XII (2014)

LECTEURS ET COPISTES DANS LES TRADITIONS MANUSCRITES IRANIENNES, INDIENNES ET CENTRASIATIQUES
——
SCRIBES AND READERS IN IRANIAN, INDIAN AND CENTRAL ASIAN MANUSCRIPT TRADITIONS

Textes réunis par / Edited by

Nalini Balbir – Maria Szuppe

EURASIAN STUDIES

LECTEURS ET COPISTES DANS LES TRADITIONS MANUSCRITES IRANIENNES, INDIENNES ET CENTRASIATIQUES / SCRIBES AND READERS IN IRANIAN, INDIAN AND CENTRAL ASIAN MANUSCRIPT TRADITIONS

Volume XII/1-2   2014

II. Circulation et reception

III. SUPPORT, FORMAT ET EMPLOI

PAIPPALĀDASAṂHITĀ 4.14.
REMOVING AN ARROW-TIP FROM THE BODY

Arlo Griffiths
École française d'Extrême-Orient

Alexander Lubotsky
Leiden University

Abstract

This article presents the critical edition with annotated translation of a hymn of the Paippalādasaṃhitā, an important early Sanskrit text consisting of poetic formulae (*mantra*s) that were to be used by priests to accompany ritual acts of diverse types. The Paippalādasaṃhitā being the last important text of the Vedic corpus not yet to have been edited and translated in its entirety, and being transmitted in unusually divergent manuscript traditions, its critical philological study offers many examples to illustrate the problems of Indian textual criticism. The hymn selected here, to that purpose, concerns the removal of an extraneous body (*śalya*-) that has penetrated a human patient's body.

❦

The hymn we present here comprises material not known in any other Vedic text.[1] It affords new insights into the life of the Vedic Indians, new lexical items, archaic verb forms next to grammatical and lexical innovations and new problems of various kinds, especially those of the manuscript transmission of the text and its (chronological) relation to other Vedic texts.

In our commentary below, we will repeatedly point out typical features of the manuscript transmission of this work, which it is vital to pay attention to in textual criticism of individual readings. At a different level

---

[1] The authors are jointly preparing a new edition with annotated translation of the whole of Paippalādasaṃhitā, kāṇḍa 4. Another study of an individual hymn from the same kāṇḍa has appeared as Griffiths, Arlo and Lubotsky, Alexander, "Paippalādasaṃhitā 4.15. To heal an open fracture: with a plant", *Die Sprache*, XLII/1-2 (2000-01 [appeared 2003]): pp. 196-210. The *editio princeps*, our basic point of reference, is that of Bhattacharya, Dipak, *The Paippalādasaṃhitā of the Atharvaveda*: I. *Consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas*. II. *[...] sixteenth Kāṇḍa*. III. *[...] seventeenth and eighteenth Kāṇḍas* (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society, 1997, 2008, 2011). For information on our editorial method, on manuscripts, and for the editions of other Vedic texts that we cite, see Griffiths, Arlo, "Paippalāda Mantras in the Kauśikasūtra", in Griffiths, A. and Houben, J.E.M. (eds.), *The Vedas: Texts, Language and Ritual* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 2004): pp. 49-99.

of criticism, it may be observed that the hymn exceeds by one the standard of seven stanzas per hymn, which is current in kāṇḍa 4; the obvious candidate for excision would seem to be stanza 8, in a different meter, but it fits the context too well to be treated as secondary addition. Such departures from norms are in any case an undeniable feature of the composition of the Paippalādasaṃhitā.

We will pay attention to previously unattested finite verb forms (*satām*, *śayāsai*), a noun that is a hapax legomenon (*puvas-* "pus"), and a mythological figure who is only very rarely attested elsewhere, Puruṣanti. The key-word of this hymn, however, is *śalyá-*, and its interpretation takes us to the domain of realia. The most recent discussion of this word seems to be the one offered by Schlerath in his 1997 reaction to earlier publications of Tapan Kumar Das Gupta, Harry Falk and especially Wilhelm Rau.[2] We agree with Schlerath that *śalyá-* does not denote the barbs of an arrow-head, but Schlerath gives no positive solution. The present hymn provides valuable new evidence on the terminology of arrow components in general, and the meaning of *śalyá-* in particular. Indeed, as Rau stated with characteristic conciseness, «das dunkle Lied AV(P) 4,14 … bedarf gesonderter Behandlung».[3]

4.14.1 Only PS

yasminn āsīḥ pratihita idaṃ tac	(11)
chalyo veṇur veṣṭanaṃ tejanaṃ ca		(11)
sūnur janitrīṃ janayehi ⁺śṛṇvann	(11)
ayaṃ ta ātmₐeta *it prahitaḥ ||	(11)

Wherein you were attached, [all] that is here: the arrow-tip, the bamboo, the wrapping, and the shaft. Being the son, beget the mother. Keep listening. Away from here indeed has this body of yours been sent forth.

āsīḥ pratihita] āśīḥ pratihita **Or**, āsīstihita **K**   tac chalyo] [**Ma**], tachalyo **Ku Ja**, tatśalyo **Vā**, taśchalyo **K**   veṣṭanaṃ tejanaṃ ca] **Ku** [**Ma Vā**] **K**, °nantejanañca **Vā**, °naṃ tejanañca **Ja**   sūnur] [**Ma**], sanur **Ku**, sunur **Ja Vā**, maunir **K**   janitrīṃ] **Or**, janitrī **K**   janayehi] **K**, jana ehi **Or**   ⁺śṛṇvann ayaṃ] śṛṇvaṃnayan **Ku Ja**, kṛṇvaṃnayan [**Ma Vā**], śṛṇvamayaṃ **K**

[2] Schlerath, Bernfried, "Metallgegenstände in vedischer Zeit", in Becker, C. et Al. (eds.), *Χρόνος. Beiträge zur prähistorischen Archäologie zwischen Nord- und Südosteuropa. Festschrift für Bernhard Hänsel* (Espelkamp: Marie Leidorf, 1997): pp. 819-27.

[3] Rau, Wilhelm, *Metalle und Metallgeräte im vedischen Indien* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1973 [= Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1973, Nr. 8, Mainz]) : p. 40, n. 52.

ta ātmeta *it] ta ātmeta ita [**Ma Ja Vā**], tu ātmeta ita **Ku**,
tātumayatahitu **K**   prahitaḥ] [**Ma Ja Vā**], prehitaḥ **K**u, prahita **K**

Bhattacharya reads *āśīḥ* and *ita prahitaḥ*. He does not indicate that *śṛṇvann* constitutes at least a slight emendation.

