



**HAL**  
open science

## Paippalāda Mantras in the Kauśikasūtra

Arlo Griffiths

► **To cite this version:**

Arlo Griffiths. Paippalāda Mantras in the Kauśikasūtra. Arlo Griffiths; Jan E.M. Houben. The Vedas: Texts, Language and Ritual, 20, E. Forsten, pp.49-99, 2004, Groningen Oriental Studies. halshs-01914925

**HAL Id: halshs-01914925**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01914925>**

Submitted on 7 Nov 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Paippalāda Mantras in the Kauśikasūtra\*

ARLO GRIFFITHS

*For H.W. Bodewitz  
On the Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*

## Introduction

The Kauśikasūtra (KauśS) is the oldest and most important ritual manual belonging to the Śaunaka school of the Atharvaveda. When giving prescriptions for which mantras are to be recited in which ritual contexts, the author of the KauśS differentiates in the usual manner between mantras included in the Saṃhitā text of his own school, and mantras found in other Saṃhitās.<sup>1</sup> With

---

\* I am happy to acknowledge here the critical comments I have received from Werner Knobl, Sasha Lubotsky and Elizabeth Tucker on an earlier draft of this paper. What a special pleasure it is for me to be able to publish it in this volume, dedicated by Jan Houben and me to our teacher Henk Bodewitz, because it is he who first inspired me to take up work on the Paippalāda Saṃhitā during a class on the Bhūmisūkta in 1997, and it is with him that I first read the Kauśikasūtra, during a special weekly seminar held on my behalf in 1998–1999!

<sup>1</sup> Among several interesting points that can be made about quotations in the KauśS I may also mention here the fact — as far as I know not yet noticed in the past — that the KauśS uses the phrase (*iti*) *vijñāya(n)te*, known in this use also from other ritual sūtras (cf. FUSHIMI 1998), to refer to Śruti sources: at 39.31 *abhicāradeśā mantreṣu vijñāyante tāni marmāṇi*, reference is made (cf. CALAND 1900a: 136 n. 21) to ŚS 5.31; the words quoted 75.5 *maghāsu hanyante gāvaḥ phalgunīṣu vyuhyata iti vijñāyate maṅgalaṃ ca* are ŚS 14.1.13cd = PS 18.2.2cd; at 87.1–2 *atha piṇḍapitryajñāḥ |1| amāvāsyaṅyāṃ sāyaṃ nyahne 'hani vijñāyate |2|* the indication *vijñāyate* may somehow refer to ŚS 18.4.65 (*ābhūd dūtāḥ prāhito jātāvedāḥ sāyāṃ nyāhna upavāndyo nṛbhiḥ | prādāḥ pitṛbhyaḥ svadhāyā té akṣann addhī tvām deva prāyatā havīmṣi |*); the reason for its usage at 138.5 *āyam āgan saṃvatsara iti catarṛbhir vijñāyate* (with reference to ŚS 3.10.8–11) is unclear, because the same meaning could have been expressed without *vijñāyate* (cf. 112.1, 127.4, and BLOOMFIELD's 'Introduction', p. xxiii); with 138.13 *ekaviṃśatisaṃstho yajño vijñāyate* compare GB 1.1.12 (... *ekaviṃśatisaṃsthaṃ yajñam* ...): this last passage

a few exceptions,<sup>2</sup> all mantras from the Śaunaka Saṃhitā (ŚS) are given in abbreviated form (*‘pratikena’*). In addition to these, an important number of mantras are given in full (*‘sakalapāthena’*). At several points in his edition of the KauśS, BLOOMFIELD indicates that mantra-material quoted *sakalapāthena* cannot be found “in any known Saṃhitā”.<sup>3</sup> For many more mantras, he refers to parallels of greater or smaller relevance to their quoted form, without being able to identify the precise source: such are in effect also cases of mantras not found in any known Saṃhitā.

Since 1889, when BLOOMFIELD published his edition, a considerable number of new mantra texts have come to light, most significantly — especially in the field of Atharvavedic literature — the Paippalāda Saṃhitā (PS). GONDA observed (1977: 78 = 1991: 367): “As to the metrical *mantras* quoted in full, both the editor and the translator<sup>4</sup> of the sūtra seem to have been unaware of the fact that some of these are found in the Paippalāda recension. This is not to say that the compiler must have borrowed them from that text; they may have belonged to a more or less undifferentiated mass of atharvanic tradition”. In fact, the editor BLOOMFIELD was well aware of the possibility that some of the mantras quoted in full were taken from the Paippalāda Śākhā, as his repeated references<sup>5</sup> to p. 23 of ROTH’s *Der Atharvaveda in Kaschmir* show: it was clear to ROTH as early as 1875, when editions of neither the Vaitānasūtra nor the Kauśikasūtra were available, that the PS — for which he could then use only the corrupt Kashmir ms. — “enthält eine grössere Zahl von Sprüchen und Sūkta, welche im Vaitāna z. B. 14. 24 und Kauçika z. B. 72. 91. 105. 115 vorkommen, aber regelmässig als ein fremdes Citat aufgeführt werden”.

But the full extent to which the KauśS is indebted to the Paippalāda school could not at the time be known by ROTH, BLOOMFIELD or CALAND, nor was

---

seems to imply the existence of the GB in some form before the KauśS (or at least the presence of the phrase *ekaviṃśatisaṃstham yajñam* — not known at present from any other source than GB — in a Śruti text which the sūtrakāra held to be authoritative), which would agree with PATYAL’s conclusion (1969: xxxix f.). Contrast WITZEL’s ‘Vorwort’ to CALAND 1990 (p. XV): where does WITZEL believe CALAND to have settled “die Posteriorität des Gopatha-Br. gegenüber dem Kauśika-Sūtra”? As far as I can see, CALAND has everywhere avoided this issue.

2 Notably some mantras that are to be found in the nineteenth book of ŚS, cf. BLOOMFIELD’s ‘Introduction’, p. xl, and 1899: 34f.

3 I have noticed such indications e.g. on pages 6 (n. 15), 7 (n. 14), 8 (n. 6), 11 (n. 8), 12 (n. 1), 17 (n. 1), 55 (nn. 2 4 6), 111 (n. 7), 220 (n. 13), 292 (n. 19). Cf. also p. 196 (n. 2: “These three lines contain a mantra-citation”).

4 GONDA refers to CALAND 1900a.

5 Cf. e.g. the notes on pp. 193, 242, 262, 268, 272.

it realized by GONDA himself. Regarding the composer of the sūtra, GONDA (1977: 84 = 1991: 373) states that there is no doubt whatever that he drew also “upon a non-Śaunakīya atharvanic tradition, perhaps not always directly on the Paippalāda-Saṃhitā”. Indeed, many of the mantras quoted in full can even nowadays not be traced in the PS,<sup>6</sup> but a good many can. Since our sūtrakāra nowhere states explicitly that he is quoting sakalapāṭha-mantras from the Paippalāda tradition,<sup>7</sup> one can always suppose they belong to other (extant or extinct) Śākhās.<sup>8</sup> However, for no schools but the Śaunaka and the Paippalāda is there any positive historical evidence in favor of the existence — once upon a time — of their own independent mantra collections.<sup>9</sup> Leaving aside non-Śaunaka mantras that occur not only in the PS but also in other known Saṃhitās (cf. e.g. under nrs. 2, 22, 39 below), for those that we can only trace in the PS I prefer, therefore, to start from what we do know, and to restrict as much as possible the postulation of such ‘lost’ Śākhās.<sup>10</sup> A survey, intended to be com-

6 These mantras seem to belong to at least three categories: (1) quotations from other known Saṃhitās (e.g. ṚV, VS); (2) ad hoc variations for ritual purposes on known mantras (i.e. truly ‘*kalpaja*’ variations, cf. CALAND 1904: 189 = 1990: 150 n. 1 about such a mantra at VaitS 16.1: “einfach eine durch den contextus notwendig gemachte Variante zu AV. III. 12. 8”); (3) untraceable quotations that may, for want of an alternative explanation, be attributed to lost Śākhās.

7 Contrast the explicit ascription of mantras to the Paippalāda school that we find in the AVParīś after Ib.1.7 (p. 26), after 8.2.5 (p. 76), and at 32.20.

8 Keśava, the author of a Paddhati on the KauśS, informs us (ed. LIMAYE et al. p. 1) that the sūtra provides the ritual injunctions to accompany the mantras not only of the Śaunaka school, but also of three unnamed other schools, among the nine Atharvavedic schools that tradition enumerates (BLOOMFIELD 1899: 11–13). The sūtra itself mentions only the schools of the Śaunakins and of the Devadarśins (KauśS 85.7: *devadarśinām* next to *śaunakinām* in the following sūtra). BAHULKAR (2002) has provided some evidence to support his idea that the four schools meant by Keśava were the Śaunaka, the Cāraṇavaidya, the Jājala, and the Paippalāda. But he does not state why the Devadarśins, mentioned by the sūtra itself, could not be meant; for some rather tenuous historical traces of their Śākhā, cf. MISHRA 1984: 213f.

9 Cf. BLOOMFIELD’s ‘Introduction’, p. xxxvi. BAHULKAR (2002: 6) seems to have his doubts about BLOOMFIELD’s suggestion that the differences between the traditionally enumerated nine Śākhās might not in every case have extended to the Saṃhitās themselves. The reason for BAHULKAR’s doubts has not become clear to me.

10 Contrast BHATTACHARYA 1989: 138f. (repeated 1991: 4–6), and the same scholar’s ‘Introduction’ (1997), pp. xl–xlv. I am grateful to Chlodwig Werba for pointing out to me that Ockham’s razor or rather Jayantabhaṭṭa’s question (Nyāyamañjarī, Mysore Ed. vol. I p. 587, l. 12) *ekenaiva ca siddhe ’rthe dvitīyaṃ kalpayema kim?* is applicable to this issue. Jayantabhaṭṭa’s question is all the more appositely quoted here, because it is precisely this 9th century Kashmirian author whose detailed discussions regarding the status of the AV and whose particular mentioning of the Paippalāda Śākhā render BHATTACHARYA’s at-

plete, of all possible cases of quotation from the PS forms the main part of this paper.

BHATTACHARYA published the first half of the PS in 1997. It is a monumental edition,<sup>11</sup> and BHATTACHARYA had to overcome many obstacles to arrive even at the still quite unsatisfactory text that he was able to constitute. He complains in his ‘Introduction’ (p. x) of the dearth of materials to supplement the often corrupt manuscript readings. It is in many cases of divergence hard to decide which branch of transmission, the one from Kashmir (**K**), or the one from Orissa (**Or**), is authentic. BHATTACHARYA has chosen to present as his edition a diplomatic version based on the text of the Orissa manuscripts. Only occasionally does he adopt evidently correct readings from **K** where the **Or** readings are corrupt. In my opinion, the **Or** readings should be systematically and consistently compared with those found in **K**, in order to reconstruct the state of the text as it existed in the archetype \*G (postulated by WITZEL in 1985), before the proto-Kashmir and proto-Orissa transmissions separated.<sup>12</sup> Frequently, however, neither branch has preserved an acceptable reading. The quotation of many Paippalāda mantras in the KauśS can be a source of assistance to the Paippalāda editor in such cases, as the survey below makes clear.<sup>13</sup>

But there will also be many occasions where improvements can be made on the available text of the KauśS. BLOOMFIELD’s edition was greeted by his contemporaries with lavish praise.<sup>14</sup> Indeed I think we can state generally that

---

tempts to disprove Paippalāda presence in Kashmir before ‘Yuddhabhaṭṭa’ (cf. GRIFFITHS 2002: 42f.) in the 15th century rather doubtful: cf. e.g. Nyāyamañjarī, Mysore Ed. vol. I p. 5, l. 3; 552, 8 (!); 589, 2–3; 614, 12; 619, 19 through 620, 2; 623, 10.

11 Nevertheless, some critical remarks can be made. Cf. e.g. GRIFFITHS 2002 and 2003b.

12 Cf. also GRIFFITHS 2002: 44.

13 In the case of the following mantras, at the following places, I have noted a (nearly) correct reading preserved in the KauśS, against corruptions in the PS mss.: 1.41.3–4 at 72.14 (nr. 24 below), 1.78.4d at 82.13 (27), 3.38.7a at 68.26 (23), 5.31.1d at 62.21 (19), 16.150.2d and 19.23.6c at 97.8 (34), 17.13.3a at 116.7 (38), 19.33.1b at 128.4 (40), 19.51.3a at 42.17 (12), 20.52.5a at 108.2 (36), 20.57.15b at 65.15 (20). The extracts from PS 16–20 presented below are all in the form of *provisional* editions: the editorial method that has been followed will be further elucidated in my forthcoming edition of PS books 6–7, as will the various kinds of signs and parentheses that have been employed (cf. for the time being GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY 2000–01 [2003]: 196 n. 1); the sigla used for PS mss. are in accordance with the usage established in GRIFFITHS 2003a, where full descriptions of the relevant mss. have been provided; I must confess to laziness on one front: I have not for all places counter-checked BARRET’s (and BHATTACHARYA’s) readings for **K** against the facsimile edition.

14 Cf. e.g. BARTH’s review, reprinted *Œuvres* Part 4 [Paris 1914], p. 141: “On espérait beau-

BLOOMFIELD’S KauśS edition is among the few editions of Vedic texts that might justly be called ‘critical’. This is not to say that CALAND, with his dissenting opinion, was undeservedly suspicious (1900b: 97 = 1990: 77) “dass der Herausgeber dieses Textes nicht überall mit der philologischen Akribie gearbeitet hat, die man bei der Veröffentlichung eines derartigen Textes anzuwenden hat”. CALAND has pointed out (1899: 207 = 1990: 46) that idiosyncratic — but correct — readings of the KauśS ms. **Bü** have often been rejected in favor of more widely supported — but corrupt — alternatives adopted by BLOOMFIELD,<sup>15</sup> and (1899: 205 = 1990: 44) that one of in fact several mss. available in Europe had been neglected by him. BLOOMFIELD’S edition also contains a considerable number of (hitherto unnoticed) misprints.<sup>16</sup>

### Kauśikasūtra Passages Quoting Paippalāda Mantras

1. At KauśS 2.1, a mantra (also *pratīkena* at 137.2) reads *tvam bhūmim aty esy ojasā tvam vedyāṃ sīdasi cārur adhvare | tvam pavitram ṛṣayo bharantas tvam punīhi duriṭāny asmad iti*. BLOOMFIELD notes: “the verse occurs xix.33.3, but the *sakalapāṭha* and the scholiast [Dārila]’s designation as *kalpajā* show that it is regarded as not belonging to the AV[Ś]”.

---

coup de M. B[loomfield], on a obtenu plus qu’on n’espérait. Non pas que toutes les parties du livre soient également intéressantes; mais parce que tout y est traité avec le même soin et que, dans ce volume compact . . . , il n’y a pas une trace de négligence ou de lassitude”, or p. 142 n. 1: “l’édition est digne de servir de modèle”. Other notable reviews are the ones by PISCHEL in GGA for 1891 (281ff.) and HILLEBRANDT in DLZ for 1891 (124f.), but especially important is BÜHLER 1891.

15 Cf. the editor’s qualification, p. xi of his ‘Introduction’, of this ms. as “extremely faulty”. CALAND: “Wie nun vom Herausgeber selber auf Grund dieser Handschrift alle in hie und da der Text gestaltet worden ist, so dürfen auch wir die in Bü, von den anderen Handschriften verschiedentlich, überlieferten Lesarten besonders berücksichtigen, zumal wenn diese Lesart sich mit den aus anderen Quellen bekannten Thatsachen vereinigen lässt”.

16 For the following survey, I have had access to microfilms of five mss. not used by BLOOMFIELD. These are in the first place the four Munich mss., AUFRECHT 1909 items “175 = Skr. 44 (Haug 49)” [this was the ms. referred to by CALAND 1899: 205 = 1990: 44, used by him there and in subsequent publications; hence **M1**], “176 = Skr. 186” [**M2**], “177 = Skr. 187” [**M3**], and “178 = Skr. 188” [**M4**]. AUFRECHT’S indications regarding lacunae in the Munich manuscripts appear not to be complete: by chance I have noted e.g. unrecorded omission of the stretches 53.2 to 58.11 and 62.13 to 65.12 in the mss. **M2** (folios 27r2 and 28v17) and **M4** (f. 20r2 and between folios 21r and 21v). In addition to these four mss., I had access for KauśS 60–72 to the Leipzig ms. numbered “103” in AUFRECHT 1901 (p. 17) [hence **L**]. Emendations by BLOOMFIELD in the text of the KauśS have been marked here with the same raised + sign that is also used in editing Paippalāda mantras.

As ROTH (1875: 18), BLOOMFIELD (1899: 34f.) i.a. had already surmised, and as is becoming increasingly clear from ongoing work by various scholars on the PS, the hymns of ŚS 19 are a compilation of Paippalāda materials. This mantra is PS 11.13.3, for which BHATTACHARYA in pāda c follows his Or. mss., which read *bharantatvaṃ* (thus also my **Ku2**), and edits [*']bharanta* *tvam*. **K**, on the other hand, reads [PSK 12.5.3, f. 143a3] *bharantastvaṃ*.

All mss. used by ROTH & WHITNEY and PANDIT in their editions for ŚS 19.33.3 agree nearly perfectly with our **K** (*ṃt ~ nt*), and read *bhāraṃtastvām*: LANMAN's addition "[all mss.] save one" is misleading, because the reading *bhāratasvām* in PANDIT's **S<sup>m</sup>** is obviously a simple error for the majority reading (with omission of anusvāra), and so is the reading *bhāraṃtaḥstvā* of PANDIT's **D**. 'Sāyaṇa' reads *abharanta*<sup>17</sup> *āhrtavantaḥ* — thus being in striking agreement with the testimony of the Or. mss. for PS. It is this reading of 'Sāyaṇa' that has been adopted by PANDIT (and VISHVA BANDHU), and by WHITNEY in his translation: 'Thou goest across the earth with force; thou sittest beauteous (*cāru*) on the sacrificial hearth at the sacrifice; the seers bore thee [as] purifier; do thou purify us from difficulties'.

Although neither BLOOMFIELD nor BAHULKAR (1990)<sup>18</sup> report any *varietas lectionis* for the mantra as quoted in the KauśS, it should be noted that in all KauśS mss. available to me for this part of the text (**M1–4**), the mantra in fact reads *bharaṃtas tvam*. The KauśS mss. are thus in agreement with the ŚS transmission, down to the use of the anusvāra. The relevant pāda, in triṣṭubh meter, is metrically flawless in the ŚS/KauśS/**K** version, but the true abhinihita sandhi of the **Or**/'Sāyaṇa' reading is common enough as well, and this latter version is obviously the only one that makes sense.

As long as no further evidence comes to light, I can only — hesitatingly — propose the following scenario: it is attractive to assume that the most original form of the mantra has been preserved in the Or. mss., and that 'Sāyaṇa' somehow too was aware of this *pāṭha*. The **K** reading must then either have been introduced through simple corruption (with chance similarity to the ŚS version), or the **K** tradition must have been influenced at some stage by that of ŚS. The KauśS can still be taken to refer to PS 11.13.3, but for this we must assume that its reading of the mantra has been influenced by the reading at ŚS 19.33.3 (see the certain case under nr. 3 below). The critical editor of the

17 This is to be read as it stands: *abharanta*. The non-application of sandhi between a word quoted from a mantra and its gloss is the rule in PANDIT's 'Sāyaṇa' edition. Thus also his mss.?

18 This publication offers a re-edition of the first Adhyāya of the KauśS [= ed. BLOOMFIELD *kaṇḍikās* 1 through 9], with occasionally changed sūtra-numbering.

