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

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 III

Anuvāka 6

The observance of the draft-ox

Introduction

The sixth anuvāka of Book 17, comprising kāṇḍikās 27–43, is composed fully in *brāhmaṇa*-style prose (with the sole exception of 17.43.1–4, which consists of *yajus*-style prose). It contains the aitiological myth and an exegetical treatment of the "observance of the draft-ox" (*anaḍuho vratam* or *anaḍudvratam*).[1] This observance is also referred to in the so-called Anaḍutsūkta (hymn ŚS 4.11 ~ PS 3.25) as *anaḍúho vratám* (ŚS 4.11.11; *anaḍuho balam* in PS 3.25.7d, 8d). This hymn was largely misunderstood by previous scholars, who ignored the possibility of using the present anuvāka as a key to uncovering its secrets.

In a recent article, Acharya (2013) cited these two texts among early sources attesting to the existence of an archaic observance, a *govrata*, that involved the imitation of the behaviour of bulls. Acharya was investigating the origins of the *pāśupatavrata*. The Pāśupatas[2] are the earliest known Śaiva sect. From the Pāśupatasūtra (PāśS) and a few related sources, we know that they taught an observance that they claimed was first performed by Indra, and which consisted of five stages: a first period that required a stay at a temple of Śiva/Rudra; a second period during which the ascetic wandered among the people, concealing his religious affiliation, and instead pretending to be a madman to provoke people with his scandalous behaviour; a third period during which the ascetic retired to a remote location to meditate; a fourth period during which the ascetic dwelt on a cremation ground; and finally a fifth stage, after death, when the ascetic achieved the end of suffering (*duḥkhānta*) and union with Rudra (*rudra-sāyujya*). The second stage was particularly important because, by behaving like a madman and by bringing scorn on himself, the ascetic provoked a magical exchange: he appropriated the *iṣṭāpūrta* (the accrued merits gained by worship and gifts) of the clueless detractors who unjustly censured him. With these merits, he was then able to proceed along his spiritual path.

By providing a new reading of the Pāśupatasūtra, Acharya showed that at all stages, the original *pāśupatavrata* required the ascetic to behave like a bull. He thus set out to survey earlier Vedic literature, and found a number of accounts describing archaic practices, referred to with various terms (*gośīla*, *govrata*, *gosava*, *godharma*, etc.), and which involved the imitation of the behaviour of bulls: eating grass from the ground, drinking from puddles, headbutting, evacuating whenever one felt the urge, sexually approaching women, etc.; it was precisely this conduct that was meant to arouse the indignation of the common people. One of Acharya's (2013) main achievements was to show, through the study of those early sources, that this archaic *govrata* belonged to the cult of Indra. Crucial to Acharya's theory is the evidence from the present text and the Anaḍutsūkta. As Bhattacharya had not yet published his edition of PS 17, Acharya refrained from treating the present anuvāka in detail. With the following commented edition and the two attached appendixes, I shall take up the task where he left it.

Indeed, even though it does not contain any detailed description of the scandalous behaviour required by the observance, our text explicitly states that the *anaḍudvrata* allowed Indra to appropriate ('wrest away', *apa-vṛj-*, *saṃ-vṛj-*) the *iṣṭá* and *pūrtá* of the Asuras who had insulted him (17.35.3–4; 17.28.6–7; 17.28.17–28). Moreover, it contains a quote by the seer Ahīnas Āśvatthi (17.35.1), who teaches the following: *na tād brāhmaṇaṃ nindāni yād enam aśṛṇon ned iṣṭāpūrtena*

---

1 The compound *anaḍudvrata-* is actually never attested as such, but it is implied by the form *anaḍudvratin-*, found in 17.35.2 and 17.38.6.

2 For more details about Acharya's research and the observance of the Pāśupatas, of which I provide only a sketch in this brief introduction, I refer the reader to Appendix I §1, §2, §3, and Appendix II §1.3.

vi bhavānīti ||, "Therefore I will not censure [this/a] brahmin for having learned about him (i.e heard about Indra, and imitated his observance), lest I be deprived of [my] merit gained from worship and donations".

Moreover, a direct connection between our text and the Pāśupatasūtra was demonstrated by Bisschop (2018),[3] who identified our PS 17.35.3–4 as the textual source of PāśS 4.10–13 (see my comment *ad loc.* and Appendix I §2).

In Appendix I (which, like Acharya's 2013 article, provides a foundation for understanding our anuvāka), I investigate the remote origins of the *pāśupatavrata* and Acharya's archaic *govrata*, tracing it back to Indo-European cultural models connected with the so-called *Männerbund*, a cultural institution devoted to the education of the youth. The rites connected with the initiation of the youth, which involved animal masking, lie at the origin of the *govrata/anaḍudvrata*, while the historical development of the *Männerbund* from a ritualised age-set (the *Jugendbund*) to a warrior brotherhood (the *Gefolgschaft*) open to various kinds of marginalised categories (a dynamic driven by socio-economical factors) can explain the persistence of this and other old Indo-European cultural traits in Vedic Vrātya culture and in the early ascetic movements, including the Pāśupatas, that emerged from such ancient brotherhoods.

In Appendix II, I treat the Anaḍutsūkta in greater detail. I provide a new critical edition of the PS version, with English translation and commentary, and offer a new interpretation of the text in light of Acharya's (2013) discovery of its connection with the present anuvāka, and in light of my hypothesis that the observance described in the two texts can be traced back to the Indo-European *Männerbund*'s initiatory practices, which are also reflected in the tradition of the Vrātyas. Thus, I identify the *anaḍudvrata* as a practice connected with the celebration of the solstices: the Gharma rite at the summer solstice, and the twelve *vrátyā* nights of the winter solstice.

The present chapter is especially interesting because it contains the narration of the myth according to which Indra was the first to perform the *anaḍudvrata*. Unfortunately, the various episodes of the myth are not told in chronological order, but are scattered across the 17 kāṇḍikās that constitute the anuvāka. Thus, it is the task of the editor to attempt a reconstruction of the original narrative sequence.

Each kāṇḍikā generally follows a fixed structure: 1) first, an aitiological myth is told; 2) secondly, we find a piece of exegesis, usually consisting of sacred equations; and 3) finally, a concluding statement illustrates what results can be achieved, or benefits obtained, by the initiate who has learned the knowledge illustrated in the kāṇḍikā and who performs ("bears", *bhṛ-*)[4] the draft-ox observance (*ya evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti*).[5]

Thus, the myth is split into small episodes that are used as aitiological myths for the kāṇḍikās' teachings. In fact, the criterion determining the order of the kāṇḍikās is not very clear, but it certainly cannot be based on the episodes of the myth: if read in a sequence, in fact, these do not yield a coherent narrative. Rather, the rationale must be found in the destination of the text: being a *brāhmaṇa*-style composition, the present anuvāka is no doubt a didactic text. Thus, the core of each kāṇḍikā is not the myth, but probably the conclusive statement that summarises the results that the initiated *vratin* can achieve and the benefits he can secure if he practises the observance.

From a close reading of the text, I am able to propose the following summary of the myth: Indra wishes to use the *vajra* to slay Vṛtra (17.27.1). He picks up the *vajra* (17.28.1a), but as he is about to strike (17.28.1d), the *vajra* slips from his hands (17.28.2a) and falls—in the form of a lightning bolt (17.28.3)—into the sea (17.28.4), burning the sea water and making it undrinkable (17.28.5). Indra steps into the sky, the midspace, and the wind (17.30.1–2, 31.1–2, 32.1–2), trying to

---

3 This discovery was first presented in 2016 (see Bisschop & Selva 2016).

4 The text plays with the metaphor of the 'heavy' (*guru*) observance that the *vratin*, like a draft-ox, has to "bear" (*bhṛ-*) rather than "practise" (*car-*). See my comment on 17.27.4.

5 Note that the mythological episodes are only found in kāṇḍikās 27–35. The second part of the anuvāka (36–43) contains only teachings in the form of exegetical prose. All kāṇḍikās end with the above-quoted concluding formula.

get a hold of the *vajra* mace/lightning bolt by holding its sharp-rimmed top, its body, its handle (17.27.2), but he fails to hold it (17.30.3, 31.3, 32.3). Thus, Indra realises that he needs to acquire the necessary power to be able to wield it, and resolves to practise an observance (17.28.6). He becomes lean and emaciated (17.28.7); he resorts to various deities for help (17.28.8–25). Finally, he goes to the gods, who tell him that his observance is too "heavy" (17.34.1). Thus, he resorts to the draft-ox for help (17.34.2a), because the draft-ox is the animal who is most accustomed to hauling heavy burdens. The draft-ox offers his help in exchange for a boon (17.34.2b–e): he wishes to rest on top of the world of the ruddy sun, sixteen worlds above (17.34.3). Indra grants him the boon and steps onto his withers to acquire his power (17.35.5). The All-gods, the Maruts, Soma, and Indrāgnī join him in his observance (17.28.26). The Asuras insult him, but he remains calm (17.28.27) and, by doing so, he appropriates their merits (*iṣṭāpūrta*) and extinguishes the fire of the *vajra* (17.28.28). Finally, he picks up the thunderbolt weapon a second time (17.28.29, 31a), but this time he successfully puts it on his arms (17.28.30, 31), now firm like the two horns of the ox and like the *ṛta* and the *satya* (17.35.10–11). With the *vajra*, he shatters Vṛtra into pieces (17.33.1–2a). These pieces become the mountains that provide Indra with a foundation (*pratiṣṭhā*) (17.33.2b–4).

The text claims that whoever is initiated into the secret knowledge contained in this myth and illustrated by the exegetical sections, and accordingly performs the observance following Indra's example, is able to appropriate his detractors' merits and secure a number of benefits. Interestingly, these are both of the spiritual kind—such as foreknowledge of the *devayāna path* and access to the *svarga loka*—as well as of the worldly kind: long life, safety against calamities, a foundation (*pratiṣṭhā*) consisting of cattle, offspring, wealth, a homestead, etc. This duality is reflected in the Anaḍutsūkta, and can be understood in light of the social changes that lead to the transformation of warrior brotherhoods into ascetic movements. I will treat this topic in more detail in Appendices I and II.

In the remaining part of this introduction, I will provide a more detailed synopsis of the text, and present the reader with a survey of the anuvāka's language and style.

Synopsis

Each kāṇḍikā is summarised on the basis of the triple structure highlighted above: 1) aitiological myth; 2) exegesis; and 3) concluding statement indicating the results achievable by the initiated *vratin* who practises the observance.

<u>Kāṇḍikā 27</u>
 <u>Myth</u>: Tvaṣṭṛ founded the *vajra* to slay Vṛtra (17.27.1b). Before this statement, the text redundantly adds that Indra founded the *vajra* (17.27.1a), but this is probably a secondary addition, due to the fact that the protagonist of the underlying myth is Indra and that his goal is to slay Vṛtra.
 <u>Exegesis</u>: The three parts of the *vajra*, the sharp-rimmed top, the body of the mace, and the handle are equated with Viśvasah, Viśvānara, and Vaiśvānara respectively (17.27.2). They are this entire world (17.27.3).
 <u>Result</u>: The initiate secures (*ava-rudh-*) all the *puṇya lokas* and the [favour of] all deities (17.27.4).

<u>Kāṇḍikā 28</u>
 <u>Myth</u>: Indra picks up the *vajra* (or tries to) and intends to strike with it (17.28.1), but the *vajra* slips from his hand (17.28.2); as a lightning bolt, it falls down into the sea with a loud noise, blazing up (17.28.3), and burns the sea (17.28.4) causing the sea water to become undrinkable (17.28.5). Indra contemplates the *vajra*, claims that it is protected (*rakṣ-*) by the Asuras and the

Devas, and resolves to perform a *vrata* (17.28.6). He becomes lean and emaciated (17.28.7). He resorts to (*upa-dhav-*) a number of deities, authorities, time periods, and sages connected with the Atharvaveda (17.28.8–25). He is joined by the All-gods, the Maruts, Soma, and Indrāgni (17.28.26). The Asuras speak harshly to him, but he remains calm (*śām-ya-*, 17.28.27).

Exegesis/results: That's why he who knows the *bráhman* and extinguishes the flash of the lightning bolt, i.e. the burn from being laughed at by his detractors, milks them, i.e. extracts their merits (17.28.28).

Myth (continued): Indra finally picks up the *vajra* by means of the *r̥ks*, the *sāmans*, the *yajuses*, the Gāyatrī, and the Vāmadevya Sāman (17.28.29). The *r̥ks* and *sāmans* are his arms (17.28.30). Indra picks up the *vajra* and rests it on his arms (17.28.31).

Exegesis: Success and imperishableness are equated with offspring (17.28.32).

Result: The initiate secures (*ava-rudh-*) offspring, success, and imperishableness (17.28.33).

Kāndikā 29

Myth: Indra takes a firm standing in the Directions (17.29.1).

Result: The initiate takes a firm standing along the Directions (17.29.2).

Kāndikā 30

Myth: Indra strides (*kram-*) into the domain of Viśvāsah (17.30.1) (which had been equated with the sharp-rimmed blade of the *vajra* in 17.27.2b above). He fails to hold the *vajra* (17.30.3).

Exegesis: Viśvāsah is the sky above (17.30.2); it is all the *puṇya lokas* and deities (17.30.3).

Result: The initiate secures (*ava-rudh-*) all the *puṇya lokas* and the favour of the deities (17.30.4).

Kāndikā 31

Myth: Indra strides (*kram-*) into the domain of Viśvānara (17.31.1) (which had been equated with the body of the *vajra* mace in 17.27.2a above). He fails to hold the *vajra* (17.31.3).

Exegesis: Viśvānara is the atmosphere, the celestial ocean, the rays of the sun, and the paths of the gods (*devayāna path*).

Result: The initiate foreknows the path of the gods (*devayāna path*) and stays firmly on it.

Kāndikā 32

Myth: Indra strides (*kram-*) into the domain of Vaiśvānara (17.32.1). He fails to hold the *vajra* (17.32.3).

Exegesis: Vaiśvānara is the wind (17.32.2) that rises and stays firm along the Directions (17.32.3).

Result: The initiate's life-breaths stay firm in him.

Kāndikā 33

Myth: Indra strides (*kram-*) into the domain of Vr̥tra (17.33.1). Vr̥tra is shattered into pieces (17.33.2).

Exegesis: The pieces of Vr̥tra are the mountains (17.33.2).

Result: Wherever the initiate wishes to be successful, he is successful (17.33.3). He finds a foundation (*pratiṣṭhā*) and a base (*āyatana*) (17.33.4).

Kāndikā 34

Myth: Indra goes to the gods, who tell him that his observance is "heavy" (*guru*) (17.34.1). Therefore, Indra resorts (*upa-dhav-*) to the draft-ox for help; the draft-ox asks for a reward (17.34.2): to become one whose world is the ruddy one, i.e. the sun (*bradhnáloka*), and to rest on the top of the ruddy one (*bradhnasya viṣṭapi*) (17.34.3).

Exegesis: The ruddy one, the top of the ruddy one is the sixteenth world above (17.34.4).

Result: The initiate becomes one whose world is the ruddy one, i.e. the sun, and rests on the top of the ruddy one (17.34.5).

Kāndikā 35

Myth: Ahīnas Āśvatthi said that he would not blame one who learns about the draft-ox observance, otherwise he would lose his *iṣṭāpūrta* (17.35.1).

Exegesis: The performance of the draft-ox observance is equivalent to witchcraft (*kṛtyā*) (17.35.2): in fact, if one insults a *vratin*, the latter appropriates his *iṣṭa* and *pūrta* (17.35.3).

Myth: Indra was the first to perform the observance among the Asuras, and appropriated their *iṣṭā*, *pūrta*, and *māyā* because they insulted him (17.35.4). He strode (*kram-*) onto the withers (*vaha*) of the draft-ox and foreknew every *loka* (17.35.5).

Exegesis: Various body parts of the draft-ox are equated with sacrificial tools or natural elements (17.35.6–9); in particular, the two horns are equated with *ṛta* and *satya* because of their being firm (17.35.10–11).

Result: The initiate takes a firm standing along *ṛta* and *satya* (17.35.12).

Kāndikā 36

Exegesis: the ears of the draft-ox are equated with trust (*śraddhā*) (17.36.1). Trust is in constant motion, which is why oxen constantly flap their ears (17.36.2).

Result: The initiate becomes trustworthy (17.36.3).

Kāndikā 37

Exegesis: More body parts of the draft-ox are equated with sacrificial tools, natural elements, and deities (17.37.1–2). In particular, his intestine and rectum are equated with the *vasor dhāra* ("stream of wealth") rite (17.37.3).

Result: The initiate secures a stream of wealth, success, and imperishableness (17.37.4).

Kāndikā 38

Exegesis: Further equations between the body parts of the ox and natural elements (17.38.3) and seasons (17.38.3–5). All together, the ox is equated with the year (17.38.6).

Result: The seasons become well-disposed towards the initiate and don't cut him down (17.38.7).

Kāndikā 39

Exegesis: The *ṛks*, *sāmans*, *yajuses*, and *brāhmaṇas* are said to be inside the ox in the form of heat, breadth, greatness, and fame (17.39.1).

Result: The initiate secures the *bráhman*, the *loka*, and becomes one with the lustre of the *brāhmaṇa* (*brāhmaṇavarcasin-*) (17.39.2).

Kāndikā 40

Exegesis: A number of items found (figuratively) inside the ox are listed. Each item is said to occur a hundred times: ritual items (17.40.2), forms of success (17.40.3), their opposite failures (17.40.4), a series of eye diseases (17.40.5).

Result: The initiate is able to envelop his detractors with the darkness that proceeds from the above-mentioned eye diseases (17.40.6). With the part of the ox to the front of his navel (probably corresponding to the positive items mentioned in 40.3), the initiate can take control (*ā-viś-*) of his detractors (17.40.7). With the part behind the ox's navel (probably corresponding to the negative items mentioned in 40.4), he overcomes death and misfortune (17.40.8). He foreknows the paths of the gods (*devayāna path*) (17.40.9).

<u>Kāṇḍikā 41</u>

<u>Exegesis</u>: More items are listed as being present inside the ox by the hundreds: time periods (17.41.2–3), ritual elements (17.41.4), types of breaths (17.41.5).

<u>Result</u>: The initiate secures long life.

<u>Kāṇḍikā 42</u>

<u>Exegesis</u>: Various types of sacrifices are listed as being present inside the ox by the hundreds (17.42.2–4).

<u>Result</u>: The ox (i.e. the initiate), with all his limbs being whole, is said to have taken (*praty aṣṭhāt*, resultative aorist) a firm standing in the middle (17.42.5). He is upheld from below and made to thrive above by the *r̥ks*, *sāmans*, *yajuses*, the Gāyatrī, and the *bráhman* (17.42.6). He thrives with offspring, cattle, a homestead, and wealth (17.42.7).

<u>Kāṇḍikā 43</u>

<u>*Yajus*-style mantras</u>: The ox (the initiate?) is addressed and equated with Indra, Parameṣṭhin, and the All-gods (17.43.1 and again in 43.3). The haters are cursed, their life-breaths torn apart (17.43.2). The ox is addressed, lauded as heavenly (*svar, svarga, svargáloka*), and asked to make the reciter go to the *svarga loka* (17.43.4).

<u>Exegesis</u>: Some characteristics of the ox (?) are explained in a rather obscure way (17.43.5–6). His feet are equated with the *pratiṣṭhā*.

<u>Result</u>: The initiate takes a firm standing (*prati-sthā-*) with offspring, cattle, homestead, and wealth.

Language and style

Most of anuvāka 6 consists of *brāhmaṇa*-style prose, with the exception of 17.43.1–4, which consist of *yajus*-style prose mantras. An overview of the characteristics of AV *brāhmaṇa*-style prose can be found in Renou 1955b: 80ff. §10ff.; on the AV *yajus*-style prose, see Renou 1955b: 74–80 §4–9. Many of the traits recognised by Renou as typical are also found in our text. In *brāhmaṇa* literature, three intertwined genres, each with their own rules, can generally be identified: 1) mythical narratives; 2) dialogues and direct speech, 3) exegetical prose. As outlined above, each kāṇḍikā of our anuvāka generally contains an episode from the aitiological myth (often including some dialogue), which is then followed by a piece of explanatory prose.

The mythological, narrative portions of anuvāka 6 regularly employ the imperfect as the tense of the narration. We can use this as a main indicator for ascribing our text to the Middle Vedic, Early (Western) Saṃhitā prose level (see Witzel 1995a: 95–97, Witzel 1989: 121–130, 139ff.; Kümmel 2000: 5–6; Whitney 1892).

The syntax and style of the exegetical prose portions deserve a more detailed account; I will provide a sketch in the following pages. I will start from the observable syntactic constructions (§1–7), then move on to the use of verbs (§7) and pronouns (§9); next, I will list other typical traits of *brāhmaṇa*-style prose found in our text (§10), then focus on the *yajus*-style prose of 17.43.1–4 (§11). Finally, I will give an overview of the special grammatical and lexical peculiarities and the *hapax legomena* and rare words found in our text (§12).

1) The nominal sentence

Nominal sentences[6] are extremely frequent in *brāhmaṇa* prose because they are the preferred form in which the secret knowledge is illustrated, that is, through sacred identifications (see OLDENBERG 1917; WITZEL 1979, 1996: 169; WEZLER 1996), also called sacred homologies or sacred equations. WITZEL (1996: 169) summarises this idea as follows: "Any two objects, ideas, entities can be linked with each other by establishing connections of smaller or greater similarity (*bandhu, nidāna*) between them. Then they are not only regarded as linked but as essentially 'identical'—at least within the framework of the ritual. Whatever is done to one object or entity affects the other. Ritual is the mesocosm that links and affects the macrocosm of the universe and the gods with the microcosm of the humans and their immediate surroundings."

We find the following types of nominal sentences:

1a) With fronted predicate: [PRED, SUBJ]

We find this type in: 17.28.32b, *paśavaḥ parūṃṣi*, "[Indra's] joints [are] the domestic animals"; 17.35.9, *droṇakalaśaḥ śiraḥ, somo rājā mastiṣkaḥ ||*, [The draft-ox's] head is the *droṇakalaśa* vessel; [his] brain is King Soma"; 17.37.2, *agnir āsyaṃ vidyuj jihvā maruto dantāḥ pavamānaḥ prāṇaḥ ||*, "[The draft-ox's] mouth is Agni; [his] tongue is the bolt of lightning; [his] teeth are the Maruts; [his] breath is the wind."

In this type, the subject encodes the old, known information (the topic or theme), while the predicate encodes the new, unknown information (the focus or rheme). In the above examples (as well as in several of those given below), we can easily identify predicate and subject because the matter that is talked about is the body parts of the draft-ox. These are equated with ritual tools, elements from the natural worlds, gods, etc. Thus, the ox's body parts are the old information that is already known to the listener (i.e. they are the subject), whereas the equated objects are what the listener is about to learn; they are the new information (the predicate). The fronting of the element encoding the new information, or the important information, is a very typical rhetorical device employed by Vedic exegetical texts for mnemonic and didactic purposes.

1b) In one case, we find two predicates coordinated with *ca*: [PRED₁ *ca* PRED₂ *ca* SUBJ]:

17.38.2, *oṣadhayaś ca vanaspatayaś cobadhyam*, "[his] bolus is the herbs and the trees".

1c) With fronted predicate and *vái*: [PRED *vái*, SUBJ]

This type is found only once, in 17.28.32 (in fact, with two subjects): *prajā vai samṛddhir akṣitiḥ*, "Success, imperishableness is offspring".

In case the predicate is not a noun, but an adjective, we find similar constructions:

1d) [ADJ, SUBJ]:

17.28.2a, *daivo vajraḥ*, "Divine is the *vajra*".

1e) [ADJ *vái*, SUBJ]

17.36.2a, *carācarā vai śraddhā*, "Trust is in constant motion".

1f) When two adjectives are found, only the first is fronted [ADJ₁, SUBJ , ADJ₂]:

17.28.2c, *kṣuraḥ paviḥ *sahasrabhṛṣṭir divispṛśaḥ ||*, "Sharp is the thousand-spiked rim of

---

6 On Vedic nominal sentences in particular, the issue of Vedic word order in general, and related topics treated in the following pages, the reader may consult the following works: DELBRÜCK 1878, 1888 (esp. 15ff.); AMANO 2009; BLOCH 1906; GREN-EKLUND 1978; BREUNIS 1990; HOCK 1991, 1992, 1996, 1997a, 1997b 2000, 2014, 2016a, 2016b; JAMISON 1991, 1997; KEYDANA 2011; HALE 1996; HETTRICH 1988; MINARD 1936, 1949–56; SPEIJER 1886, 1896; MEILLET 1906; and BENVENISTE 1950.

the [*vajra*] touching the sky". The genitive *divispŕśaḥ* might also be taken as a third qualifier.

1g) The basic word order, [SUBJ, PRED], is generally rare (indeed because the texts prefer to employ rhetorical fronting), and is mostly found within long lists of equations, as a sort of variation on the preferred word order. Indeed, it occurs only once in our text, in 17.38.2ab, *svedo varṣam, ūṣmā nīhāra*, "[His] sweat is the rain; [his] (body) steam (/warm breath?) is the fog", right after two [*yá …, sá/tá- …*] equations, and followed by a [PRED, SUBJ] line and more [*yá …, sá/tá- …*] equations.

2) The [*yá-* (old info)… , *sá/tá-* (new info)…] construction

Sacred identifications can also be expressed by means of relative-correlative constructions. In fact, this is the most frequent type found in our text. Note that the relative clause always precedes the main clause. Structurally speaking, this corresponds to the basic Vedic word order, [SUBJ (old info), PRED (new info)].

We find it in 17.27.2, *yo vajraḥ sa viśvānaro; yat *tigmavīryaṃ sa viśvāṣāḍ; yad ⁺dhārambhaṇaṃ sa vaiśvānaraḥ* ||, "The *vajra*, that is Viśvānara; the [part] whose power is sharp (i.e. the blade of the *vajra*), that is Viśvāsah; the handle [of the *vajra*], that is Vaiśvānara"; 17.35.6–8, *yāv asya pūrvapādau tau pūrvapakṣau, yāv ⁺aparapādau tāv aparapakṣau*, etc., "His two front legs, they are the two first halves; his two hind legs, they are the two latter halves"; and also in 17.35.10, 17.36.1, 17.37.1, 17.38.1, 17.38.3–5, and 17.43.7.

Note that the *sá/tá-* element is endophoric and anaphoric in function (it refers back within the text to the *yá* phrase), but grammatically it agrees with what follows. This cannot always be rendered literally in English translation: e.g., 17.36.1, *yāv* (m. du.) *asya karṇau* (m. du.), *sā* (f. sg.) *śraddhā* (f. sg.) ||, "His two ears, they are trust".

3) The [*eṣá- … , yád …*] construction (*yád-figé*):

3a) Also called the *etád-yád* construction, invariable *yád* construction, or *yád-figé*, this construction is absent from the RV and first emerges in the prose of the AV (see Renou 1955b: 85; Knobl 2009c).

It is characterised by the fact that the relative *yá-* is never in grammatical agreement with what follows, but invariably appears in the neuter adverbial form *yád*. The correlative introducing the fronted main clause is always *eṣá-* (never *sá-/tá-*). This correlative here has a cataphoric function: it refers forward to the content of the *yád* phrase. The correlative *eṣá* is almost invariably followed by the particle *vái*. Our text makes no exception.

In translating, I generally follow the following "formula" (which I owe to the teachings of Werner Knobl):
[*eṣá-* (*vái*) A, *yád* B]
"This (*eṣá-*), namely (*yád*) B, is A"
According to Knobl, it is preferable to translate the *eṣá-* correlative with the English demonstrative "this", as the latter can have a cataphoric function, as opposed to the demonstrative "that", which has anaphoric function: e.g. "To be or not to be, ← *that* is the question", versus "*This* is the question →, namely to be or not to be".

This construction is particularly frequent in our text. We find it in 17.27.3 (quoted below); 17.28.30a, *etad vā idaṃ sarvaṃ yad ṛksāme*, "These, the *ṛk* verses and *sāman* chants, are everything here"; 17.30.2, *eṣā vai viśvāṣāḍ *yad evāsau* ||, "This, that very one up there (f., i.e. the sky), is Viśvāsah"; 17.31.2, *eṣa vai viśvānaro yad antarikṣaṃ samudraḥ* ||, "This, the atmosphere, the ocean, is Viśvānara"; 17.31.3, *ete vai pathayo devayānā yat sūryasya raśmayaḥ*, "These, the rays of the sun, are the paths of the gods"; 17.32.2 *eṣa vai vaiśvānaro yad ayaṃ pavamānaḥ* ||, "This, the very wind here, is Vaiśvānara". Another case is 17.37.3, on which see §7 below.

The particularly cataphoric function of *eṣá-* can be seen in 17.27.3, in which *etad* refers to the following *yad* phrase, while *etāni* refers to the three items that follow: *etad vā idaṃ sarvaṃ yad etāni trīṇi | viśvānaro vaiśvānaro viśvāṣāṭ ||*, "These, [namely] the following three—Viśvānara, Vaiśvānara, Viśvāsah—are this entire [world]". See also §9a below.

3b) Some interesting cases are the following:

17.38.6, *saṃvatsaro vā eṣa saṃbhṛto yad anaḍvān yad anaḍudvratī ||*, "This, taken all together, namely the draft-ox, the one who performs the vow of the draft-ox, is the full year."

The above looks like an expansion of the *yád*-figé construction

[*eṣá vái* A, *yád* B]

to which an adposition is added to the *eṣá* correlative (*eṣa saṃbhṛtaḥ*, "that, taken all together"), and an extra *yád* phrase is added at the end:

[*eṣá* ADP *vái* A, *yád* B₁, *yád* B₂]

The element A is then fronted, and the particle *vái* obviously emerges in Wackernagel position to mark the focus on preceding item:

[A *vái eṣá* ADP, *yád* B₁, *yád* B₂]
saṃvatsaro (A) *vā eṣa saṃbhṛto* (ADP) *yad anaḍvān* (B₁) *yad anaḍudvratī* (B₂) ||

17.34.4, *ṣoḍaśo vā ita ūrdhvo loko yad bradhno yad bradhnasya viṣṭapaḥ ||*
"It is the sixteenth world above from here, which is the ruddy one (i.e. the sun), which is the top of the ruddy one (i.e. the sun)."

This sentence could be interpreted as having a similar structure, but without the correlative *eṣá-*. The *yad* phrases cannot be simple relative clauses, because clearly *yad* does not agree with *bradhnaḥ* or *viṣṭapaḥ*, both masculine.

17.35.2, *kṛtyā vā eṣā manuṣyeṣu carati yad anaḍvān yad anaḍudvratī ||*
"This is witchcraft, when, as a draft-ox, as one practising the observance of the draft-ox, one wanders among humans."

Here we have the correlative *eṣá-*, but also a verb, *carati*. The underlying structure can be rendered as follows: "This (*eṣā*), namely (*yád*) the draft-ox, namely (*yád*) the ox *vratin*, wanders among humans as witchcraft (*kṛtyā*)", in which *eṣā* becomes feminine out of attraction to the predicate *kṛtyā*, which is then fronted. However, we can also interpret *kṛtyā vā eṣā* as an independent nominal sentence, "This is witchcraft", followed by another main clause, followed by two relative (temporal) clauses. My translation is rather free in this case.

4) The [*tasmād … (, … hí/evá …)*] explanations

Very typical of *brāhmaṇa* prose are sentences beginning with *tasmād*, "That's why...", which follow an aitiological myth or a series of sacred equations, and shift the attention of the listener from the world of the myth and the sacred to the everyday world. In fact, very frequently within these sentences, we encounter the pronoun *eṣá-* used in exophoric recognitional function. The notions illustrated by the teacher by recounting the myth are identified as the reasons why something is the way it is in the real world. These reasons can then be further remarked upon with a causal sentence introduced by the particle *hí* (in Wackernagel position), or by an emphatic statement with *evá* (also in 2nd position).

A typical example is 17.36.1–2, in which a sacred equation is made between the ears of the ox and trust (*śraddhā*) on the grounds that trust is fleeting, elusive. This is then taken as the reason why oxen in the real world flap their ears: *yāv asya karṇau sā śraddhā || carācarā vai śraddhā, tasmāt karṇau muhur varīvarjayati ||*, "His two ears, they are trust. Trust is in constant motion; that's why he (the draft-ox) constantly flaps [his] ears back and forth every moment."

Similarly, in 17.35.10: *ye asya śŕ̥nge tad ṝtaṃ satyam || dhruvaṃ vā ṝtaṃ satyaṃ, tasmād ete dhruve ||*, "[His] two horns, they are cosmic order and truth. Cosmic order and truth are firm; that is why those two (i.e. the oxen's horns in the real world) are firm." Note that the reference to the real world is clear also from the use of the pronoun *ete* with exophoric recognitional function (see §9a below).

In 17.28.7, the centre of attention shifts from the mythical world, in which Indra performs his vow, to the world of real ascetics: *so [']ṇuḥ kṛśo [']bhavat, tasmād aṇuḥ kṛśo vratacārī bhavaty, aṇur hi kṛśo bhūtvendro asurān ⁺apāvṝṅkta ||*, "He (Indra) became lean, emaciated. That's why one who practises the observance becomes lean, emaciated, for having become lean, emaciated, Indra ripped the Asuras off" (note the final causal *hí* phrase).[7]

Another case is 17.28.27–28: *so [']śāmyat || tasmād yo brahma *vedotāpasmitaṃ śamayati dohayata *evainān ||*, "He (Indra) remained calm. That's why [the real ascetic] who knows the *bráhman* and extinguishes the burning shame from the laughter (of his detractors), he actually milks them (i.e. extracts their merits from them)" (note the final emphatic statement with *evá*).

5) The *yá evam vid-* constructions

Recognised by Rᴇɴᴏᴜ (1955b: 82–83) as one of the most typical traits of the AV *brāhmaṇa*-style prose, this formula can appear in various forms; with a perfect participle (*yá eváṃ vidvā́n* followed by a verb), as a full sentence (*yá eváṃ véda*), or in the variant *yó bráhma véda* (typical of poetry; cf. ŚS 4.11.11c ~ PS 3.25.8c, *bráhma yó véda,* but also found in our text at 17.28.28). Another poetic equivalent is the use of the pres. ptc. *vijānant-* (cf. the Anaḍutsūkta at ŚS 4.11.3d ~ PS 3.25.5d; Rᴇɴᴏᴜ 1955b: 83 fn. 1).

The person "who knows so" is of course the initiate who has learned about the secret knowledge illustrated by the teacher. In fact, this formula regularly occurs in our text at the end of a section, in the conclusive statements that illustrate the results that the initiate can achieve, and the benefits that he can secure (*ava-rudh-*) by means of the knowledge he has acquired, if he practises the observance based on such knowledge.

The attested constructions are the following:

5a) With fronted main verb, [vʙᴹᴬᴵᴺ … , *yá evaṃ vidvā́n* … vʙˢᵁᴮ]

In the *yá eváṃ vidvā́n* statements, the *yá* phrase normally comes second, contrary to the normal order according to which the relative clause precedes the main clause. This is because here it is the main clause that provides the important new information (the achieved results and benefits), and for this reason it is fronted; note that the main clause is never introduced by any correlative. Accordingly, the verb of the main sentence is also normally placed in first position within the fronted main clause, unless it is a non-salient verb like *bhavati* (Rᴇɴᴏᴜ 1955b: 82). In general, this seems to be the most frequent type, as it corresponds to the tendency to front the new and important information. However, in our text, it is fairly rare in comparison with the type in which the verb holds its normal position at the end of the main clause (see §5c below):

17.42.7, *prathate prajayā paśubhir gṛhair dhanena, ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti) ||*, "He thrives with offspring, with cattle, with a homestead, with wealth, he who, (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox)";

17.32.4, *dhriyante asmin prāṇā ya …*, "The life-breaths stay firm in him, who …".

17.43.7, *prati *tiṣṭhati prajayā paśubhir gṛhair dhanena, ya …*, "He takes a firm standing with offspring, with cattle, with a homestead, with wealth, he who …".

See also §5d below.

---

7 One more independent causal *hí* phrase is found in 17.35.4.

5b) With fronted preverb only, [PREVB … VB^{MAIN}, *yá evaṃ vidvān* … VB^{SUB}]

In the previous example, both preverb (*prati*) and main verb (*tiṣṭhati*) were placed in first position. Very frequently, however, only the preverb is fronted, while the main verb remains in final position within the main clause:

17.40.9, <u>*pra* patho</u> ⁺*devayānāñ* <u>*jānāti*</u> *ya evaṃ vidvān…*, "He foreknows the paths of the gods, he who, being initiated, …" See also §5d below.

5c) Without fronting, [… VB^{MAIN}, *yá evaṃ vidvān* … VB^{SUB}]:

This is actually the most frequent type in our anuvāka. Note that even if the verb is not fronted, in most cases an element is in placed in first position, in focus, and is highlighted by the particle *evá*:

e.g. 17.33.4, *asyām* <u>*eva*</u> *pratiṣṭhām āyatanaṃ* <u>*vindate*</u> *ya evaṃ vidvān* …, "On this very one (i.e. the earth), he finds a foundation, a base, he who, being initiated …" Cf. 17.29.2.

An object might be in focus:

17.28.33, *prajām eva samṛddhim akṣitim ava rundhe ya* …, "He secures truly offspring, [and hence] success, imperishableness, he who …" Cf. 17.37.4, 17.35.12.

Indeed, we frequently find more than one object. When this is the case, the second object can appear after the main verb:

17.27.4, *sarvān eva *puṇyām̐l lokān ava rundhe sarvāś ca devatā ya* …, "He secures truly all the pleasant places and [the favour of] all the deities, he who ..." Cf. 17.30.4.

5d) Cases with more than one main clause:

Frequently, we find that the *yá eváṃ vidvā́n* phrase is preceded by more than one main clause.

Two main clauses, *evá* particle in the first clause, no fronting (the second verb is *bhavati*):

17.39.2, *brahma caiva lokaṃ cāva rundhe, brāhmaṇavarcasī bhavati, ya* …, "He secures both the *bráhman* and the world, he becomes one with the lustre of the *brāhmaṇa*, he who …"

Two main clauses, no *evá* and no fronting (the first verb is *bhavati*):

17.34.5, *bradhnaloko bhavati bradhnasya viṣṭapi śrayate ya* …, "He becomes one whose world is the ruddy one (i.e. the sun), he rests on the top of the ruddy one (i.e. on the sun), he who …".

Three main clauses, no fronting, no *evá*:

17.41.6, *jyog jīvati, sarvam āyur eti, na purā jarasaḥ pra mīyate ya* … "He lives for a long time, he enjoys a whole lifespan, he does not die prematurely, he who ..." (note that the negation *na* is fronted within its clause).

Two main clauses, the first with verb in final position; the second clause has a fronted preverb:

17.31.4, *pathiṣu devayāneṣu dhriyate, pra patho* ⁺*devayānāñ jānāti ya* …, "He stays firmly on the paths of the gods, he foreknows the paths of the gods, he who …"

Two main clauses, only the first with fronted verb (the second verb is *bhavati*):

17.36.3, *śraddadhate [']smai śraddhānīyo bhavati ya* …, "[People] trust him, he becomes trustworthy, he who ..."

Three main clauses, only the first with fronted verb:

17.38.7, *kalpante asmā ṛtavo, na rtuṣv ā vṛścata, ṛtūnāṃ priyo bhavati ya* …, "The seasons are well-disposed towards him, he is not cut down by the seasons, he becomes dear to the seasons, he who …"

5e) The collocation *evám vidvás*- is also found in:

17.35.3, *ya evaṃ viduṣo [']sādhu kīrtayatīṣṭam evāsya pūrtaṃ {māyā(ṃ)} saṃvṛkte* ‖, "He who speaks ill of the initiated one: his merit accumulated with worship and that accumulated with gifts {the magical power} are both completely wrested away";

17.40.6, *ya evaṃ viduṣo [']sādhu kīrtayaty etair evainaṃ tamobhiḥ prorṇoti* ||, "He envelops with those very darknesses him who speaks ill of the initiated one."

6) Relative clauses

I have already treated the [*yá* …, *sá/tá-* …] identifications in §2 above. Besides this nominal type, we also find relative clauses followed by a correlative clause containing a verb. For instance, the following two [*yá-* … , *téna* … vʙ] constructions:

17.40.7, *yad asya prācīnaṃ nābhyās tena dviṣantam ā viśati* ||, "The part [of his belly] to the front of his (the draft-ox's) navel, with that he (the *vratin*) takes control of [his] hater";

17.40.8, *atha yad asya pratīcīnaṃ nābhyās tena mṛtyuṃ nāṣṭrām avartiṃ tarati* ||, "Moreover, the part [of his belly] to the back of his (the draft-ox's) navel, with that he (the *vratin*) overcomes death, calamity, misfortune".

In 17.43.5–6, we find a series of [*yéna* …, *téna* …] constructions, some with verbs (in the relative clause), some without:

17.43.5–6, *yenāsya vahas tena yajño, yena vahati tena lokaḥ || yenainaṃ* [**K**: *yenedaṃ*] *paśyati tena viśvo, yenainaṃ* [**K**: *yenedaṃ*] *gamayati tena sarvaḥ* ||, "By the fact that he has withers, he is the ritual worship; by the fact that he hauls, he is the world. By the fact that he looks at him (**K**: By the fact that now he looks), he is everything; by the fact that he makes him go (**K**: by the fact that now he makes go), he is the whole."

7) Embedded subordinate clauses

Consider 17.37.3, *eṣā vai ⁺sā yām āhur vasor dhāreti yad ⁺āntragudam* ||, "This, the intestine and the rectum, is what they call the 'stream of wealth'."

Here we find a quotation (*vasor dhāra*) embedded inside a relative clause (*yām āhur … iti*), in turn embedded in a *yád-figé* construction (*eṣā vai sā, yad āntragudam*).

A case of direct speech embedded inside a relative-correlative construction is found in 17.33.3, *sa yatra hṛdā manasā kāmayata iha me rādhyate tad asmai rādhyate* ||, "Whenever(/wherever) he wishes with his heart and mind 'I am successful here!', then(/there) he is successful." Note that here the quotation is not enclosed by an *iti* particle.

In 17.39.1, we find a relative clause embedded inside what seems to be a nominal sentence (a sacred identification) with multiple subjects and multiple (non-fronted) predicates: *tapaś ca varaś ca mahaś ca yaśaś ca* [*yad asminn ⁺antar*] *ṛcaḥ sāmāni yajūṃṣi brāhmaṇam* ||, "The heat and breadth and greatness and fame, which are inside of him (the ox), are the verses, the chants, the ritual injunctions, the formulaic spells."

8) The use of verbal tenses

8a) I have already mentioned the use of the imperfect as a tense of narration (see above). Note also the imperfect *aśṛṇot* in direct speech in 17.35.1b.

8b) We find several cases of verbal nouns used as verbal predicates: *dagdhaḥ* (17.28.5b), *saṃvṛkte* (17.35.3), *saṃvṛktā* (17.35.4b), *uttabhitaḥ*, and *prathitaḥ* (17.42.6). On this topic, see Rᴇɴᴏᴜ 1955b: 86 and my comment on 17.35.3–4.

8c) We find several subjunctives, but these are only 1st person sg. forms: *carāṇi* (17.28.6a), *asāni* (17.34.3a), *śrayā* (17.34.3b), *nindāni*, and *vi bhavāni* (17.35.1b).

8d) We find one resultative aorist in 17.43.5 (*praty aṣṭhāt*). See my comment *ad loc.*

8e) A present participle in construction with a form of *sthā*- as auxiliary to express continuous action is found in 17.28.3 (on this construction, see WG p.394f §1074–1075).

8f) We find an intensive *varīvarjayati* from the root *vṛj*- in 17.36.2b.

9) Pronouns

9a) The observable usages of *etád* (cf. KNOBL 2009c, 2018; KÜMMEL 2014) are the following:
    1. As correlative in the [*eṣá*- …, *yád* …] construction. In this case I translate with "this". See §3 above.
    2. With cataphoric (endophoric) function ('the following') in 17.27.3.
    3. With anaphoric (endophoric) function ('the above-mentioned') in 17.28.30b, 17.30.3, 17.32.3, and 17.40.6. In this case I translate with "that".
    4. Neuter adverbial ("there") in 17.28.3.
    5. As medial deictic, referring to something close or belonging to the listener ("that of yours") in 17.34.1.
    6. With exophoric recognitional function ('that well-known'): 17.35.11; probably also 17.42.5 (referring to the *vratin*/ox).

9b) The formulaic (and non-formulaic) usages of other demonstratives:
    1. The loc. sg. f. *asyām*, 'on this one here', of the proximal deictic *ayám/īyám/idám* with the formulaic meaning 'on the earth' is found in 17.33.4
    2. The proximal deictic is also found in the phrase *ayaṃ pavamānaḥ*, 'this wind here'.
    3. The neuter of the proximal deictic is also found in the formula *idaṃ sarvaṃ*, 'this whole (world)/everything here' in 17.27.3 and 17.28.30.
    4. In 17.43.6a and b, the **K** var. lectio *idaṃ* might be an adverb "now/here".
    5. The feminine distal deictic *asau* with the formulaic meaning 'that one up there (i.e. the sky)' is found in 17.30.2.
    6. The masculine of the distal deictic is used in the common non-formulaic meaning in 17.28.6 (*asau vajro*, "That one over there is the *vajra*").

9c) We frequently find the enclitic *enam*: 17.35.1b, 17.35.4b, 17.40.6, and 17.43.6a and b; in 17.28.28, we find the acc. pl. **enān*.
    The numerous occurrences of the (most likely) enclitic forms of *ayam* (synchronically belonging together with the pronoun *enam*) should be mentioned here: *asya* in 17.28.2, 17.35.3, 6a, 7a, 8a, 10, 17.36.1, 17.37.1, 17.38.1, 3, 4, 5, 17.40.7, 8, and 17.43.5, 7; *asmai* in 17.33.4, 17.36.3, and 17.38.7; *asmin* in 17.32.4, 17.39.1, 17.40.1, 17.41.1, and 17.42.1.

9d) Note the [*tắd* … , *yắd* …] construction in 17.35.1b. See BHATTACHARYA 2004. Note that this construction is found in direct speech.

