

Arlo Griffiths

## The Textual Divisions of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā\*

### INTRODUCTION

There are two reasons why Vedic scholars – especially those who are engaged in preparing editions of texts (whether they style their work “critical” or not) – ought to pay close attention to the divisions of the text they offer to the public.<sup>1</sup> In the first place: Vedic texts have a history of transmission and belong to various schools of tradition. The textual divisions – the places where they are made, the names they are given – are an integral part of the tradition, being among those marks that distinguish individual schools from each other, and as such are in themselves object of indological enquiry.<sup>2</sup> In the second place: given the way Vedic ritual manuals refer to mantras to be recited during the rituals, and given the importance of an understanding of the procedure of the ritual in question to the exegesis of the mantras being used, precise knowledge of a mantra-text’s divisions is a *sine qua non* for the interpretation of those manuals and rituals, and the mantra-text itself.

In the case of the Atharvavedic Śaunaka Śākhā, the Kauśikasūtra, e.g., presupposes knowledge of *pariyāyas*, *anuvākas*, *sūktas*, stanzas and hemistiches;<sup>3</sup> the Atharvavedapariśiṣṭas presuppose the same knowledge

---

\* Abhijit Ghosh, Jan Houben, Werner Knobl and Sasha Lubotsky kindly read earlier drafts of this paper, and made important suggestions for its improvement. I am especially obliged to Chlodwig H. Werba for his detailed editorial criticism.

<sup>1</sup> The importance of the topic was recently pointed out again by Parpola (1996: 91-93). The basic work of reference is Renou 1957.

<sup>2</sup> The reader of Zehnder 1999 and Lubotsky 2002 can easily get the impression that the Paippalāda Saṃhitā knows no *kāṇḍa* subdivisions besides hymns and stanzas. Both scholars, Indo-Europeanists whose work is of evident quality and importance, rely strongly on Bhattacharya. The omission of any discussion or indication of the textual divisions in the portions of text treated by them is thus, in my view, a small step back as compared to Bhattacharya’s edition, which at least attempts to provide information on (some of) the text’s divisions. The omission was not noticed by the reviewers of Zehnder 1999, viz. Mylius 2000 and von Hinüber 2001.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the index of “Designations of literary works, and sections, chapters, verses of the same”, p. 382 in Bloomfield’s ed. Cf. also Bloomfield 1899: 35, with n. 14 (p. 40).

(*pariyāyas*: AVParīś 32.8, 32.18, 33.6.9 [?], 37.12.1, 46.9.7; *arthasūktas*: 32.18, 32.25);<sup>4</sup> the still barely known or accessible ancillary texts of the Paippalāda Śākhā do so as well.<sup>5</sup>

Regarding the textual divisions of the Śaunaka Saṃhitā (ŚS), I may quote Bloomfield (1899: 35):

The AV. is divided into *kāṇḍa* ‘books’, *anuvāka* ‘lessons’, and *sūkta* ‘hymns’. Another continuous division into *prapāṭhaka* extends in ROTH and WHITNEY’S edition through the first 18 books (38 in all), but does not continue through books 19 and 20. In addition to *sūkta* there is also a parallel division of each *kāṇḍa* in *arthasūkta* ‘hymns divided off according to sense’, and *pariyāyasūkta*, briefer subdivisions into groups of verses, usually ten a group. The latter subdivision is to be compared with the Rigvedic *varga*, beside the *sūkta*.<sup>6</sup>

In his path-breaking article of 1957, Renou (then still working only with Barret’s transcriptions of the Kashmir ms.) made the following statement about the textual divisions of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā (PS) (p. 5):

Dans le Paippalāda, qui à tous égards est moins protégé que la vulgate, il n’existe pas de *prapāṭhaka*, et la notation des *anuvāka* est irrégulière. On trouve de temps en temps l’indication numérique du nombre d’hymnes (appelés ici *kāṇḍa*, ce qui fait confusion avec la désignation des “Livres”) groupés en *anuvāka*, Barret JAOS, XLII, p. 106; enfin, éventuellement, le milieu d’un Livre est spécifié, JAOS, XLVII, p. 238.<sup>7</sup> Tout ceci reflète des tentatives diverses, en partie contradictoires, en vue de préciser et serrer le sectionnement: l’état délabré des traditions n’a pas permis de conserver davantage.

Thus was the state of our knowledge around the time that Bhattacharyya made his famous discovery of PS mss. in Orissa (1957). In the

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Weber (1858: 434): “Ich bemerke hiezu noch, dass die Ath. Parīṣṭha im Uebrigen die jetzt vorliegende Eintheilung der Ath. S. in *kāṇḍa*, *anuvāka*, *arthasūkta*, *pariyāyasūkta* (*welche letztern beiden Bezeichnungen leider in der Editio* [i.e. Roth – Whitney’s ed. of ŚS] *fehlen*) mehrfach erwähnen” (my italics).

<sup>5</sup> See the references to *anuvākas*, *kaṇḍikās/sūktas* even in the small portion of such an ancillary text, the Vedavratavidhi of the Karmapañjikā, presented in edition below.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. in detail Whitney – Lanman 1905: cxxvii–cxxxiii. Cf. also Devasthali 1966.

<sup>7</sup> Renou refers here to the colophon, which has no parallel in the Or. mss., and can therefore not be proven to represent an old textual division, found after PS 14.4.7 (see Bhatt. 781) = PSK 14.2.17 (Barret 1927: 242) in the Kashmir ms.: *ity atharvaṇīkapaippalādayaś śākhāyāṃ caturdaśasyārdhaḥ*.

“Introduction” to Bhattacharyya’s edition of the first 15 *kāṇḍas*,<sup>8</sup> we are informed in passing about the textual divisions as they are marked in the Orissa mss. (p. xxix): “The Or. MSS indicate half-verses, verses, hymns and Kāṇḍas. Most of them indicate pāda-ends too”. This information is incomplete, even when compared with Renou’s outdated summary. It can be enhanced significantly now that authentic palm-leaf mss. have become available also to scholars outside of the Bhattacharyya family (Griffiths 2003). Information gathered during, to date, three years of work using these mss. is confronted in the final part of this paper with the important information available in an ancillary text of the Paippalāda Śākhā used by AV brahmins in Orissa. It is to the relevant section of that text, the Karmapañjikā, that I now turn.

#### THE VEDAVRATAVIDHI SECTION OF THE KARMAPAÑJIKĀ

The Karmapañjikā (KP), a text whose existence was – to my knowledge – first taken note of by Bhattacharyya (1968: 2, 23, 41), has been used here and there, but has nowhere been discussed, by Bhattacharyya in his edition of PS 1-15.<sup>9</sup> The KP claims to follow an otherwise lost Sūtra of Paiṭhīnāsi, and at several points quotes directly from this Sūtra.<sup>10</sup> I have not yet been able to find any evidence about the author of the KP, Śrīdhara, or his dates.

Presented below is a portion from the KP, its Vedavratavidhi section, that bears directly on the subject of this paper. This section comes after the Cyutavratipunarupanayanavidhi, and precedes the Brahmaçārīsnānavidhi. It shows important phraseological and thematic parallels to the Uttamaṇḍala (AVPariś 46), on which cf. Weber 1858 and Modak 1971. In order to give some impression of the nature of the KP as a whole, this section has been edited here in full, beyond what is strictly necessary for the present paper. The KP is evidently an im-

---

<sup>8</sup> Note that the introductions to Bhattacharyya 1964 and 1970 contain certain information which is not repeated in Bhattacharyya’s “Introduction”.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. “*karmapa.*” in the list of abbreviations, p. lvii, and the *app. crit.* at 5.26.3.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Bloomfield 1899: 17, and Chintamani 1939. Paiṭhīnāsi’s work referred to in the KP may have been a counterpart of the Kauśikasūtra of the Śaunaka Śākhā, i.e. a Gṛhyasūtra of the Paippalāda Śākhā, or an Atharvavedic Dharmasūtra (of the Paippalāda Śākhā). Confirmation of these interesting possibilities requires further intensive study of the KP.

portant text, deserving close attention by students of the (Paippalāda) Atharvavedic tradition.

The ms. material that is in the possession of the Bhattachary(y)a family, and the ms. that is listed as Dh/903, ser. nr. 1077, p. 117, by Mishra 1973 (reported as “missing” upon my enquiry at the Orissa State Museum, November 2000), were not at my disposal. I have used the following three mss.

- Gu1<sup>11</sup> Ms. of the Kavirāja house (Śrīpati Paṇḍā, son of the late Vidyādhara Paṇḍā<sup>12</sup>) in the village Guhiāpāḷa (correct the misprint Witzel – Griffiths 2002: 170). Written by Vidyādhara Paṇḍā’s great-uncle Daṃyānidhi Paṇḍā, during the reign of a king Kiśoradeva (the post-colophon reads: *samasta viri keśoradevaṅka a {•} ##<sup>13</sup> ṅke phālgunya śukla catuthi tithire govinda śarmāmātmaya dayānidhi śarmma idam likhidam pustakam samāptam*). This must be the same ruler as the one mentioned in PS Or. mss. V/122 and V/123 (see Griffiths 2003). My tentative datings of those two mss. to 1747-1748 must be wrong: these mss. must all date from the latter half of the nineteenth century. Gu1 is a rather carelessly written ms. It is complete, with the Vedavratavidhi on folios 103r3-106v2.
- Ku Ms. from the same collection of Harihara Upādhyāya of the village Kurumcaini (Witzel – Griffiths 2002: 170) that has yielded PS Or. mss. Ku1-3 (Griffiths 2003). A young, but nicely written and complete ms. Folios 101r3-106r2.
- Ni Ms. in the possession of Prahlāda Upādhyāya from the village Nirmaḷā (Witzel – Griffiths 2002: 173). This undated ms. is incomplete, and in a rather bad state. However, it seems to be the most carefully written, most reliable ms. Folios 90r4-95r2.

---

<sup>11</sup> Another ms. from the same village, from the collection of Ambujākṣa Upādhyāya, was photographed by me in August 1999. The photos did not come out well, and this ms., which I call Gu2, has not been used here.

<sup>12</sup> This must be the same highly regarded priest as the one mentioned by Bhattacharya (p. xvii). Witzel used recordings of recitation by this priest for his study 1985b (see p. 287). Vidyādhara Paṇḍā died in 1987.

<sup>13</sup> I do not understand the two apparently identical digits written here. On the dating system used, cf. Griffiths 2003.

Use of other sigla for PS mss. in the *apparatus criticus* and in the ensuing “analysis” follows that established in Griffiths 2003. Only significant variant readings are reported. In the edited text of KP, the placement of *danda*s follows that of the mss., which tend to write || (not |) throughout. I use [...] to report a shift to a new folio or folio-side, (...) to identify *pratīkas*, and a dot after a consonant to mark the *virāma*. In text quoted from the PS in my footnotes, readings marked with a raised + are emendations with basis in the mss. (restoration to the archetype), while \* marks readings emended beyond what is reconstructible for the archetype. In my *apparatus criticus*, capital letters indicate uncertain readings. I use the following editorial signs and brackets: + to mark scribal (interlinear or marginal) additions; • for illegible *akṣaras*; # for illegible signs that appear to be numerals; {...} to identify *akṣaras* or elements thereof deleted by the scribe. The Vedavratavidhi consists largely of *pratīkas* of PS mantras. Except in insignificant orthographical details, my edition of these *pratīkas* attempts to give the form of the mantras as it may have been familiar to Śrīdhara: this was not in all cases (e.g. 1.55.4, 19.16.19, 20.50.8, 20.57.11) the authentic form of the mantra, but in other cases (e.g. 1.21.1, 2.31.6/7, 17.43.1) seems to have been authentic where the PS mss. themselves show corruption.

#### EDITION

śrīṅṣiṃha namas te 'stu bhaktānām abhayaprada<sup>14</sup> ||  
vedavratavidhiṃ vakṣye mama bhadraprado bhava ||  
atha vedavratavidhiṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ || tathā ca śrutiḥ || caturṣu ve-  
deṣv aṣṭācatvāriṃśadvarṣaṃ<sup>15</sup> brahmacaryaṃ vedavrataṃ carīṣyed  
iti<sup>16</sup> || tathā ca jyotiḥśāstre || parāśaraḥ<sup>17</sup> ||  
agnyādheyaṃ svadhāṃ caiva yajñadānavratāni ca || [Ni 90v]  
vedavrataṃ vṛṣotsargaṃ cūḍākaraṇamekhalā<sup>18</sup> ||

<sup>14</sup> Thus Ku – *bhaktāya sarvavaraprada* Gu1, *bhaktān. sarvavaraprada* Ni. Cf. the passage 387\* inserted after Mahābhārata 2.40.19ab in one ms.

<sup>15</sup> Thus Gu1 Ni – Ku inserts hereafter: *paryantaṃ*.

<sup>16</sup> I have not been able to identify the exact source of this quotation. Cf. i.a. GB 2.5: 37.11ff., PārGS 2.5.13-14, BaudhDhS 1.3.1-2.

<sup>17</sup> Thus Gu1 Ni – *parāśare* Ku.

