



**HAL**  
open science

# The Paippalādasamhitā of the Atharvaveda, Kāṇḍas 6 and 7

Arlo Griffiths

► **To cite this version:**

Arlo Griffiths. The Paippalādasamhitā of the Atharvaveda, Kāṇḍas 6 and 7. Forsten, 22, 2009, Groningen Oriental Studies, 978-90-69-80777-5. halshs-01917946

**HAL Id: halshs-01917946**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01917946v1>**

Submitted on 23 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.

The Paippalādasamhitā of the Atharvaveda  
Kāṇḍas 6 and 7

GRONINGEN ORIENTAL STUDIES  
VOLUME XXII

Published under the Auspices of the J. Gonda Foundation  
Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences

*Editor*

H. T. Bakker, *Groningen*

*Editorial Board*

D.D.S. Goodall • A. Griffiths  
H. Isaacson • G.J. Meulenbeld

*Advisory Board*

ENZOVOORT

ନରା ନରହରିଂ ଦେବଂ ସର୍ବବିଘ୍ନପ୍ରଣାଶନଂ ।

ପିପ୍ପଲଦପ୍ରସାଦାଽ ପଠାମ୍ୟାଧର୍ବଶସ୍ତୁତଂ ॥

*Having bowed to the heavenly Narahari who destroys all obstacles,  
and by the grace of Pippalāda, do I study the Atharvanic Revelation.*

The śloka on the preceding page in transcription: *natvā narahariṃ devaṃ sarvaviḡnapraṇāśanaṃ | pippalādaprasādāc ca paṭhāmy ātharvaṇaśrutim*. On this introductory stanza before Veda-recitation of the Orissa Paippalādins, also frequently found as motto (with *likhāmy* for *paṭhāmy*) in the mss. of the Paippalādasamhitā, see BHATTACHARYYA 1964: 38, WITZEL 1985b: 269, GRIFFITHS 2003a: 346, 349, 352, 356, 359, 360.

Arlo Griffiths

The Paippalādasamhitā of the Atharvaveda  
Kāṇḍas 6 and 7  
A New Edition with Translation and Commentary

EGBERT FORSTEN • GRONINGEN

2009

The research presented in this work, as well as its publication, was made possible by grants from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). The work has been typeset by the author, with the assistance of Andrea de Leeuw van Weenen, Anshuman Pandey and Roelf Barkhuis, in 10pt Computer Modern using  $\text{\TeX}$  and  $\text{\LaTeX}$ .

ISBN XXXXXXXXXXXXX

## PREFACE

This work is a revised version of my doctoral dissertation, successfully defended at Leiden University on 29 April 2004. It was then the first major fruit of over 6 years of intensive study of the Paippalādasamhitā, and Atharvavedic tradition in general.

My promotor, Prof. Dr. H.W. Bodewitz, had suggested in 1997 that I consider taking up study of the Paippalādasamhitā, which text had been intended to play the major role (next to the Vādhūla texts) in the Leiden ‘Veda Project’ inaugurated by Bodewitz’s predecessor, Prof. Dr. M.E. Witzel, when the latter held the chair of Sanskrit at Leiden University in the early 1980s; it was under the auspices of this project that Prof. Dr. D. Bhattacharya, the *editor princeps* of the text re-edited here, spent a year at Leiden University in 1981–1982, and that a small collection of manuscripts of the Paippalādasamhitā was acquired by Witzel during pioneering fieldwork in India in 1983. On the partial basis of these manuscripts — very importantly, and uniquely in those early days of computers — an ‘electronic text’ of the Paippalādasamhitā was created under Witzel’s supervision. This ‘Leiden text’, in a state of perpetual improvement, is still being used nowadays by scholars working on the text, and was the fundamental tool in the development of the present work.

The Paippalāda part of the ‘Veda Project’ could not for many years be brought to further fruition in Leiden, after Witzel’s election to the Chair of Sanskrit at Harvard University in 1987, but nevertheless it was Witzel who guided this research in its early stages, during the year I spent at Harvard University in 1997–1998. During that same year, Dr. T. Zehnder worked at Leiden University under the guidance of Prof. Dr. A.M. Lubotsky, preparing his Zürich PhD thesis on kāṇḍa 2 of the text. Since then, Lubotsky has taken an active interest in Paippalāda studies as well, himself publishing a revised text with translation of kāṇḍa 5 in 2002, and the ‘Veda Project’ has thus seen a revival of sorts.

The present work, the regretted delay in whose publication was caused mainly by a drastic increase of new duties when I was called to the succession of my teacher Bodewitz at Leiden University, is based on a thorough study of the original manuscripts. It is the first in what, I hope, will become a series of studies on a similar methodological basis, by myself and several colleagues, of individual kāṇḍas, leading finally to a revised critical edition of the entire Paippalādasamhitā.

I must note here that Volume II of Dipak BHATTACHARYA’s edition of the Paippalādasamhitā, which includes the text of kāṇḍa 16 and an elaborate introduction that responds to criticism on Volume I, arrived too late in the

course of 2008 for any significant adjustments in this work still to be feasible on its basis.

This is also the place to acknowledge my debt of gratitude to many dear teachers, friends, and colleagues. Here is, thus, my litany of thanks.

Thanks first and foremost to my gurus: Henk Bodewitz, Stephanie Jamison, Werner Knobl, Sasha Lubotsky and Michael Witzel. All of them read my dissertation in large parts, or in its entirety, some even more than once, and provided the essential criticism upon which every young scholar depends; I am fully conscious of, and grateful for the good fortune to be able to count these five scholars, representing the best of both European and American Vedic studies, among those who have guided my work.

Thanks to my many friends, adoptive relatives and informants in Orissa, without whose help none of my Paippalāda studies would have been possible. Very few of them will ever read this work in this form, but it is hoped that an edition of the Paippalādasamhitā in Oriya script can be made available to the Atharvavedic priests in Orissa in the future.

Thanks to the regular attendants of the weekly Paippalāda sessions hosted by Professor Lubotsky in his office during the five years of my doctoral studies: Lenja Kulikov, Marianne Oort and Jan Houben, along with Lubotsky, provided a stimulating forum to present the first drafts of my treatments of the forty-three hymns studied in this work, and suggested many improvements.

Thanks to many colleagues in the Netherlands and abroad who have provided invaluable assistance at many stages in the growth of this work — I specify just some of the many ways in which each individually has helped me: Marcos Albino (for a long list of comments and corrigenda), Shrikant Bahulkar (for advice in matters relating to the Kauśikasūtra), Peter Bisschop (for corrigenda on the first draft of my introduction), Gerhard Ehlers (for re-editions and translations of sections of the Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇa), Abhijit Ghosh (for countless displays of brotherly love, including careful proof-reading), Yasuke Ikari (for advice regarding the Vādhūla texts), Harunaga Isaacson (for a long list of comments and corrigenda), Jan Meulenbeld (for advice in matters relating to Indian ethnobotany and Āyurveda), Asko Parpola (for advice regarding Sāmavedic texts), Walter Slaje (for last-minute aid and critical remarks that eventually became incorporated in his 2007 article), Elizabeth Tucker (who read large parts of my work, and pointed out some interesting connections with Avestan), and Chlodwig Werba (who inspired me with several critical remarks).

Thanks to those on whom I could count at various stages for technical and  $\text{\TeX}$  technical assistance: Roelf Barkhuis, Kengo Harimoto, Andrea de Leeuw van Weenen, and Anshuman Pandey.

Thanks to the many colleagues across the world who have been part of the electronic turn that has unfolded itself in Indological studies over the last decade and a half: the creation and maintenance of an ever-growing

corpus of electronic texts of Vedic and Sanskrit texts, which have become indispensable research tools for me and many others. I have made use of electronic texts that were available through different websites, principally those of TITUS (<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de>) and of GRETIL ([http://www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/ebene\\_1/fiindolo/gretil.htm](http://www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/ebene_1/fiindolo/gretil.htm)).

Thanks to Hans Bakker, the editor of the series Groningen Oriental Studies, and to its publisher Egbert Forsten, for patiently abiding the long transition period from the dissertation to the present book, and for providing gentle nudges without which its gestation would certainly have taken even more time.

And thanks finally to my student Kristen De Joseph, who took upon herself some proof-reading work in the spring of 2008, and carried it out in an exemplary fashion.

The research for this work was made possible between 1999 and 2004 by a doctoral fellowship (grant 350-30-002) from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research; a grant from the same Organisation (P 39-317) made its publication possible.

Leiden, December 23, 2008

## INTRODUCTION

### 1 The Study of the Paippalādasamhitā

#### 1.1 Introducing the text

The Paippalādasamhitā (PS) of the Atharvaveda is generally considered to be among the most important products of Vedism.<sup>1</sup> It is also, regrettably, among the least studied of the Vedic texts. As BLOOMFIELD wrote (1899: 15), “[a]bout one eighth or one ninth of AVP. [*i.e.*, PS] is original, being found neither in the Śaunakīya nor in any other of the accessible collections of mantras”:<sup>2</sup> the hundreds of previously unknown mantras provide a wealth of information to students of the Vedic language and its relationship to cognate languages, to students of the history of religion and of Indian medicine, to students of natural history, to students of social and cultural history, etc.

However, this is not all: the variations between those elements which the two Atharvavedic Samhitās, Śaunaka and Paippalāda, present in parallel recensions, to continue quoting BLOOMFIELD, “range all the way from inconsiderable variants to complete change of sense”, and “[p]erfect textual correspondence between parallel stanzas and hymns of the two śākhās is comparatively rare”. Provided we pay careful attention to the differences between the two Samhitās, we are given a rare opportunity to peek into the kitchen of Vedic text redaction and the formation of Vedic Śākhās. As RENOU (1947: 208) summarised for Vedic Śākhās in general: “Le problème de la Śākhā est au centre des problèmes védiques, et il est clair que si l’on réussissait à établir sur des bases solides la description et la filiation des écoles, on saurait du même coup comment s’est

---

<sup>1</sup>One of the reasons often expressed is the notion that it is, after the Ṛgveda, the most archaic Vedic Samhitā (cf., e.g., WITZEL 1997a: 282 and ZEHNDER 1999: 11). While it seems beyond doubt that substantial parts of the text do indeed belong to the most archaic strata of Vedic literature, there is also an increasing body of evidence suggesting that at least parts of the text are innovative in terms of grammatical, lexical and ritualistic developments. This issue was hinted at by me recently (GRIFFITHS 2004–05: 250 n. 3), with reference to the unfortunately still unpublished doctoral thesis of Mieko KAJIHARA, who concluded that “the final redaction of the Paippalāda-Samhitā was carried out later than that of the Śaunaka-Samhitā” (2002: 394), implying also that certain parts of the PS, especially in its twentieth kāṇḍa, are likely to be contemporary with (late) parts of certain Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads, or even Gṛhyasūtras. The two books under study here are assumed throughout this work to belong to the older strata of the text, and hence to the oldest strata of Vedic literature. The whole matter of the relative dating and stratification of the text, however, actually requires a separate investigation.

<sup>2</sup>A rather less modest estimate is suggested by BARRET (1926b: 9), on the basis only of kāṇḍas 1–12, in which kāṇḍas he found a ratio of 1530 new to a total of 3126 stanzas.

développé l'ensemble du védisme". But with regard to the thorough comparison of the Schools of the Atharvaveda, and the possible reconstruction of an Ur-Samhitā, it is worthwhile to recall the words of HOFFMANN (1986: 457f. = 1992: 819f.): "Das wird allerdings nur dann Erfolg haben, wenn sich die Elite der Indologie wieder dem Studium des *AV* zuwenden wird, wie es im vergangenen Jahrhundert der Fall war, als Rudolf Roth, William D. Whitney, Albrecht Weber, Maurice Bloomfield u.a. Wesentliches für die Erforschung des *AV* geleistet haben".<sup>3</sup>

## 1.2 Discovery of the 'Kashmirian' Atharvaveda

The first step leading towards the discovery of the PS was, as far as I am aware, made in the form of a hint published by ROTH in 1856 (p. 6): "es wäre nicht unmöglich, dass Kaschmir neue Hilfsmittel für unsern [*sc.* den Atharva] Veda darböte. Herr von HÜGEL gibt die Nachricht,<sup>4</sup> dass die Brahmanen Kaschmirs dem Atterwan oder wie sie sagen Atterman Veda angehören". Thoroughly unsatisfied by the unreliable nature of the mss. used by him and WHITNEY for their 1856 *editio princeps* of the Śaunakasamhitā, ROTH pursued this lead in the hope of finding better ones. Two decades later, this search resulted in the discovery of a manuscript in Kashmir, which turned out, however, to contain the text of the Samhitā of a different School, termed 'Kashmirian' for want of evidence of its survival elsewhere in India, and in the light of initial uncertainties as to its proper identification as the Samhitā of the Paippalāda School. Although it soon became clear that this *codex unicus* of the newly discovered Samhitā was exceedingly corrupt — incomparably more so even than the defective Śaunaka mss. that had inspired ROTH's search —, it was nevertheless deemed important enough to be published in facsimile, the magnificent edition by BLOOMFIELD & GARBE of 1901. All details surrounding the discovery of the manuscript and its importance, the issue of its attribution to an anonymous 'Kashmirian' or rather specifically to the Paippalāda Śākhā, the publication of the facsimile, etc., have been described repeatedly and in much detail elsewhere, so they need no longer detain us here.<sup>5</sup>

## 1.3 Work by Barret, Edgerton and Raghu Vira

At the end of their Preface to the facsimile edition of the Kashmirian manuscript, BLOOMFIELD & GARBE (1901/I: III), made the following announcement: "Naturally it will be the lot of the editors to follow up this first step with other

<sup>3</sup>Cf., in a similar vein, GONDA 1965a: 8.

<sup>4</sup>CARL FREIHERR VON HÜGEL, KASCHMIR UND DAS REICH DER SIEK, BAND II, S. 364.

<sup>5</sup>I refer, selectively, to ROTH 1875 and 1881; to BLOOMFIELD's announcement "A proposed photographic reproduction of the Tübingen Manuscript of the Kashmirian Atharva-Veda, the so-called Pāippalāda-Ṣākhā" in JAOS 20 (1899), pp. 184–185; to W-L, pp. lxxix–lxxxix; and to BHATTACHARYYA 1964: x–xiv. In recent years, cf. e.g. also ZEHNDER 1999: 11.

labors. A transliteration of the text in Roman characters; a detailed comparison of the Kashmirian version with the vulgate text as hitherto known; and finally, if possible, a translation may be expected from their continued cooperation". Things, however, turned out differently, and the task of transliterating the ms. was delegated to BLOOMFIELD's student BARRET, who was helped, for kāṇḍa 6, by EDGERTON, another student of the same teacher. It may suffice here further to quote HOFFMANN's summary (1968: 1 = 1975: 228):

Unfortunately the text of this manuscript . . . , is corrupt, in many cases beyond recognition. LeRoy Carr Barret, between the years 1906 and 1940, did the tedious work of transcribing the Kashmirian manuscript book by book, and added to it his attempts at reconstructing the original wording. It is not Barret's fault that for the most part his efforts and sagacity were doomed to failure, and that rarely convincing results were reached. Nevertheless all scholars who have so far concerned themselves with the Paippalāda version [of the Atharvaveda] cannot but fully acknowledge and feel grateful for the enormous amount of useful work done by Barret. His edition is distributed in several volumes of the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* and two independent publications. Thus Raghu Vira's Devanāgarī reproduction of Barret's text, which added some improvements and a specification of parallel passages was very welcome. Yet, in spite of what was achieved by Barret and Raghu Vira, everyone who has dealt with the Paippalāda version from a philological or linguistic point of view has, again and again, been driven to despair.<sup>6</sup>

#### 1.4 Durgamohan Bhattacharyya's discoveries in Orissa and his 1964/70 edition

The situation took an entirely new turn when BHATTACHARYYA announced his epoch-making discovery of palm-leaf mss. from Orissa, containing in generally well-preserved state the text of the Paippalādasamhitā (1957a, 1961, 1964).<sup>7</sup> This discovery was the crown on a life's work devoted to Vedic texts, especially such as had a transmissional or commentarial connection with eastern India.<sup>8</sup>

BHATTACHARYYA lived long enough only to see the publication of the first volume of his edition, presenting a learned Introduction and the text of kāṇḍa 1 (1964), but passed away soon thereafter, on November 12, 1965. His informative booklet dealing with various aspects of the Paippalāda tradition (1968), as well

---

<sup>6</sup>For a collection of phrases, occasionally rather poetic, used by various scholars to give expression to the severity of the manuscript's corruptness, see BHATTACHARYYA 1964: xi.

<sup>7</sup>The discovery dates to 1959 and not to 1957 (see WRIGHT 1967: 202). I thank Marco Franceschini for alerting me to the fact that my earlier published statements (GRIFFITHS 2003a: 333 and 2003b: 6) were in need of rectification.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. BHATTACHARYYA 1953, 1955a, 1955b, 1957b, 1958. A bibliography of BHATTACHARYYA's works has appeared in MUKHERJI *et al.* 2001.

as the second volume of his edition, containing the text of kāṇḍas 2–4 (1970), were published posthumously.

Although the great merit earned by him as discoverer was universally acknowledged, BHATTACHARYYA's editorial technique did not meet with unanimous approval. It seems worthwhile to quote here the clear methodological statement that BHATTACHARYYA's work provoked in a reviewer (HOFFMANN 1968: 3 = 1975: 230):

What is the task of an editor of the *Paippalāda-Samhitā*? He has to give, first of all, the manuscript readings as they are and to establish the text on this basis. If he wishes to do more he may give reasons for his decisions, quote the readings of parallel passages of the Śaunaka version (= AV.) or other texts, and add explanations. Each of these additional procedures, if adopted at all, must be carried out consistently, otherwise misunderstandings will inevitably arise.

In HOFFMANN's judgment, the edition did not entirely live up to this task. Details of HOFFMANN's criticism (1968: 1–10 = 1975: 228–237, see also 1986: 457f. = 1992: 819f.) need not be rehearsed here, as BHATTACHARYYA's two volumes were finally, after a lull of 27 years, almost entirely superseded by the new edition (1997) of his son, Dipak BHATTACHARYA.

### 1.5 Dipak Bhattacharya's 1997 edition

The son's edition cannot be said *entirely* to supersede the father's, both because some information from the 1964 Introduction has not been repeated in 1997, and — more importantly — because some editorial decisions in the first four kāṇḍas of the 1997 edition can only be explained as expressions of filial piety for his father's work: only a glance in the old edition can explain them (cf. GRIFFITHS 2003b: 12 n. 53). This new edition covers the first 15 kāṇḍas out of a total of 20. The Samhitā shows an uneven distribution of text over kāṇḍas (see §3.2 below), and the 15 edited kāṇḍas span about half of the total size of the text. BHATTACHARYYA's great merit lies in the fact that he has given us a usable text, more importantly one which has been provided with a quite reliable critical apparatus, reporting the most important *varietas lectionis*.

A single scholar working alone cannot be expected to solve all the problems which a text as large, as difficult, and as corruptly transmitted as the PS poses, even in a period of 27 years. But besides inevitable minor deficiencies, BHATTACHARYYA's work also suffers from a number of more serious faults.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>In the following paragraphs, I repeat with modifications some basic points of criticism formulated by me a few years ago (2002: 44). The reader is referred to that 2002 publication, as well as my 2003b and 2004 articles, for details and examples. The review by WRIGHT (2002) also contains important points of criticism, with examples, besides deserved praise. Only one other, very brief review has come to my attention: see Andreas Pohlus, in ZDMG 152 (2002), 220f.

The editor has not set forth his editorial principles clearly and systematically in his Introduction. Furthermore, such principles as the user of his edition may at one stage be led to infer from a series of individual instances, are often subsequently belied by inconsistency and arbitrary choices in almost every domain of editorial policy. The basic task of an editor of PS, as formulated in HOFFMANN's methodological statement (quoted under §1.4), has not been fulfilled.

The edition in many cases amounts to little more than a collation of manuscripts. BHATTACHARYA's work contains numerous instances where the application of basic philological acumen, not least of which is attention to the requirements of the meter, would have resulted in a better edition, more truly deserving of the qualification 'critical'. The editor has at many places taken recourse to underlining the edited text: his method of indicating "doubt of some kind, i.e. regarding authenticity, correctness etc." (p. xxxii). The obligation to make editorial decisions has too often been avoided, and also the method of underlining has not been carried out with consistency: evidently corrupt passages are frequently unmarked as such by underlining, while impeccable passages are not rarely provided with unnecessary underlining.

BHATTACHARYA's editorial principle — a principle which has not been made explicit as such in his Introduction (cf. WRIGHT 2002: 194) — to edit the text of the Orissa manuscripts, and consider readings from the Kashmir manuscript only when the reading of the former is evidently unacceptable, is untenable. One of the reasons for adopting this policy may have been the classic editorial misconception that readings of a certain manuscript or (as in our case) group of manuscripts may be adopted for the sole reason that the manuscript from which they are taken is 'the better manuscript' or that the group of manuscripts to which preference is given is 'the better group'. A critical edition ought, by contrast, to weigh the readings of all available manuscripts in each individual case, and the general quality of some manuscripts is never in itself an argument for or against readings of other manuscripts. Cf. WEST (1973: 50):

The quality of a ms. can only be established by reading it. And when an opinion has been formed on the quality of a ms., it can be used as a criterion only when other criteria give no clear answer. The absurdity of following whatever is regarded as the best ms. so long as its readings are not impossible is perhaps most clearly, and certainly most entertainingly, exposed by Housman, *D. Iunii Iuuenalis Saturae* (Cambridge 1905; 1931), pp. xi–xvi. Each variant must be judged on its merits as a reading before the balance can be drawn and a collective verdict passed. Since the collective judgment is entirely derived from the individual judgments, it cannot be a ground for modifying any of them, but only a ground for making a judgment where none could be made before. As Housman puts it, "since we have found P the most trustworthy MS in places where its fidelity can be tested, we

infer that it is also the most trustworthy in places where no test can be applied . . . . In thus committing ourselves to the guidance of the best MS we cherish no hope that it will always lead us right: we know that it will often lead us wrong; but we know that any other MS would lead us wrong still oftener.”

As a matter of principle, the Kashmirian and Orissa branches of PS transmission should be apportioned equal weight in the establishment of the text. Behind and besides its many corrupt readings, **K** has in numerous instances preserved a more authentic text than the Or. mss. The value of such more authentic readings is not diminished by the plethora of corruptions elsewhere in the ms.

The issues hitherto addressed center on a lack of methodological reflection, transparency and consistency in BHATTACHARYA’s edition of 1997, an edition that — as observed — seems to intend to give the text of the Orissa manuscripts. It must further be noted that the edition of kāṇḍas 1–4 is based on four of these manuscripts, while all of kāṇḍas 6–15 is based on only two. Since the representativeness of this sample of manuscripts cannot be taken for granted, it remains uncertain, especially in the case of kāṇḍas 6–15, whether the readings presented as ‘Orissa-readings’ by BHATTACHARYA are in fact common Orissa readings, or merely happen to be the readings of the few manuscripts that have been employed. Furthermore, no analysis of the interrelationships even of those few manuscripts that have been used is attempted by the editor in his Introduction.<sup>10</sup>

Such, in sum, are the grounds on which I conclude that this edition, despite all the praise that it certainly deserves, has not succeeded in laying a solid basis for historical study of the text.

## 1.6 Aims of this work

In view of the importance of the text, and in view of the unsatisfactory nature of the available edition, a number of scholars have for several years now been working toward the long-term goal of providing a complete edition of the Paippalādasamhitā of the Atharvaveda, with a translation and (more or less) elaborate commentary. Two re-editions have appeared in recent years, for kāṇḍas 2 and 5 respectively, both taking the available 1997 edition as their starting point.<sup>11</sup>

Work on a number of additional kāṇḍas is in various stages of progress. Arlo Griffiths and Sasha Lubotsky (Leiden) intend to publish a new edition,

<sup>10</sup>One of the more regrettable among the minor errors, in this regard, is the confusion that seems to be noticeable here and there between the sigla **Ma** and **Mā** in BHATTACHARYA’s apparatus: see my notes under 6.6.7a, 6.10.1 (?), 6.11.6 (?), 6.13.13. In this way, the already limited possibilities for reconstruction of the genetic relationships between the mss. become even further reduced.

<sup>11</sup>ZEHNDER 1999 (review by Klaus Mylius in IJ 43 [2000], 295–298; brief notice by Oskar von Hinüber in ZDMG 151 [2001], 459); LUBOTSKY 2002 (review ZEHNDER 2004a).

along the lines of the present work, of kāṇḍa 4.<sup>12</sup> Griffiths, who prepared a provisional edition of 19.1–10 for his MA thesis, published a single *tr̥ca* from this kāṇḍa together with Lubotsky in 1999, and has prepared a preliminary text of PS 19.53–56 in collaboration with Werner Knobl (Kyoto); he intends in the long run to publish, in international collaboration, the whole of kāṇḍa 19. He is also currently working on hymns 10.1–10, while the remaining hymns of this kāṇḍa (10.11–16) have been treated in a 2007 Oxford MPhil thesis by Victor D’Avella (currently Columbia University). Elizabeth Tucker (Oxford) has done a considerable amount of work on 11, which should lead to publication within the next years. A team of scholars working in Berlin, led by Gerhard Ehlers, has made considerable progress towards a new edition of kāṇḍa 12. Philipp Kubisch (Bonn) is editing and translating kāṇḍa 20 for his doctoral thesis. ZEHNDER’s unpublished Diplomarbeit of 1993 contains a revision, with translation, of BHATTACHARYYA’s 1964 text of kāṇḍa 1, but the author has expressed no intention to bring the work into a publishable format, up-to-date with the present state of research. LOPEZ’ unpublished dissertation of 2000 offers a treatment of kāṇḍas 13–14, but the work is seriously defective and needs to be done anew.<sup>13</sup>

The present work, then, is focused on kāṇḍas 6 and 7. Following in the footsteps of ZEHNDER (1999) and LUBOTSKY (2002), but wishing also to go beyond their achievement — especially as regards their reliance on BHATTACHARYYA’s edition — by going back to the manuscripts, my research was undertaken with the following aims:<sup>14</sup>

1. Investigation of the manuscript transmission in Orissa and establishment of a collection of PS manuscripts: see GRIFFITHS 2003a.
2. Thorough consideration of the methodological problems involved in the critical edition of the text, and design of a format suitable for the purpose.
3. Re-edition of the text of kāṇḍas 6 and 7 based on an impartial comparison of the Kashmir manuscript with a representative number of Orissa manuscripts, provided with a detailed and positive critical apparatus.
4. Provisional metrical analysis.
5. Syntactic interpretation, laid down in the form of an English translation.
6. Recording and discussion of the Śākhā-variants.
7. Commentary dealing with grammatical, metrical, and lexical peculiarities, and exegesis of the text.

<sup>12</sup>For a first preview, cf. GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY 2000–01[03].

<sup>13</sup>Cf. the observations by LUBIN (2007: 89 with n. 30), and his critical re-edition of the stanzas from the Nīlarudropaniṣad that are taken from PS 14.3–4.

<sup>14</sup>The following list corresponds partially to the ‘Aufgabenstellung’ of ZEHNDER 1999: 12.

## 8. Creation of an Index Verborum to kāṇḍas 6 and 7.

The remaining three parts of this Introduction treat of the sources used and editorial principles adopted in the establishment of the text; of the textual arrangement of the Paippalādasamhitā; and of the presentation of my edition, translation, and critical apparatus. Most of the above points will be discussed in more detail at the appropriate places.

## 2 The Constitution of the Text

In this part of the Introduction, I first present all the sources that I have drawn upon for the constitution of the text (§§2.1–2.3), then focus on certain general facts of transmission that the PS editor is confronted with (§§2.4–2.5), and, after a discussion of the history of PS transmission (§2.6), give an outline of the editorial principles that have been followed here (§2.7). The concrete application of these principles to difficult problems of orthography and sandhi forms the subject of the long concluding section (2.8).

### 2.1 Manuscripts of the Paippalādasamhitā

#### 2.1.1 The Kashmir manuscript

Throughout this work, I use the siglum **K** primarily to refer to the Kashmirian Śāradā manuscript as the codex used in my edition, occasionally also to this ms. as the sole representative of the Kashmirian Paippalāda tradition. A recent article by SLAJE (2007) recounts the background of this tradition in local Brahminical culture (cf. SLAJE 2005), and the dating of the one manuscript that has survived (most likely 1419 CE).<sup>15</sup>

I have briefly touched upon the history of the discovery of this ms. due to the efforts of ROTH, and the publication of the facsimile edition by BLOOMFIELD & GARBE (1901) in §1.2.<sup>16</sup> I have referred in §1.3 to the work done by BARRET (1905–40),<sup>17</sup> in collaboration with EDGERTON (1915), towards a Roman transliteration and a first attempt at restoration of the text, and to RAGHU VIRA’s work (1936–42) based on it, but with addition of various indexes. These are the publications concerning **K** that I have used and referred to in my critical apparatus, to counter-check my own and BHATTACHARYA’s readings.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup>On the various (late) copies from **K** that exist, none of which has been used here, see WITZEL 1973–1976.

<sup>16</sup>I acknowledge here the kindness of Stanley Insler in procuring for me on long-term loan a copy of the facsimile edition from the American Oriental Society Library housed at Yale University.

<sup>17</sup>See my bibliography for BARRET’s other publications resulting from his 35 years of labor.

<sup>18</sup>I must record here explicitly that I have not used the CD-ROM edition that has been

**2.1.1.1 Śāradā script and typical Śāradā errors** A list of typical errors in Śāradā mss., both graphical and phonetic in origin, is available in WITZEL 1994a (cf. also WITZEL 1973–76). Our ms. shows an unusually high number of such errors, much higher than in other texts transmitted in Kashmir. It also shows a number of peculiarities (of orthography, punctuation, etc.) common to Śāradā mss., which it is important to point out here, because knowledge of these peculiarities is presupposed in my critical apparatus. On the Śāradā script in general, cf. GRIERSON 1916 and SLAJE 1993.

**2.1.1.2 Orthography and sandhi** Cf. SCHEFTELOWITZ 1906: 47, DUMONT 1962, and DREYER 1986: XX–XXVI. My knowledge of Śāradā script and Kashmiri mss. is practically restricted to my experience with **K**. The following remarks on orthography and sandhi, though perhaps equally valid for other mss. written in Śāradā script, are therefore presented as belonging to the peculiarities of the ms. in question.

*b* ≈ *v* Although there are two different signs, the two sounds they are meant to represent do not seem to have been distinguished well in pronunciation, and we encounter many errors. Practically indistinguishable in the Śāradā of this ms. are *vr* and *br*.

*ṣth* = *ṣt* These clusters are written with an identical sign. When quoting readings from **K**, I have thus tried to choose the appropriate interpretation.

*Cr* → *CCr* Clusters of a consonant + *r* tend to see gemination of the consonant. EDGERTON has, throughout PS 6, misread *ttr* as *tr*.

*l* On this sign, see BARRET’s preface of 1940: “the Śāradā sign (intervocalic) which I have hitherto usually transliterated “ḍ” I now give as “ḷ”; it is very different from Śāradā ḍ”. On this sign, cf. further my discussion in §2.8 (U) below.

---

available for a few years, and which a generous grant of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research allowed me to purchase: CD-ROM Edition of the Kashmiri Paippalada [*sic*] Recension of the Atharvaveda. Digitised by e-ternals.com / Anthos Imprint Ltd. from the original birch-bark manuscript in the University library, University of Tübingen, Germany. Digitisation date: February – April 2001. University of Tübingen Catalogue ID: Ma I 42, 1–8 and Ma I 422. Second edition, May 2001. Published by Anthos Imprint Ltd. Unter den Linden 15, D-72762 Reutlingen, Germany. Product ID no.: A20010412. Product category: A (Archive Quality).

At <<http://www.e-ternals.com/english/publications/publications02.htm>> (last viewed 27 October 2007), this “archive quality” digital edition advertizes itself as no less than “a must for any serious scholar of the Atharvaveda”, *i.a.* because it “[i]ncludes some folios that were never published before, as well as ten pages of previously unpublished fragments”. (In their enthusiasm to include previously unpublished gems, the publishers have also included, on the first CD-ROM, an entirely unrelated ms. giving the text of KS 18.14:275.2–13 in Śāradā script.) It comes in 154 CD-ROMs with photos in uncompressed TIFF-format and new folio numbering that is not identical with, and provides no reference to, the numbering introduced by BLOOMFIELD & GARBE and used by BARRET and EDGERTON, and is thus so impractical in its usage for the “scholar of the Atharvaveda” (serious or less so) that he may be excused for ignoring it.

°ś ś°/°s s° **K** normally follows the common Kashmiri habit of assimilating a word-final with an initial sibilant, rather than the well-known use of visarga in such contexts. See §2.8 (P) below.

h/h/h **K** also normally shows common Kashmiri use of jihvāmūliya (-h) and upadhmanīya (-h) before *k/kh* and *p/ph* respectively. In principle, visarga -h stands only in pausa, and has hence come to function as a punctuation sign, marking pausa-form and punctuation at once. On such use of visarga, see below under §§2.1.1.3 and 2.8 (Q).

’ An avagraha sign is never used in **K**, to my knowledge. Cf. SCHEFTELOWITZ 1906: 47. WITZEL 1974a: X / 2004: xxiv mentions that his ms. of the Kaṭhā uses avagraha three times, and SLAJE 1993: 28 depicts its Śāradā-form.

**2.1.1.3 Punctuation** I have encountered just one case of double daṇḍa, at 7.18.9. Generally, **K** makes no distinction between single and double daṇḍa, and my critical apparatus presupposes double value of | (| = ||). Note further BARRET’s remark on PSK 7 (1920: 145): “the colon mark is often placed below the line of letters rather than in it”. This statement also holds true for PSK 6. I render such a subscribed (added) colon mark as (+ |).

By contrast with the Or. mss., the daṇḍa-punctuation in **K** is generally quite unreliable. It is frequently found placed where there is no end of a hemistich or stanza, and is just as often absent where there is. The following is a selection of the instances of misplaced daṇḍa-punctuation in **K**: 6.2.2, 6.2.8, 6.8.2, 6.9.12, 6.10.3, 6.11.4, 6.11.7, 6.15.2, 6.22.12, 6.23.9, 7.1.3, 7.1.11, 7.4.1, 7.8.5, 7.8.6, 7.8.8, 7.18.1. Many cases where a daṇḍa is missing in **K** show -h at the end of the (half-)stanza, and for this reason -h can almost be taken as a punctuation marker by itself, making added placement of daṇḍa superfluous. Instances of such use of h for | (see DREYER 1986: XXII n. 26) are found, e.g., at 6.20.3bc, 19.1.4b. However, the sequence -h | does also occur, e.g. at 7.6.2b, 7.8.1d. Consonants that are followed by an explicit virāma (e.g. -t at 7.9.6d)<sup>19</sup> also need no extra |, because the virāma itself marks pausa, but cases of double marking (daṇḍa after virāma) do occur.

We further encounter the symbols *Z*, and double *Z Z*.<sup>20</sup> On this sign, see WITZEL 1979–80 §1.2, p. 12. If it is used, it generally seems to mark the end of a stanza, only very rarely a hemistich: 6.4.3+4+5+7, 6.5.7, 6.6.3, 6.6.7, 6.7.1, 6.11.7+8+9, 6.12.1, 6.12.5, 6.20.4, 6.22.3, 6.22.11. The doubled form is commonly used at the ends of hymns, and other important textual divisions.

**2.1.1.4 Sporadic marking of accents** An important trait of the ms. is that it sometimes accentuates entire stanzas, or parts thereof. The system

<sup>19</sup>Throughout this work, I use the c-less cedilla (̣) as explicit transliteration of the virāma. On this and other (sometimes novel) symbols used in this work, see §4.5 below.

<sup>20</sup>BARRET transliterated these with lower case *z* and *zz*. I prefer to use capitals, for the sake of clarity.

used for marking the accents is more or less the same as that of the Kāṭha-texts, transmitted in Śāradā mss., described by VON SCHROEDER (1892, 1896, 1898: 2–3) and WITZEL 1974a: X / 2004: xxiv, with n. 66 (on p. XXV of the 1974 edition); cf. also SCHEFTELOWITZ’ description of the system encountered in the famous Kashmir (Śāradā) ms. of the ṚV (1906: 48f.), DUMONT’s of the ṚV (Śāradā) ms. from the Stein collection (1962), and in general WITZEL 1974b.<sup>21</sup>

No accents are marked in kāṇḍas 3–7, and 10. BARRET transliterated the accents that are marked in kāṇḍas 1 (1906), 2 (1910), 8 (1921), 9 (1922), 11 (1924), 12 (1926), 13 (1928), 14 (1927), and 15 (1930), as well as those marked in fragment 2 treated by him in 1934; he stopped doing so in 16–17 (1936), where he reports for kāṇḍa 16 that “accents appear on only a few stanzas” (p. 1), and for 17 that “[a]ccents are marked on a very few words only” (p. 149). While leaving the accents untransliterated for 18 (1938) too, he did note in more detail (p. 571): “Accents are marked on several entire hymns and on a considerable number of stanzas in other hymns: accents are marked on 1.1–3.8 and 21.1–23.4, also on some stanzas in hymns 5, 7, 8, 12, 15, and 24”. Also in 19–20, finally, he left the accents untransliterated (1940). PS 19 (p. 1): “Accents are marked on 85 stanzas or parts of stanzas in 28 different hymns: a few less than 20 of the accented pādas appear only in AVPāipp, and it is evident all through this ms that its accented stanzas usually are known elsewhere”; PS 20 (p. 89): “Accents are marked on some stanzas of 19 hymns in this book, but in no hymn on more than 6 stanzas: accents appear in 10 of the first 15 hymns and on 9 of the last 32; all the stanzas on which accents are marked occur in other texts, mostly in the saṅhitās of course”.

Only a complete survey of these accentuated passages will make clear to what extent the accentuation is generally reliable. My preliminary impression is that the placement of accentuation is in general somewhat more reliable than the state of transmission of the accented words themselves would suggest. It should be noted specifically, however, that syllables with udātta often lack a svarita on the following akṣara, and that accentuation tends to lapse at the end of pādas (often, again, with the concluding svarita lacking). A survey of accentuated passages will be especially interesting for the assessment of those few — hinted at by BARRET — which have no parallels in other (accentuated) mantra-texts. Besides the accentuated short extract from PS 16.104.7c edited by me under 7.13.6b, one more such passage, 1.65.4, has been published by me in GRIFFITHS 2004, where I have remarked in n. 27 under item 10 (p. 60) on the entirely unreliable accent notation for the second hemistich of that stanza. LUBOTSKY (2007: 30f.) has re-edited 8.15.11cd (and 12a) with the accents that are marked (not without mistakes) in **K** on this mantra unknown in any other text than the PS. A comprehensive survey and evaluation of the accent marking

---

<sup>21</sup>I may note here that the few jātya-svaritas which I have encountered (e.g. at 19.8.3) have all been of the subscript, tilde-shaped variety.

in this ms. must be postponed till a later occasion. As stated above, no accents are marked in **K** in kāṇḍas 6–7.

**2.1.1.5 Marginal material** Of considerable interest are the wealth of points which, besides its value as a source for the reconstruction of the text, make this codex an important historical document in its own right. I refer to information of relevance for the history of the Kashmirian branch of the Paippalāda Śākhā, as contained in colophons and marginalia etc. In the following two paragraphs, I list some data randomly noted by me in the course of my work; a specific search aiming to collect all these data would, I am sure, be very rewarding, and may throw more light on the historical events leading up to the copying of this ms., narrated in SLAJE 2007.

**Anukramaṇī/Paddhati type material** 4.27 is called *bṛhaspabhasūkta* (i.e. *bṛhaspati*°); at 6.6.4b on fol. 92a, we seem to find a reference to an *abhisekaṃ* (see my comm.); 6.14 is called *rakṣoghnasūkta*; 6.22 is called *pitr̥sūkta*; after 6.23 follows a prose portion called *śrāddhabrahmaṇa*; 12.22 is called *kuśadarbhasūkta*; BARRET 1910: 189 reports the titles *imaṃ rakṣāmantraṃ digdhandhanam* (2.49), i.e. presumably *digbandhanam* (and not, with BARRET *ad loc.*, *digdhanam*), *agnisūkta* (2.50), and *ṣaḍṛtasūkta* (2.69); BARRET 1912: 344 *rakṣāmantraṃ* (3.10/11), *somaṃ rājānaṃ aśervacana*, i.e. *āśv*° (3.34), and an “intrusion of a sūtra into our text” at 3.11: *japet sarvam*; BARRET 1915: 43 *āśv*vacanaṃ (4.4), *dīvīsū* (= *devīsūktam*) (4.28), “apannāṣṭakamta referring to no. [4.]29 (= Ç. 4.33) where there is some anukramaṇī material prefixed to the hymn”, viz. *kutsa ṛṣiḥ gāyatryaṃś chandaḥ agnir devatā apan nā aṣṭau śucaye viniyogaḥ, ṣaḍṛtaṃ sūktam* (4.30); BARRET 1927: 238f. *catasra ṛcaḥ paṭhet*; BARRET 1928: 58 *darbhādi ṛcām*; BARRET 1936: 95 *sarvatras sarvatra nīr vapāmīty anuṣaṅgaḥ Z punaruktīḥ* (16.93) and p. 147 (corrected) *pratikāṇḍam paścimaṃ padaṃ dvitīyaṃ dvitīyaṃ likhet 2 Z na tu pūrvaṃ likhitvā Z avaśyaṃ japet* (at the end of PS 16); BARRET 1940: 10f. *vṛṣabhaṛcā vṛṣotsargeti paṭhet* and *dampatyor bhuktana ṛcām* (in 19.7).

**Evidence regarding the PS tradition in Kashmir** Besides some of the paddhati-like phrases that were just quoted, I must also mention some examples of evidence for the fact that more than one codex must have been available (in Kashmir?) at one time: I have seen the indication *dvitīyapustake* at 7.2.10, and *anyatpustake* between 19.7.5 and 6.

## 2.1.2 The Orissa manuscripts

The general siglum for the Orissa mss., and for the apodosis of all extant mss., employed throughout this work is **Or**. I also use the abbreviation ‘Or.’ for

‘Orissa’. For a complete catalog of all presently known PS mss. from Orissa — those used by BHATTACHARYA and those available to other scholars —, with a discussion of their dating and numerous other details that have not found mention here, I refer to GRIFFITHS 2003a.

**2.1.2.1 The manuscripts used in this edition** For the two kāṇḍas presented in edition here, at least seven palm-leaf mss. are known to exist. The sigla, used here in a form that is somewhat simplified in comparison with those listed in GRIFFITHS 2003a, are as follows (BHATTACHARYA’s two mss. are marked with an asterisk): **Ku** (i.e. **Ku2**) **JM** (**JM1**) **RM V/126** **\*Mā** (**Mā1**) **\*Ma** (**Ma2-a**) **Pa**. Of these seven mss., six were directly available to me for collation. Besides the five mss. obtained by myself during fieldwork in Orissa, BHATTACHARYA’s **Mā** was also available for both kāṇḍas edited here, in the form of microfilms kindly given to me by Michael Witzel,<sup>22</sup> but I had no access to **Ma**, perhaps the oldest of the known mss. The siglum **Ma**, representing as it does the only ms. not available to me, has generally been placed between [...] in the critical apparatus: cf. the explanation of signs and symbols in §4.5.

All mss. were first collated completely for kāṇḍa 6. On this basis, it could be concluded that, among the mss. directly available to me, **Ku RM V/126 Mā** and **Pa** show considerably fewer insignificant variants than **JM** and **RM**, which latter are closely related, and are frequently at variance from the other Or. mss., but hardly ever with good readings that are likely to preserve an authentic transmission of the text.<sup>23</sup> In the preparation of my doctoral thesis, shortage of time forced me to limit my collation work to the first group of Or. mss. **JM** has therefore been collated only sporadically for kāṇḍa 7; **RM**, the photographs for which are frequently hard to read, has not been collated at all for this kāṇḍa.

The photographs of **Pa** that I reported to be at my disposal in my publication on the Orissa mss. of the PS (2003a: 358f.) cover kāṇḍa 6 completely, and run on into the next kāṇḍa only up to 7.2.3. It was only subsequent to the completion of my doctoral thesis (2004) that I obtained permission from the owner of the volumes which constitute **Pa** to photograph (anew) the volumes containing kāṇḍas 6–15 and 19–20, in June 2005. While this means that **Pa** could have been collated for both kāṇḍas edited in this book, and not only for kāṇḍa 6 and 7.1.1–2.3, constraints of time forced me to eschew all but sporadic collation of this ms. for the rest of kāṇḍa 7 in the preparation of this work for publication.

<sup>22</sup>These films came into his possession during Dipak Bhattacharya’s stay in Leiden in 1981–82.

<sup>23</sup>There is, however, a small number of cases where it is only this pair of mss. that supports the adopted reading, and where the Or. mss. show small errors: see 6.1.3c *svādoḥ*, 6.8.4d *śṛṅgavac chirah*, 6.12.4d and 5a *prāgāṇ*, 6.12.6a *agāṇ*, \*6.14.7c *arāyah*, 6.22.1d *’dhi*, 6.22.8a *saṇ*. With the exception of the one marked with an asterisk (on which see n. 26 below), all of these cases involve insignificant sandhi variants.

I present the palm-leaf mss. here in the order which has been adopted as standard in the critical apparatus. Manuscripts from central Orissa come first, then those from northern Orissa.

Siglum	Provenance	Used for PS 6	Used for PS 7
<b>Ku</b>	central	•	•
<b>JM</b>	central	•	•
<b>RM</b>	central	•	
<b>V/126</b>	northern	•	•
<b>Mā</b>	northern	•	•
<b>Pa</b>	northern	•	
<b>Ma</b>	northern	•	•

**2.1.2.2 Genetic relationships between the Orissa manuscripts** As I have provisionally remarked elsewhere (GRIFFITHS 2002: 38, with n. 5), the Or. mss. can be divided into two groups, styled ‘central’ and ‘northern’ in the preceding table. The grouping together of **Ku JM** and **RM** against the other Or. mss. can be established on the basis of the following evidence, culled from kāṇḍa 6 only. A clear indication comes from the order in which information is presented in hymn-colophons:<sup>24</sup> except at the end of hymn 1, the central Orissa mss. give first the stanza-count, and then the hymn-number,<sup>25</sup> while the northern Orissa mss. always (except for **Pa** at 6.12) give the hymn-number first, followed by the stanza-count (the number for the stanza-count is sometimes omitted, but minimally || ṛ || is always written). The other evidence from kāṇḍa 6 is not entirely unequivocal, and BHATTACHARYA’s (implicit) indications for **Ma** are not always clear or beyond doubt, but I can point to groupings **Ku JM RM** vs. **V/126 Mā Pa Ma** at 6.7.2 *antar/antyar*, 6.7.9 *caṅṅr/cakṅṅr*, 6.10.1 *vāsītā/vāśītā*, 6.13.1 *asmān/yo (')smān*, 6.14.7c *arāyaḥ/rāyaḥ*,<sup>26</sup> 6.20.2 *rātri/rātrī*, 6.22.3 *kuśalām diśam/kuśalāndiśam*.

Within the group of ‘central’ mss., **JM** and **RM** form a subgroup. These two mss. share numerous errors against **Ku**: cf. e.g. the critical apparatus under 6.1.7, 6.2.5, 6.5.2, 6.9.7, 6.18.7, 6.21.2+3. Although shared good readings can be used as evidence for the affiliation of mss. only with much circumspection, I am confident that the cases cited above in n. 23 are indeed also significant in this regard.

Among the ‘northern’ mss., it is evident that **Mā** and **V/126** belong very closely together, from the fact that their testimony (errors) goes together against the other Or. mss. at many places, e.g. (restricting myself again to

<sup>24</sup>Cf. §2.1.2.8. Unfortunately, BHATTACHARYA tends not to report this kind of information in his critical apparatus, so the place of **Ma** cannot be certified with this criterion.

<sup>25</sup>On the marking of stanza-count and hymn-numbers in these mss., see below, §2.1.2.8.

<sup>26</sup>**Ku** has the correct reading *arāyaḥ* only *post correctionem*.

kāṇḍa 6), 6.1.3, 6.1.7, 6.2.2, 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.11, 6.2.5, 6.4.5, 6.4.8, 6.6.5, 6.6.7, 6.6.8, 6.7.3, 6.9.2, 6.12.5, 6.13.13, 6.14.9, 6.15.4, 6.15.7, 6.19.8+9, 6.20.2+6, 6.21.5+6; I am not certain that one is copied from the other. That **Pa** and **Ma** go together also seems likely, e.g., from their agreement against other mss. at 6.1.8, 6.1.9, 6.13.2, 6.14.9, 6.17.8 (and from such telling shared corrections as at 7.1.5); moreover, it seems most likely that **Pa** is a direct copy of **Ma**, because there are many cases where **Pa** alone has an error, while **Ma** (as is implicit from BHATTACHARYA's apparatus) agrees with all other mss.: e.g., 6.1.9, 6.4.2, 6.11.3, 6.16.9, 6.22.2, 6.22.13. I have found only one reverse case: 6.6.9c.

While the genetic reality of this grouping into 'central' and 'northern' mss., and the sub-groupings (**Ku** vs. **JM RM** and **Ma Pa** vs. **V/126 Mā**), seem to me sufficiently supported by the evidence presented above, I have to emphasize that these (sub)-groupings are by no means closed.<sup>27</sup> There are many exceptions, and we clearly have to do with a conflated transmission: sources of conflation are not only written mss., but, as with Sanskrit texts in general,<sup>28</sup> with a Vedic Saṃhitā we have all the more reason to reckon with lateral influence from oral transmission. In general, it must be admitted that stemmatic reasoning — in any case a method to be employed with the utmost circumspection by the textual critic<sup>29</sup> — is of very limited utility in the case of the Or. mss., which tend to diverge only in details, but show agreement in the case of textual corruptions: this points to a common ancestor which was not free from mistakes (see §2.6.2).

**2.1.2.3 Oriya language and script** Some awareness of the basic facts of Oriya phonology is beneficial for a judicious weighing of the evidence found in the Or. mss., while knowledge of the Oriya language is indispensable for interpretation of the colophons in these sources: I may refer to RAY 2003 and to NEUKOM & PATNAIK 2003, which works contain brief but for our purposes adequate sections on Oriya phonology; they also provide descriptions of

<sup>27</sup>On 'closed' vs. 'open' recensions, cf. WEST 1973: 14, 31ff.

<sup>28</sup>Cf. HANNEDER (1998: 49): "In the case of Sanskrit a more typical source of error is certainly the practice of memorizing texts. Whereas the distorting influence of quotations in Latin and Greek is supposed to be due to "inaccurate memory" [WEST 1973: 17], it is more likely in the Indian context that a scribe substituted the reading he had learned by heart for the one in the manuscript".

<sup>29</sup>I fully agree with the opinion of the editors of the Skandapurāṇa (ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER & ISAACSON 1998: 39): "It is in our view misguided to believe that texts—especially those that are products of cultures no longer living—can be edited by rule; that any particular procedure (for instance the sometimes invoked 'stemmatic-method') could possibly be applied in mechanical or near-mechanical fashion to recover the 'original'". In the light of my discussion in §2.7 below, it may be worthwhile also to quote the footnote (n. 157) which follows after the cited passage: "This is so whether the endeavour really is to discover the original (i.e. earliest) form of the text or only some form earlier (i.e. freer from transmissional changes) than those of the extant witnesses". For further methodological discussion and a reasoned argument (with ample references) leading to "a strong devaluation of stemmatology except in specially proven cases", see HANNEDER 1998: 40–45.

other parts of grammar, along with elaborate further references to primers, dictionaries etc.

On the modern printed form of the Oriya script, cf. FRIEDRICH 2002 (chapter V) and especially MCPHERSON 1924. Extensive character sets for five dated PS mss. (plus one dated Orissa ms. of the Pañcaviṃśabrāhmaṇa, and one undated PS ms.) have been produced for the ‘Indoskript’ project of the German Research Foundation, and Kengo Harimoto has derived from these a combined list of characters that I have placed online at [www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/ebene\\_1/fiindole.htm#Sprachen](http://www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/ebene_1/fiindole.htm#Sprachen). Most of the signs and notations described in the following paragraphs are illustrated in this list.

The common errors in the Orissa mss., due to the local pronunciation of Sanskrit and to the form of the script, have already been listed by WITZEL 1985a: 260, 1985b: 267, and 282–284; BHATTACHARYA, p. xx–xxi and xxxii–xxxiv; ZEHNDER 1999: 15; and LUBOTSKY 2002: 9–12. They are therefore not repeated here.<sup>30</sup>

**2.1.2.4 Orthography and sandhi** I limit myself to those peculiarities of the Orissa mss. of which knowledge is presupposed in the critical apparatus. Cf. in general GRIFFITHS 2003a: 339–341. The following statements are a revised version of what was written there.

*b = v* Differently from Śāradā, the Oriya script does not distinguish between *b* and *v* (see BHATTACHARYA 1997: p. xxxiii). When quoting readings from Orissa mss., I have decided to choose the appropriate phoneme (rather than offering a strict transliteration, with consistent *b* or *v*: this would have posed a useless burden on the critical apparatus). The Orissa mss. cannot be used as evidence for establishing the spelling, with *b* or *v*, of rare words with uncertain etymology (cf. Ved. Var. II, §208, p. 110): e.g. 6.14.2c *balāhakam*.

*y/ȳ* The distinction between these signs was ignored in GRIFFITHS 2003a (see now GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY 2000–01[03]: 205f., n. 10). While *y* represents [j] (‘*antastha ja*’ as opposed to *j* ‘*bargya ja*’), the sign *ȳ*, with a special diacritic, is used to represent the sound [y]. The distinction has been neglected in my critical apparatus for the simple reason that I only learned to distinguish the two at a relatively late stage of my work (after the writing of GRIFFITHS 2003a): anyhow, reporting the difference between *y* and *ȳ* with precision would have meant a considerable expense of space and effort on variants without any relevance whatsoever for the constitution of the text.

*ṛ/ṝ* Cf. BHATTACHARYA 1997: xxxiii. The Oriya vowel sign *ṛ* is pronounced [ru]. Hence, the sound [ru] is mostly written either with the independent

<sup>30</sup>I have prepared rather elaborate cumulative lists, incorporating also materials culled from ZEHNDER 1999 and LUBOTSKY 2002. These can be made available upon request.

- $r$  sign, when it occurs after a vowel in words like *vaṛṇa-* (= *varuṇa-*), or with the dependent sign after a consonant, as in *caḅṛ* (= *caḅṛur*). Similarly, [rū] can be written  $\bar{r}$ , as in *puṛṇi* (= *purūṇi*), though apparently not often postconsonantly. However, the script does certainly dispose over graphemic means to distinguish *ru/rū* from  $r/\bar{r}$ , and some words seem to have a preferred spelling with the former: e.g. *dhruva-*, less often *dhṛva-*; *śatrūn*, less often *śatṛn*. My apparatus will therefore consistently report precisely how words edited with *ru* or *rū* are in fact spelt in the Orissa mss.
- $l/l$  The script distinguishes the two different lateral phonemes of the Oriya language (/l/ and /l̥/: *l* and *l̥*), and the *l̥* sign is sometimes — a pattern is not (yet) discernible (cf. ZEHNDER 1999: 21) — used in the PS mss. for *l*. Cf. also RAU 1983b. The distinction between the two has mostly been ignored in my apparatus.
- $d/\bar{r}$  The script uses a diacritic subscript dot which, in accordance with the allophony of the Oriya language, is commonly used to turn intervocalic  $\bar{d}/dh$  into  $r/\bar{r}h$ . See §2.8 (U) below on my editorial policy with regard to this distinction.
- ch/cch* The script can distinguish the two, but in practice the Or. mss. generally write *ch*, (almost) never *cch*. See my discussion under 7.5.12a as well as the readings at 6.3.1. Cf. §2.8 (N).
- $\dot{h}$  The Or. mss. use only visarga (-*h*) before sibilants, and before velar and labial voiceless stops in external sandhi. One does not encounter *jihvāmūliya* and *upadhmanīya* in these mss. Cf. §2.8 (P), (Q), (R).
- ' A sign for avagraha (') is frequently — but not consistently — used in the Orissa mss.
- $\dot{n}$  On the use of -*ṅ* (plus *virāma*) for *anunāsika* in the Or. mss., see WITZEL 1983 and §2.8 (D) below. Among the other Śākhās extant in Orissa, this may be a peculiarity of the PS tradition: a proper sign for *anunāsika* does exist in Oriya script,<sup>31</sup> but seems never to be used in the PS mss.
- $\hat{s}$  In several mss. (i.a. **Ku3**, **Pa** and **V/123**) I have noticed the occurrence of the sign for *s* plus a superscribed roughly m-shaped diacritic to mark the correction of *s* to *ś*. I transcribe it as  $\hat{s}$ : see e.g. the opening invocation of *kāṇḍa* 6 in **Mā**, and the critical apparatus for 6.3.5+9, 6.7.4, 6.10.8, 6.12.8, 6.20.6, 6.22.9, 7.6.9, 7.19.3. (See also the note provided by BHATTACHARYA 1997: 659 *ad* PS 10.7.8d.)

**2.1.2.5 Marginal and interlinear corrections/additions** Marginal corrections (or additions) are marked most often by the correct akṣara(s) vertically above or below the akṣara(s) which is/are to be corrected/added, plus an indication of the line where the correction/addition is to be made.

<sup>31</sup>An example is contained in the list that I have put online, and that was referred to above, on p. xxvi.

Small dots or the *kākapada* sign (cf. §4.5) sometimes mark the place where the correction/addition is to be inserted. Cf., e.g., my apparatus under 6.2.6 (**Pa**), 6.9.5 (**V/126**), 6.20.5 (**Pa**), 7.2.10 (**V/126** and **Ma**), 7.16.8 (**Ku**).

**2.1.2.6 Punctuation** BHATTACHARYA has pointed out (1997: xxix) that the Orissa mss. indicate half-stanzas (|) and stanzas (||), and that most of them indicate uneven pādas as well. This indication of the uneven pādas, which we do not find in all mss., is done by means of an apostrophe-like raised stroke, which I call ‘pāda-marker’.<sup>32</sup> Whenever the meter is not based on octosyllabic pādas, the placement of these markers tends to go astray. They seem to be an invention of the Orissa branch of transmission, because no trace of them can be found in **K**. I have not reported their presence or absence in my critical apparatus.

As BHATTACHARYA also reports (p. xxi), “For a two-pāda or six-pāda stanza the number of half-stanzas is given at the end of the stanza or some indication is made”. I may state here what I have seen: the markers consist of a numeral (1, 3, or even 4) superscribed over (or sometimes subscribed under) a regular double daṇḍa. The 1 is marked for single ‘hemistich’-stanzas (two pādas), the 3 for stanzas with three ‘hemistichs’ (six pādas), and the 4 for stanzas with four ‘hemistichs’, or eight pādas. I render these markers as ||<sup>1</sup> etc.: cf., e.g., my apparatus under 6.11.10, 6.20.6, 7.10 (*passim*), 7.17.1, 7.18.2.

**2.1.2.7 Abbreviations of repeated parts of mantras** The just mentioned superscribed numerals are superscribed in exactly the same way as another sign, the akṣara *kā*, which is added to the double daṇḍa after a stanza not written out in full because it repeats one or more words or pādas from the preceding stanza (||<sup>kā</sup>). My informants among the Orissa Atharvavedins all explain this syllable as an instruction to the reciter, short-hand for the Oriya word *kārheṇī*, which would mean ‘repetition’: i.e., the unwritten remainder of the stanza is to be recited as written in the preceding one. The word *kārheṇī* is not attested in Oriya dictionaries, but must be derived (by means of the productive suffix *-eṇī*, NEUKOM & PATNAIK 2003, §3.1.1.1, p. 18) from the verb *kārhibā* ‘to draw out, extract’. Other notations of abbreviation are common to the **K** and Or. transmissions, and will be discussed below in §2.5.

**2.1.2.8 Indications of textual divisions** Cf. the discussion in §3.1. The Or. mss. indicate the end of the respective textual divisions above the stanza level in the following way.

---

<sup>32</sup>On the marker, see WITZEL 1985b: 265.

**Hymns** BHATTACHARYA informs us (p. xxi), “The Or. MSS give the total number of verse[s] in the *kāṇḍikā* (hymn)<sup>33</sup> and its serial number at the end of the *kāṇḍikā*”. The mss. use the abbreviation *r* (for *rc-*) followed by the number of stanzas contained in the hymn (e.g. || *r 10* ||), but the stanza-count is (occasionally) not filled in in particular mss. (|| *r* ||), especially the more recent ones. In several mss., the stanza-count follows the hymn’s serial number, instead of preceding it (cf. above, §2.1.2.2).

**Anuvākas** The *anuvāka*-division is generally marked by *a* (for *anuvāka*) plus a number, immediately after the stanza-count/hymn number, separated from the last number by double *daṇḍa* (e.g. || *a 4* ||). Occasionally, e.g. in the post-colophons of **Ek2** and **JM2–5** reported in GRIFFITHS 2003a, the Or. mss. do write a full *anuvāka*-colophon, with the *anuvāka*-number in words rather than figures.

**Kāṇḍas** The end of a *kāṇḍa* is generally indicated by the appearance of slightly more extensive colophons, marked off from the surrounding text by sometimes quite elaborate floral designs. Only the names of the *kāṇḍas* (see §3.3), no numerical indications, are normally given. Unique, to my knowledge, is the indication *kṣudrah ṣoḍaśakāṇḍaḥ* which we find in the post-colophon to **Ji1** (GRIFFITHS 2003a: 347).

To clarify the above, I can quote as example the colophon of ms. **Ku1**, as given in GRIFFITHS 2003a: 355. When we read . . . || *r 8* || *40* || *a 8* || *iti aṣṭarccakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ* ||, this means: ‘With the 40th hymn, consisting of 8 stanzas, and the 8th *anuvāka*, an end has come to the *Kāṇḍa* of 8-stanza-hymns (i.e., PS 5)’.

Of the other textual divisions discussed in GRIFFITHS 2003b, the division into Vargas and Pādas is not relevant in *kāṇḍas* 6/7, so I mention only the division into \*Prapāṭhakas.

**\*Prapāṭhakas** This division (GRIFFITHS 2003b: 29–31) is marked in the Or. mss. with a simple insertion of the type || *śrī(h)* ||, or || *viṣṇuḥ* ||, into the text. See my apparatus under 6.12.5 and 7.4.4.

**2.1.2.9 Absence of accents** Differently from **K**, the Or. mss. mark no accents anywhere. According to WITZEL 1979–80, §2.1 p. 22 n. 5, “Überlieferung ohne Akzente bedeutet Mißachtung des Textes” (after AiGr. I, §243a p. 282). Clearly, the relative faithfulness of the Or. mss., compared with the astoundingly corrupt but sporadically accented ms. **K**, contradicts this generalization, which does not further our insight into the reason for the absence of accents in the Or. transmission. RENO 1964b: 422 speculates that the Or. mss. show no

<sup>33</sup>On BHATTACHARYA’s use of the word *kāṇḍikā*- in the meaning ‘hymn’, see GRIFFITHS 2003b: 26, with n. 240.

trace of accents “parce que la transcription en avait été faite à des fins rituelles et non pour accompagner l’apprentissage mnémonique”. But this hypothesis does not take into account the fact that the most important ritual manuals of the Orissa Paippalādins contain mantras in sakalapāṭha, and that this severely, if not entirely, limits the ritual ends to which Samhitā mss. are required. In any case we are still at a loss to explain the retention (or reinsertion) — however limited — of accentuation in **K** (see §2.1.1.4).

## 2.2 The Śāunakasamhitā

The text of ŚS consists of its proper portion of mantras not known in other collections, of mantras borrowed (in more or less altered form) from the RV, and of mantras shared with other mantra-collections. About half of the mantras of the PS find a parallel — sometimes close, sometimes more distant — among these mantras of the ŚS, which are hence a primary source of support for textual criticism of the PS, not least because of their transmission with accents, Padapāṭha, and commentary,<sup>34</sup> along with two Prātiśākhya-treatises<sup>35</sup> and two Anukramaṇi-works.<sup>36</sup> For the text of the ŚS, the following sources were at my disposal.

- The 1856 *editio princeps* by ROTH & WHITNEY, complete with the 20th kāṇḍa, intended to be and published as the first volume to which W-L (see below) became the sequel. Henceforward this edition is referred to as **<sup>1</sup>R-W**.
- The excellent critical edition by Shankar Pandurang PANDIT — henceforward referred to as **ŚPP** — of the Samhitā with Padapāṭha and the commentary attributed to Sāyaṇa. See the high praise voiced by WHITNEY (1905: xviii), but also his criticism (p. lxvi). The Critical Notice which the editor prefaces to Volume I remains essential reading.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>34</sup>On the relative reliability of accentuation and the Padapāṭha see the references collected by RENOUE 1947: 62 (add WHITNEY 1856: 402). To the examples of errors in the Padapāṭha given W-L, pp. lxix f., I may add the examples pointed out by me in my commentary on PS 6.11.5a and 6.11.8a. On the caliber of the ŚS commentary attributed to Sāyaṇa, see WHITNEY 1893 (also W-L, p. lxxvii). See SŪRYA KĀNTA 1950 and now SLAJE forthc. on the identity of the commentator.

<sup>35</sup>The Śāunakīyā Caturādhyāyikā (WHITNEY 1862, DESHPANDE 1997) and the Atharva-prātiśākhya (SŪRYA KĀNTA 1939).

<sup>36</sup>Cf. W-L, pp. lxxi ff. See the edition of the Pañcapāṭalīkā by BHAGWADDATTA 1920, and the one of Atharvavedīyabṛhatsarvānukramaṇīkā by Ramgopala SHASTRI 1922, revised ed. by VISHVA BANDHU 1966.

<sup>37</sup>It may be noted here that I ignore the other Indian editions, of which only VISHVA BANDHU’S was available to me. Although I have not undertaken even a superficial comparison of this edition with the one it claims to emulate — viz. ŚPP —, a number of details suggest to me that ŚPP’S is the more reliable of the two: e.g., the important evidence on the stanza division of 19.47 (= our 6.20) from the commentary as printed by ŚPP (Vol. 4, p. 475 *ṣaṣṭhī*

- The translation of the text (with the exception of kāṇḍa 20), with elaborate text-critical notes, by WHITNEY. The long prefatory and introductory sections to this posthumous *magnum opus*, “revised and brought nearer to completion and edited” by LANMAN and published in the latter’s Harvard Oriental Series in 1905, repay attentive and repeated study. They remain elementary reading for all research on the Atharvavedic Saṃhitās, and knowledge of the basic facts recounted therein is presupposed in the present study,<sup>38</sup> where the work is referred to throughout as **W-L**.
- The text of <sup>1</sup>R-W, revised by LINDENAU on the basis of indications in W-L, but without kāṇḍa 20. For that kāṇḍa, only <sup>1</sup>R-W and ŚPP were available to me. The siglum **R-W** henceforward refers to the text and stanza-numbering of this, the most current edition.

While RENO’s desideratum (as quoted in §1.1) of solid description of the two extant AV Schools and their interrelationships cannot be achieved with any completeness in the limited context of this study, and I have restricted myself primarily to the solution of the manifold problems which the PS itself poses, we must not forget that since the heyday of studies in the AV about a century ago, perhaps even less philological work has been done on the text of ŚS than on PS, and many problems remain to be solved there as well: a better knowledge of the Paippalāda text will, for many of the parallel passages, also contribute to the better understanding of their Śaunaka version. The question whether one of the two recensions can be designated as more original, the question as to their relative chronology, and the question to what extent a kind of Ur-Atharvaveda can be reconstructed (cf. WITZEL 1997: 275–283) remain outside the scope of the present study.

### 2.2.1 The position of ŚS kāṇḍa 19 vis-à-vis PS

That ŚS kāṇḍa 19 is a supplement to the basic collection of 18 kāṇḍas in that Saṃhitā has long been known. The mss. are far more corrupt for this kāṇḍa than elsewhere.<sup>39</sup> This and other reasons (W-L, pp. cxli, cxlvi and 895–898), coupled with the observation that “book 19 with the exception of about 12 of its 72 hymns is scattered through the AVP”, already led BLOOMFIELD (following ROTH 1875: 18) to the supposition that “this supplement to the

---

|| *dvipadeyam ṛk* etc.) is omitted by VISHVA BANDHU, and the latter’s edition also shows arbitrary (and inconsistent) orthographical changes (cf. e.g. 4.38.5ab *saṃcāranti [bis]* in ŚPP vs. *sañcāranti [bis]* in VISHVA BANDHU’s ed.). If all available editions were to be used, this would make the PS editor’s task unmanageable, but would, I am confident, not bring to bear on the PS any new facts of text-critical importance.

<sup>38</sup>Cf. the important review by OLDENBERG (1906 = 1993: 1950–1955).

<sup>39</sup>Cf. WHITNEY (1856: 410): “And it is moreover to be noticed that in the nineteenth book of the text the manuscripts are most especially faulty, so that their authority in doubtful cases is of almost no weight whatever”.

Śāunakīya is largely derived from its sister-śakhā”.<sup>40</sup> What a careful study of the **K** ms., before it was even published in facsimile, this brief statement of BLOOMFIELD implies, is shown by the following table, where mantras from PS 19 and 20 are quoted according to a provisional numbering following the Or. mss. I have printed in italics such correspondences as are merely partial, and places where the arrangement of the PS parallel is different have been marked with an exclamation point; the numbers in parentheses are the verse totals of the ŚS hymn in question.

ŚS 19	PS	ŚS 19	PS	ŚS 19	PS
1 (3)	19.43.13–15	25 (1)	20.39.8	49 (10)	14.8
2 (5)	8.8.7–11	26 (4)	1.82	50 (7)	14.9
3 (4)	1.73	27 (15)	10.7+8!	51 (2)	20.57.12–13
4 (4)	<i>19.24.7–9</i>	28 (10)	12.21	52 (5)	1.30.1–5
5 (1)	20.19.4	29 (9)	12.22.1–9!	53 (10)	11.8
6 (16)	<i>9.5</i>	30 (5)	12.22.10–14!	54 (5)	11.9
7 (5)	—	31 (14)	10.5	55 (6)	<i>20.52.1</i>
8 (7)	<i>20.49.9–10, 20.22.4</i>	32 (10)	11.12	56 (6)	3.8
9 (14)	—	33 (5)	11.13	57 (6)	3.30
10 (10)	12.16	34 (10)	11.3	58 (6)	1.110 (4) + 1.81.1–2
11 (6)	12.17	35 (5)	11.4	59 (3)	19.47.4–6
12 (1)	—	36 (6)	2.27	60 (2)	—
13 (11)	7.4	37 (4)	<i>1.54.2–5</i>	61 (1)	—
14 (1)	20.22.10	38 (3)	19.24.1–3	62 (1)	<i>2.32.5</i>
15 (6)	3.35	39 (10)	7.10	63 (1)	—
16 (2)	10.8.4–5	40 (4)	19.38.6, 20.60.3–4, 11.15.5	64 (4)	—
17 (10)	7.16	41 (1)	1.53.3	65 (1)	16.150.4
18 (10)	7.17	42 (4)	8.9.5–6, 1.77.3–4	66 (1)	16.150.5
19 (11)	8.17	43 (8)	—	67 (8)	—
20 (4)	1.108	44 (10)	15.3	68 (1)	19.35.2
21 (1)	—	45 (10)	15.4	69 (4)	19.55.12–15
22 (21)	—	46 (7)	4.23	70 (1)	20.43.1
23 (30)	—	47 (9)	6.20	71 (1)	—
24 (8)	15.5.8–10, 15.6.1–5!	48 (6)	6.21	72 (1)	19.35.3

There are, out of seventy-two, six hymns where the correspondence is imperfect, and another four where the arrangement of the text in ŚS 19 shows marked differences from the transmitted arrangement of PS, while there are thirteen hymns finding no parallel at all in PS.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>40</sup>The quotations are from BLOOMFIELD 1899: 15. See also p. 35 and RENO 1947: 67f.

<sup>41</sup>Of 19.4, whose stanzas 3–4 are PS 19.24.7–9, the first stanza is not found along with that ṛca, and is not traceable anywhere else in Vedic literature either. Of 19.6, the Puruṣasūkta, PS has a slightly different version, shorter by two stanzas (cf. GRIFFITHS 2003b: 14 n. 69, and my n. 119 below), in which ŚS 19.6.7–8 find no parallel (although they are tacked on at the back of the hymn in the Or. mss.). Of 19.7, ‘to the lunar asterisms’, we find no parallel in PS at all: the hymn seems to have been incorporated into ŚS from elsewhere at a late stage, as it is found in sakalapāṭha also at AVParīś 1.11.1–5. Of the related 19.8, ‘for well-being: to the asterisms etc.’, we find no parallels in PS for stanzas 1–3 and 7, but we do find the whole hymn once again in sakalapāṭha in AVParīś 1.26.1–7. The next hymn, 19.9, seems to have no parallel anywhere; 19.12 is not found in PS either. The pseudo-hymns 19.21–23 are mere ancillary collectanea regarding meter (21: paralleled by VSM 23.33), and the contents of the (Paippalāda?) Samhitā (23: cf. WITZEL 1985a: 269; GRIFFITHS 2003b: 27); 22–23 are found integrally in AVParīś 46.9.1–10.30. The hymn 19.37 is largely parallel to, but — especially in

For those hymns which seem not to have been borrowed from PS, I have the impression that in most cases *ad hoc* composition might be argued, and the fact that two of them are found in sakalapāṭha in an old part of the AVPariś, viz. the Nakṣatrakalpa (see BAHULKAR 1984), suggests that these might have been incorporated into the Saṃhitā from a ritual text with its own Mantrapāṭha. But I wish here to leave such interesting possibilities for what they are, and reserve them for future study. The fact remains that the text of those mantras which do have a parallel in PS is mostly (except for secondary corruptions) in perfect agreement with that of PS, and I therefore regard such parallels as testimonia in the strict sense of the term: good readings from the ŚS transmission of such mantras may be used to restore the text of PS, without further scruples about mixing up possibly authentic Śākhā-differences (cf. §2.7).

### 2.3 Testimonia and parallel mantras outside of ŚS

Besides the PS mantras transmitted in ŚS 19, there is a considerable amount of other evidence external to the manuscript tradition of the PS itself that is of importance for the history of the text, for its constitution and interpretation. This evidence is to be found in testimonia and in parallel texts. Let me mention here in the first place a source not belonging properly to any of the two categories discussed in this regard in the next section: the Nīlarudropaniṣad. LUBIN's article of 2007 contains a new edition of this small work, transmitted with accents in some of the numerous extant mss., that is composed entirely of PS stanzas, and a discussion of all information that can be extracted from it of text critical relevance for the PS. The following table of correspondences is reproduced from LUBIN's article (p. 81), with preliminary numbering of stanzas from PS 20 (where the Orissa and Kashmir transmissions diverge strongly).

Khaṇḍa 1	=	PS 14.3.1–9
Khaṇḍa 2	=	PS 14.3.10–14.4.7, 19.22.1–3
Khaṇḍa 3	=	PS 8.7.9, 19.5.8, 20.55.10, 20.60.7, 20.62.6, 20.62.7 (the final stanza found only in the Or. mss. of the PS)

#### 2.3.1 Testimonia

Except for the Nīlarudropaniṣad and the Paippalāda mantras transmitted in ŚS 19 (§2.2.1), the only testimonia in the strict sense of the term — at least as far as such have become known to me thus far — are the quotations of PS

---

the last stanza — not identical with the seeming parallel in PS 1, in a five-stanza hymn whose first stanza seems to be a later accretion: we may here have a case where ŚS has borrowed from a different Śākhā. Of hymn 55, only the first stanza seems to be found in PS; of 60 (a couplet) and the single-stanza hymns 61–63, only 62 seems to be found in PS (where it is the last stanza of a regular five-stanza hymn), and it is a striking fact (cf. W-L, p. 1001) that the text which 'Sāyaṇa' had before him also did not contain any of them. Of hymns 64, 67, 71, no trace seems to exist in PS.

stanzas in ancillary literature of the AV,<sup>42</sup> and in the Vyākaraṇa (and Nirukta) literature. I briefly discuss the sources in question.

### 2.3.1.1 Atharvavedic ancillary literature

**Śaunaka Śākhā** The Śaunaka Śākhā offers a full array of ancillary texts, almost all of which is available in print. Of the Samhitā-related sources — Padapāṭha, Prātiśākhya, Anukramaṇīs and commentary — mentioned above in §2.2, the latter needs to be mentioned here again as containing a textual transmission of the ŚS mantras independent of the ŚS mss.<sup>43</sup> On the ritual ancillary literature of the Śaunaka Śākhā, I may refer in general to BLOOMFIELD 1899 and to MODAK 1993.

Quotations in sakalapāṭha of Paippalāda mantras in the KauśS have been made the subject of a separate treatment by myself (GRIFFITHS 2004): see also my commentary under 7.6.10. A similar study might be undertaken for the other ancillary texts transmitted within the Śaunaka Śākhā. No sakalapāṭha quotations of any mantras of PS kāṇḍas 6/7 are found in the VaitS, but for some quotations from PS 2 and 5, see ZEHNDER 1999: 103–106 and LUBOTSKY 2002: 84, 123–126. As to Paippalāda quotations in AVParīś, see e.g. ZEHNDER 1999: 74 and my treatment of 7.7.9–10; cf. also BLOOMFIELD 1899: 12 and BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003: 324.

No quotations from kāṇḍas 6/7 are known to me from the GB, although this text does contain a significant number of quotations from other kāṇḍas.<sup>44</sup> The AthPrāyaś also contains several PS mantras in sakalapāṭha, one of which has been made use of for the present edition (see under PS 7.7.9). None of the manifold ‘Atharvan’ Upaniṣads yield any significant material known to me for kāṇḍas 6/7.

**Paippalāda Śākhā** Another, potentially useful, and certainly much more ample source of external evidence on the readings of the mantras (and on the rituals for which they have been employed at least in recent centuries) is available in the anonymous ritual manual called Karmasamuccaya used by the Paippalādins of Orissa (cf. GRIFFITHS 2002: 39, now also 2007: 145f.). Since this manual seems consistently to quote the mantras in sakalapāṭha, its testimony could be important, even if the scribal reliability does not seem to be high in these mss., and some interference from oral/written Samhitā transmission must always be expected. Unfortunately, I have not yet found the time to acquaint myself more than superficially with the few manuscripts (from a sea of mss.

<sup>42</sup>In fact, an important question which still has to be addressed is the exact nature of the relationship between the Paippalāda Śākhā and the ancillary literature that has been transmitted by the Śaunaka school (cf. CALAND 1904; GRIFFITHS 2004 and 2007).

<sup>43</sup>See W-L, pp. lxxvii f., and §2.6.3.1 below.

<sup>44</sup>See RENO 1947: 77f.

available in private collections throughout Orissa) in this class of literature that are available to me, and of which I have recently published a list (2007: 145f.).

The other known ritual manual, Śrīdhara's Karmapañjikā (cf. the corresponding index entry, GRIFFITHS & SCHMIEDCHEN 2007: 390), quotes mantras in pratīka, but when it becomes available in edition — a project being undertaken by Shilpa Sumant (Pune) and myself —, may still be expected to be of some value as testimony for the establishment of the readings of mantras (if only their initial words), as it has proved to be for the establishment of the places where the textual divisions are made (GRIFFITHS 2003b), and as it promises to be for the understanding of the ritual context, and hence for the interpretation of mantras.

**2.3.1.2 Vaiyākaraṇas** I need to emphasize that I do not have any specialist knowledge of Vyākaraṇa literature, and may therefore refer to the words of an authoritative śāstrin, Kamaleswar BHATTACHARYA (2001: 25f.):

It has long been recognized that in studying the Vedic literature it is essential to consider the ancient grammatical literature of India, and that in studying the latter, it is essential to consider the former: the study of the one is beneficial to the study of the other.

Now a host of evidences suggest that the ancient grammarians, from Pāṇini onward, up to the authors of the Kāśikāvṛtti at least, used the Paippalāda-Saṃhitā.

Close attention to evidence of acquaintance, on the part of the Vaiyākaraṇas, with the PS is important: first, for general historical questions surrounding the Paippalāda and Vyākaraṇa traditions, and also, at times, for establishing the text of PS; in cases where the PS mss. are corrupt, the Vaiyākaraṇa 'Nebenüberlieferung' sometimes comes to our aid. Kamaleswar BHATTACHARYA's small article contains all of the most important references,<sup>45</sup> but I may point especially to his note 6 (p. 29), giving a few instances where it seems likely — as far as the nature of Pāṇini's text allows conclusions in this regard — that Pāṇini has made use of PS.<sup>46</sup> See also my commentary under 6.12.6d and 7.9.6a.

<sup>45</sup>Although regrettably BHATTACHARYA takes no position with regard to BRONKHORST's very cautious arguments (1991: 99–102), which in fact remain unmentioned. See now BRONKHORST 2007: 196, plus appendix III (pp. 330–334), for additional words of caution concerning the connections I propose here between forms attested in the PS and rules providing for such forms in Pāṇini's grammar; BRONKHORST mainly argues for caution on the grounds that the same grammar expressly forbids several forms that are nevertheless found in the PS.

<sup>46</sup>Cf. already THIEME 1935: 39 and 41, 64, 66. Since BHATTACHARYA's article may not be easily available everywhere, I list here his examples: with PS 4.14.8 *ṣaṣṭirātra-/ṣaṣṭika-*, compare Aṣṭādhyāyī 5.1.90; with 1.44.4, 1.111.4, 3.9.1–6 [also 13.3.5, 15.16.5] *āheya-*, compare 4.3.56. These first two examples have been taken from RENOUE 1957c: 118 (where some more examples are given). BHATTACHARYA further compares PS 5.36.1–8 *śivatāti-* with Aṣṭādhyāyī 4.4.143f., and mentions the case discussed by me under 7.12.5b (contrast BRONKHORST 1991: 100 and now 2007: 195f.). I myself (2004: 67f.) have added another possible example elsewhere (PS

The special connection between Patañjali and PS has been pointed out long ago, and the evidence has been collected by RAU in 1985, who concluded (p. 103), “Das Mahābhāṣya gehört in die nächste Nähe des Kāṭhaka und des Paippalāda-Atharvaveda”. A similar conclusion was reached by RAU in 1993 (p. 109) with regard to the Kāśīkāvṛtti. For Patañjali, cf. besides RAU’s work RENO 1953: 463, WITZEL 1986: 257 n. 24, BRONKHORST 1991: 101f. (now 2007, appendix V), my commentary under 6.8.5d, 6.14.2b, 7.9.4a+5b, 7.10.7a, 7.13.9a, and my introductory remarks on 7.17;<sup>47</sup> for the Kāśīkāvṛtti, my commentary under 6.6.8d, 6.14.2c, and 6.22.9d. Cf. in general, again, the article by K. BHATTACHARYA. Regarding testimonia in the Nirukta (e.g. for PS 19.4.15), cf. RENO 1947: 72 n. 1.

### 2.3.2 Parallels in mantra texts

I have done my best to trace all the relevant parallels, and to report them above each stanza. Those pertinent to the establishment and interpretation of the PS text — and as a matter of principle I regard the preservation of Vedic accents (not transmitted by PS mss.) as a criterion for inclusion among such parallels — have been quoted in 8pt typeface below the critical apparatus to the stanza in question (see §4.1). My starting point for tracing parallel mantras and pādas was of course BLOOMFIELD 1906, and, since it became available, Marco FRANCESCHINI’s extremely convenient electronic update of the same (2000). For texts not entirely included or not included at all in the original or the updated Concordance, I have relied on searches in my database of electronic texts.

## 2.4 Perseveration in the manuscripts

Besides the usual array of visually based errors familiar to the textual critic, and errors due to local pronunciation of Sanskrit (the latter justly emphasized by WITZEL 1973–76, 1985b, 1994a), I wish to emphasize here especially one factor, which, when duly taken into account, is of particular fruitfulness for the identification of errors in the transmission, both the one in Orissa and the one in Kashmir. I refer to the psychologically based phenomenon that I call *perseveration* in this work (and is used by me to cover also its counterpart

---

20.9.4 *akasvala*:- Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.2.175), and may point here to the formation *sragviṇ*- found at 7.9.6d (Aṣṭādhyāyī 5.2.121) — on these two cases see now BRONKHORST 2007: 196 n. 26. Is the shared use of the name *pāda* for textual divisions, in PS and the Aṣṭādhyāyī (GRIFFITHS 2003b: 29), also relevant here?

<sup>47</sup>Among unattributed mantras listed by RAU 1985, I have on casual perusal noticed also the following: item 150 *indro mā vakṣat* is quoted from PS 19.34.14a. Cf. further ZEHNDER 1999: 81 (2.27.5) [not listed by RAU], 184 (2.84.1), 189 (2.87.1), 193 (2.88.1) [*amitraghāta*:- not listed by RAU; cf. RENO 1953: 443 “le mot . . . n’est pas attesté en védique, et n’est pas peut-être voulu pour tel”] and LUBOTSKY 2002: 66 (5.11.8).

*anticipation*).<sup>48</sup> Cf. the article on grammatical perseveration phenomena by OERTEL (1912–13), who speaks (p. 50 = 1994/I: 239) of “ein im Brennpunkte des Bewußtseins stehendes Lautbild” which “von einem nahe der Peripherie des Bewußtseinsfeldes liegenden Lautbild verdrängt wird, weil die Aufmerksamkeit vom fokalen Lautbild auf das periphere Lautbild abgelenkt wurde”. OERTEL gives some specific examples, culled from the KapKS (1934: 70 = 1994/I: 701), of contiguous mantras and prose sentences influencing each other. One of the first Vedic scholars to have reckoned with the same principle over longer distance was WHITNEY (1856: 414), although he did not find the use of this principle strictly convincing in the particular example he was dealing with (3× pāda-final *babhūva* for *babhūva* at ŚS 6.133.4, 8.7.12, 13.2.44): “It is to be noted . . . that the verbal form here in question stands in the Atharvan very often, indeed, in almost every case in which it occurs at all, at the end of a *pāda*; and that in numerous instances (seventeen in all) it receives an accent in that position; not without a distinct reason, it is true, in each case, such as is wanting in the three passages now under consideration; yet it may be that the frequent occurrence of that ending led to the transference of its accentuation to these three passages: the tonic cadence was familiar to the ear, and was accordingly intruded upon a few lines to which it did not properly belong”. It seems to me that the term perseveration can be used to describe all such phenomena, including the one frequently encountered in both branches of PS transmission, viz. of secondary replacement of part of mantras by parts of others, due to partial similarities between the borrowing and the lending mantra: the underlying psychological process — confusion of closely similar information stored in the memory — seems comparable.

LANMAN has provided, under the heading ‘Faulty assimilation’, a large number of instances of such perseveration from ŚS (1903: 303–305). ZEHNDER 1999 has noted several cases where parts of mantras are transferred from one to the other in **K** (pp. 51, 83, 92, 173, 187), one where both **K** and the Or. mss. have undergone such perseveration (p. 188), and two where (a part of) the Or. mss. have done so: pp. 102, 121. I have noted the phenomenon in **K** at 6.9.10a, 6.22.12d, 7.1.7, 7.3.11b, 7.5.11a, 16.73.1b (?), 20.65.10 [PSK 20.61.10c]; in (some of) the Or. mss. at 6.4.7d, 6.10.5c, 6.10.9d, 6.11.10, 7.1.5b, 7.5.11a (?), 7.6.6a+d, 7.6.8c, 7.8.1d. In cases of divergence between the two branches of transmission, I have found the search for possible sources of perseveration elsewhere in the text a very powerful tool for textual criticism: if it can be made plausible that only one of two at first sight equally fitting readings may have been perseverated from elsewhere in the text, this constitutes an important point in favor of the other reading.

---

<sup>48</sup>I follow WITZEL’s (undefined but apparently broad) use of the term *perseveration* (1997a: 280).

## 2.5 Mantra abbreviations in the manuscripts

The mss. use several ways of abbreviating (1) stanzas or groups of stanzas repeated from preceding parts of the text, as well as (2) repeated openings and refrains. Both of the devices described in the next two sections show similarities with the system of *galitas* found in ṚV (Samhitā- and Padapāṭha) mss., discussed most recently by FALK (2001: 183): “on almost every manuscript page a circle inside two *daṇḍas* replaces some part of the text. The passages omitted as well as the graphical sign is called *galita* or *galanta* in present time. The passages omitted involve usually three or more words; in rare cases one circle replaces more than a complete stanza”.

### 2.5.1 Abbreviations by *pratīka* with addition of *ity ekā* etc.

All mss. use, at precisely the same places, *pratīkas* of mantras followed by indications of the type *ity ekā*, which usage must hence be an old part of the tradition; it must in fact be part of a shared AV tradition of manuscript writing, probably going back to early medieval Gujarat (GRIFFITHS 2004: 93f. and 2007: 186f.), because precisely the same phenomenon is also found in the ŚS mss. I may quote integrally the statement regarding ŚS in W-L (p. cxix):

There are 41 cases of a repeated verse or a repeated group of verses occurring a second time in the text and agreeing throughout without variant with the text of the former occurrence. These in the mss. generally, both *samhitā* and *pada*, are given the second time by *pratīka* only, with *ity ekā* (sc. *īk*) or *īti dvē* or *īti tisraḥ* added and always accented like the quoted text-words themselves. Thus ix. 10. 4 (= vii. 73. 7) appears in the mss. as *ūpa hvaya ity ekā*. On the other hand, the very next verse, although it differs from vii. 73. 8 only by having *bhāgāt* for *nyāgan*, is written out in full. So xiii. 2. 38 (= x. 8. 18) appears as *sahasrāḥṇyām ity ekā*; while xiii. 3. 14, which is a second repetition of x. 8. 18 but contains further the added refrain *tāsya* etc., is written out in full as far as *tāsya*.

As DESHPANDE informs us (2002: lx), the same abbreviation device is found even in the Kramapāṭha-mss. of the Saunaka school. The same basic principles hold in the PS mss. as well: see BARRET 1912: 344f., 1915: 43; EDGERTON 1915: 376f.; and WITZEL 1985a: 262. Cf. a case (20.12.2–4 [PSK 20.11.1–3]) where the mss. write a *pratīka* plus *īti tisraḥ*, to refer to 16.68.4–6, and another (14.1.2–5) where the mss. give a *pratīka* plus *īti catasraḥ*, to refer to 1.25.1–4.

Further, somewhat more complicated cases in ŚS are discussed by W-L, p. cxx. A comparable example in PS is found e.g. at 15.19.9–12, where the words *yā nadīr īti catasraḥ* refer back to 7.13.11–14: although the *pratīka* is identical, there is a difference between these two sets of four stanzas, and the difference is indicated by the addition of *idam ulūṅgulukottarāḥ* (cf. BHATTACHARYA 1997: 830). The following other cases in PS have thus far come

to my attention: PS 16.33.6 *yad giriṣv iti pāñcarcīkī* (to indicate repetition of 2.35.2 rather than 4.10.7, *pāñcarcīka-* ‘from the eighteenth’ here referring to the title *pañcarcakāṇḍa* of book 2); 19.11.1–2 *aśvattho devasadana ity ajāyatānte* (a dual form to indicate repetition of two stanzas, 7.10.6–7,<sup>49</sup> without the refrain pādas e–h, rather than the single stanza 20.61.7 [PSK 20.51.8]); PSK 17.25.2 *yad asmāsv ity āṣṭadaśakī* (to indicate repetition of 15.4.2 rather than 3.30.6, *āṣṭadaśaka-* ‘from the eighteenth’ seemingly referring to the title *aṣṭadaśarcakāṇḍa* of book 15); and PS 20.58.2 *giriṃ gacheti sāptamīkī* (to indicate repetition of PS 4.24.7<sup>50</sup> rather than 12.1.9 or 20.39.5 [PSK 20.38.4], *sāptamīka-* ‘from the seventh’ here referring to the title *saptarcakāṇḍa* of book 4).<sup>51</sup> Cf. also the related comments on PS pratikas in GRIFITHS 2003b.

Both the R-W and the ŚPP edition give all the repeated stanzas in full (see W-L, p. cxix for a complete list). So does BHATTACHARYA in his 1997 edition: e.g. 2.59.12 (p. 189), 4.9.7 (p. 310), 4.17.7 (p. 324), 4.19.8 (p. 327), 5.23.4 (p. 406), 6.7.5 (p. 452), 6.11.1 (p. 459), 10.1.6 (p. 644), 12.19.8 (p. 749). On the mentioned pages he reports the actual readings of the mss. in his critical apparatus while at 6.23.8 (p. 481), 7.1.6 (p. 484), and 10.6.13 (p. 657) he does the same, but in addition places the actually unwritten words within [...] in his text: my list is not complete, and I suspect that other small inconsistencies can be found in the edition. While LUBOTSKY (2002: 107f.) follows BHATTACHARYA’s policy, ZEHNDER (1999: 137) follows the mss., and this is my policy as well.

### 2.5.2 Abbreviated openings and refrains

Another common type of abbreviation, the omission of identical openings and/or refrains in at least three consecutive stanzas, remains unmarked in the mss. (except for the marker ||<sup>ka</sup> occasionally encountered in the Or. mss.: see §2.1.2.7 above). This kind of abbreviation is also an old part of the tradition, because it is again found in all mss., and an identical practice is again found in the mss. of ŚS. W-L state for that text (p. cxx):

For the relief of the copyists,<sup>52</sup> there is practised on a large scale in both the *samhitā-* and the *pada-*mss. the omission of words and pādas repeated in successive verses. In general, if anywhere a few words or a pāda or a line

<sup>49</sup>BARRET 1940: 17 misunderstood this case, and supplied only 7.10.6, thereby leaving the hymn 19.11 one stanza short of the standard of 15 stanzas per hymn that holds in kāṇḍa 19.

<sup>50</sup>BHATTACHARYA’s stanza division is to be rearranged accordingly.

<sup>51</sup>The last two examples seem to imply that the Saṃhitā was at one time arranged strictly in the ascending order of the standard number of stanzas per hymn valid in each book, thus starting with the *ekarcakāṇḍa*, finding the *saptarcakāṇḍa* as seventh, etc. See §3.2 below. The slight difference in suffix between *āṣṭadaś-aka-* and *sāptam-ika-* is in need of explanation, if neither is actually in need of emendation.

<sup>52</sup>Cf. FALK 2001 on the RV *galitas*: this rationalization may not be correct.

or more are found in more than two successive verses, they are written out in full only in the first and last verses and are understood in the others [cf. p. 793, end]. For example, in vi. 17, a hymn of four verses, the refrain, being **c**, **d** of each of the four, is written out only in 1 and 4. Then, for verse 2 is written only *mahī dādhāre 'mān vānaspātīn*, because *yāthe 'yām pṛthivī* at the beginning is repeated. [That is, the scribe begins with the last one of the words which the verse has in common with its predecessor.] Then, because *dādhāra* also is repeated in 2–4, in verse 3 *mahī* also is left out and the verse reads in the mss. simply *dādhāra pārvatān girīn* — and this without any intimation of omission by the ordinary sign of omission.<sup>53</sup> — Sometimes the case is a little more intricate. Thus, in viii. 10, the initial words *só 'd akrāmat* are written only in verses 2 and 29, although they are really wanting in verses 9–17, *pariyāya* II. (verses 8–17) being in this respect treated as if all one verse with subdivisions [cf. p. 512 top].

This mode of abbreviation, and the rules pertaining to it in **K**, were already clearly stated by EDGERTON 1915: 377, and nicely exemplified by BARRET 1921b for PS 6.18; the practice of the Or. mss. agrees largely (though not always precisely) with **K**. Besides 6.18, other examples can be found in PS i.a. at 6.6.5–7, where pādas **cd** are written in full in stanzas 5 and 7, but abbreviated to *sa mā* in 6; at 6.11.8–6.13.3, where *yo 'smān . . .* is written in full for 6.11.8 and 6.13.3, but — in most mss. — abbreviated to *asmān . . .* in the intervening four mantras; at 6.14.2–5, where *tān ito nāśayāmasi* is abbreviated to *tān*; at 6.15.5–7, where the opening *ūrjā yā te . . .* is written in full for 6.15.5 and 6.15.7, but abbreviated to *te . . .* in the intervening mantra, where the final words *. . . ta ā dade* are also abbreviated to *. . . te* in **K** and most Or. mss.; at 6.17.2–10, where the Or. mss. omit the entire text of each second hemistich (some with the marker ||<sup>kā</sup>), while **K** for 2–9 gives its first word, in a rather unintelligent abbreviation without final visarga (*marudbhi*), and shares the full abbreviation with the Or. mss. in 10; similar abbreviations appear in 6.16, 6.19, 7.10, 7.13 and 14, and 7.16. The abbreviation of stanza 7 in the last mentioned hymn constitutes an irregularity, as noted *ad loc*.

I may refer here also to my discussion (GRIFFITHS 2003a: 343) of the case 13.1.7, where the opening word *antarhitāḥ* (found also in the surrounding stanzas 5 and 7) is omitted: this case has been misinterpreted by WITZEL 1985a: 263 as a transmissional error, namely a ‘lacuna’: the abbreviation is applied only at 13.1.7, because only 13.1.6–7–8 have an identical opening *antarhitā me*, sandhi *me ṛṣayaḥ* → *marṣayaḥ* in the abbreviated stanza apparently not being judged an infringement upon the rule.

WHITNEY writes about the practice in his edition with ROTH, comparing it with ŚPP’s (p. cxxi):

<sup>53</sup>It has not become clear to me which “ordinary sign” WHITNEY had in mind here. Perhaps a type of *galita* sign, such as the one described by FALK 2001: 183?

Very often SPP. prints in full the abbreviated passages in both *samhitā* and *pada* form, thus presenting a great quantity of useless and burdensome repetitions. Our edition takes advantage of the usage of the mss. to abbreviate extensively; but it departs from their usage in so far as always to give full intimation of the omitted portions by initial words and by signs of omission.

Despite occasional differences between the two branches of transmission and among the Or. mss. as well, this abbreviation device evidently was a typical characteristic of the common ancestor of PS tradition (see §2.6.1), and is therefore retained in my edition. I follow the example of the R-W SS edition in intimating portions omitted, but my sign is a sequence of three raised circles or *kuṇḍalas* (°°°).

## 2.6 History of transmission

The working hypothesis that has been followed in my work, and is further elucidated in the following paragraphs, is based on the scenario sketched by WITZEL 1985a.<sup>54</sup> It involves an archetype of all PS mss., dating to 800–1000, written in a late form of Gupta script, and hailing from western India (Gujarat): following WITZEL, I call this archetype \*G. It may be noted here, as will be repeatedly stressed in the discussions below, that this \*G hailed from precisely the region where the texts of the Śaunaka Śākhā have been transmitted all through the historical period (see GRIFFITHS 2004 and 2007).

Furthermore, WITZEL's scenario involves two hyparchetypes, one preceding the Kashmirian transmission, written in early Devanāgarī script, and dating to ca. 1350 (\*D); the other preceding all Orissa mss., written in so-called Proto-Bengali script, and dating at the latest to ca. 1400 (\*B).

### 2.6.1 The archetype of all PS manuscripts (\*G)

Mention of this common ancestor of Kashmirian and the Orissa transmissions of PS has already been made off and on in the preceding sections. The evidence supporting postulation of a written archetype comes primarily from common errors found in both **K** and the Orissa mss. In the following (not entirely complete) list of cases encountered in *kaṇḍas* 6/7 where all the mss. share an identical error, and I have felt compelled to emend the text, I ignore small errors. The apodosis of all mss., being the reading of the archetype, is in each case clear. Of course, shared errors do not need to be significant, but their accumulation is at least noteworthy, and especially the common omission of a syllable

---

<sup>54</sup>WITZEL's references to epigraphical and literary evidence must now be compared with KATAOKA 2007, SCHMIEDCHEN 2007 and SLAJE 2007.

at 6.2.5 seems to be a strong argument in favor of WITZEL's hypothesis.<sup>55</sup> It may be worthwhile to recall here that ROTH and WHITNEY also assumed that all their ŚS mss. descended from one common, written archetype.<sup>56</sup>

**Common errors in K and the Orissa manuscripts** 6.1.6 \**stūṣeyyam*, mss. *snu*<sup>o</sup>; <sup>57</sup> 6.2.2 \**śasāda*, mss. *sva*<sup>o</sup>; 6.2.3 \**kṣarad*, mss. *kṣu*<sup>o</sup>; 6.2.4 \**ajuryam*, mss. *adu*<sup>o</sup>; 6.2.5 \**a*<sub>d</sub>*hi* \**kṣām adhā*, mss. 'dhakṣādhā; 6.3.6 \**śundhantām*, mss. °*tvām*; 6.3.12 \**tadr̥śūr*, mss. *tvā*<sup>o</sup>; 6.4.4 \**ni*, mss. *na*; 6.4.8 \**ukṣitā*, mss. *ukṣa*<sup>o</sup>; 6.4.10 \**vātarathe*, mss. *vāma*<sup>o</sup>; 6.4.9 \**śvasyāsnaḥ*, mss. °*stnaḥ*; 6.8.4 *avivacyad*, mss. *ava*<sup>o</sup>; 6.8.8 \**pluṣayaḥ*, mss. *pulu*<sup>o</sup>; 6.10.5 \**nirṇijam*, mss. °*jah*; 6.11.7 \**gr̥bhūtān*, mss. *gr̥bhūtād*; 6.11.8b \**ye*, mss. *yo*; 6.11.9b \**tam*, mss. *tvam*; 6.12.7 \**pratispaśaḥ*, mss. °*smasaḥ*; 6.12.8 and 6.13.3 \**ṛchād*, mss. °*ts*<sup>o</sup>; 6.15.8 \**ekasaphād dade*, mss. °*śaphādade*; 6.16.2 \**vavṛmahe*, mss. *vivr*<sup>o</sup>; 6.20.1 \**aprāyi*, mss. *aprāyu*; 6.21.2 \**dehi*, mss. *dhehi*; 6.23.5 \**āsaktam*, mss. *āsakun*; 7.1.4 \**sutāt*, mss. *sutat*; 7.2.10 \**āśmanā*, mss. *āśminā*; 7.3.2 \**kr̥ṇvahe*, mss. °*mahe*; 7.3.6b \**kūlbiṣakṛtasādhi yaḥ*, mss. °*kṛt(a)sādhyā(h)*; 7.5.12 \**śatruñjayaḥ*, mss. *śatruñ*<sup>o</sup>; 7.8.7 \**durasyaḥ*, mss. *durasyaḥ*; 7.8.9 \**anāstigyam*, mss. °*āstigmaḥ*; 7.9.5 \**bobhuvatī*, mss. *bobha*<sup>o</sup>; 7.9.6 \**rukmiṇī*, mss. *rukmaṇī*; 7.9.10 \**nakulyā*, mss. *makuryā*; 7.15.7 \**yakṣmāj jatravyāt*, **Or** *yakṣmāddatkravyāt* / **K** *yakṣmādatravayā*; <sup>58</sup> 7.18.9 \**atrainam*, mss. *athainam*; 7.19.5 \**prāpī yas*, mss. *prāpyas*.

## 2.6.2 The hyparchetypes \*D and \*B

As to the hyparchetypes \*D and \*B, I refer to WITZEL's discussion (1985a), and want to limit myself here only to giving some support for the postulation of a common predecessor of the Or. mss. written in Proto-Bengali script (for which we may now compare the tables in DIMITROV 2002), because this type of argument becomes even more difficult to make cogent in the case of a sole descendant (such as **K** is) from a hypothetical predecessor (\*D), than it already is with the Or. mss. (\*B). As to those mss., perhaps the most convincing case known to me, suggesting that they descend from a common written predecessor, is the omission of the syllable *cta* at 7.8.1b, where all Or. mss. have *dṛdvr̥vat*, **K** reads *dṛktavr̥vat*, and my restoration is \**duruktam bruvat* (the anusvāra

<sup>55</sup>Another persuasive example I may note in passing is the seemingly haplographical error found in all sources at 19.44.24ab, where we read *stāyadī* for *stāyad* \**yadī*.

<sup>56</sup>Cf. ROTH (1856: 11): "Die meisten Fehler sind von der Art, dass dieselben nicht füglich auf Irrthum des Sammlers oder Diaskeuasten zurückgeführt werden können, da bei einem solchen dieser auffallende Mangel an Verständnis nicht vorausgesetzt werden darf, sondern sie sehen mit wenigen Ausnahmen Schreibfehlern ähnlich. Dass aber derartige Fehler in unseren Handschriften einstimmig gegeben werden, weist darauf hin, dass sie sämmtlich aus einer Originalhandschrift stammen und zwar aus einer Fehlerreichen Handschrift". See the example given by WHITNEY 1856: 406.

<sup>57</sup>Uncogently on this case, BHATTACHARYA 2001.

<sup>58</sup>On this example, see the elaborate discussion by KNOBL 2007: 54f. with n. 55.

of *duruktaṃ* had, it seems, been lost already in \*G). Cf. also the case of the lost syllable *ma* in 19.51.1c *nijagmīma* (discussed GRIFFITHS 2004: 62), as well as the somewhat more complicated case *dyaur* \**javena* → *dyauryenā* at 16.70.1 (*ibid.*, p. 73). A clear example of a graphic error that is more likely to have originated in a Nāgarī type script than in (an old form of) Oriya is the reading *madhamā* to which all Or. mss. point at 7.8.4b, where **K** has correctly preserved *maghavā* [DIMITROV §1.2];<sup>59</sup> in this class I would also place the **Or** reading *asyai* for *asmai* (thus **K**) at 6.7.3 [DIMITROV §2.6.4, 2.7.1]. The very frequent confusion *hy/jy* (6.9.12d, 7.5.11d, 7.19.6d; also PS 20.61.4 [GRIFFITHS 2004: 81f.]: °*śīmajyā*° **Or**, for °*śīmahyā*° **K**) may also have the same graphic origin: DIMITROV §1.2 and §2.7.1. Other common errors in the Or. mss. belong rather to the realm of phonetic errors, or if they are of graphical origin, they cannot, it seems, be attributed to the specific graphical form of \*B: e.g. *ri/ṛ* (7.8.8d, also 4.15.6d in GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY 2000–01[03]), *bh/v* (6.9.12a, 7.5.11a), *a/u* (7.4.7d, 7.10.2c), *i/ṛ* (6.20.6a, 7.4.3b). Cf. further miscellaneous errors shared by all Or. mss. at 6.3.8b (*madhuṣṭha* for *madhiṣṭhāḥ*), 6.11.10 (*manīṣori*° for *manīṣodi*°), 6.15.3c (*niṣṭhāyate* for *niṣṭhāte*), 7.2.6c (*prṣṭhūr* for *prṣṭūr*), 7.4.5c (*sodhijij* for *sahojij*), 7.6.6a (*agnir* for *indro*), 7.11.4b (*rohaṇāya* for *rehaṇāya*).

### 2.6.3 Conflation with other traditions

One of the main conclusions of my study of PS mantras quoted in the KauśS (2004) was that the relationships between the two branches of Paippalāda tradition (**K** and the Or. mss.), and the testimonia in the KauśS, and even with the text of ŚS as ‘Sāyaṇa’ knew it, are extraordinarily complex. We must not only reckon with the mutual contaminatory influence of the written transmission of the various different Atharvavedic texts, of both the Paippalāda and the Śaunaka Śākhās, and even of non-Atharvavedic texts, but also with continuing influences of oral transmission through the centuries. I wish to emphasize here two categories of evidence that point to different paths of influence.<sup>60</sup>

**2.6.3.1 Readings shared by ‘Sāyaṇa’ and PS against ŚS** Cf. BLOOMFIELD (1899: 14): “Sāyaṇa in his commentary to the Śaunakīya occasionally adopts readings from the Paippalāda”. BLOOMFIELD makes reference to WHITNEY 1893: 92, but WHITNEY himself wrote (p. 93) that this commentator’s readings “agree now and then (as noted above [p. 92]) with the readings of one or more of the parallel texts or with those of the Pâippalāda *çâkhâ*, but only sporadically and as it were fortuitously; of any special relation between

<sup>59</sup>A comparable case of confusion *dhr* :: *ghr* occurs at PS 2.19.3a, cf. ZEHNDER 1999: 62.

<sup>60</sup>Much, if not all, of the evidence for even more complex paths of influence that has been collected and discussed by BHATTACHARYA (1989, 1991, 1997: xliii ff.) has to be canceled from the dossier, because BHATTACHARYA neglects the factor ‘perseveration’ (see §2.4).

them and the variants of the Pāippalāda texts (which are upon a very different scale) no sign appears”. It is my impression that BLOOMFIELD’s less restricted statement may be closer to the truth, because there do appear to be real signs of the commentator’s acquaintance with the (Or. reading of the) PS version of mantras: cf. my note on the stanza division of 6.20. At 6.20.5 and 11.13.3 (GRIFFITHS 2004: 54) we find two cases of correspondence between the reading known to ‘Sāyaṇa’ and the Or. reading of a mantra, against the ŚS/**K** reading. Further research may or may not confirm my impression based on these very limited data.

**2.6.3.2 Readings shared by **K** and other Kashmiri texts against the Orissa manuscripts** Numerous are the cases where we can explain difference of reading between **K** and the Or. mss. by assuming that the transmitter(s) of PS in Kashmir were well acquainted with mantra texts of the Kāṭha school, and with Kashmirian Ṛgveda texts, and that their efforts at PS transmission have not remained free from contaminatory influence from such locally dominant traditions. Cf. e.g. PSK 2.76.6 [not in the Or. mss.] (ZEHNDER 1999: 172, BHATTACHARYA 1997: 201 “*kīṃ kāṭhakaprabhāvād asyātrāntarbhuktiḥ*”: KS 18.13:274.20f., etc.). — 4.27.4e *viśas tvā sarvā ā yantu* **Or**; *viśas tvā sārva vāñchantu* ŚS 4.8.4c, thus also **K**: influence on **K** not from ŚS, but from KS 37.9:89.13 or RV 10.173.1 — 4.29 (BHATTACHARYA 1997: 342 “*kāśmīrīyapustikā tu ṛgvedam evānusaratīti pratīyate*”). — Cf. further my notes under 6.1.3a, 6.20.3c, 7.4.2d below.

## 2.7 The editorial policy adopted in this work

In his article of 1968, HOFFMANN laid the methodological foundation for the text-critical study of the PS (1968: 3–4 = 1975: 230–231):

There is no doubt that the Or. mss. are closely related to one another, whereas **K**. has a different position with respect to both time and place. The Or. mss. and **K**. therefore represent two branches of Paippalāda transmission, converging far back in the past. That is to say, if a reading is common to both, we have, at the very least, an old reading, and we may even maintain, that we have an AUTHENTIC reading of the *Paippalāda-Śākhā*. It is quite another question whether we think that such an authentic reading is correct as to grammar or sense. Every Vedic Śākhā has readings which we must accept as authentic, i.e. as peculiar to the respective text. We cannot eliminate these authentic readings, even if we know that the original or the correct reading has been preserved in another text. Consequently, if we have a reading common to both branches of transmission, we are obliged to regard it as authentic and to face this fact.

The distinction between the reconstitution of an ‘original’ and an ‘authentic’ form of the text has been discussed at length by WITZEL 1979–80, §2.1 pp. 22–

24:

Diese von K. HOFFMANN geprägten Termini beziehen sich auf die Veränderungen, die beim Ritual verwendete Mantras im Laufe ihrer Tradierung, beginnend mit dem Zeitpunkt ihrer Abfassung, durchgemacht haben. Die originale Form eines Mantra ist diejenige, die er bei seiner Formulierung besaß, gleichgültig ob es sich dabei um Verse handelt, die man dem RV entnommen hat, um solche, die später als dieser verfaßt wurden, oder um Prosasprüche, die sich auf die unzähligen Einzelhandlungen beim Ritual beziehen.

Wie bereits von OLDENBERG und danach von BLOOMFIELD—EDGERTON—EMENEAU in den „Vedic Variants“ mit ausgebreitetem Material belegt worden ist, haben die aus dem RV übernommenen und die in der „Mantrazeit“ (RVKh, AV, YV-Mantra) formulierten Mantra zahlreichen Veränderungen durchgemacht, ehe sie in den YV-Saṃhitās, in den Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas, bisweilen in den alten Upaniṣads, oft aber auch erst in den Śrauta- und Gṛhyasūtren festgelegt, kanonisiert wurden und dort die für die jeweilige Vedaschule authentische Form erhielten. [...] Nun ist es nicht immer leicht, zunächst die ‚richtige‘ Gestalt des Mantra auch nur in einer Vedaschule festzustellen, da diese häufig grammatisch abnormal, der Bedeutung nach unklar oder gar unsinnig erscheint. [...]

Anders dagegen verhält es sich mit der Feststellung der originalen Form eines Mantra, die durch den Vergleich mit der Tradition anderer verwandter oder fernstehender Vedaschulen, und aufgrund von Überlegungen philologischer und linguistischer Art gewonnen werden kann. Diese Form dürfte in den meisten Fällen die der Mantrazeit gewesen sein, d.h. desjenigen Zeitabschnitts, in dem diese Sprüche verfaßt (bzw. aus dem RV übernommen) wurden: eine Periode von einigen Jahrhunderten, die sich — dem Abschluß des RV anschließend — bis hin zur Abfassung der Prosapartien der Yajurveda-Saṃhitās erstreckte und wohl an den Beginn des ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausends zu verlegen ist.

WITZEL had discussed these issues with special reference to the PS in his 1973–76 article, part II, pp. 159ff.,<sup>61</sup> where he stresses that reconstruction beyond the ‘authentic’ text on the basis of, e.g., the ŚS or other texts leads to — at least theoretically — unacceptable uncertainties about the ‘originality’ to PS of a reading established in such a way, for it would be indeterminable “by which means can one detect whether (even a corrupt) reading of AV(Ś) leaves us (although also coming from an Atharva text) with an authentic Paippalāda-reading, an Ur-Atharva-veda reading, or worse, with a reading of a time when there was no fixed AV but a floating mass of mantras, derived either from RV

<sup>61</sup>It is an unfortunate fact that two pages of WITZEL’s original typed manuscript were left out by the press here. Professor Witzel has kindly given me a copy of the missing pages.

sources or from folklore”. These basic ideas, subjected to further elaboration by HOFFMANN and especially WITZEL, can already be found voiced in the work of earlier Vedic scholars,<sup>62</sup> and I myself am in agreement with them for cases where we have the RV form of a mantra as countercheck (see below).

I fear, however, that it is an impossible thing to ask of an editor of PS to “face the fact” that all mss. at 7.9.10 point to *makuryā*, at least if facing this fact means balking at the emendation demanded by all other evidence: *nakulyā*; or if it means he is to accept the apodosis of all mss. *aprāyu*, rather than *aprāyi*, at 6.20.1, even though the parallel in ŚS 19 — a kāṇḍa which we know mostly to contain direct borrowings from PS (cf. §2.2.1) — has the expected reading; or again if he is to accept in his text an unparalleled stanza-initial *atha* rather than *atra* at 7.18.9.<sup>63</sup> It is anyhow clear that the number of such cases — where there is unanimous or near unanimous evidence in the mss. for an absolutely unacceptable reading — is in fact quite limited. Larger is the number of cases where both **K** and the Or. mss. have different, but both impossible readings, and the concept of ‘authentic’ text loses its value, because there ceases to be any objective means of establishing whether the impossible text of **K**, or that of the Or. mss. is to be awarded the predicate ‘authentic’, while chances are that neither deserves that name.

The way out of this conundrum has been paved by WITZEL himself: since we postulate, after his scenario (1985a), a written archetype \*G underlying all PS mss., we may assume that this ms. itself was not free of errors, and hence that not all readings common to **K** and the Or. mss. are necessarily the ‘authentic’ ones of the Paippalāda Śākhā. In such cases we are permitted, with due care and with the most stringent application of critical thought, to alter the uniformly transmitted shape of the text, on the basis of the philological arguments that present themselves in each individual case.

Of quite a different nature is the type of problem — luckily of rather rare occurrence —, where a seemingly impossible reading attributable to \*G, a case which one might according to the approach just set forth try to purge from the text by proposing that \*G was already corrupt, actually finds support from the other AV tradition, the one of ŚS. Such cases force us to tackle the very broad

---

<sup>62</sup>I may quote here just two examples. WINTERNITZ, in his edition of ĀpMP (1897: xv): “There are numerous cases in these Mantras where every editor would be tempted to have recourse to conjectural emendations. But on closer examination he will remember that he has to edit, and not to correct his text, and that even a grammatically impossible reading has to be retained, if it is warranted by the best authority”. This statement is perhaps somewhat too simplistic, but let us compare the words of BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON (1932: 15f.): “The study of Vedic tradition must not be content with reconstructing or defining the original body of mantras, by detecting and recording secondary fancies, adaptations, and corruptions. These secondary readings have their own right to exist; they are, as a rule, the genuine readings of their respective schools. It is our duty to sketch the development of the mantras in all the Vedic schools, assigning, where possible, causes for the changes, but rejecting no unexplained or apparently unmotivated change, however it may seem to conflict with what seems to us good mantra sense”.

<sup>63</sup>The examples have been taken from the list in §2.6.1.

question of what authority we will attribute to our transmitted Saṃhitās: how seriously do we take the compositional skills and intentions of the makers of “Vedic Variants”, and how confident may we be that the extant mss. — even if their readings are unanimous — have transmitted to us the text as they had it before them? Do we really assume the ‘Ur-AV’ to have read an impossible *pr̥ñcanti* (PS 6.1.3 / ŚS 5.2.3), instead of ṚV 10.120.3 *vr̥ñjanti*, and if we do, must we assume that this *meant something* to someone at some time, or do we see it as a mere mistake (at whatever stage it may have been made)?

## 2.8 Orthography, Sandhi

Since the two branches of PS transmission present the text in two rather different forms, from the point of view of orthography and sandhi, a specific problem is the formulation of clear editorial policies in these matters. In the Introduction to his edition of the Kaṭha-Śikṣā-Upaniṣad, WITZEL took the following position (1979–80 §1.1, pp. 11f.):

Vedische Texte sind gemeinhin in der seit einigen Jahrhunderten in Nordindien üblich gewordenen, sich an die Schreibweise des klassischen Sanskrit anlehrenden „Orthographie“ gedruckt worden. Kaschmirische, aber auch südindische Handschriften dagegen haben häufig die ältere Aussprache tradiert. Da einerseits zwischen den verschiedenen vedischen Schulen zahlreiche phonetische Besonderheiten bestehen, zum andern aber die Reproduktion der originalen (bzw. der für eine Schule authentischen) Aussprache (und damit Schreibweise) häufig Fehler in der Textüberlieferung erklärt bzw. aufklären hilft, sollte eine Veda-Edition stets die Norm der betreffenden Veda-Schule wiedergeben.

A similar position had been advocated implicitly in the Introduction to his 1974 edition of the KaṭhĀ (published in English in 2004), based entirely on (Śāradā) mss. from Kashmir, and after him by DREYER 1986: XX ff. in her edition of the first chapter of the KāṭhGS with commentaries, also all transmitted in Kashmir alone.

WITZEL, and after him DREYER, at various prominent places asserts the ‘Altertümlichkeit’ of several peculiarities of (older) Kashmir Śāradā mss. Although I am not a specialist in these mss., I would be inclined to think that such assertions cannot be accepted *a priori*. Further evidence is required. In fact, WITZEL also realized this, as appears from an important methodological observation in his commentary on the Kaṭha-Śikṣā-Upaniṣad (1979–80 §3.18, pp. 46f.):

... bleibt für einige der Kaṭha- und damit kaschmirischen Besonderheiten der Vedatradition problematisch, in welcher Zeit diese Eigentümlichkeiten entstanden (bzw. in der Tradition durchgeführt worden) sind, d.h. es erhebt sich die Frage, ob sie authentisch für diese Vedaschule sind oder ob es

sich nur um provinzielle Sonderentwicklungen handelt, die in einer oder mehreren Vedaschulen durchgeführt wurden.

Für die Kaṭhaschule wird sich die authentische Gestalt ihrer Texte — was deren phonetische Gestalt betrifft — vielleicht feststellen lassen, falls Kaṭha-Hss. in Orissa existieren. Tatsächlich ist ein Orissa-Zweig der Kaṭha-Schule aus wenigstens einer Inschrift (802 n.) bekannt (s. WZKS XXIII (1979) 10 Anm. 37).<sup>64</sup>

We are in the lucky position, in attempting to reconstruct the authentic (phonetic) form of the PS — this means in practice the tendencies of the archetype \*G (see §§2.6–2.7) —, to be able to perform precisely the countercheck that WITZEL imagined for his Kaṭha-texts transmitted only in Kashmir, if they had known an Orissa transmission.

If, in the following paragraphs, many an idiosyncrasy, especially of **K**, is rejected as unauthentic, this is not due to any desire on my part to normalize the text — on the contrary, I strongly adhere to the conviction that idiosyncrasies of the manuscripts ought, all things being equal, to be retained in the edited text. All things, however, are in our situation very often not equal: my editorial decision for each individual issue is based on a weighing of all the different factors that seemed relevant to me, and the result is my notion of what our text may have looked like as written in the archetype. This result is markedly different from ZEHNDER’s “Textgestaltung” that (1999: 20) “richtet sich in vielem nach der Kashmirer Handschrift” which — according to ZEHNDER (following WITZEL) — “manche älteren Züge bewahrt hat”.<sup>65</sup> The following pages of this section are a first attempt to specify the issues that were left untreated by BHATTACHARYA, ZEHNDER, and LUBOTSKY, and — as far as is possible while only such a small portion of the whole text is available in a reliable edition with a representative number of Or. mss. collated — to formulate provisional answers. In the course of my work on the PS, I have come across some phenomena of sandhi and orthography that are not encountered in kāṇḍas 6/7, but are nonetheless included here, for the sake of greater completeness.

**(A) Irregular non-appearance and results of vowel-contraction** An example of irregular non-appearance of vowel-contraction is 4.15.7d *tiṣṭha evam*. No cases with unanimous ms.-support occur in kāṇḍas 6/7,<sup>66</sup> but a similar case is found at PS 1.64.2cd *na eṣo*. The only further examples I

<sup>64</sup>WITZEL continues: “Ferner soll es im Tempel von Puri weitere Kaṭha-Hss. geben (s. StII 6, Materialien, Anm. 296)”. The footnote referred to has in fact been published in StII 8/9 [1982], pp. 226f. To my knowledge, there is no living or ms. tradition of the YV in Orissa, except for the Kāṇva school of the White YV.

<sup>65</sup>ZEHNDER is careful to add: “Ob damit die Regeln des Archetyps getroffen sind, ist allerdings eine komplizierte Frage, die hier nicht weiter untersucht worden ist”.

<sup>66</sup>On PS 7.18.2a, where the Or. mss. read *indra* [voc.] *ā* rather than *indrā*, see my note *ad loc.*

know are with intervening pāda boundary: 1.65.4cd *bhūtvā asyā<sub>a</sub>vata* (with uncontracted *bhūtvā asyā*, cf. GRIFFITHS 2004: 59); 2.27.4cd *hatvā +apa* (BHATTACHARYA reads *hatvā apa* but ZEHNDER, commenting “Sandhi muss eintreten”, introduced contraction: *hatvā- +<sub>a</sub>va*); 3.18.3cd *tena mām adya varcasā agne varcasvinaṃ kṛdhi* (with uncontracted *varcasā agne*).

An example of an irregular result of vowel-contraction is the sandhi *-ā o-* → *-o-* rather than *-au-* at 7.9.10b (*jihvayā+oṣṭha°* → *jihvayoṣṭha°* (see my note). No other comparable cases have as yet come to my attention.

**(B) Traces of pluti** Led by the possible interpretation of *paretā* in PS 12.7.4c *paretā apsarasah* (to be compared with PS 7.13.4) as 2pl. imp. form to a consideration of the possibility that the unexpected vowel lengthening and absence of sandhi could be attributed to the phenomenon of protraction or pluti, I pursued the question of whether any traces of such pluti can be found in the PS. The list of cases of pluti in ŚS provided by ŚCĀ 1.105 (WHITNEY 1862: 70)<sup>67</sup> has been taken as the starting point to investigate the orthographical tendencies of the PS, because several of the ŚS mantras in question have parallels in PS. One further case of pluti in ŚS with a PS parallel stands at the beginning of my list, and one case of pluti in PS without ŚS parallel stands at its end.

(1) ŚS 2.3.2abc *ād aṅgā kuvīd aṅgā satāṃ yā bheṣajāni te | tésām asi tvām uttamām* ‘Now then, forsooth! how then, forsooth? what hundred remedies are thine, of them art thou the chief’ (WHITNEY) = PS 1.108.2abc. This passage is not taken into account in STRUNK’s monograph, because the ŚS Padapāṭha and following it the ŚCĀ do not recognize any pluti here, but ZEHNDER (1993: 23) states: “Die Langvokale in *aṅgā* sind durch Pluti im Fragesatz bedingt”. ZEHNDER’s claim that this is a case of pluti may be supported by pointing out the fact that the particle *aṅgā* is liable to cause pluti, albeit it on accompanying verb-forms in the examples provided by STRUNK (1983: 32f., [20]), but the pragmatic context here, if we follow WHITNEY’s interpretation, is rather one falling “unter den Begriffen emphatischer oder affektischer Redeweise” (STRUNK 1983: 29), than that of a “Fragesatz”.<sup>68</sup>

(2) ŚS 4.15.15 *khāṇvakhāṣi khāimakhāṣi mādhye taduri | varṣāṃ vanudhvaṃ pitaro marūtāṃ māna icchata* ‘O *khāṇvakā!* O *khāimakhā!* in the middle, O *tadurī!* win ye rain, O Fathers; seek the favor of the Maruts’ (WHITNEY). This mantra has no PS parallel. See STRUNK 1983: 27, ex. (16).

(3) ŚS 9.6.18 *yajamānabrāhmaṇāṃ vā etād ātithipatiḥ kurute yād āharyāṇi prékṣata idāṃ bhūyāṣ idāṣm iti* ‘The lord of guests verily makes for himself a sacrificer’s *brāhmaṇa* in that he looks at the [portions] to be partaken of,

<sup>67</sup>STRUNK (1983: 57) wrongly suggests that this list is complete: it is only complete for the cases recognized by the tradition as reflected in the ŚS Padapāṭha. Cases of ‘semi-latent’ pluti (STRUNK 1983: 21), such as our first case below, are not included.

<sup>68</sup>Cf. STRUNK (1983: 56ff.) on the non-appearance of pluti in “Wortfragen”.

saying “is this larger, or this?”’ (WHITNEY)  $\approx$  PS 16.112.2c ... *idaṃ bhūyā idām iti*.<sup>69</sup> Cf. STRUNK 1983: 68f., ex. (82).

(4) ŚS 10.2.28ab *ūrdhvó nú sṛṣṭáṣs tiryáñ nú sṛṣṭáṣh sárva díśaḥ púruṣa á babhūváṣm* ‘Was he now created upward? [or] was he now created crosswise? did man grow unto all the quarters?’ (WHITNEY). This mantra has no PS parallel. Cf. STRUNK 1983: 67f., ex. (79).

(5) ŚS 11.3.26 *brahmavādīno vadanti párāñcam odanáṃ práśíṣh pra-tyáñcáṣm íti* ‘The theologues say: hast thou eaten the rice-dish as it was retiring, or as it was coming on?’ (WHITNEY) and ŚS 11.3.27 *tvám odanáṃ práśíṣs tvám odanáṣ íti* ‘Hast thou eaten the rice-dish, or the rice-dish thee?’ (WHITNEY)  $\approx$  PS 16.55.1a/d = 18a/d ... *brahmavādīno vadanti pratyāñcam odanáṃ práśíṣh +parāñcām*<sup>70</sup> *tvam odanáṃ práśíṣs tvām odaná íti*<sup>71</sup> ‘The theologues say: have you eaten the rice-dish as it was coming on, [or] as it was retiring? Have you eaten the rice-dish, [or] the rice-dish you?’. Cf. STRUNK 1983: 69, ex. (83) and (84).

(6) ŚS 12.4.42 *tām devá amīmāñsanta vaśéyáṣm ávaśéti | tām abravīn nāradá eṣá vaśánāṃ vaśátaméti* ‘The gods questioned about her: is this a cow, or not a cow? Of her Nārada said: she is of cows the most truly cow’ (WHITNEY)  $\approx$  PS 17.20.2 *tām devā amīmāñsanta*<sup>72</sup> *vaśeyāṃ \*nv avaśéti*<sup>73</sup> ... Cf. STRUNK 1983: 80ff., ex. (105), especially on the ŚS reading *ávaśéti*, which now finds support in the quoted PS parallel, although one expects *ávaśáṣ íti*. ZEHNDER (1993: 23), who did not have access to the Or. readings of this mantra, took the akṣara *nnu* in **K** as a misreading for an original *ṣ*, explicitly marking pluti (ZEHNDER: *vaśā iyāṣm (a-)vaśā íti*), which would make this the only known case of explicit pluti notation in the PS. The Or. readings combined with that of **K**, however, rather speak for restoring the particle *nú*, that also figures in two of the other Atharvavedic pluti-contexts discussed here; an alternative would be to read *vaśeyāṃ na vaśéti* — either way, this passage too shows only ‘semi-latent’ pluti.

(7) ŚS 12.5.50 *kṣipráṃ vái tásya pṛchanti yát tát áśíṣd idám nú táṣd íti* ‘Quickly, indeed, they ask about him: what that was, is this now that?’ (WHITNEY)  $\approx$  PS 16.145.5 *kṣipraṃ vai tasya pṛchanti*<sup>74</sup> *yat tad*<sup>75</sup> *āsīd idam*<sup>76</sup>

<sup>69</sup>Thus **Or.** **K** reads *yadaṃ bhūyā yadāciti*. In the preceding part of the mantra, there are some readings in PS that differ from ŚS, but they are not important in this context.

<sup>70</sup>The readings are, for our present mantra 1: *parāñcā* **Ku3 JM Ji1 Ji4**; *om.* **K**. For mantra 18 [PSK 16]: *parāñcā* **Ku3 JM Ji1 Ji4**; *prācyāṃ* **K**.

<sup>71</sup>Thus in mantra 1 **Ji1**; **Ku3 JM Ji4** read twice *odanāyati* and **Ji1** shares this reading in mantra 18; **K** reads *odana íti* in both mantras.

<sup>72</sup>*devā amīmāñsanta*] *devā amīmāñsanta* **JM**, *devā amīmāñsanta* **V/122**, *devā asīmāñsanta* **Ji4**, *devāmīmāñsanta* **K**.

<sup>73</sup>*vaśeyāṃ \*nv avaśéti*] *vaśeyāñnavaséti* **JM**, *vaśoyāḥ nnavaséti* **V/122**, *vaś{o}eyāñna-vaséti* **Ji4**, *vaśeyāṃ nnuvaséti* **K**.

<sup>74</sup>*pṛchanti*] *mṛchanti* **Or**, *pṛśchanti* **K**.

<sup>75</sup>*yat tad*] **Or**, *etad* **K**.

<sup>76</sup>*idam*] **Or**, *atam* **K**.

*nu tāt*.<sup>77</sup> Cf. STRUNK 1983: 45, ex. (46).

Nowhere do the mss. for the above PS passages that have a ŚŚ parallel give any trace at all of numerical pluti marking, as commonly found in ŚŚ, but in those diagnostic cases with normally short vowels (3, 4, 5, 6, 7), we do find the lengthened vowels that suggest pluti. I therefore conclude that also the final passage can be considered to show ‘semi-latent’ pluti:

(8) PS 12.7.4cd/8cd *tat paretā apsarasaḥ pratibuddhā abhūtana* ‘Go away there, Apsarases: you have been recognized’. For two comparable cases (one also including an imperative verb form), see STRUNK 1983: 32f., exx. (20) and (21).

We may expect to identify other cases of (‘semi-latent’) pluti as the study of our text advances, but no case seems to occur in PS kāṇḍas 6 and 7.

**(C) Abhinihita sandhi** See §§2.1.1.2 and 2.1.2.4 on the respective practices of **K** and the Or. mss. with regard to use of the avagraha sign. I have thus far failed to detect a pattern in their usage, and have therefore adopted the following policy, in which meter is the only objective criterion, besides the readings of the mss.

1. If the initial *a-* is metrically required and is written in both **K** and **Or**, I adopt it.
2. If one of the two transmissions offers a metrically required *a-* against ’ (avagraha) or  $\emptyset$  in the other, I follow the former. In the prose hymn 7.14, where meter cannot be used as argument, I have at 2b arbitrarily adopted the ’ of the Or. mss. rather than the *a-* of **K**.
3. I print  $a^-$  when  $\emptyset$  or ’ is found in the mss., but the meter requires a syllable *a-*.
4. I print  $a^-$  when *a-* is found in all mss., but the meter requires elision (or, as in the case of 7.8.1b, if my resolution of sandhi at pāda boundaries results in an *-a-* which is not in fact allowed by the meter — and on this analogy  $t^-$  at 7.6.1b).
5. I print ’ when it is found in one or more of the Or. mss., and when the meter requires elision.
6. I print (’), when neither ’ nor *a-* is found in any of the mss., but the sense requires an underlying *a-*, and the meter requires its elision (thus precluding  $a^-$ ).

---

<sup>77</sup>*tāt*] **Ku3 JM Ji4**, *dāt Ji1*, *dā K*.

The mss. sometimes show a secondarily elided *a-* even after an *-o* which is the result of sandhi *athā u/mā u* and should be properly *pragrhya:* see my discussion under 6.23.3+11. In these cases I have restored the *a-* and marked the restored form as an emendation with asterisk.

**(D) Final -n before vowel** As in (I) 6.1.7b *yasminn āvitha*, (II) 6.6.6b *janāñ anu*, (III) 6.1.1cd *śatrūn anu*. — Cf. AiGr. I, §279.

(I). The familiar doubling of a nasal after a short vowel before any initial vowel is generally observed in our mss., at least in the case of the dental nasal (W-L, p. cxxiii, where in n. 3 it is pointed out that nearly all mss. violate this rule in the case of the velar nasal at ŚS 11.1.22b: *pratyāñ enām*). I limit myself here to the data available in PS 6/7, where only the dental nasal comes into question.<sup>78</sup> All mss. have the expected *-nnV-* only at 6.1.7b. **K** has a tendency to render the *-nnV-* as *-ṇ V-* (in kāṇḍas 6/7, only at 6.2.6cd), or as *-ṇn V-* (6.7.7cd, 6.8.6d, 6.22.11d, 7.1.8c, 7.2.7c, 7.4.8c, 7.18.9ab). This last spelling is also occasionally found in one or more of the Or. mss. (6.7.7cd, 6.8.6d, 6.22.10d, 6.22.12d, 7.1.8c, 7.2.7c), but only once in all (7.4.8c). I assume that *-nnV-* is the authentic sandhi for our text.

(II). The sandhi of a final nasal after a long *ā* before an initial vowel is problematic (cf. AiGr. I, §279bβ): *-āñ* or the pausa-form *-ān*? Note WHITNEY's words regarding the practice of the ŚS mss. (1862: 88f.), under rule ŚCĀ [DEHPANDE] 2.1.27, which prescribes change from pausa- to anunāsika-form: "To give with the same detail the exceptions from the rule, or the cases in which final *ān* remains unchanged before a vowel, would be quite useless. They are very frequent, by far outnumbering the instances of the loss of *n*—thus, in the first four books of the text, against thirteen instances of *āñ* before a vowel, we have forty-one of *ān*, and twelve of these between two *pādas*—and they are found indifferently in all possible situations, so that it is quite impossible to lay down any rule respecting them".

WHITNEY does not intimate any variation between the individual mss., but the editor of PS is confronted with a bewildering variation between **K** and the Or. mss., without any clear means to decide what the reading of the archetype may have been. Before continuing, I must note that WITZEL 1983 states, without any specific reference, that cases of the use of *-ñ* for anunāsika as encountered in the Or. mss. (with virāma, cf. §2.1.2.4 — referred to simply as anunāsika below) are also to be found in **K**: in possible confirmation of this statement, I have thus far only found 2.15.1 *khālvāñiva*<sup>79</sup> (for *khālvāñ iva*) and 5.21.3d *marāṭāññabhi* (for *marāṭāñ abhi*).<sup>80</sup> **K** certainly uses a separate

<sup>78</sup>Some cases of the velar nasal: 2.33.4c, 13.5.7a, and 16.68.6c. Apparently no doubling at 8.6.5cd, 18.22.4b.

<sup>79</sup>Without virāma in **K** (fol. 33a1), with virāma in the Or. mss.

<sup>80</sup>WITZEL's single example (1985a: 262) "lokāñ akalpayan > lokāñ akalpayan K, Or

sign for anunāsika ( $\overset{\cdot}{m}$ ), but its use seems to be rarer than that of anusvāra ( $\overset{\cdot}{m}$ ) (cf. WITZEL 1973–76: 481, 143 on  $\overset{\cdot}{m}$  for  $\overset{\cdot}{m}$  in **K**), which is also a common spelling in the Or. mss. (there are numerous cases where some Or. mss. show  $-\overset{\cdot}{n}$ , some other  $-\overset{\cdot}{m}$ , for anunāsika).<sup>81</sup>

Again limiting ourselves to PS 6/7, we can now distinguish the following types of cases:<sup>82</sup>

1. There are four cases which seem to require assumption of an anunāsika in the archetype, two of which leave very little doubt at all, in that at least one branch of transmission has anunāsika while the other has anunāsika too, or anusvāra. 6.6.6b *aśva iva nīyate janāṃṃ anu* ( $-\overset{\cdot}{n}$  a- **Or**,  $-\overset{\cdot}{m}$  a- **K**); 6.15.2d *ā harāmi grhāṃṃ upa* ( $-\overset{\cdot}{m}$  u- **Or**,  $-\overset{\cdot}{m}$  u- **K**); 6.23.4d *mṛgāṃṃ anu pra pātaya* ( $-\overset{\cdot}{n}$  a- **Ku JM RM Ma Pa**,  $-\overset{\cdot}{m}$  a- **V/126 Mā K**); 7.2.9b *hato gaṅgaṅivāṃṃ uta* ( $-\overset{\cdot}{n}$  u- **Or**,  $-\overset{\cdot}{m}$  u- **K**).
2. There are three ambiguous cases where one branch has anunāsika, and the other has or points to dental  $-n$ . They are: 6.11.5c *divas tad arṇavāṃṃ? anv ūyase* ( $-\overset{\cdot}{n}$  a- **Or**,  $-nna$ - **K**); 7.4.8b *rakṣohāmitrāṃṃ? apabādhamānaḥ* (with intervening caesura:  $-na$ - **Or**,  $-\overset{\cdot}{m}$  a- **K**); 7.8.4c *śapathāṃṃ? upejatu* ( $-nu$ - **Or**,  $-\overset{\cdot}{m}tu$ - [presumably from  $-\overset{\cdot}{m}$  u-] **K**).
3. The cases that point clearly to assumption of  $-n$  are the following. Unanimous evidence for  $-n$  is found at 6.8.6c *tān agne kṛṣṇavartane*; 6.13.1a [prose] *asmān udīcyāḥ*; 6.13.3a [prose] *asmān ūrdhvāyāḥ*; 6.14.6de ... *keśyān arāyān* ... (with intervening pāda boundary); 6.19.3c *saṃ devo asmān aryamā*; 6.22.11a *ya +imān yajñān abhi \*vitaṣṭāra* (with intervening caesura); 6.23.2cd ... *parvatān atīmā* ... (with intervening pāda boundary); 7.4.8cd ... *amitrān asmākam* ... (with intervening pāda boundary); 7.13.5a *yās talpān anunṛtyanti*; 7.14.11c [prose] *āyusmān āyusmantam*; 7.16.8a [prose] *marutvān etasyā*. 6.11.8b [prose] *amenayas te santu \*ye 'smān abhyaghāyanti svāhā* may be added as well (all mss.  $-nabhya$ -, except **Pa**  $-n$ ,  $bhya$ -; the ŚS parallel with accents: *yé 'smāṃṃ abhyaghāyānti*). We can also safely add 7.14.1c *sa māyusmān āyusmantam kṛṇotu* ( $-nā$ - **Or**,  $-n$   $ā$ - **K**) and 7.18.1c *agne tān iha mādaya* ( $-ni$ - **Or**,  $-nni$ - **K**).

(Anunāsika) is spurious, as the stanza in question (9.5.16 of the Orissa mss.) is altogether absent in the Kashmir ms. (see GRIFFITHS 2003b: 14 n. 69).

<sup>81</sup>Note, in this regard, WHITNEY's footnote (1862: 92) with regard to ŚS/ŚCĀ: "The distinction made in ordinary usage between the simple dot and the dotted crescent, as nasal signs, is purely arbitrary, founded on nothing in the theory of the Prātiçākhyā, and having but a scanty and uncertain support from the Atharvan manuscripts: some of the latter occasionally, or even generally, attempt to use the dotted crescent for a nasalized vowel, and the dot for a nasal mute, but for the most part they employ the latter indiscriminately for both cases". Cf. also WHITNEY 1862: 17 and DESHPANDE 1997: 113 on ŚCĀ 1.11 = 1.1.13.

<sup>82</sup>Since metrical considerations may, despite WHITNEY's conclusion, play a role after all, I quote whole pādas where appropriate.

4. There are a few cases where the evidence is equivocal, but does not seem to allow assumption of an underlying anunāsika. 6.22.4d <sup>+</sup>*nainān avartiḥ sacate kutaś cana* (-ām **Or**, -an **K**); 6.22.6b *kṣīreṇa pūrṇān udakena dadhnā* (with intervening caesura: -ānu- **Or**, -ā u- **K**); 7.3.4d *tān ito nīr ṇayāmasi* (tān **Or**, tām **K**); 7.8.1cd *asmān apa* (with intervening pāda boundary: -n **Or**, -m **K**). I also classify here repeated *tān ito* with identical variation (-n **Or**, -y **K**) at 6.14.6f+9f, 7.11.3d+4d.<sup>83</sup>

A possibly significant fact (i) is that three of four cases under (1.) have a postposed preposition governing an accusative plural. Close syntactic nexus is evident also in the fourth case, because although *uta* does not appear here in enclitic position, its use is quite comparable to the ṚV examples of parallel clauses with *utá* enclitic in the second (KLEIN 1985/I: 363f.). All cases under (3.) and (4.) fail this criterion because of (ii) weaker syntactic nexus (sometimes along with intervening metrical boundaries). In cases of doubt, such as those listed under (2.), my editorial working hypothesis is that instances falling under (i) require anunāsika, while those falling under (ii) retain -ān. I therefore edit the first case under (2.) with anunāsika, while the other two get -ān, because of intervening caesura in the one, and syntactic nexus of the preverb with the verb rather than the noun in the other. But I emphasize, with WHITNEY's words in mind, that this working hypothesis may only be employed to decide cases where **K** and the Or. mss. cannot be reconciled, but never to introduce a system into the text which the mss. do not support. All *varietas lectionis* in the mss. is reported, and all sandhis subjected to regularization are marked with a <sup>+</sup>.

(III). Cf. WHITNEY 1862: 89f. I have not yet collected the full data here, but it seems that -ūn/-īn *V*- normally remains unchanged. Cf. e.g. 1.42.2a *malimlūn agne*, 1.60.1b *dasyūn iva*, and from PS 6/7: 6.1.1cd *śatrūn anu* (with intervening pāda boundary), 6.9.4c *śatrūn āyataḥ*. We may add 6.22.2b *śucīn api* (with intervening caesura), and the sandhi -īn *V*- is also found e.g. at 3.30.7a *navāratnīn avamāya*, 4.16.8a *udyan raśmīn ā tanuṣva* etc. I know two cases in PS where the Or. mss. clearly suggest a sandhi -ūn *V*- → -ūṇr *V*- (cf. AiGr. I, §279b). Both are borrowings from the ṚV: 4.32.6d *dasyūṁr +uta* (ṚV 10.83.6, ŚS 4.32.6 *dásyūṁr utá*), and 15.10.7d <sup>+</sup>*śatrūṁr anapavyayantaḥ* (ṚV 6.75.7 *śátrūṁr ánapavyayantaḥ*):<sup>84</sup> the **K** readings do not support the insertion of *r*, and the sandhi of the Or. mss. can be supposed to have arisen under influence of the ṚV. Philipp Kubisch has pointed me to one case of

<sup>83</sup>We may cancel from the comparative dossier 6.11.7c (where in restored *\*grbhātān avadyād* all mss. have perseverated -d), and the following pādas entirely omitted by **K**, where **Or** each time points to -n: 7.14.9c *sa māyusmān āyusmantam kṛnotu*; 7.18.6ab (2×) *yān asau pratisarān akas*; 7.18.6c *tvam tān indra vṛtrahan*. I also disregard 7.12.8d *mahendro dānavān iva* where the *varietas lectionis* is too diverse (-n **Ku K**, -m **V/126 Mā**, -r **Ma**).

<sup>84</sup>I quote the PS readings reported by BHATTACHARYA: *dasyūṁruta Vā Mā*, *dasyūnaruta Ja*, *dasyūnuta K*. — *śatrūṁranapavyayantaḥ Or*, *śatrūṁ anapavyayantaḥ K*.

-īṃr V-, in a variant on RV 10.139.4d *pári sūryasya paridhīṃr apaśyat* at PS 20.1.3d *nityasya rāyaḥ paridhīṃr apaśyat*.<sup>85</sup>

**(E) Anunāsika (ṃ) before s** This spelling is quite common in **K**, but I know just one case from the Or. mss.: at 18.61.8c *uto +nv asya papivāṃsam indram* (**K** not available), some read *papivāṃsam*. No examples occur in PS 6/7.

**(F) Final -n before ś-** As in 6.15.2b *sarvāñ chacīpate*. — Cf. W-L, p. cxxiv. As far as I can see, no information on the practice of the ŚS mss. is provided by WHITNEY (1862: 79f.). The PS mss. show quite a bit of variation in the treatment of this sandhi. I limit myself again to the cases encountered in PS 6/7.

6.14.6e *+arāyāñ +chvakiṣṭiṇas* (-ñ<sub>3</sub> *cha-* **Or**, -ṃ *śu-* **K**); 6.23.11b *\*asmiñ chayane* (*smiṃ cha-* **Or**, *ssyośa-* [presumably from *smiṃ śa-*] **K**); 7.4.8c *prabhañjañ chatrūn* (-ñch- **Ku** [**Ma**] **Pa**, -ṃ *ch-* **V/126 Mā**, -ṃ *ś-* **K**); 7.16.1b *+tasmiñ +chraye* (-ṃ *tśr-* **Or**, -ṃ *śr-* **K**); 7.16.5b *+tasmiñ +chraye* (-ṃ *tśr-* **Ku Pa**, -ñchr- [**Ma**], -ṃ *śr* **V/126**, *om.* **Mā K**); 7.16.10b *+tasmiñ +chraye* (-ṃ *tśr-* **Ku** [**Ma**] **Pa V/126 Mā**, -ṃ *nr-* **K**).

There is a pattern of nasal + *ch* in the Or. mss., against nasal + *ś* in **K**, as is clear from the other cases that I have been able to find in BHATTACHARYA's apparatus (1.61.2d, 1.61.5f, 2.15.2c, 3.6.3b, 3.35.1c, 4.11.4c, 5.24.4b, 5.36.1d, 10.3.7b; add 19.10.12c): it is only 3× *ch* → *tś* in 7.16 that distorts the picture if we look merely at PS 6/7. I have found only one minor exception in the Or. mss. (1.76.4c *-ṃ ch-* **Ma**, -∅ *ś-* **Vā**, -ñi *ś-* **K**), and one — perhaps important — in **K** (4.23.2d *-ñ/ñ<sub>3</sub> ch-* **Or**, -ṃ*śch-* **K**). In the information WHITNEY provides, I find no trace of anything comparable to the orthography of **K**, only abundant agreement with the tendencies of the Or. mss. It seems most likely to me that this was therefore the kind of orthography preferred in the common early medieval homeland of PS and ŚS traditions. We may consequently assume this orthography for the PS archetype: it was preserved in the Orissa transmission, but replaced almost wholesale in the Kashmirian (the one case of *ch* in **K** may be a trace of the older state of affairs). We probably may not assume that \*G was consistent as to the spelling of the nasal, although I have regularized it as *ñ* throughout.

**(G) Final -n before s-** As in *janānt svāpayāmasi*. — Cf. AiGr. I, §282; WITZEL 1979–80, §3.18, pp. 45f.; on the “exceedingly irregular” usage of the ŚS mss., see WHITNEY 1862: 76 and W-L, p. cxxiv. The quoted example, found at PS 4.6.1d *nī janānt svāpayāmasi* (RV 7.55.7d [ŚS 4.5.1d] *nī jānān[t]*

<sup>85</sup>*paridhīṃr apaśyat*] **JM V/122 Pa**, *paridhīṃr(ṛapa) aśyat* **K** [[Bar. reads *paridhīṃr \*\*\*aśyat*, but the reading of the two akṣaras that have suffered damage is still determinable on the basis of what is left of them]].

*svāpayāmasi*), has clear manuscript support: *janāñchvāpa*° **Vā**, *janā*(**Ma** *stvā* →) *tsvāya*° **Ma Ja**, *janāṃtsvā*° **K**. There is support only from the Or. mss. at 13.6.3c *śarmanṭ syāma tava saprathastame* (RV 1.94.13c *śárman syāma táva sapráthastama*), where **K** reads *śarman*. Counter-examples, however, are overwhelmingly more numerous. Cf., e.g., just from PS 6/7: 6.2.7d *ahvayan svasti*, 6.18.2c (etc.) *asmān siñcatu*, 7.3.4b *ubhayān saha*, 7.8.3a *yān samasyante*, 7.16.9a *prajananavān saha*. The occurrence of this transition sound is thus very restricted in our mss.; it does not occur in kāṇḍas 6/7 (the ostensible cases in some mss. for 7.16.1, 5, 6 [!], 10 seem to belong rather with the type of sandhi discussed in the preceding paragraph).

**(H) Final -n before c-** Regarding this sandhi, cf. WHITNEY on ŚCĀ (W-L, p. cxxiv): “Rule ii.26 virtually ordains the insertion of *ç*. Owing to the frequency of the particle *ca*, the cases are numerous, and the rule is strictly followed in all the Atharvan mss. and so of course in our edition. This is not, however, the universal usage of the Rik: cf. for example ii. I. 16, *asmāñ ca táñç ca*, and see RPr. iv.32”. On the precise facts from the RV, see OLDENBERG 1888: 432ff. The ŚS rule is generally followed by the PS mss., although it does not seem to be carried over pāda boundaries (cf. 2.81.5ab *prapatan cakṣuṣā*). We find it in kāṇḍas 6/7 at 6.3.3b, 6.5.5a, 6.8.9c, 6.9.9d, 6.14.6d, 6.22.6a, 6.23.9d, 7.2.7c, 7.2.7d, and even in cases where the historical explanation for the insertion of the *ç* (see WHITNEY 1862: 86f.; OLDENBERG *ibid.*; AiGr. I, §280) does not hold: 6.23.9d *uttarasmimś cana*. Given this generalization of the rule with disregard for historical factors, it is noteworthy that a few traces of a more historically faithful system such as that of the RV do remain: in the portion of text treated here, cf. 6.11.9a *yo + smāñ cakṣuṣā manasā* (-*n*, **c- Or**, -*n* **c- K**) for ŚS 5.6.10a *yò smāñś cakṣuṣā manasā*.

**(I) Final -n before j-** Cf. ŚCĀ 2.1.11 in DESHPANDE’s translation (1997: 274): “[The final *n* changes to *ñ*, also] before a voiced [stop] belonging to the *c*-series’. WHITNEY (1862: 77) writes with regard to this rule: “This is another rule as to the observance of which the usage of the Atharvan manuscripts is quite various; and it may almost be said here, as of the insertion of *t* between *n* and *s*, that there is not a passage in which all the codices agree either to make or to neglect the assimilation. We find written in such cases either *anusvāra*, or *ñ*, or *n*; yet the first is notably the most frequent, and in the printed text has been made, in obedience to the authority of the Prātiśākhya,<sup>86</sup> the universal usage. It might perhaps have been better, in order to avoid ambiguity, to write the palatal nasal expressly, instead of intimating it by the employment of the nasal sign over the preceding vowel: yet the cases are few in which a final *ñ* so written could be mistaken for one

<sup>86</sup>I do not understand this remark, because the Prātiśākhya (i.e. ŚCĀ) seems to sanction only *ñ*, not *n*.

which arises from the assimilation of a final *m*". In the two kāṇḍas treated here, we come across five cases: 6.14.7a <sup>+</sup>*kumārāñ janasya* (-*n*<sub>ṣ</sub> *j*- **Or**, -*ṃ* *j*- **K**); 6.22.13ab <sup>\*</sup>*enāñ jāyā* (-*ṃ* *j*- **Or K**); 7.2.5d *krīmāñ jambhayāmasi* (-*n*<sub>ṣ</sub> *j*- **Or**, -*ñj*- **K**); 7.10.4b <sup>+</sup>*anaḍvāñ jagatām* (-*n*<sub>ṣ</sub> *j*- **Or**, -*ṃ* *j*- **K**); 7.18.6e <sup>+</sup>*trṇahañ janam* (-*ṃ* *j*- **Or K**).<sup>87</sup> I may list here those further cases that I have come across in BHATTACHARYA's edition: 1.25.2b, 1.45.3a, 1.83.1d, 3.3.3ab, 4.18.2c, 4.40.1b, 5.3.4d, 5.6.4a, 5.20.4d, 5.20.4d, 8.3.1c, 11.3.2d, 11.4.5d, 12.22.10d, 13.3.7b, 15.12.1a. Although (as far as I can tell from BHATTACHARYA's critical apparatus) the Or. mss. and **K** at no place seem both to have -*ñj*-, I have regularized *ñ* here, as I have done in the sandhi discussed above under (F).

**(J) Final -n before t-** As in *dabhan tvām* and *ripūṃs tām*. — Cf. AiGr. I, §280. Only two cases occur in kāṇḍas 6/7, viz. at 7.3.3d *te agne mā dabhan tvām* and 7.11.4cd *ripūṃs tām ito nāśayāmasi*. I have followed the same principle as R-W for ŚŚ, explained in W-L, p. cxxiv f: "As in the other Vedas, so in the AV., a *s* is sometimes inserted and sometimes not; its Pr[ātiśākhya, i.e. ŚCĀ] (cf. ii. 30) allows and the mss. show a variety of usage. Of course, then, each case has been determined on the authority of the mss., nor do there occur any instances in which this is wavering and uncertain. [The matter is fully discussed in W's note to ii. 26, and the 67 cases of insertion and the 28 cases of non-insertion are given on [JAOS 7] p. 417 [= reprint p. 87]. . . .]"

**(K) Final -m before n- and before k-, c-, t-, p- and the like** Cf. AiGr. I, §283b. Presumably because he did not feel bound in each case to follow instructions of the Prātiśākhya differing from what he found in his Samhitā mss.,<sup>88</sup> WHITNEY (1862: 90) provides no comments on the usage of his ŚŚ mss. in cases covered by the rule ŚCĀ [DESHPANDE] 2.1.31 *makārasya sparśe parasasthānaḥ* '[A final] *m*, before a stop, is changed to a consonant which has the same point of articulation as the following [stop]' (DESHPANDE). Both the R-W and the ŚPP editions of ŚŚ do not follow the implication of this rule, instead following what I assume to have been the usage of their mss., viz. to employ anusvāra. Although the PS mss. occasionally do show -*n n*- (from -*m n*-), -*ñ k*-, -*ñ c*-, -*n t*-, and in external sandhi rarely -*m p*-, the vast majority of the cases supports the use of anusvāra. I have followed HOFFMANN's advice (1976: 498 n. 5): "Die Schreibung mit Anusvāra (*ṃ*) vor Verschlusslaut in verschiedenen Texten ist lediglich ein Interpretamentum der späteren Tradition bzw. der Editoren: *tānná* wird z.B. je nach seiner Entstehung als *tām ná* (< *tām ná*) oder als *tānná* (*tām ná* < *tād ná*) geschrieben. Diese Praxis sollte, auch wenn Fehlinterpretationen möglich sind, um der Übersichtlichkeit willen im Satzsandhi beibehalten bleiben".

<sup>87</sup>According to DESHPANDE (1997: 275) on ŚCĀ 2.1.11 (<sup>o</sup>*n j*<sup>o</sup> → <sup>o</sup>*ñ j*<sup>o</sup>), as a matter of general policy "S.P. Pandit's edition and the VVRI edition read -*an j*- without applying this sandhi rule", but at ŚŚ 5.8.7 they read *trṇáhāṃ* as do R-W.

<sup>88</sup>Cf. W-L, p. cxxiii.

**(L) Final -m and -n before l-** As in 6.22.9b *viṣṭāriṇaṃ loka°* and 6.22.13d <sup>+</sup>*asmiṃl loke*. — Cf. AiGr. I, §§283c and 281b. Let us quote in full WHITNEY’s remark (1862: 92) under ŚCĀ [DESHPANDE] 2.1.35 *ubhayor lakāre lakāro ’nunāsikaḥ* ‘Both [i.e. *m* and *n*] are changed to a nasal  $\tilde{l}$  before *l*’ (DESHPANDE): “It is perhaps to be regretted that the editors of the published text did not follow this rule of the Prātiçākhyā with regard to both *m* and *n*. The manuscripts, however, are almost unanimous in reading only a single *l* after an original *m*, with a nasal sign over the preceding vowel (there are but two or three cases, if I recollect aright, of a doubled *l*), and their authority has in this respect been followed. Where an original *n* has disappeared, on the other hand, the manuscripts follow, not without some exceptions, the directions of the Prātiçākhyā”. As to *-m l-*, the PS mss. agree precisely with those of ŚS. Just one case occurs in the two kāṇḍas treated here, viz. 6.22.9b *viṣṭāriṇaṃ lokajitam*, but also at all other instances known to me in the fifteen kāṇḍas edited by BHATTACHARYA (except at 14.6.1e *svargaṃ lokam Or / svargalokam K*) do we find this sandhi: 1.72.1d, 2.10.1d, 3.38.9c, 5.40.1c, 9.14.7a, 9.23.6b, 9.28.2a, 13.9.1e, 14.5.4d.

Our PS mss. treat the sandhi *-n l-* in different ways. There are three instances in kāṇḍas 6/7: 6.22.13d <sup>+</sup>*asmiṃl loke* (*-smil lo-/ -smilo- Or, -sminlo- K*); 6.23.12b <sup>+</sup>*asmiṃl loke* (*-smillo-, -smilo- Or, -smiṃnlo- K*); 6.23.12d <sup>+</sup>*asmiṃl loke* (*-smillo- Or, -smiṃnlo- K*). According to the information provided in BHATTACHARYA’s critical apparatus, a similar pattern (*-ll- Or, -ṃ/ṃn/n l- K*) holds at 5.31.4b, 11.9.5c, 12.14.4c, 14.7.1d, while at 14.6.8 <sup>+</sup>*sarvāṃl lokān* (thus BHATTACHARYA), we find *-ll-* in the Or. mss, but simply *-l-* (omitted anusvāra) in **K**, and a case of doubling in both branches of transmission is found at 14.7.10c *tāṃl lokān* (*tāllokān Or, tāṃllokān K*): while the Or. have *-l l-* (occasionally just *-l-*), **K** tends to have nasal plus single *l-*. But to the mentioned case of doubling in **K** (PS 14.7.10c), we can add e.g. 16.22.8d, 16.81.8b, and this evidence leads me to suspect that the authentic orthography was *-ṃl l-*, whose anusvāra was then dropped in the Or. transmission. This, at least, is how I have decided to edit the three cases that had to be dealt with in this work. Since the ŚS tradition also does not support an anunāsika sign  $\tilde{m}$  in this sandhi (cf. WHITNEY 1862: 92 note), it seems unwarranted to follow BHATTACHARYA’s consistent, but inconsistently marked, regularization with  $\tilde{m}$  rather than  $\tilde{m}$ .

**(M) Final -t before ś-** As in *tac chṛṇu*. — Cf. WHITNEY (1862: 80): “we have followed in the printed text the authority of the manuscripts, which, with hardly an exception, write simply *ch* instead of *cch*. This orthography is also, to my apprehension, a truer representation of the actual phonetic result of combining *t* with *ç*”.<sup>89</sup> The mentioned instance is from 7.18.2b; cf. further,

<sup>89</sup>Cf., e.g., WEBER’s decision to edit *uc-chiṣyāte* at ŚBM 13.1.1.1 as *uchiṣyāte* and, similarly, the substantivized verbal adjective *uc-chiṣṭā-* with simple *ch* in the compound

in the portion of text treated here, 6.8.4d *śṛṅgavac chiraḥ*, 7.2.6d *+yac chiraḥ*, 7.8.1c *+ārāc chaptam*, 7.8.2b *+yac chvaśuro*, 7.13.1d(ff.) *+kṛtac chiraḥ*, 7.15.4ab *+āmamac chalyān*. While **K** everywhere writes *śch*, the Or. mss. with few exceptions spell *tś* (once *ts*) in these passages. This last, rather surprising spelling is mentioned in AiGr. I, §278a (p. 329, ll. 26f.) as being attested also epigraphically. To see if there is any chance that it has to be taken seriously — in the sense of representing an authentic spelling, or else representing a reflex in the Saṃhitā-text of a now lost Padapāṭha —, I have checked the cases of the same sandhi occurring in kāṇḍa 5. To the extent we can draw conclusions from BHATTACHARYA’s negative apparatus,<sup>90</sup> they must be that this interesting writing habit was not the only option available to the Oriya scribes, but that we have in PS 6/7 merely a coincidental cluster of instances: the Or. mss. for kāṇḍa 5 appear to have this spelling only at 8.4c, 9.4b, and 10.7d, and are not even unanimous in all of these cases; at most other places, we find expected *ch*: 2.6c, 10.10e, 14.1c, 17.1b, 23.4c, 26.2c, 28.6d (*-ts-* in **K!**), 29.1a, 36.3d, 36.4 (ff.), 38.8d. I therefore do not want to take the mentioned cases from kāṇḍas 6/7 to show anything more than an awareness on the part of the scribe(s) that the second word in question, free from sandhi, begins with *ś*; otherwise, they seem merely to be examples of the common confusion *ch/ts* (and hence, since Oriya phonology does not distinguish sibilants, also *ch/tś*). I follow LUBOTSKY 2002: 9, and edit *-c ch-* “in order to preserve transparency of the text”, marking with a ‘+’ for emendation only if the Or. mss. do not show their standard *ch* (see the next paragraph).

**(N) Initial and intervocalic ch** As in *gāyatreṇa chandasā* and *gachati*. — BHATTACHARYA regularizes extension of word-initial *ch-* to *cch-* after word-final *a/i, ā* (AiGr. I, §133), and edits *cchandasā* in the former example, which is taken from 1.63.4a (cf. also 1.87.4d, 4.1.2c). In fact the mss. of our text, with hardly any exception, write *ch* (Or. mss.) and *śch* (**K**) respectively.<sup>91</sup> In rare cases, however, we do find the rule *ch* → *cch* of the grammarians (AiGr., *ibid.*) adhered to in one or the other of the Or. mss.: cf. my discussion under 7.5.12a, and the **V/126** reading at 7.18.7d. Interesting though such cases may be, they can easily be explained as adjustment to Pāṇinian rules on the part of a scribe. For me, the fundamental fact is that even though the Or. mss. *can* write *-cch-*, and sometimes do, they refrain from doing so in the overwhelming majority

---

*hutochiṣṭām* at ŚBM 12.4.2.8, etc.

<sup>90</sup>That it is probably reliable in reporting variants for this kind of sandhi is confirmed by the fact that all instances from PS 6/7 of *tś* in the Or. mss. have been reported by him, although he, too, edits *-cch-*.

<sup>91</sup>An explicit statement regarding the practice of the ŚS mss. seems not to have been made by WHITNEY anywhere, but LANMAN adds (W-L, p. cxxv), under the treatment of “Final -t before ç-” (see my preceding paragraph): “[The procedure of the edition and of the mss. is, I believe, uniformly similar also in cases like *ṛchāt, gacha, yacha*, etc.]”. Note also WITZEL 1989: 161–163.

of cases. Whatever considerations of historical phonology and meter tell us, it seems to me that we cannot ignore this apparently authentic spelling (found not only in PS, but also in ŚS and several other Vedic texts whose transmitters disposed of a grapheme *ccha* but nevertheless did not use it), and I therefore share LUBOTSKY's opinion (2002: 9) "that we should keep to the Orissa ms. tradition and edit simple *-ch-* (as is the practice of, for instance, the mss. of the RV)".

It will be observed that I do not take the **K** spelling *śch* seriously for PS, in the same way that I also reject its *jihvāmūlīya/upadhmānīya* as unauthentic (see below). There is an old controversy as to the graphic interpretation of the Śāradā sign transcribed as *śch*, whose shape has been assumed to stand for *cch*.<sup>92</sup> Cf., however, WITZEL's statement (1979–80, §1.4 p. 16): "In der Schreibung *śch* ... nur einen Lese- und Schreibfehler für *cch* ... zu sehen, ist verfehlt: Die Kashmirische Schreibung mit *śch* ist zu konstant, auch in klass. Texten" (also DREYER 1986: XXVI n. 63; WITZEL 1989: 161ff.). I assume that the akṣara in question is indeed to be read *śch*, but that its use is an artefact of Kashmiri habits — the reason for whose persistence in Kashmir, as that of *jihvāmūlīya/upadhmānīya*, remains unknown — introduced into the text only after a predecessor of our **K** got transported to Kashmir, and does not mean anything about how the PS text was written before it came to be transmitted in Kashmir.<sup>93</sup> I base myself, in making this decision, on the fact that **K** shows instances of spellings with *ch* rather than its usual *śch*: see the ms., e.g. fol. 240a15 *yāvayāchatrum* [19.2.2d], 246a7 *yathāchinnādy* [19.13.8bc]: I interpret these cases as preserving an older orthography which is in most cases lost due to the Kashmirizing efforts of PS transmitters in Kashmir. Note also the readings at 6.12.8/6.13.3, where both **K** and **Or** have *ts*: it thus seems that \*G also had instances of *ch* → *ts*. The mss. of the KauśS, which must have circulated in Gujarat simultaneously with, and among the same people as, our archetype and the predecessors of the ŚS mss. (see GRIFFITHS 2004 and 2007), show several cases of *ts* for *ch*; we find similar spellings also in another text transmitted in Gujarat, MS: 4.14.7:247.1ff. *ṛtsātām*,<sup>94</sup> but in none of these texts (nor in other locally transmitted texts with old preserved mss., like AVPariś) do we find any traces of a spelling *śch*, which we would expect if such had been a common spelling at the time and place of origin of the PS archetype.<sup>95</sup>

<sup>92</sup>Thus still DUMONT 1962: 52.

<sup>93</sup>AUFRECHT <sup>2</sup>1877: VI was willing to admit that "die Schreibung *gaśchati*, *aśchinat* ... kommt der Wahrheit viel näher als *gacchati*[.] *acchinat*", but did not adopt this orthography in his edition. Similarly, VON SCHROEDER wrote in the Introduction to his KS ed. I, p. XII: "Es hatte etwas Anmuthendes, in Formen wie *gaśchati*, *yaśchati*, *iśchati*, *yuśchati* u. dgl. m. für *gacchati* etc. etwas Archaisches zu suchen, eine erhaltung des s von dem alten präsensbildenden sk zu vermuthen". VON SCHROEDER rejected *śch*, however, on the basis of the mistaken assumption that it represented a graphical error for *cch*. Cf. finally WITZEL 1974a: IX / 2004: xxiii (with notes) and AiGr. I, p. 154 ll. 7ff., with Nachtrag p. 81 on 154, 13.

<sup>94</sup>Cf. also Ved. Var. II, §§183–185; HOFFMANN 1982: 61 = 1992: 767.

<sup>95</sup>I may note, to conclude this discussion, that a reverse scenario (*śch* in \*G, completely

**(O) Degemination of ttv, tty, ddv, ddy to tv, ty, dv, dy etc.** Cf. W-L, p. lxxvii, on ŚŚ: “the ordinary usage of the mss. makes no distinction between double consonants in groups where the duplication is phonetic, and those in groups where the duplication is morphological (cf. W’s *Grammar*, § 232)”. LANMAN’s example is *tádyám* for *tád dyám* at ŚŚ 4.19.6. The Or. mss. of our text never write the geminate in the portion of text treated here, but at such instances as 7.6.1d, 7.11.10a (and 7.6.10c), at least **K** shows that it can write *-ddy-*, *-ttv-*. All cases where none of the mss. writes the geminate have been marked by me with a <sup>+</sup>. For *-t tv-*, cf. the readings at 6.21.3d (*tasmātvam* **Or K**), 7.6.10c (*yatvemahe* **Or**, *yantvemahe* [from *yattvemahe*] **K**), 7.11.10c (*tāvatvam* **Or K**); for *-ttv-* 7.15.2b+d (*datvā* **Or**, *dattā* **K**); for *-tty-* 6.11.9b (*cityā* **Or K**<sup>pc</sup>); for *-d dy-* 7.6.1d (*tadyāvā°* **Or**, *taddyāvā°* **K**), 7.11.10a (*yāvadyaur* **Or**, *yāvaddyaur* **K**). No cases of *-d dv-* occur in kāṇḍas 6/7, but cf. 2.37.2a (no variants reported by BHATTACHARYA for **Or**, but my **Ku1** reads *asmadveṣāṃsi*; *asmaddveṣāṃsi* **K**), 10.5.4a (*yadvipāc* **Or**, *yaddvipāc* **K**), 14.5.7a (*dvipāṭ dvihastah* **Or**, *dvīṣādvihastah* **K**).<sup>96</sup> Here too belongs the reduction of *jjñ* to *jñ* that was noted in the Or. mss. for 4.15.1 (GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY 2001–02[03]: 197).<sup>97</sup>

**(P) Final visarga before ś- ṣ- s-** As stated above (§2.1.2.4), the Or. mss. have the usual system of *-h* for *-s*, before *ś- ṣ- s-*, while **K** assimilates the final *-s* to *-ś -ṣ -s*, only showing (occasional) pausa-forms at pāda boundaries (e.g. 6.11.3bc, 6.18.8ab, 6.22.3ab, 7.4.5ab), in prose-mantras also at syntactic boundaries (6.12.2b). WITZEL 1974a: IX / 2004: xxii f. (with n. 59) regards the type of sandhi found in **K** as archaic,<sup>98</sup> and the Kashmiri system is supported by ŚCĀ [DESHPANDE] 2.2.1 *visarjanīyasya parasasthāno ’ghoṣe* ‘The *visarjanīya* [= *h*], before a voiceless [consonant], is changed to a [maximally similar consonant] which has the same point of articulation as the following [voiceless consonant]’ (DESHPANDE). For information on the practice of the ŚŚ

---

eradicated by pre-/proto-Orissa transmitters) is rendered even more unlikely by the fact that the Or. mss. do write *śch* where we expect it in external sandhi: 4.13.2cd (*śiraś chinadmi*), 4.20.7ef (*manaś chāyā*), 9.7.2d (*himaś chadih*), 9.11.6b (*agnīś chāyā*); I have found only one exception, at 1.53.2c, where for *stomāś chandāṃsi* the Or. mss. have *-ā(c)cha-*.

<sup>96</sup>The **Or** reading for the last instance is particularly interesting, and is to be compared with the case of *-ṭgh-* for *-dgh-* discussed under 7.8.6d.

<sup>97</sup>We may also expect cases of *jjv* → *ju*, as they are found in the mss. for ŚŚ (cf. WHITNEY on ŚŚ 6.121.1).

<sup>98</sup>His statement, in the note, that the sandhi of the MS mss. would be of the same assimilating type is not supported by his reference to VON SCHROEDER’s *Einleitung*, p. XLII; in light of the few “sporadic cases” that WHITNEY mentions for ŚŚ in the passage quoted just below, and in light of possible geographical connections between MS and AV transmission (see §2.6, and (N) just above), WITZEL’s remark could be interesting, but nothing further is found to confirm it in VON SCHROEDER 1879 or LUBOTSKY 1983. On the facsimile of the Haug ms. kept in Munich accompanying VON SCHROEDER’s article, one case occurs: for edited *bhūtīkāmaḥ syāt*, the ms. does not have *-ssy-* but reads *bhūtīkāma syāt* (not registered in the critical apparatus).

mss. (in full agreement with the Or. mss.), cf. WHITNEY's statement (1862: 96) under the quoted rule, that his mss. do not “—except in a few sporadic cases, and without any agreement among one another as regards these—convert *visarjanîya* into a sibilant before a sibilant. In the final revision of the edited text, the rule of the Prâtiçâkhyâ in this respect was begun to be followed in the interior of a word (see ii. 3. 3, 5; iii. 21. 2; iv. 17. 2), but was soon neglected again, and the text in general shows *visarjanîya* before a sibilant in all situations”. I have not found any internal evidence suggesting the secondariness of either system, and regard the question which was the system of the PS archetype as unanswered. For practical purposes, I follow the system of the Or. mss., and I am strengthened by the arguments in the next paragraph in my implicit assumption that the system of the Or. mss. is the authentic one.

**(Q) Final visarga before k(h)- and p(h)-** Under the same just quoted Prâtiçâkhyâ-rule, WHITNEY (1862: 96) leaves no doubt as to the ŚS usage. According to the rule, “before *k* and *kh* it [i.e. *visarjanîya*] becomes *jihvâmûlîya*, and, before *p* and *ph*, *upadhmanîya*—these last two spirants being . . . clearly implied in this rule, although nowhere referred to by name as belonging to the scheme of spoken sounds recognized by the treatise. *Visarjanîya* itself, then, would only stand, in *sanhitâ*, before a pause. The theory of the Prâtiçâkhyâ, however, is not at all the practice of the manuscripts, and the latter, rather than the former, has been followed by us in the printed text. In none of the Atharvan codices is any attempt made to distinguish the *jihvâmûlîya* and *upadhmanîya* from the *visarjanîya*—and, as we cannot but think, with much reason: since the division of this indistinct and indefinite sound into three different kinds of indefiniteness savors strongly of an over-refinement of analysis”. Whatever one may think of WHITNEY's rationalization of the manuscript usage (cf. DESHPANDE 1997: 305f.), the usage itself is clear. The editor of PS is confronted with different problems, viz. the evidence of the two branches of the text's transmission, that seems at first sight to be conflicting: the Or. mss. again write visarga (*h*), and consistently so, it seems, while **K** uses *jihvâmûlîya* (*h*) and *upadhmanîya* (*h*), participating once again in common Kashmiri writing habits (cf. WITZEL 1974a: IX / 2004: xxiii; 1979–78, §1.4 p. 16; 1994: 5; DREYER 1986: XXIII). **K**, however, is far from consistent in this matter. Besides manifold cases of visarga at pāda boundaries, where the pausa-form may be expected (*-h k-* e.g. 6.9.7, 7.5.1; *-h p-* e.g. 6.10.9, 6.11.4, 7.15.8), I have also found deviations from the general practice pāda-internally: *-h k-* at 6.14.7, 7.4.2; *-h p-* 6.2.4, 6.3.11 (2×), 6.6.3, 6.6.9, 6.12.5, 6.14.6, 6.19.3, 6.22.3, 7.6.8, 7.7.2, 7.7.4, 7.9.1, 7.15.8, 8.15.6.<sup>99</sup> It may be true, as WITZEL asserts (1994: 6), that cases of *h* instead of *h* and *h* are “indicative of the late date of MSS.”, or,

<sup>99</sup>The disproportionately greater number of cases of *-h p-* than of *-h k-* may be partially explained by the special sandhi situation created when final *-s* precedes, as it so often does, a form of the verb *kar*: see the next paragraph.

as DREYER informs us (1986: XXIII), that *h/h* “werden auch von Schreibern direkt in *h* überführt”, but it seems to me that another factor may have played a role as well, viz. retention of the authentic sandhi system of \*G, which most likely agreed with that of the ŚS mss., and which — I assume — our Or. mss. have preserved intact. Further support for the assumption that our text, after it came to Kashmir, has also in this regard been subjected to Kashmirization, comes from the fact that **K** even offers clusters *hk* where, as the Or. mss. show, *šk* ought properly to have been written (6.4.3d, 6.6.5b).<sup>100</sup>

**(R) Final -ṣ/-s before k-, p-** We sometimes find deviations from the types of sandhi discussed in the preceding paragraph. They have been discussed in full detail for ŚS by WHITNEY (1862: 107–113).<sup>101</sup> As to *-ṣ/-s* preserved before *k*, the vast majority of cases is found before forms of the root *kar*, as noted for ŚS by WHITNEY (pp. 107f.), and for PS by LUBOTSKY (2002: 51f.), who, however, was not entirely correct that the sibilant is preserved in PS only before *k*- of this root: the mss. for 7.3.3b are unanimous in reading *niṣ kravyādo* (contrast WHITNEY, *ibid.*, and DESHPANDE 1997: 331 on ŚS 12.2.16 *nīḥ kravyādam*), and — as far as I can judge from BHATTACHARYA’s negative apparatus — so are the mss. for 11.9.3b *yajus kālād* (but no such variant is reported by ŚPP or W-L for ŚS 19.54.3 *yájuh kālād*, which one might have expected to follow the PS sandhi here: cf. §2.2.1). I have also found one case before *kh*: 20.39.7c *niṣ khidāmasi*. Moreover, even in kāṇḍas 6/7 alone I have found several exceptions to the preference of *-ṣ/-s* before forms of *kar*: 6.2.8b *āvarvṛtataḥ kṛṇavo* (with intervening caesura), 7.5.4d *kṛtyādūṣiḥ kṛto*, 7.19.3d *namah kṛṇmo*; one may perhaps also add 7.1.7a *punaḥ kṛtyāṇ*.<sup>102</sup> As to *-ṣ/-s* preserved before *p*-, the conditions causing it are even less easily arranged in one category, and this is reflected, for ŚS, in the fact that ŚCĀ needs 15 rules to cover all the cases on an *ad hoc* basis. All instances from kāṇḍas 6/7 may be explained by invoking close syntactic nexus (cf. D II): 7.6.10a *vāstoṣ pate* (cf. cases of *bṛhaspati*-, *vanaspati*- *passim*), 7.10.1b *himavatas pari*, 7.10.5b *ādityebhyas pari*. I have tried to follow the generally unequivocal evidence of the mss., discarding occasional jihvāmūliyas and upadhmānīyas (or even visargas) in **K**, against *ṣ/s* in the Or. mss. (e.g. 6.8.8d, 6.18.1+9), as secondary (Kashmir-style) regularizations.

**(S) Omission of visarga before st- and the like** As in 6.17.10ab *gaṇai stutā*. — Cf. WHITNEY (1862: 96), on the rule ŚCĀ [DESHPANDE] 2.2.1 quoted under (P) above: “The rule that the *visarjanīya* is to be dropped altogether

<sup>100</sup>And similarly also clusters *hp*. Cf. HOFFMANN 1986: 459 = 1992: 821 n. 3: “Im K.-ms. kann der Jihvāmūliya in *hk* [*sic*] und der Upadhmānīya oder Visarga in *hp* [*sic*], *hp* auch *ṣ* ersetzen, vgl. z. B. *vāḥpaśca* AVP IV 24,1 statt *bāṣpaśca*”.

<sup>101</sup>Cf. also p. 106 for the same combinations in internal sandhi: no problems have emerged for this internal sandhi in PS 6/7.

<sup>102</sup>Cf. also the extensive discussion by DESHPANDE 1997: 333f.

before a sibilant followed by a surd mute—a rule which is laid down by the Rik and Vâj. Prâtiçâkhyas, and not by our own, but which is rather more usually, although with very numerous and irregularly occurring exceptions, followed in the Atharvan manuscripts—has been uniformly carried out in the edition; although many will doubtless be inclined to think with me that, considering the varying usage of the manuscripts, it would have been better to follow the authority of the Prâtiçâkhyas, and so to avoid the ambiguity occasionally arising from the omission of the final spirant”. Applied to PS, following WHITNEY’s final inclination would have meant editing *gaṇais stutā*, with a type of cluster indeed encountered in **K** at 7.4.5a: *balavijñāyassthaviraḥ*, where the Or. mss. point to *balavijñāyaḥ sthaviraḥ*, as I have edited there. The habit of omitting visarga (or rather, of simplifying a cluster *sst(h)* to *st(h)*) is well known (AiGr. I, §287b; Ved. Var. II, §§972, 974–977), and is commonly (in all mss., e.g., at 6.17.10ab, 6.20.8ab, 19.7.9b, 19.9.6ab),<sup>103</sup> but — as at 7.4.5a (with intervening caesura) — not always, encountered in our mss. It is too early to attempt to synthesize the PS data for this sandhi. Surely there will be many cases where the two branches of transmission do not agree, but no clear instance of such divergence has been encountered in kāṇḍas 6/7. I have, therefore, followed the evidence of the mss., a policy which in our two kāṇḍas did not lead to difficulties.

**(T) Omission of visarga before sv-/sy- and the like** Cf. AiGr. I, §287c, and Ved. Var. II, §978: “here the regular usage of nearly all texts, and the prescriptions of all the Prâtiçâkhyas, require *ḥ*. . . . The only text which regularly drops the final *s* is ApMB.; see Winternitz’s Introduction, p. xlviii. It appears, however, that the mss. of some other texts show the same dropping of *s* not infrequently. Especially is this true of AV.; see Whitney’s note on APr. 2.86, and on his Translation of AV., 6.121.1”.

The only case relevant for us that WHITNEY (1862: 116) in fact touches upon in the passage referred to by BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON (1932) is the problematic spelling of the internal sandhi of the word *duḥṣvāpn̄ya-*, which falls under ŚCĀ 2.4.6 [DESHPANDE] *stṛtasvasvapiṣu* ‘Before *stṛta*, *sva*, and forms of the root *svap*, [the *s*, preceded by a vowel other than *a* or *ā*, is changed to *ṣ]*’ (DESHPANDE): “If we follow our treatise, then, implicitly, we shall write *anishstṛtaḥ*, *nish svâ*, *dushsvapnyam*, which are barbarous and impossible forms. The manuscripts write, without dissent, *anishṣṛtaḥ* and *nishva*; as regards *dushvapnya*, their usage is very irregular; they vary with the utmost inconsistency between that form and *duḥshvapnya*, in no single instance writing *dushshvapnya*. While, therefore, we are compelled to look upon *anishstṛtaḥ*, *nish shva*, and *dushshvapnyam* as the forms which the Prâtiçâkhyas intends to sanction, we cannot but hold the editors justified in following for the two former cases the unanimous authority of the MSS., and in making the third

<sup>103</sup>I have further noted *sva sthabitam* in **K** at 4.1.4b, Or. mss. corruptly *svastyabhitam*.

conform to them”. While the ŚS mss. vary inconsistently between *duṣvápnya-* and *duḥṣvápnya-*, those of PS show other variation: cf. 7.7.9a *duḥṣvapniyam* **Or**, *duṣvapni* **K**; contrast ZEHNDER’s decision to edit *duṣvapnya-* at 2.37.2 (*duḥṣvapnya-/duḥsvapnya-* **Or**, *dviṣvapnīya-* **K**) with LUBOTSKY’s to edit *duḥsvapnya-* at PS 5.23.7, 5.37.3. Says LUBOTSKY (2002: 171): “Bhattacharya edits this word either with *-ḥsv-* (6×) or with *-ḥṣv-* (8×; once *duṣvapnyam* at 15.4.2a), which is based on the spelling of the Or. mss. (K. also vacillates between *-ssv-* and *-(ṣ)ṣv-*”. The Or. mss. thus consistently insert a visarga,<sup>104</sup> except at 15.4.2, and in a comparable case of external sandhi at 13.4.4 (see my commentary on 6.20.8), all mss. point to a sandhi *rajjūḥ sma* → *rajjū śma*. In view of these two small pieces of evidence, and of the policy adopted by WHITNEY (followed by ZEHNDER), I reject LUBOTSKY’s choice, and edit *duṣvapnya-* at the one case encountered in kāṇḍas 6/7 (viz. 7.7.9a), where the evidence of **K** and the Or. mss. cannot be reconciled; I fully realize, of course, that the base of argumentation is in fact virtually nil, but no objective criterion suggests itself.

We may now return to the external sandhi. At none of the cases in kāṇḍas 6/7 (only *-s sv-* occurs: 6.1.3c, 6.1.8b, 6.2.6d, 6.12.5b, 6.22.3ab, 6.22.6cd, 6.22.11b, 7.7.6a, 7.13.12b) did I encounter unanimous evidence against the adoption of visarga in my edition. A perusal, on the basis of BHATTACHARYA’s critical apparatus, of all the cases in kāṇḍas 2 and 5<sup>105</sup> leads to the same result, viz. that in almost all cases the mss. write *-ḥ sv-/ḥ sy-*. I thus find LUBOTSKY’s decision to restore BHATTACHARYA’s *priyā syāma* to *priyāḥ syāma* at 5.39.7cd fully justified; cf. also <sup>+</sup>*edhamānāḥ sve* for *edhamānā sve* at PS 20.61.5 (GRIFFITHS 2004, item 31).

**(U) Intervocalic ḍ** The case of ‘Vedic ḷ’. — WITZEL states (1989: 165): “both the Kashmiri PS (with a diacritic) and the Oriya PS with a special letter used for intervocalic *-ḷ-* (now also found in Marāṭhī, Oriya, etc.) exhibit the retroflex *-ḷ-* instead of the usually printed *-ḍ-*”. These words are problematic.<sup>106</sup> In the following discussion, I make reference to the four signs nicely reproduced by ZEHNDER 1999: 21. The conventional transliteration for Śāradā (1) is *ḷa* (or *ḷ̣*), and for Oriya the conventional transliterations are (2) *ṛa*, (3) *ḷa*, (4) *la*.

First, as to the sign used in the Or. mss., it is not entirely certain what “special letter” WITZEL had in mind: the sign used in the Or. mss. for intervocalic *ḍ* certainly is not the sign used (when writing Oriya language)<sup>107</sup> to represent

<sup>104</sup>It seems quite possible that this is secondary, because the least faithful of the Or. mss. (**JM RM**) can also insert visarga in such cases as 6.1.3c.

<sup>105</sup>They are 2.13.5c, 2.28.5a, 2.31.1b, 2.49.1h, 2.53.1d, 2.54.3b, 2.56.1e, 2.57.1c, 2.60.4c, 4.31.3d, 5.4.5d, 5.14.8, 5.28.4.

<sup>106</sup>The brief statement regarding the Or. mss. of PS in note 272 on p. 211 of WITZEL 1989 does not succeed in properly identifying the issues either.

<sup>107</sup>Occasional intrusion of this Oriya grapheme/phoneme into the spelling of Vedic has been noted above, §2.1.2.4.

/l̥/, the retroflex lateral phoneme for which Oriya has a separate sign (properly *ḷ*: ZEHNDER's 3) — related palaeographically to that for *l* (ZEHNDER's 4) —, but is a sign derived by means of a subscript diacritic dot from *ḍ* (ZEHNDER's 2).<sup>108</sup> WITZEL wrongly equates the orthographies of Oriya and Marathi, which latter has no *ṛ*, and to whose *ḷ* /l̥/ the only graphic and phonemic Oriya correspondent is equally *ḷ* /l̥/. The Oriya sign for the intervocalic allophone of *ḍ* /ḍ/ is properly transliterated as *ṛ* [ṛ], and the same process, by the way, is used to derive intervocalic *ṛh* (not depicted by ZEHNDER) from *ḍh*. To take the most familiar example, the Or. mss. of PS would write *agnim ṛre purohitam*, possibly *ḷde*, but *not* (as in Marathi) *ḷe*.<sup>109</sup>

Coming, then, to the Śāradā sign in question (ZEHNDER's 1 — see also GRIERSON 1916: 686), WITZEL (1994: 14f.) has aptly described it as derived from the sign for *ḍ* by attaching a “small diacritic triangle” to the upper right side of that sign in order to express the intervocalic phonetic variant of /ḍ/.<sup>110</sup> We note that the (palaeo)graphical connection here again, as in the case of the Oriya sign *ṛ*, is with *ḍ*, rather than with *l*. This was doubtless the reason why BHATTACHARYA suggested (p. xxi) that it is possible that “*ṛa* is intended by the letter” in question, meaning that its phonetic value may not be done justice by the conventional transliteration *ḷ*, and the equation (by WITZEL, GRIERSON, BHATTACHARYA) with the (Marathi-)Devanāgarī sign conventionally transliterated that way. BHATTACHARYA's 1993 publication offers a convenient collection of occurrences of the sign in the Kashmir ms., and BHATTACHARYA in this earlier publication too is inclined to infer that it represents the “trilled variety of /ḍ/”, i.e. *ṛ* [ṛ] (1993: 106).

It must be emphasized now that the Oriya writing habit is normally as predictable when writing Oriya language<sup>111</sup> as is the Vedic allophony, and the occurrence of *ṛ(h)* in the Or. mss. of PS may hence easily be taken as an imposition by the scribes of their vernacular writing habits onto their writing habits for Vedic mantras: the authentic ‘Sprachwirklichkeit’ of the Oriya spelling *ṛ(h)* in the PS mss. may therefore not be taken for granted.<sup>112</sup> On the other hand,

<sup>108</sup>Cf. MASICA (1991: 146f.): “The favorite diacritic of the “Northern” scripts is the *subscript dot* (̣) . . . . It is used for the near-allophonic intervocalic flaps [ṛ, ṛh] corresponding to /ḍ, ḍh/ in Hindi, Bengali, and Oriya . . . ; in Marathi and Gujarati it is ignored; . . .”.

<sup>109</sup>RV 1.1.1 itself does not occur in PS, but cf. PS 19.1.10a *ṛre agnim bhavam* . . . . It is unfortunately not clear what is the basis of WITZEL's assertion (1994a: 46 n. 67): “The *ḷ* [i.e. *ḷ* AG] used in Vedic MSS now and in printed editions is a Marathi invention expressing one of their *ḷ*-sounds”.

<sup>110</sup>Surprisingly, an aspirated counterpart of the intervocalic sign does not seem to exist in Śāradā, as noted by GRIERSON 1916: 687 and WITZEL 1974a: XXV n. 63 (found on p. xxiii in the 2004 edition). Three cases occur in PS 6/7: at 7.6.5c and 8ab, **K** reads *ḍṛḥā*<sup>o</sup>, but at 7.11.5c we find the interesting spelling *ārelhi*.

<sup>111</sup>Cf. MASICA 1991: 147 n. 4 (p. 470): “There is some inconsistency about writing Oriya Ṛ”. Indeed, a few of the Or. mss. available to me do not, or not consistently, place the subscript dot. BHATTACHARYA suggests (p. xx) that his mss. only “rarely” place the dot.

<sup>112</sup>That the Orissa scribes of PS most likely did *not* intend ‘Vedic ḷ’ with *ṛ(h)* I find confirmed by autopsy (December 2003) of a Kāṇvasamhitā ms. in the village Bodāpālasā, Keon-

the apparently quite consistent use of the Śāradā sign ‘*ḷ*’ in our **K** may belong to the large number of orthographic peculiarities I have judged as secondary ‘Kashmirizations’ in the preceding paragraphs,<sup>113</sup> and may therefore be of no evidential value for the authentic Paippalāda orthography either. I have decided to go against my earlier voiced inclination (GRIFFITHS 2003a: 341) to follow the Kashmirian tendency, and instead to regularize *d(h)*, on the basis of the mentioned text-*internal* considerations, but also on the following *external* grounds.

There is no trace at all in the tradition of the Śāunaka Śākhā of the allophony *d* → *ṛ/l* (see WHITNEY 1862: 29; DESHPANDE 1997: 145), nor is there any trace of it in the other Vedic tradition historically restricted to Gujarat, that of the Maitrāyaṇīyas. Above, we have at various stages been led to postulate close orthographical agreements between the traditions of ŚS and PS, and, under (N) and (P), with MS too. Given the equivocal nature of the evidence of the PS mss. themselves, I feel that following the orthography of ŚS and MS in this case is most likely to lead us to anything resembling historical accuracy. The factual readings of the PS mss. are of course reported as faithfully as possible in my critical apparatus, where the Oriya sign is transliterated with *r*, and with considerable hesitation the Śāradā one is transliterated as *ḷ* (despite my inclination to assume that it actually represents [ṛ], as the shape of the akṣara suggests).

(V) **r/l** Cf. Ved. Var. II, §§257–263 on the confusion between *r* and *l*, which “is reflected in the earliest language and thruout the Vedic period, not only in the variations of parallel texts, but in the ms. readings of one and the same text”. Our PS is such a text: cases of divergence between **K** on the one hand, and the Or. mss. on the other, are quite numerous, and have been noted by me e.g. at 7.7.4b (*anuprlavaṃ* [*sic*] **Ku**, *anupravaṃ* **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], *anuplavaṃ* **K**), 7.12.6b (*vātapravā* **Or**, *vātaplavā* **K**), 7.13.10b (*puṣkarair* **Or**, *puṣkalair* **K**). The tendency is clearly toward *l* in **K**, and toward *r* in the Or. mss. To the extent that sense and etymology pronounce a clear verdict, these have been my criteria in establishing the text of each individual case.

---

jhar Dt., Orissa (assuming that this single ms. is representative of the orthography used in all Orissa mss. of that text): it is immediately clear that in this tradition intervocalic /d/ (‘Vedic ḷ’) is spelt with the retroflex lateral *ḷ* sign. I have seen no case of intervocalic /d̪h/, so I do not know how this would be rendered in the Orissa Kāṇvasaṃhitā mss.

<sup>113</sup>On the use of the sign in the dominant Kāṭha and ṚV tradition of Kashmir, see WITZEL 1989: 165 with n. 169.

### 3 The Arrangement of the Paippalādasamhitā

#### 3.1 Divisions and principles of arrangement of the text

In my publication GRIFFITHS 2003b, I focused in detail on the names of the divisions of our text, and on the places where divisions are made. In my 2003a paper, I have given some remarks about how these divisions are marked by means of colophons etc. in the Or. mss.: see now §2.1.2.8 above. Regarding **K**, see §2.1.1.3.

The PS is divided, in order of decreasing size, into *vargas* ‘halves’, *pādas* ‘quarters’, *kāṇḍas* ‘books’, and *\*prapāṭhakas* ‘lectures’. Every *kāṇḍa* is further subdivided into *anuvākas* ‘lessons’ which are groups of *sūktas/kaṇḍikās* ‘hymns’. Each hymn, finally, is divided into *ṛcs* ‘stanzas’ (or prose sentences which also came to be called *ṛc-* at some stage of the transmission: see BISCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003: 334 n. 97).

Not all of the larger divisions are encountered in the portion of text treated here. Two *\*prapāṭhaka* transitions fall within *kāṇḍas* 6/7: between 6.12.5/6 and between 7.4.4/5. *Kāṇḍa* 6 contains twenty-three hymns, and four *anuvākas*, with a standard length of five hymns per *anuvāka*: an overlong *anuvāka* of seven hymns covers hymns 11–17, and another one of six covers hymns 18–23 (among which 20–21 clearly form one original hymn, *arthasūkta*). *Kāṇḍa* 7 contains twenty hymns and is divided into four equally sized *anuvākas* of five hymns each.

I did not discuss the principles of arrangement behind the textual divisions in my 2003b paper. These are twofold: we can distinguish numerical principles and principles of contents. I leave out of further discussion here the division into *anuvākas* which is mostly straight-forward and based on numerical principles: it has been treated by me at length in the aforementioned article (cf. also W-L, p. cxxix ff.), only the issue of norms for the hymn totals of the *anuvākas* (W-L, p. cxxxix) in some, especially the later, books remaining unclear;<sup>114</sup> in that same paper I presented all the facts thus far known about the *\*prapāṭhaka* division (pp. 29ff.). In the following sections, I focus first on the arrangement of the text into *kāṇḍas*, and then on the arrangement of hymns within these *kāṇḍas*, with special reference to *kāṇḍas* 6/7.

#### 3.2 The *kāṇḍas* and ‘grand divisions’

On the division of the PS into 20 *kāṇḍas*, and their titles, cf. WITZEL 1985a: 267ff. The organizing principles seem to have been very similar to those of ŚS, being a combination — not yet well understood — of numerical criteria with criteria of contents (cf. W-L, p. cxlii), the latter playing a decidedly

<sup>114</sup>The reader is referred for some basic facts to the discussions in RENOUE 1947 (§53) and JHA 1952–53: 332ff., partially outdated because based only on **K**.

minor role in PS, and one that is restricted, it seems, to groupings of hymns within kāṇḍas. The following table gives for each kāṇḍa its traditional title, the number of hymns (with the norm for the amount of stanzas per hymn implied by the title, and the actual average), and the number of anuvākas per kāṇḍa (with the amounts of hymns per anuvāka).

Kāṇḍa	Title (°kāṇḍa)	Hymns <sup>115</sup>	Norm	Average <sup>116</sup>	Anuvākas	Size <sup>117</sup>
1	caturṛca°	112	4	4.3	22	5(6)
2	pañcarca°	91	5	5.3	18	5(6)
3	ṣaḍṛca°	40	6	6.9	8	5
4	saptarca°	40	7	7.6	8	5
5	aṣṭarca°	40	8	8.9	8	5
6	navarca°	23	9	10.3	4	5(6/7)
7	daśarca°	20	10	10.6	4	5
8	ekādaśarca°	20	11	11.5	4	5
9	dvādaśarca°	29	12	10.4	4	5/6/9
10	trayodaśarca°	16	13	10.3	2	6/10
11	caturdaśarca°	16	14	9.3	2	7/9
12	pañcadaśarca°	22	15	9	2	11
13	ṣoḍaśarca°	9	16	7.2	2	4/5
14	saptadaśarca°	9	17	9.3	2	4/5
15	aṣṭādaśarca°	23	18	9.9	5	4/5
16	kṣudra°	155	?	8.8	22	4–16
17	ekānṛca°	55	?	8.9	8	4–17
18	mahat°	82	?	8.9	13	3–11
19	trca°/tryrca°	56	3	16.1	14	4
20	ekarca°	65	1	9.8	10	5–8

Based on the variables indicated in the table, we can make, just as WHITNEY did for ŚS (W-L, pp. cxxvii, cxxxix f., cxlii ff.), a provisional grouping of the kāṇḍas into three ‘grand divisions’: I (1–8), II (9–15), III (16–20). While the time has not yet come to go into such details here as could be done in W-L for ŚS, I can nevertheless make the following observations.

**‘Grand division’ I** In the first ‘grand division’, the principle is clear: criteria of contents do not play any role; kāṇḍas are arranged by the decreasing total number of hymns, and the increasing number of stanzas per hymn. It is noticeable that this average is always higher (presumably in part due to secondary accretions onto the text after its first redaction) than the norm as implied by the kāṇḍa-titles, but it is always lower than the average of the next kāṇḍa. There is an additional rule, which has only few exceptions:<sup>118</sup> no hymn may

<sup>115</sup>The numbers of hymns are given according to the Or. mss. (see ZEHNDER 1999: 258).

<sup>116</sup>Except for kāṇḍas 2 and 6–7, where I have used respectively ZEHNDER’s (1999: 22) and my own counts, these calculations are based on the figures given by BHATTACHARYA 1997: xxii. For the small adjustment that is required in BHATTACHARYA’s count for kāṇḍa 9, see my special table for that kāṇḍa below.

<sup>117</sup>The figures in the last two columns are based on GRIFFITHS 2003b. Numbers within parentheses mark small and rare departures from what is otherwise a clear norm; numbers separated by ‘/’ cover the entire available variation; those separated by ‘–’ are the smallest and largest sizes encountered.

<sup>118</sup>The only possible exception known to me from kāṇḍas 6/7 is 6.21. If, however, the stanza arrangement as found in ŚS 19.47–48 (= PS 6.20–21) according to R-W and ‘Sāyaṇa’

contain fewer stanzas than the norm (*pace* RENO 1947: 65; cf. W-L, p. cxlix). Regarding the possibilities for restoring to regularity those hymns that exceed the norm current in the respective kāṇḍa, I may refer to the study of INSLER (1998b) and to my remarks introducing hymns 6.3, 6.4 (end), 6.5, 6.9, 6.11, 6.16, 6.17, 6.20, 6.22, 6.23 (10 out of 23 in kāṇḍa 6) and 7.1, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.13, 7.14 (6 out of 20 in kāṇḍa 7). Finally, in this ‘grand division’, the total number of anuvākas per kāṇḍa steadily diminishes, while the norm for the amount of hymns per anuvāka is clearly five throughout (exceptions being necessary only there where the total number of hymns is not easily divisible by five).

**‘Grand division’ II** In the second ‘grand division’, an organizing principle is at first glance hard to detect, except for the fact that all but the first and last kāṇḍas have two anuvākas each, while their size varies from four to eleven hymns per anuvāka. The norm that is implied by the titles of the kāṇḍas seems to become entirely irrelevant. The relative numbers of hymns per kāṇḍa also seem not to count any longer, while the absolute numbers may serve only to separate this ‘grand division’ from the third. The following tables for kāṇḍas 9–15 give the numerical facts.

- 9** Ostensible norm of 12 stanzas per hymn: out of 29 hymns 8 conform, 21 do not. Note that short hymns of 10 stanzas, or pairs of such hymns, are six times followed by ‘supplements’ of 5 or 7.

hymn number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
stanzas	11	10	13	12	14 <sup>119</sup>	12	14	10	5	12	14	12	10	7	
hymn number	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
stanzas	10	7	10	10	7	12	12	10	10	7	10	12	12	10	7

- 10** Ostensible norm of 13 stanzas per hymn: out of 16 hymns 3 conform (including the first), 13 do not. Note that short hymns of 10 stanzas are three times followed by ‘supplements’ of 5 or 7.

hymn number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
stanzas	13	10	7	13	14	13	10	5	10	7	10	12	10	10	10	11

- 11** Ostensible norm of 14 stanzas per hymn: out of 16 hymns 3 conform (including the first and the last), 13 do not. Note that short hymns of 10 stanzas are six times followed by ‘supplements’ of 5, 6 or 7.

---

(10+6) is correct rather than that of PS/ŚPP (9+6), we seem to have here an intrusion of the common pattern of ‘grand division’ II into I.

<sup>119</sup>16 in BHATTACHARYA’s edition: cf. however GRIFFITHS 2003b: 14 n. 69, and also my conclusions below: the principles of textual arrangement in the second ‘grand division’ do not allow a hymn of 16 stanzas.

hymn number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
stanzas	14	13	10	5	14	10	7	10	5	10	6	10	5	10	5	14

- 12** Ostensible norm of 15 stanzas per hymn: out of 22 hymns 0 conform. Just one hymn exceeds the number of 10 stanzas; hymns of 10 stanzas, or pairs of such hymns are often followed by ‘supplements’ of 5, 6 or 8; there is one hymn with 9 stanzas.

hymn number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
stanzas	10	6	10	8	10	6	10	6	10	10	9
hymn number	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
stanzas	10	5	10	8	10	6	10	10	10	10	14

- 13** Ostensible norm of 16 stanzas per hymn: out of 9 hymns 0 conform. Hymns of 10 stanzas are followed by ‘supplements’ of 5, 6 or 7, and one prose ‘hymn’ of just 1 ‘stanza’ closes the kāṇḍa.

hymn number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
stanzas	10	6	10	7	10	6	10	5	1

- 14** Ostensible norm of 17 stanzas per hymn: out of 9 hymns 0 conform. One group of hymns of 3×10 stanzas and one of 4×10 are both followed by ‘supplements’ of 7.

hymn number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
stanzas	10	10	10	7	10	10	10	10	7

- 15** Ostensible norm of 18 stanzas per hymn: out of 23 hymns 0 conform. Just four hymns minimally exceed the number of 10 stanzas; hymns of 10 stanzas are four times followed by ‘supplements’ of 6 or 8.

hymn number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
stanzas	10	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	6	10	10	
hymn number	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
stanzas	11	10	11	10	10	8	10	12	10	8	10	13

Several principles emerge. First, that the implicit norm is 10 stanzas per hymn throughout this ‘grand division’. This principle is accompanied by the following rule: no hymn may contain more than 14 stanzas. If a group of connected stanzas contains more, it is split over two hymns, giving combinations of 10+5, 10+6, 10+7, 10+8, 10+9. In other words, the rules of this kāṇḍa allow hymns

of the sizes 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 but not of 1, 2, 3, 4, or larger than 14 (cf. the norm of 15 in kāṇḍa 19). The fact that only one case (12.11) of 10+9 seems to occur, may have to be seen in the light of the basic rule that holds also in ‘grand division I’, viz. that no hymn ever contains fewer hymns than the norm, or may be merely due to chance.

**‘Grand division’ III** The third ‘grand division’ is distinguished from the first two primarily by the sudden change in the kind of titles its kāṇḍas receive, although the titles revert back to the number-based system in 19–20: this might be a reason to assume two ‘grand divisions’, covering respectively 16–18 and 19–20, rather than only one. However, all 5 kāṇḍas share characteristics against those of divisions I (e.g. unstable anuvāka sizes between kāṇḍas, and, with the exception of 19, also within kāṇḍas) and II (e.g. high total numbers of hymns and anuvākas). Grouping on a thematic basis plays a role in kāṇḍa 18, which contains i.a. the PS funeral hymns, just as does ŚS 18. Because even the basic facts are not yet entirely settled in the case of kāṇḍas 16–20, I cannot go into any details here. Suffice it to say that these kāṇḍas — with the clear exception of kāṇḍa 19, where the norm is evidently 15 stanzas per hymn, grouped in triplets (*trcakāṇḍa*) — also clearly show a pattern of hymns, or rather (as in kāṇḍa 20), groups of 10 stanzas, occasionally followed by smaller ‘supplement’ hymns. Only kāṇḍa 19 shows a clear norm of 4 hymns per anuvāka.

### 3.3 The arrangement of hymns within kāṇḍas

The following are WHITNEY’s words on this subject (W-L, cxliii, cxlvi; cf. also cliv f., clvii):

While the general guiding principles of arrangement of the books within the division are thus in large measure and evidently the external ones of verse-norms and amount of text, it is not easy to see what has directed the ordering of the several hymns within a given book. It is clear that the subject has not been considered; nor is it at all probable that any regard has been had to the authorship, real or claimed (we have no tradition of any value whatever respecting the “rishis”). Probably only chance or arbitrary choice of the arranger dictated the internal ordering of each book.

BLOOMFIELD, by contrast, noticed several tendencies that hold in ŚS: the very same that are clearly encountered in our text as well. The citations in the following paragraphs are all from BLOOMFIELD 1899: 38f.

**Lofty hymns open a kāṇḍa** “[J]ust as the introductory hymn 1.1 and the closing hymn of 19 hold their places because of their subject-matter, so there is a design in the opening-hymns of books 2, 4, 5, and 7, all of which begin with a theosophic or *brahmodya*-hymn in loftier diction”. This tendency we see clearly

exemplified in PS 6.1 and 2 (~ ŚS 5.2+1), the former being a borrowing from the ṚV, both in a style quite apart from the rest of the kāṇḍa.

**Arrangement according to subject-matter** “[T]wo, three, four, and rising from that to as high as twelve hymns, dealing with quite or nearly the same theme”; BLOOMFIELD notes that “they appear together many times not only because they deal with the same theme, but because a given group in an earlier period of mantra-production made up one and the same hymn, or two or more hymns bearing upon the same theme and the same occasion”. Of this kind of grouping, we find one clear (6.20–21 = ŚS 19.47–48) and one hitherto unrecognized example in kāṇḍa 6 (6.11–13 ~ ŚS 5.6, 9, 10), and the pairings of 6.15 with 6.16 (both hymns dealing with the topic of food) and 6.18 with 6.19 (both hymns calling for blessings) may be mentioned here as well. In kāṇḍa 7, we find one clear case of this type (7.16–17), but — as I have noted in my introductory remarks to hymns 7.14, 7.16–17, 7.20 — it seems quite possible that this pair is in truth part of a substantially larger collection of hymnic material for the use of the Purohita, specifically in *kāmyeṣṭis*.<sup>120</sup>

Division into separate hymns of material originally belonging together is not unknown in Vedic Saṃhitās: for an example from the ṚV, cf. OLDENBERG 1888: 193; in our own text, it is noticeable in all of the kāṇḍas constituting ‘grand division’ II, as well as in kāṇḍas 16–17 (see also my comments just above in §3.2 under ‘grand division’ II).

**Verbal correspondences** “Above all verbal correspondences, at times so vague as to cast doubt upon one or the other of the following observations, seem to be the sole cause of the juxtaposition of hymns. Thus 1.9, 10 are not connected by theme, but each contains the word *varuṇa* in the opening hemistich. . . . The word *vajra* links externally 6.134 and 135; the words *stana* and *stanayitnu* 7.10 and 11; *ava mṛj* and *apa mṛj* 7.64 and 65; *prajāvantaḥ* and *prajāvatīḥ* 7.74 and 75; *vṛkau* and *vṛkkau* 7.95 and 96; stem *ka*, felt to be the same as *prajāpati*, 7.100 and 101; stem *rakṣohan* 8.2.28 and 3.1; stem *prāṇa* 11.3.54 ff. and 11.4; . . .” etc. Such verbal correspondences — hymn-concatenations as they may be termed (RENOU 1947: 64) after the comparable links that connect individual stanzas (INSLER 1998b) — between the hymns of kāṇḍas 6/7 sometimes also extend over series of hymns. I have listed those correspondences that have revealed themselves to me in the introductory remarks to the hymns in question; the nature of the phenomenon makes it inevitable that quite a number will still have gone unnoticed.

<sup>120</sup>Cf. RENO 1947: 65 and 75. Hymns 7.15 and 7.18 (stanza 7!), too, stand in a direct, even more or less explicit, connection to the domain of the Purohita; the same perhaps holds true also for 7.19, although the suspected connection is far from explicit in that hymn.

### 3.4 Verbal correspondences between kāṇḍas 6 and 7?

Besides the numerical factors governing the structure of the Samhitā and its organization into kāṇḍas, and the factor of concatenation that we have just put forward as one of the factors that might help to explain the internal organization of kāṇḍas, I have entertained the possibility that the two kāṇḍas treated in this study show similar verbal linkages, too. A few rare words occur only in PS 6 and PS 7, but nowhere (or hardly anywhere) else: the hapax °*tuṇḍika-* is found at 6.14.5a and at 7.11.8b we find *tuṇḍila-*; *taṇḍa-* is found at 6.14.5a and 7.11.9a (elsewhere in PS only *taṇḍika-* at 16.79.5b); the hemistich *jayantī pratyātiṣṭhantī saṃjayā nāma vā asi* occurs in PS only at 6.4.5 and 7.12.6. Further research may reveal more such thematic/verbal linkages between these, and between other contiguous kāṇḍas, if the few examples I note here are not merely due to chance.

## 4 Text, Translation and Critical Apparatus

### 4.1 The plan of the work

In the main part of this work, the data are presented in the following way. Each hymn receives a caption, printed next to the hymn's number (cf. W-L, pp. xcv and 1024ff.), which intends to bring across my view of the general purport of the hymn. Further elaborations of my interpretation, along with sundry other information, are provided in the introductory comments that precede each hymn.

Text, translation, critical apparatus, parallel passages, and commentary then follow in that order, arranged stanza by stanza. Every stanza is provided with a heading containing its number in bold face, along with a listing of parallel passages. If relevant — but without exception in cases where they are transmitted with accentuation — these parallel passages are then quoted under the critical apparatus. Each pāda is followed by a symbol indicating its metrical structure.

### 4.2 Editorial signs in the text

The text is presented pāda by pāda. Cases of sandhi across pāda boundaries are dissolved, and such dissolution of sandhi is marked by hyphens: the critical apparatus contains the undissolved text. In the edited text, I make use of the following special signs.

- \* An asterisk precedes restored readings that had already suffered corruption by the time of the archetype (cf. §2.6.1 and §2.7).
- + The raised + sign precedes emended readings not attested as such in

any of the mss., but attributable to the archetype, or small orthographical changes upon the presumptive text of the archetype.

- †...† Obeli enclose sequences of syllables that seems to have been corrupt already in the archetype and have thus far resisted attempts at emendation; if the corrupt readings of the Or. mss. and **K** are not reconcilable, the apodosis of the Or. mss. is generally adopted.
- Three *kunḍalas* intimate abbreviating omission of repeated openings or refrains (see §2.5.2).

### 4.3 Metrical analysis

To provide a first sifting of the material for a future study of the metrical tendencies of the Atharvavedic Saṃhitās, a metrical analysis of each pāda has been given, and an attempt has been made to restore deficient pādas to a metrically satisfactory form, paying due consideration to the dangers posed by the metrical Scylla and Charybdis identified most eloquently by BLOOMFIELD in 1899 (p. 42):

Atharvan metres are so generally capable of improvement that we are in danger of singing our own rather than Atharvan hymns, when we apply ourselves to the task of improving them. An uneasy sense is left that we all know how to make better verse-lines than those that have somehow got to be in vogue among the Atharvan writers; carried out to its full consequences this would eliminate one of the more marked peculiarities that render the Atharvan what it is. Yet it is impossible to abstain entirely: such abstemiousness would suggest the equally mistaken view that all Atharvan stanzas are before us in the form in which they were originally composed.

OLDENBERG 1906: 690 = 1993: 1951 n. 1 rightly complained that W-L's Introduction added no new facts, devoting but one page to the 'Metrical Form of the Atharvan [i.e. Śaunaka] Saṃhitā' —, and it is only recently that a publication on the metrical and prosodical structures of kāṇḍas 1–7 of the Śaunakasaṃhitā (KUBISCH 2007) has taken us beyond BLOOMFIELD's two-page treatment of 1899 (§§38, 39). Unfortunately, the results and analytic refinements proposed by KUBISCH could not be applied anymore in this work, which was basically completed in 2004. The system of metrical analysis still used here is modelled upon the system developed by ZEHNDER for his 1999 edition of PS, kāṇḍa 2 (p. 14), and adopted with minor changes by LUBOTSKY for kāṇḍa 5 in 2002.

- (5) Pentasyllabic pāda
- (8) Anuṣṭubh- or Gāyatrī-pāda
- (7) Catalectic or acephalic Anuṣṭubh-pāda
- (9) Hypermetric Anuṣṭubh- or Gāyatrī-pāda
- (10) Triṣṭubh-pāda lacking one syllable
- (11) Triṣṭubh-pāda

- (11<sup>J</sup>) Hendecasyllabic pāda with an iambic (‘Jagatī’) cadence
- (12) Jagatī-pāda
- (4+8) Dodecasyllabic pāda showing an Uṣṇih-like pattern
- (12<sup>T</sup>) Hypersyllabic Triṣṭubh-pāda (on this type, see also OLDENBERG 1906: 690 = 1993: 1951 n. 1)
- (13) Hypersyllabic trimeter pāda (these tend not to be of the regular type discussed OLDENBERG 1888: 66)
- ( ) Metrical analysis unclear or impossible
- (P) Prose line or sentence

I must emphasize that my metrical analyses and restorations are not based on a thorough statistical study of the available data of PS and ŚS. The symbols listed above are only to be seen as a starting point for an analysis of the whole corpus of AV poetry (PS and ŚS) and serve as a simple means to indicate metrical regularities and oddities.

W-L (p. xciii) discuss “hypermetric words as glosses”. In my 2004 article I have experimented with the use of <...> to mark off, in the metrical indications, such superfluous material, but have opted for the more conservative analysis with the symbol ( ) in this work. Syllables which are to be restored (in case of abhinihita sandhi etc.) have been given in subscript; those to be omitted in scansion (notably <sup>i</sup>va ‘like’) in superscript. Special mention may be made here of the not uncommon metrical requirement to apply secondary sandhi. ZEHNDER 1999 has introduced the notation with  $\underline{X}Y$  (e.g. pp. 141, 146, 172: *kaśyapa* *indrāya* at 2.61.3a, *ya* *imāṃ* at 2.64.2a, *ma* *uta* at 2.76.3d) but did not introduce it into his text. This notation seems felicitous to me, and I have made use of it in the edited text itself (7.7.4a and 7.10.9a).

#### 4.4 Translation: its examples and its style

In a context unrelated to his work on ŚS, WHITNEY (1882: 396) stated most truly: “A second translator stands in a manner on the shoulders of a first, and may hope to see some things hidden from him”. In the same manner may we hope to have seen some things that remained obscure to the 19th century scholars who produced complete or selected translations from ŚS. It should be noted here that, for purely practical reasons, I have only made it a point to compare consistently and thoroughly WHITNEY’s work published in 1905. I have also made frequent reference to BLOOMFIELD’s excellent, and often more readable translations dating to 1897. Wherever WEBER’s translations were available — because PS 6/7 have a considerable number of mantras paralleled in ŚS 5, this meant in my case especially WEBER 1898 — I have consulted them. For even though his work is in many respects outdated, and his translation therefore often off the mark, his commentary remains valuable. It is a pity that I was only reminded, by re-reading the General Introduction to W-L (pp. xciv f.), after my own work was already finished, of BARTH’s positive judgement (quoted

by LANMAN) of GRIFFITH's RV and ŚS translations:<sup>121</sup> I have consulted his work only very rarely, and some important insights of GRIFFITH may for this reason have escaped my attention.

ZEHNDER (1999: 14f.) explicitly chooses WHITNEY's extremely literal style of translation as his model. WHITNEY's approach, however, has come under criticism mainly from GONDA, whose remarks deserve to be quoted in full (1965a: 8f.):<sup>122</sup>

Whitney's monumental achievement should not . . . become regarded as final, the less so as "this reproduction of the scripture in Western guise" can generally speaking hardly be called a translation. The author himself who fully recognized its provisional character may have over-estimated its value as "a basis whereon could afterwards be built such fabric of philosophic interpretation as should be called for". Whatever its merit "as a touchstone to which could be brought for due testing anything that claimed to be an interpretation", the disadvantages of a 'translation' the maker of which "need not pretend to penetrate to the hidden sense of the dark sayings that pass under his pen, to comprehend it and set it forth" are enormous. The belief that students of the history of religion, philosophy or literature could be able to fill the skeleton created by the 'Sanskrit scholar' with flesh and blood and inspire it with life is as great a misconception as the view that such "a reproduction in Western guise" would be possible at all, because almost every term of real interest is untranslatable in any modern language. A 'Sanskrit philologist' should not limit himself to mechanical word-for-word translation, to text-critical notes and the careful observation of parallel passages and correspondences in phraseology, he should try to make himself familiar with all branches of knowledge which are indispensable for a right understanding of the texts. The translation should be the result of a process of integration of a formal (text-critical and 'linguistic') and a material approach to an interpretation of the text.

These, then, are the high standards which GONDA has set for us, and it has been my attempt to achieve such an integrated translation which is at once as literal as possible and informed by the material factors that GONDA hints at, and which is accompanied by a commentary devoted mainly to further elucidation of the translated text.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup>I quote here from BARTH's *Œuvres* II [1914], 91 and 253: "Elle [the RV translation of 1889–92] se présente ainsi sans aucun appareil savant, ce qui, du reste, ne veut pas dire qu'elle n'est pas savante. L'auteur . . . a une profonde connaissance des langues, des usages, de l'esprit de l'Inde, et, pour maint passage, on aurait tort de ne pas tenir grandement compte de cette version en apparence sans prétentions", and "exécutée dans le même esprit et avec le même soin que celle-ci, elle [the ŚS translation of 1895–96] en forme le digne pendant et mérite les mêmes éloges".

<sup>122</sup>The passages quoted by GONDA are taken from W-L, p. xx.

<sup>123</sup>A reference to GONDA may not go without a reference to THIEME: the reader is advised

## 4.5 Critical apparatus

It has been my aim to record all variant readings of the manuscripts without exception in the critical apparatus of my edition. To do so I developed the conventions that will now be described.

Each individual lemma repeats the portion of text on which a variant is to be reported — but now, except for the case of restored initial subscript *a* in abhinihita sandhi (e.g. 6.1.7a), without accoutrements of my metrical analysis and pāda-division: the text proper, as it were —, and is followed by a lemma-sign (]), the ms. or mss. attesting the adopted reading, and the variant or variants, separated by commas. Some word-breaks have been introduced into the variants reported, to ease comparison with their respective lemmata, but I have not strived for consistency in this regard, and have left some variants undivided (the mss. normally present only uninterrupted strings of akṣaras). In those cases where I have adopted a reading not actually found in any of the mss., this reading has been marked in the lemma, as in the edited text, with either the + or the \* sign, as described in §4.2. It may be noted that mine, in contradistinction to BHATTACHARYA’s and those of almost all existing editions of Vedic texts, is a strictly positive apparatus (WEST 1973: 87 n. 14). For those readers to whom the disadvantages of a negative apparatus are not plain, it will be worthwhile to quote here in full a telling passage from LANMAN’s General Introduction to W-L (p. lxiv, cf. also lxv, lxvi n. 1):

The difficulty of verifying statements as to the weight of authority for a given reading may be illustrated by the following case. At iii. 10. 12c, Whitney’s first draft says, “The *ṣ* of *vy àśahanta* is demanded by Prāt. ii. 92, but SPP. gives in his text *vy àśahanta*, with the comm., but against the decided majority of his mss., and the minority of ours (H.O., and perhaps others: record incomplete).” The second draft reads, “SPP. gives in his text *vy às-*, against the decided majority of all the mss.” Scrutinizing the authorities, written and oral, for the *samhitā* (since for this variant *pada*-mss. do not count), I find that Whitney records H.O., and that SPP. records Bh.K.A.Sm.V., as giving *ṣ*, in all, seven authorities; and that Whitney records P.M.W.E.I.K., and that SPP. records K.D.R., as giving *s*, in all, nine authorities. Whitney’s record is silent as to R.T.; and SPP’s report of K. is wrong either one way or else the other. The perplexities of the situation are palpable.

As stated above, the aim I set myself from the outset in preparing the apparatus for this edition was to report the evidence of the mss. in all its minutest details,

---

to consult this great scholar’s insightful and sharp remarks in his lecture on ‘Stand und Aufgaben der Rigveda-Philologie’ (printed 1995a: 1220ff.), from among which I may quote one, showing — for once — some form of agreement with GONDA: “Selbstverständlich muß sie [i.e. the translation] von Erläuterungen, die außerhalb der Übersetzung gegeben werden, begleitet sein”.

including punctuation. I made this decision in recognition of the partly idiosyncratic orthographical tendencies and punctuation notations of the two branches of transmission, which, in turn, are widely divergent from one to the other, and in view of the heightened importance of attention to phonetic/orthographical details in establishing the text of a Vedic Saṃhitā. Hence, I have in this work not eschewed even such accidentals, “merely orthographical variants” as certain editors of recently published critical editions of Sanskrit texts (whose editions in many other ways served as my examples) had good reason to ignore in their respective *apparatus*.<sup>124</sup>

I give below an itemized list of all special symbols and brackets that were at my disposal to represent the manuscript readings as precisely as possible.

**CAPITALS** These are used to represent readings that are uncertain (due, e.g., to bad legibility of photographs).

◌̣ A cedilla sign following a consonant is used to mark explicit virāma.

◌̣̣ This symbol renders the sign, discussed above (§2.1.1.3), that is used singly and doubly as punctuation marker in **K**.

◌̣̣̣ A single raised dot represents an illegible akṣara. If a vowel follows, this means that the consonantal (basic) part of the sign is illegible, but that its vowel component is clear.

[*siglum*] Manuscripts whose readings are to be inferred from BHATTACHARYA’s negative apparatus appear between [ . . . ] in my positive apparatus; readings that are explicitly reported by BHATTACHARYA are treated here as those from my own mss. In the case of kāṇḍas 6/7, the only ms. coming into question is **Ma**.

[ [ . . . ] ] Editorial observations on the preceding reading(s) appear in double square brackets. The following indications and abbreviations may appear enclosed within them:

*folio* Shift to a new folio.

*line* Shift to a new line.

*om.* The akṣara(s) or punctuation sign(s) is/are omitted in the respective ms(s).

*note* The reader is requested to note a particularity of the preceding reading.

∇ This sign represents the sign of roughly similar shape (*kāka-pada*) used by the Or. mss. to mark a place in the line of akṣaras where a correction or insertion is to be made (see **Ku** at 7.16.8). These have been reported only where there was special reason to do so.

<sup>124</sup>Cf. e.g. ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER & ISAACSON 1998: 47f.; HANNEDER 1998: 42. I may record here that in retrospect I would probably have been more selective, as the aforementioned editors of classical Sanskrit texts have chosen to be, and I recommend future editors of parts of our text not to burden their apparatus with all the types of variants that are retained in mine.

(*open space*) The scribe has left an open space which he has forgotten to fill in with a correction.

Bar. BARRET's reading of **K**.  
 Bhatt. BHATTACHARYA's reading of **K**.  
 Edg. EDGERTON's reading of **K**.  
 R-V RAGHU VIRA's reading of **K**.

{...} Curly braces enclose akṣaras or vowel elements thereof deleted by the scribe.

⟨...⟩ Angle brackets enclose akṣaras wholly or partially lost due to damage suffered by the palm-leaves. The number of intervening raised dots (·) reflects the number of lost akṣaras.

(...) Parentheses enclose material appearing interlinearly or *in margine*. The following specifications can be made:

+ Additions: in the Orissa mss., marginal additions are often followed by a number referring to the line in which the addition is to be made (see §2.1.2.5).

→ Corrections: the marginal or interlinear material replaces the preceding material that appears in the actual line of writing. In the Orissa mss., such corrections are often followed by a number referring to the line in which the correction is to be made (see §2.1.2.5). A siglum followed by <sup>pc</sup> gives a reading *post correctionem*.

*pr. m.* Material written *prima manu*.

*sec. m.* Material written '*secunda manu*': in the Orissa mss., this often merely means that the correction or addition has been made after the ink was applied to the manuscript. Regarding the two (or more) hands that appear to have been at work in **K**, see WITZEL 1973–1976.

# This symbol represents an illegible sign that appears to be a number.  
 ★ This symbol represent (floral) ornaments in the Or. mss. around divisions of the text.

## 4.6 Miscellaneous

Having come to the end of this Introduction, I may briefly point out some remaining methodological issues that have not yet found their natural place anywhere above.

**Unmarked regularization** The only issue where I have allowed myself to deviate from ms. transmission without marking this deviation with any symbol — besides the regularized intervocalic *d(h)* (§2.8 U) — is the regularized pausa-form *-m* before *daṇḍa(s)*. The Or. mss. are quite consistent in this respect

(with the exception of the cases of confusion of final nasals: see LUBOTSKY 2002: 11f.), while **K** often has  $-m_2$ , but can also agree with the Or. mss., as at 7.18.10b *adhāspadam* | ( $-ṁ$  | in all mss.). However, even in such cases the precise readings of the mss. can be retrieved from the critical apparatus.

**Problems in reporting variants involving  $\text{pr}\ddot{\text{ṣ}}\text{ṭhamātra}$  vowels** The Orissa mss. use the *prṣṭhamātra* way of writing vowels  $-e$ ,  $-ai$ ,  $-o$ ,  $-au$ . When scribes make errors or corrections involving such akṣaras, the prescribed element is liable not to be repeated. Strict exactness in representing such readings is probably not obtainable without resorting to extremely cumbersome notations, which I have eschewed.

**Quotations from unedited parts of PS** When quoting, in my commentary, from parts of PS that have not yet been edited by BHATTACHARYA, I rely in general on provisional editions prepared by myself on the basis of the mss. available to me. In such passages, I do employ the usual  $+$  and  $*$  signs for emendations, but only in cases of serious textual uncertainty have I reported the readings of the mss. consulted by me in footnotes.

**Citation forms** Verb *roots* are cited in full grade, following the lemmas of MAYRHOFER's EWAia, and without hyphen. Verbal *stems*, as well as — much more frequently — nominal ones, are cited with hyphen.

**Nominal and verbal compounds**  $\bar{\text{A}}mreḍitas$ , because they bear only one accent in accented texts, are printed as one word (without the needless hyphen that is often seen used in editions), while *Devatā-dvandvas* that are likely to have belonged to the archaic type with full inflection and independent accentuation of both members (INSLER 1998a: 285) are printed as two.

The matter of prepositions compounded or un-compounded with the verb is complex but important, e.g., because the original accented (enclitic) or unaccented (proclitic) condition of a preposition may have been significant for other matters, such as sandhi (cf. §2.8 D, R). In principle, even though our text is transmitted largely without accents, I divide prepositions and verb-forms as though we had an accented text before us, with *Padapāṭha*, following the example of AUFRECHT's RV edition. The pattern for single prepositions with unaccented verb-forms is clear. For combinations of prepositions, with accented or unaccented verb-forms, I try to follow as closely as possible the patterns encountered in ŚS (cf. the rules ŚCĀ 4.1–5 [DESHPANDE 1997 4.1.23–27], with discussion, in WHITNEY 1862), this being the text whose grammatical tradition may be supposed to have been closest to that of PS. The problem is that ŚS does not seem to be entirely consistent, sometimes following the pattern of the RV/TS (etc.), sometimes tending towards combination of prepositions which in the RV would bear separate accents (and which, along with the RV/TS

Padapāṭhas, would thus be printed separately there). In cases of doubt, I have tended to follow the RV pattern (cf. 7.9.3a), but not so at 7.13.5a. In cases where there is clear evidence from ŚS, I have followed the instructions of ŚCĀ (e.g. 7.1.11c).

Kāṇḍa 6

Navarcakāṇḍa

At the beginning of this kāṇḍa, which corresponds in all Orissa mss. with that of a new volume of palm-leaves, the mss. open with the following invocations:

- Ku:** *śrīlakṣmīnṛsiṃhaśaraṇaṃ || || avighnam astu || || oṃ*  
**JM:** *śrīgaṇeśāya namaḥ natvā narahariṃ devaṃ sarvavighnapraṇāśa-  
naṃ | pippalādaprasādāc ca likhyāmātharvaṇaśrutim || 0 || oṃ*  
**RM:** *śrīgaṇeśāya namaḥ || || natvā narahariṃ devaṃ sarvavighnapraṇā-  
śanaṃ || pippalādaprasādāc ca likhāmy ātharvaṇaśrutim || || || oṃ*  
**V/126:** *śrīlakṣmīnṛsiṃhāya namaḥ || śrīgaṇeśāya namaḥ || oṃ*  
**Mā:** *śrīgaṇeśāya namaḥ || oṃ*  
**Pa:** *oṃ namo lakṣmīnṛsiṃhāya || || natvā raghunāthadevaṃ sarva-  
vighnapraṇāśanaṃ | pippalādaprasādāc ca likhyāmy ātharvaṇaśru-  
tim || || oṃ*  
**Ma:** *oṃ*  
**K:** *atha ṣaṣṭhaḥ kāṇḍā likhyate Z Z oṃ namamo jvālābhagavatyai Z oṃ  
namo tilotamāyaiḥ Z Z oṃ*

## 6.1. To Indra.

This hymn is attributed to a Br̥haddiva Ātharvaṇa (see stanzas 8–9 and WEBER 1898: 164f.). It is parallel to RV 10.120, and is clearly directed to Indra, in spite of WHITNEY’S title for the parallel ŚS 5.2 ‘Mystic’. Its first ṛca has parallels throughout Vedic Literature.

My references to ŚS, kāṇḍa 20, follow the edition of ŚPP, which differs from the R-W *editio princeps* in following the text of ŚS 5, as opposed to the text of RV. Next to the complete translations of GELDNER and WHITNEY, I will have occasion below to refer to WEBER 1898. My interpretation of this hymn, in particular of its stanzas 5, 8 and 9, is the result of extensive discussions with Werner Knobl.

The various ritual applications for the stanzas of this hymn in the KauśS, VaitS (see the indications in W-L), and other sūtras are too secondary and diverse to be enlightening for the hymn’s exegesis. Besides the not too revealing explanations of AA 1.3.4 (see KEITH 1909: 182), there is a relatively old and interesting commentary on the verses of the first ṛca at JB 2.144:

*tāḥ padabrāhmaṇā bhavanti | tad id āsa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham iti prajāpatir  
hi<sup>1</sup> saḥ | prajāpatir hy eṣa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭhaḥ | yato jajñā ugras tveṣaṅmṇa  
itindro ha saḥ | sadyo jajñāno ni riṇāti śatrūn iti sadyo hy eva sa jajñānas  
sarvā mṛdho vyahata | anu yaṃ viśve madanty ūmā ity ṛtavo vā ūmās  
ta evainam tad anumadanti | vāvṛdhānaś śavasā bhūryojāś śatrur dāsāya  
bhiyasaṃ dadhātītindro ha saḥ | avyanac ca vyanac ca sasni saṃ te navanta  
prabhṛtā madeṣv iti yac ca ha vai vyaniti yac ca na tat sarvam etasyaiva  
śriyāi tat sthānam | tve kratum api vṛñjanti viśve dvir yad ete trir bhavanty  
ūmā ity ṛtavo vā ūmās ta evaite dvis trir bhavanti | svādo svādīya svādunā  
sṛjā sam iti prajā vai svāduḥ prajāyāi yā prajā sā svādo svādu | adaḥ su  
madhu madhunābhi yodhīr iti prajā vai madhu prajāyāi yā prajā sā mad-  
hor madhu | api ha prajāyāi prajāṃ paśyate ya evaṃ veda | tāsu śyāitam  
uktabrāhmaṇam ||*

“There are these verse-quarter explanations. “This indeed, was the chief among beings ...”: (for?) that is Prajāpati. For Prajāpati is this chief among beings. “... whence was born the fearsome, the one with brilliant manliness”. That is Indra. “Just born, he disperses the enemies”. For only just born he shattered all his foes. “He whom all the helping ones cheer on”. The helping ones are the seasons. It is they who cheer him on in this. “Increasing in vigor, the one of manifold powers instills fear in the Dāsa, as [his] enemy”. That is Indra. “Both the one which does not breathe, and the one which does breathe, is winning; at the offering, during the intoxications (of Soma), they call to you”. That indeed which does, and that which does not breathe, that indeed is all for his glory, it is a resting

<sup>1</sup> Read *ha*? Cf. 1.312, 3.262, but cf. also 3.309.

place (?). “To you, all [gods (?)] add [their] will, when these ones become helpful, two times three times”. The helping ones are the seasons. As these (helping ones) those (usual seasons) occur two times three times (in the course of a year). “Mix together with the sweet that which is sweeter than sweet”. The sweet is offspring. The offspring of the offspring, that is the sweet of the sweet. “Fight well for yonder honey, by means of honey”. The honey is offspring. The offspring of the offspring, that is the honey of the honey.<sup>2</sup> He indeed sees even his offspring’s offspring, who knows thus. On these [stanzas] the Śyaita [Sāman], whose explanation has been given (JB 1.145–147), [is sung].<sup>3</sup>

**6.1.1** RV 10.120.1, ŚS 5.2.1 = 20.107.4, SVK 2.833, SVJ 4.5.5, VSM 33.80, VSK 32.6.11 ≈ TS 3.5.10.1 ◊ Nir 13.37 = 14.24 etc.

tad id āsa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham	(11)
yato jajña ugras tveṣanṛmṇaḥ	(10)
sadyo jajñāno ni riṇāti śatrūn	(11)
anu yaṃ viśve madantīy ūmāḥ	(10)

This, indeed, was the chief in the worlds, whence was born the fearsome, the one with brilliant manliness. Just born, he disperses the enemies, he whom all the helping [gods] cheer on.

tad] **Or**, ud **K** bhuvaneṣu] **Or**, bhuvaneṣu **K** jajña] **K**, jajña **Or** ugras tveṣanṛmṇaḥ || **RM**, (+ ugra 1)stveṣanṛmṇaḥ | **Ku**, ugra(·)tv(·)ṛmṇaḥ | **V/126**, ugrastveṣu(→ ṣa)nṛmṇaḥ **Mā**, ugrastveṣunṛmṇaḥ **JM Pa** [**Ma**], ugrastveca(sec. m. → ṣa)nṛmṇaḥ [*om.*] **K** jajñāno] [**Ma?**] **K**, jajñāno **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā Pa** ni riṇāti] **Or**, anṛṇīta **K** anu] **K**, anu **Or** madantīy] **JM RM Mā**, madantīy **Ku Pa Ma**, ma(D)antīy **V/126**, sadantīy **K** [[Edg.: °nty] ūmāḥ ||] **V/126 Pa Ma**, umāḥ || **Ku JM Mā**, omāḥ || **RM**, ūmāḥ [*om.*] || **K**

**RV 10.120.1 etc.**

tád id āsa bhúvaneṣu jyéṣṭham yáto jajñá ugrás tveṣánṛmṇaḥ |  
sadyó jajñāno ní riṇāti śátrūn ánu yám víśve mádantīy ūmāḥ ||

**ŚS 5.2.1d**

... ánu yád enaṃ mádantī víśva ūmāḥ ||

While the Vedic Brāhmaṇa texts connect this verse with Prajāpati, the Nirukta goes a different way (13.37 = 14.24): *tad bhavati bhūteṣu bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham ādityaṃ<sup>3</sup> yato jajña ugras tveṣanṛmṇo dīptinṛmṇaḥ | sadyo ... śatrūn iti |*

<sup>2</sup> The mantra seems to have been understood as *madhumadhunā*.

<sup>3</sup> Pace BHADKAMKAR 1942: 1199 n. 9 “*ādityaṃ* should be *ādityaḥ*”, this may be taken as a neuter adjective — *sc. bhuvanam* — derived from masc. *āditya-*, cf. AiGr. II/2, §34eγ p. 110.

*niriṇātiḥ prītikarmā dīptikarmā vā | anumadanti yaṃ viśva ūmāḥ | ity adhidaivatam | atha adhyātmam | tad bhavati bhūteṣu bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham avyaktam yato jāyata ugras tveṣanṛmṇo jñānanṛmṇaḥ | ... ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe* ‘That chief one, i.e. the one belonging to the sun, among creations, i.e. among worlds, whence was born the fearsome, the one with brilliant manliness, i.e. the one whose manliness is [full of] shining. Concerning the words *sadyo jajñāno niriṇāti śatrūn*: *ni-ray* is that [verb] whose meaning is to please, or whose meaning is to shine, [and this action is performed by him] whom all helpful ones cheer on. Thus macrocosmically. Now, microcosmically. That chief one, i.e. the unmanifest one, among creations, i.e. among worlds, whence is born the fearsome, the one with brilliant manliness, i.e. the one whose manliness is [full of] knowledge. ... Thus [the Ṛṣi] is speaking of the migration of the soul.’

a. On the interpretation of Vedic *bhúvana-*, and the word’s apparent polysemy, cf. GONDA 1967b: 42–57 = 1975/II: 432–447. Words similar to those of this pāda are found at RV 4.56.3ab: *sá it svápā bhúvaneṣv āsa yá imé dyāvāprthiví jajāna* ‘He is truly an artisan among beings, who created these two, Heaven and Earth’ (cf. also GONDA 1967b: 54 = 1975/II: 444). The differences with our stanza are unfortunately as striking as the similarities. It remains to be determined what *tád* refers to. I would suggest combining the Nirukta’s *adhidaivatam* interpretation with a further thematic parallel found at ŚS 10.8.16 (≈ PS 16.102.5): *yátaḥ sūryaḥ udéty ástaṃ yátra ca gáchatī | tád evá manye ’hám jyeṣṭhám tád u náty eti kíṃ caná* ‘Whence the sun rises, and where he goes to rest — that same I think the chief; that nothing whatever surpasses’ (WHITNEY). Our pāda thus seems to refer with *tád ... jyeṣṭham* to an underworld or Ur-world (*bhúvana-*), whence the sun rises, and which is Indra’s place of origin.

KÜMMEL (2000: 112, see also p. 186 on RV 4.56.3ab) takes the perfect *āsa* as ‘faktisch’, serving “nur zur Konstatierung”. Cf. RENOUE 1925: 43 on the formulaic nature of this type of phrase.

I may add that the pāda is explained, besides in the two texts referred to above (AĀ 1.3.4, JB 2.144), also at KauṣB 25.10.1–3 [ed. LINDNER 25.11:118.1f.], with disregard for grammatical gender: *tad id āsa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham iti niṣkevalyam | yajño vai bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭhaḥ | yajña u vai prajāpatir viśvajit* ‘That was the chief among the worlds’ is [used for] the Niṣkevalya (Śastra); the ritual of worship is the chief among worlds; the Viśvajit [ritual] as Prajāpati is the ritual of worship’ (cf. also 19.6.10–11 [ed. LINDNER 19.9:87.22f.]).

b. The epithet *tveṣanṛmṇaḥ* occurs elsewhere (only?) at PS 8.1.1b = ŚS 5.11.1 (of Varuṇa).

c. Cf. RV 5.30.7ab *vī śú mṛdho janúsā ... áhan* ‘Right at your birth, you shattered the foes’ and 10.113.4ab *jajñāná evá vy àbādhata spṛdhaḥ prápaśyad víró abhí páuṃsyam ráṇam* ‘When just born, he drove off the opponents; the hero was anticipating a manly deed, a battle’.

d. The word *úma-*, mostly to be taken as an adjective, occurs outside the

ṚV (and the repetitions in other Vedic texts of this mantra) only in TS 4.4.7.2 ≈ MS 2.13.12:162.6 ≈ KS 22.5:60.11, twice in AB 7.34.1–2 (of the Pitṛs), and in the *Aśtibhadram* of the Kāthaka Saṁkalana (SŪRYA KĀNTA 1943: 62, line 4). On the combination *viśve ūmāḥ*, see PISCHEL & GELDNER 1889: 223f., and cf. ṚV 5.51.1, 4.19.1. The expression may mean the same as *viśve devāḥ* (cf. also 7.39.4 and 10.73.8c *ānu tvā devāḥ śavasā madanti*), but seems more likely here to refer to the Maruts: see under 3b below.

OLDENBERG 1888: 73–74 sees the last decasyllabic pāda as an example from the category of ‘Virajzeilen in Triṣṭubh-Liedern’. The ŚS variant has rather unelegantly turned this into a dodecasyllabic pāda with Triṣṭubh cadence, and has not been followed by any other texts. PS faithfully adheres to the ṚV text, as it does with few exceptions throughout this hymn.

### 6.1.2 ṚV 10.120.2, ŚS 5.2.2 = 20.107.5, SVK 2.834, SVJ 4.5.6

vāvṛdhānaḥ śavasā bhūryojāḥ	(11)
śatrur dāsāya bhiyaśaṁ dadhāti	(11)
avyānac ca vyanac ca sasni	(11)
śaṁ te navanta prabhṛtā madeṣu	(11)

Increasing in vigor, the one of manifold powers instills fear in the Dāsa, as [his] enemy. Both the one which does not breathe, and the one which does breathe, is winning. At the offering, during the intoxications (of Soma), they call to you.

vāvṛdhānaḥ] Or, vāvṛdhānaś K śavasā] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, śavasā{śava} JM bhūryojāḥ] Or, bhūryojāś K śatrur] Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], śatur RM, śatrūr K dāsāya] JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, dāsāya Ku avyanac] Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K, ⟨A⟩vyanac V/126 ca vyanac] Or, ca avyanac K sasni] Or, saSTRi K śaṁ te] K, sante Or navanta prabhṛtā] Ku RM [Ma], nadevananta prabhṛtā JM, navanta prabhṛtā V/126 Mā, navant{i}a prabhṛtā Pa, navantaḥpipṛtā K madeṣu ||] Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma], mademadeṣu || Mā, madeṣu [om. ] K

#### ṚV 10.120.2 etc.

vāvṛdhānaḥ śavasā bhūryojāḥ śatrur dāsāya bhiyaśaṁ dadhāti |  
avyānac ca vyanac ca sasni śaṁ te navanta prabhṛtā madeṣu ||

BHATTACHARYA reports *madamadeṣu* as reading for his Mā. I clearly read *mademadeṣu* on my reproduction of the same ms.

a. Cf. *śavasā vardhāyanti* in stanza 9.

c. I quote OLDENBERG (1909–12/II: 340): “Aenderung gefällig (*sásniḥ* paßt gut für Indra) und nicht schwer; *s-* folgt, und Mask. konnte leicht durch vorangehende Neutra verderbt werden. Doch geradezu unmöglich ist das Ueberlieferte nicht. Neben *vyanát* kann auch *avyānat* als *sásni* bezeichnet werden (so *ráthaḥ sásniḥ*). *c* dann vielleicht zu *ab*, von *d* getrennt: Indra stellt Atmendes und Nichtatmendes als *sásni* hin (*dadhāti*), m. a. W. jede *sāti* kommt schließlich von ihm. Statt dessen wäre doch auch, dem Versbau genauer entsprechend, gut *c* mit *d* verbindbar; *avyānat* ist nach Stellen wie V, 45, 7; VIII, 96, 5 keineswegs

unmöglich als Subjekt zu *sám navanta*”. Since all parallel texts agree with the RV, and none makes the easy ‘improvement’ to *sásniḥ*, I follow — more or less — the above quoted JB passage, which seems to understand (*tat sarvam etasyaiva śrīyai, tat sthānam*) *sásni* as a n. adj., part of a nominal sentence.

