



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

PS 8.15. Offense against a Brahmin

Lubotsky, A.M.; Schmiedchen A., Griffiths A.

Citation

Lubotsky, A. M. (2007). PS 8.15. Offense against a Brahmin. In G. A. Schmiedchen A. (Ed.), *The Atharvaveda and its Paippaladāsākhā. Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition* (pp. 23-33). Aachen: Shaker. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16201>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16201>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

PS 8.15. Offense against a Brahmin*

Alexander Lubotsky

The topic of my paper is a hymn from the Paippalāda Atharvaveda, which is typical of what we can expect from this text: new material, new insights in the life of the Vedic Indians, new words, archaic verb forms next to grammatical innovations and, at the same time, new problems of various kinds, especially those of the tradition of the text and its relation to the Brāhmaṇas.

This hymn, which represents an appeal to the Brahmins to stay united in their protest when one of them is abused, is as far as I know unique in its subject matter. The keyword of the hymn is *kilbiṣa-* ‘offense, abuse’, which appears almost in every stanza, and the question arises what kind of abuse is here meant. It must of course be something serious and the first thing which comes to mind is *the* offense against a Brahmin, *the* archetypical *brahmakilbiṣá* so to speak, described in the famous hymn RV 10.109 (~ ŚS 5.17, PS 9.15), which is concerned with the abduction of a Brahmin’s wife by a king. Our hymn does not specify what kind of property has been taken (no doubt, a king could also expropriate land or cattle), but it seems probable to me that the poet seeks to achieve Brahmanic unity against a king’s high-handedness. We get important information about the usual procedure in case of an offense against a Brahmin from the beginning of RV 10.109:

RV 10.109.1 ~ ŚS 5.17.1 ~ PS 9.15.1

*tè 'vadan prathamā brahmakilbiṣe 'kūpārah saliló mātariśvā |
vīlūharās tāpa ugró mayobhūr āpo devīḥ prathamajā ṛténa ||*

They spoke first at the offense against a Brahmin: the boundless sea, Mātariśvan, Tapas of stout heat, the mighty Refresher,¹ the heavenly waters — the first-born according to the Ṛta.

The first deities who spoke at the offense were the powers of nature closely connected with Varuṇa (*prathamajā ṛténa*), the reason presumably being the fact that an offense against a Brahmin is an offense against the Ṛta (cf. also stanza 5 below: *brahmakilbiṣe prokta ud eva tiṣṭhet sa ṛtasya panthāḥ* ‘When an offense against a Brahmin is announced, up he should rise. This is the path of the Ṛta’). These powers of nature seem to act as the prototypical Brahmins, who in our hymn are summoned to speak unanimously at the offense of a Brahmin.

*I am very grateful to the participants of the weekly seminars at Leiden University, especially to Arlo Griffiths, Jan Houben, Leonid Kulikov and Marianne Oort, for many valuable suggestions. I am further indebted to Werner Knobl for many insightful comments on an earlier version of the paper. The responsibility for remaining infelicities is, naturally, my own.

¹The Wind? Cf. 10.169.1a *mayobhūr vāto*.

It is remarkable that in this hymn, archaic and late features exist side by side: on the one hand, we find here an archaic form *niṃsīta* (stanza 5), but, on the other hand, the poet's knowledge of the definitive make-up of the ṚV (see ad stanza 6) and of the Brahmanic families which only appear in the Brāhmaṇas (stanza 2) makes a late impression. Since the hymn contains 13 stanzas and is thus 2 stanzas longer than the usual 11 in this kāṇḍa, we may assume that stanzas 2 and 6 are later additions (note that these two stanzas only contain the names of the families plus the last pāda, which is identical with that of stanza 1). The additions may have been induced by the aim to involve as many Brahmanic families as possible in the protest. In particular, stanza 6 can be seen as an attempt to address the Ṛgvedins. We may also see in this light the mentioning of the name Prasravaṇa, which is only known from the KauṣB, a text of a Ṛgveda school.²

8.15.1 PS only (d: 2d, 6d)

| | |
|---------------------------------|------|
| yo jāmadagnya iha kauśiko ya | (11) |
| ātreya uta kāśyapo yaḥ | (9) |
| bharadvājā gotamā ye vasiṣṭhās | (11) |
| tebhyaḥ pra brūma iha kilbiṣāṇi | (11) |