<sup>18</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. Read *vṛṣotsargaṃ cūḍākaraṇaṃ mekhalāṃ*, or *vṛṣotsargacū-ḍākaraṇamekhalāḥ?*

māṅgalyam<sup>19</sup> abhiṣekaṃ ca malamāse vivarjayed iti ||  
 tatrādaḥ śiṣyaḥ<sup>20</sup> ācāryasya samīpaṃ gatvā suvinīto dakṣiṇajānuṃ bhū-  
 mau nipātyācāryāya nivedayet || bho bhagavan vedam bhavān upākuru-  
 tāṃ iti || tata ācāryaḥ om iti vadati || svīkāraṃ kṛtvety arthaḥ || tada-  
 nantaram [Ku 101v] ācāryo nakṣatrakalpoktaṃ tantraṃ kṛtvā<sup>21</sup> aman-  
 trakaṃ kṣīraudanaṃ śrapayati<sup>22</sup> || vratādeśagaṇasyāntyasūktadvayaṃ  
 parityajya mahāvyaḥṛtyādibhiḥ ca kṣīraudanaṃ juhuyāt || tadananta-  
 raṃ śan no devīr ityādy anuvākādyanuvākottamā ṛcaḥ || kāṇḍādikāṇ-  
 ḍottamā ṛcaḥ || pādāpīpāḍottamā ṛcaḥ || vargādivargottamā ṛcaḥ ||  
 vedādivedottamā ṛcaḥ<sup>23</sup> || kṣīraudanaṃ juhuyāt || tā ṛca ucyante ||  
 śan no [GuI 103v] devī<sup>24</sup> (1.1.1) || neva māmse (1.5.5) || ye trisaptāḥ (1.6.1)  
 || yadi haṃsy aśvaṃ (1.10.4) || abhīvartena (1.11.1) || asitasya brahma-  
 ṇā (1.15.4) || naktam jātā (1.16.1) || sabandhuś ca (1.20.4) || nāśam na-  
 śan<sup>25</sup> (1.21.1) || śivena mā (1.25.4) || suparṇo jātaḥ (1.26.1) || ka idaṃ  
 kasmai (1.30.6) || imaṃ me kuṣṭha (1.31.1) || indrāya sahīyase (1.35.4)  
 || yāḥ purastād ācaranti yā vā (1.36.1) || mama gāvo mamāśvā (1.40.4)  
 || agne bhyāvartin<sup>26</sup> (1.41.1) || namas te vidma te (1.45.4) || asya tvam  
 dadataḥ (1.46.1) || yas tvā nināya<sup>27</sup> (1.50.4) || gāto haviḥ (1.51.1) || ma-  
 dhuman ma<sup>28</sup> (1.55.4) || pretā jayatā (1.56.1) || ut tiṣṭha mama vai (1.60.4)  
 || yas tvā mrtyuḥ (1.61.1) || anyā vo anyāṃ (1.65.4) || dhruvas tiṣṭha

<sup>19</sup> Thus Ku Ni – *maṅgalyam* GuI.

<sup>20</sup> Thus, without sandhi GuI Ku Ni.

<sup>21</sup> Thus, without sandhi GuI Ku Ni.

<sup>22</sup> Thus GuI Ni – *śrapayet* Ku.

<sup>23</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. Note that something different is understood in the KP with *vedādivedottamā-*, than in AVParīś 46.2.4/46.3, where the initial and final stanzas of the Saṃhitās of the Ṛgveda, Yajurveda, and Sāmaveda are referred to (on the problem of which recensions are intended, see Weber 1858: 431f.). At the relevant place below (see p. 21 with n. 188), it becomes clear that the initial and final stanzas of the own Saṃhitā (PS) are intended. Logically, we thus expect *-Itame ṛcau*, and this is how the text must perhaps be read here too.

<sup>24</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. Below, this *pratīka* reoccurs several times with the correct reading *devīḥ*.

<sup>25</sup> Thus GuI Ni – *nāśam naśam* Ku (thus also most Or. mss., except Ma *nāśan naśam*: cf. Bhatt. 22). K reads *nāmannasaṃ*. Bhatt. emends *+nāsan na san+*, but it seems that the KP *pratīka* retains the authentic text. Werba suggests to me a *figura etymologica* “let them go to ruins”. This requires taking *naśan* as a rare a-aor. (inj./subj.) of *naś* “to perish”. Other a-aor. forms to this root are attested e.g. at PS 19.54.6 [PSK 19.54.5] (*naśam*), and KauśS 56.6[=7] (*anaśat*).

<sup>26</sup> Thus, without *avagraha* GuI Ku Ni. Thus also Bhatt. 40.

<sup>27</sup> Thus GuI Ni (thus also K) – *nināyaya* Ku (thus also the Or. mss; cf. Bhatt. 50).

<sup>28</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. The *pratīka* ought to be *madhuman mama*.

(1.66.1) || yebhiḥ pāśair dadhiṣupatiḥ<sup>29</sup> (1.70.4) || agniṣ te [Ni 91r] viśaḥ  
 (1.71.1) || vāstoṣ pata iti ghane na<sup>30</sup> (1.75.4) || ūrdhvo bhava (1.76.1) ||  
 suparṇas tvābhy ava paśyāt (1.80.5)<sup>31</sup> || yajñasya cakṣuḥ (1.81.1) ||  
 bhadrām vācam śivam (1.85.4) || tribhyo rudrebhyaḥ (1.86.1) || śīrṣaro-  
 gam aṅgarogam śuktivalgam (1.90.4) || payo deveṣu (1.91.1) || yā  
 devaiḥ prahiteṣuḥ patāt<sup>32</sup> (1.95.4) || rāyaspoṣam (1.96.1) || yathā kumā-  
 raḥ (1.100.4) || trīṇi pātrāṇi (1.101.1) || [Ku 102r] iṣam ūrjam (1.106.6)  
 || vātasya nu (1.107.1) || śatam<sup>33</sup> pāśām<sup>34</sup> (1.112.5) || 1 || 22 ||

arasam prācyam (2.1.1) || sapta prāṇān (2.5.8) || venas tat (2.6.1) || adhī-  
 tam adhy agāt (2.10.5)<sup>35</sup> || dīrghāyatvāya<sup>36</sup> br̥hate (2.11.1) || ye kri-  
 mayāḥ parvateṣu (2.15.5) || yā śatrūn<sup>37</sup> (2.16.1) || mātā nāmāsi (2.20.5)  
 || ā no agne (2.21.1) || sinīvāly anumatiḥ (2.25.5) || yat svapne (2.26.1)  
 || parivrajan<sup>38</sup> (2.31.6/7?) || ya uttarāt (2.32.1) || yās ca vāte (2.36.5) ||

<sup>29</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. Cf. the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 71 (ms. Ja).

<sup>30</sup> Note this interesting amplification, interrupted by *iti*: it refers to *ghane* in *pāda* b of the relevant mantra, to distinguish it from other mantras with the same first words (e.g. 1.86.3). But what does the *na* – not found in the comparably amplified *pratīkas* below – mean here? Should we read *ghanena* “with [the word] *ghana*”? But cf. the *pratīkas* for 15.15.1, 19.29.1, 20.58.1 below, where we do not find such instrumental endings.

<sup>31</sup> According to the stanza division in Bhatt., this *pratīka* quotes from *pāda* c. Even though my ms. Ku1 (also) specifies this stanza as *tryavasānā* (the hymn is lost in K), one may consider whether the division is not to be altered in such a way as to make *suparṇas tvābhy ava paśyāt* the opening words of 1.80.5. If so, stanza 4 (with just two *pādas*) and 5ab of Bhatt. together would form stanza 4. Cf. n. 38.

<sup>32</sup> Thus Ku – *prahiteṣāvantu naḥ* Gu1, *prahiteṣv avantu naḥ* Ni. Note the different choice of *pratīkas*. The amplified *pratīka* found in Gu1/Ni (cf. n. 55) ought to have been *prahiteṣur avantu naḥ*. It seems impossible to decide which *pratīka* is more authentic.

<sup>33</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. Cf. n. 170.

<sup>34</sup> Thus Gu1 Ni – *pāśā* Ku.

<sup>35</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku – Ni omits this *pratīka* entirely.

<sup>36</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. Cf. the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 132 (Or. mss.).

<sup>37</sup> Thus Gu1 Ni – Ku adds *prāśam*, which is the first member of a compound (cf. Zehnder 1999: 55).

<sup>38</sup> Thus Gu1 Ni – *parivrajam* Ku (with all PS mss.). Three points are to be noted here: (1) The important aid the Gu1/Ni reading gives toward the understanding of the text (a pple. nom. masc. sg.), given as *pari vrajam* in Bhatt. and Zehnder (1999: 89); (2) The support from the KP to the stanza division of mss. Ja and Vā (see the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 159), wherein the last mantra (nr. 7?) of 2.31 starts with *parivraja[n]*; (3) The support from the KP to the *anuvāka* division transmitted in K. See Griffiths 2002: 45f., and my remarks on the *anuvāka* division below

cittam<sup>39</sup> yajāmi (2.37.1) || asapatnā sapatnyaghnī<sup>40</sup> (2.41.5) || śerabhaka (2.42.1) || bhrātrvyakṣayaṇam (2.46.5) || ā te sauṁvīryam (2.47.1) || br̥haspatiṁ vayan̄ trātāram<sup>41</sup> yajāmahe (2.51.5) || ye keśinaḥ (2.52.1) || uttare nāma stha<sup>42</sup> (2.56.5) || yadīdam devaḥ (2.57.1) || anātūreṇa (2.61.5) || ye piśācā (2.62.1) || patiṁ te dyāvāpr̥thivī (2.66.5) || yas tvārāyaḥ (2.67.1) || agnir ivaitu (2.71.5) || agnir dyumnena (2.72.1) || payo mahyaṁ dyāvāpr̥thivī (2.76.5) || ahaṁ bibharmi<sup>43</sup> (2.77.1) || yasyāḥ suparnaḥ (2.81.5) || agniṁ te haraḥ (2.82.1) || ūrdhvām diśam (2.86.6) || manāyai<sup>44</sup> tantum (2.87.1) || vātajūte (2.91.5) || 2 || 18 ||<sup>45</sup>

ā tvā gan (3.1.1) || asau yā senā (3.5.6) || agnir no vidvān (3.6.1) || mā te manyau (3.10.6) || ye sthāsyām̄ prācyām̄ diśi (3.11.1) || agrabham̄ sam agrabham̄ (3.15.6) || paidvo 'si<sup>46</sup> (3.16.1) || ā tvā kumāraḥ (3.20.6) || imam indra vardhaye (3.21.1) || indro balenāsi (3.25.14) || gr̥hānaiva<sup>47</sup> (3.26.1) || navāratnī<sup>48</sup> (3.30.7) || devā marutaḥ (3.31.1) || abhayaṁ mitrāt (3.35.6) || jaya [Ni 91v] prehi mā<sup>49</sup> (3.36.1) || asthād dyauḥ<sup>50</sup> (3.40.6) || 3 || 8 ||

[GuI 104r] hiraṇyagarbhaḥ (4.1.1) || ut tiṣṭho 'gra<sup>51</sup> (4.5.10) || hiraṇya-śr̥ṅgaḥ (4.6.1) || yad varco gavi (4.10.8) || yenācarat (4.11.1) || ut tiṣṭha prehi samidhā<sup>52</sup> (4.15.7) || udyann ādityaḥ (4.16.1) || aṅgo nu maḥ<sup>53</sup>

p. 27. Note Bhatt. 158, and the perseverated spurious *anuvāka* marking in Or. ms. Ja reported Bhatt. 226.

<sup>39</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. Cf. the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 164 (Or. mss.).

<sup>40</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. Cf. the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 171 (all mss.).

<sup>41</sup> Thus Ku – om. GuI Ni.

<sup>42</sup> Thus GuI Ni – *sthaḥ* Ku.

<sup>43</sup> *bhirmmi* GuI, *bhibharmmi* Ku, *bibharmmi* Ni.

<sup>44</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. Cf. the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 221 (Or. mss.).

<sup>45</sup> Thus Ni – || 2 || 8 || GuI, || 2 || 1 || # || Ku.

<sup>46</sup> Thus Ni – *paidvo asi* GuI, *paidvosi* Ku (thus also Bhatt.).

<sup>47</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. Cf. the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 267 (Or. mss.).

<sup>48</sup> Thus GuI (Ku *navāratni*) Ni. The *pratīka* ought to be *navāratnīn*.

<sup>49</sup> Thus GuI Ni – *māpa* Ku.

<sup>50</sup> Thus Ni – *asthā dyauḥ* GuI Ku. Cf. the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 293 (Or. mss.) and n. 171 below.

<sup>51</sup> Thus Ku Ni – *uttiṣṭho 'grahaḥ* GuI. The *pratīka* ought to be *ut tiṣṭhogra*.

<sup>52</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. This *pratīka* is wrong. The Or. ms. read: *samidhāyi* KuI, *samidhāya* Ja Vā MaI, *samidhāmi* V/123. K reads *samudhāhi*. From the available ms. readings, I reconstruct: *sam \*adhāyi*, and it is with these words that the *pratīka* ought properly to end. The *pratīka* is extra long to avoid confusion with PS 19.35.13 which has the same opening words.

