth., lose’.³

1. BURROW’S (1979: 47) explanation of this root as an extension of Indo-European **wer-* ‘to cut’ (unattested in Sanskrit but allegedly preserved in Pkt. *ṇivvarai* ‘cuts’) does not seem convincing.

2. WHITNEY’S (1885: 165) short remark concluding the lemma *vr̥dh* ‘grow’ (“Compare √ *rdh*. The asserted √ *vr̥dh* ‘cut’ (used only of the navel-string) rests on a too narrow foundation to be admitted; it is probably a specialized application of this root”) is unclear (this root = *vr̥dh?* *rdh?*) and lacks argumentation.

3. For the meaning and syntax of this compound, see OERTEL 1926: 130f.; GONDA 1951: 26; KULIKOV 2001: 276f.; see also KRICK 1982: 540, fn. 1469 on the opposition *vyṛddhi-* ~ *samṛddhi-* (= “Dis-” ~ “Reintegration”).

The simplification of the difficult sequence vyr_2- → $vṛ-$ is attested already in late Vedic, noticed for the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa by DEBRUNNER (1957 [AiG, Nachtr. zu Bd. I]: 149),⁴ who groups this form with other instances of the loss of *y*, such as *tryeṇī / treṇī* ‘an drei Seiten bunt’ (WACKERNAGEL [AiG I], 267f., §232a). DEBRUNNER apparently noticed only those attestations of $vṛ_2^\circ$ (← vyr_2°) which crept into editions, as is the case with three forms in the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa listed below. In fact, however, $v[y]ṛdh$ occurs in some other late Vedic and post-Vedic texts as well, attested among variant readings in manuscripts or even as the only reading.

In the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, $vṛ_2^\circ$ appears instead of vyr_2° in the -*ya*-present $v[y]ṛdhyate$ (2x: PB 6.7.14, 15) and in the -*ta*-participle $v[y]ṛddha-$ (PB 6.9.26),⁵ cf.:

(PB 6.7.15)

yadi pratihartāvacchidyate, paśubhir yajamāno vṛdhyate

‘If the Pratiharta is hurt, the sacrificer is deprived of his cattle.’

All other occurrences of $vi + ṛdhya-te$ in the PB (9x: PB 9.8.16; 9.9.13; 16.5.2; 6.1; 8.7; 131.2; 18.11.1-3), as well as the second attestation of the -*ta*-participle ($vṛddham vā$ PB 6.9.23), have the regular vyr_2° .

A few occurrences of $vṛ_2$ -forms appear in the Sūtras. The -*ya*-present $v[y]ṛdhyate$ occurs in VaikhŚS 1.19:19.16, as one of the variant readings (ms. T reads $vā vṛdhyate$; other attested readings are ($vā$) $vṛdhyate$, $vāpyadhyate$, $^\circ vāpyṛdhyate$). The -*ta*-participle $v[y]ṛddha-$ is attested, among variant readings, in ĀpDhS 1.28.4 (*ativyapahāro v[y]ṛddho bhavati*; mss. have $vṛddho$, $vṛddho$ and $viruddho$). VaitS 8.3 has the correct vyr_2° in $vṛddhi-$ ‘mishap’ in all mss. ($ādhānād vṛddhiś ced ...$), but its quotation in the comm. on KātyŚS 4.11.1 has a $vṛ_2^\circ$ -form instead ($ādhānād vṛddhihāniś ced ...$) (see ed. GARBE, p. 64, crit. notes ad loc.). Finally, $vṛddhau$ (loc.sg. of $v[y]ṛddhi-$) appears in SVB 3.9.5, in ed. BURNELL, for which ed. SHARMA (qualifying ed. BURNELL as “full of misprints”) reads $vṛddhau$, with no variant readings.