b. This is likely to be the oldest attestation of *veṣṭana-*. The broad range of meanings of this neuter noun in classical Sanskrit (see PW, pw) can be reduced to a basic meaning "covering, wrapping". We find it in Vedic only once outside of the PS, namely in ŚāṅkhGS 3.1.6-11, where it is likely to be a synonym of *uṣṇīṣa-* and hence to have the specific meaning "turban": *yuvam vastrāṇi iti vāsasī paridhāya | atha asmai niṣkam badhnāti āyuṣyam varcasyam | mamāgne varca iti veṣṭanam | gṛhaṃgṛham ahaneti chattram | ā rohatety upānahau | dīrghas te astv aṅkuśa iti vaiṇavam*[4] *daṇḍam ādatte |* «Having dressed him with two garments with (the verse), 'The garments both of you' (ṚV 1.152.1), he then puts on him a golden ornament (with the words), 'Giving life and vigor' (ṚVKh 4.6). With (the verse), 'Mine, Agni, be vigor' (ṚV 10.128.1), he takes a *veṣṭana*; with (the verse), 'House by house the shining one' (ṚV 1.123.4) the parasol; with (the verse), 'Rise up' (ṚV 10.18.6) the sandals; with 'Long be thy hook' (ṚV 8.17.10) a bamboo staff». This list is taken up in the concluding instruction of the chapter in question, ŚāṅkhGS 3.1.18: *ācāryāya vastrayugaṃ dadyād uṣṇīṣaṃ maṇikuṇḍalam daṇḍopānahaṃ chattram ca* «To his teacher he shall give (that) pair of garments, the turban, jewel and ear-rings, staff and sandals, and the parasol» (we have basically followed the translations of Oldenberg,[5] although with some modifications). The text has a very close parallel in KauṣGS (also chapter 3.1), but the parallel does not throw light on the meaning of *veṣṭana-*, which is absent there, a fact that could suggest it may be an interpolation in the Śāṅkhāyana text. For a similar list of items, including the *uṣṇīṣa-*, see Knobl: 35-55 on PS 7.15.6-8.[6] It is perhaps just a coincidence that the ŚāṅkhGS list includes *veṣṭana-* as well as *vaiṇava- daṇḍa-*, while the present PS stanza has *veṇur veṣṭanam*. In the PS, *veṣṭana-* seems to be a technical term for a part of the arrow, possibly some kind of wrapping that binds the feather flight onto the shaft. Cf. also

---

[4] We follow Oldenberg's edition. Sehgal's edition shows here the obviously inferior reading *vaiṣṇavam*.

[5] Oldenberg, Hermann, *The Gṛihya-Sûtras. Rules of Vedic Domestic Ceremonies, Part I. Śâṅkhyâyana-Gṛihya-Sûtra, Âsvalâyana-Gṛihya-Sûtra, Pâraskara-Gṛihya-Sûtra, Khâdira-Gṛihya-Sûtras, Sacred Books of the East*, XXIX, XXX (Oxford: Clarendon, 1886).

[6] Knobl, Werner, "Zwei Studien zum Wortschatz der Paippalāda-saṃhitā", in Griffiths, Arlo and Schmiedchen, Annette (eds.), *The Atharvaveda and its Paippalādaśākhā: historical and philological papers on a Vedic tradition* (Aachen: Shaker, 2007): pp. 35-70.

11.2.12 *alasya vyañjanasya veṣṭanasyota parṇadheḥ | granther ⁺jyāyā iṣvā viśaraṃ nāśayāmi te* «I remove for you the piercing power of the poison, of the ornament / anointing (?), of the wrapping, of the feather-socket, of the knot, of the bow-string, of the arrow».

Regarding the meaning of *śalyá-*, it is useful in our opinion to look beyond the sole Vedic data that were taken into account by Rau and Schlerath, and to abandon the rather rigid and literalistic one-to-one determinism – whose basic assumption is that a difference in words must correspond to a difference in objects denoted – that characterizes some of the work in Vedic realia. In his anthology of Sanskrit medical writings, Wujastyk has chosen to translate *śalya-* with "splinter". He has justified his choice in terms that are equally relevant for the interpretation of the Vedic passages:[7]

> The word 'splinter' translates Sanskrit *śalya*. In some contexts this equivalence is adequate, but the semantic fields of the two words are not identical, and there are places where using 'splinter' creates an odd effect. A *śalya* is often a literal splinter of wood, bone, or metal. Its metaphorical use – sorrow as a 'splinter' in the heart … – still works in English. But in many places a *śalya* is clearly an arrow, and in others a fragment of food, etc. No single English term quite covers this range. Terms like 'spike', 'dart', 'shrapnel', or just 'foreign body' all work in places, but I have stayed with 'splinter' as the nearest generic term, for better or worse.

Keeping these problems in translating Āyurvedic *śalya-* in mind, we may observe that the word almost always occurs in explicit connection with arrows in the Atharvaveda, and even where it does not, can mostly be interpreted as "arrow-tip". Cf. e.g. PS 1.46.2d *bahiḥ śalyaś caratu rogo asmāt* «let the tip, the ailment go outside of him», 14.4.5ab *vijyaṃ dhanuḥ śikhaṇḍino viśalyo bāṇavām̐ uta* «the crested one's bow is stringless and his arrow tipless», etc. A meaning such as "splinter", or in any case a "foreign body" less directly associated with arrows, might be preferable at PS 15.20.10 *brahmaṇeto nāśayāmo yat kiñ cāṅgeṣv āmayat | ⁺śalyān[8] yakṣmasyātho ropīs tā ito vi nayāmasi* «Whatever hurts in the limbs do we make disappear from here with a formula. We remove from here the splinters and the pains of the *yákṣma*-disease». In any case, adducing a collocation such as ŚS 6.57.1cd / PS 19.10.4cd *íṣum ékatejanāṃ śatáśalyām* against the idea that *śalyá-* can mean "arrow-tip", as does Rau (1973: 40 n.

---

[7] Wujastyk, Dominik, *The Roots of Āyurveda. Selections from Sanskrit Medical Writings* (London: Penguin Books, 1998): p. 112.

[8] Ed. *śalyāṃ*.

52), seems to us to reveal a naively literalistic reading of the numerical hyperbole that is typical of Vedic mantras. See further under 5d below.

c. The interpretation of this pāda is very uncertain. Firstly, there is the problem of reading: the reading *jana ehi* that is found in the Or. mss. cannot be ruled out with certainty. The expression in 4c *iyaṃ te mātemam ehi bandhum* seems comparable at first sight, but unfortunately it appears very difficult to presume that *jana* here represents an acc. sg. form of *jánas-* n. attested at ṚV 2.2.4, which would have given an elegant syntactic parallelism («being a son who listens to his mother, go to your folk»): this consonant stem no longer exists in the language of the Atharvaveda, and no imaginable reason would have prevented the poet from saying *janam ehi*. Rather, *jana* would have to be read as loc. sg. form of *jana-*, which can denote "people" collectively, while (as pointed out by Zehnder)[9] its loc. form *jane* can function as adv. "abroad, far away". But with *ā́ ihi* "come" and *śṛṇvan* "listening" – presuming with hesitation that this reading is correct –, it is then hard to construe a sentence. In view of the likely corporeal sense of *ātman-* in the next pāda, we tentatively choose here to follow Bhattacharya's adoption of the **K** reading *janayehi*, with imperative form *janaya*. An imaginable adv. **janayā́* (cf. Scarlata)[10] is unattested in the ṚV, and therefore highly unlikely to be intended here. *ihi* would be from *ay* in its auxiliary function (cf. Delbrück),[11] joined to the present participle *śṛṇvan*. The pāda then may be seen to invert the proverbial association of mother and son, that we see at PS 17.52.2 *janitrīva prati hṛṇyāsi ⁺sūnuṃ saṃ tvā dadhāmi pṛthivīṃ ⁺pṛthivyā | ukhāḥ kumbhīr vedyāṃ saṃcarantāṃ yajñāyudhair ājyenābhiṣiktāḥ*.[12] «You shall welcome (?)[13] as a mother a son; I unite you that are earth with the earth; pots, vessels must come together on the sacred ground, being anointed with ghee by means of the utensils of worship» (~ ŚS 12.3.23, but the PS reading overall makes more sense). All in all the meaning remains very obscure, and one may wonder whether some ancient corruption lies behind the relatively uniform text transmitted by the manuscripts. It may be worth considering, for instance, to conjecture **śṛ́ṅgam* instead of *⁺śṛṇvann* (see st. 5 below). It must be pointed out that there is explicit manuscript support