<sup>53</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. The underlining in Bhatt. (following the fatherly lead of Bhattacharyya 1970: 272), to the neglect of Hoffmann 1986: 461, offers no better



(4.20.7) || [Ku 102v] khananti tvā (4.21.1) || devānām asthi (4.25.7) || kanyā vāravāyatī (4.26.1) || devāḥ śaraṇakṛta<sup>54</sup> sarvābhyah (4.30.9)<sup>55</sup> || prātar agniṃ (4.31.1) || tigmam anīkaṃ (4.35.7) || manve vām dyāvāpṛthivī (4.36.1) || śivā āpo vatsebhyah<sup>56</sup> (4.40.7) || 4 || 8 ||

namaḥ piśaṅga<sup>57</sup> (5.1.1) || samā vaśā sā (5.5.9) || sapta sūryāt<sup>58</sup> (5.6.1) || asimati (5.10.10) || anu te manyatām<sup>59</sup> (5.11.1) || ye ca dṛṣṭā ye cādrṣṭāḥ (5.15.9)<sup>60</sup> || dyaus cemaṃ (5.16.1) || tūlaṃ tardaḥ (5.20.8) || dyaus ca naḥ pitā (5.21.1) || śatena mā (5.25.8) || arātyā (5.26.1) || jyeṣṭhasya tvā (5.30.9) || atyāsarāt (5.31.1) || sapta saṃnamaḥ (5.35.12) || ye vāruṇā (5.36.1) || śatadhāraṃ (5.40.8) || 5 || 8 ||

tad id āsa (6.1.1) || yathā bhūtaṃ ca (6.5.13) || madhuman me nikramaṇam<sup>61</sup> (6.6.1) || eyam agan vāsītā<sup>62</sup> tām (6.10.9) || brahma yajñānam<sup>63</sup> (6.11.1) || ā tvā kaṇvā (6.17.11)<sup>64</sup> || sam<sup>65</sup> mā siñcantu marutaḥ (6.18.1) || yathā mṛtās ca (6.23.12) || 6 || 4 ||

suparṇas tvā (7.1.1) || āchedanaḥ (7.5.12)<sup>66</sup> || satyasya sthūnā (7.6.1) || śīrṣālākam (7.10.10) || ye parvatāḥ (7.11.1) || sahasrāṅgā śataṃ (7.15.10) || agnir mā pātu vasubhiḥ (7.16.1) || pavamānāya (7.20.10) || 7 || 4 ||

---

understanding of the text than that of the author responsible for this *pratīka*: it should correctly end in *mo[t] ← mod.*

<sup>54</sup> Thus Ni – śaraṇakṛt. Gu1, śaraṇakṛtta Ku.

<sup>55</sup> Amplified *pratīka*, in order to avoid confusion with the preceding stanzas of 4.30: cf. the *pratīkas* for 12.1.1, 15.19.12, 16.41.11, 19.9.1, 20.17.4, 20.37.1, 20.42.10 below.

<sup>56</sup> Note that a less extended *pratīka* is given in the *kāṇḍādikāṇḍottamā* portion of the text; cf. p. 20, n. 172.

<sup>57</sup> The *pratīka* ought to be *namaḥ piśaṅgabāhvai*.

<sup>58</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. The *pratīka* ought to be *sapta sūryāḥ*.

<sup>59</sup> Thus Ku – *anu te manvatām* Gu1, *anumate manyutām* Ni.

<sup>60</sup> Note that an *anuvāka* colophon is omitted Bhatt. 392.

<sup>61</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. The -ṣ- in *niṣkramaṇam*, as given Bhatt. 450, is a misprint.

<sup>62</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. Cf. the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 459 (Or. mss.).

<sup>63</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. Cf. the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 459 (Or. mss.), and n. 106 below.

<sup>64</sup> Note that some Or. mss. (Bhattacharya's Mā, my RM and V/126) have misplaced the third *anuvāka* colophon after 6.15). This is not clear from the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 468 and 471. A similar case of regularizing misplacement of *anuvāka* colophons in PS 2 has been discussed in Griffiths 2002: 45f. Cf. n. 38 above.

<sup>65</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. The Or. mss. also have *sam mā* and not *saṃ mā* (as K reads).

<sup>66</sup> Note that an *anuvāka* colophon is omitted Bhatt. 494.

kathā dive (8.1.1) || śataṃ ca me (8.5.11) || ā paśyasi (8.6.1) || patim te  
rājā varuṇaḥ (8.10.12) || catasras te (8.11.1) || ya utthāya kilbiṣe  
(8.15.13) || nava ca yā (8.16.1) || hiraṇyayena<sup>67</sup> (8.20.11) || 8 || 4 ||

ūrdhvā asya<sup>68</sup> (9.1.1) || mūrdhno devasya (9.5.14)<sup>69</sup> || imāṃ khanāmy  
ośadhim adṛṣṭāhananīm (9.6.1) || samudrāc cit (9.11.14) || samānam  
artham (9.12.1) || pāṅktaṃ chandaḥ (9.20.12) || yo vā ekaśarāvam  
(9.21.1) || kuṣṭham tapanti (9.29.7) || 9 || 4 ||

hā amba te<sup>70</sup> (10.1.1) || hiraṇyayena<sup>71</sup> (10.6.13)<sup>72</sup> || gobhiṣ ṭvā pāt<sup>73</sup>  
(10.7.1) || [Ni 92r] vi[Ku 103r]śve devā rakṣitāraḥ (10.16.11)<sup>74</sup> || 10 ||  
2<sup>75</sup> ||

vṛṣā te 'ham (11.1.1) || jīvalām naghāriṣām (11.7.7)<sup>76</sup> || kālo aśvaḥ (11.8.1)  
|| tāsām<sup>77</sup> vā (11.16.14) || 11 || 2<sup>78</sup> ||

<sup>67</sup> Thus Ku – *hiraṇmayena* Gu1 Ni. Cf. n. 71 and 174.

<sup>68</sup> *urddhāsya* Gu1, *ūrdhvā'sya* Ku, *ūrdhvāsya* Ni. Cf. n. 175.

<sup>69</sup> Note that Bhatt. 585 offers two more stanzas, 15-16, following the Or. mss. of PS against the evidence of K. K's non-inclusion of the two mantras is confirmed by the KP.

<sup>70</sup> The *pratīka* ought to be *hā amba tejane*. Cf. n. 176.

<sup>71</sup> Thus Ku – *hiraṇmayena* Gu1 Ni. Cf. n. 67.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Bhatt. 654 and 657. KP lends support to the *anuvāka* division transmitted in K.

<sup>73</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. This *pratīka* ought to end in *pātu*.

<sup>74</sup> This last mantra is omitted in K, but its explicit citation here in KP lends support to Bhattacharya's accepting it into the text. Contrast the situation at 9.5.14 (n. 69). A less extended *pratīka* is given in the *kāṇḍādikāṇḍottamā* portion of the text; cf. n. 177.

<sup>75</sup> The KP thus agrees with K in dividing the *kāṇḍa* into only two *anuvākas*. Although Bhattacharya does not print an *anuvāka* colophon on p. 664, and gives no information about his mss., of the two Or. mss. available to me for this place (JM1 and RM – missing folio in V/126, lacuna in Ku2), RM does insert an *anuvāka* marker after 10.10. My mss. V/126 and Ku2 indicate the end of the third *anuvāka* at the end of the *kāṇḍa* (JM1 and RM give no number), and this agrees with the colophon (*ṭvītyo 'nuvākaḥ*) printed Bhatt. 674. According to Bhattacharya's editorial principle of following the Or. mss., a colophon ought to have been printed Bhatt. 664.

<sup>76</sup> No *anuvāka* colophon is printed Bhatt. 691, after 11.7. Perhaps Bhattacharya's Or. mss. gave no *anuvāka* indication. K does, and so does my Or. ms. JM1 (not Ku2, RM and V/126), and the KP supports this.

<sup>77</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku – Ni omits this *pratīka*. Bhattacharya's Or. mss. read *tāsāmvā*.

<sup>78</sup> The colophon Bhatt. 711 *anuvākaḥ samāptaḥ* ought properly to read *dvitīyo 'nuvākaḥ samāptaḥ*; cf. n. 76.

agnis takmānaṃ vedih (12.1.1)<sup>79</sup> || kṛttir yoniḥ (12.11.9)<sup>80</sup> || indrasya nu (12.12.1) || yat samudraḥ (12.22.14) || 12 || 2 ||

antarhitam me (13.1.1) || sadyo jātaḥ (13.4.7) || imam stomaṃ (13.5.1) || tasmāḥ jātāt (13.9.1)<sup>81</sup> || 13 || 2 ||

endro bāhubhyāṃ (14.1.1) || yā te hetih (14.4.7)<sup>82</sup> || supārśvā (14.5.1) || uṣase naḥ (14.9.7) || 14 || 2<sup>83</sup> ||

samyam digbhyaḥ (15.1.1) || maruto mā gaṇaiḥ (15.4.10) || āyurdā deva (15.5.1) || trir ekādaśā (15.9.6) || jīmūtasyeva (15.10.1) || bhūtam brūmaḥ (15.14.11) || yāvad dyaury<sup>84</sup> ity ośadhe<sup>85</sup> (15.15.1) || yā gachanti ||<sup>86</sup> idam uluṅgulukābhyaḥ<sup>87</sup> (15.19.12) || tvaḥ jātā (15.20.1) || yāḥ samudrād uccaranti uchebhyaḥ<sup>88</sup> (15.23.13)<sup>89</sup> || [Gu1 104v] 15 || 5 ||<sup>90</sup>

antakāya (16.1.1) || ye mṛtyave (16.5.8) || rakṣoḥaṇam (16.6.1) || prati cakṣu<sup>91</sup> (16.11.5) || yā babhravaḥ (16.12.1) || āre abhūt (16.17.7) || kutas

<sup>79</sup> Amplified *pratīka*, in order to avoid confusion with 20.44.1 (PSK 20.42.1; see Zehnder 1999: 258); cf. n. 55. A less extended *pratīka* is given in the *kāṇḍādikāṇḍottamā* portion of the text (see n. 178).

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Bhatt. 732: Bhattacharya's Or. mss. give no *anuvākasūcanam*. Neither do my Ku2, V/126, RM, and JM1. Note that the Or. mss. do indicate the end of the second *anuvāka* after 12.22.14 (Bhatt. 757).

<sup>81</sup> The last sentence of this *brāhmaṇa* prose portion is taken as *uttamā ṛk* (cf. n. 103).

<sup>82</sup> Perhaps finding no *anuvāka* indication in his Or. mss., Bhattacharya gives no *anuvāka* colophon between 14.4 and 14.5 (Bhatt. 781). K here gives the unique indication of the *kāṇḍa*'s *ardha*. My mss. Ku2 and JM1 indicate the end of the first *anuvāka* here; mss. RM, V/126 give no *anuvāka* indication.

<sup>83</sup> At the end of the *kāṇḍa*, Ku2 and JM1 indicate the end of the second *anuvāka*. RM gives no *anuvāka* indication. In V/126, the end of *kāṇḍa* fourteen is not available. It seems likely that Bhattacharya's reading of his Or. mss. (*app. crit.* in Bhatt. 793) is a simple misreading of 2 as 3. His *anuvāka* colophon ought clearly to read *dvitīyo 'nuvākah*.

<sup>84</sup> Thus Ni – *yāva dyaury* Gu1 Ku. Cf. the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 822 (Or. mss.).

<sup>85</sup> Amplified *pratīka* in order to avoid confusion with 7.11.10 and 19.9.10. Cf. the *pratīkas* for I.75.4 above, and 19.29.1, 20.58.1 below.

<sup>86</sup> The double *danḍa* is found in all three mss.

<sup>87</sup> Amplified *pratīka* in order to avoid confusion with 7.13.14 (cf. n. 55). Cf. Griffiths 2003.

<sup>88</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. Cf. the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 840 (Or. mss.; an *-u-* has been omitted by Bhattacharya, surely not intentionally).

<sup>89</sup> A less extended *pratīka* is given in the *kāṇḍādikāṇḍottamā* portion of the text. Cf. n. 180.

<sup>90</sup> Thus Ni – || 1 || 6 || Ku, om. Gu1. Note the number 6 in Ku: this is based on the confusion of (older) ways of writing the numbers 5 and 6.

<sup>91</sup> The mantra has been misunderstood: its *pratīka* ought to be *prati cakṣva*.

tau (16.18.1) || prāṇa mā vat<sup>92</sup> (16.23.6) || sāhasras tveṣaḥ (16.24.1) || indro badhnātu (16.28.11) || indro manthatu (16.29.1) || anv enaṃ prajāpatiḥ (16.34.10) || yāṃ kalpayanti (16.35.1) || svāhā devebhyo diśodiśaḥ (16.41.11)<sup>93</sup> || arātīyo<sup>94</sup> (16.42.1) || sarvā cāsi<sup>95</sup> (16.48.5) || yad devā deva<sup>96</sup> (16.49.1) || apratiṣṭhāna eva (16.58.5) || kena pārṣṇī (16.59.1) || yathā deveṣv amṛtaṃ (16.65.4) || asya vāmasya (16.66.1) || kṛṣṇaṃ niyānaṃ (16.69.13) || dyauryenā<sup>97</sup> (16.70.1) || saṃ te śīrṣṇaḥ (16.75.12) || sapatnahan<sup>98</sup> (16.76.1) || piṅga jahi (16.81.8) || ucchiṣṭe (16.82.1) || taṃ lokaṃ (16.88.6) || agne jāyasva (16.89.1) || tasyaudanasyodaram (16.96.8) || ā nayaitaṃ (16.97.1) || saptarṣayaḥ<sup>99</sup> pratihitāḥ (16.103.11) || bhavāśarvau mṛdataṃ (16.104.1) || vaśāṃ devāḥ (16.110.4) || yo vā ekaṃ (16.111.1) || śarmaṇā caivainaṃ (16.126.4)<sup>100</sup> || indrasyauja stha<sup>101</sup> (16.127.1) || viṣaṃ asyām<sup>102</sup> [Ku 103v] priyaṃ (16.135.9)<sup>103</sup> || aghāyatā<sup>104</sup> (16.136.1) || upainaṃ rūpaṃ (16.139.27)<sup>105</sup> || śramaṇa tapa[Ni 92v]sā (16.140.1) || ava ripraṃ (16.149.12) || brahma yajñānaṃ<sup>106</sup> (16.150.1) || annaṃ retaḥ (16.155.6)<sup>107</sup> || 16 || 22 ||

<sup>92</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. Thus also K and all my Or. mss. (Ku3 JM2 Ji1 Ji4); ŚS 11.4.26 *mat.*

<sup>93</sup> Amplified *pratīka* to avoid confusion with the preceding mantras in PS 16.41. Cf. n. 55.