10) Other typical AV *brāhmana*-style prose traits:

I list here a number of traits, most of which have been noted by RENOU (1955b) as typical of the AV

brāhmaṇa-style prose, that we find also in our text:

10a) The use of the extraclausal connective *átha* to introduce a new chapter or topic: 17.35.1, 17.40.1, 17.41.1, 17.41.2. On extraclausal connectives, see Hock 1997b.

10b) The frequent use of the focus particle *vái*: 17.23.3, 17.28.30a, 17.28.32a, 17.30.2, 3, 17.31.2, 3, 17.32.2, 3, 17.33,2, 17.34.4, 17.35.2, 17.35.4a, 17.35.11a, 17.36.2a, 17.37.3, 17.38.6. This particle is rather rare in the RV, where it is almost completely restricted to the collocation *vā́ u*, but it is already frequent in the verses of the AV; it then becomes ubiquitous in later prose (see Renou 1955b: 81 fn. 3).

10c) The formulaic use of the adverb *ágre*, 'in illo tempore', in mythical narratives: 17.35.4a.

10d) The formulaic use of the lexeme *ava-rudh-*, 'to secure (a benefit/result by practising an observance or performing a ritual)'. In our text, it is found in the main clause of the concluding statements at the end of five kāṇḍikās: 17.24.4, 17.28.33, 17.30.4, 17.37.4, and 17.39.2.

10e) The *-anī́ya* formations (in conjunction with the verb *bhavati*). These are an innovation of AV prose (Renou 1955b: 84). A few such forms are known from a single AV text, ŚS 8.10: *upajīvanī́ya-* in ŚS 8.10.22–29 (~ PS 16.135.1–8) and *āmantraṇī́ya-* in ŚS 8.10.7 (~ PS 16.133.7). Cf. *dakṣiṇī́ya* in ŚS 8.10.4. The PS also has *ramaṇīya-* in PS 11.16.12 (*ramaṇīyo bhavati*) and *mārjanīya-* in PS 20.39.3a. Note that the name of the fire altar *āhavanī́ya-* is also one such formation (AV+: ŚS 8.10.3 ~ PS 16.133.4, ŚS 9.6.30 ~ PS 16.113.7, 15.6.14-15 ~ PS 18.32.7, PS 11.16.13). In our text, PS 17.36.3 features the form *śraddhānī́ya-*, 'to be trusted', in construction with the verb *bhavati*: *śraddhānī́yo bhavati*, "he becomes trustworthy".

10f) The absolutive is also increasingly used in AV prose. We find *sampadya* in 17.28.6, *bhūtvā* in 17.28.7c, and possibly +*vittvā* in 17.28.27b, but the reading is uncertain.

10g) Direct speech enclosed by *iti*. We find it in 17.28.1d, 17.28.26, 17.28.27 (the reading is uncertain but the presence of *iti* is very probable), 17.34.2cd, 17.34.3b, 17.35.1b, and 17.37.3. It is possibly also in 17.34.1c, but the reading is uncertain. Note that, in one case, a quotation of direct speech is reported without the particle *iti*: 17.33.3, *sa yatra hṛdā manasā kāmayata iha me rādhyate tad asmai rādhyate* ||, "Whenever(/wherever) he wishes with his heart and mind 'I am successful here!', then(/there) he is successful."[8]

10h) Multiple preverbs. We find *anu-ava-drav-* only in 17.28.26 and *anu-prati-sthā-* in 17.29.2 and 17.35.12, but in either case, *anu* can be taken as a postposition in adnominal use.

10i) The use of *pávamāna* with the meaning 'wind' and not referring to soma: 17.32.2, 17.37.2.

10j) The couple *iṣṭám* and *pūrtám*: 17.35.3–4. Note that in his speech (17.35.1), Ahīnas Āśvatthi uses the compound *iṣṭāpūrta-* instead.

10k) The increasing use of *sárva* in the sense of 'all, every' (=*víśva*) (already found in RV), besides the older meaning 'entire, whole'.
    The meaning 'all, every' is found in 17.27.4, *sarvān eva *puṇyām̐l lokān ava rundhe sarvāś ca devatā ya ...*, "He secures truly all the pleasant places and [the favour of] all the deities"; in

---

8 Note that **K** reads *kāmayeti*, which can possibly indicate that in **K** the *iti* particle was intended as preceding the quotation.

17.30.3–4, *ete vai sarve puṇyā lokāḥ sarvāś ca devatāḥ* [...] *sarvān eva ⁺puṇyāṃl lokān ava rundhe sarvāś ca devatā ya* …, "That is all the pleasant places and all the deities. [...] He secures truly all the pleasant places and [the favour of] all the deities, he who …"; in 17.32.3, *eṣa vai sarvā anu prajāto dhriyate*, "That (the wind) having risen (lit. having been born) stays firm along all [the Directions]"; in 17.35.5b, *sarvāṃl lokān prājānāt ||*, "He foreknew the way to every place"; and in the compound *sarvapṛṣṭha-*, "a ritual provided with all the Pṛṣṭha Sāmans" (17.42.3).

The meaning 'entire, whole' is found in the formula *idaṃ sarvam*, "this whole world here / everything here" (17.27.3, 17.28.30); in 17.41.6, *sarvam āyur eti*, "he enjoys a whole lifespan"; in the compounds *sarvāṅga-*, 'with whole limbs', *sarvātman-*, 'with a whole trunk', *sarvaparus-*, 'with whole joints', *sarvapad-*, 'with whole feet' in 17.42.5; and in 17.43.6b, *yenainaṃ* [**K**: *yenedaṃ*] *gamayati tena sarvaḥ ||*, "By the fact that he makes him go (**K**: by the fact that now he makes go), he is the whole." Note that the latter is in opposition to *viśva-* in 17.43.6a: *yenainaṃ* [**K**: *yenedaṃ*] *paśyati tena viśvo*, "By the fact that he looks at him (**K**: By the fact that now he looks), he is everything".

10l) References to Prajāpati and Parameṣṭhin: 17.28.8–9, 17.43.3, 17.43.1 (only Parameṣṭhin).

10m) Special names for time periods: *ārtava-* (17.28.19, 17.41.2) and the sequence *idāvatsara-*, *anuvatsara-*, *parivatsara-*, *saṃvatsara-* (17.41.3).

11) The *yajus*-style prose portion

The AV *yajuṣes* are prose mantras that, like the YV prose mantras (and unlike the didactic oriented *brāhmaṇa*-style prose portions), are meant to be recited during ritual performances. We find this style only in 17.43.1–4. Even in such a short passage, we can identify several of the typical traits that we have already encountered in anuvāka 5 (see my introduction to anuvāka 5 and the overview of *yajus*-style prose in Renou [1955b: 74–80 §4–9]).

11a) 2nd person verbal forms: the present *asi* (once in 17.43.1, four times in 17.43.3, three times in 17.43.4); the imperatives *saṃ vṛha, vi vṛha* (17.43.2), and *gamaya* (17.43.4).

11b) The formula *yo [']smān dveṣṭi yaṃ* (**K**: *ca*) *vayaṃ dviṣmas* (note the variant with *ca* in **K**) in 17.43.2.

11c) The persistent repetitions, such as that of the verb *asi* in 17.43.1, 3, and 4. The repetition with variation in *indro balenāsi* (17.43.1), *indro [']si_indrasya rūpam asi* (17.43.3). The repetition with word play on *svar* in 17.43.3: *svar asi, svargo [']si, svargaloko [']si, svargaṃ mā lokaṃ gamaya ||*, "You are the heaven, you are heavenly, you are one whose world is the heaven, make me go to the heavenly world." Note also that the length of the phrases gradually increases (Behaghel's law of increasing terms).

This tendency to use repetitions is rooted in the oral and magical character of the texts, and carries over into the *brāhmaṇa* portions as well.

It is particularly visible in kāṇḍīkās 40, 41, and 42, where we find long lists with the repetition of the word *śatam*: *śatam* X *śatam* Y *śatam* Z etc., "A hundred Xs, a hundred Ys, a hundred Zs, etc."

The particular tendency of using multiple expressions to mean the same thing is also visible:

17.38.7, *kalpante asmā ṛtavo, na ṛtuṣv ā vṛścata, ṛtūnāṃ priyo bhavati, ya* …, "The seasons are well-disposed towards him, he is not cut down by the seasons, he becomes dear to the seasons, he who..."

17.41.6, *jyog jīvati, sarvam āyur eti, na purā jarasaḥ pra mīyate, ya* …, "He lives for a long

time, he enjoys a whole lifespan, he does not die prematurely, he who …"

The following line perhaps even betrays a tendency towards introducing variation within the repetition simply for the sake of embellishing the prose:

17.28.1, *tam ādatta tam ud aiṅgayat tam upāmimīta*, "He (Indra) took it (the *vajra*), he brandished it, he weighed it out".

12) Grammatical and lexical peculiarities, *hapax legomena*, and rare words found in the text

12a) The unique lexeme *vrataṃ bhṛ*-, most likely an intentional metaphor. See my comment on 17.27.4.

12b) The compound **tigmavīryam* (17.27.2b) is otherwise only attested from the Mbh onwards.

12c) The "*wiederholende*" onomatopoeia *hariharā bhū*- in 17.28.3.

12d) The hapax *durgir*- (**durgīr*) in 17.28.5a.

12e) The lexeme (*anu*)-*ava-drav*- in 17.28.26a.

12f) The verbal noun *apasmita*- (17.28.28a, **apasmitaṃ*). Elsewhere found only in PS 8.8.5.

12g) The impersonal use of the verb *rādh*- in 17.33.3. See my comment *ad loc*.

12h) The late nom. pl. *pathayaḥ* in 17.31.3 (next to the older acc. pl. *pathaḥ* in 17.31.4) from *path*-, 'path'.

12i) The collocation *ye … akṣyau* in 17.35.7, with the masculine-looking form *akṣyau* (dual) treated as neuter (the normal gender of the word for 'eye') and accompanied by the relative *ye* (neuter dual).

12j) The word *pratīvāha*-, 'reward, counter-gift', which is only found here and in two other occurrences belonging to texts of the AV tradition: GB 1.1.23i and KauśS 10.5[79]29.

12k) The typical "boon" dialogue at 17.34.2 with the *figura etymologica varaṃ vṛṇīṣveti, sa varam avṛṇīta ||*, "Choose a boon! He chose a boon." This type of dialogue, so typical of later texts, is not found elsewhere in the AV.

12l) The rare Bahuvrīhi compound *bradhnáloka*-, 'one whose world is the ruddy one (the sun)', in 17.34.3, 5, otherwise found only in ŚS 11.3.50–51.

12m) The nom. sg. m. *viṣṭapaḥ* from a thematic stem *viṣṭápa*- (next to a locative *viṣṭapi* from the regular athematic feminine *viṣṭáp*-) in 17.34.4.

12n) The rare lexeme *kram*- (mid.) plus locative. See my comment on 17.30.

12o) The rare word *carācara*-, 'constantly moving', in 17.36.2a. The intensive interpretation is suggested by neighbouring presence of the intensive *varīvarjayai* in 17.36.2b.

12p) The *anī́ya*-formation *śraddhānīya*- in 17.36.3. See §10e above.

12q) The rare Dvandva compound *āntraguda-* in 17.37.4.

12r) The rare compound *brāhmaṇavarcasin* in 17.38.2 (otherwise found only in the PS Vrātyakāṇḍa, at 18.36.1m).

12s) The obscure terms for eye diseases at 17.40.5.

12t) It may be worth noting that text knows the following rituals: the *vasor dhāra* rite (17.37.3–4), the Sāhna, Trirātra, Atirātra, Agniṣṭoma, Dvādaśāha, Ṣoḍaśina, Sarvapr̥ṣṭa, Rājasūya, Vājapeya, Kāmapra, and Sattrāyaṇa (all mentioned in 17.42.2–4).

12u) The Odisha mss. always spell *devayāna* with the akṣara *ya* [dʒa] (normally used word initially), as they would do with two separate words. For a single word, we would expect the akṣara *ẏa* [ja] (normally used word-internally between vowels). One mss. (**Ji₄**) regularly uses the spelling *devajāna* with *ja* [dʒa].

Kāṇḍikā 27

17.27.1

a   indro vajram asiñcad vṛtrāya hantave |
b   tvaṣṭā vajram asiñcad vṛtrāya hantave ||

Indra founded the *vajra* to slay Vṛtra.
Tvaṣṭar founded the *vajra* to slay Vṛtra.

asiñcad] **[Ma] [Mā] Ji₄ V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71** asiñca **JM₃** asiñcata **K**   • vṛtrāya] vṛtrāẏa **[Ma]**
[Mā] Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃ vṛtrā **Ji₄** vṛtrā(i→*s.s.*)ẏa **V122** vṛttrāya **K**   • hantave |] **K** hantave **[Ma]**
[Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] JM3 V71 hantave || **Ji₄**   • asiñcad vṛtrāya] asiñcadvṛtrāẏa **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c**
[Mā] V71 JM₃ asiñcadvṛtrā(i→*s.s.*)ẏa **V122** asiñcata vṛttrāya **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** |
V71 K ||[1] **Ji4** |[1] **V122**

     ab. According to the myth, the creator of the *vajra* is normally Tvaṣṭṛ. For instance, RV 1.32.2, belonging to the most famous Indra hymn, reads: *áhann áhim párvate śiśriyāṇáṃ, tváṣṭāsmai vájraṃ svaryàṃ tatakṣa*, "He [i.e. Indra] smashed the serpent resting on the mountain— for him Tvaṣṭar had fashioned the resounding [/sunlike] mace" (J-B). On the contrary, the statement in line **a**, attributing the creation of the *vajra* to Indra, is unusual as well as inconsistent with the rest of our text, which seems to portray Indra's attempt at obtaining the *vajra*. It seems to me that line **b** is the correct narrative prelude, while line **a** seems to be a secondary addition that serves the purpose of highlighting the most important details of the narrative illustrating the *anaḍudvrata*: namely that the protagonist is Indra, the first to practise the observance (17.35.4), and that the goal of Indra's observance is not simply to acquire the *vajra*, but to slay Vṛtra with it. This supports the idea that the episodes narrated in our text do not follow a chronological order (see my introduction above), and that the episode of the slaying of Vṛtra (17.33) is the final one (see my comment on 17.30 below).
     On the *vajra*, see Rau 1973: 37f., Schlerath 1975, and Falk 1994a.
     The verbal root *sic-*, lit. 'to pour out', indicates here the process of founding or casting by pouring molten metal into a mould. According to Rau (1973: 37–38 fn. 44, 45, 46 with sources), three roots describe the process of fashioning the *vajra*: *sic-*, 'to cast, found, mould' ('gießen'), *takṣ-*. 'to hammer, temper' ('hämmern, härten'), and *śi-* (or *saṃ-śi-*), 'whet, sharpen' ('wetzen').
     The hendiadyc construction with double dative (dative of a noun plus dative of an infinitive) is old, and is represented especially by this specific formula, *vṛtrā́ya hántave*, 'for Vṛtra, for the killing, i.e. for the killing of Vṛtra' (RV 3.37.5a, 6c, 8.12.22a, 8.93.7b, 9.61.22b, 10.116.1b; in ŚS found only in book 20), but is not limited to it (cf. e.g. *mṛgā́ya hántave* in RV 5.34.2 or the refrain *asmai viṣāya hantave* in PS 3.9). See Delbrück 1988: 98–99 (§54), 149 (§103), and 415 (§228).

17.27.2

a	yo vajraḥ sa viśvānaro
b	yat *tigmavīryaṃ sa viśvāṣāḍ
c	yad ⁺dhārambhaṇaṃ sa vaiśvānaraḥ ‖

The *vajra*, that is Viśvānara;
the [part] whose power is sharp (i.e. the blade of the *vajra*), that is Viśvāsaḥ;
the handle [of the *vajra*], that is Vaiśvānara.

yo] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** jo **Ji₄**	• vajraḥ] **O** vajra **K**	• sa viśvānaro] **[Ma]**
[Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃ ma viśvānaro **Ji₄** se viśvānaro **Pa_c** sa vaiśvānaro **K**	yat *tigmavīryaṃ]
yattegmavīryaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** yattegmavīrya **Pa_c** yatte agnīrvīrasaṃ **K**	•
viśvāṣāḍ] **Ja** viśvāṣāt **Ma Ji₄ V122 Pa_c Mā V71 JM₃ K**	• yad ⁺dhārambhaṇaṃ] yaddhāramaṇaṃ
K yanta ārambhaṇaṃ **Ma Ja V122 Mā V71 JM₃** yam̐ntā āra{ṇa}mbhaṇaṃ **Ji₄** yanta arambhaṇaṃ
Pa_c	• sa] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** [.] **V71** *om.* **Ji₄**	• ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71**
JM₃ | **V122 K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *yattegmavīryaṃ* in **b** and *⁺yaddhārambhaṇaṃ* in **c**.
        Bhattacharya refrains from emending pāda **b**, but *tegmavīryaṃ* is clearly an unacceptable
reading, as there is no such stem as ****tegman-**. In his comment, he proposes *yat te 'gnirvīryaṃ⁺*
based on the reading of **K**. Content-wise, reference to Agni is unproblematic here, as the
vajra/lightning bolt is regarded as a form of fire. However, I fail to understand this proposal syntax-
wise (a compound with the first member in the nominative?). Perhaps *yat te 'gnivīryaṃ⁺* would be a
conceivable emendation, although the compound *agnivīrya-* is only attested in lexicographers.
However, it is unclear to me what the pronoun *te* would refer to, and also why it would be absent
from pāda **a** (I shall get to pāda **c** in a moment). Perhaps *te* could refer to the *vajra* itself, which
would explain why it is absent from **a**. On the sole basis of **K**, Raghu Vira proposed *yat te 'gner
vīryaṃ*. Here the genitive *agner* could function as an adposition of *te*, in which case we could
translate **bc** as: "that power of yours, of Agni, that is Viśvāsaḥ". An even more preferable
emendation would be *yat te *[']gne vīryaṃ*, "That power of yours, O Agni, …" (cf. TS 3.5.3.2,
quoted below). It would also be possible to explain **O** *gm* as a scribal error for *gn* (although then we
would have to assume the loss of the akṣara *e*). In pāda **c**, Bhattacharya edits *⁺yaddhārambhaṇaṃ*,
following **K**, but we may note that **O** *yanta ārambhaṇaṃ* also points to the presence of the pronoun
te, as *yanta* could be a corruption of *yat ta* (= *yat te*, in sandhi). This second *te* would also refer to
Agni. It does not seem far-fetched to consider **K** *ddhā* as a possible scribal error for *nta* (although
we need to assume that it was then merged in double sandhi with the following *ā-*), as the two
akṣaras are similar in the Śāradā script (though Kᴵᴹ, *Schreib.*, does not record any such case), and
thus reconstruct our lines as follows. In case *te* refers to the *vajra*:
        yo vajraḥ sa viśvānaro
        yat te [']gnivīryaṃ⁺ sa viśvāṣāḍ
        *yat *ta ārambhaṇaṃ sa vaiśvānaraḥ ‖
        "The *vajra*, that is Viśvānara;
        that fire power of yours [O *vajra*], that is Viśvāsaḥ;
        that handle of yours [O *vajra*], that is Vaiśvānara."
In case *te* refers to Agni:
        yo vajraḥ sa viśvānaro
        *yat te *[']gner vīryaṃ/yat te *[']gne vīryaṃ*
        *yat *ta ārambhaṇaṃ sa vaiśvānaraḥ ‖
        "The *vajra*, that is Viśvānara;
        that power of yours, of Agni/that power of yours, O Agni, that is Viśvāsaḥ;

that handle of yours [O Agni], that is Vaiśvānara."

However, there is, I think, a very strong argument against any solution involving the pronoun *te*, namely the fact that what we have here is a typical piece of *brāhmaṇa* exegesis in which some secret knowledge is illustrated by means of sacred equations (*ya-* … , *sa/ta-* …). The *brāhmaṇa* character of this *kāṇḍikā* can clearly be seen from the preceding bit of mythical narration in the imperfect tense (17.27.1), as well as from how the *kāṇḍikā* continues with a typical [*eṣá-* ..., *yad* …] construction (17.27.3), and concludes with a *yad evaṃ vidvān* phrase (17.27.4). In general, the whole character of our anuvāka is that of a *brāhmaṇa* exegesis.[9] This kind of prose is composed for didactic purposes, and is not meant to be recited during a ritual. For this reason it would be extremely unusual to find 2nd person pronouns or vocatives addressing a deity directly. We of course do find comparable bits of prose, for instance TS 3.5.3.2: *yát te agne téjas ténāháṃ tejasvī́ bhūyāsaṃ yát te agne várcas ténāháṃ vacasvī́ bhūyāsaṃ yát te agne háras ténāháṃ harasvī́ bhūyāsam* ‖ "With the brilliance that is thine, O Agni, may I become brilliant; with the radiance that is thine, O Angi, may I become radiant; with the splendour that is thine, O Agni, may I become resplendent" (Keith). However, this is a *yajus*, a portion of *yajus*-style prose, which is specifically meant to be recited as such during a ritual performance in which Agni is addressed directly. This cannot be the case for our text. We expect the addressee of these lines to be the novice who is learning about the *vrata*. Therefore, I believe that we need to find a different solution.

My contention is that these lines refer to the *vajra* as a weapon, with a handle (*ārambhaṇa* in pāda **c**) and a blade (in pāda **b**). In fact, I shall argue in favour of another alternative suggested by Bhattacharya in his commentary, one that, I believe, has more chance of being correct, namely to simply emend the corrupted portion of pāda **b** to **tigmavīryaṃ*. This emendation is tentative, as the compound *tigmavīrya-* is only attested three times in the Mbh: namely in Mbh 1.18.11, where *tigmavīryaviṣā* (Nom. pl.) ‘of virulent poison’ is said of snakes, and in Mbh 1.46.2c, where the *ṛṣi* Śṛṅgin is described as *mahātejās tigmavīryo 'tikopanaḥ* before he curses King Parikṣit to die from the bite of the serpent Takṣaka. That this compound, however, does not only directly or indirectly refer to the sharpness of a poisonous bite is clear from a third occurrence, Mbh 3.168.5a, which speaks of *dhārās tigmavīryāḥ*, ‘violent streams of water’. The presence of this late compound in our text might not be implausible, given the many elements that point to a late date for our text.

It is, however, entirely plausible that this compound could have been created in Vedic times. The RV features several compounds with *tigmá-* as first member that refer to Agni: *tigmájambha-*, ‘sharp-fanged’ (RV 1.79.6c, 4.5.4a to Agni Vaiśvānara, 4.15.5c, 8.19.22a, 8.44.27b); *tigmábhṛṣṭi-*, ‘sharp-pointed’ (RV 4.5.3a); *tigmáśṛṅga-*, ‘sharp-horned’ (RV 6.16.39b to Agni as a bull, *váṃsaga-*)[10]; *tigmáśocis-*, ‘sharp-flamed’ (RV 1.79.10a; PS 16.8.6b [the parallel in ŚS 8.3.25a has *tigmáheti-*]); *tigmáheti-*, ‘having sharp missile weapons’ (RV 4.4.4b, 6.74.4a [~ ŚS 5.6.5b, 6b, 7bc ~ PS 1.109.2a, 6.11.7a ~ MS 4.11.2:165.13]; ŚS 8.3.25a); *tigmā́nīka-*, ‘of sharp face’ (RV 1.95.2c ~ PS 8.14.2c); and *tigmā́yudha-*, ‘having sharp weapons’ (RV 2.30.3d, 6.74.4a, 7.46.1d, 9.90.3c). All the compounds of this type in RV and AV refer to Agni, with the exception of *tigmátejas-*, referring to Nṛtti in ŚS 6.63.2a and to the Rudras in ŚS 19.9.10d, and *tigmámūrdhan-*, ‘sharp-headed’, which however refers to arrows—also a weapon, just like the *vajra* implied by our text. Note that many of the elements that form the above compounds are also found in loose formulas (e.g., ŚS 6.34.2b, *agnís tigména śocíṣā*; PS 7.3.1ab *tigmebhir agne arcibhiḥ śukreṇa deva śociṣā* |, "O god Agni, with your sharp beams, with your bright flame" (Griffiths)). Other, similar formulas describing the

---

9 It is true that in the final *kāṇḍikā* of this anuvāka, 17.43, we find a mix of *yajus*-style prose (17.43.1–4) and *brāhmaṇa* prose (17.43.5–7). However, it looks like the *brāhmaṇa* portion is added as an explanation after the quotation of the *yajuses* with which the *kāṇḍikā* starts. Here instead we would have to assume the presence of a bit of *yajus* prose within *brāhmaṇa* portions. Moreover, neither in 17.43 nor elsewhere do we find structures like *yat te...*, *sa....*

10 However, in RV 7.19.1a [~ ŚS 20.37.1a], 10.28.2a, and 10.86.15a [~ ŚS 20.126.15a] it refers to Indra as a bull (*vṛṣabhá-*); in 9.97.9c, to Soma; and in ŚS 13.1.25a ~ PS 18.17.5a, to Rohita as *vṛṣabhá-*. Cf. also the refrain in PS 4.8.1a–13a and 19.29.1a.

sharpness of Agni are also found, even if no corresponding compound exists (e.g. *tigménāgnír jyótiṣā* in ŚS 13.1.11.c ~ PS 18.16.1). As I will point out below, the *vajra*/thunderbolt is a form of Agni, an identification that is certainly strengthened here by the equation with Agni Vaiśvānara.

Moreover, sharpness is also a characteristic of the *vajra*: RV 1.130.4abc, *dādṛhāṇó vájram índro gábhastyoḥ, kṣádmeva tigmám ásanāya sáṃ śyad, ahihátyāya sáṃ śyat |*, "Firmly holding the mace in his hands, Indra honed it sharp like a carving knife, for throwing—honed it for the smashing of the serpent" (J-B); RV 7.18.18d, *tigmáṃ tásmin ní jahi vájram indra*, "smash your sharp mace down on him, O Indra" (J-B); RV 8.96.9ab, *tigmám ā́yudham marútām ánīkaṃ, kás ta indra práti vájraṃ dadharṣa*, "Sharp is the weapon, the vanguard of the Maruts. (And) who dares venture against your mace, Indra?" (J-B). Cf. also the frequent epithet *kṣurápavi-*, "with a sharp rim" (also below, in PS 17.28.2). Incidentally, Indra and Agni are also invoked to sharpen a knife to magically ward off hail in PS 15.23.1.

In conclusion, a compound such as *tigmávīrya-* would not appear out of place in our text: it refers to the sharpness of the *vajra* both as a weapon as well as a form of Agni. All the compounds that I have cited above are Bahuvrīhis, and it would be natural to expect a masculine Bahuvrīhi in implicit agreement with *vajraḥ* with the meaning 'whose power is sharp'. We might then consider emending to **yaḥ *tigmavīryaḥ*. However, the mss. point to a neuter word (as also shown by the pronoun *yat*). Therefore, I believe we should rather opt for a lighter emendation, *yat *tigmavīryam*.

We thus have two possibilities: 1) we could investigate whether we can interpret the compound as a Karmadhāraya meaning 'sharp power'. Compounds with *vīryá-* as second member are mostly Bahivrīhis, but more rarely also Determinative compounds. I was only able to identify Tatpuruṣas with a substantive as first member: e.g. *bāhuvīryá-*, n., 'strength of the arms' (ŚS 5.21.10d); *paśuvīryá-*, n., 'strength belonging to cattle' (PB 7.5.8 etc.); and *bheṣajavīryá-*, n., 'healing power of medicine' (SuśS 1.31.32ab). No grammatical or semantic rule speaks against the possibility of building a Determinative compound of the Karmadhāraya type with an adjective like *tigmá-* as first member and *vīryá-* as second member. Given the rarity of these formations, this interpretation doesn't seem impossible to me, but is perhaps improbable.

2) Alternatively, we could translate *yat* as 'that thing', 'that part', indicating the sharp-rimmed top part of the *vajra*, in contrast with the bottom part, the 'handle', indicated in pāda **c** by the word *ārambhaṇaṃ* (see below), and interpret the neuter compound as a Bahuvrīhi (in accordance with the evidence of other compounds of this type) agreeing with the neuter pronoun— or we could assume agreement with an implied neuter word for 'blade' or 'weapon' (e.g. *śástra-, astrá-, ā́yudha-*).

With this emendation we have done away with the issue of justifying the presence of the 2nd person pronoun *te* in pāda **b**. Accordingly, I prefer to edit *yad ⁺dhārambhaṇam* in pāda **c**, favouring *ha* (here probably simply expressing a topic switch) over a 2nd preson pronoun *ta*(=*te*).[11] Moreover, with this explicit reference to the blade part of the weapon, the reference to a "handle" (*ārambhaṇam*) in pāda **c** now appears more understandable.

That the *vajra* has a handle (*ārámbhaṇa-*) is known for instance from AB 2.35.5, *ārambhaṇato vai vajrasyāṇimātho daṇḍasyātho paraśor*, "at the handle the *vajra* is narrow, likewise a rod, likewise an axe", and from PB 23.10.3 (on the sixteen-day rite), *pañcadaśo vai vajro na vā agṛhītena vajreṇa vīryaṃ karoti yā ṣoḍaśy ārambhaṇam eva tad gṛhītena[12] vajreṇa vīryaṃ karoti*, "The thunderbolt is the fifteen-day rite (contained in this sixteen-day rite). No one can display any prowess when he has not grasped a (destructive weapon like) the thunderbolt. The sixteenth day is the handle. He displays prowess after he has grasped with this (sixteenth day as handle) the thunderbolt (i.e. the first fifteen days)" (Caland). For other relevant passages, see Rau 1973:41-42.

---

11 It is not easy to explain **O** *yanta ā...* from an original *yaddhā*. It is perhaps possible that the Odia actually re-interpreted *yat tigm...* as *yat te gn...* (then corrupted into *yat te gm...*) under the influence of mantras like TS 3.5.3.2, quoted above. Then, it would secondarily have inserted a pronoun also in pāda **c**. I am aware, however, that this is something of an ad hoc explanation.

12 Caland takes *tadgṛhītena* as a compound.

Falk 1994a has identified the *vajra* with sharp-rimmed copper bar-celts and clubs of the Copper Hoard archaeological culture of the Indian Doab. These clubs feature a long thin handle that expands into a larger and heavier top (cf. Rau 1973:41–42, discussing how the *vajra* is described as *puroguru-*, 'heavy on the farthest end') characterised by a sharp rim. In my view, lines **b** and **c** clearly refer to the sharp-rimmed top and to the narrow handle of the *vajra*, respectively, while **a** refers to the weapon's body.

17.27.3

a   etad vā idaṃ sarvaṃ yad etāni trīṇi |
b   viśvānaro vaiśvānaro viśvāṣāṭ ||

These, [namely] the following three—Viśvānara, Vaiśvānara, Viśvāsah—are this whole [world].

sarvaṃ yad] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pac [Mā] V71 JM₃** sarva yad **Ji₄** sarvayāj **K**   • etāni trīṇi] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ V122 Pac [Mā]** etāni rasā trīṇi **K** etrāni triṇi **V71** etrā triṇi **JM₃**   • |] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** || **Pac** *om.* **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pac [Mā] JM₃** | **K V71**

a. The reading of **K** (*yad etāni rasā trīṇi*) is most likely corrupt, although it is hard to explain the two extra syllables. A nom. sg. f. of *rasā-* would be out of context, and a nom. pl. n. ****rasā(ni)** is impossible because the stem *rása-* is masculine. The presence of variants with an °*r*° sound in **O** (*etrāni* **V71** *etrā* **JM₃**) can easily be explained as anticipation of the cluster *tr* from *trīṇi*, and therefore have no relation to the reading of **K**. Note that this error only occurs in **Oᴮ**.

17.27.4

sarvān eva *puṇyām̐l lokān ava rundhe sarvāś ca devatā ya evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti ||

He secures truly all the pleasant places and [the favour of] all the deities, he who, being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox.

sarvān eva] **O** sarvānyeva puṇyeva **K**   • *puṇyām̐l lokān ava] puṇyāllokānava **K Ma Ja V122 Pac Mā** puṇyalokānava **V71** puṇyālokānnava **JM₃** puṇyākonava **Ji₄**   • rundhe] **O** rundhe | **K**   • devatā] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** devr̥tā **Pac**   • ya evaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pac [Mā] V71 JM₃** ya[.]yevaṃ **Ji₄** ekaṃ **K**   • vidvān anaḍuho] **[Ma] [Ja] Pac [Mā] V71 JM₃** vidvān, naḍuho **V122** vidvānananaḍuho **Ji₄** vidvānaḍrāho **K**   • ||] || 27 ru 4 || **Ma Ja Pac Mā** || ru || 27 || **V122** || 27 || **Ji₄ V71** | 27 ru 5 || **JM₃** Z phaśca 1 Z **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *puṇyāllom̐kānava** with a misplaced *anunāsika*, which must be a misprint.

As regards the semantics expressed by the lexeme *ava-rudh-*, 'to obtain, to secure', it might be helpful to note that this lexeme alternates with the roots *āp-* and *aś-*, as can be seen from ŚS 9.5.22ab, *áparimitam evá yajñám āpnóty áparimitaṃ lokám áva runddhe |*, "An unlimited offering does he obtain, an unlimited world does he take possession of" (Whitney), and AB 1.6.3, *sarveṣāṃ chandasāṃ vīryam avarunddhe, sarveṣāṃ chandasāṃ vīryam aśnute*, "The strength of all the meters he wins, the strengths of all the meters he attains" (Keith). The meaning 'to obtain, to secure'

is common to the AV and the Brāhmaṇas, but it is unattested in the RV, where the only occurrence of this lexeme carries a more literal meaning, close to that of the co-occurring lexeme *ni-rudh-*: RV 10.28.10, *suparṇá itthā́ nakhám ā́ siṣāyā́varuddhaḥ paripádaṃ ná siṃháḥ | niruddháś cin mahiṣás tarṣyā́vān godhā́ tásmā ayáthaṃ karṣad etá*t ||, "The eagle caught its talon just so, like a lion entrapped into a snare. The buffalo also got trapped, when it was thirsty. The monitor-lizard plowed this way for him" (J-B). The semantic development from a literal 'hold down, entrap' to a figurative 'secure for oneself, obtain' is easily conceivable. Note that although the lexeme *ava-rudh-* is on the whole quite rare, it is frequent in the Vrātyakāṇḍa, in particular in paragraphs ŚS 15.11 and 13 (~ PS 18.37, 38) which describe the merits that a host can gain (*ava-rudh-*) if they provide proper hospitality to a wandering Vrātya. On this lexeme, see also KULIKOV 2012: 200f.

The idiom *devatā* (acc. pl.) *ava-rudh-* is not infrequent (I find it in KS, TS, JB, BŚS, etc.), but its meaning is not completely clear to me. In his translation of the TS, Keith renders it with 'to win the gods': e.g. TS 6.3.7.3.2, *śīrṣatā evá yajñásya yájamānaḥ sárvā devátā áva runddhe*, "Verily the sacrificer at the beginning of the sacrifice wins all the gods" (Keith). Perhaps we should assume "wins the deities over" or "secures [the favour of] all the deities".

The action of undertaking/practising an observance (*vrata*) is commonly expressed with *vratam car-*. Other phrases used are *anu-car*, (*anu-*)*sac-*, *anv-i*, *rakṣ-*, *pā-*, and *dhṛ-* (LUBIN 2001: 566, referring to HACKER 1973). The phrase *vratam bhṛ-* is rare and unusual.[13] That the root *bhṛ-* is employed here cannot be accidental, but must contribute to an intentional metaphor: in PS 17.34.1 below, Indra's observance is deemed "heavy" (*guru*), which is the reason why Indra needs to resort to the help of the draft-ox, the animal that is most accustomed to hauling heavy burdens. The observance is heavy because it aims at getting a hold of the *vajra*, but the *vajra* itself is difficult to hold (*dhṛ-*): cf. my comment on PS 17.30 and the refrain *sa nādhārayat*. Compare also the epithet *viśvabhṛ́t-* in the Anaḍutsūkta (see Apendix II): ŚS 4.11.5cd (~ PS 3.25.4cd), *yó viśvajíd viśvabhṛ́d viśvákarmā gharmáṃ no brūta yatamáś cátuṣpāt |*, "He who wins everything, bears everything, works everything: do tell us about the four-footed *gharmá* pot". The intentional use of the special idiom *vratam bhṛ-* also explains the interpolation of *bibhrat* in PS 3.25.3c (see my comment *ad loc.* in Appendix II).

---

13 In fact, it seems to be attested only in this text, and once in GB 2.3.9bb. BLOOMFIELD (1899: 120) describes GB 2.9 as follows: "Section 9 presents a legendary explanation of the sound *hiṃ* (Vait 20.15, 16), being written in good archaic Brāhmaṇa-language [in fn. 2 p. 121 he cites the sigmatic aorist *adrāg* as an example], and deriving some interesting illustrations from everyday life. A closely similar passage has not been found". Because of the obscure language, it is not easy to summarise the content: the text gives the impression of being a patchwork of different bits of exegesis with regard to the use of the sound *hiṅ* in ritual practice, each mini-section not necessarily related to the rest. The last mini-section (which also concludes the whole section) reads as follows: GB 2.3.9bb–cc, *atho khalv āhur eko vai prajāpater vratam bibharti gaur eva, tad ubhaye paśava upajīvanti ye ca grāmyā ye cāraṇyā iti ||*, "Now, listen (*khalu*), they say: 'only one (*ekaḥ*) bears the observance of Prajāpati, a bovine really; both kinds (*ubhaye*) live upon that (? *tad upajīvanti*) for the sake of cattle (? dat.), those who are domestic and those who are wild.'" It is interesting that the expression *vratam bhṛ-* is used here in relation to a so-called *prajāpater vratam*, as we find this expression in the second section of the Anaḍutsūkta, which deals with the Twelve Nights of the midwinter celebrations (see Appendix II).

Kāṇḍikā 28

17.28.1

a   tam ādatta
b   tam ud aiṅgayat
c   tam upāmimīta
d   pra harāṇīti ‖

He (Indra) took it (the *vajra*),
he brandished it,
he weighed it out,
[saying] "I will strike with it!"

ādatta tam] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ādanta tam **Pa꜀** ādattavatam **K** • ud aiṅgayat tam] udaiṅgaẏattam **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ V122 Pa꜀ V71** udaiṅgaẏatam **Mā** uṟyaiṅgaẏattam **JM₃** udīśayattam **K** • upāmimīta] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** upāmimāta **Pa꜀** upām upeti | **K** • pra harāṇīti] **O** prabharāṇīti **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **Ji₄ K**

    The general meaning of this portion is to illustrate how Indra's attempts at handling the *vajra* fail. Indeed, in the next lines it is said that the *vajra* slips from Indra's hands (17.28.2) and falls into the sea in the form of a lightning bolt (17.28.3–5). His inability to wield the *vajra* is precisely the reason why Indra decides to perform an observance (17.28.6). The aim of his observance is to acquire the power that is necessary to wield the *vajra*.

    Looking at this portion more closely, we can interpret it in two ways in light of the rest of the kāṇḍikā. Near the end of the kāṇḍikā, after Indra has completed his observance, we learn that he is finally able to take the *vajra* and rest it on his arm joint: PS 17.28.29, *tam ṟksāmābhyām ādatta yajuṣā yajñena gāyatreṇa vāmadevyena ca* ‖, "He (Indra/the *vratin*) took it (the *vajra*) with the *ṟk* verses and the *sāman* chants, with the *yajus* ritual injunctions, with the ritual worship, with the Gāyatrī recitation, and with the Vāmadevya chant," and PS 17.28.31, *tam ādatta taṃ paruṣy ādhatta*, "He (Indra) took it (the *vajra*); he put it on [his arm's] joint". The verbal form used, *tam ādatta*, is the same in both lines. However, we might wonder whether the two occurrences mean the exact same thing or whether we should interpret them in different ways. The question is whether in our line Indra actually takes, brandishes, and weighs out the *vajra* as he does in the end, and only fails at striking with it (while in the end, after picking up the *vajra*, he rests it on his arm), or whether he is even able to properly pick up and brandish the *vajra*. We thus have two options:

    1) We can interpret the first *tam ādatta* in our line as an unsuccessful attempt, and clearly distinguish it from the second *tam ādatta*, which is a successful attempt. We can do this if we interpret the verbal forms in our line as *imperfecta de conatu*, and translate with "He (Indra) tried to take it (the *vajra*), he tried to brandish it, he tried to weigh it out [saying] 'I will strike with it!'"— only to let it slip, as is told in the next line. Indeed, this semantic nuance is not infrequently found in

Vedic, especially in case the action expresses a failed attempt. Compare the famous MS version of the legend of Yama's death (MS 1.5.12: 81.2–5), according to which the gods create the night so that Yamī can get over her grief; the gods do so only after failing to comfort her otherwise: *té devā́ yamyā́ yamám ápābruvan tā́m̐ yád ápr̥chant sā́bravīt | adyā́mr̥téti tè 'bruvan ná vā́ iyám imám itthám̐ mr̥ṣyate rā́trīm̐ sr̥jāmahā íti |*, "The gods tried[14] [in vain] to make Yamī get over Yama (lit. the gods talked [or rather: tried in vain to talk] Yama away from Yamī). When they asked her, she said: 'He just died today!' They said: 'She is not forgetting about him in this way. Let us create the night'" (my transl.).

2) We can interpret the two occurrences as both indicating successful attempts. Accordingly, in both cases Indra did pick up (and here also brandished, weighed out) the *vajra*. In the first case, however, when he attempts to strike with it, he fails: the *vajra* slips from his hands. In the second case, instead, he rests it firmly on his arm.

Both interpretations seem possible to me. In 17.28.28 (within this kāṇḍikā), it is said that he who is succesful with the observance extinguishes (*śamayati*) the *apasmitaṃ*, the fiery effect of the lightning bolt; in 17.34.1, it is said that the observance (and perhaps by extension the *vajra*) is too heavy (*guru*). Both the *vajra*'s fiery sharpness (cf. also *tigmavīryaṃ* in 17.27.2) and its heavy weight (which is the reason why the draft-ox is then asked for help) can be adduced as reasons why Indra fails at wielding it. But it is hard to use one or the other detail as an argument in favour of or against the fact that he wasn't even able to pick it up, or that he simply dropped it while striking with it.

I translate the imperfects merely with simple past forms, but a more nuanced "tried to" could also be acceptable.

17.28.2

a	so [']sya hastād amucyata
b	daivo vajraḥ
c	kṣuraḥ paviḥ *sahasrabhr̥ṣṭir divispr̥śaḥ ||

It (the *vajra*) slipped from his (Indra's) hand:
divine is the *vajra*;
sharp is the thousand-spiked rim of the [*vajra*] touching the sky.

so [']sya] sosya **[O]** somya **K**   • amucyata] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 V71 JM₃ amucyata | Ji₄ amucyataṃ **Pac** amucyate **Mā** amucyata | **K**   • vajraḥ] **O** vajraẖ **K**   • kṣuraḥ paviḥ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ kṣuraḥ | paviḥ **Pac** kṣurapavaris **K**   • *sahasrabhr̥ṣṭir] sahasrapr̥ṣṭir **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Pac** sahasr̥ṣṭir Ji₄ sahasraṣṭir **Mā** sahasrapr̥r V71 sahasrapr̥ṣṭar JM₃   • divispr̥śaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Pac [Mā]** JM₃ davispruśaḥ V71 divaspr̥śaḥ **K** Ji₄   • || **[O]** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *sosya* in **a**, *kṣurapaviḥ⁺* and *sahasrapr̥ṣṭir* in **c**.

On the intransitive (non-passive) meaning of the *ya*-formations of the root *muc*-, see Kulikov 2012: 421.

On the sharpness of the *vajra*, see my notes on PS 17.27.2 above. Bhattacharya's emendation to *kṣurapaviḥ⁺* does not seem necessary. The compound *kṣurápavi*- is indeed attested in ŚS 12.5.20 ~ PS 16.142.4, ŚS 12.5.55 ~ PS 16.146.3, but if we accept Bhattacharya's emendation, we have to take both *⁺kṣurapaviḥ* and **sahasrabhr̥ṣṭir* as adjectives of *vajraḥ*, which then makes it difficult to interpret *divaspr̥śaḥ* (unless we assume that the latter is also a nom. sg. m., however

---

14 Lanman (1884[1996]: 393) translates, "The gods sought to console Yamī for the loss of Yama."

from an unattested *a*-stem *divispṛśa*-, and not a genitive from the athematic stem *divispṛś*-).

Bhattacharya adopts *sahasrapṛṣṭir*. Comparison between the two traditions seems to suggest that this must have indeed been the reading of *G. However, this would be a *hapax legomenon* ('thousand-ribbed'?), whereas it seems obvious that the line must originally have contained the compound *sahásrabhṛṣṭi*-, 'thousand-spiked', which is a common epithet of the *vajra*, attested in RV, AV, MS, etc.; see RAU 1973: 41 fn. 58 for references. RAU (ibid.) mentions other, similar epithets as well: *tribhṛṣṭi*- (JB), *cáturbhṛṣṭi*- (AV), *śatábhṛṣṭi*- (TS), and *bhṛṣṭimánt*- (found in JB, but also in RV 1.52.15c, and not mentioned by RAU). I emend accordingly, although I take it as an epithet of the *vajra*'s rim (*paviḥ*). The error must have been caused by anticipation of the cluster *spṛś* in the following word, *divispṛśaḥ*. This might have occurred during the period of oral transmission preceding *G. Compare also the epithet *śatáparvan*- and Av. *satafštāna*-, 'with a hundred knobs' (see SCHLERATH 1975: 501).

Compare also ŚS 12.5.66, *vájreṇa śatáparvaṇā tīkṣṇéna kṣurábhṛṣṭinā*, "With a thunderbolt hundred-jointed, sharp, razor-pronged" (Whitney).

