



DOI: 10.2478/linpo-2019-0013

As above, so below: Textual variation in the Paippalāda *sūryā-sūkta*¹

Kristen de Joseph

Leiden University Center for Linguistics
k.h.de.joseph@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Abstract: Kristen de Joseph. *As above, so below: Textual variation in the Paippalāda sūryā-sūkta*. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of Arts and Sciences, PL ISSN 0079-4740, pp. 49-60

This contribution will address the variants among parallel versions of this hymn, with special attention to the Paippalāda version (of which a critical edition is currently in preparation), and how these variants reflect the different chronology, socio-religious goals and textual history of the different recensions.

Keywords: Paippalāda recension, Kashmir Atharvaveda manuscripts, Odisha Atharvaveda manuscripts, *sūryā-sūkta*.

1. Introduction

The *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali states: *navadhātharvaṇo vedāḥ* “The Veda of the Atharvans is ninefold” (Kielhorn 1880: 9, line 22). Patañjali is one of several authorities to point to the ninefold nature of the Atharvaveda (hereafter AV), so described because of the nine branches (*śākhās*) of the tradition.² Other sources have recorded the names of these *śākhās*; the Atharvaveda-Parīṣiṣṭa, for one, lists the Paippalāda, the Stauda (or Tauda), the Mauda, the Śaunakīya (or Śaunaka), the Jājala, the Jalada, the Brahmavada, the Devadarśa and the Cāraṇavaidya.³

¹ My sincere thanks to Ruixuan Chen, Daniele Cuneo, Arlo Griffiths, Nirajan Kafle, Werner Knobl, Ducio Lelli, Marianne Oort, Umberto Selva, Carmen Spiers, Thomas Zehnder and especially Alexander Lubotsky, each of whose invaluable comments have helped to improve drafts of this article and/or my broader study of Paippalāda-Samhitā book 18. I would also like to thank Maria Piera Candotti, Tiziana Pontillo, Velizar Sadvovski and the participants of SALA33 for the opportunity to present and discuss this work with a wider audience.

² See Bloomfield (1899: § 10-14) for details.

³ Atharvaveda-Parīṣiṣṭa 49.4.1: *tatra brahmavedasya nava bheda bhavanti / tad yathā / paippalādāḥ / staudāḥ / maudāḥ / śaunakīyāḥ / jājalāḥ / jaladāḥ / brahmavadāḥ / devadarśāḥ / cāraṇavaidyās ce 'ti /* (ed., Bolling & von Negelein 1910: 337).

Of the nine *śākhās*, manuscripts of only the Śaunaka Samhitā and Paippalāda Samhitā of the Atharvaveda (hereafter ŚS and PS) survive. No more than a half-century after the first print edition of the ŚS (Roth & Whitney 1856), a birchbark manuscript of the PS in Śāradā script was discovered in Kashmir. The manuscript, in its corrupt and deteriorated state, left much to be desired; nonetheless, a facsimile edition appeared in 1901 (Bloomfield & Garbe 1901), after which Barret endeavoured to transliterate and restore this so-called “Kashmirian Atharvaveda” (1905-1940).

Still other textual sources, however, intimated the existence of Paippalādin settlements outside Kashmir (Bhattacharya 1997: xi-xiii). It was these sources that prompted D.M. Bhattacharyya to embark on a field survey in eastern India where, in 1957, he discovered several codices of palm-leaf manuscripts in Odisha (Bhattacharyya 1957). From these new manuscripts, D.M. Bhattacharyya and his son Dipak compiled the first print editions of the PS, whose 20 *kāṇḍas* were released in six volumes from 1964 to 2017.⁴ In the absence of any *padapāṭha* or commentary, these volumes endeavoured to resolve the palm leaves’ *scriptio continua* into separate words, and to restore the text on the basis of both the Kashmirian testimony and the Odishan manuscripts.

Still more manuscripts were located later: on successive field trips between 1983 and 2002, Michael Witzel and Arlo Griffiths acquired a series of additional manuscripts from Odisha (Witzel 1985; Witzel & Griffiths 2002; Griffiths 2003). It is on the basis of these manuscripts, as well as Bhattacharya’s editions (1997, 2008, 2011), that several *kāṇḍas* of the PS have since been critically edited with translation and commentary.⁵

The current manuscript cache and the published editions have allowed us to refine and expand on the valuable observations recorded before such testimony was available, such as those that address the relation of the Vedic *śākhās* and their texts. Even before the facsimile edition of the “Kashmirian Atharvaveda” appeared, for example, Bloomfield had this to say of the two AV recensions: “The variations between the two texts range all the way from inconsiderable variants to complete change of sense. Perfect textual correspondence between parallel stanzas and hymns of the two *śākhās* is comparatively rare” (Bloomfield 1899: 15).