**d.** This pāda refers to Soma-ritual, as does the next stanza. It is hard to decide whether to take *prābhṛtā* as a verb. adj., nom. n./m./f. pl., or as a loc. sg. from *prābhṛti-*. LUBOTSKY 1997a assumes the former (n. pl.) interpretation. Another possibility would be to take it as nom. m. pl. (against the padapāṭha), which would be supported by RV 1.51.12b. Hesitatingly, I follow here the loc. interpretation, which OLDENBERG *ibid.* opted for (although without argumentation), and which was accepted by GELDNER; cf. RV 5.32.5, where a nom. (n./m./f.) pl. is out of the question, and where the loc. sg. is found in a syntactically similar pāda, two stanzas further.

On *saṃ-nav*, cf. RV 5.30.10, 5.45.8, 8.96.5, and OBERLIES 1999: 211f. The same idea seems to be expressed more fully, in the 1st person sg., in 5c below.

**6.1.3** RV 10.120.3, ŚS 5.2.3 = 20.107.6, SVK 2.835 = SVJ 4.5.7; cf. TS 3.5.10.1

t <sub>u</sub> ve kratum api pṛñcanti viśve	(11)
d <sub>u</sub> vir yad ete trir bhavanti <sub>y</sub> ūmāḥ	(11)
svādoḥ svādīyaḥ svādunā sṛjā sam	(11)
adaḥ su madhu madhunābhi yodhīḥ	(11)

To you, all [gods (?)] add [their] will, when these ones become helpful, two times three times. Mix together with the sweet that which is sweeter than sweet. Fight well for yonder honey, by means of honey.

pṛñcanti] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, pṛñcantu **Mā**, vṛñjanti **K** bhavanti ūmāḥ || **JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, bha(·U·) V/126, bhavanti u(→ ū)māḥ | **Ku**, bhavanti ūmā **K** [Edg.: °nty; om. || svādoḥ] **JM RM**, svādo **Ku V/126 Mā Pa Ma**, svādos **K** svādīyaḥ] **Ku JM RM Pa [Ma]**, svādīyaḥ **V/126 Mā**, svādīya **K** svādunā sṛjā] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, svā(·U·ṛ)jā **V/126** adaḥ] **Or**, adhas **K** madhunābhi] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, madhinābhi **Pa** yodhīḥ ||] **Or**, yodhī | **K**

**RV 10.120.3 etc.**

tvé krátum ápi vṛñjanti viśve dvír yád eté trír bhávanti ūmāḥ |  
svādoḥ svādīyaḥ svādúnā sṛjā sám adaḥ sū mádhu mádhunābhí yodhīḥ ||

**ŚS 5.2.3a**

tvé krátum ápi pṛñcanti bhūri . . .

BHATTACHARYA does not report the error *svāhīyaḥ* in his ms. **Mā**, which I clearly read on the reproduction available to me, and which is confirmed by its sister ms. **V/126**.

**a.** The common AV reading *pṛñcanti* is too idiosyncratic and too consistent (in ŚS also at 20.107.6; no variant among the Or. mss.) to be a common transmissional error, and **K** *vṛñjanti* can be explained as due to influence from the

local Kashmirian RV (see my Introduction, §2.6.3.2). It is a difficult reading, and the ŚS reading was in fact rejected as impossible by WEBER 1898: 166.

Already at a very early date, the redactors/transmitters of the AV Saṁhitās seem to have replaced the rare verb *api-varj* (besides at 10.120.3 and repetitions in other texts, only at RV 6.36.2d *krátuṃ vṛñjanty ápi vṛtrahátye* ‘they turn their will to [him] in the Slaying of Vṛtra (i.e. at Indra’s consumption of Soma)’, and at 10.48.3b *máyi devásō ’vṛjann ápi krátum* ‘To me [Indra] the gods turned their will’) with the equally rare verb *api-parc* (only in AV, see DELBRÜCK 1888: 447 ‘beimischen’). This verb is used at ŚS 10.4.26 (cf. 7.88.1) = PS 16.17.7 for the adding of poison to poison, but could also be used for more abstract notions, as at PS 5.15.4c: *āsu \*bhūmāny api pṛñcantu devāḥ* ‘let the gods add progeny to them’. Cf. finally, perhaps, PS 18.80.6cd (omitted in **K**): *yauvane jīvāñ apipṛñcatī jarā pitṛbhya upa saṃ parāṇayāt* ‘adding the living ones to youth, old age shall lead [them] all away to the Fathers’ (but the parallel in ŚS 18.4.50cd reads *upapṛñcatī*).

On the meaning of *krātu-* in the RV combination with *api-varj*, see OLDENBERG (1909–12/II: 340): “Mir scheint es zu heißen “den (eigenen) Willen zu Jemdn. (für Jmd.) richten”, so daß Letzterer den Zielpunkt der Willensaktion oder den, für welchen jener die Richtung gegeben wird, darstellt: beispielsweise zu Indra sich mit seinem Willen so stellen, wie die, welche sagen *tvé indrápy abhūma* II, 11, 12 (vgl. VII, 31, 5, wo sich deutlich zeigt, daß der *krātuḥ* der eigne, nicht der des Andern ist. . . .)”.

**b.** Important light shines on this pāda from RV 6.36.2d–3ab: . . . *krátuṃ vṛñjanty ápi vṛtrahátye || táṃ sadhrícīr ūtáyo . . . saścur índram* ‘. . . they turn their will to [him] in the Slaying of Vṛtra. United do the (various) forms of help accompany Indra . . .’. Note the cognate terms *ūtí-* and *úma-*. Neither GELDNER’s ‘wenn auch diese Helfer zweimal und dreimal (soviele) sind’ nor WHITNEY’s ‘when they twice, thrice become thine aids’ seems satisfactory to me: *úma-* is an epithet of the (All) Gods, and is to be connected with *vísve* (see stanza 1). Which (six) gods it is here, whose presence was apparently clear (*eté*), and who are said to be helpful to Indra in his Vṛtra slaying, i.e. at the Soma ritual, is not entirely certain, but RV 6.66.2b *dvír yát trír marúto vāvṛdhánta* strongly suggests the Maruts. On the multiplicative interpretation of the phrase *dvīḥ . . . trīḥ*, cf. RV 4.6.8a, 9.98.6a *dvír yám páñca . . . svásārah* which must refer to the 10 fingers.

**c.** Cf. RV 10.54.6b: *yó ásrjan mádhunā sám mádhūni*. LÜDERS (1959: 346): “Insbesondere ist *mádhu* die Milch, die dem Soma hinzugefügt wird”.

**d.** For *abhi-yodh*, cf. the comm. below on stanza 5. On Soma as honey, cf. OLDENBERG 1917: 364f. GELDNER interprets: “Um den Regen mit dem Soma”.

**6.1.4** ≈ RV 10.120.4 ≈ ŚS 5.2.4 = 20.107.7

iti cid dhi tvā dhanā jayantam (10)

raṇeraṇe anumadanti viprāḥ | (11)

ojīyo dhṛṣṇo sthiram ā tanuṣva (11)  
 mā tvā dabhan durevā yātudhānāḥ || (11)

For in just this way the poets cheer you on, who win riches during every battle. Draw [your bow] fearsomely and solidly, you bold one. Let the ill-natured sorcerers not deceive you.

cid dhi] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, cirddhi **Pa**, cidvi **K** jayantam] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, jAyŪntam **V/126 raṇeraṇe] Or**, raṇaṃraṇam **K** ]] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[but note °ḥ o°] dhṛṣṇo] **Or**, dhṛṣṇuo **K** [[note two vowel diacritics] sthiram] **Or**, ścīram **K** tanuṣva] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, tanusva **JM** dabhan durevā] **Mā Pa [Ma]**, (+ dabha 3)ndure{Mā}vā **Ku**, dabhanvurevā **JM RM**, dabhan dure{RE}{·}ā **V/126**, dabham durayavā **K** yātudhānāḥ ]] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K** [[*om.* ]], yātu{·}ā}dhānāḥ ]] **RM**

#### ṚV 10.120.4

īti cid dhī tvā dhānā jāyantam mādemade anumādanti viprāḥ |  
 ójīyo dhṛṣṇo sthirám ā tanuṣva má tvā dabhan yātudhānā durévāḥ ||

#### ŚS 5.2.4

yádi cin nú tvā dhānā jāyantam raṇeraṇe anumādanti viprāḥ |  
 ójīyaḥ śusmint sthirám ā tanuṣva má tvā dabhan durévāsaḥ kaśókāḥ ||

PS essentially follows the ṚV text, but agrees with ŚS in substituting *raṇeraṇe* for ṚV *mādemade* in pāda **b**, and makes an insignificant change in **d**. The ŚS version is much more idiosyncratic.

**ab.** On the meaning of *vipra-*, cf. GONDA (1963: 36ff.). The meaning of *īti cid*, also at ṚV 5.7.10 and 5.41.17, is not certain: does it really mean ‘ebenso’ (GELDNER)? Why is *hī* used?

The ṚV original has been rephrased here. In the first place, cf. ṚV 1.74.3, 6.16.15 *raṇeraṇe dhanamjayá-* both times said of Agni, but *dhanamjayá-* is used of Indra at ṚV 3.42.6 = 8.45.13. In the AV poet’s mind, *raṇeraṇe* was thus most probably connected with the preceding pāda.

On the meaning of *raṇa-*, see RENO 1939a: 368f. = 1997: 204f.: “Il est attribué en général au mot *raṇa-* dans le RV. la double valeur de “joie” ... et “combat”, celle-ci devant résulter de celle-là par l’intermédiaire de “joie de combattre”, que semble légitimer la var. AV. *raṇe-raṇe* à RV. *máde-made anumádanti viprāḥ* X 120 4”. OLDENBERG (1918: 59f. = 1967: 854f. n. 2) argued that *raṇa-* nowhere means ‘Kampf’, but can always be rendered ‘Wohlsein’. RENO concludes (p. 369): “Il semble bien qu’O[LDENBERG] l.c. a eu raison de supprimer totalement l’acception de “combat” pour le RV”. MAYRHOFER (KEWA III, 36 n., remains doubtful: “... doch is Aw. *rēna-* “Kampf” wohl nicht eliminierbar”). Taking the next stanza into account, a stanza which has not figured in his discussion, one may doubt whether OLDENBERG’s conclusion is correct.

Since it is attractive to assume that the poet who replaced *mādemade* with *raṇeraṇe* did so with the intention of adding a semantic touch to the stanza,

we may understand a play on two meanings of *rāṇa-* here, ‘battle’ and ‘rapture’ (a better parallel to *māda-* ‘intoxication (of Soma)’ than OLDENBERG’s ‘Wohlsein’): the understanding of Indra’s Soma consumption during the ritual as a *vr̥trahatya-* (RV 1.53.6) clarifies the pun. The apparent acc. *Amreḍita* in **K** is due to a simple graphic confusion of *-e* and *-am*.

**c.** Note that ŚS has replaced the voc. *dhṛṣṇo* with the nearly synonymous *śuṣmin*. Despite the existence of the epithet *dhṛṣṇvòjas-* for Indra (RV 8.70.3), *óḷyas* here is not likely to be a vocative, because vocatives of *-īyas-* stems are rare to non-existent: AiGr. III, §154bγ p. 296 gives only the present form and RV 7.32.24b *jyāyah* as examples, but the latter form is more likely to be an acc., if we may follow GELDNER. Rather, it can in our context be an acc. n. agreeing with an expected *dhānvan/dhānus* and *sthirám* (cf. RV 10.134.2b and especially 10.116.6ab *vy àryá indra tanuhi śrávāṁsy ója sthiréva dhānvano ’bhímātīh* ‘O Indra, stretch off the fame, the force of the outsider, his assaults, as the stiff [sinews?] from a bow’), or can be taken adverbially, as I take it here.

**d.** Together with ŚS, PS has shifted the order of the last two words as compared with RV. On the separate roots *dabh* ‘to deceive’ (whence *dabhan*) and *dambh* ‘to destroy’ see NARTEN 1988–90 (esp. p. 148 = 1995: 386). WHITNEY’s ‘damage’ for *dabhan* is incorrect. For the ŚS hapax *kaśóka-*, cf. perhaps the demon mentioned by several Gṛhyasūtras in their *paridāna-*mantras for the Upanayana: cf. HirGS 1.6.5 *kaśaka* (with *v.l. kaśaka-*), ĀgnivGS 1.1.3:9.13 *kaśaka-*, VaikhGS 2.6:26.2 *śaka-*.

### 6.1.5 RV 10.120.5, ŚS 5.2.5 = 20.107.8

tvayā vayam̐ +śāsadmahe raṇeṣu	(11)
prapaśyanto yudhenīyāni bhūri	(11)
codayāmi ta āyudhā vacobhiḥ	(11)
sam̐ te +śīyāmi brahmaṇā vayāṁsi	(11)

We, who anticipate many [counterparts] to be fought against, feel confident with you in battles. I impel your weapons with [my] utterances. I hone your powers with [this] poem.

+śāsadmahe] śāsadmahe **Or**, śāsa{DMA}he **K** [[°DMA° cancelled with superscribed stripes]  
 prapaśyanto] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, prapaNyanto **JM**, prapaśvanto **RM** yud-  
 henīyāni] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, yu(·)e(·)yā(·) **V/126** codayāmi] **Ku JM RM**  
**Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, codayāmiKṢO· **V/126** ta āyudhā] **Or**, thāyudhā **K** vacobhiḥ] **Or**,  
 vacobhis **K** sam̐ te] **K**, sante **Or** +śīyāmi] syāmi **Or**, śīśāmi **K** brahmaṇā vayāṁsi  
 ||] **Or K** [[vr°]

#### RV 10.120.5, ŚS 5.2.5

tvāyā vayāṁ śāsadmahe raṇeṣu prapaśyanto yudhényāni bhūri |  
 codayāmi ta āyudhā vacobhiḥ sam̐ te śīśāmi brāhmaṇā vayāṁsi ||

BHATTACHARYA edits with underlining: *śāsadmahe*.

a. On *rāṇa-*, see the comm. to the preceding stanza. OLDENBERG’s ‘Wohlsein’ seems out of the question here, and the stanza refers to the Soma ritual as a battle.

For a discussion of the rare verb <sup>2</sup>*śad* ‘to feel strong, be confident’ and its construction with an instrumental, see PINAULT 1999–2000: 446f. (with references to other publications). Cf. 6.3.9a *śāśvad ābhiḥ śāśadānāḥ*. The construction *tváyā vayám śāśadmahe* occurs in another martial Soma context, at PS 19.2.5ab <sup>+</sup>*tvayeṣvā tvayā soma dhanvanā tvayā muṣṭighnā śāśadmahe vayam* ‘We are confident with you as an arrow, with you, o Soma, as a bow, with you as a fist-fighter’. Cf. also RV 10.38.3cd: *asmābhiḥ te suśāhāḥ santu śátravas tváyā vayám tán vanuyāma saṃgamé* ‘With us let your enemies [o Indra] be easy to defeat; with you may we triumph over them in battle’.

b. The hapax *yudhénya-* has been rendered ‘Erkämpfenswerth’ (WEBER), ‘thing to be fought [for]’ (WHITNEY) or ‘zu bestehende Fehde’ (GELDNER). MAYRHOFER’s gloss ‘zu bekämpfen’ (EWAia II, 418) goes back on PW, and seems to retain the best interpretation. I explain the neuter plural by supplying *pratimānāni* from the exactly parallel pāda **d** of the following stanza.

This is more natural than supplying a form like *yuddhāni*, as GELDNER seems to suggest, and for which he might have referred to RV 10.54.2c. WEBER’s and WHITNEY’s interpretation is to be rejected, as ‘to fight for’ is normally expressed with *abhi-yodh*, cf. above, stanza 3d (also e.g. RV 1.91.23b), or else by means of a construction with a locative (e.g. PS 5.11.1c, RV 5.33.4b, 6.26.2d, and perhaps 8.45.5b).

Furthermore, there exist in the RV and AV a small number of differently formed gerundives from the same root *yodh*, which all support the rendering ‘to be fought against’: *yódhya-*, RV 9.9.7bc *tāmāṃsi soma yódhyā | tāni punāna jañghanaḥ* ‘Being purified, you shall slay, o Soma, the darkness that is to be fought against’; the negative *ayudhyá-*, RV 10.103.7c (ŚS 19.13.7c = 7.4.7c *ayodhyá-*), which passage is to be compared with i.a. ŚS 19.13.3bc = PS 7.4.3bc (see *ad loc.*) *ayodhyéna duścyavanéna dhṛṣṇúnā | tād índreṇa jayata tát sahadhvam* ‘with the invincible, with the unshakable, with the bold one, with Indra now be victorious, now win’; also *ayodhyá-* are ‘the citadels of the gods’ (ŚS 10.2.31b = PS 16.62.3b) and the war-drum (*dundubhí-*: ŚS 5.20.12b = PS 9.27.12b).

The rendering ‘to anticipate’ for *pra-paś* is confirmed by AB 2.6.8 *paśur vai nīyamānaḥ sa mṛtyum prāpaśyat* ‘the animal anticipated death, while it was being borne along’. Slightly different, with *abhí*, is RV 10.113.4ab cited under 1c above. Cf. also PW IV, 604.

d. Against his usual policy, BHATTACHARYA here adopts the **K** reading *śísāmi*, while a reading <sup>+</sup>*śiyāmi* based upon the Or. mss. is also grammatically and metrically impeccable (cf. JOACHIM 1978: 158f.; cf. also KULIKOV 2001: 504). BHATTACHARYA’s decision to follow **K** is based on the readings in RV and ŚS (cf. also RV 10.87.24c = PS 16.8.8c), but cases of **K** following the RV text against an authentic PS reading preserved in the Or. mss. are rather

common (see my Introduction, §2.6.3.2). On the other hand, assuming that **K** has preserved the authentic reading, Or. *syāmi* may also be explained as perseverance from two stanzas in hymn PS 3.19: at 3.19.2 (cf. ŚS 3.19.2abc, 3d), we read *sam aham eṣāṃ rāṣṭraṃ śyāmi sam ojo vīryaṃ balam | vṛścāmi śatruṇāṃ bāhū sam śyāmi svān aham* ‘I hone their kingship, I hone [their] force, heroism, strength. I cut off the two hands of the enemies, I hone my own [men]’, and at 3.19.6b (cf. ŚS 3.19.5a) *sam vaḥ śyāmi nara āyudhāni* ‘I hone, o men, your weapons’.<sup>4</sup> The matter seems thus fundamentally undecidable. In order not to obscure a possibly authentic variant, I follow the Or. reading.

**6.1.6** ṚV 10.120.6, Nir 11.21; cf. ŚS 5.2.7 = ŚS 20.107.10

*stuṣeyyam puruvarpasam +ṛbhvam	(11)
inatamam āptiyam āptyānām	(11)
ā darśate śavasā sapta dānūn	(11)
pra sāksate pratimānāni bhūri	(11)

[I praise] the praiseworthy one of manifold appearance, the skilful, the most energetic Āptya of the Āptyas; he shall appear to (?) the seven Dānus with his might. He shall prevail over many counterparts.

\*stuṣeyyam] snuṣeyyam **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma], snuṣeyam **Pa**, snuṣeyyam **K** puruvarpasam +ṛbhvam] puṣvarpasamṛgbhavam **Ku V/126 Pa** [Ma], puṣ{ṣa}varpasamṛgbhavam **JM**, puṣva{ṣa}rpasamṛgbhavam **RM**, puṣvarpasa(+ mṛ)mbhavam **Mā**, puruvarpasamṛtvam **K** inatamam] **Or**, inatamas **K** āptyam] **Ku JM RM V/126** [?] [Ma] **K**, āptam **Mā**, om. **Pa** āptyānām |] āptyānām | **Or K** [[misprint Edg.: °āṇām]] darśate] **Or**, śarśate **K**

#### ṚV 10.120.6

stuṣéyyam puruvárpasam ṛbhvam inátamam āptyám āptyānām |  
 á darśate śávasā saptá dānūn prá sākṣate pratimānāni bhūri ||

#### ŚS 5.2.7

stuṣvá varṣman puruvártmānaṃ sám ṛbhvāṇam inátamam āptám āptyānām |  
 á darśati śávasā bhūryojāḥ prá sākṣati pratimānaṃ pṛthivyāḥ ||

Note that the text of ŚS 5.2, besides offering many variants, no longer runs parallel to ṚV/PS, but has exchanged our stanzas 6 and 7. Note also that ŚPP’s text of ŚS 20.107.10 reads entirely as 5.2.7 (with the exchanged stanza-order), while the R-W edition of ŚS 20 follows the stanza-order of the ṚV (and continues to follow its text). BHATTACHARYA edits *srusejyam* ... *ṛgbhavam*.

a. There is no finite verb governing the accusatives in these two pādas. What we seem to have here is a form of haplogy for an underlying [*stuṣé*] *stuṣéyyam*, with a 1st sg. form (cf. KÜMMEL 1996: 134f.) parallel to *codáyāmi* and *śiśāmi/śyāmi* in the preceding stanza. The ‘clarification’ in ŚS suggests

<sup>4</sup> Again, the Or. mss. three times spell *syāmi*, but **K** points in each case to *śyāmi*.

that a finite form from the root *stav* is indeed to be supplied, but the 2nd sg. imper. introduced there seems less fitting.

The uniform reading *snu-* for the first syllable of emended *\*stuṣeyyam* in all the mss. for PS cannot be taken seriously (while the value of BHATTACHARYA’S note that his recording of Oriya recitation has *srucejyam* should not be estimated too highly either; see WITZEL 1985b): it can easily be explained as an old graphical error at the level of \*G (cf. e.g. SINGH 1991, plates 86, 88, 90). BHATTACHARYA’S explanation (2001: 9ff.) with reference to writing mistakes in old Karnataka inscriptions is not convincing (see my Introduction, §2.6).

On *puruvárpas-*, cf. RENO (1955–69/XII: 102): “Indra emploie le *śáradha(s)* ou la “force (directe)” contre Vṛtra-résistance, mais le *várpa(s)*, sorte de ruse, contre les *māyín*”, cf. RV 3.34.3. GELDNER comments: “*puruvárpasam* von den vielen angenommen Gestalten oder Verkleidungen”.

The clearly intended <sup>+</sup>*ṛbhvam* is still nearly preserved in **K**, with a typical Śāradā-error *-bhv-* → *-tv-*. The Or. reading *ṛgbhavam* might be explicable as due to a combination of an auditory error (*-bhva-* → *-bhava-*) with perhaps a ‘learned correction’, whence *ṛg-*: cf. a similar unexpected intrusion of *-g-*, *devṛgbhyo* for *devṛbhyo*, at 8.10.10d and 19.37.9d, both times not only in the Or. mss., but also in **K**. See also the stanza contained in GB 1.1.9, the ms. readings for which have been discussed by SHARMA 1959/1960: 85f. The redactor of the ŚS parallel introduces another ‘clarification’ by turning the regular *a*-stem *ṛbhva-* into an *n*-stem (*ṛbhvāṇam*).

b. On *āptyá-*, see HILLEBRANDT 1929: 309. See also 6.2.6d below.

c. I tentatively follow the unanimous but obviously corrupt AV tradition, which has an impossible form *darśate/-ti* (vaguely echoing 5b *prapásyantah?*) against much the more appropriate RV reading *darṣate*. The AV composers perhaps thought of *ā-darś* + acc. of direction. It cannot be excluded, of course, that the AV mss. have simply confused sibilants, and that their ‘reading’ is not intentional.

On Indra and a Dānu, cf. RV 2.11.18, 2.12.11. The number seven is probably to be taken as ‘Zahl der Vollständigkeit’ (cf. OBERLIES 1999: 73f.).

d. Note the secondary form *sakṣati* in ŚS, on which, see NARTEN 1964: 265. PS follows the RV text.

### 6.1.7 RV 10.120.7; cf. ŚS 5.2.6 = 20.107.9

ni tad dadhiṣe <sub>a</sub> varam param ca	(11)
yasminn āvithā <sub>a</sub> vasā duroṇe	(11)
ā mātārā sthāpayase <sup>+</sup> jigatnū	(11)
ata inoṣi karvarā purūṇi	(11)

You have deposited the lower and the higher [treasure] in the abode wherein you have helped helpfully. You make the two moving parents stand still. Then you start many exploits.

ni tad dadhiṣe] Or, nyadidyadiṣe K <sub>a</sub>varam] 'varam Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma], {a}'varam Pa, varam JM K param ca] Ku JM Pa [Ma] K, parañca RM, paramñca V/126 Mā avithāvasā] avithāvasā Or, avāthāvasā K mātārā] Or, mātara K sthāpayase] Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K, sthāpayasThe V/126 <sup>+</sup>jigatnū] jigatnu Or, jighantva K inoṣi] Ku JM RM Mā [Ma] K, inosi V/126, ino{si}ṣi Pa purūṇi] K, puṇi Ku V/126 [?] Mā Pa [Ma], puṇi JM RM

#### RV 10.120.7

ní tād dadhiṣé 'varam páram ca yásminn ávithāvasā duroṇé |  
á mātārā sthāpayase jigatnú áta inoṣi kárvarā purūṇi ||

#### ŚS 5.2.6

ní tād dadhiṣé 'vare páre ca yásminn ávithāvasā duroṇé |  
á sthāpayata mātāram jigatnúm áta invata kárvarāni bhúri ||

PS strictly follows the RV text, while ŚS presents significant variants. BHATTACHARYA edits *jigatnu*.

**ab.** Even though Sāyaṇa (cf. GELDNER's note on our pāda **a**) seems to be right in spirit when he supplies *dhanam*, the RV elsewhere actually provides the neuter word that we need here. The word seems not to be *dhānam*, but *rātnam*, which is persistently combined with forms of the verb *dhā* in the RV (as in 6.2.7a below), middle being admittedly much rarer than active forms, but cf. RV 5.1.5c, 6.74.1c. Cf. also RV 10.40.13ab *tá mandasānā mānuṣo duroṇá á dhattāṃ rayiṃ sahāvīraṃ vacasyāve* 'You two who are revelling in the abode of man, bestow wealth with heroes on the speaker'. The mentioned 'abode' must be the ritual ground (OLDENBERG 1917: 281–282).

On the words *ávaram páram ca*, see RV 1.155.3, and cf. GELDNER's note to 10.87.3b (ŚS 8.3.3 / PS 16.6.3), where reference is made to ŚS 1.8.3 and 1.12.4 (PS 4.4.9, 1.17.4): 'hüben und drüben', but the meaning in the present stanza still remains rather unclear. Can it be an expression of totality — 'the lowest and the highest, i.e. all treasures'?

**c.** This seems to me clearly to refer to Indra's mythical exploit of propping up the sky, thereby creating cosmic duality (cf. KUIPER 1979, *passim* and OBERLIES 1998: 250). The name Bṛhaddiva in the next two stanzas must probably also be seen in connection with this demiurgic act.

Heaven and Earth are called *mātārā* also at RV 10.64.14a, but I see no immediate parallels for their attribute *jigatnú* 'hurrying'. While BHATTACHARYA edits with underlining, in the light of the unreliability of Or. mss. as regards vowel length *i* ~ *ī*, *u* ~ *ū*, and of the anyhow corrupt reading *-ntva a-* in K, I do not hesitate to make the small emendation towards the RV text.

**d.** *inoṣi* (cf. *inātama-* in the preceding stanza) seems to refer here to Indra's own exploits. Cf. RV 6.24.5ab *anyád adyá kárvaram anyád u śvó 'sac ca sán múhur ācakrír índraḥ* 'one exploit today, and another tomorrow, Indra is one who makes the unreal real, within an instant'.

Besides its inclusion among the *karmanāmāni* in Nighaṇṭu 2.1 (and AV-Paríś 48.61), and the apparently unrelated homonym (meaning 'fish'?) found

at ŚS 10.4.19 / PS 16.16.9, there are, as far as I can see, only two other attestations of the word *kárvara-*. The first is found in the obscure stanza ŚS 7.3.1 / PS 20.2.1 (~ TS 1.7.12.2 etc.). The second refers to the Aśvins, and supports the interpretation that *kárvara-* refers to the deity's own exploits. It is found at ṚVKhil 1.5.7: *kṛśám cyávānam ṛṣim andhám aśvinā jujurvāmsam kṛṇuthaḥ kárvarebhiḥ | akṣaṇvántam̐ sthūlavápuṣkam<sup>5</sup> ugrá púnar yúvānam pátim ít kanínām* 'O Aśvins, by [your] exploits both you fearsome ones turn the lean, blind, aging Seer Cyavāna into one who has eyes, with an impressive appearance, who is young again, even [eligible as] a husband for maidens'. Cf. the ṚV parallels adduced by SCHEFTELOWITZ (ṚV. 1.117.13: *kárvarebhis :: śácībhis*).

**6.1.8** ṚV 10.120.8; cf. ŚS 5.2.8 = 20.107.11 ◊ d: ṚV 3.31.21d

imā brahma bṛhaddivo vivakti-	(11)
-indrāya śūṣam agriyaḥ s <sub>u</sub> varṣāḥ	(11)
maho gotrasya kṣayati svarājo	(11)
duraś ca víśvā avṛṇod apa svāḥ	(11)

Bṛhaddiva speaks these poems as a fortifying [laud] for Indra, the first to win the light. He [Bṛhaddiva] rules over the self-ruler [Indra]'s great cow-pen, and all his own doors he has opened.

brahma bṛhaddivo] **Or K** [[vr°, vr°]] vivaktīndrāya] **K**, vibhaktīndrāya **Ku V/126 Mā**, vā{tharvā}vibhaktīndrāya **JM**, vibhakti{·ā}ndrāya **RM**, vibha(→ va 2)ktīndrāya **Pa Ma** śūṣam] **Ku JM RM V/126 [Mā] K**, śūṣam **Pa Ma** agriyaḥ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa Ma**, agrYayaḥ **JM**, aGRyas **K** svarṣāḥ |] **K** [[om. ]], svarasāḥ | **Or** maho] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, m{E}aho **V/126** kṣayati] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, a(→ kṣa 1)yati **RM** svarājo] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, svarajo **JM**, svarā(→ o)jo **RM** duraś] **Or**, durāś **K** svāḥ ||] **K** [[om. ]], śvāḥ || **Or**

**ṚV 10.120.8**

imā bráhma bṛháddivo vivaktīndrāya śūṣám agriyáḥ svarṣāḥ |  
mahó gotrásya kṣayati svarājo dúras ca víśvā avṛṇod ápa svāḥ ||

**ŚS 5.2.8**

imā bráhma bṛháddivaḥ kṛṇavad índrāya śūṣám agriyáḥ svarṣāḥ |  
mahó gotrásya kṣayati svarājā túras cid víśvam aṇavat tápasvān ||

The present stanza has been translated by SCHMIDT 1968: 208, who rightly argued against GELDNER's interpretation of *svarāj-* as referring here to Vala.

<sup>5</sup> BHISE 1995: 87 does not note the striking accentuation of *sthūlavápuṣka-* in the editions: since we clearly have a bahuvrīhi here, we might either emend the accent (as seems to be suggested in VWC-Samhitās V, 3500 n. b), or accept an irregularity, seemingly belonging to the same category as ṚV 6.47.5 *citra-dīśika-*, which puzzled WACKERNAGEL, AiGr. II/1, §114d p. 297 and §115c p. 300.

But SCHMIDT’s interpretation is not yet fully satisfactory, in that he assumes a change of subject from the first to the second hemistich. Essential for the correct interpretation, in my opinion, is BERGAIGNE’s insight (1878–83/I: 46 n. 3, and II: 241, wrongly rejected by GELDNER and VINE 1997: 210), based on pāda **b** of the next stanza, that the poet Bṛhaddiva identifies himself with Indra: only if we understand Bṛhaddiva and Indra as one, can we make sense of the use of *svá-* and *svaráj-* in these lines (see also the quotation from WEBER, below). Indeed, the identification seems to be hinted at precisely by the phonological play with the forms *svarśáh*, *svarájo*, *sváh*, each occurring at the end of its pāda. If Bṛhaddiva identifies himself with the self-ruler Indra, then the doors which he opens are his own as well as Indra’s. On this act of Indra opening his doors, i.e. the doors of Vala’s cave which he has made his own, cf. SCHMIDT, pp. 172, 174, and 207f.

**ab.** On the singing of a *śūśá-* for Indra, cf. RV 1.9.10, 10.96.2, 10.133.1 etc. See also THIEME (1951a: 172 = 1984: 57): “Nicht selten erscheint *śūśá-* ohne Substantiv. Der Zusammenhang zeigt dann gewöhnlich, daß *stóma* oder *mánman* zu ergänzen”. I accept the etymological connection of *śūśá-* with the root *śav*, as suggested EWAia II, 652. Note the frequency of the word *śávas-* in this hymn: stanzas 2, 6 and 9.

On the words *agriyáh svarśáh*, WEBER comments (1898: 169): “Dass der Sänger sich selbst nennt (s. auch v. 9), geschieht ja in den Liedern des Rk mehrfach, aber dass er sich selbst als *agriyah svarśah* bezeichnet ist auffällig; ... empfiehlt es sich daher wohl, die Wörter *agriyah svarśah* sowohl wie das ganze zweite Hemistich als Lobpreis des *Indra* aufzufassen ... — Es ist indessen zu bemerken, dass nach v. 9 die Persönlichkeit des Bṛhaddiva als eine durchaus mythische erscheint, da er darin mit Indra selbst identificirt wird. So könnte denn immerhin auch *agriyah svarśah* und das ganze zweite Hemistich sich doch auf ihn beziehen ...”. In the light of my interpretation, hesitatingly suggested here by WEBER as well, the use by Bṛhaddiva of a standard (cf. i.a. RV 1.100.13, 3.34.4) Indra epithet for himself is not surprising.

Cf. in this connection also RV 1.129.2d, where Indra himself is described as follows: *yáh śúraih svàh sánitā* ‘who with the heroes is the winner of the light’, and contrast this with RV 1.131.2c, where Indra’s worshippers are called *svàh sanisyaávaḥ* (and cf. KUIPER 1960: 220 = 1983: 154 “the priests are said to be longing for the sun”). Cf. LÜDERS 1951: 265f. for numerous examples of *svarvíd-*, *svarjít-* and *svarśá-* in the RV, and SCHMIDT 1968: 208 for an interpretation of its meaning. The word *agriyá-* seems nowhere in Vedic to have been used in any special connection with Indra or with worshippers/priests, so its significance cannot be judged.

In his comments on RV 10.47.5, GELDNER states: “*svàr* in dieser Zusammensetzung ist bald im eigentlichen Sinne zu verstehen ... , bald ist das Himmelslicht s.v.a. Erleuchtung des Dichters”. Besides the fact that this begs the question what the ‘eigentliche Sinn’ of *svàr* should be, GELDNER’s examples (RV 9.9.9, 9.96.18, and also the present stanza), do not suggest to me any

mystical (?) experience of ‘Erleuchtung’, if that is what GELDNER meant by the term. Can the term, when applied to a mortal, not refer to his gaining a heavenly afterlife? Cf. i.a. *áganma jyótir* in RV 8.48.3b (on which cf. KS 32.5:23.11). See also ROESLER 1997: 232f.

c. For the interpretation of *svaráj-*, see my comments above. In addition, I may quote here SCHMIDT (1968: 208): “In *svaráj* in 8c sieht Geldner Vala. Das ist kaum richtig, da Dämonen sonst nicht *svaráj* genannt werden. Das Wort kann nur auf Indra selbst gehen”. See also SCHLERATH 1960: 132f.

d. This pāda also appears as RV 3.31.21d. Cf. i.a. RV 1.130.3fg *ápāvṛṇod iṣa índrah párvṛtā dvāra iṣaḥ párvṛtāḥ* ‘Indra has opened the locked up nourishments, the doors, the locked up nourishments’. See my comments above.

### 6.1.9 RV 10.120.9, ŚS 5.2.9 = 20.107.12

evā mahān bṛhaddivo atharvā-	(11)
-avocat svāṃ tanvānam indram eva	(11)
svāsāro mātariḥvarīr ariprā	(11)
hinvanti ca śavasā vardhayanti ca    1	(12)

Thus has Bṛhaddiva, the great Atharvan, spoken about his own self, about Indra that is. The sisters, free of defilements, singing on Mother (Earth), impel [Indra] with vigor, and strengthen [him].

mahān] Or, māṃ K bṛhaddivo] Or, vṛhaddivo K atharvāvocat] Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], ‘tharvāvocat JM RM, tharvānocat K tanvam] Ku JM RM V/126 Mā, tanmam Pa Ma, tanum K eva |] Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K [om. ], eVATA | V/126 mātariḥvarīr] K, mātariḥvarīr Ku RM Mā Pa [Ma] [Ma], mātariḥvarīr JM, mĀ⟨⋯⟩ V/126 hinvanti] Or, hinvanti K śavasā] Or, yavasā K vardhayanti] K, varddhayanti Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma], VA⟨⋯⟩ V/126 || 1 ||] || 1 || १ 9 || Ku V/126 Mā Pa, || १ |{9}| 1 || JM, || १ || 1 || RM, Z 1 Z K [Edg. mistakenly prints a ]]

#### RV 10.120.9

evā mahān bṛhaddivo átharvāvocat svāṃ tanvānam índram evá |  
svāsāro mātariḥvarīr ariprā hinvānti ca śavasā vardháyanti ca ||

#### ŚS 5.2.9cd

... svāsārau mātariḥvarī aripré hinvānti caine śavasā vardháyanti ca ||

a. On the name Atharvan, cf. SCHMIDT 1968: 40.

b. About the significance of this pāda, cf. my discussion of the preceding stanza. On the phrase *svā- tanvā-*, see OLDENBERG 1919: 109. In all its occurrences in the RV (1.72.5, 3.53.8, 5.4.6, 6.11.2, 7.3.9, 7.86.2, 8.11.10, 8.44.12, 10.8.4, 10.54.3, 10.183.2), the subject of the clause in which it occurs is identical with the referent of *svā-*.

c. According to an idea developed by me together with Werner Knobl, the hitherto misunderstood hapax *mātariḥvarīr* is interpreted here as a metrically

conditioned haplological shortening for the compound *mātari-rībhvarīr* (with overt case marking on its first member), which yielded the alliterative pattern *X rī X rī X rī X* that was surely felt to be more successful than *X rirī X rī X rī X*. The ‘sisters’ are Bṛhaddiva’s poems (cf. RV 1.164.3cd, 9.65.1, 9.66.8, 8.102.13) which sing on their Mother (Earth), i.e. on the ritual ground (see GELDNER on RV 9.89.1), and thereby fortify Indra.

## 6.2. Mystic.

This hymn is parallel to ŚS 5.1. WHITNEY gives the following introduction: “The hymn is intentionally and most successfully obscure, and the translation given is in part mechanical, not professing any real understanding of the sense. It is very probable that the text is considerably corrupted; and one cannot avoid the impression also that the lines are more or less disconnected, and artificially combined”.

WEBER’s 1898 translation introduced the ŚS parallel in similar, but more specific terms (p. 157): “Kosmogonisches Lied, zum Preise der Schöpferkraft, wie dies je am Anfang der ersten Bücher der Ath.s. üblich. Das Lied ist aus ganz disparaten, mit einander nicht zusammenhängenden, aber alterthümlichen Versen zusammengetragen; die ersten vier Verse sind direct kosmogonischen Inhaltes, die anderen fünf scheinen mehr an Varuṇa gerichtet (v. 7–9 sind es sicher). — Ein Vers (5) findet sich auch in der Ṛks., die übrigen scheinen aus gleichberechtigtem altem Hymnen-Material zu stammen”.

My translation aims to improve upon WEBER’s and WHITNEY’s “understanding of the sense”, and — by comparing the PS with the ŚS text — to throw light on WHITNEY’s suspicion that the ŚS text “is considerably corrupted”. RENO 1960: 127, following WEBER and the AthBSA, wants to see the hymn (ŚS 5.1) as primarily connected with Varuṇa, although he admits: “Tout cela certes est trouble, d’autant plus trouble que la transmission textuelle est incertaine. Même dans les portions plus claires, il se peut que l’image d’Agni se soit superposée à celle de V[a]r[ṇa]”. It seems forced to assume reference to Varuṇa in all stanzas. As was the case with the preceding hymn, the manifold applications of (stanzas from) this hymn in the KauśS (see the indications in W-L) throw no clear light on its meaning. Note the difference between the stanza-/pāda-divisions of the PS and ŚS versions.

Just as the ŚS version of the preceding hymn (parallel to ṚV 10.120 by Bṛhaddiva Ātharvaṇa), the ŚS version of this hymn too is attributed to Bṛhaddiva Ātharvaṇa by the AthBSA: although very corruptly transmitted, the present hymn does seem possibly as archaic as ṚV 10.120, and several similarities in wording explain its collocation with the preceding hymn (although they cannot prove identity of authorship): *dadhiṣe* in 6.1.7a, 6.2.3c; *pṛñcanti* 6.1.3a, *pṛṇakṣi* 6.2.8c; *śavasā vardh* 6.1.2a+9d, 6.2.8d; *avocat* 6.1.9b, *avocāma* 6.2.9d; *jyeṣṭham* 6.1.1a, *jyeṣṭhas/jyeṣṭham* 6.2.7a+d.

### 6.2.1 ŚS 5.1.1

†ṛdhañmandrayoninivihāvā†	( )
amṛtāsuḥ sujanmā vardhamānaḥ	(11)
adabdhāsur bhrājamāno aheva	(11)
trito dādharma trīṇi	( )

..., of immortal life-force, of good birth, growing, of uninjurable life-force, shining like the days, Trita, supports the three.

†ṛdhañmandrayoninovibhāvā†] **Ku RM Mā Pa** [Ma], ṛdhañmamandrayoninovibhāvā **JM**,  
 ṛdha(·)⟨YO⟩Ninovibhāvā **V/126**, ṛdhanmantrayoninovibhāvā **K** amṛtāsuḥ sujanmā]  
**Ku RM V/126 Mā** [Ma], amṛtāsuḥjanmā **JM**, amṛtāsujanmā **Pa**, amṛtāsu svajanmā **K**  
 vardhamānaḥ ||] **K** [om. ||], varddhamānaḥ | **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma], vaSTHimānaḥ |  
**Pa** adabdhāsur] **Ku RM** [Ma], adabdāsūr **JM**, a{ja}dabdhāsur **V/126**, adabdhāsu **Mā**,  
 adabdhosūr **Pa**, adubdhāsu **K** bhrājamāno aheva] bhrājamāno heva **Or**, bhrājaSā ihava  
**K** trito] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], trīto **JM**, t-to **RM**, trato **K** ||] **Or**, om. **K**

### ŚS 5.1.1

ṛdhañmantro yóniṃ yá ābabhūvāmṛtāsūr vārdhamānaḥ sujánmā |  
 ádabdhāsūr bhrājamāno 'heva tritó dhartá dādhāra trīṇi ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *ṛdhanimandra yonī no vibhāvā*.

**a.** I can offer no solution to the problems posed by the irreconcilable readings (at the beginning of the pāda) of the Or. mss. and **K** on the one hand, and the ŚS text of the whole pāda on the other.

In any case, it is important to observe that the rest of the hymn is quite regular metrically (the apparent decasyllabic pādas 5a and 7b are probably corrupt, leaving only 7a as a fairly certain decasyllabic pāda), which might be used as an argument for the assumption that somewhere the original reading of our pāda contains a vowel-contraction or abhinihita sandhi, which needs to be undone for the meter. This assumption may yield the key to improvement of the reading of the text. Although I fail to see any coherent solution in the following data and questions, I present them here as possibly containing a hint in the right direction.

- There seem to exist no compounds with first member *ṛdhak*, and even though the word is predominantly pāda-initial, it is not very promising semantically here. A pāda-initial 3rd sg. aor. subj. verb form *ṛdhat* is found ṚV 6.2.4a, and this might fit (cf. ṚV 1.173.11) with **K** and ŚS *mantra*-. Departing from the transmitted accentuation in ŚS, we may consider also a participle (nom. m. sg. or first member of a compound) *ṛdhánt*- (cf. ṚV 7.87.7, and 6.3.2 *ṛdhādvāra*-).
- There are ṚV stanzas combining *mandrá*- with *vibhāvan*:- 6.10.1, 10.61.20.
- Cf. also ṚV 9.86.17 *mandrayú*:- should we divide the akṣaras to get a word *mandrayo* (note the placement of the accent in ŚS)?
- Could the ensuing word contain *anidhmá*-, *aniná*-, *anindyá*-?
- Behind *yonino* (ŚS *yóniṃ yá*) we may also seek something like *yó nītyo*, cf. ṚV 10.12.2.
- ṚV 6.10.1 and 6.4.2 support *no vibhāvā*.
- On the adjective *vibhāvan*- (and Agni), see ṚV 6.49.9d, 10.88.7, 5.1.9, 3.3.9. Varuṇa is resplendent (*vibhāti*) at ṚV 6.68.9.

- The absence of sandhi at the pāda boundary is problematic. Cf. ŚS *ābabhū-vāmṛtāsur*: WHITNEY (1881: 210) reports a variant (not recorded in ŚPP’s ed.) *-vām̃*. Some of his mss. thus read *ābabhūvām̃ amṛtāsur*. Is it worth considering the possibility that our text originally read *vibhāvām̃ amṛtāsuḥ* (although we would not expect nasalization in such a context in the R̥V, see LUBOTSKY 1993), or may we assume that the majority of the ŚS mss. are correct in applying sandhi?
- Or may we consider dividing *vibhāv ā(m̃)*? Cf. also R̥V 4.33.3, 4.36.6, 7.48.3 *vibhvānt-*, nom. sg. *vibhvām̃*.

My very tentative guess at the Ur-AV reading of this pāda would be: *ṛdhānmanthro yó aṇindyó (?) vibhāvāmṛtāsur . . .* ‘The mantra-furtherer, who is irreproachable (?), resplendent, of immortal life-force . . .’.

**b.** The words *amṛtāsus-* and *sujānman-* are both practically hapax legomena: but see our stanza 6, and R̥V 10.18.6cd *tvāṣṭā sujānimā*.

**c.** The compound *ādabdhāsu-* has unfortunately not been discussed by NARTEN 1988–90. But from 1988–90: 155 = 1995: 393, it is clear that she takes *ādabdhā-* as ‘uninjurable’, rather than ‘uncheatable’. The simile *āheva* is found also at R̥V 6.61.9, 8.96.19, 9.70.5. R̥V 4.33.6c, just like our pāda, combines the root *bhrāj* with the simile.

**d.** The interpretation of this pāda is unclear. GONDA 1976: 107, does not contribute to its interpretation beyond noticing the word-play: “At AVŚ. 5,1,1 (AVP 6,2,1) the proper name Trita is no doubt associated with the numeral”. On the possible interpretation of Trita as referring to Varuṇa, see RENOUE (1960: 127) and BRERETON (1981: 121f.) who both refer to R̥V 8.41.6. BRERETON explains, “The link between Trita and Varuṇa is the priestly wisdom which they share”. On Trita, see OBERLIES 1998: 195ff. WEBER suggests supplying *bhuvanāni*, in disregard of the fact that the combination *bhuvanāni trīṇi/trīṇi bhuvanā(ni)* occurs only in late Vedic (I have found it only in a mantra quoted VādhŚS 9.7.66; see also the dubious stanza R̥VKhil 2.6.23); the normal expression involves three *lokās* (cf. GONDA 1966: 61 n. 38, KLAUS 1986: 24f., KIRFEL 1920: 3f.), not *bhūvanas*. There are also metrical problems. However, there are passages such as R̥V 1.154.4 *yāsya trī pūrṇā mādhunā padāny ākṣyamāṇā svadhāyā mādanti | yá u tridhātu pṛthivīm utá dyām éko dādhára bhūvanāni vísvā* and 8.41.5a *yó dhartā bhūvanānām* (of Varuṇa; see also *dhartā* in ŚS here), which do support WEBER’s suggestion, and the germs of the later concept of *tribhuvana* may be present already at such places as R̥V 7.33.7 and 9.86.46. It remains unclear what may have induced our poet to employ this metrically incomplete line.

### 6.2.2 ŚS 5.1.2

ni yo dharmaṇi prathamah \*sasāda- (11)  
-ato vapūṃṣi kṛṇute purūṇi | (11)

dhāsyur yoniṃ prathama ā viveśa- (11)  
 -ā yo vācam anuditāṃ cikāya || (11)

He who has first sat down in the Support, assumes many wondrous appearances from it. As Dhāsyu he has first entered the womb, he who observes (?) speech unspoken.

ni yo] **Or**, viniyo **K** dharmaṇi] **Or**, dharmaṇi | **K** [[note]] prathamah] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], pra{·}(→ tha)mah] **RM**, prathama **K** \*sasādāto] svasādāto **Or**, svasā ata i **K** vapūṃṣi] **Ku RM V/126 Pa** [Ma], {·}vapUṃsi **JM**, vap{u}ūṃṣi **Mā**, vapuṃsi **K** purūṇi] puṇi **Or**, puroṇi **K** dhāsyur] **Ku JM RM Pa** [Ma], dhāsvar **V/126 Mā**, yaśca **K** [[]] prathama ā viveśā] **Or**, prathamāviveśa | **K** [[note]] anuditāṃ] **Or**, anucitāṃ **K** cikāya ||] **Or**, jigāya [[om.]] **K**

### ŚS 5.1.2

ā yó dhármāni prathamāḥ sasāda táto vāpūṃṣi kṛṇuṣe purūṇi |  
 dhāsyúr yóniṃ prathamá ā viveśá yó vācam ānuditāṃ cikéta ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *dharmaṇi* with unnecessary underlining.

a. Although the two AV texts have an interesting variant (PS *ni-sad* [+ loc.] ~ ŚS *ā-sad* + acc.), at least PS seems to express the same as found at RV 4.56.7c *pāri yajñām ní śedathuḥ* ‘You two have taken seat around the worship’ and 3.1.18ab *ní duroṇé amṛto mártyanām rájā sasāda* ‘In the house of the mortals the immortal king has taken seat’. As the terms *yajñá-* and *duroṇá-* in these parallels suggest, *dhárman-* ‘the Support’ may refer concretely to the ritual ground or altar, or perhaps to heaven here: see RENO 1964a: 161, who does not explicitly allow for the first interpretation. Alternatively, we may follow another possibility listed by RENO (with reference to RV 1.159.3), and take *dharmaṇi* here as a “semi-infinitif” (‘in order to give support’), but this would require us to give a forced temporal rendering for *atas* in páda **b**.

On the frequent RV phrase combining Agni with a perf. tense form of *ni-sad*, see RENO 1925: 35 (also 66–67); cf. i.a. RV 3.1.18, 4.6.11, 5.1.5–6. Our stanza may refer to Agni as well.

b. Note that PS indeed reads *kṛṇute*, as WEBER and WHITNEY felt compelled to emend the text of ŚS. On Agni’s many ‘wondrous appearances’ (*vāpus-*), see RV 3.1.8, 3.18.5, 8.19.11; compare 4.23.9 (of Indra), as well as 5.62.1 quoted below. But cf. also stanza 8, which must clearly be connected with Varuṇa. RENO 1960: 127 wants to take our stanza as referring to Varuṇa as well, calling *vāpus-* a “terme assez caractéristique” of Varuṇa, quoting RV 5.62.1 *ṛténa ṛtām ápihitam dhruvām vām sūryasya yātra vimucānty áśvān | dáśa śatā sahā tasthus tād ékam devānām śréṣṭham vāpuṣām apaśyam* ‘Your fixed order [Mitra and Varuṇa] is covered by order, where they untie the sun’s horses. Ten hundreds are standing together: that singular one I saw, the dearest of the gods’ wondrous appearances’.

c. Cf. the important parallel ŚS 2.1.4 (PS 2.6.4) *pāri dyāvāpṛthivī sadyā āyam úpātiṣṭhe prathamajām ṛtāsya | vācam iva vaktári bhuvaneṣṭhá dhāsyúr*

*eṣá nanv èṣó agnīḥ*. The ŚS version quoted here has preserved a slightly more original text, and might mean something like, ‘I have gone at once around Heaven and Earth; I worship the first-born of order, while speaking speech as it were, standing in the world; he is Dhāsyu, certainly not Agni’ (it is unclear whether pāda **c** is to be taken with **b** or **d**: ‘the one standing in the world, speaking speech as it were, is Dhāsyu, certainly not Agni’). I have assumed here, for the moment, PINAULT’s interpretation (1989: 77–79) of *vaktári* as ‘en parlant’, and *iva* as ‘assez, plus ou moins, d’une certaine façon’. I must confess, however, that I am not entirely convinced by PINAULT’s arguments, and could easily imagine other renderings as well (especially as the supposed meaning of the context in the notoriously difficult Vena Hymn PS 2.6 / ŚS 2.1 cannot be used as argument with such ease as PINAULT does).

On the obscure word *dhāsyú-*, see ZEHNDER (1999: 36): “Die Bedeutung von *dhāsyú-* ist unbekannt . . . . Das einwandfreie Metrum von AVP [2.6.4c *dhāsyur n<sub>uv</sub> eṣa*] spricht — wie die anderen Belegstellen mit zweisilbigem Stamm — gegen die von Ai.Gr. II 2, 846 erwogene dreisilbige Messung AVŚ 2.1.4d *dhās;ýú-* und die darauf basierende Analyse als *ýú-*Ableitung von *dhāśí-* f. ‘Labung (?)’”. The word further occurs only at ŚS 4.1.2 (PS 5.2.1) *iyám pítiryā ráṣṭry etv ágre prathamáya janúṣe bhuvanesthāḥ | tásmā etám surúcam hvārám ahyam gharmám śrīñantu prathamáya dhāsyáve* ‘Let this queen of the Fathers go in the beginning for the first birth, standing in the creation; for it (him?) have I sent this well-shining sinuous one; let them mix (boil?) the hot drink for the first thirsty one (? *dhāsyú*)’ (WHITNEY). PS 5.2.1d is probably to be read *gharmaṃ śrīñanti prathamasya \*dhāsyoh* ‘they (= the priests) prepare the gharma-pot for the first *dhāsyu*’ (LUBOTSKY 2002: 18). It seems, however, not to have been noted by previous interpreters of *dhāsyú-*, that this last stanza has a parallel in ṚVKhil 3.22.2 (*prathamáya dhāśéḥ*) and in ĀśvŚS 4.6.3 = ŚākhŚS 5.9.6 (*prathamasya dhāśéḥ*). This fact needs to be kept in mind in determining the morphological relationship between *dhāsyú-* and *dhāśí-*. Since, however, the meaning of *dhāśí-* itself is unsettled (see GONDA 1971: 176), this observation does not lead us any closer to an interpretation of the meaning of our pāda.

**d.** On *ánuditā vác*, cf. KaṭhĀ III.208a:80.18 *yā vāg uditā yā cānuditā tasyai vāce nama iti* ‘The speech that is spoken, and the one that is unspoken, reverence to that speech!’. Cf. also ṚV 10.95.1cd and JUB 1.12.4.

Note that PS *ā cikāya* (**K** *jigāya* can be explained as a mixture of auditory confusion and ‘learned correction’) corresponds with ŚS *á cikéta* (cf. KÜMMEL 2000: 175, who refers to ṚV 10.28.5), from the different root <sup>1</sup>*cet*. The verbal compound *ā<sup>-1</sup>cay* is a hapax (see KÜMMEL 2000: 169). The ŚS text seems more original here.

### 6.2.3 ŚS 5.1.3

yas te śokas tan<sub>u</sub>va ārireca (11)

\*kṣarad dhiraṇyaṃ śucayo <sub>a</sub>nu svāḥ | (11)

atrā dadhiṣe amṛtāni nāma- (11)  
 -asme vastrāṇīṣa erayanta || (11)

Which blaze of yours has given up [its] bodies, it flows toward gold, and [its/your] own clear ones [come] after. In it you have received the immortal names. They (Agni's blazes?) shall place clothings, comforts, before us.

tanva ārireca] **V/126 Mā**, tanava ārireca **Ku JM RM Pa Ma**, tanvāireca **K** \*kṣarad  
 dhiraṇyaṃ] kṣuraddhiraṇyaṃ **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, kṣuraddhiraṇyaṃ **JM RM**,  
 kṣuviraṇyo **K** a<sub>nu</sub> svāḥ] 'nu svāḥ **Or**, na svā **K** dadhiṣe] **Or**, dadhiṣe **K** amṛtāni]  
**Or**, mṛtāni **K** nāmāsme] **Or**, nāmāsmi **K** vastrāṇīṣa erayanta ||] **Ku JM RM V/126**  
**[Ma]**, vastrāṇīṣa erayanta **Mā**, vastr{ī}ṇīṣa erayaṃ{·}nta || **Pa**, vastrāṇīṣerayanta |  
**K**

### ŚS 5.1.3

yás te sókāya tanvāṃ riréca kṣárad dhíraṇyaṃ sūcayó 'nu svāḥ |  
 átrā dadhete amṛtāni nāmāsmé vástrāṇī víśa érayantām ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *kṣuraddhiraṇyaṃ*.

a. Note the difference in reading between PS and ŚS. On *sóka-*, see ROESLER 1997: 13, 59, and 268: “ursprünglich: ‘Flammenglut’, im 10. Buch des RV wird der Ausdruck jedoch bereits auf die körperlichen Leiden allgemein bzw. auf die “psycho-physischen” Schmerzen der Feigheit angewandt”.

Cf. RV 10.13.4d *priyāṃ yamás tanvāṃ prārireçit* ‘Yama had given up his own body’. The PS parallel for this pāda (18.73.4d) seems to read . . . *prarireçih*. The parallel in ŚS (18.3.41d) however, reads *priyāṃ yamás tanvāṃ á rireca* (. . . has given up . . .), see KÜMMEL 2000: 424. Agni’s ‘bodies’ are referred to i.a. at RV 10.16.4c, where they seem to be the fire’s flames, as here.

b. I have attempted to improve upon WHITNEY’s syntactically awkward rendering (‘his [men] are bright (*súci*) after’) by assuming a gapped verb of motion, perhaps *guh* from 4a, with *ánu*, but the sense remains utterly obscure. No emendation suggests itself. There is a formulaic pāda-ending in Agni verses, *pathyā ánu svāḥ* (RV 3.35.8d, 7.7.2a, 10.14.2d etc.), which resembles ours, and there are numerous cases (easily surveyed for the RV in LUBOTSKY 1997a, esp. 8.44.17, cf. also ŚS 1.33.1) where the form *sūcayah* is found together with Agni. Cf. word-play with *súci-* denoting Agni on the one hand, and the waters on the other, in RV 2.35.3cd.

The unanimous manuscript evidence for *kṣu°* in the word which I emend to \**kṣarad*, on the basis of ŚS, cannot be taken seriously. *kṣurad*, as edited by BHATTACHARYA, is an absolutely impossible form. The corruption may easily be explained as a rather amusing ‘learned correction’: the original row of akṣaras *rirecakṣuraddhiraṇyaṃ* has been reinterpreted at some early point as *rirecakṣuraddhiraṇyaṃ*.

With WHITNEY, I take the form as a 3rd sg. pr. inj. and reject his alternative: “In *b*, *kṣárat* might equally be pres. pple. qualifying *híraṇyam*”. On the construction of *kṣar* + desirable object (in the acc.), cf. i.a. RV 9.86.20, 9.109.8,

ŚS 7.18.2, and see GOTŌ 1987: 124 n. 137, who explains the meaning of *kṣar* as follows: “Das Präs. *kṣár-a-* hat intransitive Bedeutung und der Akk., der mit *kṣára-* vorkommt, ist als Richtungs- bzw. als Inhaltsakk. zu beurteilen”, cf. ṚV 1.90.6ab and 9.86.37c.

c. On the ŚS version, with the dual *dadhete*, GONDA 1970: 40 comments, “The stanza AV. 5,1,3 is, like the entire ‘hymn’ 5,1, rather obscure, but so much is clear that two anonymous beings are said to assume immortal names: *átrā dadhete amṛtāni náma*. This must in any case mean names that are free from the insufficiencies and shortcomings of the normal worldly existence”. The PS reading *dadhiṣe* is to be preferred to the ‘anonymous’ dual in ŚS, and may be seen as a deliberate parallel to *vapūmṣi kṛṇute* in 2b. This leads us to the problem of how to interpret the verb *dhā*. WEBER translates ‘setzen hinein’, GRIFFITH ‘set ... on’, and WHITNEY ‘assume’ (followed by GONDA). We cannot know exactly what was meant by the poet here, but the middle voice rather strongly suggests a meaning ‘to receive’ (see also KÜMMEL 2000: 272), which I adopt here, to leave open the possibility that the ‘immortal names’ refer to hymns in praise of Agni. For a different interpretation, see LÜDERS 1959: 540 n. 2. The ‘immortal names’ are mentioned i.a. at ṚV 10.123.4 (cf. 10.139.6), PS 2.6.2 (≈ ŚS 2.1.2, ṚVKhil 4.10.2, TĀ 10.1.3–4). Cf. also ṚV 10.45.2, 8.41.5c.

d. The PS reading *vastrānīṣa* differs from the ŚS version (*vāstrāni víṣa*), but finds strong support in ṚV 7.5.8a *tám agne asmé iṣam érayasva* ‘place that comfort before us, o Agni’.

WHITNEY correctly translated not *asmái* (WEBER’s ‘ihm’, GRIFFITH’s ‘to him’) of <sup>1</sup>R-W, but *asmé*, as is also read in PS. Still, it is possible to improve on their rendering, which takes *asmé* as a dative: the material collected by JAMISON 1983a: 124 n. 38 proves that *ā-īraya-* is construed with a loc., in the literal meaning ‘to place something [acc.] in (or before) something [loc.]’.

See GONDA 1989b on the meaning of *iṣ-*. The sandhi form in PS conceals an acc. pl. *iṣas* (not a dat. fin.), as the root-accentuation of the corrupted ŚS version, and the acc. sg. in ṚV 7.5.8a, quoted above, suggest. This acc. must then be assumed to stand in apposition (see GONDA 1989b: 5) to *vastrāni*, which is probably a metaphoric reference to the warmth provided by Agni (his ‘blazes’?). It seems most attractive to assume that the masc. pronoun *ete* of 4a refers to the same unspecified subject that we need to supply for *erayanta* here: may we extrapolate a m. pl. from the *śoka-* ‘blaze’ mentioned in pāda a? On the *iṣas* provided by Agni, see i.a. ṚV 3.22.4, 3.54.22, 4.55.4 (*iṣás pátiḥ*), 5.4.2, 5.6.8.

#### 6.2.4 ŚS 5.1.4

pra yad ete prataraṃ pūrviyaṃ guḥ	(11)
sadaḥsada ātiṣṭhanto *ajuryam	(11)
kaviḥ śuśasya mātārā rihāṇe	(11)
†jāmirvadhuryuḥ† †pratimānimīta†	(11)

When these [blazes?] here go forth, further, to the first, the unaging one, as they enter each residence; the poet of the fortifying [laud] (?), the two mothers licking each other, . . . .

pra yad] Or, pred K guḥ] Or, gus K sadaḥsada ātiṣṭhanto] Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma], sadaḥsada ā tiṣṭha{·}nto V/126, svadhasvadhātiṣṭhanto K \*ajuryam |] aduryam | Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], a{hu}(→ du)ryam | RM, duryam | K [[note °m]] kavīḥ] Or, kari K rihāṇe] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, rihāṇ{ā}(+ e) JM †jāmirvadhuryuḥ†] V/126 Mā, jāmirvadharyuḥ Ku JM RM Pa [Ma], jāmīvadhvaryuḥ K [[note °ḥ p°]] †pratimānimīta† ||] Ku JM RM V/126 [Ma], pratimānimītaḥ || Mā, pratimānimīta || Pa, pratimānimīta (+ ) K

#### ŚS 5.1.4

prá yád eté pratarám pūrvyám gúḥ sádaḥsada ātiṣṭhanto ajuryám |  
kavīḥ śuśásya mātārā rihāṇé jāmyái dhúryam pátim erayethām ||

The text and translation of this stanza remain uncertain: BHATTACHARYA edits *aduryam* | . . . *jāmirvadharyuḥ pratimānimīta*. WHITNEY remarks on his own rendering of the ŚS version (‘When these formerly went further forth, approaching each unfading seat — the poet of the dry (? *śuśá*), the two licking mothers — do ye (two) send for the sister (*jāmit*) a capable (*dhúrya*) spouse’), ‘The translation is, of course, simple nonsense’.

**ab.** This AV case of a non-prohibitive aor. inj. form has not been discussed by HOFFMANN 1967. Such non-prohibitive aor. injunctives seem to be rare in subordinate clauses in the ṚV (pp. 135ff.).

Agni is *pūrvyá-* at ṚV 1.94.6, 2.2.9, 3.11.3, 8.7.36, 8.39.3, 8.75.1. He is called *ajuryá-* at ṚV 1.146.4, 2.8.2, 10.88.13: since K’s *duryam* is impossible metrically, and Or. *aduryam* (adopted by BHATTACHARYA without underlining) does not make sense, I conclude that \*G must already have been corrupt here, and emend our text on the basis of ŚS. The same mistake occurs in the Or. mss. at PS 20.40.4, where K is not available (see ZEHNDER 1999: 258). It is understandable in view of cases where Agni is called *dúrya-* (ṚV 7.1.11, 8.74.1), and can alternatively be explained graphically as well (note that KNOBL 2007: 55 strongly favors the latter explanation, in the context of his discussion of another likely case of graphical *j* ~ *d* confusion).

**c.** It seems very doubtful that the uniformly transmitted text *kavīḥ śuśásya* is original, but no emendation suggests itself. Taking the text seriously as it stands, I may first quote SHENDE (1967: 2): ‘Various deities are styled as Kavi . . . . By means of the term *kavi*, these deities are described to be omniscient’. Also (*ibid.*): ‘The work of a Kavi is the Kāvya. Agni is invoked to protect the seer with his Kāvya ([ŚS] 8.3.20). The creation of the universe (including man) is the Kāvya of Deva (*devasya kāvyam*, [ŚS] 9.15.9 [= R-W 9.10.9]; 10.8.32). The artistic skill in the creation of the universe is the divine Kāvya’.

The unanimous AV reading *śuśásya* (*śuśá-* is not discussed by MAYRHOFER in either KEWA or EWAia) can perhaps be understood as a variant of *śūśásya*

(attested at RV 1.131.2e, 8.74.1d). The problem remains, however, that there seem to be no cases of *kaví-* construed with an objective genitive.

Should we consider an emendation involving a form of *śíṣu-* (cf. RV 7.2.5c, 8.99.6b)? All the parallels (RV 3.33.1, 3.33.3, 7.2.5cd) for the formulaic phrase *mātárā (saṃ)rihāṇé* are similes overtly marked with the particles *iva* or *ná*; such a particle is conspicuously absent in our text. I am inclined to think the original reading of this pāda may have contained *śíṣuṃ ná mātárā rihāṇé* as does RV 7.2.5c.

d. For this corrupt pāda, BHATTACHARYA suggests *jāmī \*vadhūyuh pratimā \*mimīta*, which may be partially correct, but as a whole yields no sense. The word *vadhūyú-* (attested i.a. at PS 17.3.6, 20.56.13; ŚS 14.2.42; RV 3.52.3), as BHATTACHARYA suggests to emend, would seem to fit better with the Or. reading *jāmīr* than with K *jāmī* (but cf. RV 1.159.4). Perhaps an acc. *vadhūyum*, slightly closer to the ŚS reading, would fit better than BHATTACHARYA's *vadhūyuh*. It seems possible that the *r* of *ajuryam* has penetrated into this word, as also into corrupt *pr̥thuryaman* in 5a. Anyhow there remains the problem of the verb form: may we consider, with BHATTACHARYA, a 3rd sg. med. opt. *ā mimīta* 'should (ex)change (?)' (THIEME 1941: 112 = <sup>2</sup>1984: 37)? But what would this all mean?

### 6.2.5 ŚS 5.1.5

tad ū ṣu te mahā †pr̥thuryaman†	(10)
namaḥ kavīḥ kāvyenā <sub>a</sub> kṛṇot	(11)
yat samyañco <sub>a</sub> bhiyanto * <sub>a</sub> dhi *kṣām	(11)
adhā mahī rodhacakrā vavardha	(11)

He, the poet, o . . . , paid that homage to you with his great (?) poetry. When they are coming together on the earth, then [the river], having . . . as wheels, has grown great.

tad ū] **Ku JM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, tadu **RM**, taduū **V/126** ṣu te] **Ku JM Pa [Ma]**, (+ ṣu 4)te **V/126**, sute **Mā**, ṣeta **K** †pr̥thuryaman†] **Ku Pa [Ma]**, pr̥thurya{na}maṃ **JM**, pr̥thuryamaṃ **RM**, puthuryaman **V/126 Mā**, prathūryasaṃ **K** namaḥ kavīḥ kāvyenākṛṇot || **Or**, namaḥ kavīḥ kāvyenākṛṇo [*om.* ||] **K** samyañco] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, samyayañco **JM**, saṃmayañco **RM** <sub>a</sub>bhiyanto] 'bhiyanto **Or**, bhyañco **K** \*<sub>a</sub>dhi \*kṣām adhā] 'dhakṣādhā **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, 'dhlkṣādhA **RM**, yakṣādā **K** mahī rodhacakrā] **Or**, maivodacakrā **K** vavardha] vavarddha **Or**, vavardhā **K**

#### ŚS 5.1.5

tád ū śú te mahát pr̥thujman námaḥ kavīḥ kávyenā kṛṇomi |  
yát samyáñcāv abhiyántāv abhí kṣám átrā mahí ródhacakre vāvṛdhéte ||

The ŚS version of the first two pādas, which has not the god (Agni) as its subject, but his praiser (*kaví-*; see commentary to the preceding stanza), seems more comprehensible syntactically, and therefore perhaps more original; it is also metrically superior. Note WEBER's (p. 160) characterisation of the stanza:

“... ebenfalls alt und ebenso dunkel, wie das Bisherige”. Again, my translation has to struggle with an uncertain text. BHATTACHARYA edits *mahāpr̥thuryaman* (without word break, and without reporting the variant *puthuryaman* found in **Mā** and **V/126**) and *’dhakṣādhā* (without underlining).

**a.** On the meaning, or apparent lack thereof, of the formula  $\bar{u} \text{ ṣú}$ , see KLEIN 1978: 125–131. Rather than accepting the ŚS hapax *pr̥thujman*, I would compare ṚV 1.27.2b *pr̥thúpragāman-* (Agni) and ṚV 6.64.4c *pr̥thuyāman-* (Uṣas), to support an emendation either simply to *pr̥thuyāman*, or — metrically more pleasing — *pr̥thuprayāman* (cf. *práyāman-* ṚV 1.119.2a). Anyhow, the readings of PS and ŚS show that the text must have become corrupt already at a very early stage, and it is impossible to reconstruct with certainty the authentic PS reading. PS *mahā* is obviously corrupt for the reading *mahát* preserved in ŚS. I do not emend, because there seems to be a chance that this is a properly Vedic variant reading — a Vedic corruption as opposed to an error introduced during post-Vedic transmission. There is admittedly some degree of arbitrariness in this judgment, but it leads me to take *mahā* as an instr. sg. with *kāvyaena*. Is *tád* really to be taken as a pronoun, or rather as a conjunction?

**cd.** The ms. readings Or. *’dhakṣādhā* and **K** *yakṣādhā* cannot be reconstructed to a correct text. In any case, the meter and the ŚS parallel show that an akṣara *ma* must have been dropped somewhere in the transmission before \*G. As for the preverb, which reads *abhí* in ŚS (also supported by ṚV 1.95.10b, 1.183.2a, 6.18.13c, 7.18.16b), the PS mss. (except, perhaps, **RM**) seem to point to the impossible underlying form *adha* (*dha* → *ya* is imaginable in Śāradā), and we might imagine that this *adha* goes back to a preverb \**adhi*. Both *abhí kṣām* and *ádhi kṣami* are well established Ṛgvedic formulae, so although *adhi kṣām* seems to be attested nowhere, it may perhaps be accepted as a blend of the two. The masc. participle in pāda **c** seems to take up the ‘blazes’ of Agni (in his solar form) mentioned in stanzas 3–4, with reference to the flooding of rivers in the hot season (cf. FALK 1997).

The problem lies mainly in the interpretation of *ródhacakra-*. Ours is only the third attestation in Vedic of this compound, which must be connected with *ródhas-* and especially ṚV 1.38.11 *ródhasvant-* (of the waters). Besides the ŚS parallel to our stanza, it occurs at ṚV 1.190.7: *sám yám stúbho ’vánayo ná yánti samudráṃ ná sraváto ródhacakrāḥ | sá vidvāñ ubháyaṃ caṣṭe antár bṛhaspátis tára āpaś ca gṛdhraḥ* ‘Dem die Gesänge wie Flüsse zuströmen, wie dem Meere die Ströme, die die Ufer entlang rollen — Bṛhaspati erspäht als Kundiger beides, die Furt (?) und das Wasser, der Geier’ (GELDNER). The word *ródhacakra-* is listed as one of the *nadīnāmāni* at Nighaṅṭu 1.13 (cf. AV-Paríś 48.76), a fact which does not help much in its analysis. Besides GELDERNER’s rendering ‘die die Ufer entlang rollen’, I mention here WHITNEY’s ‘bank-wheeled ones’, WEBER’s ‘mit Ufer-Rädern (rollenden Ufern)’, GRIFFITH’s ‘ed-dying rivers: here apparently, Heaven and Earth’. These are all mere guesses, as the etymological connection of *rodha-* is doubtful (*rodha-* seems not to be mentioned in either KEWA or EWAia; it is mentioned, but not discussed, by

GONDA 1936: 184ff. = 1975/III: 24ff.; see also AiGr. I, 250 & 252).

Note the difference in sense between the middle (dual) in ŚS ('... they two grow into two great [rivers] having ... as wheels') and the active (singular) which we have in PS: on this use of the active pf. *vavardha*, see KÜMMEL 2000: 470, who quotes RV 3.1.11a: *urāu mahāṁ anibādhé vavardhá* 'in wide freedom, he has grown great'.

**6.2.6 ab:** ŚS 5.1.6ab ≈ RV 10.5.6ab ◊ cd: ŚS 5.1.7ab

sapta maryādāḥ kavayas tatakṣus	(11)
tāsām *id ekām abhy aṁhuro gāt	(11)
utāmṛtāsur vṛta eṣi kṛṇvann	(11)
asura āptaḥ svadhayā samadguḥ	(11)

The poets have fashioned the seven boundaries. Oppressed, he reaches just one of these. And you, of immortal life-force, go preparing troops, the Asura, the Āpta, war-bent by nature.

maryādāḥ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, maryā(+ dā)ḥ **JM**, maryādāḥ **K** kavayas tatakṣus] **K**, kavayas titakṣus **Ku RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, kava(+ ya)statakṣus **JM**, ka(VA·i·u)s **V/126** \*id] **ir Or**, an **K** ekām abhy] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, eyā(→ kā 3)mabhy **Pa** aṁhuro] **K**, anduro **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, anVuro **JM**, aṁnVuro **RM** gāt |] **Or**, gāt, **K** [virāma but not (Edg.) gāt ||] utāmṛtāsur] **Or**, utāmṛtāsu **K** vṛta eṣi] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, vṛta eṣu **JM**, vṛta e{Ṣi}(→ Ṣu) **RM**, vratesi **K** kṛṇvann] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, kṛṇvanm **Pa**, kṛṇvaṁ **K** asura āptaḥ] **RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, asu(+ ra) āptaḥ **Ku**, asurāptaḥ **JM**, asurāḥpūtas **K** svadhayā] **Ku JM Pa [Ma] K**, svadhayāT **RM**, sadhayā **V/126** [?] **Mā** samadguḥ ||] **Or**, samadgū | **K**

**RV 10.5.6ab ≈ ŚS 5.1.6ab**

saptá maryādāḥ kaváyas tatakṣus tāsām ékām íd [ŚS íd ékām] abhy aṁhuró gāt |

**ŚS 5.1.7ab**

utāmṛtāsur vrāta emi kṛṇvānn āsur ātmā tanvās tát sumádguḥ |

The general purport of this stanza is so unclear, as to reduce the attempt at interpretation of some of its parts to little more than speculation. Note WHITNEY's characterization of ŚS 5.1.7 (corresponding to our 6.2.5bc–6cd) as "most utterly hopeless". Still, the PS readings do throw considerable light on the ŚS text and help us detect some apparent corruptions in it.

This PS stanza is composed of two hemistichs which are part of separate stanzas in ŚS, and one of the two is found also in the RV (again in a separate context). The compilation of both ŚS and PS is therefore probably secondary, from the point of view of the RV.

BHATTACHARYA edits *vrata eṣi*, and his text contains the misprint *samdaguh*.

a. In combination with the next, this pāda is clearly related thematically to RV 4.5.13ab *kā maryādā vayúnā kád dha vāmám áchā gamema raghávo ná*

*vájam* ‘What are the boundaries, the beacons (?), what indeed is the gain? We would go there, as speedy (horses) to the prize’. The rare word *maryádā* seems in our context to refer to something positive, which does not fit with the interpretation as ‘cardinal sin’ given by Nir 6.27, and Sāyaṇa on ṚV 10.5.6. For the correct interpretation (‘limit, boundary’) and a rather extensive catalog of the word’s attestations (to which may be added i.a. PS 19.17.2, 19.26.7) see RENO 1936.

GELDNER comments on ṚV 10.5.6: “Es handelt sich um die sieben Schranken der Erkenntnis, um die letzten und Höchsten Ideen oder Symbole des Urwesens, bei denen die Spekulation Halt machen muß. Diese werden im Folgenden aufgezählt, nämlich Skambha, der Höchste, Nichtsein und Sein, Dakṣa Aditi, das Ṛta und die Stierkuh. Schon Yāska 6,27 und nach ihm Durga und Sāy. haben die Deutung ins Moralische umgebogen”. I must say that GELDNER’s interpretation seems a bit far-fetched to me, and so does RENO’s suggestion ‘limite’ = ‘symbole’ (1955–69/XIV: 66). I would be inclined to take ‘seven’ less specifically, perhaps as ‘Zahl der Vollständigkeit’ (OBERLIES 1999: 73). But ‘boundaries’ of what? Cf. perhaps BERGAIGNE 1878–83/II: 142 (n. 4), who argues that the ‘seven boundaries’ are the seven “places d’Agni”.

b. On the meaning of *aṃhurá-*, see GONDA (1957b: 36): ““the man who does not find a way out”?”. RENO takes *aṃhurá-* (“au sens propre de ‘angustum’”) as referring to Agni ‘aux-chemins-étroits’, 1955–69/XIV: 5, 66. Note the slight metrical adaption, normalizing the opening, of the original ṚV reading (*ékām íd* → *íd ékām*) which is shared by the AV Saṃhitās. The significance of the particle was thus no longer evident or essential to the AV redactors/poets.

c. ŚS accents *vráta*, and its padapāṭha analyses *vrátaḥ*, whence WHITNEY’s dubious attempt ‘vowed’ (cf. SCHMIDT 1958: 111). Since the paroxytone *vráta* is a hapax, and since it can only be construed to make sense with some difficulty (see BRERETON 1981: 89, 92), it seems that we should take the Or. reading *vr̥ta* seriously (against BHATTACHARYA, who here adopts the ŚS/K-reading). An accusative plural of the root-noun *vr̥t-* ‘troops’ would confirm the ŚS accentuation, and the ending *-aḥ* found in the padapāṭha. Note that the mss. of ŚS make the same error at 5.1.8d (see ed. ŚPP, and WHITNEY’s comm.), with the Or. mss. preserving the expected *ṛ*. Our **K** may then be assumed to have made an independent error here, and again at 6.2.8b, or to have been influenced by ŚS. The syntagma *vr̥taḥ kar* seems not to be attested elsewhere in Vedic, but note the juxtaposition of the words *āvár̥v̥tataḥ kṛṇavas* in ŚS 5.1.8d = PS 6.2.8b. Since the reading and interpretation here adopted allow us to discard a supposed *vráta-* (with accent as in ŚS) as a proper name, substituted for Varuṇa, we may also cancel this as a piece of evidence for the idea that “the poet must see Varuṇa as the personification of *vrata* “commandment”,” as advocated by BRERETON (1981: 89, 92).

d. On Indra as *āpt(y)á-*, cf. the ŚS 5.2.7 reading (*āptá-*) parallel to our 6.1.6b (which reads *āptya-* there). Is the reading *āptá-* simply spurious? See also my comm. to 6.1.6b.

Indra is called ‘asurian’ at RV 10.105.11. Cf. also Indra sitting down ‘in *asuratvá-*’, RV 10.99.2b. But HILLEBRANDT (1929: 427) states about the RV that Indra “in Buch II bis VII niemals ein *asura* genannt wird”, and why would we have Indra references here, suddenly? May we assume Varuṇa to have adopted some of this Indra terminology? Moreover, Varuṇa himself is also called *ásura* i.a. at RV 2.27.10, 2.28.7 (see KUIPER 1979: 6); cf. my comments on pādas 8b and 9b.

On the meaning of *svadhāyā*, see RENO 1958: 18. The hapax *samadgu-* which the PS mss. give us as opposed to ŚS *sumádguḥ* (also a hapax), seems to make fine sense, and seems to combine well with my reading *vṛta* in pāda c. One problem is the accentuation in ŚS: if we suppose its reading is a corruption for underlying \**samádguḥ*, then we must explain why it is accented differently from oxytone *vanargú-* (RV+).

**6.2.7 ab:** cf. ŚS 5.1.7cd ◊ **cd:** cf. ŚS 5.1.8ab

utāyur jyeṣṭho ratnā dadhāt,y	(10)
ūrjā vā yaṃ sacate kavir dāḥ	(10)
putro vā yat pitarā kṣatram īrte	(11)
jyeṣṭhaṃ maryādam ahvayan s <sub>u</sub> vasti	(11)

And he gives life-span, treasures: the mightiest, whom the poet, the giver either stands by with nourishment. Or when the son moves (?) to dominion, to the two parents, they called the eldest . . . to well-being.

utāyur jyeṣṭho] **Ku JM [Ma]**, utāTyurjyeṣṭho **RM**, utāyujyeṣṭho **V/126 Mā K**, utāyuntyoṣṭho **Pa** dadhāty ūrjā] **Ku V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, dadhā{nā}yarjā **JM**, dadhātyurjā **RM Mā** sacate] **Or**, cate **K** kavir] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, kavi **JM** dāḥ ||] **Or**, dāt | **K** vā] **Or**, va(+ ā) **K** pitarā] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, pi(+ (·)rā **Ku** kṣatram] **Or**, kṣantum **K** īrte] **Or**, īrte **K** ahvayan] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, a·avaya **RM**, ahvayaṃ **K**

ŚS 5.1.7cd

utá vā śakró rátnaṃ dádhāty ūrjāyā vā yát sácate havirdāḥ ||

ŚS 5.1.8ab

utá putráḥ pitáraṃ kṣatrám īde jyeṣṭhám maryādam ahvayant svastáye |

The text constituted above according to the practically unanimous Or. and **K** PS tradition, in full agreement with BHATTACHARYA’s text, seems to be the ‘authentic’ PS reading. Of course, it is complete nonsense, and — as comparison with the ŚS parallel shows — certainly not ‘original’ in this form. Whom does this stanza refer to? Who is the ‘mightiest’, the ‘son’, who are the ‘parents’, who the ‘eldest’, what *maryāda-*?

a. On Indra as *jyeṣṭha-*, cf. KUIPER (1979: 25) and RENO (1946: 125), but Varuṇa is called *jyeṣṭha-* as well, at RV 4.1.2. While I assume that the first *jyeṣṭha-* is barytone, the ŚS shows that our second *jyeṣṭha-* is oxytone; on

the difference of meaning inherent in the different accentuation, see AiGr. II/2, §277a p. 458.

Note that the meter is irregular in both the PS and ŚS version of this pāda, but WHITNEY’s suggestion (on ŚS 5.1.7) that “that deficiency might be made up by reading ... *rátanam* as trisyllabic”, is not supported by a single case of trisyllabic *rátna-* in the ṚV or the AV Saṁhitās. The phrase *áyur dhā* occurs e.g. at ṚV 3.53.16c, 7.80.2a, 10.170.1b.

b. The root noun *dā́-* ‘giver’ is a ṚV hapax: 6.16.26a *krátvā dā́ astu śréṣṭhas* (quoted with an irrelevant variant at KS 26.11:135.20, and at TB 2.4.6.2), if we do not (*pace* LUBOTSKY 1997a; see OLDENBERG 1909–12/I: 336) also take ṚV 5.41.1 *dé* as belonging to the same paradigm. Confusion *-āt* for *-āḥ* is common in **K** (6.3.3d, 16.150.9b, 19.10.3b).

The sequence *sacate kavīḥ*, as in the PS reading (*sacate kavir dāḥ* as opposed to ŚS *sacate havirdāḥ*), is found also at ṚV 1.91.14c. I would prefer to take the ŚS reading with *havirdā́-* as more original, though this word is also hardly frequent: it occurs only at ŚS 7.78.2 = PS 20.32.8 [PSK 20.31.8], KS 5.3:46.8, and three times in the dative at ṚV 1.153.3b, 4.3.7b, 7.68.6b. Might we, instead of splitting *ūrjā vā*, consider a nom. masc. of *ūrjāvan-* (as proposed in VWC-Saṁhitās II, 987)? Only *ūrjāvant-* is actually attested (PS 1.96.1b, ManB 1.5.1a).

c. JOACHIM 1978: 46 states, “Die Formen *īrte*, *īrate* sind immer intransitiv gebraucht “sich in Bewegung setzen””. She might have commented on the fact that the only ṚV attestation of the first form, *īrte*, 9.91.3ab (not quoted by her), has been consistently translated (wrongly indeed) in a transitive sense: *vīṣā vīṣṇe róruvad aṁśúr asmai pávamāno rúsad īrte páyo góḥ* | ‘Der brüllende Bulle, der Stengel, treibt für ihn, den Bullen, sich läuternd die weiße Kuhmilch heraus’ (GELDNER, similarly RENO 1955–69/IX: 40 and OBERLIES 1999: 210). I would rather translate: ‘The roaring Bull, the stalk, being purified, moves toward the white milk, for him, the Bull’. Cf. further PS 1.70.3, TS 5.1.5.1/5.3.1.3, both of which cases are intransitive. In view of the ŚS reading, it is very possible, however, that *īrte* is not the authentic PS reading at all: one might suggest an emendation *īṭte*, but it is hard to make a decisive argument for this, since the sense of these pādas is so obscure to begin with.

d. WHITNEY’s conjecture *jyeṣṭhāmaryādam* is unlikely, because the PS and ŚS readings agree here, but a (m./n.) word *maryāda-* is not otherwise known.

On *haví + svastí*, cf. ṚV 5.42.15c *kāmo rāyē havate mā svastí* ‘The desire calls me for wealth, to well-being’; GOTŌ (1987: 350): “Zusammenfassend läßt sich sagen, daß es als lebendiges Paradigma Präs. *hvāya-ti, te* ... gab; daneben existierte als rituelsprachliche Form das vollstuf. them. Wz.-Präs. *hāva-te*”. The fin. dat. in ŚS is perhaps not less original (cf. ṚV 1.35.1a *hvāyāmy agnīm prathamām svastāye* ‘I call Agni as the first one, for well-being’), though it suits this predominantly Triṣṭubh-hymn worse than the PS reading.

**6.2.8 ab:** ŚS 5.1.8cd ◊ cd: ŚS 5.1.9ab

darśan nu t̄an varuṇa ye ta iṣṭāv	(11)
āvarvṛtataḥ kṛṇavo vapūṃṣi	(11)
ardham ardhena śavasā pṛṇakṣy	(11)
ardhena śuṣmaṃ vardhase * <sub>a</sub> mūra	(11)

They shall now, o Varuṇa, see those [projectiles (*vadhá-*)], which are [yours] in your search; you shall give form to them, [the projectiles] that keep whirling, as your wondrous appearances. You mix half with half your vigor; with half you increase your strength, o intelligent one.

darśan nu] **Or**, darśam nu **K** t̄an varuṇa ye ta] t̄anvaruṇayeta **Ku RM Mā** [**Ma**], t̄anvaruṇajeta **JM**, t̄an(VA....) **V/126**, t̄an{dh}varuṇayeta **Pa**, t̄amvaruṇeca **K** ā varvṛtataḥ] **Ku RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**], ārvṛtataḥ **JM**, āvarvṛtataḥ **Mā**, āvaravrajata | **K** [[note |] vapūṃṣi |] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [**Ma**] **K** [[misprint Edg. °ṃṣi], vapūṣi **Pa** ardhham ardhena] **K**, arddham arddhena **Or** śavasā] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, śava{śā}sā **JM** pṛṇakṣy] **Or**, pṛṇakṣy **K** ardhena] **K**, arddhena **Or** śuṣmaṃ] **K**, śuṣman **Or** vardhase] varddhase **Or**, vardhayase **K** \*<sub>a</sub>mūra] 'mura **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], mura **JM RM K**

**ŚS 5.1.8cd**

darśan nú t̄á varuṇa yás te viṣṭhá āvarvratataḥ kṛṇavo vápūṃṣi ||

**ŚS 5.1.9ab**

ardhám ardhéna páyasā pṛṇakṣy ardhéna śuṣma vardhase amura |

BHATTACHARYA reads *śuṣman* ... 'mura.

**ab.** The reading of the first word of the first pāda is an old problem: our ms. **K** gives exactly that reading (*darśam*), which WEBER (on ŚS 5.1.8), followed by GELDNER (on ṚV 1.25.18), already conjectured for *darśan* of the ŚS mss. (also found in the Or. mss. of PS). WEBER felt that the 3rd plural form “will nicht recht passen”. WHITNEY does not mention WEBER’s conjecture, and just follows the ŚS mss. Since the sense is not clear either way, and since the **K**-reading can also just be a simple error, I tentatively follow the Or. mss./ŚS. Moreover, the 3rd plural does fit, in the sense that the preceding stanza closed with a 3rd plural (*ahvayan*) as well. The ṚV supports both *darśam nu* (1.25.18a) and *darśan nu* (10.27.6a), and *darśan* might of course also stand for *darśat* in sandhi.

One might assume a continued reference to ‘whirling (cf. ṚV 1.125.7a *abhí sám yantu*, 4.6.5c *drávanti*) blazes’ (cf. 3a+d, 4a, 5c), and supply an acc. pl. *śokān* to *tān*. But the context seems to have changed here, and I prefer supplying an acc. pl. of the word *vadhá-* ‘projectile’, on the basis of the parallel ṚV 2.28.7ab *mā no vadháir varuṇa yé ta iṣṭāv énaḥ kṛṇvántam asura bhriṇánti* ‘Don’t [strike] us, o Varuṇa, with your projectiles, which in your search for the transgressor, o Asura, injure [him]’. The Or. mss. prove that WHITNEY’s emendation (already referred to above, comm. to 8c) in ŚS 5.1.8d of *āvarvratataḥ*

to *āvārvṛtataḥ* was correct: the same participle occurs (only) at RV 10.30.10a, where it qualifies the waters (acc. f. pl. *āvārvṛtatīḥ*): I prefer an acc. pl. interpretation here (with *tān*), above WHITNEY’s gen. sg. The participle may be compared with a RV passage which combines the root *vart* with the noun *vadhā*–: 7.104.4a *īndrāsomā vartáyataṃ divó vadhám* ‘Indra and Soma! Hurl your projectile from Heaven!’. The ŚS parallel for our **b** has been deprived of its syntactic embedding by the rephrasing of pāda **a** (*tá varuṇa yás te viṣṭhā*) in that version, and the tentative interpretation by SCHAEFER 1994: 192 n. 582, is thus irrelevant here. On *vāpus*– + *kar*, cf. stanza 2, and ŚS 6.72.1.

**cd.** I can find no convincing interpretation of what is really meant in these two pādas. That we must follow **K**, and read *śuṣmaṃ* (against the Or. mss. followed by BHATTACHARYA, and against the apparent voc. found in the ŚS mss., already emended to *śuṣmam* by WHITNEY) is clear from RV 2.11.4, 3.32.3: *śuṣmaṃ vardh* is a formula.

About the meaning of *śuṣma*–, cf. BLOOMFIELD 1894: 565–574, curiously ignored in RENO’s comments (1955–69/VII: 57f.). BLOOMFIELD convincingly demonstrated that “the entire range of meanings covered by the word is comprised easily within the ideas ‘lightning’ and ‘fire’, in the literal and applied senses of the word (‘vigor, force’)” (p. 574). He adds, “I have failed, for my part, to find anything which forces the interpreter to resort to the etymological antecedents of *śuṣma* in order to understand the immediate sense of the word”.

On Varuṇa’s *śuṣma*–, see BLOOMFIELD 1894: 573, and PS 2.18.4 (= ŚS 6.38.3 etc.), where it has been imprecisely rendered as ‘Andringen’ by ZEHN-DER. It seems obvious to me that the poet plays with a supposed connection between *śávas*– and *śuṣma*–, so these pādas may be added to those passages collected by BLOOMFIELD (p. 573), where “*śuṣma* is so distinctly employed in parallelism with words for ‘strength’ as to leave no room for doubt that this is one of its meanings”.

The reading of the final vocative is a problem as well, because the ms. reading *amura* (also in some ŚS mss.) presents a non-existent word. Interpreters have generally understood the word as an alternate form or misspelling for *ámūra*. It is found here (all mss. unanimously: (*’*)*mura*), at the parallel to our stanza ŚS 5.1.9b (where ŚPP records two old mss. of the more reliable Gujarātī tradition as reading *ámūra*, and where WHITNEY conjectures *asura* on the basis of his misreading of **K**), at PS 8.1.5 (ed. BHATTACHARYA, and all my Or. mss., but not **K**, which reads *asūra*), which is parallel to ŚS 5.11.5 (without variants in ŚPP or W-L). Emending to *ámūra* improves the meter, and even though Varuṇa seems never to be called *ámūra*– elsewhere in Vedic literature, possible links are to be found at RV 6.67.5 and 7.61.5.

We may explain Varuṇa’s being addressed as *ámūra*– here as due to a development in Vedic religion by the time of the AV, Varuṇa taking over such other typical Agni-epithets as *jātávedas* as well (RENOU 1960: 126), and having developed a personality which “tendait à revêtir une aura secrète, propre à décrire une divinité qui, selon les qualifications de l’invocateur, est tour à tour

cachante ou révélanter” (p. 128). Anyhow, as RENOUE noted (see the passage quoted in my introduction to this hymn), it almost appears as if the poet purposefully embroidered images of Agni and Varuṇa (and Indra, see stanzas 6–7 [?]) into one composition.

### 6.2.9 ŚS 5.1.9cdef

avīvr̥dhāma +śagm̥yaṃ sakhāyaṃ	(11)
varuṇaṃ putram aditer iṣiram	(11)
kaviśastān̥y asmai vacāṃs̥y	(10)
avocāma rodasī satyavācau    2	(11)

We have [now] made to grow the potent friend, Varuṇa, the impetuous son of Aditi. For him, we have said poet-spoken words. The two spheres are of reliable speech.

avīvr̥dhāma] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, avīvr̥dhā{na}ma **Ku** +śagmyaṃ] śagmaṃ **Or**, śagnyo **K** sakhāyaṃ] **Or**, sādhyāṃ **K** varuṇaṃ] **K**, vaṇaṃ **Or** putram aditer] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma] **K**, putra{riṣiraṃ} | maditer **Mā** iṣiram || iṣiraṃ | **Or K** [[note °ṃ ||] kaviśastān̥y] **Or**, kaviśasthāny **K** vacāṃsy avocāma] **Or**, vacāṃvocāma **K** rodasī] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma] **K**, rodasī **Pa** || 2 || || ṛ 9 || 2 || **Ku**, || ṛ || (+ || 9 ||) 2 || **JM**, || ṛ || 2 || **RM**, || 2 || ṛ 9 || **V/126**, || 2 || ṛ || **Mā Pa**, Z 2 Z **K**

#### ŚS 5.1.9cdef

áviṃ vr̥dhāma śagm̥yaṃ sakhāyaṃ varuṇaṃ putráṃ ádityā iṣirám |  
kaviśastān̥y asmai vāpūṃsy avocāma rodasī satyavācā ||

BHATTACHARYA reads *śagmaṃ*, which he correctly proposes to emend to *śagmyaṃ*<sup>+</sup>.

**ab.** WHITNEY already corrected the ŚS text to +*ávīvr̥dhāma*, as read in PS, which is obviously the correct reading. Note also the reading *aditer* of PS, which seems superior (cf. RV 7.60.5d and RV 9.96.15c below) to *ádityā* in ŚS.

The ‘Streckform’ *śagmyà-* (see also my comm. to 6.9.9), which must be the underlying form in **K**, and which I thus adopt in the text, can be added to the data collected by KORN (1998): this alternate form for the adjective *śagmá-* is attested here, at RV 3.31.1 (quoted Nir 3.4), and at KauṣB 1.1:1.6 in the ed. of LINDNER, while the SREEKRISHNA SARMA edition (1.1.10) reads *śagma-*. Note the school variation regarding the spelling of the *-(i)ya-* suffix between RV/PS and ŚS (cf. WITZEL 1989: 173–182 and 1990: 46–51 for a wide-ranging discussion of this particular type of variation).

Non-congruent forms of the nouns *śagmá-* and *sákhi-* occur together at RV 8.2.27b. Our stanza harks back to another RV páda as well (7.60.5d), where the three Ādityas Mitra, Aryaman, and Varuṇa are called *śagmāsah putrá áditer ádabdhāh* ‘the potent, uninjurible sons of Aditi’. I also note that the same words *áditer iṣirám* occur in combination at RV 9.96.15c. Our pádas are thus a collage of RV elements.

On the word *iṣirá-*, see DUCHESNE-GUILLEMIN 1937, who emphasizes (p. 337), “Quel que soit le sens donné à *iṣirá-*: “inspiré, ou vigoureux, actif, diligent etc.”, l’important à noter est qu’il se réfère aux dispositions les plus propices à l’accomplissement de l’acte sacré”. See also the extensive article on etymology and semantics of this word by RAMAT 1962 (a reference to this publication is lacking in EWAia).

c. The ŚS reading *vápūṁṣy* is probably secondary, as most occurrences of *kaviśastá-* accompany the word *mántra-* (see e.g. RV 1.152.2b, 6.50.14d, 10.14.4c), which makes our *vacāṁsi* a much more apt formulaic variant.

d. The last two words make a curious impression: they might be taken as a second object of *avocāma* (‘we have spoken words to the two spheres’), or as an acc. *spatīi* (‘all over the two spheres’) but neither possibility can be connected with anything in the preceding stanzas. I hesitantly assume a separate sentence, perhaps a kind of ‘truth act’ (see THOMPSON 1998) strengthening the preceding words.

The combination of *ródasī* with PS *satyavācau* / ŚS *satyavácā* (note the variation with two different dual endings) is interesting in the light of RV 10.12.1 *dyāvā ha kṣámā prathamé ṛténābhiśrāvé bhavataḥ satyavácā*, which GELDNER rendered ‘Himmel und Erde sollen als Erste nach der wahren Ordnung zuhören, sie die ihr Wort halten’; he added the comment “Himmel und Erde haben auch sonst bei der Götteranrufung den Vortritt” (cf., e.g., RV 1.112.1, 2.32.1 etc.).

### 6.3. To the waters.

This is the first hymn which does not conform to the norm of nine stanzas per hymn, which applies in this *kāṇḍa*. The hymn seems to be a more or less unified composition, with the adjective *varuṇaprasūtāḥ* in stanzas 1 and 13 enclosing the rest of the hymn, and there are no obvious secondary accretions, despite the repeated shift in meters: 1–2 (Anuṣṭubh), 3–5 (Triṣṭubh), 6–7 (Anuṣṭubh [?]), 8 (Triṣṭubh), 9 (Anuṣṭubh), 10–13 (Triṣṭubh). The stanzas are mostly unattested elsewhere in Vedic literature.

#### 6.3.1 Only PS

ko vaḥ paścāt prāvichāyat	(8)
kaḥ puraḥ prākhanat pathaḥ	(8)
yad <sub>a</sub> aita tvaramāṇā	(8)
varuṇaprasūtā āpaḥ	(8)

Who prodded you forth from the West, who dug up the paths eastward, when you kept on running, o waters, set in motion by Varuṇa?

vaḥ] Or, vaḥ K prāvichāyat] JM RM [?], prāvitsāyat Ku Ma, prāvisāyat Pa, prāvichchāyat V/126 Mā, prāviśchāyat K kaḥ] Or, kaḥ K puraḥ] Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma], pura Pa, puraḥ K prākhanat] Or, purākhanat K pathaḥ |] Or, pathā [om. |] K yadaita] Or, yadejā K tvaramāṇā] Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], tvātvaramāṇā RM, tuparimāṇā K varuṇaprasūtā] K, varṇaprasūtā Or āpaḥ ||] Or, apaḥ K [om. |, but note °ḥ p°]

a. On *prāvichāyat*, cf. HOFFMANN 1966: 63 = 1975: 456. The combination *pra(-ā)-vich* is a hapax: this could be the earliest attestation of the secondary root *vich* in the mantra language. Even though he mentions this attestation (*loc. cit.*), HOFFMANN does not note that it offers no explicit support for his suggestion of a “Bedeutungsentwicklung”, starting from “‘sich als brutaler Schläger betätigen, brutal schlagen’, wobei dann die mit dieser Handlungsweise verbundene Absicht bei der endgültigen Bedeutung in der Vordergrund tritt: ‘durch brutale Schläge treiben’” (p. 71 = 464). The verb is regularly connected with the driving of cattle: AB 1.8.5 equates cattle with the waters.

b. The verbal compound *pra-khan* appears to be attested in Vedic only here, and at PS 9.11.11 *yo mayāḥ saraghāyāḥ prakhāya madhv ābharat | tato yavaḥ +prājāyata so bhavad viśadūṣaṇaḥ* ‘He who, having first dug up the honey, brought here the bee’s refreshment — from that, barley grew forth; it became the destroyer of poison’ (cf. also 9.8.5 ed. BHATTACHARYA *prakhāyā*, corrupt for +*prakhāya*). The reading *prakhān* at KS 37.15:95.19 is to be viewed with much skepticism, in light of the more fitting aor. inj. *praghān* found in the parallel ĀpŚŚ 6.21.1.

The use of the root *khan* is not surprising, because a frequent adjective used for the waters is *khanītrimā* (RV)/*khanītrīmā-* (ŚŚ), on which, see RENOU

(1933: 18–19): cf. RV 7.49.2, PS 2.67.4, 8.2.8 (ŚS 5.13.9 — wrongly interpreted by ZEHNDER 1999: 154 following BLOOMFIELD 1897: 28), 8.8.8 (ŚS 19.2.2, cf. ŚS 1.6.4). They are called *anabhráyaḥ khánamānāḥ* at SS 19.2.3 (PS 8.8.9). Cf. finally TS 7.4.13.1 *khányābhyāḥ svāhā* ‘Hail to the [waters] to be got up by digging’.

c. The verb *tvar* ‘to be in a hurry’ (see GOTĀ 1987: 169) is attested from the AV onward. In ŚS, it does not occur with certainty,<sup>6</sup> but it does occur at PS 9.23.10, and twice in KS, namely at 6.6:55.8 (*twareta*), and at 28.1:153.12 (where it is used in the same formulaic combination with *āpaḥ* as here, in a simile *āpas tvaramāṇā na . . .*).

d. The compound *varuṇaprasūta-* occurs also in stanza 13 below, but further only in the *kalpaja* mantra quoted in *sakalapāṭha* at KauśS 3.3: *indrāpraśiṣṭā varuṇaprasūtā āpaḥ samudrād divam ud vahantu | indrapraśiṣṭā varuṇaprasūtā divas pṛthivyā śriyam ud vahantu* ‘Under the direction of Indra, set in motion by Varuṇa, let them move the waters up to heaven from the ocean. Under the direction of Indra, set in motion by Varuṇa, let them move up the lustre of (?) heaven from the earth’. The same idea is found at ŚS 3.13.2 (PS 3.4.2, TS 5.6.1.2) *préṣitā váruṇena*, and PS 2.40.1 *rājñā varuṇena prasūtāḥ*. On Varuṇa’s connection with the waters, see LÜDERS 1951: 46–54 and in particular BRERETON 1981: 102–126; on the present stanza, also RENO 1946: 124 n. 7.

These passages suggest that to see Varuṇa as connected only with stagnant waters, or as connected with moving waters (rain) only when mentioned conjointly with Mitra (KUIPER 1960: 249 = 1983: 183, LÜDERS 1951: 47, KUIPER 1979: 27 (n. 82), and p. 85), is to neglect a certainly present (Atharva-)Vedic concept of Varuṇa setting these waters in motion, which probably refers to Varuṇa bringing rain (thus also ZEHNDER 1999: 107). It is possible that this concept developed only slightly later in the history of Vedic religion. Cf. in this connection also the material collected by BRERETON 1981: 116 & 142ff.

### 6.3.2 Only PS

prajāpatir asṛjata	(8)
sa puraḥ prākhanat pathaḥ	(8)
sa u no anv avāsrjat	(8)
tena sṛṣṭāḥ kṣarāmasi	(8)

Prajāpati released [us]. He dug up the paths eastward, and he released us down along [these paths]. Released by him, we are flowing.

puraḥ] **Or**, puraḥ **K** prākhanat pathaḥ |] **Or**, purā **K** [[note omission] sa u] **Or**, so **K** anv avāsrjat tena] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], anvavāsrjantena **Pa**, anvavāsrjattena **K** sṛṣṭāḥ] **Ku JM RM Pa** [**Ma**], sṛṣṭā **V/126 Mā K**

<sup>6</sup> If we follow GOTĀ 1987: 169–170 n. 279, ŚS 12.3.31 / PS 17.39.1 *tvaráyāhara* is to be understood as *tvaráyā ā-hara*: “*tvaráyā* ist wohl Instr. von *tvará-*, ‘Eile’”; JAMISON 1983a: 59, on the other hand, analyses *tvaráya ā-hara*, with *tvaráya* as a verb form.

The waters here answer (in the first person pl.) the question put to them in stanza 1.

a. On middle forms of *sarj*, see GONDA 1979a: 25. On Prajāpati and creation, see GONDA <sup>2</sup>1978: 180ff., and cf. TS 1.5.9.7 *prajāpatiḥ paśūn asṛjata té sṛṣṭā ahorātré prāviśan* ‘Prajāpati released (created) the cattle. Released, they entered into Day and Night’.

c. Compound forms of *sarj* are often active (cf. DELBRÜCK 1888: 255), and forms of *anv-ava-sarj* are always so: MS 1.6.6:96.13–18, TS 6.5.6.5 (= 6.5.7.1, 6.5.8.5 [2×]), MS 4.6.7:89.16–17, AB 2.6.13 (ĀśvŚS 3.3.1, ŚāṅkhŚS 5.17.3, TB 3.6.6.1–2, MS 4.13.4:203.10–11, KS 16.21:244.12), JB 1.283 = JUB 1.18.2, VādhGS (Pitṛmedha-section, pers. comm. Yasuke Ikari). In all attestations, the preverb *anu* seems to have an explicit meaning ‘along, after’ with an often explicit accusative. I therefore supply ‘these paths’ from the preceding pāda.

d. In accordance with AiGr. I, §286d we might consider the possibility that **K** (with the Or. mss. **V/126** and **Mā**) has preserved an older sandhi with its reading *sṛṣṭā kṣarāmāsi*, but it seems unlikely that the Or. mss. would have secondarily introduced the visarga. A similar situation is found at 6.3.5cd: *-h kṣ-* → *-kṣ-* must simply be a **K** error.

### 6.3.3 Only PS

punānā āpo bahudhā <sup>+</sup> sṛavanti-	(11)
-imāṃś ca lokān pradiśāś ca sarvāḥ	(11)
punant <sub>v</sub> asmān duritād avadyān	(11)
muñcantu mṛtyor nirṛter upasthāt	(11)

The waters, becoming clear, are streaming in many directions, throughout these realms and throughout all the quarters of space. Let them clear us from misfortune, from disgrace; let them release us from death, from the lap of Nirṛti.

punānā āpo] **Or**, punānāsau **K** <sup>+</sup>sṛavantīmāṃś] śṛavantīmāṃś **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, śṛavantīmāṃś **RM**, kṣiyantīsāṃś **K** lokān] **Or**, lokāṃ **K** sarvāḥ |] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, savāḥ | **JM**, sarvā | **K** punantv asmān duritād] **Or**, purantasmāduritād **K** avadyān] **Or**, avidyā **K** nirṛter upasthāt ||] nirṛterpasthāt || **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, niṛtorpasthāt || **JM**, niṛterudasthāḥ || *om.* || **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *śṛavantīmāṃś*.

a. The formula *āpaḥ + sṛav* is quite frequent, cf. i.a. ṚV 6.20.12, 7.49.2, ṚVKh 2.6.12, PS 9.11.5, 18.11.5: the reading *kṣiyanti* in **K**, although hard to explain, is thus entirely unlikely, while the reading of the Or. mss. needs to be emended only cosmetically. On *āpaḥ* in combination with the root *pav<sup>ḥ</sup>*, see i.a. PS 9.3.1, 9.25.3, and KS 23.1:73.20. See also 6.3.10a below.

It appears from ŚS 5.20.9, 12.1.4 (PS 9.27.9, 17.1.3), PS 16.102.2 that the ṚV alternation *-dhā :: -dha* (cf. *purudhā/-dhā*, *viśvādhā/-dha*, and AiGr. III, p. 429) before two consonants does not continue in the AV.

b. On the meanings of *loka-*, *ayaṃ loka-* etc., cf. GONDA 1966, where however the very frequent phrase *ime lokāḥ* is somewhat neglected.

**6.3.4** PS 19.43.6 / ŚS 6.51.2  $\diamond \approx$  RV 10.17.10 = VSM 4.2, VSK 4.1.2–3  $\diamond$   
MS 1.2.1:10.1, KS 2.1:8.10, KapKS 1.13:10.6 [2:11.14], TS 1.2.1.1

āpo asmān mātaraḥ sūdayantu	(11)
ghṛtena no ghṛtapavaḥ punantu	(11)
viśvaṃ hi ripraṃ pravahanti devīr	(11)
ud id ābhyaḥ śucir ā pūta emi	(11)

Let the waters, mothers, sweeten us. Clear like ghee, let them make us clear with [their] ghee. The goddesses indeed carry forth every defilement, so I rise from them pure and clear.

āpo asmān] **Or**, āpo asmān (+ aposmā + ·) **K** mātaraḥ] **Or**, mātaraḥ **K** ghṛtapavaḥ] ghṛtapavaḥ **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, ghṛta{PA}pavaḥ **JM**, ghṛtapivaḥ **RM**, ghṛtapavaḥ **K** pravahanti] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, pravah{i}anti **RM**, pravahantu **K** devīr ud] **K**, devīrd **Or** ābhyaḥ] **Or**, ābhyaś **K** pūta emi] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, pūtayemi **RM K**

**RV 10.17.10 = VSM 4.2, VSK 4.1.2–3**

āpo asmān mātaraḥ śundhayantu ghṛténa mā ghṛtapvaḥ punantu |  
viśvaṃ hí riprám praváhanti devír úd id ābhyaḥ śúcir ā pūtá emi ||

**MS 1.2.1, KS 2.1, KapKS 1.13**

āpo mā [KS, KapKS: asmān] mātaraḥ sūdayantu ghṛténa mā ghṛtapvaḥ punantu |  
viśvaṃ hí [MITTWEDE 1989: 41] riprám praváhantu [KapKS — KS: °vahanti] devír . . . ||

**TS 1.2.1.1**

āpo asmān mātaraḥ śundhantu ghṛténa no ghṛtapúvaḥ punantu |  
viśvam asmát prá vahantu riprám úd ābhyaḥ śúcir ā pūtá emi

BHATTACHARYA edits *ghṛtapavaḥ* and his text contains the misprint *puta* (see BHATTACHARYA n.d.-2). For a complete listing of parallels, reference must be made to BLOOMFIELD 1906. I have listed only the parallels from Saṃhitā texts.

a. RV and VS have the apparently more original *śundhayantu* for the slightly awkward *sūdayantu* in all the other Saṃhitās (except unmetrical *śundhantu* in TS). Note the concatenating link with *sūdayiṣṇavo* in the following stanza — a link which is not available in any of the other non-RV parallels. On the meaning of *sūdaya-*<sup>ti</sup>, see RENO 1955–69/IV: 119, who remarks on RV 10.64.9 *sūdayitnū-* (cf. my comm. on 6.3.5a): ““qui rend bien portant” G[e]ld[ner], cf. *sūdaya* “rends (l’oblation) savoureuse” [RV] 7.16,9, qui marquerait un lien avec *svad-* (*svādri*). Mais ailleurs, parachever, mettre en pleine forme, faire de quelqu’un un surhomme. La fréquence relative de régime *haviṣ* (ou analogue) incite à penser que l’étymologie par *svad-* suffit partout”. Cf. below, on PS stanzas 5, 7, 9, 12, and cf. also PS 11.16.3.

b. Note the probably common PS reading *-puvāḥ* (Or. mss. *-pavaḥ* ← *-puvāḥ*), parallel to TS (contrast ŚS *-pvāḥ*). But cf. AiGr. I, p. 200: “... während *-pū-* ‘reinigend’ [etc.] ... stets *-pv-* ... haben”. WITZEL’s statement that the “writing *Cuv-* ... is not attested to anywhere but in Taitt[īriya] texts” (1989: 177, with n. 203) is to be qualified in the light of this case (see already Ved. Var. II, p. 352; elaborate materials are collected in §§766–798).

Slightly similar concepts occur at RV 5.12.1 and 4.58.10. ŚBK 4.1.2.7 (with a better text than ŚBM 3.1.2.11) comments on the VS version of the pāda: *ghṛtēna no ghṛtapvāḥ punantv itī tād vāi sūpūtam yād ghṛtēna pūyāte*. I follow GELDNER’s interpretation ‘die (wie) Schmalz geläuterten’, because the reason the waters can purify is precisely that they are already pure themselves.

c. Note the reading *vahantu* of **K**: it agrees with MS, against RV and the local Kashmir text KS, whose text again is to be contrasted with that of its closest sister-school, KapKS. In view of the support the Or. reading finds in RV and ŚS, and in view of the frequent confusion of *-i* and *-u* endings in **K** (e.g., 6.10.4, 6.12.2b, 6.17.11c, 6.21.5c, 6.22.6c–7c, 6.22.8d, 6.23.7b (?), 6.23.11c), I adopt the indicative. Cf. the *ariprāḥ* rivers at 6.1.9c; cf. also stanzas 10 and 13 in this hymn.

d. For *śuci-*, cf. 6.3.7b, below, and GONDA 1979b.

### 6.3.5 ab: ≈ RV 10.64.9c ◊ cd: ≈ RV 6.52.15cd

āpo devīr mātarāḥ sūdayiṣṇavo	(12)
ghṛtaścuto madhunā saṃ *paṛcchre	(11)
tā asmabhyaṃ sūrayo viśvam āyuh	(11)
ksapa usrā varivasyantu śubhrāḥ	(11)

The waters, heavenly mothers, which sweeten [Soma], dripping with ghee, are mixed with the honey. These bright patronesses must open up (?) for us a full life-span [to be enjoyed] during nights and dawns.

devī] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, devī **JM mātarāḥ] Or**, mātaras **K sūdayiṣṇavo] Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, sūdayiṣṇivo **RM ghṛtaścuto] K**, ghṛtacyuto **Or \*paṛcchre ||] paṛcchre | Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, paṛcchre | **V/126**, paṛcchre | **K [Edg. om. ||] asmabhyaṃ] Or**, asmābhyaṃ **K sūrayo] Or**, sūdayo **K viśvam] Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, viśvam **Pa āyuh] Or**, āyu **K varivasyantu] K**, varivaḥsantu **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa Ma**, varidu(→ va 1)ḥsantu **RM śubhrāḥ] Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, subhrāḥ **Mā ||] Or**, om. **K [Edg. mistakenly prints a ||]**

#### RV 10.64.9cd

devīr āpo mātarāḥ sūdayitnvō ghṛtāvat páyo mádhuman no arcata ||

#### RV 6.52.15cd

té asmābhyam iṣāye viśvam āyuh ksāpa usrā varivasyantu devāḥ ||

BHATTACHARYA reads *ghṛtacyuto ... paṛcchre*.

**ab.** Note the concatenation with the preceding stanza of the hapax *sūdayiṣṇu-*, which may be compared with *sūdayitnū-* (on which see RENO, quoted under 4a), also a hapax, in the close parallel ṚV 10.64.9, and with AiGr. II/2, §767bβ. The mss. (almost) unanimously transmit *sūdayiṣṇavo*, and this may be seen as formed to a (f.) short *-u-* stem; see AiGr. II/2, §767d.

The Or. reading *ghṛtacyuto* (adopted by BHATTACHARYA) is perhaps based on a graphic mistake at the \*B level (but cf. already WHITNEY 1885: 49 on *cyut-*, “a blundering *varia lectio* for *scut-*”). About this variant, cf. also ZEHNDER’s note (1999: 141) on PS 2.61.4. The waters are called *ghṛtaścūt-* quite frequently in the AV Saṁhitās, i.a. PS 1.25.4 (ŚS 1.33.4), 14.1.5, 16.71.3, 16.138.8 (ŚS 10.9.27). Cf. also ṚV 3.1.8c *ścótanti dhārā mádhuno ghṛtásya* ‘the streams of honey, of ghee are dripping’.

The emendation *\*papṛcre* is suggested (but not adopted) by BHATTACHARYA. The form is not attested in the mantra language as such, but is implied by ṚV *papṛcāná-* (1.141.6, 9.74.9). Cf. in addition ṚV 8.4.8c *mádhvā sámprktāḥ*; also ṚV 1.109.4, 2.37.5, 3.54.21, 9.97.11, and PS 6.3.10d below. The waters here (as in 7) seem to be the water mixed in with Soma (*madhu-*), to prepare it for consumption.

**c.** On Soma’s capacity to make the drinkers attain a full life-span, see OBERLIES 1999: 39. The combination *sūráyaḥ + víśvam áyuh* is formulaic, cf. ṚV 1.73.5, 7.90.6. This fact may explain our curious form *sūrayaḥ*, which has to be a feminine plural, and which we may regard as simply copied from its normal masculine context. On other m./f. anomalies, involving *sūrī-*, see EWAia II, 741, AiGr. II/2, 371 and AiGr. III, §94c pp. 183f. (“NPl. *-ayaḥ* an Stelle von *-īḥ -yaḥ*”) and §94d. Cf. also f. *sūrīḥ* at ŚS 13.1.22 = PS 18.17.2. On the meaning of the word, cf. THIEME (1938: 159 = 1995b: 165): “*sūrī* heißt ‘Geschenkereicher’, ‘Herr’, und benennt insbesondere den Schutzherren des Dichters”.

**d.** The collocation *kṣápa usrá* occurs (besides the already quoted parallel ṚV 6.52.15d, to the All-Gods) only in a slightly varied form at ṚV 7.15.8a (*kṣápa usrás ca dīdīhi*, to Agni). The connection between waters and dawn is made also at ṚV 5.53.14cd *vṛṣṭví sám yór ápa usrí bheṣajám syáma marutaḥ sahá* ‘In raining, let the Waters be pleasant and wholesome, a medicine, at dawn. Let us be present [then], o Maruts’.

Note the evident corruption *varivaḥsantu* in the Or. mss. BHATTACHARYA rightly adopts the **K** reading. The word *várivās-* never occurs in combination with the verb *as*.

### 6.3.6 Only PS

udakasyodakatamā	(8)
revattamā revatīnām	(8)
*śundhantām āpaḥ	(5)
śundhant <sub>u</sub> v asmān	(5)

Most watery of water, most opulent of the opulent ones, let the Waters cleanse themselves, let them cleanse us.

udakasyodakatamā] **Or**, udakaṃsyodakatvamā **K** revattamā] **Or**, revatvamā **K** revatīnām |] revatīnām | **Or**, revatīnām [|*om.*] **K** \*śundhantām] śundhantvām **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], śundhamtvām **Ku**, śundhotvām **K** āpaḥ] **Or**, āpaś **K** śundhantv] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], śundhamtv **Ku K** [|Edg. mistakenly prints °ntv] asmān [|] **Or**, asmān, **K** [|*om.*] |, but note virāma]

BHATTACHARYA edits *śundhantvā māpaḥ*. The metrical scheme 8–8–5–5 seems not to occur elsewhere in Vedic texts.

**b.** The waters (or rivers) are called *revatī-* at RV 10.30.8 & 12, 10.180.1.

**c.** The emendation \**śundhantām* is suggested (but not adopted) by BHATTACHARYA. The form in question is not attested in the RV, but is attested elsewhere in mantra texts at MS 1.2.11:20.14 (= VSM 5.26 etc.; see BLOOMFIELD 1906: this YV mantra has a variant *śumbhantām* at ŚS 18.4.67).

### 6.3.7 Only PS

yūyam āpo vīraśriyo	(8)
yūyaṃ sūdayathā śucīn	(8)
yuṣmākam id diśo mahīr	(8)
īyante pradiśaḥ pṛthak	(8)

You, o waters, make [our] heroic sons perfect; you sweeten the clear [Soma juices (?)]. Yours, indeed, are the cardinal directions. They [the waters (?)] are speeding in separate ways, throughout the quarters of space.

yūyam] **RM V/126 Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, yūyam **Ku Pa**, yūm **JM** vīraśriyo] **Or**, vīraśriyor **K** sūdayathā] **Or**, sudayathā **K** śucīn |] **Or**, śuciṃ [|*om.*] **K** yuṣmākam] **Ku RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**], yuṣmākam **JM**, yuṣmāka{s}→ m **Mā**, yaḥkumākam **K** mahīr īyante] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], mahīriyante **JM RM**, mahiryante **K** pradiśaḥ] **Or**, pradiśaḥ **K** pṛthak [|] **Or**, pṛthak **K** [|*om.*] |, but note virāma]

The syntactic construction of this stanza is not self-evident, since it is not clear what exactly is meant, and this lack of clarity is strengthened by morphological ambiguity. My translation is just one of the possibilities.

**ab.** Note the metrical lengthening in *sūdayathā*. The adjective *vīraśrī-* is a Vedic hapax, and *vīraśrīyaḥ* is formally ambiguous: either an acc. or a nom., either a bahuvrīhi (‘having/giving the glory of heroic sons’) or, as I prefer to assume, a determinative compound, with *-śrī-* from *śrayī* (cf. EWAia II, 665f., and SCARLATA 1999: 545–554, esp. 553f.). It could be taken as an acc. together with *śucīn*, to which I supply ‘Soma juices’: this seems to refer to the pure, unmixed Soma juice (OBERLIES 1999: 155 n. 129). Cf. RV 1.30.2 and especially 7.90.1: *prā vīrayā śúcayo dadrire vām adhvaryúbhir mádhumantaḥ sutāsaḥ* ‘the pressed (juices), clear, honeyed, have been offered to you two by the Adhvaryus, with the desire for (?) heroic sons’. But a *double entendre* seems to be intended:

on the basis of pādas 4a and 4d one might also supply ‘us’, which would go well with *vīraśriyaḥ* (‘possessing the luster of heroic sons’) too. From ṚV 9.64.4 it is again clear that the pressing of Soma juice was expected to yield results, in the form of heroic manly offspring (cf. also OBERLIES 1999: 123). I tentatively assume a determinative compound, nom. f. pl., however, because this makes for semantic parallelism with *sūdayathā*, and allows to translate one pāda at a time, as in the next stanza.

cd. For the syntax — that of a nominal sentence — which I assume in pāda c, compare ŚS 11.2.10ab (≈ PS 16.104.10ab) *tāva cātasraḥ pradīśas tāva dyāus tāva pṛthivī tāvedām ugrórv àntárikṣam* ‘Yours are the four directions, yours is heaven, yours the earth, yours, o forceful one, is this broad intermediate space’. The standing phrase *dīśo mahīḥ* occurs i.a. ŚS 4.8.4 (PS 4.2.5), 8.8.5 (PS 16.29.5), VSM 21.16 = TB 2.6.18.2, TB 2.7.15.4. Alternatively, we might follow such passages as ṚV 8.3.10, 8.6.16, 8.12.3, 9.7.2, 10.64.8, 10.104.9, which have *apó mahīḥ* (vel sim.), and take our *mahār* [scil. *apaḥ*] as a vocative.

The form *pradīśaḥ* was an acc. *spatii* (or an acc. of direction) in stanza 3, most probably not a nominative. I take *īyante . . . pṛthak* as parallel to *bahudhā sravanti* (also stanza 3). I tentatively accept the shift of subject which must be assumed in this stanza to allow for the translation I offer. An alternative would be to supply ‘[the Soma juices]’ as in the first hemistich.

### 6.3.8 Only PS

yūyaṃ mitrasya varuṇasya yonir	(11)
yūyaṃ somasya dhenavo madhiṣṭhāḥ	(11)
yuṣmān devīr deva ā +kṣiyatīndur	(11)
yūyaṃ jinvata brahmakṣatram āpaḥ	(11)

You are the womb of Mitra and Varuṇa, you are the sweetest cows of Soma. In you, o goddesses, dwells the heavenly drop. You, o waters, must quicken the priests and the rulers.

yūyaṃ] **Ku JM RM V/126 [Ma] K**, yuyam **Mā**, yūya **Pa** mitrasya] **Or**, mittrasya **K** varuṇasya] **K**, varuṇasya **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, varuṇya **Mā** yūyaṃ] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, ⟨·⟩ **V/126**, yayaṃ **K** somasya] **Or**, somasye **K** dhenavo] **Or**, dhenavā **K** madhiṣṭhāḥ ||] **K** [*om.* ||], madhuṣṭha |] **Or** yuṣmān] **Or**, yakṣmām **K** devīr] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, devī **Mā** deva ā] **Or**, devā **K** +kṣiyatīndur] kṣiyatīndur **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, kṣiyatindu **RM**, kṣiyatīryamrurī **K** yūyaṃ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, yuyam **JM** brahmakṣatram āpaḥ ||] **Or**, vrahmakṣatrāpaḥ [*om.* ||] **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *madhuṣṭha*, *kṣiyatīndur*.

a. Cf. ṚV 1.151.4, 3.62.18, 5.67.2, and the material collected by BRERETON (1981: 104–109), who emphasizes that “Mitra and Varuṇa control the waters because they send the rains” (p. 109).

b. On the synecdochic use of words denoting ‘milk cows’ for milk, see OBERLIES 1999: 74 (n. 344).

BHATTACHARYA suggests but does not adopt the emendation *madiṣṭhāḥ*. Indeed, this adjective is attested at RV 4.17.6 (of *máda-*), 6.47.2 (of *sóma-*), 9.1.1 (of a stream, *dhárā-*, of Soma), and 9.6.9 (of Soma), but rapidly disappeared from active Vedic usage, as appears from the fact that there is only one authentic post-RV attestation, at ŚS 4.24.3, where it qualifies *adhvará-*. The link with Soma is clearly present in most of these passages (and this fact may be compared with *somasya dhenavaḥ* in our stanza), but there is no place where *madiṣṭha-* is directly connected with the word *dhenú-*.

It is evident that the Or. reading is unacceptable, but should we follow BHATTACHARYA in introducing through emendation an admittedly suitable but moribund RV word? It seems more attractive to me to take the reading of **K** seriously (and the Or. reading may then be seen as a ‘learned correction’, with a dropping of the final *-āḥ*, perhaps due to a scribal oversight). It can be explained as an ‘Augenblicksbildung’, a superlative to the secondarily formed oxytone adjective *madhú-* (*madhúḥ* ŚS 7.56.2; see SOMMER 1916: 168 — the ŚS form is not confirmed by **K** and the Or. mss. for the parallel PS 20.14.8 [PSK 20.13.8], which all read *madhu*). This interpretation (*mádhū-* + *dhenú-*) finds support in RV 8.4.8c *mádhvā sámpṛktāḥ sāraghéṇa dhenávaḥ* ‘mixed with bees’ honey are the cows’. The formation, a hapax, is more or less analogous to the numerous other cases of “Wörter auf *-(i)yas-* *-iṣṭha-* . . . , die ein aus derselben Wurzel gebildetes Adjektiv neben sich haben und die Steigerung des durch das Adjektiv im Positiv gegebenen Eigenschaftsbegriff ausdrücken” (AiGr. II/2, 449). The first group of this category which DEBRUNNER describes (§273bα) are those superlatives which are built to an adjective in *-u-*. It must be noted, however, that these *-u-* adjectives build their feminine forms in *-vī-* (see SOMMER 1916: 166). The formal support provided by adj. *madhúḥ* (ŚS 7.56.2) for adjectival *madhú-*, underlying the ‘Augenblicksbildung’ that I assume, is thus quite weak, but the form *madhiṣṭha-* has such an obvious semantic and formal model in *svádiṣṭha-* :: *svādú-*, that I have persuaded myself to adopt it from **K**. BHATTACHARYA’s emendation remains a serious, and grammatically much less problematic, alternative.

c. The pāda refers to the Moon as ‘heavenly drop’: on this use of the word *indu-*, cf. PW I, 801; on the waters as dwelling of the moon, BODEWITZ 2000: 41f. The Or. reading *kṣayatīndur*, as adopted by BHATTACHARYA, has to be emended in the light of the reading in **K**, and in view of the parallel ŚS 10.5.45ab (PS 16.132.7) *yát te ánnaṃ bhuvā pata ākṣiyáti pṛthivīm ánu* ‘what food of thine, O Lord of earth, dwells upon the earth’ (WHITNEY). Cf. also WERBA 1997: 172. To improve the cadence, we might consider editing *kṣīya°* (which would find support in **K**), but the evidence for a school variation *kṣīya°* as opposed to *kṣīya-ti* is restricted to a few attestations in Taittirīya texts, e.g. TB 3.7.9.9, TĀ 1.14.2, 2.15.4 (see Ved. Var. II, §536). Furthermore, it is easier to explain the Or. reading if we assume omission of an underlying short *-i* sign (an error included in LUBOTSKY’s list, 2002: 10), than if we assume that a long *-ī* sign has been dropped; the long *ī* in **K** may be explained as a auditory

error based on underlying *kṣi*. Note the comparable situation at PS 5.38.5c, where the Or. mss. have *ā kṣayati*, **K** *ā kṣīti*, and the ṚV parallel 10.136.5 *ā kṣeti*, which is the metrically required reading there: LUBOTSKY 2002 edits *ā kṣayati*, while I would emend *ā<sup>+</sup>kṣiyati* (cf. 5.6.4 *ā kṣiyanti*) or — because the underlying text of that pāda must anyhow have had *kṣeti* with ṚV 10.136.5 — simply *ā<sup>+</sup>kṣeti*.

**d.** This may be the oldest attestation of the rather rare dvandva compound *brahmakṣatra-*, which occurs elsewhere in Vedic literature only from the Brāhmaṇa period onwards. The compound is not discussed in RAU 1957. I tentatively assume that reference is made to the priests and rulers who may partake of Soma (mixed with water). Cf. ŚS 10.6.34 (PS 16.44.10): *yásmai tvā yajñavardhana máṇe pratyámucaṃ śívám | táṃ tvám śatadakṣiṇa máṇe śraīṣṭhyāya jinvatāt* ‘On whom, O sacrifice-increasing amulet, I have fastened thee, propitious, him do thou quicken unto supremacy, O amulet of a hundred sacrificial gifts’ (WHITNEY). For the use of *śréṣṭha-* as one of the “Bezeichnungen für den Regenten”, and of *śraīṣṭhya-* as a term used “für seine Stellung”, see RAU 1957: 71–72. RAU (p. 72) mentions *kṣatra-* in the same list of ‘Bezeichnungen’ for the ‘Stellung’ of the ‘regents’-class as *śraīṣṭhya-*.

On the other hand, cf. the ṚV material (1.157.2, 7.104.6, 8.22.7, 8.35.16–18, 10.66.12) collected and discussed by PIRART (1995: 429–433). All these passages contain, i.a., the syntagma *bráhman- + jinv*: PIRART concludes (p. 432) that “*bráhma* est, dans le syntagme que *JINV* forme avec lui, une désignation de paroles sacrées”. The term *kṣatrá-* occurs in one syntagma with *jinv* not only at ṚV 8.35.17 (discussed by PIRART), but besides our present PS passage also (i.a.) at PS 14.2.2, MS 2.7.7:84.8–9 (= 3.1.9:13.2), KS 39.5:123.7 (= ĀpŚS 16.30.1), and TB 1.1.1.1. PIRART (p. 432) interprets it as “une certaine emprise magique” with which the performer of the ritual holds sway over “les divinités mâles (*nṛ-*)”.

Finally, I may quote another example of *bráhman-/kṣatrá- + jinv*, found at TB 1.1.1.1: *bráhma sámḍhattaṃ tán me jinvatam | kṣatrám sámḍhattaṃ tán me jinvatam | íṣám sámḍhattaṃ táṃ me jinvatam | úrjam sámḍhattaṃ táṃ me jinvatam ...*. In view of the ritual terms *íṣ-* (see GONDA 1989b) and *úrj-* (see MINKOWSKI 1989: 10–13) with which *bráhman-* and *kṣatrá-* are paralleled here, I am tempted to reject CALAND’s rendering at ĀpŚS 12.22.6 (“Vereinigt, ihr beiden, den Priesterstand; den sollt ihr mir fördern. Vereinigt den Baronenstand; den sollt ihr mir fördern. ... Lebenskraft ... Nahrung ...”), and to follow PIRART here, but I see no real way to decide which rendering is to be preferred in our present pādas.

### 6.3.9 Only PS

śásvad ābhiḥ śásādānāḥ	(8)
†śamanānvayāmasi†	( )
āpo viśvasya sūdanīr	(8)
yā devā manave dadhuḥ	(8)

Always being confident with them, we . . . the waters, which sweeten everything, [the waters] which the gods have bestowed on man.

śaśvad] [Ma?] **K**, saśvad **Ku RM V/126**, sasvad **JM Mā**, saśvad **Pa ābhiḥ] Or**, ābhiś **K śāśadānāḥ] sāsadānāḥ **Ku JM Pa Ma**, sāsadānāḥ **RM V/126**, {·}śāśadānāḥ **Mā**, śāśadānā **K †śamanānvayāmasi† ] śamanānvayāmasi | **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, sa(sec. m. → śa)manānvayāmasi | **Ku, śamanāṃnayāmasi | **K dadhuḥ] K, daduḥ **Or**********

BHATTACHARYA edits *śamanānvayāmasi*, without underlining, and *daduḥ*.

**a.** Cf. PS 19.3.2a <sup>+</sup>*śaśvantam ic* <sup>+</sup>*chāśadānam*, 19.3.3a *yad etad bhūri* <sup>+</sup>*śāśadat*, and my discussion under 6.1.5.

**b.** I am at a loss to solve the problems posed by this pāda. I have considered reading *samanānvayāmasi*, but thematic forms from *ay* are attested only very late (GOTŌ 1990: 1000) and a subj. with primary ending would be unparalleled (MACDONELL 1910: 316). The word *samanā*, moreover, basically does not occur anymore after the ṚV (except at MS 2.13.10:161.3, and the dubious place PS 1.110.1 = ŚS 19.58.1).

The word *śamana-* (thus the mss., which are followed by BHATTACHARYA) is attested in the mantra language only at PS 9.7.(11–)12, also in a water context: *ni muñjeṣu yad udakaṃ ni naḍeṣu yad antaram | yat samudre yat sindhau tenāgnim śamayāmasi || vetasasyāvakāyā naḍasya viraṇasya ca | rohitakasya vrkṣasyāgnim śamanam ud bhare* ‘We quench the fire with the water that is in *muñja*-grass, in *naḍa*-reeds, that is in the ocean, in the river. I take to the fire the quenching of the *vetasa*-ratan, of the *avakā*-plant, of the *naḍa*-reed, and of the *viraṇa*-grass, of the red tree’. Severe emendations such as *śamanāny ā nayāmasi* ‘we are bringing [the waters] as quenchings’, *śamanā ā nayāmasi* ‘we, quenching, are bringing [the waters]’, and *śamanā-ā nayāmasi* ‘we are bringing [the waters] as quenchings’ also seem unsatisfactory. More attractive, but still uncertain, are the emendations *śamanānu yāmasi* / *śamanāny anu yāmasi* ‘we drive after the quenchings’ proposed to me by Chlodwig Werba, or rather *śamanā anu yāmasi* ‘we drive after the quenching [waters]’ (cf. *vyante* in 7d).

**c.** Assuming that pāda **b** anyhow contains a (transitive) 1st pl. verb form, I take *āpaḥ* as an irregular acc. (see AiGr. III, §131a p. 240). Depending on the final solution for the textual problems of the preceding pāda, this one may of course also turn out to be a nominal sentence, in which case *āpaḥ* would be a regular nominative.

This pāda presents us with only the second attestation of a form from the adjective *sūdana-* ‘sweetening (someone/something: gen.)’ after ṚV 4.39.5 (on which see RENO 1955–69/IV: 119: “L’hapax *sūdana* 4.39,5 doit s’expliquer en fonction de *sūday*”). It is not to be confused with classical Sanskrit *sūdana-* ‘destroying’ (AiGr. II/2, p. 198). Further attestations, only as second members of the compounds *ghṛtāsūdana-* and *havyāsūdana-* (note the different accentuation), occur in mantra-texts at PS 20.16.6 [PSK 20.15.6] = KS 35.4:53.13+15 ≈

KapKS 48.5:299.8+10 [247.5:351.14+15] and MS 1.2.12:21.14 = KS 2.13:17.16 (= PB 1.4.3) ≈ VSM 5.32 = VSK 5.8.4.

**d.** BHATTACHARYA follows the Or. mss., and edits *daduḥ*. It is a striking fact, however, that out of the 37+2+5 passages in ṚV, PS and ŚS which contain the dat. *mānave*, as well as out of the few additional passages (as listed in VWC Saṁhitās & Brāhmaṇas sections) from the other Vedic mantra texts, there is not a single passage which combines *mānave* with a form of the verb *dā*. On the other hand, there are two comparable ṚV attestations of *mānave* + *dhā*: ṚV 1.36.10ab (*yám tvā deváso mānave dadhúr ihá yájiṣṭham havyvāhana*) and 8.27.21cd (*vāmám dhatthá mānave viśvavedaso júhvānāya prácetase*). I therefore adopt the reading of **K**.

### 6.3.10 Only PS

yad dhāvanti punate tad āpo	(10)
yat tiṣṭhanti súddhā it tad bhavanti	(11)
nāsām avadyam avidam na ripram	(11)
sanād eva madhunā sam *papṛcre	(11)

When they are flowing, the waters become pure; when they stand still, they become completely clear. I have not found any disgrace about them, no defilement. From of old, indeed, they have been mixed with honey.

dhāvanti] Or, dhāvandhi **K** [Edg. mistakenly prints dhāvanvi, as noted by Bhatt.] tad] Or, dad **K** yat tiṣṭhanti] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, yantiṣṭhanti **Pa**, yastiṣṭhati **K** it] Or, yat **K** avidam na] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma?]**, avidanda(→ na 5) **Ku**, avadamyā **K** sanād] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]** **K**, samnād **JM** \*papṛcre] papṛchre **Ku RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, papṛchre **JM V/126**, papṛschre **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *papṛchre*. The variant *nam* for *na* (pāda c) in **Mā**, reported by BHATTACHARYA, cannot be detected on my reproduction of that ms.: has he confused **Mā** with **Ma**?

**ab.** Cf. ṚV 7.49.1 *punānā yanti*, and 10.18.2d *súddhāḥ pūtá bhavata yajñiyāsaḥ*.

**d.** Cf. my comments on 5b, and cf. once again ṚV 8.4.8c (*mádhvā sám-prktāḥ*), 1.141.6 and 3.54.21.

**6.3.11** Cf. MS 1.2.1:9.12–13 (≈ ĀpŚS 10.6.1) ◇ **a**: PS 1.25.1a, 14.1.2a = ŚS 1.33.1a, TS 5.6.1.1a, MS 2.13.1:151.7, TB 2.8.9.3 ◇ **cd**: cf. PS 10.9.9

hiraṇyavarṇāḥ śucayaḥ pāvakāḥ	(11)
pra cakramur hitvā <sub>a</sub> vadyam āpaḥ	(11)
śataḥ ca vaḥ prasravaṇeṣu devīḥ	(11)
sahasraḥ ca pavitāraḥ punanti	(11)

Golden-colored, bright and clear, the waters have set out, leaving disgrace behind. Your hundred and thousand purifiers, o goddesses, are purifying in [their] gushes.

hiraṇyavarṇāḥ] hiraṇyavarṇṇāḥ **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, hiraṇyavarṇṇāḥ **JM**, hiraṇyavarṇāś **K** śucayaḥ **Or**, śucayaḥ **K** pāvakāḥ] **Or**, pavaka **K** cakramur] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, cakr{u}amur **RM**, cakkramar **K** hitvāvadyam] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā Pa K**, hitvā(→ hitvā)vadyam **Ma** [?] āpaḥ |] **Or**, āpā [om. |] **K** vaḥ] *thus* **Or K** [note °ḥ p°] prasravaṇeṣu] **K**, praśravaṇeṣu **Or** devīḥ] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, devī **V/126**, devīs **K** sahasraṃ ca] **Ku JM RM Pa [Ma] K**, sahasraṇca **V/126 Mā** pavitārah] *thus* **Or K** [note °ḥ p°] punanti |] **Or**, punantī [om. |] **K**

### MS 1.2.1:9.12–13

hiraṇyavarṇāḥ śucayaḥ pāvakāḥ prá cakramur hitvāvadyám āpaḥ |  
śatāṃ pavitrā vītatāny āsu tébhir mā devāḥ savitā punātu ||

For a complete listing of parallels, and the use of mantras starting with pāda **a** (quoted in pratīka) in the sūtras, see BLOOMFIELD 1906. Note the parallel in MS (etc.), the ĀpŚS version of which has been translated by CALAND. The variant *rhītvā* (→ *hitvā*) that BHATTACHARYA reports for **Mā** is not found in that ms.: one can only presume he has confused the readings of **Ma** and **Mā**.

**ab.** The present hemistich, which is identical to the first hemistich in the MS (etc.) parallel, is built up out of pre-existent (Ṛgvedic) formulas. Note first that *śuci-* in this application of the frequent Vedic formula *śucayaḥ pāvakāḥ* (cf. i.a. ṚV 7.49.2, 7.56.12, 7.57.5; PS 17.31.1, 17.32.8 [= ŚS 6.62.3, 12.2.11]) refers to the waters, not to Soma (or the poet and his entourage) as it does at 6.3.4d and 6.3.7b (cf. also pāda 12c).

For additional passages containing (*pra*)*kram* and a reference to water/rivers and a purifier, see ṚV 2.19.2, 4.22.6, 9.45.4 and 10.75.1. The syntagma *hitvāvadyam* is formulaic as well. Cf. ṚV 5.53.14 and ŚS 18.3.58 (which has a variant with the more archaic form *hitvāya* at ṚV 10.14.8 = PS 18.75.1).

**cd.** The way in which these pādas are to be construed syntactically is nicely clarified by two Vedic parallels: ṚV 8.33.1cd *pavitrasya prasravaṇeṣu vṛtrahan pári stotāra āsate* ‘The praisers are sitting around the gushes of the purifier, o Vṛtra Slayer’: the ‘gushes’ thus belong to the ‘purifier(s)’ (gen.). ŚS 5.15.11 (≈ PS 8.5.11) *śatāṃ ca me sahasraṃ cāpavaktāra oṣadhe | řtajāta řtāvari mādhu me madhulā karaḥ* ‘I have a hundred and a thousand exorcisers, o plant; born from order, following order, you who are honeyed shall make honey for me’: in view of *oṣadhe* in this parallel, it is clear that *devīḥ* has to be taken as a voc. in our pāda **c**.

We can thus translate correctly the parallel at PS 10.9.9 *śatāṃ ca mā pavitārah punantu sahasraṃ ca prasravaṇeṣv āpaḥ | āpa iva pūto + 'smy agnir iva suvarcāḥ sūrya iva sucakṣāḥ* ‘Let the hundred and thousand purifiers purify me, o waters, in [their] gushes. I am pure like the waters, brilliant like fire, sharp-sighted like the sun’. This last parallel, in turn, would suggest with its unambiguous *mā* (see also the MS parallel) that our *vaḥ* could be taken as an acc., but *me* in the parallel ŚS 5.15.11 / PS 8.5.11 quoted just above speaks for a gen., and this last interpretation makes more sense in our context: the waters

are already *pūta-*, and it is their ‘purifiers’ which are said (note the indicative, as opposed to *punantu* at PS 10.9.9) to purify.

Cf. AiGr. III, p. 384 on the interpretation of the sequence *śatām ca ... sahāśraṃ ca* as meaning ‘1100’ in certain contexts; here, the expression does not seem so specific.

### 6.3.12 Only PS

tās *tādr̥śīr brahmāṇaṃ sūdayantiy	(11)
aṅgoṣṭhiyā stotriyā jīvadhanyāḥ	(11)
yā viśvasya śucikṛto ayātor	(11)
gāva iva payasā sthā sujātāḥ	(11)

They, who are like this, sweeten the Brahmin: they are praised in songs, praised in lauds, bringing the wealth of life. You, who make pure everyone who is not a sorcerer, are beautiful like cows with milk.

\*tādr̥śīr] tvādr̥śīr **Ku JM V/126 Mā**, tvādr̥śī **RM Pa [Ma?]**, tvāBH̥r̥śī **K** [[Edg. tvāruśī; *recte* Bhatt.]] brahmāṇaṃ] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, vra{ṇā}hmāṇaṃ **Ku sūdayantiy] JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, sūdayantiy **Ku**, sūdayamnty **RM aṅgoṣṭhiyā] Ku Pa [Ma]**, aṅgoṣṭhiyā **JM**, aṅgoṣṭhiyā **RM V/126 Mā**, aṅgoṣṭhiyā **K** [[Edg. prints °iya]] jīvadhanyāḥ || **Or**, jīvadhanyā | **K śucikṛto ayātor] Ku Mā Pa [Ma]**, śucikrato ayātor **JM RM**, śucikṛto yātor **V/126**, sucakriyovayāthor **K gāva iva] Or**, gavaiva **K payasā] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, payās{th}ā **JM sthā] Or**, stā **K sujātāḥ ||] Or**, a(→ dra)jāya **K** [[*om.* |; Bhatt. reads (→ bhra); *recte* R-V]]

BHATTACHARYA edits *tvādr̥śī* without underlining, and *sthā sujātāḥ*. He reports no variants for his reading *tvādr̥śī*, but in fact **Mā** reads *tvādr̥śīr*, as do its sister ms. **V/126** and the other Or. mss. except **RM Pa** (and **Ma?**).

a. Note that BHATTACHARYA’s Northern Or. mss. agree with **K** in omitting the *-r* in the anyhow corrupt common PS reading *tvādr̥śī(r)* (*bhṛ* in **K** is a simple error for the very similar *dr̥* akṣara). A form of the word *tvādr̥ś-* ‘like you’ is most unlikely, because it hardly yields any sense in the context, and this formation is moreover first attested only in middle/late Vedic (see AiGr. III, 436, where the ref. to TB is spurious; the ref. should be KauṣB): *asmādr̥ś-* at KauṣB 2.5.3 [ed. LINDNER 2.7:6.4], *tvādr̥ś-* at JB 3.156 (?), and KaṭhU 1.22, 2.9.

In view of such ṚV words as *sud̥r̥śī-* (1.122.2, 4.16.15, 5.44.2, see AiGr. II/2, p. 388), *sud̥r̥śīka-*, *susaṃdr̥ś-*, *sud̥r̥śīkasam̐dr̥ś-* (cf. ṚV 7.77.2), and the availability (only) in PS of the word *ādr̥ś-* (see ZEHNDER 1999: 75 on 2.24.4), one might consider an emendation \**tā(h) svādr̥śīr* (cf. similar errors at PS 19.5.9 and 19.6.13), but this emendation would go against the meter (*s<sub>u</sub>vādr̥śīr*; see OLDENBERG 1909–12/II: 209 on ṚV 10.12.3 *svāvr̥j-*). Another problem is that the ṚV words just mentioned as supporting this emendation are never used to qualify the waters; they are mostly used for Uṣas or the sun.

It is much more attractive to emend *tādr̥śīr*, with *-stv-* for *-st-* under influence of 14× *tās tvā* in PS, against 1× *tās t-*: 8.8.11d *tās ta \*ādyuttabhṛṣajīḥ*. The

formation *tādīś-a-* is attested from TS 7.3.17.1 onward, the feminine *tādīś-ī-* being attested at MS 3.7.4:78.9+11. Does the pāda refer to the ablutions which a Brahmin is to perform before commencing ritual actions proper?

b. The hapax *aṅgoṣṭhya-* (see footnote ‘i’, VWC-Saṃhitās I, 63, suggesting the emendation *aṅgoṣya-*) must be related to *aṅgoṣín-* (SVK 1.528 = 2.758, 2.467; SVJ 1.54.10, 3.35.2) and to Ṛgvedic *āṅgūṣá-* (RV 13×), *āṅgūṣyà-* (RV 1.62.2, 9.97.8). On the relationship between these last words, and on their meanings, see BAILEY 1957: 52, and SCHMIDT 1968: 51 (n. 33), who has noted that PS offers here “das ganz unklare *aṅgoṣṭhiya*” (quoting the small misreading *-a* for *-ā* by EDGERTON). May we speculate that the form is a contamination of *aṅgoṣín-/āṅgūṣyà-* and the entirely unrelated word *aṅguṣṭha-* ‘thumb’ (attested ŚS 20.136.16, and from the YV prose texts onwards)?

On the connection between *āṅgūṣá-* and *stotrā-*, cf. RV 6.34.5ab *ásmā etán máhy āṅgūṣám asmā índrāya stotrám matībhir avāci* ‘For him this great song, for him — Indra — a laud has been spoken, in verses’.

The word *jīvādhanya-* is a standing epithet for the waters, cf. RV 1.80.4, 10.30.14, ŚS 12.3.4, 12.3.25 (= PS 17.38.6), PS 14.1.10. Its exact formation (and hence its translation) is problematic; various explanations have been discussed by KORN 1998: 55.

c. Cf. perhaps 6.3.9c *viśvasya sūdanāḥ*. This is only the third attestation of the term *áyātu-*, next to the two RV passages 7.34.8a (*hváyāmi devāñ áyatur agne* ‘I call the gods, being no sorcerer, o Agni’) and, relevant for the connection between being *śúci-* and *áyātu-*, 7.104.16 (= PS 16.10.6, ŚS 8.4.16) *yó máyātum yátudhānēty āha yó vā rakṣáh śúcir asmīty āha . . .* ‘He who says to me, who am no sorcerer: “you sorcerer!”, or the evil one who says “I am pure” . . .’.

d. Note the metrical lengthening in *sthā*. On the poetical connection between waters and milk, cf. i.a. RV 3.33.1, 10.17.14, 10.30.13 etc. Cf. also PS 16.89.7. It is unclear why BHATTACHARYA has underlined his text here.

### 6.3.13 Only PS

viśvād riprān muñcata sindhavo no	(11)
yān <sub>y</sub> enāṃsi cakṛmā tanūbhiḥ	(11)
indrpraśiṣṭā varuṇaprasūtā	(11)
ā siñcatāpo madh <sub>v</sub> ā samudre    3	(11)

O rivers, free us from all defilement, the wrongdoings which we have committed ourselves. Under the direction of Indra, set in motion by Varuṇa, pour honey in the ocean, o waters.

muñcata] Or, muñcantu K sindhavo no] Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K, sindhavo{nā}no Pa enāṃsi] Or, enāsi K cakṛmā] RM V/126 Pa [Ma] K, cakrumā Ku JM tanūbhiḥ |] Ku JM V/126 Pa [Ma], taTūbhiḥ | Mā, tanūbhiḥ [om. ]] K indrapraśiṣṭā] Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], indrapraśiṣṭā RM, indraprasṛṣṭā K [misprint Edg.: °ṣṭā] varuṇaprasūtā ā] varuṇaprasūtā ā Or, varuṇasyaprasūtā K samudre] Ku

**JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, *sasu*(→ mu 4)*dre Pa* || 3 ||] || † 13 || 3 || **Ku JM**, || † ||  
 3 || **RM**, || 3 || † 13 || **V/126 Mā**, || 3 || † || **Pa**, Z 3 Z **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *indrpraśiṣṭā*. He gives no variant for *tanūbhiḥ*, but **Mā** seems to have a different reading, probably *tatūbhiḥ*.

a. Cf. 6.1.9c and my note on 4c.

b. The formula *cakṛmā tanūbhiḥ* is found also at ṚV 4.2.14 and 7.86.5.

c. The reading *indrpraśiṣṭā* of the Or. mss. (against *indrprasṛṣṭā* in **K**) is sufficiently confirmed by ṚV 10.66.2a *indrprasūtā vāruṇapraśiṣṭāḥ* and the *kalpaja* mantra at KauśS 3.3 quoted under 1d, which may be compared with PS 19.3.6 *mitrasya ca varuṇasya praśiṣṭau* (see TS 1.8.15.1, TB 2.4.6.12, ṚVKh 5.7.5f), and ṚV 10.32.6b. An identical error is found in **K** at 16.72.6d: *brahmaṇāśiṣṭāḥ* → *vrahmaṇāsrṣṭāḥ*. While BHATTACHARYA adopts the reading of the Or. mss. with underlining, he lists ṚV 7.18.15, 10.98.6, PS 1.13.1+4 (ŚS 2.29.4+7) as support for the **K** reading (which he takes seriously), but none of these passages actually contains a form of the verbal compound *pra-sarj*, which is very rare in Vedic anyhow.

d. Cf. the application of two similar mantras at KauśS 3.3 (*athodakam āsiñcati*). On the wording, cf. ṚV 8.24.13, 8.53.3, 10.32.5.

#### 6.4. To heal wounds: with lac.

Besides the early work by BLOOMFIELD (1897) and WHITNEY (and their predecessors), important contributions toward the interpretation of this hymn have been made by FILLIOZAT (1949), DAVE (1950, summarized by HORA 1952), THIEME (1951b = <sup>2</sup>1984: 64ff.), and MAHDIHASSAN (1979, 1980, 1984), while ZYSK's comparative study (1993: 73–74, 75, 97–98, 201–206) of the three available versions (PS, ŚS, ṚVKh) is rather a summary of earlier works (omitting reference to THIEME and MAHDIHASSAN). Finally, there is VISHVA BANDHU's 'textuo-linguistic' study (1971), which besides a few useful observations contains mainly idiosyncratic linguistic speculations (see also RAU 1983c: 3), which have unfortunately led MAHDIHASSAN astray.

VISHVA BANDHU summarizes (p. 1): “the object of this hymn is evident both from its wording and its prescription in the ritual. It is to cure external lesions and fractures of bones”. Further (p. 3): “AV V, 5, which is a *lākṣika*-hymn may have to be taken as an address to our familiar *lākṣā*- (*i.e.*, lac) and not to any unfamiliar plant of that name as taken, in the absence of Sāyaṇa's commentary or any other traditional help on this particular text by Zimmer (*Altindisches Leben*, p. 67) and all others, namely Grill (*Hundert Lieder*, pp. 10; 142), Griffith (I, 195), Bloomfield (20, 419), Weber ([Ind. St.] XVIII, 181) and Whitney (I, 228) who have translated it after him”.

VISHVA BANDHU was apparently not aware that his own view had already been advocated by FILLIOZAT (1949: 110–111): “*lākṣā* est la résine dite “gomme-laque” qui découle par suite de la piqûre d'un insecte, le *Coccus lacca*, des branches de diverses espèces d'arbres dont les principales sont *Ficus religiosa*, *Ficus indica*, *Rhamnus jujuba*, *Butea frondosa*”. The idea that this hymn refers to lac was taken up in detail by DAVE (1950), who could not yet have known of FILLIOZAT's interpretation. DAVE's work is original because of his suggestion that not only the product lac is being addressed, but also its producer, the lac insect: this idea was challenged by MAHDIHASSAN on the grounds that the insects are barely or not at all observable to the naked eye. He affirms that “neither any observer at the time of *Atharvaveda* had any idea of lac being an insect product, nor the lay observer of later ages” (1984: 102, also 1980: 107), but occasionally it does seem attractive to follow DAVE. The idea that *lākṣā*- is lac, and that our hymn is addressed to it, had also been put forward very succinctly by THIEME 1951b: 209 n. 1, who — in turn — had apparently not (yet) seen FILLIOZAT's or DAVE's work: “Die zahlreichen Erklärer und Übersetzer von AV. 5,5,7 fassen *lākṣā* hier als Name einer Schlingpflanze . . . . Der Wortlaut von AV. 5,5 scheint mir aber deutlich zu zeigen, daß es sich in Wirklichkeit um den Schellack (Lackharz) handelt”.

The approach to the present hymn of FILLIOZAT, DAVE, THIEME, VISHVA BANDHU (and after him MAHDIHASSAN) is indeed basically the correct one. Besides referring to pp. 3–7 of DAVE's small booklet, where he has collected much relevant information on lac and the lac insect, and to MUKHOPADHYAY

& MUTHANA 1962 (with depictions of male and female lac insects on pp. 68f.), it may be helpful to quote here some material (with my emphasis) from the lemmas “Coccus lacca” and “Lac” in WATT 1889–96, Vol. II, p. 409, where we read about the lac insect:

This insect is indigenous to the forests of India, and occurs in aggregated masses around the twigs of certain **trees**, especially the *Butea frondosa*, *Ficus religiosa*, and *Schleichera trijuga*. . . . Lac is the resinous incrustation formed on the bark of the twigs, through the action of the lac insect. When the larvae or grubs of the *Coccus lacca* escape from their eggs they crawl about in search of fresh sappy twigs. When satisfied, they become **fixed** and form a sort of cocoon by excreting a resinous substance. The male cocoon is ovoid in shape, the **female** circular. For about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  months the insects remain within their cocoons in the lethargic state, but structural changes have been accomplished by which they have reached the mature or imago condition. The male escapes from the cocoon by backing out at the ventral opening. The female has also become mature; but since it is destined to remain in the present position, it renews activity and commences to throw up around itself a more perfect coating of resin until its body becomes completely **encrusted**. It is supposed that there are about five thousand females for one male. Upon the circular body of the female there are three openings, which become developed, as the incrustation proceeds, into three **filamentous tubes**. One serves the purpose of an anal opening, and through it the impregnation is accomplished; the others are breathing stomata. . . . In the case of the lac insect, the plants chosen are those naturally possessed of resinous principles, but still the insect exercises a peculiar influence over the resinous sap, changing its properties entirely. The *Coccus lacca* penetrates the bark of the twig by its proboscis or penetrator until it reaches the sap-wood; from there it sucks its nourishment and transforms the sap into the resinous excretion — lac — which it encrusts around itself. As time advances, further changes are visible; the **body of the female enlarges considerably** and becomes **brilliantly coloured**. The **red colour** is due to the formation of a substance intended as food for the offspring. The eggs germinate below, and the larvae, eating their way through the body of the mother, make their escape to repeat this strange history.

Further on in the same volume of WATT’s *Dictionary* (p. 411) we read about the preparation of lac:

After the larvae escape, the old encrusted twigs are removed and cut up into pieces 4 to six inches long. These form *stick-lac*. They are spread upon a flat floor and a roller [is] passed over them by which the resinous crust is broken from off the twigs. The wood is carefully removed, and the resin thrown into tubs of water, where it is either beaten with a wooden pestle or trodden under foot. The liquid becomes red coloured, and one washing after

another is performed. The **washings** are carefully preserved and afterwards **evaporated**, when a red substance is obtained which is made into small cakes and dried like indigo.

As for the uses of this lac, we read in the same volume (p. 412):

The natives of India from remote times have used **lac-dye** not only for textile purposes but as a pigment. It is by them largely used for colouring leather and in wool and silk dyeing . . . .

And in vol. 4 of the same work (p. 575) reference is made to the fact that a “**decoction of shell-lac** is much used in Hindu medicine for preparing several medicinal oils”, and that lac was also used commonly as an “**application to wounds**” (cf. also MAHDIHASSAN 1979). Note however the comments by MAHDIHASSAN (1980: 119): “The word decoction has a definite connotation. A drug like myrobalan can be taken as a powder or boiled as a decoction. But if a resin is boiled, heat will coagulate it and no decoction worth the name can be recovered. In the case of crude lac if it is powdered and then boiled, it is the lac dye that will go into solution and the resin will remain as a coagulated sediment. Thus a decoction of lac can only mean a solution of lac dye for lac resin melts at about 80°C., long before water begins to boil. But lac dye is not the drug. All becomes clear when we recall the ancient theory of how a drug operates. There is the principle, like makes like.”

If we turn now to the Atharvavedic texts, it is striking how much the information we gain there recalls the above.

Despite MAHDIHASSAN’s statements to the contrary (1979: 78f.), the use of *lākṣā-* as dye is known already in the PS. At 9.28.2, we read *yathā sūtram lākṣāraktam ājyenānuṣicyate | evā te kāmah sarpatv antar asthasu majjasu pra patāto mamādhyā* ‘Just as the *lākṣā*-dyed thread is sprinkled on with ghee, so let desire creep inside your bones and marrow: fly forth from here with yearning for me’. Similarly, in the Vivāha section of the KauśS (76.8): *iyam virud iti madughamaṇim lākṣāraktena sūtreṇa vigrathyānāmikāyām badhnāti* ‘Then he binds on [her] ring-finger a Madugha-amulet by means of a *lākṣā*-dyed thread, while pronouncing the hymn ŚS 1.34’ (see also HAAS 1862: 386). The typical red color of this *lākṣā-* (lac-dye) is also mentioned twice in the AVParīś: 50.6.5 and 64.5.7.

The second use referred to above, the medicinal use of lac, is attested in Vedic literature by the three versions of the present hymn (which is the only mantra attestation of the word *lākṣā-*, besides PS 9.28.2 quoted just above), and in the KauśS application of our hymn at 28.14: *lākṣāliṅgābhir dugdhe phāṇṭān pāyayati* ‘To the accompaniment of the verses dealing with *lākṣā* he makes [the patient] drink the filterings [of *lākṣā*] in milk’ (see CALAND 1900: 90 and BAHULKAR 1994: 163 — on the meaning of *phāṇṭa-* in Āyurveda, Jan Meulenbeld refers me to Caraka, Sūtrasthāna 4.7, and to Śārṅgadharasaṃhitā, Madhyamakhaṇḍa 3.1–2). In view of the heat needed to dissolve lac-resin,

Dār.’s comment on this sūtra (with the rather heavy emendations of the editors) is to be noted: *rohiny asi* [ŚS 4.12]<sup>7</sup> *iti sūktam | rātrī mātā* [ŚS 5.5] *iti ca | rohiṇīśabdasya lākṣāparyāyatvāt | phāṇṭān uṣṇān kṣīre pāyayati* ‘With the hymn “you are *rohiṇī*”, and with ŚS 5.5 — because the word *rohiṇī* is a synonym for *lākṣā* — he makes [him] drink the **heated** filterings [prepared] in milk’. Keś. explains: *rātrī mātā iti sūktena dugdhe lākṣām kvāthayitvābhimantrya pāyayati* ‘Having boiled the *lākṣā* in milk, and having consecrated it with the hymn ŚS 5.5, he makes him drink it’. I refer here further to the fact that Keś. also understands KauśS 28.5 as requiring the use of *lākṣā*:- *rohiṇī iti avanakṣatre ’vasiṅcati* ‘With (the hymn) *rohiṇī* ([ŚS] 4.12), (he) sprinkles the patient, when the stars fade away’ (BAHULKAR 1994: 156). Keś. explains: *rohiny asīti sūktena lākṣodakam kvāthitam abhimantrya vyādhidesam avasiṅcati* ‘With the hymn ŚS 4.12 he consecrates boiled *lākṣā*-water, and besprinkles the area of the wound’. Both commentators on the KauśS thus consistently explain that the *lākṣā*- is to be used in **heated** milk or water. This agrees with the Āyurvedic definitions of *phāṇṭa*-.

The hymn uses several terms (*śilācī*-, *arundhatī*-, *ghṛtācī*-, *vidyutparṇā*-) of which it is not always clear whether they refer to the lac, to the tree which hosts the insect, or even other items. For example, the name *arundhatī*- has normally been taken as referring to a creeper-plant, and it is impossible to deny that many key phrases of the hymn seem to appertain originally to a medicinal creeper-plant. Rather than assuming that two different kinds of *materia medica* are interchangingly referred to — now the lac, then the creeper-plant — I would suggest that the hymn ‘recycles’ perhaps pre-existing verses composed for *arundhatī*- as ‘creeper-plant’, for its own lac context. Probably, a (popular [?]) etymological connection of *arundhatī*- with the word *ārus*- ‘wound’ (stanza 3) played a role here (cf. VISHVA BANDHU 1971: 285; now also HAJNAL 1999: 90f.).

The relationship between the three versions of this hymn, and their significance for the chronology and interrelationship of Vedic schools had been discussed by BARRET (1933: 28): “The two AV. versions of this hymn seem to be related as sisters and the RVKh. is a cousin, and the Pāipp. version is somewhat more like its cousin than is the Ś. version”. However, BARRET has missed a few cases of agreement between ŚS and RVKh against PS (e.g. twice in our stanza 3, once in 6). According to BARRET’s table (p. 27), we may show the relationship between the individual stanzas of the three versions as follows:

PS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
ŚS	1	2	4	5	3	7	6	8	9		
RVKh	1	2	3	5	4	7	–	–	6		

Note that the ŚS parallel (5.5) has 9 stanzas, while our PS version exceeds the norm of 9, and includes in this hymn 11 stanzas.

<sup>7</sup> See WHITNEY’S note on the readings *rohaṇī/rohiṇī*; also GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY 2000–01[03]: 199f.

I gratefully acknowledge the assistance (bibliographical and otherwise) of Jan Meulenbeld in the interpretation of this hymn.

#### 6.4.1 ŚS 5.5.1, ṚVKh 4.7.1 ◊ d: ŚS 6.100.3

rātrī mātā nabhaḥ pitā-	(8)
-aryamā te pitāmahaḥ	(8)
śilācī nāma vā asi	(8)
sā devānām asi svasā	(8)

[Your] mother is the night, [your] father is the cloud, your grandfather is Aryaman. You, verily, are called *śilācī*: so you are the sister of the gods.

rātrī] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, rātri **V/126** nabhaḥ] **Or**, nabhaḥ **K** pitāryamā te] **Ku Mā Pa [Ma] K**, pitā 'ryamāte **JM RM**, pitāryamāTRe **V/126** ]] **Or**, *om.* **K** śilācī] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, śilā{CI}cī **Pa**, śilādī **K** vā asi] **Or**, vāsi **K**

##### ŚS 5.5.1, ṚVKh 4.7.1

rātrī [ṚVKh bhūmir] mātā nábhaḥ pitāryamā te pitāmahaḥ |  
silācī [ṚVKh ghṛtācī] nāma vā asi sā devānām asi svasā ||

**ab.** BLOOMFIELD 1897: 419 comments on the ŚS parallel of this stanza: “The Atharvan poets signalise with great predilection their knowledge of the power of any substance which they employ by stating that this knowledge extends to the father, mother, and other relatives of the substance. Or, again, they indicate their control over any disease, or hostile force, by assuming the same knowledge of their kindred”.

The ‘relatives’ *rātrī*-, *nábhas*-, *aryamān*- appear to have no common denominator, and BLOOMFIELD 1897: 420 feels that “the names of the ancestors in our stanza are peculiarly fanciful and heterogeneous”. BHISE 1995: 168 comments on the reading *bhūmir* (for AV *rātrī*) in ṚVKh: “In view of *nabhas* being mentioned as the father, the [ṚVKh] reading seems to be better and more natural; the pair *dyāvāpr̥thivī* is of common occurrence”. She might more appositely have referred to the elliptic dual *nábhasī*- (AV+) in the meaning ‘heaven and earth’. However, her conclusion that the ṚVKh wording is “more natural” (similarly, ZYSK 1993: 202) is belied by ŚS 19.48.2a / PS 6.21.2a *rātrī mātā usāse naḥ pári dehī* ‘O Night, o mother: entrust us to the dawn’. I do not think it is warranted in our context to diverge from the normal meaning of *nábhas*- (‘cloud’), as BHISE does in the ṚVKh context (‘sky’).

DAVE 1950: 10 suggests that Night, Cloud, and Aryaman “have been purposely mentioned as indicating the conditions in which the lac-insects thrive best, for we already have seen [cf. DAVE, p. 6] that frost, intense heat and hot dry winds are greatly injurious to them and that swarming of larvae takes place just as the rains begin or before winter has set in”. He interprets Aryaman as a mild manifestation of the Sun. This seems incorrect. Regarding the fact that Aryaman is called the medicinal lac’s ‘grandfather’, see WINDFUHR

(1999: 319): “A function of the Iranian Aryaman not found in the Vedas is that of healer”. Cf. i.a. *Vidēvdād* 22.9 (using the Avestan verb corresponding to Vedic *bhiṣajyāti*): ‘Darauf erblickte mich der schurkische und es schuf mir der schurkische vielverderbliche Aṅra Mainyav 9 und 90 und 900 und 9000 und 9 mal 10000 Krankheiten. Und du, o Airyaman, der liebe, mögest mich heilen’ (WOLFF 1910: 438). Is our Vedic passage a link to the Old Iranian function of Aryaman? Another explanation, directly in line with DAVE’s interpretation quoted above, is that Aryaman is connected here with lac (assuming that this is what *śilācī-* refers to, see below) because he brings rain (cf. BRERETON 1981: 174–175). On the risk of heat mortality, and hence the destruction of lac crops, see MUKHOPADHYAY & MUTHANA 1962: 151.

c. The ṚVKh version of this Atharvavedic stock phrase (with *ghṛtācī-*) is found also at ŚS 10.4.24b = PS 16.17.6, ŚS 19.48.6 = PS 6.21.6.

ZYSK summarizes (1993: 202): “Most western interpreters consider *silācī* [with *s-* as read in ŚS] to be a plant, another name for *lakṣā* and *arundhatī* . . . . The derivation from *śilā*, ‘stone,’ receives support from P[S] and also brings to mind the word *śilājitu* [*sic*] which is a black substance exuding from rocks, used among the people of the Indus Valley and as an āyurvedic medicine” (cf. also his notes, p. 205; MEULENBELD 1974: 496 mentions *śilālavāṇa-*). ṚVKh reads *ghṛtācī-*: the words *ghṛtācī-* and *ś/silācī-* are accentuated differently. Perhaps we need not take the accentuation of the virtual hapax ŚS *silācī* (only at 5.5.1 and 5.5.8) too seriously? If we compare *ghṛtācī-* (‘rich in ghee’, ‘like ghee’ [?]) discussed under 6.4.8, and if we accept the palatal sibilant of PS as more original, then we may interpret *śilācī-* as ‘rich in stone’ or ‘like stone’, which seems to be a fitting epithet for the lac insect covered in its own encrustations.

Additional support for this idea is to be found in HOFFMANN’s analysis (1956: 12–13 = 1976: 393–394) of the hapax *silāñja-* (ŚS 6.16.4, cf. PS 19.5.8) as ‘Felsensalbe’. HOFFMANN also assumes *silā-* = *śilā-*.

d. This phrase occurs also ŚS 6.100.3 / PS 19.13.6 (cf. ṚV 2.32.6, PS 15.15.3). It seems that the poet intends to ascribe divine attributes to the *śilācī-* (= lac) here, cf. ZYSK 1993: 203. Since the addressee has a god as grandfather, she is on par with the gods. Cf. also 11d below.

#### 6.4.2 ŚS 5.5.2, ṚVKh 4.7.2

yas tvā pibati jīvati	(8)
trāyase puruṣaṃ t <sub>u</sub> vam	(8)
dhartrī ca śāsvatām asi	(8)
śāsvatām ca n <sub>ya</sub> ñcanī	(8)

He who drinks you, remains alive: you save the man. A bearer of numerous [men] are you, of numerous [men] a refuge as well.

pibati] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, pibatī **Pa**, pivati **K** puruṣaṃ] **K**, puṣaṃ **Ku RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, puṣe **JM**, ⟨·ṢA⟩ṃ **V/126** tvam |] **Or K** dhartrī] **Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, dhartrī **JM**, dhartri **Pa**, dharatrī **K** śāsvatām asi] **K**, śāsvatām

asi **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, *om.* **Pa** śaśvatām] **K**, saśvatāñ **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, sasvatāñ **JM**, saśvatām **RM** ca] **Or**, tya **K** nyañcanī ||] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, nyañcanī ||] **RM**, nyañcanīṃ [*om.*] **K**

### ŚS 5.5.2, ṚVKh 4.7.2

yás tvā píbatī jívati tráyase púruṣaṃ tvám |

bhartrī hí [ṚVKh \*trátriṇī] śaśvatām ási jánānām ca nyañcanī [ṚVKh samyañcanī] ||

**a.** This pāda refers to the potion of lac in hot milk, as described at KauśS 28.14 (see above): note the comments by MAHDIHASSAN 1980: 119f.

**b.** That the verb *trā* is connected semantically and poetically with *nyañcana-* (cf. *nyañcanī* in our pāda **d**) has been demonstrated by KUIPER 1958, with reference to MS 1.8.2:116.14 (*agnáu vā etán nyañcanam icchate*) ~ KS 6.2:50.19/KapKS 4.1:37.11 [2:43.13] (*agná evá tát tráṇam icchate*). VISHVA BANDHU 1971: 9 refers to ṚV 8.27.17–18.

**cd.** Note the chiasitic construction of these two pādas, which is developed more fully in our PS version than in ṚVKh, and is not noticeably present at all in ŚS.

As VISHVA BANDHU notes (1971: 7 [n. 10]), the drinking of a potion (perhaps not a “decoction”, cf. MAHDIHASSAN 1980: 119) “of *lākṣā* was believed to strengthen the resisting power of a wounded person”, which may explain the use of the terms *dhartrī-/bhartrī-* and *nyañcanī-* in the AV Saṃhitās. FILLIOZAT (1949: 111) thinks that it was lac in particular that was used for this healing purpose (by way of ‘sympathetic magic’), because it would be “le cicatrisant-type”. For *śaśvatām*, cf. ṚV 4.32.13, 8.20.13, 10.100.11. GELDNER translates ‘viele’ and ‘alle’ (cf. also WHITNEY’s comm.). Ours seems to be an example of KLINGENSCHMITT’s (1975: 67) second semantic category for *śaśvat-*: “in stetiger Folge aneinandergereiht, dicht aufeinanderfolgend, viele beisammen, zahlreich”.

On the meaning and formation of *nyañcanī-*, see KUIPER 1953 (p. 41f.) & 1958 (see also my note on pāda **b**), and VISHVA BANDHU 1971: 8–10.

### 6.4.3 abc: ŚS 5.5.4abc, ṚVKh 4.7.3abc ◊ d: ŚS 5.5.6d

yad daṇḍena yad iṣṭvā	(8)
yad arur harasā kṛtam	(8)
tasya tvam asi bheṣajī	(8)
niṣkṛtir nāma vā asi	(8)

The wound which has been made by a club, by an arrow, by a flame: you are the cure for it. You, verily, are called Mending.

yad daṇḍena] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, (·)ṇḍena **V/126**, yadaṇḍena **K** yad iṣṭvā] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, yadiṣṭvāDA **RM**, yaduṣṭā **K** arur] aṛ **Or**, adur **K** harasā] **Or**, harasā(*sec. m.* → mā) **K** kṛtam |] kṛtaṃ | **Or**, kṛtaṃ [*om.*] **K** bheṣajī] **Or**, bhīṣajīm **K** niṣkṛtir] **Or**, niḥkṛtir **K** vā asi ||] **Or**, vāsī **Z** **K** [*note Z*]

**ŚS 5.5.4abc + 5.5.6d, ṚVKh 4.7.3**

yád daṇḍéna yád iṣvā [ṚVKh iṣuṇā] yád vā́rur hárasā kṛtám |  
 táśya tvám asi níṣkṛtiḥ . . . níṣkṛtir náma vā́ asi [ṚVKh níṣkṛtis sánau níṣkṛtya óśadhīḥ] ||

Note that ṚVKh still follows the stanza order of PS, but that ŚS has shifted our stanzas 3 and 4. Furthermore, PS has a different **d** pāda than ŚS and ṚVKh.

**a.** On the construction *yád . . . yád . . . yád . . . táśya . . .*, see VISHVA BANDHU 1971: 14, who argues against “Whitney’s treatment of *yád* as a particle of condition”.

**b.** BARRET 1933 has missed this case of correspondence between the ŚS and ṚVKh versions (*vā́rur*) as against *arur* in PS. It is unclear to me why EDGERTON suggests the emendation (taken over by BARRET 1933: 27) of the **K** reading (whose short *a* is confirmed by the Or. mss.) to *ārur*. Perhaps EDGERTON’s *ārur* is a simple misprint, unnoticed as such by BARRET, for *vārur* (with ŚS). On *áruṣ-* ‘wound’, see HAJNAL 1999. On *háras-* ‘flame’, see BLOOMFIELD 1897: 420, RENO 1955–69/VIII: 59 & 1955–69/XIV: 88, as well as EWAia II, 804f. VISHVA BANDHU noted (1971: 14) “the inclusion of *agnidāhādau* in Keśava’s list of injuries that are curable by *lākṣā*” (on KauśS 28.14).

**c.** Again, BARRET 1933 misses the correspondence between the ŚS and ṚVKh versions (*níṣkṛti-*) as against *bheṣajī-* in PS.

**d.** Note the parallel ṚV 10.97.9a *iṣkṛtir náma vo mātā*. See the excellent excursus on “iṣ-kar, niṣ-kar und Verwandte” by BRUNE 1909: 44–46, whose analysis is more convincing than that of BLOOMFIELD 1896: 428–429. BRUNE argues for an originally clear difference in meaning between *iṣ-kar* and *niṣ-kar*, but adds (p. 45):

Aus der Bedeutung ‘entfernen’ von *niṣ-kar* konnte sich naturgemäß, insonderheit in Texten des Zauberrituals wie dem AV. und Kauś., die Bedeutung ‘Übel, Krankheiten entfernen’ und daraus weiter ‘heilen’ entwickeln, eine Bedeutung, die die zugehörigen Wörter in der jüngeren vedischen Literatur tatsächlich mehrfach haben . . . . Somit gelangt *niṣ-kar* schließlich infolge seiner vorwiegenden Verwendung im Zauberritual zu der gleichen Bedeutung, die *iṣ-kar* von Haus aus hat. So erklärt sich denn leicht, wie jüngere vedische Texte *iṣ-kar* nebst Ableitungen durch entsprechende Formen von *niṣ-kar* verdrängen konnten.

As BLOOMFIELD already did (1896: 428), we should also compare ṚV 8.99.8a *iṣkartāram ániṣkṛtaṃ*. With BRUNE (p. 44) and OLDENBERG (1909–12/II: 149), I analyse the second word as *án-iṣkṛta-*. A misinterpretation of this word as *á-niṣkṛta-* may originally have contributed to the lexical confusion described by BRUNE. Note that BLOOMFIELD (*loc. cit.*) assumes exactly the reverse misinterpretation.

**6.4.4 ŚS 5.5.5, ṚVKh 4.7.5**

bhadrá plakṣe \*ni tiṣṭhas,y (8)  
 aśvatthe khadire dhava | (8)

bhadrā n<sub>i</sub>yagrodhe parṇe (8)  
 sā na eh<sub>i</sub>y arundhati || (8)

Gracious you reside on the Plakṣa, on the Aśvattha, on the Khadira, on the Dhava, gracious on the Nyagrodha, on the Parṇa: so come to us, o Arundhatī.

plakṣe \*ni] plakṣena **Or**, prakṣeṇa **K** aśvatthe] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, a(+  
 śva #)·tthe **RM** parṇe] **K**, parṇe **Or** sā na eh<sub>i</sub>y] **Or**, mānehy **K** arundhati ||  
 aṇdhati || **Or**, arundhati **Z K** [*note Z*]

#### ŚS 5.5.5

bhadrāt plakṣān nīs tiṣṭhasy aśvatthāt khadirād dhavāt |  
 bhadrān nyagródhāt parṇāt sá na éhy arundhati ||

#### RVKh 4.7.5

bhadrāt plakṣé nīs tiṣṭhásvatthé khadiré dhavé |  
 bhadrāt parṇé nyagródhe sá máñṁ rautsíd arundhatí ||

On the botanical identification of the Plakṣa, the Aśvattha, the Khadira, and the Nyagrodha, see MEULENBELD 1974: 520–611 with the supplementary data contained as ‘Anhang Eins’ in DAS 1988 (pp. 425–465), and note especially the work by SYED 1990, which contains not only botanical identifications and descriptions of the plants’ salient features, but also extensive quotations pertinent to the plants in question from Vedic and post-Vedic literature, accompanied by illustrations.

The Aśvattha is *Ficus religiosa*: MEULENBELD, 536; SYED only 267 n. 3, and under *Śamī-*, 524ff. The Khadira is *Acacia catechu*: SYED, 257–268. The Nyagrodha is *Ficus benghalensis* or *Ficus indica*: SYED, 389–419. The Parṇa is *Butea frondosa* or *Butea monosperma*: SYED (*s.v. kiṃśuka-*), 204–209. The Plakṣa is *Ficus infectoria*: SYED, 448–454. All these trees occur in WATT’s list (1889–96, vol. II, 410–411) of “trees on which the lac insect is reported to feed”. More details are given in MUKHOPADHYAY & MUTHANA 1962: 17ff. and 316ff.; see also MAHDIHASSAN 1980: 115f.

SYED 1990 does not contain a reference to *dhavá-* (cf. EWAia I, 781), which PW glosses as *Grislea tomentosa* Roxb., and which MEULENBELD *apud* DAS 1988: 442 (see also DAS, p. 303) identifies as *Anogeissus latifolia* Wall. — both being trees which do not appear in WATT’s list — but which DAVE 1950: 7 tries to demonstrate may also be identified as *Schleichera trijuga* (nowadays called *Schleicheria oleosa* (Lour.) Oken, a tree which has not been recorded in MEULENBELD 1974 or SYED 1990, but which is given as botanical identification for the *kośāmra* tree by MEULENBELD (*apud* DAS 1988: 435), native to the sub-Himalayan tracts, and supposedly “the most important of all the lac trees” (see WATT’s above mentioned list, p. 411). The tree name *dhavá-* occurs elsewhere in Vedic literature only in the notoriously obscure context of the Aitaśapralāpa (on which see BLOOMFIELD 1899: 98), RVKh 5.15.14 = ŚS 20.131.14 [ed. <sup>1</sup>R-W] *áśvatthaḥ khádiro dhaváh*. The information on this tree thus remains inconclusive (cf. MAHDIHASSAN 1980: 114f.).

**abc.** BHATTACHARYA edits *plakṣe na tiṣṭhasy*. It seems clear, in comparison with the ŚS and RVKh versions, that the readings *plakṣena/prakṣeṇa* of the PS mss. must be corrupt. PS obviously agrees with RVKh in reading a loc. *plakṣe*. As for ŚS/RVKh *nīs*, I cannot agree with VISHVA BANDHU that the same preverb must also be restored in our text. Cf. in the first place PS 8.9.4: *brahmauṣadhayo ni tiṣṭhanti brahma varṣanti vṛṣṭayaḥ | brahmedaṃ sarvaṃ ātmanvad yāvāt sūryo vipaśyati* ‘The plants are standing firm as *brāhman*. The rains are pouring as *brāhman*. The *brāhman* is this entire living [cosmos] here as far as the sun can see’. Note that **K** contains the same error (*ni* → *na*) in this last quoted stanza as in ours, reading *na tiṣṭhanti*.

Further unambiguous attestations of *ni-sthā* (as opposed to *nīḥ-sthā*) seem not to occur in (older) Vedic literature. If we may follow the padapāṭha for ŚS, there are attestations of *nī-sthita-* at ŚS 14.2.62 = PS 18.13.1, 19.32.3 = PS 11.12.3 *divi te tūlam oṣadhe pṛthivyām asi niṣṭhitaḥ* ‘Your tuft is in heaven, o plant; on earth you are grown [far] out [o *darbhā*]’, and 19.34.6 = PS 11.3.6 (*trīṣ tvā devā ajanayan niṣṭhitaṃ bhūmyām ādhi* ‘Three times the gods brought you forth, who are residing on the earth’. No padapāṭha analysis is available for the other attestations of *niṣṭhita-* at PS 1.47.1, 1.89.1, 3.17.1, 16.39.10, 19.31.13, and 19.33.8, but they all provide contexts similar to those in the ŚS stanzas, and possibly derive from *ni-sthā*.

But Śākalya analyses the only RV attestation of *niṣṭhita-* as *nīḥ-sthita-*: RV 1.182.7 *kāḥ svīd vṛkṣó niṣṭhito mádhye árṇaso* ‘which tree then grew forth in the middle of the flood?’. This analysis has, to my knowledge, never been called into question (the analysis *nī/ṣṭhita-* by LUBOTSKY 1997a: 1599 is most likely due to a simple oversight of the padapāṭha), and is confirmed by a unique Vedic finite form of *nīḥ-sthā-* at RV 8.1.33 (*nalá iva sáraso nír atiṣṭhan* ‘they grew forth as reeds from a pond’), and by the attestations of *nīḥ-sthā* in the parallels to the present stanza. See also my comments on 6.15.3c.

The evidence regarding the preverb is thus ambiguous, but seems to give sufficient support for a Paippalāda Atharvavedic verbal compound *ni-sthā*, and I thus emend *\*ni*.

**d.** There exists no scholarly consensus yet as to what the word *arundhatī-* refers to. The etymology has been a matter of considerable speculation (see ZYSK 1993: 198–199), but MAYRHOFER regrettably seems to discuss the word neither in KEWA nor in EWAia, presumably because he takes the analysis *a-rundhatī-* (see AiGr. II/1, p. 216) for granted. Cf. now HAJNAL 1999: 90f.

Passages like PS 1.85.4 (*oṣadhīm ā harāmy arundhatīm*) and 15.16.2 (*rājñī hi sarvāsām asy oṣadhīnām arundhatī*) make it impossible to deny that *arundhatī-* must sometimes refer to a (creeper-)plant. In the context of our hymn, FILLIOZAT (1949: 110–111) argues against this usual interpretation, instead interpreting it as another reference to lac, by way of a metaphor: ‘Les traducteurs ont toujours supposé qu’*arundhati* [*sic*] désignait une liane s’attachant à certaines espèces d’arbres . . . . Il est dit en effet qu’elle grimpe aux arbres (AV. V.5,3) mais les traînées de résine courent sur l’écorce comme

des tiges de lianes *auxquelles on peut les comparer*. Les noms des arbres d'où “elle sort” lèvent tout équivoque” (p. 110 n. 3 [my emphasis]).

It may also be useful to quote here from ZYSK's summary (1993: 97–98) of all the various forms in which *arundhatī-* appears besides those mentioned in the present hymn: “She is described as a perennial, harmless, life-giving herb with a saving honey-sweet flower; and as *sahādevī*, she is said to protect quadrupeds (especially domestic ones), men and (small) birds from *yākṣma* and from harm. As *rōhanī*, she is the healer of the severed bone. . . . In the form of *viṣṇanakā*, she is said to have arisen from the fathers' root; and as *pippalī*, she is mentioned as having been buried by the *ásuras* and dug up again by the gods”. We may agree with ZYSK (1993: 74, 97–98) that *arundhatī-* is a plant goddess, which means that its use for *lākṣā-* is artificially extended beyond its usual connection with a plant (see my introduction to this hymn).

**6.4.5** ŚS 5.5.3, ṚVKh 4.7.4 ◊ **ab**: cf. PS 7.12.6ab ◊ **cd**: PS 7.12.6cd

vṛkṣamvṛkṣam ā rohasi	(8)
vṛṣṇyantīva kanyalā	(8)
jayantī pratyātiṣṭhantī	(8)
saṁjayā nāma vā asi	(8)

You mount every tree (and cover it), like a girl lusting for a man (embraces) [every man]. Defeating, sticking tightly [to the tree], you, verily, are called Conquest.

vṛṣṇyantīva] **Ku JM Pa [Ma]**, vṛṣa{-}nyantī **RM**, vṛṣṇyantīva **V/126 Mā**, vṛṣamnyantīva **K** saṁjayā] **K**, saṁjayā **Or** vā asi ||] **Or**, vāsī **Z K** [[note Z]

**ŚS 5.5.3**

vṛkṣamvṛkṣam ā rohasi vṛṣṇyantīva kanyalā |  
jayantī pratyātiṣṭhantī spāraṇī nāma vā asi ||

**ṚVKh 4.7.4**

vṛkṣamvṛkṣam sām patasi vṛṣṇyantīva kanyānā |  
jayantī pratyātiṣṭhantī saṁjeyā nāma vā asi ||

The stanza order of PS seems more acceptable than that of ŚS and ṚVKh: *vṛkṣamvṛkṣam* makes better sense if it is understood as referring back directly to the trees mentioned in the stanza which precedes in PS, but follows in the other versions. BHATTACHARYA does not report the reading *vṛṣṇyantīva* (with *-nya-* for *-nyā-*) found in **Mā**, as in its sister ms. **V/126**.

**a.** Note that *sām patasi* ‘you fly together’ in ṚVKh was missed by FILIOZAT, DAVE, THIEME, and VISHVA BANDHU, but does offer some additional support for the interpretation of *lākṣā-* as lac. We may interpret this phrase as referring to the way in which the lac insect disseminates itself: its larvae depend on the wind to be transported from tree to tree (see DAVE 1950: 4). The ṚVKh reading is also to be compared with *saṁpatitā* in stanza 9.

Cf. GOTŌ (1987: 276): “Die Wz. *rodh/rudh* ‘wachsen’ ist schon frühzeitig mit *roh/ruh* ‘steigen’ zusammengefloßen, so daß *róha-ti* sowohl ‘steigen’ als auch ‘wachsen’ bedeutete”. We might thus translate ‘you grow all over [these] trees’. However, in the traditional interpretation starting with a creeper-plant, translators have simply rendered ‘you climb all trees’, and the verb *ā-roh* was in fact, at least in later texts, used in combination with *vrkṣa-* in the meaning ‘climb’: cf. ŚāṅkhGS 4.7.34 (*vrkṣārohaṇa-*), GautDhS 9.32 (*vrkṣaviṣamārohaṇa-*). My rendering thus starts from *roh* ‘to climb’.

**b.** DAS connected the incomplete simile (1988: 254) with an old and persistent comparison of sexually active girls with creeper-plants covering trees. He referred i.a. to ṚV 10.10.(13c&)14ab: *anyám ū śú tvám yamy anyá u tvám pári śvajāte líbujeva vrkṣám* ‘Auch du sollst fein einen anderen, o Yamī, und dich ein anderer umschlingen, wie die Rankenpflanze den Baum’ (GELDNER). Our stanza can be taken to compare the all-pervasive production of lac on the trees by the lac insect to the sexual actions of a girl upon her various lovers (cf. FIŠER 1966: 96 n. 35), the latter being provided in the denominative stem *vrṣanya-* from *vr̥ṣan-*. As Chlodwig Werba points out to me, the quoted verse quarters from ṚV 10.10 suggest that a form of *pari-svaj* may be supplied here to complete the simile.

**cd.** These pādas, occurring also at PS 7.12.6 below, appear to contain the only attestation in (Vedic) Sanskrit of the verbal compound *praty-ā-sthā*. VIŠHVA BANDHU’S gloss ‘to stand fast against, stick fast to’ (1971: 13) seems to be acceptable here; cf., however, my commentary on 7.12.6cd. Cf. also ṚV 10.159.3 *utáhám asmi saṁjayá*.

#### 6.4.6 ŚŚ 5.5.7, ṚVKh 4.7.7

hiraṇyavarṇe yuvate	(8)
śúṣme *lomaśavakṣaṇe	(8)
apām asi svasā lākṣe	(8)
vāto hātmā babhūva te	(8)

O golden-colored youthful girl, fiery, with a hairy belly: you are the sister of the waters, o Lākṣā. The wind has become your soul.

hiraṇyavarṇe] **K**, hiraṇyavarṇe **Or** \*lomaśavakṣaṇe] lomasuvakṣaṇe **Or**, lomasamakṣaṇe **K** svasā] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, svasā **JM** lākṣe] **Or K** [misprint Edg.: °ñkṣe] hātmā] **Or**, yatsā **K** babhūva te] **Or**, babhūvyathe **K**

#### ŚŚ 5.5.7, ṚVKh 4.7.7

hiraṇyavarṇe [ṚVKh °parṇe] súbhage śúṣme [Kh sókṣme] lomaśavakṣaṇe [Kh °vakṣaṇé] |  
apām asi svasā lākṣe [ṚVKh lākṣe] vāto hātmā babhūva [ṚVKh babhūvá] te ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *lomasuvakṣaṇe*.

**a.** The golden color corresponds nicely to the ‘brightly-colored’ appearance of the female lac insect, as was pointed out by DAVE 1950: 13 (cf. also MAHDI-HASSAN 1980: 116f.). The PS reading *yuvate* is more problematic than *súbhage*

as read in ŚS/RVKh: perhaps it is simply the proverbial beauty of young girls that our text alludes to. The simile of the preceding stanza may have influenced the text of the present pāda.

**b.** On the interpretation of *śúṣme*, see BLOOMFIELD 1894: 574, and my notes to 6.2.8d. I emend the corrupt readings of the mss. (*lomasuvakṣaṇe* / *lomasamakṣaṇe*) on the basis of the parallels in ŚS and RVKh. The word *vakṣaṇā-* has been discussed at length, but somewhat inconclusively, by KIEHNLE 1979: 102–110. A theoretical possibility that seems not to have been discussed previously would be to take the second member of our compound as *vakṣāṇi-*, on which latter see KIEHNLE, pp. 101–102. KIEHNLE discusses our compound on p. 109. No interpretation can lay claim to being much more than guesswork. THIEME’s guess (1951: 209 n. 1) seems to be acceptable: “*lómaśavakṣaṇe* “die du einen behaarten Bauch hast” bezieht sich wohl auf die Unterseite des abgelösten Harzes”. See also FILLIOZAT 1949: 110 n. 3. DAVE (1950: 13, 5), however, first proposed to take this epithet quite literally. His idea was taken up by MAHDIHASSAN (1980: 119): “The lac insect is fixed within its cell but has three parts of the body as tubercles projecting upto the surface. . . . All the three tubercles secrete filaments of soft wax for dusting the surface of lac encrustation and preventing honeydew, the excreta of the lac insect, adhering to it. When a chunk of lac, with living insects, is observed, the encrustation appears covered with white woolly threads”.

**cd.** VISHVA BANDHU 1971: 20 interpreted these pādas in the following terms: “*lakṣā*, at the time of its first appearance, is in the form of viscous honey-like drops and is, therefore, appropriately described as ‘the sister of the waters’, *i.e.*, as pertaining to the sphere of liquids. . . . The exposure of ‘the sister of the waters’ to air causes its encrustment. This seems to be referred to by the description of *vātá-* as its *ātmán-*”. MAHDIHASSAN convincingly rejected this interpretation because “lac resin exudes from glands as a semi-solid secretion which cannot be observed as such, least of all with the naked eye” (1980: 120). DAVE (p. 14), on the other hand, thinks that these words refer to “the fact that but for the essential help of the breeze the insects would not be able to survive and propagate themselves”. I tentatively suggest that references to rain and wind are made because of the favorable weather conditions for lac crops in the rainy season (cf. MUKHOPADHYAY & MUTHANA 1962: 73, and the comm. on stanza 1).

#### 6.4.7 abc: ŚS 5.5.6abc, d: 5.5.4d

hirāṇyabāho subhage	(8)
sūryavarṇe vapuṣṭame	(8)
+rutam gachati niṣkr̥tiḥ	(8)
semaṁ niṣ kṛdhi +pūruṣam	(8)

O golden-armed, fortunate, sun-colored, most handsome one. The Mending goes to the injured [limb]: so you must mend this man here.

hiranyabāho] **Or**, hiranyabāhū **K** sūryavarṇe] **K**, sūryavarṇe **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], sŪ(+ ū)ryavarṇe **Ku** +rutam] ṛtam **Or K** [[Edg.: rutam]] gachati] **Ku V/126 Mā JM [Ma]**, gachanti **RM**, gachati **Pa**, gaśchami **K** niṣkṛtiḥ] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [Ma], niṣkṛtiḥ **V/126**, niṣkṛdhi **K** semam] **K**, sedam **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], seda **RM** niṣ kṛdhi] **RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, niṣkṛti(→ dhi) **Ku JM** +pūruṣam] bhadrayā || **Or**, pauruṣam **Z K** [[note Z]]

#### ŚS 5.5.6abc, 5.5.4d

hiranyavarṇe sūbhage sūryavarṇe vāpuṣtame |  
rutam gachāsi niṣkṛte . . . sémam niṣ kṛdhi pūruṣam ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *sedam niṣkṛdhi bhadrayā*.

**ab.** We expect a voc. from *ū* stem *hiranyabāhū-*, but both the Or. mss. (and **K**: cf. the same error *-ū* → *-o* at PS 19.5.1+2+3) rather point to a form derived from *hiranyabāhu-* (cf. AiGr. III, §101).

Could it be that the *lākṣā-* is called ‘golden-armed’ (*hiranyavarṇe* in ŚS) referring to the lac insect’s ‘filamentous tubes’? The other epithets clearly refer again to the lac insect’s bright-red appearance. Also, they call to mind the various Apsaras names which occur in the two Mahābhārata passages (1.59.48–49 and 1.114.51–54) referred to also in the discussion of 6.4.10, below.

**cd.** The *-ta* participle *rutá-* (from *rav* ‘to fracture’) is otherwise attested only RV 9.112.1, 10.39.3, 10.105.7, MS 2.9.9:127.12 = KS 17.16:258.21 = KapKS 27.6:118.6 [2:137.2] = VSM 16.49 (cf. VSK 17.8.3 *ṛtásya* and TS 4.5.10.1 *rudrásya*). See NARTEN (1964: 224ff.), who argues that each time a word for ‘limb’ is to be supplied. According to the unpublished draft manuscript (dated 1985) of GOTŌ’s ‘Materialien’ on the relevant verbs (which was kindly put at my disposal by the author), the form *ruta-* at KauśS 141.39, AVParíś 72.5.5 and KātyŚS 5.6.32 does not belong to the above verb, but to *rav*<sup>i</sup> ‘to cry’ (GOTŌ explains the short *u* as due to analogy — *stauti* :: *stuta-*).

As for the verb form: both the Or. mss. and **K** point to an indicative, but the reading *gaśchami* of **K** cannot be reconciled with the third person which we find in the Or. mss., and may point to influence from the ŚS reading *gachāsi* (through a simple confusion of *-s-* and *-m-*). Note however that an identical error is found at 7.2.3c, where such an explanation is not possible. The reading *gachati* of the Or. mss, as adopted also by BHATTACHARYA, is probably authentic: PS combines a third person form with a nom. *niṣkṛtiḥ*, while ŚS picks the syntactically preferable possibility of a second person with a voc.

The Or. mss. and **K** go even wider apart in pāda **d**. If we compare the shifted **d** pādas of ŚS 5.5.4 and stanza 3 above, with those of ŚS 5.5.6 and the present stanza, this leads the way to the conclusion that BHATTACHARYA has erred in following the Or. mss. These latter must have copied their less suitable reading of our pāda (*sedam niṣkṛdhi bhadrayā*) from two similar stanzas found at PS 2.63.4–5 (cf. my Introduction, §2.4). They have put it in the place of the **K** pāda, which we have also as ŚS 5.5.4d. BHATTACHARYA’s explanation of the

divergence between **K** and the Or. mss. (see his Introduction, pp. xlii–xliii) is convoluted.

#### 6.4.8 ŚS 5.5.8

ghṛtācī nāma kānīno	(8)
ajababhru pitā tava	(8)
aśvo yamasya yaḥ +śyāvas	(8)
tasya hāsnās,y *ukṣitā	(8)

“Like ghee” you are called, o goat-brown one: born of a girl is your father. Yama’s horse, which is dark brown: with its blood are you besprinkled.

kānīno] **Ku JM Pa [Ma] K**, kācīno **RM**, jānīno **V/126 Mā** ajababhru] ’jababhru **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, ’jababhUr **Pa**, tababhūr **K** tava] **Or**, bhava **K** yamasya yaḥ] **Or**, yamasye **K** +śyāvas] śāvas **Or**, śrāvas **K** tasya] **Or**, tāsyā **K** hāsnāsy] **Or**, hāSTRāsy **K** \*ukṣitā ||] ukṣatā(→ tāṃ) || **Ku**, urkṣatāṃ || **JM**, ukṣatāṃ || **RM V/126 Mā**, ukṣatā || **Pa [Ma]**, ukṣata | **K**

#### ŚS 5.5.8

silācī nāma kānīno ’jababhru pitā tava |  
aśvo yamāsyā yāḥ śyāvās tāsyā hāsnāsy ukṣitā ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *śāvas*. The misprint *hāsnāsi ukṣatā* is corrected to *hāsnāsy ukṣatā* on BHATTACHARYA n.d.-2, but see below.

a. The word *ghṛtācī-* (see also my discussion of *śilācī-* under 6.4.1) was briefly treated by KUIPER 1953, whose rather weakly supported suggestion (p. 64) to “connect *ghṛtāñc-* with the Indo-Iranian group of words that may contain *-añc-* “showing, manifesting”” has — in my view rightly — been rejected by MAYRHOFER (EWAia I, 53 & 516), who now seems to propose a connection with *añc* ‘to draw (water)’. On the semantic side, there is little doubt that the word must mean something like ‘rich in ghee’ or ‘like ghee’, and it is thus attractive (*pace* KUIPER p. 64) to compare *śvityāñc-* ‘whitish’ (AiGr. II/2, p. 424). A translation ‘ghee-ish’ or ‘like ghee’ would fit nicely with the idea that this hymn is partly addressed to the lac insect: its bright-colored secretion is here compared to ghee.

Despite the different accentuation, it is tempting to see a morphological and semantic connection between our *ghṛtācī-* and the obscure word *silācī-* (PS 6.4.1 *śilācī-*) as read here again in ŚS (see PS 6.4.1c = ŚS 5.5.1c above), which may mean: ‘like stone’.

b. This pāda must be partially corrupt, but the text of ŚS and PS is identical: the corruption must therefore be old. As for the word *kānīmā-*, in addition to the references given by BLOOMFIELD 1897: 421, I can only quote ŚS 10.4.24 *tāudī nāmāsi kanyā ghṛtācī nāma vā asi | adhaspadēna te padām ā dade viṣadūṣaṇam* ‘Thou art a girl, *tāudī* by name; verily thou art by name ghee-like; I take beneath thy poison-spoiling track’ (WHITNEY). The word is not discussed by HOFFMANN (1955: 38–39 = 1976: 381–382) in his discussion of

various derivations of *kanyā-* ‘young woman’; Sasha Lubotsky suggests to me to emend \**kanīno*, the expected archaic gen. sg. of that noun, which might have suffered in transmission after the form had disappeared from the language.

I have not been able to find any reference to a ‘brown goat’ elsewhere in Vedic. For what it is worth, I refer to the *svajā- babhrú-* (‘brown serpent’) which occurs PS 19.9.15 / ŚS 6.56.2. If we may assume that ŚS has preserved the correct place for the accent (*ájababhru*) we can have here a voc. of f. adj. *ájababhrū-*, as has been assumed by previous translators, or a nom./voc. sg. of n. *ájababhru-* (cf. TS 5.11.6.1, MS 3.13.3:169.1 etc. *śúkababhru-*); if we neglect the ŚS padapāṭha, and its accentuation, we might theoretically have two neuter vocatives (*ája bábhru*).

DAVE, again starting from biological facts (and on the implicit assumption that *ajababhru* is or stands for a nom. masc.), gives the following thought-provoking interpretation (1950: 14): “*pitā* in this verse means the actual progenitor (the male insect) and not the mythical father of the first verse, and the epithets *kānīnaḥ* and *ajababhru* are used for him in a disparaging sense. *kānīna* (from *kana* ‘little’) refers to the tiny size of the adult male and his worthlessness in respect of the production of lac, and as for the red dye, so essential an ingredient of *lākṣā* as a healing agent, he produces none at all”. This, I imagine, would result in a rendering: ‘You are called “Rich in Ghee”. Small is your father, goat-brown’. It yields some sense, provided we accept that the ancient Indians’ entomological knowledge was surprisingly advanced.

However, on the grounds of many stanzas with parallel structures, we really do not expect *kānīnó* to belong to the same phrase as *pitā*. Following Lubotsky’s suggestion mentioned above, and leaving open the question whether it is necessary to emend *ájababhru* (n.) to \**ájababhrūḥ* (m.), one may tentatively reconstruct and translate the hemistich as follows: *ś/silācī nāma \*kanīnó ’jababhru pitā táva* “‘Like ghee’ is the name of you, young girl, Goat-brown is [the name of your] father’. Given the unanimity of transmission, and the anyhow uncertain meaning of this stanza, I adopt above an admittedly much less satisfying translation, that only has the merit of attempting to account for the transmitted readings.

cd. The obscure myth which seems to be referred to here has been discussed at some length by BLOOMFIELD (1897: 422), who refers to several passages in which ‘dark brown horses’ are mentioned (RV 1.35.5, 1.71.1, 2.10.2, 3.55.11; ŚS 11.2.18), to which I may add here the noteworthy stanza PS 3.22.6: *go-bhir aśvair vasubhir apakritāsy oṣadhe | +śyāvasyāśvasya cakṣuṣā prati paśya kimīdinaḥ* ‘You have been bought with cows, horses, riches, o Plant: find out the Kimīdins, with the eye of the dark brown horse’. Especially striking is the parallel found at PS 20.56.11–12, quoted in my discussion of the next stanza. The ‘dark brown horse’ seems to have had mythical or proverbial connotations which are no longer recoverable for us.

It may be worthwhile to quote BLOOMFIELD’s suggestion (1897: 422), with reference to his own important notes on ‘The Two Dogs of Yama in a New

Rôle’ (1893: 163–172): “the brown horse of Yama may be a variant of the two dogs of Yama called śyāma and śabala, ‘sun and moon,’ or ‘day and night’ . . . , and this would again lead back to the word rātrī in st. 1”. May we consider that our pādas have somehow contaminated the phonologically similar concepts of a (*śyāvā-*) *śśva-* (not originally connected with Yama) and that of the two *yamaśvānau* ‘Dogs of Yama’, one of which (presumably representing the moon, see BLOOMFIELD 1893: 171) is frequently called *śyāvā-* (hence hypothetically *\*śyāvāśvan-*) as well? This contaminated notion of ‘Yama’s brown horse’ seems then to have been associated with the black YV myth (MS 4.9.19, TĀ 4.29, KathĀ 3.239a:104.13–17 / 3.186:70.17–21) involving a dog-footed messenger of Yama, with a bloody face (*śśrīmukha-*), who is smeared (*abhyākta-*, cf. our *\*ukṣita-*) with blood.

What all of this would finally mean in the present context remains, of course, utterly obscure. Is there indeed a connection with *rātrī mātā*, in the first stanza of this hymn? The mention of ‘blood’ alludes to the red color of the lac. Could there be any connection between the bloody-mouthed Dog in the YV passages just referred to, the ‘mouth’ or ‘blood’ (see WHITNEY on ŚS 5.5.8 and 5.5.9, and BLOOMFIELD 1897: 422 on the confusion caused by inconsistencies in the ŚS padapāṭha) of the male horse here (and in 6.4.9a), and the fact that “in the course of its last moult the male [lac-insect] loses its mouth parts” (DAVE 1950: 4)? On a possible significance of the use of the adjective *śyāvā-* ‘dark brown’ (perhaps also *ajababhru*), and the mention of ‘blood’, in this lac-context, see MAHDIHASSAN (1980: 129): “when stored and dried to be used as drug, it is reddish brown”.

BHATTACHARYA’s *ukṣatā* is impossible in the context. I emend with ŚS. Cf. the case of *°jinvata-* = *°jinivita-* at PS 2.63.3d, 5.7.12c, 10.5.7c / ŚS 19.31.7c (LUBOTSKY 2002: 7f.), “sei es, dass dies eine alte Nebenform darstellt oder eine Neuerung der Überlieferung” (ZEHNDER 2004a: 61): in our case the evidence from ŚS supports the latter evaluation of the PS ms. readings.

#### 6.4.9 ŚS 5.5.9, ṚVKh 4.7.6 ◊ cf. PS 20.56.11

*aśvasyāsnaḥ saṃpatitā	(8)
sā parṇam abhi +śśiyadaḥ	(8)
sarā +patatṛiṇy asi	(8)
sā na eḥy arundhati	(8)

You have flown together from the horse’s blood: you flowed to the Parṇa [tree].  
You are a winged stream (?): come to us, o Arundhatī.

\*aśvasyāsnaḥ] aśvasyāstnaḥ **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, aśvasyāvostanaḥ **RM**, aśvasyāSTRas **K** saṃpatitā] **V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, saṃpat(·)tā **Ku**, saṃpatitā **JM**, saṃpajitā **RM** parṇam] **K**, parṇam **Or** +śśiyadaḥ] śśiyadaḥ **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, śśiyadaḥ **JM**, śśiyataḥ **RM**, śśiyata **K** sarā] **Or**, sadā **K** +patatṛiṇy asi] patatṛiṇy asi **Or**, patatinnasi **K** [[Edg.: °tinnrasi]] sā na ehy] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, sāneyhy **Pa**, Sāneyhy **K** arundhati] arundhati **Or**, arundhatī **K**

**ŚS 5.5.9**

ásvasyāsnāḥ sámpatitā sá vṛkṣāñ abhí siṣyade |  
sarā patatṛiṇī bhūtvā sá na éhy arundhati ||

**ṚVKh 4.7.6**

\*ásvasyāsr̥k sámpatasi tát parṇám abhi tiṣṭhasi |  
sarát pataty arṇasi sá máñ rautsíd arundhatí ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *ásvasyāstnaḥ* and *śiṣyadaḥ*.

I give here a preliminary edition of the important parallel PS 20.56.11–12 [PSK 20.52.11–12]: *ásvasyāснаḥ sámpatitā parṇe te vasatiṣ kṛtā | asṛk patatṛiṇām asi jahī vāmūn †prabādhama† || asṛkto adhi jāto 'si parṇe te sadanaṁ kṛtam | āṇḍaṁ patatṛiṇām asi jahī vāmūn †prabādhama†* ‘Flown together from the horse’s mouth/blood, your home is made in the Parṇa-tree. You are the blood of the winged [...]. Or (?) you must kill those ... . You are born from blood, your seat is made in the Parṇa-tree. You are the egg of the winged [...]’.

**a.** A very tentative hint toward a biologically based interpretation of this pāda was given at the end of my discussion of the preceding stanza. Other hints were given in my discussion of the ṚVKh variant (with *sám patasi*) to 6.4.5a, which is to be compared.

**bc.** On the reduplicated forms of *syand*, see KÜMMEL 2000: 588f. The form *siṣyadaḥ*, not noted by KÜMMEL, seems to be a 2nd sg. aor. inj.

Note the interesting description of the Parṇa-tree (= *Butea frondosa/monosperma*) by SYED 1990: 207, and see my discussion of stanza 4, above. SYED reports that this tree is a favorite of birds, and one would normally render *patatṛiṇ-* as ‘bird’. But in the PS 20.56 passage just quoted, and in our pāda **c**, it also seems tempting to take *patatṛiṇ-* in an apparently previously unattested sense of ‘insect’. However, with the lac insect, only the males, generally less than 30% percent of the population, develop wings, and even of the males, the largest percentage is apterous (see MUKHOPADHYAY & MUTHANA 1962: 73, wings depicted p. 69): it is possible that even these wings are not observable to the naked eye.

Cf. the plural variant(s) of pāda **c**, which occur ṚV 10.97.9 (*sīrāḥ patatṛiṇī sthāna*), VSM 12.83 = VSK 13.6.9, PS 11.6.5, TS 4.2.6.2, MS 2.7.13:93.14, KS 16.13:236.8 / KapKS 25.4:97.20 [2:114.6]. BLOOMFIELD (1897: 422) points out: “The meaning of this Pāda is by no means established. It is formulary in character and always employed in connection with plants”. It may have been reinterpreted to fit the lac context here. The meaning of the word *sarā-/sīrā-* is unclear in all of the above contexts (‘winged plow(s)’ seems unlikely, cf. also GELDNER’s note on ṚV 10.97.9). Possible clues may be contained in ṚV 1.121.11c *sīrāsu* ‘?’ and 8.69.12 *suṣīrā-* ‘hollow’. Perhaps we can accept BLOOMFIELD’s suggestion (1897: 423) that the word (*sarā/sīrāḥ*) contains an allusion to the word *śilācī-*, i.e. (according to my explanation of that word) to *śilā-* ‘stone’: assuming that the *-ī-* in ṚV *sīrā-* is more original than the AV

reading, could our pāda **c** mean ‘you are winged stone’? Different explanations for the RV hapax *sirā-* are discussed in EWAia II, 733.

At the end of his discussion of the last stanza of the ŚS version of this hymn, ZYSK writes, apparently being wrongly informed about the readings of the Or. mss.: “K has two additional verses which, Barret states, are most probably later additions. . . . These are wanting in the Orissa manuscripts, thereby lending support to Barret’s contention” (1993: 206). This is obviously erroneous as far as the statement about the Or. mss. is concerned. Although these “additional verses” in PS do cause a break with the norm in kāṇḍa 6 of nine stanzas per hymn, they cannot be proven definitively to be linguistically later or thematically secondary, *pace* BARRET (1933: 28): “the last two stanzas of the Pāipp. version are pretty surely an addition to the nine stanzas which constitute the Ś. version”.

#### 6.4.10 Only PS

ghṛtācike *vātarathe	(8)
vidyutparṇe arundhati	(8)
+āturaṃ gamiṣṭhāsī	(8)
tvam aṅga niṣkarīyasī	(8)

Like gheeish, with the wind as your chariot, o Vidyutparṇā, o Arundhatī, you go most quickly to the injured one; you verily are a fine Mender.

ghṛtācike] **Or**, ghṛtācike **K** \*vātarathe] vāmarathe **Or**, vāmarate **K** vidyutparṇe] **K**, vidyutparṇe **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma], vidyu{t·}tparṇe **Mā** arundhati | +āturaṃ] aṅdhati | āturaṃ **Or**, arundhatīyāturaṃ [[*om.*] **K** gamiṣṭhāsī] **RM V/126 Mā Pa** [?] [Ma] **K**, gamiṣṭāsī **Ku JM** aṅga] **Or**, aṅga **K** niṣkarīyasī] **Ku JM RM Mā** [Ma] **K**, niṣ(sec. m. + k)arīyasī **V/126**, niṣka{rĀ}rīyasī **Pa**

BHATTACHARYA edits *vāmarathe* and reads *āturaṃgamiṣṭhāsī* as one word.

**a.** The *-ka-* suffix in the hapax *ghṛtācikā-* seems merely to add a diminutive meaning here (see AiGr. II/2, §361a), and this stanza appears to be addressed to the same *lākṣā-* = *arundhatī-* as the preceding ones.

The rather bold emendation *\*vātarathe* which I make here is supported by an attestation of that word at KS 36.8:75.14, but seems to be confirmed especially by PS 7.13.6 below. Besides the noteworthy collocation there of the verb *pat-* (which also just occurred two times in our present hymn) with *vātarathā-*, the hymn PS 7.13 also offers other thematic/lexical parallels to our hymn. Cf. also *vāta-* in 6.4.6d above. The word *vāmarathā-*, on the other hand, which is adopted by BHATTACHARYA, does not occur in (Vedic) Sanskrit, and hardly makes sense in the present context. The masculine (!) name *vāmaratha-* occurs very rarely, and only from late Vedic Pravara texts onwards (e.g. BaudhŚS-Pravara 27:441.1, ĀpŚS 24.8.14).

**b.** The word *vidyutparṇā-* seems otherwise to be first attested in the Mahābhārata, where it is a proper name denoting an Apsaras (see also my

comm. on *vātarathe* in **a**). Cf. Mahābhārata 1.59.48–49 and 1.114.51–54: note that several epithets which occur in the present hymn (i.a. *ghṛtācī*, *hiraṇyabāhu-*, *vapuṣṭamā-*) have exact or close parallels as Apsaras names in these Mahābhārata passages. Because the name *vidyutparṇā-* does not occur in accented Vedic texts, I cannot decide how the compound is to be interpreted. For now, it seems best to take it as a proper name here as well. Noteworthy in any case is the proverbial ‘fiery’ nature (cf. our *vidyut-*) of the Parṇa tree, whose pointed leaves “gleichen züngelnden Flammen” (SYED 1990: 207).

For a summary of the literature on, and most important characteristics of Apsarases, see OBERLIES 1998: 229 n. 384. Cf. i.a. PS 7.13, 12.7.7/ŚS 4.37.4 (also PS 18.7.10/ŚS 14.2.9) and TS 3.4.8.4: the Apsarases house, besides in the Udumbara, in much the same trees (Nyagrodha, Aśvattha, Plakṣa) as the *lākṣā-* (see stanza 4 above). Is the *lākṣā-* here divinized (as ZYSK also interprets the whole hymn) as an Apsaras? If it is the lac insect itself which is being addressed, then the name may have to do with its bright (lightning-like [?]) color.

**c.** On the meaning of (*an*)*āturā-*, see ZYSK 1985: 316. On the syntax of *āturam* + *gamiṣṭha-* see TICHY (1995: 72, 317, 321) (cf. also PS 15.16.1), and on the formation verbal root (with preverb) + suffix *-īyas/-iṣṭha-* also AiGr. II/2, §272d&f (p. 447–448): “Diese Bildungsweise ist fast ganz auf den RV. beschränkt” (p. 448).

**d.** In view of the frequent combination *tvām aṅgá* in Vedic (see i.a. ṚV 1.89.19, 5.3.11, 7.20.9, 10.54.4, PS 8.1.4), it is most likely that BHATTACHARYA is to be followed in separating *aṅga niṣkarīyasī*, although a word-play on *aṅga-* ‘limb’ (*tvam aṅganiṣkarīyasī* ‘you are a fine mender of limbs’) was probably intended by the poet as well.

The hapax *niṣkarīyas-* (cf. AiGr. II/2, §272b, cβ, f) is quite archaic, and there seems to be no internal (linguistic) reason to call this stanza secondary (as does BARRET 1933: 28), even though it is not paralleled in the ŚS or ṚVKh versions of this hymn.

**6.4.11 acd:** only PS ◊ **b:** TB 3.7.5.6 (etc.), cf. PS 20.27.8d [PSK 20.26.8d]

yat te jagdham piśācais	(7)
tat ta ā pyāyatām punaḥ	(8)
lākṣā tvā viśvabheṣajī	(8)
devebhis trāyatām saha    4	(8)

Let that swell back for you, what the Piśācas have eaten of you. Let the cure-all Lākṣā save you, together with the gods.

jagdham] **JM V/126 Mā** [Ma], ya(→ ja 2)gdham **Ku**, yagdham **RM Pa**, jagradham **K** piśācais] **Or**, piśācais **K** ta ā] **Or**, tārḥā **K** lākṣā] **Or**, lākṣāya **K** viśvabheṣajī] **Or**, viśvabheṣajīr **K** devebhis] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, debhis **JM** || 4 ||  
 || ṛ 11 || 4 || **Ku JM**, || ṛ || 4 || **RM**, || 4 || ṛ 11 || **V/126 Mā**, || 4 || ṛ || **Pa**, Z 4 Z **K**

This closing stanza is appropriately addressed to the patient, who is being treated with lac.

**ab.** Eating flesh is characteristic of Piśāca-demons, who are frequently called *kravyād-* (see OLDENBERG 1917: 265–266 n. 3, and cf. i.a. PS 2.62.3, 7.19.2, 10.11.5, 12.18.10, 12.19.2, 12.20.3+4). The formulaic combination *piśāca-* + *ghas* is found i.a. PS 12.18.3/5, 12.18.6, but note especially the parallel 7.19.8abc below.

**d.** Note that, just as the opening stanza of this hymn (1d) invoked the gods by calling *śilācī-* (= *lākṣā-*) their sister, so does the poet close the hymn by a similar invocation.

## 6.5. For safe breathing.

This hymn again exceeds the norm of 9 stanzas per hymn. The parallel ŚS 2.15 (with a total of only 6 stanzas) does not provide the expected number of stanzas either, nor does it itself conform to the norm of 5 stanzas per hymn in ŚS kāṇḍa 2 (cf. INSLER 1998b: 9). The two versions correspond in the following manner:

PS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
ŚS	1	–	3	2	–	–	4	–	–	–	–	5	6

There probably was a core of original stanzas, which has been strongly amplified with more or less suitable additions in the PS version of the hymn.

Moreover, the ŚS version lacks the **d** pādas found in PS: the perfect symmetry between the first and second hemistichs of the PS version (*na bibhīto na riṣyataḥ :: mā bibheḥ . . . mā riṣaḥ*) might be taken as more original, but this leaves open the question why the ŚS redactors would have reduced this symmetry.

As for the ritual application of the hymn, there are conflicting indications. KauśS 54.11 prescribes the use of ŚS 2.15 in the *godāna* ceremony. However, the use to which the parallel of our first stanza is put in MānGS 1.2.13, to accompany the anointing of the eyes by the Snātaka, is different. No real conclusions can be drawn about the original application(s) of this hymn.

### 6.5.1 MānGS 1.2.13 ◊ abc: ŚS 2.15.1 ◊ a: PS 5.30.3a

yathā dyauś ca pṛthivī ca	(8)
na bibhīto na riṣyataḥ	(8)
evā me prāṇa mā bibher	(8)
evā me (')pāna mā riṣaḥ	(8)

Just as both heaven and earth do not fear, do not get hurt, likewise, o exhalation of mine, do not fear; likewise, o inhalation of mine, do not get hurt.

na bibhīto] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, nabhīto **JM**, nabibhito **RM** ] **Or**, *om.* **K**  
 prāṇa mā bibher] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, prāṇabibher **JM** (')pāna] pāna **Or**  
**K** riṣaḥ ||] **Or**, riṣayā (+ ) **K**

#### ŚS 2.15.1

yathā dyauś ca pṛthivī ca ná bibhītó ná riṣyataḥ |  
 evā me prāṇa mā bibheḥ ||

#### MānGS 1.2.13

yathā dyauś ca pṛthivī ca na bibhīto na riṣyataḥ |  
 evaṃ me prāṇa mā bibha evaṃ me prāṇa mā riṣaḥ ||

The MānGS version of this mantra has been rather carelessly translated by DRESDEN: 'As sky and earth do not fear nor perish, likewise may my breath

not fear, likewise may my breath not perish’, wrongly taking *prāṇa* (thus twice in MānGS) as a nominative.

**cd.** On the various ‘breaths’ distinguished in Vedic literature, and the correct translation of *prāṇa*- and *apāna*-, see BODEWITZ 1986. Note the interesting nonce-form *bibhaḥ* in MānGS.

### 6.5.2 Only PS

yathā vāyuś cāntarikṣaṃ ca °°° || (9)

Just as both the wind and the intermediate space . . . .

cāntarikṣaṃ ca] **K**, cāntarikṣaṇ ca **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, cā’ntarikṣaṇca **JM RM** ||  
Or [[**Ku JM**: ||<sup>kā</sup>]], *om. K*

The collocation *vāyuś cāntarikṣaṃ ca* is found elsewhere i.a. at PS 9.21.8b, VSM 26.1, JB 2.77. Cf. also ŚS 4.39.3, TS 7.5.23.1.

### 6.5.3 ŚS 2.15.3 ◊ a: PS 8.6.9a

yathā sūryaś ca candramāś ca °°° || (9)

Just as both the sun and the moon . . . .

ca candramāś ca ||] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, camāśca ||<sup>kā</sup> **JM**, candramāśca | **K**

#### ŚS 2.15.3

yáthā sūryaś ca candráś ca . . . ||

Note the omission of the first *ca* in BHATTACHARYA’s edition, which reads *yathā sūryaś candramāś ca* (as does **K**, in fact). This must be a misprint, because my copy of his **Mā** reads with all other Or. mss. (except **JM**), and so must his **Ma**. The ŚS version of this stanza (*candráś ca*) is metrically preferable.

### 6.5.4 ŚS 2.15.2

yathā<sub>a</sub>haś ca rātrī ca °°° || (8)

Just as both day and night . . . .

||] **Ku JM** [||<sup>kā</sup>]] **RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, *om. K*

#### ŚS 2.15.2

yáthāhaś ca rátrī ca . . . ||

### 6.5.5 Only PS

yathā dhenuś cānaḍvāṃś ca °°° || (8)

Just as both cow and ox . . . .

||] **Ku JM** [||<sup>kā</sup>]] **RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, *om. K*

Cf. FALK 1982: 176 on TS 4.7.10.2 (*anaḍvāñ ca me dhenús ca me*): “Das letzte Paar, der *anaḍúh* und die *dhenú*, vertritt die erstrebenswerten Normaltypen. Die *dhenú* kalbt regelmässig und gibt Milch, der *anaḍúh* hilft auf dem Feld und vor dem Wagen”.

### 6.5.6 Only PS

yathā mitraś ca varuṇaś ca °°° || (9)

Just as both Mitra and Varuṇa . . . .

varuṇaś] **K**, varṇaś **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, varṣ **V/126** ca ||] **Or**, ca (+ |) **K**

### 6.5.7 ŚS 2.15.4

yathā brahma ca kṣatraṃ ca °°° || (8)

Just as both the priesthood and the nobility . . . .

kṣatraṃ ca ||] **RM**, kṣatrañ ca ||] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, kṣetraṃca ||<sup>kā</sup> **JM**, kṣatraṃ ca **Z K** [[note Z]]

#### ŚS 2.15.4

yáthā bráhma ca kṣatrám ca . . . ||

On the pair of *bráhman-* and *kṣatrá-*, see my commentary on 6.3.8d. Cf. also TS 7.5.23.2.

### 6.5.8 Only PS

yatheṇdraś cendriyaṃ ca °°° || (8)

Just as both Indra and (Indra’s) power . . . .

cendriyaṃ ca ||] **RM**, cendriyañ ca ||] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, cendriya{śca}ñca ||<sup>kā</sup> **JM**, cendri[[folio]]cendriyaṃ ca | **K**

### 6.5.9 Only PS

yathā vīraś ca vīryaṃ ca °°° || (8)

Just as both a hero and heroic force . . . .

yathā vīraś] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, yathā{prāṇaścAVI}vīraś **Pa** vīryaṃ ca ||] **JM** ||<sup>kā</sup> **RM K** [[om. ]], vīryañ ca ||] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**

### 6.5.10 Only PS

yathā prāṇaś cāpānaś ca °°° || (8)

Just as both Exhalation and Inhalation . . . .

**6.5.11** Only PS

yathā mr̥tyuś cāmṛtaṃ ca °°° || (8)

Just as both death and immortality . . . .

cāmṛtaṃ ca ||] **K** [om. ], cāmṛtañ ca || **Or**

BHATTACHARYA's edition erroneously reads: *mr̥tyuś cāmṛtaś ca*.

**6.5.12** ŚS 2.15.5

yathā satyaṃ cānṛtaṃ ca °°° || (8)

Just as both truth and unrighteousness . . . .

satyaṃ] **Ku K**, satyañ **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]** cānṛtaṃ ca ||] **JM** [||<sup>kā</sup>] **K**,  
cānṛtañ ca ||] **Ku RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, cā{·ṛ}nṛtañ ca **V/126**

**ŚS 2.15.5**

yáthā satyám cānṛtaṃ ca . . . ||

**6.5.13** ŚS 2.15.6

yathā bhūtaṃ ca bhavyaṃ ca (8)

na bibhīto na riṣyataḥ | (8)

evā me prāṇa mā bibher (8)

evā me (')pāna mā riṣaḥ || 5 || *anuvāka 1* || (8)

Just as both what is and what is to be do not fear, do not get hurt, likewise, exhalation of mine, do not fear; likewise, inhalation of mine, do not get hurt.

bhūtaṃ ca] **RM K**, bhūtañ ca **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]** bhavyaṃ ca] **RM K**  
[Edg. wrongly prints a ||], bhavyañ ca **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]** bibhīto] **Ku JM**  
**V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, bibhīto **RM** mā bibher evā me] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**  
**K**, mā{riṣe}(→ bibhe 2)revā me **JM** (')pāna] pāna **Or K** riṣaḥ] **Or**, riṣa **K** || 5 ||  
*anuvāka 1* ||] || ṛ 13 || 5 || a 1 || **Ku**, || ṛ 13 || 5 || **JM**, || ṛ || 5 || **RM**, || 5 || ṛ 13 || a 1 ||  
**V/126 Mā**, || 5 || ṛ || a 1 || **Pa**, Z 5 Z Z anu 1 Z **K**

**ŚS 2.15.6**

yáthā bhūtám ca bhávyam ca ná bibhītó ná riṣyataḥ |

evá me prāṇa má bibheḥ ||

## 6.6. To get a lover: with madhugha.

The stanzas of this hymn are mostly unattested elsewhere in Vedic literature. Except in stanza 2, no indications are given in this hymn regarding the gender of the speaker: the use of nom. sg. masculine forms in 2a (*sārayan*) and 2b (*nipedivān*), and a gen. sg. masc. form in 2c (*āyataḥ*), referring to the desired lover, in combination with the mention of *Indrānī* in stanza 4 — apparently as divine model for the speaker —, make it clear that the intended user of these mantras must have been a woman, employing a plant called *madhugha-* to get her lover.

On the word *madhugha-* (= ŚS *mad(h)úgha-*) in the PS, see in the first place ZEHNDER 1999: 90. ZEHNDER does not refer to the pertinent article by SANI (1989–1990), who argues rather cogently (pp. 247–249) against the traditional explanation of the word as derived by haplology from *madhu-dúgha-*, and proposes a novel interpretation (p. 257) “qui frappe (*hanti*) — c’est-à-dire qui ensorcelle — au moyen de la douceur”. ZEHNDER also neglects the fact that **K** reads *madhuga-* almost without exception, a fact which is interesting in view of the uncertainty (regarding the aspiration of the dental stop) which pervades all attestations of the word. In his survey of PS ‘Belegstellen’ (p. 90), ZEHNDER omits reference to all non-AV Samhitā attestations. I give here a complete list:

PS 2.31.1, 3, 4, 2.35.1, 2.77.3, 3.28.6, 4.20.5, 6.6.3–6, 8.10.3, 8.20.4, 19.47.13  
 ŚS 1.34.4, 6.102.3  
 KauśS 38.17 (with *v.l.*), 76.8 (with *v.l.*), 79.10  
 AVParīś 37.9.1  
 MS 1.3.36:42.14 (with *v.l.*)  
 KaṭhĀ 2.105:42.3 *madhughám* (oxytone)

In these last two YV attestations, it is doubtful whether we are actually dealing with the same word as the AV plant name. WITZEL 1974a/2004: 43 quite understandably follows the ‘traditional’ explanation of the word as derived from *madhudúgha-*, and renders KaṭhĀ 2.105 (*mádhu madhughám̐ sám bhariṣyāmi*) “Das Süßigkeiten strömen lassende Süße werde ich zusammentragen”.

One can only speculate (with Sāyaṇa on ŚS 6.102.3) that the word, as a plant name, may have some connection with the plant called *madhūka-* (attested perhaps TS 3.4.8.3–4, further ŚāṅkhGS 1.12.9 etc.), which has been discussed by SYED 1990: 490ff., or with Sāyaṇa (on ŚS 1.34) as *madhuka-* (again a different plant): BAHULKAR 1994: 216.

**6.6.1** ŚS 1.34.3 ◊ **ab**: cf. ṚV 10.24.6ab ◊ **d**: PS 4.20.2d, cf. 1.55.3a, 19.43.1b, 20.31.8a ≈ ŚS 7.36.1a

madhuman me nikramaṇam	(8)
madhuman me parāyaṇam	(8)
vācā madhumad udyāsam	(8)

akṣyau me madhusaṃdr̥ṣī || (8)

Honeyed [must be] my entering, honeyed my departure. May I speak like honey, with [my] voice. My eyes [must be] honey-looking.

nikramaṇaṃ] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, ni{pa}kramaṇaṃ **Ku** parāyaṇaṃ | parāyaṇaṃ | **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma] K** [[note °ṃ]], parāya[[line]YAṇaṃ **Mā** madhumad udyāsam akṣyau] madhumadhudyāsamakṣyau **Or**, madhumadudyāma akṣo **K** || **Or**, *om.* **K**

### ŚS 1.34.3

mádhuman me níkrámaṇaṃ mádhuman me paráyanaṃ |  
vācā vadāmi mádhumad bhūyāsam mádhusaṃdr̥ṣāḥ ||

**a.** BHATTACHARYA edits *niṣkramaṇaṃ*. Since all the mss. available to me, as well as the parallel in ŚS, read *nikramaṇaṃ*, this must be a misprint (cf. also ZEHNDER 2004a: 55 n. 3). The word *nikrámaṇa-* occurs also at RV 1.162.14 (etc.), and TS 1.7.2.4: I assume it has the same nuance as does German *betreten* ‘to enter’.

**d.** This same pāda is found as PS 4.20.2d. There are close parallels at PS 1.55.3a, 20.31.8a ~ ŚS 7.36.1 (*akṣyāu . . . mádhusaṃkāśe*), and at PS 19.43.1a (<sup>+</sup>*akṣyau . . . madhukāśinī*<sup>8</sup>). The unanimous reading *madhusaṃdr̥ṣī* of the mss. here (and of **K** at PS 19.43.1a) must be a nom. n. du. to bahuvrīhi *mádhusaṃdr̥ṣ-* (AiGr. III, §19cα p. 51). BARRET’s emendation of the **K** reading at PS 19.43.1 to <sup>+</sup>*madhusaṃdr̥ṣe* is thus inappropriate.

### 6.6.2 Only PS ◊ b: cf. PS 19.37.3b

mā ām anu prasārayan (8)  
mama patto <sup>+</sup>nipedivān | (8)  
atho me punar āyato (8)  
akṣyau kāmena śuṣyatām || (8)

Stretching out [his arms] after me, having lain down at my feet — and when he is coming here again, let his eyes dry up with desire for me.

prasārayan] **Or**, prasārayaṃ **K** mama] **Or**, sasa **K** <sup>+</sup>nipedivān |] nipetivān **Or**, nime-divāṃ **K** atho me] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, a{·}thome **JM**, athote **K** akṣyau] kṣyau **Or**, kṣo **K** śuṣyatām ||] śuṣyatām || **Or K** [[*om.*] ]]

BHATTACHARYA edits *nipetivān*.

**ab.** On bisyllabic initial *mām* in anuṣṭubh-pādas, cf. i.a. RV 8.74.14a, 9.67.25c, 10.145.6c (OLDENBERG 1909–12/II: 137, 167, 357). For a full list, see ARNOLD 1905: 100.

A close parallel for these pādas is found PS 19.37.3ab, which I present here in a preliminary edition: *pari tvā gām ivāsaraṃ mama patto nipattave* ‘I have

<sup>8</sup> Quoted after the Or. mss.; **K** reads *madhusaṃdr̥ṣī*.

circumambulated you as a cow, so that you will lie down at my feet’. This parallel, together with the only slightly corrupt reading *nimedivāṃ* in **K** (-*p*- ~ -*m*- in Śāradā-script), suggests that BHATTACHARYA erred in adopting the Or. reading *nīpetivān*: we have in our pāda a participle from the root *pad*, not *pat*. Cf. HOFFMANN 1975: 172f. on other examples of this confusion (“Es handelt sich hier aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach um eine sekundäre Erscheinung in der Überlieferung . . . , nicht aber um ein sprachwirkliches Eintreten von *pat* für *pad*”). On the formation of this perf. pple. *pedivān*, which appears to be previously unattested in Vedic (mantra) texts, see AiGr. II/2, pp. 912–914. The compound *ni-pad*, which seems to have had a sexual connotation, is attested also i.a. at 7.11.6–7 below, and in *nīpadana*- ‘bed’ 6.23.1b: see my discussion under that pāda.

The form *sārayan* must be a previously unattested pres. pple. form of *sārayati*. Note that the poet makes use of a different meaning of *sar* (‘to extend’) than in the parallel PS 19.37.3a (*asaram* ‘I ran’). Cf. NARTEN (1969b: 92 = 1995: 137): “Bei nicht erwähntem Objekt sind im allgemeinen wohl die Hände gemeint”.

cd. Cf. PS 2.33.3ab *ūrdhvāni te lomāni tiṣṭhantv akṣyau kāmēna śuṣyatām* ‘Let your hairs stand upright, let [your] eyes dry up with desire’ and ŚS 6.9.1cd (~ PS 2.90.2cd) *akṣyāu vṛṣaṇyāntyāḥ kēsā mām te kāmēna śuṣyantv* ‘Let the eyes, the hairs of you who are lusting, dry up with desire for me’ (cf. ŚS 6.139.2). I take *me* with *kāmēna* (DELBRÜCK 1888: 156), and *akṣyau* with *āyatas*: cf. PS 20.65.8 [PSK 20.61.8] *yathā sā tasya kāmēna na suṣvāpa kadā cana | evāsau mama kāmēna māva svapsīt kadā cana* ‘Just as she has not slept at all, due to [her] desire for him, in the same way he there must not fall asleep, due to desire for me’ (wrongly interpreted by KÜMMEL 2000: 594).

### 6.6.3 Only PS

vaśā madhugha te mātā-	(8)
-ukṣā bhrātarṣabhaḥ pitā	(8)
dhenvā adhi prajāto ’si	(8)
rājā san madhumattamaḥ	(8)

Your mother is the breeding cow, o Madhugha, your brother the full-grown bull, your father the stud bull. You are born from a milk cow, being a king, most honeyed.

madhugha] **Or**, madhuga **K** bhrātarṣabhaḥ pitā || **Or**, bhrāja ṛṣabhaḥ pitā **K** [[misprint Edg. ṛṣabhaḥ; note °ḥ p°, om. ]] dhenvā adhi] **Or**, dhenvādhi **K** ’si] **JM**, si **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K** san] **Or**, saṃ **K** madhumattamaḥ ||] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, madhumattaḥ || **JM**, madhumattamaḥ **Z K** [[note Z]

ab. The set of *vaśā-*, *ukṣāṇ-* and *ṛṣabhá-* is found elsewhere too, cf. i.a. ṚV 6.16.47, 10.91.14, ŚS 4.24.4 / PS 4.39.4. On the meaning of the cattle terminology used here, see FALK 1982: 175–176 and KIEHNLE 1979: 57f.: the plant is

called a child, i.e. a manifestation of the fertile cow and bull (*vaśā-*, *ṛṣabha-*), and is thus clearly used with the belief that it will increase fertility. Since *ukṣāṇ-* is one of Soma's epithets (e.g. RV 9.69.4, 9.95.4 — omitted by OBERLIES 1999: 81ff.), and since the plant *madhugha-* is addressed at PS 2.32.3c as 'Soma's brother' (*atho somasya bhrātāsi*), we may suppose that our **b** pāda means to connect the *madhugha-* with the Soma plant: on (King) Soma's strong links with fertility, see OBERLIES 1999: 50–55, 208–214.

**cd.** Cf. PS 2.32.1 *ya uttarād ājāyate madhugho madhughād adhi* 'the madhugha that is begotten from the upper/higher (PS 2.32.4b, ZEHNDER 1999: 91 [?]) madhuga ...'. The association of *madhugha-* with productive and fertile cattle is continued here, as is the subtle reference to King (*rājā*) Soma, who is addressed as 'most honeyed' (*mádhumattama-*) i.a. at RV 1.47.1, 8.9.7, 9.63.16.

#### 6.6.4 Only PS ◊ a: PS 12.4.5c

<i>vṛṣāṇam vṛṣṇyāvantaṃ</i>	(8)
<i>somapṛṣṭhaṃ divi śritam  </i>	(8)
<i>indrāṇy agra ābharan</i>	(8)
<i>madhughaṃ bhagāya kam   </i>	(7)

In the beginning, Indrāṇī procured Madhugha for sexual pleasure, the virile one, full of virility, with *sóma* on its back, stretching to heaven.

*vṛṣāṇam*] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], (+ *vṛ*)*ṣāṇam* **Ku**, *viṣāṇam* **K** *vṛṣṇyāvantaṃ*] **K**, *vṛṣabhaṃ santaṃ* **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma], *Babhṛsantaṃ Mā* *somapṛṣṭhaṃ divi śritam* |] **Or** [°am ||], *sāparṇam abhi śiṣyataṃ* **K** *indrāṇy*] **Ku JM RM Pa** [Ma] **K**, *indrāny V/126*, *indrā{·}ny Mā* *agra ābharan*] **Or**, *agrābharaṃ* **K** *madhughaṃ*] **Or**, *madhurī* **K** *kam* ||] *kaṃ* ||] **Or** **K** [*om.* ||]

BHATTACHARYA edits *vṛṣāṇam vṛṣabhaṃ santaṃ* and prints *diviśritam* as one word. He does not report the odd error, not clearly legible in my reproduction, *Babhṛsantaṃ* that I find in **Mā**.

**a.** Note the difference in reading between the Or. mss. (*vṛṣabhaṃ santaṃ*) and **K** (*vṛṣṇyāvantaṃ*). I follow the later more suitable reading, found also at PS 12.4.5c, because the phrase *vṛṣabhaṃ santaṃ* occurs again relatively close by in the text, at PS 6.22.10a, and it seems more likely that the Or. tradition has anticipated the phrase from there, than that **K** would have replaced an original reading preserved in the Or. mss. under influence from 12.4.5c. Moreover, the combination *vṛṣāṇ-* + *vṛṣṇyāvanta-* is formulaic, further occurring also at PS 4.5.2, ŚS 5.25.8, and in a Yajus-formula at JB 1.174 (cf. TS 3.5.6.2i), whereas there is no similarly strong support for *vṛṣāṇam vṛṣabhaṃ santaṃ* (cf. only perhaps RV 8.93.7, BaudhSS 18.49:390.12). The acc. form *vṛṣāṇam* with long *-ā-* (AiGr. III, p. 267) is not found elsewhere in PS (cf. only *vṛṣāṇau* at 7.4.1a): *-a-* forms predominate, e.g. 1.45.1a, 11.1.11a.

**b.** Here it is **K** that offers a perseverated pāda: the source is obviously PS 6.4.9b, as observed by EDGERTON 1915: 387. Neither EDGERTON nor BHATTACHARYA reports the interesting marginal material which is found in **K** on folio

92a, and which seems to read *suparṇamabhiṣyañCAtām abhiṣekaṃ*: this refers forward, it seems, to the corrupt **K** reading *suparṇam abhiṣaṅcatām*, ln. 16 of the same folio, of 6.7.2a: see my commentary on that pāda.

A compound *diviśrīta-* (cf. AiGr. II/2, §88 pp. 209f.) is attested with certainty only at ŚS 11.7[9].23d–27d / PS 16.84.3d–8d (the attestation at PS 19.49.5 listed in VWC-Saṁhitās III, 1577, is not confirmed by the Or. mss.); the phrase *divi śrīta-*, on the other hand, is quite common (e.g. ṚV 5.11.3b, 5.63.4a, PS 5.13.2b, 10.2.2b, TB 3.11.1.11, KauśS 135.9, MānGS 2.7.4 — probably also PS 15.23.12d), and I therefore assume it here as well.

The epithet *sómapṛṣṭha-* seems a little odd in the present context. It appears mainly to be employed in this context to continue the link between the *madhugha-* and *sóma-* plants.