Who is a descendant of Jamadagni here, who of Kuśika, who of Atri, and who is a descendant of Kaśyapa, the Bharadvājas, the Gotamas and the Vasiṣṭhas — to them we announce here the offenses.

jāmadagnya] **K**, jāmadagniya **JM V/126 [Ma Mā]**, jāmadagniya(→ ya) **Ku** kauśiko ya] **Or**, kauśika **K** yaḥ] **Ku V/126 [Ma Mā] K**, jaḥ **JM** bharadvājā gotamā ye] **Ku V/126 [Ma]**, bha(+ dvā)rajā gotamā **JM**, bharadvājo gotamo **Mā**, bharadvājā gautamā yaṃ **K** vasiṣṭhās] **K**, vasiṣṭhās **Or** tebhyaḥ] **Or**, tebhyaḥ **K** kilbiṣāṇi] **Or**, kilviṣāṇi **K**

The stanza refers to the descendants of the seven seers, although the usual PS list of the seven seers includes Viśvāmitra instead of Kuśika (cf. 5.28.4, 11.5.13, 14.7.3). Both names most probably refer to the same family,³ however. At ṚV 3.53.10,11, the Kuśikas are addressed as those belonging to the clan of Viśvāmitra. BHATTACHARYA edits *jāmadagnya*.

a. The reading *jāmadagniya* of the Or. mss. is less probable in view of the metre (no caesura). Cases where the Or. tradition alleviates consonant clusters by inserting an epenthetic vowel are very common.

²I am indebted to Arlo Griffiths for providing me with the critical apparatus for this hymn. The use of editorial signs and brackets throughout this paper conforms with the system explained in GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY 2000–01: 196, n. 1. The Or. mss. **Ku**, **JM** and **V/126** were collated through autopsy. In words with *br*, BARRET consistently transliterates the spelling in **K** of the common ligature as *vr*, and BHATTACHARYA follows him in this regard. In every case, a transliteration *br* could also be defended. Since the meaning of the text is nowhere affected by the decision how to transliterate this sign, I have everywhere assumed it stands for *br*.

³The authors of book III of the ṚV, cf. OLDENBERG 1888: 209 = 1967: 578.

d. For the meaning of *kilbiṣa-*, cf. the discussion in GRIFFITHS forthc. ad PS 7.3.6 and further ŚS 6.96.2 (= 7.117[112].2 ~ PS 3.17.4, 19.12.5) *muñcāntu mā śapathyād átho varuṇyād utá | átho yamásyā páḍbīśād víśvasmād devakilbiṣāt* ‘Let them free me from that which comes from a curse, then also from that which is of Varuṇa, then from Yama’s fetter, from all offense against the gods’ (WHITNEY); ŚS 6.118.1 (~ PS 16.50.3) *yád dhástābhyāṃ cakṛmá kilbiṣāṇy akṣāṇāṃ gatnúm upalípsamānāḥ | ugrampaśyé ugrajítāu tát adyāpsarásāv ánu dattām ṛṇám nah* ‘If with our hands we have done offenses, desiring to take up the course (?) of the dice, let the two Apsarases fierce-seeing, fierce-conquering, forgive today that guilt of ours’ (WHITNEY).

8.15.2 PS only (d: 1d, 6d)

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|
| *agastayaḥ kaṇvāḥ kutsāḥ prasravaṇā | (12/P) |
| virūpā gargā mudgalā +yaskāḥ śaunakāḥ | (13/P) |
| saṃkṛtayo brāhmaṇā ye na drugdhās | (11/P) |
| tebhyaḥ pra brūma iha kilbiṣāṇi | (11) |

The Agastis, the Kaṇvas, the Kutsas, the Prasravaṇas, the Virūpas, the Gargas, the Mudgalas, the Yaskas, the Śaunakas, the Saṃkṛtis — the Brahmins who are not deceitful, to them we announce here the offenses.