2. Textual variation in Paippalāda-Samhitā 18.1-14

Textual variation is not limited to parallels between the PS and ŚS; there is also Ṛg-Vedic (hereafter ṚV) material that appears in one or both AV recensions. This is particularly true of PS 18, which encompasses ŚS books 13 to 18, “characterized each [with the exception of book 16] by unity of subject” (Whitney & Lanman 1905: cxxviii). The present article focuses on textual variation in PS 18.1-14 (≈ŚS 14), an Atharvanic

⁴ D.M. Bhattacharyya personally edited *kāṇḍas* 1 and 2 to 4.27 (Bhattacharyya 1964: 1970). His son Dipak Bhattacharya, who had contributed the last 13 hymns to the latter volume, would complete the series with *kāṇḍas* 1 to 15 (Bhattacharya 1997), 16 (2008), 17 to 18 (2011) and 19 to 20 (2017).

⁵ Completed editions (either published or submitted as doctoral theses) include book 2 (Zehnder 1999); 5 (Lubotsky 2002); 6 and 7 (Griffiths 2009); 8 and 9 (Kim 2014); 13 and 14 (Lopez 2010); 15 (Lelli 2015); book 17 (Selva 2019); book 18 (de Joseph in prep.); and book 20, *sūktas* 1-30 (Kubisch 2012).

elaboration of RV 10.85, popularly known as the *sūryā-sūkta*. RV 10.85 consists of only 47 stanzas, while the ŚS and PS versions feature 139 stanzas each; the PS version is divided into “decads” of approximately 10 stanzas each. While the vast majority of the RV stanzas are also found in the AV, some two-thirds of the ŚS and PS stanzas are exclusively Atharvanic, and most usually common to both recensions.

The textual variations consist in, on the one hand, the presence or absence of entire lines and stanzas, and on the other hand, variation even within the common stanzas, specifically at the word, phrase or morpheme level. What factors motivated these variations? The answer could reveal how the *śākhās* optimized this composition for their specific uses, in line with their priestly functions and aspirations, and ultimately the role each wished to assume in Vedic society.

The mechanisms of textual adaptation, however, are difficult to identify: we have only internal evidence to determine the direction of an insertion, deletion or substitution. (While I use these terms loosely below – to refer to content that is present, absent or different with respect to other recensions – they do not necessarily imply any directionality.) What is clearer is that these mechanisms sometimes overlap: inserted material is often adapted to suit its new context, and occasionally even retains the imprint of its previous context. In what follows, I will take a closer look at these mechanisms of adaptation and how they manifest in the PS *sūryā-sūkta*; while I cannot provide a definitive answer to the ambitious question outlined above, I hope to lay some brickwork for its empirical foundation. Stanzas exclusive to the PS will be furnished with a critical apparatus based both on Bhattacharya’s printed edition (2011) and the testimony of the manuscripts collected after the elder Bhattacharyya’s 1957 discovery.

3. Material absent from the PS *sūryā-sūkta*

In what follows, I shall examine the stanzas in more or less sequential order. The first five stanzas of each Samhitā are identical in form, if not in sequence, but a first structural discrepancy soon follows. Of the Atharvanic recensions, only the PS lacks RV stanza 5, which corresponds to ŚS stanza 4:

ŚS 14.1.4 (≈RV 10.85.5)⁶

- 4a yát tvā soma (RV: deva) prapībanti
 4b táta ā pyāyase pūnaḥ |
 4c vāyúḥ sómasya rakṣitā
 4d sāmānām māsa ákṛtiḥ ||

“When, O Soma, they drink thee [up], then thou fillest thyself up again; Vāyu is Soma’s defender; the month is norm (*ákṛti*) of the years (*sāmā*).” (transl. Whitney 1905)

⁶ Where stanzas are labelled with their ŚS numeration, translations (and titles, where used) in the footnotes are taken from Whitney & Lanman 1905; with their RV numeration, from Jamison & Brereton 2014. PS translations are mine unless otherwise noted.

This stanza contains the *sūryā-sūkta*'s only reference to Vāyu, and establishes him as “Soma’s defender”. Elsewhere in the ṚV, Vāyu is also seen to have a special relationship with *soma*: as charioteer of Indra, he too is the *pūrvapā* (ṚV 1.135.4e, 4.46.1c, 7.92.1d, 8.1.26b) or *pūrvapīti* “first-drinker” (ṚV 1.134.1bc, 1.135.1d),⁷ the *śūcipā* “drinker of the unadulterated (*soma*)” (ṚV 7.90.2b, 7.91.4c, 7.92.1a, 10.100.2b). Such epithets, in fact, are scarcely to be found in the AV.⁸ Could this association have been unknown or irrelevant to the Paippalādins? Such “deletions” are not rare, but in this case they betray no obvious motivation.