The compound *divispṛ́ś*-, 'touching the sky', is always athematic. It occurs three times in PS (never in ŚS); once in our line; once with the variant *divaspṛś* in PS 1.107.1 (the parallel at RV 10.168.1 has the stem *divispṛ́ś*-), where it refers to the wind; and in PS 12.9.7b, where it qualifies a cow's yearling. In RV it appears 15 times: often as an epithet for a variety of gods (the Aśvins in 1.22.2; Indra and Vāyu in 1.23.2; Mitra and Varuṇa in 1.137.1; Indra and Vāyu's chariot in 4.46.4; Soma in 9.11.4, 9.86.14), and frequently qualifies Agni (5.13.2, 10.88.1; Agni's radiance in 5.11.1) or the sacrifice in the fire (1.142.8, 2.41.20, 8.101.9, 10.36.6; the smoke rising from the offering in the fire in 7.16.3)—clearly referring to the idea that the oblation is transferred from the fire to the heaven. Thus, it never specifically refers to the *vajra* or its rim. It is possible that we find it in our line because the *vajra*, the thunderbolt, is intended as a form of Agni. These epithets, indeed, as well as the following lines (3–5), clearly identify the *vajra* mace with the lightning bolt.

At any rate, a thematic *divispṛśa*- is never found. Therefore, I take our *divispṛśaḥ* as a genitive governed by *paviḥ*, and implying *vajrasya*, 'of the [*vajra*] touching the sky'.

If the idea of 'touching the sky' is especially connected with that of the oblation travelling from the fire on earth up towards heaven, the idea of the lightning bolt touching the sky can perhaps be reconciled with the image of the pillar of fire that bursts out of the *gharmá* pot and is conceived as an inverted lightning bolt travelling towards heaven, symbolising the initiate's (social or spiritual) ascension. On this topic, see Appendix II §3.2, 3.3.

17.28.3

sa *saṃśiñjāno [']tiṣṭhad dhariharā bhavann ⁺etad ⁺ṛchan ||

It kept on making a [sizzling, crackling] noise as it collided [with the sea], blazing up, hitting down there.

*saṃśiñjāno [']tiṣṭhad] siṃsiñjānotiṣṭhad **Ja Ma** saṃsaṃjānotiṣṭhad **Mā** saṃsiṃjānotiṣṭhad **V71 V122** saṃsijānotiṣṭhad **JM₃ Ji₄ Pa_c** siṃñcatiṣṭhad **K**   •   dhariharā bhavann] **Ja Ji₄** dhariharāmabhavann **Ma Pa_c** dhariharāṃbhavann **V122** dhariharābhavaṃn **Mā V71 JM₃** dharuttarābhavany **K**   •   ⁺etad ⁺ṛchan] etaṛścham **K** eyaditsan **Ja V122 Mā V71 JM₃** ejaditsan **Ma Ji₄ Pa_c**   • ||] **Ma Ja V122 Pa_c V71 JM₃** | **Mā Ji₄** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya writes *saṃsiñcānotiṣṭhaddhariharābhavannejaditsan ||.

Bhattacharya's conjecture *saṃsiñcāno, presumably a pres. ptc. mid. from *sam-sic*- 'to pour together', 'to found, cast metal'(see my comment on 17.27.1 above) is grammatically impossible

(we would rather expect a passive *saṃsicyamāno*) and semantically implausible.

In my view, our line is a describing the *vajra* as it falls into the sea (cf. the next lines) in the form of a lightning bolt, and comprises three syntagms. The first syntagm involves sound: the root intended must be *śiñj-*, and I propose to emend to **saṃśiñjāno [’]tiṣṭhad.*, the nom. m. sg. of a pres. ptc. middle in periphrastic construction with the 3sg. impf. of *sthā-*, used as an auxiliary expressing a continuous action. On these participial periphrastic constructions, see WG p. 394f. §1074–1075.[15]

Note that the rare root *śiñj-*, always used in the middle voice, is employed in Dīrghatamas's famous Riddle Hymn, RV 1.164 (on which see Appendix II §3), in particular in stanza 29, which describes the central moment of the Pravargya/Gharma ritual, when the *gharmá* or *mahāvīra* pot, filled with boiling ghee, bursts into a pillar of fire after the Adhvaryu has poured milk into it. There, the pot makes a sound (*śiṅkte < śiñj-*) and is likened to lightning bolt (*vidyút bhávantī*): *ayáṃ sá śiṅkte yéna gaúr abhī́vṛtā, mímāti māyúṃ dhvasánāv ádhi śritā́ | sā́ cittíbhir ní hí cakā́ra mártyaṃ, vidyúd bhávantī práti vavrím auhata ||*, "This [the pot] hums—that by which the cow is enclosed. She bellows her bellow, resting upon the smoky (fire). Because she has put down (what is) mortal with the sound 'chit-chit', becoming lightning, she pushed away her covering" (J-B). Cf. Houben's (2000b: 506)'s translation: "This one [the pot] is humming, by which the cow (the milk) is enveloped. She (the milk) lows a lowing (when she is) placed on the sparkling (fire). She with her crackling has indeed put down the mortal. Transforming herself to lightning, she pushed back her covering." Since both this and our text describe a lightning bolt, it seems attractive to also read a form of the root *śiñj-* in our line. The correspondence between the two passages is even more remarkable when we consider that, in the Anaḍutsūkta, the draft-ox is equated with the *gharmá* pot (see Appendix II).

As far as the beginning of the word is concerned, the reading of **K**, *siṁ̐*, and that of the oldest **O** mss. (**Ma**, **Ja**), namely *siṃ*, might be a corruption of the reduplication syllable of an intensive *śiṃśiñjāno (or even *śeṃśiñjāno?). Accepting this solution would require the emendation of the dental sibilant *s* into a palatal sibilant *ś*.

However, the root *śiñj-* is also attested with the preverb *sám*. In two occurrences, the lexeme *saṃ-śiñj-* appears to convey the idea of producing a noise by collision (KEWA III p. 335: 'stößt klingend zusammen'); in particular, it indicates the sound produced by two colliding sacrificial spoons.

The first passage is ŚB 11.4.2–12 (on the Agnihotra): *athā́taḥ srucórādā́nasya [...] itthám evá kuryāt ubhā́bhyām evá pāṇíbhyām juhū́m parigṛ́hyopabhṛ́ty adhinídadhyāt, tásya nòpamīmāṃsàsti, tát paśavyám ā́yuṣyám, té ásaṃśiñjayann ā́dadīta, yát saṃśiñjáyed áyogakṣemo yájamānam ṛchét, tásmād ásaṃśiñjayann ā́dadīta*, "1. Now, then, as to the taking up of the two offering-spoons [...]. 2. Let him rather do it in this way;—having taken the Juhu with both hands, let him lay it down on the *upabhṛt*; there is no question about this: it is good for (securing) cattle and life. Let him take them up <u>without clinking them together</u>,—<u>were he to let them clink together</u>, insecurity of property would befall the Sacrificer: let him, therefore, take them up <u>without clinking them together</u>" (Eggeling).

Similarly, ĀpŚS 2.13.6 (on the Full and New-moon sacrifices) reads: *na ca <u>saṃśiñjayati</u> nābhideśe ca srucau dhārayati*, "Er läßt die beiden Löffel nicht <u>klingend zusammenstoßen</u> und hält sie in der Höhe des Nabels" (Caland).

Therefore, it seems that we should interpret our *saṃśiñjāno as describing the sound produced by the lightning bolt as it collides with the sea; the next lines (PS 17.28.4–5), in fact, describes how the lightning bolt, entering the sea, burns it and makes the sea water undrinkable. A shrill, sizzling, crackling sound might be expected, such as the *cittí-*, 'chit-chit' (J-B) or 'crackling' (Houben), of RV 1.164.29c (*cittíbhir*).

However, the quality of the sound expressed by the root *śiñj-* is not so clear. The dull sound

---

15 It is of course not impossible to take the imperfect *atiṣṭhad* in the literal sense of 'it stood up'. This might describe the thunderbolt's vertical position as it falls into the sea.

of two wooden ladles colliding is not so obviously comparable to the loud noise of a lightning bolt, nor to the sizzling sound of sea water being burned by a lightning bolt. Even if we consider the root *śiñj-* as originally onomatopeic in form, we cannot imagine that the ŚB and ĀpŚS authors intended the wooden ladles to produce a "sheenj" sound.

The only other RV occurrence of the root *śiñj-* is found in RV 6.75.3. Here it expresses the sound of a stretched bowstring, which is compared to the moan of a woman: *vakṣyántīvéd ā́ ganīganti kárṇam, priyáṃ sákhāyam pariṣasvajānā́ | yóṣeva śiṅkte vítatā́dhi dhánvañ, jyā́ iyáṃ sámane pāráyantī ||*, "Wie eine, die etwas sagen will, kommt sie immer wieder an das Ohr, den lieben Freund umarmend. Wie eine Frau quiekt sie am Bogen ausgespannt, diese Sehne, die in der Schlacht durchhilft" (Geldner). J-B translate as follows: "Like a maiden (with her anklets?) she jangles" (cf. EWAia II 635, 'schwirren, klingen, summen'), but nothing indicates that the sound intended is a metallic twang. In fact, the sound involved in this line is not the vibrating twang of a bowstring when it is released, but the low hum that it produces when stretched (*vi-tan-*), a sound anyone who has practised archery will be familiar with.

A third occurrence of *saṃ-śiñj-* seems to describe the noise made by mares and horses, also glossed with "*hiṅ*": ŚB 13.2.3.2 (on the Aśvamedha), *yájamānam áśvaḥ svargáṃ lokám áñjasā nayati, híṅkaroti, sā́maivá tád dhíṅkaroty, udgīthá evá sá, vā́ḍavā úparundhanti sáṃśiñjate yáthopagātā́ra upagā́yanti tādŕ̥k tád*, "The horse leads the Sacrificer rightly to the heavenly world. It makes 'Hiṅ', and thereby makes the Sāman itself to be 'hiṅ': this is the Udgītha. They pen up mares, (and on seeing the horse) they utter a shrill sound[16]: as when the chanters sing, such like is this" (Eggeling). Eggeling translates with "they utter a shrill sound", but this is not obvious.

In fact, the onomatopoeia "*hiṅ*" mentioned above is normally used for the bellowing of a cow (a 'moo'). This meaning is also found in the above-quoted Riddle Hymn, in which the hot *gharmá* pot is likened to a milch-cow who bellows (*mā-, mímāti māyúṃ*, RV 1.164.27b) and makes the sound "*hiṅ*" (*hiṅkr̥ṇvatī́*, RV 1.164.27a; *híṅṅ akr̥ṇon*, RV 1.164.28b).

Thus, one wonders whether the verb *śiṅkte* in RV 1.164.29a should be taken as expressing a low sound, a moo or hum (as rendered by J-B and Houben). This sound, then, would have to be distinguished from the crackling sound of the pillar of fire. Perhaps it is to be intended as expressing the low gurgling sound of the boiling ghee in the pot *before* the Adhvaryu pours the milk in and the pillar of fire bursts out, making the *cittí* sound. If this is the case, I wonder whether our *saṃśiñjāno* should also be intended as expressing a low sound: perhaps the rumbling of thunder. Thus, we could translate our **saṃśiñjāno [']tiṣṭhad* as "it kept on rumbling [like thunder]".

Alternatively, we can consider *śiñj-* and *saṃ-śiñj-* as simply being general terms for 'to make a sound' and 'to make a sound by colliding', respectively, regardless of what sound is expressed, much like English *to clash*, 'to make a sound by colliding', which is also originally onomatopoeic, but does not simply describe a "clash" sound like that of cymbals. Indeed, in the preceding examples, we have found that these lexemes can express: 1) the thud of two colliding wooden ladles (ŚB 11.4.2–12, ĀpŚS 2.13.6); 2) the low sound of a stretched bowstring and 3) the moan of a woman (RV 6.75.3); 4) the neighing (*hiṅ*) of excited mares and 5) the chanting of Sāmavedins (ŚB 13.2.3.2); and 6) the bellowing of a cow (*hiṅ*) and the sound of the bursting pillar of fire (*cittí*, 'chit-chit, crackling' in RV 1.164.27–29). Thus, we can translate with 'it kept on making a noise as it collided [with the sea]', and we can specify 'a [sizzling, crackling] noise' because this would be the expected sound expected given the situation described, but not because *śiñj-* specifically expresses this kind of noise.

As I said above, our line comprises three syntagms. The second syntagm is *hariharā bhavan*. This is an expression of the kind that Karl Hoffmann called *"wiederholende" Onomatopoetika* (HOFFMANN 1952 [=1975 35ff.]). These can be of different types, with both *kr̥-* or

---

16 Note that in this case no collision is involved. The preverb *sam* might be justified because there is a plurality of subjects, the mares, who all make a sound together.

bhū- as auxiliary verbs. Normally, acoustic onomatopoeia are expressed with the auxiliary *kr̥-*, whereas if *bhū-* is used, noise is to be excluded (ibid. p. 40). Werner Knobl (pers. comm.) believes that *hariharā* should be interpreted as being formed from the (non-verbal) root *ghar-/har-*, or GHAR[2]- in EWAia I 513, PIE *$g^{wh}er$-, from which words like *háras-*, 'flame, fire', *ghr̥ṇá-*, 'heat', and also *gharmá-* 'warm, hot', 'boiler, pot' are derived. Thus it would mean 'heating up', or rather, in the case of the lightning bolt, 'flaring, blazing up'. I take the word *bhavan* as a pres. ptc. active, although it cannot be excluded that we should interpret it as an imperfect, *abhavan*, parallel to the preceding *atiṣṭhat*. This interpretation reinforces the symbolic connection between the lightning bolt (*vajra/vidyut*) and the heated *gharmá* pot mentioned above.

Lastly, I emend the third syntagm to [+]*etad* [+]*r̥chan*. I shall start by discussing the second of these two words. Bhattacharya refrains from emending it, and adopts the **O** reading, *itsan*. Instances where *ts* is mistaken for *(c)ch* are extremely common (see Kɪᴍ, *Auss.*, p. 19f. with references; sometimes possibly already in ***G**, on which see Gʀɪꜰꜰɪᴛʜs 2009: ʟxɪv). Comparison with **K** *śch* (on this akṣara, see the discussion in Gʀɪꜰꜰɪᴛʜs, ibid.) might point to an original **ichan*. The **O** mss. preserve both *ejad* (**Ma Ji₄ Pa_c**) and *eyad* (**Ja V122** and the **Oᴮ** mss.).[17] Bhattacharya adopts *ejad*, probably because it is an intelligible word in itself (it is also preserved in the more reliable and oldest ms., **Ma**), the pres. ptc. act. of the roor *ej-*, which often indicates an 'animal' or a 'living being' (cf. the formula *prāṇád éjat*, 'what breathes and what moves', i.e. 'living creatures', in PS 17.1.3c, and my comment *ad loc.* in Sᴇʟᴠᴀ 2014). This might point to adopting *ejad *ichan*, which would mean something like "wishing/searching for a living creature (to hit?)". As I believe that this and the following lines are describing a lightning bolt striking the sea, and not any creature, I find this solution unsatisfactory. As for the reading *eyad*, it is unintelligible.[18] We should then turn to **K**, which reads *eta*. This could point to an original [+]*etad* for ***G**. This pronoun could cataphorically indicate 'the following one', which will be mentioned in the following sentence, namely 'the sea', or it can adverbially mean 'over there, down there' (i.e. in the sea). In my view, this is the most preferable interpretation. However, I find a solution such as [+]*etad *ichan*, "wishing/searching for that one over there", just as implausible, because it would imply a sort of personality or intentionality on the part of the *vajra*/lightning bolt. On the other hand, **K** reads *r̥śchaṃ*. The spelling *śch* for *ch/cch* (**sk*) is common in **K** (for instance in PS 17.20.13, where the ms. reads *ruśchati* for *r̥chati*). We can then opt for a lighter emendation, namely [+]*etad* [+]*r̥chan*. I interpret the latter as a pres. ptc. act. from the root *r̥-* (AR[2]), 'to move, hit, land on' (PIE *h_1er-, cf. Gr. ἔρχομαι), and translate it as describing the lightning bolt striking down, hitting the sea, landing in the sea.

17.28.4-5   ~ GB 1.2.21ii-ll

4a   sa samudraṃ prāviśat
4b   sa samudram adahat ||
5a   tasmāt samudro *durgīr †apapid†
5b   vaiśvānareṇa hi dagdhaḥ ||

It entered into the sea;
it burned the sea.
That's why the sea (i.e. the water of the sea) is hard to swallow, … :

---

17 The fact that *eyad* is found in both **Oᴬ** and **Oᴮ** might not be an argument for its antiquity in this case, because the akṣara *ya* [dʒa] is used, not *ẏa* [ja]; thus, *eyad* is homophonous with *ejad* and could be a corruption. In fact, if the original ***G** reading was **etad* (as I argue), it is easier to explain *ejad* from this (cf. PS 17.50.8b *ejat* < *etat*) rather than from *eyad*.

18 I am not aware of any instances in which the sea, although indeed constantly moving, is described as *ejat-*.

for it was burned by Vaiśvānara.

sa] **K** [Ma] [Ja] **V122 Pa꜀** [Mā] **V71 JM₃** *om*. **Ji₄**   •   samudraṃ] **K** [Ma] [Ja] **Ji₄ Pa꜀** [Mā] **V71 JM₃** samudra **V122**   •   prāviśat] **O** cāviśat **K**   •   sa] [Ma] [Ja] **Pa꜀** [Mā] **V71 JM₃** *om*. **Ji₄ V122 K**   •   samudram adahat] [Ma] [Ja] **Ji₄ V122** [Mā] **V71 JM₃** samudraṃm adahat **Pa꜀** samārddhadusandahat **K**   •   ‖] **O** *om*. **K**   •   tasmāt] **O** tassās **K**   •   *durgīr †apapid†] durgirapapid [**Ja**] [**Ma**] durcārapapi **Ji₄**¹⁹ durggirapapid **V122** durgarapapi **Pa꜀** durgirapid **Mā** durgiṃra[.]pid **V71** durgirapa **JM3** durgarapiva **K**   •   dagdhaḥ] **K** jagdhaḥ [Ma] [Ja] **V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀** [Mā] **V71** yajagdhaḥ **JM₃** (cf. dagdhaḥ GB)   •   ‖] [Ma] [Ja] **V122 Pa꜀ Mā V71 JM₃** | **Ji₄** *om*. **K**

GB 1.2.21ii–ll (Gaastra 1919: 58–59)
(ii) […] sā samudraṃ prāviśat
(jj) sā samudram adahat
(kk) tasmāt samudro durgiravapi (variants: duṇiravavir **C**, dṛrgiratapi **E**)²⁰
(ll) vaiśvānareṇa hi dagdhaḥ

Bhattacharya's edition reads *durgirapapid* and *jagdha*.

   5a. Bhattacharya does not introduce any emendation, yet the text as he edits it does not seem understandable to me.

   On the basis of the previous line, *sa samudram adahat*, "it burned the sea", I favour the reading of **K**, *dagdhaḥ*, 'burned' (also from *dah-*) over **O** *jagdha*, 'eaten' (from *jakṣ-*). The reading *dagdha* is also found in a parallel from the GB 1.2.21ll.²¹ Since the *vajra* is a form of Agni, in

---

19 The cluster *rcā* in **Ji₄**'s reading is clearly a mistake for *rgi*.

20 **C** and **E** are two of the mss. used by Gaastra for his 1919 critical edition of GB. Descriptions can be found in Gaastra 1919: 3ff. All other mss. read *durgiravapi*, which Gaastra adopts.

21 The GB parallel does not seem related to our text content-wise. Bloomfield (1899: 112) reports that GB 1.2.18–21 deals with the "iron-shot horse at the Agnyādheya—This horse, one of the main requirements of the Agnyādheya (VaitS 5.11; ŚB 2.1.4.16), is produced by Vāc from frightful, gruesome waters"; after a mythical narration of attempts to pacify the horse, and a short section (GB 1.2.19) on the origin of the Brahman, Potṛ and Agnīdhra priests, in GB 1.2.20, "the text returns to the 'fire-footed' [*agnipada*] horse, explaining why it is called Agni Vaiśvānara in the mantra, a*gniṃ tvāhur vaiśvānaram* (VaitS 6.7; GB 1.2.21), and to differentiate it from Agni Jātavedas, the fire at the Agnyādhāna itself. The Brāhmaṇa (i.e. the Brahmanic religion) carried Agni Vaiśvānara; the latter created these worlds. Then Agni Jātavedas in rivalry determines to exhibit his billiancy and force, so that the Brāhmaṇa should carry him also. Jātavedas exhibits his virtues in four different ways; the last time 'he saw Virāj, the wife of the Brāhmaṇa' and gave her to him. Then the Brāhmaṇa built Agni Jātavedas; Agni Vaiśvānara on the other hand, became the horse which frightened the gods, and Brahman (the Brahman-priest) calmed it with the above-mentioned stanza, and with the five stanzas, VaitS 6.1. Next, anent VaitS 6.8, the chariot ([*āgnyādheyika*] *ratha*) is mounted. It originated from the sap (*rasa*) of the Brahman, went to the gods, frightened them, but sundry stanzas appeased it also. Finally reasons are given why cows and gold are presented to the Brahmans at the Cātuḥprāśya (VaitS 6.6.)". Bloomfield's account ends here, probably because the end of the section, which contains the lines parallel to our text, is rather obscure. It starts by explaining that what was not presented to the brahmins became the *āglā*. This *āglā* is the protagonist of a short myth. Unfortunately, the word is a hapax and its meaning is unknown. The section reads as follows: GB 1.2.21hh–zz: *yan nādhatta tad āglābhavat* (hh) *tad āglā bhūtvā sā samudraṃ prāviśat* (ii) *sā samudram adahat* (jj) *tasmāt samudro durgiravapi* (kk) *vaiśvānareṇa hi dagdhaḥ* (ll) *sā pṛthivīm udait* (mm) *sā pṛthivīṃ vyadahat* (nn) *sā devān āgacchat* (oo) *sā devān aheḍat* (pp) *te devā brahmāṇam upādhāvan* (qq) *sa naivāgāyan nānṛtyat* (rr) *saiṣāglā_* (ss) *eṣā kāruvidā nama* (tt) *taṃ vā etam āglāhataṃ santam āglāgṛdha ity ācakṣate parokṣeṇa* (uu) *parokṣapriyā iva hi devā bhavanti pratyakṣadviṣāḥ_* [ed. -*dviṣo*] (vv) *ya eṣa brāhmaṇo gāyano nartano vā bhavati tam āglāgṛdha ity ācakṣate* (ww) *tasmād brāhmaṇo naiva gāyen na nṛtyen māglāgṛdhaḥ syāt* (xx) *tasmād brāhmyaṃ pūrvaṃ havir aparaṃ prājāpatyaṃ* (yy) *prājāpatyād brāhmyam evottaram iti brāhmaṇam* (zz) ‖ 21 ‖, "What he did not donate, that became the *āglā* (hh). Then, having become the *āglā*, she entered the sea (gg). She burned the sea (jj). That's why the sea is *durgiravapi* (kk). For it was burned by Vaiśvānara (ll). She went up to the earth (mm). She burned up the earth (nn). She went to the gods (oo). She made the gods angry (pp). The gods resorted (*upa-dhāv-*) to the Brahman (qq). He

particular Agni Vaiśvānara, then it makes sense to me that, falling into the sea as a lightning bolt, it would burn (*dah-*) it, rather than eat (*jakṣ-*) it. It is true that the **O** reading might be considered the *lectio difficilior*, but it could simply have arisen out of an error mistaken for a metaphor.

The portion that Bhattacharya edits as *durgirapapid* is very problematic. First of all, it is not clear whether it contains two words or only one.

If it contains two words, we could emend the first to *durgīr, 'hard/bad to swallow'.

The idea would be that because the sea was burned by Vaiśvānara, the sea water has become undrinkable. Thus, our text would provide an aitiological myth for why sea water is salty and undrinkable. In order to better understand this myth, it should be recalled that salt was conceived as a solid form of water produced by the influence of fire and heat, e.g. by evaporation (Slaje 2001: 30), and similar to other solid forms of water, such as hailstones, which were thought to be produced by the influence of the fire of lightning bolts because of their frequent simultaneous manifestation (Slaje 2001: 34). The lightning bolt was associated with salt also because of its association with the *íriṇa*. This is a depression in the ground that fills up with water during the rainy season (either because of subterranean currents or rainwater), and that dries up in the dry season, leaving a layer of salty ground on the surface, which can be broken to access a layer of brine underneath, often containing solid chunks of salt. These pits were important both for the well-being of animals, who were naturally attracted to the water's nutritious saline properties, as well as for people, who would use them as salt mines. As Falk (1986: 75ff., §2.1.1 and 2.1.1.1) showed, the Ṛgveda describes cattle running to the *íriṇa* pits to find a reinvigorating drink (RV 8.4.3); Indra going after the soma is likened to them (RV 7.98.1). They do so by following the lightning bolt (RV 7.69.6); this is presumably because these pits were often hit by lightning bolts, or simply because the sight of lightning bolts meant that the pits would fill up with rainwater. As Falk (1986: 82) points out, while for the farmer salty ground was synonymous with infertility, for the cattle herder it was a precious resource for strengthening his flock; for this reason, the salty surface of these pits—or artificial replicas modelled after the real pits, and similarly called *íriṇas* and identified with the *sabhā*—were also used by the Vrātyas as a board on which to play their ritual dice games. They did so precisely because—since the *íriṇas* attracted lightning bolts and rainfall, and were a source of strength for the cattle—they were connected with Indra. Falk (1986: 80) has collected evidence to show that the *íriṇa* was considered a place of heaven on earth, where heaven and earth can reunite after they have been separated. As such, salt was considered the flavour of the sky (ŚB 2.1.1,6). This idea is also based on the notion that saltiness is an intrinsic property of water (water surrounds the earth in the form of the *samudra*, comes to earth from the sky, and returns to the sky in an endless cycle), and that heaven itself was made of water (see Slaje 2001: 38). Salt was the decisive element that established this connection (see Falk 1986: 80), and the lightning bolt, evidence of Indra's presence stretching from heaven to earth, was the manifestation of this connection.

Thus, my conjecture involves an otherwise unattested Bahuvrīhi compound *durgir-*, 'hard to swallow' (with passive meaning), formed after the root noun *gir-*, 'swallowing', from the root *gr̄-* [2] (EWAiA GAR[i2], PIE *gʷerh₃), 'to swallow'; cf. *garagír-*, 'who has swallowed poison, poisoned' (Br+), and *muhurgír-*, 'swallowing instantly' (in RV 1.128.3b said of Agni swallowing the earth). Emending is necessary, as the mss. preserve a short *i*, but a long vowel would be the regular outcome of a resonant plus laryngeal in a voiced context (PIIr. *CrHV > Ved. *CīrV*). The passive

---

did not sing, he did not dance (rr). He was that *āglā* (ss). She is Kāruvidā by name (tt). Secretly they say, 'That one (n.), although being afflicted by *āglā*, is in the greed for *āglā* (*āglāgṛdhe*, loc.? greedy for *āglā*?) (uu). For the gods are lovers of secrets and haters of publicity (vv). They say, 'That Brāhmaṇa who keeps singing or dancing, … (*āglāgṛdha*?) him' (ww). That's why should a Brāhmaṇa not sing, nor dance; may he not be *āglāgṛdha* (xx). That's why the first oblation is for the Brahman, the following is for Prajāpati (yy). The one for the Brahman truly is superior to the one for Prajāpati—so says the Brāhmaṇa (zz)." (my transl.). The overall impression is that the GB might simply have secondarily reused the PS wording because it related to Vaiśvānara. One is left to wonder why the GB would have re-utilised a line that was already corrupted, and what could it have made of it.

meaning is not problematic: compare *gá*, 'stepping, going', with *sugá*, 'good path (< easy to be walked on)' (RV), and *durgá*, 'inaccessible, unattainable' (AV).

As for the second word, the only intelligible reading among the attested ones is **Mā** *apid* (possibly supported by the other **O^B** mss., but see below). According to EWAia II 83–84, the word *apít-* belongs to the root PAY[i1], 'schwellen', and should thus be interpreted as built with a privative *a-* and a *-t* formant, *a-pí-t*, 'non-swelling'. Mayrhofer (following Geldner) translates with 'versiegt'. This word occurs only once, in RV 7.82.3, *ánv apā́ṃ khā́ny atr̥ntam ójasā sū́ryam airayataṃ diví prabhúm | índrāvaruṇā máde asya māyínó 'pinvatam apítaḥ pínvataṃ dhíyaḥ ||*, "You two drilled holes for the waters by your power, and you two raised the preeminent sun in heaven. O Indra and Varuṇa, in the exhilaration of cunning (Soma) you made the depleted (waters) swell. Make our insights swell!" (J-B).

However, it is not clear to me how we should interpret our line: "That's why the sea (sea water) is hard to swallow, and…"—dried out? Depleted? Non-swelling? The meaning 'dried out' might work if we imagine that the fiery lightning bolt has made the water evaporate, but given that Indra and its lightning bolts are normally associated with the swelling of the waters in the rainy season (as in the above-quoted RV verse), it seems odd that the lightning bolt would now be the source of the drying out of the waters. Perhaps the key to deciphering this reference is to be found in the connection with salt that I have outlined above.

However, there are philological arguments that make me hesitate in adopting this reading. If we look at the mss., we can divide them into three groups: **K** has a trisyllabic reading (*apiva*), the **O^A** mss. all have trisyllabic readings (*apapid* in **Ma**, **Ja**, **V122**; *apapi* in **Ji₄**, **Pa_c**), GB too has only trisyllabic readings (*avapi* in most mss.; *avavir*; *atapi*). Only **O^B** has disyllabic readings (*apid* in **Mā**, *apa* in **JM₃**, and *a[.]pid* in **V71**). Let us imagine that the **Mā** reading *apid* is original. Can the *va* in **K** *apiva* be a mere repetition of the beginning of the following word, *vaiśvānareṇa*? It seems unlikely: *apiva* is probably just an error for *avapi* (with inversion of the syllables). GB has *avapi* in most mss.: if the original reading were *apid*, where could this text have taken its trisyllabic reading from? If we imagine that **K** *apiva* actually underlies *apid* plus the repetition of *va-* of *vaiśvāreṇa*, we'd have to imagine that only **O^A** innovated by adding a syllable. This would mean that GB would have gotten its trisyllabic reading from **O^A**, which is unlikely. It seems more probable that both **K**, **O^A**, and GB derive their readings from a source that had a trisyllabic reading—**K** and GB perhaps from a source (***D**?) that specifically had *avapi*. If the PS written archetype had a trisyllabic reading, it is easy to explain **Mā** *apid* as an error from (***B**?) *apapid* with loss of an akṣara. Note that **V71** has an illegible akṣara, which might actually stand for this akṣara (*pa*), suggesting that *apid* is an error of **Mā** only, and not even of **O^B** as a whole. **JM₃** *apa* could be due to independent loss of the final syllable (*pi*).

All of this suggests that the PS written archetype had a reading with three syllables (*apapid* or *avapid*). This does not exclude the possibility that **Mā** *apid* corresponds by mere chance to the original reading, but adopting *apid* would imply the restoration of a stage of the text preceding the archetype. This is not impossible, but given that the reading *apid* is not convincing beyond doubt in the first place, I hesitate to adopt it.

We can then investigate possible trisyllabic solutions. It would be attractive to find a word that is based on the root *pā-*, 'to drink', with a similar passive meaning as *durgír*, thus 'undrinkable, non-potable'.[22]

However, the lightest emendation, **apapir*, would yield the active meaning 'non-drinking', as the word *papí-* belongs to the so-called *cákri* type. This category of reduplicated *i*-stems has been studied by GRESTENBERGER (2013), who has stressed that they are active, agentive formations (although they are not agent nouns, but rather "deverbal nominalizations, comparable in syntactic

---

22 One might venture to posit **apīd*, which, similarly to *apít*, would be built on a privative *a-* and a *-t* formant, but this time with the zero grade of the root *pā-*, 'to drink'. However, it would still be disyllabic.

behaviour to English 'ACC-ing' nominalizations"), often with iterative or intensive semantics, and properties similar to that of present participles, such as accusative-case objects and adverbial modification. The adjective *papí-*, 'drinking', in particular, is attested only once in RV 6.23.4b (to Indra), where it occurs together with two other formations of the same kind, *babhrí-,* 'bearing', and *dadí-*, 'giving'. RV 6.23.4ab reads: *gántéyānti sávanā háribhyām babhrír vájram papíḥ sómaṃ dadír gā́ḥ* |, "Going to even such pressings as these with his two fallow bays, bearing his mace, drinking soma, giving cows" (J-B). As Grestenberger (2013: 275) remarks, the forms in this stanza "characterize habitual actions performed by Indra. As Tichy (1995: 237) points out, the reduplicated *i*-stems in this passage display the same syntactic behavior and are used in similar contexts as the root-accented agent nouns in *-tar-* (e.g., *dā́tar-* '(habitual) giver, donor', etc.), which, according to her analysis, are likewise used to designate the agents of repeated, habitual actions. The perfect participles of *pā* 'drink' and *bhṛ* 'carry', on the other hand, have different semantics […]. The perfect indicative of *pā* is always resultative (Kümmel 2000: 308f.); the participle [*papivā́n*] always designates a perfective action". Grestenberger (2013) has shown that the *cákri*-type forms' supposed synchronic association with the perfect stem is only secondary. Thus, it does not even seem possible to perhaps regard our *papí-* as voice-indifferent on the basis of its relation to the perfect stem, nor to conceive a meaning 'non-drinkable' for a negated *a-papi-*, as this would instead mean 'non-drinking'. To regard *á-papi-* as a Bahuvrīhi, 'non-potable', i.e. lit. 'whose drinking is not there', also seems unwarranted, as *cákri*-type formations do not seem to appear in Bahuvrīhis.

Heavier emendations, such as **apeyo*, for instance, would be hard to justify paleographically. It is also somewhat suspicious that we would have two words meaning the same thing next to each other, and one is led to wonder whether the second would be a gloss.

If we regarded this portion as comprising only one word, we would have to imagine a compound such as *durgira-papi-*, 'drinker of what is hard to swallow', in this case a predicate of the sea. This seems semantically rather contrived to me. Moreover, the stem *girá/gilá* is extremely rare, if not a nonce formation (Lubotsky 2002a on PS 5.33.9) or restricted to specific uses such as demon names (see my comment on *paṇḍugirā* in PS 17.12.3, above).

Perhaps one could think of something completely different, such as **adyāpi*, 'even today'. Thus, *tasmād samudro *durgīr *adyāpi* would translate as "That's why the sea is undrinkable even today". However, it would be unusual to have such adverbs at the end of the sentence.

As no solution seems particularly preferable over the others, I adopt a trisyllabic reading between *cruces*.

17.28.6

a   sa śakra ud akrāmat
b   so [']dhyāyad
c   asau vajro
d   asuraiḥ sampadya devās taṃ *rakṣanti
e   vrataṃ carāṇīti
f   sa vratam acarat ||

Śakra stepped up [to it];
he pondered:
"That one over there is the *vajra*!
The gods, having joined forces with the Asuras, protect it.
I will practise the observance."
He practised the observance.

śakra ud akrāmat] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71 JM₃** śakr(ā →)a ud akrāmat **V122** śakradakrāmat **Ji₄** śakra ud akrāt **Pa_c** śakrod akrāmat **K**　•　so [']dhyāyad asau] so dhyāyad asau **O** so dhyāyatudiśo **K**　•　vajro] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** vajre **Ji₄** vajrai **K**　•　asuraiḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ V122 Pa_c V71** aśuraiḥ **Mā** a[x]suraiḥ **JM₃** āsurais **K**　•　sampadya] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** sampadya **V122** sapadya **K**　•　devās taṃ] devāṃs taṃ **Mā V71** devāṃs ta **Ja Ma V122 Pa_c Nā JM3** devās **K**　•　*rakṣanti] rakṣati **O** ukṣur **K**　•　vrataṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** vrajaṃ **Ji₄** vavraṃ **Pa_c** vataṃ **K**　•　carāṇīti] **[Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā]** carāṇī{vraṃ}ti **V71** (ra →)carāṇīti **JM₃**　•　acarat] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** a[.](*s.s.* →)carat **V122** acacarat **Ji₄** acārat **K**　•　‖] **[O]** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *devāstaṃ⁺ rakṣaṭi*.

    d. On *sam-pad-*, 'to reach an agreement with, join forces with', see Bodewitz 2003.

    Bhattacharya proposes the emendation **rakṣanti* in his comment, and I adopt it. Confusion between the akṣaras *ti* and *nti* distinguishing 3sg. and 3pl forms is extremely common, and the plural subject requires a verb in the plural.

    This remains one of the most puzzling portions of the texts: what does it mean that the Asuras and Devas have joined forces? Why do they "protect" the *vajra*? Why are the Devas mentioned if Indra is himself a *devá*, and since, as stated below, he only practised the observance among the Asuras (PS 17.354a; cf. PāśS 4.10), and since, thanks to the same observance, he robbed the Asuras (PS 17.28.7c) and appropriated their merits (*iṣṭa*, *pūrta*) and magical power (*māyā*) (PS 17.35.4b; cf. PāśS 4.12–13)?

    ef. On the semantics of the word *vrata*, see Schmidt 1958, Hacker 1973, and Lubin 2001. Lubin correctly shows that the gloss 'vow' is not precise, as *vrata* refers to "a regular course of ritual observance corresponding to the particular character of the deity to whom the rites pertain" (2001: 566). The stress is on the conduct that is adopted, the rule, rather than on a promise that is made.

    The *vrata* that Indra is about to undertake is obviously the *anaḍuho vratam* first mentioned in PS 17.27.4 above.

17.28.7

a   so [']ṇuḥ kṛśo [']bhavat
b   tasmād aṇuḥ kṛśo vratacārī bhavaty
c   aṇur hi kṛśo bhūtvendro asurān ⁺apāvṛṅkta ‖

He became lean, emaciated.
That's why one who practises the observance becomes lean, emaciated,
for having become lean, emaciated, Indra ripped the Asuras off.

so [']nuḥ] so nuḥ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** so ṇu(ḥ←*s.s.*) **V71** so nu **K**　•　kṛśo [']bhavat] kṛśo bhavat **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** kṛśo bhavat, **Pa_c** *om.* **K**　•　tasmād aṇuḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** tasmād aṇu **Ji₄** *om.* **K**　•　aṇur hi] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** anurdi **Ji₄** avaḷuyi **K**　•　bhūtvendro] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** bhū[x]tvendro **V71**　•　⁺apāvṛṅkta] apāvṝṃkta **Pa_c V71 JM₃ [Mā]? [Ma]? [Ja]?** apāvūṃkta **V122** apānavṝṃkta **Ji₄** upāvṛṅkta **K**　•　‖] **[O]** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya writes *apāvṛṅkta* with no emendation sign. His apparatus does not explicitly report the readings of his **O** mss. However, all my **O** mss. feature an *anusvāra* in place of a velar nasal (as found in **K**), and I assume that this is indeed the reading preserved by the Odia tradition.

    a. Interestingly, the observance described here seems to imply a regimen of fasting.

c. Note that the root *vr̥j-*, used here with preverb *ápa*, is employed again later in the text with the preverb *sám* to describe the action by which Indra appropriates the Asura's merits (*iṣṭá- pūrtá-*). For a discussion on the semantics of this root, see KULIKOV 2012: 247 and the bibliography provided there. KULIKOV gives 'prepare, lay' as the basic meaning. As most of the occurrences involve the object *barhís*, 'sacrificial grass', the meaning would thus be 'spread out, lay, prepare' (cf. the quasi-technical *prá-vr̥j-*, 'to lay (the *gharmá* pot) on the fire', 'to perform the Pravargya'). I follow GW's interpretation, according to which the basic meaning of this root is "etwas aus seiner ursprünglichen Richtung oder Lage (durch Biegen, Umwenden, Einsperren u. s. w.) herausbringen". Hence the attestations with *barhís* literally mean 'tear off a strand of grass with a circular motion of the hand, by clutching, turning and then pulling away', and then figuratively 'procure, prepare, lay out the grass for the sacrifice' (the lexeme *pra-vr̥j-* may originally have indicated the action of using one's hand to make a pot rotate on its axis to expose all sides of it to a fire).

In the presence of the preverb *ápa*, the lexeme seems to acquire the figurative meaning 'to drive away': in ŚS 3.12.6 (~ PS 20.23.3), the beam (*vaṃśá*) of a house is asked to *apa-vr̥j-* the enemies (*śátrūn*); in ŚS 13.2.9 (~ PS 18.21.3), *támas*, 'darkness', is dispelled by the Sun. A more literal meaning is perhaps found in ŚS 10.7.42 (to the Skambha; this verse has no PS parallel), *tantrám éke yuvatī́ vírūpe abhyākrā́maṃ vayataḥ ṣáṇmayūkham | prā́nyā́ tántūṃs tiráte dhatté anyā́ nā́pa vr̥ñjāte ná gamāto ántam ||*, "A certain pair of young girls of different looks approach the six-pegged web weaving it. One draws out the threads, the other lays them: they do not tear them off (*ápa-vr̥j-*). They reach no end [in their labour]" (my transl.).

As regards the lexeme *sam-vr̥j-*, which we encounter at PS 17.35.3 and 4, one may compare RV 7.3.4ab (describing Agni), *ví yásya te pr̥thivyā́m pā́jo aśret tr̥ṣú yád ánnā samā́vr̥kta jámbhaiḥ*, "You whose leading edge has spread out upon the earth when it has hungrily encircled its food with its jaw" (J-B). J-B's translation effectively conveys the circular motion expressed by the root *vr̥j-*. The preverb *sám* expresses the completion of the circular motion. Figuratively, the phrase expresses both the action of 'enclosing' and the action of 'tearing off/away': in the verse above, Agni's flames encircle the conquered land like jaws that bite off a piece of food. The effect of the draft-ox *vrata* is no different: Indra 'rips the Asuras off', he 'tears away, wrests away' the Asuras' *iṣṭá pūrtá*. The preverb *sám* can perhaps express the completion of the circular motion, and thus, figuratively, that the object is wrested away completely: he 'completely wrests the *iṣṭá pūrtá* away from' the Asuras. It is conceivable that the lexeme *apa-vr̥j-* is used here with a similar meaning: 'rip off', rather than the usual 'drive off' < 'tear away'.

Sympathetic magic also seems to be involved: just as the ascetic becomes lean and emaciated from fasting and deprivation, so too will the Asuras (the ascetic's detractors) be deprived of their religious merit.

Here, I have chosen to use the English expression 'to rip off (something from someone)' in an attempt to convey both the semantic nuance of 'tearing from' as well as the notion of illicitly depriving someone of a possession (the English expression is mostly used with 'money' as the object, but here 'acquired merit' can somehow be intended as 'religious currency'). The choice of an idiom in translation is intentional, as the use of *vr̥j-* here most certainly represents Vrātya/Pāśupata jargon.

17.28.8–25

8	sa parameṣṭhinam upādhāvat ‖
9	sa prajāpatim upādhāvat ‖
10	sa viṣṇum upādhāvat ‖
11	sa gṛhapatim upādhāvat ‖
12	sa virājam upādhāvat ‖
13	sa svarājam upādhāvat ‖
14	sa samrājam upādhāvat ‖
15	so [']horātre upadhāvat ‖
16	so [']rdhamāsān upādhāvat ‖
17	sa māsān upādhāvat ‖
18	sa r̥tūn upādhāvat ‖
19	sa ārtavān upādhāvat ‖
20	sa r̥ṣīn upādhāvat ‖
21	sa ārṣeyān upādhāvat ‖
22	so [']ṅgirasa upādhāvat ‖
23	sa āṅgirasān upādhāvat ‖
24	so atharvaṇa upādhāvat ‖
25	sa ātharvaṇān upādhāvat ‖

He resorted to Parameṣṭhin.
He resorted to Prajāpati.
He resorted to Viṣṇu.
He resorted to the *gṛhapati*.
He resorted to the Virāj.
He resorted to the Svarāj.
He resorted to the Samrāj.
He resorted to the day and the night.
He resorted to the fortnights.
He resorted to the months.
He resorted to the seasons.
He resorted to the seasonal periods.
He resorted to the R̥ṣis.
He resorted to the Ārṣeyas.
He resorted to the Aṅgirases.
He resorted to the Āṅgirasas.
He resorted to the Atharvans.
He resorted to the Ātharvaṇas.

N.B. **K** omits 17.28.10 (Viṣṇu) and has 17.28.11 (*gṛhapati*) moved to the beginning of the list. **Mā** omits lines 22 and 24. In **Ji₄**, lines 10, 12, 14, and 22 are missing. In **JM₃**, line 18 is written in superscript above line 17 by a second hand. So as not to overburden the apparatus, I exceptionally do not report the *daṇḍas*. It should be implied that **K** omits all final double *daṇḍas*; **V71** has a single *daṇḍa* after 9, 10, 11, 18, 20, 22, 23, and 24; and **Ji4** has a single *daṇḍa* at the end of line 8. Elsewhere, all the **O** mss have double *daṇḍas* at the end of each line.

————

parameṣṭhinam upādhāvat] **[O]** parameṣṭhivam upāṇvavat **K**   • sa prajāpatim] **[O]** saṃ prajāpatim **K**   • sa viṣṇum upādhāvat] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** sa viṣṇum upādhāvata **V71** *om*. **K Ji₄**   • sa gṛhapatim upādhāvat] **[O]** sa gṛhapatim upākarastavat **K**   • virājam] **[O]** virāpam **K**   • svarājam] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** savrājam **Ji₄** surājam **K**   •

samrājam upādhāvat] **[O]** samrāje | mupadhāvat **K**   • so [']horātre] so horātre **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM_3** sa so horātre **Ji_4**   so [']rdhamāsān] so rdhamāsān **[O] K**   • upādhāvat] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji_4 Pa_c [Mā] JM_3** upādhāvata **V71**   • māsān] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji_4 [Mā] V71 JM_3** myāsan **Pa_c** māsen **K**   • r̥tūn] **[O]** r̥ton **K**   • sa ārtavān] **[O]** sāntavān **K**   • ārṣeyān] ārṣeyān **[O]** ākṣayān **K**   • so [']ṅgirasa] so ṅgirasa **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] JM_3** so aṅgirasa **V71** om. **Ji_4**   • sa āṅgirasān] **[Ma] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM_3** sa āṅgirasā **Ja** sa āṅgirasa **Ji_4** sāṅgirasān **K** • so atharvaṇa] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM_3** so tharvaṇa **Ji_4** so atharvaṇam **K**   • sa ātharvaṇān upādhāvat] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji_4 Pa_c V71 JM_3** sa ātharvaṇān upādhāvat **Mā** sātharvāṇān upādhāvad **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *sohorātre*, *sordhamāsān*, and *soṅgirasa*.