JM: agastya<……>vaṇā • *agastayaḥ] agastyayaḥ Or, agastyayaḥ K kaṇvāḥ kutsāḥ] Ku V/126 [Ma], kaṇvā kutsāḥ Mā, kāṇvaḥkutsā K prasravaṇā] [Mā], praśravaṇā Ku V/126 Ma, pasravaṇā K virūpā] viṛpā Or, viśvarūpāḥ K gargā] JM [MaMā] K, gargā Ku V/126 +yaskāḥ] jaskāḥ Or, ayaskās K śaunakāḥ |] śūnakāḥ | Or, śaunakās [om. ||] K saṃkṛtayo] K, saṃhrdayo Or brāhmaṇā] K, brāhmaṇe Ku V/126 [Ma Ma], brahmaṇ{o}e JM drugdhās] ḍṛgdhās Or, dugdhās K tebhyaḥ] Or, tadyāḥ K [[misprint Bh.: tadyaḥ]] brūma] Ku JM V/126 [Ma] K, vṛma Mā kilbiṣāṇi ||] Or, kilviṣāṇi Z K

Pādas a–c are prose. This may be an indication that the whole stanza is a later addition, induced by the endeavour to mention as many Brahmanic families as possible. The fact that the text mentions the descendants of Prasravaṇa, the name which is only attested in a Ṛgvedic Brāhmaṇa, may be interpreted as an invitation towards the Ṛgvedins to join the ranks, cf. also below, ad stanza 6. BHATTACHARYA edits *agastyayaḥ* and *śūnakāḥ*.

a. The descendants of Agasti are called *agástayaḥ*, the unanimous reading of the PS mss. being due to contamination of the two forms of the name: *agastya-* (ṚV+) and *agasti-* (ŚS 4.9.3 = PS 4.38.3). Prasravaṇa is a rare name. As far as I know, it is only attested in KauṣB 13.3, where Avatsāra is called *prāsravaṇa-* ‘descendant / son of Prasravaṇa’.

c. For the name Saṃkṛti, cf. ŚB 14.9.4.31 (at the very end of the BĀU) *sāṃkṛtīputra-* in the Brahmanic genealogy. The name also occurs several times in name-lists in the Sūtra literature (e.g. LāṭyŚS 6.4.13, BaudhŚS-Pravara 23:437.1ff.).

For the meaning cf. 8a *tasmai sa druhyād ya idaṃ nāyad* ‘To him (to the oppressed Brahmin) he will be deceitful, who will not come here’. The idea of the sentence seems to be that the Brahmins that have come are not deceitful to the Brahmanic cause, to the Brahmanic unity, to the oppressed Brahmin.

8.15.3 PS only

| | |
|---|------|
| yō nottiṣṭhād brāhmaṇe nādhamāne | (11) |
| māndyena dr̥pta uta dhair̥yeṇa | (11) |
| viśve devā upadraṣṭāro a _{sya} | (11) |
| tasmin viṣaṃ saṃ nayān kilbiṣyam | (11) |

Who will not rise, being confused by sloth and by presumption, when a Brahmin is in distress, the All-Gods, who witness this, will pour the poison of the offense into him.

nottiṣṭhād] Ku V/126 [Ma Mā], nottiṣṭhā JM, notiṣṭhād K brāhmaṇe] Ku V/126 [Ma Mā], brāhmaṇo JM K māndyena dr̥pta] Or, nānyena tr̥pta K [[Bar.: nātyena; I read with R-V/Bh.]] |] Or, om. K a_{sya}] ‘sya Or, tra K tasmin viṣaṃ] Or, tasminiṣaṃ K nayān] Ku V/126 [Ma Mā], nayāma JM, nayāṃ K kilbiṣyam] Ku V/126 [Ma Mā], kilbiṣaṃ JM, kilviṣyam K

b. *māndya-* is a Vedic hapax. *dhāirya-* n., being derived from *dhīra-* ‘wise, intelligent’, usually has positive connotations (‘intelligence, forethought’), but here this is evidently not the case.

d. *kilbiṣya-* ‘pertaining to the offense’, to be read as *kilbiṣya-*, is a hapax.

8.15.4 PS only

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| yā ropayaḥ kilbiṣe brāhmaṇasya | (11) |
| yāni caināṃsi bahudhā duṣkṛtāni | (12 ^T) |
| *anuttiṣṭhan [prokta] ātmani +tan ni dhatte | (11) |
| tathā tad devā uta veśayanti | (11) |

Whatever pains there are in an offense against a Brahmin and whatever transgressions, [whatever] manifold misdeeds, he who will not stand up [when (an offense) is announced] puts it into himself, and so the gods make it enter [him].