Vāyu is not the only minor deity that the PS omits, however; two others fail to appear specifically in this recension. The next ten stanzas feature a series of identifications between immaterial entities and concrete, everyday, ones, then follow with a riddle about the third wheel of the Aśvins; this concludes what Whitney calls the “Sūryā-hymn proper”, stanzas 6 to 16 (1905, 739), after which point the content takes on a more ritualistic tone. In the second decad, we find a “substitution” that the PS shares with the ŚS: namely, stanza 2.7, which Bloomfield had already noted as “evidently [ṚV] 7.59.12 in a form adapted to the marriage-rites” – as *aryamaṇam* here stands in for *tryambakam*. He continues, “[T]he concatenation of its second hemistich with 18ab would seem to show that it was adapted to serve in the very place where it occurs in the AV” (1899: 43).

PS 18.2.7 (≈ŚS 14.1.17)

- 7a **aryamaṇam** yajāmahe
 7b **subandhuṁ pativedanam** |
 7c urvārukam ^{iva} bandhanād
 7d **ito muñcantu māmutaḥ** || (ŚS: prété muñcāmi nāmútaḥ)

“We sacrifice to Aryaman, close relative, husband-finder.
 Like a cucumber from its stem, let them free [you] from here, not from there.”

RV 7.59.12

- 12a **tryambakaṁ** yajāmahe
 12b **sugāndhim puṣṭivārdhanam** |
 12c urvārukám ^{iva} bāndhanān
 12d **mṛtyór mukṣīya māmṛtāt** ||

“We sacrifice to Tryambaka the fragrant, increaser of prosperity.
 Like a cucumber from its stem, might I be freed from death, not from deathlessness.” (transl. Jamison & Brereton 2014)

This is one of the more conspicuous examples of how the PS co-opts material for its own use, either from other traditions known to it, or from “that floating mass of mantra

⁷ The term appears in relation to Indra in ṚV 8.3.7a and 10.112.1b.

⁸ Only *pūrvapīti* occurs, but with reference to Agni (PS 6.17.9a/ṚV 1.19.9a) and Indra (ŚS 20.99.1a); and *pūrvapā* (PS 17.1.4d/ŚS 12.1.3d), in which the reciter himself prays for the status of first-drinker (perhaps so that his royal power can assume divine proportions; see Selva 2019, s.v.). Also absent is the related term *agrepā* “first-drinker”, which occurs only at ṚV 4.34.7c and 10c, both times with reference to the Ṛbhus.

materials from which all redactions flowed”, as Bloomfield puts it (1899: 49). The stanza in question is from ṚV 7.59, a composite hymn addressed to both the Maruts and Rudra, in which Tryambaka is invoked the context of the Śākamedha. The Atharvanic variant instead features Aryaman, whom we know to be the chief of the *nakṣatra* Phalgunī – mentioned elsewhere in the hymn precisely as the *nakṣatra* under which brides are led from their family home to their new husband’s house (ŚS 14.1.13/PS 18.2.2d, *phālgunīṣu vy ūhyate*, “in Phalgunīs [the bride] is married off”).

Of course, this leads one to wonder *why* exactly Tryambaka was swapped out – especially since, as we know from other texts, Rudra Tryambaka is also a husband-finder. The line *tryambakaṃ yajāmahe* is recited in the Tryambaka Homa rite, also part of the Śākamedha sacrifice, where it is specifically Tryambaka, not Aryaman, who is petitioned for a husband, and here it is Tryambaka who takes the epithets *subandhum* and *pative-danam*.⁹

The final pāda in the stanza also differs between the two AV recensions; the PS here, for example, uses the third-person plural *muñcantu* “let *them* release” as opposed to the ŚS’s first-person *muñcāmi* “I release”. This difference of subject must have had some implications for the ritual praxis, as the Kauśika-Sūtra (75.22-23) pairs this and the next stanza with ritual actions to be performed by the suitor.¹⁰ However, it is not clear from the ancillary literature what those implications could be; in the PS rendition, it is perhaps the family that is bid to release the bride.

Two related “deletions” in the PS concern another minor deity. Both AV recensions lack ṚV stanza 10.85.47; PS stanza 18.6.2, meanwhile, features a curious discrepancy from its parallel in ŚS 14.1.54.

ṚV 10.85.47 (not in AV)

- 47a sām añjantu víśve devāḥ
 47b sām āpo h̥dayāni nau |
 47c sām **mātarīśvā** sām dhātā
 47d sām u dēṣṭrī dadhātu nau ||

“Let all the gods jointly and jointly the waters anoint our two hearts.