KauśS must thus consider emending toward the **Or** reading. Of course, several other scenarios are possible as well.

2. At KauśS 2.31–34, we read *vilīnapūtam ājyaṃ ... pavitrābhyām utpunāti* |31| *viṣṇor manasā pūtam asi* |32| *devas tvā savitot punātu* |33| *achidreṇa tvā pavitreṇa śatadhāreṇa sahasradhāreṇa* <sup>+supvotpunāmīti</sup> *ṛṭīyam* |34|. We find here, split over three sūtras by the editors BLOOMFIELD and BAHULKAR (1990), a slightly different version, with addition of *śatadhāreṇa* based on the mantra parallel VSM 1.3 / VSK 1.2.3, and *kalpaja* (?) addition of *utpunāmi* at the end, of a mantra which is found at PS 20.45.7 [PSK 20.43.5] (itself a not very successful metricalization of the same VS mantra), where I would probably edit as follows (with **JM V/122** [**Pa** unavailable], **K**):

viṣṇor manasā pūtam asi	( )
devas tvā savitot punātu	( )
achidreṇa pavitreṇa	(8)
sahasradhāreṇa <sup>+sup</sup>	
tsuvā	(8)

savitot] **V/122 K**, savitā **JM** <sup>+supuvā</sup>] *suplavā* **Or**, *suṣuvā* **K**

As BLOOMFIELD and BAHULKAR report, all authentic sources for the KauśS in fact read *supotpunāmīti* (and so do my **M1–4**). This is closer (with *supā* ← <sup>+supvā</sup>) to the parallel VSM 1.3 / VSK 1.2.3 (*supvā*), than to the PS version (with *svarabhakti*) which agrees with the version (*supuvā*) of some Taittirīya Śrautasūtras (ĀpŚS 1.13.6, BhārŚS 1.13.10, HirŚS 1.3.40). Although various alternative solutions are again imaginable, perhaps the evidence is not strong enough to register this as a PS quote with complete certainty.

3. KauśS 2.36–37 read *śṛtaṃ havir abhighārayati madhvā samañjan ghr̥tavat karātheti* |36| *abhighāryodañcam udvāsasyaty ud vāsayāgneḥ śṛtam akarma havyam ā sīda pr̥ṣṭham amṛtasya dhāmeti* |37|. For the mantra in 36, BLOOMFIELD refers to ŚS 5.12.2b (*mādhvā samañjānt svadayā sujihva*). All mss. (including my **M1–4**) read *samañjan*, °*gneḥ* and *sīda*.

At PS 5.16.3, BHATTACHARYA edits *ud vāsayāgne śṛtam akarma havyam ā roha pr̥ṣṭham amṛtasya dhāma* | *vanaspataya upa barhi str̥ṇīta madhvā samantaṃ ghr̥tavat karātha* ||. PS 5.16.3c is not found in the KauśS, but otherwise the two versions obviously present the same mantra, and allow for mutual correction: in his re-edition, LUBOTSKY (2002: 85) uses the KauśS reading to

support the emendation \*<sup>o</sup>gneḥ, and he is no doubt right in his suggestion that the contextually ungrammatical form *samañjan* in the KauśS mantra has arisen under the influence of ŚS 5.12.2b. The order of the pādas has been shifted in the KauśS, in accordance with their ritual application, and the lack of application for PS 5.16.3c explains its absence in the sūtra.

The critical editor of the KauśS must use the testimony of PS, and emend <sup>+</sup>*samantaṃ*. In the same way the critical editor of PS is fully justified in using the testimony of the KauśS. I cannot yet account for the remaining variant *sīda* (KauśS) :: *roha* (PS).

4. At KauśS 4.1, another certain PS quotation is found. BLOOMFIELD edits *vṛṣṇe br̥hate svarvide agnaye śulkaṃ harāmi tviṣimate | sa na sthirān balavataḥ kṛṇotu jyok ca no jīvātave <sup>+</sup>dadhātv agnaye svāhety uttarapūrvārdha āgneyam ājyabhāgam juhoti |I. All the mss. read *dadhāty agnaye*, and BAHULKAR adopts this indicative. While the majority of BLOOMFIELD's KauśS mss. are stated to read *śuklam*, the correct reading *śulkaṃ* (cf. PS 2.65.4a, JB 1.169 etc.) reported only for **K Bh** by BLOOMFIELD is also found in all my mss., and in the majority of BAHULKAR's.*

This testimony may be used to help establish the correct text of the source-mantra, PS 19.52.6, which I edit (with **JM V/122 Pa Ji4, K**):

vṛṣṇe br̥hate svarvide	(8)
<sup>+</sup> agnaye *śulkaṃ harāmi tviṣimate	(12)
sa na sthirān balavataḥ kṛṇotu	(11)
jyok ca no jīvātave dadhātu	(11)

<sup>+</sup>agnaye] gnaye **JM**, gneye **V/122 Pa**, gn{e}aye **Ji4**, agne **K** \*śulkaṃ] śuklam **Or K**  
harāmi] **Or**, harāmas **K** balavataḥ] **Or**, balirucaṃḥ **K** jyok] **V/122 Ji4 Pa K**, yok  
**JM**

BLOOMFIELD's evident emendation *dadhātv* in the KauśS version is confirmed by the PS reading, and BAHULKAR's editorial decision to follow the mss. must be judged mistaken. The majority of the KauśS mss. help to correct the error *śuklam* of the PS sources: that this same easily made error is found also in some of the KauśS mss. is perhaps not significant.

5. The next sūtra 4.2 quotes another PS mantra. In BLOOMFIELD's edition, the sūtra reads: *dakṣiṇapūrvārdhe somāya tvam soma divyo nṛcakṣāḥ sugāṃ asmabhyam patho anu khyah | abhi no gotraṃ viduṣa iva neṣo 'chā no vācam*

*uśatīm jigāsi somāya svāheti* |2|. BLOOMFIELD's **Bü** and BAHULKAR's **B1**<sup>19</sup> both read *sugaṃ a°*; *sugamasmabhyaṃ* is found in BLOOMFIELD's **E**, BAHULKAR's **Bh1 G**, and my **M1**; my mss. **M2–M4** all read *sugāṃ a°*: there is no evidence for the *anunāsika* adopted by both editors. Furthermore, the reading *jigāsi* is found in BLOOMFIELD's **K P Bh**, apparently in BAHULKAR's **Bh2**, and is in **Bü B1** corrected to *jigāya*, which last reading is found in all remaining mss., and is adopted by BAHULKAR.

The mantra is PS 1.51.3, where BHATTACHARYA follows the Or. mss. and gives precisely the same text as preserved in the KauśS (but with his regular substitution of °*cch*° for °*ch*° in °*chā*). It is interesting to note that **K** with *sugam* has the same variant as found in four KauśS mss.

The critical editor of the PS and the KauśS ought to print (for clarity's sake) \**sugāṃ*, because the agreement between the PS and KauśS transmissions suggests that the *anunāsika* was no longer written in this stanza already at a very early stage. He ought not — in my opinion — to alter the orthography with single °*ch*°. <sup>20</sup> Obviously, BAHULKAR's choice of *jigāya* is to be rejected.

6. At KauśS 5.12 [ed. BAHULKAR 1.5.11], the mantra reads: *ā devānām api panthām aṅanma yac chaknavāma tad anupravodhum | agnir vidvān sa yajāt sa id dhotā so 'dhvarān sa ṛtūn kalpayāty agnaye sviṣṭakṛte svāhā*. BLOOMFIELD notes: “the verse occurs AV[Ś]. xix.59.3, but the *sakalapāṭha* shows that it is regarded as coming from a different source: cf. RV. x.2.3 and TS. i.1.14.3–4”. The “different source” is probably PS 19.47.6, which I edit (with **JM V/122 Pa Ji4, K**):

<i>ā devānām api panthām aṅanma</i>	(11)
<i>+yac chaknavāma tad anupravodhum  </i>	(11)
<i>agnir vidvān sa yajāt sa id dhotā</i> <sup>21</sup>	(11)
<i>so adhvarāṃ sa ṛtūn kalpayāti   </i>	(11)

api] **K**, ayi **JM V/122 Ji4**, (i)ayi **Pa** +yac chaknavāma] yachaknavāma **Or**, yaśchaknavāma **K** yajāt] **K**, yujā **Or** id] **Or**, yad **K** so adhvarāṃ] **Or**, sayadhvarāṃ **K** ṛtūn] **V/122 Pa Ji4 K**, tūn **JM** kalpayāti] **Or**, pārayāti **K**

19 These mss. both hail from Gujarat: cf. BÜHLER 1891: 245 and BAHULKAR 1990: 117. The Baroda catalog (ŚIROMAṆI 1942: 162, Acc. No. 7596) lists Saṃvat 1673 (ca. CE 1616) as date for the latter, while BLOOMFIELD ('Introduction', p. xi) called the former a “modern copy” in 1889. Are they (copies of) the same ms.?

20 Cf. BLOOMFIELD's 'Introduction', p. lxi.

21 RV 10.2.3c *agnir vidvān sā yajāt sēd u hótā*.

Although both editors give *so 'dhvarān sa*, thus without the *-t-* insertion found at ŚS 19.59.3, and although they report no variants, the mss. available to me are in fact in agreement with ŚS: *so dhvarāñt sa* **M2? M3 M4**; *so dhvarāmt sa* **M1**.

Since most of the material found in ŚS 19 is borrowed directly from the PS (see under nr. 1 above), it seems to me most attractive to assume that the mantra has indeed been taken from the PS, but that the KauśS transmission has been influenced *adhvaram* → [*'*] *dhvarāmt* by the text of ŚS 19.59.3 (whose acc. pl., against the sg. of PS, may in turn have been borrowed from the RV/TS version, also found at MS 4.10.2:147.10, KS 2.15:22.2).

**7.** KauśS 6.9 reads: *saṃsrāvabhāgās taviṣā brhantaḥ prastareṣṭhā barhiṣadaś ca devāḥ | imaṃ yajñam abhi viśve gr̥ṇantaḥ svāhā devā amṛtā mādayantām iti* |9|. BLOOMFIELD notes: “The verse occurs, with a good deal of variation, VS. ii.18; Kāty. Çr. iii.6.18; TS. i.1.13.2–3; Tāit. Br. iii.3.9.7; and its pratīka Vāit. Sū. 4.7”. The mantra is no doubt taken from PS 20.35.2 [PSK 20.34.2], where the Or. ms. **V/122** has preserved it in precisely the same form as given in the sūtra, while **JM Pa** and **K** have a few insignificant variants.

**8.** KauśS 6.11 contains the following mantra: *vi muñcāmi brahmaṇā jātavedasam agniṃ hotāram ajaram +rathasṛtam | sarvā devānām janimāni vidvān yathābhāgam vahatu havyam agniḥ*. All KauśS mss. read *rathasmṛtam*, but BLOOMFIELD’s conjecture (adopted also by BAHULKAR) is proven correct by the (**K**) text of PS 12.19.9, from which the KauśS is obviously quoting. It is interesting that BHATTACHARYA reports his Or. ms. **Mā** to read °*smṛtam* there as well. I find this same reading in my **Pa<sub>c</sub>**, while **RM** and **V/126** seem to have °*sṛtam*, and **JM** is not clearly legible here.

**9.** KauśS 20.5 reads: *aśvinā phālam kalpayatām upāvatu brhaspatiḥ | yathāsad bahudhānyam ayakṣmaṃ bahupūruṣam iti || phālam atikarṣati* |5|. The mantra is quoted from PS 8.18.6, which has the same text.

**10.** At KauśS 33.8–9, BLOOMFIELD reads: *anyā vo anyām avatv anyānyasyā upāvata sadhr̥cīḥ savratā bhūtvāsyā avata vīryam iti saṃnāyati* |8| *mā te riṣan khanitā yasmai ca tvā khanāmasi | dvipāc catuspād asmākaṃ mā riṣad devy oṣadhe || srajo nāmāsi prajāpatiṣ tvām akhanad ātmane śalyasraṃsanam | tāṃ tvā vyaṃ khanāmasy amuṣmai*<sup>22</sup> *tvā śalyasraṃsanam ity astamite chattreṇa*

22 Read *amuṣyai*? See CALAND 1900a: 110 n. 10. There seems to be some confusion in the

*vāntardhāya*<sup>23</sup> *phālena khanati*.

We thus have two anuṣṭubh-stanzas (‘*anyā vo anyām ...*’ and ‘*mā te ...*’), a yajus (‘*srajo nāmāsi*’), plus another anuṣṭubh-stanza (‘*prajāpatiṣ tvāṃ ...*’, with superfluous *tvā* in the last pāda). The yajus plus following stanza may confidently be called *kalpaja* (cf. PS 4.5.1cd = ŚS 4.4.1cd, PS 1.46.4d, ŚS 7.107.1d). The first two stanzas are quoted from PS 1.65.3–4, although their order has been reversed, in accordance with the order of the KauśS ritual. BHATTACHARYA edits: *mā te +riṣam*<sup>24</sup> *khanitā yasmai ca tvā khanāmāsi | dvipāc catuspād asmākaṃ mā riṣad devy oṣadhe || anyā vo anyām avatv anyānyasyā upāvata | sadhrīcīḥ savratā bhūtvā asyāvata vīryam ||*.

Besides the obviously preferable 1st sg. *riṣam* (‘let me, your digger, not get hurt’) in PS for *riṣan* (thus also all my mss.) in the KauśS, there are two sandhi-related differences between the KauśS version, as established by BLOOMFIELD, and BHATTACHARYA’s edition of PS 1.65.4: BLOOMFIELD edits *bhūtvāsyā avata*, found thus only in his **Bü** but also in my **M2 M3 M4**. The *varietas lectionis* is: *bhūtvā asyāvata* (**K P Bh**<sup>25</sup> and my **M1**); *bhūtvāsyāvata* (**Ch**); *bhūtvā asyāvata* (**Bi E**); *bhūtvā asyā avata* (**D**). The PS mss. all point to *bhūtvā asyāvata*: although CALAND translated “fördert ihr ihre Männlichkeit” (1900a: 109) without further comment, it seems quite possible that the PS mss. and some of the KauśS are correct in reading *asya*, which can refer to the male whom *yasmai* also refers to. As to the non-appearance of sandhi in *bhūtvā asya*<sup>o</sup>: ZEHNDER’s words (1999: 81) on PS 2.27.4cd (BHATTACHARYA: *hatvā apa*, ZEHNDER *hatvā- +<sub>a</sub>va*): “Sandhi muss eintreten” seem over-confident, as cases of non-application of expected sandhi are known in the PS, e.g. 1.64.2d *na eṣo*; 3.18.3c *varcasā agne*; 4.15.7d *tiṣṭha evam*. Although I find no other cases than 2.27.4cd of sandhi-less <sup>o</sup>*tvā a*<sup>o</sup> in the PS, while cases of the sandhi <sup>o</sup>*tvā a*<sup>o</sup> → <sup>o</sup>*tvā*<sup>o</sup> are numerous (4.14.6cd, 5.13.6cd, 8.19.10ab, 8.20.8ab, 9.5.1cd, 14.5.10cd, 15.23.9bc; 16.81.7cd, 19.5.14cd), it is a striking fact that so many KauśS mss. share here the text found also in the PS transmission, which I therefore tentatively retain.

I would, with the support of the KauśS transmission (collating my ms. **Ku1**<sup>26</sup>), edit PS 1.65.4, taking into account also the accents which are

---

sūtra text here, and in the mantra PS 1.65.4 discussed immediately below, about the gender of the person on whose behalf the ritual is to be performed.

23 Ed. *cāntar*<sup>o</sup>. See CALAND 1899: 696 = 1990: 70.

24 *terṣam Or, te ri K*.

25 BLOOMFIELD’s apparatus does not allow for a certain reconstruction of the reading of **Bh**.

26 BHATTACHARYA reports no variant readings from his mss.

marked in **K** and the parallels (for the first hemistich) at i.a. RV 10.97.14:<sup>27</sup>

anyā vo anyām avat <sub>u</sub> v	(8)
anyānyāsyā úpāvata	(8)
sadhricīḥ sávratā bhūtvā	(8)
asyā <sub>a</sub> vata vīryām	(8)

anyānyāsyā úpāvata] **Or** [no accents], <·>nyāsyāvápāvata **K** sávratā] **Or** [no accents],  
 suvratā **K** [note wrong accent] bhūtvā asyāvata] **Or** [no accents], bhūtvā ásyāvati **K**  
 [note wrong accents] vīryām ||] vīryam || **Or**, <v>īryam **Z K**

**11.** KauśS 40.14 reads: *yām tvā gandharvo akhanad vṛṣaṇas te khanitāro vṛṣā tvam asy oṣadhe | vṛṣāsi vṛṣṇyāvati vṛṣaṇe tvā khañāmasīty ucchuṣmāparivyādhāvāyasena khanati |14|*. The sūtra contains the pratīka (*yām tvā gandharvo akhanad*) for ŚS 4.4.1 = PS 4.5.1, and then gives PS 4.5.2 in full.

The only difference in reading between the above quotation in the KauśS and BHATTACHARYA's edition is his *vṛṣṇyāvati* (*vṛṣṇyāvati* **Or**; *vṛṣṇyāvati* **K**) against *vṛṣṇyāvati* of the KauśS version (all mss.). It seems to me that both versions (nom. or voc.) are equally acceptable grammatically, and that the critical editor of the PS may print *vṛṣṇyāvati* without underlining. If this is done, the critical editor of the KauśS may choose to go against the uniform reading of his mss. and edit the same nominative.