   The reason why all these particular figures are listed here is not clear. We can at least distinguish various groups of items in this list. First, a group of deities: Parameṣṭhin, Prajāpati, and Viṣṇu; then *gr̥hapati*, which can indicate both the householder, or the leader of a Vrātya band—in fact, Viṣṇu himself is also regarded by BŚS 18.26 as the leader (the term used is *sthapati*, which alternates with *gr̥hapati* in Vrātya texts) of the Maruts' troop, on which Budha and his Vrātyas, as well as the Kuru boys and their leader, modelled their bands. The second group of items includes Virāj, Svarāj, and Samrāj, which may be technical terms for political authorities (see PROFERES 2007: 117, *passim*). The third group is a list of time periods going from shortest to longest (vv. 15–19). On *ārtavá-,* see my comment on 17.22.2 above and 17.41.2 below. Finally, a fourth group includes categories of sages, in particular those related to the Atharvavedic tradition.

   It should be noted that **K** has *gr̥hapati* as the first item in the list. This might suggest that this term in particular had a special importance. The members of the warrior brotherhoods aimed at reaching the status of householders, who could benefit from those privileges (a wife, wealth, cattle, the possibility to acquire merit) from which the warriors (either because they were still too young, or because they belonged to marginalised categories) were excluded (on this dynamic, see Appendices I and II). Thus, the householders were the main victims of the cattle raids. In Appendices I and II, I propose to interpret the draft-ox observance—with its raids for religious merit, as well as the ascetics' practice of wandering for alms—as a reinterpretation of the warrior brotherhoods' cattle raids and house-to-house begging parades at midwinter. Thus, a first hypothesis could be that the list in our text describes the wandering of Indra (as a model of the *anaḍudvratins*) among various kinds of householders, with the aim of siphoning their power. In fact, in the following lines, we will see a dynamic that resembles the *pāśupatavratins*' observance: Indra gets chased by various figures who speak ill of him and threaten him. Nevertheless, he remains calm and, by doing so, he appropriates their merit.

   However, as I have said above, *gr̥hapati* can also mean 'the leader of a warrior brotherhood' rather than 'householder'. It may be useful to recall that upon forming a brotherhood—thus, at the beginning of their observance—the members choose a leader (*gr̥hapati/sthapati*) who would act as Rudra, vehicle of the secret knowledge that comes from the dead ancestors and the world of the wilderness, protector and reliable repository of the booty collected from expeditions (cf. CANDOTTI & PONTILLO 2015: 180ff., 204; FALK 1986: *passim*; KERSHAW 2000: 240ff.). Thus, the *gr̥hapati* intended here would be a protective figure, rather than the victim of Indra's observance.   Accordingly,   we could also interpret the other items in our list as protecting deities who take the side of the *vratin*/Indra. Indeed, the lexeme *upa-dhāv-* most often means 'to resort to for help', rather than simply 'run by, run near', and it is also the expression used in PS 17.34.2 when Indra resorts to the draft-ox: *so [']naḍvāham upādhāvat*. This would explain why Viṣṇu is mentioned: because he is also a Vrātya leader (*sthapati*), at least according to the legend reported in BŚS 18.26 (I cite this episode in Appendix I; note that **K**, however, does not have the Viṣṇu line at all). It would also make sense that the Atharvanic tradition, represented by the groups of sages mentioned in the last few lines, is on the side of the *vratin*. Parameṣṭhin and Prajāpati are also mentioned elsewhere in our text and in the Anaḍutsūkta: PS 17.43.1 = PS 3.25.14 states that the bull is Indra by his strength,

and Parameṣṭhin by his observance (*indro balenāsi parameṣṭhī vratena* …), and PS 17.43.3 remarks: *indro [']sīndrasya rūpam asi prajāpatir asi parameṣṭhy asi ||*, "You are Indra, you are Indra's form, you are Prajāpati, you are Parameṣṭhin." In the ŚS version of the Anaḍutsūkta, we find a prose passage inserted after the first section of the hymn, whose first line reads: *índro rūpéṇāgnír váhena prajā́patiḥ parameṣṭhī́ virā́ṭ |*, "He is Indra by [his] form, he is Agni by means of [his] withers; [He is] Prajāpati, Parameṣṭhin, Virāj". This suggests that by resorting (*upa-dhāv-*) to the items in the list, Indra/the *vratin* identifies with them, acquires their power, and places himself in the tradition within which the secret knowledge of the *anaḍudvrata* has been taught.

17.28.26

a   *viśve devā marudgaṇās tam anv *avādravan
b   somaḥ prathamo [']thendrāgnī ||

The All-gods accompanied by the troops of Maruts ran along with him:
Soma first, then Indrāgni.

*viśve devā] viśvān devā **K Mā V71 JM₃** viśvān devān **Ma V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** viśvāṃ devānu **Ja** viśvan denān **Nā**   • marudgaṇās] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** rudgaṇās **Ji₄** marudgaṇās **Pa_c**   • anv *avādravan] anvavādravaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** anvavāṃ ⌐ dravaṃ **V122** anvavāṃdravaṃ **Ji₄** anvavāhavaṃ **Nā** andasāndavaṃ **K**   • somaḥ] **[O]** stoma **K**   • prathamo [']thendrāgnī] prathamo thendrāgnī **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** prathamo thendrāṇī **Ji₄** prathamam athendrāgnī **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **V122** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *viśvān devān marudgaṇās* and then *prathamothendrāgnī ||*.

   a. The main philological problem with this line is to makes sense of the acc.pl. *viśvān* next to the nom.pl. *marudgaṇās*, considering that the mss. preserve both an acc.pl. *devān* and a nom.pl. *devā*. The main interpretative problem is whether we should consider the deities mentioned here as supporters of Indra (and thus translate *tam anv avādravan* as "ran along with him"), or as the same figures who in the next line speak ill of Indra and threaten him, and from whom he robs merit (and thus, whether we should translate as "they chased after him", construing the verb inimically).

   Bhattacharya proposes to read three acc.pl. forms, *viśvān devān marudgaṇān |* (the latter word would actually have to be a conjecture, *marudgaṇān*), supplying (or implying) an extra *upādhāvat*. This sentence would thus be the last item in the preceding list, and would translate as "[he ran] to all the gods (or the All-gods) and the troops of Maruts (or accompanied by the troops of Maruts)". The following sentence would begin with *tam*.

   There are two problems with this proposal: all the lines in the list begin with *sa*, which would be missing here. Secondly, not only do we need a conjecture (*marudgaṇān*), but we also need to assume that the verb *upādhāvat* was lost in transmission. It would not be difficult to explain *marudgaṇās* by positing the loss of *anusvāra* from an original acc.pl. *marudgaṇāṃs* in sandhi before *t-*, but this idea becomes useless if in our scenario the original line contained the verb *upādhāvat*. We would have to imagine that the verb was never there (nor a punctuation mark!). We could imagine that the *viśvān devān marudgaṇān*, with neither *sa* nor the verb, was a sort of exclamation closing the preceding list, in fact a coda of 17.28.25: "He ran to the Ātharvaṇas, to the All-gods accompanied by the troops of Maruts". However, this seems stylistically improbable to me, and is not supported by the punctuation preserved in the **O** mss.

   If we like the idea of supplying a verb (and possibly an initial *sa*), we might alternatively consider reading [*sa*] *viśvān devān* [*upādhāvat ||*], and take the nom.pl. *marudgaṇās* as the subject of the following sentence: "[He ran] to all the gods (or to the All-gods). The troops of Maruts ran

after him...” Or, alternatively, reading it together with 17.28.25: “He ran to the Ātharvaṇas, to all the gods. The troops of Maruts ran after him…”. This solution avoids resorting to emending *marudgaṇās*, but shares the remaining problems.

As is often the case, it is not easy to decide whether the *víśva- devá-* intended here are the ‘All-gods’ or ‘all the gods’, but it is not uncommon to find this formula at the end of lists, perhaps to imply that all the unmentioned deities should also be included. In light of this consideration, Bhattacharya’s hypothesis must be taken seriously despite all the problems.

However, it is also possible that there is a shift of scenery between lines 25 and 26. The long list in 8 to 25 suggests a first stage of the observance, perhaps a ritual, perhaps an initiation, perhaps involving a period of wandering around, during which the *vratin* resorts to (*upa-dhav-*) various authorities to acquire power. These authorities seem to be on the *vratin*’s side. Similarly, Indra will seek help (*upa-dhav-*) from the draft-ox in 17.34.2 to acquire the power necessary to finally bear the heavy observance. This “positive” relationship between the *vratin*/Indra and the various entities he resorts to is clearly expressed by the lexeme *upa-dhav-*. On the contrary, in 27–28, someone different appears to be hostile to the *vratin*/Indra: they speak ill of him and threaten him; he endures this censure and, in this way, he ‘rips them off’ of their merits. This is clearly the same dynamic, transposed to mythological form, that we find in the *pāśupatavrata* (both PāśS 4.10 and PS 17.35.4 mention that Indra first performed the observance *asureṣu*, then the *vratins* perform it *manuṣyeṣu*). The provocative observance causes indignation, which explains why the gods chase after him in our line. If we identify the deities mentioned in our line with those who threaten Indra in the following lines, we can dismiss our attempts at connecting our line with the preceding list.

However, it would be very strange if the All-gods and the Maruts (the latter also often serve as the model of the Vrātyas: we shall once again recall BŚS 18.26) were to be considered enemies of Indra here. We then have a third possibility: the deities here neither belong to those whom Indra resorts to (in the preceding list), nor are the same deities who speak ill of him (in the next line). Rather, these are the fellow members of Indra’s warrior brotherhood/ascetic community, who join him in his endeavour (this would be the sense of *tam anu avādravan*). The lexeme (*anv-*)*ava-dru-* is not attested elsewhere, but we find *sam-ava-dru-* in ŚB 13.4.4.6 (*samavadrútya*). This passage describes how phlegm ran from Prajāpati’s body after his vital breaths had left: *prajā́pateḥ prāṇéṣū́tkrānteṣu śárīraṃ śváyitum adhriyata tásya yáḥ śleṣmā́sīt sá sārdhám samavadrútya madhyató nastá údabhinatsá eṣá vánaspátir abhavad rájjudālas tásmāt sá śleṣmaṇáḥ śleṣmáṇo hí samábhavat ténaivaìnaṃ*, “When Prajāpati’s vital airs had gone out of him, his body began to swell; and what phlegm there was in it that flowed together and burst forth from inside through the nose, and it became this tree, the *rájjudāla*, whence it is viscid, for it originated from phlegm” (Eggeling). It seems to me that sense of the preverb *sam* here fulfils a role that is close to that of our *anu*; it expesses the fact that the action is carried out by an agent together with other agents: the phlegm ran (*ava-dru-*) out of Prajāpati’s body together (*sam*) with the vital breaths. In our line, the action of running is performed by the deities along (*anu*) with Indra. The ŚB parallel also suggests that there is no reason to interpret *ava-dru-* as an inimical action—hence, my interpretation of our *tam anv avādravan* as “they run along with him”, i.e. “they joined him”.

This would also free us from the problem of having to explain the following inconsistency: it is mentioned multiple times that Indra performed the observance among the Asuras (i.e., that the Asuras are the victims who get robbed of their merit), but if the deities mentioned in our line were also the subjects of the following lines, then Indra would be stealing merit from them; but the All-gods, Maruts, Soma, and Indrāgni can hardly be classified as Asuras.

How do we emend the line then? Both **K** and **O^B** preserve *devā*. It is true that when the two Odia sub-branches are so clearly divided, **O^A** usually preserves the oldest reading; however, given the agreement between **K** and **O^B**, it is not inconceivable that an error might have occurred in **O^A**, namely the insertion of a nasal or *anusvāra* after *devā*. This could have been caused by the following *m-*, which might have nasalised the final *-ā* of *devā*. It is perhaps possible that the accusative *viśvān* (preserved as such in both branches) is not original, but due to a sort of

perseveration, caused by the repetition of accusatives in the preceding list. This mistake must have happened in the period of oral transmission preceding the written archetype. What was the original reading then? Both *viśve devā* and *viśvadevā* (nom. pl.) are possible, although I would opt for the former, at least because such a formula occurs once in PS 8.12.2b, *viśve devā marudgaṇāḥ* |. The sequence *viśve devā marutaḥ* is also a frequent collocation (PS 1.13.2d ~ ŚS 2.29.5d; PS 3.1.4b ~ ŚS 3.4.4b; PS 19.14.15c ~ ŚS 6.93.3b; PS 19.43.11a ~ ŚS 6.64.2a; PS 20.7.1b ~ ŚS 7.24.1b; PS 20.16.8c), whereas I find no relevant occurrence with *viśvádeva-*. Notably, when the three words occur together in a sentence, they are all in grammatical agreement (I have found no occurrence, even outside the AV, of a sentence in which the three words appear inflected in different cases). In conclusion, this scenario seems more probable to me than having to supply both **sa* and **upādhāvat*.

b. One last matter deserves attention, namely the dual *indrāgnī*. If the subject of our line is Indra, the paradigmatic *vratin*, how can he joined by "Indra and Agni"? On the one hand, it is perhaps conceivable that the text as we see it today is the result of a patchwork of different sources, which resulted in inconsistencies. However, the mention of Indrāgnī next to Indra may not necessarily have been a problem for the Vedic mind: dual deities indicated by the so-called "Götterdvandvas" "were generally speaking considered to be from the ritual point of view equivalent to single deities" (GONDA 1974: 13), as such they represent a theological reality that is distinct from that of the individual members of the compound, and can appear in enumerations of gods side by side with one of their component members. Examples can be found in GONDA 1974: 13; on Indrāgnī in particular, see ibid. p. 271ff., and on offerings to Indrāgnī as as single unit, see especially p. 284ff. SCHLERATH 1975: 503–504, while discussing Indrāgnī and the *vajra*, points out a particular verse in which this dual deity is explicitly identified with the Aśvins, namely RV 1.109.4: *yuvábhyāṃ devī́ dhiṣáṇā mádāyéndrāgnī sómam uśatī́ sunoti | tā́v aśvinā bhadrahastā supā́ṇī ā́ dhāvatam mádhunā pṛṅktám apsú* ||, "For you two, o Indra and Agni, for your exhilaration, the goddess, the Holy Place, eagerly presses the soma. You two, o Asvins, with your auspicious hands and lovely palms—rinse it with honey, infuse it in the waters" (J-B).

17.28.27

a   tam *upāmantrayantāpuṇyayā vācā krūrayā ca
b   haniṣyāmas tvā ⁺vittvā †(na)cetsyāmonacatamiṣyasīti†
c   so [']śāmyat⁺ ||

Him, they (i.e. the Asuras) called near with a harsh and rude speech:
"We are going to beat you, having found …"
He remained calm.

tam *upāmantrayantāpuṇyayā] tamupāmantraẏantu puṇyaẏā **Ma Ja V122** tamupāmantaẏantu puṇyaẏā **Ji₄** tamupāmantraẏantu puṇyaṃẏā **Pa_c** tamasāmantraẏantu puṇyaẏā **Mā** tamasāmantraẏantu puṇyāẏā **JM₃** tamasāma(ndra→s.s.)ntraẏantu puṇyaẏā **V71** tamupāmantrayante puṇyayā **K**   • krūrayā] **K** krūraẏā [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** [**Mā**] **V71** krūruẏā **JM₃**   • ca [**O**] vācā **K**   • haniṣyāmas tvā] [**Ma**] **Ja V122 Pa_c V71 JM₃** haniṣyāsyāmas tvā **Mā** hanisyomā **Ji₄** hahiṣyāsas ā **K**   • ⁺vittvā] vitvā [**Ma**] **Ji₄ V122** [**Mā**] **V71 JM₃** vistvā **Ja** vi[x]tvā **Pa_c** vitnya (=BARRET *vs.* vitrya BHATT.) **K**   • †(na)cetsyāmo†] cetsyāmo [**Ma**]? **JM₃** cetsyāmo **Ja** vitvā (re→)cesyāmo ˈ **V122** *om* **Ji₄** retsyāso **Pa_c** cetsāmo **Mā V71** na theṣāmo **K**   • †nacatamiṣyasīti†] [**Ma**] **V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** [**Mā**] **V71 JM₃** catamiṣyasīti **Ja** pacāmeniṣyasīti **K**   • so [']śāmyat⁺] sobaśāmyat **K** somāmyaẏat **Ma Ja** sosamyaẏat **V122** sosāmyaẏat **Ji₄ Pa_c** sosāmvaẏat **Mā** somamyaẏat **V71** somāmva(mya?)ẏat **JM₃**   • ||] [**Ma**] [**Ja**] **Ji₄ Pa_c** [**Mā**] **V71 JM₃** | **V122** *om.* **K**

GB 1.2.21c²³
(c) *so 'śāmyat*

Bhattacharya's edition reads: *tamupāmantrayantāpuṇyayā* vācā krūrayā ca haniṣyāmastvā vittvā* ceṣyāmo⁺ na ca tamiṣyasīti ⁺sośāmyat⁺ ||.*

    According to our interpretation of the previous line, the gods mentioned there do not function as the subject of this line too. We need to assume a change in scenery here. Because it is said multiple times that Indra practises the observance in order to rob the Asuras (17.28.7c, 17.35.4a; PāśS 4.10), and since the victims of the observance are those who speak ill of the *vratin*, the implied subjects in this portion must be the Asuras. Remarkably, there is no anaphoric *sá* or other element in the first line that might suggest that we should identify the subject of this line with the subject of the previous lines—only *tam*, which must refer to Indra.

    b. The second line must contain the Asuras' harsh speech, as indicated by the final *iti*. I shall first offer a critical review of Bhattacharya's emendations (which I hope to have interpreted correctly, given that Bhattacharya does not provide a translation), as I am not able to propose any better solutions.

    The first verb, *haniṣyāmas*, is clearly a 1pl. future, expressing immediate future and intention, and the enclitic *tvā* must be its object. This makes for a first complete sentence.

    If we accept Bhattacharya's emendation *vittvā ceṣyāmo* (note that degemination of such dental clusters is the norm; see GRIFFITHS 2009: lxv §O), the absolutive would be followed by two words, namely the conjunction *ca* (regularly occurring in second position) and a verbal form, possibly *iṣyāmas*, or instead by a single word, possibly *ceṣyāmas*.

    The first solution would involve a 1pl. present from *iṣ-*, 'to send, to hurl', *iṣyāmas*, 'we hurl'. This form would be paralleled by the negated verb of the following sentence, where we read *na ca tam iṣyasi* (2sg. present), "and you do not hurl it (?)" (perhaps with a potential nuance, "and you cannot hurl it (?)"). Here the *vajra* is most likely intended by the object *tam*. We must assume that *iṣyāmas* also implies an object (*tam vajram*), although its omission is strange. The absolutive *vittvā* would also require an object, either Indra or the *vajra*. As the Asuras are previously said to guard (*rakṣ-*) the *vajra*, it would be strange if they needed to find it, so Indra is probably implied here. However, syntactically, the position of the absolutive might suggest that we should take it with the following verb ("And after finding [it], we hurl [it]", or maybe "And after finding [you], we hurl [it at you]").

    As far as the content is concerned, according to this interpretation, the Asuras would be threatening to beat Indra, and reclaiming their prerogative of using the *vajra* (which they perhaps mean to use against Indra).

    There are several problems with this solution: first of all, the missing objects. Secondly, it is stylistically and syntactically odd that the initial future is followed by two present forms. It is perhaps possible that the future is used here to convey immediacy of the Asuras' intention (i.e,. that they are determined to beat Indra in short order), whereas the present forms convey a more general

---

23 Just like the GB parallel of GB 17.28.4–5 above, this line belongs to the chapter on the 'fire-footed' (*agnipada*) horse (see footnote 21 above). At the end of section GB 1.2.20, it is said that the fiery horse came to the gods and scared them, but the Brahman priest pacified him with a series of stanzas: GB 1.2.20s–w, *sa devān āgacchat, sa devebhyo'nvātiṣṭhat, tasmād devā abibhayus, taṃ brahmaṇe prāyacchat, tam etayarcāśamayat ||* 20 ||. Section GB 1.2.21 begins with the citation of these stanzas: PS 1.95.3 and the first five stanzas of hymn RV 1.163. The latter hymn is an *aśvastuti* (forming a pair with RV 1.162) ascribed to the sage Dīrghatamas, whom I have already mentioned in relation to the Riddle Hymn (RV 1.164) in my above comment on PS 17.28.3, and whom we will encounter again in Appendices I and II, as he is believed to have practised the observance of the bull, according to the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa II.74.46ff. (cited by ACHARYA 2013). After the pratīkas of these texts, GB reads: 1.2.21c–f, *so'śāmyat, tasmād aśvaḥ paśūnāṃ jighatsutamo bhavati, vaiśvānaro hy eṣa, tasmād agnipadam aśvaṃ brahmaṇe dadāti*, "He [the horse] became calm. That's why the horse is the hungriest of the domestic animals. Because that is Vaiśvānara. That's why he gives the Agnipada horse to the Brahman priest".

statement, a matter of fact (we use the *vajra*, you do not). A third problem regards the root *iṣ-*, 'to send'. Although this root does appear once with *vajra* as its object, in RV 4.17.3 (ab: *bhinád giríṃ śávasā vájram iṣṇánn āviṣkṛṇvānáḥ sahasānā ójaḥ*, "He split the mountain, hurling his mace with his strength, revealing his power, displaying his might" (J-B)), it is certainly not the most common root employed to describe the action of hurling the *vajra* (in PS 17.28.1, above, we have *pra-hṛ*; other roots more commonly used are (*adhi-*)*as-*, (*upa-pra-*)*vṛt-*, (*abhi-ava-*)*sṛj-*; cf. e.g. Falk 1994a: 201, Rau 1973: 43 fn. 68). Moreover, in the quoted RV occurrence, we find a pres. ptc. of the 9th class nasal present of *iṣ-* (*iṣ-ṇā́-ti*), rather than a 4th cl. *ya* present (*íṣ-ya-ti*) as we have in our line. The latter, in fact, is almost exclusively used in an idiom, *vācam iṣya-ti*, 'to send speech, speak forth', or in the sense 'to impel' (e.g., when Indra sends forth the waters, *apā́ṃ iṣ-*) (see Kulikov 2012: 524). Thus, to accept *iṣyāmo* and *iṣyasi* as meaning 'we hurl' and 'you hurl' is most certainly incorrect. Moreover, content-wise, this interpretation implies that the Asuras are aware of Indra's plan to steal the *vajra* from them, whereas the common people who run into a Pāśupata *vratin* are not supposed to know what he is doing.

It is of course possible to evaluate other solutions. We could consider splitting *vitvā* into *vi* (the preverb)[24] and *tvā* (a repeated enclitic object pronoun). However, a lexeme *vi-iṣ-* is not attested, nor it would be possible to have *ca* in third position (I find no instances of the sequence [X *tvā ca*], whereas [X *ca tvā*] is common).

We might consider the entire sequence *ceṣyāmo* as a verbal form (with or without the preverb *vi*). The form *ceṣyāmas* could be the 1pl. future of all the three *ci-* roots, CAY[1] (*ciketi*), CAY[2] (*cinoti*), and CAY[3] (*cayate*) (EWAia I 531–533). Of these, only the first two occur with the preverb *vi*. However, *vi-ciketi*, 'discern, investigate', is not semantically suitable to our line. Neither is *vi-cinoti*, 'divide, part', unless we consider a figurative sense such as 'segregate, pick out' (perhaps even 'single out, point at, i.e. expose'?), but we have to imagine that the Asuras are threatening Indra in some way, and this does not strike me as a credible threat (a more violent 'tear into pieces' does not seem to be expressed by this lexeme); maybe "we will separate you from the *vajra*/we will take the *vajra* away from you"? The meanings of the simplex forms *ciketi*, 'consider, observe', and *cinoti*, 'pile up, heap up', are also unsuitable. The semantics of the simplex *cayate* (CAY[3]), 'punish, take revenge, avenge, collect debts' might be suitable,[25] but this rare root (6x in RV), although transitive, is only attested in the middle. Alternatively, **O**'s reading, *cetsyāmo*, could be interpreted as a future based on *cit-* (or *vi-cit-*), but semantically this also seems unsuitable, as, again, we would expect a threat. A conjecture such as *vi tvā *cechāmo* (*ca_ichāmas*), "and we are looking for you!" is paleographically conceivable, but incurs the same problem, namely that the verb would be a present form (the fut. *eṣiṣyāmas* would require an extra syllable), and that the conjunction *ca* would be in an odd position.[26]

---

24 Tmesis is also found in this text in 17.31.4, *pra patho devayānāṃ jānāti.*, but the latter is a typical case of a main sentence preceding a *ya evaṃ vid-* phrase: in this type of sentence, the main verb is usually found in first position if it does not have any preverb; if there is a preverb, then the preverb is found in first position, while the verb takes the normal last position in the sentence. At any rate, *brāhmaṇa* exegesis portions with *ya evaṃ vid-* constructions are not really comparable with direct speech. Indeed, we do sometimes find tmesis in direct speech in Vedic prose, so our case would not be impossible for this reason.

25 Compare RV 1.190.5 (To Bṛhaspati), *yé tvā devosrikám mányamānāḥ pāpā́ bhadrám upajī́vanti pajrā́ḥ | ná dū́dhye ánu dadāsi vāmám bṛ́haspate cáyasa ít piyā́rum ||*, "Those who are wicked and tough, who live off you who are good, taking you for a ruddy little bullock, o god to the evil-minded one you do not concede anything of value; you just punish the reviler, Bṛhaspati" (J-B); but also AB 2.7: *kīrtayed eva yo vai bhāginam bhāgān nudate, cayate vainaṃ, sa yadi vainaṃ na cayate 'tha putram atha pautraṃ, cayate tv evainam*, "He should make mention; if a man deprive one with a portion of his portion, he revenges himself on him, or if he does not revenge himself on him, then on his son, or his grandson, but he does revenge himself on him" (Keith). A future form would be preferable here to a present, and the meaning 'we will take revenge on you, we will make you pay' provided by CAY[3] could be suitable to our line, but again, the line would be lacking an object unless we assumed an unattested lexeme *vi-ci-*, *vi-cayate*, and read *vi tvā ceṣyāmo*.

26 It is also worth considering the adverb *céd* or *ná céd*, or a conditional use of the conjunction *ca*.

As for the third syntagm, we have the similar option of considering *tam iṣyasi* as two words or *tamiṣyasi* as one word, and then speculating about possible emendations on the basis of these two options. The word *tamiṣyasi* would be a 2sg. future from *tam-*. Again, a future form is preferable to the present *iṣyasi*, and a meaning like 'you will perish, you will faint, you will choke' might be conceivable. The problem is that the verb is negated by *na*,[27] which would make such a sentence a reassurance rather than a threat: "you will not perish"![28]

Another possibility would be to take the *tam* in the third syntagm as a corruption for *tvam*. This would be the subject of the final verb, and would emphatically mark the opposition between the second segment with a verb in the 1pl person, and the third syntagm with the same verb in the 2sg person. However, this observation does not take us very far either.

For lack of any attractive solutions, I enclose this portion between *cruces* (also highlighting **K**'s extra *na*).

c. The last sentence follows the Asuras' speech and describes Indra's reaction. It contains an imperfect based on the stem *śām-ya-*, 'to become calm', from the root *śam^i-*. Kulikov (2012: 618ff.), in discussing this root, proposes the emendation *so [']śāmyat^+*, (ibid. fn. 1961), stressing that, although **K** *sobaśāmyat* could represent *sa upaśāmyat*—this is in fact how Barret emended our line —the **O** mss. rather point to the simplex. Bhattacharya too preferred the simplex. Both the simplex and the form with *upa-* could convey the same meaning, "he remained calm". I am inclined to agree with Kulikov and Bhattacharya, because indeed, the **O** mss. seem to show no trace of the preverb, whereas **K** *sobaśāmyat* could perhaps underlie *so aśāmyat*, with secondary insertion of a consonant in the hiatus.

17.28.28

a   tasmād yo brahma ⁺vedotāpasmitaṃ śamayati
b   dohayata *evainān ‖

That's why he who knows the *bráhman* and extinguishes the burn caused by the flash (of the lightning bolt)/the burning shame caused by the laughter (of his detractors)—
he actually milks them (the Asuras/the detractors) out (i.e extracts the power/the merit from them)!

brahma] **[O]** vrahma **K**   • ⁺vedotāpasmitaṃ] vedotāpassitaṁ **K** vedotāpaspṛtaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄** vedotrapaspṛtaṃ **V122** vedo(//)tāpasvṛtaṃ **Pa_c** vedo apasmṛtaṃ **Mā** vedotāpasmṛtaṃ ˥ **V71** vedotāpasmṛtaṃ **JM₃**   • śamayati] **K** śamaẏati **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c JM₃** śaya(//)ti **Ji₄** samaẏati **Mā V71**   • dohayata *evainān] dohaẏata evaināṃ **[O]** dohedevaināṃ, **K**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **Ji₄** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *vedotāpaspṛtaṃ* and *evainām*.

a. Kulikov (2012: 619 fn. 1961) treats this line while discussing the root *śam^i-*, and proposes the following text: *so ⁺'śāmyat; tasmād yo brahma vedotāpas sa taṁ śamayati*. He translates as follows: "he became appeased; therefore the one who knows Brahma and the waters makes him appeased". Note that Kulikov reports the reading of **K** as *vedotāpas sa taṁ*, in place of the correct *vedotāpas si taṁ*, and therefore omits to mark *sa* as a conjecture. We should then read *tasmād yo brahma vedotāpas (veda_uta_apas) *sa taṃ śamayati*, which I would translate with "That's why, if

---

27 Note that **K** features an extra *na* in the second syntagm, apparently negating the second verb as well.
28 Another option would be to edit *na ca [tam vajram / tena vajreṇa] *yamiṣyasīti*, "and you will not hold [the *vajra*]", again imagining the Asuras reclaiming their prerogative to use the weapon that Indra wishes to acquire, but this is rather speculative. Emendations such as *śamiṣyasi*, or *gamiṣyasi* ('you will not go=escape'?) do not seem attractive.

one knows the *bráhman* and the Waters, he extinguishes it (the fire of the *vajra*)".

The root *śam^i-* is frequently used in the sense 'to extinguish (fire)' (or figuratively 'to appease, pacify' (a fiery god, Agni or Rudra); cf. e.g. ŚS 3.21.8cd (~ PS 3.12.8cd), *víśvān devā́n áṅgiraso havāmahe imáṃ kravyā́daṃ śamayantv agním ||*, "[...] all the gods, the Angirases do we call! Let them appease this flesh-eating fire" (Whitney), or ŚS 18.3.60f (~ PS 18.75.5f), *imáṃ sv àgníṃ śamaya ||*, "Kindly pacify thou this fire" (Whitney), as well as the frequent occurrences of the phrase *agneḥ śúcaṃ śamayati* in MS and other texts. It might be that this line is stating that, by keeping his own self under control (*śam^i-*, present stem *śā́m-ya-*, in PS 17.28.27) despite being censured, the *vratin*/Indra quenches (*śam^i-*, causative stem *śam-aya-*) the fire of the thunderbolt (on the semantics of the different stems of *śam^i-*, see KULIKOV 2012: 618ff. with references). We understand that the reason why Indra could not wield the *vajra* in line PS 17.28.2 was its unbearable heat, the same heat that burns the water of the sea as the *vajra* falls in it (PS 17.28.3–5). We might speculate that *bráhman* refers to the Atharvavedic knowledge, and that the Waters are invoked for their ability to quench fires.

A problem with the text proposed by KULIKOV is that I find no other occurrence of the structure [*ya-* OBJ₁ *veda_uta* OBJ₂ , *sa* …]. Thus one may question whether this syntax would be natural at all.

Moreover, although it would seem natural that the relative pronoun *yo* be followed by the correlative *sa*, it is not easy to justify the conjecture **sa* based on the mss. readings. Both **O** and **K** would naturally point to some kind of consonant cluster.[29]

On the basis of **K** *apassitam*, we might correct the text to *apasmitaṃ* with a very light emendation (in fact, **O^B** *apasmṛtam* could also support this emendation). The lexeme *apa-smay/smi-* is only found in two PS stanzas, belonging to a hymn on the healing powers of the Waters (PS 8.8). According to KIM (2014: 74), these two stanzas (8.8.4–5) are meant to heal burns: PS 8.8.4, *yad aṅgair ⁺apasismiṣe ⁺yac chīrṣṇā yac ca pṛṣṭibhiḥ | ā́pas tat sarvaṃ niṣ ⁺karan taṣṭā riṣṭam *ivānaśa ||*, "Was du dir an den Gliedern, am Kopf und an der Rippen durch Lächeln Schaden zugefügt hast, all das sollen die Wasser [wieder] zurechtbringen, wie der Zimmermann einen Schaden in den Griff bekommen hat" (Kim); PS 8.8.5, *saṃ hṛdayena hṛdayam opaśena sam opaśaḥ | adbhir muñcā́pasmitam pā́rṣṇidyotaḥ sam etu me ||*, "Dein Herz soll mit meinem Herz zusammentreffen, deine Kopfbinde mit meiner Kopfbinde. Mache durch die Wasser das los, was durch Lächeln geschädigt wurde! Dein Fersensporn soll mit meinem zusammentreffen" (Kim).[30] KIM's interpretation is based on the observation that the language of the Vedas knows a metaphor (KIM calls it a "Synästhesie") that describes the manifestation of lightning bolts with the root *smay/smi-*, 'smile, laugh, be radiant, shine'. In particular, KIM (2014: 73–74) compares RV 1.168.8, *práti ṣṭobhanti síndhavaḥ pavíbhyo yád abhríyā̃ vā́cam udīráyanti | áva smayanta vidyútaḥ pṛthivyā́m yádī ghṛtám marútaḥ pruṣṇuvánti ||*, "The rivers sound in response to your wheel-rims, when they raise up the speech coming from the (storm) clouds. The lightning-flashes smile down on the earth, when the Maruts sprinkle ghee upon her" (J-B); and also PS 2.70.1, **apādyaud apātatanad ⁺apaskandya vadhed ahim | kalyā́ṇyā yathā *smitam śam u naḥ santu vidyutaḥ ||*, "Er (Parjanya) hat die Schlange weggeblitzt, er hat sie weggedonnert, und nachdem er sie hat wegspringen lassen, möge er sie erschlagen; wie das Lächeln eines lieblichen Mädchens, so sollen uns die Blitze wohl tun" (Zehnder).

Since our line also supposedly describes how Indra was able to extinguish the burning heat of the *vajra*/lightning bolt in order to wield it, it is attractive to consider that a similar metaphor may be in use here. Thus, *apasmitaṃ śamayati* would mean 'he quenches what has been "smiled down", i.e. damaged by a smile' > 'he extinguishes what has been burned by the flash of the lightning bolt',

---

29 PS 8.6.7c (See KIM 2014: 54–55) possibly preserves the only attestation of a lexeme *apa-spṛ-* (**O** *āpaspṛta iva*, **K** *āpasprg eva*), but the line is very corrupt, and hardly related to our line content-wise.

30 A similar healing spell is ŚS 6.24.2, *yán me akṣyór ādidyóta pā́rṣṇyoḥ prápadoś ca yát | ā́pas tát sárvaṃ níṣ karan bhiṣájāṃ súbhiṣaktamāḥ |*, "Whatever hath burnt (*ā-dyut*) in my eyes, in my heels, my front feet; may the waters remove all that—they of physicians the most excellent physicians" (Whitney).

i.e. 'he heals the burning effect of the lightning bolt'. As I have shown above, the verb *śam*[i]- can be used in the sense 'to extinguish (a fire)/to appease (a fiery god, Agni, Rudra)', so this interpretation seems entirely plausible.

Moreover, we know that our text must constantly be read on multiple levels: Indra needs to extinguish the fiery power of the *vajra*; Indra/the *vratin* needs [the draft-ox power] to "bear" the weight of the observance; the (Pāśupata) *vratin* needs to withstand the insults of the people who regard him as a madman because of his behaviour. It may be possible that *apasmitam* is not only the damage caused by the smile/flash of the lightning bolt, but also that caused by the laughter of the *vratin*'s detractors, i.e., the burning shame caused by the laughter of his detractors.[31]

b. As far as the second sentence is concerned, the pronoun *ena*- normally refers to something known or mentioned immediately before. A light emendation would be *evainān, where *enān* would refer to the angry Asuras mentioned earlier in the text (and, on a different level of interpretation, the *vratin*'s detractors). We could perhaps interpret the verb *dohayate* as functioning as a synonym of *sam-vr̥j*- (see my comment on 17.28.7c), indicating that the initiated person "milks out, extracts" the *iṣṭá- pūrtá-* from "them", and by doing so, acquires the power symbolised by the *vajra*. The metaphor of 'milking' (*duh*-) is understandable on the grounds that the observance involves the imitation of the behaviour of bovines. Accordingly, in the Anaḍutsūkta it is said multiple times that the draft-ox (i.e. the *vratin*) 'milks out' various 'milkings' (*dóha*): ŚS 4.11.2 ~ PS 3.25.3; ŚS 4.11.12 ~ PS 3.25.9; ŚS 4.11.9 ~ PS 3.25.10; and especially ŚS 4.11.4 (~ PS 3.25.2) *anaḍvā́n duhe sukr̥tásya loká ... yajñáḥ páyo dákṣiṇā dóho asya*, "The draft-ox milks out for the world of merit … His milk is the ritual of worship, his milking is the priestly fee", in which *yajñáḥ* and *dákṣiṇā* most likely correspond to *iṣṭá* and *pūrtá*, the two merit-worthy ingredients that a pious person stocks up for the afterlife (see my comment *ad loc.* in Appendix II and §3.3). The fact that the *vratins* are males who imitate bulls does not seem to prevent the poets from using this metaphor, to the point that even the draft-ox's udder is mentioned in ŚS 4.11.4c ~ PS 3.25.2c, *parjányo dhā́rā marúta ū́dho asya*, "His streams [of milk] are Parjanya, his udder (!) is the Maruts".

17.28.29–30

29   tam r̥ksāmābhyām ādatta yajuṣā yajñena gāyatreṇa vāmadevyena ca ||
30a   etad vā idaṃ sarvaṃ yad r̥ksāme
30b   etāv indrasya bāhū ||

He (Indra/the *vratin*) took it (the *vajra* / the merit) with the *r̥k* verses and the *sāman* chants, with the *yajus* ritual injunctions, with the ritual worship, with the Gāyatrī recitation, and with the Vāmadevya Sāman.
These, the *r̥k* verses and *sāman* chants, are everything here.
Those two are the two arms of Indra.

tam r̥ksāmābhyām] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71** tam urkyāksa(ktha?)mābhyām **Ji₄** tam r̥ksāmābhyām **Pa_c** tam r̥ksamābhyām **JM₃** tam r̥ktasāmāthānyam **K** • ādatta] **K** uttabhihito **Ma Ja Nā** uttabhito **V122 Ji₄ Mā V71** uttabhito(bhato?) **JM₃** uttato **Pa_c** • yajuṣā] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** yuḍuṣā **V122** • gāyatreṇa] gā̀yatreṇa **[O]** gāyattreṇa **K** • vāmadevyena] **[Ma] [Ja] V122**

---

31 It would be theoretically possible to interpret *apasmitam* as the acc. sg. of a stem *apasmit*-, in which the second member, *smit*-, would be an agent noun based on *smay/smi*- with the *-t*-formant that is sometimes added to roots ending in a resonant (e.g., *bhr̥*- > *bhr̥t*-, *kr̥*- > *kr̥t*). Thus, *apasmit*- would be 'one who smiles, laughs', i.e. '[the lightning bolt] that flashes' or '[the detractor] who laughs at'. This solution is attractive, but remains speculative, as the stem *smit*- is not attested. Since *apasmitam* is attested in PS 8.8.5 as a verbal noun, is seems more plausible that we also have a verbal noun in our text.

Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃ vāmad[x]evyena **V71** vāmaṇa vāmadaivyena **K** • ‖] **[O]** | **K** • idaṃ sarvaṃ yad ṛksāme etāv] **[Ma] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** idaṃ sarvaṃ yad ṛme etāv **Ja** idaṃ sarvaṃ yad ṛksame etāv **JM₃** idam atharvākśame tāv **K** • ‖] **[O]** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *tamṛksāmābhyāmādatta⁺*.

Bhattacharya marks *ādatta* as an emendation, but this is exactly **K**'s reading, so the plus sign is unnecessary. Remarkably, the **O** tradition preserves the verbal noun *uttabhito* from the lexeme *uttambh-* (*ut-stambh-*), 'prop up, support'. This might be semantically acceptable but syntactically unsuitable, as we would then not be able to explain the acc. *tam*. The **O** reading is most likely due to influence from PS 17.42.6 below: *ṛksāmābhyām uttabhito yajuṣā yajñena gāyatreṇa brahmaṇā prathita upariṣṭāt ‖*, "He is upheld by the *ṛk* verses and the *sāman* chants; by the *yajus* ritual injunctions, by the ritual worship, by the Gāyatrī recitation, by the *bráhman* formula, he is made to thrive above." Note that the verbal form *ādatta* also occurs two lines below, in 17.28.31. This must be the same action intended here.

17.28.31

a   tam ādatta
b   taṃ paruṣy ādhatta ‖

He (Indra) took it (the *vajra*);
he put it on [his arm] joint.

taṃ paruṣyādhatta] **[Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** taṃ paruṣvādhatta **Ma** taṃ paruṣādhatta **Ji₄** taṃ paruṣā(ṣī?)dadhatta **Pa꜀** u(ta? u Bᴀʀʀᴇᴛ, ta Bʜᴀᴛᴛ.) barṣv ādhatte **K** • ‖] **[O]** om. **K**

b. To understand the reference to the arm joint in this line and the following, it is useful to recall Indra's epithet *vájra-bāhu-*, 'with the *vajra* on his arm', which suggests that this heavy weapon, probably a huge mace, was carried with the whole forearm, possibly resting on the joint.

Compare 17.28.1 above, and see my comment *ad loc*.

17.28.32

a   prajā vai samṛddhir akṣitiḥ
b   paśavaḥ parūṃṣi ‖

Success, imperishableness is offspring;
[Indra's] joints are the domestic animals.

Note that **K** features an interpolation. This starts with *prajām eva samṛddhim*, which is the beginning of the next line. After copying this part, the copyist must have eye-skipped back to the *akṣati* of our line and copied the rest a second time.

samṛddhir akṣitiḥ] **[Ja] V122 Ji₄** samṛddhir akṣatiḥ **Ma Pa꜀ Mā V71 JM₃** samṛddhim akṣati **K** • paśavaḥ parūṃṣi] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ JM₃** paśavaḥ paruṃṣi **Mā V71** aśavaḥ parūṣi prajām eva samṛddhim akṣati paśavaḥ parūṣi **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** | **V71** *om*. **K**

a. The collocation *samṛddhi- akṣiti-* occurs only in our text (here, at 17.28.33, and 17.37.4). It is not clear whether it should be intended as comprising two nouns ("success, imperishableness") or a noun and an adjective ("imperishable success"). The old adj. *ákṣiti-* occurs in RV as such only in the famous formula *ákṣiti śrávaḥ* (RV 1.40.4b=8.103.5b and 9.66.7c). The ŚS only knows the abstract noun *ákṣiti-*, 'imperishableness', from the single-line verse ŚS 18.4.27 (Funeral Hymn), *ákṣitiṃ bhū́yasīm* ||, "A more abundant inexhaustibleness" (Whitney), and from the following refrain: *prāṇāpānaú cákṣuḥ śrótram ákṣitiś ca kṣítiś ca yā́* |, "Breath-and-expiration, sight, hearing, indestructibleness and destruction […]" (Whitney), found in ŚS 11.7.25ab (~ PS 16.84.4ab) = 11.8.4ab (~ PS 16.85.4ab) = 11.8.26ab (~ 16.87.6ab). PS also has 14.6.1d, *akṣitir bhavatāt tvaṃ*, which Lopez translates with "Become imperishable!" (addressed to the Śataudanā cow), but which might well be interpreted as "Become imperishableness!" However, two further lines are also ambiguous: PS 16.72.4c, *svadhām ūrjam akṣitim ā juhomi*, "I offer *svadhā*, nourishment, imperishableness (?)/imperishable nourishment?" Similarly, PS 16.99.10c, *svadhām urjām akṣitiṃ maho asmai duhe*, "The great one milks out for him *svadhā*, nourishment, imperishableness/imperishable nourishment?" These last few lines seem to allow an adjectival interpretation, but we would have to admit that the PS has employed an adjective (*ákṣiti-*) that is otherwise only used in a rare and archaic RV formula. Therefore, I prefer to translate with 'imperishableness'.

b. The *paśavaḥ*, the domestic animals mentioned here, most likely represent the *vratins*. They perhaps even refer to the devotees of Pāśupati, the lord of cattle. They, as practitioners of the observance, i.e. as draft-oxen, bear the heat/power of the *vajra*, just like Indra's arm joint does (cf. 17.28.31 above).

17.28.33

prajām eva samṛddhim akṣitim ava rundhe ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti) ||

He secures truly offspring, [and hence] success, imperishableness, he who, (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

prajām eva] **K** **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122** **[Mā]** **V71** **JM₃** prajām evaṃ **Ji₄** prajākai(/vau?)meva **Pa꜀** • samṛddhim akṣitim ava] **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122** **Pa꜀** **V71** samṛddhim akṣitima **Ji₄** samṛddhimava **Mā** **JM₃** samṛddhim akṣatim ava **K** • ya (…) ||] **[Mā]?** **[Ma]?** **[Ja]?** yaḥ || 28 || **V122** **Pa꜀** yaḥ || [2̶]28 || **Ji₄** ya || 28 || ru || **JM₃** [.]ya[.] 28 || ru || **V71** yaḥ Z phaścā 2 Z **K**

The abbreviation *ya(ḥ)* || found in the mss. implies a repetition of the refrain first found in 17.27.4 above.

