The Paippalādasaṃhitā of the Atharvaveda : a new critical edition of the three 'new' Anuvākas of Kāṇḍa 17 with English translation and commentary
Selva, U.

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 II

Anuvāka 5

Curses and nightmares

Introduction

This fifth anuvāka contains a variety of material that is heterogeneous in both form and content. The first two kāṇḍikās (21, 22) of the six that constitute the anuvāka consist of *yajus*-style prose, and contain curses against enemies. The remaining four (23, 24, 25, 26) share an underlying theme: *duṣvápnyam*, poor sleep, and sleep haunted by nightmares; kāṇḍikās 24 and 26 consist of *yajus*-style prose, while 23 and 25 mix prose with verses, some of which are also quotations from the RV.

The AV contains numerous texts about poor sleep (*duṣvápnyam*). These are either exorcisms that are meant to repel it, or curses by which to inflict poor sleep on an enemy. Often the two aims are combined: in order to free someone from poor sleep, the affliction is transferred to an enemy. Cf. ŚS 6.46 (~ PS 19.46.10–12); ŚS 16.5, 6, 7 (~ PS 18.49, 50, 51); and ŚS 19.56 (~ PS 3.8), 57 (~ PS 3.30). We also find various scattered stanzas, sometimes present in only one of the two recensions, e.g. PS 7.7.9a, ŚS 6.121.1, ŚS 7.83.4, ŚS 10.5.24 (~ PS 16.130.2), ŚS 16.6.2 (~ PS 18.50.1b), ŚS 13.1.58 or the one-stanza hymn ŚS 7.100.1 (~ PS 20.36.4). Many of these texts present common features, as will be illustrated in my commentary below.

One R̥gvedic hymn, RV 10.164, authored by Pracetas Āṅgirasa, is labelled *duḥsvapnaghnam*, 'slaying poor sleep', by the Anukramaṇī, but it differs quite significantly from the above-listed AV hymns: its "unifying theme […] is all sorts of mental and verbal action, whether harmless of hostile, whether done consciously (awake) or not (asleep), or even both (the 'waking dream' [*jāgratsvapnáḥ*] of v. 5)" (J-B: 1645). Another interesting hymn connected with sleep is ŚS 4.5 (~ PS 4.6). This is an incantation to induce sleep. The KauśS (4.12[36].1) lists it in a chapter on women's rites, and attributes it the effect of "putting to sleep a woman and her attendants [her mother, father, dog, the *viśpáti*, her relatives, etc.], in order to approach her safely" (WHITNEY 1905: 151). Thematically comparable are also the AV hymns to the night, ŚS 19.47–48 (~ PS 6.20–21, and 49–50 (~ PS 14.8–9), which, however, mostly consist in requests for protection from the dangers of the night.

Synopsis

Kāṇḍikā 21, divided into ten lines, contains curses against enemies, and is fully composed in *yajus*-style prose. This genre has been described by RENOU (1955b: 74-80 §4–9). It comprises prose formulas that are meant to be recited in solemn or domestic rituals, just like the *ādhvaryava yajuses* contained in the YV texts (RENOU 1955b: 74). They share a number of linguistic peculiarities, and make use of a typical set of formulas and rhetorical devices, some of which can also be found in our text.

One of these is the formula *amúm āmuṣyāyaṇám amúṣyāḥ putrám* (also found in other grammatical cases), which identifies the victim of a curse by means of his name (to be supplied in place of the demonstrative *asáu-*, *amúm*, 'that one'), by his lineage on his father's side (*āmuṣyāyaṇá-*, 'descendant of such-and-such (m.)'), and by his lineage on his mother's side (*amúṣyāḥ putrá-*, 'son of such-and-such (f.)'). As such, the formula as it is preserved in the text is just a placeholder for the victim's actual name, patronymic and matronymic, which are meant to be spelled out during the actual recitation of the mantra (see my comment on 17.21.2b below). This

formula is the unifying element of the 22 lines contained in kāṇḍikās 21 and 22, as it is found in all of them.

Another trait typical of the *yajus*-style prose that we find in our text is the use of 1st person sg. performative verbs, such as *ā vṛścāmi*, 'I cut down (a victim before a deity) (i.e. I bring a victim under the wrath of a certain deity)', found in 21.2, 3, 5–10, and throughout 22.1–5. By claiming to perform an action, the reciter wishes to magically bring about its effect. In some cases, such as with the verb *vidhyāmi*, 'I pierce', the use of effigies representing the victim is not to be excluded (see my comment on 17.24.1f.).

Also typical is the presence of 2nd person verbs by which the reciter directly addresses a deity (in the voc.; elsewhere, he might address an enemy, a demon, a patient, etc.): thus, in 21.4, a "swift-bowed and swift-handed" deity is requested to pierce (*pra vidhya*) the vital organs of a victim.

Another typical trait is what RENOU calls '*écholalie*' (1955b: 76), that is the insistent (sometimes obsessive) repetition of words, sentences, or formulas. This can take a variety of forms. A frequent one is the "*ūha*". This term indicates the modifications that a *mantra* can undergo in order to be adapted to new ritual conditions and purposes, but RENOU (1955b: 75) adopts it rather loosely as a technical term to describe a particular form of *écholalie*, namely the phenomenon by which a group of words or an entire sentence or formula is repeated multiple times, with the sole modification of a single word (or a small group of words). RENOU (1955b: 80) considers these *ūha* compositions to be the original source of the AV *yajus*-style prose: this is because the desire to replace one word (e.g., the name of the addressed deity) with other words and yet keep the rest of the formula unchanged (to preserve its magical efficacy, I would add) was an obstacle to maintaining or producing a constant metrical structure. In fact, according to RENOU, the monotonous character of this type of phrase suggests that they did not develop secondarily from a versified form, but that the authors deliberately opted to use prose.

Much of kāṇḍikās 21 and 22 (in particular, 21.2–3, 5–10, and 22.1–5) contains one such *ūha* composition, in which the formula *amum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putram ā vṛścāmi* is preceded in each line by a different deity name in the dative (e.g., in 21.5, we find *pūṣṇe dhātre savitre tvaṣṭre;* in 21.6, *uṣase [']hne rātraye sūryāya*; in 21.7, *vīrudbhya oṣadhībhyo vanaspatibhyo vānaspatyebhyo*; and so forth).

Kāṇḍikā 22, also divided into ten lines, begins with the *ūha* described above (22.1–5). This is followed by three groups of lines (22.6, 7, 8) that comprise an extended variation of the same *ūha* according to the following structure:

a.   *ye X cakrur, ye X jajñuḥ |*
    'Those who have crafted X, those who have generated X'
b.   *tebhyaḥ X-kṛdbhyaḥ X-kārebhyo [']mum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putram ā vṛścāmi |*
    'Before such X-crafters, X-makers, I chop down such-and-such, etc.'
c.   *te X-kṛtaḥ X-kārā amum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putraṃ parā bhāvayantu ||*
    'Let them, the X-crafters, the X-makers, destroy such-and-such, etc.'

Finally, two more curses are found, 22.9 and 22.10, which also contain the *amum* formula, but differ from the previous ones in that they treat the enemy/victim as already dead—a magical verbal device to actually bring about someone's death. Thus, 22.9 describes a woman, with dishevelled hair, devoid of ornaments, and covered in ash, as she mourns the victim, and 22.10 describes carrion-eating birds gathering around the victim's funeral pyre.

Kāṇḍikā 23, divided into seven lines, contains a mix of prose and verse.

23.1–4 form a group of prayers to the Waters: 23.1 is a four-line Anuṣṭubh stanza with no parallels; 23.2 is prose (or perhaps two stray lines of 7 and 8 syllables?); 23.3 is another Anuṣṭubh stanza with numerous parallels in both PS, ŚS, and RV; 23.4 is again prose. Nothing suggests that

that they were conceived as a single composition, nor that the bits of prose are appendices to the verses. The only reason they fit with the rest of our anuvāka is the references to poor sleep in 23.1 (in which the Waters are asked to wash away the impurity produced by poor sleep) and 23.4 (in which the Waters are asked to release one from poor sleep and a sibling's curse).

23.5 is a single-line prose prayer to Indra, Varuṇa, Bṛhaspati, and Savitṛ for splendour (*varcas*), and does not seem connected with the rest of the text.

23.6 is a statement with which to single out an enemy (*asau me bhrātṛvyo 'sau sapatnaḥ*). It seems connected with the following 23.7, in which the same enemy (referred to with the anaphoric *tam*) is the victim of five threats (note the performative verbs: *tam hanmi, ... vidhyāmi, … abhy apa nudāmi*), the second of which is *taṃ ⁺duṣvapnyena vidhyāmi*, 'I pierce him with poor sleep', which may justify the inclusion of this text in our anuvāka.

Kāṇḍikā 24 is fully devoted to addressing poor sleep. It is divided into ten subsections, each being a repetition of the first one with the sole modification (*ūha*) of two elements in the opening formula. The structure is the following:

1) With the opening formula (lines abc), the reciter claims magical control over Sleep (*svapna*, personified) on the grounds that he knows Sleep's genealogy:

a *vidma te svapna janitraṃ*
   'We know, O Sleep, your pedigree'
b X(gen. m.) *putro 'sy* Y(abl. f.) *adhi jāto yamasya karaṇaḥ |*
   'you are son of X(m.), born from Y(f.), Yama's agent'
c. *taṃ tvā svapna tathā vidma |*
   'You, as such, O Sleep, we know in that way'

2) Secondly (lines de+f), the reciter claims good sleep for himself (*yo bhadraḥ svapnaḥ sa mama*) and sends bad sleep to an enemy (*yaḥ pāpas taṃ dviṣate pra hiṇmaḥ | tam asmai gamayāmas*).

3) Thirdly (lines g–o), we find a series of curses that the reciter employs to harm the victim by sending a number of other disgraces to him. Remarkable are the wordplays *abhūti, nirbhūti,* and *parābhūti*, already noted by Renou (1955: 90 fn. 1) as a typical trait of AV *yajus*-style prose, and the performative use of the verbs *vidhyāmaḥ, ā vṛścāmaḥ*, etc.

The following nine paragraphs repeat the whole structure with no variation in parts 2 and 3, modifying only the identity of the father and mother of Sleep in the initial formula. For a list of Sleep's "parents" see my comment on 23.1 below.

Kāṇḍikā 25, divided into eight parts, is again a mix of prose and verse.

25.1 is a two-line prose prayer/curse addressed to heaven and earth, day and night, and the night sky, so that they transfer poor sleep from the reciter to a victim (we find the *amum* formula here again).

25.2 is a quotation of an Anuṣṭubh verse from book 15 (PS 15.4.2, also found in ŚS 19.45.2), which contains a similar curse to transfer poor sleep to a victim.

The following five verses are taken from the RV.

25.3 and 4 are the two opening Gāyatrī verses (3x8) of RV 10.57, a spell "seeking the return of 'mind' to a person or persons in some distress" (J-B: 1468), and also the two closing verses of the first ŚS Rohita hymn (13.1.59–60). In both cases they seem to be secondary additions. They are concerned with ritual correctness and the success of sacrifice, and the reason for their presence in our anuvāka is not entirely clear (see the discussion in my comment on 25.3).

25.5, 6, 7 are also Ṛgvedic stanzas, corresponding to RV 10.37.1, 2b + 3, and 4 respectively. Like the whole of RV 10.37, they are dedicated to the sun, and it seems reasonable to assume that they have been included in our anuvāka because they were used to invoke the power of sunlight to ward off nightmares.

Finally, 25.8 is again a *yajus*-style prose formula, a curse to hurl (*pra hiṇmaḥ*) a number of disgraces (*anirām amīvām anāhutim*, 'want of nourishment, disease, lack of oblation') at an enemy —we find the *amum* formula here again as well. Poor sleep is not mentioned here.

Kāṇḍikā 26, divided into 21 paragraphs, contains one more *ūha* composition. A single formula, again an exorcism/curse to transfer poor sleep to someone else, is repeated 21 times, with the sole modification of the deity addressed and the agreeing verb:

a   X-Y (Dvandva, dual.) *vahatam* / Z(pl.) *vahata* / W(sg.) *vaha duṣvapnyam*
        'O X-Y(dual.)/Z(pl.)/W(sg.) carry poor sleep!'

b   *parā vahatam* / *vahata* / *vaha duṣvapnyam* |
        'Carry poor sleep away [from here]'

c   *amuṣmā āmuṣyāṇāyāmuṣyāḥ putrāya* ||
        'to such-and-such etc.'

Note that after an initial series of dual deities (26.1–6), the last pair of which is given the epithet *deva-* (*devāśvinā*), all the other lines (26.7–21) open with the vocative *deva* (or pl. *devāḥ*, *devīḥ*) before the deity's name, thus forming a long anaphora.

Kāṇḍikā 21

17.21.1   **[prose]**

a   asṛṅ māṃsaṃ tvacaṃ ⁺peṣṭraṃ mastṛhaṇaṃ ⁺majjñaḥ śarīram |
b   agniḥ kravyād ⁺attv amuṣyāmuṣyāyaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ putrasya ||

Let Agni Kravyād ('eater of bloody flesh') eat the blood, the flesh, the skin, the meat, the brain, the marrow, the body of that one, the descendant of such-and-such [father], the son of such-and-such [mother].

asṛṅ] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa𝒸 **[Mā]?** askṛṅ V71 JM₃   • māṃsaṃ] māṁsaṃ **K** māsaṃ V71 JM₃ V122 Ji₄ Pa𝒸 (māṃsaṃ **[Ja]? [Ma]? [Mā]?**)   • ⁺pestraṃ mastṛhaṇaṃ] preṣṭryamastṛhaṇaṃ **Ja Ma** V122 Ji₄ **Mā** preṣṭryaṃ mastṛhaṇaṃ **Pa𝒸** preṣṭya ᐟ mastṛhaṇaṃ V71 preṣṭhya[x]mastṛhaṇaṃ JM₃ peṣṭrasaṃtṛṇaṃ (*leg*. Bʜᴀᴛᴛ. = R-V *vs*. peṣṭrasaṃbhṛṇaṃ Bᴀʀʀᴇᴛ) **K**   • ⁺majjñaḥ] majñaḥ **[Ja] [Ma] [Mā]** V71 JM₃ Ji₄ Pa𝒸 ma[x]jñaḥ **V122** saṃsā **K**   • śarīram |] śarīram | **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa𝒸 **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ śarīraṃ || Ji₄ śarīram, | **K**   • agniḥ] **[O]** agniḥ **K**   • ⁺attv] atv **K Mā** V71 **Ma Ja** V122 Ji₄ Pa𝒸 a[x]tv **JM₃**   • amuṣyāmuṣyāyaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ] amuṣyāmuṣyāẏaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ āmuṣyāmuṣyāẏaṇasyāmuṣyā **Mā** āmuṣyāmuṣyāẏaṇasyāmuṣyā V71 āmuṣyāmuṣyāẏaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ JM₃ amuṣyāẏaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ **Pa𝒸** āmuṣyāmuṣyāẏaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ **K**   • putrasya] **[O]** putrasyā **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa𝒸 Mā | V71 JM₃ *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya reads *peṣṭramastṛhaṇaṃ ma(j)jñaḥ* in **a** and *attv* in **b**.
Gʀɪꜰꜰɪᴛʜs & Lᴜʙᴏᴛsᴋʏ 2000–01: 201 read *peṣṭraṃ mastṛhaṇaṃ, ⁺majjñaḥ* and *⁺attv ⁺amuṣyāmuṣyāyaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ*

I suspect that the fact that all of Bhattacharya's **O** mss. read *māṃsaṃ*, whereas all of those available to me read *māsaṃ*, indicates a misprint in Bhattacharya's apparatus. I therefore chose to edit on the sole basis of the mss. available to me. Gʀɪꜰꜰɪᴛʜs (2009: ʟɪx §2.8(E)) points out that the spelling of *ṃs* as *ṁs* is quite common in **K**. We can safely edit *ṃs* with no emendation sign.

    With regards to the manuscripts' habit of spelling geminated clusters as simple clusters (in our case *ttv* as *tv*), I follow Gʀɪꜰꜰɪᴛʜs's (2009: ʟxv §2.8(O)) policy of adding a plus sign when no manuscript shows gemination (which is the most common situation).

    a. On the rare and obscure word *péṣṭra-* (which occurs only here, in ŚS 4.12.2 ~ PS 4.15.5, and in ŚS 6.37.3cd ~ PS 20.18.5cd ~ RVKh 4.5.18cd), see EWAia II p. 168, 170, Zʏsᴋ 1985: 199, and the comment on PS 4.15.5 in Gʀɪꜰꜰɪᴛʜs & Lᴜʙᴏᴛsᴋʏ 2000–01: 201. Like several before them (e.g. Bʟᴏᴏᴍꜰɪᴇʟᴅ 1897: 387f, AiGr II, 2 §517aα p. 702f), the latter authors disregard the PW's conjectured meaning, 'Knochen', and rather connect this word with *piśitá-* n, *péśī-* f. '(cut up) meat' and the root *piś-* 'to carve'. Gʀɪꜰꜰɪᴛʜs & Lᴜʙᴏᴛsᴋʏ (ibid.) also provide the following translation: "Let

Agni, the eater of bloody flesh, eat the blood, the flesh, the skin, the meat, the brain, the marrows, the body of N.N., descendant of N.N., son of N.N.".

This is the oldest attestation of the word *mastr̥hán-*, which is otherwise found only in KauśS 2.2[11].16. The reliability of the KauśS reading was securely established by Eichner-Kühn (1976), who correctly recognised the stem *mastr̥hán-* as perfectly corresponding to YAv. *mastərəyan-* 'brain'. In an unpublished paper, Lubotsky (2008) proposed to interpret it as a compound **mast-(m)r̥gʰ-n-*, 'brain pan', in which the first member is possibly the same element **mast-* found in Skt. *mastiṣká-* 'brain' (< PIE *masti; cf. Toch.A *mäśśunt* 'marrow' < **mesti-uent-*), and the second member is derived from PIE **mre/ogʰn-* (cf. Gr. βρεχμός, 'front part of the head', Mod.E. *brain* < OE *brægen*), in which the initial *m-* would have been lost by dissimilation.

The word *majján-* 'marrow' (PIE **mosgʰ-en-*; cf. YAv. *mazga* 'marrow, brain' < **mosgʰ-o-*) is countable and not infrequently found in the plural referring to the marrow of single bones. The attested plural forms in AV are *majjñas, majjábhyas, majjásu*; in the RV (10.68.9d), only the sg. form *majjắnam* is found. It should be noted that the spelling *jñ* for geminate *jjñ* is common in the **O** mss., as is the case for most geminate clusters (I follow the policy of Griffiths 2009: lxv §(O), which consists of standardising to *jjñ* and adding a plus sign), but it is also frequent in the ŚS tradition. Whitney, for example, remarks that all his mss. for ŚS 2.17.2 read *majñás*; for other occurrences, see Whitney 1881: 216, which also lists *majñắ* in ŚS 4.12.3–4.

b. *kravyắd* is the epithet generally attributed to Agni in his role of cremation fire. Therefore, this paragraph could be interpreted as a curse: a wish to see one's enemy dead and consumed by the cremation fire.

However, Geib (1976) has shown that the role of Agni Kravyād as cremation fire is later and secondary: in fact, *kravyắd* did not originally describe Agni as the devourer the body of the deceased, but rather captured the dangerous aspect of fire as a threat to living beings, including people. Geib starts from an etymological analysis of the epithet, which he considers to be a compound of the root noun *ad-* 'eater' (*nomen agentis* of 'to eat') and *kravyá-* (PS+ as simplex)-, a stem derived by thematisation of *kravi-* (only attested in the compound *á-kravi-hasta-*, 'whose hands are not bloody') and related to *kravís-* 'bloody, raw flesh' (especially indicating the bloody flesh of a sacrificial victim); this in turn is ultimately connected with PIE **kreuh₂-*, whose derivatives indicate 'blood' or 'raw meat', 'meat in which blood runs' (cf. Lat. *cruor*, 'blood from a wound', OIr. *crú*, 'gore, blood', Gr. κρέας, 'meat', etc.).

Thus, Geib argues, it is unlikely that *kravyá-* in the compound *kravyắd* indicated the body of the deceased, in which blood no longer runs (and which is of course neither wounded during the funeral rites), but rather, either the flesh of a sacrificial victim offered in the course of the funerary rites (a goat or a cow, according to RV 10.16.4, 7, and ĀśGS 4.3.19ff.), or, in a more general sense, the flesh of any living being in whom blood normally runs and who can be harmed by fire. In fact, Geib points out that the epithet *kravyắd* itself is often applied also to demons that attack living beings such as people, cattle, and other creatures (e.g. RV 10.87.19, RV 7.104.2, ŚS 3.28.2, ŚS 12.3.43, ŚS 5.29.8ff.)[1], and that Agni himself—no differently from such demons—may harm living beings, and thus be addressed as *kravyắd*.

Especially telling is the hymn ŚS 12.2 ~ PS 17.44–49 (anuvāka 7 in our book), dedicated to Agni Kravyād, which is a composite collection of stanzas meant for a variety of ritual applications but, according to Geib, ultimately of two kinds: 1) healing spells to drive Agni Kravyād away from humans and animals whom the fire has attacked and whose health he is threatening (e.g. ŚS 12.2.15, *yó no áśveṣu vīréṣu yó no góṣv ajāvíṣu | kravyắdaṃ nír ṇudāmasi yó agnír janayópanaḥ ||*, "The flesh-eating one that is in our horses, heroes, that is in our kine, goats-and-sheep, do we thrust out—the fire that obstructs the people" (Whitney)) and 2) lustration spells to purify a victim killed by Agni Kravyād and protect the survivors from further attacks by banning the dangerous fire to the

---

1   I may add that the child-threatening Sadānuvas who are the topic of PS 17 anuvāka 3 are also called *kravyắd* in RV 10.162.2, ŚS 8.6.6, PS 7.11.1, 3, 4 and *āmādinīḥ krūrādinīr* in PS 17.10.14 (see my comment *ad loc.*).

afterlife with the deceased (e.g. ŚS 12.2.5, 8–10). G<small>EIB</small> argues that it is in the context of these latter spells that the connection between Agni Kravyād and funerary rites was established, although originally Agni Kravyād did not devour the corpse, but rather carried it into Yama's realm, just like Agni Jātavedas was invoked to carry the funerary oblation to the gods. Compare RV 10.16.9 (~ ŚS 12.2.8 ~ PS 17.44.8), in which the dangerous Agni Kravyād and the positive Agni Jātavedas are clearly contrasted, in order to drive away the former and make room for the latter: *kravyā́dam agním prá hiṇomi dū́rám̐ yamárājño gachatu ripravāháḥ | ihaívā́yám ítaro jātávedā devébhyo havyáṃ vahatu prajānán ||*, "Flesh-eating Agni I send off in the distance. Carrying away defilements, let him go to those who have Yama as king. Here let only this one, the other Jātavedas, carry the oblations to the gods, knowing what's ahead" (J-B).[2]

Returning to our curse, it is entirely possible that Agni is invoked here as *kravyā́d* with reference to his dangerous demonic nature, and thus instigated to harm the reciter's enemy while he is still alive.

On the *asaú- āmuṣyāyaṇá- amúṣyāḥ putrá-* formula, which is typical of the *yajus*-style AV prose (R<small>ENOU</small> 1955b: 79), see my introduction to this chapter and my comment on the following stanza.

17.21.2 [prose]

a   prātaryāvadbhyo devebhyaḥ sāyaṃyāvadbhyo devebhyo viśvadānīṃyāvadbhyo devebhyaḥ |
b   amum ⁺āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putram ā vṛścāmi ||

I chop down such-and-such, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother], before the gods who ride [their chariots] in the early morning, before the gods who ride in the evening, before the gods who ride all the time.

prātaryāvadbhyo] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** prātaryāvadbhoḥ **V71**   • devebhyaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** deve[~~bhyaḥ~~]bhyaḥ **V71** devebhy(o→)aḥ **Pa_c** devebhyas **K**   • sāyaṃyāvadbhyo] sāyaṃyāvadbhyo **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** sāyaṃyāvabhyo **V71** sāṃyāvadbhyo **K**   • viśvadānīṃyāvadbhyo] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** viśvadānīṃyāvabhyo **V71** viśvadānīyāvadbhyo **K**   • devebhyaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** dev(a →)ebhyaḥ **V71** devebhya **K**   • |] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃ ||** Ji₄ [x] | Pa_c *om.* **K**   • amum ⁺āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ] amum āmuṣyāyeṇam amuṣyaḥ **K** amuṣyāmuṣyāẏaṇam amuṣyāḥ **[Ja] [Ma] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** amuṣyāmuṣyāẏaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ **Mā** amuṣyāmuṣyāẏaṇaṣyāmuṣyāḥ **V71 JM₃**   • ||] **[O]** Z **K**

Bhattacharya reads *amuṣyāmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putram* with **Ja** and **Ma**.

a. According to AB 2.15, the 'gods who ride in the early morning' (*prātaryā́van-*; also four occurrences in RV) are Agni, Uṣas and the Aśvins (on the meaning of the similar epithet *prātarítvan-*, found in RV 1.125, see J-B p. 289ff.); next to this group of gods, the 'gods who ride in the evening' (*sāyaṃyā́van-*) are also mentioned in TB 2.1.5.10 in relation to the Agnihotra ceremony. Note that in the above passages, the attested stems are old formations with the suffix *-van* (AiGr II.2 §716 p. 894); this suffix forms *nomina agentis* that are mainly found as second

---

2   In the same hymn, I may add, it is Agni Jātavedas (and not Kravyād) who is said to 'cook' (*śrā-*) the corpse: RV 10.16.1cd–2ab, *yadā́ śṛtáṃ kṛṇávo jātavedó'them enam prá hiṇutāt pitṛ́bhyaḥ || śṛtáṃ yadā́ kárasi jātavedó'them enam pári dattāt pitṛ́bhyaḥ |*, 'When you will make him cooked to readiness, Jātavedas, then impel him forth to the forefathers. When you will have made him cooked to readiness, Jātavedas, then deliver him to the forefathers' (J-B). For further connections between Agni Jātavedas and funerary rites, see F<small>INDLY</small> 1981: 364ff.

members of compounds, just as in our case here (on this type of compound, see AiGr II 1 §75ff. p. 174ff.). However, the dental -*d*- in °*vadbhyo*° shows that the compounds in our line are formed with the suffix -*vant*. There is a tendency in the Vedic language to confuse the two suffixes, a phenomenon that ultmately leads to the disappearance of all *van*-stems (with the exception of Indra's epithet *maghávan*-; see AiGr II.2 §718d p. 901, §721a, b p. 903–905). Therefore, the presence of forms with a dental in our line seems to point to a relatively late date for our text. This is the only occurrence of these compounds in the AV.

   b. This formula is typical of the *yajus*-style AV prose (see the introduction to this chapter and RENOU 1955b: 79) and generally shows the following structure:

[*asaú*]	[*āmuṣyāyaṇá*-]	[[*amúṣyāḥ*]	*putrá*-]
such-and-such.M.CASE*i*	descendant.of-such-and-such.M.CASE*i*	such-and-such.F.GEN	son.M.CASE*i*
name	father's lineage	mother's lineage	

The first, second and fourth constituents normally agree in gender (m.), number (sg.) and case, just as below in 17.21.1b (in the genitive), 17.21.3a (in the accusative), 17.25.1b (in the locative) and 17.25.8 (in the dative), and their relationship is adpositional, whereas the third constituent is dependent on the fourth: 'such-and-such man, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother]'. Thus the formula consists of three syntagms: the first one introduces the person (the victim of a curse, the beneficiary of a healing spell, etc.); the second illustrates his lineage from the father's side (by means of the compound *āmuṣyāyaṇá*-); the third illustrates his lineage from the mother's side (by means of the phrase *āmúṣyāḥ* (gen.f.) *putrá*-). At a first glance, the first constituent/syntagm could also theoretically be interpreted as an adjective referring to *putrá*- ('such-and-such son of such-and-such [mother], descendant of such-and-such [father]') or even to *āmuṣyāyaṇá*- ('such-and-such descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother]'), but such interpretations are incorrect, as *asaú*- is simply a placeholder that is meant to be replaced by the actual proper name of the victim/beneficiary when the formula is recited (just as the second and third constituents are meant to be replaced by the actual lineage names). The first element (*asaú*-, the proper name) can, however, be omitted: e.g., ŚS 10.5.36 *āmuṣyāyaṇásyāmúṣyāḥ putrásya*.

   If we accept the reading of **Ja** and **Ma** (now confirmed by the other **O**^{A} mss.), as Bhattacharya does, the resulting formula would be the following:

amuṣya	*āmuṣyāyaṇam*	*amuṣyāḥ*	*putram*
such-and-such·M.GEN	descendant.of-such-and-such.M.ACC	such-and-such.F.GEN	son.M.ACC

The question then arises what the meaning of the first constituent, the genitive *amuṣya*, should be. It cannot be the proper name of the curse's addressee (indicated by the accusative *putram*). We would then have to regard it as dependent on *putram*, just like the feminine *amuṣyāḥ*, or supply a second *putram*: "[the son] of such-and-such [father], the descendant of such-and-such [father], the son of such-and-such [mother]". This cannot be correct, as both the first and second syntagms would thus redundantly refer to the person's lineage from the father's side. It would also go against the normal practice, according to which the first of the four constituents consists of the name of the victim. Moreover, as I have explained above, in all the occurrences of this formula, the first two constituents always agree with the fourth (*putra*-), and their relation is adpositional. I therefore accept the reading of **K**, editing the first element of the formula as *amum* in agreement with *putram*. As regards the second element, both traditions (**K** and **O**^{A}) point to an accusative, and we can safely disregard the readings of the **O**^{B} mss. as faulty. Note that Bhattacharya seems to follow this same line of reasoning in emending the faulty ms. reading *amuṣyāḥ* to **amuṣmā* (=*amuṣmai*) in PS 17.25.8b, 17.26.1b and 17.26.21b below.

   On the semantics and syntax of *ā-vraśc*- with the dative, see KULIKOV 2012: 255ff. with

references. This idiom is not easily translatable: according to the most widespread interpretation, it employs the metaphor of cutting down a tree to express the action of making someone kneel down before a deity (in the dative), or of letting them be subdued by such deity. Hence, glosses such as 'anheimfallen (machen)' (Narten, together with Ludwig), 'to make a prey to', 'to fall victim to' (Keith) or 'to fall/bring under the wrath of' (Whitney), 'to cut down before' (J-B). I translate with 'to chop down before' in an attempt to preserve the tree metaphor.

17.21.3   [prose]

vaiśvānarāya kṣipradhanvane [']mum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putram ā vṛścāmi ||

I chop down such-and-such, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother], before Vaiśvānara, before the one armed with a swift bow.

vaiśvānarāya] K vaiśvānarā̀ya **[O]**   • [']mum] mum **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa$_c$ **[Mā]** V71 JM$_3$ mam **Ji$_4$** amum **K**   • āmuṣyāyaṇam] K āmuṣyā̀ẏaṇam **[O]**   • amuṣyāḥ] **[O]** anuṣyāḥ **K**   • putram ā] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji$_4$ Pa$_c$ V71 JM$_3$ *om.* **Mā**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja]** Pa$_c$ **[Mā]** ||[1] **V122** || 1 || **Ji$_4$** | **V71 JM$_3$** Z **K**

Bhattacharya reads *kṣipradhanvanemum°*.

    a. Two questions arise: who are the deities referred to by these two epithets and, secondly, how many deities are being addressed here—one or two?

    I shall start by discussing the second epithet. The bahuvrīhi compound *kṣiprádhanvan-* 'whose bow is swift' is found in RV 9.90.3, referring to Soma (portrayed as one of the warriors that make use of the bow in battle): *śū́ragrāmaḥ sárvavīraḥ sáhāvāñ jétā pavasva sánitā dhánāni | tigmā́yudhaḥ kṣiprádhanvā samátsv áṣāḷhaḥ sāhvā́n pṛ́tanāsu śátrūn ||*, "Having a horde of champions, having hale heroes, purify yourself as victorious conqueror and winner of stakes, with your sharp weapons and snapping bows invincible in combats, vanquishing your rivals in battles" (J-B). In ŚS 11.4.23 (~ PS 16.23.3), it is employed as an attribute of the *prāṇá* (also identified as a warrior) to which the hymn is addressed: *yó asyá viśvájanmana ī́śe víśvasya céṣṭataḥ | ányeṣu kṣiprádhanvane tásmai prāṇa námo 'stu te ||*, "He who rules over this (all) derived from every source, and over everything that moves—reverence be to thee, O Prāṇa, that wieldest a swift bow against others (the enemies)" (Bloomfield); cf. "He who is lord of this that has every [kind of] birth, of every stirring thing to thee being such, O breath, having a quick bow among the unexhausted (? *ánya*), be homage" (Whitney).

    In PS 5.22.8, the same compound refers to Rudra and Bhava: *yāv īśānau carato dvipado 'sya catuṣpadaḥ | yā ugrau kṣipradhanvānau tābhyāṃ rudrābhyāṃ haviṣā vidhemānyatrāsmad aghaviṣā vy etu ||*, "We would like to bring worship with an oblation to the two: Rudra [and Bhava], who constantly rule over this two-footer and four-footer, who are mighty, with a quick bow. Let the ill-poisonous [arrow] go asunder, away from us" (Lubotsky). Having a swift bow thus seems to be a characteristic of a warrior or of the god Rudra—who is regularly characterised as carrying a bow— and the closely related Bhava. Lastly, however, it should be noted that the Vrātyakāṇḍa (in particular ŚS 15.1.6 ~ PS 18.27.5) mentions Indra's bow (*indradhanú-*), acquired by the Ekavrātya, who is possibly Indra himself portrayed not as full-fledged adult warrior armed with the *vájra* mace, but still as a young Vrātya boy undergoing initiation, and thus still within the domain of Rudra, the god with a bow.

    In the RV, the epithet *vaiśvānará-* always refers to Agni or a form of the fire. It is a vṛddhi derivative of *viśvā́nara-*, a rare epithet which only occurs four times in RV (applied to Savitṛ in RV

1.186.1, 7.76.1; to Indra in RV 10.50.1; and to Indra's 'unbent strength', *ánānata- śávas-*, in RV 8.68.4), only once in ŚS 4.11.7c (see Appendix II) and five times in the PS (once in PS 12.10.2b and four times in the prose of PS 17, anuvāka 6, paragraphs 27 and 31), where it is attributed to the *vájra*—Note that in ŚS 4.11 and PS 17, anuvāka 6, the *vájra* is identified with *viśvānara*, *vaiśvānara* and *viśvāṣaḥ*. Both epithets have generally been interpreted as meaning 'belonging to all men', being formed by compounding *víśva-* with *nár(a)-* 'man' (Cl.Skt. *nara-*, only attested as *nṛ̂-* in Vedic), the long vowel being explained by an initial laryngeal (*Hnar-a < *h₂ner-o-) (see EWAia II p. 563).[3] KUIPER (1951), pointing out how *nṛ̂-* 'hero' is semantically too narrow to include all humanity (cf. *jána* in *viśvájanya-*), explained the epithet as formed by **Hnar-* 'vitality, vital strength' (cf. *sūnára-* and *sūnṛtā*); he thus glossed *viśvānara-* with 'possessing all the (cosmic) vital strength', and *vaiśvānará* with 'related to him, who possesses the total amount of vital strength'. DE VRIES (1979), on the authority of ŚB 6.2.1.35 (*vaiśvānaró vái sárve 'gnáyaḥ*, "Vaiśvānara being all the fires" (Eggeling)), explained *viśvānara* as **viśvānala* 'all fires', i.e. *viśva + anala* 'fire', and collected a number of passages that are supposedly consistent with this interpretation.[4] As to the actual use of the vṛddhi derivative in the RV, FINDLY (1982: 7ff.) notes that almost all of the 13 RV hymns addressed to Agni Vaiśvānara point to the identification of Agni with the sun, in particular the morning sun, rising at dawn thanks to the morning kindling of the earthly fire. Taking the dawning sun as representing the totality of days, the Brāhmaṇas accordingly equate it with the year, *saṃvatsará*, the annual solar cycle, and worshipped it with the offering of 12 *kapāla*-s—12, obviously, like the months of the year (on this topic, cf. GONDA 1984, esp. p. 72ff., and GONDA 1987: 124ff.).

Secondly, according to HILLEBRANDT (1980: 78ff.) and more recently PROFERES (2007: 23ff., 46ff.), Agni Vaiśvānara is the public fire burning in the communal hearth, the tribal fire that is shared by the single households and then brought together into the fire of the tribal leader (on this see also KRICK 1982). As such it represents both the authority of the clan leader as well as the Aryan ritual of which it is the very centre.[5] Therefore it is frequently mentioned in the context of the expansion of the Aryan civilisation (see FINDLY 1982: 15ff.). Particularly significant is the legend of Māṭhava Videgha (ŚB 1.4.1.10ff.), who is said to have held the fire in his own mouth until it was summoned out by a mantra recited by his purohita Gotama Rāhūgaṇa: once freed, Agni Vaiśvānara blazed eastward all the way to the Sadānīrā river (modern Gandak), burning (*dah-*) the land and sweetening it (*svad-*, caus.). The latter expression is possibly a reference to the slash and burn technique or similar techniques that make use of fire to domesticate and fertilise the land; at the same time, it is explicitly a metaphor for Aryan acculturation. The text in fact reads: "That one [the Sadānīrā river] the Brahmans did not cross in former times, thinking, 'it has not been burnt over by Agni Vaiśvānara'. Now-a-days, however, there are many Brahmans to the east of it. At that time it (the land east of the Sadānārā) was very uncultivated, very marshy, because it had not been tasted [*svad-*, caus.] by Agni Vaiśvānara. Now-a-days, however, it is very cultivated, for the Brahmans have caused (Agni) to taste it [*svad-*, caus.] through sacrifices" (Eggeling). The final remark according to which Agni tasted/sweetened the land through sacrifices (*yajñair*) is particularly

---

3 This interpretation possibly goes back to Vedic times. Note Ṛgvedic glosses such as RV 1.59.7a, *vaiśvānaró mahimnā viśvákṛṣṭir*, 'Vaiśvānara, belonging to all communities by his greatness' (J-B), and similarly in RV 3.2.15b, *viśvácarṣaṇim* (on *kṛṣṭí* and *carṣaṇí*; see THIEME 1967). ŚB 9.3.1.3 reads *sá yáḥ sá vaiśvānaráḥ imé sá lokā́ iyám evá pṛthivī́ víśvam agnír náro 'ntárikṣam evá víśvaṃ vāyúr náro dyaúr evá víśvam ādityó náraḥ*, 'Now, Vaiśvānara is these worlds, *víśvam* is this very earth here, *nára* is Agni, *víśvam* is the very atmosphere, *nára* is Vāyu, *víśvam* is the very sky, *nára* is the Āditya'. Sāyana, on the other hand, commenting on RV 1.59 (addressed to Agni Vaiśvānara), interpreted the epithet as describing Agni in the form of the digestive fire (*narāṇāṃ jāṭhararūpeṇa saṃbandhin*).