ropayaḥ] Or, ropayaṃ K kilbiṣe] Or, kilviṣe K brāhmaṇasya yāni] Or, brāhmaṇasyāthāni K caināṃsi] Or, jīnāṃsi K duṣkṛtāni] Ku JM V/126 [Ma] K, dr̥ṣkṛtāni Mā |] Ku V/126 Mā[Ma] K, || JM *anuttiṣṭhan] anutiṣṭhan Or, anutiṣṭhaṃ K prokta ātmani] Or, proktātmānu K +tan ni] taṃ ni Ku V/126 [Ma Mā] K, tiṃ ni JM tathā] Or, tasmai K tad devā] Ku JM [Ma Mā] K, tadevā V/126

BHATTACHARYA edits *anutiṣṭhan* and *taṃ ni*; his *vahudhā* must be a misprint.

c. The emendation *anuttiṣṭhan* has been suggested to me by Jan Houben. The reading *tan* has already been proposed by BARRET. It seems likely that

prokte has been taken from the following stanza. If we delete this word, we get a regular triṣṭubh line.

d. The same idea as in pāda **d** of the previous stanza. Since *veśāyati* often occurs with a locative complement and since Kashmir reads *tasmai*, it seems attractive to emend *tathā* to **tasmīn*. For the meaning, cf. GELDNER's remark ad ṚV 1.176.2a: "*ā-viś* Kaus. ist s.v.a. einem (Lok.) etwas insinuierten".

8.15.5 PS only

| | |
|---|------|
| nā _a śnīyān na piben na *śayīta | (11) |
| na *niṃsīta jāyāṃ no _u ta putram | (11) |
| brahmakilbiṣe prokta | (7) |
| ud eva tiṣṭhet sa ṛtasya panthāḥ | (11) |

He should not eat, should not drink, should not be lying. He should not kiss the spouse, nor the son. When an offense against a Brahmin is announced, up should he rise. This is the path of the Ṛta.

nāśnīyān] Or, nāśnīyāṃ K piben] JM V/126 [Ma Mā], pi(+ be 4)n Ku, pibeyaṃ K *śayīta] śain Or, śaita K *niṃsīta jāyāṃ] niṃsīta jāyān Ku V/126 Mā, niṃsīta jāyāṃ JM [Ma], niṃsāibhujā(→ tujā)yāṃ K putram |] putraṃ | Or, putraṃ [[om.]] K brahmakilbiṣe] JM V/126 [Ma Mā], brahmaki{.}biṣe Ku, brahmakilviṣe K prokta ud] Or, proktaud K tiṣṭhet sa] Or, tiṣṭhesva K ṛtasya panthāḥ ||] Ku V/126 [Ma Mā], ṛtasya panthāḥ | JM, ritasya panthā [[om.]] K

BHATTACHARYA misprints *piven* and *vrahmakilbiṣe*.

a. I adopt BARRET's emendation (p. 283). Cf. also BHATTACHARYA 1997: xxxvi.

b. BHATTACHARYA's conjecture *niṃsīta* is adopted here. This is an archaic athenatic form of the reduplicated present to *nas* (cf. *nīṃsate* 3pl. med. ṚV+). GOTŌ 1987: 200f. argued that the meaning of this present is 'aufsuchen', 'to visit' and not 'to kiss', as had been usually assumed. Although the Ṛgvedic passages are often ambiguous, it seems clear, however, that in the PS the meaning 'to kiss' is unavoidable, cf. especially 1.55.4ab *madhuman mama nīsanam* (read: **niṃsanam*) *jaghanam madhuman mama* 'sweet is my kissing, my loins are sweet'. The word **niṃsana-* shows that already by the time of the PS *niṃs-* was conceived as a root.

8.15.6 PS only (6d = 1d, 2d)

| | |
|----------------------------------|------|
| śatarcino mādhyamā ye maharṣayaḥ | (12) |
| kṣudrasūktānām uta yā prajeha | (11) |
| ṛṣīṇām yāni janimāni vidmas | (11) |
| tebhyaḥ pra brūma iha kilbiṣāṇi | (11) |

The [descendants of the] Śatarcins, [the descendants of] the great ṛṣis who have composed the middle parts, and those here who are the progeny of those whose

hymns are short — whichever races of the ṛṣis we know, to them we announce here the offenses.