Kāṇḍikā 29

17.29.1–2

1   sa dikṣu praty atiṣṭhat ||
2   diśa evānu prati tiṣṭhati ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti) ||

He (Indra) took a firm standing in the Directions.
He takes a firm standing truly along the Directions, he who, (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

sa dikṣu] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Paᶜ [Mā] V71 JM₃** sa dikṣuṣu **Ji₄**   • atiṣṭhat] **[O]** atiṣṭhad **K**   • ||]
[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Paᶜ [Mā] V71 JM₃ | V122 *om.* **K**   • diśa evānu] **[O]** diśa evāṃ **K**   • pratitiṣṭhati]
[O] pratitiṣṭhatī **K**   • ya (…) ||] **[Mā]? [Ma]? [Ja]?** yaḥ || 29 || ru || **Paᶜ** yaḥ || 29 || **V122** yaḥ || **Ji₄**
yaḥ || 29 || ru 2 || **V71 JM₃** yaḥ Z **K**

On the lexeme *prati-ṣṭhā-*, see Gonda 1954. Gonda notes that "the Brāhmaṇas abound in passages where man is said to be able to obtain a foundation in some power-substance or other, liable to be settled on some entity or other, if he succeeds in gaining the relevant wisdom or in performing the rites which are to that purpose" (ibid., p. 354 with examples).

On the one hand, we can interpret these lines as referring to the *vratin*'s desire to be able to "bear" the heavy burden of the observance. Taking a firm footing is necessary in order to lift up a burden: ŚB 2.1.4.26, *yó vā́ asyām ápratiṣṭhito bhārám udyáchati naìnaṃ śaknoty údyantuṃ sáṃ hainaṃ śṛṇā́ti*, "For he who wants to lift a load without having a firm footing on this (earth), cannot lift it; nay, it crushes him" (Eggeling). Moreover, in ŚB 1.1.1.18 (a passage in which the water used in the ritual is likened to the thunderbolt), it is said: *vájraṃ vā́ eṣá udyachati yò 'páḥ praṇáyati yó vā́ ápratiṣṭhito vájram udyáchati naìnaṃ śaknotyúdyantuṃ sáṃ hainaṃ śṛṇā́ti*, "Now he who brings forward the water, takes up a thunderbolt; but when he takes up the thunderbolt, he cannot do so unless he is firmly placed; for otherwise it destroys him" (Eggeling).

On the other hand, finding a firm footing (*prati-ṣṭhā-*) or a foundation (*pratiṣṭhā*) means acquiring sufficient economic means to find a place in society (see Appendix I). That the *anaḍudvrata* is useful for finding a *pratiṣṭhā* is also stated below, in PS 17.33.4, where Indra finds it after slaying Vṛtra, and especially in PS 17.43.7–8, where it is also clarified what a *pratiṣṭhā* consists of: *prati *tiṣṭhati prajayā paśubhir gṛhair dhanena ya evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti* ||, "He takes a firm standing with offspring, cattle, a homestead, wealth, he who, being initiated, 'bears' the observance of the draft-ox." See also PS 17.42.5.

In its adnominal (or postpositional) use, *ánu* takes the accusative (Delbrück 1888: 444, Macdonell 1910: 417), which is the case in PS 17.32.3, *eṣa vai sarvā anu prajāto dhriyate*, "This (the wind) having risen (lit. having been born) stays firm along all [the Directions]", and in 17.35.12, *dhruvam eva ⁺rtaṃ satyam anu prati tiṣṭhati ya* (…), "He gets a firm standing along this very firm truth and veracity, he who (…)". This second instance is particularly interesting because

anu occurs next to the verb *prati tiṣṭhati*. Clearly, *ánu* is used adnominally with the accusative here. As *ánu* strictly governs the acc., we certainly need to interpret *diśa* as sandhi for acc. pl. *diśas*, rather than loc. sg. *diśe*.

Kāṇḍikā 30

17.30.1-4

1   sa viśvāṣāhy akramata ||
2   eṣā vai viśvāṣāḍ *yad evāsau ||
3   ete vai sarve puṇyā lokāḥ sarvāś ca devatāḥ sa nādhārayat ||
4   sarvān eva ⁺puṇyāṃl lokān ava rundhe sarvāś ca devatā ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti) || 30 ||

He (Indra) strode into [the domain of] Viśvāsah.
This, that very one up there (i.e. the sky), is Viśvāsah.
That is all the pleasant places and all the deities. He could not hold [it, i.e. the *vajra* in its Viśvāsah form/part].
He secures truly all the pleasant places and [the favour of] all the deities, he who, (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

N.B. Lines 30.3 and 30.4 are missing in **K**.

---

viśvāṣāhy] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** viśvāpāhy **Pa꜀** viśvāmāhy **K** • akramata] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** akramat **Ji₄** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** | **K V122 V71** • eṣā] **[O]** eṣa **K** • viśvāṣāḍ *yad] viśvāṣāḍyaur **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀** viśvāṣāṛyaur **V122** viśvāṣāḍyor **Mā V71** viṣvāṣāṛyor **JM₃** viśvāṣātsaur **K** • evāsau] **[O]** evāmau **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** | **V71** *om*. **K** • sarve] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** [~~puṇya~~]sarve **V122** sarvai **JM₃** *om*. **K** • puṇyā lokāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** puṇyā[♯]llokāḥ **V122** *om*. **K** • sa nādhārayat] sa nādhāraẏat **[O]** *om*. **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** | **V122 V71** *om*. **K** • sarvān] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** savān **Ji₄** *om*. **K** • puṇyāṃl lokān ava] puṇyāllokān ava **Ma Pa꜀ Mā V71 JM₃** puṇyāllokān va **Ja** puṇyālokān ava **V122 Ji₄** *om*. **K** • ya (…) ||] yaḥ || 30 || ru || **[Ma] [Mā]** ẏaḥ || 30 || ru || **Pa꜀** yaḥ | 30 || ru 4 | **Ja** yaḥ || 30 || 4 **V122** yaḥ || 30 || **Ji₄** yaḥ || 30 | ru 4 || **V71** yaḥ || 30 || ru 4 || **JM₃** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *eṣā vai viśvāṣā(ḍ)⁺ ḍyaurevāsau ||* in **2**, and *puṇyālloṁkān ava rundhe* in **4**.

    This kāṇḍikā opens a series of three in which it is said that Indra "strides into" (*kram-* + loc.) Viśvāsah (the present kāṇḍikā), Viśvānara (17.31), and Vaiśvānara (17.32), the three entities with which the *vajra* was equated in 17.27.2 above. After these three kāṇḍikās, a fourth one (17.33) follows, in which it is stated that Indra "strides into" Vṛtra, who is then broken. Finally, in 17.34, Indra seeks help from the draft-ox (*upa-dhāv-*) and "strides into" his *vaha*. What do these expressions mean?

    The construction *kram-* (middle) + loc., 'to stride into', is only found in our text and in PS 7.16 ~ ŚS 19.17 (For protection: to various gods), in which each of the ten lines starts with the

formula [X *mā pātu*], 'Let X protect me' (in which X is always a different deity: e.g., 7.16.1a, *agnir mā pātu*), and is followed by a refrain: *tasmin krame* ⁺*tasmiñ* ⁺*chraye tāṃ puraṃ praimi | sa mā rakṣatu sa mā gopāyatu tasmā ātmāṇaṃ pari dade svāhā ||*, "In him do I step, in him do I take refuge. To that stronghold do I go forth. Let him guard me, let him look after me. To him do I entrust myself, hail!" (Griffiths).

In this refrain, the idea of 'stepping into' a deity visualised as a stronghold (*puram*) seems to convey the idea of 'to seek refuge by X' or 'to acquire X's protection'. Thus, I wonder whether the lexeme is used with a similar nuance in our text. In this and the next two kāṇḍikās, Indra would be resorting to the three forms of the *vajra* in order to acquire their power. This would also explain why, in 17.35.5, it is said that *so'naḍuho vahe [']kramata*, "He stepped into (onto?) the withers of the draft-ox", i.e., he sought protection under the withers, he acquired the power of the withers with which he will be able to "bear" (*bhṛ-*) the heavy (*guru*; cf. 17.34.1) observance and wield the *vajra*.

The only problem is that in this case, however, the phrase *sa vṛtre [']kramata* (in 17.33.1) would appear somewhat odd, as Indra does not seek refuge in Vṛtra, nor aims to acquire his power, but rather aims to slay him. One might venture to assume that this expression was inserted secondarily in 17.33, perhaps replacing a *sa *vṛtram *āgachat* (cf. 17.34.1), but this can hardly be proven.

We can of course take *kram-* + loc. in the literal sense of 'to stride, step into', perhaps 'to step into (someone's house or domain)'. Accordingly, Indra would first be stepping into the domain of Viśvāsah, i.e. the sky, which houses the sharp-rimmed top of the *vajra* (17.27.2b, *tigmavīrya*); secondly, into the domain of Viśvānara, i.e. the atmosphere and (celestial) ocean (in 17.31) (in 17.27.2a, this was equated with the *vajra* mace's body); and thirdly, into the domain of Vaiśvānara, i.e. the wind (in 17.32), the handle (*ārambhaṇa*) of the *vajra* according to 17.27.2c. Lastly, he steps into Vṛtra's domain (in 17.33).

Even if the phrase X(loc.) *akramata* does not mean "he sought protection by X; he sought to acquire the power of X", there is little doubt that Indra's aim is to get the *vajra*. Apparently he strides into three domains across which the *vajra* is stretched, as a lightning bolt descending from the sky down into the atmosphere. He must do so in his attempt to get a hold of it.

However, he fails. In 17.30, 31, and 32 we find the refrain *sa nādhārayat*, "he did not hold [it]", perhaps with a potential nuance "he could not hold [it]".[32] In accordance with my multi-layer interpretation, I take this last enigmatic phrase as indicating that he is not able to control the fiery power of the *vajra*, to wield the lightning bolt/mace, to bear the heavy vow, to withstand the detractors' censure. In each case, the text says that, however, one who is initiated (*ya evaṃ vidvān*) into the draft-ox *vrata* is able to do that. Later on, in fact, we will learn that Indra seeks help from the draft-ox (17.34.2), strides onto his withers (*vaha*, in 17.35.5), and is able to complete his observance.

This whole storyline is summarised in the Anaḍutsūkta at ŚS 4.11.7 (only ŚS) (see my comment in Appendix II), *índro rūpéṇāgnír váhena prajápatiḥ parameṣṭhí viráṭ | viśvắnare akramata vaiśvānaré akramatānaḍúhy akramata | só 'dṛṃhayata só 'dhārayata ||*, "He is Indra by [his] form, he is Agni by means of [his] withers, [he is] Prajāpati, Parameshthin, Virāj. He strode into Viśvānara, he strode into Vaiśvānara, he strode into the draft-ox. He made himself firm. He held his [*vajra*]." This verse focuses on how the *vratin*, after three steps, i.e. after approaching Viśvānara, Vaiśvānara, and the draft-ox—reference to Viśvāsah is missing—finally makes himself firm (*dṛṃh-*), and is able to hold (*dhṛ-*) the *vajra*. Our text instead illustrates each single episode (PS 17.30, 31, 32), seemingly focusing on how none of Indra's three attempts at holding (*dhṛ-*) the three forms/parts of the *vajra* are successful. Only in PS 17.34 will Indra resort (*upa-dhāv-*) to the draft-ox for help.

This brings us to another observation. If Indra has not yet acquired the *vajra* here, nor in 17.34, then these chapters cannot be placed chronologically after the ending of 17.28, where it was

---

32 On this form, see my comment on ŚS 4.11.7 in Appendix II.

said that Indra took the *vajra* and put it on his arm. This suggests that we cannot take the sequence of kāṇḍikās as representing a chronological narration, but rather that we should take each kāṇḍikā as an independent text.

To summarise the text so far: in the beginning, we have seen Indra try to wield the *vajra*, fail, and therefore decide to undertake the observance; we have seen him resort to various entities for protection, then being followed by the All-gods and the Maruts; we have seen him withstand the insults of the Asuras and rob them of their merit, and finally get a hold of the *vajra* and rest it on his arm joint. All of this was narrated in kāṇḍikā 28. In the following kāṇḍikās (29–32), we see Indra approach (*kram-* + loc.) the *vajra* again in its three parts connected with the three domains—Viśvāsah/sky, Viśvānara/atmosphere, and Vaiśvānara/wind—and fail to hold them. In kāṇḍikā 33, he approaches (*kram-* + loc.) Vṛtra, who is dismembered. In the next section (17.34), Indra will resort (*upa-dhāv-*) to the draft-ox to acquire his power in order to bear the weight of the observance. Can we consider all of this as a continuous narrative text? If we do so, we run into several inconsistencies: Indra fails to hold (*sa nādhārayat*) the *vajra*, which he has already acquired in 17.28; Indra robs the Asuras and slays Vṛtra before resorting to the draft-ox, whose power logically allows him to "bear" the observance, withstand his detractors' insults, and to wield the *vajra*, which is necessary to slay Vṛtra.

Thus, the criterion for ordering the different kāṇḍikās must be different. In my view, the criterion was based on some kind of didactic programme centred on what each kāṇḍikā is meant to teach to the novice; after all, this is a *brāhmaṇa* text. It seems to me that we should consider the various kāṇḍikās as independent texts, each focusing on highlighting some benefits proceeding from practising the *vrata*, benefits which are stated in the formulations that conclude each one of the kāṇḍikās: … *ya evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti*. Our text must be built around these concluding statements.

Nevertheless, kāṇḍikās 29 to 33 seem to share a common structure and phraseology: the use of *kram-* + loc., a series of sacred equations, etc. Moreover, the items mentioned in the equations of kāṇḍikās 30 to 33 seem to follow a downward sequence: the sky over there (*asau*) (30), the midspace and ocean (possibly the *samudra* that surrounds the earth and from which rain falls?) (31), this wind here (*ayam*) (33), and finally the mountains (*parvatāḥ*) on earth (*asyām*) (34). It seems obvious that this is the downward path of the lightning bolt falling from the sky to the earth. One could argue that Indra is following the *vajra*/lightning bolt "step by step" until it falls on Vṛtra and destroys him. Indeed, it is never explicitly said that Indra slays Vṛtra: only the middle form *abhajyanta*, 'they were broken', referring to Vṛtra's limbs, is used. However, it seems too much to assume that the *vajra* has slain Vṛtra by itself, without Indra's intervention or intention. The myth is way too popular and established to admit such a variation, which would remain unexplained. On the other hand, given the connection between the *anaḍudvrata* and the Gharma ritual enunciated in the Anaḍutsūkta, and given that the Gharma ritual was originally a rite of passage from youth to adulthood that took place at the time of the summer solstice, which is also the time of the year when the myth of the slaying of the dragon took place (I discuss all these details in Appendix II), it seems reasonable to take kāṇḍikā 33 as a reference to Indra's intentional slaying of the dragon Vṛtra *after* the acquisition of the *vajra*, and as a symbol of the completion of the *vrata*. Indeed, as stated in 17.27 above, Indra aimed to employ the *vajra* to slay Vṛtra (*vṛtrāya hantave*). The rationale behind the relation between kāṇḍikā 33 and the preceding three is not easy to uncover, as it probably depends on ritual or didactic necessities.[33]

---

33 One might argue in favour of a chronological interpretation of the narration by saying that, between the end of kāṇḍikā 28 (when Indra finally puts the *vajra* on his arm) and the following kāṇḍikās, we need to assume an untold episode in which Indra actually hurls the *vajra*. It would then be the *vajra* that strides (*kram*) through the sky, then the atmosphere, and finally falls on Vṛtra. It would thus be the *vajra* that is the subject of the phrase *sa* X(loc.) *akramata*. Accordingly, the meaning of *sa nādhārayat* could be something like "he (the *vajra*) did not hold [his position] (i.e. it fell further down)". This interpretation, however, runs into the following problems: 1) the chronological sequence would still be interrupted after this *kāṇḍikā*, because in

2. Note that both 17.31 and 17.32 feature the following structure:

      1. *sa* X(loc.) *akramata* ||

      2. *eṣa- vai* X, *yad* Y(natural element) ||

      3. *eṣa- vai* Z(goal) [, *yad* X₂], *sa nādhārayat* ||

      4. He secures Z, he who, being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox.

in which X is one of the three forms of the *vajra*; Y is a natural element connected to it; Z is the goal, something that the *vratin* will obtain; and optionally, X₂ is something related to X.

Thus, the absence of the *yad* phrase in line 17.30.2, as preserved in both **K** and **O**, seems suspicious: *eṣā vai viśvāṣāḍyaur evāsau*. The line seems very unusual syntactically. The sandhi between *viśvāṣāḍ* and *dyaur* as seemingly preserved here is also quite unusual: Bhattacharya's emendation, *viśvāṣā(ḍ)⁺ ḍyaur*, is most likely based on the observation that the mss. mostly degeminate dental clusters (see Griffiths 2009: lxv §(O)), therefore *ḍy* could stand for an original *ḍḍy*. However, it is quite unusual that the second dental would be retroflexed. My survey of similar cases in RV showed that *-ḍ d-* is attested three times (RV 7.18.14c *ṣáḍ duvoyú*; RV 8.68.14a *ṣáḍ dvā́-dvā*; RV 10.20.4b *ā́naḍ divó*), whereas *-ḍ ḍ-* only occurs once, in RV 10.15.12b, *'vā́ḍ ḍhavyā́ni*, which is actually the result of final *-ṭ* before *h-*; *-ṭ t-* is also found three times (in RV 5.6.5d, *hávyavāṭ túbhyaṃ*; RV 7.99.7a, *váṣaṭ te viṣṇav* = 7.100.7a; and RV 8.45.27c, *vy àṇaṭ turváṇe*); *-ṭ ṭ-* is never attested. In ŚS, *-ḍ d-* is found once, in ŚS 7.97.7a, *váṣaḍ dhutébhyo*, while *-ḍ ḍ-* is found twice, in ŚS 18.3.42b, *'vā́ḍ ḍhavyā́ni* (which is the same as the RV verse), and ŚS 18.4.1c, *ávāḍ ḍhavyéṣitó* (which is not only a very similar collocation, but more importantly again a case of *-ṭ* before *h-*). In ŚS, *-ṭ t-* and *-ṭ ṭ-* are never found. The PS shows the same situation: *-ṭ t-* is found five times (PS 1.5.1a, *vaṣaṭ te pūṣann*; PS 3.1.1, *ekarāṭ tvaṃ*; PS 19.16.15b, *avīrāṭ te*; PS 19.40.5b, *antarikṣāṭ tad;* PS 20.36.3b, *prāṣāṭ tūrtam*; *-ṭ ṭ-* only once, in PS 16.18.7a, *ṣaṭ ṭvā*—which, however, corresponds to ŚS 8.9.7, *ṣáṭ tvā*; and *-ḍ d-* is found twice, in PS 10.2.9b, *virāḍ devī*, and PS 15.1.9a *samrāḍ diśāṃ*); whereas our *-ḍ ḍ-* is only found in PS 18.76.1c, *avāḍ ḍhavyeṣitā*,

---

17.34, Indra still has not successfully completed his observance (whose purpose is to retrieve the *vajra*, as is clear from 17.28.6), and that's why he resorts to the draft-ox. 2) According to this interpretation, we would have to assume that in the Anaḍutsūkta stanza ŚS 4.11.7 (*índro rūpéṇāgnír váhena prajā́patiḥ parameṣṭhī́ virā́ṭ viśvānare akramata vaiśvānaré akramatānaḍúhy akramata | só 'dṛṃhayata só 'dhārayata* ||), where the subject of the three *akramata* is the *vratin*, the latter is identfied with the *vajra*. This is unlikely, as the *vratin* is identified with Indra, who aims at obtaining the *vajra*. 3) Moreover, in the same stanza, it is said that the *vratin* approached the draft-ox (*anaḍuhy akramata*). This recalls 17.34.2, *so'naḍvāham upādhāvat*, "he resorted to the draft-ox", where the subject is clearly Indra. It also recalls 17.35.5, *so'naḍuho vahe'kramata sarvāṃl lokān prājānāt*, "he strode into the withers of the draft-ox; he foreknew the way to every place". If *kram* indicated the motion of the *vajra* after Indra had hurled it, it would not make sense that the *vajra* falls into the draft-ox or its withers, nor that the same *vajra* comes to foreknow the way to every *loka*. 4) Finally, I doubt that it would make sense to say that the *vajra* "strides" (*kram*) at all: there is no hint of any process of personification of the *vajra* in our text; it is clearly described as an object, a weapon, or a thunderbolt. From a survey of the occurrences of *kram* (or lexemes with *kram* plus preverb) in the AV, I find that the agent of the action described is mostly a god or an animal (cow, goat, horse, etc.). Some ambiguous cases are the following: ŚS 18.4.6, *dhrúva ā́ roha pṛthivī́ṃ viśvábhojasam antárikṣam upabhṛ́d ā́ kramasva | júhu dyā́ṃ gacha yájamānena sākáṃ sruvéṇa vatséna díśaḥ prápīnāḥ sárvā dhukṣvā́hṛṇyamānaḥ* ||, "O ladle, ascend the all-nourishing earth; stride, O offering spoon, unto the atmosphere; O sacrificial spoon, go to the sky in company with the sacrificer; with the little spoon (*sruvá*) [as] calf, milk thou all the teeming, unirritated quarters" (Whitney). This stanza belongs to a funeral hymn, and most likely contains a metaphor for how the sacrifice has the effect of accompanying the deceased in the afterlife (cf. ŚS 18.4.1, 2, 3, etc.); perhaps *kram* is also used here because it often expresses the idea of traversing the three worlds (hinting at Viṣṇu's three steps). Another case is ŚS 8.1.21, *ápa tvát támo akramīt*, "Darkness hath departed from thee" (Whitney), which however is hardly comparable with our line. Finally, ŚS 1.12.1 belongs to a spell aganst illnesses perhaps caused by lightning bolts (this is Whitney's conjecture); one could argue that a thunderbolt is the subject of the final verb: *jarāyujáḥ prathamá usríyo vṛ́ṣā vātābhrajā́ stanáyann eti vṛṣṭyā́ | sá no mṛḍāti tanvà ṛjugó rujján yá ékam ójas tredhā́ vicakramé* ||, "First born of the afterbirth, the ruddy (*usríya*) bull, born of wind and cloud (?), goes thundering with rain; may he be merciful to our body, going straight on, breaking; he who, one force, hath striden out threefold" (Whitney). However, the verb is first of all justified by the metaphor of the bull, and secondly, the bull is probably Indra.

corresponding to the above ŚS 18.4.1c, again an instance of *-ṭ* before *h-*. Therefore, it would be safer to presume that the original sandhi in our line was *-ḍ d-*.

However, given our observation that the absence of a *yad* phrase makes for an unusual syntactic structure, it is perhaps possible to imagine that the word *dyaur* was not originally there, but that the line read *eṣā vai viśvāṣāḍ *yad evāsau* ‖. Vedic texts very often do not mention the sky and the earth explicitly, but only by means of feminine deictic pronouns: *asaú*, 'that one over there' (f.), indicates the sky (note that *asaú*, m., can also refer to the sun), and *iyám*, 'this one here' (f.), indicates the earth. Similarly *idám*, 'this one here, here', can mean 'this world' (usually in collocation with *sárvam*, 'this whole world, everything here'). Therefore, if we removed the word *ḍyaur*, our line would convey the same meaning simply by means of the pronoun *asau* (the reference to the sky is also clear from the feminine pronoun *eṣā*), and it would feature a perfectly regular syntactic structure. Moreover, **K**'s reading, *°tsa°*, can easily be explained as a mistake for *°ḍya°* due to the similarity in the spelling of the two clusters in Śāradā script. The insertion of *dyaur* might have occurred not only as a gloss, but also under the influence of the same collocation in PS 17.51.10b (~ ŚS 12.3.20b), *dyaur evāsau pṛthivy antarikṣam* |. To be fair, both traditions point to the sequence *°aur°*. Therefore, perhaps the insertion of *dyaur* (as *ḍyaur*) had occurred before our written archetype, although not necessarily in the period of oral transmission, as the sequence *°ḍyaure°* can perhaps be explained as a mistake for *°ḍyade°*. In my view, this is enough evidence to confidently restore **yad* in our text.

On the sandhi between final *-n* before *l-*, I follow Griffiths's (2009: lxii §(L)) practice of regularising to *-ṃl l-*.

Kāṇḍikā 31

17.31.1–4

1   sa viśvānare [’]kramata ||
2   eṣa vai viśvānaro yad antarikṣaṃ samudraḥ ||
3   ete vai pathayo devayānā yat sūryasya raśmayaḥ sa (nādhārayat) ||
4   pathiṣu devayāneṣu dhriyate pra patho ⁺devayānāñ jānāti ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti) ||

He strode into [the domain of] Viśvānara.
This, the atmosphere, the ocean, is Viśvānara.
These, the rays of the sun, are the paths of the gods; he could not hold [it, i.e. the *vajra* in its Viśvānara part/form].
He stays firmly on the paths of the gods, he foreknows the paths of the gods, he who, (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

N.B. The lacuna that affected the preceding kāṇḍikā in **K** continues here: lines 32.1 and 32.2 are missing.
————————
viśvānare [’]kramata] viśvānare kramata **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c V71 JM₃** viśvānare hy akramat **Mā** *om.* **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **V122** *om.* **K**   • samudraḥ ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** samudraḥ | **V122** *om.* **K**   • ete vai pathayo] ete vai pathaẏo **[O]** ite va payayo **K**   • devayānā] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** devajānā || **Ji₄** devayānāṃ **K**   • yat sūryasya] **K** yaḥ sūryasya **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** yaḥ sūryaḥsya **Mā JM₃** ya[.]sūryaḥsya **V71**   • raśmayaḥ] raśmaẏaḥ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** raḥśmaẏaḥ **[Mā] V71** rasmaẏaḥ **JM₃** vaśmayat **K**   • sa (…) ||] **[Ma]? [Ja]?** saḥ || **V122 Pa_c Mā** sa(//)haḥ || **Ji₄** saḥ | **V71** | saṃḥ || **JM₃** saḥ **K**   • pathiṣu devayāneṣu] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] JM₃** pathiṣu devajāneṣu **Ji₄** pathiṣu devayāneṣat, **Pa_c** pathi[x]ṣu devayāneṣu **V71** patiṣu devayāneṣu **K**   • dhriyate pra] dhriẏate pra **[Ma] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** dhr̥ẏate pra **Ja** dhiẏate pra **Ji₄** dhraẏate pra **Pa_c** śrīyate | pra **K**   • ⁺devayānāñ jānāti] devayānāṃ jānāti **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c JM₃** devayānāṃ [.]ānāti **V122** devajānāṃ jānāti **Ji₄** devayānānāṃ jānāti **Mā V71** devayānāṃ jānātī **K**   • ya (…) ||] **[Ma]?** yaḥ || 31 | ru 4 || **Ja** yaḥ || ru || 31 || (space) **V122** yaḥ || 31 || **Ji₄** yaḥ || 31 || ru || **Pa_c** yaḥ || 31 || ru 4 || **Mā V71 JM₃** yaḥ Z **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *viśvānarekramata* in **1**, and *devayānāṃ jānāti* in **4**.
      1. On the construction with *kram-* (mid.) + loc., see my comment on 17.30.1 above.
      2. Reference to the *samudra* here might imply the notion of a celestial ocean, or more specifically that the earth is surrounded by water on all sides, including above, and that part of heaven itself is made of water. See Slaje 2001: 38.
      3. Note the late form, *pathayaḥ*, a nom. pl. belonging to *pánthā-/páth-*, 'path', but built on the later stem *páthi-* (analogical to the *i*-stems, and productive already since the RV). The form

pathayaḥ is not found elsewhere in RV or AV.

    4. On the sandhi between -*n* before *j*-, I follow GRIFFITHS's (2009: lx §(I)) practice of regularising to -*ñ j*-.

    On the *devayāna path*, see Appendix II §3.2, 3.3. Compare also 17.40.9 below: *pra patho *devayānāñ jānāti ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti)* ||, "He foreknows the paths of the gods, he who (being initiated, 'bears' the observance of the draft-ox)."

Kāṇḍikā 32

17.32.1–4

1   sa vaiśvānare [']kramata ||
2   eṣa vai vaiśvānaro yad ayaṃ pavamānaḥ ||
3   eṣa vai sarvā anu prajāto dhriyate sa nādhārayat ||
4   dhriyante asmin prāṇā ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti) ||

He strode into [the domain of] Vaiśvānara.
This, the very wind here, is Vaiśvānara.
That (the wind) having risen (lit. having been born) stays firm along all [the Directions]; he could not hold [it, i.e. the *vajra* in its Vaiśvānara part/form].
The life-breaths stay firm in him, who, (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

vaiśvānare [']kramata] vaiśvānare kramata **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71 JM₃** vaiśvānare trā(trī?)(//)mata **V122** viśvānare hy akramata **Mā** viśvānare kramata **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** | **V71 V122** *om*. **K**   • vaiśvānaro] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** vaiśvānare **Ji₄**   • yad ayaṃ] yadaẏaṃ **[O]** dayaṃ **K**   • pavamānaḥ] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** pavamāna **Ji₄**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** | **V71 V122** *om*. **K**   • eṣa] **[Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71 JM₃** ete **K Ma Mā**   • sarvā anuprajāto] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀** sarvānuprajāto **Ji₄ Mā V71 JM₃** sarvānuprasāro **K**   • dhriyate] dhriyate **[O]** druhyate **K**   • sa nādhārayat] sa nādhāraẏat **[O]** sa nādhārayad **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** | **V71** *om*. **K**   • dhriyante asmin] dhriẏante asmin **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71 JM₃** dhriẏante asmin, **V122 Pa꜀** dhraẏante asmin **Ji₄** dhriyante smin **K**   • prāṇā] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** prāṇāḥ **Ji₄** prā **K**   • ya (…) ||] **[Mā]? [Ma]? [Ja]?** yaḥ || 3[.] || **V122** yaḥ || [2̶] || 32 || **Ji₄** yaḥ || 32 || ru || **Pa꜀** yaḥ || 32 || ru 4 || **V71 JM₃** yaḥ **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *vaiśvānarekramata* in line **1**.

    3. On the use of *ánu* with the acc., see my note on 17.29.2 above. Here, the acc. pl. feminine *sarvā* (= *sarvāḥ*) must stand for *sarvā diśaḥ*, 'all the Directions'. I find six occurrences of this collocation in PS: 15.4.4b, 16.28.2c, 3c, 16.99.4a, 18.24.10a, and18.26.4d.

    Here we have a very peculiar situation: **K** and the two oldest mss. of **O^A** and **O^B** (namely **Ma** and **Mā**) all agree in reading *ete* at the beginning of line **3**. Yet this reading cannot be correct, as there is no place for a dual or plural subject in this line. The correct reading must be *eṣa*, preserved in the younger **O** mss. (both in **O^A** and **O^B**).

Kāṇḍikā 33

17.33.1–4

1   sa vṛtre [’]kramata ||
2a   tasya ⁺vṛtrasyāṅgā parvāṇi śarīrāṇy abhajyanta |
2b   etāni vai vṛtrasyāṅgā parvāṇi śarīrāṇi yad ime parvatāḥ ||
3   sa yatra hṛdā manasā kāmayata iha me rādhyate tad asmai rādhyate ||
4   asyām eva pratiṣṭhām āyatanaṃ vindate ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti) ||

He strode into [the domain of] Vṛtra.
The limbs, the joints, the bones of that Vṛtra were broken;
these, the very mountains here, are the limbs, the joints, the bones of Vṛtra.
Whenever(/wherever) he wishes with his heart and mind "I am successful here!", then(/there) he is successful.
On this very one (i.e. the earth), he finds a foundation, a base, he who (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

sa vṛtre [’]kramata] sa vṛtre kramata **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** sa vṛtre kramat **Ji₄** su vṛttre krama **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā]** | **V122 Pa_c V71 JM₃** *om*. **K** • ⁺vṛtrasyāṅgā] vṛttrasyāṅgā **K** vṛtrasyāṅgāḥ **Ma Ja Ji₄ Pa_c Mā** vṛtraṃsyāṅgāḥ **V122** vṛrtrahsyāṅgāḥ **V71 JM₃** • abhajyanta] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** abhavajyanta **Ji₄** abhijyanta **K** • |] **[O]** *om*. **K** • etāni] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71** etā[x]ni **JM₃** śatāni **K** • vṛtrasyāṅgā] vṛtrasyāṅgāḥ **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Mā** vṛtrasyāṅgāḥ[x] **Pa_c** vṛrtrasyāṅgāḥ **V71** rvṛrtrasyāṅgāḥ **JM₃** vṛttrasyāṅgā **K** • yad ime] **[O]** yadīpe **K** • parvatāḥ] **[O]** parvatāma **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā]** | **V122 Pa_c JM₃** [.] **V71** *om*. **K** • yatra] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** pa(ṣa?)tra **V122** • kāmayata] kāmaẏata **[O]** kāmayeti **K** • me rādhyate] **[O]** sa rādhyate **K** • tad asmai rādhyate] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** tad asmai rādhyato **Ji₄** tad asmai rājyate **Pa_c** tasmai rādhyate **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **V122** *om*. **K Ji₄** • āyatanaṃ] **K** āẏatanaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** āṃ(//)ẏatanaṃ **Pa_c** • ya (…) ||] **[Mā]? [Ma]? [Ja]?** yaḥ || 3[.] || ru || **V122** yaḥ || 33 || **Ji₄** yaḥ || 33 || ru || **Pa_c** yaḥ || 33 || ru 4 || **V71 JM₃** yaḥ **Z K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *vṛtrekramata* in line **1**.

This kāṇḍikā raises a few questions about the structure of the narrative. In my view, it does not stand in chronological order in relation to the neighbouring kāṇḍikās. Rather, it describes the concluding episode of the myth, when Indra, after resorting to the draft-ox (17.34), completing his observance, and acquiring the *vajra*, finally slays Vṛtra, which was his goal as stated in 17.27.1. For a discussion, see my comment on 17.30 above.

2. On the middle *ya*-present of *bhañj-* (stem *bhaj-ya-^{te}*), see KULIKOV 2012: 481–482.

3. I take *tad* as the correlative of *yatra*, although it could theoretically be taken with the

yatra phrase as subject of *rādhyate* (or as subject of the apodosis: see footnote 35) The apodosis would then not be introduced by any correlative.[34] On the syntactic construction of the verb *rādh-*, see KULIKOV 2012: 350ff., who summarises as follows: 'X_{NOM} is successful for Y_{DAT}'. He provides, among others, the following example: VS 1.5a (with several parallels), *ágne vratapate vratáṃ cariṣyāmi; tác chakeyaṃ; tán me rādhyatām*, "O Agni, lord of vows, I shall perform this vow; may I accomplish it; let it be successful for me". In our case, however, neither of the occurrences have an overt subject in the nominative, nor any evident implied referent (such as the *vratám* of the quoted example). Thus, it seems that we need to regard them as impersonal constructions: *iha me rādhyate*, '[it] is successful for me here' = 'I am successful here', and *tad asmai rādhyate*, 'there [it] is successful for him' = 'there he is successful'.[35]

4. The words *pratiṣṭhā-* and *āyatana-* frequently occur together. On the former, see my comment on 17.29.1–2 above. On *āyatana-*, see GONDA 1975: 178ff., who collects numerous examples covering the wide range of meanings expressed by this word, and discusses the many attempts at translating it. GONDA tries to grasp the core meaning with the following words: "To 'support' […] I would prefer 'natural position, place in which an object properly and regularly ought to be'" (ibid. p. 205), "the proper place" (ibid. p. 220). At the same time the word is often used in connection with *pratiṣṭhā* (see ibid. p. 347), almost as a synonym, 'base, support, resort, something to depend on' (on their differences, see instead ibid. p. 203ff.).

---

34 Note that **K** has *tasmai* instead of *tad asmai* (**O**). Note also the absence of an *iti* particle enclosing the quotation "*iha me rādhyate*". **K** *kāmayeti* might suggest that the *iti* particle was intended as preceding the quotation.

35 Perhaps the text originally read *tad* twice: *iha me rādhyate tat*, "That is successful for me here", and *tad asmai rādhyate*, "That is successful for him".

Kāṇḍikā 34

In this kāṇḍikā, Indra resorts to the draft-ox for help after the gods have told him that they regard his observance as "heavy" (*guru*). Logically, this must have happened after Indra had already started practising his observance (that is, after the events related in 17.28.1–6), yet before he successfully completes it (that is, before 17.28.26–32, when it is said that Indra rips the Asuras off, and before 17.33, when he slays Vṛtra). The fact that the verb *upa-dhav-* is used to describe the moment when Indra resorts to the draft-ox suggests that this episode is equivalent to the events described in 17.28.8–25, when Indra resorts to (*upa-dhav-*) a number of figures for help.

17.34.1

a   sa devān āgachat
b   taṃ devā abruvann
c   ā śaṃsāmahe gurv etad vratam āraṇyeṣu paśuṣu grāmyeṣv †aty eti† ‖

He (Indra) came to the gods. The gods said to him: "We fear: that observance [of yours] is heavy! Among wild and domestic animals …

āgachat] **[O]** āgaśchat **K**   • devā abruvann] **[Ma] V122 Pa꜀** devā abṛvaṃn **Ja V71** devābruvann **Ji₄** devābṛvaṃn **Mā** devā abruvaṃn **JM₃** devāḥ avruvann **K**   • ā śaṃsāmahe gurv etad vratam] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** ā [.]sāmahe gurv etad vratam **V71** ā śaṃsāmahe gurv eta[.]ta(⫽)m **Pa꜀** ā śaṃ sāmektanmeti | vratam **K**   • āraṇyeṣu] **[O]** ā(ha→*s.s*)hiraṇyeṣu **K**   • grāmyeṣv †aty eti†] grāmyeṣv aty eti **[O]** grāmyeṣv aśveti **K**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** | **V71** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *āgacchat*⁺ and *grāmyeṣvatyeti* ‖.
     c. As this line reports the gods' direct speech, we would expect it to conclude with *iti*. It seems quite obvious that the sequences °*atyeti* in **O** and °*aśveti* in **K** must conceal this *iti* particle. As neither *atya_iti* **O** nor *aśva_iti* **K** are satisfying solutions, the challenge is then to figure out how to emend the word preceding the particle.
     There is a second option: that the gods' speech actually ends earlier. **K** preserves an interesting reading: *ā śaṃ sāmektanmeti | vratam* etc. Here we have a *daṇḍa* preceded by *eti*. Could this perhaps be the original location of the missing *iti*? The remaining phrase would start with *vratam*, which could then be either subject (n. nom.) or object (n. acc.) of a final verb (but what verb?).
     Let us review the context. Indra is now approaching the gods. Notably, an apparently neutral *ā-gam-* is used: not *upa-dhāv-*, which is used in the text when Indra "resorts to, seeks help from" various entities (see PS 17.28.8–25 above, but also below, when Indra resorts to the draft-ox), nor

kram- + loc., by which the text expresses how Indra approaches the three forms of the *vajra* in his attempt to hold them (PS 17.30–33). The gods speak somewhat solemnly, either in awe or in fear (both nuances of *ā-śaṃs-*), and state that the observance is (too) heavy. Immediately, in the next line, we learn that Indra seeks help (*upa-dhav-*) from the draft-ox. This makes sense because the draft-ox, being accustomed to drawing heavy loads, is clearly the only animal who is strong enough to bear this heavy vow.

This interpretation speaks in favour of regarding *gurv etad vratam* as a whole sentence, "this observance is heavy", rather than in favour of ending the first sentence before *vratam*—certainly something along the lines of *ā śaṃsāmahe guru etad iti | vratam*, "'We fear: that observance [of yours] is heavy!' The vow ..." could also be conceivable. Unfortunately, I am not able to offer a good solution to explain the corruption found in **K**.

If the second part of the line is also part of the gods' speech, what could they plausibly be saying to Indra? If they are advising Indra to do something, we would expect a 2sg. imperative form ending in -*a*, which in sandhi with *iti* would yield -*eti*. **K** *aśveti* might point to *āsveti (=*āsva_iti)*, "be seated...", but we would expect the gods to suggest that Indra "goes" among the mentioned animals in search of the draft-ox. Perhaps *ateti, with a 2sg impv. from *at-*, 'to go', would fit. This root is very rare; it occurs only three times in RV: RV 1.30.4ab, *ayám u te sám <u>atasi</u> kapóta iva garbhadhím |*, "This (soma) here is yours: <u>you rush</u> to it like a dove to its nest" (J-B); RV 2.38.3b, *árīramad átamānaṃ cid étoḥ |*, "He [=Savitar] has brought to rest even the wanderer from his travelling" (J-B); and in RV 6.9.2b, where *átamānāḥ* refers to 'wandering' fingers that weave. Semantically, this root would be suitable—"Go/rush/wander among the wild and domestic animals"—but the rarity of the root makes me hesitate. It also remains unclear how Indra would perceive the above as advice to look specifically for the draft-ox.

There is also the option of considering *aty eti* as original, and to assume that a final *iti* has been lost due to haplology or haplography (*atyetīti > atyeti*). If this is correct, then we would need to understand the meaning of *aty eti* and identify the subject.

I doubt that the subject could be *vratam*. The gods could be saying that the observance is too heavy, and therefore it "goes beyond" all the animals['s power of bearing it]. But this cannot be true, because the draft-ox, who is an animal, is in fact able to bear it—or is it that he is somewhat in between the two categories? (see below). It also not easy to justify the use of the locative in such a sentence.

Incidentally, if this part of the sentence is still saying something about the *vratam*, one could also think of emending to *atīti (*ati_iti*): the line would thus translate, "We fear: that observance [of yours] is heavy, excessively (*ati*), for [both] domestic and wild animals". But again, the locative would be a problem, as *ati* would rather govern an accusative or a genitive.

The subject could be Indra. "He [Indra] goes beyond(?) (*aty eti*) among wild and domestic animals [in search for help]". This would actually work best if this sentence is not part of the gods' speech. However, an imperfect tense would be preferable, as this is the tense that is used throughout the text for the narrative parts. If we accept this meaning, we could consider emending to *aid *iti, which would have the advantage of doing away with the preverb *aty* and provide a clearer meaning: "He [Indra] went (*ait*) among wild and domesticated animals" (*iti*). This solution would also explain the absence of an overt subject: Indra/the *vratin* is constantly implied throughout the text. However, it would require that the gods' speech end after *vratam*, again without *iti* (if **K** preserves an earlier *iti*, this would be before *vratam*).

Lastly, the subject could be the draft-ox. It would make perfect sense if the gods were advising Indra to resort to the draft-ox, as he is the strongest among wild and domestic animals. The dictionaries simply report a literal meaning for *ati-i-*, 'to go beyond, through, across'. However, perhaps a figurative 'surpass, be better, excel' is conceivable. RV 9.96.6 reads *brahmā́ devā́nām padavī́ḥ kavīnā́m, ṛ́ṣir víprāṇām mahiṣó mṛgā́ṇām | śyenó gṛ́dhrāṇām 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 (excels) the filter." In this verse, the soma is likened to figures that are clearly the best in their category; they excel with respect to their category. Similarly, the soma, which flows through (*áty eti*) the filter and is purified, also excels (*áty eti*), being the best of drinks. If this is an intended pun, or a real expression, it is possible that the meaning 'to excel' could be expressed by *ati-i-* in our line as well: "[The draft-ox] excels among wild and domesticated animals!" It is true that in the RV line, *aty-i-* would govern the genitive, whereas we have a locative in our line; however, both cases can express a partitive function. Nonetheless, this remains a rather speculative solution.

We should also ask, how is the draft-ox related to wild and domestic animals? He is certainly a domestic animal, yet the bull, with its wild power, is still somewhat akin to wild animals. Note that the members of the Indo-European warrior brotherhoods lived in the wilderness as wild animals, identifying especially with dogs, wolves, and in India also tigers (see Appendix I). It is perhaps possible to conceive the draft-ox as being somewhat in between wild and domestic animals: he houses a wild, strong power, yet this power is harnessed and controlled under the yoke. From the perspective of the initiated youth (the members of the *Jugendbund*[36]), acquiring the power of the draft-ox might be a metaphor for the moment when their uncontrolled youthful energy (the fury of the Indo-European warrior) is finally harnessed, extinguished, so that the young boys, now able to responsibly control themselves, can join the society of adults. The fact that the draft-ox hovers between the wild and the domestic spheres might also be an intentional metaphor for the initiated youth or the marginalised Vrātyas, who live in a liminal stage between the wilderness and the community, which they hope to (re-)join at some point. From the perspective of the ascetic, the idea of harnessing the wild power of the bull and putting it to good use might symbolise the ascetic practices aimed at controlling bodily and mental functions.[37] There is much to be read in the image of the draft-ox. However, it seems to offer us little help in solving the philological problem in this particular line.

In conclusion, in lack of a convincing solution, I refrain from emending, and leave the text of **O** with *cruces*.

17.34.2 ~ GB 1.1.23h–l

a   so [']naḍvāham upādhāvat
b   tam anaḍvān abravīt
c   kiṃ me pratīvāho bhaviṣyatīti
d   varaṃ vṛṇīṣveti
e   sa varam avṛṇīta ||

He (Indra) resorted to the draft-ox.
The draft-ox said to him:
"What will be my reward?"
[Indra said:] "Choose a boon!"
He (the draft-ox) chose a boon.

so [']naḍvāham] so naḍvāham **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** so narvāham **V122 Ji₄** so naḍvān **K** • anaḍvān] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** anaṛvān **V122 Ji₄** anuḍvān **K** • abravīt] **[Mā] [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** abravī **V71 JM₃** avravīt, **K** • kiṃ me] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** kīmme

37 Note that Kauṇḍinya interprets the reference to *godharma* and *mṛgadharma* in PāśS 5.18 as referring to ascetic skills: "[...] what is meant is their common attribute, which is the ability to bear the pain of opposites [heat and cold, etc.] [...]" (HARA 1966: 406).

Mā V71 JM₃ • bhaviṣyatīti] **[O]** bhaviṣyasīti **K** • varaṃ vṛṇīṣveti] **[O]** *om*. **K** • avṛṇīta]
[O] avavṛṇīta **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pac [Mā] V71 JM₃** | V122 *om*. **K**

GB 1.1.23h–l (Gaastra 1919: 16)³⁸
(h) sa hovāca
(i) kiṃ me pratīvāho bhaviṣyatīti
(j) varaṃ vṛṇīṣveti
(k) vṛṇā iti
(l) sa varam avṛṇīta

Bhattacharya's edition reads *sonaḍvāham* in **a**.

 a. On *upa-dhav-*, 'resort to (for help)', see 17.28.8–25.

 c. Note the (probably intentional) pun between *anaḍ-vāh-* and *pratīvāha-*. The latter word is attested only here, in the GB parallel, and in KauśS 10.5[79].29, *gaur dakṣiṇā pratīvāhaḥ*, 'the reward is a cow as fee'.³⁹

 de. Note here the *figura etymologica*, *varaṃ vṛ-*. Dialogues of this kind, in which gods grant boons to other gods, ascetics, or other figures are very frequent in Brāhmaṇa literature (and later narrative), but this is the only example in the AV.