Together Mātariśvān, together the Disposer, together the Director – let them join us two together.” (transl. Jamison & Brereton 2014)

ŚS 14.1.54 (≈PS 18.6.2)

- 54a indrāgnī dyāvāpṛthivī **mātarīśvā** (PS: **ha pūṣā**)
 54b mitrāvāruṇā bhāgo aśvinobhā |
 54c bḥhaspātir marúto bráhma sóma
 54d imām nāriṃ prajāyā vardhayantu ||

⁹ The description of this ritual in the ŚBM (2.6.2.11 ff.) clarifies the deictic expressions in this stanza, which in the AV have no overt referent: like a cucumber, the woman is snapped from her roots – *itas*, her family home – and not from there, *amutas* – namely, her husband’s house (2.6.2.14b).

¹⁰ KauśS 75.22-23: *antarupātītya “aryamaṇam ...”* (sc. ŚS 14.1.17) *iti juhoti* / “*pra tvā muñcāmi ...*” (sc. ŚS 14.1.19) *iti veṣṭam vicṛtati* “Having crossed inside, he offers a sacrifice [with the phrase] ‘[To] Aryaman ...’; [with the phrase] ‘I free you ...’, he unties the band.” Note that ŚS 14.1.17 and 19 (≈PS 18.2.7 and 6) correspond to consecutive lines in the PS, but their order is reversed. Neither occurs in the ṚV *sūryā-sūkta*.

“Let Indra-and-Agni, heaven-and-earth, Mātariśvan, Mitra-Varuṇa, Bhaga, both Aśvins, Bṛhaspati, the Maruts, the *brāhman*, Soma, increase this woman with progeny.” (transl. Whitney 1905)

Mātariśvan appears both in the finale of the ṚV *sūryā-sūkta*, stanza 47, in the company of others, as well as in stanza 54 of the ŚS, where he likewise features in a litany of *devas* invoked to bless the new bride with children. Both AV recensions lack the final stanza of the RV; moreover, of the dozen proper names in stanza 54, Mātariśvan is the only name that is not repeated in the PS, which substitutes Pūṣan here.¹¹ Gonda, who points out that Mātariśvan occurs only in ṚV books 3 and 7, remarks that “there are good reasons for thinking that some of the minor gods and divine figures belonged, not to the pantheon of all Vedic Indians, but only to that of limited groups of worshippers” (1979: 263) – a consideration that may also apply here, not to mention in the aforementioned case of Tryambaka. In the Atharvaveda, Mātariśvan, like Vāyu, is widely identified with the wind;¹² Yāska (Nir. 7.26) even “regards Mātariśvan as a designation of Vāyu” (Macdonell 1897: 72) – whom, as we have just seen, is similarly edited out of the hymn.

4. Material exclusive to the PS *sūryā-sūkta*

I will now turn to several stanzas that are exclusive to the PS *sūryā-sūkta*, and as such are unattested elsewhere in the Vedic tradition (except where quoted and discussed in the ancillary literature). As a critical edition of this material is still in preparation,¹³ I will include a critical apparatus for each of these new stanzas.¹⁴ These stanzas, however, despite their uniqueness, typically use repurposed mantra material to add to the Atharvanic objectives of the hymn – or, in the opposite direction, furnish a source of textual material that has been reworked for other uses.

¹¹ Mātariśvan does appear elsewhere in the PS, where he is explicitly named 27 times; he is absent from books 2, 6, 8, 10, 11 and 12.

¹² Cf. ŚS 10.9.26c, *yām vā vāto mātariśvā pāvamāno mamātha* “What the wind, Mātariśvan, blowing (*pū*), shook (*math*)” (≈PS 16.138.7c).

¹³ A critical edition of PS book 18 forms the basis of my Leiden University Ph.D. dissertation (de Joseph in prep.).

¹⁴ In the critically edited text, “+” indicates an emendation based on manuscript testimony: the emendation reconstructs the supposed text of the written archetype G. Metrically restored vowels are subscripted, metrically deleted vowels superscripted. Vedic *b/v*, both rendered 𑄚 *b* in Odia script, are differentiated on the basis on external testimony. Other peculiarities of Odia script (*ỵ* for *y*, *rcc* for *rc*, *rṃṃ* for *rṃ*) are implicitly normalized but included in the apparatus; *m̄* in pausa is normalized to *m*. (When these normalizations must be inferred from Bhattacharya’s (2011) apparatus, the manuscript sigla are enclosed in square brackets.)