**cd.** Despite common statements (e.g. OLDENBERG 1917: 218, 244) to the effect that Indra’s partner Indrāṇī is (almost) entirely without distinguishing personal characteristics, in the PS she has clear associations with female lore involving beauty, and with the attraction by a woman of the man she desires; clear expressions of her mythical beauty are found already in the Vṛṣākapi hymn ṚV 10.86 as well. Atharvavedic references include in the first place PS 19.20.15–17, of which I present here a provisional edition:

*śīrṣṇo valīr āsno valīr aṅgādaṅgān mukhād valīḥ |*  
*sarvās tā indrāṇī valīr apa<sup>+</sup> mārṣṭv adhi tvacaḥ || 15 ||*  
*yās tvaci valayo jātā yā jātās tanvas pari |*  
*sarvās tā indrāṇī valīḥ śamīsākhās v ā sajāt || 16 ||*  
*ā śamīṃ māmakī valī rurohāti jahāti mām |*  
*etām indrasya jāyā validhānīm akr̥ṇvata || 17 ||*

‘The wrinkles from my head, the wrinkles from my mouth, the wrinkles from my every limb, from my face: let Indrāṇī wipe off all those wrinkles from my skin. The wrinkles that have been born on my skin, that have been born from my body: Indrāṇī shall stick all those on the branches of Śamī-wood. My wrinkle has mounted the Śamī, it is leaving me behind: Indra’s wife made this [Śamī] a wrinkle-keeper for herself’.

Secondly, cf. PS 20.31.7 *idaṃ khanāmi bheṣajam māṃpaśyam abhirorudam yenā nīcakra āsurīndrāṇī kevalam patim* ‘I dig [up] the medicine, which draws towards me his eye, which causes [love’s] tears, by means of which the Āsurī Indrāṇī allured [Indra] as her husband alone’. This stanza may be compared with ŚS 7.38.1–2, and with the examples of ‘violent’ seduction collected by SANI 1989–1990: 239–241. The myth referred to in this last stanza (PS 20.31.7 ~ ŚS 7.38.1–2) must be the same as the one referred to rather covertly in our present stanza. It has been discussed at some length by BLOOMFIELD (1897: 547, 268, with ref. i.a. to KauśB 23.4, and KS 13.5).

The compound *ā-bhar* usually refers in the AV to the procurement of *medicinal/magical* plants, amulets, honey, etc. (PS 2.11.5c, 3.28.6b, 4.25.6b, 7.5.1c, 9.8.5b). On the sexual connotation of *bhāga-*, see FIŠER 1966: 50 n. 45.

**6.6.5** Only PS ◊ d: PS 1.43.1d, 2.62.2d, 3.37.1d, 6.6.7d, 8.11.11d, RVKh 3.15.11d

pitubhojano madhughaḥ	(8)
śauṣkāsyo hr̥dayāya kam	(8)
sa mā madhunā <sub>a</sub> naktu	(8)
yathāhaṃ kāmāye tathā	(8)

The Madhugha is food-enjoyment, is dryness (of mouth) for the heart: let it anoint me with honey, just the way I want.

madhughaḥ] Or, madhugas K śauṣkāsyo] Ku JM RM Pa [Ma], śauṣkākṣo V/126 Mā, sauḥkāmyo K kam |] kaṃ | Or K [[om. || madhunānaktu] Or, madhunāvaktu K

**ab.** THIEME 1949: 32ff. discusses the process of ‘Motion’: “In der Sprache der Samhitā und der vedischen Prosa kann ein Nomen als Apposition oder Prädikat das Geschlecht des Nomens annehmen, das es qualifiziert”. THIEME gives several examples (p. 33) showing that “Geradezu Legion sind der Fälle von Motion bei den Nomina instrumenti [rather: actionis] auf *-ana*”. This explanation must hold for *pitubhojana-* and *śauṣkāsyā-*, both masculine (in agreement with *madhughaḥ*), in this stanza as well.

The word *pitubhojana-* is attested only in PS, here and at 8.3.2, where it is a neuter substantive: *utevāsi paripānaṃ yātujambhanam āñjana | utāmṛtatvasyeśīṣa utāsi pitubhojanam* ‘You are both full protection, the crushing of sorcery, o ointment, and you also rule over immortality, and you are food-enjoyment’. In the ŚS parallel ŚS 4.9.3, *jīvabhójanam* stands in the place of *pitubhojanam*. WHITNEY translates this near hapax ‘gratification of the living’. In the sexually explicit (Aśvamedha) context of its only other attestation, in the mantra TS 7.4.19g (≈ KS-Aśv 4.8:164.14, VSM 23.21, VSK 25.6.1, etc.) *yá strīṇāṃ jīvabhójano yá āsāṃ biladhāvanah*, it clearly refers to the penis: CALAND (on ApŚS 20.18.4a) translates ‘der der Weiber Lust und Leben ist, der in ihrer Vulva (hin und her) läuft’, and JAMISON (1996a: 69) ‘Which is the living pleasure-maker for women, Which is their hole-runner/cleaner’. The compound *jīvabhójana-*, basically a neuter substantive turned masculine under the same process of ‘Motion’, is best rendered ‘live enjoyment’. Since it can clearly have a sexual connotation, it seems attractive to assume such a connotation for *pitubhojana-* here as well, see pāda c: the food which Madhugha yields is the ‘honey’, i.e. the lover’s semen.

This is only the second attestation of the word *śauṣkāsyā-* besides ŚS 11.9.21, where it is a neuter substantive: *ūt kasantu hr̥dayāny ūrdhvāḥ prāṇā úd īṣatu | śauṣkāsyām ānu vartatām amītrān mótā mitrīṇah* ‘Let their hearts burst open, their breath pass up aloft; let dryness of mouth follow after our enemies, and not those who are friendly’ (WHITNEY). The word is derived from *śauṣkāsyā-* ‘dry-mouthed’ (ŚS 3.25.4, 6.139.2,4), cf. ŚS 6.139.2ab *śúṣyatu máyī te hr̥dayam átho śúṣyatv āsyām* ‘After me let your heart dry up, and let your

mouth dry up as well’. In combination here with *hṛdayāya kam*, the literal meaning of *śauṣkāśya-* seems to have become obscured.

**d.** Note the interesting fact that this ‘refrain’ pāda is only attested in PS (several times), besides only one other attestation in ṚVKh.

### 6.6.6 Only PS

sindhuprajāno madhugho	(8)
aśva iva nīyate janāṁ anu	(11 <sup>J</sup> )
sa mā °°°	

Madhugha is led like a Sindhu-born horse among men: let it . . . .

sindhuprajāno] **Or**, sindhuḥprajāno **K** madhugho] **Or**, madhugo **K** aśva iva] **Or**, śvīva **K** janāṁ anu |] janāṁ anu | **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, janāṁ (+ a 1)nu || **Ku**, janāṁ anu || *om.* || **K** sa mā °°° ||] sa mā || **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, samāmadhunānaktu || **JM RM**, sa māṁ **Z K**

Note the common abbreviation of pādas **cd** (which are given in full in the preceding and following stanzas) in the **Or.** mss. and **K**: see my Introduction, §2.5.2.

**a.** BHATTACHARYA edits two words *sindhuprajā no*, in which the use of *no* is not strictly impossible, but certainly doubtful since this whole hymn is so expressly formulated in the first person singular (the 1st pl. form *vartayāmasi* in pāda 9d can be explained: see my note *ad loc.*).

I tentatively follow RENO (1957a: 92, 105), who assumes a compound *sindhuprajāna-* ‘born from the river or from the Sindh’ with a second member *prajāna-* apparently attested also below in 6.9.7 *kārṣīvaṇaprajāna-* (see my discussion of that stanza on the formation of the noun). Alternatively, the most obvious emendation would be *sindhuprajāto*, for which we might adduce passages like PS 2.9.1cd (*madhor adhi prajātāsi sā no madhumatas kṛdhi*) and 5.1.1ab (*namaḥ piśaṅgabāhvai sindhau jātāyā ugrāyai*), but especially the occurrence of *prajāta-* already in 6.6.3c above. If the transmitted reading is really erroneous, it may be explained as having occurred under influence of the sequence *pitubhojano madhughaḥ* in the corresponding pāda of the preceding stanza. Otherwise, an old confusion of *-t-* and *-n-* could quite easily be explained at the graphic level as well (see e.g. SINGH 1991, plates 31–32). I take this adjective with *aśva-* in the next pāda, in view of BĀU 6.1.13 *mahāsuhayaḥ saindhavaḥ*, ŚāṅkhĀ 9.7 *saindhavaḥ suhayaḥ* ‘a (great) prize-stallion from the Indus region’ (cf. also ŚBM 11.5.5.12–13, and my comm. on 7.12.4a below).

**b.** BHATTACHARYA introduces abhinihita sandhi (*śva*) in his edition, against the **Or.** mss., and — it would seem — against the meter. On the simile, cf. ṚV 4.15.1: *agnīr hōtā no adhvaré vājī sán pári nīyate | devó devéṣu yajñīyah* ‘Agni, the Hotar at our ceremony, is led around as a prize-winning [horse], the god who among gods is worthy of worship’ (cf. 6.9.4ab below). The syntagma *janāṁ ánu* ‘among men’ is a ṚV formula (ZIMMER 1986: 111), also found several times in PS: e.g. 5.26.3b, 19.15.8b.

**6.6.7** Only PS

madhumatī sinīvālī	(8)
madhunā mā sam ukṣatu	(8)
sā mā madhunā <sub>a</sub> naktu	(8)
yathāhaṃ kāmāye tathā	(8)

Honeyed is Sinīvālī; let her besprinkle me completely with honey, let her anoint me with honey, just the way I want.

sinīvālī] **V/126 Mā K**, śinīvālī **Ku JM RM Pa [Ma]** sam ukṣatu ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, samamukṣatu | **JM**, samakṣatu **Z K** [*note Z*] sā] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]** **K**, sa **JM**, sā(+ sa) **RM** madhunānaktu] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]** **K**, madhunaktu **JM**

The ms. **Mā** clearly reads *sinīvālī*, and this reading is confirmed by its sister ms. **V/126**, so BHATTACHARYA must have confused the readings of **Ma** and **Mā**.

**ab.** As MACDONELL summarizes (1898: 125), Sinīvālī is “a sister of the gods, broad-hipped, fair-armed, fair-fingered, prolific, a mistress of the family, and is implored to grant offspring”. We may surmise, on the basis of the present hymn, that she was also implored by women to help them find a man. Our hymn previously referred to Indrāṇī (stanza 4). The connection between Indrāṇī and Sinīvālī is evident from ṚV 2.32.8 (OBERLIES 1998: 230f. n. 390). This same connection between the two (and other auspicious females) occurs frequently in the AV Saṃhitās as well, e.g. PS 5.11.5, 9.10.9, 10.16.5, 11.1.2, 11.1.6. Cf. in addition i.a. PS 9.11.7, 10.5.10, 11.15.1, 12.3.4, 16.25.5, 18.9.2, 19.12.3 (further material is to be found in MACDONELL & KEITH 1912/II: 449). On the meaning of *sam-ukṣ/vakṣ*, see KIEHNLE 1979: 25f.

**6.6.8 ab:** ≈ ŚS 9.1.16, PS 16.33.7ab, 19.43.3ab, 20.58.8ab [PSK 20.54.8ab]  
◇ **cd:** only PS

yathā madhu madhukṛto	(8)
n <sub>1</sub> yañjanti madhāv adhi	(8)
evā ny anajmi te mano	(8)
adhy asyāṃ māmakī *tanū	(8)

Just as honey-making [bees] anoint honey upon honey, in the same way I anoint your mind on this here, my own body.

madhukṛto nyañjanti] **Ku JM RM Pa [Ma]**, madhukṛto nyayanti **V/126 Mā**, madhukṛtassambharanti **K** ny anajmi] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, nya{·}najmi **JM**, nyunajmi **K** adhy asyāṃ ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, adhūsāṃ **JM**, ddhyasyāṃ **K** \*tanū ||] tanu || **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, tanū || **JM**, tanuṃ **K**

BHATTACHARYA does not report the error *nyayanti* found in **Mā**, shared also by its sister ms. **V/126**. He edits *'dhy*.

**ab.** This same simile is also found in a few other AV stanzas (as listed above), besides its occurrence in the brāhmaṇa passage JB 1.188 *yathā ha vā idaṃ madhukṛtaḥ puṣpāṇāṃ rasān sambharanty evaṃ ha vā etā devatāś chandasāṃ rasān samabharan* ‘Just like here in this world the bees gather the essences of the blossoms, in the same way these deities gathered the essences of the metres’ (BODEWITZ 1990: 106, with n. 6). Cf. also ŚBM 3.4.3.14.

For *nyañjanti* (see KUIPER 1953: 81), the other PS/ŚS attestations have *sambhāranti*, and this has been perseverated into the **K** text here as well: the perseverated nature of the **K** reading has escaped BHATTACHARYA, p. xliii and 1989: 136 (see my Introduction, §2.4). As the JB passage also suggests, the more original version of the simile probably is the one with *saṃ-bhar*, but the reading of the Or. mss. here is confirmed by *ny anajmi* in pāda **c**.

**c.** On the winning of the desired lover’s *mānas-*, see SANI 1989–1990: 239–242, and the next stanza.

**d.** Despite the reading of the Or. mss., and against metrical considerations, BHATTACHARYA introduces abhinihita sandhi (*'dhy*) in his edition. As had been noticed by RAU 1993 (items 0084 and 0804), and as BHATTACHARYA also notes (cf. the discussion in BHATTACHARYA 1995), this pāda has been quoted in the Kāśikāvṛtti on Aṣṭādhyāyī 1.1.19 (see also the form *māmakī* quoted by the Kāśikāvṛtti at 4.1.30), which reads: *adhy asyāṃ māmakī tanū | māmakyāṃ tanvām iti prāpte, māmakyāṃ māmakī iti, tanvāṃ tanū iti*. This testimony helps us to settle the reading (and interpretation) of the text, which has not been reliably transmitted in the PS mss. proper. Furthermore, the statement AiGr. III, p. 168 (“Die Vṛkī-Endung des LSg. *-ī* (§ 86c) ist den Devī-Nomina fremd. ... Auch außerhalb des RV. ist solches *-ī* unerhört, *mānakī* [*sic*] *tanū* in der Kāś. zu P. 1,1,19 ein frei erfundenes Beispiel”), is thus in need of revision: the form *tanū* is also found twice elsewhere in PS, correctly transmitted, with immediately ensuing *adhi*, as discussed below under 7.5.10cd. Still, the idiosyncratic loc. form *māmakī* is likely to be a nonce-formation.

**6.6.9** Cf. ŚS 7.12.4 ◊ **c:** ṚV 10.58.1–12 ◊ **d:** cf. ManB 2.2.5d

yat te manaḥ parāgataṃ	(8)
yad +baddham iha vaha vā	(8)
tat ta ā vartayāmasi	(8)
mayi badhnāmi te manaḥ    6	(8)

Your mind which has wandered off, which is bound here or there, that [mind] of yours we cause to turn back: I bind your mind on me.

yat te] **Or**, yetu **K**    manaḥ] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K** [[note °ḥ p°], mana **V/126** parāgataṃ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, {·}parāvataṃ **JM**    yad +baddham] yad-badYam **Or**, yadva[[line]]m **K**    vā ]] [**Ma**?], vāt | **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā Pa**, vā (+ |) **K**    ta ā] **Or**, tayā **K**    vartayāmasi] **K**, varttayāmasi **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā Pa**, varttaāmasi **Ma**    mayi] **Or**, api **K**    || 6 ||] || ṛ 9 || 6 || **Ku JM**, || ṛ || 6 || **RM**, || 6 || ṛ 9 || **V/126 Mā**, || 6 || ṛ || **Pa**, Z 1 Z **K**

**ŚS 7.12.4**

yád vo mánah páragataṃ yád baddhám ihá vehá vā |  
tát va ā vartayāmasi máyi vo ramatāṃ mánah ||

**ṚV 10.58.1c–12c**

tát ta ā vartayāmasi

**ManB 2.2.5d**

mayi/prati badhnāmi vo manaḥ

Cf. SANI's article 1989–1990, mentioned also under pāda **c** of the preceding stanza.

**b.** The emendation *baddham* is adopted from BHATTACHARYA's text. The phrase *ihá vehá vā* occurs also at ṚV 10.119.9–10 (on which see HAUSCHILD 1954: 272f., 285). In view of the fact that BHATTACHARYA does not report the error *vāt* | in **Mā**, and in view of the fact that all other Or. mss. share this reading, it is highly doubtful that **Ma** alone would offer the correct reading *vā* | which the silence of BHATTACHARYA's critical apparatus would imply it to have.

**cd.** Note the discrepancy between plural and singular (*vartayāmasi máyi*), which we find also in the ŚS parallel. The **c** pāda has probably been borrowed directly from the ṚV (in which context no 1st sg. form follows).

The parallel for the last pāda reads *mayi badhnāmi vo manaḥ* in BHATTACHARYA's 1958 ed. of the ManB, and is confirmed by Guṇaviṣṇu's comm. (*mayi ātmani*); JÖRGENSEN's 1911 ed. prints *prati badhnāmi vo manaḥ* (without any *v.l.*): his mss. have probably come under the influence of the reading of Sāyaṇa's comm. (*prati badhnāmi pratibaddhaṃ karomi*).

## 6.7. Against poison: with clods of earth.

This hymn, without parallel elsewhere in Vedic literature, combines in an intricate way references to the role of the Earth in creation mythology with the practical application of (clods of) earth as a medicinal cure. Soil appears to have been used as an antidote for poison (cf. the recurring term *viśadūṣaṇa-*), perhaps because it could be used to induce vomiting. There seems to be an association between the mythical act of digging up the earth by a hog, and the practical act of digging up of medicinal earth (ŚS 12.1.35 ~ PS 17.4.4 [?]), or the digging out of medicinal plants (e.g. ŚS 4.7.5–6/PS 2.1.4–5 *abhrikhāta-*, PS 1.93.4 *tīkṣṇābhir abhribhiḥ khātaḥ*), or the digging up of water by termites.

According to Dār., the medical use of clods of earth (in order to induce vomiting) is referred to at KauśS 28.1–4 (on which, see BAHULKAR 1994: 152–156), particularly sūtra 3: *saṃpātavaty udapātra ūrdhvaphalābhyāṃ digdhābhyāṃ mantham upamathya rayidhāraṇapiṇḍān anvṛcaṃ prakṛya chardayate* ‘In the water-vessel with the remnants of clarified butter, having stirred the *mantha* by means of two arrows (whose points) have been smeared with poison and whose points are upwards, (and then) having broken (into that *mantha*) lumps of earth,<sup>9</sup> after the recitation of every verse, (he) makes (the patient) vomit (by making him drink that *mantha*)’ (BAHULKAR).

The practise of giving a patient a concoction containing clods of earth is clearly prescribed at KauśS 25.7 (*ākṛtiloṣṭa-* ‘a clod of earth’, or *valmīka-* ‘earth from a termite-mound’; see BAHULKAR 1994: 76–77) and 31.26 (*valmīka-*; see BAHULKAR, 209–210). Cf. finally KauśS 32.6–7, with BAHULKAR’s notes (216–217). Compare PS 3.15 and 9.11 for some similar themes, and for similar vocabulary.

### 6.7.1 Only PS

kaśyapaś ca suparṇaś ca	(8)
yan marīcyāṃ atiṣṭhatām	(8)
suparṇaḥ pary avāpaśyat	(8)
samudre bhūmim āvṛtām	(8)

When the tortoise and the eagle were standing on a particle (?) of light, the eagle spotted the earth below, hidden in the ocean.

<sup>9</sup> BAHULKAR finds it “difficult to understand why the earth is called *rayidhāraṇā* [sic]”. It is uncertain whether Dār.’s interpretation of *rayidhāraṇapiṇḍa-* as ‘clod of earth’ is correct in the first place, but BLOOMFIELD 1902: 508 supposes that “[h]aving in mind *vasuṇḍharā* ‘earth’ his gloss seems to me much more likely than Keçava-Sāyaṇa’s *madana*-fruit”, and the phrase *rayiṃ dhar* which may underly *rayidhāraṇa-* ‘(clod) possessing wealth (?)’ is found at PS 1.112.4e, where the Aśvins (as at RV 10.40.13 *ā dhattaṃ rayiṃ*) are implored: *rayiṃ dhārayataṃ mayi* ‘Support the wealth [that is] with/around me!’.

kaśyapaś ca] **Or**, kaśyapasya **K** suparṇaś] **K**, suparṇaś **Or** marīcyām] **Ku JM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, marīcyā{ma}m **RM**, marīcām **Pa** atiṣṭhatām |] atiṣṭhatām | **Or**, abhiṣṭhatām | **K** [[Edg.: °m; note °-ṃ |]] suparṇaḥ] suparṇaḥ **Or**, suparṇaḥ **Z K** [[note Z]] avāpaśyat] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, atvāpaśyat **V/126**, avāpaścat **K** āvṛtām ||] āvṛtām || **Or**, āvṛtām [[om. |]] **K**

a. The tortoise, Kaśyapa, is celebrated as a manifestation of the sun, or at least as a sun-related entity, at PS 4.3.1 (ŚS 13.3.10) ≈ KS 37.9:89.10, TB 2.7.15.3, TĀ 1.7–8 (on which, see KLAUS 1986: 131f.). I quote from KS: *yāt te śūpaṃ kaśyapa rocanāvat | indriyāvat puṣkalām citrābhānu | yāsmiṃ sūryā ārpitās saptā sākām | tāsmiṃ rājānam ādhi viśrayemām* ‘Your decoration, o Kaśyapa, that is full of light, full of force, magnificent, of brilliant light, in which the seven suns are set together: over that you must spread out this king’. Some relevant stanzas from the PS are 1.25.1, 1.71.4, 4.40.7, 11.8.10, 16.28.4, 18.56.10, 19.31.9. Cf. also the additional material collected by BLOOMFIELD 1896: 403, who explains: “Kaśyapa is the sun as a tortoise, that creeps its slow course across the sky”. Is there a connection with the Tortoise-avatāra of Viṣṇu in later Hinduism (see GONDA 1954a: 127)? Cf. my comments on the significance of the ‘hog’ in the next stanza.

The name Suparṇa ‘eagle’ (see DAS 1987: 27) seems to be used to refer to the sun at PS 8.6.3 *suparṇasya divyasya tasya hāsi kanīkā | sā bhūmim ā rurohitha vahyaṃ śrāntā vadhūr iva* ‘Of that heavenly eagle[’s eye, o plant], you are indeed the pupil: you have grown out over the earth, as an exhausted new wife [spreads herself] over the palanquin’. In the same hymn, we also read 8.6.6 *kaśyapasya cakṣur asi + śunyāś \*caturakṣyāḥ | vīdhre sūryam iva sarpaṇam mā piśācam tīras karaḥ* ‘You are the eye of the tortoise, of the four-eyed bitch. Do not conceal the demon, [but reveal him] like the sun creeping through the clear sky’. From the PS, I may refer further to 1.80.5, 2.16.2, 2.81.5, 5.14.7, 7.1.1, 16.150.4.

b. The word *marīcī-*, not entirely of certain meaning, is noticeably more frequent in the PS than in any other Vedic text. Cf. 5.34.6, 9.11.7, 13.9.1, 19.20.9, 19.33.12, 19.35.12, 19.36.17, 19.47.8, 20.56.10, 20.64.10. Cf. in the R̥V only 10.58.6, 10.177.1, and in ŚS 4.38.5, 5.21.10, 6.113.2.

c. For *pary avāpaśyat*, and *paryapaśyat* in 6.7.2, cf. 6.7.7 *anvavindat*. These verbs all refer to the same mythological act. Cf. PS 1.85.1, 2.16.2. See my comments on the next stanza.

**6.7.2** **acd**: only PS ◊ **b**: PS 3.3.4b, 3.15.4b, 16.85.2b+6b, ŚS 3.6.3b, 11.8.2b, 11.8.6b, VSM 23.63 etc.

yām suparṇaḥ paryapaśyad	(8)
antar mahatīy arṇave	(8)
tām sūkara tvam māyayā	(8)
triḥ samudrād ud *ābharah	(8)

You, o hog, with [your] extraordinary power, three times brought up from the ocean this [Earth], which the eagle spotted, inside the great swell.

yāṃ suparṇaḥ] yāṃ suparṇaḥ **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, yāsuparṇaḥ **Pa**, suparṇam abhiṣaṅcatām **K** paryapaśyad] **Or**, paryapaśca **K** antar] **V/126 Mā Pa K**, antyar **Ku JM RM Ma** arṇave] **K**, arṇave **Or** tvaṃ] **Or**, tvān **K** māyayā] **Or**, māyā **K** triḥ] **Or**, tīras **K** \*ābharah] ābharat **Or**, ābhara **K**

Cf. ŚS 2.27.2, 5.14.1 / PS 2.16.2, 7.1.1 and especially stanza 7 below. BHATTACHARYA edits *ābharat*.

**a.** Note the problematic reading in **K**, which must be compared with the marginal material discussed under 6.6.4b, and the perseverated reading of that pāda in **K** (under influence from 6.4.9b).

**bcd.** Cf. the noteworthy passage, using similar words, from the hymn to the Earth ŚS 12.1.8abcd (PS 17.1.9): *yārṇavé 'dhi salilám ágra ásīt yāṃ māyābhir anvácaran manīśīṇaḥ | yáśyā hṛdayaṃ paramé vyòmant satyénávṛtam amṛtam pṛthivyāḥ* ‘She who in the beginning was sea upon the ocean; whom the skilful moved after with their devices; the earth whose immortal heart covered with truth is in the highest firmament’ (WHITNEY). Our stanza thus refers to the cosmogonic digging up of the Earth by a hog. Cf. in this regard the parallels ŚS 2.27.2ab (= 5.14.1ab, PS 2.16.2ab, 7.1.1) *suparṇás tvānv avindat sūkarás tvākhanan nasá* ‘The eagle discovered you, the hog dug you with its snout’ and PS 3.15.2ab *yāṃ tvā varāho akhanad ekasminn adhi puškare* ‘Of you [o Earth], on one lotus, whom the boar dug’. As is also the case in this last quoted passage, as well as in the following stanza PS 6.7.3, our present stanza refers to a myth of the Earth’s creation while addressing earth as *materia medica*. The mythical boar is associated with medicinal magic also at ŚS 8.7.23a (= PS 16.24.2a) *varāhó veda vīrúdhm* ‘the boar knows the herb’, on which passage, see GONDA 1954a: 136. Cf. also LUBOTSKY 2002: 59f. on PS 5.10.4–5 *varāhamanyu-*, *utkhātamanyu-*.

Note in this connection also that KUIPER’s comments (1970: 101f.) to the effect that the Atharvavedic *sūkará-* is identical with the primordial boar (*varāhā-*) which we find in a common YV myth (MS 1.6.3:90.4, KS 8.2:84.14 / KapKS 6.7:66.3 [2:77.10], TS 7.1.5.1, TB 1.1.3.6 [also 1.2.1.3–4], ŚBM 14.1.2.11), are now proven correct by the parallelism of PS 3.15.2 (*varāha-* + *khan*) and (i.a.) 2.16.2 (*sūkara-* + *khan*). KUIPER (1970: 102) summarizes the YV myth: “In most versions it is said that the Creator god, Prajāpati, while roaming over the waters in the shape of the wind, sees the Earth and dives into the Waters in the shape of a boar. As such he brings the first beginning of the earth to the surface. In one of the oldest texts (*Maitr. Samh.*), however, this identification of the cosmic boar with Prajāpati is lacking. It should be noted that this boar bears no name”.

It may also be relevant here to quote from KUIPER’s study of Viṣṇu’s three strides (1962: 149), in view of the fact that our stanza states the act of digging-up to have been performed three times — three is Viṣṇu’s characteristic number

(see OBERLIES 1998: 220) — and in view of the appearance in (later) Hinduism of Viṣṇu as a boar:

Now it has long been clear that Viṣṇu’s three strides are somehow connected with the totality of the universe, but it has never been expressly stated, what exactly is the mythical significance of the third step. Its explanation must be sought in the cosmogony, i.e., in the creation myth. In the beginning there was the undifferentiated primeval world consisting of the waters and the beginning of the primordial hill, which the cosmogonical boar had dug up out of the waters. Heaven still lay on the earth. By slaying Vṛtra, Indra rivets the hill, opens it, and “props up” (*stabh-*) the sky: thereby the dual organization of the cosmos is created. But at the same moment Viṣṇu “strides out”: his first step corresponds to the nether world (which includes the earth), his second step to the upper world, but his third step is a mystery, not perceptible to the human eye, for it corresponds to the totality of the opposed moieties, just as the thirteenth month stands for the totality of the preceding twelve months. All that exists, is in the three steps, or in the third that represents them.

All the preceding evidence, in combination with the enigmatic mention of the tortoise in the preceding stanza, makes it appear rather probable to me that our stanza is connected with nascent Viṣṇu mythology. I can thus not agree with the suggestion of DAS 1987: 30ff. that we would have here a reference to Rudra as disease inflicting and removing deity. See also GONDA (1954a: 136ff.): have we found “an early piece of evidence for proving the existence of something like the *varāha-avatāra* in ‘Atharvanic’ times” (p. 137)?

As for the meaning of *māyā-*, cf. GONDA 1965b: 164ff. It is remarkable, in the light of my argument above, that the power of *māyā-* seems not to have been attributed to Viṣṇu elsewhere in early Vedic literature, but that it does occur in the just quoted stanza ŚS 12.1.8 from the hymn to the Earth.

Regarding the compound verb *ud-ā-bhar*, see my comments on the next stanza. BHATTACHARYA, with his underlining, indicates that the form *ābharat* is not acceptable. My conjecture seems demanded by the sense (*tvam . . .*), and can be inferred from 6.7.3a. The same error — the Or. mss. inserting a final *-t* — is found e.g. at 5.28.3d, 6.6.9b, but it seems to have been induced here by the occurrence of *ud ābharat* in stanza 7.

### 6.7.3 Only PS

yāṃ samudrād udabharo	(8)
bhūmiṃ sūkara māyayā	(8)
saiṣā viśasya dūṣaṇīy	(8)
asmai bhavatu bheṣajī	(8)

The Earth, o hog, which you brought up from the ocean with [your] extraordinary power: she here is a spoiler of poison, let her become healing for him here.

yām] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, yaṃ **Pa** samudrād udabharo] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, sumudrād ud{ā}abharo **JM**, samudrād ududbharo **K** bhūmiṃ] **Or**, bhūmyām **K** sūkara] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, s{u}ūkara **Pa** māyayā] **Or**, māyā **K** dūṣaṇy] **Ku JM RM Pa [Ma] K**, dūṣaṇny **V/126 Mā** asmai] **K**, asyai **Or** bhavatu] **Or**, bhavanta **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *asyai*, following the Or. mss. He does not report the variant *dūṣaṇny* found in **Mā**, that is confirmed by its sister ms. **V/126**.

**ab.** About the hog, see the material collected under the preceding stanza. Note that the previous stanza had the compound verb *ud-ā-bhar*, whereas we now have simpler *ud-bhar*. The distribution between the latter (cf. ŚS 2.3.4 *upajīkā úd bharanti samudrād údhi bheṣajám*) and *ud-ā-bhar* seems to be metrically regulated: an iambic cadence was required in the last stanza's **d** pāda (and in the **b** pāda of 6.7.7 ... *udābharat*), whereas the sequence of three light syllables in *udabharo* is unproblematic in this **a** pāda (cf. OLDENBERG 1888: 26–28). The compound *ud-ā-bhar* occurs in Vedic only in the PS, and only in the present hymn, plus in the thematically related stanzas 9.11.13–14: *mahīm yoniṃ samudrasyānvavindan ṛtāyavaḥ | tāṃ devā guhyām āsinām samudrāc cid ud ābharan || samudrāc cid udābhṛtya tāṃ u puṣkara ā dadhuḥ | asyāḥ pṛthivyā devyāś cakṣur ākāśyam asi viṣadūṣaṇam* ‘The gods, followers of order, found out the great womb of the ocean: they brought it up from the ocean, [where it was] residing in secret. Having brought it up from the ocean, they placed it on a lotus: of this Goddess Earth, you are the atmospheric (?) eye [cf. also PS 3.28.5] that spoils poison’.

**d.** Since no female beneficiary of the healing rite, for which this hymn was to be employed, is explicitly mentioned anywhere, the Or. reading cannot be accepted: I adopt the masc. pronoun *asmai* as read in **K**. The error *-sm-* → *-sy-* may go back to \*B, the hyparchetype underlying all Or. mss.: cf. SINGH 1991, pl. 114.

**6.7.4 ab:** only PS ◊ **cd:** PS 3.15.1cd–4cd, 6.7.5cd–6cd

acyutā hiraṇyena	(7)
yā satye adhiṭṭhati	(8)
tasyās te viśvadhāyaso	(8)
viṣadūṣaṇam ud bhare	(8)

The one who, being unswayed due to [her] gold, is based on truth: from you who bring nourishment for all, I bring up what is poison-spoiling.

acyutā] **K**, atyātā **Ku V/126**, ayutā **JM**, atyutā **RM Mā Ma Pa** adhiṭṭhati] **Ku JM RM V/126 K**, a[[*folio*]]adhiṭṭhati **Mā**, adhigachati(→ ṭṭhasi 2) **Pa**, adhigachati(→ ṭṭhati) **Ma** viśvadhāyaso] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, viśvadhāyaso **Pa** viṣadūṣaṇam] **Ku JM RM Mā [Ma] K**, viṣadūṣam **V/126**, viṣad{u}ṣaṇam **Pa**

BHATTACHARYA's edition reads *viṣadūṣaṇad*, which must be a misprint.

a. Note that the pāda lacks a syllable: the particle *cid* (cf. RV 1.85.4b *ácyutā cid ójasā*, 6.2.9ab *tvám tyā cid ácyutágne*, 8.20.5 *ácyutā cid*) may have been consciously omitted by the poet, to avoid the unsuitable meaning ‘unswayed even by gold’. Gold belongs to the Earth itself, and forms part of the basis of its durability: ŚS 12.1.26 *śílā bhúmīr ásmā pāṃsúḥ sá bhūmīḥ sám̐dhṛtā dhṛtā | tásyai hīraṇyavakṣase pṛthivyā akaram námaḥ* ‘Stone is the Earth, rock, sand; the Earth is held together, supported; to her, the Earth, in whose breast lies gold, I have brought reverence’ (see KIEHNLE 1979: 116), cf. also ŚS 12.1.6.

b. Cf. PS 9.12.7a *vāyuh satye adhiśritah*, a pāda that is to be compared with the TS passage quoted under stanza 5. These phrases *satye adhi-sthā/śray* probably refer to the location in the waters: cf. AB 3.6.4 *dyaur antarikṣe pratiṣṭhitāntarikṣam pṛthivyām pṛthivy apsv āpah satye*, TB 3.11.1.6 *pṛthivy āsy apsu śritā*: on the identification of the waters and truth, see ŚS 10.7.37, ŚBM 7.4.1.6, KātyŚS 4.15.4, Nighaṇṭu 1.12.

cd. The hemistich is a refrain, occurring not only in three consecutive stanzas of this hymn, but also in four consecutive stanzas of PS 3.15.

On the meaning of *viśvadhāyas-*, see NARTEN (1986: 240 n. 165): “Komposita mit Hinterglied °*dhāyas-* ‘Pflege, Fürsorge, Erquickung, Sättigung’ enthalten als vorderglied das Objekt, dem die Fürsorge gilt”. Cf. RV 5.7.6 *viśvasya dhāyase* ‘for the nourishment of all’.

#### 6.7.5 PS 3.15.4 (3.15.4b: 6.7.2b)

yasyāḥ kulāyam ity ekā ||

Whose nest is inside the salty great swell: from you who bring nourishment for all, I bring up what is poison-spoiling.

yasyāḥ kulāyam ity ekā || Or, asyāḥ kulāyam ity akā K

##### PS 3.15.4

yasyāḥ kulāyam salile antar mahaty arṇave |  
tasyās te viśvadhāyaso viśadūṣaṇam ud bhare ||

The text has here been abbreviated in the usual way with the indication *ity ekā*, on which, see my Introduction, §2.5.1. The stanza is found in full as PS 3.15.4.

On the ‘nest’ of the Earth which lay in the primordial ocean, see KUIPER 1970: 103 (with reference to MS 2.7.15:98.11, 3.4.7:53.14, KS 39.3:121.4), who compares passages “where the moist lairs (*ādrā yónayah*) of the Fire god are contrasted with those which “have a nest” (*kulāyīnīḥ*)”. KUIPER concludes that “the word “nest”, accordingly, seems to refer to a more solid state of aggregation (in the midst of the waters?)” (cf. also JAMISON 1983: 50). It may further be useful to quote another passage discussed by KUIPER, TS 5.6.4.2–3 (cf. KS 22.9:65.13 ≈ KapKS 35.3:179.15 [2:209.3]) *āpo vā idám āgre salilām āsīt, sá prajāpatīḥ puṣkaraparṇé vāto bhūtò ’lēlayat, saḥ || pratiṣṭhām nāvindata, sá*

*etād apāṃ kulāyam apaśyat, tásminn agnīm acinuta, tād iyám abhavat, táto vái sá práty atiṣṭhat* ‘Waters were the world at first, the moving ocean; Prajāpati, becoming wind, rocked about on a lotus leaf; he could find no support; he saw that nest of the waters, on it he piled the fire, that became this (earth), then indeed did he find support’ (KEITH).

KUIPER (p. 103 n. 28) refers to ŚS 10.7.41 (PS 17.11.2), and points out (p. 101) the apparent connection with the Hiranyagarbha-myth of ṚV 10.121.1. He summarizes (pp. 103f.):

... it may be concluded that the first stage of the cosmogony was an undivided unity, a *rudis indigestaque moles*, in which the *instabilis tellus* deserves particular notice. In some ritual speculations, it is true, Prajāpati, the Father of the Universe, finds at last a *pratiṣṭhā*, a support, by piling the sacrificial fire on the “nest of the waters”. The most prominent characteristic of this primordial world remains, nevertheless, that the mundane egg floats on the waters and that the main concern is where to find a fixed point, a “support”.

#### 6.7.6 ab: only PS ◊ cd: PS 3.15.1cd–4cd, 6.7.5cd–6cd

yasyā bhūmyā upajīkā	(8)
gṛhaṃ kṛṇvata ātmane	(8)
tasyās te viśvadhāyaso	(8)
viśadūṣaṇam ud bhare	(8)

The Earth, out of whom termites make a house for themselves: from you who bring nourishment for all, I bring up what is poison-spoiling.

upajīkā] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, upajīpakā **JM**, upacīkā **K** [[Bhatt. incorrectly: °jīkā]] kṛṇvata ātmane] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, kṛṇvata ātmane **JM**, kṛṇvatātmane **K** viśadūṣaṇam ud bhare ||] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, viśad{u}ṣaṇamu[[*folio*]]dbhare || yasyāḥ kulāyaṃ ... viśad{u}ṣaṇamudbhare || **V/126** [[repeating 6.7.5–6 entirely]]

**a.** On the meaning and form of the word *upajīkā-*, which occurs besides this place also at PS 1.8.4, 9.10.7, 19.13.5, 19.32.11 and ŚS 2.3.4, 6.100.2, see BLOOMFIELD 1886: 482–484, 1897: 511, and AiGr. II/1, p. 11. As for the PS, **K** everywhere reads *upacīkā-*, whereas the Or. mss. read *upajīkā-* throughout. Cf. also EWAia I, 219.

Since the transmission of parallel PS 1.8.3–4 is slightly corrupt, I give the corresponding ŚS 2.3.4–5ab, which does offer a slightly different text: *upajīkā úd bharanti samudrād údhi bheṣajám | tād āsrāvāsya bheṣajám tād u rógam aśīśamat || 4 || arusrāṇam idám mahát pṛthivyā údhy údbhṛtam* ‘The ants bring the remedy from the sea: that is the cure for discharges, and that hath quieted disease. This great healer of wounds has been gotten out of the earth’ (BLOOMFIELD).

On the significance of termites, and earth of termite-mounds, in Vedic ritual, see KRICK (1982: 139–144): the mention of termites here is to be compared with the use of earth from termite-mounds in healing rites (see the KauśS passages referred to in my introduction to this hymn, where earth from termite mounds is used), because of their association with the cleansing waters (BLOOMFIELD 1886: 483). Cf. also SMITH & CARRI 1994.

**b.** On the use of sg. forms with pl. reference of the pronoun *ātmán*, see DELBRÜCK 1888: 95. The phrase *grhām kar* is used also i.a. at RV 6.28.6, 8.73.7, ŚS 4.21.6, 11.6.18 (= PS 16.86.8).

### 6.7.7 Only PS

yas tvā bhūme <sub>a</sub> nvavindad	(8)
yas tvā bhūma udābharat	(8)
tayoḥ sahasradhāmann	(7)
ahaṃ nāmāni jagrabha	(8)

I have seized the names of these two, o you of a thousand abodes: the one who has discovered you, o Earth, the one who has brought you up, o Earth.

bhūme] **Or**, bhūmiṃ **K** <sub>a</sub>nvavindad] 'nvavindad **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, nvavinda[[*folio*]]dyas tvā bhūme nvavindad **JM**, navindad **K** bhūma] **Or**, bhūmim **K** udābharat] **Ku JM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, udābharata **RM Pa** tayoh] **Or**, tayos **K** sahasradhāmann] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, sahasradhāmaṃ **RM K** jagrabha] **Or**, jagrabhaḥ **K**

**ab.** For the voc. *bhūme* that I twice read with the **Or**. mss., **K** both times reads an acc. *bhūmim*, which — although grammatically and metrically possible — must most likely be explained as secondarily introduced on the analogy of *tvā bhūmim* in the recurring PS formula *bhūmyām tvā bhūmim adhi dhārayāmi*, which is found at 5.40.3, 14.5.9, 16.97.4 and 17.38.3.

This hemistich clearly refers to the eagle and the hog of 6.7.2, and makes use of the same phraseology as ŚS 2.27.2ab (= 5.14.1ab, PS 2.16.2ab, 7.1.1): *suparṇās tvānvavindat sūkarās tvākhanan nasā*, already quoted under stanza 2.

**c.** My rendering of *sahasradhāman-* follows GONDA 1967a: 92. The term is used as a voc. to address a medicinal plant at ŚS 4.18.4 = PS 5.24.4, and further occurs only at PS 16.12.8, 16.151.4, MS 4.14.1:216.3 = TB 2.8.1.5. The ambiguous form is unaccented, and must therefore be a voc. at ŚS 4.18.4: it seems best to take it in the same way here. Moreover, a loc. would be hard to construe syntactically. The word must refer to the idea that the earth affords living-space to all.

**d.** That the phrase *nāma grabh<sup>i</sup>* does not always mean simply ‘to call/mention a name’ (thus ZEHNDER 1999: 91), was pointed out by HOFFMANN (1969: 205–206 = 1975: 300–301), who suggests: “Der Ausdruck steht, wenn ich richtig sehe, immer im Zusammenhang mit magischen Praktiken. So findet er sich im RV. eben nur in zwei Zauberliedern (I 191,13; X 145,4).

Dabei ist der Zweck der “Namenergreifung”, sich der betreffenden Person oder Wesenheit magisch zu bemächtigen, um positive oder negative Wirkungen erzielen zu können” (cf. also GONDA 1970: 63f., and 7.8.6c below).

In our context, this phrase seems to me to refer back to stanzas 1–2: the poet means to say that by knowing their (various: pl. *nāmāni*) names, he can control the ‘Eagle’ (one of many names for Viṣṇu as the Sun) and the ‘Hog’ (a name for Viṣṇu, next to i.a. the ‘Boar’ Varāha) mentioned there, next to the ‘Tortoise’ Kaśyapa, and is able to enforce their aid in warding off poison. The next stanza deals in a similar way with various names, not of incarnations of Viṣṇu, but of the Earth.

### 6.7.8 Only PS

yāni ta indro akṛṇod	(8)
bhūme nāmāni vṛtrahā	(8)
tāni te babhroḥ saṁ vidma	(8)
sehaidhi viṣadūṣaṇī	(8)

The names which Indra, the Vṛtra-Slayer, made for you, o Earth, those of you, the brown, we know thoroughly: so be a poison-spoiler here.

ta] **Or**, u **K** bhūme] **Or**, bhaume **K** vṛtrahā] **Or**, vṛttrahā **K** [[Edg.: °tr°]] babhroḥ] **Or**, babhros **K** vidma] **Or**, vidmas **K** sehaidhi] **Or**, sahaiva **K**

**abc.** The mention of Indra Vṛtrahan here, together with the Maruts — Indra’s helpers in the cosmogonic defeat of Vṛtra (OBERLIES 1998: 206, HILLEBRANDT 1929: 280ff., see ṚV 3.32.4, 3.47.2–5, 3.51.9; also i.a. 5.30.6, 6.17.11, 6.48.21) — in pāda **a** of the next stanza, makes it clear that the poet refers to Indra in his role as establisher of the Earth, in separation from heaven. The names of the Earth are its characteristic traits (cf. GONDA 1970: 28ff.), fixed only due to Indra’s creative act (cf. RENO 1946: 126). Various names and epithets of the Earth are to be found in the hymn to the Earth, PS 17.1–6 = ŚS 12.1. It may be worthwhile to quote as an example a passage which, in reminiscence of our stanza, calls the Earth ‘brown’ and ‘protected by Indra’, among other epithets: ŚS 12.1.11cd / PS 17.12.1cd *babhrūṁ kṛṣṇāṁ rōhiṇīṁ viśvárūpāṁ dhruvāṁ bhūmiṁ pṛthivīm indraguptām*.

The thorough knowledge of the Earth’s names implies control of the earth as *materia medica*, cf. GONDA (1970: 60 and *passim*): “the knowledge or utterance of a name is widely assumed to be a potent means of exerting influence upon, or through, the person or thing denoted by it”.

### 6.7.9 Only PS

yāni te marutaś cakrur	(8)
yāni saptarṣayo viduḥ	(8)
viśva ādityā yāṁ viduḥ	(8)

sā bhūmir viṣadūṣaṇī || 7 ||

(8)

[The names] which the Maruts have made for you, which the Seven Seers know: the Earth, whom all the Ādityas know, is a poison-spoiler.

marutaś] **K**, maṛtaś **Or** cakrur] **Ku JM RM V/126 K**, cakṛr **Pa Ma Mā** [?] saptarṣayo] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, sapta ṛṣayo **RM** viduḥ ]] **Or**, viduḥ **K** [om. |, but note pausa form] viśva ādityā] **Or**, viśvādityā **K** viduḥ] **Or**, vidus **K** || 7 ||] || ṛ 8 [!] || 7 || **Ku**, || ṛ 9 || 7 || **JM**, || ṛ || 7 || **RM**, || 7 || ṛ 9 || **V/126 Mā**, || 7 || ṛ || **Pa**, Z 2 Z **K**

**abc.** See my commentary on the preceding stanza. On the concept of ‘All the Ādityas’, a rare alternative for the *viśve devāḥ* (connected with the Earth at ŚS 12.1.53 / PS 17.6.1), see BRERETON 1981: 293ff. The ‘Seven Seers’ are connected with the Earth at ŚS 12.1.39 / PS 17.4.10.

As EDGERTON 1915: 389 noted with regard to pāda **c** (on the basis of the **K** readings), “the sense is anacoluthic, but no emendation is necessary”. His guess is confirmed by the *Or.* mss. insofar as they read *yām* as well (and not e.g. a hypothetical acc. n. pl. *yā*). It is imaginable that one of the two pāda-initial *yāni* replaced an original *tāni*.

The shift from impf. to pf. tense between 6.7.8 (*akṛnot*) and this stanza (*cakrur*) may be due to morphological attraction from twice *viduḥ*.

## 6.8. Against Sadānuvās: with a plant.

This hymn, not known in this form elsewhere in Vedic literature, seems to be somewhat composite in nature: in combination with unique Paippalāda material, ṚV material is borrowed here and there, and there is a thematic break after stanza 3. The hymn is primarily meant to ward off hostile female beings called Sadānuvās. Their nature is not entirely clear, but they seem somehow to be associated with a state of swollenness (6.8.5ab, 6.8.8c), bad skin (5.1.1a *piśaṅgabāhū-*, 5.1.3c *putro yas te pṛśnibāhus*), and with harm to the cattle (5.1.2, 5.1.5, 5.9.5). Otherwise, they are associated with a host of heterogeneous noxious creatures and qualities. Cf. the PS hymns 2.4, 5.1, 5.9, 10.1 and 17.12–15, also directed against Sadānuvās.

### 6.8.1 ab: only PS ◊ cd: cf. VSM 12.99cd

sahasva yātudhānān	(7)
sahasva yātudhān <sub>i</sub> yaḥ	(8)
sahasva sarvā rakṣāṃsi	(8)
sahamānās <sub>i</sub> y oṣadhe	(8)

Suppress the sorcerers, suppress the sorceresses, suppress all demons: you are suppressing, o Plant.

yātudhānān] Or, yātudhānām K   sahasva] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, sahasra JM   yātudhānyaḥ |] Or, yātudhānyāḥ [om. ||] K

Cf. besides VSM 12.99 also ŚS 19.32.6. Some material on the word *rakṣas-* has been collected by RODHE 1946: 53 (and *passim*). On *rakṣas-* and *yātū-*, see in particular OLDENBERG 1917: 264–275, esp. 265f. n. 3.

### 6.8.2 Only PS ◊ a: ĀpMP 1.15.2b, cf. PS 7.12.7b ◊ c: cf. ṚV 10.86.9c, 10.145.5ab, 10.159.3c = ĀpMP 1.16.3c

sahamāne sahasvati	(8)
sahant <sub>i</sub> y ahamuttare	(8)
utāham asmi sāsahiḥ	(8)
sāsahe vaḥ sadān <sub>u</sub> vāḥ	(8)

O suppressing, overpowering one, who are prevailing in the contest — I am suppressing as well, I keep you suppressed, o Sadānuvās.

sahanty ahamuttare] Or, saṃhatyāhamuttarā K   sāsahiḥ] Or, sāsahi | K [note ||] sāsahe] Or, sahasa K   vaḥ] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], va JM K   sadānvāḥ] Or, sadhānvā K

**ab.** On the meaning of *sāhas-* and its derivatives, cf. GONDA 1957a: 46–49. The shift in voice *sahamānā-/sahantī-* is most probably not significant: GOTO

1987: 325 observes about the verb *sah* that “Akt. und Med. nicht in Opposition stehen”.

BHATTACHARYA seems to have been correct in following the Or. mss. which read *ahamuttare* as opposed to *aham uttarā* in **K**, although this matter cannot be settled with certainty: cf. ṚV 10.145.3 / ŚS 3.18.4 (≈ PS 7.12.3) / ĀpMP 1.15.3: *úttarāhám uttara úttaréd úttarābhyah | áthā [ŚS adháh] sapátnī yā māmādharā sādharābhyah* ‘Superior [am] I, O superior one; superior, indeed, to them (f.) that are superior; below [is] she that is my rival; lower [is] she than they (f.) that are lower’ (WHITNEY). One might thus edit *sahant<sub>y</sub> aham uttarā*, and translate ‘I am prevailing, superior’.

In combination with the two vocatives from the same root that precede, I prefer to assume a vocative *sahanti*, together with the syntactic compound *ahamuttará-* (AiGr. II/1, p. 326), which is attested ŚS 4.22.1 (PS 3.21.1) *tān randhayāsmā ahamuttarēsu* ‘make them subject to him during the contests’; ŚS 12.4.50 (≈ PS 17.20.10) *tásmāt táṃ devā ágasó ’vṛścann ahamuttaré* ‘for that offense the gods cut him off, during the contest’; TB 2.8.8.1 (misunderstood and silently but unnecessarily emended by DUMONT 1969: 59, 61) *yattáu hāsāte ahamuttarēsu* ‘both are ready (THIEME 1975: 331f. = 1995a: 831f.) for the contests’. The emendation of transmitted *ahám uttaratvé* to *ahamuttaratvé* at ŚS 3.8.3 (PS 1.18.3), proposed in PW I, 891, and adopted by WHITNEY, seems misguided to me: this passage is different from the quoted *ahamuttará-* passages, in that it lacks a martial verb like *sah*, *randh* or *yat*.

**d.** On the “präsentisch-generell” use of perfect forms of *sah*, see KÜMMEL 2000: 563f., who quotes this hemistich (with misinterpretation of *vah* as gen.), to show that middle forms are “ebenfalls wie das ṛgvedische Aktiv gebraucht” (p. 564).

While the word *sadānvā-* occurs frequently in PS (53×), it is only rarely attested elsewhere: ŚS 7×, ṚV 1× (10.155.1, note the connections with ṚV 10.155 throughout our hymn), and finally in an interesting *kalpaja* mantra given in sakalapāṭha at VārŚS 1.4.4.6 “*kṣuc ca sediś ca snihitiś ca sadānvā cānāmatiś cānāhutiś ca nirṛtir etās te agne tanvo ’vartimatīś tās taṃ gacchantu yaṃ dviṣmah*” *iti dveṣyaṃ manasā dhyāyan yajamāno japati* (ed. KASHIKAR and ed. CALAND & RAGHU VIRA: *vartimatīś* without avagraha). It is provided with a fanciful etymology at Nirukta 6.30 and occurs in lists of obscure words at Nighaṇṭu 4.3 and AVParīś 48.115. BLOOMFIELD 1897: 301 connects it with *dānu* and *dānavá*, and glosses ‘female demon’.

**6.8.3 ab:** PS 5.1.6ab ≈ 3.3.5ab = ŚS 3.6.4ab ◊ **c:** 3.22.2c ◊ **d:** only PS

<i>yā sahamānā carasi</i>	(8)
<i>sāsaḥāna ivarṣabhaḥ  </i>	(8)
<i>sadān<sub>u</sub>vāghnī rakṣoghnī</i>	(8)
<i>sā tvam ugrās<sub>y</sub> oṣadhe   </i>	(8)

You, who go around suppressing, like a dominating bull, who are a killer of Sadānūvās and a killer of demons — thus you are mighty, o Plant.

sahamānā] **Or**, sahasānā **K** carasi] **Or**, carati **K** sāsahāna ivaṣṣabhaḥ ||] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], sāsahānaivaṣṣabhaḥ | **JM**, sāsahānaivaṣṣabhaḥ | **RM**, sāsahānaiva vṣṣabhaḥ ||*om.* ||] **K**

**PS 5.1.6**

yā sahamānā carasi sāsahāna ivaṣṣabhaḥ |  
sadānvāghnīm tvā vyaṁ jaitrāyāchā vadāmasi ||

**ŚS 3.6.4ab = PS 3.3.5ab**

yāḥ sāhamānāś cārsasi sāsahānā iva ṣṣabhaḥ |

**ab.** The combination present participle + *car* occurs twice more in this hymn (stanzas 5 and 6). It is nowhere necessary to assume the durative construction (DELBRÜCK 1888: 390f.), and the syntactic combination with the ablative *asmat* in 5 seems to preclude such an interpretation there.

The same simile occurs below in 7.8.5c *sa viṣāhī yatharṣabhaḥ*. The word *ṣṣabha-* is also combined with the root *sah* in PS 1.75.1cd *sapatnasāha ṣṣabho janāśād ugrāś cettā pañca kṛṣṭir vi rāja* ‘reign over the five territories, as a rival-suppressing bull, a suppresser of populations, a fearsome guardian’. As the parallel stanzas PS 5.1.6 and 3.3.5 = ŚS 3.6.4 further show, BHATTACHARYA has rightly rejected the **K** readings *carati* and *vṣṣabhaḥ* (on this last reading, cf. 6.9.6d). A few **Or**. mss. read *sāsahānaiva* here, and also at PS 5.1.6 (my **Ku** and **Ek2**), while **K** reads thus throughout. This must be a simple error, as metrical considerations also show: reading *sāsahānā eva* here and at 5.1.6 yields no acceptable sense, and there is no variant for *sāsahāna iva* in the **Or**. mss. at PS 3.3.5 = ŚS 3.6.4, so the reading is beyond doubt there.

**6.8.4 a:** only PS ◊ **b:** ŚS 7.115.1b = PS 20.18.7b ◊ **cd:** cf. PS 5.9.4

khele hai lambanastani	(8)
naśyetaḥ prāmutaḥ pata	(8)
na tvām *avivyacad iha-	(8)
-ukṣeva śṛṅgavac chiraḥ	(8)

Hey Khelā, [you] with the sagging breasts: disappear from here, fly away yonder. It (the plant) did not leave space to you here, as a stud bull (does not give space) to a horned head.

hai] **Or**, ha **K** lambanastani] **RM Pa** [**Ma**], lamḥanastani **Ku JM V/126 Mā**, lamḥmanastani **K** naśyetaḥ] **RM Pa** [**Ma**], nasyetaḥ **Ku JM V/126 Mā**, naścebhaḥ **K** prāmutaḥ] **Or**, purāmutaḥ **K** pata |] **V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], pataḥ{. . .} | **Ku**, pataḥ |] **JM RM**, pathā ||*om.* ||] **K** \*avivyacad] avivyacad **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], amavyacah **JM**, amavyatad **K** ihokṣeva] ihokheva **Or**, iho akṣevu **K** śṛṅgavac chiraḥ ||] **JM RM**, śṛṅgavatsiraḥ ||] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], śṛṅgavaśchiraḥ ||*om.* ||] **K**

**ŚS 7.115.1ab**

prá patetáh pápi lakṣmi náśyetaḥ prámútaḥ pata |

BHATTACHARYA edits *avavyacad ihokheva*, and in his note suggests the emendation *avivyacad*.

**a.** The obscure word *khelá-* is probably, with PIRART 1995: 182, to be taken as a kind of bird at ṚV 1.116.15, and denotes a noxious bird or insect in the difficult stanza PS 6.14.2 below: *khelā-* must be the feminine counterpart of this creature.

Regarding *lambanastanī-*, cf. SHARMA 1959/60: 246 on *lambanastaná-*, with reference to ĀpMP 2.13.12 etc. Its only other attestation is at PS 10.1.1 (to be compared with 7.11.8): *hā amba tejane dhenō lambanastani | na tad vido yad ichasi yad u vittam na tad ghasaḥ* ‘Hey mama, gore (cf. RAU 1981), [you] cow with sagging udders: you shall (non-them. aor. subj. *vidas*, analogous to root aor. subj. *ghasas*) not find what you are looking for, and what you’ve found, that you shall not devour’.

The interjection *hai* is rather common in PS (e.g. 2.37.4, 4.22.6, 5.1.3a+b, 7.11.8 [see my notes *ad loc.*], 10.1.1, 19.20.6, 20.46.8, 20.64.9), but occurs elsewhere in Vedic mantra texts only twice in ŚS. As in PS 10.1.1a, it occurs also twice more in collocation with *amba*: 5.1.3ab *hā amba suhūtale atho hai + sāmānantame* ‘Hey, mama Suhūtalā (easy to invoke), and hey, Sāmānantamā (most docile)’ (LUBOTSKY), 20.46.8 [PSK 20.44.2] *hā amba + vanecari*<sup>10</sup> ‘Hey mama, [you] forest-dweller (?)’.

**cd.** For these at first sight obscure (and partially corrupt) *pādas*, we must compare PS 5.9.4ab. LUBOTSKY edits and translates: *na tā itthā na tā ihāva \*māsataḥ + \*ukheva śṛṅgavac chirah* ‘Not in this way, not here will the horned head give them space, like an ukhā-pot’. I disagree with a few points of LUBOTSKY’s translation and commentary, and with his decision to read *\*ukheva*, as I will discuss further below.

First, let us compare ṚV 1.191.7c *ádṛṣṭāḥ kíṃ canéhá vaḥ* ‘o invisible ones, there is nothing at all for you here’ (redone and made more explicit at PS 4.16.4a *ghuṇā na kíṃ canéha vaḥ* ‘o Ghuṇas, there is nothing here for you’), 8.16.10b *na ta etan nyañcanam* ‘this here is not a refuge for you’, PS 9.6.3b, 17.13.3b, 20.29.3b [PSK 20.28.2b] *na va ihāsti nyañcanam* ‘there is no refuge for you here’. Our hemistisch and 5.9.4ab are nearly identically extended expressions of, or rather variations on the same Atharvavedic imprecation, which denies (*na*) room or refuge ‘here’ (*iha*) to a demonic addressee (*te, vaḥ, tvām*, or in the 3rd person, at 5.9.8a *tāḥ*).

LUBOTSKY attractively conjectures a 3rd sg. aor. subj. *ava māsatai/e* (with compound *ava-mā* supported perhaps also by PS 3.30.7a *ava-māya*, although the corrupt ŚS mss. at 19.57.6 read *ápamayā*) parallel to BHATTACHARYA’s conjecture *avivyacad*, which he explains as a “3sg. ppf. (them.) of the root *vyac-* ‘to contain, encompass’, which is often used in the function of the red. aor.”

<sup>10</sup> *panecari* **Or**, *vṛnavari* **K**.

(cf. OLDENBERG 1909–12/II: 310). LUBOTSKY adds: “Sometimes, *vyac-* means ‘to accomodate, give room for smbd.’ (cf. Geldner’s remarks ad RV 10.96.4b)”, and for this meaning we may further refer to MS 1.8.8:128.7 and 1.10.12:152.5.<sup>11</sup>

Both here and at 5.9.4d, the word *śṛṅgavant-* appears in collocation with *śiraḥ*. I do not think that LUBOTSKY’s suggestion “the ‘horned head’ presumably refers to the plant used in the ritual” (with ref. to ŚS 19.36.2a–c = PS 2.27.2a–c) is persuasive, nor do I agree that *śṛṅgavac chiraḥ* “must be the subject of the verb”. The translation ‘the horned head does not give space like an ukhā-pot’, without further explanation, fails to convince. One might rather translate LUBOTSKY’s text (with *ukheva*) ‘it did not give space to you, like an ukhā-pot (does not give space) to a head with horns’. Cf. MS 1.8.8:128.7 *náikaḥ kubjír dváu vyāghráu vivyācēti* ‘one bush (RAU 1977: 352 ‘Dickicht’) does not give space for two tigers’.

It seems still better to follow the text which underlies the corrupt reading of **K** (both here and at 5.9.4): *ihokṣeva*. We may recall the bovine simile in 3b (*sāsaḥāna ivarṣabhaḥ*), and compare RV 9.71.9a *ukṣéva yūthá pariyánn arāvīd* ‘he roared as a bull going around the herds’.

LUBOTSKY’s statement “The word *śṛṅgavant-* ‘having a horn’ is otherwise unattested in Vedic”, besides at these two places, is not correct. Cf. BaudhŚS 5.5:133.10f. *śṛṅgavān meṣo bhavaty aśṛṅgā meṣī* ‘a ram with horns is used, a ewe without horns’ (cf. also the lost Kāthasūtra quoted in the comm. on KātyŚS 5.3.6:442.21 *śṛṅgiṇaṃ meṣam aśṛṅgīṃ meṣīm*). From the parallel texts collected by EINO 1988: 95f. (notes 465–467), it is clear that the horn is a mark of masculinity for the ram, a *pumvyañjana-* (BhārŚS 8.7.5) or *pumliṅga-* (MānŚS 1.7.4.3). Since Vedic Indians saw (large) horns as a characteristic trait not only of male sheep, but also of male cattle (cf. RV 5.1.8 *sahásraśṛṅgo vṛṣabhas*, PS 4.13.4b etc. *tikṣṇaśṛṅga ivarṣabhaḥ*), it seems possible that *śṛṅgavac chiraḥ* meant ‘a head of horned (male) cattle’: just as a bull does not tolerate the presence of other bulls, so does the plant addressed in 3d not tolerate the presence of *Sadānuvās*. I thus propose to change LUBOTSKY’s text of 5.9.4d accordingly, and render: ‘Not in this way, not here will it (the plant of 5.9.3ab) give them space, like a bull (does not give space) to a horned head’ (LUBOTSKY’s arguments, p. 54 n. 9, against univervating *śṛṅgavacchiraḥ* hold *mutatis mutandis* for this interpretation as well).

### 6.8.5 Only PS

asuvāne bahuputre	(8)
anantarve mahodari	(8)

<sup>11</sup> Because *ava-vyac* is not attested, I refrain from making the further emendation *na \*tvāva \*vivyacad*, although this would give a more fitting augmentless form (‘it shall not leave space to you’, cf. RV 10.96.4 [KÜMMEL 2000: 505]), and the opening *na tvā* (PS 8×: 1.100.1, 5.21.4, 7.12.2, 11.3.7a+b, 15.3.6, 16.7.5, 16.37.6), more common than *na tvām* (PS 2.71.1 [ŚS 5.14.9], 13.4.5 — elsewhere only RV 8.92.14+22).

+pathāsmat +satvare t<sub>u</sub>vaṃ (8)  
 śarkarā bapsatī cara || (8)

You, not giving birth, [but] having many sons; not pregnant, but with a big belly: you quick one, go along the road away from us, chewing on gravel.

asuvāne] Or, amuvāne **K** anantarve] Or, anamtraśvye **K** +pathāsmat +satvare]  
 yathāsmachatvare **Or**, pathassatsattare **K** [°sature?] bapsatī] **Or**, vapsatī **K** cara]  
**Or**, tara **K**

BHATTACHARYA reads *anantarve*, and — with slight emendation of the Or. reading — *yathāsmacchatvare*<sup>+</sup>. His text contains the misprint *vapsatī*.

**ab.** The idea behind these pādas is largely unclear. It would seem that Sadānuvās were pictured as large, swollen entities, and this is confirmed, perhaps, by the use of the word *balāsapatnī*- in pāda 8c. Might we have a reference here to lesions which are swollen (*mahodari*) and spread rapidly (*bahuputre*) over the body? The voc. *anantarve* must be derived from a secondary thematic stem *antarvā*- (cf. AiGr. II/2, p. 869).

**c.** BHATTACHARYA's text contains a relative *yathā* without clear referent, and an odd compound *asmacchatvara*- 'our cross-roads' (the word *catvara*-, previously unattested in Vedic, does in fact occur below at PS 7.13.8).

It seems more sensible to follow **K** and read *pathā*. My conjecture +*satvare* can be safely reconstructed on the basis of the transmitted readings of **K** and the Or. mss. The error *-cc-* → *-ts-*, which we would have to assume if we were to follow BHATTACHARYA's emendation, is not to be expected in **K**, whereas the Or. mss. contain numerous examples of confusion *-ch-* :: *-ts-*. The word *satvara*- was previously unattested in Vedic: *satvaram* seems to be used adverbially in two passages also dealing with Sadānuvās, PS 17.12.10 and 17.13.10 (the Or. mss. available to me read *chatvaram* at both places). The word is attested twice in a late Atharvan text, the AVPariś, 68.3.1 and 71.15.10.

**d.** The image 'chewing on gravel' seems to be unattested elsewhere in Vedic literature. The idea seems to be that the Sadānuvā is to go off into the distance, not devouring the speaker, but only useless gravel (cf. the image of the log in stanza 7).

The pāda is quoted in very corrupt form in Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya under the Vārttika on Aṣṭādhyāyī 6.4.100 (ed. KIELHORN vol. III, p. 213 l. 13) *śarāve bapsatī caruḥ* — the quotation could not be traced to any Vedic text by RAU 1985, item 633. The kinds of deformation of the pāda that need to be assumed for my attribution of the quotation to PS are not at all unusual in the Mahābhāṣya (cf. WITZEL 1986).

**6.8.6 ab:** only PS ◊ **cd:** cf. RV 10.155.2cd ≈ PS 5.9.4cd

ye a<sub>r</sub>rāyāś caratha (7)  
 pākasyechanta āsutim | (8)  
 tān agne kṛṣṇavartane (8)

tīkṣṇaśṛṅgodṛṣann ihi || (8)

You, Arāyas, who go around seeking out the (offering) drink (?) of an innocent man: o Agni, you whose path is black, who have sharp horns, keep goring them.

<sub>a</sub>rāyās] rāyās **Or K** caratha] **Or**, carati **K** pākasyechanta āsutim ]] **Or** [°ṁ], pākasyeśchantvāsuciṁ [om. ]] **K** kṛṣṇavartane] kṛṣṇavartane **Or**, kṛṣṇāvartmane **K** tīkṣṇaśṛṅgodṛṣann ihi] tīkṣṇaśṛṅgodṛṣannahi **Ku V/126 Mā** [Ma], tīkṣṇaśṛṅgodaśamnahi **JM**, ti(→ tī)kṣṇaśṛṅgodaśann{i}ahi **RM**, takṣṇaśṛṅgodṛṣannahi **Pa**, tīkṣṇaśṛṅgodṛṣamnihi **K**

**RV 10.155.2cd, PS 5.9.4cd**

arāyyam [PS: sadānvā] brahmaṇaspate tīkṣṇaśṛṅgodṛṣann ihi ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *tīkṣṇaśṛṅgo drṣann ihi*.

**a.** Cf. PS 19.25.14b *ye 'rāyā yātudhānāḥ*. Several of the pādas (i.a. 2.67.5a, 6.14.6e), where PS transmits *arāya-*, lack a syllable (as also e.g. at ŚS 8.6.5–6), which suggests that in such cases the underlying text had *arāy,ya-*: in our case, the RV parallel *arāyyam* also supports this idea to some extent, but note that it is not quadrisyllabic (see also RV 8.61.11, PS 2.67.2). On *arāya-*, cf. besides the several attestations below in 6.14.6–8, 7.11.7, 7.19.5, also PS 16.79.4–6 = ŚS 8.6.4–6 (quoted under pāda **b**), and ZEHNDER's notes on PS 2.67 (1999: 153). ZEHNDER sees only a punning connection between *arāya-* ('ein vor allem Frauen befallender Dämon') and *á-rāya-* ('arm, karg'). EWAia II, p. 438, connects *arāyī-* with *rayí-*. Cf. AiGr. II/2, p. 415, where a possible connection with *arí-* 'enemy' is mentioned: the feminine *arāyī-* has Vṛkī-flexion, "woraus AV. *arāyá* als Bez. e. Dämons entwickelt wäre". This development seems possible whether one connects the word *arāyī-* with *rayí-* or *arí-*, and would anyhow explain the syllabification in the masculine.

**b.** Cf. the similar use of the same verb *eṣ* in the stanza 16.79.4: *durṇāmā ca sunāmā cobhau saṁvṛtam ichataḥ | arāyaṁ apa hanmasi sunāmā straiṇam ichatām* 'The Good-named and the Bad-named both seek out what is hidden: we smash away the Arāya; let the Good-named seek out women-stuff (see my comm. on 6.22.3)'. Cf. further PS 10.1.1 (quoted under 6.8.4), and 6.14.6+9 below; ŚS 10.1.7d / PS 16.35.7d *māsmān icho anāgāsaḥ* 'do not seek us out, who are sinless'. ZEHNDER 1999: 103 has discussed the meaning of *pāka-* ("... bezeichnet jemanden, der nichts mit schwarzer Magie zu tun hat") in his commentary on the stanza 2.38.5 *kṛtyā yantu kṛtyākṛtaṁ + vṛka ivāvimato gr̥ham | \*tokaṁ pākasya vardhatām svrṣṭa ośadhīr iva* 'Let the acts of magic go to the magician, as a wolf to the house of a sheep-owner; let the progeny of the innocent man grow, like plants in good rain'. ZEHNDER refers to ŚS 10.1.18d (PS 16.36.8d), to which I may add ŚS 4.19.3c (PS 5.25.3c), PS 7.7.6 and 19.39.2c; see also my discussion of the words *akovidam* and *akasvala-* under GRIFFITHS 2004, item 15.

The word *āsutí-* '(offering) drink' is attested 4× in the RV (1.104.7,

2.1.14, 7.97.7, 8.1.26), once more in the AV (ŚS 3.7.6, PS 3.2.5), and in the RV compounds *ghṛtāsuti-*, *bhūryāsuti-*, *sarpīrāsuti-*. It is derived from *sav* ‘to press’ (GOTŌ 1991: 691). Cf. GELDNER on RV 7.97.7d: “*āsuti* bezeichnet das stärkende Tränklein, engl. cordial. *āsunōti* wird 10,42,5 von einer besonderen Somabereitung gebraucht”. Cf. LUBOTSKY 2002: 58 on PS 5.10.1 (and 5.10.9) *viṣāsuta-* ‘poison-brew’. Cf. also RV 10.86.19 *pībāmi pākasútvano* ‘I drink of the simple presser’s [Soma]’ (cf. SCARLATA 1999: 617).

**cd.** Agni is given the same epithet *kṛṣṇāvartani-* at RV 8.23.19, PS 5.20.3, ŚS 1.28.2. Cf. also ĀpŚS 16.11.11 (with CALAND’s notes). **K** reads *kṛṣṇavartmane*, and has the same reading at PS 5.20.3 (and 19.26.13) as well, against the unanimous evidence of the Or. mss. In the present context, there can be no doubt that the Or. mss. have preserved the authentic reading, also in view of the fact that *kṛṣṇavartman-* is not attested before ĀpMP 2.14.2, and becomes common only in the Epics.

Cf. the parallels RV 10.155.2cd (cf. SCHMIDT 1968: 129) and PS 5.9.4: our stanza has substituted Agni for Brahmaṇaspati as the addressee. Contrast SCHMIDT’s assertion (p. 239) of a “Fehlen von *bráhmanaspati* als Epithet ... Agnis”. For an extensive discussion of the connections between Agni and Bṛhaspati/Brahmaṇaspati, see SCHMIDT, pp. 62–72. However this may be, if we assume an underlying *bṛhaspate* at RV 10.155.2, this would solve the metrical oddity (cf. ARNOLD 1905: 83) of trisyllabic *arāyyām*.

### 6.8.7 RV 10.155.3

ado yad dāru plavate	(8)
sindhora madhye apūruṣam	(8)
tad ā rabhasva durhaṇo	(8)
tena yāhi parastaram	(8)

The piece of wood there, which is floating in the middle of the river with no man [holding on to it]: grab hold of it, you with horrible jaws — by means of it, ride far away.

dāru] **K**, dār **Or** madhye] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, madhe **RM** apūruṣam ||  
 apūruṣam | **Or**, apūruṣam [[om. ]] **K** tad] **Or**, ud **K** [[Edg. & Bhatt. wrongly: uc] yāhi]  
**Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, yāhi **V/126** parastaram |] parastaram | **Or K**

#### RV 10.155.3

adó yád dāru plávate síndhoḥ pāré apūruṣám |  
 tád ā rabhasva durhaṇo téna gacha parastarám ||

Note the two variants upon the RV text in pādas **b** and **d**. The image of sending off an evil being by means of a log floating in a river may be compared with ŚS 10.4.3cd (PS 16.15.3cd) *udaplutám iva dārv āhīnām arasám viṣám vār ugrám* ‘like wood floating in water [is useless?], the snakes’ poison is powerless, the fearsome water’. Cf. the image of pebble-chewing in stanza 5: as long as the

Sadānuvā is chewing on wood or pebbles, she can't use her 'horrible jaws' to chew on the speaker.

The word *durhaṇu-* is only attested elsewhere (as *durhaṇū-*) at TĀ 4.32.1: *dīrghamukhi dūrhaṇu | mā sma dakṣiṇatō vadaḥ* 'You with a long face, with horrible jaws: do not speak from the South'. At PS 19.9.12 the word *pr̥ṣaddhanu-* 'having sprinkling jaws' is used of a snake.

### 6.8.8 Only PS

yasyā janitram iṣṭargā	(8)
adr̥ṣṭāḥ krimayaḥ *pluṣayaḥ	( )
tasyai balāsapatnīyai	(8)
namas kṛṇomi +kuṣṭhīyai	(8)

To (the Sadānuvā) *kuṣṭhī*, whose origin are the life-threatening, the unseen worms, the fleas, whose husband is *balāsa*, I bring homage.

yasyā] **Or**, asyā **K** janitram] **Ku V/126 Pa [Ma]**, janitrām **JM**, yanitam **RM**, janitra{·u}m **Mā**, janiṣtam **K** iṣṭargā] **Ku RM Pa [Ma] K**, aṣṭargā **JM**, iṣṭarggā **V/126 Mā** adr̥ṣṭāḥ] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, adr̥ṣṭā **Ku**, ariṣṭāḥ **K** krimayaḥ] **kṛmayah Or**, krimayaḥ **K** \*pluṣayaḥ |] **pulūṣayaḥ | Or**, puruṣāya [*om.*] **K** balāsapatnīyai] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, balāsapatnye **RM**, balāsapatnī **K** namas] **Or**, namaḥ [!] **K** +kuṣṭhīyai ||] **ku{DDH}KṢyai || Ku**, **kuKṢyaiḥ || JM**, **kuDDHyai || RM [?]** **V/126 Pa**, **kuṣyai || Mā [Ma]**, **kuṣṭhī K** [*om.* |; Edg. misplaces a | after **kṛṇomi**]

BHATTACHARYA edits *kṛmayah pulūṣayah* and *kuṣyai*.

**a.** The word *iṣṭarga-* occurs only twice elsewhere in Vedic literature. At TS 3.1.7.1 (quoted BaudhŚS 14.4:156.14f., 26.7:281.2, and BhārŚi 100) ≈ TB 1.4.6.4–5, it is only clear that the word connotes something negative: *iṣṭargo vā adhvaryūr yájamānasyeṣṭargah khálu vái pūrvo 'rṣṭúḥ kṣīyate* 'The Adhvaryu is he that brings trouble on the sacrificer, and he that brings trouble himself is ruined before the trouble'. To this translation, KEITH adds (p. 229 n. 5): "*iṣṭargah* is of very dubious sense, and *arṣṭúḥ*, an abl. of *arṣṭi*, is equally uncertain in sense. The comm. is followed, but it is impossible to say if correctly". Then, the word is also attested in the difficult stanza PS 19.29.4 (quoted in full under 7.2.8a), listing various noxious 'worms', whose pāda **c** reads: *iṣṭargā va iṣayantaḥ* 'your *iṣṭargas* that prosper'. In any case, the PS readings now allow us to discard with certainty the conjecture proposed PW I, 833 (cf. EWAia I, 200) that *iṣṭarga-* would be an error for *\*iṣvārga-* 'Pfeilabwehrer'. I propose therefore, with a view also to an apparent *figura etymologica* at PS 19.29.4c, to analyse the word as a compound *iṣ-tārga-* 'prosperity threatening' (i.e. in idiomatic English 'life-threatening', contrast *iṣkartī-*), with *targa-* an agent noun to *tarj* 'to threaten' (EWAia III, 238), otherwise attested only in post-Vedic sources, and having various descendants in MIA and NIA languages. The asterisk can thus be removed from CDIAL 5718. On the root noun *iṣ-*, cf. BURROW 1955: 326–332 and GONDA 1989b.

**b.** On the various kinds of ‘worms’, and the diseases connected with their presence, mentioned in Āyurvedic texts, see MEULENBELD 1974: 622ff. Cf. PS 5.3.8. The evidence from PS and ŚS essentially points to *krími-*, rather than *kṛími-* as the Atharvavedic form of the word. *Pace* ŚPP’s note 8 to ŚS 2.31.3,<sup>12</sup> the mss. definitely tend to *krími-*, and it is this reading that has rightly been adopted consistently by both ŚPP and R-W. By contrast, the inconsistency in BHATTACHARYA’s edition is striking: he almost everywhere reads *krimi-* when the word occurs in books 1–15, except here (and 1.87.1, where **Ku1** reads *krimer*), even though **K** has preserved exactly the expected *krimayah* also here. Anyhow, the form *kṛími-* is hardly attested in Vedic, except for several attestations in ManB. There are also single attestations in MS (3.14.11:174.9), KS-Aśv (5.7.1:179.8) and VSM (24.30), where the form *krími-* is unattested, but the Taittirīyas (only *krími-* in TS, no attestations in TB/TĀ) do not confirm an ostensible YV tendency. There are no attestations of either form in VSK, but BĀU(K) 6.1.14 reads *kṛmibhyah*, while the Mādhyandina recension has *krimi-*. In view of the (scant) actual attestations in Vedic texts, MAYRHOFER’s decision (EWAia I, 394) to qualify *krími-* as the secondary spelling is unwarranted. There is no decisive internal evidence in Indo-Aryan to accept *kṛími-* as primary, even though the evidence from cognate languages seems to point in that direction. See also AiGr. I, Nachträge, p. 19, and cf. the case of *riśya°/ṛśya°* discussed under 7.1.10ab.

The Or. mss. unanimously read *pulūṣayah*, with long *-ū-*. BHATTACHARYA adopts this reading (with underlining), and in a note suggests that the original text could have read *purīṣyāḥ* (cf. also his Introduction, p. xxxvii), but the evidence of **K** confirms neither the *-ū-* of the Or. reading, nor the *-ī-* of BHATTACHARYA’s conjecture. My conjecture *\*pluṣayah* (following a suggestion of Michael Witzel) is arguably closer to the transmitted readings, although it remains uncertain in view of the metrical deficiency of the pāda. The word *plūṣi-* (cf. BLOCH 1921 = 1985: 78–80) is collocated with *adr̥ṣta-* also at ṚV 1.191.1, and this fact provides the main argument for my emendation. The metrical problem may be partially removed by assuming a secondary sandhi across the boundary of pādas **a** and **b** (*iṣṭargādr̥ṣṭāḥ*); I do not want to resort to the heavy means of conjecturing *\*krimipluṣayah*, as proposed to me by Chlodwig Werba.

**c.** The word *balāsapatnī-* is a hapax. On the term *balāsa-* “symptomatic swelling associated with internal diseases”, see ZYSK (1993: 32–33 etc.), and cf. the terminology used in stanza 5, where the female addressee is described as swollen.

**d.** As is common in the AV (cf. e.g. PS 5.27.6, 7.9.8, 7.11.9), homage is brought here to a dangerous entity to ward it off. The readings of the Or. mss. are hard to decipher, but anyhow seem to point to a confusion in

<sup>12</sup> “The MSS. vary in the spelling of the word *krimi* in this and the following hymns, some writing *kṛ°*, and other *krī°*, and that too indiscriminately”.

reading. The reading *kukṣyai* of BHATTACHARYA’s **Ma** and **Mā** (as adopted with underlining in his edition) is not corroborated with certainty by any of my mss. It seems worthwhile, therefore, to take **K**’s reading with *-ṣṭh-* seriously.

In view of the strong connections that have been pointed out already between our hymn and RV 10.155, it may be instructive, for the establishment of the reading <sup>+</sup>*kuṣṭh<sub>ṣ</sub>yai*, to collocate our pāda with RV 10.155.1ab (*ārāyi kāṇe vīkaṭe girīṃ gacha sadānve* ‘Demoness, one-eye, monstrous Sadānūvā: go to the mountain’) and that hemistich in turn with the śloka AVParīś 9.4.5 (*mā ca cārabhaṭe dadhyān mā ca dadhyāt*<sup>13</sup> *purohite | mā ca kāṇe virūpe ca kuṣṭhi- vyāṅge tathaiṃ ca* ‘May it not place [me] near a soldier, may it not place [me] near a Purohita, nor near a one-eyed, deformed, or near a *kuṣṭha*-patient’s [skin] blemish’). Although the formation/derivation of our fem. *kuṣṭhi-* remains problematic (cf. AiGr. II/2, §247 [?]), semantically a reference to a noxious female spirit of skin-disease (*kuṣṭha-*, see FILLIOZAT 1949: 95) seems fitting, especially also in connection with *balāsa-*, even though the word *kuṣṭha-* does not occur in this sense in the AV (BAHULKAR 1994: 161), or even elsewhere in Vedic proper.<sup>14</sup>

#### 6.8.9 Only PS ◊ c: cf. PS 10.1.5a

śarvapatre bhavapatni	(8)
yātubhrātri sadān <sub>ṣ</sub> ve	(8)
<sup>+</sup> tasyāddhi putrān bhrātṛṃś ca	(8)
yatra tvā vinayāmasi    8	(8)

You, Sadānūvā, whose son is Śarva, whose husband is Bhava, whose brother is sorcery: eat the sons and brothers of him, to whom we remove you.

śarvapatre] **Or**, sarvapatre **K** bhavapatni] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, bhavapatnī **V/126**, bhavapattri **K** yātubhrātri] **Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, yātubhrātri **JM Pa**, yādutrātus **K** <sup>+</sup>tasyāddhi] tasyāddi **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā Pa**, tasyādri **Ma [?]**, tasyādhi **K** bhrātṛṃś] **Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K** [[Edg. °r°]], bhrātṛṃś **JM Pa** tvā vinayāmasi] **K**, tvāpanayāmasi **Or** || 8 || || r 9 || 8 || **Ku JM**, || r || 8 || **RM**, || 8 || r 9 || **V/126 Mā**, || 8 || r || **Pa**, Z 3 Z **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *tvāpanayāmasi*. I do not find the reading *tasyādri*, as reported by BHATTACHARYA, in ms. **Mā**. It clearly reads *tasyāddi*. BHATTACHARYA has possibly confused the readings of **Ma** and **Mā**.

**ab.** Bhava and Śarva are forms or aspects of Rudra (see BLOOMFIELD 1897: 618), who is among many other things associated with fear and disease (cf. GONDA <sup>2</sup>1978: 85–86).

On the significance in Atharvan magic of naming an inimical entity’s parents and other close relatives, see BLOOMFIELD 1897: 419. The compounds in

<sup>13</sup> The edition reads twice *dadyāt*.

<sup>14</sup> Contrast the plant name in PS 7.10 — *kuṣṭhin-* ‘leprous’, cited EWAia I, 381, is attested only very late: ĀgnivGS 3.10.1:170.17 etc.

-*putrā* and -*bhrātrī* are of course specifically selected by the poet in view of the imprecation which follows in the second hemistich.

c. Cf. PS 10.1.5a *\*tasyāta*<sup>15</sup> *putrān bhrātrīṃś ca* ‘Eat her sons and brothers!’, as well as ŚS 1.28.4 *putrām attu yātudhānīḥ svāsāram utā nāptyām | ādhā mithó vikeśyò ví ghnatām yātudhānyò ví tṛhyantām arāyyàḥ* ‘Let the sorceress eat [her own] son, sister, and daughter; then let the horrid-haired sorceresses mutually destroy one another; let the hags be shattered by each other’ (cf. KULIKOV 2001: 83f.).

d. The variance of reading between **Or** and **K** forces us to choose a preverb *apa* or *vi*. The compound *vi-nay*<sup>i</sup> indeed occurs rather frequently in our text (cf. i.a. PS 1.92.4, 2.68.1–5, 7.9.6, 9.14.6, 15.20.10), but instances of *apa-nay*<sup>i</sup> are not much rarer. Indeed, it first seemed preferable to opt for the latter compound, in light of the passages PS 1.26.4cd *tad astu sutvak tanvo yatas tvāpanayāmasi*<sup>16</sup> ‘Let that [part] of [his] body be good-skinned, from which we lead you away’ and PS 20.14.6ab [PSK 20.13.6] *apa mārjmy apanayan manyuṃ te hṛdayād adhi* ‘I am wiping off the anger, leading it away from your heart’ (cf. also PS 9.15.6 = ŚS 5.17.6). However, the mss. are unanimous in reading *yatra* in our pāda, and the absence of an ablatival form now seems to me to argue in favor of the preverb *vi*; another argument in its favor is the fact that no clear source of perseveration could explain the intrusion of the *vi* in **K**, were we to follow BHATTACHARYA in rejecting it, while the quoted pādas 1.26.4cd provide precisely such an evident source for the intrusion of *apa* that I presume to have occurred in the Or. transmission.

<sup>15</sup> BHATTACHARYA edits *tasyāttu* after [**Ma**]. *tasyātu Mā*, *tasyādhi K*. The emendation has been proposed by the editor in his apparatus.

<sup>16</sup> **K** reads *tvāpinayayāmasi*.

## 6.9. For a king, against enemies: with a bull.

This hymn links attributes of Soma's divine kingship, and the royal stature of the bull (as sacrificial animal), to the royal patron for whose ritual the hymn is intended, and constantly plays on three different possible interpretations of the recurring theme of the 'bull'. Cf. KauśS 17.3 for ritual connections between kings and bulls.

Most of it is found paralleled in TB 2.4.7.1–5. Adopting here, as in my indications below, the division of TB 2.4.7 into stanzas made by Sāyaṇa, the correspondence between PS and TB can be represented as follows:

PS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
TB	1	2	–	6	(7)	3	4	5	–	(10)	–	12

The hymn exceeds the norm of 9 stanzas by 3. The only obvious candidate for qualification as a secondary insertion is stanza 11, not found in TB and deviant metrically as well as thematically. Removing in addition the other two stanzas not found in TB (3, 9), but against whose authenticity no other criteria can be brought to bear, would leave us with the expected number of stanzas.

### 6.9.1 TB 2.4.7.1(1)

vṛṣāyāṃ aṃśúr vṛṣabhāya gṛhyate	(12)
vṛṣāyāṃ ugro ṛcakṣase	(9)
divyo naryo acikradan	(8)
mahan nāma ṛṣabhasya yat kakut	(11 <sup>J</sup> )

This [Soma] stalk is a bull. It is drawn for the bull. This fearsome one is a bull. [It is drawn] for the manly-eyed one. The heavenly, the manly one, has cried out. The withers of the bull are called Great.

aṃśúr] Or, ūcur K vṛṣabhāya] Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K, vṛṣābhāya JM, vṛṣabhRāya Pa gṛhyate] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, gṛdyate JM ugro] Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma] K, u(→ ū)gro Mā || Or, om. K naryo] Or, niryo K acikradan] 'cikradan Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma], 'i-cikradan Mā, acikradaṃ K mahan] Or, nahaṃ K ṛṣabhasya] RM K, ṛṣabhasya Ku JM V/126 Pa [Ma], ṛṣabhaSYA(+ sya) Mā yat kakut] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, yat{k}akut JM

#### TB 2.4.7.1(1)

vṛṣāsy aṃśúr vṛṣabhāya gṛhyase | vṛṣāyāṃ ugró ṛcakṣase |  
divyāḥ karmanyò hitó bṛhán nāma | vṛṣabhāsya yá kakút |

**ab.** I assume that these pādas are entirely parallel in syntax, apparently with *gṛhyate* (which has the technical meaning 'to take a draft [of Soma]' in the first pāda) being omitted the second time (it may refer here concretely to the act of drawing forth a bull). For *sóma-* as 'bull' (*vṛṣaṇ-*), see the references collected by OBERLIES 1999: 90. The 'bull' (*vṛṣabhá-*) is the royal patron.

Soma is also frequently called *nṛcákṣas-* (OBERLIES 1999: 85), but this word probably refers to the ritual patron here. GELDNER has translated ṚV *nṛcákṣas-* in various ways, among which ‘der mit dem Herren-, Herrscherblick’ but also ‘Aufseher’, while ZEHNDER (PS 2.60.3, 2.81.3) has chosen ‘der mit dem Auge eines Mannes’. GELDNER had earlier (1907) glossed: “vielleicht: Herrscherauge habend, mit seinem Blick alles schirmend und durchdringend, schützend . . .”. RENOUE points to the parallelism with the compound *nṛmānas-*, but his rendering of *nṛcákṣas-* as ‘qui possède . . . l’intuition’ (1955–69/II: 55f.) does not have much to recommend itself, at least not in our context.

A different interpretation of the compound from the one adopted here was advocated by BLOOMFIELD (1893: 170f.) who remarks that the implication ‘to look upon men (favorably)’ is always contained in this bahuvrīhi (for the paroxytone accentuation, see AiGr. II/1 §115d, p. 301), which can be rendered in most places: ‘whose eye is [looking watchfully] over men’. Cf. also HILLENBRANDT (1913: 114 n. 2), on ṚV 10.87.8: “Aus der Stelle folgt, daß *nṛcákṣas* ein Terminus ist, der einen Aufseher, Richter, Häscher bedeutet”. It is this latter interpretation that I have adopted below, for the *nṛcakṣaso draṣṭāraḥ* at PS 6.20.3 (ŚS 19.47.3: cf. LOMMEL 1953: 329 = 1978: 300). Werner Knobl points out to me that the juxtaposition in our present context with *narya-* (and with a ‘bull’ qualified as *ugra-*), strongly favors taking *nṛ-* as the agent of looking, rather than its object.

c. On the meanings of the Vedic root *krand*, and its historical developments, see JAMISON 1983a: 109–111 (cf. GOTŌ 1988: 310–311). Note especially JAMISON’s observation that “the redupl. aor. formations . . . are almost entirely intransitive” (p. 110). On “der “brüllende” König”, see OBERLIES 1999: 214ff. Soma, the ‘heavenly’ one, is called *nárya-* ‘manly’ i.a. at ṚV 9.105.5 and 9.109.1. On Soma’s connections with kingship, see the extensive discussion by OBERLIES (1999: 194–219).

d. The meter (caesura) suggests that we should follow **K** (*ṛṣabhasya*), not the Or. mss., as does BHATTACHARYA. On *kakúd-* as *mahan-nāman-*, cf. Nighaṇṭu 3.3, where *kakuhá-* (ṚV 11×) is one of the *mahannāmāni*. On the connection of this term with kingship, cf. TS 7.2.5.3 *trikakúd evá samānānāṇi bhavati* ‘he becomes thrice eminent among his peers’ (KEITH); TB 3.8.21.4 = ŚBM 13.3.3.10 *kakúd dha rájñāṇi bhavati* ‘he becomes eminent among kings’. Cf. also 7a below.

As Stephanie Jamison points out to me, the use of the relative pronoun here resembles the Iranian *izafe* (cf. AiGr. III §257gγδ, 555f.). The same construction is perhaps found at 4.11.5b, 4.26.6c, and at 7.2.6d, 7.4.1d below (also at 7.15.7b?). Cf. CALAND’s discussion (1897: 456f. = 1990: 557f.) of ostensibly similar constructions at ŚS 12.2.19 and 12.2.40 (≈ PS 17.31.9 and 17.48.1 [PSK 17.34.1]), but see the alternative translation given under 7.15.7a below.

## 6.9.2 TB 2.4.7.1(2)

viṣuvān viṣṇo bhava	(7)
t <sub>u</sub> vaṃ yo nṛpatir mama	(8)
atho indra <sup>i</sup> va devebhyo	(8)
vi bravītu jānebh <sub>i</sub> yaḥ	(8)

As Viṣṇu, be the culminating point (*viṣuvānt-*), you who are my lord. And let him [here] give instructions to the people, as Indra to the gods.

viṣuvān] **Ku JM V/126 Mā** [Ma] **K**, viṣṭavān **RM**, viṣuvāna **Pa** viṣṇo bhava] **Ku JM RM Pa** [Ma], viṣṇorbhava **V/126 Mā**, viṣṇyobhava **K** indra iva] **Or**, indreva **K** vi bravītu] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma], vibavritu **Mā**, vi[[*line*]]vibravītu **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[*note* °ḥ m°]]

## TB 2.4.7.1(2)

viṣuvān viṣṇo bhavatu | ayāṃ yó māmako vīṣā |  
atho indra iva devébhyaḥ | ví bravītu jānebhyaḥ |

BHATTACHARYA edits *viṣṇo*.

**ab.** GONDA (1954a: 164) pointed out the “striking parallelism between the special emphasis laid already in Vedic texts upon Viṣṇu’s protecting activities, and his intimate relations with kingship”. Cf. TB 1.3.5.4 (= 1.7.9.2) *viṣṇukramān kramate | viṣṇur evá bhūtvémāññi lokān abhí jayati* ‘He takes [three] Viṣṇu-steps: it is by becoming Viṣṇu that he conquers these [three] worlds’, already referred to by GONDA (p. 164f.). Pāda **a** contains an attempt at etymologizing Viṣṇu’s name (cf. DEEG 1995) by connecting it with *viṣuvānt-*: like Viṣṇu, the king is to take his place at the center of power. *viṣṇo* is thus a predicative vocative (cf. DELBRÜCK 1888: 106, and the several RV places referred to in the indices of OLDENBERG 1909–12, respectively pp. 428 and 378). To bring out the etymological play even more clearly, Werner Knobl proposes to me to resolve *viṣṇo*, even though heptasyllabic pādas are common enough that the meter does not require this, but comparable cases of trisyllabic *viṣṇu-* do not seem to exist.

**c.** In connection with this mention of Indra, “the heavenly prototype of the earthly ruler” (GONDA 1954a: 166), next to Viṣṇu as king in the preceding pādas, we may quote GONDA once again: “Viṣṇu in the course of time inherited part of the functions of his “elder brother”, . . . in younger texts it is Viṣṇu who is credited with power, influence, functions, activities which in the older literature were mainly the concern of Indra” (1954a: 167).

**d.** On the meaning of *vi-bravī* (act.), a verb standing in a suppletive relationship with *vi-ah* and *vi-vac*, ‘to give instructions/explanation about, to point out (+ acc.)’, see i.a. RV 1.145.5cd: *vy ābravīd vayúnā márttyebhyo ’gnír vidvám̐ ṛtacíd dhí satyáḥ* ‘He has pointed out the rules to mortals: for Agni, who knows, truly realizes *ṛtá*’. Cf. also TS 2.5.11.8, 7.3.1.1–2, ŚBM 11.4.1.9, PB 15.7.5, JB 3.303, KauṣB 27.1.4 [ed. LINDNER 27.1:129.16 *nirbravāṇi*].

**6.9.3** Only PS

manuṣyebhyo vi bravītu	(8)
sajūr indreṇa medinā	(8)
agnīś ca tubhyaṃ sāhantyo	(8)
rāṣṭraṃ vaiśvānaro dadhat	(8)

Let him give instructions to men, together with Indra as ally. And the overpowering Agni, the Vaiśvānara, shall bestow on you a realm.

manuṣyebhyo] **Or**, manuṣebhyo **K** vij] **Or**, dhi **K** bravītu] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, bravitu **Mā**, vравītu **K** sajūr] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, sajur **Mā** tubhyaṃ] **Or**, tubhyāṃ (*sec. m.* → BHyam) **K** sāhantyo] **Or**, sahaṃtyo **K**

**a.** See RV 1.145.5cd quoted under 2d. The subject seems to be the king. How can we explain the shift to the 2nd person in the second hemistich?

**b.** The formula *sajūr indreṇa* occurs twice in the RV (5.51.10 and 6.47.29). Our *indreṇa medinā*, a variant on *indramedin-* (see PS 9.27.7 / ŚS 5.20.8, ŚS 11.6.4, 11.6.18), occurs frequently in PS (2.25.5, 7.18.4, 7.19.1+7, 19.11.14, 19.32.1+3, 20.15.6 [PSK 20.14.6], 20.30.4 [PSK 20.29.4], 20.56.4 [PSK 20.52.4]), but only twice elsewhere (ŚS 6.65.3, 6.129.1). Cf. also PS 5.17.2.

**6.9.4** TB 2.4.7.3(6)

yasyāyaṃ bhāga ṛṣabha	(8)
indrāya pariṇīyate	(8)
sa hantu śatrūn āyato	(8)
atho hantu parāyataḥ	(8)

He whose share, this bull, is being led around for Indra, let him kill the approaching enemies, and let him also kill the fleeing ones.

yasyāyaṃ] **Or**, yasmāyaṃ **K** bhāga] **Or**, bhāgam **K** hantu] **Or**, haṃtu **K** atho] **K**, 'tho **Or** hantu] **Or**, haṃtu **K** parāyataḥ ||] **Or**, parāyataḥ [*om.*] **K**

**TB 2.4.7.3(6)**

yāsyāyām ṛṣabhó havīḥ | indrāya pariṇīyāte |  
jāyāti śātrūm āyāntam | átho hanti pṛtanyatáḥ |

**ab.** This seems to be the sacrificial bull: see stanza 7. Cf. RV 10.165.5, ŚS 18.3.3, and 10c below. Cf. also 6.6.6b above.

**6.9.5** **ab:** only PS ◊ **cd:** TB 2.4.7.3(7)

sa hantā śatror bhavatu	(8)
hantā bhavatu dodhatām	(8)
viśām aha praṇīr ayad	(8)
agram udbhindatām asat	(8)

Let him be a killer of the enemy, let him be a killer of the stubborn ones. He shall, then, go as leader of the clans. He shall be the top of those who emerge [victoriously].

hantā śatrur] **Or**, haṁtā śatrūr **K** hantā] **Or**, ahaṁtā **K** dodhatām ] dodhatām | **Ku**  
**JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, bo(→ ho 1)dhatām | **RM**, dodhatām [*om.*] **K** viśām aha]  
**Or**, viśāsaḥ **K** [*note* °ḥ p°] praṇīr ayad] **JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]** **K**, praṇī(+ ra)yad  
**Ku**, praṇī(→ nī 2)rayad **Pa** udbhindatām asat] **JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, adbhindatāmasat  
**Ku**, udbhindatā(+ ma 4)sat **V/126**, adhubhindatāvasat **K**

**TB 2.4.7.3(7)**

nṛṇām áha praṇīr ásat | ágra udbhindatām asat |

**a.** The acc. pl. *śatrūr* found in **K** may be explained either as a simple echo from the preceding stanza, or might be a more distant echo from 3.3.2 (*śatrūr* + *dodhataḥ*). In any case, the gen. of the **Or**. mss. is preferable syntactically, and is supported by the gen. in the next pāda.

**b.** On the participial forms *dódha(n)t-* etc., cf. GOTŌ 1987: 175f. Besides the places listed there, cf. also PS 1.69.1ab *jāyamāno nir arujat sapatnān dodhato bhayān* ‘while [still] being born, it snapped the stubborn and fearless rivals’ (after ZEHNDER 1993: 120; BHATTACHARYA reads *dodhatobhayān*, cf. RENOUE 1965: 16). In the **RV**, the word is used i.a. of Vṛtra (1.80.5, 8.6.6), Makha (10.171.2), and trees (? — 10.119.2).

**cd.** On the meaning and formation of *áha*, cf. LUBOTSKY 1995: 259. Regarding the verb *ud-bhed*, CALAND already suggested (in his note on ĀpŚS 18.19.5): “*udbhinnam* ist beinahe mit *jitam* gleichwertig”. The term was treated in detail (and with reference to earlier interpretations by LÜDERS, CALAND and HEESTERMAN) by FALK (1986: 169ff.), who concludes that it means “den Sieg im Spiel, den “Durchbruch”, sowie den “Durchbruch” in eine neue Welt der Sieger”. FALK discusses PS 1.72.1, to which I may add the Atharvanic stanzas ŚS 4.38.1, 5.20.11 / PS 9.27.11, 9.2.2 / PS 16.76.2.

**6.9.6** TB 2.4.7.1–2(3)

āyusmantam varccasvantam	(8)
atho adhipatiṁ viśām	(8)
asyāḥ pṛthivyāś cettāram	(8)
imam indrarṣabhaṁ kṛṇu	(8)

Make this bull here, o Indra, the guardian of this earth, and an over-lord of the clans, possessing longevity and splendor.

varccasvantam] **K**, varccasvantam **Ku** **JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, varccasvanta{ṁ}m **Pa**  
adhipatiṁ] **K**, dhīpatiṁ **Ku Pa Ma**, dhīpatiṁ **JM RM V/126 Mā** viśām ] viśām | **Or**,  
viśām (+ |) **K** asyāḥ] **Or**, asyāḥ **K** cettāram] **Or**, cettanem **K** imam indrarṣabhaṁ]  
**Ku Pa [Ma]**, imam indra ṛṣabhaṁ **JM RM V/126 Mā**, imaṁ indra vṛṣabhaṁ **K**

**TB 2.4.7.1–2(3)**

áyuṣmantam várcasvantam | átho ádhipatiṃ viśám |  
 asyáḥ pṛthivyá ádhyakṣam | imám indra vṛṣabhám kṛṇu |

cd. Note the variants in TB: **K** shares the metrically less suitable TB reading *vṛṣabhám*. An identical case of *-a rṣabha-* → *-a vṛṣabha-* occurred at 6.8.3b. It is possible that **K** has been influenced by the TB reading here: if so, the reading here may in turn have influenced **K**'s reading at 6.8.3b. On the *céttr-*, cf. i.a. RV 10.128.9, and ŚS 6.73.1 / PS 19.10.10, PS 1.75.1.

**6.9.7 TB 2.4.7.2(4)**

yaḥ suśṛṅgaḥ sukakudaḥ (8)  
 kalyāṇo barhir āśadat | (8)  
 kārṣīvaṇaprajānena (8)  
 ṛṣabheṇa yajāmahe || (8)

We worship with a bull, having its origin among cultivators, that has sat down on the sacred grass, illustrious with beautiful horns and beautiful withers.

yaḥ suśṛṅgaḥ] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, yaḥ sa(→ su 1)śṛṅgaḥ **Ku**, asyaśṛṅga **K**  
 sukakudaḥ] **Or**, suśāṇpadaḥ **K** [[note °ḥ k°] barhir] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, bahir  
**JM RM** kārṣīvaṇaprajānena] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, kārṣīvaṇa° **JM**

**TB 2.4.7.2(4)**

yáḥ suśṛṅgaḥ suvṛṣabháh | kalyāṇo dróṇa áhitaḥ |  
 kārṣīvalapragāṇena | vṛṣabhéṇa yajāmahe |

This stanza seems to put the sacrificial bull in the foreground. The ‘bull’ of the preceding stanzas belonged mostly to the metaphorical domain where the king is referred to as ‘bull’. The TB version of this stanza continues taking the ‘bull’ as Soma (*dróṇa áhitaḥ*). BHATTACHARYA edits *yāḥ*, which must be a misprint.

b. On the use of the adjective *kalyāṇa-* for cattle, see TS 7.1.5.7 (cf. BhārŚS 10.17.12).

c. The word *kārṣīvaṇa-*, the first member of the compound, is only found elsewhere in Vedic literature in the Atharvanic stanza ŚS 6.116.1 (PS 16.49.7) *yád yāmám cakrúr nikhánanto ágre kārṣīvaṇā annavído ná vidyáyā | vaivasvaté rájani táj juhomy átha yajñíyayam mádhumad astu nó 'nnam* ‘What that was Yama’s the Kārshīvaṇas made, digging down in the beginning, food-acquiring, not with knowledge, that I make an oblation unto the king, Vivasvant’s son; let our food be sacrificial, rich in sweet’ (WHITNEY). It is obviously related to the word *kṛṣīvala-* (see EWAia I, 397), which means ‘cultivator’. Cf. the following passage found in the Śrāddha section of VādhGS (of which Yasuke Ikari was so kind as to send me a provisional edition): *pitaras tasya tuṣyanti vṛṣṭyeva hi kṛṣīvalāḥ | yad gayāstho dadāty annan tac cānantyāya kalpate* ‘For his ancestors are satisfied, like cultivators are with rainfall, when he gives food while in Gayā, and prepares it for eternity’. The interpretation of *kṛṣīvala-* in this

last passage is confirmed by VāsDhS 11.42: *nandanti pitaras tasya svṛṣṭair iva karṣakāḥ | yad gayāsthō dadāty annaṃ pitaras tena putriṇaḥ* ‘When someone offers food to his ancestors at Gayā, they rejoice, just as farmers rejoice at fields that have received abundant rain; in him his ancestors are blessed with a true son’ (OLIVELLE 2000: 392f., cf. also AVParīś 69.5.3 and ṚgVidh 2.69). The compound *ākṛṣṣivalām* at RV 10.146.6 (≈ TB 2.5.5.7) is therefore likely to be a bahuvrīhi (on the accent, cf. AiGr. II/1 §114a, p. 293 ll. 40ff.): *āñjanagandhīm surabhīm bahvannām ākṛṣṣivalām | prāhām mṛgānām mātāram arañyanīm aśaṃsiṣam* ‘I have praised the forest, the mother of the animals, who smells of cosmetics and is fragrant (like a young woman), the forest who yields much food, though being without cultivators’ (after BODEWITZ 1982: 6).

Being a derivative from \**kṛṣṣvāṇ-* ‘cultivator’ (see AiGr. II/2 §§718b and 727a+c, pp. 901 and 908), *kārṣvāṇa-*, the first member of our compound, also necessarily denotes persons (‘belonging to a line of cultivators’, i.e. ‘cultivators’ themselves) at ŚS 6.116.1 / PS 16.49.7 quoted above, and I therefore adopt this interpretation here in *kārṣvāṇaprajāna-* as well.

The second member of the compound is more problematic. It has been transmitted in this reading both in **K** and in the Or. mss. The TB variant, introduced perhaps in the light of its application of the stanza to Soma, is accepted by BARRET (*apud* EDGERTON 1915: 391) and SHARMA, who disregards the fact that **K**’s reading disagrees with that of TB (1959/1960: 98). I accept the transmitted PS text, and hesitantly follow the etymological connection with *pra-jan<sup>i</sup>* suggested by RENOUE’s ‘born from a husbandman’ (1957a: 82): the word *prajāna-* seems to be attested also in PS 6.6.6 *sindhuprajāna-* above. As at that place, I hesitate to emend a uniform tradition (which is even confirmed to some extent by TB’s *-ṇ-*), and simply mention the possibility that we have here an error for °*prajātena*. If so, we might adduce e.g. TS 2.1.5.2 *paśúbhya evá prājātebhyaḥ pratiṣṭhām dadhāti* ‘he gives support to cattle, when born’ (KEITH). See my note on 6.6.6a.

The noun *prajāna-* seems to be a verbal substantive with suffix *-na-* (cf. AiGr. II/2 §561). Cf. i.a. PS 9.29.7, 19.46.3 (≈ VSM 31.7, TĀ 3.13.1), VSM 33.72, JB 2.1, 2.157, ŚBM 3.1.3.4: in these passages, the word *ājāna-* seems to mean ‘birthplace’. In view of the fact that the compound verbs *ā-jan<sup>i</sup>* and *pra-jan<sup>i</sup>* can have very similar meanings, I suggest that the previously unattested word *prajāna-* may also mean ‘place of origin, birthplace’. Our compound is thus a bahuvrīhi: ‘whose place of origin is among cultivators’, which seems comparable to *kṛṣyāḥ saṃbhūtaḥ* in stanza 10.

### 6.9.8 TB 2.4.7.2(5)

ṛṣabheṇa yajamānā	(8)
akrūreṇeva sarpiṣā	(8)
mṛdhaś ca sarvā indreṇa	(8)
pṛtanāś ca sahāmahe	(8)

Worshipping with a bull, as though with non-bloody butter, we overcome all foes and [win in] all battles, with [the aid of] Indra.

yajamānā akrūreṇeva] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma], yajamānā ak·reṇeva **Pa**, yajamānā-kraureṇaiva **K** sahāmahe] **Or**, sāmahe **K**

**TB 2.4.7.2(5)**

vṛṣabhéṇa yájamānāḥ | ákrūreṇeva sarpíṣā |  
mṛdhaś ca sárva índreṇa | pṛtanāś ca jayāmasi |

**b.** This seems to be an early example of the denial of violence in sacrificing (see HOUBEN 1999: 118ff.). However, instead of interpreting the ‘bull’ here as a sacrificial animal, slaughtered ‘as though it were’ (*iva*) a non-bloody butter-offering, we might also consider the possibility of interpreting the ‘bull’ as Soma (perhaps reading *akrūreṇaiva* with **K**), the prototypical (*eva*) vegetarian offering: ‘worshipping with the bull (Soma), as it were/that is, with non-bloody butter’. Since the TB interpretation of the preceding stanza as referring to Soma seems secondary, and is anyhow impossible according to the PS text of that stanza, I prefer the former interpretation, and accept the reading of the Or. mss. (confirmed also by TB) here.

**d.** Note the different verb (*jay*) used in TB. Contrast this fact with *pṛtanāsāhyeṣu* at 6.9.12d (also in the TB parallel). EMENEAU 1949: 354 = 1988: 17 has pointed out: “The collocation of the root *sah* and the object *pṛtanyatas* is found in the Ṛgveda and Atharvaveda with the subject usually Indra (RV 1.8.4, 1.132.1, 10.43.6), but also Indra-Agni (RV 8.40.7), Savitṛ (RV 8.86.5), and Soma Pavamāna (RV 9.61.29); in AV 19.32.10 the reciter overcomes the enemy with an amulet of *darbha*”. Cf. 7.1.3 and 7.4.7 below.

**6.9.9** Only PS

yaṃ tubhyaṃ bhāgam ṛṣabhaṃ	(8)
devāḥ kevalyaṃ daduḥ	(8)
tena vṛtrāṇi +jaṅghanaḥ	(8)
śatrūṃś ca jaḥy āhave	(8)

The bull which the gods have given to you as [your] exclusive share: by means of it you shall shatter the opponents. And strike the enemies in battle!

devāḥ] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma], devā **Mā**, devāḥ **K** kevalyaṃ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], kevalyalaṃ **JM**, kaivalyaṃ **K** daduḥ] **Ku Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, VIduḥ **JM RM**, da{duḥ}duḥ **V/126** vṛtrāṇi] **Or**, vṛttrāṇi **K** +jaṅghanaḥ] jaṅghana **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa Ma**, jaṅghanaṃ **Mā**, johanaś **K** śatrūṃś] **Ku RM Pa** [Ma] **K**, ś{·}atrūṃś **JM**, śatṛṃś **V/126**, śatṛṃś **Mā**

Cf. stanza 4, which is similar in wording and in sense. Both stanzas are concerned with the king. BHATTACHARYA edits *kevalyaṃ* and *jaṅghanaṃ*.

**b.** I take the hapax reading *kevalyaṃ* of the Or. mss. seriously. **K** *kaivalyaṃ* cannot be accepted because the word *kaivalya-* is limited in Vedic Mantra and

Brāhmaṇa literature to a unique attestation in the compound *ātmakaivalya*, in the late GB (1.1.30). Moreover, it would not make sense here. The meter precludes emending *kevalam*. We have here a previously unattested example of a ‘Streckform’ (KORN 1998) replacing *kevalam*, to suit the exigencies of the meter. KORN (1998: 73ff.) has given a number of RV examples of such “Adjektive mit *-iya-*, die nicht von Substantiven abgeleitet sind, sondern neben ansonsten gleichgebildeten Adjektiven auf *-a-* stehen (AiGr II/2/813)”. In this kāṇḍa, we already encountered another such form, *śagmya-*, at 6.2.9a.

The phrase *kévala-* + *dhā* is found a small number of times in the RV: e.g. 1.57.6, 8.52.3, 10.54.5 (also 10.96.13ab), while the AV Saṁhitās otherwise have only *kévala-* + *kar* (also in RV, e.g. 10.145.2). This last construction has been explained convincingly by OLDENBERG (1906: 693 = 1993: 1954): “Es ließe sich, meine ich, eine ganze Reihe von Stellen beibringen . . . , die beweisen, daß *kévalam* *kr̥ṇute* zusammengehört und bedeutet “etwas zu seinem ausschließlichen Besitz machen”.” Cf. e.g. PS 16.73.5, 17.10.6, ŚS 3.18.2, 11.5.10. The combination *kévala-* + *dā*, as we have it here, is attested RV 10.51.8.

c. From the available ms. readings, I reconstruct the form <sup>+</sup>*janghanas*, a 2nd sg. int. subj. from the root *han* (see SCHAEFER 1994: 203). BHATTACHARYA edits a meaningless form *janghanam*, against his ms. **Ma**, on the basis of **Mā**. My Or. mss. prove that the **Mā** reading with final anusvāra (and therefore BHATTACHARYA’s *janghanam*) is not likely to be correct. The final *-ś* of **K** provides the clue to the adopted form, which is attested also at RV 9.9.7.

**6.9.10** a: cf. RV 3.47.2c etc., TB 2.4.7.4(10) ◊ c: cf. ŚS 9.5.2 ◊ b+d: only PS

jahi śatrūn vi mṛdho nudasva	(10)
kr̥ṣyāḥ sambhūto asi vīr̥yāvān	(11)
indrāya bhāgaṃ pari tvā nayāma	(11)
urur no loko apṛtanyo astu	(11)

Strike the enemies, force away the foes. You have arisen from cultivation, full of manly strength. We lead you around as share for Indra. Let the world be wide [and] free of strife for us.

vi mṛdho nudasva] **Or**, pranpratiraṃdhayasva **K** kr̥ṣyāḥ] **Or**, kṛdhyāt **K** sambhūto] **Or**, sambhūto **K** asi] **Or**, si **K** nayāma urur] nayāma uṛ **Ku V/126 Mā**, nayāma uṛn **JM RM**, nayāmi uṛ **Pa** [**Ma**], nayāmoruṇno **K** apṛtanyo] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, amṛtanvo **V/126** astu] **Or**, stu **K**

**TB 2.4.7.4(10)**

agne jētā tvāṃ jaya | śātrūnt sahāsa ójasā |  
vī śātrūn vī mṛdho nuda |

Note the sudden change from anuṣṭubh to triṣṭubh meter (and gāyatrī in the next stanza). BHATTACHARYA follows **K** and reads *sambhūto*.

a. The RV parallel reads *jahí śátrūm̐r ápa m̐dho nudasva*, while TB has *vinod* with PS. The erroneous reading in **K** is due to perseveration from 3.27.6a (*jahi śátrūn prati randhayasva*).

b. On the abl. *kṛṣyāḥ*, an *-i* stem with a form according to the *-ī* declension, see AiGr. III §75a, p. 150. Cf. i.a. PS 2.11.5, 5.29.7. The word *kṛṣí-* seems to have a different meaning in 6.18.8 and 7.6.6, below.

The pāda seems to imply, as perhaps also 7c above, the use of (uncastrated) bulls as draught-animals. Cf. FALK 1982: 177, who observes: “Wie auch heute noch, werden im alten Indien neben kastrierten Rindern auch unverschnittene vor den Wagen gespannt worden sein. VāsDhś 2.32 lautet *tasmāt sāṇḍābhyām anasyotābhyām prak prātarāsāt karṣī syāt* — “Deswegen möge er vor der Morgenfütterung mit zwei unkastrierten (Rindern), die keinen Nasenstrick haben, pflügen.” Die Funktion *ṛṣabhá* kann also mit der Funktion *anaḍúh* wechseln”. See also Kautilya, Arthaśāstra 2.29.8 (cf. GANGULI 1930–31: 224), and LUBOTSKY 2002: 80 (on an uncastrated *anaḍvah-*).

c. ŚS 9.5.2a reads *indrāya bhāgāṃ pári tvā nayāmi*. The reading *nayāmi* (which cannot be correct in the present context) is found in some Or. mss. as well. Cf. 4b above.

d. The apparent *-ya* stem *(a)pr̥tanya-* seems to be a hapax, since the lemma *?pr̥tanyo yad* for PSK 20.54.6 [= PS 20.58.6] in VWC-Saṃhitās IV, 2093 is not confirmed by my Or. mss. for that place, and is thus probably a ghost-word.

**6.9.11** a: cf. ŚS 13.1.28b ◊ b: only PS ◊ c: cf. RV 1.12.5

ghṛtavṛddha ghṛtāhuta	(8)
sahasraśṛṅga suṣṭuta	(8)
ghṛtāhavana dīdihī	(8)

Increased by ghee, offered a libation of ghee, with a thousand horns, well praised, you, whose libation is ghee: shine!

sahasraśṛṅga] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, sahasraśṛṅgI [?] **Pa** suṣṭuta] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, suṣṭuta **V/126**, suṣṭutaḥ **K** dīdihī ||] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, dādihī | **Pa**, dīhī [om. ]] **K**

Note that this stanza is a gāyatrī, and that its contents also seem to be slightly different from the preceding stanzas, as the focus shifts to Agni as divine king (see SCHLERATH 1960: 132). Or is it just Agni who is being addressed (cf. RV 5.1.8c *sahásraśṛṅgo vṛṣabhás*), without kingship playing a role anymore, as seems also to be the case in the next stanza (but cf. *indra* in its TB parallel)? See my discussion of 6.8.6 above.

**6.9.12** TB 2.4.7.5(12)

yo ghṛtenābhighārīta	(8)
ugro jaitrāya tiṣṭhasi	(8)
sa naḥ *saṅkāsu pārāya	(8)

ṛtanāsāh<sub>1</sub>yeṣu ca || 9 || (8)

You who are standing fearsomely, for victory, sprinkled upon with ghee: protect us in clashes and in battle-victories.

ghṛtenābhighārīta] **K**, ghṛtenāvaghārīta **Or** tiṣṭhasi |] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], tiṣṭhata(→ si 3) | **Ku**, tiṣṭhasi [*om.*] |] **K** naḥ] **Or**, nas **K** \*saṅkāsu] saṅkasu **Ku Pa** [**Ma**], saṅkasu **JM V/126 Mā**, saṅkusu **RM K** pāraya] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], kā(→ pā)raya **JM**, pārayā | **K** [*note*] |] ṛtanāsāhyeṣu] **K**, ṛtanāsājyeṣu **Or** || 9 ||] || ṛ 12 || 9 || **Ku JM**, || ṛ || 9 || **RM**, || 9 || ṛ 12 || **V/126 Mā Pa**, Z 4 Z **K**

**TB 2.4.7.5(12)**

yó ghṛténābhīmānītaḥ | índra jáitrāya jajñīṣe |  
sá naḥ sáṅkāsu pāraya | ṛtanāsāhyeṣu ca |

Although the TB parallel explicitly addresses this stanza to Indra, such an interpretation is not likely in our version, as the action *abhi-ghar* (see PW II, 880) is always performed on objects, predominantly oblation materials: the addressee thus seems to be either the sacrificial bull, or Agni (cf. SCHWAB 1886: 84f.). BHATTACHARYA edits °*āvaghārīta*, and *saṅkasu*.

a. A compound *ava-ghar*, as the Or. mss. transmit, does not exist anywhere in Vedic, while *abhi-ghar* (thus **K**, the same preverb in TB) is frequent: e.g. PS 17.39.7b (*ghṛtena pātram abhi ghārayedam* ‘besprinkle this vessel with ghee’) and 16.138.6 (as well as at ŚS 5.21.3, where a war-drum is being addressed, and 10.9.25). Confusion of *-bh-* and *-v-* (in this case followed by loss of the *-i-*) is common in the Or. mss.: cf. 2.21.2d, 2.36.1a, 2.38.5b, 5.17.3d, 5.19.1c, 5.28.8c, 5.33.2a, 6.16.2c [**JM Pa**], 7.5.11a, 19.6.5b.

c. I do not see why BHATTACHARYA adopts without underlining the impossible reading *saṅkasu* of the Or. mss., and goes against the reading in the TB parallel, which I have adopted here. Cf. ṚV 6.75.5 *bahvīnām pitá bahúr asya putráś cíścá kṛṇoti sámanāvagátya | iṣudhīḥ sáṅkāḥ ṛtanās ca sárvaḥ ṛṣṭhé nínaddho jayati prásūtaḥ* ‘Of many [arrows] it is the father; many a son it has; it clatters, when it has gone down to the confrontations: tied on the back, put to action, the quiver wins all clashes and battles’.

d. Cf. 8d above.

## 6.10. At dawn: with a cow.

This hymn accompanies the gift of a cow by the ritual patron to his priests, probably at a Soma ritual (stanza 7). The ritual cow represents the Sun, and her arrival marks the dawn.

Stanzas 1 through 8 are spoken by the priest(s), while the concluding stanza is spoken by the patron: the same pattern is found also in the hymn PS 5.31 (not counting the secondary addition 5.31.9, LUBOTSKY 2002: 143), which contains many other interesting parallels as well. The cow-as-gift is not explicitly called *dakṣiṇā* in the present hymn, but comparable stanzas in 5.31, as well as in 7.15 below, seem to suggest that it is precisely this gift that is referred to: the danger implicit in its receipt (cf. HEESTERMAN 1959: 243) is repeatedly stressed (stanzas 2, 6 and 8).

### 6.10.1 Only PS

karkī subhāga ṛṣabhasya patnī	(11)
prajākāmā vaśinī vāsītā gauḥ	(11)
tāṃ sahasram ekamukhā dadāti	(11)
garbhaṃ dadhānām ṛtunā carantīm	(11)

The white cow, the blessed domineering wife of the bull, the cow in heat, desirous of offspring: he gives her as [equivalent to] a thousand [cows] with the head [turned] in one [direction], [while she is] getting pregnant, [while she is] going around in accordance with the time of the year.

karkī] **Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, kakRī [?] **JM**, karkī **Pa**, kavīs **K** patnī] **Or**, patnīḥ **K** vaśinī] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, vaśinī **JM** vāsītā] **V/126 Mā Pa K**, vāsītā **Ku JM RM [Ma?] ] Or, om. K** ekamukhā] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, ekasu(→ mu)khā **RM** dadhānām ṛtunā] **Or**, dadhānāmithunā **K** carantīm ||] carantīm || **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, carantīm([?] → ntīm 2) || **Pa**, carantī Z [!] **K**

The reading *vāsītā* that BHATTACHARYA reports for **Mā** is not found in that ms. Has he confused the readings of **Ma** and **Mā**?

a. On *karkī-* ‘white (cow/calf)’, see the collection of relevant material in GONDA 1965a: 299 (cf. EWAia I, 314). The sun is a calf at ŚS 13.1.10d — on the Sun as a cow, see HOUBEN 1991: 130 n. 151. On a possible ‘erotic connotation’ of *subhāgā-*, see FIŠER 1966: 50 (with n. 45). The nearly identical term *subhagā-* is a regular epithet of another solar divinity, Uṣas (GONDA 1959a: 101). It remains uncertain whom the word *ṛṣabha-* refers to: perhaps ‘bull’ Soma (see the preceding hymn), who represents the moon. If so, contrast *varuṇasya patnī* in 2c.

b. At RV 10.85.26cd, the adjective *vaśinī-* ‘domineering’ is applied to Sūryā as *gṛhāpatnī*, and seems to refer to a position of power in the domestic sphere.

The quality of the sibilant in *vāsītā* is unstable: in PS, we find both *vāsītā* (1.55.1, 5.15.5, also ŚS 5.20.2 [thus all mss.]) and *vāśītā* (PS 6.10 *passim*, 8.20.4, 9.27.3) According to EWAia II, 548, the palatal sibilant is original.

c. The one who gives the cow is the ‘giver’ (stanzas 5, 6, 7, 9), the patron of the ritual. On the meaning of *ekamukha-*, cf. GONDA 1965a: 316f. Besides an attestation at AVPariś 6.4.14–15, where it clearly has an unrelated meaning, the word is found elsewhere only in the almost verbatim parallel ŚS 9.4.9cd (PS 16.24.9cd) *sahāśraṃ sā ekamukhā dadāti yó brāhmaṇá ṛṣabhām ājuhóti* ‘He gives a thousand [cows] with the head [turned] in one [direction], who offers a bull into a Brahmin’. The interpretation which HENRY (1894: 131) gives of this last phrase as “formule mythique des rayons solaires” may not convince there, but seems certainly to the point in our context. The ritual cow worth one thousand pieces of cattle represents the one sun, emanating innumerable rays of light.

d. I have found no parallels for *ṛtunā carantīm*, as found in the Or. mss., against *mithunā carantīm* apparently intended in **K**, but no parallels seem to exist for the latter reading either (if we exclude the apparently unique attestation of *mithunā car* in ŚB 1.9.2.8, quoted by DELBRÜCK 1888: 135). In view of the occurrence of etymologically related *ṛtviya-* in stanza 4, and in view of the frequent confusion of *-i-* and *-ṛ-* in **K**, I follow the Or. mss. here, and read *ṛtunā*. On *ṛtú-* denoting a period of female fecundity, see SLAJE 1995, referred to more specifically under 6.10.4 below. However, it seems better here to interpret *ṛtú-* simply as ‘season’, in view of the cow’s association with the sun in this hymn.

A punning connection, on the ritual level, with female fecundity (*mutatis mutandis*, the fecundity of the ritual cow) can be assumed as well. We may therefore consider taking *ṛtunā* adverbially, with *car* in a durative sense: ‘while being in her fecund period’. This latter interpretation would allow us to work with a nice paradox between *garbhaṃ dadhānām* and *ṛtunā carantīm*; the first pāda of the next stanza contains a paradox as well. Anyhow, the present stanza seems to have reference not only to cosmology (cow = sun), but also to the cow here-and-now, i.e. in the ritual.

### 6.10.2 Only PS

garbhaṃ dadhānā paya id duhānā	(11)
agnihotraṃ vaiśvadevī duhānā	(11)
gaur no mā hiṃsīd varuṇasya patnī	(11)

Even giving milk while she is pregnant, giving milk for the Agnihotra, the cow belonging to all the gods, the wife of Varuṇa, must not harm us.

payā id] Or, pai **K** duhānā agnihotraṃ] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, duhānā agnihotraṃ **RM**, duhānāgnihotraṃ **K** duhānā] **Ku RM V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, duhānāṃ **JM**, duh{·}hānā **Mā** gaur no] gaurṇṇo **V/126 Mā**, ⟨·r·⟩ **Ku**, gauṇṇo **JM**, gaur no **RM Pa Ma**, daurga **K** hiṃsīd] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, hiṃsīd **JM**, hiṃsīr **K** patnī ||] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, patnī **Mā**, patnīm **K** [om. ]]

Note that we have here a rare 3-pāda triṣṭubh stanza.

a. The use of the particle *id* seems to point to the paradoxical idea of being pregnant and giving milk at the same time. Cf. the preceding stanza (pāda **d**). But note also the complete syntactic parallelism to 9c.

b. Cf. 5.31.1ab *atyāsarāt prathamā dhokṣyamāṇā sarvān yajñān bibhratī vaiśvadevī* ‘The cow that will give milk first has run over here, supporting all worships, belonging to all the gods’. The cow called *vaiśvadevī*- is the sun, and all the gods are its rays: see BODEWITZ 1976: 46 (with n. 46).

c. The cow, i.e. the sun, as protectress of the day-time sky, is paired here with the wife of Varuṇa, the guardian of the nocturnal sky (OBERLIES 1998: 195). The ‘wife of Varuṇa’ occurs only rarely: the only other AV occurrence seems to be PS 11.5.2ab *uta tvāhur varuṇasya patnīm atho tvāhur aditīm viśvarūpām* ‘They call you Varuṇa’s wife, and they call you the glittering Aditi’ (cf. pāda 3c below), addressed to a cow as well. Cf. also TS 1.1.3.8, 5.5.4.1 (‘the waters were the wives of Varuṇa’). At RV 1.123.5, the dawn Uṣas, often referred to as a cow, is called *vāruṇasya jāmi*, ‘relative of Varuṇa’. Cf. the ‘gown of Varuṇa’ in stanza 5.

### 6.10.3 Only PS ◊ c: cf. PS 5.31.9c

karkyā yoniṃ saṃmanaso (°)bhi gāvaḥ	(11)
prajāṃ dhitsanto vṛṣaṇaś caranti	(11)
sā na ait <sub>v</sub> aditir viśvarūpā-	(11)
-abhi krandanti bhuvanān <sub>y</sub> enām	(11)

The bulls single-mindedly [shout] at the womb of the white cow, the studs are always eager to produce offspring. Let her come to us as glittering Aditi. The creatures are lowing at her.

yonim] Or, yānim K saṃmanaso] Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma], saṃmanare Pa, samanaso K (°)bhi] bhi Or K gāvaḥ] Or, gāvaḥ | K [[note °ḥ | p°] prajāṃ] Or, prajā K dhitsanto] Or, mi(→ di)śchanto K [[Edg.: °cch°] vṛṣaṇaś] Or, dhiṣaṇaś K caranti |] Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma], cara[[folio]]ranti | V/126, carantī [[om.]] K sā na aitv] Or, mānetv K aditir] Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma], aditi Mā K viśvarūpābhi] K, viśvaṛpābhi Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], viṛpābhi JM, viśvaṛpābhi RM enām ||] enām || Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], e{-ām}nām || JM, ūnām (+ |) K

ab. It is not immediately clear which verb is to be supplied to *abhi* here. The parallelism with pāda **d** might suggest *abhi-krand*. Connecting our preverb with *caranti* in the next pāda seems less suitable, because *abhi-car* always has a strongly hostile connotation, and *car* is best taken here as a durative auxiliary, with the participle *dhitsantaḥ* (DELBRÜCK 1888: 390). Similarities, phonological and otherwise, of our *yonim saṃmanaso ’bhi* with RV 10.123.2cd (*ṛtāsya sānāv ādhi viṣṭāpi bhrāt samānām yōnim abhy anūṣata vrāḥ*) suggest *abhi-nav*<sup>(i)</sup> ‘to shout at’ (cf. the parallel of this RV stanza at PS 2.6.1, and also RV 4.1.16c). This is confirmed by PS 19.42.5c: *abhi gāvo anūṣata* ‘the bulls/cows shouted’. On these phrases, cf. also LINDENAU 1922: 36f. and JAMISON 2003: 52 with n. 33.

The ‘bulls’ that are shouting, eager to produce one offspring (*prajāṃ* sg.), probably the dawn, may be the priests, trying to awaken the dawn with their singing and recitation. Instead of interpreting it as an auxiliary verb with participle *dhitsanto*, *caranti* might thus also be taken in its technical sense ‘to perform [Adhvaryu] ritual’ (see EINO 1982–83).

c. Aditi is never called *viśvarūpā-* in the ṚV. As for the PS, see 11.5.2 (quoted under stanza 2), 17.6.10, 20.36.2. Cf. also 5.11.5, where we find Varuṇānī (= Varuṇa’s wife) juxtaposed i.a. with Aditi, which may again be compared with 11.5.2. On the meaning of the word *viśvarūpa-* ‘glittering like the sun’, cf. the discussion by BODEWITZ 1985: 15ff., and see 6.22.9, 7.15.10 below (contrast 7.2.5, 7.11.9). Cf. also 5.31.3+9.

#### 6.10.4 Only PS

prajāpatineṣitām ṛtviyāvātīm	(12)
ainām prajāyā ṛṣabhāḥ śrayante	(11)
vṛṣaṇyantīm vṛṣaṇaḥ saptanāmnīm	(11)
hiṃkṛṇvanto abhi nudantu vāsītām	(12)

The bulls lean against her, who is sent by the Lord of Offspring, bearing the mark of her fecundity, for offspring. Huffing, let the studs push forward the seven-named lustful cow in heat.

ṛtviyāvātīm] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, ṛtviyātīm **Pa**, ṛtviyāvātīm **K** ainām] **Or**, ahinām **K** ṛṣabhāḥ] **Or**, ṛṣabhā **K** vṛṣaṇyantīm] **Ku JM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, vṛṣaṇvantīm **RM**, vṛṣaṇyantī **Pa K** vṛṣaṇaḥ] **Or**, vṛṣaṇas **K** hiṃkṛṇvanto] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, ⟨...⟩nto **Ku** nudantu] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, nandanti **JM RM**, nudanti **K** vāsītām ||] vāsītām || **Or**, vāsītām [*om.*] **K**

Pāda **a** contains no caesura.

a. Concerning Prajāpati, GONDA (1987: 19) mentions the “many references to the god’s relations with and care of cattle”, with reference to many passages. He seems to be mentioned here not primarily for mythological reasons, but simply because his name emphasizes again the wish expressed in this hymn for the dawn, as offspring (*prajā-*) of the sun, to appear. On the phrase *prajāpatinā iṣita-*, cf. PS 20.63.9c [PSK 20.59.9] *prajāpatinā preṣitaḥ* ‘sent forth by Prajāpati’.

The adjective *ṛtvīyāvanta-* has been neglected by SLAJE (1995), probably because he assumed it to be connected in all its occurrences to the general meaning of *ṛtvīya-*, the one derived from the ‘Grundbedeutung’ of *ṛtú-* (“ursprünglich wohl von einem Verteilungs- zu einem Zeiteinteilungsfaktor gewandelt”, p. 109), and not from the “für ganz spezifische Kontexte angegebene Bedeutung” of periodic female fecundity, as at PS 19.42.8 *pra tvā sarpatv + aṅkataḥ kumāraḥ puruṣād adhi | ṛtor yam ṛtvīyād adhi yam te dhātācīkṣpat* ‘Let him crawl to you from the lap, a boy from a man, whom Dhātār has fashioned for you from the mark of fecundity, from the fecund period’. Cf. further PS 3.34.1, 11.1.11–12, 12.3.9 etc.

To return to *ṛtviyāvati-* (also at PS 2.70.2, 11.14.1; in the ‘general’ meaning three times in RV): the present passage clearly corroborates the interpretations of SLAJE 1995, to whose argument (p. 130: “...erklärte man sich im alten Indien die Zeugung aus dem zusammentreffen von Sperma als männlichem, und (Menstrual-)Blut als weiblichem Zeugungsstoff”) may also be added a reference to TB 1.2.1.14 *ṛtviyavati stho agnīretasau | gárbham dadhāthām* ‘Die Menses habend seid ihr beide; das Feuer als Samen habend werdet schwanger’ (CALAND 1921, transl. of ĀpŚS 5.8.8).

**b.** The rare verb *ā-śray* seems not to be attested elsewhere (see e.g. FIŠER 1966: 94) with the obvious sexual meaning (the bull mounts the cow) it has here, and is otherwise also never attested governing an acc., before some late sūtra or ancillary texts (e.g. ĀgnivGS 2.7.10:118.13, AVPariś 51.1.1), where the verb has an entirely different meaning.

**cd.** On the meaning of *vr̥ṣanyant-* ‘lustful’, see PS 2.90.2, and 6.4.5 above (cf. FIŠER 1966: 78 n. 39). This is the only occurrence of the compound *saptánāman-*, besides the passage RV 1.164.2 (with parallels in several texts), which refers to the sun as seven-named horse. Cows with seven (or three times seven) names are mentioned also at RV 1.164.3, 4.16.1, 7.87.4. Seven suns, and their seven names, are mentioned in PS 5.6 (to Sūrya, see LUBOTSKY 2002: 36), especially 5.6.10, and at 5.31.7.

The ‘huffing studs’ again seem to represent the (Sāmavedic?) priests at the morning Soma ritual, having sex with ‘cow’ (sun) to engender the ‘offspring’ (dawn). That the sexual climax was accompanied by huffing (*hiṃkāra*), is clear from JB 1.306 *retassiktir eva sā tat sahiṃkāraṃ bhavati* ‘That is the emission of seed. That is accompanied with the sound Him’ (BODEWITZ 1990: 174, with n. 50 referring to JUB 1.4.2, ĀpŚS 5.25.11, and PB 8.7.13).

Occurrences of the verb *abhi-nod* seem to be limited in Vedic to the PS (also at 1.71.2)<sup>17</sup> and to an obscure Brāhmaṇa passage JB 1.102 (repeated at 1.260): cf. n. 52 (p. 232) to the translation by BODEWITZ (1990: 59) “It is not clear to me what is meant by *arvācīm abhinudan* (and *parācīm aparudan*) ...”. It must have a sexual meaning here. The indicative *nudanti* found in **K** seems to fit the context (cf. *krandanti* in 3d) just as well as, or better than, the imper. of most Or. mss., but fluctuation of indic. and imper. endings is pervasive between **K** and the Or. mss. (cf. the examples listed under 6.3.4c).

### 6.10.5 Only PS

sā praty *adarśy uṣasā suvarṇā	(11)
*śukrāṃ vasānā varuṇasya *nirṇijam	(12)
vaiśvadevī svadhām ābharantī	(10)
prajāṃ dātā puṣyatu gopatiṣ ṭe	(11)

<sup>17</sup> The two attestations from PS 20 listed VWC-Saṃhitās I, 414 are ghost-words, not corroborated by the Or. mss.

She of golden color, clothing herself in the resplendent gown of Varuṇa, belonging to all the gods, has appeared with the dawn, bringing nourishment (*svadhā*). Let the giver, your cowherd, prosper in offspring.

\*adarśy uśasā] uda{r}rśuśasā **Ku**, udarśuśasā **JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, udarśuPasā **Pa**, uSanissuśadā **K** suvarṇā] suparṇā **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, saparṇā **Pa**, suvarṇās **K** \*śukrām] śukraṃ **Or K** varuṇasya] varṇasya **Or**, varuṇasca **K** \*nirṇijam ] nirṇijah | **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, nirṇAjaḥ | **Pa**, ninnudah ] *om.* ]] **K** vaiśvadevī] **JM K**, vaiśvadevīm **Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, vAlśvadevīm **Pa** svadhām] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, sva{nṛtāmārabhadhvam}dhām **Ku**, sudhayām **K** ābharantī] **Ku V/126 Mā**, ārabhantī **JM**, ābhara(→ rabha)ntīm **RM**, ābharantīm **Pa [Ma]**, ārabhante | **K** ] *note* ]] prajāṃ dātā] **V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, prajāndātā **Ku**, {Pra}prajāndātā **JM**, prajāṃnvā(→ dā #)tā **RM** gopatiṣ te] **K**, gopatiṣthe **Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, govatiṣthe **JM**, gopAtiṣthe **Pa**

Besides his readings *pratyudarśuśasā*, *suparṇā*, *śukraṃ* and *gopatisthe*, BHATTACHARYA edits *ābharantīm*, without any indication of variants in the Or. mss.: in fact, **Mā** shares with **V/126** and **Ku** the (nom.) reading that I adopt here.

**ab.** BHATTACHARYA's suggestion to emend *praty adarśi* is confirmed by RV 1.113.7: *eṣā divó duhitā práty adarśi vyuchántī yuvatīḥ | śukrāvāsāḥ vísvasyéśānā pā́rthivasya vásva úšo adyéhá subhage vy ùcha* 'This daughter of heaven has appeared, a radiant young woman, wearing a resplendent dress, dominating all earthly goods: o fortunate Dawn, light up here today'.

The reading *suvarṇā* of **K** is better than *suparṇā*, found in the Or. mss.: cf. ŚS 13.1.22ab *ánuvratā róhīṇī róhitasya sūrīḥ svárṇā bṛhatī svárcāḥ*. BLOOMFIELD (1897: 210) translates 'Devoted to Rohita is Rohinī his mistress, with beautiful colour (complexion), great, and lustrous', and adds in a note (p. 661) about Rohita/Rohinī: "There can be no doubt that "the red" sun and his accompanying female, who in the course of the literature is designated as Ushas, Sūryā, Sūryā Sāvitrī, or Dyū, are primarily in the mind of the poet". The epithet *suvarṇā* is thus very fitting in our context, and the Or. mss. must have confused *-p- ~ -v-* (cf. 2.27.4–5, 2.36.4a, 2.66.5d, 2.87.4a, 5.22.1c, 6.16.1d).

For *śukra-* in the context of *nirṇijam*, see RV 9.99.1c *śukráṃ vayanty ásurāya nirṇíjam* 'They weave a resplendent gown for the Asura'. This RV passage also provides the support for my conjecture \**śukrām*, which seems to be the only possibility to arrive at a correct text.

The sun, as Varuṇa's wife (stanza 2) wears his resplendent daytime gown. On Varuṇa's gown (*nirṇíj-*), see RV 1.25.13ab *bíbhṛad drāpīm hiraṇyáyam váruṇo vasta nirṇíjam* 'Wearing a golden robe, Varuṇa puts on a gown', and BRERETON (1981: 93), who refers to RV 8.41.10ab *yáḥ śvetám ádhinirṇíjaś cakré kṛṣṇám ánu vratá*, translating '(Varuṇa), who makes for himself white and black mantles [= the days and the nights], according to his commandments'. This rendering — even though it seems to convey the correct sense —

neglects the problem (pointed out by OLDENBERG 1909–12/II: 109) that “bei Deutung auf Tage und Nächte (daß es sich ungefähr um derartiges handelt, scheint *kṛṣṇām niṣṇijam* I,113,14 zu zeigen) befremdet doch Masc.” OLDENBERG’s alternative “vermutlich hat V[aruṇa] die *śvetā* zu *kṛṣṇā* gemacht” is not very attractive either. Cf. also PARPOLA 1985: 40ff.

c. Although one might think of the Vaiśvadeva Śrāddha (see my comments on 6.22.12b below), and consider this an argument to read *vaiśvadevīm* (*svadhām*) with the Or. mss., this combination in fact does not appear to occur elsewhere. Rather, we may recall 2b above, and PS 5.31.1ab quoted there (also containing a form from the root *bhar* supporting a nom. *ābharantī*), and adopt the alternative reading *vaiśvadevi*. On the meaning(s) of *svadhā-*, cf. RÖNNOW (1927: 110–153), who points out (pp. 111, 120) the parallelism between this term and words such as *payas-*: cf. stanza 2 above. Cf. also PS 5.31.5.

The **Ku** reading for *svadhām* nicely demonstrates the reason for the confusion in mss. **JM** and **K** of *ā-rabh* for *ā-bhar*: the sequence *vaiśvadevīm sūṅṛtām ārabhadhvam* is found at PS 17.32.8 and 19.30.6, and has apparently left its mark on our passage in some mss.

d. On the various syntactic constructions possible with the verb *púṣyati*, see KULIKOV 1999. This passage seems to be a syntactic variant of ŚS 14.2.37d (discussed by KULIKOV, p. 236): *prajāṃ kṛṇvāthām ihā puṣyataṃ rayīm* ‘make offspring, you two, and prosper here in wealth’. BHATTACHARYA’s suggestion to read *gopatīṣ te* instead of *gopatīṣthe* found in the Or. mss. is sensible. There is no graphic distinction between *-ṣth-* and *-ṣṭ-* in Śāradā script, so that this may in fact be the reading intended in **K**. Cf. PS 18.69.2c *eṣa te gopatīṣ tvam juṣasva* ‘this is your cowherd, you be glad’. The addressee of *te* is the cow, as addressed also in the next stanza. Contrast EDGERTON 1915: 393, who takes *gopatīṣthe* seriously, asserting: “gopatīṣthe = goṣṭhe”. This assumes a hapax *gopatīṣtha-* (‘the place of the cowherd’) which can hardly mean the same as ‘cowpen’.

### 6.10.6 Only PS

svayaṃsthāvarṃ ṛṣabhāya tiṣṭhasi	(12)
pratīcī somaṃ prati sūryam agnim	(11)
ahiṃsantī vāṣīte mām upehi	(11)
paśūn dātā puṣyatu gopatīṣ te	(11)

You stand still for the bull, self-standing one, facing Soma, facing Sūrya, [and] Agni. Not hurting, come to me, o cow in heat. Let the giver, your cowherd, prosper in cattle.

svayaṃsthāvarṃ] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], svayaṃsthāvarary **RM**, svayaṃsthāvarya **K** ṛṣabhāya] **Or**, vṛ[[line]ṛṣabhāyā **K** tiṣṭhasi] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], tiṣṭha{·}si **JM**, tiṣṭhiti **K** pratīcī] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma] **K**, prat{i}cī **Mā** agnim ] agnim | **Or K** vāṣitemām upehi] **K**, vāṣitemām upehi **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma],

vāṣitemā *[[space]]* pehi **Pa** paśūn] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, paśūm **RM** gopatiṣte] **K**, gopatiṣthe **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, govatiṣthe **JM**

We must assume a very curious lapse in BHATTACHARYA’s edition of this pāda (*satyaṃ sthāvary*), as all mss. available to me (including BHATTACHARYA’s **Mā**, for which no variant is reported) clearly read *svayaṃ*, which also yields a much clearer sense. I do not assume that by pure chance BHATTACHARYA’s **Ma** would be the only Or. ms. to contain the erroneous reading which he adopts. BHATTACHARYA’s edition leaves *vāṣitemām* unsplit, and reads *gopatiṣthe*.

Cf. the thematically related stanza 3.39.3: *tvām agne vṛṣabhaṃ vāṣiteyam ācya jānu putrakāmā saparyati | tām āroha sumanasyamānaḥ prajāpateḥ prajāyā saṃ sṛjainām* ‘To you as bull, o Agni, does she as cow in heat, desirous of sons, offer her love (?), with knees bent. Mount her, feeling happy. Unite her with the Offspring-Lord’s offspring’.

a. On *sthā* + dative, cf. DELBRÜCK 1888: 143, who renders ‘für Jemand still stehen, sich ihm fügen’. We must assume a sexual connotation here, the point probably being — on one level of interpretation — that breeding cows do not immediately stand still by themselves, before copulation, but first put up a struggle; on another level of interpretation, the word must refer to the sun’s lonely position in the sky. Though the compound *svayaṃsthāvārī-* is a hapax, its formation is well-known (cf. e.g. *svayaṃbhū-*). Because of the sandhi, we cannot see whether a nom. or a voc. is intended here. I tentatively assume a voc.

b. This pāda, mentioning Sūrya (next to the moon ‘Soma’, and the ritual fire Agni), seems to suggest that it is no longer the Sun as ‘cow’ that is being addressed, but a ritual cow: if this is indeed the case, one might interpret ‘facing the sun, facing the moon, [and] the fire’.

c. On *ahimsantī*, cf. stanza 2 above, PS 5.31.9, and the use of the words *syonā* and *suśevā* in stanza 8.

d. See the comm. on the preceding stanza, pāda d.

### 6.10.7 Only PS

vaśī dātā bhavatu vāṣitāyā	(11)
agner bhāgam usriyāṃ yo dadāti	(11)
priyaṃ dhāma hṛdayaṃ som <sub>1</sub> yaṃ madhu	(12)
vājinīm tvā vājino vājayantu	(11)

Let the giver of the cow in heat, who gives the cow as Agni’s share, be empowered. Let the prize-winners incite the [gods’] heart(’s desire), [their] favorite thing, the sweet of *soma*, [and let them incite] you, who are a prize-winner.

vaśī] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, vaśī **Mā** dātā bhavatu] **Ku JM RM Mā [Ma]**, dātā bha<sub>1</sub>line]tu **V/126**, dātā *[[space]]* tu **Pa**, dābhavatu **K** vāṣitāyā] vāṣitāyā **Ku JM RM Mā Pa Ma**, vāyā **V/126**, vāṣitāyām **K** agner] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, a{GNI}gner **V/126** usriyāṃ] **K**, usriyāṃ **Or** dhāma] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**

**K**, dhāmama **JM** somyaṃ] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [Ma], somya **V/126**, saumyaṃ **K** ||] **Or, Z K**

**a.** The *dātr-*, the patron of the ritual, was called a *gopati-* in the preceding stanzas, and the present stanza asks for his being *vaśin-*. Cf. **RV** 1.101.4a *yó áśvānāṃ yó gāvāṃ gópatir vaśí* (about Indra).

**b.** There is a playful element here in the use of the word *usriyā-*, which I have rendered ‘cow’ (see **EWAia** I, 239), but which can also mean ‘morning light’ (**EWAia**, *ibid.*, cf. **RENOU** 1955–69/III: 4 n. 2).

**c.** On the meaning of the phrase *prīyaṃ dhāma*, see **BODEWITZ** 2002. The ‘favorite thing, special sphere of interest’ of the Dawn, who is addressed here, may be the (morning) Soma ritual (cf. 3, 4d). The use of *hṛdayam* here is rather conspicuous, and my rendering not more than a guess.

The phrase *somyāṃ mádhū* is formulaic. It occurs many times in the **RV** (always with a form of the verb *pā* ‘to drink’, e.g., 1.19.9, 2.36.4+6, 8.5.11, 9.74.3), and also a few times elsewhere: in **PS** at 5.15.6.

**d.** The Dawn (*Uṣas*) is called *vājīnī* at **RV** 3.61.1a, 6.61.6b (cf. **GONDA** 1959a: 96ff.). On the meaning of the word *vāja-* and its derivatives, cf. **RENOU** 1955–69/III: 21 (“L’idée de base est celle d’un prix, d’une récompense que décerne la divinité ...”), but also the extensive discussion by **GONDA** 1954a: 48ff. The ‘prize-winners’ are the priests of the (Soma) ritual (cf. 3, 4d): the term *vājīn-* is used in this meaning also at **RV** 2.2.11, 7.93.3. I have not been able to find other clear examples in Vedic of *vājayati* + acc. + acc. of direction: ‘to incite ... to ...’, so I tentatively take all the accusatives in *pāda c*, along with *vājīnīm tvā* here, as direct objects (in asyndeton) of *vājayantu*.

### 6.10.8 Only **PS**

yo +vāśītāyāṃ gavīy antar agnir	(11)
yad asyāṃ ṅṛṇṇaṃ mahimā babhūva	(11)
namas tasmai pratigrhṇan kṛṇomi	(11)
syonā me astu tanve suśevā	(11)

The fire (*Agni*) who is inside the cow in heat, the valor, the greatness which has developed in her — to him do I who am receiving [*dakṣiṇā* (?)] bring reverence. May she be pleasant and very kind to my self.

+vāśītāyāṃ] vāsītāyāṃ **Or**, vāśītāyāṃ **K** antar] **Or**, aṃtad **K** ṅṛṇṇaṃ] **Or**, ṅṛṇṇāṃ **K** mahimā] **Or**, mahinā **K** babhūva |] **Or**, babhūva **Z** [!] **K** tasmai] **Or**, te stu **K** pratigrhṇan] **Or**, pratigrhṇaṃ **K** kṛṇomi] **Or**, gṛṇomi **K** astu] **Or**, stu **K** tanve] **JM K**, tanave **Ku RM Pa Ma**, taname **V/126 Mā** suśevā ||] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma], suśevā **Mā**, suśevau [om.] **K**

It seems that the performer of the rite is speaking here, who receives a cow, representing the sun, from the ‘giver’, the *Yajamāna*, on whose behalf he worships *Agni* and the Sun.

b. I follow the Or. reading *mahimā*, against *mahinā* of **K**. The construction is asyndetic: the relative *yad* agrees only with the first member of the asyndeton (*nṛmṇam mahimā*). If we were to follow **K**, we would have an adverbial construction *mahinā + bhav<sup>i</sup>*, for which I could not find an exact parallel. There are a few R̥gvedic places where the instrumental *mahinā* is combined with the verb *bhav<sup>i</sup>* (2.1.15, 6.15.14), but the construction there is slightly different: these passages add the preverb *vī*.

c. Cf. PS 3.12.4 / ŚS 3.21.4, where Agni is called both a ‘giver’ (see the preceding stanza) and a ‘receiver’. Cf. also PS 2.28.5c, 5.28.4ef, 11.5.13d, where the reciprocal terms *pratigrahītṛ-* and *dadvām-* are used in parallel constructions. On the basis of PS 7.15.10 below, I suggest that *dakṣiṇām* is to be supplied to *pratigrhṇan* here. On the significance of the *dakṣiṇā* as part of a system of gift exchange, see HEESTERMAN 1959, but also MALAMOUD 1976.

### 6.10.9 Only PS

eyam agan vāsītā tām pratīmaḥ	(11)
pumsām vrātena saha puṣṭyā gauḥ	(11)
ūrjaṁ dadhānā ghṛtam id duhānā	(11)
+sahasrapoṣāya me astu dātre    10    <i>anuvāka 2</i>	(11)

The cow in heat here has arrived — we approach her. Let the cow, together with a host of male [offspring], with prosperity, giving nourishment, indeed yielding ghee [as her milk], be [good] for thousandfold prosperity for me, the giver.

eyam] **Or**, yem **K** agan] **Or**, agaṁ **K** vāsītā] **K**, vāsītā **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā Ma**, nasītā **Pa** tām] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, tā **Pa** pratīmaḥ] **Or**, *thus* also **K** [[note °ḥ p°] pumsām] **Ku JM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, pusām **RM**, pumsā **Mā** saha] **Or**, sā **K** puṣṭyā gauḥ |] **Or**, puṣṭyānāgauḥ [[*om.*] **K** ūrjaṁ] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, uryaṁ **Mā** id duhānā] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], i{DDU}dduhānā **JM**, id duhānām **K** +sahasrapoṣāya me] sahasrabhogāya me **Or**, sahasrapoṣā ime **K** astu] **Or**, stu **K** || 10 || *anuvāka 2* ||] || ṛ 9 || 10 || a 2 || **Ku JM**, || ṛ || 10 || **RM**, || 10 || ṛ 9 || a 2 || **V/126 Mā**, || 10 || ṛ || a 2 || **Pa**, ZZ anu 2 ZZ **K**

BHATTACHARYA reads *sahasrabhogāya*. A nice parallel to this stanza is found PS 5.31.8 *dātre \*'mutra mahyaṁ duhānobhau lokau bhūñjati vi kramasva | iṣam ūrjaṁ dakṣiṇāḥ saṁvasānā bhagasya dhārām avase pratīmaḥ* ‘Yielding [milk] to me, who am the giver in yonder world, useful, step through both worlds. Clothed in food, in nourishment, in priestly fee, we approach the stream of fortune, for help’.

c. Note the complete syntactic parallelism with 2a, where the use of the particle *id* seemed more easily understandable than here (just ‘emphatic’?).

d. The Or. mss. read *sahasrabhogāya*: the word *sahasrabhoga-* does occur at PS 8.18.5 (*iyaṁ sītā phalavati +śatavalsā vi rohatu | iyaṁ sahasrabhogā asyā indra upāvatu* ‘Let this furrow of a hundred branches grow out bearing

fruit: it is of a thousand pleasures, let Indra cherish it'), but is otherwise unattested. On the other hand, *sahasrapoṣa-* (as in **K**) is quite well-attested. Cf. e.g. PS 19.16.19 and 20.11.9. Since this hymn earlier connected *dātṛ-* with the root *poṣ* (6.10.5d, 6d, and pāda **b** of the present stanza), I hesitantly emend *sahasrapoṣāya* here, based on **K**'s slightly corrupt reading, and assume that the Or. mss. have suffered perseveration from 8.18.5.

### 6.11. For safe entrance onto the altar ground.

The three hymns 6.11–13 belong together. This is proven by the arrangement of the corresponding material in the parallel texts.

In the following table of correspondences to PS 6.11–13 in ŚŚ, KS (mantra and brāhmaṇa), and ĀpŚŚ, the symbol ↓ is used to link text interrupted by a hymn break in PS, but uninterrupted in the parallel; [...] surrounds limited correspondences; (...) surrounds passages with related contents, but different wording.

PS	ŚŚ	KS (mantra)	ĀpŚŚ	KS (brāhmaṇa)
6.11.1	5.6.1	38.14:116.8	16.18.7	—
6.11.2	5.6.2	:116.10	16.18.7	—
6.11.3	—	—	—	—
6.11.4	5.6.3	:116.14	16.18.7	—
6.11.5	5.6.4	:116.12, 16	16.18.7, 8	—
6.11.6	5.6.11–14, 5–7	[:116.16]	[16.18.8]	—
6.11.7	5.6.5, 6, 7cd, 8	—	—	—
6.11.8	5.6.9	—	—	—
6.11.9	5.6.10	—	—	—
6.11.10	5.9.8a	37.15:95.14	—	37.16:97.1
	↓	↓		
6.12.1	5.9.8	37.15:95.18f.	6.21.1	—
6.12.2	5.6.11ab–14ab	38.14:116.16f.	16.18.8–19.1	—
6.12.3	5.9.7b	37.15:95.11f.	—	:96.13
6.12.4	—	(35.10)	(14.25.11–26.1)	—
6.12.5	—	(35.10)	(14.25.11–26.1)	—
6.12.6	—	—	—	—
6.12.7	—	37.15:95.12f.	—	:96.16f.
6.12.8	5.10.1	[:95.15f.]	[17.9.5]	—
6.12.9	5.10.2	[:95.16]	[17.9.5]	—
6.12.10	5.10.3	[:95.17]	[17.9.5]	—
	↓	↓	↓	
6.13.1	5.10.4	[:95.17]	[17.9.5]	—
6.13.2	5.10.5	—	17.9.6	—
6.13.3	5.10.6	[:95.18]	[17.9.5]	—
6.13.4–9	—	—	—	—
6.13.10	5.9.1	:95.7	17.9.7	:96.2–3
6.13.11	5.9.3	:95.7	17.9.7	:96.2–3
6.13.12	5.9.2	:95.7	17.9.7	:96.2–3
6.13.13	5.9.6	—	—	—
6.13.14	5.9.4	—	—	—
6.13.15	5.9.5	—	—	—

On this type of arrangement of material over several contiguous hymns, see my Introduction, §3.4. As discussed under 6.13, our 6.13.4–9 probably are a later insertion.

The stanza-division adopted here for 6.11 follows — with BHATTACHARYA — the one found in the Or. mss., which is to some extent (e.g. in our st. 5) the same as the division in ŚS. Our stanza 3, which has no parallel in ŚS or KS/ĀpŚS, may be a later addition: this assumption would help us reduce this hymn to the regular number of 9 stanzas. The last mantra of this hymn is followed in **K** by one further mantra that has here, following BHATTACHARYA’S ed., been taken as the first of 6.12.

Reference is made in the table above, and in the discussions below, only to ĀpŚS, because the text of HirŚS and VaikhŚS agrees with it in all the relevant instances. As the context of the mantras in the ĀpŚS parallel suggests, and as repeated references to Agni in the mantras themselves also make abundantly clear, there is a strong connection between PS 6.11–13 and a ritual resembling elements of the Agnicayana descriptions known to us.

Up to stanza 5, the ‘hymn’ 6.11 contains material that corresponds closely (with the exception of stanza 3) to the mantras which are used in a short episode of the Agnicayana according to the description of the younger Taittirīya Sūtrakāras: ĀpŚS 16.18.7 gives these mantras, followed by the injunction . . . *iti brahmavarmāṇi juhoti*. CALAND renders ‘Er bringt die Brahmavarmaspenden dar mit den vier Versen . . .’, and comments (1928: 37): “Die Spenden und deren Bezeichnung als *brahmavarmāṇi* auch in Hir.[ŚS 11.6.29] und Vaikh.[ŚS 18.16]; sie unterbrechen augenscheinlich den Vorgang”.

Rather, I prefer to take *brahmavarmāṇi* as the technical name of a group of mantras, the acc. pl. being one of duration: ‘he offers for the duration of the Brahmavarmans’. Such an accusative of duration of recitation is used for other technical names of groups of mantras e.g. at ŚBM 14.2.2.1 *vātanāmāṇi juhoti* ‘he offers for the duration of the (recitation of the) Names of the Wind [ŚBM 14.2.2.2–11 = VSM 38.7–8]’, ŚBM 11.8.4.6 *spṛtīr hutvā* ‘having offered during the (recitation of the) mantras containing the form *spṛṇomi*’, AVPariś 40.3.8 (also 40.6.10) *vrātapatīr juhoti* ‘he offers during the (recitation of the) Vratapati-stanzas’ (cf. BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003: 334 n. 97).

On these *brahmavarmāṇi*, cf. perhaps the ŚS mantras 5.8.6 and 14.1.64 quoted and put into a wider context of ritual application in my discussion of 6.12.4cd, and cf. also 7.18.8b below. The *brahmavarmāṇi* episode affords protection (*vārmaṇ-*) by means of formulated stanzas (*brāhmaṇ-*). Cf. also the mantras to be pronounced by the Yajamāna at ĀpŚS 14.26.1 (see under 6.12.4), which contain the words *brahma varma*. In our context as well, it is often the Yajamāna, rather than his officiating priest(s), who is speaking.

Immediately after the mantras for the *brahmavarmāṇi*, KS and ĀpŚS continue with mantras corresponding to our 5d–6a, to be pronounced by the Adhvaryu priests while they enter the space measured out for the altar: the *agnī-*

(cf. TSUJI 1983: 151 — the term *védi-* is not used explicitly anywhere, but see KS 37.16:97.2–4), and start with the *agnikṣetra-upadhāna*, described according to Baudhāyana by IKARI & ARNOLD 1983: 525ff., and STAAL 1983/I: 386f.: the ritual implied by the mantras of 6.11.6 onwards is different in several ways from the Baudhāyana ritual.

I offer here a tentative description of the ritual actions underlying all of 6.11–13, according to the Paippalāda version, from which the Śaunaka version probably differed only in the precise text of the mantras to be employed. Besides the text of the mantras (with correspondences listed in the table above), and the brāhmaṇa at the end of KS 37.16 (quoted in parts under 6.11.10, 6.12.1 and 6.12.4), I base myself also on the KauśS passage (51.14) quoted under 6.12.8.

(1) The Yajamāna and his Adhvaryu priest(s) leave the Old Hall (6.11.3) and prepare to enter the altar ground pronouncing the *brahmavarmāṇi* mantras, 6.11.1–5. Then they address the altar ground with 6.11.6–9.

(2) Five stones are dug into the perimeter of the altar ground by the Adhvaryu (KS 37.16:97.2): four in the cardinal directions, and the fifth in the center; the place for the sixth stone (omitted in KS), associated in (5) with the upward quarter, is not clear.

(3) The placing of each stone is accompanied by the mentioning of *ud* ‘up’ plus one of the 5 concepts mentioned in the nominative in PS 6.11.10a. The sixth is accompanied by 6.11.10b *nṛmṇam asmāsu dhehi svāhā*. It is not clear who pronounces these words. The KS brāhmaṇa mentions (3) only after (5).

(4) The Yajamāna next addresses the stones pairwise (see 6.12.1), with the three exclamations *āyuskr̥tā gopā me stho* etc., *āyuspatnī gopā me stho* etc., *svadhāvantaḥ gopā me stho* etc., and addresses the thus protected altar ground with 6.12.2–3 (also in ŚS and KS), 6.12.4–6 (only in PS), and 6.12.7 (also in KS, not in ŚS).

(5) Then, the Yajamāna and his priest(s) point successively to the six stones, while pronouncing one by one the mantras PS 6.12.8–6.13.3.

(6) The episode is concluded, apparently, by renewed pairwise address to the six stones, with the mantras 6.13.10–15. The 7 exclamations found at KS 37.15:95.7f., of which the first three agree with our 6.13.10–12, were applied differently: see KS 37.16:96.2ff.

**6.11.1** ŚS 5.6.1, PS 5.2.2 = ŚS 4.1.1, KS 38.14:116.8, ĀpŚS 16.18.7 etc.

brahma jajñānam ity ekā ||

The seer has revealed in front, from the brightly shining suture, the brāhman that was just born; he reveals its shapes of bottom and top, the womb of the existent and of the non-existent.

brahma jajñānam ity ekā ||] brahma yajñānam ity ekā || **Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, brahma ya·nam ity ekā || **JM**, (+ brahma yajñānam ity ekā ||) **Pa**, vrahmā(sec. m. → hma) jajñānam ity ekā **K** [om. ]]

**ŚS 5.6.1 = PS 5.2.2 etc.**

bráhma jajñánám prathamám purástād ví sīmatáh surúco vená āvaḥ |  
sá budhnyā upamā asya viṣṭhāḥ satás ca yónim ásataś ca ví vaḥ ||

On the abbreviations with *ity ekā*, see my Introduction, §2.5.1. The stanza is written in full at 5.2.2 (on the reading of that stanza, cf. LUBOTSKY 2002: 19), which corresponds to ŚS 4.1.1. As WHITNEY remarks, this stanza “occurs in a large number of other texts ... and, what is very remarkable, everywhere without a variant”.

The application of this stanza to the context of the *brahmavarmāṇi* seems secondary when compared to ŚS 4.1 / PS 5.2: the important words *bráhma*, *purástād*, *venás* can be subjected to interpretation on at least two levels, but there is no way of telling to what extent all these words had been reinterpreted when the stanza was included in the present context. Tentatively, I would paraphrase the stanza as translated for its present context: ‘the poet has just (aor. ind.) revealed, from the universal source of inspiration, a newly developed vision of a protective formulation: he reveals (aor. inj.) all its intricacies’.

**ab.** About the obscure noun or name *vená-* ‘seer’ or (archetypically) ‘the Seer’, cf. besides OBERLIES 1998: 228 n. 376, especially GONDA 1963: 353ff. GONDA (p. 357) rejects the interpretation given by ŚBM 7.4.1.14 of *vená-* here as the sun (cf. RV 1.83.5b) as “highly improbable”, because ŚBM 7.4.1.14 also takes *bráhman-* as the sun, and we can obviously not interpret both problematic terms, — one subject, one object — in the same way.

Commenting on his translation of ŚS 4.1, RENO (1956: 258) tries to make sense of the stanza: “c’est la Formule sacrée ou *brahman* (neutre) qui fonctionne comme principe originel”. On its being born from the East (p. 259): “l’orient est le quartier où le Rite prend naissance, donc la parole en tant que tributaire du Rite”. This interpretation seems possible in the present *brahmavarmāṇi* context of the stanza, where the protective power of formulated stanzas (*bráhman-*) is employed, but is unacceptable in the original context in which the stanza is placed in ŚS 4.1 / PS 5.2.

In the comparable stanza ŚS 2.1.1 *venás tát paśyat paramám gúhā yád yátra víśvaṃ bhávaty ékarūpam* ‘The seer saw that highest, which is in secret, where all becomes of one form’ (cf. PS 2.6.1 *venas tat paśyat paramam padaṃ yatra víśvaṃ bhavaty ekanīdam*), the object of the seer’s vision seems to be a cosmic entity, rather than a formulated stanza. In this stanza’s original context, the one of ŚS 4.1 / PS 5.2, *bráhman-* probably referred to a universal cosmic entity (cf. ŚS 10.2.35), rather than to RENO’s ‘Formule sacrée’, and *vená-* may well have referred to the sun. Alternatively, *vená-* may be an ‘Ur-god’ (thus RÖNNOW 1927: 133), closely connected with the sun (RV 4.58.4cd). In our context, Vena seems to be a Vedic poet engaged in formulating poetic speech.

I take *prathamám* adverbially (cf. AiGr. III, §203b). GONDA (p. 357) takes *purástād* as ‘of old’. My translation ‘in front’, following the interpretation most suitable to the *brahmavarmāṇi* context, anticipates *purás* in the next stanza:

on the special need expressed in Vedic texts for protection from the front, see GONDA 1955a: 109ff. = 1975/II: 322ff. In the original application of the stanza, *purástād* no doubt meant ‘in the east’.

On the long augment of *āvaḥ*, see LUBOTSKY 2000: 317. It is unclear to me whether the shift in mood (ind. to inj.) from this hemistich to the next is significant.

The interpretation of pāda **b** hinges on the grammatical analysis of *sīmatāḥ surúcaḥ* as either acc. pl. (thus WHITNEY 1862: 148) or — much more likely — abl. sg. I leave aside the analysis *sīm átah* (with conjectured accentuation), adopted by WEBER 1898: 2f. following Nir 1.7, as well as WEBER’s suggestion that *surúco* may be a nom. sg.

The meaning ‘seam, suture’ (whence ‘parting of the hair’) of *sīmán(t)(a)-* is secure in the older texts, although its etymology is not (EWAia II, 732: “schwierig”): derivation from *sā* ‘to bind’ or *sīvy* ‘to sew’ seem the most attractive choices from the semantic point of view (for the latter possibility, not considered by MAYRHOFER, cf. *syúman-*). The suffix of *sīmán(t)(a)-* was variable, but it is not clear where the variation lay: *sīmán-/sīmánt-* or *sīmán-/sīmánta-* (see also KEWA III, 475). EWAia mentions only the stem *sīmán-*, under which lemma *sīmánta-* m. is also mentioned: the only accented attestation of *sīmántam* (ŚS 6.134.3 / PS 5.33.6) could, with WHITNEY (1862: 148, contrast WHITNEY on ŚS 4.1.1), be taken to belong to *sīmánt-*, rather than to *sīmánta-*, unambiguous forms of the latter being attested only very late. To the same *sīmánt-* might then be reckoned the abl. sg. *sīmatás*, which VWC everywhere takes as *-tas* adverb from *sīmán-*, while *sīmatāḥ surúcaḥ* in our present context could be taken as acc. pl.

The stem *sīmán-* is attested in the nom. sg. (*sīmá*) at ŚBM 7.4.1.14; in the acc. sg. (*sīmánam*) at ŚS 9.8.13 / PS 16.75.3, JB 3.104, 3.111, AĀ 2.4.3 (= AU 1.3.12), ManB 1.5.2; abl. sg. *sīмнаḥ* AB 5.7.4 or *sīmatāḥ* ŚBM 7.4.1.14, JB 3.111. No unambiguous forms of *sīmánt-* exist. Since there are two indisputable cases of *sīmatāḥ* as ablative in the immediate context of forms of *sīmán-*, it seems most attractive to take this form as an alternative adverbial ablative formation next to *sīмнаḥ*, to take ŚS 6.134.3 / PS 5.33.6 *sīmántam* as a form of *sīmánta-*, and to cancel the idea of a stem *sīmánt-*: hence, we may follow the commonly accepted ablative interpretation of *sīmatāḥ surúcaḥ*. The word *sīmán-* refers in most contexts to the suture of Prajāpati’s skull (Aditi’s, being pulled by Prajāpati, at ManB 1.5.2), as source of his creative activities. In the absence of further evidence, I can only speculate that the universe was perhaps seen as Prajāpati’s (= ‘the Seer’s’ [?]) head, and that the *bráhmaṇ* emerged from his (cracked) skull at creation. If *bráhmaṇ* refers to the sun, then we may accept WHITNEY’s suggestion that *sīmatāḥ surúco* refers to the morning horizon, a mythological idea of which *aditeḥ sīman-* ‘the skull-suture of Aditi’ (as Mother Earth) in the passage ManB 1.5.2, may also be a reminiscence.

**6.11.2** ŚS 5.6.2 = 4.7.7, KS 38.14:116.10, ĀpŚS 16.18.7

anāptā ye vaḥ prathamā	(8)
yāni karmāṇi cakrire	(8)
vīrān no atra mā dabhan	(8)
tad va etat puro dadhe	(8)

Your first ones (m.) which are unattained, the rituals which they performed, during those they must not harm our heroic sons — for this purpose I place this (*brāhmaṇ-*) forward here for you.

ye vaḥ] **Or**, yava **K** cakrire] **Or**, cakkrire **K** anāptā . . . cakrire || *note* (+ anāptā . . . cakrire | 3) **Pa** vīrān no] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, varānno **Pa**, vīrāno **K** mā dabhan] **Pa**, mādabhaṃ **Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, mādamaḍabhan **JM** va etat] **Or**, vetat **K** puro dadhe] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, purodhe **RM**

**ŚS 5.6.2**

ánāptā yé vaḥ prathamā yāni kármāṇi cakriré |  
vīrān no átra má dabhan tád va etát puró dadhe ||

**KS 38.14:116.10, ĀpŚS 16.18.7**

ánāptā yá vaḥ prathamā yáśyāṃ kármāṇi kurváte [ĀpŚS kṛṇvate]  
vīrān no átra má dabhaṃs tád va etát puró dadhe ||

**abc.** The two AV versions of this stanza fully agree with each other as against the YV version: the variants have been discussed in Ved. Var. III, p. 276, but the analysis given there is inconclusive as to which version may be more original, and moreover not correct in details. It seems attractive to me to take the forms of the YV version of pāda **a** not as n. pl. (as suggested in Ved. Var.), but as f. sg., antecedent of *yasyām*, which yields a sense ('The first (f.) [Earth] of yours, unattained, on whom they perform rituals, on her . . .') that may well be more original than what little can be understood of the AV version. Cf. AB 5.25.17–18 (~ KauṣB 27.9.10–11 [ed. LINDNER 27.5:132.13]): *anāptā cānāpyā cānāptā tat pṛthivy anāpyā tad dyauḥ* 'The unattained and the unattainable': the unattained is the earth; the unattainable is the sky' (KEITH). On the Earth as 'first', 'firstborn of creation' cf. ŚBM 6.5.3.1, 14.1.2.10. Folk-etymology or word-play may be involved here, *prathamā-* being associated with the verb *prath* (and hence with *pṛthivī-*): KS 8.2:84.18 (~ JB 3.318), 31.14:16.20, TS 2.1.2.3, 7.1.5.1, ŚBM 6.1.1.15, 6.1.3.7.

In the KS version, *átra* is clearly correlative with *yá . . . yáśyām*. In the AV version, one can only guess that it is correlative with *yāni*. In the KS version, I would take *dabhan* as an impersonal 3rd plural. The AV version of these pādas has been translated in accordance with the ŚS padapāṭha (at 5.6.2 *ánāptāḥ, prathamāḥ* without variants, some variants at 4.7.7: see WHITNEY's comm.). As WHITNEY remarks (on 4.7.7), we have no way of knowing whether *ánāptā* and even *prathamā* might not rather be neuter, agreeing with *kármāṇi*. The syntax with two relative pronouns lacking any clear point of reference in

a main clause is puzzling. An alternative rendering could be (cf. DELBRÜCK 1888: 561f., and SPEIJER 1896, §272.2 p. 85): ‘If the first ones have done any deeds which were not apt<sup>18</sup> for you (o gods), let (these deeds) not harm our heroes here’. In my view, the AV’s must be a deformation of the YV version, but it is hard to see what rationale might underlie the change.

**d.** On the meaning of *puro-dhā*, ‘to place something/somebody before someone (for protection)’, see GONDA 1955a: 115ff. = 1975/II: 328ff., and cf. 7.9.2a, 7.18.7ab. It is the *brāhmaṇ-* of stanza 1 (cf. *purástād*) that is put in place as a protective shield (*varmaṇ-*).

### 6.11.3 Cf. ṚV 9.73.6

pratnān mānāt pari ye sambabhūvuḥ	(11)
ślokavantaḥ saumanasasya vantavaḥ	(12)
apānakṣāso badhirā ahāsata-	(12)
-ṛtasya panthām na taranti duṣkṛtaḥ	(12)

Those renowned ones who have assembled from the old building, the winners (?) of favor — the blind, the deaf ones have stayed behind, the evil ones do not cross the path of order — . . . .

pratnān mānāt] **Or**, pratrātmanāt **K** pari ye] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, parye **JM**, pariryē **RM** sambabhūvuḥ] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K** [not samba°, as misprinted by Edg.; note °ḥ ś], babhūvuḥ **Pa** ślokavantaḥ] **Or**, ślokavantas **K** saumanasasya vantavaḥ] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, saumana(+ sa)sya vantavaḥ **Ku**, somanasya vaṃtavaḥ **K** badhirā ahāsatarṭasya] badhirā ahāsatarṭtasya **Or**, badhiramastantasya **K** panthām na] **Or**, panthāna **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [note °ḥ s°]

#### ṚV 9.73.6

pratnān mānād ādhy ā yé samāsvaraṅ chlókayantrāso rabhasāsya mántavaḥ |  
apānakṣāso badhirā ahāsata ṛtasya pánthām ná taranti duṣkṛtaḥ ||

This mantra is not found in the parallel hymns of ŚŚ and KS/ĀpŚŚ, and is thus probably a later addition, accepted into the text because of the close proximity of its ṚV parallel to the parallel of the next stanza in the ṚV as well. On its meaning in the ṚV context, see OLDENBERG’s notes (1909–12/II: 172).

**a.** This is a reworking of the ṚV original, with substitution of the phrase (*pari ye*) *sambabhūvuḥ* (also at PS 17.53.10 [PSK 17.39.10] / ŚŚ 12.3.40, ŚŚ 13.1.18) for (*ādhy ā yé*) *sám asvaran*, which occurs 4 times in the ṚV hymn from which this verse is taken (OLDENBERG 1909–12/II: 171).

STAAL 1992 discusses the word *māna-*, and lists several older Vedic places where it clearly means ‘building’ (p. 358): in our text, cf. 7.6.7+9 below. Although this may not have been the meaning of the word in the original ṚV context, I refer to ṚV 1.30.9 (*pratnásyáukasaḥ* ‘of the old dwelling’, also at 8.69.18), and to 9.107.5 (*pratnám sadhástham* ‘the old abode’), where dwelling

<sup>18</sup> PW I, 650 (5). Can *ánāpta-* already have this meaning in Vedic?

places are called *pratnā-*, and accept the meaning ‘building’ here, because it must in our context refer to the *prācīnavamśa-* of the Agnicayana. Those who have emerged from it are the priests: on the departure from the Old Hall, before the setting up of the altar ground, see STAAL 1983/I: 380.

b. This pāda is an entirely secondary reworking of the ṚV original, and it is impossible to say to what stage of the development of our text the reworking dates back. It seems likely that the sense of the ṚV pāda, on which modern scholarship has not been able to agree (cf. OLDENBERG’s note and GELDNER’s translation with comm., followed by RENO 1955–69/IX: 23), was already forgotten at an early stage.

The word *ślokavant-* is not attested elsewhere. The same is true for the ostensible *-tu* noun *vantavaḥ*, with which it alliterates (*-vantaḥ . . . vantavaḥ*), although the latter may be compared from a formal point of view with ṚV 1.131.5 *prāvantave*. The *-tu* suffix normally does not yield agent nouns (cf. AiGr. II/2, §488), but we must here of course compare the very Ṛgvedic noun *māntu-* (not a real agent noun) of which our *vantavaḥ* is a deformation. On interchange between *-v-* and *-m-*, which must already be a very old phenomenon in OIA, cf. Ved. Var. II, 115ff. (esp. §227, p. 117: “the roots *man* and *van*, and derivatives, interchange a number of times, beginning with the RV. itself”, e.g. ṚV 1.26.4c ~ 9.64.29c).

cd. Previous translators of the ṚV parallel (GELDNER, RENO) have felt forced to accept an anacoluthic connection between this and the first hemistich because *yé* seems — although not all ṚV exegetes have agreed on this — to correlate with *té* in ṚV 9.73.4 (corresponding to our next stanza 4). Tempting as it may seem to assume a nominal sentence in the first hemistich (‘The renowned ones . . . , they are the winners . . .’), and thus remove the anacoluthon, this remains problematic. I assume this stanza to form a syntactic unit with the next.

#### 6.11.4 Cf. ŚS 5.6.3, ṚV 9.73.4 (= ĀpŚS 16.18.7), KS 38.14:116.14

sahasradhāram abhi te sam asvaran	(12)
divo nāke madhujihvā +asaścataḥ	(12)
tasya +spaśo na ni miṣanti bhūrṇayaḥ	(12)
padepade pāśinaḥ santu setave	(12)

... they, the inexhaustible ones, on the firmament of the sky, honey-tongued, together called to the one of a thousand streams. His zealous spies do not wink. Let them bear a noose at every step, for tying.

abhi] **Ku JM RM Pa [Ma] K**, a{·}(→ BHi) **V/126**, abhī **Mā** sam asvaran] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, saM-svaran **V/126**, samasmaram **K** madhujihvā] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, madhujihYā(→ hvā 4) **Pa** +asaścataḥ] asaśvataḥ **Ku JM RM Pa [Ma] Mā**, asaśvataḥ **V/126**, aśasyataḥ **K** +spaśo] syaśo **Ku RM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, sya{s}śo **JM**, syaso **Mā**, saraśo **K** ni miṣanti] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma] K** [or: niṃmiṣ°?],

niṣanti **Mā** bhūrṇayaḥ] bhūrṇayaḥ **Or**, tūrṇayaḥ **K** [[not bhū°, as misread by Edg.; *note*  
°ḥ p°]] padepade] **Or**, padepade | **K** [[*note*]] pāśinaḥ santu] **Or**, pāśinas saṃtu **K**

**RV 9.73.4, ŚS 5.6.3, KS 38.14:116.14**

sahásradhāré `va [ŚS °dhāra evá] té sám asvaran divó náke mádhujihvā asaścátaḥ |  
ásya [ŚS KS tásyā] spáśo ná ní miṣanti bhūrṇayaḥ  
padépage pāśinaḥ santi sétavaḥ [ŚS sétave] ||

BHATTACHARYA reads *asaśvataḥ* and *syáśo*.

**abc.** OLDENBERG 1909–12/II: 171 suggests that the underlying text of the RV parallel be emended to *avaté* (similarly at RV 9.74.6, 9.86.27), a suggestion which GELDNER disposes of rather convincingly with reference to the connection between this *té*, and *yé* in RV stanzas 5–6 (*mutatis mutandis* our preceding stanza). Anyhow, OLDENBERG’s problem, the combination of *áva* with *sám svar*, is removed in our version: *abhí sám svar* occurs i.a. RV 8.3.7, 9.67.9, 9.106.11, 10.96.2. It is the priests who are ‘calling’ (reciting their mantras) in our context.

The ‘one of a thousand streams’ in the RV context must be the Soma filter. The word *sahásradhāra*– clearly evokes the epithet *sahásracakṣas*– given to Varuṇa at RV 7.34.10. Varuṇa’s thousand eyes (or ‘streams’) are his spies (see pāda c), themselves called *sahasrākṣá*– at PS 5.32.2 / ŚS 4.16.4. This explains the connection between the first and the second hemistich. The pouring Soma filter conjures up the picture of a raining Varuṇa sky, Varuṇa’s non-winking eyes, his ‘spies’, being compared to the open holes of the filter, and their ‘nooses’ to the filter’s threads. It seems likely that these elaborate connections between Soma and Varuṇa no longer played a role in the application of this stanza to the *brahmavarmāni* context, and that *sahásradhāra*– was simply accepted as referring to Varuṇa directly: this change of meaning seems to be reflected in the replacement of the pronoun *ásya* of the RV version by *tásya*, referring back to *sahásradhāre/sahasradhāram*, in the AV and KS versions.

The \*G reading must be same as RV etc. *asaścátaḥ*. At first sight, one may be tempted to reconstruct *asaśvataḥ*, but *asaśvant*– is not attested, and the manuscript readings may just as well be explained as graphic errors for the reading of the parallel texts. Equally evident (cf. RV 10.10.8) is the restored reading +*spaśo* (although the **K** reading is hard to explain), which is to be compared with *-a* stem *\*pratiśpaśa*– at 6.12.7.

**d.** Note the imper. in our version, as against the ind. of the parallel texts. On the not uncommon variation between nom. (as in our RV and YV version) and dat. (AV), see Ved. Var. III, §420.

**6.11.5** ŚS 5.6.4 ◊ **abc**: cf. RV 9.110.1, KS 38.14:116.12 (≈ ĀpŚS 16.18.7), etc. ◊ **d**: ≈ KS 38.14:116.16 (= ĀpŚS 16.18.8)

pari;y ū ṣu pra dhanvā vājasātaye	(12)
pari vṛtrāṇi sakṣaṇiḥ	(8)
divas tad arṇavāṁ anv iyase	( )

sanisraso nāmāsi trayodaśo māsaḥ || (P)

Round about, you shall run forth for winning the prize, round about, overpowering the obstacles. Then you drive along the floods of heaven. You are called the slipping one, the thirteenth month.

ū ṣu] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], u(ū [[*sec. m.* ]?])ṣu **Ku**, u(→ ū)ṣu **JM**, ūsu **RM**, ū{sa}ṣu **Pa**, uṣa **K** dhanvā] **Or**, dhanva **K** vājasātaye] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**], vāyasātaye **Mā**, vāñjasātaye **K** ]] **Or, om. K** [[*note* °ḥ t°]] tad] **Or**, tud **K** arṇavāñ anvīyase] arṇavāñ, anvīyase **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], arṇavāñ, anvīyase **RM**, arṇavāñniyase **K** sanisraso] **Mā**, saniśraso **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa Ma**, sahasraśo **K** ]]] **Or, om. K** [[*note* °ḥ i°]]

#### ŚS 5.6.4

pāry ū śu prā dhanvā vājasātaye pāri vṛtrāṇi sakṣāṇiḥ |  
dviśās tād ādhy arṇavēneyase sanisraso nāmāsi trayodaśo māsa indrasya gṛhāḥ ||

#### ṚV 9.110.1 = KS 38.14:116.12

pāry ū śu prā dhanva vājasātaye pāri vṛtrāṇi sakṣāṇiḥ |  
dviśās tarādhyā [ĀpŚS taradhyai] ṛṇayā na iyase ||

#### KS 38.14:116.16

malimlucó nāmāsi trayodaśo māsa[h]

The ṚV stanza is employed (and reformulated with addition of a fourth prose pāda) because it refers to protection against enemies. It is used here to address the altar ground. Note that ŚS, despite some minor variant readings, first runs closely parallel to PS, but then has *indrasya gṛhāḥ* at the end, and once again at 5.6.11, while PS has it at the beginning of the next stanza.

a. If it is not merely a mistake, **K** shares the reading *dhanva* of ṚV and KS, as opposed to AV *dhanvā*: cf. my Introduction, §2.6.3.2. The ŚS padapāṭha analyses *dhanva* (imper.), and WHITNEY translates it as such (‘do thou run’), but since we have no (metrical) reason to assume lengthening here, I prefer interpretation as a subj. *dhanvāḥ*.

c. The PS version of this line has completely redone the ṚV original, while ŚS seems to represent a middle stage (maintaining *dviśās*, but introducing, with PS, the word *arṇavā-*). The model for the more radical PS reformulation is to be found at ṚV 8.26.17 *yād adó divó arṇavá iśó vā mādatho gṛhé | śrutám in me amartyā* ‘When you two enjoy yourselves yonder in the flood of heaven, or in the house of nourishment, do listen to me, immortals’ (cf. ṚV 3.22.3 *divó árṇa-*). The ŚS version also provides the phonetic link between ṚV and PS: *tarādhyā ṛṇayā na* → *tād ādhy arṇavéna-* (on *-r- ~ -d-*, and *-y- ~ -v-* see Ved. Var. II, §272a, and §246–255) → *tad arṇavāñ anv.*

d. I take this last line separately from what is here taken as pāda **c**, because of its being disjointed from the first three pādas in the YV version, and because of its separate application according to ĀpŚS 16.18.7–8. The two words *indrasya gṛhāḥ* which ŚS appends seem not to belong here, and are indeed

found repeated in their proper place, at ŚS 5.6.11 (which corresponds to the immediately following stanza 6 of our text).

The word *sanisrasá*-<sup>19</sup> occurs only at three other places: at PS 6.14.5 below, and in the compound *sanisrasākṣá*- ‘with constantly falling eyes’ at ŚS 2.8.5. On its formation, cf. AiGr. II/2, §25aγ. The thirteenth or intercalary month (on which, see FADDEGON 1926) is here described as *sanisrasá*- ‘slipping’, “owing no doubt to its unstable condition” (thus MACDONELL & KEITH 1912 II, 162); in her treatment of *malimlucá*- as found in the KS parallel, NARTEN 1966: 206f. = 1995: 52f., who glosses ‘der immer wieder verschwindet’, explains: “Eine solche Bezeichnung trifft nun tatsächlich das Wesen des Schaltmonats, der als 13. Monat zwar vorhanden ist, aber an der regelmäßigen Wiederkehr der übrigen 12 Monate nicht Teil hat, da er nur in bestimmten Zeitabständen an deren Ende in Erscheinung tritt”.

The line is prose, and the order of words seems to preclude a translation: ‘You are called the thirteenth slipping month’, although this is clearly the identification that is being made, see 6.12.4b. The addressee, the altar ground, seems to be identified with the intercalary month because the latter represents the totality of the year (cf. GONDA 1984: 23, and 6.12.5 below), which, in turn, is identical with Prajāpati (GONDA *op. cit.*): the altar ground is explicitly called ‘Prajāpati’ in 6.12.6d (cf. also 6.12.4a). The thirteenth month generally carries very negative connotations (GONDA 1957b: 48f. = 1975/II: 73f.), but the power of the intercalary month to protect against danger (cf. its name *aṁhasapatí*- ‘the protector against distress’: KUIPER 1979: 135 n. 110) may also have played a role here.

**6.11.6** a: PS 6.12.2a, ŚS 5.6.11a–14a, KS 38.14:116.16f., ĀpŚS 16.18.8 ◊ b: 5.6.5–7

indrasya gṛho (°)sīndrasya śarmāsīndrasya	
varmāsīndrasya varūtham asi	(P)
vy etenāvaitenāpaitenārātsīr asau svāhā	(P)

You are the house of Indra, you are the protection of Indra, you are the armor of Indra, you are the shield of Indra. You, N.N., have been deprived due to this one, have erred due to this one, have failed due to this one, hail!

(°)sīndrasya] sīndrasya **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma] **K**, sī indrasya **Mā śarmāsīndrasya** **Or**, śarmāsī indrasya **K** varmāsīndrasya] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma], varmāsīndra{·}sya **Pa**, varmāsī | indrasya **K** varūtham] varūtham **Ku V/126 Pa** [Ma], varūtham **JM RM Mā**, vairūtham **K** vy etenāvaitenāpaitenārātsīr] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [pūrvamātra element of °pai° is lacking] [Ma], vyetenāvaitenāpaitrenārātsīr **RM**, vītenāvaitenāpaitenārātstrīdad **K**

<sup>19</sup> All the PS mss. point to *sanisraso*, but this is most likely late — contrast LUBOTSKY 2002 on 5.32.8c: all ŚS mss. here read *sanisrasó*.

**ŚS 5.6.11a, 12a, 13a, 14a**

índrasya gr̥hó 'si | . . . índrasya śármāsi |  
 . . . índrasya vármāsi | . . . índrasya várūtham asi |

**KS 38.14:116.16f.**

índrasya śármāśíndrasya vármāśíndrasya várūtham asi

**ŚS 5.6.5a, 6a, 7a**

nv èténārātsīr asau svāhā | . . . ávaiténārātsīr asau svāhā | . . . ápaiténārātsīr asau svāhā |

The reproduction of **Mā** available to me does not show the variant *śármāsī* *índrasya* recorded by BHATTACHARYA.

The ŚS version, in a strangely conspicuous lapse (?) on the part of its redactors, has *índrasya gr̥háh* || at the end of 5.6.4, then inserts its stanzas 5–10, after which it resumes again with 5.6.11a *índrasya gr̥hó 'si* |. Perhaps there is some originality in the ŚS version, if we compare the KS parallel of our ‘pāda’ **a**, which omits *índrasya gr̥hó 'si*? The exclamation *svāhā*, which is used from here up to 6.12.1, is directly connected with Agni: see MYLIUS 1995: 140. From here on *agní-* (as altar, or as god) is addressed directly or indirectly in each mantra.

**a.** The names for the altar (*agní-*), ‘Indra’s house’, ‘Indra’s armor’ etc., which recur at 6.12.2, are attested also i.a. at KS 11.3:146.11f. Agni is called a *śarman-* at PS 2.36.1. The same terms are used to refer to the protective *darbhá* grass, on which the gods, including Indra, sit (cf. GONDA 1985: 69 and *passim*), at ŚS 19.30.3 (= PS 12.22.12) *tvām āhur devavárma tvām darbha bráhmanas pátim* | *tvām índrasyāhur várma tvām rāṣṭrāṇi rakṣasi* ‘You they call the armor of the gods, you, o Darbha, [they call] the lord of Bráhman; you they call Indra’s armor, you protect kingdoms’. Similarly at ŚS 19.46.4 (= PS 4.23.4a) *índrasya tvā vármanā pári dhāpayāmaḥ* ‘We surround you with [the amulet called] Indra’s armor’. Is there a connection between this identical terminology, and the placing of *darbhá* grass in a hole at the center of the Agni field in the Agnicayana (STAAL 1983/I: 387)? Cf. also the discussion under 6.12.3, below.

**b.** We have here three sentences condensed into one (cf. ŚS): see EDGERTON 1915: 377, and cf. LANMAN 1903: 302 on ŚS 8.8.2: “the words of the saṃhitā appear plainly to be . . . condensed by the non-repetition of all that is common . . .”. This makes the mantra impossible to render precisely into English. With *vy etena . . . arātsīḥ*, PS definitely has the original reading of which ŚS *nv èténārātsīḥ*, with an ostensible pāda-initial *nú* that rightly puzzled WHITNEY, is a corruption.

The compounds *ví-rādh* and *áva-rādh* can govern the instr. (see e.g. ŚS 1.1.4, 3.29.8, and AB 3.7.6 respectively), which would suggest an alternative translation ‘you have been deprived of this one, you have failed with respect to this one’, but this construction seems not to be attested for *ápa-rādh*. The addressee has shifted here from the altar ground in line **a**, to the enemy (‘N.N.’),

who has been deprived, has erred and failed due to the protective shield provided to the Yajamāna by the altar ground called ‘Indra’s house etc.’.

**6.11.7 ab:** ŚS 5.6.5bc, 6bc, 7bc, PS 1.109.2ab, ṚV 6.74.4ab ◊ **abc:** MS 4.11.2:165.13–14 ◊ **cd:** ŚS 5.6.8

tigmāyudhau tigmahetī suśevāv	(11)
agnīṣomāv iha su mṛḍataṃ naḥ	(11)
mumuktam asmān *gṛbhītān avadyāj	(11)
juṣethāṃ yajñam amṛtam asmāsu dhattam svāhā	(13)

Agni and Soma, with sharp weapons, with sharp missiles, very kind, be merciful to us here, please. Free us from disgrace, who are in its grasp. Enjoy the worship, bestow immortality upon us, hail!

tigmahetī] **RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, tigmahe(+ tī) **Ku**, tigmaheti **JM** suśevāv agnīṣomāv] **Ku JM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, suśevāv agnīṣomāv **RM**, suśevāv agnīṣomāv **Mā**, suśevāgnīṣomāv **K** su] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, ṣu **V/126** mṛḍataṃ] mṛṛatan **Ku RM**, mṛṛata **JM V/126 Mā**, mṛṛataṃ **Pa [Ma]**, mṛḷa(*sec. m.* → da)taṃ **K** [*pr. m.* not mṛḍā°, as misread by Edg. or mṛdha°, as found in R-V] ] **Or, om. K** [*note* °ḥ s°] mumuktam] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, mumuktam **Pa**, samuktam **K** asmān \*gṛbhītān] asmān gṛbhītād **Or**, asmādgṛbhītā | d **K** [*note* ] juṣethāṃ] **Ku V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, juṣ{o}ethāṃ **JM**, juṣothāṃ **RM**, ju·uṣethāṃ **Mā** [?] svāhā ||] **Or**, svāhā **Z K** [*note Z*]

ŚS 5.6.5bc, 6bc, 7bc, PS 1.109.2ab, ṚV 6.74.4ab, MS 4.11.2:165.13  
tigmāyudhau tigmāhetī suśevāu sómārudrāv ihá sú mṛḷataṃ naḥ | [ŚS ]]

#### ŚS 5.6.8

mumuktám asmán durityád avadyāj juṣéthām yajñám amṛtam asmāsu dhattam ||

#### MS 4.11.2:165.14

mumuktám asmán grāsītán . . . ||

BHATTACHARYA does not report the omission of an anusvāra in **Mā** (*mṛḍata*), and skips its variant *ju·uṣethāṃ* (?) in pāda **d**, which is not nicely legible in the reproduction available to me. He reads *asmān gṛbhītād*.

**b.** Note that PS has replaced the dual deity Soma and Rudra as found in all the parallel versions by Agni and Soma, possibly under the influence of the stanza ṚV 1.93.5 *yuvám etāni diví rocanāny agnís ca soma sákratū dhattam | yuvám síndhūṃr abhísaster avadyád agnīṣomāv ámuñcatam gṛbhītán* ‘Of one intent, you two, Agni and Soma, have placed these lights in heaven. You two have released the captured rivers from insult and blame, o Agni and Soma’. The replacement must have been made purposefully, to increase the applicability of this mantra in the ritual context.

**c.** *gṛbhīta-* is never an independent noun in Vedic (as is *durityá-*, of the ŚS version), and cannot be taken as a qualification of *avadyāt* (as the Or. mss. would have it). I therefore adopt the emendation \**gṛbhītān*, with a

view to the same RV stanza 1.93.5 (also 10.79.7), and the MS parallel (*asmān grasitān*). If we may disregard the striking placement of the *daṇḍa* right into the second word (an identical insertion is found also at 7.8.8a), the **K** reading *asmād gr̥bhūt(h)ād* can be construed to work grammatically, but must be due to some kind of perseveration (note that a considerable number of ŚS mss. read *asmād*).

**d.** This pāda is composed of a 5-syllable trimeter opening taken from RV 6.69.1c (= TS 3.2.11.2c etc.), an overlong 4-syllable break, and then a regular triṣṭubh cadence contained in the phrase *asmāsu dhattam* (known i.a. from RV 1.64.15b, 4.57.8d, 8.59.7c, mantra 10 below), plus the exclamation *svāhā* not taken into account in the metrical label.

### 6.11.8 ŚS 5.6.9, TB 2.4.2.1

cakṣuṣo hete manaso hete brahmaṇo hete menyāmenir asi | (P)  
amenayas te santu \*ye 'smān abhyaghāyanti svāhā || (P)

O missile of [their] sight, o missile of [their] mind, o missile of [their] spell, you are free of *mení*-power, due to [Agni's] *mení*-power. Let them be free of *mení*-power, who behave maliciously toward us, hail!

cakṣuṣo hete] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, thus **Mā** preceded by a repetition: (*sec. m. ?*) *tigmāyudhau tigmahetī suśevāva manaso*] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, *manaṣo V/126 brahmaṇo*] **Or**, *vrahmaṇo K menyāmenir*] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, *meny{o}āmenir JM* ||] **RM JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, || **Ku amenayas te**] **Ku JM RM V/126 [Ma]**, *amanayaste Mā*, *amenaya{t[e]}ste Pa*, *anenayaste K santu*] **Or**, *saṃtu K* [not °nt°, as read by Edg.] \*ye] **yo Or K** 'smān abhyaghāyanti] **Ku V/126 Mā [Ma?**], *smānabhyaghāyanti JM RM*, *'smān bhyaghāyanti Pa*, *smānabhyabhāyantu K svāhā* ||] **Or**, *svāhā Z K* [note Z]

#### ŚS 5.6.9

cákṣuṣo hete mánaso hete bráhmaṇo hete tápasaś ca hete |  
menyā menír [read: menyāmenír] asy amenáyas té santu yé 'smāñ abhyaghāyánti ||

#### TB 2.4.2.1

cákṣuṣo hete mánaso hete | vāco hete bráhmaṇo hete | yó māghāyúr abhidásati | tám agne menyāmením kṛṇu || yó mā cákṣuṣā yó mánasā | yó vācā bráhmaṇāghāyúr abhidásati | táyāgne tvám menyā | amúm amením kṛṇu ||

BHATTACHARYA does not report the repetition from the preceding mantra *tigmāyudhau* ... found between brackets in **Mā**. He edits *menyā menír*, and *yo*.

**a.** In my interpretation, it is the missile of the malignant opponents mentioned in **b** that is addressed here, and this interpretation is supported by the next stanza.

The word *mení*- has been discussed by JAMISON, who observes (1996b: 193) that it “denotes the power or embodiment of negative exchange, of thwarted

exchange. It is the dangerous force that is created when the standard system of tit-for-tat is interfered with. The threat of it enforces correct behavior in exchange relations, and when released, it can become the vehicle of requital for violations of these same relations”. In her survey of the word’s attestations, JAMISON has not questioned the traditional interpretation of ŚS 5.6.9.

The editions of ŚS divide the text of 5.6.9 ... *menyá menír* ..., following the indications of the padapāṭha (*menyáḥ | meníḥ* |). JAMISON thus translates (p. 189) “you are the *meni* of the *meni*” (WHITNEY: “weapon’s weapon (*meni*) art thou”). If we read the TB parallel, however (as well as ŚS 5.6.10, and our next ‘stanza’ 9), it becomes clear that there is considerable support for dividing the words differently, in a way which corroborates JAMISON’s emphasis on (thwarted) exchange. The TB interpretation (*menyá-ameníṃ*) with an instr. *menyá* followed by *amení-* immediately points to exchange of *mení-*, and of course also much improves the structure of our incantation, with its ensuing *amenáyas té santu*: ‘due to [Agni’s (see the next ‘stanza’)] *meni* you are free of *meni*, [hence] they must be so’.

Before we accept this interpretation, it is necessary to refer to ŚS 2.11.1 (PS 1.57.1) where the editions give *dúṣyā dúṣír asi hetýá hetír asi menyá menír asi* ... . The traditional interpretation, and the padapāṭha, are here probably correct. The reason I think this passage is different from 5.6.9 is firstly the different structure (as compared to our present passage) of what precedes (‘you are A against A [obj. gen.], you are B against B, you are ...’), and secondly what follows in the parallel sentences in ŚS 2.11.2 (PS 1.57.1b) etc.: *sraktyó ’si pratisaró ’si pratyabhicáraṇo ’si | āpnuhí śréyāṃsam áti samāṃ krāma || práti tám abhí cara yó ’smān dvéṣṭi yáṃ vayáṃ dviṣmāḥ* ... ‘*Sraktyá* art thou; re-entrant (*pratisará*) art thou; counter-conjuring art thou: attain the better one, step beyond the equal. Conjure against him who hates us, whom we hate ...’ (WHITNEY). This makes it clear that, differently from our passage, it is not the enemy or his agents of witchcraft but the speaker’s own agent of counter-witchcraft (an amulet?) that is addressed in this *krtyāpratiharāṇa* (AVPariś 32.2; see also KauśS 39.7).

Returning to our present ‘stanza’ and its ŚS parallel: the evidence from TB is sufficiently strong to support going against the ŚS padapāṭha and making the necessary small change in the traditional word-division adopted also by BHATTACHARYA. The ŚS padapāṭha at 2.1.11 may have influenced the padakāra at 5.6.9. This mantra can obviously not be seen separately from the following one, and it is therefore clear that also here it is *Agni’s meni-* that is being invoked, just as there, to annul the *meni-* of the enemy and his weapons (cf. PS 2.51 to Agni Menihan). This power is also associated specifically with Agni at AB 8.25.1, and perhaps MS 4.8.1:106.10f. too is to be interpreted as providing a direct connection between Agni and *meni-* (both passages have been discussed by JAMISON 1996b: 192ff.).

b. Marcos Albino has drawn my attention to the fact that this line includes, with *\*ye ’smān abhyaghāyanti*, an octosyllabic metrical element, as is proven

by its parallels ŚS ŚS 7.70[73].3d *yó naḥ kás cābhyaghāyāti* and ŚS 19.50.4d / PS 14.9.4d *yó asmāñ abhyaghāyāti*.

On the error *yo* of all mss., for *\*ye*, see WITZEL (1985a: 262) who explains the error as a writing mistake at the level of \*G (see also my Introduction, §2.6.1). It seems to me more likely to be an old case of perseveration, *yo* having intruded into our text due to anticipation of the quoted parallel in kāṇḍa 14.

### 6.11.9 ŚS 5.6.10, TB 2.4.2.1

yo <sup>+</sup>smāñ cakṣuṣā manasā  
 yaś ca vācakūtyā <sup>+</sup>cittyā brahmaṇāghāyur abhidāsāt | (P)  
 \*tam agne tvam menyāmeniṃ kṛṇu svāhā || (P)

The malicious one who will menace us with [his] sight, with [his] mind, with [his] speech, with [his] intention, with [his] thought, with a spell: him, o Agni, you must make free of *meni*-power, by [your] *meni*-power, hail!

<sup>+</sup>smāñ] 'smāñ, **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, smāñ, **JM**, smām **K** <sup>+</sup>cittyā] cityā **Or**, di(→ ci)tyā **K** brahmaṇāghāyur] **Or**, vrahmaṇāghāyur **K** abhidāsāt |] **Or**, abhidāsā **K** [*om.* |] \*tam agne tvam] tvam agne tvam **Or K** menyāmeniṃ] **Ku RM Pa [Ma]** **K**, menyāmeni **JM V/126 Mā** svāhā ||] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, svā(+ hā 1) | **V/126**, svāhā **Z K** [*note Z*]

#### ŚS 5.6.10

yò 'smāñś cakṣuṣā manasā cittyākūtyā ca yó aghāyúr abhidāsāt |  
 tvām tán agne menyāmeniṃ kṛṇu svāhā ||

#### TB 2.4.2.1

*quoted in full under 8*

No anusvāra for *menyāmeniṃ* is visible on my reproduction of **Mā**, but its omission — confirmed by sister ms. **V/126** — is not noted by BHATTACHARYA. He edits *tvam*.

**a.** Contrast the PS sandhi *asmāñ cakṣuṣā* with ŚS *asmāñś cakṣuṣā*, and cf. my Introduction, §2.8 (H).

**b.** All the PS mss. read *tvam . . . tvam*, an error which seems to go back to \*G. On the strength of the TB parallel, which has *tām agne . . . agne tvām . . .*, I emend our text to *\*tam agne tvam*.

### 6.11.10 ŚS 5.9.8, KS 37.15:95.14f.

ud āyur ut kṛtam ud balam un <sup>+</sup>manīṣod indriyaṃ (P)  
 nṛmṇam asmāsu dhehi svāhā || 11 || (P)

Up life, up work, up strength, up mental power, up force. Place valor in us, hail!

āyur ut] **K**, āyur] **Or** kṛtam ud] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, kṛtamad **Mā** [?], kṛtabad **K** balam] **Or**, valam **K** un <sup>+</sup>manīṣod] unmanīṣor **Or**, aṃnanīṣoyad **K** indriyaṃ]

Or, indraṃ **K** dhehi] **K**, dhattam Or svāhā] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, svAhā  
**Mā** || 11 ||] ||<sup>1</sup> ṛ 9 || 11 || **Ku**, ||<sup>1</sup> ṛ 10 || 11 || **JM**, || ṛ || 11 || **RM**, ||<sup>3</sup> 11 || ṛ 8 (→ 9)  
|| **V/126**, || 11 || ṛ 8 || **Mā**, || 11 || ṛ || **Pa**, | **K** [*note that K does not close the hymn here yet*]

**ŚS 5.9.8a**

úd āyur úd bālam út kṛtām út kṛtyām ún manīṣām úd indriyām |

**KS 37.15:95.14f.**

ud vācam un manīṣām ud indriyam ut prajāṃ ut paśūn

BHATTACHARYA does not report the reading *kṛtamad* of **Mā**, where my reproduction shows no *-u* vowel sign. He edits *manīṣorindriyam* and *dhattam*. For further background on the ritual application of this mantra, see the introduction to this hymn. See also under 6.12.1.

a. Even though *-r- ~ -d-* is a rather common error in **K**, while no such errors are otherwise known to me from the Or. mss., it still seems to me that the *-d* in **K**'s reading *aṃnanīṣoyad* has to be more original than the *-r* in *unmanīṣor* as transmitted in the Or. mss. (see in general Ved. Var. II, §272a). I thus accept BHATTACHARYA's suggestion that *un manīṣā ud* is intended. This means that the five nouns collocated with *úd* are nominatives.

PS purposefully differs from the probably more original ŚS/KS parallel (note that KS gives only five items), in that it gives an unambiguous nominative form (*manīṣā*) and omits all unambiguous acc. forms found in the parallel texts (ŚS *kṛtyām*, KS *vācam*). WHITNEY comments: "the nouns with 'up' are accusatives, but what verb should be supplied for the construction is not easy to see". This point is interesting, as KS 37.16:97.1f. contains a brāhmaṇa (evidently overlooked by WHITNEY, although he was aware of the mantra parallel in KS 37.15) on the KS version of this mantra, which offers a possible solution to WHITNEY's problem about which verb to supply: probably a 2nd sg. imper. of the verb *har*: *úd vācam ún manīṣām + ity* [ed. *amīty*] *etāni vā asya ní khanet tāny evód dharati* 'About the mantra *úd vācam ún manīṣām* etc.: these (stones) here he [the Adhvaryu] should bury for him; it is those (i.e. voice, etc.) that he pulls up'. Thus, the priest first places the stones in the ground of the altar enclosure, and then symbolically extracts from the ground the items speech etc. for the Yajamāna. An alternative solution for WHITNEY's problem suggests itself at VSM 5.23 / VSK 5.6.2 *út kṛtyāṃ kirāmi* 'the *kṛtyā* I dig out' (on this passage, see GOUDRIAAN 1986: 452f.).

b. Comparison with stanza 7 shows that the text of the Or. mss., which reads *dhattam*, has suffered perseveration from the text there. The **K** reading *dhehi* cannot be explained as an error, and fits better with the immediate context of 9, where Agni (as the god representing the ritual ground) is invoked, as he is here. The meaning of 6.12.1, which — as the arrangement of ŚS 5.9.8 shows — certainly belongs in some sense with the present mantra, is too unclear to take it as supporting the dual.

This last point is interesting in connection with the fact that **K** marks no

hymn boundary after the present mantra, but instead gives such marking (with ‘Z Z’) after what in this and BHATTACHARYA’s edition (following the Or. mss.) is taken to be 6.12.1 rather than part of 6.11.

## 6.12. For safe entrance onto the altar ground.

It seems to have been the intention of the scribe of **K** (note its marker *Z Z* after our 6.12.1) to include the first mantra of this hymn with the preceding hymn, which would accord better with the division as found in ŚŚ. Since the general reliability of **K**'s stanza and hymn divisions is rather low, and since the correspondences between ŚŚ and PS in this, the following, and the preceding hymn are often only rough, it seems more pragmatic to simply follow the uniform transmission found in the Or. mss., and retain the division established by BHATTACHARYA. Stanzas 4–7 have no parallel, but fit well in the context of this hymn.

### 6.12.1 ŚŚ 5.9.8, KS 37.15:95.18f., ĀpŚŚ 6.21.1

āyusṅkṛtāyusmatī svadhāvantau	(P)
gopā me stho gopāyataṃ mā	(P)
ātmasadau me +staṃ +tanve suśevau	(P)
mā mā himsiṣṭaṃ svāhā	(P)

You two life-makers (m./n.), you two (f./n.) full of life, you two (m.) full of power: you two are my guardians, guard me. You two (m.) must be seated in the (altar's) body, very kind to my body. Don't harm me, hail!

āyusṅkṛtāyusmatī] **JM K**, āyusṅkṛd āyusmatī **Ku V/126 Pa [Ma]**, āyusṅkṛd āyusmantī **RM**, āyu{Skṛ}ṣkṛd āyusmatī **Mā svadhāvantau] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, svadhāvanto **JM K** gopāyataṃ mā |] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, gopāyataṃ m(+ m)ā **V/126**, gopāyatan vā | **K** ātmasadau] **Or**, ātmasadhū **K** +staṃ +tanve] stha tanave **Or**, sta[*line*]nve **K** suśevau] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, {śu}suśevau **Ku**, suśenau | **K** [*note*] himsiṣṭaṃ] **K**, himsiṣṭaṃ **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, hisiṣṭaṃ **JM svāhā** [|] **Or**, svāhā *Z Z K* [*note punctuation*]

#### ŚŚ 5.9.8

āyusṅkṛd āyuspatnī svadhāvantau gopā me staṃ gopāyataṃ mā |  
ātmasadau me staṃ mā mā himsiṣṭaṃ ||

#### KS 37.15:95.18f.

āyusṭad āyupatnī [read: āyusṅkṛd āyupatnī, see MITTWEDE 1989: 150] svadhāvo gopā nas  
stha rakṣitāro mā naḥ kaś cit prakhān mā prameṣmahi ||

#### ĀpŚŚ 6.21.1

āyukṛd āyuhpatnī svadhāvo [cf. Ved. Var. I, 264] goptryo me stha gopāyata mā rakṣata  
mātmasado me stha | mā naḥ kaś cit praghān mā prameṣmah[i]

As noted above, this mantra is written together with our hymn 11 in **K**. BHATTACHARYA edits *āyusṅkṛd āyusmatī*, and *stha tanve*. On the ritual episode in question, cf. STAAL 1983/I: 387.

a. In interpreting this line, I assume that the accentuation of ŚŚ is correct, and that all three words are vocatives. *svadhāvantau* is thus not a nominative with *gopā*, here taken to begin a new line.

We must note, first, the agreement (only in the PS version) between the order *úd āyur ut kṛtam* of 6.11.10, and the first word of the present mantra. Since we had six items in 6.11.10, it seems attractive to try to extract three dual pairs from the transmitted readings of this line, even though the ŚS parallel seems to have one singular with two dual compounds, and the YV readings are even more different. I thus follow the **K** reading with *-kṛtā-* (surprisingly found also in Or. ms. **JM**, whose reading is here not confirmed by its sister ms. **RM**: cf. my Introduction, §2.1.2.1), and analyse *āyusḥkṛtā-āyusmatī* (cf. also WHITNEY on ŚS 5.9.8).

The three vocative pairs are addressed to the  $3 \times 2$  stones (see my comm. on 8 below), with which the six individual concepts in 6.11.10 are associated: this connection with stones (*aśman-*, m.) explains the masculine gender of *svadhāvantau* (on the interpretation of *svadhā-* as ‘power’ or ‘power-substance’, see RÖNNOW 1927: 110–154), which refers to the last pair of stones, associated with the power concepts *bāla-/nṛmṇa-* and *indriyā-*.

If I am right in my reading, *āyusḥkṛtā* could be taken as a dual dvandva compound whose two members appear separately at the head of 6.11.10, but since none of the other concepts from 6.11.10 are referred to directly here, I prefer to take it as a name, a dual form of the root-noun compound *āyusḥkṛt-* (cf. i.a. PS 10.7.8 ~ ŚS 3.31.8, MS 2.3.4:31.13–15, KS 11.8:154.13), for the first two stones, associated with the concepts *āyusḥ-* and *kṛtā-*.

For *āyusmatī* (f.), then, we would like to establish a connection with two feminine concepts in 6.11.10. Now the PS version of that mantra, which contains only one feminine word (*manīṣā-*), as we saw, shows signs of elaborate rephrasing. The possibility is not to be rejected outright that *āyusmatī* refers back to concepts no longer found in the PS, but still available in ŚS/KS: *kṛtyā-* (cf. GOUDRIAAN 1986: 454) and *manīṣā-*. Note that PS has *āyusmant-*, whereas the parallel texts have the apposition *āyuspatnī-*, which must be more original, because in the present context, referring to a pair of stones, the adjective *āyusmatī* ought to be masculine like *svadhāvantau*. The middle pair of stones, apparently connected with the two grammatically feminine concepts of *kṛtyā-* and *manīṣā-*, must as in ŚS/KS, also be referred to by the name *āyuspatnī-*. Note also the middle pair of exclamations to the (feminine) Earth of 6.13.12–13.

In sum, I base my interpretation on an underlying form of the mantras PS 6.11.10+6.12.1 (~ ŚS 5.9.8), e.g. (the extent to which the ‘original’ form of 6.11.10 differed from the extant form, with *asmāsu dhehi*, being unclear), as follows:

*úd āyur út kṛtām, út kṛtyām ún manīṣām, úd indriyām*  
*nṛmṇām asmāsu dhehi svāhā |*  
*āyusḥkṛtāyuspatnī svadhāvantau*  
*gopā me stho gopāyātam mā |*  
*ātmasādau me stam tanvè susévalu*  
*mā mā himsiṣtam svāhā ||*

The translation above follows the transmitted PS text.

**b.** While the KS version uses plural forms to refer to its five (see my comm. on 8 below) stones at once, the AV version apparently addresses the pairs of stones three times in the dual, the text itself being condensed like 6.11.6. I suggest that the recitation of this mantra would have been as follows: *āyusḥkṛtā, gopā me stho* etc., *āyuspatnī, gopā me stho* etc., *svadhāvantau, gopā me stho* etc.

**c.** This could also be taken as a Triṣṭubh-pāda (or Jagatī with Triṣṭubh cadence). Cf. PS 6.10.8d above, also containing the formula *me as + tanve suśeva-*: is this to be taken as a concatenating link, perhaps even an argument for taking the present ‘stanza’ with ‘hymn’ 6.11?

The Or. reading *stha*, which BHATTACHARYA adopts with underlining, is indeed impossible in a context with dual nouns and verb forms. The reading *stanve* in **K** (for *sta[m ta]nve* or *sta[nta]nve*), has probably preserved part of <sup>+</sup>*stam*, which I accept as a slight emendation.

The *ātman-* in *ātmasadau* refers to the torso of the altar space: cf. STAAL 1983/I: 66, 399. On this meaning, see also MINARD 1949: 46 (§129a), with many references. KS 37.16:97.2f. states: *ātmamātrī vēdir bhavaty ātmamātrām hi vārma yān nātmamātrī syān nātmāne kriyeta* ‘The Vēdi has the (Yajamāna’s) body as its unit of measurement, for an armor is of the size of a body: if it were not to have the body as its unit of measurement, performance of the rite would not benefit the body’. Our stanza 3 quite clearly identifies the speaker (the Yajamāna) with the altar space. The stones are thus places on the altar space or Vēdi, being homologous with the Yajamāna’s own body (*ātmamātrī*), as a protective armor. The connection between the torso of the (bird-shaped) altar space and the dimensions of the Yajamāna’s body seems not to be made in the Agnicayana as described by STAAL (1983).

**6.12.2 a:** PS 6.11.6a, ŚS 5.6.11a–14a ◊ **b:** ŚS 5.6.11b–14b; cf. KS 38.14:116.16ff., TB 2.4.2.4 = TĀ 4.42.2

indrasya gr̥ho (‘)sīndrasya śarmāsīndrasya  
varmāsīndrasya varūtham asi | (P)  
\*taṃ tvā pra viśāmi sarvāṅgaḥ sarvātmā sarvaguḥ <sup>+</sup>sarvapūruṣaḥ  
saha <sup>+</sup>yan me <sup>+</sup>sti tena || (P)

You are the house of Indra, you are the protection of Indra, you are the shelter of Indra, you are the shield of Indra: thus I enter into you, with my limbs whole, with my body whole, with all my cattle, with all my men, with that which is mine.

(‘)sīndrasya] sīndrasya **Or**, sindrasya **K** [[Edg. misprint: sindrasy]] śarmāsīndrasya] **Or**, śarmāsī indrasya **K** varmāsīndrasya] **Or**, varmāsī indrasya **K** varūtham] varūtham **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], varūtham **JM RM**, marhatam **K** \*taṃ tvā] tatvā **Or K** sarvāṅgaḥ] **Or**, sarvāṃ **K** sarvātmā] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, s{ā}arvātmā **Ku**

sarvaguh] Or, sarvagus K +sarvapūruṣaḥ] sarvapuṣaḥ Or, sarvapauruṣaḥ K [[note °ḥ s°] saha +yan me] sahaname Or, samye K 'sti] Ku Pa [Ma], sti JM RM V/126 Mā, stu K tena] JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, ste(→ te 4)na Ku ||] Or, om. K

#### ŚS 5.6.11–14

īndrasya gṛhó 'si | tám tvā prá padye tám tvā prá viśāmi  
sārvaguḥ sārvapūruṣaḥ sārvātmā sārvatanūḥ sahá yán mé 'sti téna || 11 ||  
īndrasya śármāsi | . . . , īndrasya vármāsi | . . . , īndrasya várūtham asi | . . .

#### KS 38.14:116.16ff.

īndrasya śármāsiīndrasya vármāsiīndrasya várūtham asi tám tvā prá padye ságus sāsvas sápuruṣaḥ || sahá yán mé 'sti téna sá me śárma ca várma ca bhava gāyatríṃl lómabhiḥ prá viśāmi . . .

#### TB 2.4.2.4 = TĀ 4.42.2

īndrasya gṛhó 'si tám tvā | prá padye ságus sāsvaḥ | sahá yán me ásti téna ||

Cf. the comments on 6.11.6. BHATTACHARYA reads *tat tvā*. In the first case the mss. transmit no avagraha, and I thus place it in brackets. The second case is treated differently in the parallel texts (ŚS & KS vs. TB/TĀ). The avagraha found in some Or. mss. cannot be proved to be authentic, but in any case the PS tradition agrees with ŚS and KS in not writing the *a-* found in the Taittirīya tradition.

b. On the meaning of *sarva-* in these compounds, cf. GONDA 1955b = 1975/II: 497ff.

BHATTACHARYA's very slight emendation (cf. my Introduction, §2.8 (O) on the orthography *tv* for *ttv*), not marked as such, of the uniform ms. reading *tatvā* to *tat tvā* seems to be syntactically possible, neuter *tat* referring to the neuter words in the preceding line. However, since we find *\*taṃ tvā* in all the parallel texts, and this appears to be the more common construction, I prefer to assume omission of an anusvāra at an early stage of the transmission (before \*G).

#### 6.12.3 ŚS 5.9.7b, KS 37.15:95.11f.

astrto nāmāham ayam asmi	(P)
sa ātmānaṃ pari dadhe dyāvapṛthivībhyāṃ	(P)
gopīthāya pra hūyase	(8)

I am (identical with) this one here, called Unsubdued: thus, I am enclosing myself, for the protection of heaven and earth, you are called.

nāmāham ayam asmi] Ku JM V/126 Pa [Ma], nāmāha(+ ma)yam asmi RM, nāmāha{YA}mayam asmi Mā, nāmāhamayām assi K sa ātmānaṃ ] Or, mātmānaṃ K dadhe] K, dade Or dyāvapṛthivībhyāṃ ] °bhyāṃ | Or K [[om. ]] gopīthāya] Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma], gop{i}īthā Pa, gopīyāya K

**ŚS 5.9.7b**

astr̥tō nāmāhām ayám asmi sá ātmānaṃ ní dadhe dyāvāpṛthivībhyāṃ gopīthāya ||

**KS 37.15:95.11f.**

[a]str̥to nāmāham asmi sa idaṃ dyāvāpṛthivyor ātmānaṃ pari dade tayoś śraye tayoḥ parākrame gopīthāya pipṛtaṃ mā

The | which the Or. mss. place after *dyāvāpṛthivībhyāṃ* is not supported by **K** (nor by ŚS). Its placement has been occasioned by the addition of the words *pra hūyase*, under the influence of the nearby stanza 6.17.1, although they do not fit here, and are supported by neither of the parallel texts. These words have obviously been added at a relatively early stage of the transmission (i.e. before \*G), and *gopīthāya pra hūyase* was then (at least in the Or. transmission) seen as a metrical pāda, to be separated from the preceding prose, with which *gopīthāya* actually belongs syntactically (as is clear from ŚS and KS). It is impossible to say whether this mistake goes back to the late Vedic period, or is rather more recent. The presentation of this mantra as two lines of prose plus one anuṣṭubh-pāda is thus rather arbitrary, my translation anacoluthic.

a. At MS 1.5.10:78.11, the earth is called *agnér astaryā priyā tanūr* ‘Agni’s unsubduable dear body’. Here it is *agnī* (cf. RV 6.16.20, 8.43.11) as the altar that is called ‘unsubdued’, and it is the speaker (the Yajamāna) who, identifying himself as ‘this one (*agnī*) here’, places the stones on the edges of the altar space, thereby enclosing himself.

b. Note that BHATTACHARYA, contrary to his usual practise, follows **K** here against the uniform Or. reading *dade*. I agree with BHATTACHARYA that a form from *dhā* is more likely: see the mantra ŚS 19.46.4 (= PS 4.23.4a) quoted under 6.11.6; cf. also the reading *ní dadhe* of the ŚS parallel here, and the word *paridhī* found in the related context of KS 35.10:58.2ff., quoted under the next stanza. The Or. mss. are not reliable in distinguishing *dh* from *d* (cf. e.g. 6.3.9d), and the support which their reading seems to receive from the KS parallel is deceptive: as the brāhmaṇa KS 37.16 (p. 96) makes clear, the action according to the Kaṭhas is not one of enclosing (*pari-dhā*), but an entrusting (*pari-dā*) of the body/self to various deities.

**6.12.4 Only PS**

astr̥to nāma prājāpatyo	( )
devo māsas trayodaśaḥ	(8)
sarvaguḥ sarvapūruṣaḥ	(8)
prāgāṃ devapurā aham	(8)

I, called Unsubdued, belonging to Prajāpati, the god Thirteenth Month, have stepped towards the strongholds of the gods, with all my cattle, with all my men.

nāma] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, nāmā **JM K** devo . . . prāgāṃ] **Or, om. K sarvapūruṣaḥ] RM, sarvapuruṣaḥ Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]** prāgāṃ] **JM RM, prā-**

gān **Ku V/126 Pa** [**Ma**], prāgā **Mā** devapurā aham] devapurā ahaṃ **Or**, devapurāyaṃ **K** || **Or**, *om.* **K**

**KS 35.10:58.2ff.**

[i]ndrasya grāho 'sy aḡrḥīto grāhyo devānāṃ pūr asi tāṃ tvā prā viśāmi tāṃ tvā prā padye sahá gṛhāís sahá prajāyā sahá paśúbhis sahártvígbbhis sahá sadasyàís sahá somyáís sahá dakṣiṇíyais sahá yajñéna sahá yajñápatinā || indrāgnī paridhī máma +vāto devapurá+ [cf. MITTWEDE 1989: 145] kṛtá tát [+tām 38.14:116.17] tvendragraha prā padye ságus sāsvas sápuruṣas sahá yán mé 'sti téna ||

**ĀpŚS 14.26.1**

indrasya graho 'sy aḡrḥīto grāhyo devānāṃ pūr asi taṃ tvā prapadye saha grahaiḥ saha pragrahaiḥ . . . saha yajñapatinā || indrāgnī paridhī mama vāto devapurā mama | brahma varma mamāntaraṃ taṃ tvendragraha prapadye saḡuḥ sāsvaḥ || varma me dyāvāpṛthivī varmāgnir varma sūryaḥ | varma me brahmaṇaspatir mā mā prāpadato bhayam || indrāgnī paridhī mama vāto devapurā mama | brahma varma mamāntaraṃ taṃ tvendragraha praviśāni saḡuḥ sāsvaḥ sapūruṣaḥ | saha yan me asti ten[a]

Note the *lapsus calami* in **K**. Two readings (*sarvapūruṣaḥ* and *prāgāṃ*) are supported only by the Or. ms. **RM** (and the second reading also by **JM**): on the idiosyncratic readings of these generally unreliable mss., see my Introduction §2.1.2.1. BHATTACHARYA does not report the reading °*puruṣaḥ* for either of his two mss., presumably due to oversight. It is to be expected that **Ma** has that reading, along with the other (Northern) Or. mss.

**ab.** The connection between the intercalary thirteenth month and the altar space was made already in PS 6.11.5d: see my comm. on that pāda. As we saw in the preceding mantra, the Yajamāna identifies himself with the altar space: in turn, then, the Yajamāna is *prājāpatya-* (cf. ŚBM 1.6.1.20, AB 2.18.2), and Prajāpati is the intercalary month: this particular identification of the intercalary month (= the altar space = the Yajamāna) as ‘belonging to or descending from Prajāpati’ seems not to be found elsewhere in Vedic literature, but is not surprising because Prajāpati was in Vedic thinking equivalent to the twelvefold year (see GONDA 1984: 78ff.), which ‘adds to itself’ (JB 1.18) as thirteenth item the intercalary month (see GONDA 1984: 23).

**cd.** The significance of these pādas, which are to be compared with stanza 2 above, in connection with the altar space called *ástrta* as the thirteenth month, lies in the fact that the phrase ‘stronghold of the gods’ appears to have had a connection with this intercalary month.

At KS 35.10 (≈ KapKS 48.8 and 48.12) we find mantras (to be compared with MS 3.12.11&13, TB 3.10.7.1, VSM 22.30, VSK 24.17.1) whose TB parallel finds application (see ĀpŚS 19.13.9, BaudhŚS 19.5:423.3) in the Sāvitracayana, a special way of piling the fire-altar in the shape of the Sun. At ĀpŚS 14.26.1, however, we find an almost literal quotation from KS 35.10, in a ceremony to be performed “wenn beim Morgendienste das Fass einen Riss bekommt” (CALAND 1924: 410). First, (ĀpŚS 14.15.11) 13 (!) libations of ghee are to be made with 13 formulas, among which are KS 35.10:57.19 (= KapKS 48.8:300.15

[247.8:353.8]) *saṁsarpāya svāhā malimlucāya svāhā* (corresponding with TB 3.10.7.1 *aṁhaspatyāya svāhā . . . saṁsarpāya svāhā*; see also MS 3.12.11:163.17 and 3.12.13:164.7f.): as we saw in our discussion of 6.11.5, *malimlucā-* is a name of the intercalary month, and the same is true (cf. MACDONELL & KEITH 1912 II: 162) of *saṁsarpa-* and *aṁhaspatyā-* (also *aṁhaspatī-*). To be compared is also TS 6.5.3.4 *tāsmād ādityāḥ śaṅ māsó dáksīṇenaiti śád úttareṇa | upayāmágrhāto 'si saṁsárpo 'sy aṁhaspatyāya tvéty āha | ásti trayodaśó mása ity āhus.*

After these 13 libations have been made, Āpastamba has the Yajamāna speak elaborate mantras over the cracked vessel. The KS and ĀpŚS versions of these mantras, containing respectively the terms *devapurá* and *devānām pūr*, have been quoted in full above. They are very closely parallel to mantras lacking these phrases found at KS 38.14:116.16ff. and ĀpŚS 16.18.8 (also quoted above, under stanza 2, employed by the Adhvaryu priests when, after the bringing of the *brahmavarmāni* libations to the accompaniment of mantras found also in our 6.11, they step onto the altar ground), and have the Yajamāna address the cracked vessel as ‘draught of Indra’ (*indrasya grāhaḥ*, *indragraha*, a secondary play on the more original wording *indrasya grhāḥ*, i.a. KS 11.3:146.11f., see CALAND 1924: 411 n. 3), and announce that he will ‘enter into’ it with all his belongings and ritual assistants. The fact that the mantras of KS 35.10 are reformulations, adapted to a new ritual situation with a broken vessel, is palpable when we compare the more original version at KS 38.14 (and ĀpŚS 16.18.8).

Still, the version at 35.10 is important for us because it twice equates the addressee (in its ritual context: the cracked vessel — probably originally: the altar ground) with the ‘stronghold of the gods’. If we put all the above facts together, and compare them with our present PS mantra, we end up with a cluster of material in which ‘Indra’s house (or, secondarily: draught)’, the intercalary ‘thirteenth’ month (with various names), and ‘the stronghold of the gods’ are mentioned in close connection with each other in mantras which originally seem to have been intended for use during entry into a sacred ground, the Vedi: cf. KS 37.16:97.4 *etāvati pṛthivī yāvati védīr asyá evátád ánteṣu púro 'dhita devapurá evákr̥tátho etá evá devátā etásām diśám paraspá akr̥ta gopīthāya* ‘The Earth is of the same dimensions as the Vedi. On its borders he has placed strongholds. It is strongholds of the gods, that he has made. It is these deities that he has then made guardians of these directions, for the sake of protection’. The Vedi is the domain of Vāyu, whence KS 35.10:58.5 states *vāto devapurá kr̥tá* [ĀpŚS *mama*].

The term *devapurá-* or *devānām pūr-*, which refers here to the Agnikṣetra (cf. also GONDA 1967c: 424 = 1975/IV: 217 quoted under 7.16.1c), occurs several times in the AV Saṁhitās (ŚS 5.8.6 = 11.10[12].17 ≈ PS 7.18.8; 14.1.64 / 18.6.12; 5.28.10–11 ≈ 2.59.8–9). Direct reference is made to the *brahmavarmāni* (about which, see 6.11) at PS 7.18.8 (ŚS 5.8.6) *yadi preyur devapurá brahma varmāni cakṛire | tanūpānaṁ paripānāni cakṛire sarvaṁ tad arasaṁ kṛdhi*

‘When they have gone to the strongholds of the gods, have made spells their armors, have made for themselves a body-protection, full protections: make all of that powerless’. This stanza’s phraseology shows striking resemblances to the context of our set of ‘hymns’ 6.11–13 (cf. e.g. 6.12.7), and many of the KS parallels, as does ŚS 14.1.64 *brāhmāparaṃ yujyātāṃ brāhma pūrvam brāhmāntatō madhyatō brāhma sarvātaḥ | anāvyaḍdhāṃ devapurāṃ prapādya śivā syonā patilokē vī rāja* ‘Let the *brāhman* be yoked after, the *brāhman* before, the *brāhman* at the end, in the middle, the *brāhman* everywhere; going forward to an impenetrable stronghold of the gods, do thou (f.), propitious, pleasant, bear rule in thy husband’s world’ (WHITNEY).

A further passage, interesting because of its connection with the term *āstrta*, through a form from the verb *star* ‘to subdue’, is TS 7.2.5.3 *devapurā evā pāry ūhate, tāsya nā kūtaś canōpāvyādhō bhavati, nānam abhicārant strṇute* ‘verily he surrounds himself with the divine citadels; no harm whatever can befall him, the practiser of witchcraft overcomes him not’ (KEITH). See also TS 5.7.3.2 where the *devapurāḥ* are called *tanūpānīḥ*, which is again to be compared with our stanza 7 below, and its KS parallel in 37.15.

### 6.12.5 Only PS

antaḥ prāgāṃ +devapurāḥ	(8)
sahagrāmaḥ s <sub>u</sub> vastaye	(8)
saṃvatsarasya madhyataḥ	(8)
sarvaiḥ sodarjyaiḥ saha    *prapāṭhaka	(8)

I have stepped in between the strongholds of the gods, together with my train,  
for well-being, in the middle of the year, together with all my siblings.

antaḥ] *thus* Or K [[note °ḥ p°]] prāgāṃ] JM RM, prāgān Ku Ma Pa, prāgā(+ ṃ)n V/126, prāgā Mā, prahāgāṃ K +devapurāḥ sahagrāmaḥ] devapurā sahagrāmaḥ Ku JM RM Pa [Ma?], devapurā sahagrāma V/126 Mā, devapurātsahagrāmas K svastaye ] Or, svastaye Z K [[note Z]] saṃvatsarasya] K, saṃvatsarasya Or madhyataḥ] Or, madhyatas K [[not sapyā°, as misread by Edg./Bhatt.]] sarvaiḥ] Or, sarvais K sodaryaiḥ] Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma], sodarjaiḥ Mā, sahodari K || \*prapāṭhaka ||] || śrī || Ku, || 0 || a || JM, || śrī || RM, || śrīḥ || V/126 Mā, || ★ || Pa, Z oṃ sarvais sahodari saha K

On the name \*prapāṭhaka used for the textual division that is marked here, see my Introduction, §3.1 and especially GRIFFITHS 2003b: 29ff. BHATTACHARYA reports the variant *sahagrāma* for **Ma**, but not for **Mā** where I see it in the reproduction available to me. It seems likely that BHATTACHARYA has confused the readings of **Mā** and **Ma** here.

b. On the meaning of Vedic *grāma-*, see RAU (1997: 203): “The term denotes in the first place a train of herdsmen roaming about with cattle ...; secondly, a temporary camp of such a train ...” (cf. also RAU 1976: 49f.).

c. The expression *saṃvatsarāsya madhyatāḥ* occurs i.a. at TS 7.5.1.4 and ŚBM 9.3.4.18, but note especially TB 1.7.7.5 *ṣaṭ purástād abhiṣekāsya juhōti | ṣād upāriṣṭāt | dvādaśa sāmpadyante | dvādaśa māsāḥ saṃvatsarāḥ | saṃvatsarāḥ khālu vai devānāṃ pūḥ | devānāṃ evā pūraṃ madhyatō vyāvasarpati | tāsya nā kútaś canōpāvyādhō bhavati* ‘He offers six before the anointing, six after. They make twelve. The year equals twelve months, and the year is the stronghold of the gods. It is the stronghold of the gods into whose middle he creeps. He has no vulnerable spots on any side’. The year itself is here equated with the ‘stronghold of the gods’: this expression, as we saw above, is also used to refer to the protective stones placed around the altar ground. I thus take the words *saṃvatsarāsya madhyatāḥ* not literally, but as a complement to *antar*, i.e. right in the middle of the altar ground, which is (homologous to) the year (6.11.5d, 6.12.4b).

d. This is the first attestation of the word *sodarya-* in Vedic, together with PS 8.15.7–8 (in both of which two places the word is trisyllabic), before ĀpGS 2.5.5, BaudhGS 1.4.25 (cf. Aṣṭādhyāyī 4.4.109).

**6.12.6** Only PS ◊ c: MānGS 1.9.8, VārGS 11.7 etc.

prāham agāṃ devapurā	(8)
ya evāsmi sa eva san	(8)
yo mā kaś cābhidāsati	(8)
sa prajāpatim ṛchatu	(8)

I have stepped towards the strongholds of the gods, being just the one that I am. Whoever assaults me, let him hit upon Prajāpati.

prāham agāṃ] **JM RM**, prāham agān **Ku V/126 Pa Ma**, prāhamagā **Mā**, prahaṇagāṃ **K** devapurā] **Or**, devāpurā **K** ya evāsmi sa eva san] **Ku JM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, eye evāsmi sa evasan **RM**, yāyevāsmi sayevasan **Pa**, yevāsmi mevanam **K** || **Or**, *om.* **K** ṛchatu || **Or**, ivagaśchati | **K** [[Edg. °cch°]

Cf. TB 3.7.5.5: *dévāḥ pitarah pitaro devāḥ | yò 'hám ásmi sá sán yaje | yásyāsmi ná tám antár emi | svám ma iṣṭám svám dattám | svám pūrtám svám śrāntám | svám hutám | tāsya me 'gnír upadraṣṭá | vāyúr upáśrotá | ādityò 'nukhyātá | dyáuḥ pitá || pṛthiví mātá | prajāpatir bāndhuḥ | yá evāsmi sá sán yaje* ‘O gods-fathers! O fathers-gods! Being the one I am, I sacrifice. I do not pass over the one to whom I belong (i.e. my father).—I have offered what is mine; I have given (to the gods) that which is mine; I have bestowed (on the priests) that which is mine; I have made the penance which is mine; I have poured as an oblation (into the fire) that which is mine.—Of this (sacrifice) of mine, Agni is the one (i.e. the witness) who sees it; Vāyu, the one (i.e. the witness) who hears it; Āditya, the one (i.e. the witness) who proclaims it.—The father is the Sky; the mother is the Earth; the kinsman is Prajāpati.—Being the one I am, I sacrifice’ (DUMONT 1961: 25f.). Cf. also ŚS 6.123.3–4, MS 1.4.11:60.6ff.

As DUMONT notes (n. 90), according to ĀpŚS 4.9.6 (thus also e.g. BhārŚS 4.13.1) “these formulas should be muttered by the Sacrificer while the first

*pravara* is performed by the Hotar, and also while the second *pravara* is performed by the Adhvaryu” (differently at AB 7.24.3).

A similar application, the Yajamāna speaking while he enters the altar ground, is imaginable for our stanza, and in any case it is striking (and no doubt significant) that the TB text also combines strong emphasis on the true identity of the speaker (*yò ’hám ásmi sá sán yaje . . . yá evásmi sá sán yaje*) with a reference to Prajāpati. Prajāpati recalls *prājāpatya-* in stanza 4: the Yajamāna becomes Prajāpati upon entering the altar ground.

### 6.12.7 Cf. KS 37.15:95.12–14

*asmā <sub>a</sub> si	*pratispaśaḥ	(8)
pāhi	riṣaḥ pāhi dviṣaḥ	(8)
pāhi	+daivyābhiśastyāḥ	(8)
sa	*ma *iha tanvaṃ pāhi	(8)

You are a rock, lying in wait. Protect [me] from the injurer, protect [me] from the foe, protect [me], o divine one, from [his] incantation: thus protect my body here.

\*asmāsi] asmāsi **Or**, asmāsu **K** \*pratispaśaḥ] pratismasaḥ **Or**, pratismaśaḥ **K** riṣaḥ] riṣaḥ **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa Ma**, riṣa **Mā**, riṣaḥ **K** dviṣaḥ] **Or**, dviṣaḥ **K** |] **Or**, *om.* **K** +daivyābhiśastyāḥ sa] daivyā abhiśastiyā sa **Ku V/126 Mā Pa Ma**, daivyābhiśastiyā sa **JM RM**, devyābhiśastyātsa **K** [[Edg. misprint: °śasyāt]] \*ma \*iha] maiva **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, myaiva **Pa** [?], mīya **K** tanvaṃ] **Pa K**, tanavaṃ **Ku JM RM Mā Ma**, tanva{ṃ}vaṃ **V/126**

#### KS 37.15:95.12–14

pāhi dviṣaḥ pāhi riṣaḥ pāhy adevyā abhiśastyā  
asmāsi tanūpānas sa ma iha tanvaṃ pāhi ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *asmāsi*, *sma śaḥ*, *daivyā abhiśastyā*<sup>+</sup>, and *maiva*.

**a.** The text, as edited here, is recoverable from the KS parallel quoted above, in combination with TS 5.7.3.1 *īndrasya vājro ’si vārtraghnas tanūpānaḥ pratispaśāḥ*, the mantra addressed by Adhvaryu and Yajamāna to the stones placed in the cardinal directions (see also under 6.12.8, and cf. STAAL 1983/I: 387).

The **Or**. mss. uniformly transmit the corrupt reading *pratismasaḥ*, and **K** has *pratismaśaḥ*, which means that the error *-spa-* → *-sma-* must have entered the text before \*G. It may have arisen under the influence of sequences *prati sma* which occur in our text at 2.38.2bc, 5.24.4c, and 5.34.5d, but the similarity of the two akṣaras in question in late Gupta script (see e.g. MALLA 1964: 80) is very striking, and we can assume that this played a role as well. Note also the root noun *spas-* which occurred in 6.11.4.

**cd.** BHATTACHARYA rightly suggests that the **Or**. reading *maiva* adopted by him is a corruption for *ma iha*, as the phrase *sa ma iha tanvaṃ pāhi* preserved without corruption in KS is confirmed by KS 37.10:91.11 *ye devās tanūpās stha*

*te ma iha tanvaṃ pāta*. Since  $y \sim h$  and  $\bar{i} \sim ai$  in **K**, its reading *mīya* may even represent an underlying agreement with KS *ma iha*. It seems certain that the contraction *ma iha* → *maiha* must have occurred already before \*G.