4. See also KULIKOV 2001: 272, fn. 836.

5. Note that all the three forms are found in book 6.

The substitution $vyr^\circ \rightarrow vr^\circ$ was not the only way to deal with the sequence $vyr-$. At MānŚS 1.6.5.1, several mss. have *vyadhyamāna-* for *vyṛdhyamāna-*. Another possibility is attested in ĀpDhS 1.28.4 *virud-dho* (mentioned above). Finally, a variety of solutions are exhibited by the mss. of the Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa quoted in ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA. We find in mss. (by order of appearance in text):

vyiriddhyante (JB 2.221:7)
virudhyante (JB 2.221:9)
viridhyante (JB 2.225:6)
vīṛddhi- (JB 3.4:6)
vīriddhi- (JB 3.4:6)
vīriddhi- (JB 3.4:9)
vīriddhi-, *vīruddhi-* (JB 3.4:11)
viraddh[a]-, *vīriddh[a]-* (JB 3.279:1)

Yet another way to transform $vyr-$ is found in the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa. In GB 2.1.16, mss. twice read *vivṛdhyate* (for which ed. GAASTRA conjectures $^+vyrḍhyate$), cf.:

(GB 2.1.16:153.12-13)
indriyeṇa vā eṣa vīryeṇā vivṛdhyate [ed. $^+vyrḍhyate$], *yasya pitā pitāmahaḥ somaṃ na pibati*
 ‘The one whose father (and) grandfather does not drink soma is deprived of power and energy.’⁶

Most likely, the sequence vyr° was first simplified to vr° ; then the preverb was secondarily restored.

For convenience, the variant readings attested in texts are summarized below:

$vyr^\circ \rightarrow$ vr°
 vya°
 $viri^\circ$
 $vyiri^\circ$
 $viru^\circ$

6. Cf. TS 2.2.1.4 *néndriyēna vīryeṇa vy ṛdhyate* ‘... he is not deprived of power and energy’. On this passage and the meaning of *indriyāṃ vīryāṃ*, see GONDA 1987: 117f.

vyṛ^o → *vira*^o
vīṛ^o
vīri^o
vīru^o
vivr^o

To sum up, we find ten variants, substituting for the original *vyṛd(d)h*^o, which suggest both phonetic processes (vocalisation *r* → *ri*, *ru*, *ra*, *a* and/or *y* → *ī*, *yi*) and semantic adaptation of the resulting sequences to the existing roots or compounds (*vṛdh* ‘grow, increase’, *vi-rudh* ‘obstruct; be opposed’).

The character of this irregular variation clearly points to the phonetic, rather than graphic, nature of the phenomenon in question. Facing the difficulties in pronouncing the sequence *vyṛ*^o, the copyists may have tried different ways to resolve it. Most of these solutions had little chance to survive, being clearly awkward and ungrammatical (cf. *vyiri*^o, *vīṛ*^o, *vīru*^o). By contrast, the *vṛ*-variants could at least be considered morphologically acceptable, being formally identical with the derivatives of the homonymous root *vṛdh₁*. Thus, the root *vṛdh₂* could be extracted from such forms as *v[y]ṛdhyate*, *v[y]ṛddha-* and *v[y]ṛddhi-*, the latter two of which are homonymous with the corresponding derivatives of *vṛdh₁*, *vṛddha-* ‘grown, increased’, and *vṛddhi-* ‘growth, increase’.

The semantics of some derivatives of *vṛdh₂* can be directly traced to the meaning ‘deprive of smth.’ (*nābhi-varadhana-* ‘depriving of the navel-string’; *śmaśru-vardhaka-* ‘barber’ = ‘the one who deprives of beard’). As for the semantic change ‘deprive of smth.’ → ‘hurt, destroy, ruin; cut (away)’, it could be supported by the influence of two phonologically similar verbal roots denoting hurting activities, *vadh* ‘slay, kill’ and *vyadh* ‘pierce’ (cf. esp. the zero grade derivatives such as the *-ya*-present *vídhyati* ‘pierces’ and *-ta*-participle *viddhá-* ‘pierced’); these verbal roots may also be responsible for the rise of the ‘carpenter’-derivatives. Another form that might have contributed to the establishing of this new verbal root is *vadhri-* (RV +) ‘eunuch’, which could easily be associated with the sense of *vy-ṛdh* ‘deprive of [manly force / membrum virile]’.