<sup>94</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. The *pratīka* ought to be *arātīyoh.*

<sup>95</sup> *pasi* Gu1, *pasi* Ku, om. Ni. The *akṣaras cā* and *pa* can be written in such a way that they are nearly indistinguishable.

<sup>96</sup> The *pratīka* ends with the first member of a compound.

<sup>97</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. Thus also all my Or. mss. (Ku3 JM2 Ji1 Ji4), evidently an error that arose in the predecessor of all Or. sources. K has *javenā*, for original *\*javena* (?).

<sup>98</sup> Thus Ku Ni – *sapatnahān* Gu1. The *pratīka* ought to be *sapatnahanam.*

<sup>99</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. *sapta ṛṣayaḥ* in all my Or. mss. (Ku3 JM2 Ji1 Ji4), and in K.

<sup>100</sup> Note that the *pratīka* starts here with the first main clause of 16.126.4, not with the last sentence (cf. n. 81 and 103), or with *yat praśiṣyaṃ.*

<sup>101</sup> Thus Ku – *sthe* Gu1 Ni.

<sup>102</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. Thus also all my Or. ms. (Ku3 JM2 Ji1 Ji4), but the sense requires *asyāpriyaṃ* (cf. also ŚS 8.10.33), and this is what PSK 16.135.10 *asyahpriyaṃ* points to (with common error *-āp/-ahp-*).

<sup>103</sup> The *pratīka* of the last sentence of this *brāhmaṇa* prose portion (PSK 16.135.12) is taken as *uttamā ṛk* (cf. n. 81).

<sup>104</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. The *pratīka* ought to be *āghāyatāṃ.*

<sup>105</sup> The numbering of the difficult hymn 16.139 has yet to be fixed upon the basis of the Or. mss. I give the stanza number here according to PSK.

<sup>106</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. This error is shared by all Or. mss. of PS (cf. n. 63).

<sup>107</sup> PSK 16.155.5d.

satyaṃ bṛhat (17.1.1) || tvam asy āvapanī (17.6.10) || kasminn aṅge (17.7.1) || asti vai tat (17.11.4) || antaḥpātre (17.12.1) || vāvadākā<sup>108</sup> (17.15.10) || dadāmīti<sup>109</sup> (17.16.1) || yadi hutām (17.20.13) || asṛṇ māṃsam (17.21.1) || amuṣyāmuṣyāyaṇasya<sup>110</sup> (17.26.21) || indro vajraṃ (17.27.1) || prati tiṣṭhati<sup>111</sup> prajāyā (17.43.1)<sup>112</sup> || naḍam ā roha (17.44.1)<sup>113</sup> || pūrṇam nārī<sup>114</sup> (17.49.7)<sup>115</sup> || pumān pumaṣaḥ (17.50.1)<sup>116</sup> || ūrdhvāyai diśe (17.55.10)<sup>117</sup> || 17 || 8 ||

satyenottabhitā (18.1.1) || brahmāparaṃ (18.6.12) || tubhyam agre (18.7.1) || syonā bhava (18.14.7) || ud ehi vājin (18.15.1) || yaṃ vātaḥ (18.19.11) || vedim bhūmiṃ (18.20.1) || imām eṣāṃ (18.26.4) || vrātyo vā<sup>118</sup> (18.27.1) || prajāpate vai parameṣṭhinaḥ (18.32.10)<sup>119</sup> || sa mahimā (18.33.1) || rātryā<sup>120</sup> parān (18.43.23)<sup>121</sup> || atisṛṣṭaḥ (18.44.1) || śakvarīstha (18.48.5)<sup>122</sup> || vidma te svapna janitraṃ (18.49.1) || vasyo bhūyāya

<sup>108</sup> Thus Ku Ni – *vāvadyākā* Gu1. The text of the mantra has been misunderstood: the *pratīka* ought to end in *-ṃ*.

<sup>109</sup> Thus Ni – *dadyāmīti* Gu1, *dadāmīty eva* Ku.

<sup>110</sup> Thus Ni – *amuṣyāmuṣyāyaṇasya* Gu1, *amuṣyāyaṇasya* Ku. This *pratīka*, referring to the last sentence of the prose mantra 17.26.21, agrees with the PSK reading (cf. also PSK 17.26.1!) *amuṣyāmuṣyāyaṇasya*, rather than with the reading found in all my Or. mss. (V/122, JM3, Ji4): *amuṣyā amuṣyāyaṇāya*. This external evidence will have to be taken into account in editing PS 17.26.

<sup>111</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. PSK (17.29.17) is corrupt here. All my Or. mss. (V/122, JM3, Ji4) read with a perseverated second person sg. ending *-asi*.

<sup>112</sup> The numbering of this prose hymn, corresponding to PSK 17.29.17 (cf. Zehnder 1999: 258), is tentative. The *pratīka* refers to the last sentence of the *brāhmaṇa* prose portion 17.43.1.

<sup>113</sup> PSK 17.30.1 (cf. Zehnder 1999: 258).

<sup>114</sup> *nārī* Gu1 Ku Ni.

<sup>115</sup> PSK 17.35.7 (cf. ib.).

<sup>116</sup> PSK 17.36.1 (cf. ib.).

<sup>117</sup> PSK 17.41.10 (cf. ib.).

<sup>118</sup> Thus Gu1 Ni – *vāveda* Ku.

<sup>119</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. The numbering of this part of PS 18, for which the evidence of K is lacking, has yet to be fixed. This *pratīka* corresponds to ŚS 15.3.26. The Or. mss. read, like ŚS, *prajāpateś ca vai sa parameṣṭhinaḥ*. The KP *pratīka* thus seems to be wrong or corrupt. Note that the substantial lacunae and consequent rearrangements in PSK 18 (cf. Zehnder 1999: 258) have resulted in the misnumbering there (cf. Barret 1938: 609) of the colophon after PSK 18.29 (= PS 18.53) as indicating the fifth *anuvāka*. The piece of text preserved in PSK 18.29 according to the Or. mss. forms the final portion of the eighth *anuvāka*.

<sup>120</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. My Or. mss. Ji4 JM4 *rātriyā*.

<sup>121</sup> Provisional numbering (cf. n. 119). This *pratīka* corresponds to ŚS 15.18.5.

<sup>122</sup> Provisional numbering (cf. n. 119). Cf. ŚS 16.4.7.

(18.53.4)<sup>123</sup> || viṣāsahim (18.54.1) || agnir mā gopāḥ (18.56.12)<sup>124</sup> || o cit sakhāyaṃ (18.57.1) || dyumantas tvā (18.62.7)<sup>125</sup> || aṅgirasō naḥ (18.63.1) || ud īrṣvaṃ<sup>126</sup> nāri (18.68.12)<sup>127</sup> || apaśyaṃ yuvatīm<sup>128</sup> (18.69.1) || ye te pūrve (18.75.13)<sup>129</sup> || ā rohata (18.76.1) || candramā apsv<sup>130</sup> antar ā (18.82.10)<sup>131</sup> || 18 || 13 ||

doṣo gāya (19.1.1) || tiṣṭhāvare (19.4.16) || namo deva<sup>132</sup> (19.5.1) || yo giriṣu (19.8.15) || idāvatsarāya kṛṇutā (19.9.1)<sup>133</sup> || prācyāṃ diśi (19.12.15) || abhi tvendra (19.13.1) || deva saṃsphān<sup>134</sup> (19.16.19) || yantāsi (19.17.1) || ā śamīm māmakī (19.20.17) || yathā sūryaḥ (19.21.1) || yad āhuḥ śakadhūmāḥ<sup>135</sup> (19.24.19) || yūpe garte (19.25.1) || śīrṣarogam aṅgarogam snāvavṛham<sup>136</sup> (19.28.15)<sup>137</sup> || agnī rakṣoheti hantu (19.29.1)<sup>138</sup> || ca[Gu1 105r]kṣuṣman me (19.32.18)<sup>139</sup> || somo rājā

<sup>123</sup> PSK 18.29.4 / ŚS 16.9.4. Cf. n. 119, and Barret 1938: 607.

<sup>124</sup> Provisional numbering (cf. n. 119).

<sup>125</sup> Provisional numbering (cf. n. 119).

<sup>126</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. ŚS 18.3.2 and my Or. ms. JM4 *īrṣva*; Or. ms. Ji4 *īraśvā*; K unavailable.

<sup>127</sup> Provisional numbering (cf. n. 119).

<sup>128</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. Thus also my Or. mss. Ji4 JM4.

<sup>129</sup> Provisional numbering (cf. n. 119).

<sup>130</sup> *candrāmāpsv* Gu1 Ku Ni. Thus also my Or. mss. Ji4 JM4. ŚS 18.4.89a *candrāmā apsv antar* .... The ŚS reading with *-ā a-* is confirmed also for PS by the K reading (PSK 18.32.14), and for the KP by the reading found below in ms. Ni in the *kāṇḍādīkāṇḍottamā* portion of the text (see n. 182).

<sup>131</sup> Provisional numbering (cf. n. 119). PSK 18.32 corresponds to PS 18.56 plus the final stanza (probably number 10) of 18.82.

<sup>132</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. The *pratīka* ends with the first member of a compound.

<sup>133</sup> Amplified *pratīka*, in order to avoid confusion with 17.21.9 and 19.51.1. Cf. n. 55.

<sup>134</sup> *saṃsphān*. Gu1, *devasyān*. Ku, *devasaṃsphāṃn*. Ni (with *virāma* in all mss.). My Or. mss. Pa and JM3 correctly read *saṃsphāna* (cf. ŚS 6.79.3 *dēva saṃsphāna* ...).

<sup>135</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. My Or. mss. read *śakadhūmaḥ mahānakṣatrāṇām*. K reads *śakadhūmāḥ nakṣatrāṇām*. Cf. also AVParīś Ib.1.4.

<sup>136</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. Thus also all Or. mss. K *strāvavibarham* points to *\*snāvavīṛham*.

<sup>137</sup> Corresponding to PSK 19.28.14d-15a. The stanza division as given by KP is confirmed by the Or. mss.

<sup>138</sup> Note the amplification, interrupted by *iti*, to distinguish the *pratīka* from PS 4.8.1, which has the same first words. Cf. the *pratīkas* for 1.75.4 and 15.15.1 above, and 20.58.1 below.

<sup>139</sup> The stanza division given by KP is confirmed by the Or. mss., against the one established by Barret (1940: 50). Or. mss. Pa and JM3 assign eighteen stanzas to this hymn: awaiting its complete edition, I adopt this number against Barret's nineteen.

(19.33.1) || yady asy apsarāvī<sup>140</sup> (19.36.18) || abhi tvā śatapāśayā  
 (19.37.1) || yaṃ papāca (19.40.15) || somasya prāṇaḥ (19.41.1) || yo na  
 āviḥ śa[Ku 104r]pati (19.44.24) || prāgnaye (19.45.1) || arkāsadhasthau  
 (19.48.19)<sup>141</sup> || indraṃ vyaṃ vanijaḥ<sup>142</sup> (19.49.1) || indrajā asi  
 (19.52.16)<sup>143</sup> || iṣirā cāsi (19.53.1)<sup>144</sup> || prabhū[Ni 93r]tena te (19.56.18)<sup>145</sup>  
 || 19 || 14 ||

dhītī vā ye (20.1.1) || saṃ jānīdhvaṃ (20.6.5)<sup>146</sup> || yan no 'gnir asanat  
 (20.7.1)<sup>147</sup> || yā viśvataḥ (20.11.13)<sup>148</sup> || upa hvaye (20.12.1)<sup>149</sup> || mayi  
 varco 'haṃ te (20.17.4)<sup>150</sup> || abhi prāgāt (20.18.1)<sup>151</sup> || yā sarasvatī  
 (20.24.4)<sup>152</sup> || dūrād bheṣajaṃ (20.25.1)<sup>153</sup> || carmaṇa ivopanītasya  
 (20.30.8)<sup>154</sup> || divi tārā (20.31.1)<sup>155</sup> || yat svapne 'nnaṃ (20.36.5)<sup>156</sup> ||  
 viśvaṃ vivyajmi syonam asmabhyaṃ (20.37.1)<sup>157</sup> || pāṭā bhinattu<sup>158</sup>

<sup>140</sup> Thus Ku (and my Or. ms. JM3) – *yadapsarāvī* Gu1, *yadyapsvarāvī* Ni. My Or. ms. Pa has *yady apsarāvī*, K *yady asy apsarāvair*.