The apparatus records the testimony of the Kashmirian manuscript (K), based on the facsimile of Bloomfield & Garbe 1901, as well as two sets of Odishan manuscripts: three collated in Bhattacharya’s apparatus, namely Ja₃, Ma₄ and Mā₂; and another five I have personally collated from TIFF files kindly provided by Arlo Griffiths, namely Ji₁, Ji₄, JM, V71 and V122. Details on the former manuscripts can be found in Bhattacharya 2011; on the latter, in Griffiths 2003. “Σ” indicates that the testimony of all manuscripts except the one specified is unanimous. Diamond brackets enclose references to lost syllables (by pāda letter and superscripted syllable number). Parentheses enclose corrections; curly brackets enclose deleted content (but note that not all corrected material is explicitly deleted).

PS 18.6.1 (non-metrical)

1a grhās tvā proruṇvantu varcasā bhagena jyotiṣmad idaṁ prati muñcasva vapuḥ |
1b uṣā iva sūryasya saṁdṛśi ||

“Let the homestead envelop you with splendour, with fortune. Assume this radiant beauty, like dawn at the appearance of the sun.”

1a grhās tvā] ∑ dhruḥṣtvā **K** •proruṇvantu] **K** pauruṇvantu **Mā**₂ proruṇvantu **Ja**₃ **Ji**₁ **V**₇₁ proruṇvadu (→va)ntu **Ji**₄ proruṇvantu **V**₁₂₂ •varcasā] **K** varcasā **Ji**₁ **Ji**₄ **JM** **V**₇₁ **V**₁₂₂ [**Ja**₃ **Ma**₄ **Mā**₂] •bhagena] ∑ bhagenā **V**₁₂₂ •jyotiṣmad idaṁ] **Ja**₃ **Ji**₁ **Ji**₄ **JM** **Ma**₄ **V**₇₁ **V**₁₂₂ jyotiṣmatīdaṁ **K** jyotiṣmad idaṁ **Mā**₂ •muñcasva] ∑ muñca prasū **K1b** uṣā iva] ∑ uṣāya va **K** •sūryasya] ∑ sūryasa **Mā**₂ •saṁdṛśi] ∑ saṁdṛśi **K**

This stanza, found amid a series of benedictions to the newlyweds, combines lines and phrases that we find elsewhere in the ṚV/AV, sometimes in radically different contexts. The phrase *prati muñcasva vapuḥ*, for example, echoes the end of PS 12.5.5a, *ut tanuṣva dhanuḥ prati muñcasva varma* (“Draw the bow, put on the armour”), which occurs in a martial context rather than a marital one, namely to bestow *vīryā* on a newborn son. The terms *varcas* and *bhaga* form a well-attested pair, not in the ṚV (where it is lacking) but chiefly in PS-only material: PS 6.19.1a, 8.20.5d, 10.6.5d, PS 17.1.5d (≈ŚS 12.1.5d), 19.38.17d, 19.41.14e, 19.43.7d. 20.26.1ad; ŚS-only 1.14.1a, 6.129.2b. The line-final collocation *sūryasya saṁdṛśi* is found in five unique lines: two in the ṚV, another two in the AV, and one line common to both traditions;¹⁵ the contexts are varied, from the ṚV’s praise hymns to Rudra, Sūrya and Asunīti to the more acutely purposive Atharvanic hymns.

Just a few stanzas later, we find this PS-only Anuṣṭubh:

PS 18.6.9

9a enājyena haviṣā – – – – – × (8)
9b prajāyai ca vareṇyam | – – – – – × (8)
9c paśubhyaś ca kaṣuṣe ca kaṁ – – – – – × (8)
9d sam agniṁ sam idhīmahi || – – – – – × (8)

“With this oblation of ghee, for the sake of offspring,
Of cattle and of eyesight, we wish to kindle Agni, the chosen [one].”

9 <a¹-b¹> **V**₁₂₂ **9a** enājyena] ∑ yenājyena **K** • haviṣā] ∑ haviṣa **K**
9b prajāyai] prajāyai **Ji**₁ **Ji**₄ **V**₇₁ **V**₁₂₂ [**Ja**₃ **Ma**₄ **Mā**₂] prajāyai {tesamu} **JM**

¹⁵ ṚV 2.33.1b (to Rudra), *mā naḥ sūryasya saṁdṛśo yuyothāh* “Do not keep us away from the sight of the sun” (≈PS 7.3.10b); 10.37.6c (to Sūrya), *mā śūne bhūma sūryasya saṁdṛśi* “Let us not be in want of the sight of the Sun”; 10.59.5c (to Asunīti), *rārandhī naḥ sūryasya saṁdṛśi* “Find pleasure in our seeing the sun”.