---

[9] Zehnder, Thomas, *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Buch 2. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Idstein: Schulz-Kirchner, 1999): pp. 151f. on 2.66.3.

[10] Scarlata, Salvatore, *Die Wurzelkomposita im Ṛg-Veda* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1999): p. 421.

[11] Delbrück, Berthold, *Altindische Syntax* (Halle an der Saale: Niemeyer, 1888 [=Syntaktische Forschungen, 5]): p. 390.

[12] Ed. *santvā*; *pṛthivīṃ pṛthivyām*; *sañcarantāṃ*; *ājyenātiṣaktāḥ*.

[13] We translate as though PS *prati hṛṇyāsi* – the reading seems relatively secure – means the same as *práti haryāsi* in ŚS.

in **K** for a word ending in *-am*, but it must also be recalled that the spelling *-ṃn* for *-nn* is a common feature of the Or. mss. (e.g. 4.13.5b: *pradahaṃn ihi* for *pradahann ihi*; 4.32.5a: *saṃn apa* for *sann apa*; 4.32.6c: *vajriṃn upa* for *vajrinn upa*), so practically there is nearly equal support for Bhattacharya's reading, that we retain for lack of a better alternative.

d. Bhattacharya's *ita prahitaḥ* is unacceptable and, since the transmitted cross-caesura sandhi can hardly be original, also unmetrical. *ita* 2pl. impv. cannot be construed with *prahitaḥ*. Therefore we emend to **it* (cf. 4c just below). The same mistake is attested at PS 2.8.5c *ād *it stenam ahiṃ* «and then the thief, the snake» instead of *ita* of the mss. (cf. Zehnder 1999: 42). The general tendency notable in the mss. to resolve complex consonant cluster by vowel epenthesis – or, if one prefers a graphic explanation, to forget *virāma* signs – may here have been compounded by perseveration from 15.11.3cd *⁺māsmām̐ arann amuta āpatantīr itaḥ prahitāḥ savitar jayantu* «May [the arrows], flying from there, not hit us. Being sent forth from here, let them be victorious, O Savitar».

The cadence remains defective (short tenth syll.).

On the concrete meaning of *ātman-* that we assume to be intended here.[14]

4.14.2 Only PS

asthi bhittvā yadi ⁺majjñaḥ ⁺papātha	(11)
yadi vāsi rataḥ puruṣantikāme |	(12ᵀ)
urvīṃ gavyūtim abhₐy ehₐy arvāṅ	(11)
paścā raśmīn ⁺udyataḥ sūrₐyasya ||	(11)

If you, having split the bone, have drunk marrow, or if you are pleased with the wish of Puruṣanti, come here to the broad pasture, West of the rays of the rising sun.

asthi bhittvā] asthi bhitvā [**Ma Ja Vā**], asi bhitvā **Ku**, asti bhittvā **K**   yadi] **Or**, yada **K**   ⁺majjñaḥ] majñaḥ **Or**, majjaḥ **K** ⁺papātha] prapātha [**Ma Ja Vā**], pra{śama}patha **Ku**, pāpātha **K** rataḥ] **Or**, ritaḥ **K**   puruṣantikāme] **Or** [[puṛṣa°]], puruṣaṃnikāme **K**   gavyūtim] gavyutim **Or**, gavyūtis **K** abhy ehy] **Or**, atyehy **K**   paścā] **K**, paśyā **Or**   raśmīn] **Or**, daśmīn **K**   ⁺udyataḥ sūryasya] uyataḥ sūryaśca **Ku Ma**, udataḥ sūryaśca [**Ja Vā**], uddhatassūryasya **K**

Bhattacharya edits *prapātha*.

---

[14] Griffiths, Arlo, *The Paippalādasaṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Kāṇḍas 6 and 7. A New Edition with Translation and Commentary* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 2009): p. 152.

a. Note that the Or. mss. read *bhitvā* and *majñaḥ*: these degeminations are common, and the latter one occurs also in the same word in PS 4.15.[15] The reading *prapātha*, adopted by Bhattacharya, yields no sense. One might be tempted to understand the pf. form here as indicating "having drunk enough", i.e. being satiated, but Kümmel[16] does not mention any cases where the pf. of this root is used with such a connotation.

bc. On the polysemy inherent in forms of *ram*, see Renou,[17] As will become clear below, we believe that the sense "to be pleased with", i.e. "to accede to", is probably intended here. For the name Puruṣanti, cf. ṚV 1.112.23cd *yābhir dhvasántim puruṣántim ávataṃ tábhir ū ṣú ūtíbhir aśvínā gatam* «come here, O Aśvins, with those helpers, with whom you helped Dhvasanti and Puruṣanti», 9.58.3ab *dhvasráyoḥ puruṣántyor á sahásrāṇi dadmahe* «we take thousands from Dhvasrā and Puruṣanti», Geldner's comments *ad loc.* and Macdonell & Keith 1912 *s.v.* What is meant by the wish of Puruṣanti is not elucidated by these two passages. If we turn to later Vedic sources to find a clue, we fortunately find one in the Sāmavedic myth recounted briefly at PB 13.7.12 and somewhat more elaborately at JB 3.139. Both passages are cited below.

PB 13.7.12 *dhvasre vai puruṣantī tarantapurumīḍhābhyāṃ vaidadaśvibhyāṃ̐ sahasrāṇy aditsatāṃ tāv aikṣetāṃ kathaṃ nāv idam āttam apratigṛhītaṃ̐ syād iti tau pratyaitāṃ dhvasrayoḥ puruṣantyor ā sahasrāṇi dadmahe tarat sa mandī dhāvatīti tato vai tat tayor āttam apratigṛhītam abhavat | āttam asyāpratigṛhītam bhavati ya evaṃ veda |*[18] «Dhvasrā and Puruṣanti wished to give a thousand (cows) to Taranta and Purumīḍha, the son[s] of Vidadaśva. These (latter mentioned) two thought: 'How may this (gift) be taken (and) not received, by us?' They accepted (it) with (the words, occurring in the tetrastich) [SVK 2.409 = ṚV 9.58.3]. Thereupon this (gift) was taken, not received by them». We have cited the translation of Caland, who explains in a note that «The stress must be laid on *ā dadmahe* 'we take' which is not the same as *pratigṛhṇīmaḥ*».