4 Note that *anala* is only attested from the Upaniṣads onwards, and is etymologically problematic (EWAia I p. 70).

5 According to HILLEBRANDT (1980: 51f., 78ff.) the Vaiśvānara fire of early Vedic culture would later develop into the *āhvanīya* fire of classical Śrauta ritual.

significant in indicating that the expansion also involved acculturation, and that Agni Vaiśvānara is a personification of brahmanical worship (as was first noted by Weber; see EGGELING 1882: 104 fn. 1).

As an embodiment of the Aryan conquest, Agni Vaiśvānara himself is sometimes portrayed as a warrior, e.g. in RV 7.5 and 7.6. The theme of Vaiśvānara's victory over enemies is exploited in the AV, where the god is commonly invoked to ward off personal threats against sickness, sin or misfortune (FINDLY 1982: 22). It is most likely this 'warrior' function that is evoked in our text. One should also recall that in RV, the Aryan expansion is particularly captured in the image of Indra conquering the Dasyu's *púr*-s with Agni's help.

We thus have four possibilities: 1) our line is addressed to Agni alone, mentioned in his aspect of Vaiśvānara, the conquering warrior, in this case portrayed carrying a swift bow, a common attribute of a young warrior; 2) our line mentions two deities, Agni Vaiśvānara and a god armed with a swift bow, perhaps Indra, who carries a bow as a young warrior or Vrātya. Note that the next line, PS 17.21.4, is also addressed to this *kṣipradhanvan*- god, and the following line, PS 17.21.5, starts by addressing Indra and Agni (*indrāgnibhyāṃ...*); accordingly, our line would be referring to the two leaders of the Aryan conquest: Agni Vaiśvānara and Indra. One may wonder why Indra would be evoked in his Vrātya form. Certainly Vrātya bands were the avant-garde of the Aryan expansion, but it is perhaps also interesting to note that in PS 17.27.32, in the chapter on the draft-ox *vratá*, the *vájra* that embodies the power to be achieved through the *vratá* is identified as Vaiśvānara. It is thus conceivable that our line refers both to the weapon Indra uses as a young uninitiated Vrātya warrior, and to the weapon he employs as an adult warrior, the *vájra*.

Alternatively we could interpret our line as mentioning indeed two deities, the second of which is simply Rudra, the god who is most often portrayed with a bow. Notably, Rudra is sometimes regarded as a manifestation of fire, in particular the destructive power of fire (HEESTERMAN 1993: 32) or, more interestingly—as Rudra embodies the dangerous powers of the wilderness—the wild forest fire. Accordingly, our line would contain a curse to make an enemy bow to both the domesticated and civilising fire of Vedic culture, Agni Vaiśvānara, as well as to the wild, uncontrolled, and destructive fire represented by Rudra.

A final possibility is that *kṣipradhanvan* refers to Rudra, and that Vaiśvānara is not an epithet of Agni here, but of Rudra himself. Our line would thus be addressed to one god only: Rudra. In the late Vedic period, Rudra often seems to share certain aspects with more prominent deities like Indra and Agni (BISSCHOP 2009: 742). It is perhaps possible that here Rudra is simply invoked as the victorious warrior, the Vrātya leader, leading the Aryan conquest. Thus the equation with Vaiśvānara or the attribution of such an epithet to Rudra himself would not seem inconceivable.

17.21.4 **[prose]**

a   kṣipradhanvan kṣiprahasta |
b   amuṣyāmuṣyāyaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ putrasya hṛdayaṃ ⁺yakṛn *matasne pra vidhya ||

O swift-bowed, O swift-handed one, pierce the heart, the liver, the two *mátasna* organs of such-and-such, the descendant of such-and-such [father], the son of such-and-such [mother].

N.B. Pāda **a** is missing in **Mā** and **V71**, while it features twice in **JM₃**.

———————

kṣipradhanvan kṣiprahasta] kṣipradhanvan, kṣiprahasta **[Ma] [Ja]** **V122** **Pa**c kṣipradhanvana kṣiprahasta **Ji₄** kṣipradhanvana kṣiprahasta kṣipradhanvani kṣiprahasta **JM₃** kṣipradhanvaṃ kṣiprahastā **K** *om*. **Mā** **V71**   • |] **[Ma] [Ja]** **V122** **Pa**c || **Ji₄** **JM₃** *om*. **K** **Mā** **V71**   • amuṣyāmuṣyāyaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ] amuṣyāmuṣyāyaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ **[Ma] [Ja]** **V122** **Ji₄** **[Mā]** **V71** **JM₃**

amuṣyāmuṣyāyaṇa[~~syāmuṣyāḥ putramāvṛścāmi~~]syā **Pa_c** amum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ **K**   • hṛdayaṃ] hṛdaẏaṃ **[O]** hṛdaṃ **K**   • ⁺yakṛn *matasne] yakṛmmataste **Ja Ma Nā V122 Ji₄ Pa_c JM₃** yatkṛtaste **Mā** yakṛmataste **V71** akṛnnatasthe **K**   • pra vidhya] **[Ma]** V122 Ji₄ Pa_c **[Mā]** V71 pra via **Ja** pravṛddhyā **K**   • ||] **[Ma] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c Mā JM₃** | **K Ja V71**

Bhattacharya reads ⁺*yakṛnmatasne**

    a. On the epithet *kṣiprádhanvan-*, see above under 17.21.4. This seems to be the only Vedic occurrence of *kṣiprahasta-*, which is instead extremely common in Epic texts.

    The long *ā* in **K** *kṣiprahastā* might be due to the confusion of the verse-end *daṇḍa* for the *daṇḍa* used as a diacritic for a long *ā* in the script (Devanāgarī) of **D**.

    b. The emendation to ⁺*yakṛn *matasne* was proposed by Bhattacharya, and I think it is correct. The *mátasna-* is an unidentified internal organ. The word mostly occurs in the dual, and has variously been interpreted as referring to the 'kidneys' or 'lungs'. See the discussion in Zᴙsᴋ 1985: 106.

    The reading of **K** with acc. *amum āmuṣyāṇam* must be due to perseveration from 17.21.3 above.

17.21.5   **[prose]**

a   indrāgnibhyāṃ prajāpataye parameṣṭhine somāya rājñe varuṇāya rājñe |
b   pūṣṇe dhātre savitre tvaṣṭre [']mum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putram ā vṛścāmi ||

I chop down such-and-such, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother], before Indra and Agni, before Prajāpati, before Parameṣṭhin, before king Soma, before king Varuṇa, before Pūṣan, before Dhātṛ, before Savitṛ, before Tvaṣṭṛ.

indrāgnibhyāṃ prajāpataye] **K** indrāgnibhyāṃ prajāpataẏe **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** indrāgnibhyā tprajāpataẏe **Ji₄** indrāgnibhyā prajāpataẏe **Pa_c**   • somāya] **K** somāẏa **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** [x]somāẏa **Ji₄**   • varuṇāya] **K** varuṇāẏa **[O]**   •]] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 || JM₃** *om.* **K Ji₄**   • pūṣṇe] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** puṣṇe **V71 JM₃** pauṣṇe **K**   • savitre] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71** savi[x]tre **V122** *om.* **JM₃**   • tvaṣṭre [']mum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ] tvaṣṭre mumāmuṣyāẏaṇamamuṣyāḥ **[O]** tvaṣṭre amumāmmuṣyāyeṇamanuṣyāḥ **K**   • vṛścāmi] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** vṛścyāmi **V122 Pa_c**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** | **K V71 JM₃**

Bhattacharya writes *tvaṣṭremum*° in **b**.

    a. Unless we accept that Agni, Indra, or both are mentioned twice in this chapter—which is entirely possible—the mention of Agni beside Indra here might suggest that the Vaiśvānara in PS 17.21.3 is in fact Rudra, seen as a manifestation of fire or of the conquering warrior. The presence of Parameṣṭhin, a late addition to the Vedic pantheon, points to the fact that our text originated at a fairly late period.

17.21.6   **[prose]**

uṣase [']hne rātraye sūryāyāmum ° ° ° ||

(…) before the dawn, before the day, before the night, before the sun.

uṣase [']hne] uṣase hne **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** uṣasenna **V71** tapase hne **Ji₄** uṣase ahne **K** • rātraye] rātraẏe **[O]** rātre **K**   • sūryāyāmum] sūryāyāmuṃ **K** sūryāyāmuṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** sūryāẏamuśca(/śma?) **Ji₄**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** ||¹ **V122 Ji₄** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya writes *uṣasehne* and *sūryāyāmumā[muṣyā . . . .] ||*.
       Note that the older form of the stem for 'night' is *rā́trī-* (which follows the *devī́*-inflectional type in RV and is still found in the AV and occasionally later), but the dative *rātraye* (not infrequently met with in the AV) must belong to the stem *rā́tri-*. On the alternation between the two stems, see AiGr III §95 p.185 and Kᴜʟɪᴋᴏᴠ 2010: 174 fn. 1.

17.21.7   **[prose]**

vīrudbhya oṣadhībhyo vanaspatibhyo vānaspatyebhyo [']mum ° ° ° ||

(…) before the plants, before the herbs, before the forest trees, before the fruit trees.

N.B. In **V122**, the sequence '*vīrudbhyā vanaspatibhyo |*' is repeated later on between 17.22.1 and 2.
———————
vīrudbhya oṣadhībhyo] **[O]** vīrudbhyo oṣadhībhyo **K**   • [']mum] muṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** mu **V71** amum, **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** ||¹ **V122 | V71** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya writes *vānaspatyebhyomu-[māmuṣyā . . . .] ||*.
       The words *vīrúdh-* 'plant' and *óṣadhī-* (or *óṣadhi-*) 'herb' are often employed as synonyms, although the latter in particular often denotes medicinal herbs that possess "a healing power of some other quality useful to men" (Mᴀᴄᴅᴏɴᴇʟʟ & Kᴇɪᴛʜ 1912: I, 125–126; II, 319). The long *ī*-stem variant *óṣadhī-* that we find in our text is only attested in Vedic (see AiGr III §95c p.186): in particular RV features short *i*-stem singular forms (*óṣadhiḥ, óṣadhe, óṣadhim*) and a short *i*-stem plural (*óṣadhayaḥ*); the remaining RV plural forms are all built on the long *ī*-stem (*óṣadhībhiḥ, óṣadhībhyaḥ, óṣadhīnām, óṣadhīṣu*—but also *óṣadhīḥ* competing with the short *i*-stem nom. pl. *óṣadhayaḥ*; and voc. *oṣadhīḥ*) (cf. Lᴜʙᴏᴛsᴋʏ 1997 s.v.). In the AV the situation is the same, but we also find two occurrences of a long *ī*-stem singular acc. *óṣadhīm*: twice in ŚS, at ŚS 8.2.6b (~ PS 16.3.6b) and ŚS 8.7.6b (~ PS 16.12.6b); and two more times in PS 15.15.7b and 19.39.11a.
       The word *vánaspáti-* indicates the 'forest tree', in particular one that is fit to be used as a post in rituals (Mᴀᴄᴅᴏɴᴇʟʟ & Kᴇɪᴛʜ 1912: II, 241), as opposed to *vr̥kṣá-*, which bears the general sense of 'tree' (ibid., II, p. 319).
       The derivative *vānaspatyá-* is glossed by Mᴀᴄᴅᴏɴᴇʟʟ & Kᴇɪᴛʜ (ibid., II, 286) as a 'small tree' with reference to the AV, or 'fruit of a tree' where the neuter is concerned. Whitney, commenting on an occurrence of this word in ŚS 8.8.14, translates it literally as "them of the forest trees", highlighting the derivation from *vánaspáti-*, but notes that "the lexicographers explain the word to mean 'fruit tree with conspicuous flowers'". My translation is tentatively on the basis of the above data.

17.21.8   **[prose]**

    adbhyo mātariśvane dyāvāpṛthivībhyām amum ° ° ° ||

(…) before the waters, before Mātariśvan (i.e. the wind), before the heaven and earth.

N.B. This line is missing from **K**.

———————

adbhyo mātariśvane]   **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Paᶜ **[Mā]** adbhyo (*subs.*→mā)tariśvane **V71** adbhyo mātaśvane **JM₃** *om.* **K**   • dyāvāpṛthivībhyāmamum] dyāvāpṛthivībhyāmamuṃ **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Paᶜ [Mā]** V71 ndāvāpṛthivībhyāmamuṃ **JM₃** dyāvāpṛthīvībhyāmamu Ji₄ *om.* **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Paᶜ **[Mā] JM₃** ||¹ **V122 Ji₄** | **V71** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya writes °*bhyāmamu[māmu . .]* ||.
    In RV, Mātariśvan appears to be either Agni himself or a promethean being who helps with kindling fire (GW s.v.); in particular, see RV 3.9.5, *sasṛvā́ṃsam iva tmánāgním itthā́ tiróhitam* | *aínaṃ nayan mātaríśvā parāváto devébhyo mathitám pári* ||, "Agni, hidden thus, as if he had run away on his own—him did Mātariśvan lead here from the far distance, stolen [or churned] from among the gods" (J-B). According to Fɪɴᴅʟʏ 1982: 20, the "Mātariśvan story gives proof of the divine origin of the Vedic fire ritual and attests to the election of the Aryans as those destined to possess this rare gift" (see ibid. fn. 39 for references to significant hymns recounting this myth). In the post-Ṛgvedic language, however, this word comes to indicate the wind, which is probably the case here.

17.21.9   **[prose]**

    idāvatsarāya parivatsarāya saṃvatsarāya bṛhate viśvarūpāyāmum ° ° ° ||

(…) before the *idā* year (?), before the *pari* year (?), before the *saṃ* year (?), before a lofty [year(?)] of any variety.

idāvatsarāya] idāvatsarāẏa **[O]** yadāvatsarāya **K**   • parivatsarāya] parivatsarāẏa **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Paᶜ [Mā]** V71 pari[x]vatsarāẏa **JM₃** parivatsārāẏa Ji₄   • saṃvatsarāya] **K** saṃvatsarāẏa **O**   • bṛhate] **[O]** vṛhate **K**   • viśvarūpāyāmum] viśvarūpāyāmu(m- **K**⁶ viśvarūpāyāmuṃ **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Paᶜ **[Mā]** viśvarūpāẏāmam **JM₃** viśvarūpāmum **V71**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja]** Paᶜ **[Mā] V71 JM₃** ||¹ **V122 Ji₄** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya writes °*pāyāmu[māmuṣyā . .]* ||.
    Bhattacharya points to ŚS 6.55.3 (~ PS 19.9.1) as a possible parallel: *idāvatsarā́ya parivatsarā́ya saṃvatsarā́ya kṛṇutā bṛhán námaḥ* | *téṣāṃ vayáṃ sumataú yajñíyānām ápi bhadré sau manasé syāma* ||, "Unto the *idā*-year, the *pari*-year, the *sam*-year, pay ye great homage; may we be in the favour of these worshipful ones, likewise in their auspicious well-willing" (Whitney). However, in this line, *bṛhán* is an attribute of *námaḥ*. The formula *bṛhán námaḥ*, 'lofty reverence', does not occur elsewhere in the AV, but it is found in RV 1.136.1a, 5.73.10d, 6.75.15d and 7.94.4a. I wonder if *bṛhánt-* in our line could indicate a fourth type of year after the ones listed before.

———————

6   The notation °*(m-* is meant to indicate that **K**'s verse final *-m* is also the initial *m-* of the following line. In its *scriptio continua*, **K** reads *viśvarūpāyāmādhbhis*, where *viśvarūpāyām* is the end of 17.21.9 and *mādbhis* is the beginning of 17.21.10 (see below).

However, although the first three items (*idāvatsará-*, *parivatsará-*, *saṃvatsará-*) are mostly found together in lists (see below), I could find no such list that includes *bṛhánt-* as well. One could tentatively interpret *bṛhate* as an adjective referring to *saṃvatsarāya* (or to all three of the preceding words). However, I have not found any parallel of *bṛhánt-* being used as an attribute of *saṃvatsará-*.

It is possible that *bṛhánt-* and *viśvárūpa-* are simply meant to express positive qualities of the listed years, 'lofty, having every beauty' (cf. RV 1.35.4, where they are employed together to describe Savitṛ's chariot). However, it is my contention that *viśvárūpa-* is sometimes used at the end of lists in a similar function as our *et cetera*: it is meant to end a list by including all the possible items that are left out (see my comment on PS 17.2.1c in Selva 2014).

The compound *idāvatsará-* (possibly 'present year', if it is a compound of *vatsará-* and *idā* 'now'; cf. *tadā, sadā*—but see footnote 8 below) is never attested in RV (nor is *vatsará* alone, which is also absent from the AV); *parivatsará-* is attested in RV 10.62.2b as *parivatsaré*, "at the turning of the year" (J-B). Both the RV and the AV also contain the compound *parivatsarī́na-*, which is attested once in RV 7.103.8b, the frog hymn (*bráhma … parivatsarī́nam*, "yearly sacred formulation" (J-B)), and once in ŚS 3.10.5a (~ PS 1.105.1b) (*havíṣ ... parivatsarī́ṇam*, "oblation of the complete year" (Whitney)). The occurrence in the frog hymn may perhaps indicate that the 'turning of the year' referred to is the beginning of the rainy season. When *idāvatsará-* and *parivatsará-* appear in the AV, it is only next to each other in lists, such as ŚS 6.55.3 (~ PS 19.9.1) quoted above, which is also the only ŚS attestation of *idāvatsará-*, as well as in PS 16.71.1 (*idāvatsaraṃ ca parivatsaraṃ ca bradhnasya viṣṭapi parame vyoman*); PS 16.72.3a (*idāvatsaraṃ ca parivatsaraṃ ca saṃvatsaram ahorātrāṇi māsaḥ*); in the current stanza, PS 17.21, and below in PS 17.41.3 (*śatam idāvatsarāḥ* [**K** adds *śatam anuvatsarāḥ*] *śataṃ parivatsarāḥ śataṃ saṃvatsarāḥ*); PS 18.52.19b, 20b, 21b (*sa idāvatsarasya pāśān ... sa parivatsarasya pāśān ... sa saṃvatsarasya pāśān ...*); PS 19.9.1 (~ ŚS 6.55.3), quoted above; and finally in PS 19.51.1a (*idāvatsarāya parivatsarāya saṃvatsarāya prati vedayāma etat*). *Parivatsará-* also appears once unaccompanied by *idāvatsará-*, namely in ŚS 8.8.23.a, *saṃvatsaró ráthaḥ parivatsaró rathopasthó virā́ḍ īṣā́gnī́ rathamukhám | índraḥ savyaṣṭhā́ś candrámāḥ sā́rathiḥ ||*, "the year is the chariot, the complete year the chariot-lap, *virā́j* the pole, Agni the chariot-mouth, Indra the left-stander, the moon the charioteer" (Whitney). Besides the above-mentioned attestations in lists, the compound *saṃvatsara-* appears frequently in RV and AV as the unmarked word for 'year'. Cf. also the derivative *saṃvatsarī́na-*, 'yearly', found once in RV 10.87.17a (~ ŚS 8.3.17a, PS 16.7.7a), *saṃvatsarī́ṇam páyaḥ,* "a year's worth of milk" (J-B), and in ŚS 7.77.3a (~ PS 20.23.6a), *saṃvatsarī́ṇā marútaḥ svarkā́ urúkṣayāḥ ságanā mā́nuṣāsaḥ*, "the Maruts, of the year, well-singing, wide-dwelling, troop attended, humane" (Whitney).[7] For references to similar lists, see Macdonell & Keith 1912: II, 412f. These authors think that these are "no more that a mere series of priestly variations of Vatsara, based on the older and more genuine Saṃvatsara and Parivatsara as variants of the simple Vatsara, 'year'". Note that *saṃvatsará-* is also found in the following line, most likely in the sense of 'full year', in opposition to the months.

---

7 In Aṣṭādhyāyī 5.1.91, Pāṇini explains that in Vedic (*chandasi*), the suffix *-īya-* is added to compounds with *vatsara-* as second member; in 5.1.92, he adds that the same suffix and the suffix *-īṇa-* are used in similar compounds, prefixed with *sam-* or *pari-* (see Böhtlingk 1887: 231). The Kāśikavṛtti provides the following examples (I give here the translation offered by Sharma 1999: 488): *idvatsarīyaḥ*, 'accomplished by two of the five years'; *idāvatsarīyaḥ*, 'id.'; *saṃvatsarīṇaḥ*, 'that which was accomplished by a year'; *saṃvatsarīyaḥ*, 'id.'; *parivatsarīṇaḥ*, 'that which was accomplished by a full year'; *parivatsarīyaḥ*, 'id.' Sharma (ibid.) notes that, according to Haradatta's Padamañjari, *idvatsara* is 'a period of two consecutive (*yuge*) years within a given span of five years (*pañcavarṣe yuge dvayor varṣayoḥ saṃjñe*)'.

17.21.10   **[prose]**

mādbhyaḥ saṃvatsarāyāmum ° ° ° || 21 ||

(…) before the months (*mās-* m.), before the full year.

N.B. This line is missing from **V71** and **JM₃**. Only the chapter-final numbering is found.

mādbhyaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** m)ādbhis **K**[8] *om.* **V71 JM₃**   •   saṃvatsarāyāmum] saṃvatsarāyāmum, **K** samvatsarāẏāmuṃ **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa_c Mā** *om.* **V71 JM₃**   • ||] **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** ||[1] ru || 21 || **V122** (space) || 21 || **Ji₄** || 21|| ru 10 || **Pa_c** 21 || ru 10 || **V71 JM₃** Z phaśca 1 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes °*rāyāmu[māmuṣyā . .] ||*.
        On *saṃvatsara-*, see my comment on the previous line. Here it likely indicates the 'full year', in opposition to the months as fractions of the year.

---

8   See footnote 6 above.

Kāṇḍikā 22

17.22.1 [prose]

digbhyo antardeśebhya āśābhya āśāpālebhyo [']mum ° ° ° ||

(…) before the directions, before the intermediate region of the compass, before the quarters, before the guardians of the quarters.

antardeśebhya āśābhya āśāpālebhyo] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** antardeśebhya āśābhy(ā→)a āśāpālebhyo **V71** antardeśebhyāśābhyāśāpālebhyo **K** • [']mum] amum, **K** muṃ **[O]** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] JM₃ Pa꜀** ||¹ vīrudbhyā vanaspatibhyo | **V122**[9] ||¹ **Ji₄** | **K V71**

Bhattacharya writes *āśāpālebhyomu[mā . . . .]* ||.

The directions (*díś*-) and the quarters (*ā́śā*-) are fundamental elements of the Vedic vision of the world, already found as such in the RV; on the other hand, the word *antardeśá*-, indicating the area enclosed by the directions (often in sequences of stanzas that list all the possible directions, e.g. ŚS 4.40), is specifically Atharvavedic—it is found in ŚS, PS, and also in the ancillary literature (e.g. KauśS 11.8[87].7, 14, GB 1.2.22, 1.3.14).[10] The word *āśapālá*- 'guardian of the quarters' is absent from RV, but found in AV (and more frequently in later literature), although only in the so-called Āśāpālīyam Sūktam (ŚS 1.31.1–4 ~ PS 1.22.1–4), which is precisely devoted to praising these divine beings.

17.22.2 [prose]

r̥tubhya ārtavebhyo [']dhipatibhya ādhipatyebhyo [']mum ° ° ° ||

(…) before the seasons, to the *ārtavá* periods, before the overlords, before the overlordships.

r̥tubhya ārtavebhyo [']dhipatibhya ādhipatyebhyo] rutubhya ārttavebhyo 'dhipatibhya ādhipatyebhyo **V122 Ji₄ JM₃ [Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** rutubhya ārttavebhyo 'dhipatibhya ādh(e →)i patyebhy(ā →)o **V71** rutubhyo ārttavebhyo 'dhipatibhya adhipatyebhyo **Pa꜀** r̥tubhyārtavebhyo adhipatibhyāmadhipatyebhyo **K** • [']mum] amum, **K** muṃ **[O]** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ||¹ **V122 Ji₄** *om.* **K**

---

9 **V122** seems to show an interpolation from PS 17.21.7 above.

10 The one occurrence outside the AV, namely TĀ 1.8.6c, *rodasyor antardeśeṣu*, refers to the intermediate space between heaven and earth, as a synonym of the more widely used *antárikṣa*-.

Bhattacharya writes the avagraha in *ārtavebhyo 'dhipatibhya ādhipatyebhyomu[mā . .]* ||.

In the AV, the rare word *ārtavá-* appears to indicate a period of time that is longer than a season (*ṛtu-*). See in particular PS 17.28.17–19, *sa māsān upādhāvat* || *sa ṛtūn upādhāvat* || *sa ārtavān upādhāvat* ||, and PS 17.41.2, *śatam ardhamāsāḥ śataṃ māsāḥ śataṃ ṛtavaḥ śatam ārtavāḥ* ||. In both the preceding lists, the items are ordered according to a criterion of increasing duration: fortnights (*ardhamāsa-*), months (*māsa-*), seasons (*ṛtu-*) and finally the *ārtava*-s. With only this data at our disposal, it is impossible to say anything more precise about the actual duration of these *ārtava* periods, although they are presumably shorter than a year (*saṃvatsará-*).

Slaje (1995) has shown that the word *ārtavá-*, in a specialised sense, could also indicate a particular fluid—a sort of female seed endowed with the power of fecundity, just like the male seed —that women were believed to produce periodically: at the beginning of each fecund period, it would be produced in great quantity, and thus overflow as the menstrual blood; then it would continue to be produced invisibly and in lesser quantity inside the body for the rest of the fecund period (*ṛtú-*, in this specialised sense corresponding to 12 to 16 days). However, there is no particular indication that these specialised meanings of *ārtavá-* and *ṛtú-* are intended in our line.

In the AV, the word *ádhipati-* 'overlord' (absent in RV) is used to qualify certain gods insofar as they are said to rule over a particular sphere of the universe or a direction (*diś-*): e.g., PS 19.53.16–18, *agniḥ pṛthivyā adhipatiḥ* […] *vāyur antarikṣasyādhipatiḥ* […] *sūryo divo adhipatiḥ*; PS 17.55.6–10 (cf. ŚS 3.27), *dakṣiṇāyai diśa indrāyādhipataye* […] *pratīcyai diśe varuṇāyādhipataye* […] *udīcyai diśe somāyādhipataye* […] *dhruvāyai diśe viṣṇave 'dhipataye* […] *ūrdhvāyai diśe bṛhaspataye 'dhipataye* […]. Cf. e.g. also PS 11.16.

The derivative *ā́dhipatya-* (n.) is only found in three stanzas (once in RV, twice in AV)— quoted below—which does not help us much to understand its meaning beyond simply 'overlordship'. Notably, however, it always occurs in the singular, which makes the plural form in our line stand out as quite special. These are the occurrences: RV 10.124.5 (pronounced by Indra, or by a new king: see J-B p. 1597ff.), *nírmāyā u tyé ásurā abhūvan tváṃ ca mā varuṇa kāmáyāse* | *ṛténa rājann ánṛtaṃ viviñcán máma rāṣṭrásyā́dhipatyam éhi* ||, "These lords [/Asuras] have lost their magic powers. And if you, Varuṇa, will love me, sifting untruth out from truth, o king, come here to the overlordship of my kingdom" (J-B); ŚS 18.4.54 (~ PS 18.81.1), *ūrjó bhāgó yá imáṃ jajā́nā́śmā́nnānām ā́dhipatyaṃ jagā́ma* | *táṃ arcata viśvámitrā havírbhiḥ sá no yamáḥ prataráṃ jīváse dhāt* ||, "The share of refreshment that generated this man; the stone attained the overlordship of the foods; him praise ye, all-befriended, with oblations; may that Yama make us to live further" (Whitney); ŚS 19.56.3 (~ PS 3.8.3) *bṛhadgā́vā́surebhyó 'dhi devā́n úpāvartata mahimā́nam ichán* | *tásmai svápnāya dadhur ā́dhipatyaṃ trayastriṃśáśaḥ svàr ānaśānā́ḥ* ||, "He of great kine (?) turned unto the gods away from the Asuras, seeking greatness; to that sleep the three-and-thirty ones, having attained the sky, imparted over-lordship" (Whitney).

17.22.3 [prose]

ṛṣibhya ārṣeyebhyo [']ṅgirobhya āṅgirasebhyo [']tharvabhya ātharvaṇebhyo [']mum ° ° ° ||

(…) before the Ṛṣis, before the lineages of the Ṛṣis, before the Aṅgirases, before the lineages of he Aṅgirases, before the Atharvans, before the lineage of the Atharvans.

N.B. In **K**, 17.22.3 comes after 17.22.4.

ṛṣibhya ārṣeyebhyo] ruṣibhya ārṣeẏebhyo **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ruṣibhya ārṣ(a →)eẏebhyo **Pa꜀** ṛṣibhyārṣebhyāyebhyo **K** • [']ṅgirobhya āṅgirasebhyo] aṅgirobhya āṅgirasebhyo **[Ma] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** 'ṅgirobhyo āṅgirasebhyo **Ja** ṅgirobhya āṅgirasebhyo

Ji₄ ṅgirobhyāṅgirasebhyo **K** • [']tharvabhya ātharvaṇebhyo] 'tharvabhya ātharvaṇebhyo **[Ma]** **[Ja] V122 Ji₄ JM₃** 'tharvabhya ātharvaṇebhy(ā →)o **V71** atharvabhya ātharvaṇebhyo **Mā** 'tharvabhya 'tharvaṇebhyo **Pa꜀** *om*. **K** • [']mum] amum, **K** muṃ **[O]** • || **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā]** **V71** ||¹ **V122 Ji₄** | **JM₃** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya writes *ārṣeyebhyo aṅgirobhya āṅgirasebhyo'tharvabhya ātharvaṇebhyomu[mā . . .] ||*.

17.22.4   [prose]

vasubhyo rudrebhya ādityebhyaḥ sādhyebhya āptyebhyo [']mum ° ° ° ||

(…) before the Vasus, before the Rudras, before the Ādityas, before the Sādhyas, before the Āptyas.

N.B. In **K** this line comes before 17.22.3. In **V122**, this line was forgotten by the copyist, who then added it in the upper margin. **V122**'s copyist enclosed the addition between a *kākapada*-sign and a numeral '3': the *kākapada* refers to another *kākapada* that the copyist placed in the third line of the mss. (referred to in turn by the numeral '3') at the end of 17.22.3, where the missing line should be read.

—————

vasubhyo] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** vasubhy(ā→)o **JM₃** vasobhyo **K**   • rudrebhya] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71** rudre[x]bhya **V122** rudrebhy(e→)a **Pa꜀** rudrebhy(o →)a **JM₃** rudrebhyas **K** • ādityebhyaḥ] **K [Ma] [Ja] [Mā] JM₃** ādityebhya **V122** ātyebhyaḥ **Ji₄** ādityebhy(o→)aḥ **Pa꜀** ādityebh[. .] **V71**   • āptyebhyo] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** āptebhyo **K JM₃**   • [']mum] amum, **K** muṃ **[O]**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ||¹ **V122 Ji₄** | **K**

Bhattacharya writes *āptyebhyomu[mā . . . .] ||*.

17.22.5   [prose]

marudbhyo [']śvibhyāṃ brahmaṇe brahmaṇaspataye [']mum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putram ā vṛścāmi ||

I chop down such-and-such, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother] before the Maruts, before the two Aśvins, before the formula, before the Lord of the formula.

marudbhyo] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** marubhyo **JM₃**   • [']śvibhyāṃ] aśvibhyāṃ **K** 'śvibhyāṃ **[Mā]** (*subs*.→')śvibhyāṃ **V71** śvibhyāṃśvibhyāṃ **JM₃** śvibhyāṃ **Ma Ja Nā V122 Ji₄** **Pa꜀** • brahmaṇe] **[O]** vrahmaṇe **K** • brahmaṇaspataye] brahmaṇaspataẏe **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀** **[Mā] V71 JM₃** brahmaṇaspataẏe || **Ji₄** vrahmaṇaspate | **K**   • [']mumāmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ] mumāmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** mumāmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyā(s.s.→)ḥ **V71** amum āmuṣyāyeṇam amuṣyāḥ **K**   • vṛścāmi] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā]** **V71 JM₃** vṛścyāmi **Ji₄ Pa꜀**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** ||¹ **V122** | **V71 K**

Bhattacharya writes *marudbhyo 'śvibhyāṃ* and *brahmaṇaspatayemum°*.

17.22.6 [prose]

a   ye svaś cakrur ye svar ⁺jajñuḥ |
b   tebhyaḥ svaḥkr̥dbhyaḥ svaḥkārebhyo [']mum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putram ā vr̥ścāmi |
c   te svaḥkr̥taḥ svaḥkārā amum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putraṃ parā bhāvayantu ||

Those who have crafted the sky, those who have generated the sky; before such crafters of the sky, before such makers of the sky, before them I chop down such-and-such, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother]. Let them, the crafters of the sky, the makers of the sky, destroy such-and-such, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother].

svaś] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** śva(*s.s.*→sva)ś **V122** mbaś **K**　　• cakrur] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** cakr̥[x]r **Ji₄** cakru[x]r **JM₃**　　• svar ⁺jajñuḥ] svar yajñuḥ **Ma Ja Ji₄ Pa꜀ Mā V71 JM₃** śva(s.s.→sva)ryajñuḥ **V122** mbarajirdhn̥us (= Barret, R-V vs mbarajibn̥us(Mumb. -cn̥us) Bhatt.) **K**　　• |] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ||[1] **V122** || **Ji₄** *om*. **K**　　• tebhyaḥ] **[O]** tebhyas **K**　　• svaḥkr̥dbhyaḥ svaḥkārebhyo] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀** svaḥkr̥dbhyaḥ svaḥkārebhyaḥ **Ji₄** svakr̥dbhyaḥ svaḥkārebhyo **V122** sakr̥dbhyaḥ svakārebhyo **Mā** svakr̥dbhyaḥ svakārebhyo **V71 JM₃** svakratubhyas svaḥkālebhyo **K**　　• [']mum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putraṃ] mum āmuṣyāÿaṇam amuṣyāḥ putraṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** mumāmuṣyāḥ putraṃ **V71** amum, **K**　　• ā vr̥ścāmi] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ā vr̥ścyāmi **V122 Pa꜀** *om*. **K**　　• |] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ V122 Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** || **V71** *om*. **K**　　• te svaḥkr̥taḥ svaḥkārā] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** te svaḥkr̥taḥ svakārā **Pa꜀** te svaṃkr̥taḥ svaḥkārā **V71** tebhyas svaḥkratubhyas svaḥkārā **K**　　• amum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putraṃ] amum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putraṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71** amum āmuṣyā[ħ]ẏaṇam amuṣyāḥ putraṃ **JM₃** amumā muṣyāya(X)ṇama muṣyāḥ putraṃ **Pa꜀**[11] amum, **K**　　• parā bhāvayantu] parā bhāvaẏantu **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** parā bhāvantuḥ **Ji₄** parā bhāvaẏantuṃ **JM₃** *om*. **K**　　• ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** ||₃ **V122**[12] ||³ **Ji₄ JM₃** | **K**

Bhattacharya writes *svarjajñuḥ*⁺ and *svaḥkārebhyomum*°.
　　The compounds *svaḥkr̥t-* and *svaḥkāra-* are both hapax legomena.

17.22.7 [prose]

a   ye tapaś cakrur ye tapo ⁺jajñuḥ |
b   tebhyas tapaskr̥dbhyas tapaskārebhyo [']mum ° ° ° |
c   te tapaskr̥tas tapaskārā amum ° ° ° |

Those who have crafted heat, those who have generated heat—before the crafters of heat, before the makers of heat, [I chop down] (…). [Let] them, the crafters of heat, the makers of heat, [destroy] such-and-such (…).

N.B. In **Ji₄** the notation *kā* and *kā₃* seem to indicate the two refrains, which are written *in extenso* in 17.22.6 and 17.22.8. On this notation see Griffiths 2009: xxxii §2.1.2.7.

––––––––––

cakrur] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** caku **Ji₄**　　• ⁺jajñuḥ] yajñuḥ **O** jiṣn̥us **K**　　• |] **Ja**

––––––––––

11 **Pa꜀** here writes a sign that looks like a Roman capital letter X, which I have not seen elsewhere. I wonder if it could indicate that **Pa**'s exemplar featured an erased akṣara at that spot.