**12.** KauśS 42.15–17 is the first of a number of cases where the KauśS first gives a pratīka, which is then (occasionally, such as here, with some intervening sūtra material) followed by the sakalapāṭha of the intended mantra:<sup>28</sup> *idāvatsarāyeti vratavisarjanam ājyam juhuyāt |15| samidho 'bhyādadhyāt |16| idāvatsarāya*

<sup>27</sup> Note this — according to my present knowledge — rare case of accented material in **K**, for which the model of accentuation cannot have been the RV, RVKh, KS or any other known mantra text transmitted in Kashmir. As a matter of fact, the accentuation for the second hemistich is almost entirely wrong in **K**.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. nrs. 14, 19, 22, 23, 24, 32, 33, 34, 35, 40, 41 below; also BLOOMFIELD's 'Introduction', p. xxix (incomplete). It seems evident to me that some kind of redactional activity is responsible for these odd redundancies. Could it be that the text at an earlier stage contained only the pratīkas, which were then expanded in this way by a redactor who saw these Paippalāda mantras were absent in his own Saṃhitā? What implications would this explanation have for the (original) affiliation of the KauśS, whose (present) Śaunaka affiliation is certified also e.g. by the technical use (KauśS 7.8) of *pūrvam* to refer to the *triṣaptīyam* = ŚS 1.1? It must be noted that not only Paippalāda mantras are treated in this way, but that we find — at least once — at KauśS 108.1–2 (nr. 36 below) a similarly redundant reference to mantras that are only partially traceable in PS. I know only one possible reference to

*parivatsarāya saṃvatsarāya prati vedayāma enat | yad vratesu duritam ni-  
jagmimo durhārdaṃ tena +śamalenāñjmaḥ || yan me vrataṃ vratapate lu-  
lobhāhorātre sam adhātāṃ ma enat | udyan purastād bhiṣag astu candramāḥ  
sūryo raśmibhir abhi grṇātṽ enat || yad vratam atipede +cittiyā manasā hrḍā |  
ādityā rudrās tan mayi vasavaś ca sam indhatām || vratāni vratapataya<sup>29</sup>  
upā karomy agnaye | sa me dyumnaṃ brhad yaśo dīrgham āyuhḥ kṛṇotu ma  
iti vratasamāpanīr ādadhāti |17|.*

This is a quotation from PS 19.51.1–4. The two versions of these mantras as preserved in the KauśS and within the PS tradition itself allow for mutual improvement. I would edit (with **JM V/122 Pa Ji4**, and **K**, leaving aside its impossible accent marks on the first two words):

idāvatsarāya parivatsarāya saṃvatsarāya	
prati vedayāma etat	(P)
yad vratesu duritam +nijagmima	(11 <sup>J</sup> )
durhārdaṃ tena *śamalen <sub>a</sub> ñjmaḥ    <sup>30</sup> [1]	(11)
yan me vrataṃ vratapate +lulobha-	(11)
-ahorātre sam adhātāṃ ma etat	(11)
udyan purastād bhiṣag astu candramāḥ	(12)
sūryo raśmibhir abhi grṇāt <sub>u</sub> v +enat    [2]	(12 <sup>T</sup> )
yad vratam *atipede	(7)
*cittiyā manasā hrḍā	(8)
ādityā rudrās tan mayi	(8)
vasavaś ca sam indhatām    [3]	(8)
vratāni vratapataya	(8)
upā karomy agnaye	(8)
sa me dyumnaṃ brhad yaśo	(8)
dīrgham āyuhḥ kṛṇotu me    [4]	(8)

idāvatsarāya] **Or**, yādāvātsarāya **K** parivatsarāya] **Or**, párivātsarāya **K** [no udatta on *rā*, but svarita under *ya*] saṃvatsarāya] **K**, samvatsarāya **Or** vedayāma etat] **V/122 Pa Ji4**, vedayama etat **JM**, vedayāmetat **K** yad] **Or**, yada **K** +nijagmima] ni-  
jagmi **Or**, najagmiya **K** [Bar. mistakenly °yam] durhārdaṃ tena] durhārdan tena **JM Ji4**, durhārdante **V/122 Pa**, druhārdaṃ tena **K** \*śamalenāñjmaḥ] śamalenāymaḥ **Or**, śamalenayakṣmā **K** vrataṃ] **Or**, vataṃ **K** +lulobhāhorātre] nulobhāhorātre **JM**

PS *pratīkena* without accompanying sakalapāṭha, viz. at 1.41, but this is rather a *kalpaja* mantra: PS 20.45.6 (= MS 4.1.5:7.15 etc.); cf. also nr. 2 above.

29 Note also the pratīka for this stanza at 6.19 (see BLOOMFIELD's 'Introduction', p. xxviii).

30 On the interpretation of this last hemistich, cf. BLOOMFIELD 1902: 512.

V/122 Pa, nulobhā(+ a)horātre J14, ululobhāmrātre K sam adhātām] Or, samudhātām  
 K ma etat] ma enat Or, metat K udyan] JM V/122 Pa, udyana J14, udyam K  
 bhiṣag] Or, bhiṣaj K candramāḥ sūryo] Or, candramāsūryo K grṇātv] Or, kṛṇātv  
 K +enat] etat Or, ainat K [Bar. mistakenly aitat] vratam] Or, vatam K \*ati-  
 pede] adhi(→ ti)pede V/122, adhipede JM Pa J14 K \*cityā] cityā Or K rudrās]  
 K, ṛdrās Or tan mayi] Or, tagmai K vasavaś ca sam] Or, vasavassam K in-  
 dhatām ||] indhatām || Or, indhatām [om. |] K vratāni] Or, vrātānām K agnaye]  
 Or, atne K dyumnaṃ] Or, bhyumnaṃ K brhad yaśo] Or, vrhaddiśo K āyuḥ]  
 Or, āyuḥ K

Stanza 1. BLOOMFIELD reads *enat* with the majority of his mss. (and all of mine), but his **Ch** and **Bü** have *etat*, and this reading is probably the correct one, as the PS mss. suggest. The ending *-mas* which BLOOMFIELD's *nijagmimo* (thus also all my mss.) seems to contain is impossible, and — while a predecessor of the Or. mss. seems to have lost the relevant akṣara here — the reading is probably restorable as *nijagmima* on the basis of **K**. At the end of this stanza, BLOOMFIELD proposed the no doubt correct emendation to °*āñjmaḥ*. His mss. showed several different readings, °*āyyaḥ*, °*āyamaḥ*, °*āyaḥ*, and finally °*āymaḥ* (thus also my **M2–M4**; **M1** reads °*āṣmaḥ*). All these readings seem to go back to °*āymaḥ*, and this corrupt reading<sup>31</sup> of the KauśS mss. is in striking agreement with the corrupt readings of the PS mss., which (°*āymaḥ* **Or**; °*ayakṣmā* **K**) also point to an old corruption °*āymaḥ*, that must have entered the transmission of the PS and thence infiltrated the KauśS transmission already at an early stage.

Stanza 2. Another example of unstable tradition, with an error shared between the Or. mss. and the KauśS transmission, are the readings underlying the form which BLOOMFIELD no doubt correctly restored as *lulobha* (cf. the phrase *yān me mātā prā lulobha cāraty ānanuvratā* at ĀpMP 2.19.1ab etc.): all the KauśS mss. point to an old error *nulobhā*<sup>o</sup>, which is found in the Or. mss. as well. It is noteworthy here that **K** has preserved a reflection of the correct reading. All KauśS mss. read twice *enat* here. The first case is certainly wrong, as the (unaccented) pronoun *ena-* is never a correlative in Vedic mantra texts.<sup>32</sup> KauśS and **K** (note the misreading by BARRET) suggest reading *enat* in pāda **d**, and this seems necessary anyhow in order to explain the entry of the reading *enat* into the transmission of pāda **b** (unless *enat* is to be read in the first stanza).

31 On the confusion *j* :: *y*, see BLOOMFIELD's 'Introduction', p. xli.

32 Cf. DELBRÜCK 1888: 29.

Note again that the transmission must already have been unstable at an early stage.

Stanza 3. The transmission of the KauśS has here preserved the correct text with *atipede*, while this reading seems to have suffered corruption already at an early stage of the PS transmission, as the reading *adhipede* shared by both **K** and the Or. transmission seems to indicate.<sup>33</sup> My mss. **M1–4** share the same reading *cityā* reported by BLOOMFIELD for all of his KauśS mss. The form *\*cittyā* is consistently transmitted — as far as I can see — as *cityā* within the PS tradition as well (i.a. PS 6.11.9b, 9.13.3b, 9.15.8d, 9.19.7b, [PSK] 16.37.7b) and the external testimony of the KauśS here demonstrates that this habit must be old: see also WHITNEY on ŚS 5.17.12, and ROTH 1894: 102.

Stanza 4. That the Vedic sandhi *āyus kr°* is undone in the KauśS version (*°ḥ k°*) is perhaps not significant: cf. also *°s p° :: °ḥ p°* in nr. 16 below.

**13.** At KauśS 43.13, two mantras are given that are not attested in this exact form anywhere but in the Paippalāda tradition.<sup>34</sup> The sūtra runs: *vāstoṣ pate prati jānīhy asmān svāveśo anamīvo na edhi | yat +tvemahe prati nas taj juṣasva catuṣpado dvipada ā veśayeha || anamīvo vāstoṣ pate viśvā rūpāny āviśan | sakhā suśeva edhi na iti vāstoṣpataye kṣīraudanasya juhōti |13|. All KauśS mss. (including mine) read *yattemahe*.*

The first mantra is PS 7.6.10, which I edit (with **Ku V/126 Mā [Ma]**, **K**) in my forthcoming re-edition of PS 6–7:

vāstoṣ pate prati jānīhy asmān	(11)
s <sub>u</sub> vāveśo anamīvo na edhi	(11)
+yat tvemahe prati nas taj juṣasva	(11)
catuṣpado dvipada ā veśayeha	(12 <sup>T</sup> )

svāveśo] **Or**, dvāveśo **K** anamīvo] **K**, 'namīvo **Or** edhi] **Ku V/126 [Ma]** **K**, e(h-)dhi **Mā** +yat tvemahe] yatvemahe **Or**, yantvemahe **K** prati nas taj] **V/126**

33 The remarkable marginal correction in Or. ms. **V/122** cannot be given a certain explanation: it may be due to chance, to influence from oral tradition, to influence from a correct transmission in ritual manuals etc.

34 Despite the statement in the Atharvaṇīya Paddhati, an ancillary text based on the KauśS, that they are not only *kalpaja*, but also *Śāṅkhāyanīya*: see BLOOMFIELD's notes, and his references to Ṛgvedic texts such as RV 7.54.1 and 7.55.1, ŚāṅkhŚS 2.16.1, ŚāṅkhGS 2.14.5, 3.4.7 that must have contributed to the mistaken attribution in the Paddhati.

[Ma], pratinastvaj **Ku**, pratinasaj **Mā**, prtanastaj **K**      dvipada ā] **Or**, dvipadā **K**  
veśayeha] **Ku Mā** [Ma], {vi}veśayeha **V/126**, veśr eha **K**

The next mantra is PS 20.23.2 [PSK 20.22.2], which I would edit (with **JM V/122, K**) precisely as transmitted in the KauśS mss.

**14.** Another instance of a mantra’s pratīka followed by its sakalapāṭha (cf. n. 28 above) is found at KauśS 46.53–54, which reads in BLOOMFIELD’s edition: *prehi pra hareti kapiñjalāni svastyayanāni bhavanti* |53| [1.] *prehi pra hara vā +dāvān gr̥hebhyaḥ svastaye | kapiñjala pradakṣiṇam +śatapattrābhi no vada* || [2.] *bhadram vada dakṣiṇato bhadram uttarato vada | bhadram purastān no vada bhadram paścāt kapiñjala* || [3.] *śunam vada dakṣiṇataḥ śunam uttarato vada | śunam purastān no vada śunam paścāt kapiñjala* || [4.] *bhadram vada putrair bhadram vada gr̥heṣu ca | bhadram asmākaṃ vada bhadram no abhayaṃ vada* || [5.] *āvadaṃ tvam śakune bhadram ā vada tūṣṇīm āsīnaḥ sumatiṃ cikiddhi naḥ | yad utpatan vadasi karkarir yathā br̥had vadema vidathe suvīrāḥ* || [6.] *yauvanāni mahayasi jigyuṣām iva dundubhiḥ | kapiñjala pradakṣiṇam +śatapattrābhi no vadeti kapiñjalāni svastyayanāni bhavanti* |54|.

CALAND (1900a: 156) translates sūtra 53: ‘Die (sechs) Strophen: “geh’ fort, bring’ fort” sind die Strophen, deren Hersagung die bösen Omina von Haselhühnern zu nichte macht’. We have here a small collection of mantras used to ward off bad omens perceived in the cries of *kapiñjala* birds etc., culled from three sources: PS 20.50.5–8 [1–3, 6], ṚVKhil 2.2.5 [4], and ṚV 2.43.3 [5].

I would edit the PS mantras PS 20.50.5–8 [PSK 20.46.7–10] as follows (with **JM V/122 Pa**,<sup>35</sup> **K**):

pr <sub>a</sub> ehi pra hara pādāv	(8)
ā gr̥hebhyaḥ s <sub>u</sub> vastaye	(8)
kapiñjala pradakṣiṇam	(8)
śatapattrābhi no vada    [5]	(8)

prehi] **Or**, pāhi **K**      gr̥hebhyaḥ] **Or**, gr̥hebhyas **K**      vada ||] **Or**, vadaḥ [om. ] **K**

35 Due to a lost photograph, this last ms. is available for this part of the text only from 6c °stānno onward.

All KauśS mss. (also my **M1–4**) read *hara vādāvā*, which BLOOMFIELD unconvincingly (see CALAND 1900a: 156 n. 19)<sup>36</sup> emended to *hara vā dāvān*. The correct PS transmission reveals the fact that the KauśS mss. contain a common error *p* → *v*. BLOOMFIELD does not report the uniform spelling °*tr*° instead of °*trr*° that I find here, and below in the stanza that is PS 20.50.8, in my KauśS mss. for his reading *śatapattrābhi*, and that I suspect actually to have been found in his mss. as well.<sup>37</sup> The PS mss. (cf. also **K** at PS 5.6.2c, all mss. at PS 19.1.9c) as well as the KauśS mss. have here preserved the etymologically correct spelling (see HOFFMANN 1976: 548 n. 3) with °*tr*°, and the critical editor of the KauśS ought to undo BLOOMFIELD’s ‘Verschlimmbesserung’.

bhadraṃ vada dakṣiṇato	(8)
bhadraṃ uttarato vada	(8)
bhadraṃ purastān no vada	(8)
bhadraṃ paścāt kapiñjala    [6]	(8)
śunaṃ vada dakṣiṇataḥ	(8)
śunaṃ uttarato vada	(8)
śunaṃ purastān no vada	(8)
śunaṃ paścāt kapiñjala    [7]	(8)
yauvanāni +mahayasi	(8)
jigyusām iva dundubhiḥ	(8)
kapiñjala pradakṣiṇaṃ	(8)
śatapatrābhi no vada    [8]	(8)

purastān] **V/122 Pa**, purastā **JM**, purastār **K**      vada] **V/122 Pa K**, {bha}vada **JM**  
kapiñjala ||] **V/122 Pa K**, kapiñjala ||  
tskā **JM**<sup>38</sup>      dakṣiṇataḥ] **Or**, dakṣiṇaś **K**      kapiñjala ||] **V/122 Pa K**, kapiñjala  
pradakṣi ||<sup>ka</sup> **JM**      yauvanāni] **K**, yovanāni **Or**      +mahayasi] maha iṣu **Or**, mahāyasi  
**K**      dundubhiḥ |] **Or**, dundubhiḥ [*om.*] **K**      vada] **V/122 Pa K**, bhada **JM**

The last stanza is to be compared with ṚVKhil 2.2.5. The latter place, together with the KauśS reading, supports the editor of the PS in discarding the

36 Cf. also HENRY (1901: 203): “je corrigerais simplement le début en *prēhi pra hara pra vada*, suggéré par le *vada* de la suite de l’invocation”.

37 According to SCHEFTELOWITZ 1906: 71, the sources for ṚVKhil 2.2.5 all have °*trr*°, but this is anyhow the standard spelling of the cluster *tr* in Śāradā script.

38 On the meaning of the symbol ||<sup>ka</sup> found here in **JM**, see GRIFFITHS 2003a: 342.

obviously corrupt Or. reading (*yovanāni maha iṣu*) of the first two pādas, in favor of the nearly faultless **K** transmission (*yauvanāni mahāyasi*).

**15.** Immediately thereafter, in sūtra 46.55 (apparently treating a different ritual situation), we read: *yo abhy u babhruṅāyasi svapantam atsi puruṣam śayānam agatsvalam | ayasmayena brahmaṅāśmamayena varmaṅā pary asmān varuṅo dadhad ity abhyavakāśe saṅviśat[i]*.

CALAND (1900a: 157) attempted to render the first half of the evidently corrupt mantra as follows: ‘Gegen dich, der du mit dem Braunen herankommst, der du den schlafenden Mann verschlingst und den liegenden’.

Additional testimony is available in AVParīś 1.36.7 (on which, see BAHULKAR 1984: 182). The mantra is taken from PS 20.9.4 [PSK 20.8.4], for which one cannot (on the basis of **K**, **JM V/122**, and the testimonia in KauśS and AVParīś) establish a satisfactory text without taking into account also the reading at PS 20.44.2 [PSK 20.42.2], as is indicated already in VISHVA BANDHU’S Vedic Word Concordance, Saṃhitās Section Vol. I, 9f. Most important, however, is the parallel for both PS mantras in JUB 4.1.2–3ff.: *yad abhyavacaraṅo ’bhyavaiṣi svapantam puruṣam akovidam aśmamayena varmaṅā varuṅo ’ntar dadhātu mā ||2|| yad abhyavacaraṅo ’bhyavaiṣi svapantam puruṣam akovidam ayasmayena varmaṅā varuṅo ’ntar dadhātu mā ||3||*.

This parallel helps us to establish (with **JM V/122 Pa**, **K**) the following text for PS 20.44.2:

yo abhyavabhṛṅāyasi	(8)
svapantam icha puruṣam	(8)
śayānam akovidam	(7)
sa naḥ sahasravīrya-	(8)
-anuṣṭhātā śivo bhava	(8)

yo abhyavabhṛṅāyasi] yo abhyababhṛṅāyasi **Or**, yotyababhṛṅāyasi **K** svapantam]  
**JM V/122 K**, svapantam **Pa** icha] **Or**, iścha **K** puruṣam] puṣam **Or**, ruṣam **K**  
 śayānam] **V/122 Pa K**, śayanam **JM**

And for PS 20.9.4:

yo abhyavabhṛṅāyasi	(8)
svapantam icha puruṣam	(8)
śayānam +akasvalam	(7)

ayasmayena varmaṇā- (8)  
 -aśmamayena varmaṇā (8)  
 pary asmān varuṇo dadhat || (8)

yo abhyavabhṛṇāyasi] yo abhyababhṛṇāyasi **Or**, yo byabababhṛṇāyasi **K** svapantam]  
**Or**, svapanṭim **K** icha] icha **JM**, itsa **V/122 Pa**, iścha **K** puruṣam] **K**, puruṣam  
**Or** <sup>+</sup>akasvalam] akasyaḷam **Or**, akaścilam **K** ayasmayena] **Or**, ayassayena  
**K** varmaṇāśmamayena] **K**, varmmaṇā'śmamayena **Or** varmaṇā pary asmān] **Or**,  
 marmaṇā | yo smān **K**

Note that all of BLOOMFIELD's KauśS mss. have *abhya*<sup>o</sup>, as does the PS transmission, instead of *abhy u*, as he edits under influence from all but one of the AVPariś mss. (see BLOOMFIELD's note, and the apparatus given by BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN 1909–1910: 41): the particle *u* is anyhow impossible here, and the emendation *abhyavabhṛṇāyasi* solves the problem. It stands in the place of JUB *abhyavacaraṇo*, which is a nominal expression of the same meaning. I see it as a previously unattested contaminated form of the 9th class stem *bhr̥ṇā-* attested in the hapax RV 2.28.7b *bhr̥ṇānti* 'they injure', with the semantically related *-āya*-formation *hr̥ṇāyānt-* (NARTEN 1982 = 1995: 263ff.), according to the formula *bhr̥ṇā-* × *hr̥ṇāyā-* = *bhr̥ṇāya-*.<sup>39</sup> Cf. also Nighaṇṭu 2.12 *bhr̥ṇāyāte* |4| *bhr̥ṇānti* |5| ... *krudhyatikarmāṇaḥ*. The *-b-* at both places in **K**, and in the KauśS/AVPariś version, in combination with the readings *-r̥-*, *-ru/rū-*, *-r-*, suggests that the stanza was already misunderstood to contain the word *babhruṇā* at a very early stage in the transmission.<sup>40</sup>

The reading *atsi* adopted by both BLOOMFIELD and the AVPariś editors rests on a very weak footing: in fact the mss. for both texts point to *atsa*, which is corrupt for *icha* as preserved in the PS tradition. The correspondence with *abhyavaiṣi* in the JUB parallel proves that this form from *eṣ* preserved in the PS transmission is correct.

The PS mss. seem to be reconstructible to <sup>+</sup>*akasvalam*, which is obviously very close to *agasvalam* as corruptly transmitted — with some variants — in the KauśS tradition, and in AVPariś. BLOOMFIELD's choice for *agatsvalam* is wrong,<sup>41</sup> and his suggestion to emend to *āgan khalam* is no more than a

39 I gratefully acknowledge my thanks to Werner Knobl, with whom I have discussed the form at some length.

40 As pointed out GRIFFITHS 2003a: 339, *b = v* and *r̥ = /ru/* in Oriya script, so the **Or** mss. can in fact either be interpreted to have preserved the authentic text intact, or to contain */babhruṇā/*.