---

38 This dialogue belongs to the first section (1.1.23) of the second Brāhmaṇa of the Praṇavopaniṣad, comprising GB 1.1.16–30. Bloomfield (1899: 108) defines the Praṇavopaniṣad as a "cosmogonic account deriving creation from the om", and gives a rather detailed summary of the text (pp. 108–110). The text of GB 1.1.23 is the following: GB 1.1.23, (a) *vasor dhārāṇām aindraṃ nagaram,* (b) *tad asurāḥ paryavārayanta,* (c) *te devā bhītā āsam,* (d) *ka imān* [ed. *īmān*] *asurān apahaniṣyatīti,* (e) *ta oṃkāraṃ brahmaṇaḥ putraṃ jyeṣṭhaṃ dadṛśrus,* (f) *te tam abruvan,* (g) *bhavatā mukhenemān asurāñ jayemeti,* (h) *sa hovāca,* (i) *kiṃ me pratīvāho bhaviṣyatīti,* (j) *varaṃ vṛṇīṣveti,* (k) *vṛṇā iti,* (l) *sa varam avṛṇīta,* (m) *na mām anīrayitvā brāhmaṇā brahma vadeyur,* (n) *yadi vadeyur abrahma tat syād iti,* (o) *tatheti,* (p) *te devā devayajanasyottarārdhe 'suraiḥ saṃyattā āsan,* (q) *tān oṃkāreṇāgnīdhrīyād devā asurān parābhāvayanta,* (r) *tad yat parābhāvayanta tasmād oṃkāraḥ pūrvam ucyate,* (s) *yo ha vā etam oṃkāraṃ na vedāvaśī syād ity atha ya evaṃ veda brahmavaśī syād iti,* (t) *tasmād oṃkāra ṛcy ṛg bhavati,* (GB 1.1.23u) *yajuṣi yajuḥ,* (v) *sāmni sāma,* (w) *sūtre sūtram,* (x) *brāhmaṇe brāhmaṇam,* (y) *śloke ślokaḥ,* (z) *praṇave praṇava iti brāhmaṇam* ‖ 23 ‖, (a) "The *aindra* (?) city of the streams of wealth: (b) that one the Asuras surrounded. (c) The gods were afraid: (d) 'Who will repel these Asuras?' (e) They saw the Oṃ-kāra, the eldest son of the *bráhman*. (f) They said to him: (g) 'We shall win these Asuras by means of You as an introduction (*mukha-*) [to the recitation].' (h) He said: (i) 'What will be my reward?' (j) 'Choose a boon!' (k) 'I will choose.' (l) He chose a boon: (m) 'The brahmins shall not utter a *bráhman* without having pronounced me [first]; (n) should they speak [without pronouncing 'oṃ' first], that [*bráhman*] shall be a non-*bráhman*!' (o) 'So be it!' (p) The gods were in conflict with the Asuras at the further end (northern side?) of the sacrificial ground. (q) The gods overcame the Asuras with the Oṃ-kāra from the Āgnīdhrīya. (r) That [episode] when they overcame [the Asuras], that's why they say the Oṃ-kāra first. (s) It is said: 'He who does not know the Oṃ-kāra, he shall be no ruler'; then it is said: 'He who knows, shall be a ruler of the *bráhman*.' (t) That's why the Oṃ-kāra becomes the *ṛk* in the *ṛk*, (u) the *yajus* in the *yajus*, (v) the *sāman* in the *sāman*, (w) the *sūtra* in the *sūtra*, (x) the *brāhmaṇa* in the *brāhmaṇa*, (y) the *śloka* in the *śloka*, (z) the *praṇava* in the *praṇava*—so says the *brāhmaṇa*" (my transl.).

39 The tenth adhyāya of the KauśS deals with marriage (Modak 1993: 67–68). This instruction is found among various other instructions on ritual actions connected with the recitation of stanzas from the Wedding Hymn. KauśS 10.5[79].28–31 reads: (28) <*pūrvāparaṃ* [14.1.23]> *yatra nādhigached* <*brahmāparaṃ* [14.1.64]>_*iti kuryāt,* (29) *gaur dakṣiṇā pratīvāhaḥ,* (30) <*jīvaṃ rudanti* [14.1.46]> <*yadīme keśino* [14.2.59]>_*iti juhoti,* (31) *eṣa sauryo vivāhaḥ.* Thus, this line does not seem connected with our text. However, it is interesting that the word *pratīvāha* is found only in texts of the AV tradition.

17.34.3–5

3a   bradhnaloko [']sāni
3b   bradhnasya viṣṭapi śrayā iti ||
4   ṣoḍaśo vā ita ūrdhvo loko yad bradhno yad bradhnasya viṣṭapaḥ ||
5   bradhnaloko bhavati bradhnasya viṣṭapi śrayate ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ
       bibharti) ||

"I will be one whose world is the ruddy one (i.e. the sun)!
I will rest on the top of the ruddy one (i.e. the sun)!"
It is the sixteenth world above here, that is the ruddy one (i.e. the sun), that is the top of the ruddy
one (i.e. the sun).
He becomes one whose world is the ruddy one (i.e. the sun), he rests on the top of the ruddy one
(i.e. on the sun), he who, (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

N.B. In **K**, line 34.5 is missing up to and including *viṣṭapi*.

---

bradhnaloko [']sāni] bradhnaloko sāni **[O]** vradhnaloko sāni **K**   • bradhnasya] **[O]** vradhnasya **K**
• viṣṭapi] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** viṣṭavi **Ji₄** viṣṭapa **K**   • śrayā] śrayā **[O]** śriyā **K**
• ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃ | V122** *om*. **K**   • ṣoḍaśo] **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** śoṛaśo **V122**
Ji₄ Pa_c V71 JM₃ ṣoḷaśo **K**   • ita] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c V71 JM₃** iti **Mā Ji₄** yad **K**   • ūrdhvo] **K**
ūdhno **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa_c V71 JM₃** udhno **Mā**   • bradhno] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃**
[x]no **V122** vradhno **K**   • bradhnasya] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** bradhnasa **Pa_c** badhnasya
V71 vradhnasya **K**   • viṣṭapaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71** viṣṭāpaḥ **Pa_c** viṣṭhapaḥ **JM₃**
niṣṭapaś **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃ | V122** *om*. **K**   • bradhnaloko] **[Ma] [Ja]**
V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃ bradhnalo[ko̶]ko **V71** *om*. **K**   • bhavati bradhnasya] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄**
[Mā] V71 JM₃ bha[x]vati bradhnasya **Pa_c** *om*. **K**   • viṣṭapi] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** piṣṭapi
V122 viṣṭapiṃ **Pa_c** *om*. **K**   • śrayate] śrayate **[O]** śreyante **K**   • ya (…) ||] **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?**
yaḥ || 33 || ru || **V122** yaḥ || 34 || **Ji₄** yaḥ || 34 || ru || **Pa_c** yaḥ || 34 || ru 5 || **V71 JM₃** yaḥ Z **K**

    Note that line 34.4 seems to feature a nom. sg. m. *viṣṭapaḥ* from the stem *viṣṭápa-*, whereas
34.5 features the loc.sg. *viṣṭapi* from the stem *viṣṭáp-*, (f.). The stem *viṣṭápa-* is always neuter in RV
and AV, and the masculine is extremely rare: I find it in PB 19.10.12, *eṣa vāva bradhnasya viṣṭapo,
yad …* (but compare PB 23.3.5 = 13.19.3, *etā vāva bradhnasya viṣṭapo, yad …* , which could point
to a feminine); *viṣṭapaḥ* in PS 18.16.6 (quoted below) is either a corruption (cf. ŚS *viṣṭápi*) or a
feminine accusative plural of *viṣṭáp-*.

    The compound *bradhnáloka* is a Bahuvrīhi, 'one whose world is the ruddy one'. It is
attested only here and in ŚS 11.3.50–51, in which benefits similar to the ones predicted in our line
are attained by one who is initiated into the knowledge of the rice meal (*odaná*): *etád vaí
bradhnásya viṣṭápaṃ yád odanáḥ || bradhnáloko bhavati bradhnásya viṣṭápi śrayate yá eváṃ véda
||*, "This—namely, the rice-dish—is indeed the summit of the ruddy one. He cometh to have the
ruddy one for his world, he resorteth to the summit of the ruddy one, who knoweth thus" (Whitney).
A corresponding Karmadhāraya, *bradhnaloká*, 'world of the ruddy one', is never attested..

    The expression *bradhnásya viṣṭáp(a)-* is already found in RV: 9.113.10, *yátra kā́mā nikāmā́ś
ca yátra bradhnásya viṣṭápam | svadhā́ ca yátra tṛ́ptiś ca tátra mā́m amṛ́taṃ kṛdhī́ndrāyendo pári
srava ||*, "Where there are desires and yearnings, where the upper surface of the coppery one [=Sun
and soma?] is, where there is independence and satisfaction, there make me immortal. —O drop,
flow around for Indra" (J-B). J-B's hesitation is due to the fact that the adjective *bradhná* is
sometimes used to refer to the soma.[40] GELDNER (1951: III, 120) takes it as the "Höhepunkt der

---

40 Indeed, J-B take the second RV occurrence of *bradhnásya viṣṭáp-* to refer to soma: RV 8.69.7 (~ ŚS 10.9.4), *úd
   yád bradhnásya viṣṭápaṃ gṛhám índraś ca gánvahi | mádhvaḥ pītvā́ sacevahi tríḥ saptá sákhyuḥ padé ||*, "As

Sonne". In fact, in the AV, the ruddy (*bradhná*) sun (possibly portrayed as a bay horse) is the addressee of various hymns collected in ŚS 13 and PS 18. Cf. ŚS 13.1.16 (~ PS 18.16.6), belonging to a hymn to the Sun ('the ruddy one', *róhita, bradhná*): *ayáṃ vaste gárbhaṃ pr̥thivyā́ dívaṃ vaste 'yám antárikṣam | ayáṃ bradhnásya viṣṭápi* (PS: *viṣṭapaḥ*) *svàr lokā́n vy ā̀naśe ||,* "This one clothes himself in the embryo (womb?) of the earth; this one clothes himself in the sky, the atmosphere; this one, on the summit of the reddish one, has penetrated the heaven (*svàr*) [rather: the sun], the worlds" (Whitney). That this expression refers to a place in the sky is also clear from PS 16.72.1b: *bradhnasya viṣṭapi parame vyoman |,* "On the top of the ruddy one, in the highest sky". Compare also ŚS 10.10.31c ~ PS 16.110.1c.

That the *bradhnaloká,* 'the world of the sun' (implied by our *bradhnáloka*) and the *bradhnásya viṣṭáp* are to be identified with the *svargá loká* (mentioned in PS 17.43.4) seems clear from passages like AB 5.30 (on the Agnihotra): (1) *ete ha vai saṃvatsarasya cakre yad ahorātre, tāb^hyām eva tat saṃvatsaram eti* […] (4) *rāthaṃtarī vai rātry, ahar bārhatam. agnir vai rathaṃtaram ādityo br̥had, ete ha vā enaṃ devate bradhnasya viṣṭapaṃ svargaṃ lokaṃ gamayato ya evaṃ vidvān udite juhoti. tasmād udite hotavyaṃ* […], "Day and night are the wheels of the year; verily thus with them he goes through the year […] The night is connected with the Rathantara, the day with the Br̥hat; Agni is the Rathantara, Āditya the Br̥hat. Those deities make him attain the vault of the tawny one, the world of heaven, who knowing thus offers after sunrise. Therefore should one offer after sunrise […]" (Keith). Similarly, ŚB 9.4.4.3 reads: […] *téna vayáṃ gamema bradhnásya viṣṭápaṃ svargáṃ lokáṃ róhantó 'dhi nā́kam uttamám ítyetát,* "Thus, 'Thereby we will go to the region of the bay (horse, the sun) mounting up to the heavenly world, beyond the highest firmament'" (Eggeling). Compare also ŚB 13.2.6.1 (on the Aśvamedha), in which the identification of the ruddy horse and the sun is also made clear: *asaú vā́ ādityó bradhnò'ruṣò'múm evā́smā́ ādityáṃ yunakti svargásya lokásya sámaṣṭyai,* "The ruddy bay, doubtless is yonder sun: it is yonder sun he harnesses for him, for the gaining of the heavenly world" (Eggeling).

On the basis of the connection between the *anaḍudvrata* and the Gharma ritual established in the Anaḍutsūkta, it should be reminded that during the *avāntaradīkṣā* of the Gharma ritual, the initiate aims to accumulate the power of the sun (see Appendix II §3.1 and fn. 23).

---

we two, Indra and (I), go up to his home along the surface of the coppery (soma), having drunk of the honey three times, might we two become comrades at the seven(th) step of the comrade." Jamison comments, "Ge[ldner] and Hoffmann, inter alia, take *bradhnásya viṣṭápam* to refer to the height or top of the sun. The phrase occurs also in IX.113.10. *bradhná-* in VIII.4.13–14 seems to refer to soma. Since *viṣṭáp-* several times occurs with *samudrásya* (VIII.34.13, 97.5=IX.12.6, IX.107.14)*,* something liquid makes sense, rather than wandering around on top of the sun. Furthermore, at least in IX.12.6 (and probably IX.107.14) the 'sea' in this expression is clearly soma. I also think that it works better as acc. of extent, rather than as goal, since the goal is the *gr̥hám*" (R̥gveda commentary on VIII.43–103 (11-25-18), p. 42, available at http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu).

Kāṇḍikā 35

17.35.1

a   athāhīnā āśvatthir abravīn

b   na tād brāhmaṇaṃ nindāni yād enam aśṛṇon ned iṣṭāpūrtena vi bhavānīti ||

Then Ahīnas Āśvatthi said:
"Therefore I will not censure [this/a] brahmin for having learned about him (i.e., heard about Indra and imitated his observance), lest I be deprived of [my] merit, gained from worship and donations."

N.B. **Ji₄** features an interpolation of 17.35.4b: [...]*ned iṣṭāpū{rttaṃ māyāṃ ... hyenaṃ || }*
rttena[...].

_____

athāhīnā āśvatthir] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 thādīnā āśvatnyar **Ji₄** athāhīnā āśvarathir **JM₃** ayathāhīnāśvatthād **K** • abravīn] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** JM₃ adbravīn V71 avravīt **K** • na tād] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ na tā Ji₄ na ad Pa꜀ tracā **K** • brāhmaṇaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ **[Mā]** JM₃ brāhmaṇa Pa꜀ brahmaṇaṃ V71 vrāhmaṇa **K** • nindāni yād] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ nindā(→ *s.s.* ndāni | yā)d V122 nindāni yātad Ji₄ nindrāni yād Pa꜀ nindyāni ād **K** • enam] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 evanam **JM₃** • aśṛṇon ned iṣṭāpūrtena] aśṛṇon ned iṣṭāpūrttena **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ aśṛṇon ned iṣṭāpū{rttaṃ māyāṃ saṃ vṛktāmindraṃ hyenaṃ ||} rttena **Ji₄** aśṛṇunyejuṣṭapūrtenaṃ **K** • vi bhavānīti] **[O]** vyabhavānīti **K** • |||] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] JM₃** | **K** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71

    a. Ahīnas Āśvatthi appears as ritual expert in various legends centred around the figures of the Keśins, 'those with long-hair" and the Dārbhyas (or Dālbhyas), 'those of the *darbha* grass'. The former is a Vrātya epithet, which refers to the warrior brotherhoods' young members' habit of sporting long unkempt hair while undergoing initiation, a very old Indo-European custom (see Kᴇʀsʜᴀw 2000: 62f), which informed both the Brāhmacārin's and the Indian ascetics' habit of letting their hair grow long, and which in Vedic India was enriched with the symbolism of Agni, whose tufts are the flames[41]. The name Dārbhya (or Dālbhya) is shared by various figures of Pañcāla

_____

[41] Cf. JB 2.225–6, [...] *vrātyāṃ dhāvayanti / [...] / agna ā yāhy āgnibhir ity agniṣṭomasāma bhavati / agnayo vai sarve devāḥ / sarvān eva tena devān api yanti / tat trayaṃstriṃśad vai sarvā devatāḥ / sarvāsv evaitad devatāsu yajñasyāntataḥ pratitiṣṭhanti // tāḥ keśinīr bhavanti / ūrjo napātaṃ ghṛtakeśam īmahe 'gnim yajñeṣu pūrvyam19 iti keśair iva hy ete caranti* [...], "They start with the Vrātya life [...]. According to the verse 'O fire, come here with fires!' Fires are indeed all the Gods. They also come to all the Gods by means of this. This group of 33 are actually the 'All gods'. Among these 'All gods' they are established at the end of the sacrifice. They (f. pl. the *devatās*) constitute the Keśinī. They live indeed with their hair in accordance with the RV verse 'We resort to Agni, child of force, butter-haired, as the first in sacrifices'" (quoted and translated in Pᴏɴᴛɪʟʟᴏ & Dᴏʀᴇ 2013: 50). This symbolism testifies to the close connection between the Vedic god Agni and Rudra, and later on with Śiva.

warriors and brahmins, who appear in a series of legends with clear Vrātya background[42]. These legends have been studied by HEESTERMAN (1962), KOSKIKALLIO (1999) and PONTILLO & DORE (2013). Many of these stories involve Sāmavedins and are found in the Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇa.

For instance. in JB 2.100 (cf. CALAND 1919: 154 §133), it is told that a Pañcāla king, Darbha Śātānīki, the son of Śatānīka Śātrājita, was not respected by his people, to the extent that even boys would make fun of him by calling him "Darbha! Darbha!" ('Grass! Grass!'). To his aid came two ritual experts, Keśin Sātyakāmi and Ahīnas Āśvatthi, who performed for him a special soma sacrifice, an Ekāha called Apaciti (the actual topic of the JB chapter), after which the king won the respect of his people. After this sacrifice, the Pañcālas also started referring to 'grass' with the word *kuśa*, abandoning the word *darbha*. In another version of the same story (BŚS 18.38–39), the same king is called Keśin Dālbhya, and it is told that the Pañcālas also created a new word for 'hair', namely *śīrṣaṇyāḥ* ('those on the head'). We know in fact that this king was also called Śīrṣaṇya Kauśa (see CALAND 1903: 25, WITZEL 1989: 101 fn. 6). On the basis of Nidānasūtra 6.11, which mentions the existence of two main Vrātya clans, namely the Aiṣīkayāvi Vrātyas and the Śīrṣādi Vrātyas, HEESTERMAN (1962, esp. p. 15ff.) has advanced the hypothesis that the name of the latter clan, the Śīrṣādi, those "whose name begins with (a reference to the) head" or "the first among whom (had a name mentioning the) head", was a direct reference to the Pañcāla figure of Śīrṣaṇya Kauśa/Keśin Dārbhya. According to HEESTERMAN, the Śīrṣādis would thus be the Pañcāla Vrātyas, whereas the Aiṣīkayāvis would be the Kuru Vrātyas. The latter, as their name suggests, would be named after the *īṣīkā* reed, while the Pañcāla Vrātyas feature names connected with the *darbha* or *kuśa* grass. KOSKIKALLIO (1999) has collected all the material pertaining to Keśin Dālbhya and related figures, such as Baka Dālbhya, providing further evidence of the Vrātya background of these characters. More recently, PONTILLO & DORE (2013) have carried out a thorough study of the connection between the ritual symbolism of long-stalked plants and the Vrātyas.

According to a second legend (JB 2.122–124; cf. CALAND 1919: 161 §137), the same Keśin Dārbhya was a Pañcāla sacrificer (*yajamāna*) engaged in a ritual contest against another sacrificer, Khaṇḍika Audbhāri.[43] At the beginning of the story, Keśin Dārbhya appears discouraged, because he has been informed that his rival is planning on performing a Sadyaḥkrī, a very fast soma sacrifice that is performed on the same day on which the soma is purchased. When the news of the completion of this sacrifice is sent to him, Keśin Dārbhya will be defeated. To his aid come his four *brāhmaṇās* (i.e. *purohitas*), Keśin Sātyakāmi, Ahīnas Āśvatthi, Ganginā Rāhakṣita, and Luśākapi Khārgali. For him the four perform a Parikrī (the actual topic of the JB chapter), an even faster sacrifice consisting of one line for every three Sadyaḥkrī. In this way, they are able to finish the sacrifice before the rival, and by means of the same sacrifice, they push Khaṇḍika Audbhāri, "away from the year/out of time" (*samvatsarād nud-*).

In a third legend (JB 1.285; cf. CALAND 1919: 111 §100), Keśin Dārbhya and Ahīnas Āśvatthi are competing to become the *purohita* of a *kṣatriya*, Keśin Sātyakāmi.[44] Of the two, Ahīnas Āśvatthi is the elder, while Keśin Dārbhya is the younger. Nevertheless, the latter exhibits a deeper knowledge of Anuṣṭubh verse and wins the competition.

In a fourth JB passage (JB 2.419ff.; cf. CALAND 1919: 219ff. §168)—this time not mentioned by KOSKIKALLIO 1999—Ahīnas Āśvatthi expounds a long and largely obscure exegesis of the symbolism of the *sāmans* to be employed in a year-long *sattra* to his sons, who are planning on performing it and have asked for instructions.

---

42 See for instance the story told in KS 10.6, in which Baka Dālbhya first performs a *sattra* with the Naimiṣya Vrātyas to gain gifts of cattle from the Kuru-Pañcālas, then visits king Dhṛtarāṣṭra Vaicitravīrya in order to receive greater gifts but, being given sick or dead cows, curses the king to lose all his wealth (see Appendix I).

43 The rivalry between these two character is a frequent theme, involving competition for ritual supremacy or even for dominion over the Pañcāla people. Cf. also MS 1.4.12, BŚS 17.54, ŚB 11.8.4, and JB 2.279, and see KOSKIKALLIO 1999: 308ff.

44 Note that the same three characters are the protagonists of the story in JB 2.100, which I have summarised above, and in which, however, Keśin Darbha/Dālbhya is the king, while the other two are the *purohitas*.

In one last passage,[45] TB 3.10.9.10–11 (see DUMONT 1951: 641), a paragraph that is part of a chapter (TB 3.10) on the Sāvitracayana, the building of a fire altar in the form of the sun for a soma sacrifice, it is said that "Ahīnas Āśvatthya [sic] (the son of Aśvattha) succeeded in knowing the Sāvitra (fire). Then, having become a golden wild goose[46] (*sá ha haṁsó hiraṇmáyo bhūtvá*), he went to the heavenly world (*svargáṁ lokám iyāya*), and he obtained intimate union with Āditya (the sun) (*ādityásya sā́yujyam)*. Verily, having become a golden wild goose, he goes to the heavenly world, (and) he obtains intimate union with Āditya, he who knows thus" (transl. Dumont, modified).

From these passages, we can draw a portrait of Ahīnas Āśvatthi as an elderly sage, a specialist in Sāmavedic knowledge, and a ritual expert in the service of Pañcāla leaders who have a Vrātya background. The above sources don't allow us to understand why precisely this character is mentioned in our text, but in my view the clear Vrātya background of the other stories in which he appears supports my hypothesis that the draft-ox *vrata* arose within Vrātya circles and is modelled after older traditions involving animal masking that ultimately go back to Indo-European *Männerbund* practices (see Appendix I).

b. On the *tā́d ... yā́d* construction, see BHATTACHARYA 2004, who also discusses the fact that this PS line is quoted (as *na tād brāhmaṇād nindāmi*) in Vāmana's Kāśikā on Pāṇini 7.1.39 to illustrate the use of the ending *-āt*; the same example is given in Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita's Siddhāntakaumudī as *na tād brāhmaṇam*.

On the *iṣṭāpūrta-*, see SAKAMOTO-GOTŌ 1997. We are introduced here to the idea that if someone censures a *vratin* who is performing the vow of the draft-ox, they lose their accrued merit, which is then transferred to the *vratin*. This is clearly the same logic behind the *pāśupatavrata*. In fact, the vocabulary used here (*nind-*, *iṣṭāpūrta-*) is exactly the same as that employed in the Pāśupatasūtra: see my comment on 17.35.4 below. On the idea of transferring merit or demerit, see HARA 1967–68, HARA 1994(=2002: 105ff.), and WEZLER 1997.

17.35.2

    kṛtyā vā eṣā manuṣyeṣu carati yad anaḍvān yad anaḍudvratī ||

This is witchcraft, when, as a draft-ox, as one practising the observance of the draft-ox, one roams (/practises the observance) among humans.

N.B. **Pa_c** has a lacuna, starting after *anaṛvān, yad a-* up to 17.35.5a *-he kramata*. Bhattacharya reports that **Nā** also has a lacuna in this line, from *carati* all the way to *soṇaḍuho* in 17.35.5a.

---

kṛtyā] **[O]** kṛtā **K**   •   manuṣyeṣu] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ **[Mā] JM₃** manuṣveṣu **Pa_c** manuṣyeṣvaṣu

---

45 Ahīnas Āśvatthi's name possibly also occurs in a chapter on the *punardahana* (CALAND 1896: x) in the Baudhāyanapitṛmedhasūtra, namely *ādhyāya* 5 = *kaṇḍikā* 13 (see CALAND 1896: 19)—with parallels in AgnivGS 3.6.4.11 (the whole chapter)—and in Hiraṇyakeśipitṛmedhasūtra 1.10 (see CALAND 1896: 43), but the mss. have conflicting readings and the constituted text is uncertain. CALAND (1896: 19) calls this passage "the most difficult of the whole sūtra", and his translation is tentative to say the least. Given the obscurity of the whole passage and the uncertainty on whether it even reads the name of Ahīnas Āśvatthi, this text cannot be used for our purposes.

46 It is perhaps interesting to read Ahīnas Āśvatthi's transformation into a golden wild goose in light of the connections, highlighted by KOSKIKALLIO (1999; see in particular the conclusions on p. 375), between the Dālbhyas and water fowl, and the motif of old ascetics meditating by the water. This symbolism expresses both these figures' liminality, as well as their ability to rise over the stream of life, worldly attachments, represented by the water. The classical image of the wild goose taking off from the surface of the water expresses the same symbolism, as it represents the *jīva*, the soul, untouched by contact with the water, i.e. the world.

V71 • carati] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** carati ˈ **V122 Pa_c** carati | **V71** tarati **K** • yad anaḍvān] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā]?** yad anarvān **V122** yad anarvān, **Ji₄** yad anaḍvān, **V71 JM₃** yenunaḍvān **K** • yad anaḍudvratī] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71 JM₃** yad anarudvratī **V122** yad anutūdvratī **Ji₄** yad a **Pa_c** yevanaḷadvratīn\ **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **K V122 Ji₄** *om.* **Pa_c**

On *kṛtyā́-,* see Gonda 1980: 255f. and Goudriaan 1986.

Compare the Anaḍutsūkta lines ŚS 4.11.3ab (~ PS 3.25.5ab), *índro jātó* (PS *eṣa*) *manuṣyèṣv antár gharmás taptáś carati śóśucānaḥ* |, "Born as Indra (PS: that one is Indra), he wanders (i.e. practises the observance) among human beings as a heated *gharmá* pot, constantly glowing bright"; see my comment *ad loc.* in Appendix II.

The formula *yad anaḍvān yad anaḍudvratī* is also found below, in PS 17.38.6.

17.35.3–4 ~ 4: PāśS 4.10–13

3 ya evaṃ viduṣo [']sādhu kīrtayatīṣṭam evāsya pūrtaṃ {māyā(ṃ)} saṃvṛkte ‖
4a indro vā *agre [']sureṣv anaḍudvratam acarat
4b teṣām iṣṭaṃ pūrtaṃ māyā saṃvṛktānindan* hy enam ‖

He who speaks ill of the initiated one: his merit accumulated with worship and that accumulated with donations {the magical power} are both completely wrested away.
Indeed, in the beginning, Indra practised the observance of the draft-ox among the Asuras.
Of them, the merit accumulated with worship, that accumulated with donations, the magical power was completely wrested away, for they censured him.

N.B. As reported above, **Pa_c** and **Nā** have a lacuna from 17.35.2 to 17.35.5, therefore they do not preserve this line. This lines are also missing from **K**. The lacuna in **K** starts here and continues all the way to 17.35.5 (inclusive). In **Ji₄**, the final part of line **4b** following *pūrttaṃ* was also interpolated in 17.35.1 (see above) with no variants.

———————

ya evaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ya eva **V122** *om.* **K Pa_c** • viduṣo [']sādhu] viduṣo sādhu **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** viduṣo ṣādhu **Ji₄** *om.* **K Pa_c** • kīrtayatīṣṭam evāsya] kīrttayatīṣṭamevāsya **V122 JM₃ [Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** kīrttayatīṣṭhamevāsya **Ji₄** kīrtayatīṣṭa(mo→*s.s.*)mevāsya **V71** *om.* **K Pa_c** • pūrtaṃ] **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]? JM₃** pūrttaṃ **V122 Ji₄ V71** *om.* **K Pa_c** • {māyā(ṃ)}] māyāṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** māyā **V71** *om.* **K Pa_c** • saṃvṛkte] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71** saṃvṛṃ(?)kte **JM₃** *om.* **K Pa_c** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71 JM₃** ˈ **V122** *om.* **K Ji₄ Pa_c** • vā *agre [']sureṣv] vāgre sureṣv **Ma Mā V71 JM₃** vāgre asureṣv **Ja** ([x]→*s.s.*)vāgre ayureṣv **V122** vāgre ṣureṣv **Ji₄** *om.* **K Pa_c** • anaḍudvratam] **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]? V71** anaruvratam **V122** anuḍudvratam **Ji₄** anarudvratam **JM₃** *om.* **K Pa_c** • acarat teṣām] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ V71** anarateṣām **V122** ācarartt
eṣām **Mā JM₃** *om.* **K Pa_c** • pūrtaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71** pūrttaṃ **V122 Ji₄ JM₃** *om.* **K Pa_c** • māyā] māyā **Mā V71** māyāṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ JM₃** *om.* **K Pa_c** • saṃvṛktānindan*] saṃvṛktānindraṃ **[Ma] [Ja] JM₃** saṃvṛktānindrā **V122** saṃvṛktāmindraṃ **Ji₄** saṃvṛktānindra **Mā V71** *om.* **K Pa_c** • hy enam] hy enaṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ V71 JM₃** hy ena **Mā** *om.* **K Pa_c** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71** | **V122 JM₃** *om.* **K Pa_c**

PāśS 4.10–13
indro vā agre asureṣu pāśupatam acarat |
sa teṣām iṣṭāpūrtam ādatta |
māyayā sukṛtayā samavindata |
nindā hy eṣānindā tasmāt |

"In the beginning, Indra practised the *pāśupata* [observance] among the Asuras. He took their merit gained from worship and donations. He obtained [it] with well-performed magic. For this censure is without censure, that's why."

Bhattacharya's edition reads *viduṣosādhu* and *māyāṃ saṃ vṛkte* in **3**, *vāgre asureṣv* in **4a**, and *māyāṃ saṃ vṛktānindraṃ hyenam* in **4b**.

    A first version of my edition of these lines was presented in 2016 (Bisschop & Selva 2016) and published in 2018 (Bisschop 2018: 9) with Prof. Bisschop's translation to illustrate his discovery that this portion is the textual model of PāśS 4.10–13. The text as it was presented and published reads as follows:

> *ya evaṃ viduṣo [']sādhu kīrtayatīṣṭam evāsya pūrtaṃ māyāṃ saṃ *vṛṅkte ||*
> *indro vā *agre*[47] *[']sureṣv anaḍudvratam acarat*
> *teṣām iṣṭaṃ pūrtaṃ māyāṃ *sam *avṛṅktānindan hy enam ||*
>
> "He completely wrests away the merit gained from worship, the merit gained from donations, the magical power of him who speaks ill of the initiated one. Verily, in the beginning, Īndra practised the observance of the draft-ox among the Asuras. He wrested away their merit gained from worship, [their] merit gained from donations, [their] magical power; for they censured him" (my transl.).

My editorial choices were heavily inspired by the comparison with the PāśS parallel: I corrected the reading *-anindram* (presumably a corruption due to the frequent references to Indra in our text) to the 3pl. imperfect **anindan*, from *nind-*, 'to blame, censure', which is the root employed in 17.35.1 above (in Ahīnas Āśvatthi's speech), as well as in PāśS 4.13, *nindā hy eṣānindā tasmād*.

    However, I also corrected *saṃvṛkta-* to the imperfect **sam *avṛṅkta*, on the basis of the observation that the imperfect is the narrative tense used throughout our text, and on the basis of comparison with the imperfect *samavindata* in PāśS 4.12, which is most likely a corruption or reformulation of out text. It should be noted that this is not a light emendation, as it presupposes the loss of the akṣara *ma* (in *sam̲a̲vṛṅkta*).

    Accordingly, I also corrected *saṃvṛkte* to a 3sg. present *saṃ *vṛṅkte*, taking *iṣṭaṃ pūrtaṃ māyāṃ* in both **3** and **4b** as accusative objects.

    Moreover, comparison with the instrumental forms in PāśS 4.12, *māyayā sukṛtayā samavindata*, "He acquired it with well-performed magic", makes the reading *māyāṃ* (but note **Ma**, **V71** *māyā*)[48] suspicious, so one would be tempted to emend to an instrumental **māyayā*. The issue is nicely presented by Bisschop (2018: 9), who in fact decided to adopt the latter emendation: "Although the acquiring of another person's magic power (*māyā*) is just conceivable, it does not appear to me very likely. After all, it is Indra himself who performs *māyā* by carrying out the vow of the ox. The theme of Indra's *māyā* is a constant one in Vedic literature (see, e.g., Oertel 1905, Gonda 1965, Goudriaan 1978: 5–15). The instrumental is also suggested by the text's earlier statement that the performance of the vow among human beings is *kṛtyā* (witchcraft), which may be regarded as the human equivalent of *māyā*. Moreover, *iṣṭa* and *pūrta* form a natural pair, well-documented by the study of Sakamoto-Gotō (2000), and they are never put on a par with *māyā*. The instrumental *māyayā* appears more plausible in this context and it is quite conceivable that the *ya* has simply been dropped in the transmission."[49]

---

47 This part of the text was unfortunately misprinted as *vāgre* in Bisschop 2018: 9.

48 Of course, all **O** mss. spell *māyāṃ/māyā*, but the difference between *y* and *ÿ* is irrelevant to this discussion, therefore to avoid confusion I do not note this distinction in the rest of my comment.

49 Werner Knobl also suggested the possibility of reading *māyā* without emendation by taking it as an instrumental. However, I am hesitant to accept this solution because, as Macdonell (1910: 264) points out, although this archaic ending is indeed most common among *-yā* (and *-tā*) stems, it is already slightly less common in RV (95 stems vs. 113 stems in *-ayā*), and it becomes significantly rare already in the other Saṃhitās, with only 5 such forms in ŚS (I have no such statistics for the PS, however). The instrumental *māyā* in particular is never attested, even in RV or AV: the ins. *māyayā* instead occurs 20 times in RV (Lubotsky 1997), 7 times in ŚS (Whitney, *Index*), and 8 times in the PS (Kim, *Index*). Given that our *brāhmaṇa* prose text

It is indeed extremely attractive to emend our text as outlined above on the basis of the PāśS; at the same time, we run the risk of imposing the readings and perhaps the reinterpretations of a later text onto ours. Thus, here I would like to evaluate the possibility of an alternative solution, one that is more conservative with respect to the manuscript readings, and does not involve emending the two verbal forms based on the root *vṛj-*.

In line **3**, the mss. preserve the form *saṃvṛkte*. This could be considered the neuter dual of a verbal noun *sam-vṛkta-*. The dual could refer to the two neuter words *iṣṭam* and *pūrtam*. If we leave out *māyāṃ* for the sake of our discussion, the translation would be: "He who speaks ill of the initiated one, his merit accumulated with worship, his merit accumulated with gifts, are both wrested away (*saṃvṛkte*)". The advantage, obviously, is that there is no need to emend the verb.

As Renou (1955b: 86) points out, the verbal noun is employed with increasing frequency and in a variety of usages already in the *brāhmaṇa* prose parts of the AV. Instances of verbal nouns used as verbal predicates can be found for instance in ŚS 11.3.14–15 (a *brāhmaṇa* portion on the *odana*), *ṛcā́ kumbhy ádhihitā́rtvijyena préṣitā || bráhmaṇā párigṛhītā sā́mnā páryūḍhā ||*, "14. With the sacred verse (*ṛc*) is the vessel put on, with priesthood sent forth; 15. With sacredness (*bráhman*) seized about, with sacred chant (*sā́man*) carried about" (Whitney); and in ŚS 12.5.1–3 (~ PS 16.140.1a-e) (another *brāhmaṇa* text on the brahmin's cow), *śrámeṇa tápasā sṛṣṭā́ bráhmaṇā vittā́ rté śritā́ || satyénā́vṛtā śriyā́ prā́vṛtā yáśasā párīvṛtā || svadháyā párihitā śraddháyā páryūḍhā dīkṣáyā guptā́ yajñé prátiṣṭhitā lokó nidhánam ||*, "1. By toil, by penance [is she] created, acquired by *bráhman*, supported (*śritā*) on righteousness. 2. Covered with truth, enclosed with fortune, enveloped with glory. 3. Set about with *svadhā́*, surrounded with faith, guarded by consecration, standing firm in the offering, the world her post (*nidhána*)" (Whitney). We also find it elsewhere in this text, in 17.28.5b, *vaiśvānareṇa hi dagdhaḥ ||*, "for it was burned by Vaiśvānara"; and 17.42.6, *ṛksāmābhyām uttabhito yajuṣā yajñena gāyatreṇa brahmaṇā prathita upariṣṭāt ||*, "He is upheld by the *ṛk* verses and the *sāman* chants; by the *yajus* ritual injunctions, by the ritual worship, by the Gāyatrī recitation, by the *bráhman* formula, he is made to thrive above."

The problem is what to do with *māyāṃ*. It is perhaps possible to consider it an interpolation due to anticipation from **4b**: after all, as pointed out above, the magic power available to humans is the *kṛtyā* of 17.34.2, whereas the *māyā* pertains to the gods. Indeed, the word *māyā* fits in line **4**, which refers to Indra and the Asuras, but seems out of place in line **3**, which deals with human *vratins* and human detractors.

Now, as concerns **4b**, the **Oᴬ** mss. point to *māyāṃ*, **Oᴮ** to *māyā* (with the exception of **JM₃**, which, however, very often shows contamination from **Oᴬ**). Bhattacharya has adopted *māyāṃ*: this can only work if we have a transitive verb and we take *iṣṭam pūrtaṃ māyāṃ* as three objects. Indeed, my emendation to *sam *avṛṅkta, 'he werested away' (based on PāśS *samavindata*), was proposed accordingly. However, the sequence *samvṛktānindram* (or *samvṛktānindam* after my emendation of the second part) could not only underlie *saṃvṛkta*, which I had interpreted as a corrupt form of the imperfect *sam *avṛṅkta (as I had first emended), but also the form *saṃvṛktā*. This could be another verbal noun, this time a nominative feminine singular. If we adopt the **Oᴮ** reading *māyā*, we would have *māyā saṃvṛktā*, "the magic power (*māyā*, nom. sg. f.) was wrested away (*saṃvṛktā*, nom. sg. f.)". What to do with the preceding *iṣṭam pūrtaṃ*? We can simply take them as nominative forms. All three words, *iṣṭaṃ*, *pūrtaṃ*, and *māyā*, would then be nominative subjects; however, the predicate *samvṛktā* would regularly agree only with the third element, out of attraction, because *māyā* is the closest element in the phrase. The translation thus would be: "Of them (*teṣāṃ*), the merit gained from worship (*iṣṭaṃ*), the merit gained from gifts (*pūrtaṃ*), the magic power (*māyā*) was wrested away (*saṃvṛktā*)". The advantage is once again that we avoid intervening in the text with an emendation.

Also note that in 17.28.7, the imperfect *apāvṛṅkta* is correctly preserved with the nasal infix: *apāvṛṃkta* **O**, *upāvṛṅkta* **K**. If lines **3** and **4b** also featured similar verbal forms with nasal infix, it

---

is probably late, an instrumental *māyā* would seem rather exceptional here.

would seem strange that this would have been lost in both cases.

One detail needs clarification: if **V71** *māyā* is original, then it was this *māyā* that was interpolated in line **3**, and not *māyāṃ*. The anusvāra would have been added later only in **O^A**. Indeed, in line **3**, **V71** has *māyā* just like in line **4**. However, in line **3**, **Mā** supposedly has *māyāṃ* (Bhattacharya's apparatus is silent, so we can only assume this). We thus have several possible scenarios: if we consider **V71**'s **3/4b** *māyā* as original, then we need to assume that an anusvāra was added independently in both **3** and **4b** in the **O^A** sub-branch, and only in **3** in **Mā**; if we consider **Mā**'s **3** *māyāṃ* as original, then **V71**'s **3/4b** *māyā* would be a later correction that restored the original reading (or an error of transmission that happens to correspond to the original reading).

First scenario:

1) In stage one, the original text was the following:

> *ya evaṃ viduṣo [']sādhu kīrtayatīṣṭam evāsya pūrtaṃ saṃvṛkte ||*
> *indro vā agre [']sureṣv anaḍudvratam acarat*
> *teṣām iṣṭaṃ pūrtaṃ* <u>*māyā*</u> *samvṛktānindan hy enam ||*

2) In stage two, in **4b** *māyā* was interpolated in line **3**:

> *ya evaṃ viduṣo [']sādhu kīrtayatīṣṭam evāsya pūrtaṃ* <u>*māyā*</u> *saṃvṛkte ||*
> *indro vā agre [']sureṣv anaḍudvratam acarat*
> *teṣām iṣṭaṃ pūrtaṃ* <u>*māyā*</u> *samvṛktānindan hy enam ||*

This is the situation preserved in **V71**, and possibly the situation of the **O^B** sub-archetype.

3) Finally, in the third stage, **O^A** inserted the anusvara in both **3** and **4b**, **Mā** only in **3a**:

> *ya evaṃ viduṣo [']sādhu kīrtayatīṣṭam evāsya pūrtaṃ* <u>*māyāṃ*</u> *saṃvṛkte ||*
> *indro vā agre [']sureṣv anaḍudvratam acarat*
> *teṣām iṣṭaṃ pūrtaṃ* <u>*māyāṃ*</u> (**Mā**: *māyā*) *samvṛktānindan hy enam ||*

The alternative scenario is the following:

2) In stage two, the anusvāra was inserted in line **4b**, perhaps before the written archetype:

> *ya evaṃ viduṣo [']sādhu kīrtayatīṣṭam evāsya pūrtaṃ saṃvṛkte ||*
> *indro vā agre [']sureṣv anaḍudvratam acarat*
> *teṣām iṣṭaṃ pūrtaṃ* <u>*māyāṃ*</u> *samvṛktānindan hy enam ||*

3) Then, **4b** *māyāṃ* was anticipated in **3** (this seems more likely to have happened because of the oral transmission):

> *ya evaṃ viduṣo [']sādhu kīrtayatīṣṭam evāsya pūrtaṃ* <u>*māyāṃ*</u> *saṃvṛkte ||*
> *indro vā agre [']sureṣv anaḍudvratam acarat*
> *teṣām iṣṭaṃ pūrtaṃ* <u>*māyāṃ*</u> *samvṛktānindan hy enam ||*

This would be the situation of the PS archetype (or at least the Odia archetype) as preserved in **O^A**.

4) Later, in **O^B**, *māyāṃ* was changed (a correction, an error) to *māyā* in both **3** and **4b** but, for some reason, not in **3** in **Mā**—unless Bhattacharya's apparatus simply does not record this variant. It is also possible that an error first occurred in **4b** (*māyāṃ* > *māyā*), which is why we find *māyā* in both **Mā** and **V71**, and then **V71** would have introduced *māyā* also in **3**:

> *ya evaṃ viduṣo [']sādhu kīrtayatīṣṭam evāsya pūrtaṃ* <u>*māyā*</u> (**Mā**: *māyāṃ*) *saṃvṛkte ||*
> *indro vā agre [']sureṣv anaḍudvratam acarat*
> *teṣām iṣṭaṃ pūrtaṃ* <u>*māyā*</u> *samvṛktānindan hy enam ||*

All scenarios are somewhat problematic and require several assumptions.

In the end we have two possibilities: on the one hand, we are very tempted to heavily emend our text on the basis of the PāśS; this would yield a very good text—it would be especially nice to read an imperfect *sam avṛṅkta*, as this is the tense used in the narration throughout the text (*anindan* is also an imperfect). On the other hand, it is possible to make sense of the text without any significant emendation. The price to pay is that we need to remove *māyā(ṃ)* from **3**, considering it an interpolation (and without being one hundred percent sure about which scenario yielded the readings in our mss.).

As much as I find my older solution attractive, I think that, from an editorial point of view, it is best to leave the text as it is, as much as we can make sense of it. Therefore, I refrain from

correcting the verbal forms, and I also leave *māyā(ṃ)* in **3**, simply marking it as a possible interpolation.

3. On *saṃ-vr̥j-*, see my comment on 17.28.7c above.

Compare this line with PS 17.40.6 below: *ya evaṃ viduṣo [']sādhu kīrtayaty etair evainaṃ tamobhiḥ prorṇoti ||*, "He envelops with these very darknesses him who speaks ill of the initiated one."

4a. The variant *vāgre asureṣv* with initial *-e a-*, adopted by Bhattacharya, seems to be an innovation of **Ja** and the closely related ms. **V122**.

The attested reading *vāgre* is certainly due to double sandhi: *vai_agre > vā agre > vāgre*.

17.35.5

a   so [']naḍuho vahe [']kramata
b   *sarvāṃl lokān prājānāt ||

He strode onto the withers of the draft-ox. He foreknew the way to every place.