PS 1.70.2b, *nāsyauṣadhīṣv apy asti nāpsv antar / nāsyā sūryaṁ saṁdṛśam eti caḥṣuḥ* “His vision does not penetrate to the plants, nor to the waters, nor is it going to look at the sun” (transl. Thomas Zehnder, personal communication); ŚS 8.1.4cd (“For someone’s continued life”), *mā chitthā asmāl lokād agnēḥ sūryasya saṁdṛśah* “Be not severed from this world, from the sight of fire, of the sun” (≈PS 16.1.4cd).

Note that, line-finally, the phrase is consistently read *sūryasya saṁdṛśah*; this would render PS 18.6.1b an Anuṣṭubh verse in isolation, but “pāda” a appears to be non-metrical.

• vareṇyam] vareṇyam **Ji₁ Ji₄ JM V₇₁ V₁₂₂ [Ja₃ Ma₄ Mā₂] • paśubhyaś] ∑ paśubhyaḥ **JM 9d**
 sam agniṁ] **Ja₃ Ji₄ JM Ma₄ Mā₂ V₇₁ V₁₂₂** sam agnyam **K** sam agniṁ sam agniṁ **Ji₁** • sam
 idhīmahi] **K Ji₁ Ji₄ JM V₇₁** sam idhīmahi **V₁₂₂** sam idhāmahi **Ja₃** sami(→ma)dhīmahi **Ma₄** adhīma-
 hi **Mā₂****

This stanza, by contrast, features some more aberrant variations, despite its very typical subject matter of benedictions related to household and family and its references to standard ritual acts. The phrase *ājyena haviṣā*, for example, is rare; the stock phrase (that is, the double-case apposition) is *haviṣā gṛ̥tēna* in early Vedic. The variation *ājyena haviṣā* appears only once elsewhere in the PS (9.25.7a, *ājyam ... haviḥ*), and once in the ŚS (9.5.38a, *ājyam havir*).¹⁶

While the word order would perhaps lead us to expect a dative *vareṇāya* “for the selection of a bride”, the accusative *vareṇyam* (9b) is rather an epithet of *agniṁ* (9d). Agni frequently appears as the object of the root √vr̥ (most pointedly in ṚV 5.11.4d: *agniṁ vr̥ṇānā vr̥ṇate kavikratum*, “Choosing Agni, they choose him who possesses a poet’s purpose”); however, the particular epithet *vareṇya* is applied to him only twice elsewhere¹⁷ in the RV/AV.

Other features of the stanza are also out of the ordinary. While *prajā* and *paśu* are typical objects of prayer, *cākṣus* is a more seldom occurring request; moreover, entreaties that involve *cākṣus* seem to assume different interpretations of what the term actually implies.¹⁸ The sense here could perhaps be similar to that in PS 3.23, a hymn for political unity that invokes harmony on various levels, such as in 6cd: *saṁ vo jāyānām manasā manāmsi / saṁ patīnām uta cakṣuḥ srjāmi*, “I unite the spirits of your wives with your spirit, and I unite the eye of the spouses.”¹⁹ In the domestic context of PS 18.6.9, it could likewise refer to familial harmony.

The last of the three complete PS-only stanzas occurs in the next *anuvāka*, 7:

PS 18.7.7

7a apa rakṣāmsy apa durmatir̥ḥ hataṁ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ || ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ × (11)
 7b śubhaspatī vahator yāto asmāt | ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ || ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ × (11)

¹⁶ In later Vedic, chiefly in the Taittirīya corpus, the same instrumental form is also found at VSM 2.9 and ŚBM 1.4.5.4; the locative *ājye haviṣi* at ŚGS 1.9.13; and the non-oblique forms *havir ājyam* (AVPariś 31.1.5), *ājyam haviḥ* (VaikhGS 1.6.1, VaikhŚS 4.5:44.13-15, VārGS 1.14; BaudhGS 3.12.2: *pr̥ṣadājyam haviḥ*) and *ājyāni haviṁṣī* (BhārŚS 8.18.4, 5, 19; HirŚS 5.4.38, 50, 93). Other later texts feature variations on the phrase *haviṣa ājyasya* (ĀpŚS, ĀśŚS, ṚVKh., KB, TB, BhārŚS, MS, ŚŚS) as well as the compound *ājyahavis* (ĀpŚ, ŚBM).

¹⁷ ṚV 8.102.18, *prācetasam tuvā kave / āgne dūtām vareṇiyam / havyavāham ni śedire* “You, o sage Agni, a discerning messenger worthy to be chosen, have they installed as conveyor of the oblation.” (Cf. also ṚV 1.12.1a = ŚS 20.101.1a, *agniṁ dūtām vr̥ṇīmahe* “Agni we choose as messenger.”) ŚS 7.53.6cd, *āyur no viśvāto dadhad / ayām agnir̥ vareṇiyah* “Let Agni here, desirable one, assign us life-time from all sides.”