12 In **V122** here, the subscript (!) numeral '3' contradicts the superscript '1' after the first of the three lines.

Ma V122 Pa꜀ Mā V71 ‖ **JM₃ Ji₄** *om.* **K**   tebhyas tapaskṛdbhyas] **[O]** te tapaskṛtyas **K**   •
tapaskārebhyo] **K [Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** tapa(*s.s.*→ḥ)skārebhyo **V122** tapaḥkārebhyo **Ji₄**
tapask(o →)ā(*s.s.* →re)bhyo **V71**   • [']muṃ] amum, **K** muṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** mu
˥ kā **Ji₄** mu **Pa꜀**   • ‖] **Ma Ja Ji₄ Pa꜀ Mā V71** ‖ **V122 JM₃** *om.* **K**   • te tapaskṛtas tapaskārā
amum] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** te [x](→ta)paskṛtas tapaskārā amuṃ **V122**[13] te tapaskatas
tapaskārā ˥ amuṃ kā(*s.s.*→)3 **Ji₄** te tapaskṛdbhyas tapaskārāmum, **K**   • ‖] **Ma Ja Ji₄ Pa꜀ Mā**
V71 JM₃ ‖³ **V122** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya writes *jajñuḥ⁺* and abbreviates the refrain in the second and third lines as
tapaskārebhyomu [māmuṣyā . . .] | and *tapaskārā amu[māmuṣyā . . . yantu]* |, respectively.
    The compounds *tapaskṛt-* and *tapaskāra-* are both hapax legomena.

17.22.8   [prose]

a   ye brahma cakrur ye brahma ⁺jajñuḥ |
b   tebhyo brahmakṛdbhyo brahmakārebhyo [']mum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putram ā vṛścāmi |
c   te brahmakṛto brahmakārā amum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putraṃ parā bhāvayantu ‖

Those who have crafted the formula, those who have generated the formula; before the crafters of
the formula, before the makers of the formula, I chop down such-and-such, descendant of such-and-
such [father], son of such-and-such [mother]. Let them, the crafters of the formula, the makers of
the formula, destroy such-and-such, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such
[mother].

N.B. After *brahmakārebhyo* in 8b, **Pa꜀** features a lacuna, which extends all the way to 17.22.9b.

———————

ye brahma cakrur] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ye brahma cakūr **Ji₄** ye vrahma cakrur **K**
• ye brahma ⁺jajñuḥ] ye brahma yajñuḥ **O** ye vrahma jiṣṇus **K**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā]**
V71 ‖ **JM₃ Ji₄** *om.* **K**   • tebhyo brahmakṛdbhyo] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** tebhyo
brahmakṛbhyo **JM₃** tebhyo vrakṛdbhyo **K**   • brahmakārebhyo] **[O]** vrahmakārebhyo **K**   •
[']mum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putram] mum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putram **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄**
[Mā] V71 JM₃ amum, amumāmuṣyāyeṇam amuṣyaḥ putram **K** *om.* **Pa꜀**   • ā vṛścāmi] **K [Ma]**
[Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃ ā vṛścyāmi **V122** kṛścyāmi **Ji₄** *om.* **Pa꜀**   • ‖] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā]**
V71 ‖ **JM₃** *om.* **Pa꜀**   • te brahmakṛto] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** te vrahmakṛto **K** *om.*
Pa꜀   • brahmakārā amum] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** vrahmakārā mam **K** *om.* **Pa꜀**   •
āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putraṃ parā bhāvayantu] āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putraṃ parā bhāvayantu
[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃ āmuṣyāyeṇam amuṣyaḥ putraṃ parā bhāvayantu **K** *om.* **Pa꜀**   •
‖] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71** ‖³ **V122 Ji₄ JM₃** | **K** *om.* **Pa꜀**

Bhattacharya writes *brahmakārebhyomum°*.
    The epithets *brahmakṛ́t-* and *brahmakārá-* are otherwise absent from the AV. However, the
former is found seven times in RV, and is applied to various entities: first, to the Maruts, in RV
3.32.2, *gávāśiram manthínam indra śukrám píbā sómaṃ rarimá te mádāya | brahmakṛ́tā mắrutenā
gaṇéna sajóṣā rudraís tṛpád ắ vṛṣasva* ‖, "Mixed with cows [=milk], stirred (with meal), or pure, o
Indra—drink the soma. We have given it to you for your exhilaration. Joined in pleasure with the
formulation-making flock of Maruts, with the Rudras, drench yourself (in it), to satiety" (J-B).

———————

13 In **V122** here, the correction is written in subscript directly below the erased akṣara, and is accompanied by the
     numeral '4', indicating that it refers to the fourth line in the manuscript.

Secondly, *brahmakŕt-* is used to describe a *gaṇá* that is meant to accompany Agni in his mission towards the gods in RV 7.9.5b, *ágne yāhí dūtyàm mā́ riṣaṇyo devā́m̐ áchā brahmakŕtā gaṇéna*); could these be the Maruts themselves? Or maybe the soma pressers (see below)?

The epithet is also found with reference to various gods in RV 10.66.5, *sárasvān dhībhír váruṇo dhṛtávrataḥ pūṣā́ víṣṇur mahimā́ vāyúr aśvínā | brahmakŕto amŕtā viśvávedasaḥ śárma no yaṃsan trivárūtham áṃhasaḥ ||*, "Sarasvant along with insights, Varuṇa whose commandments are upheld, Pūṣan, Viṣṇu, the Greatness, Vāyu and the Aśvins, the creators of sacred formulations, immortal, having all possessions, they will extend to us shelter providing threefold defence from difficult straits" (J-B)—unless *brahmakŕtó* is not an epithet here but a category of divine beings, perhaps again the Maruts.

However, the same epithet can also refer to humans, in particular to those who press the soma (RV 7.32.2a, 8.66.6cd, 10.50.7a). In one case, a Ṛgvedic poet attributes the epithet to himself in the final line of his composition (RV 10.54.6cd): *ádha priyáṃ śūṣám índrāya mánma brahmakŕto bṛhádukthād avāci*, "So, a dear fortifying thought has been spoken to Indra from Bṛhaduktha, the crafter of sacred formulations" (J-B).

In most cases, it seems, the image evoked is that of a group of people (gods or seers) who craft poems out of the inspiration provided by soma drinking.

A similar image is inferred from the only RV occurrence of *brahmakārá-*, RV 6.29.4, *sá sóma ā́miślatamaḥ sutó bhūd yásmin paktíḥ pacyáte sánti dhānā́ḥ | índraṃ nára stuvánto brahmakārā́ ukthā́ śáṃsanto devávātatamāḥ ||*, "(But) the pressed soma has become the most firmly attached (to him), in whose (presence) the cooked food is cooked and there are roasted grains, while the men who create the sacred formulations are praising Indra and reciting their hymns as the men most cherished by the gods" (J-B).

Along the same lines, RV also features the word *bráhmakṛti-* "the preparation of the chanter's (*árcataḥ*) sacred formulation" (J-B), which is inspired by Indra (RV 7.28.5c, 7.29.5c, 7.30.5c), who then takes pleasure in it (RV 7.29.2a).

17.22.9 [prose]

a   aghāriṇīm *amūm aghaviddhāṃ vikeśīm apapratidhim *āsāktāṃ devamanuṣyāḥ paśyantu |
b   amum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putraṃ ⁺ruruduṣīm ||

Let the gods and men see such-and-such [woman], without having anointed [her hair], struck by mishap, with dishevelled hair, without the [two] *pratidhí* ornaments, covered with ash, as she has been mourning such-and-such, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother].

N.B. At the beginning of 17.22.9b, **K** shows an interpolation (anticipation) from 17.22.10b. The whole of 9a is missing from **Pa_c**.

---

aghāriṇīm] **K Ma Ja V122 Mā** agharaṇīm **Ji₄ JM₃** aghāraṇī[x]m **V71** *om.* **Pa_c** • *amūm] amum **K Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Mā V71 JM₃** *om.* **Pa_c** • aghaviddhāṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71** agharvaddhāṃ **JM₃** aghaviddhām **K** *om.* **Pa_c** • vikeśīm] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** bikeśrīm **K** *om.* **Pa_c** • apapratidhim] **V122 Ji₄ V71 JM₃** apapratithim **Ma Ja**[14] amapratidhim **Mā** upapratim **K** *om.* **Pa_c** • *āsāktāṃ] āsoktīṃ **Ma Ja V122 Mā V71 JM₃** āsottīṃ **Ji₄** āsoktān **K** *om.* **Pa_c** • devamanuṣyāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā]** devamanusyā **V71 JM₃** devamanuṣyāḥ **K** *om.*

---

14 Given that all my **O** mss. read *apapratidhi*, with °*dhi*°, I am inclined to think that Bhattacharya's *apapratithi* (**Ma Ja**) with °*thi*° might be a misprint.

Pa꜀ • paśyantu | amum] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** paśyantu ‖ amum **V122** mum **Pa꜀** paśyantu | vayā́ṃsi śakunavayo mum **K** • āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ] āmuṣyāẏanam amuṣyāḥ **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** āmuṣyāḥẏaṇam amuṣyāḥ **V122** āmuṣyāẏeṇam amuṣyaḥ **K** • putraṃ] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** putra **JM₃** • ⁺ruruduṣīm] rurudhuṣīm **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71** rurundhuṣīm **Mā** rurudh(ī →)uṣīm **JM₃** ruduṣīn **K** • ‖] **O** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya writes *amū*maghaviddhām̐*, probably correcting the akṣara *mu* into **mū*. He then writes *apapratidhim*, oddly without any emendation sign, although his mss. (**Ja**, **Ma**, **Mā**) do not feature that reading as such (it is found instead in **V122**, **Ji₄**, **V71**, **JM₃**)—unless °*thi*° in his apparatus is a misprint (see footnote 14). He then writes *āsoktīm̐*. Finally, he writes *rurudhuṣīm*, following the **O** mss.

    a. Note that **amūm* stands for a feminine name. We can imagine that the name of an enemy's wife is to be supplied here.

    With regards to *aghāriṇīm* and *vikeśīm*, Bhattcharya refers to ŚS 11.9, a hymn addressed to Arbudi, a (snake?) demon and ally of Indra, whom the poet invokes for help with defeating enemies. Indeed, within this hymn, ŚS 11.9.14 seems to describe the mourning wife or sister of a man (the speaker's enemy) who has been 'bitten, scratched' (i.e. killed?) by Arbudi: *pratighnānā́ḥ sáṃ dhāvantū́raḥ paṭūrā́v āghnānā́ḥ | aghāríṇīr vikeśyò rudatyàḥ púruṣe haté radité arbude táva ‖*, "Smiting themselves let them (f.) run together, smiting on the breast, the thighs (?), not anointing, with dishevelled hair, wailing when the man is slain, bitten, O Arbudi, of thee" (Whitney). PW glosses *aghāríṇī-* more precisely with 'nicht salbend (die Haare)'.

    The word *vikeśī́-*, certainly also referring to hair, is similarly used to describe a mourning woman in the same hymn in ŚS 11.9.7: *pratighnānā́śrumukhī́ kṛdhukarṇī́ ca krośatu | vikeśī́ púruṣe haté radité arbude táva ‖*, "Smiting herself, tear-faced, and crop-eared (?), let her yell, with dishevelled hair, when the man is slain, bitten (? *rad*), O Arbudi, of thee" (Whitney). Compare also ŚS 12.5.46–48 (~ PS 16.145.3–4), quoted in my comment on PS 17.22.10 below. The same word refers to a woman wailing and mourning in ŚS 14.2.60 (~ PS 18.12.7):[15] *yádīyáṃ duhitā́ táva vikeśy árudad gṛhé ródena kṛṇvaty aghám | agníṣ ṭvā tásmād énasaḥ savitā́ ca prá muñcatām ‖*, "If this daughter of thine has wailed with loosened hair in thy house, doing evil with wailing, from that sin let Agni and Savitar release thee" (Whitney).

    More references to the connection between unkempt hair and mourning women in the Veda have been collected by Bᴌᴏᴏᴍꜰɪᴇʟᴅ (1890b: 336ff.). Particularly interesting is ŚS 8.1.19, *út tvā mṛtyór apīparaṃ* [...] *| mā́ tvā vyastakeśyò mā́ tvāgharúdo rudan ‖*, "I have passed you over death … may the women with dishevelled hair not wail over you, may the women who bewail misfortune (or who wail ominously) not wail over you" (Bᴌᴏᴏᴍꜰɪᴇʟᴅ, ibid., p. 339). The same author points out that, according to KauśS 84.10, women with dishevelled hair (*prakīrṇakeśyaḥ*) act as performers during the preparation of the cremation ground (*śmaśāna*).

    Again *vikeśī-* is not only used to describe wailing women, but also sorceresses (*yātudhānī-*), for instance in a hymn meant to ward them off (ŚS 1.28.4cd: *ádhā mithó vikeśyò ví ghnatāṃ yātudhānyò* [...], "then let the horrid-haired sorceresses mutually destroy one another" (Whitney)), as well as in another hymn to describe certain evil beings whom Paśupati is asked to drive away (ŚS 11.2.11, "To Rudra": […] *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, the dogs go, away the weepers of evil with dishevelled hair" (Whitney); ~ PS 16.105.1). Cf. also ŚS 5.17.4ab (~ PS 9.15.4a), describing a meteor—a bad omen—as a woman with dishevelled hair: *yā́m āhús tā́rakaiṣā́ vikeśī́ti duchúnāṃ grā́mam avapádyamānām | sā́ brahmajāyā́ ví dunoti rāṣṭráṃ yátra prā́pādi śaśá ulkuṣī́mān ‖*, "The misfortune, descending upon

---

15 This stanza belongs to a series of three (14.2.59, 60, 61 ~ PS 18.12.7, 8, 9) dealing with the purification of a house in which a marriage is being arranged, in the event that women have recently been mourning (with wailing and dancing) there (see Bᴌᴏᴏᴍꜰɪᴇʟᴅ 1890b: 336ff.).

the village, of which they say "this is a star with dishevelled hair"—as such, the Brahman's wife burns up the kingdom, where hath gone forth a hare [i.e. the moon] accompanied with meteors (*ulkuṣī*)" (Whitney).

The rare word *pratidhí* also occurs in a stanza about hair and probably mourning: PS 5.34.3 (in a charm "Against a female rival"), *ye keśā yau pratidhī , yat kurīraṃ ya opaśaḥ | atho ye te svāḥ santi , sarve te te 'bhiśocanam ||*, "The hair, the two *pratidhis*, the *kurīra*, the *opaśa*, and also the [hair] which is your own—they all are your torment" (Lubotsky). The only other occurrence of *pratidhí-* is in RV 10.85.8ab (the wedding hymn) ~ ŚS 14.1.8ab, *stómā āsan pratidháyaḥ kurī́raṃ chánda opaśáḥ*, "the praises were the *pratidhi*-ornaments, metre was the *kurīra*, the *opaśa*" (Lubotsky). Note that J-B still prefer the translation 'cross-bars': as Whitney (commenting on ŚS 14.1.8) points out, this interpretation is based on the commentaries, according to which the *pratidhí*-s are 'cross-pieces on the chariot pole' (cf. also Sparreboom 1985: 123). However, as Whitney himself noted (ibid.)—and our line supports his view—this word must indicate some kind of ornament.

According to AiGr II.1 §110bβ p. 282, the preverb *ápa* as the first member of a bahuvrīhi yields various possible meanings: 'fern' (e.g. *ápodaka*, 'far from water, waterless', *ápaśiras*, 'without head', *apagrāma*, 'exiled, far from the community', etc.); 'verkehrt' (e.g. *apartú*, 'untimely'); and 'abgewandt' (e.g. Cl.Skt. *apaśruti*, 'from which one turns away his ears, unpleasant to hear'), the most common being the first meaning. Thus, the compound *apapratidhi-* must certainly mean 'without *pratidhí* ornaments'.

The compound *aghaviddhā-*, 'struck by mishap', is a hapax. Bodewitz (2006) has shown that, although the original, general meaning of *aghá-* in Vedic is 'evil', in RV it particularly expresses the misery of a victim of a mishap, and in the AV and ŚB it is specifically connected with the distress caused by mourning the loss of a relative. Such semantics perfectly fit our line. Thus we might also consider interpreting our compound as 'torn by sorrow'.

Bhattacharya writes *āsoktīṃ*, pointing out in his comment that it would be a hapax and considering a possible mistake for *āsotthīṃ*, which we could perhaps interpret as meaning 'standing on ashes', given that Bhattacharya further refers to PS 16.74.10a (~ ŚS 9.8.10a), *āso balāso bhavatu*, "Let the *balāsa*[16] become ash", and to *āsakundume*, as he writes the final part of PS 6.23.5d. As I understand it, this latter reference is also meant to provide a parallel of a problematic reading of the akṣaras °*kta*° and its confusion with °*ku*°, an error that he is considering for our text. In editing PS 6.23.5d, which presented a similar problem, Griffiths (2009: 250) opted to read °*kta*° over an attested °*ku*° (...*āsakun*... **O**, ...*āmakuṇ*... **K**), and proposed the emendation *āsaktaṃ, 'afflicted' (from *ā́-sañj-*). The line in question is very problematic, and I shall not discuss it here. I also refer to Griffiths's comment for a discussion of this adjective. Note that at any rate our mss. unanimously agree on reading °*kt*° (with the probably irrelevant exception of the often corrupted **Ji₄**). I shall simply observe here that perhaps *āsaktāṃ, 'afflicted' (with feminine accusative ending; compare the long vowel in *āsoktān* in **K**), could be a possible emendation for our text. However, I alternatively propose the (unattested) compound *āsākta-*, 'covered in ash' (from *ā́sa-*, 'ash', and *aktá-*, the verbal adjective of *añj-*, 'to anoint'). Of course, the appropriate emendation should be the feminine accusative *āsāktāṃ (for the long vowel in the ending, compare *āsoktān* in **K**). This would be a possible reference to covering one's head or body with ashes, a practice attested cross-culturally in relation to funeral ceremonies.

In conclusion, we can say that all these elements seem to portray a mourning woman, most likely the wife or sister of the reciter's enemy.

Bhattacharya follows the Odisha mss. and writes *rurudhuṣīm* at the end of the line. I can make no sense of this line if we accept a form of the root *rudh-*, 'to obstruct', and I rather propose to emend this final perfect participle to +*ruruduṣīm* (cf. *ruduṣīm* **K**). The root *rud-*, 'to cry, weep', can also be employed in transitive constructions with the meaning 'to mourn, bewail, wail over

---

16 A kind of sickness: see Zysk 1985: 32f.

(someone)'. Meaning-wise, this seems more consistent with the theme of our stanza, and is supported by the many occurrences of forms of the root *rud-* in similar stanzas (see e.g. ŚS 8.1.19, quoted above, and BLOOMFIELD 1890b for other references). A possible problem with this proposal is that no perfect form is attested before the Mahābhārata. In fact, this would be the earliest attestation of the perfect of *rud-*[17] or, from a different perspective, it would add to the indications that we are dealing with a rather late text. One may wonder what the poet is wishing to express here with a perfect: it is possible that he is magically invoking his enemy's death by treating it as a fact that has already happened.

17.22.10 [prose]

a   aliklavā gr̥dhrāḥ kaṅkāḥ suparṇāḥ śvāpadāḥ patatriṇaḥ |

b   vayāṃsi śakunayo [']muṣyāmuṣyāyaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ putrasyādahane carantu ||

Let the *aliklava* carrion birds, the vultures, the adjutant storks, the eagles, the scavengers, the winged ones (/ the carrion-eating winged ones), the birds, the *śakuni* birds, go about in the cremation ground of such-and-such, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother].

aliklavā] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā]** V71 JM₃ aliklavā V122 Pac alikḷīvā Ji₄ aliklusāka **K**   • gr̥dhrāḥ] **[O]** gr̥ddhrāḥ **K**   • kaṅkāḥ] kaṅkās **K** kaṃkāḥ **Ma Ja Ji₄ Pac Mā V71 JM₃** kaṃṅkāḥ **V122**   • suparṇāḥ] suparṇṇā **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Mā V71** suparṇṇāsuparṇṇā **Pac** saparṇṇā **JM₃** suvarṇās **K**   • śvāpadāḥ] śvāpadāḥ **K** śvapādāḥ **[Ma]?** ścapādāḥ **Ja V122 Ji₄ Pac Mā V71 JM₃**   • patatriṇaḥ] **[O]** patatriṇo **K** |] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pac **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ || Ji₄ *om.* **K**   • vayāṃsi] **K** vayāṃsi **[O]**   • śakunayo] **K** śakunaẏo **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pac **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ syakunaẏo Ji₄   • [']muṣyāmuṣyāyaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ] muṣyāmuṣyāẏaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ **[Ma] [Ja]** Ji₄ V71 'muṣyāmuṣyāẏaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ **JM₃** muṣyāẏaṇasyāmuṣyāḥ **Mā** Pac muṣyāẏa[.]syā muṣyāḥ V122 mum āmuṣyāyeṇam amuṣyaḥ **K**   • carantu] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pac **[Mā]** V71 carantu[ḥ] **JM₃**   • ||] **[Ma]? [Ja]?** || 22 || ru 10 || **Mā V71 JM₃ Pac** || ru || 22 || **V122** || 22 || ° || **Ji₄**[18] ZZ phaśca 2 ZZ **K**

Bhattacharya writes *aliklavāḥ gr̥dhrāḥ* (if original, this sandhi would be problematic, but all my mss. read *-vā gr̥-*, so I assume that Bhattacharya's edition must feature a misprint) and *śvapādāḥ* in **a**. He writes *śakunayomuṣyā* in **b**.

    a. Note that the word *alíklava-* occurs only twice in the ŚS, in 11.2.2 (~ PS 16.104.2), "To Rudra", and 11.9.9, "To Arbudi", the very same hymns that I quoted above with regard to *aghariṇī* and *vikeśī*. Whitney renders it with "buzzard", although, he admits, "purely conjecturally". Mayrhofer rather identifies it (correctly) as a carrion bird ("eine Art Aasvogel", EWAia I p.127). For a discussion on its etymology and a possible connection with terms like *kravís-* and *krūrá-* (possibly also with the hapax *ákravihasta-*, "whose hands are not bloody", (?) in RV 5.62.6 as well as *víklava-*, 'scared') see DAS 1987, who discusses a possible interpretation as "dessen rohes Fleisch [von dem er sich ernährt] / Aas Feinde sind", based on variants with °*r*° (*ari*°, °*kravi-*, °*krava-*) the details of which do not interest us here. A third occurrence of *alíklava-* is found in JB 2.440, in which a story is told according to which the gods need to retrieve the cows stolen by the Paṇis and

---

17 KÜMMEL 2000 does not record any perfect form of *rud-*.

18 Note that the sequence "|| 22 || # ||" in Ji₄ is extended (by leaving ample space between each sign) so as to fill up all the rest of the manuscript line up to the right margin. Clearly the copyist wished to make the end of the chapter match the end of the line, and wished the next chapter to begin at the left margin in the following line. This detail could be relevant when investigating the genetic relationship of this ms. and other mss. However, none of the extant mss. shows this pattern here.

entrust the *aliklava* with the task (*te devā aliklavam ūcus suparṇa imā no gā anviccheti*). The bird finds the Paṇis; these, however, present him with an offering of various milk products in exchange for his silence. The bird flies back and lies to the gods, but Indra squeezes his throat, making him vomit the milk products. The gods then send the bitch Saramā after the Pāṇis while Indra curses the *aliklava*: *taṃ ha tac chaśāpāśilaṃ jālma te jīvanaṃ bhūyad yo no gā anuvidya tā na prāvoca iti tasya ha etad grāmasya jaghanārdhe yat pāpiṣṭhaṃ taj jīvanam*, "[Indra] cursed him then: 'o scoundrel, may the life of you, who, having found the cows, did not tell us, become disreputable'. To him [belongs] that hind-part of the village, which is the worst (i.e. the dump, where the rubbish is wasted); that [is his] life". Whatever the interpretation, the word *aliklava* is most likely a substantive, although an adjectival use cannot be excluded (cf. DAS 1987: 94f.).

The word *gŕdhra-* already occurs 8 times in RV, both as an adjective, glossed by GW with 'gierig, begierig, eifrig strebend', and as a noun, 'Geier'. However, it can also be a general word for 'bird of prey': cf. RV 9.96.6, *brahmā́ devā́nām padavī́ḥ kavīnā́m, ŕṣir víprāṇām mahiṣó mṛgā́ṇām | śyenó gŕdhrāṇām svádhitir vánānām, sómaḥ pavítram áty eti rébhan ||*, "Brahmán priest among the gods, track [= word]-finder among the poets, seer among the inspired ones, buffalo among the wild animals, falcon among the birds of prey, axe among the trees, gurgling the soma goes beyond the filter (= is the best[19])" (my translation).

The fourth item in our list, the *suparṇá-*, 'schön geflügelt' (PW), can also indicate both a bird of prey as the eagle, as well as vultures: GW glosses it with 'ein grosser Vogel: Adler, Geier'.

FITZGERALD (1998) has shown that the word *kaṅka-* (on which see also EWAia I p.289), glossed by all dictionaries with 'heron', not only refers to such bird, but is also used throughout the Mbh to indicate some kind of carrion-eating bird (which cannot be a heron, as these birds are not scavengers). Fitzgerald has proposed to identify it with the *Leptopilos dubius*, commonly known as the greater adjutant stork, or the *Leptopilos javanicus*, the lesser adjutant stork, both members of the ciconidae family—to which herons also belong—and both carrion birds. The word is not attested in RV.[20]

The identity of the *śakúni-* (or *śakuná-*; see EWAia II p. 603 for related forms) is unclear. It is sometimes described as a black or ruddy bird of ill-omen, *kṛṣṇáḥ śakúnir* in ŚS 7.64 (a two-stanza hymn against the evil influence of this bird) ~ PS 20.16.6-7 (immediately following a stanza against bad dreams, PS 20.16.5 = PS 5.23.7 ~ ŚS 4.17.5), and in PS 3.30.4a (a hymn against nightmares, which shows several parallels with PS 17.24 and 25 below); *kṛṣṇáḥ śakuná* in ŚS 12.3.12 (~ PS 17.51.3), notably a hymn about cremation, and ŚS 18.3.55 (~ PS 18.74.8 ~ RV 10.16.6), a stanza from a funeral hymn and in which *śvā́padaḥ* are also mentioned (see below); and *bradhnaḥ śakuniḥ* in PS 7.7.10, in which the *darbha* grass (to which the hymn is addressed) is employed against sorcerers (*yātudhā́na-*) and against this "ruddy bird"—again immediately following a stanza (PS 7.7.9) in which poor sleep is "burnt off" (*apadagdhaṃ +duṣvapnyam ...*).

In relation to *ādáhana-*, 'cremation ground', compare the following lines, in which the image of carrion birds is juxtaposed with that of long-haired women (most likely wailing women) beating themselves (cf. my comment on PS 17.22.9 above): ŚS 12.5.46–48 (~ PS 16.145.3–4), *yá eváṃ vidúṣo brāhmaṇásya kṣatríyo gā́m ādatté || kṣiprám vaí tásyāhánane gŕdhrāḥ kurvata ailabám || kṣiprám vaí tásyādáhanaṃ pári nŕtyanti keśínīr āghnānā́ḥ pāṇínórasi kurvāṇā́ḥ pāpám*

---

19 On this use of *ati-i-* see my comment on PS 17.34.1b.

20 Elsewhere in the AV, *kaṅka-* is only found in the compound *kaṅkáparvan-*, attested in ŚS 7.56.1 (a hymn against poison of snakes and insects): *tiráścirājer asitā́t pŕdākoḥ pári sáṃbhṛtam | tát kaṅkáparvaṇo viṣám iyáṃ vīrúd anīnaśat ||*, "From the cross-lined [snake], from the black snake, from the adder [what is] gathered that poison of the heron-jointed (?) one hath this plant made to disappear" (Whitney) ~ PS 20.14.7, *tiraścirājer asitāt , +pṛdākor adhi saṃbhṛtam | tat kaṅkaparvaṇo viṣam , iyaṃ vīrud adūduṣat ||*, "Von der Quergestreiften, von der Schwarzen, von der Gepunkteten Zusammengetragenes, das Gift der Ringumgürteten hat die Pflanze hier jetzt schlechtgemacht" (Kubisch). For a different interpretation of *kaṅkáparvan-* as 'scorpion', see DAS 1985: 265f. Another compound, *kaṅka-cít-*, glossed by Mayrhofer as 'in Gestalt eines *k°* geschichtet' (EWAia I 289; cf. PW s.v. *kaṅka-*), is found in YV texts.

ailabám ||, "Whatever Kshatriya takes to himself the cow of a Brahman who knoweth thus. Quickly, indeed, at his killing the vultures make a din. Quickly, indeed, about his place of burning dance the long-haired women, beating on the breast with the hand, making an evil din" (Whitney).

As concerns the fifth word in our line, if we trust Bhattacharya's apparatus, all of the **O** mss read *ścapādāḥ* except for Bhattacharya's ms. **Ma**., which reads *śvapādāḥ*. The latter ms. is indeed the most reliable, and sometimes it alone preserves the correct reading, but given that all of the other **O** mss. (including mine) have *śca-*, I would not rule out the possibility of a misprint in Bhattacharya's apparatus. It is also possible that the reading of **Ma** is a secondary emendation from an original **O** *ścapādāḥ. However, a solution such as *suparṇāś ca pādāḥ* doesn't make sense to me, and to imagine *suparṇāś* ca *[su]pādāḥ* with ellipsis of *su-* is perhaps too speculative. Given the reading of **K**, *śvāpadāḥ*, it seems safe to assume that the cluster *śv* is original. However, what is the word we are looking for? Bhattacharya, on the basis of **Ma**, opts for a nom. pl. form of the compound *śvapāda-* (= *śvapada*): 'a dog's foot, or its mark branded on the body' (MW), 'Hundepfote, als Brandmahl' (PW). This is a late compound of *śvan-* and *pāda-* (Manusmṛti+ according to the dictionaries) and is probably not the correct editorial choice. Again, following **K**, I would instead consider *śvápada-* a derivative of the old compound *śvápad-*.

The bahuvrīhi compound *śvápad-*, 'wildes Tier' (EWAia II 675 *s.v. śván-*; Hoffmann, 1956: 6 = 1976: 388f.), 'having the foot like that of a dog', is first found as a genitive plural in ŚS 8.5.11abc = 19.39.4abc (~ PS 16.28.1abc = PS 7.10.4abc)—the only occurrences in the AV— belonging to hymns "against witchcraft with an amulet" and "to the Kuṣṭha plant", respectively: *uttamó asy óṣadhīnām anaḍvā́n jágatām iva vyāghráḥ śvápadām iva* |, "Thou art the chief of herbs, as the ox of moving creatures, as the tiger of wild beasts (*śvápad*)' (Whitney). Griffiths (2009) translates PS 7.10.4 as follows: "You are the supreme among plants, like the ox among moving creatures, like the tiger among the 'dog-footed'". Thus, *śvápad-* seems to indicate a category of animals, among which the tiger (*vyāghráḥ*) is the most prominent example. This formation is an old one, as it is also attested as Av. *spō.pad-*, which is however the proper name of one of the holy beings worshipped in Yašt 13(116), a composition devoted to the *fravašis*, and thus does not teach us anything further about the semantics and use of this formation. A second Vedic occurrence, KS 35.4, is discussed below.

The vṛddhi derivative *śvā́pada-*[21] (according to MW 'beast of prey', PW 'ein reissendes Tier'; cf. also AiGr II, 1 §48a p. 109, §56c p. 133, Nachtr. p. 35; II, 2 §36bβ p. 122; Hoffmann *ibid*.) occurs 3x in the AV (one of which instances is paralleled in the RV) besides our line, 3x in ŚB[22] (one of which instances in the BĀU), 1x in ChU, 2x in BŚS, 1x in ŚāṅkhĀ and 1x in ĀpŚS, for a total of 11 occurrences (besides the one in our line). In six of these occurrences (plus the one in our line), the word is attested as a masculine, in five as a neuter.

It is interesting that all the words in our line refer to birds, so we need to explain why "wild beasts" would be mentioned here: can this word also indicate some kind of bird or be an adjective describing birds? In order to find an answer it will be worth it to survey all of its occurrences in prose and poetry, discuss its semantics, whether it is a noun or an adjective, and why, as we will see, it occurs both in the masculine and in the neuter gender.

---

21 PW only records the lemmata *śvā́pad*. m., and *śvā́pada* m., n. Whitney, *Index*, p. 298, groups all ŚS occurences under the heading "*śvā́pada, śvā́pad, śvā́pad*", without specifying what attestation is an instance of which stem. AiGr II,1 §48a p. 109 also mentions all three stems. Just like PW, Hoffmann (1956: 7 = 1976: 388f.) identifies only two stems instead, and regards as suspect a nom. pl. from a stem *śvā́pad* in ŚS 11.10.8. He considers the option that it might be an error, or that it should be interpreted as a nom. sg. from the root *śvā́pada-*. Griffiths (2009) too only takes into consideration the stems *śvā́pada* and *śvā́pad*, but makes no mention of their gender. I follow PW, Hoffmann and Griffiths in positing only two stems, the bahuvrīhi *śvápad-* and the vṛddhi derivative *śvā́pada-*, as there is indeed no compelling evidence also to posit a stem *śvā́pad-*.

22 The references to ŚB given in PW (ŚB 5.5.4.10; ŚB 14.2.4.16; ŚB 4.2.29) are incorrect: the correct ones are the following: ŚB 5.5.4.10, ŚB 4.2.4.16; ŚB 14.4.2.29 (=BĀU 1.4.16).

Let's first consider the Vedic prose passages.

(1) In one ŚB passage (ŚB 5.5.4.10) various entities are born flowing out of the openings of Indra's vital breaths; among them are the *śvā́padas*. Here we learn that the *śvā́pada* is a category of animals of which is the tiger is the foremost (*śārdūlájyeṣṭhāḥ*): ŚB 5.5.4.10, *sá yán nástó 'dravat tátaḥ siṃháḥ sámabhavad átha yát kárṇābhyām ádravat táto kŕ̥kaḥ sámabhavad átha yád ávācaḥ prāṇā́d adrávat tátaḥ śārdūlájyeṣṭhāḥ śvā́padāḥ* (nom. pl. masculine) *sámabhavat* […], "From what flowed from the nose a lion sprang; and from what flowed from the ears a wolf sprang; and from what flowed from the lower opening wild beasts sprang, with the tiger as their foremost" (Eggeling). At first sight it is not clear whether the lion and the wolf should be excluded from the *śvā́pada* category, or if we should rather translate with "from what flowed from the lower opening [other] wild beasts sprang, with the tiger as their foremost". At any rate the mention of the *śārdūlá*, recalls the above-quoted occurrence of *śvápad-*, in which the most prominent example of the category was the *vyāghrá*. From this it would seem that *śvápad-* and *śvā́pada-* are synonyms.

(2) There is a second example in which *śvápad-* and *śvā́pada-* seem to be equivalent: ĀpŚS 9.17.5 describes what to do in case a *śvā́pada* touches (*mŕ̥ś-*) an oblation. The text prescribes the recitation of a stanza (~ KS 35.4) that calls on Agni to cleanse what a *śvápad-* has licked (*lih-* in the ĀpŚS version, but *mŕ̥ś-* in the KS version). The passage is the following: *yad avālikṣac chūpān* (cf. KS 35.4: *avā́mŕ̥kṣac chvápān*) *mukhena nirŕ̥te tava | agniṣ ṭat sarvaṃ śundhatu havyavā́ḍ ghr̥tasūdana iti śvāpadāvamr̥ṣṭam abhimantrayate | abhyavaharaṇādi pūrvavat | nātra pātraṃ prayujyate | anyasmin gr̥hṇāti*, "Wenn sie von einem Tiere, welches Klauen wie die des Hundes hat, berührt worden ist, so spricht er über derselben den Vers: 'Was ein hundefüssiges Tier mit deinem Munde, o Nirr̥ti, beleckt hat, das alles soll Agni ... reinigen'. Das Ins-wasser-werfen wie früher. Hier wird aber die Schale nicht wieder verwendet. Er schopft (neue gesprenkelte Butter) in eine andere Schale" (Caland). Here *śvāpada-* is compounded with *avamr̥ṣṭa-*, so we cannot infer anything about its gender. Note, however, how the *śvāpada-* of the prose text corresponds to *śvápad-* of the KS stanza as if they were synonyms.

(3) From a second ŚB passage (ŚB 4.2.4.16) we learn that the *śvā́padas*, like humans, touch the ground directly with their feet, as opposed to the hoofed animals, in which the hoof separates the foot from the ground. The passage describes how different creatures are born from a sacrifice, depending on whether the libations are placed on something that separates them from the ground, or on the ground directly: in the first case hoofed animals are born, whereas in the second case men and *śvā́padas* are born: *eṣá vaí prajā́patiḥ yá eṣá yajñás tāyáte yásmād imā́ḥ prajā́ḥ prájātā etám vevā́py etarhy ánu prájāyante sá yā́nupakīrṇe sādáyati tásmād yā́s tā́n ánu prajā́ḥ prajā́yante tā́ anyénātmáno 'syām prátitiṣṭhanti yā́ vaí śaphaíḥ pratitíṣṭhanti tā́ anyénātmáno 'syām prátitiṣṭhanty átha yád etám vyúhya ná tŕ̥ṇam ca nàntardhā́ya sādáyati tásmād yā́ etam ánu prajā́ḥ prajā́yante yā́ ātmánaivā̀syām prátitiṣṭhanti manuṣyā̀ś ca śvā́padāś* (nom. pl. masculine) *ca*, "Now, that sacrifice which is being performed is Prajāpati, from whom these creatures on earth have been born,—and indeed even now they are born after this (sacrifice). The creatures that are born therefrom after those (libations) which he deposits on the raised (mound), stand on this (earth) with something different from their own self,—for those which stand on hoofs indeed stand on this (earth) with something different from their own self. And when he deposits this (Dhruva cup) after shifting aside (the dust), and not leaving so much as a blade of grass between,—the creatures that are born thereafter from this (sacrifice), stand on this (earth) with their own self, namely, men and wild beasts" (Eggeling). Therefore the *śvā́pada* is not any wild animal, but one that does not have hoofs.