N.B. This line is missing in **K**. The lacuna in **K** ends here. The lacuna in **Pa_c** ends with *-he kramata*.
————
so [']naḍuho] so naḍuho **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** so naṛuho **V122** *om*. **K Pa_c**   • vahe [']kramata] vahe kramata **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** he kramata **Pa_c** *om*. **K**   • sarvāṃl lokān] sarvāl lokān **O** *om*. **K**   • prājānāt] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c V71 JM₃** prajānāt **Mā** *om*. **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ V71 JM₃** | **Mā V122 Pa_c** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *sonaḍuho*, *vahekramata*, and *sarvālloṁkān* (probably a misprint).

On *kram-* (mid.) plus loc., see the discussion in my comment on 17.30 above.

On *váha-*, the ox's 'withers', see my comment on PS 3.23.11 in Appendix II.

On the sandhi between final *-n* before *l-*, I follow Griffiths's (2009: lxii §(L)) practice of regularising to *-ṃl l-*. The asterisk is necessary as the mss. preserve no trace of the *anusvāra*.

17.35.6–9

6a   yāv asya pūrvapādau tau pūrvapakṣau
6b   yāv ⁺aparapādau tāv aparapakṣau ||
7a   yāv *asyauṣṭhau tau puroḍāśau
7b   ye nāsike tau sruvau ||
8a   ye *asyākṣyau tau sūryācandramasau
8b   ye nimeṣās tāny ahorātrāṇi
8c   yāni vakṣaṇāni te sūryasya raśmayaḥ ||
9   droṇakalaśaḥ śiraḥ somo rājā mastiṣkaḥ ||

His two front legs, they are the two first halves;
his two hind legs, they are the two latter halves.
His two lips, they are the two sacrificial cakes;
his two nostrils, they are the two *sruva* ladles.
His two eyes, they are the sun and the moon;

[his] eye blinks, they are the days and the nights;
[his] flanks, they are the rays of the sun.
[His] head is the *droṇakalaśa* vessel; [his] brain is King Soma.

Note that in **JM₃**, the scribe eye-skipped from *tāu* in line **a** to *tāv* in line **b**, leaving a lacuna.

———

pūrvapādau] **Pa꜀** pūrvapadau **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Mā V71 JM₃** pūrvaḫ pādau **K**   • tau] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** *om.* **JM₃ V122** to **K**   • pūrvapakṣau] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** *om.* **JM₃**   • yāv ⁺aparapādau] yāv aparapadau **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ Mā V71** *om.* **JM₃** yāv apādau **K** • tāv aparapakṣau] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** tāv apṟrapakṣau **JM₃**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **V122 Pa꜀** *om.* **K**   • yāv *asyauṣṭhau] yāv asyoṣṭhau **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** yāvasyoṣṭau **Ji₄** yosyekṣe **K**   • tau puroḍāśau] **V71 [Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** tau puroṟāśau **V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ JM₃** tau puroḻāśau **K** • ye nāsike] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** ye nāśike **V71 JM₃**   • tau sruvau] **K** tau śruvau **O**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **Pa꜀** *om.* **K**   • ye *asyākṣyau] ye asyākṣau **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ye a[.]śākṣa **Ji₄** yosyaukṣe **K**   • tau sūryācandramasau] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** tau sūryyācandramasau **Pa꜀**   • ye nimeṣās] **[O]** yā nimeṣās **K**   • tāny ahorātrāṇi] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** tāndehorātrāni **Ji₄** tav ahorātre **K**   • yāni vakṣaṇāni te sūryasya] **[Ma] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** yāni vakṣaṇā te sūryasya **Ja** yat sūryasya **K**   • raśmayaḥ] raśmayaḥ **[O]** raśmayas **K**   • ‖] saḥ ‖ **Ma Ja Mā V71 JM₃** saḥ ‖ (*s.s.* →)[. . .] **V122** saḥ hā **Ji₄** saḥ [x] | **Pa꜀** sa **K**   • droṇakalaśaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** droṇakalasya **Ji₄** droṇakalaśa **K**   • śiraḥ somo] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** [x]śira(ḥ←*s.s.*) somo **JM₃** śiras somo **K**   • rājā] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** rā[ɟā]jā **V71**   • mastiṣkaḥ] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** mastiṣkaṣkaṃ **Ji₄** mastaṣkaḥ **Pa꜀**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** | **V122 V71 JM₃** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *pūrvapādau⁺* in **6a**, *yāvaṣyoṣṭhau.* in **7**, and *sa (nādhārayat)* ‖ at the end of **8c**.

    Here begins a long series of lines in which the body parts of the draft-ox are equated with various items possessing sacred and ritual significance.

    6. The correct reading, *pūrvapādau*, is preserved in **Pa꜀**, but given that all the other **O** mss. feature a variant with short a (*pūrvapadau*), it is very likely that **Pa꜀**'s is a learned correction.

    The compounds *pūrvapakṣa-* and *aparapakṣa-* normally indicate the first and second half of the month (or of the year), respectively. However, it is not clear to me why they are used in the dual here, as logically each month (or year) only has one first half and one second half. At the same time, one wonders if lines 7 and 8 actually refer to some specific ritual in which two sacrificial cakes and two *sruva* ladles are used, or if these items all come in pairs simply because they correspond to body parts that come in pairs.

    7. The reading of **K**, *yosyekṣe*, must be due to anticipation of **8a**, *yosyaukṣe*. The **O** reading, *asyoṣṭhau*, must be due to double sandhi, therefore I emend it.

    8a. Note that **O** *ye asyākṣau* and **K** *yosyaukṣe* must be emended to *ye *asyākṣyau* (correcting the stem of *akṣán-/ákṣi-*), if not to **yāv *asyākṣyau*. The word for 'eyes' is neuter, and if we have to trust the mss., apparently even masculine-looking forms like *akṣyau* are treated as neuters. This form, absent in RV, is actually the most frequent nom./acc. dual form in AV (7x in ŚS according to Whitney, Index p. 11; I counted more than twice as many in PS, as opposed to *ákṣiṇī*, 2x in ŚS).

    8b. The compound *ahorātrá-* can be either masculine or neuter (contrary to the general rule according to which a Dvandva should take the gender of its second member, which in this case is the feminine), although the neuter is more frequent, especially in the older language. In particular, the only RV occurrence, 10.190.2c, is the neuter pl. *ahorātrā́ṇi*, and only the neuter is found in the AV, normally the neuter dual *ahorātré*. In AV, the neuter plural is found only in ŚS 4.35.4 *ahorātrā́*, ŚS 13.3.8 *ahorātraiḥ*, and PS 16.72.3b *ahorātrāṇi.* (a second occurrence, PS 18.24.5a, corresponds to the quoted RV line, although the rest of the stanza is different). As far as our line is concerned, **K**

tav ahorātre cannot be correct as such: the sandhi is irregular and, at any rate, the pronoun should be *te, in agreement with the neuter gender. Thus, the dual *ahorātre* is the expected form, but accepting it requires the emendation of the pronoun. On the other hand, *ahorātrāṇi* is also attested in PS, and **O** *tāny ahorātrāni* is perhaps preferable, not only because, being the rarest variant, we might consider it the *lectio difficilior,* but also because the corresponding item in the *ya* phrase is also a plural (masculine), not a dual. For these reasons, I adopt it.

8c. Bhattacharya writes *sūryasya raśmayaḥ sa (nādhārayat)* ‖, but the *saḥ* preserved in the mss. is certainly a case of perseveration from 17.31.3, *ete vai pathayo devayānā yat sūryasya raśmayaḥ sa (nādhārayat)* ‖. The error must be ascribed to the period of oral transmission preceding the written archetype; in fact, we find it in both branches.

17.35.10–12

10   ye asya śṛṅge tad ṛtaṃ satyam ‖
11a   dhruvaṃ vā ṛtaṃ satyaṃ
11b   tasmād ete dhruve ‖
12   dhruvam eva ⁺rtaṃ satyam anu prati tiṣṭhati ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti) ‖

[His] two horns, they are cosmic order and truth.
Cosmic order and truth are firm;
that is why those two (i.e. the horns of oxens) are firm.
He gets a firm standing along the very firm cosmic order, [along] truth, he who, (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

ye asya] **[O]** ye sya **K**   • satyam ‖] satyaṃ ‖ **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** satyaṃ | **V71 V122 Pa꜀** satyaṃ **K**   • dhruvaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** dhruvā **Ji₄** (k̶r̶u̶→)dhruvaṃ **Pa꜀**   • ṛtaṃ] **[O]** ritaṃ **K**   • dhruve ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** dhruve | **V122** dhṛve | **Pa꜀** *om*. **K** • dhruvam eva ⁺rtaṃ] dhruvam evavartaṃ **Ma** dhruvam evavartiṃ **Ja** dhruva[ṃ]m evarttaṃ **V122** dhṛvam evavarttaṃ **Pa꜀** dhruvam evattaṃ **Mā Ji₄** [x]dhruvam evarttaṃ **V71** dhruvam e(*s.s* →[x])varttaṃ **JM₃** dhruvam eva tvāṃ **K**   • satyam anu] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** satya[ṃ]m anu **Pa꜀**   • ya (…) ‖] yaḥ ‖ 35 ‖ ru ‖ **Ma Pa꜀** yaḥ ‖ ru 2.35 ‖ **Ja?** yaḥ ‖ ru ‖ 35 ‖ **V122** yaḥ ‖ 35 ‖ **Ji₄** yaḥ ‖ 35 ‖ ru 12 ‖ **Mā V71 JM₃** yaḥ Z **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads ⁺*dhruvamevartaṃ*.

Kāṇḍikā 36

From this kāṇḍikā onwards, the Odia and Kashmirian traditions disagree on the order of the lines. The Odia order seems more consistent with the content, therefore I follow it. The Kashmirian order is the following: 37.1, 2, 3, 4 ‖ Z 10 Z ‖ 38.1, 2, 4, 5, 3, 6, 33.4 (repeated) (38.7 is missing) ‖ Z 11 Z ‖ 36.1, 3 (with a lacuna: 36.2 is missing) ‖ Z 12 Z ‖ 39.1, 2 ‖ 40.1, 42.3, 40.2, 3 (with a lacuna), 4, 41.5 (40.6-9 are missing) ‖ 14 ‖ 40.1 (repeated), 41.1, 2, 3, 40.5, 41.5 (repeated) ‖ Z 15 Z ‖ 42.1, 2, 41.4, 42.4, 5, 6, 7 ‖ Z 16 Z ‖. The lines of the last kāṇḍikā, 43, follow the same order.

17.36.1-3

1   yāv asya karṇau sā śraddhā ‖
2a   carācarā vai śraddhā
2b   tasmāt karṇau muhur varīvarjayati ‖
3   śraddadhate [']smai śraddhānīyo bhavati ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ
       bibharti) ‖

His two ears, they are trust.
Trust is in constant motion;
that's why he (the draft-ox) constantly flaps [his] ears back and forth every moment.
[People] trust him, he becomes trustworthy, he who, (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

N.B. **K** features a lacuna due to eye-skip from after *śraddhā* in **1** to (*śraddhā*)*nīyo* in **3**.
———————
karṇau] **K** karṇṇau **Pa_c V71 JM₃ [Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** karṇṇo **V122** karṇṇo **Ji₄**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** | **V122 V71** *om*. **K**   • tasmād] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** tasyāt **V122** *om*. **K** • karṇau] karṇṇau **V122 Pa_c V71 JM₃ [Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** karṇṇo **Ji₄** *om*. **K**   • muhur] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** mahur **Ji₄** *om*. **K**   • varīvarjayati] varīvarjaẏati **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** va[.]varjayati **V122** *om*. **K**   • śraddadhate [']smai] śraddadhate smai **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** śradadhate smai **Ji₄** *om*. **K**   • śraddhānīyo] śraddhanīyo **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c V71 JM₃** śraddhāśraddhānīyo **Mā** (śraddhā)nīyo **K**   • bhavati] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** bha[x]vati **Pa_c** bhavatī **K**   • ya (…) ‖] **[Ma]? [Ja]?** yaḥ ‖ 36 ‖ ru ‖ **V122** yaḥ ‖ 36 ‖ **Ji₄ Pa_c** yaḥ ‖ 36 ‖ ru 3 ‖ **Mā JM₃** yaḥ ‖ 36 ‖ ru [. **V71** yaḥ Z 12 Z **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *śraddadhatesmai* and *ya (evaṃ … bibharti)* ‖.
       This passage supports HEESTERMAN's (1993: 77–78, 251 fn. 36; cf. 1968: 243) view that the term *śraddhā-* does not indicate a man's attitude towards a god ('faith'), but 'trust' between man and man. HEESTERMAN (1993: 78) pointed out that the "newly adopted king should send certain

ceremonial gifts to his peers and rivals, the 'counterkings' (*pratirājan*). By accepting his gifts the latter signify that they are his allies, or as [MS 4.9.9: 61.4] puts it, 'they place faith in him'" (*śráddhāsmai suṣuvāṇā́ya dadhati*). Similarly, "the gods are said to have 'made faith'—found 'credit'—with their opponents, the mighty Asuras", according to RV 10.151.3. The sense of *śraddhā* as 'confidence' in the efficacy of the ritual starts to appear only "when the gifts sent to the *pratirājans* are prescribed as *dakṣiṇās* to be given to the officiating brahmins". On *śraddhā*, see also Köhler 1973.

There are only two more occurrences of the compound *carācará-* in the AV: PS 7.11.2ab (~ RV 10.162.3ab) (For safe pregnancy: with bdellium), *yas te hanti carācaram* (RV *patáyantaṃ*) *utthāsyantaṃ* (RV *niṣatsnúṃ yáḥ*) *sarīsṛpam* |, "The one that kills your fetus of ten-months, moving to and fro, about to emerge, smoothly gliding" (Griffiths), and ŚS 14.1.11d (~ PS 18.1.10d ~ RV 10.85.11d) (Wedding hymn), *diví pánthāś carācaráḥ*, "die Straße zieht sich am Himmel hin" (Geldner). The presence of the intensive *varīvarjayati* in **2b** suggests an intensive interpretation of this compound: 'going and going, constantly going/moving, in constant motion' (cf. Hoffmann 1960: 248 [= 1975: 119] with references to AiGr). The sense must be that trust is elusive, fleeting, hard to secure. The ox figuratively compensates by flapping his ears back and forth, being attentive to everything and everyone: hence he is trustworthy. A similar wording with *kárṇa-* as the object of an intensive causative of *vṛj-* is found in ŚS 12.5.22a ~ PS 16.143.1b (part of a hymn to the Brahman's cow, and a subsection about the frightening aspects of the cow): *sarvajyāníḥ kárṇau varīvarjáyantī*, "Total scathing when twisting about her ears" (Whitney).

On *śraddhānīya-* and the *-anī́ya* formations, see my comment (§10e) in the introduction to this chapter.

Kāṇḍikā 37

17.37.1

a   yāsya dakṣiṇā hanuḥ sā *juhūr
b   yā savyā sopabhṛd
c   yaḥ kaṇṭhaḥ sā dhruvā ‖

His right cheek, that's the *juhū* ladle;
[his] left [cheek], that's the *upabhṛt* ladle;
[his] throat, that's the *dhruvā* ladle.

yasya dakṣiṇā] **K** **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** yasya[x]dakṣiṇā **Paᶜ**   •   hanuḥ sā] **[O]** haṇus sā **K**   • *juhūr] juhur **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Paᶜ [Mā] V71** juhu(//) **JM₃**   •   yā savyā sopabhṛd] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Paᶜ [Mā] V71 JM₃** yā savā sopabhṛd **Ji₄** yādadaryāsaṃ yāsaṃ vyāso bavrunyaḥ **K**   •   kaṇṭhaḥ sā] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Paᶜ [Mā] V71 JM₃** kaṇṭha sā **V122** kaṇṭhasyā (=Bʜᴀᴛᴛ. vs. kaṇḍhasyā Bᴀʀʀᴇᴛ) **K**   •   ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** | **V122 Paᶜ V71** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya writes *juhur*. Indeed, both **K** and **O** agree on the short *u*. However, the correct stem of this well known word is *juhū́-*, f. Therefore, an emendation is necessary. These three ladles, together with the *sruva* (mentioned above in 17.35.7b), are the most important ladles used in Śrauta rituals (Sᴛᴀᴀʟ 1983: I 207; cf. Cᴀʟᴀɴᴅ & Hᴇɴʀʏ 1906: xxɪɪɪ ff.). The *juhū́*, made of *palāśa* wood (*Butea frondosa*), the *upabhṛ́t*, made of *aśvattha* wood (*Ficus religiosa)*, and *dhruvā́*, made of *vikaṅkata* wood (*Flacourtia sapida*), are often referred to with the general term *sruc*, 'ladle' (Mʏʟɪᴜs 1995: 139 s.v.), and frequently form a triad: compare for instance ŚS 18.4.5ab, *juhū́r dādhāra dyā́m upabhṛ́d antárikṣaṃ dhruvā́ dādhāra pṛthivī́ṃ pratiṣṭhā́m* |, "The *juhū́* ladle upholds the sky, the *upabhṛ́d* ladle the atmosphere; the *dhruvā́* ladle upholds the earth, the foundation".

17.37.2

a   agnir āsyaṃ
b   vidyuj jihvā
c   maruto dantāḥ
d   pavamānaḥ prāṇaḥ ‖

[His] mouth is Agni;
[his] tongue is the bolt of lightning;
[his] teeth are the Maruts;
[his] breath is the wind.

āsyaṃ vidyuj] **K [Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71 JM₃** āsyaṃvidy[.]j **V122** āśaṃ vidyuj **Ji₄** āsyaṃvidyuj **Pa꜀**
• dantāḥ pavamānaḥ prāṇaḥ] **[Ma] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** dantāḥ paśavamānaḥ prāṇaḥ **Ja**
dantāḥ pavamāḥ prāṇaḥ **K**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] |** **V122 Pa꜀ V71 JM₃** *om*. **K**

Note the syntactic variation between this line and the previous: in 17.37.1, we had the
following structure: [*ya-* (old info), *sa-* (new info)]; here we have a [PRED (new info), SUBJ (old
info)] structure, in which the predicate (new info) is fronted.

17.37.3–4

3   eṣā vai ⁺sā yām āhur vasor dhāreti yad ⁺āntragudam ‖
4   vasor eva dhārāṃ samṛddhim akṣitim ava rundhe ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho
       vrataṃ bibharti) ‖

This, the intestine and the rectum, is what they call the "stream of wealth".
He secures a real stream of wealth, success, imperishableness, he who, (being initiated, "bears" the
observance of the draft-ox).

eṣā vai ⁺sā] eṣā vai ṣā **O** eṣā vai mā **K**   • āhur] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ JM₃** āhūr **Mā V71**   •
vasor dhāreti] **K** vasorddhāreti **Ma Ja Ji₄ Pa꜀ Mā JM₃** vasodhāreti **V122** visor ddhāreti **V71**   •
yad ⁺āntragudam] yad āntigudaṃ **Ma Ja Pa꜀ Mā V71 JM₃** yadāntigu(haṃ→*s.s.*)daṃ **V122**
yadāntigu[x]dam **Ji₄** yad antragudaṃ **K**   • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃ |** **V122 Pa꜀** *om*. **K**   •
dhārāṃ] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** dhā[.]ṃ **V122**   • samṛddhim akṣitim] **[Ma] [Ja]**
V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃ samṛddhimaḥkṣitim **Ji₄** samṛdim akṣitim **V71** samṛddham akṣatim **K**   • ava
rundhe] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** ava e[.](//)ndh (=ava ru[.]ndhe) **JM₃**   • ya (…) ‖]
[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]? yaḥ ‖ 37 ‖ ru (space) ‖ **V122** yaḥ ‖ 39 ‖ **Ji₄** yaḥ ‖ 37 ‖ ru ‖ **Pa꜀** yaḥ ‖ 37 ‖ [. **V71**
yaḥ ‖ 37 ‖ ru 4 ‖ **JM₃** yaḥ Z 10 Z **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *eṣā vai sā* and *⁺yadāntragudam* ‖.
        Bhattacharya writes *sā*, but this reading is not found in any of the mss., so adopting it
requires an emendation. The question here is whether *ṣā* was already there in the PS written
archetype, or if it is simply a mistake of the Odia tradition. I think that it is impossible to say for
certain. If *sā* is original, *ṣā* could have come about by perseveration of *eṣā* (during the period of oral
transmission) because of the automatic effect of the ruki rule in close sandhi contact (perhaps
favoured by recitation, but at any rate during the period of oral transmission), or due to a scribal
mistake (during the period of written transmission). I would say that the first two scenarios (or
maybe the influence of both) are more probable. If this is true, then the written archetype would
already have featured *ṣa*, as preserved by **O**. Theoretically, Śāradā *mā* could be derived from *ṣā* by
the loss of a horizontal trait; however, KIM (*Schreib.* p. 50) records only one such case (PS 9.11.11d,
viṣadūṣaṇaḥ **O**, *vimadūṣaṇā* **K**). On the contrary, confusion of *sa* for *ma* is an extremely common
mistake in **K** so, in fact, **K** *mā* most likely points to the presence of *sā* in the written archetype. I
am inclined to think that there is a higher likelihood that this latter scenario is the correct one, so I
emend to *⁺sā*, although, as I have said, we cannot be certain (the plus sign is required, not the
asterisk, precisely because I assume that the reading was there as such in the written archetype).
        In classical Śrauta ritual, the so-called *vasor dhārā* is a continuous oblation of clarified
butter poured into the sacrificial fire during the Agnicayana ritual (MYLIUS 1995: 114; RENOU 1954:
135; HILLEBRANDT 1897: 164). A long, large wooden ladle, the *praseka,* whose length is determined
by measuring the distance between the top of the *yajamāna*'s head and his feet, is installed on the

uttaravedi fire altar by means of a double support: its rear end stands on four crossed bamboo sticks, with a pile of bricks to support its front end, positioned above the fire, so that the ladle is inclined towards the fire. The Pratiprasthātṛ, standing at the opposite end of the *praseka*, pours the clarified butter, which flows down a groove carved along the centre of the ladle and trickles into the fire. Meanwhile, the Adhvaryu recites TS 4.7.1–11. This recitation is also called *vasor dhāra*. On this performance, see Staal 1983: I 563ff.

The Dvandva compound *āntraguda-* is only attested in SuśS 3.3.33 and VadhŚS 13.12.

On the formula *samṛddhi- akṣiti-*, see my comment on 17.28.32 above.

Kāṇḍikā 38

17.38.1

a   yad asya carma tad abhraṃ
b   yāni lomāni tāni nakṣatrāṇi ||

His hide, that is the cloud;
[his] hairs, they are the constellations.

carma] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** carmaṃ **Pa꜀**   • nakṣatrāṇi] **[O]** nakṣattrāṇi **K**   •
||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** | **V122 V71 JM₃** *om.* **K**

17.38.2

a   svedo varṣam
b   ūṣmā nīhāra
c   oṣadhayaś ca vanaspatayaś cobadhyam ||

[His] sweat is the rain;
[his] (body) steam (/warm breath?) is the fog;
[his] bolus is the herbs and the trees.

svedo] **[O]** sve **K**   • ūṣmā] **K** uṣmā **O**   • nīhāra] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** nīrhāraḥ
Ji₄ nihrāro **K**   • oṣadhayaś ca] oṣadhaẏaś ca **[O]** yad oṣadhayaś ca **K**   • vanaspatayaś] **K**
vanaspatayaś **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā] V71 JM₃** vanaspataẏeś **Ji₄** (vasore(//)vadhārāṃ→)vanaspataẏaś
Pa꜀   • cobadhyaṃ] **[O]** codhyam, **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** | **V122 V71 JM₃** *om.* **K**

    This line shows one more syntactic variation. So far we have seen the following syntactic structures:
        [*ya* phrase (ox body part = old info), *sa/ta* phrase (ritual/natural item = new info)]
        e.g. *yad asya carma tad abhraṃ*.
    Alternatively, when nominal phrases were used (in 17.35.9 or 37.2), the new piece of information was fronted:
        [PRED (ritual item = new info, focus), SUBJ (ox body part = old info, topic)]
        e.g. *droṇakalaśaḥ śiraḥ*.
    Here we also find nominal phrases, but no fronting is involved. Since in our text the body parts of the ox constitute the old information, while the ritual and natural items that are equated with them constitute the new information, it seems reasonable to assume that here we have the normal

word order:

<center>[SUBJ (ox body part = old info), PRED (ritual/natural item = new info)]</center>

Thus, although it is not evident from my translations, the underlying syntax here is different from the nominal sentences we found earlier.

Some of the equations found in our line are also found in PS 16.54.1:[50] *tasyaudanasya bhūmiḥ kumbhī dyaur apidhānam śiro 'bhram ūṣmā nīhāro bṛhad āyavanaṃ rathantaraṃ darviḥ | diśaḥ pārśve sītāḥ parśavaḥ +sikatā +ūbadhyaṃ* (Bhattacharya: *siktā ubhadyaṃ*) *palalam upastaraṇam ahorātre vikramaṇe odanasya ||*, "Of this rice-dish (*odana*) the jar is the Earth, the lid is the sky; the head (top part?) is the raincloud, the steam is the fog; the spoon (*āyavana*) is the Bṛhat Sāman, the ladle (*darvi*) is the Rathantara Sāman. The two sides are the Directions, the knives (*parśu*) are the furrows; the sand (grains? *sikatā*) is the bolus; the bran is the act of spreading out the grass; the two steps of the rice-dish are the day and the night" (my transl.). Note here too the constant change of syntax between nominal sentences with and without a fronted predicate.

17.38.3

a yo [']sya dakṣiṇo [']rdhas tau śāradau māsau
b yaḥ savyas tau haimanau ||

His right side, that is the two months of autumn;
[his] left [side], that is the two [months] of winter.

yo [']sya] yo sya **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** yo 'sya **V122** yo asya **Pa_c** • dakṣiṇo [']rdhas] dakṣiṇo rdhas **[Ma] [Ja]** dakṣiṇo rddhas **V122 Pa_c Mā V71 JM₃** dakṣiṇā rddhas **Ji₄** jaghanas **K**[51] • śāradau] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** śāra(vau→s.s.)dau **V122** • yaḥ savyas] **[O]** yasya vakṣas **K** • haimanau] **[O]** hemantau **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **V122 Ji₄ Pa_c** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *yosya dakṣiṇordhastau*.

  The *avagraha* in **V122** and the *a-* in **Pa_c** are most certainly due to secondary improvement of the text (cf. 17.43.7). The readings of all the other **O** and **K** mss. suggest that the PS written archetype read *yosya*.

17.38.4

a yo [']sya jaghanārdhas tau śaiśirau māsau
b yaḥ pūrvārdhas tau vāsantau ||

His hind side, that is the two months of the cool season;
[his] front part, that is the two [months] of spring.

yo [']sya] yosya **K [Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** yo 'sya **V122** ye sya **Ji₄** yasya **V71** • jaghanārdhas]

<div style="font-size:smaller">

50 They are missing in the ŚS parallel at 11.3.11: *iyám evá pṛthivī́ kumbhī́ bhavati rā́dhyamānasyaudanásya dyaúr apidhā́nam || 11 || sītā́ḥ párśavaḥ síkatā ū́badhyam || 12 ||.* But note that ŚS 11.3.6 reads: *kábru phalīkáraṇāḥ śáro 'bhrám ||6||,* with *śáras-*, 'cream film on boiled milk', instead of *śíras,* 'head, top part'.

51 The reading of **K**, *jaghanas*, must be a corrupt repetition of 38.4 *jaghanārdhas.*, which in **K** occurs earlier.

</div>

K jaghanārddhas **[Ma]? [Ja]? Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]? V71 JM₃** ja([.]→ *s.s.*)ghanārddhas **V122** • māsau] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** māse **V122** • yaḥ pūrvārdhas] yaḥ pūrvārdhas **K** yaḥ pūrvārddhas **[Ma]? [Ja]? V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]? V71 JM₃** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** | **V122 JM₃** […] **V71** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya writes *yosya*.

17.38.5

a   yad asya pr̥ṣṭhaṃ tau graiṣmau māsau
b   yan madhyaṃ tau vārṣikau ‖

His back, that is the two months of summer;
[his] middle part, that is the two [months] of the rainy season.

yad asya pr̥ṣṭhaṃ tau] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā]** yad asya pr̥ṣṭhantau **V122 Ji₄ JM₃** […] (//)ntau **V71** yat pr̥ṣvaṃ tau **K** • graiṣmau] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** greṣmau **Ji₄** grīṣmau **K JM₃** • māsau] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** masau **Ji₄** • yan madhyaṃ tau] **K** yanmadhyantau **Ma Ja Ji₄ Pa꜀ Mā V71 JM₃** yan ma(s.s.→dhya)ntau **V122** • vārṣikau] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** vāṣako **Pa꜀** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** | **V122 JM₃** *om*. **K**

The Anaḍutsūkta at ŚS 4.11.8 (~ PS 3.25.11) seems to identify the middle part (*madhyam*) of the ox with its *váha*: *mádhyam etád anaḍúho yátraiṣá váha ā́hitaḥ | etā́vad asya prācī́naṃ yā́vān pratyáṅ samā́hitaḥ ‖*, "That is the middle of the draft-ox, where this carrying (*váha*) is set; so much of him (the ox) is in front [of the withers], as much as he is put together/located behind [the withers]" (Whitney). However, in this verse, *mádhyam* may also indicate the "essence", i.e. the "essential function" of the ox, which is his ability to haul or convey (*vah-*), i.e. his hauling power (*váha*) located in his shoulder (also *váha*) (see my comment *ad loc*. in Appendix II). Perhaps then it is a different *madhyam* that is intended in our line, possibly simply the middle part or the belly. The connection with the rainy season might suggest the ox's urinary system or the udder: cf. ŚS 4.11.4c ~ PS 3.25.2c (again from the Anaḍutsūkta), *parjányo dhā́rā marúta ū́dho asya*, "His streams are Parjanya, his udder is the Maruts"—the text does not make any distinctions between a male ox and a female cow.

17.38.6

    saṃvatsaro vā eṣa saṃbhr̥to yad anaḍvān yad anaḍudvratī ‖

Taken all together, this, the draft-ox, the one who performs the vow of the draft-ox, is the full year.

saṃvatsaro] **K** samvatsaro **Ma Ja V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ Mā JM₃** samvatsvaro **V71** • eṣa] **K [Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** eṣaṃ **V122 Ji₄** • saṃbhr̥to] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** saṃbhr̥ṃto[x] **Ji₄** • yad anaḍvān] yad anaḍvān, **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]? V71 JM₃** yad anar̥vān, **V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀** yenānaḍvā **K** • yad anaḍudvratī] **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** yad anaṛudvratī **V122 Ji₄** yad anaṛudvra[x]tī **Pa꜀** yad anaṛuvratī **V71** yad anaṛuvratī **JM₃** yenanaḷadvatīn **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **V122 Ji₄** *om*. **K**

The connection of the ox and the full year is all the more interesting in relation to my hypothesis, according to which the Anaḍutsūkta deals with the performance of the draft-ox observance in relation with the celebrations of the solstices (see Appendix II).

Note that the formula *yad anaḍvān yad anaḍudvratī* is also found above, in PS 17.35.2.

17.38.7   ~ PS 9.21.6

kalpante asmā r̥tavo na rtuṣv ā vr̥ścata r̥tūnāṃ priyo bhavati ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti) ||

The seasons are well-disposed towards him, he is not cut down by the seasons, he becomes dear to the seasons, he who, (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

N.B. This line is missing from **K**. The same ms. ends this kāṇḍikā with a repetition of line 33.4: *yasyām eva pratiṣṭhām āyatanaṃ vindate yaḥ Z 11 Z.*

_____

asmā] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** [x]smā **V122** *om*. **K**   • nartuṣv] **Mā** narntuṣv **V71** narntmaṣv **JM₃** narttuṣy **Ma Ja** narttuṣv **V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀** *om*. **K**   • ā vr̥ścata] **Mā V71 JM₃ Ji₄** ā vaścata **Pa꜀** ā vr̥ścyata **Ma Ja** ā vr̥ścyanta **V122** *om*. **K**   • priyo] priẏo **[O]** *om*. **K**   • ya (…) ||]
[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]? yaḥ || 38 || ru || **V122 Pa꜀** yaḥ || 38 || **Ji₄** yaḥ || 38 || ru 7 || **V71 JM₃** Z 11 Z **K**

PS 9.21.6e
kalpante asmā r̥tavo na rtuṣv āvr̥ścata r̥tūnāṃ priyo bhavati ya [evaṃ veda] |
"Wer [solches weiß], der wird zu einem, der den Jahreszeiten lieb ist. Die Jahreszeiten passen sich ihm an. Er wird von den Jahreszeiten nicht losgetrennt" (Kɪᴍ 2014: 380).
"The R̥tus [= seasons] conform to him. [He] who [knows thus] is not brought low to the R̥tus, he becomes pleasant for the R̥tus […]" (Kᴜʟɪᴋᴏᴠ 2012: 258).

On the semantics of *ā-vr̥śc-*, see Kᴜʟɪᴋᴏᴠ 2012: 255ff. Three **Oᴬ** mss. (**Ma**, **Ja**, **V122**) preserve the passive stem *vr̥ścya-*. However, Kᴜʟɪᴋᴏᴠ points out that the stem variant *vr̥śc-a-^te* (with a simplified cluster) is regularly attested in AV and MS, up to the late texts of their traditions, such as VaitS and MānŚS (ibid. p. 257–258), and that it is the regular passive stem of PS (ibid. p. 258 fn. 673), and therefore emendations to *vr̥śc-ya-^te* are not necessary for these texts. Kɪᴍ (*Schreib.*) records one instance of the error *ca* for original *cya* in PS 5.40.8b *vyacamānaṃ* for *vyacyamānaṃ*, and two instances of the error *cya* for original *ca* in the **O** mss, namely PS 4.4.7d *vr̥ścyatu* for *vr̥ścatu*, and PS 5.6.2a *nīcyāda* for *nīcādā*. Therefore, it is not impossible to regard the readings of **Ma**, **Ja**, and **V122** as secondary. Moreover, the parallel at PS 9.21.6e is preserved as *āvr̥ścata* by all the **O** mss., and as *āvr̥ścatu* by **K**. Thus, I edit *ā vr̥ścata* (which is of course the sandhi form for *ā vr̥ścate*).

The most common construction with *ā-vr̥śc-* (see Kᴜʟɪᴋᴏᴠ 2012: 256) requires the dative of the agent (normally a deity), but the locative, although rare, is also found (cf., e.g., ŚS 12.4.6b, *ā́ sá devéṣu vr̥ścate |*, "he is cut down by the gods").

Kāṇḍikā 39

17.39.1–2

1   tapaś ca varaś ca mahaś ca yaśaś ca yad asminn ⁺antar r̥caḥ sāmāni yajūṃṣi
      brāhmaṇam ||

2   brahma caiva lokaṃ cāva rundhe brāhmaṇavarcasī bhavati ya (evaṃ vidvān
      anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti) ||

The heat and breadth and greatness and fame that are inside of him (the ox) are the verses, the
chants, the ritual injunctions, the formulaic spells.
He secures both the *bráhman*, and the world, he becomes one with the lustre of the *brāhmaṇa*, he
who, (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

ca yaśaś ca] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ ca yaś[e]aś ca **Pa꜀**   • yad asminn ⁺antar r̥caḥ]
yad asmin antara r̥cas **K** yad asminn anta r̥caḥ **Ma Ja** V122 Ji₄ yad aścasminn anta r̥caḥ **Pa꜀** yad
asmin anta r̥caḥ **Mā** V71 JM₃   • yajūṃṣi] **K Ja** V122 Ji₄ **Pa꜀** JM₃ yajuṃṣi **Ma** yajuṣi **Mā** yajūṣi
V71   • brāhmaṇam] **[O]** vrāhmaṇam **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja]** Ji₄ **Pa꜀ [Mā]** | V71 JM₃ V122 *om*. **K**
•   brahma] **[O]** vrahma **K**   • brāhmaṇavarcasī] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **[Mā]** V71 JM₃
brāhmaṇavarccasāsī **Ji₄** brāhmaṇavarccasī **Pa꜀** vrāhma varcasī **K**   • bhavati] **[O]** bhavatī **K**   •
ya (…) ||] **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** yaḥ || 39 || ru (space) || **V122** yaḥ || 39 | || **Ji₄** yaḥ || 39 || ru || **Pa꜀** yaḥ ||
39 || ru 2 || **V71 JM₃** yaḥ Z 3 Z **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *yadasminnantarr̥caḥ⁺*.

    A full understanding of the idea of securing (*ava-rudh-*) or becoming (*bhū-*) the *bráhman*
would require an inquiry into the semantic history of this word across Vedic literature (from the
'formulation' of the RV to the principle beyond reality of the Upaniṣads), which goes beyond the
scope of this work. I refer the reader to the recent works by Nᴇʀɪ & Pᴏɴᴛɪʟʟᴏ, 2015 and 2016, the
first of which also deal with the concept of *brahmaloká* (seemingly implied in our text by the
unusual formulation *brahma caiva lokaṃ ca*).

    The compound *brāhmaṇavarcasin-* is based on *brāhmaṇavarcas-*, 'the lustre of the
brāhmaṇa', which occurs several times in the AV, namely in the refrain at 5.35.1–12,[52] in PS

---

52 PS 5.35.1, *agnaye sam anaman tasmai pr̥thivyā sam anaman | yathāgnaye pr̥thivyā samanamann* [the refrain
    starts here:] *evā mahyaṃ saṃnamaḥ saṃ namantu | vittiṃ bhūtiṃ puṣṭiṃ paśūn brahma brāhmaṇavarcasam |
    saṃnataya stha saṃ me namata svāhā ||*, "They paid reverence to Agni; they paid reverence to him with the
    Earth. Just as they paid reverence to Agni with the Earth, [Refrain:] so let the reverencers pay reverence to me.
    [Give me] gain, thriving, prosperity, cattle, a formula, the splendor of the Brahmins; you are the reverencers;
    pay me reverence: *svāhā!*" (Lubotsky). The remaining 11 stanzas replace Agni and the Earth with other deities,
    natural elements, ritual items, etc.

9.20.10 and PS 9.21.3,[53] in the refrain at ŚS 10.5.37–41 (~ PS 16.132.2),[54] in ŚS 17.1.21 (~ PS 18.56.5),[55] and in the prose of ŚS 13.4.14.[56] The only other occurrence of *brāmaṇavarcasin* is found in the PS version of the Vrātyakāṇḍa at 18.36.1m (~ ŚS 15.10.8 reads *brahmavarcasī* instead): *ainaṃ brahma gachati <u>brāhmanavarcasī</u> bhavati yo 'gniṃ brahma bṛhaspatim bhūmiṃ veda ||*, "The *bráhman* goes to him, he becomes one possessing the lustre of the *brāhmaṇa*, who knows Agni/the fire as *bráhman*, Bṛhaspati as the earth" (my transl.)[57] The variant *brahmavarcasin* does not occur in the PS, but is found in ŚS 8.10.25 (belonging to a hymn to the goddess Virāj).[58] This compound is based on *brahmavarcas-*, which is attested only later. However, we find *brahmavarcasá-* in the single-stanza hymn ŚS 19.71.1. The same stanza also features the only occurrence of the word *brahmaloká* in the AV.[59]

---

53 These two prose texts contains sequences of twelve stanzas, each dedicated to one of twelve nights and consecrated to twelve deities. In Appendix II (fn. 40), I suggest that they might be connected with the twelve nights of the midwinter solstice celebrations. If so, the fact that they share some vocabulary with our text would be significant.

54 ŚS 10.5.37–41, belonging to a fifty-stanza hymn, partly in metre and partly in prose, dedicated to the "Preparation and use of water-thunderbolts" (WHITNEY 1905: 579ff.): *sū́ryasyāvŕ̥tam anvā́varte dákṣiṇām ánv āvŕ̥tam | sā́ me dráviṇaṃ yachatu sā́ me brāhmaṇavarcasám || 37 || díśo jyótiṣmatīr abhyā́varte | tā́ me dráviṇaṃ yachantu tā́ me brāhmaṇavarcasám ||38|| saptaŕ̥ṣīn abhyā́varte | té me dráviṇaṃ yachantu té me brāhmaṇavarcasám ||39|| bráhmābhyā́varte | tán me dráviṇaṃ yachantu tán me brāhmaṇavarcasám ||40|| brāhmaṇā́m̐ abhyā́varte | té me dráviṇaṃ yachantu té me brāhmaṇavarcasám ||41||*, "37. I turn after the sun's turn (*āvŕ̥t*), after his turn to the right; let it yield (*yam*) me property; [let] it [yield] me Brahman-splendor. 38. I turn toward the quarters full of light; let them yield me property, let them etc. etc. 39. I turn toward the seven seers; let them yield etc. etc. 40. I turn toward the *bráhman*; let it yield etc. etc. 41. I turn toward the Brahmans; let them yield etc. etc." (Whitney).

55 ŚS 17.1.21 (~ PS 18.56.5), dedicated to Indra and the Sun: *rúcir asi rocó 'si | sá yáthā tváṃ rúcyā rocó 'sy evā́haṃ paśúbhiś ca brāhmaṇavarcaséna ca ruciṣīya ||*, "Brightness art thou, bright are thou; shiny art thou; as thou by brightness art bright, so may I by both cattle and Brahman-splendor be bright" (Whitney).

56 ŚS 13.4 is dedicated to extolling the sun. The text is divided into six paryāyas and 56 lines. The first *paryāya* (1–13) equates the sun with various deities. Then the text continues: *eté asmin devā́ ekavŕ̥to bhavanti || 13 || kīrtíś ca yáśaś cā́mbhaś ca nábhaś ca brāhmaṇavarcasáṃ cā́nnam cānnādyaṃ ca || 14 || yá etáṃ devám ekavŕ̥taṃ véda || 15 || [...] sárve asmin devā́ ekavŕ̥to bhavanti ||* [here the second paryāya begins repeating the same structure:] *bráhma ca tápaś ca kīrtíś ca yáśaś cāmbhaś ca nábhaś ca brāhmaṇavarcasáṃ cā́nnaṃ cānnā́dyaṃ ca ||21||*, "13. These gods in him become single. 14. Both fame and glory and water (? *ámbhas*) and cloud-mass and Brahman-splendor and food and food-eating. 15. He who knows this single god [...] 21. All the gods in him become single. Both worship (*bráhman*) and penance and fame and glory and water and cloud-mass and Brahman-splendor and food and food-eating" etc. (Whitney). Later on, we find the term again in ŚS 13.4.48–49 (=13.4.55–56, the final lines of the hymn), *námas te astu paśyata páśya mā paśyata || 48 ||, annā́dyena yáśasā téjasā brāhmaṇavarcaséna ||49||*, "48. Homage be to thee, O conspicuous one (*paśyata*); see (*páśya*) me, O conspicuous one. 49. With food-eating , with glory, with brilliancy (*téjas*), with Brahman-splendor" (Whitney).

57 The full passage is the following: PS 18.36.1, *yasyaivaṃ vidvān vrātyo rājño 'tithir gṛham āgachet | śreyāṃsam enam ātmano *mānayet tathā rāṣṭrāya nā́ vŕ̥ścate tathā kṣatrāya nā́ vŕ̥ścate tathā brahmaṇe nā́ vŕ̥ścate | tato vai brahma ca kṣatraṃ codatiṣṭhatāṃ te abrūtāṃ kaṃ *pra viśāveti | te prajāpatir abravīd bṛhaspatim eva brahma prāviśad indraṃ kṣatram iti | tato vai bṛhaspatim eva brahma prāviśad indraṃ kṣatram | iyam vāva bhūmir bṛhaspatir asau dyaur indraḥ | ayaṃ vāvāgnir brahmāsāv ādityaḥ kṣatram | ainaṃ kṣatraṃ gachatīndrayā vī bhavati ya ādityaṃ kṣatraṃ divam indraṃ veda | ainaṃ brahma gachati <u>brāhmanavarcasī</u> bhavati yo 'gniṃ brahma bṛhaspatim bhūmiṃ veda || 36 ||.* Compare the version from the Śaunaka Vrātyakāṇḍa: ŚS 15.10, *tád yásyaivám vidvā́n vrā́tyo rā́jñó 'tithir gṛhā́n āgáchet ||1|| śréyāṃsam enam ātmáno mānayet táthā kṣatráya nā́ vŕ̥ścate táthā rāṣṭráya nā́ vŕ̥ścate ||2|| áto vaí bráhma ca kṣatráṃ cód atiṣṭhatāṃ té abrūtāṃ kám prá viśāvéti ||3|| áto vaí bṛ́haspátim evá bráhma prá viśatv índraṃ kṣatráṃ táthā vā́ íti ||4|| áto vaí bṛ́haspátim evá brahma prā́viśad índraṃ kṣatrám ||5|| iyáṃ vā́ u pṛthivī́ bṛ́haspátir dyaúr evéndraḥ ||6|| ayáṃ vā́ u agnír bráhmāsāv ādityáḥ kṣatrám ||7|| ainaṃ bráhma gachati <u>brahmavarcasī́</u> bhavati || 8|| yáḥ pṛthivī́m bṛ́haspátim agníṃ brahma véda ||9|| ainam indriyáṃ gachatīndriyávān bhavati ||10|| yá ādityáṃ kṣatrám dívam índraṃ véda ||11||*, "1. So then, the houses of whatever king a thus-knowing Vrātya may come as guest, —2. He should esteem him better than himself; so does he not offend (*ā-vrā́śc*) against

Kāṇḍikā 40

17.40.1

>   atha yad asminn antaḥ ||

Now, what is inside of him (the ox):

atha yad] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ atha jyad **Pa꜀** yathed **K**   • asminn antaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** asmin antaḥ V71 JM₃ asminyantaś **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja]** Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ | V122 *om.* **K**

This line also opens kāṇḍikā 41 and 42 below.

17.40.2

>   śataṃ śraddhāḥ śataṃ dīkṣāḥ śataṃ yajñāḥ śataṃ dakṣiṇāḥ ||

A hundred trusts, a hundred initiations, a hundred worship rituals, a hundred priestly fees.