Is our mantra directed to the individual stones, or to the altar ground identified as stone? Agni is said to protect from incantation e.g. at ṚV 7.11.3 and 7.13.2. With the above quoted TS mantra 5.7.3.1 and brāhmaṇa 5.7.3.2 (*tanūpā . . . pratispaśāḥ, devapurāḥ . . . tanūpānīḥ*), cf. the *dāivyā tanūpā* mentioned i.a. at ŚS 6.41.3 (PS 19.10.3 *daivyāsas tanūpāvānaḥ*).

It is unclear what form BHATTACHARYA, perhaps just copying his text from EDGERTON (1915: 397), supposed *abhiśastyā*<sup>+</sup> to be. We need of course an abl. sg. from the noun *abhiśasti-*, and the reading *abhiśastyāt sa* of **K** indeed points to an underlying *abhiśastyās sa*, with *-ts-* ← *-ss-* as in 6.12.5ab just above (cf. also 6.9.10b, 17.12.2a, 19.48.13b). The introduction of *-ā a-* for *-ā-* in the Or. mss. is also not unparalleled (cf. 5.21.4cd, 5.26.9a [LUBOTSKY 2002: 100, 117]).

#### 6.12.8 ŚS 5.10.1, TS 5.7.3.1 ◊ cf. KS 37.15:95.15f.

yo 'smān prācyā diśo 'ghāyur abhidāsāt | (P)  
etat sa \*ṛchād aśmavarma no 'stu || (P)

The malicious one who will assault us from the eastern direction: he will hit upon this here, let it be a rock-armor for us.

'smān] Or, sman **K** 'ghāyur] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], ghāyur **JM RM K** abhidāsāt ]  
**Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], abhidāt | **JM**, abhidāsā | **K** etat sa] **Ku JM RM V/126**  
**Mā** [Ma] **K**, eta{cha}tsa **Pa** \*ṛchād] ṛtsād **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma], ṛtsad **Pa**,  
ditsād **K** aśmavarma] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma] **K**, aśmavarma **Pa** no] Or, ṇo  
**K** 'stu] Or, stu **K** ||] Or, om. **K**

#### ŚS 5.10.1

aśmavarmā me 'si yó mā prācyā diśo 'ghāyúr abhidāsāt |  
etat sá ṛchāt ||

#### KS 37.15:95.15f.

etañ sa ṛchatu yo maitasyā diśo 'bhidāsātīndrāgnī maitasyā diśo gopāyatām

#### TS 5.7.3.1

yó naḥ purástād dakṣiṇatāḥ paścād uttaratò 'ghāyúr abhidāsaty etañ só 'smānam ṛchatu

The Taittirīya Śrautasūtras (BaudhŚS 10.24:22.9; VādhŚS 8.18–19; ĀpŚS 17.9.5–6, VaikhŚS 19.6:290.5, HirŚS 12.2.25; BhārŚS unavailable) agree directly with the Brāhmaṇa found in TS 5.7.3.1 itself, and use the (expanded) mantra, corresponding to our 6.12.8–6.13.1, to the accompaniment of the placing of four (or, according to *eke* 'some': five) stones called '*vajriṇī(-bricks)*' in the four cardinal directions (and the center) on the altar-ground. See IKARI & ARNOLD 1983: 621, who translate BaudhŚS 22.5:123.16f.: "As for putting down the Vajriṇī bricks: (the view expressed in) the sūtra [i.e. 10.24:22.9] is

Śāliki's. On this point Baudhāyana says that, standing in front of the peg that marks the place of the hole for the sacrificial post, one should string the bow, draw it and shoot the arrow to the east (i.e., *outside* the Field of Agni. He should run after it and put a stone (at the spot). He should do the same in the south, west, and north" (to which is added in note 14: "The stones placed in the quarters are called Vajriṇī bricks in accordance with the contents of the mantra with which they are put in place"). The Taittirīya sūtras do not prescribe the more elaborate acts associated with the placing of the 4 (in the Taittirīya tradition), 5 (Kāṭhaka tradition), or 6 (AV tradition) stones, as reconstructed in my introduction to 6.11.

There is a generic application, for warding off an enemy, of a *kalpaja* mantra (*yo mā prācyā diśo 'ghāyur abhidāsād apavādīd iṣugūhaḥ*) similar to the ŚS parallel at KauśS 49.7–9 (cf. with Baudhāyana's rite the word *iṣugūhaḥ* in the KauśS mantra). Cf. also KauśS 51.14 *aśmavarma ma iti ṣaḍ aśmanaḥ saṃpātavataḥ +sraktiṣūpary*<sup>20</sup> *adhastān nikhānati* 'With the mantras ŚS 5.10.1–6 he digs into the ground six stones smeared with dregs, on the corners'. Keś. specifies: *ṣaḍ aśmanaḥ saṃpātavato 'bhimantrya tato gṛhakoṇeṣu nikhānati caturaḥ | ekaṃ gṛhamadhya ekaṃ gṛhopari nidadhāti* 'Having spoken the mantras over the six stones smeared with dregs, he then digs four into the corners of the house, one at the center of the house, one he lays on top of the house'. The ritual application of the mantras corresponding to our 6.12.8–6.13.3 as clearly described in the KauśS and by Keś. for a domestic context, is the same *mutatis mutandis* as the application of these mantras on the altar ground.

On the systems of classification underlying the agreements between directions of space of the AV version of 6.12.8–6.13.3 (ŚS 5.10.1–6), and the (dual) deities found in the corresponding mantras of the KS, see BODEWITZ 2000. Cf. also the hymn 7.17 below.

b. On the sign -ṣ- used here in **Pa**, see my Introduction, §2.1.2.4.

**6.12.9** ŚS 5.10.2, TS 5.7.3.1 ◊ cf. KS 37.15:95.16f.

°°° asmān dakṣiṇāyā diśaḥ °°° ||

The malicious one who will assault us from the southern direction: . . . .

asmān] yo 'smān **Ku V/126 RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, yo 'n **JM**, asmāṃ **K** dakṣiṇāyā] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, dakṣiṇā(+ yā) **JM** ||] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, ||<sup>kā</sup> **V/126, om. K**

#### ŚS 5.10.2

aśmavarmā me 'si yó mā dáksiṇāyā diśó 'ghāyúr abhidāsāt |  
etát sá ṛchāt ||

#### KS 37.15:95.15f.

pitāro maitasyā diśo gopāyantu

<sup>20</sup> Ed. *sraktiṣu pary*, em. CALAND 1899: 222 = 1990: 61.

**TS 5.7.3.1***see under 6.12.8*

This and the next stanzas (into hymn 13) are abbreviated in all the mss., both at the end and at the beginning: from here up to and including 6.13.2, **K** each time omits the beginning *yo*, and undoes the abhinihita sandhi. The Or. mss. keep writing *yo 'smān* here, but start to diverge in hymn 6.13: the Northern Or. mss. tend to agree with **K**, while the Central Or. mss. still maintain *yo 'smān*. I suspect that **K** has preserved the text as it was written in \*G, with the maximal abbreviation (see my Introduction, §2.5.2), interestingly crossing the artificial hymn-boundary. The Or. mss. have secondarily, and not consistently, re-introduced the beginning, in accordance with stanza 8 (and 6.13.3).

**6.12.10** ŚŚ 5.10.3, TS 5.7.3.1; cf. KS 37.15:95.17

°°° asmān prāṭīcyā diśah °°° || 12 ||

The malicious one who will assault us from the western direction: . . . .

asmān] **K**, yo 'smān **Or** prāṭīcyā] **Ku JM V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, prāṭīcyā **RM Mā**  
|| 12 ||] || ṛ 10 || 12 || **Ku**, || ṛ 9 || 12 || **JM**, || 12 || ṛ || **RM Pa**, || 12 || ṛ 10 || **V/126**  
**Mā**, Z 2 Z **K**

**ŚŚ 5.10.3**

aśmavarmā me 'si yó mā prāṭīcyā diśó 'ghāyúr abhidāsāt |  
etāt sá ṛchāt ||

**KS 37.15:95.15f.**

savitā maitasyā diśó gopāyatu

**TS 5.7.3.1***see under 6.12.8*

BHATTACHARYA does not report the reading *prāṭīcyā* for **Mā**.

### 6.13. For safe entrance onto the altar ground.

I follow the majority of the Or. mss. in giving this hymn 15 mantras (our 13 is omitted in the two closely related Northern Or. mss. **V/126** and **Mā**; **K** omits 12–14: that these are indeed all omissions is proven by the parallel ŚS 5.10.1–6).

The application of the first 3 mantras, which belong with the last 3 of 6.12, has been discussed under 6.12.8a. As to mantras 10–15, besides the fact that their number (2 times 3) corresponds with the six-fold rows of 6.11.10+6.12.1 and 6.12.8–6.13.3, we may also note (as done under 6.12.1), that the PS arrangement of these 6 exclamations again places two feminine terms (twice *pr̥thiviyai svāhā*) in the center, precisely as in my reconstruction of 6.11.10+6.12.1 (~ ŚS 5.9.8) as given under 6.12.1. Of course, this correspondence may be merely chance, and the mantras are too generic to be of any help for settling the question of the ritual context in which we are to see them. Cf. KS 37.16:96.2ff. on the application of its exclamations *pr̥thiviyai svāhā* etc. (KS 37.15:95.7f.). The ŚS version of the mantras 10–15 is applied in a *sarvabhaisajya* rite at KauśS 28.17ff.

Different is the situation with mantras 4–9: these have their fullest parallel in TS, where the corresponding mantras are given to be employed during the Aśvamedha (thus also the mantras contained in MS 3.12.7, 3.12.8, KS V.11.1–6 and V.1.6 etc.), and this seems indeed to be their original context (although they have found an alternative employment in later texts, e.g. at BaudhGS 2.8.36, BhārGS 3.13:81.6ff.). They have no parallel in either ŚS or KS (cf. the table given before 6.11, p. 132). There is thus reason to assume that these 6 exclamations did not belong in our hymn originally. Their insertion was facilitated by the simplicity of these exclamations, which follow strictly the order and sense of our 6.12.8–13.3. But it is to be noted that our 6.13.8, without parallel in the YV Aśvamedha mantra-sections, must have been added to make the sequence six-fold: if we follow this assumption, it also allows us to infer that PS 6.13 once had the regular number of 9 stanzas, where it now has 15.

Our ms. **K** adds a label *iti rākṣoghñasūktam* (to be read, with EDGERTON 1915: 398, *iti rākṣoghñasūktam*) at the end of this ‘hymn’. This label seems, however, to refer forward to 6.14, unless it intends to link our hymn, with its Agnicayana connection, to Agni Rakṣohan (GONDA 1959a: 91).

#### 6.13.1 ŚS 5.10.4, TS 5.7.3.1 ◊ cf. KS 37.15:95.17f.

°°° asmān udīcyā diśaḥ °°° ||

The malicious one who will assault us from the northern direction: . . . .

asmān] **V/126** **Mā** **Pa** **Ma** **K**, yo smān **Ku**, yo ’smān **JM** **RM** ||] **Ku** **JM** **RM** **Mā** **Pa** [**Ma**], ||<sup>kā</sup> **V/126**, om. **K** ||<sup>note</sup> °ḥ a°]

**5.10.4**

aśmavarmā me 'si yó móḍicyā diśó 'ghāyúr abhidāsāt |  
etāt sá ṛchāt ||

**KS 37.15:95.15f.**

mitrāvaruṇau maitasyā diśo gopāyatām

**TS 5.7.3.1**

see under 6.12.8

BHATTACHARYA, who only had access to two (Northern) Or. mss., prints [*yo*] 'smān. Indeed, the Northern Or. mss. agree with **K** in omitting *yo* (and then reading *asmān* without abhinihita sandhi), against the Central mss. **JM**, **RM** and **Ku** (which last ms. omits the avagraha). **K** had already started omitting *yo* (by way of abbreviation) after its first appearance in the fully written mantra 6.12.8: see my comm. on 6.12.9.

**6.13.2 ŚŚ 5.10.5 (& ĀpŚŚ 17.9.6?)**

°°° asmān dhruvāyā diśaḥ °°° ||

The malicious one who will assault us from the fixed direction: . . . .

asmān] **Pa Ma**, yo 'smān, **JM RM V/126**, yo smān, **Ku Mā**, asmān **K** dhruvāyā] **JM RM K**, dhṛvāyā **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]** ||] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, ||<sup>kā</sup> **V/126**, om. **K** [[note °ḥ y°]]

**5.10.5**

aśmavarmā me 'si yó mā dhruvāyā diśó 'ghāyúr abhidāsāt |  
etāt sá ṛchāt ||

**ĀpŚŚ 17.9.6**

. . . yo na upariṣṭād aghāyur abhidāsaty etaṃ so 'śmānam ṛcchatu

On the meanings, respectively, of *dhruvā diś* and *ūrdhvā diś* in a six-fold classification of the quarters of space, see BODEWITZ 2000: 30–34.

The full text of ĀpŚŚ 17.9.6 runs: *indrasya vajro 'si vārtraghnas tanūpā naḥ pratīspāṣaḥ | yo na upariṣṭād aghāyur abhidāsaty etaṃ so 'śmānam ṛcchatu iti madhye pañcamīm eke samāmananti*. For this association of the center with what is called 'above' (*upariṣṭāt*), see BODEWITZ 2000: 33. Note also the clear connection between the *dhruvā diś* and the center which is found in the KauśŚ application of this mantra quoted, with Keś.'s explanation, under 6.12.8. A connection with this 'center above' seems to be found rather for the 'fixed direction' (*dhruvā diś*) than for the 'upward direction', which is why I hesitantly quote the ĀpŚŚ *sakalapāṭha*-mantra here, and not under 6.13.3: it might also be quoted there, with reference to the fivefold classification with *ūrdhvā diś* as last item, just as in the ĀpŚŚ context, at AB 6.32.20 and TS 7.1.15.1 (see BODEWITZ 2000: 30).

**6.13.3** ŚS 5.10.6 (& ĀpŚS 17.9.6?); cf. KS 37.15:95.18

yo 'smān ūrdhvāyā diśo 'ghāyur abhidāsāt | (P)  
 etat sa \*ṛchād aśmavarma no 'stu || (P)

The malicious one who will assault us from the upward direction: he will hit upon this here, let it be a rock-armor for us.

'smān] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, smān **Mā K** ūrdhvāyā] **K**, ūrdhvāyā **Or** diśo] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, di{śaḥ}śo **RM** 'ghāyur] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, ghāyur **JM RM K** abhidāsāt] **Ku RM Pa [Ma] K**, abhidāsāt **JM**, abhidāsāt **Mā V/126** ||] **Ku RM V/126 Pa Mā [Ma]**, |{|} **JM, Z K** etat] **Or**, tat **K** \*ṛchād] ṛtsād **Or**, ritsād **K** aśmavarma] **Or**, aśmavarma **K** no 'stu] **Or**, no stu **K** ||] **Or**, (+ |) **K**

**ŚS 5.10.6**

aśmavarmā me 'si yó mordhvāyā diśo 'ghāyúr abhidāsāt |  
 etát sá ṛchāt ||

**KS 37.15:95.15f.**

bṛhaspatir maitasyā diśo gopāyatu

See the comm. on the preceding mantra. BHATTACHARYA does not report the **Mā** error *abhidāsāt* (also found in its sister ms. **V/126**).

**6.13.4** TS 7.1.15.1 etc.

prācyai diśe svāhā || (P)

To the eastern direction, hail!

prācyai] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, prācyē **V/126**, prācyai **K** [[Edg. mistakenly prā°] ||]  
**Or**, (+ |) **K**

**TS 7.1.15.1**

prācyai diśe svāhā

**6.13.5** TS 7.1.15.1 etc.

dakṣiṇāyai diśe svāhā || (P)

To the southern direction, hail!

**TS 7.1.15.1**

dākṣiṇāyai diśe svāhā

**6.13.6** TS 7.1.15.1 etc.

pratīcyai diśe svāhā || (P)

To the western direction, hail!

pratīcyai] **Ku JM V/126 Mā** [Ma], prat{i}icyai **Pa**, praticyai **RM**, praticai **K** || **Or**,  
(+ |) **K**

**TS 7.1.15.1**

pratīcyai diśe svāhā |

**6.13.7** TS 7.1.15.1 etc.

udīcyai diśe svāhā || (P)

To the northern direction, hail!

udīcyai] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, udīcyai **RM** ||] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma]  
**K**, || udīcyai diśe svāhā || **JM** [*note repetition*]

**TS 7.1.15.1**

údīcyai diśe svāhā |

**6.13.8** Only PS

dhruvāyayai diśe svāhā || (P)

To the fixed direction, hail!

dhruvāyayai] **JM RM K**, dhṛvāyayai **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] diśe] **JM RM V/126 Mā**  
**Pa** [Ma] **K**, diśe{di} **Ku**

**6.13.9** TS 7.1.15.1 etc.

ūrdhvāyayai diśe svāhā || (P)

To the upward direction, hail!

ūrdhvāyayai] **K**, ūrddhvāyayai **Or**

**TS 7.1.15.1**

ūrdhvāyayai diśe svāhā

This, the fifth item in the order of TS (our 6.13.8 finding no parallel there), is followed there by a (6th) summarizing exclamation: *digbhyāḥ svāhā*. TS then adds a 7th item: *avāntaradiśābhyāḥ svāhā*, which is obviously connected with the 7th item that is added at ŚS 5.10.7 to what is a first sixfold row (i.e. 6.12.8–6.13.3) in PS: *aśmavarmā me 'si yó mā diśām antardeśébhyo 'ghāyúr abhidásāt | etát sá ṛchāt*.

**6.13.10** ŚS 5.9.1

dive svāhā || (P)

To heaven, hail!

**ŚS 5.9.1**

divé svāhā ||

Cf. ĀpŚS 17.9.7 (employed immediately after the *sakalapāṭha*-mantra discussed by me under 6.13.2): *pr̥thivyai tvāntarikṣāya tvā dive tveti tisro lokeṣṭakāḥ*. KS again has mantras corresponding to the following exclamations in its section 37.15:95.7ff. Only the ŚS parallels are quoted here because only ŚS and PS agree in having six items (or rather:  $2 \times 3$ ).

**6.13.11** ŚS 5.9.3

antarikṣāya svāhā || (P)

To the intermediate space, hail!

ŚS 5.9.3

antārikṣāya svāhā ||

**6.13.12** ŚS 5.9.2

pr̥thivyai svāhā || (P)

To earth, hail!

pr̥thivyai svāhā ||] Or, om. K

ŚS 5.9.2

pr̥thivyái svāhā ||

**6.13.13** ŚS 5.9.6

pr̥thivyai svāhā || (P)

To earth, hail!

pr̥thivyai svāhā ||] Ku JM RM Pa [Ma?], om. V/126 Mā K

ŚS 5.9.6

pr̥thivyái svāhā ||

BHATTACHARYA does not report the omission of this mantra in his ms. **Mā**, omitted also in **Mā**'s sister ms. **V/126**, while he does report such omission for **Ma** (the sister ms. of **Pa**, which shows no omission here): I conclude that BHATTACHARYA's apparatus has confused **Ma** for **Mā**.

**6.13.14** ŚS 5.9.4

antarikṣāya svāhā || (P)

To the intermediate space, hail!

antarikṣāya svāhā ||] Or, om. K

ŚS 5.9.4

antārikṣāya svāhā ||

**6.13.15** ŚS 5.9.6

divé svāhā || 13 ||

(P)

To heaven, hail!

divé] **Or**, deve **K** || 13 ||] || 13 || ṛ 15 || **Ku**, || ṛ 15 || 13 || **JM**, || ṛ || 13 || **RM**, || 13 ||  
 || ṛ 14 || **V/126 Mā**, || 13 || ṛ || **Pa**, Z 3 Z iti rākṣoghnasūktam Z Z **K**

**ŚS 5.9.5**

divé svāhā ||

## 6.14. Against noxious creatures.

The hymn's contents make it likely that the label given after PS 6.13 in **K**, folio 94b, line 5 *rakṣoghnasūktam* (thus slightly emended by EDGERTON 1915: 398) refers forward to this hymn.

It contains several previously unattested words and word-forms, and is here and there difficult to understand. At two places (4a, 6d), the text cannot be constituted with certainty. Important phraseological and thematic parallels can be found especially in the Atharvavedic hymn ŚS 8.6 / PS 16.79–81. The first five stanzas seem to be built up mostly of two-word pādas, each with a noun and a qualifying adjective, but even here it is in some cases hard to see which is the noun, and which is the attribute.

### 6.14.1 Only PS

mahākaṇṭhaṃ kariṣajam	(8)
+ūbadhyādam anāhutim	(8)
oṣṭhaḥ kokamukhaś ca yas	(8)
tān ito nāśayāmasi	(8)

The one with a large neck, born from dung, the one which is not a proper offering, eating bowel-contents — and the *koka*-faced Lip (?): these we cause to vanish from here.

kariṣajam] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], kariṣajam **JM**, kariṣajam **K** +ūbadhyādam] ubadhyādam **Or**, abaddhyādas **K** [[Edg. °m a°] anāhutim |] anāhutim | **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma], {u}anāhutim | **Mā**, anāhutam | **K** oṣṭhaḥ kokamukhaś] **Or**, oṣṭhaḥ kokhamukhaś **K** yas tān] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [Ma], yaḥstān **V/126**, yastāy **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K**

**abc.** On the various kinds of worms distinguished in Āyurvedic literature, see MEULENBELD 1974: 622–625. Although none of the names used in this stanza seem to recur in the medical texts, our *kariṣaja-* is to be compared with Āyurvedic names in °*ja-* (*kuṣṭhaja-*, *majjāja*, *jarāyuja-*): cf. also MEULENBELD p. 286 (with n. 5) on worms arising from faecal matter. The word *mahākaṇṭha-* may be compared with *prṭhumuṇḍa* (perhaps “the proglottides of species of tapeworms of the genus *Taenia*”, MEULENBELD p. 623), and *ūbadhyād(a)-* with *antrāda-* (tapeworm, *ibid.*).

On the form and meaning of *ūvadhya-/ūbadhya-*, cf. KÖLVER 1972: 118–120 & 123f. I may add to KÖLVER's data: JB 2.267, ŚBM 12.9.1.2, ĀśvGS 4.8.28, KauśS 48.16–19 (all mss. -*b-*) and 50.19 (most mss. -*b-*). The AV attestations are, to be precise: ŚS 9.4.16, 9.7[12].17, 11.3.12, 12.5.39 (each time with nearly uniform ms. support for -*b-*), and PS 16.25.6 (**K**: corrupt), 16.139.15 (**K**: -*v-*), 16.145.1 (**K**: -*v-*), (PSK) 17.29.11 (**K**: corrupt). As I have noted in my Introduction, §2.1.2.4, the Or. mss. cannot be used to establish the correct reading, with

*b* or *v*, of words whose etymology is uncertain. Since **K** unmistakably reads with a *b* here, and since both ŚS and KauśS have *b* consistently, I adopt BHATTACHARYA's emendation \**ūbadhyādam*. Cf. ŚS 9.4.16c (PS 16.25.6c) *ūbadhyam asya kīṭēbhyah* 'his bowel contents [they maintained] for the *kīṭā* worms'.

The word *ānāhuti-* 'not a proper offering, not constituting an offering' is attested e.g. at TS 5.4.3.2, TB 3.8.8.2, ŚBM 13.1.3.6, ĀpŚS 9.6.8. At RV 10.37.4 and 10.63.12, GELDNER translates 'Mangel an Opfern'. Alternatively, we might take the **K** reading *anāhutam* seriously, and consider it to be an error for, or by-form (cf. PW I, 749) of *anāhūta-* 'uninvited'.

I take *ca* as coordinating the second hemistich with the first (see KLEIN 1985/I: 222ff.). Consequently, the Vedic hapax *kokamukha-* (attested also as a name of Kālī in verses appearing in some mss. after 6.22.16 in the Mahābhārata: crit. ed. vol. 7, Appendix I, p. 710 ln. 16) is hesitantly taken as qualifying the noun *oṣṭha-*, not as a separate noun. The significance of the word *kokamukha-* (cf. Āyurvedic worm names like *dvimukha-*, *sūcīmukha-*, MEULENBELD p. 625) is doubtful. On the animal name *kōka-*, meaning 'wolf' in some contexts, and denoting the Cakravāka bird in others, see LÜDERS 1942: 60 = 1973: 527, who discusses the stanzas ŚS 8.6.2 and 5.23.4 (PS 16.79.2 and 7.2.4), and concludes: "Vielleicht war *kōka* wirklich der Name eines Wurmes". Note that the *koka-* is here mentioned close to the *gṛdhra-* (2e), just as we find *gṛdhraḥ kōkaś ca* at ŚS 5.23.4 (≈ PS 7.2.4), and *kōkayātu-* in one stanza with *gṛdhrayātu-* at RV 7.104.22.

#### 6.14.2 Only PS

rāmadantam avadalaṃ	(8)
prahālam ahināsikam	(8)
upavartaṃ balāhakaṃ	(8)
khelaṃ gardabhanādinam	(8)
gṛdhraṃ hast,yāyanaṃ	(7)
tān °°°	

The dark-toothed Splitter, the snake-nosed Striker, the Approacher (?) *balāhaka*, the *khelā* that brays like an ass, the vulture that moves like an elephant: these do we cause to vanish from here.

rāmadantam avadalaṃ] arāma{va}dantamavadalaṃ **Ku**, arāmadantam avadalaṃ **JM RM Mā [Ma]**, arāmadāntam avadalaṃ **V/126**, arāmadantavadalaṃ **Pa**, rāmadantasodanaṃ **K** prahālam] **Or**, prahāram **K** ahināsikam] ahināsikaṃ **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]** **K**, aināsikaṃ **JM** |] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ṃ u°]] upavartaṃ] upavarttaṃ **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, u{·}pavarttaṃ **RM**, upavṛttaṃ **K** khelaṃ] **Or**, khenam **K** gardabhanādinam] **RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]** **K** [+ ]], gardabhanādi{kam}nam **Ku**, gardabhanādi{kam}{·}nam **JM** gṛdhraṃ] gaṛdhraṃ **Or**, gṛddhraṃ **K** tān ||] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, tāni ||kā **JM**, tāni || **RM**, tyā (+ |) **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *arāmadantam* and *upavarttaṃ*.

a. Although it is easier to assume a deletion in one branch of the transmission, rather than assuming a seemingly inexplicable insertion in the other, sense and meter favor the reading *rāmadantam*, perserved almost faultlessly in **K**, against *arāma°* in the Or. mss.

The word *avadala-* appears also at BhārŚS 1.6.11 in RAGHU VIRA’s *editio princeps* (reprinted in RAGHU VIRA 1981), but KASHIKAR chooses the reading *avalayaṃ* (translated ‘not requiring twirling’), above the variant reading *avadalaṃ* of some of his manuscripts. A variant *avidala-* is found at VārŚS 1.2.2.6 and HirŚS 1.3.3 (comm.: *avilagnāny asaṃśliṣṭāny dalāni yasya tat*), parallel to the BhārŚS place, and ĀpŚS 1.6.9. I take the word *avadala-*, which thus seems to be hapax, as derived (with ‘colloquial’ *-l-* for *-r-*, see LUBOTSKY 2002: 155) from *ava-dar<sup>(i)</sup>*. BHATTACHARYA’s suggestion (with a view to the **K** reading *odanam*) that the original text was *avadanam* cannot be correct.

b. Another ‘colloquial’ form may be retained in the reading *prahālam* of the Or. mss., but see my introduction §2.8 (V). Patañjali mentions an existing word *ahinas-* (Mahābhāṣya on Aṣṭādhyāyī 5.4.118, ed. KIELHORN vol. II, p. 443, l. 3), the underlying form from which our otherwise unattested *ahināsika-* is derived. PS 17.35.1 [PSK 17.29.8] *athāhīnā āśvatthir abravīn na tād brāhmaṇaṃ nīndāni yād enam aśṛṇon ned iṣṭāpūrtena vi bhavānīti* ‘Now, the serpent-nose (?) Āśvatthī said, “I ought not blame a Brahmin that he heard it. Otherwise I might be deprived of the benefit accruing from (my) good deeds”’ (text and translation BHATTACHARYA 2004) is probably the source of Patañjali’s example: the mss. available to me for that passage (**JM V/122 Ji4, K**) all confirm BHATTACHARYA’s *ahinas-*, which is however surely to be emended to *ahinās-* on the strength of our *ahināsika-* and Patañjali’s testimony.

c. The translation ‘approacher’ for the hapax *upavarta-* (with regular doubling of the following consonant to *-tt-* in the Or. mss.) is little more than a guess. We expect an active meaning (hence not, more or less with **K**: *upavṛttam*) parallel to *avadala-* and *prahāla-*.

The meaning of the word *balāhaka-* or *valāhaka-* is unclear here. Besides occurring in the list of *meghanāmāni* at Nighaṇṭu 1.10, and being mentioned in the Kāśikāvṛtti (cf. RAU 1993, item 0736 — one may doubt whether this is really a ‘vedisches Zitat’) on Aṣṭādhyāyī 6.3.109, it is attested only in post- (or very late) Vedic sources, where it seems to mean ‘rain-cloud’ (as in the Nighaṇṭu), e.g. AVPariś 24.5.1, 61.1.15. But in Suśruta, Kalpasthāna 4 (ed. GUPTA vol. II, p. 265, l. 7), it is one among a host of very poisonous ‘*darvīkara*’ snakes. The word is spelt with *b-* in **K** (on *-b-* = *-v-* in the Or. mss., see my Introduction, §2.1.2.4). Contrast PW VI, 808: “Die Schreibart mit *va* ist die richtigere, da das Wort ursprünglich identisch mit *varāha* ist”.

d. The few attestations of the word *khelā-/khelā-*, probably referring to a kind of bird, have been listed under 6.8.4a. The compound *gardabhanādīn-* occurs elsewhere only at ŚS 8.6.10 (≈ PS 16.79.10) *yé śālāḥ parinīṣṭyanti sāyāṃ gardabhanādīnaḥ | kusūlā yé ca kukṣilāḥ kakubhāḥ karūmāḥ śrīmāḥ | tān oṣadhe tvām gandhēna viśūcīnān vi nāśaya* ‘They who dance around the dwellings in

the evening, making donkey noises — they that [are] *kusūlas* (granaries) and *kukṣilās* (paunchy), exalted (*kakubhā*), *karūmas*, *srīmas* — these, O herb, with thy smell do thou make to disappear scattered’ (WHITNEY).

The meaning of *hastyāyana-* is not clear: is the wobbling gait of the vulture compared to that of an elephant? Cf. ALI & RIPLEY (1968: 313) on the Indian Scavenger Vulture: “invariably keeping to the neighbourhood of human settlements . . . . Here seen perched on mounds, ruined buildings and the like, or sauntering about on the ground — body held horizontal like a duck’s and with a ludicrous, waddling ‘goose-stepping’ gait — looking for food”. If we may identify the *gr̥dhra-* as Indian Scavenger Vulture (apparently a “very silent” species) on this basis, it is at least possible that the *khela-* was a different species of Vulture, its ‘braying like an ass’ referring to the noise it produces. ALI & RIPLEY record for the Black or King Vulture (p. 297) that it produces a “raucous ‘roaring’ during copulation”. For the Indian Griffon Vulture (p. 302), and the Indian Whitebacked Vulture (p. 309): “Raucous, strident, creaky screeches or ‘laughter’ *kakakaka* while one bird is supplanting another at a carcass or roost. Long-drawn grating noises, as of a hoe being scraped over a cement floor, uttered by female during copulation”.

### 6.14.3 Only PS

<sup>+</sup> pramṛṣyādinam abhyamaṃ	(8)
bhīmahastaṃ marīmṛṣam	(8)
trastākṣam mṛdvaṅgulim	(8)
nakhograṃ dantavīryaṃ	(8)
tān °°°	

The Grabber that eats what must be groped for, the Groper with a horrible hand, the Shuddering-eyed one with soft fingers, the Nail-strong one with force in the teeth: these do we cause to vanish from here.

<sup>+</sup>pramṛṣyādinam] pramu{khyā}śyādinam **Ku**, pramuśyādinam **JM V/126 Mā**, pasuśyādinam **RM**, pramuśyādinam **Pa**, pramuśyāditam **Ma** [°nam?], pramṛṣyādinam **K** abhyamaṃ] **Or**, atyamaṃ | **K** [note] bhīmahastaṃ] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, bha(→ bhī 1)mahastaṃ] **RM** marīmṛṣam | marīmṛṣam | **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], marīmṛṣam || **RM**, sarīspaṃ (→ NĀḤ [?]) marīmṛṣam | **K** trastākṣam] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], tastākṣam] **RM**, bhrastākṣam] **K** mṛdvaṅgulim] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K** [+ ]], mṛdvaṅgulim] **JM**, mṛddhamgulim] **RM** dantavīryaṃ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], vīryaṃ] **JM**, daṃcavīryaṃ] **K** tān ||] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], tāni | **RM**, tāṃ] **K** [om. ]]

a. BHATTACHARYA emends <sup>+</sup>*pramṛṣyādinam*, referring to ŚS 5.9.6. Correctly, the reference should be to PS 5.9.6c and 5.9.7c, where we read *yā garbhān pramṛṣanti* ‘[Sadānuvās] who grope for embryos’. Does BHATTACHARYA assume a compound (cf. VWC-Saṃhitās IV, 2193 n. e)? This seems inevitable, because *ādin-* is attested independently only once, and only very late: ĀpDhS 2.28.5

(Aṣṭādhyāyī 8.4.48 cannot be taken as attestation of the word *ex composito*). As second member of a compound, *-ādín-* is attested early, in *kevalādín-* ‘eating alone’ (RV 10.117.6), although hardly thereafter (cf. e.g. *aviṣādin-* i.a. at TĀ 1.19.1).

As to the first member of the apparent compound, all the mss. point to its ending in a suffix *-ya*. With a view to RV 1.104.8b *má naḥ priyá bhójanāni prá moṣṭh* (cf. also ŚBM 14.1.3.16), we might assume a gerundive from of *pra-moṣṭi* ‘to steal’. This would mean that we could refrain from emending, and adopt the reading *pramuṣya-* as preserved in several Or. mss.

But it seems more attractive to follow BHATTACHARYA, who — against his usual principle — rejects the Or. readings *pramuṣya-/pramuśya-*. The support, as adduced by him from PS 5.9.6–7 for his slight emendation to (elsewhere unattested) <sup>+</sup>*pramṛśya*, can be strengthened by referring to ŚS 8.6.6ab / PS 16.79.6ab *anujighrāṃ pramṛśántaṃ kravýádam utá rerihám* ‘the after-snuffling, fore-feeling, and the much-licking flesh-eater’ (WHITNEY); ŚS 8.6.18a / PS 16.80.9a *yás te gárbhaṃ pratimṛśát* ‘who shall grope after your embryo’. Cf. also ĀpMP 2.13.12f (= HirGS 2.3.7f, ĀgnivGS 2.1.3:47.14, BhārGS 1.32:24.5); ŚBM 1.2.2.13 (cf. 3.3.4.6, 3.8.1.6); TS 4.5.7.1. All these places support assumption of a form derived from *pra-marś*, presumably a gerundive: that which ‘must be groped for’ is the woman’s embryo. On the type of demon that ‘gropes for’ or ‘licks’ embryos, see 7.11.4, 5, 9, and 7.19.5 below.

The derivative *abhyama-* from *abhy-am* ‘to grab hold of, attack’ seems to be unattested elsewhere (see HOFFMANN 1969: 195f. = 1975: 290f.), but the form, as Elizabeth Tucker suggests to me, may be an exact counterpart of Young Avestan *auui.ama-* / *a<sup>i</sup>βiiāma-* (on which, cf. DE VAAN 2003: 33).

b. Cf. PS 19.35.10ab *ut te hārdiṃ śocayāmi hastenābhimarīmṛśat* ‘your heart I cause to dry up, groping over [you] with [my] hand’.

c. This attestation of the *-ta* participle *trasta-* is presumably older than that at ŚBM 2.4.1.14. The compound *trastākṣa-*, which is hapax, is related in meaning to ŚS 2.8.5 *sanisrasākṣá-*, and of course to *parystākṣá-* at ŚS 8.6.16 / PS 16.80.7. See also my commentary on 7.13.7b, below.

#### 6.14.4 Only PS

†paryanyam† abhipāpadam	(8)
jigīṣamāṇam rūpakam	(8)
atho śalalyam śevalam	(8)
tān °°°	

The constantly approaching . . . , the phantom that tries to win (food); and also the slimy one with quills: these do we cause to vanish from here.

†paryanyam†] Or, paryandam K abhipāpadam] Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma], abhipāpadam Mā, ibhipāpadam | K [note ]] jigīṣamāṇam] Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma], ji{·}gīṣamāṇam Mā, jigīṣmāṇo K rūpakam ]] ṛpakam | Or, rūpakam | K śalalyam] Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K, śa(→ kha 4)lalyam V/126 śevalam] JM RM V/126

Mā Pa [Ma], śe(+ va 5)laṃ Ku, śeḥva K tān ||] Ku RM V/126 [||<sup>kā</sup>] Pa [Ma], tāni  
 ||<sup>kā</sup> JM, tāni Mā, tāṃ (+ |) K

BHATTACHARYA edits *paryanyam*.

a. The Or. reading *paryanyam*, accepted by BHATTACHARYA, is doubtful: dividing *pary anyam* does not yield an appreciable sense or syntax, nor does a bahuvrīhi compound *pary-anya-*. I have considered the possibility of a derivative *paryanya-* from *pary-an<sup>i</sup>* ‘to breathe around’ (cf. Patañjali, Mahābhāṣya on Aṣṭādhyāyī 8.4.19–20, ed. KIELHORN vol. III, p. 459, l. 22). Taking the K reading *paryandam* seriously, we might alternatively try to connect a word *paryanda-* with the basically unattested root *and* meaning ‘to bind’ (Dhātupāṭha *bhūvādayaḥ* nr. 63 in BÖHTLINGK’s 1887 ed.), from which the obscure *āndā-* (VSM 30.16 / VSK 34.3.3, TB 3.4.12.1) may derive, or we may even compare *paryundāna-* in stanza 9, and emend *paryundam*. Although it would be easy to emend *parjanya*, it seems hardly imaginable that the god of rain, who is always mentioned in positive terms (e.g. PS 11.14.8–9), would appear here as a noxious creature.

I take *abhipāpada-* as an *-a-* derivative from a previously unattested intensive formation of the root *pad*, of SCHAEFER’s type ‘1a’ (1994: 25), cf. KNOBL 2007: 68 n. 122. It is to be compared with *marīmṛśa-* in the preceding, and *sanisrasa-* in the next stanza, and another previously unattested intensive formation *roruha-*, as found in stanza 9. Since the reading and meaning of the noun it qualifies are not clear, it is hard to see what nuance the verb *abhi-pad* carries here: it has a clearly negative meaning at RV 10.71.9c.

b. On the meaning of the desid. stem *jīgīṣa-*, see NARTEN 1986: 121ff. Cf. RV 1.163.7ab *ātrā te rūpām uttamām apaśyaṃ jīgīṣamāṇam iśā ā padé gōḥ* ‘There I saw your highest form, trying to win nourishment in the Cow’s track’. Cf. also PS 13.3.3a *pāpaka pāparūpaka* and ŚS 11.9[11].15a *śvānvatīr aparāso rūpakā utārbude | antaḥpātré rérihatīm riśām durṇihitaiśīṇīm | sārṃvās tā arbude tvām amātrebhyo dṛśé kurūdārāmś ca prá darśaya* ‘The dog-like Apsaras, and also the Rūpakās (phantoms), the plucking sprite, that eagerly licks within the vessel, and her that seeks out what has been carelessly hidden, all those do thou, O Arbudi, make the enemies see, and spectres also make them see!’ (BLOOMFIELD 1897: 125). BLOOMFIELD comments, p. 636: “The word *rūpaka* suggests the root *rup*, ‘injure’”. AiGr. offers two interpretations: ‘in angenommener Gestalt (v. *rūpā-*) erscheinend’ (II/1, 105 & II/2, 522) or as (pejorative) diminutive (II/2, 516), but the barytone accent of ŚS *rūpaka-* forms an important argument against the latter interpretation (AiGr. II/1, §45h).

c. Although it is not elsewhere quotable, we must accept here a word *śalalya-* (derived from *śalala-*, as attested at PS 5.9.1): an accusative from *śalalī-* would have to scan *śalalyam* metrically, and the word is moreover accompanied by a clearly non-feminine adjective form: *śevalam* ‘slimy’. On this word, cf. KUIPER 1991: 44. It is attested elsewhere only at ŚS 1.11.4cd / PS 1.5.4cd (≈ ĀpMP 2.11.20) *āvaitu pṛśni śevalaṃ śūne jarāyṃ āttave* ‘Let the

speckled slimy afterbirth come down, for the dog to eat [it]’.

**6.14.5** Only PS ◊ **b**: PS 16.79.1d = ŚS 8.6.1d

taṇḍam agretuṇḍikam	(7)
aliṃśam uta vatsapam	(8)
dāmagranthiṃ sanisrasam	(8)
araṇyeyam cārm <sub>i</sub> yeyam	(8)
tān ° ° °	

The Beater with a snout in front — the *aliṃśa* and the *vatsapa*; the Slipping one whose knot is as [tight as] that of a cord — the one belonging to the jungle, and the one belonging to *ármas*: these do we cause to vanish from here.

tuṇḍikam aliṃśam uta] **Or**, tuṇḍikadalyaṃśa uta **K** vatsapam |] vatsapaṃ | **Or K** dāmagranthiṃ] **Or**, dāmagranthyam **K** sanisrasam] **Ku Pa [Ma] K**, sani{śra}srasam **JM**, sanisrasaṃm **RM**, saniśrasam **V/126 Mā** araṇyeyam] **Or**, udraṇyedaṃ **K** cārm<sub>i</sub>yeyam] **Ku JM Mā Pa [Ma]**, cārmeyam **RM**, cārm<sub>i</sub>yeyam **V/126 [?]**, cārusyan **K** tān ||] **Ku RM V/126 [||<sup>kā</sup>]** **Mā Pa [Ma]**, tāni ||<sup>kā</sup> **JM**, tāṃ **K** [*om.* |, but note °ṃ i°]

BHATTACHARYA edits *agre tuṇḍikam*.

**a.** The noun *taṇḍa-* (cf. Class. Skt. *vitaṇḍā-*) could be derived, in the same way as *abhy-am-a-* (st. 3), from the otherwise unattested root *taṇḍ* meaning ‘to beat’ (Dhātupāṭha *bhūvādayah*, nr. 300 in BÖHTLINGK’s 1887 ed.), but must in any case be related to PS 11.12.2 / ŚS 19.32.2 *tāḍa-* ‘blow’ etc. (on this last word, cf. EWAia I, 640f.). It occurs also at PS 7.11.9 below.

In view of the complete syntactic parallelism between the distichs **ab** and **cd** (with ... *ca* ... parallel to ... *uta* ...), and in view of the rather common occurrence of compounds with an inflected first member *agre*<sup>o</sup> (see AiGr. II/1, 210), I take *agretuṇḍikam* as a (hapax) compound.

Note that *tuṇḍéla-* / *tuṇḍila-*, probably meaning the same as *tuṇḍika-* here, is attested in close proximity with *taṇḍa-* at ŚS 8.6.17 / PS 7.11.8 (see below). The word *túṇḍika-* occurs also at ŚS 8.6.5ab: *yáḥ kṛṣṇáḥ keśy ásurā stambajā utá túṇḍikāḥ* ‘the Asura that is black, hairy — the tuft-born and the snouty one’, for whose parallel PS 16.79.5b the mss. seem to point to *taṇḍikāḥ*. Cf. also, perhaps, the obscure pādas PS 19.25.4ab<sup>21</sup> *aḍadve kam aḍadve tuṇḍe na maśīkatam*. Epic Sanskrit attests a word *tuṇḍāgra-*, referring to birds (Mahābhārata 1.280.20, 4 App. \*704.26 etc.).

**b.** The word *aliṃśa-*, of obscure meaning, is attested only in the identical pāda **d** of ŚS 8.6.1 / PS 16.79.1, where it qualifies a *durṇāman-* demon. The word *vatsāpa-* is also attested at PS 15.18.3: *andhācīm asitācīm ulūkhalasya budhnena | avaitaṃ vatsapaṃ jahi* ‘The darky (f.) one, the blacky (f.) one, strike down this *vatsapa* with the bottom of a mortar’.

<sup>21</sup> Quoted in a tentative collation of **K** with Or. mss. **V/122, J14**.

c. The word *dāmagranthi-*, which probably refers to a (type of) snake, further occurs only twice, as a proper noun — a pseudonym for Nakula — in the Mahābhārata, at 4.18.32 and 4.30.19, passages from the Virāṭaparvan where Nakula and the other Pāṇḍavas are residing incognito at king Virāṭa’s court. These passages offer support to my interpretation of *dāmagranthi- sanisrasa-* as referring to a (kind of) snake, because the reversal of roles which the Pāṇḍavas undergo during their exile seems in the case of Nakula to be reflected in a reversal of names also. Nakula means ‘Mr Mongoose’, and his pseudonym gains much poignancy if we understand it to mean ‘Mr Snake’: the proverbial enemy precisely of the mongoose. The compound has been taken as a bahuvrīhi here, but might equally well be a tatpuruṣa, in which case it is the name (‘Knot-of-cords’), rather than the attribute.

The significance of the word *sanisrasa-* here (see also my discussion of 6.11.5d) is not certain: although I have not been able to find examples of such a usage, it seems possible that Vedic had an idiom identical to English ‘slipping of a knot’. Alternatively, one might also think of snakes lying in wait in trees, to drop on their prey, and translate: ‘the Dangling one’ or ‘the Falling one’.

d. On the meaning of *árma-*, and its link with the *áraṇya-*, see GRIFFITHS (forthc.). The derivatives *armyeya-* and *araṇyeya-* were not previously attested.

#### 6.14.6 Only PS ◊ e: cf. PS 16.79.6c, ŚS 8.8.6c

idaṃ yaj jānukeśavaṃ	(8)
rakṣaś carat,y āsuraṃ	(8)
bahiḥ prayutam ichati	(8)
†aṃsūn pāṃsyūṃś† ca keś,yān	(8)
+arāyāñ +chvakiṣkiṇas	(7)
tān ito nāśayāmasi	(8)

The knee-hairy Asurian demon that roams here, that seeks out the absent-minded one; the Arāyas that are . . . , that are . . . , and on the hair, the ones that are *śvakiṣkīn*: these do we cause to vanish from here.

idaṃ] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, {pramuṣyādinam abhyamaṃ ||} idaṃ **V/126**, idi **K** yaj jānukeśavaṃ] **Or**, yajñānakeśavaṃ **K** āsuraṃ] **Or**, āhutaṃ **K** bahiḥ prayutam] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, bahiprayUtam **JM**, bahiḥpraTyutam **RM**, barhiḥ(*sec. m.* → hiḥ)predam **K** [*note* °ḥ p°] ichati || **Or**, iśchati (+ |) **K** †aṃsūn pāṃsyūṃś†] aṃsūn, pāṃsyūṃś **Ku** [*sic*], aṃsūna pāṃsyūś **JM**, aṃsūn, pāṃsūṃś **RM**, aṃsūn, pāsyūṃś **V/126 Pa**, aṃsūn, pāṃsyūṃś **Mā [Ma]**, asyauna pāSyō(*sec. m.* → syo)ś **K** keśyān] **JM Mā [Ma]**, keśyā(+ ŃKĀ 1)n **Ku**, keśān **RM**, keśYān **V/126**, keśyān{·} **Pa**, gejñān **K** +arāyāñ] arāyān, **Or**, urāyāṃ **K** +chvakiṣkiṇas] chakiṣkitas **Or**, śukihyanas **K** tān] **Or**, tāy **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *vahiḥ prayutam*, *aṃsūn pāṃsyūṃś* (without underlining!), and +*chvakiṣkitas*.

**ab.** The word *jānukēśava-* is a hapax: in connection with pādas **bc**, it seems syntactically impossible to read two words *jānu keśavam*. I take it to be a compound of the type ‘arm-strong’ (cf. *nakhogra-* in 3d).

The reading *āhutam* in **K** is hard to explain. But the Or. reading *āsuram* fits too well to consider the possibility that it is unoriginal.

**c.** On this usage of the verb *eṣ*, see my commentary on PS 6.8.6b. Cf. also *svapantam icha* ‘seek out the sleeping [man]’ at 5.27.6, and *svapantam icha puruṣam ... akovidam/† akasvalam* ‘seek out the sleeping man, who is unexperienced/whose eyes are unopened’ at 20.9.4/20.44.2 [PSK 20.8.4/20.42.2] (GRIFFITHS 2004, item 15). On the meaning of *práyuta-* ‘absent-minded, careless’, see the elaborate RV materials collected by SCARLATA 1999: 438ff. It seems to correspond in sense with *pāka-* at 6.8.6b. The particular phrase *prayutam ichati* seems to be restricted to PS: see stanza 9 below (*prayutaiṣaṇa-*), and 7.13.14 *yā gachanti janamjanam ichantiḥ prayutam bahu | tāsām + śvanvatīnām indro api + kṛtac chiraḥ* ‘They who go from man to man, eagerly seeking out the unsuspecting person: of those dog-accompanied [Apsarases] Indra shall cut off the head’ (pādas **ab** identical with 15.19.12ab).

There is a rather obvious phonetic correspondence between *prayutam bahu* in this last mantra, and the problematic text of our present pāda. BHATTACHARYA rightly rejects the **K** reading *barhiḥ*. Since *vahi-* or *vahiṣ-* are not Vedic words, I assume BHATTACHARYA intended *bahiḥ*. If this is indeed the correct reading, the word could be taken to stand in a syntactic connection with *carati* (‘roams outside’: cf. Mahābhārata 4.24.5 *bahiścara-* ‘spy’), or it may be taken with *prayuta-*, as I do here. I assume it means the same as simply *prayuta-*. As a compound, we would rather expect *bahiṣprayuta-*. A rather attractive, but perhaps too audacious, alternative would be to assume that the readings of the 7.13.14/15.19.12 pāda and ours are not only phonetically similar, but originally actually phraseologically identical, and to make the strong emendation: *\*bahu*, adv. (assuming corruption already at the stage of the archetype \*G).

**d.** I assume that this pāda contains three adjectives agreeing with *arāyān* in the next. The transmitted readings of the first two words are corrupt. On *kéśya-* ‘belonging to the hair’, cf. ŚS 14.2.68cd *ápāsyāḥ kéśyaṃ málam ápa śīrṣaṇyāṃ likhāt* ‘[the comb] shall scratch away the defilement of the hair of her, away that of her head’ (WHITNEY). It seems likely that the first corrupt words were derivatives of body parts. The solution for the first word may be available in RV 1.191.7ab *yé aṃsyā yé ángyāḥ sūcīkā yé prakañkatāḥ* ‘The stinging [insects] on the shoulders, the ones on the limbs, the ones that are *prakañkatá*’: an emendation *aṃsyān* ‘on the shoulders’ seems worth considering. Several AV passages, then, use the word *parśu-* ‘rib’ (PS 2.84.4–6), or its derivative *pārśva-* (PS 4.7.2–3), next to *aṃsa-* ‘shoulder’ in parallel phrases, and we might hence think of an emendation *pārśvyān* (cf. VSM 39.9 *antahpārśvyá-*). Since, however, we would need an *-ū-* in the ending to explain the deformation of *aṃsyān* to *aṃsyūn* (etc.), and the assumption of another *-(i)ya-* derivative besides *\*aṃs(i)ya-* and *keś(i)ya-* would lead to metrical problems, we might rather consider an unat-

tested vṛddhi derivative *pārśu-* ‘on the ribs’, whence *pārśūn?* Such a derivation seems to be without parallel. I therefore refrain from emendation.

e. Note the odd sandhi *-n ch-* that the Orissa mss. explicitly point to, using the virāma, while **K** points to *-n/-ñ ś-*. A similar case of *-n ch-* in the Or. mss., with *-n ś-* in **K**, is to be found at 10.7.3b. Cf. my Introduction, §2.8 (F).

On the word *arāya-*, and its metrical behavior, see my commentary on 6.8.6a. The phrase *arāyāṃ śvakiṣkīṇaḥ* at ŚS 8.6.6c (PS 16.79.6c) was rendered by WHITNEY: ‘the niggards, the dog-*kiṣkins*’. For a very tentative interpretation of *śvakiṣkīn-*, see HENRY 1894: 55: ‘ayant l’avant-bras d’un chien’ (cf. class. Skt. *kiṣku-*): if this interpretation has any merit, we may compare the wild ‘dog-footed’ (*śvāpad-*) beasts mentioned below at 7.10.4c. Note, alternatively, that the Dhātupāṭha (*curādayaḥ*, BÖHTLINGK 1887: 81\* nr. 146) contains a root *kiṣk* (with several variants), in the meaning ‘to injure’. Cf. also the word *śvanvatī-* qualifying noxious Apsarases at PS 1.89.2, 2.27.6, 7.13.1–14, ŚS 11.9.15.

The corruption from *-ṇa-* to *-ta-* which the Or. mss. have in *chvakiṣkīṇas* is hard to explain. **K**’s *-na-* lends sufficient support to my assumption that PS originally also had *-ṇa-* here, as it does at 16.79.6c (for other cases of *-ṇ-* :: *-n-* in **K**, see 6.22.9c, 19.2.8c, 19.10.5a+b).

#### 6.14.7 Only PS

yaḥ +kumārāṅ janasyātti	(8)
taruṇān dāsa āsuraḥ	(8)
arāyaḥ keśy aghalo	(8)
yo janān hantṛy +atti ca	(8)
tam ito nāśayāmasi	(8)

The Asurian fiend who eats a man’s young boys, the hairy, dreadful Arāya who slays and eats men: him do we cause to vanish from here.

yaḥ] **Or**, yaḥ **K** +kumārāṅ] kumārān, **Or**, kumārāṃ **K** janasyātti] **Or**, jarasyāmi **K** taruṇān] tarṇān, **Or**, tṛṇāṃ **K** dāsa āsuraḥ ] **Or**, dāsāsura [[om. ]] **K** arāyaḥ] **JM RM**, (+ a)rāyaḥ **Ku**, rāyaḥ **V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]** **K** [[note °ḥ k°]] keśy aghalo] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, keśy aGHalo **V/126**, keśyākilana **K** janān hantṛy] janān, hantṛy **Or**, hvanānahantṛv **K** +atti] atī **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, ati **RM**, akti **K**

BHATTACHARYA reads *rāyaḥ*, *atī*, *aghalo*.

ab. On the sandhi *-ñ j-*, see my Introduction, §2.8 (I). The standing phrase *kumāra- taruṇa-* occurs in PS also at 1.100.4 and 3.20.6. On the ‘Asurian Dāsa’, presumably some kind of demonic being here, cf. the materials collected by PARPOLA 1988: 210f., 217f., 227f.

c. All the Northern Or. mss. agree with **K** in having metrically deficient *rāyaḥ*, while the Central Or. mss. **JM RM** (and, *post correctionem*, **Ku**) have preserved the correct text.

The word *aghala/akhala-* ‘dreadful’ is attested at PS 5.3.8 (*gh* in **Or**, *kh* in **K**), and at 16.29.10 (*aghanā* in **Or**, *khalā* in **K**), which corresponds to ŚS 8.8.10

(all mss. *aghalā*). The word is also found in the KauṣB (ed. LINDNER 2.2:4.23 *aghalā*-, ed. ŚREEKRISHNA SARMA 2.3.4 *akhala*-), where it denotes Rudra, and at JB 2.66, JB 2.254, JUB 1.5.1+4 (all *akhala*-), and JB 2.266–267 (*aghalā*-): on the meaning of the word, and especially on the Jaiminiya passages, see OERTEL 1942: 31f. = 1994/II: 1531f. I see no possibility to establish the authentic form of the word with certainty, and tentatively follow the Or. mss.

**d.** Although I do not know any identical errors in **K**, it seems that the cluster *-kt-* in **K** may well be a writing mistake for original *-tt-* (cf. also *-tt-* → *-m-* in pāda **a**), and I see no reason to doubt that the archetype \*G simply read *atti*. The Or. reading *atī* is hard to explain.

#### 6.14.8 Only PS

hirākṣo nāma geh <sub>i</sub> yo	(8)
<sup>+</sup> <sub>a</sub> rāyo nāma sūrtahā	(8)
tam ito nāśayāmasi	(8)

The one called Vein-eyed, who is in the house; the one called Arāya, who is a slayer of that, which (or: him, who) is shone upon by the sun: him do we cause to vanish from here.

hirākṣo] **Or**, hirājño **K**    <sup>+</sup><sub>a</sub>rāyo] rāyā **Or**, rāya **K**    sūrtahā] sūrtahā **Or**, sūntaha **K**  
 [[Edg. mistakenly sūnuha]]    ||] **Or**, **Z** **K**

BHATTACHARYA reads *gehyorāyānāmasūrtahā*, without underlining.

**a.** The word *hirākṣa-* is a hapax. Presumably this pāda refers to a bloody-eyed demon, thought to live in or about the house. The word *gēhya-* is very rare, occurring elsewhere only at PS 7.11.3 (below), at ṚV 3.30.7, and in the formula *nāmas tālpyāya ca gēhyāya ca* (TS 4.5.9.1 etc.).

**b.** BHATTACHARYA's reading is not comprehensible to me; if he understands the sequence of akṣaras to stand for *<sub>a</sub>rāyānām asūrtahā*, one must object that the gen. pl. of *arāya-* would be *arāyāṇām*, while the mss. unanimously give a dental nasal. Rather than restore such a gen. pl. with its proper retroflex, I prefer to emend to *arāyo nāma*, following the syntactic pattern of the preceding pāda, although one would really expect *arāyaḥ sūrtahā nāma*, with a particularizing name after the generic class name *arāya-*.

The word *sūrtahan-* is also a hapax. Its meaning is quite uncertain, and the text as edited is therefore suspect. On Vedic (*a*)*sūrta-* '(un)besont', see EWAia II, 794. The few other attestations of this word all qualify *rājas-* 'space': ŚS 10.3.9/PS 16.63.8, and ṚV 10.82.4 (cf. TS 4.6.2.2 etc.), with important notes in OLDENBERG 1909–12/II: 284f.

#### 6.14.9 Only PS

vitūlaṃ bhasvam ākhidaṃ	(8)
vanakrośaṃ ca roruham	(8)
āmādaṃ prayutaīṣaṇaṃ	(8)

paryundānaṃ paridravaṃ	(8)
vṛkasya *nyañcaṃ gañgaṇaṃ	(8)
tān ito nāśayāmasi    14	(8)

The chewing, robbing Vitūla, and the ever climbing (?) Forest-Shriek(er); the eater of raw [flesh], that seeks out the absent-minded [person]; the one running around, wet all over; the deep howling of a wolf: these do we cause to vanish from here.

vitūlaṃ bhasvam] **Ku** [**Ma**], vitūlamBHasvam **JM**, vitūlaṃ mbhasam **RM**, vitūlaṃ bhas{m}vam **V/126**, vitūlaṃ bhasmam **Mā**, vitūlaṃ bhasvam **Pa**, nitūlaṃbhakṣam **K** roruham || roḥaṃ | **Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [**Ma**], ro(+ ṛ 2)haṃ | **V/126**, roruham | **K** āmādaṃ] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, amādaṃ **Mā** prayutaiṣaṇaṃ] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā Pa** [[pūrvamātra element of °tai° is lacking] [**Ma**], prayatīṣaṇaṃ **K** paryundānaṃ] paryuundānaṃ **Ku** [[note two vowel diacritics], paryuŪmdānaṃ **JM**, paryūdānaṃ **RM**, paryuṃdānaṃ **V/126 Mā Ma**, śary{u}ūmdānaṃ **Pa**, paryamḍānaṃ **K** paridravaṃ] **Or**, paridravaṃ **K** vṛkasya \*nyañcaṃ] vṛkasyanDaṃca **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**?], vṛkasyamdañca **JM RM**, vṛkasyanṛca **K** gañgaṇaṃ] **Ku RM**, gaṃgaṇaṃ **JM**, gaṃgaṇaṃ **V/126 Mā**, kañgaṇaṃ **Pa Ma**, gaṃgrāṇaṃ **K** tān] **Or**, tāy **K** || 14 ||] || ṛ 9 || 14 || **Ku JM**, || ṛ || 14 || **RM**, || 14 || ṛ (+ 9) || **V/126**, || 14 || ṛ || **Mā Pa**, Z 4 Z **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *bhasvam*, *nyamca*.

**a.** The name *vitūla-* seems to refer to a demonic dog, as it does at ĀpMP 2.16.8 (HirGS 2.7.2). The word *bhasva-* is a hapax (**K** *-kṣ-* can be explained as a graphic error for *-sv-*). I take it to be a *-va-* derivative, nomen agentis, from the root *bhas* (cf. AiGr. II/2, 867f. §700b).

The nomen agentis *ākhidá-* is found also at MS 2.9.8:127.3, KS 17.15:258.11, KapKS 27.5:117.15 [2:137.9], and at these places, as well as at TS 4.5.9.2, VSM 16.46, VSK 17.7.5, we also find the apparently synonymous participle *ā(k)khidánt-*. Other forms derived from *ā-khed* (see GOTŌ 1987: 127 n. 143) in mantra texts are to be found at ṚV 4.25.7, ŚS 6.102.2 / PS 19.14.2, ŚS 4.22.7, PS 3.36.1, 5.9.8, 16.73.5, TS (cf. also ṚV 6.61.1 *ācakháda*, on which form see KÜMMEL 2000: 152f.).

**b.** The name *vanakrośa-* is a hapax, and it cannot be determined whether *krośa-* is here to be taken as nomen agentis or actionis. Cf. the attestation of the verb *kroś* in the related context of ṚV 10.146.4 *gām anḡáíṣá á hvayati dārv anḡáíṣó ápāvadhīt | vásann arañyānyāṃ sāyám ákrukṣad íti manyate* ‘“But some one is calling his cow! But some one has cut down a tree! [But some one] has shrieked!”’, thinks an inhabitant of the forest at night-fall’. Also previously unattested is the intensive formation *roruha-* of *roh* ‘to climb’ (or ‘to grow’?), belonging to SCHAEFER’s type ‘2c’ (1994: 32). On the striking use in this hymn of several intensive nominal derivatives in *a-*, see my remark under 4a.

**c.** Cf. ŚS 8.6.23 (PS 16.81.5) *yá amám māṃsam adanti páuruṣeyaṃ ca yé kravīḥ | gárbhān khādanti keśavás tán itó nāśayāmasi* ‘They who eat raw meat, and who the flesh of men, the hairy ones [that] devour embryos — them we

make to disappear from here' (WHITNEY). On *prayutam eṣ*, see my commentary on 6c.

d. The participle *paryundāna-*, and the verbal compound *pary-od* from which it is derived, are previously unattested.

e. BHATTACHARYA does not report the variant *vr̥kasyandaṃca* that I find in **Mā**, and find confirmed by all the Or. mss. available to me. I am confident that BHATTACHARYA's *yaṃca* . . . is a misreading for *ndaṃca*. The Oriya akṣara *-nda-* can rather easily be confused with *-ya-* as well as *-nya-*, and it is hard to say in some cases whether the Or. mss. intend *-nya-* or *-nda-*: BHATTACHARYA's reading of **Ma** may thus also be incorrect.

However, it appears that the tentative *-nDa-* which I give in my apparatus does represent an original Or. reading *-nya-* (as given by BHATTACHARYA), and this is confirmed by the reading in **K** (*-nr̥-* and *-nya-* are very similar in Śāradā). I conjecture here an acc. m. sg. attestation of the adjective *nyāñc-*, in the sense 'low, deep [of sounds]', for which meaning I refer to ŚBM 11.4.2.5–6 (see PW IV, 333). The final anusvāra seems to have been lost already at the stage of \*G. The word *gaṅgaṇa-* is attested only in PS (5.34.5, 7.2.9, 16.145.12, 17.15.5 [PSK 17.15.7]), although it must be compared with JB 3.185 *gaṅgaṇi-* (see HOFFMANN 1952: 255f. & 1952/1956: 60 [1975: 36f. & 1976: 354]) and *agaṅgūyat* at PB 14.3.19. As is proven by 17.15.5ab [PSK 17.15.7], the word is masculine: *yāsāṃ ghoṣaḥ saṃgatānāṃ vr̥kāṇāṃ iva gaṅgaṇaḥ* '[The Sadānuvās], whose noise, when they are joined together, is like the howling of wolves'.

## 6.15. To Indra, for sustenance.

This hymn offers important additions to our knowledge of the divine figure of Indra (RENOU 1946: 123). As RENOU wrote (p. 129):

Le fait est que l’Atharvaveda abonde, au sujet d’Indra, en traits singuliers, qui laissent deviner l’existence d’un répertoire mythique assez développé. Sous la monotonie relative du grand culte et de l’hymnologie traditionnelle, il y avait place pour des données plus familières, dont les origines comme l’évolution ultérieure nous échappent dans une large mesure.

The role of Indra (as Śakra, Śacīpati) here in connection with agriculture, is important because his association with agriculture is not well-known from other Vedic sources. I may simply continue quoting RENOU (*ibid.*) at length:

Le rôle d’Indra comme dieu de la fécondité, rôle perceptible par mille détails, provoque en particulier la mention du dieu comme “maître du sillon” *śīrapati* [ŚS] VI. 50, 1, au cours d’une répartition “agricole” des fonctions divines . . . . Le mouvement générale du vers—qui est cité et utilisé PGS. III. 1, 6—imite ṚV. X. 85, 9, et dans le ṚV. se trouvent déjà des mentions analogues, cf. l’épithète *urvarāpate* et le vers IV. 57, 7: références MEYER *Trilogie* 3 p. 154 ubi alia.

Ailleurs Indra est appelé “le convoyeur des semences” *bījasyābhyāvadhā* VIII. 11, 2 [PS] (et cf. VIII. 18, 1 [PS]?); le tas de grains ou plutôt sans doute la meule mise en réserve pour le chef (BARRET *JAOS*. XLVI p. 41) est citée et exaltée sous le nom d’indrarāśi XII. 3 [PS(K)]. C’est pour Indra qu’on apporte l’abondance dans le grenier VIII. 11, 8 (et cf. 9) [PS] . . .

RENOU refers several times to the PS: the reference to PS(K) 12.3 corresponds to BHATTACHARYA’s PS 11.10–11. I may add the hymn 8.18, and KauśS 106.7. One is further reminded of Indra’s later role as rain god (GRIERSON 1923).

### 6.15.1 Only PS

yaś ca bhūmā yā ca sphātir	(8)
yo <sub>ṁ</sub> rjā yo rasaś ca te	(8)
harāmi śakra *tām ahaṃ	(8)
tvayā Prattāṃ śacīpate	(8)

What opulence, and what abundance, what nourishment and what sap you have: that [abundance] I carry off, o Śakra, Lord of Power, granted by you.

bhūmā] Or, bhaumā K sphātir] Or, sphāti K yorjā] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma],  
 yojā JM, yayorjā K rasaś ca] Or, rasasya K harāmi] Or, havāmi K śakra] Ku  
 RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, śa(+ kra 3) JM \*tām ahaṃ] tām ahaṃ Ku V/126 Mā  
 Pa [Ma], tā ahaṃ JM, tām {·}ahaṃ RM, tām han K tvayā] JM RM V/126 Mā Pa  
 [Ma], tvayā{ṁ} Ku, taya K ||] Or, om. K

BHATTACHARYA edits *tām ahaṃ*.

**cd.** Because the syntagma *sphātīm har* is found at PS 2.91.4a *sphātihārī rasahārīḥ* ‘You [Kimīdins] who carry off abundance, who carry of the sap’, at 4.13.6ab / ŚS 2.25.3ab *arāyam asṛkṣpāvānaṃ yás ca sphātīm jhūrṣati* ‘the blood-crinking Arāya, and the one that tries to carry off [our] abundance’, and at PS 4.13.7b *yā naḥ sphātīm upāharān* ‘[the Kaṇvās] who shall take for themselves the abundance’, I assume that the ambiguous form *tām* must stand for *tām* (acc. f. sg.). On Indra providing agricultural abundance, cf. PS 11.10.2: *indraráśīm mītrāvaruṇāv aviddhaṃ nir akṛntatam | prasūtam indrenogreṇa*<sup>22</sup> *brāhmaṇānām asat pituḥ* ‘Mitra and Varuṇa have cut out Indra’s heap, [like] a pierced arrow-head. It shall be the food of Brahmins, sent on by the fearsome Indra’.

### 6.15.2 Only PS

kṣetrātkṣetrād ā harāmi	(8)
sphātīm sarvām śacīpate	(8)
tvayāhaṃ vṛtrahan prattam	(8)
ā harāmi gr̥hāṃ upa	(8)

I fetch all abundance from every field, o Lord of Power. I fetch what has been granted by you, o Vṛtra-slayer, towards the homestead.

kṣetrātkṣetrād] **Or**, kṣetrātkṣetrād **K** [[Edg. mistakenly twice °tr°] harāmi] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, (+ ha)rāmi **Ku** sphātīm] **Or**, sphāntī **K** sarvām śacīpate] **K**, sarvāmśacīpate **Ku**, sarvāmśchacīpate **JM RM**, sarvāśchacīpate **V/126 Mā**, sarvāñchacīpate **Pa [Ma: °pate ‘worm-eaten’, Bhatt.]** tvayāhaṃ] **Or**, tayāhaṃ **K** vṛtrahan] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, vṛtrahana **RM**, vṛttrahaṃ **K** [[Edg. mistakenly °tr°] prattam] **Or**, pattam **K** [[Edg.: patum] harāmi] **Or**, harāmi | **K** [[note || gr̥hāṃ] **K**, gr̥hāṃ **Or** upa] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, ntama **Pa [!]** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *sarvāñ chacīpate*.

**bc.** The **Or.** readings with *ch-* seem to have resulted from the mistaken interpretation of the form of *sarva-* as acc. m. pl., just like *tām* (→ *tām̃*) seems to have been misinterpreted in both **K** and the **Or.** mss. in the preceding stanza. The reading *prattam* here seems suspect: may we consider emending *prattām*, as in 1d?

**d.** On the meaning of *gr̥hāḥ* (pl.), see RAU 1957: 37 (‘Anwesen’). On the usage of *ā-har*, cf. PS 2.12.5 (≈ ŚS 2.26.5 / RVKh 2.9.5), and also PS 11.10.3ab *nainam aśnīyād abrahmaṇo na gr̥hān pra haret svān | tṛṣṭam viṣam iva taimātam indrarāśīḥ khale śaye* ‘No Non-brahmin may eat it, or carry it forth to his own homestead: as pungent Taimāta-poison, Indra’s heap lies on the threshing floor’.

<sup>22</sup> The printing error *indrenogreṇo* has been corrected by BHATTACHARYA (n.d.-1, p. iv).

## 6.15.3 Only PS

yas te sītābhagaḥ kṣetre	(8)
yā +rāddhir yac ca śīyate	(8)
atho yā niṣṭhā te kṣetre	(8)
tāṃ ta ādiṣi brahmaṇā	(8)

What fortune of produce you have in the field, what success, and what [wealth] falls [down], and also what growth you have in the field: that of yours I have taken by means of [this] spell.

yas te] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, {SA}yaste **JM** sītābhagaḥ] **Or**, sītābhagā **K** kṣetre] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, kṣete **RM**, kṣetre | **K** [[note |; Edg. mistakenly °tr°] yā +rāddhir] yārāddir **Ku JM RM Pa**, yārādvir **Mā V/126 Ma**, ārāddhir **K** yac ca śīyate] yac ca śīyate **Or**, yaścaśīyate **K** [[thus R-V; misprint Edg. yaśśaci°] niṣṭhā te] **K**, niṣṭhāyate **Or** kṣetre] **Or**, kṣetre **K** [Edg. mistakenly °tr°] tāṃ ta ādiṣi] **Ku Mā Pa [Ma]**, tāṃ ta ādiṣi **JM**, tānta ādiṣi **RM**, tāntayādiṣi **V/126**, itvāhārsi **K** brahmaṇā] thus **Or K** [[vr°]

BHATTACHARYA edits *śīyate* and *niṣṭhāyate*.

a. Cf. RV 4.57.6 (≈ ŚS 3.17.8) *arvācī subhage bhava sīte vāndāmahe tvā | yāthā naḥ subhāgāsasi yāthā naḥ suphālāsasi* ‘Become aimed in this direction, o good-fortuned furrow: we praise you, so that you shall be good-fortuned for us, so that you shall be full of good fruit for us’. Even though this meaning is not registered in the dictionaries, in later texts *sītā-* must sometimes be rendered ‘agricultural produce’, cf. Kauṭilya, Arthaśāstra 2.15.2 *sītādhyakṣopanītaḥ sasyavarṇakāḥ sītā* ‘The various kinds of grains brought in by the Director of Agriculture constitute agricultural produce’ (KANGLE 1972: 122). It seems attractive to assume this meaning here also. The compound *sītābhaga-* is attested elsewhere only in the difficult stanza PS 11.15.2 *mo \*asmākam<sup>23</sup> ugrāḥ saṃrabdhās tanvaḥ kiṃ canāmamat | rāyaspoṣaṃ śunāsūrā atho sītābhagaś ca yaḥ* ‘And let, o fearsome united ones (?), nothing hurt our body, [or] the increase of wealth, Śuna and Śira, and the fortune of produce’.

b. The word *rāddhi-* is specifically connected with agriculture at ĀpDhS 2.16.14 *saptame karṣe rāddhiḥ* ‘[If he offers the Śrāddha] on the seventh day, he will be successful in agriculture’ (OLIVELLE). It otherwise occurs in the AV Saṃhitās only in the more general contexts of ŚS 10.2.10, 11.6.22 / PS 16.60.2, 16.84.2. On the meaning of *rāddhyate*, see KULIKOV 2001: 263ff. The verb occurs in agricultural context in a slightly corrupt hemistich quoted at KauŚS 20.6, and in another mantra at KauŚS 33.10.

On the basis of the Or. mss., BHATTACHARYA accepts a form *śīyate* ‘is bound’ (Aṣṭādhyāyī 6.4.66) that seems rather unlikely in this context. On the

<sup>23</sup> BHATTACHARYA follows the mss., and accepts an elided *a-*: *mo [']smākam*. But the result of *mā u* should be *praḡhya*. Cf. my Introduction, §2.8 (C). Should, in view of the meter, an emendation *\*māsmākam* be considered here?

verb form *śīyate*, as correctly preserved in **K**, see KULIKOV 2001: 325ff. For the meaning α ‘(be)fall’ (expressing “spontaneous obtaining of goods, prosperity, success”), cf. TB 3.7.14.4–5 (etc.) *parṇám vānaspāter iva || abhī naḥ śīyatām rayāḥ | śacātām naḥ śacīpātīḥ* ‘Like a leaf [falls] from a tree, let wealth fall to us, let the Lord of Power accompany us’. This place clarifies what is left implicit in our pāda, and agrees with it in specifically addressing Śacīpati (cf. stanzas 1 and 2).

c. That BHATTACHARYA cannot be followed in adopting the unmetrical Or. reading *niṣṭhāyate*, and that **K** has preserved the right reading was seen correctly by KULIKOV 2001: 327 n. 1016.

The meaning of *ni(h)ṣṭhā-* is somewhat problematic. At RV 3.31.10cd (*vī ródasī atapad ghósa eṣām jāté niṣṭhām ádadhur góṣu vīrān*) and 9.110.9c (*yūthé ná niṣṭhá vṛṣabhó ví tiṣṭhase*), GELDNER takes it as ‘Verteilung’, but this was rejected by OLDENBERG (1909–12/I: 241), who follows PW IV, 249 and takes it as an adjective ‘hervorragend’. It seems to me, however, that the RV passages (probably also 10.80.1b *karmaniṣṭhā-*, on which cf. OLDENBERG 1909–12/II: 283, and 5.1.6c/8.2.9a *puruniṣṭhá/á-*) can be dealt with satisfactorily if we derive the word from *niḥ-sthā* ‘to grow forth, arise (German *ent-stehen*)’: cf. RV 1.182.7a *vṛkṣó niṣṭhito mádhye árṇasaḥ* ‘the tree arisen in the middle of the ocean’, 8.1.33d *nalá iva sáraso nír atiṣṭhan* ‘they arose as reeds from a pool’. This derivation is obviously fitting in the present context as well. Cf. also my discussion under 6.4.4.

#### 6.15.4 Only PS

yat khale yan mayāre	(7)
yad goṣṭhe yac ca śevadhau	(8)
atho yat kumbh;yāṃ śāye	(8)
tasya te rasam ā dade	(8)

What [grain lies] on the threshing floor, what in the grain basket, what in the cow-pen, and what in the hoard, and also what lies in the pot: from that of yours I am taking the sap.

yan mayāre] **Or**, nasayāde **K** śevadhau] **Ku JM RM Pa [Ma] K**, sevadh(AU) **V/126**, sevadhau **Mā** atho yat kumbhyāṃ śāye] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, athāyatkumbh(→ bhy)āṃ śāye **Pa**, athokussyāṃse **K** dade] **Or**, dadhe **K**

BHATTACHARYA does not report the variant *sevadhau* that I find in **Mā**, and find confirmed in its sister ms. **V/126**.

a. On the PS hapax *mayāra-* ‘grain basket’, which occurs only in PS (5.30.3, 8.18.11, 11.11.6, 19.38.13), see LUBOTSKY 2002: 133ff.

d. LUBOTSKY (p. 134) translates this pāda ‘of you do I take the strength’, assuming the common syntactic construction (JAMISON 1992) in which the pronoun *tá-* is combined with a personal pronoun: *tasya te* would then refer here together to the *yat* clauses that precede. The context (3a) here makes it

clear that *te* still refers to Indra, and *tasya* alone takes up the relative clauses of the first three pādas.

### 6.15.5 Only PS

ūrjā yā te niruptasya-	(8)
-ūrjā yāvahatasya te	(8)
ūrjāṃ te piṣyamāṇasya-	(8)
-ūrjāṃ piṣṭāt ta ā dade	(8)

Your nourishment which belongs to what has been scattered, your nourishment which belongs to what has been threshed — I am taking your nourishment which belongs to what is being ground, your nourishment from what has been ground.

ūrjā] JM V/126 Pa [Ma] K, urjā Ku Mā, uparjā RM niruptasyorjā] niṣṭasyorjā Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], niṣṭasyoYArjā JM, niṣṭasyorjā K yāvahatasya] JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, yāvahat{e}asya Ku || Or, om. K ūrjāṃ te] V/126, ūrjānte Ku JM RM Pa Ma, urjāṃ te Mā, ūrjāṃ te K piṣyamāṇasyorjāṃ] Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma], piṣyamāṇasyorjāṃ Pa, paṣyamāṇasyorjāṃ K ta ā] Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma], ta {ā}(→ yā) V/126, tā K dade] Or, dadhe K || JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, ||<sup>kā</sup> Ku

a. Cf. PS 11.10.6 *ya indrarāśiṃ nirvapād vardhayāt khalamānyāḥ | sphātiṃ ca khalyāṃ gṛhṇātu gavāṃ ca bahu puṣyatu* ‘Let him take hold of the abundance of the threshing floor and prosper in lots of cattle, who shall scatter Indra’s heap, shall increase the measurements (?) of the threshing-floor’. *nir-vap* seems to refer here to the scattering of harvested grains on the threshing floor.

### 6.15.6 Only PS

°° te niruptasya-	(8)
-ūrjā yāvahatasya te	(8)
ūrjāṃ te pacyamāṇasya-	(8)
-ūrjāṃ pakvāt te °°	(8)

Your nourishment which belongs to what has been scattered, your nourishment which belongs to what has been threshed — I am taking your nourishment which belongs to what is being cooked, your nourishment from what has been cooked.

te] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, ūrjāṃ te JM niruptasyorjā] niṣṭasyorjā Or, niṣṭasyorjā K [Edg. prints ni°] yāvahatasya] JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma], yāvahat{e}asya Ku Mā, vātāasya K ūrjāṃ te] JM, ūrjānte Ku V/126 Pa Ma, urjānte RM Mā, ūrjāṃ te K pacyamāṇasyorjāṃ] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], pacyamāṇasyorjāṃ JM, piḥyamāṇasyorjāṃ K pakvāt te || Ku Mā Pa [Ma], pakvāt ta ā dade || JM, pakvāt{e}a(+ādade) || RM, {yā}pakvāt te || V/126, pakvā te [om. ] K

On the modes of abbreviation used here, see my Introduction, §2.5.2.

cd. We cannot say with certainty whether the forms from *pac* here belong to *pácyate* ‘ripens’ or *pacyáte* ‘is cooked’, but the order of the stanzas (with forms from *peṣ* in the preceding stanza) suggests the latter. KULIKOV 2001: 116 assumes that these two stanzas were used to accompany “the preparation of the ritual porridge”: there seems to be no evidence for this assumption. The *te* possessives must be taken to refer to Indra, as before (cf. my interpretation of *tasya te* in 4), rather than translating *te niruptasya* etc. ‘of you who have been scattered’.

### 6.15.7 Only PS

ūrjā yā te +prañaddhasya-	(8)
-ūrjā yā mathitasya te	(8)
ūrjāṃ te duhyamānasya-	(8)
-ūrjāṃ dugdhāt ta ā dade	(8)

Your nourishment which belongs to what has been bound up, your nourishment which belongs to what has been churned — I am taking your nourishment which belongs to what is being milked, your nourishment from what has been milked.

ūrjā] **Ku V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, urjā **JM RM Mā yā] Ku JM RM Pa [Ma] K**, jā **V/126 Mā** +prañaddhasyorjā] prañadhvasyorjā **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, prañadhvasyojā **V/126**, prañugdhasyojā **K mathitasya] Or**, madhitasya **K |] Or**, (+ |) **K** ūrjāṃ te] ūrjānte **Ku JM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, ūrjānte **RM Mā**, ūrjāte **K duhyamānasyorjāṃ] Or**, duhyamānasyorjāṃ **K dugdhāt ta ā] Or**, dugdhātā **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *prañadhvasyorjā*.

a. Both **K** and the Or. mss. point to a reading with *-ṇ-*. BHATTACHARYA’s suggestion to emend +*prañaddhasya* must be correct. The **K** reading with *prañugdha-* seems to have suffered reverse perseveration from pāda **d** (moreover *-ddh-* and *-gdh-* are quite similar in Śāradā). The verbal compound *pra-ṇah* is unattested, except for the hapax derivative *prāṇāhā-*, which — according to WHITNEY’s interpretation — is to be taken as an adjective qualifying *tṛṇa-* at ŚS 9.3.4b / PS 16.39.5b: *prāṇāhāsya tṛṇasya* ‘of [your] binding grass’. In view of the other dairy products listed in this stanza, it seems possible that *pra-ṇah* refers to the binding up of curds in a sack or cloth, to press out the whey: cf. Dutch *hang-op*.

### 6.15.8 Only PS

ā te dade gavām ūrjāṃ	(8)
ūrjāṃ avibhya ā dade	(8)
ajābhya ūrjāṃ ādāya-	(8)
-ā ta *ekasāphād dade	(8)

I am taking your nourishment which belongs to the cows, I am taking the nourishment from the ewes. Having taken the nourishment from the she-goats, I am taking yours from the uncloven-hoofed.

dade] **Or**, tade **K** gavām ūrjām ] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], gavāsūrjām **Pa**, gavām ūrjām ūrjām **K** avibhya ā] **Or**, avityā **K** dade] **Or**, dadhe **K** ajābhya] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], ājābhya **JM**, ajādya **K** ūrjām] **Ku JM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**], ūryām **RM**, urjām **Mā**, ūrjom **K** [[Edg. mistakenly °jam]] ta \*ekāśaphād dade ||] ta ekaśaphādade || **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**], tayekaśaphādade **Mā**, ta ekaśapādade ||*om.* ||] **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *ādāyāta*, without word-division, and *ekāśaphā dade*.

**d.** I have made the obvious emendation to an ablative *ekāśaphād*, parallel to the ablatives within this stanza, and in the preceding **d**-pādas. The single *-d-* goes back to the common predecessor (\*G) of the **K** and **Or**. manuscripts: it has obviously arisen due to perseveration from the sequence *ā dade* in the preceding four stanzas. The class of uncloven-hoofed animals (horses, donkeys, mules, cf. OLIVELLE 2002: 10) supplements the cloven-hoofed (female) domesticated animals mentioned in the first three pādas.

The reading *tayekaśaphā* in **Mā**, which is a common case of glide insertion by an Oriya scribe, and is not shared by any of the other mss. here,<sup>24</sup> was mistaken to be an archaic un-Pāṇinian sandhi-form by WITZEL 1989: 190.

### 6.15.9 Only PS

ūrjā yā te puruṣeṣu-	(8)
-ūrjā vitte ca vedye	(8)
+ūrjām te sarveṣām ahaṃ	(8)
grhāṇām brahmaṇā dade    15	(8)

Your nourishment which is among men, your nourishment which is in the gain and in the future gain — I am taking your nourishment which belongs to the whole homestead by means of [this] spell.

ūrjā] **Ku RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, urjā **JM Mā** yā] **Ku JM RM Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, jā **V/126 Mā** puruṣeṣūrjā] puruṣeṣūrjā **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], puruṣeṣūryā **JM**, puruṣūrjā **K** vitte] **Or**, citte **K** vedye] **Ku RM Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, DYeDYe **V/126**, vidye **JM** +ūrjām te] ūrjānte **Ku V/126 Pa** [**Ma**], urjānte **JM RM Mā**, ūrjāte **K** brahmaṇā] **Or**, vrahmaṇā **K** || 15 ||] || 15 || 9 || 15 || **Ku JM**, || 15 || a || **RM**, || 15 || 15 || a || 3 || **V/126**, || 14{·} || 15 || a || 3 || **Mā**, || 15 || 15 || **Pa**, Z 5 Z **K**

Note the regularized anuvāka division in the sister mss. **V/126** and **Mā** (as well as in **RM**), which continues after 6.20.10, without however yielding the logical result of a fifth anuvāka marked at the end of the kāṇḍa. The proper third anuvāka division is marked in the majority of mss. after 6.17.11, with the end of the kāṇḍa corresponding to that of the fourth anuvāka. See my Introduction, §3.1–2, and especially GRIFFITHS 2003b: 13, n. 64.

<sup>24</sup> The scribe of **Mā** seems to have a special inclination to insert *y*: cf. e.g. its reading *ta-y-ādiṣi* at 3d above.

**ab.** The pair *vittám védyam* is found also i.a. at KS 13.5 (3×), 25.6 (2×), 31.10:12.15; TB 1.4.6.3, 1.5.9.2, 1.7.4.6; TS 6.2.4.3 (2×); VSM 18.11 (VSK 19.5.2: *vittám ca me vittiś ca me*). The paired nouns are mostly asyndetically combined (and thus misunderstood as noun + adjective in KEITH’s translation of TS 6.2.4.3). Note the change from genitive (stanzas 5–7) to locative: *puruṣāṇām* would also have fit metrically in pāda **a**, but no genitives would have fit in pāda **b** without removing *ūrjā* or accepting a bad cadence.

## 6.16. To food.

After GELDNER's translation, the ṚV version of this hymn has been translated also by LOMMEL 1955: 100f. There are notes by RENO (1955–69/XVI: 95), and some exegetical remarks by GONDA (1978: 128): “the term *pitu* denotes the *soma* draught”. On Soma as the quintessential and divine ‘Food’, cf. OBERLIES 1999: 30 (with n. 141), 49.

There are only four small — simplifying — variant readings in the PS version as compared to the ṚV (in stanzas 3 and 7), plus two small changes in the order of the text (see stanzas 8/9, and 11). The KS version has still fewer variants on the text of the ṚV. Why this hymn of 11 stanzas is included in the *navarcakāṇḍa* remains unclear. A thematic connection with the preceding hymn may be found in the topic ‘food’.

**6.16.1** ṚV 1.187.1, KS 40.8:141.18f., VSM 34.7, VSK 33.1.2 ◊ Nir 9.25, RgVidh 1.26

pitum nu stoṣam	(5)
maho dharmāṇam taviṣim	(8)
yasya trito v <sub>i</sub> y ojasā	(8)
vṛtram +viparvam ardayat	(8)

I now praise the Food, of the great one the sustainer, the energy, by whose power Trita shook the jointless Vṛtra to pieces.

pitum nu] pitunnu **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], pitunnu(→ nna 1) **RM**, pitum na **K** taviṣim] taviṣim **Ku JM V/126 Mā** [Ma], taVI(+ ·)ṣim **RM**, taviṣam **Pa**, taviṣi **K** trito] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma] **K**, tito **Pa** vṛtram] **Or**, vṛttram **K** [[Edg. mistakenly °tr°] +viparvam] piparvam **Ku RM Mā Pa Ma**, pipa{ma}rdam **JM**, piva(→ 1 pa)rvam **V/126**, viparyam **K**

**ṚV 1.187.1, KS 40.8:141.18f. etc.**

pitum nú stoṣam mahó dharmāṇam táviṣim |  
yásya tritó vy ójasā vṛtrám víparvam ardáyat ||

BHATTACHARYA's text contains a misprint: *dharmāṇam*.

**a.** On the form *stoṣam* and its probably performative meaning, cf. NARTEN 1964: 277 and HOFFMANN 1967: 251. The performative character of this pāda may help to explain its metrical deficiency (OLDENBERG 1888: 39f.).

**b.** It is not clear to me how GELDNER arrives at his “die mächtige Erhalterin der Stärke”, or LOMMEL at his “die bestens uns erhält und stärkt”. *mah-* is an adjective (presumably for Trita), *táviṣi-* a noun. Cf. RENO's “(qui est) une force-active maintainante”.

**d.** On the meaning of *ardáyati*, cf. JAMISON 1983a: 107 n. 2.

**6.16.2** ṚV 1.187.2, KS 40.8:141.20f.

svādo pito madho pito	(8)
vayaṃ t <sub>u</sub> vā *vavṛmahe	(8)
asmākam avitā bhava	(8)

O sweet Food, o honeyed Food: we have picked you out. Become our helper!

\*vavṛmahe] vivṛmahe **Ku JM RM Pa Ma**, vivurmahe **V/126**, vivuma{r}he **Mā**, vivṛmahe **K** avitā] **Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, abhitā **JM Pa**

**ṚV 1.187.2, KS 40.8:141.20f.**

svādo pito mādho pito vayāṃ tvā vavṛmahe |  
asmākam avitā bhava ||

BHATTACHARYA, who edits *vivṛmahe*, reports the reading *vivumahe* for his **Mā**. More precisely, the reading (with scribal correction) is as above.

**b.** The PS tradition unanimously points to an old corruption *vivṛmahe*, which is retained with underlining by BHATTACHARYA.

On the picking out of food, cf. ṚV 5.82.1ab *tāt savitūr vṛṇīmahe vayāṃ devāsya bhōjanam* ‘we pick out this food of the god Savitar’. Here, it is the god Soma (representing food) who is picked out (cf. ṚV 9.65.28b). This ‘picking out’ implies the wish to receive help also, e.g., at ṚV 3.9.1 and 8.21.2.

**6.16.3** ṚV 1.187.3, KS 40.8:142.1f. ◊ **d:** ṚV 1.91.15c, 7.55.1c, PS 20.23.2c etc.

upa naḥ pitav ā gahi	(8)
śivaḥ śivābhir ūtibhiḥ	(8)
mayobhūr adviṣeṇyaḥ	(8)
sakhā suśeva edhi naḥ	(8)

Come to us, o Food, gracious with gracious help. Be for us a delightful, unhatable, a very kind companion.

upa] **Or**, uTTA **K** naḥ pitav] **Or**, naḥ piTTAv **K** gahi] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, {·}(→ 1 ga)hi **V/126** śivaḥ] **Or**, śivaś **K** śivābhir ūtibhiḥ] **K**, śivābhiṛtibhiḥ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, śivābhiṛbhi **JM** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ m°] adviṣeṇyaḥ] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, adviṣeśya(→ ṇya) **Pa**, adviṣeṇyas **K** suśeva] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, su{G}(→ ś)eva **V/126** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ t°]

**ṚV 1.187.3, KS 40.8:142.1f.**

úpa naḥ pitav ā cara śivāḥ śivābhir ūtibhiḥ |  
mayobhūr [KS mayobhūr] adviṣeṇyāḥ sakhā suśévo ádvayāḥ ||

**a.** Note PS *ā gahi* for ṚV/KS *ā cara*.

**c.** Note the agreement between PS and KS *mayobhūr*, against ṚV *mayobhūr*. This adjective qualifies Soma i.a. at ṚV 9.78.4d.

**d.** Note the simplification *edhi naḥ* for *ádvayāḥ* of the ṚV and KS versions, in agreement with ṚV 1.91.15c etc. *sakhā suśéva edhi naḥ*.

**6.16.4** ṚV 1.187.4, KS 40.8:142.3f.

tava t<sub>i</sub>ye pito rasā (8)  
 rajāṁs<sub>i</sub>y anu viṣṭhitāḥ | (8)  
 divi vātā iva śritāḥ || (8)

These juices of yours, o Food, are divided over the [cosmic] spaces, they are set in the sky, like the winds.

viṣṭhitāḥ] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, viṣṭitāḥ **Mā** || **Or**, *om. K* [[note °ḥ d°]]  
 iva] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, iNDRA **RM** [?] śritāḥ] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa**  
 [Ma] **K**, {Pri}(→ śri 2)tāḥ **V/126** || **Or**, *om. K* [[note °ḥ t°]]

**ṚV 1.187.4, KS 40.8:142.3f.**

táva tyé pito rásā rájāṁsy ánu viṣṭhitāḥ |  
 divi vātā iva śritāḥ ||

**6.16.5** ṚV 1.187.5, KS 40.8:142.5f.

tava tye pito dadatas (8)  
 tava svādiṣṭha te pito | (8)  
 pra svādmāno rasān<sub>a</sub>āṁ (8)  
 tuvigrīvā iverate || (8)

These sweeteners of (your) juices, which give [a share] of you, o Food, those [which give a share] of you, o very sweet Food, are moving forth like strong-necked bulls.

dadatas] **Or**, dadataḥ **K** [[note °ḥ t°]] tava] **Ku JM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, taVĀ(→ va 2)  
**RM**, tavi **Pa** svādiṣṭha] **Or**, svātiṣṭha **K** te] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, t{o}e  
**Ku** svādmāno] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, svā{hvā}(→ dmā 1)no **Pa** rasānāṁ  
 tuvigrīvā] **Ku RM Mā**, rasānāntuvigrīvā **JM Ma**, rasānāṁ{tu}(→ ntu 2)vigrīvā **V/126**,  
 catsānāntuvigrīvā **Pa**, rasānāṁ tuvigrīvā **K** iverate] **K**, yu{.}verate **Ku JM V/126 Mā**  
**Pa Ma**, yu{.}verate **RM**

**ṚV 1.187.5, KS 40.8:142.5f.**

táva tyé pito dádatas táva svādiṣṭha té pito |  
 prá svādmāno rásānāṁ tuvigrīvā iverate ||

a. On the various possible grammatical interpretations of *dádatas*, probably to be taken as nom. pl., see OLDENBERG 1909–12/I: 184. I take it as an attribute to *svādmāno*. On the partitive genitive with *dā*, see DELBRÜCK 1888: 158.

c. GELDNER's assumption, following Sāyaṇa, of a m. agent noun *svādmán-* 'Genießer' was not taken over by LOMMEL (who seems to assume *svādmán-* = *svādmán-*: 'Süßigkeiten'). According to RENO "svādmán- 'qui goûte (avec plaisir)' est théoriquement plausible, mais on a *svādmā pitúnām* [recte *pitúnām*] 69,3, *svādmānaṁ vācāḥ* 2.21,6 (fig.), donc 'douceur au goût' est préférable". I do not share RENO's preference, because the shift of accent has to be accounted for. It would be easiest to accept, with GELDNER, a masculine agent

noun *svādmán-* side by side with a neuter action noun *svādman-* (AiGr. II/2, §602b/605a). With additional reference to 5.7.6 *svādanam pitūnām* ‘the sweetener of foods’, I replace GELDNER’s ‘enjoyer’ with ‘sweetener’.

The ‘sweeteners of (your) juices’ seems to be a poetic expression for ‘the sweeteners that (your) juices are’: *rāsānām* may be taken as gen. *identitatis* (pace WHITNEY 1889 §295), rather than a poss. genitive. The movement of cattle is also used in a comparable simile at PS 19.9.11. Cf. the parallel RV 10.97.8ab *úc chúsmā óṣadhīnām gávo goṣṭhád iverate* ‘the vigors of the plants move up like cows from a cow-pen’, where *súsmā óṣadhīnām* corresponds to our *svādmáno rāsānām*.

#### 6.16.6 RV 1.187.6, KS 40.8:142.7f.

t <sub>u</sub> ve pito mahān <sub>a</sub> ām	(8)
devān <sub>a</sub> ām mano hitam	(8)
akāri cāru ketunā	(8)
tavāhim avasāvadhīt	(8)

On you, o Food, the mind of the great gods is set. Under the banner [of the dawn], something precious was done: with your help, he killed the snake.

tve] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, v{i}e **Pa**, yatte **K**    mano] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, (+ mano) **RM**    hitam |] hitam | **Or K**    cāru] **K**, cār **Or**    avasāvadhīt] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, avasāvadhīta **Pa**, avasāvadhīt, [*om.*] **K** [*note* °t, y°]

#### RV 1.187.6, KS 40.8:142.7f.

tvé pito mahānām devānām máno hitám |  
ákāri cāru ketúnā távāhim ávasāvadhīt ||

c. The translation of *ketúnā* is problematic. Note the conflicting statements on the meaning of *ketú-* even of one scholar: RENO 1958: 15f., and 1955–69/VII: 24 (and 47). Since the next stanza clearly refers to the moment of sunrise, and since passages like TB 1.4.4.5 and MS 2.10.1:131.15 explicitly connect *ketúnā* with Uṣas, I tentatively connect the word with the dawn here. Alternatively, another *táva* (next to *tvé* in **a** and *táva* in **d**) might be supplied with this pāda, as do GELDNER and LOMMEL: ‘under [your] banner’.

#### 6.16.7 RV 1.187.7, KS 40.8:142.9f.

yad adaḥ pito ajagan	(8)
vivasva parvatān <sub>a</sub> ām	(8)
atrā cin no madho pito	(8)
<sub>a</sub> ram bhakṣāya gam <sub>i</sub> yāḥ	(8)

When, o Food, yonder illumination of the mountains has arrived, just then, o honeyed Food, you should arrive, ready for our consumption.

adaḥ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, a{do}daḥ **JM**, adaḥ **K**    pito ajagan] **Ku JM RM Mā [Ma] K**, pito(→ tau → to 3){a}jagan, **V/126**, pito ajagana **Pa**    parvatānām |]

parvatānām | Or, parvatānām, K [om. |, but note °m, a°] cin no] Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma: ‘worm-eaten’] K, ci{·}nno RM madho] Or, madhu K a[raṃ] ’raṃ Or, raṃ K gamyāḥ] Or, gamyām K

**RV 1.187.7, KS 40.8:142.9f.**

yád adó [KS adáh] pito ájagan vivásva párvatānām |  
átrā cin no madho pitó ’ram bhakṣāya gamyāḥ ||

**ab.** On the “Unregelmäßigkeit des Sandhi” in the RV version, regularized as *adaḥ* in the KS and PS versions, see OLDENBERG 1909–12/I: 184. GELDNER, followed by KÜMMEL (2000: 158), takes *ajagan* as a 3rd sg. form, with *vivásva* as subject, and renders ‘gekommen ist’. This seems much more attractive than OLDENBERG’s translation (*ibid.*) ‘wenn du dorthin gingst zum Hellwerden der Berge’ (followed, without arguments against GELDNER, by RENO). OLDENBERG’s reference to RV 1.24.12 *náras ca yé pitubhájo vyùṣtau* ‘and the men who share in food at the illumination (i.e. the Dawn)’ also supports GELDNER’s interpretation.

**6.16.8** RV 1.187.9, KS 40.8:142.13f.

yat te soma gavāśiro (8)  
yavāśiro bhajāmahe | (8)  
vātāpe pīva id bhava || (8)

When we, o Soma, partake of you, mixed with cows, mixed with barley, become the fat, o friend of the wind.

gavāśiro] Or, gaāśiro K yavāśiro] JM RM K, javāśiro Ku V/126 Mā Pa Ma pīva] Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, pīva RM id bhava ||] Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K, i{·}dbhava || (+ KĀ) V/126

**RV 1.187.9, KS 40.8:142.13f.**

yát te soma gāvāśiro yāvāśiro bhájāmahe |  
vātāpe pīva íd bhava ||

Note the reversal of the stanza-order: RV KS 9 = PS 8.

**ab.** On the significance of the ‘cows’ (i.e. milk) and ‘barley’ in these pādas, cf. OBERLIES 1999: 44ff. and 54f. As WITZEL noticed (*apud* BHATTACHARYA 1997: xliv, with n. 31), the error *gaāśiro* found in K is made also by the scribe of the Chambers ms. at KS 40.8:142.13, but not in all mss. of that text, as BHATTACHARYA’s argument implies.

**c.** We do not know the normal place of the accent of *vātāpi-*, here appearing with (fronted?) vocative accentuation due to its pāda initial position. Note the bahuvrīhi accent at TS 3.5.8.1 *vātāpibhyaḥ* — where ‘whose friend is the Wind’ is most likely —, contrasted AiGr. II/2, §654a (p. 815) with RV *vātāpya-*. On that word, cf. GELDNER (comm. on RV 9.93.5 and 10.105.1), and Nir 6.28 (*vātāpyam udakaṃ bhavati | vāta etad āpyāyayati*). RENO (1955–69/IX: 104) proposes ‘qui gagne l’ami’ (from *van* ‘to gain’, *vāta-* plus *āpi-* ‘friend’). Pāda

4c above rather or — assuming a likely play on the homonymy of *vāta-* — additionally, suggests that an association with *vāta-* ‘wind’ may have been on the poet’s mind. I tentatively follow GELDNER and LOMMEL, and translate ‘friend of the wind’ (*vāta-* plus *āpī-*).

**6.16.9** ṚV 1.187.8, KS 40.8:142.11f.

yad apām oṣadhīnām (8)  
pariṁśam āriśāmahe ° ° ° || (8)

When we graze the . . . of the waters, of the plants, become the fat, o friend of the wind.

yad] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma] **K**, yṛd **Pa** pariṁśam] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma], pariṁśam **Pa**, baliṁsam **K** āriśāmahe ||] āriśāmahe ||<sup>kā</sup> **Ku**, āriśāmahe || **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa Ma**, āriśāmahe | vātape pīva id bhava || **K**

**ṚV 1.187.8, KS 40.8:142.11f.**

yád apām oṣadhīnām pariṁśám āriśāmahe |  
vātāpe pīva íd bhava ||

It seems likely that the Or. mss. are more authentic — in any case they are more consistent —, in omitting the last pāda of this stanza, which is found identically also in the preceding and following stanza: on this mode of abbreviation, see my Introduction, §2.5.2.

**b.** Note the comments on the problematic hapax *pariṁśá-* by RENO. Following OBERLIES 1999: 49, I leave it untranslated.

**6.16.10** ṚV 1.187.10, KS 40.8:142.15f.

karambha oṣadhe bhava (8)  
pīvo vṛkka udāraṭhiḥ | (8)  
vātāpe pīva id bhava || (8)

Become gruel, o plant, the fat, the . . . kidney(fat), become the fat, o friend of the wind.

karambhā oṣadhe] **Ku RM V/126** [Ma] **K**, karambha oṣadhīdhe **JM**, karambha oṣadh{ī}e {nām pari} **Mā**, kara{sta}{(→ ·)}(+ o){oṣadhe}sta oṣadhe **Pa** pīvo] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, pīva(→ vo 4) **RM** udāraṭhiḥ] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma] **K**, uDāraṭhiḥ | **Mā** [two vowel diacritics] ||] **Or**, om. **K** [note °ḥ v°] pīva id] **Ku JM V/126 Pa** [Ma] **K**, pīvayid **RM**, p{i}īva id **Mā** ||] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, ||<sup>kā</sup> **V/126**

**ṚV 1.187.10, KS 40.8:142.15f.**

karambhā oṣadhe bhava pīvo vṛkkā udāraṭhiḥ |  
vātāpe pīva íd bhava ||

**ab.** Cf. ŚS 4.7.3ab / PS 2.1.2ab *karambhām kṛtvā tiryāṁ pībasphākām udāraṭhīm* (ed. R-W) ‘Having made gruel of sesame (?), teeming with fat,

steaming (?)’ (WHITNEY). *vṛkká udārathīḥ* remains problematic, cf. OLDENBERG 1909–12/I: 184, and EWAia I, 216f.

**6.16.11** RV 1.187.11, KS 40.8:142.17f.

taṃ tvā vyaṃ pito vacobhir	(9)
gāvo na havyā suṣūdimā	(9)
asmabhyaṃ tvā sadhamādaṃ	(8)
devebhyas tvā sadhamādam    16	(8)

You, o Food, we have with words made sweet, as cows [sweeten] libations (of Soma): you, the participant in our feast, you, the participant in the gods’ feast.

taṃ tvā] Or, tantvā K pito vacobhir gāvo] Ku JM RM Pa [Ma] K, pīto vacobhirggāvo V/126, pitobhirggāvo Mā havyā] thus Or K [[Edg. mistakenly havya] suṣūdimā] Ku JM Mā Pa [Ma] K, suṣūdimā RM, suṣ·dima V/126 asmabhyaṃ] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], asmabhya JM, asmābhyaṃ K sadhamādaṃ] Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], sadamādaṃ RM K devebhyas] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, vebhyas JM sadhamādam] sadhamādaṃ Or, sadamādam K || 16 ||] || ṛ 11 || 16 || Ku JM, || ṛ || 16 || RM, || 16 || ṛ 11 || V/126, || 15[?] || ṛ 11 || Mā, || 16 || ṛ || Pa, Z 6 Z K

**RV 1.187.11, KS 40.8:142.17f.**

táṃ tvā vyaṃ pito vácobhir gāvo ná havyā suṣūdimā |  
devébhyas tvā sadhamādam asmābhyaṃ tvā sadhamādam ||

BHATTACHARYA imprecisely reports *-rg-* for *-rgg-* in Mā.

**ab.** On the meter of the first pāda, cf. OLDENBERG 1909–12/I: 184, where the second pāda remains undiscussed.

**cd.** Note that PS shifts the order of these pādas. On the word *sadhamā́d(a)-*, see SCARLATA 1999: 380f.

## 6.17. To Agni and the Maruts.

This hymn, like the preceding one, is taken over with some small variants, from the ṚV: it is ṚV 1.19, for which I refer to the translation, with notes, by RENO (1955–69/X: 54, 113f.). As compared to the ṚV version, our version changes the order of stanzas 4–5, and exchanges the pādas 7b/8b. The last two stanzas are secondary additions, in excess of the standard of 9 stanzas per hymn. Stanza 10 is found only in PS.

There are several phraseological points of concatenation between this hymn and the preceding one, which may help to explain their collocation in PS: see under stanza 1 (and under 2). The connection with 6.18, where the Maruts are mentioned in stanza 1, is clear.

**6.17.1** ṚV 1.19.1, SVK 1.16, SVJ 1.2.6, Nir 10.36 ◊ **b**: PS 6.12.3c ◊ ĀśvŚS 2.13.2, KauśS 127.7, VaitS 23.8

prati tyam cārum adhvaram (8)  
gopīthāya pra hūyase | (8)  
marudbhir agna ā gahi || (8)

Towards this precious ritual you are called, for protection. Come here, together with the Maruts, o Agni.

cārum] **K**, cāṛm **Or** hūyase ||] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, sūyase **JM** marudbhir]  
**K**, maṛdbhir **Or** agna] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, agn{i}a **RM**

### ṚV 1.19.1 etc.

prāti tyám cārum adhvarám gopīthāya prá hūyase |  
marúdbhir agna ā gahi ||

**a.** *tyam* concatenates with twice *tye* in 6.16.4–5, *cārum* with *cāru* in 6.16.6c.

**b.** An alternative translation ‘pour la boisson des vaches’ (for *gopīthāya*), going back to Sāyaṇa, was taken up by HENRY (CALAND & HENRY 1906–07/II: 381 n. 1) with the rather enigmatic argument “à cause de *pra hūyase*”. See GELDNER’s note: “*gopīthá* bedeutet aber nur ‘Schutz’”. Cf. the anticipation of this pāda in a prose context at 6.12.3c.

**c.** The words *ā gahi* of the refrain concatenate with 6.16.3a (only in the PS version of that pāda!).

**6.17.2** ṚV 1.19.2

nahi devo na mart;yo (8)  
mahas tava kratum paraḥ ° ° ° || (8)

Surely no god, no mortal is beyond the deliberation of you, the great one. Come here, together with the Maruts, o Agni.

martyo] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, mar(*sec. m.* + t)yo **V/126** paraḥ ||] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] [Ku JM V/126 (*sec. m.*): ||<sup>kā</sup>]**, purāḥ marudbhir agna ā gahi | **K** [note °ḥ m°]

**RV 1.19.2**

nahí devó ná mártyo mahás táva krátum parāḥ |  
marúdbhir agna ā gahi ||

BHATTACHARYA mistakenly splits *na hi*.

**ab.** In my rendering of *nahí*, I follow RENOÜ, and DELBRÜCK 1888: 524. On *krátu-*, cf. RENOÜ 1958: 32. It is just chance that *mahas* concatenates with 6.16.1b, as does *tava* with 6.16.4–6?

**c. K**, which does not yet abbreviate here (cf. my Introduction, §2.5.2), offers two ways of abbreviating **c**: ... *marudbhi* | in 3–9, and complete deletion of the pāda in 10. The agreement between **K**'s deletion of the **c** pāda in 10 and the consistent deletion in the Or. mss. makes it probable that the latter have preserved the authentic system of abbreviation.

**6.17.3 RV 1.19.3 ◊ b: RV 9.105.2b**

ye maho rajaso vidur (8)  
viśve devāso adruhaḥ °°° || (8)

Come here, o Agni, together with the Maruts, the undecitful All-Gods, who know the great space.

ye maho] **Or**, yameha **K** vidur] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, vidu **Pa** adruhaḥ ||] adṛhaḥ ||] **Ku** [||<sup>kā</sup>] **JM** [||<sup>kā</sup>] **RM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, adṛhaḥ | **Mā**, adruhaḥ marudbhi | **K** [note °ḥ m°]

**RV 1.19.3**

yé mahó rájaso vidúr víśve devāso adrúhaḥ |  
marúdbhir agna ā gahi ||

**b.** Although KUIPER (1979: 50 n. 162) expressed his doubts, RENOÜ's idea (1955–69/X: 1f. n. 2, 3f.) that the Maruts seem to be called 'All-Gods' here, appears acceptable: the two groups of gods are both equated with *viś-* in the Brāhmaṇas (cf. VISHVA BANDHU 1966), and are associated interchangeably with the northern direction (see KUIPER, p. 55).

**6.17.4 RV 1.19.5**

ye śubhrā ghoravarpasaḥ (8)  
sukṣatrāso riśādasaḥ °°° || (8)

Come here, o Agni, together with the Maruts, the bright ones, of terrible appearance, of good dominion, Riśādases.

ye śubhrā] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, yeśubhrā **Pa** ghoravarpasaḥ] **Or**, ghora-  
varpasas **K** sukṣatrāso] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, sukṣetrāso **Pa**, sukṣatrāso **K**

[[Edg. mistakenly °tr°] riśādasah ||] **Ku** [||<sup>kā</sup>] **RM Pa** [**Ma**], ri{·}(+ śā)da{·}sah ||<sup>kā</sup>  
**JM**, riśādasah ||(*sec. m.* <sup>kā</sup>) **V/126**, risādasah || **Mā**, riśādasah marudbhi | **K** [note °ḥ  
m°]

**RV 1.19.5**

yé śubhrā ghorāvarpasah sukṣatrāso riśādasah |  
marúdbhir agna á gahi ||

**b.** The meaning of the divine epithet *riśādas-* (see EWAia II, 451 and GONDA 1959a: 119, with n. 172) has not been established with certainty. Cf. now PINAULT 1999–2000.

**6.17.5** RV 1.19.4

ya ugrā arkam āṅcur (8)  
anādhṛṣṭāsa ojasā °°° || (8)

Come here, o Agni, together with the Maruts, the forceful ones, who have sung the song, [who are] invincible in force.

ya ugrā arkam] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, {ya}ya ugrārkam **JM** āṅcur] **Or**,  
āṅtar **K** anādhṛṣṭāsa] **Or**, anādhṛṣṭāma **K** [[Edg./Bhatt. mistakenly °sa] ojasā ||] **Ku**  
[||<sup>kā</sup>] **JM RM V/126** [*sec. m.* ||<sup>kā</sup>] **Mā Pa** [**Ma**], ojasā | marudbhi | **K**

**RV 1.19.4**

yá ugrā arkám āṅcúr anādhṛṣṭāsa ójasā |  
marúdbhir agna á gahi ||

BHATTACHARYA's *akram* must be a misprint. All mss. have *arkam*.

**6.17.6** RV 1.19.6

ye nākasyādhi rocané (8)  
divi devāsa āsate °°° || (8)

Come here, o Agni, together with the Maruts, the gods who sit on the light-space of the firmament, in heaven.

devāsa āsate ||] **Ku** [||<sup>kā</sup>] **JM** [||<sup>kā</sup>] **RM V/126** [*sec. m.* ||<sup>kā</sup>] **Mā Pa** [**Ma**], devāssahāsate |  
marudbhi | **K**

**RV 1.19.6**

yé nākasyādhi rocané divi devāsa āsate |  
marúdbhir agna á gahi ||

**ab.** On this passage, and the meaning of (*nākasya*) *rocaná-*, see LÜDERS 1951: 66 (also ROESLER 1997: 122).

**6.17.7** ṚV 1.19.7 ◊ b: ṚV 1.19.8b

ya ĩṅkhayanti parvatān (8)  
tirah̄ samudram ojasā ° ° ° || (8)

Come here, o Agni, together with the Maruts, who rock the mountains with [their] force, through the ocean.

ya ĩṅkhayanti] **RM V/126 Mā Pa** [?], ya i{ÑKHA}ĩṅkhayanti **Ku**, ya ĩṅkhayanti **JM Ma**, ayaṁkṣayanti **K** parvatān tirah̄] **RM V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], parvatāmtirah̄ **Ku**, parvatātirah̄ **JM**, parvatānirah̄ **Pa**, parvatāmtiras **K** ojasā ||] **Ku** [||<sup>kā</sup>] **JM** [||<sup>kā</sup>] **RM V/126** [sec. m. ||<sup>kā</sup>] **Mā Pa**, ojasā (+ |) marudbhi | **K**

**ṚV 1.19.7**

yá ĩṅkháyanti párvatān tiráh̄ samudráṁ arṇavám |  
marúdbhir agna á gahi ||

**ab.** On the connection between the Maruts and the mountains, see LÜDERS 1951: 190 n. 2. Note that PS has exchanged *ójasā* (of the ṚV stanza 8) with *arṇavám* of 7.

It is not clear whether *tiráh̄ samudráṁ* is to be taken as specifying the place ('across the ocean') or the direction ('straight through the ocean') of the Maruts' rocking. I follow RENO's interpretation '(passant eux-mêmes) par delà l'océan', and refer to the phraseological connection with ṚV 9.35.2a *índo samudramĩṅkhaya* 'o drop [of Soma], ocean-rocker'.

**6.17.8** ṚV 1.19.8 ◊ b: ṚV 1.19.7b

ā ye tanvanti raśmibhis (8)  
tirah̄ samudram arṇavam ° ° ° || (8)

Come here, o Agni, together with the Maruts, who extend with [their] rays through the ocean, the flood.

tanvanti] **RM Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, tanvaṁti **Ku JM V/126 Mā** raśmibhis] **Ku RM V/126 Mā K**, rasmbhis **JM**, raśmibhiḥ **Pa Ma** tirah̄] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], tira **JM**, tiras **K** samudram] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, samudra{sa}m **V/126** arṇavam ||] arṇavam ||] **Ku** [||<sup>kā</sup>] **RM V/126** [sec. m. ||<sup>kā</sup>] **Mā Pa** [**Ma**], arṇaṁ ||<sup>kā</sup>] **JM**, arṇavam (+ |) marudbhi | **K**

**ṚV 1.19.8**

á yé tanvánti raśmíbhis tiráh̄ samudráṁ ójasā |  
marúdbhir agna á gahi ||

**ab.** As noted under the preceding stanza, PS has exchanged *ójasā* (of the ṚV stanza 8) with *arṇavám* of 7. In his rendering of ṚV 1.19.8, GELDNER takes *ā tanvanti* in a reflexive meaning ('Die sich mit den Strahlen ausdehnen'), while RENO supplies an object: 'qui tendent (l'espace)'. Could it be that the PS redactors purposefully introduced *arṇavam* here, to supply the verb with an

object? If so, the translation would have to be: ‘who extend the flood with their rays (cf. German *Sonnenstrahl/Regenstrahl* ‘stream of sun/rain’), through the ocean’.

### 6.17.9 R̥V 1.19.9, Nir 10.37

abhi tvā pūrvapītaye (8)  
srjāmi som;yaṃ madhu °°° || (8)

I pour out for you the Soma honey, for [your] first drinking. Come here, together with the Maruts, o Agni.

pūrvapītaye] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, pūrvapātaye **Pa**, pūrvapītaya **K** madhu ||  
**Ku** [|<sup>kā</sup>] **JM** [|<sup>kā</sup>] **RM V/126** [*sec. m.* |<sup>kā</sup>] **Mā Pa [Ma]**, madhu | marudbhi | **K**

#### R̥V 1.19.9 = Nir 10.37

abhí tvā pūrvápītaye srjāmi somyám mádhu |  
marúdbhir agna á gahi ||

**ab.** GELDNER translates: ‘Dich lasse ich zum somischen Honigtrank zu’. With my translation of *abhí-sarj*, I follow RENOUE, p. 114. RENOUE (‘pour toi’) in turn seems to follow LÜDERS 1951: 219 (‘dir’) in his interpretation of *abhí tvā*. On the significance of the first drink of Soma, ordinarily reserved for Vāyu but here offered to Agni with the Maruts, cf. LÜDERS 1951: 217ff. LÜDERS’ explanation (p. 219) that “im allgemeinen die Somaspense in das Opferfeuer gegossen wurde” suggests the rendering ‘over you’, that I prefer.

### 6.17.10 Only PS

ā yantu maruto gaṇai (8)  
stutā dadhatu no rayim °°° || (8)

Let the Maruts come with [their] troops. Praised, let them bestow wealth upon us. Come here, together with the Maruts, o Agni.

ā] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, a(→ ā) **V/126** yantu] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma]**  
**K**, yanta **Mā** maruto] **K**, maṛto **Or** rayim ||] rayim || **Ku** [|<sup>kā</sup>] **JM** [|<sup>kā</sup>] **RM**  
**V/126** [*sec. m.* |<sup>kā</sup>] **Mā Pa [Ma]**, rayim | **K**

Note the sudden change in the extent of abbreviation applied in **K**.

**a.** Cf. PS 15.4.10a / ŚS 19.45.10a *marúto mā gaṇáir avantu* ‘Let the Maruts help me with [their] troops’ (also PS 15.4.6a ff. ≈ ŚS 19.45.6a ff.).

**b.** Cf. R̥V 5.52.14 *ácha ṛṣe márutam gaṇám dānā mītrám ná yoṣánā | divó vā dhṛṣṇava ójasā stutá dhūbhír iṣanyata* ‘[Speak], o Ṛṣi, to the Marut-troop, for the sake of [their] liberality, like a lady to [her] friend. Or speed with force from heaven, audacious ones, praised with inspired poems’ (cf. OLDENBERG 1909: 290f. = 1967: 306f.).

**6.17.11** Cf. ṚV 1.14.2

ā tvā kaṇvā +ahūṣata (8)  
 gr̥ṇanti vipra te dhīyaḥ | (8)  
 marudbhir agna ā gahi || 17 || *anuvāka 3* || (8)

The Kaṇvas have called you here. [Their] inspired poems, o poet, are singing for you. Come here, together with the Maruts, o Agni.

kaṇvā +ahūṣata] kaṇvā abhūṣata **Ku JM RM Pa** [Ma], ka{n}(→ ṇ)vā abhūṣata **V/126**,  
 kanvā abhūṣata **Mā**, kaṇvāhūṣata **K** gr̥ṇanti] **Or**, gr̥ṇantu **K** dhīyaḥ] **Ku RM V/126**  
**Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, dh{ī}yaḥ | **JM** |] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ m°]] marudbhir] **K**, maṛdbhir  
**Or** || 17 || *anuvāka 3* ||] || ṛ 11 || 17 || a 3 || **Ku**, || ṛ 11 || 17 || **JM**, || ṛ || 17 || **RM**, ||  
 17 || ṛ (+ 11) || (+ 3 a 3) **V/126**, || 17 || ṛ || **Mā**, || 17 || ṛ || a 3 || **Pa**, Z 7 Z anu 3 Z **K**

**RV 1.14.2**

ā tvā káṇvā ahūṣata gr̥ṇánti vipra te dhīyaḥ |  
 devébhir agna ā gahi ||

**a.** The Or. reading *abhūṣata* was rightly rejected by BHATTACHARYA, as the verb *bhūṣ* is always active.

**b.** GELDNER's rendering 'sie preisen deine (weisen) Gedanken', RENO's 'ils chantent, ô (dieu) inspiré, les poèmes (émanant) de toi' (1955–69/V: 2; see also 1955–69/IV: 14 "Les pensées que tu formes au bénéfice des hommes et que ceux-ci traduisent en poèmes (*dhī*)"), and GONDA's 'they praise thy visions' (1963: 84 "The sense seems to be that the Kaṇva's praise — i.e. strengthen or increase — the god's "visions" in which they hope to participate"), taking *dhīyaḥ* as acc., all seem rather unsatisfactory to me. I take *dhīyaḥ* as nom., and *te* as dat., comparing ṚV 10.7.2ab: *imā agne matáyasa túbhyam jātā góbhira ásvair abhī gr̥ṇanti rādhaḥ* 'These poems are born for you, o Agni: [the poems] praise the reward with cows, with horses'.

## 6.18. For the blessings of rain.

This hymn has expanded up to the length of nine stanzas one formula, which occurs twice further on in the PS itself (at 12.19.8 and 20.13.5 [PSK 20.12.5], at both places abbreviated with . . . *ity ekā*), and — with some variation (very concisely described by WHITNEY) — in several other texts as well. In none of these other cases do we find any expansion at all. The elements of expansion used to make this hymn's stanzas 2–9 are found only in the PS. On such Ātharvaṇic expansions of pre-existing mantra material, cf. BLOOMFIELD 1899: 50ff. On the present case, cf. BARRET 1921b.

The concatenating link with the preceding hymns lies in the invocation of the Maruts in stanza 1. This first stanza, with the Maruts as rain-gods, and the last stanzas, where *soma-* represents the moon as dispenser of rain, make it clear that the attainment of progeny, wealth, and a long life-time was dependent on abundant fertilizing rains.

**6.18.1** ŚS 7.33[34].1, PS 12.19.8, 20.13.5; cf. PS 20.60.4 [PSK 20.56.4], KS 35.3:52.1–3 = KapKS 48.4:298.5–7 [247.4:350.10–12], TĀ 2.18.4, JB 1.362, ĀpŚS 14.18.1, PārGS 3.12.10 ◊ KauśS 24.8, 57.22+25, VaitS 29.21 etc.

saṃ mā siñcantu marutaḥ	(8)
saṃ pūṣā saṃ bṛhaspatiḥ	(8)
saṃ māyam agniḥ siñcatu	(8)
prajayā ca dhanena ca	(8)
dirgham āyusḥ kṛṇotu me	(8)

Let the Maruts pour me together, together Pūṣan, together Bṛhaspati, let Agni here pour me together with progeny and wealth. Let him make a long life-time for me.

saṃ mā] **K**, sammā **Or** marutaḥ] maṛtaḥ **Or**, marutas **K** bṛhaspatiḥ] **Or**, Vṛhaspatiḥ **K** |] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ s°]] saṃ māyam] **V/126 Mā K**, sammāyam **Ku JM RM Pa** [Ma] agniḥ] **Or**, agnis **K** siñcatu] **JM RM Pa** [Ma], siñca{n}tu **Ku**, siñcantu **V/126 Mā**, siñcatu **K** dhanena ca] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K** [+ ]], dhaneca **JM** āyusḥ] **Or**, āyuh **K** kṛṇotu] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, kṛtu **JM**

### ŚS 7.33[34].1

sám mā siñcantu marútaḥ sám pūṣá sám bṛhaspátīḥ |  
sám māyám agniḥ siñcatu prajáyā ca dhánena ca dirghám áyuhḥ kṛṇotu ||

### PS 20.60.4 [PSK 20.56.4]

saṃ mā siñcantu marutaḥ saṃ vāto rohiṇīr uta |  
saṃ māyam agniḥ siñcatu prajayā ca dhanena ca dirgham āyusḥ kṛṇomi te ||

### TĀ 2.18.4

sám mā siñcantu marútaḥ sám índraḥ sám bṛhaspátīḥ |  
sám māyám agniḥ siñcatv āyusā ca bálena cáyusmantam karota méti ||

**JB 1.362**

... siñcatv āyusā ca balena ca dīrgham āyuh kṛṇotu ma iti

**PārGS 3.12.10**

... siñcatv prajayā ca dhanena ceti

**KS 35.3 = KapKS 48.4[47.4]**

saṃ vas siñcantu marutas saṃ pūṣā saṃ dhātā sam indras saṃ bṛhaspatiḥ |  
saṃ vo 'yam agniḥ siñcatv prajayā ca dhanena ca | āyusmantam kṛṇotu mā ||

**ĀpŚS 14.18.1**

saṃ vaḥ siñcantu marutaḥ sam indraḥ saṃ bṛhaspatiḥ |  
saṃ vo 'yam agniḥ siñcatv āyusā ca dhanena ca | sarvam āyur dadhātu me |

BHATTACHARYA's note, p. 471, on the Or. mss. for this stanza, *sarvatra 'saṃ' ity asya sthāne 'sam' iti*, is not correct: his **Mā**, and the closely related **V/126**, read *saṃ* in pāda **c**.

e. On the sandhi in *āyus kṛṇotu*, cf. my Introduction, §2.8 (R).

**6.18.2 Only PS**

°°° siñcant<sub>uv</sub> ādityāḥ (8)  
saṃ mā siñcant<sub>uv</sub> agnayaḥ | (8)  
indraḥ sam asmān siñcatu °°° || (8)

Let the Ādityas pour me together, let the Fires pour me together, let Indra pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let him make a long life-time for me.

siñcantv] siñcantv **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, (+ sammā) siñcantv **RM**, saṃ mā siñcantv **JM K** ādityāḥ] **Or**, ādityās **K** saṃ mā] **K**, sammā **Or** |] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[*note* °ḥ i°]] indraḥ] **Or**, indras **K** sam asmān] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, sa(+ ma)smāna **RM** siñcatu ||] **Ku** [|<sup>kā</sup>] **RM** [|<sup>kā</sup>] **V/126 Pa [Ma]**, siñcantu **JM**, siñca{ntu}tu || **Mā**, siñcatu **K** [[*om.* |]

On the mode of abbreviation used here and below, see my Introduction, §2.5.2. Cf. especially BARRET 1921a.

**6.18.3 Only PS**

°°° siñcant<sub>uv</sub> aruṣāḥ (8)  
sam arkā ṛṣayaś ca ye | (8)  
pūṣā sam °°° || (8)

Let the reddish ones pour me together, together the songs and the Seers, let Pūṣan pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let him make a long life-time for me.

siñcantv] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, samāsiñcantv **JM** aruṣāḥ] arṣāḥ **Or**, anuṣā **K** sam ||] saṃ || **Ku RM V/126** [[*sec. m.* |<sup>kā</sup>] **Mā Pa [Ma]**, sam asmān, siñcantu prajayā ca dhanena ca dīrgham āyus kṛ{tu}ṇotu me || **JM**, saṃ **K** [[*om.* |]

a. On the problem of the meaning of *aruṣa-* in this context, see ZEHNDER 1999: 167.

b. The introduction of a relative construction here (and in 5b, 6b, 9a) seems to be *metri causa*, and is best not taken over in translating. Alternatively, the relative pronoun could here be taken to have the “generalizing force” which GONDA attributes to it (1954b: 14 = 1975/1: 177, with reference to RV 1.51.8, 1.94.5, 6.25.3, ŚS 1.15.2). In that case, one could translate ‘and [all] the Seers’.

#### 6.18.4 Only PS

°°° siñcantu gandharvāpsarasah	( )
saṃ mā siñcantu devataḥ	(8)
bhagaḥ sam °°°	(8)

Let the Gandharvas and the Apsarases pour me together, let the deities pour me together, let Bhaga pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let him make a long life-time for me.

siñcantu] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, sammā siñcantu **JM**, siñcatu **K** gandharvāpsarasah] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, gandharvāpsaSYARAsah **Mā**, gandharvāpsarasas **K** saṃ mā] **K**, sammā **Or** |] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ bh°]] bhagaḥ] **Or**, bhagas **K** sam ||] saṃ || **Ku RM V/126** [[*sec. m.* ||<sup>kā</sup>]] **Mā Pa [Ma]**, sam asmān, siñcantu prajayā ca dhanena ca dīrgham āyuṣ kṛṇotu me || **JM**, saṃ **K** [[*om.* ||] **K**

#### 6.18.5 Only PS

°°° siñcantu pṛthivīḥ	(8)
saṃ mā siñcantu yā divaḥ	(8)
antarikṣaṃ sam °°°	( )

Let the earths pour me together, let the heavens pour me together, let the intermediate space pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let it make a long life-time for me.

siñcantu pṛthivīḥ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, sammā siñcantu pṛthivī **JM**, siñcatu pṛthivī **K** saṃ mā] **K**, sammā **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, samā **JM** divaḥ |] **Or**, diva | **K** sam ||] saṃ || **Ku RM V/126** [[*sec. m.* ||<sup>kā</sup>]] **Mā Pa [Ma]**, sam asmān, siñcantu prajayā ca dhanena ca dīrgham āyuṣ kṛṇotu me || **JM**, saṃ **K** [[*om.* ||] **K**

b. This stanza offers only the second certain case of *divaḥ* as nom. pl. in Vedic (besides ŚS 11.7.14b / PS 16.83.4b). Cf. AiGr. III §122h, p. 226.

#### 6.18.6 Only PS

°°° siñcantu pradiśah	(8)
saṃ mā siñcantu yā diśah	(8)
āśā sam °°°	(8)

Let the intermediate quarters pour me together, together me the quarters [of space], let the space pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let it make a long life-time for me.

siñcantu] **Ku RM Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, sammā siñcantu **JM**, (*sec. m.* + sa·ā 4) siñcantu **V/126** pradiśaḥ] **Or**, pradiśas **K** saṃ mā] **K**, sammā **Or** ]] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[*note* °ḥ ā°]] sam ]] saṃ ]] **Ku RM Mā Pa** [Ma], sam asmān, siñcantu prajayā ca dhanena ca dīrgham āyus kṛṇotu me ]] **JM**, saṃ ]] (*sec. m.* kā) siñcantu pradiśaḥ sammā siñcantu yā diśaḥ | **V/126** [[*note lapsus calamī*]], saṃ **K** [[*om.* ]]

### 6.18.7 Only PS

°°° siñcantu nad<sub>i</sub>yaḥ (8)  
 saṃ mā siñcantu sindhavaḥ | (8)  
 samudraḥ sam °°° ]] ( )

Let the streams pour me together, let the rivers pour me together, let the ocean pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let it make a long life-time for me.

siñcantu] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, sammā siñcantu **JM RM** nadyaḥ] **Or**, nabhyaḥ **K** saṃ mā] **K**, sammā **Or** ]] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[*note* °ḥ s°]] samudraḥ] **Or**, samudrās **K** sam ]] saṃ ]] **Ku Pa** [Ma], sam asmān, siñcantu prajayā ca dhanena ca dīrgham āyus kṛṇotu me ]] **JM**, samaḥ ]] **RM**, sama ]] **V/126** [[*sec. m.* ]]<sup>kā</sup>] **Mā**, saṃ | **K**

This is stanza 8 in **K**. It seems impossible to determine whether **K** or the *Or.* mss. have preserved the authentic order. The error *sama* ]] in **Mā** has not been noted by BHATTACHARYA.

### 6.18.8 Only PS

°°° siñcantu kṛṣayaḥ (8)  
 saṃ mā siñcant<sub>u</sub>v oṣadhīḥ | (8)  
 somaḥ sam °°° ]] (8)

Let the crops pour me together, let the plants pour me together, let Soma pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let him make a long life-time for me.

siñcantu kṛṣayaḥ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K** [[*note* °ḥ s°]], sammā siñcantu kṛṣayaḥ] **JM** saṃ mā] **K**, sammā **Or** siñcantv] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma] **K**, siñcanty **Mā** oṣadhīḥ] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma] **K**, oṣadh{i}īḥ **Pa** ]] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[*note* °ḥ s°]] somaḥ] **Or**, saṃmās **K** sam ]] saṃ ]] **Ku V/126** [[*sec. m.* ]]<sup>kā</sup>] **Mā Pa** [Ma], sam asmān, siñcantu prajayā ca dhanena ca dīrgham āyus kṛṇotu me ]] **JM**, sama ]] **RM**, saṃ [[*om.* ]] **K**

Note that this is stanza 7 in **K**. **Mā** rather clearly writes *siñcanty*, but this error has not been noted by BHATTACHARYA.

a. While the meaning ‘cultivation’ is acceptable at 6.9.10 above, a more concrete noun seems better here and at 7.6.6 below. Besides the concrete meaning ‘field’, it seems that *kṛṣī-* can also mean ‘produce of the field, crop’. Cf. PS 7.6.6,

and also 2.11.5 (ŚS 2.4.5) and 5.29.7, where ZEHNDER's translation ('Acker') and LUBOTSKY's ('agriculture') may have to be substituted. PW II, 411, refers i.a. to YājñSm 1.275, where the Mitākṣarā commentary glosses *kṛṣīphala-*.

### 6.18.9 Only PS

saṃ mā siñcantu yā āpaḥ	(8)
saṃ mā siñcantu vṛṣṭayaḥ	(8)
sarasvatī sam asmān siñcatu	( )
prajayā ca dhanena ca	(8)
dīrgham āyusḥ kṛṇotu me    18	(8)

Let the waters pour me together, let the rains pour me together, let Sarasvatī pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let her make a long life-time for me.

saṃ mā] sammā **Or**, saṃmās **K** siñcantu yā āpaḥ] **Or**, siñcantv āpas **K** saṃ mā] **K**, sammā **Or** || **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ s°]] sarasvatī] **Or**, satyaṃ **K** asmān] **Or**, asmāna **K** siñcatu] **Ku V/126 Pa** [Ma] **K**, siñcantu **JM RM**, siñca{ntu}tu **Mā** ca dīrgham] **Or**, ca | dīrgham **K** āyusḥ] **Or**, āyuh **K** kṛṇotu] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, kṛṇot{e}u **Ku** || 18 ||] || ṛ 9 || 18 || **Ku JM**, || ṛ || 18 || **RM**, || 18 || ṛ 9 || **V/126 Pa**, || 19 || ṛ 9 || **Mā**, Z 1 Z **K**

Note that **K** exchanges pāda c with 6.19.9c below. The *Or.* mss. have preserved the correct arrangement of the text.

## 6.19. For blessings.

BARRET (1921a) observed that this hymn runs parallel in some ways to the preceding one; rather, it is a continuation of it, as the deities invoked are not the same, except for Bhaga in st. 1 (cf. 6.18.4). From the perspective of the arrangement of words, the pattern of stanzas 1–7 is constant, but then stanzas 8–9 suddenly return to the pattern of hymn 6.18.

It is sometimes possible to discern a rationale in the connection of deities with other items in this hymn’s stanzas. While *sūryā* is mentioned in 5c apparently because of a paronomastic association with *surā* in 5b, other kinds of associations can also be detected, such as the pairing of Dhātar, establisher of embryos (PS 5.12.8d, 11.1.2a+5b, 12.3.3b etc.), and Aryaman (arranger of marriages), with ‘Pouring’ (of semen) in 3; of solar Savitar and Sūrya with the moon in 6; and of cattle with *yajña-* and *dakṣiṇā-* in 7. But there are also cases where the connection remains obscure: why, e.g., is Amśa associated with Vāyu and *vāta-* in 4?

### 6.19.1 Only PS

saṃ bhago varcasā māgne	(8)
saṃ viṣṇuḥ puṣṭyāsīcat	(8)
kṣatram sam asmān siñcatu	(8)
prajayā ca dhanena ca-	(8)
-āyuṣmantam kṛnotu mā	(8)

Together with splendor [has] Bhaga [poured] me, o Agni; together with prosperity has Viṣṇu poured [me]. Let dominion pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let it make me full of life.

bhago] **Or**, bhargo **K** varcasā] **K**, varccasā **Or** viṣṇuḥ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], viṣṇaḥ **JM**, viṣṇuḥ **K** puṣṭyāsīcat |] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], puṣṭyāsīcata | **JM RM**, puṣṭyāstjāt, **K** [*om.* ], but note virāma] kṣatram] **Or**, kṣettram **K** [[Edg. mistakenly °etra°] asmān] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, asmāna **RM** siñcatu] **Or**, siñcatu **K** [[Edg. mistakenly °ñc°] cāyuṣmantam] **Or**, ca | āyuṣmantam **K** mā ||] **Or**, māṃ [*om.* ]] **K**

The gods Bhaga and Viṣṇu both have solar associations. The latter, as king *par excellence* (cf. GONDA 1954a: 164ff.), is connected with *kṣatra-* in **c**. BHATTACHARYA splits here, and below: *puṣṭyā sicat*.

**b**. BHATTACHARYA assumes an aor. inj. *sicat*. The collocation with *siñcatu* in pāda **c**, and *kṛnotu* in **d**, might indeed suggest that we need a verb form with hortative meaning here, rather than an augmented 3rd sg. aor. ind. *asīcat*. Metrically and semantically, a pres. inj. form *siñcat* (HOFFMANN 1967: 261 — no modal function of the pres. inj.) was not available to the poet here, nor was *\*sīcatu* (HOFFMANN p. 264 — 3rd sg. aor. inj. for unattested aor. imp.).

We could, therefore, regard *sicat* as a precious rare example of the hortatively used injunctive (HOFFMANN 1967: 255ff.), which is all but lost in the language of the AV: cf. 1.108.4c *kran*; *kṛtat* in 7.13 below, a form occurring also at 1.89.2 in parallel to 3rd sg. pres. subj. *hanat* in stanza 3; perhaps also 1.21.1a <sup>+</sup>*nāsaṃ* <sup>+</sup>*naśan svayam srasan* ‘let [the Apacits] go to ruins, let them fall off by themselves’ (and non-prohibitive *guḥ* at 1.108.4c, and 6.2.4a above). Another possible interpretation also suggests itself for a form *sicat*, and most of the other just quoted forms: they could be subjunctives. In the aor. system ṚV *vocati* occurs next to *vocāti*, which suggests that (at least some of) the forms deemed “[inj./subj.]” by LUBOTSKY 1997a: 1216 are subjunctives. Cf. HOFFMANN’s treatment (1967: 107f.) of several apparent injunctive forms in Vedic prose as “abnorm gebildete Konjunktive”, and the form *bruvat* at 7.8.1b.

An (augmented) aorist form can, however, also be given good sense in the context, and we in fact find such an augmented form in the thematically related passage ŚS 4.8.6: *abhī tvā varcasāsīcann āpo divyāḥ páyasvatīḥ | yáthāso mītravárdhanas táthā tvā savitá karat* ‘The heavenly waters, rich in fluid, have poured on you with splendor. Savitar shall make you such that you shall increase friendships’, where the augmented form is confirmed by the padapāṭha. Such confirmation is not available in the following parallel passage, where WHITNEY (on ŚS 4.8.6) and BLOOMFIELD (1906: 91) assume *asicam* (Sāyaṇa on TB assumes *sicam*, whence the word-division in the TB editions): it is TB 2.7.15.4–5 (PS 4.2.7ab, 8.10.10ab ≈ KS 36.15:84.1, 37.9:89.16) *abhī tvā varcasāsīcam divyéna | páyasā sahá | yáthāsā rāṣṭravárdhanaḥ || táthā tvā savitá karat* ‘I have poured on you with splendor, together with the heavenly fluid ...’. Cf. also PS 20.26.1 [PSK 20.25.1]: *saṃ mā bhagena dviguṇena varcasā saṃ mā pṛthivyā \*saṃ \*mauṣadhībhiḥ | saṃ māpo mayobhuvo bhagena varcasāsīcan* ‘Together me with fortune, with twofold splendor, together me with the earth, together me with the plants, together have the delightful waters poured me with fortune, with splendor’ (a form *dhattām* follows in the next stanza). It may be noted that the aorist form is in all these passages followed by a hortative expression. I therefore assume *asicat*.

### 6.19.2 Only PS

saṃ virāḍ varcasā māgne	(8)
saṃ deṣṭrī puṣṭyāsīcat	(8)
iḍā sam asmān siñcatu	(8)
prajayā ca °°°	

Together with splendor [has] the Virāḥ [poured] me, o Agni; together with prosperity has Deṣṭrī poured [me]. Let Refreshment pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let it make me full of life.

varcasā] **K**, varccasā **Or** deṣṭrī] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, {surāpu}deṣṭrī **V/126** puṣṭyāsīcat |] **Ku V/126 Mā [Ma]**, {varcca}puṣṭyāsīcata | **JM**, puṣṭyāsīcata | **RM**, po(→

pu 2)ṣṭyāsīcat | **Pa**, puṣṭyāsṛjat, **K** [*om.* |, but note °t, i°] idā] iṛā **Or**, iṛā **K** [[Edg. mistakenly °d°] siñcatu] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, siñcatu **JM** prajayā ca ° ° ° ||] **Ku RM Mā Pa** [**Ma**], prajayā ca dhanena cāyusmantam kṛnotu mā || **JM**, prajayā ca dhanena cā || **V/126**, prajayā ca dhanena ca | **K**

The goddess Deṣṭrī ‘the Directress’ (thus WHITNEY), discussed at some length by GONDA (1965a: 341f.), is referred to a number of times in the PS, at 5.26.5, 11.15.3, 12.11.3, 16.22.2 (ŚS 11.4[6].12), 16.108.6 (ŚS 10.10.17), 19.42.7, and once in the RV: 10.85.47 (= ManB 1.2.15, ĀpMP 1.11.3 etc.). Three of the PS passages refer to her as Sinīvālī (see OBERLIES 1998: 230 n. 390 for literature). She is connected with the term *prāṇa-* together with *virāj-* also at 16.22.2 (ŚS 11.4[6].12), and is equated with the *vaśā-*cow at 12.11.3, as are both *virāj-* and *idā-* in the preceding stanza 12.11.2.

### 6.19.3 Only PS

saṁ dhātā varcasā māgne (8)  
 saṁ siktiḥ puṣṭyāsīcat | (8)  
 saṁ devo asmān aryamā (8)  
 prajayā ca ° ° ° ||

Together with splendor [has] Dhātar [poured] me, o Agni; together with prosperity has the pouring [of semen] poured [me]. [Let] the god Aryaman [pour] us together with progeny and wealth. Let him make me full of life.

saṁ dhātā] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, saṁdhātā **RM** varcasā] **K**, varccasā **Or** siktiḥ] *thus* **Or K** [[*note* °ḥ p°] puṣṭyāsīcat |] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], puṣṭyāsīcata | **JM**, puṣṭyāsṛjat, **K** [*om.* |, but note °t,] asmān] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**], asmā{·}n **Mā**, smān **K** prajayā ca ° ° ° ||] **RM V/126** [[*sec. m.* ||<sup>kā</sup>] **Pa** [**Ma**], prajayā CA{DHA} || **Ku**, prajayā ca dhanena cāyusmantam kṛnotu mā || **JM**, prajayā ca dhanena ca | **Mā K**

### 6.19.4 Only PS

saṁ aṁśo varcasā māgne (8)  
 saṁ vāyuh puṣṭyāsīcat | (8)  
 vātaḥ saṁ asmān siñcatu (8)  
 prajayā ca ° ° ° ||

Together with splendor [has] Aṁśa [poured] me, o Agni; together with prosperity has Vāyu poured [me]. Let the wind pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let it make me full of life.

varcasā] **K**, varccasā **Or** vāyuh] **Or**, vāyuh **K** [[Edg. mistakenly °ḥ] puṣṭyāsīcat |] **Or**, puṣṭyāsṛjat, **K** [*om.* |, but note °t, v°] vātaḥ] **Or**, vātas **K** siñcatu] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, siñcatu **JM** prajayā ca ° ° ° ||] **Ku RM V/126** [[*sec. m.* ||<sup>kā</sup>] **Mā Pa** [**Ma**], prajayā ca dhanena cāyusmantam kṛnotu mā || **JM**, prajayā ca dhanena ca | **K**

## 6.19.5 Only PS

saṃ sabhā varcasā māgne	(8)
saṃ surā puṣṭiyāsīcat	(8)
sūryā saṃ °°°	(8)

Together with splendor [has] the assembly [poured] me, o Agni; together with prosperity has the surā-liquor poured [me]. Let Sūryā pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let her make me full of life.

varcasā] **K** [note superscribed e (?)], varccasā **Or** māgne saṃ surā] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], (·SU)rā **Ku**, māMgne saṃ sarā **K** puṣṭiyāsīcat] **Or**, puṣṭyāsṛjat **K** saṃ °°° ||] saṃ || **Ku RM V/126** [sec. m. ||<sup>kā</sup>] **Mā Pa** [Ma], sam asmān, siṅcatu pra{jā}jayā ca dhanena cāyusmantam kṛnotu mā || **JM**, saṃ | **K**

Consumption of liquor may have been one of the ‘impure’ activities members of the assembly engaged in. Cf. FALK 1986: 89f., where reference is made only to this stanza, and to ŚS 15.9.1–2 (add also 15.9.3) ~ PS 18.35.1. As mentioned above, the connection between *surā-* and *sūryā-* seems to be no more than paronomastic.

## 6.19.6 Only PS

saṃ savitā varcasā māgne	( )
saṃ sūryaḥ puṣṭiyāsīcat	(8)
candraḥ saṃ °°°	(8)

Together with splendor [has] Savitar [poured] me, o Agni; together with prosperity has the sun poured [me]. Let the moon pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let it make me full of life.

varcasā] **K**, varccasā **Or** sūryaḥ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], sūryāḥ **JM**, sūryaḥ **K** puṣṭiyāsīcat] **Or**, puṣṭyāsṛjat **K** candraḥ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], candra **JM K** [Bhatt. reports ‘Mu. candraḥ’] saṃ °°° ||] saṃ || **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], sam asmān, siṅcatu prajayā ca dhanena cāyusmantam kṛnotu mā || **JM**, sam asmāna siṃ || **RM**, saṃ [om. ] **K**

## 6.19.7 Only PS

saṃ paśavo varcasā māgne	( )
saṃ yajñāḥ puṣṭiyāsīcat	(8)
dakṣiṇā saṃ °°°	( )

Together with splendor [have] the (sacrificial) animals [poured] me, o Agni; together with prosperity has the worship poured [me]. Let the sacerdotal fee pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let it make me full of life.

varcasā māgne] varccasā māgne **Or**, varccasāgne **K** yajñāḥ] **Or**, yajñāḥ **K** puṣṭiyāsīcat] **Or**, puṣṭyāsṛjat **K** saṃ °°° ||] saṃ || **Ku RM V/126 Mā** [ ] **Pa** [Ma], sam asmān,

siñcatu prajayā ca dhanena cāyusmantam kṛnotu mā || **JM**, saṃ | **K** [[Edg. mistakenly °m]]

### 6.19.8 Only PS

saṃ mā siñcatu draviṇam (8)  
 saṃ mā siñcat<sub>u,v</sub> indriyam | (8)  
 tejaḥ sam °°° || (8)

Let strength pour me together, let power pour me together, let ardor pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let it make me full of life.

saṃ mā] **V/126 Mā K**, sammā **Ku JM RM Pa Ma** siñcatu] **Ku Pa Ma K**, siñcantu **JM RM V/126 Mā** saṃ mā] **V/126 Mā K**, sammā **Ku JM RM Pa Ma** indriyam || indriyam | **Or K** [[Edg. mistakenly °m]] tejaḥ] **Or**, tejas **K** sam ||] saṃ || **RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], sa{h}ṃ || **Ku**, sam asmān, siñcatu prajayā ca dhanena cāyusmantam kṛnotu mā || **JM**, saṃ | **K**

Note the sudden return to the pattern of hymn 6.18: the change is here not yet complete, because of the singular predicates: all of the **ab** pādas in 6.18, as in stanza 9 of the current hymn, have plural predicates.

**abc.** On this meaning of *draviṇa-*, cf. PW III, 798. The word is mentioned together with *indriyá-* also at ŚS 7.67.1 / PS 3.13.6. For the juxtaposition of *indriya-* and *tejas-*, cf. BĀU 6.4.5.

### 6.19.9 Only PS

saṃ mā siñcantu varcāṃsi (8)  
 saṃ mā siñcantu bhūtayaḥ | (8)  
 satyam sam asmān siñcatu (8)  
 prajayā ca dhanena ca- (8)  
 -āyusmantam kṛnotu mā || 19 || (8)

Let forms of splendor pour me together, let forms of well-being pour me together, let truth pour us together with progeny and wealth. Let it make me full of life.

saṃ mā] **V/126 Mā K**, sammā **Ku JM RM Pa Ma** siñcantu] **Or**, siñcatu **K** varcāṃsi saṃ mā siñcantu] **K**, varccāṃsi sammā siñcantu **Ku RM Mā** [?] **Pa Ma**, varccāṃsiñcantu **JM**, varccāṃsi saṃ mā siñcantu **V/126** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ s°]] satyam] **Or**, sarasvatī **K** cāyusmantam] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma], cāca(→ cā 1)yuśmantam] **Pa**, ca | āyusmantam] **K** || 19 ||] || ṛ 9 || 19 || **Ku JM RM**, || 19 || ṛ (+ 9) || **V/126**, || 19 || ṛ || **Mā Pa**, Z 2 Z **K**

**c.** As is proven by its conceptual connection (cf. ĀpŚS 16.29.2, ManB 2.4.2 [ed. JÖRGENSEN 2.4.5], JaimGS 1.2:2.17f.) with *tejas-* in the preceding, and *varcas-* in the present stanza, the word *satyam* of the Or. mss. is fitting only here, and **K** has exchanged 6.19.9c with 6.18.9c.

## 6.20. To the night.

This hymn (= ŚS 19.47), which belongs together with the following (= ŚS 19.48), is transmitted in ŚS together with two more hymns (19.49–50) that in PS are found as 14.8–9.

Comparison of the sometimes corruptly transmitted ŚS readings with the text as preserved in the PS tradition yields a nearly flawless text (except at 6.20.9a): the ŚS version has generally suffered more corruption than the version found here, and this may be due to the fact that the hymns of ŚS 19 are mostly borrowed into that kāṇḍa from various places in PS, and have not been as accurately transmitted as the rest of ŚS (cf. my Introduction, §2.2.1).

There is some uncertainty regarding the arrangement of PS 6.20 / ŚS 19.47 into stanzas, as I have discussed under stanza 6. In the form that our mss. give the hymn, it exceeds the standard of nine stanzas per hymn by one. 6.21, with only 6 stanzas, does not agree with the standard either: why these two rātrī-hymns are placed here in this kāṇḍa, and why they are incorporated in the *navarcakāṇḍa* in the first place, remains unclear: the older anukramaṇī of the ŚS (Pañcapaṭalikā, BHAGWADDATTA 1920) does not take ŚS 19 into account, so it is hard to judge the significance of the fact that the later AthBSA analyses ŚS 19.47 as *navakam*, despite the fact that the ŚS mss. also divide the hymn into 10 stanzas (albeit with some differences from the PS division after stanza 6). Is neither the division of the hymn into stanzas as adopted here, nor that of the ŚS mss., the original one? See my commentary on stanza 6.

### 6.20.1 ŚS 19.47.1, RVKh 4.2.1, VSM 34.32, VSK 33.2.1, Nir 9.29

ā rātri pārthivaṃ rajaḥ	(8)
pitur *aprāyi dhāmabhiḥ	(8)
divaḥ sadāṃsi bṛhatī vi tiṣṭhasa	(12)
ā tveṣaṃ vartate tamaḥ	(8)

O Night, the earthly space has been filled [by you] with the positions of [your] father. Over the heaven's seats you are spreading high. The sparkling darkness is coming on.

rajaḥ] **Or**, rajaḥ **K** pitur \*aprāyi dhāmabhiḥ] pitura(+ ḥ) prāyudhāmabhiḥ **Ku**, pituraḥprāyudhāmabhiḥ **JM RM V/126 Mā**, pituraḥprāyudhāmabhiḥ **Pa [Ma]**, pituraḥprāyudhāmabhiḥ **K** ] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ d°] divaḥ sadāṃsi] **Ku RM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, diva sadāṃsi **JM**, divaḥ saṃdāsi **Mā**, divas sudhāṃsi **K** bṛhatī vi] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, bṛhatī vi **V/126**, Vṛhatīva **K** tveṣaṃ] **Or**, tveṣaṃ **K** vartate] **K**, varttate **Ku JM Mā Pa [Ma]**, vattate **RM V/126** tamaḥ ||] *thus Or K* [[*om.* ], but note °ḥ n°]

#### ŚS 19.47.1 etc.

ā rātri pārthivaṃ rājaḥ pitúr aprāyi dhāmabhiḥ |  
divāḥ sādāṃsi bṛhatī ví tiṣṭhasa ā tveṣāṃ vartate támaḥ ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *pituraprāyudhāmabhiḥ*.

**bc.** The archetype of all PS mss. (\*G) must already have been corrupt, as they unanimously read *aprāyu*, which goes against all parallel texts, and makes no sense. It is impossible to recover when this error crept into the text, but it seems likely that it did so because a form of the word *āyudha-* was understood to be present. The correspondence between the visarga found in some Or. mss., and the upadhmaniya in **K** *pitaraḥprāyudhāmabhiḥ* may be mere chance.

The meaning of *dhāman-*, and of its instr. pl. form, is a notorious problem (see GONDA 1967a, esp. p. 41). The parallelism of *pitúr . . . dhāmabhiḥ* with *divāḥ sādāṃsi* is noteworthy. Comparing also ṚV 1.90.7bc (*mādhumat pārthivaṃ rájaḥ | mádhu dyáur astu naḥ pitā*), it seems to me that there is ample support for taking the ‘father’ as Father Heaven, the father of the night (*duhitar divaḥ* in 5, also at ṚV 10.127.8), rather than GONDA’s “anonymous mighty god”. The concrete functions of Father Heaven are rather limited and vague (see OBERLIES 1998: 264f.). Perhaps his ‘positions’ are the stars that lighten up the night-time sky (see also pāda **d**).

Cf. ṚV 10.127.2 *órv àprā ámarthyā niváto devy údvátaḥ | jyótiṣā bādhate támaḥ* ‘The immortal heavenly [night] has filled the wide [space], the depths, the heights: she removes the darkness with light’. This parallel seems to favor a different suggestion for the agent of *aprāyi*, a “patientive Oppositionsbildung zu aktivem *á prā*”, than KÜMMEL’s (1996: 72): ‘Angefüllt (worden) ist jetzt, o Nacht, der irdische Raum von den Satzungen des Vaters’.

### 6.20.2 ŚS 19.47.2 ◊ e: ṚVKh 4.2.4d

na yasyāḥ pāraṃ dadṛśe na yoyuvad	(12)
viśvam asyāṃ nī viśate yad ejati	(12)
ariṣṭāśas ta urvi tamasvati	( )
rātri pāraṃ aśīmahī	(8)
bhadre pāraṃ aśīmahī	(8)

In this [night], whose other side is not, [whose] receding [space (?)] is not visible, all that moves comes to rest. O wide one full of [sparkling] darkness, uninjured may we reach your other side, o Night, may we reach [your] other side, o gracious one.

yasyāḥ] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [Ma], yasyā **V/126**, yasyāḥ **K** yoyuvad] **Or**, yoyavad **K** viśvam asyāṃ] **Or**, yasyasasyāṃ **K** nī viśate yad] **Or**, mimiṣater **K** ejati] **Ku JM RM Pa** [Ma] **K**, eyati **V/126 Mā** ariṣṭāśas ta urvi] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], ariṣṭāśa urvi **JM**, ariṣṭāśasyaca udurva **K** tamasvati] **RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], tamaśvati **Ku**, tamasYati **JM**, tisasyaca **K** rātri] **Ku JM RM K**, rātrī **V/126 Mā Pa Ma** aśīmahī] **Ku V/126 Mā** [Ma], aśīmahī **JM**, asi(+ ma 3)hiśī **RM**, aśīmahī **Pa**, aśīmahī | **K** [note ||] bhadre pāraṃ aśīmahī] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma] **K**, om. **Mā** ||] **Or**, om. **K**

#### ŚS 19.47.2

nā yasyāḥ pāraṃ dadṛśe [ŚPP dadṛśe] ná yoyuvad viśvam asyāṃ nī viśate yad ejati | ariṣṭāśas ta urvi tamasvati rātri pāraṃ aśīmahī bhadre pāraṃ aśīmahī ||

BHATTACHARYA does not report the small error *eyati* in **Mā**, that is shared by its sister ms. **V/126**.

a. As SCHAEFER has proven (1994: 35ff., cf. already JAMISON 1983b: 43–53, also LUBOTSKY 1997b: 558f.), the subjunctive of the intensive had zero-grade in the root, and there would thus be no morphological problem in interpreting *yóyuwat* as a 3rd sg. int. subj. here. According to this interpretation, we could translate ‘whose other side is not visible, [but] shall not keep away (tr./intr.?) [either]’ (supplying *pārám* as subject to *yóyuwat* as well). SCHAEFER herself (1994: 171f.) discussed the form, which she — following WHITNEY — takes as a participle n. sg. of the int. stem of <sup>2</sup>*yav*: “Die Intensivbildung drückt entweder iteratives ‘Schritt für Schritt’ bzw. ‘Stück für Stück’ zurückweichen aus, oder sie steht zur Bezeichnung einer einfachen Wiederholung der Verbalhandlung”. She supplies ‘das Dunkel’ (*támas-*) as neuter noun. I prefer, in tentatively accepting this line of interpretation, to supply *rájas-* ‘space’ (cf. pāda 1a, and ṚV 1.52.10 *dyáús . . . áyoyavīt* ‘the Heaven receded’). Is it the dark earthly space that is referred to as invisible?

c. WHITNEY 1881: 70 assumes the scansion *ur<sub>u</sub>vi*, which seems to have no parallels in other ṚV or AV attestations of *urvī-*.

### 6.20.3 ŚS 19.47.3 ≈ ṚVKh 4.2.2, ŚāṅkhŚS 9.28.10

ye te rātri nṛcakṣaso	(8)
draṣṭāro navatir nava	(8)
aśītiḥ santiy aṣṭā	(7)
uto te sapta saptatiḥ	(8)

The ninety-nine watchers over men, the observers, o Night, that are yours — there are eighty-eight, and seventy-seven of yours; . . . .

ye te rātri] **Or**, eterātre **K** draṣṭāro] **Or**, dṛṣṭāro **K** nava |] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa**  
 [Ma], navaḥ | **RM K** aśītiḥ santy] **Or**, aśītis santv **K** aṣṭā uto] **K**, aṣṭāvuto **Ku**  
**V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], aṣṭāvṛto **JM**, aṣṭāvūto **RM** saptatiḥ ||] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa**  
 [Ma], saptati || **V/126**, saptatiḥ [*om.*] **K** [*note °ḥ ṣ°*]

#### ŚS 19.47.3, ṚVKh 4.2.2

yé te rātri nṛcákṣaso draṣṭāro [ṚVKh yuktāso] navatír náva |  
 aśītiḥ santy [ṚVKh santv] aṣṭā úto te saptá saptatiḥ ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *aṣṭāvuto*. On the interpretation of the “unüberschbar vielen (denn das bedeutet diese nach der Grundzahl 11 gestaffelte Zahlenreihe) Auslugern der Nacht” as the stars, in this and the following stanzas, cf. LOMMEL 1953: 328ff. = 1978: 299ff. Stephanie Jamison suggests to me that the steadily decreasing numbers in these stanzas might be a reference to the observation of fewer and fewer stars as the sky begins to lighten for the hopefully expected dawn.

a. For a discussion of the possible interpretations of *nṛcákṣas-*, see under 6.9.1b above.

**cd.** Note that **K** seems to agree with the RVKh text, in reading imp. *santv*. If this is not a mere graphical error in **K** (*Cy* → *Cv*), it is an example of a typical Kashmiri reading which has influenced the text of PS in its Kashmir transmission (cf. my Introduction, §2.6.3.2). WHITNEY explains that ŚPP’s emendation of the transmitted accentless verb to *sánty* is “without sufficient reason, since *santi* is defensible, **3 c** to **5 b** inclusive being of the nature of a parenthesis, extending the *navatír náva* of **3 b**”. My translation here and in the following stanzas attempts to express this interpretation of WHITNEY’S.

In view of the reading offered by **K** and the parallel texts, and in view of the overwhelming evidence for sandhi *-au u-* → *-ā u-* (see AiGr. I, §274 p. 326) also in the PS (e.g. 13.3.4c, cited below in the introduction to 7.19), I assume that the Or. reading *aṣṭāvuto* is due to hiatus-breaking insertion of a glide (cf. insertion of °*y*° in some or all of the Or. mss. at 6.15.8d, 6.16.10d, 6.22.13a, 19.3.9b), and therefore make the necessary small change to BHATTACHARYA’S text.

#### 6.20.4 ŚŚ 19.47.4

ṣaṣṭiś ca ṣaṭ ca revati	(8)
pañcāśat pañca sumnaya	(8)
catvāraś catvāriṁśac ca	(8)
trayas triṁśac ca vājini	(8)

... and sixty and six, o wealthy one; fifty-five, o well-willing one; four and forty, three and thirty, o prize-winner...

ṣaṣṭiś] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, ṣaṣṭi Mā, ṣaṣṭyuś **K** ṣaṭ ca] **Or**, ṣaḍuca **K** revati pañcāśat pañca] **Ku RM Pa [Ma]**, revatipañcāśatpañca **JM**, revatipañcāśatpañca **V/126 Mā**, revatyaṁcāśatyamca **K** sumnaya |] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā Pa**, sumna(→ mni)yi | **Ma**, naśamnihi [om. |] **K** trayas triṁśac] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]** **K**, traya{śca}striṁśac **RM** vājini ||] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, vājini || **RM**, vādini **Z** **K** [note punctuation]

#### ŚŚ 19.47.4

ṣaṣṭiś ca ṣaṭ ca revati pañcāśat pañca sumnaya |  
catvāraś catvāriṁśac ca trayas triṁśac ca vājini ||

**ab.** In a letter dated February 9, 2005, Marcos Albino has proposed to me the following convincing explanation for the form *sumnaya*:

Das als Anrede an die Nacht dienende Wort [*sumnaya*] wird von WHITNEY wie ein Vokativ von *sumnayú-* wiedergegeben; zu der ungewöhnlichen Form äußert er sich nicht. DEBRUNNER, *Ai.Gr.* II 2, § 247b Anm., der *sumnaya* mit der Bemerkung “unklar” zu den Vr̥kī-Stämmen stellt, vergleicht zweifelnd *sumnayú-* ‘günstig’; ähnlich MAYRHOFER, *EWAia* II, S. 737. Die Textstelle zeigt m.E. jedoch recht gut, wie sich die Form erklärt. Die Strophe enthält, kongruierend mit dem in Str. 3 vorausgehenden femininen Vokativ *rātri* ‘o Nacht’, drei parallele Vokative (als Götterepitheta),

jeweils in Kadenz. Bei zwei der drei Adjektive handelt es sich um das movierte Femininum eines Konsonantenstammes (*revātī-*, *vājīnī-*) mit dem regulären Vokativ *revati*, *vājini*. Das movierte Femininum zu *sumnayú-* lautet *sumnayú-*, als Vokativ könnte man entsprechend \**sumnayu* erwarten. Das statt dessen belegte *sumnayi* erklärt sich offensichtlich als eine textbedingte Augenblickbildung, reimend mit *revati* und *vājini*.<sup>25</sup>

The epithets *revātī-* and *sumnayú-* belong properly to the sphere of the goddess of the dawn, as do the other epithets used in this and the following stanza (GONDA 1959a: 96).

d. Regarding the epithet *vājīnī-*, cf. my notes on 6.10.7d.

### 6.20.5 ŚŚ 19.47.5

d <sub>u</sub> vā ca viṃśatīś ca te	(8)
rātrīy ekādaśāvamāḥ	(8)
tebhir no <sub>a</sub> dya pāyubhir	(8)
<sup>+</sup> ni pāhi duhitar divaḥ	(8)

... and two and twenty of yours, o Night, eleven the least —: with those protectors you must protect us today, o daughter of heaven.

rātry ekādaśāvamāḥ |] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, rātryayakādaśāvamāḥ | **JM**, rātrī ekādaśāvamā [om. |] **K** tebhir] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, (+ t 4)ebhir **Pa** <sub>a</sub>dya] 'dya **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, '(+ ·)dya **JM**, dya **K** <sup>+</sup>ni pāhi] nupāhi **Or**, nṛpāhi **K** duhitar divaḥ] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, duhitarddivaḥ **RM**, duhitamṛdivaḥ **K** ||] **Or**, om. **K** [note °ḥ r°]

#### ŚŚ 19.47.5

dvāu ca te viṃśatīś ca te rātry ékādaśāvamāḥ |  
tébhir no adyá pāyúbhir \*ní [SPP <sup>+</sup>nú, mss. ná] pāhi duhitar divaḥ ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *nu pāhi*. Note that the Or. mss. write *dya* without avagraha in stanza 7.

d. Basically all mss. for the ŚŚ version of this pāda read *ná*. WHITNEY rightly judged this reading to be impossible: “We emended it to *ní* (cf. *ní pāti* in ix.10.23); SPP., following that blind guide the comm., reads *nú*; this is entirely unacceptable, both on account of the sense, and because *nú* cannot stand at the beginning of a pāda...”.

WHITNEY’s outright rejection of the reading offered by Sāyaṇa is put in a new perspective by the fact that the Or. mss. transmit precisely that same reading *nu*: a very interesting case of agreement between Sāyaṇa and the Or. mss.

<sup>25</sup> Albino adds in a note: “Dass die Vokative *rātri*, *revati* und *vājini* bei der Bildung von *sumnayi* eine Rolle gespielt haben, wurde bereits von Zubatý, “Zu den ai. männl. -ī-St.”, S. 20 erkannt. Seine Erklärung von *sumnayi* ist allerdings überholt; sie beruht auf der Annahme, dass es neben den -yu-Stämmen gelegentlich heteroklitische Stämme auf -ya- gab und zu beiden -ī-Feminina.”

But the fact remains that *nú* is unacceptable at the beginning of a pāda (the ṚV distribution with enclitic *nú* and pāda initial *nú* is lost in the AV: initial *nú* does not exist at all anymore, except in the ṚV mantras of ŚS 20).

**K** here (*nṛpāhi*), as well as at PS 19.2.1 (*nṛpātu*; ŚS 6.4.1 and Or. mss.: *nu pātu*), might be taken to point to a reverbalized imper. form derived from the secondary agent noun *nṛpātár-* attested at ṚV 1.174.10 and 7.74.6 (cf. AiGr. II/1, p. 188, and RENO 1955–69/XVI: 52). However, at neither place does this interesting possibility raised by **K** receive any confirmation from the Or. mss., or from the ms. readings of the ŚS parallels: the readings *nṛpāhi* and *nṛpātu* can therefore not be taken seriously. The words *nu pāhi* are transmitted unanimously by **K** and the Or. mss. at 2.80.1d: *tam ū nu pāhi tam ū nu \*jinva jāgrhi* ‘protect this now, enliven this now, stay awake’. Here the particle *nu* fits perfectly, as it does at PS 19.2.1 / ŚS 6.4.1. Leaving aside the problems of how the ŚS mss. acquired the reading *ná*, and how Śāyaṇa came to know of the reading found in the Or. mss. (if their correspondence is not merely chance, which seems unlikely in view of his agreement with the Or. mss. in the stanza-division of this hymn: see below under stanza 6), we may thus speculate that the sequence *nu pāhi* has been introduced here into the Or. transmission through perseveration from PS 2.80.1.

The only possibility is to accept WHITNEY’s emendation to *ní pāhi* (cf. PS 4.28.7 [note *na* in Or.!), 18.58.9c, 19.50.10c; ŚS 9.10.23c), for which emendation we may adduce as extra support the fact that — just as *nipā°* would have been reinterpreted in **K** as *nṛpā°* — *sicat* has been reinterpreted as *srjat* in **K** at PS 6.19.1b–7b, and the same mistake *Ci* → *Cṛ* occurs frequently elsewhere in **K** as well: cf. e.g. 6.3.13c, 6.6.4a, 6.9.2a. It is therefore plausible that \*G simply read *ni pāhi*, and that the reading *nṛpā°*, once introduced here in **K**, also caused the perseveration from *nu pātu* to *nṛpātu* at 19.2.1.

**6.20.6** ŚS 19.47.6ab ◊ a: ṚV 6.71.3d, 6.75.10d, KS 4.10:35.19,  
KS 5.6.1:173.10 etc. ◊ b: ṚV 1.23.9c, 7.94.7c

rakṣā mākir ṇo aghaśaṃsa īśata (12)  
mā no duḥśaṃsa īśata || (8)

Give protection! Let no slanderer become our master. Let the evil-speaker not become our master.

mākir ṇo] **K**, mākrṇvo **Or** aghaśaṃsa] **Ku JM Pa [Ma] K**, a{·}ghaśaṃsa **RM**, aghaśaṃsa **V/126**, aghasāṃsa **Mā** [?] īśata] **Ku JM V/126 [Ma] K**, īśata **RM**, īśata **Mā** [?], īśata **Pa** duḥśaṃsa] **Or**, duśśaṃsa **K** [Bhatt.: °śc°] īśata] **V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, īśata **Ku JM**, i{·}śata **RM** ||] **Ku JM RM Pa**, ||<sup>1</sup> **V/126 Mā**, (+ |) **K**

**ŚS 19.47.6ab**

rākṣā mākir ṇo aghaśaṃsa īśata mā no duḥśaṃsa īśata |

BHATTACHARYA reads *mā krṇvo*. The reproduction of **Mā** available to me is barely legible here. It seems to read *aghasaṃsa* and *īśata*, but no such readings

are reported by BHATTACHARYA.

a. While referring in his apparatus to the Or. readings for 7.11.7cd, BHATTACHARYA calls the reading *mā kṛṇvo* ‘questionable’ (*sandigdhaḥ*): rightly so, as the correct text is found in **K**. Note that ms. T1 for KS 4.10:35.19 confirms the retroflexion to *ṇo* in **K**, while all other sources have *no*.

On the ‘preventive’ use of *mā* . . . *īśata*, and the analysis of the verb form as red. aorist, see HOFFMANN 1967: 44, 65f. On the various hostile persons listed here and in the following stanzas, cf. HOFFMANN’s list (p. 65), as well as RODHE 1946: 48.

b. Note that this pāda stands at the end of both R̥V stanzas in which it occurs. While **K**’s inserted daṇḍa can be intended both as marking a hemistich, and as marking a stanza-end (see my Introduction, §2.1.1.3), the Or. mss. unanimously place a double daṇḍa (||) — mss. **V/126** and **Mā** even making explicit that this is a ‘single hemistich (*ekāvasānā*) stanza’ (see my Introduction, §2.1.2.6) — and this must mean that the Or. tradition saw the stanza as ending here. The textual division of the ŚS — with conflicting evidence from mss., the Bṛhatsarvānukramaṇikā, and Sāyaṇa’s comm. — has been discussed by W-L.

VISHVA BANDHU’s 1960 ŚS edition does not faithfully reproduce Sāyaṇa’s comm. on the ŚS version, and ŚPP’s edition thus needs to be consulted: only the latter gives Sāyaṇa’s words *śaṣṭhī || dvipadeyam ṛk |*. This is in contrast with the probably secondary adjustment to the standard of nine stanzas per hymn prevalent in PS 6, and perhaps remembered in the ŚS tradition (?), that is found at AthBSA 10.27: *ā ratri pārthivam iti catvāri sūktāni | pūrvam navakam | . . . māśvānām iti tryavasānā śaṭpadā . . .*. Admittedly, the place of this hymn in the sixth (*navarca*) kāṇḍa makes a reduction to nine stanzas along the lines of the Bṛhatsarvānukramaṇikā attractive, but the Or. mss. seem so clear in their division of the text into ten stanzas (see also my crit. app. to stanza 10), and Sāyaṇa’s evidence is so nicely in agreement with it, that I maintain the same division of the text as adopted by BHATTACHARYA on the basis of his Or. mss.

### 6.20.7 ŚS 19.47.6cd–7ab

<i>mā no adya gavāṃ steno</i>	(8)
<i>māvināṃ vṛka īśata  </i>	(8)
<i>māśvānāṃ bhadre taskaro</i>	(8)
<i>mā nṛṇāṃ yātudhāṇyaḥ   </i>	(8)

Let the robber not become master of our cows today, not the wolf of [our] sheep; not the thief of [our] horses, o gracious one, not the sorceresses of [our] men.

adya] **Or**, dya **K** māvināṃ] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, māvināṃ **V/126**, māvināṃ **K** vṛka īśata] **JM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, vṛka īśata **Ku RM**, vṛka īśata **Mā**, vṛkaiśataḥ **K** ]]

thus **Or K** māśvānām] **Or**, sā(→ mā)śvānām **K** ||] thus **Or K** [||]

ŚS 19.47.6cd–7ab

mā no adyā gāvām stenó māvīnām vṛka īśata || 6 ||  
māśvānām bhadre táskaro mā ṛṇām yātudhānyàḥ |

Regarding the division of the text, see under the preceding stanza. BHATTACHARYA does not report the erroneous spelling *Isata* that I find in **Mā**. There is a marginal correction opposite **K** fol. 96b4, missed by EDGERTON (and BHATTACHARYA), but noted by RAGHU VIRĀ, correcting the first akṣara of the reading *sāśvānām*.

a. INSLER proposes (1970: 139) to render *adyā* here by ‘tonight’, which is elegant, but lacking in precision.

6.20.8 ŚS 19.47.7cd–8ab [= ŚPP 19.47.7cdef] ◊ **cd**: ŚS 4.3.2cd

paramebhiḥ pathibhi	(7)
steno dhāvatu taskaraḥ	(8)
pareṇa datvatī rajjuḥ	(8)
pareṇāghāyur arṣatu	(8)

Let the robber, the thief, run along the most distant paths; along a distant one let the toothed rope, along a distant [path] let the malicious one shoot forth.

paramebhiḥ] **Or**, paramebhiḥ **K** pathibhi] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, pathibhi{ḥ} **JM** dhāvatu] **Or**, dhāvatu **K** datvatī] **K**, dadvatī **Ku V/126 Pa**, dadvatī **JM RM**, davyatī **Mā Ma** rajjuḥ] **Or**, rajjuḥ **K** pareṇāghāyur arṣatu ||] **Or**, pareṇāyurakṣatu [om.] ||] **K**

ŚS 19.47.7cd–8ab [= ŚPP 19.47.7cdef]

paramébhiḥ pathībhi stenó dhāvatu táskaraḥ || 7 ||  
páreṇa datvatī rájjuḥ páreṇāghāyúr arṣatu |

ŚS 4.3.2 (corresponding with considerable variation to PS 2.8.2) is parallel to this whole stanza, and offers two identical pādas: *páreṇaitu pathá vṛkaḥ paraménotá táskaraḥ | páreṇa datvatī . . .*

c. BHATTACHARYA writes in his crit. app., regarding the **Or**. reading *davyatī*: *davyatī iti ‘dadvatī’ ity asyaiva lekhane pramādād udbhūtam iti pratīyate | idam api apāṇinīyam*, and he refers to Aṣṭādhyāyī 1.4.19. Indeed, the Oriya akṣara *vya* can be written in such a way that it is (nearly) identical to *dva*, and it seems certain to me that the scribes of BHATTACHARYA’s **Ma** and **Mā** also intended *dva*. The **K** reading with *tv* is authentic (cf. AiGr. II/2, §712f pp. 890f.), and BHATTACHARYA has done well to deviate from his usual adherence to the **Or**. transmission.

Besides the parallels to this mantra mentioned above, the ‘toothed rope’ occurs only at PS 13.4.4, where the fact that it designates snakes (cf. WHITNEY’s comm.) is made explicit. I quote the text of pādas **cd** after ZEHNDER (*apud* KULIKOV 2001: 442): *yadā paidvo ’śvamātā krandenāḥin apāvapat | rajjū*

*ṣma* \**datvatīḥ śere* + *pūyantīḥ pṛthivīm anu* ‘When Paidva, who has a horse as mother, dispersed the snakes with his neighing, the toothed ropes lay over the earth, rotting’ (note this early example of *sma* + present yielding a preterite meaning; note also the interesting sandhi °*ūḥ sm*° → °*ū ṣm*°, which is relevant to the problematic case of how to edit PS *du(h/ṣ)ṣvapnya-/duḥsvapnya-*: cf. my Introduction, §2.8 (T), and BENFEY 1848: XLV).

**6.20.9** ŚS 19.47.8cd–9ab [= ŚPP 19.47.8] ◇ ≈ PS 14.9.1, ŚS 19.50.1

andhaṃ rātri †tiṣṭhadhūmam†	(8)
aśīrṣāṇam ahiṃ kṛṇu	(8)
hanū vṛkasya jambhaya-	(8)
-ā stenam drupade jahi	(8)

Make, o Night, the *tiṣṭhadhūma* snake blind, headless. Crush the jaws of the wolf. Strike at the robber [bound] on the post.

andhaṃ] **Or**, andho **K** †tiṣṭhadhūmam†] *thus* **Or K** aśīrṣāṇam] **Or**, aśīrṣāṇim **K**  
ahiṃ] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, Āhiṃ **V/126** hanū] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**,  
hanu **V/126**, hano **K** vṛkasya jambhayā] **JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, vṛkasyājambhayā  
**Ku**, vṛka[[*folio*]]jambhayā **Mā** stenam drupade] *stenam drupade* **Or**, dvainaṃṛpate **K**

ŚS 19.47.8cd–9ab [= ŚPP 19.47.8]

\*andhām [ŚPP ádha] rātri tṛṣṭádadhūmam aśīrṣāṇam áhiṃ kṛṇu || 8 ||

hánū vṛkasya \*jambhayá \*stenám [ŚPP jambháyās téna tám] drupadé jahi ||

**ab.** The PS text here and at 14.9.1 confirms (ROTH and) WHITNEY’S “plausible correction” of the reading *ándha* of the majority of the ŚS mss. to *andhām*. The unanimous reading of the PS mss. (*tiṣṭhadhūmam* or *tiṣṭha dhūmam*) is odd. Since all the remaining pādas of this stanza contain an imper. form, there is something to be said for the latter analysis, while ṚV 10.46.7 *arcaddhūma-* ‘of singing/shining smoke’ (of the fire) might be taken to favor a small emendation *tiṣṭhaddhūmam* ‘of enduring smoke’, perhaps supported by the connection between night and smoke that is made, e.g., at JB 1.49. But neither of these interpretations seem to make any sense in the context. All mss. of ŚS point to a bahuvrīhi compound *tṛṣṭádadhūmam* ‘of pungent/poisonous smoke’, an expression which may be compared with the reference to Agni’s smoke being *tṛṣṭá-* that we seem to find at ṚV 3.9.3a *áti tṛṣṭám vavakṣitha* ‘you (o Agni) have grown beyond the pungent’.<sup>26</sup> But in order to have this expression qualify the *áhi-* ‘snake’ (cf. ŚS 12.1.46 / PS 17.5.4 *tṛṣṭádamśman-*, also at PS 15.17.7, 19.20.7b), we would either need to assume that somehow the image of the fire’s smoke has been poetically transferred to the snake’s poison, or that *dhūma-* ‘smoke’ in this compound could mean also ‘breath, odor’ (thus GRIFFITH) and

<sup>26</sup> Cf. GELDNER’S comment: “Das Scharfe oder Giftige (*tṛṣṭám*) ist der zuerst entstehende Rauch, der für eine Wirkung des Rakṣas galt, vgl. 1, 140, 5; 5, 2, 9 und Śat. 2, 3, 2, 9, wo Agni in diesem Stadium dem Rudra gleichgesetzt wird”.

hence perhaps even ‘poison’. Both assumptions are quite *ad hoc*, and I therefore hesitantly retain the transmitted PS reading within obeli (even though the **K** reading at 7.19.3a supports assumption of confusion *ṛṣṭa-/tiṣṭ(h)a-*). Note that the parallel R̥VKh 3.21.2ab (also SVK 2.1221; cf. ŚS 6.67.2ab / PS 19.6.14ab) has *andhā amitṛā bhavatāśṛṣṇāṇo ’haya iva* ‘become blind, you enemies, like headless snakes’, which supports taking *andham* as an adj. to *ahim* in the present stanza as well.

**cd.** R-W’s conjectures for the ŚS version (cf. also W-L) of this stanza and its very close parallel at ŚS 19.50.1 are corroborated by the PS version. Nearly the same corrupt reading as found here is given in **K** also at 14.9.1: *tvainamṛpate*. WHITNEY’s rendering ‘cast into the snare’ for *á . . . drupadé jahi* seems ill-founded. The only other attestation offered for such a meaning ‘befestigen’ by PW VII, 1500, viz. ŚB 13.2.9.6 [= TB 3.9.7.4–5] does not in fact support the gloss (cf. EGGELING’s translation), nor do the cases of *áhata*-mentioned there. Except in the obscure stanza R̥V 4.32.23, the other instances of the locatives *drupadé/drupadéṣu* in Vedic (PS 19.11.3a = ŚS 6.63.3a/6.84.4a, R̥V 1.24.13b, VādhŚS 6.2.5.17 [ed. CHAUBEY 6.9.18]) are all combined with a form of the verb *bandh* ‘to bind’: a *drupadá-* is thus not a snare into which a robber can be cast, but a post to which or a fetter in which he can be bound (cf. ZEHNDER 2004b: 384, n. 24), and then beaten: *āhánana-* simply means ‘striking at’ in ŚS 12.5.39+47 (but cf. *āghmāná-* + loc. in 48).

#### 6.20.10 ŚS 19.47.9cd–10 [= ŚPP 19.47.9]

tvayi rātri vasāmasi	(8)
svapiṣyāmasi jāgṛhi	(8)
gobhīyo naḥ śarma yacha-	(8)
-asṣebhyaḥ puruṣebhyaḥ    20	(8)

With you, o Night, we stay. We are about to go to sleep, you must stay awake. Grant protection to our cows, horses, men.

tvayi] **Or**, tai **K** vasāmasi] **Or**, viśāmasi **K** svapiṣyāmasi] **Ku V/126 RM Mā Pa** [**Ma**], ṣvapiṣyāmasi **JM**, sapuṣtyāmasi **K** jāgṛhi |] **Or**, jāgṛvi **K** [[*om.*] |] naḥ śarma] **Or**, naś śarma **K** yachāśṣebhyaḥ] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa Ma**, yaCchāśṣebhy{e}aḥ] **Ku**, yaśchādaśṣebhyaḥ] **K** puruṣebhyaḥ] **K**, puṣebhyaḥ] **Or** || 20 ||] || ṛ {9}→ 10 || 20 ||] **Ku**, || ṛ 10 || 20 ||] **JM**, || ṛ || 20 ||] **RM**, || 20 || ṛ (+ 9 + 10) || a 4 ||] **V/126**, || 20 || ṛ || a 4 ||] **Mā**, || 20 || ṛ ||] **Pa Ma**, Z 3 Z **K**

#### 19.47.9cd–10 [= ŚPP 19.47.9]

tvāyi rātri vasāmasi svapiṣyāmasi jāgṛhī || 9 ||  
góbhyo naḥ śarma yachāśṣebhyaḥ púruṣebhyaḥ || 10 ||

At the end of this hymn, note the continued regularization of the anuvāka division in **Mā** and **V/126**, which started after 6.15.

**a.** As WHITNEY well knew, “‘Stay’ (*vas*) means specifically ‘spend the night’”, but it must be rendered ‘to stay’ here, in order to avoid ‘with you, o

Night, we spend the night’.

**b.** The same error *jāgrvi* is found in 6.21.6d below, and at 16.73.3d and 18.2.10b. Cf. ZEHNDER on PS 2.80.1d, where once again the Or. mss. give *jāgrhi*, while **K** has *jāgrvi*. It is unclear why **K** has *jāgrvi* at all those places, but not at 16.8.8c and 18.15.8d. Werner Knobl proposes to me that the **K** reading, at least in our context, would make good sense “if we could presuppose a feminine stem-form *jāgrvī-* of which *jāgrvi* would then be the regular vocative meaning ‘O wakeful one’ and being addressed to Night”. But perseveration from cases of *jāgrviḥ* such as at 9.13.10b explains the **K** readings well enough.

**c.** Since the reading *-ād* of **K** is not confirmed by the Or. mss., and finds no support in the ŚS transmission, INSLER’s suggestion (1970: 142) to read *\*yachatād* cannot be accepted.

## 6.21. To the night.

### 6.21.1 ŚS 19.48.1

atho yāni ca vasmahe (8)  
yāni cāntaḥ +pariṇahi | (8)  
tāni te pari dadmasi || (8)

And we entrust to you both those that we are wearing, and those that are inside the trunk.

ca vasmahe] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, ca masmahe **RM**, tamassahe **K** yāni] **Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, yā **Pa**, yā[*line*]yāni **JM** cāntaḥ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, cānta **JM**, cāntaḥ **K** +pariṇahi || pariṇahi | **Ku JM RM Mā Pa Ma**, pari(→ re 1)ṇahi | **V/126**, pareṇihi **K** te] **Or**, ye **K** dadmasi ||] **RM Pa [Ma]**, dadma(→ dhma)si **Ku**, dadhmasi **JM V/126 Mā K**

#### ŚS 19.48.1

átho yāni ca yásmāha [R-W \*cáyāmahe] yāni vāntáḥ [ŚPP +cāntáḥ] pariṇáhi |  
tāni te pári dadmasi ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *dadmasi*.

a. The Or. mss. preserve the correct reading *ca vasmahe*, which also underlies the corruption in **K**. The problems posed by the transmitted ŚS text (cf. WHITNEY's commentary) are thus solved. The verb form *vasmahe* here plays on *vasāmasi* in the last stanza of the preceding hymn (with which the present hymn originally formed one whole). The neuter plural object (*yāni* . . . *tāni*) to be supplied with *vasmahe* is probably *vāstrāṇi* (RV 1.140.1, 1.152.1, 3.39.2, 8.1.17, 9.97.2), if jewellery or some other luxury goods are not intended (cf. RV 6.11.6, 9.72.8).

b. Note that ŚPP's choice to follow Sāyaṇa's reading against transmitted *vāntáḥ* (see WHITNEY's commentary) is confirmed by the unanimous PS reading *cāntaḥ*. On the meaning(s) of the word *pariṇáh-* (the ŚS mss. transmit *páriṇahi*, emended by R-W and ŚPP to *pariṇáhi*), see OBERLIES 1992: 118ff. and JAMISON 1997.

### 6.21.2 ŚS 19.48.2 ◊ cf. ŚS 19.50.7 = PS 14.9.7

rātri mātar uṣase naḥ pari \*dehi | (4+8)  
uṣā no ahne pari dadātv ( )  
ahas tubhyaṃ vibhāvāri || (8)

O Mother Night: entrust us to Dawn. Let Dawn entrust us to the day, the day [us] to you, o resplendent one.

rātri] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, rātrī **JM RM** mātar uṣase] **K**, mātaḥṣase **Ku**, mātaḥṣase **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]** naḥ] **Or**, nā **K** \*dehi] dhehi **Or K** ]]  
**Or**, om. **K** uṣā] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, usā(→ ṣā) **Pa**, juṣā **K** ahne] **Ku JM**

V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], 'hne RM, ahnā K dadātv] Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, dadāv  
JM RM ||] Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma], | V/126, om. K

### ŚS 19.48.2

rātri mātara uśāse naḥ pári dehi | uśā no áhne pári dadātv áhas túbhyaṃ vibhāvāri ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *dhehi*. Cf. PS 14.9.7 / ŚS 19.50.7 *uśāse naḥ pári dehi sárvaṇ rātry anāgāsaḥ | uśā no áhna* [R-W *áhna*, PS *ahna*, ŚPP *áhne*]<sup>27</sup> *á bhajād áhas túbhyaṃ vibhāvāri* ‘Unto the dawn, O night, do thou commit us all, free from guilt; may the dawn bestow us on the day, the day on thee, O shining one’ (WHITNEY). Just as in the present stanza, all PS mss. read *dhehi* there, which is to be emended. Cf. also ManB 1.5.15 *sa tvāhne paridadātv ahas tvā rātryai paridadātu . . . ṛtavas tvā saṃvatsarāya paridadātu saṃvatsaras tvāyuse jarāyai paridadātv asau*.

**ab.** For the metrical analysis of the first pāda as *anuṣṭubh*, preceded by two vocatives, cf. the first pāda of the just quoted parallel ŚS 19.50.7 / PS 14.9.7. The second pāda is an unmetrical reformulation of ŚS 19.50.7c / PS 14.9.7c.

In his crit. app., BHATTACHARYA notes that emendation of the unanimously transmitted reading *dhehi* to *dehi* is “*dhyeyaḥ*”. Rather than this emendation being merely ‘to be considered’, I would say that the context forces us to make it. This decision furthermore finds support in the ŚS parallels in 19.48 and 19.50, and in the ManB parallel 1.5.15 (cf. also, e.g. ŚS 6.107.1–4 / PS 19.44.7–10). The same emendation is to be made at PS 14.9.7a. Cf. PS 5.14.7 *ṛṣibhyaḥ pari dehi mām* (with variant *dhehi* in some Or. mss.). Confusion of forms of *dhā* and *dā* is quite common in all Atharvavedic texts.

### 6.21.3 ŚS 19.48.3

yat kiṃ cedaṃ patayati	(8)
yat kiṃ cedaṃ sarīṣpam	(8)
yat kiṃ ca padvad +āsanvat	(8)
+tasmāt tvam rātri pāhi naḥ	(8)

Whatever flits-and-flutters here, whatever is creepy-crawly here, and whatever has foot and mouth: o Night, protect us from it.

yat] Or, yadi K kiṃ cedaṃ] Ku Mā, kiṃ{ce}(→ ṅce 2)daṃ V/126, kiṅcedaṃ JM RM Pa [Ma] K patayati] Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], pataya{·}ti RM, pated K yat] Or, yadi K kiṃ cedaṃ] JM V/126 Mā, kiṃṅcedaṃ Ku, kiṅcedaṃ RM Pa [Ma], kiṃdedaṃ K sarīṣpam] sarīṣpaṃ Or K ||] Ku JM Mā Pa [Ma], || RM V/126, om. K yat] Or, yadi K kiṃ ca] JM V/126 Mā, kiṅca Ku Pa [Ma] K, kiṅc{e}a RM padvad +āsanvat] padvatāsamvat Ku, padvatāṃsaṃvat JM, padvatāṃsamvat RM, padvatāsaṃvat V/126 Mā Pa Ma, padvadāsunvan K +tasmāt tvam] tasmātvaṃ Or

<sup>27</sup> Either the edition of R-W or the one of ŚPP (and the one of VISHVA BANDHU) must contain a misprint or unidentified emendation. Reading *áhna* with R-W and PS is evidently the only possible choice here.

**K** rātri] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, rātrī JM RM** naḥ ||] **Or, nā (+ ) K** [*thus* R-V, Edg. mistakenly naḥ]

### ŚS 19.48.3

yát kīṃ cedāṃ patáyati yát kīṃ cedāṃ sarīsrpám |  
yát kīṃ ca párvatāyāsátvaṃ tásmat tvám rātri páhi naḥ ||

c. The PS readings offer the “definite solution” (WHITNEY) to the problems posed by the corrupt ŚS text. *āsanvat*, as correctly restored by BHATTACHARYA, is found only in the AV: it occurs just once more, at PS 19.4.5 ≈ ŚS 6.12.2cd *yád brahmábhīr yád ṛṣībhīr yád deváir vīditám* [PS *uditám*] *purá* | *yád bhūtám bhávyam āsanvát ténā te vāraye viṣám* ‘I restrain your poison with [the following utterance] that was known/uttered of old by Brahmins, by seers, by the gods, that was and will be, [and] contains the word ‘mouth’ (wrongly WHITNEY ‘that has a mouth’ and BLOOMFIELD 1897: 29 ‘[that] is now present’). In that specific context, where the following mantra contains the word *āsné*, the word *āsanvánt-* is to be compared with PS 2.78.4–5 *agnivant-/sūryavant-* ‘[utterances (*vācas-*)] referring to Agni/Sūrya’: see the notes by ZEHNDER, and cf. AiGr. II/2, §707bα p. 878f. Here, the suffix *-vant-* is not used in such a technical sense: *āsanvánt-* probably refers to those members of the three mentioned categories of creatures, that can strike by biting. *padvánt-* is attested i.a. at RV 1.48.5; PS 3.9.1, 4.22.2, 9.8.1. Cf. also INSLER 1970: 143.

d. On the almost entirely consistent simplification in our mss. of the cluster *ttv* to *tv*, see my Introduction, §2.8 (O).

**6.21.4** ŚS 19.48.4 ◊ **d:** RV 6.54.9c, PS 20.3.5c, ŚS 7.9.3c etc.

sā paścāt páhi sā puraḥ	(8)
sottarād adharād uta	(8)
gopāya no vibhāvāri	(8)
stotāras ta iha smasi	(8)

Protect [us] thus from behind, from the front, from above, and from below. Watch over us, o resplendent one. We are the ones here who praise you.

pāhi sā puraḥ sottarād] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, pāhi sāpurāsottarād **JM**, sāhi mādhurāsattarād **K** vibhāvāri] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, vibhāvāri RM** smasi] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, nasm{i}asi **RM**, ssasi **K**

### ŚS 19.48.4

sā paścāt páhi sā puráḥ sóttarād adharád utá |  
gopāyá no vibhāvāri stotāras ta ihá smasi ||

**ab.** Cf. the beginning of KS 37.10, quoted in full under the next stanza.

**d.** WHITNEY renders ‘thy praisers are we here’ at ŚS 7.3.9, but for ŚS 19.48.4 he gives ‘here we are, thy praisers’, which latter choice seems to miss the point, viz. that it is the speakers who should be spared, as they are the ones who praise the night among other people (‘here’) who do not.

## 6.21.5 ŚS 19.48.5 ◊ abcd: ≈ KS 37.10:91.8f.

ye rātrim anutiṣṭhanti	(8)
ye ca bhūteṣu jāgrati	(8)
paśūn ye sarvān rakṣanti	(8)
te na ātmasu jāgratu	(8)
te naḥ paśūṣu jāgratu	(8)

They that remain up during the night, and that hold vigil over beings, that guard all animals: let them hold vigil over our selves, let them hold vigil over our animals.

jāgrati] Or, jāgrabhi K paśūn] Ku JM RM Pa [Ma] K, paśūna V/126 Mā rakṣanti] Or, rakṣantu K na ātmasu] Or, nātvamasi K naḥ paśūṣu] Ku RM V/126 Pa [Ma], naḥ paśūṣu JM, na(+ h){ātma}paśūṣu Mā, naḥ paśubhir K jāgratu] Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma] K, (+ jā)gratu Mā ||] Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma], |(sec. m. + |) V/126, om. K

## ŚS 19.48.5

yé rātrim anutiṣṭhanti yé ca bhūteṣu jāgrati |  
paśūn yé sārvaṅ rakṣanti té na ātmāsu jāgrati té naḥ paśūṣu jāgrati ||

BHATTACHARYA's text contains a misprint: *rakṣati* for *rakṣanti*. This mantra, together with the preceding one, is illuminated by the interesting parallel KS 37.10, that I quote and translate here in its entirety:

*bodhaś ca mā pratibodhaś ca purastād gopāyatām asvapnaś ca mānavadrā-  
ṇaś ca dakṣiṇato gopāyatām gopāyamānaś ca mā rakṣamāṇaś ca paścād  
gopāyatām jāgrviś ca mārundhatī cottarād gopāyatām ||  
anamitraṃ no adharāg anamitraṃ udak kṛdhi |  
indrānamitraṃ naḥ paścād anamitraṃ puras kṛdhi ||  
anamitraitr ahobhis sacīmahi viśve devā anamitrā na uśasas santu nimiru-  
caḥ || yāṣ ṣaḍ urvīḥ pañca pradīśas tā naḥ pāntu mitradhā no mitre dadhātā  
abhayaṃ no astu ||  
ye rātrim anutiṣṭhatha ye ca bhūteṣu jāgrtha |  
paśūn ye sarvān rakṣatha te na ātmasu jāgrta ||  
bodha pratibodhāsvapnānavadrāṇa gopāyamāna rakṣamāṇa jāgrve 'rundha-  
ti ye devās tanūpās stha te ma iha tanvaṃ pāta bodha pratibodhety asau  
vā ādityo bodho 'gniḥ pratibodho 'svapnānavadrāṇeti candramā vā asvapno  
yaḥ pavate so 'navadrāṇo gopāyamāna rakṣamāṇety ahar vai gopāyamāno  
rātrī rakṣamāṇo jāgrve 'rundhatīti yajño vai jāgrvir dakṣiṇārundhaty ete  
vai devā rāṣṭrabhṛtas tān eveṭṭa ātmano gopithāya ||*

‘Let the one that is awake and the one that awakes watch over me in the East. Let the one that does not sleep and the one that does not slumber watch over me in the South. Let the one that watches and the one that guards watch over me in the West. Let the one that is vigilant and

Arundhatī<sup>28</sup> watch over me in the North.

Make freedom from enemies for us below, freedom from enemies above, o Indra. Make freedom from enemies for us in the back, freedom from enemies in front.

May we enjoy days without enemies, o All-Gods. Let the dawns, the dusks be without enemies for us. The broad ones<sup>29</sup> that are six, [and] the five divisions of space: let them protect us. The friendship-establisher (?) shall establish us in friendship. Let there be no danger for us.

You that remain up during the night, and that hold vigil over beings, that guard all animals: thus hold vigil over our selves.

O you that are awake, o you that awake, o you that do not sleep, o you that do not slumber, o you that watch, o you that guard, o you that are vigilant, o Arundhatī: being the body-protecting gods that you are, protect my body here.

As to [why he says] “o you that are awake, o you that awake”: the one that is awake is yonder sun, the one that awakes is the fire. As to [why he says] “o you that do not sleep, o you that do not slumber”: the one that does not sleep is the moon, the one that does not slumber is he that blows.<sup>30</sup> As to [why he says] “o you that watch, o you that guard”: the one that watches is the day, the one that guards is the night. As to [why he says] “o you that are vigilant, o Arundhatī”: the one that is vigilant is the worship, Arundhatī is the *dakṣiṇā*. These indeed are gods that support one’s reign. It is them that he pays reverence to, for his own protection.’

a. It seems that *rātrim anu-sthā* here and in the KS passage must mean ‘to remain up during the night’. If the ŚS transmission may be trusted in reading *anu* rather than *ānu*, it can here not be taken as a postposition with *rātrim*, but we may perhaps still refer to *anurātram* ‘during the night’, found at AB 3.22.1, and at VādhŚS 1.1.2.22 = 1.4.1.23 [ed. CHAUBEY 1.2.25, 1.11.27]. The wording of this sūtra recalls that of our stanza: *anurātram śalkair agnim inddhe jāgriyād dhaiva na suṣupset* ‘during the night, he kindles the fire with chips (of wood): he should remain awake, he should not try to sleep’.

The KS passage provides a clue as to who the unmentioned subjects of this stanza are: most probably the divine items addressed as ‘the one that is awake’ etc. (on which, cf. also ŚS 8.1.13 / PS 16.2.3, MānGS 2.15.1, PārGS 3.4.15ff.), that are called ‘gods’ in the KS passage, but ‘seers’ at PS 9.13.10 ≈ ŚS 5.30.10 *īṣī bodhapratibodhāv asvapnó yás ca jāgrviḥ | táu te prāṇásya goptárau dívā náktam ca jāgrtām*.

de. The imper. forms in PS (and indirectly *jāgrta* in KS) confirm WHITNEY’s estimate that emendation of *jāgrati* to *jāgratu* in the ŚS text of pādas **de** “would be decidedly welcome”.

<sup>28</sup> See under 6.4.4d above.

<sup>29</sup> I.e. the 3 heavens and the 3 earths: cf. GELDNER on ṚV 10.128.5.

<sup>30</sup> I.e. the wind, cf. PārGS 3.4.17.

**6.21.6** ŚS 19.48.6 ◊ b: PS 16.17.6b = ŚS 10.4.24b, RVKh 4.7.1c

veda vai rātri te nāma	(8)
ghṛtācī nāma vā asi	(8)
tām tvā bharadvājo veda	(8)
sā no vitte 'dhi jāgrhi    21	(8)

Verily, o Night, I know your name: Rich-in-ghee, verily, you are called. Bharadvāja knows you thus. Thus hold vigil over our gain.

nāma] JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, {rā}nāma Ku ghṛtācī] Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, ghṛtā{te}(→ cī) RM nāma vā asi] Or, nāmivāsi K ] Ku JM RM Pa [Ma] K, || V/126 Mā 'dhi] RM, dhi Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K jāgrhi] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], jāgra{·} | [[line]] hi JM, jāgrvi K || 21 || || ṛ 6 || 21 || Ku JM, || ṛ || 21 || RM, || 21 || ṛ 6 || V/126 Mā Pa, Z 4 Z K

**ŚS 19.48.6**

vēda vāi rātri te nāma ghṛtācī nāma vā asi |  
tām \*tvā [SPP tvām] bharadvājo veda sā no vitte 'dhi \*jāgrhi [SPP +jāgrati, mss. jāgrati] ||

**b.** On the word *ghṛtācī-*, see my discussion under 6.4.8a.

**cd.** All PS mss. read *tvā*, thereby confirming the R-W emendation of *tvām* to *tvā*. Regarding the R-W emendation of *jāgrati*, discussed by WHITNEY: it is confirmed by the Or. mss, while **K** has the same error *jāgrvi* as found at 6.20.10b.

## 6.22. With a ‘viṣṭārin’ rice-mess.

With the important exception of its stanzas 10–13, this hymn has a parallel in ŚS 4.34. That hymn is used in a Savayajña named — according to Keś. [333.12] (*brahmāsya śīrṣam iti sūktena brahmāsyaudanaṃ savam*) — after the hymn that is employed. No specifics are known about this *brahmāsyaudana*-ritual, other than the rules given KauśS 66.6–10, that throw light especially on the stanzas 6 through 8 below:

*brahmāsyeṭy odane hradān pratidiśaṃ karoti || upary āpānam || tadabhi-  
taś catasro diśyāḥ kulyāḥ || tā rasaiḥ pūrayati || pṛthivyāṃ surayādbhīr  
āṇḍīkādivanti mantroktāni pratidiśaṃ nidhāya ||* ‘He makes, per cardinal  
direction, pools in the rice-mess to the accompaniment of ŚS 4.34. (He  
makes,) on the upper side, a cavity for fluid (cf. KauśS 62.15), and on the  
sides of that four channels directed to the quarters of space. He fills these  
with fluids (cf. KauśS 8.19), after having placed on the earth, in every  
direction, (together) with *surā*-liquor and water the (objects) mentioned  
in the mantras including the egg-shaped bulbs’ (after GONDA 1965a: 95f.,  
with minor improvements and additions).

Cf. GONDA(1990: 181): “An *odana* is a rice-dish (cooked rice) which in  
... atharvanic circles is regarded as a cosmic entity commensurate with the  
universe and identified and associated with the highest concepts and potencies.  
By sacrificing it the sacrificer will be able to transcend mundane existence”.  
On the rice-dish being commensurate with the universe, cf. also GONDA  
1965a: 38. Further, cf. GONDA (1965a: 28): “It is ... the cooked rice which is  
explicitly stated to go to the world of those who have acquired religious merit  
..., to heaven ... and to conduct the sacrificer to that celestial world ... . By  
preparing the rice-dish which is a granter of desires and by depositing it in the  
brahmans the sacrificer secures a “heaven-going road” ...”.

Kauśika is silent about the fact that it is a specific type of ritual (1d), and a  
specific type of *odanā*, whose utility is praised in this hymn: the ritual and the  
rice-mess used in it are called *viṣṭārin-*, a term that is mentioned in the whole  
of Vedic literature only in the present hymn, and may no longer have been  
understood by Kauśika. It was almost certainly no longer in vogue by the time  
of Keśava, who invents (?) the name *brahmāsyaudana*. GONDA (1965a: 276)  
quotes with apparent approval WHITNEY’s statement that it is on account of  
the treatment described in the KauśS — i.e. in WHITNEY’s words “the mak-  
ing of pools and channels in the rice-mess, filling them with juices (*rasa*), and  
setting on the ground, with *surā* and water, knob-bearing plants as specified  
in the text” — “that the rice-mess in question is called *viṣṭārin-* ‘out-strewn,  
expanded’”. GONDA adds (p. 277) about the word *viṣṭārin-*: “according to the  
comm. [Sāyaṇa] this means “the members (portions) of which are spread out”  
(*viṣṭīyamāṇāvayavaḥ*). The term does not seem to occur elsewhere”. GONDA  
follows (p. 279) Sāyaṇa’s wrong explanation of *vītata-* in stanza 5 as meaning

*viṣṭṛta-* (see my commentary on 5c below). It seems that WHITNEY’s explanation (cf. also BLOOMFIELD 1899: 76, who glosses ‘spreader’), going back to Sāyaṇa, and followed again by GONDA, of the term *viṣṭārīṇ-* can be improved. Even though the KauśS does not explicitly allude to the word *viṣṭārīṇ-* that is so prominent in this hymn, the sūtra’s injunctions suggest the following interpretation.

There is a cavity in the center (which is raised) of the rice-mess: this represents the *ūrdhvā diś*, or the heaven (cf. the connection made with the Parameṣṭhin in the mantra ŚS 12.3.45ab used at KauśS 62.15, which also enjoins: *upary āpānam*). There are four pools divided over the cardinal directions, with channels connecting the central cavity to these pools. “The rice-dish is commensurate with the universe” (GONDA, p. 38), and the term *viṣṭārīṇ-* seems to refer to the geometrical lay-out of the cosmos which is made in the *odanā-*. For the element *°stāra-*, we may compare the compound *prastāra-*, which is a technical term in the Śulbasūtras for geometrically (but not necessarily symmetrically) arranged layers of bricks for fire-altars (cf. e.g. BÜRK 1902: figures 35–38, 46, 49, 52–53, 56) and is also used technically to refer to esoterically employed diagrams in some tantric traditions (cf. SCHOTERMAN 1982: 181–209). Now the meter-name *prastārapaṅkti-* refers to the asymmetrical pattern 12+12+8+8, while the patterns called *viṣṭārapaṅkti-* (8+12+12+8) and *viṣṭārabṛhatī-* (8+10+10+8) are symmetrical rearrangements — not enlargements — of the Paṅkti (5×8=40) and Bṛhatī (8+8+12+8=36) patterns.

I therefore propose that *viṣṭārā-* can have the sense ‘symmetrical array, diagram’. The word is actually attested only in the hemistich ṚV 5.52.10cd: *etébhir máhyaṃ nāmabhir yajñāṃ viṣṭārā ohate*. Although LUBOTSKY 1997a follows the padapāṭha analysis of the word as nominative here, most modern scholars feel forced to assume a locative (cf. GELDNER, RENOU 1955–69/X: 80), because *ohate* must be a third person plural (NARTEN 1969a: 11 = 1995: 99, n. 17 — thus also LUBOTSKY 1997a: 373 [!]). GELDNER suggests in the note to his translation, followed by RENOU, that “*viṣṭārā* ist das spätere *viṣṭāra*” [i.e. ‘expansion, width’, Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.3.33]. Hence, he translates ‘unter diesen Namen in breiter Schar (kommend) würdigen sie [the Maruts] mein Opfer’. As GELDNER notes, much is obscure about this stanza, so the possibility cannot be excluded that the horde of Maruts appear ‘in a symmetrical array’.

The *viṣṭārīṇ-* rice-mess then, in my interpretation, is a rice-mess in which such a symmetrical diagram is drawn, representing the cosmos — four channels linking the earth with the heaven. The ritual in which this rice-mess is central aims at providing the sacrificer (and his forefathers and descendants: stanzas 10–12) an undiminishing store of nourishment and other comforts in the afterlife.

Our ms. **K** takes this hymn together with 6.23 as one long hymn, and adds at the end some corrupt brāhmaṇa material under the name *śrāddhabrāhmaṇa* (without parallel in the Śrāddhabrāhmaṇa edited by SŪRYA KANTA 1943: 53–

59): see my crit. app. under 6.23.12, and cf. EDGERTON 1915: 409f. It seems moreover to have gone unnoticed by EDGERTON (as well as by RAGHU VIRA and BHATTACHARYA), that the scribe of **K** has added at the beginning of this hymn the name *pitṛsūktam* in the lower left margin of folio 96b (cf. my Introduction, §2.1.1.5).

I suppose the insertion of a little *śrāddhabrāhmaṇa* at the end of 6.22 (which does not deal with ancestors, but which the scribe who inserted this Śrāddhabrāhmaṇa took as one with the preceding hymn), must rather be taken to pertain to our hymn 6.22. Use of the term *śrāddadhāna*- in stanza 9 may have suggested to him a connection with ancestral Śrāddha rites. On this type of ritual, cf. CALAND 1888: 8ff., CALAND 1893, KANE 1953: 334ff., GONDA 1980: 441ff., and JAMISON 1996a: 181–183. The fact that a special portion of rice is set aside for the ancestors in a Śrāddha rite during Savayajñas (KauśS 61.9, cf. GONDA, p. 137) may also be relevant here. The name *pitṛsūkta* (connected with a little *śrāddhabrāhmaṇa*) seems to have been given to 6.22 at some stage of transmission, because the hymn was understood to be connected with the forefathers. This connection emerges especially in the stanzas 10–13, which may be somewhat later additions to the text, because they have no parallel in ŚS, and are in excess of the standard of nine stanzas per hymn.

For the first 9 stanzas of PS, that correspond to 1–8 of the ŚS version, we have GONDA's translation (1965a: 95f.) with elaborate explanations (pp. 276ff.) at our disposal. As it makes little sense to repeat the often important observations made by GONDA, I simply refer here to his treatment, and offer below only such additional or corrective ideas that appear to me relevant. I focus, of course, also on the differences between the PS and ŚS versions.

PS 6.22 / ŚS 4.34 is an *odanā*-hymn (cf. BLOOMFIELD 1899: 78). Unique Paippalāda *odanā*-hymns can be found i.a. at PS 5.13–14, 5.31, 5.40 (re-edited and translated in LUBOTSKY 2002), 16.71–73 and 16.93–96. It is to be noted that the meter of the Ātharvaṇic *odanā*-hymns is highly irregular, as is immediately clear also from the metrical analysis given by LUBOTSKY of the relevant hymns from PS 5. The present hymn is no exception to this.

### 6.22.1 ŚS 4.34.1

brahmāsya śīro bṛhad asya pṛṣṭham	(11)
vāmadevyam udaram odanasya	(11)
chandāṃsi pakṣau mukham asya satyaṃ	(11)
viṣṭārī yajñas tapaso 'dhi jātaḥ	(11)

Brahman is its head, the Bṛhat [sāman] is its back, the Vāmadevya [sāman] is the belly of the rice-mess. The meters are the two sides, the truth is its mouth. The Viṣṭārīn is a ritual of worship born out of austerity.

brahmāsya] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], brahmā'sya **JM**, Vrahmāsi **K** pṛṣṭham] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma] **K**, (+ pṛ)ṣṭham **Pa** odanasya] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma]

**K**, odasya **JM** viṣṭārī] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], viṣṭārī **JM**, viṣṭā **K** 'dhi] **JM**  
**RM**, dhi **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K** jātaḥ ||] **Or**, jātā | **K**

#### ŚS 4.34.1

brāhmāsya śīrśām bṛhād asya pṛṣṭhām vāmadevyām udāram odanāsya |  
 chāndāmsi pakṣāu mūkham asya satyām viṣṭārī jātās tāpaso 'dhi yajñāḥ ||

PS has the more common form *śīras*, where ŚS has the secondarily thematized form *śīrśām*. The only other difference between the two versions is that of the word order in the last pāda.

a. GONDA (1965a: 276) summarizes: “the meaning obviously is that the component parts of the deified rice-dish are equivalent to the might inherent in these sāmans or representations of that power. . .”. The equation that we see here of parts of the rice-mess to sāmans etc. recalls the much more elaborate equations in ŚS 11.3. Cf. also such brāhmaṇa equations as found, e.g., at PB 16.11.11.

d. Note the abhinihita sandhi, which is metrically ‘durchgeführt’. As already observed by GONDA (1965a: 277), it is Prajāpati’s ‘austerity’ as creator of the cosmos that is meant here: his ‘austerity’ yields the heat with which he cooks the rice-mess, model of the cosmos. Cf. ŚS 4.35.1: *yām odanām prathamajā ṛtāsya prajāpatis tāpasā brahmāṇé 'pacat | yó lokānām vídhṛtir nābhīrēṣāt ténaudanéṇāti tarāṇi mṛtyúm* ‘The rice-mess which Prajāpati, first-born of righteousness, cooked with fervor for Brahmán; which, separator of the worlds, shall not harm (?) — by that rice-mess let me overpass death’ (WHITNEY; somewhat differently GONDA, pp. 96 and 282f.).

**6.22.2 ab:** ŚS 4.34.2ab ◊ **c:** 4.34.3a ◊ **d:** 4.34.2c

anasthāḥ súddhāḥ pavanena pūtāḥ	(11)
śucayaḥ śucīn api yanti lokān	(11)
viṣṭārīṇam odanam ye pacanti	(11)
naiṣām śīśnam pra dahati jātavedāḥ	(12 <sup>T</sup> )

Boneless, cleansed, purified with the purifier, the clean ones go to clean worlds. Jātavedas does not burn off the penis of them who cook the Viṣṭārīn rice-mess.

anasthāḥ súddhāḥ] **Or**, anastās súddhāḥ **K** pūtāḥ śucayaḥ] **Or**, pūtas śucayaś **K** śucīn  
 api] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, śucīpi **Pa** yanti] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**]  
**K**, { }yanti **JM** lokān |] **Or**, lokān, **K** [[*om.* ], but note °n, v°; cf. error Edg.] naiṣām  
 śīśnam] **Or**, naihiṣām siṣnam **K** dahati] **Or**, dahāj **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[*note* °ḥ n°]]

#### ŚS 4.34.2ab, 4.34.3a, 4.34.2c

anasthāḥ pūtāḥ pávanena súddhāḥ śucayaḥ śucīm api yanti lokām |  
 viṣṭārīṇam odanam ye pácanti . . . naiṣām śīśnam prá dahati jātavedāḥ

BHATTACHARYA edits *dahati*: note the reading *dahāj* in **K**. Since no such reading is found in **K** for the repetition of pāda **d** in stanza 3, and the reading here can easily be explained as an anticipation of PS 16.96.1 *pumān pumso adhi*

*tiṣṭha carma na te śiṣṇaṃ pra dahāj jātavedāḥ | bhavāt te straiṇam apy apsarāsu* ‘Stand on the skin, being a man [born from] a man. Jātavedas shall not burn off your penis. There shall be women-stuff for you, among [the] Apsarases’, where both **K** and the Or. mss. have it, there is no reason to doubt the indicative *dahati* transmitted here by ŚS and the Or. mss.

a. Note the difference of word order between PS and ŚS, and GONDA’s pertinent remarks (1965a: 277). GONDA also offers (*ibid.*) an explanation of what/who the *pāvana-* might be: “As it appears from ĀśvGS. 4,5,7 that the bones of the deceased were carefully cleansed (*pavanena saṃpūya*) after cremation, . . . the text may refer to the ritually pure condition of the beatified”.

### 6.22.3 ŚS 4.34.2cd, 3b

naiṣāṃ śiṣṇaṃ pra dahati jātavedāḥ	(12 <sup>T</sup> )
s <sub>u</sub> varge loke bahu straiṇam eṣāṃ	(11)
nainān yamaḥ pari muṣṇāti retaḥ	(11)

Jātavedas does not burn off their penis. Much women-stuff is theirs in the heavenly world. Yama does not rob them of their seed.

naiṣāṃ śiṣṇaṃ] Or, naihiṣāṃ siṣṇāṃ **K** jātavedāḥ] *thus* Or **K** [[note °ḥ s°] svarge] **JM RM Pa** [Ma] **K**, svargge **Ku V/126 Mā** loke] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma], ·loke **Pa**, loka **K** straiṇam] Or, strīṇim **K** eṣāṃ |] eṣāṃ | Or, eṣāṃ [[om. |] **K** yamaḥ pari] Or, yasaḥpari **K** [[note °ḥ p°] retaḥ ||] Or, retā **Z K** [[note punctuation]

#### ŚS 4.34.2cd, 3b

naiṣāṃ śiṣṇāṃ prá dahati jātávedāḥ svargé loké bahú stráiṇam eṣāṃ || 2 ||  
 . . . nainān yamaḥ pári muṣṇāti rétaḥ |

a. Note the odd repetition of the immediately preceding pāda (2d), not repeated in ŚS, which has a different ordering altogether.

b. WHITNEY renders the rare word *straiṇa-* (cf. AiGr. II/2, pp. 353 & 734) as ‘what is woman’s’ at ŚS 8.6.4 (PS 16.79.4), but as ‘women-folk’ in the present passage, and *astraiṇá-* as ‘women-less’ at 8.6.16 (PS 16.80.7b). The word is attested three times more in the AV, viz. at PS 16.79.4 (quoted under 6.8.6), PS 16.96.1 (quoted under the preceding stanza), and in the difficult stanza PS 11.2.7, which may refer to impotence: *yas tvā straiṇād apasaro yaḥ puṃso adhyāruhat | āklāntaṃ saṃklāntaṃ snāva tad u te kalpayāmasi* ‘The *apasara* that mounted upon you from women-stuff, the one that [mounted upon you] from a man, we fix that languishing, exhausted tendon [i.e. penis] for you’. In all Atharvavedic attestations, *straiṇa-* ‘women-stuff’ may be taken as referring to sex with women (Apsarases: cf. stanza 13), although simply ‘women-folk’ is possible too. In Urvaśi’s revealing words at RV 10.95.15c, the word seems to be an adjective: *ná vái straiṇāni sakhyāni santi* ‘There are no friendships that are women’s’.

## 6.22.4 ŚS 4.34.3cd, ab

āste yama upa yāti devān	(10)
saṃ gandharvair madati som <sub>i</sub> yaiḥ	(10)
viṣṭāriṇam odanaṃ ye pacanti	(11)
<sup>+</sup> nainān avartiḥ sacate kutaś cana	(12)

He sits with Yama, he drives up to the gods, he revels with the soma-drinking Gandharvas. Destitution does not from anywhere join them who cook the Viṣṭārin rice-mess.

āste] **Or**, yāste **K** saṃ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, *om.* **JM** madati somyaiḥ] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, mada(*sec. m.* → i)ti somyaiḥ **Ku**, asaditisaumyaiḥ **K** |] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °h v°]] <sup>+</sup>nainān] nainām **Or**, nainan **K** avartiḥ] avarttiḥ **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [[Bhatt.: °rtiḥ] **Pa**, ? **Ma** [[Bhatt. unclear], ivanti **K** sacate] **Or**, sajate **K** kutaś] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa [Ma?] K**, kṛtaś **Mā**

## ŚS 4.34.3cd, ab

āste yamā úpa yāti devānt sám gandharvair madate somyébhiḥ || 3 ||  
viṣṭāriṇam odanaṃ yé pácanti nainān ávartiḥ sacate kadā caná |

The PS version has *somyaiḥ* and *kutaś* for ŚS *somyébhiḥ* and *kadā*. PS hardly knows the sandhi °n s° → °nt s°, that ŚS has here (see my Introduction, §2.8 G).

a. WHITNEY and GONDA translate *úpa yāti* ‘goes to’, which is wrong: *úpa yā* typically means ‘to drive towards’, cf. RV 1.182.2d, 6.68.10d, 7.72.2a, and *rathayāna iyate* in the next stanza. Cf. also JOACHIM 1978: 138, and the references collected by KULIKOV 2001: 261. On the connection between the word *ávarti-* and hunger, cf. VādhAnv 4.38.1 [CALAND 1928b: 171 = 1990: 471] (see also BODEWITZ 1973: 186f. n. 2).

## 6.22.5 ŚS 4.34.4cd, 5ab

rathī ha bhūtvā rathayāna iyate	(11)
pakṣī ha bhūtvā <sub>a</sub> pi divaṃ sam eti	(12 <sup>T</sup> )
eṣa yajño vitato vahiṣṭho	(10)
viṣṭāri pakvo divam ā sasāda	(11)

As a charioteer, he drives on the chariot-driveway; as a bird, he goes in to heaven. This ritual of worship, when performed, is the best carrier. The cooked Viṣṭārin has reached heaven.

ha] **Or**, ya **K** rathayāna iyate] **Or**, rathayāniyate **K** bhūtvāpi] **Or**, bhūtvāpya **K** sam eti] **Or**, śamayati **K** vahiṣṭho] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, vihiṣṭho **JM**, bahiṣṭho **K** viṣṭāri] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, viṣṭāri **JM**, viṣṭāra **K** sasāda ||] **Or**, samāda | **K** [[Edg. omits |]

## ŚS 4.34.4cd

rathī ha bhūtvā rathayāna iyate pakṣī ha bhūtvāti divaḥ sám eti || 4 ||  
eṣā yajñānāṃ vītato vāhiṣṭho viṣṭāriṇaṃ paktvā divam ā viveśa |

**ab.** The word *rathayāna-* is further attested only twice, at JB 2.128 and 2.207. The ŚS version has plural ‘heavens’, and *āti* for our *āpi*. The combination *āpi-sām-ay* ‘to go in to [?]’ seems to be unique.

**c.** Rather than following Sāyaṇa’s explanation of *vītata-* as *vistr̥ta-*, and the resulting literal translation ‘extended’ (WHITNEY, GONDA), it would seem to me that the technical meaning of *vi-tan* ‘to perform [a ritual]’ is fitting here: cf., besides the references given in PW III, 219, i.a. PS 1.81.1c (ŚS 19.58.5), 16.113.4b (ŚS 9.6.28), 18.77.3a (ŚS 18.4.13).

While the Or. mss. do not distinguish *b* from *v*, it is interesting that **K** agrees with all the ŚS mss. (see WHITNEY’s comm.) in reading *bahiṣṭho*, a reading that R-W rightly emended to *vāhiṣṭho*: although *bahī(h)ṣṭha-* does occur twice in (late) Vedic, at HirŚS 4.2.57 and HirPS 55: 8, the accentuation in ŚS is enough to show that this compound cannot be meant (cf. AiGr. II/1, §90b p. 214). The carrying of course refers to transportation of the worshipper to heaven, as is clear from PS 16.93.1ff. (see also GONDA 1965a: 279).

**d.** The ŚS version, where the cooker of the Viṣṭārin is said to have entered heaven, is formulated differently. The idea of the (cooked) rice-mess going up to heaven is found perhaps at PS 5.13.6, 5.14.1, 5.14.7 (where the addressee, the worshipper or the rice-mess, is each time not entirely clear). Since the rice-mess is a ‘carrier’, the implication of the PS version is the same as that of the ŚS version, i.e. that the cooker is conveyed to heaven.

### 6.22.6 ŚS 4.34.7

caturaḥ kumbhāṁś caturdhā dadāti	(11)
kṣīreṇa pūrṇān udakena dadhnā	(11)
etās tvā kulyā upa yantu viśvataḥ	(12)
s <sub>u</sub> varge loke svadhayā pinvamānāḥ	(12 <sup>T</sup> )

He gives four pots in four places (?), full of milk, water, curd. From all sides let these channels, swelling with nourishment, go up to you [when you are] in the heavenly world.

caturaḥ kumbhāṁś] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma], caturaḥ kumbhyaṁś **Mā**, catuṣkr̥(*pr. m.* → ku)mbhyāṁ **K** [[Edg. °ṣku°, but cf. R-V and Bhatt.]] caturdhā] **K**, caturddhā **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], caturaddhā **JM** pūrṇān] pūrṇān **Or**, prajā **K** udakena] **Ku RM V/126 Pa** [Ma] **K**, ud{e}akena **JM**, ūdakena **Mā** yantu] **Or**, yanti **K** viśvataḥ] **Or**, viśvahā **K** [[*om.* |; cf. the next stanza]] svarge] **JM RM Pa** [Ma] **K**, svargge **Ku V/126 Mā** pinvamānāḥ ||] **Or**, pinvamānā | **K**

### ŚS 4.34.7

catūraḥ kumbhāṁś caturdhā dadāmi kṣīreṇa pūrṇān udakēna dadhnā |  
etās tvā dhārā ūpa yantu sārvaḥ svargé loké mádhumat pinvamānā  
ūpa tvā tiṣṭhantu puṣkarīṇīḥ sāmantaḥ ||

The pāda **e** of the ŚS version was found before at the end of its 5 (an overlong stanza containing also what is PS 8ab) and 6 (PS 7), but is found in the PS

version of this hymn only as 8d. Note the absence of sandhi between the words *pūrṇān udakena*, where ŚS has anuṅāsika: cf. my Introduction, §2.8 (D). On the ritual actions accompanying this and the following mantras, cf. KauśS 66.6–10 quoted in the introduction to this hymn.

**ab.** Cf. especially KauśS 66.7–9. Note that ŚS reads *dadāmi*: the PS text requires us to assume at least three participants in the ritual (a priest as giver, a priest as speaker, and a patron as addressee), while the ŚS version — if it is not corrupt — presupposes only two: the functions of performing and reciting priest may have been merged in that tradition.

It seems that we may explain the four pots mentioned in this mantra by referring to KauśS 66.6–10, where in 66.10 the placing (*ni-dhā*, cf. our *dadāti* / ŚS *dadāmi*) of the items mentioned in the mantras ŚS 4.34.5ff. (*āṇḍīkādīvantī mantroktāni*) is enjoined. This could mean that, together with the other mentioned items, four pots are placed in the four cardinal directions (KauśS *pratiśam* corresponds to our *caturdhā*).

**c.** Note that **K** gives *viśvahā* here, where the Or. mss. have *viśvataḥ*, and the situation is reversed in the next stanza.

**d.** In view of the scansion of pādas 3b, 10b and 13a, I scan *s<sub>u</sub>varge* also here, and in the next two stanzas, which means these pādas are to be read as dodecasyllabic, with triṣṭubh cadence.

On the meanings of the word *svadhā-*, see the somewhat conflicting statements and references of GONDA 1965a: 237, 271, 281, and especially RÖNNOW 1927: 110–153 (cf. RENO 1958: 19f.). See also PS 5.31.5ab *jānīhi sma saṁskṛte dhenō gopatiṁ yas tvā dadāti \*prathamāṁ svadhānām* ‘Recognize, o prepared cow, [your] cowherd, who gives you as the first of the nourishing oblations (to the ancestors)’.

The principle of *similia similibus* seems to be at work here: as the channels in the ritual situation are flowing full of fluids, just so — according to the speaker’s wish — will streams of nourishment swell in the patron’s direction when he has reached the heavenly world after death.

### 6.22.7 ŚS 4.34.6

ghṛtahradā madhukūlāḥ <sup>+</sup> surodakāḥ	(12)
kṣīreṇa pūrṇā udakena dadhnā	(11)
etās tvā kulyā upa yantu viśvahā	(12)
s <sub>u</sub> varge loke svadhayā mādayantīḥ	(12 <sup>T</sup> )

With pools of ghee, with slopes of honey, with surā-liquor for water, filled with milk, water, curd — let these channels, causing exhilaration with nourishment, constantly go up to you [when you are] in the heavenly world.

ghṛtahradā] **K**, ghṛtahṛdā **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, ghṛtahNadā **RM** [?]] madhukūlāḥ] **JM**, madhukulāḥ **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, madhukulyā **K** <sup>+</sup>surodakāḥ] sūrodakāḥ **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, sarodakā **RM**, svarodakā **K** pūrṇā] **K**, pūrṇā **Or** dadhnā] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]** **K**, dadhnā **V/126** kulyā] **Or**, ntalyā

**K** [[Edg./Bhatt. mistakenly nulyā] yantu] **Or**, yanti **K** viśvahā] viśvahāḥ **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], vi{hā}śvahāḥ **JM**, viśvatas **K** [[but cf. the prec. stanza!] svarge] **JM RM Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, svargge **Ku V/126 Mā** loke] **Or**, loka **K** svadhayā] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, svadhayī(→ yā 1) **Pa** mādayantīḥ] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**], {·}mādayantīḥ **Mā**, mādayantī **K**

#### ŚS 4.34.6

gṛtāhradā mādrukūlāḥ sūrodakāḥ kṣīreṇa pūrṇā udakēna dadhnā |  
etās tvā dhārā ūpa yantu sārvaḥ svargé loké mādhumat pīnvamānā  
ūpa tvā tiṣṭhantu puṣkarīṇīḥ sāmaktāḥ || 6 ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *madrukulāḥ sūrodakāḥ, viśvahāḥ*.

a. Cf. KauśS 66.6 quoted above. GONDA 1965a: 280 quotes with apparent approval WHITNEY’s comment on the ŚS reading *mādrukūlāḥ* (all Or. mss., except for **JM** whose correct °*kū*° is probably secondary, have *madrukulāḥ*), that “we would expect rather *madrukulyās*”, a reading which — despite WHITNEY’s obviously misguided statement (“Ppp. [= **K**] agrees . . . with our text”) to the contrary — is precisely what we find in **K**. In the light of the agreement of the ŚS text with the Or. reading, it seems preferable to reject the **K** reading as due to perseveration from *kulyā* in the preceding stanza. What is more, the bahuvrīhi adjectives in this pāda obviously qualify *kulyā* in pāda c (*dhārā* in ŚS), and WHITNEY’s expectation would thus — in any case in the PS version of this stanza — result in the tautology ‘[channels] with channels of honey’.

c. BHATTACHARYA follows the Or. mss. and gives the erroneous form *viśvahāḥ*. **K**, as can be seen in my crit. app. under the preceding stanza, has preserved the correct reading, but in a different place than the Or. mss.: it seems impossible to say which branch of transmission has preserved *viśvahā/viśvatas* in the original place.

#### 6.22.8 ŚS 4.34.5c–g

puṇḍarīkaṃ kumudaṃ saṃ tanoti	(11)
+bisam śālūkaṃ śaphako mulālī	(11)
suvarge loke svadhayā pīnvamānā	(12 <sup>T</sup> )
upa mā tiṣṭhantu puṣkarīṇīḥ samaktāḥ	(13)

The lotus is spreading out, the white waterlily, the lotus-stalk, the lotus-root, the *śāphaka*, the lotus-fiber — let these anointed [channels or pools] with lotuses approach me, swelling with nourishment, [when I am] in the heavenly world.

kumudaṃ] **Or**, kumidaṃ **K** saṃ tanoti] **JM RM**, santanoti **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**  
+bisam] viśam **Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, viśam **V/126** śālūkaṃ] **Or**, śālūkaṃ **K**  
svarge] **JM RM Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, svargge **Ku V/126 Mā** loke] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**]  
**K**, lo[[*folio*]]loke **Mā** svadhayā] **Or**, svadhaya **K** pīnvamānā] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa**  
[**Ma**] **K**, vi(*sec. m.* → pi 4)nvamānā **V/126** tiṣṭhantu] **Or**, tiṣṭhanti **K** puṣkarīṇīḥ] **Or**,  
puṣkarīṇīs **K** samaktāḥ ||] **JM Pa** [**Ma**], samaktāḥ ||] **Ku RM V/126 Mā**, samakta  
**K** [[*om.* ]; Edg. mistakenly prints one]

**ŚS 4.34.5c–g**

āṇḍīkaṃ kúmudaṃ sáṃ tanoti bísam śālūkaṃ śáphako mulālī |  
 etās tvā dhārā úpa yantu sárvāḥ svargé loké mádhumat pínvamānā  
 úpa tvā tiṣṭhantu puṣkarīṇīḥ sámantāḥ || 5 ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *viśaṃ*.

**ab.** The transmitted reading *viśaṃ* is unacceptable here: I emend with ŚS. The ŚS version of this pāda, which is metrically deficient, has the rare word *āṇḍīkaṃ* ‘bulb’ (elsewhere, besides at KauśS 66.10, only at ŚS 5.17.16, and PS 10.2.10cd *śriyaṃ bhrātr̥vyāṇām ā datsvāṇḍīkaṃ ivādhi puṣkarāt*) for our *puṇḍarīkaṃ*.

The compound *sáṃ tanoti* is nearly always transitive, but GONDA correctly observes (p. 280) that “there is apparently no object” in these pādas, although he translates ‘stretches its rootstock’ on p. 96. That the verb is not necessarily transitive is proven by ŚS 8.7.16 (PS 16.13.6), a stanza to which GONDA also refers: *mumucānā ośadhayo ’gnér vaiśvānarād ādhi | bhūmim̐ saṃtanvatīr ita yāsāṃ rājā vānaspātīḥ* ‘The herbs, becoming freed from Agni Vaiśvānara — go ye stretching over the earth, [ye] whose king is the forest-tree’ (WHITNEY).

On the various (parts of) lotuses mentioned here, cf. EWAia *s.vv.* On the *puṇḍarīka-* and *kúmuda-*, cf. SYED 1990. Cf. also RAU 1954, items 62, 26, 68 [?], 71–72, and the informative article by HANNEDER (2002). *mulālī* is a hapax, and may either be a fem. *-ī-* stem, or a derivative in *-in-*. *śáphaka-*, apparently an adjective meaning ‘hoof-shaped, hoofed’, is found elsewhere only at PS 8.7.7d, ĀpŚS 9.14.14, BhārŚS 9.16.18, HirŚS 15.4.21 (see the comm.!); its use as a phytomorphological plant name (see DEROIN & LIYANARATNE 1995) seems restricted to this place.

Sāyaṇa appears to take *sáṃ tanoti* here transitively, as an action performed by the priest (although his comment *mulālīti mṛṇālī vivakṣitā* makes clear that he takes that word as a nominative; why does he give *iti* here but not with the other words commented on?), but this is impossible because there is at least one certain nominative form in pāda **b**.

Note the interestingly close correspondence with the list of materials in the Aṣṭāṅgahr̥dayasaṃhitā, Sūtrasthāna 6.90: *mṛṇālabisaśālūkakumudotpala-kandakam* ‘Lotustengel fein und grob (*mṛṇāla*, *bisa*), Lotuswurzeln (*śālūka*), die Knolle von Nymphaea Lotus (*kumuda*), und Nymphaea stellata (*utpala*)’ (HILGENBERG & KIRFEL 1941: 35f.).

**d.** The patron seems now to be speaking (contrast stanza 6), as he is in the following stanzas. ŚS has *tvā*, which implies that a/the priest is speaking.

**6.22.9 a:** PS 16.71.5a ◊ **cde:** ŚS 4.34.8 ◊ **c:** PS 5.40.1b, PS 16.71.5c

yam odanaṃ pacāmi śraddadhāno	(11)
viṣṭāriṇaṃ lokaḥjitaṃ saṃvargam	(11)
sa me mā kṣeṣṭa sadam +aśyamāno	(11)
viśvarūpā kāmadughā dhenur astu me	(13)

Let the heavenly world-winning Viṣṭārin rice-mess that I cook, showing [my] hospitality, not run short for me — even though constantly being eaten. Let it be a brilliant wish-fulfilling milk cow for me.

pacāmi śraddadhāno] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, pacāmi śraddhaddadhāno **Pa**, pacasi-  
miśraddhadhāno **K** lokajitaṃ] **Or**, lokajitiyaṃ **K** svargam ]] svarggaṃ | **Ku RM**  
**V/126 Mā**, svargaṃ | **JM Pa [Ma]**, svargyaṃ [om. ]] **K** me] **Or**, meṃ **K** mā kṣeṣṭa]  
**K**, māṃkṣeṣṭha **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, māṃyeṣṭha **JM** +aśyamāno] asyamāno  
**Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, {ā}asyamāno **JM**, iṣyamāno **K** viśvarūpā] viśvaṛpā **Ku**  
**JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, viśvaṛpā **Pa**, viśvarupā **K** kāmadhughā] **K**, kāmadhughā  
**Or**

#### ŚS 4.34.8

imām odanāṃ nī dadhe brāhmaṇeṣu viṣṭāriṇaṃ lokajitaṃ svargāṃ |  
sā me mā kṣeṣṭa svadhāyā pīnvamāno viśvarūpā dhenūḥ kāmadhughā me astu ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *memām . . . asyamāno*.

Cf. PS 16.71.5 [PSK 16.71.6] *yam odanaṃ pacāmi śraddadhānaḥ pātrīpū-  
raṃ ghṛtapṛṣṭhaṃ juṣāṇaḥ | sa me +mā kṣeṣṭa sadam +aśyamāno yamasya loke  
parame vyoman* ‘The ghee-backed vessel-filling rice-mess that I cook, showing  
[my] hospitality, full of enjoyment, may it — even though constantly being  
eaten — not run short for me in Yama’s world, in the highest heaven’.

**a.** The ŚS version of this pāda, which is there part of the final stanza, men-  
tions the apportioning of food to invited brahmins (cf. ŚS 11.1.28), a standard  
element of Savayaṅgas: cf. GONDA, pp. 28 and 48ff.

Note the frequent occurrence of the compound *śraddadhāna-*, as well as  
the word *śraddhā-*, in AV *odanā-*hymns (see the Sanskrit Index in GONDA  
1965a). On the significance of *śraddadhāna-*, cf. GONDA 1965a: 286, but es-  
pecially JAMISON 1996a: 176–184, who demonstrates that *śraddhā-* in certain  
contexts “can hardly be anything but the expression of extraordinary hospital-  
ity” (p. 180). She relates (pp. 179f.) the epic story of Mudgala, who, motivated  
by *parā-śraddhā-* (Mahābhārata 3.246.15), “regularly feeds hundreds of Brah-  
mans at his twice-monthly New and Full Moon Sacrifices, but his food mirac-  
ulously increases to meet the demand, because of his virtue”. The hospitality  
is extended, by means of the *viṣṭāriṇ-* rice-mess, to ancestors and especially to  
brahmins attending the ritual (cf. JAMISON, p. 181).

**b.** Werner Knobl points out to me that this pāda must mean ‘the Viṣṭārin  
winning the heavenly world’: “Obviously, *svarga-* and *loka-* belong together as  
in so many other stanzas of this hymn where, however, the two words follow  
one another in their natural order. It is not only the meter that asked for the  
actual formulation of **b**, but rather the fact that in Vedic a three-membered  
compound like *svarga-loka-jit-* would have been highly unusual”.

**c.** Cf. KULIKOV 2001: 42f., and LUBOTSKY 2002: 179 on PS 5.40.1b, whose  
emendation to *aśyamāna-* I follow. A small argument in favor of this emen-  
dation, against adoption of the consistent **K** reading *iṣyamāna-*, might be the

agreement in use of the word *āvarti-* together with <sup>+</sup>*aśyamāna-* between ŚS 12.5.37 *āvartir aśyamānā nīrtir aśitā* ‘[the Brahmin’s cow is] destitution while being eaten, ruin when eaten’ (~ PS 16.144.9 *ārtir aśyamānā vikarto* + *śitā* ‘affliction while being eaten, a butcher when eaten’) on the one hand, and pādas 4cd together with the closely related present stanza.

**d.** Note the different word order in the ŚS version of this second 13-syllabic **d** pāda in a row: the words are quoted in the order we find them here in the Kāśikāvṛtti on Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.2.70, cf. RAU 1993, item 0348.

On the various possible meanings of *viśvārūpa-*, especially for those passages in which it seems to refer “to colour and outward impression (“glitter”) rather than to form”, cf. BODEWITZ 1985: 15ff. In the present context, GONDA’s observation (1965a: 246) that the adjective “helps to suggest the ideas of universality, omnipresence etc.” is most applicable. Cf. also my note on 6.10.3c, and the passages referred to there.

#### 6.22.10 Only PS ◊ b: ≈ KS 39.2:119.9, ĀpŚS 16.29.1

vṛṣabhaṃ santaṃ saha sūnṛtayā (11)

s<sub>u</sub>varge loke amṛtaṃ duhānam | (11)

ye me putrāḥ pitaraś ca santi (10)

te tvā viṣṭārinn upa sarve sadeyuḥ || (12<sup>T</sup>)

The sons and fathers that I have, o Viṣṭārin, may they all sit near you, who — though being a bull — liberally yield ambrosia in the heavenly world.

**Mā** jumps from *tvā viṣṭārinn* to *anu pra* in 12d, omitting all that intervenes • sūnṛtayā] **RM**, sūnṛtayā **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], saunṛtayā **K** svarge] **JM RM Pa** [**Ma**], svargge **Ku V/126 Mā**, svarge(*sec. m. + rga*) **K** loke] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, lok(+ e) **Pa** amṛtaṃ] **RM K**, ’mṛtaṃ **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**] duhānam |] duhānam | **Or**, duhāne | **K** putrāḥ] **Or**, putrāḥ **K** ca santi] **Ku RM V/126 Mā**, caranti **JM Pa**, casa(→ ra)nti **Ma**, casati **K** tvā] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, {·}tvā **V/126** tvā (... [12d]) viṣṭārinn anu] *om.* **Mā** viṣṭārinn] **Ku JM RM Pa** [**Ma**], viṣṭārinn **V/126**, viṣṭārid **K** sarve] **Ku JM RM Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, sarVve **V/126** sadeyuḥ ||] **Ku RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**] **K** [*om.* |, but note °ḥ y°], {·}sadeyuḥ || cha | **JM**

**a.** The cadence is bad. BHATTACHARYA’s evident emendation <sup>+</sup>*sūnṛtayā* is actually found as a reading in my Or. ms. **RM**, where it has probably been (re)introduced secondarily (see my Introduction, §2.1.2.1). On the meaning and etymological derivation of the word, cf., besides EWAia II, 740, KUIPER 1951: 14–19, RENO 1958a: 8ff., GONDA 1971: 169f.

The participle *sānt-* often has concessive sense in Vedic prose (cf. MINARD 1956, §398), and this is its predominant sense in earlier texts as well (personal communication from Werner Knobl). It is here used to express the paradox of the bull giving milk.

**bcd.** Since the meter does not support an original abhinihita sandhi, I follow the two mss. **JM** and **K** that read *amṛtaṃ*, against the majority of

the Or. mss. Note the agreement between **Ma** and **Pa** on the one hand, and Central Orissa ms. **JM** on the other, in reading *caranti* for *ca santi* (contrast my Introduction, §2.1.2.2). Note also, with BHATTACHARYA (bottom of p. 479), the *saut du même au même* from here to 12d, with resulting omission of two stanzas, in ms. **Mā**.

### 6.22.11 Only PS

ya +imān yajñān abhi *vitaṣṭāra	(11)
yasyeme lokāḥ svadhayā samaktāḥ	(11)
ye me pautrā uta ye pitāmahās	(11) <sup>J</sup>
tebhyo viṣṭārinm amṛtāni dhukṣva	(11)

Yield [drinks of] ambrosia, o Viṣṭārin, for the grandsons and the grandfathers of me, who have spread out over these rituals of worship, with whose nourishment these worlds are anointed.

omitted in **Mā** • +imān] imāṃ **Or**, imāni **K** \*vitaṣṭāra] viṣṭitāra **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**?], viṣṭatāni **K** lokāḥ svadhayā] **Or**, lokāssva[[line]svadhayā **K** samaktāḥ |] **Ku V/126 Pa K** [[om. |, but note °ḥ y°], samamktāḥ |] **JM RM**, sāmaktāḥ | **Ma** pautrā] **Or**, pautrā(sec. m. → pitā) **K** viṣṭārinm] **Or**, viṣṭārimn **K** ||] **Or**, **Z K** [[note punctuation]]

**a.** The readings and the grammatical interpretation of this pāda are quite problematic. BHATTACHARYA edits *imāṃ*, with the Or. mss., but a f. sg. ('this [earth]') seems syntactically hard to construe here. A light emendation *imam* (sc. *odanam*) would seem possible, but the long *ā* in both branches of transmission and especially also the *n* in **K**'s *imāni*, rather point to the reading *imān* adopted here. For the sandhi °ān y°, cf. i.a. PS 1.71.4d, 5.31.1b, 7.3.6c, 9.29.9c.