śatarcino] [Ma? Mā?] K, śatarccino Ku JM V/126 mādhyamā] Or, sā(→ mā)dhyamā K maharṣayaḥ] Ku V/126 [Ma Mā] K, maharṣ{i}ayaḥ JM yā] Ku V/126 [Ma Mā], {jā}yā JM ṛṣīnām] Ku JM [Ma Mā] K, ṛṣīnām V/126 yāni janimāni] JM [Ma Mā] K, jāni janimāni Ku, jānimāni V/126 tebhyaḥ pra] thus Or K [[note °ḥp°]] kilbiṣāni ||] Or, kilviṣāni Z K

BHATTACHARYA's edition omits the apparatus for this stanza.

The stanza seems to be a later addition. This is indicated by its strange position in the hymn and by the fact that it mentions the authors of the Ṛgvedic hymns, which are only known since the late texts of the Ṛgveda school: while the *mādhyamāḥ* are referred to at KauṣB 12.3:5ff., the earliest other attestation of *śatarcinaḥ* seems to be at AitĀ 2.2.1 (alongside the *mādhyamāḥ*), and the *kṣudrasūktāḥ* are not referred to before ŚāṅkhGrS 4.10, ĀsvGrS 3.4.2. A typical passage is ŚāṅkhGrS 4.10.3: *śatarcinaḥ, mādhyamāḥ* — *gr̥tsamadaḥ, viśvāmitraḥ jamadagniḥ, vāmadevaḥ, atriḥ, bharaadvājah, vasiṣṭhaḥ* — *pragāthāḥ, pāvamānāḥ, kṣudrasūktamahāsūktāḥ*. For *viśvāmitraḥ jamadagniḥ*, cf. ṚV 3.53, 10.167.4.

a. The intention of the poet is clear: he addresses the descendants of the great poets of the ṚV, but the syntax is rather cumbersome.

c. Note the aberrant form of 1pl. pf. → pres. *vidmas*. The regular form *vidma* is the usual form and is abundantly attested in the PS, but *vidmas* is further found at 15.13.10c (*iṣūr yā eṣām vidmas*) and *vidmasi* is found at 17.12.2b, 17.13.13c (*nāmadheyāni vidmasi*) and at 19.47.2b (*mayūraṃ vayaṃ vidmasi*). The latter form is secured by the metre and conclusively shows that *vidmas* is not a mistake of the transmission, but an original 1pl. form of the PS, although it is not attested in the ŚS. The present form *vidmas(i)* is most probably due to the reinterpretation of ppf. *avet* as an impf.

8.15.7 PS only

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| sodaryāṇām pañcadaśānām śatānām | (12 ^T) |
| trayastrimśad ud aśiṣyanta devāḥ | (11) |
| ekasmin viddhe sarve arupyan | (10) |
| tad brāhmaṇe kilbiṣam anv avindan | (11) |

From the fifteen hundred of the same kin, there were [only] thirty-three gods left. When one was wounded, all suffered racking pain. In that way they discovered the offense against a Brahmin.

pañcadaśānām] Ku V/126 [Ma Mā] K, pañca{śa}daśānām JM trayastrimśad] thus Or K [[misprint Bar.: trayastrinśad]] K ud aśiṣyanta] Or, utaśiṣyanta K devāḥ |] Or, devāḥ K [[om. |, but note °ḥ e°]] viddhe] K, vidye Or arupyan tad] 'rpyam Ku [Ma], rpyam JM V/126, rūpyam Mā, rupyamtvad K brāhmaṇe] Or, brāhmaṇa K kilbiṣam] Ku JM [Ma Mā], kilbiṣ{e}am V/126, kilviṣam K avindan] Or, avindaṃ K

BHATTACHARYA edits '*rupyam*.'

a. In early Vedic, *sodarya-* is only found in the PS. Cf. 6.12.5d *sarvaiḥ sodar_iyaiḥ saha* 'together with all [my] siblings'. Later, the word appears in the Gṛhyasūtras (GRIFFITHS forthc. ad loc.).

'Fifteen hundred' is more likely than 'hundred fifteen'. The original number of gods must be big and presumably be divisible by three, cf. ṚV 3.9.9ab *trīṇi śatā trī saḥāsrāṇy agnīm trimśác ca devā náva cāsaparyan* '3339 gods honored Agni'.

d. *kilbiṣam* + loc. means 'offense against smbd.', cf. ŚS 5.19.5cd *kṣīrām yād asyāḥ pīyāte tād vai pitṛṣu kílbiṣam* 'when her milk is being drunk, this is really an offense against the Fathers'.