¹⁸ It is not even necessarily positive; cf. RV 10.87.8d, *n̥cākṣasaś cākṣuḥ randhayainam* “Make him subject to the eye of the one with his eye on men”; PS 15.4.1cd (≈ŚS 2.7.5cd) *cakṣurmantrasya durhārdaḥ / pr̥ṣṭir̥ api śr̥ṇāñjana* “O ointment, crush the ribs of the evil-hearted one, whose formula [is] his glance” (transl. Lelli 2015); PS 20.22.2a, *sūryo mā cakṣuṣaḥ pātu* “Let the Sun protect me from the (malignant) glance” (transl. ibid.). See Lelli 2015: 86-87 for further discussion on *cakṣus*.

¹⁹ I thank Carmen Spiers for details on this hymn.

d: “so that you, being fertile, attain old age.” (transl. mine)

7 <c¹-d¹¹> V₇₁ 7a sumañgali] ∑ sumañgalya JM • prataranī] ∑ prataranañī Ja₃ 7b śvaśurāya] K śvaśurāya Ji₁ Ji₄ [Ma₄ Mā₂] śvasurāya JM V₇₁ V₁₂₂ svaśurāya Ja₃ • sambhūh] Ji₄ Mā₂ V₇₁ V₁₂₂ sambhum K sambhūh Ja₃ Ji₁ JM Ma₄ 7c śvaśruvai] Mā₂ V₇₁ V₁₂₂ svaśruṣī K śvaśruvaiḥ Ja₃ Ji₁ Ji₄ JM Ma₄ • pra] ∑ om. JM 7d prajāvatī] ∑ prajāpatī Mā₂ • jaradaṣṭir] ∑ jaradaṣṭi JM • yathāsaḥ] Ja₃ Ji₁ Ji₄ JM Ma₄ V₇₁ yathāsat K yathāsaḥ V₁₂₂ yayāsahaḥ Mā₂

This pāda is not only found identically in the PS (4.10.4d), but also earlier in the *sūryā-sūkta* itself, albeit with a phrasal substitution: *mayā patyā*, “with me as husband”, instead of *prajāvatī* (RV 10.85.36a/PS 18.5.6b/ŚS 14.1.50a). It also occurs once elsewhere in the PS, at 1.83.1d, where the first constituent is the neutral *āyusmān* instead of a more unequivocally domestic word or phrase.

Thus we see that, while the majority of its content is shared with the RV and especially with the ŚS, the PS *sūryā-sūkta* nevertheless contains a number of textual variations worthy of extended consideration. The omission of elements – not to mention the omission of *related* elements – found in the RV and ŚS traditions could speak to differences in the PS tradition; however, it is difficult if not impossible at this point to ascertain precisely what motivated these omissions – did they represent elements of tradition unknown to the Paippalādins? Were they rejected? Or was it just an accident of textual history? Of course, we could ask much the same about omissions of PS-only stanzas in the ŚS – and perhaps even of Atharvanic material in the RV. The positive evidence of insertions and substitutions, on the other hand, reveals how the texts were adapted, in one direction or another, to the specific needs of different reciters; the PS contains elsewhere-unattested material that is nonetheless still patently Atharvanic in nature, and makes use of collocations and set phrases that we encounter elsewhere in the Vedic corpus. How this “new” material – as well as the relative order of the stanzas in each recension, which is not addressed here – interacted with ritual praxis as we know it is an open question, one that entails further, exhaustive comparisons with the ancillary literature, not to mention a definitive critical edition of the complete PS.

Abbreviations

ĀpŚS – Āpastamba-Śrauta-Sūtra; ĀśŚS – Āśvalāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra; AV – Atharvaveda (both recensions); AVPariś – Atharvaveda-Pariśiṣṭas; BaudhGS – Baudhāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra; BhārŚS – Bhāradvāja-Śrauta-Sūtra; HirŚS – Hiranyakeśi-Śrauta-Sūtra; KB – Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa; MS – Maitrāyaṇī-Samhitā; Nir. – Nirukta; PS – Paippalāda-Samhitā; RV – R̥gveda; RVK̄h – R̥gveda-Khilāni; ŚBM – Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (Mādhyamīna rec.); ŚGS – Śāṅkhāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra; ŚSS – Śāṅkhāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra; ŚS – Atharvaveda-Śaunaka; TB – Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa; VaikhGS – Vaikhānasa-Gṛhya-Sūtra; VaikhŚS – Vaikhānasa-Śrauta-Sūtra; VārGS – Vārāha-Gṛhya-Sūtra; VSM – Vājasaneyi-Samhitā (Mādhyamīna rec.).