<sup>141</sup> Provisional stanza numbering taken from PSK. It may turn out to be stanza 20 when the entire hymn 19.48 is edited. This corresponds to Barret's 19.48.19bc. The following is a tentative edition of the mantra, which is to be compared with KaṭhĀ 3.146-149 and VādhŚS 13.5.1 (Caland 1926: 162f.): *arkāsa-dhasthau \*kavimātariśvānau yamāṅgirasah | yaśasvinam mā devā yaśasah kṛṇuta svāhā* || (all mss. *kavim*<sup>o</sup>).

<sup>142</sup> Thus Gu1 Ku Ni. Or. mss. Pa JM3 *vañijo havāmahe*, K *vañijaṃ*.

<sup>143</sup> Provisional stanza numbering taken from PSK.

<sup>144</sup> The hymns PS 19.53-56 are partly missing and/or jumbled in K (which has only fifty-five hymns), and the mantra in question is not found there. The KP lends support to the text as presented by the Or. mss.

<sup>145</sup> See the previous note. I make reference here to the numbering of my own preliminary edition of PS 19.53-56. The *pratīka* corresponds to PSK 19.55.18.

<sup>146</sup> PSK 20.5.5 (cf. Zehnder 1999: 258).

<sup>147</sup> PSK 20.6.1 (cf. ib.).

<sup>148</sup> PSK 20.10.13 (cf. ib.).

<sup>149</sup> PSK 20.11.1 (cf. ib.).

<sup>150</sup> PSK 20.16.4 (cf. ib.). Note the amplified *pratīka* (cf. n. 55), in order to avoid confusion with 5.29.8.

<sup>151</sup> PSK 20.17.1 (cf. ib.).

<sup>152</sup> PSK 20.23.4 (cf. ib.).

<sup>153</sup> PSK 20.24.1 (cf. ib.).

<sup>154</sup> The numbering of PS 20.30, corresponding to PSK 20.29 (cf. ib.), cannot yet be fixed. I therefore tentatively assign number 8 to its last stanza here, following Barret 1940: 122.

<sup>155</sup> PSK 20.30.1 (cf. ib.).

<sup>156</sup> PSK 20.35.5 (cf. ib.).

<sup>157</sup> PSK 20.36.1 (cf. ib.). Note the amplified *pratīka* (cf. n. 55), in order to avoid confusion with 2.28.1.

<sup>158</sup> Thus Ku Ni – *bhi{te}nantu* Gu1. See the next note.

tenāhaṃ (20.42.10)<sup>159</sup> || indra jīva (20.43.1)<sup>160</sup> || yovanāni<sup>161</sup> (20.50.8)<sup>162</sup>  
 || ut tabhnāmi (20.51.1)<sup>163</sup> || tasmin ma etat<sup>164</sup> suhutaṃ (20.57.11)<sup>165</sup> ||  
 veda vai te takmann iti viśvasaḥ (20.58.1)<sup>166</sup> || śālālavaṃ (20.65.11)<sup>167</sup> ||  
 20 || 10 || 155<sup>168</sup> || ity anuvākādyottamā<sup>169</sup> ṛcaḥ ||

atha kāṇḍādikāṇḍottamā ṛcaḥ || śan no devīḥ (1.1.1) || śataṃ<sup>170</sup> pāśām  
 (1.112.5) || arasaṃ prācyam (2.1.1) || vātajūte (2.91.5) || ā tvā gan (3.1.1)  
 || asthād dyauḥ<sup>171</sup> (3.40.6) || hiranyagarbhaḥ (4.1.1) || śivā āpaḥ<sup>172</sup> (4.40.7)  
 || namaḥ piśaṅga<sup>173</sup> (5.1.1) || śatadhāraṃ (5.40.8) || tad id āsa (6.1.1) ||  
 yathā mṛtās cā (6.23.12) || suparṇas tvā (7.1.1) || pavamānāya (7.20.10)

---

<sup>159</sup> PSK 20.40.10 (cf. ib.). The stanza numbering of the hymn has yet to be fixed; I thus tentatively follow Barret 1940: 133 in assigning the number 10 to its final stanza. Note the amplified *pratīka* (cf. n. 55); this can only be meant to distinguish the mantra from 7.12.9. Note that all PS mss. read *bibharty* here, as the opening of 7.12.9 also has. The reading *bhinattu* in KP here must have arisen somehow under the influence of PS 20.38.10 (PSK 20.37.10), but a straightforward process of perseveration in manuscript transmission cannot be assumed here.

<sup>160</sup> This would have corresponded to PSK 20.41.1 (cf. Zehnder 1999: 258), but the first words of the stanza are missing in K.

<sup>161</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. Thus also all Or. mss. K has the correct reading *yauvanāni*, which is confirmed by the testimony of RVKhil 2.2.5 and KauS 46.54 (cf. Griffiths, forthcoming).

<sup>162</sup> PSK 20.46.10 (cf. Zehnder 1999: 258). The stanza numbering is provisional.

<sup>163</sup> PSK 20.47.1 (cf. ib.).

<sup>164</sup> Thus Ni – *tasminmayetat* GuI, {•}ta{smā}sthisma etat Ku. I follow the reading of Ni, which seems to be the (corrupt) reading of the KP. My Or. ms. V/122 reads *tasminn eṣa suhutam*; JM5 *tasminn eta suhutam*; K *tasminn eṣa soto*.

<sup>165</sup> PSK 20.53.11. The stanza numbering of PS 20.57 (PSK 20.53 [cf. Zehnder 1999: 258]) cannot yet be fixed. I therefore tentatively assign number 11 to its last stanza here, following Barret 1940: 145.

<sup>166</sup> PSK 20.54.1 (cf. Zehnder 1999: 258). Note the amplified *pratīka*, in order to avoid confusion with 4.24.2. Cf. the *pratīkas* for 1.75.4, 15.15.1, 19.29.1 above.

<sup>167</sup> PSK 20.61.11. The stanza numbering of PS 20.65 (PSK 20.61 [cf. ib.]), cannot yet be fixed. I therefore tentatively assign number 11 to its last stanza here, following Barret 1940: 152.

<sup>168</sup> Thus GuI Ni – om. Ku. The number does not tally with the sum total of the *anuvākas* per *kāṇḍa* (which comes to 162). How is this to be explained?

<sup>169</sup> Thus Ku Ni – *anuvākādyonta* GuI. But at the beginning of the section (above p. 10), the text had *anuvākādyanuvākottamā*.

<sup>170</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. Cf. n. 33.

<sup>171</sup> Thus Ni – *asthā dyauḥ* GuI Ku. Cf. n. 50.

<sup>172</sup> Cf. above p. 13, and n. 56.

<sup>173</sup> Cf. n. 57.



|| kathā dive (8.1.1) || hiraṇyayena<sup>174</sup> (8.20.11) || ūrdhvā asya<sup>175</sup> (9.1.1) || kuṣṭhaṃ tapanti (9.29.7) || hā amba te<sup>176</sup> (10.1.1) || viśve devā (10.16.11)<sup>177</sup> || vṛṣā te 'haṃ (11.1.1) || tāsāṃ vā (11.16.14) || agnis takmānaṃ (12.1.1)<sup>178</sup> || yat samudraḥ (12.22.14) || antarhitam me (13.1.1) || tasmāj jātāt (13.9.1)<sup>179</sup> || endro bāhubhyām (14.1.1) || uṣase naḥ (14.9.7) || samyan digbhyaḥ (15.1.1) || yāḥ samudrāt (15.23.13)<sup>180</sup> || antakāya (16.1.1) || annaṃ retaḥ (16.155.6) || satyaṃ bṛhat (17.1.1) || ūrdhvāyai diśe (17.55.10)<sup>181</sup> || satyenottabhitā (18.1.1) || candramā apsv<sup>182</sup> antar ā (18.82.10) || doṣo gāya (19.1.1) || prabhūtena te (19.56.18)<sup>183</sup> || dhītī vā ye (20.1.1) || śālālavam (20.65.11)<sup>184</sup> || [Ku 104v] iti kāṇḍādyuttamā<sup>185</sup> ṛcaḥ ||

atha pādādipādottamā ṛcaḥ || śan no devīḥ (1.1.1) || yad ado devāḥ (5.25.4) || vibhindatī (5.25.5) || hatās [Ni 93v] tiraści<sup>186</sup> (16.16.3) || kairātikā (16.16.4) || pari tvā dhāt (18.16.10) || iyam tvā pṛṣatī (18.17.1) || śālālavam (20.65.1) || iti pādādipādottamā ṛcaḥ ||

atha vargādivargottamā ṛcaḥ || śan no devīḥ (1.1.1) || hatās tiraści<sup>187</sup> (16.16.3) || kairātikā (16.16.4) || śālālavam (20.65.11) || iti vargādivargottamā ṛcaḥ ||

atha vedā[Gul 105v]dyuttame ṛcau<sup>188</sup> || śan no devīḥ (1.1.1) || śālālavam (20.65.11) || iti vedādyuttame ṛcau ||<sup>189</sup>

<sup>174</sup> Thus Ku – *hiraṇmayena* Gul Ni. Cf. n. 67.

<sup>175</sup> *ūrdhvwāsya* Gul Ni, *ūrdhvwā'sya* Ku. Cf. n. 68.

<sup>176</sup> Cf. n. 70.

<sup>177</sup> Cf. p. 14, and n. 74.

<sup>178</sup> Cf. p. 15, and n. 79.

<sup>179</sup> Cf. p. 15, and n. 81.

<sup>180</sup> Cf. p. 15, and n. 89.

<sup>181</sup> Cf. n. 117.

<sup>182</sup> Thus Ni – *candramāpsv* Gul Ku. Cf. n. 130.

<sup>183</sup> Cf. n. 145.

<sup>184</sup> Cf. n. 167.

<sup>185</sup> Thus Gul Ku Ni. But at the beginning of the section (above p. 10), the text had *kāṇḍādikāṇḍottamā*.

<sup>186</sup> *hatātiraści* Gul, *hatā{+stira}{raści}stiraści* Ku, *hatāśca*[new folio]*stiraści* Ni. The *pratīka* ends with the first member of a compound.

<sup>187</sup> Cf. the preceding note.

<sup>188</sup> Thus Ni – *vidyā*[new folio]*duttamo ṛcau* Gul, *vedādivedottamā ṛcaḥ* Ku. Cf. n. 23.

<sup>189</sup> Ku inserts an unclear double digit number (27, 37?) here, which is not found in Gul and Ni.

tata ācārya agne vratapate vratam carīṣyāmi || kāmas tad (PS 1.30.1) iti kaṇḍikāṃ ca kṣīraudanaṃ juhuyāt || tadanantaram ācāryaḥ<sup>190</sup> mahāvyaḥṛtisāvitrīśāntivācanadharmeṇa<sup>191</sup> śiṣyaṃ vācayet<sup>192</sup> || vācanadhar-  
mas tūktaḥ || tata ācāryaḥ śiṣyahaste puṣpaṃ dattvā || vedabrahma-  
caryam dvādaśavārṣikaṃ haviṣyabhakṣaṇaṃ keśadhāraṇaṃ<sup>193</sup> triṣava-  
ṇasnānaṃ kāṣāyavastraparidhāpanaṃ<sup>194</sup> yathoktadharmaviśiṣṭaṃ ṣo-  
ḍaśamāsapramāṇaṃ kalpoktaṃ yathāśaktitāś carīṣyāmi tad agnau  
nivedayāmi tatra me bhagavann avighnam<sup>195</sup> astv iti śiṣyaṃ vāca-  
yitvāgnau puṣpaṃ dāpayet || tata ācāryaḥ punar mahāvyaḥṛtisāvitrī-  
śāntivācanadharmeṇa śiṣyaṃ vācayet || tadanantaram ṣaṃ no devīr (PS  
1.1.1) ity anuvākaṃ pṛṣṇiparyantaṃ<sup>196</sup> vādhyāyanadharmenādhyaya-  
naṃ [Ku 105r] śiṣyaṃ kārayet || tadanantaram ṣaṃ no devīr (PS 1.1.1)  
iti kaṇḍikā<sup>197</sup> udakam abhimantrya śiṣyam ācāmed<sup>198</sup> abhyukṣec<sup>199</sup> ca ||  
tataḥ kartā sabrāhmaṇaṃ<sup>200</sup> madakarmoktakarmaṃ<sup>201</sup> cāśrāvayet ||  
[Ni94r] atha madakarma<sup>202</sup> || sa ucyate || sarveṣāṃ atharvaṇaṃ karma  
|| apareṇāgner lohitaṃ ānaḍuham<sup>203</sup> carma prāggṛivam uttaraloma  
prastīrya ||<sup>204</sup> tatrāśmamaṇḍale<sup>205</sup> somaṃ nidadhāti || ekarcair ekādaśair

<sup>190</sup> Thus, without sandhi GuI Ku Ni.

<sup>191</sup> *mahāvyaḥṛti*<sup>o</sup> GuI Ku Ni.