(4) A passage from BŚS (24.5:189.8–10) lists categories of animals based on the typology of their legs (or their body shape): *saptāraṇyā dvikhurāś ca śvāpadāni* (nom. pl. neuter) *ca pakṣiṇaś ca sarīsr̥pāni ca hastī ca markaṭaś ca nādeyā saptame*, "The seven wild animals are: the cloven-hoofed, the *śvāpadas*, the birds, the creepy-crawlies, the elephant, the monkey, and as the seventh the river-animals" (transl. from GRIFFITHS 2009, commenting on *śvápad-* in PS 7.10.4).

From the above passages it seems reasonable to consider the *śvā́padas* as wild animals, such

as tigers (and possibly lions and wolves) who have pads under their feet. Note also that from the BŚS passage, it would seem clear that *śvā́padas* and birds are different categories.

All the other post-AV passages support these conclusions. In particular the following two passages point to large four-footed beasts:

(5) In ŚāṅkhĀ 12.26, the neuter singular *śvāpadam* stands as a general term that apparently includes tigers, wolves and panthers: *nainaṃ vyāghro na vŕko na dvīpī na śvāpadaṃ* (nom. sg. neuter) *hiṃsati kiṃcanainam | na hastinaṃ kruddham upaiti bhītim irāmaṇiṃ bailvaṃ yo bibhartti ||*, "Him neither tiger, nor wolf, nor panther, nor beast of prey whatsoever hurts. No angry elephant meets he to scare him, who bears a comforting amulet of Bilva" (Keith).

(6) Similarly, a neuter singular is used in BŚS 27.5:329.6–8: *etad eva yasya puruṣo ratho 'śvo gaur mahiṣo varāho 'hir mŕgaḥ śvā vānyad vā śvāpadam antarāgnīn gacchet*, "This [expiation] is for one whose fires would be trespassed by a man, a chariot, a horse, a cow, a buffalo, a boar, a snake, a deer, a dog, or another *śvāpada*" (transl. from GRIFFITHS 2009 *ibid*.). Perhaps more precisely, "a dog or another *śvāpada*", without the comma, taking only the dog as member of the *śvāpada* family, and excluding the other hoofed animals.

The remaining two occurrences seem to make a clear distinction between the *śvā́padas* and birds:

(7) In ŚB 14.4.2.29 (=BĀU 1.4.16), the *ātman* is described as a *loká* for various entities, including *śvā́padas*, birds, and ants, mentioned together as opposed to humans and livestock: *átho ayám vā́ ātmā́ sárveṣām bhūtā́nām lokáḥ, sá yáj juhóti yád yájate téna devā́nām lokó, 'tha yád anubrūté ténárṣīṇ̄ām, átha yát prajā́m icháte yát pitŕbhyo nipṛṇā́ti téna pitṝṇā́m, átha yán manuṣyā̀nvāsáyate yádebhyó'śanam dádāti téna manuṣyā̀ṇām, átha yát paśúbhyas tṛṇodakám vindáti téna paśūnā́m, yád asya gṛhéṣu śvā́padā* (nom. pl. masculine) *váyāṃsyā́ pipílikābhya upajī́vanti téna téṣām lokó*, "Now, this self *(ātman)* is a world for all beings. So, when he makes offerings and sacrifices, he becomes thereby a world for the gods. When he recites the Vedas, he becomes thereby a world for the seers. When he offers libations to his ancestors and seeks to father offspring, he becomes thereby a world for his ancestors. When he provides food and shelter to human beings, he becomes thereby a world for human beings. When he procures fodder and water for livestock, he becomes thereby a world for livestock. When creatures, from wild animals and birds down to the very ants, find shelter in his houses, he becomes thereby a world for them" (Olivelle). The choice of mentioning these three groups of animals would seem based on the fact that they represent three very different categories, large predators, birds, and small insects—perhaps also in that they belong to different domains: the surface of the earth, the sky, and the ground—so as to cover the whole range of wildlife (as opposed to the domestic animals, *paśúbhyas*, mentioned before).

(8) Finally, ChU 7.2.1 lists all the things that Vāc, 'Speech', can make known, from the Vedas to all kinds of creatures; among them we find also the *śvāpadāni* (a neuter plural, as in example 4 above from BŚS): *divaṃ ca pṛthivīṃ ca vāyuṃ cākāśaṃ cāpaś ca tejaś ca devāṃś ca manuṣyāṃś capaśūṃś ca vayāṃsi ca tṛṇavanaspatīñ śvāpadāny* (acc. pl. neuter) *ākīṭapataṅgapipīlakaṃ*, "sky, earth, wind, space, water, fire, gods, humans, domestic animals, birds, grasses, trees, and wild beasts down to the very worms, moths, and ants" (Olivelle). Again, birds and *śvā́padas* are distinguished here.

To sum up, it seems evident that in Vedic prose, *śvā́pada-* may in fact have simply replaced the older *śvā́pad-* as a general term for wild beasts, predators, such as tigers, wolves, panthers, but also dogs, all of which have pads under their feet (and not hoofs).

In the AV, however, the word *śvā́pada-* features more specific, and, as we will see, more archaic semantics: namely, it is used only in stanzas which, just like ours, deal with death and corpses, and it seems to indicate carrion eating animals—or wild beasts, only insofar as they are scavengers.

(9) ŚS 18.3.55 (~ PS 18.74.8; ~ RV 10.16.6, to Agni—this is also the only occurrence in the

RV) belongs to a funeral hymn and mentions animals feeding on the body of the deceased: *yát te kr̥ṣṇáḥ śakuná ātutóda pipīláḥ sarpá utá vā śvā́padaḥ* (nom. sg. masculine) | *agníṣ ṭád viśvád agadáṃ kr̥ṇotu sómaś ca yó brāhmaṇā́ṃ́ āvivéśa ||*, "What of thee the black bird thrust at, the ant, the serpent, or also the beast of prey, let the all-eating Agni make that free from disease, and the soma that hath entered the Brahmans" (Whitney); "What of yours the black omen-bird pecked at, or the ant, the serpent, or the dog-footed (beast), let omnivorous Agni make it free from curse, and Soma, who has entered the brahmins" (J-B). Here the *śvápada* is mentioned among other carrion-eating animals, the black bird, the ant, the serpent, from which it is distinguished (*utá vā śvā́padaḥ*).

The above is clearly a reference to the old practice of exposing the body of the dead for it to be devoured by carrion-eating animals. Such a practice was particularly important for the Zoroastrians. Vidēvdād 6.44ff. reads: "'Where, O Ahura Mazdā, shall we carry the body of a dead man, where lay it down?' Then said Ahura Mazdā: 'On the highest places, Spitāma Zaraθuštra, so that most readily (lit., "often") corpse-eating dogs (*sunō kərəfš.xᵛarō*) or corpse-eating birds shall perceive it'" (transl. from Boyce 1993). Once all the decayable parts of the body are removed by the animals, the bones are then placed in an ossuary (see Shahbazi 1987). Boyce (1993) points out that reference to dogs and birds as excarnators is standard in Iranian literature up to the Pahlavi texts, and that the practice of exposing dead bodies is attested throughout the history of the Iranian peoples. The same author cites ancient accounts from both western Classical sources (e.g. Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 1.45.108, in turn based on Greek sources, according to which being devoured by dogs was considered the best burial in Hyrcania) as well as China (e.g., the traveller Wei-jie, who writes in ca. 6–7th c. A.D. Samarkand, describes a specialised community of undertakers who dispose of the dead by feeding them to special dogs in a dedicated building). Boyce remarks that "keeping dogs as excarnators is … attested for Bactria, Sogdia, and Hyrcania from Achaemenid to late Sasanian times, but is not recorded among western Iranians". Thus, the pratice of exposing the dead body seems to have existed in eastern Iran since earlier times, and have spread to western Iran with Zoroastrianism. It survived until the 1970s in Iran, and survives today in the Indian Parsis's practice of exposing their dead to the elements and to carrion-eating birds in the so-called "towers of silence".

As far as dogs are specifically concerned, besides their role as excarnators, they were actually employed in various Zoroastrian funerary rituals: for instance, during mourning, a rite known as *sagdīd* ('the viewing by the dog') was performed in which a dog (male and at least four months old) was brought to look at a corpse for three times (after the washing, after the fire was kindled, and before carrying the body to the place of exposure) (see Modi 1922: 58ff. and Omidsalar et al. 1995); also "during the three days after death […] a lane dog would be tied up in the courtyard (Persia) or on the verandah (Gujarat) and given food for the soul's sake at every mealtime, and then, in Persia, once a day outside the house for the next forty days" (Omidsalar et al. 1995 with references). In the rite known as *barašnom-e nō šaba*, a dog is shown to a person who undergoes purification from pollution caused by contact with a corpse, as it is believed to have the power to drive off Nasu, the contaminating carrion demon (Boyce 1988).

Behind these practices we can identify a conception of the dogs as repeller of the demons who might threaten the souls of the departed, as psychopomps, or as guardians of the path to the world of the afterlife. Such ideas are extremely old and can be compared to the shamanic myths in which dogs lead the shaman to heaven, or to the well-known mythical hellhounds (see Witzel 2012: 266), such as the four-eyed hounds of Yama (Keith 1925: 406–07)—probably a special kind of hunting hound from the subcontinent, such as the Tibetan mastiff (characterised by light-coloured tufts above the eyes which resemble a second set of eyes), which was also used in battle, most notably by the Persians against the Greek, as mentioned by Herodotus (7.187)—the dogs who guard the Činvat bridge (Vidēvdād 13.9, 19.30) in Zoroastrian religion, and the Greek Kerberos.

In the Indo-European world, the connection between dogs and the domain of death is visible in the initiation practices of the youth, who would spend certain periods of time in the wilderness in

a condition of ritualised marginality that allowed them to be in contact with their dead ancestors, acquire their power, learn the traditional lore, and thus be entitled to become adult warriors; at specific moments of the year, the young boys would return to the village and parade around in terrifying wolf masks that represented the dead ancestors visiting the world of the living—a tradition that survives in many forms across Indo-Europa up to today (see Appendix I). This connection between dogs and death may ultimately go back to pre-Indo-European times (see e.g. Schlerath 1954–58, White 1989 and 1991, Mair 1998, Kershaw 2000, Witzel 2012: 264ff., Brown & Anthony 2017). It may have even been precisely the wolves' scavenging habits to bring them nearby human settlements in the first place and favour contacts that would eventually lead to domestication (Zeuner 1963: 39, 83, cited in Omidsalar et al. 1995).

As far as the early Vedic culture is concerend, the documented methods of disposing of the dead body are mainly burial and cremation. However, exposure is indeed mentioned in the AV (Zimmer 1879: 408, Macdonell & Keith 1912: I, 8, Keith 1925: 417). In particular, the famous stanza ŚS 18.2.34 (*yé níkhātā yé pároptā yé dagdhá yé códdhitāḥ | sárvāṃs tā́n agna ā́ vaha pit̄́n havíṣe áttave ||*) has been interpreted as listing four ways of disposing the body: *níkhāta-*, 'buried', *dagdhá-*, 'cremated', but also *páropta-* (<*vap-*), presumably 'cast away', and *úddhita-*, 'exposed'.

But the idea of dogs and birds feeding on the body of the deceased (often next to other carrion feeders, such as ants, worms and flies) is frequently found in passages—just like the one I am commenting on—that consist of curses, and portray the enemy as a dead corpse in an attempt at magically producing such an outcome. This might be indirect evidence of the practice of exposure, at least of the corpses of deceased warriors. As an example we may quote two stanzas from ŚS 11.10, a hymn to Triṣaṃdhi (which also contains invocations to Arbudi, the ally of Indra to whom ŚS 11.9 is dedicated and which I have quoted above with regards to *aghāríṇī, vikeśí-* and *alíklava-*): ŚS 11.10.23–24 read *yé varmíno yé 'varmā́ṇo amítrā yé ca varmíṇaḥ | sárvāṃs tā́m̐ arbude hatā́ṃ chvā́no 'dantu bhū́myām || yé rathíno yé arathā́ asādā́ yé ca sādínaḥ | sárvān adantu tā́n hatā́n gŕdhrāḥ śyenā́ḥ patatríṇaḥ ||*, "Who have defenses, who have no defenses, and the enemies who have defenses—all those, O Arbudi, being slain, let the dogs eat on the ground. Who have chariots, who have no chariots, those without seats and they who have seats—all those, being slain, let vultures, falcons, birds eat" (Whitney).

In the same Triṣaṃdhi/Arbudi hymn, ŚS 11.10, we find one of the AV occurrences of *śvā́pada-*:

(10) ŚS 11.10.8: *ávāyantām pakṣíno yé váyāṃsy antárikṣe diví yé cáranti | śvā́pado* (=*śvā́padaḥ*, nom. sg. masculine[23]) *mákṣikāḥ sám rabhantām āmā́do gŕdhrāḥ kúṇape radantām ||*, "Let the winged ones descend, the birds, they that go about in the atmosphere, in the sky; let the wild beasts, the flies, take hold together; let the raw-flesh-eating vultures scratch at the human carrion" (Whitney).

Note that similar macabre scenes of dogs and birds feeding on the corpse of dead warriors are also described in Mbh (e.g. 5.139.51, 6.95.50, cited in White 1991: 221 fn. 24), and are most likely the testimony of an old Indo-European poetic tradition. In fact, similar images are frequent also in Homer (30x in the Iliad, 6x in the Odyssey: see Lilja 1976: 17ff. and footnote 15).

The last AV occurrence of *śvā́pada* is also found in a similar curse as the one we read before, this time belonging to the Arbudi hymn, ŚS 11.9:

(11) ŚS 11.9.9–10: *alíklavā jā́ṣkamadā́ gŕdhrāḥ śyenā́ḥ patatríṇaḥ | dhvā́ṅkṣāḥ śakúnayas tŕpyantv amítreṣu samīkṣáyan radité arbude táva || átho sárvaṃ śvā́padaṃ* (nom. sg. neuter) *mákṣikā tŕpyatu krímiḥ | paúruṣeyé 'dhi kúṇape radité arbude táva ||*, "Let the buzzards, jāṣkamadás, vultures, falcons, winged ones, let the crows, the birds (*śakúni*), satisfy themselves—exhibiting among the enemies—in case of thy bite, o Arbudi. And let all the wild beasts [Note that

---

23 In his translation Whitney assumes a nom. pl. from the stem *śvā́pad-*, given that all the neighbouring nouns are plural, but this would be the only attestation of such a stem, and I agree with Hoffmann (*ibid.*) that this is suspect, and that it is either an error or to be taken as a singular.

śárvaṃ śvápadaṃ is singular], let the fly, let the worm, satisfy itself upon the carrion of men, bitten, o Arbudi, of thee" (Whitney).

Note that the fact that the Vedic texts mention wild beasts in the role of excarnators and not specifically dogs is not problematic. First of all, the etymology of *śvápad* and *śvápada* speaks for itself. Secondly, the replacement of dogs with wild beasts in the imaginary of the Aryan people is a general phenomenon, as can be seen from the fact that in the lexicon of the South Indian Männerbund, the warrior is increasingly portrayed as a lion (*siṃhá*) or other local predator, and it is simply due to cultural adaptation to the new environment (see VASSILKOV 2015: 235). Thirdly, the behaviour of tigers and similar predators is compatible with this idea: tigers, for instance, mainly feed on the bodies of the animals they hunt themselves, but do occasionally eat dead animals when driven by hunger and if it spares them the trouble of hunting. Also, other "dog-like" animals such as jackals and hyenas, which were most likely included in the *śvápada* category, are indeed scavengers.

All the above evidence goes to show that **K** *śvápadāḥ*, with the meaning "wild beasts, predators", would thematically fit our line.

However, I still find it stylistically unsatisfying that wild beasts would be mentioned among what are otherwise only birds, and so many different kinds of birds: *śvápadāḥ* is preceded by four kinds of birds, and followed by three more words indicating birds. Note that other stanzas of this kind also mention other carrion-eating animals (from flies to worms), but here only birds are mentioned.   Thus, given the remarkable fluctuation in gender in the attestations illustrated above, I wonder if we shouldn't in fact consider the word *śvápada* primarily as an adjective, which, of course, can also be substantivised.

HOFFMANN (1956: 6 = 1976: 388) considered the neuter to be a collective noun 'reißendes Getier' (with regards to *śvāpadaṃ* in (5) ŚāṅkhĀ 12.26, *śvápadaṃ* in (11) ŚS 11.9.10, and *śvāpadāni* in (8) ChU 7.2.1—he does not mention the BŚS passages (4) and (6), which are the other two neuter occurrences). However, I find no real difference in the meaning of the neuter vs. the masculine occurrences.

For instance I find no difference in the use of the masculine plural *śvápadāni* in the lists of (4) BŚS 24.5:189.8–10 and (8) ChU 7.2.1, as opposed to the masculine plural *śvápadāḥ* in the lists of (1) ŚB 5.5.4.10 or (7) ŚB 14.4.2.29 (=BĀU 1.4.16): they simply seem to indicate a plurality of animals belonging to the *śvápada* category, and it seems unnecessary to translate the former as "packs of wild beasts".

Moreover, the phrase *śvā vānyad vā śvāpadam*, in (6) BŚS 27.5:329.6–8, can hardly admit a collective interpretation such as "a dog or another pack of wild beasts". This phrase, as well as the occurrence in (5), can easily be explained by interpreting the neuter singular *śvāpadam* as meaning "a wild beast", being used as a general term for any specimen of its kind, just like the masculine *vyāghro*, *vṛko*, and *dvīpī*, which stand parallel to it in (5), or *śvā* in (6) simply mean "the tiger", "the wolf", "the panther", "a dog", as in "any tiger", "any wolf", "any panther", "any dog".

The phrase *sárvaṃ śvápadaṃ mákṣikā tṛpyatu krímiḥ | paúruṣeyé 'dhi kúṇape* in (11) could indeed mean "Let a whole pack of wild beasts, let the fly, let the worm satisfy itself upon the carrion of a man", but *sárvaṃ* may also refer to both *śvápadaṃ*, *mákṣikā* and *krímiḥ*, and it is neuter simply because it agrees with the noun that is closer to it in the sentence. Accordingly, *śvápadaṃ* is singular just like *mákṣikā* (f.) and *krímiḥ* (m.) are. Thus the meaning can be "every wild beast, every fly, every worm"; so it appears that *śvápadaṃ* can simply be both masculine or neuter, because its gender was not fixed.

If this is correct, it is likely that the nominal usage of *śvápada-* (with fluctuating gender) is derived from an original adjectival use, e.g. 'the ravenous one' < 'ravenous'—an adjective that could occur in either gender—in turn based on the meaning of the original compound *śvápad-*. Thus we have: *śvápad-* 'wild beast' > *śvápada* adj. 'ravenous (like a *śvápad*)' > *śvápada* noun (m./n.) 'the ravenous one'. In most cases the latter deadjectival substantive came to indicate a 'wild beast', and

as such is equivalent to the old *śvápad-* (as can be seen from examples (1) and (2)).

My contention is that in the dialect of the AV, probably because of the specific poetic tradition of portraying scenes featuring wild beasts as scavengers, the adjective came to be used a general term meaning 'carrion-eating', and thus the noun could also mean 'carrion-eating animal, scavenger' in general.

Thus, as regards our line, I believe it possible to consider *śvāpadāḥ* either as an attribute of *patatriṇaḥ*—and translate the two words together as "the carrion-eating winged ones"—or both words as substantivised adjectives: "the scavengers (i.e. the carrion-eating birds!), the winged ones".

Kāṇḍikā 23

17.23.1   [Anuṣṭubh]

a	tad āpaḥ pra vahata-	7	[∪ − − ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪]
b	-avadyaṃ ca malaṃ ca yat |	8	[∪ − − ∪ | ∪ − ∪ ×]
c	yad *duṣvapnᵢyam ārima	8	[− − − ∪ | ∪ − ∪ ×]
d	yad *r̥tānr̥tam ūdima ||	8	[∪ ∪ − ∪ | ∪ − ∪ ×]

O waters, do carry away that, [namely] the shame and the filth; when we have contracted poor sleep, when we have pronounced falsehood concerning *r̥tá*.

tad āpaḥ] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**c **JM₃** yad āpaḥ **Mā Ji₄** tadā [ā]paḥ **V71**   • pra vahatāvadyaṃ ca] **[Ma]? [Ja]?** pra vahatāvadyañ ca **Mā V71 JM₃ Ji₄ Pa**c pra vahatā[.]dyañca **V122** pra vāhatā avadyaṃ ca **K**   • malaṃ ca yat] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**c **[Mā] V71 JM₃** malañ ca yat, **K Ji₄**   • \|] **K [Ma] [Ja] Pa**c **Mā V71 JM₃** \|\| **V122 Ji₄**   • yad *duṣvapnyam] yad duḥsvapnyam **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa**c yadusvapnyam **Mā** yaduspupnyam **V71** yaddupsvapnyam **JM₃** yadvasvapnim **K**   • ārima] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ārimaṃ **Pa**c   • yad *r̥tānr̥tam udīma] yadr̥cānr̥tamudīma **[Ma] [Ja] V122 JM₃ Ji₄ Pa**c yadūcānr̥tamudīma **Mā V71** yadr̥jā arṣatamūlima **K**   • \|\|] **[O]** \| **K**

Bhattacharya writes *duḥsvapnyam* in **c** and *r̥cānr̥tam* in **d**.

   a. Compare ŚS 10.5.24, *ariprā́ ā́po ápa riprám asmát \| prā́smád éno duritáṃ suprátīkāḥ prá duṣvápnyam prá málaṃ vahantu* \|\|, "Free from defilement [are] the waters ; [let them carry] away from us defilement, forth from us sin, mishap, they of good aspect; let them carry forth evil dreaming, forth filth" (Whitney); in part repeated in ŚS 16.1.10–11, *ariprā́ ā́po ápa riprám asmát* \|\| *prā́smád éno vahantu prá duṣvápnyaṃ vahantu* \|\|, "Free from defilement [are] the waters; let them [carry] away from us defilement. Let them carry forth from us sin; let them carry forth evil-dreaming" (Whitney).

   b. Bhattacharya writes °-*vadyaṃ ca*°, silently implying that mss. **Ma** and **Ja** feature the sequence °*aṃc*°, but since all my **O** mss. (and also **Mā**, as reported by Bhattacharya's apparatus) rather feature the cluster °*añc*°, it is hard for me to imagine that **Ma** and **Ja** would differ. At any rate, I normalise it on the basis of **K** °*aṃc*°. Interestingly, the situation is the opposite in the second half of the line, where the **O** mss. have *malaṃ ca* (except for the corrupt **Ji₄**) and **K** has *malañ ca*.

   c. On the issue of the spelling of the word for 'poor sleep', see my Introduction, §2.3.1.

   The 1pl. perfect *ārima* may belong to the simplex root [2]*ar*- (PIE *h₁er-), pres. *r̥cháti*, or to the same root compounded with preverb *ā́*. The latter lexeme is frequently found with *ā́rti*, *énas* or similar words as objects, in the meaning 'incur (evil), contract (an illness), suffer (from a disease)'.

Compare ŚS 4.27.6[24], AB 2.31.6[25], ŚB 1.6.1.16[26], ŚB 1.4.3.11[27], ŚB 3.6.1.29[28], TB 3.7.12.2 (~ TĀ 2.3.1)[29]. Given the semantics of our line, I opt for this latter meaning (cf. Kümmel 2000: 103): it seems that *duṣvapnyam*, 'poor sleep, nightmare', is conceived as an illness one may contract.

d. Bhattacharya accepts the **O** reading, *r̥cānr̥tam*, 'falsehood concerning verses'(?). Indeed both **O^A** °*r̥cā*° (**O^B** °*ucā*°) and **K** °*r̥jā*° point to the presence of a palatal in the archetype. However, the word *r̥ca-* is only found at the end of compounds, e.g. *tryr̥ca-* (or *tr̥ca-*), *caturr̥ca-* etc., so this compound seems implausible to me, as we'd expect *r̥c-anr̥ta-*. I tentatively suggest the emendation **r̥tānr̥tam*, from a compound *r̥tānr̥ta-* (*r̥tá-* + *ánr̥ta-*). This compound is recorded in MW as a Dvandva meaning 'truth and falsehood', but it is never found in RV and AV (cf. instead the attested *satyānr̥tá-*, 'truth and falsehood', RV 7.49.3b). Therefore, I rather propose a tatpuruṣa interpretation of the kind *aśvānr̥ta-*, 'falsehood/false testimony concerning horses', *gavānr̥ta-*, 'falsehood concerning cows' (both in Manu 8.98), *puruṣānr̥ta-* 'falsehood concerning men' (Manu 9.71), *bhūmyanr̥ta-* ' falsehood concerning land' (Manu 8.99).[30]

17.23.2 [7 + 8?]

a	āpaḥ sapta sravantīs	7	[– – – ∪ ∪ – –]
b	tā no muñcant_uv aṃhasaḥ ||	8	[– – – – | ∪ – ∪ ×]

The seven streaming waters—let them free us from anxiety.

N.B. **Ji₄** features a lacuna and lacks the sequence corresponding to °*stānomuñcan*°.

———

āpaḥ sapta sravantīs tā] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 apaḥ sapta śravantī **Ji₄** apaḥ sapta sravantīs ta **Pa_c** apas

---

24 ŚS 4.27.6, *yádíd idáṃ maruto mã́rutena yádi devā daívyenedŕ̥g ára | yūyám īśidhve vasavas tásya níṣkr̥tes té no muñcantv áṃhasaḥ \|\|*, "If now indeed, O Maruts, by what relates to the Maruts—if, O gods, by what relates to the gods, I have fallen into such a plight: ye, O Vasus, are masters of the removal of that: let them free us from distress" (Whitney).

25 AB 2.31.6, *sa ya enaṃ śaste tūṣṇīṃśaṃsa upa vā vaded anu vā vyāharet, tam brūyād: eṣa evaitām ārtim āriṣyati. […] so ha vāva tām ārtim r̥chati, ya evaṃ vidvān saṃśaste tūṣṇīṃśaṃsa upa vā vadaty anu vā vyāharati […]*, "If any person should after ther recitation of the silent praise reproach him or curse him, he should say of him, 'He will fall into this misfortune […].' He falls into misfortune who knowing thus, after the silent praise is recited, either reproaches or curses" (Keith).

26 ŚB 1.6.1.16, *sá yády enam purástāt yajñásyānuvyãháret tám práti brūyān múkhyām ãrttim ãriṣyasy andhó vā badhiró vā bhaviṣyasíty etã́ vaí múkhyā ãrttayas táthā haivá syāt*, "And if any one were to imprecate evil on him previously to (or, in the fore-part of) the (chief) sacrifice, let him be thus spoken to, 'Thou shalt suffer some disease of the face! thou shalt become either blind or deaf!' for these, in truth, are diseases of the face: and thus it would indeed fare with him" (Eggeling).

27 ŚB 1.4.3.11, *sá yády enam prathamā́yām sāmidhenyã́m anuvyãháret tám práti brūyāt prāṇám vã́ etád ātmáno 'gnā́v ã́dhāḥ prāṇénātmána ãrttim ãriṣyasíti táthā haivá syāt*, "And if anyone were to curse this one (the Hotri) at the (recitation of the) first kindling verse, then he (the Hotri) should say to him, 'Thereby thou hast put thine own out-breathing into the fire: by that out-breathing of thine shalt thou undergo suffering!' for this is what would take place" (Eggeling).

28 ŚB 3.6.1.29, […] *tásmād yám dīkṣitā́nām abalyáṃ vindéd ã́gnīdhram enaṃ nayatéti brūyāt tád ánārtaṃ tán nã́riṣyatíti*, "And if weakness were to come upon one of those that are consecrated, let (the Adhvaryu) say, 'Lead him to the Agnidhra !'—thinking 'that is unscathed, there he will not meet with affliction.'" (Eggeling).

29 TB 3.7.12.2 (~ TĀ 2.3.1), *r̥téna dyā́vāpr̥thivī | r̥téna tváṃ sarasvati | kr̥tã́n mā muñcata_énaso* (em. Dumont) *yád anyákr̥tam ārimá*, "By means of the cosmic truth, O Heaven and Earth, by means of the cosmic truth, O you Sarasvatī, do free us from the evil that is caused, when we incur [evil] caused by others" (my transl.).

30 After all, Bhattacharya's *r̥cānr̥ta-*, if meaning 'falsehood concerning verses', would require a similar interpretation.

taptaḥ sravantis tā **Mā** apa(*s.s.*→)ḥ saptaḥ sravantis tā **V71** apaḥ sapta sravantisā **JM₃** āpas sapta sravantīs **K** • no muñcantv] **Ja Mā V71 JM₃** no muñcaṃtv **Ma V122 Pa꜀** tv **Ji₄** muñcaṁtv **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀** ‖ 3 ‖ **Mā V71 JM₃** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya writes *muñcaṃtv* in **b**.

17.23.3   **[Anuṣṭubh]** ~ PS 3.17.4 ~ PS 19.12.5 ~ ŚS 6.96.2 (= ŚS 7.112.2) ~ RV 10.97.16; a. ~ ŚS 11.6.7a (~ PS 15.16.7a); cd. ~ 8.7.28cd

a	muñcantu mā śapath꜁yād	8#	[− − ∪ − | ∪ ∪ ∪ ×]
b	atho varuṇ꜁yād uta |	8	[∪ − ∪ ∪ | ∪ − ∪ ×]
c	atho yamasya *paḍvīśād	8#	[∪ − ∪ − | ∪ − − ×]
d	viśvasmād devaduṣkṛtāt ‖	8	[− − − − | ∪ − ∪ ×]

Let them free me from [the fetter] of a curse, and also from [the fetter] of Varuṇa; and from the fetter of Yama, from every offence against the gods.

śapathyād] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** śa(*s.s.*→sa)pathyād **V122**³¹   • varuṇyād] **[O]** vāruṇyād **K** • ‖] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ‖ **Ji₄** • *paḍvīśād] paḍvīśād **Ja Ma Pa꜀** paṛvīśād **V122** paḍviṣād **Ji₄** paḍvīṣā **Mā V71 JM₃** paḍbiṣād **K**   • viśvasmād devaduṣkṛtāt] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** visvasmā devaduṣkṛtāt **Ji₄** viśvasmādevakilviṣāt, **K**   • ‖] **[O]** \| **K**

PS 3.17.4
muñcāmi tvā śapathyād atho varuṇyād uta \|
atho yamasya paḍvīśād viśvasmād devakilbiṣāt ‖

PS 19.12.5
muñcantu mā śapathyād atho varuṇyād uta \|
atho yamasya paḍvīśād viśvasmād devakilbiṣāt ‖

ŚS 6.96.2 = ŚS 7.112.2
muñcántu mā śapathyàd átho varuṇyàd utá \|
átho yamásya páḍbīṣāt víśvasmād devakilbiṣát ‖

RV 10.97.16
muñcántu mā śapathyàd átho varuṇyàd utá \|
átho yamásya páḍbīṣāt sárvasmād devakilbiṣát ‖

ŚS 8.7.28
út tvāhārṣaṃ páñcaśalād átho dáśaśalād utá \|
átho yámasya páḍvīṣād víśvasmād devakilbiṣát ‖

ŚS 11.6.7ab (~ PS 15.16.7a)
muñcántu mā śapathyàd *ahorātré átho uṣā́ḥ* \| […]

Bhattacharya reads ⁺*paḍvīśād*.

---

31 The correction is placed in the upper margin and followed by a number "3" pointing to our text in the third line of the mss., where the typical three-dot sign indicates that *sa* should replace the *akṣara* '*śa*'. Clearly the correction is wrong.

Whitney translates the ŚS version as follows: "Let them free me from that which comes from a curse, then also from that which is of Varuṇa, then from Yama's fetter, from all offense against the gods" (Whitney). J-B translate the RV version as follows: "Let them release me from (the shackle) of a curse, and also from (the shackle) of Varuṇa, and from the shackle of Yama— from every offence against the gods" (J-B).

a. Note that all versions of pādas **ab** have *muñcantu mā*, except for PS 3.17.4 which reads *muñcāmi tvā*, "I free you". The latter phrase also opens ŚS 1.10.4a (also an Anuṣṭubh), and PS 1.62.1a (~ ŚS 3.11.1a = ŚS 20.96.6a), which, however, is a Jagatī line.

c. I replace Bhattacharya's emendation ⁺*paḍvīśād*, marked by a + sign, with conjecture marked by a * sign, as all the mss. read °*ṣ*° for °*ś*°, even though confusion between these two sounds is a very common mistake (see KIM, *Auss.*, p. 53ff.). Note, however, that the reading is preserved correctly in some of the mss. for PS 3.17.4. The word in question appears in two variants: *pádbīśa-* (in RV) and *páḍvīśa-*. It may indicate a 'foot-fetter' (this is the translation adopted by J-B; cf. e.g. RV 1.162.14b, 16c.), if the first part is indeed the word *pád-* 'foot' (although retroflexed forms such as ins. pl. *paḍbhíḥ* would be difficult to explain); others connect it with a root *paś-*, "to fasten" (cf. *pā́śa-* in 17.23.4b below); the second part of the word is unclear (see EWAia II p. 68f.).

d. Note that the RV version reads *sárvasmād* against AV *víśvasmād*. The use of *víśva-* in the meaning 'all, every' is already rare in the later books of RV. Given that the RV parallel provided above reads *sárvasmād*, the AV reading *víśvasmād* looks like an intentional archaism.

Note that all parallels (including the PS parallels) read *devakilbiṣā́t*, as does **K** (*devakilviṣāt*), against **O** *devaduṣkṛtāt*. These are the only occurrences of *devakilbiṣá-* in the RV and AV. On the other hand, *devaduṣkṛta-* appears to be a hapax. The two words seem to convey the same meaning. This situation requires a difficult editorial decision: **O** *devaduṣkṛta* being unattested elsewhere, could be a corruption; however, it is also possible that **K**'s reading is due to perseveration from the other PS parallels, or that **K**'s transmission has been influenced by ŚS and RV. Therefore, since the reading of **O** is grammatical, I choose to adopt it, on the basis of the priniciple of *lectio difficilior*, and with the goal of preserving a variant that would otherwise be overlooked.

17.23.4 [prose]

⁺*jāmiśaṃsād duṣvapnyād druho mā muñcantu varuṇasya pāśāt ||*

From a sibling's curse, from poor sleep—let them free me from deceit, from the fetter of Varuṇa.

⁺*jāmiśaṃsād*] jāmi[x](→śaṃ)sād **Ji₄** jāmisaṃsād **Ma Ja JM₃** yāmisaṃsād **V122** jāmisaṃsā **Pa_c** yāmiśaṃsā **Mā** jāmisaṃsā **V71** jahāsiśaṃsād **K** • duṣvapnyād] **K** duḥsvapnyā **Ma Ja V122** dru(*subs.→* du)ḥsvapnyā **Ji₄** dyusvapnyā **Pa_c** dusvapnyā **JM₃** dusvapnā **Mā** (*subs.* du)ṣpapnā **V71** • druho] **[O]** druhe **K** • muñcantu] **[O]** muñcaṃntu **K** • pāśāt ||] **[O]** pāśāt, **K**

Bhattacharya writes *jāmiśaṃsād duḥsvapnyād* in pāda **a**.

Compare ŚS 2.10.1ab (~ PS 2.3.1ab): *kṣetriyā́t tvā nírṛtyā jāmiśaṃsā́d druhó muñcāmi váruṇasya pā́śāt |*, "From *kṣetriyá*, from perdition, from imprecation of sisters, from hatred do I release thee, from Varuna's fetter" (Whitney); slightly modified in the following stanza, ŚS 2.10.2cd (repeated in stanzas 3-8; ~ PS 2.3.4cd), *evā́hám tvā́ṃ kṣetriyā́n nírṛtyā jāmiśaṃsā́d druhó muñcāmi váruṇasya pā́śāt |*, "so from kṣetriyá, from perdition, etc. etc." (Whitney).

a. *jāmi-* can indicate both a m. and f. sibling, although more frequently a female relative belonging to one's own clan, i.e., from the perspective of a male, every woman from his generation whom he is forbidden to marry in accordance to the exogamy rule (see BROUGH 1953: xiv).

b. The concept of "deceit's fetter" goes back to the RV (e.g. 7.59.8.c), as does the concept of "Varuṇa's fetter". Varuṇa, the god personifying kingship and judicial authority, punishes by "binding": being bound by Varuṇa's fetter is the punishment for violating *ṛtá-*, which can be done by committing untruthfulness in speech or action, i.e. by deception and betrayal of oaths, or, especially in later ritualistic literature, by making ritual errors (cf. e.g. RV 1.24.15a, 7.88.7b; see also my comment to PS 17.23.3 above); this concept is common also in AV (see e.g. ŚS 7.83 "For release from Varuṇa's fetter") and is even more frequent in later literature (see Brereton 1981: 128ff.); the exact formula *váruṇasya pā́śāt* (invariably next to a form of *muc-*) is found in RV 6.74.4c and 10.8524a (~ ŚS 14.1.19a, 14.1.58a ~ PS 18.2.6a), and even more frequently in the AV: ŚS 14.1.57c, 14.2.49a (~ PS 18.11.9a), 16.8.26e (~ PS 18.52.28b); PS 1.33.5d (*pra mā muñcantu varuṇasya pāśāt ||*), 2.52.5d, 5.32.2d, 20.8.8d.

17.23.5 [prose]

mahyam indro varuṇo bṛhaspatiḥ savitā varca ādadhan ||

To me, Indra, Varuṇa, Bṛhaspati, Savitṛ will give splendour.

bṛhaspatiḥ] [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃ bṛhaspati V122 vṛhaspatis K   • varca ādadhan ||] [Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71 JM₃ varca sā ādhan, || V122 varccasādadhan, || Ji₄ varcca ādadhan, || Pa꜀ varca dadhaṃ | K

Note how both the fact that the non-enclitic form of the dative of the 1st person pronoun is used, and the fact that it is dislocated to the left before the four subjects, are meant to express emphasis.