BHATTACHARYA reads as one word *abhiviṣṭitān* (with *virāma*), but gives no sign of emendation, and thus apparently assumes a decasyllabic pāda. **K** reads *viṣṭ(h)atāni* (note that in Śāradā °ṣṭ° = °ṣṭh°). It is an important fact that none of my Or. mss. — **Mā** omitting this entire stanza — confirms BHATTACHARYA's reading, which one ought in principle to infer was found by him in his ms. **Ma**, since no **Ma** variant is quoted in his apparatus. I suspect an error has slipped into BHATTACHARYA's text and apparatus here. What is more, the accusatives in BHATTACHARYA's pāda **a** lack a verb, and the text as he edits it is thus syntactically impossible.

It is likely that an attempt at 'etymological' explanation of the term *viṣṭārīn-* is being made here (cf. DEEG 1995: 150ff.). For this reason, I would rather take *abhi* as a postposition with *yajñān* (cf. ŚS 12.1.33a [PS 17.4.3a] *yāvāt te 'bhī vipāśyāmi* 'over as much of you, as I look out', with accented *abhī* before *vi°*).

Not too far from the **K** reading (although its looks may be deceptive), and metrically attractive, would be an emendation to *viṣṭarāni*, 1st sg. aor. subj.:

however, neither this precise form, nor any unambiguously athematic aor. forms of *star<sup>á</sup>* ‘to spread’ are attested (cf. GOTŌ 1997: 1042 — the form *astaram* conjectured for PS 19.19.11 by EICHNER-KÜHN 1976: 27<sup>31</sup> is not confirmed by the Or. mss.), and this form is SYNTACTICALLY somewhat unsmooth as well.

Since bad cadences also occur elsewhere in this hymn (as in other *odaná-*hymns), I see no metrical objection to conjecturing a perf. act. form *tastāra*, previously attested first at JB 2.270 (cf. KÜMMEL 2000: 577). Note that *tastāra* is best taken as 1st person singular form here: besides the fact that the long root vowel may even at the earliest stage of the transmission have been caused by contamination with *viṣṭārīn-*, parallel 1st sg. forms with long *ā* are attested already in the (younger) Vedic mantra language: cf. KÜMMEL 2000: 30, who lists *vavāra* (TS<sup>m</sup>); *cakāra*, *jagāra* (TB<sup>m</sup>), and WHITNEY 1889: 283 (§793d) who lists “**cakāra** and **jagrāha** (doubtful reading) in AV., **cakāra** in AÇS. and BAU. (ÇB. **cakara**), **jigāya** in AÇS., as first persons”.

Analogical retroflexion of the ‘Wurzelaumlaut’ of augmented or reduplicated forms after preverbs in *°i* is rather common in the AV: cf. AiGr. I, §205a p. 235; HOFFMANN 1986: 459 = 1992: 821, and LUBOTSKY 2002 on PS 5.8.1, 5.37.1 (cf. 9.23.4), and 5.38.8 (cf. also to the analogical intrusion of retroflexion into *antaṣṭya-*, discussed under 7.15.7d). At PS 5.37.1 and 9.23.4 the tradition has, obviously under the influence of the present forms of *sthā*, replaced a reduplication syllable *ta°* by *tī°*. This same replacement seems to have occurred here, since *°ṣṭh°* converged with *°ṣṭ°* both phonetically and graphically throughout the history and branches of transmission of our text. The replacement was followed by metathesis *°ṣṭ°/°t°*, probably under the influence of frequent *viṣṭhita-*, or of *viṣṭārīn-*. I thus tentatively adopt the conjecture *vitaṣṭāra*, which to my taste does better justice to the ms. readings than the alternative *viṣṭarāni*. The sense of the pāda remains somewhat difficult, and does not become significantly better if we assume a syntactic split between <sup>+</sup>*imān* and *yajñān*, supplying an implicit *lokān* from pāda **b**: ‘who have spread out these [worlds] over [my] rituals of worship’.

**b.** This seems to refer to the spreading of food substances over the rice-mess, which represents the cosmos.

### 6.22.12 Only PS

yadi pṛthivīm yadīy antarikṣam	(11)
yadi divam devatā vā jagantha	(11)
ye me prapautrāḥ prapitāmahās ca	(11)
te tvā viṣṭārinn anu pra jñeṣur atra	(12 <sup>T</sup> )

<sup>31</sup> With n. 21: “Falls die Lesung *astaram* richtig ist, würde hiermit J. NARTEN’s Annahme (Sigmatische Aoriste, p. 281) bestätigt werden, daß *stī* ‘ausbreiten’ ursprünglich einen Wurzel-aorist gebildet hat”.

If to the earth, if to the intermediate space, if to the heaven you have gone, or to the deities, o Viṣṭārin: may my great-grandsons and great-grandfathers track you down there.

**Mā** omits up to and including *tvā viṣṭārin* • yadi pṛthivīm] **Ku JM RM V/126** [**Ma**], yadi pṛthiv{i}īm **Pa**, yatpṛthivīyaṃ **K** vā] **Or**, yā **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** ye me] **Or**, ye(*pr. m.* → ye) me **K** prapautrāḥ] **Ku JM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**], pautrāḥ **RM**, prapautrāḥ | **K** [[*note* ||] prapitāmahāś] **K**, prapitāmahāś **JM RM V/126 Pa** [**Ma?**], pra{p·}pitāmahāś **Ku** te tvā] **Or**, tebhyo **K** viṣṭārin] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, viṣṭāriṃ **RM** jñeṣur atra ||] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], jñeṣurata ||] **RM**, jñeṣutatra [[*om.* ||] **K**

**ab.** On the meaning of these pādas, cf. CALAND (1893: 97): “Nun denken sich die alten Inder, wie bekannt, den aufenthalt des vaters auf der erde, des grossvaters im luftraum, des urgrossvaters im himmel, und die sūtras erlauben, dass, wenn man die namen der verstorbenen nicht kennt, beim klößeniederlegen für den vater die formula: *pitṛbhyah pṛthivīśadbhyaḥ*, für den grossvater und urgrossvater die formulae *p. antarikṣasadbhyaḥ* und *p. divīśadbhyaḥ* gebraucht werden”. The destination *devatāḥ* can hardly be disconnected from the Daivam or Vaiśvadevam part of all descriptions of Śrāddha rituals. Cf. CALAND (1893: 181): “Beim Çrāddha, wenigstens so wie es später verrichtet wurde, soll jeder an den väterbrāhmaṇas zu vollziehenden handlung die gleiche handlung vorangehen, aber für die Allgötter (*daivapūrvam çrāddham kurvīta*)”. CALAND adds (p. 182): “Nach meiner meinung sind diese Devāḥ auch die Väter. Aber nicht die gewöhnlichen menschlichen Väter, nicht die verstorbenen in engerem sinne. Es giebt nämlich in den ältesten überlieferungen noch eine andere art Väter: „die göttlichen Väter[“]: *devāḥ pitarāḥ*, und diesen gilt das Daivam”. Cf. the possible (secondary) connections with Śrāddha rites mentioned in my introduction to this hymn.

**c.** BHATTACHARYA does not report a variant for **Ma** (while **Mā** omits all of this stanza up to *tvā*), which implies that it reads as edited: *prapitāmahāś*. All **Or.** mss. available to me read °*mahāṃś*, which I suspect must be **Ma**’s reading as well.

**d.** Cf. PS 3.38.9 (≈ ŚS 9.5.16) *ajo ’sy aja svargo ’si tvayā lokam aṅgirasah pra jānan | taṃ lokam anu pra jñeṣma* ‘You are a goat. You are heavenly, o goat. Through you the Aṅgirasas knew (inj.?)<sup>32</sup> [their way] to the [heavenly] world. May we [too] track down that world’. Cf. ṚV 3.26.8, AB 2.1.1.

### 6.22.13 Only PS

s <sub>u</sub> varge loke apsarasa *enāñ	(11)
jāyā bhūtvopa śerate	(8)
viṣṭāriṇam odanaṃ ye pacant <sub>i</sub> y	(11)
+asmiṃl loke dakṣiṇayā pariṣkṛtam    22	(12)

<sup>32</sup> ŚS reads *prājānan*.

As wives, do the Apsarases lie down in the heavenly world with them who cook the Viṣṭārin rice-mess, made perfect in this world with a sacerdotal fee.

svarge] JM RM Pa [Ma] K, svargge Ku V/126 Mā loke] RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, lo(+ ke 4) Ku, ke JM apsarasa] K, 'psarasa Or \*enāñ] enaṃ Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K, yenaṃ Pa ] Or, om. K pacanty] JM RM V/126 Mā K, pacanty Ku Pa Ma +asmiṃl loke] asmiṃloke Ku V/126 Pa Ma, asmiṃloke JM RM Mā, asmiṃloke K dakṣiṇāyā] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], dakṣiṇāyā JM, dakṣiṇāyāḥ K pariṣkṛtam] pariṣkṛtaṃ Or K || 22 || ] || ṛ {1#}13 || 22 || Ku, || ṛ 13 || 22 || JM, || ṛ || 22 || RM, || 22 || ṛ (sec. m. 1#) || V/126, || 22 || ṛ || Mā Pa, om. K

BHATTACHARYA reports *psarasa* as the reading found in his Or. mss., but at least his **Mā** certainly shows an avagraha on the reproduction available to me, and it is to be expected that **Ma** agrees in this respect, against what BHATTACHARYA reports, with the other Or. mss. He edits *enaṃ* and *asmiṃl loke* (with *anunāsika*).

a. The unanimous reading *enaṃ* of the mss. is syntactically impossible in combination with the relative clause in pāda c. The singular pronoun *enam* that we do not expect here, after plural forms with the same relative clause in 2d, 3c, 4d, may have crept in from PS 5.13.2cd (*dyaur enaṃ sarvataḥ pātu yas tvā pacaty odana*) and 16.96.3 (*saptainaṃ sūryā +abhitaḥ . . . yas tvā pacaty odana*). The sandhi  $^{\circ}ñ j^{\circ}$  may of course be spelt  $^{\circ}ṃ j^{\circ}$  in the mss., so the only difference between my conjecture and the transmitted reading is the length of the vowel: note that **K** also gave a short *a* in 4d (and again in 6.23.3d below).

d. The evidence does not support BHATTACHARYA's introduction of an *anunāsika* sign, against the mss. The regular sandhi in PS (and ŚS) appears to be  $^{\circ}ṃl l^{\circ}$ : see my Introduction, §2.8 (L).

On the importance and meaning of the *dakṣiṇā*- 'sacerdotal fee' in connection with the Savayajñas, see GONDA 1965a: 18–26. In particular, pp. 19f.: "A *dakṣiṇā* is an offering — a cow, another animal or almost any other valuables, including rice — presented to the officiant(s) by which the sacrifice is "fortified and made perfect" (ŚBK. 1,2,2,1). It is not the receiver, but the giver who derives reward and benefit from it". But see also MALAMOUD 1976.

Note that **K** omits any kind of separation between our hymns 22 and 23, taking them together as 6.22 (with addition of some brāhmaṇa material: see my introduction to this hymn, and the apparatus under 6.23.12).

### 6.23. To get rid of a rival wife.

Note the absence of separation between this hymn and the preceding one in **K** (see my introduction to 6.22). It exceeds the standard of nine stanzas per hymn by three, but there are no evidently secondary stanzas. Is *pra dahāmasi* in 3d the concatenating link with 6.22?

Thematically related material is found at PS 2.58, 5.34, 19.47.7–9. The further unspecified (feminine) addressee of 1ab, 2, 10 (also 2.58.1cd, 2ab, 19.47.7, 8, 9ab) is probably a plant: cf. voc. *oṣadhe* in 2.58.4c. The hymn apparently belongs to the class of *sapatnībādhana* hymns (BLOOMFIELD 1899: 70, SHENDE 1952: 67ff.), and the husband of stanzas 2 and 11 seems to belong also to the speaker(s) on whose behalf this hymn was to be employed, i.e. the speaker(s) and their/her female rival would be *sapatnīs*. The use of the verb form *kuru* in stanza 2 (rather than *kṛṇu*) suggests that the mantra was indeed meant for use by female speakers (cf. HOFFMANN 1976: 581). It remains unclear whether these co-wives shared the same domicile, or lived separately.

#### 6.23.1 Only PS ◊ c: 3c, 5c

nir ṇudaināṃ pra ṇudaināṃ	(8)
<sup>+</sup> svān nipadanād adhi	(8)
vibhramśam asyai kṛṇmo	(7)
vi gṛhair bhramśatām asau	(8)

Push her out, push her forth from [her (or: my?)] own bed. We cause failure for her. Let N.N. fail in the homestead.

nir ṇudaināṃ] nirṇudaināṃ **Or**, ninnudaināṃ **K** pra ṇudaināṃ] **Or**, *om.* **K** <sup>+</sup>svān nipadanād] svām nipadanād **Ku Pa**, svām nipatanād **RM V/126 Mā** [Ma?], svānipadanād **JM**, svānyapatanād **K** |] **Or**, *om.* **K** vibhramśam] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa** [Ma], vibhramśam **Mā**, bibhramśam **K** asyai kṛṇmo] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], asmai kṛ{Ṇmā}ṇmā **JM**, asye kṛṇvo **K** gṛhair] gṛhai **Or**, gṛhīr **K** [[Edg./Bhatt. mistakenly gṛhī, but note R-V]] bhramśatām] **RM K**, bhramśatām **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa Ma** asau ||] **Or**, asu | **K** [[Edg. *om.* |]

BHATTACHARYA, following his ms. **Mā** — also **Ma**? the reading of **Ma**'s sister ms. **Pa** suggests otherwise —, edits *svām nipatanād*; further *gṛhair*.

**ab.** For pāda **b**, I follow the readings of my mss. **Ku Pa JM**, altering the sandhi slightly. The word *nipadana-* seems to occur only twice elsewhere. I find it at PS 4.20.1 (where **K** again has °*patan*°): *madhumatī patye asmī jārāya madhumattarā | atho \*madhavyaṃ me bhramso madhu nipadane aham* ‘I am sweet to my husband, sweeter to my lover, and full of honey are my loins — honey am I on the bed’; and again in an interesting parallel to this hemistich found at PS 19.35.12 (cf. ZEHNDER 1999: 176): *ut tvā hanmī nipadanād ut tvā*

*hanmi gr̥hebhyaḥ | mā spr̥kṣathā niṣadanāya sād̥hava ut tiṣṭha prehi sabhām*<sup>33</sup>  
 ‘I beat you out of the bed! I beat you out of the homestead! Do not desire  
 after a descent dwelling! Get up, head out to the assembly!’.

Concerning the sexual connotation of *ni-pad*, see my commentary on PS 6.6.2 (where the Or. mss. all have *t* for *d*). Cf. also 7.11.6–7 below, and LUBOTSKY 2002: 81. But as FORSSMAN (1996: 53) has noted, the attestation of the related compound *upa-ni-pad* at ŚBM 4.1.1.28 shows that the sexual connotation was not always present. The derivative *nipadana-* seems to mean ‘bed, place for lying down (and making love)’. Cf. PS 2.58.6ab *asti vai vāṇ vidvikam ubhau śayane antarā* ‘(Now) there is a separation between the both of you in bed’, and especially *śayane sve* in 11b below.

c. Regarding the metrical deficiency of this pāda (and 5c), see my note on 7.9.2c. Because separate akṣaras *ṇma* and *ṇva* do exist in the variety of Śāradā script of the scribe of our **K**, it is a striking fact that the error °*ṇv*° for °*ṇm*° that we find here and in stanzas 3 and 5 below, is also found in **K** in all other cases (to be culled from BHATTACHARYA’s 1997 of PS 1–15) of the form *kr̥ṇmah*/°*ṇmo* (1.32.4b, 2.26.3, 4.10.2d+3c, 5.4.10d, 5.11.2d [also in the Or. mss.!), 5.19.4c, 5.37.4d, 7.9.1d, 12.5.6c+7c, 12.6.3c, 15.23.11b — add 7.19.3d+4d [also in several Or. mss.!), while **K** reads *kr̥ṇo* at 7.9.2c. The same error is found in *kr̥ṇmasi* at 1.30.5b (*kr̥ṇvasa*) and 1.85.4b, but the correct spelling is more common for this form (1.54.5d, 7.8.6e, 11.2.8d), and is mostly found for *kr̥ṇmahe* (1.86.7c, 4.12.4d, 15.22.9d), although all mss. wrongly write *kr̥ṇvahe* at 7.3.2c. An explanation for these curious facts is not apparent.

d. On the meaning of *vī-bhramś* + instr. ‘scheitern an’, see GOTŌ 1987: 231.

### 6.23.2 Only PS

apāñcaṃ patim ā kur <sub>uv</sub>	(8)
+adharācīm striyaṃ naya	(8)
+atīmān daśa parvatān	(8)
atīmā nāv <sub>i</sub> yā daśa	(8)

Make the husband turn away [from her], lead the wife to the South, beyond these ten mountains, beyond these ten [rivers] that can be crossed [only] by a boat.

apāñcaṃ patim] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], apāñcaṃ patim **JM**, apāñcapatim **RM**, apāñcaṃ pratim **K** kurv +adharācīm] kurv adharācī **Ku JM Pa** [Ma], kuvidharācī **RM**, ku{ṛ}vadharācī **V/126 Mā**, kurcyadharācīyaṃ **K** striyaṃ] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, str{i}iyaṃ **V/126** +atīmān] atīmāṃ **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, atīmāṃ **JM** nāv<sub>i</sub>yā daśa] **K**, nāvādaśa **Or**

BHATTACHARYA edits *adharācī* and *atīmāṃ*.

<sup>33</sup> I read thus in **Pa**. It seems possible that the authentic reading for this stanza should rather contain *nipadanāya* (ṣ/p!).

a. Cf. ŚS 5.8.7d (PS 7.18.6cd) *tān ... pratīcaḥ púnar á kṛdhi* ‘turn them back again’.

b. The correct reading with anusvāra, which is missing in the Or. mss., is available in only slightly deformed state in **K**. In combination with the second hemistich, *adharācīm naya* seems to mean ‘lead her to the South’ (see also the next stanza), but cf. ŚS 3.18.4cd (≈ PS 7.12.3cd) *adhāḥ sapátnī yá māmādhara sādharābhyah* ‘below [is] she that is my rival; lower [is] she than they (f.) that are lower’ (WHITNEY).

c. I have normalized the sandhi. BHATTACHARYA follows the unanimous ms. evidence, and edits °*mām daśa*, without underlining (at 10.3.4a he does underline *idhmām devaiḥ*, and similarly at 11.12.6c, 15.22.1c; no underlining at 11.5.3b).

d. KLAUS 1989a: 17 (with the notes 59–61 on p. 32) explains: “*nāvvyā* bezeichnet ... einen Fluß, der so tief und so breit ist, daß er nicht durchwatet oder durchschwommen werden kann, sondern mit einem Boot überquert werden muß”. The Or. error °*dv°* ← °*vy°* is easily explained with reference to the close similarity between the two ligatures.

### 6.23.3 Only PS ◊ c: 1c, 5c

adharācīm avācīm	(7)
atho *akuśalām diśam	(8)
vibhramśam asyai kṛṇmas	(7)
tenainām pra dahāmasi	(8)

[Lead her] toward the South, downward, and to the unhappy quarter of space. We cause failure for her. By means of that [spell] we burn her off.

avācīm atho] **Or**, apācīm ato **K** \*akuśalām diśam |] kuśalām{NDA}diśam | **Ku**, kuśalām diśam | **JM RM**, kuśalāndiśam | **V/126 Mā Pa Ma**, kuśalām̐bhiṣam (+ |) **K** vibhramśam] **Or**, bibhramśam **K** asyai] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, a{sm}syai] **JM** kṛṇmas] **Ku JM RM Mā Pa [Ma]**, kṛṇma(→ o)s **V/126**, kṛṇvas **K** tenainām] **Or**, tenainām **K** dahāmasi ||] **Or**, timāmasi | **K**

BHATTACHARYA’s text contains a misprint: *agharācīm*. He edits *kuśalām*.

**ab**. Although it is not completely certain, it seems better to accept — with BHATTACHARYA — the Or. reading *avācīm* rather than **K**’s *apācīm*. While I do not know of any passages mentioning an *āpācī diś*, the *āvācī diś* is known from i.a. MS 2.13.21:167.8 and VSM 22.24. We seem to have here three names for the inauspicious realms to which rivals are to be relegated: cf. BODEWITZ 1999a: 111, and 2002c: 214, 216f. Both meter and sense support the conjecture of *akuśalām* for *kuśalām*. Cf. MS 1.11.10:172.3 *cātasro diśaś cātasró ’kuśalīḥ*.

I assume here that °*o* resulting from sandhi with the particle *u* in such cases as *atho* and *mo* was also praḥya in our text (cf. AiGr. I, §273b), and therefore do not choose to assume elision at the diasceustic level (which would mean editing *atho* *kuśalām*). Although elision is also found in all mss. after

*atho* at 1.28.2d (*atho harito* for ŚS 1.22.2d *átho áharito*), and after *mo* in 11b below (*mo smin* for *mo asmin*) and 11.15.2 (*mo smākam* for *mo asmākam*: or rather *\*māsmākam?*), I would choose to see these as mere (late) artifacts of the manuscript transmission, where at some point knowledge of praṅhya rules may have been lost. In the majority of cases, at least one of the two branches of transmission of the PS retains the expected initial *a°* in this environment: *atho a°* 3.26.5c, 5.18.2b, 6.9.6b, 11.3.4b; *mo a°* 1.12.4c+d, 1.20.1d, 1.78.1d, 4.19.1–7c, 17.37.7d, 19.16.5c.

**d.** The m./n. pronoun *tena* cannot refer to the plant which is addressed in 1ab, 2, 10. It is the same *vidveṣaṇa-* (*brahmaṇ-*) ‘discord sowing spell’ that is known from PS 2.58.1, 5.34.1 and 19.25.1, and that — just as it is a veritable fire at 2.58.2cd, 3c, 4d and in our 9a below — is used here to burn off the rival.

**6.23.4** Only PS ◊ **d**: PS 19.36.17c, 19.47.8c, 20.56.10c [PSK 20.52.10c]

$\bar{a}$ <sub>a</sub> ja nir aja bilaṃ	(8)
bilād araṇyam ā kur <sub>u,v</sub>	(8)
araṇyād araṇaṃ janam	(8)
mṛgāṃ anu pra pātaya	(8)
vātasyaināṃ śikhāṃ kuru	(8)

Drive [her] onward, drive [her] down a hole. Remove [her] from the hole toward the jungle, from the jungle to a foreign people. Cause [her] to fly forth, after wild animals, make her the crest of the wind.

nir aja] **Or**, nir uja **K** bilaṃ] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, bi{·}laṃ **Pa** araṇyam] **Or**, arṇyām **K** janam |] janam | **Or K** mṛgāṃ anu] mṛgāṃ, anu **Ku RM Pa Ma**, mṛgāṃ anu **V/126 Mā K** [[Edg. mistakenly mṛgā], mṛgāṃ, {·}anu **JM** vātasyaināṃ] **Or**, vātasyainā **K** śikhāṃ] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, śikhā **JM** kuru] **K**, kuṛ **Or**

**abc.** The verb *nir-aj* normally means ‘to drive out’, with an accusative of the object (PS 4.13.4, 5.1.4, 5.9.2, ŚS 12.2.2–3), but it seems impossible to construe it that way here. On removing enemies or rivals into a pit or hole, see BODEWITZ 1999b: 215f. Cf. also ŚS 5.22.12d *gáčhāmúṃ áraṇaṃ jánam* ‘go to yonder foreign people’.

**d.** With a view to the semantic development of its Iranian cognates (see KEWA II, 669f., and EWAia II, 370f.; cf. also SCHMIDT 1980), and RV 1.182.7c *mṛgá patáru*, it may be more appropriate to take *mṛga-* as ‘wild bird’ here. Cf. PS 19.19.14 (quoted under 7.7.10b below).

**6.23.5** Only PS ◊ **c**: 1c, 3c

vātāgre asyā hṛdayaṃ	(8)
mano reṣmaṇi dadhmasi	(8)
vibhraṃśam asyai kṛṇmo	(7)

\*vidhvaṃsam \*āsaktaṃ +dame || (8)

We place her heart at the top of the wind, her mind [we place] in a storm. We cause failure for her, ruin afflicted on [her] house (?).

asyā] Or, yasSā K reṣmaṇi] Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma], reṣmaṇi Pa, reṣvanu K vibhraṃśam] Ku RM V/126 [Ma], vibhraṃśasam JM, vibhraṃśam Mā Pa, bibhraṃśam K asyai] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, asmai JM kṛṇmo] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], kṛṇmā JM, kṛṇvo K \*vidhvaṃsam \*āsaktaṃ +dame] viddhvaṃsamāsakundume Or, viddhvaṃsamāsakundase K [Edg. āmaktaṇḍase!]

BHATTACHARYA edits *viddhvaṃsamāsakundume*.

**ab.** Cf. 2.58.5ab. The compound *vātāgra-* occurs elsewhere only at TS 1.7.7.2 (PB 1.7.5, ĀpMP 2.21.17, BaudhŚS 18.17:363.3–5 etc.) *aṅkāu nyāṅkāṃ abhīto rātham yāu dhvāntāṃ vātāgrām ānu saṃcārantaṃ | dūrēhetir indriyāvān patatrī té no 'gnāyaḥ páprayaḥ pārayantu* ‘May the two Aṅkas, the two Nyāṅkas, which are on either side of the chariot, speeding on with the rushing wind, the far-darting, powerful one, the winged one, the fires which are furtherers, further us’ (KEITH).

**d.** My conjectures for this pāda are offered with considerable hesitation. Besides the fact that the text as edited has a bad cadence, one may object that all other attestations of the locative *dāme* in the AV Samhitās are restricted to ṚV repetitions. New forms of the word (to be compared with *dampatī* in 10c and 12d below) seem not to exist in the AV, except perhaps at PS 1.95.3b: ZEHNDER (1993: 166) conjectures *sa \*damān pradahan nv agāḥ* for transmitted *sadanān . . .*<sup>34</sup>

The verb *vī-dhvaṃs* is first attested MS 2.2.1:15.8, and also at BĀU 1.3.7 ~ JUB 1.7.6, 1.60.7–8, 2.3.12–13, ~ ChU 1.2.7–8; the possible attestation at PS 19.26.15 listed by GOTŌ 1987: 189 is not confirmed by the Or. mss. The derivative *vidhvaṃsa-*, that I conjecture here, is otherwise first attested in the Mahābhārata (12.317.19): the akṣaras °*dhva*° and °*ddha*° could easily be confused in the late Gupta script of our archetype \*G: cf. SINGH 1991, plates 84 & 86.

The same holds for the akṣaras °*kta*° and °*ku*°: plates 69 & 83. On the meanings of the verb *ā-sañj* ‘to fasten on, to oppress (an enemy)’, and the derivative *āsakti-/āsakti-* (ṚV 10.85.28b, ŚBK 4.6.1.7 etc.), see GOTŌ 1980: 21ff. GOTŌ’s assumption (1987: 321) of a “VAdj. *ā-saktá-* AV+” (*recte ā-sakta-*) is based on a wrong conjecture by ROTH & WHITNEY for ŚS 19.48.3 (= our 6.21.3 above), already withdrawn by WHITNEY 1905: 978. This verbal adjective is

<sup>34</sup> “Die Lesung *sadanān* von AVP und GopB [1.2.21] kann kaum richtig sein, da *sādana-* ‘Sitz, Wohnsitz’ nur als Neutrum belegt ist. VaitS [6.7] *sa dahan* ist zwar syntaktisch richtig, es fehlt dann aber ein Objekt zu *prá-dah*. Die Emendation *dāma-* M ‘Haus’ ist zwar keineswegs sicher, bewirkt aber, dass der Satz syntaktisch und inhaltlich aufgeht. *dāma-* ist im AV wenig geläufig (AVŚ nur 7.29.01–02 *dāme-dame* ‘in jedem Haus’) und wurde deshalb nicht mehr verstanden und durch *sadana-* M (†) ersetzt”.

first attested only in later texts, and can mean both ‘attached, hung up’ (ŚBM 6.7.1.17, BaudhŚS 11.2:66.4, Nir 9.20) and ‘affected, afflicted’ (ŚBM 4.1.3.9).

### 6.23.6 Only PS ◊ b: PS 2.72.3b, 8.9.12d

sarvam anu pari plavatām	(9)
antarā dyāvapṛthivī ubhe	( )
yathānavadhṛtā carād	(8)
<sup>+</sup> vṛṣatūlam ivopari	(8)

Let her float around, in between both heaven and earth, along with every [gush of wind], so that she shall roam above unstably, like a tuft of vṛṣa.

sarvam] **Or**, śarvam **K** yathānavadhṛtā carād] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, yathānavadhṛtā carād **Ku**, yathānavadhṛidāntarād **K** <sup>+</sup>vṛṣatūlam] vṛṣatūlam **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, vṛṣyatūlam **Pa**, viśatūlam **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *yathānavadhṛtā* and *vṛṣatūlam*.

**a.** I hesitantly supply ‘[gush of wind]’: cf. PS 5.34.7b *vātas tūlam ivaijaya?*

**b.** Deletion of either *antarā* or *ubhe* would render this pāda regular: this seems a better analysis than ZEHNDER’s statement (1999: 162) “Das Metrum fehlt eine Silbe am Pādaende”. Cf. BLOOMFIELD 1906: 69, and the metrical situation in trimeter verse at PS 1.27.1b = 3.35.5b, and 19.31.9b. Cf. also 19.39.9d and 19.48.16b (anuṣṭubh context).

**cd.** BHATTACHARYA proposes in his crit. app. to emend *anavadhūtā* (does he mean *anavadhūtā?*) and *busatūlam*. Both of these proposals are misguided. The transmitted reading *anavadhṛtā* is perfectly acceptable (cf. i.a. KauṣB 16.5.6 [ed. LINDNER 16.4:71.6], ĀśvŚS 12.4.20). The word *busa-* ‘mist/refuse (?)’ is exceedingly rare (see EWAia II, 229f.) and makes no sense here. With a view to ŚS 19.32.3a / PS 11.12.3a *divī te tūlam ośadhe* ‘your blade/tuft is in heaven, o plant’ and PS 5.20.8a *tūlam ... tṛṇasya* (cf. also 5.34.7b, 19.54.14a) we expect a plant name here. I therefore make the light emendation *vṛṣatūlam*: the *vṛṣa-* plant, of unknown botanical determination, is mentioned also i.a. PS 2.67.4d (the obeli can be removed from ZEHNDER’s text) and KS 30.1:182.9 (KapKS 46.4:279.3 [245.4:327.16]).

### 6.23.7 Only PS

aśam aśyai vāto vāt <sub>u</sub> v	(8)
aśam tapatu sūr <sub>i</sub> yaḥ	(8)
atho yad annam aśnāti	(8)
tad aśyai viṣavattaram	(8)

Let the wind blow unfavorably, let the sun burn unfavorably for her, and what food she eats: [let] that [be] very poisonous for her.

aśam] **Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, aśam **JM**, aśyam **Pa** vāt<sub>v</sub> aśam] **RM Mā Pa [Ma] K**, vātva{taṃ}(→ śam) **Ku**, vātvasam **JM**, vātvaṃśam **V/126** tapatu] **Ku JM**

**RM V/126 Pa** [Ma], ta{·}patu **Mā**, tadati **K** |] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ s°]] atho]  
**JM RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma] **K**, {śām asyaivā}atho **Ku** tad asyai] **Or**, tatassī **K**  
viṣavattaram ||] viṣavattaram ||] **Or**, viṣavattaram | **K**

**ab.** Cf. PS 15.15.5cd *śam vātaḥ śam bṛhaspatiḥ śam te tapatu sūryaḥ* and especially ŚS 7.69.1ab *śam no vāto vātu śam nas tapatu sūryaḥ*.

### 6.23.8 PS 2.58.3

siṃhas te astu cakṣuṣa ity ekā ||

Let him be a lion to your eye, a tiger in embrace. Let there be fire between the both of you, so that there will be no (more) get-together for you two.

siṃhas] **Or**, si(*sec. m.* → siṃ)has **K** te astu] **V/126 Mā Ma**, testu **Ku JM Pa K**, te 'stu **RM** ity ekā ||] **Ku JM RM V/126 Mā** [Ma] **K** [*om.* |; Edg. mistakenly prints a ||], iTY(→ ty 4)ekā **Pa**

#### PS 2.58.3

siṃhas te astu cakṣuṣe vyāghraḥ pariṣvañjane |  
agnir vām astv antarā yathā vām na sahāsatī ||

On this type of abbreviation, see my Introduction, §2.5.1. Important notes are provided by ZEHNDER (1999: 131f.) on PS 2.58.3, where the stanza is given in full.

### 6.23.9 Only PS ◊ c: PS 2.58.3d, 19.25.1–3d

eṣa vām agnir antarā (8)  
sa viṣvañcau v<sub>i</sub>y asyatu | (8)  
yathā vām na sahāsatīy (8)  
uttarasmiṃś canāyusi || (8)

[Let] this fire [be] between you two: let it shoot you two asunder, in separate directions, so that there will be no (more) get-together for you two at all, in [your] remaining life-time.

eṣa] **Or**, e(*sec. m.* → ·)ṣa **K** agnir antarā] **Or**, agnimantarā | **K** [[note ||] viṣvañcau] **Or**, viśvañcau **K** |] **Or**, *om.* **K** vām na sahāsaty] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], vāna sahāsaty **RM**, vām sāmanty **K** uttarasmiṃś] **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa** [Ma], uttarasmiś **JM**, uttarastyoś **K**

See my comment on 3d above. Cf. PS 2.58.2cd *atholmukam iva khādīram agnir vām astv antarā* ‘and then let it be a fire, a torch of Acacia wood as it were, in between you two’, 2.58.6cd *viṣvañcau pary ā vartethām yathā vām na sahāsatī* ‘turn in separate directions, so that there will be no (more) get-together for you two’, and 2.58.4ab *vy \*adyaud vy +atatanad vy \*āsthat kapaṭv iva* ‘it has flashed asunder, thundered asunder, shot [them] asunder, like a fungus’.

**d.** The collocation *uttare āyusi* seems to mean something slightly different at TB 1.3.10.7 *uttara āyusi lōma chindīta | pitṛṇām hy etarhi nēdīyaḥ* ‘In the

latter part of his life he should cut his hair off, for he is closer to the Fathers than’.

### 6.23.10 Only PS ◊ d: 19.47.8a

ut pātaya śimidāvati	(9)
pra pātaya śimidāvati	(9)
imau v <sub>i</sub> y asya dampatī	(8)
pakvaṃ māṃsam ivāsinā	(8)

Cause [her] to fly up, you who have Śimidā, cause [her] to fly away, you who have Śimidā: shoot these two spouses asunder, like cooked meat with a knife.

pātaya] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K**, pā{da}taya **Ku** śimidāvati] **Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, {si}śimidāvati **RM**, Si(*sec. m.* → śi)midāvati | **K** [*note*] || pra pātaya śimidāvati || **Ku JM [Ma?]**, pra pātaya simidāvati | **V/126 Mā**, pra pādaya śimidāvati | **Pa**, (+ pra pādaya śimidāvati 4) | **RM**, *om.* **K** dampatī] **JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, dampatī **Ku**, dampatīḥ **K** māṃsam] **Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, māsam **JM Pa** ivāsinā || ivāsinā **Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, ivāsinī **JM**, ivāsināṃ [*om.*] || **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *ivāśinā*. He reports an error *simidāvati* for **Mā** under pāda **a**, where it is misplaced: the error should have been reported under the next pāda.

**ab.** On the obscure words *śimidā-* / *śimidāvant-* / *śimidvant-*, the last form being attested also already in PS, cf. EWAia II, 637f. I list here the passages with partially new material from PS, none of which, however, helps to establish the meaning of these words: 4.34.6 (ŚS 4.25.4), 16.144.8 (ŚS 12.5.36), 8.16.5, 19.35.13, 19.47.7, 20.39.4 [omitted in PSK 20.38], 20.56.10 [PSK 20.52.10]. In the edition of VON SCHROEDER, the mantra MS 4.9.8:128.7 is given as follows: ... *svāhā* <sup>v</sup> *śimidvate tvā vātāya svāhā* ... (thus also the Ānandāśrama ed. of TĀ 4.9.1), but the padapāṭha gives *aśimidvate*. This analysis, rejected by VON SCHROEDER presumably on the basis of TĀ, makes much better sense in the context, where favorable winds are listed, and finds strong support in VSM 38.7 = VSK 38.2.1 *aśimidāya tvā vātāya svāhā* [note the typographical error in the saṃhitāpāṭha in ed. SHARMA 1999: 286]. The association of *śimid(ā)-* with the wind fits well in this hymn.

**d.** BHATTACHARYA proposes the reading *asinā* in his crit. app., and it can be adopted here without further sign of emendation because **JM** has the correct sibilant (on idiosyncratic readings in this ms., cf. my Introduction, §2.1.2.1), as it does in 19.47.8a (where it clearly reads °*vāsinā*). On the meaning of *aśi-* (‘Schlachtsmesser’, or rather — as appears also from this passage — simply ‘knife’), see THIEME 1958: 514f. = <sup>2</sup>1984: 768f., and SCHLERATH 1997: 823ff.

### 6.23.11 Only PS

meyam asmin patau ramsta	(8)
mo *asmiñ chayane s <sub>u</sub> ve	(8)

jahātu +vasanaṃ s<sub>u</sub>vam (8)  
 ahir jīrṇām iva tvacam || (8)

Let this [wife] here not find peace with him as husband, nor in [her (or: my?)] own bed here. Let her abandon her own clothes, like a snake its worn skin.

meyam] Or, meham K asmin patau] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, asminapato JM mo \*asmiñ chayane] mosmiṃ chayane Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], mosmichayane JM, mossośayane K jahātu] Or, jahati K +vasanaṃ svam] vacanaṃ svam Or, vasanoścam K jīrṇām] K, jīrṇām Or tvacam || tvacam || Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], tvaca || JM, tvacam [[om. ]] K

BHATTACHARYA edits *mosmiṃchayane* and *vacanaṃ*.

a. HOFFMANN *apud* NARTEN 1964: 219 n. 658 takes *raṃsta* in the meaning ‘Ruhe finden’. In view of the polysemy of the root *ram* (cf. RENO 1955–69/IX: 102f.), a play on words (‘finds peace/finds pleasure’) seems likely here (as at 7.12.1/2b below). Cf. the problematic pādas ŚS 3.18.3ab *nahī te nāma jagrāha nō asmīn ramase patau* ‘Since he has not named thy name, thou stayest not with him as husband’ (WHITNEY — note his comm.). The form *patau* is found only here in PS: elsewhere, PS consistently has the form *patyām* (2.41.3 [unduly emended to *patyau* by ZEHNDER], 4.10.2, 3, 6, 12.10.3, 18.5.5, 20.19.5 [PSK 20.18.5]).

b. My slight alteration of the transmitted readings takes account of the meter, and yields a comprehensible text: on the pragṛhya status of *mo* (← *mā u*) in our text, see my note on pāda 3b above. On the sandhi °n ś° → °ñ ch°, see my Introduction, §2.8 (F).

c. K points to the correct reading *vasanaṃ*, rather than *vacanaṃ* found in the Or. mss. Cf. RV 1.95.7d (PS 8.14.7d, 15.12.5d) *nāvā mātṛbhyo vāsanaḥ jahāti* ‘He leaves the parents their new clothes’. Although *vāsana-* does not seem to be attested in the meaning ‘dwelling place’ in Vedic, it is not unattractive to assume such a meaning here: in that case, twice *sva-* can be rendered ‘[my] own’. On the simile, see BODEWITZ 1973: 39 n. 6.

### 6.23.12 Only PS

yathā mṛtās ca jīvās ca- (8)  
 -+asmiṃ loke v<sub>i</sub>yokasaḥ | (8)  
 eve,mau dampatī stām (8)  
 +asmiṃ loke v<sub>i</sub>yokasau || 23 || *anuvāka* 4 || (8)

Just as the dead and the living have separate dwellings in this world, let these two spouses have separate dwellings in this world.

jīvās] Or, jīvāṃs K +cāsmiṃ] cāsmil Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa Ma, cāsmi JM, cāsmiṃn K [[Edg. mistakenly °in]] ] Or, om. K [[note °ḥ e°]] evemau] Ku RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma], evamau JM, evesau K dampatī] JM RM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma] K, dampatī Ku stām] Ku JM RM Pa [Ma] K, sthām V/126 Mā [?] +asmiṃ] asmil Or, asmiṃn K

[[Edg. mistakenly °in] || 23 || *anuvāka 4* ||] || ॠ 11 || 23 || a 4 (+ *sec. m.* 4) || **Ku**, || ॠ 12 || 23 || a 4 || **JM**, || ॠ || 23 || **RM**, || 23 || ॠ (*sec. m.* 11) || (*sec. m.* + a 4 4) **V/126**, || 23 || ॠ || **Mā**, || 23 || ॠ || a 4 || **Pa Ma**, Z pitāḥ pitarau tuṣṭārmātārmātāmahās tena vrahāṇās tena śchandāsās svargo lokās svargasya lokar gamayate ya ivaṃ veda Z anu 4 Z iti śrāddhaVrahmaṇam Z Z oṃ asmiṃṃ loke vyokasau Z **K**

On the brāhmaṇa fragment that **K** inserts here, see my introduction to 6.22 above. BHATTACHARYA edits twice with *anunāsika*, using the raised + sign for emendation only once: *cāsmiṃṃloke*<sup>+</sup> . . . *asmiṃṃ loke*. Cf. 6.22.13d, and see my Introduction, §2.8 (L). BHATTACHARYA does not report a reading *sthām* for **Mā**, as I seem to read (although the reproduction available to me is unclear), and as is found in the sister ms. **V/126**.

The text of kāṇḍa 6 has here come to an end. The mss. give the following colophons.

**Ku RM:** *navarccakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ* || śrī ||

**JM:** *navarccakāṇḍa samāptaḥ* || 0 || *pātu vo narasiṃhaḥ* || śrī ||

**V/126 Mā Pa Ma:** *navarccakāṇḍaḥ* ||

**K:** *Z ity atharvaṇi paippalādaśākhāyām ṣaṣṭhaḥ kāṇḍaḥ Z*



Kāṇḍa 7

Daśarcakāṇḍa

At the beginning of this kāṇḍa, which in all mss. follows immediately after the colophon of kāṇḍa 6, we find the following invocations:

**Ku JM V/126 Mā Pa:** *oṃ*

**K:** *atha saptamaḥ oṃ namo nārāyaṇāya Z oṃ namo jvālābhagavatyaiḥ  
oṃ namo tilotamāyaiḥ ZZ oṃ*

## 7.1. To counter witchcraft.

This hymn corresponds, with considerable variation of phrasing and stanza order, to ŚS 5.14: stanzas 5, 9 and 13 of that hymn have no parallel here, but at PS 2.71.5 (partly), 2.71.1, and 2.71.5. The hymn exceeds the norm of 10 stanzas per hymn by two; there are no obvious secondary additions. To the list of translations given by WHITNEY, the one by RENOU (1938: 148f.) can be added.

The hymn offers counter-spells against *kr̥tyá-*. GOUDRIAAN (1986: 452) distinguishes two aspects of this term: “an impersonal one, a material object produced by a sorcerer and handled by him according to more or less technical prescriptions; and a more personally conceived power which in a way is thought to be connected with this material substratum, sometimes in the form of a highly effective and dangerous being which threatens to destroy somebody’s life or property”.

The ritual which these mantras were to accompany made use of an unspecified plant (BLOOMFIELD 1897: 429), and perhaps (stanza 10) of a (leather) strap or noose. This last point recalls some of the actions described in KauśS 39.15–16, involving a skin and straps. Despite GOUDRIAAN’s statement to the contrary (p. 453), CALAND (1900: 132 n. 1) — and before him HENRY (1896: 39f.) and BLOOMFIELD (1897: 603) — seem to have been correct in allowing for the interpretation of the material form of the *kr̥tyá-* as a ‘figurine’: the wording of KauśS 39, sūtras 13 (*gulphān*) and 14 (*āśayati*) clearly implies an object of human (or animal) shape, and so do stanzas like ŚS 10.1.1, 10.1.24.

### 7.1.1 ŚS 5.14.1 ◊ ab: PS 2.16.2ab / ŚS 2.27.2ab

suparṇas tvā <sub>a</sub> nv avindat	(8)
sūkaras tvākhanan nasā	(8)
dipsauśadhe tvam dipsantaṃ	(8)
prati kr̥tyākṛto daha	(8)

The eagle discovered you, the hog dug you with its snout: you, o plant, must seek to harm the one who seeks to harm, lay counter-fire to the witchcraft-makers.

suparṇas] **K**, suparṇas **Ku V/126 Mā Pa** [**Ma**], saparṇas **JM** tvānv avindat] **Ku JM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**], Ttvānvavinda **Mā**, tvāmnvavindat **K** tvākhanan] **K**, tvākhanam **Ku JM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**], Ttvākhanam **Mā** || **Or**, (+ |) **K** dipsauśadhe] **Or**, disośage **K** dipsantaṃ] **Or**, dipsantaṃ(*sec. m.* → psvantaṃ) **K** daha] **Ku JM V/126 Pa** [**Ma**] **K**, dahi **Mā**

#### ŚS 5.14.1

suparṇas tvānv avindat sūkaras tvākhanan nasā |  
dipsauśadhe tvam dipsantaṃ āva kr̥tyākṛtaṃ jahi ||

BHATTACHARYA does not notice the doubling of *-t-* elements in the twice occurring akṣara *-sTtvā-* (*suparṇastvā*, *sūkarastvā*) in **Mā**: the scribe has blended two ways of writing this akṣara.

**ab.** Cf. my comments on 6.7.1–2 and 6.7.7, and on the significance of the eagle and the boar, cf. especially DAS 1987: 25ff., who rightly prefers a mythological above a naturalistic interpretation. The scansion of the sequence *anv-avind<sup>o</sup>* at other places in our text (e.g. 4.33.6a, 7.6.1b, 8.13.4b, 8.15.7d, 9.11.13b, 9.15.5c, 12.15.1b) supports the analysis *tvā<sub>a</sub>nv*, adopted here, rather than *tvā<sub>n</sub>v*.

### 7.1.2 ŚS 5.14.2 ◊ a: PS 2.63.4a

prati daha yātudhānān	(8)
prati kṛtyākṛto daha	(8)
atho yo asmān dipsati	(8)
tam u tvam jah <sub>y</sub> oṣadhe	(8)

Lay counter-fire to the sorcerers, lay counter-fire to the witchcraft-makers, and he who seeks to harm us, that one too you must slay, o plant.

the first hemistich omitted in **K** • asmān] 'smān **Ku Pa**, 'asmān **JM**, asmāṃ **V/126 Mā**, 'smāṃ **Ma**, smān **K** dipsati] **Ku JM V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, di{PSA}psati **Mā** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °e a°]]

#### ŚS 5.14.2

áva jahi yātudhānān áva kṛtyākṛtaṃ jahi |  
átho yó asmān dípsati tám u tvāṃ jahy oṣadhe ||

**cd.** On the meaning of *átho* in the AV, see KLEIN 1997. WHITNEY's 'then' is certainly wrong here. Compared with the ŚS version which has (*áva*) *jahi* throughout, the sudden change of verb-form (*daha* to *jahi*) in our last pāda has a slightly less original appearance.

### 7.1.3 ŚS 5.14.8

agne pṛtanāṣāt pṛtanāḥ sahasva	( )
prati kṛtyāṃ kṛtyākṛte	(8)
pratiharaṇena harāmasi	( )

As Agni a winner in battle, win the battles. We return the witchcraft to the witchcraft-maker, with a returner.

pṛtanāḥ] **Or**, pṛtanā **K** |] **Or**, *om.* **K** kṛtyākṛte] **Or**, kṛtyākṛte | **K** [[note |]] harāmasi] **Ku JM V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, hamasi **Mā**

#### ŚS 5.14.8

ágne pṛtanāṣāt pṛtanāḥ sahasva |  
púnaḥ kṛtyāṃ kṛtyākṛte pratihāraṇena harāmasi ||

The metrical analysis of this stanza is problematic (cf. WHITNEY on the ŚS parallel). Deletion of the epithet *ṛtanāṣāt* would render the first line octosyllabic. Perhaps the element *ṛati*°, which in a sense is pleonastic, could also be removed from *ṛatiharaṇena*, to render the whole a nice gāyatrī stanza. GRILL's proposal (1888: 147) to restore **ab** *agnínā ṛtanāśāhā ṛtanāsu sāhasvatā* and **d** *ṛatisarēṇa hanmasi* is not convincing.

**a.** I tentatively take *ágne* here as a predicative vocative: the plant is compared to Agni. Cf. my commentary on 6.9.2a *viṣṇo*. On *ṛtanā-* + *sah*, see my note under 6.9.8d.

**b.** Cf. PS 2.71.2 *yathā te devy oṣadhe ṛaticīnaṃ phalaṃ kṛtam | evā tvam kṛtvane kṛtyāṃ hastagr̥hya parā ṇaya* ‘Just as your fruit, o heavenly plant, is made to point backward, so you must lead the witchcraft [far] away to the one who has made it, having grasped it by the hand’. Cf. also PS 4.8.1–13de quoted under pāda **c**, and PS 2.38.4ab *punaḥ kṛtyāṃ kṛtyākṛte hastagr̥hya parā ṇaya*. This in turn is to be compared with PS 2.71.3ab *punaḥ kṛtyāṃ kṛtyākṛte godhe-vāvaṭam \*anv ayat*. ZEHNDER (1999: 160) proposes to read *kṛtyā kṛtyākṛtam* (it is clear that this reading — if indeed original — could have suffered perseveration from 2.38.4ab *punaḥ kṛtyāṃ kṛtyākṛte*): ‘The witchcraft shall go back to the witchcraft-maker, like a monitor lizard into its hole’. Cf. finally stanza 7 below.

**c.** On the word *ṛatiháraṇa-*, cf. PS 4.8.1–13de *ṛatyak ṛatiharaṇenāghāyate 'ghaṃ ṛati harāmaḥ* ‘Against the evil-doer do we return the evil, with a returner’. It seems likely that *ṛatiháraṇa-* is intended as an adj. (*scil. bráhmaṇ-*: 11d). A list of *kṛtyāṃṛatiharaṇa* hymns is given in AVParís 32.2, closely agreeing with the list of hymns given at KauśS 39.7 to be used in a *ṛatiharaṇa* ritual (thus named at KauśS 71.13), cf. CALAND 1900: 133f. If *ṛatiháraṇa-* here, too, refers rather to the act than to the means, a rendering like ‘by way of a counter-measure’ is also imaginable.

#### 7.1.4 ŚS 5.14.12

<i>iṣvā ṛjīyaḥ patatu</i>	(8)
<i>dyāvāṛṥthivī tat *sutāt  </i>	(8)
<i>tat taṃ mṛga iva vidhyatu</i>	(8)
<i>kṛtyā kṛtyākṛtaṃ kṛta   </i>	(8)

Straighter than an arrow let it fly. You must speed it on, o heaven and earth. Let it wound him like a wild-animal [wounds its prey], as witchcraft made against a witchcraft-maker.

*iṣvā ṛjīyaḥ*] **Ku JM V/126 Mā** [Ma], *iṣvā*{·} *ṛjāyaḥ* **Pa**, *yāḥkvār̥hīya* **K** *patatu*] **Or**, *pa utu* **K** *\*sutāt*] *sutat* **Or K** *tat*] **Or**, *ut* **K** *mṛga iva*] **Or**, *mṛgam iva* **K** *vidhyatu*] **Or**, *viddhat* **K** *kṛtyā*] **Or**, *kṛtye* **K**

#### ŚS 5.14.12

*iṣvā ṛjīyaḥ patatu dyāvāṛṥthivī taṃ ṛati |*  
*sā taṃ mṛgām iva ḡṛṇātu kṛtyā kṛtyākṛtaṃ pūnaḥ ||*

BHATTACHARYA edits *tat sutat*.

**b.** The mss. unanimously read *tatsutat* at the end of this pāda. The emendation *\*sutāt* has been suggested to me by Werner Knobl. In a letter d.d. 14 August 2003, he explains:

In later Vedic (MS+) a new class II verb-stem of root *sav<sup>i</sup>/sū* came into being, i.e. *sau-/suv-*. We would expect *sū-* to occur before endings with consonantal anlaut. But instead we find *su-* in, for example, two forms of the imperative, in the 2nd singular *-suhi*: ĀśvŚS 5.11.1 (and other ŚSs) *praśāstaḥ prasuhi* and the 2nd plural *suta*: TĀ 4× (1.1.2 etc.) *putravattvāya me suta*. A 2nd dual imperative *\*sutam* would nicely fit in with the 2nd singular *suhi* of the ŚSs and the 2nd plural *suta* of the TĀ. Yet, it could be that *\*sutāt* is to be preferred. For one thing, it is just a little closer to the unanimous reading of the mss. For another, the future imperative typically follows after a present imperative, see Delbrück, SF III (1878) 2ff. Finally, *\*sutāt* may prove the more elegant solution (‘die apartere Lösung’), as this form constitutes a rarity, and therefore should engage our deeper interest. Why is it a rarity? Because the future imperative in *-tāt* occurs most often as a ‘substitute’ (Aṣṭādhyāyī 7.1.35) for the 2nd and 3rd singular imperatives in *-hi* and *-tu*. Of a form in *-tāt* being used as a 2nd dual, only one example seems to be known, i.e. ṚV 10.24.5cd *nāsatyāv abruvan devāḥ pūnar ā vahatād iti* ‘The gods said to the Nāsatyas, “Drive [them] (the two *arāṇās* that have flown away) here again!” (that is, after you have found them)’.

I find Knobl’s second suggestion singularly persuasive, and the error shared by all mss. may easily be explained as due to perseveration from the demonstrative *tat*.

**cd.** The **K** reading *mṛgam iva* agrees with ŚS against the *lectio difficilior* found in the Or. mss. With much hesitation, I adopt this latter reading, as there seems to be no plausible explanation for its having entered the Or. transmission, if we reject it as unoriginal. That the original composition of this stanza had *mṛgām iva* seems beyond doubt. The **K** reading *kṛtye* may be an anticipation of 8d.

**7.1.5** ŚS 10.1.5 (cf. PS 16.35.5) ◇ **cd**: PS 16.35.2de

agham ast <sub>u</sub> v aghakṛte	(8)
śapathaḥ śapathīv <sub>a</sub> ne	(8)
pratyak <sup>+</sup> pratiprahiṇmasi	(8)
yaś cakāra tam ṛchatu	(8)

Let it be an evil to the evil-doer, a curse to the curser. We send it forth, back against [the witchcraft-maker]. Let it (the returner) hit upon the one who has made it (the witchcraft-figurine).

agham] **Ku JM V/126 Mā K**, agha(→ ya 4)m **Pa**, agha(← ya)m **Ma** śapathah] śapathāḥ **Ku JM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, śṛpathāḥ **Pa**, śapathas̄ **K** śapathīvne] **Or**, śapathiñcine **K** || **Or**, *om.* **K** pratyak +pratiprahinmasi] pratyakṣ pratipravarttaya **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, pratyakpratipravarttaya **JM**, pra{·}tyakṣ prativarttaya **RM**, pratyānpratiprahinvasi **K** [Bhatt. mistakenly: °ṇ, pra°] yaś] **Ku JM V/126 Pa [Ma] K**, śas̄ **Mā** ṛchatu] **Or**, aśchatu **K**

### ŚS 10.1.5

aghām astv aghakṛte śapāthaḥ śapathīyaté |  
pratyák pratipráhiṇmo yáthā kṛtyākṛtam hánat ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *śapathāḥ* and *pratipravarttaya*.

**b.** The apparent nom. pl. *śapathāḥ* that the Or. mss. transmit here cannot be made to fit syntactically. I therefore adopt the **K** reading, which agrees with ŚS. It seems that the Or. reading has been influenced by the text of PS 16.35.5 *kṛtyāḥ santu kṛtyākṛte śapathāḥ śapathīvne | pratyakṣ pratiprahinmasi yaś cakāratam ṛchatu*. The reading for the second word of this pāda, here, and in the parallel at 16.35.5 is *śapathīvne* in all the Or. mss., while **K** gives *śapathiñcine* here, and *śapathyanvine* in the parallel pāda: the underlying **K** reading seems to be *śapathinvine*. The meaning as conveyed by the participle *śapathīyánt-* in the ŚS parallel of this stanza is clear. While the form *śapathinvin-* (**K**) defies explanation, *śapathīvan-* (Or. mss.) may be explained as formed in analogy to the semantically somewhat comparable word *pratidīvan-* ‘adversary at the dice’. I accept this word *śapathīvan-* only with considerable hesitation, as it seems impossible to reconcile *śapathīvne* with the underlying **K** reading.

**c.** The sequence *pratipra* occurs elsewhere in PS only in 20.22.7c [PSK 20.21.7c] *idaṃ pratipravādinam*, and in 10.1.8c *tasyai pratipravarttaya*. It seems necessary to reject the syntactically impossible Or. reading *pratipravarttaya*, and explain it as due to anticipation of the latter passage. The parallel passage in ŚS has *pratiprahinmas*, and we find *pratiprahinmasi* at PS 16.35.2+5, as (unanimously) in stanza 11 below. I assume this reading, preserved with only slight corruption in **K**, to be original (contrast BHATTACHARYA’s reverse assumption, p. xlvi of his Introduction).

**cd.** Cf. 7.18.6 below. On the univerbation of the two prepositions with the verb, cf. ŚS 10.1.5c *pratyák pratipráhiṇmas* and ŚCĀ [ed. DESHPANDE] 4.1.24, with WHITNEY’s comment 1862: 185.

### 7.1.6 PS 2.38.3

yas tvā kṛtya ity ekā ||

He who, o witchcraft, has sent you forth knowingly to the house of an unknowing one, to him we give you back, so that you shall slay the witchcraft-maker.

kṛtya ity ekā ||] **Ku V/126 Pa Ma**, kṛtya ity ekā ||<sup>1</sup> **JM**, kṛtyā ity ekā || **Mā**, kṛtyety ekā (+ |) **K**

**PS 2.38.3**

yas tvā kṛtye \*prajighāya vidvāñ aviduṣo gṛham |  
punas tvā tasmā ā dadhmo yathā kṛtyākṛtaṃ hanah ||

Regarding the abbreviation with *ity ekā*, see my Introduction, §2.5.1. On the correct reading of this stanza, see ZEHNDER 1999: 102.

**7.1.7** ŚS 5.14.4 ◊ **ab**: PS 2.38.4ab, 2.71.3a+2d

punaḥ kṛtyāṃ kṛtyākṛte	(8)
hastagr̥hya parā ṇaya	(8)
samakṣam asmā ā dadhmo	(8)
yathā kṛtyākṛtaṃ hanat	(8)

Lead the witchcraft [far] away back to the witchcraft-maker, having grasped it by the hand. We place it before his eyes, so that it shall slay the witchcraft-maker.

punaḥ] **Or**, punaḥ **K** kṛtyāṃ] **Ku JM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, kṛtyā **Pa** kṛtyākṛte] **Or**, kṛtyāṃkṛte **K** hastagr̥hya parā ṇaya] **JM V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, ha(⟨...⟩)parā ṇaya **Ku**, pratiharāṇaṃna harāmasi **K** asmā] **Or**, asminn **K** hanat ||] **Ku JM V/126 Mā**, hinat ||] **Pa Ma**, hanah [*om.*] **K** [*note °ḥ p°*]

**ŚS 5.14.4**

púnaḥ kṛtyāṃ kṛtyākṛte hastagr̥hya pára ṇaya |  
samakṣám asmā ā dhehi yáthā kṛtyākṛtam hánat ||

**ab.** Cf. the parallels from PS 2 quoted under 3b above. The **K** reading *pratiharāṇaṃna harāmasi* seems due to perseveration from stanza 3.

**cd.** **K** *asminn* is perseverated from 3.28.4c *hṛcchokam asminn ā dadhmo*, and (cf. already ZEHNDER 1999: 102) *hanah* from 2.38.4d.

**7.1.8** ŚS 5.14.10

putra <sup>i</sup> va pitaraṃ gacha	(8)
svaja <sup>i</sup> vābhiṣṭhito daśa	(8)
tantur <sup>i</sup> vāvavyayann <sup>+</sup> ihi	(8)
kṛtye kṛtyākṛtaṃ kṛtā	(8)

Go as a son to his father, bite like a viper trampled upon. Having been made (to harm us), go, o witchcraft, to the witchcraft-maker (to harm him instead), as an unraveling (?) yarn.

gacha] **Or**, gaścha **K** svaja ivābhiṣṭhito] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, sva ivā<sup>i</sup>bhiṣṭhito **JM**, svadaivābhiṣṭhito **K** ivāvavyayann] **V/126 Mā**, ivāvavyayann **Ku JM**, i{t}vāvavyayann **Pa**, ivāvavyayann **Ma K** <sup>+</sup>ihi] **ihi Or**, idi **K** kṛtā ||] **Or**, kṛtāḥ | **K**

**ŚS 5.14.10**

putrá iva pitáram gacha svajā ivābhíṣṭhito daśa |  
bandhám ivāvakramí gacha kṛtye kṛtyākṛtaṃ púnah ||

BHATTACHARYA edits °*vyayannāhi*.

**b.** The identification of the *svajā-* as ‘viper’ follows MACDONELL & KEITH 1912/II: 491f.

**c.** Cf. RV 4.13.4ab *vāhiṣṭhebhīr viháran yāsi tántum avavyáyann ásitam deva vásma* ‘With your best draft horses you drive, loosening (?) the yarn, unfolding (?) the black dress, o god’. The words *tántu-* and *avavyáyant-* do not agree with each other grammatically in this RV passage (for which previous translators give quite varied renderings), but their collocation there must be connected with their combined occurrence here: it seems likely that the PS poet, being familiar with the RV stanza, paronomastically associated *avavyáyant-* (originally from *ava-vyā*) with the pseudo-stem (EWAia II, 538) *vaya-* ‘to weave’ (perhaps also with *ava-vi-ay?*) and therefore took it together with *tántu-*. Cf. RV 10.130.1cd *imé vayanti pitáro yá āyayúḥ prá vayāpa vayéty āsate taté* ‘The fathers, who have come here, are weaving. Saying “weave forward, weave backward”, they sit near the warp’ and ŚS 14.1.45a *yā ákṛntann ávayan yás ca tatniré* ‘They (the goddesses) who spun, wove, and who warped’. The significance of the simile may lie in the speed of an unraveling yarn held by its end (cf. emphasis on speed in 4a, 9ab), or perhaps in the outward movement of an unraveling yarn (held by the spindle) that is turned inwards when the end is reached and the spindle is kept turning. It seems likely that the simile was chosen here because of a paronomastic connection of the forms derived from the root *kar* in pāda **d** with <sup>2</sup>*kart* ‘to spin’ (cf. the likely word-play with *parikṛtya* from <sup>1</sup>*kart* ‘to cut’, paronomastically connected with *kṛtyā-* in ŚS 5.14.3b, quoted under stanza 10).

### 7.1.9 ŚS 5.14.11

ud eṇīva vāriṇy	(8)
abhiskandaṃ mṛgīva	(8)
kṛtyā kartāram ṛchatu	(8)

Like a she-antelope with raised tail, jumping forward like a doe, let the witchcraft hit upon its maker.

eṇīva] **JM V/126 Mā** [Ma], e{ri}ṇīva **Ku**, eṇ{i}va **Pa**, udenaiva **K** vāriṇy abhiskandaṃ] **Or**, vāruṇy abhikrandaṃ **K** mṛgīva ]] **Ku JM V/126 Mā** [Ma], mṛ{·}gīva | **Pa**, mṛgaiva [[*om.* ]] **K** kartāram] **K**, kartāram **Or** ṛchatu] **Or**, ṛchatu **K**

#### ŚS 5.14.11

úd eṇīva vāraṇy àbhiskándaṃ mṛgīva |  
kṛtyā kartāram ṛchatu ||

**a.** The Or. mss. offer the word *vāriṇī* (from *vāra-* ‘tail, (tail) hair’: EWAia II, 545), which solves the problems surrounding the ŚS reading *vāraṇī*, noted by WHITNEY (to be compared with the reading *rukmaṇī* for *\*rukmiṇī* at 7.9.6d below). MACDONELL & KEITH (1912/I: 120) identify the *eṇī-* as the

female antelope (cf. PRATER 1971: 270f.). Elsewhere in Vedic we find the compound *údvāra-*: TS 1.8.9.2 *raudrāṃ gāvīdhukāṃ carúṃ akṣāvāpāsya gr̥hé śabāla údvāro dáksīṇā* ‘A mess of Gavīdhuka to Rudra in the house of a dice-thrower; the fee is a speckled (bull) with raised hair (i.e. a furry one)’ (cf. TB 1.7.3.6, BaudhŚS 12.5:92.9). KEITH translates *údvāra-* as ‘with raised tail’, but (as FALK 1986: 115 has shown) the essential point is the hairiness of the remuneration, and one may anyhow wonder how having a raised tail could be a permanent characteristic of a bull. Because, in our context, a loose *úd* ‘up’ hardly seems fitting as a description of an animal’s fast movement, I assume that *úd . . . vāriṇī* is a rare example of an analyzed (‘loose’) compound (cf. AiGr. II/1, §9c p. 28 [“nur poetisch”, i.e. in classical Sanskrit], but also OLDENBERG 1909–12/I: 348, II: 80 [“sehr wahrscheinlich”], 87 [RV 8.11.1], 283 [10.80.3]), with common pleonastic *-in-*suffix (AiGr. II/2, §212k), although we must assume here the meaning ‘having a raised tail’ (mark of an antelope on the run).

b. The simile is to be compared with ŚāṅkhŚS 8.25.1b *ṛṣyān iva pamphaṇataḥ* ‘like leaping antelopes’ (CALAND). On the form *abhiskādam*, cf. the discussion by BLOOMFIELD 1897: 430. The root accentuation (cf. RENO 1929: 359) clearly favors an interpretation as absolutive, because we would expect suffix accentuation (cf. AiGr. II/2, §31a) if the word were the (sexual) nomen agentis that GRILL (1888: 147 ‘Bespringer’), and after him BLOOMFIELD (*ibid.* ‘the mating (buck)’), took it to be, evidently ignoring the accentuation. The semantics (RENO, p. 361) also support the interpretation as *-am* absolutive (RENO, p. 389). The sole finite attestation of *abhi-skand* in the problematic stanza ŚS 7.115.2 probably does not share in the common sexual connotations of creeper-similes (e.g. my comments on 6.4.5b): *yá mā lakṣmīḥ patayātūr ájuṣṭābhicaskānda vāndaneva vṛkṣám | anyātrāsmát savitas tām itó dhā hiraṇyahasto vāsu no rārāṇaḥ* ‘The unsavoury mark which flying has alighted upon me, as a creeper upon a tree, that mayest thou put away from us, away from here, O golden-handed (golden-rayed) Savitar (the sun), bestowing goods upon us!’ (BLOOMFIELD 1897: 168). The parallel of this ŚS stanza, PS 20.18.8 [PSK 20.17.8], reads *adhicaskanda* in the Or. mss. (**K** is corrupt).

#### 7.1.10 ŚS 5.14.3 ◊ cd: PS 19.39.5cd

<sup>+</sup> ṛṣyasyeva <sup>+</sup> parīśāsaṃ	(8)
parimāya pari tvacaḥ	(8)
durhārde <sup>+</sup> cakruṣe kṛtyāṃ	(8)
grīvāsu prati muñcata	(8)

Having measured [it] off, as [one measures off] a strap from the skin of a stag, hang [o gods] the witchcraft around the neck of the evil-hearted one who has made it.

<sup>+</sup>ṛṣyasyeva] riśyasyeva **Ku Mā** [Ma], riśvasyeva **JM**, riśYasyeva **V/126**, riṇya(→ śya 2)syeva **Pa**, ḥṛsvasyaiva **K**    <sup>+</sup>parīśāsaṃ] pariśāsaṃ **Or**, pariśāsaṃ **K**    tvacaḥ || **Or**, tvaca | **K**

durhārde] **Ku JM V/126 Pa [Ma]**, duhārde **Mā**, druhārde **K** +cakruṣe] cakṣuṣe **Or**,  
caṣkṛṣe **K** prati muñcata] prati muñcatu **Or**, pra muñcata **K**

### ŚS 5.14.3

rīsyasyeva pariśāsām parikṛtya pári tvacáh |  
krtyám krtyákṛte devā niškám iva práti muñcata ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *rīsyasyeva*, *cakṣuṣe*, and *muñcatu*.

**ab.** Cf. the commentary by LUBOTSKY on 5.34.9 (2002: 158), where BHATTACHARYA's (Or. based) *rīsyapuchaṃ* is emended to *ṛṣyapuchaṃ*. As noted by WHITNEY in his commentary on the ŚS parallel (cf. also WHITNEY 1881: 74, 249), the form *ṛṣya°* is original, but is found written *rīṣya°* and even *rīṣya°* in the ŚS mss. The Or. mss. tend to use the same spelling *rīṣy°* (5.34.9, 8.12.3 [?], 9.6.7, 20.19.7), but in sandhi also preserve the expected form °ā *r°* (4.5.6, 8.12.3). **K** generally preserves *r°* (4.5.6, 9.6.7) (even in sandhi °ā *r°* 8.12.3), or a trace of *r°* (*hṛ°*), as here, and at 5.34.9; it is corrupt at PS 20.19.7. Cf. the case of *krīmi-/kṛmi-* discussed under 6.8.8b.

The acts with a skin (*carmaṇ-*) and straps (*bandha-*) described at KauśS 39.15 somehow seem inspired by the contents of this stanza. Its (syntactic) interpretation is problematic. What action on what object is intended with *parimāya* (ŚS *parikṛtya*)?

**cd.** The emended reading *cakruṣe* is based on the occurrence of the same hemistich as 19.39.5cd, where the Or. mss. and **K** read *cakṛṣe* and *muñcata* (*muñcatā* in **K**). The ending *-tu* found in the Or. mss. may have been taken from *ṛchatu* in the preceding stanza: the ŚS parallel suggests that the gods are being addressed. If we were to accept the Or. reading *muñcatu*, we would have a sūtra-like instruction about the performer of the rite, which does not fit in with the context of this hymn. Cf. also the parallel ŚS 4.18.4cd / PS 5.24.4cd *práti sma cakruṣe krtyám priyám priyáivate hara* 'Return [o Apāmārga plant] the witchcraft to its maker, a mistress (or: something [f.] owned) to her beloved (or: its owner)'.  
'.

On the meaning of *prati-moc*, see SOMMER (1977: 64) who compares ŚS 8.6.26cd *vṛkṣād iva srájam kṛtvápriye práti muñca tát* 'das wirf dem Unhold über, wie wenn du von einem Baum einen (Laub-)Kranz gemacht hättest' with "ŚB I 8,1,5, wo Manu das Tau seines Schiffes am Horn des Fisches festgemacht hat: *práti mumoca*" (n. 5, p. 80), but where — it may be added — the tying of the boat to the tree is expressed (in 1.8.1.6) with *práti-badh*. Cf. also the passages and references under 7.8.9c. On the hanging of magical implements around the neck, cf. further BaudhŚS 12.14:106.13f. *tad etān mañin ekasmīn sūtra āvayati madhyata audumbaram karoti tān grīvāsu pratiśajya . . .* 'Then he strings these amulets on one thread. He puts the one of Udumbara wood in the middle, and after attaching them to the neck, . . .'. The precise construction *grīvāsu prati-moc* also occurs at ĀpŚS 20.13.4 *aśvasya grīvāsu sawarṇaniṣkam pratimucya* 'having hung a golden plate around the horse's neck'.

## 7.1.11 Only PS ◊ cf. ŚS 5.14.7

yā kṛt <sub>i</sub> ye devakṛtā	(8)
yā vā manuṣyajā asi	(8)
tām tvā pratiprahīṃmasi	(8)
praticīnena brahmaṇā	(8)

You, o witchcraft, who are made by a god, or who are born from a human, do we send forth against [the witchcraft-maker], with a counter-spell.

manuṣyajā asi] **Ku JM V/126 Mā [Ma]**, manuṣyā(→ ṣya 3)jā asi **Pa**, manuṣyajāsi **K** pratiprahīṃmasi] **Or**, pratyāṅprahīṃmasi (+ |) **K** [*note inserted*] || praticīnena brahmaṇā] **Ku V/126 Mā Pa [Ma]**, praticīnena brahmaṇā **JM**, praticīnayana vrahmaṇā **K**

## ŚS 5.14.7

yādi vāsi devakṛtā yādi vā pūruṣaiḥ kṛtā |  
tām tvā pūnar ṇayāmasīndreṇa sayūjā vayām ||

**ab.** Cf. LUBOTSKY 2002: 110 on the exceptional trisyllabic scansion of *kṛtyā-*.

## 7.1.12 ŚS 5.14.6

yadi strī yadi vā pumān	(8)
kṛtyāṃ cakāra pāpmane	(8)
tām u tasmai nayāmasy	(8)
āśvam ivāśvābhidhānyā    1	(8)

If a woman, or if a man has made a witchcraft for evil, that one too do we lead [back] against him, like a horse by a horse-halter.

yadi] **Or**, yada **K** strī yadi] **Or**, strī[*line*]di **K** vā pumān] **Or** [°n], vāsmāna **K** tām u] **Ku JM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, tā{sa}mu **Pa** nayāmasy āśvam] **Or**, nayāmassy āśvam **K** || 1 ||] || 1 ||] **Ku**, || 1 ||] **JM**, || 1 ||] **V/126**, || 1 ||] **Mā**, || 1 ||] **Pa**, Z 1 Z **K**

## ŚS 5.14.6

yādi strī yādi vā pumān kṛtyāṃ cakāra pāpmane |  
tām u tasmai nayāmasy āśvam ivāśvābhidhānyā ||

## 7.2. Against ‘worms’ threatening a child.

The word *krími-*, which for the sake of convenience is here rendered ‘worm’ throughout, in fact could refer to various types of parasitic insects (MEULENBELD 1974: 623), and even to imaginary creatures assumed to cause unexplainable symptoms, besides the normal reference to worms.

On the ritual application of the ŚS version (5.23) of these stanzas at KauśS 29.20–26 in a rite to remove worms from the body of a child (cf. stanza 2), see BAHULKAR 1994: 176ff.

Phrasal and thematic concatenation with the preceding hymn is found in 1a (*dyāvāprthivī*: 7.1.4b), 2b (*jahi*: 7.1.2d, and other forms of *han* in 2c, 4d, 7c, 8cd, 9abc: 7.1.7d *hanat*), 10d (*dahāmi*: repeated *daha* in 7.1.1+2).

### 7.2.1 ŚS 5.23.1

okte me dyāvā pṛthivī	(8)
oktā devī sarasvatī	(8)
oktau ma indraś cāgnīś ca	(8)
krimiṃ jambhayatām imam	(8)

Summoned by me are heaven and earth, summoned is the goddess Sarasvatī, summoned by me are Indra and Agni: let them two crush this worm.

okte] Or, oṣate K    oktā] Or, okatā K    devī] Ku V/126 Mā [Ma] K, dev{i}ī Pa  
oktau] Or, okato K    krimiṃ] Ku V/126 Mā [Ma], krimi Pa, kṛmiṃ K    imam ||  
imam || Or, imam [om. ] K

#### ŚS 5.23.1

óte me dyāvā pṛthivī ótā devī sárasvatī |  
óttau ma índraś cāgnīś ca krímiṃ jambhayatām íti ||

**abc.** The PS version of this stanza has *okta-* for the problematic ŚS reading *óta-*, which is given the following explanation by WHITNEY and LANMAN: “The pple. *óta* (p. *áouta*) [‘woven on, worked in’ (*ā + vā*)] seems to mean ‘brought in for my aid’; a root *u* is insufficiently supported [see Whitney, *Roots* etc.]”. Cf. also BLOOMFIELD (1897: 453), who admits: “The meaning of the stem *óta-* (*á uta-*) is not altogether certain. . . . But I do not see how the meaning of the stem can be derived from the root *vā*, ‘weave,’ and the preposition *á*”. BLOOMFIELD guessed (p. 23) the problematic ŚS words *óta- me* to mean ‘I have called upon’, with the gen. pronoun *me* expressing the agent (cf. MINARD 1949, §122b, 1956 §603e).

BLOOMFIELD’s guess seems to have been entirely correct: while there is no PS parallel for ŚS 6.94.3 (*óte me dyāvāpṛthivī ótā devī sárasvatī | óttau ma índraś cāgnīś cardhyāśmedám sarasvatī*), we do find the same alternation ŚS *óta-* :: PS *okta-* also at PS 19.4.11 (*oktā āpaḥ karmaṇyā muñcantv itaḥ<sup>+</sup> prañītaye | sadyo bhavantv etave*), for ŚS 6.23.2 (*ótā āpaḥ karmaṇyā muñcántv itáḥ prañītaye | sadyáḥ kṛṇvantv étave*). In this context, the immediately preceding pāda (of

the first stanza of the ṛca ŚS 6.23 / PS 19.4.10–12) reads *apó devír úpa hvaye* (ŚS 6.23.1d) / *apo devír upa bruve* (PS 19.4.10d): ‘I call upon the heavenly waters’ (the R̥VKh parallel 3.13.1 has *á devír ávasā huve*). The PS version of this ṛca, where the suppletive relationship between *bravī* (*upa bruve*) and *vac* (*ā-ukta-*) is evident, suggests that *okta-* must be the original reading in all mentioned passages. The use of the word *vācas-* in the next stanza here (also in the ŚS version) confirms this. The compound *ā-vac* ‘to summon’ is rare but attested certainly at RV 5.41.14, 7.73.2. On Indra’s role as remover of worms, cf. BLOOMFIELD 1897: 454 (and WATKINS 1995, i.a. pp. 464, 468, 521f.). For Agni, cf. PS 5.3.8.

**d.** On the meaning and the fluctuating spelling in the Atharvavedic mss. of the word *krīmi-*, see my commentary on 6.8.8b. Note ŚS *īti* for perhaps less original *imam* in PS.

### 7.2.2 ŚS 5.23.2

asye;ndra kumārasya	(8)
krimiṃ dhanapate jahi	(8)
hatā viśvā arātayo	(8)
ānena vacasā mama	(8)

O Indra, lord of the booty, kill the worm in this boy. Killed are all Arātis, by this spell of mine.

asyendra] **Or**, yasyendra **K** krimiṃ] krimin **Or**, kṛmiṃ **K** viśvā arātayo ānena] viśvā arātayo 'nena **Or**, viśvārātayogreṇa **K** [[note reading 9d] mama ||] **Or**, mimā (+ |) **K**

#### ŚS 5.23.2

asyéndra kumārásya krímīn dhanapate jahi |  
hatá viśvā árātaya ugréṇa vācasā máma ||

**ab.** Indra is called *dhánapati-* (cf. BLOOMFIELD 1897: 454) also at KS 21.14:56.17, PS 1.43.1, 19.29.5 etc.

**c.** On the meaning of *árāti-*, see my introduction to 7.9 below. There seems to be little connection between the plural *árātis* here, and the singular personification of stinginess in 7.9.

**d.** **K** exchanges the pādas 2d and 9d of the Or. mss., and points here to *ugreṇa vacasā mama*, with ŚS.

### 7.2.3 ŚS 5.23.3

yo + <sub>a</sub> kṣyau parisarpati	(8)
yo nāse parisarpati	(8)
datāṃ yo madhyaṃ gachati	(8)
taṃ krimiṃ jambhayāmasi	(8)

The one that crawls around [in] the eyes, that crawls around [in] the nostrils, that goes to the middle of the teeth: this worm do we crush.

**Pa** not systematically collated beyond *yo 'kṣau pari • yo +<sub>a</sub>kṣyau*] *yo 'kṣau* **Ku Pa** [**Ma**], *yokṣau* **V/126 Mā K** *yo nāse*] **Or**, *yenāsau* **K** *datām*] **Or**, *natām* **K** *gachati*] **Or**, *gaśchami* **K** *krimiṃ*] **Or**, *kṛmiṃ* **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K**

### ŚS 5.23.3

*yó akṣyau parisárpati yó nāse parisárpati |*  
*datām yó mádhyaṃ gáchatī tām kṛimīṃ jambhayāmasi ||*

BHATTACHARYA edits *'kṣau*, without underlining.

**ab.** For the fluctuation in ŚS mss. of forms from *ákṣi-* ‘eye’ with and without *-y-*, see WHITNEY 1881: 11 (add ŚPP’s reading at ŚS 19.50.1c). Cf. also ZEHNDER on PS 2.81.2d, and the reading *akṣau* in all mss. at PS 4.20.2d, 14.9.1c. At PS 1.55.3a, 2.8.3, 2.33.2+3, 2.90.2b+c, 6.6.1+2, 8.10.7, 12.18.5 (etc.), the mss. fluctuate. In view of this fluctuation, it seems best to restore *akṣyau* here as well, with ŚS.

Note that Āyurvedic texts distinguish a particular kind of ‘worm’ called *parisarpa-* (MEULENBELD 1974: 625). Cf. MEULENBELD (p. 624) on the larva of *Chrysomya bezziana*, which may be denoted by the *kuṣṭhaja* ‘worm’ of Āyurvedic texts: a kind of fly that “is frequently found in India, where it appears to have a predilection for human beings, the female laying her numerous eggs in the nasal cavity or in tissues from which offensive discharges emanate”.

**c.** On the dental condition referred to here, perhaps caries caused by the *dantāda* ‘worm’ of Āyurvedic literature, cf. BLOOMFIELD 1897: 454. The same odd error *gaśchami* for *°ti* occurred in **K** at 6.4.7c.

**7.2.4** ŚS 5.23.4 ◊ **c**: PS 19.5.8a = ŚS 6.16.3c ◊ **d**: 19.29.6b

virūpau dvau sarūpau dvau	(8)
kṛṣṇau dvau rohitau d <sub>u</sub> vau	(8)
babhrúś ca babhrukarnaś ca	(8)
gṛdhrāḥ kokāś ca te hatāḥ	(8)

Two of various colors, two of like color, two black, two red, [one] brown and [one] brown-eared, and the greedy *kokas*, they are killed.

*virūpau*] **K**, *viṛpau* **Or** *sarūpau*] *saṛpau* **Ku** [**Ma**], *saropau* **V/126 Mā**, *surūpau* **K** *kṛṣṇau dvau*] **Or**, *kṛṣyau dvo* **K** *dvau*] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**] **K**, *dau Mā* ||] **Or**, (+ |) **K** *babhrúś*] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, *babh{r}Uś* **V/126** *babhrukarnaś*] **K**, *babhrukarnaś* **Or** *gṛdhrāḥ*] **Or**, *gṛdhraḥ* **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ y°]

### ŚS 5.23.4

*sārūpau dváu virūpau dváu kṛṣṇáu dváu rōhitau dváu |*  
*babhrúś ca babhrúkarnaś ca gṛdhraḥ kókaś ca té hatāḥ ||*

**bc.** Note the animals *rōhito dhūmrárohitaḥ karkándhurohitas* and *babhrúr aruṇābabhruḥ śúkababhrus* occurring in the same YV animal lists as mentioned under the next stanza.

d. Cf. LÜDERS 1942: 60 = 1973: 527 on the possibility that *kóka-* denotes a kind of worm. LÜDERS rejects the interpretation of *gṛdhra-* ‘vulture’ as a name for a kind of worm, but does not give a suggestion of his own. Although the attributive meaning ‘greedy’ that is traditionally allowed for *gṛdhra-* (besides its appellative meaning as a bird-name) seems open to some doubt, the placement of *ca* does seem to allow combining *gṛdhrāḥ* with *kokāś* as one class of ‘worms’, coordinated with the two items in pāda c. WHITNEY (‘the vulture and the cuckoo’) and BLOOMFIELD (‘the (one like a) vulture, and the (one like a) cuckoo’) took *ca* as coordinating the two words. Nothing definitive can be said, it seems, given the obscurity of the whole stanza and the color-classification of worms that it seems to imply.

### 7.2.5 ŚS 5.23.5

ye krimayaḥ śitikakṣā	(8)
ye kṛṣṇāḥ śitibāhavaḥ	(8)
ye ke ca viśvarūpās	(7)
tān krimīṅ jambhayāmasi	(8)

The worms that have white armpits, the black ones that are white-armed, and the ones that are of various colors: those worms do we crush.

krimayaḥ śitikakṣā] Or, krimayas sitavakṣā K kṛṣṇāḥ śitibāhavaḥ] Or, kṛṣṇās sitabāhavaḥ K || Or, om. K [[note °ḥ y°]] viśvarūpās] K, viśvaṛpās Or krimīṅ] K, krimīn, Or jambhayāmasi] Ku V/126 [Ma] K, ja[[line]]jambhayāmasi Mā

### ŚS 5.23.5

yé kṛimayaḥ śitikákṣā yé kṛṣṇāḥ śitibāhavaḥ |  
yé ké ca viśvárūpās tān krímīn jambhayāmasi ||

ab. On the word *kákṣa-*, generally referring to the ‘armpit’ but here rather problematic in that sense, cf. JAMISON 1987: 83ff., who (p. 84) finds the compound *śitikákṣa-*, as referring to a worm, puzzling. Since *krími-* does not necessarily denote worms *per se*, this problem must not be overestimated. The words *śitikákṣa-* and *śitikakṣīṅ-* are also attested in a list of animals to be sacrificed during the Áśvamedha, at MS 3.13.5:169.10 / VSM 24.4 and TS 5.5.20.1 / KS-Áśv 7.10:181.5. Besides the interesting facts that the TS/KS variant of the list seems to have *śitikakṣīṅ-* as an adjective with *gṛdhrāḥ* (cf. our stanza 4), and that the MS/VS variant dedicates the animal to Indra and Agni (cf. our 1), these cases do not help in identifying the particular ‘worm’ in question.

The word *śitibāhú-* (equally unsuitable for ‘worms’ taken literally) occurs in the same lists at KS-Áśv 9.3:182.15, TS 5.6.13.1; MS 3.13.3:169.2, 3.13.8:170.3 (and in similar lists at 4.2.4:25.17, 4.2.14:37.11); VSM 24.2+7.

### 7.2.6 Cf. ŚS 2.32.2

yo dviśīrṣā caturakṣaḥ	(8)
krimīḥ *sāraṅgo arjunaḥ	(8)

śṛṅām; y asya pṛṣṭīr (7)  
 api vṛścāmi + yac chirah || (8)

The worm that is two-headed, four-eyed, spotted, whitish: its ribs do I break, what(ever) is its head do I cut off.

dviśīrṣā] **Ku V/126** [Ma], dviśīrṣā **Mā**, dviśīrṣāś **K** caturakṣah] **Or**, caturakṣah **K**  
 krimih \*sāraṅgo] krimih sāraṅgo **Or**, krimiścariṅgo **K** arjunah] **K** [Ma?], 'rjunah **Ku**  
**V/126 Mā** || **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °h s°]] pṛṣṭīr] **K**, pṛṣṭhīr **Or** api] **Or**, apa **K**  
 +yac chirah] yatśīrah] **Ku V/126 Ma**, yatśīrah] **Mā**, yaśchirah] **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note  
 °h t°]]

### ŚS 2.32.2

viśvarūpaṃ caturakṣāṃ kṛimīṃ sārāṅgam ārjunam |  
 śṛṅāmy asya pṛṣṭīr āpi vṛścāmi yac chirah ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *sāraṅgo*. Cf. the closely parallel stanza ŚS 5.23.9 *triśīrṣāṇaṃ trikakūdaṃ kṛimīṃ sārāṅgam ārjunam | śṛṅāmy asya pṛṣṭīr āpi vṛścāmi yac chirah*, as well as PS 2.14.2ab *yo viśvarūpaś caturakṣah krimih sāraṅgo arjunah*.

**b.** The word *sāraṅga-* is transmitted with *s°* in the **Or.** mss. at the other places (2.14.2, 15.18.7+8) where it occurs. **K** throughout offers the ‘Verschlimmbesserung’ *sārīnga-* (or further corruptions thereof, as here).

**c.** Cf. 2.84.6 *idaṃ te +pṛṣṭīr*<sup>35</sup> *bhinadmi yātudhāna svāhedam te +parśūr ni tṛṇadmi bhūmyām* ‘I now split your ribs, sorcerer: hail! I now bore into your rib-bones, on the earth’.

**d.** The interpretation of the relative clause is uncertain: most likely, it belongs to the type of cases discussed under 6.9.1d above.

**7.2.7** ŚS 5.23.6 ◊ **a:** RV 10.159.1a, ŚS 1.29.5a, PS 1.11.4a, 2.35.1a, 2.41.1a, 19.29.8c ◊ **b:** PS 5.3.2b, 19.7.4d = ŚS 6.52.1d, RV 1.191.8b+9d

ud asau sūr;yo agād (8)  
 viśvadrṣṭo adrṣṭahā | (8)  
 drṣṭāṃś ca ghnann adrṣṭāṃś ca (8)  
 sarvāṃś ca pramṛṇan krimīn || (8)

Over there the sun has come up, seen by all, killer of the invisible, killing both the visible and the invisible, and smashing all worms.

ud] **V/126 Mā** [Ma], {Ja}ud **Ku**, tad **K** agād] **Ku V/126 Mā K**, 'gād **Ma** adrṣṭahā] **Or**, adrṣṭhā **K** drṣṭāṃś ca ghnann adrṣṭāṃś ca ] **V/126 Mā** [Ma], drṣṭāṃś ca ghnann adrṣṭāṃśca **Ku**, drṣṭāṃśya ghninn adrṣṭāṃ ca **K** pramṛṇan krimīn ||] **Or** [°n, k°], pramṛṇaṃ krimīn, [[*om.* ]] **K**

<sup>35</sup> This obvious emendation was made by ZEHNDER (1999: 185), who discusses the error *pṛṣṭhi-* for *pṛṣṭi-* with reference to Ved. Var. II, §86 and PS 5.26.1c.

## ŚS 5.23.6

út purástāt sūrya eti viśvádr̥ṣṭo adṛṣṭahá |  
dr̥ṣṭāṁś ca ghnānn adṛṣṭāṁś ca sárvāṁś ca pramṛṇán kṛímīn ||

## 7.2.8 ŚS 5.23.7

yevāśāsaḥ +kaśkaśāso	(8)
+dhrūkṣṇasaḥ śípavitnavah	(8)
dr̥ṣṭāś ca hanyatām kṛimir	(8)
adr̥ṣṭāś cota hanyatām	(8)

The Yevāśas, the Kaśkaśas, the Dhrūkṣṇas, the Śípavitnus: let the visible worm be killed, and let the invisible one also be killed.

yevāśāsaḥ +kaśkaśāso] yevāśāsaḥ kaskaśāso **Or**, yavāśavākhāsaḥ kaḥkiśyāmo **K** +dhrūkṣṇasaḥ] dhrūkṣṇāsaḥ **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, dhrūnāsaḥ **Mā**, dhūkṣāma(*sec. m.* → sa)ś **K** śípavitnavah] **Or**, caparivṛkṇavaḥ **K** || **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ d°]] hanyatām ||] hanyatām || **Or**, hanyatām, [*om.*] **K**

## ŚS 5.23.7

yévāśāsaḥ káśkaśāsa ejatkāḥ śípavitnukāḥ |  
dr̥ṣṭāś ca hanyátām kṛimir utádr̥ṣṭāś ca hanyatām ||

BARRET does not note the correction *ma* → *sa* that **K** makes in pāda **b**. BHATTACHARYA edits *kaskaśāso dhrūkṣṇāsaḥ, kṛimir*, and misreads *dhrūṇā* in **Mā** as *dhlṛnā* (?). I assume that **Ma** (as well as **Mā**) has been misread by BHATTACHARYA, and that all *Or.* mss. have *dhrū*°.

**a.** Cf. PS 19.29.4, which I tentatively edit *kaśkiśāḥ kaśapiśā yevāśā yeśāḥ | ištargā va iṣyantah saikatāḥ pāṁśavāḥ* ‘The Kaśkiśas, the Kaśapiśas, the Yevāśas, the Yeśas, your life-threatening ones (cf. 6.8.8a) that prosper, sandy, dusty’. This parallel supports the slight alteration upon BHATTACHARYA’s text (*kaska*° → *kaśka*°) that I make, following ŚS (note also °ḥk° in **K**).

**b.** I restore a form of the word *dhrūkṣṇa*-, that I know from two other attestations in our text (while it seems entirely unattested outside of the AV mantra corpus). For PS 16.4.6 there is a parallel at ŚS 8.2.16, that is identical except for the spelling of this particular word: *yát te vāsaḥ paridhānam yám nívīm kṛṇuśé tvám | śívám te tanvè tát kṛṇmah saṁsparśé ’dhrūkṣṇam*<sup>36</sup> *astu te* ‘What enveloping garment thou hast, what inner wrap thou makest for thyself, that we make propitious unto thy body; be it not harsh to thy touch’ (WHITNEY — the meaning ‘harsh’ is taken over from Sāyaṇa’s gloss *arūkṣam*). The other attestation is in a PS stanza without ŚS parallel, 8.16.5: *anusṛptām gahaneṣu dhrūkṣṇām pāpīm śimidvatīm | tām etām dasyūnām dāsīm pra dahātaś cukākaṇi* ‘O Cukākaṇi, burn away from there the Dāsī of the Dasyus, crept [off] along the shrubs, *dhrūkṣṇa*, evil, full of *śimid* (?)’. Based only on ŚS 8.2.16, and following an idea of HOFFMANN first reported in KEWA

<sup>36</sup> PS ‘*dhrūkṣṇam* (BHATTACHARYA 2008 *dhrūkṣṇam*).

III, 838, MAYRHOFER (EWAia I, 759) connects the form *drūkṣṇa-* with the hapax legomenon *druhīla-* (in the Caturhotṛka, a Parisiṣṭa of the Vārāha school of the Black YV; RAGHU VIRA 1981: 372, transl. on p. 380; cf. *drahīla-* in the parallel at MānŚS 5.2.14.14), attributing the contextually suitable meaning ‘coarse’ to both rare words, and mentioning a possible etymological connection with an Old Norse word. One might also refer to the rare word *druhiṇa-* (ViṣṇuSm 98.80). Although the context at first sight suggests otherwise, I am inclined to see in *dhrūkṣṇa-* (with *dh°*) a *-sna-* derivative from *drogh* comparable to *tūkṣṇá-* from *tej* (AiGr. II/2, §766b; on the lengthened vowel: AiGr. I, §39 pp. 43f.), whose basic meaning would be ‘treacherous’. It seems to be used as antonym to *śívám* in the context of ŚS 8.2.16 / PS 16.4.6. If I am correct, then the PS attestations (with *dh°*) have preserved the proper *Anlaut*. In any case, *dhrūkṣṇa-* appears in the present context to function as proper noun, amidst names of obscure meaning and (certainly non-IA) derivation. For *śípavitnu-*, cf. *śípavi-* in the next stanza.

d. Note *ca ... cota* here, and *ca ... utá ... ca* in ŚS: judging by KLEIN 1985, these patterns do not exist in the RV.

### 7.2.9 Cf. ŚS 5.23.8

hato yevāṣo hataḥ śípavir	( )
hato gaṅgaṇivāṃ uta	(8)
hatā viśvā arātaya	(8)
ugreṇa vacasā mama	(8)

Killed is the Yevāṣa, killed is the Śípavi, killed also is the Howling one, killed are all Arātis, by my forcible spell.

hato] Or, hito K yevāṣo] [Ma], yevāṣo(*sec. m. → so*) Ku, yevā(*sec. m. + so 4*) V/126, yevāso Mā, yavākho K hataḥ śípavir] Ku [Ma], hataḥ śi{va}vi(*sec. m. + HI 4*)r V/126, hataḥ śípavihataḥśípavir Mā, hataścapavir K gaṅgaṇivāṃ uta] gaṅgaṇivāṃ, uta Ku Ma, gaṅgaṇivāṃ, (*sec. m. + u 4*)ta V/126, gaṅgaṇivāṃ, ta Mā, ṣaṅgaṇavāṃ uta K viśvā arātaya] Or, viśvārātaya K ugreṇa] Or, anena K [[note reading 2d] vacasā] Ku V/126 [Ma] K, vasā Mā

#### ŚS 5.23.8

ható yévāṣaḥ kṛmīṇāṃ ható nadanimótá |  
sárvān ní maṣmaśākaraṃ dṛṣádā khálvāṃ iva ||

a. Deletion of *hataḥ* would render the pāda octosyllabic.

b. The stem *gaṅgaṇivant-* is probably to be connected with the noun *gaṅgaṇa-* ‘howling’ (see my commentary on 6.14.9e). A form *gaṅgaṇavant-*, that K points to, might at first sight be considered more likely, but we must note the *-i-* in *nadanimán-* in ŚS, semantically (if indeed, as WHITNEY suggests, derived from *nad*) confirming the connection with *gaṅgaṇa-*, and keep in mind that redundant derivation is a well attested process (cf. e.g. AiGr. II/2, §713bβ).

d. Note the metathesis of the pādas 2d and 9d in **K** *vis-à-vis* the Or. mss.: cf. my commentary on 2d.

### 7.2.10 ŚS 5.23.13

sarveṣāṃ ca krimīṇāṃ	(8)
sarvāsāṃ ca krimīṇāṃ	(8)
bhinadm;y *ásmanā śíro	(8)
dahām;y agninā mukham    2	(8)

Of all male worms, and of all female worms do I split the head with a stone, do I burn the face with fire.

sarveṣāṃ ca] **V/126 Mā** [Ma] **K**, sarveṣāñca **Ku** krimīṇāṃ] **Ku V/126** [Ma] **K**, krimīṇāṃ **Mā** sarvāsāṃ ca krimīṇāṃ |] sarvāsāñca krimīṇāṃ | **Or**, (+ sarvāṣāṃ ca krimīṇāṃ [[*om.*]] dviṭīyapustake) **K** bhinadm;y \*ásmanā] bhinadm;y aśvinā **Ku**, bhi(→ chi 4) nadmy aśvinā **V/126**, bhinadmaśvinā **Mā**, chi(→ bhi) nadmy aśvinā **Ma**, bhinadm;y aśminā **K** dahāmy] **Ku V/126** [Ma] **K**, dadāmy **Mā** mukham] mukhaṃ **Or K** || 2 ||] || ॠ 10 || 2 || **Ku**, || 2 || ॠ 10 || **V/126**, || 2 || ॠ || **Mā**, Z 2 Z **K**

#### ŚS 5.23.13

sárveṣāṃ ca kṛimīṇāṃ sárvasāṃ ca kṛimīṇāṃ |  
bhinádmy áśmanā śíro dáhāmy agnínā múkham ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *krimīṇāṃ* |, *aśvinā*, and reports the reading *aśyvinā* for **Mā**: is this a printing error? I do not see such an odd cluster in the reproduction available to me.

b. The interlinear (*sec. m.*?) insertion *sarvāṣāṃ ca krimīṇāṃ dviṭīyapustake* in **K** supplies what was initially skipped: cf. my Introduction, §2.1.1.5 on this and similar interesting (though very rare) hints at other PS manuscripts that seem once upon a time to have been extant in Kashmir.

### 7.3. Against creatures that threaten offspring.

The mantras of this hymn, which consists almost entirely of new material, seem to have accompanied a rite of purification from the influence of noxious creatures eating the meat of embryos. As appears from stanzas 1–4, fire played a part in this ritual, as did an ablution with water (7, 9), and an oblation to Rudra (10, 11).

The theme of ‘burning’ and ‘leading’ off noxious creatures that we saw in the preceding two hymns is continued here: note *daha* in 2b (cf. 7.2.10d *dahāmi*), and *nayāmasi* in 3a, 4d (cf. 7.1.12c); heaven and earth reappear in stanza 8. The norm of 10 stanzas per hymn is exceeded by one: it seems that of the two concluding triṣṭubh stanzas 10 (borrowed from the ṚV) is most likely to have been a secondary accretion.

**7.3.1 ab:** cf. ṚV 6.48.7ab ◊ **cd:** only PS

tigmebhir agne arcibhiḥ	(8)
śukreṇa deva śociṣā	(8)
āmādo ni vaha t <sub>v</sub> vam	(8)
anyam āsani kṛṇvatām	(8)

O god Agni, with your sharp beams, with your bright flame, carry down (to Yama) the eaters of raw [meat]. Let them place another in their mouth.

tigmebhir] **Ku Mā [Ma] K**, tigmebhi(*sec. m.* → BHI [?])r **V/126** agne] **Or**, agnir **K**  
arcibhiḥ] ’rcibhiḥ **Or**, arcibhiś **K** ||] **Or**, (+ |) **K** āsani] **Or**, āsuni **K** kṛṇvatām]  
kṛṇvatām **Or K** ||] **Or, om. K**

#### ṚV 6.48.7ab

bṛhādbhir agne arcibhiḥ śukreṇa deva śociṣā |

**ab.** On the meaning of the words *arci-* and *śociś-*, see ROESLER 1997: 56–59 (and 187f.).

**c.** On the creatures called *āmādas*, cf. ŚS 8.6.23 quoted under 6.14.9c above; 7.11.4c below; and PS 17.14.10 *āmādinīḥ krūrādinīr anagnigandhyādīnīḥ | amuṃ paretyoddhītam śavam atta sadānvāḥ | śavaḥ kevala ācāraḥ kim u śālāsv + ichatha* ‘You Sadānuvās who eat raw [meat], who eat bloody flesh, who eat what does not smell of fire: go away and eat yonder exposed corpse. The corpse is [your] only diet, so what do you seek in [our] dwellings?’. There is a particular form of Agni himself, that is called *āmād-*, i.a. at TS 1.1.7.1.

The unanimous reading *ni vaha* at first sight seems doubtful, because the verbal compound *ni-vah* is rather rare, is mostly construed with a dative, and seems nowhere to be attested in the negative sense that is required here. Cf. however PS 19.39.14 [PSK 19.40.2] *yās te ūrdhvās tanvo jātavedo yās tiraścīr uta yā anūcīḥ | tābhiḥ tam agne sayujā gṛṇāno jānan yamāya ni vahā kusīdam* ‘Your shapes, o Agni, that are upward, the ones that are sideways, and the ones that are lengthwise: by means of them, being praised by [your]

companion, knowingly carry this lazy man down to Yama’ (cf. also 19.39.13 [PSK 19.39.13]). It seems that a dative *yamāya* is implicit in our stanza.

### 7.3.2 Only PS

śociṣāgne arciṣā ca	(8)
nir daheto aghāyataḥ	(8)
sakh <sub>i</sub> yam āvaṃ *kṛṇvahe t <sub>u</sub> vaṃ ca-	(11)
-āmāda upa śaṃ *bhuvan	(8)

Burn the malevolent ones out of here with your flame, o Agni, and with your beam. We two, [I] and you, make a partnership. The eaters of raw [meat] shall be serviceable [to us] for [our] weal.

arciṣā] **K**, 'rciṣā **Or** aghāyataḥ] 'ghāyataḥ **Or**, aghāyavaḥ **K** āvaṃ] **Or**, āsaṃ **K** \*kṛṇvahe] kṛṇmahe **Or** **K** cāmāda upa] **Or**, camāmādupa **K** śaṃ \*bhuvan ||] śaṃbhuvaṃ || **Or**, śaṃbhuvaṃ [*om.*] **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *kṛṇmahe*, and prints *upaśaṃbhuvam* as one word.

**b.** The **K** reading *aghāyavaḥ*, which does not fit in this context, is an anticipation of 5d.

**cd.** See my commentary on 6.23.1cd above: the opposite error (*ṇv* for *ṇm*) is found in all mss. at 5.11.2d. Cf. ṚV 9.86.20 *sakhyāya kártave* and 10.48.9 *sakhyā kṛṇuta*. This appears to be the first mantra attestation of the presumably old nom. dual form *āvam*: cf. AiGr. III, §229c.

On the syntactic construction ‘[X] Y *ca*’ (‘passages involving an ellipsed pronoun with a dual verb’) that occurs a number of times in the ṚV, see KLEIN 1985/I: 128f. Since *śaṃbhū-* is attested as second member of a compound only after *viśvá-*, BHATTACHARYA’s *upaśaṃbhuvam* is not very likely. Note that *śaṃbhū-* is collocated with the word *sakhyá-* (without grammatical agreement) at ṚV 6.60.14 and 10.36.7, but in the light of AiGr. III, §101c p. 195, assuming a neuter adj. form *śaṃbhuvam* agreeing with *sakhyam* would also be problematic. With reference (1) to ŚS 7.69.1c (PS 20.34.1c [PSK 20.33.1c]) *áhāni śám bhavantu naḥ* and (2) to ŚS 14.1.40abc (PS 18.4.9abc) *śám te híraṇyaṃ śám u santv āpaḥ śám methír bhavatu śám yugásya tárdma | śám ta āpaḥ śatápavitrā bhavantu*, Werner Knobl has suggested to me to emend transmitted *bhuvam* to *bhuvan*: intrusion of final anusvāra for °*n* is rather common in the PS mss. (cf. 7.17.1ff. below, as well as LUBOTSKY 2002: 63f. on PS 5.10.10d; also 2.19.4b *ṛṭanyāṃ ← ṛṭanyān*, 9.16.5d *asyāṃ ← asyān*). I add PS 2.70.1d *śam u naḥ santu vidyutaḥ*.

Emendation of *śam* to *sam* ‘I/they shall become joined upon the eaters of raw meat’ does not, to my mind, yield an entirely plausible sense (otherwise unattested *upa-sam-bhav<sup>i</sup>* could be compared with *upa-sam-ay* etc., or *upa* could be *karmapravacanīya*). Emendation of the preverb *upa* to *uta* does not have much to recommend itself either (besides the **K** error *upa* → *uta* in 5b). I prefer to take *upa* closely together with *bhav<sup>i</sup>*, in the meaning ‘to be serviceable’:

cf. RV 1.138.4a *asyá ū śú ṇa úpa sātáye bhuvah* ‘Do prove helpful to us for the conquest of this [newer granting of wealth]!’. In our stanza, *śam* functions as a dative comparable to *sātáye* in the closely parallel construction of RV 1.138.4a. Cf. also *upabhūti-* at 7.18.7b below (~ ŚS 5.8.5 *ápabhūti-*!), and my comments under that pāda. The idea expressed in this pāda is euphemistic: only in state of annihilation shall the ‘eaters of raw meat’ be ‘weal to’ the speaker.

### 7.3.3 Only PS

nir āmādo nayāmasi	(8)
niṣ kravyādo gr̥hebh <sub>i</sub> yaḥ	(8)
sasyādo nāma ye deva	(8)
te agne mā dabhan t <sub>u</sub> vām	(8)

We lead out the eaters of raw [meat], out the eaters of bloody flesh from [our] homestead. Let those not deceive you, o god Agni, that are called crop-eaters.

nayāmasi] **Or**, na[[*line*]]nayāmasi **K** niṣ kravyādo] **Or**, niṣkravyādho **K** [[*note* °šk°] sasyādo] **Or**, samyādo **K** te agne] **K**, te 'gne **Ku Pa** [**Ma?**], t(+ e) 'gne **V/126**, tegne **Mā** mā dabhan tvām] mā dabhantvām **Or**, mārabhantām **K** ||] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], | **Mā**, (+ |) **K**

BHATTACHARYA does not note the reading *tegne* of **Mā**. As regards **Ma**, I have consulted here its sister ms. **Pa**, that reads *te 'gne*, which may well be the reading of that ms. too.

**bc.** On *kravyād-*, cf. GEIB 1975. *sasyād-* (also in the next stanza) does not occur elsewhere in Vedic literature. The context of this hymn seems to require taking *sasya-* ‘crop’ here and in the next stanza as a metaphorical reference to the speaker’s offspring, unless we want to assume an early reference to an ideology of vegetarianism: self-proclaimed vegetarians who are in fact the worst kind of carnivores, i.e. cannibals.

### 7.3.4 Only PS

āmādaś ca kravyādaś ca	(8)
sasyādaś cobhayān saha	(8)
prajāṃ ye cakrire bhāgaṃ	(8)
tān ito nir ṇayāmasi	(8)

Suppress the eaters of raw [meat], and the eaters of bloody flesh, and the crop-eaters, both kinds [of them]. Those that have made [our] offspring their share, them we lead out of here.

kravyādaś ca sasyādaś cobhayān] **Or** [[°n<sub>i</sub>], kravyādaś cādasyobhayāṃ **K** [[misprint Bar.: eādasyo°] ]] **Or**, (+ |) **K** cakrire] **Or**, cakkrire **K** [[Bar. mistakenly cakrire] tān] **Or**, tām **K** nir ṇayāmasi] nirṇayāmasi **Or**, nir nayāmasi **K**

**ab.** Cf. PS 17.12.7ab *sadānvāḥ sadānveyā strīpūṃsān ubhayān saha*. One may assume that *ubhayān* in our context also is used to be all-inclusive, i.e. to

cover both the carnivorous (*āmād-* and *kravyād-*) and the vegetarian (*sasyād-*) demons.

c. The self-benefactive interpretation of middle *cakrire* seems acceptable in the light of attestations of the phrase *bhāgam/bhāgadheyam* + acc. + *kar* ‘to make . . . the share of someone [else]’, with the verb in the active at PS 5.17.6 (ŚS 6.111.1), 9.1.11, 16.100.3 and 20.33.1, and passivized at PS 1.81.2 / ŚS 19.58.6.

### 7.3.5 Only PS

ya āmeṣ <sub>u</sub> v aramanta	(8)
na pakvam *upadādhṛṣuḥ	(8)
te yantu sarve saṁbhūya-	(8)
-anyatreto aghāyavaḥ	(8)

They that found pleasure in [pieces of] raw [meat], [and] have not ventured near cooked [meat], let them all together, the malicious ones, go elsewhere.

ya āmeṣv aramanta na] **Or**, yāmeṣvaramanta **K** \*upadādhṛṣuḥ |] upadādiṣu | **Ku Mā** [Ma], upavādiṣu | **V/126**, utadādhṛṣu [|om. |] **K** saṁbhūyānyatreto] **Or**, sasambhūyānyatreto **K** aghāyavaḥ] 'ghāyavaḥ **Or**, ghāyavaḥ **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *upadādiṣu*.

**ab.** Cf. pāda **ab** and **e** of PS 17.14.10 quoted above under 1c. On the meaning of *ram* + loc., see my commentary on 6.23.11a. As BARRET already proposed, the **K** reading *dādṛṣu* seems to point to *dādṛṣuḥ*. Despite the fact that the Or. readings now force us to assume that the loss of aspiration and the final visarga must have occurred already at a rather early stage (before \*G), adopting the emendation *upadādhṛṣuḥ* remains attractive. On *upa-dharṣ*, a compound which — as Werner Knobl points out to me — is of Indo-Iranian age, being attested also at Yašt 8.44 (KELLENS 1984: 170), cf. in Vedic TS 6.4.7.1 *tám aghnant sò 'pūyat tám devá nópādhṛṣṇuwan té vāyúm abruwann imám naḥ svadaya íti* ‘They slew him; he became putrid; the gods could not endure him, they said to Vāyu, ‘Make him sweet for us’ (KEITH). As the further attestations of the compound at ŚBM 9.5.2.1, ŚBK 7.1.1.4 (according to CALAND’s emendation), JB 1.124, 2.113 = 2.126 show, KEITH’s rendering ‘could endure’ is too free. Cf. also *upethana* in 9b. On the preterit rather than present meaning, in post-ṚV texts, of ind. perf. forms from the root *dharṣ*, see KÜMMEL 2000: 266, and p. 268 on the long reduplication.

### 7.3.6 **ab**: only PS ◊ **cd**: ŚS 14.2.10cd = PS 18.8.1cd

ya enasvī duṣkṛtakṛt	(8)
*kilbiṣakṛtasādhī yaḥ	(8)
punas tām yajñiyā devā	(8)
nayantu yata āgatāḥ	(8)

The sinner, the committer of bad deeds, and he who accomplishes criminal deeds: let the gods, worthy of worship, lead them back whence they came.

ya enasvī] **Or**, yenasī **K** duṣkṛtakṛt] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], duṣkṛtamkṛt **Mā**, duṣkṛtakṛta **K**  
 \*kilbiṣakṛtasādhi yaḥ ] kilbiṣakṛtsādhyah **Or**, kilviṣakṛtasādhyā ] *om.* ]] **K** tān yajñiyā]  
**Ku** [**Ma**], tān{ } (→ a) yajñiyā **V/126**, tānayajñiyā **Mā**, tvānyajñiyā **K** nayantu] **Or**,  
 yantu **K** ]] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], | **Mā**, *om.* **K** ] *[note °ḥ a°]*

ŚS 14.2.10cd = PS 18.8.1cd

pūnas tān yajñiyā devā nayantu yāta āgatāḥ ]]

BHATTACHARYA edits *kilbiṣakṛt sādhyah*.

**ab.** On the Vedic concepts of ‘sin’, and the terms used to denote them, see LEFEVER 1935 and HARTOG 1939. The word *enasvīn-* was previously not attested before ŚBM 3.2.1.40 (cf. also GHOSH 1927: 107). The compound *duṣkṛtakṛt-* is hapax. Neither **Or** *kilbiṣakṛt-* (cf. ṚV 10.71.10 *kilbiṣasṛt-*?) nor **K** *kilbiṣakṛta-* is attested elsewhere. If only for metrical reasons, it seems unattractive to accept — with BHATTACHARYA — the former reading. It would require us to assume a *simplex pro composito* gerundive *sādhyah* from [*apa*] *sādhayati*, that we find in the same meaning as *apa sedhati* (e.g. 7.5.7 below) at PS 11.3.3cd: *apeto jaṅgiḍāmatim iṣum asteva sādhyaya* ‘Away from here, o Jaṅgiḍa, send off thoughtlessness, as an archer an arrow’, but the attestations of such a gerundive at PSK 9.25.17 and 14.3.2 (= PS 9.29.7, 14.5.2) listed VWC-Saṃhitās V, 3367, in singular forms *sādhyā* and *sādhyām* are not confirmed by the **Or**. mss. (on the frequent plural forms *sādhyāḥ*, cf. KUIPER 1979: 243ff.). Although the **K** reading would at first sight seem likely to have arisen due to perseveration from *duṣkṛta-*, I do not see any more attractive solution than accepting it, and interpreting it as a first member of a compound ending in *sādhin-* (cf. BaudhGS 1.3.39 *prasādhin-* [also as variant reading at BhārGS 1.13:14.2, HirGS 1.2.18]), a compound followed then — with the same syncope that we also see after a similar formation *prāpin-* in 7.19.5c *\*prāpī yas* (see my commentary on that pāda) — by relative pronoun *yaḥ*. The compound *kilbiṣakṛtasādhin-* does make a somewhat pleonastic impression, and because I retain serious doubts about the restoration here adopted, I may also mention the only alternative solution that has occurred to me: in the light of such surprising phenomena as we find i.a. at 7.8.6d below, it might be possible to restore *\*kilbiṣakṛd asādhyah*. *asādhyā-* ‘incorrigible’ does not appear to exist in Vedic literature, but is common elsewhere (typically of diseases in medical texts; also e.g. Mahābhārata 4 App. I Nr. 12 ln. 24: *kāmavyādhir asādhyo mām apy ākrāmati bhāmīni* ‘And an incurable affliction of passion is coming upon me, o beaming one’).

**cd.** As their syntactically loose connection with the nom. sg. m. relative pronoun *yas* in pāda **a** suggests, the application of these pādas — that occur also elsewhere — in the present stanza appears to be secondary. *nayantu* here does contrast nicely with *neṣat* in the next stanza.

## 7.3.7 Only PS

ava reṇum ava rajo	(8)
nenije hast <sub>i</sub> yaṃ malam	(8)
dhātā no bhadrāyā neṣat	(8)
sa no gopāyatu prajāṃ	(8)

Down the dust, down the dirt, I wash and wash, [down] the filth of the hands. Dhātār shall lead us graciously: let him guard our offspring.

ava reṇum] **Or**, avareṇas **K** nenije hastyaṃ] [**Ma?**], neniye hastiyaṃ **Ku V/126 Mā**, nenije hastiyaṃ **Pa**, nenaḥaṃ hastiṃ **K** malam] malaṃ **Or**, balaṃ **K** neṣat sa] **Or**, neṣatsa(→ śca) **K** prajāṃ ||] prajāṃ || **Or**, prajāṃ (+ |) **K**

BHATTACHARYA reports no variant for **Ma**. Its sister ms. **Pa** reads *nenije hastiyaṃ*. It is doubtful whether **Ma** in fact supports *hastyaṃ*, but this is certainly the desired reading.

**b.** Cf. the waters mentioned in stanza 9.

**cd.** On Dhātār's connection with embryos, and hence with offspring, cf. PS 5.12.8d, 11.1.2a+5b, 12.3.3b etc., and 6.19.3 above. On the frequent insertion of epenthetic *i* in the **Or**. mss. (*hastyaṃ* → *hastiyaṃ*), see ZEHNDER 1999: 15, and cf. similar insertion of *i* to dissolve consonant clusters at 5.28.8c, 7.4.1c, 7.6.4b, 7.7.8b, 7.7.9a.

## 7.3.8 Only PS

kṛṇve 'haṃ rodasī varma	(8)
s <sub>i</sub> yāma savituḥ save	(8)
mātā no bhadrāyā bhūmir	(8)
dyaus cāsmān pāt <sub>v</sub> aṃhasaḥ	(8)

I make the two spheres my armor. May we be in the furtherance of Savitar. Let mother earth graciously [protect] us, and let heaven protect us from oppression.

kṛṇve] **V/126 Mā K**, kṛṇm(*sec. m.* → *v*)e **Ku** 'haṃ] **Ku**, haṃ **V/126 Mā K** savituḥ] **Or**, savitus **K** bhūmir] **Ku V/126**, bhūmi **Mā K**

BHATTACHARYA reports that **Ma** is worm-eaten (*kṛtadaṣṭam*) for this stanza. Cf. 7.15.5d *kṛṇute varma dakṣiṇām*.

## 7.3.9 Only PS

yad asurāṇām ahan <sub>i</sub> y	(8)
asmān pāpā upethana	(8)
devānām payaś ca daivyam	(8)
āpaḥ śundhantu mām imāḥ	(8)

If on a day of the Asuras you evil ones approach us, then let these waters of the gods and the divine milk cleanse me.

ahany] [Ma] K, ahaṃny Ku V/126 Mā, ahanv(→ nd) Pa upethana |] Or, tamedhinaḥ  
 [om. |] K [note °ḥ d°] payas ca] Or, paśya K āpaḥ] Or, āpas K śundhantu]  
 V/126 Mā [Ma] K, śundhaṃtu Ku imāḥ ||] Or, imāḥ (+ |) K

a. The ‘day of the Asuras’ seems to be a concept not found elsewhere in Vedic literature. If it is not simply a reference to the night, it appears to represent the opposite of ‘the day of Indra’, mentioned ŚS 7.52.2 (PS 19.15.1): *sám jānāmahai mánasā sám cikivá má yuṣmahi \*mánasádaivyena | má ghóṣā út sthur bahulé vinírhate méṣuḥ paptad índrasyáhany ágate* ‘May we agree in mind and thought, may we not struggle with one another, in a spirit displeasing to the gods! May not the din of frequent battle-carnage arise, may the arrow not fly when the day of Indra has arrived’ (BLOOMFIELD, emending from transmitted *mánasā dáivyena*; differently WHITNEY: ‘let not Indra’s arrow fall, the day being come’). BLOOMFIELD considers the possibility that ‘Indra’s day’ is the day on which Indra, “by fighting his battle removes all need of fighting enemies” (1897: 551). This seems to be quite close to the mark: as ‘Indra’s day’ appears to be a day of safety, so ‘a day of the Asuras’ appears to be one of danger.

b. The ‘divine milk’ (marked with *ca*) could be a redundant expression for the ‘waters (of the gods)’: cf. VISHVA BANDHU 1966: 467f. for the common identification of *páyas-* with the waters. It could also, however, be a reference to the night in an auspicious form, because the night can, on occasion, also be referred to as *páyasvatī-* (ŚS 3.10.1–2 / PS 1.110.1–2).

7.3.10 Cf. RV 2.33.1 etc.

ā te pitar marutām sumnam emi	(11)
mā naḥ sūryasya saṃdṛśo yuvathāḥ	(11)
abhi no vīro arvatīḥ kṣameta	(11)
pra +jāyāmahai rudara prajayā	(11)

O father of the Maruts, I am coming to your benevolence. Do not keep us from the sight of the sun. May the hero have mercy upon our mares. We shall reproduce, o Rudra, in offspring.

pitar marutām] pitarmaṛtām Ku [Ma], pitaramaṛtām V/126 Mā, piturmarutām K naḥ]  
 Or, nas K sūryasya saṃdṛśo] V/126 Mā [Ma] K, sūrya(·ṛ)śo Ku yuvathāḥ |] Or,  
 yuvathā | K vīro arvatīḥ] vīro ’rvatīḥ Ku [Ma], vīrorvatīḥ V/126 Mā, vīrorvati K  
 kṣameta] Or, kṣametat K pra +jāyāmahai] prajayāmahai Or, prajāyāmahi K rudra]  
 K, ṛdra Or ||] Or, om. K

#### RV 2.33.1

ā te pitar marutām sumnám etu má naḥ sūryasya saṃdṛśo yuyothāḥ |  
 abhi no vīro arvati kṣameta prá jāyemahi rudra prajābhiḥ ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *’rvatīḥ* and *jayāmahai*.

a. Cf. RV 1.114.9b *rāsvā pitar marutām sumnám asmé* ‘Afford us, o father of the Maruts, your benevolence’.

**b.** The metrically worse variant *yuvathāḥ* that our text gives for ṚV *yuyothāḥ* (from <sup>2</sup>*yav* ‘to separate’), itself an exceptional form (HOFMANN 1967: 90), is a 2nd sg. pres. inj. built to another stem, <sup>1</sup>*yav* ‘to hold fast’. Cf. GOTŌ 1997: 1033, and p. 1026 n. 128 for references to “deutliche Beispiele von <sup>1</sup>*yav*/*yu* ‘festhalten’ mit Akk. und Abl. (‘etw. von etw. weg für sich festhalten, an sich ziehen, in Besitz nehmen’)”.

**cd.** *rudra* must be read *rud<sub>a</sub>ra* (OLDENBERG 1909–12/I: 214). The cadence of the PS variant (with *prajayā* for *prajābhīḥ*) remains bad. **K** agrees with the text of the ṚV (cf. my Introduction, §2.6.3.2), against the reading *arvatīḥ*, that I think is likely to be an old simplifactory recasting of the ṚV text. OLDENBERG (*ibid.*) takes the ‘hero’ as a name of Rudra, although this usage does not appear actually to be attested elsewhere. The readings of **K** and the Or. mss., when compared with *jāyemahi* of the ṚV, present a problem: did the original PS agree with the ṚV, did it read *jāyāmahai* (1st plur. pres. subj. from *jan<sup>a</sup>*), or is the Or. reading *jāyāmahai* (1st plur. pres. subj. from *jay*) that BHATTACHARYA accepts really to be taken seriously? Since middle forms from *jay* are basically attested only with preverbs *vi* and *parā* (GOTŌ 1987: 148f.), the last choice seems clearly wrong. Both **K** and the Or. mss. agree in having a long *ā* before the suffix, and the Or. reading can easily be explained as due to anticipation of *prajayā*. The suffix *-mahi* of **K** may be due to influence from the ṚV.

Beside the invocation of Rudra as father of the rain gods, the Maruts, the ‘mares’ could in the present (recast) context and form of the stanza be interpreted as rain-waters, referring to the ritually employed waters of the preceding stanza. But perhaps the ṚV stanza was merely included here because of the key-word *prajā-*.

### 7.3.11 Only PS

yo <sub>a</sub> vṛddham hanti yo garbhe antar	(11)
yo jātam janitavyam ca pūruṣam	(12)
tasmā ṛdhyāsam haviṣāham adya	(11)
sa naḥ prajāṃ jaradaṣṭim kṛnotu    3	(11)

He who kills a man not [yet] full grown, who [kills him when he is still] in the womb, who [kills him when he is] born and [still] to be born: for him, may I be successful with my oblation today. Let him make our offspring attain to old age.

yo <sub>a</sub>vṛddham hanti yo garbhe antar yo jātam] yo vṛddham . . . jātam **Or**, yo garbhe antar yo vṛdhre | antar yaḥ jātam **K** janitavyam ca] **V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, janitavyaṅca **Ku** pūruṣam] pūṛṣam **Or**, pauruṣam **K** ]] **Or**, *om.* **K** tasmā ṛdhyāsam] **Or**, tasmāṛdyāsam **K** adya] **Or**, adhya **K** sa naḥ] **Or**, sanaḥ(→ mānaḥ) **K** || 3 ||] || † 1{1}1 || 3 || **Ku**, || 3 || † (*sec. m. + 11*) || **V/126**, || 3 || † || **Mā**, ZZ 3 ZZ **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *vṛddham*.

**ab.** Although these pādas do not seem to be phrased in a specific order (from old to young or vice versa) that could provide an additional argument,

consideration of the meter alone suggests we have to read *vr̥ddham* in **a**. **K** *yaj jātam* is due do perseveration from PS 4.33.7b *yaj jātam janitavyam ca kevalam* (cf. my Introduction, §2.4). The rest of its reading, which seems to show displacement and omission of some words, is hard to explain. The metrical analysis of pāda **b** is problematic.

**d.** On the word *jarádaṣṭi-*, see TUCKER 2002a.

## 7.4. To Indra.

WHITNEY gives this hymn the caption ‘For success in war’, and GELDNER agrees in his introductory characterisation of the ṚV version (10.103): “Ein urwüchsiges, ganz im Atharvastil gehaltenes Schlachtlied, das den ausziehenden Soldaten nachgesungen wird. Daß gleichzeitig ein Opfer stattfindet, wird durch Str. 8 [our 9] angedeutet” (cf. on this matter also GONDA 1989a: 46, 134f., as well as BLOOMFIELD 1899: 75f. on Atharvanic battle-charms). The idea that this hymn was originally meant to accompany concrete acts of aggression (as is enjoined e.g. at AB 8.10.4) does not seem entirely certain to me. One might interpret the first stanza of the AV version (pāda c), and such a *double entendre* as *havéṣu* in stanza 11, to mean that the manifold martial references in this hymn can also be taken as an extended allegory of battle for the ritual which this hymn was to accompany: Indra’s martial prowess is the mythical prototype for ritualistic accomplishments (cf. 7.18.2, also 6.1.4 above). GELDNER himself elsewhere did adopt such a line of interpretation, as is clear from his commentary on the Indra hymn ṚV 1.102 (cf. *hávaneṣu* in 10.102.10d with *haveṣu* in 11d here): “Die vielen Hinweise auf Kampf und Sport sind wohl nur bildlich zu verstehen”. GONDA’s contradiction (1989a: 107f.) is not convincing: “one might rather take this *sūkta* [10.102] to have been intended for recitation on some agonistic occasion”. I remain uncertain about how literally we have to take the words of the hymn, and therefore give no further specifications in my caption.

The hymn is found in all other Vedic Saṃhitās, except in the SVJ. The version of ŚS 19.13 is practically identical with ours, confirming the hypothesis (Introduction, §2.2.1) that ŚS kāṇḍa 19 is basically a compilation of Paippalāda materials. The most authentic version of the hymn is probably ṚV 10.103 (OLDENBERG 1888: 247, 1909–12/II: 322), from which the parallel versions of SVK 2.1199ff., MS 2.10.4:135.9ff. (cf. 3.3.7:40.2ff.), KS 18.5:269.9ff. (cf. 21.10:49.20ff.), TS 4.6.4.1–4 (cf. 5.4.6.3–4), VSM 17.33ff. (cf. ŚBM 9.2.3.6), VSK 18.4.1ff. differ little, or not at all. The ṚV stanzas occur here in the order 1–3, 5–7, 4, 8–9, 11. Because the school variants have been aptly discussed in W-L, and because the parallels for each pāda can easily be traced with the aid of BLOOMFIELD 1906, I make consistent reference below only to the ŚS and ṚV versions.

We have no evidence yet that the hymn’s designation as ‘Apratiratha’, given by the AthBSA and found in the Brāhmaṇas (AB 8.10.4, ŚB 9.2.3.1, 5, 11, GB 2.1.18), in various Śrautasūtras (i.a. VaitS 1.18, 13.11, 29.16), and in later texts such as the AVPariś (6.1.15, 13.3.15, 17.2.8, 44.4.2) was also in vogue in the Paippalāda tradition, but its currency in most other Vedic Śākhās, and its frequent use in texts belonging (at least in their present form) to the Śaunaka tradition, suggest that this name must also have been known among Paippalādins. It may be noted here that Somāditya in his commentary on VaitS 1.18 states that the hymn belongs to the Jājala school (*indrasya bāhū*

*ity ekādaśarcaṃ jājalānāṃ paṭhyate*), but this is a piece of information that I would treat more cautiously than does BAHULKAR (2002: 5).

The word *asurāṇām* in 1d concatenates with 9a of the preceding hymn, as does 3b *dhṛṣṇunā* with the verbal form *dādhrṣuḥ* in 7.3.5b. It may not be due merely to chance that Indra’s invocation here follows after the invocation of Indra and Agni together in 7.2.1, Indra by himself once again immediately thereafter in 7.2.2, and Agni in 7.3.1–3. Omission of stanza 1, without parallel in the ṚV, would help reduce the hymn to its proper extent of 10 stanzas in this *daśarcakāṇḍa*.

#### 7.4.1 ŚS 19.13.1, cf. SVK 2.1219

indrasya bāhū sthvirau vṛṣāṇau	(11)
citrā imā vṛṣabhau pārayiṣṇū	(11)
tau †yokṣye prathamau yoga āgate	(12)
yābhyāṃ jitam asurāṇāṃ s <sub>u</sub> var yat	(11)

Indra’s two arms, stout, manly: these two are wondrous successful bulls. Now that the [time of] yoking has arrived, I am going to yoke first these two, by means of which the sun, which belonged to the Asuras, was won.

indrasya] Or, idyasū K vṛṣāṇau] Or, vṛṣāṇau | K [[note punctuation] citrā imā] Mā, citrā i(sec. m. → ya)mā V/126, citrāyamā Ku Ma, citrāyamā K pārayiṣṇū] K, pārayiṣṇu Or tau †yokṣye] tau yokṣye Or, tayokṣe K prathamau yoga āgate] Or, prathamayogāgate K yābhyāṃ] Ku [Ma] K, jābhyāṃ V/126 Mā jitam asurāṇāṃ] Or, catamasurāṇā K

#### ŚS 19.13.1

indrasya bāhū sthvirau vṛṣāṇau citrā imā vṛṣabhāu pārayiṣṇū |  
tau yokṣe prathamó yóga āgate yābhyāṃ jítam ásurāṇāṃ svàr yát ||

#### SVK 2.1219

indrasya bāhū sthvirau yuvānāv anādhṛṣyau supratīkāv asahyau |  
tau yuñjīta prathamau yoga āgate yābhyāṃ jitam asurāṇāṃ saho mahat ||

b. On the sandhi, cf. WHITNEY: “The combination *citrā imā vṛṣ-*, if representing, as the sense clearly requires, *citrāú : imāú : vṛṣ-*, is anomalous in AV., though regular for some of the other Vedic texts (cf. Prāt. ii22 note); and the *pada*-text shows a sense of this, by reading *citrāḥ : imā : vṛṣ-*. SPP. gives as his *pada*-text *citrā : imā*, which leaves the *saṃhitā* reading unaccounted for; the comm. assumes *citrāu* and *imā*. The reference is to his own treatment of the ŚCĀ (1862: 82f.): “final *āv* before a vowel—the result of the change of an original *āu*, by iii. 40—remains *āv*, being subject to no farther change. This rule is uniformly observed in the *saṃhitā* of the Atharvan, excepting in a couple of cases in book xix, which book the Prātiçākhyā does not recognize as forming part of the Atharvan text: these are *pādā ucyete* (xix.5.5) [PS 9.5.5],” and

the present case. As DESHPANDE observes (1997: 286), “[o]ne cannot discount the possibility that the 19th book [of ŚS] represents a somewhat different linguistic tradition [from that of the rest of ŚS]”. Since ŚS 19 consists mainly of borrowings from PS, we may perhaps specify DESHPANDE’s different linguistic tradition as that of the Paippalāda school.

c. On the phrase *yóga ágate*, rendered ‘when the conjuncture arrives’ by WHITNEY, cf. TS 1.6.8.4 and TS 5.5.3.1. This last passage is found in much more elaborate form at KS (22.6:61.19ff. ≈ KapKS 34:175.10ff. [2:203.11ff.]), which in turn has a close but not identical parallel at MS 3.4.5:50.6ff.:

*yó vá agníṁ yógā ágate ná yuñkté ná yuñjánéṣu yuñkté ’gne yukṣvā hí yé távéty agníṁ vá etád yógā ágate yuñkté yuñkté yuñjánéṣu yó vá agníṁ vimoká ágate ná vimuñcáte ná vimuñcámāneṣu ví muñcate ví te muñcāmi raśanáṁ ví raśmín ity agníṁ vá etád vimoká ágate vimuñcate ví + vimuñcámāneṣu<sup>37</sup> muñcate*

‘He who does not yoke the Agni, when the [time of] yoking has arrived, does not yoke among those who are yoking. When the [time of] yoking has arrived, he therefore yokes the Agni with the mantra *agne yukṣvā hí yé táva* (RV 6.16.43 = MS 2.7.17:101.8). He yokes among those who are yoking. He who does not unyoke the Agni when the [time of] unyoking has arrived, does not unyoke among those you are unyoking. When the [time of] unyoking has arrived, he therefore unyokes the Agni with the mantra *ví te muñcāmi raśanáṁ ví raśmín* (MS 1.4.1:48.2, 2.12.3:147.1). He unyokes among those who are unyoking.’

As is clear from this passage, *yóga-* stands in opposition to *vimoká-*: WHITNEY’s ‘conjuncture’ is too vague. On the equation of the (Soma) ritual with a chariot, see EDGERTON 1919 (cf. also SPARREBOOM 1985: 75ff.), who refers i.a. to RV 9.88.2ab *sá ṁṛ rátho ná bhuriṣál ayoji maháḥ purúṇi sātáye vásūni* ‘Like a much-conquering car, he (Soma) has been yoked (made ready), in order to win power and many good things’. The R-W emendation of ŚS *yokṣe* to *yokṣye* is confirmed by the Or. mss. (which insert *i*, cf. my discussion under 7.3.7c).

d. The notion that the sun won by Indra (cf. RV 1.130.8, 8.15.12, 10.167.2) was ‘of the Asuras’ seems not to be found elsewhere. On the mythology, cf. OBERLIES 1998: 391ff. I have tentatively assumed that the relative pronoun is part of a true relative clause here, but it may equally well belong to the type of construction discussed above in my commentary on 6.9.1d.

#### 7.4.2 ŚS 19.13.2, RV 10.103.1 etc.

<i>āsuh śísāno vṛṣabho na bhīmo</i>	(11)
<i>ghanāghanaḥ kṣobhanaś carṣaṇīmām  </i>	(11)
<i>saṁkrandano (’)nimiṣa ekavīraḥ</i>	(11)

<sup>37</sup> The edition of VON SCHROEDER omits *vi*°.

śataṃ senā jayatu sākam indraḥ || (11)

The swift one, sharpening his [cudgel] like a terrible bull [its horns], constantly slaying, the shaker of peoples, the vociferating, unwinking sole hero, Indra: let him defeat a hundred armies at once.

āsuh] āsuḥ **V/126 Mā Ma**, āśU(→ su 2)(+ ḥ) **Ku**, āśuś **K** na] *thus* **Or K** [[misprint Bar.: no] ghanāghanah kṣobhanaś] **Ku** [**Ma**], ghanāghanakṣobhanaś **V/126 Mā**, ghānānah kṣobhanaś **K** [[note °ḥ k°] carṣaṇinām |] carṣaṇinām | **Or**, carṣaṇinām, [[*om.*] **K** saṃkrandano] [**Ma**], saṃkrand{e}ano **Ku**, sa(+ ṃ)krandano **V/126**, sakrandano **Mā**, saṅkrandano **K** (°)nimīṣa] nimīṣa **Or K** ekavīraḥ] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], eka{VRĪ}vīraḥ **Ku**, ekavīraś **K** senā jayatu sākam] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], senā jayatu sā(k·)(*sec. m.* → ka 2)m **Ku**, senā ajayatsākam **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ s°]

ŚS 19.13.2, ṚV 10.103.1 etc.

āsúḥ śísāno vṛṣabhó ná bhīmó ghanāghanáh kṣóbhanaś carṣaṇinām |  
saṃkrándano ’nimīśá ekavīráḥ śatám sénā ajayat sākám índraḥ ||

BHATTACHARYA does not report for **Mā** the omission of visarga found here before *kṣobhanaś* just as in **V/126**.

**abc.** On the simile, cf. GELDNER’s note (where a reference to ṚV 1.55.1cd may be added): I supply *vájram* and *śrínge*. For parallels of Indra’s epithet *kṣóbhanaś carṣaṇinām*, see the references in GELDNER’s note: THIEME (1967 = 21984: 247–258, esp. §6) appears to have missed these cases of Indra as ‘shaker’ of peoples (contrast Indra as *duścyavaná-* in the next stanza). The epithet *saṃkrándana-* is used of the war-drum at PS 9.27.9 / ŚS 5.20.9.

**d.** Since there is evidence (in 4b+d, 6; note also 9a) that the ŚS text, which — according to our hypothesis (my Introduction, §2.2.1) — should be in origin identical to that of PS, has suffered contamination from the ṚV (and other traditions?) also elsewhere in this hymn, and since there seems to be no other reason to reject the Or. reading *jayatu* (for *ajayat* of all the parallel texts, and of our **K**) as secondary, I follow BHATTACHARYA here in rejecting the **K** reading: the latter may be explained as due to influence from the local Kashmirian ṚV or KS traditions, rather than (with BHATTACHARYA, p. xliii) as “lingering influence [on **K**] of a non-Paippalāda, non-Śaunakiya lost Atharvaveda of Kashmir itself”. Cf. my Introduction, §2.6.3.2.

7.4.3 ŚS 19.13.3, ṚV 10.103.2 etc.

saṃkrandanenānimīṣeṇa jiṣṇunā- (12)  
-ayodhyena duścyavanena dhṛṣṇunā | (12)  
tad indreṇa jayata tat sahadhvaṃ (11)  
yudho nara iṣuhastena vṛṣṇā || (11)

With the vociferating, with the unwinking, with the victorious, with the invincible, with the unshakable, with the bold one, with Indra now be victorious, now win the fights, o men, with the bull, arrow-in-hand.

saṁkrandanenānimiṣeṇa] **Or**, saṁkrandanenānimiṣeṇa **K** duścyavanena] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, duścavanena **V/126 Mā** dhr̥ṣṇunā] **K**, dhiṣṇunā **Or** ||] **Or**, (+ |) **K** nara iṣuhastena] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, nara(*sec. m.* + i 3)ṣuhastena **V/126** vṛṣṇā ||] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], vṛṣṇYA ||] **Ku**, vṛṣṇyā [*om.*] ||] **K**

**ŚS 19.13.3, RV 10.103.2 etc.**

saṁkrandanenānimiṣeṇa jiṣṇunāyodhyeṇa [**RV** jiṣṇunā yutkāreṇa] duścyavanēna dhr̥ṣṇunā | tād indreṇa jayata tāt sahadhvaṁ yúdhō nara iṣuhastena vṛṣṇā ||

See my commentary on 6.1.5b above, about the word *ayodhyá-*. WHITNEY translates *yúdh-*, here and below (except in 7d), as ‘fighter’. I follow GELDNER, who renders twice *tāt* as ‘jetzt ... jetzt’ (cf. WHITNEY: ‘thus ... thus’).

**7.4.4 ŚS 19.13.4, RV 10.103.3 etc.**

sa iṣuhastaiḥ sa niṣaṅgibhir vaśī	(12)
saṁsraṣṭā yudha ind <sub>a</sub> ro gaṇeṇa	(11)
saṁsṛṣṭajit somapā bāhuśardhy	(11)
ūrdhavadhanvā pratihitābhir astāt    * <i>prapāṭhaka</i>	(11)

He with his quiver-carrying [men] who are arrow-in-hand, with his troop, is Indra, in power, who causes fights to meet. The arm-boasting soma-drinker who wins fights that have met, with raised bow, with [arrows] fitted to it, let him shoot.

iṣuhastaiḥ sa niṣaṅgibhir] **Or**, iṣuhastaissa nakaṁkribhir **K** saṁsraṣṭā yudha] **Or**, saṁsṛṣṭā adhi **K** saṁsṛṣṭajit] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, saṁsṛ{ji}ṣṭajit **V/126** bāhuśardhy ūrdhavadhanvā] bāhuśardhyūrdhavadhanvā **Or**, bāhośaśchū(→ dū)rdhavadhanvā **K** pratihitābhir astāt ||] **Mā** [**Ma**], pratihitābhir astā(*sec. m.* + t.) ||] **Ku**, pratihitābhi(+ ra 4)stāt, ||] **V/126**, pratihitābhir astā | **K** \**prapāṭhaka* ||] śrī ||] **Ku**, śrīḥ ||] **V/126 Mā**, oṁ ūrdhavadhanvā pratihitābhir asthā **K**

**ŚS 19.13.4, RV 10.103.3**

sá iṣuhastaiḥ sá niṣaṅgibhir vaśī sámsraṣṭā sá yúdhā índro gaṇéna | saṁsṛṣṭajit somapā bāhuśardhy ūgrádhanvā prátihitābhir ástā [ŚS mss. ástāt] ||

On the \**prapāṭhaka* textual division that is marked here, see my Introduction, §2.1.2.8.

**abc.** Cf. ŚS 10.10.24ab (PS 16.109.4ab) *yúdhā ékaḥ sám sṛjati yó asyā éka íd vaśī* ‘Alone he causes fights to meet, he who alone is in power over her (the *vaśī*)’. For other possible interpretations of *saṁsṛṣṭajit-*, cf. SCARLATA 1999: 159.

Note that the PS mss. show no trace in **b** of the pronoun *sá* that is found in the **RV** parallel (as well as in **ŚS**, perhaps under influence of the **RV**). The scansion *ind<sub>a</sub>ro* after a late caesura, which I assume for the PS version of this páda, is dubious (cf. ARNOLD 1905: 97f.): it is found in the **RV** only — possibly — at 1.130.10c (thus ARNOLD, and OLDENBERG 1909–12/I: 135; VAN NOOTEN & HOLLAND 1994: 590 assume a hypometric páda).

**d.** I assume that the ŚS reading *ugrādhanvā* is due to influence from the RV, as all PS mss. point to the reading *ūrdhavadhanvā* that is found also in the Black YV parallels of this stanza.

**K**, as often, agrees with the RV text (*asthā*, in its repetition of pāda **d** to mark the textual division, is probably not to be taken seriously in any way). The complete agreement, however, between all ŚS mss. (*ástāt*) and our Or. mss. (*astāt*), requires this reading (which was rejected by R-W, SPP, and again by WHITNEY) to be taken seriously.

If we may ignore the accent given to *astāt* by the ŚS mss., we can perhaps interpret the form as a 3rd sg. a-aor. subj. of *as* ‘to shoot’. At PS 5.8.3, the Or. mss. read *āsthat* and **K** *āstṛtat*, and LUBOTSKY 2002: 50 rightly accepts the former reading (3rd sg. a-aor. ind.). The same form occurs with good ms.-support at PS 14.2.10. At PS 2.58.4, however, all the mss. point to *āstat*, but HOFFMANN (1976: 566, n. 19) and after him ZEHNDER emend this form to *āsthat*, because forms from a stem *āstha-* are well-known (cf. HOFFMANN 1967: 59f.; see also GRIFFITHS 2004, item 40, on PS 19.33.3 *asthata*, 2nd pl. a-aor. imper.). HOFFMANN observed: “Das auffallende, in K. und Or. übereinstimmende *āsta-* statt *āstha-* findet sich auch in AV. VII 76,3 *nirāstam*, das Ludwig und Bloomfield wohl mit Recht zu *nir āstham* ‘ich habe herausgeworfen’ verbessern”, referring also to PS 19.40.7, where the reading **K** *tarāstvam* is judged to be “wohl eher aus *nirāstham* als aus *nirāstam* verderbt”.<sup>38</sup> Must we follow HOFFMANN’s conclusion: “Die handschriftlichen Lesungen erlauben es wohl kaum, die sprachwirkliche Existenz eines Aoriststammes *asta-* anzunehmen, obwohl er auf der 3.Sg. Wurzelaor.Med. *\*as-ta* beruhen könnte, wie *astha-* auf der 2.Sg. *as-thās*”? One might think the cumulative evidence from PS 2.58.4, ŚS 7.76.3 / PS 19.40.7 (read *nir āstam* / *parāstam*?) and the present pāda could rather be taken to mean that there was after all an aor. stem *asta-*, and might consider undoing the HOFFMANN/ZEHNDER emendation at PS 2.58.4, while the form *vi-pary-ā-asta(h)* transmitted at ĀpŚS 7.22.8 need, perhaps, not necessarily be emended to *°paryāsthāḥ* (with Rudradatta, CALAND 1902: 552 = 1990: 87) or *°paryasthaḥ* (CALAND 1921: 257). Cf. also NARTEN 1964: 252 (n. 782).

There is, however, an alternative way to interpret our form *astāt*, viz. as *as-tāt*, 3rd sg. root-aor. imper. built to the same root. Clauses containing *-tād* imperatives are ordinarily preceded either by a conditional clause (DELBRÜCK 1878: 3) or by one or more different imperatives (pp. 4f.), but perhaps the contents of pāda **a** can be seen as sufficient fulfilment of this syntactic constraint. No other forms of the root aor. of this verb seem to be known besides *asan*

<sup>38</sup> The Śāradā akṣaras *stha* and *stva* are indeed quite similar. Unfortunately the Or. mss. do not help to clinch this matter, as they are not unanimous: my mss. **Pa** and **Ji4** read *parāstam*, while **V/122** and **JM** read *parāstham* (with a different preverb than HOFFMANN expected).

at RV 4.3.11a (JOACHIM 1978: 39). Although *tād*-imperatives of the (root) aor. are exceedingly rare or non-existent (WHITNEY 1889, §839 only knows AB 5.30.11 *abhiśastād*, a form explained, not quite certainly, as an abl. sg. by NARTEN 1964: 253f.), there are other examples of *-tād* imperatives formed from non-present stems: cf. *vocatād* in RV 5.61.18a (from the redup. aor.), typically preceded by *vaha* in 17b, and also the apparently only fut. imper. of the perfect, RV 5.60.6d *vittād*.<sup>39</sup>

I tentatively follow the second interpretation in my translation, but must of course admit that neither of the two proposed interpretations as a verbal form of *as* ‘to shoot’ is at all certain. The form *astāt* is anyhow a secondary alteration of the nom. ag. *ástā* of the RV version.

#### 7.4.5 ŚS 19.13.5, RV 10.103.5 etc.

balavijñāyaḥ sthaviraḥ pravīraḥ	(11)
sahasvān vājī sahamāna ugraḥ	(11)
abhivīro abhiśatvā sahojij	(11)
jaitrāyendra ratham ā tiṣṭha govidam	(12)

Recognizable by his strength, bold, foremost hero, powerful, booty-winner, fearsome suppressor, surpassing heroes, surpassing warriors, winning victories: o Indra, mount your cattle-finding chariot, for victory.

balavijñāyaḥ sthaviraḥ] **Ku** [**Ma**], balavijñāyasthaviraḥ **JM**, balavijñāyasthaviraḥ **V/126** **Mā**, balavijñāyassthaviraḥ **K** pravīraḥ] *thus* **Or K** [[*note* °ḥ s°]] sahasvān vājī] **V/126** **Mā K**, sahasvān vājī [**Ma?**], sahasvānavājī **Ku JM Pa** sahamāna] **Or**, sahasāna **K** || **Or**, *om.* **K** [[*note* °ḥ a°]] abhivīro abhiśatvā] abhivīro ’bhiśatvā **Or**, abhivīro abhissatvā **K** sahojij] **K**, sodhijij **Or** jaitrāyendra] **Or**, jaitrāyai ā **K** govidam ||] govidam || **Or**, kovidam | **K**

#### RV 10.103.5, ŚS 19.13.5 etc.

balavijñāyā [ŚS °jñāyāḥ] sthāviraḥ pravīraḥ sahasvān vājī sahamāna ugrāḥ |  
abhivīro abhiśatvā sahojā [ŚS °śatvā sahojij]  
jāitram indra rātham ā tiṣṭha govīt [ŚS govīdan] ||

Cf. WHITNEY’S (and LANMAN’S) commentary on the ordering of the stanzas in the RV and ŚS (and PS). They further aptly summarize for the ŚS parallel: “SPP. retains in **a** the *visarga* before *sthāv-*, with the majority of the mss.; he also accepts in **c** *abhiśatvā*, with half the mss., but against all the parallel texts, apparently because the comm. has *ṣ. . .* [The *govīdam* of the Berlin text seems to be an emendation. Nearly all the authorities of W. and of SPP., and SPP’S text as well, and the comm., have *govīdan*; but one or two have *govīt*, with

<sup>39</sup> Werner Knobl writes to me about the latter form: “This form of the perfect is mentioned by Whitney as belonging to the second class present, but since in the RV only the pluperfect *avedam* etc. occurs, and not yet the newly formed present tense *\*vedmi* etc., it is certainly safe to use *vittād* as another good example”.

RV. etc.]”. Most of the PS mss. confirm the preservation of visarga here in ŚS (cf. my Introduction, §2.2.1), and the retroflexion in *abhīṣatvā* is confirmed by the Or. mss. BHATTACHARYA marks *abhīṣatvā* (with avagraha in the Or. mss.) as an emendation, but this does not seem necessary.

**cd.** The Or. reading *sodhijj* seems inexplicable. Since compounds in °*jīt*-generally (always?) show an object relationship between first and second member (SCARLATA 1999: 154–162), I am inclined to assume the same relationship here as well, rather than WHITNEY’s ‘conquering with power’. The meaning of the preceding compounds *abhīvīra*- and *abhīṣatvan*- seems to support my interpretation. On the compound *govīd*-, see SCARLATA 1999: 483f.

**7.4.6** ŚS 19.13.6 (= ŚS 6.97.3), ṚV 10.103.6 etc.

imaṃ vīram anu harṣadhvam ugram	(11)
indraṃ satvāno anu saṃ rabhadhvam	(11)
grāmajitaṃ gojitaṃ vajrabāhuṃ	(11)
jayantam *ajma pramṛṇantam ojasā	(12)

Be excited along with this fearsome hero, take hold of each other, o warriors, after Indra, winner of trains, winner of cattle, cudgel-armed, winner of the raid, crushing with his force.

harṣadhvam] **Or**, harṣādhvam **K** satvāno anu] **K**, satvāno `nu **Or** rabhadhvam || rabhadhvaṃ | **Or** **K** \*ajma] ajmaḥ **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], aymaḥ **Ku**, ajmā **K** pramṛṇantam] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, pramṛṇantam **V/126 Mā**

**ŚS 19.13.6**

imāṃ vīrām ānu harṣadhvam ugrām indraṃ sakhāyo ānu saṃ rabhadhvam |  
grāmajitaṃ gojitaṃ vajrabāhuṃ jāyantam ājma pramṛṇantam ojasā ||

**ṚV 10.103.6 etc.**

gotrabhīdaṃ govīdaṃ vajrabāhuṃ jāyantam ājma pramṛṇantam ojasā |  
imāṃ sajātā ānu vīrayadhvam indraṃ sakhāyo ānu saṃ rabhadhvam ||

BHATTACHARYA reads *ajmah*.

**bcd.** The ŚS reading *sakhāyo* seems to be due to influence from the ṚV text. Regarding the meaning of *grāma*-, see my note on 6.12.5b. On the basis of the parallel texts, I correct the impossible reading *ajmah* of the Or. mss., to which **K** *ajmā* may also be traced back, and which therefore may well have belonged to the archetype \*G.

**7.4.7** ŚS 19.13.7, ṚV 10.103.7 etc.

abhi gotrāṇi sahasā gāhamāno	(12 <sup>T</sup> )
ādāya ugraḥ śatamanyur indraḥ	(11)
duścyavanaḥ pṛtanāṣād ayodhīyo	(12)
asmākaṃ senā avatu pra yutsu	(11)

Penetrating, with force, into the cow-pens, let the pitiless, the fearsome Indra, of hundred-fold fury, the unshakable, the invincible victor in battle, let him support our armies onward in the fights.

gotrāṇi] **Or**, gotrāṇi **K**    a<sub>a</sub>dāya ugraḥ] 'dāya ugraḥ **Or**, madāyurugrās **K**    śatamanyur] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], (+ sa → *sec. m.* śa)tamanyur **Ku**, catamatsur **K**    ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[*note* °ḥ d°]]    duśc<sub>y</sub>avanaḥ] **Ku** [**Ma**], duśc(+ y)a(*sec. m.* → ścĀ 1)vanaḥ **V/126**, duśc<sub>a</sub>vanaḥ **Mā**, duśc<sub>y</sub>avanaḥ **K** [[*Bar.* °śśya°]]    pṛtanāśād] pṛtanāśāḥ **Or**, pṛtanāśā] **K**    asmākam] **Ma Pa**, 'smākam **Ku Mā**, smākam **V/126**, ssākam **K**    yutsu] **K**, yatsu **Or**

**ŚS 19.13.7, ṚV 10.103.7 etc.**

abhī gotrāṇi sāhasā gāhamāno 'dāyā ugrāḥ [ṚV 'dayō vīrāḥ] śatāmanyur indraḥ |  
duśc<sub>y</sub>avanaḥ pṛtanāśād ayodhyò [ṚV ayudhyò] 'smākam sēnā avatu prá yutsú ||

**ab.** WHITNEY explains *gotrāṇi*: “The stalls, namely, in which the kine are shut up by the Asuras”. The kine represent the light of the sun, see stanza 1. On the form *adāyās*, cf. WHITNEY’s commentary. The difference in root vocalism between this and ṚV *adayās* has yet to receive a satisfactory explanation. According to KUIPER (1974: 128 = 1997a: 413), who supposes that the latter form means ‘pitiless’ (and connects it with a third *dayate* ‘to pity’; contrast EWAia I, 700 and GOTŌ 1987: 173 n. 287), “the variants *adāyó* TS., *ādāyó* MS. are clearly corruptions” (TS 4.6.4.2, MS 2.10.4:135.17; KUIPER overlooks the AV cases).

**c.** On *pṛtanā-* + *sah*, see my note under 6.9.8d.

**7.4.8** ŚS 19.13.8, cf. ṚV 10.103.4 etc.

bṛhaspate pari dīyā rathena	(11)
rakṣohāmitrān apabādhamānaḥ	(11)
prabhañjañ chatrūn +pramṛṇann amitrān	(11)
asmākam edhy avitā tanūnām	(11)

Fly around, o Bṛhaspati, with your chariot, slaying demons, driving away the enemies, breaking up the foes, crushing the enemies: be the helper of our bodies.

bṛhaspate] **Or**, vṛhaspatī **K**    rakṣohāmitrān] **Or**, rakṣohāmittrāñ **K**    apabādhamānaḥ ||] **Or**, apabādhamāna(+ ḥ) [[*om.* ||]] **K**    prabhañjañ chatrūn +pramṛṇann] prabha{ja}ñjañchatrūn, pramṛṇann **Ku**, prabhañjam chatrūn, pramṛṇann **V/126 Mā**, prabhañjañchatrūn, pramṛṇann **Pa** [**Ma**], prabhañjam śatṛṇpramṛṇann **K**    amitrān asmākam] **Ku** [**Ma**], amitrān, smākam **V/126 Mā**, amitrānasmākam **K**    edhy avitā] **Or**, edhyevitā **K**    tanūnām ||] **K**, tanūnām ||] **Or**

**ŚS 19.13.8**

bṛhaspate pári dīyā ráthena rakṣohámítrāñ apabádhamānaḥ |  
prabhañjám chátrūn pramṛṇánn amítrān asmákam edhy avitá tanúnām ||

**ṚV 10.103.4cd etc.**

... | prabhañján sēnaḥ pramṛṇó yudhá jáyann asmákam edhy avitá ráthānām ||

BHATTACHARYA does not report the reading *amitrān, smākam* found in his **Mā** (and my **V/126**). He falsely reports *ttr* for the Or. mss. (which simply read *rakṣohāmītrān*), and ignores the gemination found in **K**. His apparatus implies that **Ma** has the sandhi °ñ *ch*° in pāda **c**. The presence of this sandhi, uncommon in the Or. mss. (but found here also in **Ku**: see my Introduction, §2.8 F), is confirmed by its sister ms. apograph **Pa**.

**a.** On this stanza, and the role of Bṛhaspati, cf. SCHMIDT 1968: 100.

**b.** Regarding my decision to accept the sandhi of the Or. mss. (°ān *apa*°) rather than that of **K** (°āñ *apa*°), see my Introduction, §2.8 (D).

#### 7.4.9 ŚS 19.13.9, ṚV 10.103.8 etc.

indra āsām ne;tā bṛhaspatir	(11 <sup>J</sup> )
dakṣiṇā yajñāḥ pura etu somaḥ	(11)
devasenānām abhibhañjatīnām	(11)
jayantīnām maruto yantu madhye	(11)

Indra [be] their leader, let Bṛhaspati, let the sacerdotal fee, let the ritual of worship, let Soma go in front of these attacking, conquering armies of the gods, let the Maruts go in [their] midst.

āsām netā bṛhaspatir] **Or**, eṣām nayatā vṛhaspatir **K** dakṣiṇā yajñāḥ] **Ku Mā [Ma]**, dakṣi{ya}ṇāya{ḥ}jñāḥ **V/126**, dakṣiṇo yajñāḥ **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ d°]] a-bhibhañjatīnām] **Ku V/126 Mā K**, abhibhuñjatīnām **Ma Pa** maruto] **K**, maṛto **Or** yantu] **Ku [Ma] K**, ja(*sec. m.* → ya)ntu **V/126**, jantu **Mā**

#### ŚS 19.13.9, ṚV 10.103.8 etc.

indra āsām [ŚS eṣām] netā bṛhaspátir dákṣiṇā yajñāḥ purá etu sómaḥ |  
devasenānām abhibhañjatīnām jáyantīnām marúto yantu mádhye [ṚV yantv ágram] ||

**a.** On the trisyllabic scansion of *netā*, see ARNOLD 1905: 91 (**K** *nayatā* is simply an example of common confusion *aya* :: *e*, cf. 6.22.5b, 7.1.11d). I tentatively assume that the Or. mss. have preserved the correct pronoun (*āsām*, with the ṚV), although the agreement concerning the reading *eṣām* between **K** and ŚS is not very easy to explain away (influence respectively from local texts KS 18.5:270.3 and MS 2.10.4:136.6, which both read *eṣām*?).

**b.** On Soma as *puraetā*, cf. ṚV 9.87.3a and 9.97.29d. Cf. GONDA (1955a: 114 = 1975/II: 327): GONDA and SCHMIDT (1968: 99) compare ṚV 1.18.5, after GELDNER.

#### 7.4.10 ŚS 19.13.10, ṚV 10.103.9 etc.

indrasya vṛṣṇo varuṇasya rājñā	(11)
ādityānām marutām śardha ugram	(11)
mahāmanasām bhuvanacyavānām	(11)
ghoṣo devānām jayatām ud asthāt	(11)

Arisen has the noise of the bull Indra, of king Varuṇa, of the Ādityas, of the Maruts — fearsome is [their] troop —, of the great-spirited, earth-shaking, victorious gods.

vṛṣṇo ] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, vṛ{·}ṣṇo **V/126** varuṇasya] varṇasya **Or**, marutasya **K** marutām] **K**, marṭām **Or** śardha] **K**, śarddha **Ku** [**Ma**], ś{r}addha **V/126**, śraddha **Mā** ugram ]] ugram | **Or K** bhuvanacyavānām] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, bhuvanacya(+ vā)mYānām **V/126** ghoṣo] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, gho(+ ṣo 1) **Ku** jayatām] **Or**, jayatāmm **K** asthāt ||] **Or**, astām, [[*om.*] ]] **K**

**ŚS 19.13.10, ṚV 10.103.9 etc.**

īndrasya vṛṣṇo váruṇasya rájña ādityānām marútām śárdha ugrám |  
mahámanasām bhuvanacyavānām ghóṣo devānām jáyatām úd asthāt ||

b. I follow GELDNER's idea that (*marútām*) *śárdha ugrám* “ist Anakoluthie oder Satzparentese”.

**7.4.11 ŚS 19.13.11, ṚV 10.103.11 etc.**

asmākam indrah samṛteṣu dhvajéṣuv	(12 <sup>T</sup> )
asmākam yā iṣavas tā jayantu	(11)
asmākam vīrā úttare bhavantuv	(11)
asmān devāso avatā haveṣu    4	(11)

[Let] Indra [be] *ours*, when the banners collide. Let *our* arrows win. Let *our* heroes be superior. Help *us*, o gods, during the calls.

indrah] **Or**, indras **K** iṣavas] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**] **K**, iŚAvas **Mā** vīrā] **Or**, vīra **K** asmān] **Or**, asmām **K** avatā] 'vatā **Or**, vatā **K** || 4 ||] || ṛ 11 || 4 || **Ku**, || 4 || ṛ (*sec. m.* 11) || **V/126**, || 4 || ṛ || **Mā**, Z 4 Z **K**

**ŚS 19.13.11, ṚV 10.103.11 etc.**

asmākam indrah sámṛteṣu dhvajéṣv asmākam yā iṣavas tā jayantu |  
asmākam vīrā úttare bhavantv asmān devāso 'vatā [ṚV asmām u devā avatā] háveṣu ||

BHATTACHARYA's *ya* for *yā* must be a misprint. All mss. read *yā*.

d. It seems next to *avatā* that *háveṣu* (WHITNEY ‘at the invocations’, GELDNER ‘während der Kampfruhe’) can be understood on two levels (*avatā háveṣu/avatāháveṣu*, cf. *āhavá-* ‘battle’), and it may also be compared with ṚV 1.102.10d *hávaneṣu* ‘during the oblations’. For another possible case of *double entendre* playing on the same words, cf. 7.18.1d, 2a, 3e.

## 7.5. To an amulet.

The present hymn, which is unique to PS, seems to have been intended to accompany the fabrication of an amulet, but its contents do not give unequivocal clues as to its ritual application, and the superficial first impression that the amulet was one made of gold is made uncertain by repeated references to the Aśvattha (fig) tree: in the end, it seems to me that it is most likely that the amulet in question was made of fig-wood rather than of gold, or else of two raw materials. As to the Aśvattha tree, I may refer to the elaborate citation of botanical sources, and the discussion of literary references by EMENEAU (1949 = 1988: 11–27 [references below are to the original publication]). Comparable hymns are not common: I may point especially to PS 1.82 = ŚS 19.26, and the material on golden amulets collected by GONDA 1991: 31–36.

The hymn exceeds the norm of ten stanzas per hymn by two, but even the divergent triṣṭubh-stanza 9 is not evidently a secondary intrusion. The hymn's place here in this kāṇḍa is explained by the quite elaborate concatenating phraseological links with the preceding hymn: on the name Br̥haspati (1, 2), cf. 7.4.8, 9; with *rakṣohan-* (8), compare 7.4.8; the verb *apa-bād̥h* and the word *śatru-* co-occur in our stanza 12, again concatenating with 7.4.8 where they are also found together; with *sahas-* (2, 8, 9), cf. 7.4.3 *sahadhvam* and 7.4.5 *sahasvān . . . sahamānaḥ . . . sahojit*, 7.4.7 *sahasā*; the word *ugra-* (6, 9) occurs also in 7.4.5, 6, 7, 10; and there are several other somewhat less conspicuous phraseological correspondences.

### 7.5.1 Only PS ◊ b: 3c, 7c

vaiśvānarād arocata	(8)
jāto hiraṇyayo maṇiḥ	(8)
tam ābharad br̥haspatiḥ	(8)
kaśyapo vīr;yāya kam	(8)

Born from Vaiśvānara, the golden amulet did shine. Kaśyapa, the Br̥haspati, brought it here for a heroic deed.

vaiśvānarād] Or, vaiśvanarād K    |] Or, om. K [[note °ḥ t°]]   br̥haspatiḥ] Or, vṛhaspatiḥ  
K [[note °ḥ k°]]   kaśyapo] Or, kasyapo K   kam ||] kam || Or, kam [[om. ||] K

**ab.** Cf. ŚS 3.20.1ab (PS 3.34.1ab) *ayām te yónir ṛtvīyo yāto jāto ārocathāḥ* ‘This is thy seasonable womb, whence born didst thou shine’ (WHITNEY). On the connection between fire and gold, and the latter’s origin in the former (cf. PS 1.82.1 / ŚS 19.26.1), see GONDA 1991: 14ff. On the use of forms from the root *roc* to denote “glückbringendes Scheinen”, cf. ROESLER 1997: 126f.

**cd.** PS 6.6.4cd *indrāṇy agra ābharan madhugham bhagāya kam* has a similar structure. It appears that the Seer Kaśyapa and Br̥haspati are identified here. This may be explained by the fact that certain potent *brāhmans* are said to be Kaśyapa’s, e.g. at PS 1.15.4 (ŚS 1.14.4) and 1.85.1: Kaśyapa seems,

therefore, in a sense to be a Brahmanaspati ('Master of Spells'). It is attractive to take Bṛhaspati not as deity here, but as an epithet (cf. SCHMIDT 1968: 239). On Kaśyapa's relationship with amulets, see also ŚS 8.5.14 (PS 16.28.4–5ab) *kaśyāpas tvām asṛjata kaśyāpas tvā sām airayat | ābibhas tvēndro mānuṣe bibhrat saṁśreṣiṇé 'jayat | maṇiṁ sahasravīryaṁ vārma devā akṛṇvata* 'Kaśyapa created thee; Kaśyapa collected thee; Indra bore thee in human wise (?); bearing [thee], he conquered in the conflict (?); the amulet, of thousand-fold might, the gods made their defense' (WHITNEY). On Brahmanaspati/Bṛhaspati and amulets, cf. i.a. PS 1.11.1c, 16.42.6ff. Cf. further ŚS 8.5.1 (PS 16.27.1) *ayāṁ pratisaró maṇír vīró vīráya badhyate | vīryāvānt sapatnahá śúravīraḥ paripāṇaḥ sumanigālaḥ* 'This attacking talisman, (itself) a man, is fastened upon the man: it is full of force, slays enemies, makes heroes of men, furnishes shelter, provides good luck' (BLOOMFIELD 1897: 79). Cf. also 7.18.2e below. See GONDA 1939 on the significance of the verb *ābharat*: it may mean 'wore', as *bharāmi* seems to mean 'I wear' in 5b.

### 7.5.2 Only PS

bṛhaspatis tam akṛṇon	(8)
maṇiṁ vaiśvānaraṁ sahaḥ	(8)
saptarṣayo balāya kaṁ	(8)
saṁ dadhuṣ ṭvā vayodhasaḥ	(8)

The Bṛhaspati made this amulet, the power belonging to Vaiśvānara. The Seven Seers, the life giving ones, put you together for strength.

bṛhaspatis] Or, vṛhaspataṁs K akṛṇon maṇiṁ] Ku [Ma], akṛṇonmaṇiṁ V/126 Mā, akṛṇomaṇiṁ K sahaḥ |] Or, saha [[om. ||] K saṁ dadhuṣ ṭvā] Ku K, saṁnda(+ ·u 1)dhuṣṭvā V/126, sandadhuṣṭvā Mā ||] Or, om. K [[note °ḥ v°]

BHATTACHARYA does not report the error *akṛṇmon* found in Mā (and V/126).

**ab.** The syntax of these pādas seems to require taking *vaiśvānara-* not as a proper noun, as in the preceding and following stanzas, but as an adjective derived from that name (cf. TS 5.2.4.2, further PW VI, 1421); see also 9a below. An Aśvattha amulet is called *mahaṭ sahaḥ* in PS 2.55.1b.

**c.** On the list of Seven Seers, among whom Kaśyapa of stanza 1, cf. LUBOTSKY on PS 5.28.4 (2002: 126).

### 7.5.3 Only PS ◊ c: 1b, 7c ◊ d: ŚS 8.2.27d, 8.7.16b / PS 16.5.8d, 16.13.6b

viśve devās ta indriyaṁ	(8)
saptarṣayaś ca saṁ dadhuḥ	(8)
jāto hiraṇyayo maṇir	(8)
agner vaiśvānarād adhi	(8)

All the gods, and the Seven Seers, put together your force. The golden amulet is born from Agni Vaiśvānara.

ta indriyaṃ] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], ta i{ya}ndriyaṃ **Ku**, tvindriyaṃ **K** ]] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**],  
 || **Ku**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ j°]] maṇir agner] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, maṇi{·}ragner **Ku**

**a.** It is possible that *te* does not refer to the amulet, as *tvā* does throughout this hymn, but to its wearer: cf. my comments under stanzas 7 and 10.

#### 7.5.4 Only PS

aśvattho jātaḥ prathamo (8)  
 agneḥ priyatama tanūḥ | (8)  
 vaiśvānarasya sṛṣṭiḥ yā (8)  
 kṛtyādūṣiḥ kṛto maṇiḥ || (8)

The Aśvattha was born first, the favorite form of Agni. With the emission by [Agni] Vaiśvānara, the amulet has been made a witchcraft spoiler.

aśvattho] **Or**, aśvatho **K** jātaḥ] **Or**, jātaḥ **K** agneḥ] 'gneḥ **Or**, gneḥ **K** tanūḥ] **Ku**  
**V/126 Mā** **K**, tanu(→ nū)ḥ **Ma** ]] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ v°]] sṛṣṭiyā] **K**, sṛṣṭayā **Ku**  
**Ma**, pṛ(sec. m. → 1 sṛ)ṣṭayā **V/126**, pṛṣṭayā **Mā** kṛtyādūṣiḥ] **Or**, kṛtyādūṣiḥ **K** ]]]  
**Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ k°]]

**ab.** The precise significance of these pādas is not clear. Aśvattha wood was also used for making amulets: PS 1.66.2–3. The upper kindling stick was made from this hard wood (MACDONELL & KEITH 1912/I: 43), which is hence generally connected with (the production of) fire, cf. TB 1.1.3.9 etc. On the phrase *priyā- tanū-*, cf. BODEWITZ 2002b: 159. Perhaps the Aśvattha is mentioned here because of the destructive, ‘strangling’ quality of the fig-tree (EMENEAU 1949: 347ff.): cf. ŚS 3.6.3. It is even imaginable that the amulet is one of Aśvattha throughout the hymn, because — as GONDA 1991: 32f. has discussed — even wooden amulets could be called ‘golden’.

**cd.** These pādas (cf. 3cd also) state that the amulet is produced by Agni Vaiśvānara (*vaiśvānarasya* gen. subj.), but does this mean literal production of a (golden) amulet from fire, or can it mean that a part of ‘Agni’s favorite form’, of the Aśvattha-tree, was used? On the word *sṛṣṭi-* ‘emission (of offspring)’, cf. ŚS 3.28.1, and JB 1.69. On the meaning(s) of the word *kṛtyā-*, translated ‘witchcraft’ throughout this hymn, see my introduction to 7.1 above. On the compound *kṛtyādūṣi-* (AiGr. II/2, §186bγ p. 295), cf. ŚS 2.4.6ab *kṛtyādūṣir a-yāṃ maṇir ātho arātidūṣiḥ* ‘This amulet is a witchcraft spoiler, and a spoiler of miserliness’. Cf. also ŚS 8.5.2 (PS 16.27.2) *ayāṃ maṇiḥ sapatnahā svīrah sāhasvān vājī sāhamāna ugrāḥ | pratyāk kṛtyā dūṣayann eti vīrah* ‘This amulet is a slayer of rivals, providing excellent heroes, powerful, victorious, defeating, forcible: [itself] a hero, it keeps spoiling the witchcrafts, [turning them] against [the witchcraft-maker]’; ŚS 4.18.5ab (PS 5.24.6) *anāyāhām ośadhyā sārvaḥ kṛtyā adūduṣam* ‘With this plant, I have spoiled all witchcrafts’.

## 7.5.5 Only PS

kr̥tyādūṣiṃ t <sub>u</sub> vāvidam	(8)
kr̥tyādūṣiṃ bharāmi tvā	(8)
kr̥tyādūṣiṃ kṛṇomi tvā	(8)
kr̥tyādūṣiṃ vayodhasam	(8)

I have found you: a spoiler of witchcraft. I wear you: a spoiler of witchcraft. I make you: a spoiler of witchcraft, a life giving spoiler of witchcraft.

kr̥tyādūṣiṃ] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, kṛtvādūṣiṃ **V/126 Mā** kr̥tyādūṣiṃ] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, kṛtvādūṣiṃ **V/126 Mā** bharāmi] **Or**, bharāsi **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** kr̥tyādūṣiṃ] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K** [[misprint Bar.: °duṣiṃ]], kṛtvādūṣiṃ **V/126 Mā** kr̥tyādūṣiṃ] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, kṛtvādūṣiṃ **V/126 Mā** vayodhasam ||] vayodhasam ||] **Or** **K**

**b.** I tentatively take the simplex *bhar* here (and in 11c) in the meaning ‘to wear (an amulet)’ (cf. GONDA 1939: 71 = 1975/II: 173). It could also be taken as a *simplex pro composito ā-bhar*, as in 1c and 8d: in that case, we need not assume that the wearer himself, who seems to be addressed in 7, is speaking.

## 7.5.6 Only PS

patatrī pakṣī balavān	(8)
kr̥tyādūṣiḥ sapatnahā	(8)
nitatnir viśvabheṣaja	(8)
ugra āpatiko maṇiḥ	(8)

Pinioned, winged, strong, a witchcraft-spoiling slayer of rivals, all-healing, extending [deep] down into [the host], powerful is [this] Āpatika amulet.

patatrī] **Or**, patatrī **K** pakṣī] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, va(→ pa 4)kṣī **Ku** balavān kr̥tyādūṣiḥ] **Ku** [**Ma**] [°n, k°], balavān, kṛtvādūṣiḥ **V/126 Mā**, balavānkr̥tyādūṣiḥ **K** sapatnahā |] **Or**, sapūtnahā [*om.*] **K** nitatnir] **Or**, nitanni **K** ugra āpatiko] **Or**, ugraḥpatiko **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ p°]]

BHATTACHARYA does not report the error *kṛtvādūṣiḥ* in **Mā** (and **V/126**).

**a.** Cf. pāda 7a and 7.8.10 (*vayāmsīva pakṣiṇa ā viśantu patatrīṇaḥ*) below.

**c.** At MS 2.8.13:117.3, KS 40.4:137.14 (cf. ViṣṇuSm 67.7), a brick is given the name *nitatnī-*; TS 4.4.5.1 uses the variant *nitatnī-* (but the derived mantras at TB 3.1.4.1 *nitatnyāi*). The word is used in connection with a plant at ŚS 6.136.1 (PS 1.67.1) *devī devyām ādhi jātā pṛthivyām asy oṣadhe | tāṃ tvā nitatni kéśebhyo dīṃhanaṇāya khanāmasi*. While WHITNEY thinks that “*nitatnī* is apparently not the name, but an epithet, “sending its roots far down” (*nyakprasaraṇaṇāçilā*, comm.)”, BLOOMFIELD (1897: 31, 536) takes the word as a plant name, and refers to KauśS 31.28: the sūtra’s reference to a *mantroktā* (plant) implies that a plant name is to be found in the hymns 6.136–137 which it quotes. BAHULKAR (1994: 211f.) judiciously discusses the few possibilities, all rather doubtful. I am inclined to follow WHITNEY’s interpretation, and to

suggest that we connect *nītatni-* here with the initially epiphytic nature (on which, cf. again EMENEAU 1949) of the ‘strangling fig’, the *Aśvattha*. This means that perhaps the *sūtrakāra* no longer understood *nītatni* correctly. The following stanzas, containing the only other attestations of the word, are not conclusive.

At PS 3.29.2 (cf. ŚS 7.38.1), the attributive meaning seems possible: *imāṃ khanāmy oṣadhīm nītatnīm + anutantanām*<sup>40</sup> | *āyataḥ pratinandanīm parāyato nīvartanīm* ‘I dig this plant, extending [deep] down into [the ground], extending [far] along [the ground], that welcomes someone arriving, that causes someone departing to return’. Cf. also the stanzas PS 20.38.4–5 *udicīnaḥ pra tanoti nītatnir bhūmyām adhi | ojmānaṃ paśya vīrudho mithunā sam avīvanat || ni + tvātanam*<sup>41</sup> *nītatninā pari tvāgām sahīyasā | + śyenād abhidravīyasā suparṇān nīkarīyasā* ‘Turned northwards, extending [deep] down into [the ground], it spreads over the earth. Behold the power of the plant (cf. PS 4.14.7, 5.10.8, 7.12.10)! It has made the pair to fall in love. I have rooted you down by means of the [plant] that extends [deep] down into [the ground]. I have encircled you with the very mighty [plant], more aggressive than a falcon, more oppressive than an eagle’.

d. The word *āpatika-* occurs further only at PS 8.10.8 *ā sacasva talāśeva vṛkṣa ivāpatikaḥ patim | tvaṃ sam agrabhīḥ puṃsaḥ śyena ivānyān patatrināḥ* ‘Go after a husband, [you who are] like a *Talāśā* (-tree), like an *Āpatika* on a tree. You have snatched the men, like a falcon other birds’ (cf. ŚS 6.15.3), and PS 12.5.1 *jāyasvāgne ’śvatthād asmai kṣatrāyaujase | ugra āpatikād adhi yo vṛkṣām adhirohati* ‘Be born, o Agni, from the *Aśvattha*-wood, for him, [his] dominion, [his] power, as a powerful one, from the *Āpatika* that grows over trees’: in both of these contexts, it may be taken as an epithet of the *Aśvattha*-tree. Cf. with the phrasing of the last-quoted stanza that of ŚS 3.6.6ab *yāthāśvattha vānaspatyān ārōhan kṛṇuṣe ’dharān* ‘As, O *aśvattha*! climbing the forest trees you put them [the enemies] below you ...’ (EMENEAU). There is some evidence (cf. PW I, 657) that the word *āpatika-* was known in later Sanskrit to denote a bird of prey: this may be compared with *śyena iva* in PS 8.10.8, and with the words in *pāda a* here, as well as in 7a. All this can be combined unproblematically with the unquestionable derivation from *ā-pat* ‘to land upon’, as a bird of prey, or as seed that will develop into an epiphyte; that ancient Indians knew the necessary naturalistic details is proven by the sources discussed in EMENEAU’s article (cf. also the role attributed to birds in the spreading of seeds of another strangling fig, the *Plakṣa*, according to the classical Sanskrit passages he discusses 1949: 360ff.).

**7.5.7** Only PS ◊ c: 1b, 3c ◊ d: cf. PS 19.17.1b / ŚS 6.81.1b, ŚS 4.25.4b

patatrī te balāya kaṃ

(8)

<sup>40</sup> Em. Werner Knobl. BHATTACHARYA *anutantamām*, after the Or. mss.; K *anutantunām*.

<sup>41</sup> The mss. read *tvātanam*.

nitatnir bheṣajāya te | (8)  
 jāto hiraṇyayo maṇir (8)  
 apa rakṣāṃsi sedhatu || (8)

The golden amulet has been born pinioned for your strength, extending [deep] down into [the host] for your healing: let it drive off the demons.

patatrī] **Or**, patatrī **K** nitatnir] **Or**, nitannir **K**

**ab.** These pādas take 6a and 6c back up. Whereas the second person addressed elsewhere in this hymn is clearly the amulet itself (alternately addressed in the third person), it seems likely that twice *te* here refers to its wearer. Is the wearer also addressed in 10?

**7.5.8** Only PS ◊ **a**: PS 10.5.7a ◊ **b**: ṚV 10.97.6d / PS 11.6.9d, PS 10.1.12b / ŚS 1.28.1b, PS 15.3.7b / ŚS 19.44.7b etc.

devo maṇiḥ sapatnahā (8)  
 rakṣohāmīvacātanah | (8)  
 hiraṇyayonir aṃśumān (8)  
 kaśyapenābhṛtaṃ sahaḥ || (8)

The amulet, a rival-slaying god, a demon-slaying remover of afflictions, having its origin in gold, with [many] shoots: the power was brought forth by Kaśyapa.

maṇiḥ] **Or**, maṇis **K** ] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ h°]] hiraṇyayonir aṃśumān] **Or**, hiraṇmayannar aṃśmāna **K** sahaḥ ||] **Or**, saha | **K**

**c.** The word *aṃśumānt-* seems to introduce here the same reference to deep-rooted growth, hence strength and reliability, as the word *nitatni-* seems to do in the preceding stanzas, and can, again — if one takes the resulting problems with *hiraṇyayoni-* for granted —, be connected with the growth habits of the Aśvattha tree, one of “those species that develop from their branches aerial roots that may reach the ground and thicken into “pillar-roots,” or subsidiary trunks” (EMENEAU 1949: 346). Cf. ŚS 8.7.4 (PS[K] 16.12.3–4) *prastrṇatī stambínīr ékaśuṅgāḥ pratanvatīr óśadhūr á vadāmi | aṃśumátīḥ kaṇḍínīr yá víśākḥā hváyāmi te vírúdhō vaiśvadevīr ugráḥ puruṣajīvanīḥ* ‘The plants that spread forth, those that are bushy, those that have a single sheath, those that creep along, do I address; I call in thy behalf the plants that have shoots, those that have stalks, those that divide their branches, those that are derived from all the gods, the strong (plants) that furnish life to man’ (BLOOMFIELD 1897: 41).

**d.** Cf. stanza 1.

**7.5.9** Only PS ◊ **c**: cf. ṚV 1.91.19c etc.

vaiśvānaram tejanam ekam āhur (11)  
 agner yoneḥ saha candreṇa jātam | (11)

gayasphānaḥ pratarāṇo vayodhāḥ (11)  
 kṛtyādūṣir valagahās;ṃ y graḥ || (11)

They say that the [amulet] belonging to Vaiśvānara is a single shaft born from Agni's womb, together with the shining [gold]. You are a powerful, witchcraft-spoiling, *valaga*-slaying, (life-)lengthening giver of energy, who cause the patrimony to prosper.

tejanam ekam] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], teya(*sec. m.* → ja)nam ekam **Ku**, tenamekaṃm **K** yoneḥ] **Or**, yones **K** candreṇa] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, candre(N·)(*sec. m.* → ṇa 5) **Ku** jātam || jātam | **Or**, jātam [*om.*] **K** gayasphānaḥ] **V/126** [**Ma**], ·gayasphānaḥ **Ku**, rāyasphānaḥ **Mā**, gayasphānaḥ **K** vayodhāḥ] **Or**, vayodhaḥ **K** valagahāsy] balagahāsy **Or** [?] **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [*note* °ḥ y°]

BHATTACHARYA prints *balaga*°.

**ab.** Regarding the adj. *vaiśvānara*-, see my comm. on 2ab above. The adj. *candrā*- qualifies gold e.g. at RV 9.97.50, TB 1.7.6.3. Cf. also RVKh 2.6.1 (PS 10.7.10, and 7.15.6 below). The pāda seems to exclude, now, a reference to a wooden amulet: perhaps it was made of a combination of fig-wood and gold?

**c.** Cf. RV 1.91.19cd *gayasphānaḥ pratāraṇaḥ suvīró 'vīrahā prá carā soma dúryān* 'You, Soma, who cause the patrimony to prosper, who lengthen (our life-span), who provide heroic sons, who do not slay sons: enter the porch'.

**d.** Although the word *valagá*- is of uncertain etymology (EWAia II, 524), and the possibility that the spelling with initial *b* in **K** is an authentic variant cannot be absolutely excluded, the fact that no such variant seems to be attested anywhere else, and the general unreliability of **K** in this respect (cf. *b* for *v* at 6.22.5c, 6.23.1c, 6.23.3c; as noted in my Introduction, §2.1.2.4, the *Or.* mss. have no evidential value in this matter), support reading *valagá*°. Cf. ZEHNDER (1999: 118), who describes this word as a "Bezeichnung eines bestimmten Zaubermittels. Valagas scheinen insbesondere vergraben worden zu sein", and compares TS 1.3.2.1, ŚS 19.9.9c. I may add ŚS 10.1.18 (PS 16.36.8) *yāṃ te barhīṣi yāṃ śmaśānē kṣētre kṛtyāṃ valagāṃ vā nicakhnúḥ | agnāu vā tvā gārhapatyē 'bhicerúḥ pákaṃ sántaṃ dhīratarā anāgāsam* 'What [witchcraft] they buried for thee in the *barhīs*, what in the cemetery, [what] witchcraft or secret spell (*valagá*) in the field, or practiced against thee in the householders' fire—they, being wiser, [against thee] who art simple, innocent' (WHITNEY). *kṛtyá*- and *valagá*- are parallel terms also elsewhere, e.g. ŚS 5.31.12ab (PS 1.47.4ab) *kṛtyākṛtaṃ valagīnaṃ mūlīnaṃ śapatheyyaṃ* 'the witchcraft-maker, armed with *valagá*, with roots, practicing curses'. Cf. also GOUDRIAAN 1986: 452f.

### 7.5.10 Only PS

yasyedaṃ bhūm;yāṃ adhi (8)  
 nīkrāntaṃ pāmsure padaṃ | (8)  
 mṛjānas +tanvo yad rapas (8)

tasya snāhi tanū adhi || (8)

He whose foot-step has been impressed in the dusty [soil], here on the earth, wash [yourself], wiping the ailment from [your] body onto his body.

nīkrāntaṃ] **Or**, nīskrāntaṃ **K** pāṃsure] **K**, pāṃsure **Ku Mā Ma**, pāsure **V/126** pa-  
dam || padaṃ | **Or K** mṛjānas] **Ku Mā [Ma]**, (+ *sec. m.* mṛ)Mṛjānas **V/126**, mṛdānas **K**  
+tanvo] tanavo **Or**, tanno **K** yad rapas] **V/126 Mā [Ma]**, yadra{va}pas **Ku**, yadrū(*sec.*  
*m.* → dra)(+ dra)pas **K** [[*note* double correction]] tanū adhi] **Or**, tanūvadhī **K**

**ab.** Cf. ṚV 1.22.17 *idāṃ viṣṇur ví cakrame tredhā ní dadhe padám | sám-  
ūlham asya pāṃsuré* ‘Viṣṇu has trodden here, has three times placed his foot-  
step, protected in the dusty [soil]’ (after OLDENBERG 1909–12/I: 17).

**cd.** Although it does seem possible to follow a different line of interpretation  
(‘wash [your wearer], . . . from [his] body onto that of that [tree]’; cf. stanza 7),  
I assume that the stanza is addressed to the wearer of the amulet: just as the  
golden element is freed of impurities while being smelted, so must its wearer  
become free of afflictions.

On the syntagma *marj + rāpas-*, cf. ṚV 1.34.11c (*nī rāpāṃsi mṛkṣatam*),  
with the comments of PIRART 1995: 69f. The syntagma *tanū adhi* occurs twice  
more: at 6.6.8d above (see my commentary on this pāda for discussion of the  
form *tanū*), and PS 20.41.10 [not in PSK 20.39] *yan me payo viṣiṣice jāgrataḥ  
svapataś ca yat | punas tad adya me devā ā siñcantu tanū adhi* ‘What milk of  
mine has been spilled while I was awake, and while I was sleeping: today let  
the gods pour that back into my body’.

**7.5.11** Only PS ◊ **d**: PS 3.13.5b / ŚS 3.5.5b, 16.28.9b / 8.5.20b, PS 19.25.6b,  
20.58.9b

dūṣyās tvā vadhaṃ vayaṃ (8)  
devasya savituḥ save | (8)  
jīvātave bharāmasi (8)  
mahyā ariṣṭatātaye || (8)

In the furtherance of god Savitar, we wear you, the weapon of spoiling, for  
living, for great safety.

dūṣyās tvā vadhaṃ] **Or**, dūṣātvāvidaṃ **K** vayaṃ] **K**, bhayaṃ **Or** savituḥ] **Or**, savitus  
**K** bharāmasi] **V/126 Mā [Ma]** **K**, bharā{bhi}masi **Ku** mahyā] **K**, majyā **Or**

BHATTACHARYA edits *tvāvadhāṃ bhayaṃ*.

**a.** The text as edited by BHATTACHARYA, on the basis of the *Or.* mss., does  
not yield any sense: *tvā* needs to be separated from *vadhaṃ*, and **K** *vayaṃ* is  
clearly the correct reading. The *Or.* mss. anyhow do frequently confuse *bh* and  
*v* (cf. the instances quoted under 6.9.12a), but in addition, the *Or.* error may  
be due to anticipatory influence from PS 16.30.6b (*kṣudhaṃ sediṃ vadhaṃ  
bhayaṃ*). The **K** reading *tvāvidaṃ* is due to perseveration from stanza 5.

**d.** This common AV pāda is used in contexts dealing with amulets (*deva-maṇī-*, *parṇamaṇī-*) also in the first two mentioned parallels.

### 7.5.12 Only PS

āchedanaḥ pracchedano	(8)
dviṣatas tapano maṇiḥ	(8)
*śatruñjayaḥ sapatnahā	(8)
dviṣantam apa bādhatām    5    <i>anuvāka 1</i>	(8)

[It is] an amulet that cuts off, that rends, that scorches the one who hates [its wearer], that conquers the enemy, that slays the rival: let it drive away the one who hates [its wearer].

āchedanaḥ pracchedano] **V/126 Mā**, āchedanaḥ pracchedano **Ku [Ma] Pa**, āchedanaḥ pratyedano **K** maṇiḥ | \*śatruñjayaḥ] maṇiḥ | śatruñjayaḥ **Or**, maṇiśśatruñjayas **K** apa] **Ku Mā [Ma] K**, a{va}(sec. m. → PA) **V/126** bādhatām] **K**, bādhatām **Or** || 5 || *anuvāka 1* ||] || 5 || a 1 || **Ku**, || 5 || 5 (sec. m. 12) || a 1 || **V/126**, || 5 || 5 || a 1 || **Mā**, Z 5 Z a 1 Z **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *āchedanaḥ pracchedano* and *śatruñjayaḥ*. As was already noted GRIFFITHS 2003b: 13 n. 66, he omits the *anuvāka* colophon.

**a.** Use of the ligature *cch* is extremely rare in the Or. mss. (cf. my Introduction, §2.8 M–N), but the implication from BHATTACHARYA’s apparatus that **Ma** has twice *cche* is confirmed by its sister ms. **Pa**, and the same is found in the less closely related ms. **Ku**. A word *avachedana-* is attested at PS 20.53.8c [PSK 20.49.8] (with *ch* in all my Or. mss. [**JM Pa V/122**]), and *avachedanī-* at PS 20.54.1d [PSK 20.50.1d] (with *ts* in the same mss.) and 2b (with *ch* in **JM**; *ts* in **Pa V/122**), thus without any trace of *cch* in three cases. In accordance with the rules of (internal) sandhi that have been postulated for PS in my Introduction, §2.8 (N), I therefore follow the readings of **Mā** and **V/126** (with *ch*) also here. The words *ā(c)chedana-* and *pra(c)chedana-* are not attested elsewhere as nomina agentis. The latter is attested as a nomen actionis at ṢaḍvB 4.3.3. The former is attested as a nomen actionis at BaudhŚS 20.1:5.13, and in the meaning ‘stubbles’ (cf. CALAND’s index of words, p. 41) at 1.2:2.15, 20.2:7.16. Cf. also ĀpŚS 1.5.5, BhārŚS 1.5.1 *ā(c)chedanī-*.

**b.** Cf. ṚV 2.23.4c *brahmadviṣas tāpanaḥ* and PS 12.21.1 / ŚS 19.28.1 *imám badhnāmi te maṇīm . . . dviṣatás tāpanam hṛdāḥ* || (pāda **d** is also 12.22.13b / 19.30.4b).

**c.** I emend to *śatruñjayaḥ* because the long *ū* transmitted in all mss. may easily have been introduced under the influence of the clear concatenating link with 7.4.8; because compounds with first member inflected in the plural are very rare (AiGr. II/1, §86f); and because other compounds in *śatrumṇ°* are attested (§87aγ): note especially KauśS 56.13 *śatrumjaya-*.

## 7.6. Accompanying the building of a steady dwelling.

This hymn provides a counterpart, unknown from any other mantra collection, to the famous Śālāsūkta (ŚS 3.12 ~ PS 3.20+20.23.3+17.35.7): the treatment of that hymn by BODEWITZ (1977–78) contains complete references to all seven earlier translations, and several other relevant secondary sources. The present hymn is not a parallel in the strict sense — although there are some verbatim agreements — but does deal with the same topic, and in very closely related phraseology. In accordance with RENOUE (1939b: 481f. = 1997: 819f.), the word *śālā-* used at several places in these two Śālāsūktas would point to the building of a common domicile, rather than a rudimentary construction for ritual purposes. This assumption follows from the words of the hymns themselves, and agrees with the application of these and similar (cf. ŚS 9.3 / PS 16.39–41; cf. also PS 1.50) mantras in the Gṛhyasūtras: cf. HirGS 1.27, MānGS 2.11, ĀpMP 2.15 (ĀpGS 7.17), BhārGS 2.3, ĀgnivGS 2.4.1, PārGS 3.4, ŚāṅkhGS 3.2, ĀśvGS 2.8 — below, reference is mostly made only to HirGS. In the light, however, of the allusions to soma-offerings that are possibly present in stanza 7 below, in pāda 5d, as well as in stanzas like ŚS 9.3.19 (quoted below under stanza 6), it seems to me that the possibility of a connection of these types of mantras with huts constructed for ritual purposes only cannot be entirely excluded. Indeed, RENOUE wrote about ŚS 9.3.7 (1939b: 500 = 1997: 838) “que la maison décrite ici est moins une habitation privée qu’une résidence rituelle comportant tous les édifices annexes prévus pour les grands sacrifices”. The Vedic texts describe, in RENOUE’s words (p. 504), “un type de maison extrêmement rudimentaire . . . Rien n’oblige évidemment à considérer que c’était là le type normal d’une résidence privée; aussi bien une partie des traits qui nous aident à la reconstituer sont fournis par la description de “huttes” rituelles dont la destination est toute différente”.

The word *an-amīva-* in 10b concatenates with 7.5.8b *amīva-cātana-*; 5b *ariṣṭa-vīra-* with 7.5.11d *ariṣṭa-tāti-*; *bṛhaspati-* in 6b with 7.5.2a. Throughout, we find a variety of words connected with the root *dhar*, clearly the theme of the hymn.

### 7.6.1 Only PS ◊ d: RV 10.47.8c

satyasya sthūnā pṛthivīm dādihāra-	(11)
-ṛtena devā amṛtam anv avindan	(11)
dhruveṇa tvā haviṣā dhārayām;y	(11)
abhi tad dyāvā pṛthivī gṛṇītām	(11)

The post of reliability steadies the earth; by means of order the gods discovered the nectar. I steady you with a steadfast oblation. Let heaven and earth welcome it.

satyasya] Or, patyasya K pṛthivīm] V/126 Mā [Ma], pṛthivīm Ku, pṛthivī K dādihārartena] dādihārartena Or, dādihāra ṛtena K amṛtam] Or, amṛtām K

dhruveṇa] **K**, dhṛveṇa **Or** haviṣā] **Or**, ha[[*line*]]haviṣā **K** tad] **K**, ta **Or** gr̥ṇītām  
 ||] gr̥ṇītām || **Or**, ghṛṇītām [[*om.*] ||] **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *dādhāra-rtena*.

**ab.** Although it cannot be excluded that *satya-* refers here to reliable steadfastness, it seems more likely that it belongs to the sphere of cosmic ‘Zentralbegriffe’ (LÜDERS 1959): see 2d.

On the consistently present meaning of *dādhāra* in the RV, cf. KÜMMEL (2000: 261): “Deutlich präteritaler Bezug ist niemals vorhanden, das bloße Vorkommen neben eindeutigen Präterita läßt sich wegen des Erzählungsstils der meisten RV-Lieder nicht als Argument verwenden”. The long reduplication syllable of the verb form (on which cf. *ibid.*, n. 388), causes problems for the cadence. Although the sandhi *ahāsata+ṛtasya* straddling the pāda-boundary at 6.11.3cd, and *duhānā+ṛtasya* at 19.52.1ab (cf. GRIFFITHS 2004, item 28) needs to be dissolved, metrical considerations here (admittedly not a strong argument in a persistently irregular composition such as the present hymn) favor the **Or** reading, and speak against dissolution (on this sandhi in Śāradā mss. of the Kaṭha school, see WITZEL 1974a: X).

**cd.** The pronoun *tvā* in the Śālāsūktas consistently refers to the Śālā. The phrase *dhruvéṇa haviṣā dhar* occurs also in the RV hymn 10.173 (cf. PS 19.6.4–9 / ŚS 7.94.1+6.87–88 etc.) for establishing a king in sovereignty. Cf. BODEWITZ’ remarks (1977–78: 64ff.) on the parallelism with the Rājasūya, à propos of ŚS 3.12.6ab (PS 20.23.3ab) *ṛtēna sthūṇām údhi roha vaṃśogró virājann āpa vṛṅkṣva sátrūn* ‘Mount on top of the post in accordance with order, o cross-beam; powerfully reaching out [on both sides], wrench off the enemies’.

Note the degemination *ddy* → *dy* in all **Or.** mss., but not in **K**: cf. my Introduction, §2.8 (O).

### 7.6.2 Only PS

yebhir homair viśvakarmā	(8)
dādhāremām pṛthivīm mātaram naḥ	(11)
tebhiṣ tvā homair iha dhārayām;y	(11)
ṛtam satyam anu carantu homāḥ	(11)

The oblations by means of which Viśvakarman steadies this earth, our mother, with those oblations do I steady you here: [in accordance with] order, in accordance with reliability, let the oblations move.

dādhāremām] **Or**, dadhāremām **K** naḥ ||] **Ku Mā** [Ma] **K**, na{hA}ḥ | **V/126** dhāra-  
 yāmy ṛtam] **Or**, dhārayāmṛcam **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K**

**ab.** On this mythological reference, cf. PS 2.72.3ab *yāṃ viśvakarmā nijaghāna methim antarā dyāvā pṛthivī ubhe* ‘The pillar which Viśvakarman has struck in between heaven and earth’ as well as ŚS 12.1.60ab (PS 17.6.9ab) *yām anvāichad dhaviṣā viśvakarmāntār arṇavé rājasi práviṣṭām* ‘[The earth],

entered into space, in the flood, that Viśvakarman strove for by means of an oblation’.

**d.** It is uncertain how to interpret the syntax of this pāda. *ṛtam* and *satyam* might alternatively be separated from *anu*, and be taken in the adverbial sense that BODEWITZ (1977–78: 66) takes *ṛtena* to have in the preceding stanza. In that case, the verbal compound *anu-car* would invite comparison with the noun *anucaraṇa-* (‘moving along’?) found at KauśS 43.3. The translation of KauśS 43.3–15, where the well-known Śālāsūkta is put to ritual use, as is the last stanza of the present hymn, together with PS 20.23.2, was given the simple caption “Das Bauen einer Wohnung” by CALAND 1900: 147. The interpretation of these rules (and Dār.’s commentary on them), especially 3–4, is partially problematic, and the text of 3 is uncertain (cf. CALAND 1900: 147f., and BLOOMFIELD 1902: 512). CALAND does not hint at BLOOMFIELD’s interesting deliberations (1896a: 12f.) involving the possibility (depending partially on the commentators of the sūtra, partially on emendation of KauśS 43.3) that the rite in question may be specifically a ‘Śyenejyā’. I tentatively read and translate KauśS 43.3: *ati dhanvānīty avasānaniveśanānucaraṇaninayanejyā* ‘The [introductory] (Śyena) worship with alighting (upon the spot where a dwelling is to be built), sitting down upon it, moving along (?) it, and pouring (water) upon it [takes place] to the accompaniment of ŚS 7.41’. But Dār. seems to gloss *anucaraṇam* as *śāntiyudakena samprokṣaṇam*.

### 7.6.3 Only PS

iha dhriyadhvaṃ dharuṇe pṛthivya	(11)
uśatyā mātuḥ subhagāyā upasthe	(12 <sup>T</sup> )
aparāṇuttā mahasā modamānā	(12 <sup>T</sup> )
asmin vāstau suprajaso bhavātha	(11)

Be steady here, on the steady ground of the earth, in the lap of the willing and fortunate mother. Not pushed away, greatly enjoying yourselves, you shall become blessed with offspring in this building.

dharuṇe] **K**, dhaṛṇe **Or** mātuḥ] **Or**, mātus **K** aparāṇuttā] **Or**, aparāṇutvā **K** mahasā] **Or**, sahasā **K** suprajaso] **Or**, suprajāsau **K** ||] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, | **V/126 Mā**

**a.** For *dharuṇe* cf. ŚS 3.12.3a (PS 3.20.3a) *dharuṇy āsi śāle* ‘You are a spacious store, o dwelling’, with BODEWITZ’ notes (1977–78: 61).

**b.** The epithets *uśatī-* and *subhagā-* (cf. GONDA 1959a: 101, 104) are elsewhere applied to Uṣas. Cf. also the related terms applied to the solar cow at PS 6.10.1 above, and ŚS 3.12.2 (PS 3.20.2) *ihāvā dhruvā prāti tiṣṭha śālē śvāvātī gomatī sūnṣṭāvātī | ūrjasvatī ghṛtāvātī pāyasvaty ūc chrayasva mahaté sūbhagāya* ‘Be a steadfast foundation for us, right here, o dwelling, full of horses, of cattle, of liberal gifts; rise up full of vigor, of ghee, of milk, for great fortune’.

**cd.** The formula *māhasā modamāna-*, also in the next stanza, occurs elsewhere only at PS 18.11.3b = ŚS 14.2.43b. The parallelism of the preceding

hemistich with ŚS 3.12.2, where horses and cattle are explicitly mentioned, suggests that it is these (plural) who are addressed in the present stanza as well (and in the first hemistich of the next).

#### 7.6.4 Only PS

suprajaso mahasā modamānā	(11)
varṣman pṛthivyā upari śrayadhvam	(11)
asyai śālāyai śarma yachantu devā	(12 <sup>T</sup> )
dhārābhir enām pṛthivī pipartu	(11)

Blessed with offspring, greatly enjoying yourselves, repose on the top of the earth. Let the gods afford protection to this dwelling, let the earth preserve it with [her] streams [of milk].

suprajaso mahasā] **Or**, suprājasau sahasā **K** varṣman] **K**, variṣman, **Ku Mā Ma**, vari-sm{ī}aṅ **V/126** śrayadhvam] śrayadhvaṃ **Or K** |] **Ku Mā [Ma] K**, || **V/126** yachantu] **Ku V/126 Ma**, yacha **Mā**, yaśchantu **K** [[Bar.: °ccha°] enām] **Ku [Ma] K**, enā(*sec. m. + m*) **V/126**, enā **Mā** pipartu] **K**, piparttu **Or**

**b.** Cf. ŚS 3.4.2c (PS 3.1.2c) *vārṣman rāṣṭrāsya kakūdi śrayasva* ‘[O king], repose on the top of the realm, at the pinnacle’: we have here another phraseological parallel with a mantra aimed at establishing a king in sovereignty (cf. my comments on stanza 1).

**d.** Cf. TS 1.6.5.1 (etc.) *urúdhārā pṛthivī yajñé asmín* ‘Broad-streamed [be] the earth during this worship’. The qualification *urúdhārā-* is used of (metaphorical) cows yielding milk in broad streams, besides at RV 9.69.1, at RV 8.1.10cd *índraṃ dhenúṃ sudúghām ányām ísam urúdhārām araṃkṛtam* ‘[I call] Indra, the well-providing milk cow, the undiminishing [cow of] life, whose [milk] streams are broad, who makes [everything] right’ and 8.93.3 *sá na índraḥ śívāḥ sákhāsāvavad gómad yávamat | urúdhāreva dohate* ‘He, our gracious partner Indra, shall provide [wealth] consisting in horses, cows and barley, like a broad-streamed [cow]’. The word *dhārā-* seems to refer paronomastically to the Leitmotiv of this hymn, the root *dhar*.

#### 7.6.5 Only PS ◊ **b**: PS 3.20.1d; cf. ŚS 3.12.1d, HirGS 1.27.2d

imām śālām śreṣṭhatamām vasūnām	(11)
ariṣṭavīrā abhi +saṃ carema	(11)
dṛḍhā asyā upamito bhavantu	(11)
sthīrā vīrā upasado bhavantu	(11)

May we, with unharmed sons, move together towards this dwelling, the ‘most richest’ of goods. Let its props be steady, let the males that approach it reverently be solid.

śreṣṭhatamām] **Or**, śraiṣṭhyatamaṃ **K** vasūnām ariṣṭavīrā abhi] **Or**, vasānām ariṣṭavīrā abhi **K** +saṃ carema] sañcarema **Or K** dṛḍhā asyā upamito] dṛḥhā asyā upamito **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, dṛḥhā asyā up{i}amito **Mā**, dṛḥhātapasito **K**

**ab.** Cf. ŚS 3.12.1cd *tām tvā śāle sárvaṅvīrāḥ suvīrā áriṣṭavīrā úpa sám carema* ‘You, being so, do we, with all males, with good males, with uninjured males, approach, o dwelling’. On the meaning of *áriṣṭavīrā-* in this context, cf. BODEWITZ 1977–78: 61. HirGS and the other Black YV Gṛhyasūtras read *anu sám carema*, while PS at 3.20.1d has *abhi*, as we also find here and in stanza 9 below.

**c.** If SCARLATA (1999: 385), à propos of the root-compound *upamít-* ‘prop’, meant to include the whole of Vedic literature when stating that a syntagma *úpa-may* ‘to erect’ is not attested, he was wrong: cf. i.a. KS 25.8 / KapKS 40.1 (3×). As is suggested by the parallelism between KS 25.8:114.14 *divo vā viṣṇa uta vā pṛthivyā iti dakṣiṇasya havirdhānasya methīm upa minoti* and ĀpŚS 11.7.3 *divo vā viṣṇav ity adhvaryur dakṣiṇasya havirdhānasya dakṣiṇam karṇātardam anu methīm nihanti* ‘with the words “Either from the sky, o Viṣṇu, or . . .” he rams down the post at the right *karṇātarda* (cf. RAU 1983a: 23 n. 21) of the southern havirdhāna-cart’, *upa-may* probably means the same as *ni-han* (cf. also ĀpŚS 14.33.5).

**d.** BODEWITZ (1977–78: 67), following BLOOMFIELD (1897: 347), compares the parallel ŚS 3.12.6c (PS 20.23.3c) *má te riṣann upasattáro gṛhānām śāle* with ŚS 2.6.2c *má te riṣann upasattáro agne*: “The parallel proves that *upasattṛ* does not just denote the inmates of the house, but “they that approach thee reverently” (Bloomfield)”. BODEWITZ gives no other explanation than that the house “is deified (*mānasya patnī*)”. *upasattṛ-* in the quoted parallel indeed suggests that the pāda was at some stage or at some level of interpretation thought to contain a nomen agentis: SCARLATA does not hint (1999: 562f.) at the possibility of *upasád-* in that sense, but it is known from ŚS 6.142.3 / PS 20.49.4, 15.3.10–11 / 18.29.1. In view of the allusions to soma rituals also elsewhere in this hymn (7b), and in other Śālāsūktas, and in view of the passage KS 29.2:170.2 *vīryam vā upasadaḥ*, the present pāda could also be given a second interpretation: ‘let the Upasads be steadfast males’. It remains unclear why BHATTACHARYA has underlined *sthīrā vīrā*.

#### 7.6.6 ŚS 3.12.4 / PS 3.20.4

imāṃ śālāṃ savitā vāyur indro	(11)
bṛhaspatir ni minotu prajānan	(11)
*ukṣantūdnā maruto gṛtēna	(11)
bhago no rājā ni kṛṣiṃ dadhātu	(11)

Let Savitar, let Vāyu, let Indra, let the foreknowing Bṛhaspati fix this dwelling down. Let the Maruts sprinkle [it] with water, with ghee. Let king Bhaga place our crops down [in it].

indro] **K**, agnir **Or** bṛhaspatir ni minotu] **Or**, vṛhaspatinnimnotu **K** \*ukṣantūdnā] ukṣantūdnā **Ku V/126 Mā**, ukṣantū(dnā → )dhnā **Ma Pa**, ukṣamtūrṇā **K** maruto] **K**, marṭo **Or** bhago] **K**, somo **Or** kṛṣiṃ dadhātu] **Ku [Ma]**, kṛṣindadhātu **V/126**, kṛṣiṃndadhātu **Mā**, kṛṣam dadātu **K**

ŚS 3.12.4 / PS 3.20.4

imām śālām savitā vāyur indro bḥaspátir [agnis tvaṣṭā hotā PS] ní minotu prajānán |  
 +ukṣántūdnā marúto ghṛténa bhágo no rájā ní kṣīm tanotu ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *vāyur agnir*, *ukṣantūdhnā* and *somo no rájā*.

**ab.** Cf. BODEWITZ (1977–78: 62): “Among the gods who should fix the *śālā* (i. e. the central post of the *śālā*) Savitr is mentioned first. This may imply that one rams down the post *devasya savituh prasave*”. And regarding Vāyu, BODEWITZ rightly observes (p. 63) that he “belongs to the *antarikṣa*, the space between heaven and earth, produced by the raising of heaven along the *axis mundi* in the cosmogony, which is repeated in the construction of a house”. BODEWITZ further explains: “Bṛhaspati (here called *prajānant*) fixes the (central post of the) house on account of his association with the mantras recited . . . . Bṛhaspati . . . symbolizes the recitation of the consecratory formula (*brahman*)”, and refers to ŚS 9.3.19 *bráhmaṇā śālām nímitām kavíbhír nímitām mitām | indrāgní rakṣatām śālām amṛtau somyám sádaḥ* ‘This dwelling fixed down with a formula, fixed down by poets, fixed — let the immortal Indra and Agni protect this dwelling, the seat for soma’. This last stanza mentions the dual deity Indrāgnī, of whom the former god concludes the list in ŚS 3.12.4a, where BODEWITZ explains: “Indra should fix the central post of the *śālā*, since he is associated with the cosmic pillar (cf. the Indradhvaja)”. **K** here agrees with the ŚS reading, while the Or. mss. read *agnir* (cf. *agnis* in all PS mss. at 3.20.4a): I suggest this Or. reading here is due to perseveration from the many other cases of the sequence *vāyur agnir* in PS (e.g. 1.18.1c, 2.73.2c, 3.20.4, 10.6.11a, 19.1.12c, 19.10.7b). With the assumption that **K**, reading *indro*, has preserved the correct text here, BHATTACHARYA’s deliberations in his Introduction, p. xlv (also 1989: 137) lose another piece of support. Cf. my commentary on pāda **d** below.

**c.** Regarding the text of ŚS 3.12.4c, cf. W-L: “In **c** it [PSK] begins with the true reading *ukṣantu*; this is so naturally suggested as emendation of the *uchāntu* of the mss. that all the translators assume it (. . .); *ukṣāntu* is also read by the comm., and by two or three of SPP’s mss. that follow him; and SPP. very properly admits it into his text. SPP. also reads after it *udnā*, with the comm., but against all his mss. [except the çrotriya **K**]; there is no instance where *udnā* and *udnās* are correctly read in any of them (here, our Bp.O.OP. have *utnā*, P.M. *utvā*, the rest *\*unnā*: our edition gives *unnā*, and . . . it was corrected in the *Index Verborum* [under *udán*.]) . . . [\* E.H.D.K.Kp and Ppp. have *unnā*; I. has *uttā*; W. has *-tu tvā*.]”.

At PS 3.20.4c, which corresponds to ŚS 3.12.4c, BHATTACHARYA adopts *ukṣantūdhnā* from the Or. mss., without underlining. **K** there reads *ukṣamtūnā*; in view of the frequent confusion *r* :: *d* in **K**, its reading *ukṣamtūrṇā* here may be said to point to °*ūdnā*, as it reads also at PS 2.33.1 (for **Or** *udhnā*), where ZEHNDER edits °*ūdhnā*, the only (somewhat certain) attestation of the instr. sg. of *ūdhar-* ‘udder’ in Vedic. A glance at the passages with active forms

of the verb-stem *ukṣa-* found in ṚV and AV collected by KIEHNLE (1979: 141f.) does not show any instrumentals of body parts in combination with the verb in question, while (p. 147f.) there are several cases where we find instrumentals of fluids. Further, assumption of an instr. of *udán-* is supported by ṚV 1.85.5d (*marútaḥ*) *udábhīr vy àndanti bhúma* ‘The Maruts drench the earth with waters’ (BLOOMFIELD 1897: 345). I therefore propose to follow here and at 3.20.4 — with partial support from the **K** readings at both places — the text adopted by WHITNEY from Sāyaṇa for ŚS 3.12.4. I further assume that **K** *udnā* at 2.33.1 is either correct, or (if incorrect) a phonetic error, or an anticipation of the present stanza; that **Or** *udhnā* there is probably a small phonetic error for *ūdhnā*, and that that reading has influenced the ms. readings at 3.20.4 and here through perseveration (the **Ma** reading *ante correctionem* may be due to chance). Regarding the meaning of *ukṣantūdā*, I follow KIEHNLE 1979: 162f.

**d.** Contrary to BHATTACHARYA (Introduction, p. xlv and 1989: 137), I assume again that **K** (*bhago*, as in ŚS 3.12.4d) has preserved the correct text here, because the **Or.** reading *somo* can be explained as a case of perseveration from the many cases of *somo rājā* in PS (e.g. 1.92.3c, 1.108.1c, 2.80.4b, 5.26.6a etc.), while there are only two cases of the sequence *bhago rājā* besides the one at 3.20.4d (viz. 1.50.3b, 18.6.7d; on PS 19.33.1b, see GRIFFITHS 2004, item 40).

BODEWITZ (p. 63) suggests this verse refers not “to the consecration or building of the house (one might think of sprinkling water on the floor and ploughing the site of the house), but to the future: May enough rain fall down near the house for the cultivation of the crops”. The parallel ŚS 3.12.4d / PS 3.20.4d reads *ní kṛṣīm tanotu*, on which see BODEWITZ. Cf. my note on 6.9.10b regarding a different meaning of *kṛṣí-*, and 6.18.8a for the one adopted here.

**7.6.7** Only PS ◊ **cd**: cf. ŚS 3.12.3cd+7ab / PS 3.20.3ab+6ab, PārGS 3.4.4 etc.

mānasya patni haviṣo juṣasva	(11)
tīvrāntasya bahulamadhyamasya	(11)
ā tvā śísūr +vāśyatām ā kumāra	(11)
ā +vāśyantām dhenavo nityavatsāḥ	(11)

O mistress of the building, enjoy the oblation that is sharp at the end and thick in the middle. Let the young (animal) bellow at you, at [you] the boy, let [our] cows, always being with calves, bellow at you.

patni] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, patn{ṭ}i **Ku** śísūr] **Or**, śásīr **K** +vāśyatām] vāśyatām **Or**, vādhyatām **K** +vāśyantām] vāśyantām **Or**, vābhyantām **K** nityavatsāḥ] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, nityavachāḥ **V/126 Mā** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *vāśyatām* and *vāśyantām*.

**a.** The expression *mānasya pátnī-* (cf. BLOOMFIELD 1897: 346) occurs, besides in stanza 9 below, also at PS 1.50.3, 3.20.5 (ŚS 3.12.5 etc.), 16.39.4+6+9 (9.3.5+6+9), 16.40.8 (9.3.21). On the meaning of *māna-*, cf. my notes under 6.11.3a above.

**b.** These words are known elsewhere only to qualify a specific kind of oblation, viz. an oblation of soma. See AB 2.20.15 (ĀśvŚS 5.1.15, 17, cf. ŚāṅkhŚS 6.7.10) *tāsv adhvaryo indrāya somaṃ sotā madhumantam | vṛṣṭivanim tivrāntam bahuramadhyam vasumate . . . | yasyendraḥ pītvā vṛtrāṇi jaṅghanat* ‘In these [waters], o Adhvaryu, you will press for Indra with the Vasus, . . . , the honeyed soma, that wins rain, that is sharp at the end, thick in the middle, having taken a drink of which Indra shall slay the resistances’; ṚVKh 5.7.4p . . . *āpād indraḥ sōmaṃ gāvāśīraṃ yāvāśīraṃ tivrāntam* <sup>+</sup>*bahulāmadyam*<sup>42</sup> . . . ‘Indra has drunk the soma mixed with cows, mixed with barley, sharp at the end, thick in the middle’. A certain interpretation of the words ‘sharp at the end’ and ‘thick in the middle’ (conversely ‘thick at the ends’: ṚV 10.42.8b *tivrāḥ sōmā bahulāntāsaḥ*) is not available: cf. OLDENBERG 1912: 247 and KEITH 1920: 149 n. 7; also JB 2.151.

**cd.** Whether the words *śīśu-* and *kumāra-* have been interpreted correctly as referring respectively to an animal and a human child remains uncertain.

The slight emendation to two forms from *ā-vās* ‘to bellow at’, proposed by BHATTACHARYA in his apparatus (and accepted by KULIKOV 2001: 270), are adopted here as well: the **K** reading <sup>o</sup>*dhya*<sup>o</sup> (hence <sup>o</sup>*bhya*<sup>o</sup>) can easily be explained graphically as representing underlying <sup>o</sup>*śya*<sup>o</sup>, and we may compare the variant readings for *vāśītā-*, occurring several times in PS 6.10.

Henk Bodewitz has proposed to me the at first sight very attractive conjectures *veśyatām/veśyantām*. The edited text, though arguably not impossible from the point of view of the sense, lacks the support of compositional unity (a strong factor in this hymn) that the conjecture of two pass. caus. (cf. KULIKOV 2001: 591) forms would receive so beautifully from *svāveśa-* and *ā veśaya* in stanza 10 below. The conjecture of forms from *ā-veś* could, moreover, be nicely supported with reference to ŚS 3.12.3cd *ā tvā vatsó gamed ā kumārā ā dhenávaḥ sāyám āsyāndamānāḥ* ‘May the calf come to you, to [you] the boy, to [you] the milk cows, streaming in at nightfall’ and 3.12.7ab (PS 3.20.6ab) *émām kumārás táruṇa ā vatsó jágatā sahá (. . . aguḥ/ayat)* ‘to it a tender boy, to [it] a calf, in the company of [other] moving creatures, [have/shall come]’. The unanimous *ā* (for *e*) of the mss. could then be argued to have arisen due to influence of such passages as 5.31.1c *upa vatsam srjata vāśyate gauḥ*. But it must be admitted that there are at least two strong arguments in favor of the authenticity of the text with *ā-vās* that the mss. point to. While at PārGS 3.4.4c *ā tvā śīśur ā krandatv ā gāvo dhenavo vāśyamānāḥ* ‘Let the young cry to you, to [you] the bellowing cows’, *krandatu* might, in view of the evidence above, perhaps still be taken as a candidate for emendation to *krāmatu*, the following passage from the PS Śālāsūkta 3.20, corresponding to ŚS 3.12.3cd as quoted above, cannot — it seems — be explained away: 3.20.3cd *ā tvā vatso* <sup>+</sup>*māmayad ā kumāra ā dhenavaḥ sāyam ā* <sup>+</sup>*syādamānāḥ* ‘The calf shall low to you, to [you] the boy,

<sup>42</sup> Text after MINKOWSKI 1991: 228, except that the impossible accentuation *bahulamādhyam* accepted by MINKOWSKI has been emended.

to [you] the milk cows ...’. It seems that the editors of PS have consciously replaced hypothetically ‘original’ (cf. my Introduction, §2.7) verbs of ‘arriving’ (*ā-veś*, *ā-gam*) by verbs of ‘lowing’ (*ā-vāś*, *ā-mā*). That they were not the only ones to have preferred such recasting is clear from the quoted PārGS mantra.

### 7.6.8 Only PS

ḍṛḍhās te sthūṇā bhavantu bhūmyām adhi	(13)
ḍṛḍhāḥ pakṣāsas tava devi śāle	(11)
sthiravīrā <sub>a</sub> namitrā na edhi	(11)
śarma no yacha dvipade catuṣpade	(12)

Let your posts become steady on the earth, steady your wings, o goddess dwelling. For us be possessed of solid males, and free of enemies. Afford protection to our biped and quadruped [moving creatures].

ḍṛḍhās] **K**, ḍṛḥās **Or** bhūmyām] **Ku V/126 [Ma] K**, {·}bhūmyām **Mā** ḍṛḍhāḥ] **K** [[note °ḥ p°], ḍṛḥāḥ **Or** sthiravīrānamitrā] **Ku Mā [Ma]**, sthiravīrāna(*sec. m. + ·*)mitrā **V/126**, sthiravīrā annasitā **K** na edhi] **K**, na ehi **Mā [Ma]**, ne(*sec. m. → na e #*)hi **Ku**, na e(*sec. m. → ne*)hi **V/126** yacha] **Or**, yaścha **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *ehi*.

**ab.** Cf. the mantra — not traceable in any known Saṁhitā — at KauśS 135.9 (WEBER 1858: 409 nr. 13) *aṣṭasthūṇo daśapakṣo yadṛchajo vanaspate* ‘Mit acht Säulen, zehn Seitenflügeln, freigewachsen, *Vanaspati!*’. Cf. on *pakṣá-* further ŚS 3.7.3ab / PS 3.2.3ab *adó yád avarócate cátuṣpakṣam iva chadhī* ‘(The horn) that glistens yonder like a roof with four wings (sides)’ (BLOOMFIELD 1897: 15); ŚS 9.3.4 / PS 16.39.5 *vaṁśánāṁ te náhanānāṁ prāṇāhásya tṛṇasya ca | pakṣáṇāṁ vísvavāre te naddhāni ví cṛtāmasi* ‘From thy beams, thy bolts, thy frame, and thy thatch; from thy sides, (O house) abounding in treasures, do we loosen the fastenings’ (BLOOMFIELD 1897: 194); and ŚS 9.3.21 / PS 16.40.8 *yá dvípakṣā cátuṣpakṣā śátpakṣā yá nimīyáte | aṣṭápakṣāṁ dáśapakṣāṁ śálāṁ mánasya pátnīm agnír gárbha ivá śaye* ‘In the house which is built with two facades, four facades, six facades; in the house with eight facades, with ten facades, in the ‘mistress of dwelling’, Agni rests as if in the womb’ (BLOOMFIELD 1897: 195). Cf. also *pákṣas-* at VSM 29.5. The meaning of the word *pakṣá-* is not clear in any of these contexts, cf. BLOOMFIELD 1897: 597, 599. Cf. also RENO 1939b: 500 = 1997: 838.

**cd.** BHATTACHARYA follows the Or. mss. against *edhi* as I read here with **K**. I do not see any parallels for such an ostensible request directed at the ‘goddess dwelling’ to ‘come hither’: other goods and blessings are asked to come to the dwelling. We find *na edhi* in all mss. in stanza 10b below. I suppose that the Or. reading *na ehi* here is due to perseveration from 1.73.1d, 1.97.1d, 4.32.5d, etc. *jagate* is to be supplied from 9b.

**7.6.9** Only PS ◊ **b**: ŚS 3.12.5c / PS 3.20.5c, HirGS 1.27.8c etc.

śālā devī gārhapatyāya cākḷpe	(12)
tṛṇaṃ vasānā jagate suśevā	(11)
sthirāṅgāṃ tvā sthirapūruṣāṃ mānasya patni	( )
*sthirāṃ tvā vīrā abhi saṃ carema	(11)

The goddess dwelling has been arranged for householdership, dressed in grass, very kind to moving creatures. May we as males move together towards solid you, who have solid limbs, you who provide solid men, o mistress of the building.

gārhapatyāya] **Or**, gārhapatyāya **K** cākḷpe] cākḷpe **Ku RM [Ma] Pa**, cākḷpe **JM V/126**, cākape **Mā**, cakḷpe **K** tṛṇaṃ] **Or**, *thus* also **K** [[Bar.: tṛṇaṃ]] jagate] **Or**, jagatī **K** suśevā] suśevā **Ku**, susevā **V/126 Mā Ma**, ṣusevā **K** sthirāṅgāṃ] **K** [[Bar.: °ṅgāṃ]], sthirāṅgāṃ **Or** sthirapūruṣāṃ mānasya] sthirapūruṣāṃ mānasya **Ku [Ma]**, sthirapūruṣāṃ mānasya **V/126 Mā**, sthirapauruṣānasya **K** patni] **Or**, pattriḥ **K** [[*note* °ḥ sthi°]] \*sthirāṃ tvā vīrā] sthirā tvā vīrā **Ku RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, sthirāvīrā **JM saṃ carema] V/126 Mā [Ma]**, saṅcarema **Ku K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *sthirā tvā*.

**ab.** The akṣara that appears to be *kl̥* is (just like in Devanāgarī) probably the normal way to represent *kl̥* in the Oriya script, and the other ms. readings (except **Mā**) also all point to (locally) current pronunciations of the akṣara in question. The **Ku** reading *suśevā* (cf. my Introduction, §2.1.2.4 on *ṣ*) is enough to remove the asterisk marked on *suśevā* by BHATTACHARYA. Cf. ŚS 3.12.5c (PS 3.20.5c etc.) *tṛṇaṃ vāsānā sumānā asas tvām* ‘dressed in grass you shall be of good intentions’; on the use of grass as building material, cf. also ŚS 9.3.4b (PS 16.39.5) quoted under the preceding stanza, ŚS 9.3.17 *tṛṇair āvṛtā*, and RENO 1939b: 500 = 1997: 838.

**c.** Removal of *tvā* and *mānasya patni* would render the pāda metrical.

**d.** It seems that the feminine gender of the word *śālā-* has played a role in the repeated emphasis on male (humans and animals) flocking to it (her). The reading *sthirā tvā*, to which all mss. clearly point, yields no sense. Neither the emendation *sthirās tvā*, nor the emendation *sthirāṃ tvā* adopted here, is entirely satisfactory, because the simplex *vīrāḥ* remains somewhat incongruous, as comparison with 5b *ariṣṭavīrā abhi +saṃ carema* suggests. Should we consider a far-reaching conjecture like *sthirāṅgavīrā*? The sequence *sthirā vīrā* may have been transposed from 5d *sthirā vīrā upasado bhavantu*, although intervening *tvā* would seem to make this explanation less likely.

**7.6.10** Cf. RV 7.54.1, MS 1.5.13:82.13, TS 3.4.10.1 etc. ◊ quoted KauśS 43.13

vāstoṣ pate prati jānīḥ,y asmān	(11)
s <sub>u</sub> vāveśo anamīvo na edhi	(11)
+yat tvemahe prati nas taj juṣasva	(11)
catuṣpado dvipada ā veśayeha    6	(12 <sup>T</sup> )

O lord of the building, admit us; to us be of good entrance and free of afflictions. Take pleasure in this, on our behalf, what we ask of you: let the biped and the quadruped [moving creatures] enter here.

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 [Ma]**, prati-  
nastvaj **Ku**, pratinasaj **Mā**, pṛtanastaj **K** dvipada ā] **Or**, dvipadā **K** veśayeha] **Ku**  
**Mā [Ma]**, {vi}veśayeha **V/126**, veṣ́̄ eha **K** || 6 ||] || १ 10 || 6 || **Ku**, || 6 || १ 10 || **V/126**,  
|| 6 || १ || 10 || **Mā**, Z 1 Z **K**

**RV 7.54.1 etc.**

vāstoṣ pate prāti jānīhy asmān svāveśó anamīvo bhavā naḥ |  
yát tvémahe prāti tán no juṣasva śám no bhava dvipáde śám cátuṣpade ||

The stanza is found with a few small variants in the RV, but is quoted in this Paippalāda version at KauśS 43.13 (cf. GRIFFITHS 2004, item 13).

## 7.7. For protection: with darbha.

This hymn, unique to PS, provides a valuable addition to the small store of AV hymns dedicated to the employment of the grass called *darbhá-*: e.g. PS 11.12–13, 12.21–22 (gathered together in ŚS as 19.28–30 and 32–33), ŚS 6.43 / PS 19.33.7–10. For further information on this type of grass, cf. GONDA 1985. Repeated references are made (in stanzas 7–8, implicitly also in 3) to ‘burning off’ of evil creatures and afflictions, and emphasis is given to the bright (5), fiery (6, 10) nature of the grass in this context: cf. GONDA, pp. 53 (n. 15), 55, etc. The hymn’s last two mantras are found employed in an expiation ceremony for one whose barhis grass catches fire before completion of the ritual (*yasyāsamāpte karmaṇi barhir ādīpyeta*) at AthPrāy 2.5 and AVParīś 37.5. However, in view of stanza 8, it seems unlikely that this expiation ceremony represents the original application of the hymn.

The word *amīva-* in 3c and 8d concludes the concatenating link that started with *amīva-cātana-* in 7.5.8b and continued with *an-amīva-* in 10b of the preceding hymn.

**7.7.1** Only PS ◊ **ab**: PS 15.22.10ab ◊ **cd**: 7cd, cf. ŚS 2.4.2cd / PS 2.11.2cd ◊ **d**: 5d, 10d, 11.3.5b (ŚS 19.34.5b)

darbho agra oṣadhīnām	(8)
śatakāṇḍo ajāyata	(8)
sa sahasravīryaḥ	(7)
pari ṇaḥ pātu viśvataḥ	(8)

The hundred-jointed *darbha* was born at the head of plants. Let it, having a thousand powers, protect us from all sides.

darbho agra] **Or**, darbhogra **K** ajāyata] **K**, 'jāyata **Or** sa sahasravīryaḥ] **Or**, sahasravīryaḥ **K** ṇaḥ] **Or**, ṇaḥ **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K**

**ab**. These pādas occur identically at PS 15.22.10. At PS 5.25.3a, BHATTACHARYA follows his *Or.* mss. and reads <sup>+</sup>*agresy oṣadhīnām*; **K** there reads *agrehy oṣadhīnām*; ŚS 4.19.3a reads *ágram eṣy oṣadhīnām*; LUBOTSKY edits *agre 'sy oṣadhīnām*. We may also compare PS 7.19.10c below (*jajñānam agre vṛkṣānām*) besides 20.23.6c *agre vṛkṣasya jāyase*. The meaning is nicely glossed by PS 11.12.10ab / ŚS 19.32.10ab *sapatnahá śatákāṇḍaḥ sáhasvān oṣadhīnām prathamáḥ sám babhūva* ‘Rival-slaying, hundred-jointed, powerful, came into being the first of plants’ (WHITNEY).

On the word *śatakāṇḍa-*, cf. ŚS 2.7.3cd *téna sahásrakāṇḍena pári ṇaḥ páhi viśvataḥ*, PS 11.12.1 / ŚS 19.32.1 *śatákāṇḍo duścyavanáḥ sahásraparṇa uttiráḥ | darbho yá ugrá oṣadhī́s tám te badhnāmy áyuṣe* ‘Hundred-jointed, hard to be stirred, thousand-leaved, uplifting (?) — the *darbhá* that is a formidable herb, that I bind on thee in order to [prolonged] life-time’ (WHITNEY). Further 11.13.1a / 19.33.1a; the only other place outside of Atharvavedic literature where this epithet of the *darbha* plant is found in a *saṃbhāra* list at

VādhŚS 1.4.1.2, followed at 1.4.2.12 [ed. CHAUBEY 1.11.2, 1.12.11] by *darbhaṃ śatakāṇḍam idhmam upanahyati* ‘he binds together hundred-jointed *darbha* as fuel’.

c. This is a hypometrical variant of a formulaic type of pāda, always combined with *pāri ṇaḥ pātu viśvataḥ* in the next pāda, that occurs without metrical flaw as ŚS 2.4.2c / 2.11.2c *maṇāḥ sahasravīryaḥ*, and as *darbhaḥ sahasravīryaḥ* in 7c below.

d. PS 11.12.10cd / ŚS 19.32.10cd *sá no ’yám darbháḥ pári pātu viśvátas téna sākṣīya pṛtanāḥ pṛtanatáḥ* ‘let that *darbhá* here protect us all about; by it may I overpower fighters, them that fight [against me]’ (WHITNEY).

### 7.7.2 Only PS ◊ d: 4d, 10.12.8d

yathā darbho jāyamānas	(8)
tvacam bhinatti bhūmyāḥ	(8)
evā sa bhidyatāṃ jano	(8)
yo naḥ pāpaṃ cikitsati	(8)

Just as the *darbha*, when it is born, splits the skin of the earth, so let that man be split, who is intent on evil against us.

darbho] **Ku Mā** [Ma], {Ga}darbho **V/126**, bharbho **K** jāyamānas] **Or**, ajāyamānas **K** bhinatti] **Ku Mā** [Ma], bhin{·}atti **V/126**, bhinantya **K** bhūmyāḥ |] **Or**, bhūmyām | **K** sa] **Ku** [Ma], ma **V/126 Mā**, sya **K** yo naḥ] [Ma], yo{JA}naḥ **Ku**, yona **V/126**, y(o ···) **Mā**, yonaḥ **K** [note °ḥ p°]

**abc.** On the theme of skin-splitting employed here, cf. PS 2.39.3a, 2.84.10a, 16.6.4a (ŚS 8.3.4, RV 10.87.5), RV 10.68.4cd, and especially PS 12.21.4 / ŚS 19.28.4 *bhīnddhī darbha sapātnānāṃ hṛdayaṃ dviśatām maṇe | udyān tvācam iva bhūmyāḥ śīra eṣām ví pātaya* ‘Split, o *darbhá*, the heart of our rivals, of our haters, o amulet, [you who split,] as it were, the skin of the earth, while you rise; make their head fly apart’.

**d.** The root *cet* seems elsewhere to be connected with *pāpa-* only in the nominal compound *pāpacéetas-* (with wrong accent!), which occurs in Vedic at RVKh 4.5.30. Close to that stanza, we also read 4.5.38–39 (with emended accentuation) *yáthā + vidyúddhato vṛkṣá á múlād + anuśúṣyati | evám sá práti śuṣyatu yó me pāpám + cikīrṣati || yáthā prátihitā bhūtvá tám evá práti dhāvati | pāpám tám evá dhāvatu yó me pāpám + cikīrṣati* ‘Just as a tree that has been struck by lightning withers down to the root, so let him, who tries to do evil against me, dry up in return. Just as [the arrow], having become placed against [the bow-string] speeds against that very [bow-string], so let the evil speed against him who tries to do evil against me’. Obviously, our *pāpaṃ cikitsati* (thus also in PS 10.12.8d) must mean more or less the same as *pāpám + cikīrṣati* does here.

**7.7.3** Only PS ◊ d: RV 1.191.8d, PS 1.99.1d, 2.4.5d / ŚS 2.14.3d etc.

apa nādam apa kṛtyām	(8)
apa rakṣaḥ sadān <sub>u</sub> vāḥ	(8)
amīvāś cātayāmasi	(8)
sarvāś ca yātudhān <sub>y</sub> yaḥ	(8)

Off [we burn] the reed, off the witchcraft, off the demon, [off] the Sadānūvās. We cause afflictions and all sorceresses to go into hiding.

nādam] nāram **Or**, nātram **K** rakṣaḥ sadān<sub>u</sub>vāḥ |] **Or**, rakṣasyadhānvā | **K** cātayāmasi sarvāś] **Or**, c(ĀTAY...SA)rv(ĀM)ś **K** [[Bar.: c\*\*\*\*\*sarvāmś]] yātudhānyah ||] **Mā** [**Ma**], yātudhān<sub>u</sub>vāḥ ||] **Ku V/126**, yātudhānaḥ(→ nyaḥ) [[om.]] **K**

**ab.** Somewhat similar is the mantra VSM 35.11ab = VSK 35.4.10 *āpāghām āpa kīlbiṣam āpa kṛtyām āpo rāpaḥ | āpāmārga tvām asmād āpa duḥṣvāpnyam śuva* ‘Off the evil, off the transgression, off the witchcraft, off the disease, off from us, o Apāmārga, you must force the nightmare’. Another verb is found at PS 1.99.1 *apochantī duṣvapnyam apa durhārdam \*uchatam | apoṣtam sarvaṃ kṣetriyaṃ sarvāś ca yātudhānyah* ‘You two [stars] who shine away nightmare, shine away the evil-hearted one: shone away is all the Kṣetriya (disease), and [shone away are] all sorceresses’. Yet another verb is compounded with the preverb *āpa* at the important parallel PS 11.3.3 (ŚS 19.34.3 [corrupt]) *arasaṃ kṛtrimaṃ nādam arasāḥ sapta visrasaḥ | apeto jaṅgiḍāmatim iṣum asteva sādahaya* ‘(May the Jaṅgiḍa make) the fashioned reed sapless (non-poisonous), the seven debilities sapless. Send straight way from here, o Jaṅgiḍa, the thoughtlessness, as an archer an arrow’. It appears that a *nāda-* may have been a poisoned arrow or a blow-pipe, made out of reed (*nāda-*), although I know of no textual evidence which can confirm this idea, suggested to me by Elizabeth Tucker. Cf. also the *āṅgirasī* (CALAND 1910: 14 “zu einer unheiligen Handlung (Behexung) gebraucht”) plant *nāḍā-* listed VaitS 5.10. *apa-cat* does not exist, and it seems to me that the verb to be supplied in these pādas, rather than <sup>2</sup>*sav*<sup>i</sup>, <sup>2</sup>*vas* or *sedh*, is *dah*: cf. stanzas 8–9 below.

**c.** Cf. 7.5.8ab above (*devo maṇiḥ sapatnahā rakṣohāmīvacātanaḥ*) and PS 11.3.9cd / ŚS 19.34.9cd *āmīvāḥ sūrvāś cātāyañ jahí rākṣāṃsy oṣadhe*.

**7.7.4** Only PS ◊ d: 2d, 10.12.8d

asti vai nivata <sub>u</sub> udvanam	(8)
na vai sarvam anuplavam	(8)
asi tvam tasya dūṣaṇo	(8)
yo naḥ pāpaṃ cikitsati	(8)

There is [always] a rising from the lowland; all is not a [smoothly] floating along. You are spoiler of him who is intent on evil against us.

asti] **Or**, asthi **K** udvanam] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], dvanam **Mā**, udvalam **K** anuplavam |] anuplavam | **Ku** [[sic], anupravam | **V/126** **Mā** [**Ma**], anuplavam | **K** naḥ pāpaṃ] **Or**, thus also **K** [[note °ḥ p°]]

BHATTACHARYA reads *anupravam*.

**a.** The pāda is hypermetric in BHATTACHARYA’s edition and could be regularized by deleting *vai* (as an intrusion from pāda **b**), but *asti vai* is a stock stanza-opening in PS (2.58.6, 17.11.4ab, 20.56.2 [PSK 20.52.3]), and I therefore prefer to apply secondary sandhi (cf. my Introduction, §4.3).

Cf. NEISSER 1913: 152–156 = 1980: 251–255 on *nivāt-*, *udvāt* etc., e.g., RV 10.142.4a *yād udvāto nivāto yāsi*. At RVKh 3.15.10, *údvana-* belongs with the root *van* ‘to love’, and cannot be connected with the word occurring in our pāda. The form *udvana-* can be an adjective (KS 25.4:107.6f. = 29.8:176.17f., KapKS 39.1:213.6f. [2:249.8f.] *dakṣiṇata udvanāṃ kuryād | devayajanasya rūpaṃ | rakṣasām apahatyai* ‘He should make [her (the earth)] rising to the South. [That is] the shape of the sacrificial ground. To ward off the demons’) but a substantive *udvaná-* is also known (TĀ 6.11.2 *udvanād udakānvāpāsmát syandatām aghám* ‘let evil flow away from us, like water from the height’), and this must be how the word is used in our pāda. The **K** reading *udvalaṃ*, which one might derive from *ud-var* ‘to open (?)’ (elsewhere only ŚBM 5.4.3.24?), yields no sense.

**b.** BHATTACHARYA follows the Or. mss., and univervates *anupravam*, a reading that I cannot make sense of. **K** reads *anuplavam*, which seems preferable to me: cf. 6.23.6a above (*sarvam anu pari plavatām*). The idea, here as in the first pāda, seems to be that a smooth moving along (respectively on level ground and on the surface of water) is always bound finally to come upon an obstacle, and that the evil-doer’s scheme’s are therefore bound to come to nothing, when the *darbha* is used against him.

#### 7.7.5 Only PS ◊ d: cf. 1d

pari sāyaṃ pari prātaḥ	(8)
pari madhyaṃdinaṃ pari	(8)
darbho hiraṇyahastaghnaḥ	(8)
pari ṇaḥ pātu viśvataḥ	(8)

Around in the evening, around early in the morning, around at mid-day, around [at night]: being [as it were] a golden arm-guard, let the *darbha* protect around us from all sides.

sāyaṃ pari] **Or**, sāyaṃ (+ |) pari **K** prātaḥ] **Or**, prātaḥ **K** madhyaṃdinaṃ] **Ku**  
**V/126 Mā**, madhyandinaṃ **Ma K** pari |] **Or**, pari (+ |) **K** darbho] **Or**, garbho **K**  
 hiraṇyahastaghnaḥ] **V/126 Mā [Ma]**, hiraṇyahasta{ghno}(→ ghnaḥ 4) **Ku**, hiraṇyahasta-  
 ghnaḥ (+ |) **K** ṇaḥ pātu] **Or**, na(+ |)ḥpātu **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K**

**c.** On the word *hastaghna-* ‘arm-guard (of an archer)’, cf. LÜDERS 1942: 39 = 1973: 506 (with notes 3 and 4): “In vedischer Zeit umwickelte man beim Bogenschießen den linken Arm, um ihn vor dem Anprall der zurückschnellenden Sehne zu schützen, mit dem *hastaghna*, wie aus dem Waffensegen RV.

6,75,14 hervorgeht:<sup>43</sup> „Wie eine Schlange läuft er in Windungen um den Arm, den Schlag der Sehne abwehrend. Der *hastaghna*, aller Regeln kundig, der männliche, möge den Mann auf allen Seiten schützen.“ Der Ausdruck *hastaghna* oder *hastatra* [Lāṭy.Śr.S. 3,10,7 in einem Yajus] kommt in der vom Veda unabhängigen Literatur nicht mehr vor [Im Anschluß an den Mantra wird *hastaghna* Nir. 9,14f.; Āp.Śr.S. 20,16,12 gebraucht. Naigh. 5,3 wird er unter den Waffennamen aufgezählt]. Note the parallelism of the ṚV mantra with ours. GARBE’s conjecture of the same word at ĀpŚS 20.16.12 was rejected by CALAND 1928: 244, but the word does, apparently, occur also at VādhŚS 11.16.12 (text corrupt). The hapax compound might perhaps also be interpreted as a bahuvrīhi: ‘having [as it were] a golden hand-guard’.

### 7.7.6 Only PS

girau jātaḥ svar +ahāsi	(8)
sākaṃ somena babhruṇā	(8)
mā pāpakṛtvanaḥ śiṣo	(8)
mā pākaḥ puruṣo riṣat	(8)

Born on the mountain, together with brown soma, you, then, are [like] the sun. Do not let the evil-doers remain. Let the innocent man not get hurt.

jātaḥ svar] **Or**, jātaṣvar **K** +ahāsi] ahāsu **Or**, āsi **K** babhruṇā] **K**, (+ ba 4)bhruṇā **Ku**, babh(sec. m. + r)U{h}(sec. m. → ṇā 1) **V/126**, babhṛṇā **Mā [Ma]** pāpakṛtvanaḥ] **Ku** **Mā [Ma]**, pāpakṛtvanaḥ **V/126**, pāpakṛtvanaś **K** śiṣo] **V/126** **Mā [Ma]**, śiṣo **Ku**, śikho **K** puruṣo] **K**, puṛṣo **Or** riṣat ||] **Or**, **K** om. ri(ṣat . . . sahasravīryaḥ [7d] pari)

BHATTACHARYA edits *māpāpakṛtvanaḥ*.