JB 3.139 *atha ha vai tarantapurumīḍhau vaidadaśvī*[19] *dhvasrayoḥ puruṣantyor bahu pratigṛhya garagirāv iva menāte | tau ha smāṅgulyā*

────────────

[15] Griffiths and Lubotsky, "Paippalādasaṃhitā 4.15".

[16] Kümmel, Martin Joachim, s.v. "*pā*", in Id., *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2000).

[17] Renou, Louis. *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes* (EVP), 17 vols. (Paris: Boccard, 1955-1969): p. 102f.

[18] Variant readings: *vaidadaśvibhyām*] thus Calcutta ed. [C], *vaitadaśvibhyāṃ̐* Benares ed. [B]. – *aditsatāṃ*] B, *adichatāṃ* C. – *pratyaitāṃ*] C, *pratyetāṃ* B. – *dadmahe*] C, *daprahe* B.

[19] *vaidadaśvī*] em. (Oertel), *vaitadaśvī* Ed.

sātaṃ pratimamṛśāte | tāv akāmayetām asātaṃ nāv idaṃ sātaṃ syād āttam ivaiva na pratigṛhītam iti | tāv etac caturṛcam apaśyatām, tena pratyaitām | tato vai tayor asātaṃ sātam abhavad āttam ivaiva na pratigṛhītam | sa yaḥ pratigṛhya kāmayetāsātam ma idaṃ sātaṃ syād āttam ivaiva na pratigṛhītam iti sa haitena caturṛcena pratīyāt | asātaṃ haivāsya sātaṃ bhavaty āttam evaiva na pratigṛhītam | «Now indeed Taranta and Purumīḍha, two descendants of Vidadaśva, having received much of the two, Dhvasra and Puruṣanti, considered themselves like two persons having swallowed poison. Well, they touched what they had got with the finger. They wished: 'Would that we had not got what we have got here, that we had not received, what we have taken as it were.' They saw this *ṛc*-quatrain. With it they returned. Thence indeed what they had got became not got, what they had taken as it were [became] not received. If anyone having received (something) should wish: 'Would that I had not got what I have got here, that I had not received what I have taken as it were', he should return with this *ṛc*-quatrain. Then, indeed, what he has got becomes not got, what he has taken as it were [becomes] not received» (after transl. Oertel,[20] with modification only of his interpretation of *dhvasrayoḥ puruṣantyor*).

These passages are clearly significant for the interpretation of our stanza which, like the quatrain used by Taranta and Purumīḍha, must have been intended to get rid of an unwanted "gift". The PB passage explicitly makes a connection with cattle (cf. our *gavyūti-*), and the JB explicitly relates the unwanted gift with poison. If the addressee, i.e. the arrow-tip, here wishes to accede to Puruṣanti's desire, it shall accept the gift of cattle and go out to wide pasture. And by using this mantra, the one struck by the (poisoned?) arrow-tip will be rid of the cause of his ailment. It seems possibly relevant for the estimation of the age of the present hymn that it is familiar with a piece of mythology attested clearly only in two Brāhmaṇa texts, while the two places where Puruṣanti occurs in the ṚV seem to lack the essential element of her (his?) wish to give an undesirable gift.

d. We accept Bhattacharya's emendation ⁺*udyataḥ*, for whose attribution to the archetype the **K** reading seems sufficient guarantee, and accept also his adoption of the **K** reading *sūryasya*. We presume that «West of the rays of the rising sun» means fully exposed to the sun, rising in the East, or else we might interpret «after the rays», i.e., following the sun's example of leaving the confined darkness of the night/underworld.

4.14.3 Only PS

mātariśvā pavamānas ⁺t_uvāyan   (11)
sūrya ābhrājan tan_uvā dṛśe (')kaḥ | (11)

---

20 Oldenberg, Hermann, "Das Çâñkhâyagrihyam", *Indische Studien*, XV (1878): p. 40.

asno gandhāt puvasaḥ pra cyavasva   (11)
vi mucyasva yon_iyā yā te atra || (11)

Mātariśvan, blowing, looking for you – the blazing sun himself has made [you] visible. Emerge from the blood, from the smell, from the pus; get released from your womb here.

> mātariśvā pavamānas] **Or**, mātariśvānpavamānās **K**   ⁺tvāyan]
> tvāyaṃ **Or K**   sūrya ābhrājan] sūrya ābhrājaṃ **Or**,
> sūryābhrājan **K**   (')kaḥ] kaḥ **Or K** [[Bar. mistakenly: kāḥ]]
> |] [**Ma Ja Vā**] **K** [[there is a stroke above the |]], |{|} **Ku**   asno]
> **K**, aślo **Or**   puvasaḥ] **Or**, puṃsaḥ **K**   pra cyavasva] **Or**,
> pratyavasva **K**   mucyasva] [**Ja Vā**] **K**, mucyasya **Ku Ma**
> yonyā yā te atra] **Or**, yonyayāstetra **K**

Bhattacharya edits *tvāyaṃ* and *puvasaḥ*.

a. Bhattacharya's *ayaṃ* is not impossible, but in none of the 26 other occurrences of the name Mātariśvan in the text is it joined with a proximal deictic pronoun such as *ayam*. Considering that confusion of nasals in final position is common in the mss. of this text (see e.g. unacceptable *paśyāṃ* for ⁺*paśyān* in 7b below), we propose the restoration *tvāyan*, nom. sg. of *tvāyant-* "looking for you, longing for you" (in the ṚV, almost always scanned *t_uvāyánt-*), the interpretation suggested by Zehnder.[21]

It seems certain that *pavamāna-* is intended as double entendre, meaning "blowing" besides "purifying", for while Mātariśvan is in the Atharvaveda sometimes presented in close association with the sun (e.g. PS 10.7.4, 13.1.7), as he is here, he is most often clearly associated with the wind. Cf. e.g. ŚS 10.9.26 (~ PS 16.138.7) *ulūkhale músale yáś ca cármaṇi yó vā śū́rpe taṇḍuláḥ káṇaḥ | yáṃ vā vā́to mātaríśvā pávamāno mamā́thāgníṣ ṭád dhótā súhutaṃ kṛṇotu* «What in the mortar, on the pestle, and on the hide, or what rice-grain, [what] kernel in the winnowing-basket, or what the wind, Mātariśvan, blowing, shook – let Agni as *hótar* make that well-offered» (Whitney), and further PS 5.16.1, 7.20.9, 15.2.4, 16.1.5, 16.22.5, 17.5.9. In the tṛca PS 19.50.1-3 (for removal of a *śalyá-*), the pāda 2a *pra tvā vātaś cyāvayatu* makes the connection with the wind explicit.

c. Bhattacharya proposes an emendation **pīvasaḥ* in his critical apparatus, but it seems unnecessary to us. Although the word *puvas-* is not attested elsewhere in Vedic or later Sanskrit, it is a perfect match of Gr. πύος n., Lat. *pūs, pūris* "pus" ← PIE **puH-os-*. The normal Sanskrit word for 'pus' is *pū́ya-* m.n., attested from the Brāhmaṇas onwards, but it is a transparent derivative from the present *pū́yati* 'to become putrid'.