17.23.6 [prose]

bhrātṛvyahan *sapatnahann asau me bhrātṛvyo [']sau sapatnaḥ ||

O slayer of rivals, O slayer of foes, such-and-such [is] my rival, such-and-such [is] my foe.

bhrātṛvyahan] bhrātṛvyahaṃ [Ja] [Ma] [Mā] Pa꜀ bhrātṛ(*subs.→*vy)haṃ V122[32] bhrātṛvyaha Ji₄ bhrātṛvyaṃham V71 JM₃ bhātṛvyaṃ sau K   • *sapatnahann asau me] sapatnaham asau me Ja Ma Mā V71 JM₃ Pa꜀ sapatnaham aso me V122 sapatnahasasau me Ji₄ sapatnāsaso me K   • bhrātṛvyo [']sau sapatnaḥ] bhrātṛvyo 'sau sapatnaḥ [Ma] bhrātṛvyo sau sapatnaḥ Ja Pa꜀ Mā V71 bhrātṛvyo sau sapa[.]tnaḥ[ḥ] JM₃ bhrātṛnyo(/nvo) sau sapatna(*subs.→* na)ḥ V122[33] bhrātṛbhyasau sapatna[na](*subs.→*na)ḥ Ji₄ bhrātṛvyaṃ sau mapatnaḥ K   • ||] K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ JM₃ | Mā V71

Bhattacharya reads: *bhrātṛvyaham sapatnahamasau* and *bhrātṛvyo 'sau*.
   Once again (cf. my comment on 17.21.2 above), the pronoun *asaú-* does not mean 'that one

---

32 The correction is written in the bottom margin and followed by a numeral "4" referring to line four just above it, where an inverted candrabiṇḍu (*kākapada*) marks the point where the correction should be inserted.

33 This apparently redundant correction written in the bottom margin is marked in exactly the same way as the previous one. Note the strikingly similar correction in Ji₄.

over there', but is merely meant to be replaced by the name of the victim during the recitation of the curse. The latter is apparently spelled out in PS 17.23.7 below.

For a discussion on the meaning of *bhrā́tṛvya-*, originally 'brother's son, nephew', but specifically in Vedic also 'father's brother's son, cousin' > 'rival (as far as family inheritance is concerned)' > 'enemy', see BENVENISTE 1969: 259ff.; on the formation type, see also RAU 2011. The rare compound *bhrātṛvya-hán-* , 'slayer of rivals', appears in the feminine *bhrātṛvya-ghnī́-* in ŚS 10.9.1, addressing a cow that is being sacrificed, but also in the masculine in TS 1.3.2.1,6(=f), as an epithet of the Samrāj metre, and in AB 4.2, as an epithet of the Nānada *sāman*.

The compound *sapatna-hán-*, 'slayer of rivals', already occurs in RV 10.166.2a (in which the poet compares himself to Indra), 10.170.2d (as an epithet of Sūrya), 10.174.5a (praising a king), and also in 10.159.5a (*sapatna-ghnī́-*), rendered by J-B with "smiting cowives", and it is fairly common in the AV as an epithet of a variety of figures.

The term *sapátna-* is an analogically formed masculine corresponding to *sa-pátnī-* 'co-wife, female rival' (MACDONELL & KEITH 1912: II, 424), and it indicates a 'rival, enemy' in general. However, since *bhrā́tṛvya-*'s meaning of 'rival, enemy' is also derived from a situation of family-internal rivalry (specifically that which may occur among heirs of the same head of an enlarged family), I wonder whether this line (which most likely introduces the curse in the next paragraph) refers specifically to two aspects of such family-internal rivalries.

Note that a sequence of two vocatives is also met with above in 17.21.4a.

On the (very variable) sandhi of final *-n* before *s-*, see GRIFFITHS 2009: LX §2.8(G). As for the case of final *-n* before vowel, the expected sandhi is *-nnV-*, although again with a great variety of attested variants (cf. GRIFFITHS 2009: LVI §2.8(D)). In our case both **O** and **K** actually seem to point to the reading *sapatnahamasau*, with °*ma*° (in **K** and **Ji4**, °*sa*° must be an error for °*ma*°); therefore an emendation is necessary.

17.23.7   **[prose]**

a   taṃ hanmi
b   taṃ ⁺duṣvapnyena vidhyāmi
c   tam anāyuṣṭayā vidhyāmi
d   taṃ kṣapitāyavyena vidhyāmi
e   tam adharāñcaṃ mṛtyupatham abhy apa nudāmi ||

I slay him, I pierce him with poor sleep, I pierce him with deprivation of lifetime, I pierce him with the condition of having a ruined lifetime, I thrust him onto the downward path of death.

⁺duṣvapnyena] duṣvapnena **K** duḥsvapnyena **[Ma] [Ja] Ji4 Pac** duḥsva([x]ye→*subs*.pnye)na **V122** dusvapnena **Mā** dduspa[xx]pnyena **V71** dusvāpny[x]ena **JM3**   • vidhyāmi] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pac** **[Mā] V71 JM3** vidhyāni(//)vidhyāmi **Ji4** vidyati **K**   • tam anāyuṣṭayā] tam anāyuṣṭayā **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pac** tam anājuṣṭayā **Mā V71 JM3 Ji4** tamunā iṣṭayāvena **K**   vidhyāmi] **[O]** viddhyāmi **K**   • kṣapitāyavyena] kṣapitāyavyena **[Ma] V122 Ji4 [Mā] V71** kṣipitā ẏavyena **Ja** kṣepitāyavyena **Pac**[34] pitā ẏavyena **JM3** kṣītayavena **K**   • vidhyāmi] **[O]** viddhyāmi **K**   • tam adharāñcaṃ] **[Ja] [Ma] V122 Pac V71** tam adharāñca **Mā Ji4** tam adh(i→)arāñcaṃ **JM3** tam adharāñcaṃ **K**   • mṛtyupatham abhyapa nudāmi] **[O]** mṛtyumathanabhya(*s.s.*→natya)purādāsī **K**   • ||] **Ma**[35] || 9 || **Ja?**[36] || ru 9 || 23 || **V122** || 23 || **Ji4** || 23 || ru || **Pac** || 23 || ru 10 || **Mā V71** || 23 || 10 || **JM3** Z pha 3 Z

---

34 Here **Pac** does not spell *-ẏ-* between vowels.
35 Bhattacyarya simply states that **Ma** does not feature any numeral at the end of the *kāṇḍikā*.
36 Bhattacharya simply states that, at the end of the *kāṇḍikā,* **Ja** writes the numeral "9", but does not explicitly

K

Bhattacharya writes *duḥsvapnyena* in **a**.

c. The word *anāyuṣṭā-* is hapax. It is presumably an abstract in *-tā,* built on the word *ā́yus-,* 'lifetime', with privative *a-/an-*. Note the variant spelling °*yu*° and °*ju*° in **O**, both of which are pronounced [ju].

d. The word *kṣapitāyavya-* appears to be a *ya*-suffixed neutral abstract (see AiGr II, 2, §666 p. 833ff.) based on an unattested compound *kṣapitāyu-,* presumably a bahuvrīhi, 'whose lifetime is ruined'. The first member of this compound must be *kṣapitá-,* 'destroyed, ruined', the verbal noun belonging to the causative (*kṣapayati*) of the root *kṣi-,* 'to destroy, ruin' (trans.) or 'waste away, perish' (intr.) (cf. Gr. φθίνω). Note that both the causative as well as the derived verbal noun are attested only from the Epics onwards, which might suggest a late date for our text. The second member of the compound must be *āyú-,* 'lifetime' (RV+; a synonym of *ā́yus*). As I said, *kṣapitāyu-* as such is unattested, however, in RV 10.161.2 (~ PS 1.62.2 ~ ŚS 3.11.2), a stanza belonging to a charm against diseases and meant for procuring long life that displays a very Atharvanic character and has numerous AV parallels (see J-B p. 1643), we find the compound *kṣitā́yus-,* 'whose lifetime is exhausted', based on the verbal noun *kṣitá-* (derived from the same root *kṣi-*) and *ā́yus-,* 'lifetime'. This shows that *kṣapitāyavya-* is a semantically plausible formation. **K**'s variant *kṣītayavena* may suggest a formation based on *kṣitá-,* but it is best explained as a corruption. As for the full grade before the suffix *-ya* in *kṣapitāyavya-,* one may compare formations like the patronymic Bhāvayavya (< *bhāvayu-,* 'caring, cherishing') or *vāyavya-,* adj. 'relating to Vāyu'.

Incidentally, this stanza shows rather clearly that the word *duṣvapnyam* itself is to be considered a neuter abstract. Something like 'the condition of experiencing nightmares', i.e. 'poor sleep', rather than simply 'nightmare'.

The compound *mṛtyupatha-* too appears to be late, as it is first attested in Rām. 6.36.118.

---

say whether it reads || ru 9 || 23 ||, || 23 || ru 9 ||, just || 9 || or something else.

Kāṇḍikā 24

17.24.1 **[prose]** ~ ab: PS 18.49.1a, ŚS 16.5.2a; c: PS 3.30.4b, PS 19.46.12a, ŚS 6.46.2d, ŚS 16.5.1c–6c, ŚS 19.57.4a; de: PS 3.30.3cd, ŚS 19.57.3bcd; ef: ŚS 16.5.4; ghijkl: ŚS 16.7.1abcdef; no: ŚS 16.7.2–3

a   vidma te svapna janitraṃ
b   pāpmanaḥ putro [']sy abhūtyā adhi jāto yamasya karaṇaḥ |
c   taṃ tvā svapna tathā vidma |
d   yo bhadraḥ svapnaḥ sa mama
e   yaḥ pāpas taṃ dviṣate pra hiṇmaḥ |
f   tam asmai gamayāmas
g   tenainaṃ vidhyāmo
h   [']bhūtyainaṃ vidhyāmo
i   nirbhūtyainaṃ vidhyāmaḥ
j   parābhūtyainaṃ vidhyāmo
k   grāhyaiṇaṃ vidhyāmas
l   tamasainaṃ vidhyāmo
m   [']gna enaṃ kravyāda ā vṛścāmo
n   devānām enaṃ ghoraiḥ krūraiḥ *praiṣair abhi preṣyāmo
o   vaiśvāṇarasyainaṃ daṃṣṭrayor api dadhmaḥ ||

a   We know, O sleep, your pedigree:
b   you are son of evil, born from misery, Yama's agent.
c   You, as such, O sleep, we know in that way.
d   The pleasant sleep: that is mine!
e   The bad one, we hurl at the one who hates [us].
f   We send it to him;
g   we pierce him with it;
h   we pierce him with misery;
i   we pierce him with loss;
j   we pierce him with defeat;
k   we pierce him with disease;
l   we pierce him with darkness;
m   O Agni, we chop him down before [you,] the eater of bloody flesh;
n   we command him with the terrible, ferocious injunctions of the gods;
o   we set him among the two fanged-jaws of Vaiśvānara.

N.B. In **Ji₄** the sequence *nirbhūtyainaṃ vidhyāmaḥ parābhūtyainaṃ* (the following *vidhyāmo* is missing) is secondarily added in the upper margin, while a *kākapada* indicates the place where it

should be supplied in the second line of the ms. (i.e. in between *bhūtyainaṃ vidhyāmo* and *grāhyaiṇaṃ*)

svapna] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ sva(p[x]→*s.s.*)pna Ji₄ svapne **K** • pāpmanaḥ] **[O]** pāpmanaḥ **K** • putro [']sy] putro asy **[O]** putro sy **K** • abhūtyā adhi jāto] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 abhūyā adhi jāto Ji₄ a | bhūtyā adhi jāto JM₃³⁷ abhūtyādhi jātor **K** •]] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 || Ji₄ JM₃ *om.* **K** • taṃ tvā] **[O]** tantvā **K** • vidma]] **[Ma]** V122 **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ ׀ Ji₄ vidmaḥ | **Ja** vidma || Pa꜀ vidma **K** • yo bhadraḥ] **]Or]** yo bhadras **K** • svapnaḥ sa mama yaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** svapnaḥ sa mama (s.s. → ya)ḥ V122³⁸ svapnaḥ sa mata yaḥ Ji₄ svapna sa mamayaḥ V71 svapna sa maẏamaẏaḥ JM₃ svapnas svapnama yaḥ **K** • dviṣate] **K** **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ dviṣatata Ji₄ dviṣa[.]e V71 • hiṇmaḥ] **[O]** hiṇma **K** •]] **K** **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ || Ji₄ • gamayāmas] **K** gamaẏāmas **[O]** • tenainaṃ] **[O]** tenenaṃ **K** • vidhyāmo (')bhūtyainaṃ] vidhyāmo bhūtyainaṃ **[Ma] [Ja]** Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** JM₃ vidhyāmo bhūtyenaṃ V122 V71 viddhyāmo bhūtyainaṃ **K** • vidhyāmo nirbhūtyainaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** JM₃ vidhyāmo nirbhūtyenaṃ V71 viddhyano nibhūtyainaṃ ma **K** • vidhyāmaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 vidhyām(o →)aḥ JM₃ vidhyāsaḥ **K** • vidhyāmo grāhyaiṇaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** JM₃ vidhyāmo grāhyainaṃ V71 grāhyainaṃ Ji₄ vidyāmo grāhyeṇaṃ **K** • vidhyāmas tamasainaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ viddhāmas tamasya(*subs.*→sa)inaṃ Ji₄ vidyāmaś camaścainaṃ **K** • vidhyāmo [']gna enaṃ] vidhyāmo gna enaṃ **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ viddhyāmo gna enaṃ Ji₄ vidyāmo agnedaṃ **K** • kravyāda ā vṛścāmo] **[Ja]** Ji₄ **[Mā]** JM₃ kravyā(*s.s.*→)da ā vṛścāmo V71 kravyādā vṛścẏāmo **Ma** V122 kravyādaẏā vṛścẏāmo | Pa꜀ kravyādhā vṛścāmo **K** • **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ • ghoraiḥ] **[O]** ghoraiḥ **K** • krūraiḥ] **[Ma] [Ja]** Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 *om.* JM₃ (*s.s.* →)krūrai V122 krūraiḥ **K** • *praiṣair abhi*] preṣyair abhi **[O]** preṣyad api **K** • preṣyāmo] **[Ma]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ praiṣyāmo **Ja** peṣyāmo **K** • vaiśvānarasyainaṃ] **K** JM₃ vaiśvānaraḥsyainaṃ **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** vai[.(//)narḥsyainaṃ V71 • daṃṣṭrayor] daṃṣṭraẏor **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ daṃṣṭrayoḥ Pa꜀ daṃṣṭayor **K** • api dadhmaḥ] **[O]** api dadhma **K** • || **O** *om.* **K**

ŚS 16.5
vidmá te svapna janítraṃ gráhyāḥ putró 'si yamásya káraṇaḥ |
ántako 'si mṛtyúr asi |
tám tvā svapna táthā sáṃ vidma *sá naḥ svapna duṣvápnyāt pāhi* ||1||
vidmá te svapna janítraṃ nírṛtyāḥ putró 'si [...] || 2 ||
vidmá te svapna janítraṃ ábhūtyāḥ putró 'si [...] || 3 ||
vidmá te svapna janítraṃ nírbhūtyāḥ putró 'si [...] || 4 ||
vidmá te svapna janítraṃ párābhūtyāḥ putró 'si [...] || 5 ||
vidmá te svapna janítraṃ devajāmīnáṃ putró 'si [...] ||6||

PS 18.49
vidma te svapna janitraṃ pāpmanaḥ putro 'si yamasya karaṇaḥ |
*sa naḥ svapna *duṣvapnyā*t³⁹ *pāhi* ||1||
vidma te svapna janitraṃ grāhyāḥ putro 'si […] ||2||
vidma te svapna janitraṃ nirṛtyāḥ putro 'si […] ||3||
vidma te svapna janitram abhūtyāḥ putro 'si […] ||4||
vidma te svapna janitraṃ nirbhūtyāḥ putro 'si […] ||5||
vidma te svapna janitraṃ parābhūtyaḥ putro 'si […] ||6||
vidma te svapna janitraṃ devajāmīnāṃ putro 'si […] ||7||

---

37 The exemplar of **JM₃** probably featured a pāda marker, which the copyist confused for a full-fleged daṇḍa.

38 The superscript correction written in the upper margin is also followed by the numeral "1" referring to the first line in the manuscript.

39 The emendation is mine. Bʜᴀᴛᴛᴀᴄʜᴀʀʏᴀ (2011: 1321) writes *su(<du)ṣvapnyāt*. See the discussion *ad loc*.

ŚS 16.7.1
ténainaṃ vidhyāmy ábhūtyainaṃ vidhyāmi nírbhūtyainaṃ vidhyāmi párābhūtyainaṃ vidhyāmi gráhyainaṃ vidhyāmi támasainaṃ vidhyāmi ||1||
devánāṃ enaṃ ghoraíḥ krūraíḥ praiṣaír abhipréṣyāmi ||2||
vaiśvānarásyainaṃ dáṃṣṭrayor ápi dadhāmi ||3||

ŚS 6.46.2
vidmá te svapna janítraṃ devajāmīnā́ṃ putró 'si yamásya káraṇaḥ |
ántako 'si mṛtyúr asi táṃ tvā svapna táthā sáṃ vidma *sá naḥ svapna duṣvápnyāt pāhi* ||2||

ŚS 19.57.3–4
dévānāṃ patnīnāṃ garbha yámasya kara yó bhadráḥ svapna |
sá máma yáḥ pāpás tád dviṣaté prá hiṇmaḥ |
mā́ tṛṣṭā́nām asi kṛṣṇaśakunér múkham ||3||
táṃ tvā svapna táthā sáṃ vidma […] ||4||

PS 3.30.3–4
devānāṃ patnīnāṃ garbha yamasya karaṇaḥ |
yo bhadraḥ svapnaḥ sa mama yaḥ pāpas taṃ dviṣate pra hiṇmaḥ ||3||
tṛṣṇāmā nāmāsi kṛṣṇaśakuner mukhaṃ nirṛter mukham |
taṃ tvā svapna tathā vidma ||4||

Bhattacharya reads *putro asy* in line **a**; *vidhyāmo (')bhūtyainaṃ* and *vidhyāmogna enaṃ* in line **f**; *preṣyair* in line **n**.

For an overview on the AV texts dealing with poor sleep (*duṣvápnyam*) see my introduction to this chapter.

This whole portion under consideration here is repeated ten times throughout this kāṇḍikā. The only variation is in the names of the fathers of sleep (indicated by the formula "[Father-gen.m.] *putro'si*", "you are son of [father]") and its mothers (indicated by the formula "[Mother-abl.f.] *adhi jātaḥ*", "born from [mother]"). A few times, however, this symmetry is broken: we find female entities in the "fathers'" part of the formula (*grāhi*, *tandrī*, and probably *dyu*), and once a neuter word in the "mothers'" part of the formula (*abhva*); one "father" is also neuter (*ahar*):

	[Father-gen.m.] *putro'si*	[Mother-abl.f.] *adhi jātaḥ*
1	pāpman	abhūti
2	**grāhi (f.!)**	niṛrti
3	varuṇa	varuṇānī
4	**ahar (n.)**	rātri
5	**dyu (f.?)**	bhūmi
6	vanaspati (pl.)	oṣadhī (pl.)
7	vānaspatya (pl.)	vīrudh (pl.)
8	**tandrī (f.!)**	*kātyā
9	rakṣas (pl.)	***abhva (n.!)**
10	gandhrarva (pl.)	apsaras (pl.)

The opening formula "*vidmá te svapna janítraṃ … karaṇaḥ.*" is also found as a refrain in PS 18.49 and ŚS 16.5,

In the former the refrain goes like this: *vidma te svapna janitraṃ* [X-gen.] *putro 'si yamasya karaṇaḥ | sa naḥ svapna *duṣvapnyāt pāhi ||*, "We know, O sleep, your pedigree: you are son of [X], Yama's agent. As such, O sleep, protect us from poor sleep". The name of the mentioned parent of sleep is masculine in the first refrain (*pāpmanaḥ*), but always feminine in the following lines: *grāhyāḥ, nirr̥tyāḥ, abhūtyāḥ, nirbhūtyaḥ, parābhūtyaḥ, devajāmīnāṃ*.

In the ŚS, the refrain is the following: *vidmá te svapna janítraṃ* [X-gen.f.sg./pl.] *putró 'si yamásya káraṇaḥ | ántako 'si mr̥tyúr asi | tám̐ tvā svapna táthā sáṃ vidma sá naḥ svapna duṣvápnyāt pāhi ||*, "We know thy place of birth [better: pedigree], O sleep; thou art son of [X], agent of Yama; end-maker art thou; death art thou; so, O sleep, do we comprehend thee here; do thou, O sleep, protect us from evil-dreaming" (Whitney).

Note that this refrain also includes the formula *tám̐ tvā svapna táthā sáṃ vidma* (ŚS 16.5.1c-6c, ŚS 19.57.4a), which appears in our text without the preverb: *taṃ tvā svapna tathā vidma* (= PS 3.30.4b ~ 19.46.12a). The latter variant reads like an Anuṣṭubh (with [∪ – – ×] cadence).

In the ŚS refrain, only the mothers of sleep are mentioned, but the sequence is exactly the same: *gŕ̥hyāḥ, nírr̥tyāḥ, ábhūtyāḥ, nírbhūtyaḥ, párābhūtyaḥ, devajāmīnáṃ*.

In the rest of our refrain, we find a similar sequence: the victim of the curse (the hater, *dviṣant-* in line **e**), or the effigy representing him (see my comment on line **f** below), is pierced (*vyadh-*) by means of the following disgraces: *ábhūti, nírbhūti, párābhūti, gŕ̥hi, támas*.

a. Whitney translates *janitram* with "place of birth", but as our text clarifies immediately afterwards, no place of birth is concerned; rather, the sleep's parents are mentioned. In fact, *janitra-*, in the plural, can mean 'parents',[40] if not even 'family' in the wider sense, as illustrated by the following passage: AB 2.6.12 (in relation to an animal sacrifice), *anv enam mātā manyatām anu pitānu bhrātā sa garbhyo 'nu sakhā sayūthya iti janitrair evainaṃ tat samanumatam ālabhanta |*, "'May its mother approve it, it father, its brother from the same womb, its comrade from the same flock' (he says); verily thus they slay it with the approval of its generators" (Keith). According to this interpretation, but taking into account that our line features a singular, I propose to translate with "pedigree".

b. Note that *ábhūti-*, although being a short i-stem, features here a gen./abl. sg. ending *-yās*, which is analogical to that of the *devī-*inflection, instead of the expected *-es*. This analogy affecting feminine short i-stems is operative already in the RV, although only in a few occurrences, which increase in number in the AV (WG §336g p. 117). Actually, in the case of the word *ábhūti-*, which is first attested in the AV, only the gen./abl. sg. *ábhūtyāḥ* is found (ŚS 7.100.1b ~ PS 20.36.4b; ŚS 16.5.3a, ŚS 16.8.13e; PS 10.9.2a, 10.10.7a, 20.48.8b).

Given the frequency of this ending in our text as well as in the other nightmare hymn ŚS 16.5, one may wonder whether this is a specific stylistic preference of their author (or authors). However, *nírbhūti-* and *párābhūti-*, as well as *gŕ̥hi*, which are found next to *ábhūtyāḥ* in the refrain in ŚS 16.5 and PS 18.49, only feature the gen./abl. sg. forms *nírbhūtyāḥ, párābhūtyāḥ*, and *gŕ̥hyāḥ* (also below in 17.24.2)—the first two words actually only appear in the neighbourhood of the word *ábhūti-*, clearly as artificial variations (see ŚS 12.5.35a ~ PS 16.144.4a, ŚS 16.5, 16.7.1, PS 17.40, 18.49, 18.52).

As for the case of *nírr̥ti-*, which appears below in 17.24.2 as *nirr̥tyāḥ* (and similarly in ŚS 16.5.2), this form of the gen./abl. sg. is actually the most frequent in the AV (see Whitney, *Index*, p. 165), although the older *nírr̥teḥ* is also attested, but almost only in one specific recurrent formula: in ŚS 3.11.2c = 20.96.7c (…*nírr̥ter upásthād*… ~ RV 10.161.2c ~ PS 1.62.2c), ŚS 7.53.3 (…*nírr̥ter upásthāt*… ~ 20.11.6c), ŚS 8.4.9d (…*ā́ vā dadhātu nírr̥ter upásthe*… ~ RV 7.104.9d ~ PS 16.9.9d), PS 2.30.4d (…*ā dhehi nirr̥ter upasthe*), PS 6.3.3d (*muñcantu mr̥tyor nirr̥ter upasthāt*), PS 12.18.10d (*apy enaṃ dhehy nirr̥ter upasthe*) and PS 18.74.2d (…*nírr̥ter upásthāt*… ~ RV 10.18.10d). Besides appearing in this old formula (already found in RV as can be seen from the

---

40 This meaning is old: cf. RV 1.185.6b, in which Heaven and Earth are personified as the two parents of the gods (*devā́nām … jánitrī*).

previous references; see also RV 10.95.14c), the gen./abl. in *-es* also appears in PS 3.30.4a (… *nirṛter mukham*), which is in fact one of the above-mentioned nightmare hymns.[41] Therefore, we must conclude that the *-yās* forms are not *per se* specific to the style of these texts, but testify to a wider tendency in the language, although they suggest that these texts date to fairly late period when this paradigmatic analogy had already spread.

c. The addition of a deictic pronoun next to a personal pronoun such as in *taṃ tvā* is a common syntactic phenomenon, attested since the RV and all throughout Vedic literature. The two pronouns can occur both in the nom. (e.g. in RV 6.45.17c, *sá tvám na indra mṛlaya*, "You, as such, O Indra, be merciful (2nd sg.) to us") as well as in an oblique case (e.g. RV 4.32.13c, *tám tvā vayám havāmahe*, "We invoke you as such"); the personal pronoun can also be omitted, and only the additional deictic expressed (e.g. RV 10.69.3c, *sá giró juṣasva*, "[you] as such (*sá* [*tvám*]) enjoy (2nd sg.) the praises!"; RV 2.29.4b, *té mṛlata nā́dhamānāya máhyam*, "Such they=[you (pl.)] as such (*té* [*yūyám*]) be merciful (2nd pl.) to me who is seeking help"). This phenomenon is not to be confused with that of *sá-fígé*, and not distinct from cases in which other deictic pronouns besides *sá/tá-* are added: e.g. RV 5.40.7ab, *mā́ mām imáṃ* […] *ní gārīt*, "May he not swallow this me"="May he not swallow me as such"; also, with omission of the personal pronoun: RV 7.74.1c, *ayáṃ vām ahvé 'vase*, "This one here[=I] (*ayáṃ* [*ahám*]) have called (1st sg.) you two for help"; RV 8.91.2ab, *asaú yá eṣi vīrakó gṛháṃ-gṛham*, "That one over there=[you] over there (*asaú* [*tvám*]), little man, who go (2nd sg.) from house to house".

The additional deictic pronoun *sá* is generally interpreted as being anaphoric ("as such"). However, JAMISON (1992) has shown that this phenomenon occurs predominantly in the case of 2nd person imperatives, *-si*-imperatives, root aorist injunctives used as commands, etc. On the grounds of this, she has argued for a stronger emphatic deictic function of the additional deictic pronouns. As such, these would express a 'here and now' nuance, that JAMISON proposed to convey with translations such as 'me here', 'you there'; KLEIN (1996: 23) has suggested 'hey there' for the cases in which the personal pronoun is omitted. For a more detailed overview on the whole phenomenon, also in relation to the *sá-fígé* debate, see HOCK 1997: 53ff., DUNKEL 1990, JAMISON 1992, KLEIN 1996 and 1997, and WATKINS 2002. At any rate, this construction never occurs at the beginning of a hymn or of a stanza, so that some anaphoric reference to a preceding statement can always be identified. This is certainly clear in the case of our pāda, in which the reciter can claim to know sleep "as such", that is as "son of evil, born from misery, Yama's agent", i.e. on the basis of its pedigree illustrated in the preceding statement.

de. Cf. ŚS 19.57.3, *dévānāṃ patnīnāṃ garbha yámasya kara yó bhadráḥ svapna | sá máma yáḥ pāpás tád dviṣaté prá hiṇmaḥ |*, "Embryo of the wives of the gods, instrument of Yama, excellent dream; the evil [dream] that is mine, that do we send forth to him that hates us" (Whitney). Whitney translates *sá máma yáḥ pāpás* as one phrase on the basis of the position of the *daṇḍa*. However, I think that the line should be divided differently. The correct pāda/sentence division seems preserved in PS 3.30.3, *devānāṃ patnīnāṃ , garbha yamasya karaṇaḥ | yo bhadraḥ svapnaḥ sa mama , yaḥ pāpas taṃ dviṣate pra hiṇmaḥ*. I translate accordingly, taking *yo bhadraḥ svapnaḥ* as the *yad*-phrase correlating with the following *sa*-phrase, namely *sa mama*, and taking *yaḥ pāpas* as the *yad*-phrase correlating with the following *sa*-phrase, *taṃ dviṣate pra hiṇmaḥ*.

Note that the repha in *pra* causes the retroflex articulation to spread to the following *hinmaḥ* > *hiṇmaḥ*. This suggests a close pronunciation which may go back to an old formulaic use. The only parallel of our formula is the above-quoted ŚS 19.57.3 ~ PS 3.30.3. The formula as such is not found in RV, but we do find several cases of *prá hiṇ°* in RV book 10: *prá hiṇutāt* (RV 10.16.1d ~ PS 18.63.8d ~ ŚS 18.2.4d), *prá hiṇomi* (RV 10.16.9 ~ PS 17.44.8a ~ ŚS 12.2.8a), *prá hiṇotana* (RV 10.30.7); and even more frequently in the AV: *prá hiṇmaḥ ||* (PS 2.37.2d), *prá hiṇmas* (PS 5.15.1c; PS 16.36.5b ~ ŚS 10.1.15b; PS 20.18.10c ~ ŚS 7.115.3c; always pāda final), *prá hiṇmasi* (PS 7.1.11c; PS 16.35.2d, 5c ~ ŚS 10.1.5c; PS 16.38.2d ~ ŚS 10.1.30d; PS 19.52.18b; ŚS 5.31.10b;

---

41 Unrelated are ŚS 11.1.29d ~ PS 16.91.9d and PS 19.49.5a.

always pāda final), *prá hiṇomi* (PS 3.37.3d, 4d, 9a; PS 12.1.5a ~ ŚS 5.22.4a; PS 17.44.4c, 10b; PS 20.27.7a ~ ŚS 10.5.23a; PS 20.39.9c; PS20.40.1b; ŚS 12.2.4c; ŚS 12.2.10b), *prá hiṇuta* (PS 18.79.10a ~ ŚS 18.4.10a; ŚS 6.130.1c, 2c, 3c; ŚS 6.131.1c, 2c). See also *pra hiṇmaḥ* in 17.25.8 below. In fact when *prá* and *hi-* occur in close collocation in RV 10, we never find *prá hin°*.

On the contrary, *prá hin°* is only found in RV book 9, in *prá hinvānáḥ* (RV 9.64.16a, 9.90.1a, 9.107.15d; always pāda initial), and never in the AV. In fact, I have not found any occurrence of *prá … hi-* in tmesis in the AV (not even in prose), whereas these do occur in RV, although only in book 10: *prā́smai hinota…* (RV 10.30.8a), *prá tát te hinavā…* (RV 10.95.13c), *prá nūnáṃ jātávedasam áśvaṃ hinota vājínam* | (RV 10.188.5ab); the sole exception is *prá vo deváṃ cit sahasānám agním áśvaṃ ná vājínam hiṣe námobhiḥ* | (RV 7.7.1ab).

To sum it up, we can identify four chronological stages: 1) in RV 7, *prá … hin°* can occur with tmesis; 2) in RV 9, *prá hin°* can occur in close collocation, but retroflexion does not spread forward; 3) in RV 10, *prá (…) hin°* is used more frequently[42] and can occur both with tmesis, as well as in close collocation, in which case retroflexion always spreads; 4) in AV, *prá-hiṇ-* only occurs in close collocation, and retroflexion always spreads. Thus, for the AV stage, we could perhaps speak of completed univerbation.

f. It is attractive to consider that this and the following lines might refer to a ritual in which an effigy representing the hater (*dviṣant-*) is pierced (*vyadh-*) and eventually placed (*api dhā-*) over the fire (*kravyād-*, *vaiśvānara-*). The pronoun *ayám* (accented) expresses near deixis, and the dative *asmaí*, 'to this one here', might refer to an effigy present in the hand of the priest/magician at the moment of recitation. The following *enam* would also refer to such effigy. The use of effigies, dolls and puppets (*kṛtyā́-*, *ā́kṛti-*) for witchcraft rituals is well known in the Atharvanic tradition: they can either represent the spell or curse, and thus, for instance, be placed in the vicinity of the patient/victim, or they can represent the patient/victim themselves, in which case, what is done to the effigy (including piercing and burning) magically affects the patient/victim (e.g. KauśS 5.3[39] and 6[47–49] and AVPariś 31.9.4–5, among other passages; see MODAK 1993: 62, 73, 314, 318, 326; CALAND 1900: 132ff.; GOUDRIAAN 1986: 453f.; HENRY 1909: 159f., 227ff.).

However, there is no way to tell if *asmai* was accented. Unaccented enclitic forms of the *ayám* pronoun supply the missing forms of the enclitic pronoun *ena-* (only attested in the acc., and only rarely in few other cases), and, accordingly, have an unemphatic anaphoric deictic function. Thus, *asmai* (unaccented) could simply refer back to the "hater" (*dviṣant-*) mentioned in line **e**. All the following *enaṃ* pronouns would then also refer to him.

As regards pādas **ef**, compare also ŚS 16.6.2–4 (~ PS 18.50.1b–d), in which the last verse is almost a perfect parallel to our text, at least content-wise: *uṣó yásmād duṣvápnyād ábhaiṣmā́pa tád uchatu* || *dviṣaté tát párā vaha śápate tát párā vaha* || *yáṃ dviṣmó yáś ca no dvéṣṭi tásmā enad gamayāmaḥ* ||, "O dawn, of what evil-dreaming we have been afraid, let that fade away. Carry that away to him that hates; carry that away to him that curses. Whom we hate, and who hates us, to him we send it".

j. The word *grā́hi-* is first found in RV 10.161.1c (a hymn against disease), *grā́hir jagrā́ha yádi vaitád enaṃ tásyā indrāgnī prá mumuktam enam*, "Or if a Grabber has truly grabbed him in this way, from her, O Indra and Agni, release him" (J-B); cf. also ŚS 6.113. The semantics of *grah-*, *gráha-*, *grāhá-*, etc., point to the meaning 'disease' (< 'seizure', '[bad] influence'), perhaps as a personified female demon (as in J-B's translation of the above RV passage), mother of *svápna-*, according to ŚS 16.5.1 and PS 17.24.2 here below. As the other curses are all feminine *-ti* abstract formations, I prefer to translate *grā́hi-* accordingly, interpreting the feminine gender as expressing an abstract condition, rather than personification into a female demon.

m. In his comment, Bhattacharya entertains the idea of emending the voc. *agne* with a dat. *agnaya(=*agnaye*) in agreement with *kravyāde*. This would require that a syllable or an akṣara was lost during the transmission. **K** *agnedaṃ* (double sandhi?) suggests that no such extra syllable was

---

[42] Also *práhitaḥ* in RV 10.165.4c, and *prahyè* in RV 10.109.3c.

present in the common written archetype. We would then have to assume some kind of haplology, along the lines of *agnaiai ainam > (haplology:) agnai ainam > agna ainam > agna enaṃ in the early period of oral transmission. Such an emendation would make for a nice solution syntactically, but after all it is not necessary, and the ms. evidence does not support it.

On Agni Kravyā́d see my comment on PS 17.21.1 above.

n. Bhattacharya writes *preṣyair*, sticking to the manuscripts' readings. The word *preṣya-*, 'servant', is frequent in later texts, and rarely attested in Vedic: e.g. AB 7.29, […] *'tha yady apaḥ śūdrāṇāṃ sa bhakṣaḥ śūdrāṃs tena bhakṣeṇa jinviṣyasi śūdrakalpas te prajāyām ājaniṣyate 'nyasya preṣyaḥ kāmotthāpyo yathākāmavadhyo*, "If water (they bring), it is the food of the Śūdras; with this food thou wilt strengthen the Śūdras; in thine offspring one like a Śūdra will be born, the servant of another, to be removed at will, to be slain at will" (Keith). However, this meaning does not seem to fit our sentence—who would these servants of the gods be? On the other hand, ŚS 16.7.2 *praiṣaír*, from *praiṣá-*, is a better reading, although, as Whitney points out (*ad loc.*), the word should be taken in its etymological sense ('demand' (Whitney), or 'command, injunction') rather than in its technical ritual sense (i.e. the Adhvaryu's call or command to an assistant or another priest so that he begins his assigned task). Alternation between *ṣa*, *ṣya*, *śa* and *śya* (also with other vowels) is not infrequent in the transmission (see KIM, *Schreib.* and *Auss.*); however, comparison between **K** and **O** indeed points to the reading *preṣyair* for the written archetype, or perhaps *preṣair*. The latter could perhaps be a phonetic variant of *praiṣair* (cf. Ved. Var. II p. 321ff.), or simply an early error in the transmission due to anticipation of the following *preṣyāmo*. Therefore, I emend to *praiṣair* in accordance with the ŚS reading.