41 As is the emendation *agatvalam* 'immobile' proposed by HENRY (1901: 203).

gratuitous play on the shape of the akṣaras. Pāṇini actually teaches the formation *kasvara-* (3.2.175), unfortunately without semantic indication. In view of the parallel *akovidam* in PS 20.44.3 and the JUB passage, I suppose<sup>42</sup> that *a-kas-va-* must mean ‘with [eyes] unopened, i.e. unsuspecting, unaware, unintelligent’ (cf. *vi-kas-va-* ‘with [eyes] opened’ PW VI, p. 987; AiGr. II/2, p. 907). That such a person may well be the object of the verb *eṣ* is clear from PS 6.8.6, 6.14.6c+9c, etc. Cf. also *svapantam icha* at PS 5.27.6c.

In sum, the very corrupt transmission of the KauśS and AVPariś can in this case nicely be corrected with the help from the PS tradition itself, and the parallel in JUB. The reading *brahmaṇā* in KauśS and AVPariś is shown to be corrupt in the same way.

**16.** The sūtra KauśS 47.16 reads: *vajro 'si sapatnahā tvayādya vṛtram sākṣīya | tvām adya vanaspate vṛkṣāṇām ud ayuṣmahi || sa na indra purohito<sup>43</sup> viśvataḥ pāhi +rakṣasaḥ | abhi gāvo anūsatābhi dyumnaḥ bṛhaspate || prāṇa prāṇam trāyasvāso<sup>44</sup> asave mṛḍa | nirṛte nirṛtyā naḥ pāśebhyo muñca || iti daṇḍam ādatte |16|*. The same mantra is found at AVPariś 37.1.7–8. It is taken from PS 19.42.4–6, which I would edit (with **JM V/122 Pa Ji4, K**):

vajro <sub>a</sub> si sapatnahā	(8)
tvayādya vṛtram sākṣīya	(8)
t <sub>u</sub> vām adya vanaspate	(8)
vṛkṣāṇām ud ayuṣmahi    [4]	(8)
sa na indra purohito	(8)
viśvatas pāhi rakṣasaḥ	(8)
abhi gāvo +anūsata-	(8)
-abhi dyumnaḥ bṛhaspate    [5]	(8)
prāṇa prāṇam ity ekā <sup>45</sup>    [6]	

42 Following a suggestion by Sasha Lubotsky.

43 Thus the ed., corrected by BLOOMFIELD 1906: 416, who univerted and interpreted *indrapurohito* as a bahuvrīhi compound. CALAND 1900a: 161 (with n. 15) assumed a tatpuruṣa. HENRY (1901: 203), whom I follow here and below, defended the text as edited: “je traduirais, d’après le sens étymologique: “O Indra, te plaçant à notre tête . . .” Le piquant de l’invocation est précisément ici le semi-calembour, puisque d’habitude c’est Brhaspati, nommé plus bas, qui est le *purôhita*”.

44 Ed. *trayasvaso*, for which no variant readings are reported, must be a misprint, because my **M1–4** all give *trāyasvāso*, as expected.

45 This last mantra is repeated from PS 15.3.4 = ŚS 19.44.4: *prāṇa prāṇam trāyasvāso asave mṛḍa | nirṛte nirṛtyā naḥ pāśebhyo muñca ||*. On the use of the abbreviation device . . . *ity ekā*, see GRIFFITHS 2003a: 342f.

asi] si **Or K** tvayādyā vṛtram] **Pa Ji4**, tvayāda vṛtram **JM**, tvayā(→ ā-)dya vṛtram **V/122**, tvayā vyatramha **K** sāksīya ] **Or**, sāksīyaḥ [om. ] **K** tvām adya vanaspate] **JM V/122 Pa**, tvām addha(→ DYA)vaspate **Ji4**, tām adhya vanaspate **K** ud ayuṣmahi] **Or**, utayuṣmahi **K** indra purohito] **JM V/122**, indrapurohito **Ji4**, irohito **K** pāhi] **V/122 Pa Ji4**, pāti **JM**, māhi **K** rakṣasaḥ ] **Or**, rakṣataḥ [om. ] **K** +anūṣatābhi] anuṣatābhi **Or**, amuṣatābhṛ **K** dyumnaḥ] **Or**, dyumna **K** prāṇa] **K**, prāṇaḥ **Or**

It is noteworthy in stanza 5 that all the KauśS mss., including mine, and several of the AVParīś mss. share the error *rakṣataḥ* with **K**.<sup>46</sup> That the KauśS and AVParīś mss. undo the Vedic sandhi in *viśvatas pāhi* is perhaps insignificant: cf. also °ṣ k° ∴ °ḥ k° in nr. 12 (stanza 4) above.

**17.** At KauśS 56.17 BLOOMFIELD reads: *yathāpaḥ pravatā yanti yathā māsā aharjaram | evā mā brahmacāriṇo dhātar ā yantu sarvadā || svāhety ācāryaḥ samidham ādadhāti |17|*. The mantra is taken from PS 20.52.9 [PSK 20.48.9], which I would edit (with **JM V/122 Pa, K**) in precisely the same form.

**18.** At KauśS 58.1 BLOOMFIELD reads: *bhadrāya karṇaḥ krośatu bhadrāyākṣi vi vepatām | parā duḥṣvapnyam suva yad bhadram tan na ā suva || akṣivepaḥ duḥṣvapnyam ārtim puruṣareṣiṇīm | tad asmad aśvinā yuvam apriye prati muñcatam || yat pārśvād uraso me aṅgādaṅgād avavepate | aśvinā puṣkarasrajā tasmān naḥ pātam aṃhasa iti karṇam krośantam anumantrayate |1|*.

The source of the mantras are PS 20.54.6–8 [PSK 20.50.6–8], which I edit (with **JM V/122 [Pa unavailable], K**):

bhadrāya karṇaḥ krośatu	(8)
bhadrāyākṣi vi vepatām	(8)
parā duḥṣvapnyam suva	(8)
yad bhadram tan na ā suva    [6]	(8)
akṣivepaḥ duḥṣvapnyam	(8)
ārtim puruṣareṣiṇīm	(8)
tad asmad aśvinā yuvam	(8)
apriye prati muñcatam    [7]	(8)
yat pārśvād uraso me	(8)
<sup>a</sup> ṅgādaṅgād avavepate	(8)
aśvinā puṣkarasrajā	(8)
tasmān naḥ pātam aṃhasaḥ    [8]	(8)

46 Cf. already GONDA 1977: 79 = 1991: 368.

karṇaḥ] karṇṇaḥ **Or**, ka[*line*]ḥ **K** krośatu] **Or**, krośanta **K** bhadrāyākṣi] **Or**,  
 bhadrāyākṣa **K** vi vepatām] **K**, vivepatām **JM**, vi(→ ·)patām **V/122** duḥṣvapnyam] **V/122**,  
 duḥṣvapnam **JM**, duṣvapnyam **K** tan na ā] **Or**, tanvā **K** akṣivepaṃ] **Or**,  
 akṣave[*line*]ṣvapnis **K** ārtiṃ] ārtiṃ **Or**, āntaṃ **K** puruṣareṣiṇīm ]] puṣareṣaṇiṃ |  
**JM**, puṣaṇiṃ | **V/122**, puruṣarīṣiṇīm [om. ]] **K** tad asmad] **V/122**, tadaŚMI(→  
 sma)d **JM**, tatastum **K** yuvam] **Or**, yum **K** apriye prati] **JM** **K**, apri[*foli*]ti  
**V/122** muñcatam] muñcataṃ **Or**, muñcataḥ **K** uraso] **Or**, utaso **K** avavepate]  
**K**, upavepate **Or** puṣkarasrajā] **Or**, puṣkarāsrjā **K** naḥ pātam] **Or**, naḥpātum **K**  
 aṃhasaḥ ]] **Or**, aṃhasaḥ [om. ]] **K**

In the last stanza, the KauśS version suggests that the Or. transmission has suffered a corruption *ava* → *upa*, while **K** has preserved the correct reading. The majority of the KauśS mss.<sup>47</sup> read *duḥṣvapnyam*, and thus give support to the Or. reading with visarga as against **K** *duṣvapnyam* (without).

**19.** At KauśS 62.20–21, we encounter another example (cf. n. 28 above) of a pratīka followed by a sakalapāṭha quotation: *tām atyāsarāt prathameti yathoktaṃ dohayitvopasiñcati* |20| *atyāsarāt prathamā dhokṣyamāṇā sarvān yajñān bibhratī vaiśvadevī* | *upa vatsam srjata vāśyate gaur vy asrṣṭa sumanā him kṛṇoti* || *badhāna vatsam abhi dhehi bhuñjatī nijya godhug upa sīda dugdhi* | *irām asmā odanaṃ pinvamānā kīlālam ghrtaṃ madam annabhāgam* || *sā dhāvatu yamarājñāḥ savatsā sudughāṃ pathā prathameha dattā* | *atūrṇadattā prathamedam āgan vatsena gāṃ saṃ srja viśvarūpām iti* ||21|. Comparison with the two KauśS mss. available to me for this part of the text (**L M1**) suggests that BLOOMFIELD’s apparatus may not contain all significant *varietas lectionis*. All mss. (including **L**) read *dhokṣamāṇā*, except for BLOOMFIELD’s **K** which has the correct form, and **M1** which omits the relevant akṣara (*dhomāṇā*). There are several variants for *srjata* (thus also **L**), to which **M1** adds another: *srjate*; for *vaiśvadevī* | *upa* it reads *vaiśvadevīnyamtya upa*; for *vy asrṣṭa* it reads *yabhiyantēsṛṣṭaḥ*, while **L** reads *vyasrṣṭaḥ* with several other mss. Several mss. (including **M1**) read *sumanābhīhimkṛṇoti*, against the remaining mss. (including **L**) *sumanāhimkṛṇoti*. Note BLOOMFIELD 1890: 171 n. 16 on that variant: “this perhaps stands for *sumanā abhihimkṛṇoti*, a reading which goes against the metre, but seems rather more suitable to the sense. Is *sumanā himkṛṇoti* the product of emendation, arising from the better metrical feeling of the scribe?”. For *atūrṇadattā* **L** reads *atūrṣṭadaṣṭattā*, and **M1** reads *atūrṇarṣṭadattā* (cf. BLOOMFIELD’s **B1**: “*akṛṣṭadatvā* or °*danvā*”).

47 Including my **M1**; **M2–M4** do not include this portion of the text.

The mantras are PS 5.31.1–3. BHATTACHARYA edits *atyāsarāt prathamā dhokṣamāṇā sarvān yajñān bibhratī vaiśvadevī | upa vatsam sṛjata vāśyate gaur vy asṛstah sumanā hiṃ kr̥ṇomi || badhāna vatsam abhi dhehi bhuñ-jatīm ni dya godhug upa sīda dugdhi | iḍām asmā odanaṃ pinvamānā kīlālaṃ ghṛtaṃ madam annabhāgam || sā dhāvatu yamarājñah savatsā sukṛtām pathā prathameha dattā | aturṣṭadattā prathamedam āgan vatsena gām sam sṛja viśvarūpām ||*. The PS mss. thus offer the better readings *bhuñjatīm ni dya*, *iḍām*, and moreover *sukṛtām* for the unanimous and interesting KauśS reading *sudughām*.

The KauśS mss., on the other hand, lend support to the obvious correction of *kr̥ṇomi* in BHATTACHARYA's ed. (all PS mss.) to *kr̥ṇoti*, made by LUBOTSKY. The above-quoted readings from **L M1** preserve additional traces of the cluster *ṣṭa* in <sup>+</sup>*atrṣṭa dattā* as LUBOTSKY (2002: 138f.) restores for BHATTACHARYA's *aturṣṭadattā* and BLOOMFIELD's *atūrṇadatā*. The impossible form *dhokṣamāṇā* (LUBOTSKY 2002: 137) of all KauśS mss. but one, and all PS mss., could be an old error, if the correct reading adopted by BLOOMFIELD from his **K** is due to chance.

**20.** An interesting case is found at KauśS 65.14–15, where we read: [1.] *agneṣ tvāsyena prāśnāmi bṛhaspater mukhena | indrasya tvā jaṭhare sādāyāmi varuṇasyodare |* [2.] *tad yathā hutam iṣṭam prāśnīyād* <sup>+</sup>*devātmā tvā prāśnāmy* [3.] *ātmāsy ātmann ātmānaṃ me mā hiṃsīr iti prāśitam anumantrayate* [14] [4.] *yo 'gnir nṛmaṇā nāma brāhmaṇeṣu praviṣṭah | tasmin ma eṣa suhuto 'stv odanaḥ sa mā mā hiṃsīt parame vyoman ||* [5.] *so asmabhyam astu parame vyomann iti dātāraṃ vācayati* [15]. For the emended reading (*prāśnīyād*) *devātmā tvā*, BLOOMFIELD reports the variants **P Bh Bū** *devātmā* (without *tvā*); **K Ch E Bi** *devātvā*. The latter is the reading of the four KauśS mss. available to me for this place (**L M1 M3 M4**), and these mss. also confirm the implication from BLOOMFIELD's apparatus that the KauśS mss. offer a cluster °*dde*°. Further, BLOOMFIELD reports the variants *etat*° and *eta* (respectively **Ch** [my **M3**] and **Bū** [my **M3**]) for *eṣa* [my **L M1**]).

We have here 5 mantra elements. While the VSK mantras 2.3.5+7 that BLOOMFIELD points to for [1.] offer only partial parallels, the mantras [1.] and [4.] precisely correspond with PS 20.57.14–15 [PSK 20.53.10–11], to which some *kalpaja* materials ([2–3.], [5.]) have been added. I would edit these mantras as follows (with **JM V/122** [**Pa** is not fully legible], **K**):

agneṣ tvāsyena prāśnāmi bṛhaspater mukhena | (P)  
indrasya tvā jaṭhare sādāyāmi varuṇasyodare || [14] (P)

yo 'gnir nṛmaṇā nāma brāhmaṇeṣu praviṣṭaḥ | (P)  
 tasminn +etat suhutam astu prāśitaṃ (12)  
 tan mā mā hiṃsīt parame vyoman || [15] (11)

agneṣ ... mukhena || Or, om. **K** indrasya] V/122 **K**, indra **JM** sādāyāmi] Or,  
 sādhayā **K** varuṇasyodare] varuṇasyodare **Or**, varuṇasyodadhe **K** 'gnir nṛmaṇā]  
 'gninnṛmaṇā **JM**, agniRNNamaṇā V/122, gniinnṛmaṇā **K** +etat] eta **JM**, eṣa V/122 **K**  
 suhutam astu prāśitaṃ] Or, sotostu sauśās **K** tan mā mā] Or, sanomā **K** hiṃsīt]  
**K**, hiṃsīt] Or

The *kalpaja* phrase [3.] *ātmāsy ātmann ātmānaṃ me mā hiṃsītḥ* is quoted in the same full form at VaitS 1.3.11. For the words [2.] *tad yathā ... prāśnāmy* of the sūtra, we may compare PS 9.21.1 *sa ya evaṃ vidvān prāśnīyād etām eva devatām manasā dhyāyed ekarṣes tvā cakṣuṣā paśyāmy ekarṣes tvā hastābhyām ā rabha ekarṣes tvāsyena prāśnāmy ekarṣes tvā jathare sādāyāmīti | sa yathā hutam iṣṭaṃ prāśnīyād evainam prāśnāti ||*. It would seem that BLOOMFIELD's emended reading *devātmā tvā* can on this basis be improved to the shorter emendation *evā tvā*.

It is curious to see that the KauśS offers for [4–5.] what appears to be an ad hoc composition<sup>48</sup> (with insertion of *ma*) based on PS 20.57.15 and 16.72.9, the latter being a stanza which — to my knowledge — does not occur anywhere else in texts of the Śaunaka Śākhā either. I quote it here in a provisional ed. based on Or. mss. **Ku** and **Ji1**: *yadi māruto yadi vaiśvadevaḥ | yas te agnir nṛmaṇā nāma hr̥dyas tasminn eṣa suhuto astv odanaḥ so 'smākam astu parame vyoman ||*. The variant readings, quoted above, with *eta(t)* reflect confusion based on the difference between PS 20.57.15 and 16.72.9. They help to confirm the authenticity of the reading +*etat* for PS 20.57.15b, that grammar also requires, but which in some of the PS mss. has suffered from perseveration of 16.72.9 *eṣa*.

**21.** KauśS 67.27 through 68.2 read: *śarāveṇa catuḥśarāvaṃ devasya tvā savituḥ prasava ṛṣibhyas tvārṣeyebhyas tvaikarṣaye tvā juṣṭaṃ nirvapāmi |27||67|| vasavas tvā gāyatreṇa chandasā nir vapantu | ūrjam akṣitam akṣīyamāṇam upa jīvyāsam iti dātāraṃ vācayati |1| rudrās tvā traiṣṭubhena chandasā | ādityās tvā jāgatena chandasā | viśve tvā devā ānuṣṭubhena chandasā nir vapantu | ūrjam akṣitam akṣīyamāṇam upa jīvyāsam iti dātāraṃ vācayati |2|*. Although we cannot positively state that this is a mantra quoted

48 Cf. PATYAL 1969: xl.

from PS, variations in this type of mantra are easily attributable to the sūtrakāra himself,<sup>49</sup> and the partial similarities with 16.70.1–5 are too strong to be left unmentioned. I would edit these mantras as follows (with **JM Ku3 Ji1, K**):

dyaur *javena	(P)
pr̥thivī varimṇā	(P)
antarikṣaṃ mahitvā	(P)
apo bhūmnā	(P)
devasya tvā savituḥ prasave (')śvinor bāhubhyāṃ	
pūṣṇo hastābhyāṃ prasūto brāhmaṇebhyo nir vapāmi    [1]	(P)
ṛṣibhyas tvārṣeyebhyas tvā	(P)
juṣṭatamaṃ vahnitamaṃ papritamaṃ sasnitamaṃ	(P)
ūrjo bhāgam akṣitam akṣitaye nir vapāmi    [2]	(P)
vasavas tvā gāyatreṇa chandasā nir vapantu    [3]	(P)
rudrās tvā traiṣṭubhena chandasā nir vapantu    [4]	(P)
ādityās tvā jāgatenā chandasā nir vapantu    [5]	(P)

dyaur \*javena] dyauryenā **Or**, dyaurjavenā **K** varimṇā antarikṣaṃ] **Ji1 K**, varimṇāntarikṣaṃ **Ku3**, varimṇā'ntarikṣaṃ **JM** mahitvā apo] **K**, mahitvāpo **Or** bhūmnā] **Or**, bhūsnā **K** savituḥ] **Or**, savituḥ **K** (')śvinor] śvinor **Or K** prasūto] **Ku3 Ji1 K**, pūṣṇo **JM** tvārṣeyebhyas tvā |] **Or**, tvā ṛṣayebhyas tvā ṛṣiyebhyas tvā [om. |] **K** papritamaṃ] **Ku3 Ji1 K**, p{r}apritamaṃ **JM** sasnitamaṃ] **Or**, svastitamaṃ **K** akṣitam akṣitaye] **Or**, akṣatam akṣataye **K** chandasā] **Or**, śchandasā **K** rudrās] ṛdrās **Or**, rudras **K** chandasā nir vapantu ||] **Or**, śchandasā Z 3 ZZ **K** [note abbreviation] chandasā] **Or**, śchandasā **K** ādityās ... vapantu ||] **Ku3** gives this line *sec. m. in margine*

**22.** At KauśS 68.9–10, we find another example (cf. n. 28 above) of praṭikas of mantras followed by their full version: *ā pyāyasva saṃ te payāṃsīti dvābhyāṃ pratiṣiñcet* |9| *ā pyāyasva sam etu te visvataḥ soma vṛṣṇyam | bhavā vājasya saṃgathe || saṃ te payāṃsi sam u yantu vājāḥ saṃ vṛṣṇyāny abhimātiṣāhaḥ | āpyāyamāno amṛtāya soma divi śravāṃsy uttamāni dhiṣveti* |10|. These mantras are found, besides as ṚV 1.91.16+18 (and the numerous other mantra-texts referred to by BLOOMFIELD, notably in juxtaposition at VSM 12.112–113), also as PS 20.55.4+6 [PSK 20.51.4+6], which I would edit precisely in the way the KauśS quotes them. The PS mss. (**JM V/122**,

49 Cf. n. 6 above.

**K**<sup>50</sup>) contain no variants that require mention here. There is no certain way of saying whether these are indeed taken from PS, or from another mantra text.