---

dominion; so does he not offend against royalty. 3. Thence verily arose both sanctity (*bráhman*) and dominion; they said: Whom shall we enter? 4. Let sanctity enter Bṛhaspati [and] dominion Indra; thus verily: it was said (*íti*). 5. Thence (*átas*) verily sanctity entered Bṛhaspati [and] dominion Indra. 6. This earth verily is Prajāpati, the sky is Indra. 7. This fire verily is sanctity, yonder Āditya is dominion. 8. To him comes sanctity, he becomes possessed of the splendor of sanctity (*brahmavarcasín*),—9. Who knows earth as Bṛhaspati, fire as sanctity. 10. To him comes Indra's quality, he becomes possessed of Indra's quality,—11. Who knows Āditya as dominion, the sky as Indra" (Whitney).

58 ŚS 8.10.25, *sód akrāmat sā́ saptarṣī́n ā́gachat tā́ṃ saptarṣáya úpāhvayanta bráhmaṇvaty éhī́ti | tásyāḥ sómo rā́jā vatsá ā́sīc chándaḥ pā́tram | tā́ṃ bṛhaspátir āṅgirasó 'dhok tā́ṃ bráhma ca tápaś cādhok | tád bráhma ca tápaś ca saptarṣáyo úpa jīvanti brahmavarcasy ùpajīvanī́yo bhavati yá eváṃ véda ||*, "She [Virāj] ascended; she came to the seven seers; the seven seers called to her: O rich in *bráhman*, come! of her king Soma was young, meter [was] vessel; her Bṛhaspati son of Aṅgiras milked; from her he milked both *bráhman* and penance; upon that, both *bráhman* and penance, the seven seers subsist; possessed of *bráhman*-splendor, one to be subsisted upon, becometh he who knoweth thus" (Whitney). The rest of the hymn consists of similar stanzas with identical structure, but with different protagonists who go to Virāj, milk her, etc. Thus, other terms replace *brahmavarcasī́* in the other stanzas. The hymn is also present in PS (16.133–135), but the refrain is abbreviated and it is not clear what the corresponding line (16.135.5) should read.

59 ŚS 19.71.1, *stutā́ máyā varadā́ vedamātā́ prá codayantāṃ pāvamānī́ dvijā́nām | ā́yuḥ prāṇáṃ prajā́ṃ paśúṃ kīrtíṃ dráviṇaṃ brahmavarcasám | máhyaṃ dattvā́ vrajata brahmalokám ||*, "Praised by me [is] the Veda-mother. Let them urge on the soma-hymn of the twice-born. Having given to me life-time, breath, progeny, cattle, fame, property, Vedic splendor, go ye to the *brahma*-world" (Whitney).

śraddhāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ **[Mā]** śraddhā **K** Pa꜀ V71 JM3 • dīkṣāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ dīyāḥ **Pa꜀** dīkṣā **K** • yajñāḥ śataṃ] **[O]** yajñāś śataṃ **K** • dakṣiṇāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ dakhiṇāḥ **Ji₄** dakṣiṇaś **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 ǀ V122 JM₃** *om.* **K**

17.40.3

śataṃ bhūtayaḥ śataṃ puṣṭayaḥ śataṃ prabhūtayaḥ śataṃ samr̥ddhayaḥ ‖

A hundred well-beings, a hundred prosperities, a hundred dominances, a hundred successes.

N.B. **K** features a lacuna after *bhūtayaś* until the end of the line.
————————
śataṃ] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ śa **Ji₄** • bhūtayaḥ] bhūtaẏaḥ **[O]** bhūtayaś **K** • puṣṭayaḥ] puṣṭaẏaḥ **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ puṣṭāẏaḥ **Ji₄** [x]puṣṭaẏaḥ **Pa꜀** *om.* **K** • prabhūtayaḥ] prabhūtaẏaḥ **[O]** *om.* **K** • śataṃ samr̥ddhayaḥ] śataṃ samr̥ddhayaḥ **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ śata samr̥ddhaẏaḥ **Ji₄** *om.* **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃ ǀ V122 V71** *om.* **K**

17.40.4

śatam abhūtayaḥ śataṃ nirbhūtayaḥ śataṃ parābhūtayaḥ śatam asamr̥ddhayaḥ ‖

A hundred wretchednesses, a hundred losses, a hundred defeats, a hundred failures.

śatam abhūtayaḥ] śatamabhūtaẏaḥ **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ śataṃmabhūtaẏaḥ **Pa꜀** catam abhūtayaś **K** • śataṃ nirbhūtayaś] śataṃ nirbhūtaẏaś **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** JM₃ śataṃ nibhr̥taẏaḥ **V71** śatannirbhūtayaś **K** • parābhūtayaḥ] parābhūtaẏaḥ **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ parādhaẏaḥ **Ji₄** parābhūtayaś **K** • śatam asamr̥ddhayaḥ] śatamasamr̥ddhayaḥ **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ śatamasamr̥rddhaẏaḥ **Ji₄** śataṃmasamr̥ddhaẏaḥ **Pa꜀** śataṃ samr̥ddhayo **K** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃ ǀ V122 Ji₄** *om.* **K**

17.40.5

śatam andhyāni śatam algaṇāni śataṃ tamāṃsi śataṃ rudhirāṇi ‖

A hundred blindnesses, a hundred *algaṇa*-eye diseases, a hundred darknesses, a hundred bloody/red-eye diseases (?).

śatam andhyāni] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71 JM₃** śatamandhyāyāni **V122** *om.* **Ji₄** śatandhyāni **Pa꜀** śata sindhyāni **K** • śatam algaṇāni] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ śatam algāni śatam algāni **Ji₄** śata(//)[x]malgaṇāni **Pa꜀** śatam abgaṇāni **K** • śataṃ tamāṃsi] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** śataṃ tamāṃtsi **V71** śataṃ śatamāsi **JM₃** • śataṃ rudhirāṇi] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ śatataṃ śataṃ rudhirāṇi **Ji₄** • ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃ ǀ V122 Ji₄ V71** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *śata<u>m</u>andhyāni*.

On *andh(i)ya-*, 'blindness' (cf. *ándhas-*, 'darkness', *andhá-*, 'blind'), and *algaṇa-*, 'a kind of eye disease', see Zehnder's comment on PS 2.81.2 (To preserve the sight), *yad andhiyaṃ yad algaṇaṃ ⁺yo armo adhirohati | ayasmayas tad aṅkuśo *akṣṇo 'rman apa ⁺lumpatu*, "Die Blindheit, das Algaṇa-Leiden, das Arma-Leiden, welches aufsteigt: der metallen Haken soll das, das Arma-Leiden, vom Auge beseitigen" (Zehnder), and the discussion by Knobl (2007a: 35ff.) about PS 7.15.6 (extolling the protective power of the dakṣiṇā), *uṣṇīṣaṃ tvā śīrṣaktyā vāsas tvā ⁺tanvāmayāt | candraṃ hiraṇyam andhyāt* (metrically *andh₍i₎yāt*) *karṇād dattaṃ śukraṃ bhrājad bādhiryāt pātu dakṣiṇā ||*, "A sacerdotal fee [offered to me by you], the turban must protect you from head-ache, the dress [must protect] you from body-pain, the shining gold from blindness, the brightly glittering [ring] that is taken from the ear [must protect you] from deafness" (Griffiths).

These are also the only passages where *algaṇa* is attested, so the meaning remains rather obscure. Zehnder (ibid.) compares it with *lagaṇa-*, 'eine krankhafte Schwellung des Augenlids', attested in the SuśrS.

Just as obscure is the meaning of *rudhira-* (lit. 'red, bloody') in this context. Notably, a late text of the Ayurvedic tradition, the Śārṅgadharasaṃhitā (1.7.87), names a disease of the eyelids called *lohita* (PW s.v.). We can only guess that *rudhira-* indicated some kind of reddening, irritation, or infection of the eyes, perhaps the rather common conjunctivitis.

17.40.6

ya evaṃ viduṣo [']sādhu kīrtayaty etair evainaṃ tamobhiḥ prorṇoti ||

He envelops with those very darknesses him who speaks ill of the initiated one.

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

viduṣo [']sādhu] viduṣo sādhu **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** viduṣo ṣādhu **Ji₄** *om*. **K** • kīrtayaty] kīrttaẏaty **V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Ma]? [Ja]?** kīrttiẏaty **V71 JM₃ [Mā]?** *om*. **K** • evainaṃ tamobhiḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** edhenaṃntamobhiḥ **Ji₄** *om*. **K** • prorṇoti] prorṇṇoti **V71 JM₃ V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** *om*. **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] |** **V122 V71 JM₃** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *viduṣosādhu* and *kīrtataty* (probably a misprint).

This line recalls PS 17.35.3 above.

Bhattacharya's apparatus is silent with regard to *kīrtayaty*, thus we don't know whether **Mā** shared the other **Oᴮ** manuscripts' error, *kīrtiyaty*. He is similarly silent with regard to *prorṇoti*, spelled with a geminate in all of my mss. I silently normalise the spelling of the consonant clusters in both words.

17.40.7

yad asya prācīnaṃ nābhyās tena dviṣantam ā viśati ||

The part [of his belly] to the front of his (the draft-ox's) navel, with that he (the *vratin*) takes control of [his] hater.

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

___

nābhyās tena] **[Ma] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71** nābhyāṃs tena **JM₃** nāmbhāṃs tena **Ja Mā** *om*. **K**   •   ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** | **V122 V71** *om*. **K**

On the lexeme *ā-viś-*, 'to enter', figuratively 'to magically possess, take control by means of magic', see my comment on PS 3.25.1d in Appendix II.

With *dviṣant-*, here the *vratin*'s detractors are certainly intended.

17.40.8

atha yad asya pratīcīnaṃ nābhyās tena mṛtyuṃ nāṣṭrām avartiṃ tarati ‖

Moreover, the part [of his belly] to the back of his (the draft-ox's) navel, with that he (the *vratin*) overcomes death, calamity, misfortune.

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

___

yad asya] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** ya sya **V122** *om*. **K**   •   pratīcīnaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** pracīnaṃ **Ji₄** *om*. **K**   •   nābhyās tena] **[Ma] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ V71** nābhyāṃs tena **JM₃** nāmbhāṃs tena **Ja Mā** *om*. **K**   •   mṛtyuṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** mṛtyaṃ **Ji₄** *om*. **K**   •   nāṣṭrām avartiṃ tarati] **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** nā(//)[.]ām avarttiṃ tarata **V71** nāṣṭrām avarttaṃ tarati **V122 Pa꜀ JM₃** nā[e]ṣṭrām avṛttaṃ tarati **Ji₄** *om*. **K**   •   ‖] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **V122** *om*. **K**

17.40.9

pra patho ⁺devayānāñ jānāti ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti) ‖

He foreknows the paths of the gods, he who (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

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

___

devayānāṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** devajānāṃ **Ji₄** deva([x]nāṃ→)yānāṃ **Pa꜀** *om*. **K**   •   ya (…) ‖] yaḥ ‖ 40 ‖ ru ‖ **Ma Pa꜀** yaḥ | 40 ‖ ru 9 ‖ **Ja** yaḥ ‖ 40 ‖ ru (space) ‖ **V122** yaḥ ‖ 40 ‖ **Ji₄** yaḥ ‖ 40 ‖ ru 10 ‖ **Mā V71** ya ‖ 40 ‖ ru 9 ‖ **JM₃** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *devayānāṃ jānāti*.

On the sandhi between *-n* before *j-*, I follow GRIFFITHS's (2009: LX §(I)) practice of regularising to *-ñ j-*.

On the *devayāna path*, see Appendix II §3.2, 3.3, and PS 17.31.4 above.

Kāṇḍikā 41

17.41.1

    *atha *yad *asminn *antaḥ ||

Now, what is inside of him (the ox):

*atha *yad *asminn *antaḥ ||] yathedasminyantaś **K** *om.* **O**

Bhattacharya does not include this line in his edition. Indeed, it is missing from the **O** mss. (two of which, namely **V71** and **JM₃**, accordingly count five lines instead of six in this kāṇḍikā; the others do not report the line count, nor does **K**). On the other hand, **K** reads *yathedasminyantaś*. Since kāṇḍikās 40 and 42 are very similar to 41 in structure and content, and since both begin with this formula (also in **O**), it would seem obvious to find the same formula at the beginning of 41 as well. It may be possible that, sometime early on in the Odia tradition, this line was regarded as a refrain and abbreviated. Indeed, normally only the first and last occurrences of a refrain are written *in extenso*, while the repetitions in between are marked with an abbreviation; cf. the recurrent "*yaḥ* ||" at the end of many paragraphs of our text. Perhaps this abbreviation was then lost. Assuming this scenario, I include it my edition as 41.1.

17.41.2

    śatam ardhamāsāḥ śataṃ māsāḥ śatam r̥tavaḥ śatam ārtavāḥ ||

A hundred fortnights, a hundred months, a hundred seasons, a hundred seasonal periods (?).

ardhamāsāḥ] **Pa꜀** [Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]? arddhamāsāḥ **V122 Ji₄ V71 JM₃** ardhamāmāś **K**   • māsāḥ] [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 māsā JM₃ mā(*s.s.* mā)sāḥ **V122** māsāś **K**   • r̥tavaḥ] [O] r̥tavaś **K** • ārtavāḥ] [Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]? ārttavāḥ **JM₃ V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀** ā(nta → *subs.*)rttavāḥ **V71** ārtavāś **K**   • ||] [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃ | **V122 V71** *om.* **K**

    The exact meaning of *ārtavá-* is not known. We can only guess that it indicates a period longer than a season (*r̥tú*) and shorter than a year, on the basis of the occurrence of this term in lists such as the one here or at 17.28.17–19 above. See also my comment on PS 17.22.2. Cf. Macdonell & Keith 1912: I p.63.

17.41.3

śatam idāvatsarāḥ śatam *anuvatsarāḥ śataṃ parivatsarāḥ śataṃ saṃvatsarāḥ ||

A hundred *idā* years (?), a hundred *anu* years (?), a hundred *pari* years (?), a hundred full years.

idāvatsarāḥ] **[O]** idāvatsarāś **K** • śatam *anuvatsarāḥ] śatam anuvatsarāś **K** *om.* **O** • śataṃ parivatsarāḥ] **[O]** śataṃ parivatsarāś **K** • saṃvatsarāḥ] saṃvatsarāḥ **O** saṃvatsarāś **K** • ||] **[O]** *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya omits the second item, *śatam anuvatsarāḥ*, which is indeed attested in **K** but absent in the Odia mss. Since all the neighbouring lines contain four items, I think it is quite likely that the reading of **K** is original, and that *śatam anuvatsarāḥ* was lost in the Odia tradition, perhaps under the influence of PS 17.21.9, where we find a similar list without *anuvatsara-* (see my comment *ad loc*).

17.41.4

śataṃ brahmāṇi śataṃ karmāṇi śataṃ jyotīṃṣi śatam amr̥tāni ||

A hundred formulas, a hundred ritual actions, a hundred lights (i.e. ritual fires), a hundred nectars (i.e. soma drinks).

brahmāṇi] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** brahma **Ji₄** vrahmāṇi **K** • jyotīṃṣi] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā]** jotiṣi **Ji₄** yotīśi **Pa_c** yotīṃṣiṃ **V71** jyotīṃṣiṃ **JM₃** • śatam amr̥tāni] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā]**śatam amr̥tāni **Pa_c** śatamr̥mr̥tāni **V71** śamamr̥tāni **JM₃** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** | **V122 Ji₄ V71** *om.* **K**

This line looks like a list of the fundamental elements of Vedic ritual, i.e. worship by means of formulas and ritual actions, but also fire and soma, which is probably what is intended with the words *jyotiṣ-* and *amr̥ta-*, respectively.

17.41.5

śataṃ prāṇāḥ śatam apānāḥ śataṃ vyānāḥ śataṃ samānāḥ ||

A hundred exhalations, a hundred inhalations, a hundred diffused breaths, a hundred concentrated breaths.

śataṃ prāṇāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** śataḥ prāṇāḥ **Pa_c** śataṃ prāṇāś **K** • śatam apānāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** śatamapānā **Pa_c** śatamapānāś **K** • śataṃ vyānāḥ] **[O]** śataṃ vyānāś **K** • śataṃ samānāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** śatam apānāḥ **Pa_c** śataṃ samānāś **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **V122** *om.* **K Ji₄**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *prāṇāṃ*—no doubt a misprint.
    Note that of the five life-breaths, the *udāna-*, 'upward breath', is missing here.

17.41.6

> jyog jīvati sarvam āyur eti na purā jarasaḥ pra mīyate ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti) ||

He lives for a long time, he enjoys a whole lifespan, he does not die prematurely, he who (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

jyog jīvati] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** yo || jyognīvati **V71** • āyur] āẏur **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** āẏūr **V122 V71 JM₃** āyar **K** • jarasaḥ pra] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71 JM₃** jarāsaḥ pra **Ji₄** jarasaḥ pra **K** • mīyate] **K** mīẏate **[O]** • ya (…) ||] **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** yaḥ || 41 || ru (space) || **V122** yaḥ || (//) || 41 || **Ji₄** ya evaṃ vedaḥ || 41 || ru || **Pa꜀** yaḥ || 41 || ru 5 || **V71 JM₃** yaḥ Z 15 Z **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *eti ta purā*—no doubt a misprint.

Kāṇḍikā 42

17.42.1

atha yad asminn antaḥ ||

Now, what is inside of him (the ox):

atha yad asminn antaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** atha yad asmin antaḥ **V122 V71 JM₃** yathed amasminy antaś **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 [Mā]** | **Ji₄ Pa_c V71 JM₃** *om*. **K**

17.42.2

śataṃ gāyatrāḥ śataṃ sāhnāḥ śataṃ trirātrāḥ śatam atirātrāḥ ||

A hundred Gāyatrī recitations, a hundred one-day-long rituals, a hundred three-day-long rituals, a hundred rituals performed overnight (Atirātra).

gāyatrāḥ] gāyatrāḥ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** gāẏatrā **Ji₄** rayindhāś **K** • śataṃ sāhnāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** śata sāhnā **Ji₄** śatam sahannāś **K** • śataṃ trirātrāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** śata trirātrāḥ **Ji₄** śatam trirātrā(*s.s.* trā)ḥ **V71** śatam trirātrāś **K** • śatam atirātrāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71** *om*. **Pa_c JM₃** śatam atirātraś **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** | **V122 V71** *om*. **K JM₃**

17.42.3

śatam agniṣṭomāḥ śataṃ dvādaśāhāḥ śataṃ ṣoḍaśinaḥ śataṃ sarvapṛṣṭhāḥ ||

A hundred Agniṣṭoma rituals, a hundred twelve-day-long rituals, a hundred Ṣoḍaśin rituals, a hundred rituals provided with all the Pṛṣṭha Sāmans.

agniṣṭomāḥ] **[O]** agniṣṭomāś **K** • śataṃ dvādaśāhāḥ śataṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** śataṃ dvādaśāhyā(/hvā?)śataṃ **V71** śatardvā(ndvā?)daśāhāścataṃ **K** • ṣoḍaśinaḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] [Mā] V71** ṣoraśinaḥ **JM₃ V122 Ji₄** ṣora(ṣinaḥ →)śinaḥ **Pa_c** ṣolaśinaś **K** • sarvapṛṣṭhāḥ] **O** sarvapṛṣṭhyaś **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **V122** *om*. **K**

Bhattacharya proposes to emend to +*sarvapṛṣṭhyāḥ*, following **K**. I find the stem *sarvapṛṣṭhya-* only

in JB 2.307.[60] The stem attested in **O**, *sarvapṛṣṭha-*, is quite frequent both as an adj., 'provided with all the *pṛṣṭhas*', applied to various rituals, and as a feminine (*sarvapṛṣṭhā-*) noun indicating a specific ritual (MW, PW s.v.). The *pṛṣṭhas* are *sāmans* (Mylius 1995: 93). Unfortunately, neither Mylius 1995 nor Renou 1954 include a lemma *sarvapṛṣṭha-/ya-*, nor are the latter mentioned in Hillebrandt 1987.

17.42.4

śataṃ rājasūyāḥ śataṃ vājapeyāḥ śataṃ kāmaprāḥ sahasraṃ ⁺sattrāyaṇāni ||

A hundred Rājāsūya rituals, a hundred Vājapeyas, a hundred Kāmapra, a thousand Sattrāyaṇas.

rājasūyāḥ śataṃ] **V71** rājasūyaḥ śataṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** rājasūyaśśataṃ **K**   • vājapeyāḥ śataṃ] vājapeyaḥ śataṃ **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** vājapeyā̈ (*s.s.*: satam?) **V71**[61] **JM₃** vājapeyāśśataṃ **K**   • kāmaprāḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** kāmasāḥ **Pa_c** kāmaprās **K** • sahasraṃ ⁺sattrāyaṇāni] sahasraṃ satrāyaṇāni **K** sahasraṃ satrāÿaṇāni **Ma Pa_c** sahasraṃ śatrāyaṇāni **Ja V122 Ji₄ JM₃** sahasrāṃ śatrāÿani **Mā** sahasrāṃ śatrāÿa[x]ni **V71**   • ||] **[Ma] Ja Ji₄ Mā JM₃ | V122 Pa_c V71** *om*. **K**

The Kāmapra ritual ('for fulfilment of desire') and the Sattrāyaṇa ritual ('Long-course ritual') are also not recorded in Mylius 1995, Renou 1954, or Hillebrandt 1897.

17.42.5

eṣa *vā *anaḍvān sarvāṅgaḥ sarvātmā sarvaparuḥ sarvapān madhyataḥ praty asthāt ||

This one, the ox, with whole limbs, with a whole trunk, with whole joints, with whole feet, has taken a firm standing in the middle.

eṣa *vā *anaḍvān] eṣa vānaḍvān **K** eṣa vānaḍvān, **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]? V71** eṣa vānarvān, **V122** eṣa vānarvan, **Ji₄** eṣa vānarvānata **Pa_c** eṣa vāna[.](//)n, **JM₃**   • sarvāṅgaḥ] **[O]** sarvāśśas **K**   • sarvaparuḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** sarvaparu **Pa_c** sarvaparus **K**   • sarvapān] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** sarvipān **V71**   • madhyataḥ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] JM₃** madhataḥ **V71** madhyatu **K**   • praty asthāt] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄** praty asthāta **Pa_c** praty atiṣṭhāt **Mā V71 JM₃** pratiṣṭhātu **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Pa_c V71 JM₃ | V122 Mā ||**(←*s.s.*)bharā **Ji₄** *om*. **K**

Note the aorist *praty asthāt*. In ritual texts, the aorist is normally found in direct speech with the function of expressing the recent past. If found in sections containing ritual instructions, instead, it normally expresses the direct result of a previously mentioned action or the achieved result or effect of the described ritual procedure. This is the so-called resultative aorist. The same can also

---

60 JB 2.307 reads: *atha yasyaitasya jyotir gaur āyur iti tryaho viśvajit sarvapṛṣṭhya ukthyaṣ ṣoḍaśimāñ chandomapavamānaḥ sarvastoma ukthyaḥ pañcaviṃśaṃ mahāvrataṃ jyotir atirātro yaḥ kāmayetopetyābhiplavam upetya pṛṣṭhāny upetya chandomān mahāvrataṃ ma upetaṃ syād iti sa etena yajeta.*

61 The reading of **V71** is added (perhaps by a second hand) in the left margin, right before *kāmaprāḥ*. Between the two words is a candrabindu sign, probably marking the place where an addition should be inserted, or perhaps indicating that a further addition needs to be inserted there. Indeed, again in the left margin, before the first line, above the candrabindu, we seem to read *satam*.

express an action (a secondary, preliminary procedure) that was done before the current ritual timeline described in the text. On these different usages, see AMANO 2009: 15ff. It is hard to uncover the ritual reality behind our line: what seems plausible is that some of these lines were recited during an actual ritual performance—as is certainly the case for kāṇḍikā 43, which contains *yajus*-style prose—or that they were recited during a re-enactment of the ritual for didactic purposes.

The readings preserved by both **O** and **K** suggest that the PS written archetype must have contained a faulty reading, *vānaḍvān*, with double sandhi between *vai* and *anaḍvān*. Note that the resultative aorist (at least in the MS) is very especially found with *evá* (sometimes also with *vā́ etád* or *vā́vaitád*) (see AMANO 2009: 16), so one wonders whether the original reading might have been *eṣaivānaḍvān*.

On *madhyatas* and the semantics of the *-tas* suffix, see my comment on PS 17.1.1 (SELVA 2014: 6).

17.42.6

ṛksāmābhyām uttabhito yajuṣā yajñena gāyatreṇa brahmaṇā prathita upariṣṭāt ||

He is upheld by the *ṛk* verses and the *sāman* chants; by the *yajus* ritual injunctions, by the ritual worship, by the Gāyatrī recitation, by the *bráhman* formula, he is made to thrive above.

uttabhito yajuṣā] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ utabhito yajuṣā **Ji₄** uttabhito yayusā **Pa_c** ādattetatr̥to **K** • gāyatreṇa] gāẏatreṇa **[O]** gāyattreṇa **K** • brahmaṇā] **[O]** vrahmaṇā **K** • prathita upariṣṭāt] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** JM₃ pathita ([.]→*s.s.*)[.]pariṣṭāt, **V71** pratata upariṣṭāt **K** • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **V122** *om*. **K**

17.42.7

prathate prajayā paśubhir gr̥hair dhanena ya (evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vrataṃ bibharti) ||

He thrives with offspring, with cattle, with a homestead, with wealth, he who, (being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox).

prathate] **K [Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Ji₄ Pa_c [Mā]** JM₃ pratham(*s.s.*→t)e **V71** • prajayā] **K** prajaẏā **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 **Pa_c [Mā] V71 JM₃** praṇiẏā **Ji₄** • gr̥hair dhanena] **K [Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** gr̥hairddhanena **V122 Pa_c V71 JM₃** gr̥hirddhanena **Ji₄** • ya (…) ||] **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** yaḥ || 42 || ru (space) || **V122** yaḥ || 42 || **Ji₄** ya evaṃ vedaḥ || 42 || ru || **Pa_c** yaḥ || 42 || ru 7 || **V71 JM₃** yaḥ Z 16 Z **K**

Bhattacharya's edition reads *dhanana*—no doubt a misprint.

Note the *figura etymologica* between *prathate* and the *prathita* of the previous line.

Kāṇḍikā 43

In the first four lines of this final kāṇḍikā, the text switches from the narrative or exegetical (*brāhmaṇa*-style) prose of the previous sections to a series of *yajus*-style prose injunctions, typically characterised by 2sg. verbal forms, that were presumably meant to be recited during a ritual performance.

17.43.1-2　　　 ~ PS 3.25.14

1　　　indro balenāsi parameṣṭhī vratena yena gaus tena vaiśvadevaḥ ||
2　　　yo [']smān dveṣṭi yaṃ (**K**: ca) vayaṃ dviṣmas tasya prāṇān saṃ vr̥ha tasya prāṇān vi vr̥ha ||

By strength you are Indra, by means of [your] observance [you are] Parameṣṭhin; by the fact that you are a bovine, you belong to the All-gods.
The one who hates us, (and) the one we hate, tear out his life-breaths altogether, tear his life-breaths apart.

N.B. Here **Ma** has a lacuna. The sequence "*-na yena gaus tena*" is missing.

――――――

balenāsi] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** balenāsiṃ **V71** balenā **JM₃** balenāmya **K**　　• parameṣṭhī] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa꜀ [Mā] V71** par(e→)ameṣṭhī **Ji₄** parameṣṭ(i →[.]) **JM₃**　　• vratena yena] **K [Ja] V122 Ji₄ V71 JM₃** vrate **Ma** vratena (space) **Pa꜀** vrateyena **Mā**　　• gaus tena] **K Ja V122 Ji₄ [Mā] JM₃** gos tena **Pa꜀ V71** *om.* **Ma**　　• ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** | **V122 V71 JM₃** *om.* **K**　　• yo [']smān dveṣṭi] yo 'smāṃ dveṣṭi **V122** yosmāndveṣṭi **K Ja Mā** yosmāṃ dveṣṭi **Ma** yosmāṃ dveṣṭi **Ji₄ Pa꜀ JM₃** yosmādeṣṭi **V71**　　• yaṃ (ca) vayaṃ] ẏaṃ vaẏaṃ **V122 Pa꜀ V71** ([**Ma**]? [**Ja**]? [**Mā**]?) ẏaṃ vaṃ **Ji₄** y(i→)aṃ vaẏaṃ **JM₃** yaṃ ca vayaṃ **K**　　• dviṣmas tasya] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** dviṣmaḥ tasya **Pa꜀**　　• prāṇān] prāṇān, **Ma Ja V122 Pa꜀ Mā V71** prāṇāna **Ji₄** prān, **JM₃** prāṇāni **K**　　• saṃ vr̥ha tasya] **[Ma] Pa꜀ [Mā] JM₃** saṃ vr̥hattasya **Ja V122 V71** saṃ vr̥haṃ tasya **Ji₄** sambar̥ha tasya **K**　　• prāṇān vi vr̥ha] prāṇān, vi vr̥ha **[Ma]? [Ja]? V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]? V71 JM₃** prāṇān vi barha **K**　　• ||] **JM₃ [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa꜀ [Mā]** | **K V122 V71**

PS 3.25.14
indro balenāsi parameṣṭhī vratena yena gaus tena vaiśvadevaḥ |
yo [']smān dveṣṭi yaṃ (ca) vayaṃ dviṣmas tasya prāṇān, saṃ *vr̥ha tasya prāṇān vi vr̥ha ||

Bhattacharya's edition reads *yosmān*.
　　　An exact parallel for these two lines is found in PS 3.25.14 (with no ŚS parallel), concluding the PS version of the Anaḍutsūkta. The readings of the mss. preserving this parallel passage confirm that the written archetype most probably read *yo smān* (*yo smān* **K**, *yo 'smāṃ* **Ma₁ Ma₂ Ja Ek₂ Ji₃**

V153, *yo (asmān,→)'smāṃ* **Vā**, *yo smāṃ* **Ek₁ Ku₁**).

They also confirm that the Kashmirian tradition read *yaṃ ca vayaṃ dviṣmas*, whereas the Odia tradition did not feature the conjunction (*yaṃ vayaṃ dviṣmas* **[O]**[62], *yaṃ ca vaya dviṣsas* **K**). I discuss this issue in my comment on PS 3.25.14 in Appendix II.

The readings preserved by our mss. confirm that *saṃ vṛha tasya* is also the correct reading in PS 3.25.14 (see my edition in Appendix II).

17.43.3

indro [’]sīndrasya rūpam asi prajāpatir asi parameṣṭhy asi ||

You are Indra, you are Indra's form, you are Prajāpati, you are Parameṣṭhin.

indro [’]sīndrasya] indro sīndrasya **[O]** indro sīndrasya **K**   • prajāpatir] **[O]** praprajāpatir **K**   • parameṣṭhy asi] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Pa꜀ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ parame(//)[.]y asi **Ji₄** parameṣṭhir asi **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ **[Mā]** JM₃ | V122 Pa꜀ |(?) V71 *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya writes *indrosīndrasya*.

This line closely resembles ŚS 4.11.7ab, the opening of the prose passage that concludes the first section of the Anaḍutsūkta in the ŚS (with no direct parallel in the PS version). The whole of ŚS 4.11.7, which I have also quoted in my comment on 17.30 above, reads: *índro rūpéṇāgnír váhena prajā́patiḥ paramēṣṭhī́ virā́ṭ | viśvānare akramata vaiśvānaré akramatānaḍúhy akramata | só 'dṛṃhayata só 'dhārayata ||*, "He is Indra by [his] form; he is Agni by means of [his] withers; [he is] Prajāpati, Parameshthin, Virāj. He strode into [the domain of] Viśvānara, he strode into [the domain of] Vaiśvānara, he strode onto the draft-ox. He made himself firm. He held his [*vajra*]." See my discussion on this passage in my comment on 17.30 above and in Appendix II, §2.2.

17.43.4

svar asi svargo [’]si svargaloko [’]si svargaṃ mā lokaṃ gamaya ||

You are the heaven, you are heavenly, you are one whose world is the heaven, make me go to the heavenly world.

svargo [’]si] svargosi **[O]** svarosi **K**   • svargaloko [’]si] svargalokosi **K [O]**   • mā] **[O]** smā **K** • gamaya] **K** gamaẏa **[Ma] [Ja]** V122 Ji₄ Pa꜀ **[Mā]** gamaẏaḥ V71 JM₃   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja]** Ji₄ **[Mā]** V71 JM₃ | **K** V122 Pa꜀

Bhattacharya's edition reads *svargosi svargalokosi*.

On the *svargá loká*, see my discussion in Appendix II §3.2, §3.3.

Here, *svargaloko* (=*svargalokaḥ*) must be a Bahuvrīhi compound, much like *bradhnálokaḥ*

---

62 Note that all of my **O** mss. (except for **JM₃**) read *dveṣṭi ẏaṃ* (with *ẏ*) *vayaṃ*. Unfortunately, Bhattacharya does not record this spelling for his mss. Similarly, all my mss. containing the Anaḍutsūkta parallel read *dveṣṭi ẏaṃ* (with *ẏ*) *vayaṃ*. The only exception is **Ek₁**, which has *dveṣṭi yaṃ vayaṃ*. As the akṣara *ẏ* [j] is used only in the middle of words, between vowels, in the Odia tradition (whereas at the beginning of a word only the akṣara *y* [dʒ] is found), it would seem that, perhaps because this was such a frequent formula, the words were pronounced as one single continuous utterance: thus the sequence *dveṣṭiyaṃ* was not perceived as two words.

in 17.34.3,5 above.

17.43.5–6

5a   yenāsya vahas tena yajño
5b   yena vahati tena lokaḥ ||
6a   yenainaṃ [**K**: yenedaṃ] paśyati tena viśvo
6b   yenainaṃ [**K**: yenedaṃ] gamayati tena sarvaḥ ||

By the fact that he has withers, he is the ritual worship;
by the fact that he hauls, he is the world.
By the fact that he looks at him (**K**: By the fact that now he looks), he is everything;
by the fact that he makes him go (**K**: by the fact that now he makes go), he is the whole.

yenāsya] **[O]** yenāmi **K**   • vahas] **K [Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**c **[Mā] V71 JM₃** vaha[x]s **Ji₄**   • yajño] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa**c **[Mā] V71 JM₃** ya[. .] **V122**   • vahati] **[O]** vṛhaspati **K**   • lokaḥ] **[O]** loko **K**   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa**c **[Mā] V71 JM₃** | **V122** *om.* **K**   • viśvo] **K [Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ Pa**c **[Mā] V71 JM₃** viśvo (*subs. sec.m.* → viśvo) **V122**   • yenainaṃ] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Ji₄ Pa**c **[Mā] JM₃** yenai[x]naṃ **V71** yenedaṃ **K**   • paśyati] **[Ma] [Ja] V122 Pa**c **[Mā] JM₃** pa([x]nti → *subs.*)śyati **V71** pasyati **Ji₄** gamayati **K**   • yenainaṃ] **[O]** yenedaṃ **K**   • gamayati] **K** gamaẏati **[O]**   • sarvaḥ] **[O]** śarvaḥ **Pa**c   • ||] **[Ma] [Ja] Ji₄ [Mā] V71 JM₃** | **V122 Pa**c *om.* **K**

Bhattacharya edits *yenāsya*.

    In his comment, Bhattacharya proposes to emend to **yenāsi*. There is little doubt that the °*m*° in **K** is a mistake for °*s*°. However, it would be strange to have a 2g. *asi* followed by a 3sg. *vahati*. Moreover, the following line, 43.6, reads *paśyati* and *gamayati*, both 3sg. verbs. Clearly there has been a shift to the third person. Therefore, I am inclined to think that *yenāsya* is a better reading.

    O *vahati* corresponds to **K** *vṛhaspati* (Bṛhaspati). One wonders whether this difference is intentional. However, there is no mention of Bṛhaspati anywhere else in this anuvāka, nor in the Anaḍutsūkta. Moreover, the absence of a visarga (*vṛhaspatiḥ*) speaks in favour of considering **K**'s reading simply a corruption of *vahati*.

    The reference to 'looking' (*paśyati*) is very obscure—can it be related to the curses involving darkness and eye diseases in 17.40.5–6 above?[63] Note that **K** reads *gamayati* twice. The reference to 'making go' (*gamayati*) evokes 17.43.3, *svargaṃ mā lokaṃ gamaya*, above. In fact, the change to the third person here raises the question as to whether we are back to *brāhmaṇa*-style exegetical prose that is not meant to be recited during a ritual, but perhaps only during a re-enactment for didactic purposes, or if these lines too are *yajuses* meant to be recited. In the first case, the *yajus* in 17.43.3 would actually have been pronounced during the ritual, and our line here would be explaining it. In the second case, instead, we have to imagine the presence of multiple people reciting different lines. But who is who here?

    The difference between **O** *yenainam* and **K** *yenedaṃ* is interesting. The unemphatic enclitic *enam* normally refers anaphorically to someone just mentioned in the text. This would suggest that the referent of *enam* is the subject of sentences **5a** and **5b**. Let's call it "A" to distinguish it from the

---

63 In light of the connection between the *anaḍudvrata* and the Gharma ritual (see Appendix II, §3.1), it might be interesting to note that on the first day of the *avāntaradīkṣā*, the novice is made to look at the sun and then blindfolded, as if to retain its lustre. He is spends the first night of his initiation like that. On the second day, having returned to the wilderness, he is made to look at seven objects that supposedly represent the sun (see Appendix II, fn. 23).

supposed subject of **6a** and **6b**, or "B" for the sake of the discussion: "By the fact that A has withers, A is the ritual of worship; by the fact that A hauls, A is the world; By the fact that B looks at him (=at A, just mentioned), B is everything; by the fact that B makes him (=A, just mentioned) go, B is the whole." Is it perhaps possible that A is an actual ox (who has withers and hauls), and B is a *vratin*? There is very little room for certainty here, also because the *vratin* is likened to an ox throughout the text, so that even the subject of *vahati* could be the *vratin* instead of the ox. However, I would hesitate to regard the subject of **6** as identical to that of **5**. This would mean that *enam* would not refer to the subject of **5** (just mentioned before), but to someone outside the text, in the real world, maybe present at the scene. In this case, in a *brāhmaṇa*-style explanation we would expect to find the pronoun *eṣa* (so here *etam*), while in a formulaic *yajus* (much like in an instance of direct speech), we would expect to find the pronoun *ayam* (so here *imam*). At the same time, this might not be such a strict rule. It is interesting that we also find the pronoun *enam* in the Anaḍutsūkta, at ŚS 4.11.4 (~ PS 3.25.2): *anaḍvā́n duhe sukṛtásya loká ainaṃ pyāyayati* (PS ⁺*pyāyet*) *pavamānaḥ purastāt* |, "The draft ox milks out into the world of merit. May the [wind] blowing from the East swell him". On the one hand, the use of *enam* in this stanza seems justified by the fact that it refers to the *anaḍvān* just mentioned before. On the other hand, this *anaḍvān* is certainly a *vratin*, probably present at the scene when this stanza is recited. It is he who should figuratively swell and produce the milk (i.e. merit) that will grant him access to the *sukṛtásya loká*. Moreover, we could imagine that it is the *vratin* who pronounces 17.43.3 above: *svargaṃ mā lokaṃ gamaya*, "make me go to the heavenly world"—perhaps addressing the ox! In this case, the *vratin* certainly could not be the subject of our *gamayati*: on the contrary, it would be the ox, who makes him (the *vratin*) go [to the heavenly world]. This would suggest that *enam* (the *vratin*) truly has a referent in the real world, and does not simply refer to someone mentioned above in the text (i.e., the subject of line **5**). Yet nothing prevents the *vratin* in the real world from being the subject of **5**, since, as I have pointed out above, the *vratin* is likened to an ox! In this case, *enam* (= the *vratin*) in **6** would also be justified in its intratextual anaphoric function.

The case is different if we prefer **K**'s reading, *idam*. Here, the referent must be something in the real world, but because *idam* is neuter, this referent certainly cannot be an ox, nor a *vratin*. Alternatively, *idam* could be taken as an adverb 'here, now': e.g., 'By the fact that now he looks, he is everything; by the fact that now he makes go (i.e. he fulfils the function of making [the *vratin*] go), he is the whole". Both the **O** and the **K** variants seem possible, therefore I include the **K** alternative in my edition and translation.

17.43.7

> ye [']sya pādāḥ sā pratiṣṭhā ||
> prati *tiṣṭhati prajayā paśubhir gṛhair dhanena ya evaṃ vidvān anaḍuho vratam bibharti ||

His feet, they are the foundation.
He takes a firm standing with offspring, with cattle, with a homestead, with wealth, he who, being initiated, "bears" the observance of the draft-ox.

ye [']sya] ye sya **K** **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **Ji₄** **Paᶜ** **[Mā]** **V71** **JM₃** ye asya **V122**[64]   • pādāḥ] **[Ma]** **[Ja]** **V122** **Paᶜ** **[Mā]** **V71** **JM₃** padāḥ **Ji₄** pādāt **K**   • |||] || **Ji₄** **JM₃** | **[Ma]?** **[Ja]?** **V122** **Paᶜ** **[Mā]?** **V71** *om.* **K**   • prati *tiṣṭhati] prati tiṣṭhasi **V122** **Ji₄** **Paᶜ** **V71** **JM₃** (**[Mā]?** **[Ma]?** **[Ja]?**) prathate **K**   • prajayā]

---

[64] This reading is most likely secondary. Cf. 17.38.3 above.

K prajayā **[O]** • paśubhir gṛhair dhanena]⁶⁵ **K [Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** paśubhir gṛhairddhanena **JM₃ V122 Ji₄ Paᶜ** paśubhi gṛheddhinena[x] **V71** • vidvān anaḍuho] **[Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** vidvān anaṛūho **V71** vidvā(*s.s.* na)naṛuho **JM₃** vidvān, nanaṛuho **V122** vidvā[x]nnaṛuho **Ji₄** vidvā[. . .]ho **Paᶜ** vidvān ana(ḍvā →)ḍuho **K** • bibharti]⁶⁶ **K [Ma]? [Ja]? [Mā]?** bibhartti **V122 Ji₄ Paᶜ V71 JM₃** • ‖]] ‖ 43 ‖ ru ‖ 6 ‖ **Ma** a 6 | 43 | ru 8 | **Ja** ‖ 43 ‖ ru (space) ‖ **V122** ‖ (space) ‖ 43 ‖ **Ji₄** ‖ 43 ‖ ru ‖ 5 ‖ **Paᶜ** ‖ 43 ‖ ru ‖ **Mā V71** ‖ 43 ‖ ru 8 ‖ **JM₃** Z 17 Z **K**

Bhattacharya edits *yesya* and *prati tiṣṭhati*.

The last two lines continue in the 3sg. person, in the *brāhmaṇa*-style prose that we have encountered in the previous kāṇḍikās, also repeating the formula that concludes all the other kāṇḍikās in this anuvāka.

Bhattacharya counts both lines together as 17.43.7 (counting a total of seven lines in this kāṇḍikā), and separates them with a single *daṇḍa*. His apparatus does not report the punctuation found in his mss., so we can only assume that they all read a single *daṇḍa*. If this is true, then the majority of the mss. would indeed point to a single daṇḍa. However, the two mss. that mark the line count (**Ja** from **Oᴬ**, and **JM₃** from **Oᴮ**)⁶⁷ both feature the number "8". There is no other reasonable way to count eight lines than to split this last portion into two lines, 43.7 and 43.8. In fact, **JM₃** also separates the two lines with a double daṇḍa; **Ji₄** does the same. However, **Ja**, despite counting eight lines, (presumably) doesn't use double daṇḍas. Nevertheless, in all of the preceding kāṇḍikās of this anuvāka, the last line (containing the *ya evaṃ vidvān* formula and beginning with a verb) is always separated by double daṇḍas from the sacred equations that precede it. Therefore, it would seem consistent to edit two independent lines (7 and 8) here as well, separated by double daṇḍas.

Bhattacharya edits *prati tiṣṭhati* (3sg.) and does not report any variant in his apparatus. However, all of my **O** mss. have *prati tiṣṭhasi* (2sg.). As in many other cases, I assume that his mss. actually have the same reading as mine. At any rate, Bhattacharya's *prati tiṣṭhati* is the correct reading in my view, although it should be marked as a conjecture. **K**'s reading of *prathate* must be due to perseveration from 17.42.7, whereas *prati *tiṣṭhati* is consistent content-wise with line 17.43.7, which contains the noun *pratiṣṭhā*. It was probably under the influence of the numerous 2sg. forms in the preceding lines that the 2sg. ending *-si* was introduced here. Note that *prati tiṣṭhati pajayā* is also the pratīka given by the Vedavratavidhi section of the Karmapañjikā in the list of pādas that begin and end the anuvākas of kāṇḍa 17 (see Introduction §1.2).

---

⁶⁵ From Bhattacharya's edition, it would appear that all his mss. read *gṛhairdhanena*. As all my mss. read the cluster *rddha* (**V71** *ddhi* could also easily be a carelessly written *rddha*), it would be strange if Bhattacharya's mss. read differently. His apparatus his silent. He most likely silently normalised the geminated cluster.

⁶⁶ Once again, Bhattacharya's apparatus is silent, and from his edition it would appear that all his mss. read *bibharti*. As all my **O** mss. read *bibhartti*, I deduce that Bhattacharya silently normalised the reading of his mss. and adopted the degeminated cluster.

⁶⁷ The numeral "6" in **Ma** is probably meant to mark the end of the sixth anuvāka. The numeral "5" in **Paᶜ** appears to be a mistake.

Here the sixth anuvāka comes to an end. The following colophons are found in the mss.:

K: iti saptādaśakāṇḍe ṣaṣṭo nuvākaḥ ZZ

Ma: ‖ 6 ‖ (?)
Ja: *not reported by Bhattacharya*
V122: (*s.s.*) ityekānr̥cakāṇḍe ṣaṣṭho 'nuvākaḥ ‖ 6 ‖
Ji₄: ityekānr̥cakāṇḍe ṣaṣṭho nuvākaḥ ‖ 6 ‖ # ‖ (śrīṃ ‖ …)
Pa_c: *no colophon*

Mā   ityekā . . . ‖ (*the rest is not reported by Bhattacharya*)
V71:   ityekānr̥cakāṇḍe [.]ṣṭe[…(//)nuvākaḥ ‖
JM₃: ityekanr̥cakāṇḍe ṣaṣṭhonuvākaḥ ‖ # ‖