The overall meaning of the line is clear: the speaker claims to take control of the victim. However, it remains obscure to me what exactly these 'injunctions of the gods' are.

o. On Vaiśvānara as a form of Agni, see my comment on PS 17.21.3 above. The image of Agni's fangs is not uncommon: cf. RV 10.87.3 (to Agni), *ubhóbhayāvinn úpa dhehi dáṃṣṭrā hiṃsráḥ śíśānó 'varam páraṃ ca / hiṃsráḥ śíśānó 'varam páraṃ ca / utā́ntárikṣe pári yāhi rājañ jámbhaiḥ sám dhehy abhí yātudhā́nān ||*, "You who have (teeth) in both, bring both jaws close together, the upper and the lower, as you sharpen (them), with murderous intent. Encircle (them) in the midspace, O king, and set upon the sorcerers altogether with your fangs" (J-B).

17.24.2 [prose]

° ° ° janitraṃ grāhyāḥ putro [']si nirṛtyā adhi ° ° ° ||

(…) pedigree: you are son of Disease, (born) from Dissolution (…).

grāhyāḥ] **[O]** grāhyāḥ **K** • putro [']si] putro si **[O]** putro sa **K** • nirṛtyā adhi] **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** nirrutyā adhi **V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71 JM₃** nirityādhi **K** • ||] **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ Mā** jāto || **V71 JM₃** | **K**

Bhattacharya writes the first part of the refrain in full: *vidma te svapna janitraṃ grāhyāḥ putrosi nirṛtyā adhi jāto yamasya karaṇaḥ | taṃ tvā . . . dadhmaḥ ||*. He does the same for the following instances of the refrain, abbreviating the opening only in 17.24.7–9. However, none of my mss. reports such a large portion of the refrain; they all abbreviate it to *janitraṃ ... adhi*, sometimes adding *jāto*. Here, for instance, the word *jāto* is only preserved in **V71** and **JM₃**.

17.24.3   [prose]

° ° ° janitraṃ varuṇasya putro [']si varuṇānyā adhi ° ° ° ||

(…) pedigree: you are Varuṇa's son, (born) from Varuṇānī (…)

varuṇasya] **[O]** varuṇaḥ **K**　　• putro [']si] putro si **[O] K**　　• varuṇānyā adhi] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** varuṇānvādhi **V71 JM₃**[43] varuṇānyādhi **K**　　• ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃ | K V71**

Bhattacharya writes *putrosi*.

　　Compare ŚS 6.46.1, *yó ná jīvó 'si ná mr̥tó devā́nām amr̥tagarbhó 'si svapna | varuṇānī́ te mātā́ yamáḥ pitā́rárur nā́māsi ||*, "Thou who art not alive, not dead, immortal-embryo of the gods art thou, O sleep; Varuṇānī is thy mother, Yama thy father; Araru by name art thou" (Whitney) (~ PS 19.46.10abc, up to *yamaḥ pitā*, with no mention of the name Araru[44]).

　　The presence of Varuṇa here might be due to the association of the god with the night and with darkness, as well as the idea of Varuṇa as a dangerous god. This association becomes stronger in the course of Vedic religious history, and it goes hand in hand with the strengthening of the connection between the god Mitra, the sun, and the light of day. This pattern, in which Mitra becomes ever more visibly connected with light and positive elements, and Varuṇa with the darkness and negative elements, has been discussed by Brereton (1981: 52ff.).

　　However, this connection is rooted in old ideas, such as that of Varuṇa being the god of the western direction and of the rocky netherworld, where the sun resides when it sets (Kuiper 1964: 107ff.) and which, at night, extends (upside down) above the earth as the night sky (Kuiper 1964: 114f.). It may also be relevant to recall that Vasiṣṭha, in his famous monologue addressed to Varuṇa, RV 7.86, tries to explain his guilt (*ā́gas*) and find justifications for the offense (*énas*) he has committed against Varuṇa in the following way: RV 7.86.6, *ná sá svó dákṣo varuṇa dhrútiḥ sā́ súrā manyúr vibhī́dako ácittiḥ | ásti jyā́yān kánīyasa upāré svápnaś canéd ánr̥tasya prayotā́ ||*, "This [offence] was not [my] own intention! it was deception: it was liquor, dice, thoughtlessness! The elders share the [responsibility of the] misdeed of the younger ones! Not even sleep prevents *ánr̥ta*!" (my transl.). The last sentence is revealing: it comes after a series of attempts on the part of Vasiṣṭha to shake off his guilt; first he blames liquor, dice, and thoughtlessness for having deceived him; then he tries to blame his elders; finally, he mentions "sleep" and "*ánr̥ta*". He does so precisely because the night and *r̥tá* are the domains of Varuṇa. By saying "not even" (*caná*, further stressed by *íd*), he is highlighting the fact that at night, while Varuṇa's spies, the stars (see Kuiper 1964: 115), are surveying the sleeping world, no violation of the cosmic order (*ánr̥ta*) should be committed; yet, he says, even then, this can happen. Thus, in my view, on the one hand Vasiṣṭha is trying to get Varuṇa to cut him some slack (since even he, the god of *r̥tá*, cannot prevent *ánr̥ta* from being committed before his eyes), and on the other hand, he is trying to pass the responsibility of his misdeed onto Varuṇa himself for not having prevented him from committing it. As such, this sentence represents the culmination of a dramatic stanza in which a desperate Vasiṣṭha, in an attempt to get Varuṇa's forgiveness, reaches the point of blaming Varuṇa himself. For the sake of understanding our line, at any rate, this RV stanza sheds some light on the relationship with Varuṇa and sleep.[45]

---

43 Here both **V71** and **JM₃** feature a cluster °*nvā*° (although most certainly "*nyā*" is intended), in which the "ā" sign (a vertical stroke) is placed to the right of the subscript "*va*" sign (and connected to it), rather than to the right of the main akṣara ("*na*")—in fact, it looks almost like a "*nvva*"(? or "*nyya*") cluster. This peculiar spelling strengthens the impression that **V71** and **JM₃** derive from the same exemplar.

44 Whitney 1905 (*ad loc.*) notes that myths about an Asura with this name are to be found in TB 3.2.9.4ff. and MS 4.1.10.

45 Note that later exegetical tradition has imagined that Vasiṣṭha had visited Varuṇa's house during sleep (see

17.24.4   **[prose]**

° ° ° janitram ahnaḥ putro [’]si rātryā adhi ° ° ° ||

(…) pedigree: you are son of the day, (born) from the night (…)

janitram ahnaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā]** janitraṃmahnaḥ **V122 V71 JM₃** janitram ahnaṃ **Ji₄** janitraṃ sahaṃnaḥ **K**   • putro [’]si] putro si **[O] K**   • rātryā adhi] **[O]** rātryādhi **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** | **K V71 JM₃**

Bhattacharya writes *putrosi*.
     The abl. ending *-yās* in *rātryā* would point to a long *ī*-stem: as KULIKOV (2010: 174 fn. 1) points out, the old stem *rā́trī-* is still found in the AV (and it is even to be assumed for metrical reasons where the ms. evidence speaks against it). However, since in PS 17.21.6 above we undoubtedly find a form of the short i-stem *rā́tri-* (namely *rātraye*), it is safer to assume that at the stage of the language represented by our prose text, only the short i-stem was found, and regard the *devī*-inflection abl. ending *-yās* as analogical (see also my comment on PS 17.24.1b above).

17.24.5   **[prose]**

° ° ° janitraṃ divas putro [’]si bhūmyā adhi ° ° ° ||

(…) pedigree: you are son of heaven, (born) from the earth (…)

putro [’]si] putro si **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** putro siṃ **Ji₄**   • bhūmyā adhi] **[O]** bhūmyādhi **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** | **K V71**

Bhattacharya writes *putrosi*.
     On *bhūmyā(ḥ)* from *bhū́mi-* but with an analogical *devī*-inflection abl. ending, see my comment on PS 17.24.1b above.
     The sandhi *-s p-* (see MACDONELL 1910: 70–71 §78.2cβ, AiGr I §286c p. 340, Ved. Var. II. p. 449ff.) is not unusual in PS: I counted 39 instances of *divas p-* in PS (in a restricted number of collocations: *divas payaḥ, divas pari, divas pṛthivyāḥ/vīm, divas pṛṣṭhe/am, divas putraḥ, divas patiḥ*)—other cases of *-s p-* are even more numerous—against only five instances of *divaḥ p-* (in similar collocations).

17.24.6   **[prose]**

° ° ° janitraṃ vanaspatīnāṃ putro [’]sy oṣadībhyo [’]dhi ° ° ° ||

(…) pedigree: you are son of trees, born from herbs (…)

vanaspatīnāṃ] **[O]** vānaspatyānāṃ **K**   • putro [’]sy] putro sy **[O] K**   • oṣadībhyo [’]dhi] oṣadībhyo dhi **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] Ji₄ Pa_c** oṣadībhyo adhi **V122** oṣadībhyo **K JM₃ V71**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** | **V71** *om*. **K**

GELDNER 1951: 256–257).

Bhattacharya writes *putrosy°* and *oṣadībhyodhi*.

Clearly paragraphs 17.24.6 and 17.24.7 have been conflated in the Kashmirian tradition. The reading *vanaspatīnāṃ* is missing from **K**, while *vānaspatyānāṃ* corresponds to the beginning of 17.24.7 in the **O** mss. The reading *oṣadhībhyo* is found in **K** after *vānaspatyānaṃ*, whereas *vīrudbhyo* (**O** 17.24.7) is missing from **K**:

	O	K
24.6	vanaspatīnaṃ putro … oṣadībhyo …	vānaspatyānaṃ putro … oṣadībhyo
24.7	vānaspatyānaṃ putro… vīrudbhyo …	

On *vánaspáti-* and *óṣadhi/ī-*, see my comment on PS 17.21.7 above.

17.24.7 [prose]

° ° ° janitraṃ vānaspatyānāṃ putro [']si vīrudbhyo [']dhi ° ° ° ||

(…) pedigree: you are son of fruit trees, born from plants (…)

N.B. In **K** this stanza has been conflated with the preceding one (see my comment above).
––––––––
putro [']si] putro si **[O]** • vīrudbhyo [']dhi] vīrudbhyo adhi **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** vīrudhbyo dhi **Ji₄ Pa_c** • ||] **[O]**

Bhattacharya abbreviates this and the following two instances of the refrain as follows: *(***) janitraṃ vānaspatyānaṃ putrosi vīrudbhyo adhi (. . . . . .) ||*.

On *vānaspatyá-* and *vīrúdh-*, see my comment on PS 17.21.7 above.

17.24.8 [prose]

° ° ° janitraṃ ⁺tandriyaḥ putro [']si *kāṭyāyā adhi ° ° ° ||

(…) pedigree: you are son of weariness, born from her who dwells in pits (…)

⁺tandriyāḥ] tandriyāḥ **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c** tantriÿāḥ **V122** tantri[x]ÿāḥ **JM₃** tandriÿā **Mā V71** indriyaḥ **K** • putro [']si] putro si **[O] K** • *kāṭyāyā adhi] koṭīyā adhi **[Ma]? [Ja]? V122** koṭyaÿā adhi **Mā Ji₄** koṭīyā adhi jāto **V71** koṭāyā adhi jāto si **JM₃** kopaiÿā **Pa_c** krajāyādhi (=Bhatt. *vs.* krarṇayā Barret) **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃ | V71 K**

Bhattacharya writes *tandriyāḥ* (following the **O** mss.) *putrosi koṭīyā*.

The word *tandrī́-*, 'weariness' (on its etymology see Kümmel 2005), has only a few attestations: the nom. sg. *tandrī́s* in ŚS 8.8.9 (~ PS 16.29.9; from a hymn to conquer enemies), *sedír ugrā́ vyṛ̀ddhir ā́rtiś cānapavācanā́ | śrámas tandrī́ś ca móhaś ca taír amū́n abhí dadhāmi sárvān ||*, "Debility, formidable ill-success, and mishap that is not to be exorcised away, toil and weariness, and confusion—with these do I encircle all you men" (Whitney); and in ŚS 11.8.19 (~ PS 16.86.9; from a mystic hymn on the constitution of man), *svápno vaí tandrī́r nírṛtiḥ pāpmā́no nā́ma devátāḥ*

| *jarā́ khálatyaṃ pálityaṃ śárīram ánu prā́viśan* ||, "Sleep, weariness, misery, the deities named evils, old age, baldness, hoariness, entered the body afterwards" (Whitney). See also PS 4.18.2b.

This word is also attested in the compound *saṃbādha-tandrī́-* in ŚS 10.2.9 ~ PS 10.60.1 (again on the constitution of man), *priyā́priyā́ṇi bahulā́ svápnaṃ saṃbā́dhatandryàḥ | ānandā́n ugró nándāṃś ca kásmād vahati pū́ruṣaḥ* ||, "Numerous things dear and not dear, sleep, oppressions and wearinesses, delights and pleasures—from where does formidable man bring (*vah*) them?" (Whitney).

Interestingly, these last two quoted stanzas feature *tandrī́-* next to *svápna-* (as well as *nírr̥ti-*, which also occurs in our text), which is seen in a negative light.

Bhattacharya writes *tandriyāḥ*, following the **O** mss., but this form looks like a mix of *vr̥kī́-* and *devī́-*inflections. In the above-quoted pāda, *svápnaṃ saṃbā́dhatandryàḥ*, the metre requires that a syllable be restored, namely in *-tandríyaḥ* (nom. pl.). From this and from the sigmatic nominative *tandrī́s* in the above-quoted stanzas, it would appear that *tandrī́-* follows the *vr̥kī́-*inflection. Thus, we would expect a gen./abl. sg. *tandryàḥ=tandríyaḥ*. The one remaining attestation in PS 2.57.4 also supports this: *ye +tandriyā *jalpyā* (to be read *jalpiyā*) *prorṇuvanti svapnaṃ durbhūtam abhi ye kiranti | ye devānāṃ dharmadhr̥to babhūvus tebhyaḥ sarvebhyo namasā vidhema* ||, "Die, welche (einen) mit Müdigkeit, mit irrem Gefasel umhüllen, welche (schlechtes) Träumen (und) Unglück ausstreuen, welche die Gesetzesbewahrer der Götter sind: diese alle möchten wir mit Verehrung zufrieden stellen" (Zehnder). Here both the metre as well as the ms. evidence (see ZEHNDER 1999: 128) preserve an instrumental form based on the *vr̥kī́-*inflection.

As regards our line, all of the **O** mss. remarkably preserve the short vowel *-i-* (which Bhattacharya in fact adopts); they do preserve a long *ā* in the suffix, which therefore appears as *-iyāḥ*, but **K**, in which the word seems to have been confused with a nom. of *indriyá-*, actually preserves the correct ending *-iyaḥ*. It is possible then that the long *ā* is a corruption that came about in the **O** transmission, perhaps as a consequence of the frequency of the gen./abl. feminine ending *-yās* in this text (see my comment on 17.24.1b above). Therefore, on the basis of the comparison of both traditions, I emend to *+tandriyaḥ*.[46]

My conjecture *kā́ṭyāyā* is tentative. KIM (*Schreib.*) mentions a case of confusion of *ko* for original *kā* (12.5.1c, *āpatikod adhi* for *āpatikād adhi*); confusion between *ā* and *ī* is also fairly frequent (WITZEL 1985a: 260). We definitely need a feminine noun in the ablative case. My proposal is to consider the adj. *kā́ṭya-*, 'belonging to, dwelling in the *kā́ṭá-*'.

The noun *kā́ṭá-*, on which the adjective is based, means 'hole, pit, depth', in particular, according to GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY (2000-01: 203), some "deep water", or a "well", as it is frequently mentioned in lists of bodies of water: GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY quote MS 3.12.12:164.1–4, ĀpŚS 17.2.6, KS 40.4:137.20–138.2, and VSM 16.37, 16.44 (more on these last two passages below).

It is first found in RV 1.106.6, in which the poet Kutsa calls for help, having been forced down into a *kā́ṭá*: *índraṃ kútso vr̥trahánaṃ śácīpátiṃ kā́ṭé níbāḷha r̥ṣir ahvad ūtáye | ráthaṃ ná durgā́d vasavaḥ sudānavo víśvasmān no áṃhaso níṣ pipartana* ||, "Kutsa the seer, squeezed down into a pit, called on Indra, smasher of Vr̥tra, lord of power, for help. – Like a chariot from a hard place, O good ones of good gifts, rescue us from all narrow straits" (J-B).

In the AV, it is found in ŚS 12.4.3 ~ PS 17.16.3 (a hymn to the cow as belonging exclusively to the brahmins, which forms the fourth anuvāka of PS 17), *kū́ṭáyāsya sáṃ śīryante śloṇáyā kāṭám ardati | baṇḍáyā dahyante gr̥háḥ kāṇáyā* (Whitney: *kāṇáyā_ā́*) *dīyate* (PS: *jīyate*) *svám* ||, "By a hornless one they are crushed for him[47]; by a lame one he falls (? *ard*) into a pit; by a crippled one

---

46 ZEHNDER (1999: 128) had suggested the same emendation.

47 Whitney (*ad loc.*) interprets the feminine adjectives in this stanza as referring to defective cows; each has a threatening effect on the person who refuses to donate them to a priest (see the preceding stanza). Whitney also understands *gr̥háḥ* (to be supplied from pāda c) as the subject of this pāda: i.e. "his houses are crushed".

his houses are burned; by a one-eyed one his possessions are taken away (?)[48]” (Whitney).

It also occurs in PS 4.15.6 (the parallel at ŚS 4.12.7 has *kartá*-[49]), belonging to a famous hymn to heal an open fracture with a plant that was edited by GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY (2000-01): *yadi vajro viṛṣṭas tvāra *kāṭaṃ patitvā yadi vā viriṣṭam | vṛkṣād vā yad avasad daśaśīrṣa ⁺ṛbhū rathasyeva saṃ dadhāmi te paruḥ ||*, “If a vajra that has been hurled has hit you, or if there is an injury due to falling into a well, or one that is there [due to falling] from a tree: the ten-headed one shall remove [it]. I put together your joint as Ṛbhu [the parts] of a chariot” (transl. and ed. from GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY 2000-01: 202). The parallel at ŚS 4.12.7 reads only slightly differently,[50] and contains the word *kartá*: this word carries the same meaning as *kāṭá*, and might be a hypersanskritism based on *kāṭá*-, as suggested by GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY (2000-01: 203), unless *kāṭá*- is a Prakrit form of *kartá*- (see EWAia II p. 335f.).

The image of falling into a pit is frequent and variously expressed in the Vedas (cf. PS 3.25.5 in Appendix II), and clearly indicates, either literally or metaphorically, a bad situation to be avoided. Thus, we could say that *kāṭá*- has conveys negative nuance, which might fit our text.

The derived adjective *kā́ṭya*- is only found in the masculine, referring to Rudra, in the following two passages belonging to the Śatarudrīya: VS 16.37, *námaḥ srútyāya ca páthyāya ca námaḥ kā́ṭyāya ca nī́pyāya ca námaḥ kúlyāya ca sarasyàya ca námo nādeyā́ya ca vaiśantā́ya ca |*, “Homage to him [i.e. Rudra] who dwells on paths and roads, homage to him who dwells in rugged spots and on the skirts of mountains, homage to him who dwells in water courses and lakes, homage to him who dwells in rivers and meres” (Griffith); VS 16.44, *námo vrájyāya ca góṣṭhyāya ca námas tálpyāya ca géhyāya ca námo hṛdayyàya ca niveṣyàya ca námaḥ kā́ṭyāya ca gahvareṣṭhā́ya ca |*, “Homage to him who is in herds of cattle and to him who is in cow-pens, homage to him who is on beds and to him who is in houses. Homage to him who is in hearts, and to him who is in whirlpools, homage to him who is in wells and to him who is in abysses” (Griffith).

Whatever the precise meaning (Griffith translates it with ‘he who is in rugged spots’ the first time, and ‘he who is in wells’ the second time, but being based on *kāṭá*-, its basic meaning is ‘he who is in a pit’), here it clearly refers to a person, in fact a god, Rudra, who is said to dwell in pits (the Śatarudrīya lists a great number of places and entities in which Rudra is said to belong, i.e. which he presides over). Thus it seems plausible to assume that our text contained an abl. sg. of the a feminine *kā́ṭyā*- ‘she who dwells in pits’, perhaps Rudrāṇī herself, or perhaps simply a personification of the uncomfortable situation (much feared by the Vedic man) of falling into a pit. One may even go further and imagine a reference to dreaming about falling—a very common human experience.

As an alternative conjecture, we could consider **kṛtyāyā* (= abl. sg. *kṛtyāyāḥ*) from *kṛtyā́*- ‘witchcraft’, although it may be more difficult to justify it.

Note that only **V71** and **JM₃** preserve *jāto* (**JM₃** even adds a verb *si=asi*, which is not found even in 17.24.1).

17.24.9 [prose]

° ° ° janitraṃ rakṣasāṃ putro [’]sy *abhvebhyo [’]dhi ° ° ° ||

(…) pedigree: you are son of *rákṣas*-es, (born) from monsters (…).

---

48 PS: “he is deprived of his own property” (my transl.).

49 The word *kāṭá*- might be a Prakrit form of *kartá*-, (see EWAia II p. 335f.), unless *kartá* is a hypersanskritism based on *kāṭá*, as suggested by GRIFFITHS & LUBOTSKY (2000-01: 203). This word is also found four times in RV.

50 ŚS 4.12.7, *yádi kartáṃ patitvā saṃśaśré yádi vā́śmā práhṛto jaghāna | ṛbhū́ ráthasyevāṅgāni sáṃ dadhat páruṣā páruḥ ||*, “If, falling into a pit, he hath been crushed, or if a stone hurled hath smitten [him]—as a Ṛbhu the parts of a chariot, may it put together joint with joint” (Whitney).

rakṣasāṃ] **K** [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Pa_c** [**Mā**] **V71 JM₃** rākṣasām **Ji₄**   • putro ['] sy] putro sy [**O**] prabhṛvesy **K**   • *abhvebhyo [']dhi] abbhavebhyo adhi] [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** adbhavebhyo adhi **Mā V71 JM₃** adradhobhyodhi **K**   • ‖] [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** [**Mā**] **JM₃** | **V71** (*subs.*→)| **K**

Bhattacharya reads *putrosyabbhavebhyo adhi*.

Here we clearly have three variants: *abbhavebhyo* **O^A** *adbhavebhyo* **O^B** *adradhobhyo* **K**. At first sight, the agreement between **O^B** and **K** would seem to point to a word beginning with *ad°*. However, I believe that once again **O^A** preserves a reading that is closer to the original, and that **O^B**'s and **K**'s readings are independent errors that just coincidentally look alike.

But let's first evaluate the possibility that the original reading began with *ad°*. Although we would expect a feminine word in this position within the refrain, the ending *-ebhyas* can only be masculine or neuter. As a few of the entities in the "father" part of the refrains are female, it does not seem impossible that we are now dealing with a male or neuter word in the "mother" part of this refrain. From the **O** evidence, we could posit a stem *abbhava-* or *adbhava-*, neither of which is attested, however. Assuming that the former is a Prakrit form of the latter, **O^B** *adbhavebhyyo* would be our candidate for the original reading, of which **K** *adradhobhyo* would be a corruption. As the stem *adbhava-* is unattested, we could look for possible related terms to understand what it could mean. The first term that comes to mind is the adjective *ádbhuta-* 'extraordinary, wonderful, mysterious, arcane', a negated verbal noun of the root *dabh-* 'to deceive' with a peculiar phonetic and semantic history: the *-u-* is most likely abstracted from the present stem *dabhnoti*, re-analysed as an infixed present **dʰbʰ-né-u-ti* (see Gotō 2005; compare the parallel negated verbal noun *á-dabdha-* 'not deceived, not deceivable' ~ JAv *dapta-*, with the original semantics; cf. also the compound *ádbhuta-kratu-* 'whose resolution can't be deceived' rather than 'with wonderful mental power'). Thus, we justify the unexpected form of *ádbhuta-* with the speaker's desire to avoid an unwanted cluster, **a-dʰbʰ-ta > *adbdha*, and to make the *-ta*-suffix more transparent; the cluster was also simplified in YAv *abda-* 'wonderful', which incidentally shows that the formation and the semantic shift are old. However, no such justification is possible for *adbhava-*, which would instead have to be explained *ad hoc* as an *a*-suffixed derivative from a synchronic root (*a-*)*dbhu-* (or rather the full grade (*a-*)*dbhav-*) abstracted from *ádbhuta-*. As for the semantics, *ádbhuta-* is mostly used to qualify deities (Indra, Soma, Vāyu, Varuṇa, Mitra, the *gandharva-*s, etc.) as 'extraordinary' or 'wonderful' (Gotō, 2005: 193). We could assume an abstract neuter *adbhavam*, 'wonder', or a concrete masculine noun (but neuter is also possible), 'extraordinary being'. Given that the term is used in the plural, as parallel to the *rákṣas-es*, a substantive with concrete meaning would be more suitable, but nowhere does *ádbhuta-* appear to convey the negative semantics that we seem to need here.

However, there is a second possibility, which seems more appealing to me—namely to emend to **abhvebhyo*, abl. pl. from *abhvà-* 'monster'.

In the RV we only find *ábhva-* with initial accentuation. This word is a neuter substantive indicating the 'formless void',[51] the chaos that existed before creation (RV 1.185.2–8; RV 2.33.10; RV 5.49.5), which seems to stand in opposition to the cosmic order and whose thought instills fear. This meaning is exemplified by the refrain in RV 1.185, a hymn dedicated to Heaven and Earth, "the defining structures of the world", which "help dispel that fear and provide protection from the void in various ways" (J-B p. 388). In particular, RV 1.185.1–2 read: *katarā́ pū́rvā katarā́parāyóḥ*

---

51 Etymologically, *ábhva-/abhvà-* is explained as a thematic noun based on the root *bhū-* with privative *a-*, 'Un-Wesen' (EWAia I p. 94). This word can also stand for various formless entities like the wind (RV 1.24.6; RV 6.71.5), Agni's smoke (RV 2.4.5; RV 6.4.3), and the clouds (RV 1.168.9; RV 1.169.3). Only once is it used in the plural, as a masculine adjective (agreeing with *giráyas*, "mountains") according to PW and GW, or as a neuter noun according to J-B (and also Geldner, *ad loc.*): RV 1.63.1, *tvám mahā́m̐ indra yó ha śúṣmair dyā́vā jajñānáḥ pṛthivī́ áme dhāḥ | yád dha te víśvā giráyaś cid ábhvā bhiyā́ dṛḷhā́saḥ kiráṇā naíjan* ‖, "You are great, Indra, you who, on just being born, with your tempests put heaven and earth in (the path of your) onslaught, so that all the vast masses, even the mountains, though firmly fixed, stirred like dust-motes in fear of you" (J-B).

kathā́ jāté kavayaḥ kó ví veda | víśvaṃ tmánā bibhr̥to yád dha nā́ma ví vartete áhanī cakríyeva || bhū́riṃ dvé ácarantī cárantaṃ gárbham apádī dadhāte | nítyaṃ ná sūnúm pitrór upásthe dyā́vā rákṣatam pr̥thivī́ no ábhvāt ||, "(1) Which of these two is the earlier, and which the later? How were they born, O poets? Who fully understands? By themselves the two carry everything that is a name.[52] Day and Night roll through (them) like two wheels. (2) The two, unmoving and footless, conceive an ample embryo, moving and footed, like a natural son in the lap of his parents. — O Heaven and Earth, protect us from the formless void" (J-B). The final refrain is repeated up to stanza 8, while the two world halves are praised for "giving help with their help" (st. 4, *ávasā́vantī*), and described as "the two broad and wide, voluminous and of distant boundary … bringing good fortune" (st. 7: *urvī́ pr̥thvī́ bahulé dūréante … subháge*), etc. It follows that the concept of *ábhva-* entails some kind of primordial empty space where man cannot thrive.

As similar tone pervades RV 5.49.5, in which the poet wishes that the "formless void" be replaced by the *várīyas-*, the unthreatening wide space, the ordered cosmos, in which men can comfortably expand with their cattle: *prá yé vásubhya ī́vad ā́ námo dúr yé mitré váruṇe sūktávācaḥ | ávaitv ábhvaṃ kr̥ṇutā́ várīyo diváspr̥thivyór ávasā madema ||,* "Those who have presented such great reverence to the good ones, who possess well-spoken speech for Mitra and Varuṇa, let the formless void go away (from them); make a wider space (for them). With the aid of Heaven and Earth may we rejoice" (J-B).

This fearsome void is sometimes described as "black" (*kr̥ṣṇá-*; in RV 1.92.5; RV 1.140.5; RV 4.51.9); e.g., in 1.95.5, the particular cosmic principle that brings order dispelling the formless void is the dawn: *práty arcī́ rúśad asyā adarśi ví tiṣṭhate bā́dhate kr̥ṣṇám ábhvam | sváruṃ ná péśo vidátheṣv añján citrám divó duhitā́ bhānúm aśret ||,* "Her gleaming ray has appeared opposite. She spreads herself out, thrusts away the black void. The Daughter of Heaven has propped up her bright beam, her ornament, like (a priest) propping up the sacrificial post, the ornament at the ceremonies, and anointing it" (J-B).

Only once does the word occur in the masculine, apparently indicating the personified fear of such cosmic formlessness. In fact, the stanza at issue prays Indra to keep this *ábhva-* (m.) away: RV 1.39.8, *yuṣméṣito maruto mártyeṣita ā́ yó no ábhva ī́ṣate | ví táṃ yuyota śávasā vy ójasā ví yuṣmā́kābhir ūtíbhiḥ ||,* "Whether sent by you, Maruts, or sent by a mortal, the formless being that sets upon us— keep him away by your strength, by your power, away by the help that stems from you" (J-B).

In the AV, the personification of this fear of the cosmic void into a fearful formless being is completed. In fact, in the AV, we only find a neuter *abhvà-*, with final accentuation,[53] in the meaning 'monster'. Remarkably, in both of its two occurrences, this word appears next to *rákṣas-*, and once also next to *daúṣvapnyam* (ŚS) / *duḥsvapnyam* (PS, Bhattacharya 1997). ŚS 4.17.5 (= ŚS 7.23.1 ~ PS 5.23.7) reads: *daúṣvapnyaṃ daúrjīvityaṃ* (PS *duḥsvapnyaṃ durjīvitam*) *rákṣo abhvàm arāyyāḥ*

---

52 J-B (p. 388) rightly recognise this as expressing an idea that is similar to the later concept of *nāma-rūpa-*; remarkably, *nā́ma* and *rūpá* are called *abhvà-*s (and *yakṣá-*s) in an ŚB passage of cosmic character that I quote below.

53 Kuiper (1962b: 230) remarks: "a change of accent is often found in later Vedic texts (sometimes as a corollary of a semantic change, e.g. RV. *párya-* "last" < YV. *pāryà-* "on the other side") and since it cannot be proved that *abhvà-* has ever been pronounced as a trisyllable, it is more plausible to take it as ultimately identical with *ábhva-*. The accent shift may have been favoured by the circumstances that *ábhva-* probably had gone out of use in common speech at an early date. Besides the passages in RV. and AV. it only occurs in two passages of the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa but from the fact that the author of the second passage accents on the last syllable (abhvá-) we may probably infer that he did no longer know the word from the spoken language. If there has been an accent shift *ábhvam > abhvàm* this is likely to have been due to analogy. The only forms in *-bhvàm* that occur in the Rigvedic text are *vibhvàm* (4) and *subhvàm* (1). These text forms themselves were authoritative, rather than their pronunciation according to the general rule of RV-Prātiśākhya XVII. 13 (cf. 14 and VIII.22 with Uvaṭa's commentary). Has perhaps *subhvàm* in RV. IX.79.5ab *evā́ ta indo subhvàm supéśasaṃ rásaṃ tuñjanti prathamā́ abhiśríyaḥ* erroneously been interpreted as an accusative of *subhvà-* and has this induced the accentuation *abhvàm* of the Atharvaveda?"

| *durṇā́mnīḥ sárvā durvácas tā́ asmán nāśayāmasi* ||, "Evil dreaming, evil-living, demon, monster (*abhvà*), hags, all the ill-named (f.), ill-voiced—them we make disappear from us." (Whitney); "Bad dreaming, bad living, demon, monster, hags, [witches] with bad voice, all of bad nature – we make this disappear from here" (Lubotsky); ŚS 12.4.25 (part of a hymn to the Sun), *sá evá mṛtyúḥ sò 'mṛtaṃ sò 'bhvàṃ sá rákṣaḥ* ||, "He verily [is] death, he immortality, he the monster (*abhvà*), he the demon".

An intermediate stage between the RV and AV meanings can perhaps be found in the following ŚB passage. Here a creation myth is narrated in which Bráhman emanates Form (*rūpá*) and Name (*nā́ma*), which are then described as the two *abhvás* or the two *yakṣás*. Thus, *abhvá-*[54] here still represents a cosmic character as in RV, but it's on its way to being personified into a spirit/demon-like creature, as shown by the parallelism with the word *yakṣá-*, which undergoes a similar semantic shift from 'wonder' to 'spirit, semi-divine being'. ŚB 11.2.3.1–5, *(1) bráhma vá idám ágra āsīt, tád devā́n asṛjata, tád devā́nt sṛṣṭvaiṣú lokéṣu vyàrohayad, asmínn evá lokè'gníṃ vāyúm antárikṣe divyèvá sū́ryam, (2) átha yé'tha ūrdhvā́ lokā́ḥ tád yā́ áta ūrdhvā́ devátās téṣu tā́ devátā vyàrohayat, sá yáthā haivèmá āvír lokā́ imā́ś ca devátā evám u haivá tá āvír lokā́s tā́ś ca devátā yéṣu tā́ devátā vyàrohayat, (3) átha bráhmaivá parārdhám agachat, tát parārdhám gatvaìkṣata: kathám nv ìmā́ṃ lokā́n pratyáveyām íti, tád dvā́bhyām evá pratyávaid rūpéṇa caivá nā́mnā ca, sá yásya kásya ca nāmā́sti, tán nā́ma yásyo ápi nā́ma nā́sti yád véda rūpéṇedáṃ rūpám íti tád rūpám etā́vad vā́ idáṃ yā́vad rūpáṃ caivá nā́ma ca, (4) té haité bráhmaṇo mahatī́ abhvé, sá yó haité bráhmaṇo mahatī́ abhvé véda, maháddhaivàbhvám bhavati, (5) té haité bráhmaṇo mahatī́ yakṣé, sá yó haité bráhmaṇo mahatī́ yakṣé véda maháddhaivá yakṣám bhavati [...]*, "(1) Verily, in the beginning, this (universe) was the Brahman (neut.). It created the gods; and, having created the gods, it made them ascend these worlds: Agni this (terrestrial) world, Vāyu the air, and Sūrya the sky. (2) And the deities who are above these he made ascend the worlds which are above these; and, indeed, just as these (three) worlds and these (three) deities are manifest, so are those (higher) worlds and those (higher) deities manifest—(the worlds) which he made those deities ascend. (3) Then the Brahman itself went up to the sphere beyond. Having gone up to the sphere beyond, it considered, 'How can I descend again into these worlds?' It then descended again by means of these two—Form and Name. Whatever has a name, that is name; and that again which has no name, and which one knows by its form, 'This is (of a certain) form,' that is form: as far as there are Form and Name so far, indeed, extends this (universe). (4) These, indeed, are the two great *forces* [the italic is mine, ed.] of the Brahman; and, verily, he who knows these two great *forces* of the Brahman becomes himself a great *force*. (5) These, indeed, are the two great manifestations (or phantasmagories, illusive representations) of the Brahman; and, verily, he who knows these two great manifestations of the Brahman becomes himself a great manifestation. [...]" (Eggeling).

The fact that the meaning 'monster', typical of the AV, then becomes the standard one can be seen from the other ŚB myth, in which Indra is born from the powerful womb of Vāc, which he then squeezes into a horn (the same horn that the ritual patron wears while undergoing his initiation during the Śrauta rituals), in order to prevent a powerful and dangerous 'monster' (*abhvà-*) from being born after him: ŚB 3.2.1.25–28, *(25) só 'yáṃ yajñó vā́cam abhídadhyau: mithunyènayā syām íti, tā́ṃ sáṃbabhūva, (26) índro ha vá īkṣā́ṃ cakre: mahád vá itó 'bhvàṃ janiṣyate, yajñásya ca mithunā́d vā́caś ca, yán mā tán nàbhibhávéd íti, sá índra evá gárbho bhūtvaìtán mithunám prāviveśa, (27) sá ha saṃvatsaré jā́yamāna īkṣā́ṃ cakre: mahā́vīryā vā́ iyáṃ yónir yā́ mā́m ádīdharata, yád vaí metó mahád evā́bhvàṃ nànuprajā́yeta, yán mā tán nàbhibhávéd íti, (28) tā́ṃ pratiparāmṛ́śya véṣṭyáchinat, tā́ṃ yajñásya śīrṣán prátyadadhād, yajñó hí kṛ́ṣṇaḥ, sá yáḥ sá yajñás tát kṛṣṇājínám, yó sā́ yóniḥ sā́ kṛṣṇáviṣāṇā́tha yád enām índra āveṣṭyáchinat, tásmād ā́veṣṭiteva sá yáthaivā́ta indró 'jā́yata gárbho bhūtvaìtásmān mithunā́d evám evaìṣó 'tó jā́yate gárbho bhūtvaìtásmān mithunā́t*, "(25) That Yajña (sacrifice) lusted after Vāc (speech), thinking, 'May I pair with her!'. He united with her. (26) Indra then thought within himself, 'Surely a great *monster*

---

54 On the accentuation in this passage, see the previous footnote.

will spring from this union of Yajña and Vāc: [I must take care] lest it should get the better of me.' Indra himself then became an embryo and entered into that union.(27) Now when he was born after a year's time, he thought within himself, 'Verily of great vigour is this womb which has contained me: [I must take care] that no great *monster* shall be born from it after me, lest it should get the better of me !' (28) Having seized and pressed it tightly, he tore it off and put it on the head of Yajña (sacrifice); —for the black (antelope) is the sacrifice: the black deer skin is the same as that sacrifice, and the black deer's horn is the same as that womb. And because it was by pressing it tightly together that Indra tore out (the womb), therefore it (the horn) is bound tightly (to the end of the garment); and as Indra having become an embryo, sprang from that union, so is he (the sacrificer), after becoming an embryo, born from that union (of the skin and the horn)" (Eggeling).