**ab.** The felicitous emendation *ahāsi* was proposed by BHATTACHARYA. Monosyllabic *svār* is hardly found in the ṚV (once at 2.35.6a: hesitantly ARNOLD 1905: 83), but is known in the AV: cf. WHITNEY 1881: 332 and LUBOTSKY 2002: 23 on PS 5.2.8d. On *āha*, cf. above under 6.9.5cd. The grass shares with Soma the characteristic of growing on the mountain pastures, and — as the sun rises from behind mountain tops —, it may hence be said to equal the sun: the point seems to be that the heat of the *darbha* grass is compared with the glaring heat of the sun.

On the mountain(s) as “Wachstumsort der Soma-Pflanze”, see OBERLIES 1999: 12–16. The *kuṣṭha* plant (see my comments under 7.10.1b and 5a below) is also mountain-born: cf. ŚS 5.4.1ab+2ab (PS 19.8.14ab+15ab) *yó girīṣv ājāyathā vīrúdhām bālavattamaḥ . . . || suparṇasúvane giráu jātám himávatas pári* ‘You, the strongest of plants, who were born on the mountains, . . . [They go] to the one born on an eagle-bearing mountain, from the Snowy [mountain range]’. Poison is mountain-born at ŚS 4.6.8 / PS 5.8.7.

<sup>43</sup> *āhir iva bhogaīḥ páry eti bāhúm jyáya hetím paribádhamānaḥ | hastagnó víśvā vayúnāni vidván púmān púmāṃsam pári pātu víśvátaḥ ||.*

c. It is unclear why BHATTACHARYA unverbates and underlines, because *pāpakṛtvān-* is well-attested (in PS at 11.4.3, 16.37.3a). Cf. PS 12.5.9b *vṛścainān mopajām śiṣaḥ* ‘cut them down, do not let [their] offspring remain’ (BHATTACHARYA edits *mopajām*, but cf. ŚS 11.1.19c). Cf. also RVKh 4.5.12.

d. About the meaning of *pāka-*, see my commentary on 6.8.6b above.

7.7.7 Cf. ŚS 2.7.3 ◊ d: cf. 1d

divo mūlam avatataṁ	(8)
pṛthivyām ota āhitaḥ	(8)
darbhaḥ sahasravīryaḥ	(8)
pari ṇaḥ pātu viśvataḥ	(8)

The root [of it] is stretched down from heaven, it is placed on, woven into the earth: let the *darbha*, having a thousand powers, protect around us from all sides.

**K** omits up to *pari* • mūlam] **Ku**, mūlam **V/126 Mā Ma** ṇaḥ pātu] **Mā** [**Ma**], ṇa(*sec. m.* h)pātu **Ku**, ṇapātu **V/126**, ṇaḥpātu **K** viśvataḥ ||] **Or**, vidvataḥ **Z K**

### ŚS 2.7.3

divo mūlam ávatataṁ pṛthivyá ádhy úttataṁ |  
téna sahasrakāṇḍena pári ṇaḥ páhi viśvátāḥ ||

**ab.** For ŚS 2.7.3, GRILL 1888: 81f. refers to ŚS 19.32.1, 3, 7 (PS 11.12.1, 3, 7), on the mythology around the *darbha* grass: cf. especially 3ab *diví te túlam ośadhe pṛthivyám asi níṣṭhitaḥ* ‘Your tuft is in heaven, o plant; on earth you are grown [far] out [o *darbhá*]’ and 7ab+d *darbhéṇa devájātena* + *diviṣṭambhéna śásvad ít ... ásanam sánavāni ca* ‘With the *darbha*, god-born, founded in heaven, constantly ... I have conquered and will I conquer’. Cf. further ŚS 6.43.2 (PS 19.33.8) *ayám yó bhúrímūlaḥ samudrám avatíṣṭhati* | *darbháh pṛthivyá úthhito manyuśámāna ucyate* ‘This that is many-rooted, [that] reaches down to the sea, the *darbhá*, arisen out of the earth, is called a fury-appeaser’ (WHITNEY). Through a long discussion of many text places, EME-NEAU (1949: 368 = 1988: 25) has shown “that there existed an ancient cliché about a plant that somehow was reversed in position, its roots somehow above and, in consequence, its branches (or the rest of the plant) below its roots”, and concluded that its “application in the Atharvan passage [...] to some grass-like plant could in no way be interpreted naturalistically”.

The use of weaving terminology (*°tata-*, *ota-*) that we find in the present *pādas* (and their ŚS parallel) seems not to be found elsewhere in *darbha*-contexts. Perhaps the fact that this kind of grass was used as raw material for production of textiles (RAU 1970: 12) can help to explain its metaphoric use here. On *ota-* + loc., cf. ŚS 10.8.37ab *yó vidyát sūtram vítataṁ yásminn ótaḥ prajā imáh* ‘Whoso may know the stretched-out string in which these offspring are woven in’ (WHITNEY) and PS 4.10.2cd *tayā tvā patyām otām kṛṇmo*

*madhumatīm vayam* ‘with that (honey-whip) do we make you woven into your husband, honey-sweet’.

### 7.7.8 Only PS

sahasrakāṇḍas taviṣas	(8)
tīkṣṇavalśo viṣāsahīḥ	(8)
darbheṇa sarvā rakṣāmsy	(8)
amivāś cāpa dahāmasi	(9)

Thousand-jointed, energetic, sharp-sprouted, overpowering [it is]: with *darbha* do we burn off all demons and afflictions.

sahasrakāṇḍas] **Ku Mā [Ma] K**, sa{(+ sa 1)}hasrakāṇḍas **V/126** tīkṣṇavalśo] **K**, tīkṣṇavallīso **Ku**, tīkṣṇavallīso **V/126 Mā Ma** viṣāsahīḥ |] **Or**, viṣāsahi | **K** darbheṇa sarvā] **Or**, garbheṇa sarvā **K** amivāś] **Or**, asivāś **K** dahāmasi ||] **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, hāmasi **Mā**, dhāmasi **K**

**b.** The *darbha* is called *tīkṣṇá-* and *viṣāsahí-* at PS 11.13.4a (ŚS 19.33.4a); *tīkṣṇavalśa-* is a hapax.

### 7.7.9 Only PS ◊ quoted AthPrāy 2.5:84.8–9 and AVPariś 37.5.5 ◊ **c:** cf. 3d

apadagdham +duṣvapnyam	(8)
apadagdhā arātayaḥ	(8)
sarvās ca yātudhānyah	(8)

Burnt off is the nightmare, burnt off are the Arātis and all sorceresses.

apadagdham] **Or**, apadugdham **K** +duṣvapnyam] duṣvapnyam **Or**, duṣvapni **K** apadagdhā arātayaḥ] **V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, apada(·)dh(·)ḥ **Ku** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [note °ḥ s°] sarvās] **Or**, sarvās **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K**

Both in AthPrāy and in AVPariś, the quotation reads twice *avadagdha-*.

**a.** Cf. the VS mantra quoted under 3ab. On the (emended) reading *duṣvapnyam*, see my Introduction, §2.8 (T). Fluctuation *iy :: y* after consonant clusters is very common in the **Or**. mss. (see my note on 7.3.7c), and the **Or** reading °*svapnyam* does not have to be considered authentic here.

**b.** On the Arātis, see my introduction to 7.9 below.

### 7.7.10 Only PS ◊ quoted AthPrāy 2.5:84.9–11 and AVPariś 37.5.6 ◊ **d:** cf. 1d

mā tvā dabhan yātudhānā	(8)
mā bradhmaḥ śakuniḥ patan	(8)
darbho rājā samudriyaḥ	(8)
pari ṇaḥ pātu viśvataḥ    7	(8)

Let the sorcerers not deceive you, [let] the ruddy bird not [deceive you], while it flies. Let the *darbha*, oceanic king, protect around us from all sides.

dabhan yātudhānā] dabhan, yātudhānā **Ku V/126** [Ma], dabha(·)tudhānā **Mā**, dabham yātudhānām **K mā** bradhnaḥ] **Or**, sā[*line*]sādhradhniś **K śakuniḥ** patan ]] **Or**, śakuniḥpatham, | **K samudriyaḥ**] **Or**, samudriyaḥ **K ṇaḥ**] **Or**, ṇaḥ **K || 7 ||** || 7 || 10 || 7 || **Ku**, || 7 || 7 (sec. m. 10) || **V/126**, || 7 || 7 || **Mā**, Z 2 Z **K**

The quotation in the AVPariś reads pāda **b** corruptly: *mā bradhnaḥ śamyum icchata*. Cf., however, the *variae lectiones* reported (1909–1910: 242) by BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN: the readings of mss. C (*śambhumīṣyatam*), T (*śambhumīṣyati*) and Roth (*śambhumīṣyatam*), via underlying *śambhumīṣ patam*, bring us close to the transmitted PS text. AthPrāy reads *dabhyam* in **a**, and is heavily corrupt for the second pāda: *mā bradhnaḥ śarmabhīḥ ṣṭuḥi*.

**a.** Cf. above, 6.1.4d / RV 10.120.4d *mā tvā dabhan yātudhānā durévāḥ*.

**b.** It is unclear to me who or what this ‘ruddy bird’ might be. Is it a reference to the sun (cf. e.g. ŚS 7.22.2), or rather to the usually black bird of ill-omen (ŚS 7.64, 12.3.13)? Cf. the interesting parallels PS 19.47.8b + *śakuniprapatanān kṛdhi* ‘make a bird’s attempts at flying’ and 19.19.14 *yaṁ mṛgo na samāpnoti pakṣābhyāṁ śakuniḥ patan | divaṁ yaḥ sarvāṁ stabhnāti tasmā aśvattha te namaḥ* ‘[That Aśvattha] whom a wild bird, flying, does not cover with its wings; who props up the entire sky: to you as that [heavenly tree], o Aśvattha, [be] reverence!’. Cf. the role of Śakuni as cheat in the Mahābhārata (1.2.101, 1.57.94, also HOPKINS 1915: 200).

**c.** The *darbhā* is called a king also at PS 11.13.4a (ŚS 19.33.4a). On its connection with the ocean, see ŚS 6.43.2 (PS 19.33.8) quoted under stanza 7. I suspect a *double entendre* here, since the ocean is also the birth-place of fire in Vedic mythology, and ‘oceanic’ may thus mean ‘fiery’ in the context of this hymn: cf. i.a. TS 5.1.5.7–8 *bhārann agnīm purīṣyām ity āha | agnīm hy èśā bhārati . . . vṛṣāgnīm vṛṣaṇam bhārann ity āha vṛṣā hy èśā vṛṣāgnis | apām gárbbham || 7 || samudrīyam ity āha | apām hy èśā gárbbho yád agnis* ‘Bearing Agni of the dust’, he says, for he bears Agni. . . . ‘The strong, bearing the strong Agni’, he says, for he is strong, and Agni is strong. ‘Germ of the waters, him of the ocean’, he says, for Agni is the germ of the waters’ (KEITH).

## 7.8. Against curses: with barley.

This hymn, unique to PS, is intended to ward off curses, to make them return to the curser himself, employing *yava-* ‘barley’ probably because of a paronomastic connection with the root <sup>2</sup>*yav* ‘to keep away’, of which the hymn contains several forms (cf. similar paronomasia with *tyajana-/tejana-* in PS 3.40, 19.48.9). It has even in the Or. mss. been transmitted rather more corruptly than usual, but the text can be reconstructed satisfactorily in all places but one (3b).

Concatenating links with the preceding hymn are detectable in the words *babhru-* (4, cf. 7.7.6), and *viṣāhiṇ-* (5, cf. *viṣāsahī-* in 7.7.8), and perhaps in the phrase *pari mā pātu* (8, cf. 7.7.1d, 5d, 7d, 10d). Note also the pair of compounds *hiraṇya-dhanvan-* (4c) and *hiraṇya-hastaghna-* (7.7.5c), which both to belong to the domain of archery.

### 7.8.1 Only PS

yo naḥ pāpena vacasā-	(8)
- <sup>a</sup> ghoṣato *duruktaṃ bruvat	(8)
+ārāc chaptam aprāpyāsmān	(8)
apa tad yātu sarvataḥ	(8)

If someone shall, with an evil utterance, speak an imprecation against us while we are not listening: being cursed from afar, and without having reached us, let it move off on all sides.

naḥ] Or, naḥ K \*duruktaṃ bruvat] duṛḍvṛvat, {ḥ} Ku, duṛḍvṛvat, V/126 Mā [Ma], dṛktavṛvat, K +ārāc chaptam aprāpyāsmān apa tad] ārātsaptamaprāpyāsmān { } apa tad Ku, ārā(ŚA)ptamaprāpy(sec. m. + ā)smānapa tad V/126, ārātsaptamaprāpyāsmānapa tad Mā Ma, ārāschapatamaprāsmāmupā nad K sarvataḥ] K, savyataḥ Ku Mā, savYa(sec. m. arrow vya)taḥ V/126

BHATTACHARYA edits *vacasā ghoṣato*, *durudbruvat* and *savyataḥ*.

a. On the use of the relative pronoun here, see DELBRÜCK 1888: 561f., and SPEIJER 1896, §272.2 p. 85.

b. See GOTŌ 1987: 130ff. on the meaning(s) of *ghoṣ*: the translation ‘to listen’ is nowhere certain in Vedic, but it seems more attractive to assume that meaning here and to understand *aghoṣant-* (‘not listening’), than to work with BHATTACHARYA’s *ghoṣant-* (presumably based merely on BARRET 1920: 155), or even *āghoṣant-*, which could both only yield the less suitable meanings ‘listening’ or ‘making noise’.

My reconstruction of the rest of the pāda assumes that a syllable *ka* was early on lost in the Or./\*B branch of PS transmission, and that the anuvāra of *duruktaṃ* had been lost already in \*G. How the *d* in *dvṛvat* entered the Or. text I am still at a loss to explain. With the syntagma *duruktaṃ bravī*, compare KāthGS 3.16 / VārGS 9.19 / MānGS 1.2.19 *duruktavacanam*. Cf. also PS 5.19.7cde *krodhaṃ manyum \*anṛtaṃ bhāmaṃ duruktaṃ abhiśocanam āre*

*yakṣmaṃ ni dadhmāsi* ‘we remove far away anger, fury, falsehood, wrath, imprecation, torment, the *yakṣma*-disease’ (after LUBOTSKY 2002: 96f.). *bruvat* formally has to be an injunctive of the secondary 6th class stem *bruva-* (OERTEL 1934: 53 = 1994/I: 684), but seems to be used as a subjunctive: cf. my discussion under 6.19.1a above. OERTEL (*ibid.*) quotes some examples of alternation *bruva°/brava°* between different mantra texts.

**cd.** On the construction of *śap* with internal object, see KÜMMEL 2000: 514 (also GOTĒ 1987: 305): I supply *duruktam*. The Or. reading *yātu savyataḥ*, which makes little sense in the present context, is obviously due to perseveration from the words *pātu savyataḥ* found at 2.85.3b (and below at 7.15.1b).

### 7.8.2 Only PS

yan naḥ śapād araṇo yat sapatnaḥ	(11)
śvaśrūr vā +yac chvaśuro vā śapāti	(11)
jyāyasaḥ śapathān vayaṃ	(8)
yavena yāvayāmasi	(8)

If a stranger shall curse us, if a rival, if mother-in-law or father-in-law shall curse [us]: by means of barley, we keep the curses of one who is senior away.

naḥ] Or, naś K śapād araṇo] Or, śapādvaruṇo K yat sapatnaḥ] yaḥ sapatnaḥ Ku V/126 Ma, yaḥ (s···) Mā, yatsapatniś K śvaśrūr] Ku V/126 [Ma] K, śvaśrūr Mā +yac chvaśuro] yaḥ śvaśuro Ku V/126 Ma, yaḥ śvasuro Mā, yaśchvaśuro K jyāyasaḥ śapathān] Or, jyāyasaścaphān K vayaṃ yavena] Or, vāyiyavainam K

**cd.** *jyāyasaḥ* can be certified as a gen. sg., rather than an acc. pl. with *śapathān*, on the basis of parallel passages which lack an explicit accusative: cf. 2.26.3 *yat kumāraḥ kumāreṣu yad vā jyāyastareṣu ca | nīviṃ yat kṛtvā śepiṣe tat kṛṇmo agadaṃ śivam* ‘Wenn du falsch geschworen hast, als Knabe unter Knaben, oder auch unter Älteren, (oder) nachdem du dir ein Leibtuch gemacht hast: das machen wir gesund und heilsam’ (ZEHNDER); 2.30.5 *jyāyasaḥ śaṃsād uta vā kanīyasaḥ +sajātaśaṃsād uta jāmiśaṃsāt | anādiṣṭam anyakṛtaṃ yad enas tvaṃ nas tasmā jātavedo mumugdhi* ‘Vom Fluch eines Mächtigeren oder auch eines Schwächeren, vom Verwandtenfluch und vom Geschwisterfluch, (was) ein nicht angezeigtes, was ein von anderen verschuldetes Vergehen ist, davon befreie du uns, Jātavedas’ (ZEHNDER). I assume that the various types of kin mentioned in the present stanza, as in the two passages from PS 2, mean that *jyāyas-* has to be interpreted as ‘senior’ rather than ‘stronger’ (hence ZEHNDER’s “eines Mächtigeren” and “eines Schwächeren” may have to be changed). Also cf. stanza 8 below.

### 7.8.3 Only PS

yān samasyante śapathān	(8)
†vākṣamyānr̥tviyāmadhi†	(8)
yavaṃ tvaṃ bibhrad bāh <sub>v</sub> voḥ	(8)

pūrvah prati śṛṇīhi tān || (8)

The curses which they aim [at you], . . . (?), bearing barley in your arms, you must [go] ahead [and] break them to pieces.

yān] yān, **Ku V/126 Mā**, yāna **Ma**, yām **K** śapathān] śapathān, **Or**, pathām **K** †vāk-  
kṣamyānṛtviyāmadhi†] **Mā [Ma]**, vātkakṣamyānṛtviyāmadhi **Ku**, vā{t}k(sec. m. .)kṣamā-  
nṛtviyāmadhi **V/126**, vākṣampānṛtyāmadhi **K** ] **Or**, (+ |) **K** yavaṃ tvam] **Or**,  
yuvamtam **K** bāhvoḥ] **V/126 Mā [Ma]**, bāhpoḥ **Ku**, vāhvo **K** pūrvah] **Ku [Ma]**,  
pūrva **V/126 Mā**, pūrvah **K** prati śṛṇīhi] **Ku Mā [Ma]**, pratiśṛṇīhi **V/126**, pratiśṛṇīya  
**K** tān] **Or**, tān **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *samasyan, te*, and *vākkṣamyānṛtviyāmadhi* without underlining.

a. A 3rd pl. med. *samasyante* appears preferable here above the participle plus *te* that BHATTACHARYA seems to understand: a 2nd sg. enclitic pronoun *te* is impossible because it would have to stand in second place in the pāda, and a nom. masc. pl. (*té*) seems unlikely to me, even though I fully realize that a solution to the still unsolved riddle of pāda **b** may well also throw new light on the present pāda.

b. I cannot make sense of BHATTACHARYA’s text: the word *kṣāmya* ‘earthly’ is attested ṚV 2.14.11b, 7.46.2a, but does not fit here. The absolutive *ākṣamya* (cf. CALAND 1899: 215 = 1990: 54) ‘having interrupted (study)’ is attested at HirGS 2.18.7 and 2.20.9 (cf. OLDENBERG 1892: 242 — the same form also at ĀgnivGS 1.2.1:13.6–7, 1.2.2:16.14), but does not seem to help us here either. Werner Knobl suggests to me that in an adjective qualifying *śapathān*, “an obvious *vāc-* would be followed by a gerundive of root *kṣam*”, and that although “this root usually means ‘bear, put up with’, an occasional ‘resist, overcome’ may perhaps be supposed”, this meaning being attested for later Sanskrit. Under that assumption, the compound would qualify the curses as ‘to be resisted / to be overcome by speech’. I do not know any attestations of *ṛtviyā-*, and the ostensible combination of an acc. with postposition *adhi* is doubtful (cf. *ṛtviyād adhi* in PS 19.42.8, quoted under 6.10.4a?). Does the pāda contain the word *anṛta-*, which is often (e.g. in stanza 8 below) combined with *śap* and *śapatha-*?

c. The (masculine) addressee of this stanza, as of 6 and 9, seems to be the patron on whose behalf the ritual which this hymn was to accompany is being performed.

#### 7.8.4 Only PS

ṛjukeśo yavo babhrur (8)  
maghavā no (')numādīyaḥ | (8)  
hiraṇyadhanvā śapathān upejatu || (12)

Straight-haired, brown, liberal, to be cheered on by us, golden-bowed, let the barley drive the curses near.

yavo] **K**, javo **Or** babhrur maghavā] babhUrmadhamā **Ku**, babhr̥madhamā **V/126** [**Ma**], babhṛ̥(ma-)mā **Mā**, babhr̥rmaghavā **K** (')numādyah | ] numādyah | **Ku V/126**, (+ nu)mādyah | **Mā**, naMābhya [[*om.*] ] **K** [[Barr.: nasābhya] hiraṇyadhanvā] **Or**, hiraṇyadhanvāṃ **K** śapathān upejatu] śapathān upejatu **Ku Mā** [**Ma**], śapathān, {PA}(*sec. m.* → u 4)pejatu **V/126**, śapathāṃ tupejatu **K** ||] **Or**, (+ |) **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *babhrūr* (printing error?) and *maghavā*. The error *madhamā* in **Or** is a tell-tale pointer to some kind of Nāgarī hyparchetype (\*B): cf. my Introduction, §2.6.2.

**ab.** The compound *ṛjukeśa-* is a hapax: it is presumably to be connected with the long awn or beard of slender bristles on the spikelet of ripe barley. *babhrú-* is a standing epithet of soma (OBERLIES 1999: 87, also 7.7.6b above), and *maghāvan-* is used thus as well; soma is also called *ṛjú-* at **R̥V** 9.97.43a, and is *anumādyā-* at 9.24.4c+6b, 9.76.1b, 9.107.11c (about the possible *double entendre*, see my comments on 6.1.4ab above): as RENOUE has pointed out (1946: 126 n. 14), barley can take soma's place as Indra's source of strength in the AV, e.g. PS 9.9.3. This is clearly expressed here by transfer of epithets. In the light of the shift of subject to Indra in the next stanza, it is perhaps not insignificant that the two epithets in pāda **b** are both also — persistently in the case of the former, at **R̥V** 6.34.2d, 7.6.1b in the case of the latter — applied to Indra.

**c.** The compound *hiraṇyadhanvan-* is also a hapax. With the verb form *ījatu*, apparently built to the reduplicated present stem *īja-* of *aj* 'to drive' (JOACHIM 1978: 36), cf. **R̥V** 10.19.2cd *indra eṇā nī yachatv agnīr eṇā upājatu* 'Let Indra hold them (the cows), let Agni drive them near'. Active forms from this reduplicated stem are extremely rare if existing at all: I only find identical *upējatu* at **R̥VKh** 5.2.3 *aiṣu nahyā viśādanam̐ hariṇāsya dhīyaṃ yyathā | pāraṇi amitṛāṇi aiṣatv arvācī gāur upējatu*, which however corresponds to ŚS 6.67.3 (PS 19.6.15) *aiṣu nahya vīṣājīnam̐ hariṇāsya bhīyaṃ kṛdhi | pāraṇi amitṛa ēṣatv arvācī gāur upēṣatu* 'Bind the skin on them, as a bull. Put the fear of an antelope [into them]! Let the enemy hurry far away, let the cow hurry here'. Although comparison with **R̥V** 6.64.3c *āpejate śūro āsteva śātrūn* 'She (Uṣas) drives [the darkness] off, like a valiant archer the enemies' suggests an emendation *apejatu*, the readings of the mss. leave no doubt (since *tu-* :: *u-* in Śāradā) that the archetype \*G read *upejatu*, and I therefore hesitantly accept the transmitted *u-*. Werner Knobl suggests to me that perhaps '[in order to destroy them]' could be supplied to complete the sense. One might also consider emending *upaijatu*: 'let the barley move toward the curses', which would require supplying the same words.

### 7.8.5 Only PS

t <sub>u</sub> vām pītv <sub>a</sub> endro vṛtram	(8)
śakro jaghāna vāsavaḥ	(8)
sa viśāhī yatharṣabhah	(8)

sahasva śapathān yava || (8)

Having drunk you, Indra the powerful, he of the Vasus, slew Vṛtra: so, being overpowering like a bull, overpower the curses, o barley.

tvām] Or, tām K vṛtram] Or, vṛttram K śakro] Or, śakno(→ kra kno) K jaghāna vāsavaḥ ] Or, jaghāna | vāsava K [[note punctuation]] sa viśāhī yatharṣabhaḥ] [Ma], sa viśāh{i}yatharṣabhaḥ Ku V/126 Mā, saiśāhyata ṛṣabhas K sahasva śapathān yava] Or [[° n, y°], sahasvaḥ śapathān iva K

BHATTACHARYA edits *vṛttram* (printing error?) and *saviśāhī*.

**ab.** Cf. Renou 1946: 123f. on the continuing role of the dragon episode in Atharvavedic Indra mythology. On Indra’s epithet *vāsavá-*, not yet known in the RV, see RENOU p. 128, and cf. ŚS 6.82.1 / PS 19.17.4.

**c.** Despite BHATTACHARYA’s apparent doubts about the authenticity of the text of this pāda, the Or. mss. have transmitted it faultlessly, and its meaning is quite plain. The hapax *viśāhin-*, derived from *vi-śah*, belongs to the “Bildungen, die zu einem Verbalstamm in Beziehung stehen und „den Verbalbegriff vollziehend“ bedeuten” (AiGr. II/2, §216a). Is *sa viśāhī* a play on *viśāśahī-* (7.7.8b)? Basically the same simile is found at 6.8.3b above: *sāsahāna ivarṣabhaḥ* ‘like a dominating bull’ (see my commentary on that pāda — it is also found at 5.1.6b and 3.3.5b / ŚS 3.6.4b).

### 7.8.6 Only PS

ārāc carantu śapathā yutā ito (12)  
jihvā u ditā arasāḥ santu sarve | (12<sup>T</sup>)  
nāmagrāhād vāco heḍād (8)  
\*ikṣitād ghoracakṣasaḥ (8)  
śarma te varma kṛṇmasi || (8)

Let the curses, kept away from here, move far off. And let [the cursers’] tongues all be tied and powerless. We make for you a cover, an armor, against name-grasping, against [bad] speech, against anger, against the glance, against the evil eye.

ārāc] Or, ārā K yutā] Or, itā K jihvā u ditā arasāḥ] jihpā u ditā arasāḥ Ku, jihvo u ditā arasāḥ V/126 Mā, ’jihvā u ditā arasāḥ Ma, jihvo ditārasās K santu sarve ] V/126 Mā [Ma] K, (+ santu 3) sarve Ku nāmagrāhād] Or, nāsagrāhā K heḍād] heṛād Or, heḷād K \*ikṣitād ghoracakṣasaḥ] ikṣitāt, ghoracakṣasaḥ Ku Ma, ikṣitāta ghoracakṣasaḥ V/126 Mā, ikṣitā | aghoracakṣasa K [[note punctuation]] śarma] V/126 Mā [Ma] K, śa{-}rma Ku

BHATTACHARYA edits *ito-jihvā u ditā*.

**a.** Cf. RV 1.53.4d *yutādveśas-* and 6.47.13d (etc.) *ārāc cid dvéśaḥ sanutār yuyotu* ‘let [Indra] keep hostility very far away in the distance’, 7.58.6c *ārāc cid dvéšo vṛṣaṇo yuyota* ‘keep hostility very far away, o bulls’. Despite these

parallels, it seems more natural here to connect *ārāt* with *carantu* than with *yutāḥ*.

**b.** BHATTACHARYA's text can be accepted without underlining. Cf. ŚS 5.30.16ab (PS 9.14.6ab) *iyám antár vadati jīhvá baddhá pañṣpadá* 'This much-quivering tongue, bound, speaks within' (WHITNEY). Contrast PS 20.37.7e [PSK 20.36.7c] *jīhvāyām astu me raso*.

**c.** Regarding *nāmagrāhā-* (also PS 16.36.2a / ŚS 10.1.12a), cf. my comments on 6.7.7d above.

**d.** The emendation *īkṣītād* is proposed by BHATTACHARYA. The ms. readings are interesting: the ligature *dgha* is known e.g. at 10.1.1d, and *dghṛ* at 11.16.6a, so the **Or** spelling °ṭ *gh°* (from which the two sister mss. **V/126 Mā** only differ by omission of the virāma) cannot be due to graphic difficulties of recent date. Rather, the inopportune punctuation found in **K** seems to suggest that already some ancient scribe preferred to use the spelling with virāma (which may be compared with orthographic practise elsewhere in India: e.g. in Malayalam mss., cf. IKARI 1996: 2 — cf. also the **Or** reading at 14.5.7). If this is correct (but cf. other cases of unexpected *daṇḍa* in **K**, e.g. in stanza 8 below), we have here another piece of evidence for postulation of a written archetype (\*G). On *īkṣīta-* in this substantivized (hostile) sense, cf. ManB 1.3.2 (cf. also PS 10.12.6c: *yo mā durasyān īkṣātai*). *ghorācakṣas-* (*bahuvrīhi*) occurs at RV 7.104.2c (ŚS 8.4.2c / PS 16.9.2c), PS 10.12.9b. Cf. GONDA 1969: 5 n. 11 (with extensive literature), 33f., 73.

### 7.8.7 Only PS

apāñco yantu śapathā	(8)
janenāstā aghāyunā	(8)
yo no *durasyāj jīvate	(8)
svenānāgase sate	(8)

Away let the curses go that have been shot [like an arrow] by a malicious man, who shall malign with his own [sin] the one among us who is living, even though he (the latter) is without sin.

apāñco] **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, apāñco **Mā**, apāñco **K**    janenāstā aghāyunā |] **Or**, danenāstāghāyunā **K**    yo no] **K**, yeno **Or**    \*durasyāj] durasyāṃ **Or K**    jīvate] **Or**, jīvase **K**    svenānāgase sate] **Ku Mā [Ma]**, svenānāgase sat{o}e **V/126**, senānākasyeṣate **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *yeno durasyāṃ* and *sa te*.

**cd.** The meaning of these pādas has not been understood by BHATTACHARYA. The whole stanza may be compared with PS 2.62.4 *prati daha yātudhānān + mūradevān vicarṣaṇe | ye no \*durasyān dveṣeṇāthāsāṃ mohayanti nah* 'Lay fire, o Vicarṣaṇi, to the sorcerers, the Mūradevas who shall malign us with hostility, [and who] then lead our wish astray'. The emendation *durasyān* for transmitted *durasyā* at PS 2.62.4 was proposed but not adopted

by ZEHNDER (1999: 143). I believe the reading *durasyāṃ* here may be used to support the emendation *durasyān* there, because it — just like *ye* in the Or. mss. — seems to be perseverated here from the original reading there, which was consequently lost in the context from where it had been copied. We may adopt the **K** reading *yo no* as two words (rather than BHATTACHARYA’s *yeno*), and make the consequent restoration to *durasyāj* here (note also possible confusion in *jī :: ñj* \*G: SINGH 1991, plates 83 & 85). Cf. ŚS 4.36.1c *yó no durasyād dípsāc cá*.

Whatever may be the historically correct explanation of the formation *durasyāti* (cf. EWAia I, 736), it seems likely that the verb was perceived to be connected with *as* ‘to shoot’ (cf. *samasyante* in 3a, *astāḥ* in the preceding pāda). Werner Knobl points out to me that many *-ya-* formations including denominatives in *-ya-* are regularly construed with the dative: Pāṇini, Aṣṭādhyāyī 1.4.37 refers to *krudhya-*, *druhya-*, *īrṣya-*, *asūya-*, and implicitly to other verbs expressive of ‘anger’. Cf. also *glāya-* or *arātīyá-*, and especially *irasyá-* (RV 3×) synonymous with *īrṣya-*. We may, therefore, construe *durasya-* with the datives *jīvate* and *anāgase*, which last word is to be connected with a third dative *sate*. On the predominantly concessive sense of the participle *sánt-*, at least in Vedic prose, cf. MINARD 1956: 397 (§398).

### 7.8.8 Only PS

pari mā pātu śapathād	(8)
anṛtād duriṭād uta	(8)
pari mā jyāyasaḥ śamsād	(8)
yavo rakṣatu mā +riṣam	(8)

Let [the barley] protect me from the curse, from the lie, and from misfortune; let the barley guard me from the calumny of one who is senior; let me not get hurt.

pari mā pātu] **Or**, pari pātu **K** śapathād] **Ku V/126 Mā**, śapathā | d **K** [[note || anṛtād duriṭād] **K**, anṛtāduriṭād **Or** || **V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, || **Ku** jyāyasaḥ] **Or**, jyāyasaś **K** śamsād yavo] **Or**, śamsāddivo **K** mā +riṣam] mā ṛṣam **Or**, māmiṣam **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *mā ṛṣam* and relegates the correction *riṣam* to his apparatus.

**a.** Note the inopportune punctuation in **K**, which is to be compared with 6.11.7c (and perhaps also with 6d) above.

**b.** On the meaning of *anṛta-*, cf. LÜDERS 1959: 415ff.

**c.** On the ‘imprecation of one who is senior’, cf. stanza 2 above, where the accumulation of kinship terms seems to preclude taking *jyāyas-* in the meaning ‘stronger’.

**d.** BHATTACHARYA’s emendation is of course correct. The confusion *ṛ :: ri* is quite common: cf. e.g. 6.12.7b, 7.10.2c.

## 7.8.9 Only PS

*anāstigiyaṃ śapathair	(8)
anativyādhīyaṃ kṛtam	(8)
bṛhad varma prati muñcāmi te yavam	(12)

As a tall armor, made [to be] unassailable, impenetrable by curses, I put on you the barley.

\*anāstigyam] anāstigmaṃ **Or**, anāstayajñaṃ **K** anativyādhyam] **Or**, anucivyāddhyam **K** kṛtam ||] kṛtam | **Or** **K** bṛhad] **Or**, vṛhada **K** te yavam ||] te yavam || **Or**, te | yavam **K** [[note punctuation]]

BHATTACHARYA edits *anāstigmaṃ* without underlining, and his text contains a misprint *muñcāmi* corrected BHATTACHARYA n.-d. 1: iii.

a. The text as BHATTACHARYA edits it (‘Faceless, sharp, by cursers . . .’) does not seem to yield any sense. Surely, as the meter and the syntax (juxtaposition with an instr.) demand, we must have here a gerundive similar in meaning to *anativyādhīyaṃ* in the following pāda. Werner Knobl led the way to the solution that is adopted here, by suggesting a gerundive *anāstighya-* from the root hitherto commonly quoted as *stegh*. I refer to LUBOTSKY’s article (2008) on the Indo-Iranian root *steg* for the evidence that supports the slight modification to *anāstigya-* and the translation ‘unassailable’ given here.

b. Cf. ŚS 9.2.16 (PS 16.77.1) *yāt te kāma śārma trivārūtham udbhū brāhma vārma vītatam anativyādhyāṃ kṛtām | téna sapātnān pāri vṛṅdhi yé máma páry enān prāṇāḥ pasāvo jīvanam vṛṅaktu* ‘What sufficient (*udbhū*) triply-guarding defense thou hast, O Kāma, worship (*brāhman*) as extended protection (*vārman*), made unpierceable, with that do thou avoid them that are my rivals; let breath, cattle, life avoid them’ (WHITNEY).

c. Cf. PS 12.5.5a *ut tanuṣva dhanuḥ prati muñcasva varma* ‘stretch [your] bow, put on your armor’. Regarding the meaning of *prati-moc*, see my commentary on 7.1.10cd, and on its syntax, cf. LUBOTSKY 2002: 146. For the construction with the dative, cf. ŚS 10.6.30b (PS 16.45.2b) *prāti muñcāmi me śívām* ‘I fasten on myself the propitious one’ (WHITNEY), ŚS 9.3.24a (PS 16.41.2a) *mā naḥ pásam prāti mucaḥ* ‘do not put the noose on us’, and ŚS 5.14.3cd (cf. 7.1.10cd above) *kṛtyāṃ kṛtyākṛte devā niṣkām iwa prāti muñcata* ‘hang the witchcraft on the witchcraft-maker, like a breastplate, o gods’.

## 7.8.10 Only PS

taṃ vayāmsīva pakṣiṇa	(8)
ā viśantu patatṛiṇaḥ	(8)
śaptāraṃ śapathāḥ punaḥ    8	(8)

Let them (the curses), winged and pinioned like birds, enter him. [Let] the curses [enter] the curser again.

taṃ vayāṃsīva] **Ku** [**Ma**], taṃ vayāsīva **V/126 Mā**, tardhyayāyāṃsīva **K** pakṣiṇa ā]  
**Or**, pakṣaṇā **K** viśantu] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, viśantu **Ku** patatṛiṇaḥ | śaptāraṃ]  
**Or**, patatṛiṇas(+ |)śapatāraṃ **K** śapathāḥ] **Or**, śapathāḥ **K** || 8 ||] || 8 || 10 || 8 || **Ku**,  
|| 8 || 8 (sec. m. 10) || **V/126**, || 8 || 8 || **Mā**, Z 3 Z **K**

The combination of three words which each individually can mean ‘bird’ is striking: two are found combined above at 7.5.6a, two others at 13.1.9b (*antarhitam vayo yat patatri*); cf. also PS 16.106.4c *vayāṃsi śakunāḥ patatṛiṇaḥ* and finally 17.22.11c [PSK 17.22.12–14], among the *paippalādā mantrāḥ* quoted at AVPariś 1b.1.7, *pātāḥ patatṛiṇo vayāṃsi śakunayaḥ*. It is clear that the curses are at the same time compared to arrows, which are also pinioned.

Cf. PS 20.18.4a [PSK 20.17.4a] *śaptāraṃ yantu śapathāḥ*, ŚS 2.7.5a *śaptāram etu śapāthah*, as well as ChU 6.8.2 *sa yathā śakuniḥ sūtreṇa prabaddho diśaṃ diśaṃ patitvānyatrāyatanam alabdhvā bandhanam evopāśrayate* ‘It is like this. Take a bird that is tied with a string. It will fly off in every direction and, when it cannot find a resting place anywhere else, it will alight back upon the very thing to which it is tied’ (OLIVELLE).

## 7.9. To appease Arāti.

This hymn (parallel to ŚS 5.7) addressed to Arāti ‘Miserliness’ is according to WHITNEY “a euphemistic offering of reverence to the spirit of avarice or stinginess”. BLOOMFIELD (1897: 423) expressed himself in a similar vein: “The Veda, especially the Atharvan, is much given to personify evil qualities as female divinities, e.g. nírti, áraddhi, árti, aráyí, and particularly árāti. The present hymn aims to appease the powers of avarice and grudge personified as Arāti”. On Arātis, cf. 7.2.2+9c above and 7.7.9b, 7.15.4c, 7.19.3+4d below, the entire hymn PS 5.26, and RODHE 1946: 54ff. On the word *árāti-*, cf. KUIPER 1961–62: 50 n. 10, who interprets it as “the negative power which detains the gifts of the nether world”. Cf. also RENOU 1958: 6–8. The last two stanzas of the ŚS recension of this hymn find no parallel here, but rather — partly — in 7.19.3–4 below.

The ritual applications of (parts of) the ŚS version of this hymn have been aptly summarized by BLOOMFIELD (1897: 423f.) and by WHITNEY in their introductions: none of the KauśS or VaitS passages seem to throw much light on the contents of this hymn, a hymn which evidently must have been well-known to Patañjali, who quotes from its stanzas 4 and 5 (respectively ŚS 5.7.3 and 8).

There are again concatenating links with the preceding hymn(s): with *jihvayā* in 10b, compare *jihvāḥ* in 7.8.6b; with *somena babhrūṇā* in 10d, the same phrase in 7.7.6b and *babhrus* in 7.8.4a. Stanza 9 of the ŚS version of this hymn is found as 7.19.4 below.

### 7.9.1 abd: ŚS 5.7.1 ◊ c: only PS

ā no diśa mā pari ṣṭhā arāte	(11)
mā no rakṣīr dakṣiṇām yācamānām	(11)
pra ṇaḥ pradātā savitā ca yachatām	(12)
namo <sup>+</sup> vīrtsāyā asamṛddhyai ca kṛṇmaḥ	(12 <sup>T</sup> )

Assign [it] to us, do not stand in the way of, Arāti, don’t guard from us our sacerdotal fee when it is being begged for. Let Pradātar and Savitar give it to us. We bring reverence to Frustration and to Failure.

diśa mā] Or, diśamsā K ṣṭhā arāte] Ku, ṣṭhā arāte V/126 Mā Ma, ṣṭhārāter K no rakṣīr] Or, nordakṣair K dakṣiṇām] Or, dakṣiṇā K yācamānām |] yācamānām | Ku Mā [Ma], ya(sec. m. → ā)camānām | V/126, yātumāvām [[om. ||] K pra ṇaḥ pradātā] Or, punaḥ prajātā K [[note °ḥ p°] yachatām] V/126 Mā Ma, ya[[folio]ya(→ cha)tām Ku, yaśchatām K namo] Or, nator K <sup>+</sup>vīrtsāyā asamṛddhyai] vīchāyā asamṛddhyai Or, vīraśchāyāsamṛddhyai K kṛṇmaḥ] Or, kṛṇva K

#### ŚS 5.7.1

ā no bhara mā pári ṣṭhā arāte mā no rakṣīr dáksiṇām nīyámānām |  
nāmo vīrtsāyā ásamṛddhaye námo astv árātaye ||

**ab.** ŚS reads *bhara* for PS *diśa*, and again has a form of *bhar* where PS has a form of *bhaj* in 8b below. On the meaning of *rakṣis* in this context, see MINARD 1949, §180b and NARTEN 1964: 216. Cf. ŚS 12.4.1abc (PS 17.16.1abc) *dādāmīty evā brūyād ānu cainām ābhutsata | vaśām brahmābhyo yācadbhyaḥ* ‘I give [her] — thus should he say, if they have noticed her — [I give] the cow (*vaśā*) to the priests that ask for her’ (WHITNEY), and GONDA 1965a: 353 on ‘begging for’ (*yāc*) gifts (of cows), as well as stanza 10 below. The verb, subject of detailed study by JAMISON (1996a: 191–195), does not seem to be used elsewhere with *dākṣiṇā-* as object.

**c.** Pradātar — the divine prototype of the human giver of *dākṣiṇās?* — and Savitar occur next to each other in a wider group of deities, as names of the Muhūrtas, at TB 3.10.9.7+3.10.10.3 (cf. ĀpŚS 19.12.2+6). Cf. also PS 20.57.9–10 [PSK 20.53.7–8] *indra \*āroddhā prajāpatiḥ pradātā || bṛhaspates tvā mukhena yācāmi* ‘Indra is the one who locks up, Prajāpati is the one who gives: I ask for you with Bṛhaspati’s mouth’.

**d.** On the spelling *kṛṇva* in **K**, see my notes under 6.23.1cd. On the meaning of *vīrtsā-*, derived from the desid. stem *vīrtsa-*, see my comments on 3c below. Note ŚS *ásamṛddhaye* ~ PS *asamṛddhyai* (AiGr. III, §74a p. 149).

### 7.9.2 ŚS 5.7.2

yam arāte purodhatse	(8)
puruṣam +parirāpiṇam	(8)
namas te tasmai kṛṇmo	(7)
mā vaniṃ mama vivyathaḥ	(8)

The calumnious man whom you make your Purohita, o Arāti, to him of yours do we bring reverence: do not cause my earnings to falter.

purodhatse] **Or**, purodhatsvai **K** puruṣam +parirāpiṇam] puṣam parirāviṇam **Or**, puru-  
[[line]]ṣarāpṛṇam **K** namas te] **V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, nam{e}aste **Ku** kṛṇmo] **Or**, kṛṇo  
**K** vaniṃ] **K**, va[*(sec. m. → l)*]iṃ **Ku V/126**, vaḷiṃ **Mā Ma** vivyathaḥ ||] **Ku Mā**  
[**Ma**], vivYa[*(sec. m. → vya)*]thaḥ ||] **V/126**, vyathaḥ [[*om.*] **K** [[*note* °ḥ a°]]

#### ŚS 5.7.2

yám arāte purodhatsé púruṣam parirāpiṇam |  
námas te tásmāi kṛṇmo má vaniṃ vyathayīr máma ||

**a.** Regarding the general meaning of *puro-dhā*, cf. my comments under 6.11.2d above, and on a possible *double entendre* involving the word *púraṃ-dhi-*, see under stanza 7 below. The pāda is to be compared with 7.18.7ab below.

**b.** *parirāpiṇ-* is connected (cf. AiGr. II/2, §217b) with *parirāp-*: this root-noun occurs only at RV 2.23.3 (KS 26.11:136.11f.) *ā vibādhyā parirāpas tāmāṃsi ca jyōtiṣmantam rátham ṛtásya tiṣṭhasi | bṛhaspate ...* ‘Après avoir dis(persé et) refoulé calomnies et ténèbres, tu gravis le char lumineux de l’Ordre (manifesté par le chant rituel), ô Bṛhaspati ...’ and at 2.23.14

*téjīṣṭhayā tapanī rakṣāsas tapa yé tvā nidé dadhiré dṛṣṭāvīryam | āvīs tát kṛṣva yád āsat ta ukthyām bṛhaspate ví parirāpo ardaya* ‘Du feu le plus acéré brûle les démons qui t’ont livré à la calomnie, toi dont la valeur-virile était visible! Manifeste cette (valeur) tienne, en sorte qu’elle soit digne de l’hymne! O Bṛhaspati, dis(perse et) tourmente les médisants’ (RENOU 1955–69/XV: 52, 54).

The root-noun *parirāp-* was explained by GELDNER with reference to the present passage (ŚS 5.7.2) and to ŚS 12.4.51, at both of which places it is (contextually) connected with the *dāksīṇā-*: “Es bezeichnet wohl den, der sich durch Ausflüchte von dem Priesterlohn zu drücken suchte”. The root-noun, most recently discussed by SCARLATA (1999: 452f.), was translated by RENOU (*ibid.*) as ‘calomnie’, ‘médisant’, and as ‘das (lügnerische) Herumgerede’ by SCHMIDT (1968: 105), who argued (p. 110f.) against GELDNER that the *parirāpas* “sich nicht auf den Priester gegenüber betrügerisch handelnde Opferherren beziehen, sondern auf Gegner, die dem Gott Bṛhaspati feindlich sind: Sie sind *rakṣāsah*, Unholde”. Since we find the verb *purodhatsé* (“lit. ‘dost make thy agent or purohita’”, BLOOMFIELD 1897: 424) here, and since Bṛhaspati in RV 2.23.3+14 is the archetypical Purohita, the mentioned passages must, however, be rather closely connected, and GELDNER seems to have been nearer to the truth than SCHMIDT. Do we have here an intended paradox: ‘the man behaving like a niggardly Yajamāna whom you make your Purohita’? Not feeling able to reach an entirely certain conclusion, I settle for translating as ‘calumnious’. Cf. also ŚS 12.4.51 (PS 17.20.11) *yé vaśáyā ádānāya vádanti parirāpīṇaḥ | índrasya manyáve jālmá á vṛscante ácittyā* ‘The calumnious ones who speak for the withholding of the cow, those villains expose themselves to the wrath of Indra, in their thoughtlessness’ and the connection made between *rakṣāṃsi* and *parirāpīṇas* at 7.19.2 below. Arāti is called *parirāpīṇī* in the next stanza.

c. As WHITNEY observed, this pāda “can be read as full only by violence”. However, it does seem to be the case that the form *kṛṇmas* is occasionally to be scanned trisyllabically in the cadence of an anuṣṭubh-pāda or in the break of a trimeter-line in the PS, where this ‘violent’ means (*kṛṇmas<sub>i</sub>*, or, less ‘violently’, *kṛṇ<sub>u</sub>mas*) would render the following pādas regular: 1.32.4b *namo rūrāya kṛṇmo vayaṇ te*, 6.23.1+5c *vibhraṃśam asyai kṛṇmo*, 12.6.3c *rāṣṭrāya tubhyaṇ kṛṇmaḥ*, 16.104.3c *namas te rudra kṛṇmas*.

d. On the form *vyathayīs* in the ŚS parallel, cf. NARTEN 1964: 250 and WHITNEY 1889, §1048 p. 384. Our *vivyathas* appears not to be attested elsewhere before TĀ 4.20.2 (on which place, cf. NARTEN 1964: 250 n. 772) / KaṭhĀ 1.198.11: cf. HOFFMANN 1980: 98f. = 1992: 758f.

### 7.9.3 Only PS ◊ b: ŚS 3.20.9d

yam adyābhi prayuñjmahe	(8)
manasā hṛdayena ca	(8)
arāte taṃ no mā +vīrtsīr	(8)
+ditsantaṃ +parirāpīṇi	(8)

You must not, o calumnious Arāti, try to frustrate the one whom we today, in mind and in heart, go to work for/on, who wants to give [to us].

yam adyābhi prayuñjmahe] yam adyābhi(+ ḥ)prayujmahe **Ku**, yam adyābhiḥprayujmahe **JM**, yam adyābhiprayaujmahe **V/126 Mā Ma Pa**, anavaṃdyābhiḥprayuñjmahe **K** arāte] **Or**, arāti **K** taṃ no] [**Ma**] **Pa**, tanno **Ku V/126 Mā**, tanvo **K** +vīrtsīr] vīchīr **Or**, vīriśche **K** +ditsantaṃ] dipsantaṃ **Or**, diśchantaṃ **K** +parirāpiṇi ||] parirāviṇi || **Or**, parirāpṛiṇi(→ nī) (+ |) **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *dipsantaṃ*. Cf. the similar structure of stanza 10.

**ab.** The verbal compound *abhi-pra-yoj* seems to be found employed in at least two senses. First, in the sense of performing a ritual (which appears in the accusative): TS 6.1.2.2 *ākūtyā hí púruṣo yajñám abhí prayuñkté yájeyéti* ‘for with the intention, “I wish to worship”, does a man undertake his worship’; at KauṣB 14.7.15–17 [ed. LINDNER 14.5:65.3] *tā amuto ’rvācyo devatās tṛtīya-savanāt prātaḥsavanam abhi prāyuñjata* |15| *tad yad abhi prāyuñjata* |16| *tat praūgasya praūgatvam* |17| ‘These deities from over there hitherward undertook the morning pressing from the third pressing; in that they undertook it, that is why the Praūga has its name’; and (with ellipsis of the name of the ritual) at ŚBK 1.6.3.9 *áthābhiprayuñjānāsya pūrvedyúḥ paurṇamāsyáḥ śunāsīryeṇa yajetátha vaiśvadévenátha paurṇamāsénety* +*uv abhiprayuñjānāsya*+ ‘Now for one who is undertaking [the performance of the four-monthly ritual]: [the rule] “He should worship with the Śunāsīrya on the day preceding the full moon, then with the Vaiśvadeva, then with the full-moon offering” holds also for the one undertaking [it]’, which corresponds to ŚBM 2.6.3.13 *átha púnaḥ prayuñjānāsya* | *pūrvedyúḥ phālgunyái paurṇamāsyái śunāsīryeṇa yajetátha prátár vaiśvadévenátha paurṇamāsénaitád u púnaḥ prayuñjānāsya* ‘And in the case of one who recommences (the Seasonal offerings),—let him perform the Śunāsīrya on the day preceding the Phālguna full-moon, and on the following day the Vaiśvadeva, and after that the Full-moon offering. This, then, (is the rule) for him who recommences (the Seasonal offerings)’ (EGGELING).

Second — more commonly — in a hostile sense, with the person whom the ritual action is directed against in the accusative: TB 1.5.6.3 *devāsurāḥ sāmnyatta āsan* | *té saṃvatsaré vyāyacchanta* | *tān devás cāturmāsyáir evābhí prāyuñjata* ‘Gods and Asuras were engaged in fighting: they were contending about the year. It is with the Four-monthly offerings that the gods went to work against them’; cf. also JB 1.196; KS 10.1:125.1, 12.3:165.15f., 13.4:183.17, 13.8:190.23; MS 2.1.7:8.5–8 *āgnāvaiṣṇavám ékādaśakapālaṃ nír vaped abhicārann abhicaryámāṇo vā sárasvatīm ápy ájyasya yajed agnír vái sárva devátā devátābhir evāsya devátāḥ práti carati víṣṇur yajñó yajñéna yajñám vāk sárasvatī vácá vácamaṃ tád abhicáryābhipráyukta* ‘One who is performing magic or against whom magic is being performed should offer [a cake] on 11 sherds for Agni and Viṣṇu, and he should worship Sarasvatī with butter. Agni is All the deities: it is with the deities that he counter-acts his (i.e. the rival’s) deities. Viṣṇu is the worship. [It is] with [his own] worship [that he counter-

acts the other’s] worship. Sarasvatī is speech. [It is] with [his own] speech [that he counter-acts the other’s] speech. In this way he has, by performing magic against [him], [effectively] gone to work against [his rival]’ and 2.1.10:12.1–3 *agnāye yāviṣṭhāyāṣṭākapaḷaṃ nīrvaped abhicaryāmāṇo yābhir evānam itaraḥ prāyuktībhir abhiprayukṭé tá asmād yāviṣṭho yoyāva* ‘One against whom magic is being performed should offer [a cake] on 8 sherds for Agni Yaviṣṭha: it is those means with which the other one goes to work against him that Yaviṣṭha wards off from him’.

As especially the first-quoted MS passage makes clear, *abhi-pra-yoj* can be used in a hostile sense for performing *kāmyeṣṭis* (cf. CALAND 1908: 33f.) against a rival. The context here seems to require a sense like ‘to perform on behalf of someone (i.e. a Yajamāna)’ rather than ‘against someone’, or (cf. 10ab) ‘to go to work on, i.e. to attempt to persuade’. Depending on the interpretation, the ‘mind and the heart’ of pāda **b** refers to the sincerity of the speakers, or the place where the speakers try to affect the *ditsant-* (i.e., in that case, in the latter’s mind and heart).

**c.** On the form *vīrtsīs* (also in 8a below; cf. *vīrtsā-* in 1d and *vīrtsantī* in 5c), one of the very few aor. formations from the desiderative, cf. WHITNEY 1889, §§1033+1035 p. 376 and INSLER 1968: 65f. WHITNEY writes that all such forms “have lost their distinct desiderative meaning, and come to bear an independent value”, but it seems unnecessary to assume loss of distinct desiderative meaning here: in the older language desideratives of the causative were not yet in use, and — although this grammatical phenomenon does not seem to have been noticed in the handbooks — at least one other example of a simple desid. form doing the office of an expected (but not yet existing) causative form is known to me: PS 19.55.2ab [not in PSK] *yo mā vadantaṃ hṛdayena vācā vācā śrotreṇa manasā jihṛkṣāt* ‘if someone tries to excite me in speech, hearing, or thought, me who am speaking in heart and in mind . . .’. In that stanza, *jihṛkṣa-* belongs with *harṣaya-*, and stands for what would be *\*jiharṣayiṣa-* in the later language. Similarly, *vīrtsa-* belongs here with *ardhayati* rather than with *ṛdhyate*.

**d.** The reading *diśchantaṃ* in **K** points to underlying *ditsantaṃ*, which is the reading we need here: the Yajamāna’s liberality must not be frustrated by Arāti. For a possible explanation of how the Or. readings *dipsantaṃ* here, and *dipsanto* in 8, have entered the text, see my commentary on the latter stanza.

#### 7.9.4 ŚS 5.7.3

pra ṇo vanir devakṛtā	(8)
divā naktam ca sidhyatu	(8)
arātim anupremo vayam	(9)
namo <sub>a</sub> st <sub>u</sub> v arātaye	(8)

Let god-made earnings succeed for us by day and at night. We follow Arāti, reverence be to Arāti.

pra ṇo] Or, pṛṇo **K**    naktam] **Ku** **Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, naKTam **V/126**    sidhyatu | arātim

anupremo] Or, siddhyatu | rātim anupreme K   <sub>a</sub>stv] 'stv Or, stv K   arātaye] Or,  
arāyataye K

### ŚS 5.7.3

prā ṇo vanīr devākṛtā dīvā nāktam ca kalpatām |  
ārātim anuprémo vayām námo astv ārātaye ||

a. This pāda is found quoted by Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya on Aṣṭādhyāyī 8.4.28, ed. KIELHORN vol. III, p. 460, ll. 12f. (cf. RAU 1985, item nr. 442).

b. On the syntax and meaning of *sādh* + dat., cf. KULIKOV 2001: 482.

c. The hypersyllabic scansion of this pāda is confirmed by the identical ŚS reading; although reading *rāti-* with **K** is not only attractive from the point of view of meter but might also seem to yield good sense (cf. ṚV 6.63.8d *ānu rātīm āgman*, 8.79.5b *gáčhān . . . rātīm*), the same alternation Or./ŚS *arāti-* :: **K** *rāti-* also occurs in the next stanza, and **K** is probably erroneous in both places (as the occurrence of the same alternation at 7.11.7c and 7.19.5c, where the meter leaves no doubt about the reading, also suggests). On *anu-pra-ay*, which seems to mean something like ‘to follow dependently’, cf. PS 1.78.4 *yasya trayā gatam anuprayanti devā manuṣyāḥ paśavaś ca sarve | tan no devaṃ mano adhi bravītu sunūti no nayatu dviṣate mā radhāma* ‘[The mind], whose track all three kinds — gods, men and animals — follow: let that heavenly mind speak in favor of us; of good leadership let it lead us; let us not be subjected to him who hates [us]’ (cf. GRIFFITHS 2004, item 27).

### 7.9.5 ŚS 5.7.8

uta nagnā *bobhuvatī	(8)
svapnayā sacase janam	(8)
arāte cittam +vīrtsant <sub>y</sub>	(8)
ākūtīm puruṣasya ca	(8)

And becoming naked time after time, o Arāti, you follow a man in his dream, trying to frustrate the man’s thought and intention.

nagnā \*bobhuvatī] nagnā bobhavatī Or, nagna āpobhavatī K   svapnayā sacase] Or, svapnayā sṛjese K   janam | arāte] janam | arāte Or, canam | rāte K   cittam] Or, citti K   +vīrtsant<sub>y</sub>] vīchamty Ku, vīchanty V/126 Mā Ma, vīriśchimdy K   ākūtīm] Ku V/126 [Ma] K, ākūtīm Mā   puruṣasya] K, puṣasya Ku V/126 [Ma], puṣ{e}asya Mā ||] Ku V/126 [Ma] K, | Mā

### ŚS 5.7.8

utā nagnā bóbhuvatī svapnayā sacase jānam |  
ārāte cittām vīrtsant<sub>y</sub> ākūtīm puruṣasya ca ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *bobhavatī* (cf. his Introduction, p. xxv), and his text contains a misprint: *citam*.

a. The mss. point to *bobhavatī*, but this form is impossible, and I have emended it on the basis of ŚS. On the repetitive meaning of the intensive

participle, cf. SCHAEFER 1994: 162. On the possible meaning of Arāti appearing as a naked woman, cf. BLOOMFIELD (1897: 424f.), who suggests it “recalls the German ‘alp,’ or ‘mahre’ which also manifests itself as a woman”. Cf. PS 5.26.3abc *yā svapnayā carati gaur bhūtvā janāṁ anu | arātim indra tvaṃ jahi* ‘O Indra, slay Arāti which assumes the form of a cow and goes after men in their dreams’. Cf. VON NEGELEIN 1912: 200ff., 269f.

b. Patañjali, in his Mahābhāṣya under vārttika 1 on Aṣṭādhyāyī 7.1.39, ed. KIELHORN vol. III, p. 257, ll. 1f., had occasion to quote this pāda too (cf. RAU 1985, item nr. 736).

### 7.9.6 ab: ŚS 5.7.7ab ◊ cd: only PS

paro (‘)peh <sub>i</sub> y asamṛddhe	(8)
vi te hetim nayāmasi	(8)
yaṃ dviṣmas taṃ sacasva	(7)
kanyā bhūtvā sragviṇī *rukmiṇī dṛśe	(12)

Go far away, Failure: we avert your missile. Take the appearance of a maiden wearing a wreath and a breast-ornament, and follow him whom we hate [in his dreams].

(‘)pehy] pehy **Or**, mehy **K** asamṛddhe vi te] **Or**, asimṛddhe mṛte **K** dviṣmas taṃ sacasva kanyā] **Ku V/126** [Ma], diṣmas taṃ sacasva kanyā **Mā**, dviṣmastam(→ ntaṃ) vimvakavyā **K** sragviṇī] **V/126 Mā** [Ma], srĀgvi(→ ·#)ṇī **Ku**, sṛgmaṇī **K** \*rukmiṇī] ṛkmaṇī **Ku Mā** [Ma], ṛkma(sec. m. → i)ṇī **V/126**, rukmaṇī **K** dṛśe ||] **Or**, dṛśet, [om. ||] **K**

#### ŚS 5.7.7ab

paró ‘pehy asamṛddhe ví te hetim nayāmasi |

BHATTACHARYA edits *rukmaṇī*.

d. Cf. VON NEGELEIN 1912: 280f. On *dṛśe bhavī*, cf. PS 8.18.3d *dṛśe bhavata mā guhā* ‘become visible [o waters]: do not [remain] hidden’ and 12.8.6ef *priyo dṛśe bhūtvā gandharvaḥ sacate strīyaṃ* ‘the Gandharva assumes a pleasing appearance and follows the woman’. This is possibly the oldest attestation of the stem *sragviṇ-* taught by Pāṇini, Aṣṭādhyāyī 5.2.121; the word is used of the bride and groom at BaudhGS 1.1.24; it occurs in older Vedic only at the difficult passage JB 2.103 (quoted ĀpŚS 22.12.4–9): *sa rukmī prāvepī sarvābharāṇy aṃśumān bhavati, tasya vaiyāghraḥ parivāro bhavati dvaipo dhanvadhīr ārkṣa upāsaṅgaḥ, khāḍgakavaco ‘dhyāsthātā bhavati saṃnaddhas saṃnaddhasārathīr āvṛtaḥ pratihitābhyām, niṣkī sragvī saṃgrahītā bhavati* ‘[the chariot] is gold-plated, adorned with pendants (?) and all ornamentations, radiant; its deck is made of tiger skin, its bow-case of panther skin, its harness of bear skin; the fighter on it has a cuirass of rhinoceros skin, is ready to fight, is accompanied by a ready charioteer, protected by two ready arrows; the driver is bejeweled and wreathed’ (after CALAND 1919: 156).

All mss. — with the odd exception of the *post correctionem* reading in **Mā** — point to *rukmaṇī*, but the error °*aṇī* for °*iṇī* is quite common in AV transmission (cf. PS 4.15 *rohiṇī-* :: ŚS 4.12 *róhaṇī-*, discussed by GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY 2000–01[03]: 199f. (with n. 3), ŚS 4.37.3 *pramandanī-* :: PS 12.7.3 *pramandinī-*, ŚS 5.14.11 *vāraṇī-* :: PS 7.1.9 *vāriṇī-*), and the just quoted JB passage collocates *rukmiṇ-* (at some distance) with *sragviṇ-*, so therefore I emend to a proper fem. form of the former stem. On the identification of the metal object called *rukma-*, see RAU 1973: 54f.

**7.9.7 ab:** only PS ◊ **cd:** ŚS 5.7.7cd ◊ **e:** only PS

namas te 'st <sub>u</sub> v asamṛddhe	(8)
mā mām purodhiṃ kṛṇuthāḥ	(8)
veda tvāhaṃ nimīvantīm	(8)
nitudantīm arāte	(7)
*martyān martyebhyo adhi nirvadantīm	(11)

Reverence be to you, o Failure. Stop making me your Purohita (?). I know you, o Arāti, [to be] one who forces down, who thrusts down, who removes mortals from among mortals.

'st<sub>u</sub>v asamṛddhe] **Or**, stusamṛddhe **K** mā mām] **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, mīmām **Mā**, māmāhaṃ **K** kṛṇuthāḥ ||] **Or**, kṛṇvatha ||*om.* ||] **K** veda] **Or**, varmī **K** nimīvantīm nitudantīm arāte] **V/126 Mā**, nimīvantīm nituda{·}ntīm arāte **Ku**, namīvantīm nutadantīmāte **K** \*martyān] martyām **Or K** martyebhyo] **V/126 Mā [Ma]**, {·}martyebhyo **Ku**, sa[[*line*]]santyebhyo **K** adhi] **K**, 'dhi **Or** nirvadantīm] nirvadantīm **Or K** ||] **Or**, (+ |) **K**

**ŚS 5.7.7cd**

vēda tvāhāṃ nimīvantīm nitudántīm arāte ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *martyām*.

**b.** Note the bad cadence. The word *purodhi-* is a hapax. The meaning of *puro-dhā* here and in stanza 2 is not clear. It seems likely that the poet was somehow playing on the word *púramdhi-*, subject of a word-study by RENO (1958: 6–8): this morphologically opaque word, which basically does not survive after the (Ṛgvedic) mantra language, “s’oppose à *úrāti*, dont le sens propre est nécessairement “absence de don” [at ṚV] IV.26, 7; 27, 2; 50, 11 et passim (re-frain); de même la *p°* est *rātisāc* VII.36, 9. Sujet à la personnification, le terme, dans plusieurs énumérations de noms divins, désigne la déesse de la Libéralité” (cf. also KUIPER 1961–62: 50 n. 10 and NARTEN 1986: 207–210). However, the precise way in which such a word-play would have to be understood here and in stanza 2 is still obscure.

**e.** It seems unlikely that Arāti would here be called ‘mortal’, as BHATTACHARYA’s text suggests, and moreover *nirvadantīm* requires an object. I therefore restore the acc. m. pl. form *martyān*: other examples of the error °*nm°* → °*mm°* (in all mss.) can be found at 5.12.8a and 5.23.5c. The apparent bisyllabic scansion of twice *martya-* is noteworthy (cf. WHITNEY 1881: 221).

On *nir-vad* (+ acc. + abl.), cf. MS 4.2.8:29.10–12 *prajāpatir vai ná vyáharat sá ātmány evá púṇyam áyachad ātmánaḥ púṇyaṃ ná nír avadad etád vai tád yájur vādan nānyáthā brūyāt || púṇyaṃ práśastam || íti brūyād ātmány evá púṇyaṃ yáccchaty ātmánaḥ púṇyaṃ ná nír vadati* ‘Prajāpati was not speaking. It is with himself that he stored merit. He did not remove his merit from himself by speaking. Thus, and in no other way, should he speak when he pronounces this formula, “Merit is praised”, [is what] he should say. It is in himself that he keeps his merit; he does not remove his merit from himself by speaking’. Whether the point is here that Arāti causes dissension among mortals by stimulating stinginess in those who ought to give, or that she causes death, I am not able to say.

### 7.9.8 Cf. ŚS 5.7.6

mā no vaniṃ mā vācaṃ mā +vīrtsīr	(11)
ugrāv indrāgnī na ā bhajatām vasūni	(13)
sarve no <sub>a</sub> dya +ditsanto	(8)
arātiṃ prati haryata	(8)

Do not try to frustrate our earnings, not [our] speech. Let the fearsome Indra and Agni grant us wealth. All of you who want to give to us today, do welcome Arāti!

vaniṃ] **K**, valiṃ **Ku V/126 Mā**, valiṃ **Ma** vācaṃ] **Ku Mā [Ma] K**, va(*sec. m.* → ā)caṃ **V/126** +vīrtsīr ugrāv] vīchīgrā **Or**, vīriścham ugrāv **K** na ā] **Or**, nām **K** vasūni] **V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, vasūn{ī} **Ku** ]] **Or**, *om.* **K** no] **Or**, ṇo **K** <sub>a</sub>dya] ‘dhi **Or**, dya **K** +ditsanto] dipsanto **Or**, diśchatta **K** arātiṃ] **K**, ‘rātiṃ **Or** haryata ||] **Or**, haryatām [*om.*] **K**

### ŚS 5.7.6

mā vaniṃ mā vācaṃ no vīrtsīr [*v.l.* vīrtsīr] ubhāv indrāgnī ā bhajatām no vasūni |  
sārve no adyá dītsantó ‘rātiṃ práti haryata ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *ugrā indrāgnī*, and places a pāda-boundary between the two words, adding in his n. on p. 503 “*mā. anusāreṇa kṛto ‘yaṃ pādavibhāgaḥ sandehāspadam*” ‘this pāda-division made following **Mā** is a matter of doubt’; he further edits ‘*dhi dipsanto ‘rātiṃ*’.

**ab.** The syntax requires placement of the pāda-boundary between *vīrtsīr* and *ugrāv*, and the pāda-marker in **Mā** that BHATTACHARYA refers to can be ignored (cf. my Introduction, §2.1.2.6). °*au* + *i*° → °*āv i*° seems to be the regular sandhi in our text, so I follow the reading of **K**. Cf. RV 6.60.5a *ugrā vighanīnā mṛdha indrāgnī havāmahe* ‘We call to the fearsome Indra and Agni, who smash the foes’; the ŚS reading with *ubhāv* is equally acceptable: cf. RV 6.60.13a *ubhā vām indrāgnī āhvādhyai* ‘For the invocation of you two, o Indra and Agni!’ (cf. also e.g. 5.86.1ab).

Note the small differences between the text of ŚS and PS, in which latter the thrice repeated *mā* (twice in ŚS) seems problematic, while in ŚS the placement

of the enclitic pronoun *nas* twice causes surprise. WHITNEY suggests that this “first half-verse is irregular”, but the hypersyllabic pāda **b** does have a perfect triṣṭubh cadence in both ŚS and PS, and the first pāda of the PS version is quite regular if we undo the sandhi in *vi-ṛtsīr*. However, it seems clear that neither Saṃhitā has preserved the original text of pāda **a**, which can be reconstructed as a tolerable triṣṭubh: *mā no vanīm mā no vācam vṛtsīh*.

**cd.** The reading *no* in **K** agrees with what is reported for several ŚS mss. by WHITNEY and ŠPP. The rest of this pāda is problematic. The reading *dya diśchatta* in **K** definitely seems to agree with the transmitted ŚS version (*adyá dītsanto*), which I assume to be the original reading of the pāda. The Or. mss., on the other hand, point to *adhi dipsanto*, which BHATTACHARYA finds acceptable: since *adhi-dabh* does not exist, the ostensible preverb may be explained as a perseveration from 7a (or from the sequence *no adhi* at 1.29.4d, 4.16.1c, 5.17.2c); how the participle *dipsant-* entered the Or. transmission here and in 3d remains problematic: we may wonder whether the 3 forms *dipsa-* of hymn 7.1–3 are found perseverated here (but Werner Knobl suggests to me dissimilation of the original reading *dītsanto* which contains 5 dental sounds, 3 of them stops).

BLOOMFIELD explained (1897: 424): “The passage seems to contain the euphemistic insinuation that Arāti when sufficiently cajoled is favourable to generosity. Or, those who desire to be generous must curry favour with Arāti; otherwise she frustrates their desires”, and refers to ŚS 1.8.2: *ayám stuvāná āgamad imám sma práti haryata | bṛhaspate váśe labdhvāgnīṣomā ví vidhyatam* ‘This man hath come, speaking out; this man do ye welcome; O Brihaspati, taking [him] into thy control — O Agni and Soma, do ye (two) pierce [him] through’ (WHITNEY): a hearty welcome, as this stanza shows, need not always be what is seems. The verb *prati-har* in our stanza must be seen together with the reverence given to Arāti in stanza 4: appeasement seems to be the main intention.

### 7.9.9 Cf. ŚS 5.7.4

savitāram anumatiṃ	(8)
bhagaṃ yanto havāmahe	(8)
vācam juṣṭāṃ madhumatiṃ vadāni	(11)
devānāṃ devahūtiṣu	(8)

We call to Savitar, to Anumati, to Bhaga, as we go. I shall speak pleasant, honeyed speech, at the god-involutions of the gods.

savitāram . . . vadāni] savadā[[*line*]ni **K** [[*note* omission]] juṣṭāṃ] **Ku** [**Ma**], juṣṭā **V/126 Mā**, *om.* **K** devahūtiṣu ||] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], devahūtiṣu **Ku** [[two vowel diacritics], devadūtiṣu **K**

#### ŚS 5.7.4

sārasvatīm anumatiṃ bhāgaṃ yānto havāmahe |  
vācam juṣṭāṃ mádhumatīm avādiṣaṃ devānāṃ devahūtiṣu ||

a. The ŚS reading *sārasvatīm* seems slightly more suitable than our *savitāram*: cf. PS 1.50.3ab *anumatīḥ sarasvatī bhago rājā nyānayat*, 12.11.2ab *vaśeḍā vaśānumatir vaśām āhuḥ sarasvatīm*; ŚS 9.4.12ab (16.25.2ab) *pārśvé āstām ānumatyā bhāgasyāstām anūvijau*; cf. however also PS 20.7.1cd [PSK 20.6.1cd] *tad asmabhyaṃ savitā satyadharmā sarasvaty anumatir ni yachāt*, and well-known collocations of Savitar and Bhaga such as at ṚV 5.46.3d (PS 19.1.12b), and the invocation of Savitar against Arāti at PS 1.78.1: *dhātāram indram savitāram ūtaye huve devāṃ amṛtān martyaḥ san | + śreṣṭhe*<sup>44</sup> *no vasavo dhatta dhāmi mā radhāma divṣate mo arātaye* ‘The immortal gods Dhātar, Indra, Savitar do I, being mortal, call to aid. Place us in the best position, o Vasus; let us not be subjected to him who hates [us], nor to Arāti’. On the figure Anumati, cf. KUIPER 1961–62: 48f.

b. Is *yānto havāmahe* perhaps an inversion of metrically unpleasing *\*imo hāvamānāḥ* ‘we keep calling’? Or is there a connection with ṚV 10.107.5ab *dākṣiṇāvān prathamō hūtā eti dākṣiṇāvān grāmaṅṛ āgram eti* ‘Celui qui donne la rétribution marche au premier rang, où on l’appelle; celui qui donne la rétribution marche en tête, conduisant le village’ (PINAULT 1999–2000: 439). If so, we may have here an example of the meaning “*bittend kommen, erbitten; nur im part. praes.*” assumed in PW I, 754 for ṚV 5.27.4, 6.29.1, 7.74.5.

cd. The subj. here seems more appropriate than the aor. ind. of the ŚS version. The apparently somewhat pleonastic syntagma *devānām devahūti-* occurs also, e.g., at KS 31.15:17.16 *etā vai devānām devahūtayo yanty asya devā devahūtiṃ na yajñāc chidyate ya evaṃ veda* ‘These are the god-invocations of the gods; the gods come to his (the sacrificer’s) god-invocation, he is not severed from [his] ritual of worship, if he knows thus’ and at PS 20.41.7ef [not in PSK] *devānām + devahūtyām mayi*<sup>45</sup> *tyā devatāḥ punaḥ* ‘[Let] those deities [put it] back in me again, at the god-invocation of the gods’. Cf. WATKINS’ treatment of the comparable stylistic figure *gaṇānām gaṇāpati-* (1997; 1995: 241–246), but especially GONDA 1938: 69f., who provides a few further examples of this type of expression and interprets it as “soms uiting van een geliefde neiging tot abundantie, soms gevolg van een vervagen van de etymologische waarde en eigen betekenis van delen van de samenstellingen”.

**7.9.10 ab:** cf. ŚS 5.7.5 ◊ **cd:** ŚS 5.7.5cd

yaṃ yācāmi *nakulīyā	(8)
jihvayoṣṭhāpidhānayā	(8)
śraddhā tam adya vindatu	(8)
dattā somena babhruṇā    9	(8)

Whom I beg with [my] tongue, a lip-covered she-mongoose: let zeal find him today, given by brown soma.

<sup>44</sup> BHATTACHARYA *śreṣṭho*. Conj. RENOU 1965: 23.

<sup>45</sup> All mss. *devahūtyāmayi*.

yācāmi] Or, vācāma K \*nakulyā] makuryā Or, makuryāj K jihvayoṣṭhāpidhānāyā ]  
V/126 Mā [Ma] K, jihpayoṣṭhāpidhānāyā Ku śraddhā tam] Or, śraddha cam K  
dattā] Or, dattās K babhrūṇā] K, babhrṇā Ku Mā [Ma], ba{·}bhrṇā V/126 || 9 ||  
|| ॠ 10 || 9 || Ku, || 9 || ॠ (sec. m. 10) || V/126, || 9 || ॠ || Mā, Z 4 Z K

### ŚS 5.7.5

yām yācāmy ahām vācā sárasvatyā manoyújā |  
śraddhá tám adyá vindatu dattá sómena babhrúṇā ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *makuryā*, without underlining.

**ab.** A noun *makurī-* (apparently unproblematic to BHATTACHARYA) is not known, and the word *makura-* ‘mirror, a stick or handle of a potter’s wheel, a bud, Mimusops Elengi, Arabian jasmine’ (all glosses from MW, all attributed to lexicographical works) is only very badly attested even in post-Vedic sources.

The solution must lie in two closely related stanzas from later Vedic texts. They are AĀ 3.2.5 *oṣṭhāpidhānā nakulī dantaiḥ parivṛtā pavīḥ | sarvasyai vāca śānā cāru mām iha vādayet* ‘May the lip-covered she-mongoose, a [metal] tire surrounded by teeth, that rules all speech, make me speak sweetly here’ and ManB 1.7.15 *oṣṭhāpidhānā nakulī dantaparimitaḥ pavīḥ | jihve mā +jihvalo*<sup>46</sup> *vācam cāru mādyeha vādaya* ‘A lip-covered she-mongoose, a [metal] tire enclosed by teeth [are you], o tongue: do not cause [my] speech to falter; make me speak sweetly here today’. One might consider restoring an *r*-form (*\*nakuryā*) that would be closer to the PS mss., but no evidence for the existence of such a dialectal variant for standard *nakulā-* seems to be available in EWAia or CDIAL, and at least the **K** reading clearly contains a re-interpretation of the pāda as containing *kuryāt*, which may explain *l* → *r*. KEITH (1909: 255f. n. 5) does not appear to have understood the likening of the tongue to a *nakulī*: the reason seems to lie not in a she-mongoose being “a synonym for what is piercing” (although this could be supported by an alternative interpretation of *pavī-* as ‘[metal] tip’: see RV 9.50.1c, 10.180.2c), but in the wiggly behavior (cf. Guṇaviṣṇu on ManB 1.7.15: *nakulī nakulīva calasvabhāvā*) and long flat shape that tongue, tire and mongoose share, perhaps additionally in the “hoarse mew” that the Common Mongoose gives out (PRATER 1971: 100); the feminine gender is of course due to attraction from *jihvā-*. One might — as Werner Knobl suggests to me — also argue with TS 7.3.18.1, where *nakulā-* designates a color, that the (soma-licking) tongue is simply called ‘mongoose-colored’ here, which would nicely fit into this stanza where also *sóma- babhrú-* is mentioned. On the fact that *babhru(ka)-* denotes a kind of mongoose, cf. NENNINGER 1993: 167.

We expect *jihvayaṣṭhāpi*<sup>o</sup>, but perhaps the sandhi *°ā o°* → *°o°* found in all mss. is acceptable: cf. AiGr. I, 319f. (§269c).

**cd.** Cf. BLOOMFIELD 1897: 424 on *śraddhá* here: “This zeal is naturally bestowed by brown soma, i.e. in the course of solemn sacrifice, and through the

<sup>46</sup> Ed. STÖNNER & ed. BHATTACHARYYA: *vihvalo*; *v.l. jihvalo* reported by STÖNNER, cf. also HOFFMANN 1980: 97 = 1992: 759.

inspiration that comes from the hymns (Vāk Sarasvatī), sung while drinking the soma”. Cf. also BLOOMFIELD 1896b: 411f., and OLDENBERG 1896: 448–450 = 1967/I: 26–28 on the connection with the verb *dā*, expressing specifically the giving of *dākṣiṇā*-. Also JAMISON 1996a: 177f., and 7.15.3 below.

## 7.10. To the plant kuṣṭha.

Specialists of Indian medicine and of ethnobotany are agreed that, besides the common denotation of dermatological disorders in later Sanskrit literature, Vedic *kúṣṭha*- denotes a plant, which is to be identified as *Saussurea lappa* C.B. Clarke (MEULENBELD 1974: 545, BRUCKER 1975: 133 n. 9, ZYSK 1985: 151, DAS 1988: 211 and 295 — superseded nomenclature: *Saussurea costus*). The plant grows in the mountainous regions of north-western South Asia, from Pakistan to Himachal Pradesh, at an altitude of 2000–3300 meters (POLUNIN & STANTON 1984: 207). On its use in Āyurveda, cf. NADKARNI 1954: 1108–1113 (esp. p. 1108 “Roots only are used in medicine”, p. 1109 “aphrodisiac effects”, p. 1110 “in indigenous medicine the root is used as an aphrodisiac and as a tonic”, *ibid.* “Āyurvedic physicians describe the drug as bitter, acrid, stimulant and alleviative of wind, phlegm, fever ...”). Also CHOPRA *et al.* (1958: 406): “In the indigenous medicine in India the root of *S. lappa* is used as an aphrodisiac and as a tonic. ... [T]he essential oil is excreted in the urine and during its passage through the urethra it may produce a certain amount of irritation giving rise to aphrodisiac effects. In the old Sanskrit books the drug has been suggested as a remedy for malaria. It has been tried in a number of cases of different types of this disease with no benefit whatever”.

See BLOOMFIELD’s introduction (1897: 414–416) to ŚS 5.4 on the Vedic data about this plant. Its medicinal use (especially against fever but generally also as a panacea) that we encounter in the present hymn is known also from the hymns PS 1.31, 1.93, 19.8.13–15; ŚS 5.4, 6.95 (the meaning of the word *kuṣṭhá*- — with different accent! — is unclear at PS 3.30.2b = ŚS 19.57.2b). The plant is used in love magic at PS 2.77.3 *āñjanasya madhughasya kuṣṭhasya naladasya ca | vīrodekasya mūlena mukhe nimandanam kṛtam* ‘(Aus der Wurzel) der Salbe(npflanze), der Madhugha-Pflanze, der Kuṣṭha-Pflanze und der Narde, aus der Wurzel ... (*vīrodekasya*) ist ein Betörungsmittel an (mein) Gesicht gemacht’ (ZEHNDER 1999: 174), where the use of the root of the *kuṣṭha*-plant is explicitly mentioned. Less explicit is ŚS 6.102.3 (PS 19.14.3) *āñjanasya madúghasya kúṣṭhasya náladasya ca | turó bhágasya hástābhyām anuródhanam úd bhare* ‘Of ointment, of *madúgha*, of *kúṣṭha*, and of nard, by the hands of Bhaga, I bring up quick a means of subjection’ (WHITNEY). Another nice example of the use (of *kuṣṭha*-juice) in love magic is found at PS 9.28.3–4, 9.29.7:

*yathā kuṣṭhaḥ prayasyati yathā dahyate arcīṣā |*  
*evā te dahyatām manah pra (patāto mamādh<sub>i</sub>yā) || 3 ||*  
*pumśaḥ kuṣṭhāt pra kṣarati stoka ādhībhir<sup>47</sup> ābhṛtaḥ |*  
*sa te hṛdaye vi vartatām pra (patāto mamādh<sub>i</sub>yā) || 4 ||*

...  
*kuṣṭham tapanti marutaḥ + s<sub>u</sub>vādh<sub>i</sub>yam*

<sup>47</sup> Ed. BHATTACHARYA: *ādhībhir*. K: *stokādhībhir*.

+ *dūraājānaṃ*<sup>48</sup> *svarayanto arciṣā* |  
*yathā na svapāt katamac canāhar*  
*aiva gachān mamādh<sub>3</sub>yā* || 7 ||

‘Just as the Kuṣṭha boils, just as it burns with heat, so let your mind burn. Fly forth from there with yearning for me. As [a drop, i.e. semen] from a man, brought on by yearnings, the drop flows from the Kuṣṭha: so let it turn onto your heart. Fly forth from there with yearning for me. . . . The Maruts, shining with their flame, heat up the strongly-yearning Kuṣṭha, whose place of origin is far away. He shall come here out of yearning for me, so that he shall not sleep a single day’.

This hymn concatenates with the preceding hymn(s) in that *sākaṃ somena* (5e) recalls 7.9.10d (*somena babhruṇā*) and 7.7.6b (*sākaṃ somena babhruṇā*); *divā* (refrain 2e, 4f) occurred in 7.9.4b. More distant links we see in the occurrence of *jagat* here (4b) and in 7.6.9b, and in the refrain *sarvās ca yātudhānyaḥ* here (1d, 5g, 8h) and in 7.7.3d+9c. The name *māriṣā-* (3c) recalls *mā riṣam* in 7.8.8d.

**7.10.1** ŚS 19.39.1 ◊ **d**: ṚV 1.191.8d; PS 1.99.1d, 2.4.5d, 7.7.3d+9c etc. ◊  
**cd**: 5fg, 8gh

aitu devas trāyamāṇaḥ (8)  
kuṣṭho himavatas pari | (8)  
takmānaṃ sarvaṃ nāśayan (8)  
sarvās ca yātudhānyaḥ || (8)

Let the savior god Kuṣṭha come here from the Snowy [mountain range], causing all fever and all sorceresses to vanish.

trāyamāṇaḥ] **Or**, trāyamāṇa **K** nāśayan] **Or** [°n, s°], nāśayaṃ **K** yātudhānyaḥ] **Or**,  
yātudhānyaḥ **K** ||] **Ku** [Ma], | **V/126 Mā**, *om.* **K** [note °ḥ t°]

### ŚS 19.39.1

aitu devās trāyamāṇaḥ kuṣṭho himāvatas pári |  
takmānaṃ sárvaṃ nāśaya sárvās ca yātudhānyaḥ ||

**ab.** Cf. ŚS 5.4.1cd *kuṣṭhéhi takmanāśana takmānaṃ nāśáyann itáḥ* ‘Come here (*á-ihī*, WHITNEY 1862: 146f.), o fever-banishing Kuṣṭha, cause fever to vanish from here’. On Kuṣṭha’s association with the Himalayas, cf. e.g. PS 1.31.2 *udag jāto himavataḥ*, 1.93.4b *himavadbhyo nirābhṛtaḥ*.

**c.** Note WHITNEY (and LANMAN) on ŚS: “Emendation in **c** to *nāśáyan* is suggested as acceptable; [and *nāśayaṃ* is the reading of Ppp., both here and in 5 f]”. The **Or**. mss. confirm WHITNEY’s judgment.

**d.** This refrain occurs frequently in Vedic literature, specifically also twice in hymn 7.7 above.

<sup>48</sup> Ed. BHATTACHARYA: *svādhyandura ājānaṃ*.

## 7.10.2 ŚS 19.39.2

trīṇi te kuṣṭha nāmāni	(8)
naghamāro *naghāriṣo *naghāyuso	(12)
na ghāyaṃ puruṣo riṣat	(8)
yasmai paribravīmi tvā	(8)
sāyaṃprātar atho divā	(8)

Three names you have, o Kuṣṭha: By-no-means-death, By-no-means-harm, By-no-means-separation. By no means does this man get hurt, on whose behalf I speak [these stanzas] around you, in the evening, early in the morning, and by day.

kuṣṭha] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, kṛṣṭha **V/126 Mā** naghamāro] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, naTĀ(*sec. m.* → gha 4)māro **V/126** \*naghāriṣo \*naghāyuso] naghāyuso **Or** [*note omission*], naghāriṣo **K** [*note omission*] ghāyaṃ] **K**, ghāyuma **V/126 Mā Ma**, ghā{mā}yuma **Ku** puruṣo] **K**, puṣo **Or** riṣat] **V/126 Mā Pa K**, ṛ(→ ri 5)ṣat **Ku**, ruṣat **Ma** [*probably error Bhatt. for ṛṣat*] yasmai] **Or**, asmai **K** bravīmi] **Or**, vravīmi **K** divā ||] **Ku Mā**, divā ||(*sec. m.* 3) **V/126**, divaḥ [*om.*] **K** [*note °ḥ j°*]

## ŚS 19.39.2

trīṇi te kuṣṭha nāmāni +nadyamāro nadyāriṣaḥ |  
 +nadyāyāṃ puruṣo riṣat |  
 yāsmāi +paribrāvīmi tvā sāyaṃprātar ātho divā ||

The AthBSA lists this stanza as *tryavasāna*, but neither the R-W edition of ŚS, nor any of the PS mss., match the daṇḍa after pāda **b** that is placed there by ŚPP against most of his mss.<sup>49</sup> BHATTACHARYA edits *naghamāro naghāriṣo* in pāda **b**, and prints *naghāyaṃ* together in **c**.

**a.** On the names of Kuṣṭha, cf. also ŚS 5.4.8 (PS 1.31.2) *ūdaṇ jāto himāvataḥ sā prācyāṃ nīyase jānam | tātra kúṣṭhasya nāmāny uttamāni ví bhejire* ‘Born a northerner, from the Snowy [mountain range], so you are led to the people in the East: there they have divided among themselves the supreme names of Kuṣṭha’.

<sup>49</sup> I quote notes 2–3 from ŚPP’s critical apparatus integrally: “[**2**] **R S<sup>m</sup>** *nadyámáro nadyáriṣo nadyáyāṃ puruṣo riṣat* (**R** ṛṣat) | *yāsmāi pári bravīmi*. **A** *nadyámáro nadyáyuso nadyáyāṃ puruṣo riṣat* | *yāsmāi pári bravīmi*. **B<sup>h</sup> C** *nadyámáro nadyáyuso nadyáyāṃ puruṣorṣat* | *yāsmāi pári bravīmi*. **D** *nadyámáro nadyáyuso nadyáyāṃ puruṣo riṣat* | *yāsmāi pári bravīmi*. **K K<sup>m</sup>** *nadyámáro nadyáyusaḥ* | *nadyáyāṃ puruṣo riṣat* | *yāsmāi pári bravīmi*. **Dc** *nadyámáro nadyáriṣo* (corrected to *nadyáyusaḥ*) | *nadyáyāṃ puruṣo riṣat* | *yāsmāi pári bravīmi*. **Cs** *nadyámáro nadyáriṣo* (corrected to *nadyáyuso*) *nadyáyāṃ puruṣo riṣat* | *yāsmāi pári bravīmi*. The accents on *nadyamāro*, *nadyāyaṃ* and *paribravīmi* are ours. [**3**] **A B<sup>h</sup> C D R<sup>m</sup> S Cs** do not end the pāda here [i.e. after *nadyáriṣaḥ*], but **K K<sup>m</sup>** and **Dc** (the latter subsequently) do. The *Sarvānukramaṇikā* considers the mantra as *tryavasāna*. On the repeated error *dya* for *gha* in the ŚS mss., see WHITNEY, as well as BLOOMFIELD’s note (1897: 677).

**bc.** According to the editions of ŚS, and BHATTACHARYA (who here — against his usual policy — adopts the **K** reading rather than **Or** *naghāyuṣo*), this pāda would contain only two names, and this must lead to contorted translations such as e.g. BLOOMFIELD’S: ‘Three names hast thou, O kuṣṭha, (namely: kuṣṭha), na-ghā-māra (‘forsooth-no-death’), and na-ghā-risha (‘forsooth-no-harm’)’. Following an ingenious suggestion of Elizabeth Tucker, I take the conflicting ms.-evidence (in **Or**, **K**, ŚS mss.) seriously, and reconstruct for the second pāda a text which is not attested as such in any ms., but which forms a pleasing reconciliation of all variant readings, and answers the announcement of three names in pāda **a**.

On the name Naghamārá, see ZEHNDER (1993: 162 n. 261): “. . . vgl. noch AVŚ 6.93.01a: *agha-mārá-* ‘Übel zerstörend’ und AVŚ 4.17.06a *kṣudhā-mārá-* ‘Hungertod’ und *tr̥[ṣ]ṇā-mārá-* ‘Tod durch Verdursten’”. Besides another use of the name Naghāriṣa in a Kuṣṭha-hymn at PS 1.93.2, this name is also used to refer to the plant *arundhatī-* at ŚS 8.2.6, 8.7.6 / PS 16.3.6, 16.12.6, and at PS 11.7.7.

The contrast between *naghāmāra-* and *naghāriṣa-* led scholars to think of an explanation of the difference in terms of a rhythmical rule (AiGr. II/1, §56 pp. 130f.). I would prefer to explain *naghāmāra-* as formed in phonological analogy to *aghamārá-* (and in semantic analogy to *kṣudhā-mārá-* and *tr̥ṣṇā-mārá-*), while explaining *naghāriṣa-* and further unattested *naghāyuṣa-* as syntactic compounds (AiGr. II/1, §35a p. 85 and §123b pp. 326f.; cf. also the name *māriṣā-* in the next stanza) built on phrases containing augmented aor. stems *ariṣ-a-* and *ayūṣ(-a)-*. For the latter, cf. ŚS 6.123.4 *yūṣam*, 7.52[54].2 *ayuṣmahī* (*pace* NARTEN 1964: 213f. and GOTŌ 1997: 1031). Perhaps BLOOMFIELD’S idea (*ibid.*) that “the element *āyusha* seems to be due to a secondary effort to contrast the word with *māra* in the preceding, and thus strain sense out of it” is also still worth consideration: a connection of *naghāriṣa-* with *āyus-* ‘life’ (note also the Or. reading *naghāyuyam* in pādas 2c and 4d) is explicit at PS 11.7.7: *jīvalam̐ naghāriṣām ā te badhnāmy oṣadhīm | yā ta āyur upāharād apa rakṣāmsi cātayāt* ‘I bind on you the Naghāriṣā plant, full-of-life, which shall offer you a [full] life-span, shall remove the evil spirits’.

Under PS 1.93.2, ZEHNDER (1993: 162) observes with regard to these names: “Daß hier *ná gha* nur eine Volksetymologie ist und keinen Anhaltspunkt für Bedeutung und Etymon von *nagha-* bietet (diese sind vielmehr unklar), wird aus der falschen Konstruktion *ná + Inj.* ersichtlich”. Although one may, with ZEHNDER, allow the possibility that popular etymology was at play here, it is not so easy to neglect with ZEHNDER the collection of non-modally (but not ‘falsely’) used injunctives with *ná*-negation offered by HOFFMANN (1967: 99f.). It also seems problematic that ZEHNDER on the one hand rejects the construction as impossible, but on the other hand does allow himself to accept it in translating *ná . . . riṣat* ‘soll keinen Schaden nehmen’, by contrast with HOFFMANN (p. 100) who simply classifies this passage among those injunctive forms negated with *ná* where “die Annahme modalen Sinnes unmöglich oder doch

ganz unwahrscheinlich ist”, and who renders: ‘der Mann leidet nicht Schaden, für den ich bespreche ...’. One might even consider the possibility that *riṣat* in **c** was taken to be a subj. form (cf. *bruvat* in 7.8.1b above). Anyhow, I see no reason to follow ZEHNDER in his doubts about *nagha*<sup>o</sup> simply representing the sequence *ná gha* (cf. ŚS 5.13.10–11 / PS 8.2.9–10).

**d.** The verb *pari-brav*<sup>i</sup> is quite rare, and its precise meaning is not clear. It occurs at MS 4.8.7:115.5–8 *jīvā nāma stha tā imāṃ jīvayata jīvikā nāma stha tā imāṃ jīvayata saṃjīvā nāma stha tā imāṃ saṃjīvayata || iti yāvān ekaviṃśatiṃ darbhapiñjūlāni cāvadhāya páribrūyād áthābhímantrayeta ...* ‘He should place 21 [grains of] barley and [as many] bushels of *darbha*-grass [in a water-pot?], and speak around [the water]: “You are called the live ones, so enliven him here; you are called the livening ones, so enliven him here; you are called the fully live ones, so fully enliven him here!”’. Then he should speak mantras over [him] ...’. This passage and the following — both to be compared with ĀpŚS 14.20.8 (cf. CALAND 1924: 399 with n.), VaikhŚS 21.6:326.5–9, HirŚS 15.5.24 — mutually clarify each other: KS 27.4:143.16f. (KapKS 42.4:251.20f. [2:294.3f.]) *yaṃ kāmayetāmayāvināṃ jīved ity agner ante brāhmaṇāya procyāpaḥ paribrūyāt* ‘When one [of the dikṣitas?] is ill and he wants him to stay alive, he should announce it to a brahmin and should speak around the water, near the fire’. A blend of these two places is found in corrupt form at AthPrāy 6.6:140.10–15 (text cited precisely as edited by VON NEGELEIN): *sarveṣu cābhicārikeṣu saṃdikṣitānām ca vyāvarttetāgneran brāhmaṇaḥ procyā jīvā nāma sthā tā imāṃ jīvet(v)o | ’pajīvā nāma sthā tā imāṃ jīveta | jīvikā nāma sthā tā imāṃ jīveta saṃjīveta | jīvalā nāma sthā tā imāṃ jīveta saṃjīveta | saṃjīvikā nāma sthā tā imāṃ jīve(st)v)e | ’ty apāḥ paribrūyāt*. Cf. further GB 2.2.19, and PS 4.16.2 *apsarā mūlam akhanad gandharvaḥ pary abravīt | tena vo vṛtrahā sūryo ni + jambhyāñ amṛtad ghuṇāḥ*<sup>50</sup> ‘An Apsaras dug the root, a Gandharva spoke [incantations] around it: by this means did Sūrya, the Vṛtra-slayer, destroy your teeth, o Ghuṇas’. Observe that the mantras spoken by way of *parivacana* in the above YV passages are very similar to the *jīvalā*-mantra that follows in the next stanza in our present context.

### 7.10.3 ŚS 19.39.3 ◊ **c**: only PS (omitted in ŚS)

<i>jīvalā nāma te mātā</i>	(8)
<i>jīvanto nāma te pitā  </i>	(8)
<i>māriṣā nāma te svasā</i>	(8)
<i>na ° ° °   </i>	

Your mother is called Full-of-life, your father is called Lively, your sister is called No-harm. (This man ...).

<sup>50</sup> Thus the Or. mss.; ed. BHATTACHARYA: \**amrucad + ghuṇān*. In accordance with an as yet unpublished suggestion of Leonid Kulikov, I take *amṛtat* as imperf. from the very rare root *mṛt/mṛit/mlit* (OERTEL 1926: 240–242, see also KULIKOV 2001: 610 and 2006: 36f.).

this whole stanza with the next written *in margine* in **Mā** • pitā | māriṣā] pitā māriṣā **Or** [[*om.* ]], pitā | māriṣā **K** svasā na ° ° ° ||] svasā na ||<sup>kā</sup> **Ku**, {SVA}SVAsā na ||<sup>kā</sup> **V/126**, svasān, **Mā**, śvasāḥ [[*om.* ]] **K** [[*note* °ḥ u°]

### ŚS 19.39.3

jīvalā nāma te mātā jīvantó nāma te pitā |  
 +nādyāyām puruṣo riṣat |  
 yāsmāi +paribrāvīmi tvā sāyamprātar atho divā ||

BHATTACHARYA prints no daṇḍa after *pitā*. Since the AthBSA lists this stanza as *tryavasāna*, and since **K** actually places the daṇḍa that is lacking in the Or. mss, but is found also in ŚS (R-W and ŚPP), I follow **K** here.

**ab.** Cf. BLOOMFIELD’s note (1897: 678): “The Atharvan has a way of formulating qualities as father, mother, brother, &c. of the object they are attributed to”, and see his comments on ŚS 5.5.1 quoted above under 6.4.1ab. He refers (*ibid.*) to another father of this particular plant, mentioned at ŚS 5.4.9b (= PS 1.31.3b). On the names *jīvalā-* and *jīvantā-*, cf. PS 1.93.2a *jīvalam naghāriṣam* (of Kuṣṭha); PS 8.7.11b *arasam jīvale kṛdhi* (to Arundhatī); PS 11.7.7a *jīvalam naghāriṣam* (of Arundhatī); ŚS 8.2.6ab, 8.7.6ab (PS 16.3.6ab, 16.12.6ab) *jīvalam naghāriṣam jīvantim ośadhīm ahām* (of Arundhatī); PS 15.16.3 *trāyamānā hy asi jīvalā vīryāvati | arundhati tvām āhārṣam ito mā pārayān iti* ‘For you are a powerful Savioreess full-of-life, o Arundhatī: I’ve brought you here [with the expectation]: “they shall rescue me from this” ’; the same plant Arundhatī is also called *jīvalā-* at ŚS 6.59.3 = PS 19.14.12. The waters are called *jīvalāḥ* at PS 16.42.3 (= ĀpŚS 7.9.9, BhārŚS 7.7.11) and at ŚS 12.3.25 = PS 17.52.6 [PSK 17.38.6]. Cf. finally PS 19.55.12–15 [PSK 19.54.11–14] *jīvā stha jīvyāsam sarvam āyur jīvyāsam || upajīvā sthopa jīvyāsam sarvam āyur jīvyāsam || samjīvā stha sam jīvyāsam sarvam āyur jīvyāsam || jīvalā stha jīvyāsam sarvam āyur jīvyāsam ||*.

**c.** Next to *na-gha-ariṣa-/na-gha-ayusa-* in the preceding stanza, we must have here another syntactic compound, *mā-riṣa-*, which would literally seem to mean: ‘[Let X] not get hurt’ (cf. 7.8.8d above). It is interesting that whereas the two versions of this hymn further fully agree with each other in extent and arrangement of the mantras, ŚS here omits this pāda.

### 7.10.4 ŚS 19.39.4 ◊ **abc**: ŚS 8.5.11abc / PS 16.28.1abc

uttamo ’s <sub>i</sub> y ośadhīmām	(8)
anaḍvāñ jagatām iva	(8)
v <sub>i</sub> yāghraḥ śvapadām iva	(8)
na ghāyam puruṣo riṣat	(8)
yasmai paribrāvīmi tvā	(8)
sāyamprātar atho divā	(8)

You are the supreme among plants, like the ox among moving creatures, like the tiger among the ‘dog-footed’: this man does not get hurt, on whose behalf

I speak [these stanzas] around you, in the evening, early in the morning, and by day.

this whole stanza with the preceding written *in margine* in **Mā** • 'sy] **Or**, sy **K** anaḍvāñ jagatām] ana(.....)ām **Ku**, anaḍvānājagatām **V/126** **Mā**, anaḍvāñ jagatām [**Ma**] **Pa**, anaḍvāñ jagatām **K** iva vyāghraḥ śvāpadām] **Or**, iva | vyāgra svāpadām **K** [[*note*] ghāyam] **K**, ghāyūṃ **Or** puruṣo] **K**, puṣo **Or** |] **V/126** **Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, || **Ku** yasmai] **Or**, asmaī **K** bravīmi] **Or**, vравīmi **K** sāyamprātar atho divā] **Ku** **V/126** [**Ma**], sāyamprātara **Mā**, sāyamprātaratho divaḥ **K** ||] **Ku** [**Ma**], ||(*sec. m.* 3) **V/126**, *om.* **Mā**, *om.* **K** [[*note* °ḥ t°]

#### ŚS 19.39.4

uttamó asy óśadhīnām anaḍvāñ jāgatām iva vyāghrāḥ śvāpadām iva |  
 +nádyāyām púruṣo riṣat |  
 yásmai +paribrāvīmi tvā sāyamprātar átho divā ||

The AthBSA defines this stanza as *ṣaṭpadā jagatī* on the simplistic calculation that  $4 \times 12 = 48 = 6 \times 8$ : this is an example of the methodological “woodenness” of the author of this Anukramaṇī whose “equipment as a critic of meters hardly goes beyond the rudimentary capacity for counting syllables” (W-L, p. lxxiii). ŚPP places a daṇḍa between **c** and **d** (perhaps assuming that the stanza being called ‘hexa-pādic’ implies its being *tryavasāna*), while R-W do not; our **K** does while the Or. mss. do not. Since only one Or. ms. indicates a 3 (for *tryavasāna*) at the end of the stanza, and does so only *secunda manu*, I tentatively disregard the daṇḍa in **K**.

**a.** Cf. PS 1.31.3 *uttamo nāmāsy uttamo nāma te pitā | yataḥ kuṣṭha prajāyase tata ehy ariṣṭatātaye* ‘You are called Supreme. Your father is called Supreme. Come hither, o Kuṣṭha, from where you are born, for [our] safety’, and ŚS 5.4.9 *uttamó nāma kuṣṭhāsy uttamó nāma te pitā | yákṣmaṃ ca sárvaṃ nāsāya takmānaṃ cārasāṃ kṛdhi* ‘... Cause all consumption to vanish, and make the fever forceless’.

**bc.** On the meaning of *śvāpada-*, glossed ‘wildes Tier’ at EWAia II, 675, cf. the attestations of its derivative *śvāpada-* at BaudhŚS 24.5:189.8–10 *saptāraṇyā dvikhurās ca śvāpadāni ca pakṣiṇaś ca sarīṣpāni ca hastī ca markāṣaś ca nādeyā saptame* ‘The seven wild animals are: the cloven-hoofed, the *śvāpadas*, the birds, the creepy-crawlies, the elephant, the monkey, and as the seventh the river-animals’ and 27.5:329.6–8 *etad eva yasya puruṣo ratho ’śvo gaur mahiṣo varāho ’hir mṛgaḥ śvā vānyad vā śvāpadam antarāgnīn gacchet* ‘This [expiation] is for one whose fires would be trespassed by a man, a chariot, a horse, a cow, a buffalo, a boar, a snake, a deer, a dog, or another *śvāpada*’. Besides ŚS 18.3.55 / PS 18.74.8, it is especially ŚS 11.9[11].10 *átho sárvaṃ śvāpadaṃ mákṣikā tṛpyatu krīmīḥ | páuruṣeyé ’dhi kūṇape radité arbude táva* ‘And let every *śvāpada-*, let the fly, let the worm satisfy itself on the human carrion, o Arbudī, in the case of your bite’ that points to the carnivorous habits of this undesirable creature. The precise meaning of the word is not determinable on the basis of its attestations,

and the significance of the creature being called ‘dog-footed’ remains obscure (cf. perhaps the *śvakiṣkīṇ-* Arāyas at 6.14.6e above). The similes are not known to me from elsewhere in Vedic literature in any closely similar form, but cf. MS 3.7.4:79.5f. *anaḍvān vāi sārvaṇi vāyāṁsi paśūnām* ‘the ox equals all powers of (domesticated) animals’ and ŚBM 12.7.1.8 *sá vyāghrò ’bhavad āraṇyāṇām paśūnām rájā* ‘It (Indra’s wrath) became the tiger, the king of wild animals’.

**7.10.5** ŚS 19.39.5 ◊ **b**: PS 1.93.1d ◊ **e**: 8f, **fg**: 1cd, 8gh

triḥ śāmbubhyo <sup>+</sup> gireyebhyas	(8)
trir ādityebhyas pari	(8)
trir jāto viśvadevebhyaḥ	(8)
sa kuṣṭho viśvabheṣajaḥ	(8)
sākam somena tiṣṭhati	(8)
takmānaṁ sarvaṁ nāśayan	(8)
sarvāś ca yātudhānyaḥ	(8)

Three times [born] from the Śāmbu mountain dwellers, three times from the Ādityas, three times born from the All-gods: so, all-healing Kuṣṭha stands together with Soma, causing all fever and all sorceresses to vanish.

triḥ śāmbubhyo] **Mā**, triḥ śāmbubhyo **Ku Ma Pa**, tra(*sec. m.* → i)ḥ {śā}(*sec. m.* → sā 1)mbubhyo **V/126**, tiṣyāmidyo **K** <sup>+</sup>gireyebhyas trir] gireyebhyaḥstrir **Ku**, girayebhyaḥstrir **V/126 Mā**, gire(← gira)yebhyaḥstrir **Ma**, gireyebhyaḥ trir **Pa**, girayebhyas trir **K** viśvadevebhyaḥ] **V/126 Mā [Ma]**, viśv{e}adevebhyaḥ **Ku**, viśVA(→ śva)devebhyas **K** viśvabheṣajaḥ sākam] **Or**, viśvabheṣaja | sākam **K** [[note ]] tiṣṭhati |] **Or**, tiṣṭhasi [[*om.* ]] **K** nāśayan] **Or** [°n, s°], nāśayaṁ **K** || ||<sup>3</sup> **Ku V/126**, ||<sup>4</sup> **Mā**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ a°]]

### ŚS 19.39.5

triḥ śāmbubhyo āngirebhyas trir ādityebhyas pari |  
trir jāto viśvadevebhyaḥ |  
sá kuṣṭho viśvabheṣajaḥ sākam somena tiṣṭhati |  
takmānaṁ sārvaṁ nāśaya sārvaś ca yātudhānyaḥ ||

The AthBSA lists this stanza as *caturavasāna*, and both the R-W and the ŚPP editions of ŚS indeed place a daṇḍa after pāda **c**, which is not matched in any of the PS mss. (note the daṇḍa in **K** after **d** rather than **e**).

**abc**. Similar phrases (without *tris*) occur also at ŚS 4.10.4–5, PS 8.12.4, 19.29.2, 19.32.4–7. The first three pādas are to be compared with PS 1.93.1 *triḥ kuṣṭhāsi vṛtrāḥ jātāḥ trir divas pari \*jajñiṣe*<sup>51</sup> | *triḥ somāḥ jajñiṣe tvam trir ādityebhyas pari* ‘Three times, Kuṣṭha, you are born from Vṛtra, three times you have been born from heaven, three times you have been born from Soma, three times from the Ādityas’. The significance of the repeated emphasis on

<sup>51</sup> Thus already the silent emendation of BHATTACHARYA 1964: 84. Ed. BHATTACHARYA: *jajñire*.

*kuṣṭha-* having been born ‘three times’ is uncertain, but may perhaps — if we want to stretch the likelihood of naturalistic interpretations — be connected with triangularity in the morphology of the plant in question. Cf. POLUNIN & STAINTON 1984: 207 (on *Saussurea costus* = *S. lappa*, nr. 725): “A tall robust perennial, with large triangular long-stalked basal leaves . . . Lower leaves pinnate, 30–40 cm, with an irregularly winged leaf-stalk and often triangular terminal lobe . . .”. Or is there a connection with the three times of day mentioned in 14 and 4f?

The reading *sāmbubhyo* is confirmed by the ŚS text. Says WHITNEY: “All our *samhitā*-mss., and the majority of SPP’s *samhitā*-authorities, with the text of the comm., read after it *āṅgireyebhyas* (one or two *-raye-*), and the comm. takes the word as adjective (= *āṅgirasām apatyabhūtebhyah*) qualifying *çāmbubhyas*. SPP. adopts *āṅgirebhyas*, with the rest of the mss.; our emendation to *-robhyas* is a very simple and plausible one”, and would seem to receive support, in the present context, from the mythological opposition between Aṅgirasas and Ādityas (KUIPER 1979: 63f.) — but it is not confirmed by the PS text. The reading *gireyebhyas* which, disregarding the erroneously inserted visarga found in the Or. mss., is found in **Ku** (and **Ma**), receives interesting partial confirmation in the majority of the ŚS mss. (*āṅgireyebhyah*). Although *-eya-* derivations without *vr̥ddhi* in the root are regularly made only from oxytone *-ā*-stems (AiGr. II/2, §341a p. 508), the contextually attractive form *gireya-* (from *giri-*) does exist in Sanskrit: it is found at Mahābhārata 14.84.11 *tatrāpi draṇḍair andhrair oḍrair*<sup>52</sup> *māhiṣakair api tathā kollagireyaiś ca yuddham āsīt kirīṭinah* ‘There also the diademed one (i.e. Arjuna) did battle with the Draṇḍas, the Andhras, the Oḍras, the Māhiṣakas and with those dwelling on the Kolla Mountain’. While noting that the more expected derivation *gaireya-* is found close by in 7.12.2d, I restore *gireyebhyah* in this pāda, and for Kuṣṭha’s connection with *giris* refer to ŚS 5.4.1ab (PS 19.8.15ab) *yó girīśv ājāyathā vīrūdhām bālavattamaḥ* and 5.4.2ab (19.8.14ab) *suparṇasúvane giráu jātām himāvatas pári* (cf. POLUNIN & STAINTON 1984: 207).

Since other cases of interchange *ś :: k* in loan-words are known (cf. WITZEL 1998: 344 with n. 29, also p. 362), it may not be unattractive to connect the apparent ethno- or toponym *śāmbu-* with the name *kamboja-* (= *kambo-ja-*?; first attested Nir 2.2) denoting a tribe that lived in the mountainous north-western regions near Kabul (MACDONELL & KEITH 1912/I: 138; more details and extensive references in WITZEL 1980: 92, with nn. 81 and 84 on pp. 114f.) that are repeatedly said to be *kuṣṭha*’s place of origin: cf. the just quoted places, and the ones listed under 1ab above. Cf. also the proper names *Śāmburāyaṇa-* and *Śāmbavyāyana-* at BaudhŚSPrav 20:434.1, 27:440.2 respectively, and *Śāmbuputra-* at Nidānasūtra 9.1:153.21, plus the ethnonym *Śāmbu-* at ĀśvŚS 12.12.5. Alternatively, one might suppose that since PS 1.93.1 men-

<sup>52</sup> The crit. ed. reads *andhrāi raudrāi*, but the obviously correct reading is preserved in mss. B3.4.

tions Vṛtra as first originator of *kuṣṭha-*, the name Śāmbu here can be connected with Indra’s enemy Śambara who — as Elizabeth Tucker points out to me — also lives in the mountains (RV 1.130.7, 2.12.11, 4.30.14, 6.26.5, PS 12.15.2; PARPOLA 1988: 261f., now also 2002: 271–281).

e. On this pāda, cf. BLOOMFIELD 1897: 678 and ZYSK 1985: 157. Cf. ŚS 5.4.7ab / PS 19.11.2ab (to Kuṣṭha) *devébhyo ádhi jātó ’si sómasyāsi sákḥā hitáh* ‘You are born from the gods, you are provided as a companion to Soma’.

**7.10.6** ŚS 19.39.6 ◊ **ab**: PS 20.61.7ab ◊ **bc**: cf. PS 15.15.4bc ◊  
**abc**: ŚS 5.4.3abc = 6.95.1abc

aśvattho devasadanas	(8)
ṛtīyasyām ito divi	(8)
tatrāmṛtasya cakṣaṇam	(8)
tataḥ kuṣṭho ajāyata	(8)
sah ° ° °	

The Aśvattha is the seat of the gods, in the third heaven from here. There is the appearance of immortality; from there Kuṣṭha was born: (all-healing ...).

omitted in Mā • ito] Or, itau K tataḥ] Or, tva[*line*]h K ajāyata sah ° ° ° ||] ’jāyata  
||<sup>4+kā</sup> Ku, ’jāyata ||<sup>4</sup> V/126 Ma, jāyatātsah [[*om.*] K [[*note* °ḥ h°]

#### ŚS 19.39.6

aśvatthó devasádanas ṛtīyasyām itó divi |  
tátrāmṛtasya cákṣaṇam tátaḥ kúṣṭho ajāyata |  
sá kúṣṭho víśvábheṣajaḥ sákam sómēna tiṣṭhati |  
takmānaṃ sárvaṃ nāśaya sárvas ca yātudhānyāḥ ||

On the unwritten refrain in the ŚS text of stanzas 6 and 7, cf. WHITNEY: “SPP. adds to this verse and the next the last four pādas of vs. 5, as a refrain continued from that verse; and this is evidently the understanding of the Anukr., and the comm. ratifies it. Whether SPP. makes the addition on the authority of these two alone, or whether some of his mss. also intimate it, he does not state; not one of our mss. gives any sign of it”.

There are several parallels for the formulaic elements from which this stanza is composed. ŚS 5.4.3 = 6.95.1 *aśvatthó devasádanas ṛtīyasyām itó divi | tátrāmṛtasya cákṣaṇam devāḥ kúṣṭham avanvata* ‘...’, there the gods won Kuṣṭha, [which is] the appearance of immortality’; PS 15.15.4 *arundhatī nāmāsi ṛtīyasyām ito divi | tatrāmṛtasya rohaṇam tena tvāchā vadāmasi* ‘You are called Arundhatī in the third heaven from here. There is the mounting of immortality. Therefore we invite you’; 20.61.7 [PSK 20.51.8] *aśvattho devasadanas ṛtīyasyām ito divi | tatra lohītavṛkṣo jātaḥ + śīgruḥ kṣiptabheṣajaḥ* ‘...’, there the red tree is born, the Śīgru which is the cure for [missiles] thrown’.

**ab**. Cf. ChU 8.5.3 *atha yad arañyāyanam ity ācakṣate brahmacaryam eva tat | tad araś ca ha vai ṇyaś cārṇavau brahmaloke ṛtīyasyām ito divi | tad*

*airaṃmadīyaṃ saraḥ | tad aśvatthaḥ somasavanaḥ | tad aparājita pūr brahma-  
naḥ prabhuvimitaṃ hiraṃmayam* ‘And finally, what people normally call “the  
embarking to the wilderness” (*araṇyāyana*) is, in reality, the life of a celibate  
student. Now, Ara and Ņya are the two seas in the world of *brahman*, that is,  
in the third heaven from here. In that world are also the lake Airaṃmadīya, the  
banyan tree Somasavana, the fort Aparājita, and *brahman*’s golden hall Prabhu’  
(OLIVELLE 1998: 279). Clearly, there existed a Vedic myth of an Aśvattha tree  
in heaven, associated with divine soma-drinking (cf. ṚV 10.135.1ab *yásmiṃ  
vr̥kṣé supalāśé devāiḥ sampibate yamaḥ* ‘the fair-leaved tree in/under which  
Yama drinks together with the gods’), and hence with Kuṣṭha, but that is  
perhaps all we can say about it.

Pāda **b** once again establishes the connection between the *kuṣṭha*- and the  
*soma*-plant: cf. TS 3.5.7.1 etc. (see KLAUS 1986: 173 for further references)  
*tr̥tīyasyaṃ itó divi sóma āsīt* ‘Soma was in the third heaven from here’. Re-  
garding the tripartite division of heaven, cf. LÜDERS 1951: 57–62 and KLAUS  
1986: 42–44, 173.

**cd.** On the meaning of the phrase *amṛtasya cákṣaṇa-*, cf. ZYSK 1985: 151,  
who discusses previous interpretations (also with reference to ṚV 1.13.5c)  
and concludes that it means “the appearance or manifestation of the divine”.  
The opening *tátrāmṛtasya* ... is combined with various nouns: ṚV 1.170.4c  
*tátrāmṛtasya cétanaṃ yajñám te tanavāvahai*, PS 1.93.3cd *tátrāmṛtasyeśānaṃ  
kuṣṭhaṃ devā abadhata*, ŚS 5.4.4cd = 6.95.2cd *tátrāmṛtasya púṣpaṃ devāḥ  
kúṣṭham avanvata*, ŚS 4.7.1cd ( $\approx$  PS 5.8.8cd = 9.10.7cd) *tátrāmṛtasyásiktaṃ  
ténā te vāraye viśám*.

**7.10.7** ŚS 19.39.7  $\diamond$  **ab:** ŚS 5.4.4ab = 6.95.2ab

+hiraṇyayī naur acarad (8)  
dhiraṇyabandhanā divi °°° || (8)

The golden boat with golden mooring moved in heaven. (There is ...).

omitted in **Mā** • +hiraṇyayī] hiraṇy{ai}ayai **Ku**, hiraṇyayai **V/126** [**Ma**], hiraṇye **K**  
naur] **Or**, non **K** dhiraṇyabandhanā] **Or**, dhiraṇyardhandhanā **K** divi °°° ||] divi  
||<sup>4+kā</sup> **Ku**, divi ||<sup>4</sup> **V/126** **Ma**, divi sa | **K**

ŚS 19.39.7

hiraṇyáyī náur acarad dhiraṇyabandhanā divi |  
tátrāmṛtasya cákṣaṇaṃ tátaḥ kúṣṭho ajāyata |  
sá kúṣṭho víśvábheṣajaḥ sákāṃ sómena tiṣṭhati |  
takmānaṃ sárvaṃ nāśaya sárváś ca yātudhānyāḥ ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *hiraṇyayai*.

**a.** About the meaning of this stanza, cf. my commentary on 8ab. The read-  
ing *hiraṇye* in **K** can very well be a simple corruption for *hiraṇyayī* as reads the  
evidently correct text preserved in ŚS 19.39.7 (and 5.4.4 = 6.95.2), the reading  
that must also be adopted here. Note that all mss. (**Or.** and **K**) read *hiraṇyair*

for \**hiranyayīr* at the parallel PS 19.8.13 ≈ ŚS 5.4.5 *hiranyāyāḥ pānthāna āsann āritrāṇi hiranyāyā | nāvo hiranyāyīr āsan yābhiḥ kuṣṭhaṃ nirāvahan* ‘Golden were the roads, the oars golden, the ships were golden by which they brought down the *kuṣṭha*’ (WHITNEY). The pāda has been cited in very corrupt form by Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya under Vārttika 7 on Aṣṭādhyāyī 6.4.174 (ed. KIELHORN vol. III, p. 235 l. 13): cf. RAU 1985, item 751, and WITZEL 1986: 250.

**b.** Cf. PS 12.7.5 *yatra preṅkho gandharvāṇām divi baddho hiranyayaḥ | tat paretā apsarasaḥ pratibuddhā abhūtana* ‘Where the Gandharvas’ golden swing is tied in heaven (cf. ṚV 1.163.2–4), go away there, Apsarases: you have been recognized’.

### 7.10.8 ŚS 19.39.8 ◊ cdefgh: 6cd+5defg

yatra nāvaḥ prabhraṃśanaṃ	(8)
yatra himavataḥ śiraḥ	(8)
tātrāmṛtasya cakṣanaṃ	(8)
tataḥ kuṣṭho ajāyata	(8)
sa kuṣṭho viśvabheṣajaḥ	(8)
sākam somena tiṣṭhati	(8)
takmānaṃ sarvaṃ nāśayan	(8)
sarvās ca yātudhānyāḥ	(8)

There where the ship’s descent is, where the top of the Snowy [mountain range] is, there is the appearance of immortality; from there Kuṣṭha was born: so, all-healing Kuṣṭha stands together with Soma, causing all fever and all sorceresses to vanish.

omitted in **Mā** • yatra] **Or**, sayatra **K** [[note sa] nāvaḥ] **Or**, navaḥ **K** yatra] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, yaDra **V/126** [?] himavataḥ] **Or**, himavataś **K** ] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ t°] tataḥ] **Or**, tataḥ **K** ajāyata] **K**, ’jāyata **Or** [[note different sandhi at 6d] ] **Ku** **Ma** **K**, || **V/126** kuṣṭho] **Or**, kuṣṭhaṃ **K** viśvabheṣajaḥ] **Or**, viśvabheṣaja **K** tiṣṭhati] **Or**, tiṣṭhasi **K** nāśayan] **Or** [°n, s°], nāśam **K** [Bar.: nāśayaṃ] ||] [**Ma**], ||<sup>4</sup> **Ku** **V/126**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ y°]

#### ŚS 19.39.8

yātra nāvaprabhrāṃśanaṃ yātra himāvataḥ śiraḥ |  
tātrāmṛtasya cakṣanaṃ tataḥ kuṣṭho ajāyata |  
sā kuṣṭho viśvabheṣajaḥ sākam somena tiṣṭhati |  
takmānaṃ sarvaṃ nāśaya sarvās ca yātudhānyāḥ ||

**ab.** The PS reading *nāvaḥ prabhraṃśanaṃ*<sup>53</sup> makes the elaborate discussions of the corrupt ŚS reading by BLOOMFIELD (1897: 679), and by WHITNEY, superfluous. BLOOMFIELD further writes (*ibid.*): “It seems difficult to abstain from comparing with this passage certain features of the well-known legend of

<sup>53</sup> Thus also (only) ŚPP’s ms. **D**: *nāvaḥ prabhraṃśanaṃ*.

Manu and the flood. In the *Sat. Br.* I, 8, 1, 6 the northern mountain upon which Manu’s ship settled is styled ‘Manu’s descent,’ manor-avasarpnam, and in the version of the flood-legend in the Mahābhārata I, 12797 [crit. ed. 3.185.47] it is called nau-bandhana”. According to ZYSK 1985: 158 (following BLOOMFIELD 1897: 680) these pādas probably refer “to the descent of the crescent moon (“golden boat”) to the top or “summit” (*śīraḥ* in *b*)”. ZYSK continues: “Such a place could be looked upon as the third heaven, the birthplace of *kūṣṭha* and Soma. The reference to the legend of Manu’s descent is forced”. It seems possible to me that it is the sun, rather, that is referred to (cf. 7.7.6ab), and the last part of ZYSK’s *siddhānta* is certainly misconceived, because the following (phraseological and mythological) connections with the flood-myth can hardly be coincidental: cf. with our pādas **ab** MBh. 3.185.47ab (*tac ca naubandhanam nāma śṛṅgam himavataḥ param*); with the role of the fish (*matsya-*) and Manu in the myth compare the names *mātsya-* and *aikṣvāka-* in stanza 9 (Ikṣvāku is Manu’s son: Rāmāyaṇa 1.69.18, 2.102.5; HOPKINS 1915: 201).

### 7.10.9 ŚS 19.39.9

yaṃ tvā veda pūrva aikṣvāko	(8)
yaṃ vā tvā kuṣṭha kāśyaḥ	(8)
yaṃ śāvaso yaṃ +mātsyas	(8)
tenāsi viśvabheṣajaḥ	(8)

You whom the ancient one belonging to the Ikṣvākus knows [as all-healing], or you, o Kuṣṭha, whom the one belonging to the Kāśis, whom the one belonging to the Śavasas, whom the one belonging to the Matsyas [knows as such]: in the same way you are all-healing [now, to us].

veda] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, ve(+ da 3) **Ku** pūrva aikṣvāko] **Or**, pūrvakṣvāko **K** yaṃ] **K**, 'yaṃ **Or** kuṣṭha kāśyaḥ | yaṃ śāvaso] **Ku** [**Ma**], kuṣṭha kāKHY(*sec. m.* → śya 4)ḥ | yaṃ śāvaso **V/126**, kuṣṭha kāśyaḥ | yaṃ śāvaso **Mā**, kuṣṭhikāśca ahiśyāvaso **K** [*om.*] | yaṃ +mātsyas] yaṃ māchyas **Or**, anusāriśchas **K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [*note* °ḥ t°]

#### ŚS 19.39.9

yāṃ tvā veda pūrva ikṣvāko yāṃ vā tvā kuṣṭha kāmyaḥ |  
yāṃ vā vāso yāṃ ātsyas tēnāsi viśvabheṣajaḥ ||

BHATTACHARYA’s text contains a misprint: *aikṣāko* (corrected n.d.-1: iii). WHITNEY commented on the corrupt ŚS version of this stanza: “there is almost nothing here that is not very questionable”. The readings of the PS mss. now solve all the textual problems. The stanza refers to four ethnonyms, each of which is also known from other sources. Precisely why it is these tribes that are mentioned, and whether there is a geographical pattern in their arrangement, remains unclear.

**a.** WITZEL writes about this occurrence (1997b: 50): “The mysterious Ikṣvākus, which already appear at RV 8.60.4, may help to explain the developments in the Eastern part of the Pañcāla area. They are mentioned already

in the AV 19.39.9 = PS 7.10.9 as one of the Eastern groups (with the Kāśi and Matsya) living at the edge of Indo-Aryan settlements”, and refers to his own publication of 1980, for further information on the Ikṣvākus. The information given there (1980: 88 with n. 25 p. 105) is, however, not very conclusive. WITZEL quotes BaudhŚS 2.5:40.7–8 *videheṣu me śīpatho mahāvarṣeṣu me glaur mūjavatsu me tapnā dundubhau me kāśikekṣvākuṣu me pittam kaliṅgeṣu me ’medhyam* ‘my elephantiasis towards the Videhas, my wen-like excrescence (lump) towards the Mahāvarṣas, my fever towards the Mūjavants, my cough towards the drum, my bile towards the Ikṣvākus, my ritual impurity to the Kaliṅgas’ and tries to deduce from the collocation with the Videhas of the (North) East, the Mūjavants (North/North-West) and the Kaliṅgas (of the South-East [?]) that the Ikṣvākus must have inhabited a region to the South(-West?) of Madhyadeśa. The significance of *pūrva-* in this pāda remains unclear, but if it indeed means ‘eastern’ it would seem to speak with WITZEL 1997b: 50 against WITZEL 1980: 88. I prefer, however, to assume it is used to lend an authority of age to the knowledge of the Aikṣvāka, rather than to provide a geographical specification.

b. On the Kāśi people (also at PS 12.2.2), cf. WITZEL 1980: 87 (with n. 13 p. 103 referring to MACDONELL & KEITH 1912/I: 153ff.): they belong to the eastern area around modern Benares.

c. On the Matsya tribe, cf. MACDONELL & KEITH 1912/II: 121f., and *ibid.* on the Śavasa tribe: the existence of these latter (called ‘*Vaśas*’ in the *Vedic Index*) was not previously recognized, because the three places where they are mentioned all transmit the name in variously corrupt forms. The PS mss. clearly point to the form *śāvasa-*, derivative — parallel to *aikṣvāka-* from *ikṣvāku-*, *kāśya-* from *kāśi-*, *mātsya-* from *matsya-* — of *śavasa-*, and it is to this form of the name that the other attestations can safely be restored.

AB 8.14.3 *tasmād asyāṅ dhruvāyām madhyamāyām pratiṣṭhāyām diśi ye ke ca kurupañcālānām rājānaḥ savaśośīnarāṇām rājyāyava te ’bhiṣicyante* ‘Therefore in this firm middle established quarter, whatever kings there are of the Kuru-Pañcālas with the Vaśas and Uśīnaras, they are anointed for kingship’. I have quoted KEITH’s translation, which is based on the reading *savaśośīnarāṇām*, whose element *savaśa-* KEITH interprets as *sa-vaśa-*, following an old but unconvincing argumentation by OLDENBERG (1881: 400f. = 1993: 1849f. n. 2: “Dies die herkömmliche und, wie ich glaube, richtige Uebersetzung von savaçoçīnarânâm. Die Vaça werden identisch sein mit den Vamsa der buddhistischen Völkeraufzählungen”).

GB 1.2.10 *taṁ mātovāca ta evaitad annam avocaṁs ta ima eṣu kurupañcāleṣv aṅgamagadheṣu kāśīkauśaleṣu śālvamatsyeṣu + śavasośīnareṣūdīcyeṣu*<sup>54</sup> *annam adantīti* ‘(His) mother spoke to him, “Those (people) alone have talked

<sup>54</sup> GAASTRA reads *savaśośīna°*, an emendation based on the AB passage. She reports the following readings (1919: 43 n. 12): *śavasa uśīta°* A; *śavasa uśīna°* B; *savasva uśīna°* C; *savasva uśīna°* E.

about this food. Those (people) partake of this food in the Kuru and Pañcāla countries, the Aṅga and Magadha countries, the Kāśi and Kauśala countries, the Śālva and Matsya countries, the Śavasa and Uśīnara, and the northern countries”’ (PATYAL).

KauṣU 4.1 (ŚāṅkhĀ 6.1) *so ’vasad uśīnareṣu savasanmatsyeṣu*<sup>55</sup> *kuru-pañcāleṣu kāśivideheṣv iti* ‘He stayed with the Uśīnaras, with the Śavasas (?) and the Matsyas, with the Kurus and Pañcālas, and with the Kāśis and Videhas’. At this place, *pace* BODEWITZ 2002a: 59 n. 200 (and his predecessors), *savasan*<sup>o</sup> is in my opinion not to be emended to *savaśa*<sup>o</sup> (or to *satvan*<sup>o</sup>), but if anything to *śavasa*<sup>o</sup>.

d. Of the 11 cases of RV *yām/yām tvā* listed by HETTRICH 1988: 724, not a single case shows *tēna* (or anything comparable) in the main clause. I tentatively assume a relativized form of the ‘*sá figé*’ construction (type *tām tvā* ...: JAMISON 1992) in the first three pādas (HETTRICH’s suggestion, p. 748, seems to support this assumption: “Demnach scheint der Typ *yām tvā* sekundär nach dem Muster von *tām tvā* ebenfalls erst Indisch entstanden zu sein”). BLOOMFIELD solves the problem ingeniously by supplying ‘(We know)’ at the beginning of the stanza: “(We know) thee whom . . . knew: therefore art thou a universal remedy”. On the usage of *vā*, cf. KLEIN 1985/II: 190ff. (esp. p. 193).

### 7.10.10 ŚS 19.39.10 ◊ cd: PS 12.1.4cd / ŚS 5.22.3cd

śīrṣālākam tṛtīyakam	(8)
†sadandir yaś ca hāyanah	(8)
takmānam viśvadhāvīrya-	(8)
-adharāñcam parā suva    10    <i>anuvāka 2</i>	(8)

The tertian fever that is poison to the head, and the [fever] which is perennial, is annual — do you, o [Kuṣṭha] of unremitting strength, force away downwards.

†sadandir] sadamdir **Or**, sadantī **K** hāyanah] **Ku V/126 [Ma] K**, hā anah] **Mā** || **Or**, *om.* **K** [[note °ḥ t°]] viśvadhāvīryādharāñcam] viśvadhāvīryā’dharāñcam **Or**, viśvadhāvīryā adharāñcam **K** suva || 10 || *anuvāka 2* || suva || ṛ 11 || 10 || a 2 || **Ku**, suva || 10 || ṛ (*sec. m.* 12 [!]) || a 2 || **V/126**, suva || 10 || ṛ || a 2 || **Mā**, suvah] Z Z 5 Z anu 2 Z **K**

#### ŚS 19.39.10

śīrṣalokam tṛtīyakam sadamdir yaś ca hāyanah |  
takmānam viśvadhāvīryādharāñcam parā suva ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *sadandir* and reports the reading *sadamdir* only for his **Ma**, while I also find it in his **Mā**.

a. The ŚS reading *śīrṣalokam* can perhaps be explained as a graphical error: confusion *CāCā* :: *CaCo* is rampant in medieval North Indian ms.-tradition,

<sup>55</sup> BHIM DEV (1980: 37), who edits *so ’vasan matsyeṣu*, reports a reading *savasama*<sup>o</sup> in one of his mss., while the other mss. whose readings are reported read *savasanma*<sup>o</sup>.

due to the *pr̥ṣṭhamātra* way of writing *Co* with a post- and prescript element, so that the postscript *ā*-mātra of an akṣara could easily be mistaken to be the prescript element of the ensuing one. If this explanation of the ŚS error is correct, it would imply a written transmission of ŚS 19 at an early stage, an implication entirely in line with the observations made in my Introduction, §§2.2.1 and 2.6. ZYSK (1985: 158) speculates that *śr̥ṣālāka*- “may be ‘pain from inflammation (or poison) in the head’ (cf. *alají* at AVŚ 9.8.20)”. More relevant than *alají*- seem to be the words *ālaka*- and *vyālaka*-, which co-occur at PS 9.10.10a, *vyāla*- in 12.1.8a, and *ālīkī*- in 8.2.6a: these specimens of poison-terminology have been discussed with some comparative data and with full parallels from ŚS by GHOSH 2002: 125f. The length of the second syllable in °*ālaka*- remains problematic. The compound as such can be compared with *śr̥ṣakti*- ‘head-ache’ at 7.15.6a below.

On *tṛ̥ṭīyaka*- (PS 1.32.4, 1.32.5 / ŚS 5.22.13, 1.25.4; PS 1.45.1, 4.18.2, 20.60.8 [PSK 20.57.7–8]), cf. FILLIOZAT 1949: 97 n. 2: “dans la médecine classique *tṛ̥ṭīyaka* désigne la fièvre qui revient le troisième jour (en comptant celui du premier accès pour un) donc la fièvre tierce”. There are some complications regarding the interpretation of *tṛ̥ṭīyaka*- at other places (cf. FILLIOZAT *ibid.* and ZYSK 1985: 140), but they do not seem to concern us here.

**b.** This pāda is to be compared with pādas **b** in ŚS 5.22.13 *tṛ̥ṭīyakaṃ vitṛ̥ṭīyāṃ sadandīm utá śāradām | takmānaṃ śītāṃ rūrāṃ grāīṣmaṇi nāśaya vār̥ṣikam* ‘Destroy [, O plant,] the *takmān* who recurs every third day (tertian), who has the third day free (quartan?), who is continual, who is autumnal, who is hot and cold, who arises in the summer and in the rainy season’ (ZYSK 1985: 42), and PS 1.32.5 *tṛ̥ṭīyakaṃ vitṛ̥ṭīyāṃ \*sadandīm uta hāyanam | takmānaṃ viśvaśāradaṃ grāīṣmaṇi nāśaya vār̥ṣikam* ‘Destroy the tertian fever, which has the third day free (quartan?), which is perennial, which is hibernal, which is autumnal, which arises in the summer, which arises in the rainy season’. On *sadandī*- (also at PS 1.45.1c, 20.60.8a [PSK 20.57.8a]), cf. BLOOMFIELD 1897: 452, who compares the adverb *sadadī* ‘every day’ known from YV texts (e.g. MS 1.5.12:80.18, 1.10.9:149.15; *Kūṣmāṇḍabrahmaṇa* [SŪRYA KĀNTA 1943] 90:10, etc.). Further BLOOMFIELD (1897: 681): “*hāyaná* either sums up the varieties of the *takmān* which are described in V, 22, 13 as *śāradá*, *grāīṣma*, and *vār̥shika*, and would then have to be translated ‘occurring through the year;’ or it means simply ‘yearly,’ i.e. occurring (at a given time) every year;’ cf. *visváśārada* at IX, 8, 6; XIX, 34, 10”. My translation for *hāyana*- at 1.32.5 follows a suggestion of Werner Knobl.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>56</sup> “I would opt for taking *hāyanam*, too, in a seasonal sense. The noun *hāyaná*- is cognate with Av. *zaiiana*-, which means ‘winterly’. It is etymologically related to *héman*- < \**ǵ<sup>h</sup>eǵmen*- and may derive from an Indo-Iranian pre-form \**j<sup>h</sup>āyana*- with additional *v̥ddhi* (cf. EWAia II, 814) << \*\**ǵ<sup>h</sup>eǵmn-o*-. Although the meaning ‘winterly’ does not seem to be attested for *hāyana*- as yet, this context all but forces us to accept it here in exactly that sense. Thus, the seasons referred to in this one stanza would be four in all.” (email dated 2-11-2003)

## 7.11. For safe pregnancy: with bdellium.

This hymn, which shows several thematic links with 7.3, makes a rather composite impression: it has substantial (verbatim) correspondences in RV 10.162 (ŚS 20.96.11–16; cf. ZYSK 1993: 51–53) and MānGS 2.18.2, but also contains stanzas not known from other mantra collections, and opens with a stanza that concludes an Agni hymn in ŚS. The protectively employed *gulgulu-* plays no role before stanza 10, which makes that stanza appear as an afterthought.

As to the parallel in MānGS 2.18.2: the same mantras are also used in KāṭhGS 48.1, where they are only indicated *pratīkena* in CALAND’s 1925 edition, which (p. 216, n. 1) lists a few variants from the MānGS readings; the full text of the KāṭhGS mantras is contained in KAUL SHĀSTRĪ’s edition, 1934: 209–214. Below, reference is made to KāṭhGS only under stanza 3 where there are also significant variants in its version of the mantra, and references to ŚS are also generally omitted, because its text is — but for phonetic details (see 5c) — a direct copy from the RV.

*somapṛṣṭhāḥ* in 1a concatenates with 7.10.8f and with recurring forms of *soma-* in 7.6.6d, 7.7.6b, 7.9.10d; repeated *nāśayāmasi* concatenates with repeated *nāśayan* in 7.10.

### 7.11.1 ŚS 3.21.10

ye parvatāḥ somapṛṣṭhā	(8)
āpa uttānaśivarīḥ	(8)
vātaḥ parjanya ād agnis	(8)
te kravyādam aśīśaman	(8)

The mountains that are soma-backed, the waters that are lying supine, the wind, the rain and the fire: they have put the eater of bloody flesh to rest.

parvatāḥ] **Or**, parvatās **K** somapṛṣṭhā āpa] **Ku** [Ma], somapṛṣṭh{·}(sec. m. ā)ḥ āpa **V/126**, somapṛṣṭhāḥ āpa **Mā**, somapṛṣṭhāpa **K** uttānaśivarīḥ |] **Or**, uttānaśivari | **K** vātaḥ] **Or**, vātaḥ **K** parjanya ād] **Ku** **Mā** [Ma], parya(→ rja)nya ād **V/126**, parjanyaḍ **K** kravyādam aśīśaman] **Ku** [Ma], kravyādam{u}(→ ma)śīśaman **V/126**, kravyādamaśīśaman **Mā**, kravyādamaśīśamaḥ **K**

#### ŚS 3.21.10

yé párvatāḥ sómapṛṣṭhā āpa uttānaśivarīḥ |  
vātaḥ parjanya ād agnis té kravyādam aśīśaman ||

**b.** The epithet *uttānaśivarī-* is known only here. It may be compared with JB 3.367 *sa* + *uttānaśayān*<sup>57</sup> *apaśyat* ‘He (Indra) saw [the seasons] lying supine’.

<sup>57</sup> The ed. reads *tā uttānaśayyām*; the Baroda ms. reads *sa uttānaśayyām*; Burnell *tā uttānaśayyām*; N2 *ta uttānaśayyām* (readings kindly provided by Gerhard Ehlers). The somewhat far-reaching emendation to an acc. pl. °*śayān* seems to be required by the context.

c. On the use of *ád* as a “conjunction joining the last term of a series to its preceding members”, see KLEIN 1985/II: 137.

d. Normally, *kravyád-* (sg.) is an epithet of Agni, and so it functions in ŚS 3.21.8–10, where this stanza also occurs — 8d: *imám kravyádaṃ śamayantu agnīm*; 9a *śāntó agnīḥ kravyát* — with surprising pacification of Agni by himself. Here, however (cf. FILLIOZAT 1949: 107 n. 2), the term clearly refers rather to the damaging demonic beings that are mentioned in 7.3, and several times in this hymn (cf. GEIB 1975): should we understand *śamayati* rather in its (euphemistic) sense ‘to kill’ (cf. OERTEL 1942: 8f. = 1994/II: 1508f.) here? Cf. 7.18.7e.

### 7.11.2 Cf. ṚV 10.162.3, MānGS 2.18.2<sup>c</sup>

yas te hanti carācaram	(8)
utthāsyantaṃ sarīṣṛpaṃ	(8)
garbhaṃ yo daśamāsyaṃ	(8)
tam ito nāśayāmasi	(8)

The one that kills your fetus of ten-months, moving to and fro, about to emerge, smoothly gliding: that one do we cause to vanish from here.

hanti] Or, hantu K carācaram] Ku Mā [Ma] K, carācara{ṃ}m V/126 sarīṣṛpaṃ | sarīṣṛpaṃ | Or, sarīṣṛpaṃ, [om. ] K

#### ṚV 10.162.3, MānGS 2.18.2<sup>c</sup>

yás te hánti patáyantaṃ niṣatsnúṃ yáḥ sarīṣṛpám |  
jātám yás te jíghāṃsati tám itó nāśayāmasi ||

ab. In his commentary on the ṚV parallel, GELDNER follows Sāyaṇa’s suggestion that the pādas refer to three stages of conception before birth: “*patáyantam*: Sāy. richtig ‘den als Samen hineinkommenden Fötus’. *niṣatsnúm* ‘den festsitzenden’, also = conceptus”. *sarīṣṛpám* would refer to movements of the fetus after the third month of the pregnancy. I have the impression that at least our version of the stanza cannot be interpreted in this way. All adjectives in the first hemistich seem to agree with the adjective *daśamāsya-* in pāda c, and appear to refer to a fetus about to be born; the repetition of the relative pronoun does not seem to imply any syntactic break.

*carācará-* (see HOFFMANN 1960a: 248 = 1975: 119) can refer i.a. to an offering of (boiling?) Agnihotra milk, as in the mantra found at ĀpŚS 6.5.7 (BhārŚS 6.10.6, BhārGS 2.2:32.8 etc.; cf. TĀ 3.11.33): *idāyāḥ padaṃ ghṛtavac carācaram jātavedo havir idam juṣasva*, which corresponds to ŚS 3.10.6ab (PS 1.105.2ab, ManB 2.2.11ab) *idāyās padám ghṛtávat sarīṣṛpám jātavedaḥ práti havyā grbhāya* ‘The track of Idā [is] full of ghee, greatly trickling; O Jātavedas, accept thou the oblations’ (WHITNEY): rather than referring to a different stage of pregnancy, *carācará-* seems to mean more or less the same as *sarīṣṛpá-*. Cf. 6.21.3ab above: *yat kiṃ cedam patayati yat kiṃ cedam sarīṣṛpaṃ*. The ṚV parallel also combines the verb *pataya-* with *sarīṣṛpá-*, and we find the same

apparently standard combination at KS 15.3:211.10f. *vanaspatibhyas svāhā patayadbhyas svāhā pariplavebhyas svāhā carācarebhyas svāhā sarīṣṛpebhyas svāhā* (not at TS 1.8.13.3, VSM 22.29).

c. On the ‘fetus of ten months’, cf. ṚV 5.78.7–8; PS 3.14.2, 5.12.5, 5.37.8, 9.15.8, 20.22.9, 20.27.4 [PSK 20.21.9, 20.26.4]; ŚS 1.11.6, 3.23.2 etc., and the discussion in MACDONELL & KEITH 1912/II: 159.

**7.11.3** MānGS 2.18.2<sup>f</sup> ◊ d: 4d below, PS 6.14.1d, 6+9f, 16.80.1+6e / ŚS 8.6.11e, 14e, 23d

yadi ghnant <sub>i</sub> y apsaraso	(8)
gandharvā geh <sub>i</sub> yā uta	(8)
kravyādo mūradevinas	(8)
tān ito nāśayāmasi	(8)

If the Apsarases and the Gandharvas that are in the house [try to] slay, and [if] the Mūradevins that eat bloody flesh [do so]: them do we cause to vanish from here.

yadi ghnanty apsaraso] **V/126 Mā** [Ma], yadi ghnant<sub>i</sub>yapsaraso **Ku**, yadagnibhyapsaraso **K** gandharvā] **Or**, gandharvāṃ **K** gehyā] *thus* **Or K** [misprint Bar.: gehya] mūradevinas] **Or**, mūradevenas **K** tān] **Or**, tāy **K** ||] **Ku** [Ma] **K**, | **V/126 Mā**

**MānGS 2.18.2<sup>f</sup>**

ye te ghnanty apsaraso gandharvā goṣṭhās ca ye |<sup>58</sup>  
kravyādaṃ suradevināṃ tam ito nāśayāmasi ||

b. Cf. 6.14.8 above on the rare word *gehya-*.

c. On *mūra-deva-* (PS 2.62.4, 16.6.2, 16.7.3, 16.11.4), cf. EWAia II, 369. The metrically conditioned extended form with *-in-* is attested only here and at 7.19.2 below: on such use of the *-ín-* suffix, cf. AiGr. II/1, p. 121f. and especially KORN 1998: 105–111.

d. BHATTACHARYA edits <sup>+</sup>*tām̐ ito*. Contrast his retention of the transmitted **Or** text in 6.14.1, 6, 9 above, and cf. my Introduction, §2.8 (D).

**7.11.4** Only PS ◊ a: cf. ṚV 10.162.4a, MānGS 2.18.2<sup>ga</sup> ◊ d: 3d above, PS 6.14.1d, 6+9f, 16.80.1+6e

yas ta <sup>+</sup> ūrū ārohat <sub>i</sub> y	(8)
asṛk te rehaṇāya kam	(8)
āmādaḥ kravyādo ripūṃs	(8)
tān ito nāśayāmasi	(8)

<sup>58</sup> As observed by DRESDEN 1941: 173 n. 10, the mantra as enjoined under KāṭhGS 48.1 (CALAND 1925: 216 n. 1; KAUL SHĀSTRĪ 1934: 211) has the metrically better reading *gandharvā goṣṭhyā gehyās ca*. KāṭhGS continues *kravyādam uta devināṃ . . .*

The one that mounts your thighs in order to lick your blood, the treacherous eaters of raw [meat], eaters of bloody flesh: them do we cause to vanish from here.

ta ūrū ārohaty] ta uṛ ārohaty **Ku V/126 Pa**, ta uṛ ārohaty **Mā**, ta uṛ ārohaty [**Ma?**], tā urvārohaty **K** rehaṇāya] **K**, rohaṇāya **Or** kam |] kaṁ | **Or**, kaṁ (+ |) **K** āmādaḥ kravyādo] **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, āmadakravyādo **Mā**, āmādaḥkravyādhe **K** ripūṁs] **Mā**, ripūṁs **Ku V/126 Ma K** tān] **Or**, tāy **K**

My reproduction of BHATTACHARYA's ms. **Mā** does not show the long  $\bar{u}$  which he reports for it; I cannot check his **Ma**, but its sister ms. **Pa** does not help to strengthen the likelihood that BHATTACHARYA correctly reported the **Ma** reading. I hence mark  $\bar{u}r\bar{u}$  as an (admittedly very slight) emendation.

a. Cf. the first pāda of the ṚV parallel quoted under the next stanza.

b. Regarding the demon that licks menstrual blood from the female womb, see LUBOTSKY 2002: 170f. on PS 5.37.2, where extensive parallels are listed, as well as 6.14.3a above. SLAJE 1995 has shown that the woman's (menstrual) blood was in Vedic and later India considered to be the female counterpart of the man's semen (*rétas-*), essential for successful conception, and therefore in the center of hostile demons' attention. See also 5c, my conjecture *\*pratipāvne* in stanza 9, and 7.19.5 below.

#### 7.11.5 Cf. ṚV 10.162.4, MānGS 2.18.2<sup>g</sup>

yas te śroṇī cyāvayat,y	(8)
antarā dāmpatī śāye	(8)
yonim yo antar āreḍhi	(8)
tam ito nāśayāmasi	(8)

The one that moves your hips, [that] lies in between the spouses, that licks inside the womb: that one do we cause to vanish from here.

śroṇī] **Ku V/126 [Ma] K**, śroṇ{i}ī **Mā** cyāvayaty] cyāvayaṁty **Ku**, cy(*sec. m.*  $\bar{A}$ )vaya(*sec. m.* ṁ)nty **V/126**, cyavayaṁty **Mā**, cyāvayanti **Ma**, vyāvayati **K** dāmpatī] **V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, dāmpatī **Ku** yonim] **Or**, yonī **K** antar] **K**, 'ntar **Or** āreḍhi] āreḥi **Or**, ārelhi **K** ||] **Ku Mā K**, || {yadi ghnanty apsar{e}aso . . . | . . . nāśayāmasi | yas ta uṛ ārohaty aṣṅk te ||} **V/126** [[thus repeating all of st. 3, and the beginning of 4; all the redundant akṣaras are marked for deletion both *pr. m.* by dots superscribed over them, and *sec. m.* by brackets around the superfluous portion]]

#### ṚV 10.162.4 / ŚS 20.96.14, MānGS 2.18.2<sup>g</sup>

yās ta ūrū vihāraty antarā dāmpatī śāye |  
yónim yó antár āréḥi<sup>59</sup> tám itó nāśayāmasi ||

a. On ŚS 7.116[121].1 *cyāvana-*, which seems to be an epithet of *takmán-* 'fever', see ZYSK 1993: 148f. It is unclear whether the 'fever' of love, or perhaps

<sup>59</sup> Note that **K** and ŚS 20.96.14 share the reading *ārelhi/ārelhi*.

the fever resulting from an internal infection, or shaking due to some other cause is meant here. Alternatively, the shaking might be taken more simply to refer to the movement of hips in sexual intercourse, with the demon taking the husband's place: cf. Indrāṇī's words at ṚV 10.86.6cd *ná māt práticyaviṅyasī ná sákthy údyamīyasī* 'No woman moves her [hips] in better rhythm than I, no woman holds her thigh out farther'.

**7.11.6** ṚV 10.162.6, MānGS 2.18.2<sup>d</sup>

yas tvā svapnena tamasā	(8)
mohayitvā nipadyate	(8)
prajāṃ yas te jighatsati	(8)
tam ° ° °	

The one that confounds you with sleep and darkness, and lies down with you, that wants to devour your offspring: that one (...).

pādas **cd** omitted in **K** • prajāṃ yas te jighatsati] **Or, om. K** tam ° ° ° ||] tam || **Or, om. K**

**ṚV 10.162.6, MānGS 2.18.2<sup>d</sup>**

yás tvā svápnena támasā mohayitvá nipádyate |  
prajāṃ yás te jíghāṃsati tám itó nāśayāmasi ||

- b.** On the meaning of the verb *ni-pad*, see my commentary under 6.23.1b.  
**c.** Note ṚV *jíghāṃsati* (*han*) while we have *jíghatsati* (*ghas*).

**7.11.7** Only PS ◊ **ab**: ṚV 10.162.5ab, MānGS 2.18.2<sup>eab</sup> ◊ **c**: PS 4.13.4c

yas tvā patyuh <sup>+</sup> pratirūpo	(8)
jāro bhūtvā nipadyate	(8)
arāyaṃ kaṇvaṃ pāpmānaṃ	(8)
tam ito nāśayāmasi	(8)

The one that becomes your lover, a counterfeit of your husband, and lies down with you, the evil Arāya, the Kaṇva: that one do we cause to vanish from here.

pādas **ab** omitted in **K** • yas tvā] **Or, om. K** patyuh] **Ku [Ma]**, paty·(sec. m. u)h  
**V/126**, p{r}atyu{prati}h **Mā, om. K** +pratirūpo] pratīpo **Or, om. K** jāro bhūtvā  
nipadyate |] **Or, om. K** arāyaṃ] **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, {prajāṃ yaste jighatsatī | ya |}  
arāyaṃ **Mā, rāyaṃ K** kaṇvaṃ] **K, kṛṇvaṃ V/126 Mā [Ma]**, kṛṇ{m}vaṃ **Ku**

**ṚV 10.162.5, MānGS 2.18.2<sup>eab</sup>**

yás tvā bhrātā pátir bhūtvá jāró bhūtvá nipádyate |  
prajāṃ yás te jíghāṃsati tám itó nāśayāmasi ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *pratirūpo* and *kṛṇvaṃ*.

- a.** Since no form *pratirūpa-* with lengthened *i* is elsewhere quotable, while *pratirūpa-* occurs quite commonly (e.g. at ṚV 6.47.18a; KauśS 23.7, 46.3, 52.3;

but also in our text: PS 2.57.5c, 10.4.10b), it seems to me that — in the absence of **K** evidence — we may ignore the long  $\bar{i}$  of the Or. mss. here (even though its linguistic reality cannot be rejected with complete certainty: cf. AiGr. II/2, §56b pp. 131f. and KNOBL 2007: 61–66).

c. The omission of the initial  $a-$  of *arāyaṃ* in **K** is to be compared with the facts mentioned under 7.9.4c above. As to *kaṇvaṃ*, BHATTACHARYA points out in his critical apparatus (p. 507) that the Or. mss. also sometimes read *kr̥ṇvaṃ* in the mantras of PS 4.13: in stanzas 4.13.4 and 6, to be precise, at both of which places BHATTACHARYA follows the **K** reading *kaṇva-*; at PS 12.7.1 he edits *kr̥ṇvaṃ*, at 12.20.2 *kr̥ṇvena*. Despite HOFFMANN’s theory (1940: 148ff. = 1975: 15ff.) that the name Kaṇva would derive from \**kr̥ṇva-*, the inconsistent tendency of the Or. mss. to read *kr̥ṇva-* can easily be explained as due to influence from the many finite and participial forms of *kar* that have the same Anlaut, and anyhow KUIPER’s arguments (1991: 16f., 43) against HOFFMANN’s interpretation remain decisive to me (*pace* WITZEL 1985c: 231; also 1998: 356 n. 81). On the negative attitude to Kaṇvas in the Yajurvedic texts, see HOFFMANN (p. 149 = 16) and WITZEL 1985c: 231 n. 1. As to the Atharvaveda, where they also occur as female witches, cf. i.a. PS 1.86.2–3, 4.13 *passim*, 5.9.3+5, 19.36.15–16. Regarding the Arāya-demon, see my comments on 6.8.6a.

### 7.11.8 Only PS

hā hai kharva khalate	(7)
naigūrakarṇa tuṇḍila	(8)
indrasya tigmam āyudhaṃ	(8)
tena tvā nāśayāmasi	(8)

Hey, hey, you deformed baldy, you snouty Naigūra-ear(ed one): Indra has a sharp weapon — with it do we cause you to vanish.

hai] **Or**, hī **K** khalate] **Or**, khalute **K** naigūrakarṇa] naigūrakarṇa **Or**, naigurakarṇa **K** tuṇḍila] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, t(·)ṇḍila **V/126**, taṇḍila **Mā** indrasya] **Or**, indraśca **K** tigmam āyudhaṃ] **Ku** **Mā** [**Ma**], {tī}tigmamāyudhaṃ **V/126**, tigmasāyudhaṃ **K** tvā] **Or**, t(v)ā **K** ||] **Ku** **Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, || {yas tvā svapnena . . . nipadyate |} **V/126** [thus repeating 6ab — the redundant akṣaras are marked doubly, as seen under 5]

The **Mā** reading *taṇḍila* is not reported by BHATTACHARYA.

a. About the interjection *hai*, see my comments on 6.8.4a above. It occurs in identical juxtaposition with *hā* (only) at PS 4.22.6 *hā hai kalyāṇi subhage pṛśnīparṇy anātura | imaṃ me adya + pūruṣaṃ dīrghāyutvāyon naya* ‘Hey, hey, auspicious, fortunate one, o undamaged [plant] with speckled leaves: today lead this man of mine here up, for long life’. We seem to have in *hā hai* (from *hai hai*, with peculiar dissimilation) a precursor of the “Doppelsetzung einer einfachen Interjektion” in epic/classical Sanskrit (*hā hā, hū hū* etc.) pointed out by HOFFMANN 1952: 258 = 1975: 39, n. 3.

The rare word *kharvā-* ‘mutilated’ (EWAia I, 448f.) to my knowledge occurs elsewhere in the Saṃhitās only at RV 7.32.13ab *māntram ākharvaṃ sūdhitaṃ*

*supéśasam dádhāta yajñīyeṣv á* ‘You must establish a well-established, graceful mantra, undeformed, on behalf of the venerable [gods]’; ŚS 11.9[11].16ab *khaḍḍūre ’dhicaṅkramāṃ khārvikāṃ kharvavāsīnām* ‘Her that strides upon the *khaḍḍūra*, mutilated, wearing what is mutilated (?)’ (WHITNEY); MS 3.7.4:78.13 (cf. MITTWEDE 1986: 126) *[a]kāṇā́ syād akharváśroṇásaptáśaphā́* ‘[The cow] should not be one-eyed, not mutilated, not lame, not seven-hooved’; TS 2.5.1.6–7 *yá parṇéna píḇati tásyā unṃáduko yá kharvéṇa píḇati tásyai kharvās . . . añjalínā vā píḇed ákharveṇa vā pátreṇa* ‘to her who drinks from a leaf, a drunkard [gets born], to her who drinks from a damaged [vessel], a deformed [child is born]. . . She should drink either from the palm of her hand, or from an undamaged vessel’ (cf. SLAJE 1995: 113–121, 138).

b. The element *naigūra-* is quite obscure, being attested elsewhere only in the very problematic stanza PS 10.1.3 *asāme kurame naigūrasya svasaḥ | arāte nirṛte amate snuhite* ‘You without conciliation, not coming to rest, sister of Naigūra. O Arāti, Nirṛti, Amati, Snuhiti!’. Could it be connected with R̥V 9.97.53+54 *nigūt-/naigutá-* (EWAia II, 41)? Regarding the word *tuṇḍila-*, see under 6.14.5a above.

c. On Indra’s ‘sharp weapon’, his *vájra-*, cf. R̥V 8.96.9.

### 7.11.9 Only PS

namas taṇḍāya namaḥ kusumāya	(11)
namaḥ *pratipāvne namaḥ †kaḥsvadheye†	( )
namas tubhyaṃ nirṛte viśvavāre	(11)
jar <sub>a</sub> emaṃ dhāpayatāṃ viśvarūpā	(12 <sup>T</sup> )

Homage to the Beater, homage to Kusuma, homage to the Up-drinker, homage to . . . , homage to you, Nirṛti, who bestow all treasures. Let brilliant old age give him (this baby) here to suckle.

namas] **Or**, nasas **K** taṇḍāya] **V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, t{ā}ṇḍāya **Ku** namaḥ] **Or**, namaḥ **K** namaḥ \*pratipāvne] namaḥ pratidīpsāvne **Ku Mā [Ma]**, namaḥ pratidi(*sec. m.* → ī){·}psāvne **V/126**, namaḥpradiṣṭ(h)āmne **K** namaḥ †kaḥsvadheye† |] **Or**, namaḥkaśyade **K** tubhyaṃ] **Ku V/126 [Ma] K**, tubhaṃ **Mā** jaremaṃ dhāpayatāṃ] jaremandhāpayatāṃ **Ku V/126 Ma**, jaresandhāpayatāṃ **Mā**, jalemaṃ dhāpayetāṃ **K** viśvarūpā ||] viśvaṛpā || **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, viśvaṛpāṃ || **Mā**, viśvarūpāṃ ||*om.* ||] **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *pratidīpsāvne* and *kaḥsvadheye*.

a. With the sudden reverential attitude towards the demonic beings in this stanza, compare the reverence paid to Arāti in 7.9 (see my comments under 7.9.8c). On *taṇḍa-* ‘beater’, cf. 6.14.5a above. Werner Knobl suggests to me that we might attribute to *kusuma-* in this context already one of the meanings that lexicographers of later Sanskrit quote for it (see PW II, 373): it seems highly unlikely that the word literally means ‘flower’ here, but it is not at all improbable that it is used in the figurative sense of ‘menses’. Thus, Kusuma could be seen as a personification of the woman’s Menstruation. On the use of

*puspa-* / *puṣpitā-* in this sense, and on similar metaphors in other languages (German *Blüte*, *Blut*; Latin *flōs*, *flōris* (→ French *fleurs*; English *blooms*), see SLAJE 1995: 126f. n. 36.

**b.** Comparison of the unlikely form *pratidīpsāvne* — *prati-dabh* does not exist — that we find in the Or. mss. with the equally problematic **K** reading *pradiṣṭ(h)āmne* does not immediately yield an acceptable form. I assume that perseveration from *pratidīvne* at 1.72.4a and 4.9.7a has played a role in the formation of the **Or** reading, and with some hesitation propose to emend *pratipāvne*. The feminine *pratipāvarī-* is in fact attested at VādhŚS 13.2.1.1, 13.2.1.11, 13.3.4.28 [ed. CHAUBEY 13.4.2, 13.4.16, 13.10.26] where it qualifies *sikatāḥ* ‘sand’ used to form the *ucchiṣṭakhara* in the Pravargya (CALAND 1926: 203 = 1990: 386 translated the word as ‘zur Reinigung geeignet’). With this we could compare the *asṛkpāvan-* Arāya at ŚS 2.25.3 = PS 4.16.3, which is also *garbhādā-* and *kāṅva-* (see 7c); the ‘Grabber that eats what must be groped for’ (<sup>+</sup>*pramṛśyādin-* *abhyama-*) at 6.14.3; and especially (with *prati*<sup>o</sup>) the pādas 7.19.5abc below. A *pratipāvan-* demon thus seems to be an ‘Up-drinker of menstrual blood’.

The last word in this metrically unanalyzable pāda remains a complete mystery: might it be connected with *kaśú-* ‘small’ (HOFFMANN 1940: 140f. = 1975: 7f.)? Since we need a dative, an attempt at reconstruction might start with the assumption of a form ending in <sup>o</sup>*dhaye*, but this assumption does not seem to lead us much further.

**d.** *dhāpayatām* is a rare caus. of <sup>2</sup>*dhā* ‘to suck’: cf. ṚV 5.47.4b *dāśa gārbham carāse dhāpayante* ‘ten give the baby to suckle, so it will move’ and 3.55.12ab *mātā ca yātra duhitā ca dhenuṁ sabardūghe dhāpayete samīcī* ‘where the ever-yielding milk cows, mother and daughter in unison, give [the calf] to suckle’, whence I supply *garbham* (cf. stanza 2, and MānGS 2.18.2<sup>hab</sup> *abhinnāṅḍā vṛddhagarbhā ariṣṭā jīvasūvarī*). On the Viśvarūpa milk cow (*dhenu-*), see 6.10.3 and 6.22.9 above, as well as LUBOTSKY 2002: 139 under PS 5.31.3.

**7.11.10** Cf. PS 15.15.1 ◊ **a:** PS 19.9.10a

yāvad dyaur yāvat pṛthivī	(8)
yāvat paryeti sūryaḥ	(8)
<sup>+</sup> tāvat tvam ugra gulgulo	(8)
parīmāṃ pāhi viśvataḥ    11	(8)

As far as the sky, as far as the earth [stretches forth] — as far as the sun goes around: so far must you, o fearsome Gulgulu, protect her here, all around.

yāvad dyaur yāvat pṛthivī] **K**, yāvadyauryāvapṛthivī **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], yāvadyaur-yāvapṛthivīr **Mā** paryeti sūryaḥ |] **Or**, payeti sūryaḥ [|om. |] **K** [|note °ḥ t°] <sup>+</sup>tāvat tvam] tāvatvam **Or K** ugra] **Or**, u[|line]mugra **K** gulgulo] **Ku V/126 Mā**, guggu(→ lgu)lo **Ma**, gulgu(→ ggu 3)lo **Pa**, lulgulo **K** parīmāṃ] **K**, parīmāṃ **Or** || 11 ||] || 11 ||] || **Ku**, || 11 ||] || 11 ||] || **V/126**, || 11 ||] || 11 ||] || **Mā**, Z 1 Z **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *pari māṃ*.

The text of the stanza is nearly identical to that of PS 15.15.1 *yāvad dyaur yāvat pṛthivī yāvat paryeti sūryaḥ | tāvat tvam ugra oṣadhe pari pāhy arundhati* ‘As far as the sky, as far as the earth [stretches forth] — as far as the sun goes around: so far must you, o fearsome plant Arundhatī, protect me’. Its structure is further to be compared with PS 4.22.4 (cf. 9.10.12) *yāvat sūryo vitapati yāvac cābhi vipāśyati | tāvad viśasya dūṣaṇam vaco nir mantrayāmahe* ‘As much as the sun heats up, and as much as it overlooks: so extensive an utterance do we use as mantra, to spoil poison’, and 19.9.10 *yāvad dyaur yāvat pṛthivī yāvad ābhāti sūryaḥ | tāvat sṛjāmi te viṣam yāvad arṣanti sindhavaḥ* ‘As far as the sky, as far as the earth [stretches forth] — as far as the sun gives light: so far do I hurl your poison [away], as far as the rivers flow’. At least in pāda **b**, an alternative translation ‘as long as’ suggests itself for *yāvat*.

**cd.** On *guggulu-/gulgulu-* ‘bdellium’, see POTTS *et al.* 1996. The context obviously requires acceptance of the **K** reading with *imāṃ*, rather than BHATTACHARYA’s *māṃ*.

## 7.12. For a queen, against rival wives: with pāṭā.

The plant *pāṭā-* is mentioned elsewhere only in the hymn ŚS 2.27 / PS 2.16 (put to ritual use at KauśS 38.18 and ŚK 19.6), in PS 20.38.10 [PSK 20.37.10] (quoted under stanza 5 below), and in PS 20.42.11 (stanza 9). At several places in his commentary on ŚS 3.18 (in which hymn the name itself is nowhere explicitly mentioned), Sāyaṇa affirms that it is a plant called *pāṭhā-* that is being addressed. ŚS 3.18 in turn has nearly identical parallels in ṚV 10.145 / ĀpMP 1.15, and the use to which those hymns are put respectively in ṚgVidh 4.12 (cf. also Bṛhaddevatā [longer recension, ed. MACDONELL] 8.55cd–57ab; TOKUNAGA 1997: 288) and in ĀpGS 3.9.4–8 confirms Sāyaṇa’s information: the name *pāṭhā-* figures prominently in both passages (see the long note by GONDA 1951: 110). This *pāṭhā-* is a plant name known from Āyurvedic texts (besides from HirPS 45:9) and the assumption that it is the same as *pāṭā-* forms the starting point of DAS’ thorough but unfortunately inconclusive attempt (1987) to settle the botanical identity of the Vedic plant *pāṭā-*. DAS still had to work with BARRET’s transcription (1920) of **K**, and the Or. mss. now allow for considerable improvements upon the text of the hymn. Still, neither the improved text of this most important *pāṭā-*-hymn, nor the two stanzas from PS 20 which were not yet known to DAS, provide new information that can clinch the issue of identification. The ritual texts, mostly overlooked by DAS, do not seem to help either.

It is to be noticed that the text of the mantras implies a shift back and forth between priest and queen as speakers, in the execution of the ritual which the mantras were to accompany. This ritual must have been quite different from the acts which KauśS 39.19–21 enjoins: *imāṃ khanāmīti bāṇaparṇīm lohitaṅjāyā drapsena samnīya śayanam anuparikirati* |19| *abhi te ’dhām* [ŚS 3.18.6a] *ity a-dhastāt palāśam upacṛtati* |20| *upa te ’dhām* [3.18.6b] *ity upary upāsyati* ‘Dem Liede III.18 kommt (die folgende Handlung) zu. Nachdem er ein (zu Pulver gestossenes) Pfeilkrautblatt mit der mit Wasser vermischten sauren Milch einer rothen Ziege vermischt (und mit dem Liede eingeseget hat,) giesst er [(diese Substanz) um das Bett (der Nebenbuhlerin) herum. Mit der Viertelstrophe III.18.6<sup>a</sup> legt er ein (Pfeilkraut-)blatt darunter. Mit der Viertelstrophe III.18.6<sup>b</sup> wirft er eines darüber’ (CALAND 1900: 122f.). The sūtrakāra takes the hymn to require the usage of *bāṇaparṇī-*, which may well be a synonym of *pāṭā-* (cf. *uttānaparṇā-* in 7a): Dār. glosses *śarapuṅkheti prasiddhā*, and Keś. *māsikā loke prasiddhā*.<sup>60</sup>

The very rare word *gāireyī-* in 2d recalls the hapax *gīreya-* of 7.10.5a, while *uttānaparṇā-* in 7a concatenates nicely with *uttānaśīvarī-* in stanza 1 of the

<sup>60</sup> Jan Meulenbeld kindly informs me that *śarapuṅkhā-* is generally identified as *Tephrosia purpurea* (Linn.) Pers.; that *bāṇaparṇī-* recalls the plant name *bāṇa-*, commonly identified as one of the species of the genus *Barleria*, sometimes used as a synonym of *śarapuṅkhā-*; and that *māsikā-* is unknown to him.

preceding hymn, and *vāta*<sup>o</sup> in 6c with 7.11.1.

### 7.12.1 Only PS ◊ c: 7d below ◊ d: PS 5.1.6d

ekarājñīm ekavratām	(8)
ekasthām ekalāmikām	(8)
pātām sapatnacātānīm	(8)
jaitrāyāchā vadāmasi	(8)

To victory do we invite Pātā, who is a sole queen, has but one observance, but one place, who alone gives rest [to her husband], who removes rivals.

ekarājñīm] **Or**, yaikarāgnīm **K** ekalāmikām |] ekalāmikām | **V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, ekalāmik{ō}ām | **Ku** pātām] **Ku Mā [Ma]**, thus **K** [[Bar. pājām]], śā(sec. m. → pā)ḥī(sec. m. → ā)ḥ **V/126** sapatnacātānīm] **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, sapatnacātānī **Mā**, sannacātānīm **K** jaitrāyāchā] **Or**, jaitrāyāśchā **K**

**a.** The magical relevance of the epithet *ekarājñī-* becomes clear from the request in 5d below. The significance of *ekavratā-* ‘having but one observance (viz. faithfulness to the husband)’ (cf. *pátivratā-*, RVKh 3.17.1+3) being applied here to the plant remains unclear.

**b.** The interpretation of the compound *ekastha-* is not quite certain. Does it mean ‘standing alone’ or ‘standing in one place’? The rule BaudhDhS 2.11.20 *varṣāsv ekasthaḥ* ‘he resides in one place during the rainy season’ (cf. OLIVELLE 2000: 536 [note on GautDhS 3.13]) would seem to favor the latter interpretation, or is a *double entendre* intended? With DAS 1987: 34 n. 54, I assume <sup>o</sup>*lāmikā-* to be derived from *ram*, and to show a dialectal *l*-variant. Following a suggestion of Werner Knobl, I assume the stem *lāmaka-* is to be considered parallel in meaning with the causative *rāmayati* (cf. AiGr. II/2, §46c p. 145), not — as DAS translates (‘the one that stays/enjoys itself alone’) — the simplex *ramate*. On the polysemy of the root *ram*, see my commentary under 6.23.11a: it seems likely that a *double entendre* is intended here too.

**d.** On the connection between Pātā and victory, see 6d below.

### 7.12.2 Only PS

ekarājñīy ekavrata	(8)
ekastha ekalāmike	(8)
na tvā sapatnī sāsāha	(8)
gaireyī ca na bāhīyā	(8)

O sole queen, who have but one observance, but one place, who alone give rest [to your husband]: no rival from the mountains overpowers you, none from abroad either.

ekarājñīy ekavrata] **V/126 Mā [Ma]**, ekarājñīekavrata **Ku**, yaikarājñī ekavrata (+ |) **K**

ekastha] Or, ekasthā K sapatnī sāsāha] Or, sapatnīsāsaha<sup>61</sup> K gaireyī] Or, śaire K  
bāhyā ||] Or, vāhyā [om. ]] K

BHATTACHARYA edits *vāhyā*.

c. On the present meaning of perfect forms of *sah* with the stem *sāsah-* in RV and AV, see KÜMMEL 2000: 563f.

d. With this pāda cf. PS 1.100.1 *ud ehi devi kanya ācitā vasunā saha | na tvā taranty oṣadhayo bāhyāḥ parvatīyā uta* ‘Come up, maiden goddess, loaded up with riches. No plants from abroad or from the mountains surpass you’ and PS 15.3.6 = ŚS 19.44.6 *dēvāñjana trāikakuda pāri mā pāhi viśvataḥ | nā tvā taranty oṣadhayo bāhyāḥ parvatīyā utā* ‘O ointment god from the three-peaked [mountain], protect me all around. . .’. After we have had occasion to call attention to the formation (without vṛddhi) of *gireya-* just above at 7.10.5a, it is now all the more striking that we find here the regular derivative *gaireya-*, previously unattested before JB 3.156 and BaudhŚS 15.16:220.13, 18.2:344.5, 18.39:389.5.

**7.12.3** Cf. ŚS 3.18.4, RV 10.145.3, ĀpMP 1.15.3

uttarāham uttarābhya	(8)
uttared adharābh <sub>i</sub> yaḥ	(8)
adhaḥ sapatnī māmak <sub>y</sub>	(8)
adhared adharābh <sub>i</sub> yaḥ	(8)

Superior am I to those that are superior, superior indeed to those that are inferior. Below is my rival, inferior indeed to those that are inferior.

uttarāham uttarābhya] Or, uttarāham uttarabhyo K [[Bar.: tattarabhyo]] adharābhyaḥ |  
adhaḥ] Or, adharabhyaḥ adhas K [[om. |: note °ḥ a°]] māmaky] Ku [Ma], māmakV  
V/126 Mā, sāmakty K ||] Ku V/126 [Ma], | Mā, om. K [[note °ḥ n°]]

ŚS 3.18.4, RV 10.145.3, ĀpMP 1.15.3

úttarāhám úttara úttaréd úttarābhyaḥ |  
adháḥ [RV, ĀpMP áthā] sapátñi yá māmádhara sádharaḥbhyaḥ ||

a. Cf. my commentary on 6.8.2ab above.

**7.12.4** Only PS

na saindhavasya puṣpasya	(8)
sūryo mlāpayati tvacam	(8)
pāṭe <sub>a</sub> mlātayā tvayā	(8)
sapatnyā varca ā dade	(8)

The sun does not cause the skin of the flower from Sindhu to wither: o Pāṭā, by means of you who are unwithered, do I take the splendor from [my] rival.

<sup>61</sup> The sequence °*nīsA*° looks somewhat like Devanāgarī °*nīrsā*°, i.e. with a superscript stroke that is not interpretable in Śāradā terms.

puṣpasya] **Ku V/126 [Ma] K**, puṣyasya **Mā** mlāpayati] **Or**, snāpayati **K** tvacam ]  
 tvacam | **Or**, tvacām, [om. ]] **K** pāṭe] **V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, pā(ṭe·) **Ku** mlātayā]  
 'mlātayā **Or**, snāpayā **K** sapatnyā] **Or**, sapatnā **K** varca ā] varcca ā **Or**, varcā **K**  
 dade ]] **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, | **Mā**, dadhe **K**

a. Cf. DAS 1987: 34 n. 57: “*saindhava* could refer to salt, but could equally refer to something coming either from Sindh, the Sindhu (= Indus?) or from the sea. ‘Flower’ could refer to flowers in general. Or else we have here ‘flower of the *saindhava*’ or ‘flower which is *saindhava*’. In any case, what is meant remains unclear. But compare, nevertheless, *sindhupuṣpa* ‘conch shell’, attested, however, only lexically in later classical Sanskrit”. For further information on the variety of associations attached to the word *saindhava*- especially in its reference to ‘salt’, cf. SLAJE 2001. But this pāda must be connected with PS 15.3.5 = ŚS 19.44.5, a stanza addressed to an (eye-)ointment (cf. BLOOMFIELD 1896b: 405f.): *sīndhor gārbho ’si vidyūtāṃ pūṣpam | vātaḥ prāṇāḥ sūryaś cākṣur divās páyaḥ* ‘Embryo of the river art thou, flower of the lightnings; the wind [thy] breath, the sun [thine] eye, from the sky [thy] milk’ (WHITNEY). At PS 19.24.3 = ŚS 19.38.2 *gulgulu*- is also called *saindhavá*- as well as *samudŕya*-, terms which led ZIMMER (1879: 28, and after him GRILL 1888: 193, FILLIOZAT 1949: 110, ZYSK 1993: 115) to the interesting suggestion that *gulgulu*- was an object of riverine and maritime trade; POTTS *et al.* 1996: 299 are less explicit, but advocate a translation ‘coming from the country of Sindhu’ (cf. also LÉVI 1915: 49 and 100 on *saindhava*- in this sense in a much later geographical list). Stanza 2d above can be interpreted to mean that Pāṭā is neither a mountainous nor a foreign plant, so it may well have been native to the plains of the Indus system (cf. also my commentary on 6.6.6a above).

b. On the theme of withered skin, cf. PS 20.62.10 [PSK 20.56.8] *abhīli naśyetaḥ paras tvacam me mābhi mimlapaḥ | agastyasya brahmaṇābhīlīm nāśayāmasi* ‘Vanish far away from here, you Abhīli: do not cause my skin to wither. We cause the Abhīli to vanish by means of Agastya’s spell’ (cf. KNOBL 2007: 56ff.) and R̥V 8.55.3b *cārmāṇi mlātāni*. See JAMISON 1991: 176–182 on the nexus of Vedic ritual and formulaics surrounding skin-disease and brahmin’s splendor (*brahmavarcaśá*-), apparently related to our stanza.

### 7.12.5 Only PS

na vai pāṭe pāṭevāsi	(8)
subhāgaṃkaraṇīd asi	(8)
pāṭe bhagasya no dheḥy	(8)
atho mā mahiṣīm kṛṇu	(8)

Not indeed, o Pāṭā, are you [anything] like a splitter: it’s a maker of good fortune that you are. Bestow [a share of good] fortune on us, o Pāṭā, and make me the chief-queen.

pāṭevāsi] **Or**, pāṭevāsi **K** asi] **V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, asī **Ku** ]] **Or**, om. **K** bhagasya]

Or, bhagamya K dhehy atho] Or, dheyatho K mahiṣīm kṛṇu ||] Or, mahiṣīnkṛṇu | K

a. The second *pātā-* plays on a (folk-etymological?) connection between the plant name *pātā-* and the rather rare root *paṭ* ‘to split, cut’ (EWAia II, 67): cf. BaudhŚS 28.7:355.11 *athaitasyai vapāyai sthāne yat kiṃ cin medorūpam avasiṣṭam syāt tad utpātya tena pracaret* ‘And if some fatty substance is left in the place of this omentum, he should cut it out and perform [the rite] with it’; ŚāṅkhŚS 17.1.2 *hotā preṅkhaphalakam utpātayati* ‘the hotṛ orders to pull out the plank for the swing’ (CALAND); ViṣṇuSm 6.25 *likhitārthe pravṛṣṭe likhitam pātayet* ‘When the goal of a contract has been reached, he should tear up the contract’. The same connection seems to underlie PS 20.38.10 *pātā + bhinatti*<sup>62</sup> *kumbham pātā kumbhīm gadohanīm | pātā sarvasya pātrasya vadhūṃ*<sup>63</sup> *kṛṇotu viśvataḥ* ‘The Pātā (‘Breaker’) breaks the jar, Pātā the milk-pail (cf. PS 5.9.5b). Let the Pātā ubiquitously procure a bride for each Pātra’: this last stanza must contain a further word-play with *pātra-* ‘vessel’ and another meaning attachable to that word, which seems to survive in the tatsama (*bara*)*pātra* ‘suitable (bridegroom)’ in modern Oriya (PW IV, 644f. lists *pātra-* ‘eine würdige Person’, attested only in post-Vedic literature).

b. On this *pāda*, cf. PS 1.100.3b *āvataṃkaraṇīd asi* ‘You indeed are one who makes for closeness (*āvāt-*)’. Formations of the type *priyaṃkaraṇa-* (PS 3.28.6) have been taught by Pāṇini, Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.2.56, and have been discussed (mainly from a Pāṇinian point of view) by BALASUBRAHMANYAM (1984). Vārttika 6 on Aṣṭādhyāyī 4.1.15 deals with the formation of corresponding feminine forms, several more of which are found in the AV besides *āvataṃkaraṇī-* and *subhāgaṃkaraṇī-*: PS 1.26.5 / ŚS 1.24.4 *sarūpaṃkārāṇī-*, 8.8.11 / 19.2.5 *ayaḥkṣmaṃkārāṇī-*, ŚS 6.139.1 *subhagaṃkārāṇī-*. The two examples which Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya provides (ed. KIELHORN vol. II, p. 209, ll. 7 and 10) are *ādhyāṃkaraṇī-* and *subhagaṃkaraṇī-*. As noted, the latter is attested at ŚS 6.139.1 (cf. RAU 1985, item nr. 713),<sup>64</sup> and the precise stem *subhāgaṃkaraṇa-*, of which we find a fem. form in our stanza, is attested at ManB 2.4.8b. The formation *subhagaṃkaraṇa-/°karaṇī-* was apparently better known to Pāṇini and, as Werner Knobl points out to me, is likely to have been more frequently used than *subhāgaṃ°* because the stem *subhāga-* was far more frequent in independent use: in the RV, for example, it occurs 61 times, whereas *subhāgá-* is attested only twice (the same proportion 30:1 holds, more or less, in ŚS [cf. WHITNEY 1881: 317], while in PS the figures are roughly 36:8).

cd. On the partitive gen. with verbs of ‘giving’, cf. DELBRÜCK 1888: 158

<sup>62</sup> Or: *bhinattu*. K: *bhinatya*.

<sup>63</sup> Thus Or. K: *vidhīm*.

<sup>64</sup> Note however that — as WHITNEY and ŚPP report — the majority of the mss. actually read *subhāgaṃ°*, while the ŚS padapāṭha does seem to read *subhagaṃ°*: cf. further WHITNEY 1881: 317, AiGr. Introduction générale [RENOU 1957b] p. 119, AiGr. II/2, §20g p. 67.

(4b), where, however, we find no reference to *dhā* in this particular usage, but see e.g. PS 1.100.2c (*evā bhagasya no dhehi*), 2.68.6b (*tasya no dhehi*). On the meaning of *māhiṣī-*, cf. RAU 1957: 105f., and see 1a+2a above.

**7.12.6** Only PS ◊ **cd**: PS 6.4.5cd ≈ ŚS 5.5.3cd, RVKh 4.7.4cd

yat pāṭe adhi vṛkṣe	(7)
vātaplavā mahīyase	(8)
jayantī pratyātiṣṭhantī	(8)
+saṃjayā nāma vā asi	(8)

When, o Pāṭā, on a tree, floating in the wind, you feel great, defeating, sticking tightly [to the tree], you, verily, are called Conquest.

adhi] 'dhi **Or**, adha **K** vātaplavā] **K**, vātapravā **Or** mahīyase] **Or**, mahīyame **K**  
+saṃjayā] saṃjayā **Or**, saṃjāyā **K** vā asi] **Or**, vāsi **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *vātapravā*. The stanza is to be compared with 6.4.5 above: *vṛkṣaṃvṛkṣam ā rohasi vṛṣaṇyantīva kanyalā | jayantī pratyātiṣṭhantī saṃjayā nāma vā asi* 'You mount every tree, like a lusty girl . . . '.

**b.** The **Or**. mss. read °*pravā*, and **K** °*plavā*: at 7.7.4, where we have accepted *anuplavam* in our text, we found the same difference between the two branches of transmission. Considering PS 1.59.4c *vātasyānu pravāṃ* 'along with the blowing of the wind' and ŚS 12.1.51ef / PS 17.5.9ef *vātasya pravāṃ upavāṃ ānu vāty arcḥi* 'the flame blows with the blowing to and fro of the wind', one might be inclined to edit *vātapravā* (with *pravā-* 'gush of wind') here, following BHATTACHARYA, but that would lead to syntactic problems. I prefer the syntactically unproblematic interpretation that follows from the **K** reading *vātaplavā* (with precisely the same kind of thematic formation as *bṛhadvadā-* in the next stanza), because the image of 'floating' in the wind is not foreign to India (Rāmāyaṇa 5.1.131ab *ayaṃ vātātmajaḥ śrīmān plavate sāgaropari* 'This glorious son of the wind [Hanumant] floats above the sea') and is known even in the PS: see 6.23.6 above (to be compared with 5.34.7b). Cf. however also RV 1.116.3 *antarikṣaprūt-* (SCARLATA 1999: 340): we cannot be absolutely certain whether the *l* of **K** is authentic rather than the *r* of the **Or**. mss. (cf. also my Introduction, §2.8 V).

On the meaning of *mahīyase*, cf. KUIPER 1997b: 103f. It seems to me, however, that *ā-rohasi* (itself a *double entendre*) in the quoted parallel 6.4.5 is sufficient reason to assume that a connection with *mahānt-* was on the poet's mind. One might therefore consider a translation like 'you grow'.

**cd.** It is not certain that the translation of *pratyātiṣṭhantī* I have followed for 6.4.5c is fitting here: it would imply identification of *pāṭā-* as a creeper or lichen, for which there is no other evidence, and the translation may moreover be thought to disagree with the qualification 'floating in the wind'. As Werner Knobl suggests to me, the participle may have to be taken in the sense of 'resisting', a meaning that would nicely fit in with *jayantī* and *saṃjayā*.

Note that **K** reads *saṁjayā* at 6.4.5d. Other hymns dedicated to Pāṭā also emphasize the association with victory (*jay*): ŚS 2.27.1 *néc chātruḥ prāśaṁ jayāti sāhamānābhībūr asi | prāśaṁ prātiprāśo jahy arasān kṛṇv ośadhe* ‘So that the enemy shall not win the case, you keep overpowering, superior [to him]. Smite the disputing adversaries, make [them] powerless, o plant’ ~ PS 2.16.1 *yā śatrūn prāśaṁjayā sāhamānābhībūr asi | sāmūn pratiprāśo . . .* (Keś. under KauśS 38.20: “*jayārtham*”), and cf. DAS’ discussion of the Āyurvedic plant names *jayantī-*, *vijayā-* and *jayā-* (1987: 37–40).

**7.12.7** Only PS ◊ **ab**: cf. ĀpMP 1.15.2ab, ṚV 10.145.2ab, ŚS 3.18.2ab ◊ **b**: PS 6.8.2a ◊ **d**: 1c above

uttānaparṇām subhagām	(8)
sahamānām sahasvatīm	(8)
achā bṛhadvadām vada	(8)
pāṭām sapatnacātanīm	(8)

Invite the fortunate Pāṭā, who has outstretched leaves, who is suppressing, overpowering, dominant-speaking, who removes rivals.

uttānaparṇām] **K**, uttanaparṇām **Or** subhagām] **V/126 Mā [Ma] K**, su(BHAGĀM) **Ku** sahasvatīm || sahasvatīm | **Or K** achā] **Or**, aśchā **K** bṛhadvadām] **Or**, vṛhadvadā **K** pāṭām] **Or**, thus **K** [[Bar.: pāṭam]] sapatnacātanīm ||] sapatnacātanīm || **Or**, śapatnacātanīm [om. ]] **K**

**ĀpMP 1.15.2, ṚV 10.145.2, ŚS 3.18.2**

uttānaparṇe sūbhage sāhamāne [ṚV, ŚS dévajūte] sāhasvati |  
sapatnīm me pārā dhama [ŚS ṇuda] pātiṁ me kévalam kṛdhi [ṚV kuru] ||

**ab.** These pādas are a rephrasing in the accusative of pādas known also from three other mantra texts. Cf. also Bṛhaddevatā [ed. MACDONELL] 8.56c *uttānaparṇām pāṭhām*.

**c.** On the epithet *bṛhadvadā-*, cf. the pāda *bṛhád vadema vidáthe suvīrāḥ* which concludes 22 of the 43 hymns of the Gṛtsamada Maṇḍala ṚV 2 plus an additional Gṛtsamada composition ṚV 9.86.48, and occurs also as PS 18.71.1d / ŚS 18.3.24d. The syntagma *bṛhád vad* is otherwise very rare: I have found it only at ṚV 10.94.4a; we may compare *bṛhádúktha-* at ṚV 5.19.3, 10.56.7, 10.54.6 etc., and the mantra *bṛhánn asi bṛhádgrāvā bṛhatīm índrāya vácām vada* at VSM 5.22, TS 1.3.2.2 etc.

**7.12.8** Cf. PS 2.16.3, ŚS 2.27.4ab+5ab

pāṭām ind <sub>a</sub> ro v <sub>i</sub> y āśnād	(8)
dhantavā asurebh <sub>i</sub> yaḥ	(8)
tayāham sapatnīm sākṣīya	(9)
mahendro dānavān iva	(8)

Indra ate up the Pāṭā, in order to slay the Asuras. By means of her may I overpower [my] rival, like Indra [did with] the Dānavas.

indro vy āśnād dhantavā] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**], indro vyāśnāddantavā **V/126**, ivyāṣṇārhantavā **K** [[Bar.: °ṣṇān ha°] asurebhyaḥ |] **Or**, amurebhyaḥ [[om. |] **K** [[note °ḥ t°] tayāhaṃ sapatnīm] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], tayāhaṃ {śātrū}sapatnīm **Ku**, tayā sapatnyam **K** dānavān] **Ku K**, dānavām **V/126 Mā**, dānavār **Ma**

**PS 2.16.3**

pāṭām indro vy āśnād dhantavā asurebhyaḥ |  
tayāhaṃ śātrūn sāksīyendraḥ sālāvṛkān iva ||

**ŚS 2.27.4–5**

pāṭām indro vy āśnād asurebhya stārītave |  
prāśam prātiprāśo jahy arasān kṛṇv ośadhe ||4||  
tāyāhām śātrūnt sāksa<sup>65</sup> indraḥ sālāvṛkān iva |  
prāśam prātiprāśo jahy arasān kṛṇv ośadhe ||5||

BHATTACHARYA prefers the sandhi + *dānavām iva*.

**a.** I tentatively scan *ind<sub>a</sub>ro*, although in the ṚV such trisyllabic scansion is exceedingly rare in dimeter verse (ARNOLD 1905: 98 and 105f.), while it seems to be entirely unattested in this context in ŚS (WHITNEY 1881: 5).

**d.** The Dānavas appear to have been a demonic group connected with Vṛtra and the Asuras: relatively little attention seems to have been paid to them, and BROWN’s elaborations (1942: 88–92 = 1978: 23–27) are unfortunately mostly not provided with textual evidence, except n. 33 on p. 90 = 33 (cf. also KUIPER 1970: 122f. = 1983: 121f.): in addition to the ṚV references collected there (all to singular *dānavá-/dānu-*), let me here list the other attestations from Vedic Saṃhitās.

PS 4.17.3 *vidutsurasya*<sup>66</sup> *dānavasya tasya tvam napād asi | tasyāgre ’rasam viṣam tatas \*tavārasam viṣam* ‘Of the Dānava V., of him you are the grandson. His poison [was] powerless in the beginning, therefore your poison is powerless [now]’.

ŚS 4.24.2 (PS 4.39.3) *yá ugrīṇām ugrábāhur yayúṛ yó dānavānām bálam ārurója | yéna jitāḥ síndhavo yéna gávaḥ sá no muñcatv áṃhasaḥ* ‘He who, having formidable arms, is repeller (?yayú) of the formidable ones (f.); who battered the strength of the Dānavas; by whom are conquered the rivers, by whom the kine—let him free us from distress’ (WHITNEY).

ŚS 10.6.10 (PS 16.43.2) *yám ábadhnād bḥhaspátir maṇím . . . | tám bíbhrac candráma maṇím ásurāṇām púro ’jayad dānavānām hiraṇyáyīḥ | só asmai*

<sup>65</sup> WHITNEY comments that his “translation implies emendation of the inadmissible *sāksē* to *sāksye*, than which nothing is easier (considering the frequent loss of *y* after a lingual or palatal sibilant) or more satisfactory, for both sense and meter; it is favored, too, by the P[ai]pp[alāda] reading”.

<sup>66</sup> Thus **Or. K**: *vidapsutaśya*. Emend *vidacchutasya?* (*vi*)*duchunasya?* Or, as Werner Knobl suggests to me, *vidyutsutasya?*

*śrīyam id duhe bhūyobhūyaḥ* . . . ‘What amulet Brihaspati bound on . . . — bearing that amulet, the moon conquered the strongholds of the Asuras, the golden [strongholds] of the Dānavas; it yields to him fortune, more and more . . .’ (WHITNEY).

MS 2.2.10:23.19–24.1 (cf. CALAND 1908: 94) *īndro vāi vṛtrāya vājram úd ayachat tām dānavā nānv amanyanta tām etēna bhāgadhéyenānv amanyanta tāto vāi sò ’bhīmātīr ahan* ‘Indra held his cudgel up against Vṛtra. The Dānavas did not release it (i.e. the cudgel: MS 4.1.3:4.20). In exchange for this share they released it, whereupon he slew the assailants’.

KS 13.5:186.6f. *īndro vāi vilisteṅgāṃ dānavīm akāmayata so ’sureṣv acarat stry eva strīṣv abhavat pumān puṁsu* ‘Indra coveted the Dānavī Vilisteṅgā. He roamed among the Asuras. He became a woman among the women, a man among the men’. (Cf. BROWN 1978: 201, with references in n. 1, notably to ŚS 7.38.2 [~ PS 20.31.7].)

KS 37.14:94.3–7 *devās ca vā asurās ca saṃyattā āsann asureṣu tarhy amṛtam āsic chuṣṇe dānave tac chuṣṇa evāntar āsye ’bibhar yān devānām aghnaṃs tad eva te ’bhavan yān asurāṇām tāñ chuṣṇo ’mṛtenābhivyānīt te sam ānan sa īndro ’ved asureṣu vā amṛtañ śuṣṇe dānava iti sa madhvaṣṭhīlā bhūtvā prapathe ’śayat tāñ śuṣṇo ’bhivyādādāt tasyendraś śyeno bhūtvāsyād amṛtaṃ nir amathnāt*<sup>67</sup> ‘The gods and the Asuras were opposed in battle. At that time the ambrosia was among the Asuras, inside the Dānava Śuṣṇa: it was Śuṣṇa who carried it within his mouth. Those gods that they (the Asuras) slew, they became just that [ambrosia / slain (?)]. Those Asuras that they (the gods) slew, on them Śuṣṇa blew with ambrosia: they breathed again. Indra realized: the ambrosia is among the Asuras, inside the Dānava Śuṣṇa. He took the shape of a honey-comb and lay on the path. Śuṣṇa opened his mouth to swallow it. Indra then took the shape of a falcon and snatched the ambrosia out of his mouth’ (on this last passage, cf. HOFFMANN 1960b: 60 = 1976: 516f.). Cf. also ŚBM 3.1.3.11, 11.5.5.13, AVParīś 7.1.11–2.

Since *sapatnīm* is singular, and since the two parallels PS 2.16.3 and ŚS 2.27.4ab+5ab show agreement of number between *comparatum* and *comparandum*, it is enticing to take the **V/126** and **Mā** reading *dānavām* seriously, but the only known feminine of *dānava-* seems to be *dānavī-* (as at KS 13.5:186.6).

**7.12.9** Cf. PS 20.42.11

<i>pāṭā bibhartīy aṅkuśaṃ</i>	(8)
<i>hiraṇyavantam aṅkinam  </i>	(8)
<i>tena sapatnīyā varca</i>	(8)
<i>ā lumpāmi mamed asat   </i>	(8)

<sup>67</sup> Read thus with *amathnāt* for *amuṣṇāt*: NARTEN 1960: 123 = 1995: 13. Cf. further MITTWEDE 1989: 149.

The Pāṭā bears a hook, a golden one with barbs: by that means do I rake [my] rival’s splendor here, [thinking:] “It shall be mine alone”.

pāṭā] **Ku Mā Ma**, *thus* **K** [Bar.: pājā], pāṭām **V/126** bibharty] **K**, {bhi}bibhartty **Ku**, bibhartty **V/126 Mā [Ma]** aṅkuśam] **K**, aṅkuśam **Or** aṅkinam |] **K**, aṅkinam | **Or** sapatnyā] **Ku [Ma]** **K**, sapatnā **V/126 Mā** varca] **K**, varcca **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, va{·}rcca **Mā** lumpāmi] **Mā [Ma]**, lumpāmi **Ku**, lu{sp}mpāmi **V/126**, lumpasi **K** mamed asat] **Or**, samedhamat, **K** ||] **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, | **Mā**, *om.* **K**

The same stanza is repeated with a different third pāda as PS 20.42.11 [PSK 20.40.10] *pāṭā bibharty aṅkuśam hiraṇyavantam aṅkinam | tenāham anyeṣāṃ striya ā lumpāmi mamed \*asan*<sup>68</sup> ‘...: by that means do I rake the wives of other men here, [thinking:] “They shall be mine alone”’. Cf. also PS 2.81.2 *yad andhiyaṃ yad algaṇaṃ yo armo adhirohati | ayasmayas tad aṅkuśo \*akṣṇo (‘)rmam apa + lumpatu* ‘Die Blindheit, das Algaṇa-Leiden, das Arma-Leiden, welches aufsteigt: der metallene Haken soll das, das Arma-Leiden, vom Auge beseitigen’ (ZEHNDER 1999: 181; GRIFFITHS forthc.).

**ab.** A clear difference in meaning between *aṅkuśa-* and *aṅka-*, words which do not elsewhere seem to co-occur, is hard to discern. In any case it is clear that Pāṭā (DAS 1987: 35 n. 62 and especially p. 36) must have been a “thorny or (hard) sprigged (= prickly?), barbed (?)” plant. On plants with ‘golden thorns’, cf. PS 2.79.4 *hiraṇyākṣi madhuvarṇe + hiraṇyaparicartane | + aṅko hiraṇyayas tava tenāsyai patim ā vaha* ‘O golden-eyed, honey-colored, golden-belted [plant]: you have a golden barb — bring a husband here with it’ and in the next stanza 2.79.5cd *iyam tvā mahyam oṣadhir + aṅkeneva ny ā nayāt* ‘this plant will lead you down here for me, with what may be called its barb’. An *ayasmaya-* *aṅka-*, comparable to the *ayasmaya-* *aṅkuśa-* of PS 2.81.2 quoted above, is known from ŚS 7.115.1cd (PS 20.18.7cd) *ayasmāyenāṅkēna dviṣatē tvā sajamasi* ‘with a metal barb we attach you to him who hates [us]’, and ‘barbed Asuras with metal nets’ (*ayasmāyaiḥ pāśair aṅkīnas*) are known from PS 16.150.5 / ŚS 19.66.1.

**c.** Cf. 4d above and PS 20.29.2cd *sapatnyā varca ādāyāthāsmābhiḥ sahāsasi* ‘And having taken away [your] rival’s splendor, you shall be with us’; cf. 6.8.8c for the scansion *sapatn<sub>i</sub>yās*.

**7.12.10** Cf. ŚS 3.18.1, RV 10.145.1, ĀpMP 1.15.1 ◊ **d**: only PS

imāṃ khanām <sub>i</sub> y oṣadhīm	(8)
vīrudhām balavattamām	(8)
yayā sapatnīm bād hate	(8)
kr̥ṇute kevalam patim    12	(8)

I dig up this plant, the strongest of all herbs, by which means she repels her rival, makes her husband hers alone.

<sup>68</sup> **Or**: *asūṃ*. **K**: *asam*.

khanāmy] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, Ga(*sec. m.* → kha 3)nāmy **V/126** oṣadhīṃ] **Ku V/126**  
 [**Ma**] **K**, oṣadhīṃ **Mā** vīrudhāṃ] **K**, vīḍhāṃ **Or** balavattamām |] balavattamām |  
**Or**, balavattamām [|*om.* |] **K** [*note* °ṃ a°] yayā] **Or**, athā **K** kevalam] **Ku V/126**  
 [**Ma**] **K**, kavalam **Mā** patim] **K**, patim **Or** || 12 ||] || † 10 || 12 || **Ku**, || 12 || † (*sec.*  
*m.* 10) || **V/126**, || 12 || † || **Mā**, Z Z **K**

**ŚS 3.18.1, RV 10.145.1, ĀpMP 1.15.1**

imāṃ khanāmy oṣadhīṃ vīrudhāṃ [**RV**, **ĀpMP** vīrudham] bālavattamām |  
 yāyā sapātnīṃ bādhatē yāyā samvīndatē pātīm ||

Cf. PS 20.31.7 *idaṃ khanāmi bheṣajam māṅpaśyam abhīrorudaṃ yenā nicakra āsurīndrāṇī kevalam patim* ‘I dig [up] the medicine, which draws towards me his eye, which causes [love’s] tears, by means of which the Āsurī Indrāṇī allured [Indra] as her husband alone’ (see my discussion under 6.6.4cd). The combination of this stanza with ours sheds interesting light on the mythological connection with the *imāṃ khanāmi*-hymn that appears from the Bṛhaddevatā (ed. TOKUNAGA) 8.51cd–52ab [ed. MACDONELL 8.55cd–56ab] *imāṃ khanāmīti sūktam indrāṇī yat svayam jagau || tad aupaniṣadam ṣaṭkaṃ bhāvavṛttam pracakṣate* ‘‘This (plant) I dig’, the hymn which Indrāṇī herself sang, they declare to be an esoteric evolutionary hymn of six stanzas’ (MACDONELL 1904/II: 308).

### 7.13. Against dog-accompanied Apsarases.

This hymn exceeds the norm of 10 stanzas per hymn by four: 5 of its 14 pairs of **ab** pādas occur also in PS 15.19. It seems possible that one of the two hymns has borrowed from the other, or that borrowing has occurred in both directions, and that the present hymn can thus be reduced to an original core of 10 stanzas: but which 4 of the 5 stanzas 2, 11, 12, 13, 14 do not originally belong to the hymn it seems impossible to decide as long as a critical study of PS 15.18–19 is still outstanding. The repetition of the last four stanzas of our hymn in 15.19 is fully abbreviated in the mss. there, being marked with the indication *yā nadīr iti catasrah || idam uluṅgulukottarāḥ* (cf. my Introduction, §2.5.1).

The Apsarases were connected with the game of dice: this fact seems to have gone unmentioned in FALK’s study of 1986, but had been discussed on the basis of the facts known at that time already by LÜDERS in his 1907 study *Das Würfelspiel im alten Indien*, of which I use here the re-edition in *Philologica Indica* (1940: 106–175): 111f., 144, 152f. FALK (1986: 108–111) has pointed out the various elements of canine terminology in the ancient Indian dice-game, where e.g. the winner was *śvahnīn-* ‘dog-slayer’, and the losing throw (*kali-*) seems to have been the ‘dog’. This hymn is specifically aimed at eradication by Indra of *śvanvatī-* ‘dog-accompanied’ Apsarases, probably those Apsarases which were thought to be involved in a bad outcome of the dice-game. Cf. also my comments under 1b.

On the Apsarases in general, cf. OBERLIES 1998: 229 n. 384, where — after references to the sparse older secondary literature — it is admitted: “Die Apsaras verdienten eine eigene Untersuchung, in die natürlich auch RV 7.33 (...) und 10.95, das Lied von Purūravas und Urvaśī (...), einzubeziehen wären”. The AV, in particular the PS, also contains important data: besides the contents of this hymn, cf. PS 1.29, 1.89, 12.7–8, 15.18–19; thematic and verbatim correspondences are noticeable also in the various PS hymns to the Sadānuvās (see my introduction to 6.8), to the Kaṇvās (see under 7.11.7c), and to other noxious female creatures; see also my comments on 6.4.10b above.

The hymn concatenates quite clearly with the preceding hymn(s) through *uttānāḥ* in 6b (cf. 7.11.1b, 7.12.7a), *vāta-/vāta°* in 1b, 3a, 6a (7.11.1c, 7.12.6b), and *vr̥kṣa-* in 7a (7.12.6a).

**7.13.1** Only PS ◊ **b**: 13.3.5b ◊ **cd**: 14cd below ◊ **d**: 1.89.2d

yāsām ārād āghoṣāmo	(8)
vātasyeva pr̥thag yataḥ	(8)
tāsām +ś <sub>u</sub> vanvatī <sub>a</sub> ām	(8)
indro +api +kṛtac chirah	(8)

Of whom we hear [the noises] from afar, as of the wind going in various directions: of those dog-accompanied [Apsarases] Indra shall cut off the head.

āghoṣāmo] Or, āghoṣāso K vātasyeva] Or, vātasyai K pṛthag yataḥ] Ku [Ma] K,  
 pṛthagvataḥ V/126 Mā ||] Or, om. | K [[note °ḥ t°] +śvanvatīnām] śmanmatīnām  
 Or, sanvānām K indro +api] indro +pi Or, indra apa K +kṛtac chiraḥ] kṛtatśiraḥ Or,  
 kṛtaśchiraḥ K ||] Or, om. K [[note °ḥ y°]

**ab.** The second pāda occurs also in PS 13.3.5: *ye ke cedam +upāśrauṣur*<sup>69</sup> *vātasyeva pṛthag yataḥ | aṅgo nu sarve brūtāheyam arasaṃ viṣam* ‘All you who have heard this [invocation<sup>70</sup>], like [the noise] of the wind going in various directions, come on, speak out: sapless is the snake-poison’.

RENOU 1957a: 78 interprets the **K** reading *āghoṣāso* as a nom. pl. of a noun *āghoṣa-* ‘crying aloud (demon)’. This noun is otherwise quotable only from Nir 5.11 *āṅgūṣaḥ stoma āghoṣaḥ*, while ŚāṅkhŚS 4.19.7–8 attests *āghoṣiṇī- teṣu lohitaśram ūvadyam avadhāya | rudrasenābhyo ’nudiśati || āghoṣiṇyaḥ pratighoṣiṇyaḥ saṃghoṣiṇyo vicinvatyaḥ śvasanāḥ kravyāda eṣa vo bhāgas taṃ juṣadhvaṃ svāheti* ‘On these he places the excrementa mixed with the blood and assigns (this mixture) to Rudra’s army with (the formula): “Ye noisy ones, ye noise-making ones, ye roaring ones, ye dispersing ones, ye hissing ones, ye carrion-devouring ones, this is your part, accept it graciously! *svāhā!*”’ (CALAND). Despite this last interesting parallel which seems to confirm that *āghoṣa-* ‘demonic noise’ did exist independently as a noun, I tentatively accept 1st plural *āghoṣāmas* ‘we hear’, even though no other comparable 1st person (pl.) forms occur in the hymn. The possibility that *ā-ghoṣ* anywhere means ‘to hear’ in Vedic has been called into question (GOTŌ 1987: 130–132), but historical considerations (GOTŌ, p. 131) make this assumption — which anyhow leads to unnatural interpretations at several places (p. 132) — unattractive. Since the parallel in PS 13.3.5 uses an explicit accusative, I assume that one needs to be supplied here also, rather than working with the possibility of *ā-ghoṣ* governing a genitive (ṚV 8.64.4 *āghoṣaṅ carṣaṇvīnām* — GELDNER: ‘auf die Völker horchend’, GOTŌ: ‘indem er (Indra) [das Wort] der Völker erklingen läßt’).

On the noise of the Apsarases, see stanza 13 below, and cf. 17.15.5 [PSK 17.15.7] *yāsāṃ ghoṣaḥ saṃgatānām vṛkṅṅāṃ iva gaṅgaṇaḥ | pracaṅkaśām †aivaharāṃ† prayachantūṃ pratigrahāṃ nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ* ‘The Sadānuvās, whose noise, when they are joined together, is like the howling of wolves, do we cause to vanish: the one that looks forward, that ..., that gives, that takes’. Cf. also ŚS 3.19.6bcd (PS 1.56.2d–3ab) ... *úd vīrāṇām jāyatām etu ghóṣaḥ | pṛthag ghóṣā ululāyaḥ ketumānta úd vīratām* ‘Let the noise of winning heroes go up. In various directions let the noises, the marked (?) howlings move up’ and PS 1.107.1ab (cf. ṚV 10.168.1ab) *vātasya nu mahimā*

<sup>69</sup> Or (and BHATTACHARYA): *upāśrauṣur*; **K**: *āpāśveṣur*. The emendation is somewhat uncertain, but cf. JB 3.276 *te ’smāi stutās tathākurvan yathaiśām upāśroṣat*, where ms. Bar reads °*śrauṣam*, while Bur M read °*śreṣat*° (readings kindly provided by Gerhard Ehlers): emendation to ‘irregular’ (NARTEN 1964: 260) °*śrauṣat*, with the same lengthened grade found in the Bar reading that we also seem to have in the PS passage, must now be considered.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. ṚV 10.97.21a *yās cedām upaśṛṇvānti* ‘Die dieser (Rede) zuhören’ (GELDNER).

*rathasyārujann eti stanayann asya ghoṣaḥ* ‘The greatness of the Wind Chariot now (goes) destroying, thundering goes its noise’. Sounds moving *pr̥thak* are found, besides in ŚS 3.19.6 quoted just above, also at ŚS 4.15.4ab / PS 5.7.5ab *gaṇās tvōpa gāyantu mārutāḥ parjanya ghoṣīṇaḥ pṛthak* ‘Let the noisy troops of Maruts sing to you all over, O Parjanya’ (LUBOTSKY) and ŚS 5.20.7ab / PS 9.27.8ab *antarémé nábhasī ghóṣo astu pṛthak te dhvanáyo yantu śībham* ‘Let there be noise between these two firmaments; severally let thy sounds go swiftly’ (WHITNEY).

c. On the Apsaras-epithet *śvanvatī-*, correctly transmitted in the Or. mss. at PS 1.89.2 and 2.27.6, cf. ZEHNDER 1999: 81f. The word, which is to be compared formally with *śvanín-* ‘dog-leader (in a hunt)’ (found in two parallel mantras i.a. at TS 4.5.4.2, TB 3.4.3.1, VSM 16.27 and 30.7), occurs twice in ŚS. At 11.9[11].15 *śvānvatīr*<sup>71</sup> *apsarāso rūpakā utārbude antaḥpātré rérihatīm riśām durñihitaiṣīṇīm | sārvas tā arbude tvām amítrebhyo dṛśé kuru* ... ‘The dog-accompanied Apsarases and the phantoms, o Arbudi, the *riśá*, constantly licking the inside of the vessel, seeking out what is badly stored, all those, o Arbudi, make appear to [our] enemies ...’ — the word is translated ‘déguisées en chiennes’ by HENRY 1896: 128, ‘dog-like’ by BLOOMFIELD 1897: 125, but WHITNEY’s ‘dog-accompanied’ (perhaps influenced by Sāyaṇa’s gloss *śunā krīḍārthena sārameyeṇa sahitāḥ*) seems most acceptable, in the light of my interpretation presented above in the introduction to this hymn. At 19.36.6c *śatām śaśvanvātīnām*, was emended by R-W to *śatām ca śvānvatīnām* — with an impossible accent on the last word (AiGr. II/2, §709aα pp. 883f.): the text of PS 2.27.6c (*śatām śvanvatīnām*) now allows for a proper restoration of the ŚS pāda to *śatām śvanvātīnām*.<sup>72</sup>

The hymn 15.18, dedicated to Apsarases, contains two stanzas which seem unrelated to the epithet *śvanvatī-*, because the ‘heavenly dog’ there seems to refer to the sun (as at ŚS 6.80.1 / PS 19.16.12–13; BLOOMFIELD 1893: 163–172): PS 15.18.7–8 *āskandike viškandike parācīr apa \*nṛtyantu*<sup>73</sup> | *sāraṅgeṇa śunā saha || yaḥ sāraṅgo +hiraṇyadañ \*chvā divyaḥ pariplavaḥ | tasyāhaṃ nāma jagrabhāsmā ariṣṭatātaye* ‘O here-jumper (cf. FALK 1986: 118f.), there-jumper: let them dance off into the distance, together with the speckled dog. I have taken the name of the speckled, golden-toothed, heavenly dog that floats around, for the safety of him here’. Even if we would connect the epithet *śvanvatī-* with this particular ‘dog’ — rather than with the dice-game — and adduce the next stanza in support of this preference, WHITNEY’s translation ‘dog-accompanied’ would still stand.

d. Cf. PS 1.89.3d / 15.18.4d *indro apsaraso hanat* ‘Indra shall slay the Ap-

<sup>71</sup> Regarding the accent, cf. WHITNEY’s comment: “The accent of *śvānvatīs* seems certainly wrong, but it is read by all the mss., and avouched by the commentary to Prāt. iii.73” (see DESHPANDE 1997: 446).

<sup>72</sup> WHITNEY rendered this second attestation of the adjective as ‘doglike’.

<sup>73</sup> BHATTACHARYA *nṛtyatu*, after the Or. mss. **K**: *nṛtyataś*.

sarases’. I would like to connect Indra’s intervention here with his role in ṚV 1.133.3–4, a passage discussed by FALK (1986: 104), and with Indra’s comparison with a *śvaghñin-* at ṚV 2.12.4c, 4.20.3c, 8.45.38c, 10.42.9b, 10.43.5a. *kṛtat* must be a direct poetic allusion to the connection of the hymn with gambling (*kṛtá-* ‘winning throw’). The form, known only in the PS, here and at 1.89.2d (where it occurs next to the subj. *hanat* in 3d), can according to the existing grammars only be taken as a 3rd sg. a-aor. inj. of *kart* ‘to cut’ (cf. ṚV 1.63.4 *ákrtaḥ*). We thus might have here one of the rare Atharvavedic examples of the hortatively used injunctive, but interpretation as a subjunctive form seems more attractive to me (see my discussion under 6.19.1b above).

**7.13.2** Only PS ◊ **ab**: PS 15.19.2ab ◊ **a**: PS 1.29.1a, 1.36.1a

yāḥ purastād ācaranti (8)  
sākaṃ sūryasya raśmibhiḥ °°° || (8)

They who approach from the East, together with the rays of the sun: (of those ...).

yāḥ purastād] **Or**, yāḥpurastād **K** [misprint Bar.: °puru°] °°° ||] **Mā**, ||<sup>kā</sup> **Ku**, ||(sec. m. kā) **V/126**, om. **K** [note °ḥ y°]

These same pādas occur also as PS 15.19.2ab.

**a.** This is 1.36.1a: the same pattern (with different ablative forms in the place of *purastād*) is found in the 3 other **a** pādas of PS 1.36 (to the Sadānuvās), and identically in PS 1.29.1 *yāḥ purastād ācaranti nīcaiḥ sūryād adho divaḥ | etam apsarasāṃ vrātaṃ brahmaṇāchā vadāmasi* ‘Those that approach from the East, down from the sun and the sky: this troop of Apsarases we invite with a formula’. Cf. also 13a below, and 1.29.2a quoted there.

**b.** Cf. ŚS 4.38.5ab *sūryasya raśmīn ānu yāḥ saṃcāranti mārīcīr vā yā anusamcāranti* ‘[The Apsarases] that move along the rays of the sun, or that move along [its] beams’.

**7.13.3** Only PS

yā vātam anusamṃyantiy (8)  
antarikṣe adho divaḥ °°° || (8)

They who assemble after the wind, in the intermediate space, below the heaven: (of those ...).

vātam anusamṃyantiy] **Or**, vācamanasavyamny **K** antarikṣe adho] antarikṣe ’tho **Ku** **Mā**, antarikṣe ’dhAU(sec. m. → dho) **V/126**, antarikṣe ’(→ a)dhau **Ma**, antarikṣedadho **K** °°° ||] **Mā**, ||<sup>kā</sup> **Ku**, ||(sec. m. kā) **V/126** [the place in the ms. where <sup>kā</sup> has most likely been written, is lost because a worm has eaten it], om. **K** [note °ḥ y°]

BHATTACHARYA reports no variant ’tho for his **Mā**, although this is clearly the reading that I see in my reproduction of it. With the whole stanza compare

15.19.8ab *yā antarikṣa īrayanti vātena reṣmaṇā saha* ‘[The Apsarases] that set (...?) in motion in the intermediate space, together with the storm-wind’.

a. The verbal compound *anu-sam-ay* seems to be rare. I have found it at ŚS 11.5[7].2b (PS 16.153.3) *brahmacārīṇaṃ pitāro devajanāḥ pṛthag devā anusāmyanti sārve* ‘The Fathers, the god-folk, all the gods individually assemble after the Vedic student’ (WHITNEY); TB 3.1.1.7 *yāsya devā anusāmyānti cetaḥ* ‘[Aryaman] whose will the gods obey’ (DUMONT 1954: 209); SVK 2.1214 *kaṅkāḥ suparṇā anu yantv enān gr̥dhrāṇām annam asāv astu senā | maiṣāṃ mocy aghahāraś canendra vayāṃsy enān anusāmyantu sarvān* ‘Let the Kaṅkas, the eagles go after them. Let yonder army be food for the vultures. Let no damned robber (?) soever<sup>74</sup> be free of them, o Indra. Let the birds go after all of them’.

b. The reading *atho* in some of the Or. mss. may be due to perseveration from PS 1.29.1b, quoted under the preceding stanza (although reading *adho* with **K** there seems a serious possibility). At PS 15.21.7, where BHATTACHARYA edits *atho divaḥ* (after **K**), and the Or. mss. read *atho diśaḥ* (perseveration from 15.13.5b *antariṣam atho diśaḥ*), it seems that we may also restore the following text: *ye te rocane bṛhatī antarikṣe \*adho divaḥ | tābhyaṃ upa pra yāhi naḥ sarvavīrāṃ ariṣyataḥ* ‘Your two lofty realms of light in the intermediate space, below the heaven: drive through them towards us, so that our heroes are healthy, and we do not get hurt’. The phrase *adho divaḥ* seems to be known elsewhere only at SVK 1.172 / SVJ 1.18.8 *ye te panthā adho<sup>75</sup> divo yebhir vy aśvam airayaḥ | uta śroṣantu no bhuvāḥ* ‘Those paths of yours below the sky, along which you set the horse in motion, [let them] and let the worlds obey us’.

#### 7.13.4 Only PS

yāsāṃ preṅkho divi baddho (8)  
antariṣe hiraṇyayaḥ °°° || (8)

They in the intermediate space whose golden swing is tied in the sky: (of those ...).

<sup>74</sup> The SVK padapāṭha divides *ca | na | indra*, and after it the various editors of the Saṃhitā, read *ca nendra*, which has led DAS, in his otherwise informative section on the identification of the *kaṅkā*-bird (1985: 267–273), to misunderstand: “Auch nicht der das Schlechte Entfernende (d.h. Priester o. dgl.) (?) unter diesen [Feinden] entkomme, o Indra” (p. 269). The word *aghahāraś*, whose meaning is not certain, occurs elsewhere only at ŚS 6.66.1 / PS 19.11.10 and PS 1.86.6.

<sup>75</sup> SVidhB 1.5.12 confirms this reading. Asko Parpola kindly informs me that in his opinion *adho* is probably also the correct Jaiminīya reading: “Caland 1907 p. 43 at JS 1.2.1.6.8 has *atho* and remarks in footnote 2: “So Gāna-Hss.; ato Saṃh.-Hs.” and accordingly Raghu Vira’s JS ed. (1938 p. 14) at JS 1.18.8 has *atho*. However, Vibhūtibhūṣaṇa Bhaṭṭācārya’s ed. of the J[aiminīya]G[rāmageya]G[āna] (1976, p. 83) at 2.6.22 has *adho*, and so has my Malayalam ms. at the corresponding place (p. 307)”.

preñkho] **Ku Mā** [Ma], pr{ai}eñkho **V/126**, preñkhyo **K** baddho] **Or**, vṛddho **K** antarikṣe] **V/126 Mā K**, 'ntarikṣe **Ku** [Ma] hiraṇyayaḥ] **V/126 Mā** [Ma] **K**, hiraṇya{ḥ}yaḥ **Ku** ° ° ° ||] **Mā**, ||<sup>kā</sup> **Ku**, ||(*sec. m. kā*) **V/126**, *om. K* [note ° ḥ y°]

**ab.** Cf. PS 12.7.5 (*preñkho . . . divi baddho hiraṇyayaḥ*) quoted in full under 7.10.7b above, and PS 5.9.6 *yās tarke tiṣṭhanti yā valīke yāḥ preñkhe* + *preñkhayanta uta yā nu ghorāḥ | yā garbhān pramṛśanti sarvāḥ pāpīr anīnaśam* ‘Those [Sadānuvās] who stay in the twisted grass (?), who in the thatch, who swing in a swing, and those who are terrible now, who lay hold of the embryos, all the bad ones have I destroyed’ (LUBOTSKY 2002: 56), PS 15.19.1 *yāḥ preñkhe preñkhayante santāne mālāvā iva | idam uluṅgulukābhyo apsarābhyo karam namaḥ* ‘I have brought reverence here to the Uluṅgulukā (?) Apsarasas, who swing in a swing, like girls from Mālava (?) in a line’.

### 7.13.5 Only PS

yās talpān anurṭyant<sub>i</sub>y (8)  
 antarikṣe hiraṇyayān ° ° ° || (8)

They who dance over golden beds in the intermediate space: (of those . . .).

omitted in **K** • hiraṇyayān ] **Ku Mā** [Ma], hiṇya(*sec. m. + ra 1*)yān **V/126** ° ° ° ||] ||<sup>kā</sup> **Ku**, ||(*sec. m. kā*) **V/126**, | **Mā**

**a.** In the RV, *ānu* always seems to keep its accent if it immediately follows the noun it governs. Cf. e.g. — with an additional preposition between *ānu* and the verb — 4.22.7c *yāt sīm ānu prá mucó badbadhānās* or 10.68.12b *yāḥ pūrvīr ānv ārōravīti*, and — with no second preposition in between — 5.73.4b *viśvā yād vām ānu śtāve* (I have found one exception RV 3.39.5ab *sākhā ha yātra sākhibhir nāvagvair abhiñv ā sātvaḥ gā anugmán*). But the situation seems to have changed in ŚS. Besides several cases of *anu* combined with another preposition (both unaccented) and an accented verb form (e.g. 3.21.7b, 5.7.3c, 8.10.33, 9.6.29), I have noticed several cases like the following, which supports univerbation of *anu* with *nṛtyanti*: ŚS 9.8.7a *yā ūrū anusárpati*. Cf. my Introduction, §2.8 (D), on the pausa-form *talpān* found in the Or. mss., for which unfortunately we lack confirmation from **K**.

On the association of the Apsarasas with dancing, see PS 12.7.6ab *gandharvāṇām apsarasām ānartam iti saṅgamam* ‘The assembly of Gandharvas and Apsarasas is ‘The Dancing Ground’’, 15.18.7 quoted under 1c above, and the imprecation of Apsarasas at 15.18.9b *parācīr apa nṛtyata* ‘dance off into the distance’. Further ŚS 4.38.3 *yāyaiḥ parinṛtyaty ādādānā kṛtām glāhāt | sá naḥ kṛtāni siṣatī prahām ānotu māyáyā | sá naḥ páyasvaty áitu má no jaiśur idám dhānam* ‘[The Apsaras] that dances around together with the outcomes, taking the *kṛta* from the portion: let her, trying to win for us (? — cf. GOTÖ 1997: 1038) the *kṛtas*, gain the advantage<sup>76</sup> with her magical power. Let her come here full of milk for us. Let them not win our wealth here’.

<sup>76</sup> The word *prahā-*, a technical term of the dice-game, has not been commented upon by

## 7.13.6 Only PS

yāḥ patanti vātarathā (8)  
uttānāḥ pādaghātinīḥ ° ° ° || (8)

They, with the wind as their chariot, who fly outstretched, striking with their feet: (of those ...).

yāḥ] Or, yāḥ K vātarathā uttanāḥ] V/126 Mā [Ma], vātarathā u{thā}ttānāḥ Ku, vātarathāduttānāḥ K pādaghātinīḥ] Or, pādaghātinīm K ° ° ° ||] Mā, ||<sup>kā</sup> Ku, ||(sec. m. kā) V/126, om. K

a. The Apsarases are associated with chariots also at ŚS 6.130.1ab *ra-thajītām rāthajiteyīnām apsarāsām ayāṃ smarāḥ* ‘Of the Apsarases, chariot-conquering, belonging to the chariot-conquering, [is] this the love’ (WHITNEY). Cf. my comments on PS 6.4.10, also addressed to an Apsaras, where I conjectured a bahuvrīhi *vātarathe*. A tatpuruṣa compound *vātaratha-* is attested at KS 36.8:75.13ff. *sa vṛtram abhītya vṛtram dṛṣṭvorustambhagr̥hīto ’tiṣṭhad anabhidhr̥ṣṇuvam̐s taṃ maruta aiṣīkair vātarathair adhy aiyanta te ’ty aiṣam̐s te ’sya yatra marmāgaccham̐s tad aceṣṭat* ‘He (Indra) approached Vṛtra, saw Vṛtra, and stood stricken with paralysis of the thighs, without daring to have a go [at him]. The Maruts, with their wind-chariots made of reed, rushed into him (Indra). They tried to get past him. When they came to his weak spot, then he moved (again)’ (after HOFFMANN 1968b: 371 = 1975: 211).

b. The compound *pādaghātin-* is not attested elsewhere, but may be compared with the pāda *śarvėṇādhvagaghātīnā* that we find in one of the Tübingen Kaṭha mss. (SCHROEDER 1898: 15), which corresponds to PS 16.104.7c *rudrėṇādhvagaghātīnā*.<sup>77</sup> The whole pāda is reminiscent of the Aditi epithet *uttānāpad-* at RV 10.72.3d, 4a, found used of the earth also at PS 5.10.4d (= 19.47.12d?), and perhaps also attested at 20.58.6b [PSK 20.54.6b].

LÜDERS 1940: 148f. (‘Einsatz’ after Ludwig) or FALK 1986: 127, 183 (‘Rückstand’) in their discussions of the other Saṃhitā attestation RV 10.42.9 (ŚS 7.50[52].6), to which we may add PS 16.149.4 (omitted in VWC) *yat te akṣeṣu daurbhāgyaṃ prahāyām adhidevane (ayaṃ tad viśvabheṣajo apāmārgo ’pa lumpatu)* ‘What ill-fortune is yours with regard to the dice, with regard to the advantage, on the gambling-ground: this all-healing Apāmārga shall remove that’. I tentatively follow CALAND’s guess in his translation of PB 16.14.2 (20.11.4): *etena vā aṅgīrasa ādityān āpnuvan yo hīna ānujāvāra iva syāt sa etena yajetāpnoti pūrveṣāṃ prahām āpnuvan hy etenāṅgīrasa ādityān* ‘By this (rite), the Angirases reached the Ādityas. He who is left behind, coming behind (inferior), as it were, should perform this (rite). He reaches the advantage of those who precede him, for, by it, the Angirases had reached the Ādityas’.

<sup>77</sup> Thus with K, which marks accents on this portion of the text. The Or. mss. checked by me [Ku3 JM Ji1 Ji4] all point to ° *dhvaka*°, while ŚS 11.2.7c reads even more corruptly *rudrėṇārdhakaghātīnā*. Perhaps — if the correct K reading, with its accents, is due to influence from the Kaṭha school — the agreement between Or. mss. and ŚS must be interpreted to represent an old, authentic AV idiosyncrasy.

## 7.13.7 Only PS

yā vṛkṣaṃ parisarpanti (8)  
 sāc<sub>y</sub> +akṣī karikratīḥ °°° || (8)

They who creep around a tree, constantly making their eyes squint: (of those ...).

yā] **Or**, *om.* **K** sācy +akṣī] sācy akṣi **Or**, sācakṣu **K** karikratīḥ ] **Or**, karikrati **K** °°° ||] **Mā** **K**, ||<sup>kā</sup> **Ku**, ||(*sec. m.* <sup>kā</sup>) **V/126**

BHATTACHARYA edits *akṣi* here and at 15.19.6, where the ms. readings are the same (**Or** *sācyakṣi*, **K** *sācakṣu*).

**a.** On the association of Apsarases with trees, cf. PS 1.29.3a *yāḥ kulyā yā vanyāḥ* ‘Those [Apsarases] that belong to the streams, and those that belong to the forests’; ŚS 4.37.4 (PS 12.7.7) *yātrāśvatthā nyagródhā mahāvṛkṣāḥ śikhāṇḍīnaḥ | tāt páretāpsarasaḥ prátibuddhā abhūtana* ‘Where the Áśvatthas, the Nyagrodhas, the great crested trees grow: disappear there, Apsarases. You have been recognized’; ŚS 14.2.9cdef (PS 18.7.10cdef) *yé gandharvā apsarásaś ca devír eśú vānaspatyéśu yé ’dhi tasthúḥ | syonás te asyaí vadhvài bhavantu má hīmsiśur vahatúm uhyámānam* ‘The Gandharvas and the Apsaras-goddesses, those that reside on these forest-trees, let them be hospitable to this bride, let them not cause harm to this [bridal] procession as it is proceeding’; TS 3.4.8.4–5 *náiyagrodha áudumbara áśvatthaḥ plákṣa ítīdhmó bhavaty eté vái gandharvāpsarásāṃ gṛháḥ svá eváinān ||4|| áyátane śamayati* ‘Fuel of Nyagrodha, Udumbara, Áśvattha, or Plakṣa wood is used. These [trees] are the homes of the Gandharvas and Apsarases. It is in their own place that he [thus] appeases them’.

**b.** The rare and formally undetermined (EWAia II, 721f., FORSSMAN 1986: 26 n. 19) word *sācī* (thus according to the ṚV padapāṭha) was previously known elsewhere only in the following attestations: perhaps in the place name (?) Sācīguṇa which the śloka AB 8.23.4 mentions, but certainly at PB 5.1.12 *sācīva vai vayaḥ pakṣau kṛtvā patīyaḥ patati*, where CALAND translates: ‘the bird, forsooth, when holding his wings aslant, so to say, flies swifter’. In the context (an argument for singing the ‘wings’ of the Mahāvratatotra in disequilibrium, fifteen-versed the one, 17-versed the other), the word *sācī* ‘aslant (?)’ seems to refer to keeping the wings in asymmetrical or unbalanced position, because it stands in opposition to *savīvadhatvāya* (5.1.11) and *samau* (5.1.11+12). Applying this meaning to the last attestation, ṚV 10.142.2ab *pravát te agne jánimā pitūyatáḥ sācīva víśvā bhúvanā ny íñjase*, we may translate: ‘Your birth, o Agni, when you are after food, is a downhill rush. You perturb all beings (to such an extent that they stand) in a rather unbalanced position’ (after RENOU 1955–69/XIV: 99 and TUCKER 2002b: 287f.).

Whatever the formal interpretation of *sācī* may be, the meaning ‘disbalanced, asymmetrical’ that seems to present itself in the PB passage works well in the present context, which we must compare with PS 1.29.2b *jīhmā*

*mukhā karikratīḥ* ‘[The Apsarases] that keep making their faces squint’. *sācī kar* seems to mean ‘to squint’ here, and *sācī/jihma- kar* clearly is another expression of the skewing of the gaze that is typical of demonic beings; some other expressions (*trastākṣa-*, *sanisrasākṣá-*, *paryastākṣá-*) have been mentioned under 6.14.3c above. See also PS 15.19.6ab *yā adhastād udvikṣante sācy + akṣī karikratīḥ* ‘[The Apsarases] that glance upward from below, constantly making their eyes squint’.

As to BHATTACHARYA’s *akṣi*, it is clear that we rather need a dual here, which is provided by the archaic form *akṣī* (AiGr. III, §158b p. 303). Confusion of short and long *ī* is rampant in the Or. mss. and may have been caused here by the fact that the form *akṣī* was no longer known to the reciters (having been replaced by *akṣinī*).

### 7.13.8 Only PS

yāś catvare saṃgachante (8)  
vikumbāś celavāsiniḥ °°° || (8)

They who gather on a cross-roads, without head-band (?) and with raggy clothes: (of those ...).

catvare saṃgachante] **Or**, catvārisaṃgaśchati **K** [[Bar.: °riṣaṃgaśchanti] vikumbāś] **Ma**, vikumbā(sec. m. → mbhā 4)ś **Ku**, vikumbhāś **RM V/126 Mā K**, om. **JM** celavāsiniḥ] **Or**, celanāsini **K** °°° ||] **K**, ||<sup>kā</sup> **Ku**, ||(sec. m. <sup>kā</sup>) **V/126**, | **Mā**

BHATTACHARYA edits *vikumbhāś*.

**a.** This is the first attestation in Vedic of the word *catvara-*. The ominous nature of cross-roads is well-known: cf. e.g. the entry ‘Kreuzweg’ in the *Sachregister* of CALAND 1900 (p. 191).

**b.** The ostensible *vikumbhā-* of the majority of the Or. mss. and **K**, accepted by BHATTACHARYA, could perhaps be interpreted as ‘with broken jars’ (AiGr. II/1, §110b: p. 285), with reference to two passages where demonic female beings are associated with the breaking of vessels. Cf. PS 5.9.5, addressed to a Sadānuvā: *vi te nu manthāḥ \*śāsrīre bibhīde te gadohanī | dadau te adya gauḥ kaṇve parehy avaraṃ mṛṇe* ‘Your churning sticks have now fallen to pieces, your milk-pail has burst [containing what] the cow has given you today, O Kaṇvā. Disappear, I crush [you] down’ (LUBOTSKY 2002: 55), and PS 20.38.10ab where *kumbha-/kumbhī-* and *gadohanī-* (on which word, cf. LUBOTSKY, *ibid.*) are juxtaposed: *pāṭā + bhinatti kumbhaṃ pāṭā kumbhīm gadohanīm* ‘The Pāṭā breaks the jar, Pāṭā the milk-pail’. The resulting meaning is, however, dubious as a permanent qualification of Apsarases. The reading preserved in **Ma**, as well as in **Ku** (*ante correctionem*) is certainly preferable. Cf. ŚS 6.138.3 *klība klībāṃ tvākaraṃ vādhre vādhrīm tvākaraṃ ārasārasāṃ tvākaraṃ | kurīraṃ asya śrīśāṇi kūmbaṃ cādhinīdadhmāsi* ‘Impotent one, I have made thee impotent; eunuch (*vādhrī*), I have made thee eunuch; sapless one, I have made thee sapless; the *kurīra* and the *kūmba* we set down upon his head’ (WHITNEY). Because the mss. for the parallel of this stanza at PS 1.68.4f unanimously

read *kumbhaṃ* (accepted without underlining by BHATTACHARYA), there is no problem in assuming the same error to have entered the text in most mss. here. The precise meaning of *kúmba-* is not clear (cf. MACDONELL & KEITH 1912/I: 163), but that is was “some distinctively womanish head-dress or ornament” (WHITNEY) is confirmed by the several Śrautasūtra passages where it occurs, e.g. BaudhŚS 6.1:156.6f. *tāvanty eva patnīm abhito bhavanti kumbhaṃ ca kurīraṃ ca vāsaś ca . . .* ‘As many [objects] surround the wife: a head-band, a hair-net, a garment . . .’. Cf. the nearly contemporary explanation of this sūtra in the Karmānta section of the same text (BaudhŚS 25.4:232.2): *vidalam u ha kumbhaṃ bhavati jālaṃ kurīraṃ* ‘the *kumba* is a bamboo-reed, the *kurīra* a net’. CALAND 1924: 142 (on ĀpŚS 10.9.5 *kumbakurīra-*) cites the further explanation by the medieval commentator Bhavasvāmin (on the just quoted BaudhŚS passage): *vaṃśabidalaṃ jālasya nemibhūtam*, and concludes: “das Ganze ist danach eine Art Kopfbedeckung bestehend aus einem Reif von Bambusrohr mit einem Netz von wollenen Fäden”. These explanations yield fine sense in our context, where reference is presumably made to the Apsarases’ unkempt hair.

Note the juxtaposition of *kumba-* with *vāsa-* at BaudhŚS 6.1:156.6f. (and 6.4:160.8f.), as we find *vikumbā-* here juxtaposed with *celavāsini-*. For the latter hapax, we may compare PS 5.9.7 *yās celam vasata uta yā nu + dūrśam nīlam piśaṅgam uta lohitaṃ yāḥ | yā garbhān pramṛśanti sarvāḥ pāpūr anīnaśam* ‘Those who are dressed in rags, and who [are dressed] in coarse cloth, [be it] deep blue, brown or red, who lay hold of the embryos, all the bad ones have I destroyed’ (LUBOTSKY 2002: 56). Cf. AVParīś 68.2.46cd–47ab, where the words *duścela-* and *virāgavāsa-* denote ominous creatures: *rūḍhaśmaśrunakhānām ca duścelānām ca vāsaśam || virāgavāsaśam vāpi vikṛtānām tathaiiva ca* ‘[The dream-vision] of grown facial hair and nails, of raggy clothes, of discolored clothes, and of disfigured ones [is inauspicious (*akuśala-*)’]’ (cf. VON NEGELEIN 1912: 275).

**7.13.9** Only PS ◊ **b**: PS 20.33.4b, cf. ŚS 7.83.1b, KS 3.8:27.7, ĀśvŚS 3.6.24

yāsām sikatavāpiṣu (8)  
grho mito hiraṇyayah °°° || (8)

They whose golden house is built on dams of sand: (of those . . .).

yāsām sikatavāpiṣu] **Or**, yāsaṃsiktavāmiṣur **K** mito] **K**, 'mito **Or** °°° ||] **Mā**, ||<sup>kā</sup>  
**Ku**, ||(sec. m. <sup>kā</sup>) **V/126**, om. **K** [note °ḥ y°]

BHATTACHARYA edits *yāsām sikatavāpiṣu* and 'mito.

**a.** The reading of the Or. mss. — with *sikata*° also supported by **K** *sikta*° — can probably be accepted as it stands. Cases of shortening of the final vowel of a first member of a compound before a heavy first syllable in the last member are well-known: cf. AiGr. II/1, §56e p. 134 (Nachträge p. 41), e.g. *amīva-cātana-* (*āmīvā-*), *medhā-sāti-* (*medhā-*). On the association of Apsarases with

sand/gravel, see ŚS 7.109.2ab / PS 4.9.3ab *ghṛtām apsarābhyo vaha tvám agne pāmsūn akṣēbhyaḥ sīkatā apás ca* ‘You must take the ghee to the Apsarases, o Agni, dust, sand and water for the dice’. Other references to banks of *sīkatā*- in the AV occur only in metaphorical (medical) contexts, where patches applied in order to stop bleeding are referred to at PS 19.4.14 (ŚS 1.17.4) *pari vaḥ sīkatāmayār dhanūs*<sup>78</sup> *tiraś cid + asthīran* ‘The sandbanks have taken their place right across you’; PS 1.94.4ab *pari vaḥ sīkatāmayam maruṃ bile vapāmasi* ‘We strew around you a sandy place, on the opening’. The word *vāpi*- ‘dam’ was not previously attested in Vedic, but was known from the example given by Patañjali under Vārttika 7 on Aṣṭādhyāyī 3.3.108 (ed. KIELHORN vol. II, p. 155, l. 6); cf. also AiGr. II/2, §§187b and 247f pp. 299, 386f.

**b.** The same error *'mito* is found in Or. mss. **V/122** and **Pa** at PS 20.33.4b [PSK 20.32.4b], while **JM** there has no avagraha. The stanza PS 20.33.4 corresponds with two small variants (the word order in pāda **b** and *no muceḥ* for *muñcatu*) to ŚS 7.83.1 *apsú te rājan varuṇa gṛhó hiraṇyáyo + mitáh | táto dhṛtāvrató rájā sárva dhámāni muñcatu* ‘In the waters, o king Varuṇa, your golden house is built. Let king Varuṇa, of firm rules, release us from it, throughout all abodes’ (cf. also KS 3.8:27.7f. = ĀśvŚS 3.6.24 *dvīpé rájño váruṇasya gṛhó hiraṇyáyo mitáh | táto dhṛtāvrató rájā dhámno dhāmna ihá muñcatu*).

### 7.13.10 Only PS

yā ārokaiḥ prapadyante (8)  
 puṣkarair iva jāmayah ° ° ° || (8)

They who step forth along with the beams of light, like female relatives with lotus-blossoms: (of those ...).

yā ārokaiḥ] **Or**, yārokaiḥ **K** prapadyante] prapadyanti **Or**, papadyante **K** puṣkarair] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**], puṣkare (*sec. m.* → ai)r **V/126**, puṣkalair **K** jāmayah] yāmayah **Or**, jāmaya **K** ° ° ° ||] **Mā K**, ||<sup>kā</sup> **Ku**, || (*sec. m.* kā) **V/126**

**a.** With BHATTACHARYA, I reject the active ending found in the Or. mss. (*prapadyanti*), because the verb *pra-pad* is not reliably attested with active forms (KULIKOV 2001: 248 knows and discusses only RVKh 4.2.7, to which perhaps the late TĀ 10.43 could be added).

The word *āroká*- seems to have been used in two rather different meanings in Vedic (cf. also GONDA 1966: 9 and 26 on *roka*- and *lokaṃprṇā*-). Firstly, in the sense as ‘beam of light’: RV 8.43.3 *āroká iva ghéd áha tigmá agne táva tvíṣaḥ | dadbhír vānāni bapsati* ‘Your sharp glows, o Agni, are truly like beams: with their teeth they chew at the wood’ (after RENO 1955–69/XIII: 71 and 153; contrast GELDNER: ‘sind wie durchsichtige Maschen’) and, among the mystical names of the seven suns, at PS 5.6.10a (see LUBOTSKY 2002: 42f.). In

<sup>78</sup> **Or**: *sīkatāmayīrddhanus*; **K**: *sīktāmayībanūs*. Note the same error ° *sīkata* → ° *sīkta* in **K** in the pāda under discussion.

later texts, a second meaning seems to have become dominant, viz. ‘gap, mesh’, presumably derived from the first meaning through the connection of ‘holes in walls’ with ‘beams of light’: TB 3.8.19.2 (~ PB 21.4.13) *yúpeṣu grāmyān paśún niyuñjānti | ārokéṣv āraṇyān dhārayanti | paśúnām vyāvṛtṭyai* ‘they bind the tame animals to the sacrificial stakes, (but) they keep the wild animals in the intermediate spaces (of the stakes). (This is done) for the purpose of distinguishing the animals’ (DUMONT 1948: 471); ŚBM 3.1.2.18 (cf. ŚBK 4.1.2.10) *tāsya vā etāsya vāsasaḥ | agnēḥ paryāsó bhāvati vāyór anuchādó nīvīḥ pitṛṇām sarpāṇām praghātó víśveṣām devānām tántava āroká náksatraṇām* ‘Now the woof of this cloth belongs to Agni, and the warp to Vāyu, the thrum to the Fathers, the fore-edge to the snakes, the threads to the All-gods, and the meshes to the asterisms’ (EGGELING); ManB 1.3.4 *ārokeṣu ca danteṣu hastayoḥ pādayoḥ ca yat | tāni te pūrṇāhutyā sarvāṇi śamayāmy aham* ‘And the [evils] that are in the gaps between [your teeth], and in the teeth, and in the hands and in the feet: all those do I appease for you with the Full offering’; ĀpŚS 10.5.3 *sraktiṣv ārokān karoti* ‘He makes openings at the corners’ (cf. CALAND 1924: 128f.; BhārŚS 10.3.3, HirŚS 14.3.51, VaikhŚS 12.4:135.3).