**23.** At KauśS 68.25–26, we find two pratīkas followed by the same mantras in sakalapāṭha (cf. n. 28 above): *tantram sūktam pacchaḥ snātena yau te pakṣau yad atiṣṭhaḥ* |25| *yau te pakṣāv ajarau patatrināu yābhyām rakṣāmsy apahaṃsy +odana | tābhyām pathyāsma sukṛtasya lokam yatra ṛṣayaḥ prathamajāḥ purāṇāḥ || yad atiṣṭho divas pṛṣṭhe vyomann adhy odana | anvāyan satyadharmāṇo brāhmaṇā rādhasā saha* |26|.

The two mantras are PS 3.38.6 (cf. TS 4.7.13.1, VSM 18.52) and 3.38.7 (no parallels), edited as follows by BHATTACHARYA: *yau te pakṣāv ajarau patatrināu yābhyām rakṣāmsy apahaṃsy odana | tābhyām patyāsma sukṛtasya lokam yatra ṛṣayaḥ prathamajāḥ purāṇāḥ || yatas tiṣṭho divas pṛṣṭhe vyomann adhy odana | anvāyan satyadharmāṇo brāhmaṇā rādhasā saha ||*.

The PS version confirms BLOOMFIELD's emendation of the uniform KauśS reading *odanaḥ* to *odana*. All his mss. (as also the two mss. available to me: **L M1**) had *pathyāsma(t)*, which cannot easily be understood: the PS version, with *patyāsma*, has preserved a precative form corresponding to the pres. opt. *patema* of the VSM and and TS parallels. Although two of BHATTACHARYA's mss. (**Vā Ja**) in fact share the non-application of sandhi in *yatra ṛṣayaḥ*, the meter speaks against such hiatus found also in the KauśS version. For the opening words of stanza 7, however, the KauśS mss. appear to have preserved the authentic text (*yad atiṣṭho*; thus also in my two mss.) which BHATTACHARYA's edition (*yatas tiṣṭho*) — following the Or. mss. — obfuscates: the impf. form agrees with *anvāyan* in pāda c, and the *d* of *yad* finds confirmation also in the **K** reading *yaditiṣṭho*.

**24.** At KauśS 72.13–14 we first find a number of pratīkas for mantras taken from ŚS, followed by four pratīkas that cannot be traced there, and which are subsequently (cf. n. 28 above) given in sakalapāṭha as well: *param mṛtyo vyākaromy ā rohatāntardhiḥ pratyañcam arkam ye agnayo namo devavadhe-bhyo 'gne 'bhyāvartinn agne jātavedaḥ saha rayyā punar ūrjeti* |13| *agne 'bhyāvartinn abhi na ā vavṛtsva | āyusā varcasā sanyā medhayā prajayā dhana-nena || agne jātavedaḥ śatam te sahasram ta upāvṛtaḥ | adhā puṣṭasyeśānaḥ punar no rayim ā kṛdhi || saha rayyā ni vartasvāgne pinvasva dhārāyā | viś-vapsnyā viśvatas pari || punar ūrjā vavṛtsva punar agna iṣāyusā | punar naḥ*

50 There is an insertion of some extraneous material including the RV stanza 5.13.4 — not so far traceable in **Or** — in **K** after *ā pyāyamānā* (as it reads), and **K** omits *amṛtāya . . . dhiṣva*.

*pāhy aṃhasaḥ ||14|.*

The four mantras first quoted in pratīka, and then in full, together constitute the hymn PS 1.41, which BHATTACHARYA edits: *agnebhyāvartinn abhi na ā vavṛtsva | āyusā varcasā sanyā medhayā prajayā dhanena || agne jātavedaḥ śataṃ te santv āvṛtaḥ sahasraṃ ta upāvṛtaḥ | adhā puṣṭasyeśānaḥ punar no rayim ā kṛdhi || saha rayyā ni vartasvāgne pinvasva dhārayā | +viśvapsnyā viśvatas pari || punar ūrjā vavṛtsva punar agne viśāyusā | punar naḥ pāhy aṃhasaḥ ||.*

The omission of an avagraha here for 'bhyāvartinn may be a simple printing error. Pāda **a** of stanza 2 of the KauśS version as edited shows an odd gap when compared with the PS: the words *santv āvṛtaḥ* are omitted, and BLOOMFIELD reports no variants. This is certainly a mere printing error, because my mss. **L M1**<sup>51</sup> do have the missing words. BLOOMFIELD reports no variants for *viśvapsnyā*, and my **L M1** also read thus: this must also have been the reading of the PS archetype \*G, and BHATTACHARYA has rightly adopted it.<sup>52</sup> The archetype must already have had the corrupt text *agne viśāyusā*, to which — rather than to BHATTACHARYA's *agne viśāyusā* — all PS mss. point (**K** with accent notation *viśāyusā*), but the KauśS quotation preserves the mantra (with correct *agna iśāyusā*) as it must have read before that error entered the PS transmission.

**25.** In KauśS 73.1–19, amidst (partly) metrical material not recognized as mantric by Keśava, we find in 73.14–15: *yathāśakti yathābalaṃ hutādo 'nye ahutādo 'nye | vaiśvadevaṃ havir ubhaye saṃ caranti |14| te samyañca iha mādayantām iṣam ūrjaṃ yajamānā yam ichata | viśve devā idam havir ādityāsaḥ saparyata | asmīn yajñe mā vyathiṣy amṛtāya haviṣ kṛtam |15|.* BLOOMFIELD's sūtra-division is wrong. We have first (*hutādo ... yajamānā yam ichata*) a mantra quoted from PS 5.15.2, showing a variant from the transmitted PS text *yajamānāya matsva*: these readings, and the important parallel PS 5.28.3 have been briefly discussed by LUBOTSKY (2002: 78f.). Then a stanza quoted from PS 19.35.1, which I would edit in precise accordance with the KauśS quotation. There are no variants in the PS mss. checked by me (**JM Pa, K**) that require mention here.

**26.** At KauśS 78.10, we first find pratīkas for ŚS 6.78.1, 14.2.1, 14.2.45, and then the sakalapāṭha of two short Paippalāda hymns: *tena bhūtena tubhyam*

<sup>51</sup> **M2–M4** are not available for this part of the text.

<sup>52</sup> **Or** *viśvapsnyā*, **K** *vi-vapsvyā*. Cf. FORSSMAN 1968: 35.

*agre śumbhanī agnir janavin mahyaṃ jāyām imām adāt somo vasuvin mahyaṃ jāyām imām adāt pūṣā jātivin mahyaṃ jāyām imām adād indrah sahīyān mahyaṃ jāyām adād agnaye janavide svāhā somāya vasuvide svāhā pūṣṇe jātivide svāhendrāya sahīyase svāheti |10|.*<sup>53</sup>

The two Paippalāda hymns are PS 1.34 and 1.35, which belong together. BHATTACHARYA edits them as they are quoted in the KauśS, except that for KauśS *jātivin, jātivide*, he follows **Or** *jñātivin, jñātivide (jñātuvina, jñātuvide K)*. These are clearly the correct readings: cf. ŚāṅkhGS 1.9.9 *pūṣā jñātimān*. BLOOMFIELD reports no variants, but all my available KauśS mss. (**M1 M3 M4**) read twice *jñāti°*, so this is merely a misprint in the KauśS edition.<sup>54</sup>

27. At KauśS 82.13 we read: *yasya trayā gatam anuprayanti devā manuṣyāḥ paśavaś ca*<sup>55</sup> *sarve | +taṃ no devaṃ mano adhi bravītu sunītir no nayatu dviṣate mā radhāmeti śāntyudakenācamyābhyukṣya |13|*. BLOOMFIELD reports that *taṃ no* is emended for *tanno* (thus also my **M1 M2 M4**<sup>56</sup>) and that *sunītir no* is an emendation for **K Bü E Ch** *sunītino* (thus also **M1 M2 M4**); **P Bh** *sunītuno*; **Bi** *sunānutino*; **Ku** *sunono*.

The mantra is PS 1.78.4, which BHATTACHARYA edits: *yasya trayā gatam anuprayanti devā manuṣyāḥ paśavaś ca sarve | tan no devaṃ mano adhi bravītu*<sup>57</sup> *sunītinno nayatu dviṣate mā radhāma ||*. BHATTACHARYA bases his reading *tan no* not only on the Or. mss., rejecting **K** *taṃ no*, but also refers explicitly to the manuscript readings of the KauśS mss. Since *adhi-bravi* must be construed with a dative (*no*), and *devaṃ manaḥ* must go together (as at RV 1.164.18d), *tan* (← *tad*) indeed is the preferable reading. BHATTACHARYA considers the emendation *sunītiṃ no*, but it seems to me that *sunīti* is the only possible form of a ntr. adj. qualifying *devaṃ manas-*,<sup>58</sup> and that this majority reading of the KauśS mss. can be adopted.<sup>59</sup>

53 The text of the sūtra is quoted here without *āgachataḥ* at the end, in accordance with BLOOMFIELD 1902: 514.

54 Another case of a misprint *j* for *jñ* is reported by BLOOMFIELD 1902: 514.

55 CALAND (1894: 369 = 1990: 5) has pointed out that the text, whose printing is unclear here in BLOOMFIELD's edition, and apparently reads *paśavaśva*, should of course read *paśavaś ca*.

56 **M3** does not cover this part of the text.

57 Thus corrected by BHATTACHARYA himself (n.d.-1) for the printing error *bavītu*.

58 Cf. the famous phrase *ākṣiti śrāvas* (3× RV), and VSM 5.5 *ójó 'nabhiśasti*. I now see that this same interpretation had already been mentioned as a *pūrvapakṣa*, without references to other examples of such ntr. °*ti*- adjectives, by ZEHNDER in his unpublished 1993 Lizentiatsarbeit on PS 1.

59 There is no ms.-support for the alternative *sunīti* (archaic instr. sg.: cf. RV 6.45.1ab *ānayat ... sūnīti*) mentioned to me as a *lectio pulcherrima* by Werner Knobl.

28. At Kauś 82.21, the situation is complex. BLOOMFIELD edits *yadyat kravyād gṛhyed yadi kravyādā nānte 'paredyuh | divo nabhaḥ śukraṃ payo duhānā iṣam ūrjaṃ pinvamānāḥ || apāṃ yonim apādhvam svadhā yās cakṛṣe jīvaṃs tās te santu madhuścuta ity agnau sthālīpākam nipṛṇāti* |21|.

As BLOOMFIELD notes, the first words of this sūtra seem hopelessly corrupt. Then follows some mantra material that seems to have been taken, in very corrupt and lacunar form, from PS 19.52.1–3. I edit these stanzas as follows (with **JM Pa Ji4, K**):

divo nabhaḥ śukraṃ payo duhānā-	(11)
-rtasya nābhir amṛtaṃ vi caṣṭe    [1]	(11)
ghṛtaṃ duhānām viśvataḥ prapītām	(11)
ūrjaṃ duhānām anapasphurantīm	(11)
upāsataṃ sukṛtaḥ svadhābhiḥ    [2]	(10)
ghṛtam *iṣam pinvamānām	(8)
imāṃ yonim upādhvam	(8)
svadhā yās cakṛṣe *jīvan	(8)
tās te santu madhuścutaḥ    [3]	(8)

divo] **Or**, diva **K** nabhaḥ] **Or**, nabhaś **K** śukraṃ] **Or**, śukra **K** duhānartasya] duhānartasya **JM Pa**, duhānattasya **Ji4**, -uhāntasya **K** ||] ||<sup>1</sup> **JM Pa**,<sup>60</sup> |<sup>1</sup> **Ji4**,] **K** viśvataḥ prapītām ūrjaṃ duhānām] **Or**, viśvataḥprapīṇāmūrjanduhānāj **K** anapasphurantīm |] anapasphurantīm] **JM Pa**, anasphuranti || **Ji4**, anapasphuranti | **K** sukṛtaḥ] **JM**, sukṛta **Pa Ji4**, sukṛtas **K** svadhābhiḥ || ghṛtam] **Or**, svadhābhirghṛtam **K** \*iṣam] ucha **Or**, iśchaṃ **K** imāṃ] **Or**, imā **K** upādhvam |] upādhvam | **Or**, upādhvam [om. |] **K** svadhā yās] **K**, svadhayās **JM Ji4**, svadhāyās **Pa** cakṛṣe] **Or**, cakṛṣa **K** \*jīvan] jīvaṃ **Or K** ||] **Or**, om. **K** [note °ḥ s°]

The rare verb form *upādhvam* is found also e.g. PS 9.4.2, JUB 4.11.2. A variant of 19.52.2a is found at PS 4.31.7c: *ghṛtaṃ duhānā viśvataḥ prapītā*. 19.52.3cd are known also as ŚS 18.2.20cd *svadhā yās cakṛṣe jīvan tās te santu madhuścutaḥ* ||. Although BLOOMFIELD edits *jīvaṃs* on the authority of just one ms., the majority of the ŚS and KauśS, and all PS mss. read *jīvaṃ* (thus also my **M1 M2 M4**<sup>61</sup>). The often idiosyncratic KauśS ms. **Bü**<sup>62</sup> has the expected reading *jīvan*, adopted also by PANDIT (while ROTH & WHITNEY give

60 On the meaning of the symbol ||<sup>1</sup>, see GRIFFITHS 2003a: 342.

61 **M3** is not available for this part of the text.

62 Cf. n. 15 above.

*jīvāms*). Cf. the similar sandhi at PS 1.51.1a, 4.14.3b, 5.10.8d, 13.5.7b etc., and see WHITNEY's commentary on ŚS 18.2.20.

The emendation to \**iṣam* is supported by known cases of *iṣam pinv* (PS 20.5.5, ṚV 6.63.8b, 7.24+25.6c etc.). However, the sequence *ghṛtam iṣam* seems not to occur elsewhere. Perhaps the readings of the mss. can be explained as representing an underlying *it sam*, itself already corrupt (because *sam-pinv* does not exist) under the influence of many cases of the sequence *ghṛtam id* (PS 3.4.5a, 6.10.9c, 16.76.7a). The most obvious emendation *utsam* (cf. PS 18.79.6, 5.40.8 = ŚS 18.4.36, ĀpŚS 2.21.7) cannot be construed with fem. *pinvamānām* here, and is therefore impossible.

Difficulties are caused by the divergence of the KauśS text from that preserved in the PS transmission. The KauśS reading *apāṃ yonim apādhvam* for *imāṃ yonim upādhvam* seems to be a simple corruption. But where is our PS 19.52.1b through 3a?<sup>63</sup> How has the punctuation of the KauśS arisen, and is its *iṣam ūrjaṃ pinvamānāḥ* somehow a garbled version of the transmitted PS text?

**29.** At KauśS 89.1, we find four gāyatrī stanzas followed by an anuṣṭubh, all quoted in full: *mano nv ā hvāmahe nārāśamsena*<sup>64</sup> *stomena | pitṛṇāṃ ca manmabhiḥ || ā na etu manaḥ punaḥ kratve dakṣāya jīvase | jyok ca sūryaṃ dr̥ṣe || punar naḥ pitaro mano dadātu daivyo*<sup>65</sup> *janaḥ | jivam vrātaṃ sacemahi || vyaṃ soma vrate tava manas tanūṣu bibhrataḥ prajāvantaḥ sacemahi || ye sajātāḥ sumanaso jīvā jīveṣu māmakāḥ | teṣāṃ śrīr mayi kalpatām asmin goṣṭhe śataṃ samā iti |I|. BLOOMFIELD reports<sup>66</sup> that three of his mss. (**K Bü P**) read °*mahi* for °*mahe* in the first pāda, and I find this same °*mahi* in my mss. **M1 M2 M4**. Four of BLOOMFIELD's mss. (**K P Bi Bü**) read *sūryāya* for *sūryaṃ*, and again I find this variant confirmed in my mss.*

The anuṣṭubh stanza is VSM 19.46 etc. The four gāyatrīs are known as ṚV 10.57.3–6 etc., but are also found at PS 19.24.10–13, which I would edit as follows (with **JM Pa Ji4, K**), with four variants upon the ṚV parallel:

63 A visual or recitational skip from *ghṛtam* to *ghṛtam* cannot fully explain the gap.

64 Thus corrected by BLOOMFIELD 1902: 514. The edition has a misprint: *nāra*°.

65 The ed. reads *daivyaḥ* which, before *janaḥ*, is an impossibility: as CALAND already observed (1900b: 98 = 1990: 78), it must be a printing error, and my mss. **M1 M2 (M3 not available, M4 unclear)** indeed read *daivyo*, as expected.

66 Cf. CALAND 1904: 188 = 1990: 149 n. 3.

mano n <sub>u</sub> v āh <sub>u</sub> vāmahi	(8)
nārāśaṃsena stomena	(8)
pitṛṇāṃ ca manmabhiḥ    [10]	(8)
ā na etu manaḥ punaḥ	(8)
kratve dakṣāya jīvase	(8)
jyok ca sūr <sub>i</sub> yāya dr̥ṣe    [11]	(8)
punar naḥ pitaro mano	(8)
dadātu daiv <sub>i</sub> yo janaḥ	(8)
jīvaṃ vrātaṃ sacemahi    [12]	(8)
vayaṃ soma vrata tava	(8)
manas <sup>+</sup> tanūṣu bibhrataḥ	(8)
prajāvantaḥ sacemahi    [13]	(8)

āhvāmahi] **Or**, āhuvāmahe **K** nārāśaṃsena] **JM Ji4 K**, nārāśaṃsena **Pa** ] **Or**, *om.*  
**K** pitṛṇāṃ ca] **JM K**, pitṛṇāṅca **Ji4 Pa** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [note °ḥ ā°] manaḥ punaḥ]  
**Or**, manaḥpunaḥ **K** jyok ca] **K**, jyokta **JM Ji4**, yokta **Pa** sūr<sub>i</sub>yāya] **Or**, sūr<sub>i</sub>yaṃ **K**  
punar naḥ] **Or**, punannaḥ **K** janaḥ ] **Or**, janā [om. ] **K** vrātaṃ] **Or**, vrātaṃ **K**  
vayaṃ] **Or**, vayaṃ **K** manas] **JM Ji4**, ma·(+ ta 1)s **Pa**, nas **K** <sup>+</sup>tanūṣu] tanuṣu **Or**,  
tanoṣi **K** ] **Or**, *om.* **K** [note °ḥ p°] prajāvantaḥ] **Or**, prajāvantaḥ **K**

All parallel texts read *ā huvāmahe* (pres. ind.), as does **K**. However, since the idiosyncratic (a-aor. ind. — or inj.?) reading of the **Or**. mss. is confirmed by six **KauśS** mss., and since it is confirmed also by the pratīkas for these mantras found at *VaitS* 20.9 (*mano nv āhvāmahīti*) and *AVPariś* 43.6.4 (*mano nv āhvāmahīty evam pañcabhir mana upāhvayeta*),<sup>67</sup> and since cases of influence of parallel texts (**R̥V**, **KS**) on the readings of **K** for **PS** are well-known,<sup>68</sup> I propose that the reading °*mahi* rejected by BLOOMFIELD for the **KauśS** ought to have been adopted by him, as I adopt it for the **PS**.<sup>69</sup>

By the same argumentation, I adopt the idiosyncratic **Or**. reading *sūr<sub>i</sub>yāya dr̥ṣe* in 11c, even though it makes for a much less pleasing cadence than the reading (*jyok ... sūr<sub>i</sub>yaṃ dr̥ṣe*) of all the many parallels for this pāda, which occurs also **PS**[**K**] 17.31.7 and 19.7.11 (each time with **K** pointing to *sūr<sub>i</sub>yaṃ*, and *sūr<sub>i</sub>yāya* in the **Or**. mss.).