<sup>192</sup> Thus Ku – *vācayitvā* GuI Ni.

<sup>193</sup> This word is found in GuI, but not in Ku and Ni.

<sup>194</sup> Thus GuI – *kāṣāyavastraṃ paridhāpanaṃ* Ku Ni.

<sup>195</sup> Thus GuI Ni – *bhagavan nirvighnam* Ku.

<sup>196</sup> Alternatively (*vā*) up to PS 1.5.4 (c: *avaitu pṛṣṇī śevalaṃ*), as opposed to the full *anuvāka*, which would include 1.5.5?

<sup>197</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. Read *kaṇḍikayā*? However this may be, note the absence of sandhi.

<sup>198</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. Read *ācāmayed*?

<sup>199</sup> *abhyukṣe* GuI Ku Ni.

<sup>200</sup> Thus GuI Ni – *brāhmaṇaṃ* Ku.

<sup>201</sup> *madakarmmoktha(ṇ)karmmaṃ* GuI Ni (with *-ṇ*), *mahatkarmmoktakarmmaṃ* Ku. Cf. n. 202, 213, 220, 224. Neither a *madakarman*, nor a *mahakarman* is known from elsewhere, to my knowledge. *madakarma* is more likely here, in the light of the *brāhmaṇa* passage that follows, as well as the description of the rite itself, focusing on various fluids. Cf. the following variant readings.

<sup>202</sup> Thus GuI Ni – *mahakarma* Ku. Cf. n. 201.

<sup>203</sup> Thus Ku – *ānuḍuham* GuI Ku.

<sup>204</sup> The preceding instruction is almost entirely identical to VaikhŚS 1.5: 7.2f. (cf. ĀpŚS 5.5.1) where the injunction is preceded by a libation using the mantra which corresponds to PS 1.1.1, also just used here in the KP.

<sup>205</sup> The technical term *āsmamaṇḍala* occurs elsewhere only at KauśS 36.33, 53.2, 53.14, 54.8, 54.16. Its occurrence in KP confirms the authentic Atharvavedic nature of this text.

gr̥hṇāti || dvyṛcair<sup>206</sup> dvādaśaiḥ || tryṛcais trayodaśaiḥ<sup>207</sup> || caturṛcais<sup>208</sup>  
caturdaśaiḥ || pañcarcaih pañcadaśaiḥ || ṣoḍaśarcaih<sup>209</sup> ṣoḍaśaiḥ ||  
saptarcaih saptadaśaiḥ || aṣṭarcair aṣṭādaśaiḥ || navarcair navadaśaiḥ  
|| daśarcair viṃśatibhiḥ<sup>209a</sup> || ekāṅrcair mahadbhiḥ saṃsthāpya || prās-  
nāti rasān haviṣāṃ<sup>210</sup> (?) || rasān iti bahuvacanaṃ || yad uktaṃ paribhā-  
ṣāyāṃ ||

dadhāni ca ghr̥taṃ caiva madhūny udakam eva ca ||

ete rasāḥ samākhyātāḥ prayojyā<sup>211</sup> misritāḥ sadeti ||<sup>212</sup>

atha madakarmabrāhmaṇam<sup>213</sup> [GuI 106r] āha || pārthivaśyeti (?) ma-  
hāmanā ṛṣir āsīt sa aharahaḥ svādhyāyādhyayanena kīlālena hutena  
cāha<sup>214</sup> (?) sma devān (?) mantram (?) maharṣayo 'bhiṣiñcan (?) || so  
'bhiṣiktaḥ somam upajahāra || taṃ surākīlālopoṣaḥ<sup>215</sup> (?) prajāpatiḥ  
pratikāliśvartto<sup>216</sup> (?) 'dhyagan<sup>217</sup> || tam indraḥ somasukho bhūtvdhyā-  
gacchan<sup>218</sup> || taṃ hovāca varam vṛṇīṣyati sa varam avṛṇīta sa [Ku 105v]-  
rveṣāṃ bhūtānāṃ sarveṣāṃ devānāṃ sarveṣāṃ lokānāṃ adhipatiḥ  
syāmi<sup>219</sup> || sa tasmai madakarma<sup>220</sup> provāca || sarveṣāṃ bhūtānāṃ sarve-  
ṣāṃ devānāṃ sarveṣāṃ lokānāṃ adhipati [Ni 94v]r babhūva || ya icchet<sup>221</sup>  
sarveṣāṃ bhūtānāṃ madhye adhipatiḥ<sup>222</sup> syāmi<sup>223</sup> sa etan madakar-

<sup>206</sup> *dvyarccair* GuI, *darccair* Ku, *dvarcaih* Ni.

<sup>207</sup> *trivricais trayodaśaiḥ* GuI, *trivrcais trayodaśaiḥ* Ku – Ni omits these two words entirely.

<sup>208</sup> *caturccais* GuI Ku Ni.

<sup>209</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. Was *ṣaḍṛcaih* intended originally?

<sup>209a</sup> *viṃśatih* GuI Ku Ni. Cf. n. 231

<sup>210</sup> Thus Ku Ni – *haviṣyāṃ* GuI. Read after GuI, *haviṣyān*? Cf. n. 232.

<sup>211</sup> Thus GuI Ni – *prayojya* Ku.

<sup>212</sup> Cf. KauśS 8.19 *dadhi ghr̥taṃ madhūdakam iti rasāḥ*.

<sup>213</sup> Thus GuI Ni – *mahatkarma*<sup>o</sup> Ku. Cf. n. 201.

<sup>214</sup> *caha* GuI, {cā}ca || *ha* Ku, *ca* | *ha* Ni. *ha sma* cannot stand at the beginning of a sentence.

<sup>215</sup> *°posaha* GuI, *°posa* Ku Ni.

<sup>216</sup> *pratikāliśvartto* GuI, *pratikāliśva*{r}tto Ku, *pratini*•*śvatto* Ni.

<sup>217</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. The originally intended reading may be *°agacchat*: see the next note. That an *akṣara cha* has been omitted seems more likely than that *°agan* is an authentic aor. form.

<sup>218</sup> *°agachan* GuI Ku Ni. The originally intended reading may be *°agacchat*.

<sup>219</sup> Thus Ku Ni, *syāmiḥ* GuI. Cf. n. 223. As Werba has suggested to me, the originally intended reading must be *syām iti*. Was *syāmi* as some stage felt to be a possible first person sg. verb form?

<sup>220</sup> Thus GuI Ni – *mahatkarmma* Ku. Cf. n. 201.

<sup>221</sup> *ya itse* GuI, *yati icche* Ku, *ya i*{kṣ}cche Ni.

<sup>222</sup> Thus, without elision GuI Ku Ni.

<sup>223</sup> Thus GuI Ku Ni. Cf. n. 219.

ma<sup>224</sup> kuryād iti brāhmaṇam || 0 || athoktakarmavidhiṃ vyākhyāsyā-  
maḥ || tatra bādarāprabhṛtīn upakalpayet || tataḥ kartā citrāpaurṇa-  
māsyā nisāyāṃ samuccayatanreṇāgnim upasamādhāya || dakṣiṇārdhe  
purastāddhomān juhuyāt || yukto yujyādikam juhuyāt || ā yātu mitra  
(PS 1.18.1) itiprabhṛtibhir madhye juhuyāt || raseṣūttarasampātān ||  
tubhyam<sup>225</sup> prabhṛtīni raseṣūddhṛtyāñjanodapātre sampātān || śaṃ no  
devir (PS 1.1.1) itiprabhṛtibhiś codapātre sampātān || mā no vidann  
(PS 1.20.1) itiprabhṛtibhir nayet || sarvatra parāgghomān<sup>226</sup> manyeta  
|| parāñcas tatra juhuyāt || tatra yatprayojanena taṃ tatra pratyanayet  
|| iti sambādhijitīputraḥ<sup>227</sup> (?) kātyāyanaḥ || trīn uddhared iti  
mācukarṇaḥ<sup>228</sup> || na kiṃ caneti<sup>229</sup> śauṇāyanaḥ ||

strīmantrasalilabrāhmaṇābhivādādiṣu vyāmarśam || paśūn sarvān pi-  
trmedham uddhared iti pāṇiniḥ || vātsīputraś ca paiṭhīnasiḥ || vājo  
vā-(PS 19.55.7?<sup>230</sup>)-itiprabhṛtibhir<sup>231</sup> juhuyāt || raseṣu sampātān āniya  
saṃsthāpya homān || rasān prāśnāti haviṣyān<sup>232</sup> iti || 0 || tadanantaram  
kartā śiṣyasya vratam ādiśet || [Ku 106r] ta ucyante || triṣavaṇasānaṃ  
|| kāṣāyaparidhānaṃ || rātrau na bhoktavyaṃ || guruśuśrūṣā [GuI  
106v] kartavyā || śrāddhasūtakaśūdrānaṃ na bhoktavyaṃ || taṇḍu-  
lādigrā[Ni 95r]haṇam kāryam || lavaṇotkaṭamāṣanavanītatakracchin-  
nakadadhipiṇyākādīni<sup>233</sup> nāśnīyāt || ity evamādinīyamaṃ kuryāt || ta-  
taḥ kartā uttaratantram kuryāt ||<sup>234</sup> iti śrīmannṛsimhacaraṇaparicā-  
rakaśrīmanmahopādhyāyaśrīdharaviracitāyāṃ vivāhādikarmapañjikā-  
yāṃ vedavratavidhiḥ samāptaḥ ||

<sup>224</sup> Thus GuI Ni – *madatkarma* Ku. Cf. n. 201.

<sup>225</sup> Thus GuI Ni – *jubhyāṃ* Ku. If a mantra is being quoted here (but there is no *iti*), then it may be PS 1.12.1.

<sup>226</sup> *parāhomān* Ku, *parāṃgahomān* GuI Ni. The emendation is tentative.

<sup>227</sup> Thus Ni – *samādhijatīputraḥ* GuI, *sampādhijitīrātraḥ* Ku.

<sup>228</sup> Thus GuI Ni (?) – *yācukarṇaḥ* Ku. Cf. AVParīś 43.4.40 Jātūkarma.

<sup>229</sup> Thus (?) Ni – *kakimcaneti* GuI, *kaKimcaneti* Ku.

<sup>230</sup> The mss. read *vājo veti*°. The mantra PS 19.55.7 (*vāto vā agnim ainddha sa vāteneddo jvalat so dīpyata saḥ* [...]) is not found in K. Its *pratīka* ought to be *vāto* [!] *vā iti*°, but the identification is highly doubtful.

<sup>231</sup> °*prabhṛti* GuI Ku, °*prabhṛtir* Ni.

<sup>232</sup> *haviṣān* GuI Ku Ni. Cf. n. 210.

<sup>233</sup> Thus GuI – °*mā{rśa}rśa*° Ku, °*māsa*° Ni. In the light of KauśS 1.35, °*māṃsa*° is perhaps also possible.

<sup>234</sup> Ku inserts hereafter: *bhūmimantrya* ||.

## ANALYSIS

The above edition of the relevant section of the KP, its Vedavratavidhi, provides elaborate data on the places where textual divisions are marked in the PS: it is evident that the KP has preserved a line of traditional knowledge of these textual divisions, and also to some extent of the reading of the stanzas themselves, independent of the PS Or. mss.: it is sometimes more authentic than these, receiving repeated confirmation from K (cf. my notes 38, 72, 75, 110 [?], 130/182): it is these agreements with K, in a text from Orissa, against the “local” Saṃhitā mss., that lead me to conclude that the textual divisions indicated in the KP can truly be called *the* textual divisions of the PS. In place of, and in addition to the data which Renou (quoted at the beginning of this paper) could summarize in 1957, several new facts have come to light about the divisions which are traditionally made in the PS: *anuvākas* and *kāṇḍas* were already known, but the division into *pādas* and *vargas* has hitherto not been noticed.<sup>235</sup> I now present a summary of the textual divisions of the PS.

(1) Stanzas (and Parts thereof): *ṛcs* and *ardharcas*

The KP provides no specific information on the places where this smallest subdivision of the text, which it refers to as *ṛc*,<sup>236</sup> is made.<sup>237</sup> Half-stanzas (referred to in the KP as *ardharca*) and whole stanzas are marked in the Or. mss. by the common single (|) and double *daṇḍa* (||) sign. K only uses, and very unreliably so, a single *daṇḍa* (|), besides its other punctuation sign “z” (Barret 1905: 198). Some Or. PS mss. even indicate stanza-quarters, which is done by means of an apostrophe-like raised stroke (which I call “*pāda*-marker”<sup>238</sup>). Since there is no trace of

---

<sup>235</sup> These facts are only new because scholars (except for Witzel 1985a: 269) have not realized that the Uttamapaṭala (AVPariś 46) gives a “table of contents” of PS. Witzel’s assumption is beautifully confirmed by the KP.

<sup>236</sup> At the top of every page of his edition, Bhattacharya uses the abbreviation “*ma.*”, for *mantra*. Since the PS mss. also use the abbreviation *ṛ* (for *ṛc*) followed by the number of verses in the hymn (see Griffiths 2003), Bhattacharya’s choice of “*ma.*” is infelicitous.

<sup>237</sup> Except incidentally at 1.80.5 and 2.31.6/7, where the *pratīkas* as given in KP imply a division into stanzas of the hymns in question different from the division adopted in Bhattacharya’s edition.