In the light of the (partly) sinister nature of Apsarases, one might hence consider a translation: ‘Who enter through the holes [in the wall]’. Keeping in mind, however, the association of the Apsarases with the sun’s rays (as we have seen in stanza 2), and in view of the simile (where lotuses seem to stand for the beauty of sunlight) it seems to me that an interpretation along the lines of the first meaning is more likely.

b. On the meaning of the word *púṣkara-*, cf. HANNEDER 2002: 296f. and 302. Note the variance **Or** *puṣkarair* / **K** *puṣkalair*. Several other cases of such *r/l* variation have been noticed in my Introduction, §2.8 (V).

### 7.13.11 Only PS ◊ ab: 15.19.9ab

yā nadīḥ pratigāhante (8)  
saṁrabhya kaṇḥyā iva °°° || (8)

They who plunge into rivers, as girls holding on to each other: (of those ...).

nadīḥ] **Or**, nadīḥ **K** pratigāhante] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], prat{ī}gāhante **Mā**, pratigāhayante **K** iva °°° ||] **Mā**, iva ||<sup>kā</sup> **Ku**, iva ||(*sec. m.* <sup>kā</sup>) **V/126**, vayah ||*om.* ||] **K** ||*note* °ḥ y°]

The same two pādas occur also as 15.19.9ab. They are to be compared — for the combination of forms with *gā(d)h* and *sam-rabh* — with JB 3.329 *sa yathogragādhe saṁrabhyātīyād evam evaitaṁ tṛtīyaṁ tryahaṁ devā atyāyan* ‘As one may cross a dangerous ford by holding on to each other, in the same way the gods managed to cross this third Tryaha’.

On the association of the Apsarases with rivers, cf. the next stanza and ŚS 4.37.3ab (PS 12.7.3ab) *nadīm yantv apsarāso ’pām tārām avaśvasām* which WHITNEY renders: ‘Let the Apsarases go to the stream, to the loud (?) down-blowing of the waters’. For the PS parallel, the Or. mss. read *iva śvasan*

(cf. 4.20.7a *iva śvasaḥ*), while **K** reads *iva svasam*, and this latter reading finds partial confirmation in Sāyaṇa’s commentary on ŚS 4.37.3ab (see WHITNEY’S note): neither the ŚS nor the PS text seems to make sense.

**7.13.12** Only PS ◊ **ab**: 15.19.10ab

yās tīrthāni vigāhante (8)  
 aghnyāḥ \*śvasatīr iva °°° || (8)

They who immerse themselves at fords, like panting cows: (of those ...).

tīrthāni vigāhante] **Or**, tīrthānavagāhante **K** aghnyāḥ] 'ghnyāḥ **Or**, ghnyā **K** \*śvasatīr]  
 svasatīr **Or**, svasitīr **K** iva °°° ||] **Mā K**, iva ||<sup>kā</sup> **Ku**, iva ||(*sec. m.* kā) **V/126**

BHATTACHARYA edits *śvasatīr*. The same two pādas occur also as 15.19.9ab, where he edits \**śvasatīr*. The emendation seems well justified by parallels such as PS 19.9.11ab +*ucchvasanta ud irate gāva āvasathād iva* ‘They (the rivers) rise like cows from the shelter, taking a deep breath (i.e. swelling up)’ (cf. RV 9.86.43c = ŚS 18.3.18c *sīndhor ucchvāsé*); 4.20.7a *aṅgo nu mod iva śvasaḥ* ‘Come on, don’t pant any longer’ (cf. NARTEN 1993: 320 = 1995: 402). Does ŚS 4.37.3ab / PS 12.7.3ab quoted under the preceding stanza point to an association of the Apsarases with heavy breathing? Cf. also *śvasanāḥ* in ŚāṅkhŚS 4.19.7–8 quoted under 1ab.

**7.13.13** Only PS ◊ **ab**: 15.19.11ab

yāḥ samudrād uccarantīy (8)  
 uccair ghoṣān karikratīḥ °°° || (8)

They who move up out of the ocean, constantly making loud noises: (of those ...).

yāḥ] **Or**, yās **K** samudrād uccaranty uccair] **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, samudrāduccarantyuccair  
**Mā**, samudrāduccarantyuccair **K** ghoṣān karikratīḥ] **V/126 Mā** [°n, k°], ghoṣānakarikra-  
 tīḥ **Ku**, ghoṣānikrakrati **K** [note °nk°] °°° ||] **V/126 Mā K**, ||<sup>kā</sup> **Ku**

The same two pādas occur also as 15.19.11ab.

**a.** Cf. 2a and PS 1.29.2a *yā adharād ācaranti* ‘[The Apsarases] that move here from down below’ (and the **a** pādas of PS 1.36). On the association of the Apsarases with the ocean, cf. ŚS 2.2.3 (PS 1.7.3) *anavadyābhiḥ sám u jagma ābhir apsarāsv āpi gandharvā āsīt | samudrā āsāṃ sādanaṃ ma āhur yātaḥ sadyā ā ca pārā ca yānti* ‘He hath united with those irreproachable ones; in among the Apsarases was the Gandharva; in the ocean is, they tell me, their seat, whence at once they both come and go’ (WHITNEY); PS 12.7.4ab *yatrāmartyā apsv antaḥ samudre turūrnīli turvaśi puṇḍarikā* ‘Where the immortal [Apsarases] are in the ocean, under water: Turūrnīli, Turvaśi, Puṇḍarikā’; 15.18.5d *samudram apa +gachata*<sup>79</sup> ‘Go away to the ocean’. Should we

<sup>79</sup> BHATTACHARYA: *gacchatī*<sup>+</sup>.

interpret *samudrā-* as ‘confluence (of the Panjab rivers)’ in all these passages (KLAUS 1989b)?

b. On the noise of the Apsarases, see under stanza 1 above.

**7.13.14 PS ◊ ab:** 15.19.12ab

yā gachanti janamjanam	(8)
ichantīḥ prayutaṁ bahu	(8)
tāsaṁ <sup>+</sup> ś <sub>u</sub> vanvatīnāṁ	(8)
indro <sup>+</sup> api <sup>+</sup> kṛtac chiraḥ    13	(8)

They who go from man to man, eagerly seeking out the unsuspecting person:  
of those dog-accompanied [Apsarases] Indra shall cut off the head.

yā gachanti] **V/126 [Ma]**, yā gacchanti **Ku**, yā gachant{i}{h} **Mā**, āgaśchantī **K** ichantīḥ  
prayutaṁ] **Or**, iśchantīḥprahitaṁ **K** <sup>+</sup>śvanvatīnām] śmanmatīnām **Or**, sunvatīm **K** a-  
pi] ‘pi **Or**, apa **K** <sup>+</sup>kṛtac chiraḥ] kṛtatśiraḥ **Ku V/126 Mā Ma**, kṛtaśchiraḥ **K** || 13 ||  
|| 14 || 13 || **Ku**, || 13 || 14 || (*sec. m.* 14) || **V/126**, || 13 || 14 || **Mā**, Z 3 Z **K**

The first two pādas occur also as 15.19.12ab.

b. See my comments under PS 6.14.6c (*bahīḥ prayutam ichati*) above. I take *bahu* adverbially (DELBRÜCK 1888: 185).

## 7.14. For full life.

Shorter variant versions of this prose *kaṇḍikā* are found at the following places: TS 2.3.10.3, ĀpMP 2.14.5–9, KS 11.7:153.10–15, MS 2.3.4:31.13–16, PārGS 1.16.6. The various items called ‘full of life’ and invoked for the sake of a full life-span are arranged as follows in these source:

	PS	TS	ĀpMP	KS	MS	PārGS
1	Agni	Agni	Agni	Gods	Agni	Agni
2	Vāyu	Soma	Soma	Brahman	Brahman	Soma
3	Sūrya	Yajña	Yajña	Agni	Yajña	Brahman
4	Candra	Brahman	Brahman	Yajña	Amṛta	Gods
5	Soma	Gods	Gods	Soma		Ṛṣis
6	Yajña	Pitṛs		Plants		Pitṛs
7	Ocean					Yajña
8	Brahman ( <b>K</b> : Indra)					Ocean
9	Indra ( <b>K</b> : Brahman)					
10	Gods					
11	Prajāpati					

The table shows that the PS version, including also a rudimentary cosmic classification, is by far the most extensive: its elements Vāyu, Sun, Moon, Prajāpati do not occur in any of the other lists, all of which show a primarily ritualistic classification. It is not clear which one of the elements of the PS list might be treated as superfluous in order to restore the hymn to the number of 10 stanzas that is the standard in this *kāṇḍa*. The arrangement of the items (in which **K** exchanges the order of items 8–9 of the Or. mss.) also does not seem to provide any clues in this regard.

While the ĀpMP formulae are put to use in Gṛhya rites following after birth in ĀpGS 6.15.12–13 + 6.16.1 and the PārGS employs them in the Āyusya rite that follows the Medhājanana (cf. GONDA 1980: 372), the formulae of the Black YV Saṃhitās are used (cf. BaudhŚS 13.32:142.11, ĀpŚS 19.24.11, MānŚS 5.2.2.11) in the Āyuskāmeṣṭi, fully described by CALAND 1908, §169 pp. 112–117 (on further connections between PS *kāṇḍa* 7 and the domain of the Kāmyeṣṭis, see my Introduction §3.3). The employment of the PS hymn, where the associations between items ‘full of life’ and the elements that accompany/cause them in the instrumental are so common as to make further comments superfluous, must have been aimed at acquiring a full life-span as well. Below, I in principle quote only from the closest parallels TS and KS.

Some lexical items provide concatenating links with the preceding hymn: *samudra-* in 7a (7.13.13a) and *nadī-* in 7b (7.13.11a), as well as *antarikṣa-* in 2b (7.13.3b, 7.13.5b) and *div-* in 3b (7.13.3b, 4a).

**7.14.1** Cf. TS 2.3.10.3, KS 11.7:153.12 etc.

agnir āyusmān (P)  
 sa vanaspatibhir āyusmān | (P)  
 sa māyusmān āyusmantam kṛnotu || (P)

Agni is full of life: he is full of life due to the trees. Full of life let him make me full of life.

āyusmān sa] **K**, āyusmān, sa **Or** vanaspatibhir] **Ku Mā [Ma] K**, vanaspati(*sec. m.* + bhi 3)r **V/126** āyusmān |] **Or**, āyusmān, [*om.* |] **K** kṛnotu] **Or**, kṛnotu **K** [[*Bar.:* kṛnotu]

**TS 2.3.10.3**

agnir āyusmānt sā vānaspátibhir āyusmān  
 téna tvāyusāyusmantam karomi

**KS 11.7:153.12**

agnir āyusmān sā vānaspátibhir āyusmāns  
 tāsya yām āyusāyusmān astv asáu

**7.14.2** Only PS

vāyur āyusmān (P)  
 so 'ntarikṣeṇāyusmān °°° || (P)

Vāyu is full of life: he is full of life in the intermediate space. (Full of life . . . .)

āyusmān so] **K**, āyusmān, so **Or** 'ntarikṣeṇāyusmān °°° ||] **Mā [Ma]**, 'ntarikṣeṇāyusmān  
 ||(*sec. m. kā*) **Ku V/126**, antarikṣeṇāyusmān, [*om.* |] **K**

It seems that the instrumental must here, as in formulae 3–4, be taken in a comitative sense or as “Instrumentalis der Raumerstreckung” (DELBRÜCK 1888: 128f.).

**7.14.3** Only PS

sūrya āyusmān (P)  
 sa divāyusmān °°° || (P)

The Sun is full of life: he is full of life in the sky. (Full of life . . . .)

āyusmān sa] **K**, āyusmān, sa **Or** divāyusmān] **Ku Mā [Ma] K**, divā {A}yusmān **V/126**  
 °°° ||] **Mā [Ma] K**, ||(*sec. m. kā*) **Ku V/126**

**7.14.4** Only PS

candra āyusmān (P)  
 sa nakṣatrain āyusmān °°° || (P)

The Moon is full of life: he is full of life among the asterisms. (Full of life . . . .)

āyusmān sa] **K**, āyusmān, sa **Or** nakṣatrair] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], nakṣ{e}atrair **Ku**, nakṣa-  
ttrair **K** āyusmān °°° ||] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], āyusmā(+ n) ||(*sec. m.* + *kā*) **Ku**, āyusmān,  
[[*om.*] ] **K**

**7.14.5** Cf. TS 2.3.10.3, KS 11.7:153.13f. etc.

soma āyusmān (P)  
sa oṣadhībhir āyusmān °°° || (P)

Soma is full of life: he is full of life among the plants. (Full of life . . . .)

āyusmān sa] **K**, āyusmān, sa **Or** oṣadhībhir] **Or**, oṣadhībhir **K** āyusmān °°° ||]  
**V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], āyusmān ||(*sec. m.* + *kā*) **Ku**, āyusmān, [[*om.*] ] **K**

**TS 2.3.10.3**

sóma áyusmānt sá oṣadhībhir

**KS 11.7:153.13f.**

sóma áyusmān sá oṣadhībhir áyusmāñs  
tásyāyám áyusáyusmān astv asáu

**7.14.6** Cf. TS 2.3.10.3, KS 11.7:153.13 etc.

yajña āyusmān (P)  
sa dakṣiṇābhir āyusmān °°° || (P)

The ritual of worship is full of life: it is full of life due to the sacerdotal fees.  
(Full of life let it . . . .)

āyusmān sa] **K**, āyusmān, sa **Or** āyusmān °°° ||] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], āyusmān ||(*sec. m.*  
+ *kā*) **Ku**, āyusmān, [[*om.*] ] **K**

**TS 2.3.10.3**

yajñá áyusmānt sá dáksīṇābhir

**KS 11.7:153.13**

yajñá áyusmān sá dáksīṇābhir áyusmāñs  
tásyāyám áyusáyusmān astv asáu

**7.14.7** Cf. PārGS 1.16.6

samudra āyusmān (P)  
sa nadībhir āyusmān | (P)  
sa māyusmān āyusmantam kṛṇotu || (P)

The Ocean is full of life: it is full of life due to the rivers. Full of life let it make  
me full of life.

āyusmān sa] **K**, āyusmān, sa **Or** āyusmān ] **Or**, āyusmān, [[*om.*] ] **K** sa māyusmān  
āyusmantam kṛṇotu ||] **Or**, *om.* **K**

**PārGS 1.16.6**

samudra āyusmānt sa sravantībhir āyusmāñs  
tena tvāyusāyusmantam karomi

In **K**, the continued omission of the last hemistich makes sense in light of the reverse order in which it offers stanza 8–9. Neither the order of **K**, nor that of the Or. mss. seems evidently unoriginal.

**7.14.8** Cf. TS 2.3.10.3, KS 11.7:153.11f. etc.

brahmāyusmat	(P)
tad brahmacāribhir āyusmat	(P)
tan māyusmad āyusmantam kṛnotu	(P)

The sacred poetry is full of life: it is full of life due to the students. Full of life let it make me full of life.

brahmāyusmat tad brahmacāribhir] **Ku**, brahmāyusmat, dbramacāribhir **V/126**, brahmāyusmantadbrahmacāribhir **Mā** [**Ma**], vrahmāyusmāntādvrahmacāribhir **K** āyusmat |] **V/126** [**Ma**], āyusma{n}t | **Ku**, āyusma{nta}t | **Mā**, āyusmān, [*om.*] **K** tan māyusmad āyusmantam] **Ku** **Mā**, ta{ma}nmāyusmadāyusmadāyusmantam **V/126** [*note redundance*], tanmāyusmā āyu(*sec. m.* → śmann āyu)śmantam **K**

**TS 2.3.10.3**

brāhmāyusmat tād brāhmaṇāír āyusmad

**KS 11.7:153.11f.**

brāhmāyusmat tād brāhmaṇāír āyusmat  
tāsyāyām āyusāyusmān astv asáu

This is stanza 9 in **K**.

**7.14.9** Only PS

indra āyusmān	(P)
sa vīryeṇāyusmān	(P)
sa māyusmān āyusmantam kṛnotu	(P)

Indra is full of life: he is full of life due to manly power. Full of life let him make me full of life.

indra āyusmān sa] **Or** [°n, s°], indreṇāyusmānsa **K** vīryeṇāyusmān] **V/126** **Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, vīrye{ṇa}ṇāyusmān **Ku** |] **Or**, *om.* **K** sa māyusmān āyusmantam kṛnotu |] **Or**, *om.* **K**

This is stanza 8 in **K**.

**7.14.10** Cf. TS 2.3.10.3, KS 11.7:153.10f. etc.

devā āyusmantas	(P)
te 'mr̥tenāyusmantah	(P)

te māyusmanta āyusmantam kṛṇvantu || (P)

The gods are full of life: they are full of life due to ambrosia. Full of life let them make me full of life.

devā āyusmantas] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, deva āyusmantas **JM**, devāyusmantas **RM V/126 Mā** 'mṛtenāyusmantah] **Ku** [**Ma**], mṛtenāyusmantah] **JM RM V/126 Mā K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[*note °ḥ t°*]] māyusmanta] **JM** [**Ma?**], mā āyusmanta **Ku Mā Pa**, māyāyusmanta **RM**, mā {ā}yusmanta **V/126**, śā āyusmanta **K** āyusmantam] **Or**, āyusmanta **K** kṛṇvantu] **Ku** [**Ma**], kṛṇotu **JM RM V/126 Mā**, kṛṇuta **K**

### TS 2.3.10.3

devā āyusmantas tē 'mṛtena

### KS 11.7:153.10f.

devā āyusmantas tē 'mṛtenāyusmantas  
tēṣām ayām āyusāyusmān astv asāu

BHATTACHARYA reports the reading *mā āyusmanta* only for his **Mā**, not for **Ma**, but the sister ms. **Pa** of the latter agrees with most of the other *Or.* mss.; my ms. **JM**, however, confirms the possibility that **Ma** indeed preserves the correct text (and **V/126** *post correctionem* hints at this same possibility).

### 7.14.11 Only PS

prajāpatir āyusmān (P)  
sa prajābhīr āyusmān | (P)  
sa māyusmān āyusmantam kṛṇotu || 14 || (P)

Prajāpati is full of life: he is full of life due to [his creation of] creatures. Full of life let him make me full of life.

āyusmān sa] **K**, āyusmān, sa **Or** āyusmān |] **Or**, āyusmān, [[*om.* |]] **K** āyusmantam kṛṇotu] **Or**, āyuskṛṇta kṛṇotu **K** || 14 ||] || ṛ 10 || 14 || **Ku**, || 14 || ṛ (*sec. m.* 11) || **V/126**, || 14 || ṛ || **Mā**, Z 4 Z **K**

Presumably due to oversight, BHATTACHARYA omits pāda **b** entirely.

## 7.15. To the dakṣiṇā.

This hymn extolls the protective power which the bestowal of *dakṣiṇā*- ‘sacerdotal fee’ (MALAMOUD 1976) on the priest will afford to the giver. Cf. in general the hymn 6.10 above (with my introductory comments), but especially the hymn 1.46, which shares many themes with the present one. While the giver seems to be speaking in 1, and perhaps in 2, the remainder of the hymn seems to be pronounced by the priest(s).<sup>80</sup>

The shift back and forth between dimeter and trimeter verse — even within single stanzas — gives the hymn a somewhat mixed appearance, and the fact that nearly identical forms of the first and last stanzas are attested also in other contexts in kāṇḍas 2 and 5 respectively (neither of which contexts, however, are more fitting than the present context), adds to the uncertainty about the unity of its composition. The single evident concatenating link with the preceding hymn is the mention of *dakṣiṇās* there in 7.14.6.

### 7.15.1 Only PS ◊ abc: PS 2.85.3abc

dakṣiṇā mā dakṣiṇato	(8)
dakṣiṇā pātu savyataḥ	(8)
paścād anuvyādhāt pātu	(8)
sarvasyā bhavahetyāḥ	(8)

Let the sacerdotal fee protect me from the right, [let it protect me] from the left, let her protect [me] from being wounded in the back, from every missile of Bhava.

dakṣiṇā] V/126 Mā [Ma] K, dakṣi(+ nā) Ku mā] Or, sā K dakṣiṇā pātu] Or, dakṣiṇāḥpātu K savyataḥ | paścād] Or, savyataḥpaśśād K anuvyādhāt] Or, anuvyādhāt K bhavahetyāḥ] Or, bhavahetyā K ||] Ku V/126 [Ma] K, | Mā

**b.** ZEHNDER 1999: 187 has pointed to the parallel RV 1.18.5c *dákṣiṇā pātu áṃhasaḥ* ‘let the sacerdotal fee protect [the mortal] from oppression’.

**c.** On the word *anuvyādhā-*, attested only here and at 2.85.3c, see ZEHNDER 1999: 187 where it is explained (after RENO 1957a: 76) as a nomen actionis to *anu-vyadh* ‘to pierce, to wound’. Cf. *vyadhman-* (also hapax) in 1.46.2c quoted under 4b below, and *viddha-* in 1.46.1c quoted under 3b.

**d.** PS 2.85.3 has a different last pāda: *purastāt pātu dakṣiṇā*. Bhava’s mention here next to the use of *paśupati-* in the following stanza is not coincidental. His missile occurs also at 8.9.13cd *bhavāśarvau tapuṣīm hetim asmai mayeṣitau vi sṛjatām vadhāya* ‘Let Bhava and Śarva, incited by me, shoot the burning

<sup>80</sup> Three of its stanzas (6, 7, 8) have been submitted to detailed philological scrutiny in a recent publication by KNOBL (2007, part A), partly on the basis of my treatment of this hymn as contained in my doctoral thesis. That treatment has here been improved with grateful reference to KNOBL’s contributions.

missile at him here, so as to slay [him]’ and TS 4.5.2.1 (MS 2.9.3:122.13, KS 17.12, VSM 16.18) *námo bhavásya hetýái jágatām pátaye námas* ‘Homage to Bhava’s missile, to the lord of moving creatures homage’.

### 7.15.2 Only PS

paśunā tvam paśupate	(8)
dvipād +dattvā catuspadā	(8)
ātmanvatīm dakṣiṇām	(7)
*prāṇam +dattvā prāṇihi	(7)

Having given a two-footed [gift], you cattle-lord, along with four-footed cattle, having given breath (life) [in the form of] an animate sacerdotal fee, do breathe.

+dattvā] datvā **Or**, dattā **K** catuspadā] **V/126** [**Ma**] **K**, {·}catusVadā **Mā**, catuspadāt, **Ku** ||] **Or**, (+ |) **K** ātmanvatīm dakṣiṇām] **Or**, ātmanvatīdakṣiṇā **K** \*prāṇam +dattvā] prāṇaddatvā **Ku** **Mā** [[Bhatt.: prāṇadyatvā]] [**Ma**], prāṇamddatvā **V/126**, prāṇadattā **K** prāṇihi ||] **Or**, prāṇehi [[*om.*] **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *dvipāddatvā* and *prāṇaddatvā*. He reads *dvipādyatvā* in his *Or.* mss. **Mā** and **Ma**, but *dda* and *dya* can be written with identical shape in Oriya script.

**a.** Paśupati is normally used as a name of Rudra (as is Bhava in the preceding stanza), but seems here to be used (punningly?) to address the giver of *dakṣiṇā*-cows, in a manner that must be compared with *gopati-* in 6.10.5d/6d *prajāṃ/paśūn dātā puṣyatu gopatiḥ te*.

**b.** It seems that *dvipād* must be a neuter acc. (cf. ṚV 4.51.5d, 10.27.10b, ŚS 6.107.1–4 / PS 19.44.7–10, ŚS 8.8.14c / PS 16.30.4c). On the giving of human beings as sacerdotal fee, see MALAMOUD 1976: 175–176, but especially the following ṚV Dānastuti passages 1.126.3ab (*vadhūmanto dáśa ráthāsas*), 6.27.8ab (*viṃśátim gā vadhūmatas*), 7.18.22ab (*dvā ráthā vadhūmantā*), 8.2.42ab (*tyé payovfdhā māki ráṇasya napyā*), 8.19.36ab (*pancāsátam ... vadhūnām*), 8.46.33a (*syá yóṣaṇā mahī*), 8.56.3c [~ ṚVKh 3.8.3c] (*śatām dāsán*), 8.56.4b [~ ṚVKh 3.8.4b] (*pūtákratāyī* [Khil] *vyáktā*). It seems impossible to take it as the first member of a compound with the anyhow syntactically problematic **K** form °*dattā*. Simplification of clusters like *ttv* is almost the rule in our mss. (see my Introduction, §2.8 O).

**cd.** The word *ātmanvatī-* is used here clearly to contrast the living remunerations (by means of humans or a cows), with the material objects mentioned further on in the hymn. Although it seems likely that the reading *prāṇam* in **V/126** is merely due to secondary insertion of an anusvāra, I do tentatively follow its cue: *prāṇam* thus restored is the primary object of the second *dattvā*, and indirectly *ātmanvatīm dakṣiṇām* is governed by *dattvā* too. Secondly, it may be possible to construe *prāṇam* as internal object of *prāṇihi*. On the equation of cattle with *prāṇa-*, cf. ŚBM 4.3.4.24–27 quoted and translated by MALAMOUD, pp. 174f.

## 7.15.3 Only PS

yāṃ dadāsi śraddadhāno	(8)
dakṣiṇāṃ brāhmaṇakṛte	(8)
sā tvā yakṣmāt pārayat <sub>v</sub>	(8)
agneḥ +saṃtāpād div <sub>v</sub> yasya śokāt	(11)

The sacerdotal fee that you give, full of generosity, for the benefit of the priest: let it save you from *yākṣma*, from the burning of Agni, from the heat of the heavenly one.

dadāsi] Or, dadhāmi (+ |) K [[Bar.: °si]] śraddadhāno] Or, yaddhadāno K brāhmaṇakṛte] brāhmaṇekṛte Ku V/126 Ma Pa, brahmaṇakṛte Mā, vrāhmaṇakṛte K |] V/126 Mā [Ma] K, |{|} Ku pārayatv] Ku V/126 Mā, pārayatvam Ma Pa, pārayaty K agneḥ] Or, agne K +saṃtāpād div<sub>v</sub>yasya] santāpāddiv<sub>v</sub>yasya Mā [Ma] Pa K, santāpādiv<sub>v</sub>yasya Ku, santāpāddiv<sub>v</sub>(*sec. m.* → *vy*)asya V/126 śokāt ||] Or, śokā [*om.*] K

BHATTACHARYA's text contains the misprint *śokād*.

a. On the connection between *śraddhā-* (hence *śraddadhāna-*) with generous dispensing of *dakṣiṇās*, see JAMISON 1996a: 177f. (with references). Cf. 7.9.10, and contrast 6.22.9, where the word has a different implication.

b. A compound *brāhmaṇakṛt-* is not attested, but could be explained with reference to the neuter *brāhmaṇa-*, which in the AV sometimes (e.g. ŚS 7.66–67[68–69], 10.8.20, 33, 37–38, 11.5[7].5c, 23c, and 11.5[7].10 — THIEME 1952: 118f. = <sup>2</sup>1984: 127f.) seems to come close in meaning to *brāhmaṇ-*, and be attributed the same meaning as *brahmakṛt-* ‘poet’: cf. SCARLATA 1999: 76f., and RV 8.66.6cd *tvām id dhī brahmakṛte kāmyaṃ vāsu deṣṭhaḥ sunvaté bhúvaḥ* ‘for it is you who tends to be the most liberal giver of desirable goods to the poet who presses’. This would leave us with a metrically undesirable short antepenultimate syllable. The same objection can be made against the alternative interpretation of BHATTACHARYA's text (based on K) chosen here: I assume that we find here an example of the prepositional use of *kṛte* (*in fine compositi* or juxtaposed with a gen.) described by SPEIJER (1886, §193 p. 137f.) for classical Sanskrit (cf. also PW II, 400); in fact, this also seems to have been VISHVA BANDHU's interpretation: VWC-Saṃhitās IV, 2300 n. 1 *ca[turthīvi-bhakti]arthe saptamāvibhaktipratirūpakam avya[yam]*. This *kṛte*-construction, unprecedented in Vedic, would also allow for a metrically desirable departure from the ms. readings: *\*brahmaṇaḥ kṛte*.

c. On the disease *yākṣma-* (tuberculosis, ‘consumption’), left untranslated here throughout, see ZYSK 1993: 12ff.

d. The ‘heavenly one’ may be the *divyá-* *suparṇá-* of ŚS 4.20.3 / PS 8.6.3, or perhaps the *śván-* *divyá-* of ŚS 6.80.1: both are representatives of the sun, as *divya-* must be here.

## 7.15.4 Only PS

dadāsīmāṃ dakṣiṇāṃ mā ta +āmamac	(12)
chalyān yakṣmān vi vṛhāmo vayaṃ te	(11)
karnaśūlam upahatyā arātiḥ	(11)
sarve yakṣmā apa tiṣṭhantu sākam	(11)

You give this sacerdotal fee. Let no [disease] cause pain [to any part] of you. We pull out from you the [arrow] tips, the forms of *yákṣma*, the ear-ache, the injuries, the Arātis. Let all forms of *yákṣma* stand away together.

dadāsīmāṃ] Or, dadāmīmāṃ K dakṣiṇāṃ mā] Or, dakṣiṇāmā K ta +āmamac chalyān yakṣmān vi] ta āmamatśalyān, yakṣmān, vi Or, tāmamaśchalyābhyakṣmādvī K vṛhāmo] Or, barhāmo K vayaṃ te] K, vayante Or || V/126 Mā [Ma] K, |{|} Ku karnaśūlam] karṇaśūl[*sec. m.* → l]am Ku, karṇaśūlam JM RM, karṇaśūlam V/126 Mā [Ma], karnaśūlam K upahatyā arātiḥ] upahatyā arātiḥ Ku V/126 Mā [Ma], upahatyā'rātiḥ JM RM, upahatyārātis K yakṣmā] JM RM V/126 Mā [Ma] K, ya(ks-) Ku apa] Ku JM RM, upa V/126 Mā [Ma] K tiṣṭhantu] Ku JM RM Mā [Ma] K, tiṣṭant{i}u V/126 sākam ||] sākam || Or, sākam [*om.*] K

BHATTACHARYA edits *arātiḥ* and *upa tiṣṭhantu*.

a. On the syntax *āmayati* + gen., see OERTEL 1944: 69f. = 1994/1: 538f. It seems best to take the genitive as *partitivus*. Cf. further HOFFMANN 1969: 196f. = 1975: 291f., and JAMISON 1983a: 107f. The form *āmamat* is here beyond doubt, and HOFFMANN's rejection (1967: 66, followed by LUBOTSKY 1997a/I: 103) of the padapāṭha analysis in favor of *amamat* at RV 9.114.4d, 10.59.83 (10.59.9–10f) may perhaps have to be reconsidered. On the association of this verb with *yákṣma*-, see PS 2.49.1d *muñcemam asmād yakṣmād asmād āmayataḥ svāhā* 'Free him from this *yákṣma*, from this thing that causes pain. Hail!'

b. This theme also twice occurs in the hymn 1.46: cf. 1.46.2cd *\*māsyā susron nāśayā vyadhmano viṣaṃ bahiḥ śalyaś caratu rogo asmāt* 'Let no [blood] of his flow forth: cause the poison to disappear from the wound. Let the [arrow] tip move out, the disease out of him'; 1.46.4d *sraṃsatāṃ śalyo adhy āre asmāt* 'let the [arrow] tip fall far away from him'. Cf. also 15.20.10 *brahmaṇeto nāśayāmo yat kiñ cāṅgeṣv āmayat | +śalyān yakṣmasyātho ropis tā ito vi nayāmasi* 'We cause to disappear from here, by means of a spell, whatever is causing pain in [our] limbs. The [arrow] tips, and the pangs of *yákṣma*: these do we lead away from here'.

cd. Cf. PS 1.46.6 *yadā dadāti pradadāti yadā brahmā prati gṛhṇāti rādho asya | ād id vi dyād upahatyā \*arātiḥ sarve yakṣmā apa tiṣṭhantu sākam*<sup>81</sup> 'When he gives, when he hands over, [then] the priest receives his gift. Then he shall cut the injuries, the Arātis to pieces. Let all forms of *yákṣma* stand away together'.

<sup>81</sup> BHATTACHARYA edits *upahatyārātiḥ* with the majority of his Or. mss. His Vā reads *upahatyā arātiḥ* . . . *upa*; K reads *upahatyārātis* . . . *upa*.

Since *śūla-* seems to be used in Vedic only as a masculine (cf. e.g. the forms *śūlau* at ŚBM 11.4.2.4 and *śūla iva* at 11.7.3.2), *karnaśūlam* is most likely to be an accusative, and the restoration of the rest of the pāda — transmitted satisfactorily neither in the Or. mss. nor in **K** — follows from this observation: the whole c pāda supplies additional objects to *vi vṛhāmas* (cf. 15.20.10d *vi nayāmasi* and 1.46.6 *vi dyāt*, pres. subj. of the verb *vī-dyati* whose meaning has been discussed by KULIKOV 2001: 496ff.). The noun *upahatyā-* is elsewhere only attested in the singular: ŚS 5.4.10 (PS 1.31.4) *śr̥ṣāmayām upahatyām akṣyós tanvò rápaḥ | kúṣṭhas tát sárvaṃ níṣ karad dáivam samaha vṛṣṇyam* ‘The head-pain, the injury, the afflictions of eyes and body: Kuṣṭha shall heal all that. Verily, it is a divine virility’; PS 1.58.2 *pra mṛṇṇhy upahatyām kardamaṃ nīlāsākyam | adhā sāram iva dāruṇa āyus kṛṇomy antaram* ‘Crush the injury, the Kardama, the Nīlāsākya. Then I make the life within [as durable] as the heartwood of a tree’; 1.90.3 *nir balāsaṃ balāsino visalpam uta vidradham | paropahatyām te vayaṃ parā yākṣmaṃ suvāmasi* ‘The Balāsa [do we force] out of [you, a] Balāsa-patient, the Visalpa and the Vidradha, away your injury, away do we force [your] *yākṣma*’; ŚS 9.8.1–3 (PS 16.74.1–2, 4) *śr̥ṣaktīm śr̥ṣāmayām karnaśūlām vilohitām | sárvaṃ śr̥ṣanyām te rógam bahír nir mantrayāmahe || kárṇābhyām te kánkūṣebhyaḥ karnaśūlām visálpakam | ... || yásya hetóḥ pracyávate yākṣmaḥ karṇató āsyatáh | ...* ‘The head-ache, the head-pain, the ear-ache, *vilohitá* (anemia?): every head disease of yours do we exorcise. From your ears, from the Kánkūṣas, [we exorcize] the ear-ache, the Visalpaka. [We exorcize that] due to which the *yākṣma* emerges from [your] ear and mouth’. The last two passages show the same association of *upahatyā-* with *karnaśūla-* and with *yākṣma-* that we find in the present hemistich.

The reading *apa tiṣṭhantu*, found here in my Central Or. mss. (**Ku JM RM**), is obviously better than *upa tiṣṭhantu*: on *apa-sthā*, cf. ṚV 8.20.1, 8.48.11, 9.19.6, 10.106.2, 10.124.8, and especially PS 1.58.4 *kābavasya viṣkandhasyāpāsthāpanabheṣajam | idaṃ kṛṇomi bheṣajam yathāyam agado ’sati* ‘A removing cure for Kābava, for Viṣkandha: I produce this cure so that he here shall be healthy’ (perhaps also <sup>+</sup>*apasthāna-* in PS 1.58.1, but the ms. readings are ambivalent).

### 7.15.5 Only PS

annena prāṇaṃ vanute	(8)
tiro dhatte paridhānena yākṣmam	(11)
hiraṇyam aśvaṃ gāṃ dadat	(8)
kṛṇute varma dakṣiṇām	(8)

He gains life by [giving] food, he conceals *yākṣma* by [giving] a garment. By giving gold, a horse, a cow, he makes the sacerdotal fee his armor.

annena prāṇaṃ] **Or**, anyena prāṇī **K** dhatte] **Ku V/126 [Ma] K**, dhate **Mā** ya-  
kṣmam || yākṣmaṃ | **Or**, yākṣmā [[*om.* ||] **K** dadat] **Or**, dada(→ dā)tu **K** [[Bhatt. (mis-  
print?): °nu]] dakṣiṇām ||] dakṣiṇām || **Or**, dakṣiṇā | **K**

**ab.** On the connection between food (*anna-*) and life (*prāṇa-*) in Vedic texts, see BODEWITZ 1973: 230 with n. 1 (p. 233), 271f. On the meaning of *paridhāna-*, see LUBOTSKY 2002: 153. By the priest's wearing the gifted garment, the giver removes his own *yákṣma*.

**d.** Cf. PS 1.46.4ab *ā pyāyatam papurir dakṣiṇayā varmeva syūtam pari pāhi viśvataḥ* 'Let the liberal giver swell due to the sacerdotal fee: like a [tightly] sewn armor, protect [him] all around' (cf. also 7.3.8a above).

The translation given below for the following three stanzas closely follows KNOBL's German rendering (2007), with elaborate commentary, that leaves only little to add here.

### 7.15.6 Only PS

uṣṇīṣam tvā śīrṣaktiḥyā	(8)
vāsas tvā +tan <sub>u</sub> vāmayāt	(8)
candram hiraṇyam andhiyāt	(8)
*karṇādattam śukram bhrājad	(8)
bādhiryāt pātu dakṣiṇā	(8)

As sacerdotal fee [offered to me by you], the turban must protect you from head-ache, the dress [must protect] you from body-pain, the shining gold from blindness, the brightly glittering [ring] that is taken from the ear [must protect you] from deafness.

uṣṇīṣam tvā śīrṣaktiḥyā vāsas] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], uṣṇīṣam tvā śīrṣaNTyā vāsas **Ku**, uṣṇīṣamtyā śīrṣaktiḥyādvāsas **K** tvā +tanvāmayāt | candram] tvā tanavāmayāt | candram **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], tvā tanavāmayāt || adhaspadād āmayataḥ candram **Mā**, tvāttaṃnāmayā candram **K** [*om.*] hiraṇyam andhiyāt] **Ku V/126 Mā**, hiraṇyamandhāt **Ma**, hiraṇyam mithyā **K** \*karṇādattam] karṇāddattam **Or**, karṇāddattam **K** bhrājad] **Or**, bhājātu **K** bādhiryāt pātu] **Ku**, bādhiryāt, pātu **V/126** [**Ma**] **Pa**, bādhiryāt, tpātu **Mā** [*Bhatt. (misprint?): bādhiryāt,*], vādhuryātpātu **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *hiraṇyamandhiyāt*.

**cd.** On the use of *candra-* to qualify gold, cf. 7.5.9b (with my commentary). The words *śukram bhrājat* form a formulaic pair. Cf. e.g. ŚS 13.2.1ab (PS 18.20.5ab) *úd asya ketávo divi śukrá bhrájanta irate* 'His (the Sun's) banners are rising in the sky, brightly glittering'; PS 16.150.10 (VaitS 14.1) *vaiśvānaraḥ samudram pary eti śukro gharma bhrājan tejasā rocamaṇaḥ* | +*nudañ chatrūn pradahan me sapatnān ādityo dyām adhyarukṣad vipāscit* 'Vaiśvānara umkreist das Luftmeer: der helle Gharma, es erleuchtend, mit Glanz strahlend. Feinde verjagend, Nebenbuhler mir verbrennend, hat jetzt die Einsichtsvolle Sonne den Himmel erstiegen' (CALAND 1910: 39).

### 7.15.7 Only PS

upabarhaṇam t <sub>u</sub> vā grīv <sub>a</sub> āmayān	(12)
maṇayo *yakṣmāj *jatravyāt	(8)

aṅgarogād abhyañjanam (8)  
 annaṃ +tvāntaṣṭiyāmayāt || (8)

The cushion [must protect] you from neck-pain, the necklace-beads from *yākṣma* at the collar-bones, the unguent from limb-disease, the food [must protect] you from stomach-pain.

upabarhaṇaṃ | Or, upavarhaṇaṃ | K tvā grīvāmayān | V/126 Mā, ⟨...M⟩yān | Ku, kṛtvā grīvāmayār | K \*yākṣmāj \*jatravyāt || (+ ya)kṣmāddatkravyāt | Ku, yakṣmāddatkravyāt | V/126 Mā [Ma], yakṣmādatravayā || om. || K annaṃ | Or, anyan | K +tvāntaṣṭiyāmayāt || tvāntaṣṭiyāmayāt || Ku V/126 Mā [Bhatt.: tvāntaṣṭiyāmayāt], tāṃniṣṭiyāmayā || om. || K

BHATTACHARYA edits *yakṣmāddat kravyāt* and *tvāṃ taṣṭiyāmayāt*. He misreads **Mā** *aṅgarogād* as *aṅgirogād*.

a. Cf. ŚS 12.2.19–20 (PS 17.45.9–10 [PSK 17.31.9–10]) *śīse mṛḍdhvaṃ nadé mṛḍdhvam agnáu sámkasuke ca yát | átho ávyāṃ rāmáyaṃ śīrṣaktīm upabárhaṇe || śīse málaṃ sādāyitvá śīrṣaktīm upabárhaṇe | ávyāṃ ásiknyāṃ mṛṣṭvā súddhá bhavata yajñíyāḥ* ‘Wipe [the defilement] off on the lead, wipe [it] off on the reed, and [also wipe off that] which is in the Saṃkasuka-fire, but also [wipe it off] on the black wool; the head-ache [wipe off] on the cushion. Having set the defilement on the lead, the head-ache on the cushion; having wiped off on the black wool, let you who are worthy of worship become pure’.<sup>82</sup> The ‘cushion’ and ‘unguent’ (pāda c) are juxtaposed also in ŚS 9.6.10–11 (PS 16.11.10+12) *yát kaśípupabarhaṇám áháranti paridháya evá té || yád añjanābhyañjanám áháranty ájyam evá tát* ‘In that they fetch mattress and pillow, those are the enclosing sticks. In that they fetch ointment and unguent, that is sacrificial butter’ (WHITNEY).

b. On the use of *mañi-* to remove *yākṣma-*, cf. ŚS 19.36.3 / 2.27.3 *yé yākṣmāso arbhaká mahánto yé ca sábdínaḥ | sárván durṇāmahá mañiḥ śatávāro anīnaśát* ‘The forms of *yākṣma* that are little, and the ones that are big, noisy: all of them has the slayer of Ill-named ones, the Śatavāra amulet caused to disappear’. The translation of *mañi-* used in the translation of this stanza and the entirely persuasive restoration of the rest of the pāda are both due to KNOBL (2007).

d. KNOBL (2007: 40) has taken over my restoration *antaṣṭya-* and the explanation of this form that I proposed in my doctoral thesis, but without taking over there my observation that the word is attested in this precise form once more in PS, at 8.8.3: *śaṃ te santu hṛdayāya śaṃ te +hṛdayyābhyah*<sup>83</sup> | *śaṃ te*

<sup>82</sup> As Werner Knobl points out to me, CALAND’s daring interpretation of the syntax of stanza 19 (1897: 457 = 1990: 558) can be avoided by supplying [*málam*] to *yát*. It may be noted that both **K** and the Or. mss. point to *ca yah* in the PS parallel.

<sup>83</sup> BHATTACHARYA edits *hṛdayābhyah*. Cf., besides the meter, however PS 4.7.3 *klomnas te hṛdayyābhyo halīkṣṇāt pārśvābhyām | yakṣmaṃ matasnābhyām plīhno +yaknas te*

*yakaklomabhyah śam u \*te antaṣṭyebhyah*<sup>84</sup> ‘Let them (the waters) be weal to your heart, weal to your coronary [arteries], weal to your liver and lungs, and weal to your intestines’.

### 7.15.8 Only PS

adhaspadād āmayataḥ	(8)
pado rogād upānahau	(8)
daṇḍas tvādattaḥ pari pātu sarpād	(11)
dakṣiṇataḥ prayato dakṣiṇena	(11)

The sandals [must protect you] from disease at the feet that hurts underfoot. The staff given by you must fully protect [you] from serpent [bite], the one that is handed over with the right [hand], [must protect you] from the right (and from the South).

adhaspadād] **Or**, adhampadād **K** āmayataḥ pado] *thus Or K* [[note °ḥ p°]] rogād upānahau |] **Or**, rogānupānahūḥ [[*om.*] ]] **K** [[note °ḥ d°]] tvādattaḥ] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], tvāda{TTA}(→ tta 1)ḥ **Ku**, tvādattaḥ **K** pātu sarpād dakṣiṇataḥ] **Mā** [**Ma**], pātu sa{rvā}rpāddakṣiṇataḥ **Ku**, pātuḥsarpāddakṣiṇataḥ] **V/126**, pātu sarpāddakṣiṇataḥ **K** [[note °ḥ p°]] prayato] **Or**, preto **K**

**bc.** On the pair of sandals and the staff as *dakṣiṇā-*, cf. the Mīmāṃsaka sources quoted by MALAMOUD 1976: 180f.

**d.** For the interpretation of this pāda, cf. TS 1.7.13.4 (cf. VSM 5.19, PS 20.7.8) *pradātāraṁ havāmaha indram ā havīṣā vayām | ubhā hí hástā vásunā pṛṇásvā́ prá yacha dáksṣiṇād ótá savyát* ‘We summon Indra, the giver, with an oblation. Do fill both of your hands with wealth. Hand it over [to us], from the right and from the left [hand]’. Cf. also TS 1.2.13.2, MS 1.2.9:19.6–7, and especially ŚS 7.26[27].8 (PS 20.7.8).

### 7.15.9 Only PS ◊ **bc**: ≈ PS 5.31.8cd

saumanasaṁ dakṣiṇāṁ dakṣamāṇā	(11)
iṣam ūrjaṁ dakṣiṇāṁ saṁvasānāḥ	(11)
bhagasya dhārām avase pratīmaḥ	(11)

We, who are capable of friendliness [towards the priest], of [giving] a sacerdotal fee, who are dressed in food and nourishment, in the fee, meet with [her as] a stream of fortune, for favor.

dakṣamāṇā] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], dakṣ{i}a(+ mā 1)ṇā **Ku**, dakṣimāṇa **K** [[Bhatt. (misprint?): °māṇā]] dakṣiṇāṁ saṁvasānāḥ |] **V/126**, dakṣiṇāṁ{dakṣi} saṁvasānāḥ ||] **Ku**, dVakṣiṇā

*vi vṛhāmasi* ‘We pull out the *yákṣma* from your [right] lung, from [your] coronary [arteries], from [your] *halīkṣṇa-*, from [your] two sides, from [your] two *matasnas*, from [your] spleen, from your liver’.

<sup>84</sup> BHATTACHARYA edits *te yantaṣṭebhyah* (with **Mā**); **Ma**: *teyantaṣṭebhyah*; **K**: *teyaṁ- nveṣṭebhyah*.

samva(→ ṁva)sānāḥ | **Mā** [[Bhatt. (misprint?): samvat,sānāḥ]], dakṣiṇām samvasānāḥ | **Ma**, dakṣiṇām samvasānā | **K** bhagasya] **Or**, ghṛtasya **K** avase] **Or**, ase **K** pratīmaḥ ||] **Or**, pratīmas [[*om.*] **K**

**PS 5.31.8**

dātre \*'mutra mahyaṁ duhānobhau lokau bhuñjatī vi kramasva |  
iṣam ūrjam dakṣiṇāḥ samvasānā bhagasya dhārām avase pratīmaḥ ||

**a.** The med. forms of *dakṣ* are normally intransitive (GOTĀ 1987: 171) and the syntax here is consequently somewhat elusive. The parallel stanza 5.31.8 supports the assumption that the speaker is here the giver of the *dakṣiṇā*, as in stanza 1.

**b.** On this pāda, cf. LUBOTSKY 2002: 142 (with reference to TS 4.2.5.1 etc. *iṣam ūrjam abhī samvāsānau*).

**c.** The **K** reading *ghṛtasya* must be rejected, because it can easily have entered the text as perseveration from *ghṛtasya dhārā-* at 2.73.2a (cf. also PS 8.13) etc.

**7.15.10** ≈ PS 5.31.9

sahasrāṅgā śatam jyotīṁṣy asyā (11)  
yajñasya paprir amṛtā svargā | (11)  
ā na etu dakṣiṇā viśvarūpā- (11)  
-ahiṁsantīm prati gr̥hṇīma enām || 15 || *anuvāka 3* || (11)

Thousand-limbed she is, hers are a hundred lights, saving the ritual of worship [from failure], immortal, heavenly: let the sacerdotal fee, the Viśvarūpā [cow] come to us. We receive her as one who does no harm.

sahasrāṅgā] **Or**, sahasrāṅgām **K** jyotīṁṣy] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], jyotīṁṣv **Mā**, jyotīyamhy **K** paprir amṛtā] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], papri(+ ramṛ 2)tā **Ku**, papriramṛtā (+ |) **K** svargā |] **Ku** [**Ma**], svarggā | **V/126 Mā**, svargā [[*om.*] **K** na etu] **Or**, netu **K** viśvarūpāhiṁsantīm] viśvaṛpā'hiṁsantīm **Ku V/126 Ma**, viśvaṛpā'hiṁsantī **Mā**, viśvarūpā ahiṁsantī **K** enām] enām **Ku V/126 Ma K**, yenām **Mā** || 15 || *anuvāka 3* ||] || 15 || **Ku**, || 15 || 15 (sec. m. 10) || (sec. m. + || a || 3) **V/126**, || 15 || 15 || **Mā Ma**, Z anu 3 Z **K**

BHATTACHARYA observes that in his *Or.* mss., *kāṇḍikānte anuvāko na sūcitaḥ* “No Anuvāka is marked at the end of the hymn”. My ms. **V/126** does seem to offer it, however (inscribed after inking).

**a.** This stanza celebrates the *dakṣiṇā* cow in her solar aspect: cf. the sun as a cow in the hymn 6.10.

**b.** LUBOTSKY (2001: 143) translates *papri-* with ‘replenisher’ at 5.31.9 (assuming derivation from *par* ‘to fill’). In two places in the ṚV (1.91.21a, 8.16.11a), *pāpri-* belongs rather with anīṭ *par*: *pīpartī = pāráyati*. What is more, the single ŚS context of *pāpri-* at 12.2.47ab (PS 17.48.8ab [PSK 17.34.8ab]), to be compared with *pāpritamā-* at PS 16.70.2b (GRIFFITHS 2004, item 21), as well as *pāprayas* at TS 1.7.7.2 (TB 2.7.16.1, PB 1.7.5, etc.)

shows that the word could mean ‘saving’ or ‘saviour’. In the AV-passages, it co-occurs with forms from the root *vah* ‘to carry’ — which fact alone might already suggest *pápri-* to be derived from *par*<sup>85</sup> —, while in the YV-passages it stands side by side with *pārayantu*, leaving no doubt about the root which that *pápri-* belongs to. Our present context seems to yield no clues for the root-derivation of the word here, and intentional ambiguity seems likely, but I tentatively assume the meaning ‘saving’.

c. LUBOTSKY’s statement (2002: 143) about the secondary addition, supposedly borrowed from the present hymn, of 5.31.9 at the end of hymn 5.31 can be slightly amplified, because the two stanzas are not in fact perfectly identical (hence the present stanza is also not abbreviated with *ity ekā*: cf. my Introduction, §2.5.1). PS 5.31.9c reads: *sā na aitu dakṣiṇā viśvarūpā*. On the Viśvarūpā cow, see 6.22.9d, 7.11.9e and LUBOTSKY 2002: 139; cf. also my comments under 6.10.3c.

d. Cf. 6.10.8cd *namas tasmai pratighṇan kṛṇomi syonā me astu tanve suśevā* and 6.10.6cd *ahimsantī vāśitemām upehi paśūn dātā puṣyatu gopatiṣ ṭe*.

---

<sup>85</sup> But at PS 16.70.2 *papritama-* occurs besides with *vahnitama-* also with *sasnitama-* which recalls RV 2.23.10b *pápriṇā sásninā*, where *pápri-* is not likely to mean ‘saving’.

## 7.16. For protection: to various gods.

This and the next hymn, which belong together intimately, are found transmitted together in virtually identical form also in ŚS 19 as 19.17–18 (cf. my Introduction, §2.2.1). W-L introduce the first of those two hymns in the following terms: “This hymn and the next are used, the comm. points out, in the same ceremony as [ŚS 19.]16, with other hymns, as detailed in Pariṣiṣṭa 4.4; both are also prescribed in Par. 19.1 (...), in a ceremony against danger from the various quarters. . . . [Note that the vss. of this hymn group themselves in 5 dyads (comm., *paryāya-dvayas*), one for each cardinal point and a fifth for the ‘fixed and upward points’; and that those of h. 18 do likewise and are so grouped by the comm. also.]”. The second AVPariś passage that WHITNEY refers to is 19.1.9: *agnir mā pātu agniṃ te vasumantam ṛcchantv iti || yathāsvalingaṃ dvābhyāṃdvābhyāṃ pradakṣiṇaṃ pratidiśam upasthāpayet*. GONDA (1967c: 424 = 1975/IV: 217) has translated this rule: ‘with (AVŚ. 19,17,1) ‘Let Agni [with the Vasus] protect me [on the East; in him I step, in him I take refuge, to that stronghold I proceed; let him guard me, let him protect me; to him I commit myself; *svāhā*],’ and (AVŚ. 19,18,1) ‘Let those [malicious beings who will treat me inimically from the eastern quarter] meet with Agni with the Vasus’ he (the officiant) must make (him, viz. the king) worship, with two stanzas each time, in accordance with the distinguishing words of the mantras (the Indradhvaja), while circumambulating it from left to right (and pronouncing the mantras) to every cardinal point of the compass’.

To elucidate this AVPariś injunction, GONDA (*ibid.*) has provided elaborate commentary on ŚS 19.17–18, which is still fully relevant also for PS 7.16–17. He must be quoted here at length:

AV. 19,17 was according to the comm. AV. to be used, together with AV. 19,16, 18, and 19, also in a nocturnal ceremony to be performed by the purohita on the entrance of the king into his sleeping-apartment; cf. AVPar. 4,4,10; in AVPar. 32,15 it occurs among śānti formulas.—Both texts, 19,17 and 19,18, which are addressed to the same gods and are closely accordant in peculiarities of structure (they consist of five dyads), are therefore used in the same ceremonies. [...] the combinations of gods expressed by the phrases Agnir vasumān, Soma rudravān, Indro marutvān and Varuṇa ādityavān (cf. AV. 19,17 and 18,1; [3;] 4; 8) occur in a fourfold mantra “First let Agni with the Vasus aid us; let Soma . . .” used as invitational and consecratory formulas in *kāmyeṣṭis* (“Wunschopfer”) and found (with some variants) in TS. 2,1,11,2; KS. 10,12: 141,1–2; MS. 4,12,2: 180,1–2, and, accordingly, in ŚSS, 3,6,2 in a *saṃjñāneṣṭi*, i.e. a ceremony for producing unanimity: “relations who are in mutual disagreement should pour out (and offer) sacrificial material (rice, barely, etc.) for a sacrifice to a plurality of deities (viz., those mentioned above); the invitational-and-offering stanzas are (those quoted), and they should mutter the hymn of concordance (i.e. RVKh. 5,1).” Cf. also ĀśvŚS. 2,11,12. See especially Caland, *Altindische*

*Zauberei*, Amsterdam 1908, p. 81 ff. From the mythological and ritualistic explanation of the ceremony given in TS. 2,2,11,5 f. (cf. also ŚB. 3,4,2,1 ff.) it appears that the man who is mutually at variance with his fellows should have this ceremony performed as a result of which he will become Indra and be recognized as superior by his fellows. In the AV. texts under discussion these groups of deities were correlated with the quarters of the universe (cf. e.g. AV. 4,40; 5,10) and the four stanzas containing their names were amplified by parallel stanzas.

Further elements from GONDA's rich commentary will be referred to below. We seem to have here, as we had in 7.14 above, an amplified collection of Śrauta mantras meant for use by priests for rites in the domain of Ātharvaṇic Purohitas. The hymn consists of a not very successful mixture of at least two types of classifications: (a) the cardinal directions, combined with groups of deities and their leader; (b) a cosmological classification made up of parts of the cosmos and the deities associated with them (cf. BODEWITZ 2002). The ten stanzas seem to represent a combination of 5 cardinal directions with five cosmic layers.

We might explain the placement of hymns 16–17 after hymn 15 with the repeated occurrence of *pātu* in 15–16, and with the dedication of 15 to the *dakṣiṇā*, and the occurrence in 16–17 of *dakṣiṇāyā diśaḥ*. If we realize that hymns 12 (for a queen), and perhaps also 14–15 were meant for use by royalty, or for priests on behalf of or directed to royalty, it may be possible to suggest that the grouping of these hymns in PS 7 is at least loosely connected to their connection with a Purohita milieu.

### 7.16.1 ŚS 19.17.1 ◊ pratīka at AthPrāy 2.9:94.7, 6.9:143.10

agnir mā pātu vasubhiḥ purastāt	(11)
tasmin krame +tasmiñ +chraye	(P)
tām puram praimi	(P)
sa mā rakṣatu sa mā gopāyatu	(P)
tasmā ātmānaṃ pari dade svāhā	(P)

Let Agni protect me from the East, together with the Vasus. In him do I step, in him do I take refuge. To that stronghold do I go forth. Let him guard me, let him look after me. To him do I entrust myself, hail!

vasubhiḥ] Or, vasubhiḥ K    tasmin krame] tasmiñ krame V/126 Mā [Ma], tasminkrame  
 Ku Pa K [[note °nk°]]    +tasmiñ +chraye tām] tasmimṭśraye tām Or, tasmimyaṃ  
 śrapayethām K    praimi] Or, vravīmi K    tasmā ātmānaṃ] Or, tasmātmānaṃ K  
 dade] Or, dadhe K    ||] Or, Z K

#### ŚS 19.17.1

agnir mā pātu vāsubhiḥ purastāt tāsmin krame tāsmiñ chraye tām pūram prāimi |  
 sá mā rakṣatu sá mā gopāyatu tasmā ātmānaṃ pári dade svāhā ||

a. The different placement of the form of *pā* in this mantra, as compared with the ensuing ones, must be intentional, and I therefore do not consider this to be a prose line.

About Agni's '*vasusāhitya*', Sāyaṇa (on ŚS 19.17.1; see also his comm. on stanzas 3, 4) refers to a tradition 'elsewhere' (*anyatra*): MS 4.2.2:180.1–2, KS 10.12:141.1–2, ĀśvŚS 2.11.12, ŚāṅkhŚS (≈ TS 2.1.11.2) *agnīḥ prathamó vāsubhīr no avyāt sómo rudráir abhī rakṣatu tmānā | índro marúdbhīr ṛtuthā kṛṇotv ādityáir no váruṇaḥ sárma yaṃsat* 'May Agni with the Vasus first aid us; let Soma with the Rudras hold guard over us, himself; let Indra with the Maruts act in due course; Varuṇa with the Ādityas shall afford us protection'. On the use of this mantra in the Saṃjñāneṣṭi and on the brāhmaṇa tale (MS 2.2.6:19.11–20, KS 11.3:146.9–147.1, TS 2.2.11.5–6, ŚBM 3.4.2.1) that explains this fourfold groupwise division of the gods, see CALAND 1908: 81–83.

Regarding Agni's connection with the Vasus, GONDA refers (1967c: 424 = 1975/IV: 217) further to ŚBM 6.1.2.10, 8.6.1.5. About his connection with the East, cf. BODEWITZ 2000: 25.

b. On the sandhi *tasmiñ chraye*, cf. my Introduction, §2.8 (F).

c. On this theme, cf. 6.12.4d, 5a, 6a above. GONDA (*ibid.*) observes: "According to the comm. AV. the stronghold mentioned in AV. 19,17,1 is the king's bed-chamber (...); if however we take it to refer to Agni (cf. R.V. 1,189,2; 5,19,2; 10,87,22; Renou, E. V. P. XII, p. 109) these words suit also the present situation".

### 7.16.2 ŚS 19.17.2

vāyur māntarikṣeṇaitasyā diśaḥ pātu tasmin °°° ||

Let Vāyu protect me from this [same] direction, together with the intermediate space. (In him ... .)

māntarikṣeṇaitasyā] **Ku V/126** [Ma], māntarikṣeṇa tasyā **Mā K** diśaḥ pātu tasmin °°° ||] **Or**, diśas [[*om.*] **K**

#### ŚS 19.17.2

vāyúr māntárikṣeṇaitásyā diśáḥ pātu tásmin krame ... ||

The Or. mss. use here a different abbreviation from the one they use in the rest of this hymn (the one that **K** also uses here), because stanza 1 has a different structure: cf. my Introduction, §2.5.2.

Although one might think of a reference to the intermediate directions (BODEWITZ 1973: 143 n. 9), it seems more likely that the words *etasyā diśaḥ* refer here and in 4, 6, 8, to the direction just mentioned in the respective preceding odd-numbered mantras (cf. DELBRÜCK 1888: 219f.). This means that Vāyu is here associated with the East, which seems to be unusual.

### 7.16.3 ŚS 19.17.3

somo mā rudrair dakṣiṇāyā diśaḥ °°° ||

Let Soma protect me from the southern direction, together with the Rudras.  
(In him . . . .)

rudrair] ṛdrair **Or**, rudraiḥ **K** [[note °ḥ d°]] dakṣiṇāyā diśaḥ °°° ||] **Or**, diśaḥ [[om. ]] **K**  
[[note °ḥ v°]]

### ŚS 19.17.3

sómo mā rudráir dáksṣiṇāyā diśáḥ pátu . . . ||

About Soma's '*rudrasāhitya*', see my comments on 1a. GONDA (1967c: 424 = 1975/IV: 217) notes: "For the Rudras as lords of the South, see e.g. ŚB. 8,6,1,6, for their connection with Soma ibid. 8 (Maruts instead of Rudras) and especially E. Arbman, *Rudra*, Uppsala 1922, p. 158 ff.". On Soma's connection with the South, cf. BODEWITZ 2000: 27.

### 7.16.4 ŚS 19.17.4

varuṇo mādityair etasyā diśaḥ °°° ||

Let Varuṇa protect me from this [same] direction, together with the Ādityas.  
(In him . . . .)

varuṇo] varṇo **Or**, varuṇa **K** mādityair etasyā diśaḥ °°° ||] **Or**, mānatīnetasyā diśas  
[[om. ]] **K**

### ŚS 19.17.4

váruṇo mādityáir etásyā diśáḥ pátu . . . ||

About Varuṇa's '*ādityasāhitya*', see my comments on 1a. GONDA (1967c: 424 = 1975/IV: 217) notes: "For Varuṇa and the Ādityas see also ŚB. 8,6,1,7". On his rare connection, together with Soma, with the South, see BODEWITZ 2000: 23 n. 10 (and p. 51).

### 7.16.5 ŚS 19.17.5

sūryo mā dyāvāpr̥thivībhyām̐ pratīcyā diśaḥ pátu	(P)
tasmin krame +tasmiñ +chraye	(P)
tām puram̐ praimi	(P)
sa mā rakṣatu sa mā gopāyatu	(P)
tasmā ātmānaṃ pari dade svāhā	(P)

Let Sūrya protect me from the western direction, together with Heaven and Earth. In him do I step, in him do I take refuge. To that stronghold do I go forth. Let him guard me, let him look after me. To him do I entrust myself, hail!

pratīcyā] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, {prathivībhyām̐}pratīcyā **V/126** diśaḥ pátu] **Ku V/126**  
[**Ma**], diśaḥ ||] **Mā**, diśa **K** tasmin krame +tasmiñ +chraye] tasmin, krame{tta}(→ ta

3)smiṁśraye **Ku**, tasmiṁ kramettasmiṁ śraye **V/126**, tasmiṁ krame tasmimśraye **Pa**, tasmiṁ krame tasmimśraye [**Ma**], *om. Mā K* tāṁ puraṁ prāimi |] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], *om. Mā K* tasmā . . . svāhā ||] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], *om. Mā K*

### ŚS 19.17.5

sūryo mā dyāvapṛthivībhyāṁ pratīcyā diśāḥ pātu . . . ||

To the associations between sun and other cardinal directions collected by BODEWITZ (2000: 26), this unique (?) example of an association between the sun and the West can now be added. Why Sūrya is paired here with Heaven *and* Earth also remains unclear: his association with Heaven is common (BODEWITZ 2000: 34ff.). The deities of formula 4 seem more properly to belong here.

### 7.16.6 ŚS 19.17.6

apo mauṣadhīmatīr etasyā diśāḥ pāntu	(P)
tāsu krame tāsu śraye	(P)
tāṁ puraṁ prāimi	(P)
tā mā rakṣantu tā mā gopāyantu	(P)
tābhya ātmānaṁ pari dade svāhā	(P)

Let the waters protect me from this [same] direction, together with the plants. In them do I step, in them do I take refuge. To that stronghold do I go forth. Let them guard me, let them look after me. To them do I entrust myself, hail!

mauṣadhīmatīr] **Or**, soṣadhasitīr **K** diśāḥ] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**], di(*sec. m. + śa 1*)ḥ **V/126**, diśāḥ **K** tāsu] **Or**, tāsu **K** tāsu śraye] tāsutśraye **Or**, tā āśraye **K** tāṁ] **Or**, thām **K** prāimi] **Or**, vravīmi **K** tābhya ātmānaṁ] **Or**, tābhyātutmānaṁ **K**

### ŚS 19.17.6

āpo māuṣadhīmatīr etāsyā diśāḥ pāntu tāsu krame tāsu śraye tāṁ puraṁ prāimi |  
tā mā rakṣantu tā mā gopāyantu tābhya ātmānaṁ pari dade svāhā ||

BHATTACHARYA does not report the reading *tśraye*, with *t* taken from preceding *tasmimśraye*, that all *Or.* mss. available to me (including **Pa**, that I specifically checked for some readings in this hymn) clearly offer, and edits *apo*, because all *PS* mss. here read *apo*, while the *ŚS* mss. apparently read *āpo*. Although it is of course imaginable that the unexpected short *a-* that the *PS* mss. offer for this nominative form is corrupt, under influence from the acc. *apas* in the corresponding mantra of the next hymn, I prefer to accept this irregular form as original. Other attestations of the form *apas* functioning unambiguously as nom. (cf. AiGr. III, §131a p. 240) are known in *PS*, e.g. at 19.4.12: *devasya savituh save karma kṛṇvanti mānuṣāḥ | śaṁ no bhavantu apa oṣadhīr imāḥ* ‘Men perform [their] ritual under the impulse of god Savitar. The waters, the plants here must be weal to us’. On the association of the waters with the West, cf. BODEWITZ 2000: 26, 44ff., 51f.

**7.16.7** ŚS 19.17.7

viśvakarmā mā saptarṣibhir udīcyā diśāḥ °°° ||

Let Viśvakarman protect me from the northern direction, together with the Seven Seers. (In him . . . .)

saptarṣibhir udīcyā] saptarṣibhṛdīcyā **Or**, saptarṣibhirudīcā **K** diśāḥ °°° ||] **Or**, diśāḥ  
[[om. ]] **K** [[note °ḥ i°]]

**ŚS 19.17.7**

viśvakarmā mā saptarṣibhir udīcyā diśāḥ pātu tāsmin krame . . . ||

All mss. give an abbreviated text, which seems to run counter to their usual system (cf. my Introduction, §2.5.2): the grammatical differences in the refrains of the preceding stanza and the present one would normally have been cause for the complete writing of both.

Cf. GONDA (1967c: 424 = 1975/IV: 217): “Viśvakarman, who is also a “lord of speech” (Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 118) is ṚV. 10, 81, 1 called a ṛṣi and 10, 82, 4 assisted by the ṛṣis of yore”, and ŚS 2.35.4 (PS 1.88.4, TS 3.2.8.3) *ghorā ṛṣayo nāmo astv ebhyaś cākṣur yād eṣāṃ mānasaś ca satyām | bṛhaspātaye mahiṣa dyumānn nāmo viśvakarman nāmas te pāhy āsmān* ‘Terrible [are] the seers; homage be to them! what sight [is] theirs, and the actuality of their mind. For Brihaspati, O bull, [be] bright homage; O Viçvakarman, homage to thee! protect thou us’ (WHITNEY). On the association of the Seven Seers (the asterism Ursa Maior), with the North (Polaris), see WITZEL 1996.

**7.16.8** ŚS 19.17.8

indro mā marutvān etasyā diśāḥ °°° ||

Let Indra protect me from this [same] direction, with the Maruts. (In him . . . .)

marutvān etasyā] **K**, marṭvā(+ ) **Ku** [[the scribe has forgotten to supply the missing akṣaras, although a √ sign is placed after °tvā]], marṭvānetasyā **V/126 Mā [Ma]** diśāḥ °°° ||]  
**Or**, diśāḥ [[om. ]] **K**

**ŚS 19.17.8**

indro mā marútvān etásyā diśāḥ pātu . . . ||

About Indra’s ‘*marutsāhitya*’, cf. my comments on 1a. His association here with the North appears to be unknown from other Vedic classifications of the quarters of space.

**7.16.9** ŚS 19.17.9

prajāpatir mā prajananavān saha pratiṣṭhayā dhruvāyā diśāḥ °°° ||

Let Prajāpati possessed of generative power protect me from the fixed direction, together with a firm support. (In him . . . .)

prajananavān saha pratiṣṭhayā] prajananavān, saha pratiṣṭhayā **Or**, prajananavānsaptabhi-  
ṣṭhāyā **K** dhruvāyā] **K**, dhṛvāyā **Or** diśaḥ ° ° ° ||] **Or**, diśaḥ [om. ||] **K** [note ° ḥ  
v°]

### ŚS 19.17.9

prajāpatir mā prajānanavānt sahá pratiṣṭhāyā dhruvāyā diśaḥ pātu . . . ||

Note the small orthoepical difference between the PS and ŚS text, which latter inserts a *t* between *prajānanavān* and *sahá*: cf. my Introduction, §2.8 (G). The word *prajānanavānt-* does not occur elsewhere, except at MS 1.7.4:113.5 / KS 9.2:105.14 (*prajānanavāt-*). On the *dhruvā diś*, cf. BODEWITZ 2000: 31–33, where no examples of Prajāpati's association with it are provided. BODEWITZ does refer to GONDA 1965a: 131, where AB 8.14.3 is quoted: *asyāṁ dhruvāyāṁ madhyamāyāṁ pratiṣṭhāyāṁ diśi* (also AB 8.19.1). This connection with *pratiṣṭhā-*, for which cf. also ŚS 18.4.5, ŚBM 2.1.1.10 etc., is missing in 7.17.9.

### 7.16.10 ŚS 19.17.10

bṛhaspatir mā viśvair devair ūrdhvāyā diśaḥ pātu	(P)
tasmin krame +tasmiñ +chraye	(P)
tāṁ puraṁ praimi	(P)
sa mā rakṣatu sa mā gopāyatu	(P)
tasmā ātmānaṁ pari dade svāhā    16	(P)

Let Bṛhaspati protect me from the upward direction, together will the All-gods. In him do I step, in him do I take refuge. To that stronghold do I go forth. Let him guard me, let him look after me. To him do I entrust myself, hail!

bṛhaspatir] **Or**, vṛhaspatir **K** viśvair] **Ku V/126 [Ma] K**, v{e}iśvair **Mā** de-  
vair ūrdhvāyā] **K**, devaiṛrdhvāyā **Or** diśaḥ] **Or**, diśaḥ **K** tasmin krame +tasmiñ  
+chraye] tasmin, krametasmimṭśraye **Ku Pa [Ma]**, tasmin, krametasmimṭśraye **V/126 Mā**,  
tasminkrametasmiyāṁ nraye **K** tāṁ] **Or**, thāṁ **K** praimi] **Or**, vravīmi **K** gopāyatu]  
**Or**, gopayatu **K** [Bar. misprint: gōp°] tasmā ātmānaṁ] **Or**, tasmātmānaṁ **K** || 16  
||] || ṛ 10 || 15 || **Ku**, || 16 || ṛ (sec. m. 10) || **V/126**, || 16 || ṛ || **Mā**, ZZ 1 ZZ **K**

### ŚS 19.17.10

bṛhaspátir mā viśvair deváir ūrdhvāyā diśáḥ pātu . . . ||

BHATTACHARYA does not report the reading *krametta*° that I find in my reproduction of his **Mā**.

GONDA (1967c: 424 = 1975/IV: 217) refers for Bṛhaspati's association with the All-gods to ŚBM 8.6.1.9 and 14.2.2.10. Cf. also BODEWITZ 2000: 30 (with n. 40).

## 7.17. Against malicious assaults: to various gods.

For general comments relevant to this hymn, see my introduction to the preceding one, with which it forms a pair. For similar groups of mantras, cf. ŚS 4.40, MS 1.5.4:71.9–15, KS 7.2:64.11–17 / ĀpŚS 6.18.3, and especially ŚS 5.10 / PS 6.12.8–10 through 6.13.1–3 (with my commentary).

BHATTACHARYA follows the mss. and edits (')*bhidāsām* throughout, underlining °*dāsām* only in the first mantra. Given the fact that final *m* and *n* are quite commonly interchanged in the PS ms.-transmission (see my note on 7.3.2cd), I do not hesitate to restore +'*bhidāsān* throughout. About the text of ŚS 19.18, cf. W-L: “All the mss., and the comm., have at the end of all the verses '*bhidāsāt*, which SPP. accordingly retains; our edition makes the absolutely necessary emendation to *-sān*. [Is *-dāsāt* a faulty reminiscence of AV. v. 10?].” The ŚS text places a *daṇḍa* (|) after the first, the main clause of each mantra.

RAU (1985) has under items 723 and 607 pointed out that Patañjali in his *Mahābhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 8.2.15 (ed. KIELHORN vol. III, p. 396, lines 15 and 18) quotes the first halves of the 5th and 7th mantras, but twice with the suffix *-mant-* rather than *-vant-* as both AV *Samhitās* transmit for the words in question. Cf. also BRONKHORST 1987: 55 — as Werner Knobl points out to me, BRONKHORST’s argument that “[i]t is unlikely that Patañjali made a mistake in quoting, for the issue of *m* or *v* is discussed in that context” is spurious because, although *m* versus *v* are indeed at stake in this context, Patañjali may well have misquoted two original AV passages containing *-vantam*, and not *-mantam*. His mistake would be all the more likely as there existed a strong tendency towards substituting *-mant-* for *-vant-* after *i/ī*, a tendency that set in already in early Vedic (cf. *Ved. Var.* II, §239, and *AiGr.* II/2, §709cα 880f.).

### 7.17.1 ŚS 19.18.1

agnim̐ te vasumantam ṛchantu (P)  
ye māghāyavaḥ prācyā diśo +'*bhidāsān* || (P)

Let the malicious ones who will assault me from the eastern direction hit upon Agni with the Vasus.

agnim̐ te] **K**, agnim̐[*folio*]nte **Ku**, agninte **V/126 Mā Ma** ṛchantu] **Or**, ṛśchantu **K**  
ye māghāyavaḥ] **Or**, i māmaghāvaya(+ |)ḥ **K** +'*bhidāsān*] *bhidāsām* **Or K** ||] **V/126**  
**Mā Ma**, ||<sup>1</sup> **Ku**, *om.* **K**

#### ŚS 19.18.1

agnim̐ té vāsuvantam ṛchantu | yé māghāyávaḥ prācyā diśó '*bhidāsāt* ||

### 7.17.2 ŚS 19.18.2

vāyum̐ te 'ntarikṣavantam ṛchantu (P)  
ye māghāyava etasyā diśo +'*bhidāsān* || (P)

Let the malicious ones who will assault me from this [same] direction hit upon Vāyu with the intermediate space.

omitted in **K** • vāyuṃ te] vāyunte **Or** +’bhidāsān ||] bhidāsāṃ || **Ku V/126 [Ma]**,  
bhidāsāṃ | va || **Mā**

**ŚS 19.18.2**

vāyūṃ tē ’ntārikṣavantam ṛchantu | yé māghāyāva etāsya diśó ’bhidāsāt ||

**7.17.3 ŚS 19.18.3**

somaṃ te rudravantam ṛchantu (P)  
ye māghāyavo dakṣiṇāyā diśó +’bhidāsān || (P)

Let the malicious ones who will assault me from the southern direction hit upon Soma with the Rudras.

somaṃ te] **K**, somante **Or** rudravantam] **K**, ṛdravantam **Or** ṛchantu ye] **Or**, ṛśchanta  
i **K** +’bhidāsān ||] bhidāsāṃ || **Or**, bhidāsāṃ (+ |) **K**

**ŚS 19.18.3**

sómaṃ té rudrāvāntam ṛchantu | yé māghāyāvo dākṣiṇāyā diśó ’bhidāsāt ||

**7.17.4 ŚS 19.18.4**

varuṇaṃ ta ādityavantam ṛchantu (P)  
ye māghāyava etasyā diśó +’bhidāsān || (P)

Let the malicious ones who will assault me from this [same] direction hit upon Varuṇa with the Ādityas.

varuṇaṃ ta ādityavantam] varṇanta ādityavantam **Ku V/126 Ma**, varṇta ādityavantam  
**Mā**, varuṇaṃ tvādityavantam] **K** ṛchantu ye] **Or**, ṛśchanta i **K** +’bhidāsān] bhidāsāṃ  
**Or K** ||] **Or**, *om.* **K**

**ŚS 19.18.4**

vāruṇaṃ tá ādityāvāntam ṛchantu | yé māghāyāva etāsya diśó ’bhidāsāt ||

**7.17.5 ŚS 19.18.5**

sūryaṃ te dyāvāpṛthivīvantam ṛchantu (P)  
ye māghāyavaḥ pratīcyā diśó +’bhidāsān || (P)

Let the malicious ones who will assault me from the western direction hit upon Sūrya with Heaven and Earth.

sūryaṃ te] **K**, sūryante **Or** dyāvāpṛthivīvantam ṛchantu] **Or**, dyāvāpṛthivīvanta iśchanta  
**K** ye . . . diśó] **Or**, *om.* **K** +’bhidāsān ||] bhidāsāṃ || **Or**, *om.* **K**

**ŚS 19.18.5**

sūryaṃ té dyāvāpṛthivīvantam ṛchantu | yé māghāyāva pratīcyā diśó ’bhidāsāt ||

**7.17.6** ŚS 19.18.6

apas ta oṣadhīmatīr ṛchantu (P)  
 ye māghāyava etasyā diśo +’bhidāsān || (P)

Let the malicious ones who will assault me from this [same] direction hit upon the waters with the plants.

apas ta oṣadhīmatīr ṛchantu] **Or, om. K** ye] **Or, i K** māghāyava] **Ku Mā [Ma] K,**  
 māghāyav{o}a **V/126** +’bhidāsān] bhidāsām **Or K** ||] **Or, om. K**

**ŚS 19.18.6**

apás tá oṣadhīmatīr ṛchantu | yé māghāyáva etásyā diśó ’bhidásāt ||

**7.17.7** ŚS 19.18.7

viśvakarmāṇaṃ te saptarṣivantam ṛchantu (P)  
 ye māghāyava udīcyā diśo +’bhidāsān || (P)

Let the malicious ones who will assault me from the northern direction hit upon Viśvakarman with the Seven Seers.

viśvakarmāṇaṃ te] **K,** viśvakarmāṇante **Or** ṛchantu ye] **Or, ṛschanta i K** +’bhidāsān]  
 bhidāsām **Or K** ||] **Or, om. K** [[note °ṃ i°]

**ŚS 19.18.7**

viśvákarmāṇaṃ té saptarṣívantam ṛchantu | yé māghāyáva údīcyā diśó ’bhidásāt ||

**7.17.8** ŚS 19.18.8

indram te marutvantam ṛchantu (P)  
 ye māghāyava etasyā diśo +’bhidāsān || (P)

Let the malicious ones who will assault me from this [same] direction hit upon Indra with the Maruts.

indram te] indrante **Or,** indram me **K** marutvantam] **K,** maṛtvantam **Ku V/126 [Ma],**  
 maṛtvantavantam **Mā** [[Bhatt. falsely: marutvantam]] ṛchantu ye] **Or, ṛschanta i K**  
 +’bhidāsān] bhidāsām **Or K** ||] **Or, om. K**

**ŚS 19.18.8**

índram té marútvantam ṛchantu | yé māghāyáva etásyā diśó ’bhidásāt ||

**7.17.9** ŚS 19.18.9

prajāpatiṃ te prajananavantam ṛchantu (P)  
 ye māghāyavo dhruvāyā diśo +’bhidāsān || (P)

Let the malicious ones who will assault me from the fixed direction hit upon Prajāpati possessed of generative power.

prajāpatiṃ te] **K**, prajāpatinte **Or** ṛchantu ye] **Or**, ṛschanta i **K** dhruvāyā] **K**, dhruvāyā **Or** +'bhidāsān ||] bhidāsām || **Or**, bhidāsām prajāpatiṃ pra te prajānanavantam ṛschanta i māghāyavo dhruvāyā diśo bhidāsām **K** [[note repetition]]

**ŚS 19.18.9**

prajāpatiṃ té prajānanavantam ṛchantu | yé māghāyāvo dhruvāyā diśo 'bhidāsāt ||

Note that Prajāpati's/the fixed direction's connection with *pratiṣṭhā-*, which we saw in 7.16.9, is absent here.

**7.17.10 ŚS 19.18.10**

bṛhaspatiṃ te viśvadevavantam ṛchantu (P)  
ye māghāyava ūrdhvāyā diśo +'bhidāsān || 17 || (P)

Let the malicious ones who will assault me from the upward direction hit upon Bṛhaspati with the All-gods.

bṛhaspatiṃ te] bṛhaspatinte **Or**, vṛhaspatiṃ te **K** viśvadevavantam ṛchantu ye] **Ku** **V/126** [**Ma**], viśvedevavantamṛchantu ye **Mā**, viśvadevāvantamṛschanta i **K** māghāyava] **Ku** **Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, māghāya{vo}va **V/126** ūrdhvāyā] ūrdhvāyā **Or**, ūrdhvā **K** +'bhidāsān] bhidāsām **Or** **K** || 17 ||] ||<sup>1</sup> ṛ 10 || 17 || **Ku**, || 17 || ṛ (*sec. m.* 10) || **V/126**, || 17 || ṛ || **Mā**, Z 2 Z **K**

**ŚS 19.18.10**

bṛhaspātiṃ té viśvadevavantam ṛchantu | yé māghāyāva ūrdhvāyā diśo 'bhidāsāt ||

## 7.18. Against enemies: to Indra and Agni.

This hymn is parallel to ŚS 5.8. There are only minor variants between the two recensions of the hymn, all belonging to common types of Śākhā differences. In most cases, attempting to decide which of the two recensions has preserved the Ur-Atharvavedic form of the mantras seems to amount to little more than arbitrary guesswork. It does seem to be the case that the PS recension is metrically superior, but who is to say whether this is an archaic trait preserved, or a result of later polishing of originally irregular poetry?

The application of the hymn at KauśS 48.4 (with some elaborations in Keś.) does not help to clarify its interpretation. The word *atisarā-*, which plays a major role in both recensions of the hymn, probably refers to some kind of magical object (an amulet?) with which the performer hoped to ‘out-run’ (i.e. out-do) a rival ritualist.

There is no obvious concatenating link with the preceding hymn to explain this hymn’s placement here in the kāṇḍa: the invocation of Indra among other gods in hymns 16–17, followed by his major role in 18–19 provides only a very loose correspondence, as does *adhaspada-* (7c, 10b) with 7.15.8a.

### 7.18.1 ŚS 5.8.1

vaikaṅkaten <sub>a</sub> edhmena	(8)
devebhya āj <sub>i</sub> yaṃ vaha	(8)
agne tān iha mādaya	(8)
sarva ā yantu me havam	(8)

Carry the butter for [the enjoyment of] the gods, by means of fuel of Vikaṅkata wood, o Agni, exhilarate them here. Let them all come to my call.

vaikaṅkatenedhmena] **V/126**, vaikaṅkatenedhmena **Ku**, vaikaṅkatenedhmena **Mā**, vaikaṅkatenedhmena | **K** [*note*] agne tān] **Or**, agnaye thānn **K** mādaya] **Or**, sādaya **K** sarva ā yantu] **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**], sarva āyuntu **Ku**, sarvā yaṃtu **K** havam ||] havam || **Ku Mā** [**Ma**], {va}havam || **V/126**, havam [*om.*] **K** [*note* °ṃ i°]

#### ŚS 5.8.1

vaikaṅkaténedhména devébhya ájyaṃ vaha |  
ágne táñ ihá mādaya sárva á yantu me hávam ||

a. As WEBER noted (1898: 194 n. 2), “das Holz von vikaṅkata, *Flacourtia sapida*,<sup>86</sup> dient zur herstellung von Opfergeräthen, yajnapātriyo vṛikṣaḥ Schol. zu Çat. II, 2, 4, 10; vajro vai vikaṅkataḥ Çat. V, 2, 4, 18”. But cf. in particular KRICK 1982: 185, and p. 172 (with n. 438) on the use of this wood — one of the kinds of wood especially associated with Agni — as fuel in the Agnyādheya.

<sup>86</sup> Jan Meulenbeld informs me that *F. sapida* Roxb. is currently referred to as *Flacourtia indica* (Burm.f.) Merr. = *Flacourtia ramontchi* L’Herit.

b. Cf. VSM 2.8 *áskannam adyá devébhya ájyaṁ sám bhriyāsam* ‘May I today gather the ghee for the gods unspilt’. It is the speaker’s offering that Agni is implored to transport, not that of the rival priest (3c).

c. Together with the next pāda, we seem to have here a case of hysteron proteron. Although WHITNEY judged the **K** reading *sādaya* to be “better”, the Or. mss. confirm the reading found in ŚS. Only one case of *iha sādāyā-* is known to me, viz. VSM 29.6d, TS 5.1.11.3d (etc.) *ṛtāsya yónāv ihá sādāyāmi*, while *iha mādāyā-* is formulaic: cf. ṚV 3.32.1c, 7.11.5b, 10.14.5b (ŚS 18.1.59b, PS 18.63.2b etc.), 10.104.3c, 10.128.5 (ŚS 5.3.6b, PS 5.4.6b), PS 5.15.2c, ŚS 9.2.8b / PS 16.76.7b, etc. All these cases, it is true, have the verb form in the middle voice.

The invocation of Agni here, in a hymn that largely relies on invocation of Indra, is echoed in 2f and 3c, but especially in the pāda 7e, which is absent in the ŚS version of this hymn. The importance of his role — in the form of the altar space — to both the speaker of this hymn and his rival priest(s), becomes clear in stanza 8.

d. Cf. PS 5.11.4 *atharvāṇo aṅgirasō viśve devā ṛtāvṛdhaḥ | śṛṇvantv adya me havam asyai putrāya vettave* ‘May the Atharvans, the Aṅgirasas, the All-Gods, who increase the Ṛta, today hear my call in order for her to get a son’ (LUBOTSKY). Perhaps the present pāda contains a *double entendre* with *hávam*, which could also have been taken to mean ‘oblation’ (although it does not actually seem to be attested in that sense in Vedic). Cf. another possible play on the same word in 7.4.11d above.

**7.18.2** ≈ ŚS 5.8.2 ◊ f: PS 4.4.2b / ŚS 1.7.2b

indra ā yāhi me havam	(8)
idaṁ kariṣyāmi +tac chṛṇu	(9)
ima aindrā atisarā	(8)
ākūtīḥ saṁ namantu me	(8)
tebhiḥ śakema vīryaṁ	(8)
jātavedas tanūvaśin	(8)

O Indra, drive towards my call. I am about to do this [heroic deed], listen to that [call]. Let these out-runners of Indra harmonize my intentions. By them may we be capable of a heroic deed, o Jātavedas, self-ruler.

indra ā] **Or**, indrā **K** havam idaṁ] **Or**, havaṁ idaṁ **K** +tac chṛṇu] tatśṛṇu **Or**, taśchṛṇu **K** ima aindrā atisarā ākūtīḥ] **Ku** [**Ma**], i{ndra}(sec. m. → ma) aindra atisarā ākūtīḥ **V/126**, ima {e}aindrā atisarāḥ ākūtī **Mā**, imamindrātīrākūtī **K** saṁ namantu] sannamantu **Or**, saṁ navam̐bhū **K** tebhiḥ śakema ] **Or**, tebhiśśakemaṁ **K** tanūvaśin] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], tan{u}ūvaśin **Mā**, tanūvaśim **K** |||<sup>3</sup> **Or**, om. **K**

### ŚS 5.8.2

indrā yāhi me hávam idám kariṣyāmi tác chṛṇu |  
imá aindrā atisarā ākūtīḥ sám namantu me |  
tébbhiḥ śakema vīryaṁ jātavedas tánūvaśin ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *indra ā*.

**a.** Cf. the difference between *indra ā* of the Or. mss. on the one hand, and expected *indrā́* as found in ŚS and **K** (and several Vedic pādas listed in BLOOMFIELD 1906: 224) on the other. Because the **Or** reading cannot easily be explained as due to perseveration, it may be another authentic example of non-appearance of vowel contraction (cf. my Introduction, §2.8 A); this likelihood is raised by the “well-known fact that in prose texts of the classical literature the vocative often (though far from consistently) remains unaffected by the rules of sandhi” (KUIPER 1947: 210, also 1955: 253[1] = 1997a: 284 n. 1).

**bc.** With *tac chr̥ṇu*, cf. PS 5.11.4c *śṛṇvantv . . . havam* quoted under 1d. WHITNEY suggests that “[f]or *idám karisyāmi* in **b** is probably to be substituted in practical use a statement of the act performed”, i.e. the particular kind of *vīryam* to be achieved. WEBER (1898: 195) wants to read *karisyāmi* trisyllabically, but I know no justification for this: another hypersyllabic pāda occurs below (6a), and 9b is hyposyllabic. WEBER further comments: “Indra soll nur auf den Ruf der diesen Spruch Sprechenden hören, nicht auf den Ruf anderer, und die von diesen nach Indra’s Art gemachten Anläufe sollen “vorüberlaufen”, ihr Ziel verfehlen, sich der Absicht des Betenden neigen”.

The precise meaning of *atisarā-* is not known (cf. LUBOTSKY 2002: 140f.), but it is obvious from stanza 4 that WEBER cannot have been correct in taking them to have been hostile weapons (although the ŚS [5.8.7] text of stanza 6 has *atisarā-* and in this way supports WEBER); rather, they are the means, derived from Indra’s power, with which the speaker wishes to rid himself of his rival. In view of the meaning of the term *pratisarā-*, discussed below under 6a, it seems likely that these *atisarās* too were a kind of amulet: cf. 7.5.1d, part of an amulet hymn, and the amulet-mantras quoted in my commentary on that pāda, where *vīrá-/vīryā-* is an important theme. While pāda 4d definitely connects the name of the amulet with *ati-sar* in a meaning like ‘to out-run’, we may also compare — as to the physical form of the amulet — interpretations of the word *pratisarā-* such as in PW IV, 984: “Band an Arm oder Hals, als Amuletschnur (in sich zurücklaufend)”; and in a similar vein W-L under ŚS 2.11.2: “it seems to mean virtually a circular amulet—[such as a bracelet? For *re-entrant*, Whitney has interlined *revertent (sic)*, better, perhaps, *reverting*, trans. or intrans.].” GONDA’s attempt to disconnect *pratisarā-* from *sar* ‘to run’ (1937 = 1975/II: 375ff., still of influence in EWAia II, 706) is to be rejected in the light of *ati-sarā-/ati-dhāv* (see 4). May we take *ati-sarā-* to denote some kind of necklace or bracelet, usable for strangling (5e)?

**d.** While WEBER renders the ŚS parallel, with singular *ākūtim*, ‘sollen sich meiner Absicht beugen’, WHITNEY translates it ‘let they bring to pass my design’, which is better, if uncharacteristically free. Cf. ŚS 3.8.5ab = 6.94.1ab *sám vo mánāṃsi sám vratā́ sám ākūtīr namāmasi* ‘we harmonize your thoughts, your observances, your intentions’, a parallel which seems here to favor the PS text, with its acc. pl., as original. Conversely, amulets could also be used to damage a rival’s intentions: PS 2.89.3ab *varco jahī manyuṃ jahy ākūtim*

*dviṣatām maṇe* ‘kill the glory, kill the wrath, kill the intention of those who hate [us], o amulet’.

e. Cf. RV 10.43.5c *ná tát te anyó ánu víryàṃ śakat* ‘No one else shall be capable of that heroic deed of yours [o Indra]’. That the ‘heroic deed’ refers here to the performance of a ritual is made likely by the common association of the word *vīrá-* and its derivatives with ritual terminology: cf. the passages collected by BLOOMFIELD 1928: 202f.

f. The divine epithet *tanūvaśin-* ‘self-ruler’ (or ‘lord of bodies’? — thus GRIFFITH 1895–96) is found only in the AV Saṁhitās, besides in the identical pāda PS 4.4.2b / ŚS 1.7.2b also at ŚS 4.4.4d (Indra), 4.4.8d (Agni?), PS 19.28.4b (Agni), and at ŚS 7.109.1b / PS 4.9.2b.

### 7.18.3 ≈ ŚS 5.8.3

yad asāv amuto devā	(8)
adevaḥ saṁścikīrṣati	(8)
mā tasyāgnir havyaṃ vākṣīd	(8)
dhavaṃ devās ca mopa gur	(8)
mamaiva havam etana	(8)

If the ungodly N.N., o gods, wants to accomplish a [rite] at such-and-such a place, let Agni not carry his offering, and let the gods not go to [his] call. Come only to my call!

asāv amuto devā adevaḥ] Or, asāmamuco devādevā K saṁścikīrṣati] Or, saścikīrṣati K mā] Or, vā K vākṣīd] Or, sāksīd K mopa] Or, somapa K gur] Ku [Ma] K, Śu(sec. m. → Pu 4)r V/126, {·u}→ gur Mā etana ||] Or, etunaḥ | K [Bar. om. ]]

#### ŚS 5.8.3

yád asāv amúto devā adeváh sámścikīrṣati |  
mā́ tásyāgnír havyám vākṣīd dhávam devā́ asya mópa gúr mámaivá hávam étana ||

a. On the interpretation of *yad*, cf. DELBRÜCK 1888: 561f. and SPEIJER 1896, §272.2 p. 85. The place for performing (magical) rites is called the ‘strongholds of the gods’ in 8a.

b. Why is *sám* accented in ŚS?

d. The PS version of this pāda avoids the metrical problems noticed in ŚS by WHITNEY. On the phrase *havam upa ay/gam/gā*, cf. ŚS 4.24.1c (~ MS 3.16.5:190.11, KS 22.15:71.9, TS 4.7.15.1) *yó dāsúṣaḥ sukṛto hávam éti* ‘who goes to the call of a pious worshipper’.

### 7.18.4 Only PS ◊ a: ŚS 5.8.4a ◊ b: cf. SVK 2.223d

ati dhāvatāṭisarā	(8)
viśvasyeśānā ojasah	(8)
vṛṣcatāmuṣya jīvitam	(8)
indreṇa saha medinā	(8)

Out-run [him], o out-runners, who hold control over all power. Together with Indra as ally, cut off the life of N.N.

dhāvatātisarā] **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, dhāva atisarā **Mā**, dhāvatātisarā **K** ojasah |] **Or**, ojasā | **K** vṛścatāmuṣya] **K**, vṛścyatāmuṣya **Or** jīvitam] **Or**, jīvati (+ |) **K** medinā] **Or**, medhinā **K**

**a.** This pāda (in combination also with 5a) nicely illustrates the suppletive relationship between the roots *dhāv* and *sar*, on which cf. NARTEN 1969b: 90f. = 1995: 136f.; DESHPANDE 1992: 29–31.

**b.** While the last pāda of ṚV 9.101.5 contains an instrumental form (*īndur indrāya pavata iti devāso abruvan | vācās pātir mahasyate víśvasyésāna ójasā*), the corresponding stanza in its SVK transmission has a genitive, as we find here: *víśvasyésāna ójasaḥ* (cf. Ved. Var. III, §585). Despite the fact that *ísāna-ójasā* in the singular is a standing Indra-epithet (ṚV 1.11.8a, 1.175.4b, 8.6.41b, 8.17.9a, 8.32.14c, 8.40.5e), I do not take the **K** reading seriously here, because cases of *-ah | → -ā |* are very common in **K** (cf. e.g. 6.22.1d, 6.22.3c above), and influence from the ṚV attestations of this pāda (*ójasā |* also at ṚV 8.17.9b) might moreover be suspected (cf. my Introduction, §2.6.3.2).

**c.** On two other cases (PS 1.67.3b, 5.32.10c) of insertion of *y* after *vṛśc°* in the Or. mss., all probably instances of hypercorrection, cf. KULIKOV 2001: 197f. with notes 614 and 615.

**d.** Cf. 6.9.3b above, 9d in the present hymn, and 7.19.1d+7d below, on Indra as *medín-* ‘ally’.

### 7.18.5 ≈ ŚS 5.8.4 ◊ e: PS 5.9.8b

atisṛty <sub>a</sub> ātisarā	(8)
indrasy <sub>a</sub> aujasā hata	(8)
aviṃ vṛka <sup>1</sup> iva mathnīta	(8)
tato vo jīvan mā moci	(8)
prāṇam asyāpi nahyata	(8)

Having out-run, o out-runners, slay [him] with the force of Indra, snatch [his life] like a wolf a sheep: after that, let him not get away from you alive, shut up his breath.

**K** omits from *prāṇam* up to 6d *praticāḥ* • atisṛtyātisarā] **Or**, atimṛtātisarāv **K** indrasyaujasā hata] **V/126 Mā**, indrasy{au}ojasā **Ku**, indrasyojasā **Ma K** vṛka iva mathnīta] **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, vṛka iva mathnīta **Mā**, vṛkīva satnīca **K** tato] **Ku Mā K**, ⟨·⟩TO **V/126 jīvan] Or**, jīvaṃ **K** moci] **V/126 [Ma]**, mo⟨·⟩ **Ku**, meci **Mā**, mociḥ **K** [[note °ḥ p°]] prāṇam asyāpi] **V/126 Mā [Ma]**, ⟨·⟩masyāpi **Ku**, *om.* **K** nahyata ||] **Or**, *om.* **K**

#### ŚS 5.8.4

āti dhāvatātisarā indrasya vācasā hata |  
aviṃ vṛka iva mathnīta sá vo jīvan mā moci prāṇám asyāpi nahyata ||

c. Cf. NARTEN 1960: 123f. = 1995: 13f. on the verb *math<sup>i</sup>* ‘to snatch’, typically of wolves: NARTEN refers, besides to the present passage, to R̥V 8.66.8 *vṛkaś cid asya vāraṇā urāmāthir ā vayúneṣu bhūṣati | sémaṃ na stómaṃ jujuṣāṇā ā gahi índra prá citráyā dhíyá* ‘Even a wild wolf that snatches lambs becomes favorable within his (Indra’s) domains: so you, o Indra, must come forth and enjoy this laud of ours, with brilliant vision’ (cf. THIEME 1949: 24 and GONDA 1959b: 85, as well as 8.34.3b *úrāṃ ná dhūnute vṛkaḥ* ‘as a wolf shakes a lamb’), and to ŚS 7.50.5cd *ávīṃ vṛko yáthā máthad evá mathnāmi te kṛtām* ‘As a wolf will snatch a sheep, so do I snatch your successful dice-throw’. We can add from the PS the following instances of the same simile: 1.72.2 *medinas te vaibhīdakās tata índra upāvatu | avyā vṛka iva saṃrabhya jīgīvān astam āyasi* ‘The dice are your allies, let Indra therefore (?) help you: like a wolf taking off with a sheep, you shall go home a victor’; 2.38.5ab *kṛtyā yantu kṛtyākṛtaṃ + vṛka + ivāvīmato gr̥ham* ‘Let the witchcrafts go to the witchcraft-maker, like a wolf to a shepherd’s house’; 20.18.1 [PSK 20.17.1] / ŚS 6.37.1 *úpa prágāt sahasrākṣó yuktvá śapátho rátham | śaptāram anvichán máma vṛka ivāvīmato gr̥hám* ‘The thousand-eyed curse has come near, having yoked its chariot, seeking after the curser, like a wolf ...’, and 6.20.7b above. NARTEN (*ibid.*, n. 15) also pointed to a passage from the Vādhūla corpus, edited first by CALAND 1928b: 133 = 1990: 433 (and again by CHAUBEY 2001, without improvement of the text): it is VādhĀnv 4.12, and Yasuke Ikari has been so kind as to send me his provisional edition of this paṭala. The line in question is *sa u ha vā eṣa eva vṛkā<sup>87</sup> urāmāthayo yad ṛtavaḥ pitara ete ha vai tasya yajñam mathnanti ye ’parāhṇe dīkṣant[e]<sup>88</sup>* ‘And lamb-snatching wolves is what the seasons, the fathers are; it is those who are consecrated in the afternoon that snatch his worship’. Based on the notion of ‘snatching a *yajñā*’ expressed in this last passage (for which NARTEN, p. 124 = 14, has collected several further parallels), one might alternatively consider supplying the same noun, rather than *prāṇam* from e, as object for *mathnāta*.

d. The ŚS version of the pāda is hypometrical. Regarding the ablatival interpretation of *vaḥ* (thus WHITNEY), it must be noted that DELBRÜCK 1888: 206 does not mention this case-meaning for *vaḥ*: a *dativus ethicus* might therefore also be considered (cf. AiGr. III, §236d and DELBRÜCK *ibid.*).

### 7.18.6 ≈ ŚS 5.8.7

yān asau pratisarān akāś	(9)
cakāra kṛṇavac ca yān	(8)
t <sub>u</sub> vam tān indra vṛtrahan	(8)
pratīcaḥ punar ā kṛdhi	(8)

<sup>87</sup> Thus K1, K4. MC: *lokā*. The reading of Ikari’s Malayalam mss. perfectly confirms the conjecture proposed already by NARTEN.

<sup>88</sup> K1, K4: *ye parāhṇe dīkṣanta*; M, Cm: *ye ’parāhṇe dīkṣanta*; C: *yo ’parāhṇe dīkṣata*. Note the important difference from CALAND’s (= CHAUBEY’s) text (C).

yathāmum +tr̥ṇahañ janam || (8)

The counter-runners N.N. has just made, has ready, and the ones he shall make: you, o Indra the Vr̥tra-Slayer, make them turn back again, so that they shall shatter that man.

**K** omits up to *pratīcaḥ* • yān asau pratisarān] **Or**, *om.* **K** akaś cakāra] **Ku JM RM V/126 Pa**, akaśk̄kāra **Mā Ma** [?], *om.* **K** kṛṇavac ca yān |] **Ku V/126 Mā**, kṛṇavarcca yān | **Ma Pa**, *om.* **K** tvam] **Or**, *om.* **K** tān] **Ku Mā [Ma]**, ·tān **V/126**, *om.* **K** indra] **Or**, *om.* **K** vr̥trahan pratīcaḥ] **Ku Mā [Ma]** [°n, p°], vr̥trahan, pratīca (*sec. m.* + BHa 1)ḥ **V/126**, *om.* **K** yathāmum +tr̥ṇahañ] yathāmum tr̥ṇahaṃ **Or**, yathāmantriṇahaṃ **K** janam ||] janam ||] **Or**, janam [om. ||] **K**

### ŚS 5.8.7

yān asāv atisarāṃś cakāra kṛṇāvaca ca yān |  
tvam tān indra vr̥trahan pratīcaḥ pūnar ā kṛdhi yāthāmum tr̥ṇaham janam ||

BHATTACHARYA edits *tr̥ṇahaṃ*. The reading *akaśk̄kāra* he reports for **Mā** and **Ma** is valueless, because *śca* and *śṛ* are often indistinguishable, while **Mā**'s and **Ma**'s respective sister-mss. **V/126** and **Pa** here clearly read *śca*.

**ab.** The tenses of the first two of the three verb forms (where ŚS has only two) pose a problem, because in the perfect paradigms of *kar*, according to KÜMMEL (2000: 134), “Indikativ und Partizip sind immer vergangenheitsbezogen gebraucht”: our passage does not seem to allow anything but a present-resultative interpretation. A similar phrase, again with only two of the three verb forms, is found at RV 7.26.3ab *cakāra tā kṛṇāvan nūnām anyā yāni bruvānti vedhāsaḥ sutēṣu* ‘[Indra] has done these [deeds], shall do other [deeds] now, which the experts recount at the pressed [soma stalks]’.

Both the ŚS and the PS version of these pādas are metrically imperfect, but in different ways. It is unfortunate that the evidence of **K** is here not available to corroborate that while the ŚS continues with *atisarā-*, PS here, after the preceding forms derived from *ati-sar*, places *pratisarās* in the enemy’s hand: the noun *pratisarā-* (subject of an elaborate study, with full collection of textual references, in GONDA 1937: 311ff. = 1975/II: 375ff.) is attested several times in the AVPariś (4.4.9, 6.1.11, 17.2.16, 20.1.3, 20.6.8–7.2, 33.6.12), where it is mostly combined with the verb *ā-badh* and seems to denote a kind of amulet. This agrees with its attestations in the AV Saṃhitās, where I have noted it at ŚS 2.11.2a (PS 1.57.2) *saktyó ’si pratisaró* [PS adds *punaḥsaro ’si*] *’si pratyabhicāraṇo ’si* | *āpnuhí śréyāṃsam āti samám krāma* ‘You are Sraktya, you are a counter-runner, you are a counter-magic: catch a better one, pass over an equal’, PS 2.64.3 (cf. ŚS 3.7.2bcd) *kaśyapasya pratisaro dyauṣ pitā pṛthivī mātā* | *yathābhicakra devās tathāpi kṛṇutā punaḥ* ‘[This is] the counter-runner of Kaśyapa, heaven is [its] father, the earth [its] mother: just as, o gods, you have achieved (magical effect in the past), so make [this now] again’ (after ZEHNDER 1999: 147), and PS 13.1.1d–13d + 13.2.1d–4d / ŚS 4.40.1d–8d *pratyág enān pratisarēṇa hanmi* ‘I slay them back with a counter-runner’. Especially

important, however, are the following stanzas ŚS 8.5.1, 4–6 (cf. PS 16.27.1, 4–6):

*ayám pratisaró mañír vīró vīráya badhyate |*  
*vīryāvānt sapatnahā śúravīrah paripāṇaḥ sumāṅgālah ||1||*  
 ...  
*ayám srākyó mañiḥ pratīvartāḥ pratisarāḥ |*  
*ójasvān vimṛdhó vaśī só asmān pātu sarvātāḥ ||4||*  
*tád agnīr āha tād u sóma āha bṛhaspátīḥ savitā tād índrah |*  
*té me devāḥ puróhitāḥ pratīcīḥ kṛtyāḥ pratisarāír ajantu ||5||*  
*antár dadhe dyāvāpṛthivī utáhar utá sūryam |*  
*té ... ||6||*

‘This attacking talisman, (itself) a man, is fastened upon the man: it is full of force, slays enemies, makes heroes of men, furnishes shelter, provides good luck—. . . . This talisman of sraktya assails and attacks. With might controlling the enemies, it shall protect us on all sides—. Agni has said this, and Soma has said this; Bṛhaspati, Savitar, Indra (have said) this. These divine purohitas (chaplains) shall turn back for me (upon the sorcerer) the sorceries with aggressive amulets—. I have interposed heaven and earth, also the day, and also the sun. These . . . .’ (transl. BLOOMFIELD 1897: 79)

The phraseological parallels between these *pratisarā*-stanzas and the present *atisarā*-hymn are manifold. The word *punahṣarā*- (PS 5.23.2b / ŚS 4.17.2b, 16.35.9d / 10.1.9d, 19.32.2a / 6.129.3a) also seems to belong to the same sphere of amulets.

e. WHITNEY 1889: 252 (§687) has explained the ŚS form *tṛṇáhāṁ* (for *padapāṭha tṛṇáhān*) as a 3rd pl. pres. subj. doubly characterised for the mood; PS has the expected form *tṛ-ṇa-h-an*. On the regularized sandhi °ṇ j° → °ṇ j°, against the evidence of both **K** and the Or. mss. as well as ŚS, cf. my Introduction, §2.8 (I). On Indra’s connection with the shattering of enemies, cf. PS 9.6.3 *indrāmitrā indrahātā na va ihāsti nyañcanam | indro vaḥ sarvāsām sākam śakras tṛṇedhu vṛtrahā* ‘Enemies of Indra, slain by Indra: there’s no refuge for you here. Let Indra, Śakra the Vṛtra-Slayer, shatter [the embryos/eggs]<sup>89</sup> of all of you (f.) together’.

**7.18.7 abcd:** ≈ ŚS 5.8.5 ◊ **d:** cf. 20.28.5c ◊ **e:** only PS

yam amī purodadhire	(8)
brahmāṇam upabhūṭaye	(8)
indrasya te adhaspadaṁ	(8)
taṁ pra yachāmi mṛtyave	(8)
kravyād enaṁ śamayatu	(8)

<sup>89</sup> Cf. PS 17.13.3 (edited in GRIFFITHS 2004, item 38), and 9.6.6c.

The priest that N.N. have made their Purohita, for assistance: under the foot of you, Indra, do I give him over to death. Let [Agni] the eater of bloody flesh put him to rest.

purodadhire] **Ku JM RM Mā [Ma] K**, purodadhīre **V/126** brahmāṇam upabhūtaye] **Or**, vrahmāṇam abhibhūtaye **K** taṃ pra yachāmi] **Ku Mā Ma**, taṃ pra yacchāmi **V/126**, tvaṃ pṛschāmi **K** śamayatu] **Or**, samayatu **K**

### ŚS 5.8.5

yám amí purodadhīré brahmāṇam ápabhūtaye |  
 índra sá te adhaspadám tám práty asyāmi mṛtyáve ||

a. Regarding the meaning(s) of *puro-dhā*, cf. my commentary on 6.11.2d. For the present construction with rel. pron. *yam*, cf. 7.9.2ab above.

b. The Or. reading *upabhūtaye* adopted by BHATTACHARYA is perhaps doubtful because *upa-bhav*<sup>1</sup> seems to be attested only at RV 1.138.4a *asyá ū śú ṇa úpa sātáye bhuvah* ‘Do prove helpful to us for the conquest of this [newer granting of wealth]!’, at 10.183.2 *ápaśyaṃ tvā mánasā dídhyanāṃ sváyāṃ tanú řtvye nádhamānām | úpa mām uccá yuvatír babhūyāḥ prá jāyasva prajāyā putrakāme* ‘I saw you while you were pondering in your mind, worrying about the reproductive fluid in your own body: may you, a young woman, be fruitful to me (your man); reproduce yourself with offspring, you who desire sons’ (my translation partially follows SLAJE 1995: 139), and in 7.3.2d above.

The ŚS reading *ápabhūtaye* (WHITNEY: ‘for failure’) seems to receive some support from such passages as TS 3.4.8.2 *yó rāṣṭrād ápabhūtaḥ syát tásmāi hotavyāḥ* and 3.4.8.7 *yó jyeṣṭhābandhur ápabhūtaḥ syát táñ sthāle ’vasáyya brahmaudanām cátuḥśarāvam paktvá tásmāi hotavyā vārṣma vái rāṣṭrabhīto vārṣma sthālam vārṣmaṇaiváinaṃ vārṣma samānānāṃ gamayati* ‘if the head of a family is expelled, they should be offered for him, placing him on a mound and cooking a Brahman’s mess of four Śarāvas in size; the Rāṣṭrabhīts are pre-eminence, the mound is pre-eminence; verily by pre-eminence he makes him pre-eminent among his equals’ (KEITH), but one would prefer in this context a noun derived from a verb which can have transitive syntax (‘in order to make [me] fail’), which does not seem to be true for *apa-bhav*<sup>1</sup>: cf. RV 1.131.7fg, 4.35.1b, 9.85.1b, 10.67.11c, 10.128.9, etc.

The reading *abhibhūtaye*, finally, that we find in **K**, has the appearance of a *lectio facilior* that may have been introduced due to perseveration from the participle *abhibhūta-* found at PS 4.12.6b, 4.32.4a (and at 15.1.3a, 19.16.8b, 19.32.10c). Dative forms of the noun *abhibhūti-*, often in a double dative construction, are attested e.g. at TS 3.1.7.1, 7.5.5.1; PB 9.4.6–7; JB 1.342, 344; AB 8.2.1, 8.3.1. Since there seems to be no source within PS from which the Or. reading *upabhūtaye* might have been perseverated, and since the sense it yields seems acceptable, I tentatively follow BHATTACHARYA in adopting this reading.

d. The phrase *pra yachāmi mṛtyave* has several parallels in the PS: 2.37.5ab *tam ahaṃ nīrtaye pra yachāmi taṃ mṛtyoḥ páse badhnāmi* ‘Him do I give over

to ruin, him do I bind in the sling of death'; 20.28.5cd [PSK 20.27.3cd] *taṁ mṛtyave pra yachāmi sa rudrasyāstv ākhaṇaḥ* 'Him do I give over to death: let him be Rudra's target'. I find a similar phrase only once in ŚS, at 8.8.10ab = PS 16.29.10ab *mṛtyāve 'mūn prá yachāmi mṛtyupāśáir amí sitáh* 'I give N.N. over to death: they are tied up in the slings of death'. ŚS here has *mṛtyāve práty-as*, a phrase found also at ŚS 6.37.3 (PS 20.18.5 [PSK 20.17.5], RVKh 4.5.18) *śúne péśtram ivāvakṣāmaṁ táṁ práty asyāmi mṛtyāve* 'I throw him to Death, like a piece of burnt meat to a dog' (cf. GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY 2000–01[03]: 201).

e. Cf. stanza 1. About the euphemistic usage of the verb *śamayati* in the meaning 'to kill', cf. my comments on 7.11.1d.

**7.18.8** ≈ ŚS 5.8.6, 11.10[12].17 ◊ d: PS 19.54.10b–12b [PSK 9b+10b]

yadi preyur devapurā	(8)
brahma varmāṇi cakrire	(8)
tanūpānaṁ paripāṇāni cakrire	(12)
sarvaṁ tad arasaṁ kṛdhi	(8)

When they have gone to the strongholds of the gods, have made spells their armors, have made for themselves a body-protection, full protections: make all of that powerless.

yadi preyur] Or, yadviprair K brahma] Or, vrahma K cakrire] Or, cakkrire K [[Bar.: cakrire]] |] Ku Mā [Ma] K, || V/126 cakrire] Or, cakkrire | K [[Bar.: cakrire]]

ŚS 5.8.6 = 11.10[12].17

yádi preyúr devapurá bráhma vármāṇi cakriré |  
tanūpānaṁ paripāṇaṁ kṛṇvāná yád upociré sárvaṁ tád arasaṁ kṛdhi ||

WEBER summarizes (1898: 196): “Es kommt eben nur darauf an, wer Indra's Hülfe sich zu *gewinnen weiss*; *ihr* brahmán und *ihre* bráhmāni sollen ihnen nichts helfen”.

a. On the use of the words 'stronghold(s) of the gods' to denote the altar ground used for the performance of the rite — in this case one of hostile magic (a *kāmyeṣṭi* of some kind?) by the enemy — referred to in 3ab, cf. my comments on 6.12.4d above. See also 7.16.1c (and the subsequent mantras) above.

b. Although he translates 'have made incantation (*bráhma*) their defenses', WHITNEY comments: “*Bráhma* may have here one of its higher senses”. I believe the more down-to-earth interpretation is to be preferred here, and this becomes inescapable if we accept the possibility available to us since KUIPER's study of 1955 (esp. p. 281[29] = 1997a: 312) of interpreting *brahma* here as a case of *brahmā* (acc. pl.) with shortened final vowel (cf. RV 6.23.1a *ráthakṣayāṇi bráhma*), perhaps under the influence of the opening of RV 6.75.19d (RVKh 4.5.37d, 4.5.40c, ŚS 1.19.4d / PS 1.20.4d etc.) *bráhma váрма mármántaram*. About the theme, cf. my introduction to 6.11.

c. Cf. my commentary on 6.12.4cd and 7cd for various other Vedic mantras (in related contexts) containing the word *tanūpāna-* or similar forms. ŚS reads

*paripāṇam* (cf. i.a. ŚS 8.5.1 quoted under 6ab), in the metrically rather different context of its parallel to this pāda.

### 7.18.9 ≈ ŚS 5.8.9

*atrainam indra vṛtrahann	(8)
ugro marmaṇi vidhya	(7)
atraivainam abhi tiṣṭha	(8)
śakra medīy ahaṃ tava	(8)
anu tvendrā rabhāmahe	(8)
sīyāma sumatau tava	(8)

Pierce him here, o Indra the Vṛtra-Slayer, who are powerful, in his weak spot; trample upon him in this very spot. O Śakra, I am your ally. We take hold of you, o Indra. May we be in your favor.

\*atrainam] athainam **Or** **K** vṛtrahann] **Or**, vṛttrahaṃn **K** ugro] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**] **K**, u(+ gro) **Mā** vidhya |] **Or**, viśya [*om.*] **K** [*note* °a a°] atraivainam] **Or**, atraivenam **K** tiṣṭha śakra] **Or**, tiṣṭhaśśakra **K** [*Bar.:* °śakra] medīy ahaṃ tava] **Or**, nedyahantavaḥ **K** |] **K**, || **Or** ||] | **Or**, || **K** [*note* ||]

#### ŚS 5.8.9

ātrainān indra vṛtrahann ugró mārmaṇi vidhya |  
 ātraivāinān abhī tiṣṭhēndra medīy āhāṃ tāva |  
 ānu tvendrā rabhāmahe syāma sumatāu tāva ||

The *Or.* mss. assume a four-pāda stanza here. It is a striking fact that, according to WHITNEY'S (and LANMAN'S) note, several ŚS mss. end this stanza after pāda **d** as well, and “reckon the last two pādas as a tenth [or separate] verse”, in contradiction to the AthBSA which calls the stanza *tryavasānā śatpādā* (and the hymn *navakam*); the uncertainty about the division is increased by an exceptional phenomenon in **K**: at the end of what is here — in the absence of convincing alternatives, along with BHATTACHARYA — taken as pāda **f**, we find the only explicit double daṇḍa (||) known to me from this ms. so far (the single daṇḍa after pāda **d** may be taken to mark a stanza-end, in accordance with the *Or.* mss., or a simple avasāna: cf. my Introduction, §2.1.1.3). Since all the surrounding hymns conform perfectly to the norm of this kāṇḍa of 10 stanzas per hymn, I do not consider following a possible interpretation of the punctuation in **K** as indicating a separate 2-pāda stanza (our 9ef would be 10, our 10 would be 11) an attractive solution. BHATTACHARYA edits *athainam*.

**a.** Note that all PS mss. read *athainam*, where ŚS has *ātrainān*. Since *ātha* cannot stand at the beginning of a stanza in Atharvavedic verse (KLEIN 1997: 9f.), and since a reshuffling of the stanza boundaries in such a way that 9a becomes a non-initial pāda is — despite the uncertainties just indicated about the stanza-division as it stands — *not* one of the possible alternatives, I emend after ŚS; the reading with *atha* may perhaps have arisen due to perseveration

from cases of pāda-initial *atha* + pronoun elsewhere in the Saṁhitā (1.30.5d *athaitasya* . . . , 4.4.7c *athaiṣām indro* . . . , 5.31.5d *athaiṣa* . . .).

**b.** Cf. PS 1.76.4d *kṛtyākṛtaṃ duṣkṛtaṃ hṛdaye vidhya marmaṇi* ‘Pierce the witchcraft-maker, the evil-doer in his heart, his weak spot’ and ŚS 8.3.17d / PS 16.7.7d (≈ RV 10.87.17d) *tām pratyāñcam arcīṣā vidhya mármaṇi* ‘Pierce him back, with your beam, in his weak spot’.

**d.** See my commentary on 4d above.

**e.** Cf. WEBER (1898: 197): “der samanvārambha, dass sich nämlich Alle an einander, je Einer an den Andern, anhängen, so dass Alle im Schutze des Voranschreitenden, Ersten stehen, ist im Ritual solenner Brauch”. Cf. CALAND 1899: 215–217 = 1990: 54–56, GONDA 1965a: 153f. on the (*sam-*)*anvārambhaṇa*-rite.

**f.** The same formula occurs also at RV 7.18.3d (*syāma te sumatāv indra śárman*), 8.44.24c (*syāma te sumatāv ápi*) and TS 4.1.2.4 etc. (*vayám syāma sumatáu pṛthivyáḥ*).

**7.18.10** ≈ ŚS 5.8.8 ◊ **d:** PS 2.58.2b, 19.15.9d (ŚS 6.75.2d / TB 3.3.11.4), 19.47.7d, 20.27.6d, ŚS 6.75.3e, cf. VSM 40.8

yathendra udvācanaṃ	(8)
labdhvā cakre adhaspadam	(8)
kṛṇve ’mum adharaṃ tathā	(8)
śásvatībhyaḥ samābhyaḥ    18	(8)

Just as Indra took and brought Udvācana underfoot, so do I bring N.N. down, for all years [to come].

yathendra udvācanaṃ] **Or**, yathendramudvātanam **K** labdhvā cakre] **V/126 Mā [Ma]**,  
 labdhvā cakre **Ku**, labdhā cakkre **K** [*recte* Bhatt.; Bar.: labdhvā cakre] adhaspadam ]  
 adhaspadam | **Or K** kṛṇve ’mum] **Or**, kṛṇemim **K** śásvatībhyaḥ] saśvatībhyaḥ **Ku**  
**V/126 Ma**, sasvatībhyaḥ **Mā**, śásvatībhyas **K** || 18 ||] ||<sup>3</sup> 10 || 18 || **Ku**, ||(*sec. m.* <sup>3</sup>)  
 18 || 1 ( *sec. m.* 10) ||(*sec. m.* <sup>3</sup>) **V/126**, || 18 || 1 || **Mā Ma**, Z 3 Z **K**

### ŚS 5.8.8

yáthendra udvācanaṃ labdhvā cakre adhaspadám |  
 kṛṇvé ’hám ádharān táthā amúñ chaśvatībhyaḥ sámābhyaḥ ||

The Or. mss. indicate with ||<sup>3</sup> (cf. my Introduction, §2.1.2.6) that they take our 9ef and 10 together as one stanza, but the sense (9ef are addressed to Indra in the second person) does not support this.

**a.** The name (?) Udvācana is unfortunately not known anywhere else in Vedic literature.

**d.** On this kind of ‘Dativ bei Zeitbegriffen’, cf. DELBRÜCK 1888: 149.

## 7.19. To the pīlu tree: for protection.

This hymn is dedicated to the tree called *pīlu*-. We may start its discussion by quoting from MAYRHOFER's treatment (EWAia II, 138f.) of this etymologically problematic word:

Name eines Baumes, wohl: *Careya arborea* ... . In AV 20,135,12 *pīlú*-n. liegt wohl keine Bezeichnung der Frucht des *p*<sup>o</sup>-Baumes vor, sondern ein von dem Baumnamen zu trennendes (oder sein Etymon enthaltendes?) Wort für 'fett'; dazu AV 18,2,48 *pīlúmatī*- (als 'fettreich') und die Augenblicksbildung MS *pīlvà*- (ĀpŚS *pīlva*-) ... . Ved. *pī-lú*- 'fett' dann gewiß zu *pīvan*- usw. (~ *pīlā*-?). — Der Baumname unbestimmter Zuweisung mag von *pīlú*- 'fett' herkunftsverschieden sein ... .<sup>90</sup>

The name *pīlu*- is attested elsewhere in Vedic, outside the present hymn, only in the following passage: PS 13.3.4 *ahijambhās carāmasi muṣkābarho gavām iva | +pīlā upa svajāṃ*<sup>91</sup> *hanma upa stambhe pṛdākvam* 'We go around crushing snakes, like a castrator of bulls: we slay the viper on the Pīlu tree, the leopard-snake on the post'. Note that this passage suggests on the one hand an association of the Pīlu tree with poison (*svaja*-!) and on the other a parallelism between this tree and a post (at least, if *stambha*- does not mean 'stem' here): was the Pīlu a tall straight tree? If so, a derivative from this *pīlu*- may be found at ŚS 18.2.48 (PS 18.67.12) *udanvātī dyáur avamā \*pīlumatīti madhyamā | tṛtīyā ha pradyáur iti yásyāṃ pitāra āsate* 'The lowest heaven [is called] Full-of-water, the middlemost is called Full-of-Pīlu, the third — where the fathers reside — is called Fore-Heaven', although HOFFMANN 1956: 7f. =

<sup>90</sup> MAYRHOFER refers i.a. to HOFFMANN 1956: 7f. = 1976: 389, and adds a reference to Tamil *pēlai-maram* 'Careya arborea', taken from EMENEAU 1959: 327 = 1988: 194f., where also Malayalam *pel(u)*, *pēla* are quoted, and a judicious evaluation of the "suspicious similarity" between the Sanskrit and South Dravidian words is formulated.

<sup>91</sup> *pīlū upa svajāṃ* **Or**, *kīlā upa sṛjāṃ* **K**. Of the two entries for derivatives from *upa-svaj* listed VWC-Vedāṅga Section, part I, 723, the one for VārŚS 3.2.2.34 (see now ed. KASHIKAR 3.2.2.35, and MānŚS 2.5.4.21) is — as VISHVA BANDHU's placement of a "?" already foretold — a ghost-word, while HirŚS 10.3.26 (erroneous for 10.3.10 [p. 1066 l. 25]) reads *mitro na ehi sumitradhā ity ūrāvāsannaṃ rājānam upasvaja upaiva grhṇīte* (with a variant °*jata u*<sup>o</sup> i.e. *upasvajata upaiva* [?] reported for 5 codices), where the word *upasvaje* is glossed *vakṣasi* by the printed Jyotsnā commentary. Otherwise, *úpa* is to my knowledge never compounded with *svaj*, so it is almost certainly not to be univerted here with *svajāṃ*, and must be a postposition governing the locative or the accusative. BHATTACHARYA makes the slight emendation *pīlū*, which can normally (*pīlu*- m.) only be a dual form: this seems contextually problematic, because with singular *svajāṃ* we expect a singular form of *pīlu*- also, and *stambhe* (*stambha*- m.) must certainly be a locative. Reconstructing a locative *pīlā* = *pīlau* (AiGr. III, §76az 152f.) is substantially supported by **K**. Regarding the sandhi, cf. my comm. on 6.20.3cd above, and AiGr. I, §274 p. 326.

1976: 389 prefers to interpret transmitted *pīlúmatī* here as ‘fettreich’, derived from a probably non-existent *pīlú-* n. meaning ‘fett’; it seems to me more attractive (cf. st. 4 below) to interpret ‘Full-of-Pīlu’ as referring to *pīlu*-trees as cosmic props. HOFFMANN does not remark on the accentuation of the mss., which point to *pīlúmatī-* (with a variant *pīlumatī* reported by WHITNEY for two padapāṭha mss., and a variant *pītumatī* in one Saṁhitā ms. — no variants reported by ŚPP): as has been pointed out in AiGr. II/2, §697 p. 866 and §709a p. 883, this is an impossible reading. Because the mss. for ŚS 20.135.12c (discussed below) suggest the simplex is barytone, I prefer to emend *pīlu-matī* rather than *pīlu-māti*, which latter would require the existence of an oxytone simplex.

To be separated from our *pīlu-* is the word *pīlvà-* found at MS 2.7.12:92.15f. (ĀpŚS 16.18.6): *uṣṭārayoḥ pīlvàyor átho ābandhanīyayoḥ | sárveṣāṃ vidma vo nāma vāhāḥ kīlāpeśasaḥ* ‘Of the two camels, of the two *pīlvàs*, and of the two [animals] to be bound on, of all of you we know the name, o draught animals ornamented with *kīlāla*’. Following EWAia I, 237 (“Wohl . . . nicht von *úṣṭra-* zu trennen”), I take *uṣṭāra-* to mean the same as *úṣṭra-*, a word with Iranian connections whose meaning was settled by HOFFMANN 1940: 142–146 = 1975: 9–13 (compare with the MS/ĀpŚS mantra under discussion ŚS 20.127.2a *trīny úṣṭrasya nāmāni*). The form *pīlvà-*, then, had been explained by HOFFMANN 1956: 7f. = 1976: 389 as a metrically conditioned nonce formation based on *pīlú-*, after the model of the thematized form *uṣṭāra-*: *uṣṭārayoḥ pīlvàyoḥ* for \**uṣṭróḥ pīlvòḥ* (from \**uṣṭārau pīlú*). HOFFMANN’s explanation was quoted approvingly by SHARMA 1959/60: 195. It must now be judged in the light of PS 20.25.9 [PSK 20.24.9] *ime ye anasi yuktā uṣṭārā uta pīlvāḥ | teṣāṃ sam agrabhaṃ padaḥ sam īrmān sam u sakthyāḥ* ‘These camels and the *pīlvàs* that are yoked to the cart: I have taken hold of their feet, of [their] fore-feet, and of [their] thighs’. The word *pīlvà-* thus clearly is more than just a nonce-formation in the strict sense of that term, but its precise meaning remains uncertain. Without suggesting a translation, HOFFMANN (*ibid.*) connected it with a neuter word *pīlú-* he thought to be attested at ŚS 20.135.12 (ŚāṅkhŚS 12.16.5, RVKh 5.21.2), where I, however, read as follows: *tvám indra kapótāya + chinnāpakṣāya vāñcate | + śyāmākāṃ pakvāṃ + pīlu ca vār asmā + akṛṇor + bahú*.<sup>92</sup> In adopting

<sup>92</sup> The transmission of the Kuntāpa hymns of ŚS 20 is notoriously corrupt (cf. WHITNEY 1856: 418 n. \* and 1881: 2; BLOOMFIELD 1899: 96; HOFFMANN 1940: 139, 145 = 1975: 6, 12). I have followed <sup>1</sup>R-W in correcting the accentuation of transmitted *chinnapakṣāya* and *śyāmākāṃ*, and have further omitted the transmitted accent on *akṛṇor*, because this verb form stands in a main clause. The ŚS mss. all point to *pīḍu ca* (note the place of the accent), which <sup>1</sup>R-W and ŚPP emend *pīlú ca*. RVKh has the nonsensical reading *viruja* for ŚāṅkhŚS *pīlu ca*: three of HILLEBRANDT’s mss. of ŚāṅkhŚS [“C E (orig.) G (orig.)”] read *pīlu ja* (see HILLEBRANDT 1888: 239f. and 260), the rest — as far as I can interpret the indications in his negative apparatus [A B C D Bs] — presumably *pīlu ca* as edited. In the light of this evidence, I accept the restoration of the *l*, but the <sup>1</sup>R-W emendation of the accent to *pīlú*

the emendation *pīlu*, we can cancel the single attestation of *pīlú-* n. (given the etymologizing gloss ‘fett’ by HOFFMANN), and we find in this last passage a reference to the Pīlu tree’s fruit, a neuter word derived from *pīlu-* m. without further suffixation (cf. Aṣṭādhyāyī 4.3.163 *phale luk*, but also the next sūtras, 4.3.164ff.). I translate: ‘You, o Indra, provided for the staggering pigeon whose wings were clipped much ripe millet (cf. BhārŚS 6.18.1 *śyāmākeṣu pakveṣu*) and *pīlu*-fruit, [and you provided] water for it’.

MS/ĀpŚS PS *pīlvà-* may rather be compared with classical Sanskrit *pīlu-* ‘elephant’: despite the fact that MAYRHOFER relegates this word to the “Jüngere Sprache” (EWAia III, 326), he wrote in KEWA II, 296 that the word — attested already in ancient near eastern languages<sup>93</sup> — belongs “zu einer Handelswortspitze weiter Verbreitung, deren nicht sicher geklärter Ursprung möglicherweise in Indien zu suchen ist”. I am convinced that our *pīlvà-* is somehow connected with classical Sanskrit *pīlu-* ‘elephant’ and Akkadian *pīru/pīlu* ‘*id.*’, hence probably another word with western connections next to *uṣtra-/uṣṭāra-*. The likelihood that the word also meant ‘elephant’ in Vedic is heightened by the striking collocation VSM 24.28–29 / VSK 26.6.3–4 *tvāṣṭra uṣṭrān || prajāpataye pūruṣān hastīna ā labhate* ‘For Tvaṣṭar camels, for Prajāpati he slaughters male elephants’ (the same words but not collocated at MS 3.14.8+10).

There is an Apsaras called *pīlā-*, whose name is attested at ŚS 4.37.3 (PS 12.7.3) *nadīm yantv apsarāso ’pām tārām avaśvasām | gulgulūḥ pīlā nalady āukṣāgandhiḥ pramandanī | tāt páretāpsarasaḥ prátibuddhā abhūtana* ‘Let the Apsarases go to the stream, to the loud (?) down-blowing of the waters: Guggulū, Pīlā, Naladī, Āukṣagandhi, Pramandanī: so go away, ye Apsarases; ye have been recognized’ (cf. some parallel passages cited in my introduction to 7.10 above). The quoted translation is that of WHITNEY, who comments: “Pādas **c** and **d** appear to be made up of names of Apsarases, all formed upon odor-names: *guggulū* is fem. to *gúggulu* ‘bdellium,’ and *naladī* to *nálada* ‘nard’; and *āukṣāgandhi* means something like ‘ox-smell’”: on *naladī-* cf. further BRUCKER 1975: 133f.; on *aukṣāgandhi-*, see KIEHNLE 1979: 188f. (with note 2) and GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY 1999: 481; BLOOMFIELD (1897: 410) connected *pramandanī-* with the word *pramanda-* known from the KauśS, where he took it to be a plant name (cf. BLOOMFIELD 1889: lii), and the PS reading (12.7.3d) *pramandinī* confirms the connection with that word, whose mean-

---

seems baseless, because there is no other evidence concerning the original place of the accent of *pīlu-* (as discussed above, ŚS 18.2.48 *pīlúmatī* must be corrupt). The text of ŚS as edited by ŚPP reads *bahūḥ*, and so do all the mss. of ŚāṅkhŚS that were available to HILLEBRANDT (1888: 260). Following the edition <sup>1</sup>R-W (and HILLEBRANDT), I make the slight correction to the neuter form that is found also in ṚVKh.

<sup>93</sup> Frans van Koppen informs me that the word *pīru*, more rarely *pīlu*, is attested in Akkadian from the middle of the second millennium BCE onwards. Due to my insufficient knowledge of Italian, I was not able to consult the long study VALLINI 1979.

ing however has been disputed by CALAND (1900: 15 n. 11), who suggested it means “eine gewisse zum Salben verwendete Substanz” (p. 182) — cf. now PS 1.55.3 *pramandana-* ‘ointment’. Perhaps *aukṣāgandhi-* and *pramandanī-* are hence to be taken together (‘the Aukṣagandhi used as lotion’), but the other Apsaras names here are derived from known plant names, and I hence conclude that Pīlā may have been the Apsaras dwelling in the Pīlu tree, and that *pīlā-* probably also denoted a fragrant substance.

On the basis of the Vedic evidence quoted above, and the contents of the hymn 7.19 that follows, we may summarize that *pīlu-* was a tree whose fruits contain poisonous pits (stanza 3, cf. the association with the viper at PS 13.3.4 quoted above), that probably grew straight and tall (st. 4), was used in protective magic as a kind of amulet or talisman to be bound on (st. 10), and yielded the raw material for a fragrance. According to MEULENBELD 1974: 575, Sanskrit *pīlu-* can denote not only *Careya arborea* Roxb. but also (in the first place) *Salvadora persica* Linn. P.V. SHARMA 1979: 63 identifies *pīlu-* as the latter, which he describes as “a shrub or a small tree with short twisted trunk” (similarly WATT 1889–96/VI pt. II, p. 449, adding that “[i]t is said to be administered in Sind with good effect in cases of snake-bite”), while *Careya arborea* is described by WATT 1889–96/II: 157 as “a large deciduous tree” whose seeds, moreover, “are said to be more or less poisonous”.

When I concluded the treatment of this hymn in 2003, it seemed to me that the modern use of *Salvadora persica* against snake-poison is unlikely to be significant, and that *Careya arborea* could be the proper identification of the Vedic tree name. In a very recent publication, MEULENBELD (2007–08) tries to discredit both mentioned identifications, and investigates an alternative, namely to identify the Vedic Pīlu with *Strychnos nux-vomica* Linn., without however reaching a definitive conclusion.

References to *pīlu-* in later literature are quite common, and have been discussed in MEULENBELD’s recent study. I mention here only Arthaśāstra 13.1.16 *pīluwikhādanena karakayoṣṭrayā gardabhīkṣīrābhīmanthaneneti dhruvopakāriṇaḥ* ‘[He should stir up] those who constantly oblige, by the eating of the *pīlu*-fruit, the hail, the female camel and churning of the she-donkey’s milk’: the rather obscure passage is quoted with the dubious translation by KANGLE who adds the equally dubious comment (1972: 476) that “*pīlu* is a kind of fruit which apparently provides no nourishment, but is only a source of trouble”. Does the collocation with *uṣṭrā-* not rather suggest we have the ‘elephant’ word here once again? Elsewhere in the same text we do find the use of a ball (*piṇḍa-*) of the soot of *pīlu*-bark, and use of an amulet (*maṇi-*) of *pīlu-* is further enjoined by Kauṭilya in occult practices at 14.2.22–24 and 34. Cf. also *pīluka-* used in the preparation of blinding eye-salve and water-contaminator at 14.1.15, of a stupefying preparation at 14.1.17, and of a cholera inducing mixture at 14.2.23. Perhaps the indication in Surapāla’s Vṛkṣāyurveda verse 323 (DAS 1988: 419f.) that Pīlus presage good health (*ārogya-*) can be connected with the use of *pīlu-* in the present hymn.

The hymn is linked with 7.18 through clear phraseological concatenation, especially noteworthy being the word *medin-* in stanzas 1, 7 (cf. 7.18.4, 9) and the name *śakra-* in 6 (cf. 7.18.9). The fondness of its author for the turn of phrase *āhuh* is quite striking: the same usage is found above in 7.5.9b, in another amulet-hymn.

**7.19.1** Only PS ◊ **a**: AB 7.17.3, ŚāṅkhŚS 15.24 ◊ **cd**: ≈ 7cd ◊ **d**: 7d below, PS 2.25.5d, 19.32.1b, 3b; ŚS 6.129.1b

āṅgirasō janmanāsi	(8)
tam u tvāhur vanaspate	(8)
sa pīlo rakṣo bādhasva	(8)
sākam indreṇa medinā	(8)

You are an Āṅgiras-descendant by birth, and so they call you, o tree. So, o Pīlu, together with Indra as ally, drive [away] the evil spirit.

āṅgirasō] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**], āṅga(*sec. m.* → i)raso **V/126**, aṅgirasō **K** tvāhur] **Or**, hāhur **K**  
vanaspate |] **Or**, vanaspatim [*om.* ||] **K** sa] **Or**, sva **K** medinā] **Or**, medhinā **K**

**a.** These words are identical with the words addressed to Śunaḥṣepa by Aḷigarta Sauyavasi at AB 7.17.3, ŚāṅkhŚS 15.24. See my commentary on 6a below. On the significance of the use of the word *āṅgiras-* to denote objects/plants used in magical practice, see BLOOMFIELD 1896c: 182 and, more elaborately, 1897: xviii f., xxii (and in PS, e.g. PS 3.22.1–2, 5.30.9, 16.13.8).

**b.** Cf. 6b and 9b below. I follow BHATTACHARYA, and read *vanaspate* with **Or**, assuming that **K** *vanaspatim* is due to the reading of stanza 9.

**d.** Cf. my commentary on 6.9.3b and 7.18.4d+9d above.

**7.19.2** Only PS

apa rakṣāṃsi bādhasva	(8)
bādhasva +parirāpiṇaḥ	(8)
piśācān pīlo kravyādo	(8)
bādhasva mūradevinaḥ	(8)

Drive away the evil spirits, drive [away] the calumnious ones, drive [away], o Pīlu, the Piśācas that eat bloody flesh, the Mūradevins.

+parirāpiṇaḥ |] parirāviṇaḥ | **Or**, parirapṛṇa | **K** piśācān pīlo] *thus Or* [°n, p°] **K**  
kravyādo] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, kravyā·do **V/126** mūradevinaḥ] mūradevinaḥ] **Or**, pūradevinaḥ] **K** ||] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**] **K**, | **Mā**

**b.** Cf. my discussion of the word *parirāpīṇ-* under 7.9.2b, where the mss. (**Or** and **K**) show nearly identical errors.

**cd.** Cf. my comments on 7.11.3cd above, the only other context where *mūradevin-* is attested. The pādas are also to be compared with PS 2.62.3–4 *āśāṇ mahyaṇ \*rādhayitvendriyeṇa*<sup>94</sup> *yathāmṛtām | tvam agne kravyādaḥ*

<sup>94</sup> Cf. ZEHNDER 2004a: 61, n. 11.

*sarvān piśācāṃ arciṣā daha || prati daha yātudhānān + mūrādevān vicarṣaṇe | ye no \*durasyān*<sup>95</sup> *dveṣeṇāthāsāṃ mohayanti naḥ* ‘Having fulfilled for me with [your] power [my] wish befitting [your] immortality (?), o Agni, burn all the Piśācas, eaters of bloody flesh, with [your] beam. Lay fire, o Vicarṣaṇi, to the sorcerers, the Mūrādevas who shall malign us with hostility, [and who] then lead our wish astray’. Cf. my commentary on 6.4.11a about the frequently mentioned flesh-eating habit of Piśāca-demons. Cf. also GEIB 1975.

**7.19.3** Only PS ◊ cd: 4cd ≈ ŚS 5.7.9cd ◊ c: ŚS 5.7.9c

yayāhus +tr̥ṣṭaṃ kaṭukam	(8)
apagūḍhaṃ phale kulam	(8)
tasyai hiraṇyakeśyai	(8)
namaḥ kṛṇmo arātaye	(8)

She by whom, they say, a harsh, sharp pit is hidden away in [its] fruit, to her, the golden-haired Arāti, do we bring homage.

yayāhus +tr̥ṣṭaṃ] yayāhustuṣṭaṃ **Ku**, yayāhastuṣṭaṃ **Mā**, yayāha(*sec. m.* → uu)stuṣṭaṃ **V/126** [[note two vowel diacritics u], yayāhustuṣṭaṃ **Ma**, athāhustuṣṭaṃ **K** apagūḍhaṃ phale] a{va}pagūḥṛhaṃ phale **Ku**, apagūḥṛhaṃ phale **V/126** **Mā** [**Ma**], avagūḍhaṃ pale **K** kulam |] kulam | **Ku** [**Ma**], kuḷam | **Mā** **V/126**, kuḷam [[*om.* |] **K** hiraṇyakeśyai] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, hiraṇyakeśyai **V/126**, hiraṇyakaisyai **Mā** namaḥ] **Or**, namaḥ **K** kṛṇmo] **JM RM**, kṛṇvo(→ ṇmo 4) **Ku**, kṛṇvo **V/126** **Mā** **K** arātaye] **K**, (*sec. m.* + ')rātaye **Ku**, 'rātaye **JM V/126** **Mā** **Ma**

The hymn now shifts (stanzas 3–4) to a demonic spirit (Arāti) apparently associated with the Pīlu tree. BHATTACHARYA edits *kṛṇvo*.

**ab.** The words *tr̥ṣṭá-* and *kátuka-* are found juxtaposed also at RV 10.85.34 (ŚS 14.1.29, PS 18.3.8, ĀpMP 1.17.9) *tr̥ṣṭám etát kátukam etád apāṣṭhavad viṣávan náitád áttave | sūryám yó brahmá vidyát sá íd vádhyam arhati* ‘Harsh is this, sharp is this [dress (*vāsas-*)], barbed, poisonous, it is not to be eaten. Only the priest who would know the Sūryā [hymn] is entitled to the bride’s [dress]’. While the word *kátuka-* is not attested anywhere else in older Vedic literature, *tr̥ṣṭá-* is commonly associated with poison elsewhere too: e.g. PS 9.17.10 / ŚS 5.18.3, PS 11.10.3, 15.17.6–7, 20.17.1–2 [PSK 20.16.1–2] / ŚS 7.113.1–2, PS 17.5.4 / ŚS 12.1.46. Hence, we may assume the words *tr̥ṣṭaṃ kaṭukam* to denote a poisonous object here as well, and this poisonous object must be the *kula-* hidden away by the Arāti in the Pīlu tree’s fruit.

Although such a meaning is not registered for *kula-* in any of the dictionaries, this passage alone would be enough to postulate a meaning ‘pit, stone’ for the word in question. In fact, there is another passage in the PS that rather clearly attests the same meaning. It is 9.11.7 *gandharvas te mūlam + āsīc chākhā apsarāsas tava | marīcīr āsan parṇāni sinīvālī kulam tava* ‘The Gandharva was

<sup>95</sup> Cf. my commentary on 7.8.7cd above.

your root, the Apsarases your branches, the particles of light were [your] leaves, Sinivālī your *kula*’. After three other parts of the plant (Arundhatī: 9.11.10d?), it would anyhow seem most natural to assume a meaning in the same domain for the last item too, but this interpretation is made certain by ŚS 9.4.14ab / PS 16.25.5ab *gúdā āsant sinivālyāḥ sūryāyās tvācam abruvan* ‘His intestines were Sinivālī’s; they called his skin Sūryā’s’ (WHITNEY), where Sinivālī is again connected with something hidden/inside (an association that can perhaps be linked with her role in child-conception: see my comments on 6.6.7ab above).

Now, pw II, 81 does list a meaning ‘Fruchtkern’ under the lemma *kulaka-*, and refers to Carakasamhitā 6.1 [= Cikitsāsthāna 1?] for it.<sup>96</sup> Based partly on this (ghost-)word, TURNER (CDIAL 3331) postulates a proto-form *kulaka-* under which he lists several forms with identical or related meanings, all from Dardic languages:<sup>97</sup> although our *kula-* lacks the suffix, we do seem to have found in it the indirect ancestor of these Dardic words, and hence another example of an isogloss connecting Vedic with the Dardic languages (cf. BUDDRUSS 1961: 241–244). It becomes necessary to quote from the small print under the

<sup>96</sup> The Calcutta edition used by BÖHTLINGK was not available to me. The index of “plant substances” in vol. VI of the 1949 Jamnagar edition, where *kulaka-* is listed on p. 134, lists the following places: Sūtrasthāna 27.97; Vimānasthāna 8.143; Cikitsāsthāna 3.189, 17.97, 23.225, 26.156 [spurious?], 27.27, 27.34, 30.74, 30.259. None of these places seem to confirm BÖHTLINGK’s gloss (how is Ci. 3.189 *paṭolapatraṃ saphalaṃ kulakaṃ pāpacetikam* to be translated?). P.V. SHARMA (1981) everywhere leaves the word untranslated or ignored. The mentioned index indicates that the word is also attested in the Suśrutasaṃhitā, and in the Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā (where I find it at Sūtrasthāna 6.77; Cikitsāsthāna 4.21; Uttaraśthāna 38.1): at none of the word’s attestations in this last text do HILGENBERG & KIRFEL (1941) assume a meaning ‘Fruchtkern’. Jan Meulenbeld kindly refers me to Uday Chand Dutt’s *The Materia Medica of the Hindus* (revised edition, Calcutta 1922), pp. 199–200, where it is written about *Strychnos nux-vomica* Linn. (Sanskrit: *kupīlu* = *kulaka*): “The ripe fruits of the size of apples contain a bitter gelatinous pulp, within which the flat and curiously umbilicated seeds are found imbedded. *Nux vomica* seeds produce a sort of intoxication, for which they are habitually taken by some natives as an aphrodisiac. Those who do so gradually become so far accustomed to this poison that they often come to take one seed daily, which is cut into small pieces and chewed with a packet of betel leaf”. Meulenbeld informs me that the identification of the Sanskrit names is based on Bhāvaprakāśanighaṇṭu, Anekārthanāmavarga, *dvyyarthāni nāmāni*: *kulaka* = (1) *paṭola*, (2) *kupīlu*, but that Aruṇadatta and Hemādri give yet another identification in their commentaries on Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā, Sūtrasthāna 6.77: *kulaka* = *kākatinduka*, mostly identified as a *Diospyros* (*D. montana* Roxb., *D. melanoxylon* Roxb., *D. exsculpta* Buch.-Ham. = *D. tomentosa* Roxb.). The source of BÖHTLINGK’s gloss remains a mystery.

<sup>97</sup> To the layman’s eye, the forms listed by TURNER do not seem to show a trace of the *-ka-* suffix. Georg Buddruss kindly informs me, however, in a letter dated 18.9.2003: “Shina *kūlo* (so zu schreiben!), geht eindeutig auf *kulaka* zurück, da *-aka* → Shina unbetontes *-o*. Skt. *kula* hätte *kul* ergeben, nicht *kūlo*”.

lemma *kūla-* (“n. Speisegemeinschaft d.i. Kreis der Blutsverwandten ...”) in EWAia I, 373:

Für RV 1,161,1 *mahākūla-* (vom Becher, *camasá-*, gesagt) ist ‘eine große Höhlung habend die natürlichste Übersetzung (...<sup>98</sup>). Liegt hier ein *\*kūla-*<sup>2</sup> (~ nhd. *hohl*, got. *us-hulon* ‘aushöhlen’) vor (mit Pāṇ[ini 5.4.62] *niṣkūlākar* ‘auskernen’, Hoffm[ann] a.a.O.), oder geht *kūla-* ‘\*Haus’ auf *\*kūla-* ‘Höhlung’ zurück (...; s. auch *kūlāla-*)? Die ir. ~ idg. Wörter für ‘Verwandtschaft’ u.dgl. müßten dann fernbleiben.

The evidence suggests that the basic meaning of *kūla-* was ‘core, center’, which developed in rather different semantic directions: ‘core of a fruit, i.e. pit’, ‘center of an object, i.e. hole’ and — if this is not a separate etymon — ‘center of social activities, i.e. family’.

As to the first meaning, it cannot, I believe, in view of the striking phonetic resemblance to the words of the present pāda, be a coincidence that in later Sanskrit (lexicographical [Amarakośa 2.4.2.9, Hemacandra’s *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* 1142] and commentarial) literature, a synonym of the *pīlu-* is *gūḍaphala-* ‘having a globular fruit’, which, according to PW II, 777, appears also as *gūdhaphala-* ‘having a hidden fruit’ in the Rājanighaṇṭu, as a gloss of *badara-* (another plant: *Ziziphus mauritiana* Lam. = *Z. jujuba* Lam.). The authors of PW thought that the former is “die richtige Form”.

cd. Regarding the epithet *hiraṇyakeśī-*, see my commentary on the next stanza. Cf. my commentary on 6.23.1cd above, about the frequent spelling *kṛṇvo* for *kṛṇmo* in **K**, that is here also found in several Or. mss., notably those on which BHATTACHARYA had to rely for his edition.

#### 7.19.4 ≈ ŚS 5.7.9

yā mahatī mahonmānā	(8)
sarvā āśā vyānaśe	(8)
tasyai hiraṇyakeśyai	(8)
namaḥ kṛṇmo arātaye	(8)

She the great one, of great height, who has pervaded all spaces, to her, the golden haired Arāti, do we bring homage.

mahatī mahonmānā] **Or**, sahatī mahormānā **K** sarvā āśā] **Or**, sarvāsā **K** |] **Or**, *om.*  
**K** hiraṇyakeśyai] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, hiraṇyakeśyai **V/126**, hiraṇyakesyai **Mā** namaḥ] **Or**,  
 namas **K** [[*note* °s k°]] kṛṇmo] **JM RM**, kṛṇvo(→ ṇmo) **Ku**, kṛṇvo **V/126 Mā** [**Ma**]  
**K** arātaye] **K**, (*sec. m.* + ’)rātaye **Ku**, ’rātaye **V/126 Mā Ma** ||] **Ku V/126 K**, |  
**Mā Ma**

#### ŚS 5.7.9

yā mahatī mahónmānā víśvā āśā vyānaśe |  
 tāsyaī hiraṇyakeśyaī nírṛtyā akaraṃ námaḥ ||

<sup>98</sup> MAYRHOFER here refers to HOFFMANN 1952/56: 57f. = 1976: 352f.

BHATTACHARYA edits *kṛṇvo*.

**ab.** These pādas seem to offer the most natural explanation for the name \**pīlumati-* given to the middle heaven in ŚS 18.2.48 (PS 18.67.12), quoted and discussed above. For the idea, cf. also RV 9.86.15 *só asya viśé máhi śárma yachati yó asya dhāma prathamám vyānaśé | padám yád asya paramé vyòmany áto viśvā abhí sám yāti samyátaḥ* ‘He (Soma) affords great protection to the clan of him who has reached his first abode. That station which is his in the highest heaven, from there he speeds toward all encounters’. While *sárvā áśāḥ* in this version of the stanza has only few parallels (PS 3.35.6d = ŚS 19.15.6d, VSM 18.34d / MS 2.12.1:144.11 / KS 18.13:274.17d, ŚBM 9.2.3.25 / 14.2.2.16 glossing VSM 17.66c / 14.2.2.16 *viśvā áśāḥ . . .*), *viśvā áśāḥ* of the ŚS has many more parallels, of which I mention here only PS 1.74.4c, referring for the other attestations to BLOOMFIELD 1906: 882.

**c.** The epithet *hiraṇyakeśī-* is found elsewhere only at KāṭhGS 54.5 *sthūnāyāṃ dhruvāyāṃ śriyai hiraṇyakeśyai vanaspatibhyaś ceti* ‘[He offers] at the post, in the center, with “To golden-haired Śrī” and “To the trees”’, and — euphemistically as here — of the same Arāti in two stanzas from ŚS 5.7, the hymn parallel to PS 7.9 above (where these two ŚS stanzas find no parallel): these two stanzas are 5.7.9 (quoted just above) and 10 *hiraṇyavarṇā subhágā hiraṇyakaśipur mahí | tásyai hiraṇyadrāpayé ’rātyā akaraṃ námaḥ* ‘Gold-colored, fortunate, gold-cushioned, great — to her, the golden-mantled, to the niggard have I paid homage’ (WHITNEY).

### 7.19.5 Only PS

yas te yoniṃ pratiredḥy	(8)
āṇḍādo garbhādūṣaṇaḥ	(8)
arāyaṃ putraṃ *prāpī yas	(8)
taṃ pīluḥ sahatām itaḥ	(8)

The egg-eating, fetus-spoiling Arāya that licks at your womb, that reaches [your] son, let the Pīlu defeat it from here.

|| Or, om. K [note °ḥ r°] arāyaṃ Or, rāyaṃ K \*prāpī yas] prāpyās Or, prāpyas K taṃ Or, tvam K pīluḥ Ku [Ma], pīluḥ V/126 Pa, pīlu Mā, pīlus K sahatām itaḥ Or, sahaḥāsītā K || Ku [Ma] K, | V/126 Mā

BHATTACHARYA edits *prāpyāstaṃ* and *sahatāmītaḥ*.

**a.** On the significance of the Arāya demon (cf. my notes on 6.8.6a above) licking the womb of the addressee (the beneficiary of the rite which this hymn was to accompany), cf. my comments on 6.14.3a and 7.11.4b (see also 7.11.5), and 7.11.9a.

**b.** There is no need to assume with LUBOTSKY 2002: 170 that the hapax *āṇḍāda-* is a Vṛddhi derivative (‘descendant of the Egg-eater’) from *āṇḍād-*, because thematization of *-ād-* to *-adā-* is common: AiGr. II/2, §27b p. 90. The *-ād-* form from which the word in question is derived is attested at ŚS 8.6.25

(PS 16.81.6) *pīṅga rākṣa jāyamānaṃ mā pūmāṃsaṃ strīyaṃ kran | āṇḍādo gārbhān mā dabhan bādhasvetāḥ kimāḍīnaḥ* ‘Piṅgá, defend thou [the child] in process of birth; let them not make the male female; let not the egg-eaters injure the embryos; drive thou the *kimāḍíns* from here’ (WHITNEY).

c. Although BHATTACHARYA accepts the text of the Or. mss. without underlining any part of it in his edition, it cannot be correct. Note that **K** once again has *rāyam* corresponding to *arāyam* of the Or. mss. (cf. its readings *rāyam* for *arāyam* in 7.11.7c, also *rāti-* for *arāti-* 7.9.4c+5c): since omission of *a-* in such cases seems to be a habit of the scribe of **K** (or one of his predecessors), I am not inclined to take this reading seriously. As to the rest of the pāda, my conjecture requires only the rather small restoration of the *-i-* in *\*prāpī yas* (**K**: *prāpyas*, **Or**: *prāpyās*), which must then be assumed to have been syncopated already at the stage of \*G (for another case of such syncopation, cf. 7.3.6b above). On *-in-*agent nouns governing the acc., see AiGr. II/2, §217d p. 346f., and cf. DELBRÜCK 1888: 182. Examples are RV 2.14.1c *kāmí . . . pītím* and the common AV phrase (ŚS 1.34.5c, 2.30.1d, 6.8.1d, 2d, 3d; PS 2.9.2c, 2.17.1d) *yáthā máṃ kāmíny asaḥ*. It may perhaps be objected that *prāpiṅ-* is not attested in Vedic, but the formation was quite productive, and several other (near) hapaxes of the same type have already been noticed above: cf. my commentary on 6.14.2de (*gardabhanādin-*), 3a (*pramṛśyādin-* ‘eating what must be groped for’, also of a demon), 7.3.6b °*sādhin-*, 7.8.5c (*viśāhiṅ-*). Moreover, none of the other solutions that have occurred to me (*arāyam \*putraṃprāpīyasam taṃ*, *arāyaṃ \*putram \*aprāpya taṃ*, *arāyaṃ putram prāpya \*tvam*) is as economic or as plausible as the one I have adopted.

d. Cf. ŚS 8.6.7 (PS 16.79.8) *yás tvā svápne nipádyate bhrátā bhūtvá pitéva ca | bajás tánt sahatām itáḥ klībárūpāṃs tirīṭīnaḥ* ‘He who lies with thee in sleep, having become [like] a brother and like a father—they, eunuch-formed, tiara-decked, let the *bajā* force from here’ (WHITNEY) and PS 17.14.5 [PSK 17.14.7] *yāsāṃ gandho nānārūpaḥ paryeti puruṣam pathi | tā agniḥ sahatām ito jātavedāḥ sadānvāḥ* ‘They whose variegated smell surrounds a man on the road, those Sadānuvās let Agni Jātavedas defeat from here’.

### 7.19.6 Only PS

yadā pīlav āṅgīrasa	(8)
pakvo (‘)tiṣṭho vanaspate	(8)
athāhur indraṃ jajñānaṃ	(8)
śakraṃ +barjahye prati	(8)

When, o Aṅgiras-descendant Pīlu, o tree, you stood ripe, then they say that Indra, Śakra, having [just] been born, [was] at the nipples.

pīlav āṅgīrasa] **Ku Mā** [Ma], pīla-vāṅgīrasa **V/126**, pīlamaṅgisah | **K** [[note]] (‘)tiṣṭho] tiṣṭho **Or**, tiṣṭha **K** athāhur] **Or**, tadāhur **K** jajñānaṃ] **K**, yajñānaṃ **Or** śakraṃ] **Or**, śakkraṃ **K** [[Bar.: śakraṃ]] +barjahye] barjahye **Ku Mā** [Ma], barjaṃjye (*sec. m.* → jo) **V/126**, prajjahye **K**

a. Cf. 1a above.

c. Note the reading *tadāhur* in **K**: a *lectio facilior*? *yadā ... atha* is also attested at PS 8.16.8, 18.63.8–9.

d. In his article on *bārjaha-*, THIEME renders RV 1.92.4ab *ádhi péśāmsi vapate nṛtúr iváporṇute vákṣa usréva bārjaham* as follows (1994: 369): ‘Sie (die Morgenröte) wirft sich Farben über, wie eine Tänzerin [Schminken aufträgt]. Sie enthüllt ihre Brust wie eine rötliche (Kuh) ihr Euter [nackt trägt]’. Cf. also ŚS 11.8[10].14 (PS 16.86.4) *ūrú pádāv aṣṭhāvántau síro hástāv átho múkham | pṛṣṭúr barjahyè pāśvé kás tát sám adadhād ṛṣiḥ* ‘The thighs, the feet, the shanks, the head, the hands, and the face; the ribs, the nipples, the sides: which seer has put that together?’, with *barjahyà-* ‘nipple’ from *bārjaha-* ‘udder’ (THIEME’s interpretation, pp. 370f., of *barjahyà-* as ‘testicles’ fails to convince). I am not quite certain about the interpretation of this obscure stanza, but I have the impression that ‘nipple’ — which can in English too be used metaphorically — here represents a *double entendre*: just as the infant seeks after the strengthening milk at its mother’s nipples, so Indra, seeking to remove his weariness (*sedī-*, see the next stanza with imperfect referring to mythological time), was after the ripe Pīlu-fruit, which perhaps was characterized by some kind of protuberance that may have been likened to the shape of a female nipple.

7.19.7 Only PS ◊ **cd**: ≈ 7cd ◊ **d**: 1d above, PS 2.25.5d, 19.32.1b, 3b; ŚS 6.129.1b

yathā sedim abādhatāḥ	(8)
pacyamāno vanaspate	(8)
evā pīlo rakṣo bādhasva	(9)
sākam indreṇa medinā	(8)

Just as you drove [Indra’s] weariness [away], while getting ripe, o tree, so, o Pīlu, together with Indra as ally, drive [away] the evil spirit.

sedim] **Or**, sedhim **K** abādhatāḥ pacyamāno] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], abādathāpacyamāno **Mā**, apabādhatāpasyamāno **K** sākam] **Or**, sakam **K**

a. Regarding the meaning of “AV + *sedī-* f. Entkräftung”, MAYRHOFER (EWAia II, 693) refers to “AV + *sanná-* ‘niedergesetzt, versunken, erloschen, erschöpft, tot’”: cf. ŚS 6.76.4 (PS 19.15.16) *náimam ghnanti paryāyīno ná sannāñ áva gachati | agnér yáḥ kṣatríyo vidvān náma grhnāti áyuse* ‘They that go about do not slay him, he goes not down to the dead (? *sanná*)—the *kṣatríya* who, knowing, takes the name of Agni unto length of life’ (WHITNEY), PS 8.3.12 *nainam ghnanti paryāyīno na sannāñ áva gachati | jane sa na pra mīyate yas tvā bibharty añjana* ‘... , he does not perish among the people, who wears you, o collyrium’, TB 2.4.7.11 *sannān mávagāta* ‘do not descend to the dead (?)’.

The word itself is quite frequently attested, notably in opposition to *írā-* ‘refreshment’, at ŚS 4.11.10 (PS 3.25.12) *padbhīḥ sedím avakrámann írām*

*jānghābhir utkhidán | srámeṇānaḍvān kīlālaṃ kīnāśaś cābhī gachataḥ* ‘With his feet treading down debility, with his thighs extracting refreshing drink — with weariness go the draft-ox and the plowman unto sweet drink’ (WHITNEY), PS 15.2.8 (cf. MS 2.7.14:85.8f., TS 4.2.7.1 etc.) *iṣam ūrjam aham ata ādi yajñasya yonau mahiṣasya dhāman | ā no goṣu \*viśatv ā prajāyāṃ jahāmi sedim anīrām amīvām* ‘I took hence the food, nourishment, in the womb of the worship, in the abode of the buffalo. Let it enter into our cattle, into our offspring! I abandon weariness, lack of refreshment, disease’ (see also TĀ 4.23). Cf. further the connection with *kṣúdh-* ‘hunger’ at ŚS 8.8.18 / 16.30.6, TĀ 4.22 and in a mantra at KauśS 70.1, and finally ŚS 8.8.9 (PS 16.29.9) *sedīr ugrā vyṛddhir ārtiś cānapavācānā | śrámas tandrīś ca móhaś ca táir amún abhī dadhāmi sárvañ* ‘[The] ferocious [force of] weariness, failure, and affliction that is not to be exorcized, toil, and exhaustion, and confusion: with these do I cover all those men’, to be compared with PS 19.1.10 *īde agniṃ bhavaṃ sarvaṃ rakṣa + ubjad ahiṃ balāsam uta sedim ugrām | āre asmad adite daivyaṃ bhayaṃ svvīryaṃ marutaḥ śarma yachata* ‘I praise Agni, Bhava, everything which oppresses evil, the snake, balāsa, as well as [the] ferocious [force of] weariness. Far from us, o Aditi, [must be] divine danger. You, o Maruts, must afford us protection with good heroes’.

### 7.19.8 Only PS

yat piśācaiḥ puruṣasya	(8)
jagdhaṃ bhavat,y ātmanaḥ	(8)
ā pīlo pyāyate punas	(8)
tava cāśnāti pippalam	(8)

All of a man’s body that is eaten by Piśācas swells up again, o Pīlu, if he eats your berry.

piśācaiḥ] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], piśācai **Mā**, piśācaiḥ **K** puruṣasya] **K**, puṣasya **Or** ] **Or**, *om.* **K** [[*note* °ḥ ā°]] pīlo] **Ku Mā** [**Ma**] **K**, p{i}īlo **V/126** cāśnāti] **Or**, caṣṇātu **K** pippalam] **Mā** [**Ma**], pipPalam] **Ku**, pipy(*sec. m.* → pp)alam] **V/126**, pipṛlam] **K**

**abc.** Cf. 6.4.11ab above, with my comments on the Piśāca-demons as flesh-eaters.

**d.** Although the original accents of this PS mantra are not transmitted, it seems certain that we have here an example of the use of *ca* in conditional clauses with accented verb form, on which cf. DELBRÜCK 1888: 329 and 475, and HOFFMANN 1967: 216f. n. 205 (with further references). The accented verb form in this construction can be indic. or conj. (our *aśnāti* can be both), and while the conditional clause most commonly precedes the main clause, KLEIN’s discussion of all ṚV examples of the construction (1985/I: 238–251) also offers 9 cases with postposed *ca*-clause that can be compared with ours (pp. 248–251). WHITNEY (1856: 395) lists the instances of the construction that he could cull from the ŚS: 8.10.31; 11.3.28; 29, 32–49a, 55, 56; 12.4.1\*, 13\*, 16, 19\*, 25;

15.12.3. GONDA 1957c: 52 = 1975/I: 371 has added ŚS 1.17.2. Those marked with a \* have a postposed conditional clause.

The word *píppala*- normally denotes the berry of the *Ficus religiosa* specifically (THIEME 1949: 63). On the possibility that it could mean ‘berry’ generically, cf. KUIPER 1991: 61 who is of the opinion that “Turner’s suggestion that CDIAL 8208 *piplu*- ‘\*berry’ contains the same basic element as *píppal*- is attractive”, although “the meaning ‘berry’ is based on NIA evidence (Lahnda, Panjabi)” (*piplu*- has been taken to mean ‘mole, freckle’ in Vedic, based on KS 12.13:176.6 *piplukárṇa*- [of a goat]). The evidence of the present passage for this generic meaning seems undeniable.

### 7.19.9 Only PS

pīluṃ tvāhuḥ pīvaṃ tvāhur	(8)
atho tvāhur vanaspatim	(8)
sarvā te bhadrā nāmāni	(8)
tebhir naḥ pāhy aṃhasaḥ	(8)

They call you Pīlu, they call you fat, and they call you tree. All your names are auspicious: protect us from oppression, by means of them.

pīluṃ] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, pīluṃ **V/126** **Mā** tvāhuḥ pīvaṃ tvāhur] **V/126** [**Ma**], tvāhuḥ pīvaṃ{nta}tvāhur **Ku**, vāhuḥ pīvaṃ tvāhur **Mā**, tvāhuḥ pītvaḥur **K** [[note °ḥ p°]] vanaspatim |] vanaspatim | **Or** **K** te] **Or**, tve **K** nāmāni] **Or**, mā[[line]nāmāni **K** tebhir naḥ] **Ku** **V/126** [**Ma**], te(+ bhi)rnaḥ **Mā**, tebhinnaḥ **K** pāhy aṃhasaḥ] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, pā{Ha}(sec. m. → hya 3)mhasaḥ **V/126**, pātvaṃhasaḥ **Mā** ||] **Or**, om. **K** [[note °ḥ r°]]

**a.** This passage suggests that although the etymological connection with *pīvan*- ‘fat’, that EWAia II, 138f. (quoted in the introduction to this hymn) alludes to, is indeed to be rejected, *pīvan*- was at least considered to be connected with *pīlu*- in the realm of folk-etymology.

**b.** Cf. 1b above.

**c.** Cf. ṚV 1.123.12 *ásvāvatīr gómatīr vísvāvārā yátamānā raśmībhiḥ sūryasya | pārá ca yānti púnar á ca yanti bhadrā náma váhamānā uśásaḥ* ‘Possessing horses, possessing cattle, having all choice things, taking their position with the rays of the sun, they go away and come back, the dawns bearing auspicious names’.

**d.** Variants of this pāda occur i.a. as PS 1.41.4c (etc.) *punar naḥ pāhy aṃhasaḥ*, MS 4.14.17:244.9 *kṛtān naḥ pāhy áṃhasaḥ*, ṚV 1.36.14a *úrdhvó naḥ pāhy áṃhaso* . . . , ṚV 6.16.30a, 7.15.15a *tvám naḥ pāhy áṃhasaḥ*.

### 7.19.10 Only PS ◊ d: PS 4.23.1c, 11.12.1d

rakṣoḥaṇaṃ vṛtrahaṇaṃ	(8)
pīluṃ piśācajambhanaṃ	(8)
jajñānaṃ agre vṛkṣāṇāṃ	(8)

taṃ te badhnāmy āyuṣe || 19 || (8)

The evil-slaying, Vṛtra-slaying Pīlu that crushes Piśācas, that was born at the head of trees, it do I bind [on you] for the sake of your [full] lifespan.

rakṣoḥaṇaṃ vṛtrahaṇaṃ V/126 Mā [Ma], rakṣoḥaṇaṃ {·}vṛtrahaṇaṃ Ku, rakṣoḥaṇaṃ  
vṛtrahaṇaṃ K pīluṃ Ku [Ma] K, pīluṃ V/126 Mā [?] Pa piśācajambhanaṃ ]  
piśācajambhanaṃ | Ku V/126 [Ma] K, piśācajambhanaṃ | Mā jajñānam K, yajñānam  
Ku Mā Ma, y{ā}ajñānam V/126 taṃ te] Ku K, tante V/126 Mā Ma || 19 ||  
|| 10 || 19 || Ku, || 19 || 10 || (sec. m. 10) || V/126, || 19 || 10 || Mā Ma, ZZ 4 ZZ K

b. The word *piśācajambhana-* occurs elsewhere only at PS 2.46.1b, and at ŚS 5.29.14a (of *samīdh-* ‘fuel’).

c. Cf. my commentary on 7.7.1ab above.

d. On the use of *pīlu-* as an amulet that can be bound on, cf. Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra, 14.2.34. With this pāda, compare ŚS 4.10.7 (PS 4.25.7) *devānām āsthī kṛśanaṃ babhūva tād ātmanvāc caraty apsv antāḥ | tāt te badhnāmy āyuṣe vārcase bālāya dīrghāyutvāya śatāśārādāya kārśanās tvābhī rakṣatu* ‘The gods’ bone became pearl; that goes about within the waters, possessing soul; that do I bind on thee in order to life-time, splendor, strength, to length of life for a hundred autumns: let [the amulet] of pearl defend thee’ (WHITNEY). Cf. also PS 1.83.1, 11.12.1 (ŚS 19.32.1), 11.13.4.

## 7.20. To the wind as enemy-slayer.

The whole hymn must probably be interpreted as employing various ‘Names of the Wind’: cf. the so-called Vātanāmāni listed at TĀ 4.9.1 (≈ VSM 38.7, with brāhmaṇa at ŚBM 14.2.2.1ff.) *samudrāya tvā vātāya svāhā* | *salilāya tvā vātāya svāhā* | *anādhṛṣyāya tvā vātāya svāhā* | *apratidhṛṣyāya tvā vātāya svāhā* | *avasyāve tvā vātāya svāhā* | *dúvasvate tvā vātāya svāhā* | *śimidvate tvā vātāya svāhā* ‘You to the ocean (of air or atmospheric waters), to the Wind, *svāhā!* You to what is waving, to the Wind, *svāhā!* You to the unassailable, to the Wind, *svāhā!* You to the irresistible, to the Wind, *svāhā!* You to him who desires to help, to the Wind, *svāhā!* You to the favourable, to the Wind, *svāhā!* You to Śimidvat, to the Wind, *svāhā!*’ (HOUBEN 1991: 122 n. 103). Cf. BaudhŚS 9.10:279.4f., ĀpŚS 15.10.8 etc. (5 names from TĀ 4.9.1); BaudhŚS 10.54:57.5ff., ĀpŚS 17.20.11 etc. (3 names: TS 4.7.12.3 *samudrò ’si nābhasvān ādrádānuḥ śambhūr mayobhūr abhí mā vāhi svāhā mārutò ’si marútāṃ gaṇāḥ śambhūr mayobhūr abhí mā vāhi svāhāvasyúr asi dúvasvān chambhūr mayobhūr abhí mā vāhi svāhā*); BaudhŚS 13.38:146.11, ĀpŚS 19.26.1 (and 19.27.14) etc. (8 names: TS 2.4.7.1, MS 2.4.7:44.1–5, KS 11.9:11–14 — CALAND 1908: 130f.: “der Text dieser Formeln ist aber in allen uns bekannten Rezensionen zu verdorben um sie zu übersetzen”).

Just as in previous hymns (14, 16–17) in this kāṇḍa, it seems that we have here an extended variation on mantra-collections also known, in somewhat different (shorter) form, from other Vedic texts. In the case of the mentioned preceding hymns, I was able to demonstrate the likelihood of their application in Kāmyeṣṭis on the basis of parallel mantras used in such contexts available in other collections. The evidence is somewhat weaker here, because no closely corresponding material is available elsewhere, but we may perhaps suggest that just as BaudhŚS 13.38:146.11, ĀpŚS 19.26.1 (and 19.27.14) etc. enjoin the use of mantras containing certain Vātanāmāni in the Kārīṛiṣṭi (aimed at producing rain, see CALAND 1908: 129–134), the purpose of the invocation of the wind under various names in our hymn may also have been to bring about rain. The word *śatruháṇ-*, which I do not find used as epithet of the wind at any other place, admittedly might seem to indicate a different ritual application. The placement of the hymn here in the kāṇḍa, rather than next to the other Kāmyeṣṭi hymns, in any case remains unexplained.

The mentioned parallels, where *samudrá-* is among the first names to be employed, show that it is **K** that has misplaced the third item (*samudrāya*) towards the end.

### 7.20.1 Only PS

sagarāya śatruhaṇe svāhā ||

(P)

To the sea, the one that slays enemies, hail!

śatruhaṇe] **Ku V/126** [Ma], śatṛḥaṇe Mā, śatruhaṇe **K** ||] Mā [Ma] **K**, ||<sup>1</sup> **Ku**, | **V/126**

On *sāgara-* ‘sea’ (RV 10.89.4) as name of the wind, cf. ĀpMP 2.17.21. The word seems to denote a deity also at VādhŚS 4.2.3.36 [ed. CHAUBEY 4.7.53] *malimlucāya svāhā saḡarāya svāhā gaṇaśṛiyai svāhābhīhva svāhā*.

### 7.20.2 Only PS

śarṇīlāya śatruhaṇe svāhā || (P)

To the water, the one that slays enemies, hail!

śarṇīlāya] śarṇīlāya **Or**, śaramṇīlāya **K** śatruhaṇe ] **Ku V/126** [Ma], śatṛḥaṇe Mā, śatruhaṇe **K** ||] **Or**, (+ |) **K**

Nighaṇṭu 1.12 (~ AVParīś 48.75.28) lists *sārṇīka-* as one of the Udakanāmāni. Cf. TS 4.4.6.2 *salilāya tvā sārṇīkāya*<sup>99</sup> *tvā sātīkāya tvā kētāya tvā prācetase tvā vīvasvate tvā divās tvā jyōtiṣa ādityēbhyaḥ tvā* ‘To the ocean thee, to water thee, to the watery thee, to impulse thee, to the wise thee, to the radiant thee, to the light of the sky thee, to the Ādityas thee’ (KEITH). I am convinced that our *śarṇīla-* must be connected with this *sārṇīka-*; the word can also not be separated from *kasarṇīra-/kasarṇīla-*, that we find at TS 1.5.4.1 *sarpā vāi jīryanto ’manyanta sā etām kasarṇīrah kādraveyō māntram apaśyat tāto vāi té jīṛṇās tanūr āpāghnata* ‘The serpents thought that they were growing worn out; Kasarṇīra Kādraveya beheld this mantra; then did they strike off their worn-out skins’ (KEITH), and in two AV passages: ŚS 10.4.5 (PS 16.15.5) *paidvō hanti kasarṇīlaṃ paidvāh svitrām utāsītām | paidvō ratharvyāh śīrah sām bibheda pṛdākvāh* ‘Paidva slays the *kasarṇīla* (snake), Paidva the whitish and the black; Paidva hath split altogether the head of the *ratharvī*, of the *pṛdākū*’ (WHITNEY) and 10.4.17 (16.16.7) *īndro mé ’him arandhayat pṛdākum ca pṛdākvām | svajāṃ tīraścīrājīm kasarṇīlaṃ dāsonasim* ‘Indra hath put the snake in my power, the *pṛdāku* and the she-*pṛdākū*, the constrictor, the cross-lined one, the *kasarṇīla* the *dāsonasi*’ (WHITNEY).<sup>100</sup> In these last three passages, the words with *ka-* prefix denote snakes (*āhi-*): the folkloristic association of snakes with water is well known, e.g. from the Vedic figure Ahi budhnya (cf. HILLEBRANDT 1929: 305f. and the passages collected by him p. 305 n. 2). Cf. also VOGEL 1926, index *s.vv.* ‘Springs or Fountains’, ‘Water-well’.

The pair *sārṇīla-/sārṇīka-* :: *kasarṇīra-/kasarṇīla-* may perhaps be compared with the pair *sṛbinda-* :: *kusur(u)bīnda-* pointed out by KUIPER 1991: 40 (cf. also pp. 42 and 82). Both pairs seem to show double prefixing. May we

<sup>99</sup> MS 2.8.13:117.4 reads *sṛdīkāya*. On both words, cf. SHARMA 1959/60: 318.

<sup>100</sup> SŪRYA KĀNTA’S *versio amplior* of the AthPrāt (1939: 151) quotes the word in the form *kasannīlam* under rule 217a/3.22. The PS mss. consulted by me show the following readings: 16.15.5 *kasannīlaṃ Ku3 Ji1*, *kasarṇīlaṃ JM*, *kvaśarṇīlaṃ K* — 16.16.7 *kasarṇīlān Ku3 JM Ji1*, *kuśīnnīlaṃ K*. We may reconstruct *kasarṇīla-* as the authentic PS form of the word.

compare the Dravidian words for ‘water’, viz. Tamil etc. *nīr* (DEDR 3690a)? The similarity of form — assuming that TS/Nighaṇṭu *sārṇāka-* (with *-ka-*) is secondary — and meaning is striking, but the prefixing morphology precludes a direct borrowing from (Proto-)Dravidian.

### 7.20.3 Only PS

samudrāya śatruhaṇe svāhā || (P)

To the ocean, the one that slays enemies, hail!

this is 8 in **K** • śatruhaṇe] **Ku V/126** [Ma], śatṛhaṇe **Mā**, śatruhaṇe **K**

Cf. the brāhmaṇa on TS 4.7.12.3 (~ MS 3.4.3:48.11f.) quoted in the introduction to this hymn: TS 5.4.9.4 *samudrò 'si nābhasvān ity āha | etād vāi vātasya rūpām | rūpēṇaivā vātam āva runddhe* ‘‘Thou art the ocean, full of mist’, he says; that is the form of the wind; verily by the form he wins the wind’ (KEITH).

### 7.20.4 Only PS

sandhasāya śatruhaṇe svāhā || (P)

To the *sandhasa*, the one that slays enemies, hail!

this is 3 in **K** • sandhasāya] **Or**, sadamsāya **K** śatruhaṇe] **Ku V/126** [Ma], śatṛhaṇe **Mā**, śatruhaṇe **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *sandhasāya*. With common fluctuation *d/dh* and misplacement of the anusvāra, the **K** reading seems to represent underlyingly the same *sandhasāya* that we find in the Or. mss. The word is even more obscure than *śarṇāla-* in 2. If we would like to take the liberty to consider the element *saṇ°* a perseveration from *samudrāya* in the preceding mantra, and do not mind turning a blind eye to several other problems, we may perhaps compare MS 3.12.12:164.1–4 / KS 40.4:138.1f., where among dedications to large bodies of water we find *dharnasāya svāhā* (on *dharnasā-*, see AiGr. II/2, §136 p. 237).

### 7.20.5 Only PS

iṣirāya śatruhaṇe svāhā || (P)

To the impetuous one that slays enemies, hail!

this is 4 in **K** • iṣirāya] **Ku V/126** [Ma] **K**, iṣirāya **Mā** śatruhaṇe] **Ku V/126** [Ma], śatṛhaṇe **Mā**, śatruhaṇe **K**

Regarding the meaning of the word *iṣirā-*, see my note under 6.2.9ab above. On its use as epithet of the wind, cf. GONDA 1959a: 210, 251; also JB 3.227.3.

### 7.20.6 Only PS

avasyave śatruhaṇe svāhā || (P)

To the one desiring to help, the one that slays enemies, hail!

this is 5 in **K** • avasyave] **K**, avasyave **Or** śatruhaṇe] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], śatṛḥaṇe **Mā**, śatruhaṇe **K**

### 7.20.7 Only PS

vāyave śatruhaṇe svāhā || (P)

To Vāyu, the one that slays enemies, hail!

this is 6 in **K** • śatruhaṇe] **V/126** [**Ma**], śatṛḥaṇe **Ku**, śatṛḥaṇe **Mā**, śatruhaṇe **K**

### 7.20.8 Only PS

vātāya śatruhaṇe svāhā || (P)

To the wind, the one that slays enemies, hail!

this is 7 in **K** • śatruhaṇe] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], śatṛḥaṇe **Mā**, śatruhaṇe **K**

### 7.20.9 Only PS

mātariśvane śatruhaṇe svāhā || (P)

To Mātariśvan, the one that slays enemies, hail!

mātariśvane] **Ku** [**Ma**] **K**, mātari[*folio*](+ śvane) **V/126**, mātariś{e}ane **Mā** śatruhaṇe] **V/126** [**Ma**], śatṛḥaṇe **Ku**, śatṛḥaṇe **Mā**, śatruhaṇe **K**

### 7.20.10 Only PS

pavamānāya śatruhaṇe svāhā || 20 || *anuvāka* 4 || (P)

To the one that blows, the one that slays enemies, hail!

śatruhaṇe] **V/126** [**Ma**], śatṛḥaṇe **Ku**, śatṛḥaṇe **Mā**, śatruhaṇe **K** || 20 || *anuvāka* 4 ||] ||<sup>1</sup> 10 || 20 || a 4 || **Ku**, || 20 || 1 (sec. m. 10) || a 4 || **V/126**, || 20 || 1 || a 4 || **Mā** [**Ma**], ZZ **K**

The text of kāṇḍa 7 has here come to an end. The mss. give the following colophons.

**Ku**: *daśarccakāṇḍa*(sec. m. *ḥ*) *samāptaḥ* ||

**V/126 Mā Ma**: *daśarccakāṇḍaḥ* ||

**K**: *ZZ ity atharvaṇīkapaippalādayās śākhāyāṃ saptamaḥ kāṇḍas samāptaḥ ZZ kā 7 ZZ*

## ABBREVIATIONS

### *Texts*

ĀĀ	Aitareyāraṇyaka; ed. & transl. KEITH 1909.
ĀB	Aitareyabrāhmaṇa; ed. AUFRECHT 1879; transl. KEITH 1920.
ĀgnivGS	Āgniveśyagr̥hyasūtra; ed. RAVI VARMA 1940.
ĀpDhS	Āpastambadharmasūtra; ed. & transl. OLIVELLE 2000.
ĀpGS	Āpastambagr̥hyasūtra; ed. WINTERNITZ 1887.
ĀpMP	Āpastambamantrapāṭha; ed. WINTERNITZ 1897.
ĀpŚS	Āpastambaśrautasūtra; ed. GARBE 1882–1902; transl. CALAND 1921, 1924, 1928a.
ĀśvGS	Āśvalāyanagr̥hyasūtra; ed. & transl. STENZLER 1864–65.
ĀśvŚS	Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra; ed. VIDYĀRATNA 1864–74.
AthBSA	Atharvavedīyabr̥hatsarvānukramaṇikā; ed. Ramgopala SHASTRI 1922 and revised ed. VISHVA BANDHU 1966.
AthPrāt	Atharvaprātisākhya; ed. & transl. SŪRYA KĀNTA 1939.
AthPrāy	Atharvaprāyaścittāni; ed. VON NEGELEIN 1913–14.
AU	Aitareyopaniṣad; ed. & transl. OLIVELLE 1998.
AV	Atharvaveda; see PS and ŚS.
AVPariś	Atharvavedapariśiṣṭas; ed. BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN 1909–10.
BĀU	Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad (Kāṇva Recension); ed. & transl. OLIVELLE 1998.
BaudhDhS	Baudhāyanadharmasūtra; ed. & transl. OLIVELLE 2000.
BaudhGParibhS	Baudhāyanagr̥hyaparibhāṣāsūtra; ed. SHAMA SASTRI <sup>2</sup> 1920.
BaudhGS	Baudhāyanagr̥hyasūtra; ed. SHAMA SASTRI <sup>2</sup> 1920.
BaudhŚS	Baudhāyanaśrautasūtra; ed. CALAND 1904–1923; revised ed. with transl. KASHIKAR 2003.
BhārGS	Bhāradvājagr̥hyasūtra; ed. SALOMONS 1913.
BhārŚi	Bhāradvājaśikṣā; ed. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR & SUNDARAM AYYAR 1938.
BhārŚS	Bhāradvājaśrautasūtra; ed. & transl. KASHIKAR 1964.
Bṛhaddevatā	Ed. & transl. MACDONELL 1904; new ed. TOKUNAGA 1997.
ChU	Chāndogyopaniṣad; ed. & transl. OLIVELLE 1998.
Dār.	Dārila's Kauśikabhāṣya; ed. DIWEKAR <i>et al.</i> 1972.
GautDhS	Gautamadharmasūtra; ed. & transl. OLIVELLE 2000.
GB	Gopathabrāhmaṇa; ed. GAASTRA 1919; transl. PATYAL 1969.

- HirGS Hiranyakeśiḡrhyasūtra; ed. KIRSTE 1889.
- HirPS Hiranyakeśipitrmedhasūtra; cited after page and line nr. of CALAND's 1896 edition.
- HirŚS Hiranyakeśisrautasūtra; eds. ĀGĀŚE & MĀRŪLAKARA 1907–32.
- JaimGS Jaiminiyagrhyasūtra; ed. & transl. CALAND 1922.
- JB Jaiminiyabrāhmaṇa; eds. RAGHU VIRA & LOKESH CHANDRA 1954; on the forthcoming new edition of this text and the manuscripts available for it, see EHLERS 2000.
- JUB Jaiminiyopaniṣadbrāhmaṇa; ed. OERTEL 1894.
- KapKS Kapiṣṭhalakāṭhasaṁhitā; cited after the editions RAGHU VIRA <sup>1</sup>1932 and <sup>2</sup>1968.
- Kāśikāvṛtti Ed. VIDYĀVĀRIDHI 1997.
- KāthĀ Kāthāraṇyaka; ed. & transl. WITZEL 1974a, 2004.
- KāthGS Kāthakagrhyasūtra; ed. CALAND 1925 and ed. (as 'Laugākṣiḡrhyasūtra') with full commentary of Devapāla by KAUL SHĀSTRĪ 1928–34.
- KātyŚS Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra; ed. WEBER 1859.
- KauṣB Kauṣitakibrāhmaṇa; quoted after ed. SREEKRISHNA SARMA 1968 [and ed. LINDNER 1887].
- KauśS Kauśikasūtra; ed. BLOOMFIELD 1890.
- KenaU Kenopaniṣad; ed. FUJII 1996; ed. & transl. OLIVELLE 1998.
- Keś. Keśava's Kauśikapaddhati; ed. LIMAYE *et al.* 1982.
- KS Kāthakasāṁhitā; ed. VON SCHROEDER 1900–10.
- KS-Aśv KS 'V' (*aśvamedho nāma pañcamo granthaḥ*): see KS.
- ManB Mantrabrāhmaṇa; complete ed. (with commentaries of Guṇaviṣṇu and Sāyaṇa) BHATTACHARYYA 1958; Prapāṭhaka I: ed. & transl. STÖNNER 1901; Prapāṭhaka II: ed. & transl. JÖRGENSEN 1911.
- Mahābhārata Critical ed. SUKTHANKAR *et al.* 1927–59.
- MānGS Mānavagrhyasūtra; ed. KNAUER 1897; transl. DRESDEN 1941.
- MānŚS Mānavaśrautasūtra; ed. & transl. VAN GELDER 1961–63.
- MS Maitrāyaṇisaṁhitā; ed. VON SCHROEDER 1881–86.
- Nidānasūtra Ed. BHATNAGAR 1939.
- Nighaṇṭu Ed. LAKSHMAN SARUP 1920–27.
- Nir Nirukta; ed. LAKSHMAN SARUP 1920–27.
- PārGS Pāraskaragrhyasūtra; ed. & transl. STENZLER 1876–78.
- PB Pañcaviṁśabrāhmaṇa; ed. CHINNASWAMI ŚĀSTRĪ (& PATTĀBHIRĀMA ŚĀSTRĪ); transl. CALAND 1931.
- PS Paippalādasāṁhitā; unless further specification is given, reference is made for kāṇḍas 1, 3–4, 8–15 to the ed. BHATTACHARYYA 1997, for kāṇḍa 2 to the ed. ZEHNDER

	1999, and for kāṇḍa 5 to the ed. LUBOTSKY 2002; references to other kāṇḍas are based on my own (provisional) editions based on the mss. described in GRIFFITHS 2003a.
PSK	PS read/numbered according to the Kashmirian manuscript ( <b>K</b> ); ed. BARRET 1905–40.
Rāmāyaṇa	Critical ed. BHATT <i>et al.</i> 1960–75.
R̥gVidh	R̥gvidhāna; ed. (& transl.) BHAT 1987; transl. GONDA 1951.
RV	R̥gvedasaṃhitā; ed. AUFRECHT <sup>2</sup> 1877; transl. GELDNER 1951–57.
R̥VKh	R̥gvedakhilas; ed. SCHEFTELOWITZ 1906.
ṢaḍvB	Ṣaḍviṃśabrahmaṇa; ed. EELSINGH 1908.
ṢāṅkhĀ	Ṣāṅkhāyanāraṇyaka; ed. BHIM DEV 1980.
ṢāṅkhGS	Ṣāṅkhāyanagr̥hyasūtra; ed. SEHGAL 1960.
ṢāṅkhŚS	Ṣāṅkhāyanaśrautasūtra; ed. HILLEBRANDT 1888; transl. CALAND 1953.
ṢBK	Ṣatapathabrāhmaṇa, Kāṇva recension; ed. CALAND 1926–39.
ṢBM	Ṣatapatha Brāhmaṇa, Mādhyam̐dina recension; ed. WEBER 1855; transl. EGGELING 1882–1900.
ṢCĀ	Ṣaunakīyacaturādhyāyikā; ed. & transl. WHITNEY 1862; new ed. & transl. DESHPANDE 1997.
ṢK	Ṣāntikalpa; ed. BOLLING 1904–13.
ṢS	Ṣaunakasam̐hitā; first ed. ROTH & WHITNEY 1856 [= <sup>1</sup> R-W], revised (by LINDENAU) 1924 [= R-W]; critical edition (with padapāṭha and commentary attributed to Sāyaṇa) PANDIT 1894–98 [= ŚPP]; transl. WHITNEY 1905 [= W-L].
SVidhB	Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa; ed. BURNELL 1873.
SVJ	Sāmavedasam̐hitā, Jaiminīya recension; ed. CALAND 1907 and ed. RAGHU VIRA 1938.
SVK	Sāmavedasam̐hitā, Kauthuma recension; ed. BENFEY 1848: the text is referred to in the continuous numbering, see the first column of the table on pp. 347–362 of WHITNEY 1853; ed. with padapāṭha and various commentaries SHARMA 2000–01.
TĀ	Taittirīyāraṇyaka; ed. PHAḌAKE 1897.
TB	Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa; ed. GOḌBOLE 1898.
TS	Taittirīyasam̐hitā; ed. WEBER 1871–72; transl. KEITH 1914.
VādhAnv	Vādūlānvākhyāna; ed. CHAUBEY 2001; references are also given to the provisional numbering of the critical edition based on authentic mss. that is currently under production by Yasuke Ikari (cf. IKARI 1998).

VādhGS	Vādhūlagṛhyasūtra; reference to this unpublished text, of which an edition is under preparation by Yasuke Ikari and Mieko Kajihara, is made on the basis of transcriptions from the K1 ms. (cf. IKARI 1998) kindly provided by Ikari.
VādhŚS	Vādhūlaśrautasūtra; ed. CHAUBEY 1993; references are also given to the (provisional numbering of the) critical edition based on authentic mss. that is under production by Yasuke Ikari with his students (cf. IKARI 1998), and of which the first prapāṭhaka has been published (IKARI 1995, 1996).
VaikhGS	Vaikhānasagrhyasūtra; ed. CALAND 1927.
VaikhŚS	Vaikhānasaśrautasūtra; ed. CALAND 1941.
VaitS	Vaitānasūtra; ed. GARBE 1878; new ed. (with Somāditya's Ākṣepānuvidhi) VISHVA BANDHU 1967; transl. CALAND 1910.
VārGS	Vārāhagrhyasūtra; ed. RAGHU VIRA 1932, reprinted with transl. in ROLLAND 1971.
VārŚS	Vārāhaśrautasūtra; ed. KASHIKAR 1988 (replaces the older ed. by CALAND & RAGHU VIRA 1933).
VasDhS	Vasiṣṭhadharmasūtra; ed. & transl. OLIVELLE 2000.
ViṣṇuSm	Viṣṇusmṛti; ed. JOLLY 1881.
VSK	Vājasaneyisaṁhitā, Kāṇva recension; ed. B.R. SHARMA 1988–99.
VSM	Vājasaneyisaṁhitā, Mādhyamīna recension; ed. WEBER 1852.
YājñSm	Yājñavalkyasmṛti; ed. ACHARYA 1949

*Reference works, Miscellaneous*

AiGr.	Altindische Grammatik: WACKERNAGEL & DEBRUNNER 1896–54.
CDIAL	Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages: TURNER 1966.
DEDR	Dravidian Etymological Dictionary. Second Edition: BURROW & EMENEAU 1984.
EWAia	Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen: MAYRHOFER 1992–96 and 1997–2001.
KEWA	Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen: MAYRHOFER 1956–80.
MW	Sanskrit-English Dictionary: MONIER-WILLIAMS 1899.
<sup>1</sup> R-W	ROTH & WHITNEY 1856.

PW	Sanskrit-Wörterbuch ('Großes Petersburger Wörterbuch'): BÖHTLINGK & ROTH 1855–75.
pw	Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung ('Kleines Peters- burger Wörterbuch'): BÖHTLINGK 1879–89.
<sup>1</sup> R-W	ROTH & WHITNEY 1856.
R-W	ROTH & WHITNEY 1924.
ŚPP	PANDIT 1894–98.
Ved. Var.	Vedic Variants: BLOOMFIELD & EDGERTON 1930, 1932; BLOOMFIELD, EDGERTON & EMENEAU 1934.
VWC	Vedic Word Concordance: VISHVA BANDHU <sup>(2)</sup> 1973–92.
W-L	WHITNEY 1905.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

The abbreviations for journals and other series are the common ones. See also DANDEKAR 1946–2004.

Acharya, Narayan Ram

- 1949 Yājñavalkyasmṛti of Yogīśvara Yājñavalkya. With the Commentary Mitākṣarā of Vijñāneśvara, Notes, Variant Readings, etc. Bombay.

Adriaensen, R., H.T. Bakker & H. Isaacson

- 1998 The Skandapurāṇa. Volume I. Adhyāyas 1–25. Critically Edited with Prolegomena and English Synopsis. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

Āgāṣe, Kāśīnāthaśāstrī & Śaṅkaraśāstrī Mārūlakara

- 1907–32 Satyāśādhaviracitaṃ Śrautasūtram. 10 vols. Poona.

Albino, Marcos

- 1999 Vedisch *pūr* ‘füllen’. In: WZKS 43, 5–19.

Ali, Sālim & S.D. Ripley

- 1968 Handbook of the Birds of India and Pakistan. Volume 1: Divers to Hawks. Bombay: Oxford University Press.

Arnold, E. Vernon

- 1905 Vedic Metre in its Historical Development. Cambridge.

Aufrecht, Theodor

- <sup>2</sup>1877 Die Hymnen des Ṛgveda. 2 Parts. Bonn: Adolph Marcus.  
1879 Das Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. Bonn: Adolph Marcus.

Bahulkar, S.S.

- 1984 The Nakṣatralakṣaṇa and the Śāntikalpa. In: PAIOC 31st Session Jaipur 1982 (Poona: BORI), 179–184.  
1994 Medical Ritual in the Atharvaveda Tradition. Pune: Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth [Shri Balmukund Sanskrit Mahavidyalaya Research Series, No. 8].  
2002 Kauśika-Sūtra and the Śākhās of the Atharvaveda. In: G.U. Thite (ed.), Subhāṣiṇī. Dr. Saroja Bhate Felicitation Volume (Pune), 1–11.

Bailey, H.W.

- 1957 Dvārā matīnām. In: BSOAS 20, 41–59.

Balasubrahmanyam, M.D.

- 1984 *subhagamkaraṇī* in AV 6, 139, 1. In: S.D. Joshi (ed.), Amṛtadhāra. Professor R.N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume (Delhi: Ajanta Publications), 21–27.

Barret, Leroy Carr

- 1905–40 The Kashmirian Atharva Veda. Book one. JAOS 26, 197–295 — 1910: Book two. JAOS 30, 187–258 — 1912: Book three. JAOS 32, 343–390 — 1915: Book four. JAOS 35, 42–101 — 1917: Book five. JAOS 37, 257–308 — EDGERTON 1915: Book six. JAOS 34, 374–411 — 1920a: Book seven. JAOS 40, 145–169 — 1921a: Book eight. JAOS 41, 264–289 — 1922: Book nine. JAOS 42, 105–146 — 1923: Book ten. JAOS 43, 96–115 — 1924: Book eleven. JAOS 44, 258–269 — 1926a: Book twelve. JAOS 46, 34–48 — 1927: Book fourteen. JAOS 47, 238–249 — 1928: Book thirteen. JAOS 48, 36–65 — 1930a: Book fifteen. JAOS 50, 43–73 — 1936: Books sixteen and seventeen. New Haven — 1938: Book eighteen. JAOS 58, 571–614 — 1940: Books nineteen and twenty. New Haven.
- 1920b Pāippalāda and Rig Veda. In: Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield (New Haven: Yale University Press / London: Humphrey Milford – Oxford University Press), 1–18.
- 1921b Note on Pāippalāda 6.18. In: JAOS 41, 318–319.
- 1926b The Contents of the Kashmirian Atharva-Veda, Books 1–12. In: JAOS 46, 8–14.
- 1930b Two Pāippalāda Manuscripts. JAOS 50, 104–111.
- 1932 On the Making of Vedic Saṁhitās. In: Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 63, lxiv.
- 1933 Three Versions of an Atharvan Hymn. In: Jal Dastur Cursetji (ed.), Oriental Studies in Honour of Cursetji Erachji Pavry (Oxford), 26–28.
- 1934 Three Pāippalāda Fragments. In: JAOS 54, 70–74.

Barth, Auguste

- 1914 Quarante ans d'indianisme. Œuvres de Auguste Barth. Tome deuxième. Bulletins des religions de l'Inde (1889–1902). Paris: Ernest Leroux.

Benfey, Theodor

- 1848 Die Hymnen des Sāma-Veda. Leipzig.

Bergaigne, Abel

- 1878–83 La Religion Védique d'après les hymnes du Rig-Veda. 3 parts. Paris [Reprint 1963: Librairie Honoré Champion].

Bhadkamkar, R.G.

- 1942 The Nirukta of Yāska (With *Nighaṅṭu*). Edited with Durga's Commentary. Vol. II. Bombay: Department of Public Instruction.

Bhagwaddatta

- 1920 The Atharvavediya Pancha-Patalika. Lahore: D.A.V. College.

Bhat, M.S.

- 1987 Vedic Tantrism. A Study of R̥gvidhāna of Śaunaka with Text and Translation. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

- Bhatnagar, K.N.  
 1939 Nidāna-Sūtra of Patañjali. Edited with an Introduction, a fragmentary Commentary and Indices. Lahore: Meharchand Lachhmandas [Reprint Delhi 1971].
- Bhatt, G.H. *et al.*  
 1960–75 The Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa critically edited for the first time. 7 vols. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- 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.), Prajñāyoti. Prof. Dr. Gopikamohan Bhattacharya Commemoration Volume (Kurukshetra: Nirmal Book Agency), 1–7.  
 1993 A Problem in the Transcription of the Kashmir Manuscript of the Atharvaveda Paippalāda. In: JOIB 42, 101–106.  
 1995 Māmākī and the Altindische Grammatik. In: R.T. Vyas (ed.), *Śilpasamvit* Consciousness Manifest: Studies in Jaina Art and Iconography and Allied Subjects in Honour of Dr. U.P. Shah (Vadodara: Oriental Institute/Abhinav Publications), 135–136.  
 1997 The Paippalāda-Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Volume One, Consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society.  
 2001 Two difficult readings in the Paippalāda-Saṃhitā — *snuṣēyyam* and *mā vṛkṣamajyā* etc. In: JAS 43, 9–15.  
 2004 On *yāt*, *tāt*, *uttarāt* and Similar Forms. In: A. Griffiths & J.E.M. Houben (eds.), The Vedas: Texts, Language and Ritual (Proceedings of the 3rd International Vedic Workshop) (Groningen: Egbert Forsten), 181–215.  
 n.d.-1 Corrections and Additions [to BHATTACHARYA 1997]. Loose sheet, distributed by the Asiatic Society (Calcutta), pp. i–iv.  
 n.d.-2 Further additions etc. to AVP I. Loose sheet, 1 page.
- Bhattacharya, Kamaleswar  
 2001 Marginal Notes on the Paippalāda-Saṃhitā. In: MUKHERJI *et al.* 2001, 25–32.
- Bhattacharyya, Durgamohan  
 1953 A Pre-Sāyaṇa Vedic Commentator of Bengal. In: Our Heritage 1, 141–162.  
 1955a Lights on the Paippalāda Recension of the Atharvaveda. In: Our Heritage 3, 1–14.  
 1955b The Condition of Vedic Studies in Ancient and Medieval Bengal (as reflected in epigraphic records and literary references). In: Our Heritage 3, 211–220.  
 1957a A Palm-Leaf Manuscript of the Paippalādasamhitā: Announcement of a Rare Find. In: Our Heritage 5, 81–86.

- 1957b Materials for further Study of the Vaitānasūtra (Specially in its relation to the Saṃhitāvidhi, Yajñaprāyaścittasūtra and Gopatha Brāhmaṇa). In: Our Heritage 5, 13–27.
- 1958 Chāndogya-brāhmaṇa with the Commentaries of Guṇaviṣṇu and Sāyaṇa. Calcutta: Sanskrit College [Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series No. I].
- 1961 Palm-leaf Manuscript of the Paippalādasamhitā: textual importance of the new finds. In: ALB 25, 203–215.
- 1964 Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. First Kāṇḍa. Edited from original manuscripts with critical notes. Calcutta: Sanskrit College [Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series No. XXVI].
- 1968 The Fundamental Themes of the Atharvaveda (with special reference to its Paippalāda-saṃhitā). Poona: S.P. Mandali.
- 1970 Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Volume Two. Edited from original manuscripts with critical notes. Calcutta: Sanskrit College. [Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series No. LXII]
- Bhim Dev  
1980 Śāṅkhāyanāranyakam. Critically Edited. Hoshiarpur: VVRI.
- Bhise, Usha R.  
1995 The Khila-Sūktas of the Ṛgveda: A Study. Poona: BORI.
- Bisschop, Peter & Arlo Griffiths  
2003 The Pāśupata Observance (*Atharvavedaparīśiṣṭa* 40). In: IJ 46, 315–348.
- Bloch, Jules  
1921 Sanskrit *pluṣi-* “puce”. In: MSL 22, 239–241.  
1985 Recueil d’Articles de Jules Bloch, 1906–1955. Textes rassemblés par Colette Caillat. Paris [Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation Indienne, fascicule 52].
- Bloomfield, Maurice  
1886 Seven Hymns of the Atharva-Veda. In: AJPh 7, 466–488.  
1890 The Kāuṣika-Sūtra of the Atharva Veda. With Extracts from the Commentaries of Dārila and Keçava. New Haven [= JAOS 14 (1889)].  
1893 Contributions to the interpretation of the Veda. [Third Series]. In: JAOS 15, 143–188.  
1894 Contributions to the interpretation of the Veda. Sixth Series. In: ZDMG 48, 541–579.  
1896a Contributions to the interpretation of the Veda. [Fifth Series]. In: JAOS 16, 1–42.  
1896b Contributions to the interpretation of the Veda. Seventh Series. In: AJPh 17, 399–437.  
1896c The meaning of the compound *atharvāṅgirasah*, the ancient name of the fourth Veda. In: JAOS 17, 180–182.  
1897 Hymns of the Atharva-Veda. Oxford.

- 1899 The Atharva-Veda and the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa. Strassburg.  
 1902 Review of CALAND 1900. GGA 1902 No. 7, 489–514.  
 1906 A Vedic Concordance. Cambridge (Mass.).  
 1928 The Home of the Vedic Sacrifice. In: JAOS 48, 200–224.
- Bloomfield, Maurice & Franklin Edgerton  
 1930 Vedic Variants. Volume I: The Verb. Philadelphia [Reprint: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, New Delhi 1979].  
 1932 Vedic Variants. Volume II: Phonetics. Philadelphia [Reprint: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, New Delhi 1979].
- Bloomfield, Maurice, Franklin Edgerton & Murray B. Emeneau  
 1934 Vedic Variants. Volume III: Noun and Pronoun Inflection. Philadelphia [Reprint: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, New Delhi 1979].
- Bloomfield, Maurice & Richard Garbe  
 1901 The Kashmirian Atharva-Veda (School of the Pāippalādas). Reproduced by Chromatography from the Manuscript in the University Library at Tübingen. 3 parts. Baltimore.
- Bodewitz, H.W.  
 1973 Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 1–65. Translation and Commentary with a Study: Agnihotra and Prāṇagnihotra. Leiden: E.J. Brill.  
 1976 The Daily Evening and Morning Offering (*agnihotra*) according to the Brāhmaṇas. Leiden: E.J. Brill.  
 1977–78 Atharvaveda Saṃhitā 3, 12: The Building of a House. In: ABORI Diamond Jubilee Volume, 59–68.  
 1982 Ṛgveda 10, 146: The Hymn to Araṇyānī. In: K.R. Pal (ed.), D.N. Shastri Felicitation Volume (Ghaziabad: Vimal Prakashan), 3–15.  
 1985 Yama's Second Boon in the Kaṭha-Upaniṣad. In: WZKS 29, 5–26.  
 1986 Prāṇa, apāna and other prāṇa-s in Vedic Literature. In: ALB 50, 326–348.  
 1990 The Jyotiṣṭoma Ritual: Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 66–364. Leiden: E.J. Brill.  
 1991 Light, Soul and Visions in the Veda. Poona: BORI [Professor P.D. Gune Memorial Lectures, 5th Series].  
 1999a Yonder World in the Atharvaveda. In: IIJ 42, 107–120.  
 1999b Pits, Pitfalls, and the Underworld in the Veda. In: IIJ 42, 211–226.  
 2000 Classifications and Yonder World in the Veda. In: WZKS 44, 19–59.  
 2002a Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad. Translation and Commentary with an Appendix Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka IX–XI. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.  
 2002b Where and what is the *prīyāṃ dhāma* of a Vedic god? In: IIJ 45, 153–171.  
 2002c The Dark and Deep Underworld in the Veda. In: JAOS 122.2 [Special Issue in honor of Stanley Insler], 213–223.

- Böhtlingk, Otto  
 1879–89 Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung. 7 parts. St. Petersburg.  
 1887 Pāṇini's Grammatik: herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen. Leipzig.
- Böhtlingk, Otto & Rudolph Roth  
 1855–75 Sanskrit-Wörterbuch. 7 parts. St. Petersburg.
- Bolling, George Melville  
 1904–13 The Çāntikalpa of the Atharva-Veda. In: Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 35 (1904), 77–127; JAOS 33 (1913), 265–277.
- Bolling, George Melville & Julius von Negelein  
 1909–10 The Pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda. Volume 1 [all published], in 3 parts: Text and Critical Apparatus, Indices. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- Brereton, Joel Peter  
 1981 The Ṛgvedic Ādityas. New Haven: AOS.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes  
 1987 Review of RAU 1985. In: Kratylos 32, 52–57.  
 1991 Pāṇini and the Veda Reconsidered. In: M.M. Deshpande & S. Bhate (eds.), Pāṇinian Studies. Professor S. D. Joshi Felicitation Volume (Michigan), 75–121.  
 2007 Greater Magadha. Studies in the Culture of Early India. Leiden.
- Brown, W. Norman  
 1942 The Creation Myth of the Rig Veda. In: JAOS 62, 85–98.  
 1978 India and Indology. Selected Articles by W. Norman Brown. Edited by Rosane Rocher. Delhi.
- Brucker, Egon  
 1975 Ai. nālada = Nardostachys jatamansi DC. In: Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques 29, 131–138.
- Brune, Johannes  
 1909 Zur Textkritik der dem Sāmaveda mit dem achten Maṇḍala des Ṛgveda gemeinsamen Stellen. Kiel.
- Buddruss, Georg  
 1961 Der Veda und Kaschmir. In: KZ/ZVS 77, 235–245.
- Bürk, Albert  
 1901–02 Das Āpastamba-Śulba-Sūtra, herausgegeben, übersetzt und mit einer Einleitung versehen. In: ZDMG 55, 543–591 & 56, 327–391.
- Burnell, A.C.  
 1873 The Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa (being the third Brāhmaṇa) of the Sāmaveda. Vol. I. Text and Commentary, with Introduction. London: Trübner & Co.
- Burrow, T.  
 1955 Vedic *iṣ-* 'to prosper'. In: BSOAS 17, 326–345.

- Burrow, T. & M.B. Emeneau  
 1984 A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary. Second Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Caland, Willem  
 1888 Über Totenverehrung bei einigen der Indo-Germanischen Völker. Amsterdam: VKNAW 17.  
 1893 Altindischer Ahnencult. Das Śrāddha nach den verschiedenen Schulen mit Benutzung handschriftlicher Quellen dargestellt. Leiden.  
 1896 The Piṭṛmedhasūtras. Leipzig: Brockhaus [AKM X, no. 3].  
 1897 Eine übereinstimmung zwischen Vedischem und Avestischem sprachgebrauch. In: KZ 34, 456–457.  
 1899 Zur Exegese und Kritik der rituellen Sūtras, XVIII–XXVII, XXVIII–XXXII. In: ZDMG 53, 205–230, 696–702.  
 1900 Altindisches Zauberritual. Probe einer Uebersetzung der wichtigsten Theile des Kauśika Sūtra. Amsterdam.  
 1902 Zur Exegese und Kritik der rituellen Sūtras, XXXVIII–XLI. In: ZDMG 56, 551–558.  
 1904 Zur Atharvedalitteratur. In: WZKM 18, 185–207.  
 1904–23 Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtram. 3 vols. Calcutta.  
 1907 Die Jaiminīya-Saṃhitā, mit einer Einleitung über die Sāmavedalitteratur. Indische Forschungen, 2. Heft. Breslau.  
 1908 Altindische Zauberei. Amsterdam.  
 1910 Das Vaitānasūtra des Atharvaveda. Amsterdam.  
 1919 Das Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl: Text, Übersetzung, Indices. Amsterdam.  
 1921 Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba. Aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt. 1.–7. Buch. Göttingen.  
 1922 The Jaiminigr̥hyasūtra belonging to the Sāmaveda. Lahore.  
 1924 Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba. Achtes bis fünfzehntes Buch, aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt. Amsterdam [Reprint Wiesbaden 1969].  
 1925 The Kāṭhakagr̥hyasūtra with Extracts from Three Commentaries, an Appendix and Indexes. Lahore.  
 1926 Eine dritte Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra. In: AO 4, 1–41, 161–213.  
 1926–39 The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa in the Kāṇvīya Recension. Lahore [Reprint Delhi 1983].  
 1927 Vaikhānasaśmārtasūtram, the Domestic Rules of the Vaikhānasa School Belonging to the Black Yajurveda. Critically edited. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal.  
 1928a Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba. Sechszehntes bis vierundzwanzigstes und einunddreissigstes Buch, aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt. Amsterdam [Reprint Wiesbaden 1969].

- 1928b Eine vierte Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra. In: AO 6, 97–241.
- 1931 Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa. The Brāhmaṇa of the twenty five chapters. Calcutta.
- 1953 Śāṅkhāya-Śrautasūtra being a major yājñika text of the Ṛgveda. Edited with an Introduction by Dr. Lokesh Chandra. Nagpur.
- 1990 Kleine Schriften. Herausgegeben von Michael Witzel. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Caland, W. & V. Henry  
1906–07 L’Agniṣṭoma. Description complète de la forme normale du Sacrifice de Soma dans le culte védique. Tome premier, 1906. Tome Second, 1907. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Caland, W. & Raghu Vira  
1933 Vārāha-Śrauta-Sūtra being the main ritualistic sūtra of the Maitrāyaṇī Śākhā. Critically edited for the first time. Lahore: Meharchand Lachhmandas [Reprint Delhi 1971].
- Chaubey, Braj Bihari  
1993 Vādhūla-Śrautasūtram. Critically edited with Introduction and Indices. Hoshiarpur: Katyayan Vaidik Sahitya Prakashan.  
2001 Vādhūla-Anvākyānam. Critically edited with detailed Introduction and Indices. Hoshiarpur: Katyayan Vaidik Sahitya Prakashan.
- Chinnaswami Śāstri, Pandit A. (& Pandit Pattābhīrāma Śāstrī)  
1935–36 The Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa belonging to The Sāma Veda with the Commentary of Sāyaṇāchārya Edited with Notes, Introduction, etc. 2 parts. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office (Kashi Sanskrit Series No. 105 — Veda Section, No. 6).
- Chopra, R.N. *et al.*  
1958 Chopra’s Indigenous Drugs of India. Second edition revised and largely rewritten. Calcutta.
- Dandekar, Ramchandra Narayan  
1946–2004 Vedic Bibliography. 6 vols. Poona: BORI.
- Daniel, J.C.  
1998 The Asian Elephant — A Natural History. Dehra Dun: Natraj Publishers.
- Das, Rahul Peter  
1985 Altindiarisches *kāca-* „(Joch-)Strick; Joch“ und die Sippe um tamilisches *kā* „Stange; Joch“. In: Die Sprache 31, 256–278.  
1987 On the Identification of a Vedic Plant. In: G.J. Meulenbeld & D. Wujastyk (eds.), Studies on Indian Medical History (Groningen: E. Forsten), 19–42.  
1988 Das Wissen von der Lebensspanne der Bäume. Surapālas Vṛkṣāyurveda. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner [Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 34].

- Dave, K.N.  
 1950 Lac and the Lac-Insect in the Atharva-Veda. Nagpur.
- Deeg, Max  
 1995 Die altindische Etymologie nach dem Verständnis Yāska's und seiner Vorgänger. Dettelbach: Verlag J.H. Röhl.
- Delbrück, Berthold  
 1878 Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Çatapathabrāhmaṇa dargestellt [Syntaktische Forschungen von B. Delbrück und E. Windisch III]. Halle.  
 1888 Altindische Syntax. Halle/Saale [Syntaktische Forschungen V].
- Deroin, Thierry & Jinadasa Liyanaratne  
 1995 Plant Names and Phytomorphological Terminology in Āyurvedic Science. In: Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society 4, 11–25.
- Deshpande, Madhav M.  
 1992 Justification for Verb-Root Suppletion in Sanskrit. In: Historische Sprachforschung (KZ/ZVS) 105, 18–49.  
 1997 Śaunakīya Caturādhyāyikā. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.  
 2002 Recitational Permutations of the Śaunakīya Atharvaveda. Critically Edited with an Introduction. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.
- Dimitrov, Dragomir  
 2002 Tables of the Old Bengali Script (on the basis of a Nepalese manuscript of Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaḍarśa*). In: D. Dimitrov, U. Roesler and R. Steiner (eds.), Śikhisamuccayaḥ. Indian and Tibetan Studies (Collectanea Marpurgensia Indologica et Tibetica) [= Felicitation Volume Michael Hahn], Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 53]. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, 27–78.
- Diwekar, H.R., V.P. Limaye, R.N. Dandekar, C.G. Kashikar, & V.V. Bhide  
 1972 Kauśikasūtra-Dārilabhāṣya. Poona.
- Dresden, Mark Jan  
 1941 Mānavagṛhyasūtra. A Vedic Manual of Domestic Rites. Translation, Commentary and Preface. Groningen/Batavia: J.B. Wolters.
- Dreyer, Caren  
 1986 Das Kāṭhaka-Gr̥hya-Sūtra mit Vivaraṇa des Ādityaḍarśana, Bhāṣya des Devapāla, Gr̥hyapañcikā des Brāhmaṇabala. Kritische Edition mit Anmerkungen. Teil I: 1. Kaṇḍikā und Sandhyopāsanamantrabhāṣya des Devapāla. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner [Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 30].
- Duchesne-Guillemain, J.  
 1937 Gr. *ἰερός* ~ skr. *iṣirá-*. In: Mélanges Émile Boisacq, part one [= Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves 5], 333–338.

Dumont, Paul-Émile

- 1948 The Horse-Sacrifice in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa. In: Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 92, 447–503.
- 1954 The Iṣṭis to the Nakṣatras (or oblations to the lunar mansions) in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa. In: Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 98, 204–223.
- 1961 The Full-Moon and the New-Moon Sacrifices in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa (Fourth Part). In: Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 105, 11–36.
- 1962 The Manuscript of the Ṛgveda of the M. A. Stein Collection. In: E. Bender (ed.), Indological Studies in Honor of W. Norman Brown (New Haven: American Oriental Society), 51–55.
- 1969 The Kāmya Animal Sacrifices in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa. In: Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 113, 34–66.

Edgerton, Franklin

- 1915 The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Book Six. In: JAOS 34, 374–411.
- 1919 Studies in the Veda 7. The Metaphor of the Car in the Rigvedic Ritual. In: AJPh 40, 175–193.

Eelsingh, H.F.

- 1908 Ṣaḍvimsābrāhmaṇam Vijñāpanabhāṣyasahitam. Leiden.

Eggeling, Julius

- 1882–1900 The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. According to the Text of the Mādhyandina School. 5 vols. Oxford.

Ehlers, Gerhard

- 2000 Auf dem Weg zu einer neuen Edition des Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa. In: Berliner Indologische Studien 13/14, 1–28.

Eichner-Kühn, Ingrid

- 1976 Vier altindische Wörter. In: MSS 34, 21–37.

Einoo, Shingo

- 1982–83 Zum Namen *Caraka-*. In: StII 8/9, 169–170.
- 1988 Die Cāturmāsya oder die Altindischen Tertialopfer dargestellt nach den Vorschriften der Brāhmaṇas und der Śrautasūtras. Tokyo: ILCAA.

Emeneau, Murray Barnson

- 1949 The strangling figs in Sanskrit literature. In: University of California Publications in Classical Philology 13 No. 10, 345–370.
- 1959 Review of MAYRHOFER, Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen, fascicles 11–12, pp. 161–320 (1958). In: Language 35, 323–328.
- 1988 Sanskrit Studies of M.B. Emeneau. Selected Papers. Edited by B.A. van Nooten. Berkeley.

Faddegon, Barend

- 1926 The thirteenth month in ancient Hindu chronology. In: AO IV, 124–133.

- Falk, Harry  
 1982 Zur Tierzucht im Alten Indien. In: IJ 24, 169–180.  
 1986 Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel. Untersuchungen zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des vedischen Opferrituals. Freiburg: Hedwig Falk.  
 1997 The Purpose of Ṛgvedic Ritual. In: M. Witzel (ed.), *Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts: New Approaches to the Study of the Vedas* (Cambridge, Mass.) [HOS Opera Minora vol. 2], 69–88.  
 2001 The Galitas in the Ṛgveda Padapāṭha: On the Origins of the Saṃhitapāṭha and the Padapāṭha. In: Axel Michaels (ed.), *The Pandit. Traditional Scholarship in India* [South Asia Institute, New Delhi Branch, Heidelberg University; South Asian studies 38 / Festschrift Parameswara Aithal] (New Delhi: Manohar), 181–202.
- Filliozat, Jean  
 1949 La doctrine classique de la médecine indienne. Ses origines et ses parallèles grecs. Paris [Reprint Paris 1975].
- Fišer, Ivo  
 1966 Indian Erotics of the Oldest Period. Praha: Universita Karlova.
- Forssman, Bernhard  
 1986 Vedisch *sākām*. In: Die Sprache 32 [Festgabe für Manfred Mayrhofer], 22–28.  
 1996 Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa III 352 und eine homerische Parallele. In: MSS 56, 45–60.
- Franceschini, Marco  
 2005 An Enlarged Version of Bloomfield's Vedic Concordance (Electronic Version). URL: [www.dslo.unibo.it/iniz.html](http://www.dslo.unibo.it/iniz.html).
- Friedrich, Elvira  
 2002 Einführung in die indischen Schriften. Teil II: Gujarātī, Gurmukhī, Bengālī, Oṛiā. Hamburg: Buske.
- Fujii, Masato  
 1996 Kena-Upaniṣad (= Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 4,10 [4,18–21]). In: Indo-shiso to bukkyo-bunka — Indian Thoughts and Buddhist Culture. Essays in Honour of Professor Jun-kichi Imanishi on His Sixtieth Birthday (Tokyo: Shunjū-sha), 842–821[107–128].
- Gaastra, Dieuke  
 1919 Das Gopatha Brāhmaṇa. Leiden.
- Ganguli, R.  
 1930–31 Cattle and Cattle-Rearing in Ancie[n]t India. In: ABORI 12, 216–230.
- Garbe, Richard  
 1878 Vaitāna Sūtra. The Ritual of the Atharvaveda. London.  
 1882–1902 The Śrauta Sūtra of Āpastamba. 3 vols. Calcutta.

Geib, Ruprecht

- 1975 *Agní Kravyád* das Fleisch fressende Feuer im Ṛg- und Atharvaveda. In: KZ/ZVS 89 [1976], 189–220.

van Gelder, Jeanette

- 1961–63 The Mānava Śrautasūtra, belonging to the Maitrāyaṇīya Saṁhitā. 2 vols. New Delhi [Reprint Delhi, Sri Satguru Publications 1985].

Geldner, Karl Friedrich

- 1907 Der Rigveda in Auswahl. Erster Teil. Glossar. Stuttgart.  
1951–57 Der Rig-Veda. Aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen. 4 parts. Parts 1–3: 1951. Part 4: 1957. Cambridge (Mass.)

Ghosh, Abhijit

- 2002 Śaunaka vis-à-vis Paippalāda: Variants of Some Words of Austric Origin. In: Abhijit Ghosh (ed.), Ātharvaṇā (a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition) (Kolkata), 122–132.

Ghosh, Batakrishna

- 1927 Collection of the Fragments of Lost Brāhmaṇas. Calcutta.

Goḍbole, V.S.R. Nārāyaṇa Śāstrī

- 1898 Taittirīyabrāhmaṇam. 3 vols. Poona.

Gonda, Jan

- 1936 Zur Homonymie im Altindischen. In: AO 14, 161–202.  
1937 Altind. *pratisara-*, *sraj-* und Verwandtes. In: AO 15, 311–328.  
1938 Stilistische Studie over Atharvaveda I-VII. Wageningen.  
1939 *Ābharṇa*. In: New Indian Antiquary 2, 69–75.  
1951 The Ṛgvidhāna. English translation with an introduction and notes. Utrecht.  
1954a Aspects of Early Viṣṇuism. Utrecht.  
1954b The Original Character of the Indo-European Relative Pronoun *īo-*. In: Lingua 4, 1–41.  
1955a Purohita. In: O. Spies (ed.), Studia Indologica. Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel (Bonn), 107–124.  
1955b Reflections on *sarva-* in Vedic texts. In: Indian Linguistics 16 (Chatterji Jubilee Volume), 53–71.  
1957a Some Observations on the Relation Between “Gods” and “Powers” in the Veda, a Propos of the Phrase *sūnuḥ sahasaḥ*. The Hague.  
1957b The Vedic Concept of *aṃhas*. In: IJ 1, 33–60.  
1957c The use of the particle *ca*. In: Vāk 5, 1–73.  
1959a Epithets in the Ṛgveda. The Hague: Mouton.  
1959b Four Studies in the Language of the Veda. The Hague.  
1963 The Vision of the Vedic Poets. The Hague.  
1965a The Savayajñas. (Kauśikasūtra 60–68. Translation, Introduction, Commentary). Amsterdam.

- 1965b Change and Continuity in Indian Religion. The Hague.
- 1966 Loka. World and Heaven in the Veda. Amsterdam.
- 1967a The Meaning of the Sanskrit Term Dhāman-. Amsterdam.
- 1967b “*Bhuvana*”. In: VIJ 5, 42–57.
- 1967c The Indra Festival according to the Atharvavedins. In: JAOS 87, 413–429.
- 1969 Eye and Gaze in the Veda. Amsterdam.
- 1970 Notes on Names and the Name of God in Ancient India. Amsterdam.
- 1971 Old Indian. Leiden: E.J. Brill [Handbuch der Orientalistik, 2. Abteilung [Indien], 1. Band, 1. Abschnitt].
- 1975 Vedic Literature (Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas). Wiesbaden.
- 1975/I Selected Studies. Volume I. Indo-European Linguistics. Leiden.
- 1975/II Selected Studies. Volume II. Sanskrit Word Studies. Leiden.
- 1975/III Selected Studies. Volume III. Sanskrit: Grammatical and Philological Studies. Leiden.
- 1975/IV Selected Studies. Volume IV. History of Ancient Indian Religion. Leiden.
- 1976 Triads in the Veda. Amsterdam.
- 1977 The Mantras of Kauśika-Sūtra 10–52. In: Studia Orientalia 47, 71–87.
- 1978 Hymns of the Ṛgveda not Employed in the Solemn Ritual. Amsterdam.
- <sup>2</sup>1978 Die Religionen Indiens I. Veda und älterer Hinduismus. Zweite, überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- 1979a The Medium in the Ṛgveda. Leiden.
- 1979b Śuci. In: Ludwik Sternbach Felicitation Volume, Part One (Lucknow), 119–127.
- 1980 Vedic Ritual. The Non-Solemn Rites. Leiden: E.J. Brill [Handbuch der Orientalistik, 2. Abteilung [Indien], 4. Band, 1. Abschnitt].
- 1984 Prajāpati and the Year. Amsterdam.
- 1985 The Ritual Functions and Significance of Grasses in the Religion of the Veda. Amsterdam.
- 1989a The Indra Hymns of the Ṛgveda. Leiden.
- 1989b The Meaning of Vedic Ṣ. In: D.C. Bhattacharyya & D. Handa (eds.), Prācī-Prabhā, Perspectives in Indology (Essays in honour of B.N. Mukherjee) (New Delhi), 1–8.
- 1991 The Functions and Significance of Gold in the Veda. Leiden.
- Gotō, Toshifumi
- 1980 Vedisch *utsaṅga* und Verwandtes. In: MSS 39, 11–36.
- 1987 Die „I. Präsensklasse“ im Vedischen. Untersuchung der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia. Wien.
- 1988 Review of JAMISON 1983. In: IJ 31, 303–321.

- 1990 Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen: 1. *am<sup>i</sup>*, 2. *ay/i*, 3. *as/s*. In: Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka, Japan) 15/4, 987–1012.
- 1991 Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen: 4. *dogh/dugh/doh/duh*, 5. *sav/su*, 6. <sup>1</sup>*sav<sup>i</sup>/sū*, 7. <sup>2</sup>*sav<sup>i</sup>/sū*. In: Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka, Japan) 16/3, 681–707.
- 1997 Materialien zu einer Liste altindischer Verbalformen: 16. *chad*, 17. *chand/chad*, 18. *chard/chrd*, 19. *dagh/dhag*, 20. *dveṣ/dviṣ*, 21. *bandh/badh*, 22. <sup>1</sup>*man*, 23. <sup>2</sup>*man*, 24. *mnā*, 25. <sup>1</sup>*yav/yu*, 26. <sup>2</sup>*yav/yu*, 27. *san<sup>i</sup>*, 28. *star/str*, 29. *star<sup>i</sup>/stṛ*. In: Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka, Japan) 22/4, 1001–1059.
- Goudriaan, Teun  
1986 Vedic *kr̥tyā́* and the Terminology of Magic. In: W. Morgenroth (ed.), Sanskrit and World Culture (Berlin [DDR]: Akademie-Verlag), 450–456.
- Grierson, George  
1916 On the Sarada Alphabet. In: JRAS for 1916, 677–708.  
1923 Indra and Durgā in modern Hindōstān. In: ZII 2, 133–139.
- Griffith, Ralph Thomas Hotchkin  
1889–92 The Hymns of the Ṛigveda. Translated with a Popular Commentary. 4 vols. Benares-London [New Revised Edition in one volume: Delhi 1973].  
1895–96 The Hymns of the Atharvaveda. Translated with a Popular Commentary. 2 vols. Benares-London [Complete rev. and enl. ed.: New Delhi 1985].
- 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 Samhitā. In: ZDMG 153, 333–370.  
2003b The Textual Divisions of the Paippalāda Samhitā. In: WZKS 47 [appeared 2004], 5–35.  
2004 Paippalāda Mantras in the Kauśikasūtra. In: A. Griffiths & J.E.M. Houben (eds.), The Vedas: Texts, Language and Ritual (Proceedings of the 3rd International Vedic Workshop) (Groningen: Egbert Forsten).  
2004–05 Tumburu: a Deified Tree. In: BEI 22–23 [appeared 2007], 249–264.

- 2007 The Ancillary Literature of the Paippalāda School. A Preliminary Survey with an Edition of the *Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad*. In GRIFFITHS & SCHMIEDCHEN 2007, 141–193.
- forthc. Once Again: the Meaning of Vedic *árma-*.
- Griffiths, Arlo & Alexander Lubotsky  
1999 Postscript on Vedic *jan̄gahe*. In: JAOS 119, 480–481.
- 2000–01 Paippalāda Saṃhitā 4.15. To heal an open fracture: with a plant. In: Die Sprache 42/1–2 [appeared 2003], 196–210.
- Griffiths, Arlo & Annette Schmiedchen  
2007 The Atharvaveda and its Paippalādaśākhā. Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic tradition. Aachen.
- Grill, Julius  
1888 Hundert Lieder des Atharva-Veda (Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage). Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Gupta, Madhusūdana  
1835–36 The Suśruta, or System of Medicine, taught by Dhanwantari, and composed by his disciple Suśruta. 2 vols. Calcutta.
- Haas, E.  
1862 Die Heiratsgebräuche der Alten Inder, nach den Ḡrihyasūtra. In: Indische Studien 5, 267–412.
- Hajnal, Ivo  
1999 Altindisch *áruṣ-* “Wunde, Erkrankung”. In: J. Habisreiter, R. Plath, S. Ziegler (eds.), Gering und doch von Herzen. 25 indogermanistische Beiträge Bernhard Forssman zum 65. Geburtstag (Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag), 89–100.
- Hale, Mark  
1987 Notes on Wackernagel’s Law in the language of the Rigveda. In: Calvert Watkins (ed.), Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985) (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 38–50.
- Hanneder, Jürgen  
1998 Abhinavagupta’s Philosophy of Revelation. An edition and annotated translation of *Mālinīślokaśārttika I*, 1–399. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.  
2002 The Blue Lotus. Oriental Research between Philology, Botany and Poetics? In: ZDMG 152, 295–308.
- Hartog, Hans  
1939 Zur Frage des frühvedischen Sündenbegriffes. Eine sprach- und religionswissenschaftliche Untersuchung. Dissertation Marburg.
- Hauschild, Richard  
1954 Das Selbstlob (*ātmastuti*) des somaberauschten Gottes Agni (RV X, 119). In: Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller. Zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden Kollegen und Schülern (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz), 247–288.

Heesterman, J.C.

- 1959 Reflections on the Significance of the *dākṣiṇā*. In: IJ 3, 241–258.

Henry, Victor

- 1894 Les Livres VIII et IX de L'Atharva-Véda. Traduits et Commentés. Paris: Maisonneuve.

- 1896 Les Livres X, XI et XII de L'Atharva-Véda. Traduits et Commentés. Paris: Maisonneuve.

Hettrich, Heinrich

- 1888 Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Hilgenberg, Luise & Willibald Kirfel

- 1941 Vāgbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅgahr̥dayasaṁhitā. Ein altindisches Lehrbuch der Heilkunde aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übertragen mit Einleitung, Anmerkungen und Indices. Leiden.

Hillebrandt, Alfred

- 1888 The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra together with the commentary of Varadattasuta Ānartīya. Vol. I: Text of the Sūtra, Critical notes, Indices. Calcutta.

- 1913 Lieder des Ṛgveda. Göttingen.

- 1927 Vedische Mythologie. Zweite veränderte Auflage in zwei Bänden. 1. Band. Breslau.

- 1929 Vedische Mythologie. Zweite veränderte Auflage in zwei Bänden. 2. Band. Breslau.

Hoffmann, Karl

- 1940 Vedische Namen. In: Wörter und Sachen 21, 139–161.

- 1952 „Wiederholende“ Onomatopoetika im Altindischen. In: IF 60, 254–264.

- 1952/56 Altindische Präverbien auf *-ā*. In: MSS 1, 54–60.

- 1955 Ein grundsprachliches Possessivsuffix. In: MSS 6, 35–40.

- 1956 Notizen zu Wackernagel-Debrunner, Altindische Grammatik II,2. In: MSS 8, 5–24.

- 1960a Der vedische Typus *menāmenam*. In: KZ 76, 242–248.

- 1960b Die Weltentstehung nach dem Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa. In: MSS 27, 59–67.

- 1966 Vedisch *vichāyāti* und *govyachá-*. In: MSS 19, 61–72.

- 1967 Der Injunktiv im Veda. Eine synchronische Funktionsuntersuchung. Heidelberg.

- 1968a Remarks on the New Edition of the Paippalāda-Saṁhitā. In: IJ 11, 1–10.

- 1968b Die Komposition eines Brāhmaṇa-Abschnittes (MS. I 10, 14–16). In: Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de L. Renou (Paris), 367–380.

- 1969 Materialien zum altindischen Verbum: 11. *am<sup>i</sup>*, 12. *jakṣ*. In: KZ 83, 193–215.

- 1975 Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik. Band 1. Herausgegeben von Johanna Narten. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- 1976 Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik. Band 2. Herausgegeben von Johanna Narten. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- 1980 Das Verbaladjektiv von *hvr̥* bei Pāṇini. In: StII 5/6 [Festschrift Paul Thieme zur Vollendung des 75. Lebensjahres], 87–98.
- 1982 Vedica. In: MSS 41, 61–94.
- 1986 Textkritisches zur Paippalāda-Saṃhitā. In: W. Morgenroth (ed.), Sanskrit and World Culture (Berlin [DDR]: Akademie-Verlag), 457–461.
- 1992 Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik. Band 3. Herausgegeben von Sonja Glauch, Robert Plath, Sabine Ziegler. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Hopkins, E. Washburn  
1915 Epic Mythology. Strassburg.
- Hora, S.L.  
1952 Lac and the Lac-Insect in the Atharva-Veda. In: JASB 18, 13–15.
- Houben, Jan E.M.  
1991 The Pravargya Brāhmaṇa of the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka: an ancient commentary on the Pravargya ritual. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.  
1999 To kill or not to kill the sacrificial animal (*yajñā-paśu*)? Arguments and perspectives in Brahminical ethical philosophy. In: J.E.M. Houben and K.R. van Kooij (eds.), Violence Denied. Violence, Non-Violence and the Rationalization of Violence in South Asian Cultural History (Leiden: Brill), 105–183.
- Ikari, Yasuke  
1995 Vādhūla Śrautasūtra 1.1–1.4 [Agnyādheya, Punarādheya]. A New Critical Edition of the Vādhūla Śrautasūtra, I. ZINBUN: Annals of the Institute for Research in Humanities – Kyoto University, Nr. 30.  
1996 Vādhūla Śrautasūtra 1.5–1.6 [Agnihotra, Agnyupasthāna]. A New Critical Edition of the Vādhūla Śrautasūtra, II. ZINBUN: Annals of the Institute for Research in Humanities – Kyoto University, Nr. 31.  
1998 A Survey of the New Manuscripts of the Vādhūla School — MSS. of  $K_1$  and  $K_4$  —. ZINBUN: Annals of the Institute for Research in Humanities – Kyoto University, Nr. 33.  
1999 Place of *Gopitṛyajña* Rite of the Vādhūla School. In: ZINBUN 34(2), 1–30.
- Ikari, Yasuke & Harold Arnold  
1983 Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra on the Agnicayana: BaudhŚS X, English Translation. In: STAAL 1983/II, 478–675.

Insler, Stanley

- 1968 Sanskrit *īpsati* and *īrtsati*. In: IF 73, 57–66.  
 1970 Sanskrit *táskara-* and text criticism to AV. xix 47–50. In: Die Sprache 16, 138–148.  
 1998a *mitráváruṇā* or *mitrá váruṇā*? In: J. Jasanoff, H.C. Melchert and L. Oliver (eds.), *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins* (Innsbruck) [Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 92], 285–290.  
 1998b On the Recensions of the Atharva Veda and Atharvan Hymn Composition. In: WZKS 42, 5–21.

Jamison, Stephanie W.

- 1983a Function and Form in the *-áya-* Formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.  
 1983b Two Problems in the Inflection of the Vedic Intensive. In: MSS 42, 41–73.  
 1987 Linguistic and philological remarks on some Vedic body parts. In: Calvert Watkins (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985)* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter), 66–91.  
 1991 The Ravenous Hyenas and the Wounded Sun. Myth and Ritual in Ancient India. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.  
 1992 Vedic “*sá figē*”: An inherited sentence connective? In: *Historische Sprachforschung (KZ/ZVS)* 105, 213–239.  
 1996a *Sacrificed Wife/Sacrificer’s Wife. Women, Ritual, and Hospitality in Ancient India*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
 1996b Vedic *mení*, Avestan *maēni*, and the power of thwarted exchange. In: StII 20 [Veda-Vyākaraṇa-Vyākhyāna: Festschrift Paul Thieme zum 90. Geburtstag am 18. März 1995], 187–203.  
 1997 Sanskrit *pāriṇāhya* ‘household goods’: Semantic Evolution in Cultural Context. In: D.Q. Adams (ed.), *Festschrift for Eric P. Hamp, Volume I* (Washington D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man), 139–145.  
 2003 Vedic *vrá*: evidence for the *svayaṃvara* in the Rig Veda? In: Siamak Adhami (ed.), *Paitimāna: Essays in Iranian, Indo-European, and Indian Studies in Honor of Hanns-Peter Schmidt*, 2 vols. (Costa Mesa, California: Mazda Publications), 39–56.

Jha, Subhadra

- 1952–53 Studies on the Paippalādi Atharvaveda, books—I & II. In: *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 38 & 39, 233–244; 331–354.

Joachim, Ulrike

- 1978 *Mehrfachpräsentien im Ṛgveda*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Jolly, Julius

- 1881 *Viṣṇusmṛtiḥ*. The Institutes of Viṣṇu, together with extracts from the Sanskrit commentary of Nanda Paṇḍita called *Vaijayantī*. Calcutta.

- Jørgensen, Hans  
 1911 Das Mantrabrāhmaṇa. 2. Prapāṭhaka. Diss. Kiel. Darmstadt.
- 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.
- Kane, Pandurang Vaman  
 1953 History of Dharmasāstra. Vol. IV (Pātaka, Prāyaścitta, Karmavipāka, Antyeṣṭi, Āsauca, Śuddhi, Śrāddha and Tīrthayātra). Poona: BORI.
- Kangle, R.P.  
 1969 The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. Part I. Sanskrit Text with a Glossary. Second edition. Bombay [2nd edition — Reprint Delhi 1992].  
 1972 The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. Part II. An English Translation with Critical and Explanatory Notes. Second edition. Bombay [2nd edition — Reprint Delhi 1992].
- Kashikar, C.G.  
 1964 The Śrauta, Paitṛmedhika and Pariśeṣa Sūtras of Bharadvāja. Critically Edited and Translated. 2 parts. Poona: Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala.  
 1988 Vārāha Śrautasūtra belonging to the Maitrāyaṇī recension of Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda. Pune.  
 2003 The Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra. Critically edited and translated. 4 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Kataoka, Kei  
 2007 Was Bhaṭṭa Jayanta a Paippalādin? In: GRIFFITHS & SCHMIED-CHEN 2007, 313–327.
- Kaul, Srikanth  
 1967 Rājatarāṅgiṇī of Jonarāja: edited with text comparative and critical annotations and an elaborate Introduction. Hoshiarpur: VVRI.
- Kaul Deambi, B.K.  
 1982 Corpus of Śāradā Inscriptions of Kashmir. With special reference to origin and development of Śāradā script. Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan.
- Kaul Shāstrī, Madhusūdan  
 1928 The Laugākshi=Gr̥hya=Sūtras with the Bhāshyam of Devapāla. Edited with Preface and Introduction. Volume I. Srinagar/Bombay: ‘Nirnaya Sagar’ Press [Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies XLIX].  
 1934 The Laugākshi=Gr̥hya=Sūtras with the Bhāshyam of Devapāla. Volume II. Srinagar/Bombay: ‘Nirnaya Sagar’ Press [Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies LV].

- Keith, Arthur Berriedale  
 1909 The Aitareya Āraṇyaka. Oxford.  
 1914 The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittirīya Sanhitā. 2 Vols. Cambridge (Mass.).  
 1920 Rigveda Brāhmaṇas: The Aitareya and Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇas of the Rigveda. Cambridge (Mass.).
- Kellens, Jean  
 1984 Le verbe avestique. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Kiehnle, Catharina  
 1979 Vedisch UKṢ und UKṢ/VAKṢ. Wortgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchungen. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner [Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 21].
- Kielhorn, F.  
 1880 The Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. Volume I. Third edition 1962 (Revised and furnished with additional readings, references, and select critical notes) by K.V. Abhyankar. Pune: BORI.  
 1883 The Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. Volume II, Adhyāyas III, IV and V. Third edition 1965 (...) by K.V. Abhyankar. Pune: BORI.  
 1885 The Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. Volume III, Adhyāyas VI, VII and VIII. Third edition 1972 (...) by K.V. Abhyankar. Pune: BORI.
- Kirfel, Willibald  
 1920 Die Kosmographie der Inder, nach Quellen dargestellt. Repr. 1967 Darmstadt: WBG.
- Kirste, J.  
 1889 The Gṛihyasūtra of Hiraṇyakeśin with Extracts from the Commentary of Mātridatta. Vienna.
- Klaus, Konrad  
 1986 Die altindische Kosmologie. Nach den Brāhmaṇas dargestellt. Bonn [Indica et Tibetica 9].  
 1989a Die Wasserfahrzeuge im vedischen Indien. Wiesbaden.  
 1989b *samudrā* im Veda. In: ZDMG Supplement VII, 364–371. [XXIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag, vom 16. bis 20. September 1985 in Würzburg, ausgewählte Vorträge, herausgegeben von Einar von Schuler].
- Klein, Jared S.  
 1978 The Particle *u* in the Rigveda. A Synchronic and Diachronic Study. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.  
 1985 Towards a Discourse Grammar of the Rigveda. Volume I: Coordinate Conjunction. 2 parts. Heidelberg.  
 1992 On Verbal Accentuation in the Rigveda. New Haven: American Oriental Society [Essay Number 11].