67 For *VaitS*, cf. VISHVA BANDHU's ed., and CALAND 1904: 188 = 1990: 149 n. 2 (alluding to GARBE 1878: 67). Both CALAND and VISHVA BANDHU separate *ā hvāmahi* (inj.!), as do BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN for *AVPariś*.

68 Cf. i.a. **PS** 2.76.6 [ZEHNDER 1999: 172], 6.1.3a, 6.20.3c, 7.3.10c.

69 Similar variations between Vedic mantra-texts have been collected by BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1930: §121 (cf. also §§229, 230).

30. At KauśS 89.12, we find the following four mantras: *ramadhvaṃ mā bibhītanāsmiṃ goṣṭhe karīṣiṇaḥ | ūrjaṃ duhānāḥ śucayaḥ śucivratā grhā jīvanta upa vaḥ sadema || ūrjaṃ me devā adadhur ūrjaṃ manuṣyā uta | ūrjaṃ pitṛbhya āhārṣam ūrjasvanto grhā mama || payo me devā adaduh payo manuṣyā uta | payaḥ pitṛbhya āhārṣam payasvanto grhā mama || vīryaṃ me devā adaduh vīryaṃ manuṣyā uta | vīryaṃ pitṛbhya āhārṣam vīravanto grhā mameti |12|*.

The first three are PS 18.82.3–5, while the last might — at first sight — be taken as a *kalpajā vikṛti*<sup>70</sup> of the preceding ones. I would edit PS 18.82.3–5 as follows (with **JM V/121 Ji4 Pa<sub>c</sub>**<sup>71</sup>):

ramadhvaṃ mā +bibhīтана-	(8)
+asmiṃ goṣṭhe karīṣiṇaḥ	(8)
ūrjaṃ dadhānāḥ sukṛtaḥ śucivratā	(12)
grhā jīvanta upa vaḥ sadema    [3]	(11)
ūrjaṃ me devā adadhur	(8)
ūrjaṃ manuṣyā uta	(8)
ūrjaṃ +pitṛbhya āhārṣam	(8)
ūrjasvanto grhā mama    [4]	(8)
payo me devā adaduh	(8)
payo manuṣyā uta	(8)
payāḥ pitṛbhya āhārṣam	(8)
payasvanto grhā mama    [5]	(8)

stanzas 4–5 omitted in **V/121** and **Ji4** • +bibhītanāsmiṃ] bibhīтана asmiṃ **JM**, bibhītanā asmiṃ **V/121 Ji4 Pa<sub>c</sub>** karīṣiṇaḥ] **JM V/121 Ji4**, karīṣiṇiḥ **Pa<sub>c</sub>** ūrjaṃ dadhānāḥ] **V/121 Ji4 Pa<sub>c</sub>**, ūrjandadhānā **JM** adadhur ūrjaṃ] adadhurjraṃ **JM**, adaduh rraṃ **Pa<sub>c</sub>** +pitṛbhya āhārṣam] pitṛbhyo hārṣam **JM**, pitṛbhyo āhārṣam **Pa<sub>c</sub>** ūrjasvanto] ūrjaṣvanto **JM**, urjasvanto **Pa<sub>c</sub>** pitṛbhya] **Pa<sub>c</sub>**, pitṛbh{o}a **JM**

The KauśS variants *duhānāḥ* for *dadhānāḥ*, and *adadhur/h* for *adadhus/h* all seem secondary: both the syntagms *ūrjaṃ doh* and *ūrjaṃ dhā* are quite common, but only in the PS version does the finite verb form (*adadhus*) take up the participle (*dadhānāḥ*). It is harder to make a choice between *śucayaḥ* (KauśS) and *sukṛtaḥ* (PS): despite such testimony as R̥V 8.44.21 *agnīḥ śucivratatamaḥ śúcir vípraḥ śúcih kavīḥ | śúcī rocata āhutaḥ ||*, the collocation (without gram-

70 Cf. n. 6 above.

71 **K** is not available for this part of PS 18. Cf. ZEHNDER 1999: 258.

matical agreement) of the words *sukṛte śucivratā*<sup>72</sup> at RV 1.182.1d, and especially 6.70.2b *ghṛtām duhāte sukṛte śucivrate*, would seem to speak in favor of PS *sukṛtaḥ*. But the last quoted pāda, with its form of *doh*, would also speak in favor of KauśS *duhānāḥ*. Taking into account the fact that the PS offers parallels only for the first three of the four mantras quoted by the KauśS, we ought perhaps to consider whether (some of) the noted differences between the PS and the KauśS might not — on second thought — rather be authentic ‘Vedic variants’. This would mean that the KauśS is quoting no Paippalāda mantras here but mantras from a third, lost Śākhā.

**31.** In the next sūtra, KauśS 89.13, we find another set of mantras: *antarupātītya samidho ’bhyādadhāti | ayaṃ no agnir adhyakṣo ’yaṃ no vasuvittamaḥ | asyopasadye mā riṣāmāyaṃ rakṣatu naḥ prajāṃ || asmin sahasraṃ +puṣyāsmāidhamānāḥ sve gr̥he | imaṃ sam indhiṣīmahy āyuṣmantaḥ suvarcasah || tvam agna īdīta ā tvāgna indhīmahīti |13|. BLOOMFIELD’s *puṣyāsmāidhamānāḥ* is an emendation: all his KauśS mss. (as also my **M2 M4**) read without visarga, while only my **M1** reads with visarga.<sup>73</sup>*

The last two pratikas refer to ŚS 18.3.42 and 18.4.88, but the two stanzas quoted *sakalapāthena* are PS 20.61.4–5 [PSK 20.56.7–8], which I would edit (with **JM V/122** [**Pa** unavailable], **K**):

ayaṃ no agnir adhyakṣo	(8)
ayaṃ no vasuvittamaḥ	(8)
asyopasadye mā riṣāma-	(9)
-ayaṃ rakṣatu naḥ prajāṃ    [4]	(8)
asmin sahasraṃ puṣyāsmā-	(8)
-edhamānā s <sub>u</sub> ve gr̥he	(8)
imaṃ sam +indhiṣīmahy	(8)
āyuṣmantaḥ suvarcasah    [5]	(8)

ayaṃ] **V/122**, ayan **JM K**      agnir adhyakṣo] **Or**, agnirddhyakṣo **K**      ayaṃ]  
**V/122**, yaṃ **JM**, ayan **K**      |] **Or**, om. **K** [note °ḥ a°]      asyopasadye] **V/122**,

72 Cf. PIRART 1995: 39 and 367.

73 Cf. CALAND 1899: 212 = 1990: 51: “Weniger konsequent ist die Überlieferung wenn es sich um die Verbindung eines anlautenden Sibilanten mit Nasal oder Halbvokal handelt. So wird z. B. 89, 15 der Visarga vor sy in fünf Handschriften weggelassen, 68, 6 wird er von allen Handschriften ausser Bü E weggelassen; in beiden Fällen nimmt Bloomfield ihn in den Text auf; 67, 11 dagegen, wo alle Handschriften *haviṣyabhakṣā syur* bieten, hätte er um konsequent zu sein auch *-bhakṣāḥ* schreiben sollen”.

asyopasadyo **JM**, asyopasabhya **K** mā riṣāmāyaṃ] **K**, māṣāmāyaṃ **Or** rakṣatu] **Or**, rahatu **K** prajāṃ ||] prajāṃ || **Or**, prajāṃ [om. ] **K** sahasraṃ] **Or**, sahasra **K** puṣyāsmāidhamānā] **Or**, puṣyāsvadhayāmāna **K** sam +indhiṣīmahyāyūṣmantaḥ] sam(ī)iddiṣīmajyāyūṣmantaḥ **JM**, samindiṣīmajyāyūṣmantaḥ **V/122**, samiddhiṣīmahyāyūṣmantas **K** suvarcasah] suvarccasah **Or**, suvardasā **K**

BLOOMFIELD's small emendation can perhaps be undone: at least for the time being, I assume that °s sv° → °sv° was an accepted sandhi in the PS: *apa svalḥ* at 19.1.11b (cf. also 5.39.7 *priyā syāma*, and AiGr. I, p. 342f.). However, it is not applied with any consistency, and one might alternatively suspect the omission of visarga to be a mere artifact of medieval scribal practice.

**32.** At KauśS 90.25–91.1 we find yet another case (cf. n. 28 above) of a mantra's pratīka followed, after some sūtra injunctions, by its sakalapāṭha: *madhu vātā ṛtāyata ity etābhir evābhimantraṇam* |25| *tathā pratimantraṇam* |26| *madhu vātā ṛtāyate madhu kṣaranti sindhavaḥ | mādhvīr gāvo bhavantu naḥ || madhu naktam utoṣaso madhumat pārthivaṃ rajaḥ | mādhvīr naḥ santv oṣadhīḥ || madhumān no vanaspatir madhumāñ astu sūryaḥ | madhu dyaur astu naḥ pitā ||* |1|. The same pratīka is found once again<sup>74</sup> at KauśS 118.1.<sup>75</sup> BLOOMFIELD reports no significant variants, nor do my mss. offer any.

The three mantras are PS 19.45.5–7, which I would edit (with **JM V/122 Pa Ji4, K**):

madhu vātā ṛtāyate	(8)
madhu kṣaranti sindhavaḥ	(8)
mādhvīr gāvo bhavantu naḥ    [5]	(8)
madhu naktam utoṣaso	(8)
madhumat pārthivaṃ rajaḥ	(8)
mādhvīr naḥ sant <sub>v</sub> oṣadhīḥ    [6]	(8)
madhumān no vanaspatir	(8)
madhumāñ astu sūr <sub>y</sub> aḥ	(8)
madhu dyaur astu naḥ pitā    [7]	(8)

<sup>74</sup> With a printing error *vāta* for *vātā* in BLOOMFIELD's edition.

<sup>75</sup> There, these same mantras are referred to with the phrase *etena sūktena*. The usage of such indications in the 13th Adhyāya of the KauśS seems to be unreliable: at 126.9 *etena sūktena*, with preceding pratīka, refers to something which does not form a separate hymn in ŚS (5.17.4) nor in PS (9.15.4). On the “laxity of style” in this Adhyāya, cf. BLOOMFIELD's ‘Introduction’, p. xxiii.

vātā] **JM Pa Ji4 K**, vāta **V/122** ||] **V/122 Pa**, | **JM Ji4**, *om. K* [note °ḥ m°] naktam  
 utoṣaso] **K**, naktā utoṣaso **JM V/122 Pa**, nakta utoṣaso **Ji4** |] **Pa V/122**, || **JM Ji4**, *om.*  
**K** [note °ḥ m°] mādhvīr naḥ] **Or**, mādhvīnnas **K** ||] **V/122 Pa Ji4**, | **JM**, *om. K*  
 [note °ḥ m°] madhumān no] **JM V/122 Pa K**, madhumāno **Ji4** madhumāñ] **K**,  
 madhumāñ **JM**, madhumāṃ **V/122 Pa Ji4** |] **Or**, *om. K* [note °ḥ m°] naḥ] **Or**,  
 naḥ **K**

Instead of *naktam* of **K**, the KauśS, and the many parallel texts (e.g. RV 1.90.7a, KS 39.3:121.9), the Or. mss. point to *naktā*: this can, in the absence of any credibly supportive cases of a stem *naktā-*, hardly be explained as another acc. pl. form (*naktāḥ*) next to the RV hapax 2.2.2 *náktīs*. A dual form *naktā* (AiGr. III, p. 233) would not be pragrhya. I therefore reject the **Or** reading as an error. We may — as Werner Knobl suggests to me — perhaps invoke the sequence °tā r° in the same metrical position in the preceding stanza to account for the problematic reading. That this quotation most likely indeed derives from the Paippalāda tradition is suggested by the unique arrangement (cf. BLOOMFIELD’s n. 15) of the pādas, shared only by KauśS and PS.

33. Another such case (cf. n. 28 above) is then found at KauśS 92.30–31: *āhrte ’nne juhōti yat kāma kāmayamānā ity etayā |30| yat kāma kāmayamānā idam kṛṇmasi te haviḥ | tan naḥ sarvaṃ sam ṛdhyatām athaitasya haviṣo vīhi svāheti |31|*. The mantra is known as ŚS 19.52.5, but the sakalapāṭha shows that it must be taken from elsewhere, viz. from PS 1.30.5, which BHATTACHARYA edits precisely in the way the KauśS and ŚS transmit it.

34. One more such case (cf. n. 28 above) occurs at KauśS 97.7–8, where BLOOMFIELD reads: *apeta etu nirrtir ity anena sūktena juhuyāt |7| apeta etu nirrtir nehāsyā +api kiṃ cana | apāsyāḥ satvanaḥ pāsān mṛtyūn ekaśataṃ nude || ye te pāsā ekaśataṃ mṛtyo martyāya hantave | tāṃs te yajñasya māyayā sarvāñ apa yajāmasi || nir ito yantu nairrtyā mṛtyava ekaśataṃ paraḥ sedhāmaṣāṃ yat tamaḥ prāṇaṃ jyotiś ca dadhmahe || ye te śataṃ varuṇa ye sahasraṃ yajñiyāḥ pāsā vitatā mahāntaḥ | tebhyo asmān varuṇaḥ soma indro viśve muñcantu marutaḥ svarkāḥ || brahma bhrājad udagād antarikṣaṃ divaṃ ca brahmāvadhūṣṭāmṛtena mṛtyum | brahmopadraṣṭā sukṛtasya sāksād brahmāsmad apa hantu śamalaṃ tamaś ca ||8|. api is an emendation for *apa* in all mss. For *nairrtyā* (thus also my **M2 M4**), **K E P Bi** read *nairrtyāṃ*, and **Bü** *nairrtā*, while my **M1** has *nairtyāṃ*. All mss. read *sedhāmeṣāṃ*. °dhūṣṭā°, as I now read in **M1** (*dhūṣvā M2*; *dhuṣvā M4*), was an emendation for °dhūṣṭvā° (**K Ch**); °dhuṣṭvā° (**Ku**); °dhoṣvā° (**Bü**); °dhausṭvā°*

(**Bi**); °*dhuṣṭavā*° (**E**); °*ṣṭā*° (**P**). BLOOMFIELD reports a variant *tapas* only for his **Ch**, but I find it also in my **M2 M4** (**M1** has *tamaś* as edited).<sup>76</sup>

The stanzas we find combined here are the *ṭṛca* PS 19.23.4–6, followed by two more Paippalāda stanzas, 18.82.7 and 16.150.2. The *sūtra*'s wording (*anena sūktena*) would seem to imply that all the stanzas quoted *sakalapāṭhena* together form one hymn. If this were so, we would have here a reference to a lost Śākhā. I assume, however, that the five stanzas were simply grouped under the heading *sūkta* in a loose sense (a kind of 'arthasūkta'). The phrase *etena sūktena* (with a different pronoun) is used in a similar way to refer to an ad hoc collection of stanzas at KauśS 108.1–2 (see nr. 36 below).

I would edit the *ṭṛca* PS 19.23.4–6 as follows (with **JM V/122 Pa Ji4, K**):

apeta etu nirṛtir	(8)
nehāsyā *api kiṃ cana	(8)
apāsyāḥ satvanaḥ pāsān	(8)
mṛtyūn ekaśataṃ nude    [4]	(8)
ye te pāsā ekaśataṃ	(8)
mṛtyo martyāya hantave	(8)
tāṃs te yajñasya māyayā	(8)
sarvāñ apa yajāmasi    [5]	(8)
nir ito yantu nairṛtā	(8)
mṛtyava ekaśataṃ paraḥ	(8)
*sedhām <sub>a</sub> aiśāṃ yat tamaḥ	(8)
prāṇaṃ jyotiś ca dadhmahe    [6]	(8)

stanza 4 omitted in **V/122** • apeta etu] **Or**, apetoti **K** nirṛtir] **Or**, nirṛtinirṛtin **K**  
 nehāsyā \*api] nehāsyāpi **Or K** kiṃ] **JM**, kiñ **Pa Ji4 K** apāsyāḥ] **Or**, apāsyāṃ **K**  
 satvanaḥ] **Or**, satvanaḥ **K** pāsān mṛtyūn] **Pa**, pāsānmṛtyūn **JM**, pāsānmṛtyān **Ji4**,  
 pāsānmṛtyon **K** martyāya] **Or**, martāya **K** hantave] **V/122 Pa Ji4 K**, haṃtave **JM**  
 tāṃs te] **Or**, tāṃsya **K** sarvāñ apa] sarvāna apa **JM**, sarvāñ apa **V/122 Pa**, sarvābhaṃ  
 apa **Ji4**, sarvāṃ apa **K** ito yantu] **Or**, atoyanta **K** mṛtyava ekaśataṃ] **JM V/122**  
**Pa**, mṛtyo eka(+ va)śataṃ **Ji4**, mṛtyavekaśataṃ **K** paraḥ] **Or**, papaḥ [om.] **K** [note  
 °ḥ s°] \*sedhām<sub>a</sub>aiśāṃ] sedhānmeṣāṃ **Or**, sedhammeṣāṃ **K** tamaḥ] **Or**, tamaḥ  
**K** prāṇaṃ jyotiś] **JM V/122 Ji4**, prāṇaṃ yotiś **Pa**, prāṇaṃcotiś **K** dadhmahe] **Or**,  
 dadmahe **K**

<sup>76</sup> Another case of confusion of the words *tamas*- and *tapas*-, in the *kalpaja* mantra at KauśS 49.6, was pointed out by BLOOMFIELD (1902: 514).

The reading *nairrtā* of BLOOMFIELD's ms. **Bü** is confirmed here by the PS sources. The Or. reading *sedhānmeṣāṃ*, with intruding nasal found also in **K** (*sedhammeṣāṃ*), is revealed as corrupt by the almost correct reading of the KauśS mss. *sedhāmeṣāṃ*, that BLOOMFIELD correctly emended to *sedhāmaiṣāṃ*. The KauśS mss. (°ā *apa*) combined with the PS mss. (°ā*pi*) yield correctly °ā \**api*.

The text of PS 18.82.7 is available to me in the three mss. **JM V/121** and **Ji4**,<sup>77</sup> which show no significant *varietas lectionis*. Its reading has been preserved faultlessly in the KauśS.

The text of PS 16.150.2, finally, is available to me in the mss. **JM Ji1 Ji4**,<sup>78</sup> **K**. I edit it as follows:

brahma bhrājad ud agād antarikṣaṃ divaṃ ca <sup>79</sup>	11+3
brahmāvādhūṣṭa <sub>a</sub> mr̥tena <sup>80</sup> mr̥tyum	(11)
brahmopadraṣṭā sukṛtasya sāksād	(11)
brahmāsmad apa <sup>81</sup> hantu śamalaṃ *tamaś ca	( )

brahma] **Or**, vrahma **K**    bhrājad] **JM Ji1 K**, bhrāyad **Ji4**    divaṃ] **K**, divaṅ  
**Or**    brahmāvādhūṣṭamr̥tena] **Or**, vrahmavādhūṣṭā amr̥tenā **K**    brahmopadraṣṭā]  
**Or**, vrahmopadraṣṭā **K**    brahmāsmad] **Or**, brahmāsmid **K**    \*tamaś] tapas **Or K**

All PS mss. have *tapas* at the end of 16.150.2. This reading turns out also to be found in three KauśS mss., but *tamaś* — as most KauśS mss. read — is obviously the authentic reading, which the editor of the PS may adopt in this text.