In conclusion, the co-occurrence of *abhvà-* with *rákṣas-* and 'poor sleep/evil dreaming' is in my view the strongest argument in favour of emending our text to to *abhvebhyo*.

As for the attested readings, they can be explained as errors: epenthetic vowels are often inserted during recitation to resolve difficult clusters or as an effect of solemn *lento* recitation (see WITZEL 1985b: 267, 284 in the case of the Odisha recitation style), so that a change from *abhve* to *abhave* can either have occurred during the early common transmission or independently in the two branches. As for the divergence of the **K** reading: correspondence between an original labial (*p/b/bh/v*) preserved in **O** and a dental (*d/dh*) in **K** is rather frequent[55] for various reasons, although most likely because of scribal mistakes due to confusion of the Śāradā akṣaras *bh* vs. *d* (which could explain the corruption in the first part of the word—but see below) and *v* vs. *dh* (which can certainly explain the corruption in the second part of the word, *-vebhyo > -dhobhyo*—with not unusual confusion of *e* with *o*, perhaps also because of the immediately following *bhyo*, which may have tricked the copyist's eye). The cluster *dr-* in **K** is admittedly more problematic. The only attestation of **K** *dr-* vs. **O** *bh-* recorded by KIM (*Schreib.*) is **K** *adri* vs **O** *abhi* in 9.27.10c, in which, however, **K**'s reading is original, so this particular example is not relevant to our argument. In my view, the most likely scenario is that the archetype already contained a cluster *abbh* by retention of the gemination (and preceding vowel shortening) even after the resolution of the cluster with epenthesis, i.e., the original *abhve* = [ɔbʰ.ve] was pronounced [ɔb.bʰə.ve], then written as °*abbhave*°, preserved in **O**, and finally the Śāradā akṣara *bbha* was then confused with similar looking akṣara *dra* by a Kashmirian copyist.

17.24.10 [prose]

a   vidma te svapna janitraṃ gandharvāṇāṃ putro [']sy apsarobhyo [']dhi jāto yamasya karaṇaḥ |
b   taṃ tvā svapneti trīṇi ||

We know, O sleep, your pedigree: you are son of *gandharva*-s, born from *apsaras*-es, Yama's helper. You there, O sleep (…). [*Repeat the following*] *three* [*pādas*].

vidma te] **[O]** vidhmahe te **K**   • putro [']sy] putro sy **[O] K**   • apsarobhyo [']dhi] apsarobhyo adhi **[Ma] [Ja]** Ji₄ Pa_c **[Mā]** JM₃ aṣparobhyo adhi V71 aṣṭarobhyo adhi V122 apsarobodhi **K**   •

---

55 Some examples from KIM (*Schreib.*) are *da* vs. *pa*: 6.3.3d nirr̥te̱r(=ru)pasthāt **O** nirr̥terudasthāt **K**, 6.23.7b tapatu **O** tadati **K**; *dabhr̥* vs. *dbhi*: 9.27.11b; udbhit **O** odabhr̥t **K**, 20.9.9d udbhit **O** udabhr̥t **K**; *di* vs. *bhi*: 8.10.9b bhagābhiṣecanīḥ **O** bhagādiṣecanaṃ **K**; *dr̥* vs. *pr̥*: 14.6.4b pr̥ṣṭhāni **O** dr̥ṣṭyāni **K**; *dr̥* vs. *bhr̥*: 20.25.1a ābhr̥taṃ **O** ādr̥taṃ **K**; *dya* vs. *bhya*: 6.15.8c ajābhya **O** ajādya **K**; *dyo* vs. *bhyo*: 7.10.5a śāmbubhyo **O** ṣyāmividyo **K**, 13.6.1c tāvakebhyo **O** tāvakedyo **K**; *dyu* vs. *bhyu*: 13.6.1a bibhyuḥ **O** svidyuḥ **K**; *dvi* vs. *rbhi*: 14.8.8b yuvatirbibharṣi **O** yuvatidvibharṣi **K**; *dha* vs. *ba*: 20.1.4d +babhūvānu] babhuvānu **O** dhabhūvānu **K**; *dhi* vs. *bhi*: 13.3.8c abhikrandasya **O** adhikrasya **K**, 20.9.2b odabhiḥ **O** odadhiḥ **K**; *dhi* vs. *vi*: 6.9.3a vi **O** dhi **K**; and *dhi* vs. *vr̥*: 6.10.3b vr̥ṣaṇaś **O** dhiṣaṇaś **K**.

yamasya] **K** [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Pa_c** [**Mā**] **V71 JM₃** yasyaśa **Ji₄**   • karaṇaḥ] [**O**] kararaṇaḥ **K**   • **||**
V71 JM₃ Pa_c || **V122 Ji₄** ([**Ma**]? [**Ja**]? [**Mā**]?)[56]   • taṃ tvā] **Ma Ja Ji₄ Pa_c** taṃntvā **Mā** tantvā **K**
V122 V71 JM₃   • svapneti] **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa_c JM₃** ṣvapnetathā **Mā** ṣapneti **V71** svapnetu **K**
• ||] || 24 || ru 10 ||] **Ma Ja Pa_c Mā V71 JM₃** || ru (*space*) || 24|| **V122** || 24 || **Ji₄** || 24 || ru 11 || **Pa_c** Z
phaśca 4 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes the beginning of the refrain in full and the final part as *taṃ tvā svapna (tathā vidma | . . . . . . dadhmaḥ) ||10||*. He writes *putrosyapsarobhyo adhi*.

On abbreviations of mantras consisting of a pratīka followed by notations like *íty ékā* (f.sg., i.e. 'one stanza (ŕc-, f.)), *íti dvé* (f.du., 'two stanzas'), *íti tisraḥ* (f.pl. 'three stanzas'), etc. in the AV, see Griffiths 2009: xlii–xliii §2.5.1. Similarly, the notation "*iti trīṇi*" (neuter pl.) here must imply *trīṇi pādāni*, "three pādas", and must refer to the full remaining portion of the refrain, which is, in fact, divided into three sections, as can be seen from the punctuation: 1) *taṃ tva ... vidma |*, 2) *yo bhadraḥ ... pra hiṇmaḥ |*, 3) *tam asmai ... api dadhmaḥ ||*.

After reading this *kāṇḍikā* (17.24), we may compare ŚS 19.56.6ab, *vidmá te sárvāḥ parijâḥ purástād vidmá svapna yó adhipâ ihâ te |*. This line contains a hapax, *parijāḥ*. Whitney renders the first pāda with "We know all thine attendants (?) in front". Lanman specifies in the comment that this translation is based on the commentary, which features the gloss *parijanān*. Lanman deems this interpretation more probable than the conjecture put forward by the PW, namely "Ort der Entstehung". This makes sense given that the second pāda translates as "we know, O sleep, who is thine over-ruler here" (Whitney), thus constituting an opposition "attendant", "over-ruler". Apparently knowing sleeps' attendants and over-ruler would grant the poet-magician the power to control sleep. However, in light of the list of "fathers" and "mothers" found in our text, and my discussion on *jánitra-* in 17.24.1 above, where it means 'pedigree, family of origin'—a usage that may include brothers and comrades (as shown by AB 2.6)—I cannot but wonder whether *parijā-* would be better translated as "people born around (someone)", i.e. "relatives, members of the large family". Accordingly, in this stanza there would be no parallelism between "attendants" and an "over-ruler". In fact, the "over-ruler" is none other than the poet-magician, who has control over the *svápna* precisely because he knows the names of its relatives. Thus, I would like to take the first *vidma* as meaning "we know", with "we" as a pluralis majestatis, and the second *vidma* rather as an inclusive "you and I know". I would translate: "We(=I) know all your relatives beforehand—you and I know, O sleep, who your overlord is here (namely me)".

---

56 Bhattacharya does not edit a daṇḍa after *karaṇaḥ*. From his implicit apparatus, one would then deduce that neither **Ma**, **Ja** nor **Mā** featured any punctuation sign in this particular position. However, all my mss. have one or two daṇḍas. Based on comparison with 17.24.1, we would expect a single daṇḍa. This is what we find in **V71** and **JM₃**, which belong to **O^B**, as well as in **Pa_c**, which belongs to **O^A**. **V122** and **Ji₄** feature two daṇḍas, but there are many instances in this chapter in which these two mss. have two daṇḍas while all the others have one—not to mention that **Ji₄** mostly has only double daṇḍas. These observations make me suspect that the absence of punctuation in Bhattacharya's edition might just be a misprint, and that his mss. too most likely featured a single daṇḍa.

Kāṇḍikā 25

17.25.1   [prose] ~ b: ŚS 16.7.8 ~ PS 18.51.1f

a   dyāvāpṛthivī ahorātre *nakṣatrapeśaḥ |
b   idam aham amuṣminn āmuṣyāyaṇe [']muṣyāḥ putre ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ *mṛje ||

O heaven and earth, O day and night, O one decorated with stars (i.e the night sky); now I wipe off poor sleep on such-and-such, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother].

N.B. After *amuṣminn āmuṣyā...* **Pa**c features a big lacuna, which extends all the way to 17.25.4c *...m asīmahi*.

─────────

*nakṣatrapeśaḥ] nakṣatraẏeṣaḥ **Ma Ja V122 Mā V71** [xx]nakṣatraẏeṣaḥ **Pa**c nakṣatra eṣaḥ **JM₃ Ji₄** nakṣatrapayasaḥ **K**   • |] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**c **[Mā]** || **Ji₄ V71 JM₃** *om*. **K**   • idam] **[O]** yadam **K** • āmuṣyāyaṇe [']muṣyāḥ] āmuṣyāẏaṇe muṣyāḥ **[O]** āmuṣyā **Pa**c āmuṣyāyeṇe amuṣyaḥ **K**   • putre] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** putreṇa **K** *om*. **Pa**c   • ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ] duṣvapniṃ **K** duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā]** duspapnyaṃ **V71** dusvapnyaṃ **JM₃** *om*. **Pa**c   • *mṛje ||] vrajet || **[Ja] [Ma] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** vrajet | **V71** vrajet, **K** *om*. **Pa**c

ŚS 16.7.8
idám ahám āmuṣyāyaṇè 'múṣyāḥ putré duṣvápnyaṃ mṛje ||

PS 18.51.1f
idam aham amum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putraṃ duṣvapnyād ava *daye ||

Bhattacharya reads °*āmuṣyāyaṇemuṣyāḥ* and *duḥsvapnyaṃ* <u>vrajet</u> || in **b**.
       a. Bhattacharya writes **nakṣatrapeśaḥ*, clearly on the basis of **K**, which preserves the labial; as regards *śa*, confusion of the sibilants is a trivial error in both branches. The word *péśas-* does appear at the end of various compounds in the RV (as far as the AV is concerned, only *supéśas-* is attested in ŚS 7.48.2a ~ PS 20.11.9a, *apéśas-* in ŚS 20.26.6a, 20.47.12a, 20.69.11a, *viśvápeśas-* in 20.35.16c) with the meaning 'ornamented, decorated with', but this particular compound is not attested in the RV and AV as such. However, we may compare the following line, which features a form of the root *piś-*, of which *péśas* is a derivative: RV 10.68.11ab, *abhí śyāváṃ ná kṛśanebhir áśvaṃ nákṣatrebhiḥ pitáro dyā́m apiṃśan |*, "Like the dusky horse with pearls, the Fathers ornamented heaven with stars". In my view, this correspondence strengthens the validity of Bhattacharya's emendation.
       Thus, the compound is an s-stem vocative: either feminine, in agreement with an implied *dyauḥ* (f.), as in the verse just quoted, or masculine, perhaps in agreement with *nā́ka-* 'firmament, night sky'. Naturally the image evokes the starry night sky, which the poet invokes for protection during sleep, but it should be taken into consideration that the Sun is also a *nákṣatra,* and it is not to

be excluded that the poet is invoking the sunny sky to dispel poor sleep with the light of the day.

Perhaps an alternative emendation could be *nakṣatreśa, "O lord of the stars (i.e. the moon[57])" (or *nakṣatreśaḥ, nom. sg., but we would then have to regard the previous duals as nominatives)—although we'd then have to explain the insertion of an extra syllable in the ms. tradition (see below). This latter compound is also unattested as such, but we do find a corresponding formula in ŚS 6.86.2 (a charm for supremacy): *samudrá īśe sravátām agníḥ pr̥thivyā́ vaśī́ | candrámā nákṣatrāṇām īśe tvám ekavr̥ṣó bhava ||*, "The ocean is the master of the streams; Agni is the controller of the earth; the moon is master of the asterisms; do thou be sole chief" (Whitney).

From a paleographic point of view, the **O** mss with *-aẏe-* and *-a e-* could be considered consistent with each other because *-ẏ-* is often inserted in hiatus (cf. 17.25.6b *teẏadevaḥ* in **Ji₄** vs. *te adevaḥ* in the other mss.; cf. 17.25.8). Therefore one could assume the reading *-a e-* for the **O** archetype. However—and this seems more plausible to me—we could also imagine the opposite scenario: an original *-pe-* was mistaken for *-ẏe-* (perhaps in proto-Bengali), then spelled *-ẏe-* in Odisha because of its word-internal and intervocalic position. Later, the scribes of **JM₃** and **Ji₄**, aware of the fact that *-ẏ-* sometimes marks hiatus, and unable to interpret *nakṣatraẏeṣa* as one word, parsed it into *nakṣatra* and *eṣa*, thus inserting the hiatus.

c. The reading *vrajet* (3sg. opt. from *vraj-*) preserved in the mss. cannot be correct, as the line requires the verb to be in the 1st person sg. (see PS 18.51.1f quoted below, where an identical problem led Bhattacharya to correct *dayet* with **daye*). Moreover, the root *vraj-* does not seem semantically suitable either. Bhattacharya writes <u>vrajet</u>, but proposes *vr̥ñje* or *vr̥jaye* in his comment. I propose to emend with **mr̥je* on the basis of the following arguments.

First of all, *mr̥je* is found in the ŚS parallel of this line, ŚS 16.7.8: *idám ahám āmuṣyāyaṇè 'múṣyāḥ putré duṣvápnyaṃ mr̥je ||*, "Now do I wipe off evil-dreaming on him of such-and-such lineage, son of such-and-such a mother" (Whitney). Another PS parallel is not exactly comparable, as the syntax is different: PS 18.51.1f, *idam aham amum āmuṣyāyaṇam amuṣyāḥ putraṃ duṣvapnyād ava *daye* (Bʜᴀᴛᴛᴀᴄʜᴀʀʏᴀ 2011; the mss. read *dayet*).

The presence of the form *mr̥je* in the ŚS verse is of course an insufficient argument for us to edit the same form in our text. However, the same construction, namely [*mr̥j-* + acc. + loc.], is found in another similar ŚS verse, but this time also in its PS parallel: ŚS 13.1.58, *yó adyá deva sūrya tvā́ṃ ca mā́ṃ cāntarā́yati | duṣvápnyaṃ tásmiṃ chámalaṃ duritā́ni ca mr̥jmahe ||*, "Whoso this day, O heavenly sun, shall go between both thee and me – on him we wipe off evil-dreaming, pollution, and difficulties" (Whitney); ~ PS 20.28.2, *yo adya deva sūrya tvāṃ ca māṃ ⁺cāntarāyati | tasmin duṣvapnyaṃ sarvaṃ duritāni ca mr̥jmahe*, "Wer heute, o Gott Sūrya, zwischen dich und mich gehen sollte, auf den streifen wir jeglichen Albtraum und [alle] Übel ab" (Kubisch).

Moreover, note that PS 17.25.3–4 below has a perfect parallel in ŚS 13.1.59–60, the verses immediately following the one just quoted above. This fact, I think, testifies to the connection between these lines and the likelihood that the construction [*mr̥j-* + acc. + loc.] is the one intended here.

17.25.2 ~ PS 15.4.2

yad asmāsv ity āṣṭādaśakī ||

[The stanza beginning with] "Which is on us" [belonging to the kāṇḍa consisting of hymns of eighteen stanzas, i.e. kāṇḍa 15]

---

57 The moon is also called *nákṣatrāṇām ádhipatiḥ* in ŚS 5.24.10a.

N.B. This portion is absent from **Pa_c**.

———————

asmāsv ity] **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Mā V71 JM₃** asmāsyutyā **K** *om*. **Pa_c** • āṣṭādaśakī] **Ma Ja Mā V71 JM₃** āṣṭādaśakī(*s.s.*→ kī) **V122**[58] ā[.]ṣṭādaśakī **Ji₄** aṣṭādaśakī **K** *om*. **Pa_c** • ‖] **Ma Ja V122 Mā V71 JM₃** | **Ji₄** *om*. **K Pa_c**

This line is an abbreviation of stanza PS 15.4.2. It consists of a pratīka, "*yad asmāsu*", "Which is on us" (i.e. the first words of the stanza), and the notation "*iti āṣṭādaśakī*". The latter word is the feminine (presumably implying *ṛc*- 'stanza') of the compound *āṣṭādaśaka*-, 'belonging to the *āṣṭādaśa*', which is a reference to the *āṣṭādaśarcakāṇḍa*, 'the book consisting of hymns of eighteen stanzas', the title of the fifteenth book of the PS. On these abbreviations, see Griffiths 2009: xlii §2.5.

In place of this abbreviation, Bhattacharya writes the full stanza PS 15.2.4 as he prints it in Bhattacharya 1997: *yad asmāsu duṣvapnyaṃ yad goṣu yacca no gṛhe ‖ amāmagatyasta durhārdaḥ priyā(ḥ) prati muñcatām ‖*.

The stanza as edited by Lelli (2015) reads: *yad asmāsu duṣvapnyaṁ yad goṣu yac ca no gṛhe | †amāmagatyasta† ⁺durhārd *apriyaḥ prati muñcatām ‖*, "Let an evil-hearted enemy put on himself the nightmare which [is] in us, which [is] in the cows, and which [is] in our home … (?)" (Lelli). The parallel in ŚS 19.45.2 (a: ~ ŚS 19.57.4d) reads: *yád asmāsu duṣvápnyaṃ yád góṣu yác ca no gṛhé | ánāmagas táṃ durhā́rdaḥ priyáḥ práti muñcatām ‖*, "What evil-dreaming [is] in us, what in [our] kine, and what in our house, also the … of one hostile, let him that is unfriendly take upon himself" (Whitney). Compare also ŚS 19.57.4 and PS 3.30.6. All these stanzas present numerous difficult philological problems: for a discussion see Lelli 2015: 87f.

At any rate, this stanza is clearly a spell to repel poor sleep and transfer it to an adversary.

17.25.3   [Gāyatrī] ~ RV 10.57.1 ~ ŚS 13.1.59

a	mā pra gāma patho vayaṃ	8	[− υ − υ | υ − υ ×]
b	mā yajñād indra sominaḥ |	8	[− − − − | υ − υ ×]
c	mānta sthur no arātayaḥ ‖	8	[− υ − υ | υ − υ ×]

Let us not depart from the path, nor, O Indra, from the ritual worship with soma. Let hostilities not stand between us[59].

N.B. This stanza is absent from **Pa_c**.

———————

gāma] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** gā[x]ma **Ji₄** *om*. **Pa_c** • patho] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** matho **K** *om*. **Pa_c** • vayaṃ] **K** vaẏaṃ **[O]** • mā yajñād indra] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** mā jajñās indra **Ji₄** sā yajñād indrā **K** *om*. **Pa_c** • sominaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** somenaḥ **K** *om*. **Pa_c** • |] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] ‖ V71 JM₃** *om*. **K Pa_c** • mānta sthur no] mām̐tasthurno **Ma Mā JM₃ Ji₄** mātasthūrnno **Ja** mām̐tasthūrno **V122** mātasthurno **V71** mā tastho no **K** *om*. **Pa_c** • arātayaḥ] **K** arātaẏaḥ **[O]** • ‖] **Ma Ja Ji₄ Mā** | **V122 V71 JM₃** *om*. **K Pa_c**

RV 10.57.1 ~ ŚS 13.1.59
mā́ prá gāma pathó vayáṃ mā́ yajñā́d indra somínaḥ |
mā́ntā sthur no árātayaḥ ‖

———————

58 This redundant correction is written in the upper margin and followed by the bumeral "1", referring to the first line of the manuscript.

59 My translation is derived from J-B and Whitney's with slight modifications. See my comment below.

Bhattacharya writes *mānta*, but the asterisk is not necessary.

This and the following Gāyatrī stanza constitute the opening of hymn RV 10.57, a spell "seeking the return of "mind" to a person or persons in some distress" (J-B p. 1468). Within this hymn, our two stanzas seem to be simply a preface, "seeking to avoid ritual wrongdoing and to attain the help of Agni" (J-B ibid.), so that one doubts whether this is their original locus.

The same two stanzas also constitute the closing of ŚS 13.1, "to Rohita", namely ŚS 13.1.59–60. Note that the whole group, ŚS 13.1.56–60, is not found in the corresponding Rohita section of PS 18, which suggests that these stanzas are an insertion originating from different sources. Of these five stanzas, only st. 58 and st. 59 have parallels in PS: st. 59 here in PS 17, and st. 58 in PS 20.28.2, as part of a decad that also does not appear to be a compositional unit, but rather a collection of verses for various purposes.[60] In particular, PS 20.28.2 opens a series of four concatenated curses (KUBISCH 2012: 160). Interestingly, although our stanza, PS 17.25.3, and its parallel, ŚS 13.1.59, apparently do not deal with poor sleep, ŚS 13.1.58 and PS 20.28.2 do: *yó adyá deva sūrya tvā́ṃ ca mā́ṃ cāntarā́yati | duṣvápnyaṃ tásmiṃ chámalaṃ duritā́ni ca mr̥jmahe ||*, "Whose this day, O heavenly sun, shall go between both thee and me—on him we wipe off evil-dreaming, pollution, and difficulties" (Whitney). Note that this verse is an Anuṣṭubh, not a Gāyatrī like ours (and like PS 17.25.4 immediately following), which suggests that their ultimate origin might be different. Nevertheless, one wonders what the relationship between this stanza and ours is, given that we find the latter in our chapter on poor sleep, but not the former, which actually mentions poor sleep.[61]

The RV parallel of our stanza (RV 10.57.1) is translated in J-B as "Let us not depart from the path, nor from the sacrifice of the one who has soma, Indra. Let hostilities not stand between us", thus taking *somínaḥ* as a genitive. Geldner (*ad loc.*) had adopted the same solution: "nicht von dem Opfer des Somaspenders". Indeed, the most frequent meaning of *somín-* in RV and AV is 'one who has soma, one who deals with soma, soma-bearer, priest'. However, *somín-* can also be an adjective: 'possessing soma, characterised by soma'. As such it is used to qualify *brāhmaṇá-* (e.g. RV 7.103.8, *brāhmaṇā́saḥ somíno*, "the brahmins possessing soma"), conveying a meaning that is pretty much equivalent to that of the simple noun *somín-*, but also to qualify other things. Although I have not found any example in which it qualifies *yajñá-*, this adjective does qualify the pressing stones (*grā́van* in RV 8.34.2, *ádri* in RV 10.94.1): "pressing stones characterised by [the residue of] the soma [pressing]", "pressing stones for the soma [ritual]". Therefore it is perfectly possible that *somínaḥ* is here an ablative agreeing with *yajñāt*. Whitney too preferred this solution in translating ŚS 13.1.59: "Let us not go forth from the road, nor, O Indra, from the sacrifice with soma; let not the niggards stand between us" (Whitney).

This stanza (and its parallels) features the only occurrences of the aor. inj. (*prá*) *gāma* (from *gā-* 'to step, move') in RV and AV.

17.25.4   [Gāyatrī] ~ RV 10.57.2 ~ ŚS 13.1.60

a	yo yajñasya prasādhanas	8	[− − − ∪ | ∪ − ∪ ×]
b	tantur deveṣ_uv ātataḥ |	8	[− − − − | ∪ − ∪ ×]
c	tam āhutam aśīmahi ||	8	[∪ − ∪ ∪ | ∪ − ∪ ×]

He who assures the success of the sacrifice, who is the thread stretched to the gods, him [=Agni],

---

60 KUBISCH (2012: 160) points out, for instance, that the first stanza actually forms a prayer to Sarasvatī together with the last verse of the previous decad.

61 On the employment of these stanzas in the later Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra literature, see Whitney's comment *ad loc.*

bepoured, might we attain.[62]

N.B. The lacuna in **Pa_c** (see previous stanzas) ends after pāda **b**.

———————
deveṣv ātataḥ] [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃ devaṣv ātataḥ Ji₄ deveṣv ātaḥ K *om*. Pa_c   • |]
[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 ‖ JM₃ *om*. K Pa_c   • tam] K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃
ntam V71 *om*. Pa_c   • āhutam aśīmahi] K Ja Ji₄ āhutam asīmahi Ma V122 Mā V71 JM₃ m
asīmahi Pa_c   • ‖] [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃ | K Pa_c

RV 10.57.2
yó yajñásya prasā́dhanas tántur devéṣv ā́tataḥ |
tám ā́hutam naśīmahi ‖

ŚS 13.1.60
yó yajñásya prasā́dhanas tántur deváṣv ā́tataḥ |
tám ā́hutam aśīmahi ‖

On the relationship between this stanza and the preceding one see my comment above.

Whitney's translation of the ŚS parallel (13.1.60) is as follows: "What line, accomplisher of the sacrifice, is stretched clear to the gods, that, sacrificed unto, may we attain" (Whitney).

Note the alternation between the 1pl. aorist optative middle *aśīmahi* in the AV, with regular zero grade of the root, and RV *naśīmahi*, with full grade of the root. The latter form occurs only in RV, and only three times (besides five occurrences of *aśīmahi*),[63] and has been explained by HOFFMANN (1967a) as a secondary variant of *aśīmahi* that would have been created by the poets for metrical reasons: in particular, to avoid a hiatus in RV 8.6.9a (*prá tám indra naśīmahi*), and to produce an (iambic) cadence in RV 10.36.3c (*svàrvaj jyótir avr̥kám̐ naśīmahi*), as well as in our RV 10.57.2c (*tám ā́hutaṃ naśīmahi*). In fact, differently from our PS pāda **c** and its ŚS parallel, the RV line is fully iambic, both in the cadence and in the opening. With a different approach, KORTLANDT (1983=2010: 128, 2004=2010: 134) is of the opinion that the 3pl. person of the aor. opt. mid. originally featured a full grade in the (accented) root, and thus explains the isolated 1pl. *naśīmahi* as an analogical variant of the original full-grade 3pl.

17.25.5   [Jagatī]

a	namo mitrasya varuṇasya cakṣase	12	[ᴜ – – – ᴜ | ᴜ ᴜ | – ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
b	maho devāya tad r̥taṃ saparyata |	12	[ᴜ – – – ᴜ | – ᴜ | – ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
c	dūredr̥śe devajātāya ketave	12	[– – ᴜ – | – ᴜ – | – ᴜ – ᴜ ×]
d	divas putrāya sūr_iyāya śaṃsata ‖	12	[ᴜ – ᴜ – ᴜ | – ᴜ | – ᴜ – ᴜ ×]

Homage to the eye of Mitra, of Varuṇa. Dedicate this great orderly thing to the god. To the banner of the gods, visible from afar, the son of heaven, to the sun—recite!

———————
62 I adopt here J-B's translation of the RV parallel.

63 In RV, *naśīmahi* is found in the following three verses: RV 8.6.9a, RV 10.36.3c, RV 10.57.2c (~ ŚS 13.1.69c ~ PS 17.25.4c). It is never found in the AV. On the other hand, *aśīmahi* is found five times in RV: RV 7.32.26d (~ ŚS 18.3.67d ~ ŚS 20.79.1d ~ PS 18.75.12d ~ PS 20.61.2d); RV 10.36.4c; RV 10.37.6d; RV 10.40.12d (~ ŚS 14.2.5d ~ PS 18.7.5d); also once accented, *aśīmáhi* in RV 5.47.7c (~ PS 12.17.6c). Elsewhere in the AV, *aśīmahi* is found also (twice) in ŚS 19.47.2de ~ PS 6.20.2de.

namo] **K** **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122** **Ji₄** **[Mā]** **V71** **JM₃** na yo **Pa꜀**[64]   • mitrasya] **[O]** mittrasya **K**   • maho devāya] maho devā̀ya **[O]** maho vāya **K**   • |] **K** **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122** **Ji₄** **Pa꜀** **[Mā]** **JM₃** ‖ **V71**   • dūredr̥śe] **[O]** dūredviśe **K**   • devajātāya] **K** devajātāya **[O]**   • divas putrāya] divas putrāya **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122** **Ji₄** **Pa꜀** **[Mā]** **JM₃** divasyutrāya **V71** dis putrāya **K**   • sūryāya] **K** sūryāya **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122** **Pa꜀** **[Mā]** **V71** **JM₃** sūryā **Ji₄**   • śaṃsata] **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **Pa꜀** **[Mā]** śaṃsat, **V122** **V71** **JM₃** syaṃsataḥ **Ji₄** (saṃśata→)śaṃsata **Pa꜀** śam̐sata **K**   • ‖] **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **Ji₄** **Pa꜀** **[Mā]** | **V122** **V71** **JM₃** Z **K**

RV 10.37.1
námo mitrásya váruṇasya cákṣase
mahó devā́ya tád r̥tám saparyata |
dūredŕ̥śe devájātāya ketáve
divás putrā́ya sū́ryāya śaṃsata ‖

This stanza corresponds to the opening of RV 10.37, a hymn dedicated to the sun-god Sūrya. Note that 17.25.6 and 7 below also correspond to RV 10.37.2b, 3, 4. The three stanzas PS 17.25.5, 6, 7, thus clearly form a unit. Presumably the rationale behind their presence in our chapter is that they were used to invoke the power of sunlight to ward off nightmares.

Geldner translates RV 10.37.1 as follows: "Verneigung vor dem Auge des Mitra und Varuṇa! Dem großen Gotte weihet dieses wahre (Wort); dem weithin sichtbaren, gotterzeugten Wahrzeichen, des Himmels Sohne, dem Sūrya traget (es) vor!" (Geldner).

The construction of *saparyati* ('do service, serve, honour, worship') with dative of the person worshipped and accusative of the object by which the worship is performed (perhaps better rendered by 'dedicate, consecrate A (acc.) to B (dat.)') is only found here and in RV 1.93.2, *ágnīṣomā yó adyá vām idáṃ vácaḥ saparyáti | tásmai dhattaṃ suvī́ryaṃ gávām póṣaṃ sváśvyam ‖*, "Agni und Soma! Der euch heute diese Rede weiht, dem bringet die Meisterschaft, Gedeihen der Rinder, Besitz guter Rosse!" (Geldner).[65]

Most likely, the phrase *tád r̥tám*, "this fitting thing, this orderly thing, this properly arranged thing, this appropriate thing, this truthful thing, this truth", was originally meant to refer to the stanza itself or the hymn, RV 10.37, that the stanza opens. This is supported by the fact that the 2nd pl. imperative *saparyata* is paralleled by the imperative *śaṃsata* "recite!" (2nd pl.), from *śaṃs-*, which specifically indicates the solemn recitation of *r̥cs*. Moreover, the fact that the object of *saparyáti*, by which the worship is performed in RV 1.93.2 above, is *idáṃ vácaḥ*, "this speech", seems to convey the same meaning as *tád r̥tám*, namely the idea of a poem that is crafted in conformity with the cosmic order and appropriate for the worship of the god. Note how in RV 10.30.2, the stanza immediately following (also quoted below) contains a *satyókti-*, a 'truthful statement about reality', namely that "everything else that moves goes to rest: [but] the waters always [flow], the sun always rises" (*víśvam anyán ní viśate yád éjati viśváhā́po viśváhód eti sū́ryaḥ*). This is a different kind of "truth" (*satyá*), one that is performative: by pronouncing this truthful statement, the poet makes it become true. In fact, the poet commands the statement to protect him "from all sides, wherever heaven and earth (lit. the two heavens) and the days will stretch" (*sā́ mā satyóktiḥ pári pātu viśváto dyā́vā ca yátra tatánann áhāni ca |*).

d. On the sandhi *-s p-* in *divas putro*, see my comment on PS 17.24.5 above.

---

[64] Note that **Pa꜀** clearly writes *na yo*, with *-y-* (not *-ẏ-*) as if they were two words (although in *scriptio continua*), instead of *naẏo*.

[65] J-B interprets this construction slightly differently, and translate RV 10.37.1, "Homage to the eye of Mitra and Varuṇa. Do great service to this truth [=hymn] for the god. To the one seen from afar, the signal born of the gods, the son of heaven, to the Sun—recite!"; and RV 1.93.2, "Agni and Soma, whoever today renders this speech as service for you two, for him establish an abundance of heroes, the thriving of cattle, an abundance of horses."

17.25.6 [Jagatī] a: ~ RV 10.37.2b; bcde: ~ RV 10.37.3

a	dyāvā ca tatra tatanann ahāni ca	12	[− − ∪ ∪ ∪	∪ ∪	− ∪ − ∪ ×]
b	na te adevaḥ pradivo vivāsati		12	[∪ − ∪ − −	∪ ∪	− ∪ − ∪ ×]
c	yad etaśebhiḥ *patarai ratharyasi	12	[∪ − ∪ − −	∪ ∪	− ∪ − ∪ ×]
d	prācīnam anyad anu vartate raja	12	[− − ∪ − ∪	∪ ∪	− ∪ − ∪ ×]
e	ud anyena jyotiṣā yāsi sūriya ‖	12	[∪ − − −	− ∪ −	− ∪ − ∪ ×]

There, heaven and earth (lit. the two heavens) and the days will stretch; from the early morning on, no godless person tries to attack your [doing], when you ride a chariot with flying colourful steeds. One [wheel of the chariot] rolls eastwards along the dusky realm; with the other [wheel], i.e. with the light, O Sun, you ride upwards.

tatra] K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃ ttatra Ji₄ • tatanann ahāni ca] [Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā] JM₃ tatanahāni ca V122 tataṃnihāni ca Ji₄ tata(*subs.*→na)nn ahāni ca V71 tatanaṃv ahāni | ja K • na te adevaḥ] [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃ na teẏadevaḥ Ji₄ ni to ya devaḥ K • pradivo] [Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃ prativo V122 pradidivo Ji₄ pratiyo K • vivāsati ‖] K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃ vivāsati ‖ Ji₄ • yad etaśebhiḥ] [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c yad etasebhiḥ Mā V71 JM₃ yad ītaśebhiḥ K • *patarai] pratarai K [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃ prata(→ti)rai Ma pratirai Ji₄ Nā pratitarai Pa_c • ratharyasi] [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃ ratharnāsi Ji₄ ryadharyasi K • prācīnam] K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃ prācīm Ji₄ • anyad] K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃ anyud V122 • vartate] K varttate [O] • raja] [O] ratha K • ud anyena] [Ma] [Ja] Pa_c udannena V122 Mā JM₃ ud an[.]ena V71 ud anyana Ji₄ udatyena K • yāsi sūrya] [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 yāsi sūryaḥ JM₃ yāhi sūrya K • ‖] [O] | K

RV 10.37.2b,
dyā́vā ca yátra tatánann áhāni ca |

RV 10.37.3
ná te ádevaḥ pradívo ní vāsate
yád etaśébhiḥ pataraí ratharyási |
prācī́nam anyád ánu vartate rája
úd anyéna jyótiṣā yāsi sūrya ‖

Bhattacharya writes *vi vāsati* (as two words) in pāda **b** and *pratarai* in pāda **c**.

Pāda **a** was extracted from RV 10.37.2. Here it is in its original context: *sā́ mā satyóktiḥ pári pātu viśváto dyā́vā ca yátra tatánann áhāni ca | víśvam anyán ní viśate yád éjati viśvā́hā́po viśvā́hód eti sū́ryaḥ ‖*, "Let this expression of reality protect me around on all sides, where(ver) Heaven (and Earth) and the days will extend: 'Every other thing that stirs settles down. But always the waters (are in motion), always the Sun rises'" (J-B); "Diese wahre Rede soll mich allenthalben schützen, solange Himmel und Erde und die Tage dauern. Alles andere geht zur Ruhe, was sich regt; allezeit (fließen) die Gewässer, allezeit geht die Sonne auf" (Geldner).

The rest of the stanza corresponds to RV 10.37.3: *ná te ádevaḥ pradívo ní vāsate yád etaśébhiḥ pataraí ratharyási | prācī́nam anyád ánu vartate rája úd anyéna jyótiṣā yāsi sūrya ‖*, "No godless one seeks the upper hand against you early in the day, when you drive your chariot with its flying steeds. The one (wheel) rolls eastward along the dusky realm; with the other one, the light, you drive upward, o Sun" (J-B); "Seit alters hält dir kein Ungott stand(?), wenn du mit den geflügeten Etaśa's fährst. Ostwärts dreht sich die eine dunkle Seite, mit der anderen, dem Lichte, gehst du auf, o Sūrya" (Geldner).

abc. I am hesitant to accept the PS variant *pratarai(ḥ)* (vs. RV *pataraí(ḥ)*, ins. pl. from

patará- 'flying'): the word *pratara-* is not attested (although we do find the adverb *pratarám*, 'farther'; one could consider emending to *pratirai, from *pratirá-* 'carrying across, furthering, helpful'; however, it is also possible that the intial cluster *pr°* is an error due to perseveration (anticipation) from *prācīnam* in pāda **c** (perhaps influenced by the allitteration of *r* in the following portion of the verse: *°taṛai ṛathaṛyasi | prā°*). If such an error occurred during the early phase of oral transmission, then obviously we find it in both branches. Since a correction is necessary anyway, it seems safer to me to emend according to the RV.