- 1997 Early Vedic *áthā* and *átho*. In: D.Q. Adams (ed.), Festschrift for Eric P. Hamp, Volume II (Washington D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man), 1–25.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert  
1975 Altindisch *śásvat-*. In: MSS 33, 67–78.
- Knauer, Friderich  
1885 Das Gobhilagrhyasūtra. Erstes heft: Text (nebst einleitung). Zweites heft: Uebersetzung und commentar. Leipzig.  
1897 Das Mānava-grhya-sūtra. St. Petersburg.
- Knobl, Werner  
2007 Zwei Studien zum Wortschatz der Paippalāda-Saṃhitā. In: GRIFFITHS & SCHMIEDCHEN 2007, 35–69.
- Kölver, Bernhard  
1972 Zwei unerkannte Ableitungen der Wurzel *vap-*. In: MSS 30, 111–127.
- Korn, Agnes  
1998 Metrik und metrische Techniken im R̥gveda. Graz: Leykam.
- Krick, Hertha  
1982 Das Ritual der Feuergründung (Agn̄yādheya). Herausgegeben von Gerhard Oberhammer. Wien.
- Kubisch, Philipp  
2007 The Metrical and Prosodical Structures of Books I–VII of the Vulgate Atharvavedasaṃhitā. In: GRIFFITHS & SCHMIEDCHEN 2007, 1–22.
- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus  
1939 Indo-Iranica. In: AO 17, 17–64.  
1947 Traces of Laryngeals in Vedic Sanskrit. In: India Antiqua, A Volume of Oriental Studies presented by his friends and pupils to Jean Phillipe Vogel (Leyden), 198–212.  
1951 Νόροπυ χαλκῶ. In: MKNAW 14/5, 201–227.  
1953 The Three Sanskrit Roots *añc-/añj-*. In: Vāk 2, 36–98.  
1955 Shortening of Final Vowels in the R̥gveda. In: MKNAW 18/11, 253–289.  
1958 *Nyañcanī-*, “Refuge” Ath.S. V.5.2d. In: IJ 2, 158.  
1960 The Ancient Aryan Verbal Contest. In: IJ 4, 217–281.  
1961 Zur kompositionellen Kürzung im Sanskrit. In: Die Sprache 7, 14–31.  
1961–62 Remarks on *The Avestan Hymn to Mitra*. In: IJ 5, 36–60.  
1962 The Three Strides of Viṣṇu. In: E. Bender (ed.), Indological Studies in Honor of W. Norman Brown (New Haven: American Oriental Society), 137–151.  
1970 Cosmogony and Conception: a Query. In: History of Religions 10, 91–138.  
1974 *vī dayate* and *vidátha-*. In: IT 2 [1975], 121–132.

- 1979 Varuṇa and Vidūṣaka. On the Origin of the Sanskrit Drama. Amsterdam.
- 1983 Ancient Indian Cosmogony. Essays Selected and Introduced by John Irwin. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- 1991 Aryans in the Rigveda. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.
- 1997a Selected Writings on Indian Linguistics and Philology. Edited by A. Lubotsky, M.S. Oort and M. Witzel. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi.
- 1997b ápaśyaṁ jāyám ámahīyamānām (RV. IV.18.13c). In: IJ 40, 103–113.
- Kulikov, Leonid
- 2001 The Vedic *-ya-* presents. PhD Dissertation Leiden.
- 2006 The Sanskrit *-yet-* Optative. A Formation Not Yet Recorded in Sanskrit Grammars. In: WZKS 50, 27–68.
- Kümmel, Martin Joachim
- 1996 Stativ und Passivaorist im Indoiranischen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- 2000 Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen. Eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums und ihrer Weiterentwicklung in den altindoiranischen Sprachen. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Lakshman Sarup
- 1920–27 The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta. The Oldest Indian Treatise on Etymology, Philology and Semantics. Critically edited from Original Manuscripts and Translated for the first time in English, with Introduction, Exegetical and Critical Notes, Indexes and Appendices. 3 parts bound in one. London/Lahore [Reprint Delhi 1998].
- Lanman, C.R.
- 1903 Atharva-veda: Critical Notes; with some Account of Whitney's Commentary. In: Album – Kern. Opstellen geschreven ter eere van Dr. H. Kern hem aangeboden door vrienden en leerlingen op zijn zeventigsten verjaardag den VI. April MDCCCIII (Leiden), 301–307.
- Lefever, Henry
- 1935 The Vedic Idea of Sin. Nagercoil, Travancore, India: London Mission Press.
- Lévi, Sylvain
- 1915 Le catalogue géographique des Yakṣa dans la Mahāmāyūrī. In: JA 5, 19–138.
- 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.
- Lindenau, Max
- 1922 Ein schwieriger Hymnus des Atharvaveda (II, 1). In: ZII 1, 33–49.

- Lindner, Bruno  
 1887 Das Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa. I. Text. Jena.
- Lommel, Herman  
 1953 Die Späher des Varuna und Mitra und das Auge des Königs. In: Oriens 6, 323–333.  
 1955 Gedichte des Rig-Veda. Auswahl und Übersetzung von Herman Lommel. München.  
 1978 Kleine Schriften. Herausgegeben von Klaus L. Janert. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Lopez, Carlos Alfredo  
 2000 The Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda: A Critical Edition, Translation, and Study of Books 13 and 14. Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University (UMI Dissertation Services).
- Lubin, Timothy  
 2007 The *Nīlarudropaniṣad* and the *Paippalādasamhitā*. A Critical Edition with Translation of the *Upaniṣad* and Nārāyaṇa's *Dīpikā*. In: GRIFFITHS & SCHMIEDCHEN 2007, 81–139.
- Lubotsky, Alexander M.  
 1983 On the External Sandhis of the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā. In: IJ 25, 167–179.  
 1993 Nasalization of the final *ā* in the Ṛgveda. In: IJ 36, 197–210.  
 1995 Vedic *samaha* 'verily'. In: IJ 38, 257–260.  
 1997a A Ṛgvedic Word Concordance. 2 parts. New Haven: AOS.  
 1997b Remarks on the Vedic Intensive. In: JAOS 117, 558–564.  
 2000 The Vedic root *vr-* 'to cover' and its present. In: B. Forssman & R. Plath (eds.), Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik (Wiesbaden: Reichert), 315–325.  
 2002 Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Kāṇḍa Five: Text, translation, commentary. Columbia, Missouri: South Asia Books [HOS Opera Minora vol. 4].  
 2007 PS 8.15. Offense against a Brahmin. In: GRIFFITHS & SCHMIEDCHEN 2007, 23–33.  
 2008 The Indo-Iranian root *\*stig-*. In: L. Kulikov & M. Russanov (eds.), Indologica. T. Ya. Elizarenkova Memorial Volume (Moscow: Izd-vo RGGU), 305–314.
- Lüders, Heinrich  
 1940 Philologica Indica. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften von Heinrich Lüders. Festgabe zum siebenzigsten Geburtstage am 25. Juni 1939 dargebracht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.  
 1942 Von indischen Tieren. In: ZDMG 96, 23–81.  
 1951 Varuṇa. Band I: Varuṇa und die Wasser. Göttingen.  
 1959 Varuṇa. Band II: Varuṇa und das Ṛta. Göttingen.

- 1973 Kleine Schriften. Herausgegeben von Oskar von Hinüber. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony  
 1897 Vedic Mythology. Strassburg.  
 1904 The Bṛhad-devatā attributed to Śaunaka. A Summary of the Deities and Myths of the Rig-Veda. 2 parts. Cambridge (Mass.).  
 1910 Vedic Grammar. Strassburg.
- Macdonell, A.A. & Keith, A.B.  
 1912 Vedic Index of Names and Subjects. 2 vols. London [Reprint: Delhi 1982].
- Mahdihassan, S.  
 1979 Lac as a drug. In: Studies in History of Medicine 3, 75–79.  
 1980 Lac as Drug in Atharva-Veda and its Identity. In: Hamdard 23, 106–132.  
 1984 Lac as Mentioned in Atharvaveda and Lac from Arizona. In: Studies in History of Medicine 8, 101–106.
- Malamoud, Charles  
 1976 Terminer le sacrifice. Remarques sur les honoraires rituels dans le brahmanisme. In: M. Biarreau & C. Malamoud, Le sacrifice dans l'Inde ancienne (Paris: Presses universitaires de France), 155–204.
- Malla, Śaṅkaramāna Rājavamśī  
 1964 Licchavilipi-saṁgraha. Kathmandu: Vīrapustakālaya Bāṭa [Purātatva Prakāśana Mālā — 28].
- Masica, Colin P.  
 1991 The Indo-Aryan languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred  
 1956–80 Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen / A Concise Etymological Sanskrit Dictionary. 4 volumes. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.  
 1992–96 Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. I. & II. Band. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.  
 1997–2001 Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. III. Band. Zweiter Teil: Jüngere Sprache. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- McPherson, Hugh  
 1924 The Oriya Alphabet. In: Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society 10, 168–170.
- Meulenbeld, Gerrit Jan  
 1974 The Mādhavanidāna and its Chief Commentary. Chapters 1–10, Introduction, Translation and Notes. Leiden.  
 2007–08 A Quest for Poison Trees in Indian Literature, Along with Notes on Some Plants and Animals of the Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra. WZKS 51, 5–75.

- Minard, Armand  
 1949 Trois Enigmes sur les Cent Chemins. Recherches sur le Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. — I. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.  
 1956 Trois Énigmes sur les Cent Chemins. Recherches sur le Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. — II. Paris: de Boccard.
- Minkowski, Christopher Z.  
 1989 The Udumbara and its Ritual Significance. In: WZKS 33, 5–23.  
 1991 Priesthood in Ancient India: A Study of the Maitrāvaruṇa Priest. Vienna [Publications of the de Nobili Research Library (vol. XVIII)].
- Mittwede, Martin  
 1986 Textkritische Bemerkungen zur Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner [Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 31].  
 1989 Textkritische Bemerkungen zur Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner [Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 37].
- Modak, B.R.  
 1993 The Ancillary Literature of the Atharva-Veda. A Study with special reference to The Pariśiṣṭas. New Delhi: Rashtriya Veda vidya Pratishthan.
- Monier-Williams, Monier  
 1899 A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. New Edition, Greatly Enlarged and Improved. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mukherji, R., A. Thakur, S. Bhattacharya & D. Bhattacharya  
 2001 Traividyaṃ: Vedic Studies in Memory of Durgamohan Bhattacharyya. Kolkata: Subarnarekha.
- Mukhopadhyay, B. & M.S. Muthana  
 1962 A Monograph on Lac. Namkum: Indian Lac Research Centre.
- Mylius, Klaus  
 1995 Wörterbuch des altindischen Rituals. Wichtrach: Institut für Indologie.
- Nadkarni, A.K.  
 1954 Dr. K.M. Nadkarni's Indian Materia Medica. Third Editions, Revised & Enlarged in two volumes. Volume One. Bombay: Popular Book Depot.
- Narten, Johanna  
 1960 Das vedische Verbum *math*. In: IJ 4, 121–35.  
 1964 Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda. Wiesbaden.  
 1966 Ai. *malimlu-* und *malimluca-*. In: IJ 9, 203–208.  
 1969a Zum “proterodynamischen” Wurzelpräsen. In: J.C. Heesterman, G.H. Schokker & V.I. Subrahmoniam (eds.), Pratiḍānam. Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies Presented to Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper on his Sixtieth Birthday (The Hague: Mouton), 9–19.

- 1969b Ai. *sr* in synchronischer und diachronischer Sicht. In: MSS 26, 77–103.
- 1986 Der Yasna Haptaṅhāiti. Wiesbaden.
- 1988–90 Die vedischen Verbalwurzeln dambh und dabh. In: Die Sprache 34, 142–57.
- 1993 Ved. *stanáyati*, gr. *στένω* etc.: idg. ‘donnern’ und ‘stöhnen’. In: Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift für H. Rix zum 65. Geburtstag (Innsbruck), 314–339.
- 1995 Kleine Schriften. Band I, herausgegeben von Marcos Albino und Matthias Fritz. Wiesbaden.
- Negelein, Julius von
- 1912 Der Traumschlüssel des Jagaddeva. Giessen.
- 1913–14 Atharvaprāyaścittāni. Text mit Anmerkungen; Sachindex, Register der Vers- und Yajus-Anfänge, Wortindex, Berichtigungen; Vorwort und Einleitung. In: JAOS 33, 71–144; 217–253; JAOS 34, 229–277.
- Neisser, Walter
- 1913 Veda. In: Beiträge zur Sprach- und Völkerkunde. Festschrift für ... Alfred Hillebrandt ... zu seinem sechzigsten Geburtstage ... von seinen Breslauer Schülern dargebracht (Halle), 144–159.
- 1980 Kleine Schriften. Herausgegeben von Rahul Peter Das. Wiesbaden.
- Nenninger, Claudius
- 1993 Wie kommt die Pharaonsratte zu den Vedischen Göttern? In: StII 18, 161–168.
- Neukom, Lukas & Manideepa Patnaik
- 2003 A grammar of Oriya. Zürich [ASAS: Arbeiten des Seminars für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Zürich, Nr. 17].
- Nooten, Barend A. van & Gary B. Holland
- 1994 Rigveda. A Metrically Restored Text with Introduction and Notes. Cambridge (Mass.).
- Oberlies, Thomas
- 1992 Zur Wortkunde des Kāṭhaka III. In: MSS 53, 117–131.
- 1998 Die Religion des Ṛgveda. Erster Teil: das religiöse System des Ṛgveda. Wien: Publications of the de Nobili Research Library (vol. XXVI).
- 1999 Die Religion des Ṛgveda. Zweiter Teil: Kompositionsanalyse der Soma-Hymnen des Ṛgveda. Wien: Publications of the de Nobili Research Library (vol. XXVII).
- Oertel, Hanns
- 1894 The Jāiminīya or Talavakāra Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa: Text, Translation, and Notes. In: JAOS 16, 79–260.
- 1912–13 Über grammatische Perseverationserscheinungen. In: IF 31 [Festschrift Berthold Delbrück], 49–66.

- 1926 The Syntax of Cases in the Narrative and Descriptive Prose of the Brāhmaṇas. I. The Disjunct Use of Cases. Heidelberg.
- 1934 Zur Kapiṣṭhala-Kāṭha-Saṁhitā. Sitzungsber. der Bay. Ak. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abt., Heft 6. München.
- 1942 Euphemismen in der vedischen Prosa und euphemistische Varianten in den Mantras. Sitzungsber. der Bay. Ak. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abt., Heft 8. München.
- 1944 Zu den ai. Ellipsen. In: KZ 68, 61–82.
- 1994 Kleine Schriften. Herausgegeben von Heinrich Hettrich und Thomas Oberlies. 2 parts. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Oldenberg, Hermann
- 1881 Buddha. Sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz.
- 1888 Die Hymnen des Rigveda. Band I: Metrische und textgeschichtliche Prolegomena. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz.
- 1892 The Gr̥hya-Sūtras. Rules of Vedic Domestic Ceremonies. Part II. Gobhila, Hiranyakesin, Âpastamba — Âpastamba, Yagñā-Paribhāshā-Sūtras translated by F. Max Müller. Oxford.
- 1896 Vedische Untersuchungen 1–6. In: ZDMG 50, 423–462.
- 1906 Review of WHITNEY 1905. In: ZDMG 60, 689–694.
- 1909 Dative auf *-ā* und *-ai* von *a*-Stämmen? In: ZDMG 63, 287–293.
- 1909–12 Rigveda. Textkritische und exegetische Noten. I: Erstes bis sechstes Buch. II: Siebentes bis zehntes Buch. Berlin.
- <sup>2</sup>1917 Die Religion des Veda. Stuttgart-Berlin.
- 1918 Die vedischen Worte für „schön“ und „Schönheit“ und das vedische Schönheitsgefühl. NG for 1918, 35–71.
- 1919 Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft. Die Weltanschauung der Brāhmaṇa-Texte. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- 1967 Kleine Schriften. Teil 1 & 2. Herausgegeben von K.L. Janert. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- 1993 Kleine Schriften. Teil 3. Herausgegeben von H.P. Schmidt. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Olivelle, J. Patrick
- 1998 The Early Upaniṣads. Annotated Text and Translation. New York.
- 2000 Dharmasūtras. The Lax Codes of Âpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana, and Vasiṣṭha. Annotated Text and Translation. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- 2002 Food for Thought. Dietary Rules and Social Organization in Ancient India. Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Pandit, Shankar Pandurang
- 1894–98 Atharvaveda Samhita. With the Commentary of Sayanacharya. 4 vols. Bombay [Reprint Varanasi 1989: Krishnadas Academy — Krishnadas Sanskrit Series 109].

Parpola, Asko

- 1985 The Sky-Garment. A Study of the Harappan religion and its relation to the Mesopotamian and later Indian religions. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society.
- 1988 The coming of the Aryans to Iran and India and the cultural and ethnic identity of the Dāsas. In: *Studia Orientalia* 64, 195–302.
- 2002 Pre-Proto-Iranians of Afghanistan as Initiators of Śākta Tantrism: on the Scythian/Saka Affiliation of the Dāsas, Nuristanis and Magadhans. In: *Iranica Antiqua* 37 [Felicitation Volume C.C. Lamberg-Karlovsky], 233–324.

Patyal, Hukam Chand

- 1969 Gopatha Brāhmaṇa. English Translation with Notes & Introduction. Thesis University of Poona.

Phadake, V.S.R.R. Bābāśāstrī

- 1897–98 Taittirīyāranyakam. 2 vols. Poona.

Pinault, Georges-Jean

- 1989 Reflets dialectaux en védique ancien. In: C. Caillat (ed.), *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes* (Paris), 35–96.
- 1999–2000 Le nom primitif pour la rétribution rituelle en védique ancien. In: *BEI* 17–18, 427–476.

Pirart, Éric

- 1995 Les Nāsatya. Volume I. Les noms des Aśvins. Traduction commentée des strophes consacrées aux Aśvin dans le premier maṇḍala de la Ṛgvedasaṁhitā. Liège [Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège — Fascicule CCLXI].

Pischel, Richard & Karl F. Geldner

- 1889 *Vedische Studien*. I. Band. Stuttgart.

Polunin, Oleg & Adam Stainton

- 1984 *Flowers of the Himalaya*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Potts, D.T., A. Parpola, S. Parpola, & J. Tidmarsh

- 1996 Guḥlu and Guggulu. In: *WZKM* 86 [Festschrift für Hans Hirsch], 291–305.

Prater, S.H.

- 1971 *The Book of Indian Animals* (Third Edition). Bombay: Oxford University Press/Bombay Natural History Society.

Raghu Vira

- 1932 Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṁhitā. A Text of the Black Yajurveda. Critically edited for the first time. Lahore. Second edition: Delhi 1968.
- 1932 Vārāha-Gṛhya-Sūtra with short extracts from the Paddhatis of Gaṅgādhara and Vasīṣṭha. Lahore: University of the Panjab.
- 1936–42 Atharva Veda of the Paippalādas. 3 vols. Lahore.
- 1938 Sāmaveda of the Jaiminīyas. Lahore.

- 1981 Vedic Studies. A Collection of the Research Papers of Prof. Dr. RAGHU VIRA. New Delhi (Śatapiṭaka Series 272).
- Raghu Vira & Lokesh Candra  
1954 Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda. Nagpur.
- Ramachandra Dikshitar, V.R. & P.S. Sundaram Ayyar  
1938 Bhāradvājaśikṣā. With Nāgeśvara's Commentary. Poona: BORI.
- Ramat, Paolo  
1962 Gr. *ἱερός*, Scr. *iṣiráh* e la loro famiglia lessicale. In: Die Sprache 8, 4–28.
- Rau, Wilhelm  
1954 Lotusblumen. In: Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller. Zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden Kollegen und Schülern (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz), 505–513.  
1957 Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien. Wiesbaden.  
1970 Weben und Flechten im vedischen Indien. Wiesbaden.  
1973 Metalle und Metallgeräte im vedischen Indien. Wiesbaden.  
1976 The Meaning of *pur* in Vedic Literature. München: Wilhelm Fink.  
1977 Vedische Lebensweisheit. In: H. Härtel (ed.), Beiträge zur Indienforschung: Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet (Berlin: Museum für Indische Kunst), 345–352.  
1981 Vedisch *tejanī-* f. und *tedanī-* f. / *tedani-* f. In: MSS 41, 169–178.  
1983a Zur vedischen Altertumskunde. Wiesbaden.  
1983b Notiz zum cerebralen *ḷ* in südindischen Sanskrit-Handschriften. In: MSS 42, 187–189.  
1983c Vaidika-Padānukrama-Koṣa und Veda-Lexikographie. In: Kratylos 28, 1–25.  
1985 Die vedischen Zitate im Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.  
1993 Die vedischen Zitate in der Kāśikā Vṛtti. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.  
1997 The Earliest Literary Evidence for Permanent Vedic Settlements. In: M. Witzel (ed.), Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts: New Approaches to the Study of the Vedas (Cambridge, Mass.) [HOS Opera Minora vol. 2], 203–206.
- Ravi Varma, L.A.  
1940 Āgniveśyagr̥hyasūtra. Trivandrum.
- Ray, Tapas S.  
2003 Oriya. In: G. Cardona & D. Jain (eds.), The Indo-Aryan languages (London: Routledge), 444–476.
- Renou, Louis  
1925 La Valeur du Parfait dans les Hymnes Védiques. Paris [Collection Linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris. — XVIII].  
1929 L'absolutif sanskrit en *-am*. In: MSL 32, 359–392.

- 1933 Le suffixe -ima- en sanskrit. In: O. Stein & W. Gampert (eds.), Festschrift Moriz Winternitz (Leipzig), 18–28.
- 1936 Sur le sens de Sanskrit *maryādā*-. In: BSL 37, 141–144.
- 1938 Hymnes et prières du Veda. Textes traduits du sanskrit. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- 1939a Les éléments védiques dans le vocabulaire du sanskrit classique. In: JA 231, 321–404.
- 1939b La maison védique. In: JA 231, 481–504.
- 1946 Indra dans l’Atharvaveda. In: New Indian Antiquary 8, 123–129.
- 1947 Les écoles védiques et la formation du Véda. Paris.
- 1953 Études Pāṇinéennes. 1. Les transitions dans la grammaire de Pāṇini. 2. Le Veda chez Patañjali. In: JA 241, 417–464.
- 1955–69 Études védiques et pāṇinéennes [EVP]. 17 vols. Paris [Publications de l’insitut de civilisation indienne, fascicules 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 26, 27, 30].
- 1956 Hymnes spéculatifs du Véda. Paris: Gallimard.
- 1957a List of remarkable words from the Kashmirian (Paippalāda) version of the Atharva Veda. In: Vāk 5, 74–108.
- 1957b Altindische Grammatik. Introduction générale. Nouvelle édition du texte paru en 1896, au tome I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- 1957b Faits de langue propres au Paippalāda-Atharvaveda. In: EVP III (1957), 105–119.
- 1958 Études sur le Vocabulaire du Rgveda. Première série. Pondichéry: Institut Français d’indologie.
- 1960 Varuṇa dans l’Atharvaveda. In: B. Schlerath (ed.), Festgabe für Herman Lommel zur Vollendung des 75. Lebensjahres (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz), 122–128.
- 1964a Sur deux mots du R̥gveda. 1. dhármaṇ. 2. jar-. In: JA 252, 159–167.
- 1964b Notes sur la version “paippalāda” de l’Atharvaveda (première série). In: JA 252, 421–450.
- 1965 Notes sur la version “paippalāda” de l’Atharvaveda (deuxième série). In: JA 253, 15–42.
- 1997 Choix d’études indiennes. Réunies par Nalini Balbir et Georges-Jean Pinault. 2 parts. Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient.
- Rodhe, Sten  
1946 Deliver us from Evil. Studies on the Vedic Ideas of Salvation. Lund/Copenhagen [Publications by the Swedish Society for Missionary Research, 2].

- Roessler, Ulrike  
 1997 Licht und Leuchten im Ṛgveda. Untersuchungen zum Wortfeld des Leuchtens und zur Bedeutung des Lichts. Swisttal-Odendorf [Indica et Tibetica 32].
- Rolland, Pierre  
 1971 Un rituel domestique védique. Le Varāhagr̥hyasūtra. Traduit et Annoté. Publications universitaires de lettres et sciences humaines d'Aix-en-Provence. Editions OPHRYS.
- Rönnow, K.  
 1927 Trita Āptya. Eine Vedische Gottheit. Uppsala.
- Roth, Rudolph  
 1856 Abhandlung über den Atharva Veda. Tübingen [Tübinger Universitätsschriften 1856, no. 5].  
 1875 Der Atharvaveda in Kaschmir. Tübingen [Tübinger Universitätsschriften 1875, no. 2].  
 1881 Un manuscrit de l'Atharvavéda. In: Atti del IV congresso internazionale degli orientalisti (Firenze 1878), Firenze 1881, Vol. II 89–96.  
 1894 Rechtschreibung im Veda. In: ZDMG 48 101–119, 676–684, 710–11.  
 1994 Kleine Schriften. Herausgegeben von Konrad Meisig. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Roth, Rudolf & William Dwight Whitney  
 1856 Atharva Veda Sanhita. Berlin.  
 1924 Atharva Veda Sanhita. Dritte, unveränderte Auflage (nach der von Max Lindenau besorgten zweiten Auflage). Bonn 1966.
- Salomons, H.J.W.  
 1913 Het Hindoesche Huisritueel volgens de School van Bhāradvāja. Leiden.
- Sani, Saverio  
 1989–90 *Madugha* ou la violence de la douceur. In: BEI 7–8, 238–260.
- Scarlata, Salvatore  
 1999 Die Wurzelkomposita im Ṛg-Veda. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Schaefer, Christiane  
 1994 Das Intensivum im Vedischen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Scheftelowitz, Isidor  
 1906 Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda. Breslau.
- Schlerath, Bernfried  
 1960 Das Königtum im Rig- und Atharvaveda. Ein Beitrag zur Indogermanischen Kulturgeschichte. Wiesbaden [AKM XXXIII, 3].

- 1997 Metallgegenstände in vedischer Zeit. In: C. Becker *et al.* (eds.) *Χρόνος*. Beiträge zur prähistorischen Archäologie zwischen Nord- und Südosteuropa. Festschrift für Bernhard Hänsel (Espelkamp: Marie Leidorf), 819–827.
- Schmidt, Hanns-Peter  
 1958 Vedisch vratá und awestisch urvāta. Hamburg.  
 1968 Br̥haspati und Indra. Untersuchungen zur vedischen Mythologie und Kulturgeschichte. Wiesbaden.  
 1980 The Sēnmurw. Of Birds and Dogs and Bats. In: *Persica* 9, 1–85.
- Schoterman, J.A.  
 1982 The Ṣaṣsahasra Saṁhitā. Chapters 1–5. Leiden.
- Schroeder, Leopold von  
 1897 Ueber die Māitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā, ihr Alter, ihr Verhältniss zu den verwandten Ḍākhā's, ihre sprachliche und historische Bedeutung. In: *ZDMG* 33, 177–207.  
 1881–86 Māitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā. Die Saṁhitā der Māitrāyaṇīya-Ḍākhā. 4 vols. Leipzig [Reprint: Wiesbaden 1970, 1971, 1972, 1972].  
 1892 Die Kāṭhaka-Handschrift des Dayārām Jotsī in Ḍrīnagar und ihre Accente. In: *ZDMG* 46, 427–431.  
 1896 Zwei neuerworbene Handschriften der k.k. Hofbibliothek in Wien mit Fragmenten des Kāṭhaka. In: *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Wien)* 133:11.  
 1898 Die Tübinger Kāṭha-Handschriften und ihre Beziehung zum Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka. In: *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Wien)* 137:4.  
 1900–10 Kāṭhakam. Die Saṁhitā der Kāṭha-Ḍākhā. 3 vols. Leipzig [Reprint: Wiesbaden 1970, 1971, 1972].
- Schwab, Julius  
 1886 Das altindische Thieropfer. Mit Benützung handschriftlicher Quellen bearbeitet. Erlangen.
- Sehgal, S.R.  
 1960 Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtram (Belonging to the Rgveda). Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications [Second Revised Edition 1987].
- Shama Sastri, R.  
 1920 The Bodhāyana Gṛhyasutra. Mysore.
- Sharma, Aryendra  
 1959/60 Beiträge zur vedischen Lexikographie. München: Kitzinger [PHMA 5/6].
- Sharma, B.R.  
 1988–99 Kāṇva Saṁhitā with the Padapāṭha and the Commentaries of Sāyaṇācārya and Ānandabodha. 4 vols. Pune: VSM.

- 2000–01 Sāmaveda Saṃhitā of the Kauthuma School with Padapāṭha and the commentaries of Mādhava, Bharatasvāmin and Sāyaṇa. 2 vols. Cambridge (Mass.).
- Sharma, P.V.
- 1979 Fruits and Vegetables in Ancient India. Varanasi/Delhi: Chaukhambha Orientalia.
- 1981 Caraka-Saṃhitā. Agniveśa's treatise refined and annotated by Caraka and redacted by Dṛḍhabala (Text with English Translation). 2 Vols. Varanasi/Delhi: Chaukhambha Orientalia.
- Shastri, Pandit Ramgopala
- 1922 Brihat Sarvanukramanika of the Atharva Veda edited from original mss. with An Introduction & An Index. Lahore: D.A.V. College.
- Shende, N.J.
- 1952 The Religion and Philosophy of the Atharvaveda. Poona: BORI [Reprint 1985].
- 1967 Kavi and Kāvya in the Atharvaveda. Poona [Univ. of Poona, Publications of the CASS, Class B, No. 1].
- Singh, A.K.
- 1991 Development of Nāgarī Script. Delhi: Parimal Publications.
- Slaje, Walter
- 1993 Śāradā. Deskriptiv-synchrone Schriftkunde zur Bearbeitung kaschmirischer Sanskrit-Manuskripte. Auf der Grundlage von Kuśalas *Ghaṭakharpara-Gūḍhadīpikā* und unter graphischer Mitwirkung von Eva Slaje. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler. Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen.
- 1995 *Ṛtú-*, *Ṛtv(i)ya-*, *Ārtavá-* Weibliche "Fertilität" im Denken vedischer Inder. In: Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society 4, 109–148.
- 2001 Water and Salt (I): Yājñavalkya's *saindhava dr̥ṣṭānta* (BĀU II 4,12). In: IJ 44, 25–57.
- 2005 Kashmir im Mittelalter und die Quellen der Geschichtswissenschaft. In: IJ 48, 1–70.
- 2007 Three Bhaṭṭas, Two Sulṭāns, and the Kashmirian Atharvaveda. In: GRIFFITHS & SCHMIEDCHEN 2007, 329–353.
- forthc. Sāyaṇa oder Mādhava. Verfasserschaft und Reihenfolge der Vedakommentare aus Vijayanagara. Paper delivered at the 30. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Freiburg i.Br., September 2007.
- Smith, Frederick M. & S.J. Carri
- 1994 The Identity and Significance of the *valmīkavapā* in the Vedic Ritual. In: IJ 37, 201–231.
- Sommer, Ferdinand
- 1916 Das Femininum der *u-* und *i-*Adjektiva im Ṛgveda und im Altiranischen. In: IF 36, 165–232.

- 1977 *śatāvayam* RV V 61,5. In: B. Forssman (ed.), *Schriften aus dem Nachlaß* (München: J. Kitzinger), 61–85.
- Sparreboom, M.  
1985 *Chariots in the Veda*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Sparreboom, M. & J.C. Heesterman with assistance of A. De Leeuw van Weenen  
1989 The ritual of setting up the sacrificial fires according to the Vādhūla school (Vādhūlaśrautasūtra 1.1–1.4). Wien.
- Speijer, J.S.  
1886 *Sanskrit Syntax*. Leiden.  
1896 *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*. Straßburg.
- Sreekrishna Sarma, E.R.  
1968 *Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa*. 1: Text. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Staal, Frits  
1983 *AGNI: The Vedic Ritual of the Fire Altar*. 2 vols. Berkeley.  
1992 *Māna: Vedic*. In: B. Bäumer (ed.), *Kalātattvakośa Volume II: Concepts of Space and Time* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass), 355–367.
- Stenzler, Adolf Friedrich  
1864–65 *Indische Hausregeln (I). Āçvalāyana*. Erstes Heft: Text. Zweites Heft: Uebersetzung. Leipzig.  
1876–78 *Indische Hausregeln (II). Pāraskara*. Erstes Heft: Text. Zweites Heft: Uebersetzung. Leipzig.
- Stöner, Heinrich  
1901 *Das Mantrabrāhmaṇa*. 1. Prapāṭhaka. Diss. Halle/Saale.
- Strunk, Klaus  
1983 *Typische Merkmale von Fragesätzen und die altindische ‚Pluti‘*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Sukthankar, V.S. *et al.*  
1927–59 *The Mahābhārata*. For the first time critically edited by V.S. Sukthankar and others. 19 vols. Poona: BORI.
- Sūrya Kānta  
1939 *Atharva-Prātiśākhya*. Edited for the first time together with an Introduction, English translation, notes and indices. Lahore: Meharchand Lachhmandas [Reprint New Delhi 1999].  
1943 *Kāṭhaka-Saṁkalana*. Lahore: Meharchand Lachhmandas [Reprint New Delhi 1981].  
1950 Was the Commentator of the AV. identical with Sāyaṇa of the RV.? In: *Bhāratīya Vidyā* 11, 75–84.
- Syed, Renate  
1990 *Die Flora Altindiens in Literatur und Kunst*. 2 vols. Diss. München.
- Thieme, Paul  
1935 *Pāṇini and the Veda*. Studies in the early history of linguistic science in India. Allahabad: Globe Press.

- 1938 Der Fremdling im R̥gveda. Leipzig 1938.
- 1941 Beiträge zur Vedaexegese. In: ZDMG 95, 82–116, 338–349.
- 1949 Untersuchungen zur Wortkunde und Auslegung des Rigveda. Halle/Saale: Max Niemeyer.
- 1951a Etymologische Vexierbilder. In: KZ 69, 172–178.
- 1951b Der Lachs in Indien. In: KZ 69, 209–216.
- 1952 *Bráhmaṇ*. In: ZDMG 102, 91–129.
- 1958 Review of CARNOY, Dictionnaire étymologique du proto-indo-européen (1955). In: Language 34, 512–515.
- 1967 *kr̥ṣṭí* und *carṣañí*. In: KZ 81, 233–244.
- 1975 Wurzel *yat* im Veda und Avesta (nebst einem Exkurs über eine altiranische (altindische?) Analogie zum zweiten Abenteuer Sindbads, des Seefahrers). In: Monumentum H.S. Nyberg III [Acta Iranica 6] (Leiden), 325–354.
- 1984 Kleine Schriften. 2., unveränderte Auflage mit einem Nachtrag 1984 zur Bibliographie. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- 1994 *barjaha-*. In: StII 19 [Festschrift Georg Buddruss], 367–375.
- 1995a Kleine Schriften II. Herausgegeben von Renate Söhnen-Thieme. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- 1995b Opera Maiora. Band 1. Herausgegeben von Nobuhiko Kobayashi und Werner Knobl. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- Thompson, George
- 1998 On Truth-Acts in Vedic. In: IJ 41, 125–153.
- Tichy, Eva
- 1995 Die Nomina Agentis auf *-tar-* im Vedischen. Heidelberg.
- Tokunaga, Muneo
- 1997 The Bṛhaddevatā. Text reconstructed from the Manuscripts of the Shorter Recension with Introduction, Explanatory Notes, and Indices. Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co.
- Tsuji, N.
- 1983 The Agnicayana Section of the Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā with Special Reference to the Mānava Śrautasūtra. In: STAAL 1983/II, 135–160.
- Tucker, Elizabeth
- 2002a When old is not old . . . : *R̥V jarádaṣṭi-*, *jaradvīṣam*, and the vulture *jaradgava*. In: JAOS 122, 419–427.
- 2002b *RV ṛgmín-*, *ṛgmíya-* and *ṛñjate*. In: Historische Sprachforschung (KZ/ZVS) 115, 274–300.
- Turner, R.L.
- 1966 A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages. London: Oxford University Press.
- de Vaan, Michiel
- 2003 The Avestan Vowels. Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi.

Vallini, Cristina

- 1979 Gr. ΕΛΕΨΑΣ: Storia di un'etimologia. In: ΑΙΩΝ. Annali del Seminario di Studi del Mondo Classico, Sezione linguistica 1, 123–186.

Vidyāratna, Rāmanārāyaṇa

- 1864–74 The Śrauta Sūtra of Āśwalāyana with the commentary of Gārgya Nārāyaṇa. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society [Reprint 1989].

Vidyavāridhi, Vijayapāla

- 1997 Śrī-Vāmana-Jayāditya-viracitā Pāṇinīyāṣṭādhyāyīsūtravṛttiḥ Kāśikā. Rāmlāl Kapūr Ṭraṣṭ, Bahālgar, Haryana.

Vine, Brent

- 1997 On the Expression of Reflexive Possession in the Rig-Veda: RV *svá-*. In: E. Pirart (ed.), Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes (Barcelona: Editorial AUSA), 203–214.

Vishva Bandhu

- 1960 Atharvaveda (Śaunaka) with the Pada-pāṭha and Sāyaṇācārya's Commentary. 4 parts. Hoshiarpur: VVRI [Second edition: 1990].
- 1966 Brāhmaṇic Citations. Hoshiarpur: VVRI.
- 1966 Atharvavedīya-Bṛhatsarvānukramaṇikā. Hoshiarpur: VVRI.
- 1967 Vaitāna-Śrauta-Sūtra with The Commentary called *Akṣepānwidhi* by Somāditya. Hoshiarpur: VVRI.
- 1971 Vedic Textuo-Linguistic Studies. 8. An Atharvan Hymn to Lac (*Lākṣā-*) — AV V,5. In: VIJ 9, 1–20, 281–289.
- (2)1973–92 A Vedic Word Concordance. 5 parts, 16 vols. Hoshiarpur: VVRI.

Vogel, J.Ph.

- 1926 Indian Serpent-Lore or The Nāgas in Hindu Legend and Art. London: Arthur Probsthain.

Wackernagel, Jakob & Albert Debrunner

- 1896 Altindische Grammatik. Band I: Lautlehre. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. [Nachträge zu Band I von Albert Debrunner. Göttingen 1957].
- 1905 Altindische Grammatik. Band II,1: Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. [Nachträge zu Band II 1 von Albert Debrunner. Göttingen 1957].
- 1930 Altindische Grammatik. Band III: Nominalflexion – Zahlwort – Pronomen von Albert Debrunner und Jakob Wackernagel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- 1954 Altindische Grammatik. Band II,2: Die Nominalsuffixe von Albert Debrunner. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Watkins, Calvert

- 1995 How to Kill a Dragon: aspects of Indo-European poetics. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 1997 'Throng-lord of throngs': An Indo-Iranian Stylistic figure. In: E. Pirart (ed.), Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes (Barcelona: Editorial AUSA), 215–220.

- Watt, George  
 1889–96 A Dictionary of the Economic Products of India. 6 vols. & Index. Calcutta [Reprint: Delhi 1972].
- Weber, Albrecht  
 1852 The Vâjasaneyi-Sanhitâ in the Mâdhyandina- and the Kâṇva-Çâkhâ with the Commentary of Mahîdhara. Berlin & London.  
 1855 The Çatapatha-Brâhmaṇa in the Mâdhyandina-Çâkhâ. Berlin & London.  
 1858 Zwei Vedische texte über Omina und Portenta. In: Abh. der Kön. Ak. der Wiss. zu Berlin, 320–413.  
 1859 The Çrautasûtra of Kâtyâyana with Extracts from the Commentaries of Karka and Yâjñikadeva. Berlin & London.  
 1871–72 Die Taittirîya-Saṃhitâ. 2 vols. Indische Studien 11 (1871) & 12 (1872).  
 1898 Fünftes Buch der Atharva-Saṃhitâ. In: Indische Studien 18, 154–288.
- Werba, Chlodwig H.  
 1997 Verba Indoarica. Die primären und sekundären Wurzeln der Sanskrit-Sprache. Pars I: Radices Primariae. Wien.
- West, Martin L.  
 1973 Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique applicable to Greek and Latin texts. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Whitney, William Dwight  
 1853 Tabellarische Darstellung der gegenseitigen Verhältnisse der Sanhitâs des Rik, Sâman, weissen Yajus und Atharvan. In: Indische Studien 2, 321–368.  
 1856 Contributions from the Atharva-Veda to the Theory of Sanskrit Verbal Accent. In: JAOS 5, 387–419.  
 1862 The Atharvaveda-Prâtisâkhya or Śaunakîya Caturâdhyâyikâ: text, translation and notes. JAOS 7 [Reprint: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies XX, Varanasi 1962].  
 1881 Index Verborum to the Published Text of the Atharva-Veda. JAOS 12 [Reprint: Topos Verlag, Vaduz, Liechtenstein 1982].  
 1882 Eggeling's Translation of the Çatapatha-Brâhmaṇa. In: AJPh 3, 391–410.  
 1885 The Roots, Verb-forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language. Leipzig [Reprint: New Haven (Ct.) 1945, American Oriental Series, Vol. 30].  
 1889 Sanskrit Grammar. Leipzig [Second edition, 17th issue 1993: Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press].  
 1893 The Native Commentary to the Atharva-Veda. In: Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth zum Doktor-Jubiläum 24. August 1893 von seinen Freunden und Schülern (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer), 89–96.

- 1905 Atharva-Veda Saṁhitā: translated with a critical and exegetical Commentary. Revised and brought nearer to completion and edited by Charles Rockwell Lanman. 2 vols. Cambridge (Mass.).
- Windfuhr, Gernot L.
- 1999 A Note on Aryaman's Social and Cosmic Setting. In: J. Bronkhorst & M.M. Deshpande (eds.), *Aryan and Non-Aryan in South Asia. Evidence, Interpretation and Ideology* (Cambridge, Mass.) [HOS-Opera Minora vol. 3], 295–336.
- Winternitz, Moriz
- 1887 *Āpastambīya Gṛihyasūtra*. With extracts from the commentaries of Haradatta and Sudarśanārya. Vienna.
- 1897 *The Mantrapāṭha or the Prayer Book of the Āpastambins*. Oxford.
- Witzel, Michael
- 1973–76 On the Reconstruction of the Authentic Paippalāda-Saṁhitā. Part I: *Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha* 29 (1973), 463–488. Part II: *JGJKSV* 32 (1976), 137–168.
- 1974a *Das Kaṭha Āraṇyaka*. Textkritische Edition mit Übersetzung und Kommentar (Teildruck). Erlangen (Diss. Erlangen 1972).
- 1974b On Some Unknown Systems of Marking the Vedic Accent. In: *VIJ [Vishva Bandhu Commemoration Volume]* 12, 472–502.
- 1979–80 *Die Kaṭha-Śikṣā-Upaniṣad und ihrer Verhältnis zur Śikṣāvallī der Taittirīya-Upaniṣad*. In: *WZKS* 23, 5–28; *WZKS* 24, 21–82.
- 1980 Early Eastern Iran and the Atharvaveda. In: *Persica* 9, 86–128.
- 1983 Anunāsika in Medieval Veda tradition. In: *IJ* 25, 180.
- 1985a *Die Atharvaveda-Tradition und die Paippalāda-Saṁhitā*. In: *ZDMG*, Supplementband VI, 256–271.
- 1985b *Die mündliche Tradition der Paippalādins von Orissa*. In: *MSS* 44 [= Festgabe für Karl Hoffmann, Teil I], 259–287.
- 1985c Zu den Namen vedischer Śākhās. In: *StII* 10, 231–237.
- 1986 On the Archetype of Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*. In: *IJ* 29, 249–259.
- 1989 Tracing the Vedic Dialects. In: C. Caillat (ed.), *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes* (Paris), 97–265.
- 1994a *Kashmiri Manuscripts and Pronunciation*. In: Y. Ikari (ed.), *A Study of the Nīlamata. Aspects of Hinduism in Kashmir* (Kyoto), 1–53.
- 1994b *The Brahmins of Kashmir*. In: Y. Ikari (ed.), *A Study of the Nīlamata. Aspects of Hinduism in Kashmir* (Kyoto), 237–294.
- 1996 Looking for the Heavenly Casket. In: *StII* 20 [Veda-Vyākaraṇa-Vyākhyāna: Festschrift Paul Thieme zum 90. Geburtstag am 18. März 1995], 531–544.
- 1997a *The Development of the Vedic Canon and its Schools: The Social and Political Milieu*. In: M. Witzel (ed.), *Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts: New Approaches to the Study of the Vedas* (Cambridge, Mass.) [HOS-Opera Minora vol. 2], 257–345.

- 1997b Early Sanskritization. Origins and development of the Kuru State. In: B. Kölver (ed.), *Recht, Staat und Verwaltung im klassischen Indien. The state, the Law, and Administration in Classical India* (München: R. Oldenbourg), 27–52.
- 1998 Aryan and non-Aryan Names in Vedic India: Data for the linguistic situation, c. 1900–500 B.C. In: J. Bronkhorst & M.M. Deshpande (eds.), *Aryan and Non-Aryan in South Asia. Evidence, Interpretation and Ideology* (Cambridge, Mass.) [HOS-Opera Minora vol. 3], 337–404.
- 2004 *Kaṭha Āraṇyaka*. Critical edition with a translation into German and an introduction. Cambridge (Mass.).
- Wolff, Fritz  
1910 *Avesta. Die heiligen Bücher der Parsen*. Strassburg.
- Wright, J.C.  
1967 Review of BHATTACHARYYA 1964. In: BSOAS 30, 201–202.  
2002 Review of BHATTACHARYA 1997. In: BSOAS 65, 194–196.
- Zehnder, Thomas  
1993 *Vedische Studien: Textkritische und Sprachhistorische Untersuchungen zur Paippalāda-Saṃhitā. Kāṇḍa 1*. Unpublished Lizentiatsarbeit, Zürich.  
1999 *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Buch 2, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Idstein: Schulz-Kirchner Verlag.  
2004a Review of LUBOTSKY 2002. In: IJ 47, 54–62.  
2004b Review of Rodríguez Martín SEVILLA, *Conjuros mágicos des Atharvaveda*. Estudio, transcripción del texto sánscrito, traducción y comentario (Oviedo 2002). In: IJ 47, 375–386.
- Zimmer, Heinrich  
1879 *Altindisches Leben. Die Cultur der Vedischen Arier nach den Saṃhitā dargestellt*. Berlin.
- Zimmer, Stefan  
1986 On a Special Meaning of *jána-* in the Ṛgveda. In: IJ 29, 109–115.
- Zysk, Kenneth G.  
1985 Towards the Notion of Health in the Vedic Phase of Indian Medicine. In: ZDMG 135, 312–318.  
1993 *Religious Medicine. The History and Evolution of Indian Medicine*. New Brunswick-London: Transaction Publishers [Reprint of *Religious healing in the Veda*, Philadelphia 1985].



## INDEX VERBORUM

The following is an index to all the words and word-forms contained in kāṇḍas 6 and 7 of the PS. Citation forms of nouns generally follow EWAia. Pronouns are cited in their nominative singular (masculine) form. For example, all forms of the first person pronoun are found under *aham*, all forms of the demonstrative pronoun under *sa*, etc. Verbal roots are cited in full grade, and homophonous roots are numbered in accordance with EWAia.

### Structure of a nominal lemma

A lemma is the stem of the word, delimited by a hyphen (-). Compounds have been dissolved and are given in the alphabetical order resulting from this dissolution: *nis-nij-* and not *nirṇij-*. Non-initial members are also listed separately, and marked with a raised circle (°). The order of cases is conventional: nominative, vocative, accusative, instrumental, dative, ablative, genitive, locative. In the case of pronouns and adjectives, the nom.-acc. sg. neuter directly follows the nom. masculine. Feminine forms stand at the end of the lemma. Furthermore, “[c]ases of identical form in the same number are not distinguished from one another: thus, for example, the nominatives and accusatives neuter (nor, in adjective-stems in *a*, is the accus. masc. sing. separated from the neuter), the genitives and ablative singular, the dative and ablative plural, and so on. But the homophonous cases of different numbers are always given separately; and vocatives are distinguished from nominatives and accusatives in all numbers” (WHITNEY 1881: 6).

### Structure of a verbal lemma

A lemma is the citation form of the root, without further delimitation. Only secondary verbal stems are delimited by a raised circle (°). Individual forms are not analyzed explicitly, but appear in the following order: pres. act. (indic., impf., inj., subj., opt., impv., ptc.); pres. med. (idem); aor. act. (indic., inj., subj., opt./prec., impv., ptc.; aor. med. (idem); pf. act. (indic., ppf., ppf. inj., subj., opt., ptc.; pf. med. (idem); fut. act./med.; pass., pass. aor.; caus. act./med., redupl. aor.; des. act./med.; int. act./med.; non-finite forms (ta-/na-participle, gerundive, absolute, infinitives); noteworthy nominal derivatives. Uncompounded forms are given first, then forms compounded with preverbs (+), in the alphabetical order of the preverbs. Preverbs (prepositions) are also given under a separate lemma, where preverbal function is distinguished (with *prev.*) from prepositional usage. In the case of tmesis or postposition of preverbs, the preverb is printed before the verb form, but with intervening dots (...).

### Other symbols

- Dubious lemmata are prefixed with a question mark (?)
- Cross-references are indicated by an arrow (→)

**aṁśa-** aṁśas 6.19.4a  
**aṁśu-** aṁśus 6.9.1a  
**aṁśumant-** aṁśumān 7.5.8c  
**†aṁsūn†** 6.14.6d  
**aṁhas-** aṁhasas 7.3.8d 7.19.9d  
**aṁhura-** aṁhuras 6.2.6b  
**a-kuśala-** \*akuśalām 6.23.3b  
**°akti-** → śīrṣ-akti-  
**a-krūra-** akrūraṇa 6.9.8b  
**°akṣa-** → an-akṣa- → catuṣ-akṣa-  
 → trasta-akṣa- → sam-akṣa-  
 → hirā-akṣa-  
**akṣi-** akṣī 7.13.7b<sup>+</sup> akṣyau 6.6.1d,2d  
 7.2.3a<sup>+</sup>  
**agni-** agnis 6.9.3c 6.10.8a 6.18.1c 6.23.9a  
 7.2.1c 7.11.1c 7.14.1a 7.16.1a 7.18.3c agne  
 6.8.6c 6.11.9c 6.17.1c,11c 6.19.1a,2a,4a,5a,  
 6a,7a 7.1.3a 7.3.1a,2a,3d 7.18.1c 6.19.3a  
 agnim 6.10.6b 7.17.1a agninā 7.2.10d  
 agnes 6.10.7b 7.5.3d,4b,9b 7.15.3d agna-  
 yas 6.18.2b  
**°agni-** → indrā-agni-  
**agni-hotra-** agnihotram 6.10.2b  
**agnī-soma-** agnīṣomau 6.11.7b  
**agra-** agram 6.9.5d agre 6.6.4c 7.7.1a  
 7.19.10c  
**°agra-** → vāta-agra-  
**agriya-** agriyas 6.1.8b  
**agre-tuṇḍika-** agretuṇḍikam 6.14.5a  
**agha-** agham 7.1.5a  
**agha-kṛt-** aghakṛte 7.1.5a  
**aghalā-** aghalā 6.14.7c  
**agha-śaṁsa-** aghaśaṁsas 6.20.6a  
**aghāy°** *aghāyant-* aghāyatas 7.3.2b  
 +**abhi** abhyaghāyanti 6.11.8b  
**aghāyu-** aghāyus 6.11.9b 6.12.8a 6.13.3a  
 6.20.8d aghāyunā 7.8.7b aghāyavas  
 7.3.5d 7.17.1b,2b,3b,4b,5b,6b,7b,8b,9b,10b  
**a-ghoṣant-** aghoṣatas 7.8.1b  
**aghnyā-** aghnyās 7.13.12b  
**aṅkin-** aṅkinam 7.12.9b  
**aṅkuśa-** aṅkuśam 7.12.9a  
**aṅga** 6.4.10d  
**°aṅga-** → sarva-aṅga- → sahasra-

aṅga- → sthira-aṅga-  
**aṅga-roga-** aṅgarogāt 7.15.7c  
**°aṅguli-** → mṛdu-aṅguli-  
**?aṅgoṣṭhya-** aṅgoṣṭhyās 6.3.12b  
**a-cyuta-** acyutā 6.7.4a  
**achā** 7.12.1d,7c  
**aj**  
 +**ā** āja 6.23.4a  
 +**upa** upejatu 7.8.4c  
 +**nis** nir aja 6.23.4a  
**?aja-babhru-** ajababhru 6.4.8b  
**ajā-** ajābhyas 6.15.8c  
**a-jurya-** ajuryam 6.2.4b\*  
**ajman-** ajma 7.4.6d\*  
**añj** anajmi 6.6.8c anaktu 6.6.5c,7c  
 +**ni** nyanjanti 6.6.8b  
 +**sam** *sam-akta-* samaktās 6.22.8d,  
 11b  
**atas** 6.1.7d 6.2.2b  
**ati** + *acc.* 6.23.2c,d *prev.* 7.18.4a,5a  
**°ati-vyādhyā-** → an-ati-vyādhyā-  
**ati-sara-** atisarās 7.18.2c,4a,5a  
**atra** 6.2.3c 6.11.2c 6.22.12d 7.18.9a\*,9c  
 atrā 6.16.7c  
**atha** 7.19.6c  
**atharvaṇ-** atharvā 6.1.9a  
**atho** 6.6.2c 6.9.2c,4d,6b 6.14.4c 6.15.3c,4c  
 6.21.1a 6.23.3b,7c 7.1.2c 7.10.2e,4f 7.12.5d  
 7.19.9b  
**ad** atti 6.14.7a,7d<sup>+</sup> addhi 6.8.9c  
**°ad-** → āma-ad- → kravya-ad-  
 → sasya-ad-  
**°ad(a)-** → āṇḍa-ada-  
 → ūbadhyā-ad(a)-  
**a-dabdha-asu-** adabdhāsus 6.2.1c  
**a-dāya-** adāyas 7.4.7b<sup>+</sup>  
**a-diti-** aditis 6.10.3c adites 6.2.9b  
**a-drṣṭa-** adrṣṭas 7.2.8d adrṣṭās 6.8.8b  
 adrṣṭān 7.2.7c  
**a-drṣṭa-han-** adrṣṭahā 7.2.7b  
**a-deva-** adevas 7.18.3b  
**adya** 6.20.5c,7a 7.3.11c 7.9.3a,8c,10c  
**a-druh-** adruhas 6.17.3b  
**a-dviṣeṇya-** adviṣeṇyas 6.16.3c

- adhara-** adharam 7.18.10c adharāt  
6.21.4b adharā 7.12.3d adharābhyas  
7.12.3bd
- adharāñc-** adharāñcam 7.10.10d  
adharācīm 6.23.2b<sup>+</sup>,3a
- adhas** 7.12.3c 7.13.3b
- adhas-pada-** adhaspadam 7.18.7c,10b  
adhaspadāt 7.15.8a
- adhā** 6.2.5d
- adhi** + *abl.* 6.6.3c 6.22.1d 6.23.1b 7.5.3d  
7.9.7e + *loc.* 6.2.5a\* 6.6.8bd 6.17.6a  
6.21.6d 7.5.10ad 7.6.8a 7.12.6a *prev.* 6.7.4b
- adhi-pati-** adhipatim 6.9.6b
- adhvara-** adhvaram 6.17.1a
- an-akṣa-** anakṣāsas 6.11.3c
- anaḍvah-** anaḍvān 6.5.5a 7.10.4b
- an-ati-vyādhyā-** anativyādhyam  
7.8.9b
- an-antarva-** anantarve 6.8.5b
- an-amitra-** anamitrā 7.6.8c
- an-amīva-** anamīvas 7.6.10b
- an-ava-dhṛta-** anavadhṛtā 6.23.6c
- an-astha-** anasthās 6.22.2a
- an-āgas-** anāgase 7.8.7d
- an-ā-dhṛṣṭa-** anādhṛṣṭāsas 6.17.5b
- an-āpta-** anāptā(ḥ) 6.11.2a
- an-ā-stigya-** anāstigyam 7.8.9a\*
- an-ā-huti-** anāhutim 6.14.1b
- an<sup>i</sup>**  
+ **pra** prāṇihī 7.15.2d  
+ **vi** *vyanant-* vyanat 6.1.2c  
→ a-vi-anant-
- a-nimiṣa-** animiṣas 7.4.2c animiṣeṇa  
7.4.3a
- anu** + *acc.* 6.3.2c 6.6.2a,6b 6.16.4b  
6.23.4d,6a *prev.* 6.1.1d,4b 6.2.3b(?) 6.7.7a  
6.11.5c 6.21.5a 6.22.12d 7.1.1a 7.4.6ab 7.6.1b,  
2d 7.8.4b 7.9.4c 7.13.3a,5a 7.18.9e
- an-udita-** anuditām 6.2.2d
- anu-plava-** anuplavam 7.7.4b<sup>+</sup>
- anu-mati-** anumatim 7.9.9a
- anu-mādyā-** anumādyas 7.8.4b
- anu-vyādha-** anuvyādhat 7.15.1c
- an-ṛta-** anṛtam 6.5.12a anṛtāt 7.8.8b
- °anta-** → tīvra-anta-
- antar** + *acc.* 6.12.5a 7.11.5c + *loc.*  
6.7.2b 6.10.8a 6.21.1b 7.3.11a
- antarā** 6.23.6b,9a 7.11.5b
- antarikṣa-** antarikṣam 6.5.2a 6.18.5c  
6.22.12a antarikṣeṇa 7.14.2b 7.16.2a  
antarikṣāya 6.13.11a,14a  
antarikṣe 7.13.3b,4b,5b
- antarikṣavant-** antarikṣavantam  
7.17.2a
- °antarva-** → an-antarva-
- antaṣṭya-āmaya-** antaṣṭyāmayāt  
7.15.7d<sup>+</sup>
- andha-** andham 6.20.9a
- andhya-** andhyāt 7.15.6c
- anna-** annam 6.23.7c 7.15.7d annena  
7.15.5a
- anya-** anyam 7.3.1d
- anyatra** anyatra 7.3.5d
- ap-** āpas 6.3.1d,3a,4a,5a,6c,7a,8d,9c,10a,  
11b,13d 6.18.9a 7.3.9d 7.11.1b apas  
7.16.6a 7.17.6a apām 6.4.6c 6.16.9a
- apa** *prev.* 6.1.8d 6.11.3c 6.11.6b 7.4.8b  
7.5.7d,12d 7.7.3aab(?) 7.7.8d 7.7.9ab 7.8.1d  
7.9.6a 7.15.4d 7.19.2a,3b
- apa-gūḍha-** apagūḍham 7.19.3b
- apa-dagdha-** apadagdhām 7.7.9a  
apadagdhās 7.7.9b
- apa-bādhamāna-** apabādhamānas  
7.4.8b
- a-parā-nutta-** aparānuttās 7.6.3c
- apāñc-** apāñcam 6.23.2a apāñcas  
7.8.7a
- apāna-** apāna 6.5.1d,13d apānas  
6.5.10a
- apī** 6.1.3a 6.22.2b,5b 7.2.6d 7.13.1d–14d  
7.18.5e
- °apidhāna-** → oṣṭha-apidhāna-
- a-pūruṣa-** apūruṣam 6.8.7b
- a-pṛtanya-** apṛtanyas 6.9.10d
- a-prāpya** aprāpya 7.8.1c
- apsaras-** apsarasas 6.22.13a 7.11.3a
- °apsaras-** → gandharva-apsaras-
- abhi** + *acc.* 6.11.4a 6.22.11a 7.4.7a

- prev.* 6.1.3d 6.2.5c 6.2.6b 6.4.9b 6.9.12a  
6.10.3a(?)b,4d 6.11.8b 6.11.9b 6.12.6c  
6.12.8a–13.3a 6.14.4a 6.17.9a 7.1.8b,9b  
7.3.10c 7.4.9c 7.6.1d,5b,9d 7.9.3a 7.17.1b–  
10b 7.18.9c
- abhi-añjana-** abhyañjanam 7.15.7c  
**abhi-ama-** abhyamam 6.14.3a  
**abhi-ghārīta-** abhighārīta 6.9.12a  
**abhi-pāpada-** abhipāpadam 6.14.4a  
**abhi-bhañjant-** abhibhañjatīnām  
7.4.9c  
**abhi-yant-** abhiyantas 6.2.5c  
**abhi-vīra-** abhivīras 7.4.5c  
°**abhi-śasti-** → daivya-abhiśasti-  
**abhi-satvan-** abhiṣatvā 7.4.5c  
**abhi-sthita-** abhiṣṭhitas 7.1.8b  
**am** āmamat 7.15.4a  
*āmayant-* āmayatas 7.15.8a  
→ abhi-ama-  
**a-mitra-** amitrān 7.4.8bc  
°**amitra-** → an-amitra-  
**amīva-** amīvās 7.7.3c,8d  
°**amīva-** → an-amīva-  
**amīva-cātana-** amīvacātanās 7.5.8b  
**amutas** 6.8.4b 7.18.3a  
**a-mūra-** amūra 6.2.8d\*  
**a-mṛta-** amṛtam 6.5.11a 6.11.7d 6.22.10b  
7.6.1b amṛtena 7.14.10b amṛtasya  
7.10.6c,8c amṛtā 7.15.10b amṛtāni  
6.2.3c 6.22.11d  
**amṛta-asu-** amṛtāsus 6.2.1b,6c  
**a-meni-** amenis 6.11.8a amenim  
6.11.9c amenayas 6.11.8b  
**a-mlāta-** amlātayā 7.12.4c  
<sup>1</sup>**ay** eṣi 6.2.6c aita 6.3.1c ayat 6.9.5c  
*yant-* yantas 7.9.9b ihi 6.8.6d 7.1.8c<sup>+</sup>  
yantu 7.3.5c 7.4.9d 7.8.7a °*ita-* → dus-  
ita-  
+**anu+pra** anupraimas 7.9.4c  
+**anu+sam** anusamṃyanti 7.13.3a  
+**apa** apehi 7.9.6a  
+**api** api yanti 6.22.2b  
+**api+sam** api. . . sam eti 6.22.5b  
+**abhi** *abhi-yant-* abhiyantas 6.2.5c  
+**ā** ā. . . emi 7.3.10a ehi 6.4.4d,9d aitu  
6.10.3c 7.10.1a ā. . . etu 7.15.10c aitana  
7.18.3e ā yantu 6.17.10a 7.18.1d *ā-*  
*yant-* āyatas 6.6.2c 6.9.4c  
+**ut+ā** ut. . . ā. . . emi 6.3.4d  
+**upa** upehi 6.10.6c upethana 7.3.9b  
upa yantu 6.22.6c,7c  
+**parā** *parā-yant-* parāyatas 6.9.4d  
+**pari** paryeti 7.11.10b  
+**purās** pura etu 7.4.9b  
+**pra** praimi 7.16.1c,5c,6c,10c *pra-*  
*yant-* prayatas 7.15.8d preyus 7.18.8a  
+**prati** pratīmas 6.10.9a 7.15.9c  
<sup>2</sup>**ay** inoṣi 6.1.7d  
°**ayana-** → parā-ayana- → hastya-  
ayana-  
**ayam** ayam 6.9.1ab,4a 6.12.3a 6.18.1c  
7.10.2c,4d idam 6.14.6a 6.21.3ab 7.5.10a  
7.18.2b imam 6.4.7d 6.9.6d 7.2.1d 7.4.6a  
7.11.9d anena 7.2.2d asmaī 6.2.9c  
6.7.3d 7.1.7c asya 6.22.1aac 7.2.2a,6c  
7.18.5e asmin 6.22.13d 6.23.11a 6.23.11b\*  
6.23.12bd 7.6.3d imau 6.23.10c,12c 7.4.1b  
ime 6.22.11b 7.18.2c imā 6.1.8a imān  
6.3.3b 6.22.11a<sup>+</sup> 6.23.2c eṣām 6.22.2d,3ab  
iyam 6.10.9a 6.23.11a imām 7.6.2b,5a,6a  
7.11.10d 7.12.10a 7.15.4a asyai 6.23.1c,3c,  
5c,7ad 7.6.4c asyās 6.9.6c 6.23.5a 7.6.5c  
7.15.10a asyām 6.6.8d 6.10.8b 6.20.2b  
imās 6.23.2d 7.3.9d ābhis 6.3.9a ābhyas  
6.3.4d āsām 6.3.10c 7.4.9a  
**a-yātu-** ayātos 6.3.12c  
**a-yodhya-** ayodhyas 7.4.7c  
ayodhyena 7.4.3b  
<sup>1</sup>**ar** īrte 6.2.7c  
+**pra** pra. . . īrate 6.16.5d  
+**ā** erayanta 6.2.3d  
+**sam** *sam-ṛta-* samṛteṣu 7.4.11a  
<sup>2</sup>**ar** ṛchāt 6.12.8b\* 6.13.3b\* ṛchatu  
6.12.6d 7.1.5d,9c ṛchantu 7.17.1a,2a,3a,  
4a,5a,6a,7a,8a,9a,10a  
**araṇa-** araṇas 7.8.2a araṇam 6.23.4c  
**araṇya-** araṇyam 6.23.4b araṇyāt  
6.23.4c

- araṇyeya-** araṇyeyam 6.14.5d  
**aram** 6.16.7d  
**a-rasa-** arasam 7.18.8d arasās 7.8.6b  
**a-rāti-** arāte 7.9.1a,2a,3c,5c,7d arātim 7.9.4c,8d arātaye 7.9.4d 7.19.3d,4d arātayas 7.2.2c,9c 7.7.9b arātīs 7.15.4c  
**a-rāya-** arāyas 6.14.7c,8b<sup>+</sup> arāyam 7.11.7c 7.19.5c arāyās 6.8.6a arāyān 6.14.6e  
**a-ripra-** ariprās 6.1.9c  
**a-riṣṭa-** ariṣṭāsas 6.20.2c  
**ariṣṭatāti-** ariṣṭatātaye 7.5.11d  
**ariṣṭa-vīra-** ariṣṭavīrās 7.6.5b  
**arundhatī-** arundhati 6.4.4d,9d,10b  
**aruṣa-** aruṣās 6.18.3a  
**aruṣ-** aruṣ 6.4.3b  
**arka-** arkam 6.17.5a arkās 6.18.3b  
**arc** ānrcus 6.17.5a  
**arci-** arcibhis 7.3.1a  
**arciṣ-** arciṣā 7.3.2a  
**arjuna-** arjunas 7.2.6b  
**aṇava-** aṇavam 6.17.8b aṇave 6.7.2b aṇavān 6.11.5c  
**ard** ardayat 6.16.1d  
**ardh** ṛdhyāsam 7.3.11c  
<sup>+</sup>**vi** vīrtsīs 7.9.3c<sup>+</sup>,8a<sup>+</sup> *vi-ṛtsant-* vīrtsantī 7.9.5c<sup>+</sup>  
**ardha-** ardham 6.2.8c ardhena 6.2.8cd  
**armyeya-** armyeyam 6.14.5d  
**aryamaṇ-** aryamā 6.4.1b 6.19.3c  
**arvant-** arvatis 7.3.10c  
<sup>1</sup>**arṣ** arṣatu 6.20.8d  
<sup>2</sup>**arṣ**  
<sup>+</sup>**ut** *ut-ṛṣant-* udṛṣan 6.8.6d  
**aliṃśa-** aliṃśam 6.14.5b  
**ava** 6.3.2c 6.7.1c 6.11.6b 6.15.5b,6b 7.1.8c 7.3.7a<sup>2</sup> 7.7.7a  
**ava-ṛti-** avartīs 6.22.4d  
**ava-tata-** avatatam 7.7.7a  
**ava-dala-** avadalam 6.14.2a  
**avadya-** avadyam 6.3.10c,11b avadyāt 6.3.3c 6.11.7c  
<sup>o</sup>**ava-dhṛta-** → an-ava-dhṛta-  
<sup>o</sup>**avama-** → ekādaśa-avama-
- avara-** avaram 6.1.7a  
**avas-** avasā 6.1.7b 6.16.6d avase 7.15.9c  
**avasyu-** avasyave 7.20.6a  
**ava-hata-** avahatasya 6.15.5b,6b  
**avāñc-** avāñcīm 6.23.3a  
**av<sup>i</sup>** avatā 7.4.11d āvitha 6.1.7b  
<sup>+</sup>**pra** avatu pra 7.4.7d  
**avi-** avim 7.18.5c avibhyas 6.15.8b avīnām 6.20.7b  
**a-vi-anant-** avyanat 6.1.2c  
**avitar-** avitā 6.16.2c 7.4.8d  
**a-vṛddha-** avṛddham 7.3.11a  
**a-śam** 6.23.7ab  
**aś<sup>i</sup>** aśnāti 6.23.7c 7.19.8d *aśyamāna-* aśyamānas 6.22.9c<sup>+</sup>  
<sup>+</sup>**vi** vy āśnāt 7.12.8a  
**aśīti-** aśītīs 6.20.3c  
**a-śīrṣaṇ-** aśīrṣaṇam 6.20.9b  
**aśman-** aśmā 6.12.7a\* aśmanā 7.2.10c\*  
**aśma-varmaṇ-** aśmavarma 6.12.8b 6.13.3b  
**aśva-** aśvas 6.4.8c 6.6.6b aśvam 7.1.12d 7.15.5c aśvasya 6.4.9a aśvebhyas 6.20.10d aśvānām 6.20.7c  
**aśva-abhidhānī-** aśvābhidhānyā 7.1.12d  
**aśvattha-** aśvatthas 7.5.4a 7.10.6a aśvatthe 6.4.4b  
**aṣṭa-** aṣṭau 6.20.3c  
<sup>o</sup>**aṣṭi-** → jarat-aṣṭi-  
<sup>1</sup>**as** asmi 6.8.2c 6.12.3a,6b asi 6.4.1cd,2c,3cd,5d,6c,8d,9c,10c 6.6.3c 6.8.1d,3d 6.9.10b 6.11.5d,6aaaa,8a 6.12.2aaaa,7a 6.21.6b 7.1.11b 7.5.9d 7.7.4c,6a 7.10.4a,9d 7.12.5ab,6d 7.19.1a asti 6.12.2b 7.7.4a sthas 6.12.1b smasi 6.21.4d sthā 6.3.12d santi 6.20.3c 6.22.10c asat 6.9.5d 7.12.9d asati 6.23.9c syāma 7.3.8b 7.18.9f edhi 6.7.8d 6.16.3d 7.4.8d 7.6.8c,10b astu 6.9.10d 6.10.8d,9d 6.12.8b 6.13.3b 6.22.9d 6.23.8a 7.1.5a 7.9.4d,7a stam 6.12.1c<sup>+</sup> stām 6.23.12c santu 6.11.4d,8b 7.8.6b *sant-* san 6.6.3d 6.12.6b santam 6.22.10a sate 7.8.7d āsa 6.1.1a

- <sup>2</sup>**as** astāt 7.4.4d *asta-* astās 7.8.7b  
 +**vi** vy asyatu 6.23.9b vy asya  
 6.23.10c  
 +**sam** samasyante 7.8.3a  
**a-samṛddhi-** asamṛddhe 7.9.6a,7a  
 asamṛddhyai 7.9.1d  
**a-saścant-** asaścatas 6.11.4b<sup>+</sup>  
**asi-** asinā 6.23.10d  
**asura-** asuras 6.2.6d asurebhyas  
 7.12.8b asurāṇām 7.3.9a 7.4.1d  
**a-suvāna-** asuvāne 6.8.5a  
 °**asu-** → amṛta-asu- → a-dabdha-asu-  
**asṛj-/asan-** asṛk 7.11.4b asnā 6.4.8d  
 asnas 6.4.9a\*  
**asau** asau 6.11.6b 6.23.1d 7.2.7a 7.18.3a,  
 6a adas 6.1.3d 6.8.7a 6.16.7a amum  
 7.18.6e,10c amuṣya 7.18.4c amī 7.18.7a  
**a-strīta-** astrītas 6.12.3a,4a  
 °**astha-** → an-astha-  
<sup>2</sup>**ah** āhus 7.5.9a 7.19.1b,3a,6c,9aab  
**aha** 6.9.5c 7.7.6a  
**aham** aham 6.6.5d,7d 6.7.7d 6.8.2c  
 6.12.3a,4d,6a 6.15.1c,9c 7.3.8a,11c 7.9.7c  
 7.12.3a,8c 7.18.9d 6.15.2c mām 6.6.2a  
 6.10.6c 7.3.9d 7.9.7b mā 6.6.5c,6c,7bc  
 6.12.1bd,6c 6.18.1ac,2b,4b,5b,6b,7b,8b,9ab  
 6.19.1ae,2a,3a,4a,5a,6a,7a,8ab,9abe 6.22.8d  
 7.8.8ac 7.12.5d 7.14.1c,7c,8c,9c,10c,11c  
 7.15.1a 7.16.1add,2a,3a,4a,5add,6add,7a,  
 8a,9a,10add 7.17.1b,2b,3b,4b,5b,6b,7b,8b,  
 9b,10b mama 6.6.2b 6.9.2b 7.2.2d,9d  
 7.9.2d 7.12.9d 7.18.3e me 7.2.1c 6.5.1cd,  
 13cd 6.6.1abd,2c 6.10.8d,9d 6.12.1bc,2b,  
 7d\* 6.18.1e,9e 6.22.9cd,10c,11c,12c 7.2.1a  
 7.18.1d,2ad mayi 6.6.9d āvam 7.3.2c  
 vayam 6.1.5a 6.16.2b,11a 7.5.11a 7.8.2c  
 7.9.4c 7.15.4b asmān 6.3.3c,4a,6d 6.11.7c,  
 8b,9a 6.12.8a,9a,10a 6.13.1a,2a,3a 6.18.2c,  
 9c 6.19.1c,2c,3c,4c,9c 7.1.2c 7.3.8d,9b 7.4.11d  
 7.6.10a 7.8.1c asmabhyam 6.3.5c 6.16.11c  
 asmat 6.8.5c asmākam 6.16.2c 7.4.7d,  
 8d,11abc nas 6.3.2c,4b,13a 6.9.10d,12c  
 6.10.2c 6.11.2c,7b 6.12.8b 6.13.3b 6.16.3ad,  
 7c 6.17.10b 6.20.5c,6ab,7a,10c 6.21.2ab,  
 3d,4c,5e,6d 7.3.7cd,8c,10bc,11d 7.6.2b,6d,  
 8cd,10bc 7.7.1d,2d,4d,5d,7d,10d 7.8.1a,2a,  
 4b,7c 7.9.1abc,3c,4a,8abc 7.12.5c 7.19.9d  
 asmāsu 6.11.7d,10b asme 6.2.3d  
**aham-uttara-** ahamuttare 6.8.2b  
**ahar-/ahan-** ahar 6.5.4a 6.21.2c ahā  
 6.2.1c ahne 6.21.2b ahani 7.3.9a  
**ahi-** ahis 6.23.11d ahim 6.16.6d 6.20.9b  
**a-hiṃsant-** ahiṃsantī  
 6.10.6c ahiṃsantīm 7.15.10d  
**ahi-nāsika-** ahināsikam 6.14.2b  
**ā** *prev.* 6.1.4c 6.1.6c(?),7c 6.2.2cd,3a,4b,8b  
 6.3.1a(?),4d,8c,13d 6.4.4d,5ac,9d,11b 6.6.2c,  
 4c,9c 6.7.1d,2d,7b 6.8.7c 6.9.4c,7b 6.10.3c,  
 4b,5c,9a 6.14.9a 6.15.1c,2ad,3d,4d,5d,7d,  
 8abcd,9d 6.16.3a,7ad,9b 6.17.1c–11c,5b,8a,  
 10a,11a 6.20.1b\*d,9d 6.22.5d,12b 6.23.2a,  
 4ab,5d\* 7.1.7c 7.2.1ac 7.3.6d,10a 7.4.1c,5d  
 7.5.1c,8d,12a 7.6.7c<sup>2</sup>d,10d 7.7.7b<sup>2</sup> 7.8.9a,10b  
 7.9.1a,8b 7.11.4a,5c 7.12.4d,6c,9d 7.13.1a,2a  
 7.15.6d,10c 7.18.1d,2a,3e,6d,9e 7.19.8c  
**ā-ukta-** oktau 7.2.1c oktā 7.2.1b okte  
 7.2.1a  
**ā-uta-** otas 7.7.7b  
**ā-kūti-** ākūtim 7.9.5d ākūtyā 6.11.9b  
 ākūtīs 7.18.2d  
**ā-khida-** ākhidam 6.14.9a  
 °**āgas-** → an-āgas-  
**ā-gata-** āgate 7.4.1c āgatās 7.3.6d  
**āṅgīrasa-** āṅgīrasas 7.19.1a āṅgīrasa  
 7.19.6a  
**ā-chedana-** āchedanas 7.5.12a  
**ājya-** ājyam 7.18.1b  
**āṇḍa-ada-** āṇḍādas 7.19.5b  
**āt** 7.11.1c  
**ā-tura-** āturam 6.4.10c<sup>+</sup>  
**ātman-** ātmā 6.4.6d ātmānam 6.12.3b  
 7.16.1e,5e,6e,10e ātmane 6.7.6b  
 ātmanas 7.19.8b ātmasu 6.21.5d  
 °**ātman-** → sarva-ātman-  
**ātmanvant-** ātmanvatīm 7.15.2c  
**ātma-sad-** ātmasadāu 6.12.1c  
 °**ā-datta-** → karna-ā-datta-  
**āditya-** ādityās 6.7.9c 6.18.2a

- ādityais 7.16.4a ādityebhyas 7.10.5b  
 ādityānām 7.4.10b  
**ādityavant-** ādityavantam 7.17.4a  
 °**ādin-** → pramīśya-ādin-  
 °**ā-dhr̥ṣṭa-** → an-ā-dhr̥ṣṭa-  
**āp** *āpta-* āptas 6.2.6d  
 → an-āpta- → pra-āpiṇ-  
 +**pra** → a-prāpya → pra-āpiṇ-  
**ā-patika-** āpatikas 7.5.6d  
 °**āpi-** → vāta-āpi-  
 °**āpin-** → pra-āpiṇ-  
 °**āpta-** → an-āpta-  
**āptya-** āptyam 6.1.6b āptyānām  
 6.1.6b  
**ā-bharant-** ābharantī 6.10.5c  
**ā-bhr̥ta-** ābhr̥tam 7.5.8d  
**āma-** āmeṣu 7.3.5a  
 °**āmaya-** → antaṣṭya-āmaya- →  
 grīva-āmaya- → tanū-āmaya-  
**āma-ad-** āmādam 6.14.9c āmādas  
 7.3.2d,1c,3a,4a 7.11.4c  
**ā-yudha-** āyudham 7.11.8c āyudhā  
 6.1.5c  
 °**āyudha-** → tigma-āyudha-  
**āyuṣ-** āyus 6.2.7a 6.3.5c 6.11.10a 6.18.1e,  
 9e āyuṣe 7.19.10d āyuṣi 6.23.9d  
**āyuṣ-kr̥t-** āyuṣkr̥tā 6.12.1a  
**āyuṣmant-** āyuṣmān 7.14.2a,1abc,2b,  
 3ab,4ab,5ab,6ab,7abc,9abc,11abc āyuṣmat  
 7.14.8abc āyuṣmantam 6.9.6a 6.19.1e,  
 9e 7.14.1c,7c,8c,9c,10c,11c āyuṣmantas  
 7.14.10abc āyuṣmatī 6.12.1a  
**āra-** ārāt 7.8.1c,6a 7.13.1a  
**ā-roka-** ārokais 7.13.10a  
 °**ālāka-** → śīrṣ-ālāka-  
 °**ā-veśa-** → su-ā-veśa-  
**āśā-** āśā 6.18.6c āśās 7.19.4b  
 °**āśir-** → gav-āśir- → yava-āśir-  
**āśu-** āśus 7.4.2a  
**ās** āste 6.22.4a āsate 6.17.6b  
**ā-sakta-** āsaktam 6.23.5d\*  
**āsan-** āsanī 7.3.1d  
**āsan-vant-** āsanvat 6.21.3c+  
**ā-suti-** āsutim 6.8.6b
- āsura-** āsuras 6.14.7b āsuram 6.14.6b  
 °**ā-stigya-** → an-ā-stigya-  
**ā-hava-** āhave 6.9.9d  
 °**ā-havana-** → ghr̥ta-ā-havana-  
**ā-hita-** āhitas 7.7.7b  
 °**ā-huta-** → ghr̥ta-ā-huta-  
 °**ā-huti-** → an-ā-huti-  
**iḍā-** iḍā 6.19.2c  
**it** 6.1.1a 6.2.6b\* 6.3.4d,7c,10b 6.10.2a,9c  
 6.16.8c,10c 7.12.3bd,5b,9d  
 °**ita-** → dus-ita-  
**itas** 6.8.4b 6.14.1d,6f,7e,8c,9f 7.3.2b,4d,5d  
 7.8.6a 7.10.6b 7.11.2d,3d,4d,5d,7d 7.19.5d  
**iti** 6.1.4a  
**idhma-** idhmena 7.18.1a  
**inatama-** inatamam 6.1.6b  
**indu-** indus 6.3.8c  
**indra-** indras 6.5.8a 6.7.8a 6.9.2c 6.18.2c  
 7.2.1c 7.4.2d,4b,7b,9a,11a 7.6.6a 7.8.5a  
 7.12.8a 7.13.1d,14d 7.14.9a 7.16.8a in-  
 dra 6.9.6d 7.2.2a 7.4.5d 7.18.2a,6c,9ae,  
 10a indram 6.1.9b 7.4.6b 7.17.8a 7.19.6c  
 indreṇa 6.9.3b,8c 7.4.3c 7.18.4d 7.19.1d,  
 7d indrāya 6.1.8b 6.9.4b,10c indrasya  
 6.11.6aaaa 6.12.2aaaa 7.4.1a,10a 7.11.8c  
 7.18.5b,7c  
 °**indra-** → mahā-indra-  
**indra-praśiṣṭa-** indrapraśiṣṭās 6.3.13c  
**indrā-agni-** indrāgnī 7.9.8b  
**indrāṇī-** indrāṇī 6.6.4c  
**indriya-** indriyam 6.5.8a 6.11.10a 6.19.8b  
 7.5.3a  
**iva** 6.2.1c 6.3.12d 6.4.5b 6.6.6b 6.8.3b,4d  
 6.9.2c,8b 6.16.4c,5d 6.23.6d,10d,11d 7.1.4c,  
 8abc,9ab,10a,12d 7.8.10a 7.10.4bc 7.12.5a,  
 8d 7.13.1b,10b,11b,12b 7.18.5c  
**iṣ-** iṣam 7.15.9b iṣas 6.2.3d  
**iṣira-** iṣiram 6.2.9b iṣirāya 7.20.5a  
**iṣu-** iṣvā 6.4.3a iṣvās 7.1.4a iṣavas  
 7.4.11b  
**iṣu-hasta-** iṣuhastena 7.4.3d  
 iṣuhastais 7.4.4a  
**iṣṭi-** iṣṭau 6.2.8a  
**iṣ-targa-** iṣṭargās 6.8.8a

**iha** 6.6.9bb 6.7.8d 6.8.4c 6.11.7b 6.12.7d\*  
6.21.4d 7.6.2c,3a,10d 7.18.1c  
**īkṣ** *īkṣita-* īkṣitāt 7.8.6d\*  
**īṅkh** īṅkhayanti 6.17.7a  
°**īrtsā-** → vi-īrtsā-  
**īś** īśata 6.20.6ab,7b *īśāna-* īśānās  
7.18.4b  
**u** 6.3.2c 6.20.3d 6.23.11b 7.1.2d,12c 7.8.6b  
7.19.1b  
**ukṣ** ukṣantu 7.6.6c *ukṣita-* ukṣitā  
6.4.8d\*  
+**sam** sam ukṣatu 6.6.7b  
**ukṣan-** ukṣā 6.6.3b 6.8.4d  
**ugra-** ugras 6.1.1b 6.9.1b,12b 7.4.5b,7b  
7.5.6d,9d 7.18.9b ugra 7.11.10c ugram  
7.4.6a,10b ugreṇa 7.2.9d ugrau 7.9.8b  
ugrās 6.17.5a ugrā 6.8.3d  
°**ugra-** → nakha-ugra-  
**uccais** uccais 7.13.13b  
**ut** *prev.* 6.3.4d 6.7.2d,3a,4d,6d,7b 6.8.6d  
6.9.5d 6.11.10aaaaa 6.20.8d 6.23.10a 7.2.7a  
7.4.10d 7.11.1b,2b 7.12.7a 7.13.6b,13a  
ut = ut- 7.1.9a  
**uta** 6.2.6c,7a 6.8.2c 6.14.5b 6.20.3d 6.21.4b  
6.22.11c 7.2.8d,9b 7.8.8b 7.9.5a 7.11.3b  
**ut-ṛṣant-** udṛṣan 6.8.6d  
**uttama-** uttamas 7.10.4a  
**uttara-** uttarāt 6.21.4b uttarasmin  
6.23.9d uttare 7.4.11c uttarā 7.12.3ab  
uttarābhyas 7.12.3a  
**ut-tāna-** uttānās 7.13.6b  
**uttāna-parṇa-** uttānaparṇām 7.12.7a  
**uttāna-śivan-** uttānaśivarīs 7.11.1b  
°**ut-māna-** → mahā-unmāna-  
**ut-vana-** udvanam 7.7.4a  
**ut-vācana-** udvācanam 7.18.10a  
**ut...** **vāriṇ-** ut... vāriṇī 7.1.9a  
**ut-sthāsyant-** utthāsyantam 7.11.2b  
**udaka-** udakena 6.22.6b,7b udakasya  
6.3.6a  
°**udaka-** → surā-udaka-  
**udakatama-** udakatamās 6.3.6a  
**udañc-** udācyai 6.13.7a udācyās 6.13.1a  
7.16.7a 7.17.7b

**udan-** udnā 7.6.6c\*  
**udara-** udaram 6.22.1b  
°**udara-** → mahā-udara-  
**udārathi-** udārathis 6.16.10b  
°**udita-** → an-udita-  
°**udra-** → sam-udra  
**upa** + *acc.* 6.15.2d 6.16.3a *prev.* 6.10.6c  
6.22.4a,6c,7c,8d,10d,13b 6.23.4a 7.3.2d,5b,  
9b 7.18.3d  
**upajīka-** upajīkās 6.7.6a  
**upa-barhaṇa-** upabarhaṇam 7.15.7a  
**upa-bhūti-** upabhūtaye 7.18.7b  
**upa-mit-** upamitas 7.6.5c  
**upari-** upari 6.23.6d 7.6.4b  
**upa-varta-** upavartam 6.14.2c  
**upa-sad-** upasadas 7.6.5d  
**upastha-** upasthāt 6.3.3d upasthe  
7.6.3b  
**upa-hatyā-** upahatyās 7.15.4c  
**upā-naha-** upānahau 7.15.8b  
**ubha-** ubhe 6.23.6b  
**ubhaya-** ubhayān 7.3.4b  
**uru-** urus 6.9.10d urvi 6.20.2c  
**uśas-** uśā 6.21.2b uśasā 6.10.5a uśase  
6.21.2a  
**uṣṇīṣa-** uṣṇīṣam 7.15.6a  
**usra-** usrās 6.3.5d  
**usriya-** usriyām 6.10.7b  
**ū** 6.2.5a 6.11.5a  
**ūti-** ūtibhis 6.16.3b  
**ūbadhya-ad(a)-** ūbadhyādam  
6.14.1b<sup>+</sup>  
**ūma-** ūmās 6.1.1d,3b  
**ūru-** ūrū 7.11.4a<sup>+</sup>  
**ūrj-** ūrjam 6.10.9c 7.15.9b ūrjā 6.2.7b  
**ūrjā-** ūrjā 6.15.1b,5ab,6b,7ab,9ab ūrjām  
6.15.5cd,6cd,7cd,8abc,9c<sup>+</sup>  
**ūrdhva-** ūrdhvāyai 6.13.9a ūrdhvāyās  
6.13.3a 7.16.10a 7.17.10b  
**ūrdhva-dhanvan-** ūrdhvanvā  
7.4.4d  
**ṛjīya-** ṛjīyas 7.1.4a  
**ṛju-keśa-** ṛjukesās 7.8.4a  
**rta-** ṛtam 7.6.2d ṛtena 7.6.1b ṛtasya

- 6.11.3d  
 °**rta-** → an-ṛta-  
 °**rti-** → ava-ṛti-  
**rtu-** ṛtunā 6.10.1d  
**ṛtviyāvanta-** ṛtviyāvatiṁ 6.10.4a  
 °**rddhi-** → a-sam-ṛddhi-  
 †**ṛdhaṁmandrayoninovinivbhāvā†**  
 6.2.1a  
**ṛbhva-** ṛbhvam 6.1.6a<sup>+</sup>  
**ṛśya-** ṛśyasya 7.1.10a<sup>+</sup>  
**ṛṣabha-** ṛṣabhas 6.6.3b 6.8.3b 6.9.4a  
 7.8.5c ṛṣabham 6.9.6d,9a ṛṣabhena  
 6.9.7d,8a ṛṣabhāya 6.10.6a ṛṣabhasya  
 6.9.1d 6.10.1a ṛṣabhās 6.10.4b  
**ṛṣi-** ṛṣayas 6.18.3b  
 °**ṛṣi-** → sapta-ṛṣi-  
**eka-** ekam 7.5.9a ekām 6.2.6b  
**eka-mukha-** ekamukhā 6.10.1c  
**eka-rājan-** ekarājñi 7.12.2a ekarājñīm  
 7.12.1a  
**eka-lāmika-** ekalāmike 7.12.2b  
 ekalāmikām 7.12.1b  
**eka-vīra-** ekavīras 7.4.2c  
**eka-vrata-** ekavrate 7.12.2a  
 ekavratām 7.12.1a  
**eka-śapha-** ekaśaphāt 6.15.8d\*  
**eka-stha-** ekasthe 7.12.2b ekasthām  
 7.12.1b  
**ekādaśa-avama-** ekādaśāvamās  
 6.20.5b  
**ej** ejati 6.20.2b  
**eṇī-** eṇī 7.1.9a  
**ena-** enam 7.18.7e,9ac enān 6.22.3c,4d,  
 13a enām 6.10.3d,4b 6.23.1aa,3d,4e 7.6.4d  
 7.15.10d  
**enas-** enāmsi 6.3.13b  
**enasvin-** enasvī 7.3.6a  
**eva** 6.1.9b 6.3.10d 6.12.6bb 6.23.12c 7.18.3e,  
 9c  
 °**eva-** → dus-eva-  
**evā** 6.1.9a 6.5.1cd,13cd 6.6.8c 7.7.2c 7.19.7c  
 1<sup>1</sup>**eṣ** ichati 6.14.6c *ichant-* ichantas  
 6.8.6b ichantīs 7.13.14b  
 2<sup>2</sup>**eṣ** *iṣita-* iṣitām 6.10.4a  
 °**eṣaṇa-** → prayuta-eṣaṇa-  
**eṣas** eṣas 6.22.5c 6.23.9a etat 6.11.2d  
 6.12.8b 6.13.3b etena 6.11.6bbb ete  
 6.1.3b 6.2.4a eṣā 6.7.3c etasyās 7.16.2a,  
 4a,6a,8a 7.17.2b,4b,6b,8b etās 6.22.6c,7c  
**aikṣvāka-** aikṣvākas 7.10.9a  
**aindra-** aindrās 7.18.2c  
**o**  
 +**ā** *ā-uta-* otas 7.7.7b  
 °**okas-** → vi-okas-  
**okta-** → ā-ukta-  
**ojas-** ojasā 6.16.1c 6.17.5b,7b 7.4.6d  
 7.18.5b ojasas 7.18.4b  
 °**ojas-** → bhūri-ojas-  
**ojīyas-** ojīyas 6.1.4c  
**ota-** → ā-uta-  
**od**  
 +**pari** *pari-undāna-* paryundānam  
 6.14.9d  
**odana-** odanam 6.22.2c,4c,9a,13c  
 odanasya 6.22.1b  
**oṣadhi-/ī-** oṣadhe 6.8.1d,3d 6.16.10a  
 7.1.1c,2d oṣadhim 7.12.10a oṣadhīs  
 6.18.8b oṣadhībhis 7.14.5b oṣadhīnām  
 6.16.9a 7.7.1a 7.10.4a  
**oṣadhīmant-** oṣadhīmatīs 7.16.6a  
 7.17.6a  
**oṣṭha-** oṣṭhas 6.14.1c  
**oṣṭha-apidhāna-** oṣṭhāpi-  
 dhānayā 7.9.10b  
**ka-** kas 6.3.1ab 6.12.6c kim 6.21.3abc  
 ke 7.2.5c  
 †**kaḥsvadheye†** 7.11.9b  
**kakud-** kakut 6.9.1d  
 °**kakuda-** → su-kakuda-  
 °**kakṣa-** → śiti-kakṣa-  
**kaṭuka-** kaṭukam 7.19.3a  
 °**kaṇṭha-** → mahā-kaṇṭha-  
**kaṇva-** kaṇvam 7.11.7c kaṇvās 6.17.11a  
**kanyalā-** kanyalā 6.4.5b  
**kanyā-** kanyā 7.9.6d kanyās 7.13.11b  
**kam** 6.6.4d,5b 7.5.1d,2c,7a 7.11.4b  
**kam**<sup>i</sup> kāmāye 6.6.5d,7d  
**kar** kṛṇomi 6.8.8d 6.10.8c 7.5.5c kṛṇmas

- 6.23.1c,3c,5c 7.9.1d,2c 7.19.3d,4d kṛṇmasi  
7.8.6e akṛṇot 6.2.5b 6.7.8a 7.5.2a kṛ-  
ṇavas 6.2.8b kṛṇavat 7.18.6b kṛṇu  
6.9.6d 6.11.9c 6.20.9b 7.12.5d kuru 6.23.4e  
kṛṇotu 6.18.1e,9e 6.19.1e,9e 7.3.11d 7.14.1c,  
7c,8c,9c,11c kṛṇvantu 7.14.10c kṛṇ-  
vant- kṛṇvan 6.2.6c hiṃkṛṇvantas  
6.10.4d kṛṇve 7.3.8a 7.18.10c kṛṇute  
6.2.2b 7.12.10d 7.15.5d kṛṇvahe 7.3.2c\*  
kṛṇvate 6.7.6b kṛṇuthās 7.9.7b kṛṇva-  
tām 7.3.1d akas 7.18.6a kṛdhi 7.18.8d  
cakāra 7.1.5d,12b 7.18.6b cakṛmā 6.3.13b  
cakrus 6.7.9a cakre 7.18.10b cakrire  
6.11.2b 7.3.4c 7.18.8bc cakṛvas- cakru-  
ṣe 7.1.10c<sup>+</sup> kariṣyāmi 7.18.2b akāri  
6.16.6c karikrant- karikratīs 7.13.7b,  
13b kṛta- kṛtas 7.5.4d kṛtam 6.4.3b  
6.11.10a 7.8.9b kṛtā 7.1.4d,8d → deva-  
kṛta-  
+ā ā kuru 6.23.2a,4b ā kṛdhi 7.18.6d  
+nis niṣ kṛdhi 6.4.7d  
+pari pariṣkṛtam 6.22.13d  
+sam samścikīṣati 7.18.3b  
°karaṇa- → subhāgam-karaṇa-  
karambha- karambhas 6.16.10a  
°kariyas- → niṣ-kariyas-  
kariṣa-ja- kariṣajam 6.14.1a  
karkī karkī 6.10.1a karkyās 6.10.3a  
karna-ā-datta-  
karna-ā-dattam 7.15.6d\*  
°karna- → naiḡūra-karna- → babhru-  
karna-  
karna-śūla- karnaśūlam 7.15.4c  
kart  
+api api kṛtat 7.13.1d-14d  
kartar- kartāram 7.1.9c  
karmaṇ- karmāṇi 6.11.2b  
°karmaṇ- → viśva-karmaṇ-  
karvara- karvarā 6.1.7d  
kalp caklpe 7.6.9a  
kalyāṇa- kalyāṇas 6.9.7b  
kavi- kavis 6.2.4c,5b,7b kavayas 6.2.6a  
kavi-śasta- kaviśastāni 6.2.9c  
kaśyapa- kaśyapas 6.7.1a 7.5.1d  
kaśyapena 7.5.8d  
kaṣkaṣa- kaṣkaṣāsas 7.2.8a<sup>+</sup>  
°kāṇḍa- → śata-kāṇḍa-  
→ sahasra-kāṇḍa-  
kānīna- kānīnas 6.4.8a  
kāma- kāmena 6.6.2d  
°kāma- → prajā-kāma-  
kāma-dugha- kāmudughā 6.22.9d  
kārsīvaṇa-prajāna- kārsīvaṇaprajā-  
nena 6.9.7c  
kāvyā- kāvyena 6.2.5b  
kāśya- kāśyas 7.10.9b  
kilbiṣa-kṛta-sādhin- kilbiṣakṛtasā-  
dhī 7.3.6b\*  
°kiṣkiṇ- → śva-kiṣkiṇ-  
kutas 6.22.4d  
kumāra- kumāras 7.6.7c kumārasya  
7.2.2a kumārān 6.14.7a  
kumuda- kumudam 6.22.8a  
°kumba- → vi-kumba-  
kumbha- kumbhān 6.22.6a  
kumbhī- kumbhyām 6.15.4c  
kula- kulam 7.19.3b  
kulāya- kulāyam 6.7.5a  
kulyā- kulyās 6.22.6c,7c  
°kuśala- → a-kuśala-  
kuṣṭha- kuṣṭhas 7.10.1b,5d,6d,8de  
kuṣṭha 7.10.2a,9b  
kuṣṭhī- kuṣṭhyai 6.8.8d<sup>+</sup>  
kusuma- kusumāya 7.11.9a  
°kūti- → ā-kūti-  
°kūla- → madhu-kūla-  
°kṛt- → āyus-kṛt- → agha-kṛt-  
→ kṛtyā-kṛt- → dus-kṛta-kṛt-  
→ madhu-kṛt-  
°kṛta- → dus-kṛta- → deva-kṛta-  
→ pari-skṛta-  
°kṛta-sādhin- → kilbiṣa-kṛta-sādhin-  
°kṛti- → nis-kṛti-  
°kṛte → brāhmaṇa-kṛte  
kṛtyā- kṛtyā 7.1.4d,9c kṛtye 7.1.6a,8d,  
11a kṛtyām 7.1.3b,7a,10c,12b 7.7.3a  
kṛtyā-kṛt- kṛtyākṛtam 7.1.4d,7d,8d  
kṛtyākṛte 7.1.3b,7a kṛtyākṛtas 7.1.1d,

- 2b  
**kr̥tyā-dūṣi-** kr̥tyādūṣis 7.5.4d,6b,9d  
kr̥tyādūṣim 7.5.5abcd  
°**kr̥tvān-** → pāpa-kr̥tvān-  
**kr̥ṣi-** kr̥ṣim 7.6.6d kr̥ṣyās 6.9.10b  
kr̥ṣayas 6.18.8a  
**kr̥ṣṇa-** kr̥ṣṇās 7.2.5b kr̥ṣṇau 7.2.4b  
**kr̥ṣṇa-vartani-** kr̥ṣṇavartane 6.8.6c  
**ketu-** ketunā 6.16.6c  
**kevala-** kevalam 7.12.10d  
**kevalya-** kevalyam 6.9.9b  
°**keśa-** → hiraṇya-keśa-  
°**keśava-** → jānu-keśava-  
**keśin-** keśī 6.14.7c  
**keśya-** keśyān 6.14.6d  
**koka-** kokās 7.2.4d  
**koka-mukha-** kokamukhas 6.14.1c  
**kratu-** kratum 6.1.3a 6.17.2b  
**krand** abhi krandanti 6.10.3d  
acikradan 6.9.1c  
°**krandana-** → sam-krandana-  
**kram**<sup>i</sup> krame 7.16.1b,5b,6b,10b  
+**pra** pra cakramus 6.3.11b  
+**ni** *ni-krānta-* nikrāntam 7.5.10b  
°**kramaṇa-** → ni-kramaṇa-  
**kravya-ad-** kravyād 7.18.7e kravyā-  
dam 7.11.1d kravyādas 7.3.3b,4a 7.11.3c,  
4c 7.19.2c  
**krimi-** krimis 7.2.6b,8c krimim 7.2.1d,  
2b,3d krimayas 6.8.8b 7.2.5a krimīn  
7.2.5d,7d krimīṇām 7.2.10ab  
°**krūra-** → a-krūra-  
°**krośa-** → vana-krośa-  
**kṣatra-** kṣatram 6.2.7c 6.5.7a 6.19.1c  
°**kṣatra-** → brahma-kṣatra-  
→ su-kṣatra-  
**kṣap-** kṣapas 6.3.5d  
**kṣam-** kṣām 6.2.5c\*  
**kṣam**<sup>i</sup>  
+**abhi** abhi... kṣameta 7.3.10c  
<sup>1</sup>**kṣay** kṣayati 6.1.8c  
<sup>2</sup>**kṣay**  
+**ā** ā kṣiyati 6.3.8c<sup>+</sup>  
<sup>3</sup>**kṣay** kṣeṣṭa 6.22.9c  
**kṣar** kṣarāmasi 6.3.2d kṣarat 6.2.3b\*  
**kṣīra-** kṣīreṇa 6.22.6b,7b  
**kṣetra-** kṣetrātkṣetrāt 6.15.2a  
kṣetre 6.15.3ac  
**kṣobhana-** kṣobhanas 7.4.2b  
**khadira-** khadire 6.4.4b  
**khan**<sup>i</sup> khanāmi 7.12.10a  
akhanat 7.1.1b  
+**pra** prākhanat 6.3.1b,2b  
**kharva-** kharva 7.11.8a  
**khala-** khale 6.15.4a  
**khalati-** khalate 7.11.8a  
°**khida-** → ā-khida-  
**khed** → ā-khida-  
**khela-** khelam 6.14.2d  
**khelā-** khele 6.8.4a  
**gaṅgaṇa-** gaṅgaṇam 6.14.9e  
**gaṅgaṇivant-** gaṅgaṇivān 7.2.9b  
**gaṇa-** gaṇena 7.4.4b gaṇais 6.17.10a  
**gandharva-** gandharvās 7.11.3b  
gandharvais 6.22.4b  
**gandharva-apsaras-**  
gandharvāpsarasas 6.18.4a  
**gam** gachati 6.4.7c 7.2.3c gachanti  
7.13.14a gacha 7.1.8a gamyās 6.16.7d  
jagantha 6.22.12b ajagan 6.16.7a  
+**ā** ā... agan 6.10.9a ā gahi 6.16.3a  
6.17.1c–11c *ā-gata-* āgatās 7.3.6d  
āgate 7.4.1c  
+**parā** *parā-gata-* parāgatam 6.6.9a  
+**sam** saṃgachante 7.13.8a  
**gamiṣṭha-** gamiṣṭhā 6.4.10c  
**gaya-sphāna-** gayasphānas 7.5.9c  
**gay**<sup>i</sup> jinvata 6.3.8d  
<sup>1</sup>**gar**<sup>i</sup> gṛṇanti 6.17.11b  
+**abhi** abhi... gṛṇitām 7.6.1d  
**gardabha-nādin-** gardabhanādinam  
6.14.2d  
**garbha-** garbham 6.10.1d,2a 7.11.2c  
garbhe 7.3.11a  
**garbha-dūṣaṇa-** garbhadūṣaṇas  
7.19.5b  
**gav-** gaus 6.10.1b,2c,9b gām 7.15.5c ga-  
vi 6.10.8a gāvas 6.3.12d 6.10.3a 6.16.11b

gobhyas 6.20.10c gavām 6.15.8a 6.20.7a  
**gav-āsīr-** gavāsīras 6.16.8a  
<sup>1</sup>**gā**  
 +**abhi** abhi...gāt 6.2.6b  
 +**ut** ut...agāt 7.2.7a  
 +**upa** upa gus 7.18.3d  
 +**pra** prāgām 6.12.4d,5a pra...agām  
 6.12.6a pra...gus 6.2.4a  
**gārhapatya-** gārhapatyāya 7.6.9a  
**gāh** *gāhamāna-* gāhamānas 7.4.7a  
 +**prati** pratigāhante 7.13.11a  
 +**vi** vigāhante 7.13.12a  
**giri-** girau 7.7.6a  
**gireya-** gireyebhyas 7.10.5a<sup>+</sup>  
**gulgulu-** gulgulo 7.11.10c  
**gr̥dhra-** gr̥dhram 6.14.2e gr̥dhrās  
 7.2.4d  
**gr̥ha-** gr̥has 6.11.6a 6.12.2a 7.13.9b gr̥-  
 ham 6.7.6b gr̥hān 6.15.2d gr̥hais  
 6.23.1d gr̥hebhyas 7.3.3b gr̥hānām  
 6.15.9d  
**gehya-** gehyas 6.14.8a gehyās 7.11.3b  
**gaireya-** gaireyī 7.12.2d  
**go-jit-** gojitam 7.4.6c  
**gotra-** gotrasya 6.1.8c gotrāṇi 7.4.7a  
**go-pa-** gopāya 6.21.4c gopā 6.12.1b  
**go-pati-** gopatī 6.10.5d,6d  
**gopāy°** gopāyatu 7.3.7d 7.16.1d,5d,10d  
 gopāyatam 6.12.1b gopāyantu 7.16.6d  
**go-pītha-** gopīthāya 6.12.3c 6.17.1b  
**go-vid-** govidam 7.4.5d  
**go-stha-** goṣṭhe 6.15.4b  
**goh**  
 +**apa** *apa-gūḍha-* apagūḍham  
 7.19.3b  
 °**granthi-** → dāma-granthi-  
**grabh<sup>i</sup>** jgrabha 6.7.7d gr̥hyate 6.9.1a  
*gr̥bhīta-* gr̥bhītān 6.11.7c\* → hasta-  
 gr̥hya  
 +**prati** prati gr̥hṇīma 7.15.10d  
*prati-gr̥hṇant-* pratigr̥hṇan 6.10.8c  
 °**grāma-** → saha-grāma-  
**grāma-jit-** grāmajitam 7.4.6c  
 °**grāha-** → nama-grāha-

°**grīva-** → tuvi-grīva-  
**grīvā-** grīvāsu 7.1.10d  
**grīva-āmaya-** grīvāmayān 7.15.7a  
**gha** 7.10.2c,4d  
**ghanāghana-** ghanāghanas 7.4.2b  
**ghar**  
 +**abhi** *abhi-ghārīta-* abhighārītas  
 6.9.12a  
**ghas** jighatsati 7.11.6c  
*jagdha-* jagdham 6.4.11a 7.19.8b  
 °**ghātin-** → pāda-ghātin-  
**ghṛta-** ghṛtam 6.10.9c ghṛtena 6.3.4b  
 6.9.12a 7.6.6c  
**ghṛta-ā-havana-** ghṛtāhavana 6.9.11c  
**ghṛta-ā-huta-** ghṛtāhuta 6.9.11a  
**ghṛtāñc-** ghṛtāñcī 6.4.8a 6.21.6b  
**ghṛta-pū-** ghṛtapuvas 6.3.4b  
**ghṛta-vṛddha-** ghṛtavṛddha 6.9.11a  
**ghṛta-ścut-** ghṛtaścutas 6.3.5b  
**ghṛta-hrada-** ghṛtahradās 6.22.7a  
**ghṛtācika-** ghṛtācike 6.4.10a  
**ghora-cakṣas-** ghoracakṣasas 7.8.6d  
**ghora-varpas-** ghoravarpasas 6.17.4a  
**ghoṣ** → a-ghoṣant-  
 +**ā** āghoṣāmas 7.13.1a  
**ghoṣa-** ghoṣas 7.4.10d ghoṣān 7.13.13b  
 °**ghoṣant-** → a-ghoṣant-  
 °**ghna-** → hiraṇya-hasta-ghna-  
**ca** 6.1.2cc,7a,8d,9dd 6.3.3bb,11cd 6.4.2cd  
 6.5.1aa,2aa,3aa,4aa,5aa,6aa,7aa,8aa,9aa,10aa,  
 11aa,12aa,13aa 6.7.1aa 6.8.9c 6.9.3c,8cd,  
 9d,12d 6.11.9b 6.12.6c 6.14.1c,5d,6d,7d,9b  
 6.15.1aab,3b,4b,9b 6.18.1dd,3b,9dd 6.19.1dd,  
 2d,3d,4d,9dd 6.20.4aacd,5aa 6.21.1ab,3abc,  
 5b 6.22.10c,12c 6.23.12aa 7.2.1cc,4ccd,5c,  
 7ccd,8cd,10ab 7.3.2ac,4aab,8d,9c,11b 7.5.3b  
 7.7.3d,8d,9c 7.9.1cd,3b,4b,5d 7.10.1d,5g,8h,  
 10b 7.12.2d 7.18.3d,6b 7.19.8d  
 °**cakra-** → rodha-cakra-  
**cakṣaṇa-** cakṣaṇam 7.10.6c,8c  
 °**cakṣas-** → ghora-cakṣas-  
 → nṛ-cakṣas-  
**cakṣuṣ-** cakṣuṣā 6.11.9a cakṣuṣe  
 6.23.8a cakṣuṣas 6.11.8a

- cat** cāṭayāmasi 7.7.3c  
**catuṣ-akṣa-** caturakṣas 7.2.6a  
**catuṣ-dhā** caturdhā 6.22.6a  
**catuṣ-pad-** catuṣpadā 7.15.2b  
 catuṣpade 7.6.8d catuṣpadas 7.6.10d  
**catvar-** caturas 6.22.6a catvāras  
 6.20.4c  
**catvara-** catvare 7.13.8a  
**catvāriṃśat-** catvāriṃśat 6.20.4c  
**cana** 6.22.4d 6.23.9d  
**candra-** candas 6.19.6c 7.14.4a  
 candram 7.15.6c candreṇa 7.5.9b  
**candra-mas-** candramās 6.5.3a  
<sup>1</sup>**cay**  
 +ā ā...cikāya 6.2.2d  
**car** carasi 6.8.3a carati 6.14.6b caratha  
 6.8.6a caranti 6.10.3b acarāt 7.10.7a  
 carāt 6.23.6c cara 6.8.5d carantu  
 7.6.2d 7.8.6a *carant-* carantīm 6.10.1d  
 +**abhi+sam** abhi saṃ carema 7.6.5b,  
 9d  
 +ā ācaranti 7.13.2a  
 +**ut** uccaranti 7.13.13a  
**carācara-** carācaram 7.11.2a  
**carṣaṇi-** carṣaṇinām 7.4.2b  
<sup>o</sup>**cātana-** → amīva-cātana-  
 → sapatna-cātana-  
**cāru-** cāru 6.16.6c cārum 6.17.1a  
**cit** 6.1.4a 6.16.7c  
**citta-** cittam 7.9.5c  
**citti-** <sup>+</sup>cittyā 6.11.9b  
**citra-** citrau 7.4.1b  
<sup>1</sup>**cet** cikitsati 7.7.2d,4d  
**cettar-** cettāram 6.9.6c  
**cela-vāsin-** celavāsinīs 7.13.8b  
**cod** codayāmi 6.1.5c  
**cyav** cyāvayati 7.11.5a <sup>o</sup>*cyavāna-* →  
 bhuvana-cyavāna- <sup>o</sup>*cyuta-*  
 → a-cyuta-  
<sup>o</sup>**cyavana-** → dus-cyavana-  
<sup>o</sup>**cyavāna-** → bhuvana-cyavāna-  
<sup>o</sup>**cyuta-** → gṛta-cyuta-  
 → a-cyuta-  
**chandas-** chandāṃsi 6.22.1c  
**ched** → <sup>o</sup>chedana-  
<sup>o</sup>**chedana-** → ā-chedana-  
 → pra-chedana-  
<sup>o</sup>**ja-** → karīṣa-ja- → manuṣya-ja-  
**jagat-** jagate 7.6.9b jagatām 7.10.4b  
**jatraya-** jatrayāt 7.15.7b\*  
**jana-** janas 7.7.2c janam 6.23.4c 7.9.5b  
 7.18.6e janamjanam 7.13.14a janena  
 7.8.7b janasya 6.14.7a janān 6.6.6b  
 6.14.7d janebhyas 6.9.2d  
**jan<sup>i</sup>** ajāyata 7.7.1b 7.10.6d,8d  
 +**pra** pra jāyāmahai 7.3.10d<sup>+</sup> *jāya-*  
*māna-* jāyamānas 7.7.2a jajña 6.1.1b  
*jajñāna-* jajñānas 6.1.1c jajñānam  
 6.11.1a 7.19.6c,10c *jāta-* jātas 6.22.1d  
 7.5.1b,3c,4a,7c 7.7.6a 7.10.5c jātam 7.3.11b  
 7.5.9b  
 +**pra** *pra-jāta-* prajātas 6.6.3c  
 → su-jāta-  
**janitavya-** janitavyam 7.3.11b  
**janitra-** janitram 6.8.8a  
**janman-** janmanā 7.19.1a  
<sup>o</sup>**janman-** → su-janman-  
<sup>2</sup>**jambh** jambhayāmasi 7.2.3d,5d jam-  
 bhaya 6.20.9c jambhayatām 7.2.1d  
<sup>o</sup>**jambhana-** → piśāca-jambhana-  
**jay** jayatu 7.4.2d jayata 7.4.3c jayantu  
 7.4.11b *jayant-* jayantam 6.1.4a 7.4.6d  
 jayatām 7.4.10d jayantī 6.4.5c 7.12.6c  
 jayantīnām 7.4.9d *jigīṣamāna-* jigī-  
 ṣamānam 6.14.4b *jīta-* jītam 7.4.1d  
<sup>o</sup>**jaya-** → śatrum-jaya-  
**jar** jāgrati 6.21.5b jāgrhi 6.20.10b  
 6.21.6d jāgratu 6.21.5d  
**jarat-aṣṭi-** jaradaṣṭim 7.3.11d  
**jarā-** jarā 7.11.9d  
**jar<sup>i</sup>** *jīrṇa-* jīrṇam 6.23.11d  
<sup>o</sup>**jāta-** → su-jāta-  
**jāta-vedas-** jātavedās 6.22.2d,3a  
 jātavedas 7.18.2f  
**jānu-keśava-** jānukeśavam 6.14.6a  
**jāmi-** jāmayas 7.13.10b  
 †**jāmīrvadhuryus†** 6.2.4d  
**jāyā-** jāyās 6.22.13b

- jāra-** jāras 7.11.7b  
**jigatnu-** jigatnū 6.1.7c<sup>+</sup>  
<sup>o</sup>**jit-** → go-jit- → grāma-jit- → loka-  
 jit- → sam-sr̥ṣṭa-jit- → sahas-jit-  
**jiṣṇu-** jiṣṇunā 7.4.3a  
<sup>o</sup>**jihva-** → madhu-jihva-  
**jihvā-** jihvayā 7.9.10b jihvās 7.8.6b  
**jīv** jīvati 6.4.2a *jīvant-* jīvan 7.18.5d  
 jīvate 7.8.7c jīvātave 7.5.11c  
**jīva-** jīvās 6.23.12a  
**jīva-dhanya-** jīvadhanyās 6.3.12b  
**jīvanta-** jīvantas 7.10.3b  
**jīvala-** jīvalā 7.10.3a  
**jīvita-** jīvitam 7.18.4c  
<sup>o</sup>**jurya-** → a-jurya-  
<sup>o</sup>**juṣ-** → sa-juṣ-  
**jaitra-** jaitrāya 6.9.12b 7.4.5d 7.12.1d  
**joṣ** juṣasva 7.6.7a,10c juṣethām 6.11.7d  
*juṣṭa-* juṣṭām 7.9.9c  
**jñā**  
 +**anu+pra** anu pra jñeṣus 6.22.12d  
 +**pra** *pra-jānant-* prajānan 7.6.6b  
 +**prati** prati jānihi 7.6.10a  
 **jyāyas-** jyāyasas 7.8.2c,8c  
 **jyeṣṭha-** jyeṣṭhas 6.2.7a jyeṣṭham  
 6.1.1a 6.2.7d  
 **jyotiṣ-** jyotiṣi 7.15.10a  
 **takman-** takmānam 7.10.1c,5f,8g,10c  
 **takṣ** tatakṣus 6.2.6a  
 **taṇḍa-** taṇḍam 6.14.5a taṇḍāya 7.11.9a  
 **tatas** 7.10.6d,8d 7.18.5d  
 **tatra** 7.10.6c,8c  
 **tathā** 6.6.5d,7d 7.18.10c  
<sup>1</sup>**tan**  
 +**ava** *ava-tata-* avatatam 7.7.7a  
 +**ā** ā...tanvanti 6.17.8a ā tanuṣva  
 6.1.4c  
 +**ut** *ut-tāna-* uttānās 7.13.6b  
 → uttāna-parṇa- → uttāna-śīvan-  
 +**ni** → ni-tatni-  
 +**vi** *vi-tata-* vitatas 6.22.5c  
 +**sam** sam tanoti 6.22.8a  
**tanū-** tanūs 7.5.4b tanvam 6.1.9b  
 6.12.7d tanve 6.10.8d 6.12.1c<sup>+</sup> tanvas  
 7.5.10c<sup>+</sup> tanū 6.6.8d\* 7.5.10d tan-  
 vas 6.2.3a tanūbhis 6.3.13b tanūnām  
 7.4.8d  
**tanū-āmaya-** tanvāmayāt 7.15.6b<sup>+</sup>  
**tanū-pāna-** tanūpānam 7.18.8c  
**tanū-vaśin-** tanūvaśin 7.18.2f  
**tantu-** tantus 7.1.8c  
**tap** tapatu 6.23.7b  
**tapana-** tapanas 7.5.12b  
**tapas-** tapasas 6.22.1d  
**tamas-** tamas 6.20.1d tamasā 7.11.6a  
**tamasvant-** tamasvati 6.20.2c  
<sup>o</sup> **taraṇa-** → pra-taraṇa-  
**tar<sup>1</sup>** taranti 6.11.3d  
**taruṇa-** taruṇān 6.14.7b  
<sup>o</sup>**targa-** → iṣ-targa-  
**tarh** tr̥ṇahan 7.18.6e  
**talpa-** talpān 7.13.5a  
**taviṣa-** taviṣas 7.7.8a  
**taviṣi-** taviṣim 6.16.1b  
**taskara-** taskaras 6.20.7c,8b  
**tādr̥śi-** tādr̥śis 6.3.12a\*  
<sup>o</sup>**tāpa-** → sam-tāpa-  
**tāvant-** <sup>+</sup>tāvāt 7.11.10c  
**tigma-** tigmam 7.11.8c tigmebhis  
 7.3.1a  
**tigma-heti-** tigmahetī 6.11.7a  
**tigma-āyudha-** tigmāyudhau 6.11.7a  
**tiras** 6.17.7b,8b 7.15.5b  
**†tiṣṭhadhūmam†** 6.20.9a  
**tīkṣṇa-valśa-** tīkṣṇavalśas 7.7.8b  
**tīkṣṇa-śr̥ṅga-** tīkṣṇaśr̥ṅga 6.8.6d  
**tīrtha-** tīrthāni 7.13.12a  
**tīvra-anta-** tīvrāntasya 7.6.7b  
<sup>o</sup>**tuṇḍika-** → agre-tuṇḍika-  
**tuṇḍila-** tuṇḍila 7.11.8b  
<sup>o</sup>**tura-** → ā-tura-  
**tuvi-grīva-** tuvigrīvās 6.16.5d  
<sup>o</sup>**tūla-** → vi-tūla- → vṛṣa-tūla-  
**tr̥ṇa-** tr̥ṇam 7.6.9b  
**tr̥ṭīya-** tr̥ṭīyasyām 7.10.6b  
**tr̥ṭīyaka-** tr̥ṭīyakam 7.10.10a  
**tr̥ṣṭa-** tr̥ṣṭam 7.19.3a<sup>+</sup>  
**tejana-** tejanam 7.5.9a

- tejas-** tejas 6.19.8c  
**tod**  
 +**ni** *ni-tudant-* nitudentīm 7.9.7d  
**tya-** tyam 6.17.1a tye 6.16.4a,5a  
**trayodaśa-** trayodaśas 6.11.5d 6.12.4b  
**trasta-akṣa-** trastākṣam 6.14.3c  
**trā** trāyase 6.4.2b trāyatām 6.4.11d  
*trāyamāṇa-* trāyamāṇas 7.10.1a  
**tri-** trayas 6.20.4d trīṇi 6.2.1d 7.10.2a  
**triṃśat-** triṃśat 6.20.4d  
**trita-** tritas 6.2.1d 6.16.1c  
**tris** 6.1.3b 6.7.2d 7.10.5abc  
**tvac-** tvacam 6.23.11d 7.7.2b 7.12.4b  
 tvacas 7.1.10b  
**tvam** tvam 6.4.2b,3c,10d 6.7.2c 6.8.3d,  
 5c 6.9.2b 6.11.9c 6.21.3d 7.1.1c,2d 7.3.1c,  
 2c 7.7.4c 7.8.3c 7.11.10c 7.15.2a 7.18.6c  
 tvām 6.8.4c 7.3.3d 7.8.5a tvā 6.1.4ad  
 6.4.2a,11c 6.7.7ab 6.8.9d 6.9.10c 6.10.7d  
 6.12.2b 6.16.2b,11acd 6.17.9a,11a 6.21.6c  
 6.22.6c,7c,10d,12d 7.1.1ab,6a,11c 7.5.2d,  
 5abc,11a 7.6.1c,2c,7c,9cd,10c 7.7.10a 7.9.7c  
 7.10.2d,4e,9ab 7.11.6a,7a,8d 7.12.2c 7.15.3c,  
 6ab,7ad 7.18.9e 7.19.1b,9aab tvayā 6.1.5a  
 6.15.1d 7.12.4c 6.15.2c tubhyam 6.9.3c,  
 9a 6.21.2c 7.11.9c tava 6.4.8b 6.16.4a,  
 5ab,6d 6.17.2b 7.6.8b 7.18.9df 7.19.8d te  
 6.1.5cd 6.2.3a,5a,8a 6.4.1b,6d,11ab 6.6.3a,  
 8c,9acd 6.7.4c–6c,8ac,9a 6.10.5d,6d 6.15.1b,  
 3acd,4d,5abcd,6abcd,7abcd,8ad,9ac 6.16.8a  
 6.17.11b 6.20.2c,3ad,5a 6.21.1c,4d,6a 6.23.8a  
 7.3.10a 7.5.3a,7ab 7.6.8a 7.8.6e,9c 7.9.2c,6b,  
 7a 7.10.2a,3abc 7.11.2a,4ab,5a,6c 7.15.4ab  
 7.18.7c 7.19.5a,9c,10d tvayi 6.20.10a tve  
 6.1.3a 6.16.6a vām 6.23.9ac yūyam  
 6.3.7ab,8abd yuṣmān 6.3.8c yuṣmākam  
 6.3.7c vas 6.3.1a,11c 6.8.2d 6.11.2ad  
 7.18.5d  
**tvar** *tvaramāṇa-* tvaramāṇās 6.3.1c  
**tvādatta-** 7.15.8c  
**tveṣa-** tveṣam 6.20.1d  
**tveṣa-nṛmṇa-** tveṣanṛmṇas 6.1.1b  
**daś** daśa 7.1.8b  
**dakṣ** *dakṣamāṇa-* dakṣamāṇās 7.15.9a  
**dakṣiṇa-** dakṣiṇena 7.15.8d  
 dakṣiṇāyās 6.12.9a 7.16.3a 7.17.3b  
**dakṣiṇatas** dakṣiṇatas 7.15.1a,8d  
**dakṣiṇā-** dakṣiṇā 6.19.7c 7.4.9b 7.15.1ab,  
 6e,10c dakṣiṇām 7.9.1b 7.15.2c,3b,4a,5d,  
 9ab dakṣiṇayā 6.22.13d dakṣiṇāyai  
 6.13.5a dakṣiṇābhis 7.14.6b  
**daṇḍa-** daṇḍas 7.15.8c daṇḍena 6.4.3a  
**datvant-** datvatī 6.20.8c  
**dadhi-** dadhnā 6.22.6b,7b  
**dant-** datām 7.2.3c  
 °**dant-** → rāma-dant-  
**danta-vīrya-** dantavīryam 6.14.3d  
**dabh** dabhan 6.1.4d 6.11.2c 7.3.3d 7.7.10a  
 dipsati 7.1.2c dipsa 7.1.1c *dipsant-*  
 dipsantam 7.1.1c *dabdha-* → a-dabdha-  
 asuṣ-  
**dama-** +dame 6.23.5d  
**dam-pati-** dampatī 6.23.10c,12c 7.11.5b  
<sup>1</sup>**day<sup>i</sup>**  
 +**pari** pari dīya (°ā) 7.4.8a  
<sup>2</sup>**day<sup>i</sup>** dīdīhi 6.9.11c  
**darbha-** darbhas 7.7.1a,2a,5c,7c,10c  
 darbheṇa 7.7.8c  
**darś** darśan 6.2.8a darṣe 6.20.2a dṛṣe  
 7.9.6d *dṛṣṭa-* dṛṣṭas 7.2.8c dṛṣṭān  
 7.2.7c → a-dṛṣṭa- → a-dṛṣṭa-han- →  
 viśva-dṛṣṭa-  
 +**ā** ā darśate 6.1.6c(?)  
 +**prati** praty adarśi 6.10.5a\*  
**darh** *dṛḍha-* dṛḍhās 7.6.5c,8ab  
 °**dala-** → ava-dala-  
**daśa-** daśa 6.23.2cd  
**daśa-māsyā-** daśamāsyam 7.11.2c  
**dah** dahāmi 7.2.10d  
 +**apa** apa dahāmasi 7.7.8d  
*apadagḍha-* apadagḍham 7.7.9a  
 apadagḍhās 7.7.9b  
 +**nis** nir daha 7.3.2b  
 +**pra** pra dahāmasi 6.23.3d pra  
 dahati 6.22.2d,3a  
 +**prati** prati... daha 7.1.1d,2a prati  
 ... daha 7.1.2b  
<sup>1</sup>**dā** dadāti 6.10.1c,7b 6.22.6a dadāsi

7.15.3a,4a *dadant-* dadat 7.15.5c da-  
 datas 6.16.5a dadus 6.9.9b dās 6.2.7b  
*ditsant-* ditsantam 7.9.3d<sup>+</sup> ditsan-  
 tas 7.9.8c<sup>+</sup> *datta-* dattā 7.9.10d →  
 tvādatta- dattvā 7.15.2bd  
 +ā ā dade 6.15.4d,5d,7d,8b,9d 7.12.4d  
 ā... dade 6.15.8ad ādiṣi 6.15.3d ādāya  
 6.15.8c → karna-ā-datta-  
 +**pari** pari dadmasi 6.21.1c pari dehi  
 6.21.2a\* pari dadātu 6.21.2b pari dade  
 7.16.1e–10e  
 +**pra** *pratta-* prattam 6.15.2c  
 prattām 6.15.1d → pra-dātar-  
<sup>3</sup>**dā** *dita-* ditās 7.8.6b  
<sup>5</sup>**dā/dās**<sup>o</sup>  
 +**abhi** abhidāsati 6.12.6c abhidāsāt  
 6.11.9b 6.12.8a–13.3a abhidāsān 7.17.1b–  
 10b<sup>+</sup>  
**dātar-** dātā 6.10.5d,6d,7a dātre 6.10.9d  
<sup>o</sup>**dātar-** → pra-dātar-  
**dānava-** dānavān 7.12.8d  
**dānu-** dānūn 6.1.6c  
**dāma-granthi-** dāmagranthim 6.14.5c  
<sup>o</sup>**dāya-** → a-dāya-  
**dāru-** dāru 6.8.7a  
**dāsa-** dāsas 6.14.7b dāsāya 6.1.2b  
<sup>o</sup>**diti-** → a-diti-  
<sup>o</sup>**dina-** → madhyam-dina-  
<sup>o</sup>**diva-** → bṛhat-diva-  
**divya-** divyas 6.9.1c divyasya 7.15.3d  
**diś-** diśam 6.23.3b diśe 6.13.4a,5a,6a,7a,  
 8a,9a diśas 6.3.7c 6.12.8a,9a,10a 6.13.1a,  
 2a,3a 6.18.6b 7.16.2a,3a,4a,5a,6a,7a,8a,9a,  
 10a 7.17.1b,2b,3b,4b,5b,6b,7b,8b,9b,10b  
<sup>o</sup>**diśa-** → pra-diśa-  
**dirgha-** dirgham 6.18.1e,9e  
<sup>o</sup>**dugha-** → kāma-dughā-  
**durasy**<sup>o</sup> durasyāt 7.8.7c\*  
**duroṇa-** duroṇe 6.1.7b  
**dus-ita-** durityāt 6.3.3c 7.8.8b  
**dus-ukta-** duruktam 7.8.1b\*  
**dus-eva-** durevās 6.1.4d  
**dus-kṛta-** duṣkṛtas 6.11.3d  
**dus-kṛta-kṛt-** duṣkṛtakṛt 7.3.6a

**dus-cyavana-** duścyavanas 7.4.7c  
 duścyavanena 7.4.3b  
**dus-śamsa-** duḥśamsas 6.20.6b  
**dus-svapnya-** <sup>+</sup>duṣvapnyam 7.7.9a  
**dus-hanu-** durhaṇo 6.8.7c  
**dus-hārd-** durhārde 7.1.10c  
**duhitar-** duhitar 6.20.5d  
**dūṣaṇa-** dūṣaṇas 7.7.4c dūṣaṇī 6.7.3c  
<sup>o</sup>**dūṣaṇa-** → garbha-dūṣaṇa- → viṣa-  
 dūṣaṇa-  
**dūṣi-** dūṣyās 7.5.11a  
<sup>o</sup>**dūṣi-** → kṛtyā-dūṣi-  
<sup>o</sup>**drś-** → sam-drś-  
<sup>o</sup>**drṣṭa-** → a-drṣṭa-  
<sup>o</sup>**drṣṭa-han-** → a-drṣṭa-han-  
**deva-** devas 6.3.8c 6.12.4b 6.17.2a 6.19.3c  
 7.5.8a 7.10.1a deva 7.3.1b,3c deva-  
 sya 7.5.11b devās 6.3.9d 6.9.9b 7.3.6c  
 7.5.3a 7.6.1b,4c 7.14.10a 7.18.3ad devāsas  
 6.17.3b,6b 7.4.11d devān 6.22.4a devais  
 7.16.10a devebhis 6.4.11d devebhyas  
 6.9.2c 6.16.11d 7.18.1b devānām 6.4.1d  
 6.16.6b 7.3.9c 7.4.10d 7.9.9d  
<sup>o</sup>**deva-** → a-deva- → viśva-deva-  
**deva-kṛta-** devakṛtā 7.1.11a 7.9.4a  
**devatā-** devatās 6.18.4b 6.22.12b  
**deva-purā-** devapurās 6.12.4d,5a<sup>+</sup>,6a  
 7.18.8a  
**deva-sadana-** devasadanā 7.10.6a  
**deva-senā-** devasenānām 7.4.9c  
**deva-hūti-** devahūtiṣu 7.9.9d  
<sup>o</sup>**devin-** → mūra-devin-  
**devī-** devī 7.2.1b 7.6.9a devī 7.6.8b  
 devīs 6.3.4c,5a,8c,11c  
**deś**  
 +ā ā... diśa 7.9.1a  
**deṣṭrī-** deṣṭrī 6.19.2b  
**daivya-** daivyam 7.3.9c  
**daivya-abhi-śasti-** daivyābhiśastyās  
 6.12.7c<sup>+</sup>  
**dogh** dhukṣva 6.22.11d  
*duhāna-* duhānam 6.22.10b duhānā  
 6.10.2ab,9c *duhyamāna-* duhyamāna-  
 sya 6.15.7c *dugdha-* dugdhāt 6.15.7d

- dodhant-** dodhatām 6.9.5b  
**dyav-** dyaus 6.5.1a 7.3.8d 7.11.10a divam 6.22.5bd,12b divā 7.9.4b 7.10.2e,4f 7.14.3b dive 6.13.10a,15a divas 6.11.4b, 5c 6.18.5b 6.20.1c,5d 7.7.7a 7.13.3b divi 6.6.4b 6.16.4c 6.17.6b 7.10.6b,7b 7.13.4a  
**dyāvā-pr̥thivī-** dyāvāpr̥thivī 6.23.6b 7.1.4b 7.2.1a 7.6.1d dyāvāpr̥thivībhyām 6.12.3b 7.16.5a  
**dyāvāpr̥thivīvant-** dyāvāpr̥thivīvantam 7.17.5a  
**°drava-** → pari-drava-  
**draviṇa-** draviṇam 6.19.8a  
**draṣṭar-** draṣṭāras 6.20.3b  
**dru-pada-** drupade 6.20.9d  
**°druh-** → a-druh-  
**dva-** dvā 6.20.5a dvau 7.2.4aabb  
**dvār-** duras 6.1.8d  
**dvi-pad-** dvipād 7.15.2b dvipade 7.6.8d dvipadas 7.6.10d  
**dvi-śiṛṣaṇ-** dviśiṛṣā 7.2.6a  
**dviṣ-** dviṣas 6.12.7b  
**°dviṣeṇya-** → a-dviṣeṇya-  
**dvis** 6.1.3b  
**dveṣ** dviṣmas 7.9.6c *dviṣant-* dviṣantam 7.5.12d dviṣatas 7.5.12b → a-dviṣeṇya-  
**dhana-** dhanena 6.18.1d,9d 6.19.1d,9d dhanā 6.1.4a  
**dhana-pati-** dhanapate 7.2.2b  
**dhan<sup>1</sup>**  
 +**pari+pra** pari... pra dhanvās 6.11.5a  
**°dhanya-** → jīva-dhanya-  
**°dhanvan-** → ūrdhva-dhanvan- → hiraṇya-dhanvan-  
<sup>1</sup>**dhay<sup>1</sup>** dhāpayatām 7.11.9d  
**dhar** dādhāra 6.2.1d 7.6.1a,2b dhriyadhvam 7.6.3a dhārayāmi 7.6.1c, 2c *°dhr̥ta-* → an-ava-dhr̥ta-  
**dharaṇa-** dharuṇe 7.6.3a  
**dhartṛī-** dhartṛī 6.4.2c  
**dharmaṇ-** dharmāṇam 6.16.1b dharmaṇi 6.2.2a  
**dhars̥**  
 +**upa** upadādhṛṣus 7.3.5b\*  
 +**ā** *°ādhr̥ṣṭa-* → an-ā-dhr̥ṣṭa-  
**dhava-** dhave 6.4.4b  
**°dhas-** → vayas-dhas-  
**dhā** dadhāti 6.1.2b 6.2.7a dadhmasi 6.23.5b dadhat 6.9.3d dadhātu 7.6.6d dhattam 6.11.7d dadhatu 6.17.10b dhehi 6.11.10b 7.12.5c dadhus 6.3.9d dadhiṣe 6.2.3c *dadhāna-* dadhānā 6.10.2a,9c dadhānām 6.10.1d *dhitsant-* dhitsantas 6.10.3b *hita-* hitam 6.16.6b +**ā** ā dadhmas 7.1.7c *āhita-* āhitas 7.7.7b  
 +**tiras** tiro dhatte 7.15.5b  
 +**ni** ni... dadhiṣe 6.1.7a  
 +**pari** pari dadhe 6.12.3b  
 +**puras** puro dadhe 6.11.2d puro dhatse 7.9.2a purodadhire 7.18.7a  
 +**prati** *pratihita-* pratihitābhis 7.4.4d  
 +**sam** sam dadhus 7.5.2d,3b → śrad-dadhāna-  
**dhātar-** dhātā 6.19.3a 7.3.7c  
**°dhāna-** → pari-dhāna-  
**dhāman-** dhāma 6.10.7c dhāmabhis 6.20.1b  
**°dhāman-** → sahasra-dhāman-  
**°dhāyas-** → viśva-dhāyas-  
**°dhāra-** → sahasra-dhāra-  
**dhārā-** dhārām 7.15.9c dhārābhis 7.6.4d  
**dhāv** dhāvanti 6.3.10a dhāvatu 6.20.8b +**ati** ati dhāvata 7.18.4a  
**dhāsyu-** dhāsyus 6.2.2c  
**dhī-** dhiyas 6.17.11b  
**dhṛṣṇu-** dhṛṣṇo 6.1.4c dhṛṣṇunā 7.4.3b  
**dhenu-** dhenus 6.5.5a 6.22.9d dhenvās 6.6.3c dhenavas 6.3.8b 7.6.7d  
**dhruva-** dhruveṇa 7.6.1c dhruvāyai 6.13.8a dhruvāyās 6.13.2a 7.16.9a 7.17.9b  
**dhrukṣa-** dhrukṣnāsas 7.2.8b<sup>+</sup>  
**°dhvaṃsa-** → vi-dhvaṃsa-  
**dhvaja-** dhvajeṣu 7.4.11a

**na** 6.3.10cc 6.4.4d,9d 6.5.1bb,13bb 6.8.4c  
6.10.3c 6.11.3d,4c 6.16.11b 6.17.2a 6.20.2aa  
6.21.5d 6.22.2d,3ac,4d 6.23.9c 7.3.5b 7.4.2a  
7.7.4b 7.10.2c,3d,4d 7.12.2cd,4a,5a 7.15.10c  
**nakulī-** nakulyā 7.9.10a\*  
**nakt-** naktam 7.9.4b  
**nakṣatra-** nakṣatrais 7.14.4b  
**nakha-ugra-** nakhogram 6.14.3d  
**nagna-** nagnā 7.9.5a  
**naghamāra-** naghamāras 7.10.2b  
**naghāyūṣa-** naghāyūṣas 7.10.2b\*  
**naghāriṣa-** naghāriṣas 7.10.2b\*  
**nad** → °nādin-  
**nadī-** nadyas 6.18.7a nadīs 7.13.11a  
nadībhis 7.14.7b  
**nabhas-** nabhas 6.4.1a  
**nam**  
+**sam** sam namantu 7.18.2d  
**namas-** namas 6.2.5b 6.8.8d 6.10.8c  
7.9.1d,2c,4d,7a 7.11.9aabb 7.19.3d,4d  
**nay<sup>1</sup>** nayāmasi 7.1.12c naya 6.23.2b  
nayantu 7.3.6d neṣat 7.3.7c nīyate  
6.6.6b  
+**apa** apanayāmasi 6.8.9d  
+**nis** nis... nayāmasi 7.3.3a  
nir ṇayāmasi 7.3.4d  
+**parā** parā ṇaya 7.1.7b  
+**pari** pari... nayāmas 6.9.10c  
pariṇīyate 6.9.4b  
+**pra** → pra-nī-  
+**vi** vinayāmasi 6.8.9d  
vi... nayāmasi 7.9.6b  
**nart**  
+**anu** anunṛtyanti 7.13.5a  
**narya-** naryas 6.9.1c  
**nav**  
+**sam** sam... navanta 6.1.2d  
**nava-** nava 6.20.3b  
**navati-** navatis 6.20.3b  
<sup>1</sup>**naś** aśmahī 6.20.2de  
+**vi** vyānaśe 7.19.4b  
<sup>2</sup>**naś** naśya 6.8.4b nāśayāmasi 6.14.1d,  
6f,7e,8c,9f 7.11.2d,3d,4d,5d,7d,8d  
**nāśayant-** nāśayan 7.10.1c,5f,8g

**nas-** nasā 7.1.1b  
**nāsa-** nāse 7.2.3b  
**nah**  
+**api** api nahyata 7.18.5e  
+**pra** praṇaddha- +praṇaddhasya  
6.15.7a<sup>+</sup>  
°**nah-** → pari-nah-  
**nahi** 6.17.2a  
**nāka-** nākasya 6.17.6a nāke 6.11.4b  
**nāḍa-** nāḍam 7.7.3a  
°**nādin-** → gardabha-nādin-  
**nāma-grāha-** nāmagrāhāt 7.8.6c  
**nāman-** nāma 6.2.3c 6.4.1c,3d,5d,8a  
6.9.1d 6.11.5d 6.12.3a,4a 6.14.8ab 6.21.6ab  
7.3.3c 7.10.3abc 7.12.6d nāmāni 6.7.7d,  
8b 7.10.2a 7.19.9c  
°**nāman-** → sapta-nāman-  
**nāvya-** nāvyaś 6.23.2d  
°**nāsika-** → ahi-nāsika-  
**nī** 6.1.1c,7a 6.2.2a 6.4.4a\* 6.6.2b,8bc 6.11.4c  
6.20.2b,5d<sup>+</sup> 6.23.1b 7.3.1c 7.5.6c,7b,10b  
7.9.7cd 7.6.6bd 7.11.6b,7b  
**nī(ṣ)-sthā-** niṣṭhā 6.15.3c  
**nī-kramaṇa-** nikramaṇam 6.6.1a  
**nī-krānta-** nīkrāntam 7.5.10b  
**nī-tatni-** nitatnis 7.5.6c,7b  
**nī-tudant-** nitudantīm 7.9.7d  
**nitya-vatsa-** nityavatsās 7.6.7d  
**nī-padana-** nipadanāt 6.23.1b  
°**nimiṣa-** → a-nimiṣa-  
**nī-mīvant-** nīmīvantīm 7.9.7c  
**nivat-** nivatas 7.7.4a  
**niṣaṅgiṇ-** niṣaṅgibhis 7.4.4a  
**nis** 6.4.7d 6.15.5a,6a 6.23.1a,4a 7.3.2b,3ab,  
4d 7.9.7e  
**nīs-upta-** niruptasya 6.15.5a,6a  
**nīs-ṛti-** nirṛte 7.11.9c nirṛtes 6.3.3d  
**nīs-karīyas-** niṣkarīyasī 6.4.10d  
**nīs-kṛti-** niṣkṛtis 6.4.3d,7c  
**nīs-nij-** nirṇijam 6.10.5b\*  
**nīs-vadant-** nirvadantīm 7.9.7e  
°**nī-** → pra-nī-  
**nu** 6.2.8a 6.16.1a  
**nṛ-** naras 7.4.3d nṛṇām 6.20.7d

- nṛ-cakṣas-** nṛcakṣase 6.9.1b  
nṛcakṣasas 6.20.3a
- nṛ-pati-** nṛpatis 6.9.2b
- nṛmṇa-** nṛmṇam 6.10.8b 6.11.10b
- °nṛmṇa-** → tveṣa-nṛmṇa-  
**nej**  
+ava ava...nenije 7.3.7b
- netar-** netā 7.4.9a
- naigūra-karṇa-** naigūrakarṇa 7.11.8b
- nod**  
+abhi abhi nudantu 6.10.4d  
+nis nir ṇuda 6.23.1a  
+parā → a-parā-nutta-  
+pra pra ṇuda 6.23.1a  
+vi vi...nudasva 6.9.10a
- nau-** naus 7.10.7a nāvas 7.10.8a
- nyak-rodha-** nyagrodhe 6.4.4c
- nyañc-** nyañcam 6.14.9e\*
- nyañcanī-** nyañcanī 6.4.2d
- °pa-** → go-pa-
- pakva-** pakvas 6.22.5d 7.19.6b pakvam  
6.23.10d 7.3.5b pakvāt 6.15.6d
- pakṣa-** pakṣau 6.22.1c pakṣāsas 7.6.8b
- pakṣiṇ-** pakṣī 6.22.5b 7.5.6a pakṣiṇas  
7.8.10a
- pac** pacāmi 6.22.9a pacanti 6.22.2c,4c,  
13c *pacyamāna-* pacyamānas 7.19.7b  
pacyamānasya 6.15.6c
- pañca-** pañca 6.20.4b
- pañcāśat-** pañcāśat 6.20.4b
- pat** patayati 6.21.3a patanti 7.13.6a  
patatu 7.1.4a *patant-* patan 7.7.10b  
+ā → ā-patika-  
+ut ut pātaya 6.23.10a  
+pra pra...pata 6.8.4b pra pātaya  
6.23.4d,10b  
+sam *sam̐patita-* sam̐patitā 6.4.9a
- patatṛiṇ-** patatṛī 7.5.6a,7a patatṛiṇas  
7.8.10b †patatṛiṇī 6.4.9c
- pati-** patim 6.23.2a 7.12.10d pate  
7.6.10a patyus 7.11.7a patau 6.23.11a
- °pati-** → adhi-pati- → go-pati-  
→ dam-pati- → dhana-pati- → nṛ-  
pati- → paśu-pati- → prajā-pati-  
→ śacī-pati-  
**°patika-** → ā-patika-  
**°patna-** → sa-patna- → sa-patna-  
cātana- → sa-patna-han-  
**patnī-** patnī 6.10.1a,2c patnī 7.6.7a,9c  
**°patnī-** → balāsa-patnī- → bhava-  
patnī- → sa-patnī-
- pad**  
+abhi → abhi-pāpada-  
+ni nipadyate 7.11.6b,7b  
*nipedivāms-* nipedivān 6.6.2b<sup>+</sup>  
+pra prapadyante 7.13.10a
- pad-** padam 7.5.10b pattas 6.6.2b  
pados 7.15.8b
- °pad-** → catuṣ-pad- → dvi-pad-  
→ śva-pad-
- pada-** padepade 6.11.4d
- °pada-** → adhas-pada- → dru-pada-
- °padana-** → ni-padana-
- pad-tas** pattas 6.6.2b
- padvant-** padvat 6.21.3c
- panthā-** panthām 6.11.3d pathā  
6.8.5c<sup>+</sup> pathas 6.3.1b,2b pathibhis  
6.20.8a
- papri-** papris 7.15.10b
- payas-** payas 6.10.2a 7.3.9c payasā  
6.3.12d
- <sup>1</sup>pay<sup>i</sup>** *pinvamāna-* pinvamānās 6.22.6d,  
8c
- par** pipartu 7.6.4d pārāya 6.9.12c  
pārayatu 7.15.3c
- para-** param 6.1.7a pareṇa 6.20.8cd
- parama-** paramebhis 6.20.8a
- paras** paras 6.17.2b 7.9.6a
- parastara-** parastaram 6.8.7d
- parā** 6.6.9a 6.9.4d 7.1.7b 7.10.10d
- parā-ayana-** parāyaṇam 6.6.1b
- parā-gata-** parāgatam 6.6.9a
- °parā-nutta-** → a-parā-nutta-
- parā-yant-** parāyatas 6.9.4d
- pari** + *abl.* 6.11.3a 7.1.10b 7.8.8ac 7.10.1b,  
5b 7.15.8c *prev.* 6.7.1c,2a 6.9.4b,10c  
6.9.10c 6.11.5ab 6.12.3b 6.14.9d 6.21.1c,2ab  
6.22.3c 6.23.6a 7.1.10b 7.2.3ab 7.4.8a 7.7.1d,

- 5aabb,7d,10d 7.9.1a 7.10.2d,4e 7.11.10bd  
7.13.7a 7.16.1e–10e
- pari-undāna-** paryundānam 6.14.9d  
**pariṃśa-** pariṃśam 6.16.9b  
**pari-drava-** paridravam 6.14.9d  
**pari-dhāna-** paridhānena 7.15.5b  
**pari-nah-** <sup>+</sup>parīnahi 6.21.1b  
**pari-pāna-** paripāṇāni 7.18.8c  
**pari-rāpiṇ-** parirāpiṇam 7.9.2b<sup>+</sup>  
parirāpiṇi 7.9.3d<sup>+</sup> parirāpiṇas 7.19.2b<sup>+</sup>  
**pari-śāsa-** pariśāsam 7.1.10a<sup>+</sup>  
**pari-skr̥ta-** pariśkr̥tam 6.22.13d  
**parc** pṛnakṣi 6.2.8c  
<sup>+</sup>**api** api pṛncanti 6.1.3a  
<sup>+</sup>**sam** sam papīcre 6.3.5b\*,10d\*
- parjanya-** parjanyas 7.11.1c  
**parṇa-** parṇam 6.4.9b parṇe 6.4.4c  
<sup>°</sup>**parṇa-** → uttāna-parṇa- → vidyut-  
parṇa- → su-parṇa-  
‡**paryanyam**‡ 6.14.4a  
<sup>°</sup>**parva-** → vi-parva-  
**parvata-** parvatās 7.11.1a parvatān  
6.17.7a 6.23.2c parvatānām 6.16.7b  
<sup>1</sup>**par**<sup>i</sup> *pūrṇa-* pūrṇās 6.22.7b pūrṇān  
6.22.6b  
**pavana-** pavanena 6.22.2a  
**pavamāna-** pavamānāya 7.20.10a  
**pav**<sup>i</sup> punanti 6.3.11d punantu 6.3.3c,  
4b punate 6.3.10a *punāna-* punānās  
6.3.3a *pūta-* pūtas 6.3.4d pūtās  
6.22.2a  
**pavitār-** pavitāras 6.3.11d  
**paś**  
<sup>+</sup>**pari** paryapaśyat 6.7.2a  
<sup>+</sup>**pari+ava** pary avāpaśyat 6.7.1c  
<sup>+</sup>**pra** *prapaśyant-* prapaśyantas 6.1.5b  
  
<sup>+</sup>**prati** → prati-spaś-  
**paśu-** paśunā 7.15.2a paśavas 6.19.7a  
paśūn 6.10.6d 6.21.5c paśuṣu 6.21.5e  
**paśu-pati-** paśupate 7.15.2a  
**paścāt** 6.3.1a 6.21.4a 7.15.1c  
<sup>1</sup>**pā** pāhi 6.12.7bbcd 6.21.3d,4a 7.19.9d  
pātu 7.3.8d 7.15.1bc,6e,8c 7.16.1a–5a,7a–  
10a pāntu 7.16.6a  
<sup>+</sup>**ni** ni pāhi 6.20.5d<sup>+</sup>  
<sup>+</sup>**pari** pari... pāhi 7.11.10d pari pātu  
7.15.8c pari... pātu 7.7.1d,5aabb,7d,10d  
7.8.8a  
<sup>2</sup>**pā** pibati 6.4.2a pītvā 7.8.5a  
<sup>+</sup>**prati** → prati-pāvan-  
**pāmsura-** pāmsure 7.5.10b  
‡**pāmsyūmś**‡ 6.14.6d  
**pāka-** pākas 7.7.6d pākasya 6.8.6b  
**pāṭā-** pāṭā 7.12.5a,9a pāṭām 7.12.1c,  
7d,8a pāṭe 7.12.4c,5ac,6a  
**pāda-ghātin-** pādaghātinīs 7.13.6b  
<sup>°</sup>**pāna-** → tanū-pāna- → pari-pāna-  
**pāpa-** pāpam 7.7.2d,4d pāpena 7.8.1a  
pāpās 7.3.9b  
**pāpa-kṛtvān-** pāpakṛtvānas 7.7.6c  
<sup>°</sup>**pāpada-** → abhi-pāpada  
**pāpman-** pāpmānam 7.11.7c  
pāpmane 7.1.12b  
**pāra-** pāram 6.20.2ade  
**pārayiṣṇu-** pārayiṣṇū 7.4.1b  
**pārthiva-** pārthivam 6.20.1a  
**pāvaka-** pāvakās 6.3.11a  
<sup>°</sup>**pāvan-** → prati-pāvan-  
**pāśin-** pāśinas 6.11.4d  
**pitā-maha-** pitāmahas 6.4.1b  
pitāmahās 6.22.11c  
<sup>°</sup>**pitāmaha-** → pra-pitāmaha-  
**pitu-** pitus 6.20.1b pitum 6.16.1a pito  
6.16.2aa,3a,4a,5ab,6a,7ac,11a  
**pitu-bhojana-** pitubhojanas 6.6.5a  
**pitar-** pitā 6.4.1a,8b 6.6.3b 7.10.3b pita-  
ram 7.1.8a pitar 7.3.10a pitarā 6.2.7c  
pitaras 6.22.10c  
**pippala-** pippalam 7.19.8d  
**piśāca-** piśācān 7.19.2c piśācais 6.4.11a  
7.19.8a  
**piśāca-jambhana-** piśācajambhanam  
7.19.10b  
<sup>°</sup>**pīti-** → pūrva-pīti-  
<sup>°</sup>**pītha-** → go-pītha-  
**pīlu-** pīlus 7.19.5d pīlum 7.19.9a,10b  
pīlo 7.19.1c,2c,6a,7c,8c

- pīva-** pīvam 7.19.9a  
**pīvas-** pīvas 6.16.8c,10bc  
**puṇḍarīka-** puṇḍarīkam 6.22.8a  
**putra-** putras 6.2.7c 7.1.8a putram  
6.2.9b 7.19.5c putrās 6.22.10c putrān  
6.8.9c  
°**putra-** → bahu-putra- → śarva-  
putra-  
**punar** 6.4.11b 6.6.2c 7.1.7a 7.3.6c 7.8.10c  
7.18.6d 7.19.8c  
**pumāms-** pumān 7.1.12a pumsām  
6.10.9b  
**pur-** puram 7.16.1c,5c,6c,10c  
**puras** 6.3.1b,2b 6.21.4a *prev.* 6.11.2d  
7.4.9b 7.9.2a 7.18.7a  
**purastāt** 7.13.2a 7.16.1a  
°**purā-** → deva-purā-  
**puru-** purūṇi 6.1.7d 6.2.2b  
**puru-varpas-** puruvarpasam 6.1.6a  
**puruṣa-** puruṣas 7.7.6d 7.10.2c,4d pu-  
ruṣam 6.4.2b 7.9.2b puruṣasya 7.9.5d  
7.19.8a puruṣebhyas 6.20.10d puruṣe-  
ṣu 6.15.9a → pūruṣa-  
**purodhi-** purodhim 7.9.7b  
**puṣkara-** puṣkarais 7.13.10b  
**puṣkariṇī-** puṣkariṇīs 6.22.8d  
**puṣṭi-** puṣṭyā 6.10.9b 6.19.1b,2b,3b,4b,  
5b,6b,7b  
**puṣpa-** puṣpasya 7.12.4a  
°**pū-** → ghr̥ta-pū-  
**pūruṣa-** pūruṣam 6.4.7d<sup>+</sup>,7.3.11b →  
puruṣa-  
°**pūruṣa-** → a-pūruṣa- → sarva-  
pūruṣa- → sthira-pūruṣa-  
**pūrva-** pūrvas 7.8.3d 7.10.9a  
**pūrva-pīti-** pūrvapītaye 6.17.9a  
**pūrvya-** pūrvyam 6.2.4a  
**pūṣaṇ-** pūṣā 6.18.1b,3c  
**ṛṭtanā-** ṛṭtanās 6.9.8d 7.1.3a  
**ṛṭtanā-sah-** ṛṭtanāsāḥ 7.1.3a 7.4.7c  
**ṛṭtanā-sāhya-** ṛṭtanāsāhyeṣu 6.9.12d  
°**ṛṭtanya-** → a-ṛṭtanya-  
**ṛṭthak** 6.3.7d 7.13.1b  
**ṛṭthivī-** ṛṭthivī 6.5.1a 7.6.4d 7.11.10a  
ṛṭthivīm 6.22.12a 7.6.1a,2b ṛṭthivyai  
6.13.12a,13a ṛṭthivyās 6.9.6c 7.6.3a,4b  
ṛṭthivyām 7.7.7b ṛṭthivīs 6.18.5a  
†**ṛṭthuryaman†** 6.2.5a  
**ṛṣṭi-** ṛṣṭīs 7.2.6c  
**ṛṣṭha-** ṛṣṭham 6.22.1a  
°**ṛṣṭha-** → soma-ṛṣṭha-  
**peṣ** *piṣyamāna-* piṣyamānasya 6.15.5c  
*piṣṭa-* piṣṭāt 6.15.5d  
**poṣ** puṣyatu 6.10.5d,6d  
°**poṣa-** → sahasra-poṣa-  
**pautra-** pautrās 6.22.11c  
°**pautra-** → pra-pautra-  
**pyā**  
+**ā** ā . . . pyāyate 7.19.8c ā pyāyatām  
6.4.11b  
**pra** 6.1.5b,6d 6.2.4a 6.3.1a,1b,2b,4c,11b  
6.6.2a,3c 6.8.4b 6.11.5a 6.12.2b,3c,4d,5a,  
6a 6.15.1d,2c,7a 6.16.5c 6.17.1b 6.22.2d,  
3a,12d 6.23.1a,3d,4d,10b 7.1.5c,11c 7.2.7d  
7.3.10d 7.4.6d,7d,8cc 7.6.6b 7.8.1c 7.9.1c,  
3a,4ac 7.13.10a 7.15.2d,8d 7.16.1c,5c,6c,10c  
7.18.7d,8a  
**pra-āpiṇ-** prāpī 7.19.5c\*  
**pra-chedana-** prachedanas 7.5.12a  
**prajananavant-** prajananavān 7.16.9a  
prajananavantam 7.17.9a  
°**prajas-** → su-prajas-  
**prajā-** prajāṃ 6.10.3b,5d 7.3.4c,7d,  
11d 7.11.6c prajāyā 6.18.1d,9d 6.19.1d,  
2d,3d,4d,9d 7.3.10d prajāyai 6.10.4b  
prajābhis 7.14.11b  
**prajā-kāma-** prajākāmā 6.10.1b  
**pra-jāta-** prajātas 6.6.3c  
°**prajāna-** → kārṣivaṇa-prajāna-  
→ sindhu-prajāna-  
**pra-jānant-** prajānan 7.6.6b  
**prajā-pati-** prajāpatis 6.3.2a 7.14.11a  
7.16.9a prajāpatim 6.12.6d 7.17.9a pra-  
ajāpatinā 6.10.4a  
**pratara-** prataram 6.2.4a  
**pra-taraṇa-** prataraṇas 7.5.9c  
**prati** + *acc.* 6.10.6b 6.17.1a 7.19.6d  
*prev.* prati 6.4.5c 6.10.5a,8c,9a 7.1.1d,

2ab,3b,5c,10d,11c 7.4.4d 7.6.10ac 7.8.3d,9c  
7.9.8d 7.12.6c 7.13.11a 7.15.9c,10d 7.19.5a  
**prati-pāvan-** pratipāvne 7.11.9b\*  
**prati-māna-** pratimānāni 6.1.6d  
†**pratimānimīta**† 6.2.4d  
**prati-rūpa-** †pratirūpas 7.11.7a  
**prati-sara-** pratisarān 7.18.6a  
**prati-sthā-** pratiṣṭhayā 7.16.9a  
**prati-spaśa-** pratispaśas 6.12.7a\*  
**prati-haraṇa-** pratiharaṇena 7.1.3c  
**prati-hita-** pratihitābhis 7.4.4d  
**praticīna-** praticīnena 7.1.11d  
**pra-tta-** prattam 6.15.2c prattām  
6.15.1d  
**pratna-** pratnāt 6.11.3a  
**pratyāñc-** pratyak 7.1.5c pratīcas  
7.18.6d pratīcī 6.10.6b pratīcyai 6.13.6a  
pratīcyās 6.12.10a 7.16.5a 7.17.5b  
**prathama-** prathamas 6.2.2ca 7.5.4a  
prathamau 7.4.1c prathamā(h) 6.11.2a  
**pra-dātar-** pradātā 7.9.1c  
**pra-diśa-** pradiśas 6.3.3b,7d 6.18.6a  
**pra-nī-** prañīs 6.9.5c  
**pra-pitāmaha-** prapitāmahās 6.22.12c  
**pra-pautra-** prapautrās 6.22.12c  
**pra-bhraṃśaṇa-** prabhraṃśanam  
7.10.8a  
**pra-mṛṇant-** pramṛṇan 7.4.8c  
pramṛṇantam 7.4.6d  
**pra-mṛśya-ādin-** †pramṛśyādinam  
6.14.3a  
**prayuta-eṣaṇa-** prayutaiṣaṇam 6.14.9c  
**pra-vīra-** pravīras 7.4.5a  
°**praśiṣṭa-** → indra-praśiṣṭa-  
°**prasūta-** → varuṇa-prasūta-  
**pra-sravaṇa-** prasravaṇeṣu 6.3.11c  
**pra-hāla-** prahālam 6.14.2b  
**prā**  
+ā ā... aprāyi 6.20.1b\*  
**prājāpatya-** prājāpatyas 6.12.4a  
**prāñc-** prācyai 6.13.4a prācyās 6.12.8a  
7.17.1b  
**prāṇa-** prāṇas 6.5.10a prāṇa 6.5.1c,  
13c prāṇam 7.15.2d\*,5a 7.18.5e

**prātar** 7.7.5a  
**priya-** priyam 6.10.7c  
**priyatama-** priyatamā 7.5.4b  
**preṅkha-** preṅkhas 7.13.4a  
**plakṣa-** plakṣe 6.4.4a  
**plav** plavate 6.8.7a  
+**anu** → anu-plava-  
+**pari** pari plavatām 6.23.6a  
°**plava-** → anu-plava- → vāta-plava-  
**pluṣi-** pluṣayas 6.8.8b\*  
**phala-** phale 7.19.3b  
**badhira-** badhirās 6.11.3c  
**bandh** badhnāmi 6.6.9d 7.19.10d  
*baddha-* baddhas 7.13.4a baddham  
6.6.9b+  
°**bandhana-** → hiraṇya-bandhana-  
**babhru-** babhrus 7.2.4c 7.8.4a ba-  
bhruṇā 7.7.6b 7.9.10d babhros 6.7.8c  
°**babhru-** → ?aja-babhru-  
**babhru-karṇa-** babhrukarṇas 7.2.4c  
**barjahya-** †barjahye 7.19.6d  
°**barhaṇa-** → upa-barhaṇa-  
**barhiṣ-** barhis 6.9.7b  
**bala-** balam 6.11.10a balāya 7.5.2c,7a  
**balavattama-** balavattamām 7.12.10b  
**balavant-** balavān 7.5.6a  
**bala-vijñāya-** balavijñāyas 7.4.5a  
**balāsa-patnī-** balāsapatnyai 6.8.8c  
**balāhaka-** balāhakam 6.14.2c  
**bahis** 6.14.6c  
**bahu-** bahu 6.22.3b 7.13.14b  
**bahudhā** 6.3.3a  
**bahu-putra-** bahuputre 6.8.5a  
**bahula-madhyama-** bahulamadhya-  
masya 7.6.7b  
**bādh** bād hate 7.12.10c abād hathās  
7.19.7a bādhasva 7.19.1c,2bd,7c  
+**apa** apa... bādhasva 7.19.2a  
apa bādhatām 7.5.12d *apabādhamāna-*  
*apabādhamānas* 7.4.8b  
**bādhirya-** bādhiryāt 7.15.6e  
**bāhu-** bāhū 7.4.1a bāhvos 7.8.3c  
°**bāhu-** → vajra-bāhu- → śiti-bāhu-  
→ hiraṇya-bāhu-

- bāhu-śardhin-** bāhuśardhī 7.4.4c  
**bāhya-** bāhyā 7.12.2d  
**bila-** bilam 6.23.4a bilāt 6.23.4b  
**bisa-** +bisam 6.22.8b  
**br̥hat-diva-** br̥haddivas 6.1.8a,9a  
**br̥hat-vada-** br̥hadvadām 7.12.7c  
**br̥hant-** br̥hat 6.22.1a 7.8.9c br̥hatī 6.20.1c  
**br̥haspati-** br̥haspatis 6.18.1b 7.4.9a 7.5.1c,2a 7.6.6b 7.16.10a br̥haspatim 7.17.10a br̥haspate 7.4.8a  
**bradhna-** bradhnas 7.7.10b  
**brav<sup>i</sup>** bruvat 7.8.1b  
 +**pari** paribravīmi 7.10.2d,4e  
 +**vi** vi bravītu 6.9.2d,3a  
**brahma-kṣatra-** brahmakṣatram 6.3.8d  
**brahmacāriṇ-** brahmacāribhis 7.14.8b  
**brahmaṇ- (m.)** brahmāṇam 6.3.12a 7.18.7b  
**brahmaṇ- (n.)** brahma 6.1.8a 6.5.7a 6.11.1a 6.22.1a 7.14.8a 7.18.8b brahmaṇā 6.1.5d 6.11.9b 6.15.3d,9d 7.1.11d brahmaṇas 6.11.8a  
**brāhmaṇa-kṛte** brāhmaṇakṛte 7.15.3b  
**bhakṣa-** bhakṣāya 6.16.7d  
**bhaga-** bhagas 6.18.4c 6.19.1a 7.6.6d bhagam 7.9.9b bhagāya 6.6.4d bhagasya 7.12.5c 7.15.9c  
 °**bhaga-** → sītā-bhaga- → su-bhaga-  
**bhaj** bhajāmahe 6.16.8b  
 +**ā** ā bhajatām 7.9.8b  
**bhañj**  
 +**abhi** abhibhañjant- abhibhañjatī-nām 7.4.9c  
 +**pra** prabhāñjant- prabhāñjan 7.4.8c  
**bhadra-** bhadrā 6.4.4ac 7.19.9c bhadre 6.20.2e,7c bhadrayā 7.3.7c,8c  
**bhay<sup>i</sup>** bibhītas 6.5.1b–13b bibhes 6.5.1c–13c  
**bhar** bharāmi 7.5.5b bharāmasi 7.5.11c bibharti 7.12.9a *bibrat-* bibrat 7.8.3c +**ā** ābharat 6.6.4c 7.5.1c *ābharant-* ābharantī 6.10.5c *ābhr̥ta-* ābhr̥tam 7.5.8d  
 +**ut** udabharas 6.7.3a ud bhare 6.7.4d,6d  
 +**ut+ā** ud ābharas 6.7.2d\* udābharat 6.7.7b  
**bharat-vāja-** bharadvājas 6.21.6c  
**bhava-patnī-** bhavapatni 6.8.9a  
**bhava-heti-** bhavahetyās 7.15.1d  
**bhav<sup>i</sup>** bhavati 7.19.8b bhavanti 6.1.3b 6.3.10b bhavātha 7.6.3d bhava 6.9.2a 6.16.2c,8c,10ac bhavatu 6.7.3d 6.9.5ab 6.10.7a bhavantu 7.4.11c 7.6.5cd,8a babhūva 6.4.6d 6.10.8b  
*bobhuvant-* bobhuvatī 7.9.5a\*  
*bhūta-* bhūtam 6.5.13a bhūteṣu 6.21.5b  
 bhūtvā 6.22.5ab,13b 7.9.6d 7.11.7b  
 +**upa** upa. . . bhuvan 7.3.2d\* → upa-bhūti-  
 +**sam** sambabhūvus 6.11.3a  
*sambhūta-* sambhūtas 6.9.10b sambhūya 7.3.5c  
**bhavya-** bhavyam 6.5.13a  
<sup>1</sup>**bhas** *bapsant-* bapsatī 6.8.5d  
**bhasva-** bhasvam 6.14.9a  
**bhāga-** bhāgas 6.9.4a bhāgam 6.9.9a, 10c 6.10.7b 7.3.4c  
 °**bhāga-** → su-bhāga-  
 °**bhāvan-** → vi-bhāvan-  
**bhiyas-** bhiyasam 6.1.2b  
**bhīma-** bhīmas 7.4.2a  
**bhīma-hasta-** bhīmahastam 6.14.3b  
**bhuvana-** bhuvanāni 6.10.3d bhuvaneṣu 6.1.1a  
**bhuvana-cyavāna-** bhuvanacyavānām 7.4.10c  
 °**bhū-** → mayas-bhū-  
**bhūti-** bhūtayas 6.19.9b  
 °**bhūti-** → upa-bhūti-  
**bhūman-** bhūmā 6.15.1a  
**bhūmi-** bhūmis 6.7.9d 7.3.8c bhūme 6.7.7ab,8b bhūmim 6.7.1d,3b bhūmyās 6.7.6a 7.7.2b bhūmyām 7.5.10a 7.6.8a

- bhūri** 6.1.5b,6d  
**bhūri-ojas-** bhūryojās 6.1.2a  
**bhūrṇi-** bhūrṇayas 6.11.4c  
**bhed** bhinadmi 7.2.10c bhinatti 7.7.2b  
 bhidyatām 7.7.2c  
 +**ut** *udbhindant-* udbhindatām  
 6.9.5d  
**bheṣaja-** bheṣajāya 7.5.7b bheṣajī  
 6.4.3c 6.7.3d  
 °**bheṣaja-** → viśva-bheṣaja-  
 °**bhojana-** → pitu-bhojana-  
**bhramś**  
 +**vi** vi... bhramśatām 6.23.1d  
 °**bhramśa-** → vi-bhramśa-  
 °**bhramśaṇa-** → pra-bhramśaṇa-  
**bhrāj** *bhrājant-* bhrājat 7.15.6d  
*bhrājamāna-* bhrājamānas 6.2.1c  
**bhrātar-** bhrātā 6.6.3b bhrātṛn 6.8.9c  
 °**bhrātrii-** → yātu-bhrātrii-  
**maghavan-** maghavā 7.8.4b  
**maṇi-** maṇis 7.5.1b,3c,4d,6d,7c,8a,12b  
 maṇim 7.5.2b maṇayas 7.15.7b  
 °**mati-** → anu-mati- → su-mati-  
**math<sup>i</sup>** mathnīta 7.18.5c  
**mad** mādaya 7.18.1c  
*mādayant-* mādayantīs 6.22.7d  
 +**anu** anumadanti 6.1.1d,4b  
 → anu-mādaya-  
 +**sam** sam... madati 6.22.4b  
**mada-** madeṣu 6.1.2d  
**madhiṣṭha-** madhiṣṭhās 6.3.8b  
**madhu-** madhu 6.1.3d 6.3.13d 6.6.8a  
 6.10.7c 6.17.9b madho 6.16.2a,7c mad-  
 hunā 6.1.3d 6.3.5b,10d 6.6.5c,7bc mad-  
 hau 6.6.8b  
**madhu-kūla-** madhukūlās 6.22.7a  
**madhu-kṛt-** madhukṛtas 6.6.8a  
**madhugha-** madhughas 6.6.5a,6a ma-  
 dhugha 6.6.3a madhugham 6.6.4d  
**madhu-jihva-** madhujihvās 6.11.4b  
**madhumattama-** madhumattamas  
 6.6.3d  
**madhumant-** madhumat 6.6.1abc  
 madhumatī 6.6.7a madhumatim 7.9.9c  
**madhu-saṃdrś-** madhusaṃdrśī 6.6.1d  
**madhya-** madhyam 7.2.3c madhye  
 6.8.7b 7.4.9d  
**madhyatas** 6.12.5c  
 °**madhyama-** → bahula-madhyama-  
**madhyam-dīna-** madhyaṃdinam  
 7.7.5b  
**manas-** manas 6.6.8c,9ad 6.16.6b 6.23.5b  
 manasā 6.11.9a 7.9.3b manasas 6.11.8a  
 °**manas-** → mahā-manas-  
**manīṣā-** +manīṣā 6.11.10a  
**manu-** manave 6.3.9d  
**manuṣya-** manuṣyebhyas 6.9.3a  
**manuṣya-ja-** manuṣyajā 7.1.11b  
**manth<sup>i</sup>** *mathīta-* mathitasya 6.15.7b  
 °**manyu-** → śata-manyu-  
<sup>1</sup>**may** minotu 7.6.6b *mīta-* mitas  
 7.13.9b  
 +**upa** → upa-mit-  
**mayas-bhū-** mayobhūs 6.16.3c  
**mayāra-** mayāre 6.15.4a  
**mar** *mṛta-* mṛtās 6.23.12a  
<sup>1</sup>**mar<sup>i</sup>**  
 +**pra** *pramṛṇant-* pramṛṇan 7.2.7d  
 7.4.8c pramṛṇantam 7.4.6d  
**marīci-** marīcyām 6.7.1b  
**marīmṛśa-** marīmṛśam 6.14.3b  
**marut-** marutas 6.7.9a 6.17.10a 6.18.1a  
 7.4.9d 7.6.6c marudbhis 6.17.1c,11c  
 marutām 7.3.10a 7.4.10b  
**marutvant-** marutvān 7.16.8a  
 marutvantam 7.17.8a  
**marj** *mṛjāna-* mṛjānas 7.5.10c  
**marḍ** mṛḍatam 6.11.7b  
**martya-** martyas 6.17.2a martyān  
 7.9.7e martyebhyas 7.9.7e  
**marmaṇ-** marmaṇi 7.18.9b  
**maryāda-** maryādam 6.2.7d  
**maryādā-** maryādās 6.2.6a  
**marś** → marīmṛśa-  
 +**pra** → pra-mṛśya-ādin-  
**mala-** malam 7.3.7b  
 °**mas-** → candra-mas-  
**mah-** mahas 6.1.8c 6.16.1b 6.17.2b,3a

- mahī 6.2.5d mahyai 7.5.11d mahīs  
 6.3.7c  
**maha-** mahānām 6.16.6a  
**mahas-** mahasā 7.6.3c,4a  
**mahā-** mahā 6.2.5a  
**mahā-indra-** mahendras 7.12.8d  
**mahā-udara-** mahodari 6.8.5b  
**mahā-unmāna-** mahonmānā 7.19.4a  
**mahā-kaṇṭha-** mahākaṇṭham 6.14.1a  
**mahānt-** mahān 6.1.9a mahat 6.9.1d  
 mahatī 7.19.4a mahati 6.7.2b  
**mahā-manas-** mahāmanasām 7.4.10c  
**mahiman-** mahimā 6.10.8b  
**mahiṣī-** mahiṣīm 7.12.5d  
**mahiṃ<sup>o</sup>** mahiṃyase 7.12.6b  
**mā** 6.1.4d 6.5.1cd–13cd 6.10.2c 6.11.2c  
 6.12.1d 6.20.6b,7abcd 6.22.9c 6.23.11ab  
 7.3.3d,10b 7.7.6cd,10ab 7.8.8d 7.9.1ab,2d,  
 3c,7b,8aaa 7.15.4a 7.18.3cd,5d  
<sup>2</sup>**mā**  
 +**pari** parimāya 7.1.10b  
**māṃsa-** māṃsam 6.23.10d  
**māki-** mākis 6.20.6a  
**mātaribhvan-** mātaribhvarīs 6.1.9c  
**mātariśvan-** mātariśvane 7.20.9a  
**mātar-** mātā 7.10.3a 6.4.1a 6.6.3a 7.3.8c  
 mātār 6.21.2a mātaram 7.6.2b mātus  
 7.6.3b mātārā 6.1.7c 6.2.4c mātaras  
 6.3.4a,5a  
**mātsya-** mātsyas 7.10.9c<sup>+</sup>  
<sup>o</sup>**māda-** → sadha-māda-  
<sup>o</sup>**mādyā-** → anu-mādyā-  
**māna-** mānasya 7.6.7a,9c mānāt  
 6.11.3a  
<sup>o</sup>**māna-** → prati-māna-  
**māmaka-** māmakī 6.6.8d 7.12.3c  
**māyā-** māyayā 6.7.2c,3b  
**māriṣā-** māriṣā 7.10.3c  
**māsa-** māsas 6.11.5d 6.12.4b  
<sup>o</sup>**māsya-** → daśa-māsya-  
<sup>o</sup>**mit-** → upa-mit-  
**mitra-** mitras 6.5.6a mitrasya 6.3.8a  
<sup>o</sup>**mitra-** → a-mitra-  
**mīv** +**ni** *nimīvant-* nimīvantīm 7.9.7c  
**mukha-** mukham 6.22.1c 7.2.10d  
<sup>o</sup>**mukha-** → eka-mukha- → koka-  
 mukha-  
**mulālī-/<sup>o</sup>in-** mulālī 6.22.8b  
<sup>o</sup>**mūra-** → a-mūra-  
**mūra-devin-** mūradevinas 7.11.3c  
 7.19.2d  
**mūla-** mūlam 7.7.7a  
**mṛga-** mṛgas 7.1.4c mṛgān 6.23.4d  
 mṛgī 7.1.9b  
<sup>o</sup>**mṛta-** → a-mṛta-  
**mṛtyu-** mṛtyus 6.5.11a  
 mṛtyave 7.18.7d mṛtyos 6.3.3d  
**mṛdu-aṅguli-** mṛdvaṅgulim 6.14.3c  
**mṛdh-** mṛdhas 6.9.8c,10a  
**medin-** medī 7.18.9d medinā 6.9.3b  
 7.18.4d 7.19.1d,7d  
**meni-** menyā 6.11.8a,9c  
<sup>o</sup>**meni-** → a-meni-  
**meṣ** miṣanti 6.11.4c  
**moc** muñcata 6.3.13a muñcantu 6.3.3d  
 mumuktam 6.11.7c moci 7.18.5d  
 +**prati** prati muñcata 7.1.10d prati  
 muñcāmi 7.8.9c  
**mod** *modamāna-* modamānās 7.6.3c,  
 4a  
**moṣ**  
 +**pari** pari muṣṇāti 6.22.3c  
**moh** mohayitvā 7.11.6b  
**mlā** mlāpayati 7.12.4b  
*mlāta-* → a-mlāta-  
**ya-** yas 6.12.6b 6.2.2ad,3a 6.4.2a,8c 6.7.7ab  
 6.9.2b,7a,12a 6.10.7b,8a 6.11.9ab 6.12.6c,8a  
 6.13.3a 6.14.1c,7ad 6.15.1ab,3a 7.1.2c,5d,6a  
 7.2.3abc,6a 7.3.6ab,11aab 7.7.2d,4d 7.8.1a,  
 7c 7.10.10b 7.11.2ac,4a,5ac,6ac,7a 7.19.5ac  
 yat 6.1.3b 6.2.4a,5c,7c 6.3.10ab 6.4.3aab,  
 11a 6.6.9ab 6.7.1b 6.8.7a 6.9.1d 6.10.8b  
 6.12.2b<sup>+</sup> 6.14.6a 6.15.3b,4aabbc 6.16.7a,8a,  
 9a 6.20.2b 6.21.3abc 6.23.7c 7.2.6d 7.3.9a  
 7.4.1d 7.5.10c 7.6.10c 7.8.2aa,2b<sup>+</sup> 7.12.6a  
 7.18.3a 7.19.8a yam 6.1.1d 6.2.7b 6.7.3a  
 6.9.9a 6.22.9a 7.9.2a,3a,6c,10a 7.10.9abcc

7.18.7a yasmai 7.10.2d,4e yasya 6.9.4a  
6.16.1c 6.22.11b 7.5.10a yasmin 6.1.7b  
yābhyām 7.4.1d ye 6.2.8a 6.8.6a 6.11.2a,  
3a,8\* 6.17.3a,4a,5a,6a,7a,8a 6.18.3b 6.20.3a  
6.21.5abc 6.22.2c,4c,10c,11acc,12c,13c  
7.2.5abc 7.3.3c,4c,5a 7.11.1a 7.17.1b,2b,3b,  
4b,5b,6b,7b,8b,9b,10b yāni 6.3.13b 6.7.8a,  
9ab 6.11.2b 6.21.1ab yān 7.8.3a 7.18.6ab  
yebhis 7.6.2a yā 6.7.4b 6.8.3a 6.15.1ab,  
3bc,5ab,6b,7ab,9a 7.1.11ab 7.19.4a yām  
6.7.2a,9c 7.15.3a yayā 7.12.10c 7.19.3a  
yasyās 6.7.5a,6a 6.8.8a 6.20.2a yās 6.3.9d,  
12c 6.18.5b,6b,9a 7.4.11b 7.13.2a,3a,5a,6a,  
7a,8a,10a,11a,12a,13a,14a yāsām 7.13.1a,  
4a,9a  
**yakṣma-** yakṣmam 7.15.5b yakṣmāt  
7.15.3c,7b\* yakṣmās 7.15.4d yakṣmān  
7.15.4b  
**yaj** yajāmahe 6.9.7d  
*yajamāna-* yajamānās 6.9.8a  
**yajña-** yajñās 6.19.7b 6.22.1d,5c 7.4.9b  
7.14.6a yajñam 6.11.7d yajñasya  
7.15.10b yajñān 6.22.11a  
**yajñiya-** yajñiyās 7.3.6c  
**yatas** 7.3.6d 6.1.1b 7.13.1b  
**yatra** 6.8.9d 7.10.8ab  
**yathā** 6.5.1a,2a,3a,4a,5a,6a,7a,8a,9a,10a,11a,  
12a,13a 6.6.5d,7d,8a 6.23.6c,9c,12a 7.1.7d  
7.7.2a 7.8.5c 7.18.6e,10a 7.19.7a  
**yadā** 6.3.1c 7.19.6a  
**yadī** 6.22.12aab 7.1.12aa 7.11.3a 7.18.8a  
**yam** yacha 6.20.10c 7.6.8d yachantu  
7.6.4c  
+**pra** pra...yachatām 7.9.1c pra  
yachāmi 7.18.7d  
**yama-** yamas 6.22.3c yamasya 6.4.8c  
yame 6.22.4a  
<sup>2</sup>**yav** yuvathās 7.3.10b yāvayāmasi  
7.8.2d *yoyuvant-* yoyuvat 6.20.2a  
*yuta-* yutās 7.8.6a  
+**pra** *prayuta-* prayutam 6.14.6c  
7.13.14b → prayuta-eṣaṇa-  
**yava-** yavas 7.8.4a,8d yava 7.8.5d  
yavam 7.8.3c,9c yavena 7.8.2d

**yava-āsīr-** yavāsīras 6.16.8b  
<sup>1</sup>**yā** yāhi 6.8.7d īyase 6.11.5c  
īyate 6.22.5a īyante 6.3.7d  
+**apa** apa...yātu 7.8.1d  
+**ā** ā yāhi 7.18.2a  
+**upa** upa yāti 6.22.4a  
<sup>2</sup>**yā** īmahe 7.6.10c  
**yāc** yācāmi 7.9.10a  
*yācamāna-* yācamānām 7.9.1b  
<sup>o</sup>**yātu-** → a-yātu-  
**yātu-dhāna-** yātudhānās 7.7.10a  
6.1.4d yātudhānān 6.8.1a 7.1.2a yātu-  
dhānyas 6.8.1b 6.20.7d 7.7.3d,9c 7.10.1d,  
5g,8h  
**yātu-bhrātri-** yātubhrātri 6.8.9b  
**yāvant-** yāvat 7.11.10aab  
**yudh-** yudhas 7.4.4b,3d yutsu 7.4.7d  
<sup>o</sup>**yudha-** → ā-yudha-  
**yudhenya-** yudhenyāni 6.1.5b  
**yuvati-** yuvate 6.4.6a  
**yevāṣa-** yevāṣas 7.2.9a yevāṣāsas  
7.2.8a  
**yoga-** yoge 7.4.1c  
**yoj** yokṣye 7.4.1c<sup>+</sup>  
+**abhi+pra** abhi prayuñjmahe 7.9.3a  
**yodh**  
+**abhi** abhi yodhīs 6.1.3d  
→ yudhenya- → a-yodhya-  
<sup>o</sup>**yodhya-** → a-yodhya-  
**yoni-** yonis 6.3.8a yonim 6.2.2c 6.10.3a  
7.11.5c 7.19.5a yones 7.5.9b  
<sup>o</sup>**yoni-** → hiraṇya-yoni-  
**rakṣ** rakṣanti 6.21.5c rakṣatu 7.8.8d  
7.16.1d,5d,10d rakṣantu 7.16.6d rakṣīs  
7.9.1b  
**rakṣas-** rakṣas 6.14.6b 7.7.3b 7.19.1c,  
7c rakṣā 6.20.6a rakṣāṃsi 6.8.1c 7.5.7d  
7.7.8c 7.19.2a  
**rakṣas-han-** rakṣohā 7.4.8b 7.5.8b  
rakṣohaṇam 7.19.10a rakṣoghni 6.8.3c  
**rajas-** rajās 6.20.1a 7.3.7a rajāsas  
6.17.3a rajāṃsi 6.16.4b  
**rajju-** rajjus 6.20.8c  
**raṇa-** raṇeraṇe 6.1.4b raṇeṣu 6.1.5a

- ratna-** ratnā 6.2.7a  
**ratha-** ratham 7.4.5d rathena 7.4.8a  
<sup>o</sup>**ratha-** → vāta-ratha-  
**ratha-yāna-** rathayāne 6.22.5a  
**rathin-** rathī 6.22.5a  
**rapas-** rapas 7.5.10c  
**rabh**  
 +**anu**+**ā** anu...ā rabhāmahe 7.18.9e  
 +**anu**+**sam** anu sam rabhadhvam 7.4.6b  
 +**ā** ā rabhasva 6.8.7c  
 +**sam** samrabhya 7.13.11b  
**ram** aramanta 7.3.5a ramsta 6.23.11a  
**ray<sup>i</sup>** riṇāti 6.1.1c  
**rayi-** rayim 6.17.10b  
<sup>2</sup>**rav** ruta- rutam 6.4.7c<sup>+</sup>  
**raśmi-** raśmibhis 6.17.8a 7.13.2b  
**rasa-** rasas 6.15.1b rasam 6.15.4d rasā 6.16.4a rasānām 6.16.5c  
<sup>o</sup>**rasa-** → a-rasa-  
<sup>o</sup>**rāj-** → vi-rāj-  
<sup>o</sup>**rāja-** → sva-rāja-  
**rājan-** rājā 6.6.3d 7.6.6d 7.7.10c rājñas 7.4.10a  
<sup>o</sup>**rājan-** → eka-rājan-  
<sup>o</sup>**rāti-** → a-rāti-  
**rātrī-/rātri-** rātrī 6.4.1a 6.5.4a rātri 6.20.1a,2d,3a,5b,9a,10a 6.21.2a,3d,6a rātrim 6.21.5a  
**rāddhi-** rāddhis 6.15.3b<sup>+</sup>  
**rādh**  
 +**vi/ava/apa** vi/ava/apa...arātsīs 6.11.6b  
<sup>o</sup>**rāpiṇ-** → pari-rāpiṇ-  
**rāma-dant-** rāmadantam 6.14.2a  
<sup>o</sup>**rāya-** → a-rāya-  
**rāṣṭra-** rāṣṭram 6.9.3d  
**ripu-** ripūn 7.11.4c  
**ripra-** ripram 6.3.4c,10c riprāt 6.3.13a  
<sup>o</sup>**ripra-** → a-ripra-  
**riśādas-** riśādasas 6.17.4b  
**rukmiṇ-** rukmiṇī 7.9.6d\*  
**rudra-** rudra 7.3.10d rudrais 7.16.3a  
**rudravant-** rudravantam 7.17.3a  
<sup>o</sup>**rudh-** → vī-rudh-  
<sup>o</sup>**rūpa-** → prati-rūpa- → vi-rūpa- → viśva-rūpa- → sa-rūpa-  
**rūpaka-** rūpakam 6.14.4b  
**rec**  
 +**ā** āireca 6.2.3a  
**reṇu-** reṇum 7.3.7a  
**retas-** retas 6.22.3c  
**revattama-** revattamās 6.3.6b  
**revant-** revati 6.20.4a revatīnām 6.3.6b  
**reś**  
 +**ā** āriśāmahe 6.16.9b  
**reṣ** riṣyatas 6.5.1b–13b riṣam 7.8.8d<sup>+</sup> riṣas 6.5.1d–13d 6.12.7b riṣat 7.7.6d 7.10.2c,4d → a-riṣṭa- → ariṣṭatāti- → ariṣṭa-vīra-  
**reṣmaṇ-** reṣmaṇi 6.23.5b  
**reh** rihāṇa- rihāṇe 6.2.4c  
 +**ā** āreḍhi 7.11.5c  
 +**prati** pratireḍhi 7.19.5a  
**rehaṇa-** rehaṇāya 7.11.4b  
<sup>o</sup>**roka-** → ā-roka-  
**roga-** rogāt 7.15.8b  
<sup>o</sup>**roga-** → aṅga-roga-  
**roc** arocata 7.5.1a  
**rocana-** rocane 6.17.6a  
**rodas(ī)-** rodasī 6.2.9d 7.3.8a  
**rodha-cakra-** rodhacakrā 6.2.5d  
**roruha-** roruham 6.14.9b  
**roh** → roruha-  
 +**ā** ā rohasi 6.4.5a ārohati 7.11.4a  
**rohita-** rohitau 7.2.4b  
**labh** labdhvā 7.18.10b  
**lambana-stana-** lambanastani 6.8.4a  
**lākṣā-** lākṣā 6.4.11c lākṣe 6.4.6c  
<sup>o</sup>**lāmika-** → eka-lāmika-  
**loka-** lokas 6.9.10d loke 6.22.3b,6d,7d,8c,10b,13ad 6.23.12bd lokās 6.22.11b lokān 6.3.3b 6.22.2b  
**loka-jit-** loka-jitam 6.22.9b  
**lop**  
 +**ā** ā lumpāmi 7.12.9d  
**lomaśa-vakṣaṇā-** lomaśavakṣaṇe

- 6.4.6b<sup>+</sup>  
 °**vakṣaṇa-** → lomaśa-vakṣaṇā-  
**vac** vivakti 6.1.8a avocat 6.1.9b  
 avocāma 6.2.9d → dus-ukta-  
 +ā *okta-* oktau 7.2.1c oktā 7.2.1b  
 okte 7.2.1a  
**vacas-** vacasā 7.2.2d,9d 7.8.1a vacāṃsi  
 6.2.9c vacobhis 6.1.5c 6.16.11a  
**vajra-bāhu-** vajrabāhum 7.4.6c  
 °**vatsa-** → nitya-vatsa-  
**vatsapa-** vatsapam 6.14.5b  
**vad** vadāmasi 7.12.1d vadāni 7.9.9c  
 vada 7.12.7c udyāsam 6.6.1c  
 → an-udita-  
 +**nis** *nirvadant-* nirvadantīm 7.9.7e  
 °**vada-** → br̥hat-vada-  
**vadh** avadhīt 6.16.6d  
**vadha-** vadham 7.5.11a  
**van** vanute 7.15.5a  
 °**vana-** → ud-vana-  
**vana-krośa-** vanakrośam 6.14.9b  
**vanaspati-** vanaspatim 7.19.9b vanas-  
 pate 7.19.1b,6b,7b vanaspatibhis 7.14.1b  
**vani-** vanis 7.9.4a vanim 7.9.2d,8a  
**vantu-** vantavas 6.11.3b  
**vap**  
 +**nis** *nirrupta-* nirruptasya 6.15.5a,6a  
**vapuṣ-** vapuṃṣi 6.2.2b,8b  
**vapuṣṭama-** vapuṣṭame 6.4.7b  
**vayas-** vayāṃsi 6.1.5d 7.8.10a  
**vayas-dhas-** vayodhās 7.5.9c vayod-  
 hasam 7.5.5d vayodhasas 7.5.2d  
<sup>1</sup>**var**<sup>i</sup> var̥mahe 6.16.2b\*  
<sup>2</sup>**var**  
 +**apa** apa. . . avṛnot 6.1.8d  
 +ā *āvṛta-* āvṛtām 6.7.1d  
**varivasy**<sup>o</sup> varivasyantu 6.3.5d  
**varuṇa-** varuṇas 6.5.6a 7.16.4a varuṇa  
 6.2.8a varuṇam 6.2.9b 7.17.4a varuṇa-  
 sya 6.3.8a 6.10.2c,5b 7.4.10a  
**varuṇa-prasūta-** varuṇaprasūtās  
 6.3.1d,13c  
**varūtha-** varūtham 6.11.6a 6.12.2a  
**varcas-** varcas 7.12.4d,9c varcasā  
 6.19.1a,2a,3a,4a,5a,6a,7a varcāṃsi 6.19.9a  
**varcasvant-** varcasvantam 6.9.6a  
 °**varṇa-** → su-varṇa- → sūrya-varṇa-  
 → hiraṇya-varṇa-  
**vart**  
 +ā ā. . . vartate 6.20.1d ā vartayāma-  
 si 6.6.9c *āvarvṛtant-* āvarvṛtatas  
 6.2.8b  
 °**varta-** → upa-varta-  
 °**vartani-** → kṛṣṇa-vartani-  
**vardh** vardhase 6.2.8d *vardhamāna-*  
 vardhamānas 6.2.1b vavardha 6.2.5d  
 vardhayanti 6.1.9d avīvr̥dhāma 6.2.9a  
 vāvṛdhānas 6.1.2a  
 → a-vṛddha- → ghr̥ta-vṛddha-  
 °**varpas-** → ghora-varpas-  
 → puru-varpas-  
**varmaṇ-** varma 6.11.6a 6.12.2a 7.3.8a  
 7.8.6e,9c 7.15.5d varmāṇi 7.18.8b  
 °**varmaṇ-** → aśma-varmaṇ-  
**varṣmaṇ-** varṣman 7.6.4b  
**varh**  
 +**vi** vi vṛhāmas 7.15.4b  
**valaga-han-** valagahā 7.5.9d  
 °**valśa-** → tikṣṇa-valśa-  
**vaś** *uśant-* uśatyās 7.6.3b  
**vaśā-** vaśā 6.6.3a  
**vaśin-** vaśi 6.10.7a 7.4.4a vaśinī 6.10.1b  
 °**vaśin-** → tanū-vaśin-  
<sup>1</sup>**vas** *vasāna-* vasānā 7.6.9b  
 +**sam** *saṃvasāna-* saṃvasānās  
 7.15.9b  
**vasana-** vasanam 6.23.11c<sup>+</sup>  
**vasu-** vasūni 7.9.8b vasubhis 7.16.1a  
 vasūnām 7.6.5a  
**vasumant-** vasumantam 7.17.1a  
**vastra-** vastrāṇi 6.2.3d  
**vah** vākṣīt 7.18.3c vaha 7.3.1c 7.18.1b  
 +**pra** pravahanti 6.3.4c  
**vahiṣṭha-** vahiṣṭhas 6.22.5c  
**vā** 6.2.7bc 6.6.9bb 6.22.12b 7.1.11b,12a  
 7.8.2bb 7.10.9b  
<sup>1</sup>**vā** vātu 6.23.7a  
 †**vākṣamyānṛtviyāmadhi**† 7.8.3b

- vāc-** vācam 6.2.2d 7.9.8a,9c vācā 6.6.1c  
6.11.9b vācas 7.8.6c  
°**vāc-** → satya-vāc-  
°**vāja-** → bharat-vāja-  
**vājay**° vājayantu 6.10.7d  
**vāja-sāti-** vājasātaye 6.11.5a  
**vājin-** vājī 7.4.5b vājinas 6.10.7d  
vājini 6.20.4d vājiniṃ 6.10.7d  
**vāta-** vātas 6.4.6d 6.19.4c 6.23.7a 7.11.1c  
vātam 7.13.3a vātāya 7.20.8a vātasya  
6.23.4e 7.13.1b vātās 6.16.4c  
**vāta-agra-** vātāgre 6.23.5a  
**vāta-āpi-** vātāpe 6.16.8c,10c  
**vāta-plava-** vātaplavā 7.12.6b  
**vāta-ratha-** vātarathe 6.4.10a\*  
vātarathās 7.13.6a  
°**vāpi-** → sikata-vāpi-  
**vāmadevya-** vāmadevyam 6.22.1b  
**vāyu-** vāyus 6.5.2a 6.19.4b 7.6.6a 7.14.2a  
7.16.2a vāyum 7.17.2a vāyave 7.20.7a  
°**vāra-** → viśva-vāra-  
**vāriṇ-** vāriṇī 7.1.9a → ut...vāriṇ-  
**vās**  
+ā ā...vāśyatām 7.6.7c<sup>+</sup>  
ā vāśyantām 7.6.7d<sup>+</sup>  
**vāśitā-** vāśitā 6.10.1b,9a vāśite 6.10.6c  
vāśitām 6.10.4d vāśitāyās 6.10.7a vā-  
śitāyām 6.10.8a<sup>+</sup>  
**vāsava-** vāsavas 7.8.5b  
**vāsas-** vāsas 7.15.6b  
°**vāsin-** → cela-vāsin-  
**vāstu-** vāstos 7.6.10a vāstau 7.6.3d  
**vī** *prev.* 6.1.2c 6.8.9d 6.9.2d,3a,10a 6.11.6b  
6.16.1c,4b 6.20.1c 6.22.11a 6.23.1d,9b,10c  
7.9.3c,5c,6b,8a 7.12.8a 7.13.12a 7.15.4b  
7.19.4b  
**vi-anant-** vyanat 6.1.2c  
°**vi-anant-** → a-vi-anant-  
**vi-īrtsā-** vīrtsāyai 7.9.1d<sup>+</sup>  
**vi-okas-** vyokasau 6.23.12d vyokasas  
6.23.12b  
**viṃśati-** viṃśatis 6.20.5a  
**vi-kumba-** vikumbās 7.13.8b  
**vich**°  
+**pra(+ā)** prāvichāyat 6.3.1a  
°**vijñāya-** → bala-vijñāya-  
**vi-tata-** vitatas 6.22.5c  
**vi-tūla-** vitūlam 6.14.9a  
°**vid-** → go-vid-  
**vidyut-parṇa-** vidyutparṇe 6.4.10b  
**vi-dhvaṃsa-** vidhvaṃsam 6.23.5d\*  
**vi-parva-** viparvam 6.16.1d<sup>+</sup>  
**vipra-** vipra 6.17.11b viprās 6.1.4b  
**vi-bhāvan-** vibhāvāri 6.21.2c,4c  
**vi-bhraṃśa-** vibhraṃśam 6.23.1c,3c,  
5c  
**vi-rāj-** virāṭ 6.19.2a  
**vi-rūpa-** virūpau 7.2.4a  
**vivasvan-** vivasva 6.16.7b  
**viś-** viśām 6.9.5c,6b  
**viśva-** viśvam 6.3.4c,5c 6.20.2b viśvāt  
6.3.13a viśvasya 6.3.9c,12c 7.18.4b viśve  
6.1.1d,3a 6.7.9c 6.17.3b 7.5.3a viśvais  
7.16.10a viśvās 6.1.8d 7.2.2c,9c  
**viśva-karmaṇ-** viśvakarmā 7.6.2a  
7.16.7a viśvakarmāṇam 7.17.7a  
**viśvatas** 6.22.6c 7.7.1d,5d,7d,10d 7.11.10d  
**viśva-dṛṣṭa-** viśvadṛṣṭas 7.2.7b  
**viśva-deva-** viśvadevabhyas 7.10.5c  
**viśvadevavant-** viśvadevavantam  
7.17.10a  
**viśva-dhāyas-** viśvadhāyasas 6.7.4c,  
6c  
**viśvadhā-vīrya-** viśvadhāvīrya  
7.10.10c  
**viśva-bheṣaja-** viśvabheṣajas 7.5.6c  
7.10.5d,8e,9d viśvabheṣajī 6.4.11c  
**viśva-rūpa-** viśvarūpās 7.2.5c  
viśvarūpā 6.10.3c 6.22.9d 7.11.9d 7.15.10c  
**viśva-vāra-** viśvavāre 7.11.9c  
**viśvahā** 6.22.7c  
**viṣa-** viṣasya 6.7.3c  
**viṣa-dūṣaṇa-** viṣadūṣaṇam 6.7.4d,6d  
viṣadūṣaṇī 6.7.8d,9d  
**viṣavattara-** viṣavattaram 6.23.7d  
**viṣuvant-** viṣuvān 6.9.2a  
**viṣṭāriṇ-** viṣṭāri 6.22.1d,5d viṣṭāriṇ  
6.22.10d,11d,12d viṣṭāriṇam 6.22.2c,4c,

- 9b,13c  
**viṣṇu-** viṣṇus 6.19.1b viṣṇo 6.9.2a  
**viṣvañc-** viṣvañcau 6.23.9b  
**vi-sāsahi-** viṣāsahis 7.7.8b  
**vi-sāhin-** viṣāhī 7.8.5c  
**vi-sthita-** viṣṭhitās 6.16.4b  
**vīra-** vīras 6.5.9a 7.3.10c vīram 7.4.6a  
vīrās 7.4.11c 7.6.5d,9d vīrān 6.11.2c  
°**vīra-** → abhi-vīra- → ariṣṭa-vīra-  
→ eka-vīra- → pra-vīra-  
→ sthira-vīra-  
**vīra-śrī-** vīraśriyas 6.3.7a  
**vī-rudh-** vīrudhām 7.12.10b  
**vīrya-** vīryam 6.5.9a 7.18.2e vīryeṇa  
7.14.9b vīryāya 7.5.1d  
°**vīrya-** → danta-vīrya-  
→ viśvadhā-vīrya- → sahasra-vīrya-  
**vīryāvānt-** vīryāvān 6.9.10b  
**vṛka-** vṛkas 6.20.7b 7.18.5c vṛkasya  
6.14.9e 6.20.9c  
**vṛkka-** vṛkkaś 6.16.10b  
**vṛkṣa-** vṛkṣam 7.13.7a vṛkṣamvṛkṣam  
6.4.5a vṛkṣe 7.12.6a vṛkṣāṇām 7.19.10c  
**vṛt-** vṛtas 6.2.6c  
**vṛtra-** vṛtram 6.16.1d 7.8.5a vṛtrāṇi  
6.9.9c 6.11.5b  
**vṛtra-han-** vṛtrahā 6.7.8b vṛtrahan  
6.15.2c 7.18.6c,9a vṛtrahaṇam 7.19.10a  
°**vṛddha-** → ghrta-vṛddha-  
**vṛṣaṇ-** vṛṣā 6.9.1ab vṛṣāṇam 6.6.4a  
vṛṣṇā 7.4.3d vṛṣṇas 7.4.10a vṛṣṇau  
7.4.1a vṛṣaṇas 6.10.3b,4c  
**vṛṣaṇy°** *vṛṣaṇyant-* vṛṣaṇyantī 6.4.5b  
vṛṣaṇyantīm 6.10.4c  
**vṛṣa-tūla-** vṛṣatūlam 6.23.6d<sup>+</sup>  
**vṛṣabha-** vṛṣabhas 7.4.2a vṛṣabham  
6.22.10a vṛṣabhāya 6.9.1a vṛṣabhau  
7.4.1b  
**vṛṣṭi-** vṛṣṭayas 6.18.9b  
**vṛṣṇyāvānt-** vṛṣṇyāvāntam 6.6.4a  
<sup>1</sup>**ved** avidam 6.3.10c 7.5.5a *vitta-*  
vitte 6.21.6d  
+**anu** anvavindat 6.7.7a 7.1.1a anv  
avindan 7.6.1b  
<sup>2</sup>**ved** veda 6.21.6c 7.9.7c 7.10.9a vidus  
6.7.9c 6.17.3a  
+**sam** sam vidma 6.7.8c  
**vedya-** vedye 6.15.9b  
**veś**  
+**ā** ā viśantu 7.8.10b ā viveśa 6.2.2c  
ā veśaya 7.6.10d  
+**ni** ni viśate 6.20.2b  
+**pra** pra viśāmi 6.12.2b  
**vai** 6.4.1c,3d,5d 6.21.6ab 7.7.4ab 7.12.5a,6d  
**vaiśvānara-** vaiśvānaras 6.9.3d  
vaiśvānaram 7.5.2b,9a vaiśvānarāt  
7.5.1a,3d vaiśvānarasya 7.5.4c  
**vaikaṅkata-** vaikaṅkatena 7.18.1a  
**vaiśvadeva-** vaiśvadevī 6.10.2b,5c  
**vyac** avivyacat 6.8.4c\*  
**vyath** vivyathas 7.9.2d  
**vyadh** vidhya 7.18.9b vidhyatu 7.1.4c  
+**ati** → an-ati-vyādhyā-  
+**anu** → anu-vyādhyā-  
**vyā**  
+**ava** *avavyayant-* avavyayan 7.1.8c  
**vyāghra-** vyāghras 7.10.4c  
°**vyādha-** → anu-vyādhyā-  
°**vyādhyā-** → an-ati-vyādhyā-  
°**vrata-** → eka-vrata-  
**vraśc** vṛścata 7.18.4c  
+**api** api vṛścāmi 7.2.6d  
**vrāta-** vrātena 6.10.9b  
**śams** → kavi-śasta- → daivya-abhi-  
śasti-  
**śamsa-** śamsāt 7.8.8c  
°**śamsa-** → dus-śamsa-  
→ agha-śamsa-  
**śak** śakema 7.18.2e  
**śakuni-** śakunis 7.7.10b  
**śakra-** śakras 7.8.5b śakra 6.15.1c  
7.18.9d śakram 7.19.6d  
**śagmya-** śagmyam 6.2.9a<sup>+</sup>  
**śacī-pati-** śacīpate 6.15.1d,2b  
**śata-** śatam 6.3.11c 7.4.2d 7.15.10a  
**śata-kāṇḍa-** śatakāṇḍas 7.7.1b  
**śata-manyu-** śatamanyus 7.4.7b  
**śatru-** śatrus 6.1.2b śatros 6.9.5a

- śatrūn 6.1.1c 6.9.4c,9d,10a 7.4.8c  
**śatrum-jaya-** śatruñjayas 7.5.12c\*  
**śatru-han-** śatruhaṇe 7.20.1a–10a  
<sup>2</sup>**śad** śāśadmahe 6.1.5a<sup>+</sup> *śāśadāna-*  
 śāśadānās 6.3.9a  
**śap** śapāt 7.8.2a śapāti 7.8.2b *śapta-*  
 śaptam 7.8.1c  
**śapatha-** śapathāt 7.8.8a śapathās  
 7.8.6a 7.1.5b 7.8.7a,10c śapathān 7.8.2c,  
 3a,4c,5d śapathais 7.8.9a  
**śapathīvan-** śapathīvne 7.1.5b  
**śaptar-** śaptāram 7.8.10c  
<sup>o</sup>**śapha-** → eka-śapha-  
**śaphaka-** śaphakas 6.22.8b  
**śam** śamayatu 7.18.7e  
 aśīśaman 7.11.1d  
**śam** 7.3.2d  
<sup>o</sup>**śam** → a-śam  
 †śamanānvayāmasi† 6.3.9b  
**śayana-** śayane 6.23.11b  
**śay**<sup>1</sup> śaye 6.15.4c 7.11.5b  
 +**upa** upa śerate 6.22.13b  
**śar**<sup>1</sup> śṛṇāmi 7.2.6c  
 +**prati** prati śṛṇīhi 7.8.3d  
**śarkarā-** śarkarās 6.8.5d  
**śarṇīla-** śarṇīlāya 7.20.2a  
**śardhas-** śardhas 7.4.10b  
<sup>o</sup>**śardhin-** → bāhu-śardhin-  
**śarmaṇ-** śarma 6.20.10c 7.6.4c,8d 7.8.6e  
 6.11.6a 6.12.2a  
**śarva-putra-** śarvaputre 6.8.9a  
**śalalya-** śalalyam 6.14.4c  
**śalya-** śalyān 7.15.4b  
**śavas-** śavasā 6.1.2a,6c,9d 6.2.8c  
**śāśvant-** śāśvat 6.3.9a śāśvatām  
 6.4.2cd śāśvatībhyas 7.18.10d  
<sup>o</sup>**śasta-** → kavi-śasta-  
<sup>o</sup>**śasti-** → an-abhi-śasti-  
**śā** *śīśāna-* śīśānas 7.4.2a  
 +**sam** śyāmi 6.1.5d<sup>+</sup>  
**śāmbu-** śāmbubhyas 7.10.5a  
**śālā-** śālā 7.6.9a śālām 7.6.5a,6a  
 śālāyai 7.6.4c śāle 7.6.8b  
**śālūka-** śālūkam 6.22.8b  
**śāvasa-** śāvāsas 7.10.9c  
**śās** <sup>o</sup>*śīṣṭa-* → indra-praśīṣṭa-  
<sup>o</sup>**śāsa-** → pari-śāsa-  
**śīkhā-** śīkhām 6.23.4e  
**śīti-kakṣa-** śītikakṣās 7.2.5a  
**śīti-bāhu-** śītibāhavas 7.2.5b  
**śīpavi-** śīpavis 7.2.9a  
**śīpavitnu-** śīpavitnavas 7.2.8b  
**śīmidāvant-** śīmidāvati 6.23.10ab  
**śīras-** śīras 6.8.4d 6.22.1a 7.2.6d,10c  
 7.10.8b 7.13.1d,14d  
**śīlācī-** śīlācī 6.4.1c  
**śīva-** śīvas 6.16.3b śīvābhis 6.16.3b  
**śīśu-** śīśus 7.6.7c  
**śīśna-** śīśnam 6.22.2d,3a  
**śīy**<sup>o</sup> śīyate 6.15.3b  
**śīrṣ-akti-** śīrṣaktyā 7.15.6a  
<sup>o</sup>**śīrṣan-** → a-śīrṣan-  
**śīrṣ-ālāka-** śīrṣālākam 7.10.10a  
<sup>o</sup>**śīvan-** → uttāna-śīvan-  
**śūkra-** śūkrām 7.15.6d śūkreṇa 7.3.1b  
 śūkrām 6.10.5b\*  
**śūci-** śūcis 6.3.4d śūcayas 6.2.3b 6.3.11a  
 6.22.2b śūcīn 6.3.7b 6.22.2b  
**śūci-kṛt-** śūcīkṛtas 6.3.12c  
**śūbhra-** śūbhrās 6.3.5d 6.17.4a  
**śūṣa-** śūṣasya 6.2.4c  
**śūṣma-** śūṣmam 6.2.8d śūṣme 6.4.6b  
<sup>o</sup>**śūla-** → karṇa-śūla-  
**śūṣa-** śūṣam 6.1.8b  
<sup>o</sup>**śṛṅga-** → tīkṣṇa-śṛṅga  
 → sahasra-śṛṅga- → su-śṛṅga-  
**śṛṅgavant-** śṛṅgavat 6.8.4d  
<sup>o</sup>**śeva-** → su-śeva-  
**śevadhi-** śevadhau 6.15.4b  
**śevala-** śevalam 6.14.4c  
**śeṣ** śīṣas 7.7.6c  
**śoka-** śokas 6.2.3a śokāt 7.15.3d  
**śociṣ-** śociṣā 7.3.1b,2a  
**śodh** śundhantu 6.3.6d 7.3.9d  
 śundhantām 6.3.6c\*  
*śuddha-* śuddhās 6.3.10b 6.22.2a  
**śoṣ** śuṣyatām 6.6.2d  
**śauṣkāya-** śauṣkāyas 6.6.5b

°**ścut-** → ghr̥ta-ścut-

**śyāva-** śyāvas 6.4.8c<sup>+</sup>

**śrad-dadhāna-** śraddadhānas 6.22.9a  
7.15.3a

**śraddhā-** śraddhā 7.9.10c

**śray** śraye 7.16.1b–10b śrayadhvam  
7.6.4b *śrīta-* śrītam 6.6.4b śrītās  
6.16.4c

+**ā** ā...śrayante 6.10.4b

**śrav** śr̥ṇu 7.18.2b

**śreṣṭhatama-** śreṣṭhatamām 7.6.5a

**śroṇi-** śroṇī 7.11.5a

**ślokavant-** ślokavantas 6.11.3b

**śva-kiṣkiṇ-** śvakiṣkiṇas 6.14.6e

**śvanvant-** śvanvatīnām 7.13.1c<sup>+</sup>, 14c<sup>+</sup>

**śva-pad-** śvapadām 7.10.4c

**śvaśura-** śvaśuras 7.8.2b

**śvaśrū-** śvaśrūs 7.8.2b

**śvas** *śvasant-* śvasatīs 7.13.12b\*

**ṣaṣ-** ṣaṣ 6.20.4a

**ṣaṣṭi-** ṣaṣṭis 6.20.4a

**sa-** sa 6.3.2bc 6.6.5c, 6c 6.9.4c, 5a, 12c  
6.12.3b, 6bd, 7d, 8b 6.13.3b 6.22.9c 6.23.9b  
7.3.7d, 11d 7.4.4aa 7.7.1c, 2c 7.8.5c 7.10.5d,  
63, 8e 7.14.1bc, 2b, 3b, 4b, 5b, 6b, 7bc, 9bc, 11bc  
7.16.1dd, 5dd, 10dd 7.19.1c tat 6.1.1a,  
7a 6.2.5a 6.3.10ab 6.4.11b 6.6.9c 6.8.7c  
6.11.2d, 5c 6.23.7d 7.1.4bc 7.4.3cc 7.6.1d,  
10c 7.8.1d 7.14.8bc 7.18.2b<sup>+</sup>, 8d tam  
6.11.9c\* 6.12.2b\* 6.14.7e, 8c 6.16.11a 7.1.2d,  
4c, 5d 7.2.3d 7.5.1c, 2a 7.8.10a 7.9.3c, 6c,  
10c 7.11.2d, 5d, 6d, 7d 7.18.7d 7.19.1b, 5d,  
10d tena 6.3.2d 6.8.7d 6.9.9c 6.12.2b  
6.23.3d 7.10.9d 7.11.8d 7.12.9c tasmaī  
6.10.8c 7.1.12c 7.3.11c 7.9.2c 7.16.1e, 5e, 10e  
tasmāt 6.21.3d<sup>+</sup> tasya 6.4.3c, 8d 6.8.9c<sup>+</sup>  
6.11.4c 6.15.4d 7.5.10d 7.7.4c 7.18.3c tas-  
min 7.16.1bb, 2b, 5bb, 10bb tau 7.4.1c  
tayos 6.7.7c te 6.1.2d 6.11.4a, 8b 6.16.5b,  
8a 6.21.5de 6.22.10d, 12d 7.2.4d 7.3.3d,  
5c 7.11.1d 7.14.10bc 7.17.1a–10a tānī  
6.7.8c 6.21.1c tān 6.2.8a 6.8.6c 6.14.1d,  
2f, 3e, 4d, 5e, 6f, 9f 6.15.1c<sup>+</sup> 7.2.5d 7.3.4d, 6c  
7.8.3d 7.11.3d, 4d 7.18.1c, 6c tebhis 6.20.5c

7.6.2c 7.18.2e 7.19.9d tebhyas 6.22.11d  
sā 6.4.1d, 4d, 7d, 9bd 6.6.7c 6.7.3c, 8d, 9d  
6.8.3d 6.10.3c, 5a 6.21.4aab, 6d 7.15.3c tām  
6.7.2c 6.10.1c, 9a 6.15.3d 6.21.6c 7.1.11c,  
12c 7.16.1c, 5c, 6c, 10c tayā 7.12.8c ta-  
syai 6.8.8c 7.19.3c, 4c tasyās 6.7.4c, 6c  
tās 6.3.5c, 12a 7.4.11b 7.16.6dd tābhyas  
7.16.6e tāsām 6.2.6b 7.13.1c, 14c tāsū  
7.16.6bb

°**saṃdr̥ś-** → madhu-saṃdr̥ś-

**sakṣaṇi-** sakṣaṇis 6.11.5b

**sakhāy-** sakhā 6.16.3d sakhāyam  
6.2.9a

**sakhya-** sakhyam 7.3.2c

**sagara-** sagarāya 7.20.1a

**saṅkā-** saṅkāsu 6.9.12c\*

**sac** sacase 7.9.5b sacate 6.2.7b 6.22.4d  
sacasva 7.9.6c

**sa-juṣ-** sajūs 6.9.3b

**sañj**

+**ā** *āsakta-* āsaktam 6.23.5d\*

**satya-** satyam 6.5.12a 6.19.9c 6.22.1c  
7.6.2d satyasya 7.6.1a satye 6.7.4b

**satya-vāc-** satyavācau 6.2.9d

**satvan-** satvānas 7.4.6b

°**satvan-** → abhi-satvan-

**satvara-** satvare 6.8.5c<sup>+</sup>

**sad**

+**ā** āsadat 6.9.7b ā sasāda 6.22.5d

+**upa** upa...sadeyus 6.22.10d

+**ni** ni...sasāda 6.2.2a\*

°**sad-** → ātma-sad- → upa-sad-

°**sadana-** → deva-sadana-

**sadandi-** sadandis 7.10.10b<sup>+</sup>

**sadam** 6.22.9c

**sadas-** sadaḥsadas 6.2.4b sadāṃsi  
6.20.1c

**sadānvā-** sadānve 6.8.9b sadānvās  
6.8.2d 7.7.3b

**sadānvā-han-** sadānvāghnī 6.8.3c

**sadyas** 6.1.1c

**sadha-māda-** sadhamādam 6.16.11cd

**sana-** sanāt 6.3.10d

**sanisrasa-** sanisrasas 6.11.5d

- sanisrasam 6.14.5c  
**sandhasa-** sandhasāya 7.20.4a  
**sa-patna-** sapatnas 7.8.2a  
**sa-patna-cātana-** sapatnacātanīm  
 7.12.1c,7d  
**sa-patna-han-** sapatnahā 7.5.6b,8a,  
 12c  
**sa-patnī-** sapatnī 7.12.2c,3c sapatnīm  
 7.12.8c,10c sapatnyās 7.12.4d,9c  
**sapta** sapta 6.1.6c 6.2.6a 6.20.3d  
**sapta-ṛṣi-** saptarṣayas 6.7.9b 7.5.2c,3b  
 saptarṣibhis 7.16.7a  
**saptati-** saptatis 6.20.3d  
**sapta-nāman-** saptanāmnīm 6.10.4c  
**saptarṣivant-** saptarṣivantam 7.17.7a  
**sabhā-** sabhā 6.19.5a  
**sam**  
*prev.* 6.1.2d,3c,5d 6.3.5b,10d 6.4.9a 6.6.7b  
 6.7.8c 6.9.10b 6.11.3a,4a 6.18.1abbc,2abc-  
 9abc 6.19.1abc-9abc 6.22.4b,5b,8a 7.3.5c  
 7.4.6b 7.5.2d,3b 7.6.5b,9d 7.8.3a 7.13.3a,8a,  
 11b 7.15.9b 7.18.2d,3b  
**sam-akta-** samaktās 6.22.8d,11b  
**sam-akṣa-** samakṣam 7.1.7c  
**samad-gu-** samadgus 6.2.6d  
**samā-** samābhyas 7.18.10d  
**sam-udra-** samudras 6.18.7c 7.14.7a  
 samudram 6.17.7b,8b samudrāya  
 7.20.3a samudrāt 6.7.2d,3a 7.13.13a  
 samudre 6.3.13d 6.7.1d  
**samudriya-** samudriyas 7.7.10c  
**sam-ṛta-** samṛteṣu 7.4.11a  
<sup>o</sup>**sam-ṛddhi-** → a-sam-ṛddhi-  
**sam-krandana-** samkrandanas 7.4.2c  
 samkrandanena 7.4.3a  
**sam-jaya-** samjayā 6.4.5d 7.12.6d<sup>+</sup>  
**sam-tāpa-** samtāpāt 7.15.3d<sup>+</sup>  
**sam-dṛś-** samdṛśas 7.3.10b  
**sam-patita-** sampatitā 6.4.9a  
**sam-bhūta-** sambhūtas 6.9.10b  
**sam-manas-** sammanasas 6.10.3a  
**samyāñc-** samyāñcas 6.2.5c  
**sam-vatsara-** samvatsarasya 6.12.5c  
**sam-srṣṭa-jit-** samsrṣṭajit 7.4.4c  
**sam-sraṣṭar-** samsrāṣṭā 7.4.4b  
**sar**  
 +**ati** atisṛtya 7.18.5a  
 +**pra** *prasārayant-* prasārayan  
 6.6.2a  
<sup>o</sup>**sara-** → ati-sara- → prati-sara-  
**sarasvatī-** sarasvatī 6.18.9c 7.2.1b  
**sarā-** sarā 6.4.9c  
**sarīsrpa-** sarīsrpam 6.21.3b 7.11.2b  
**sa-rūpa-** sarūpau 7.2.4a  
**sarj** asṛjata 6.3.2a *srṣṭa-* srṣṭas 6.3.2d  
 +**abhi** abhi...srjāmi 6.17.9b  
 +**ava** avāsṛjat 6.3.2c  
 +**sam** sam...srjās 6.1.3c  
**sarp** → sarīsrpa-  
 +**pari** parisarpatī 7.2.3ab  
 parisarpanti 7.13.7a  
**sarpa-** sarpāt 7.15.8c  
**sarpiṣ-** sarpiṣā 6.9.8b  
**sarva-** sarvam 6.23.6a 7.7.4b 7.10.1c,5f,8g  
 7.18.8d sarve 6.22.10d 7.3.5c 7.8.6b 7.9.8c  
 7.15.4d 7.18.1d sarvā 6.8.1c 7.7.8c 7.19.9c  
 sarvān 6.21.5c 7.2.7d sarvais 6.12.5d  
 sarveṣām 6.15.9c 7.2.10a sarvām 6.15.2b  
 sarvasyās 7.15.1d sarvās 6.3.3b 6.9.8c  
 7.7.3d,9c 7.10.1d,5g,8h 7.19.4b sarvāsām  
 7.2.10b  
**sarva-gu-** sarvagus 6.12.2b,4c  
**sarvatas** 7.8.1d  
**sarva-pūruṣa-** sarvapūruṣas 6.12.2b<sup>+</sup>  
 6.12.4c  
**sarva-ātman-** sarvātmā 6.12.2b  
**sarva-aṅga-** sarvāṅgas 6.12.2b  
**sava-** save 7.3.8b 7.5.11b  
**savitar-** savitā 6.19.6a 7.6.6a 7.9.1c  
 savitāram 7.9.9a savitus 7.3.8b 7.5.11b  
**savyatas** 7.15.1b  
<sup>1</sup>**sav**<sup>i</sup> → a-suvāna-  
<sup>2</sup>**sav**<sup>i</sup> suva 7.10.10d sutāt 7.1.4b\*  
 +**pra** → varuṇa-prasūta-  
<sup>o</sup>**saścant-** → a-saścant-  
**sasni-** sasni 6.1.2c  
**sasya-ad-** sasyādas 7.3.3c,4b  
**sah** *sahant-* sahanti 6.8.2b sahāmahe

- 6.9.8d sahasva 6.8.1abc 7.1.3a 7.8.5d  
 sahatām 7.19.5d sahadhvam 7.4.3c  
*sahamāna-* sahamānas 7.4.5b sa-  
 hamānā 6.8.1d,3a sahamāne 6.8.2a  
 sahamānām 7.12.7b sākṣīya 7.12.8c  
 sāsāhe 6.8.2d sāsāha 7.12.2c *sāsahāna-*  
 sāsahānas 6.8.3b  
 +**pra** pra sākṣate 6.1.6d  
 +**vi** → vi-sāsahi- → vi-sāhin-  
 °**sah-** → pṛtanā-sah-  
**saha** 6.4.11d 6.10.9b 6.12.2b,5d 6.22.10a  
 6.23.9c 7.3.4b 7.5.9b 7.16.9a 7.18.4d  
**saha-grāma-** sahaḡrāmas 6.12.5b  
**sahas-** sahas 7.5.2b,8d sahasā 7.4.7a  
**sahas-jit-** sahojīt 7.4.5c  
**sahasra-** sahasram 6.3.11d 6.10.1c  
**sahasra-aṅga-** sahasraṅgās 7.15.10a  
**sahasra-kāṇḍa-** sahasrakāṇḍas 7.7.8a  
**sahasra-dhāman-** sahasradhāman  
 6.7.7c  
**sahasra-dhāra-** sahasradhāram  
 6.11.4a  
**sahasra-poṣa-** sahasrapoṣāya 6.10.9d<sup>+</sup>  
**sahasra-vīrya-** sahasravīryas 7.7.1c,  
 7c  
**sahasra-śṛṅga-** sahasraśṛṅga 6.9.11b  
**sahasvant-** sahasvān 7.4.5b sahasvati  
 6.8.2a sahasvatīm 7.12.7b  
**sā** setave 6.11.4d  
 °**sā-** → svar-sā-  
**sākam** 7.4.2d 7.7.6b 7.10.5e,8f 7.13.2b  
 7.15.4d 7.19.1d,7d  
**sāci** 7.13.7b  
 °**sāti-** → vāja-sāti-  
**sādh**  
 +**pra** pra...sidhyatu 7.9.4b  
 °**sādhin-** → kilbiṣa-kṛta-sādhin-  
**sāyam** 7.7.5a  
**sāyam-prātar** sāyamprātar 7.10.2e,4f  
**sāraṅga-** sāraṅgas 7.2.6b\*  
**sāsahi-** sāsahis 6.8.2c  
 °**sāsahi-** → vi-sāsahi-  
**sāhantya-** sāhantyas 6.9.3c  
 °**sāhin-** → vi-sāhin-
- °**sāhya-** → pṛtanā-sāhya-  
**siṃha-** siṃhas 6.23.8a  
**sikata-vāpi-** sikatavāpiṣu 7.13.9a  
**sikti-** siktis 6.19.3b  
**sinīvālī-** sinīvālī 6.6.7a  
**sindhu-** sindhos 6.8.7b sindhavas  
 6.3.13a 6.18.7b  
**sindhu-prajāna-** sindhuprajānas  
 6.6.6a  
**sītā-bhaga-** sītābhagas 6.15.3a  
**su** 6.1.3d 6.2.5a 6.11.5a,7b  
**su-ā-veśa-** svāveśas 7.6.10b  
**su-kakuda-** sukakudas 6.9.7a  
**su-kṣatra-** suksatrasas 6.17.4b  
**su-janman-** sujanmā 6.2.1b  
**su-jāta-** sujātās 6.3.12d  
 °**suti-** → ā-suti-  
**su-parṇa-** suparṇas 6.7.1ac,2a 7.1.1a  
**su-prajas-** suprajajas 7.6.3d,4a  
**su-bhaga-** subhage 6.4.7a subhagām  
 7.12.7a subhagāyās 7.6.3b  
**su-bhāga-** subhāgā 6.10.1a  
**subhāgam-karaṇa-** subhāgaṃkaraṇī  
 7.12.5b  
**su-mati-** sumatau 7.18.9f  
**sumna-** sumnam 7.3.10a  
**sumnayī-** sumnayī 6.20.4b  
**surā-** surā 6.19.5b  
**surā-udaka-** surodakās 6.22.7a<sup>+</sup>  
**su-varṇa-** suvarṇā 6.10.5a  
**su-śṛṅga-** suśṛṅgas 6.9.7a  
**su-śeva-** suśevas 6.16.3d suśevau  
 6.11.7a 6.12.1c suśevā 6.10.8d 7.6.9b  
**su-stuta-** suṣṭuta 6.9.11b  
**sūkara-** sūkaras 7.1.1b sūkara 6.7.2c,  
 3b  
**sūd** sūdayatha (°ā) 6.3.7b sūdayanti  
 6.3.12a sūdayantu 6.3.4a suṣūdimā  
 6.16.11b  
**sūdana-** sūdanīs 6.3.9c  
**sūdayiṣṇu-** sūdayiṣṇavas 6.3.5a  
**sūnṛtā-** sūnṛtayā 6.22.10a  
**sūri-** sūrayas 6.3.5c  
**sūrta-han-** sūrtahā 6.14.8b

- sūrya-** sūryas 6.5.3a 6.19.6b 6.23.7b  
7.2.7a 7.11.10b 7.12.4b 7.14.3a 7.16.5a  
sūryam 6.10.6b 7.17.5a sūryasya 7.3.10b  
7.13.2b
- sūrya-varṇa-** sūryavarṇe 6.4.7b
- sūryā-** sūryā 6.19.5c
- sr̥ṣṭi-** sr̥ṣṭyā 7.5.4c
- sec**  
+ā ā siñcata 6.3.13d  
+sam sam...siñcantu 6.18.1-9a,2-  
9b,1c,2c,4c,9c 6.19.9ab sam...asicat  
6.19.1b,2b,3b,4b,5b,6b,7b
- sedi-** sedim 7.19.7a
- sedh**  
+apa apa...sedhatu 7.5.7d
- senā-** senās 7.4.2d,7d
- °senā- → deva-senā-
- saindhava-** saindhavya 7.12.4a
- sodarya-** sodaryais 6.12.5d
- soma-** somas 6.18.8c 7.4.9b 7.14.5a  
7.16.3a soma 6.16.8a somam 6.10.6b  
7.17.3a somena 7.7.6b 7.9.10d 7.10.5e,8f  
somasya 6.3.8b
- °soma- → agnī-soma-
- soma-pā-** somapās 7.4.4c
- soma-pr̥ṣṭha-** somapr̥ṣṭham 6.6.4b  
somapr̥ṣṭhās 7.11.1a
- somya-** somyam 6.10.7c 6.17.9b  
somyais 6.22.4b
- saumanasa-** saumanasam 7.15.9a  
saumanasasya 6.11.3b
- skand**  
+abhi abhiskandam 7.1.9b
- star** → a-str̥ṭa-
- star<sup>i</sup>**  
+vi vitaṣṭāra 6.22.11a\*
- stav** stoṣam 6.16.1a *stuta-* stutās  
6.17.10b → su-stuta-
- °stuta- → su-stuta-
- stuṣeyya-** stuṣeyyam 6.1.6a\*
- steg**  
+ā → an-ā-stigya-
- stena-** stenas 6.20.7a,8b stenam 6.20.9d
- stotar-** stotāras 6.21.4d
- stotrya-** stotryās 6.3.12b
- strī-** strī 7.1.12a striyam 6.23.2b
- straiṇa-** straiṇam 6.22.3b
- °stha- → eka-stha-
- sthavira-** sthavirus 7.4.5a sthavirau  
7.4.1a
- sthā** tiṣṭhasi 6.9.12b 6.10.6a tiṣṭhati  
7.10.5e,8f tiṣṭhanti 6.3.10b atiṣṭhas  
7.19.6b atiṣṭhatām 6.7.1b
- +adhi adhitīṣṭhati 6.7.4b
- +anu anutiṣṭhanti 6.21.5a
- +apa apa tiṣṭhantu 7.15.4d
- +abhi abhi tiṣṭha 7.18.9c  
*abhiṣṭhita-* abhiṣṭhitas 7.1.8b
- +ā ā tiṣṭha 7.4.5d ā...sthāpayase  
6.1.7c *ātiṣṭhant-* ātiṣṭhantas 6.2.4b
- +ut ud asthāt 7.4.10d *utthāsyant-*  
utthāsyantam 7.11.2b
- +upa upa...tiṣṭhantu 6.22.8d
- +ni ni tiṣṭhasi 6.4.4a\*
- +pari pari ṣṭhās 7.9.1a
- +prati+ā *pratyātiṣṭhant-*  
pratyātiṣṭhantī 6.4.5c 7.12.6c
- +vi vi tiṣṭhase 6.20.1c *viṣṭhita-*  
viṣṭhitās 6.16.4b
- °sthā- → prati-sthā-
- °sthāvan- → svayam-sthāvan-
- sthira-** sthiram 6.1.4c sthirās 7.6.5d  
sthirām 7.6.9d\*
- sthira-aṅga-** sthirāṅgām 7.6.9c
- sthira-pūruṣa-** sthirapūruṣām 7.6.9c
- sthira-vīra-** sthiravīrā 7.6.8c
- sthūṇā-** sthūṇā 7.6.1a sthūṇās 7.6.8a
- snā** snāhi 7.5.10d
- spas̥-** spaśas 6.11.4c<sup>+</sup>
- °spas̥a- → prati-spas̥a-
- sphāti-** sphātis 6.15.1a sphātim 6.15.2b
- °sphāna- → gaya-sphāna-
- syand**  
+abhi abhi ṣiṣyadas 6.4.9b<sup>+</sup>
- syona-** syonā 6.10.8d
- sraṃs** → sanisrasa-
- sragviṇ-** sragviṇī 7.9.6d
- srav** sravanti 6.3.3a<sup>+</sup>

°**sraṇa-** → pra-sraṇa-

°**sraṣṭar-** → sam-sraṣṭar-

**sva-** svam 6.23.11c svena 7.8.7d svāt  
6.23.1b sve 6.23.11b svās 6.2.3b svām  
6.1.9b svās 6.1.8d

**svaja-** svajas 7.1.8b

**svadhā-** svadhām 6.10.5c svadhayā  
6.2.6d 6.22.6d,7d,8c,11b

**svadhāvanta-** svadhāvanta 6.12.1a

**svap** svapiṣyāmasi 6.20.10b

**svapna-** svapnena 7.11.6a

**svapnayā** 7.9.5b

°**svapnya-** → dus-svapnya-

**svayam-sthāvan-** svayamsthāvāri  
6.10.6a

**svar**

+**sam** sam asvaran 6.11.4a

**svar-** svar 7.4.1d 7.7.6a

**sva-rāja-** svarājas 6.1.8c

**svarga-** svargam 6.22.9b svarge 6.22.3b,  
6d,7d,8c,10b,13a svargā 7.15.10b

**svar-sā-** svarṣās 6.1.8b

**svasṛ-** svasā 6.4.1d,6c 7.10.3c svasāras  
6.1.9c

**svasti-** svasti 6.2.7d svastaye 6.12.5b

**svādiṣṭha-** svādiṣṭha 6.16.5b

**svādīyas-** svādīyas 6.1.3c

**svādu-** svādo 6.16.2a svādunā 6.1.3c  
svādos 6.1.3c

**svādman-** svādmānas 6.16.5c

**svāhā** 6.11.6b,7d,8b,9c,10b 6.12.1d 6.13.4a,  
5a,6a,7a,8a,9a,10a,11a,12a,13a,14a,15a  
7.16.1e,5e,6e,10e 7.20.1a,2a,3a,4a,5a,6a,7a,  
8a,9a,10a

**ha** 6.4.6d,8d 6.22.5ab

°**hatyā-** → upa-hatyā-

**han** hanti 6.14.7d 7.3.11a 7.11.2a ghna-  
ntī 7.11.3a jahi 6.9.9d,10a 7.1.2d 7.2.2b  
hantu 6.9.4cd hata 7.18.5b *ghnant-*  
*ghnan* 7.2.7c hanat 7.1.7d jaghāna  
7.8.5b hanyatām 7.2.8cd jaṅghanas  
6.9.9c<sup>+</sup> *hata-* hatas 7.2.9aab hatās  
7.2.2c,4d,9c hantavai 7.12.8b  
+**ava** *avahata-* avahatasya 6.15.5b,

6b

+**ā** ā...jahi 6.20.9d

°**han-** → a-dṛṣṭa-han- → rakṣas-han-  
→ valaga-han-

→ vṛtra-han- → śatru-han-

→ sadānvā-han- → sapatna-han- →  
sūrta-han-

**hanu-** hanū 6.20.9c

°**hanu-** → dus-hanu-

**hantar-** hantā 6.9.5ab

**hay** hinvanti 6.1.9d

+**prati+pra** pratiprahiṇmasi

7.1.5c<sup>+</sup>,11c

<sup>1</sup>**har** harāmi 6.15.1c

+**ā** ā harāmi 6.15.2ad

+**prati** prati...harāmasi 7.1.3c

→ prati-haraṇa-

<sup>2</sup>**har**

+**prati** prati haryata 7.9.8d

**haras-** harasā 6.4.3b

**harṣ** harṣadhvam 7.4.6a

**hav** → an-ā-huti- → ghr̥ta-ā-huta-

**hava-** havam 7.18.1d,2a,3de haveṣu  
7.4.11d

°**hava-** → ā-hava-

°**havana-** → ghr̥ta-ā-havana-

**hav**<sup>1</sup> ahvayan 6.2.7d havāmahe 7.9.9b

+**ā** ā...ahūṣata 6.17.11a<sup>+</sup>

+**pra** pra hūyase 6.12.3c 6.17.1b

**haviṣ-** haviṣā 7.3.11c 7.6.1c haviṣas  
7.6.7a

**havya-** havyam 7.18.3c havyās 6.16.11b

°**hasta-** → iṣu-hasta- → bhīma-hasta-

**hasta-gr̥hya** hastagr̥hya 7.1.7b

°**hasta-ghna-** → hiraṇya-hasta-ghna-

**hastya-** hastyam 7.3.7b

**hastya-ayana-** hastyāyanam 6.14.2e

**hā** jahātu 6.23.11c hitvā 6.3.11b

+**apa** apa...ahāsata 6.11.3c

**hāyana-** hāyanas 7.10.10b

°**hārd-** → dus-hārd-

°**hāla-** → pra-hāla-

**hi** 6.1.4a 6.3.4c

**himavant-** himavatas 7.10.1b,8b

- him-kr̥vant-** himkr̥vantas 6.10.4d  
**hiraṇya-** hiraṇyam 6.2.3b 7.15.5c,6c  
 hiraṇyena 6.7.4a  
**hiraṇya-keśa-** hiraṇyakeśyai 7.19.3c,  
 4c  
**hiraṇya-dhanvan-** hiraṇyadhanvā  
 7.8.4c  
**hiraṇya-bandhana-** hiraṇyabandha-  
 nā 7.10.7b  
**hiraṇya-bāhu-** hiraṇyabāho 6.4.7a  
**hiraṇyaya-** hiraṇyayas 7.5.1b,3c,7c  
 7.13.4b,9b hiraṇyayān 7.13.5b  
 hiraṇyayī 7.10.7a  
**hiraṇya-yoni-** hiraṇyayonis 7.5.8c  
**hiraṇyavant-** hiraṇyavantam 7.12.9b  
**hiraṇya-varṇa-** hiraṇyavarṇe 6.4.6a  
 hiraṇyavarṇās 6.3.11a
- hiraṇya-hastaghna-** hiraṇyahasta-  
 ghnas 7.7.5c  
**hirā-akṣa-** hirākṣas 6.14.8a  
<sup>o</sup>**huta-** → ghr̥ta-ā-huta-  
<sup>o</sup>**huti-** → an-ā-huti-  
**hr̥daya-** hr̥dayam 6.10.7c 6.23.5a hr̥da-  
 yena 7.9.3b hr̥dayāya 6.6.5b  
**heḍa-** heḍāt 7.8.6c  
**heti-** hete 6.11.8aaa hetim 7.9.6b  
<sup>o</sup>**heti-** → tigma-heti- → bhava-heti-  
<sup>1</sup>**heṣ/hiṃs**<sup>o</sup> hiṃsīt 6.10.2c hiṃsiṣṭam  
 6.12.1d *hiṃsant-* → a-hiṃsant-  
**hai** 6.8.4a 7.11.8aa  
<sup>o</sup>**hotra-** → agni-hotra-  
**homa-** homās 7.6.2d homais 7.6.2ac  
<sup>o</sup>**hrada-** → ghr̥ta-hrada-

## INDEX LOCORUM

The commentary to kāṇḍas 6 and 7 contained in this work cites a significant number of previously untranslated pādas, hemistichs, stanzas and occasionally longer passages from the PS. In so doing it often proposes emendations to published readings, or furnishes preliminary editions for unpublished parts of the text. The references in this index are to the pages where such PS *loci* are cited in the commentary.

1.5.4cd	174	1.99.1	319
1.21.1a	209	1.100.1	374
1.26.4cd	109	1.107.1ab	384
1.29.1	386	1.108.4c	209
1.29.2a	395	1.112.4e	88 n. 9
1.29.2b	390	2.6.1	135
1.29.3a	390	2.14.2ab	273
1.31.3	353	2.16.2ab	90
1.32.5	362	2.26.3	326
1.46.2cd	405	2.30.5	326
1.46.4ab	407	2.32.1	81
1.46.4d	405	2.33.3ab	80
1.46.6	405	2.37.5ab	431
1.55.3	438	2.38.4ab	261
1.57.1	146	2.38.5ab	428
1.58.1	406	2.49.1d	405
1.58.2	406	2.58.2cd	252
1.58.4	406	2.58.4	291
1.68.4f	391	2.58.4ab	252
1.69.1ab	114	2.58.6cd	252
1.72.2	428	2.62.3–4	439
1.75.1cd	100	2.62.4	330
1.76.4d	434	2.71.2	261
1.78.1	344	2.71.3ab	261
1.78.4	339	2.72.3ab	307
1.85.4	62	2.79.4	381
1.89.3d	385	2.80.1d	218
1.90.3	406	2.81.2	381
1.93.1	354	2.84.6	273
1.94.4ab	393	2.89.3ab	425
1.95.3b	250	2.91.4a	183

3.15.2ab	90	8.16.10b	101
3.15.4	93	8.16.5	274
3.19.2	12	8.18.3d	340
3.19.6b	12	8.18.5	130
3.20.3cd	313	9.6.3	430
3.20.4c	311	9.6.3b	101
3.22.6	68	9.7.(11-)12	47
3.29.2	301	9.11.13-14	92
3.30.7a	101	9.11.7	440
3.38.9	244	9.12.7a	93
3.39.3	128	9.13.10	228
4.7.3	408 n. 83	9.28.2	55
4.8.1-13de	261	9.28.3-4	347
4.10.2cd	322	9.29.7	347
4.13.6ab	183	10.1.1	101
4.13.7b	183	10.1.3	369
4.16.2	351	10.1.5a	109
4.16.4a	101	10.1.8c	263
4.17.3	379	10.2.10cd	239
4.20.1	246	10.9.9	49
4.20.7a	395	11.2.7	234
4.22.4	371	11.3.3	319
4.22.6	368	11.3.3cd	281
5.1.3ab	101	11.3.6	62
5.2.2	135	11.5.2ab	123
5.9.4ab	101	11.7.7	350
5.9.4d	102	11.10.2	183
5.19.7cde	325	11.10.3	183
5.25.3a	317	11.10.6	186
5.26.3abc	340	11.12.3	62
5.27.6c	177	11.15.2	184
5.31.1ab	123	12.5.1	301
5.31.5ab	237	12.5.5a	332
5.31.8	130	12.5.9b	322
5.34.7b	251	12.7.3	437
5.38.5c	46	12.7.3ab	394
8.3.12	445	12.7.4ab	395
8.3.2	83	12.7.5	358
8.6.3	89	12.7.6ab	388
8.6.6	89	12.8.6ef	340
8.8.3	408	13.3.3a	174
8.9.13cd	402	13.3.4	435
8.9.4	62	13.3.5	384
8.10.8	301	13.4.4	220

14.9.7	225	17.13.10	103
15.2.8	446	17.13.3b	101
15.4.10a	201	17.14.10	277
15.15.1	371	17.14.5	444
15.15.4	356	17.15.5	384
15.16.2	62	17.15.5ab	181
15.16.3	352	17.35.1	171
15.18.3	175	17.39.7b	120
15.18.4d	385	17.45.9–10	408
15.18.5d	395	18.13.1	62
15.18.7–8	385	18.67.12	435
15.18.9b	388	18.69.2c	127
15.19.1	388	18.73.4d	24
15.19.6ab	391	18.80.6cd	8
15.19.8ab	387	19.1.10	446
15.20.10	405	19.2.5ab	11
15.21.7	387	19.3.6	52
16.4.6	274	19.4.10d	270
16.15.5	450	19.4.11	269
16.16.7	450	19.4.12	416
16.24.2a	90	19.4.14	393
16.24.9cd	122	19.4.5	226
16.25.6c	170	19.8.13	358
16.29.10ab	432	19.9.10	371
16.30.6b	304	19.9.11ab	395
16.35.5	263	19.10.3	160
16.44.10	46	19.15.1	283
16.71.5	240	19.15.16	445
16.79.10	171	19.19.11	243
16.79.4	104	19.19.14	324
16.79.5b	175	19.20.15–17	82
16.79.6ab	173	19.25.4ab	175
16.80.9a	173	19.29.4	106, 274
16.84.3d–8d	82	19.35.10ab	173
16.96.1	233	19.35.12	246
16.104.10ab	44	19.37.3ab	79
16.104.7c	389 n. 76	19.39.14	277
16.132.7	45	19.39.5cd	267
16.144.9	241	19.40.7	291
16.149.4	389	19.42.5c	123
16.150.10	407	19.42.8	124
17.1.9	90	19.43.1a	79
17.12.10	103	19.47.8b	324
17.12.7ab	279	19.55.12–15	352

19.55.2ab	338	20.38.10	376
20.7.1cd	344	20.38.10ab	391
20.9.4	177	20.38.4–5	301
20.14.6ab	109	20.41.10	304
20.18.5	432	20.41.7ef	344
20.18.8	266	20.42.11	381
20.22.7c	263	20.44.2	177
20.23.6c	317	20.46.8	101
20.25.9	436	20.53.8c	305
20.26.1	209	20.54.1d	305
20.28.5cd	432	20.56.11–12	70
20.29.2cd	381	20.57.9–10	335
20.29.3b	101	20.61.7	356
20.31.7	82, 382	20.63.9c	124
20.33.4	393	20.65.8	80
20.37.7e	330		