<sup>238</sup> On this marker, see Griffiths 2003.

such marking in K, this *pāda*-marker is probably not an old part of the tradition.

(2) Hymns: *sūktas/kaṇḍikās*

The KP provides no specific information on the places where this subdivision of the text is made.<sup>239</sup> Bhattacharya informs us (Bhatt. p. xxi):

The Or. MSS give the total number of verse[s] in the *kaṇḍikā* (hymn) and its serial number at the end of the *kaṇḍikā*.

Bhattacharya does not explain where he has found the term *kāṇḍikā*<sup>240</sup> (which is also found abbreviated as “*kāṇḍi*.” at the top of every page of his edition). My mss. of the KP write *kaṇḍikā* everywhere, and this is of course the expected form of the word (Renou 1957: 7). But this is not the only term used by the tradition to refer to this textual division: the KP frequently uses the well-known term *sūkta* (which is also the standard term in the KauśS, of the sister Śaunaka school). That the terms are not entirely interchangeable, however, is clear from such phrases found in the KP as *sahasrākṣam iti dvikaṇḍikaṃ sūktam* (Ku 14v, to refer to PS 9.25-26) or *ā rātri iṣirā yoṣā iti dve kaṇḍike sūkte* (Ku 9r, to refer – probably – to PS 6.20-21 with PS 14.8-9).<sup>241</sup> While the Or. mss. number hymns continuously per *kāṇḍa*, K starts counting anew with each *anuvāka*.

(3) Lessons: *anuvākas*

As far as I can see, Bhattacharya does not mention the *anuvāka* division in his “Introduction”, although it is prominently present in his edition, and is clearly marked by both the Kashmir ms. (where we find i.a. the abbreviations *anu*, *anuvā* plus a number), and the Or. mss. (where the

<sup>239</sup> Except at 9.5.14, where the *pratīka* as given in KP implies an extent of the hymn in question different from the division adopted by Bhattacharya, or at 10.16.11 and 19.53.1, where it helps to confirm the extent of the hymns as found in the Or. mss. against the different evidence of K.

<sup>240</sup> One must assume that he has seen some reason to follow the reading *kāṇḍikā* reported by Barret (1905: 207, see also p. 199) from Roth’s transcript – unavailable to me – of K (original now lost), under PSK 1.8, and to neglect the evidence of the KP. Cf. the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 6, 96, 129, 148, 179, etc.

<sup>241</sup> I may add here a simple reference, without attempt at explanation, to Barret (1936: 149), who mentions an apparent abbreviation *phaśca* used in K (*kāṇḍa* 17) to indicate the ends of hymns.

abbreviation is simply *a* plus a number, or where the *anuvāka* colophons write the word in full). The KP's Vedavratavidhi demonstrates how essential a part of the tradition this division was,<sup>242</sup> and helps to correct some errors in Bhattacharya's edition, which too slavishly follows the evidence of the PS Or. mss.<sup>243</sup>

#### (4) Books: *kāṇḍas*

The KP's Vedavratavidhi confirms the basic nature of this textual division. In the description of the *madakarman*, which is for some reason part of the *vedavrata*, some titles of *kāṇḍas* appear to be used (in somewhat corrupt form<sup>244</sup>). A fuller list is found in AVPariś 46.10.<sup>245</sup> Combining the readings found in the AVPariś with those found in the colophons of the PS Or. mss., the following list of *kāṇḍa*-titles can be given:

1. *caturṛcakāṇḍa*, 2. *pañcarcakāṇḍa*, 3. *ṣaḍṛcakāṇḍa*, 4. *saptarcakāṇḍa*, 5. *aṣṭarcakāṇḍa*, 6. *navarcakāṇḍa*, 7. *daśarcakāṇḍa*, 8. *ekādaśarcakāṇḍa*, 9. *dvādaśarcakāṇḍa*, 10. *trayodaśarcakāṇḍa*, 11. *caturdaśarcakāṇḍa*, 12. *pañcadaśarcakāṇḍa*, 13. *ṣoḍaśarcakāṇḍa*, 14. *saptadaśarcakāṇḍa*, 15. *aṣṭadaśarcakāṇḍa*, 16. *kṣudrakāṇḍa*, 17. *ekāṅṛcakāṇḍa*,<sup>246</sup> 18. *mahatkāṇḍa*,<sup>247</sup> 19. *ṛcakāṇḍa*/*tryṛcakāṇḍa*, 20. *ekarcakāṇḍa*.

<sup>242</sup> Also elsewhere in the KP, the term is used for quoting groups of PS mantras.

<sup>243</sup> Incidentally, I may note here that Caland's question (1900: 406 n. 2) "Stehen vielleicht die mystischen Zahlen in GB. I. 1. 8 in irgend welcher Beziehung zu den Zahlen der Anuvākas der Paippalāda Saṃhitā?" can – it seems – now be answered in the negative: I have failed to detect any relationship.

<sup>244</sup> As the same corrupt forms are used also in the Or. mss. themselves, they are probably rather old (Orissa) errors, and I have therefore not emended them in my edition above.

<sup>245</sup> The titles of the *kāṇḍas* of the PS have been listed and discussed by Witzel (1985a: 269). Cf. n. 235.

<sup>246</sup> Modak 1993: 181, n. 120 explains this title, as it occurs in several texts of the Śaunaka Śākhā (e.g. ŚS 19.23.22 = AVPariś 46.10.22), where it is according to him (p. 159) applied to *kāṇḍas* 12 through 14 of the ŚS, as follows: "It means 'that which contains *sūktas* one of which consists of non-*ṛks* (i.e. *paryāyas*)'. The word *ekarca* (applied to *kāṇḍa* VII) may be noted in this connection. It may further be noted that *kāṇḍas* XI to XIII each contain one *paryāya-sūkta*". In the absence of a critical edition of PS 17, I do not yet feel competent to judge whether Modak's explanation may be less, equally, or better applicable to that *kāṇḍa*.

<sup>247</sup> This *kāṇḍa*, largely lacking in K, which corresponds to most of ŚS 13-18, is also called *maṅgalakāṇḍa* in Or. ms. V/121. It seems to have a division into *khaṇḍas* (a textual division otherwise unknown in the PS): the second *khaṇḍa* ends after

The titles of the *kāṇḍas* of PS are not – to my knowledge – used anywhere in K, where colophons only give numerical indications (*prathamah*, *dvitīyah*, etc.) of the *kāṇḍas*. The fact that these titles do represent a reasonably old tradition not restricted to Orissa, is proved by their presence in AVPariś 46 / ŚŚ 19.22-23.

(5) Quarters: *pādas*

Perhaps the most interesting detail in the KP's Vedavratavidhi is its confirmation of small bits of evidence to be found in some PS Or. mss., as well as in AVPariś 46.2.4 (see Bolling – von Negelein's *variae lectiones*, p. 296, ms. T *pādottamaiḥ*), viz. for a division of the PS into *pādas*.

Precisely as the KP indicates, between 5.25.4 and 5.25.5 (cf. the *app. crit.* in Bhatt. 408), several Or. mss. indicate the end of the *prathamah pādaḥ*. While some only mark a *śrī* sign (identical to the one used to mark the presumptive mechanical division that is discussed below, p. 29ff.), and while K (see Barret 1917: 288) also simply has the “normal” corresponding repetition of a stanza-quarter, plus *om̐*, Bhattacharya's mss. Ma and Ja, as well as my Ji3,<sup>248</sup> V/123,<sup>249</sup> and Ek2<sup>250</sup> here explicitly use the words *prathamah pādaḥ*. I have not yet found any explicit mention of the *dvitīyah pādaḥ* in any of the PS Or. mss. available to me, after 16.16.3 where we expect it according to the KP, but Ku3 Ji1 Ji4 do insert there a *śrī* sign, while K (Barret 1936: 18) inserts only *om̐*. The *ṛtīyah pādaḥ* is mentioned between 18.16.10-18.17.1 – again, precisely in the place indicated by the KP – in V/122, while JM4 and V/71 insert the same *śrī* (nothing in Ji1 Ji4), and K again has simply *om̐* (Barret 1938: 594). Finally, we find in the colophon at the end of *kāṇḍa* 20 in Pa and V/122 a reference to the *pippalādaśākhāyāṃ mantrasya caturthaḥ pādaḥ*, where K repeats the last stanza-quarter and

---

18.56, which is usually the place where the mss. split PS 18 in two. Further research on PS 18 must reveal where the first *khaṇḍa* ends, and whether or not the *kāṇḍa* contains more such *khaṇḍas*. I may also add here that some Or. mss. (JM4 V/71; see Griffiths 2003) refer at the end of PS 18 to *aṣṭāvīṃśatikāṇḍimaṅgalāḥ*, or (in Ji4) *ṣaḍvīṃśatyeti kaṇḍike*; the meaning of these indications remains unexplained for the time being.

<sup>248</sup> The colophon (f. 115r) reads: ... || *iti pippalādaśākhāyāṃ prathamah pādaḥ* ||

...

<sup>249</sup> The colophon (f. 92v) reads: ... || *prathamah pādaḥ* || ...

<sup>250</sup> The colophon (f. 130v) reads: ... || *ity ātharvaṇe pippalādaśākhāyāṃ prathamah pādaḥ* || *viṣṇuḥ* || ...



adds *om̐* (Barret 1940: 152). The evidence that we have here yet another old textual division, which ought clearly to be marked in a critical edition, is undeniable.

It is necessary to refer to Renou's article of 1957 once again, because he there discusses the technical term *pāda* as a name of a textual division at some length (p. 15f.). According to Renou's data, the term does not occur before Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī (1957: 15):

*Pāda*, comme nom de la section des *adhyāya*, apparaît dans l'usage avec Pāṇini, qui peut-être en a créé l'emploi. Il n'est pas douteux que l'usage du terme dans les deux Prātiśākhya de l'Atharvaveda ne soit secondaire par rapport à l'Aṣṭādhyāyī. En tout cas le mot n'a fait fortune qu'après l'époque védique, chez les grammairiens non-pāṇinéens et jusque chez les grammairiens prākritis.

We must now seriously consider the possibility that what we have found in the Paippalāda Saṃhitā represents a still earlier use of the term, in the proper sense of "quarter". It remains problematic, for the time being – provided we may assume the redactors of PS worked with a rational/mathematical principle, and that they were dealing with a text of the same extent as the one we now have – to see on what basis they divided the text into the above (p. 21) four parts: (I) 1.1.1-5.25.4, (II) 5.25.5-16.16.3, (III) 16.16.4-18.16.10, (IV) 18.17.1-20.65.11. By my count, these 4 blocks in any case do not have the same number of stanzas. Possibly, the redactors were counting words,<sup>251</sup> but I cannot test this hypothesis with a computer-aided count, since an electronic Padapāṭha for the PS is not yet available.

#### (6) Halves: *vargas*

These were also known already from AVPariś 46.2.4. They consist merely of two pairs of *pādas*. Note the difference in size between this *varga*, and the Ṛgvedic one (Renou 1957: 2f.)

#### (7) A Further Textual Division: *\*prapāṭhakas*

Leaving behind, now, the evidence of the KP, I add here a brief discussion of yet another textual division in PS, whose name seems to have been lost to history. As pointed out very briefly by Witzel (1985a: 262),

---

<sup>251</sup> Cf. the elaborate system of counting words in the Taittirīya tradition (Renou 1957: 9).

“die gewissen Versen vorangehenden *om/Śrī*” may be reckoned among the striking “formale Übereinstimmungen”<sup>252</sup> that exist between K and the PS Or. mss.; to be more precise, each *kāṇḍa* of the PS contains numerous cases where a verse which in the Or. mss. is preceded by an auspicious sign (mostly a stylized *śrī*, but in some cases also e.g. *viṣṇuḥ*, or a “floral” ornament) is matched in K by *om̃* and the repetition of one stanza-quarter.<sup>253</sup>

I have not yet been able to work through all *kāṇḍas*, but the following list for *kāṇḍas* 1-16 (based on a perusal of the mss. Ku1-3) is probably fairly close to complete.<sup>254</sup> For *kāṇḍas* 1-15, I mention the page-number in Bhattacharya’s edition if the presence of these signs has been indicated in his *apparatus*. Bhattacharya uses such indications as *ataḥ padmādīni* [sic] *an̄kitāni*, *kāṇḍikānte maṅgalacih̄nādīni*, *mantrānte śrī iti*, etc. For *kāṇḍa* 16, I give reference to the page-number of Barret’s 1936 transcription of K for that *kāṇḍa*.

#### Kāṇḍas 1-15

1.6/1.7 (Bhatt. 6), 1.31/32 (not in the *app. crit.* of Bhatt.), 1.40/41 (not in the *app. crit.* of Bhatt.), 1.54/55 (not in the *app. crit.* of Bhatt.), 1.63.2/3 (Bhatt. 64), 1.92/93 (Bhatt. 96), 2.8/9 (Bhatt. 129), 2.23/24

---

<sup>252</sup> Witzel uses these formal correspondences as argument for his hypothesis of a common written archetype (\*G) for the Kashmir and Orissa PS traditions. To my knowledge, Witzel’s hypothesis has not yet been seriously discussed anywhere (except my remarks in Griffiths 2002: 40-44 and 2003: n. 25), nor does Bhattacharya discuss it in his “Introduction”. I may state here my opinion that this particular example might equally be treated as a “formal difference”, because even though the two traditions agree strikingly in where they insert these markers, the markers themselves are nowhere the same.