**35.** Yet another example (cf. n. 28 above) of a mantra's pratīka followed by its sakalapāṭha is found at KauśS 107.1–2: *atha yatraitat sṛjantyor vā kṛtanyor vā nānā tantū saṃsrjato manāyai tantuṃ prathamam ity etena sūktena juhuyāt*

<sup>77</sup> **K** is not available for this part of PS 18. Cf. ZEHNDER 1999: 258.

<sup>78</sup> **Ku3** is not available for this mantra. Cf. GRIFFITHS 2003a: 356.

<sup>79</sup> Contrast BLOOMFIELD's n. 9, p. 253, where the words *divaṃ ca* are taken with pāda **b**, and it is observed that they disturb the meter. The metrical analysis adopted here, with *divaṃ ca* interpreted as meaning extension of *antarikṣam*, was suggested to me by Werner Knobl. As he writes: "The stylistic advantage of this new division between **a** and **b** is that all four pādas now start with *brahma*".

<sup>80</sup> On the form *adhūṣṭa*, cf. NARTEN 1964: 154.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. BLOOMFIELD's n. 12, p. 253: "by cancelling the syllable *smad* and reading *brahmāpa* good triṣṭubh metre may be constructed".

|1| *manāyai tantuṃ prathamam paśyed anyā atanvata | tan nārīḥ pra bravīmi vaḥ sādhvīr vaḥ santūrvarīḥ || sādhuṣ vas tantur bhavatu sādhuṣ etu*<sup>82</sup> *ratho +vṛtaḥ | atho horvarīr yūyaṃ prātar vodheva*<sup>83</sup> *dhāvata || khargalā iva patvarīr apām ugram ivāyanam | patantu patvarīr ivorvarīḥ sādhunā pathā || apācyau te +totudyete todenāsvatarāv iva | pra stomam urvarīṇām śaśayānām astāviṣam || nārī pañcamayūkham sūtravat +kr̥ṇute vasu | ariṣṭo asya vastā prendra vāsa utodira ||2|. In BLOOMFIELD's text, *etu ratho* is adopted in place of *oturatho* of his mss. **K P Bü** and my **M1**; *vṛtaḥ* is an emendation for *vṛtā* (**Ch E Ku**, my **M1**), *vṛtāḥ* (**K Bü P Bi**, my **M2 M4**); *totudyete* for *tonudyote* (except for **E taunudyotai**, all mss. including mine); *pañcamayūkham* is found only in **Bü**, all other mss. *pañcamayūṣam* or *pañcamayūṣam*; *kr̥ṇute* is an emendation for *°tam* of all mss.*

The hymn quoted here is PS 2.87. Since a complete evaluation of the corrections which the readings of the KauśS mss. allow the editor of the PS to make has already been provided by ZEHNDER (1999: 189ff.), I can dispense with it here, and note only — *vice versa* — the corrections which we are now in the position to make in the KauśS text. The KauśS and PS traditions share the error *manāyai*, which can be restored for the PS (and hence, for KauśS) to *manāyyai* on the basis of Patañjali's citation *manāyyai tantuḥ*, presumably from PS, under the vārttika ad Pāṇini 2.3.62 (ed. KIELHORN vol. I p. 466, l. 15). The PS tradition has correctly preserved *paśced*, corrupted in the KauśS mss. ZEHNDER's reconstruction *otur atho* is confirmed by several KauśS mss., and ought to be adopted there as well. The Or. mss. agree with a number of KauśS mss. in the correct reading *vṛtā*: BLOOMFIELD's emendation can be undone. BLOOMFIELD's emendation *totudyete*, following PW, is confirmed by the Or. mss., as is his choice for the reading *pañcamayūkham*. His emendation of *kr̥ṇutam* to *kr̥ṇute* must be undone. The PS reading *utau tira* must be adopted for corrupt *utodira*.

**36.** At KauśS 108.1–2, the phrase *etena sūktena* is used to refer to an ad hoc grouping ('*arthasūkta*') of stanzas, in the same way that *anena sūktena* was seen used under nr. 34 above: the '*sūkta*' consists of mantras similar to VSM 5.3 (etc.) and to ṚV 1.12.6 (etc.), of ṚV 8.43.14, and of two mantras from PS, which read in BLOOMFIELD's edition: *pāhi no agna ekayā pāhi na uta*

82 Cf. BLOOMFIELD's n. 13.

83 BLOOMFIELD's text reads *vodhave*. Cf. ZEHNDER (1999: 191): "Da BLOOMFIELD weder die Abweichung zu WEBERS Edition [1858] noch Ms.-Varianten erwähnt, dürfte es sich bei *vodhave* um einen Druckfehler handeln". This observation is confirmed by my KauśS mss. which all read *vodheva*.

*dviṭṭyayā | pāhi gīrbhis tisṛbhir ūrjāṃ pate pāhi catasṛbhir vaso || samīcī māhanī pātām āyuṣmatyā ṛco mā satsi | tanūpāt sāmno vasuvidaṃ lokam anusaṃcarāṇi ||*. The reading *satsi* is found in BLOOMFIELD'S **P Bi Ch<sup>pm</sup>** and in my **M1 M4**, but the following variant readings are known: *śit* (**E**); *syatsi* ? (**Bü**); *sitsi* (**Ch<sup>sm</sup>** and my **M2**); *chitsi* (**Ku**). Only **K P Bi** (and my **M1**) read *tanūpāt sāmno*, while **Bü** reads *tanūpāḥsāmno* and all remaining mss. *tanūpāh sāmno*. All mss. (including my **M1 M2 M4**) read *anusaṃcarāṇi*, except **Bü** which is reported to read *anucarāṇi*.

The mantras are PS 20.52.4–5 [PSK 20.48.4–5]. The first of these two is transmitted in the same way in the Or. mss., with only insignificant variants in **K**. PS 20.52.5 [PSK 20.48.5] I would perhaps edit as follows (with **JM V/122, K**):

samīcī +māhanī pātām	(8)
āyuṣmatyā ṛco mā chitsi	(8)
*tanūpāt sāmno <sup>84</sup>	( )
*vasuvidaṃ lokam anu carāṇi	(11)

+māhanī] nāhanī <b>Or</b> , maghāyanī <b>K</b>	pātām] <b>JM K</b> , māpātām <b>V/122</b>	chitsi] chichi
<b>Or</b> , śchitsi <b>K</b>	*tanūpāt sāmno] tanūpāhsāmno <b>Or</b> , tanūpasmāgnau <b>K</b>	*vasuvidaṃ]
vasuvṛtaṃ <b>Or</b> , vasujitaṃ <b>K</b>	carāṇi] <b>Or</b> , carāmi <b>K</b>	

The Or. mss. read *nāhanī*, but the correct reading has surely been preserved in the KauśS *māhanī*, whose *m* is confirmed by the reading of **K**. In the last pāda,<sup>85</sup> all of BLOOMFIELD'S mss. read *anusaṃcarāṇi*, except for the idiosyncratic ms. **Bü**,<sup>86</sup> which agrees precisely with the preserved Or. reading (**K** *carāmi* is thus an error).

We may compare JB 1.167 *āyuṣmatyā ṛco mā chaitsi, mā sāmno bhāgadheyād viyoṣam iti*. NARTEN (1964: 116) already pointed out that the expected form is *chitsi*, as indeed preserved in PS. Although BLOOMFIELD'S ms. **Ku** has this precise reading, he adopted the predominant but corrupt reading *satsi*. The JB passage (*sāmno bhāgadheyād*), together with the parallels

84 As Werner Knobl suggests to me, the pāda is to be regularized by supplying *mā chitsi* from the preceding pāda. The omission of these words also in the KauśS quotation suggests that this is not a conscious abbreviation on the part of the written PS transmission (cf. GRIFFITHS 2003: 343 for such modes of abbreviation), but belongs to an older phase of composition/redaction. Contrast the case of abbreviation with *ity ekā* under nr. 16 above.

85 Cf. PS 20.46.5 [PSK 20.44.1 with lacuna] *yaśasvī janutām anu carāṇi svāhā*.

86 Cf. n. 15 above.

TS 3.2.7.1 (*tanūpāt sāmnaḥ*), ĀśvŚS 5.2.14 etc., shows that we must have an ablative at the beginning of pāda **c**: although one may play with the possibility of retaining the Or. reading *tanūpās* on the analogy of ṚV *jās-pāti-* (itself a problematic case: AiGr. III, p. 129), or might even take the short *a* of **K** seriously (cf. Avestan *fšū-šō* = OIA \**paśu-ṣaḥ*: AiGr. III, p. 127), this seems much too far-fetched to me. I would rather simply read *tanūpāt*, preserved in a few of the KauśS mss., as did BLOOMFIELD. The striking agreement between the other KauśS mss. and the Paippalāda tradition (both showing the same erroneous reading with *h*) must be duly noted.

Finally, there are the irreconcilable readings *vasuvṛtaṃ* (**Or**) and *vasujitaṃ* (**K**), against the unanimous KauśS reading *vasuvidaṃ*. Since the compound *vasuvṛt(a)-* does not appear to exist, and since *vasuvid-* is quite common (in PS e.g. at 1.34.2a, 4.31.6c, 20.60.7b etc.), while *vasujit-* occurs only at PS 9.27.10a (cf. ŚS 5.20.10.a), 18.54.1c–4c (cf. ŚS 13.1.37a) and may easily have been perseverated from there to this place 20.54.5,<sup>87</sup> I adopt here the KauśS reading, as I did in the preceding pāda.

**37.** At KauśS 115.2 we find a quotation of an entire hymn: *payo deveṣu paya oṣadhīṣu paya āśāsu payo 'ntarikṣe | tan me dhātā ca savitā ca dhattāṃ viśve tad devā abhi saṃ gr̥ṇantu || payo yad apsu paya usriyāsu paya +utseṣūta parvateṣu | tan me dhātā ca savitā ca dhattāṃ viśve tad devā abhi saṃ gr̥ṇantu || yan mṛgeṣu paya āviṣṭam asti yad ejati patati yat patatriṣu<sup>88</sup> | tan me dhātā ca savitā ca dhattāṃ viśve tad devā abhi saṃ gr̥ṇantu || yāni payāmsi divy ārpitāni yāny antarikṣe bahudhā bahūni | teṣāṃ īśānaṃ vaśīnti no adya pra dattā dyāvāpṛthivī ahr̥ṇīyamānā ity etena sūktena juhuyāt |2|.*

The hymn is PS 1.91. In BHATTACHARYA's edition, the refrain in stanzas 1–3 has a hypometric version of pāda **c**: *tan me dhātā savitā ca dhattāṃ*.<sup>89</sup> All KauśS mss. (including my **M1 M2 M4**) have each time twice *ca*, which can either be regarded as a secondary regularization of the meter, or as a preservation of the original (metrically impeccable) text. The PS offers the better readings *īśāne* in 4c, where all KauśS (including my **M1 M2 M4**) read *īśānaṃ*, except **E** *īśāno*, and *dattāṃ* in 4d, where the KauśS mss. have *mattā* (**P M1**), *datā* (**Ku**), and all other mss. (incl. my **M2 M4**) *dattā*. The omission of the anusvāra in this last case and the misreading of *-e* as *-aṃ* in the former case must be relatively old errors, but they have been made independently in the KauśS transmission.

<sup>87</sup> I find no combinations of either word with *loka-*.

<sup>88</sup> Thus corrected by BLOOMFIELD 1902: 514. The edition contains a misprint: *patatatriṣu*.

<sup>89</sup> This reading is found also in my **Ku1**.

BHATTACHARYA reads *\*uktheṣūta* in 2b. He reports the readings *ukteṣupaya ut* (**K**) and *uktheṣuta* (**Or**), and adds a long note mentioning i.a. the possibility that *°kthe°* in his Or. mss. can also be read as, or can be a graphical error for *che*. This suggestion is confirmed by my ms. **Ku1** that in fact reads *ucheṣuta*. Since *ts* → *ch* is a very common error in the Or. transmission, we can safely emend *utseṣu*. The KauśS mss. are reported by BLOOMFIELD to read *uttheṣūta* (**Bi**), *uttheṣuta* (**P Ch<sup>sm</sup>**), *uttheṣuta* (**K**), *ucheṣuca* (**E Ch<sup>pm</sup>**), *uttheṣūca* (**Ku**). I can now add: *utheṣūta* (**M1**), *utcheṣūta* (**M2**), *ucheṣūta* (**M4**). Despite this bewildering variety of readings, it appears to me that the KauśS mss. can also safely be assumed to support BLOOMFIELD’s emendation *utseṣūta*.<sup>90</sup>

WITZEL 1985: 267 discussed this case, and summarized: “Bei der Interpretation von dergleichen Belegen kann man annehmen, eine bereits korrupte Hs (z.B. die Vorlage von D<sup>91</sup>) habe Kauś.S beeinflußt — falls die Redaktoren (im Mittelalter) von KauśS diese Stellen verglichen haben. Andererseits kann man annehmen, daß es sich um Mantras handelt, die ursprünglich aus PS stammen (aus \*G also), sich dann aber in genau derselben Weise entwickelt haben wie die Vorlage von K, D ...”.<sup>92</sup> It seems to me, however, that nothing speaks against the assumption of an independent origin for the error *tse* → *che* in both KauśS and Or. transmissions. Whether the error in **K**, through the similarity of the akṣaras *kte* and *tthe*, must be taken to stand in any relationship with the predominant reading of the KauśS mss.,<sup>93</sup> or is simply an independent misspelling for underlying *tse* (or *che*) cannot be ascertained.

**38.** At KauśS 116.7, BLOOMFIELD edits: *ut tiṣṭhata nir dravata na va ihāstv ity añcanam | indro vaḥ sarvāsāṃ sākam garbhān āṇḍāni bhetsyati |*, adding a note that pāda **b** is probably “to be restored as follows: *na va ihāstu nyañcanam*”. The reading *āṇḍāni* was found only in his **Bü**, all other mss. (as also my **M1 M2 M4**) reading *āṃḡāni* except **K** *āṃjāni*.

The mantra is PS 17.13.3. Its first two pādas are, however, also found at

90 WITZEL 1985: 267 already pointed to the comparable (reverse) error *bhetsyati* → *bhe(r)chati* found in some mss. at KauśS 116.7: see 38 below. Cf. also BLOOMFIELD’s ‘Introduction’, p. lxi, where other cases of *ts* :: *ch* in the KauśS mss. are listed.

91 The hyparchetype preceding the Kashmir transmission of PS postulated by WITZEL.

92 \*G is the archetype for all PS mss. postulated by WITZEL: the assumption that in his second scenario the mantras must have been taken from \*G seems ill-considered. Why could they not “stem from PS”, having been quoted from that text before the existence of any mss.? One could also speculate about various other scenarios.

93 Cf. the example of such a relationship in nr. 38.

PS 20.29.3ab [PSK 20.28.3ab], which I edit (with **JM V/122 Pa, K**):

ut tiṣṭhata nir dravata (8)  
na va ihāsti nyañcanam | (8)

nir] **K**, ni **Or** na va ihāsti] **V/122 Pa**, na vā ihāsti **JM**, na va hyāstvi **K**

Its middle pādas **bc** are found also in PS 9.6.3 *indrāmitrā indrahatā na va ihāsti nyañcanam | indro vaḥ sarvāsām sākam śakras tṛṇedhu vṛtrahā ||*, where **K** reads *hyāsti*. I edit the quoted stanza PS 17.13.3 as follows (with **JM Ji4 V/122, K**):

ut tiṣṭhata \*nir dravata (8)  
na va ihāsti nyañcanam | (8)  
indro vaḥ sarvāsām sākam (8)  
garbhān āṇḍāni bhetsyati || (8)

**V/122** only very vaguely legible for pādas **ab** • \*nir] ni **Or K** va ihāsti nyañcanam] vai hāsti nyañcanam **Or**, va hyāstvinviDañcanam **K** [Bar. °pañca°] bhetsyati] **JM V/122**, bhetsati **Ji4**, bhaśchasi **K**

The **K** reading at 20.29.3a, as well as the KauśS mss., supports the adopted emendation \**nir* for — at this place — uniformly transmitted *ni*. The compound *ni-drav* does not exist in PS: at 15.23.8c, where BHATTACHARYA reads *parācy anu ni drava* we must emend to *nir*, in the light of the corrupt but revealing reading *anundrava* in **K** (°rC° :: °nC° in Śāradā). Anyhow *nir-drav* is obviously best here: cf. also e.g. 2.55.5a, 16.75.3d–8d.

The text of pāda **b**, as BLOOMFIELD saw, is hopelessly corrupt in the KauśS mss., which show the readings *ihāstvityañcanam* (as adopted by BLOOMFIELD, thus also my mss.), *ddhāstityaṃcanam* (**Bi**) and *ihāstvityaṃdhanam* (**Ku**). Besides the simple error *nya* → *tya*, all KauśS mss. share the surprising insertion of a *v*, to give the same sequence °*āstvi*°<sup>94</sup> that is found also (two out of three times) in **K**. This interesting case of correspondence between the Kashmir and KauśS transmissions was already pointed out by WITZEL in 1985 (p. 266f.). It seems to imply some kind of contact between the KauśS sources and predecessors of our **K**.

94 That **Bi** reads °*āsti*° may rather be an omission of the *v*, than a retention of the correct reading.

39. At KauśS 127.5–7 BLOOMFIELD reads: *vāyav ā rundhi no mṛgān asmabhyaṃ +mṛgayadbhyaḥ | sa no nediṣṭham ā kṛdhi vāto hi raśanākṛta iti vāyavyasya |5| āśānām iti diśyasya |6| prati tyam cārum adhvaram gopīthāya pra hūyase | marudbhir agna ā gahīti mārutasya |7|*. All his (and my) mss. read *rumdhi*, and *mṛgayudbhyaḥ* respectively.

There are two sakalapāṭha mantras, interspersed with one pratīka for ŚS 1.31.1. The last mantra (*prati tyam . . .*) is known as PS 6.17.1, but could also have been taken from the RV (1.19.1). The first quoted stanza is PS 20.51.4 [PSK 20.47.4], which I would edit identically: while **K** reads *mṛgayadbhyaḥ*, as expected, it is a striking fact that the Or. mss. agree with the KauśS transmission in reading *mṛgayudbhyaḥ*. Admittedly, the verb is normally middle (*mṛgayate*), but the more far-fetched alternative of emending *mṛgayubhyaḥ* is not favored by the meter. May we assume some kind of contact between the Or. and the KauśS transmissions?

The imper. form *rundhi* (*rṃhi V/122 Pa*, *raṃhi JM*, *rundha K*) seems to be limited to the AV, as it occurs elsewhere only at ŚS 19.29.3 (4×).<sup>95</sup> Cf. also *ā rundhām* imper. 3rd sg. at ŚS 3.20.10c = PS 3.34.11c.

40. The text of BLOOMFIELD’s edition for KauśS 128.3–4 offers another example (cf. n. 28 above) of a mantra’s pratīka followed by its sakalapāṭha: *soma rājā savitā ca rājety etena sūktena juhuyāt |3| soma rājā savitā ca rājā bhuvo rājā bhuvanam ca rājā | śarvo rājā śarma ca rājā ta u naḥ śarma yachantu devāḥ || ādityair no bṛhaspatir bhagaḥ somena naḥ saha | viśve devā urv antarikṣam ta u naḥ śarma yachantu devāḥ || utāvidvān niṣkṛdayāthosraghnī yathāyatham | mā no viśve devā maruto hetim ichata ||4|*.