References

- Barret, Leroy Carr. 1905-1940. The Kashmirian Atharva Veda. 1905. Book one. *Journal of the American Oriental Society (JAOS)* 26. 197-295; 1910. Book two. *JAOS* 30. 187-258; 1912. Book three. *JAOS* 32. 343-390; 1915. Book four. *JAOS* 35. 42-101; 1917. Book five, *JAOS* 37. 257-308; 1920. Book seven, *JAOS* 40. 145-169; 1921. Book eight. *JAOS* 41. 264-289; 1922. Book nine. *JAOS* 42. 105-146; 1923. Book ten. *JAOS* 43. 96-115; 1924. Book eleven. *JAOS* 44. 258-269; 1926. Book twelve. *JAOS* 46. 34-48; 1927. Book fourteen. *JAOS* 47. 238-249; 1928. Book thirteen, *JAOS* 48. 36-65; 1930. Book fifteen. *JAOS* 50. 43-73; 1936. Books sixteen and seventeen. New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society. 1938. Book eighteen. *JAOS* 58.571-614. 1940. Books nineteen and twenty. New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society.
- Bhattacharya, Dipak. 1997; 2008; 2011; 2016. *The Paippalāda-Samhitā of the Atharvaveda*. Vols. 1-4. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society.
- Bhattacharyya, Durgamohan. 1957. A palm-leaf manuscript of the Paippalādasamhitā: Announcement of a rare find. *Our Heritage* 5. 81-86.
- Bhattacharyya, Durgamohan. 1964; 1970. *Paippalāda Samhitā of the Atharvaveda*. Vol. 1; Vol. 2. Calcutta: Sanskrit College.
- Bloomfield, Maurice. 1899. *The Atharvaveda*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Bloomfield, Maurice & Garbe, Richard. 1901. *The Kashmirian Atharva-Veda (School of the Pāippalādas)*. Reproduced by chromatography from the manuscript in the University Library at Tübingen, Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins.
- Bolling, George Melville & Negelein, Julius von. 1910. *The pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda*. Vol. I, part II. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1914. The Kashmirian Atharva Veda. *JAOS* 34. 374-411.
- Joseph, Kristen de. (In prep.). Atharvaveda-Paippalāda: Kāṇḍa 18. Ph.D. thesis, Leiden University.
- Gonda, Jan. 1979. Differences in the rituals of the Ṛgvedic families. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 42. 257-264.
- Griffiths, Arlo. 2009. *The Paippalāda Samhitā of the Atharvaveda. Kāṇḍas 6 and 7. A New Edition with translation and commentary*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. & Brereton, Joel P. 2014. *The R̥gveda: The earliest religious poetry of India*. 3 Vols. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kielhorn, Franz. 1880. *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali*. Vol. 1. Bombay: Government Central Book Depot.
- Kim, Jeong-Soo. 2014. *Die Paippaladasamhita des Atharvaveda, Kanda 8 und 9. Eine neue Edition mit Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Dettelbach: J.H. Röhl.
- Kubisch, Philipp. 2012. *Paippalāda-Samhitā Kāṇḍa 20, Sūkta 1-30. Kritische Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Ph.D. diss.: University of Bonn.
- Lelli, Duccio. 2015. *The Paippalādasamhitā of the Atharvaveda kāṇḍa 15: A new edition with translation and commentary*. Ph.D. diss., Leiden University.
- Lopez, Carlos Alfredo. 2010. *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda: Kāṇḍas thirteen and fourteen. Text, translation, commentary*. Columbia, Miss.: South Asian Books.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 2002. *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, kāṇḍa five: Text, translation, commentary*. Columbia, Miss.: South Asian Books.
- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony. 1897. *Vedic Mythology*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Roth, Rudolph & Whitney, William Dwight. 1856. *Atharva Veda Sanhita*. Berlin: Dümmler.
- Selva, Umberto. 2019. *The Paippalādasamhitā of the Atharvaveda: A new critical edition of the three 'new' anuvākas of kāṇḍa 17 with English translation and commentary*, Ph.D. diss., Leiden University.
- Whitney, William Dwight & Lanman, Charles Rockwell. 1905. *Atharva-Veda-Samhitā*. 2 Vols., Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University.

- Witzel, Michael. 1985. Die Atharvaveda-tradition und die Paippalāda-Samhitā. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft-Supplement* 6. 256-271.
- Witzel, Michael & Griffiths, Arlo. 2002. A list of Paippalāda-AtharvaVedin settlements. In Ghosh, Abhijit (ed.). *Ātharvaṇā: A collection of essays on the Atharva Veda with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition*, 167-179. Kolkata: Sanskrit Book Depot.
- Zehnder, Thomas. 1999. *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Buch 2: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Idstein: Schulz-Kirchner.