---

[21] Zehnder, Thomas. *Das periphrastische Kausativ im Vedischen* (Bremen: Hempen, 2011): p. 25.

4.14.4 Only PS

pra cyavasvāto ⁺abh₍i₎y eh₍i₎y arvāṅ	(11)
arthāṃs te vidma bahudhā bahir ye		(11)
imāḥ svasāro ayam it pitā ta	(11)
iyaṃ te māt₍ā₎emam ehi bandhum ||	(11)

Emerge from there, get over here! We know many goals for you, which are outside. These are [your] sisters, this is really your father, this is your mother; come to [your] kinsman here.

> pra cyavasvāto] **Or**, pratyavasvātau **K**   ⁺abhy ehy] adhyehy [**Ma Ja Vā**], adhyahy **Ku**, satyehy **K**   arvāṅ arthāṃs te] **K** [[thus Bh.; Bar. reads arvāṅktāṃste]], arvāṅ, a{˙}ndhāste **Ku**, arvāṅa arthāste **Vā**, arvāṅ, arthāste **Ma**, arvāṅ, arthānte→ste **Ja**   bahir ye] **Or**, vavīrye **K**   imāḥ] imā **Ku** [**Ja Ma**], imā → māṃ **Vā**, imās **K**   ayam it] **Ku** [**Ja Ma**], ayami(→ma)t **Vā**, ayamat **K** [[Bar. misreads: ayam it]]   ta iyaṃ te] ta iyante [**Ma Ja Vā**], ta{ya}tiyante **Ku**, cayaṃ te **K**   bandhum ||] bandhuṃ || **Or K** [[|]]

Bhattacharya edits *adhy*.

   a. We can safely emend *abhy*. The **K** reading *saty* shows the confusion of *ty* and *bhy* that is typical for Śāradā script (cf. also 7c *atyaktaḥ* for *abhyaktaḥ*). Neither *adhi-ā-ay*, nor *ati-ā-ay* are attested; *adhi-ay* means "to observe, understand, mind", which does not suit the context. Most importantly, cf. *abhy ehy arvāṅ* at 2c. For other cases of replacement of *abhi* by *adhi*, we refer to our discussion under 4.16.1 in our forthcoming comprehensive publication on PS 4.

4.14.5 Only PS

amitrair astā yadi vāsi mitrair	(11)
devair vā devi ⁺prahitāvasr̥ṣṭā		(11)
*viddh₍u₎vā śr̥ṅgaṃ puruṣe jahātha	(11)
bāṇaḥ ⁺śr̥ṅgaṃ śikharaḥ saṃ satām itaḥ ||	(12)

Whether you are shot by enemies or by friends, or, O goddess, [you have been] sent forth, released by the gods, you have left the horn in the man, having pierced [his skin]. The arrow, the horn, the top — let them be bound together away from here.

> amitrair astā] **Or**, amittrair astvā **K**   vāsi mitrair] vāsimi{tr}trer **Ku**, vā(+ si)mitrair **Vā**, vāsamitrair **Ma Ja**, vāsumittrair **K**   devi] [**Ma Ja Vā**], deva **Ku K**   ⁺prahitāvasr̥ṣṭā | *viddhvā] prahitoviśiṣṭā | vidvān, **Ku**, prahitovaśiṣṭāḥ | vidvāna **Vā**, prahitovaśiṣṭvā | vidvān, **Ma**, prahitovaśiṣṭā | vidvān, **Ja**, prahitāvaśr̥ṣṭāvadvān, **K**   śr̥ṅgaṃ] śr̥ṅgaṃ **Ku Vā**, śr̥ṅgaḥ **Ma**

Ja [[?]], śr̥(→sr̥)gaṃ **K**   jahātha] **Or**, jahāti z **K** [[note z]]
bāṇaḥ] **Or**, om. **K**   ⁺śr̥ṅgam] śr̥ṅgaḥ **Or** [[?]], śr̥ṅgo **K**
śikharaḥ saṃ] **Or**, śikharassaṃ **K**   satām itaḥ ||] **Or**, sr̥jāmitaḥ
[[om. |, but note °ḥ s°]] **K**

Bhattacharya edits ⁺*prahitāvasr̥ṣṭā* | *vidvān śr̥ṅgaṃ* and *vāṇaḥ śr̥ṅgaḥ*. His apparatus obfuscates the readings for *śr̥ṅgam*, i.e. his *śr̥ṅgaḥ*: the mss. **Ma** and **Ja** are quoted as reading *śr̥ṅgaḥ* in pāda **d** (and our **Ku** confirms this), while this is also the adopted reading, so it would not have been necessary to quote it in the apparatus, and the reading of Bhattacharya's **Vā** for this pāda remains unknown.

bc. We accept Bhattacharya's emendation *prahitāvasr̥ṣṭā*, as the vacillation of *s* and *ś* is very frequent in all mss. for the PS.

However, the form *vidvān* accepted by Bhattacharya is impossible for several reasons. First of all, the masculine participle does not concord with the feminine gender of the subject (*devi*!). Secondly, the sandhi -*n ś*- would be unique for the Or. mss. (cf. Griffiths,[22] which supersedes the comments on 5.6.5b in Lubotsky).[23] Griffiths[24] proposed to read ⁺*prahitāvasr̥ṣṭāviddhā śr̥ṅgaṃ puruṣe jahātha* «with differently placed punctuation, following **K**». We now propose an alternative solution to the textual problem, namely to emend **viddhvā* (although we remain hesitant because it seems that a form with preverb *ā́* is desirable, in light of the evidence cited below).

We find the same kinds of errors in the mantra PS 19.33.3, found quoted at KauśS 128.4, where Griffiths[25] proposed to edit: *utāviddhāṃ niṣkhidatātho śrathnīthāyatām | mā no viśve devā maruto hetim asthata* «Both regurgitate the penetrated [arrow], and slacken the strung [bow-string]: do not throw the missile of the Maruts at us, O All Gods». The readings in the case of this last mantra are: KauśS *utāvidvān*; **Or** °*vidvā/vidvān*; **K** °*riddhāṃ*. The nasal that we see in the readings of the mss. for the present mantra (**Or** *vidvān/vidvāna*; **K** *vadvān*) may be attributed to anticipation of this mantra in PS 19. A last passage worth quoting here, also from PS 19, has a parallel at ŚS 6.109.1: *pippalī́ kṣiptabheṣajy ùtā́tividdhabheṣajī́ | tā́ṃ devā́ḥ sám akalpayann iyáṃ*

[22] Griffiths, *The Paippalādasaṃhitā of the Atharvaveda*: p. LIX.

[23] Lubotsky, Alexander M., *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Kāṇḍa Five: Text, translation, commentary* (Columbia, Missouri: South Asia Books, 2002 [HOS Opera Minora, 4]): p. 39.