This ṛca is PS 19.33.1–3. I would edit the first two stanzas precisely in the way the KauśS transmits them. This means that I reject the uniform Or. and **K** reading *bhago* in 19.33.1b. Since pādas **a** and **c** are clearly playing on etymology or at least alliteration, *bhuvo* (cf. VSM 13.54) is much to be preferred: the reading of the PS sources may be explained as perseveration from the sequence *bhago rājā* at PS 1.50.3b, 18.6.7d. Regarding his readings for the first half of the last stanza, BLOOMFIELD admits: “I am unable to restore this very corrupt line: the text above represents merely the best supported readings of the MSS. taken collectively”. For *ichata* in **d**, some of his mss. have *archata*. My edition of this stanza (with **JM Pa Ji4, K**) is as follows:

95 The corresponding text of PS 12.22.3 reads *bhāndhi*: since the mantras of ŚS 19 normally derive from PS, we may suspect a corruption here.

utāviddhām niṣ khidata-	(8)
-atho śrathnīth <sub>a</sub> āyatām	(8)
mā no viśve devā	( )
maruto hetim asthata	(8)

utāviddhām] utovidvā **JM**, utā(→ śe 1)vidvā **Pa**, utāvidvān **Ji4**, utāriddhām **K** niṣ khidatātho] **Or**, niṣpidatām<sub>a</sub>tho **K** [note °sp°, not °hp°<sup>96</sup>] śrathnīthāyatām] śrathnīthāyatām **Pa**, śrathnīthāthāyatām **JM**, śrathnāthāyatām **Ji4**, sratnīyathāyathām **K** maruto] **K**, marṭo **Or** asthata] **Pa Ji4**, asthita **JM**, asyatām **K**

Perhaps by chance, the Or. mss. share with the KauśS transmission the corrupt reading *utāvidvān*, while **K** has nearly preserved the correct text there. The same error *ddh* → *dv* occurs in the Or. mss. also at PS 4.14.5ab, where BHATTACHARYA's *prahitāvasṛṣṭā*<sup>+</sup> | *vidvān śṛṅgam puruṣe jahātha* is to be read <sup>+</sup>*prahitāvasṛṣṭāviddhā śṛṅgam puruṣe jahātha* | (with differently placed punctuation, following **K**).

The corrupt readings of the KauśS had concealed the fact that this stanza contains two interesting previously unattested 2nd pl. imper. forms: one from the rare verb *niṣ-khed* 'to regurgitate' (PS 9.17.6, TS 6.1.9.1, KS 8.5:89.11, cf. MS 1.6.4:93.10) or 'to excise' (PS 20.39.7 *yām [iṣum] asyati ... tām asya niṣ khidāmasi*), and the other from the secondary thematic aor. stem *astha-* from *as* 'to shoot, to throw' (cf. HOFFMANN 1967: 59f., 1976: 566 n. 19 on PS 2.58.4; cf. also PS 5.8.3). **K** agrees with the KauśS mss. in inserting the syllable *ya* into its reading for the verb-form *śrathnī[ya]tha*: apparently pāda **b** was understood to end in *yathāyatham* or *yathāyathām*. May we again assume some contact between a predecessor of **K** and the KauśS transmission?

**41.** Yet another case of a pratīka followed, after another pratīka, by a quotation in full (cf. n. 28 above) is found at KauśS 133.2–3: *mamobhā mitrāvaruṇā mahyam āpo madhumad erayantām ity etābhyām sūktābhyām juhuyāt* |2| *mamobhā mitrāvaruṇā mamobhendrābr̥haspatī | mama tvaṣṭā ca pūṣā ca mamaiva savitā vaśe || mama viṣṇuś ca somaś ca mamaiva maruto bhavan | sarasvāmś ca bhagaś ca viśve devā vaśe mama || mamobhā dyāvāpṛthivī antarikṣam svar mama | mamemāḥ sarvā oṣadhīr āpaḥ sarvā vaśe mama || mama gāvo mamāśvā mamājās cāvayaś ca mamaiva puruṣā bhavan | mamedam sarvam ātmanvad ejaṭ prānad vaśe mameṭi* |3|.

While the second pratīka (*mahyam āpo madhumad erayantām*) refers to

<sup>96</sup> *kh* is similar to *p* in Śāradā.

ŚS 6.61, the first hymn referred to *pratīkena*, then *sakalapāthena* is PS 1.40. BHATTACHARYA edits this hymn in the same form, with the following exceptions: in 3a he reads *mamobhe dyāvā*<sup>o</sup> with the feminine dual form expected on the basis of ṚV 1.35.9b and 9.81.5a. Since all my three mss. also have this reading, and since BLOOMFIELD reports no variant readings,<sup>97</sup> *mamobhā* must be a printing error. All KauśS mss. (including mine) consistently point to the problematic form *bhavan*, while the Or. mss. offer the aor. subj. *bhuvan*.<sup>98</sup> **K** reads *bhuvam*, then *bhavam*, which latter reading probably stands in no relationship to *bhavan* in the KauśS mss. However, the next case I would be inclined, perhaps, to judge differently: BLOOMFIELD reports for just one ms. (**Ku**) the reading *puruṣo*, but I find this same reading also in my three mss. (**M1 M2 M4**). The same reading is found in all Or. mss. for the PS, while **K** has the correct reading *puruṣā*: it seems likely that there is some connection between the Or. reading, and that of (some of) the KauśS mss.<sup>99</sup>

### Conclusions

The brahmins who have transmitted to us ŚS and KauśS have, for all we know, always resided in western India. The manuscripts on which the editions of both these texts are based in any case all hail directly or indirectly from Gujarat and Maharashtra, the area where brahmins of the Śaunaka school have been living for many centuries. The only other Atharvavedic school that has survived to the present, with a Saṃhitā and ancillary texts of its own, is that of the Paippalādins. They had their homes, in recent centuries, in Kashmir and Orissa, and the manuscripts of their Saṃhitā are written in the Śāradā and Oriya scripts respectively. Besides the evidence for Paippalāda presence in Orissa, there is also evidence — mostly epigraphical — for their presence in medieval Bengal.<sup>100</sup> Earlier still, there are mid-first millennium CE inscriptions that attest

97 The third stanza is curiously omitted in WEBER's editio princeps (1858: 403), as noted by BLOOMFIELD.

98 My ms. **Ku1** in fact reads twice *bhavan*, but this must to be an independent error, because my **V/123 Ek1 Ek2** all have twice *bhuvan*: the latter two mss. both hail from central Orissa, as does **Ku1**.

99 The only obvious source of (reverse) perseveration is PS 5.12.1d+2b *puruṣo bhavan/bhava*: the assumption of a connection between the Or. and KauśS errors rests on the fact that no similar source is available within the KauśS, and that the reading *puruṣo* has thus possibly been introduced under the influence of some (pre-Orissa) branch of the PS transmission.

100 Cf. WITZEL 1985: 264–267.

to Paippalāda presence in western India.<sup>101</sup> WITZEL (1985) has worked out a hypothesis for the transmissional history of the PS; although some of the specific evidence adduced by him 20 years ago has not stood the test of time, I still believe his hypothesis is largely acceptable: the Archetype manuscript (\*G) of the PS seems to have been written in Gujarat, in precisely the region where Śaunaka brahmins have resided all through the historical period.

Study of the KauśS quotations from the PS is rewarding both for the constitution of the text of the mantras themselves and for the constitution of the text of the sūtra. However, the likelihood that the PS and KauśS traditions both hail from early medieval Gujarat gives the mantra-quotations in the sūtra an additional historical interest. It has become clear that the relationships between the two branches of Paippalāda tradition, and the testimonia in the KauśS, and even with the text of ŚS as ‘Sāyaṇa’ knew it, are extraordinarily complex. There are cases where the KauśS mss. agree with **Or** against **K**, or with **K** against **Or** — besides those cases (listed in n. 13 above) where they have preserved correct readings against errors in both **K** and **Or**, or those where they have gone wrong, and the PS mss. preserve the authentic text, or again those where they share with both **K** and **Or** a corrupt reading.

I can only explain these phenomena by invoking the mentioned geographical contiguity, long ago, between KauśS and PS transmissions. Beside WITZEL’s emphasis (1985) on the written tradition, and on archetypes, subarchetypes (and descendant mss.) that may have exerted a contaminatory influence on the written transmission of the KauśS at various stages of its development, I am convinced that one must also assume continuing influences of oral PS transmission in or near the circles of Śaunaka brahmins transmitting the KauśS to account for these complex relationships.

I conclude this paper with a list showing per book the places in the PS where the mantras surveyed above originate, and under which nr. they have been discussed:

1. 1.30.5 (33), 1.34 + 1.35 (26), 1.40 (41), 1.41 (24), 1.51.3 (5),  
1.65.3–4 (10), 1.78.4 (27), 1.91 (37)
2. 2.87 (35)
3. 3.38.6–7 (23)
4. 4.5.1–2 (11)
5. 5.15.2 (25), 5.16.3 (3), 5.31.1–3 (19)

---

101 Cf. BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003: 320f.

6. 6.17.1 (39?)  
 7. 7.6.10 (13)  
 8. 8.18.6 (9)  
 9–10. no quotations  
 11. 11.13.3 (1)  
 12. 12.19.9 (8)  
 13–15. no quotations  
 16. 16.70.1–5 (21?), 16.150.2 (34)  
 17. 17.13.3 (38)  
 18. 18.82.3–5 (30?), 18.82.7 (34)  
 19. 19.23.4–6 (34), 19.24.10–13 (29), 19.33.1–3 (40), 19.35.1 (25),  
 19.42.4–6 (16), 19.45.5–7 (32), 19.47.6 (6), 19.51.1–4 (12),  
 19.52.1–3 (28), 19.52.6 (4)  
 20. 20.9.4 (15), 20.23.2 (13), 20.35.2 (7), 20.45.7 (2?), 20.50.5–8  
 (14), 20.51.4 (39), 20.52.4–5 (36), 20.52.9 (17), 20.54.6–8 (18),  
 20.55.4+6 (22?), 20.57.14–15 (20), 20.61.4–5 (31)

Even when taking into account the differences in size of the 20 books, the predominance of books 1 and 19–20 is striking. This cannot at the moment be satisfactorily explained, but seems to be related to the chronological layering of the Saṃhitā, where at least the latter parts of books 19–20 are certainly later additions, with elaborate collections of Ṛg̥hya mantras.<sup>102</sup>

### Bibliography

AUFRECHT, Theodor

- 1901 *Katalog der Sanskrit-Handschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Leipzig*. Leipzig.  
 1909 *Die Sanskrit-Handschriften der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in München*. München.

BAHULKAR, Shrikant Shankar

- 1984 “The Nakṣatralalpa and the Śāntikalpa.” In: PAIOC 31st Session Jaipur 1982 (Poona: BORI), 179–184.  
 1990 “Kauśikasūtra.” In: T.N. DHARMADHIKARI, R.S. SHASTRI, N.P. JAIN, S.S. BAHULKAR (eds.), *Vedic Texts: A Revision. Professor C.G. Kashikar Felicitation Volume* (Delhi), 115–134.

102 Cf. KAJIHARA 2002, §§5.2.7 and 5.3.9, as well as nn. 23 and 26 in her contribution to the present volume.

- 2002 “Kauśika-Sūtra and the Śākhās of the Atharvaveda.” In: G.U. THITE (ed.), *Subhāṣiṇī. Dr. Saroja Bhate Felicitation Volume* (Pune), 1–11.
- BHATTACHARYA, Dipak
- 1989 “Was Kashmir the Home of the Atharvaveda Paippalāda?” In: PAIOC 33rd Session Calcutta 1986 (Poona: BORI), 133–139.
- 1991 “The Identity of the Atharvavedic Tradition of Kashmir.” In: Debabrata SEN SHARMA and Manabendu BANERJEE (eds.), *Prajñājyoti. Prof. Dr. Gopikamohan Bhattacharya Commemoration Volume* (Kuruksheṭra: Nirmal Book Agency), 1–7.
- 1997 *The Paippalāda-Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda*. Volume One, Consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas. Calcutta.
- n.d.-1 “Corrections and Additions.” Loose sheet, distributed by the Asiatic Society (Calcutta), pp. i–iv.
- n.d.-2 “Further additions etc. to AVP I.” Loose sheet, privately circulated, 1 page.
- BISSCHOP, Peter & Arlo GRIFFITHS
- 2003 “The Pāśupata Observance (*Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* 40).” *IJJ* 46, 315–348.
- BLOOMFIELD, Maurice
- 1890 *The Kauçika-Sūtra of the Atharva Veda*. With Extracts from the Commentaries of Dārila and Keçava. New Haven [= *JAOS* 14 (1889)].
- 1899 *The Atharva-Veda and the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa*. Strassburg.
- 1902 Review of Caland, *Altindisches Zauberritual* (1900). *GGA* 1902 No. 7, 489–514.
- 1906 “Corrections and Conjectural Emendations of Vedic Texts.” *AJPh* 27, 401–417.
- BLOOMFIELD, Maurice & Franklin EDGERTON
- 1930 *Vedic Variants*. Volume I: The Verb. Philadelphia.
- BOLLING, George Melville & Julius VON NEGELEIN
- 1909–1910 *The Pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda*. Volume 1: Text and Critical Apparatus, in 3 Parts. Leipzig.
- BÜHLER, Georg
- 1891 Review of Bloomfield, *The Kauçika-Sūtra of the Atharvaveda* (1890). *WZKM* 5, 244–247.
- CALAND, Willem
- 1894 “Zum Kauçikasūtra.” *WZKM* 8, 367–370 [= 1990: 3–6].
- 1899 “Zur Exegese und Kritik der rituellen Sūtras, XVIII–XXVII, XXVIII–XXXII.” *ZDMG* 53, 205–230, 696–702 [= 1990: 44–69, 70–76].
- 1900a *Altindisches Zauberritual. Probe einer Uebersetzung der wichtigsten Theile des Kauçika Sūtra*. Amsterdam.

- 1900b “Zur Exegese und Kritik der rituellen Sūtras, XXXIII.” *ZDMG* 54, 97–99 [= 1990: 77–79].
- 1904 “Zur Atharvavedalitteratur.” *WZKM* 18, 185–207 [= 1990: 146–168].
- 1990 *Kleine Schriften*. Herausgegeben von Michael WITZEL. Wiesbaden.
- DELBRÜCK, Berthold  
1888 *Altindische Syntax*. Halle/Saale.
- FORSSMAN, Bernhard  
1968 “Vedisch viśvápsnya-.” *MSS* 24, 35–38.
- FUSHIMI, Makoto  
1998 “Brāhmaṇa passages in Āpastamba-Śrautasūtra.” *EJVS* 4-1 (<<http://www1.shore.net/~india/ejvs/ejvs0401/ejvs0401article.pdf>>).
- GARBE, Richard  
1878 *Vaitāna Sūtra. The Ritual of the Atharvaveda*. London.
- GONDA, Jan  
1977 “The Mantras of Kauśika-Sūtra 10–52.” *Studia Orientalia* 47, 71–87 [= *Selected Studies* VI/1 (Leiden 1991), 360–376].
- GRIFFITHS, Arlo  
2002 “Aspects of the Study of the Paippalāda AtharvaVedic Tradition.” In: Abhijit GHOSH (ed.), *Ātharvaṇā (a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition)* (Kolkata), 35–54.
- 2003a “The Orissa Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā.” *ZDMG* 153, 333–370.
- 2003b “The Textual Divisions of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā.” *WZKS* 47, 5–35.
- GRIFFITHS, Arlo & Alexander LUBOTSKY  
2000–01 “Paippalāda Saṃhitā 4.15. To heal an open fracture: with a plant.” *Die Sprache* 42/1–2 [appeared 2003], 196–210.
- HENRY, Victor  
1901 Review of Caland, *Altindisches Zauberritual* (1900). *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature* 1901 (no. 11), 201–204.
- HOFFMANN, Karl  
1967 *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Eine synchronische Funktionsuntersuchung. Heidelberg.
- 1976 *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. Band 2. Herausgegeben von Johanna Narten. Wiesbaden.
- KAJIHARA, Mieko  
2002 *The brahmacārīn in the Veda: The Evolution of the “Vedic Student” and the Dynamics of Texts, Rituals, and Society in Ancient India*. Thesis Harvard University.
- LIMAYE, V.P., R.N. DANDEKAR, C.G. KASHIKAR, V.V. BHIDE, S.S. BAHULKAR  
1982 *Keśava’s Kauśikapaddhati on the Kauśikasūtra of the Atharvaveda*. Pune: TMV.

- LUBOTSKY, Alexander M.  
 2002 *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Kāṇḍa Five: Text, translation, commentary.*  
 Columbia, Missouri: South Asia Books [HOS Opera Minora 4].
- MISHRA, Rama Chandra  
 1984 “The Extant AV Śākhās and their Area of Circulation.” In: PAIOC  
 31st Session Jaipur 1982 (Poona: BORI), 207–214.
- NARTEN, Johanna  
 1964 *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda.* Wiesbaden.  
 1982 “Die vedischen Präsensstämme *hr̥ṇāyá-*, *hr̥ṇīyá-* und Verwandtes.”  
*MSS* 41, 139–149.  
 1995 *Kleine Schriften.* Band I, herausgegeben von Marcos ALBINO und  
 Matthias FRITZ. Wiesbaden.
- PANDIT, Shankar Pandurang  
 1894–1898 *Atharvaveda Samhita. With the Commentary of Sayanacharya.* 4  
 vols. Bombay.
- PATYAL, Hukam Chand  
 1969 *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa. English Translation with Notes & Introduction.*  
 Thesis University of Poona.
- PIRART, Éric  
 1995 *Les Nāsatya. Volume I. Les noms des Aśvins. Traduction commentée  
 des strophes consacrées aux Aśvin dans le premier maṇḍala de la  
 Ṛgvedasamhitā.* Liège.
- ROTH, Rudolph  
 1875 *Der Atharvaveda in Kaschmir.* Tübingen.  
 1894 “Rechtschreibung im Veda.” *ZDMG* 48 101–119, 676–684, 710–711.
- ROTH, Rudolph & William Dwight WHITNEY  
 1856 *Atharva Veda Sanhita.* Berlin. Dritte, unveränderte Auflage (nach der  
 von Max Lindenau besorgten zweiten Auflage). Bonn 1966.
- SCHEFTELOWITZ, Isidor  
 1906 *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda.* Breslau (Indische Forschungen, Heft 1).
- ŚIROMANI, Raghavan Nambiyar  
 1942 *An Alphabetical List of Manuscripts in the Oriental Institute, Baroda.*  
 Vol. I. Baroda.
- VISHVA BANDHU  
 1960 *Atharvaveda (Śaunaka) with the Pada-pāṭha and Sāyaṇācārya’s  
 Commentary.* 4 parts. Hoshiarpur: VVRI [Second edition: 1990].  
 1967 *Vaitāna-Śrauta-Sūtra with The Commentary called Ākṣepānuvidhi by  
 Somāditya.* Hoshiarpur: VVRI.
- WEBER, Albrecht  
 1858 “Zwei vedische Texte über Omina und Portenta.” *Abhandlungen der  
 Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 320–413.

WITZEL, Michael

1985 “Die Atharvaveda-Tradition und die Paippalāda-Saṃhitā.” *ZDMG*,  
Supplementband VI, 256–271.

ZEHNDER, Thomas

1999 *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Buch 2, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*.  
Idstein: Schulz-Kirchner Verlag.