8.15.8 PS only

| | |
|---|------|
| tasmai sa druhyād ya idaṃ n _a āyad | (11) |
| yo nottiṣṭhād yo na vadātā asmin | (11) |
| brāhmaṇasya kilbiṣe nāthitasya | (11) |
| sodaryatām ichato brāhmaṇeṣu | (11) |

To him (to the oppressed Brahmin) he will be deceitful, who will not come here, who will not rise, will not come to an agreement about this, about the offense against an oppressed Brahmin who is seeking solidarity among the Brahmins.

JM: vadātā<...>hmaṇasya • sa druhyād] sadṛhyād Or, taddruhyād K ya idaṃ] Or, dīdaṃ K nottiṣṭhād] Or, notiṣṭhād K na vadātā asmin] Or, nojātāsmi K kilbiṣe] Or, kilviṣam K sodaryatām] Ku V/126 [Ma Mā] K, sodary{ā}atām JM ichato] Or, íschato K brāhmaṇeṣu] Or, vrāhmaṇeṣu K

b. The cadence is wrong. It is conceivable that the original text had *vadāta asmin* with a more archaic subjunctive form (*vadāte*). For the meaning of *vad* in the middle ('to converse, consult, come to an agreement', later maybe 'to (re)claim') see GOTÖ 1987: 282. Cf. further ṚV 10.109.4: *devā etāsyaṃ avadanta pūrvē saptaṛṣāyās tāpase yé niṣedúḥ | bhīmā jāyā brāhmaṇāsyópanītā durdhām dadhāti paramé vyòman* "Die Götter, die sieben Ṛṣi's, die sich zur Kasteiung niedergesetzt hatten, besprachen sich vormals über diese: Furchtbar wird des Brahmanen Weib, wenn es von einem anderen heimgeführt wird; es schafft Unordnung im höchsten Himmel" (GELDNER). The author of the PS hymn clearly summons the Brahmins to do the same.

d. *sodaryatā-* is a hapax.

8.15.9 PS only

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ut *tiṣṭhata brāhmaṇāḥ saṃ vadadhvaṃ | (11) |
| jītaṃ yācāmi punar aitu sarvam | (11) |
| indrā _a gnī viśve devās | (8) |
| te me jītaṃ punar ā vartayantu | (11) |

O Brahmins, rise, come to an agreement: “I ask for [returning] what has been scathed. Let it come back whole again. Let Indra and Agni, the All-Gods bring back to me again what has been scathed.”

JM: te me<10> • ut *tiṣṭhata brāhmaṇāḥ] uttiṣṭhadbrāhmaṇāḥ Or, uttiṣṭhadvrāhmaṇās K vadhvaṃ] Or, vidadhvaṃ K yācāmi] Ku JM, yācāmi(→ ma) Ma, yācāma V/126 [Mā], yācāmi K sarvaṃ |] Or, sarvaṃ K [[om. |, but note °ṃ i°]] indrāgnī] Ku [Ma Mā] K, indrāgni JM, indrāgn{i}ī V/126 jītaṃ] V/126 [Ma Mā], jī{t·}taṃ Ku, jītaṃ K vartayantu ||] varttayantu || Or, vardhayantu Z K

BHATTACHARYA edits *uttiṣṭhad* and *yācāma*.

a. In the present context, I do not understand the form *uttiṣṭhad*, which the mss. transmit unanimously. The proposed emendation yields better metre.

b. For the meaning of *jīta-* (both ‘what is scathed’ and ‘who is scathed’), cf. ŚS 12.5.57ab (= PS 16.146.7ab) *ādāya jītāṃ jītāya lokè ’múṣmin prā yachasi* ‘Taking to thyself what is scathed for him who is scathed, thou presentest [it to him] in yonder world’ (WHITNEY).

The reading *yācāma* (1pl. subj.) found in V/126 Mā (and Ma, *post correctionem*) is also theoretically possible: it would mean that the direct speech of the Brahmins begins with *punar aitu sarvaṃ*. However, *me* in pāda d pleads for the adopted reading.

8.15.10 PS only

| | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| sa dīrgham āyusḥ kṛṇute | (8) |
| sa prajāyai cikitsati | (8) |
| yo brāhmaṇasya brāhmaṇo | (8) |
| hūto †anveti† kilbiṣe | (8) |

He makes his own life long, he takes care for his progeny, who, being a Brahmin, speaks (?) at the offense against a Brahmin, when called upon [to do so].

āyusḥ kṛṇute] Or, āyusḥkṛṇoti K sa prajāyai] Or, suprajāye K cikitsati] Ku JM V/126 [Mā], cikicha(→ tsa)ti Ma, jigiśchati K hūto] Or, huto K †anveti†] Ku JM V/126 [Ma], anyeti Mā, nnatu K kilbiṣe] Or, kilviṣe K

d. *anveti* or *anvetu* is most probably the authentic reading of the archetype, but the verb is always transitive and does not suit the context. I would propose to emend the text to **vadati* (cf. 11d and ṚV 10.109.1, discussed in the introduction) and assume that *anveti* is due to perseveration from passages like PS 9.24.6cd *amaiva puṇyam astu no atrn* (lege: *attrn*) *anv eti* (or: *etu*) *kilbiṣam* ‘let it be propitious for us at home, the offense goes/may go to the Devourers (name of the demons)’, PS 20.23.9d *yuṣmān anv etu kilbiṣam* ‘let the offense go to you’.

8.15.11 PS only

| | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| nāsyā prajāṃ śarvo hanti | (8) |
| na rudro hanti nāśaniḥ | (8) |

yó brāhmaṇásya brāhmaṇáh (8)
 satyám vádati kílbise || (8)

Neither does Śarva slay, nor does Rudra slay, nor [does] the thunderbolt [slay] the progeny of him, who, being a Brahmin, speaks the truth about the offense against a Brahmin.

JM: from satye to 13b avāyati | (inclusive) written *in margine* • nāṣaniḥ |] **Or**, nāṣani **Z K** |] **V/126** [**Ma Mā**] **K**, || **Ku** brāhmaṇásya] **Ku V/126**, brāhma(+ ṇa)sya **Ma**, brāhmasya **Mā**, brahmaṇásya **K** [[misprint Bar.: vrahmanásya]] brāhmaṇáh] **Ku V/126** [**Ma Mā**] **K** [[brāhmaṇah]], brāhmaṇa **JM** satyám vádati] satye vadati **Or**, satyámva(→ tyéva)dati **K** kílbise] **Ku V/126** [**Ma**], kilbiṣam **JM**, kiṣe **Mā**, kílvise **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits *satye*.

Accents are marked on the second hemistich in **K**, and on the first word of the next stanza. I have added the accent on *vádati*, and corrected *brāhmaṇáh*, which is incorrectly accented in the ms., without marking this word as an emendation. Cf. GRIFFITHS 2004: 60 (with n. 27) for another case of an accented mantra unique to PS.⁴ Cf. the Introduction to GRIFFITHS forthc., §2.1.1.4, for general information on the sporadic marking of accents in **K**.

a. Cf. PS 20.61.8ab *na tatra bhavo hanti na śarva iṣum asyati* 'There Bhava does not slay, nor does Śarva shoot an arrow, ...'.

8.15.12 PS only

tám somapītho juṣate (8)
 nṛcakṣā grāvabhiḥ saha | (8)
 yo brāhmaṇasyāstām hṛdaḥ (8)
 sūrya ivāpālupat tamaḥ || (8)

The drink of Soma, looking after men, together with the pressing-stones is pleased about him, who has removed a shot [arrow] from the Brahmin's heart as Sūrya [removes] the darkness.

tám] **Or**, tvám **K** somapītho] **K**, somapitho **Or** juṣate] **Or**, juguthe **K** nṛcakṣā] **Or**, nṛcakṣād **K** grāvabhiḥ] **JM** [**Ma**], grāmabhiḥ **Ku**, grāvabhi **V/126**, śrāvabhi **Mā**, grāvabhis **K** saha] **Ku V/126** [**Ma Mā**] **K**, saḥ **JM** |] **Or**, *om.* **K** brāhmaṇasyāstām] **Ku V/126** [**Ma Mā**], brāhmaṇasyāstām **JM**, brā[[*line*]]brāhmaṇasyāstām **K** hṛdaḥ] **Or**, hṛdas **K** sūrya ivāpālupat] sūrya ivāpālapat **Or**, sūryaivāpālupat **K** tamaḥ ||] **Or**, tamaḥ **K** [[*om.* |, but note °ḥ y°]]

BHATTACHARYA edits *brāhmaṇasyāstām*.

⁴By contrast with the mantra PS 1.65.4 edited there, the accentuation — although limited in extent — has been done with care here: *udātta* (vertical stroke above accented *akṣara*), *anudāttatara* (vertical stroke below preceding *akṣara*) and dependent *svarita* (dot below ensuing *akṣara*) are all duly marked.

a. Present VI *juṣate* is an innovation of the AV, arisen from the a-aor. *juṣa-* of the RV.

8.15.13 PS only

| | |
|---|--------|
| ya utthāya kilbiṣe brāhmaṇasya- | (11) |
| -annam ⁺ ichann avāyati | (8) |
| ubhe enaṃ dyāvāpṛthivī saṃ tapatām | (13/P) |
| athait _{uv} agatasya panthām 15 <i>anuvāka</i> 3 | (9/P) |

Who would rise at the offense against a Brahmin and go away, looking for food, let both Heaven and Earth scorch him, and let him go [along] the path of what is not gone (= Death).

JM: the marginal addition ends with *avāyati* 3; thereafter in line 3: {*syānnasītsannavāyati* |} • *kilbiṣe*] *kilviṣe* **K** *brāhmaṇasyānnam* ⁺*ichann*] *brāhmaṇasyānnasītsann* **Ku** **V/126** **Mā**, *brāhmaṇasyānnasīchann* **JM** [**Ma**], *brāhmaṇasyāṃnamaiśchaṃ* **K** *avāyati* |] **Or**, *avāyate* | **K** [[**Bar.**, **Bh.** omit |] *ubhe enaṃ*] **Ku** **JM** [**Ma** **Mā**], *ubhe ekaṃ* **V/126**, *utainaṃ* **K** *saṃ tapatām*] **V/126** [**Ma**], *saṃtapatām* **Ku**, *santapatām* **JM**, *saṃtapam* **Mā**, *santapatām* **K** *agatasya*] **Or**, *aktasya* **K** *panthām* || 15 || *anuvāka* 3 ||] *panthām* || ṛ 13 || 15 || a 3 || **Ku**, *panthām* || ṛ {·}12 || 15 || **JM**, *panthām* || 15 || ṛ (*sec. m.* ·) || a 3 || **V/126**, *panthām* Z 5 Z anu 3 Z **K**

BHATTACHARYA edits ^o*nnasīcchann*. Presumably, pādas **c** and **d** are prose.

d. The collocation *agatasya panthā-* is a standing expression in the AV, cf. ŚS 14.2.74c *tām vahantv āgatasyaṅnu pānthām* (~ PS 18.14.4c ... *ābhi panthām*) 'her let them carry along the road of what is not gone' (WHITNEY), ŚS 11.10.16f *candrāmā yutām āgatasya pānthām* 'let the moon put [them = the enemies] on the track of what is not gone' (WHITNEY). Cf. *ṛtasya panthāḥ* in 5d above.

References

Barret, Leroy Carr

1921 The Kashmirian Atharva-Veda, Book Eight. Edited with critical notes. In: JAOS 41, 265–289.

Bhattacharya, Dipak

1997 The Paippalāda-Saṃhitā of the Atharva-veda, critically edited from palmleaf manuscripts in the Oriya script discovered by Durgamohan Bhattacharyya and one Śāradā manuscript. Volume One, consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas. Calcutta.

Geldner, Karl Friedrich

1957 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.).

Gotō, Toshifumi

- 1987 Die „I. Präsensklasse“ im Vedischen. Untersuchung der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia. Wien.

Griffiths, Arlo

- 2004 Paippalāda Mantras in the Kauśikasūtra. In: A. Griffiths & J.E.M. Houben (eds.), *The Vedas. Texts, Language & Ritual* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten), 49–99.

forthc. *The Paippalādasamhitā of the Atharvaveda, Kāṇḍas 6 and 7. A New Edition with Translation and Commentary.*

Griffiths, Arlo & A.M. Lubotsky

- 2000–01 Paippalāda Samhitā 4.15. To heal an open fracture: with a plant. In: *Die Sprache* 42/1–2 [appeared 2003], 196–210.

Oldenberg, Hermann

- 1888 Über die Liedverfasser des Rigveda. Nebst Bemerkungen über die vedische Chronologie und über die Geschichte des Rituals. In: *ZDMG* 42, 199–247.

1967 *Kleine Schriften*, herausgegeben von Klaus L. Janert. Wiesbaden.