[24] Griffiths, Arlo. "Paippalāda Mantras in the Kauśikasūtra", in Griffiths, A. and Houben, J.E.M. (eds.), *The Vedas: Texts, Language and Ritual* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 2004): pp. 49-99, here p. 92.

[25] Griffiths, "Paippalāda Mantras": pp. 91f.

jī́vitavā́ álam «The berry, remedy for what is bruised, and remedy for what is pierced – that did the gods prepare; that is sufficient for life» (Whitney). Here the evidence of the mss. for the PS version, 19.27.9 – unanimously *utātavidvabheṣajī* in the Or. mss., *uta ca viśvabheṣajī* in **K** – cannot be resolved without taking recourse to conjecture: we hesitantly propose to restore **utātividdhabheṣajī*, as the ŚS mss. unanimously transmit. But what is certain is that we have here another case of corrupt transmission of a form of *vyadh*. And from PS 11.10.1c *āviddhaṃ śalyaṃ *cākṛttur* [26] «They pulled out the arrow-tip that had penetrated», it is clear that the key-word *śalya-*, unmentioned in this stanza, may be implicit in all such passages.

d. Bhattacharya's *vāṇaḥ* can simply be read as *bāṇaḥ*, because the Or. mss. do not distinguish *b* and *v*, while **K** omits the word. The **K** reading *śṛṅgo* shows the mistake of *o* for *aṃ* that is frequently found in Śāradā manuscripts. The reading of the Or. mss. is a clear case of the influence of surrounding forms in *-aḥ*. The textual evidence does not allow a convincing argument that *śṛṅga-* and several other words (*anīka-*, *mukha-*, *śalya-*) cannot all denote the "arrow-tip". Since arrow-tips were at that time usually made of horn, this metonymic reference is only natural. It seems impossible to us to read in the Vedic passages discussed by Rau and Schlerath systematic descriptions of the composition of arrows, where every term would denote a separate part. Rather, we believe that such passages contain redundancies, something Rau[27] as well as Schlerath found difficult to accept: «Störend ist jedenfalls, daß bei allen diesen Deutungen Spitze (*śṛṅga-*, *anīka-*, *mukha-*) und *śalya-* des Pfeils einen einzeigen Teil bilden».[28] One of the synonyms for "arrow-tip" thus far unattested may have been *śikhara-*, unless it refers to the whole construction for fixing the horn tip.

Besides this passage, the only other attestation of the word *śikhara-* in what are normally considered the older strata of Vedic literature – i.e. the Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas – occurs at KauṣB 26.2.6 [ed. Lindner 26.1:120.17f.] *tad yathā giriśikharāt kartam abhi praskanded evaṃ tat stomakṛntatram* «it is as if from a mountain peak one should fall into a pit; it is a cleaving of the Stomas» (Keith). One could interpret the use in our text of this word, not likely to be part of inherited vocabulary (EWAia II, p. 634f.), as sign of lexical innovation.

The form *satām* is 3pl. impv. middle of the root-aor. of *sā* (← **sH-atām*), and seems to present the first attestation of this ending in the root-aorist. The ending *-atām* is frequently attested in the athematic present, cf.

---

[26] Ed. *cākratur*.

[27] Rau, Wilhelm, *Metalle und Metallgeräte im vedischen Indien* : p. 38 n. 52.

[28] Schlerath, "Metallgegenstände": p. 820.

the following forms (the unmarked ones being from the ṚV): pres. II *īratām*, *stuvatām* (AV), pres. III *jíhatām*, *dadhatām*, *sisratām* (ṚVKh), pres. VII *indhatām*, pres. V/VIII *ṛṇvatām*, *kurvatām*, *tanvátām*, *vanvatām* (all AV), pres. IX *jānatām*, *vṛṇatām* (AV). One could interpret the use of this form as an archaic trait.

4.14.6 Only PS

*śikhāsu sakto yadi vās̮y agre	(11)
| yadi vāsi saktaḥ puruṣasya māṃse |	(12ᵀ)
*dadhṛṅ na pāśān ⁺apavṛjya muktvā-	(11)
-akṣi śalyaḥ kṛṇutām āyanāya ||	(11)

[to the arrhow-tip:] If you are stuck in the hair-locks, or on the top [of the head (?)], or if you are stuck in the flesh of the man – boldly, as it were, having torn off, released the bonds, let the arrow-tip make an "eye" for coming.

*śikhāsu] sikhāsu **Or**, siṣāsi **K**   sakto] **Ku** [**Ma Ja**] **K**, sa(→ṣa)kto **Vā**   vāsi saktaḥ] **Or**, vāsyaritaḥ [[note °ḥ p°]] **K** |] **Or**, om. **K**   *dadhṛṅ na pāśān] dadhirṇṇaḥ pāśāṅ ̮ **Vā**, dadhirṇṇa pāśāṅ ̮ **Ku Ma**, dadhirṇṇa→rna pāśāṅ ̮ **Ja**, dadhṛṇpaśān **K** [[Bh. reads °pāśān, perhaps one can read dadhṛṅpāśān]]   ⁺apavṛjya] apavṛhya **Or**, upavṛjya **K**   muktvākṣi] **Or**, muktākṣi **K**   śalyaḥ kṛṇutām] **Or**, śalyaḫ kṛṇutām **K** [[Bar. misprints °tāṃ]]   āyanāya ||] **Or**, āyināya [[om. |]] **K**

Bhattacharya edits *sikhāsu*, *dadhir na* and *-akṣiśalyaḥ*.

a. Bhattacharya's reading is not acceptable, because the word *śikhā-* appears with palatal initial elsewhere in the PS (6.23.4e *śikhāṃ*, 5.24.4a *viśikhān* = ŚS 4.18.4a). However, the reason for the use of the plural here is as unclear to us as the reason why 'hair-locks' would be mentioned here.

c. Bhattacharya's *dadhir* is meaningless and does not account for the available ms. readings. The emendation to **dadhṛṅ* was already hinted at by Barret (who proposed *dadhṛk pāśān*). The adverb *dadhṛ́k* was still part of the active vocabulary of the PS poets, as appears from its occurrence in another PS mantra not attested in any other Saṃhitā: 4.27.3cd *gobhājam ⁺aṃśaṃ tava ye samānāḥ sarve samagrā dadhṛg ābharanta* «Those who are your equals, all, alike, *dadhṛk* have brought a share consisting of cows». This hemistich, where *dadhṛk* stands after the sequence *samānāḥ sarve samagrāḥ*, is important for determining the meaning of this rare Vedic word. Usually (and, we think, correctly) *dadhṛ́k* is taken as an adverb (n. sg.), derived from the adj. **dadhṛ́ṣ-*, which is reflected in ṚV *dadhṛṣá-*, *dadhṛṣváni-* "bold". Common translations are: "herzhaft, fest, tüchtig,

fortiter" (pw), "fest, zuversichtlich, herzhaft" (EWAia), "strongly, boldly" (MW), etc. An important indication in support of this analysis follows from the parallel use of *dadhŕk* and *dhr̥ṣát* in R̥V 8.82.2 *tīvrā́ḥ sómāsa ā́ gahi sutā́so mādayiṣṇávaḥ | píbā dadhŕ̥g yáthociṣé* (to Indra) «Strong are the Soma-juices, come here. Intoxicating are the ones that are pressed out. Drink [them] boldly (= without hesitation), as you are used to» and 6.47.6a *dhr̥ṣát piba kaláśe sómam indra* «Drink boldly the Soma in the jar, O Indra».