Abbreviations

ĀpDhS	Āpastamba-Dharma- Sūtra	Mbh.	Mahā-Bhārata
Cl.	Classical Sanskrit	PB	Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa
Ep.	Epic Sanskrit	Rām.	Rāmāyaṇa
GB	Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa	SVB	Sāmavidhāna- Brāhmaṇa
JB	Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa	TS	Taittirīya-Saṃhitā
KātyŚS	Kātyāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra	VaikhŚS	Vaikhānasa-Śrauta- Sūtra
MānŚS	Mānava-Śrauta-Sūtra	VaitS	Vaitāna-Sūtra
ManuSmṛ.	Manu-Smṛti		

REFERENCES

Text editions

- ĀpDhS Ed. BÜHLER, George: *Āpastambīyadharmasūtram. Āpastamba's Aphorisms on the sacred law of the Hindus*. 3rd ed. ... Bombay, 1932. (*Bombay Sanskrit Series*; 44, 50).
- GB Ed. GAASTRA, Dieuke: *Das Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*. Leiden, 1919.
- JB Ed. RAGHU VIRA/LOKESH CHANDRA: *Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda*. Critically edited by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra. Delhi, 1986.
- KātyŚS Ed. WEBER, Albrecht: *The Ṣrautasūtra of Kātyāyana with extracts from the commentaries of Karka and Yājñikadeva...* Berlin – London, 1859.
- MānŚS Ed. VAN GELDER, Jeannette M.: *The Mānava Śrautasūtra belonging to the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*. 2 vols. New Delhi, 1961, 1963. (*Śatapitaka Series*; 17, 27).

- ManuSmṛ. Ed. JOLLY, Julius: *Mānava Dharma-Śāstra, the code of Manu...* text critically edited... by J. Jolly. London, 1887.
- Mbh. *The Mahābhārata* critically ed. for the first time by Vishnu S. SUKTHANKAR et al. Poona, 1933-1966.
- PB Ed. A. Chinnaswami ŚASTRI: *Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa* belonging to the Sāma Veda with the commentary of Sāyaṇāchārya. 2 vols. Benares, 1935, 1936. (*Kashi Sanskrit Series*; 105).
- Rām. *The Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa* critically ed. for the first time by G.H. BHATT et al. Baroda, 1960-1975.
- SVB Ed. B.R. SHARMA: *Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa with Vedārthaprakāśa of Sāyaṇa and Padārthamātravivṛti of Bharatasvāmin*. Tirupati, 1964. (*Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Series*; 1).
Ed. BURNELL, A.C.: *The Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa (being the third Brāhmaṇa) of the Sāma Veda*. Vol. I. Text and commentary with introduction. London, 1873.
- VaikhŚS Ed. CALAND, W.: *Vaikhānasa-Śrautasūtram*. Calcutta, 1941. (*Bibliotheca Indica*; 265).
- VaitS Ed. VISHVA BANDHU: *Vaitāna-Śrauta-Sūtra with the commentary called Ākṣepānuvidhi by Somāditya*. Edited, critically,... by Vishva Bandhu in collaboration with Bhim Dev & Pitambar Datt. Hoshiarpur, 1967. (*Woolner Indological Series*; 13).
Ed. GARBE, Richard: *Vaitāna Sūtra. The ritual of the Atharvaveda*. Edited with critical notes and indices by Richard Garbe. London, 1878.

Secondary Literature

BÖHTLINGK, Otto & ROTH, Rudolf (1855-75) [PW] *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

BURROW, Thomas (1979) *The problem of shwa in Sanskrit*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

DEBRUNNER, Albert (1957) *Altindische Grammatik. Nachträge zu Bd. I*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

GONDA, Jan (1951) *Remarks on the Sanskrit passive*. Leiden: Brill.

— (1987) *Rice and barley offerings in the Veda*. Leiden: Brill.

KRICK, Hertha (1982) *Das Rutual der Feuergründung (Agnýādheya)*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

KULIKOV, Leonid (2001) *The Vedic -ya-presents*. PhD thesis. Leiden University.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred (1956-80) [KEWA] *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Bd. I-IV. Heidelberg: Winter.

— (1986-96) [EWAia] *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Bd. I-II. Heidelberg: Winter.

OBERLIES, Thomas (2003) *A grammar of Epic Sanskrit*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter. (*Indian Philology and South Asian Studies*; 5).

OERTEL, Hanns (1926) *The syntax of cases in the narrative and descriptive prose of the Brāhmaṇas. I. The disjunct use of cases*. Heidelberg: Winter.

WACKERNAGEL, Jacob / DEBRUNNER, Albert (1896–) [AiG] *Altindische Grammatik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

WHITNEY, William Dwight (1885) *The roots, verb-forms, and primary derivatives of the Sanskrit language*. Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel.