Cover Page

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/73909 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Selva, U.
Title: The Paippalādasaṃhitā of the Atharvaveda : a new critical edition of the three 'new' Anuvākas of Kāṇḍa 17 with English translation and commentary
Issue Date: 2019-06-11

PART I

Anuvāka 3

Against Sadānuvās

Introduction

The following chapter consists of a series of stanzas containing charms meant to repel female demons who haunt houses and threaten the well-being of pregnant women and their children.

In much of South Asia, childbirth has historically been characterised by what anthropologists since Dumont (1972) have called 'pollution'. In fact, up to this day, childbirth is considered by the Hindu, Muslim and Christian communities of South Asia as causing one of the worst kinds of pollution (Rozario & Samuel 2002b: 185; see also the papers collected in Rozario & Samuel 2002a).

As Rozario & Samuel (2002b: 183f.) point out, pollution requires the seclusion of the mother not only during childbirth, but also for several days after the delivery, until purity is restored by the appropriate rituals. In communities that are less exposed to modern urban values, it may be considered shameful for the mother to give birth in a public space, such as a hospital. For this reason, and also because of the male medical personnel's reluctance to expose themselves to the polluting presence of birthing women, childbirth mostly takes place at home. Women are attended to by female relatives and by traditional birth attendants, healers, or midwives, who are called *dai* in North India. The latter are women who generally come from a low-class or untouchable caste, and rarely have formal medical training. Their service consists precisely of taking on the risks of pollution.

Such customs, attitudes, and beliefs have been studied by sociologists and anthropologists, often within projects aimed at developing policies to fight the phenomenon of the devaluation of women who work as midwives, as well as finding better ways to provide proper biomedical care to birthing women.

The attitudes and beliefs described above clearly arose in pre-modern societies, when childbirth was an even riskier event than now, and mother and child mortality rate was high. The high frequency of deaths and illnesses connected with childbirth were interpreted as manifestations of attacks on the part of evil spirits.

This is consistent with the Vedic belief according to which diseases in general are not seen as problems with physiological origins, as in modern Western medicine, nor as an imbalance of humours, as in the later Āyurveda medicine, but rather as caused by external demonic forces that penetrate the body of their victim from the outside (Zysk 1985: 8). This penetration (*ā-viś-*, *saṃ-kram-*, *upa-sṛj-*; see Das 2000a) could happen not only by means of physical contact, but also through seeing and hearing (Das 2003a: 37; Das 2000a: 68-69)—hence, perhaps, the numerous epithets in our hymn that describe the demonesses' ugly and fearsome appearance, as well as their noises. However, the phenomenon of contagion was mainly conceived as an act of seizing (*grah-*; see Das 2000: 65, 72; Emmerick 1993: 84ff.): "Disease itself was regarded in the Indo-Iranian period as being the manifestation of a supernatural entity, whose seizure of the person constitutes the notion of disease" (Emmerick 1993: 91).

Thus, during pregnancy and the days (though in some cases also months or years) following the delivery, the mothers and their children were thought to be highly susceptible to being attacked by evil spirits, in particular female demonesses.

Some of these demonesses came to be deified as child-protecting goddesses, and became the object of widespread worship. A famous case is the ancient Buddhist goddess Hāritī, whom the Pāli Canon and various Buddhist sources characterise as a child-eating demoness whom the Buddha converted into a child-protecting goddess. Her cult, attested all across North India—from Gandhāra

and Mathura in the first century BCE, to 11th c. Odisha (as evinced by her depiction at the Ratnagiri Buddhist complex)—spread alongside Buddhism throughout South and Southeast Asia, China and Japan, and survives today in Nepal and Bali (Samuel 2002; Strong 1992; deCaroli 2004). Her brahmanical equivalent, the ancient goddess Ṣaṣṭhī, whose *vāhana* is a black cat, is worshipped to this day as a protector of children and women by both Hindu and Muslim communities in much of North India, where she also bears the name of Bemātā, Baimātā, or Behamātā (Rozario & Samuel 2002b: 188; Samuel 2002; Samuel 2008: 248; Gadon 1997; Chawla 1994). Her original demonic nature is betrayed by the fact that popular NIA words for pollution caused by childbirth, such as Hindī *chaṭhī*, Bengali *chodi* or *chutti* (in Bengal, the rituals of purification that follow childbirth are called *chodi tula*, 'removal of pollution'), are actually derived from her Sanskrit name, Ṣaṣṭhī (Rozario & Samuel 2002b: 187-188). Her Bengali equivalent, the snake goddess Manasā, has an ambivalent character as well, being both a protector of children as well as a threatening patron of snakes (Samuel 1997: 3, 2002: 2).

These deities have traditionally been grouped together into sets of 'mother goddesses' (Kosambi 1960; Samuel 2008: 248), together with other disease-causing folk goddesses, such as Śītalā, the goddess of smallpox and cholera (Samuel 2008: 248, Samuel 2002: 2; Auboyer & de Mallman 1950; Dimock 1982; Ferrari 2009, 2015), and her South Indian equivalent Mariamman (Samuel 2008: 248). In medical texts as well as in mythological narratives, they are often treated as 'seizing' deities, and mentioned beside the planets (*graha*-), which are also supposed to affect the health and behaviour of people by 'grabbing' them with their influence (Samuel 2008: 249; Wujastyk 1997: 4).

Samuel (2008: 229ff.) has treated these deities and demonesses while investigating the origin of the Tantric Śakta wild goddesses, which he believes can be traced back either to goddesses of local folklore, the so-called *yakṣiṇīs*, or to the *ḍakiṇīs* who accompanied *kāpālika* and *bhairava* Śaivite ascetics, which he in turn correctly traces back to a Vrātya background. These ascetics seem to have inherited their Vrātya predecessors' privileged connection with the world of the dead, and as such they have specialised in dealing with the most inauspicious and polluting aspects of human life: as the male ascetics would attend to cremation grounds, their female counterparts most likely dealt with childbirth and illnesses, acting as healers and midwives. Perhaps further research on the ritual role of the women who would accompany the Indo-European *Männerbündler* and the Indian Vrātyas might shed light on later female Śaiva and Tantra figures. Here we broach the realm of the marginalised, the popular, the demoniac, a realm to which both the Vrātya warrior, the Atharvavedic healer, and the Śaivite ascetic belong. The Atharvaveda is the privileged *locus* in which the beliefs and practices of this marginal, popular, unorthodox world come to be re-elaborated into the brahmanical orthodoxy.

Samuel's (2008: 249) opinion that "it is not possible at present to say when the idea of female disease/demons arose, though if it were significant in the Vedic period one would expect more reference to it in sources such as the Atharvaveda, which is very concerned with countering diseases of all kind"[1] is certainly an understatement of the Vedic evidence. We may mention the Vedic Grāhi, 'seizure', another female disease-demon first attested in RV 10.161.1 (~ ŚS 3.11.1, 8.1.20), *muñcā́mi tvā havíṣā jīvanāya kám ajñātayakṣmā́d utá rājayakṣmā́t | grā́hir jagrā́ha yádi vaitád enaṃ tásyā indrāgnī prá mumuktam enam*, "I release you, with an oblation, to living, from the unknown disease, from the kingly disease. Or if a Grabber has truly grabbed him in this way, from her, o Indra and Agni, release him" (J-B). This demoness is frequently mentioned in the AV: ŚS 2.9.1; 2.10.6,8 (~ PS 2.3.4,5); 3.2.5; 6.112-113; 8.2.12 (~ PS 16.4.2); 12.2.39; 12.3.18; 16.5.1; 16.7.1; 19.45.5; and PS 1.62.1; 5.17.6; 5.21.2; 15.4.5; 16.46.1; 16.48.

As for the child-threatening demonesses that are the topic of our chapter, they are often

---

1 Samuel (*ibid.*) mentions Richard Gombrich's suggestion that the belief in these demonesses may have become more widespread with increasing urbanisation if, as it is presumable, this implied an increase in the incidence of epidemics.

grouped under the common name of Sadānuvās (mostly spelled Sadānvās). We first find them mentioned in RV 10.155:

> 1. You one-eyed, deformed demoness, go to the mountain—you Sadānvā. With the warriors of Śirimbiṭha, with them we banish you.
> 2. She is banished from here, banished from yonder, having assailed all fetuses. Go at the demoness, o sharp-horned Brahmaṇaspati, and gore her.
> 3. That piece of wood over there that floats to the farther shore of the river with no man at the helm, grab hold of that, you with your evil jaws: with it go in the farther distance.
> 4. When you women with rusty "boxes" [=genitals], leaning forward, beat your breast, slain were all the rivals of lndra—with their ejaculations ["spurts"] (dissipated like) bubbles.
> 5. These (men) here have led the cow around; they have taken the fire around. They have made themselves fame among the gods. Who will venture against them? (J-B)[2].

These demonesses are the main addressees of a good number of AV hymns, namely ŚS 2.14 (~ PS 2.4), PS 1.36, 5.1, 5.9, 6.8, 10.1 and our PS 17.12–15, which is the only hymn that also addresses them as Bhaṇvās. A class of a similar kind of male demons, called Kaṇvas, is addressed in ŚS 2.25 ~ PS 4.13. Frequently, a female demoness called Arāyī is mentioned (a male Arāya also exists). All these hymns contain charms against miscarriage and the dangers connected with pregnancy. Other AV hymns with similar themes may be compared, in which similar demons and demonesses are found: ŚS 8.6 (~ PS 16.79–80, To guard a pregnant woman from demons), PS 6.14 (Against noxious creatures), 7.3 (Against creatures that threaten offspring), 7.11 (For safe pregnancy with bdellium), 7.13 (Against dog accompanied Apsarases). Sparse mentions of these demonesses may also be found in other hymns.[3] A short hymn of this kind also found its way into the RV, namely RV 10.162 (Against miscarriage), which we may quote in full:

> 1. In concert with a sacred formulation let Agni, demon-smasher, repel from here whatever evil-named affliction lies on your embryo, in your womb.
> 2. Whatever evil-named affliction lies on your embryo, in your womb, Agni, along with a sacred formulation, has banished the flesh-eater.
> 3. Who smites your (embryo) as it flies, when it is emplanted, as it squirms, who intends to smite your (embryo) when it is just born, that one we banish from here.
> 4. Who pries apart your thighs, lies between the married couple, who licks within your womb, that one we banish from here.
> 5. Who, having become brother, husband, lover, goes down on you, who intends to smite your offspring, that one we banish from here.
> 6. Who, having stupefied you with sleep, with darkness, goes down on you, who intends to smite your offspring, that one we banish from here (J-B)[4].

---

2 RV10.155, *árāyi kā́ṇe víkaṭe giríṃ gacha sadānve | śirímbiṭhasya sátvabhis tébhiṣ ṭvā cātayāmasi || 1 || cattó itáś cattā́mútaḥ sárvā bhrūṇā́ny ārúṣī | arāyyàm brahmaṇas pate, tī́kṣṇaśṛ́ṅgodṛṣánn ihi || 2 || adó yád dā́ru plávate síndhoḥ pāré apúruṣám | tád ā́ rabhasva durhaṇo téna gacha parastarám || 3 || yád dha prā́cīr ájagantóro maṇḍūradhānikī́ḥ | hatā́ índrasya śátravaḥ sárve budbudáyāśavaḥ || 4 || párīmé gā́m aneṣata páry agním ahṛṣata | devéṣv akrata śrávaḥ ká imā́m̐ ā́ dadharṣati ||*

3 On similar themes, the following hymns may also be mentioned: ŚS 2.13 (For long life of an infant; cf. ŚS 2.28); ŚS 1.11 (For successful childbirth), with sparse parallels in PS; ŚS 6.81 (~ PS 19.17.1–3, For successful pregnancy: with an amulet); and ŚS 6.110 (For a child born at an unlucky time).

4 RV 10.162, *bráhmaṇāgníḥ saṃvidānó rakṣohā́ bādhatām itáḥ | ámīvā yás te gárbhaṃ durṇā́mā yónim āśáye || 1 || yás te gárbham ámīvā durṇā́mā yónim āśáye | agníṣ tám bráhmaṇā sahá níṣ kravyā́dam anīnaśat || 2 || yás te hánti patáyantaṃ niṣatsnúm yáḥ sarīṣṛpám | jātáṃ yás te jíghāṃsati tám itó nāśayāmasi || 3 || yás ta ūrū́ vihárāty antarā́ dámpatī śáye | yóniṃ yó antár āréḷhi tám itó nāśayāmasi || 4 || yás tvā bhrā́tā pátir bhūtvā́ jāró bhūtvā́ nipádyate | prajā́ṃ yás te jíghāṃsati tám itó nāśayāmasi || 5 || yás tvā svápnena támasā mohayitvā́ nipádyate | prajā́ṃ yás te jíghāṃsati tám itó nāśayāmasi || 6 ||*

Demonesses of the kind described above are found also in a number of later sources across Indian literary history, and have several Eurasian parallels, from the Greek Gello, Mormo, and Lamia, to the Slavic *kikimora*, and possibly the Irish *banshee*, etc. The closest parallel to the Indian demonesses is perhaps the Central Asian demoness Al, known in Armenia as *al*; in Georgia as *ali*; in Iran as *āl*; in Tajikistan and Afghanistan as *ol*, *hāl* and *xāl*; in Dardic as *halmasti*; and in Turkic languages as *almasti* or *albasti* (see ASATRIAN 2001; BENVENISTE 1960). These demonesses "mainly appear with sharp fangs, disheveled hair, copper claws, iron teeth, the tusks of a wild boar and sagging breasts, resembling a crone. They are also endowed with clay noses and fiery eyes. The favorite pursuit of the *al* is the theft of the lung, liver and heart of women in childbirth, new mothers (i.e., women having just given birth) or pregnant women, as well as the destruction of newly-formed embryos in the womb, resulting in miscarriage" (ASATRIAN 2001: 149)—a description that is largely valid also for our Sadānuvās.

As for later Indian sources, in an article in which he addresses the question of what women in ancient India were told was happening when they had miscarriages, WUJASTYK (1997: 3ff.) points out that, even though medical texts traditionally divide medical science into eight divisions, the divisions called Bhūtavidyā, 'science of evil spirits', and the Kaumārabhṛtya, 'science of nurturing children', are often treated together as a single topic, "since children and mothers are seen as being the people most vulnerable to demonic influence" (*ibid*. p. 4).

WUJASTYK (1997: 4) discusses evidence from the Suśrutasaṃhitā, which mentions nine such demons, called *graha*, many of which are feminine: Skanda, Skandāpasmāra, Śakunī, Revatī, Pūtanā, Andhapūtanā, Śītapūtanā, Mukhamaṇḍikā and Naigameṣa. A much later medieval text, the Kumāratantra of Rāvaṇa (a short compendium specifically dedicated to these demons, which seems to have been extremely influential, as translations have been found in Tamil, Tibetan, Chinese, Cambodian and Arabic), mentions 12 such demonesses. These are called 'little mothers' (*mātṛkās*): Nandā, Sunandā, Pūtanā, Mukhamaṇḍitikā, Kaṭapūtanā, Śakunikā, Śuṣkarevatī, Āryakā, Sūtikā, Nirṛtā, Pilipicchikā and Kāmukā (WUJASTYK 1997: 7–9). These texts provide a list of the symptoms that each demoness can cause to manifest in the child, and instructions on how they can be repelled. This is normally done by means of the moulding and venerating of an image, fumigation and, most importantly for us, chanting mantras (WUJASTYK 1997: 8–9). A similar list, comprising names, symptoms, and treatments, is found in Agnipurāṇa 299 (see GANGADHARAN 1984–87, vol. 3, p. 820ff.): here we find 39 names of demonesses who may attack the child during the first ten days after birth, then during the first 12 months, then during the first 17 years of life.[5]

In the article quoted above, WUJASTYK (1997: 10ff.) also mentions a third text, the Kāśyapasaṃhitā (7th c. AD?), which contains a chapter dedicated to one of these demonesses, Revatī, who is the protagonist of an interesting myth: during the battle between gods and demons, she sides with the gods, but notices that the demons killed are reborn as human and animal embryos. Therefore, she transforms herself into a miscarriage-causing goddess, Jātahāriṇī, 'she who takes away what has been born', or 'Childsnatcher' in Wujastyk's fitting rendering. The text explicitly maintains that whenever a miscarriage occurs, it is because the embryo was actually a former demon, and that miscarriages happen to bad women. We find no such moral implications in the Atharvaveda, of course.

The AV hymns dedicated to these demonesses preserve many similar names and epithets,

---

5   The names, according to Gangadharan's translation, are the following: 1st day, Pāpinī; 2nd day, Bhīṣaṇī; 3rd day, Ghaṇṭālī; 4th day, Kākolī; 5th day, Haṃsādhikā; 6th day, Phaṭkārī; 7th day, Muktakeśī; 8th day, Śrīdaṇḍī; 9th day, Ūrdhvagrāhī; 10th day, Rodanī; 1st month, Pūtanā; 2nd month, Mukuṭā; 3rd month, Gomukhī; 4th month, Piṅgalā; 5th month, Lalanā; 6th month, Paṅkajā; 7th month, Nirāharā; 9th month, Kumbhakarṇī; 10th month, Tāpasī; 11th months, Rākṣasī; 12th month, Cañcalā; 2nd year, Yātanā; 3rd year, Rodanī; 4th year, Caṭakā; 5th year, Cañcalā; 6th years, Dhāvanī; 7th year, Yamunā; 8th year, Jātadevā; 9th year, Kālā; 10th year, Kalahaṃsī; 11th year, Devadūtī; 12th year, Balikā; 13th year, Vāyavī; 14th year, Yakṣiṇī; 15th year, Muṇḍikā; 16th year, Vānarī; 17th year, Gandhavatī; then Pūtanā 'during the day' and Sukumārikā 'during the whole year'.

some of which are of rather difficult interpretation. Many feature the *ka*-suffix, which has long been described as belonging to a popular, colloquial register, and is especially typical of female speech (Jamison 2008 and 2009; Edgerton 1911; AiGr II.2 pp. 515–540 etc.). This suffix is employed as a diminutive in words for small animals, birds and insects, in some cases with an endearing nuance— but also, especially in the AV, with a pejorative nuance, in terms for vermin and other noxious creatures. The two functions can also be seen in how this suffix is used not only in personal names, nicknames, and terms of endearment, but also in names of demons, again with a derogatory, pejorative nuance. A famous example is the episode (RV 8.91.2) in which Apālā addresses Indra with the nickname *vīraká*-, both a fitting term of endearment in the mouth of a young girl, as well as a means to "verbally tame the formidable powers and sexual appetites of Indra and render him an approachable and non-threatening figure likely to aid a prepubescent girl" (Jamison 2008: 159).

A similar dynamic might be at play in our hymn. The domestic background of the Sadānuvā hymns is undeniable: note the frequent characterisation of the demonesses as haunting houses (*śālā*; see my comment on PS 17.12.10c below). Before being collected in the *saṃhitā* for the use of the Atharvan priests, these charms may have been used especially by women,[6] which would mean that we should be able to identify elements of colloquial female speech in these texts: quite conspicuous for instance is the use of *l*-variants as opposed to *r*-variants (e.g. 17.12.2 *ulukī* (**K**) vs. *urukī* (**O**); 17.12.9 *hvala* for *hvara;* 17.15.7 (**K** 17.15.6) *pulīkayā* for *purīkayā;* 17.15.8 *vicalantī* for *vicarantī*). Moreover, the charms are addressed to female demonesses, whose threatening power needs to be tamed. Thus, the use of the *ka*-suffix in the nicknames of demonesses might be explained as being due to female speech, or because these names are meant to have a pejorative nuance (cf. also variants like -*ākā*, e.g. *rodākā* in PS 17.12.8b; see AiGr II.2 §150), or because the speaker is trying to belittle the dangerous power of these evil spirits.

The reason for the importance afforded to the demons' names throughout Indian cultural history lies in the notion that knowing the (secret) name of a demon allows one to take control over them and thus repel them. This is also why the stanzas of our hymn largely consist of lists of such names and epithets (a telling epithet is *durṇāman*, 'ill-named'), and it also explains the poet's frequent claim to know the designations of the demonesses (*nāmadheyāni vidmasi*), as this implies that he can claim control over them.

As a general rule, the epithets found in our text describe supposed physical characteristics of the demonesses or highlight a particular aspect of their behaviour.

As far as their physical appearance is concerned, the epithets focus on the absence of typically human traits, on exaggerated, deformed features that convey a sense of danger, fear as well as repulsion:

1) absence of typically human traits: *anāsikā*, 'noseless/mouthless' (17.15.9c), *paruṣā*, 'pale like a dead person (?)' (17.13.2a);

2) exaggerated features, such as the ears: *karṇā*, 'long-eared' (17.12.2a); the hair: *keśinī*, 'long-haired' (17.12.2b), *dīrghakeśa*, 'long-haired' (17.12.7b), *vikeśī*, 'with dishevelled hair'

---

6 To this day, women perform special *vratas* or sacrifices to obtain domestic welfare (see Robinson 1985). These *vratas* are usually characterised by a four-part structure, consisting of a simple ritual (e.g. planting seeds in a consecrated vase to symbolise fertility), recitation of verses (often vernacular), the drawing of pictorial diagrams (to provide a seat for the invoked deity) and the recitation of a story about the meaning of the *vrata*. Traditionally, women are both the patrons and the performers of these *vratas* and sacrifices. Robinson (1985: 209) points out that "the traditional priestly disdain for *vratas* as a collection of trivial women's customs has recently given way to priestly appropriation of the practices. For example, during the 1960s, an increasing number of temple *purohits* (priests) at Calcutta's prominent Kalighat temple began to offer their services to women clients who wished to have any of several *vratas* performed in the temple setting for reasons of convenience and prestige. […] The modern arrangement is advantageous to temple priests in that they earn fees for their services as they do for other rites they perform at the temple." It is perhaps possible that the ancient Vedic charms against miscarriage witnessed a similar destiny before they were collected in the Atharvaveda.

(17.14.4a) (all also general characteristics of inhabitants of the wilderness); the teeth: *phāladatī*, 'ploughshare-toothed' (17.12.3a), *caturdaṃṣṭra* (m.), 'four-tusked' (17.12.7a), *udradantī*, 'otter-toothed' (17.15.9c)—all of these also portray the demons as dangerous devourers of humans (especially children; more on this below); the genitals (this is particularly relevant, as these demons target the reproductive abilities of people): thus we find the epithets *sthūlaśaṅkhā*, 'who has a large conch shell (i.e. vagina)' (17.13.4a) or *kumbhamuṣka* (m.) 'pot-testicled' (17.12.7a);

3) deformed features, e.g. their feet: *visṛkpadī*, 'duck-footed' (17.13.2b), *vṛṅktapadī*, 'with twisted feet' (17.15.9b);

4) repulsive features, e.g. their smell: *bastagandhā*, 'smelling like bucks' (17.12.5b), *alābugandhi*, 'smelling like bottle-gourds' (17.12.7c), *pāpagandhā*, 'who smells awful' (17.13.2a), cf. also 17.14.5ab;

5) fearsome features, e.g. their eyes: *bhīmacakṣu/us/as*(?), 'of terrible glances' (17.14.1a), *ghoracakṣu*, 'of fearsome glances' (17.14.4b);

6) as far general appearance, the demonesses might wear skin-clothes (*bastavāsinī*, 'wearing buckskin clothes' in 17.12.1d; cf. *dūrśe*, 'in a pelt', in 17.12.1b) or go around naked (*nagnā*, in 17.14.1b); in general they are *duḥsaṃkāśā*, 'of ugly appearance' (17.14.1a).

As far as behaviour is concerned, the main threat to humans originates in the Sadānuvās' habit of attacking embryos and children. In particular, they lick (*rih-, ā-rih-, pra-rih-*) the women's menstrual blood—the female equivalent of the male semen (see SLAJE 1995)—thus making women barren (see my comment on PS 17.14.8 below). This is the idea behind expressions like *antaḥpātre rerihati*, 'constantly licking in the inside bowl (i.e. the uterus or vagina)' (17.12.1a) or epithets like *asṛṅmukha* (m.), 'blood-faced' (17.12.7b) and *abhiśrayā*, 'who clings onto [women]' (17.14.2b, 3a); cf. also 17.12.4d. Hence also the hidden sexual reference in words like *āvapana*, 'trough (in which the demons chew food like mares and she-donkeys), i.e. the vagina' (cf. *antaḥpātra*, 'the inside bowl, i.e. the vagina' quoted above), or in pādas like 17.12.9bc (*bhitsv antar vane hvala upa vṛkṣeṣu śerate*, 'inside the furrows, in the woods, in the recess, they lie by the trees' (see my comment *ad loc*.). In general, these demonesses torment women, hence epithets like *prakhidā*, 'tormentor' (17.14.2) and *pracaṅkaśā*, 'constantly staring [at women]' (17.15.5c).

Secondly, these demonesses 'grope for' (*pra-mṛś-*) embryos and feed on them (see my comment on PS 17.14.8 and PS 17.13.8cd below). This is why we find the epithets *sūtikaiṣī*, 'seeking a woman who has recently given birth' (17.14.2d), or *śiśumākā*, 'who makes children scream' (17.15.8b). Accordingly they are frequently portrayed as feeding on raw flesh (the flesh of embryos and children): *āmādinī*, 'eater of raw flesh'; *krūrādinī*, 'eater of bloody flesh'; *anagnigandhyādinī*, 'eater of what does not smell of fire (i.e. is uncooked)' in 17.14.10ab; *kaṅkī*, 'a female carrion-eating stork' (17.14.2a); *prakhādinī*, 'devourer' (17.15.3b).

As such, they attack women and their children in their own environment, i.e. in their houses (*śālā, gṛha*): e.g. *kim u śālāsv *ichatha*, "what do you seek in [our] houses?" asks the poet in 17.14.10; in 17.13.10, a haunted house is purified by means of a Sādānuvā-killing (*sadānvāghnī*) herb; and in 17.12.10c, the demonesses seek shelter in houses after being frightened by a storm. Conversely, in 17.13.3, the exorcist repels them by stating that "there is no refuge" for them "here" (*na va ihāsti nyañcanam*), i.e. in the human settlement. In 17.13.8c, he drives the demonesses towards someone else's corral (*gṛham*); in 17.14.1, a demoness is repelled thanks to the household fire.

Often, it is stressed that the demonesses wander and look for prey at night: 17.12.4 (*naktam ichanti*); 17.14.2 (*caranti naktam*); 17.15.6 (*sāyaṃ … rātrīṃ prerate*).

Among their victims are not only children and women, but also sleeping people (17.12.4); a man walking down a path (17.14.5); the body of the deceased (17.14.6); and boys and elders (17.15.3). They can even damage a chariot (*rathabhañjanī*, 'the demoness who makes a chariot break', in 17.14.3c) and interfere with the distillation of the *surā* liquor (17.13.5–7; more on this below).

Very frequent are references to the demonesses' noisy behaviour. We find descriptions like *yāsāṃ jātāni krośanti*, 'whose breed shriek' (17.12.9a) and *yāsāṃ ghoṣaḥ saṃgatānāṃ vṛkānām iva gaṅganaḥ*, 'whose noise, when they come together, is like the howling of wolves' (17.15.5ab), as well as epithets like *vakmakā*, 'little bad mouth' (17.12.1); *kraku*, 'howling' (17.12.2b); *rudatī*, 'crying' (17.12.8b); *ajamāyu*, 'who bleats like a goat' (17.13.5); *achavākā*, 'who says "this way!"' (17.13.9a); *vanekṛku*, 'howling in the forest' (17.13.9b); *hasanā*, 'laughing' (17.13.9c); *kanikradā*, 'constantly neighing (/whining)' (17.13.9c); *pratiśrukā*, 'the one who responds [to the scream of a child(?)]'; (17.15.8b), *āvadantī*, 'who shouts' (17.15.10a); *nāmahūkā*, 'who calls names' (17.15.10a); and *vāvadākā*, 'the one who repeatedly utters sounds' (17.15.10a), but also *alpabhāṣā*, 'taciturn' (17.15.10a).

The demonesses often behave in a crazed way, as if out of control: *unmaditya* […] *śīrṣāṇy anyā anyāsāṃ vitāvantīr ivāsate*, 'having gone crazy […] they keep kind of *vi-tāv*-ing each other's heads' (17.14.4abcd); *āpatantīr vikṣiṇānā*, 'flying towards [here], striking death all around' (17.12.5).

Their behaviour is sometimes likened to that of animals: in 17.14.7, it is said that they are accustomed to chewing dried, ground [fodder] in a trough (i.e. the vagina) like mares [and] she-donkeys" (*vaḍavā gardabhīr iva*), and in 17.14.8 they lick the body of women like cows (*gāvaḥ … iva*).

The stanzas make frequent reference to the origins of the demonesses and what motives bring them to human settlements: in 17.15.7, it is said that "their cowherd alone knows where the Sadānuvās are born" (*gopā āsām eko veda yato jātāḥ sadānvās*); the following stanza, 17.15.8, calls them *caṇḍasya naptyaḥ*, 'granddaughter of Caṇḍa', hinting at a genealogy (cf. ŚS 2.14.2, in which they are called *magundyā duhitaraḥ*, 'daughters of Magundi'). A variety of sparse details is given in other stanzas: in 17.12.8, it is said that they are "born on a tuft of grass, on a tuft of hair" (*stambe jātā adhi bāle*; see my comment *ad loc.* for an interpretation); in 17.12.10, they are pushed to the settlement after having been frightened by a storm; in 17.15.6, they "emerge from their respective hideouts" (*yathāsthāmād … prerate*); 17.13.1 speaks of demonesses who arise from cultivated corn fields that are sown or dug up. Frequent are the references to the *śakadhūma*, 'the pile of cow dung' (*śakadhūmī* in 17.13.4c; cf. also 17.13.8) or the *khala*, 'the threshing floor' (cf. *khalājjātā* in 17.14.3), as places where the Sadānuvās are born and belong. It seems, in fact, that a variety of demons can arise from any typical item or place belonging to a typical Vedic rural settlement: this can be seen for instance in the list contained in PS 1.86.4 (Against the female demons called Kaṇvās): *yā tantiṣat khalasad yā ca goṣṭhe yā jātāḥ śakadhūme sabhāyām | prapāyāṃ jātā uta yāś ca bhitsu tāś cātayāmaḥ śivatā no astu ||*, "The [demoness] who is sitting on the rope [to fasten the cattle], the one who is sitting on the threshing floor, and the one who is in the cowshed, those who are born in the pile of cow dung, in the assembly hall, those born in the water reservoir, those in the furrows, whom we frighten away—Let there be benevolence towards us!" (my transl.). I discuss this further in my comment on 17.13.4c. Interestingly, it seems that the Sadānuvās can also attack as a consequence of one's Fathers' guilt (*pitṛyāt* in 17.14.9a). According to 17.15.4, these demonesses can arise both in the realm of the Asuras (*dāsīr asurāṇām* 'who are *dāsa* women of the race of the Asura demons), or be fashioned from the race of men (*manuṣyebhyaś ca yāḥ kṛtāḥ*)—a possible reference to man-made curses.

This brings us back to the idea that these demons, like any other (super)natural power, can be controlled. Taking control over them allows one to hurl them against an enemy in the form of a curse, as well as to repel them from one of their victims. Because, in the Vedic worldview, "disease" is nothing but the seizure of a victim on the part of a demon—as we have seen above—the process of healing is somewhat identical to that of an exorcism.

The above notions are rooted in what Das (1984: 234f; 2000: 70) has called a *magisches Weltbild*, a mode of looking at the world as wholly consisting of "powers" (i.e. with no distinction between living vs. non-living, corporeal vs. non-corporeal) in various states or forms, that can react

48

with each other as a consequence of imbalances or disturbances, out of their own volition or when forced to act, and that thus "penetrate" or "take control of" each other. "Since all actions, voluntary or involuntary, cause reactions, it is necessary to know all about such actions and reactions or at least to know which actions to avoid (so as not to cause unwanted reactions) or to do (so as to bring about desired reactions). […] We thus see that correct knowledge is might, as by means of it one can compel 'powers' or 'substances' to do as one wishes (these may of course also be coaxed, bribed, propitiated, begged etc. to act of their own free will […] but compulsion is more effective, though one can also bid them by means of a pact. […] Knowing something about a 'power' or 'substance' (especially something secret) gives one might over it, and also, because 'correct knowledge' itself is a 'power' or 'substance', [it gives one might] over 'truth' […]. This 'power' or 'substance' 'truth' seems to be able to compel all others, so that he who controls it properly controls all others too" (DAS 1984: 235). This explains the importance of mantras as a means to control these demons, and thus as a healing remedy for the diseases that they induce.

BENVENISTE (1945) believed to have identified a shared Indo-European medical doctrine in texts like Videvdāt 7.44 (which he compared to Pindar's third Pythian ode [40–45] and others), which speaks of a 'medicine of the plants' (*uruuarō.baēšaza-*), a 'medicine of the knife' (*karətō.baēšaza-*), and a 'medicine of the spells' (*mąθrō.baēšaza*). Thus, this doctrine would consist of a tripartite classification of illnesses and cures based on the tripartite structure of society: 1) consumption or exhaustion of the body is cured by beneficial potions or by the application of remedies prepared from herbs, i.e. by resorting to the science of the cultivators; 2) ulcers and wounds, spontaneous or caused by weapons, require incisions with the knife, surgery, i.e. resorting to the dexterity of the warriors/surgeons; 3) curses and possessions require treatment by means of charms, i.e. they require resorting to the wisdom of the magicians/priests.

Regardless of whether one believes in the reality of a tripartite principle structuring the society of the earliest Indo-European peoples, BENVENISTE's analysis has the merit of highlighting a number of mechanisms by which these ancient peoples conceived medicine: in line with the power of analogy and opposition—which governs the fact that herbs can both poison a healthy person as well as return vigour to a sick person, or that knives can both hurt if used as weapons as well as heal the flesh if used as surgical instruments—incantations can function both as curses or as healing exorcisms. Indeed, BENVENISTE himself points out that charms were also used to heal wounds and fractures or to stop a haemorrhage. Incantations, indeed, were the most powerful of remedies, as they directly address the demonic power that is causing the disease.

The above observations explain the importance of the stanzas contained in our hymn and the other Sadānuvā hymns as some of the highest forms of Vedic medical science. Due to their peculiar content, style, and purpose, these hymns can be considered as belonging to the categories of *strīkarmāṇi* (cf. BLOOMFIELD 1899 §53), as they pertain to women, and at the same time both *ābhicārikāni*, i.e. charms against demons (cf. BLOOMFIELD 1899 §52), as well as *bhaiṣajyāni*, i.e. charms to cure diseases (cf. BLOOMFIELD 1899 §50).

It is thus worth surveying the methods by which the Atharvavedic poet/priest, in his function of healer/exorcist, is able to repel the Sadānuvā demonesses and protect the threatened women and children.

1) The first concern of the Atharvavedic exorcist is completeness: the poet needs to make sure to address all the demonesses he aims to repel, without leaving any of them out. This is the sense of expressions such as *yati jātāni vas tati naśyatetaḥ sadānuvāḥ*, "As many sorts [that there are] of you, that many [of you] disappear from here!" (17.12.1gh, 17.13.9fg).

Accordingly, note the frequent use of the word *sarva*, 'all' (often next to *sākam*, 'all together, at once'), e.g. *sarvāsāṃ bhaṇvā vaḥ sākaṃ nāmadheyāni vidmasi*, "O Bhaṇvā demonesses, we know *all* your names *together*!" (17.12.1gh, 17.13.9fg); *asātāḥ sarvā vo brūmo*, "We pronounce you *all* "empty-handed"!" (17.12.3c); *durṇāmnīḥ sarvā santokā*, "*all* the ill-named ones together with their offspring" (17.12.8c, 9d, 10d); *indro vaḥ sarvāsāṃ sākaṃ garbhān āṇḍāni*

bhetsyati, "Indra is going to split the embryos, the eggs of you *all together*!" (17.13.3cd); *sarvā yantu ⁺kurūṭinīḥ*, "let *all* of them go [away] as docile (?) [cows]!" (17.15.1c); *sarvāś caṇḍasya naptyo nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ*, "We make *all* the granddaughters of Caṇḍa, the Sadānuvās, disappear!" (17.15.8de).

Similarly, all the possible places from which the demons might approach need to be taken into account. This is especially clear from the ablative *yathāsthāmād* and *viśvād* in 17.15.6: *yāni … yathāsthāmād yakṣāṇi prerate agniṣ *ṭā sarvā sāhantyo viśvād rakṣāṃsi sedhatu*, "[Those] Yakṣás who emerge each from their respective hideouts … Let the overpowering Agni repel them all, the *rákṣas* demons, from every place"; *viśvād* is also used in 17.15.3cd, *tā indro hantu vṛtrahā yo devo viśvād rakṣāṃsi sedhati*, "Let Indra, the slayer of Vṛtra, the god who repels demons away from everyone, slay them!"

Accordingly, when necessary, the Atharvavedic poet lists all the possible classes of the demons concerned: *yāḥ kumārīr yāḥ sthavirā yuvatīr yāḥ sadānvāḥ*, "Those Sadānuvās who are [either] little girls, elderly women, [or] young women" (17.15.1ab); *sadānvāḥ ⁺sādānveyān ⁺strīpuṃsāṁ ubhayān saha*, "The Sadānuvās, the descendants of the Sadānuvās, both the male and female ones, together" (17.12.6ab); *yāś ca dāsīr asurāṇām manuṣyebhyaś ca yāḥ kṛtāḥ | ubhayīs*, "Both those [demonesses] who are *dāsa* women of the race of the Asura demons, and those who have been [magically] created from the race of men" (17.15.4abc).

One remarkable stylistic trait of these stanzas is that they often feature epithets arranged in pairs, each epithet being either the opposite of or complementary to the other. This phenomenon too most certainly arises from the above-mentioned need for completeness: e.g. *rodākām rudatīṃ tvat*, "either the one who makes [children/women] cry, or the one who herself is crying" (17.12.8b); **duḥsaṃkāśe bhīmacakṣo*, "O one of ugly appearance (i.e. bad when you look at her), O one of terrible glances (i.e. bad when she looks at you)" (17.14.1); *prayachantīṃ pratigrahām* (17.15.5d); *śiśumākāṃ pratiśrukām*, "her who makes children scream, the one who responds [to the scream of a child]" (17.15.8b); *vāvadākām *alpabhāṣām*, "The one who repeatedly utters sounds, the taciturn one" (17.15.10a).

A similar desire to be absolutely sure of covering all possibilities surely lies behind the use of lists of synonyms: *yā dhānyāt sambhavanti kṣetrād ⁺uptād v ⁺arpitāt | kṛtād …*, "Those [demonesses] who arise from the corn field that is sown or dug up … cultivated" (17.13.1abc); *indro vaḥ … garbhān āṇḍāni bhetsyati*, "Indra … is going to split the embryos, the eggs of you" (17.13.3cd); *āmādinīḥ krūrādinīr anagnigandhyādinīḥ*, "O eaters of raw flesh, O eaters of bloody flesh, O eaters of what does not smell of fire (i.e. is uncooked)" (17.14.10). The means to repel the Sadānuvās also has to be complete; thus, in a stanza that uses fire to repel the demons, we find listed all forms of fire—*dhrājiṃ ⁺tviṣiṃ śucim agnim*, "The blaze, the flare, the glowing fire" (17.14.1)—as well as the people to be protected: *kumārān ekā sthavirān yā adanti ... tā indro ... sedhati*, "Those who eat boys and elders—Let Indra … slay them!"

2) Secondly, the exorcist may ask for help from a god. He may simply state that a god will harm the demons, or he may pray to the god so that the god may repel the demons. Thus, in 17.13.2cd, Indra is invoked as Śacīpati to drive away (*nir aja*, 2sg. impv.) the demonesses after striking them (*samarpayan*) with the *vajra*; in 17.13.3, the poet states that Indra is going to split (*bhetsyati*, 3sg. future) all the embryos and eggs of the Sadānuvās; in 17.13.4, the poet commands Indra to slay (*jahi*) and crush (*mṛṇīhi*) the demons with 2sg. imperatives; similarly, in 17.15.2, he commands Indra/Śakra in the form of Rudra, the shooter (*astā*), to hurl (*vi sṛja*, 2sg impv) his flare (*tviṣim*) at the demons and slay them (*hantu*, 3sg impv.) with the *vajra*, not to leave any remainder of them (*moc chiṣa*, *mā* + 2sg. aor. inj.) and to thresh (*phalīkuru*, 2sg. impv.) them. Indra Vṛtrahan is also invoked in 17.15.3 (*hantu*, 3sg. impv.), and is qualified as the god who repels demons (*yo devo viśvād rakṣāṃsi sedhati*).

Brahmaṇaspati is invoked in 17.14.4, in which the poet commands him to pierce the Sadānuvās [to drive them] away from the human embryos (*sadānvā barhmaṇaspate paro bhrūṇāny*

arpaya).

The god Agni is invoked in 17.14.1, so that the exorcist, speaking directly to the demoness, can say *nis *tvauṣāmi sadānve*, "I burn you completely, O Sadānuvā!" Agni Jātavedas is invoked in 17.14.5: *tā agniḥ sahatām ito jātavedāḥ sadānvāḥ*, "Let Agni Jātavedas vanquish them from here, the Sadānuvās." In 17.15.7, Agni is called 'overpowering' (*sāhantyaḥ*) and is invoked to repel (*sedhatu*) the Rakṣases.

3) It should be noted that, precisely because the Sadānuvās specifically aim at attacking children, the exorcist frequently executes analogical counter-attacks, aiming to harm the Sadānuvās' children. Alternatively, he makes sure to repel both the adult Sadānuvās and their children. This can be seen in the refrain at 17.12.8cd, 9de, 10de, *durṇāmnīḥ sarvāḥ santokā nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ*, "all the ill-named ones together with their offspring—We make the Sadānuvās disappear!"; the reference to *sadānvāḥ ⁺sādānveyān*, "The Sadānuvās, the descendant of the Sadānuvās" in 17.12.6a; and the threat at 17.13.3: *indro vaḥ sarvāsāṃ sākaṃ garbhān āṇḍāni bhetsyati ||*, "Indra is going to split the embryos, the eggs of you all together!".

4) The exorcist may repel the demoness simply with a statement of truth, i.e. by claiming to vanquish them, or by stating that their power is ineffectual: hence numerous refrains like *nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ*, "We make the Sadānuvās disappear" (17.12.2d, 12.8d, 12.9e, 12.10e, 13.4d, 13.5d, 13.7d, 14.7d, 15.5d, 15.8d, 15.9d, 15.10d ~ ŚS 2.14.1d); *tā ito nāśayāmasi*, "Them we make disappear from here!" (17.12.4f, 14.2e, 14.3e, 14.6e, 14.8e, 15.7e); and *durṇāmno nāśayāmasi*, "We make the ill-named ones disappear!" (17.12.7d). Along the same lines, compare statements like *asātāḥ sarvā vo brūmo*, "we pronounce you all 'empty-handed'!" (17.12.3), i.e., we magically make real the fact that you, Sadānuvās, have not made prey of any of our children. Similarly, the poet may describe his attack: *sahe sahasvān sahasā vi mṛdho hanmi rakṣasaḥ*, "I, strong with strength, overcome. One by one I strike the foes, the Rakṣases" (17.12.6cd). Statements like the above have a performative function: the exorcist repels the demons by saying that he is repelling them.

5) The exorcist may announce his action directly to the demoness: e.g. in 17.12.5cd, "I am going to stab you with a ritual knife like a sharp-horned bull" (*asinā totsyāmi tīkṣṇaśṛṅga iva ṛṣabhaḥ*); in 17.14.1, he claims: *nis *tvauṣāmi sadānve*, "I burn you completely, O Sadānuvā!". Thus, he ritually mimics their killing.

6) The exorcist can speak directly to the demons and command them to leave. Such is the case of the refrain *naśyatetaḥ sadānvāḥ*, "O Sadānuvās, disappear from here!" (17.12.1b, 17.13.9g, 17.12.3d, 17.13.1d). Similarly 17.13.3ab, *ut tiṣṭhata *nir dravata na va *ihāsti nyañcanam*, "Get up! Run away! There is no refuge for you here!"

7) He may command them with a 3rd person imperative: e.g. 17.13.8, *⁺apārogāḥ chakadhūmān vṛkṣāṇāṃ yantu satvaram | atho ⁺durhārdaso gṛhaṃ pra mṛśantv arāyyaḥ ||*, "Let them of the trees (?) quickly go away to [someone else's] healthy heaps of cow dung. Then, let the evil-hearted Arāyī́ demonesses lay hold of [their] corral!"; 17.15.4, *tāḥ parā yantu parāvataṃ navatiṃ nāvyā ⁺ati ||*, "Let them both go away into the distance beyond 90 deep rivers!"; or with a negative imperative, as in 17.14.1e, *dhūmaṃ mābhi pra *gāyi*, "Let her not advance towards [our] smoke [i.e. our fire]!".

8) He may ask rhetorical questions: *kim ichanty *abhiśrayāḥ*, "What are the clinging ones seeking?" (17.14.2b); *kim u śālāsv *ichatha*, "What do you seek in [our] houses?" (17.14.10f); *dhrājiṃ ⁺tviṣiṃ śucim agnim arāyi kim ihechase*, "O Arāyī, what are you seeking here? The blaze, the flare, the glowing fire?" (17.14.1cd)—implying that the demonesses should not bother staying around any longer.

9) He may employ a magical herb (*oṣadhi*), as in 17.13.10, *sahasvatīṃ pra harāmīmāṃ śālāṃ viṣāsahim | sadānvāghnīm oṣadhiṃ jaitrāyāchā vadāmasi ||*, "I bring forth into this house the one possessing strength, the conquering one. We welcome the Sadānuvā-killing herb for the sake of victory." This is of course a statement of truth with a performative function: the exorcist effectively employs the herb, as he states that he is employing it. Perhaps also the *muṣṭāgreṇa* in 17.14.6d is to

be interpreted in this way.

10) The most peculiar method employed to repel the Sadānuvās is perhaps that of resorting to the compelling force of a social norm. This is the case in 17.14.9 and 10. The former stanza describes Sadānuvās who arise because of the guilt of the victims' Fathers (*yāḥ pitr̥yāt saṃbhavanti*): these demonesses are qualified (somewhat euphemistically) as *indradānās*, 'gifts from Indra (?)', and the exorcist repels them by giving them back like a debt that has been paid (*apamityam ivābhr̥taṃ punas tā prati dadmasi*). By qualifying them as 'gifts from Indra', the exorcist means to generate the need for such debt to be paid back. Consequently, the exorcist returns the debt, i.e. the demonesses (presumably to Indra, who is often invoked as their destructor), and thus removes them from the victim. The conclusion of the transaction seems to guarantee that the demonesses will not come back to haunt the victim. The efficacy of such a method rests on the compelling power of the social norms that govern gift-giving and the extinction of debts.

Along similar lines, in 17.14.10, the exorcist commands the demonesses to ignore the living humans of the haunted settlement, and commands them instead to eat an exposed corpse (*amuṃ paretyoddhitaṃ śavam atta*) on the grounds that they are eaters of raw flesh, i.e. not eaters of living beings (*āmādinīḥ krūrādinīr anagnigandhyādinī*)—a statement of truth. However, the exorcist adds *sa vaḥ kevala ācāraḥ*, "That alone is your customary conduct." Thus, he is supporting his statement of truth by resorting to the compelling power of a social norm: the Sadānuvās ought to behave according to the traditional customary conduct that is proper to their social group (*ācāra*) (see my comment *ad loc*.).

The two stanzas mentioned above clearly constitute a pair: they come one after the other, and deal with a similar theme. This observation brings us to one last issue in need of discussion, namely that of the order of the stanzas. This does not appear to follow any overarching organisational principle. Quite certainly our anuvāka was not conceived as a single composition, but is rather a collection of charms used on a variety of occasions, and which were gathered together solely on the basis of their purpose: repelling the Sadānuvās.

However, we can frequently identify smaller groups of two or three stanzas associated with a single theme and which might indeed constitute a single composition. Besides the case illustrated above, another interesting case is that of 17.13.5–7. These three stanzas describe the Sadānuvās as they interfere with the production of the *surā* liquor. Specifically, the demonesses are said to make the various ingredients go bad, causing the resulting brew to be sour and eventually causing headache and abdominal pain to the drinkers. Notably, 17.13.6 and 7 also appear to be syntactically connected: the pronoun *yasya* in 17.13.6a probably refers to the drinker mentioned in 17.13.7, and *tasyāḥ* (f.) in 17.13.7 refers back to *surām* (f.) in 17.13.6e. It seems very likely that these stanzas formed a single composition.

Other small groups of stanzas may be identified, but they are in general less closely connected, and may simply have been placed next to each other on the basis of a shared theme or because of the presence of a particular linking element, a word, lexeme, or refrain contained in both stanzas. For instance, 17.12.8, 9 and 10 share the same pādas cd, with the refrain *durṇāmnīḥ sarvāḥ santokā nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ*, "all the ill-named ones together with their offspring—We make the Sadānuvās disappear!" Stanzas 17.13.2–4 all mention Indra: st. 2 mentions Śacīpati striking the demonesses with the *vajra;* st. 3 states that Indra is going to split the embryos, the eggs of the demonesses; and st.. 4 invokes Indra to slay and crush the demonesses. Both 17.14.1 and 2 contain the question *kim iṣ-: arāyi kim ihechase*, "O Arāyī, what are you seeking here?" (1d); *kim ichanty *abhiśrayāḥ*, "What are the clinging ones seeking?" (2b). At the same time, 17.14.2 and 3 share the refrain *tā ito nāśayāmasi*, "them we make disappear from here!". Both stanzas 17.14.5 and 6 contain the word *puruṣa-*, and may both in fact deal with connected themes: the birth of a man (5) and his death (6). Both 17.14.7 and 8 liken (with the particle *iva*) the Sadānuvās to animals: mares and she-donkeys (7) as wel as cows (8). We have already mentioned 17.14.9 and 10, which aim to repel the demons by means of social norms, but the immediately following stanza, 17.15.1, again

likens the demonesses to docile milch cows of good breed (⁺*kurūṭinīḥ kulīnā *dhenuḥ*), as if re-connecting it with the preceding stanzas 17.14.7–8. Again stanzas 17.15.2 and 3 are connected by the mention of Indra. Stanzas 17.15.7 and 8 first mention the Sadānuvās' cowherd (*gopā*), who alone knows where they are born (7), then qualify them as 'granddaughters of Caṇḍa' (8); thus both stanzas deal with their genealogy.

More linking elements may be found by a close reading of the stanzas, although just as many elements can be found to be shared by stanzas located at distant positions in the text, as well as by stanzas in other Sadānuvā hymns (in particular with ŚS 8.6 ~ PS 17.16.79–80). In fact, all the AV hymns dealing with similar demonesses or with the dangers of childbirth appear to share a common vocabulary, common phraseology, formulas, and refrains. It is my hope that the above-sketched analysis can guide the reader not only through the anuvāka treated here, but also through the related Vedic hymns.

Sūkta 12

17.12.1   **ab**: ~ ŚS 11.9.15cd; **c**: ŚS 11.9.16a; **efgh**: ~ PS 17.13.9defg; **h**: ~ PS 17.12.3d, 17.13.1d

a	antaḥpātre rerihati	8#	[– – – – | – ᴜ ᴜ ×]
b	*dūrśe durnihitaiṣiṇi |	8	[– – – ᴜ | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
c	uruṇḍe abhicaṅkrame	8	[ᴜ – ᴜ ᴜ | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
d	vakmake bastavāsini |	8	[– ᴜ – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
e	sarvāsāṃ bhaṇvā vaḥ sākaṃ	8#	[– – – – | – – – ×]
f	nāmadheyāni vidmasi |	8	[– ᴜ – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
g	*yati jātāni ⁺vas ⁺tati	8	[ᴜ ᴜ – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
h	naśyateḥ sadānᵤvāḥ ||	8	[– ᴜ – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]

O [demoness], constantly licking inside the inner bowl (i.e. the uterus or vagina), O [demoness], wearing a cloak, seeking what has been poorly hidden (i.e. the embryo in the mother's conspicuously prominent belly) / seeking what has been carelessly laid down (i.e. an unattended newborn); O Uruṇḍā, who constantly attacks; O little bad mouth, who wears buckskin clothes—O Bhaṇvā demonesses, we know all your names together! As many sorts [that there are] of you, that many [of you], O Sadānuvās, disappear from here!

N.B. **K** divides this stanza into two stanzas of four lines each. **K** then groups the Odisha st. 2 and 3 into one, numbered *Z 3 Z*. The Odisha division seems preferable, as both stanzas end in a command for the Sadānuvās to disappear. Also note that the end of Odisha st. 2 corresponds to the *prapāṭhaka* division, which is marked in the same locus in **K**.

---

antaḥpātre] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71 JM₃** antapātre **Mā** antaḥpātre **K**   • rerihati] **K** reruhati **O** • *dūrśe] dūḥśe **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀** duḥse **Mā JM₃ V71** duśce **K**   • durnihitaiṣiṇi \|] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** durvihitaiṣiṇi \| **Ji₄** tunnahiteṣiṇī (*leg.* R-V *vs.* ttannahiteṣiṇī *leg.* Bᴀʀʀᴇᴛ, Bʜᴀᴛᴛ.) \| **K**   • uruṇḍe] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ūruṇḍe **Ji₄** ulaṇḍe **V122** duraṇḍe **K** • abhicaṅkrame] **Pa꜀ V71** abhicaṃkrame **Ma Ja Ji₄ Mā JM₃** abhicaṃtrāme **V122** acaṅkrame **K** • vakmake] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** vakmaṃke **Pa꜀** vakṣamukha **K**   • bastavāsini] vastavāsini **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** vastavāsasi \|\| **Ji₄** vastavāsinīm, **K**   • \|] **Pa꜀ V71 JM₃** ([Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?) \|\| **V122 Ji₄ Z 1 Z K**   • sarvāsāṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃ V71** sarvā **Ji₄**   • bhaṇvā] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃ V71** bhaśvāṇvā **Ji₄**   • vaḥ sākaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** vatsākaṃ **K**   • nāmadheyāni] nāmadheẏāni **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** nāmadheyāni **JM₃**[7] namayeyāni **K**   • \|] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** ˺ **JM₃** \|\| **Ji₄**   • *yati jātāni] yadi jātani **[Ma] [Ja] V71 JM₃** yadi yātani **V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀** yadi jātoni **[Mā]** yāni jātāni **K**   • ⁺vas ⁺tati] varttati **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71 JM₃** varttanti **Mā** vasvabhi **K**   •

---

7   Here **JM₃** spells *namadheyāni* with the akṣara *yā*, not with the intervocalic *ẏā*.

naśyataḥ sadānvāḥ] **Ma Ja V122 JM₃** naśyateta sadānvāḥ **Pa_c Mā** nasyatetaḥ sadānvāḥ **Ji₄** naśyetetaḥ sadānvāḥ **V71** naśyatetasmākaṃ nāmayeyāni vidmasi | yāni jātāni vasv abhi naśyatetasmadānvā **K** • ‖] **Ma Ja Pa_c V71 JM₃** ‖⁴ **V122** ‖³ **Ji₄** | **Mā** Z 2 Z **K**

ŚS 11.9.15-16
śvànvatīr apsaráso rū́pakā utā́rbude |
antaḥpātré rérihatīṃ riśā́ṃ durṇihitaiṣíṇīm |
sárvās tā́ arbude tvám amítrebhyo dṛśé kurūdārā́ṃś ca prá darśaya ‖15‖
khaḍū́re 'dhicaṅkramā́ṃ khárvikāṃ kharvavāsínīm |
yá udārā́ antárhitā gandharvā́psarásaś ca yé sarpā́ itarajanā́ rákṣāṃsi ‖16‖

PS 17.13.9defg
sarvāsāṃ bhaṇvā vaḥ sākaṃ
nāmadheyāni vidmasi |
yati jātāni vas tati
naśyatetaḥ sadānvāḥ ‖

Bhattacharya writes pāda **b** as *duḥśe durnihitaiṣiṇi |*; he writes *vastavāsini* in pāda **d**, and *yati* jātāni vastati+* in pāda **g**. Note that Bhattacharya omits the daṇḍa after pāda **d**. He does not mention whether any of his mss. feature a raised number at the end of the stanza to indicate that the number of hemistichs should be three. Moreover, Bhattacharya's apparatus reads "*U. * abhicaṃkrame * * |*", but it is not clear whether this final daṇḍa belongs to the mss. (in which case it is not clear why he didn't adopt it—unless the omission is simply due to carelessness at the printing stage), or if it is a punctuation mark in Bhattacharya's apparatus (as is often the case). All my mss. feature a daṇḍa. **V122** ends the stanza with the raised numeral "4," indicating four hemistichs. Only **Ji₄** features the raised numeral "3", which would be consistent with Bhattacharya's choice. However, even this latter (and usually unreliable) ms. features a (double) daṇḍa after pāda **d** (it then omits the daṇḍa after *vidmasi*). In conclusion, I decide to adopt a daṇḍa after pāda **d**.

This stanza is aimed at repelling Sadānuva demonesses. The reciter first lists various names of demonesses (in the vocative case), then commands them to disappear. The logic behind this charm is based on the notion that the knowledge of someone's real (sometimes secret) name grants the reciter control over such person. It is precisely this notion that the reciter recalls by saying *sarvāsāṃ … vaḥ sākaṃ nāmadheyāni vidmasi*, 'we know all your names together'; he is confident that he can drive the Sadānuvās away, precisely because he knows their names and thus has power over them.

Note that of the eight pādas (4 + 4), only the first (pāda **a**) and fifth (pāda **e**) pādas have irregular cadences—certainly an intentional arrangement—and both start with a sequence of long syllables. Pāda **e** in particular contains only long syllables, perhaps a rhetorical device to further stress the reciter's claim to be able to overpower the demons by knowing every single one of their names.

a. The parallel at ŚS 11.9.15.c reads *antaḥpātré* with a single final accent, compelling us to regard it as one word, rather than a combination of *antár* plus the loc. of the noun *pā́tra-*.[8]

Wackernagel (AiGr II.1 §102eα p.258) lists *antaḥ-pātrá-* as a prepositonal Tatpuruṣa: when forming compunds of this category, the adverb *antár* can either mean 1) 'zwischen ...', e.g. *antar-deśá-*, 'zwischengegend' or 'the intermediate region of the compass' (cf. AV 4.40.8; i.e. a regular Karmadhāraya 'B that is A', 'a *deśa* that is *antár*'); or 2) 'innen ...', in which case the compounds mean 'the internal part of B', e.g. *antaḥ-pura-*, 'der innere Teil der Burg' or *antaḥ-pātrá-* 'der innere Raum eines Gefäßes'. Bloomfield's rendering, '(...licks) within the vessel', is based on the same interpretation. On the other hand, Whitney translates it as '(...licking) in the inner vessel', thus

---

8 Sāyaṇa's commentary on ŚS 11.9.15 features a different opinion; he reads two independent words: *pātre antaḥ madhye rerihatīṃ punaḥ-punar lihatīṃ.*

interpreting it as the locative of a Karmadhāraya compound meaning 'a vessel (*pắtra*) that is inside (*antár*)'.

Ultimately, both interpretations are grammatically possible.[9] However, Whitney's interpretation seems preferable to me, as the 'vessel that is inside' is undoubtedly the 'uterus' or the 'vagina'. Not only do we know that, in general, the Sadānuvās are a threat to women's reproductive ability, but we know from several other stanzas that the Sadānuvās specifically lick (*rih-*, also with various preverbs; see my comment on 17.14.8d below) the women's menstrual blood—which in the mind of the Vedic people was a kind of female semen (see SLAJE 1995)—thus making women barren. This must be the meaning of this pāda.

Theoretically, we could have expected an accusative *antaḥ-pātrám* '(...licking) the bowl that is inside' or '(licking) the inside of the bowl'. However, the root *lih-* can also occur with a loc. object (MW p.903,1), and at any rate the loc. may have been preferred in order to create a syntactical parallelism with pāda **b** (if this indeed contains a locative), or for other stylistic effect (all four initial words of the four initial pādas end in *-e*, loc. or voc., and the sequence *-re rerihati* appears as a double reduplication of the intensive!).

The form *rerihati* is the feminine vocative of an intensive active pres. ptc. *rerihat-* (f. *-at-ī*) from *rih-*, *réḷhi*. The form is well attested (3x already in RV) although a corresponding intensive present active is missing; only the intensive middle present *rerihyate* is attested, next to an intensive middle pres. ptc. *rerihāna-* (see SCHAEFER 1994: 174).

b. The second word of this pāda must be the feminine vocative of a demoness name. It can be interpreted as the feminine of a compound of *dur-nihita* and *esin-*; thus Bloomfield, 'her that seeks out what has been carelessly hidden' or Whitney, 'seeking what is ill-deposited'. These literal translations may acquire some sense if we interpret *durnihita-* as indicating the embryo, 'poorly hidden' inside the conspicuously prominent woman's womb, or perhaps the newborn 'carelessly put down' and unattended by the mother.[10]

As for the first word, the PS readings seem to require an emendation. The ŚS parallel reads *riśắm*.[11] The word *riśắ-* is a hapax. PW glosses it as 'die Rupfende, Zerrende' on the basis of the root *riś-* 'to tear, pluck', and MW as 'N. of a partic. small animal'.[12] If we accept that *riśắ-* is a 'plucking demoness' (Bloomfield translates it as "plucking sprite"), it is not inconceivable to regard the PS readings as the corruption of an original *riśé* (we expect a feminine vocative where the ŚS has feminine accusatives). We could explain the corruption as simply due to anticipation of the morpheme *dus-* from *durnihitaisini*. A stage at which *ri* became *ru* and favoured anticipation is also conceivable, but this common mistake (cf. pāda **a**: **K** *rerihati*, **O** *reruhati*) is likely connected with

---

9 On the basis of the unaccented PS text, one might be tempted to interpret our compound as the feminine vocative of a substantivised governing compound **antaḥpatrắ-*, i.e. 'she who is inside vessels'—one more demoness name in our list. Prepositional governing compounds (in which the first member is a preposition or an adverb, which governs the second member) are normally accented on the first member, unless the second member features an *-a-* or *-ya-*suffix, in which case the suffix is accented (e.g. *adhas-pad-á-*, 'under the feet', *prati-lomá-*, 'against the hair, reversed'). These compounds are normally adjectives, but can be substantivised: e.g. *upānasá-*, an adjective meaning 'being on/by a wagon', in RV 10.105.4 (MACDONELL 1910:175; cf. AiGr II.1 §48e p.111—yet, to be fair, both Geldner and J-B interpret it as a noun), but a noun meaning 'the space on a wagon' in ŚS 2.14.2. However, the final accentuation of the ŚS strongly contradicts this interpretation, as a vocative at the beginning of a pāda would have initial accentuation.

10 Sāyaṇa's gloss on ŚS 11.9.15, "*duṣṭanikṣiptam icchantīṃ*," is not particularly revealing.

11 Note that Sāyaṇa's commentary does not read *riśắm*, but *vaśắṃ*, acc. of *vaśắ-* f., 'cow'—and is in fact then glossed with "*gām.*"

12 A possibly connected lemma, *riśádas-*, is used in RV and AV as an epithet of the Ādityas or the Maruts (J-B comm. on RV 1.2.7), but its meaning is unclear. EWAia II 451 records two main interpretations: that of HOFFMANN (1976: 564 fn.16) as 'Speiserupfer', **riśá-adas-* "Speise rupfend (etwa im Sinne von 'wälerisch')" (cf. AiGr II 1 p.316f.), and of THIEME (1938: 157ff.) as *ri(<ari-)-*śādas* (cf. gr. κῆδος), 'Sorge für den Fremdling hegend', on the basis of an ethical interpretation of the role of the Gods, to whom the epithet is applied. Cf. also PINAULT 1999.

Odia recitation practice, whereas in our case, the error must have occurred in the course of the oral transmission preceding the PS archetype. However, such an *ex post* explanation is not a conclusive argument. Moreover, given that ŚS *riśā́m* is a hapax, it is worth looking for alternative solutions.

Bhattacharya suggests considering the word *dūrśá-* n. 'garment, cloak', of which our text would obviously feature a locative. This word is actually found in PS 5.9.7, a hymn against Sadānuvās: *yáś celaṃ vasata uta yā́ nu +dūrśaṃ*[13] *nīlaṃ piśaṅgam uta lohitaṃ yā́ḥ | yā́ garbhā́n pramŕ̥śanti ' sárvāḥ pāpī́r 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). It also appears in ŚS 4.7.6 (~ PS 2.1.5b) (Against poison): *pavā́stais tvā páry akrīṇan dūrśébhir*[14] *ajínair utá | prakrī́r asi tvám oṣadhé 'bhrikhāté ná rūrupaḥ ||*, "For covers (? *pavásta*) they bought thee, also for garments (? *dūrśá*), for goat-skins; purchasable (? *prakrī́*) art thou, O herb; spade-dug one, thou rackest not" (Whitney), "Für Decken (?) tauschten sie dich ein, für Kleidung und für Felle; getauscht bist du, Pflanze; mit Spaten Ausgegrabene, du wirst keine Schmerzen verursachen" (Zehnder). Zehnder (*ad loc*.) notes that BLOOMFIELD (1897: 378) had proposed an interpretation of this stanza based on considering the three items as worthless objects of trade. It is perhaps possible that they are mentioned because they have a connection with the wilderness (perhaps that's where the mentioned herb is procured), as is suggested by the only other attestation of *dūrśá-*, namely ŚS 8.6.11b (~ PS 16.80.1b) *yé kukúndhāḥ kukū́rabhāḥ kŕ̥ttīr dūrśā́ni*[15] *bíbhrati | klībā́ iva pranŕ̥tyanto váne yé kurváte ghóṣaṃ tā́n itó nāśayāmasi ||*, "The *kukúndhas*, the *kukū́rabhas*, that bear skins (*kŕ̥tti*), pelts (? *dūrśá*), dancing on like impotent men, that make a noise in the forest—them we make disappear from here" (Whitney).

Thus, the *dūrśá*, like other hides (*ajína, kŕ̥tti*), is the garment of beast-like demons[16] who inhabit the forest (*vána*) where eunuchs dance (*pra-nŕ̥t-*); in fact, this reference to impotency might be relevant to our text. Note that ŚS 8.6 is a collection of spells to guard a pregnant woman from demons, and features plenty of lexical and content similarities with our anuvāka. Therefore, Bhattacharya might have the right idea. Of course, what we diagnosed above as anticipation of the morpheme *dur-*, could just as well be deliberate alliteration, and we could read our pāda **b** as **dūrśe durnihitaiṣiṇi*. Thus the locative would translate as 'in a cloak', i.e. 'wearing a cloak', indicating that the demoness 'seeks what has been carelessly hidden / poorly laid down' is herself 'in a cloak', i.e. 'wearing a cloak'. Note that this is very much compatible with the image of the the buckskin-clothed demoness (*basta-vāsinī-*) mentioned in pāda **d**.[17]

c. The word *uruṇḍe* can be either a locative m. from *uruṇḍa-*, or a voc. f. of an unattested **uruṇḍā*. The masculine *úruṇḍa-* is attested at ŚS 8.6.15 (again the same hymn to guard pregnant women from demons), seemingly indicating a category of demons: *yéṣāṃ paścát prápadāni puráḥ pā́rṣṇīḥ puró múkhā | khalajā́ḥ śakadhūmajā́ úruṇḍā yé ca maṭmaṭā́ḥ kumbhámuṣkā*[18] *ayāśávaḥ |*

---

13 **K** reads *duṣaṃ*, Bhattacharya's **O** mss. *dūraśaṃ*; Lubotsky also reports **V/123** *dūraśaṃ* and **Ku1** *dūrasaṃ*.

14 ZEHNDER (1999: 24) records the following variants: *duruśebhir* **Ja1**, **Vā**; *durr̥śebhir* **Ma1**; *duruśyebhir* **Pa**; *duruṣebhir* **K**.

15 Note that the ŚS commentary has *dūṣyāni*. Bhattacharya's **O** mss. have *duruśāni*, **K** *mūriśāni*.

16 The sequence *kuku*, clearly onomatopoeic, indicates the sounds of various animals (cf. *kukkuṭa* 'cock', *kukura/kukkura* 'dog'). I wonder whether these demons, wearing animal skins and making animal sounds, have something to do with Vrātya animal transformations. Maybe the reference to dancing eunuchs can be understood in this sense: recall the Vrātya category of the *jyeṣṭhās*, who are said to be *śamanīcāmeḍhra* (FALK 1986: 52), 'whose penis hangs down', i.e. impotent, socially precluded from intercourse, or practising abstinence (see Appendix 1).

17 An alternative emendation could be **dūṣye*, the feminine vocative of the adjective *dūṣya-* 'vile', lit. 'to be corrupted', based on the causative stem *dūṣaya-*. The first attestations of this adjective are late, but the causative stem is already attested once in RV 7.104.9b and fairly frequent in the AV, thus the formation is perfectly possible. Alternatively, a vocative **dūṣe*, from *dū́ṣi-*, f. 'corrupting' (adj.), 'toxic substance' (noun), could also be considered—perhaps as a demoness name—or a dative infinitive **duṣe*, 'aiming to corrupt', based on the root *duṣ-*.

18 This word is also found in out text at PS 17.12.7a below.

tā́n asyā́ brahmaṇas pate pratībodhéna nāśaya ||, "Of whom the front-feet are behind, the heels in front, the faces in front, who are threshing-floor-born, dung-smoke-born, who are *úruṇḍas* and *maṭmaṭas*, pot-testicled, *ayāśús* (impotent?)—these from her, O brahmaṇaspati, do thou make disappear by attention (?*pratibodha*)" (Whitney). If the *uruṇḍa* is a demon, it seems more reasonable at first sight to read two vocatives in our pāda and translate "O Uruṇḍā, O [demoness] who attacks."[19]

d. The first word of this pāda is doubtful. The mss. are in disagreement: *vakmake* **O**, *vakṣamukha* **K**. The reading of **K** does not fit the metre, nor it would be easy to explain the ending -*a*. Moreover, there is no such stem as **vakṣa-*, only *vákṣas-*, 'breast, chest', but this does not appear as *vakṣa-* in composition (actually, no such compound is attested in Vedic), although a **vakṣas-mukha-* (**vakṣomukha-*), 'with her face on her chest', might sound like a plausible demoness name.[20]

The Odisha reading looks like the voc. f. of an otherwise unattested *vakmakā-*, seemingly formed from the word *vákman-* with a *ka*-suffix. Epithets for demons and demonesses featuring the *ka*-suffix are frequent, as this suffix is used both with a pejorative sense and in nicknames with the aim of belittling and taming a dangerous entity's power (see my introduction to this chapter). The word *vákman-* is also a hapax, attested in RV 10.132.2.[21] It presumably belongs to the root *vac-*, and thus means 'speech'. If we assume a pejorative meaning for the *ka*-suffix, *vakmakā-* might be '(a demoness) who speaks bad words', 'little bad mouth'.[22]

The form *bastavāsini* must be a f. sg. voc. from a compound *basta-vāsinī-*. The corresponding masculine *bastavāsín-* is only attested in ŚS 8.6.12 (To guard pregnant women from demons) (~ PS 16.80.3c): *yé sū́ryaṃ ná títikṣanta ātápantam amúṃ diváḥ | arā́yān bastavāsíno durgándhīṃl lóhitāsyān mákakān nāśayāmasi* ||"They who do not endure yonder sun, burning down from the sky, the niggards, buck-clothed, ill-smelling, red-mouthed, the *mákakas*, we make to disappear" (Whitney). A compound *bastābhivāsín-* (the comm. reads *bastāvivāsin-*) is also attested in ŚS 11.9.22 (To Arbudi; another hymn with many lexical similarities to our text), *yé ca dhī́rā yé*

---

19 I shall mention another possibility, although I prefer the solution outlined above. The ŚS parallel reads *khaḍū́re 'dhicaṅkramā́ṃ*, in which the second word, an acc. f., is syntactically connected with the rest of the stanza, while *khaḍū́re* appears to be a loc. sg. governed by it. The latter word is a hapax of obscure meaning (EWAia I p.443). Bloomfield translates 'mist' on the basis of Sāyaṇa's gloss, *dūrabhūtam kham khaduram ākāśe dūradeśe*; Whitney leaves it untranslated. Our anuvāka at PS 17.12.2c actually seems to feature a feminine *khaḍūrī-* (**khaḍūrīṃ*), but the context only suggests that it might be another name of a demoness. If PS *khaḍūrī* is a demoness, then ŚS *khaḍū́ra* could be a male demon. It is thus possible that the ŚS pāda means '[the demoness] that strides upon the male demon *khaḍū́ra*'. If this is the case, then, given the syntactic structure of pādas **ab** in our stanza, namely loc. + voc., I wonder whether we should actually take *uruṇḍe* as a loc. If there is a demoness who strides upon a *khaḍūra* demon, there might as well be a demoness attacking an *uruṇḍa* demon. After all, however, this solution seems less attractive to me. First of all, we expect our text to list demonesses who threaten children and women, rather than demonesses who threaten other demons. Secondly, if there exists a f. *khaḍūrī* demoness next to a m. *khaḍūra* demon, there might as well be a female **uruṇḍā* demoness next to a m. *uruṇḍa* demon. Third, in the ŚS parallel, the loc. *khaḍū́re* is certainly governed by the preverb *adhi* prefixed to (*a*)*dhicaṅkramā́ṃ*; in our text, however, the preverb *abhí* in *abhicaṅkrame* would rather call for an accusative. This suggests that the locative interpretation is less plausible.

20 Perhaps a **rakṣomukha* might also do, but there is little ground for such a conjecture.

21 Part of a hymn to Indra: RV 1.132.2, *svarjeṣé bhára āprásya vákmany uṣarbúdhaḥ svásminn áñjasi krāṇásya svásminn áñjasi | áhann índro yáthā vidé śīrṣṇā́-śīrṣṇopavā́cyaḥ | asmatrā́ te sadhryàk santu rātáyo bhadrā́ bhadrásya rātáyaḥ* ||, "At the match to win the sun, at the speech of the Propitiator, at the very anointing of the one who wakes at dawn [=Agni]—at the very anointing of the one being prepared [=soma]—on (that) day lndra is to be invoked by every head [=person], in the way that is known. Toward us only let your gifts be directed—the auspicious gifts of the auspicious one" (J-B).

22 Alternatively, we might perhaps conceive a corruption of *nagnaká-*; cf. ŚS 8.6.21 (from the hymn to guard a pregnant woman from demons), *pavīnasā́t taṅgalvā̀c chāyakā́d utá nágnakāt | prajā́yai pátye tvā piṅgáḥ pári pātu kimīdínaḥ* ||, "From the rim-nosed, the the *taṅgalvà*, the shady and naked, from the *kimīdín*, let the brown one protect thee about for progeny, for husband" (Whitney).

cádhīrāḥ párāñco badhiráś ca yé | tamasā́ yé ca tūpará átho bastābhivāsínaḥ | sárvāṃs tám arbude tvám amítrebhyo dŕ̥śé kurūdārā́ṃś ca prá darśaya ||, "Both they who are wise and they who are unwise, those going away and they who are deaf, they of darkness and they who are hornless (*tūpará*), likewise those that smell of (?) the goat—all those (m.), O Arbudi, do thou make our enemies to see, and do thou show forth specters" (Whitney). Compare also *bastagandhāḥ* at 17.12.5b below.

Bhattacharya spells *vasta°* with *v*. The Odisha mss. do not distinguish *b* and *v*, and **K** also points to *v*, both here and in the case of *bastagandha-* at 17.12.5b below. However, according to EWAia II p. 216, the older spelling of the word for 'buck' is *bastá-*, and such is the spelling of the only RV attestation at RV 1.161.13 (to the Ṛbhus), a rather obscure stanza: *suṣupvā́ṃsa ṛbhavas tád apṛchatā́gohya ká idáṃ no abūbudhat | śvā́nam bastó bodhayitā́ram abravīt saṃvatsará idám adyā́ vy àkhyata ||*, "After you slept, Ṛbhus, you asked this: "Who awakened us here, o Agohya?" The billy-goat [=the Sun?] said the dog [=the Moon?] was the awakener. Here today, after a year, you opened your eyes" (J-B). The same spelling is found in the ŚS, where this word only appears as the first member of the above-quoted compounds. Besides the above-quoted stanzas, the PS also has the following occurrence with initial *b*: PS 4.5.6a, *aśvasya ṛśyasya bastasya* (**K** *bhastasya*) *puruṣasya ca | ya ṛṣabhasya vājas tam asmai dehy oṣadhe ||*, "Of the horse, of the male antelope, of the buck and of the man, the vigour of the bull, give that to him, O herb!"

ef. As highlighted above, these two pādas reveal the logic behind the magical power of this verse. In fact, it is only because he knows the demonesses' names and epithets that the poet is able to impose his will on them and ultimately chase them away.

The word *bhaṇvā-* is only attested in this anuvāka. It appear to be the name of another class of female demons, if not simply an alternative name for the Sadānuvās.

g. The emendations in this pāda were proposed by Bhattacharya (if I correctly interpret his spelling *vastati+* as standing for *⁺vas ⁺tati*).

17.12.2 **d**: ~ PS 17.12.8d, 12.9e, 12.10e, 13.4d, 13.5d, 13.7d, 14.7d, 15.5d, 15.8d, 15.9d, 15.10d ~ ŚS 2.14.1d

a	*karṇāṃ *dr̥ṣadrathāsaham	8	[– – ᴜ – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
b	urukīṃ keśinīṃ krakum |	8	[ᴜ ᴜ – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
c	*khaḍūrīm ambarīṣᵢyaṃ	8	[ᴜ – – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
d	nāśayāmaḥ sadānᵤvāḥ || (*prapāṭhaka ||)	8	[– ᴜ – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]

The long-eared one, the one who draws a grindstone-chariot, the little wide one, the long-haired one, the howling one, the *khaḍūrī*, the *ambarīṣī*—we make the Sadānuvās disappear!

karṇāṃ][23] karṇā **K Mā**? karṇṇā **[Ma]**? **[Ja]**? **V122 Ji₄ Pa_c V71 JM₃** • *dr̥ṣadrathāsaham]* dr̥ṣadrathāmaham **[Ma] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c JM₃** dr̥ṣadrathāmahyam **Ja** dupadrathāmaham **Mā** duṣadrathāmaham **V71** dŕ̥ṣadratāmahām **K** • *urukīm]* **[O]** ulukīm **K** • *keśinīṃ krakuṃ]* **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** keśanīṃ kraku \|\| **Ji₄** keśinīṃ krakūṃ **K** • *khaḍūrīm]* khaḍurīm **[Ma] [Ja] Mā JM₃** kharurīṃ **V122 Ji₄ Pa_c V71** ṣaḍurim **K** • *ambarīṣyaṃ]* **[Ma]** aṃbarīṣvaṃ **Ja Mā V71 JM₃** ambarīṣvaṃ **V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** aṃbarhiṣyan **K** • *nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ]* nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ **[O]** nāśayāmas sadānvā **K** • \|\| *prapāṭhaka \|\|]* \|\| śrī \|\| viṣṇuḥ \|\| śrī \|\| **Ma Ja Mā** \|\| # \|\| **Pa_c JM₃** \|\| ### \|\| **V122** \|\| **Ji₄** \|\| (*space*) \|\| # \|\| **V71** Z om̐ nāśayāmas sadānvā Z om̐ **K**

_____

23 Bhattacharya's apparatus explicitly gives *karṇā* as the reading of **Mā** (it is silent about **Ja** and **Ma**). However, given that all my **O** mss. read *ṛṇṇā*, I suspect that Bhattacharya has ignored this particular (and very common) Odia spelling in this case.

Bhattacharya writes *karṇā dṛṣadrathāmaha murukī* in pāda **ab**, *khaḍurīm* in pāda **c**.

The label *prapāṭhaka*, 'lecture', indicates a textual division found consistently in both branches of the transmission. As such, it must go back to the archetype. See GRIFFITHS 2003b: 2ff., GRIFFITHS 2009: lxxii.

a. Given that—along the same lines as the previous stanza—pādas **b** and **c** contain demoness names, this time feminine accusatives, we would expect to find the same in pāda **a**. However, this proves very difficult without considering some emendations.

In a comment, Bhattacharya—who writes *karṇā* separately from *dṛṣadrathāmaha* and *murukī*—proposes to emend to **karṇāṃ* (I interpret this as the f. acc. of a demoness name *karṇā-*, 'the long-eared one'; cf. *karṇá-* 'long-eared', which is also the name of a Mahābhārata hero) or, alternatively, to interpret *karṇā* as an instrumental; he does not mention the possibility of reading an ablative *karṇād*. At any rate, neither option seems to yield much sense to me, and Bhattacharya's **karṇāṃ* seems the best guess, and requires the least heavy emendation.

The lightest possible intervention that could make the following part of the pāda intelligible is to emend **O** *°maham*, **K** *°mahām* to **saham*. The resulting text would read **dṛṣadrathāsaham*, the acc. sg. f. of a compound *dṛṣad-rathā-sah-*, a hapax. The compound *rathāsáh-* qualifies Vāyu's horses in RV 8.26.20, *yukṣvā́ hí tváṃ rathāsáhā*, "yoke the two that power the chariot" (J-B), "So schirre denn die beiden den Wagen bemeisternden (Rosse) an" (Geldner). SCARLATA (1999: 608) explains this epithet as stressing not so much the fact that the horses are able to draw a chariot, since the chariot is famously a very light vehicle, but rather that they are in control of it, skillful in handling it.[24]

The word *dṛṣád-*, f., 'millstone, grindstone',[25] is mostly used in metaphors describing Indra or Agni smashing evil beings: e.g. RV 7.104.22 (~ ŚS 8.4.22 ~ PS 16.11.2), *úlūkayātuṃ śuśulū́kayātuṃ jahí śváyātum utá kókayātum | suparṇáyātum utá gṛ́dhrayātuṃ dṛṣádeva prá mṛṇa rákṣa indra ||*, "The owl-sorcerer, the owlet-sorcerer—smash them, and the dog-sorcerer and the wolf-sorcerer, the eagle-sorcerer and the vulture-sorcerer. As if with a mill-stone, pulverize the demonic power, Indra" (J-B); and PS 5.3.8, *methiṣṭhā *agnir aghalas tviṣīmān krimīṇāṃ jātāni pra +dunotu sarvā | bṛhaspater +medine jātavedā adṛṣṭān hantu dṛṣadeva māṣān ||*, "Let Agni, standing at the cattle-shed, fearful, vehement, burn all species of worms. Let Jātavedas smash the unseen for Bṛhaspati's friend, like beans with a grind-stone" (Lubotsky).

The last example shows that the *dṛṣád* was an everyday object. We know from various sources that the Sadānuvās originate from various items belonging to the typical environment of a Vedic rural settlement. Particularly illustrative is PS 1.86.4[26] (Against the female demons called Kaṇvās): *yā tantiṣat khalasad yā ca goṣṭhe yā jātāḥ śakadhūme sabhāyām | prapāyāṃ jātā uta yāś ca bhitsu tāś cātayāmaḥ śivatā no astu ||*, "The [demoness] who is sitting on the rope [to fasten the cattle], the one who is sitting on the threshing floor, and the one who is in the cowshed, those who are born in the pile of cow dung, in the assembly hall, those born in the water reservoir, those in the furrows, whom we frighten away—let there be benevolence towards us!" (my transl.). Therefore, we can perhaps make sense of an epithet such as *dṛṣadrathāsah-* 'drawing a grindstone-chariot' by picturing female demons who draw a grindstone as horses would draw a chariot.[27]

---

24 SCARLATA further notes that the compound can also be interpreted as being built on an accusative relation, 'conquering the chariots', in the sense conveyed by RV 10.178.1ab, *yám ū ṣú vājínaṃ devájūtaṃ sahā́vānaṃ tarutā́ram ráthānām*, "This god-sped prizewinner, victorious overtaker of (other) chariots" (J-B); or on an instrumental relation, 'winning with a chariot', as conveyed by RV 6.75.7ab, *tīvrā́n ghóṣān kṛṇvate vṛ́ṣapāṇayo 'śvā ráthebhiḥ sahá vājáyantaḥ*, "They make their sharp cries—the bullish-hooved *horses* along with the chariots, as they seek the prize" (J-B) (cf. also RV 8.22.15).

25 In RV, this word also appears in the compound *dṛṣádvatī*, 'the one full of stones', the name of a river (RV 3.23.4c). In the PS we find the compound *dṛṣadpiṣṭā*, qualifying the *surā* liquor as 'ground with a grindstone' in PS 5.10.1b.

26 As regards this stanza, see my comments on PS 17.12.9b, 17.13.4c, and 17.14.3d below.

27 I fail to see any solution in taking *°rathām* as an acc. f. sg.. The following *aham* would not fit the syntax. One

b. The Odisha mss. preserve a from with *r*, namely *urukī̐m*, whereas **K** has *ulukī̐m* with *l*. The Kashmirian reading could be easily emended to **ulūkī̐m*, possibly 'the little owl-looking one', based on *úlūka-* 'owl'. According to PW and MW, an identical formation, Ulūkī, is found in the Harivaṃśa and Viṣṇupurāṇa as the name of a 'primordial owl'. This does not help us much, although it goes to show that the formation is plausible. Theoretically, we could also make sense of the Odisha reading if we consider *urukī-* as being based on *uru-* 'wide', thus meaning 'the little wide one'.[28] As far as the meaning is concerned, neither solution appears evidently more preferable than the other; therefore, I opt for the Odisha reading, as it does not require any emendation. Note, however, that **K** *ulukī̐m* could also be perfectly correct if we take it as an *l*-variant of *urukī-* in colloqual female speech.

The epithet *keśinī-*, 'the long-haired one', is the most transparent in the entire stanza.

The word *kraku-* is obscure. I have found a correspondance only in the name Kraku(c)chanda (also spelled Krakutsanda, Kakucchanda, Kakutsanda, and in Pali Kakusaṃdha), "the name of a former Buddha, almost invariably the third before Śākyamuni" (BHSD, p. 169). As this is probably just an unrelated assonance, we should consider *kraku-* a hapax. We obviously expect this word to be another feminine epithet. The ending *-um* could of course be f. acc. (cf. *dhenúm*, f. acc. of *dhenú-*). **K**'s reading, *krakūm*, if it is not a corruption, only makes the feminine gender more explicit. There does not seem to be any ground for preferring one variant over the other.

More relevant is *kṛku-* (or *vane-kṛku-*?), probably just a variant of our *kraku-*, in PS 17.13.9b below. Notably, this stanza contains a number of epithets that are all based on noises that the demonesses make. In fact, it is very likely that both words are onomatopoeic. We may perhaps compare RV *krákṣamāṇa-* 'howling', said of Indra in RV 8.76.11;[29] *avakrakṣín-* 'howling', said of Indra when likened to a bull in RV 8.1.2;[30] and *vanakrakṣá-* 'howling in the wood', said of the soma (possibly as a bull) bubbling in a wooden vessel in RV 9.108.7[31] (see also EWAia I p. 407). My

---

could consider a verb ending in *-mahe* or *mahai*—perhaps *arthāmahe* "we demand"? Theoretically, *ṛṣadrathā-*, 'she who pushes a chariot'(?), could be an intelligible epithet—compare *ṛṣad-gu-* 'he who pushes cattle' (Mbh), a proper name—but it does not sound so obviously suitable for a demoness. Perhaps *riṣad-rathā-*, 'destroying the chariot' (from *riṣ-*, intr. 'to get injured', but also tr. 'to hurt, destroy') would be more plausible. According to PW and MW, the name *ṛṣadgu* mentioned above also appears in the variant *ruṣadgu-* and *uṣadgu-* in late sources (note that a variation of this kind could be relevant to our case, as *ṛ* is pronounced and often spelled [ru] in Odia), but also as *ruśad-gu-*, built on *rúśant-* 'bright, white'; thus the meaning would be 'having white cattle'. Cf. also the proper name *uṣad-ratha-* (= *ṛṣad-ratha*, 'pushing a chariot'?) in the Viṣṇupurāṇa, next to *ruśad-ratha-*, 'having a shiny (*rúśant-*) chariot', the name of a prince in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. Going back to our text, note that whereas **O** reads °*ṛṣad*° with a retroflex, **K** has °*ṛśad*° with a palatal; confusion of the sibilants is a frequent phenomenon in both branches of the transmission. However, it seems even more unlikely that a demoness would be called **ruśadrathām*, 'her with a shiny chariot'. Semantically, one could imagine an unattested compound like *riśad-rathā-*, 'tearing(?) the chariot' (from *riś-/liś-* 'to tear, pluck'). Other similar sounding roots are *luṣ-/lūṣ-* 'to steal' (only mentioned in the Dhātupāṭha, however), or *ruṣ-*, which however is only intransitive in Vedic. The Dhātupāṭha also has a transitive *ruṣ-* (=*ruś*?) 'to hurt, kill'.

28 A stem *uruka-* is found at MS 1.5.11: 80,13, and is tentatively rendered by Amano as "Räumchen" (see AMANO 2009: 200 fn. 352).

29 RV 8.76.11, *ánu tvā ródasī ubhé krákṣamāṇam akṛpetām | índra yád dasyuhā́bhavaḥ ||*, "Both the world-halves yearned after you as you howled, Indra, when you became the smiter of the Dasyus" (J-B).

30 RV 8.1.2, *avakrakṣíṇaṃ vṛṣabháṃ yathājúraṃ gā́ṃ ná carṣaṇīsáham | vidvéṣaṇaṃ saṃvánanobhayaṃkarám mámhiṣṭham ubhayāvínam ||*, "Him, rumbling loudly like a bull, unaging, conquering territory as if (conquering) cow(s); making both: division by hate and unions by love—having it both ways, the most munificent one" (J-B).

31 RV 9.10.7–8, *ā́ sotā pári ṣiñcatā́śvaṃ ná stómam aptúraṃ rajastúram | vanakrakṣám udaprútam || sahásradhāraṃ vṛṣabhám payovṛ́dham priyáṃ devā́ya jánmane | ṛténa yā́ ṛtájāto vivāvṛdhé rā́jā devā́ ṛtám bṛhát ||* "Press it, sprinkle it around, as one sprinkles a horse—(the soma that is stoma, i.e.,) the praise song that crosses the waters, crosses the airy realms, that is howling in the wood and swimming in the waters. The bull

translation is just tentative.

c. The Odisha mss. read *khaḍurīm* with short *u*. This reading evokes the word *khaḍū́re*, with long *ū*, found in ŚS 11.9.16,[32] a stanza that we have quoted above as a parallel to PS 17.12.1. This ŚS stanza (together with ŚS 11.9.15)[33] is a charm containing a list of names of demons and demonesses, and is meant to be recited with the aim of teasing such demons out of their hideout in order to chase them away. The word *khaḍū́ra-* (see footnote 19 above and EWAia I, p.443), a hapax, however, is not necessarily a demon's name: in fact, it appears as a locative governed by a demoness name in the syntagm *khaḍū́re 'dhicaṅkramā́ṃ*, 'her (acc.) who strides upon the *khaḍū́ra*'. Bloomfield tentatively translates this as 'mist' on the basis of Sāyaṇa's gloss, *dūrabhūtaṃ khaṃ khaḍūram* (sic!) *ākāśe dūradeśe*, whereas Whitney refrained from translating it at all. Clearly, Sāyaṇa's is a folk etymology based on the interpretation of *khaḍū́ra* as *khá-*, 'cavity, vacuity, empty space, ether, sky', plus *dūrá-*, 'distance'. This, of course, leaves both the retroflex *ḍ* (note that Sāyaṇa reads a dental *d*) and the accentuation unexplained. Thus, to imagine a *khaḍūrī-*, a 'demoness of the mist' or 'of the distant space', would be rather far-fetched (although it would fit semantically with the following *ambarīṣī-*, if this means 'demoness of the atmosphere'—see below). A connection with *khaṇḍ-* 'to break' (cf. *khaḍga-* 'sword') is perhaps a better guess: the epithet *khaḍūrī-* would perhaps be suitable for some aggressive demoness. At any rate, the PS feminine and the ŚS locative must be connected. Thus, I write **khaḍūrīm*, correcting the short *u* with a long *ū*.

The word *ambarīṣyam* (to be scanned as five syllables) appears to be the f. acc. of a *vr̥kī́-* inflected *ambarīṣī-*. This is presumably a feminine of the noun *ambarīṣa-*, which appears to be a 'frying pan' used in a fire ritual at TS 5.1.9.4 (see KEITH 1914: 400), but also the proper name of a r̥ṣi, composer of RV 1.100 and 9.98 (see also EWAia I, p. 99). It is not clear whether the proper name is directly derived from the word for 'frying pan', in which case our epithet could mean 'she who looks like a frying pan', or whether both the word for 'frying pan' and the proper name are derived from *ámbara-*. The latter word occurs only in RV 8.8.14, *yán nāsatyā parāváti yád vā sthó ádhy ámbare | átaḥ sahásranirṇijā ráthenā́ yātam aśvinā ||*, "When, Nāsatyas, you are in the far distance or when upon the circumference [?], from there drive here with your chariot with its thousandfold raiment, o Aśvins" (J-B). Geldner translates more explicitly with "Himmelszelt" (see also the comment *ad loc.*). This interpretation is also adopted by Mayrhofer (EWAia I p. 99), who glosses the term with 'Luftraum, Himmel, Luftkreis, Luft'. Given the occurrence of *ámbare* next to *parāváti*, it would seem attractive to interpret *khaḍūrī-* and *ambarīṣī-* as expressing similar or related concepts—a 'demoness of (or from) the distant space' and a 'demoness of (or from) the atmosphere'—but we have seen that such an interpretation of *khaḍūrī-* is unwarranted. Rather, given that the Sadānuvās are notorious for threatening mothers and children, I cannot but wonder

---

of a thousand streams, growing strong through the milk, dear to the divine race, who born of truth through truth has grown strong as king, god, and lofty truth" (J-B).

32 Note that, interestingly, some of Whitney's mss. also read *ṣaḍū́re* (WITHNEY 1905: 654), which is comparable to the reading we find in **K**: *ṣaḍurim*.

33 I report the text here once more, with Bloomfield and Whitney's translations for ease of reference: ŚS 11.9.15–16, *śvànvatīr apsaráso rū́pakā utárbude | antaḥpātré rérihatīṃ riśā́ṃ durṇihitaiṣiṇīm | sárvās tā́ arbude tvám amítrebhyo dr̥śé kurūdārā́ṃś ca prá darśaya ||15|| khaḍū́re 'dhicaṅkramā́ṃ khárvikāṃ kharvavāsínīm | yā́ udārā́ antárhitā gandharvāpsarásaś ca yé sarpā́ itarajanā́ rákṣāṃsi ||16||*, "The dog-like Apsaras, and also the Rupakas (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! (And also make them see) her that strides upon the mist, the mutilated one, who dwells with the mutilated ; the vapoury spooks that are hidden, and the Gandharvas and Apsaras, the serpents, and other brood, and the Rakshas" (Bloomfield); "Dog-accompanied Apsarases, she-jackals (*rūpaka*) also, O Arbudi, the *riśá*, licking much in the inner vessel, seeking what is ill-deposited; all these (f.), O Arbudi, do thou make our enemies to see, and do thou show forth specters.16. Her that strides upon the *khaḍūra*, mutilated, wearing what is mutilated (?); the specters that are concealed, and what Gandharvas-and-Apsarases? [there are], serpents, other-folk, demons" (Whitney).

whether our reading is actually a corruption of an otherwise unattested compound with *ambā-*, 'mother', as first member, and perhaps a noun based on the root *riṣ-*, 'to hurt', as second member: something like *ambā-riṣī-* (<*ambā-riṣa-*), 'hurting the mother', with metathesis of the vowel length (note that **K** preserves a short *i*).

17.12.3   **d**: ~ PS 17.12.1h, 13.1d, 13.9g

a	paṇḍugirāṃ phāladatīm	8#	$[- \cup \cup - \vert - \cup \cup \times]$
b	asaṃsūktanigāriṇīm |	8	$[\cup - - \cup \vert \cup - \cup \times]$
c	asātāḥ sarvā vo brūmo	8#	$[\cup - - - \vert - - - \times]$
d	naśyatetaḥ sadān$_u$vāḥ ||	8	$[- \cup - - \vert \cup - \cup \times]$

The *paṇḍu*-swallowing one, the ploughshare-toothed one, the one devouring the *asaṃsūkta* (?)—we pronounce you all "empty-handed"! O Sadānuvās, disappear from here!

paṇḍugirāṃ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ paṇḍūgirāṃ Ji₄ paṇḍu[x]girāṃ **Pa**꜀ paṇḍugiryāṃ (*leg*. R-V, Bʜᴀᴛᴛ. *vs.* Bᴀʀʀᴇᴛ paṇḍugaryāṃ) **K**   •   phāladatīm]³⁴ **[Mā] [Ma]** V122 phālavatī **Ja** pāṃladratīm Ji₄ pāṃladatīm **Pa**꜀ pāṃladantīm V71 pāṃladantīm[s̶a̶]m JM₃ pālajatīm **K**   • asaṃsūktanigāriṇīm] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ **Pa**꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ asausūktānigāriṇī **K**   • \|] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Pa**꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ \|\| Ji₄   • asātāḥ] **[O]** āmātās **K**   • vo brūmo] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā]** JM₃ vo [. .]o **V122** ṇyoso brūmo Ji₄ vo brumo **Pa**꜀ vo brṛmo(?) **V71** vo vrūmo **K**   • naśyatetaḥ sadānvāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Pa**꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ ḷaśyatetaḥ sadānvāḥ Ji₄ naśyatetas sadānvā **K**   • \|\|] **[O]** Z 3 Z **K**

 a. *paṇḍu-* (not to be confused with *pāṇḍu-* 'pale'): MW and PW regard this as an incorrect reading of *paṇḍra-* or *paṇḍa-*, *paṇḍaka-*, late words meaning 'eunuch, impotent man, weakling' (see Dᴀs 2003b: 560ff.). As the Sadānuvās are dangerous to pregnancy, this might be the semantic field we need to consider.

 The word *girá* (or *gilá*) only occurs at the end of compounds, and it is extremely rare. The oldest attestations are the compounds *saṃgirá-*, 'swallowing up, devouring', in ŚS 6.135.3 (~ PS 5.33.9) and 18.4.60 (~ PS 18.81.7), and *asaṃsūktagilá* (PS °*gira*), on which see below. Commenting on the above-quoted PS 5.33.9d, Lubotsky regards *girá* as a Vedic hapax and "no doubt a nonce form." Nevertheless, considering the following words, we expect -*āṃ* to be an acc. f. ending from a stem *girá-* rather than the more common gen. pl. from *gír-*.

 On *phāladatī*: the name of this demoness (*phāla-* m., 'ploughshare, ploughblade', *datī-* f. from *dant-* m., 'tooth') is given next to *ayodatī*, 'iron-toothed', as an example of a feminine Bahuvrīhi with *danta* as second member in the Kāśikāvṛttī on Pāṇini 5.4.143. Compare the epithet *udradantī-*, 'otter-toothed', found in 17.15.9c below.

 b. This pāda is problematic. It seems to preserve the acc. f. of a compound *asaṃsūktanigārin-*. A similar compound, *asaṃsūktagilá-* (with *gilá-* in ŚS, *gira-* in PS), also a hapax, is found as an epithet of Rudra's dogs in ŚS 11.2.30, *rudrásyailabakārébhyo 'saṃsūktagilébhyaḥ \| idáṃ mahā́syebhyaḥ śvábhyo akaraṃ námaḥ*, "To Rudra's howl-making, unhymned-swallowing(?), great-mouthed dogs I have paid this homage" (Whitney) (~ PS

---

34 The spelling of *pha* and *pāṃ* in Odia are almost identically formed by a *pa* sign next to a raised circle. Rigorously speaking, in *phā* the daṇḍa indicating long *ā* should appear to the right of the circle (this is very clear in **V122**), in *pāṃ* to its left (as found in the other mss. I could consult). My transcription is based on this difference, but it should not be excluded that when I transcribe *pāṃ*, *phā* might have been intended by the scribe.

16.106.10, which reads *'saṃsūktagirebhyaḥ* with *r*). Whitney's tentative translation is inspired by Sāyaṇa's commentary. This is based on a very implausible analysis of *saṃsūkta* as being built from the preverb *sám* plus the noun *sūktá*, 'hymn' (lit., 'well spoken')[35]. Differently, PW glosses the compound with "Unverkleinertes, Ungekautes schlingend", analysing it as *a-saṃ°-gila*, but fails to provide a lemma (*a*)*saṃsūkta*. As Whitney comments, "How *asaṃsūkta* should come to mean 'unmasticated', as given in the Pet. Lexx., does not appear." Perhaps Böhtlingk and Roth were imagining Rudra's dogs as becoming unleashed? At any rate, their gloss remains unexplained. The only possible lexeme from which *saṃsūkta* could theoretically be derived is *saṃ-sūc-*, 'to point out clearly, imply, betray, tell'. The root *sūc*, however, is only secondarily derived from the present *sūcayati*, 'to point out, indicate', which Mayrhofer (EWAia II p. 739) regards as a denominative of *sūcī́* 'needle, pointy object' (the corresponding attested verbal adjective being *sūcita*). Moreover, this verb is only attested in post-Vedic sources, and seems semantically unfit to explain our formations.

It should be noted that any attempt at emending[36] would have to face the problem of explaining how both formations would have been corrupted in both recensions—perseveration? Is one secondarily derived from the other? As such, emending here would entail reconstructing a proto-AV text, not simply the original PS reading or the reading of the PS written archetype.[37]

At any rate, comparison of the two compounds supports the analysis of *asaṃsūktanigāriṇī* as being formed by the obscure word *asaṃsūkta* and a feminine *-in-ī-* formation built on an unattested *nigāra-*, 'swallowing', from *ni-gṝ-* 'to gulp down'. As such, *nigārin-* is also unattested; however, its intended meaning must not diverge too much from the corresponding element *gilá-*/*girá-* in the parallel formation.

c. The word *asātāḥ*, a hapax, must be a bahuvrīhi compound (nom. f. pl.) built on the verbal noun *sātá-*, 'gained > gain, possession, wealth', with privative *á-*. Thus, the meaning must be 'whose gain is nil', i.e. 'empty-handed'. Clearly, it is implied that the ill-intentioned Sadānuvās had come to appropriate something (most likely, to devour children or lick the women's "semen"). However, by ritually stating that the Sadānuva's gain is nil, the reciter is magically making the Sadānuva's failure a reality.

---

35 On compounds formed with *sám* as first member, see AiGr II, 1 p.73–77 and SCHNEIDER 2013: 203–204.

36 A very tentative emendation could be the following: in PS 17.14.10ab, below, we find the epithets *āmādinīḥ krūrādinīr anagnigandhyādinīḥ*, 'eater of raw flesh, eater of bloody flesh, eater of what does not smell like fire (i.e. is uncooked)'. I wonder if the word we are looking for may be semantically comparable to these epithets, the third one in particular. We could consider emending to *saṃśukta*, a verbal adjective derived from a lexeme like *saṃ-śuc-*, perhaps in the sense 'to burn completely' → 'to be fully cooked'; compare the inverse semantic extension in the case of the lexeme *sam-pac-*, 'to cook thoroughly' → 'to burn'. The meaning of the verbal noun *saṃ-śukta-* would thus be 'completely burnt', or rather 'fully cooked'. Finally *a-saṃśukta-gira-*/*nigārin-* would then mean 'devouring something not fully cooked', 'devouring what is uncooked'. To be fair, however, the lexeme *saṃ-śuc-* is only attested in one ŚB passage (8.6.1.22), with the meaning, 'to blaze together'. The passage in question describes two bricks that are likened to two fires: "Between (each) two he throws loose soil, for these two bricks being fires, he does so fearing lest these two fires should blaze up together (*saṃśocātaḥ*)" (Eggeling). Nevertheless, it is unquestionable that the preverb *sam* can express 'completeness', thus the meaning 'to burn completely' cannot be fully excluded on the basis of a single attestation of this lexeme in a late Vedic text from a different dialectal area, such as the ŚB. At any rate, mine remains a very speculative proposal overall.

37 Along these lines, with regard to PS 16.106.10, edited by Bhattacharya as *'+saṃsūktagirebyaḥ*, it seems reasonable to consider the **O** variant, *asaṃsuptakirebhyaḥ*, a corruption (**K** has *sausūktagirebhyaḥ*). The word *saṃsupta* is also attested only in post-Vedic texts.

17.12.4   **f**: ~ PS 17.14.2e, 14.3e, 14.6e, 14.8e, 15.7e

a	yāḥ śayānaṃ jambhayanti	8#	[– ᴜ – – | – ᴜ – ×]
b	naktam ichantᵢy āturam |	8	[– ᴜ ᴜ – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
c	atho janasya suptasya	8#	[ᴜ – ᴜ – | ᴜ – – ×]
d	mukhā hastān pra ⁺rihanti	8#	[ᴜ – – – | ᴜ ᴜ – ×]
e	†datsudatkavanocitās†	8	[– ᴜ – ᴜ | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
f	tā ito nāśayāmasi ||	8	[– ᴜ – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]

Those [demonesses] who, at night, crush a man when he's lying, who seek a man who is sick, then lick the faces, the hands of the sleeping folk, †...†—Them we make disappear from here!

This stanza is missing from **Pa꜀**.

————————

yāḥ śayānaṃ] yāḥ śayānaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71** yāḥ śaẏanaṃ **JM₃** yāmanaṃ(→ yānanaṃ) **K**   • jambhayanti] jambhaẏanti **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** jambhanti **Ji₄** jambhayanta **K**   • naktam] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** nakam **Ji₄**   • ichanty] **V122 JM₃** icha[x]nty **V71** ichaṃty **[Ja] [Ma] Ji₄ [Mā]** iśchantiy **K**   • āturaṃ]] **O** āturam, \| **K**   • janasya suptasya] **[O]** danasya saptasya **K**   • mukhā] **[O]** sukha **K**   • hastān pra] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71 JM₃** hastā[ndra] **V122** hastāndra **Ji₄** hastāni pra **K**   ⁺rihanti] līyanti **K** ruhanti **[Ja] [Ma] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ruruhanti **V122**   • †datsudatkavanocitās†] **[Ma] [Ja] JM₃ V71** datsukavanocitās **Mā** [.]tsudatkavanocitās **V122** hatsutatkavaẏo(taẏā?)nācitās **Ji₄** tatsadudakamanohitās **K**   • tā ito nāśayāmasi] tā ito nāśaẏāmasi **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** tā ito nā[x]śaẏāmasi **V71** tā ito (s.s.→tamīto) nāśaẏāmasi **K**   • \|\|] **[O]** Z 4 Z **K**

Bhattacharya reads +*icchanty* in **b**, *pra r̲ū̲hanti* in **d**, and *datsudatkavanocitās* in **e** with no underlyining.

   Note that no manuscript preserves a daṇḍa after pāda **d**. Interestingly, pāda **d**'s cadence is irregular. As we generally find in the AV, irregular stanzas are common in odd pādas, whereas even pādas—or rather hemistich- or stanza-ending pādas—normally have a regular cadence; thus the irregularity of the cadence somewhat confirms that pāda **d** is not supposed to be closed by a daṇḍa.

   b. With regards to demonesses roaming at night, compare PS 17.4.2b below.

   cd. Bhattacharya suggests in a comment that **O** *ruhanti* might be an error for *rihanti*. I think that this suggestion is correct. The error is quite frequent (see Kɪᴍ, *Auss.*, p. 44), and it also occurs above, in 17.12.1a, where all **O** mss. read *reruhati* vs. **K** *rerihati*, which is correct. Therefore, I emend it accordingly. This appears to be the oldest attestation of the lexeme *pra-rih-* (according to PW, only *pra-lih-* is attested at SuśrS 2.450.1). On the semantics of *rih-* in relation to the Sadānuvās, see my comment on 17.14.8d below.

   In the AV, the acc. pl. neuter *mukhā*, with the old ending *-ā*, is just as frequent as the new form *mukhāni*: the ŚS has *múkhā* twice (ŚS 6.106.2d ~ PS 19.33.4d; ŚS 8.6.15b ~ PS 16.80.2b) as well as *múkhāni* twice (ŚS 7.56.4 ~ PS 20.14.10b; ŚS 10.9.1 ~ PS 16.136.1a). In the PS, the old ending is found five times (in our line, in the two passages corresponding to the above-quoted ŚS occurrences, and also in PS 1.29.2b and PS 14.4.4c), while *mukhāni* is found three times: in the two stanzas cited above, plus PS 9.6.4d.

   The fact that both *mukhā* and *hastān* are found in the plural (notably, the latter is not in the dual) compels us to take *janasya* in pāda **b** as having the collective meaning 'people, folk', rather than that of '(single) person'.

   e. This pāda seems very corrupted. The **O** mss. point to *datsudatkavanocitās*, whereas **K** has *tatsadudakamanohitās*. Both variants seem to feature a feminine plural nominative *-ās* at the end of the pāda, most likely another epithet. The opening of the **O** variant might be the word *datsu* (loc. pl. of *dant-*), 'in the teeth'. This could make sense given that body parts are mentioned in the previous

line. The rest is obscure.[38]

17.12.5   **d**: ~ PS 4.13.4b = 19.32.9b, 6.8.3b; cf. also PS 10.2.3ab

a	āpatantīr vikṣiṇānā	8#	[– ᴜ – – | ᴜ ᴜ – ×]
b	bastagandhāḥ sadānᵤvāḥ |	8	[– ᴜ – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
c	bhaṇvā *asinā totsyāmi	8#	[– – ᴜ ᴜ | – – – ×]
d	tīkṣṇaśṛṅga iva rṣabhaḥ ||	8	[– ᴜ – ᴜ | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]

O Sadānvās, flying towards [here], striking death all around, smelling like bucks; O Bhaṇvās, I am going to stab [you] with a ritual knife like a sharp-horned bull.

N.B. Pādas **a** and **b** are missing from **Paᶜ**.
——————
āpatantīr] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ V71 JM₃ āpatantī **Mā** apadannīr **K**   • vikṣiṇānā] **[Ja] [Ma]** V122 **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ vikṣaṇānā Ji₄ vakṣaṇānā **K**   • bastagandhāḥ sadānvāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ bastugandhāḥ sadānvāḥ **Mā** V71 JM₃ vastagandhās sadānvā **K**   • \|] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 Paᶜ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ \|\| Ji₄   • bhaṇvā *asina] bhaṇvā sinā **[O]** bhaṇvāṁsinaha **K**   • totsyāmi] **[O]** tośchāmi **K**   • tīkṣṇaśṛṅga] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Paᶜ **[Mā]** JM₃ tīkṣaṇaśṛṅga V71   • \|\|] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Paᶜ **[Mā]** JM₃ \| V71 Z(//)Z 5 Z **K**

PS 4.13.4b = PS 19.32.9b
tīkṣṇaśṛṅga ivarṣabhaḥ \|\|

PS 6.8.3b
sāsahāna ivarṣabhaḥ \|

PS 10.2.3ab
tīkṣṇaśṛṅga ṛṣabhaḥ
samudra ivākṣitodakaḥ \|

Bhattacharya reads *vastagandhāḥ* in **b** and *(a)sinā* in **c**.
      a. It is perhaps remarkable that the pres.ptc *āpatantī* also occurs in PS 15.18.4, which is part of a hymn against Apsarases that shows several lexical correspondances with ours: *dūrād enāḥ pratyāpaśyam āpatantīr *adho divaḥ | devānāṃ havyamohanīr indro apsaraso hanat ||*, "I saw them from afar, flying towards [here], below the heaven. Indra will slay the Apsarases confusing [our] oblation to the gods" (Lelli).
      The form *vikṣiṇānāḥ* is a pres. middle ptc. from *kṣi-* (pres. *kṣiṇāti*), 'to kill', with preverb *ví*. With my translation I try to convey the semantic contribution of the preverb.
      b. The compound *bastagandha-* is a hapax. See my comment on 17.12.1d above.
      c. As remarked multiple times, the name Bhaṇvā only occurs in this text.
      An emendation to **asinā* seems necessary to me. In the RV, the *ási-* is a sacred ritual knife used to slaughter or sacrifice animals (by cutting their joints): see RV 1.162.20d (a horse), 10.79.6d

——————
38 **O** might point to *vanocita-*, 'accustomed to the woods'(?), or *anucita-*, 'placed lengthwise or in rows'(?), or 'improper, wrong, unusual, strange' (MW); **K** to *manohita*, 'placed in the mind'(?) or *anuhita-*, 'placed along' (?). **K** may contain the words *tat sad udakam*. The string *datka* might be the word *datka-*, 'toothed' (?), 'little tooth'(?) (cf. an attested *a-dat-ka* 'toothless')—but with which syntactic function? The word *datka-* might also be a *ka*-suffixed formation built on the pres. ptc. of one of the *dā-* roots (cf. *ejatká-*, 'a kind of insect', in ŚS 5.23.7, from *ej-*, 'to stir, move'). However, none of these analyses yields much sense, and the line probably requires heavier emendations in order to be deciphered.

(a cow), 10.86.18c (an ass), 10.89.8b (joints, *párvan*). Compare the following ŚS pādas, where it is used to sacrifice a goat: ŚS 9.5.4ab, *ánuchya śyāména tvácam etā́ṃ viśastar yathāparv àsínā mā́bhí maṃsthāḥ |*, "Cut along this skin with the dark [metal], O slaughterer, joint by joint with the knife" (Whitney). In the AV, it also employed to cut the witchcraft's joints, an apotropaic use that is relevant to our text; cf. ŚS 10.1.20, *svā́yasā́ asáyaḥ santi no gr̥hé vidmā́ te kr̥tye yatidhā́ párūṃṣi | út tiṣṭhaivá párehīto 'jñāte kím ihéchasi*, "There are knives of good metal in our house; we know thy joints, O witchcraft, how many they are; just stand up; go away from here; unknown one, what seekest thou here?" (Whitney). Similarly, in the Arbudi hymn, ŚS 11.9, the *ási-* is included in a list of equipment used to counter evil: ŚS 11.9.1, *yé bāhávo yā́ íṣavo dhánvanāṃ vīryā̀ṇi ca |asī́n paraśū́n ā́yudhaṃ cittākūtáṃ ca yád dhr̥dí | sárvaṃ tád arbude tvám amítrebhyo dr̥śé kurūdārā́ṃś ca prá darśaya*, "What arms [there are], what arrows, and the powers of bows, swords (*asi*), axes, weapon, and what thought-and-design in the heart — all that, O Arbudi, do thou make our enemies to see; and do thou show forth specters" (Whitney). In PS 15.23.2, this knife is employed to magically ward off hail (by magically cutting the clouds?): *asir me *tigmaḥ *svāyasa indrāgnibhyāṃ ⁺susaṃśitaḥ | tena sedhāmi *hrāduniṃ kr̥ṣiṃ me māva gād iti sasyaṃ me mā vadhīd iti ||*, "My knife is sharp, made of good metal, well sharpened by Indra and Agni. With that I ward off the hail [with the intention]: may [the hail] not go down to my field, may [the hail] not destroy my crop" (Lelli) (see also Lelli's comment *ad loc.*).

Remarkably, the form *totsyāmi* appears to be the only Vedic occurrence of a *sya*-future formation derived from the root *tud-*.

d. This pāda also occurs in PS 4.13.4b and 19.32.9b; compare also PS 6.8.3b, where *sāsahāna ivarṣabhaḥ* is said of a herb used against the Sadānuvās, and PS 10.2.3ab, *tīkṣṇaśr̥ṅga r̥ṣabhaḥ samudra ivākṣitodakaḥ |*, with *iva* in pāda b, most likely to be supplied in pāda a too.

The compound *tīkṣṇaśr̥ṅgá-* only appears in the ŚS with the accent on the first member (*tīkṣṇáśr̥ṅgāḥ*): in ŚS 19.50.2b (~ PS 14.9.2b), where the night is compared to a draft ox; and in the feminine (*tīkṣṇaśr̥ṅgī́-*, referring to herbs) in ŚS 4.37.6d (~ PS 12.7.10d; cf. the very similar 12.8.1cd) and ŚS 8.7.9b (~PS 16.12.9b). It is more common in the PS, where, besides the above-mentioned passages, it is also found in 5.9.4d, 6.8.6d and 14.9.2b, for a total of 10 occurrences including our pāda. Among these, PS 5.9.4 is particularly relevant, as it seems to have the same purpose as our text, namely, to drive off the Sadānuvās. The stanza reads: *na tā itthā na tā ihāva *māsatā *ukheva śr̥ṅgavac chiraḥ | sadānvā brahmaṇaspate tīkṣṇaśr̥ṅgodr̥ṣann ihi ||* "Not in this way, not here will the horned head [i.e. the plant used in the ritual] give them space like an ukhā-pot. O Brahmaṇaspati with a sharp horn, keep piercing the Sadānuvās" (Lubotsky). Compare also PS 6.8.6, addressed against the Arāya demons, but part of a hymn against Sadānuvās: *ye 'rāyāś caratha pākasyechanta āsutim | tān agne kr̥ṣṇavartane tīkṣṇaśr̥ṅgodr̥ṣann ihi ||*, "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" (Griffiths). Compare also the very similar RV 10.155.2 (from the only Rgvedic hymn against the Sadānuvās): *cattó itáś cattā́mútaḥ sárvā bhrūṇā́ny ārúṣī | arāyyàm brahmaṇas pate tī́kṣṇaśr̥ṅgodr̥ṣánn ihi ||*, "She is banished from here, banished from yonder, having assailed all fetuses. Go at the demoness, o sharp-horned Brahmaṇaspati, and gore her" (J-B).

17.12.6

a	sadān₍ᵤ₎vāḥ ⁺sādānveyān	8#	[∪ – ∪ – | – – – ×]
b	⁺strīpuṃsā́ṃ ubhayān saha |	8	[– – – ∪ | ∪ – ∪ ×]
c	sahe sahasvān sahasā	8#	[∪ – ∪ – | – ∪ ∪ ×]
d	vi mr̥dho hanmi rakṣasaḥ ||	8	[∪ ∪ – – | ∪ – ∪ ×]

The Sadānuvās, the descendants of the Sadānuvās, both the male and female ones, together—I, strong with strength, overcome. One by one I strike the foes, the Rakṣases.

sadānvāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀** sadānvā **Mā V71 JM₃** sadānvāsas **K** • ⁺sādānveyān] sādānveyāṃ **[Ma] V122 Pa꜀** sādānveẏā **Mā V71 JM₃** sa(ā?)dānveẏāṃ **Ji₄** sadānveẏ(?)āṃ **Ja** sadānveyā **K** • ⁺strīpuṃsāṃ] strīpuṃsāṃ **K [Ja] [Ma] Ji₄** strīstrīpuṃsāṃ[x] **Pa꜀** strīpuṃsā **Mā V71** strīpusāṃ **JM₃** • ubhaẏān saha] ubhaẏān, saha **V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71 ([Mā] [Ma] [Ja])**³⁹ ubhaẏā saha **JM₃** ubhayāṃ saha **K** • ||] **K [Mā] V71 JM₃ [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀** || **Ji₄** • sahe] **[Mā] V71 JM₃ [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀** atho **K** • sahasvān sahasā] sahasvān, sahasā **V71 JM₃ V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ ([Mā] [Ma] [Ja])** sahasvān sāmaha **K** • vi mṛdho] **[O]** vi mṛdo **K** • rakṣasaḥ] rakṣasā **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃ | V71** Z 6 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *sādānveyāṃ strīpuṃsāṃ* and *vimṛdho*.
    This stanza is stylistically quite remarkable. There is a clear division between pāda **ab** and pāda **cd**. The former contain a list, which fulfils one of the frequent requirements of charms of this kind, namely that their efficacy covers all possible cases. By mentioning the Sadānuvās, their descendants, male and female, pādas **a** and **b** make sure that the charm is effective on all kinds of demons. Pādas **c** and **d** focus on the aim of the charm, namely the overcoming (*sah-*) of said demons. The *figura etymologica* built around the root *sah-* in pāda **c** is especially aimed at stressing the core purpose of the charm and magically strengthening its power. The centrality of the verb *sahe*, which begins the second half of the stanza, is highlighted by the pun with *saha* at the end of pāda **b**, which concludes and recapitulates the list in pāda **ab**, so that the couplet *sahe | saha* really captures the whole sense of the stanza, the overcoming of all the demons together. The alliteration of the sibilants (and nasals) also contributes to the same goal. Finally, note that the addressees of the charms, the Sadānuvās (female) and the Rakṣases (male), are mentioned at the very beginning and end of the stanza, a choice that once again stresses the centrality of the verb *sahe*. When we read the stanza, we can almost picture the demons converging towards the speaker during the first two pādas into the word *saha*, 'together', after which the power of the charm explodes with the verb "*sahe!*" The *figura etymologica* charges the speaker with power. The following slaying (*vi hanmi*) of the demons has them almost running away, leaving what remains of them off in the distance at the far end of the stanza (*rakṣasaḥ*).
    a. The matronymic *sādānveyā-* is also attested at PS 16.8.10a, *sādānveyaṃ pra mṛṇa raka indra yātudhānakṣayaṇair mūraiḥ* |, "Crush the descendant of the Sādānuvas, O Indra; provide protection by means of impetuous destructions of sorcerers" (my transl.). Both **K** and **Ja** (**Ji₄** is not clear and often unreliable) have a variant with short *a*, but matronymics of this kind are normally formed with the vṛddhi grade (cf. *saiṃhikeya-* < Siṃhikā) and, given that the majority of the Odisha mss. have long *ā* (in both sub-branches), I'm inclined to regard the reading of **Ja** as secondary.
    Given that pāda **b** seems to have two acc. pl. forms, the final *anusvāra* in *sādānveyāṃ* must conceal an acc. pl. ending *-ān*.
    b. If we accept the reading *strīpuṃsāṃ*, I think we have no options but to interpret it as an acc. pl. (*strīpuṃsān*) agreeing with *ubhaẏān* and deriving from the late *a*-stem *strīpuṃsa-*, which is attested in the meaning 'man and wife' or 'both male and female'. The older formation, *strī́puṃs-* (ŚBr, LŚS), would yield *strīpuṃs-as* in the acc. pl. Both branches are unanimous; if the original reading was **strīpuṃsas*, then the error must be earlier than the reading of the PS archetype.
    GRIFFITHS (2009: lvi (D)), dealing with the sandhi of final *n* (in particular *-ān*) before a vowel, does not seem to consider the case that both branches have anusvāra, *-āṃ* V-. GRIFFITHS considers the following categories of cases (I keep GRIFFITHS's numbering, but I change the order of exposition for

---

39 Bhattacharya's apparatus does not explicitly confirm of deny whether his mss. employ a *virāma* to split the cluster *-ān, sa-*, as do the four manuscripts in my possession which preserve the nasal. The same is valid for the identical sandhi in the next pāda.

the argument's sake): 1) both branches have anunāsika, or one branch preserves it, and one branch doesn't: he reconstructs the anunāsika; 3) both branches have a dental: he adopts a dental; 4) equivocal cases in which the two branches show *-ān* V- versus *-ā* V-, or *-ān* V- versus *-ām* V-: in each case he believes that the dental is original; 2) one branch has anunāsika, the other a dental: here GRIFFITHS evaluates each case separately. He points out that, in three out of the four cases discussed under (1), one notices a close syntactic nexus between the acc. pl. and the following word (in his cases, a postposition governing the acc. pl.), whereas in the cases under (3) and (4), no such close syntactic nexus is visible. Thus, as a working hypothesis, GRIFFITHS proposes that, when evaluating the cases under (2), in instances showing a close syntactic nexus, we should expect anunāsika, whereas in instances lacking a close syntactic nexus, we should expect a dental.

As far as our case is concerned, both branches have anusvāra (*-ām* V-), a category not considered by GRIFFITHS (we my call it category 5). It should be recalled that anusvāra can be used both for final *-n* as well as for anunāsika in both traditions, even though both traditions have a way to write anunāsika (**K** employs an inverted candrabiṇḍu, and the Odia mss. use "*-ṅ*,"). Now, it seems reasonable to me to consider *strīpuṃsān_ubhayān*, 'both the female and male ones', as a single syntagm, and thus expect anunāsika because of the stronger syntactic nexus. Moreover, in a similarly ambiguous case at 15.5.6a (**O** *-ām a-*, **K** *-a a-*), with no explicit trace of a dental nasal (and no explicitly close syntactic nexus), LELLI (2015: 26) decides to restore the anunāsika. One may add a paleographical note: in cases where the mss. have *-ām* or *ā̃m*, the following vowel is written as an independent akṣara (*a-*, *u-*, etc.); conversely, in those cases in which the mss. have a dental, the following vowel is part of the same akṣara as the dental: *-ā na-*, *-ā nu-*, etc. Therefore, at least as far as the written archetype is concerned, we can hardly reconstruct a dental in the cases under 1 and 5, unless we impose a heavier emendation. We would also need to assume that a scribe who copied from the written archetype had the two akṣaras *-Cā-na-* before his eyes, but modified the spelling to *-Cā-ṃ a-*, thus changing *na-* to *a-*. This is of course possible in the case that the text was dictated to the scribe, but it seems more likely to me that the written archetype already contained *-m̐* or *-ṃ*. In my view, this suggests that when the text was dictated to the scribe who wrote the written archetype, no dental was pronounced in this case. Therefore, in conclusion, I restore the anunāsika. I follow GRIFFITHS in marking all regularisations with a plus sign.

d. This is one of the rare instances of tmesis in the AV.

Among the many interpretations allowed by the versatile semantics of the preverb *ví*, it seems attractive to me to consider a distributive meaning for *vi-han-* in this particular case. The core semantics of the preverb *ví* is the expression of duality: with verbs for hitting, striking, breaking, etc., this can manifest itself both in the object (e.g. 'strike apart', 'break in two') or affect the action ('strike back and forth, here and there, all around' or even 'through, in between'); with multiple objects, however, the action can be distributive ('strike one by one'). This latter interpretation seems appropriate to me not only because we do have two objects (*mṛdhas*, and *rakṣasaḥ*, each itself a group including a further multiplicity of victims), but also because the purpose of the whole stanza is to overcome each and every Sadānuva, each one of their children, be they female or male.

17.12.7   **ab**: ~ ŚS 11.9.17ab

a	caturdaṃṣṭrān kumbhamuṣkān	8#	[ᴜ – – – | – ᴜ – ×]
b	dīrghakeśān asṛṅmukhān |	8	[– ᴜ – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
c	alābugandhīn undurān	8#	[ᴜ – ᴜ – | – – ᴜ ×]
d	durṇāmno nāśayāmasi ||	8	[– – – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]

The four-tusked ones, the pot-testicled ones, the long-haired ones, the blood-faced ones, the ones

who smell like a bottle gourd, the rats—we make the ill-named ones disappear!

caturdaṃṣṭrān] caturdaṃṣṭrān, **[O]** caturdauṣṭrān **K**   • kumbhamuṣkān] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** sum[.]muṣkān, **V122**   • dīrghakeśān asṛṅmukhān |] dīrghakeśāṅ, asṛṅmukhān, | **[Mā] V71 JM₃ [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c** dīrghaṃ keśāṅ, asṛṅmukhān, || **Ji₄** dirghakeśān amunsukhām, (*leg.* Bhatt. *vs.* R-V amunmukhām,) **K**   • alābugandhīn]⁴⁰ **[O]** alavugandhīn **K**   • undurān] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c JM₃** u[xxx]ndurāṃ **V122** undurāṃ **Ji₄** undurā **Mā** u[.]rā[. **V71** ansurān **K**   • durṇṇāmno] durṇṇāmno **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄** du[xx]rṇṇāmno **Pa_c** durnāmno **K Mā JM₃** .]urnāmno **V71**   • nāśayāmasi] **K** nāśayāmasi **[O]**   • ||] **O** Z 7 Z **K**

ŚS 11.9.17
cáturdaṃṣṭrāṃ chyāvádataḥ kumbhámuṣkām̐ ásṛṅmukhān |
svabhyasā́ yé codbhyasáḥ ||

Bhattacharya writes *dīrghakeśām̐ asṛṅmukhān* in agreement with **O**.
        Note that in this stanza, only male demons are listed.
        a. Besides the ŚS parallel, where we also find *cáturdaṃṣṭra-*, the compound *kumbhámuṣka-*, 'pot-testicled', also appears in ŚS 8.6.15c ~ PS 16.80.2d, quoted above in my comment on PS 17.12.1c.
        b. The sandhi between the two words in this pāda falls under category (2) of those described by Griffiths 2009: lvi (D), and is discussed in my comment on the previous stanza. In this category of cases, one branch features anunāsika, the other a dental. Griffiths's policy is to treat each case differently: his working hypothesis is to adopt the anunāsika if there is a close syntactic nexus between the two words, a dental if there is no such nexus. In our case no such nexus exists; therefore I adopt **K**'s reading, with a dental.⁴¹
        c. The compound *alā́bugandhi-* is a hapax, but the word *alā́bu-*, 'bottle gourd', and the compound *alābupatrá-*, 'bottle-gourd vessel', are found in the prose of ŚS 8.10.29-33 (~ PS 16.135.8-9), which prescribes the ritual use of a vessel made with this fruit: *sód akrāmat sā́ sarpā́n ā́gachat tā́ṃ sarpā́ úpāhvayanta víṣavaty éhī́ti | tásyās takṣakó vaiśaleyó vatsá ā́sīd alābupātráṃ pā́traṃ | tā́ṃ dhṛtárāṣṭra airāvató 'dhok tā́ṃ viṣám evā́dhok | tád viṣáṃ sarpā́ úpa jīvanti upajīvanī́yo bhavati yá eváṃ véda || tád yásmā eváṃ vidúṣe 'lā́bunābhiṣiñcét pratyā̀hanyā́t || ná ca pratyāhanyā́n mánasā tvā́ pratyā̀hanmī́ti pratyā̀hanyāt || yát pratyāhánti viṣám evá tát pratyā̀hanti || viṣám evā́syā́priyaṃ bhrā́tṛvyam anuvíṣicyate* [PS: *hanti*] *yá eváṃ véda* ||, "She [=the Virāj] ascended; she came to the serpents; the serpents called to her: O poisonous one! of her Takṣaka descendant of Viśala was young, the gourd-vessel [was] vessel; her Dhṛtarāṣṭra son of Irāvant milked; from her he milked poison; upon that poison the serpents subsist; one to be subsisted upon becometh he who knoweth thus. Then for whomsoever that knoweth thus one shall pour out with a gourd, he should reject [it]. Should he not reject [it], he should reject [it] by [thinking]: with the mind I reject thee. In that he rejects [it], he thus rejects poison. Poison is poured out after the unfriendly foe of him who knoweth thus" (Whitney). Thus, the smell intended here might be a poisonous smell.

---

40 It is worth recalling here that the Odia script does not distinguish between *b* and *v*.
41 Note that in an identical context, the ŚS parallel (11.9.17b) features anunāsika: *kumbhámuṣkām̐ ásṛṅmukhān*.

17.12.8   **cd**: ~ PS 17.12.9de, 12.10de; **e**: ~ PS 17.12.2d, 12.9e, 12.10e, 13.4d, 13.5d, 13.7d, 14.7d, 15.5d, 15.8d, 15.9d, 15.10d ~ ŚS 2.14.1d

a	stambe jātā adhi bāle	8#	[− − − − | ∪ ∪ − ×]
b	rodākāṃ rudatīṃ t$_u$vat |	8	[− − − ∪ | ∪ − ∪ ×]
c	durṇāmnīḥ sarvāḥ santokā	8#	[− − − − | − − − ×]
d	nāśayāmaḥ sadān$_u$vāḥ ||	8	[− ∪ − − | ∪ − ∪ ×]

Those [demonesses] born on a tuft of grass, [those born] on a tuft of hair; either the one who makes [children/women] cry, or the one who herself is crying; all the ill-named ones together with their offspring—we make the Sadānuvās disappear!

Bhattacharya notes that the lower half of each *akṣara*, in the portion corresponding to "*dhi bāle rodākā*" in **Ma** is effaced, making it hard to read. The very same portion is missing in **Pa$_c$**.

───────

stambe] **[O]** stambhe **K**   • jātā adhi] **[Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** jātā a[.] **[Ma]** jātā a **Pa$_c$** jātādhi **K**   • vāle] **[Ja] V122 Ji₄ V71 JM₃** vālo **Mā** [. .] **[Ma]** *om.* (*space*) **Pa$_c$** pāle **K**   rodākāṃ] **K** rodākāṅ, **Ja V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** [. . . .] **[Ma]** *om.* (*space*) **Pa$_c$**   • rudatīṃ] **[Ma] V122 Ji₄ Pa$_c$ [Mā] V71 JM₃** rudantīṃ **Ja** ruhatīṃ yaṃs **K**   • tvat \|] **Ja** tvat \|\| **Ji₄** tvat\ \| **K** (tvata→)tvat \| **Ma** tvata \| **V122 Nā Mā V71 JM₃** tvata **Pa$_c$**   • durṇāmnīḥ][42] durṇṇāmnīḥ **[Ma]? [Ja]? V122 Ji₄ Pa$_c$** durṇāmnīḥ **Mā V71 JM₃** durnāmnīs **K**   • sarvāḥ] **[O]** sarvās **K**   • santokā] **[Ja] [Mā] Ji₄ Pa$_c$ [Mā] V71 JM₃** saṃtokā **V122** sardhvo(→ndho)kā **K**   • nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ] nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa$_c$ [Mā] JM₃** nāśayāma dānvāḥ **V71** nāśayāmas sadānvā **K**   • \|\|] **[O]** Z 8 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *bāle* in pāda **a**, and *rodākām̐* in agreement with **O** in pāda **b**.

a. The word *stambá-* indicates a 'tuft of grass', a 'bush' or other kinds of clumps or clusters. It is absent from the RV but occurs twice in the AV. Its core meaning is visible in the derivative *stambín-*, 'bushy', found in ŚS 8.7.4 (~ PS 16.12.4),[43] a hymn to the plants, or in the compound *darbhastambá-*, 'a bunch of Darbha grass' (TS 5.6.4.1.17; AB 5.23.9, etc.).

The obscure expression 'born on the tuft of grass', with reference to a demon, is found also in the now familiar hymn to guard pregnant women from demons: ŚS 8.6.5 (~ PS 16.79.5), *yáḥ kr̥ṣṇáḥ keśy ásura stambajá* (PS: *stambajā*) *utá túṇḍikaḥ | aráyān asyā muṣkábhyāṃ bháṃsasó 'pa hanmasi*, "The *ásura* that is black, hairy, tuft-born, also snouted, the niggards we smite away from her pudenda, from her buttocks" (Whitney). Compare also from the same hymn the obscure stanza ŚS 8.6.14, which contains the only other AV occurrence of the simplex *stambá-*: *yé pūrve badhvò yánti háste śŕ̥ṅgāni bíbhrataḥ | āpākesthā́ḥ prahāsína stambé yé kurváte jyótis tā́n itó nāśayāmasi*, "They who go before a woman, bearing horns in the hand, stayers in the oven, laughing out, who make light in the tuft them we make to disappear from here" (Whitney).

The word *bā́la-* (spelled *vā́ra-* in the RV, but later found spelled either *vā́ra*, *vā́la* or *bā́la*) indicates 'the long hair of an animal's tail', in particular horsetail hair (e.g. *áśvya-* in RV 1.32.2, *átya-* in 2.4.4, etc.; cf. Lit. *vãlas*, *valaĩ*, 'horsetail hair, cloth fringe, fishing line'; see EWAia p.545), a 'tuft of hairs'; the 'tail' itself (e.g. in ŚB 3.4.1.17 and ŚB 3.6.2.4)—although it is sometimes explicitly distinguished by a tail (*púcha*) (e.g. in ŚS 10.9.22 ~ PS 16.138.2; ŚS 9.7.8c ~ PS

───────

42 As in several other cases, Bhattacharya probably silently regularises the spelling *rṇṇ*. However, it is very likely that all the **O**^{A} mss. feature such a spelling in this case.

43 ŚS 8.7.4 (~ PS 16.12.4), *prastr̥ṇatī́ stambínīr ékaśúṅgāḥ pratanvatír óṣadhīr ā́ vadāmi | aṃśumátīḥ kaṇḍínīr yā́ viśākhā́ hváyāmi te vīrúdho vaiśvadevī́r ugrā́ḥ puruṣajī́vanīḥ ||*, "The spreading, the bushy, the one-spathed, the extending herbs do I address; those riches in shoots, jointed, that have spreading branches; I call for thee the plants that belong to all the gods, formidable, giving life to men" (Whitney).

16.139.5a);[44] or a strainer made of animal hair. The latter is actually the most frequent meaning in RV, where the word features mostly in book 9 and indicates a strainer made of animal hairs employed to filter the soma. This strainer is almost invariably made of sheep fleece (*ávya-*, e.g. in RV 9.7.6, 9.12.4, 9.50.3, 9.64.5, etc.).

Note that the word is used interchangeably in the singular or in the plural in all the meanings described above. The plural, 'the hairs', is used metaphorically for 'a bunch of hairs, tuft' as well as 'tail', and when the poet says that the soma purifies itself 'in the hairs', a strainer made of multiple hairs is obviously intended.

The same word is also the name of the hair strainer used to purify the *surā* drink (KOLHATKAR 1999: 124; OORT 2002: 356 and fn.7). As such, it is also mentioned (with the spelling *vala-*) in the Sautrāmaṇi section of the VS (19.88), as well as in ŚS 12.8.1.14, belonging to a chapter that describes the same ritual as a way to restore Indra's weakened power by offering the *surā*: *vālena pávayanti | go'śvásya vā etád rūpáṃ yád válo go'śvénaivaìnaṃ punanti ||*, "They purify by means of a tail-whisk—such a tail-whisk doubtless is a form of kine and horses: with kine and horses they thus purify him [i.e. Indra]" (Eggeling). In translating a related passage, ŚS 12.7.3.11, Eggeling seems to make a distinction between *vára*, 'tail', and *vála*, 'tail-whisk', but *vára* could just be the old spelling preserved in the yajus mantra: *váreṇa śáśvatā tanéti válena hy èṣā pūyáte*, "[the priest says] 'with the perpetual tail', for with a tail-whisk that (liquor) is purified" (Eggeling).

It seems indeed that *vára* is the oldest spelling—or at least the standard RV spelling. In the AV we find the spelling *vára* three times (ŚS 10.4.2 ~ PS 16.15.2; ŚS 20.129.18; PS 1.94.1c), the spelling *vála* only once (ŚS 9.7.8c ~ PS 16.139.5c), and the spelling *bála* five times (ŚS 10.9.3a ~ PS 16.136.3a; ŚS 10.9.22a ~ PS 16.138.2a; ŚS 12.4.7b ~ PS 17.16.8b; ŚS 10.10.1c ~ PS 16.107.1c; and also ŚS 10.8.25a).[45] Later, the spelling *vála* seems to become the most frequent. In our case, **K** has *p*, and the corresponding Odia akṣara can be read as both *b* and *v*. I follow Bhattacharya in writing *b*, as this seems to be the preferred spelling in the AV.

It is hard to tell what the significance of these two phrases is: perhaps 'born in the bush' refers to demons originating in the wilderness, while 'born in the tuft of hair' may refer to the impure residue collected in the hair strainer, especially if the dangerous *surā* drink is intended (note that PS 17.13.5–6 below also refers to the *surā*).

b. The epithet *rodākā-* is a hapax. It appears to be built on the causative stem of *rud-*, 'to cry, howl'. Thus it is perhaps a 'demoness who makes people (children? women?) cry'. The suffix *-āka-* can have a pejorative meaning (see AiGr II.2 §150 p.266-267). The next word, *rudatī*, is a regular present participle from the same root. Cf. the demoness Rodanī, who attacks children on their tenth day of life, according to the Agnipurāṇa (see the introduction to this chapter).

The **O** variant, *rodākāṅ* (with the spelling *-ṅ* for anunāsika), seems to point to an accusative plural masculine. This is unlikely to be correct. The reading of **K**, *rodākāṃ* (acc. sg. f.), is preferable.

The enclitic demonstrative *tva*, 'one, many a one', is often used pronominally or adjectivally

---

44 Spelled *bála* in ŚS 10.9.22a (~ PS 16.138.2a) (on the offering of a cow and 100 rice-dishes), *yát te púchaṃ yé te bálā yád ūdho yé ca te stánāḥ | āmíkṣāṃ duhratāṃ dātré kṣīráṃ sarpír átho mádhu ||*, "What tail is thine, what thy tail-tuft, what udder, and what thy teats—let them yield to thy giver curd, milk, butter, also honey" (Whitney); spelled *vála* in ŚS 9.7.8c (~ PS 16.139.5a) (prose; extolling the ox), *indrāṇī bhasád vāyúḥ* (PS *vātaḥ*) *púchaṃ pávamāno válāḥ ||*, "Indrāṇī his buttock, Vāyu his tail, the purifying [soma] his whisk (*válās*)."

45 ŚS 10.8.25 (part of the second Skambha-hymn): *bálād ékam aṇīyaskám utaíkaṃ néva dṛśyate | tátaḥ párivajīyasī devátā sā máma priyā ||*, "One thing is more minute (*áṇu*) than a child (*bála*), also one is hardly (*né'va*) seen; then that a more embracing deity, is she dear to me" (Whitney). Whitney interprets this occurrence as meaning 'child'—a meaning that is otherwise only first attested in Late Vedic sources—and records it as a separate item in his Index. However, I see no reason not to translate the first pāda as 'One thing is finer than a hair'. A similar metaphor is used for instance in ŚS 8.3.4.1, in which the bricks called Vālakhilyas are described as being laid down at a distance from each other that is equal to the width of a hair (*vālamātrá*).

in lists to express alternatives: 'one... another one...', 'one X... another X'. The neuter can be used adverbially in a similar fashion. A few examples have been collected by Delbrück (1888: 26–27; he glosses with 'bald... bald...'): e.g. RV 7.101.3a, *starī́r u tvad bhávati sū́ta u tvad*, "Sometimes he becomes a barren cow, sometimes he gives birth " (J-B); ŚB 1.8.1.39, *prāṇéṣv evá hūyate hótari tvad yájamāne tvad adhvaryáu tvat*, "In the vital airs rather it is offered, partly in the Hotṛ, partly in the Sacrificer, partly in the Adhvaryu" (Eggeling). As far as our stanza is concerned, we probably need to imagine pāda **b** as shortened for *rudākām tvad rudantīṃ tvat*, which could mean 'sometimes she is one who makes people cry, sometimes she is herself crying', if only one demoness is intended. However, as multiple demonesses are referred to in pāda **a**, it is also possible that the *rudākā* and the *rudatī* are two different demonesses. Therefore, it may be preferable to translate as 'Either the one who makes people cry, or the one who is herself crying'.

    c. The dictionaries only record the compound *sa-toka-*, mfn., 'together with progeny'. This is indeed the form that is attested in the ŚS. However, the PS regularly employs the variant *santoka-* (i.e. *saṃ-toka-*, sometimes spelled with *anusvāra* in some mss.): e.g. ŚS 6.56.1ab, *mā́ no devā áhir vadhīt sátokānt sahápuruṣān* ~ PS 19.9.13, *mā no devā ahir vadhīt santokāṃ +sahapūruṣān*, "Let not the snake, O gods, slay us with our offspring, with our men" (Whitney). Other PS occurences are: PS 5.26.4c, in which Varuṇa is invoked to slay the Arāti demoness and her projeny (*santokām*),[46] and PS 17.12.10d below. On the variation between *sam-* and *sa-* as the first member of compounds, see AiGr II, 1 p.73–77 and Schneider 2013: 203–204.

17.12.9   **de**: ~ PS 17.12.8cd, 12.10de; **d**: ~ PS 17.12.2d, 12.8d, 12.10e, 13.4d, 13.5d, 13.7d, 14.7d, 15.5d, 15.8d, 15.9d, 15.10d

a	yāsāṃ jātāni krośanti	8#	[− − − − | ∪ − − ×]
b	bhits_uv antar vane hvala	8	[− ∪ − − | ∪ − ∪ ×]
c	upa vṛkṣeṣu śerate |	8	[∪ ∪ − − | ∪ − ∪ ×]
de	° ° ° ‖		

[Those demonesses] whose breed shriek, inside the furrows, in the woods, in the recess, they lie by the trees; [all the ill-named ones together with their offspring—we make the Sadānuvās disappear!]

yāsāṃ jātāni krośanti] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** yāsāṃ yātāni krośanti **V122** yāsā krośāni krośanti **Pa꜀** yāsāṃ jātāni kroṣanti **K**   • bhitsv antar vane hvala] **V122** bhitsvantarvanehyāla **Ma Ja Nā** tititsvataṃrvanehvala **Ji₄** bhitsvantarvanet, kala **Pa꜀** bhitsvantahyorvale **Mā** bhitsvantarvane[.]la **V71** [t̶s̶v̶a̶]bhitsvantarvanehvala **JM₃** hṛśchaṃtujjalejvala **K**   • upa] **[O]** rupa **K**   • śerate] **[Mā] V71 JM₃ [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀** merate **K**   • \| ° ° ° ‖] (**Mā? Ma? Ja?**) \|ᵏᵃ **V122** kā \| **V71** ‖ᵏᵃ **JM₃** ‖ **Ji₄ Pa꜀** Z 9 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes pāda **b** as *bhitsvantarvanejvala*.

    bc. Bhattacharya writes *jvala* on the basis of **K**. This however is not a known Vedic word—unless Bhattacharya was thinking of an *l*-variant of *jvara-*, 'fever', first attested in the SuśrS, but also found in AV in the compound *aṅga-jvará-*, 'causing fever' (MW), 'waster of limbs' (Whitney *ad* ŚS 5.30.8), 'splitter of limbs' (Whitney *ad* ŚS 5.30.9), 'Gliederschmerz' (EWAia II p. 607). Emending to **jvala*, the sandhi form of loc. sg. *jvāle*, "in the flame", does not seem to yield a suitable meaning, and would produce an irregular cadence.

---

46 PS 5.26.4, *śreṣṭho me rājā varuṇo havaṃ satyena gachatu | arātiṃ hatvā santokām ugro devo'bhi dāsatu ‖*, "Let the highest king Varuṇa truly go to my call. Let the powerful god be inimical to Arāti by slaying her with [her] projeny" (Lubotsky).

I think the reading preserved in most **O** mss., namely *hvala*, is acceptable. It must be the loc. sg. (*hvale*) of an *l*-variant (most likely an instance of female speech) of the word *hvara-*, based on the root *hvar-*, 'to go in a crooked way'. The stem *hvara-* is not attested as a simplex, but we do find it from the early language onward as the second member of various compounds: *upahvará-* indicates a remote place in the mountains (*upahvaré girīṇā́ṃ*) in RV 8.6.28a, a remote place in which Indra found the cows in RV 8.69.6d, the eddy of a river in RV 1.62.3c and 8.96.14b, and the "byways" (J-B, *upahvaréṣu*) on which the Maruts journey like birds in RV 1.87.2a; *pratihvará-*, 'slope, curve' occurs in RV 7.66.14ab, *úd u tyád darśatáṃ vápur divá eti pratihvaré* |, "This lovely marvel [=the Sun] arises on the curve of heaven" (J-B); compare also *ánavahvara-* and *avahvara-* discussed in my comment on 17.15.5c below. Note that all of the occurrences mentioned above are in the locative case. The meaning 'remote place, recess' for *hvara-* might be fitting in our line. This is most likely a euphemism for female genitals (more on this below).

The absence of the effect of the Nati rule in *vane* (not *vaṇe*) suggests that *antar* is to be taken as an independent word, rather than as the first member of a compound *antarvaṇa-* 'situated in the forest' (attested in Pāṇini). Most likely, as a postposition, it governs the preceding locative *bhitsu*.

The word *bhitsu* is the loc. pl. of the root noun *bhíd-*, f., 'splitting, crack'. The meaning 'splitting' is evident from the attested root compounds (see Scarlata 1999: 355–356 with references): *adribhíd-*, 'den Felsen aufspaltend'; *udbhíd-*, 'aufbrechend, Erschliesser, hervorbrechend, hervorsprudelnd'; *gotrabhíd-*, 'den Kuhpferch aufbrechend'; *pūrbhíd-*, 'die Wälle aufbrechend'. The simplex root noun occurs more rarely (1x in RV and 3x in PS), and its meaning is less clear.

RV 1.174.8c, recounting Indra's deeds, reads: *sánā tā́ ta indra návyā ā́guḥ sáho nábhó 'viraṇāya pūrvī́ḥ | bhinát púro ná bhído ádevīr nanámo vádhar ádevasya pīyóḥ* ||, "Dies sind deine alten (Taten), Indra. Neue (Wolken) sind gekommen. Überwinde die vielen Wolken, daß die Unfreude aufhöre. Brich die gottlosen Einbrüche (?) wie ihre Burgen; wende die Waffe des gottlosen Widersachers ab!" (Geldner). "These are your old (deeds), Indra; new ones have come: you overpowered and exploded the many (strongholds) for the lack of joy [/end of battle] (of the godless). You split the godless (clans) into pieces, like strongholds; you bowed the weapon of the godless reviler" (J-B). The phrase *bhinát … bhídaḥ* here looks like little more than a *figura etymologica*: 'split into splittings'.

A second AV occurrence (besides the one in our line, and a third stanza quoted below) is PS 1.86.4 (Against the female demons called Kaṇvās): *yā́ tantiṣat khalasad yā́ ca goṣṭhe yā́ jātāḥ śakadhūme sabhāyām | prapāyāṃ jātā uta yā́ś ca bhitsu tā́ś cātayāmaḥ śivatā no astu* ||, "The [demoness] who is sitting on the rope [to fasten the cattle],[47] the one who is sitting on the threshing floor, and the one who is in the cowshed, those who are born in the pile of cow dung, in the assembly hall, those born in the water resevoir, those in the *bhíd*-s whom we frighten away—let there be benevolence towards us!" (my transl.). This stanza might be an important parallel to our line. First of all, the Kaṇvā demonesses recall the Kaṇvas, male demons who are dealt with in a ŚS hymn (ŚS 2.25) that is traditionally employed against abortion. Secondly, the above stanza features a few lexical similarities with our hymn: the use of the verb *cat-* (see PS 17.12.10 below) or the mention of the pile of cow dung.[48] As far as the meaning of *bhíd* is concerned, it can be noted that all the other elements in the stanza appear to be everyday items belonging to a typical Vedic homestead. What kind of 'splitting' would fit such a context?

Schindler (1972: 34) mentions an additional JB occurrence that might shed some light on the

---

47 Cf. RV 6.24.4, *śácīvatas te puruśāka śā́kā gávām iva srutáyaḥ saṃcáraṇīḥ | vatsā́nāṃ ná tantáyas ta indra dā́manvanto adāmā́naḥ sudāman* ||, "The abilities that belong to you, the able one, o you of many abilities, are converging like streams of cattle. (They are) like cords for calves, Indra, binding without bonds, o you of good bonds [/gifts]" (J-B).

48 On the word *śakadhūma-*, see my comment on PS 17.13.4c below.

above stanza: JB 1.330 reads: *bhago vā asau, bhid iyam; pumān vā asau, strīyam*, "Zuteiler ist jener Himmel, Spalte diese Erde; Mann ist jener Himmel, Weib diese Erde" (Schindler). Schindler translates it as 'Spalte', but explicitly interprets the line "im sexuellen Sinn." It seems obvious to me that the 'splitting' of the earth (lit. 'this one here', *iyam*), conceived as a woman (*strī*), must be the 'furrow'.[49] Thus *bhitsu* in PS 1.86.4, quoted above, might indicate the furrows in the proximity of the settlement.

If this is correct, then we might have a key to interpreting the third and last AV occurrence of *bhíd*, namely *bhitsu* in PS 12.8.4 (cf. ŚS 4.37.10):[50] *avakādā́m̐ abhiśāco bhitsu dyotayamāmakān | gandharvān sarvān oṣadhe pra ṇudasva parā ṇaya ||*, "O herb, push away, lead away all the Gandharvas, who eat the *avakā* plant,[51] who torment/burn (**abhiśocān*? cf. ŚS), in the *bhíd*-s, the will-o'-the-wisps (?)"[52] (my transl.). Here it is also not clear whether *bhitsu* should be syntactically taken with the preceding or following word. However, if openings or cracks in the ground are intended, then *bhitsu* should perhaps be taken with the following *dyotayamāmakān* as indicating the so-called will-o'-the-wisps, or ephemeral fires, which may be caused by gases originating in the ground.

Finally, it is then perhaps conceivable that the reference to demons that appear 'inside the furrows, in the woods, in a recess' in our pāda **b** might also be a reference to the same phenomenon of ephemeral fires.

However, along the lines of Schindler's observation on the sexual meaning of *bhid* in the JB passage—and given the frequent sexual references in our hymn, especially in that it is meant to be used to ward off demons that threaten pregnancy—it seems very attractive to interpret *bhitsv antar*, 'inside the furrows', as meaning 'inside the vaginas'. Note that the related word *bhedá-*, 'splitting', also has a similar sexual meaning in RV 9.112.4: *áśvo vóḷhā sukháṃ rátham hasanā́m upamantríṇaḥ | śépo rómaṇvantau bhedaú vā́r ín maṇḍū́ka ichatī́ndrāyendo pári srava ||*, "The draft-horse seeks an easy-rolling chariot, beguilers a joke; the penis seeks the hairy split, the frog just seeks water. — O drop, flow around for Indra" (J-B).

Accordingly, the neighbouring words might also allow a sexual interpretation: *vana-* ('woods', i.e. the hairy bush around a woman's genitals?); *hvara-*, ('recess, remote place', another euphemism for female genitals?); *vṛkṣa-* ('tree', a penis?). That this interpretation is correct is in my view confirmed by the fact that the lexeme *upa-śī-* is most frequently used to describe a woman lying with a man (e.g. RV 10.18.8, ŚB 1.1.1.20, ŚB 4.1.5.9, etc.).

17.12.10   **de**: ~ PS 17.12.8cd, 12.9de; **e**: ~ PS 17.12.2d, 12.8d, 12.9e, 13.4d, 13.5d, 13.7d, 14.7d, 15.5d, 15.8d, 15.9d, 15.10d ~ ŚS 2.14.1d

a	yā vātābhra utpatite	8#	[− − − ᴜ | − ᴜ ᴜ ×]
b	⁺cattā varṣeṇa vidyutā	8	[− − − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
c	śālā ichanti *satvaram |	8	[− − − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
d	durṇāmnīḥ sarvāḥ santokā	8#	[− − − − | − − − ×]
e	nāśayāmaḥ sadānᵤvāḥ ||	8	[− ᴜ − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]

---

49 This is a recurrent sexual mytheme in Indian literature: we may recall the figure of Sītā, 'Miss Furrow', who was in fact born from a furrow made by King Janaka while ploughing. It is also possible that in the quoted JB line, a certain parallelism is intended between Heaven, conceived as 'dispenser' (*bhaga*) of riches, and Earth, herself dispensing goods, i.e. agricultural products that emerge from the cultivated furrows.

50 ŚS 4.37.10, *avakādā́n abhiśocā́n apsú jyotayamāmakā́n | piśācā́nt sárvān oṣadhe prá mṛṇīhi sáhasva ca ||*, "The *ávakā*-eating ones, scorching, making light (?) in the waters—all the *piśācás*, O herb, do thou slaughter and overpower" (Whitney).

51 Apparently, this *avāka* or *avakā* plant is the same as the *paruṣṇī- śīpālā-* (or *śaivala* or *śaivāla*), on which see my comment on 17.13.2 below. It is not clear why the Gandharvas would eat it.

52 Conjecture by Roth quoted by Whitney (1905: 213), commenting on ŚS 4.37.10.

Those [demonesses] who—when winds and storm clouds have risen—frightened away by by the rain, by the lightning, hastily seek [shelter in people's] houses. All the ill-named ones, together with their offspring—we make the Sadānuvās disappear!

vātābhra utpatite] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71 JM₃** vātābhra utpa[x]tite **V122** vātābhra upatite **Ji₄** vātābhra utpatite | **Pa_c** vātātradutpantite **K** • +cattā] carttā **O** catvā **K** • vidyutā]⁵³ **K Mā** vidyutāḥ **V71 JM₃ Ja Ma V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** • ichanti] **[O]** santi **K** *satvaram] chatvaraṃ **O** śchatvaraṃ **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃ ‖ Ji₄** *om.* **K** • durṇāmnīḥ]⁵⁴ durṇṇāmnīḥ **V122 Pa_c [Ja]?** **[Ma]? [Mā]?** durnāmnīḥ **V71** durṇāmnī **JM₃** durṇṇāmnāḥ **Ji₄** durnāmnīs **K** • sarvāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** sarvā **Ji₄** sarvās **K** • nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ] nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ **[Ma] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71** nāśayamaḥ sadānvāḥ **JM₃** nāśay(?)āmaḥ sadānvā **Ja** nāśayāma sadānvāḥ **Ji₄** nāśaya nas sadānvā **K** • ‖‖] ‖ ru 10 ‖ **Ma Mā** ‖ 12 | ru 11 | **Ja** ‖ ru ‖ 12 ‖ **V122** ‖ 12 ‖ **Ji₄** ‖ 12 ‖ ru 10 ‖ **Pa_c JM₃** ‖ 12 ‖ 10 ‖ **V71** Z 10 Z **K**

Bhattacharya reads *cattā+* in **b**, *icchanti satvaram* with no emendation sign in **c**.

a. The compound *vātābhrá-* as such does not occur anywhere else. However, we find *vātābhrajā́-* in ŚS 1.12.1⁵⁵ (~ PS 1.17.1): *jarāyujáḥ prathamá usríyo vŕṣā *vātābhrajā́ stanáyann eti vṛṣṭyā́ | sá no mṛḍāti tanvà r̥jugó ruján yá ékam ójas tredhā́ vicakramé ‖*, "First born of the afterbirth, the ruddy (*usríya*) bull, born of wind and cloud (?), goes thundering with rain; may he be merciful to our body, going straight on, breaking; he who, one force, hath stridden out threefold" (Whitney). Whitney's translation is based on Weber's (1858a: 406) and Bloomfield's (1886: 470) emendation of the editio princeps's reading *vātabhrajā* to *vātābhrajā́* on the basis of ŚS 1.12.3c⁵⁶.

Indeed, in stanza 3 of the same hymn, we find the same concept expressed by two compounds, *abhrajā́* and *vātajā́*: ŚS 1.12.3 (~ PS 1.17.3), *muñcá śīrṣaktyā́ utá kāsá enaṃ párusparur āvivéśā yó asya | yó abhrajā́ vātajā́ yáś ca śúṣmo vánaspátīnt sacatāṃ párvatāṃś ca ‖*, "Release thou him from headache and from cough—whoever hath entered each joint of him; the blast (? *śúṣma*) that is cloud-born and that is wind-born, let it attach itself to forest-trees (*vánaspáti*) and mountains" (Whitney).

The rain clouds (*abhrā́ṇi*) are also described as 'wind-hurried' (*vā́tajūtāni*) in ŚS 4.15.1 (~ PS 5.7.1), a hymn for abundant rain: *samútpatantu pradíśo nábhasvatīḥ sám abhrā́ṇi vā́tajūtāni yantu | maharṣabhásya nádato nábhasvato vāśrā́ ā́paḥ pṛthivī́ṃ tarpayantu ‖*, "Let the misty directions fly up together; let the clouds, wind-hurried, come together; let the lowing cows of the resounding misty great bull, the waters, satiate the earth" (Lubotsky transl. of the PS parallel).

That *vātābhrá* indicates stormy clouds⁵⁷ is also clear from the occurrence of *abhrá-* next to *vidyút-* and *varṣá-* in ŚS 11.7.21 (~16.84.1), where the three items are conceptually conceived as a group (next to similar groups of stones and herbs): *śárkarāḥ síkatā áśmāna óṣadhayo vīrúdhas tŕ̥ṇā | abhrā́ṇi vidyúto varṣám úcchiṣṭe sáṃśritā śritā́ ‖*, "Pebbles, gravel, stones, herbs, plants, grasses, clouds, lightnings, rain—in the remnant [are they] set together, set" (Whitney).

---

53 Barret's reading of **K**, *vidyuta*, must be a misprint. Given the unanimity of all the other mss., it is very likely that **Mā**'s reading, *vidyutā*, is secondary, and due to loss of *visarga*.

54 Again, Bhattacharya probably silently regularises the spelling °*rṇṇ*°. Notably, in all cases (17.12.7d, 17.12.8c and here), the two Odisha sub-branches seem clearly divided: **O^A** preserves retroflex °*rṇṇ*°, **O^B** has °*rn*°. However, in this last case, we have to deduce from Bhattacharya's implicit apparatus that **Mā** has °*rṇ(ṇ)*°. I suspect that Bhattacharya might have failed to report a reading °*rn*° for **Mā** here.

55 This stanza belongs to a short hymn about the bolt of lightning conceived as causing fever. The hymn is used to heal *takmán*. See Whitney 1905: 12–13 with references.

56 Vishva Bandhu (1960: 87) reports the following readings: *vā́tavrajā, vā́tabhrajā*. Whitney (1905: 13) reports that Sāyaṇa reads *vātavrajās* and explains it as "going swiftly like the wind" or "having a collection of winds," taking the bull mentioned as "the sun"; he adds that Roth had translated it as "with scorching wind," emending to *vātābhrajjās*.

57 The word *abhrá-* is explained as **ap-bhrá-*, "Wasser tragend," by Thieme (1985: 537[=1995: 1049]) and **n̥bʰ*-ró- in EWAia I p. 94. Cf. Lat. *imber*, Gr. ἀφρός.

b. The emendation to +*cattā* was proposed by Bhattacharya. This is the nom. f. pl. of the verbal adjective of the root *cat-*, 'to scare away, cause to hide' (attested forms: pres. ptc. *cátant-* RV+, caus. pres. *cātayāmasi* RV+). Note that *cātana* is an Atharvavedic category of spells aimed at banishing evil forces, i.e. exorcisms (see KauśS 8.25; cf. BLOOMFIELD 1899: 66, MODAK 1993: 59). This form in fact occurs in exorcisms, e.g. in RV 10.152.2 (the only Ṛgvedic hymn against the Sadānuvās), which reads *cattó itáś cattámútaḥ sárvā bhrūṇány ārúṣī | arāyyàm brahmaṇas pate tíkṣṇaśṛṅgodṛṣánn ihi ||*, "She is banished from here, banished from yonder, having assailed all fetuses. Go at the demoness, o sharp-horned Brahmaṇaspati, and gore her" (J-B). In these lines, *catta-* is used to exorcise the Sadānuvās from the dwellings of the living (similarly, ŚS 2.14.2 (~ PS 2.4.4) (Against Sadānuvās). … *gṛhebhyaś cātayāmahe ...*, "we frighten you away from [our] houses"). Our stanza seems to describe the opposite situation instead, namely when a storm causes the scared Sadānuvās to find shelter in the dwellings of the living, haunting them.

The formula *varṣeṇa vidyutā* is found in PS 15.19.5 (Against Apsarases), *yā uttarād ācaranti varṣeṇa vidyutā saha idam uluṅgulukābhyo apsararābhyo 'karaṃ namaḥ ||*, "Who approach from the North with the rain, with the lightning: (I paid homage here to the Uluṅgulukā Apsarases)" (Lelli), which, testifying to how all these anti-demon hymns share a similar poetic language, in turn resembles PS 1.36.4 (Against Sadānuvās), *yā uttarād ācaranty adharād vā sadānvāḥ aśmānaṃ ṛcchantīr yantu yo 'yaṃ svādāv ⁺anādyaḥ ||*, "Those [demonesses] who approach from the North or from the South: let them reach the stone, this one which is inedible in sweetness."

c. The faulty reading *ichanti chatvaraṃ* of **O** and *santi śchatvaraṃ* of **K** must be due to early perseveration of the syllable *cha* (then perhaps geminated in sandhi). Bhattacharya correctly writes *satvaram*, but omits the emendation sign *, which is necessary as the written archetype must already have featured *cha°* in place of *sa°*.

Whereas the word *gṛhá-* indicates the 'house' in general,[58] the word *śā́lā-* designates the profane habitation as opposed to cultic constructions (RENOU 1939: 482). The invocation *mā́nasya patni* (voc.), addressed to the *śā́lā* at ŚS 3.12.5 (For the building of a house), suggests that this word actually indicated only one specific part of an ensemble (RENOU 1939: 499). The meaning 'house' might in fact be a secondary *pars pro toto* designation of the entire house after the single part. This word notably occurs in ŚS 8.6, the above-mentioned hymn against demons threatening pregnant women and which has many parallels with ours. ŚS 8.6.10 reads: *yé śā́lāḥ pariṇṛ́tyanti sāyáṃ gardabhanādínaḥ | kusū́lā yé ca kukṣiláḥ kakubháḥ karúmāḥ srímāḥ | tā́n oṣadhe tváṃ gandhéna viṣūcī́nān ví nāśaya ||*, "They who dance around the dwellings (*śālā*) in the evening, making donkey-noises, they that [are] *kuśūlās* (granaries) and *kukṣilās* (paunchy), exalted (*kakubha*), *karumas*, *srimas*, these, O herb, with thy smell do thou make to disappear scattered" (Whitney). Both this and our stanza seem to express a worry about demons and demonesses who threaten women in their own houses. On this theme, see also ŚS 2.14.2 (~ PS 2.4.4) (Against Sadānuvās) (… *gṛhébhyaś cātayāmahe...*, "we make you hide away from [our] houses") and ŚS 2.14.4 (~ PS 5.1.4), *bhūtapátir nír ajatv índraś cetáḥ sadánvāḥ | gṛhásya budhná ā́sīnās tā índro vájreṇā́dhi tiṣṭhatu ||*, "Let the lord of the beings and Indra drive out from here the Sadānuvās, who sit at the bottom of the house. Let him (Indra) subdue them with the *vajra*" (Lubotsky). From the same PS hymn, 5.1.1cd, 5.1.2a read: *yo asyai nama it karad aped asya gṛhād ayat || apehi no gṛhebhyo*, "She will certainly go away from the house of this [man], who will pay her homage. Go away from our homestead!" (Lubotsky); and again, PS 5.1.5ab, *apetetaḥ sadānvā ahiṃsantīr imaṃ gṛham |*, "Go away from here, O Sadānuvās, not harming this house" (Lubotsky). On the same theme, compare PS 17.13.8, 17.13.10 and 17.14.10 below; see also the exorcism at ŚS 14.2.19 (~ PS 18.8.10), to be employed by a bride to purify her house when she first moves in.

---

58 In early Vedic, it is actually found mostly in the plural, in the meaning 'estate', 'homestead' (see RAU 1957: 37ff.), i.e. the complex of the various fenced areas and constructions constituting the settlement (cowpen, barn, etc.); while the singular indicates a single 'fenced area, corral'.

d. On *santokā* see my comment on PS 17.12.8c above.

Sūkta 13

17.13.1   **d**: ~ PS 17.12.1h, 12.3d, 13.9g

a   yā dhānₐyāt sambhavanti   8#   [− − ᴜ − | − ᴜ − ×]
b   kṣetrād ⁺uptād ⁺ᵤv ⁺arpitāt | 8   [− − − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
c   kr̥tād abhiprahāyₐyā   8   [ᴜ − ᴜ ᴜ | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
d   naśyatetaḥ sadānᵤvāḥ || 8   [− ᴜ − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]

Those [demonesses] who arise from the cornfield that is sown or dug up; those [demonesses] who are to be sent forth against [an enemy, away] from the [field that is] cultivated. O Sadānuvās, disappear from here!

yā dhānyāt] **K** **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122 Ji₄ Pa𝒸 [Mā]** **JM₃** yā[.]ṣākmat **V71**   •   sambhavanti] **K** saṃbhavanti **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122 Ji₄ Pa𝒸 [Mā] V71 JM₃** saṃbhavaṃti **Ja**   •   kṣetrād ⁺uptād ⁺v ⁺arptitāt |]] kṣetrāduptāvyārpitāt | **Ma Ja Pa𝒸 Mā V71 JM₃** kṣatrādr̥ptāvyarpitāt || **Ji₄** kṣetrāduptārva(rda?)rpitāt | **V122** kṣettrāt(*vs.* kṣetrāt Bᴀʀʀᴇᴛ, Bʜᴀᴛᴛ.)pitādva(*space*)rpitā **K⁵⁹**   •   abhiprahāyyā] **[Ja]** **[Ma]** abhiprahāryā **Pa𝒸** abhiḥ prahāyyā **Ji₄** abhiḥ prahājyā **V122** abhiprahājyā **Mā V71 JM₃** apiprāhyā **K**   •   naśyatetaḥ sadānvāḥ] **[O]** naśyatetas sadānvā **K**   • || **[Mā] JM₃ [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa𝒸** | **V71** Z 1 Z **K**

Bhattacharya reads *saṃbhavanti* in a and *uptādvarpitāta+* in b, the latter probably a misprint for *-arpitāt*.

b. Note that the **O** mss. read °*ptāvyā*°, whereas **K** has °*ptādva*°. As we most definitely need to read an ablative *uptād*, the question is whether the original cluster was *dvy* or *dv*, i.e. whether it's easier to explain **O** *vy*, **K** *dv* from an original *dvy* or from an original *dv*. Assessing this is crucial to deciding whether to adopt *uptād vyarpitāt* (or *vyārpitāt*) or *uptād v arpitāt*. In my view, the most plausible scenario is one according to which the original cluster was *dv* (as in **K**), as this could easily have been confused with *vy* in the **O** tradition. Thus I assume °*uptādvarpitāt* > °*uptāvyarpitāt*, and I emend to ⁺*uptād* ⁺*v* ⁺*arpitāt*. Bhattacharya's *uptādvarpitāta+* also features the conjunction *u*; Bhattacharya's *arpitāta* is probably just a misprint for *-arpitāt*.

Moreover, reading *vyarptitāt* (or *vyārptitāt*) would pose the problem of how to interpret the lexeme *vy-r̥-* (*vy-ā-r-* is not attested). In the RV, it carries the meaning 'to open (e.g. a door)' (RV 1.69.10a, [...] *dúro vy r̥ṇvan*, "they open the doors" ; RV 1.128.6g, *dvárā vy r̥ṇvati*; RV 10.25.5b, *vy r̥ṇvire*; RV 3.30.10b, *vy ára*; RV 1.139.4a, *vy r̥ṇvathas*). These forms are classified under ¹*ar-* (*h₃er-) in Lᴜʙᴏᴛsᴋʏ 1997 (followed by Kɪᴍ, *Index*), and under ²*ar-* (*h₁er-) by Küᴍᴍᴇʟ (2000: 103f; LVV p. 11). The only occurrence of the lexeme in the AV is the following, and in my view it seems

---

59 In **K**, the akṣaras °*dva*° and °*rpi*° are separated by a large space in which two more akṣaras could fit. Nevertheless, the space is not empty; the two akṣaras are in fact united by the upper line from which they "hang down."

best ascribed to ¹*ar-* (*h₃er-): ŚS 7.44.1cd (~ PS 20.16.3cd, *índraś ca viṣṇo yád ápaspṛdhethāṃ tredhā́ sahásraṃ ví tád airayethām* ||, "O Viṣṇu, Indra also, what ye fought, a thousand—that did ye triply dispersed"; "O Indra und Viṣṇu, als ihr in Wettstreit geraten wart, da habt ihr das Tausend dreifach aufgeteilt" (Kubisch). Neither of the above meanings seem very suitable for our line.

On the other hand, the causative *arpaya-* is generally employed in the AV to describe the violent action of piercing by means of a weapon (and it is thus best classified as belonging to ²*ar-* (*h₁er-) 'to hit'[60]): e.g., ŚS 10.9.1b (~ PS 16.136.1b), *sapátneṣu vájram arpayaitám* |, "Cast this thunderbolt on [our] rivals." Compare also the lexeme *sam-ṛ-*, used in the causative with *vajram* in a similar fashion in PS 17.13.2, below. Similarly, ŚS 5.19.2b (~ PS 9.18.8b) (part of a series of curses against oppressors of brahmins), *yé bṛhátsāmānam āṅgirasám ā́rpayan brāhmaṇáṃ jánāḥ | pétvas téṣām ubhayā́dam ávis tokā́ny āvayat* ||: "The persons who pierced Bṛhatsāman, the descendant of Aṅgiras, the Brāhmaṇa—a ram with two rows of teeth, a sheep devoured their offspring" (Bloomfield). Among other attestations, we find PS 17.14.4 *sadānvā brahmaṇaspate paro bhrūṇāny arpaya*, "O Brahmaṇaspati, pierce the Sadānuvās [to drive them away] away from the embryos" (my transl.); cf. also PS 2.85.1c.

Interestingly, however, we find a similar causative form employed in a stanza belonging to the Earth hymn, in which the Earth is being dug up: ŚS 12.1.35cd (PS 17.4.4cd), *yát te bhūme vikhánāmi kṣiprám tád ápi rohatu | mā́ te márma vimṛgvari mā́te hṛ́dayam arpipam* ||, "What I dig up of you, O Earth, let it quickly grow back; let me not pierce through a vital spot of yours, oh cleansing one, [nor] through your heart." It is possible that the poet is aiming for a wordplay between the more violent meaning of *arpaya-*, namely 'pierce (with a weapon)', and another meaning, one that would naturally occur to a native speaker of Vedic if the verb were used with *bhūmi* as object. This meaning must be close to that of *vi-khan-*, 'to dig up', namely 'to pierce the ground', likely by means of a shovel or harrow, both instruments whose use requires a motion comparable to that of piercing with a weapon. Thus, the *kṣetra- arpita-* of our stanza must be a 'field that is dug up (with a shovel)' or 'tilled (with a harrow)'.

The Sadānuvās are called *kṣetriyā́-* in ŚS 2.14.5 (~ PS 2.4.2) (Against Sadānuvās), *yádi sthá kṣetriyā́ṇāṃ yádi vā púruṣeṣitāḥ | yádi sthá dásyubhyo jātā́ náśyatetáḥ sadā́nvāḥ* ||, "If ye are of the endemic (? *kṣetriyā́*) ones, or if sent by men; if ye are born from the barbarians (*dásyu*) disappear from here, O *sadā́nvās*" (Whitney); "Ob ihr nun vom Kṣetriya-Leiden her seid, oder ob von Menschen ausgesandt, oder ob ihr von den Dasyus abstammt; verschwindet von hier, Sadānuvās" (Zehnder). Both Whitney and Zehnder adhere to the interpretation according to which the *kṣetriyá* referred to here is an illness (on this interpretation, see ZEHNDER 1999: 30; on the illness, see ZYSK 1985: 20ff.). However, in light of our stanza, a more literal interpretation is perhaps possible: "If you originate in the field …"

c. The verbal adjective *kṛtá-* is attested in the meaning 'cultivated' (MW) at least in Manu 10.114 (discussing the brahmins' means of subsistence): *akṛtaṃ ca kṛtāt kṣetrād gaurajāvikam eva ca | hiraṇyaṃ dhānyamannaṃ ca pūrvaṃ pūrvam adoṣavat*, "(Accepting) an untilled field is not as much of a fault as (accepting) a tilled one; a cow, a goat, a sheep, gold, grain, and cooked food— each (is less of a fault to accept) than the one that follows it" (DONIGER & SMITH 1991: 197).

The lexeme *abhi-pra-hay/hi-* (pres. *hinoti*) is attested in the verbal noun *abhiprahita-* in ŚS 10.1.15 (~ PS 16.36.5d) (Against witchcraft, *kṛtyā́*): *ayám pánthāḥ kṛtyéti tvā nayāmo 'bhipráhitāṃ práti tvā prá hiṇmaḥ | ténābhí yāhi bhañjaty ánasvatīva vāhínī viśvárūpā kurū́ṭínī* ||, "Saying 'this is the road, O witchcraft' we conduct thee; thee that wast sent forth against [us] we send forth back again; by that [road] go against [them], breaking, like a draft-cow with a cart, all-formed, wearing a wreath (?)" (Whitney). In this stanza, an enemy has sent (*hi-*) forth (*prá-*) the witchcraft against

---

60 In the AV, the causative *arpaya-* (verbal noun *arpita-*) occurs as a simplex as well as with the preverbs *ā́*, *adhy-ā́*, *ní*, *práti*, and *sám*. KIM, *Index*, classifies them all under ¹*ar-* (*h₃er-), and similarly the equivalent RV forms are classified under ¹*ar-* (*h₃er-) in LUBOTSKY 1997 (although Lubotsky has since changed his mind). However, they are best ascribed to ²*ar-* (*h₁er-).

(*abhí-*) the reciter, who then sends (*hi-*) her forth (*prá-*) back again (*práti*). Therefore, even though in our stanza, the ablative *kṛtād* suggests that these demoness are to be sent *away* from it, the preverb *abhi* suggests that the intention is to send them against an enemy. Exorcising demons or curses by sending them against someone else is typical of AV magic.

The formation *abhiprahāyya-* is a gerundive. A form without the preverb *abhi* occurs in the Vrātyakaṇḍa in the meaning 'messenger' (< 'one to be sent forth'): ŚS 15.3.10 (~ PS 18.29.1l), *tásya devajanā́ḥ pariṣkandā́ ā́sant saṃkalpā́ḥ prahāyyà víśvāni bhūtā́ny upasádaḥ ||*, "Of him [i.e. the vrātya] the god-folk were the footmen, resolves the messengers, all beings the waiters" (Whitney).

17.13.2

a	yāḥ paruṣāḥ pāpagandhāḥ	8#	[– U U – | – U – ×]
b	⁺sadārūkṣā visṛkpadī |	8	[U – – – | U – U ×]
c	tā vajreṇa samarpayan	8	[– – – U | U – U ×]
d	nir ajetaḥ śacīpate ||	8	[U U – – | U – U ×]

Those deathly pale (?) [demonesses], who smell awful, always rough, duck-footed—them, striking with the *vájra*, drive away from here, O lord of might.

N.B. Pāda **b** is unreadable in **Ma**. **Pac** features a lacuna from after *pāpa...* to *...kpadī*.

————————

yāḥ paruṣāḥ] [**Ma**] [**Mā**] yāḥ puruṣāḥ **Ja V122 Ji₄ Pac JM₃** yā puraṣā **V71** yāḥ puruṣāḥ **K** • pāpagandhāḥ] [**Ja**] **Ji₄** [**Mā**] **V71 JM₃** pāpagandhāḥ […] **Ma** pāpa(// *space*) **Pac** pāpagaṃ ° ° ° ° ° (//) ° ° **K**[61] • ⁺sadārūkṣā] sadāruksā [**Ja**] **Ji₄** [**Mā**] **V71 JM₃** […] **Ma Pac** sadākūkṣā **K** • visṛkpadī] [**Ja**] **Ji₄** [**Mā**] **V71 JM₃** […] **Ma** (*space*)kpadī **Pac** visarpatī **K** • \|] **K** [**Mā**] **V71 JM₃** [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Pac** \|\| **Ji₄** • tā] **K** [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Ji₄ Pac** tāṃ **Mā V71 JM₃** • samarpayan niratejaḥ] samarpayanniratejaḥ [**Mā**] **V71 JM₃** [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122** samarpayannirateja **Pac** samarpayanvirajetaḥ **Ji₄** samarpayantirajetaś **K** • śacīpate] **K** śacīpateḥ **O** • \|\|\|] [**O**] Z 2 Z **K**

Bhattacharya reads *rukṣā* in pāda **b**.

a. Even though **K** and most of the **O** mss. preserve *puruṣāḥ*, **Ma** and **Mā**'s reading *paruṣāḥ* (notably preserved in the older mss. of the two Odisha sub-branches) can be regarded as the *lectio difficilior*. Moreover, the pronoun *yāḥ* points to a feminine plural, but *puruṣāḥ* can only be masculine (the corresponding feminine stem, already attested in RV, is *púruṣī-*). On the other hand, the old feminine form (RV, AV) of the adjective *paruṣá-*, 'grey, dirt-coloured' (EWAia II p.95), is *páruṣṇī-*, with seven occurrences in RV, six of which are the feminine name of a river, Páruṣṇī, the modern Ravi (RV 4.22.2, 5.52.9, 7.18.8,9, 8.74.15, 10.75.5; the remaining occurrences of *páruṣa-* in RV refer to 'grey' cattle: f. at 8.93.13, *ukṣán-* m. at RV 5.27.5, and *gáu-* m. at RV 6.56.3); the

————————

61 In **K**, the sequence *pāpagaṃ* is followed by five small dots up to the end of f217a line 15, then two more dots at the beginning of line 16. I wonder if this could suggest that **K**'s antigraph featured seven illegible *akṣaras*. However, this is incompatible, on the one hand, with the corresponding Odisha text, which has four akṣaras, and on the other hand with the metre of the two lines, which implies no more than three missing syllables (exactly what the four Odia akṣaras supply). It might be that the two dots at the beginning of f217a16 correspond to the first two syllables of pāda **b** (presumably *sadā*), but it seems reasonable to believe that **K**'s copyist simply added enough dots at the end of f217a15 to fill the space left before the margin. It is interesting that **Pac** has a somewhat corresponding, though larger *lacuna*: from *pāpa* (at the end of p. 11, line 3) up to *kpadī* (which is preceded by some empty space in line 4). In **Ma**, too, the whole of pāda **b** is unreadable (Bhattacharya's apparatus reads: **Ma** *"gandhāḥ X X . . padī" iti naṣṭam*).

younger feminine *paruṣā-*, as recorded by PW, MW, is regularly found in the later language, in which we find the form *paruṣṇī* only in the restricted use of river name. In the AV, the old feminine *páruṣṇī* is found once in ŚS 6.12.3, referring to a "grey" plant, the *śīpālā*, or *blyxa octandra*, a grey=green weed growing in pools, but the feminine *paruṣā* does not occur. Therefore, in adopting the reading *paruṣāḥ* without any emendation, we need to assume that this alternative feminine was already possible at the time of the AV. Perhaps the different morphological form was due to a specialised meaning: whereas *páruṣṇī* was still the general feminine form of the word for 'grey', in the vocabulary of the AV poets, *paruṣā* referred specifically to a personified grey demoness.

The few other AV occurrences of the adjective are the following: ŚS 5.22.3ab defines *tákman*, 'fever' (to which the hymn is dedicated), as *yáḥ paruṣáḥ pāruṣeyó 'vadhvaṃsá ivāruṇáḥ*, "who [is] grey, son of the grey one [and] red like (saw-)dust" (Zysk 1985: 41). ŚS 10.4.2 is a rather obscure stanza belonging to a hymn against poisonous snakes: *darbháḥ śocís tarū́ṇakam áśvasya vằraḥ paruṣásya vằraḥ | ráthasya bándhuram*, "Darbhá-grass, brightness, young shoot (?*tarū́ṇaka*); horse's tail-tuft, rough one's tail-tuft; chariot's seat (?*bándhura*)" (Whitney). Here *paruṣásya* is again perhaps best interpreted as a reference to grey coloured cattle.

After this survey, it is still not evident why a demoness would be called *paruṣā*. One last occurrence may give us a hint. In ŚS 8.8.4, part of a hymn "to conquer enemies" that the Kauśikasūtra employs in an army rite (KauśS 16.9-20; summarised by Lanman in Whitney 1905: 502f.), a grey net is invoked to make the enemies grey as well (i.e. dead?): *paruṣā́n amū́n paruṣāhváḥ kṛṇotu hántv enān vádhako vadhaíḥ | kṣiprám śará iva bhajantāṃ bṛhajjāléna sáṃditāḥ ||*, "Let the one named Grey make those men grey; let the killer slay them with deadly weapons; let them be divided quickly like a reed, tied together with a lofty net" (my transl.). If I am correct in interpreting 'to make the enemies grey' as meaning 'to make the enemies dead', then it is possible that in our stanza the grey colour is intended to evoke a pallor comparable to that of a dead person, which sounds like a plausible feature for a deadly demoness.[62]

b. Bhattacharya adopts the **O** reading, *rukṣā*. The word *rukṣá-*, interpreted as a derivative from *ruc-* (EWAia II p.452), is only attested in RV 6.3.7b, where Agni is described: *vṛ́ṣā rukṣá óṣadhīṣu nūnot |*, "der glänzende(?) Stier brüllt in den Pflanzen" (Geldner). If we accept this reading

---

62 Other solutions involving emendation do not seem to yield significantly more attractive meanings. We might consider emending to the related word **pā́ruṣyāḥ*. The noun *pá́ruṣya-* occurs in ŚS 12.5.30 (~ PS 16.144.1), belonging to a prose section that describes the brahmin's cow as embodying a number of dangerous entities that may harm whoever should steal it: *pāpmā́dhidhīyámānā pá́ruṣyam avadhīyámānā ||*, "[She is] evil when being set on, harshness when being set down" (Whitney). However, to suppose there are demonesses called *pāruṣyāḥ*, 'harshnesses', seems rather contrived to me. We might then consider emending to **paruṣyāḥ*. The word *paruṣya-* only occurs in AB 3.34.2, belonging to a section that describes how Prajāpati's seed first turned into coal and was then turned into various beings: *yāni parikṣāṇāny āsaṃs te kṛṣṇā pasavo 'bhavan ' yā lohinī mṛttikā te rohitā atha yad bhasmāsīt ' tat paruṣyaṃ vyasarpad gauro gavaya ṛśya uṣṭro gardabha iti ye caite 'ruṇāḥ paśavas te ca*, "The extinguished coals became black cattle; the reddened earth ruddy (cattle). The ash which there was crept about in diverse forms, the buffalo, the Gayal, the antelope, the camel, the ass, and these ruddy animals" (Keith). Keith takes *paruṣyaṃ* adverbially ("in diverse form"). PW glosses it with 'bunt, mannichfaltig' and treats it as a derivative from *páruṣ-*, 'joint, knot, limb'. EWAia II p. 95 glosses it with "rauh, struppig (AiBr)", in connection with "*paruṣiman-* m. 'Struppigkeit' (AiBr)" (glossed by PW with "rauhes Aussehen (im Gegensatz zu der Glätte und Fülle des wohlgenährten Viehes", with reference to AB 4.26, *tasmād etayor eva śaiśirayor māsayor āgatayor ye caiva grāmyāḥ paśavo ye cāraṇyā aṇimānam eva tat paruṣimāṇaṃ niyanti*, "Therefore in these months of the cool season the cattle of the village and of the wild become thin and shaggy" (Keith). It would not be implausible to have a 'shaggy demoness', but this solution is no more attractive than just leaving *paruṣāḥ* without resorting to emendation. Lastly, one could wish to emend to **puruṣyāḥ*: the word *puruṣyà* is absent from the AV, and found only in RV 7.29.4, where it refers to the Ṛṣis as "Menschensöhne" (Geldner). PS 17.15.4b below mentions demonesses "who have been [magically] created from the race of men (*manuṣyebhyaś ca yāḥ kṛtāḥ*), as opposed to those who act as "*dāsa* women of the race of the Asura demons". Thus, *puruṣyāḥ* demonesses could similarly be "demonesses born from men." This kind of argument might work as an ex-post explanation, but is no more compelling that our interpretation of *paruṣāḥ* as 'deathly pale'. Thus, I prefer to keep the text without emending.

and interpretation for our text, we would have to imagine a "shining" demoness, which doesn't seem too plausible to me given the context. Differently, J-B interpret the RV occurrence as a loc. sg. of a variant of *vr̥kṣá-*: "(that) bull keeps roaring in the tree, in the plants" (J-B). If this is correct, then we need to look elsewhere. PW suggests that *rukṣá-* might be a variant of *rūkṣá-*, which is widely attested (Br+) both in the literal meaning, 'rough, dry to the touch, arid, dreary', or 'emaciated, thin' when referring to physical appearance (esp. in medical texts), as well as metaphorically, 'harsh, unkind, cruel', said of persons and speech. This range of meanings would fit much better as a name or a characteristic of a demoness. I therefore propose to emend to ⁺*rūkṣā* on the basis of **K** *kūkṣa*, which in fact preserves a long vowel (the initial *k* is probably due to assimilation).[63] I opt for translating with 'rough', as it can refer to both physical appearance or behaviour—although all the other items in the two pādas seem to describe physical characteristics.

It is likely that *sadā* and *rūkṣā* here form the compound *sadārūkṣā*. Compare the compounds *sadāpr̥ṇá-*, *sadā́vr̥dha-*, *sadāsáḥ-*, and *sadāsā́-*, all found in RV (not in the AV), and possibly also *sadānvā-*, if based on *sadā* and the root *nu-*.

The compound *visr̥kpadī* is a hapax. Although other compounds with *padī* as the second member do occur, (e.g. *ghr̥tápadī* in RV 10.70.8), *visŕ̥j-* is never attested in compounds, nor as a root noun (although we find other root compounds with *sŕ̥j-*: *niḥsŕ̥j-*, *saṃsŕ̥j-*). The meaning is not immediately evident. The lexeme *vi-sr̥j-* is constructed with a body part as the object in ŚB 3.6.3.21, in which the sacrificer is instructed to relax his fingers at the end of a ritual phase that required him to clench his fists: *athā́trāṅgúlīr vísr̥jate*, "he now loosens his fingers" (Eggeling). The literal meaning must be 'to stretch out'. Thus, it is possible that our *visr̥kpadī* means 'stretching out [her] feet'. As the whole stanza is devoted to highlighting some uncharming characteristics of the Sadānuvās, I wonder if this compound could mean 'duck-footed'. Compare also the epithet *vr̥ṅktapadī*, 'having twisted feet', in 17.15.9b below.

d. The compound *śacīpati-* can be an epithet of Indra or the Aśvins, but the reference to the *vájra*, Indra's weapon, leaves no doubt as to the interpretation here. Indra is also invoked in the next stanza.

17.13.3   ~ KauśS 13.24[116].7; **ab**: ~ PS 20.29.3ab; **bc**: ~ PS 9.6.3bc

a	ut tiṣṭhata *nir dravata	8#	[− − ∪ ∪	− ∪ ∪ ×]
b	na va *ihāsti nyañcanam		8#	[∪ ∪ ∪ −	− − ∪ ×]
c	indro vaḥ sarvāsāṃ sākaṃ	8#	[− − − −	− − − ×]
d	garbhān āṇḍāni bhetsyati ‖	8	[− − − −	∪ − ∪ ×]

Get up! Run away! There is no refuge for you here! Indra is going to split the embryos, the eggs of you all together!

*nir dravata] ni dravata **K Ma Ji₄ Pa꜀ Mā** ni dravataḥ **Ja** ni dra[x]vata **V122** nni dravata **V71 JM₃** • va *ihāsti nyañcanam] vai hāsti nyañcanaṃ **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71 JM₃** vai hāsta nyañcanaṃ **Mā** va hyāstvinviḍañcanam,(=Griffiths *vs.* Barret, Bhatt. °vipañca°) **K**   • ‖] [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ‖ **Ji₄** *om*. **K**   • indro vaḥ] [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** i[.]ndro vaḥ **V71** indro vas **K**   • bhetsyati] [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** bhetsati **Ji₄** bhaśchasi **K**   • ‖]] [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** | **V71** Z 3 Z **K**

---

63 I wonder if the shortening could have been favoured by a tendency to an iambic rhythm in the opening. It is, however, more likely that the error occurred in the written transmission.

KauśS 13.24.7 = 116.7 (Bloomfield 1890a: 269)
ut tiṣṭhata nir dravata
na va ihāstv ity añcanam |
indro vaḥ sarvāsāṃ sākaṃ
garbhān āṇḍāni bhetsyati
phaḍ ḍhatāḥ pipīlikā iti ||

PS 20.29.3ab
ut tiṣṭhata nir dravata
na va ihāsti nyañcanam |
amuṣya vittam abhi vaḥ suvāmi
†tad anuvadhvaṃ sudatīr ahinas tat†

PS 9.6.3
indrāmitrā indrahatā
na va ihāsti nyañcanam |
indro vaḥ sarvāsāṃ sākaṃ
śakras tṛṇedhu vṛtrahā ||

Bhattacharya reads +*nirdravata* (Griffiths 2004: 90, *nir dravata) in **a**, +*ihāsti* in **b** (Griffiths has no emendation sign).

A first edition of this stanza, and the parallel from book 20, was presented by Griffiths in his survey of Paippalāda mantras in the Kauśikasūtra (2004: 89f.). His edition was based on the readings of **JM**, **Ji₄**, **V122**, **Pa**, and **K**. Griffiths provides no translation. Kubisch translates the parallel of pādas **ab** (20.29.3ab) as follows: "Erhebt euch! Lauft heraus! Hier gibt es keine Zuflucht für euch."

a. The emendation *nir, first proposed by Griffiths (ibid.), is supported by the KauśS and the PS parallel at 20.29.3ab (here, once again, the **O** mss. consulted by Griffiths and Kubisch preserve *ni*, but **K** has *nir*), as well as by the absence of the lexeme *ni-dru-* from the PS (Griffiths ibid.).

Note that the lexeme *nir-dru-* is used in a hymn against various diseases, in which said diseases are ordered to leave the sick person's body with the formula "let them run out, out of the orifice", *nír dravantu bahír bílam* (see ŚS 9.8.11a, 13–18d ~ PS 16.75.1a, 3-8d; note that the diseases referred to in the second group of verses are female).

b. In commenting on the KauśS reading, *na va ihāstv ity añcanam*, Bloomfield (1890a: 269) suggests emending it to *na va ihāstu nyañcanaṃ*. This corresponds to the PS text, with the only difference that the present *asti* is preserved, rather than the imperative *astu*.

Bhattacharya writes +*ihāsti* with a plus sign; Griffiths does not write any emendation sign. However, the **O** spelling °*vaihāsti*° consists of three akṣaras, namely *vai*, *hā*, and *sti*. If we believe that the archetype preserved the correct reading, it must have featured four akṣaras: *va, i, hā*, and *sti*. Thus, at least a plus sign is necessary. If we believe that the archetype already featured the incorrect spelling with three akṣaras, then an asterisk is required. Since **K** has *va, hyā, sti* (**K** also reads *va, hyā, sti* at 9.6.3 and *va, hyā, stvi* at 20.29.3), it seems easier to explain **K** *vahyāsti* as being due to metathesis of the semivowel from *vai hāsti*, rather than from *va ihāsti* (which contained no semivowel). This kind of error could have arisen when the text was dictated to the scribe who wrote **K**. This means that the written archetype likely already had *vai hāsti*, just as we find in the **O** mss. Thus, if we restore *va ihāsti*, we are reconstructing a stage that is earlier than that of the written archetype, and, accordingly, we need to mark our emendation with an asterisk.

On the sequence °*stinya*° PS ~ °*stvitya*° KauśS, the following remark by Griffiths (ibid.) is worth quoting in full: "Besides the simple error *nya → tya*, all KauśS mss. share the surprising insertion of a *v*, to give the same sequence °*āstvi*° that is found also (two out of three times) in **K**. This interesting case of correspondence between the Kashmir and KauśS transmissions was already pointed out by Witzel in 1985[=1985a] (p. 266f.). It seems to imply some kind of contact between

the KauśS sources and predecessors of our **K**.”

On *nyáñcana-*, see KUIPER 1953: 41f and KUIPER 1958 with references.

Note that this is one of the very few instances in this hymn in which we find an irregular cadence in an even pāda at the end of a hemistich (cf. PS 17.14.6b, PS 17.15.9b).

cd. As noted by GRIFFITHS (2004: 89) with regards to the KauśS parallel, the reading *āṇḍāni*, which is preserved by the PS, is found only in the KauśS ms. **Bü**, whereas all the other mss. read *āṃgāni*, except one that reads *āṃjāni*.

The threat of Indra splitting the Sadānuvās' embryos and eggs seems to be a retaliation for the fact that these demonesses threaten human children. A similar curse is found in PS 2.85.1.

17.13.4   **d**: ~ PS 17.12.2d, 12.8d, 12.9e, 12.10e, 13.5d, 13.7d, 14.7d, 15.5d, 15.8d, 15.9d, 15.10d ~ ŚS 2.14.1d

a	indra jahi sthūlaśaṅkhāṃ	8#	[– ᴗ ᴗ ᴗ | – ᴗ – ×]
b	mr̥ṇīhi durṇaśīṃ kuham |	8	[ᴗ – ᴗ – | ᴗ – ᴗ ×]
c	*arāyyaṃ śakadhūm‚yaṃ	8	[ᴗ – – ᴗ | ᴗ – ᴗ ×]
d	nāśayāmaḥ sadān‚vāḥ ||	8	[– ᴗ – – | ᴗ – ᴗ ×]

O Indra, slay her who has a large conch shell (vagina?); crush the hiding one who is hard to find; the Arāyī́ demoness, the one who belongs to the pile of cow dung—we make the Sadānuvās disappear!

sthūlaśaṅkhāṃ] sthūḷaśaṅkhāṃ **V122** sthūlaśaṃkhāṃ **Ji₄ JM₃** sthūla[x]śaṃkhāṃ **Pa꜀** sthūlaśa(ṅgā →)ṅkhāṃ **V71** sthūraśaṅkaṃ **Ma Ja Mā** sthūraśaṅkaṃ **K**   •   mr̥ṇīhi] **[O]** mr̥ṇha (= R-V, BHATT. vs. mr̥ṇīhi BARRET) **K**   •   durṇaśīṃ kuham \|] durṇṇaśīṃ kuham **Ma Ja V122 Pa꜀ Mā V71 JM₃** durṇṇanī nr̥īṃ(? sthīṃ?) kuham \|\| **Ji₄** durniśīṅkuham, \| **K**   •   *arāyyaṃ] rāyaṃ **K** arāÿīṃ **[Ma] V122 Ji₄** arāÿāṃ **Ja Pa꜀ Mā V71 JM₃**   •   śakadhūmyaṃ] **K [Ma] Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71 JM₃** śakadhūmaṃ **Mā**   •   nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ] nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** nāśaÿāmaḥ sanvāḥ **JM₃** nāśayās sadānvā **K**   •   \|\|] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] \|\|** yāḥ pu \|\| **V122**[64] \| **V71 JM₃ Z 4 Z K**

Bhattacharya reads *sthūlaśaṃkhāṃ* in pāda **a**, *arāyīṃ* in pāda **c**.

a The compound *sthūlaśaṅkhā-*, literally 'a woman with (a) large conch shell(s)', is glossed by MW as 'a woman having a large vulva'. The compound is only attested once in the Karṇaparvan of the Mbh (st. 8.30.21): here the text describes the country of the Bāhlīkas as being inhabited by depraved women, who, intoxicated, throw away their clothes to sing and dance. The text reports the nostalgic speech of a Bāhlīka man who has dwelt for some time in Kurujaṅgala (in the country of the Kuru, farther east?) and longs for his home country: Mbh 8.30.21, *śatadrukanadīṃ tīrtvā tāṃ ca ramyām irāvatīṃ gatvā svadeśaṃ drakṣyāmi sthūlaśaṅkhāḥ śubhāḥ striyaḥ \|\|*, “Having crossed the river Śatadru and the pleasant Irāvatī, having gone to my home country, I will see those beautiful women *with large conch shells*” (my transl.). PW and MW do not record any sexual meaning for the word *śaṅkha-*, 'shell', although MW's gloss seems fitting here[65]. Certainly interesting and possibly relevant for the interpretation of our stanza is the vulgar and highly sexualised tone of the Mbh

---

64 It looks as if the copyist of **V122** started copying stanza 17.13.2a again by mistake.

65 A puzzling passage is Harivaṃśa (Bhaviṣyaparvan) 116.35, which, while describing a series of instances of corrupt behaviour typical of the end of the Kali-Yuga, reads *ekaśaṅkhās tathā nāryo …*, “then women have only one conch shell”. If *śaṅkha-* indicated the vagina, this passage would not make sense. Perhaps 'adorn themselves with only one conch shell'? I am not able to judge, however, why such habit would be listed among instances of corruption.

passage.

b. The compound *durṇaśa-*, 'difficult to attain, access, find' occurs once in ŚS 5.11.6 (in the dialogue hymn between Varuṇa and Atharvan), *ékaṃ rájasa enā́ paró anyád ásty enā́ pará ékena durṇáśaṃ cid arvā́k | tát te vidvā́n varuṇa prá bravīmy* […] ||, "There is one other thing beyond the welkin; there is something hard to attain, hitherward from what is beyond; this I Varuṇa, knowing it, proclaim to thee. […]" (Whitney).

The variant *dūnáśa-* is found once in RV, also in a mystical hymn: RV 3.56.8, *trír uttamā́ dūnáśā rocanā́ni tráyo rājanty ásurasya vīrā́ḥ | ṛtā́vāna iṣirā́ dūḷábhāsas trír ā́ divó vidáthe santu devā́ḥ* ||, "Threefold are the highest realms of light, difficult to reach; (there?) rule/ shine three heroes of the Lord. Truthful, vigorous, difficult to deceive—three times a day let the gods be at the rite" (J-B).

Of course, our stanza does not share such a mystic tone: in fact, our f. *durṇaśī́-* must simply indicate a demoness who is hidden (see my comment on *kuham* here below) and difficult to locate and flush out.

The RV also features the adjective *dūṇā́śa-* (6x), which carries the same meaning as the variants with short *a*, and which is mostly used to qualify things that one aspires to get: in RV 9.63.11c, it qualifies "wealth" (*rayím*); RV 7.32.7d mentions the "patrimony" (*gáyam*) of one who is difficult to get at (*dūṇā́śaḥ*); in 6.45.26a, it qualifies "partnership" (*sakhyám*) with Indra; in 7.18.25d the *kṣatrám;* in 6.27.8d the *dákṣiṇā*. One last occurrence might be compared to our stanza, as here this adjective qualifies an enemy: RV 1.176.4, *ásunvantaṃ samaṃ jahi dūṇā́śaṃ yó ná te máyaḥ | asmábhyam asya védanaṃ daddhí sūríś cid ohate* ||, "Smash anyone who doesn't press soma, anyone difficult to get at who is no joy to you. Give his possessions to us, even though he will laud himself as a patron" (J-B).

The word *kuham* is a hapax. Both **K** and **O** preserve the ending *-am*: if we want to interpret this as a feminine accusative in conformity with the neighbouring words, we need to assume a stem *kuh-* (a f. root noun). A root *kuh-* has been posited (it is also found in the Dhātupāṭha) on the basis of Cl. Skt. *kuhayate*, 'to deceive with tricks', as well as a family of words such as *kuhaka-*, m., 'cheater, fraudster' (Up+), *a-kuhaka-* 'not a charlatan' (SuśrS), *kuhana* and *kuhanikā*, 'trickery, deception' (Lex.), Pāli *kuhanā*, f. 'fraud', and possibly also skt. *kuhara-*, n., 'cavity, hole' and *kuhū́*, f., 'the goddess of the new moon < the hidden one(?)' (to whom ŚS 7.47 is dedicated; this word is also found in TS and various Brāhmaṇas). This root has been variously explained (see W-P II p.550, KEWA III p. 249f, EWAia I p. 383, with references) as inherited and cognate with Gr. κεύθω, 'to hide', or as a dialectal variant of *guh-* 'to hide', or rather as secondarily derived from the above-quoted words, which in turn might be based on the interrogative *kúha*, 'where?' (Mayrhofer leans towards this latter explanation). At any rate, in order to interpret our *kuham* as f. acc., we need to posit a synchronic root *kuh-*, 'to cheat' or 'to hide', and thus a root noun *kuh-*, f., 'cheating' or 'hiding' (agent noun).[66] Given the neighbouring *durṇaśīm*, 'hard to find', it seems attractive to interpret this *kuh-* as indeed related to *guh-*, 'to hide', or *kúha*, 'where?', and thus meaning 'hiding'.

c. On the Arāyī́ demoness (a male Arāya also exists), see the Griffiths's (2009: 104) comment on PS 6.8.6a. Bhattacharya writes *arāyīm*, but this word follows the *vṛkī́-*inflection: nom. *arāyī́ḥ* (PS 17.15.1.e), voc. *arāyi* (PS 14.1d, RV 10.155.1a), acc. *arāyyàm* (RV 10.155.2c, trisyllabic), nom. pl. *arāyyaḥ* (PS 17.13.8d, etc.), acc. pl. *arāyīḥ* (PS 17.14.2d). However, we also find the *devī́-*inflected acc. sg. *arāyīṃ* (**O** *arāyīṃ*, **K** *rāyīṃ*) in PS 17.15.10 below. We have three options here: 1) to emend to **arāyyaṃ* (*vṛkī́-*inflected acc. sg. f. of *arāyī́-*); 2) to accept the *devī́-*inflected acc. sg. f. *arāyīṃ*, preserved in some of the **O** ms. (in particular in **Ma**, the oldest and most reliable one), perhaps as a peculiarity of our text, as it is attested in PS 17.15.10 below; or 3) to emend to *⁺arāyaṃ*, acc. sg. masculine from *arā́ya-*, the male Arā́ya demon (see e.g. Griffiths's

---

66 Possibly attested in the compound *viṣū-kuh-*, 'nach beiden Seiten zerfallend, zweispältig" (PW), found in ĀśvŚS 5.3 (*viṣūkuham iva dhanvanā vyastāḥ paripanthinam*, "zerschneide mit dem Pfeile in zwei Stücke," PW); according to PW, also in LāṭyŚS 3.11.3 (*parāvada durhārdo ye viṣūkuhaḥ*).

comment on PS 7.19.5a). The latter decision would force us to take *śakadhūmyaṃ* as the acc. sg. m. of an otherwise unattested *ya*-derivative, *śakadhūmya-*, based on *śakadhū́ma-* (instead of an acc. sg. f. from *śakadhūmī́-*, as I propose below and as is favoured by the metre). As pādas **ab** only include feminine nouns, and since pāda **d** only addresses the female Sadānuvās, I prefer to discard option (3). I also prefer to discard option (2), because, differently from PS 17.15.10 below, where the ms. evidence is unanimous, here we find both the ending -*yam* in **K** as well as *yāṃ* in both sub-branches of the **O** mss. This seems to suggest that the written archetype had at least *arāyaṃ*. Therefore I prefer to write **arayyaṃ*, assuming simplification of the cluster.[67]

The word *śakadhūmyaṃ* (five syllables)[68] must be the acc. of a *vṛkī́*-inflected feminine stem *śakadhūmī́-*, based on the m. *śakadhū́ma-*. The latter is generally regarded as a compound of *śákar/n-* (*śákṛt-*), 'dung', and *dhūmá-*, 'smoke' (EWAia II p. 602; cf. the phrase *śakamáyaṃ dhūmáḥ*, 'the smoke made of dung', in RV 1.164.43 ~ ŚS 9.10.25), and it has been given a variety of interpretations based on its very few attestations. Much of the discussion has revolved around hymn ŚS 6.128, in which something (or someone) called *śakadhū́ma* is called the "king of constellations" (*nakṣatrarājan*),[69] and invoked to bring auspicious days (or good weather? *bhadrāhá-*); according to Weber, this was actually the fire lit before dawn; for Bloomfield, a weather prophet; for others indeed, a constellation or the Milky Way, etc. A summary of the sources and the interpretations can be found in CHARPENTIER 1936, who himself proposes an identification with the Kṛttikās, the Pleiades.

Regardless of the particular function of the *śakadhū́ma* asterism in ŚS 6.128, most scholars agree that the basic meaning is 'dung smoke'. More precisely, if CALAND (1900: 16 fn.13, 175 fn. 8) is correct, it rather indicates 'a piece of dried cow dung'. These items are a part of daily life in rural India even today, as they are employed for multiple purposes, from fuel for kindling fires (thanks to their high methane content) to construction material. Shaped like flat patties, they can often be seen stacked up in large piles in rural settlements.

This seems to be the best way to interpret the occurrence of *śakadhū́ma* in PS 1.86.4 (Against the female demons called Kaṇvās): *yā tantiṣat khalasad yā ca goṣṭhe yā jātāḥ śakadhūme sabhāyām | prapāyāṃ jātā uta yāś ca bhitsu tāś cātayāmaḥ śivatā no astu ||*, "The [demoness] who is sitting on the rope [to fasten the cattle],[70] the one who is sitting on the threshing floor, and the one who is in the cowshed, those who are born in the pile of cow dung, in the assembly hall, those born in the water reservoir, those in the furrows, whom we frighten away—let there be benevolence towards us!" (my transl.). Here, all the elements that are mentioned are typical items or locations in a rural settlement: the threshing floor, the cowshed, the water reservoir, the furrows,[71] even the *sabhá́*, the men's assembly hall situated to the south of the Vedic settlement. Thus, I think it is likely that here *śakadhū́ma* indicates the stack or pile of ready-to-use cow-dung patties that certainly no Vedic village lacked. It would thus be a case of metonymy: 'cow-dung smoke' for 'the patty of cow dung that produces smoke' or 'the stack, the pile, or cow-dung patties'.

The AV also features the compound *śakadhūmaja-* qualifying demons in ŚS 8.6.15 ~ PS 16.80.2 (again the same hymn to guard pregnant women from demons), seemingly indicating a category of demons: *yéṣām paścá́t prápadāni puráḥ pá́rṣṇīḥ puró múkhā | khalajá́ḥ śakadhūmajá́*

---

67 But note that in PS 17.13.8, the mss. faithfully preserve the cluster in *arāyyaḥ* (some mss. spell it *jya*).

68 This scansion produces a regular Anuṣṭubh cadence. As this is not a hemistich-final pāda, an irregular cadence would also be allowed. In fact, it is also theoretically possible to read *arāyiyaṃ śakadhūmyaṃ* [ᴜ − ᴜ − | ᴜ ᴜ − ×].

69 *nakṣatrarāje* (voc.) in ŚS 6.128.4c. Also ŚS 6.128.1ab, *śakadhū́mam nákṣatrāṇi yád rá́jānam ákurvata [...]*, "When the constellations made Śakadhū́ma their king …"

70 Cf. RV 6.24.4, *śácīvatas te puruśāka śá́kā gávām iva srutáyaḥ saṃcáraṇīḥ | vatsá́nāṃ ná tantáyas ta indra dá́manvanto adāmá́naḥ sudāman ||*, "The abilities that belong to you, the able one, o you of many abilities, are converging like streams of cattle. (They are) like cords for calves, Indra, binding without bonds, o you of good bonds [/gifts]" (J-B).

71 On this interpretation of *bhíd-*, see my comment on PS 17.12.9b above.

úruṇḍā yé ca maṭmaṭā́ḥ kumbhámuṣkā ayāśávaḥ | tā́n asyā́ brahmaṇas pate pratībodhéna nāśaya ||, "Of whom the frontfeet are behind, the heels in front, the faces in front, who are threshing-floor-born, dung-smoke-born, who are *úruṇḍas* and *maṭmaṭas*, pot-testicled, *ayāśús* (impotent?)—these from her, O Brahmaṇaspati, do thou make disappear by attention (?*pratibodha*)" (Whitney). According to what we have argued above, the *śakadhūmajā́ḥ* demons might be 'born in the pile of cow-dung patties', just like some are *khalajā́ḥ*, 'born on the threshing floor'.

  Thus, the *śakadhūmī́* demoness of our stanza must herself 'consist of dung smoke' or look like or belong to 'a piece or a pile of cow dung'.

17.13.5   **d**: ~ PS 17.12.2d, 12.8d, 12.9e, 12.10e, 13.4d, 13.7d, 14.7d, 15.5d, 15.8d, 15.9d, 15.10d ~ ŚS 2.14.1d

a	kimāsutāṃ *nagnahv₁yam-		8#	[ᴜ − ᴜ − | − − ᴜ ×]
b	⁺ajamāyuṃ ca ⁺nighnatīm |		8	[ᴜ ᴜ − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
c	viṭiṭiṅgāḥ *pratodinīr		8	[ᴜ ᴜ − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
d	nāśayāmaḥ sadānᵤvāḥ ||		8	[− ᴜ − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]

The demoness who makes the liquor go bad, the one who is a [bad] ferment, and the one who bleats like a goat while knocking you out; the Viṭiṭiṅgās (?) who carry a goad—we make the Sadānuvās disappear!

kimāsutāṃ *nagnahvyam] kimāsutāṃ nagnahvaẏam **Ma Ja Ji₄ Pa꜀ Mā JM₃** kimāsutrāṃ nagnahvaẏam **V122** kimāsutāṃ nagnaddāẏam **V71** kimāsutārdhvagnihvam **K**   • ⁺ajamāyuṃ ca] ajamāyuñ ca **K** ajamāẏaṃ ja **O**   • ⁺nighnatīm \|] naghnatīm \| **Ma Ja V122 Pa꜀ Mā** naghatīm \|\| **Ji₄** naghr̥tīm \| **V71 JM₃** nighnatī \| **K**   • viṭiṭiṅgāḥ] [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Ji₄** [**Mā**] **V71 JM₃** viṭiṭiṅgā **Pa꜀** viṭiṭiṅkaḥ **K**   • *pratodinīr] pradodanī **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ Mā** pratodanīr **V71 JM₃** pralodinīṃ **K**   • nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ \|\|] nāśaẏāmaḥ sadānvāḥ \|\| [**O**] nāśayāmas sadānvā Z 5 Z **K**

Bhattacharya reads +*nagnahvamajamāyuṃ ca nighnatīm*+ | and *pratodinīr.

  This stanza and the next two (17.13.6 and 7) form a group dealing with demonesses who interfere with the process of brewing and the distillation of the *surā* liquor.

  a. The word *āsuta-*, 'pressed, distilled, brewed', is the verbal adjective derived from *ā-su-*, (pres. *āsunoti*), 'to press out, to distil' (cf. *āsutí-*, f., 4x in RV). It is found in PS 5.10.4, where the *surā* liquor, to which the hymn is dedicated, is described as *patra āsutā*, "brewed in a cup", and *viṣāsutā*, "a poison brew". The word *kimāsutā-* is most certainly a compound of the type formed with the interrogative *kím* or *kád* as first member (see AiGr II,1 p. 83f.), which generally conveys a derogatory meaning: e.g. *kim-puruṣá-*, 'mongrel' (< lit. 'What sort of human?') (Br+), or *kad-ratha-*, 'a bad chariot' (< lit. 'What sort of chariot?') (ŚaṅkŚS). These can be Tatpuruṣas, as in the previous examples, or Bahuvrīhis: e.g. *kiṃ-śilá-*, '[a land] characterised by a gravelly soil (*śilā́-* 'stone')' (< 'What kind of stone?') (TS, VS, MS +). Thus, *kimāsutā-*, f., could refer to a poorly distilled *surā* (f.) as 'bad liquor' (< 'What sort of liquor') or (more likely in our case) to a demoness 'whose liquor is bad' or rather 'who makes the liquor go bad'.

  The *surā*, which is produced by distillation of a preparation of grains, is made to ferment with the *nagnáhu*, a ferment made of pulses and spices (see Oort 2002). Bhattacharya writes +*nagnahvam*, the acc. sg. nn. of *nagnáhu-*. However, we most likely need another feminine epithet here. Perhaps **O** *nagnahvaẏam* (four syllables) can underlie an accusative *nagnahvyàm* (=*nagnahvíyam*) from a *vr̥kī́*-inflected *nagnahví-*, '[a demoness] who is in the ferment' or 'who herself is a (bad) ferment'. I emend accordingly.

In fact, it seems very attractive to consider this as a case of ellipsis[72] (gapping) of the first member, and supply *kim-* also as a first member in composition with the second word: *kim-āsutāṃ* (*kim-*)*nagnahvyam*, "The demoness who makes the liquor go bad, the one who makes the ferment go bad" (< "The what-sort-of-liquor (f.), the what-sort-of-ferment (f.)"). The word *kimnagnahvī-* would simply be a feminine of *kimnagnahu-*, 'bad ferment' (< 'what sort of ferment?'), to be interpreted as a Bahuvrīhi, just like *kimāsutā-*.

b. The Bahuvrīhi compound *ajá-māyu-*, 'whose bleating is like that of a goat', 'bleating like a goat', is not attested elsewhere in the AV, but it is found twice in the famous frog hymn, RV 7.103, in st. 6 and 10—qualifying the frogs and the brahmins (next to *gó-māyu-*), who chant, intoxicated by the arrival of the rainy season and by the soma respectively. In our stanza, this compound most likely hints at intoxication by liquor.

The emendation to [+]*nighnatīm* was proposed by Bhattacharya. The position of *ca* suggests that *ajamāyuṃ nighnatīṃ* is to be taken as a single syntagm.

c. The word *viṭiṭiṅgā-* is a hapax of obscure meaning.

The emendation to *pratodinīr was proposed by Bhattacharya. The word *pratodá-*, m., 'goad' or 'whip for animals', is attested in the Vrātyakāṇḍa refrain at ŚS 15.1.7, 15.2.7, 15.2.14 and 15.2.20, belonging to a portion in which each item of the equipment of a wandering Vrātya is equated with various entities. Here the goad (*pratodá*) is equated with the storm (*reṣmán*): *mātariśvā ca pávamānaś ca vipathavāhaú vắtaḥ sắrathī reṣmā́ pratodáḥ kīrtíś ca yáśaś ca puraḥsaraú ‖*, "Matariśvan and Pavamāna (the 'cleansing' wind) the two drawers (-*vāhá*) of the rough vehicle, the wind the charioteer, the whirlwind the goad, both fame and glory the two forerunners" (Whitney). In a similar fashion, ĀpŚS 22.5.5 lists the *pratodá* among items of the equipment of a Vrātya. Fᴀʟᴋ (1986: 24) also refers to PB 17.1.14 and KātyŚS 22.4.10. The derivative *pratodín-*, 'carrying a goad', 'who pokes with a goad', only appears as second member of the compound *śroṇi-pratodín-*, referring to *rákṣāṃsi* in ŚS 8.6.13 (again, a hymn against demons threatening pregnant women that has many parallels with ours): *yá ātmắnam atimātrám áṃsa ādhắya bíbhrati | strīṇắṃ śroṇipratodína índra rákṣāṃsi nāśaya ‖*, "They who, putting their excessive self on the shoulder, carry [it], thrusters-forth of women's hips O Indra, make the demons disappear" (Whitney). The reference to the women's hips is particularly relevant. In any case, if this goad or whip is used by both Vrātyas and Rakṣasas, it must belong to the world of the wilderness, and it is thus not implausible to imagine a demoness called *pratodinī-*.

Bhattacharya writes *pratodinīr, with an asterisk, as neither of the mss. available to him preserves a voiceless dental *t* (**Ma**, **Ja**, **Mā** have *d*, **K** has *l*). His decision remains valid even with the addition of **V71** and **JM₃** *pratodanīr*, as this must be a secondary and late **Oᴮ** "error" (or rather a correction!). Note that **Mā** (the oldest **Oᴮ** ms.) has *d* like all of the **Oᴬ** mss; it is of course theoretically possible that **Mā**'s *d* is an error, and that **V71** and **JM₃** preserve the **Oᴮ** hyparchetype's correct reading, *t*, although it seems unlikely to me that **Mā** would have precisely the same error shared by all of the **Oᴬ** mss.

On the other hand, it is not to be excluded that the suffix vowel *a* in *-a-nī-*, preserved by all of the **O** mss., is correct, and that **K** *-i-nī-* is secondary. As such, *pratodanī-* would be the feminine of an *ana*-formation, *pratodana-*, 'poking' (action noun), or in this case rather 'poker' (agent noun), with the vocalism of the causative stem (*pra-tod-aya-*), no differently from the noun *pra-tod-á-*. In this case, we would have to emend to *pratodanīr. Nevertheless, as this latter stem is so far unattested, I follow Bhattacharya.

---

72 On ellipsis and related phenomena in Vedic, one may consult Gᴇʟᴅɴᴇʀ 1919, Rᴇɴᴏᴜ 1955a, Gᴏɴᴅᴀ 1960 and Dᴜɴᴋᴇʟ 1976.

17.13.6

a	yasyāsutaṃ randhayadhve	8#	[− − ∪ − │ − ∪ − ×]
b	yūyaṃ bhaṇvāḥ sadān$_u$vāḥ │	8	[− − − − │ ∪ − ∪ ×]
c	tṛṣṭaṃ kṛṇut$_a$āṇḍaraṃ	8#	[− − ∪ ∪ │ ∪ − ∪ ×]
d	yadā rasena tṛpyata-	8	[∪ − ∪ − │ ∪ − ∪ ×]
e	-āt surām ava mehatha ‖	8	[− ∪ − ∪ │ ∪ − ∪ ×]

Whosever brew you take under your control (/prepare), you, O Bhāṇvās, O Sadānuvās, make it sour [and] "with balls" (?). When you are satisfied with the sap, you piss down the *surā* liquor.

N.B. **JM₃** identically repeats pāda **cde** twice. **Pa$_c$** repeats both this whole stanza and the next (i.e. it reads 17.13.6 then 7, then again 6 then again 7), without any differences.

————

yasyāsutaṃ randhaẏadhve] yasyāsutaṃ randhaẏadhve **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa$_c$ JM₃** yasyāsutaṃ raddhaẏadhve **V122** yasyāsutaṃ ravaẏadhve **Mā V71** yasyāṃsurabhaṃdhayaddhve **K** • yūyaṃ bhaṇvāḥ] yūyaṃ bhaṇvāḥ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa$_c$ [Mā]** kṣūyaṃ bhaṇvāḥ **Ji₄** yūyaṃ bhaṇvā **JM₃** [.]ū[. .] **V71**[73] yumya bhaṇvās (= BHATT. vs. bhaṇvas BARRET) **K** • sadānvāḥ ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa$_c$ [Mā] V71 JM₃** sadānvāḥ ‖ **Ji₄** sadānvā │ **K** • tṛṣṭaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa$_c$ [Mā] V71 JM₃** tṛṣṭa **Ji₄** triṣṭhaṃ **K** • kṛṇutāṇḍaraṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa$_c$ [Mā]** kṛṇutāṇḍabhāṃ **Ji₄** kṛṇvutāṇḍaraṃ **V71 JM₃** kṛṇutāṃ duraṃ (→ *subs.* tvarāṃ) **K** • yadārasena] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa$_c$ [Mā] V71 JM₃** yadāsyena **Ji₄** yabhārasena **K** • tṛpyatātsurāmava] **[O]** tṛpyatāmasurāpava **K** • mehatha] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa$_c$ V71 JM₃** sehadha **Mā** mehitā **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa$_c$ [Mā] V71 JM₃** │ **V122** Z 6 Z **K**

Bhattacharya reads *yadārasena tṛpyatāt* in pāda **d**, *surāmava me hatha* in pāda **e**.

   a. This stanza most certainly forms a triad with the preceding and the next one, as all deal with the theme of the Sadānuvās' interference in the production of the *surā* liquor and the effects of their intervention. The feminine *tasyāḥ* in PS 17.13.7a also refers syntactically to the feminine *surām* in our pāda **e**. Similarly, the apparently suspended genitive *yasya* in our pāda **a** most likely refers to the person who, in the next stanza, is said to be in pain after having drunk of the liquor.

   On the causative stem *randhaya-*, 'to make weak, make subject, subdue', see JAMISON 1983: 144. The middle forms are rare (1x in RV, 3x in PS), but they convey the same meaning as the active ones: see RV 3.30.16d, *jahí rákṣo maghavan randháyasva*, "Smash the demonic force, bounteous one, make them subject to you" (J-B), PS 3.27.6a, *jahi śatrūn aprati*[74] *randhayasva*, "Slay the enemies without opposition" (my transl.), PS 9.4.7b, *sahānyān randhayādhvai*, 'Zusammen werdet ihr andere in eure Gewalt bringen' (Kim), PS 19.3.11b, *asurān randhayāsai*, "you will subdue the Asuras" (my transl.). It is then possible that the meaning of our pāda **a** is "Whosever brew you subdue/take under your control," in the sense that the Sadānuvās interfere with the distillation process (see my comment on pāda **e** below).

   A derived meaning 'cook, prepare (food)'[75] for *randh-* is also recorded (see MW *s.v.*, W-P II p. 439, KEWA III p. 40, EWAia II p. 431) with reference to MānGS 2.9.7–8: *avaśiṣṭaṃ bhaktaṁ randhayati │ śvo'vaśiṣṭaṃ bhaktaṃ randhayitvā* […] *piṇḍān nidadhāti*, "He prepares the remaining food. The following day, having prepared the remaining food […] he places some balls of rice and

————

73 The space occupied by the unreadable sequence in **V71** cannot possibly be enough for both the missing words.

74 Bhattacharya writes *prati*. Carmen Spiers informs me that the reading *śatrūn aprati* is only preserved in ms. **Ek₂** (other mss. have *prati* or *'prati*), but that it could also be a case of omission of *virāma* in the preceding *śatrūn*. At any rate, the metre requires an extra syllable, and the lexeme *prati-randh-* is not attested, therefore *aprati* is definitely to be preferred.

75 Perhaps a semantic shift 'make weak' > 'make soft' > 'make (food) soft' > 'cook (food)', rather than 'unterwerfen > schlagen > zubereiten, kocken' (as reported by EWAia II p. 431)

flour" (my transl.). This meaning is also attested by a variety of related words, such as *randhana-*, n., 'destruction'(TS), but also 'cooking, preparation' (comm.), *randhi-*, f., 'subjugation' in RV, but later 'cooking, readying' in BhP (see the above-quoted sources for references); it is also preserved in various NIA languages, e.g. in Hindī *rāṃdhnā*, 'to cook, prepare food'. As pāda **a** of our stanza features the acc. object *asutaṃ*, 'brew, infusion', this latter meaning of *randh-* may have also been intended. In fact, the poet may have purposefully intended to make a pun between the idea of cooking and that of taking control of the process against the will of the victim.

c. The adjective *tṛṣṭá-* describes a harsh flavour or smell (and also by extension 'harshness of speech', e.g. *vācás tṛṣṭáṃ* in RV 10.87.13b ~ ŚS 8.13.12b ~ PS 16.7.2b). It often qualifies something inedible and poisonous: e.g. RV 10.85.34ab (about the polluted bride's garment), *tṛṣṭám etát káṭukam etád apāṣṭhávad viṣávan naítád áttave* |, "This is rough; this is sharp, barbed, poisonous: it is not for eating" (J-B); ŚS 5.18.3 (~ PS 9.17.10), *ā́viṣṭitāghám̐viṣā pṛdākúr iva cármaṇā | sā́ brāhmaṇásya rājanya tṛṣṭaíṣā́ gaúr anādyā̀* ||, "Just like an ill-poisonous adder enveloped with [cow-] skin[76], this cow of the brahman, O noble, is harsh, not to be eaten" (Whitney). Poisonous animals are characterised as having a sharp bite (*tṛṣṭádaṃśman*) in ŚS 12.1.46ab (~ PS 17.5.4ab), belonging to the hymn to the Earth: *yás te sarpó vṛ́ścikas tṛṣṭádaṃśmā hemantájabdho bhṛmaló gúhā śáye* |, "Your serpent, [your] scorpion of sharp bite lies hidden, torpid, crushed by the winter" (my transl.). See also GRIFFITHS 2009: 440 with additional references.

The last word of the pāda might be *aṇḍaram* or *āṇḍaram*. The first option does not seem attractive,[77] while the latter, though unattested, may be interpreted as a *ra*-formation based on the noun *āṇḍa*, 1) 'egg', 2) 'testicle' (normally used in the dual). For similar formations, see AiGr II,2 §686 p. 856ff. One may compare *muṣkara-*, 'testiculatus (PW), male, animal with testicles', derived from *muṣká-*, 'testicle, scrotum'. Cf. e.g. TS 5.5.1.1, […] *aindrā́ḥ paśávo yé muṣkarás | yád aindrā́ḥ sánto 'gníbhya ālabhyánte devátābhyaḥ samádaṃ dadhāti* |, "The male animals belong to Indra; in that being Indra's they are offered to the fires, he causes strife among the deities" (Keith). Thus, an *āṇḍara-* liquor is perhaps a liquor "with balls," i.e. strong, suitable for men only[78].

In conclusion, both *tṛṣṭam* and *āṇḍaram* are adjectives, object predicates governed by *kṛṇuta* and agreeing with *āsutam* in pāda **a**.

d. Bhattacharya writes *tṛpyatāt* as in the **O** mss. The form *tṛpyatāt* may at first glance be interpreted as a *-tāt* imperative from the root *tṛp-* 'to be satisfied with (+ ins.)'. Such an imperative formation can be used for the 2nd person singular, dual. or plural (see BAUM 2006: 35–37). Here we would certainly need to interpret it as a 2nd person plural. BAUM (ibid.) points out that the *-tāt* imperative has a tendency to show up in the apodosis of conditional (*yád*) or temporal (*yadā́*) clauses. However, here we would seem to find it in the protasis introduced by *yadā*. This is impossible (cf. DELBRÜCK 1888: 325, 590).

The sequence is best analysed as *tṛpyata_āt*, in which the second part is the conjunction *ā́t*, 'afterwards', which is frequently constructed in correlation with *yadā́*. The first part can either be a 2pl imperative or a 2pl injunctive. Since an imperative would be impossible in a *yadā* phrase, we must take it as an injunctive. As the correlative *ā́t* phrase features a present *mehatha*, one wonders whether it would be attractive to emend *tṛpyata* to a present **tṛpyatha*: alternation between indicative and imperative is very frequent, also in the 2pl *-tha* vs *-ta* (see Ved. Var. I p. 23). The same may be valid for *kṛṇuta* in pāda **c**, which can hardly be an imperative (why would the poet command the Sadānuvās to interfere with one's brewing process?), and must be interpreted as an injunctive or emended to **kṛṇutha*. It is true that injunctives are increasingly more rare in the AV, but they are nevertheless found even in prose, and given the present stage of our knowledge, it is

---

76 Differently, KIM (2014: 350): "Umhüllt [ist] der [Pfeil] mit schlimmem Gift wie die Pṛdāku-Schlange mit [ihrer] Haut ..."

77 PW and MW record *aṇḍara-*, m., as the name of a tribe (*gaṇa*) (they also record a denominative *aṇḍarāya(te)*, 'to behave like an *aṇḍara*'). This meaning does not seem suitable for our stanza.

78 That drinking the *surā* liquor makes men aggressive is evident throughout PS 5.10.

hard to tell whether an injunctive would be out of place here. Until the use of the injunctive in the AV is studied in more detail, it seems safer to avoid emending, and rather accept both *kṛṇuta* and *tṛpyata* as injunctives here.

The next question is whether we should read *yadā_arasena* or *yadā rasena*.[79] The word *arasá*, 'sapless', is found very frequently in the AV, especially in incantations to render some kind of poison (or threat in general) 'powerless'. Compare for instance ŚS 4.6.6 (~ PS 5.8.5), *arasás ta iṣo śalyó 'tho te arasáṃ viṣám | utā́rasásya vṛkṣásya dhánuṣ ṭe arasārasám ||*, "Your tip, O arrow, is powerless, and also your poison is powerless. And your bow, O powerless one, is powerless, [made] of a powerless tree" (Lubotsky). Similar examples are countless. Thus, our line could be translated as "When you are satisfied with something sapless, then piss the *surā* liquor." This perhaps could be interpreted as a charm aimed at preventing the demons from making the *surā* poisonous.

We do find one collocation of *rása-* with *tṛp-*, namely in ŚS 10.8.44 (belonging to a mystic hymn): *akāmó dhī́ro amṛ́taḥ svayaṃbhū́ rásena tṛptó ná kútaś canónaḥ | tám evá vidvā́n ná bibhāya mṛtyór ātmā́naṃ dhī́ram ajáraṃ yúvānam ||*, "Free from desire, wise (*dhī́ra*), immortal, self-existent, satisfied with the sap, not deficient in any respect—knowing that wise, unaging, young soul, one is not afraid of death" (Whitney). This expression probably has to do with the idea of *rása* as a nourishing essence proceeding from the waters or from herbs and delivering good health to people (via medicinal herbs) or to the earth (via the rain, etc.) (e.g. ŚS 1.5.1, ŚS 3.31.10, ŚS 4.35.3, ŚS 9.4.5, etc.). In fact, the *rása* is one of the constituents of an individual, as can be seen from the following stanza from a funeral hymn: ŚS 18.2.24, *mā́ te máno mā́sor mā́ṅgānāṃ mā́ rásasya te | mā́ te hāsta tanvàḥ kíṃ canéhá ||*, "Let nothing whatever of thy mind, nor of thy life (*ásu*), nor of thy members, nor of thy sap, nor of thy body, be left here" (Whitney). It does not seem suitable for our line to take the phrase *yadā rasena tṛpyata* as simply having a meaning along the lines of "when you are healthy, full of energy."

It is noteworthy that the *rása*, being a constituent of the human body, can also be stolen by ill-intentioned beings. The following stanza, belonging to a hymn "against various evils with a plant," mentions a demoness, who, although not explicitly called Sadānuvā, aims to eat the *rása* of a child, and is compelled to eat her own child: ŚS 1.28.3 (= ŚS 4.17.3 ~ PS 5.23.3[80]), (Against various evils with a plant): *yā́ śaśā́pa śápanena yā́ghám mū́ram ādadhé | yā́ rásasya háraṇāya jātám ārebhé tokám attu sā́ ||*, "She that hath cursed with cursing, that hath taken malignity as her root, that hath seized on [our] young to take [its] sap—let her eat [her own] offspring." It is possible that the reciter of our stanza is hoping that the Sadānuvās will be content with drinking the sap of the *surā* liquor, and stay away from the human sap.

More simply, our stanza might just be describing the Sadānuvās as busy with preparing the *surā* liquor: at the moment when they are satisfied with the "sap, essence" of the drink (or with its "taste"—this is another possible meaning for *rása*), they shall finish distilling it. The whole stanza would just be the prelude to the following one, which describes a man who has drunk from the liquor (*tāsyāḥ* in 17.13.7a clearly refers back to *surām* in 17.13.6d) and is now in pain, lying down with a headache.

e. The root *mih-* is employed to describe the process of distillation of the *surā* liquor in PS 8.12.12ef, *madhye satasya *mastiṣko anaḍvān iva mehatu*, "Let the brain (=the name of the top-pot) piss into the middle of the *sata* pot like an ox" (transl.: LUBOTSKY 2002a: 63). In order to produce the *surā* liquor, a mash of fermented grains, fruits, and water is heated up inside a receptacle placed over the fire. The alcohol vapours of the heated mash rise up to the cold bottom of a water-filled pot (*mastiṣka*, 'brain, skull', i.e. the condenser) placed on the top rim of the heated receptacle. Here the vapours condense and finally drip (the upper pot "pisses", *mih-*) into another smaller pot (*sata*, the

---

79 Another option is to read *yadā* (or even *yad ā*) *rase na tṛpyata*, "when (/if) you are not satisfied with the sap."
80 PS 5.23.3: *yā śaśāpa śapanena yā vā gha mūram ādadhe | yā vā rasasya *prāśāyārebhe tokam attu sā ||*, "She who has cursed with a curse, or she who has held a root, or she who has taken hold of [our children] for eating the sap—let her eat [her own] offspring" (Lubotsky).

receiver) placed right underneath the condenser (see Oort 2002).

17.13.7   **d**: ~ PS 17.12.2d, 12.8d, 12.9e, 12.10e, 13.4d, 13.5d, 14.7d, 15.5d, 15.8d, 15.9d, 15.10d ~ ŚS 2.14.1d

a	tasyāḥ pītvā_avamakt_iy	8#	[− − − − | ᴜ ᴜ − ×]
b	atho śīrṣakt_iy ā śaye |	8	[ᴜ − − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
c	tā ekā_annadūṣaṇīr	8	[− − − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
d	nāśayāmaḥ sadān_uvāḥ ||	8	[− ᴜ − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]

Having drunk of that [*surā* liquor], he has pain in the lower [abdomen] (?); then he is lying there having a headache. Them who spoil [it] for the drinking mates—we make the Sadānuvās disappear!

N.B. **Pa_c** repeats pāda **cd** (and the following stanza, 17.13.8) identically after 17.13.9c.

―――――

tasyāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** V71 JM₃ tasyā V122 yasyāḥ K   • pītvāva] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c** V71 JM₃ pātvā Mā pīḥtvāva Ji₄ pīḍāva K   • maktyatho] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Pa_c [Mā]** makthyatho V71 ma[x]kthyatho **JM₃** makyatho Ji₄ manyatho K   • śirṣaktyā] K **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Pa_c [Mā]** V71 JM₃ śīrṣantyā Ji₄   • śaye] K śaẏe **[O]**   • \|] K **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā]** V71 JM₃ \|\| V122 Ji₄   • tā ekānnadūṣaṇīr] **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c** tā ekānnad(u→)ūṣaṇīr V122 etānnadūṣaṇīm K   • nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ \|\|] nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ \|\| **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ[x] \|\| **Pa_c** nāśayāmas sadanvā Z 7 Z K

Bhattacharya writes *pītvāva <u>makty</u>* in pāda **a**.

ab. This stanza is certainly the continuation of the preceding one. The genitive *tasyāḥ* in pāda **a** clearly refer to the *surām* (f.) mentioned in PS 17.13.6e.

The sequence *śīrṣaktyā* may be intepreted as the ins. sg. of *śīrṣaktí*, 'headache' (on *śīrṣaktí-*, see Kuiper 1939). As for the sequence *avamakty*, it would seem to underlie *avamaktī*, nom. m. sg. of the unattested *avamaktin-*. It seems attractive to interpret this as based on (an also unattested) *avamakti-*, 'pain in the lower part (*avama*) [of the body]', 'pain in the lower [abdomen]' or 'pain in the lower [parts]', thus maybe 'stomachache' or 'pain when urinating'[81]; in turn, this formation would be based on *avama-*, 'lower', and perhaps a stem *kti-*, 'pain', extrapolated from a re-analysis of *śīrṣaktí-*, 'headache' (*śīrṣ-aktí-*) as *śīrṣa-ktí-*, or in fact built from *avamá* and *aktí*, but with shortening of the *a* analogically to *śīrṣaktí*—unless we want to emend to *avamākty*.

In fact, we know from PS 5.10.10 (belonging to a hymn to the *surā* liquor) that drinking the *surā* liquor can cause racking pain (*pra-rup-*, caus.): *asimatīm iṣumatīm un nayāmi satād adhi | mādayābhi mādayāhir +ivaināṇ pra ropayāṇyo 'nyasya moc chiṣan ||*, "The knife-sharp, arrow sharp [Surā] do I raise up from a *sata*-pot. Make [them] intoxicated, make [them] tipsy. Like a snake, cause them racking pain, let them leave nothing of each other" (Lubotsky).

On *in*-formations based on *i*-stems, see AiGr II,2 §212c p. 329. Semantically, we may compare *balāsin-*, 'suffering from the *balā́sa* disease',[82] which shows that a formation like X-*in*- can mean 'suffering from X'.

―――――

81 Compare PS 7.15.6, in which the pain of the body is distinguished from that of headache: PS 7.15.6, *uṣṇīṣaṃ tvā śīrṣaktyā vāsas tvā +tanvāmayāt | candraṃ hiraṇyam andhyāt *karṇādattaṃ śukraṃ bhrājad bādhiryāt pātu dakṣiṇā ||*, "A 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" (Griffiths).

82 See Zysk 1985: 32

If the above is correct,[83] it would also be attractive to interpret *śīrṣaktyā* as *śīrṣaktī_ā*, in which *śīrṣaktī* would be the nom. sg. m. of an (unattested) stem *śīrṣaktin-*, 'having a headache', parallel to *avamaktin-*, 'having pain in the lower part of the body', while *ā* would function as a preverb of *śaye*[84]. However, the lexeme *ā-śi-* normally expresses the idea of "*enter* a place to lie in it', or 'lying *inside* a place', and generally governs an object: cf. PS 5.12.1[85], PS 5.12.6a (~ ŚS 5.25.9b, PS 12.4.7b)[86], ŚS 9.3.21 (~ PS 16.40.8)[87], ŚS 12.4.19ab (~ PS 17.17.8ab)[88], and ŚS 5.17.12ab[89]. Therefore, it seems preferable to me to take *śīrṣaktyā* as an instrumental and *śaye* as a simplex.

Moreover, KNOBL (2007b: 119–120[=2009: 59-60] and fn. 45; 2009b) has pointed out that the simplex *śay-* (which he interprets as a departicular root meaning 'to be lying there') is most often used with a markedly depreciatory sense, i.e. it describes a way of lying "in an awkward, or shameful, or downright abject kind of state [or] in a rather unpleasant state" (KNOBL 2007b: 120 with examples).

c. I tentatively take *ekānnadūṣaṇīr* as the nom. sg. f. of a (otherwise unattested) f. compound, *ekānna-dūṣaṇī-*, in turn built from *ekānna-*, adj., 'commensal, dining mate',[90] and *dū́ṣaṇa-*, 'spoiling, corrupting' (AV+). It seems that the intended meaning is that the demons, by spoiling the liquor and causing a hangover, ruin the experience of the drinking mates. In fact, I prefer to translate *ekānna-* with "drinking mates" in this particular case, even though the word is etymologically based on the root *ad-* 'to eat', as clearly the situation portrayed here is that of people drinking liquor together.

17.13.8

a	⁺apārogāñ chakadhūmān	8#	[ᵁ − − − | ᵁ − − ×]
b	vŕ̥kṣāṇāṃ yantu satvaram |	8	[− − − − | ᵁ − ᵁ ×]
c	atho ⁺durhārdaso gr̥ham	8	[ᵁ − − − | ᵁ − ᵁ ×]
d	pra mr̥śantᵤv arāyᵢyaḥ ||	8	[ᵁ − − ᵁ | ᵁ − ᵁ ×]

---

83 One may of course speculate on possible emendations: as confusion between the akṣaras *ma* and *sa* (or other sibilants) is frequent, one may propose *avaśaktin, 'without energy (*śákti*)', *avasakthin 'down to his thighs (*sákthi*)', or *avasaktin 'hanging down (?)' (< *ava-sañj-*).

84 By the opposite reasoning, one might wish to emend *avamaktyatho* to *avamaktyātho* (=*avamaktyā_atho*) to have a perfect parallelism between *śīrṣaktyā* and *avamktyā* (ins. of *avamakti-*).

85 PS 5.12.1 (for successful conception) *vr̥ṣā ⁺jajñe madhavāno 'yaṃ madhumatībhyaḥ | sa u te yonim ā śayāṃ baḍ *dakṣaḥ puruṣo bhavan ||*, "The bull Madhavāna is born from the sweet (f.) ones. Let him descend into your womb, forsooth becoming a dexterous man" (Lubotsky).

86 PS 5.12.6a (~ ŚS 5.25.9b, PS 12.4.7b), *garbhas te yonim ā śayāṃ garbho *jarāyv ā śayām |*, "May an embryo get into your womb, may an embryo get into the afterbirth" (Lubotsky).

87 ŚS 9.3.21 (~ PS 16.40.8) (to accompany the release of a house), *yā́ dvípakṣā cátuṣpakṣā ṣáṭpakṣā yā́ nimīyáte | aṣṭā́pakṣāṃ dáśapakṣāṃ śā́lāṃ mā́nasya pátnīm agnír gárbha ivā́ śaye ||*, "[The dwelling] which is fixed with two sides, with four sides, which with six sides—the eight-sided, the ten-sided dwelling, the mistress of the building, Agni lies in like an embryo" (Whitney).

88 ŚS 12.4.19ab (~ PS 17.17.8ab) (About the cow belonging exclusively to the brahmin), *duradabhnaínam ā́ śaye yācitā́ṃ ca ná dítsati |*, "Door-damaging (?) she lies on him, if he is not willing to give her when asked for" (Whitney)—perhaps better: "Breaking through the door she lies inside him (i.e. his house) ..." unless we want to emend to *durdabhnā, 'hard to deceive' (cf. Whitney 1905: 649).

89 ŚS 5.17.12ab (on the brahmin's wife), *nā́sya jāyā́ śatavāhī́ kalyāṇī́ tálpam ā́ śaye |*, "Not on his couch lies a beautiful hundred-bringing wife" (Whitney).

90 This meaning is recorded by MW (p. 230): "having or eating the same food, a messmate". However, no references are provided.

Let them of the trees quickly go away to [someone else's] healthy heaps of cow dung. Then, let the evil-hearted Arāyī́ demonesses lay hold of [their] corral!

N.B. After 17.13.9c, **Pac** repeats 17.13.7cd a second time and then repeats this stanza without variants.

⁺apārogāñ chakadhūmān] apārogāṃ chakadhūmān **Ma Ja Pac JM₃** a(*s.s.*→)pārogāṃ chakadhūmān **V122** apāṃropāṃ chakadhūmān, **Ji₄** apārogā chakadhūmān **Mā V71** apārogāṃ śakadhūmāṃ **K** • vṛkṣāṇām] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pac JM₃** vṛkṣaṇam **Mā V71** • yantu] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pac [Mā] V71 JM₃** yanti **Ji₄** yānti **K** • satvaram] satvaram, **K** chatvaraṃ **O** • |] **K Ma Ja V122 Pac Mā V71 JM₃** || **Ji₄** • ⁺durhārdaso] durhārdaśo **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pac** dūhādaśo **Mā** dṛhādaśo **V71** dṛhārdaśo **JM₃** druhāṃdaso (= R-V, Bhatt. *vs.* druhaṃdaso Barret) **K** • gṛhaṃ] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pac JM₃** gṛha **Mā V71** • pra mṛśantv] pra mṛśaṃtv **Ma Ja Pac** vra mṛśaṃtv **V122** pra muṣaṃtv **Ji₄** pra mṛṇaṃtv **Mā JM₃** pra muṇaṃtv **V71** prāviśantv **K** • arāyyaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] Pac** arā(yyaḥ → *s.s.*) jyaḥ[x] **V122** arāyaḥ **Ji₄**[91] arājyaḥ **Mā V71 JM₃** arāyyāḥ **K**

Bhattacharya writes *apārogāñchakadhūmān* in pāda **a**, *durhārdaso* in pāda **c**, neither with an emendation sign.

As is often the case in the AV, this stanza seems to be both a charm to repel demons as well as a curse, in that the repelled demons are sent to haunt someone else. Thus, the reciter invites the Arāyīs to haunt a healthy pile of cow dung, i.e. one that is not yet haunted, perhaps near a victims' house, and to lay hold of the house of a victim. For another possible interpretation, see my comment on pāda **c** below.

a. The compound *a-roga-*, adj.,'free from disease, healthy', is first attested in Manu (1.83 referring to people; 7.226 referring to a king) and SuśrS (PW). However, in the AV we find both *róga-*, 'disease, infirmity' (multiple occurrences); the compound *roga-nā́śana-* (once in ŚS 6.44.2d ~ PS 20.34.8e); and the compound *á-rogaṇa-*, 'freeing from disease' in ŚS 2.3.2 (~ PS 1.8.2e=PS 19.33.14e), qualifying a medicine, and in PS 15.21.3b, qualifying the benevolent forms of the two Rudras, Bhava, and Śarva.

On *śakadhū́ma-*, see my comment on PS 17.13.4c above. Notably, this pāda qualifies the Arāyī́ demonesses as belonging to the *śakadhū́ma*!

I standardise the sandhi *-n ś-* to *-ñ ch-* with a plus sign (see Griffiths 2009: LIX §(F)).

I am not aware of any other occurrence of *śakadhū́ma* in the plural. In fact, I wonder whether pāda **a** is corrupted, and the original text read an ablative sg. *arogāc chakadhūmād*. The meaning would slightly change the sense of the stanza to being a charm to simply repel the demons without sending them to haunt someone else: "Let them of the trees go away *from* [our] healthy heap of cow dung". This would support my suggestion to emend to *pra *mṛṣyantu* (see below), as the whole stanza would then simply be aimed at repelling the demons from the reciter's house.

b. I hesitate on how to interpret the gen. pl. *vṛkṣāṇām*. Clearly it would not make sense to take it with *śakadhūmān*, "the cow-dung heaps of the trees." I tentatively take it as referring to the implicit subject of *yantu* ("Let them of the trees go"), who must be the demons. It might refer to demons or demonesses that belong to the forest (cf. PS 17.13.9b below: *vanekṛkur*, "a demoness who howls in the forest"; see my comment *ad loc.*), or it could perhaps be a euphemism for demons or demonesses that attach to men's penises (cf. PS 17.12.9c above: *upa vṛkṣeṣu śerate*, "they lie near the trees (penises?)"?. Nevertheless, the syntax is odd.

cd. Both traditions clearly point to *gṛhaṃ*. Nevertheless, it would seem very attractive to emend *gṛhaṃ* to **garbhaṃ*, 'embryo', as the lexeme *pra-mṛś-* is frequently used in the Sadānuvā hymns to describe how these demonesses attack embryos. On the lexemes *pra-mṛś-* (as well as

---

91 Note that **Ji₄** reads *arāyaḥ* without the intervocalic akṣara *ẏa*, pronounced [ja], but rather with the akṣara *ya*, pronounced [dʒa].

prati-mr̥ś-; both are attested in the hymn for protection of pregnant women, at ŚS 8.6.6 ~ PS 16.79.6 and ŚS 8.6.18 ~ PS 16.80.9, respectively), see the evidence collected in GRIFFITHS's (2009: 173) comment on PS 6.14.3. GRIFFITHS proposes the meaning 'to grope for (an embryo)' and connects it with the usage of *rih* (with various preverbs) (see my comment on PS 17.14.8d below). The object of *pra-mr̥ś-* is indeed frequently *garbham*: e.g. PS 5.9.7cd (Against Sadānuvās), *yā garbhān pramr̥śanti ' sarvāḥ pāpīr anīnaśam ||,* "[Those] who lay hold of the embryos, all the bad ones have I destroyed" (Lubotsky). See also PS 17.14.8a below.

In fact, if we keep *gr̥ham,* **K** *prāviśantu*—to be emended to ⁺*praviśantu,* "Let them enter"— would seem more attractive. However, it is also possible that this is a mistake triggered by the presence of *gr̥ham.*

Alternatively, we may wish to emend *pra mr̥śantu* to *pra *mr̥ṣyantu.* Pādas **cd** would then translate as: "Then, let the evil-hearted Arāyís forget [our] house!" This emendation would be supported by an emendation of *arogāñ chakadhūmān* to an abl. sg., **arogāc *chakadhūmād* (see my comment on pāda **a** above).

On the *vr̥kī́*-inflected *arāyí-,* see my comment on 17.13.4c above.

17.13.9   **defg**: ~ PS 17.12.1efgh; **g**: ~ PS 17.12.3d, 17.13.1d

a	tāsām *ekā_achavākā	8#	[− − − − │ − ∪ − ×]
b	śaṅkāvaṅkā vanekr̥kur	8	[− − − − │ ∪ − ∪ ×]
c	hasanaikā kanikradā │	8	[∪ ∪ − − │ ∪ − ∪ ×]
d	sarvāsāṃ bhaṇvā vaḥ sākaṃ	8#	[− − − − │ − − − ×]
e	nāmadheyāni vidmasi │	8	[− ∪ − − │ ∪ − ∪ ×]
f	yati jātāni vas tati	8	[∪ ∪ − − │ ∪ − ∪ ×]
g	naśyatetaḥ sadān_uvāḥ ||	8	[− ∪ − − │ ∪ − ∪ ×]

Among them, there is one who says "this way!", one who is crooked with fear (?), one who howls in the forest; one who laughs, one who constantly neighs (/whines)—O Bhaṇvā demonesses, we know all your names together! As many sorts [that there are] of you, that many [of you], O Sadānuvās, disappear from here!

N.B. After pāda **c**, **Pa_c** repeats 17.13.7cd, 17.13.8 (the whole stanza), and again 17.13.9abc, after which it concludes this stanza with the remaining pādas **defg**. Differences in readings in the repeated portion are marked here with the siglum **Pa_c(2)**.

---

tāsām *ekāchavākā] tāsāmekāchavakā **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** tāsāmekāchava **Pa_c(2)** tāsāmikātmavr̥kā **K**   •   śaṅkāvaṅkā] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ JM₃** śaṅkā **V122** śaṅkāṃ **Pa_c** śaṅkāṃvaṅkā **Pa_c(2) V71** śakāṃvakāṃ **Mā** śakāvaṅkā **K**   •   vane kr̥kur] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** vanekr̥ku **Pa_c(2)** vanetrapuru **K**   •   hasanaikā] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71** hanaikā **JM₃** haśanaikā **Pa_c** hiśanaikā **Pa_c(2)** hāṃśanīkā **K**   •   kanikradā] **K Ji₄** kanikladā **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** kaniklavā **V122**   • |] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** || **Ji₄** *om*. **K** •   sarvāsāṃ] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** sarvasā **V71 JM₃**   •   bhaṇvā] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** bha([x] → *s.s.*)ṇvā **V122** bhaṃṇḍā (*vs.* bhaṃḍā BARRET, BHATT.) **K**   •   vaḥ sākaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** vatsākaṃ **K**   •   nāmadheyāni] **K** nāmadheẏāni **[O]**   • |] **K [Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** || **V122 Ji₄**   •   yati] **Ma Pa_c** yadi **K Ja V122 Mā V71 JM₃** yatidi **Ji₄**   •   vastati] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** varttastatidi **Ji4** vasyati **K**   •   naśyatetaḥ sadānvāḥ] **[O]** paśyateta sadanvā (= R-V, BHATT. *vs.* paśyatetas sadanvā BARRET) **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā]** ||³ **V122 Ji₄ JM₃** | **V71** Z 9 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *ekā chavakā* in pāda **a**, and writes *yati jātāni vastati* in pāda **f**.

It seems that most of the epithets in this stanza have to do with words, sounds, and noises.

a. **O** preserves *ekāchavakā*, **K** *ekātmavṛkā*. One possibility is to read, as in **K**, *ātmavṛkā-* 'oneself's wolf', which would be a hapax. However, one wonders why we don't have *ātmavṛkī-* instead. Comparing the two branches, one might wish to emend to *śālāvṛkā (if **O** *ch* is a corruption of an original *ś*), but once again the attested word for 'she-jackal' is *śālāvṛkī*. Rather, given that the following words seem to refer to noises, it seems attractive to read the second part of the word as *-vākā*, f. from *vāka-*, 'saying, sounding'. In fact it would be easy to emend to *achavākā (or *achāvākā). The *a(c)chavāká-*, 'he who says "*áchā*!"'[92], is one of the RV priests who assist the Hotṛ during the soma ritual. Besides reciting various *śāstrāṇi*, his main task is to officially invite and welcome the Adhvaryu priest to the soma drinking. It seems implausible that a demoness would be named after such priest. We may simply imagine a demoness "who says 'this way!'" and invites people to a dangerous place, perhaps in the forest (see pāda **b**). At any rate, this seems to me the lightest[93] emendation possible by which we could obtain an understandable reading from this line.[94]. It is perhaps remarkable that in the next stanza (PS 17.13.10d), a magical herb is welcomed (*achā vadāmasi*) into a house in order to repel the demonesses that are haunting the house.

b. The sequence *śaṅkāvaṅkā* might be a single word, perhaps one more onomatopoeic feminine epithet, or perhaps two words: *śaṅkā́-* f., 'fear, doubt' (Br+), and *vaṅkā-*, a hapax, possibly based on *vañc-*. The semantics of this root have been studied by ELIZARENKOVA & TOPOROV 1979: it can express the idea of 'going in a twisted way', both in a positive sense ('to be nimble, dexterous') or in a negative way ('to be dodgy, indirect, crooked'). I tentatively inteprret our word as a compound meaning 'crooked with fear'. However, of all the epithets in this stanza, this would be the only one that does not have to do with sound.

The word *kṛku-* (necessarily feminine) is a hapax. Compare, however, *kraku-* (which also must be feminine) in 17.12.2b above. Surely, both terms are onomatopoeic, if not variant spellings of the same word. See my comment *ad loc.*, in which I compare the various formations based on an onomatopoeic root *krakṣ-*, 'to howl'. Notably, we also find the compound *vanakrakṣá-*, 'howling in the wood' (i.e., bubbling in the wooden vessel), said of the soma (likened to a bull) in RV 9.108.7. An even more interesting piece of comparison is the compound *vanakrośa-*, describing a demon in PS 6.14.6, translated with "Forest-Shriek(er)" by Griffiths. References to demons inhabiting the forest are innumerable. See also *vṛkṣāṇāṃ* in the preceding stanza, PS 17.13.8b. It is thus possible that we should consider *vane* not as a separate word, but as the first member of a compound *vane-kṛku-* (cf. *vane-jā́-* 'born in the woods' in RV 6.3.3d, and 10.97.7a; a similar compound with inflected first member, *khalājjātā-*, 'born on the threshing floor', occurs in PS 17.14.3c below).

c. The word *hasanā́-*, occurring in RV 9.112.4, has been interpreted by some as 'laughter', by others in a sexualised sense as 'laughing woman' (see KEWA III p. 585); cf. *hasrá*, describing a woman laughing in a seductive way in RV 1.124.7; cf. also the etymologically related Av. *jahī-* and *jahikā-*, 'prostitute'. Laughter has frequently been considered inappropriate behaviour (or inappropriately seductive, in the case of women) throughout the history of Indian culture, as can be deduced from a variety of evidence: from the degrading function of laughing at someone in classical drama, to the prescription of Pāśupata ascetics to worship Paśupati with laughter.

A masculine adj., *kanikrada-*, occurs in VS 13.48, qualifying a horse: *imáṃ mā́ hiṃsīr ékaśaphaṃ paśúṃ kanikradáṃ vājínaṃ vā́jineṣu*, "Harm not this animal whose hooves are solid, the courser neighing in the midst of coursers" (Griffith). The formation is based on the intensive stem (see SCHAEFER 1994: 109f.) of the root *krand-*, 'to make a noise', 'neigh (like a horse)', 'creak (as a wheel)', 'lament, cry, weep, whine'.

---

92 Also spelled *ácha*.

93 The cluster *tma* in **K** might be a scribal error for *tsa*, which in turn frequently represents the pronunciation variant of an original cluster *cha*.

94 A less light emendation could be *śabdakā, 'little bad word'.

That the only occurrence of *kanikrada-* is used to describe a neighing horse might suggest that we should also imagine a neighing demoness. Indeed, in the majority of the AV occurrences, the intensive of this root is used to describe the sound of a horse (see PS 5.2.8d, 8.20.5c, etc.). A lustful man is described as a neighing horse in ŚS 2.30.5 (to secure a woman's love): *éyám agan pátikāmā jánikāmo 'hám ā́gamam | áśvaḥ kánikradad yáthā bhágenāháṃ sahā́gamam ||*, "Hither hath this woman come, desiring a husband; desiring a wife have I come; like a loud-neighing (krand) horse, together with fortune have I come" (Whitney). It is thus possible that our *kanikradā* carries a sexual meaning just like the preceding *hasanā*.

At the same time, the semantic field of 'lamenting, whining' expressed by *krand-* might also be intended in opposition to the laughing expressed by the preceding word. Cf. RV 10.95.13, in which a broken-hearted Purūravas is said to cry like a screeching wheel: *práti bravāṇi vartáyate áśru cakrán ná krandad ādhyè śivā́yai | prá tát te hinavā yát te asmé párehy ástaṃ nahí mū́ra mā́paḥ ||*, "[Urvaśī:] "I'll give him an answer when he lets his tear roll. Like a wheel he screeches for kindly care. I will send it [=child] to you, that thing of yours that's with us. Go away home. For you will not attain me, you fool" (J-B).

defg. See my comments on PS 17.12.1efgh above.

17.13.10

a	sahasvatīṃ pra harāmi-	8#	[ᵕ − ᵕ | ᵕ ᵕ − ×]
b	-imāṃ śālāṃ viṣāsahim |	8	[ᵕ − − − | ᵕ − ᵕ ×]
c	sadānᵤvāghnīm oṣadhiṃ	8#	[ᵕ − ᵕ − | − − ᵕ ×]
d	jaitrāyāchā vadāmasi ||	8	[− − − − | ᵕ − ᵕ ×]

I bring forth into this house the one possessing strength, the conquering one. We welcome the Sadānuvā-killing herb for the sake of victory.

sahasvatīṃ] **[O]** sahasvīrī **K** • harāmīmāṃ] **Ma Ja V122 Paᶜ JM₃** harāmīmoṃ **Ji₄** harāmīmā **Mā V71** praharāmimāṃ **K** • śālāṃ viṣāsahiṃ |] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Paᶜ [Mā] JM₃** śālāṃ viṣāsahiṃ || **Ji₄** [śa]śālāṃ vi[ṣa]ṣāsahiṃ | **V71** śālāṃ viṣāsahīm, **K** • sadānvāghnīm oṣadhiṃ] **[[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Paᶜ Mā]** sanvāghnīm oṣadhiṃ **Ji₄** sadānvāghnī[..]ṣadhiṃ **V71** sadānvāghnīm oṣadh(ī→)iṃ **JM₃** sadānvāghnīm oṣadhīṃ **K** • jaitrāyāchā] jaitrāyāchā **[O]** jāitrāyāśchā **K** • ||] **[Ma]? [Ja]?** || 13 || ru 10 || **Mā V71 Paᶜ** || 13 || 10 || **JM₃** || ru || 13 || **V122** || 13 || **Ji₄** Z 10 Z phaśca 2 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *harāmīmāṃ*, as he does not split pāda **a** from pāda **b**, and writes *jaitrāyāchā+ vadāmasi* in pāda **d**.

This stanza seems to imply a ritual by which a herb is brought (thrown?) into a haunted house to exorcise the Sadānuvā demonesses.

ab. A comparable construction with *pra-hṛ-* and double accusative (acc. of object and acc. of destination)[95] is found in PS 11.10.3ab, *nainam aśnīyād abrāhmaṇo, na gṛhān pra haret svān*: "A non-brahmin should not eat it (*enam*); he should not bring [it (reading *enam* again)] into his own homestead" (my transl.).[96]

---

95 Elsewhere in the AV, *pra-hṛ-* is found with the following constructions: 'strike something (acc.) with something (ins.)' (e.g. in ŚS 7.56.8a); 'hurl something (acc.) at someone (dat.)' (e.g. ŚS 10.5.50a ~ PS 16.132.6a); or 'insert something (acc) in something (loc.)' (e.g. ŚS 14.2.38d ~ PS 18.10.9d).

96 The alternative option would be to consider the two epithets *sahasvatīm* and *viṣāsahim* as qualifying the house (*śālām*), while pādas **ab** would then have to be rendered with something like "[With a herb] I strike this strong and conquering house." This seems implausible to me, especially in light of the habit of characterising herbs as "victorious" (see below).

On *śā́lā-*, 'house', see my comment on PS 17.12.10c, which also deals with demonesses haunting houses. Cf. also PS 17.13.8 above.

c. On the alternation between the short *i*-stem *óṣadhi-* (in RV only sg.) and long *ī*-stem *óṣadhī* (in RV only plural, in AV also sg.) see my comment on PS 17.21.7 below. Here the **O** mss. preserve the more archaic short *i*-stem singular, whereas **K** has the newer long *ī*-stem singular. It seems easier to justify the **K** variant as influenced by the neighbouring long vowels, and take the **O** reading as the *lectio difficilior*. I find no better criterion by which to make an editorial decision.

A herb is also employed against the Sādanuvās in PS 5.1.6–8 and PS 6.8, both featuring frequent repetition of forms related to the root *sah-*, aimed at enhancing the overpowering quality of the herb. The use of herbs to exorcise demons is very common. See for instance ŚS 2.25 (~ PS 4.13) in which a spotted-leafed plant (*pṛśniparṇī-*) is employed against the Kaṇva demons and to prevent abortion. In our stanza, instead, a herb seems to be used to exorcise demonesses who haunt a house. On this theme, see my comment on PS 17.12.10c above.

Sūkta 14

17.14.1

a	*duḥsaṃkāśe bhīmacakṣo	8#	[− − − − | − ∪ − ×]
b	nagne bhaṇve sadān_uve |	8	[− − − − | ∪ − ∪ ×]
c	dhrājiṃ ⁺tviṣiṃ śucim agnim	8#	[− − ∪ − | ∪ ∪ − ×]
d	arāyi kim ihechase |	8	[∪ − ∪ ∪ | ∪ − ∪ ×]
e	dhūmaṃ mā_abhi pra *gāyi	8#	[− − − ∪ | ∪ ∪ − ×]
f	nis *tvauṣāmi sadān_uve ||	8	[∪ − − ∪ | ∪ − ∪ ×]

O one of ugly appearance, O one of terrible glances, O naked one, O Bhaṇvā, O Sadānuvā; O Arāyī, what are you seeking here? The blaze, the flare, the glowing fire? Let her not advance towards [our] smoke [i.e. our fire]! I burn you completely, O Sadānuvā.

Bhattacharya writes *duḥśaṅkāśe* in pāda **a**, omits the daṇḍa after pāda **b**, and writes *kimihecchase+* in pāda **d**, *dhūmam* in pāda **e**, and *ni stauṣāmi* in pāda **d**.

*duḥsamkāśe] duḥ(śaṃ→s.s.)saṃkāśe **V122** duḥśaṅkāśe [**Ma**] [**Ja**] duḥśaṃkāśe **Ji₄ Pa_c** duścakāśe **Mā** duśśaṃkāśe **V71** duśvaṃkāśe **JM₃** yaścaṅkāśe **K**   • nagne] [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **Ji₄ Pa_c** [**Mā**] **V71 JM₃** ragne **V122** raragne **K**   • bhaṇve] [**O**] bhaṃṇva **K**   • sadānve] [**O**] sahānve **K**   • \|] [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **Pa_c** [**Mā**] \| **JM₃** \|\| **V71 Ji₄** ⸠ **V122**   • dhrājiṃ ⁺tviṣiṃ] dhrājiṃ dviṣiṃ **O** vrajintviṣyam **K**   • śucim] **K** [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Ji₄** [**Mā**] **V71 JM₃** ś[.]cim **Pa_c**   • agnim arāyi] **K** agnimarāī **Ma Ja Mā** agnimarāī **V71 V122** agni(s.s.→)ḥmarāī **JM₃** agniṃmarāī **Ji₄** agnisamarāī **Pa_c**   • kim] **K** kīm **O**   • ihechase] **O** ihekṣase **K**   dhūmaṃ mābhi] [**O**] dhūmamābhi **K**   • pra gāyi*] pra gāi **O** pra gāhya **K**   • nis *tvauṣāmi] nistauṣāmi [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Ji₄ Pa_c V71** nistaumiṣāmi **Mā** nistau(space)ṣāmi **JM₃** nistūṣāmi **K**   • sadānve] [**O**] mahānve **K**   • \|\|] [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **Pa_c** [**Mā**] \|\|³ **V122 Ji₄ JM₃** \|\| 3 \|\| **V71** Z 1 Z **K**

In this stanza, a single demoness is repelled by means of fire. Given the Sadānuvās' habit of haunting women and children in their own houses, it is possible that the fire intended here is the household fire.

   a. All of the **O^A** mss. point to °ḥśaṃ° or °ḥśaṅ° with a palatal; both **K** (*śc*) and **O^B** (*śc, śś, śv*) point to a different cluster in which the initial *ḥ* was assimilated to the following sibilant. I think it is safe to say at least that the written archetype had already preserved a corrupted reading with *ś*. Only **V122** corrects *śaṃ* to *saṃ*, but this is definitely an educated correction. In conclusion, I believe that it is necessary to mark our emendation with an asterisk, as we are reconstructing the original text, before the written archetype.

   The word *duḥsaṃkāśe* must be the voc. sg. of the feminine epithet *duḥsaṃkāśā*. The compound *duḥ-saṃkāśa-*, 'of ugly appearance', is not attested elsewhere. However, both the verbal

lexeme *saṃ-kāś-*, 'to appear, be visible', and the noun *sáṃkāśa-*, 'appearance, look, aspect', are attested in the AV, and so is the compound *mádhu-saṃkāśa-*, 'of lovely appearance' (ŚS 7.31.1 ~ PS 20.31.8a; PS 1.55.3a), which conveys precisely the opposite meaning of our *duḥsaṃkāśa-*. Cf. also *mádhu-saṃdr̥ś-* (PS 4.20.d, 6.6.1d) and *mádhu-saṃdr̥śa-* (ŚS 1.34.3d).

The form *bhīmacakṣo* can either be the sandhi form of a feminine vocative *-as* from the stem *bhīmacakṣas-* (nom. f./m. *bhīmacakṣās*, voc. *bhīmacakṣas*; see Whitney, *Grammar* §418 p. 156), or it can be the regular *-o* voc. of the f. stem *bhīmacakṣus-* or *bhīmacakṣu-*: with the latter, we may compare the form *ghoracakṣavaḥ*, 'the [demonesses] of fearsome eyes/glances', in PS 17.14.4b, below, which most certainly belongs to a *u*-stem feminine *ghoracakṣu-*. In the AV, we find both compounds with *-cakṣas-* (*uru-cákṣas*, *ghorá-cakṣas-*, *nr̥-cákṣas-*, *viśvá-cakṣas-*), *-cakṣus-* (*ághora-cakṣus-*, *ádabdha-cakṣus-*, *jarā-cakṣus-*, *vi-cakṣus-*), as well as *-cakṣu-* (*sahasra-cakṣu-*, 'thousand-eyed', attested multiple times, and *muni-cakṣu-*, 'muni-eyed(?)', once in PS 5.34.5b). As the compound in our line is not attested elsewhere, we have no means to tell which is the correct stem. And even if we had another attestation, we would not be completely sure, as variation is possible even within the same text, as can be seen in the case of *ghorá-cakṣas-*, *ghora-cakṣu-* and *ághora-cakṣus-*.

b. The feminine of the adj. *nagná-* 'naked' is found only once, in a hymn against the *árāti* (f.): ŚS 5.7.8 reads *utá nagnā́ bóbhuvatī svapnayā́ sacase jánam | árāte cittám vī́rtsanty ā́kūtim púruṣasya ca ||*, "Likewise, greatly making thyself naked, thou fastenest on (*sac*) a person in dreams, O niggard, baffling the plan and design of a man" (Whitney).

Bhattacharya omits the *daṇḍa* at the end of pāda **b**, as it does not occur in any of his mss. I find a single or double *daṇḍa* in several of my mss. The same mss. also feature the numeral "3" at the end of the stanza. This, together with the fact that this division is attested in both Odisha sub-branches, suggests that we should write a *daṇḍa* instead.

On *bhaṇvā-*, see my comment on PS 17.12.1e above.

cd. The word *dhrā́ji-*, f., indicates a 'rush, gust, force (of wind)' (e.g. RV 10.136.2 ~ PS 5.38.2) or a 'burst (of flame)' (see examples below): in particular, this word is often employed in charms in which the force of the wind or a burst of flame are invoked to repel enemies: e.g. ŚS 3.1.5, *indra sénāṃ mohayāmítrāṇām | agnér vā́tasya dhrā́jyā tā́n víṣūco ví nāśaya ||*, "O Indra, confound the army of our enemies; with the blast of fire, of wind, make them disappear, scattering" (Whitney); PS 5.20.1, *paro 'pehi paraś cara paras tarda parastaram | agner vātasya dhrājyā apa bādhe ahaṃ tvām ||*, "Go far away, move far away, away, O borer, still farther away. I repel you with the force of fire, of wind" (Lubotsky).

Thus, like the examples just quoted, pādas **cd** are clearly a threat addressed to the demoness. In pāda **d**, the reciter asks her what she is looking for, but this is just a rhetorical question. The answer was already given in pāda **c**: she is only going to find a burning fire ignited to repel her.

The emendation to [+]*tviṣim* was proposed by Bhattacharya, and it is certainly correct. The *tvíṣi-*, 'energy, impetus, vehemence, sprightliness, liveliness', is a typical characteristic of fire, and can be translated as 'flare, brightness': e.g. RV 5.8.5d (to Agni), *tvíṣiḥ sā́ te titviṣāṇásya nā́dhr̥ṣe ||*, "When you have flared, that flare of yours is not to be challenged" (J-B). Compare also the use of the root noun *tvíṣ-* in RV 8.43.3: *ārokā́ iva ghéd áha tigmā́ agne táva tvíṣaḥ | dadbhír vánāni bapsati ||*, "Like brilliants, certainly, are your sharp scintillations, Agni. With their teeth they snap at the woods" (J-B); or the use of *tveṣá-* in RV 3.22.2, *ágne yát te diví várcaḥ pr̥thivyā́ṃ yád óṣadhīṣv apsv ā́ yajatra | yénāntárikṣam urv ā̀tatántha tveṣáḥ sá bhānúr arṇavó nr̥cákṣāḥ ||*, "O Agni, worthy to receive the sacrifice, your luster, which is in heaven and on earth, which is here among the plants and the waters, and by which you have stretched throughout the wide midspace—that is glittering, undulating radiance watching men" (J-B).

On the *vr̥kī́*-inflected word *arāyī́-*, see my comment on 17.13.4c above.

e. Bhattacharya writes *dhū<u>mam</u> mābhi pra gāyi**, emending **O** *gāi* and **K** *gahya* to **gayi*, the (otherwise unattested) passive aorist injunctive of the root *gā-*, 'to make a step, advance', with

preverbs *abhi* and *pra*. The lexeme *abhi-pra-gā-* is attested in PS 20.18.1a (the ŚS parallel, 6.37.1, has *upa-pra-gā-*), in which a curse is described as approaching the reciter, who tries to avert it and direct it against the curser: ŚS 6.37.1–2 (~ PS 20.18.1-2): *úpa* (PS: *abhi*) *prā́gāt sahasrākṣó yuktvā́ śapátho rátham | śaptā́ram anvichán máma* (PS: *yātu*) *vŕ̥ka ivā́vimato gr̥hám || pári ṇo vr̥ṅgdhi* (PS: *vr̥ṇdhi*) *śapatha hradám agnír ivā* (PS: *iva*) *dáhan | śaptā́ram átra no* (PS: *tvaṃ*) *jahi divó* (PS: *divyā*) *vr̥kṣám ivāśániḥ ||*, "Hither hath come forth, having harnessed his chariot, the thousand-eyed curse, seeking after my curser, as a wolf the house of a sheep-owner. Avoid us, O curse, as a burning fire a pond; smite our curser here, as the bolt from heaven a tree" (Whitney); "Hergekommen ist der tausendäugige Fluch, nachdem er [seinen] Streitwagen angespannt hat. Dem Flucher nachspürend ziehe er [zu ihm], wie ein Wolf zum Haus von jemandem, der Schafe hat. Umgehe uns, o Fluch, wie das brennende Feuer einen See. Den Flucher hier schlage du, wie der himmlische Donnerkeil einen Baum" (Kubisch). Whereas the preverb *úpa* in the ŚS version simply expresses the fact that the curse has come "by, near", in the PS the preverb *abhi* highlights the fact that the curse has approached "inimically", "against" the reciter. This is how I interpret *abhi* in our line as well: the implied subject must be the Sadānuvā demoness, who is to be kept away from the reciter's fire, implied by the metonymy of the smoke.

The construction [*mā́* + aor. inj.] conveys a negative command with the particular aim of preventing an action from happening (preventive function; see HOFFMANN 1967b). As for the semantics of the passive aorist of *gā-*, we may compare that of the passive aorist of *gam-*, *agāmi*: KÜMMEL (1996: 18) describes *agāmi* (only attested in RV 6.16.19) as "agentiv", and glosses it with 'ist gekommen': RV 6.16.19, *ā́gnír agāmi bhā́rato vr̥trahā́ purucétanaḥ | dívodāsasya sátpatiḥ ||*, "Agni has come here [KÜMMEL (1996: 40): "ist jetzt hergekommen"], the one belonging to the Bharatas, obstacle-smasher, manifest to many, lord of the settlements of Divodāsa" (J-B). KÜMMEL (ibid.) ultimately likens its meaning to that of the root aorist active *agan*. Thus, we may compare RV 7.50.1, in which we find the injunctive *gan* used in a negative imperative construction with preventive function: RV 7.50.1ab, *ā́ mā́m mitrāvaruṇehā́ rakṣataṃ kulā́yáyad viśváyan mā́ na ā́ gan |*, "Guard me here, Mitra and Varuṇa. Do not let the nesting or the swelling thing come upon us" (J-B). In conclusion, I take our *mā_abhi pra gāyi* to mean "Let [the Sadānuvā] not advance (inimically) against...". The preceding *dhūmaṃ* must be an acc. of destination, thus "… against the smoke". The word *dhūmaṃ* must metonymically stand for *agnim*, just like *dhrā́jiṃ*, *tviṣiṃ* and *śucim* in pāda **c**.

f. This pāda is problematic. The forms *stauṣāmi* (**O**) and *stūṣāmi* (**K**) do not exist as such. The syntagm *ni-stu-* (*ni-ṣṭu-*) is actually never attested in Vedic. It is only mentioned by Pāṇini (8.3.70), in the context of an explanation of how roots with initial *s-* change it to *ṣ-* when preceded by the preverbs *pari*, *vi*, and *ni*.[97] In fact, the phenomenon described by Pāṇini is the norm in the Paippalāda (see for instance PS 17.3.8d *ni ṣīdāmi*), and it can also occur when the preverb *ni* does not immediately precede a verb, but another word: e.g. ŚS 8.4.10d ~ PS 16.9.10d *ní ṣá hīyatāṃ tanvà tánā ca*, "Let him be degraded with self and with posterity" (Whitney). Therefore, the reading *ni stauṣāmi* without retroflexion, as adopted by Bhattacharya, is extremely improbable.

The lightest emendation might be *nis *tvauṣāmi* (=*tvā_oṣāmi*), "I burn you out/away/completely." This conjecture is both syntactically consistent with the following vocative singular *sadānuve*, as well as thematically consistent with the fact that the whole stanza revolves around fighting a demoness with fire. The lexeme *nir-uṣ-* is not attested, but we may compare the following stanzas, both belonging to hymns against sorcerers and demons, in which the lexeme *ny-uṣ-* is employed to express threats against such evil beings: ŚS 8.3.21 (~ PS 16.8.1), *tád agne cákṣuḥ práti dhehi rebhé śapharújo yéna páśyasi yātudhā́nān | atharvaváj jyótiṣā daívyena satyáṃ dhū́rvantam acítaṃ nyòṣa ||*, "Set thou in the reciter, O Agni, that eye with which thou seest the hoof-breaking sorcerers; Atharvan-like, with brightness of the gods, scorch (*uṣ*) down the truth-damaging fool (*acít*)" (Whitney); ŚS 8.4.1 (~ PS 16.9.1), *índrāsomā tápataṃ rákṣa ubjátaṃ ny*

---

97 The forms *niṣṭauti* and *nyaṣṭaut* are given as examples.

àrpayataṃ vṛṣaṇā tamovṛ́dhaḥ | párā śṛṇītam acíto ny òṣataṃ hatáṃ nudéthām ní śiśītam attríṇaḥ ||, "O Indra-and-Soma, burn the demon, oppress (*ubj*) [him]; put (*arpay-*)[98] down, ye two bulls, them that thrive in darkness; crush away, scorch down the fools (*acít*); slay, push, pin (*śā*) down the devourers" (Whitney).

17.14.2   **e**: ~ PS 17.12.4f, 14.3e, 14.6e, 14.8e, 15.7e

a	kaṅk$_i$y ekā prakhidaikā	8#	[– ᴜ – – │ ᴜ ᴜ – ×]
b	kim ichant$_i$y *abhiśrayāḥ │	8	[ᴜ – – ᴜ │ ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
c	caranti naktaṃ durṇāmno	8#	[ᴜ – ᴜ – │ – – – ×]
d	*$_a$rāyīḥ sūtikaiṣ$_i$yas	8	[ᴜ – – – │ ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
e	tā ito nāśayāmasi ||	8	[– ᴜ – – │ ᴜ – ᴜ ×]

One is a carrion-eating stork, the other is a tormentor; what are the clinging ones seeking? The ill-named ones roam about at night. The Arāyí́ demonesses who are after pregnant women—them we make disappear from here!

kaṅkyekā] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa$_c$ **[Mā]** kaṃṅkmekā V71 kaṃṅkmaikā JM₃ kaṅkekāḫ K   •   prakhidaikā] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa$_c$ **[Mā]** V71 prakṣidaikā JM₃ priṣad aikāḫ K   •   kimichanty] **Ja** kimichāṃty Ji₄ kimitsyaṃ(*s.s.*: tsyaṃ)ty V122 kimitsyaṃty Pa$_c$ kimitsyanty **Mā Ma** kimitsānty JM₃ kimuśchrayanty K[99]   •   *abhiśrayāḥ] abhiśrayā **[O]** abhiśchrayā K   •   naktaṃ] K **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa$_c$ **[Mā]** JM₃ nakta[. V71   •   durṇāmno] durṇṇāmno **Ja** V122 Ji₄ Pa$_c$ durnnāmno **Mā Ma** durnāmno JM₃ . . .] V71 durnamno (*vs.* durnāmno Barret, dunnamno R-V, Bhatt.) K   •   *arāyīḥ] rāyī K rāyī **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa$_c$ **[Mā]** rāẏa V71 JM₃   •   sūtikaiṣyastā ito] **[O]** sūtakīṣyastayito K   •   nāśayāmasi ||] nāśaẏāmasi ||**[O]** nāśayāmasi Z 2 Z K

Bhattacharya writes +*kimicchantyabhiśrayā* in pāda **b**, *rāyī(ḥ)* in pāda **d**.

   a. The epithet *kaṅkī-* must be based on *kaṅká-*, a carrion-eating bird (EWAia I p. 289), according to Fitzgerald (1998) the 'greater adjutant stork'. See my comment on PS 17.22.10, in which this bird appears next to other carrion birds in a curse against an enemy.

   b. The epithet *prakhidā-* must be based on the lexeme *pra-khid-*, attested in VS 16.46 (belonging to the Śatarudrīya), in which Rudra is praised as follows: […] *náma ākhidaté ca prakhidaté* […], "homage to him who troubles and to him who afflicts" (Griffith).

   Bhattacharya writes *abhiśrayā*, most likely another epithet in the nom. f. sg. However, the verb *ichanti* is in a 3rd pl. person. This might not be too much of a problem if one considers that three demonesses are mentioned (*kaṅkyā*, *prakhidā*, and *abhiśrayā*). However, strictly speaking, we have three syntactically independent sentences here: two nominal sentences (*kaṅkī_ekā*, and *prakhidā_ekā*), and a third sentence with a 3rd pl. verb. In this case, even though both traditions point to -*ā*, I think we should correct to *abhiśrayāḥ* (nom. f. pl.) in order to have a plural subject (as in pāda **c**). This is requires only a light emendation, as *visarga* is frequently lost in pausa.

   The stem *abhi-śraya-* is not found elsewhere, with the exception of the next stanza, where we find the acc. sg. f. *abhiśrayām*, used as a demoness epithet. The simplex *śraya-* is also not attested as such, but we find other compounds such as *apa-śrayá-* 'bolster, cushion(?)', in ŚS 15.3.8 ~ PS 18.29.1j, and *sa-pari-śraya-*, 'with an enclosure', in ŚB 14.9.4.22, which show that *śraya-* must be derived from *śri-*, 'to lean' (rather than *śrī-* or *śrā-*, but see footnote 101 below). Thus,

---

98 The stem *arpaya-* is better translated as "hit, pierce"; see my comment on PS 17.13.1b above.

99 The extra *repha* in the cluster *śchra* in **K** is perhaps due to anticipation of the similar cluster in the following word.

abhi-śraya- may be interpreted as derived from the lexeme *abhi-śri-*, lit. 'lean against', but glossed by PW with 'herbeiführen, vereinigen mit', and MW with 'to spread, extend (as brightness)', with reference to the aorist in ŚS 13.2.9 (to the Sun) only: *út ketúnā bṛhatā́ devā́ ā́gann ápāvṛk támo 'bhí jyótir aśrait |*, "The god hath come up with great show (*ketú*); he hath wasted away the darkness, hath set up (*abhi-śri*) the light" (Whitney). Whitney adds in his comment that *abhi-śri-* means "more literally 'fasten on, affix' (to the sky)"). To understand why such a lexeme would be suitable for a demoness epithet, we may compare the lexeme *anu-śi-*, attested in ŚS 8.6.19 (from the hymn to protect pregnant women from demons, which we have quoted many times; see also my comment on pāda **d** below): here demons are said to kill babies by lying down next to (*anuśérate*) women who have just given birth, as in ŚS 8.6.19ab, *yé amnó jātā́n māráyanti sū́tikā anuśérate |*, "They who suddenly make die those that are born, [who] lie by the bearing [women]" (Whitney). Compare also the semantics of the root *sac-* (mid.), 'to fasten on to, to possess someone', e.g. in ŚS 5.7.8 (quoted above, in my comment on PS 17.14.1b), where the *nagnā́- árāti-* possesses a person in their sleep, or in ŚS 4.37.11bc (another hymn against various demons), which reads *gandharváḥ sacate stríyas | tám itó nāśayāmasi*, "the *gandharvá* fastens upon women; him we make disappear from here" (Whitney). Thus the *abhiśrayā-* must be a demoness who leans against women or fastens herself to women.

    c. With regard to demonesses roaming at night, compare PS 17.12.4b above.

    d. On the Arāyī́ demoness, see my comment on PS 17.13.4c above.

    The word *sūtikaiṣyas* is the acc. pl. of. of a *vṛkī́*-inflected *sūtikaiṣī-* (hapax), 'seeking a woman who has recently given birth', a compound based on the root noun *iṣ-*, 'seeking', and *sūtikā-*, f., 'a woman who has recently given birth'. The only attestation of this latter word in the AV occurs in ŚS 8.6.19 (which I quote above with regard to the semantics of *anu-śi-*), belonging to the same hymn to protect women from demonesses: *yé amnó jātā́n māráyanti sū́tikā anuśérate | strī́bhāgān piṅgó gandharvā́n vā́to abhrám ivājatu ||*, "They who suddenly make die those who are born, who lie by the bearing [women] — the Gandharvas, woman-seekers (?), let the brown one drive, as the wind a cloud" (Whitney). Remarkably, the epithet *strī́bhāgān*, attributed to the Gandharvas in this stanza, seems to convey the same meaning as our hapax *sūtikaiṣ-*.

17.14.3   **e**: ~ PS 17.12.4f, 14.2e, 14.6e, 14.8e, 15.7e

a	apakrathām abhiśrayām	8	[ᴜ − ᴜ − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
b	ānṛtyantīṃ ⁺kutūhalām |	8	[− − − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
c	kusūlīṃ ⁺rathabhañjanīṃ	8	[ᴜ − − ᴜ | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
d	khalājjātās trikūkᵤvas	8	[ᴜ − − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
e	tā ito nāśayāmasi ||	8	[− ᴜ − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]

The one who chokes [her victims], the one who clings to [women], the curious one who comes dancing, the Kusūlī (?), the one who makes the chariot break, those who are born from the threshing floor, the Trikūkus (?)—them we make disappear from here!

apakrathām] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ apakrathom Ji₄ apakrathā[x]m **Pa**꜀
apakrātām **K**   •
abhiśrayām] **K** abhiśraẏām **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ abhiśaẏām Ji₄   •   ānṛtyantīṃ] **K** **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ ānṛtyantī Ji₄   • ⁺kutūhalām] kutūhalam, **K** kṛtohalām \| **Mā** V71 kṛ̇tohaḷāṃ \| **Ma Ja** kutohaḷāṃ \| **Pa**꜀ kutohaḷāṃ \| JM₃ V122 kutohayaṃ \|\| **Ji₄**[100]   • kusūlīṃ] **Pa**꜀ JM₃ kusū[x]līṃ V71 kusūḷīṃ **Ma** kusulīṃ **Ja** kusulī V122 Ji₄ kusūlāṃ **Mā** kuśūliyaṃ **K**   •

---

[100]Note that *kutohayaṃ* in **Ji₄** is not spelled with the intervocalic akṣara *ẏa* [ja], but with the akṣara *ya* [dʒa]. This is very likely a scribal mistake for *ḷa*.

⁺rathabhañjanīm] rathabhañjanīṅ **V71** rathabha[.]nīṅ **JM₃** rathabhañjanīṃṅ **V122** rathabhaktinīṅ **Ji₄** ratharbhañjanīṅ **Pa𝒸** (rathabhajjanīṅ **Mā? Ma? Ja?**) rasabhañjanīṃ **K**   • khalājjātās trikūkvas] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ V71** khalājātāstikūkvas **Mā Pa𝒸** khalājjātāsikūkvas **JM₃** khalāñ jātās trivrūkyas **K**   • tā ito nāśayāmasi] tā ito nāśayāmasi **[Mā] V71 JM₃ [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa𝒸** tā ito nāśayā[x]masi **V122** tāyito nāśayāmasi **K**   • ‖] **Mā V71 JM₃ [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa𝒸** Z 3 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *kutūhalām+* in pāda **b**, *rathabhajjanīṃ* in pāda **c**, and *trikūkvas* in agreement with the Odisha mss. in pāda **d**.

a. The root *krath-*, glossed by the dictionaries with 'rejoice', is only attested in TB 2.3.9.9 (*krāthayed*), although Gotō (1987: 121 fn.126) regards it as a mistake for *kvath-* 'boil', used metaphorically. The root *klath-* 'sich drehen oder ballen' (PW) occurs once in VSM 39.5, where the different states of a milk offering (when prepared, heated, poured, etc.) are equated with various deities: *mārutáḥ kláthan* (= *kláthat*), "the Maruts when the milk is clotting" (Griffith). Both of these roots seem out of context in our text. According to PW, Pāṇini's Dhātupāṭha mentions the roots *krath-*, *klath-*, *knath-*, with the meaning 'hurt, injure' (*hiṃsārthe*), but they are never attested in Vedic. In the Mbh we find Krātha used as a proper name (the name of a sub-race of the Yādavas, descendants of a Kratha, and also the name of Skanda's retinue; see MW), while the form *krathana* is found in the Carakasaṃhitā as an adj., 'one who is in danger of suffocation', and as a neuter noun, 'interruption of breath'. The compound *apa-kratha-* is a hapax. I translate tentatively sticking to the attested meaning of the Carakasaṃhitā, which appears to be a technical meaning derived from the more general one attested in Pāṇini. Our demoness might be a demoness who chokes her victims.[101]

On *abhiśrayā-*, see my comment on the previous stanza.

b. Renou (1957a: 83) glosses the epithet *kutūhalā* with "wonderful"; Mayrhofer (EWAia I p. 364) glosses the adj. *kutūhala-* with "wunderbar, ungewöhnlich". In classical sources, we also find the neuter noun *kutūhalam*, indicating something able to excite curiosity or someone's interest towards something unusual. Mayrhofer (ibid.) also compares *kutūhalin-* 'eine ungewöhnliche Erscheinung teilnahmsvoll verfolgend', *kautūhala-*, n., 'Interesse, Verlangen, Neugier', *kautuka-*, n., 'Neugier, Interesse', etc. I translate this epithet with 'the curious one' to allow both interpretations.

As regards the lexeme *ā-nṛt-*, compare ŚS 4.37.7 (~ PS 4.28.7), part of a hymn against supernatural beings: *ānṛ́tyataḥ śikhaṇḍíno gandharvásyāpsarāpatéḥ | bhinádmi muṣká̄v ápi yāmi śépaḥ ‖*, "Of the hither-dancing, crested Gandharva, Apsaras-lord, I split the testicles, I bind fast (?) the member" (Whitney).

c. Bhattacharya writes *kusūlīṃ*, even though none of his mss. has this reading (**Ma** has *kusūḷīṃ*, **Ja** *kusulīṃ*, **Mā** *kusūlāṃ*), because he is silently normalising *ḷ* to *l*.

Mayrhofer (EWAia I p.382f.) mentions a series of words (all possibly related to each other) indicating female demons: *kusitā́yī* (MS), *kusidā́yī* (KS), *kústā* (MS), *kusulī* (AV) and *kusū́la* (AV). In particular, the word *kusū́la* (a feminine *ā*-stem) is found in ŚS 8.6.10c (belonging to the hymn to protect pregnant women), part of a stanza that I have quoted in full in my comment on PS 17.12.10c above, and which contains several obscure names for demonesses. I assume that our *ī*-stem is an alternative but equivalent designation for the same being.

Bhattacharya writes *rathabhajjanīṃ*. However, an emendation sign is necessary, as only **K** features a final anusvāra, while the **O** mss. have final *ṅ* (in the cluster *ṅkha*). Moreover, none of my mss. read the cluster *jj*, but only *ñj*; Bhattacharya does not explicitly report his reading in his apparatus, and I wonder if the cluster *jj* in his edition is a misprint for *ñj*, as clearly an *ī*-stem from *bhañjana* (another demoness's name) is most likely the correct reading. The compound *ratha-*

101An alternative idea would be to interpret *apakrathā-* as based on *krath-=kvath-*, 'to boil' in parallel to interpreting *abhiśrayā* as based on *śrā-* (*śṛṇāti*) 'to cook'. Thus *apakrathā/apakvathā-* could be a 'demoness who spoils the boiling/decoction (*kvatha*)' and *abhiśrayā-* maybe 'a demoness who roasts [her victims]'?

bhañjana- is a hapax.

d. The phrase *khalāj jātās* (perhaps rather a compound *khalāj-jātā-*) resembles the compound *khala-já-* 'born in the threshing floor', found in ŚS 8.6.15 (~ PS 16.80.2), a stanza from the hymn for the protection of pregnant women that I have quoted in full in my comment on PS 17.12.1c and PS 17.13.4c and referred to several times, as it contains various names and epithets of demonesses that recur in our text, including *śakadhūma-já-* and *khala-já-*. Compare *khala-sad-*, '[a demoness] sitting on the threshing floor' in PS 1.86.4 (also quoted in my comment on PS 17.13.4c, to which I refer the reader), which illustrates how demons can originate in various locations within a rural settlement. The following occurrence of *khála-* is also noteworthy, as it belongs to a hymn against Apsarases that has several lexical correspondences with ours: PS 15.18.5 reads *āhatā apa tā itaḥ khalād iva yātudhānyaḥ | amuṃ gachata pūruṣaṃ samudram apa gacchata ||*, "Them, beaten up, [remove] away from here, like sorceresses from the threshing floor. Go to that man over there, go away to the ocean" (Lelli).

The **O** mss. point to *trikūkvas*, while **K** has *trivrūkyas*, two variants that are not so easily reconciled. **K** *trivrūkyas* might underlie *trivṛkyas*, acc. pl. f. of *tri-vṛkī-*, 'she who has three wolves' (?); **O** *trikūkvas* might be an acc. pl. f. of a *tri-kūku-*, 'who has three daughters'. The latter meaning would be based on an unattested **kūku-* 'Mädchen, Tochter', assumed on the basis of the late stem *kūkuda-* 'einer, der seine Tochter wohlausgestattet zur Ehe übergibt', attested by various lexicographers (see PW *ad loc.*, and EWAia III p. 116, from which I take the glosses quoted above). However, we have no other arguments in favour of this tentative etymology. Moreover, I find it somewhat odd that such an epithet would be used in the plural, implying the existence of multiple demonesses, each one having three daughters. We could also consider heavier emendations: e.g. to *trikakudas, 'three-headed, three-humped' (with metathesis of the vowel colour?); cf. ŚS 5.23.9, *triśīrṣā́ṇaṃ trikakúdaṃ krímiṃ sāráṅgam árjunam | śṛṇā́my asya pṛṣṭī́r ápi vṛścāmi yác chíraḥ ||*, "The three-headed, the three-humped (*-kakúd*), the variegated, the whitish worm—I crush the ribs of it; I hew at what is its head" (Whitney). However, this emendation would yield an irregular cadence. This might not be a problem, as pāda **d** does not end the hemistich. However, the metre seems unusually regular in our stanza (also in pāda **a** and **c**), which makes such a conjecture less attractive. At any rate, either solution is speculative. I tentatively accept the Odisha reading, as it might be correct without emendation.

17.14.4 (K 17.14.6)

a	yā vikeśīr unmaditya-	8#	[− ᴜ − − | − ᴜ − ×]
b	-urarā ghoracakṣavaḥ |	8	[ᴜ ᴜ − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
c	śīrṣāṇ₍ᵢ₎y anyā anyāsām	8#	[− − ᴜ − | − − − ×]
d	vitāvantīr ivāsate |	8	[ᴜ − − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
e	sadānvā brahmaṇaspate	8	[ᴜ − − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
f	paro bhrūṇāṇ₍ᵢ₎y arpaya ||	8	[ᴜ − − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]

Those [demonesses] who have dishevelled hair, having gone crazy, the Urarās with fearsome glances, they keep kind of *vi-tāv*-ing each other's heads. O Brahmaṇaspati, pierce the Sadānuvās [to drive them] away from [human] embryos.

yā vikeśīr] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** yā vi([x]→*s.s.*)keśīr **V122** yā vikeśā **Pa**_c   • unmadityorarā] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄** unmadityorā **Mā V71** unmadityocarā **JM₃** anmadityorarā **Pa**_c unmṛtyoranā **K**   • ghoracakṣavaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa**_c **[Mā] V71** ghoracakṣa(*s.s.*→)vaḥ **JM₃** ghoraca(kṣavaḥ→)kṛvaḥ **K**   • \|][**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Pa**_c **Mā V71 JM₃** \|\| **Ji₄** *om.* **K**   • śīrṣāṇyanyā

anyāsāṃ] **[Ma] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** śīrṣṇāṇyanyā anyāsāṃ **Ja** śīrṣāṇyānyānyāsām (*vs* śīrṣāṇyanyānyāsām Barret) **K** • vitāvantīr] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** vitāvatrīr **V122** • ivāsate ‖] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ivāsate ‖ **Ji₄** • sadānvā] **[O]** sadānvā **K** • brahmaṇaspateparo] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** brahmaṇaspate[.]ro **V71** brahmaṇaspa **Pa꜀** vrahmaṇaspatepado **K** • bhrūṇānyarpaya] **K** bhrūṇānyarpaya **[Ja] V122** bhr̥ṇānyarpaẏa **Mā** bhr̥ṇāṃnyarpaẏa **V71 JM₃** bhrūṇāṃnyarpakmaṣaṃẏa **Ji₄** rpaẏa **Pa꜀** (illegible) **[Ma]** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā]** ‖³ **V122 Ji₄ V71 JM₃ Z 6 Z K**

    a. The word *vikeśī-*, 'with dishevelled hair', is typically used to characterise both mourning and wailing women, as well as sorceress or demonesses. For a survey of its uses see my comment on PS 17.22.9 below.

    This is the only Vedic attestation of the absolutive *unmaditya*. The lexeme *un-mad-*, however, is well attested in the AV, although mostly in rather specific texts, such as ŚS 6.111, a short hymn to cure insanity, PS 5.17, against possession by a demon, and in ŚS 6.130.4, a spell to make a man fall crazily in love.

    I dissolve the sandhi between pādas **ab** as *unmaditya_urarā*, taking the absolutive as ending in *-ya* with short final *a*, as is the norm in the AV (see WG §993a, p. 357).

    b. The word *urarā-* is obscure. One wonders whether it could belong to the same family as the Uruṇḍā (PS 17.12.1c) and the Urukī (PS 17.12.2b), or whether it could be connected to *úras-*, 'breast', and thus indicate a demoness characterised by large breasts or somehow dangerous to women's breasts.

    On *ghoracakṣu-*, see my comment on "*bhīmacakṣo*" in PS 17.14.1 above.

    cd. A proper understanding of these pādas depends on the intepretation of *vitāvantīr*. This must certainly be a pres. ptc. from a verbal lexeme *vi-tāv-*. An overview of the discussion of this alleged lexeme can be found in Griffiths (in prep.);[102] I shall summarise the main points. Hoffmann dedicated a short article (1963: 94f=1975: 158f.) to the form *vitā́vati*, which occurs in two stanzas belonging to the long hymn on Agni Kravyād, which also forms the seventh anuvāka of PS 17 (Sūktas 44-49 ~ ŚS 12.2). Stanza ŚS 12.2.38 (~ PS 17.48.8) reads: *múhur gŕ̥dhyaiḥ prá vadaty ā́rtim mártyo nī́tya | kravyā́d yā́n agnír antikā́d anuvidvā́n vitā́vati ‖*, "A mortal, going down to mishap, speaks forth repeatedly with greedy ones (? *gŕ̥dhya*); whom (pl.) the flesh-eating Agni, from near by, after-knowing, follows (? *vi-tāv*)" (Whitney). The same refrain is found in ŚS 12.2.52 (~ PS 17.48.10ab, 9cd[103]), *préva pipatiṣati mánasā múhur ā́ vartate púnaḥ | kravyā́d yā́n agnír antikā́d anuvidvā́n vitā́vati ‖*, "He desires, as it were, to fly forth with his mind; repeatedly he returns again—they whom the flesh-eating Agni, from near by, after-knowing follows" (Whitney). Whitney's translation was tentative, and Hoffmann tried to do away with the problem of assuming a verbal lexeme *vi-tāv-* by interpreting *vitā́vati* as a locative of the adj. *tā́vant-*, reinforced by the preverb *ví-*, in the meaning "in noch so großer Entfernung" (clearly in opposition to *antikā́d*). Mayrhofer (EWAia I p. 645) accepted this interpretation rejecting the idea of a root *tāv*.

    However, these authors did not consider further PS attestations of related forms, which can hardly be explained without positing a verbal lexeme *vi-tāv-*: namely, our stanza, in which the form *vitāvantīr* cannot but be regarded as the nom. pf. f. of a pres. ptc. of such a lexeme, as well as PS 10.1.5 (also belonging to a hymn against the Sadānuvās), edited by Griffiths (ibid.) as **tasyātta putrān bhrātr̥̄ṃś ca tasya goṣṭhaṃ vitāvata | yaś ca sato nāstivākī yaś cāsāv ahavirgr̥haḥ | durṇāmnīs tatra gachata tatra sarvāḥ paretana ‖*, "Eat his sons and his brothers, *vi-tāv* his cow-pen. Both he who says that what exists, does not, and yonder house of one without oblations: go there, all you ill-named ones, go away there" (Griffiths). Here, *vitāvata* must be a 2pl person imperative (just like *atta*, *gachata*, and *paretana*). As Griffiths (ibid.) rightly points out, "these passages force us to accept a stem *tāv*, but it is difficult to connect this with *tav*[i] 'to be strong'" (see EWAia I p.

---

102 I am grateful to Prof. A. Griffiths for sharing with me a draft of his edition of PS 10.1.

103 PS 17.48.9ab, preceding the refrain, reads: *te deveṣv ā vr̥ścante pāpaṃ jīvanti sarvadā |.*

638f.).

From these few occurrences, it is just as difficult to uncover the semantics of this root. It is something that Agni Kravyād (on which see my comment on PS 17.21.1) does to a mortal who commits sin; it is something demons can do to someone's cow pen; it is something demonesses can do to each other's heads when they go crazy. All we can tell is that it is most likely something negative. Perhaps interesting is the fact that *vi-tāv-* occurs twice next to a form of the root *ad-*: next to the epithet *kravyā́d* in the refrain from the Agni Kravyād hymn, and next to the imperative *atta* in PS 10.1.5. Given this uncertainty, I refrain from translating.

It seems more attractive to take the 3pl person *āsata* as an auxiliary constructed with the pres. ptc. *vitāvantīr* and expressing continuous action, rather than taking the verb as literally meaning "they are seated".

ef. Pāda **e** appears to be octosyllabic without the need to restore a syllable in the word Sadān(u)vā, which must then be read as three syllables.

The word *bhrūṇá-*, 'embryo', next to a form of the verb *²ar-* and an invocation to Brahmaṇaspati is also found in the only Rgvedic hymn against the Sadānuvās. RV 10.155.2 reads *cattó itáś cattā́mútaḥ sárvā bhrūṇā́ny ārúṣī | arāyyàm brahmaṇas pate tī́kṣṇaśṛ́ṇgodṛṣánn ihi ||*, "She is banished from here, banished from yonder, having assailed all fetuses. Go at the demoness, o sharp-horned Brahmaṇaspati, and gore her" (J-B).

Note that in the stanza just quoted, Brahmaṇaspati fights the Sadānuvās with a sharp horn (on this, see my comment on 17.12.5d). This sheds some light on what action is implied by the causative *arpaya* (from *²ar-*), 'strike, pierce'. On the semantics of the caus. stem *arpaya-* in general, see my comment on PS 17.13.1b above, in which I show that it frequently involves hitting something with a sharp weapon or tool. The collocation *bhrūṇa- ²ar-* in particular is also found in PS 3.16.4, *nābhūd ahir bhrūṇam ārad ahir adrim arasāvadhīt |*, "The serpent did not show up, [nor] did it pierce the embryo. The serpent wounded a stone with powerless [venom]" (my transl.). This is a typical AV spell that aims at preventing (or repairing the consequences of) an unwanted event by stating that it did not happen or that the victim was someone/something else (here, for instance, a stone, not the embryo). The piercing referred to here must obviously involve the serpent's teeth, another pointy object. One last occurrence is the difficult PS 2.85.1; see Zehnder's discussion *ad loc*. The frequency of this collocation suggests that it is a fixed expression, perhaps even a technical term for causing an abortion by means of a pointy tool. It is perhaps not by chance that in RV 10.155.2 above, Bṛhaspati is portrayed as sharp-horned, as the intention might be to make the Sadānuvā suffer the same kind of pain she inflicts (*ārúṣī*, *²ar-*) on her victims. This must be the same logic behind our stanza, in which the object of *arpaya* is not the embyros (*bhrūṇāni*, acc. pl. n. governed by *paras*) but the Sadānuvās (acc. pl. f.) of pāda **e**.

17.14.5 (K 17.14.7)

a	yāsāṃ gandho nānārūpaḥ	8#	[− − − − | − − − ×]
b	paryaiti puruṣaṃ pathi |	8	[− − ᴗ ᴗ | ᴗ − ᴗ ×]
c	tā agniḥ sahatām ito	8	[− − − ᴗ | ᴗ − ᴗ ×]
d	jātavedāḥ sadānuvāḥ ||	8	[− ᴗ − − | ᴗ − ᴗ ×]

[They] whose varied smell surrounds a man down the path—let Agni Jātavedas vanquish them from here, the Sadānuvās.

nānārūpaḥ] [[Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pac Mā] JM₃ [Ma] nā[. .]paḥ | V71 nānārūpaḥ K • paryaiti] [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pac [Mā] JM₃ paryai[.] V71 paraitu K • pathi] [Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃

paryati[.] **Ji₄** paryeti **Pa𝚌** prati **K**　　•　|] **K** [Ma] [Ja] V122 **Ji₄ Pa𝚌** [Mā] V71 **JM₃** || **Ji₄**　　• tā agniḥ] **[O]** tāgnis **K**　　•　jātavedāḥ sadānvāḥ] **[O]** jātavedās sadānvā **K**　　•　|||] **[O]** | stāv ito nāśayāmasi Z 7 Z **K**

ab. As regards the smell of demons and demonesses, compare the epithet *pā́pagandhāḥ* in PS 17.13.2a and *alābugandhī́n* in PS 17.12.7c above.

I wonder if the path intended is that of a man on his way to be born. Compare the next stanza, which mentions a dead person (*puruṣa*) burning on a pyre. It is possible that these two stanzas form a pair concerning the first and last moments of life.

d. Scholars generally agree in considering Agni's epithet *jā́tavedas-* as a bahuvrīhi, but differ in their interpretation of the two members of the compound along the following lines: *jātá-* can either be an adjective meaning 'born' or 'innate', or a substantive meaning 'creature', 'offspring', while *védas-* can mean 'knowledge' (if derived from *vid-* 'to know') or, more likely, 'possession' (if from *vid-* 'to find'). Therefore the following translations have been proposed: "knower of the creatures/generations/of (all) beings" (Keith, Macdonell, Böhtlingk, Eggeling, etc.), "finder of creatures" (Shende), "having whatever is born as property" (Whitney, Haug), "having innate wisdom/wise at birth" (Bloomfield, etc.).[104] In her dedicated monograph (1981: 353), Findly argues for the meaning "'whose possessions are the creatures', 'in whose possession are the creature' or more colloquially, the fire 'in charge of the creatures'", with particular reference to Agni Jātavedas' functions of 1) granting unbroken ritual presence over generations of Aryan worshippers; 2) granting the continuity of the generations of Aryan families via offspring; 3) caring for and regulating the relationship with the ancestors (*pitṛ́-s*), i.e. granting the continuity of the lineage in the afterlife.

Whatever the original meaning of the compound, Eggeling (1885=ŚB part II p. xxxi) was right in pointing out that "at the time of Yáska—who (7, 19) proposes five different derivations for the term […]—the real meaning of the compound was unknown; and even at the time of the hymns, the epithet seems to have been understood in different ways." In fact, Vedic poets and ritualists seem to deliberately play with different meanings. Some text explicitly connect it with the root *vid-*, 'to know' (e.g. RV 6.15.13[105] and 10.15.13[106]); other times the epithet is connected with the root *vid-*, 'to find' (e.g. in AB 3.36.1–2).[107] Thus, regardless of the original meaning, the epithet was interpreted in various ways early on.

However, what is relevant for us is that the functions of this form of Agni were rather well defined, and have been correctly described by Findly (1981) as outlined above. The one that is most relevant for our stanza is the second function, which Findly describes as that of "the keeper of the family" (p. 360ff.). Findly refers to a variety of stanzas in which the intimacy of Agni Jātavedas with the domestic sphere is stressed in stanzas such as RV 10.110.1ab, *sámiddho adyá mánuṣo*

104For a survey, see Findly 1981: 349f with bibliography.

105RV 6.15.13, *agnír hótā gṛhápatiḥ sá rā́jā víśvā veda jánimā jātávedāḥ | devā́nām utá yó mártyānāṃ yájiṣṭhaḥ sá prá yajatām ṛtā́vā ||*, "Agni is the Hotar, the houselord; he is the king. He knows all the creatures, as Jātavedas. He who is of gods and of mortals the best sacrificer, let him, the truthful one, set the sacrifice in motion" (J-B).

106RV 10.15.13, *yé cehá pitáro yé ca néhá yā́ṃś ca vidmá yā́m̐ u ca ná pravidmá | tváṃ vettha yáti té jātavedaḥ svadhā́bhir yajñáṃ súkṛtaṃ juṣasva ||*, "Both the forefathers who are here and those who are not here, both those whom we know and those whom we do not know, *you* know how many they are, o Jātavedas. Through your own powers [/at *svadhā*-calls], enjoy the well-performed sacrifice" (J-B).

107AB 3.36.1–2: *jātavedasyaṃ śaṃsati, prajāpatiḥ prajā āsṛjata, tāḥ sṛṣṭāḥ parācya evāyan, na vyāvartanta, ta agninā paryagachat, tā agnim upāvartanta, tam evādyāpy upāvṛttāḥ, so 'bravīj: jātā vai prajā anenāvidam iti, yad abravīj, jātā vai prajā anenāvidam iti, taj jātavedasyam abʰavat, taj jātavedaso jātavedastvaṃ*, "He recites (a hymn) to Jātavedas; Prajāpati created offspring; they created went away and returned not. Them he surrounded with Agni; they came up to Agni; to him to-day even they come up. He said 'Offspring born by him I have found'. In that he said 'Offspring born by him I have found', that became (the hymn) to Jātavedas; that is why Jātavedas has his name" (Keith).

duroṇé devó devā́n yajasi jātavedaḥ |, "Kindled today in the dwelling of Manu, as god you sacrifice to the gods, o Jātavedas" (J-B); RV 6.12.4b ~ 7.12.2b, *agní ṣṭave dáma ā́ jātávedāḥ* |, "Agni is praised in the house as Jātavedas" (my transl.); and others in which he is called *dámūnas-* and *dámya-*, or described as protector of the descendants of Manu and their offspring (cf. RV 10.4.7, *bráhma ca te jātavedo námaś ceyáṃ ca gī́ḥ sádam íd várdhanī bhūt | rákṣā ṇo agne tánayāni tokā́ rákṣotá nas tanvò áprayuchan* ||, "Sacred formulation and homage and this song here shall always be strengthening for you, o Jātavedas. Guard our progeny and posterity, o Agni, and guard our own bodies unremittingly" (J-B)), who in turn kindle him generation after generation (*jánmañ-janman níhito jātávedāḥ*, e.g. RV 3.1.20–21). Therefore it seems absolutely plausible that Agni Jātavedas is invoked in our stanza against the offspring-threatening Sadānuvās precisely because he is in charge of granting the continuity of the pious family through progeny who in turn will attend to him.

Moreover, FINDLY points out (p. 367) that Jātavedas is considered the 'protector of (our) bodies' (cf. RV 5.4.9d, 6.48.2d, 10.4.7d), and—probably insofar as he is in charge of granting the continuity of the lineage of the Aryan worshippers—also a protector against sorcerers or demons (ibid. p. 364 and 369ff.). In particular, in RV 10.87 ~ ŚS 8.3 ~ PS 16.6–8, a hymn dedicated to Agni in his function as a demon-slayer, Agni is explicitly called Jātavedas. In the stanzas of this hymn shared by RV, the inimical entities are sorcerers (*yatudhā́na-*).[108] However, in a stanza from the same hymn but only found in AV, Agni Jātavedas is invoked against the demons called *kimīdíns*.[109]

In the AV, Agni Jātavedas is also invoked against *yatudhā́nas* in ŚS 1.7.2, 5, 6 (~ PS 4.4.2, 5, 6; stanza 2 also mentions *kimīdíns*)[110] and *piśācás*[111] in ŚS 5.29.10 (~ PS 12.19.2ab, 12.18.9cd) and

---

[108]RV 10.87.2 (~ ŚS 8.3.2 ~ PS 16.6.2), *áyodaṃṣṭro arcíṣā yātudhā́nān úpa spṛśa jātavedaḥ sámiddhaḥ | ā́ jihváyā mū́radevān rabhasva kravyā́do vṛktvy ápi dhatsvāsán* ||, "Possessing jaws of metal, (first) brush the sorcerers with your flame, o Jātavedas, when fully kindled. (Then) with your tongue seize hold of those who have fools for gods. Having wrenched the flesh-eaters, stick them in your mouth" (J-B); RV 10.87.5 (~ ŚS 8.3.4 ~ PS 16.6.4), *ágne tvácaṃ yātudhā́nasya bhindhi hiṃsrā́śanir hárasā hantv enam | prá párvāṇi jātavedaḥ śṛṇīhi kravyā́t kraviṣṇúr ví cinotu vṛkṇám* ||, "Agni, split the skin of the sorcerer. Let the murderous (arrow-)point smite him with its blaze. Cleave his joints, Jātavedas. When he is hewn apart, let the flesh-eater, craving his bloody flesh, open him up" (J-B); RV 10.87.6 (~ ŚS 8.3.5 ~ PS 16.6.6) *yátredā́nīm páśyasi jātavedas tíṣṭhantam agna utá vā cárantam | yád vāntárikṣe pathíbhiḥ pátantaṃ tám ástā vidhya śárvā śíśānaḥ* ||, "When now you see him standing still or moving about, o Agni Jātavedas, or flying along the paths in the midspace, as archer pierce him with your missile, sharpening it" (J-B); RV 10.87.7 (~ ŚS 8.3.7 ~ PS 16.6.7), *utā́labdhaṃ spṛṇuhi jātaveda ālebhānā́d ṛṣṭíbhir yātudhā́nāt | ágne pū́rvo ní jahi śóśucāna āmā́daḥ kṣvíṅkās tám adantv éníḥ* ||, "And, Jātavedas, with your spears recover what was seized, from the sorcerer who seized it. Constantly blazing in front, o Agni, smite him down. Let the mottled vultures that eat raw meat eat him" (J-B); RV 10.87.11 (~ ŚS 8.3.11 ~ PS 16.7.1) *trír yātudhā́naḥ prásitiṃ ta etv ṛtáṃ yó agne ánṛtena hánti | tám arcíṣā sphūrjáyañ jātavedaḥ samakṣám enam gṛṇaté ní vṛ́ndhi* ||, "Three times let the sorcerer who smites truth with untruth meet your onslaught, o Agni. Sizzling him with your flame, o Jātavedas, wrench him down for the singer before his very eyes."

[109]ŚS 8.3.25 (~ PS 16.8.6), *yé te śṛ́ṅge ajáre jātavedas tigmáhetī bráhmasaṃśite | tā́bhyāṃ durhā́rdam abhidā́santaṃ kimīdínaṃ | pratyáñcam arcíṣā jātavedo ví nikṣva* ||, "Your two horns, unaging, oh Jātavedas, sharp weapons, whetted by *bráhman*—with them, with [your] flame, oh Jātavedas, pierce (*vi-nikṣ-*?) the attacking ill-intentioned one, the advancing *kimīdín*" (my transl.).

[110]ŚS 1.7.2, 5, 6 (~ PS 4.4.2, 5 ,6), *ā́jyasya parameṣṭhin jātavedas tánūvaśin | ágne taulásya prā́śāna yātudhā́nān ví lāpaya* || 2 || […] *páśyāma te vīryàṃ jātavedaḥ prá ṇo brūhi yātudhā́nān nṛcakṣaḥ | tváyā sárve páritaptāḥ purástāt tá ā́ yantu prabruvāṇā́ úpedám* ||5|| *ā́ rabhasva jātavedo 'smā́kárthāya jajñiṣe | dūtó no agne bhūtvā́ yātudhā́nān ví lāpaya* || 6 ||, "O most exalted one, Jātavedas, self-controller, Agni, partake of the sacrificial butter, of the sesame oil (?), make the sorcerer cry out. […] We would fain see thy heroism, O Jātavedas; proclaim to us the sorcerers, O men-watcher; let them all, burnt about by thee in front, come to this place, proclaiming themselves. Take hold, O Jātavedas; thou wast born for our purpose; becoming our messenger, O Agni, make the sorcerers cry out" (Whitney).

[111]ŚS 5.29.10 (~ PS 12.19.2ab, 12.18.9cd), *kravyā́dam agne rudhiráṃ piśācáṃ manohánaṃ jahi jātavedaḥ | tám índro vājī́ vájreṇa hantu chināttu sómaḥ śíro asya dhṛṣṇúḥ* ||, "The flesh-eating, bloody, mind-slaying *piśācá* do thou slay, O Agni, Jātavedas; let the vigorous Indra slay him with the thunderbolt; let bold Soma cut [off] his head" (Whitney); PS 5.40.3, *brahmaṇokhām adhi dadhāmy agnau bhūmyāṃ tvā bhūmim adhi dhārayāmi* |

PS 5.40.3.

In conclusion, the fact that Agni Jātavedas protects the continuity of the lineage, and the fact that he is also frequently invoked for protection against demons, explain why he is invoked in our line against the demons that precisely threaten the offspring grant continuity to the desired lineage.

17.14.6 (K 17.14.5)   **e**: ~ PS 17.12.4f, 14.2e, 14.3e, 14.8e, 15.7e

a	yāḥ puruṣaṃ dahyamānaṃ	8#	[– ᴜ ᴜ – | – ᴜ – ×]
b	śūnyam agnau jighatsanti |	8#	[– – – – | ᴜ – – ×]
c	bhaṇvā ⁺niḥkuṣṭhā nāmāsi	8#	[– – – – | – – – ×]
d	muṣṭāgreṇa sadānᵤvās	8	[– – – ᴜ | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
e	tā ito nāśayāmasi ||	8	[– ᴜ – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]

Those [demonesses] who wish to devour an absent (i.e. dead) man who is being burned in a fire—you are Bhaṇvā Niḥkuṣṭhā by name!—with the top of the *muṣṭa* (?) we make them, the Sadānuvās, disappear from here!

N.B. Pāda **e** and part of pāda **d** are missing in **Paᶜ**.
————————
yāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Paᶜ [Mā]** yā **V71 JM₃** yaḥ **K**   • śūnyam] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Paᶜ JM₃** sūnyam **Mā V71**   • jighatsanti \|] **[Ma] [Ja]** [.]ghatsanti \| **V122** gachanti \|\| **Ji₄** jighatsa[x]nti \| **Paᶜ** jighatsaṃti \| **Mā V71** jighatsaṃnti \| **JM₃** jighatsvanti \| **K**   • bhaṇvā ⁺niḥkuṣṭhā] bhaṇvā niṣkuṣṭā **[Ma] [Ja] V71 JM₃** bhaṇvā nikr̥ṣṭā **V122** bhaṇvā ṣkaṣṭā **Ji₄** bhaṇvā nipkuṣṭā **Mā** bhaṇḍā naḫkuṣṭa(/ṣṭha) **K**   • nāmāsi] nāmasi ᶦ sa **Ja** nāmāsa **Ma V122 Ji₄ Paᶜ Mā V71 JM₃** nāmām̐si **K**   • sadānvās] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** sadā(//)[.](*s Paᶜ e*) **Paᶜ**   • tā ito nāśayāmasi] tā ito nāśayāmasi **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** tā īto nāśayāmasi **V71** *om.* **Paᶜ** tāyito nāśayāmasi **K**   • \|\|] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** \| **V71** *om.* **Paᶜ** Z 5 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *niṣkuṣṭā* in pāda **c**.

This stanza seems to deal with demonesses threatening the body of a dead person (*puruṣa*) that is being burned on a pyre. If we are correct in interpreting the preceding stanza as regarding a person (*puruṣa*) on his path to being born, the two stanzas would appear to form a pair concerning the beginning and the end of a person's life.

b. The adj. *śūnya-*, 'empty', is not attested in the RV or elsewhere in the AV, which only feature the noun *śūna-*, 'emptiness, absence'. Only the compound *śūnyaiṣí-* is attested in ŚS 14.2.19 (~ PS 18.8.10), belonging to the wedding hymn: *út tiṣṭhetáḥ kím ichántīdám ā́gā aháṃ tveḍe abhibhū́ḥ svád gr̥ā́t | śūnyaiṣī́ nírr̥te yájagánthót tiṣṭhārāte prá pata méhá raṃsthāḥ ||*, "Stand up from here; desiring what hast thou (f.) come hither? I [am] thine overcomer, O Iḍā, out of [my] own house; thou that hast come hither, O perdition, seeking the empty—stand up, O niggard; fly forth; rest not here" (Whitney). As Whitney reports in his comment, this stanza is an exorcism, meant to accompany, "according to KauśS 77.16, a complete sprinkling of her new home by the bride". This certainly makes it relevant to our investigation into demons who endanger the lives of women and their children. Now, it is the person (*puruṣa*) being burned in a fire (certainly a pyre) that is is qualified as *śūnya*, 'empty', or rather 'absent' in our stanza: this must indicate the dead body, qualified as 'empty' in the sense of 'devoid of life', or as 'absent' in the sense of 'departed'. It is

————————
agniḥ pacan rakṣatv odanam imaṃ rakṣaḥpiśācān nudatāṃ jātavedāḥ ||, "With (this) formula I put the pot on the fire: onto the Earth I bring you, earth (= clay, the pot). Let the cooking Agni protect this gruel, may Jātavedas push away demons and Piśācas" (Lubotsky).

certainly relevant that in the exorcism belonging to the wedding hymn quoted above, it is Nirṛti, the personification of dissolution and death, who is qualified as *śūnyaiṣī́-*, 'seeking the empty'. This epithet must mean 'seeking the empty [body of a dead person]', 'seeking the absent (i.e. the dead)'.

The desiderative of the root *ghas-* (on which see HEENEN 2006: 127f.) is also used in PS 7.11.6 (For safe pregnancy: with bdellium), *yas tvā svapnena tamasā mohayitvā nipadyate | prajāṃ yas te jighatsati tam [ito nāśayāmasi] ||*, "The one that confounds you with sleep and darkness, and lies down with you, that wants to devour your offspring: that one [we cause to vanish from here]" (Griffiths). From the same stem, compare the epithet *jighatsú-*, 'desirous of devouring', found in a list of Sadānuvā epithets at ŚS 2.14.1 ~ PS 2.4.1 (Against Sadānuvās).

c. I take this pāda as a syntactically independent aside. However, given that pāda **b**, rather unusually, features a metrically irregular cadence at the end of the hemistich, I wonder if the original reading of pādas **ab** was *yā … jighatsati*, "The [demoness] who wishes to devour …", which would naturally continue with pāda **c** as its main clause: "You are …".

The reading of the second word in this pāda is uncertain: the **O** mss. point to *niṣkuṣṭā*, while **K** has *naḫkuṣṭa(/ṣṭha)* (note that *ṣṭa* and *ṣṭha* are not distinguished in **K**). The lexeme *niṣ-kuṣ-*, 'to tear, pull out, extract, husk, shell', is only attested in late sources, and its verbal adjective is *niṣkuṣita-*. Thus, we might try to emend to ⁺*niḫkuṣṭhā*. The dictionaries (see esp. KEWA I p. 246f.) record several lexemes homophonous with *kuṣṭha-*: 1) *kuṣṭha-*, n., 'leprosy' (SuśrS+); 2) *kúṣṭha-*, m., a curative herb, possibly from the Saussurea genus, used to treat *takmán* (AV, KauśS, SuśrS); 3) *kúṣṭha-*, m., 'the prominent part of anything, mouth of a basket' (Br+), probably related to *kúṣṭhikā-* f., 'dewclaw'; 4) *kúṣṭha-*, m., a fraction of one twelfth, also derived from *kúṣṭhikā-*; 5) *kúṣṭha-*, m., with specific reference to VS 25.6[112] *kúṣṭhābhyām*, 'the two cavities of the loins' (N.B.: of the sacrificial horse). This latter meaning is based on the commentary interpretation, but it is considered "ganz unsicher" by Mayrhofer (KEWA ibid.), who instead also connects this word with *kúṣṭhikā-*, 'dewclaw'. Nevertheless, in the VS list, the term appears in a list after hips, thighs, groins and buttocks (see footnote 112), so there is a good chance that it would refer to the same area of the body. If the word is related to *kúṣṭhikā-*, indicating some kind of prominent part, I wonder if the two *kuṣṭhas* intended here are the two prominent parts of the hip bone, the ilia, which are clearly visible both in the body of a horse and in that of a human. Thus, perhaps, *niḫ-kuṣṭhā-*, 'she who has no hip bones', would perhaps not be too odd an epithet for a demoness who harms the bodies of women in their most intimate parts.

Note that PS 6.8.8d (belonging to a hymn against Sadānuvās) mentions a demoness *kuṣṭhī*, which GRIFFITHS (2009: 108) tentatively interprets as a "noxious female spirit of skin-disease".

d. The mss. unanimously preserve *muṣṭāgreṇa*, which must be the instrumental of a compound *muṣṭa-agra-*, of which the first member is obscure.[113] I refrain from emending[114] in the remote possibility that the tip of a particular plant is intended. Cf. e.g. *kuśāgra-*, n., 'the sharp point of the Kuśa grass' (Mbh), used in various Tantric purification rituals.[115] We may perhaps notice the assonance between *…kuṣṭā/kuṣṭhā…* in pāda **c**, and *muṣṭā...* in pāda **d**.

112This passage belongs to a section (VS 25.1–9) on the Aśvamedha, in which each body part of the sacrificed horse is assigned to deities or deified items (GRIFFITH 1899: 224): VS 25.6.a: *marútāṁ skándhā víśveṣāṃ devā́nāṃ prathamá kī́kasā rudrā́ṇāṃ dvitī́yādityā́nāṃ tṛtī́yā vāyóḥ púccham agníṣómayor bhā́sadau krúñcau śróṇibhyām índrābŕhaspátī ūrúbhyām mitrā́váruṇāv algā́bhyām ākrámaṇaṁ sthūrā́bhyām bálaṃ kúṣṭhābhyām |*, "The shoulders belong to the Maruts; the first rib-cartilages to the All-Gods; the second to the Rudras; the third to the Ādityas; the tail belongs to Vāyu; the hind-quarters to Agni-Soma. I gratify the two Curlews with the hips; Indra-Bṛhaspati with the thighs; Mitra-Varuṇa with the groins; Approach with the buttocks; Strength with the two cavities of the loins" (Griffith).

113It is unlikely to be related to the root *muṣ-*, 'to steal', whose verbal adj. is *muṣitá-* (RV+), although in the classical language we do find the variant *muṣṭa-*. The verbal adj. *muṣitá-* is found as the first member of compounds in the meaning 'bereft of'. Semantically, this seems unsuitable for our line.

114One might wish to emend to *muṣṭy-agreṇa*, 'with the top of the fist', as some kind of threat. Cf. *aṅguly-agrá-*, 'the tip of the finger' (Br+).

115Dr. Nirajan Kafle, personal communication.

17.14.7 (K 17.14.4)   **d**: ~ PS 17.12.2d, 12.8d, 12.9e, 12.10e, 13.4d, 13.5d, 13.7d, 15.5d, 15.8d, 15.9d, 15.10d ~ ŚS 2.14.1d

a	yā ucitā āvapane	8#	[− ◡ ◡ − │ − ◡ ◡ ×]
b	śuṣkaṃ khādanti ⁺maṣmasaṃ	8	[− − − − │ ◡ − ◡ ×]
c	vaḍavā gardabhīr iva │	8	[◡ ◡ − − │ ◡ − ◡ ×]
d	nāśayāmaḥ sadān$_u$vāḥ ‖	8	[− ◡ − − │ ◡ − ◡ ×]

The [demonesses] who are accustomed to chewing dried, ground [fodder] in a trough like mares [and] she-donkeys—we make the Sadānuvās disappear!

yā ucitā āvapane] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **[Mā]** yā uvitā āvapane **Ji₄** yā ucitā āva[x]pane **Pa꜀** yā ucitā āpavane **JM₃** yā ūcitā ā[.]pane **V71** yāducittāvapane **K** • śuṣkaṃ] **[O]** śuṣka **K** • maṣmasaṃ]¹¹⁶ **JM₃ [Ma]? [Ja]?** V122 muṣasaṃ **Ji₄** [x]maṣ[.]ṃ **Pa꜀** ma(ṣma̶)ṣmasaṃ **V71** vaṣmuṣāṃ **K** • vaḍavā] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] JM₃** varavā **V71 Ji₄ Pa꜀** varāvā **V122** vaḷavā (=Bhatt. *vs*. vaḷardhā Barret) **K**¹¹⁷ • gardabhīr iva] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 **[Mā]** gardabhīva **Ji₄** gardibhīr iva **V71 JM₃** • ∣] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Pa꜀ [Mā]** V71 ṃ **JM₃**¹¹⁸ ‖ **Ji₄** *om*. **K** • nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ] nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Ji₄ [Mā]** V71 **JM₃** nāśayāma sadānvāḥ **Pa꜀** nāśayāmas sadanvā **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** │ V71 **JM₃** Z 4 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *maṣmasaṃ* with a dental sibilant in pāda **b**.

A similar animal metaphor is found in the next stanza, in which the demonesses are likened to cows, accustomed (*ucita-*) to licking. There the demonesses/cows are explicitly said to lick the bodies of women. Here, most likely, the trough (*āvapanam*) is similarly a metaphor for the uterus or the vagina.

a. On *āvápana-*, n. 'vessel, jar', compare the unique feminine *āvápanīḥ* at ŚS 12.1.61 ~ PS 17.6.10, belonging to the Earth hymn, in which the earth is called *āvápanīr jánānām*, 'receptacle, manger of people'.

b. The word *maṣmaṣa-* is known from its use in a construction with *kṛ-* in the meaning 'to grind to powder' (KEWA II p. 604, EWAia II p. 335; on similar "'*wiederholende*' *Onomatopoetika*", see Hoffmann 1952 = 1975 p. 35f.). Zehnder (1993: 54) mentions the following variants: *maṣmaṣā́-kṛ-* in ŚS, KS, TĀ; *masmasā́-kṛ-* in TS, VS, ŚB; and *mṛṣmṛśā-kṛ-* in MS. The PS has *mṛṣmaśā-karaṃ* (**O**) vs. *mṛṣmisāgaraṃ* (**K**) at 1.29.3.

The AV occurrences are the following: ŚS 5.23.8 (against worms) (ab ~ PS 7.2.9, also against worms; cd ~ PS 1.29.3cd, To the Apsaras), *ható yévāṣaḥ krímīṇām ható nadanimótá │ sárvān ní maṣmaṣā́karaṃ dṛṣádā khálvām̐ iva ‖*, "Slain is the *yévāṣa* of the worms, slain also the *nadanimán*; I have put them all down, smash (*maṣmaṣā́*)! like *khálva*-grains with a millstone" (Whitney). The PS parallel at 1.29.3 reads *yāḥ kulyā yā vanyā yā u conmādayiṣṇavaḥ │ sarvās tā mṛṣmaśākaraṃ* (**K** *mṛṣmisāgaram*) *dṛṣadā khalvām̐ iva ‖*, "Welche zu den Bächen, welche zum Wald gerhören und auch welche aufregen wollen, alle diese habe ich zermalmt, wie *khalva*-Körner mit dem Mühlstein" (Zehnder).

Our mss. preserve *ṣ-s* in **O**, *ṣ-ṣ* in **K**. As all the variants mentioned by Zehnder feature the same sibilant twice, and since the ŚS has *ṣ-ṣ*, I reject Bhattacharya's choice of writing *maṣmasaṃ*, and write ⁺*maṣmaṣaṃ* instead.

c. The word *vaḍavá* appears in many variants: *vaḍabá, baḍavá, baḍabá*, etc. (see PW s.v. *vaḍava* and EWAia II p. 494).

116Bhattacharya points out that the sequence *maṣmasaṃ* in **Ma** and **Ja** is half cut off.

117**K** employs a special sign for *ḷa* here. See Zehnder 1999: 21 and Griffiths 2009: lxix §(U).

118What looks like a minuscule *ṃ* in **JM₃** (*ivaṃ*!), if it is not an inserted nasal favoured by the following *n-*, could perhaps be a hastily written *daṇḍa*.

17.14.8   **e**: ~ PS 17.12.4f, 14.2e, 14.3e, 14.6e, 15.7e

a	garbhān ekāḥ *pratimarśaṃ	8#	[− − − − │ ∪ ∪ − ×]
b	yā adanti sadān_uvāḥ |	8	[− ∪ − ∪ │ ∪ − ∪ ×]
c	ucitās tan_uvaṃ striyā	8	[∪ ∪ − ∪ │ ∪ − ∪ ×]
d	gāva ārehiṇīr iva	8	[− ∪ − − │ ∪ − ∪ ×]
e	tā ito nāśayāmasi ||	8	[− ∪ − − │ ∪ − ∪ ×]

Those particular Sadānuvās who eat the embryos, groping for [them], accustomed to licking the body of a woman like cows—them we make disappear from here!

ekāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ ekaḥ **K**   • *pratimarśaṃ] pratimorśaṃ **[Ma]** pratimorṣaṃ **Ja** Ji₄ **Mā** V71 JM₃ pratimośaḥ **Pa꜀** **Nā** pratimr̥śaṃ **K**   • yā adanti] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ V71 JM₃ yā ādanti **Mā** yātādranti **Pa꜀** vyāvarti **K**   • sadānvāḥ] **[O]** sadānvā **K**   • \|\| **K [Ma] [Ja]** Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ \|\| V122 Ji₄   • ucitās] **[Ma] [Ja]** Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ ucittās V122 uritās Ji₄ ucitas **K**   • tanvaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** JM₃ tandha V71 tanvo **K**   • striyā] **K** striyā **[O]**   • gāva] gāvā **O** gava **K**   • ārehiṇīr iva] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 āreha[x]ṇīr iva **Pa꜀** ārohiṇī[x]r iva **Ji₄** ārohaṇīr iva **Mā** V71 JM₃ ārohiṇer ivā **K**   • tā ito] **[O]** tā yito **K**   • nāśayāmasi \|\|] nāśayāmasi \|\| **[O]** nāśayāmasi Z 8 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *prati morśaṃ (← mr̥śaṃ)* in pāda **a**, *gāva* in pāda **b**.

    a. The lexemes *prati-mr̥ś-* and *pra-mr̥ś-* are frequently used in the Sadānuvā hymns to describe how these demonesses attack embryos, and as such they appear frequently with the word *gárbha-* as object: e.g., ŚS 8.6.18 (~ PS 16.80.9), belonging to the familiar hymn for the protection of pregnant women, *yás te gárbhaṃ pratimr̥śā́j jātáṃ vā māráyāti te | piṅgás tám ugrádhanvā kr̥ṇótu hr̥dayāvídham \|\|*, "Whoever shall handle the embryo, or shall make it born dead—let the brown one, with formidable bow, make him pierced to the heart" (Whitney). In the same hymn, at ŚS 8.6.6a (~ PS 16.79.6), the child-threatening demonesses are called *pramr̥śántaṃ*. Cf. also PS 5.9.7cd (Against Sadānuvās), *yā garbhān pramr̥śanti sarvāḥ pāpīr anīnaśam \|\|*, "[Those] who lay hold of the embryos, all the bad ones have I destroyed" (Lubotsky). Gʀɪꜰꜰɪᴛʜs's (2009: 173) has collected evidence of these expressions in his comment on PS 6.14.3, and has proposed the translation 'to grope for (an embryo)'.

    I emend to the adverbial -*am* gerund *pratimarśam (on this formation, see WG §995 p. 359). This form is not attested elsewhere.

    cd. Bhattacharya writes *gāva*, but since the **O** mss. read *gāvā*, while **K** has *gava*, an emendation sign is necessary.

    The same demons and demonesses who 'grope for' the embryos (*pra/prati-mr̥ś-*) are also known for licking the intimate parts of women, as we have already seen in PS 17.12.1a. In particular, they make women sterile by licking (simplex *rih-* or *ā-rih*, but also *prati-rih-*: cf. PS 7.19.5) their menstrual blood, which was considered a kind of female semen, just as important for conception as male semen is. On this topic, see Sʟᴀᴊᴇ 1995 and the examples collected in Lᴜʙᴏᴛsᴋʏ's (2002a: 170f.) comment on PS 5.37.2, a stanza belonging to a hymn for the birth of a song, and which may be worth quoting here as an example of this idea: *yady … durṇāmāno vā r̥tviyam asyā *rihanti… ayaṃ tā nāṣṭrā apa hantv agniḥ \|\|*, "If … the demons lick her procreative fluid … let this Agni destroy these perditions" (Lubotsky).

    The compound *ārehin-* is a hapax, but we find *lehin-* as the second member of compounds in the later language. As far as the lexeme *ā-rih-* is concerned, it is used only once in RV, in the hymn against miscarriage, so precisely in the same context as we have in our stanza: RV 10.162.4 reads *yás ta ūrū́ viháraty antarā́ dámpatī śáye | yóniṃ yó antár āréḷhi tám itó nāśayāmasi \|\|*, "Who pries apart your thighs, lies between the married couple, who licks within your womb, that one we banish

from here" (J-B).

The same lexeme occurs in the AV, in the compound *āréhaṇa-*, which is used in a similar context as above in PS 7.11.4 (For safe pregnancy: with bdellium): *yas ta ⁺ūrū ārohaty asṛk te rehaṇāya kam | āmādaḥ kravyādo ripūṃs tān ito nāśayāmasi ||*, "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" (Griffiths).[119]

17.14.9

a	yāḥ pitr~i~yāt sambhavanti-	8#	$[- - \cup - \mid - \cup - \times]$
b	-indradānāḥ sadān~u~vāḥ |	8	$[- \cup - - \mid \cup - \cup \times]$
c	apamityam ivābhṛtaṃ	8	$[\cup \cup - \cup \mid \cup - \cup \times]$
d	punas tā prati dadmasi ||	8	$[\cup - - \cup \mid \cup - \cup \times]$

The Sadānuvās who come into being because of the [guilt] of [our] Fathers as gifts from Indra, them we give back like a debt that has been paid.

yāḥ] **[O]** yā̆ḥ **K** • sambhavantīndradānāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** sambhavantīndra[.]nāh **V122** sambhavantindradānāh **Pa~c~** sambhavantīndrajānas **K** • sadānvāḥ] **[O]** sadānvā **K** • \|\| **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa~c~ [Mā] V71 JM₃** \|\| **Ji₄** • apamityam] **[O]** apamṛtyum **K** • ivābhṛtaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ivābhūtaṃ **Pa~c~** ivāhatuṃ **K** • tā] **[O]** tvā **K** • dadmasi] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa~c~ [Mā] V71** dadhmasi **K Ji₄ JM₃** da[.]masi **V122** • \|\|] **[O]** Z 9 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *sambhavantīndrajā naḥ* in pāda **ab**.

a. On *pítrya-* as indicating the Fathers' sin, a guilt inherited from the Fathers, compare for instance ŚS 6.120.2cd ~ PS 16.50.10 (To reach heaven): *dyaúr naḥ pitā́ pítryāc cháṃ bhavāti jāmím ṛtvā́ mā́va patsi lokā́t ||*, "May our father heaven be weal for us from paternal [guilt], let me not fall down from their world" (Whitney).

b. The reading of this pāda is uncertain. **K** has *indrajānas*, which Bhattacharya interprets as *indrajā naḥ*; **O** points to *indradānāḥ*. If we follow Bhattacharya, the line must mean, "The Sadānuvās who come into being from the [guilt] of our Fathers (*naḥ pitryāt*, lit. "our [guilt] from the Fathers") and who are born from Indra."

The compound *indra-jā́-*, 'born from Indra', is actually attested in ŚS 4.3.7 (Against wild beasts and thieves): *yát saṃyámo ná ví yamo ví yamo yán ná saṃyámaḥ | indrajā́ḥ somajā́ ātharvaṇám asi vyāghrajámbhanam ||*, "What thou contractest (*sam-yam*) mayest thou not protract (*vi-yam*); mayest thou protract what thou dost not contract; Indra-born, soma-born art thou, an Atharvan tiger-crusher" (Whitney). However, rather than indicating a demon, here it is the *ātharvaṇá* (possibly a 'descendant of Atharvan') who is characterised as Indra-born. This makes me hesitate to accept Bhattacharya's reading.

A similar puzzling meaning would follow from emending to +*indrajānāḥ*: "The Sadānuvās whose origin is Indra …" (?). Moreover, no such compound, nor similar compounds with *jāná-* as a second member, are attested in Vedic.

Accepting the **O** reading, *indradānāḥ*, poses a new set of problems. First of all, the

---

[119]The same compound is used in a different context in ŚS 6.9.3 (~ PS 2.90.4) ("To win a woman's love"): *yā́sāṃ nā́bhir āréhaṇaṃ hṛdí saṃvánanaṃ kṛtám gā́vo ghṛtásya mātáro 'múṃ sáṃ vānayantu me ||*, "They whose navel is a licking, in [whose] heart is made conciliation—let the kine, mothers of ghee, conciliate her yonder to me" (Whitney), "Die Kühe, deren Zusammengerhörigkeit in Ablecken zum Ausdruck kommt, in deren Herz gegenseitige Zuneigung gelegt ist, die Mütter des Ghees, die sollen die N.N. mir zugeneigt machen" (Zehnder). The comm. glosses *āréhaṇaṃ* with *āsvādanīyam*, 'something to be enjoyed by tasting' (Whitney 1905 *ad loc.*), but I think Zehnder's interpretation is more plausible.

compound *indra-dāna-* is not attested. However, *dāná-* does form compounds in Vedic: e.g. *sahásra-dāna-*, 'bestowing a hundred gifts' (RV 3.30.7d, 7.33.12b), *vasu-dā́na-*, 'bestowing wealth' (ŚS 6.82.3a ~ PS 19.17.6a). Secondly, we might interpret this compound in various ways. As a Tatpuruṣa, 1) 'a gift from Indra', 2) 'a gift for Indra'; as a Bahuvrīhi, 3) 'whose gift is Indra', 4) 'who is related to Indra's gift'. Given that pādas **cd** mention returning (*punar prati-dā-*) the demonesses like a debt (*apamitya*) that has been paid (*ā-bhṛ-*), it is perhaps conceivable that the same Sadānuvās are here called 'gifts from Indra' or 'gifts for Indra'. What seems to be intended is that, because of the guilt inherited from the Fathers, Indra has punished the reciter by cursing him to be haunted by the Sadānuvās. Now the reciter speaks humbly or euphemistically of such a curse as a "gift", which he pays back by repelling the Sadānuvās. The reciter is certainly counting on the fact that once a debt is paid, a gift reciprocated, then the transaction will be concluded without any lingering obligations. Thus, he sort of drives the Sadānuvās away with the compelling force of a social norm.

     c. PW and MW record a compound *apamitya-*, n., 'Schulden', 'debt' with reference to ŚS 6.117.2. However, the edition reads *apamítya*, which Whitney interprets as an absolutive: ŚS 6.117.2 (For relief from guilt or debt), *ihaívá sántaḥ práti dadma enaj jīvā́ jīvébhyo ní harāma enat | apamítya dhānyàm yáj jaghásāhám idáṃ tád agne anṛṇó bhavāmi ||*, "Being just here we give it back; living, we pay it in (*ni-hṛ-*) for the living'; what grain I have devoured having borrowed [it], now, O Agni, I become guiltless as to that" (Whitney). As in our stanza, both **O** and **K** preserve the final *-m*, it seems attractive to leave the text as it is, and write *apamityam*, indeed assuming a neuter stem *apamitya-*, 'debt'.

     The meaning 'pay' for *bhṛ-* is only attested from Manu and the Epics onwards (PW). I have not found any example of *ā-bhṛ-* meaning 'pay', but it seems that we are forced to accept this meaning, as reading *abhṛtam*, 'unpaid', 'an unpaid person',[120] would make little sense.

17.14.10

a	āmādinīḥ krūrādinīr	8#	[− − ∪ − | − − ∪ ×]
b	anagnigandhᵢyādinīḥ |	8	[∪ − ∪ − | ∪ − ∪ ×]
c	amuṃ paretyₐoddhitaṃ	8	[∪ − ∪ − | ∪ − ∪ ×]
d	śavam atta sadānᵤvāḥ |	8	[∪ ∪ − ∪ | ∪ − ∪ ×]
e	sa vaḥ kevala ācāraḥ	8#	[∪ − − ∪ | ∪ − − ×]
f	kim u śālāsᵤv *ichatha ||	8	[∪ ∪ − − | ∪ − ∪ ×]

O eaters of raw flesh, O eaters of bloody flesh, O eaters of what does not smell of fire (i.e. is uncooked), O Sadānuvās, having gone away [from here], eat that exposed corpse over there. That alone is your customary conduct, so what do you seek in [our] houses?

N.B. In **Ji₄**, pādas **abc** are repeated again after PS 17.15.1c, with some variations.[121] I report these

---

120This meaning is in Manu 8.231: *gopaḥ kṣīrabhṛto yastu sa duhyāddaśato varām | gosvāmyanyanumate bhṛtyaḥ sā syāt pāle'bhṛte bhṛtiḥ*, "A hired cowherd who is paid in milk may, with the consent of the owner, milk the best of ten (cows); this should be the pay for a herdsman who is not paid (in any other way)" (Doniger & Smith 1991: 153). We would then have to translate with "Them we give back like a debt to a person who has not [yet] been paid [back]."

121Note that PS 17.15.1d should start with *kulīnādhena*, but **Ji₄** has *kṛ°*, then continues with the repetition *°rādinīr* etc., and then picks up from *°līnādhena*, after the interpolation. Therefore, it is not clear whether we should take the initial *kṛ°* as part of a word *kṝādinīr*, which would be a variant of *krūrādinīr* in stanza 17.14.10, or as part of a *kṛlīnādhena*, variant of *kulīnādhena*. in 17.15.1. It is possible that both words in **Ji₄**'s exemplar read *kṛ*, which was the source of the interpolation (I follow this scenario in my apparatus), but it is also

variants with the label **Ji₄(2)**.

āmādinīḥ krūrādinīr] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Pa**c āmādinīḥ kūrādinīr **Mā** JM₃ āmādinīḥ kurādinīr **V71** āmādinīḥ charādinīr **Ji₄** kr̥rādinīr **Ji₄(2)** āmādinīś churādinīr **K** • anagnigandhyādinīḥ] **[Ma]** **V122 Pa**c **Ji₄(2) [Mā]** V71 JM₃ anagnigandhyākidinīḥ **Ji₄** anagnigandhyādinī **K Ja** • |] **K [Ma]** **[Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa**c **[Mā] V71 JM₃** || **Ji₄(2)** • amuṃ] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa**c **[Mā] V71 JM₃** amu **Ji₄ Ji₄(2)** • paretyoddhitaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Ji₄(2) [Mā] V71** parotyoddhitaṃ **Pa**c pacaratyoddhitaṃ **JM₃** parebhyo hutaṃ **K** • śavamatta] **K** śavamatra **O** • sadānvāḥ] **[O]** syadānvā **K** • |] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**c **[Mā] V71 JM₃** || **Ji₄** • savaḥ] **Ma** V122 **Ji₄ Pa**c śavaḥ **Mā JM₃** saśvavaḥ **V71** śivaḥ **Ja** sava ̠ḥ **K** • kevala ācāraḥ] **[Ja]** V122 **Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** kevala ācāraḥ **Ma** kevala āścararaḥ **Pa**c kevalācara **K** • śālāsv *ichatha] śālāsvitsatha **Ma Ja Mā V71** śaśāsvitsatha **JM₃** śālāsvitsaḥ[x]taḥ **Ji₄** śālā[t̶s̶v̶i̶]svitsyatha **Pa**c śālāsy uśchitaḥ **K** • ||] ||³ 14 || ru 10|| **Ma Ja Mā** || 14 || ru 10|| **Pa**c **V71** || 14 || 10 || **JM₃** || 14 || **Ji₄** Z Z 10 phaśca Z 3 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *śavaḥ* in pāda **e** and *śālāsvicchatha⁺* in pāda **f**.

    This stanza has been cited and translated by Griffiths (2009: 277) in his comment on PS 7.3.1 (belonging to a hymn against creatures that threaten offspring) as follows (note that Griffiths reads *śavaḥ* in pāda **e**, instead of *savaḥ* or *sa vaḥ* as I do): "You Sadānuvās who eat raw [meat], who eat bloody flesh, who eat what does not smell like fire: go away and eat yonder exposed corpse. The corpse is [your] only diet, so what do you seek in [our] dwellings?" (Griffiths).

    ab. The three compounds in the first two pādas are all hapax legomena. The final member, *ādin-* (< *ad-*, 'to eat'), is also extremely rare, both as a simplex (occurring only once, in ĀpDhS 2.28.5) as well as in composition. The RV features the compound *kevalādín* in the maxim at RV 10.117.6d (In praise of generosity), *kévalāgho bhavati kevalādī́*, "Who eats alone has only evil" (J-B), but the word *ādin-* is otherwise completely absent from the ŚS; it is found in PS only in the compound *pramr̥ṣyādin-*, 'who eats what must be groped for' (Griffiths 2009: 172) at PS 6.14.3 (Against noxious creatures), and in the compound *puruṣādin-* at PS 9.6.9 (Against parasitic worms), *ye vaḥ santi sapta jātā adr̥ṣṭāḥ puruṣādinaḥ* […], "Die Unsichtbaren, die eure sieben Arten sind [zeichnen sich dadurch aus, daß sie] Menschen verzehren [...]" (Kim). Compare also *prakhādinī* (< *pra-khad-*) at 17.15.3, below.

    The compounds *āmādin-* and *krūrādin-* can be compared with the compounds *āmād-* and *kravyā́d-*. The former is first attested in RV 10.87.7 (To Agni demon-smiter), *utā́labdhaṃ spr̥ṇuhi jātaveda ālebhānā́d r̥ṣṭíbhir yātudhā́nāt | ágne pū́rvo ní jahi śóśucāna āmā́daḥ kṣvíṅkās tám adantv énīḥ* ||, "And, Jatavedas, with your spears recover what was seized, from the sorcerer who seized it. Constantly blazing in front, o Agni, smite him down. Let the mottled vultures that eat raw meat eat him" (J-B). Here it qualifies carrion birds, but it is frequently found in AV hymns as an epithet of demons, such as in PS 7.3.3–4, belonging to a hymn against creatures that threaten offspring, in which it occurs next to *kravyā́d*, 'eater of bloody flesh' (also an epithet of demons, as in ŚS 8.6.6b and PS 7.11.1, 3, but most often it is an epithet of Agni; see Geib 1975 and my comment on PS 17.21.1 below): *nir āmādo nayāmasi niṣ kravyādo gr̥hebhyaḥ | sasyādo nāma ye deva te agne mā dabhan tvām* || *āmādaś ca kravyādaś ca sasyādaś cobhayān saha | prajāṃ ye cakrire bhāgaṃ tān ito nir ṇayāmasi* ||, "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. 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" (Griffiths). Similarly, compare PS 7.11.4 (For safe pregnancy: with bdellium), *yas ta ⁺ūrū ārohaty asr̥k te rehaṇāya kam | āmādaḥ kravyādo ripūṃs tān ito nāśayāmasi* ||, "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" (Griffiths). See also PS 6.14.9c, 7.3.1c, 2d. Griffiths (2009: 277) notes that *āmā́d-* can also be an

---

possible that the copyist mistook a subscript *u* for a subscript *r̥*.

epithet of Agni, as in TS 1.1.7.1. Compare also ŚS 8.6.23 (from the hymn to protect pregnant women), *yá āmáṃ máṃsam adanti paúruṣeyaṃ ca yé kravíḥ | gárbhān khádanti keśavás tán itó nāśáyāmasi ||*, "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). The idea is clear: the Sadānuvās and similar demons eat the raw flesh of embryos and children.

Just like the two epithets in pāda **a**, the form *anagnigandhᵢyādinīḥ* must be a voc. pl. f.. The compound *anagnigandhyādin-* is a hapax, and is best interpreted as having the following structure: [[an-[*agni-gandhí*]]*ādin*], '[eater of [what does not [smell of fire]]]. Griffiths's (2009: 277) translation "who eat what does not smell like fire" is certainly correct. This word surely indicates something that has not been touched by fire, i.e. something uncooked, raw: once again, human meat, no doubt in particular that of embryos and children.

cde. The term *ācāra-* indicates a customary norm, i.e. based on a traditional practice regarded as proper, good, and as such followed by powerful, respected, and authoritative people, who in turn set the behavioural standard for the larger community.[122] That the notion of *ācāra* specifically concerns a delimited group is stressed by Davis (2010: 149), who points out that it "refers precisely to the caste, lifestage, and community-bound rules that together constitute the substantive rules of law pertinent to an individual and to the groups to which he or she belongs." Moreover, "*ācāra* always possesses a normative and obligatory quality that is not necessarily implied by custom alone" (Davis 2010: 145). Thus, clearly, in pronouncing our stanza, the reciter aimed to impose on the Sadānuvās the compelling authority of their own customary norm, which is —as the reciter claims—to feed on corpses rather than on living human children. Once again, as in the previous stanza, the Sadānuvās are driven away by resorting to the pressure of a social norm.

In the RV, the rare lexeme *ud-dhā-* simply means 'raise' (the penis in RV 10.101.12; vigour, *vayás*, in RV 3.18.4); the verbal noun appears in RV 8.51.2, where someone who was lying down, *śáyānaṃ*, is made to rise up, *úddhitam*. We find the same meaning also in the AV ('raise' a hall, *mánasya pátnī-*, ŚS 9.3.6 ~ PS 16.39.6; the *védi* at ŚS 19.42.2; less clearly, the Fathers at ŚS 18.2.34 ~ PS 18.66.7b). A similar meaning is found in ŚB 5.1.5.1–2, where someone is said to mount a cartwheel that is set up (*uddhita-*) on a post.

However, the lexeme also conveys a more specialised meaning, namely 'to expose (a dead body)'. Besides burial and cremation, which are the two most common methods of disposing of the body of a deceased person in Vedic India, exposure is also mentioned in the AV (see Zimmer 1879: 408; Macdonell & Keith 1912: I, 8; Keith 1925: 417). In particular, the lexeme *ud-dhā-* occurs in ŚS 18.2.34 (*yé níkhātā yé pároptā yé dagdhá yé códdhitāḥ | sárvāṃs tán agna á vaha pitṝn havíṣe áttave ||*), which is believed to list four methods of disposing of the body: *níkāta-*, 'buried'; *dagdhá-*, 'cremated'; *páropta* (<*vap-*), possibly 'cast away'; and *úddhita-*, 'exposed'. On exposure as an Indo-Iranian tradition, see my comment on 17.22.10 below. On the other hand, there is no evidence of the practice of exposing children, that is, of abandoning them alive in a remote place, as we find for instance in the custom of Ancient Greece.

The question naturally arises as to whether the aim of these pādas is to redirect the Sadānuvās towards the corpse of an adult or that of a child. We might imagine that the intention is to divert the Sādanuvās from a living child towards the body of a dead child, possibly to the child of an enemy—this is not made explicit, even though the demonstrative *asaú-* normally serves this purpose[123]—so that they would attack the dead, leaving the living alone. Alternatively, the exposed

---

122 The literature on *ācāra*, particularly in relation to *dharma* and *smṛti*, as a normative practice that constitutes a source for Hindu law, is rather broad. See especially Davis 2010: 144ff., as well as Lariviere 2004, Wezler 2004, Olivelle 2006 and 2018.

123 As is well known, the demonstrative *asaú-* can be used as a placeholder for the name of a person, which is to be supplied during the actual recitation of the spell (see my comment on PS 17.21.2b). We may then wish to translate *amuṃ paretya* with "having gone away to N. N.". However, such N. N. is most certainly the same individual as the one that is an *uddhitaṃ śavam*, thus *amuṃ* can simply be an adjective of *śavam*, "that over there."

corpse must be intended as that of an adult man (the corpse of an enemy?). However, this seems less likely, as the Sadānuvās definitely prefer to feed on children.

It is also possible that it is not the corpse of a human child that is intended here with *śavam*, but that of a baby animal: ŚB 4.5.2.13 discusses what to do in case a cow is found to have been pregnant only after she has been sacrificed; one of the options that is considered (with their religious advantages and risks) is to expose, i.e. raise (*ud-dhā-*), the embryo on a tree.[124] Csaba Dezső informs me that he has witnessed the practice of hanging up the bodies of dead animals, wrapped in cloth, on banyan trees in India. Although I have no further information about this practice in modern India, it seems attractive to consider that the corpse intended in our stanza is in fact that of a baby animal who is offered to the demons so that they leave the humans babies alone.

Bhattacharya writes *śavaḥ* (with **Mā**; cf. **Ja** *śivaḥ*, and contra **Ma** *savaḥ*) *kevala ācārāḥ*, and GRIFFITHS (2009: 277) reads the same, translating "The corpse is [your] only diet." However, availing ourselves with additional manuscript evidence, we may notice that *savaḥ*, the reading preserved by the oldest and usually most reliable ms., **Ma**, is also the prevailing reading among **O^A** mss. (with the exception of **Ja**). The variant with *śa-* seems to belong to **O^B**, and might be regarded as a scribal error. Indeed, **K** also reads *savaḥ*, supporting the view according to which the original reading contained a dental sibilant. The reading *savaḥ* can certainly be considered the *lectio difficilior*, as *śavaḥ* can easily be explained as due to perseveration from the preceding pāda **d** (*śavam atta sadānuvāḥ*). The stem *savá-*, however, does not seem to yield much sense in this context: perhaps we may wish to translate with "[Your] customary conduct is [my] command (*savaḥ*) only." It seems more attractive to me to read *sa vaḥ* as separate words: "That (*sa*) is your (*vaḥ*) customary conduct." In this way, also have the advantage of not having to supply the necessary word "your" as GRIFFITHS is forced to do in his translation.

f. I have touched on the theme of the Sadānuvās haunting houses several times in my comments above: see PS 17.12.10, 17.13.10 (possibly also 17.13.8, if the reading *gṛham* is correct).

Similar questions (*kim iṣ-*) are asked in 17.14.2b and 17.14.1d.

As regards *ichatha*, **O** writes *tsa*, while **K** has *ścha*. Even though these are common variants, an asterisk is necessary to mark the emendation.

---

124 ŚS 4.5.2.13, *tádāhuḥ kvaìtaṃ gárbhaṃ kuryādíti vṛkṣá evaìnam úddadhyur antárikṣāyatanā vai gárbhā antárikṣam ivaitad yád vṛkṣás tád enaṃ svá evàyátane prátiṣṭhāpayati tádu vā́ āhuryá enaṃ tátrānuvyāhéred vṛkṣá enam mṛtám úddhāsyantī́ti táthā haivá syāt*, "Here now they say, 'What is he to do with that embryo?' They may expose it on a tree; for embryos have the air for their support, and the tree is, as it were, the same as the air: thus he establishes it on its own support. But, say, they, if, in that case, an one were to curse him, saying, 'They shall expose him [according to Eggeling, referring to both the sacrificer and the embryo] dead on a tree', then verily it would be so" (Eggeling). In the following paragraphs (14–16), other options are illustrated: throwing the embryo into the water, burying it in a molehill, or offering it to the Maruts in the fire of the animal sacrifice.

Sūkta 15

17.15.1

a	yāḥ kumārīr yāḥ sthavirā	8#	[– ∪ – –	– ∪ ∪ ×]
b	yuvatīr yāḥ sadān_uvāḥ		8	[∪ ∪ – –	∪ – ∪ ×]
c	sarvā yantu ⁺kurūṭinīḥ	8	[– – – ∪	∪ – ∪ ×]
d	kulīnā *dhenuḥ sarpat_uv	8#	[∪ – – –	– – ∪ ×]
e	arāyīr abhibhā itaḥ ||	8	[∪ – – ∪	∪ – ∪ ×]

Those Sadānuvās, who are [either] little girls, elderly women, [or] young women—let all of them go [away] as docile (?) [cows]! Let the Arāyī́ demoness, the apparition, creep [away] from here as a milch cow of good breed.

N.B. At the beginning of pāda **d**, **Ji₄** features an interpolation: see my apparatus of stanza 17.14.10 above.

————————

yāḥ kumārīr] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** yā(*s.s.* →)ḥ kumā(ꝝ)rīr **V71** ya<u>ḥ</u> kumārīr **K**   •
yāḥ sthavirā] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c** yā sthavirā **V122 Mā V71 JM₃** yāstvavirā **K**   • yuvatīr] **K [Ma]
[Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** suvatīr **V122**   • yāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c** yaḥ **Ji₄ JM₃** yā **Mā V71**
yās **K**   • sadānvāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** sadānvā **K V71**   • ||] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122
Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** || **Ji₄**   • yantu] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** yanttu **V71** yanti **Ji₄**   •
⁺kurūṭinīḥ]¹²⁵ **Ja?** kuruṭinīḥ **Ji₄ JM₃** kuruṭinīḥ **Ma V122 Pa_c** kuruṭanīḥ **Mā V71** kurūṭunī **K**   •
kulīnā *dhenuḥ] kulīnādhenu **K** kulīnādhena **Ja V122 Pa_c Mā V71 JM₃** kuḷīnādhena **Ma Nā**
kṛlīnādhena **Ji₄**   • sarpatv] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** svapitv **Ji₄** sarpatu **K**   • arāyīr]
arāyīr **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71** arāyār **JM₃** arāÿaṃr **Ji₄** arāyā **Pa_c**¹²⁶ rāyī **K**   • abhibhā itaḥ]
[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃ cabhibhā itaḥ **Pa_c** raṣibhā hitā **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c
[Mā] JM₃** | **V71** Z 1 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *kurūṭinīḥ*+ in pāda **c**, and *kulīnādhe<u>nu</u>* in pāda **d**.
    a. According to PW, the meaning 'old' for *sthávira* is only attested from the Brāhmaṇas onwards. Indeed, in the RV and generally also in the AV, we find the older meaning 'thick, big, strong' (often an attribute of Indra). However, the fact that in our stanza *sthavirā*- occurs next to *kumārī*-, 'little girl, virgin' and *yuvatī*-, 'young woman', leaves no doubt that age is concerned. The PS, in fact, contains two more stanzas in which *sthávira*- has the same meaning.
    The first stanza is PS 9.6.11 (Against the parasite worm), *adṛ́ṣṭebhyas taruṇebhyo*

————————

¹²⁵**Ja**'s reading in Bhattacharya's apparatus corresponds to the accepted reading, but it is followed by a question mark. It is not clear what this means. If **Ja** reads *kurūṭinīḥ*, then Bhattacharya does not need to use a plus sign. Perhaps Bhattacharya is unsure about **Ja**'s reading, and uses a plus sign on the basis of the other mss. This is not made explicit, however.

¹²⁶Note that **Pa_c** does not spell *arāyā* with the intervocalic akṣara *ẏa* [ja], but with *ya* [dʒa].

yuvadbhya sthavirebhyaḥ | āhārṣam ugrām oṣadhiṃ yebhyo bimbīvadhaḥ kṛtaḥ ||. KIM (2014: *ad loc*.) translates as follows: "Gegen die Unsichtbaren, seien sie Neugeborene, seien sie Junge, seien sie Dick-gewordene, gegen diejenigen, gegen die eine Mordwaffe aus der Bimbi-Pflanze beritgemacht ist, habe ich die gewaltige Heilpflanze herbeigeholt." However, the neighbouring *táruṇa-*, 'newborn, young, tender', and *yúvan*, 'youth, young adult', suggests that *sthávira-* does not simply concern size, but also age.

The second stanza in which *sthávira-* means 'old, elder' is PS 17.15.3 below, which mentions demonesses who feed on boys (*kumārān*) and elders (*sthavirān*). Once again, the opposition is one of age.

c. The word *kurūṭínīḥ* occurs in ŚS 10.1.15 (~ PS 16.36.5d) (Against witchcraft, *kṛtyā́*): *ayáṃ pánthāḥ kṛtyéti tvā nayāmo 'bhipráhitāṃ práti tvā prá hiṇmaḥ | ténābhí yāhi bhañjaty ánasvatīva vāhínī viśvárūpā kurūṭínī ||*, "Saying 'this is the road, O witchcraft' we conduct thee; thee that wast sent forth against [us] we send forth back again; by that [road] go against [them], breaking, like a draft-cow with a cart, all-formed, wearing a wreath (?)" (Whitney). Whitney's tentative gloss is based on a supposed connection to the late words *kirīṭa-*, 'diadem', and *kirīṭin-*, 'wearing a diadem' (cf. EWAia I p. 372).

It is certainly remarkable that both the above stanza and ours contain a cow metaphor. The purpose of the above stanza is to send the *kṛtyā́* back along the way whence she came, thus she is likened (and magically turned into) a docile cow. All the qualities that are ascribed to her, if they are not simply typical characteristics of a cow, must be positive: thus, *ánasvatī* and *vāhínī* might simply characterise the cow/witchcraft as 'a draft-cow with a cart', but also highlight the fact that she is a healthy cow who is *able* to draw a heavy cart. Similarly, *viśvárūpā* is commonly used for 'speckled' cows or a mythical cow created by the Ṛbhus (see RV 4.33.8, 1.161.6). Thus, *kurūṭinī* must also express either a common characteristic of a cow, or some positive quality that is helpful for the reciter to make sure that the *kṛtyā́*/cow will be able to go all the way back where she came from. Note also that both in this stanza and in ours, the cows are invited to go (*yāhi, yantu*). Clearly both stanzas must express the same idea. Thus, in our stanza the Sadānuvās of all ages are invited to go as/being *kurūṭinī* (docile?) cows (subject predicate).

d. The cow metaphor continues in pāda **d**, in which the Arāyī́ demoness is likened to a milch cow of good breed (*kulīnā dhenuḥ*) and is invited to creep away as such. Clearly it is implied that a cow of good breed is docile and can be controlled. This must be the same logic that drives the poet to qualify the demonesses in pāda **abc**, and the *kṛtyā́* in ŚS 10.1.15 (~ PS 16.36.5d), as *kurūṭinī*. Thus, I take *kulīnā dhenuḥ* as subject predicate, just as I take *kurūṭinī* as subject predicate in the previous sentence.

The emendation to *dhenuḥ is necessary, as no ms. preserves the visarga. Absence of *visarga* before initial *s-* is a common phenomenon.

e. On the Arāyī́ demoness, see my comment on PS 17.13.4c above.

The compound *abhi-bhā́-* means 'apparition, portent', in particular an inauspicious, dangerous one, and is not infrequently found in AV spells to ward off evil beings. Compare for instance ŚS 11.2.11cd (To Bhāva and Śarva): *sá no mṛḍa paśupate námas te paráḥ kroṣṭā́ro abhibhā́ḥ śvánaḥ paró yantv agharúdo vikeśyàḥ ||*, "do thou be gracious to us, O lord of cattle; homage to thee; away let the jackals, the portents (*abhi-bhā́*), the dogs go, away the weepers of evil with disheveled hair" (Whitney).

17.15.2

a	tābh[i]yo rudro vi sr̥ja	8#	[– ᴗ – ᴗ | – ᴗ ᴗ ×]
b	tviṣim *adhvagaghātinīm |	8	[ᴗ ᴗ – ᴗ | ᴗ – ᴗ ×]
c	tā astā hantu vidyutā	8	[– ᴗ – – | ᴗ – ᴗ ×]
d	vajreṇānaparādhinā |	8	[– – – ᴗ | ᴗ – ᴗ ×]
e	tāsāṃ tvaṃ śakra moc chiṣa	8	[– – – – | ᴗ – ᴗ ×]
f	indra bhaṇvāḥ phalīkuru ||	8	[– ᴗ – – | ᴗ – ᴗ ×]

As Rudra[, O Indra,] hurl at them the flare that kills travellers! Let the shooter (i.e. Indra) slay them with the lightning bolt, the infallible *vájra*! O powerful one, you do not leave any remainder of them! O Indra, thresh the Bhaṇvās!

tābhyo] **K** **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **Ji₄** **Pa꜀** **[Mā]** **JM₃** tābhyo[x] **V71** pābhyo **V122**　•　visr̥ja tviṣim] **[O]** visr̥ṇatvamagham **K**　•　*adhvagaghātinīm] addhikaghātinīṃ **Ja** **Ji₄** **JM₃** addikaghātinīṃ **Ma** addhikaghā(ẏi→s.s.)tinīm **V122** addhakaghātinīṃ **Pa꜀** addhikaghātanīṃ **Mā** **V71** adhyaghaghātvinī **K**　•　\|] **K** **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122** **Pa꜀** **[Mā]** **V71** **JM₃** \|\| **Ji₄**　•　tā astā] **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122** **Ji₄** **Pa꜀** **V71** **JM₃** tā āstā **Mā** tāstvā **K**　•　hantu vidyutā] **K** **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122** **Ji₄** **Pa꜀** **[Mā]** **V71** **JM₃** hanta vidyurā **Ji₄**　•　\|] **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122** **Pa꜀** **[Mā]** **V71** **JM₃** \|\| **Ji₄** *om*. **K**　•　tāsāṃ tvaṃ] **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122** **Ji₄** **Pa꜀** **[Mā]** **V71** **JM₃** tāsāntaṃ **K**　•　śakra] **[O]** nakra(<śakra) **K**[127]　•　mocchiṣa][128] **V71** mocchisa **Ji₄** mochiṣa **JM₃** **V122** **Pa꜀** (? **[Mā]**? **[Ma]**? **[Ja]**?) mośchiṣam **K**　•　bhaṇvāḥ] **[O]** bhaṇthā(/ṇdhāḥ?) (vs bhaṇthās Bhatt., bhaṇdhās (typo?) Barret, bhaṇḍhāḥ R-V) **K**　•　phalīkuru] **K** **[Ja]** **V122** **Ji₄** **[Mā]** **JM₃** phaḷīkuṃru **Ma** pha(li→)līkuru **V71** pālīkuru **Pa꜀**　\|\|] **[Ja]** **Pa꜀** **[Mā]** \|\|³ **Ma** **V122** **Ji₄** **JM₃** \|\| 3 \|\| 3 \|\| **V71** Z 2 Z **K**

Bhattacharya reads *vi sr̥ja(t) tviṣim adhvaga+ghātinīm* in pāda **ab**, and *mocchiṣa+* in pāda **e**.

abcd. I take the initial *tābhyaḥ* as a dativus incommodi, 'against them (f.)', i.e. against the Bhaṇvās mentioned in pāda **f**.

The word *rudro* (=*rudraḥ*) is a nominative, and must stand in adposition to an implicit *indraḥ*. The references to the *vidyút-* and *vájra-* in pādas **c** and **d** leave no doubt as to the fact that the 'thrower' (*ástr̥-*) of pāda **c** is Indra (mentioned in pāda **f**—note also the typical epithet Śakra in pāda **e**). Moreover, the *tvíṣi-* of pāda **b** must also refer the lightning bolt: the *tvíṣi-* 'energy, impetus, vehemence, sprightliness, liveliness' is a characteristic of fire (see my comment on 17.14.1c above), and can thus be translated with 'flare, scintillation, brightness'; the *vájra*, being the lightning bolt, is a form of fire (see e.g. PS 17.27.2, 17.28.3–5). Thus, the command *visr̥ja* ("hurl!") must also be addressed to Indra.

However, Indra behaves like Rudra insofar as he "kills the travellers": in fact, the compound *adhvagaghātin-*, 'killing one who goes down a road', is only found in PS 16.104.7 (abd ~ ŚS 11.2.7abd) (To Rudra, Bhava, and Śarva), in which it qualifies Rudra, *astrā nīlaśikhaṇḍena sahasrākṣeṇa vājinā | rudreṇādhvagaghātinā* (ŚS has *rudréṇārdhakaghātínā*) *tena mā sam arāmahi* |, "With the thrower who has a blue hair lock, who is thousand-eyed, vigorous; with Rudra who kills travellers; may we not come into conflict with him!" One may also recall the Śatarudrīya, in which Rudra, "who dwells on paths and roads" (VS 19.37), is described as protector of thieves, robbers and killers (VS 19.20–21, etc.).

The "travellers" must be the same demonesses who are invited to go away in the previous stanza.

The lexeme *apa-rādh-* means both 'miss (a target)' or 'commit sin, offence' (PW). Clearly

---

127 I agree with Barret's impression that **K** only apparently reads *nakra*: the first akṣara looks like *na* only due to defacement, but the ms. originally read *śa*.

128 Bhattacharya writes *mocchiṣa+*, with a plus sign, but does not report the readings of his mss in the apparatus.

both meanings are implied here, as on the one hand the *vájra* never fails to hit its target, and on the other hand, slaying the demons is not a sin. The compound *an-apa-rādhin-* is a hapax, but we find a similar formation, *anaparāddha-*, in ŚB 2.1.2.19, referring to a *nakṣatra* that is 'faultless', i.e. it helps the sacrificer to avoid sins and ritual faults if he decides to set up his fires under it.

e. Bhattacharya writes *mocchiṣa+* in pāda **e**, but does not report the readings of his mss. Presumably they featured the akṣara *ch*, which he restores to *cch*. At any rate, the emendation sign is not necessary in light of the new ms. evidence.

The lexeme *phalī-kṛ-*, 'to separate the grain from the husks, to thresh, to winnow', is attested in the AV in the derivative *phalīkáraṇa-* in ŚS 11.3.6 (~ 16.53.3i).[129]

17.15.3   **d**: ~ PS 17.15.6d

a	kumārān ekā sthavirān	8#	[∪ − − − │ − ∪ ∪ ×]
b	yā adanti *prakhādinīḥ |	8	[− ∪ − ∪ │ ∪ − ∪ ×]
c	tā indro hantu vṛtrahā	8	[− − − − │ ∪ − ∪ ×]
d	yo devo viśvād rakṣāṃsi sedhati ||	11ᴶ	[− − − − − − │ − ∪ − ∪ ×]

Those particular [demonesses], devourers, who eat boys and elders—let Indra, the slayer of Vṛtra, the god who repels demons away from everyone, slay them!

sthavirān] **K** sthavirāṃ **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa_c Mā V71** sthavirāṃne **JM₃**   • yā adanti] **[O]** yādanti **K**   • prakhādinīḥ*] prakhādinīṃ **O** praghātinī **K**   • \|] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** \|\| **Ji₄**   • tā] **[O]** tān **K**   • hantu] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** hanta **Ji₄**   • vṛtrahā] **[O]** vṛttrahā **K**   • yo] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** ryaṃ **Ji₄**   • rakṣāṃsi] **[O]** rakṣāṃdra **Ja** rakṣaṃsi **K**   • sedhati] **[Ma] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c V71 JM₃** sidhati **Ja** sedhata **Mā** sedhatu **K**   • \|\|] **[O]** Z 3 Z **K**

PS 17.15.6cd
*agniṣ *ṭā sarvā sāhantyo*
viśvād rakṣāṃsi sedhatu \|\|

a. On *sthávira-* in the meaning 'old, elder', see my comment on 17.15.1 above.

b. The emendation to **prakhādinīḥ* was proposed by Bhattacharya on the basis of the **O** evidence. One based on **K**, **praghātinīḥ*, would seem grammatically just as sound—the lexeme *pra-han-*, 'smite forth, away', is also fairly frequent in the AV. On the other hand, the lexeme *pra-khād-* is not found in the AV, and occurs only in RV 1.158.4d, in which Agni is said to chew at the earth (*prá yád ... khā́dati kṣā́m*, "When he [i.e. Agni] … chews at the earth" (J-B)). It is of course possible that a corruption from *praghātinīḥ* to *prakhādinīḥ* was triggered by the neighbouring *adanti*. Nevertheless, *prakhādinīḥ*, 'devourers, chewers', seems semantically more suitable as a Sadānuvā name: compare PS 17.14.7, above, in which the demonesses are described as animals chewing (*khādanti*) in a trough (probably a metaphor for female genitalia), or in general the frequent stress on the Sadānuvās' licking (PS 17.12.1, 17.12.4, 17.14.8d) or eating (PS 17.14.6b, 17.14.8ab, 17.14.10ab). For this reason, I accept Bhattacharya's emendation. He is most certainly

---

[129]This line belongs to a hymn aimed at extolling the rice dish (*odaná*), and in particular belongs to a section in which various deities and entities are equated with parts of the rice plant, tools used in the preparation of the rice dish and stages of the preparation: ŚS 11.3.3–6, *cákṣur músalaṃ kā́ma ulū́khalam \|\| dítiḥ śū́rpam áditiḥ śūrpagrāhī́ vā́tó 'pāvinak \|\| áśvāḥ káṇā gā́vas taṇḍulā́ maśákās túṣāḥ \|\| kábru phalī́káraṇāḥ śáro 'bhrám \|\|,* "Sight the pestle, desire the mortar. Diti the winnowing basket, Aditi the basket-holder; the wind winnowed. Horses the corns, kine the grains, flies the husks. *Kábru* the hulls, the cloud the stalk" (Whitney).

right in correcting to a nom. pl. f.

d. This pāda is metrically irregular: it counts 11 syllables, but the cadence is not that of a Triṣṭubh, but rather that of an Anuṣṭubh or Jagatī. Compare, in fact, PS 17.15.6d, which reads *viśvād rakṣāṃsi sedhatu* and is a regular Anuṣṭubh. Perhaps our verse was composed as a variation of the latter. However, our line appears irregular even if we take it as a hypometrical Jagatī (11^J), as the second syllable after the caesura (after the fifth syllable—or the third?) is long—though exceptions to this rule are frequent in the AV. Note that the next stanza also features a longer final pāda (8 + 8 + 8 + 12), which however is a regular Jagatī.

The ablative *viśvād* seems best rendered here as "from everyone", because the demonesses are portrayed as attacking people (boys and elders): as such, they need to be repelled "from everyone". Conversely, in PS 17.15.6d, below, the demoness are portrayed as emerging from their hideouts, and, therefore, it makes sense that they should be repelled "from every place" (*viśvād*).

17.15.4   **cd**: ~ ŚS 8.5.9ef; **d**: ~ ŚS 10.1.16c

a	yāś ca dāsīr asurāṇāṃ	8#	[− ∪ − − | ∪ ∪ − ×]
b	manuṣyebhyaś ca yāḥ kr̥tāḥ |	8	[∪ − − − | ∪ − ∪ ×]
c	ubhayīs tāḥ parā yantu	8#	[∪ ∪ − − | ∪ − − ×]
d	parāvataṃ navatiṃ nāvₜyā ⁺ati ||	12	[∪ − ∪ − | ∪ ∪ − | − ∪ − ∪ ×]

Both those [demonesses] who are *dāsa* women of the race of the Asura demons, and those who have been [magically] created from the race of men—let them both go away into the distance, beyond 90 deep rivers!

yāś ca] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 Paᶜ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ yośca Ji₄   •   yāḥ kr̥tāḥ] **[O]** yāḥ kr̥tāḥ **K**   •   manuṣyebhyaś ca] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ manuṣyebhyaḥś ca Ji₄ m(u →)anuṣyebhyaś ca Paᶜ   •   \|] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Paᶜ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ \|\| Ji₄ *om*. **K**   •   ubhayīs tāḥ] ubhayīs tāḥ **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Paᶜ **[Mā]** ubhayās tā V71 ubhayāṃs tāṃ JM₃ ubha īsthāḥ Ji₄ ubhe hastāḥ **K**   •   parā yantu] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Paᶜ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ parā yantra Ji₄ parā yanti parā yanti **K**   •   parāvataṃ] **[O]** parāvatiṃ **K**   •   navatiṃ nāvyā ⁺ati \|\|] navatiṃ nāvyāȳati \|\| V122 Ji₄ navatin nāvyāȳati **Mā Ma Ja Paᶜ** na[.]ti[.]āvyāȳati \|\| **V71** navati nāvyāȳati \|\| **JM₃** navatiṃ nāvyāti Z 4 Z **K**

ŚS 8.5.9ef
ubháyīs tā́ḥ párā yantu parāváto navatíṃ nāvyā̀ áti \|\|

ŚS 10.1.16c
páreṇehi navatíṃ nāvyā̀ áti

Bhattacharya writes *nāvyā ati** in pāda **d**.

a. This pāda is reminiscent of a series of stanzas in PS 8.16 (containing exorcisms that make use of the Cukākaṇī herb), in which the *dasyūnāṃ dāsī*, 'the *dāsa* woman of the Dasyu race', is described as crawling (*sr̥p-*) into deep places (*gahana-*, *kevaṭā-*) and into the *strīṇāṃ putrasuvanaṃ*, 'the place that serves women to produce a son', according to Kɪᴍ's (2014: 157) interpretation. The stanzas (PS 8.16.5, 6, 8) read as follows: *anusr̥ptāṃ gahaneṣu dhrūkṣṇāṃ pāpīṃ śimidvatīm \| tām etāṃ dasyūnāṃ dāsīṃ pra dahātaś cukākaṇi \|\| 5 \|\| yā strīṇāṃ putrasuvanaṃ kevaṭān upasarpati \| tām etāṃ dasyūnāṃ dāsīṃ pra dahātaś cukākaṇi \|\| 6 \|\| […] yadāsyāḥ srakve dahed yadā mūrdhānam agninā \| athaiṣā dasyūnāṃ dāsī putthagi ni layiṣyate \|\| 8 \|\|*, "Treibe durch Brand diese Dāsa-Frau des Dasyu-Volkes von dort fort, die an den tiefen Stellen entlang kroch, die

heimtückische, die bösartige, die [reichlich] mit śímid-versehene, du Cukākaṇī! Treibe durch Brand diese Dāsa-Frau des Dasyu-Volkes von dort fort, die zum Erzeugungsort einens Sohnes für die Frauen, [nämlich] zu den Vertiefungen hinschleicht, du Cukākaṇī! […] Sobald sie (?) in ihrem Maul, sobald [sie (?)] mit dem Feuer den Kopf verbrennt, wird sich diese Dāsa-Frau des Dasyu-Volkes verstecken, du Putthagī!"

Also relevant is PS 6.14.7 (belonging to a hymn against noxious creatures), in which the male Arāya demon, described as eating boys, is called *dāsa āsuraḥ*. The stana reads as follows: *yaḥ ⁺kumārāñ janasyātti taruṇān dāsa āsuraḥ | arāyaḥ keśy aghalo yo janān hanty ⁺atti ca tam ito nāśayāmasi ||*, "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" (Griffiths).

That *gahana*, *kevaṭā* and *putrasuvana* are euphemisms for female reproductive organs seems evident, and it is possible that the *dāsī́* intended here is of the same kind intended in our stanza, i.e. a Sadānuvā demoness: perhaps a demonic personification of the low-caste midwives who were hired to attend women during delivery because of the pollution connected to childbirth (see my introduction to this chapter). The fact that these women were exposed to such dangerously polluting elements must have made them dangerous as well. We can also imagine that complications or accidents that might happen during the delivery would be blamed on them or on demonesses attacking the birthing woman through them.

In the AV, the *dāsī́*-, 'a barbarian woman, a low-caste woman, a slave', is invariably characterised as impure or dangerous. For instance, in ŚS 12.3.13.cd (~ PS 17.51.3cd), ritual tools touched by a *dāsī́* need to be cleansed;[130] in ŚS 5.13.8 (~ PS 8.2.7), the poison of *dāsī́* is rendered "sapless" (*arasá*);[131] and sometimes unwanted instances of misfortune are exorcised from the victim and redirected to a *dāsī́*: e.g. in ŚS 5.22.6-7 (~ PS 12.1.8-9), the fever (*tákman*) is sent away to the *dāsī́*.[132] In PS 5.26.5, the Arāti demoness that the poet wishes to have slain is likened to a *dāsī́* who has committed a transgression (*ā́gas*). The stanza reads, *deṣṭrī ca yā sinīvālī sapta ca śrotyā yāḥ | arātiṃ viśvā bhūtāni ghnantu dāsīm *ivāgasi ||*, "The directress Sinīvālī and the seven streams, let all the beings slay Arāti, like a *dāsa* woman because of a transgression" (Lubotsky). Note that Sinīvālī is the new-moon goddess who presides over fertility, fecundity, birth and offspring (MACDONELL 1897: 125; MACDONELL & KEITH 1912: II, 449). That this particular goddess is mentioned here next to *dāsī́* is certainly no chance, and strengthens the connection of the *dāsī́* with birth. Such a connection is also evinced by PS 9.23.6 (belonging to a series of expiation spells), *sakhyur jāyāṃ svāṃ dāsīṃ sūtikāṃ lohitāvatīm aśuddhāṃ yad upeyima | ayaṃ mā tasmād odanaḥ pavitraḥ pātv aṃhasaḥ ||*, "If we sexually approached a companion's *dāsa* wife, who is bloody, impure, being one who has just given birth, let this purifier, the rice porridge, protect me from that anxiety" (my transl.). Compare also ŚS 12.4.9 (~ PS 17.16.9) (belonging to the hymn about the Brahmin's cow that forms the fourth anuvāka of PS 17), in which the *dāsī́* is blamed for the birth of something deformed (*aparūpa*) and sinful: *yád asyāḥ pálpūlanaṃ śákṛd dāsī́ samásyati | tátó 'parūpaṃ jāyate tásmād ávyeṣyad énasaḥ ||*, "If the lye, the dung of her [i.e. the brahmin's cow] a

---

[130]ŚS 12.3.13.cd (~ PS 17.51.3cd): *yád vā dāsy àrdráhastā samaṅktá ulū̀khalam músalam śumbhatāpaḥ ||*, "when the barbarian woman (*dāsī́*) with wet hands smears over—cleans, ye waters, the mortar [and] pestle" (Whitney).

[131]ŚS 5.13.8 (~ PS 8.2.7): *urugū́lāyā duhitā́ jātá dāsy ásiknyā | pratáṅkaṃ dadrúṣīṇāṃ sárvāsām arasám viṣám ||*, "Daughter of the broad-knobbed one (?), born of the black barbarian (f.)—of all of them (f.) that have pierced defiantly (?) the poison [is] sapless" (Whitney, who emends to *dāsā́ ásikinyāḥ*); "Die Tochter der Urugūlā, die als eine Dāsa-Frau des schwarzen [Clans (?)] Geborene, die schleichend Bohrende; diese hat jetzt die Schlangen unschädlich gemacht."

[132]ŚS 5.22.6: *tákman vyā̀la ví gada vyàṅga bhū́ri yāvaya | dāsī́ṃ niṣṭákvarīm icha tā́ṃ vájreṇa sám arpaya || tákman mū́javato gacha bálhikān vā parastarā́m | śūdrā́m icha prapharvyàṃ tā́ṃ takman vī́va dhūnuhi ||*, "O fever, trickish one, speak out (?); O limbless one, keep much away (?); seek the fugitive (?) barbarian woman; make her meet a thunderbolt. O fever, go to the Mūjavants, or to the Balhikas, further off; seek the wanton Śūdra woman; her, O fever, do thou shake up a bit" (Whitney).

barbarian woman flings together, then is born what is deformed, what will not escape from that sin" (Whitney).

b. The word *kṛtāḥ* can perhaps be explained by interpreting *kṛ-* in the sense of 'making [magically]', a meaning that can be seen in *kṛtyā́*, 'witchcraft' (cf. Lat. *factura* > Ita. *fattura*, 'witchcraft, spell'). The idea of demons as being summoned by a curse is common in the AV.

This might be the idea behind the compound *púruṣeṣitāḥ*, 'sent by men (instrumental relation)/from men (ablative relation)', which characterises the Sadānuvās in the following stanza: ŚS 2.14.5 (~ PS 2.4.2) (Against Sadānuvās), *yádi sthá kṣetriyā́ṇāṃ yádi vā púruṣeṣitāḥ | yádi sthá dásyubhyo jātā́ náśyatetáḥ sadā́nvāḥ ||*, "Ob ihr nun vom Kṣetriya-Leiden her seid [or "those who come from the soil"?[133]], oder ob von Menschen ausgesandt, oder ob ihr von den Dasyus abstammt; verschwindet von hier, Sadānuvās" (Zehnder). Note also the reference to Sadānuvās born from the *dásyu* race (*dásyubyo jātā́ḥ*), which stands next to *púruṣeṣitāḥ* just like our *dāsīr asurāṇām* is found next to *manuṣebhyaḥ kṛtāḥ*.

On the basis of comparison with the semantics of the compound *púruṣeṣita-*, and with the phrase *dásyubhyo* (abl.) *jātā́ḥ*, I believe that our *manuṣyebhyaḥ* should be taken as an ablative (as in my translation), rather than as a dative ("created for men").

cd. The emendation to *ati* was proposed by Bhattacharya, who marks it with an asterisk. A plus sign seems sufficient to me, as both branches show typical errors that may occur in hiatus: **K** merges the vowels (*nāvyāti*), while **O** inserts a *ẏ* (on this phenomenon, see my Introduction §2.2). It seems reasonable to assume that the written archetype preserved the correct reading, which was then corrupted in the two branches in different ways.

Pādas **cd** have an exact parallel in ŚS 8.5.9ef. The full stanza (belonging to a hymn against witchcraft with an amulet) reads, *yāḥ kṛtyā́ āṅgirasī́r yāḥ kṛtyā́ āsurī́r yāḥ | kṛtyā́ḥ svayáṃkṛtā yá u cānyébhir ā́bhṛtāḥ | ubháyīs tā́ḥ párā yantu parāváto navatíṃ nāvyā̀ áti ||*, "The witchcrafts that are of the Angirases, the witchcrafts that are of the Asuras, the witchcrafts that are self-made, and those that are brought by others let these, of both kinds, go away to the distances, across ninety navigable [streams]" (Whitney).

The formula *parā i- navatíṃ nāvyā̀ áti* is also found in ŚS 10.1.16c. The full stanza (part of a hymn against witchcraft) reads, *párāk te jyótir ápathaṃ te arvā́g anyátrāsmád áyanā kṛṇuṣva | páreṇehi navatíṃ nāvyā̀ áti durgā́ḥ srotyā̀ mā́ kṣaṇiṣṭhāḥ párehi ||*, "Offward is light for thee, hitherward is no road for thee; make thy goings elsewhere than [toward] us; go thou by a distant [road] beyond ninety difficult navigable streams; do not wound thyself; go away" (Whitney). The number 90 seems to stand simply for 'a very high number' here, and it is otherwise only used in the AV in rather obscure formulas that involve other numbers and sequences of numbers (ŚS 5.15.9, 5.19.11, 6.25.3, 19.47.3).

The word *nāvyā-*, 'navigable', indicates a river that is deep enough to be navigable, and as such one that is unfordable. The idea behind the spell is thus to send the demonesses far away beyond a great number of rivers that cannot easily be crossed, should the demonesses desire to come back.

A similar image, also involving a river, is found in RV 10.155.3 (the only RV hymn against Sadānuvās), a stanza which has a parallel in PS 6.8.7 (Against Sadānuvās); *adó yád dā́ru plávate síndhoḥ pāré (PS madhye) apūruṣám | tád ā́ rabhasva durhaṇo téna gacha (PS yāhi) parastarám ||*, "That piece of wood over there that floats to the farther shore of the river with no man at the helm, grab hold of that, you with your evil jaws: with it go in the farther distance" (J-B)

The idea of sending demons away into the distance or to a remote place is a recurring one. See e.g. ŚS 2.25.5ab (Against Kaṇvas and abortion), *párāca enān prá ṇuda kā́ṇvān jīvitayópanān |*, "Thrust them forth to a distance, the life-obstructing *kánvas*" (Whitney). Sometimes the evil beings are sent to or into a mountain: e.g., from the same hymn, 2.25.4ab, *girím enā́m̐ ā́ veśaya kā́ṇvān jīvitayópanān |*, "Make them enter the mountain, the life-obstructing *kánvas*" (Whitney); RV

---

[133]On this alternative interpretation of the pāda, see my comment on PS 17.13.1b.

10.155.1b, *girím gacha sadānve* |, "Go to the mountain, O Sadānuvā!" Sometimes the destination is the ocean: PS 15.18.5 (Against Apsarases), *āhatā apa tā itaḥ khalād iva yātudhānyaḥ | amuṃ gachata pūruṣaṃ samudram apa gacchata* ||, "Them, beaten up, [remove] away from here, like sorceresses from the threshing floor. Go to that man over there, go away to the ocean" (Lelli).

17.15.5 (K 17.15.7)   d: ~ PS 17.12.2d, 12.8d, 12.9e, 12.10e, 13.4d, 13.5d, 13.7d, 14.7d, 15.8d, 15.9d, 15.10d ~ ŚS 2.14.1d

a	yāsāṃ ghoṣaḥ saṃgatānāṃ	8#	[− − − − | − ᴜ − ×]
b	vṛkāṇām iva gaṅgaṇaḥ |	8	[ᴜ − − ᴜ | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
c	pracaṅkaśām *avahvarāṃ	8	[ᴜ − ᴜ − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
d	prayachantīṃ pratigrahām	8	[ᴜ ᴜ − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]
e	nāśayāmaḥ sadānᵤvāḥ ||	8	[− ᴜ − − | ᴜ − ᴜ ×]

Whose noise, when they come together, is like the howling of wolves; the one who constantly stares straight [at women], the devious one; the one who takes, even though she holds her hands forward [as if to present a gift]—we make the Sadānuvās disappear!

ghoṣaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** ghosaḥ **Ji₄** ghoṣā **K**   • saṃgatānāṃ] **Ma Ja Pa_c JM₃** sa(s.s.→)ṅ(?)gatānā **V122** saṅgatānāṃ **Ji₄** saṃgatānā **Mā V71** saṅgatā **K**   • vṛkāṇām iva] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** vṛkāṇā(ṃ→)m iva **Pa_c** vṛkān āpi va (= Bʜᴀᴛᴛ., Bᴀʀʀᴇᴛ, *vs* vṛkānām iva R-V) **K**   • gaṅgaṇaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** (ga→s.s.)gaṅgaṇaḥ **V122** gaṅgaṇa **K**   • ‖] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** ‖ **Ji₄**   • pracaṅkaśām *avahvarāṃ] pracaṅkaśāmaivaharāṃ **[Ma]** pracaṃkaśāmaivaharāṃ **V122 Mā V71 JM₃** pracaṃkaśāmaivaharām **Pa_c** pracakaśāmaivaharām **Ja** pracaṃkaśāmaivaharās **Ji₄** mṛcaṃkaśāmayivāraṃ **K**   • prayachantīṃ]¹³⁴ praẏachantīṃ **V122 Mā? V71 JM₃** praẏ(?)achantīm **Ma** prayyachantim **Ja** pāẏachantis **Ji₄** praẏachantam **Pa_c** prayaśchantīṃ **K**   • pratigrahām] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** patīgrahā **Ji₄** pratigrahā **K V122**   • nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ] nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** nāśaẏāmasadānvāḥ **V71** vāśayāmas sadānvā **K**   • ‖] **[O]** Z 7 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *pracaṅkaśām̲a̲i̲v̲a̲h̲a̲r̲ām̲ +prayacchantīṃ* in pādas **cd**.

   b. On *gaṅgana-*, 'howling', a word that is found only in PS, see Gʀɪꜰꜰɪᴛʜs 2009: 181 on PS 6.14.9e, Lᴜʙᴏᴛsᴋʏ 2010: 47, Hᴏꜰꜰᴍᴀɴɴ 1952: 255f.[= 1975:36f.].

   c. The compound *pra-caṅkaśa-* is not attested as such. However, we find the negated compound *á-pra-caṅkaśa-* in ŚS 8.6.16 (~ PS 16.80.7)¹³⁵ (belonging to the hymn for protection of pregnant women that I have frequently quoted above): *paryastākṣā́ ápracaṅkaśā astraiṇā́ḥ santu páṇḍagāḥ | áva bheṣaja pādaya yá imā́ṃ saṃvívṛtsaty ápatiḥ svapatíṃ stríyam* ||, "With eyes cast about, not looking forward (? *ápracaṅkāśa*), womenless be the eunuchs; make to fall down, O remedy, him who, not her husband, tries to approach this woman that has a husband" (Whitney). In this stanza a potential harasser is cursed to be a eunuch (*páṇḍaga-*), of which *ápracaṅkaśa* is an attribute. Whitney's tentative translation seems plausible: the impotent man casts his eyes around without daring to stare forward at women. Whitney (*ad loc.*) notes that the commentary reads *pracaṅkaśās* instead of *apracaṅkaśās*, and "strangely" glosses it with *prakṣīṇorupradeśās*, which

---

¹³⁴Bhattacharya's edition features the emendation ⁺*prayacchantīṃ*, but his apparatus only reports the readings of **Ma** and **Ja**, not **Mā**. As the other two mss. of **O^B** read *prayachantīṃ*, I assume that this is also the reading of **Mā**, and that Bhattacharya used a plus sign to mark the emendation *ch > ⁺cch*.

¹³⁵Bhattacharya writes pādas PS 16.80.7ab as ⁺*paryastā̲k̲ṣā̲ḥ̲ pracaṅkaśā straiṇāḥ santu paṇḍagāḥ* |, but the text is probably to be emended in agreement with the ŚS parallel.

Whitney does not translate. This gloss must mean "whose region of the thigh has been destroyed", possibly a reference to the eunuchs' castration. The commentator must have interpreted *pracaṅkaśa-* as based on the root *kaś-*, 'to strike, hurt'. However, this root is not attested in Vedic, and (*a*)*pracaṅkaśa-* is best explained as an intensive formation based on the root *kāś-*, 'to be visible'. This is how Debrunner (AiGr II.2 p. 84) and Mayrhofer (EWAia I p. 344) classify it. However, their gloss, 'ohne Sehkraft', does not seem plausible to me, given the context in which the term appears, and I prefer Whitney's interpretation. That the meaning of the intensive of *kāś-* is 'to look at' ('beschauen, betrachten') has been argued by SCHAEFER (1994: 102ff.). Accordingly, our *pracaṅkaśā* must be a demoness who harasses women by constantly staring at them.[136]

Bhattacharya writes *aivaharāṃ*, but judges the reading doubtful. In his comment, he proposes to emend to *ahivārāṃ, which must mean 'whose tail is like that of a snake'. Such compound is unattested, but the formation would be totally regular,[137] and the meaning does not seem less implausible than that of the other colourful epithets we have encountered so far.

Another possibility is to emend to *avahvarāṃ: the compound *ava-hvara-* is unattested as such, but it forms the basis of the attested *án-ava-hvara-*, 'not crooked, straightforward', found once in RV 2.41.6 (To various gods, here in particular to Mitra and Varuṇa), *tā́ samrā́jā ghr̥tā́sutī ādityā́ dā́nunas pátī | sácete ánavahvaram ||*, "These two sovereign kings, whose potion is ghee, Ādityas, the lords of the drop, accompany him who does not go astray" (J-B). Mitra and Varuṇa preside over proper behaviour, thus, one who is *ánavahvara-* must be one whose conduct is ethically sound. Thus, the epithet *avahvarā* would characterise a demoness as 'devious', 'behaving deviously'. As can be seen from pāda **d** (and in many other cases in this hymn), epithets often come in pairs and describe parallel or opposite characteristics. It seems attractive to think that the poet aimed to play with the semantics of the preverbs *prá* and *áva*, with the purpose of highlighting the opposition between the fact that the demoness constantly stares (*kāś-*) forward (*prá*) in a straight direction towards the woman she is harassing, while at the same time she goes down (*áva*) a crooked (*hvar-*) path by behaving in a devious way. The emendation to *avahvarāṃ also has the advantage of yielding a regular cadence (ᴜ – ᴜ ×), as opposed to *aivaharāṃ* (– ᴜ ᴜ ×) and *ahivārāṃ (ᴜ ᴜ – ×).

d. I suspect that this pāda is hardly an innocuous reference to presenting (*pra-yam-*) and accepting (*prati-gr̥h-*) gifts. I wonder if the poet is once again aiming at a wordplay, taking the two epithets in the sense of 'holding [the hands] forward' and 'grabbing back', with an eerie reference to the Sadānuvās' habit of groping for embryos (see my comment on PS 17.14.8a above). Accordingly, I take *prayachantīṃ* not as an independent epithet but as a present participle describing a circumstance that is subordinate to *pratigrahām*; in particular I take this present participle as having concessive meaning. The sense of the two epithets must be the following: "even though she is holding [her hands] forward [as if to present a gift] (*prayachantī*), she is one who takes [i.e. grabs the embryo] (*pratigrahā*)."

17.15.6 (K 17.15.5)   d: ~ PS 17.15.3d

a	yāni sāyaṃ yathāsthāmād	8#	[– ᴜ – – | ᴜ – – ×]
b	rātrīm yakṣāṇi prerate |	8	[– – – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
c	agniṣ *ṭā sarvā sāhantyo	8#	[– – – – | – – – ×]
d	viśvād rakṣāṃsi sedhatu ||	8	[– – – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]

[Those] Yakṣás who emerge, each from their respective hideouts in the evening [and] at night—let

---

[136]It should also be noted that the attested intensive stem of *kāś-* has the form *cākaś-*: *cākaśīti, acākaśām, cākaśat-* (RV+), *cākaśyáte* (Br+).

[137]On the word *vā́ra-* and its variant spellings, see my comment on PS 17.12.8 above.

the overpowering Agni repel them all, the *rákṣas* demons, from every place!

sāyaṃ] sāyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** śāẏaṃ **JM₃** śāṃ **K**   • rātrīṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** rātriṃ **Ji₄** rātrī **K**   • prerate |] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** prerat[x]e | **V71** prerato(/te | ?) **Ji₄**   • agniṣ *ṭā] agniṣṭā **[Mā] V71** agniṣṭvā **K Ja Ma V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ JM₃**   • sāhantyo] **[O]** santyo **K**   • sedhatu] **[O]** sīdhatu **K**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **V122** Z 5 Z **K**

PS 17.15.3cd
tā indro hantu vṛtrahā
yo devo viśvād rakṣāṃsi sedhati ‖

    a. The compound *yathāsthāmá-* only occurs in the one-stanza hymn ŚS 7.67 (~ PS 3.13.6): *púnar maitv indriyáṃ púnar ātmā́ dráviṇaṃ bráhmaṇaṃ ca | púnar agnáyo dhíṣṇyā yathāsthāmā́ kalpayantām ihaívá ‖*, "Again let sense (*indriyá*) come to me, again soul, property, and *bráhmaṇa* (sacred knowledge); let the fires of the sacred hearth again officiate just here in their respective stations" (Whitney). PW glosses it by simply referring to the preceding lemmata, *yathāsthāná*, 'the right or proper place' (and related adverbial forms in -*am*, 'according to place'). This interpretation is followed by Whitney in his comment *ad loc.*, and by AiGr II.2 §92 p. 206. On compounds of this kind, see AiGr II.1 §122d p. 325.
    b. The accusative of the word *rā́trī/i-* (on the alternation between the two stems, see AiGr III §95 p. 185 and Kulikov 2010: 174 fn. 1) is regularly used adverbially in the sense 'at night' or 'on [a particular] night', e.g. in ŚS 1.16.1, *yé 'māvāsyā̀ṃ rā́trim udásthur vrājám attríṇaḥ | agnís turī́yo yātuhā́ só asmábhyam ádhi bravat ‖*, "What devourers, on the night of the new moon, have arisen troopwise (?)—the fourth Agni is the demon-slayer; he shall bless us" (Whitney); ŚS 16.7.9, *yád adóado abhyágachaṃ yád dóṣā́ yát pū́rvāṃ rā́trim ‖*, "What I went at on such-and-such an occasion, what at evening, what in early night" (Whitney).
    c. The adjective *sāhantyá-* is attested as an epithet of Soma, who is asked to subdue the Asuras in ŚS 6.7.2a (~ PS 19.3.11a); as epithet of Agni Vaiśvānara, as bestower of *rāṣṭram* at PS 6.9.3 (For a king); and of Agni in TS 2.2.3.4, with an offering to acquire strength. The variant *sahantyá* also exists: in both RV 1.27.8 and RV 8.11.2, it is an epithet of Agni, and so it is in TS 1.5.10.2. In TS 3.1.10.3 it is instead an epithet of Viṣṇu.
    Bhattacharya writes *agniṣ ṭā* with no emendation sign; however, the akṣara *ṣṭā* is found only in **Mā** (as implied from the omission of its reading from Bhattacharya's apparatus) and in **V71**, while the third **O^B** ms., **JM₃**, shows, as is often the case, contamination from **O^A**. As all the other mss. of the usually more reliable **O^A** sub-branch, as well as **K**, have *ṣṭvā*, I wonder how likely it is that the PS archetype **G** (or even the Oriya archetype **B**) actually read *ṣṭā*. It would be easier to explain **Mā** and **V71**'s reading, *ṣṭā*, as an error caused by the omission of the subscript element -*v*-, or perhaps as a deliberate restoration of the correct reading. Whatever our interpretation of the **O^B** data, the alternative scenario (i.e. assuming that the same mistake, *ṣṭā > ṣṭvā*, occurred in both **K** and **O^A**) seems unlikely. Therefore, I think that we need to assume that the written archetype **G** contained a reading that was already corrupted, *ṣṭvā*. Moreover, while we certainly adopt the correct reading, *ṭā*, we do so not on the basis of **Mā** and **V71** (whose reading may be correct by chance), but only after grammatical and paleographic considerations. For this reason, we need to mark *ṭā* with an asterisk as a conjecture. As for the error *agniṣṭā > agniṣṭvā* (pre-dating the written archetype), it might be due to perseveration during the period of oral transmission: the PS contains the phrase *agniṣ ṭvā* six times (2.26.1c, 18.12.7c, 18.13.1d, 19.30.1c, 19.35.11a, 20.64.10a), in every case at the beginning of a hemistich (after a daṇḍa or at the beginning of a stanza).

17.15.7 (K 17.15.6)   e: ~ PS 17.12.4f, 14.2e, 14.3e, 14.6e, 14.8e.

a	yā r̥kṣīkāḥ kalīlāndā	8#	[– – – – │ ᴜ – – ×]
b	ₐpsu jātāḥ pulīkayāḥ │	8	[ᴜ ᴜ – – │ ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
c	gopā āsām eko veda	8#	[– – – – │ – – – ×]
d	yato jātāḥ sadān_uvās	8	[ᴜ – – – │ ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
e	tā ito nāśayāmasi ‖	8	[– ᴜ – – │ ᴜ – ᴜ ×]

Those [demonesses] who are R̥kṣīkās, Kalīlāndās, Pulīkayās born in the waters, their cowherd alone knows where the Sadāṇuvās are born—them we make disappear from here!

r̥kṣīkāḥ] rukṣīkāḥ **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ruyākāḥ **Pa_c**[138] rakṣīkaḥ̱ **K**   • kalīlāndā apsu] kalīlā(nvā→*subs*.)ṇḍā 'psu **V122** kalīlāndāpsu **[Ja] Pa_c V71 JM₃** kalīlāndhāpsu **Mā** kaḷīlāndāpsu **Ma** kalīṇḍayāṣṭu **Ji₄**[139] kalilāntāpsu **K**   • pulīkayāḥ] pulīkayāḥ **[Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71** puḷīkāyāḥ **Ma** pulīkayā **JM₃** purīkayā **K**   • │] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c ‖ V71 JM₃ (Mā?) Ji₄** • gopā āsām] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** topā āsām **Ji₄** gopā āsyām **Pa_c** gopāsām **K**   • eko] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c V71 JM₃** ekā **Mā**   • yato] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** yatoṃ **Ji₄** yato **Pa_c**   • jātāḥ sadānvāstā ito] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] JM₃** [jātā](//)jātāḥ sadānvāstā ito **Pa_c** jātāḥ sadānvā ⌐ stā ito **V122 V71** jātaḥ sadānvāḥ ⌐ ‖ stā ito **Ji₄** jātas sadānvā │ stā yito **K**   • nāśayāmasi] **K** nāśayāmasi **[O]**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 │ JM₃** Z 6 Z **K**

Bhattcharya writes *kalīlāndā(a)psu* in pāda **ab**.

   a. The *r̥kṣī́kā-* is an evil female being—the word is possibly connected with *r̥kṣá-*, 'bear' (f. *r̥kṣī́-*), with the suffix *-ka* (see the introduction to this chapter)—and it is generally found in lists among various other evil beings associated with the wilderness: e.g., in ŚS 12.1.49 (~ PS 17.5.7) (to the Earth), *yé ta āraṇyā́ḥ paśávo mr̥gā́ váne hitā́ḥ siṃhā́ vyāghrā́ḥ puruṣā́daś cáranti │ uláṃ vŕ̥kaṃ pr̥thivi duchúnām itá r̥kṣī́kāṃ rákṣo ápa bādhayāsmát ‖*, "Those sylvan animals of yours, those wild beasts found in the woods, the lions, the tigers, who go about eating men; O wide one, drive away from here, from us, the ulá, the wolf, misfortune, rhe *r̥kṣī́kā*, the *rákṣas* demon!" (my transl.). Cf. also ŚB 13.2.4.2, […] *nárkṣīkāḥ puruṣavyāghrā́ḥ parimoṣíṇa āvyādhínyastáskarā áraṇyeṣvā́jāyeran* […], "no ogres, man-tigers, thieves, murderers, and robbers would come to be in the forest" (Eggeling); similarly also ŚB 13.2.4.4. In VS 30.8, belonging to a portion on the Puruṣamedha in which various types of people are sacrificed to various deities, a descendant of the Niṣādas, the aboriginal tribes, is offered to the R̥kṣīkās.[140] See also ŚS 18.2.31b ~ PS 18.66.4b; PS 20.40.10a.

   The word *pulīkayā-* is attested with various spellings, and seemingly indicates some kind of aquatic being. With the spelling *purīkáyā-*, it is found in ŚS 11.2.25 (~ PS 16.106.5, which reads *pulīkayā*) (belonging to a hymn to Rudra, Bhava, and Śarva), in which it is associated with the waters and other aquatic beings: *śiṃśumā́rā ajagarā́ḥ purīkáyā* (PS: *pulīkayā*) *jaṣā́ mátsyā rajasā́ yébhyo ásyasi │ ná te dūráṃ ná pariṣṭhā́sti te bhava sadyáḥ sárvān pári paśyasi bhū́miṃ pū́rvasmād dhaṃsy úttarasmin samudré ‖*, "The dolphins (*śiśumā́ra*), boas (*ajagará*), *purīkáyas*, *jaṣás*, fishes, *rajasás*, at which thou hurlest: there is no distance for thee nor hindrance for thee, O Bhava; at once thou lookest over the whole earth, from the eastern thou smitest in the northern ocean". With the spelling *kulīkáyā-*, we find it in TS 5.5.13.1, belonging to a section on the horse sacrifice in which all kinds of beings are listed as appropriate sacrificial victims for various deities (e.g. a boar for

---

138Note that *ruyākāḥ* in **Pa_c** is spelled with the akṣara *yā* [dʒaː], not with intervocalic *ẏā* [jaː]. This is most likely a scribal error for *kṣī*.

139Note that *kalīṇḍayāṣṭu* in **Ji₄** is spelled with the akṣara *yā* [dʒaː], not with intervocalic *ẏā* [jaː].

140VS30.8 […], *r̥kṣī́kābhyo náiṣādaṃ puruṣavyāghrā́ya durmádaṃ gandharvāpsaróbhyo vrā́tyam* […], "for R̥kṣīkās a Niṣāda's son, for the Man-tiger a madman, for Gandharva and Apsarases a Vrātya […]" (Griffith).

Indra, a black antelope for Varuṇa, a deer for Yama, etc.); once again it is associated with the waters: *apā́ṃ náptre jaṣás | nākró mákaraḥ kulikáyas té 'kūpārasya*, "To the offspring of waters a fish; the crocodile, the dolphin, the Kulīkaya are for the ocean" (Keith). Mayrhofer (KEWA I p. 240 and EWAia I p. 375) also mentions the variants *kulīpáya-* and *pulīraya-*. Cf. also *kulī́kā-/pulī́kā-*, 'a kind of bird' (KEWA ibid.). The preference for the consonant *l* over the *r* in our stanza might be an instance of female speech.

The word *kalīlānda-* is a hapax. The etymology is unclear.

cd. The *gopā-*, 'cowherd' mentioned in this pāda may be the Caṇḍa mentioned in the next line (PS 17.15.8d ~ ŚS 2.14.1c), in which the Sadānuvās are called *caṇḍasya naptyaḥ*, 'granddaughters of Caṇḍa', or the Magundi of stanza ŚS 2.14.2, in which they are called 'daughters of Magundi' (*magundyā duhitaraḥ*). There exist other male figures who seem to have the role of protector of a group of demonesses: for instance, Uluṅgula (=*uru(ṃ)gula*, 'having a broad glans', according to Karl Praust; see Lᴇʟʟɪ 2015: 194), mentioned in PS 15.18.6, and into whose ranch (*gṛha-*) the *uluṅgulukā* Apsarases (PS 15.18.10) are invited.

17.15.8   **de**: ~ ŚS 2.14.1cd; **d**: ~ PS 17.12.2d, 12.8d, 12.9e, 12.10e, 13.4d, 13.5d, 13.7d, 14.7d, 15.5d, 15.9d, 15.10d

a	guruchāyām ūrdhār$_i$yaṃ	8#	[ᴗ – – – | – – ᴗ ×]
b	śiśumākāṃ pratiśrukām |	8	[ᴗ ᴗ – – | ᴗ – ᴗ ×]
c	atiduhnāṃ vicalantīṃ vitūlumām |	12	[ᴗ ᴗ – – | ᴗ ᴗ – | – ᴗ – ᴗ ×]
d	sarvāś caṇḍasya napt$_i$yo	8	[– – – – | ᴗ – ᴗ ×]
e	nāśayāmaḥ sadān$_u$vāḥ ||	8	[– ᴗ – – | ᴗ – ᴗ ×]

The [demoness] casting a large shadow, the Ūrdhārī (?), she who makes children scream, the one who responds [to the scream of a child], the Atiduhnā (?), she who wanders around, the Vitūlumā—we make all the granddaughters of Caṇḍa, the Sadānuvās, disappear!

guruchāyām ūrdhāryaṃ] guruchāyāmūrddhāryaṃ **[O]** guruśchāyāmūladāyaṃ **K**   • śiśumākāṃ] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** śisumākāṃ **V71**   • pratiśrukām] **[O]** pratiśrukā **K**   • \|] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 \|\| Ji₄** *om.* (*space*) **JM₃** *om.* **K**   • atiduhnāṃ] **[Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** atiduhnām, **Ma** atiduhmā **K**   • vicalantīṃ] **[Ja] V122 [Mā] JM₃** vicalantīm, **Ma** vicaḷanti **Ji₄** vicalantīm **Pa꜀** vicalantiṃ **V71** vyatarantīṃ **K**   • vitūlumām \|] vitūlumāṃ \| **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ JM₃** vitūlumāṃ $^|$ **Ji₄** vitulumāṃ \| **Mā V71 V122** vyatulimām, \| **K**   • caṇḍasya] **[O]** caṇḍasa **K** • naptyo] **K [Ma] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** naptryo **Ja**   • nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ] nāśaẏāmaḥ sadānvāḥ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** nāśa(*s.s.*→)ẏāmaḥ sadānvāḥ **V71** nāśayāmas sadānvā **K**   • \|\|] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] \|\|^3 V71 JM₃ V122 Ji₄** Z 8 Z **K**

ŚS 2.14.1
niḥsālā́ṃ dhṛṣṇúṃ dhiṣáṇam ekavādyā́m jighatsvàm |
sárvāś cáṇḍasya naptyò nāśáyāmah sadā́nvāḥ ||

Bhattacharya writes +*gurucchāyāmūrddhāryam* in pāda **a**, *atiduhnām* in pāda **c**.

The parallel at ŚS 2.41.1 (belonging to a hymn against Sadānuvās), quoted above, is translated by Whitney as follows: "The expeller, the bold, the container, the one-toned, the voracious—all the daughters (*naptī́*) of the wrathful one, the *sadā́nvās*, we make to disappear."

abc. All the epithets in these pādas are hapax legomena.

The first, *guruchāyā-* seems easily analyzable as formed from *gurú-*, 'heavy' (in this case

perhaps 'large'?) and *chāyā́-*, 'shadow, shade'.

The second epithet might read *ūrdhāryaṃ-*[141] or *mūrdhāryaṃ-*,[142] depending on whether we assume loss of anusvāra after *guruchāyā°*. Neither form is understandable as such, but I cannot offer any emendation with confidence.[143] At any rate it must be the accusative of a *vṛkī-*inflected *ī-* stem.

The third epithet, *śiśumākā-*, most likely contains the word *śíśu-*, m., 'child, infant'. This is consistent with the Sadānuvās' being demonesses who attack pregnant women and their children. However, the formation is unclear: it could be parsed as *śiśu-māka-* or *śiśum-āka-*. In either case, the second member is not an attested word. We might interpret the former as based on the root ¹*mā-* (pres. *mímāti*), 'to bellow, bleat, roar, scream' (cf. *ajámāyu-*, 'bleating like a goat', in 17.15.5b above) with the typical *ka-*suffix (see my introduction to this anuvāka). Thus, perhaps, 'the little child-screamer', i.e. 'she who screams like a child', 'she who screams at children' or 'she who makes children scream'.[144]

That the meaning of *śiśumāka* might have to do with sound is also suggested by the neigbouring epithet *pratiśrukā-* (indeed, as we have seen, these epithets come in pairs or groups dedicated to a specific theme), which can be interpreted as a *ka-*suffixed formation based on the lexeme *prati-śru-*, 'to listen (act.)/ be audible (mid.)'.[145] The active is specifically used in the sense of 'to pay heed to, take notice of, respond to (a call or request)', as can be seen from RV 1.25.20, in which the poet tells Varuṇa, *sá yā́mani práti śrudhi*, "listen in response to my entreaty" (J-B); and in ŚS 9.6.50 (~ PS 16.116.2), in which a servant listens and responds (*pratiśṛṇoti pratyā́śrāvayati*) to the call (*ā́-śravay-* in ŚS 9.6.49) of the house master (or in which the Agnhīdh is summoned by the Adhvaryu; see Whitney *ad loc.*). The *pratiśrukā-* might then be a demoness 'who responds [to the noise/cry/scream of a baby]', i.e. who is attracted to her prey, the children, by their noise.[146]

141Gemination of dentals in clusters is typical of the Odia mss.'s spelling; therefore we can restore *rdh* from *rddh*.

142The reading of **K**'s *m)ūladāyaṃ* is actually intelligible: *mūla-dāya-*, 'giving roots'. However, such a compound is unattested, and the meaning does not seem suitable in our line. Moreover, it would require emendation to **mūladāyāṃ* to fit in the syntax of the stanza, and the pāda would still be one syllable too short.

143The former might be emended to **ūrdhvaryaṃ*, from a feminine stem, *ūrdhvarī-*, 'the upright one' (?) based on *ūrdhvá-*, 'upright, erect, high, above' (note however that no stem *ūrdhvara-/ī-* is attested), or tentatively to *ūrdhvārī-*, the feminine of a stem, *ūrdhvāra-*, formed by *ūrdhvá-* and *ā́rā-*, 'awl, piercing tool'. This rare word occurs only in the Pūṣan hymn, RV 6.53: Pūṣan holds it to pierce the hearts of the Paṇís (st. 5 and 6) or to impel the *bráhman* (the *ā́rā-* is called *brahmacódanī-*); it might be the same as the goad (*áṣṭrā-*) that Pūṣan holds in st. 9 (cf. GELDNER 1951: 157). GELDNER (ibid.) reports that Sāyaṇa describes the *ā́rā* as a rod with a metal point, and identifies it with the *pratodá*. Now the Sadānuvās are called *pratodinī-*, 'carrying a goad', in 17.13.5c above (see my comment *ad loc.*). It would thus seem plausible here to have an epithet *ūrdhvāra-*, 'the one with an upright awl', 'holding an awl upright'. The alternative, *mūrdhāryaṃ*, might be similarly interpreted as formed from *mūrdhán* (*mūrdha-* in composition), 'head', and *ā́rā*; the resulting compound would perhaps best interpreted as an inverted Bahuvrīhi meaning 'whose head is an awl' or, with locative relation, 'having a (severed) head on her awl' (cf. the type *dhanur-hasta-*, 'having a bow in one's hands'). However, it is likely that *ára-* would remain *-ārā* in a feminine compound, and not change to *-ārī* on the model of a masculine compound in *-āra* (AiGr II.1 §37a p. 89; WG p. 514f.). Thus, this solution remains tentative. I am inclined to favour a solution involving the word *ūrdhvá-*, as it would make sense to explain the epithet *guruchāyā*, 'casting a large shadow', if we imagine a demoness who stands upright, high above, or holding an awl upright, or something along these lines.

144This epithet is also strongly reminiscent of the word *śiśumāra-*, 'the Gangetic porpoise, dolphin, alligator' (depending on the interpretation), which was early on given the folk etymology of 'child (*śiśu*) killer (*māra*)'. This would be a good epithet for a Sadānuvā, and one wonders whether the poet might have intended to make a pun. However, in the AV (ŚS 11.2.25 ~ PS 16.106.5, quoted in full in my comment on PS 17.15.7b above), this word still preserves the original spelling *śiṃśumāra* (as found in RV1.116.18.d). Cf. also Pāli *suṃsumāra*.

145For the middle meaning, cf. RV 1.169.7ab, in which the rumbling sound of the approaching Maruts "is heard" (*práti ... śṛṇve*): *práti ghorā́ṇām étānām ayā́sām marútāṃ śṛṇva āyatā́m upabdíḥ* |, "The trampling of the antelopes of the fearsome, irrepressible Maruts is heard opposite as they come here" (J-B).

146Note that the hail (*hrādúni*) is qualified as "echoed (*pratiśruta-*) on a mountain" in PS 15.23.5c, 6c (i.e. the reciter, by stating that the hail is echoed on a mountain, makes the hail stay away from his own barley crop).

The reading of first word in pāda **c** is uncertain: the **O** mss. have *atiduhnām*, while **K** has *atiduhmā*. We can identify the preverb *áti*, 'beyond, excessively', a feminine accusative ending *-ām*, and possibly the root *duh-*, 'to give milk, to milk', but neither *duhnā-*, nor *duhmā-* are known formations. In a comment, Bhattacharya proposes **atidurghnām*, which I interpret as 'very difficult to slay'. This is a creative solution, but I find no instance of *áti* and *dur* used in the same compound in Early Vedic, nor any attestations of a stem *durghna-*, which makes this solution less attractive.[147] Nevertheless, this word must be an acc. f. epithet.

The word *vicalantīm* is the accusative feminine of the pres. ptc. of *vi-cal^i-*. The variation between *car^i-* and *cal^i-* is old: the RV (which in general prefers *r*-variants) always has *r*, but also the form *calācalá-* (RV 1.164.48d); the AV has numerous occurrences of both variants. However, a pattern can be discerned, in that the variant *car^i-* occurs across the entire collection, whereas the variant *cal^i-* is restricted to a few texts: in particular, PS 5.34, where we find the caus. imperatives *abhi cālaya* (st. 7) and *prati cālaya* (st. 8), is a charm against female rivals, and contains numerous features of female speech. Lubotsky (2002a: 156) considers the preference for *l* over *r* as one of these features. Thus it is very much possible that our *vicalantī-* is a variant of *vicarantī-* in female speech.

At any rate, hardly any semantic difference is noticeable between *vi-car^i-* and *vi-cal^i-* in the AV, where they both mean 'to wander, roam'. Interestingly, *vi-car^i-* only occurs twice (in ŚS 4.21.4 and 20.127.11), whereas *vi-cal^i-* is found more frequently: in fact, the numerous occurrences of *vi-cal^i-* account for almost all of the occurrences of the root *cal^i-* in the AV. Moreover, the vast majority of the the occurrences of *vi-cal^i-* are found in the Vrātyakāṇḍa (ŚS 15, PS 18.27–43), where the lexeme (or the variant *anu-vi-cal^i-*) is used to describe the Vrātya's wandering.[148] Once again, this must be a stylistic preference of this particular text, a colloquialism that can perhaps be explained by the specific social composition of the audience of the Vrātyakāṇḍa, namely the younger generation undergoing initiation in the wilderness or other categories of people living outside society. In conclusion, the variant *vi-cal^i-* is not a separate lexeme from *vi-car^i-*, nor that it is the preferred AV form, but rather a specific sociolectal form preferred in specific texts directed to specific audiences. Thus, our *vicalantīm* is best explained as female speech, as suggested above.

The word *vitūlumā-* might perhaps be related to *vitūla-*, "a demonic dog" according to Griffiths (2009: 180), commenting on PS 6.14.9c. The whole stanza reads: *vitūlaṃ bhasvam ākhidaṃ vanakrośaṃ ca roruham | āmādaṃ prayutaiṣaṇaṃ paryundānaṃ paridravaṃ vṛkasya *nyañcaṃ gaṅgaṇaṃ tān ito nāśayāmasi ||*, "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 we do cause to vanish from here" (Griffiths).

d. On the phrase *caṇḍasya naptyaḥ*, see my comment on *gopā* in the previous stanza. The word *caṇḍa-* is attested in Epic Sanskrit with the meaning 'wrathful', in Pāli 'fierce', etc. Its etymology is controversial; see EWAia I p. 525.

Could the *pratiśrukā* demoness then be 'one who echoes', or 'one who echoes [the cry of a baby]'?

147This epithet might make sense if read together with the following, *vicalantīm*, as we could imagine that a demoness who constantly "moves here and there" would be more difficult to hit. However, the meaning of *vi-cal^i-* seems to be rather 'to wander, roam'.

148The AV also features the compounds *ávicācala-* in ŚS 10.8.4 (~ PS 16.101.7) and *ávicācalant-* in ŚS 6.87.1–2 (~ PS 19.6.5–6; ~ RV 10.173.1–2 have *ávicācali-*).

17.15.9   **d**: ~ PS 17.12.2d, 12.8d, 12.9e, 12.10e, 13.4d, 13.5d, 13.7d, 14.7d, 15.5d, 15.8d, 15.10d ~ ŚS 2.14.1d

a	āvadantīṃ nāmahūkām	8#	[– ᴜ – – | – ᴜ – ×]
b	taṃstanīkāṃ vr̥ṅktapadīm |	8#	[– ᴜ – – | – ᴜ ᴜ ×]
c	⁺udradantīm ⁺anāsikām	8	[– ᴜ – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
d	nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ ||	8	[– ᴜ – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]

The [demoness] who shouts, the one who calls names, the Taṃstanīkā (?), the one with twisted feet, the otter-toothed one, the noseless (mouthless?) one—we make the Sadānuvās disappear.

āvadantīṃ] V122 JM₃ āvadantiṃ **Mā** V71 āvadantīn **Ma Ja Ji₄** āva[x]dantīn **Pa꜀** yāvantīn **K**   • nāmahūkām] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ **Pa꜀** nāmahukāṃ **K Mā** V71 JM₃   • taṃstanīkāṃ] **[Ja]** V122 **Ji₄ [Mā]** V71 JM₃ (*illegible*) **Ma** *om.* (*space*) **Pa꜀**[149] tvaṃstanīkāṃ **K**   • vr̥ṅktapadīm]] vr̥ṃktapadīm \| **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ **[Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ (*illegible*) **Ma** vr̥[.]padīṃ \|\| **Ji₄** (*space*)ktapadīm \| **Pa꜀** vr̥m̐ndhapatīm\ \| **K**   • ⁺udradantīm] udrayantīm **Ma Ja** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ JM₃ udrayantim **Mā** V71 ūpridantīm **K**   • ⁺anāsikāṃ] anāsitāṃ **O** anāmikān **K**   • nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ] nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ **[O]** nāśayānnas sadānvā **K**   • \|\|] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 \| JM₃ Z 9 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes ⁺*āvadantīṃ* in pāda **a**. and *vr̥ṃktapadīm* in pāda **b**.

a. The lexeme *ā-vad-* is well attested in the AV, but no other pres. ptc. is found.

The epithet *nāmahūka-* is a hapax. It must be a *ka*-suffixed formation based on the root *havⁱ-*, 'to call'. The phrase *nā́ma havⁱ-*, 'to call by name', is found in RV 7.56.10a (*priyā́ vo nā́ma huve*, "I call the dear names of you [Maruts]"); in the refrain of ŚS 17.1.1–4 ~ PS 18.54.1-4 (*ī́dyaṃ nā́ma hva* (PS: ⁺*hvaya*) *índram ā́yuṣmān bhūyāsam* \|\|, "I call praiseworthy Indra by name; my I have a long lifespan"); and ŚS 7.20.4a ~ PS 20.5.5a (*yát te nā́ma suhávaṃ ... 'numate*, "Your well-invoked name, O Anumati [...]"). Knowing someone's (secret) name may allow a magician to claim control over that person. We may guess that our demoness's threat derives from the fact that she knows people's names. However, all the above quotations are invocations to a deity. Nowhere do we find evidence of the same implications for magical practices as we often see in the case of the phrase *nā́ma grabhⁱ-* (see GRIFFITHS 2009: 95 on PS 6.7.7d, with references), or in the case of formulas like PS 17.24.1a, *vidma te svapna janitraṃ*.

b. The compound *vr̥ṅkta-pad-* is a hapax. It resembles the epithet *visr̥kpadī*, 'stretching out [her] feet, duck-footed (?)', in 17.13.2b above. The first member appears to be a verbal adjective from *vr̥j-*, 'to twist', normally spelled *vr̥ktá-*, but here remodelled on the present stem (*vr̥ṅkte*). I silently restore the velar nasal *ṅ* where the mss. have *ṃ* or *m̐*.

The previous observation might lead us to consider whether the word *taṃstanīkāṃ* (in **O**; *tvaṃstanīkāṃ* in **K**), most certainly another female epithet, may contain a similar verbal adjective as first member (from *taṃs-*, 'to shake'? Note that no verbal adjective of this root is attested). The second part of the word might be the word *anīka-*, 'face', but accepting this would require emending the length of the vowel at the juncture of the two members (*taṃstānīkāṃ?). I find no textual arguments in support of this emendation. Therefore, this epithet remains obscure to me.

c. The emendations to ⁺*udradantīm* and ⁺*anāsikāṃ* were proposed by Bhattacharya. With the former epithet, compare *phāladatī*, 'ploughshare-toothed', in 17.12.3a above. The latter may be interpreted as *a-nāsika-* or *an-ās-ika-* (with derogatory suffix -*ika-*). This ambiguity resembles the one that sparkled a controversy about the phrase *anā́so dásyūn* (RV 5.29.10), interpreted early on as 'the noseless (*a-nā́s-*) Dasyus' (i.e. flat-nosed, supposedly a derogatory feature of non-Aryan aboriginals), and later reinterpreted as 'the mouthless (*an-ā́s-*) Dasyus' (i.e. unable to speak Vedic, babblers; an etymology inspired by that of the word "barbarian") (see EWAia I p. 182).

---

[149]Interestingly, **Ma** and **Pa꜀** have a similar lacuna here.

17.15.10   **d**: ~ PS 17.12.2d, 12.8d, 12.9e, 12.10e, 13.4d, 13.5d, 13.7d, 14.7d, 15.5d, 15.8d,
15.9d, ~ ŚS 2.14.1d

a	vāvadākām *alpabhāṣām	8#	[– ᴜ – – | – ᴜ – ×]
b	†vijavrāṃ labruvaṃ lavuṃ† |	8	[ᴜ – – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
c	arāyīṃ vācamejayām	8	[ᴜ – – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
d	nāśayāmaḥ sadānᵤvāḥ ||	8	[– ᴜ – – | ᴜ – ᴜ ×]

The one who repeatedly utters sounds, the taciturn one, †…†, the Arāyī́ demoness who makes [the women's] voice tremble [in fear]—we make the Sadānuvās disappear!

vāvadākām] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71 JM₃** vāvadakām **Mā**   • *alpabhāṣām] albhaṣāsām **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** albh[.]aṣāsām **V71** albhaṣā[x]sām **V122** albhagāsām (=Bʜᴀᴛᴛ., R-V *vs.* albhagāsām Bᴀʀʀᴇᴛ) **K**   • †vijavrāṃ†] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** vijavāṃ **Pa꜀**   • †lavruvaṃ†] **[Ma] V122 Pa꜀ V71 JM₃** lavr̥vaṃ **Ja Ji₄** lavrīvaṃ **Nā** lavr̥r̥vaṃ **Mā** cavūṃ **K**   • †lavuṃ† \|] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** lavuṃ \|\| **Ji₄** bavrūm\ \| **K**   • arāyīṃ] arāyīṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** arāyāṃ **Pa꜀** rāyīṃ **K**   • vācamejayām] vācamejaẏām **[O]** vātamejayān **K**   • nāśayāmaḥ sadānvāḥ] nāśaẏāmaḥ sadānvāḥ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** nāśayāmaḥsadānvāḥ **V71** nāśayāmas sadānvā **K**   • \|\|] \|\| **Ma Ja [Mā]** \|\| 15 \|\| ru 10 \|\| **V71 JM₃** \|\| ru \|\| 15 \|\| **V122** \|\| 15 \|\| **Ji₄** \|\| 15 \|\| ru 10 \|\| **Pa꜀** \| Z 10 Z phaśca 4 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *albhaṣāsāṃ* in pāda **a**, *vijavrāṃ labruvaṃ lavuṃ* in pāda **b**.

abc. The most transparent of the epithets contained in these pādas is *vācamejaya-* in pāda **c**. This must be formed from a fossilised accusative *vā́cam* and the form *ejaya-*, 'causing to tremble'; compare the name of the famous Mahābharata king Janamejaya, 'who makes people tremble'. Thus our demoness is called 'she who makes [people's] voice tremble [in fear]'. In our case, the people whose voice tremble are most likely women.

It is possible that the other epithets also have to do with sound. The first one, *vāvadāka-*, is based on the intensive stem of the root *vad-* ('to utter a sound, make a noise'). This root is especially used for the noises of animals (or the sound of drums, the crackling of fire, etc.) in opposition to human speech (*vac-*). According to Sᴄʜᴀᴇꜰᴇʀ (1994: 178), the intensive of *vad-* does not emphasise an increase in volume, but rather has a repetitive-iterative function.

The reading of the second word of pāda **a** is corrupted. If the theme of the stanza is sound, and the neighbouring epithet conveys the idea of repeatedly making sounds, a solution for this second epithet could be emending to **alpabhāṣām*. The stem *alpabhāṣa-* is not attested, but we do find *alpa-bhāṣin-*, 'taciturn' in CarS 1.30.79d.

The second pāda remains obscure to me.[150] I report the text as Bhattacharya has it. Note that the cadence appears to be regular.

The word *arāyī́-* generally follows the *vr̥kī́-*inflection (see my comment on PS 17.13.4c above). Here, however, the mss. unanimously preserve a *devī́-*inflected acc. sg. f..

---

[150]Bhattacharya seems to identify three words, *vijavrām* (an acc. f. of an *ā-*stem?), *labruvaṃ* (an acc. of a f. stem *labru-*? Perhaps to be connected to *rabh-* or *grabh-*? Perhaps, since the theme of the stanza seems to be sound, we might wish to investigate a connection of this word with the root with *brū-* 'to tell') and *lavuṃ* (an acc. of a f. stem *lavu-*?).

The text of kāṇḍa 17, anuvāka 3 comes to an end here. The mss. give the following colophons:

iti saptādaśakaṇḍe tṛtīyo nuvākasamāptaḥ Z (*space*) Z **K**

a 3 || **Ma Ja Pa**ᶜ
ityekānṛcakāṇḍe tṛtīyo'nuvākaḥ || **V122**
ityekanṛcakāṇḍe tṛtīyonuvākaḥ || 3 || ### || **Ji₄**

ityekānṛcakāṇḍe tṛtiẏ(?)o'nuvākaḥ || **Mā**
ityekānucakāṇḍe tṛtiẏo'nuvākaḥ || **V71**
ityekanṛcakāṇḍe tṛtīẏānuvākaḥ || # || # || **JM₃**