However, it seems to us that in these contexts, *dadhŕ̥k* may have been felt to mean not "boldly, without hesitation", but rather "in one draught, at once, totally". Parting from this assumption, we can interpret the difficult passage R̥V 10.16.7 (~ ŚS 18.2.58 / PS 18.68.8): *agnér várma pári góbhir vyayasva sám prórṇuṣva pī́vasā médasā ca | nét tvā dhr̥ṣṇúr hárasā járhr̥ṣāṇo dadhŕ̥g vidhakṣyán paryaṅkháyāte* «(to the body of a deceased person:) Wrap around you a protection of the milk(-products) against the fire, cover yourself with fat and grease, lest the bold one, being excited, fasten himself around you with his glow, about to totally consume you». Here the meaning "totally" would arguably provide a better sense than "boldly", since the idea of 'wrapping' the corpse is to preserve it ritually from total annihilation.

The next problem we have to face is whether to read *naḥ* (for which there is only weak ms. support) or *na*, and if the latter, whether to interpret it in negative or comparative sense. The frequency of comparative *ná* is on the decline in the language of the AV, but is not unknown,[29] so the choice must be determined by an understanding of what the mantra intended to convey, which is precisely the problem here. An interpretation such as "having boldly/totally released – *not* (just) torn off – the bonds" might be conceivable. The fact that some cases of the combination *naḥ pāśa- moc* are found in the AV Saṃhitās (ŚS 19.44.4cd *nírr̥te nírr̥tyā naḥ pā́śebhyo muñca*, 9.3.24a / PS 16.41.2a *mā́ naḥ pā́śaṃ práti mucas*) is not necessarily an argument for the reading *naḥ*, for the appearance of the visarga in **Vā** may precisely be due to perseveration from such passages, and the syntactic constructions are different. On the other hand, the stanza PS 2.31.3 *indro haniṣyatāṃ vadhaṃ vi naḥ pā́śām̐ ivācr̥tat* «Indra untied for us like bonds the weapon of those about to hit» might speak in favor of reading *naḥ* here: "having boldly/totally torn off, released for us the bonds". But we tentatively opt for *na* in comparative sense.

On the sandhi *pāśān apa°*, here treated differently in **K** on the one hand, and the **Or** mss. on the other (the exact spelling of the nasal being irretrievable for Bhattacharya's mss.; our **Ku** suggests all have the

---

[29] Whitney, William Dwight, "Index Verborum to the Published Text of the Atharva-Veda", *JAOS*, XII (1881): pp. 1-383 [Reprint: Vaduz, Liechtenstein: Topos Verlag, 1982]: p. 160.

orthography with -*n*, as we assume in our apparatus).[30] *apa-varh* is not attested, so we read *apavṛjya* after **K** (confusion of *hy* and *jy* is rampant in the Or. mss., see Zehnder).[31] Cf. especially ŚS 10.7.42cd *prāṇyā́ tántūṃs tiráte dhatté anyā́ nā́pa vṛñjāte ná gamāto ántam* «The one draws forth the threads, the other sets [them]; they wrest not off, they do not go to an end» (Whitney).

d. Presumably, *akṣi* refers to an abnormal passageway in the flesh, called 'fistula' in Western medical jargon. When the arrow-tip has become lodged in the body (see stanzas 2 and 3) but the patient survives the ensuing infection, the wound forms a pipe-like drainage for the pus. Eventually, the foreign element (the arrow-tip) will become encapsulated and can then be easily removed, and stanza 8 refers to this. The words *akṣi* and *śalyaḥ* clearly do not form a compound.

4.14.7 Only PS

hastād dhastaṃ sam ayo bhriyamāṇo	(11)
bahiṣ ṭvā ⁺paśyān vīrudhāṃ balena		(11)
adbhiḥ praṇiktaḥ śayāsā abh˳yaktaḥ	(12¹)
kośe jāmīnāṃ nihito ahiṃsaḥ ‖	(11)

You will become united, being carried from hand to hand. Due to the power of the plants, they will see you outside. Washed by the waters, you will lie, anointed, placed in the box of the female relatives, not harmful.

hastād dhastaṃ] **Or**, hastābhyastaṃ **K**   sam ayo] **Or**, śamayo **K**   bhriyamāṇo] **Ku** [**Ja Ma**], bhrīyamāṇo **Vā K**   bahiṣ ṭvā] [**Ja Ma**], bahi{śa}ṣvā **Ku**, bahiṣṭā→ṣṭvāṃ **Vā**, vahiṣṭā **K** ⁺paśyān] paśyāṃ **Or**, pacyāṃ **K**   adbhiḥ praṇiktaḥ] [**Vā Ja**], adbhipraṇiktaḥ **Ku Ma**, adbhiḥprāṇakta **K**   śayāsā abhyaktaḥ] **Ku** [**Ma Vā**], śayāsābhyaktaḥ **Ja**, syāssatyaktaḥ **K** [[note °ḥ k°]] jāmīnāṃ nihito] **Or**, jamīnāṃ nihataṃ **K**   ahiṃsaḥ ‖] [**Ma Ja Vā**], a{rvi}hiṃsaḥ **Ku**, hyaṃsaḥ [[om. |]] **K** [[note °ḥ ṣ°, Bar. misprints °saḥ.]]

Bhattacharya edits *paśyāṃ*.

a. On the construction X-abl. + X-acc. 'from X to X', cf. 15.23.5ab **vartrād *vartram ā krāma parvatād adhi parvatam* "step from dam to dam, from mountain to mountain".

---

[30] Griffiths, *The Paippalādasaṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Kāṇḍas 6 and 7*: pp. LVI-LVIII.

[31] Zehnder, *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda*.

b. The expression *vīrudhāṃ balena* is also attested at PS 5.10.8a. *paśyāṃ* is an impossible form, and can easily be emended to 3pl. subj. See our remark on confusion of final nasals under 3a.

c. *śayāsai* is 2sg. subj. with double characterization. The form is a hapax. Cf. ŚS 10.1.25 *abhy àktā́ktā svàraṃkṛtā sárvaṃ bhárantī duritáṃ párehi* «Anointed, smeared, well-adorned, bearing all difficulty, go thou away» (Whitney). On another level of interpretation, the anointing could here refer to the poisoning of the arrow-head, once it has been removed, to be re-used against other enemies.

d. Cf. ŚS 1.14.4cd (= PS 1.15.4cd) *antaḥkośám iva jāmáyó 'pi nahyāmi te bhágam* «I shut up thy portion (*vulva* ?), as sisters do what is within a box» (Whitney). Another interpretation needs to be made as well: the "female relatives" stand for "arrows", and so their *kośa-* is the quiver. Note the metaphoric use of kinship terminology also in stanzas 1 and 4.