Similarly the first two pādas seem to feature other faults due to perseveration if compared to the RV parallel: in pāda **a**, PS *tatra tatanann* vs. RV *yátra tatánann*; variation *tatra* vs. *yatra* is extremely frequent, but in this particular case it could be due to anticipation of the alliterating *t*. Reading *yatra* with RV would allow us to take this pāda as subordinate to pāda **b** (note that in RV the verb *tatánan* is accented), which would make more sense syntactically. Note that PS has a daṇḍa after pāda **b**, suggesting in fact that PS pādas **ab** should form one unit; conversely, the RV parallel of PS pāda **b** (*ná te... ní vāsate*) is clearly to be read with the following subordinate clause (*yád ... ratharyási*)—in fact, it seems impossible to take it otherwise, even in the PS version, despite the daṇḍa. The PS texts gives the impression of a not fully successful rearrangement attempt.

Moreover, in pāda **b** we find PS *pradivo vi vāsati* (with possible perseveration of the alliterating *v*) vs. RV *pradívo ní vāsate*. However, here we might be on the wrong track. In fact the RV reading is doubtful and the PS reading might be correct. The lexeme *ní vāsate* is not found elsewhere; *vās-* is not a known root, and the form can hardly be ascribed to any other root without raising some semantic or morphological issues. The matter is discussed at length by OLDENBERG (1912: 241f.), who ultimately accepts Ludwig's suggestion to ascribe this form to the root *van-*, 'to win, to conquer', and who proposes to emend to *nívaṃsate* (3sg. s-aor. subj. mid.), or rather *vívāsate* (3sg. desid. mid.). I find particularly convincing the argument according to which the latter form would have been corrupted into *ní vāsate* under the influence of *ní viśate* in the preceding stanza (RV 10.37.2c). The translation would be: "nicht versucht von altersher ein Götterfeind einen Angriff gegen (dies Tun) von dir". For comparable semantics, OLDENBERG also refers to the desid. act. ptc. *abhy àvívāsatām* in 7.104.2: *índro yātūnáͫ abhavat parāśaró havirmáthīnām abhy àvívāsatām | abhī́d u śakráḥ paraśúr yáthā vánam pā́treva bhindán satá eti rakṣásaḥ ||*, "Indra has become the one who pounds aside the sorcerers, the oblation-stealers, those who seek to ambush. The able one, splitting them like an axe a tree, breaking them like pots, advances against those who are really demons" (J-B). Cf. Geldner: "...die nachstellen". Finally, OLDENBERG compares the adjective *ávāta-*, 'unattacked, indestructible'[66], and the adjective *vanús-* 'eager to attack'[67].

I find this solution plausible overall, although the function of the pronoun *te* still raises some doubts. At any rate, if PS *vivāsati* is not due to perseveration, it might actually support Ludwig's suggestion. In fact, the active seems even preferable.

de. With regards to pādas **de** (RV pādas **cd**), Geldner (*ad loc.*) refers to RV 6.9.1 for comparison: *áhaś ca kṛṣṇám áhar árjunaṃ ca ví vartete rájasī vedyā́bhiḥ | vaiśvānaró jā́yamāno ná rā́jā́vātiraj jyótiṣāgnís támāͫsi ||*, "Es drehen sich der schwarze Tag [=die Nacht] und der helle Tag, (die lichte und) die dunkle Seite (=der Sonne) mit Vorbedacht. Agni Vaiśvānara überwand, eben geboren, wie ein König mit seinem Lichte die Finsternis" (Geldner); "The black day and the silvery day roll out through the two dusky realms according to their knowing ways. Agni Vaiśvānara, (even) while being born, like a king suppressed the dark shades with his light" (J-B).

Accordingly, GELDNER (1951, III p. 189, and II p. 101—also OLDENBERG 1912: 242) interprets *anyád* and *anyéna* in our stanza as agreeing with *rája* and *jyótiṣā*, and indicating a dark and light

---

66 Applied to Agni (RV 6.16.20), Indra (RV 6.18.1), the Dawn (RV 6.64.5), Soma (RV 9.89.7, RV 9.96.8, 9.96.11), and *yuvatáyaḥ* (RV 6.67.7).

67 RV 9.91.5c, *yé duḥṣáhāso vanúṣā bṛhántas, tā́ͫs te aśyāma purukṛt purukṣo ||*, "Lofty (riches?), which are hard to capture by the covetous—might we attain from you, o you who do many things and have many cattle" (J-B). Less relevant: RV 4.44.3c, *ṛtásya ... vanúṣe* "for the [one] striving for truth" (J-B).

side of the sun. I prefer to follow J-B and take *anyad … anyena* as referring to Sūrya's chariot's wheels. I assume that the words to be supplied would be *cakrám … cakréṇa*; cf. RV 1.155.6ab (to Viṣṇu), *catúrbhiḥ sākáṃ navatíṃ ca nā́mabhiś cakráṃ ná vṛttáṃ vyátīm̐r avīvipat* |, "With the four times ninety names [=days], he has caused the paired (horses) [=days and nights] to quiver like a wheel set rolling" (J-B).

17.25.7   **[Jagatī]** ~ RV 10.37.4; b: cf. RV 10.75.3b, RV 10.140.2b

a	yena sūrya jyotiṣā bādhase tamo	12	[– ◡ – ◡ | – ◡ – | – ◡ – ◡ ×]
b	jagac ca viśvam abhīyarṣi bhānunā |	12	[◡ – ◡ – ◡ | ◡ – | – ◡ – ◡ ×]
c	tenāsmad viśvām anirām anāhutim	12	[– – – – – | ◡ ◡ | – ◡ – ◡ ×]
d	apāmīvām apa duṣvapn~i~yam suva ||	12	[◡ – – – | ◡ ◡ – | – ◡ – ◡ ×]

O sun, the light with which you thrust away the darkness, and the radiance with which you move towards every moving creature, with that drive away from us every want of nourishment, every lack of oblation, away disease, away poor sleep.[68]

yena] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**c **[Mā] V71 JM₃** ye **Ji₄**   • bādhase] **K O**   • tamo] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa**c **[Mā] V71** tatamo **JM₃**   • jagac ca] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa**c **[Mā] V71 JM₃** jagacca(*s.s.*→ tsa) **V122** jagaś ca **K**   • abhīyarṣi] abhīyarṣi **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ V71 JM₃** abhiyarṣi **Mā** abhaẏarṣi **Pa**c adyanṛthi **K**   •]] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**c **[Mā] V71 JM₃** (*subs.* →) | **K** || **Ji₄**   • tenāsmad viśvām] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄** te[~smā~]nāsmad,(//)viśvām **Pa**c tenāsma viśvām **Mā V71 JM₃**   • anirām] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa**c **[Mā] JM₃** ani(tvā →*s.s.*)rām **V71** ajarām **K**   • anāhutim] **[O]** anāhutam **K**   • apāmīvām] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**c **[Mā] V71 JM₃** apāmanīvām **Ji₄** apāmevām **K**   • duṣvapnyam] **K** duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa**c **[Mā] JM₃** dusvapyna **V71**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa**c **[Mā] V71 JM₃** | **K V122**

RV 10.37.4
yéna sūrya jyótiṣā bā́dhase támo
jágac ca víśvam udiyárṣi bhānúnā |
ténāsmád víśvām ánirām ánāhutim
ápā́mīvām ápa duṣvápnyaṃ suva ||

RV 10.75.3b
anantáṃ śúṣmam úd iyarti bhānúnā |

RV 10.140.2b
ánūnavarcā úd iyarṣi bhānúnā |

Bhattacharya writes *vādhase* in pāda **a** (of course all **O** mss. are ambiguous, but **K** clearly reads *bādhase*), and *duḥsvapnyaṃ* in pāda **d**.

This stanza ends this group of three referring to the sun with parallels in RV 10.37. In particular, RV 10.37.4 translates as follows: "The light with which you thrust away the darkness, o Sun, and the radiance with which you rouse up every moving creature, with that drive away from us every want of nourishment, every lack of oblation, drive away disease, away the bad dream" (J-B); "Mit welchem Lichte du, Sūrya, das Dunkel verdrängst und mit deinem Schein alles Lebende auftreibst, mit dem verbanne von uns jegliche Verschmachten, den Mangel an Opfern, Krankheit und bösen Traum!" (Geldner).

---

68 My translation is based on J-B's translation of the RV parallel, with significant modifications and adaptations.

b. Note the variation between RV *udiyárṣi* (incidentally with irregular accent) and PS *abhīyarṣi*[69].

As regards this variation, the first thing that is worthy of note is that the PS line is conspicuously irregular because, due to the long vowel *ī* in *abhīyarṣi*, the second syllable after the caesura is long. For this reason, the PS reading seems inferior, if not unacceptable. Nevertheless, it is worth investigating whether PS *abhīyarṣi* is grammatically acceptable.

The first issue I want to address is whether the verbal stem *iyar-* here expresses transitive (as we would expect at first) or intransitive semantics (as our conclusion will be).

The 2sg. present *íyarṣi* is derived from the root [1]*ar-* (<*$h_3$er-). This root forms a reduplicated present meaning 'to move' (tr. and intr.), or more frequently 'to raise (tr.) / rise (intr.)' (especially with preverb *úd*), act. tr. *íyarti* (*h_3i-$h_3$er-ti), mid. intr. *írte* (*h_3i-h_3r-toi), as well as a 5th class nasal present *ṛṇóti* (*h_3r-neu-ti),[70] 'to set in motion' (tr.), next to a root aorist (mid.).

From a survey of the 44 occurrences in the RV and the three in the AV[71] (most of which are occurrences of the lexeme *ud-*[1]*ar-*), it appears that, in the vast majority of cases, the stem *íyar-* indeed has a transitive meaning, 'to move, raise, rouse',[72] but in at least four RV occurrences and one AV occurrence, it can also have intransitive meaning 'to rise' (RV 1.165.4b; RV 4.45.1a; RV 7.68.3a; RV 10.140.2b; PS 5.2.8a),[73] equivalent to that of *írte*.

In fact, the only other occurrence of the present stem *íyar-* with preverb *abhí*, namely *abhīyarti* in PS 5.2.8, appears to convey the intransitive meaning "rises" (literally "moves towards the top (*agram*)": *mūrdhnā yo agram abhyarty* [read: *abhīyartiy*] *ojasā *bṛhaspatim ā vivāsanti devāḥ | bhinad valaṃ vi mṛdho dardarīti kanikradad gāḥ svar apo jigāya ||*, "The gods try to win Bṛhaspati, who powerfully rises with [his] head to the top; he broke Vala, he smashes the enemies, roaring he has won the cows, the sky, the waters" (Lubotsky).

Moreover, all the other occurrences of *abhí* with a form of the root [1]*ar-* (*$h_3$er-) are also intransitive—remarkably, even with the stem *ṛṇav-* which is normally transitive—and mean 'to move towards'.

First, let's consider RV 1.35.9.[74] Interestingly, in this stanza the lexeme *abhí+ṛṇoti-* is found next to the phrase *ámīvam ápa bādh-*, 'to push away disease', which recalls our stanza. However, the subject is not the sun, but Savitṛ, who in fact 'moves towards' heaven (*dyā́m*): RV 1.35.9, *híraṇyapāṇih savitā́ vícarṣaṇir ubhé dyā́vāpṛthivī́ antár īyate | ápā́mīvām bā́dhate véti sū́ryam abhí kṛṣṇéna rájasā dyā́m ṛṇoti ||*, "Golden-palmed Savitar, whose boundaries are distant, shuttles between both, both heaven and earth. He thrusts away affliction; he pursues the sun; he reaches to heaven through the black realm" (J-B).

In RV 3.1.4, the preverb *abhí* is found with the 3pl. perfect *ā́rur*. The stanza reads as follows: *ávardhayan subhágaṃ saptá yahvī́ḥ śvetáṃ jajñānám aruṣám mahitvā́ | śíśuṃ ná jātám abhy àrur áśvā devā́so agním jániman vapuṣyan ||*, "The seven young women strengthened him of good fortune, who is white as he comes to birth, red in his greatness. (Those) mares came to him (newly born) as to a new-born colt. The gods marveled at Agni at his birth" (J-B). If we follow LUBOTSKY

---

69 It seems reasonable to consider **K** *adyanṛthi* a mere corruption. On the alternation between **O** *bh* (correct) and **K** *d* (error), see my comment on **abhvebhyo* in PS 17.24.9 above.

70 Note that some occurrences of *ṛṇóti* are best classified with [2]*ar-* (*$h_1$er-): see KÜMMEL (2000: 103f.; LVV p. 11).

71 Our line, ŚS 6.22.3a ~ PS 19.22.12a (transitive), and PS 5.2.8a (intransitive), discussed below.

72 Frequent objects are *vā́c-*, 'speech', *stóma-*, 'praise'.

73 I discuss these stanzas below.

74 KÜMMEL (2000: 104) also quotes "AVP 13.1.15c *mā smāto'ₐbhiy ṛṇoḥ punaḥ* 'Gelange von dort nicht wieder herbei!'", which is actually BARRET's emendation of **K** 13.1.15c *mā smāto bhīrṇaḥ punaḥ*, corresponding to PS 12.2.5c, edited by Bhattacharya (1997) as *mā smāto abhyair naḥ punas* on the basis of **O**. This line corresponds to ŚS 5.22.11c (against *takmán*, 'fever'), *mā́ smā́to'rvàṅ aíḥ púnaḥ*, "Come not back hitherward from there" (Whitney) (also quoted and translated by KÜMMEL as "kehre von dort nicht wieder hierher zurück!").

1997 and ascribe this perfect form to ¹*ar-*, the meaning must once again be 'to move towards',[75] so that it would correspond to the (intransitive!) presents *abhí+ṛṇoti* or *abhí+iyarti* (unless, wholly theoretically, we assume an unattested intransitive *abhí+īrte*). At any rate, the meaning is intransitive.

In RV 9.79.3, we find *abhí* next to *sám* with root aorist middle optative *arīta* (belonging with ¹*ar-* < *h₃er- according to LUBOTSKY 1997), although it is debatable whether *abhí* is a postponed preverb or an adnominal adverb here (as for *sám*, it probably highlights that the action affects a plurality of objects[76]): RV 9.79.3cd, *dhánvan ná tŕ̥ṣṇā sám arīta tắm̐ abhí sóma jahí pavamāna durādhyàḥ* ||, "As if in a desert, thirst should strike them. O self-purifying Soma, smite those of evil intent" (J-B). More literally "As if in a desert, thirst should move to all of them together ..."[77] This meaning also fits that of the present *abhí+ṛṇoti* or *abhí+iyarti*, 'to move towards'.

KÜMMEL (2000: 104) concedes that the attingent meaning 'to move towards' of *abhí+¹ar-* can only be understood from a basic 'attain, reach' (this would seem closer to the semantics of ²*ar-* < *h₁er-, *ṛcháti*, 'to reach'), perhaps 'set oneself in motion'. At any rate, if *abhí+¹ar-* (*iyar-* and *ṛṇav-*), where attested, is always intransitive (despite the morphologically transitive active appearance of some of the attested forms!), it seems safe to assume that our *abhīyarṣi* should also be translated intransitively. Therefore the accusative *jagat ... víśvam*, which functions as an object in the RV parallel, must instead indicate a destination in our stanza.

I mentioned above that there are three RV stanza and one AV stanza in which a verbal form based on the stem *iyar-* conveys an intransitive meaning. The AV stanza is PS 5.2.8, which we discussed above. To this count we can now add our stanza. Interestingly, of the four RV stanzas, two[78] have to do with *bhānú-*, 'radiance': once, *bhānú-* is the subject ('Now this radiant beam arises'), but another time the same formula that characterises our stanza, with a form of *iyar-* followed by *bhānúnā*, is used.

RV 4.45.1 (describing the Aśvins driving the sun's chariot) reads: *eṣá syá bhānúr úd iyarti yujyáte ráthaḥ párijmā divó asyá sā́navi | pṛkṣā́so asmin mithunā́ ádhi tráyo dŕ̥tis turī̆yo mádhuno ví rapśate* ||, "Now this radiant beam arises; the earth-encircling chariot is hitched up upon the back of this heaven. Three bringing nourishment [=Aśvins and Sūryā] are upon it [=the chariot] as a pair; a fourth, a skin-bag, teems with honey" (J-B).

RV 10.140.2 (to Agni) reads: *pāvakávarcāḥ śukrávarcā ánūnavarcā úd iyarṣi bhānúnā | putró mātárā vicárann úpāvasi pṛṇákṣi ródasī ubhé* ||, "Of pure luster, of gleaming luster, of unfailing luster, you rise up with your radiance. As a son wandering between your two mothers, you approach (them) helpfully. You fill both world-halves" (J-B). Here *úd iyarṣi bhānúnā* is clearly the same formula that we find in the RV parallel of our stanza. Even more so interesting, because in RV 10.140.2b, the same verbal form is intransitive, whereas in the mentioned parallel RV 10.37.4b, it is

---

75 Differently, KÜMMEL (2000: 102) ascribes this perfect form to ²*ar-* (*h₁er-), *ṛcháti* 'to go, to reach'.

76 KÜMMEL (2000: 104) points out that the preverb *sám* is only found with *ṛṇóti* 'set in motion' (as far as *h3er-presents are concerned; i.e. never with *iyárti/ī́rte* 'raise/rise') or with *ṛcháti* (*h₁er-); thus, *sám ṛṇoti* means 'to move (smth) together, to collect' (act.) vs. 'to convene, to gather together' (mid.). These meanings obviously do not fit our line. Semantically, *(abhí) sám arīta* would fit better with *ṛchati* '(thirst) reaches all (of them) together', but according to LUBOTSKY 1997, the root aorist belongs with *h3er-, not *h₁er-. Therefore, in the case of *abhí sám arīta*, we need to assume that the core lexeme is *abhí + arīta*, with semantics corresponding to *abhí ṛṇoti*, 'to move towards', as we have seen above, and that *sám* only secondarily adds the notion of an action involving a plurality of objects (at least in the particular line under consideration) to the basic meaning expressed by *abhí arīta*, "would/should move towards".

77 Compare the Italian idiomatic expression *mi è salita una sete!* "Such a thirst rose up to me=I got so thirsty!" (also used with hunger, sleepiness, fatigue, etc.).

78 The third and fourth occurrences of an intransitive *íyar-* in RV are: RV 7.68.3, *prá vāṃ rátho mánojavā iyarti tiró rájāṃsy aśvinā śatótiḥ | asmábhyaṃ sūryāvasū iyānáḥ* ||, "O Aśvins, your chariot swift as thought rises forth across the airy spaces, bringing hundredfold help, speeding to us, o you who bring Sūryā as goods" (J-B); RV 1.165.4b, *śúṣma iyarti prábhṛto me ádriḥ*, "My explosive power rises; the pressing-stone is brought forth to me" (J-B).

transitive: "the radiance with which you *rouse up* every moving creature" (a subordinate clause).

Other instances of *bhānú-* with an intransitive form of ¹*ar-* are the following: RV 7.34.7a (probably about Agni), *úd asya śúṣmād bhānúr nā́rta*, "it has arisen like a radiant beam" (J-B); RV 4.1.17.b, *úd devyā́ uṣáso bhānúr arta ǀ*, "the radiance of the goddess Dawn arose" (J-B); RV 5.25.6e, *bānúr arta tmánā diváḥ*, "The radiance of heaven has arisen by itself" (my transl.).

The instances of the collocation of *bhānú-* next to ¹*ar-* are not numerous, which makes this coincidence interesting.[79] Clearly the notion of the rising radiance of the sun, dawn, heaven, or of something rising by means of or with such radiance was a common poetic image. This goes to show that the image of the sun rising with radiance towards all moving creatures as described in our PS stanza is perfectly suitable.

Exceptions to the rule according to which the second syllable after the caesura are, after all, also found in the RV. Therefore I refrain from emending the PS mss. reading *abhīyarṣi*.

17.25.8 [prose]

viśvām anirām amīvām anāhutim ⁺amuṣmā ⁺āmuṣyāyaṇāyāmuṣyāḥ putrāya pra hiṇmaḥ ǁ

Every want of nourishment, disease, lack of oblation, we hurl [it] to such-and-such, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother].

amīvām] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** amī(*subs.*→ vī)vām **V122** amī[x]vām **JM₃** anasīvām **K** • ⁺amuṣmā ⁺āmuṣyāyaṇāyāmuṣyāḥ putrāya] amuṣmāẏāmuṣyāẏaṇāẏāmuṣyāḥ putrāẏa **V71** amuṣmāẏāmuṣyāẏaṇāmuṣyāḥ putrāẏa **JM₃** amu(ṣyā→subs.)ṣmāẏaṇā(*subs.*→ṇā)ẏāmuṣyāḥ putrāẏa **V122** amuṣyāẏāmuṣyāẏaṇāẏāmuṣyāḥ putrāẏa **Ma Ja Ji₄ Pa꜀ Mā** amuṣyāẏeṇāẏāmuṣyāḥ putrāya **K** • hiṇmaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** hi[x](*subs.*→ṇma)ḥ **V122** hiṇma **K** • ǁ] **[Ma] [Mā]** ǁ ru 10 ǁ **Ja**[80] ǁ ru (space) ǁ 25 ǁ **V122** ǁ 25 ǁ **Ji₄** ǁ 25 ǁ ru ǁ **Pa꜀** ǁ 25 ǁ ru 8 ǁ **V71 JM₃** Z pha 5 Z **K**

Bhattacharya writes *amuṣmā*yāmuṣyāyaṇāyāmuṣyāḥ* with the **O** mss. These, however, insert an extra -*ẏ*- in the hiatus (see Introduction, §2.2) between *amuṣmā* (or variants) and *āmuṣyayaṇāyāmuṣyāḥ*, which needs to be omitted in the edited text. For the same reason I believe that the correction sign (*) is not necessary (although Bhattacharya was right to use it on the basis of his mss. only), and I replace it with a plus sign. For an explanation of the formula and the reasons behind the emendation, see my comment on PS 17.21.2 above.

Note that the phrasing of the opening of this line repeats some of the words in the preceding stanza.

---

79 Interestingly, the only instances of *bhānú-* next to a form of ¹*ar-* in which the verb is transitive are only two: our RV parallel, RV 10.37.4b, and RV 10.75.3b (about the Sindhu river (f.)): *anantáṃ śúṣmam úd iyarti bhānúnā ǀ*, "She sends up snorting without end along with radiance" (J-B), which, however, are both occurrences of the formula we met in our stanza (clearly designed by the poets of RV 10 to fit the cadence of second pādas, although always with different syntax). An intransitive interpretation might also be possible for these lines.

80 Bhattacharya does not explicitly say whether the numeral "ǁ 25 ǁ" is present in his mss., only that **Ja** has "ṛ 10", while **Ma** and **Mā** do not specify the number of mantras.

Kāṇḍikā 26

17.26.1

a   dyāvāpṛthivī vahataṃ *duṣvapnyaṃ parā vahataṃ ⁺duṣvapnyam |
b   *amuṣmā āmuṣyāyaṇāyāmuṣyāḥ putrāya ||

O heaven and earth, carry (du.) poor sleep, carry poor sleep away [from here] to such-and-such, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother].

*duṣvapnyaṃ] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā]** duḥsvapnya **Pa꜀** dusvapnyaṃ **V71 JM₃** dussvapni **K**   •   parā vahataṃ] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** parā [x]va(*s.s.*→ha)taṃ **JM₃** •   ⁺duṣvapnyam] duḥsvapnyaṃ **V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Ma] [Ja] [Mā]** du(*s.s.*→ḥ)svapnyaṃ **V71** dusvapnyaṃ **JM₃** duṣvapnim, **K**   • |] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71** || **Ji₄ Pa꜀ JM₃** *om*. **K**   • *amuṣmā āmuṣyāyaṇāyāmuṣyāḥ] amuṣyā āmuṣyāyaṇāẏāmuṣyāḥ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** amuṣyā āmuṣyāyaṇāẏāmuṣyāḥ **Ji₄** amuṣyāmuṣyāyeṇasyāmuṣyāḥ **K**   • putrāya] putrāya **[O]** putrāya pra hiraṇma **K**   • ||] **[O]** | **K**

Bhattacharya writes *duḥsvapnyaṃ* and *duḥsvapnyam |* in line **a**, and **amuṣmā* in line **b**.
      The emendation to **amuṣmā* (=*amuṣmai*) was proposed by Bhattacharya. For an explanation of the formula and the emendation, see my comment on PS 17.21.2 above.

17.26.2

     vātāpavamānau vahatam ° ° ° ||

O wind and Pavamāna (purifying) wind, carry (du.) (…).

vātāpavamānau] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** vātāpavamāno **JM₃**   • vahatam] vahataṃ **[O]** vahatam, **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** | **K Ji₄ V71**

Bhattacharya writes *vātāpavamānau vahatam (duḥsvapnyaṃ . . . . . .) ||*

17.26.3

     indrāgnī vahatam ° ° ° ||

O Indra and Agni, carry (du.) (…).

indrāgnī] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**ᶜ **[Mā] V71 JM₃** [.]indrāgnī **Ji₄**   • vahatam] vahataṃ **[O]** vahatam, **K**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**ᶜ **[Mā] JM₃** | **K V71** ˈ **Ji₄**

17.26.4

  mitrāvaruṇā vahatam ° ° ° ‖

O Mitra and Varuṇa, carry (du.) (…).

mitrāvaruṇā] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** mitrāvaruṇāya **V71** mitrāvaruṇā[x] **Pa**ᶜ mittrā(→vitrā)varuṇau **K**[81]   • vahatam] vahataṃ **[O]** vahatam, **K**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa**ᶜ **[Mā] JM₃** | **K V71**

17.26.5

  bhavāśarvau vahatam ° ° ° ‖

O Bhava and Śarva, carry (du.) (…).

bhavāśarvau] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**ᶜ **[Mā] V71 JM₃** bhavāsarvau **Ji₄**   • vahatam] vahataṃ **[O]** vahatam, **K**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa**ᶜ **[Mā] JM₃** | **V71** *om.* **K**

17.26.6

  devāśvinā vahataṃ ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ parā vahataṃ ⁺duṣvapnyam ° ° ° ‖

O two gods, O two Aśvins, carry (du.) poor sleep, carry (du.) poor sleep away (…).

devāśvinā] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**ᶜ **[Mā] V71 JM₃** devāsvinā **Ji₄**   • vahatam] vahataṃ **[O]** vahatam, **K**   • ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**ᶜ **[Mā]** duḥsvapyaṃ **Ji₄** duṣvapnyaṃ **V71** dupsvapnyaṃ **JM₃** duṣvapniṃ **K**   • parā vahatam] parā vahataṃ **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71 JM₃** parā vahata **V122 Ji₄** parā vahatam, | **K** *om.* **Pa**ᶜ   • ⁺duṣvapnyam] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā]** duspa[x]pnyaṃ **V71** dupsvapnyaṃ **JM₃** duṣvaptriṃ **K** *om.* **Pa**ᶜ   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa**ᶜ **[Mā]** | **V71 JM₃** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya writes *duḥsvapnyaṃ* and *duḥsvapnyam | [. . . . . .] ‖*.
  The sequence *devāśvinā* is not a Dvandva compound, but two words in the dual, *devā* and *aśvinā*. In fact, here and in the following lines, *deva-* is used as an epithet of the deities mentioned immediately after.

---

81 The correction is placed in the left margin. An 'x' sign is placed above the sequence °*mittra*° to indicate that
   the correction refers to it.

17.26.7

devā maruto vahata ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ parā vahata ⁺duṣvapnyam ° ° ° ||

O gods, O Maruts, carry poor sleep, carry poor sleep away (…).

devā] **[O]** deva **K** • vahata] **[O]** vahatu | **K** • ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** duspapnyaṃ **V71** dusvapnyaṃ **JM₃** duṣvapniṃ **K** • parā vahata] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** parā vahataṃ **V71** parā vahat, **JM₃** parā vahatam, | **K** • ⁺duṣvapnyam] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** duspa[x]pnyaṃ **V71** duṣvaptriṃ **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** | **V71** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya writes *duḥsvapnyaṃ* and *duḥsvapnyam* | *(. . . . . .)* ||.

17.26.8

devāḥ pitaro vahata ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ parā vahata *duḥsvapnyam ° ° ° ||

O gods, O Forefathers, carry poor sleep, carry poor sleep away (…).

devāḥ] **[O]** deva **K** • vahata] **[O]** vahantu | **K** • ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** du[x]svapnyaṃ **V71** duṣvaptri **K** • parā vahata] **[O]** parā vahat, (*s.s.*→ |) **K** • *duṣvapnyam] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** duspapnyaṃ **V71** duḥsvaptriṃ **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** | **V71** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya writes *duḥsvapnyaṃ* and *duḥsvapnyam* | *(. . . . . .)* ||.

17.26.9

deva sūryo vaha ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ parā vaha ⁺duṣvapnyam ° ° ° ||

O god, O Sun, carry poor sleep, carry poor sleep away (…).

sūryo] **K [Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā]** sūrya **V122 Ji₄ V71 JM₃** • vaha] **[O]** vahad **K** • ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** dusvapnyaṃ **V71 JM₃** duṣvapniṃ **K** • parā vaha] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** parā vahata **V71** parā vahad **K** • ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ] duḥsvapnyaṃ **Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** duḥsvapnyaṃ parā duḥsvapnyaṃ **V122** duspapnyaṃ **V71** dusvapnyaṃ **JM₃** duṣvapniṃ **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** | **V71** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya writes *duḥsvapnyaṃ* and *duḥsvapnyam* | *(. . . . . .)* ||.

17.26.10

deva candramo vaha ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ parā vaha ⁺duṣvapnyam ° ° ° ||

O god, O Moon, carry poor sleep, carry poor sleep away (…).

vaha] **[O]** vahad **K**   • ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** dutsvapnyaṃ **V71** dusvapnyaṃ **JM₃** duṣupniṃ **K**   • parā vaha] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** parā vahata **V71 JM₃** parā vahad **K**   • ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** dusvapnyaṃ **V71 JM₃** duṣvapni **K**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃ | V71** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya writes *duḥsvapnyaṃ* and *duḥsvapnyam | (. . . . . .) ‖*.

17.26.11

      devā nakṣatrāṇi vahata ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ parā vahata ⁺duṣvapnyam ° ° ° ‖

O gods, O constellations, carry poor sleep, carry poor sleep away (…).

devā] **K Mā** devāni **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71 JM₃**   • nakṣatrāṇi] **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71 JM₃** nakṣatraṃ **Mā** nakṣattrāṇi **K**   • vahata] **[O]** vahataṃ **K**   • ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** duspapnyaṃ | **V71** dusvapnyaṃ **JM₃** duṣvapniṃ, **K**   • parā vahata] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** parā ha **JM₃** parā vahataṃ **K**   • ⁺duṣvapnyam] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** dusvapnyaṃ **V71 JM₃** duṣvapniṃ **K**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃ | V71 K**

Bhattacharya writes *duḥsvapnyaṃ* and *duḥsvapnyam | (. . . . . .) ‖*.

17.26.12

      devīr āpo vahata ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ parā vahata ⁺duṣvapnyam ° ° ° ‖

O gods, O waters, carry poor sleep, carry poor sleep away (…).

vahata] **[O]** vahataṃ **K**   • ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** dusvapnyaṃ **V71** dusva[x]pnyaṃ **JM₃** duṣvapniṃ **K**   • parā vahata] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** parā vaha(*subs*. →)ta **Ji₄** parā vahatam, **K**   • ⁺duṣvapnyam] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** dusvapnyaṃ **V71 JM₃** duṣvapniṃ **K**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃ | V122 V71** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya writes *duḥsvapnyaṃ* and *duḥsvapnyam | (. . . . . .) ‖*.

17.26.13

      deva viṣṇo vaha *duṣvapnyam ° ° ° ‖

O gods, O Viṣṇu, carry poor sleep (…).

deva] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** devā **Pa_c** • vaha] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** vahatu **Ji₄** vahata **V71** • *duṣvapnyam] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** dutsvapnyaṃ **V71** dusvapnyaṃ **JM₃** *om*. **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** | **Ji₄ V71 K**

Bhattacharya writes *duḥsvapnyaṃ (. . .)* ‖.

17.26.14

deva tvaṣṭar vaha ° ° ° ‖

O god, O Tvaṣṭ, carry (…).

N.B. Before this line, **K** has 17.26.17 (see below).

———

tvaṣṭar] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** [x]tvaṣṭar **V122** tvaṣṭur **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **Ji₄ K** duḥsvapnyaṃ ‖ **V122**

17.26.15

deva dhātar vaha ° ° ° ‖

O god, O Dhāt, carry (…).

dhātar] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** dhār **Ji₄** dhātur **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **Ji₄ Pa_c K**

17.26.16

deva savitar vaha ° ° ° ‖

O god, O Savit, carry (…).

savitar] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** sarvatar **V71** savitār **Ji₄** savitur **K** • ‖] **[O]** | **K**

17.26.17

deva pūṣan vaha ° ° ° ‖

O god, O Pūṣan, carry (…).

N.B. In **K** this line appears as the fourteenth, between 17.26.13 and 17.26.14.

———

pūṣan vaha] pūṣanvaha **K** pūṣan, vaha **[Ma]? [Ja]? V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]?** pūṣana **V71** pūṣaṇa **JM₃**

• ‖] **[O]** | **K**

17.26.18

deva bṛhaspate vaha ° ° ° ‖

O god, O Bṛhaspati, carry (…).

bṛhaspate] **[O]** vṛhaspater **K**   • ‖] **[O]** | **K**

17.26.19

deva prajāpate vaha ° ° ° ‖

O god, O Prajāpati, carry (…).

vaha] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** vahaṃ **V71**   • ‖] **[O]** | **K**

17.26.20

deva parameṣṭhin vaha ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ parā vaha *duṣvapnyam ° ° ° ‖

O god, O Parameṣṭhin, carry poor sleep, carry poor sleep away.

parameṣṭhin vaha] parameṣṭhinvaha | **K** parameṣṭhin, vaha **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]? V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** parameṣṭhin, vaha | **JM₃** parameṣṭhina vaha **V71**   • ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** dussvapniyaṃ **V71**[82] dusvapniÿaṃ **JM₃** duṣvapniṃ **K**   • parā vaha] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** parā vahat, **V71 JM₃** parā vahad **K**   • *duṣvapnyam] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** dussvapniyaṃ **V71** dusvapniÿa **JM₃** duḥsvapnim, **K**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c V71 JM₃** | **K [Mā]**

Bhattacharya writes *duḥsvapnyaṃ* and *duḥsvapnyam | (. . . . . .)* ‖.

17.26.21

ahorātre vahataṃ ⁺duṣvapnyaṃ parā vahataṃ ⁺duṣvapnyam |
*amuṣmā āmuṣyāyaṇāyāmuṣyāḥ putrāya ‖

O day and night, carry (du.) poor sleep, carry (du.) poor sleep away [from here] to such-and-such, descendant of such-and-such [father], son of such-and-such [mother].

---

82 Here **V71** does not spell -*ÿ*- between vowels in *dussvapniyaṃ*!

N.B. In **Pa꜀** the first half of the mantra is written twice.

---

vahataṃ] **K [Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** vahata **V122** vahate **Ji₄** mahataṃ **Pa꜀** vahatta **V71** vahat, **JM₃**   •
⁺duṣvapnyaṃ] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀** dusvapniyaṃ **[Mā]** dussvapniẏaṃ **V71**
dapsvapnyaṃ **JM₃** duṣvapnim, | **K**   • parā vahataṃ] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā]** parā vaha[t̶a̶ṃ̶]
Pa꜀ parā vahat, **V71 JM₃**   • ⁺duṣvapnyam] duḥsvapnyaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀** duḥsvapniyaṃ
Mā dussvapniẏaṃ **V71** dupsvapiẏaṃ **JM₃** duṣvapnim, **K**   • |] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71 JM₃** || **V122**
Ji₄ ahorātre mahataṃ duḥsvapnyaṃ parā vahataṃ duḥsvapnyaṃ || **Pa꜀** *om.* **K**   • *amuṣmā
āmuṣyāyaṇāyāmuṣyāḥ] amuṣyā āmuṣyāẏaṇāẏāmuṣyāḥ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** amuṣpā
(*subs.*→ā)muṣyāẏaṇāẏāmuṣyāḥ **V71** amuṣyāmuṣyāyeṇāyāmuṣyāḥ **K**   • putrāya] putrāẏa **[O]**
putrāẏa pra hiṇma **K**   • ||] || ru 21 || 26 || **Ma Ja** || ru (space) || 26 || **V122** || 26 || **Ji₄** || 26 || ru || **Pa꜀** ||
26 || ru 21|| **Mā** || 26 || ru || **V71 JM₃** Z phaśca 6 Z **K**

The emendation to *amuṣmā (=*amuṣmai*) was proposed by Bhattacharya. For an explanation
of the formula and the emendation, see my comment on PS 17.21.2 above.

Here kāṇḍa 17, anuvāka 5 comes to an end. The mss. contain the following colophons:

K   iti saptādaśakāṇḍe pañcamo nuvākas samāptaḥ Z Z

Ma   a 5 ||
Ja   a 5 ||
V122   ityekānr̥cakāṇḍe pañcamo 'nuvākaḥ || (*space*) ||
Ji₄   ityekānr̥cakāṇḍe pañcamo 'nuvākaḥ || 5 || # ||
Pa꜀   a 5 ||

Mā   ityekānr̥cakāṇḍe pañcamo nuvākaḥ ||
V71   ityekānr̥cakāṇḍe pañcamo 'nuvākaḥ ||
JM₃   ityekānr̥cakāṇḍe pañcamo 'nuvākaḥ || # ||