<sup>253</sup> The use of this device in K was noted by Edgerton 1915: 411, but he wrongly suggested that it occurs only “at the end of a hymn”. As we saw above (p. 28), it is used also for the marking of “Quarters” (*pādas*) in K. In fact, it appears to be a generic device to mark the end of textual divisions in this ms.: see e.g. the repetitions at the end of *kāṇḍas* 1, 2, 5, 6 (Edgerton ib.), 16, 17 (*om̃*, but no repetition!), 18, 19, 20.

<sup>254</sup> I have come across another example of the same phenomenon during my work on *kāṇḍa* 19 (my 1998 Leiden M.A. thesis offered an edition with translation of PS 19.1-10; the brief communication by Griffiths – Lubotsky 1999 contains another small result of my work on this *kāṇḍa*): between 19.4.9 and 19.4.10 the Or. mss. available to me insert *śrī*, while K adds a repetition of 19.4.9d: *z om̃ anu sūtam̃ suvitave z om̃* (Barret 1940: 7).

(Bhatt. 148), 2.39.2/3 (Bhatt. 167), 2.51/52 (Bhatt. 179), 2.73/74 (Bhatt. 206), 3.10/11 (not in Ku1, Bhatt. 242), 3.30/31 (Bhatt. 274), 4.8/9 (Bhatt. 308), 4.27/28 (Bhatt. 340), 5.7.8/9 (Bhatt. 377), 5.22.4/5 (Bhatt. 404), (5.25.4/5 [first *pāda*, Bhatt. 408]), 5.38.4/5 (Bhatt. 434), 6.12.5/6 (Bhatt. 462), 7.4.4/5 (Bhatt. 490), 8.13.6/7 (Bhatt. 551), 9.6.2/3 (Bhatt. 586), 10.5.10/11 (Bhatt. 653), 11.6.2/3 (Bhatt. 687), 12.5.8/9 (Bhatt. 720), 12.19/20 (Bhatt. 750), 15.14/15 (not in the *app. crit.* of Bhatt.).

### Kāṇḍa 16 (based on Ku3 [and Ji1])

16.6.2/3 (not paralleled in K; see Barret 1936: 7), (16.16.3/4 [second *pāda*; ib. p. 18]), 16.19.6d/6e (ib. p. 21), (16.34/16.35 [sixth *anuvāka*, not paralleled in K; ib. p. 35]), 16.51.5/6 (not paralleled in K; ib. p. 52), (16.69/70 [eleventh *anuvāka*; ib. p. 69]), 16.84/85 (ib. p. 86), 16.101.6/7 (ib. p. 102), (16.110/111 [seventeenth *anuvāka*, not paralleled in K; ib. 112]), (16.126/127 [eighteenth *anuvāka*; ib. p. 122]), 16.153.4/5 (ib. p. 144).

Since the material is not yet complete, I hesitate to offer a hypothesis about these striking correspondences between K and the Or. mss. I can only suggest that we may have here a vestige of a “division mécanique” (Renou 1957: 2f.) of the text into portions of (roughly?) equal size. As in the case of the *pādas*, the principle of division escapes me: a test of the stretches 5.38.5 to 6.12.5, 6.12.6 to 7.4.4, 7.4.5 to 8.13.6, and 8.13.7 to 9.6.2 did not yield equal numbers of stanzas. Again, it is possible that a principle of equal numbers of words underlies this division, or perhaps equal numbers of *daṇḍas*, stanza-quarters, or syllables. With a view to the division of ŚS 1-18 into *prapāṭhakas*, a division – not extended into ŚS *kāṇḍas* 19 and 20 – which, “though noticed in all the mss.”, is according to Whitney – Lanman 1905: cxxviii, “probably a recent, and certainly a very secondary and unimportant one”, I propose to call this unnamed textual division of PS *\*prapāṭhaka*. My proposal is based mainly on the fact that the number of *\*prapāṭhakas* for the whole of PS will probably not exceed 60, a figure arguably within the same order of magnitude as the figure 34 for ŚS 1-18 (Whitney – Lanman ib.). It seems possible that the *\*prapāṭhaka* division of the Paippalāda tradition is one among several features secondarily taken over by the Śaunaka from the Paippalāda Śākhā.

## ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ĀpŚS                      Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra, ed. R. Garbe (Calcutta 1882-1902).
- AVPariś                 Atharva Veda Pariśiṣṭas, ed. G.M. Bolling – J. von Negelein (Leipzig 1909-1910).
- Barret 1905-1940      L.C. Barret, The Kashmirian Atharva Veda. Book one. *JAOS* 26 (1905) 197-295 – Book two. *JAOS* 30 (1910) 187-258 – Book three. *JAOS* 32 (1912) 343-390 – Book four. *JAOS* 35 (1915) 42-101 – Book five. *JAOS* 37 (1917) 257-308 – Book seven. *JAOS* 40 (1920) 145-169 – Book eight. *JAOS* 41 (1921) 264-289 – Book nine. *JAOS* 42 (1922) 105-146 – Book ten. *JAOS* 43 (1923) 96-115 – Book eleven. *JAOS* 44 (1924) 258-269 – Book twelve. *JAOS* 46 (1926) 34-48 – Book fourteen. *JAOS* 47 (1927) 238-249 – Book thirteen. *JAOS* 48 (1928) 36-65 – Book fifteen. *JAOS* 50 (1930) 43-73 – *Books Sixteen and Seventeen*. [*AOS* 9]. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1936 – Book eighteen. *JAOS* 58 (1938) 571-614 – *Books Nineteen and Twenty*. [*AOS* 18]. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1940.
- BaudhDhS  
Bhatt.                     Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra, ed. P. Olivelle (Delhi 2000).  
Dipak Bhattacharya, *The Paippalāda-Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda*. Volume One, Consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas. [*Bibliotheca Indica Series* 318]. Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1997.
- Bhattacharyya 1957    Durgamohan Bhattacharyya, A Palm-Leaf Manuscript of the Paippalādasamhitā: Announcement of a Rare Find. *Our Heritage* 5 (1957) 81-86.
- Bhattacharyya 1964    Id., *Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda*. First Kāṇḍa. Edited from original manuscripts with critical notes. [*Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series* XXVI]. Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1964.
- Bhattacharyya 1968    Id., *The Fundamental Themes of the Atharvaveda* (With Special Reference to its Paippalādasamhitā). [*Kaushik Lecture Series* VI]. Poona: S.P. Mandali, 1968.
- Bhattacharyya 1970    Id., *Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda*. Volume Two. Edited from original manuscripts with critical notes. [*Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series* LXII]. Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1970.
- Bloomfield 1899        M. Bloomfield, *The Atharvaveda*. [*Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde* II/18]. Strassburg: K.J. Trübner, 1899.
- Caland 1900            W. Caland, Review of Bloomfield 1899. *GGA* 162 (1900) 402-409 (= *Kleine Schriften*, ed. M. Witzel. Stuttgart 1990, p. 594-601).
- Caland 1926            Id., Eine dritte Mitteilung über das Vādhūlasūtra. *AO* 4

- (1926) 161-213 (= *Kleine Schriften*, ed. M. Witzel. Stuttgart 1990, p. 344-396).
- Chintamani 1939 T.R. Chintamani, Fragments of Paiṭhīnasi Dharmasūtra. *Annals of Oriental Research of the University of Madras* 4/1 (1939) 5-40.
- Devasthali 1966 G.V. Devasthali, The Form and the Arrangement of the Atharva-Veda. In: *Professor Birinchi Kumar Barua Commemoration Volume*, ed. M. Neog – M.M. Sharma. Gauhati 1966, p. 43-53 (= *Indian Antiquary* [third series] 2 [1967] 29-39).
- Edgerton 1915 F. Edgerton, The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, Book Six. Edited, with critical notes. *JAOS* 34 (1915) 374-411.
- GB Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, ed. D. Gaastra (Leiden 1919).
- Griffiths 2002 A. Griffiths, Aspects of the Study of the Paippalāda AtharvaVedic Tradition. In: *Ātharvaṇā* (A Collection of Essays on the AtharvaVeda with Special Reference to its Paippalāda Tradition), ed. A. Ghosh. Kolkata 2002, p. 35-54.
- Griffiths 2003 Id., The Orissa Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā. *ZDMG* 153/2 (2003) 333-370.
- Griffiths, forthcoming Id., Paippalāda Mantras in the Kauśikasūtra. In: *Proceedings of the Third International Vedic Workshop*, ed. A. Griffiths – J.E.M. Houben.
- Griffiths – Lubotsky 1999 A. Griffiths – A. Lubotsky, Postscript on Vedic *jan̄gahe*. *JAOS* 119 (1999) 480f.
- von Hinüber 2001 O. von Hinüber, Review of Zehnder 1999. *ZDMG* 151 (2001) 459.
- Hoffmann 1986 K. Hoffmann, Textkritisches zur *Paippalāda-Saṃhitā*. In: *Sanskrit and World Culture*, ed. W. Morgenroth. Berlin 1986, p. 457-461 (= *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. Band 3, ed. S. Glauch – R. Plath – S. Ziegler. Wiesbaden 1992, p. 819-823).
- K The Kashmir tradition/ms. of PS
- KaṭhĀ Kaṭha Āraṇyaka, ed. M. Witzel (Kathmandu 1974).
- KauśS Kauśika Sūtra, ed. M. Bloomfield (New Haven 1890 = *JAOS* 14 [1889]).
- KP (Vivāhādi) Karmapañjikā composed by Śrīdhara (unpublished).
- Lubotsky 2002 A.M. Lubotsky, *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda Kāṇḍa Five*. Text, Translation, Commentary. [*HOS Opera Minora* 4]. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 2002.
- Mishra 1973 Nilamani Mishra, *An Alphabetical Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Collection of the Orissa State Museum, Bhubaneswar*. Part 1. Bhubaneswar: Orissa State Museum, 1973.

- Modak 1971 B.R. Modak, The Veda-Vrata. *Indian Antiquary* (third series) 5 (1971) 35-37.
- Modak 1993 Id., *The Ancillary Literature of the Atharva-Veda*. A Study with Special Reference to the Pariśiṣṭas. New Delhi: Rashtriya Veda Vidya Pratishthan, 1993.
- Mylius 2000 K. Mylius, Review of Zehnder 1999. *IJJ* 43 (2000) 295-298.
- Or. Orissa; the Orissa tradition/mss. of PS
- PārGS Pāraskara Gṛhya Sūtra, ed. A.F. Stenzler (Leipzig 1876).
- Parpola 1996 A. Parpola, On the Upagrantha(sūtra) of the Sāmaveda. 1. Contents and Textual Divisions. In: *Langue, style et structure dans le monde indien*, ed. N. Balbir – G.-J. Pinault. Paris 1996, p. 91-121.
- PS Paippalāda Saṃhitā, (unless stated otherwise) numbered according to the Orissa mss.
- PSK Paippalāda Saṃhitā, (numbered/read) according to the Kashmir (K) ms., ed. Barret 1905-1940 and Edgerton 1915.
- Renou 1957 L. Renou, Les divisions dans les textes sanskrits. *IJJ* 1 (1957) 1-32 (= *Choix d'études indiennes*. Réunies par N. Balbir et G.-J. Pinault. Paris 1997, II/487-518).
- RV Ṛg Veda Saṃhitā, ed. Th. Aufrecht (Bonn 1877).
- RVKhil Ṛg Veda Khilāni, ed. I. Scheftelowitz (Breslau 1906).
- ŚS Śaunaka Saṃhitā, ed. R. Roth – W.D. Whitney (Berlin 1856).
- VādhŚS Vādhūla Śrauta Sūtra, ed. B.B. Chaubey (Hoshiarpur 1993).
- VaikhŚS Vaikhānasa Śrauta Sūtra, ed. W. Caland (Calcutta 1941).
- Weber 1858 A. Weber, Zur Textgeschichte der Vedasamhitās, insbesondere der Atharva-Samhitā. *Indische Studien* 4 (1858) 431-434.
- Whitney – Lanman 1905 W.D. Whitney – C.R. Lanman, *Atharva-Veda Saṃhitā*. With a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. 2 vols. [HOS 7-8]. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1905.
- Witzel 1973-1976 Michael Witzel, On the Reconstruction of the Authentic Paippalāda-Saṃhitā. *Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha* 29 (1973) 463-488 and 32 (1976) 137-168.
- Witzel 1985a Id., Die Atharvaveda-Tradition und die Paippalāda-Saṃhitā. *ZDMG-Supplement* 6 (1985) 256-271.
- Witzel 1985b Id., Die mündliche Tradition der Paippalādins von Orissa. *MSS* 44 (1985) 259-289.
- Witzel – Griffiths 2002 M. Witzel – A. Griffiths, A List of Paippalāda-Atharva Vedin Settlements. In: *Ātharvaṇā* (A Collection of Essays on the AtharvaVeda with Special Reference to its Paippalāda Tradition), ed. A. Ghosh. Kolkata 2002, p. 167-179.

Zehnder 1999

Th. Zehnder, *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Buch 2*. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Eine Sammlung altindischer Zaubersprüche vom Beginn des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr. [*Beiträge zur Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft* 107]. Idstein: Schulz-Kirchner Verlag, 1999.