4.14.8 Only PS

ṣaṣṭirātre ṣaṣṭikasya	(8)
śalyasya paridhiṣ kṛtaḥ		(8)
itas tam adya te vayam	(8)
⁺āsthānāc cyāvayāmasi ‖ 14 ‖	(8)

In a period of sixty days, for the arrow-tip, which [develops] in sixty days, an enclosure has been prepared. We today remove it (the arrow-tip) for you from here, from its place.

> ṣaṣṭirātre] [**Ja**] **K**, ṣaṣṭhirātre **Ku Ma Vā**   ṣaṣṭikasya] ṣaṣṭhikasya **Or**, ṣaṣṭiśasya **K**   paridhiṣ kṛtaḥ ‖] **Or**, paridhih̲kṛtaḥ [[om. ‖]] **K** [[note °ḥ y°]]   itas tam] [**Ma Ja Vā**], tatastam **Ku**, yatastvam **K**   te vayam] te vayaṃ **Or**, devayam **K**   ⁺āsthānāc cyāvayāmasi] māsthānācyāvayāmasi **Or**, āsthā | nāśyāvayāmasi **K**   ‖ 14 ‖] ‖ r̲ 8 ‖ 14 ‖ **Ku** [**Ma Ja Vā**], | **K**

The stanza refers to the removal of the encapsulated splinter of an arrow-tip through the fistula after a period of sixty days (cf. our comments under st. 6).

a. In the older language, *ṣaṣṭirātra-* and *ṣaṣṭika-* are only attested at Aṣṭādhyāyī 5.1.90 *ṣaṣṭikāḥ ṣaṣṭirātreṇa pacyante* «*ṣaṣṭika*s ripen in sixty days», clearly referring to the quick-ripening rice, which is the usual meaning of this word in later texts (e.g. Mahābhārata 13.63.14 *ghṛtakṣīrasamāyuktaṃ vidhivat ṣaṣṭikaudanam*).

b. Note the sandhi *paridhiṣ kṛtaḥ* (cf. Griffiths).[32]

d. Degemination of *TTy*-clusters is virtually a rule in the mss.: cf. Griffiths.[33]

☙

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Bhattacharya, Dipak, *The Paippalādasaṃhitā of the Atharvaveda.* I. *Consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas.* II. *[…] sixteenth Kāṇḍa.* III. *[…] seventeenth and eighteenth Kāṇḍas* (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society, 1997, 2008, 2011).

Delbrück, Berthold, *Altindische Syntax* (Halle an der Saale: Niemeyer, 1888 [= Syntaktische Forschungen, 5]).

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

——, *The Paippalādasaṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Kāṇḍas 6 and 7. A New Edition with Translation and Commentary* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 2009).

Griffiths, Arlo and Lubotsky, Alexander, "Paippalādasaṃhitā 4.15. To heal an open fracture: with a plant", *Die Sprache* XLII/1-2 (2000-01) [appeared 2003]: pp. 196-210.

Knobl, Werner, "Zwei Studien zum Wortschatz der Paippalāda-saṃhitā", in Griffiths, Arlo and Schmiedchen, Annette (eds.), *The Atharvaveda and its Paippalādaśākhā: historical and philological papers on a Vedic tradition* (Aachen: Shaker, 2007): pp. 35-70.

Kümmel, Martin Joachim, *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2000).

Lubotsky, Alexander M, *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Kāṇḍa Five: Text, translation, commentary* (Columbia, Missouri: South Asia Books, 2002 [HOS Opera Minora, 4]).

Macdonell, Arthur Anthony and Keith, Arthur Berriedale, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects* (London: Murray, 1912).

Narten, Johanna, *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1964).

Oertel, Hanns, "Contributions from the Jāiminīya Brāhmaṇa to the history of the Brāhmaṇa literature. First series", *JAOS*, XVIII (1897): pp. 15-48 [= *Kleine Schriften*: part I, pp. 28-61].

——, *Kleine Schriften.* Edited by Heinrich Hettrich and Thomas Oberlies, 2 parts (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1994).

Oldenberg, Hermann, "Das Çâṅkhâyagṛihyam", *Indische Studien*, XV (1878): pp. 1-166.

——, "The G*ṛi*hya-Sûtras. Rules of Vedic Domestic Ceremonies", Part I. "S*â*ṅkhyâyana-G*ṛi*hya-Sûtra, Â*s*valâyana-G*ṛi*hya-Sûtra, Pâraskara-G*ṛi*hya-Sûtra,

---

[32] Griffiths, *The Paippalādasaṃhitā of the Atharvaveda*: p. LXVII.

[33] Ibid.: p. LXV.

Khâdira-G*ṛi*hya-Sûtras", in *Sacred Books of the East*: XXIX, XXX (Oxford: Clarendon, 1886).

Rau, Wilhelm, *Metalle und Metallgeräte im vedischen Indien* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1973 [= Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1973, Nr. 8, Mainz]).

Renou, Louis, *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes* (EVP), 17 vols. (Paris: de Boccard, 1955-1969).

Scarlata, Salvatore, *Die Wurzelkomposita im Ṛg-Veda* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1999).

Schlerath, Bernfried, "Metallgegenstände in vedischer Zeit", in Becker, C. et Al. (eds.), *Χρόνος. Beiträge zur prähistorischen Archäologie zwischen Nord- und Südosteuropa. Festschrift für Bernhard Hänsel* (Espelkamp: Marie Leidorf, 1997): pp. 819-27.

Sehgal, S.R., *Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtram (Belonging to the Ṛgveda)* (Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1960 [Second Revised Edition 1987]).

Whitney, William Dwight, "Verborum to the Published Text of the Atharva-Veda", *JAOS*, XII (1881): pp. 1-383 [Reprint: Vaduz, Liechtenstein: Topos Verlag, 1982].

Wujastyk, Dominik, *The Roots of Āyurveda. Selections from Sanskrit Medical Writings* (London: Penguin Books, 1998).

Zehnder, Thomas, *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Buch 2. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar.* (Idstein: Schulz-Kirchner, 1999).

——, *Das periphrastische Kausativ im Vedischen* (Bremen: Hempen, 2011).

❧

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Arlo Griffiths held the chair of Sanskrit at Leiden University from 2005 through 2008, before joining the École française d'Extrême-Orient as Professor of Southeast Asian History. His main fields of academic interest are ancient Southeast Asian history on the basis of inscriptions, and Sanskrit philology at large. He is the author of *The Paippalādasaṃhitā of the Atharvaveda. Kāṇḍas 6 and 7. A New Edition with Translation and Commentary* (Forsten, 2009), several articles on Atharvavedic philology, and several more on Sanskrit as well as vernacular epigraphy of Southeast Asia.

Alexander Lubotsky is Professor of Comparative Indo-European Linguistics at Leiden University. His publications include *The system of nominal accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European* (Brill, 1988), *A Ṛgvedic Word Concordance*, 2 vols. (American Oriental Society, 1997), and *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, kāṇḍa five. Text, translation, commentary* (Harvard Oriental Series: Opera Minora, 4, 2002).