

The bulk of this volume consists of eight papers presented at the panel 'Studien zur Paippalāda Śākhā des Atharvaveda' (Studies on the Paippalāda branch of the Atharvaveda) and organized by the first of the two co-editors, Arlo Griffiths, at the 29. Deutscher Orientalistentag held in September 2004 in Halle. It is supplemented by two contributions that were not part of the panel (by Kei Kataoka and Alexis Sanderson). The contributions cover a wide variety of issues in the research of the Paippalāda recension of the *Atharvavedasamhitā* (hereafter abbreviated as PS), the second most ancient text of the Vedic tradition, dated to the beginning of the 1st millennium BC.

The volume opens with short 'Prefatory remarks' by Arlo Griffiths, introducing the scope of the book and summarizing the content of the papers.

The contribution by Philipp Kubisch, 'The metrical and prosodical structures of Books I–VII of the Vulgate Atharvavedasamhitā', is a pioneer study of the Atharvavedic metres. While the standard Vedic metres, as attested foremost in the *Ṛgveda* (RV), were well-described more than 100 years ago in the seminal works of Hermann Oldenberg, Edward Arnold, and other Vedic scholars, little attention was paid to the metrical patterns found in the *Atharvaveda*. The numerous deviations from the *Ṛgvedic* meters, typically qualified as mere irregularities, may in fact represent peculiar metrical schemes. Thus, the author notices heptasyllabic verses with trisyllabic (catalectic) cadence alongside the regular octosyllabic demeters such as gāyatrī and anuṣṭubh, hybrid triṣṭubh-jagatī (T/J) pādas (= 'Triṣṭubh-pādas [that] can be scanned as Jagatī-pādas by means of restoring a syllable in the last place but one' [p. 9f.]). Kubisch offers a highly sophisticated and complex apparatus of several dozens of meters, which can serve as a useful tool in the metrical analysis of the *Atharvaveda*.

Alexander Lubotsky ('PS 8.15. Offense against a Brahmin') offers an exemplary critical edition, accompanied with a philological and grammatical analysis and translation of the Paippalāda hymn 8.15. The hymn is dedicated to quite a rare topic, abusing a Brahmin. On the basis of the fact that the hymn is two stanzas longer than most hymns of book 8, the author arrives at the plausible conclusion about the

secondary character of two stanzas (2 and 6)—probably later additions. He offers solutions for many textual difficulties, greatly contributing to our understanding of this hymn and leaving virtually no obscure passage without clarification.¹

Werner Knobl, in his excellent lexicographic study of two hitherto unknown Vedic words ('Zwei Studien zum Wortschatz der Paippalāda-Saṃhitā'), offers convincing solutions for a number of obscure PS passages. He explains the word †*jatravya-* (at PS 7.15.7b, edited in editio princeps as *maṇayo yakṣmād †datkravyāt†*) as '[yakṣma-disease] of collarbone' and *abhīlī-* (attested in PS-Orissa 20.62–20.63, based on the compound verb *abhī-lī* 'adhere, cling'—i.e., literally, 'adhering') as the term for a peculiar skin disease affecting primarily the face.² On his way to the final solutions, the author leaves virtually no relevant topic untouched, finding convincing arguments for his interpretations on both grammatical and philological grounds. His short excursuses represent exhaustive elaborations of several relevant issues, being, in fact, mini-papers on (1) the meaning and uses of the word *maṇi-* 'jewel; necklace' (p. 43); (2) nominal formations in *-avyā-* (derived with the suffix *-yā-* from *-u-*stems) (p. 45–7); and (3) the meaning of the medical term *jatrū-* 'collarbone' (p. 47–53).

Yasuhiro Tsuchiyama's paper, 'On the meaning of the word *rāṣṭrā:* PS 10.4.71', is an interesting study about the status and content of the notion of kingdom, or royal power (*rāṣṭrā-*), in the times of the Atharvaveda and about the ancient Indian social history, in general. In connection with this topic, Tsuchiyama takes a closer look at the Paippalāda hymn 10.4, as well as some other passages from book 10,³

¹ The only reading of the mss. which remains an enigma is †*anveti†* at PS 8.15.10 *sa dīrgham āyus kṛṇute † sa prajāyai cikitsati | yo brāhmaṇasya brāhmaṇo † hūto †anveti† kilbiṣe*. According to Lubotsky, it requires a heavy emendation to **vadati* (attested in a similar construction in pāda 11d), and the verse is translated by the author as 'He makes his own life long, he takes care for his progeny, who, being a Brahmin, speaks (?) at the offense against a Brahmin, when called upon [to do so]' (p. 30). Although Lubotsky's explanation of *anveti* (attested in most Orissa manuscripts of the Paippalāda) as 'due to perseverance from passages like PS 9.24.6cd *amaiva puṇyam astu no atṛn* (lege: *atṛin*) *anv eti* (or: *etu*) *kilbiṣam* "let it be propitious for us at home, the offense goes / may go to the Devourers (name of the demons)', PS 20.23.9d *yusmān anv etu kilbiṣam* 'let the offense go to you'" (ibid.) is quite plausible, one might suppose an alternative solution for this form: *hūto* **niveti kilbiṣe*; cf. the variant reading *anyeti* attested in one of the manuscripts (Mā). The verb *nī-vī* 'force a way into, rush (at/against)' is attested with the locative in the Ṛgveda, e.g., in RV 3.55.9a *nī veveti palitō dūtā āsu* 'the grey messenger (impetuously) approaches these [wives]'. The occurrence in question might have preserved a somewhat different (more archaic?) meaning of this root, 'chase, hunt, drive (away)' or the like—attested also for some of its cognates (Avestan *vaiie'ti*, Lith. *výti*); see, in particular, Schaefer 1994, 190. The meaning of the last pāda could then be rendered as '... [who] rushes against the offense, when called upon [to do so]' or the like.

² The conjecture **śīyatām* in PS (Orissa) 20.62.9cd *evā me aśvinā mukhād † abhīly apa *śīyatām* 'so may the *abhīlī*-disease fall away from my face, O Aśvins' is perhaps unnecessary, since the Atharvaveda consistently has *s* for *ś* in this present. The change *ś* → *s* (or confusion *ś/s*) is very common in the AV in the context before *i/y*; see, for instance, Kulikov 2009, 142, with ft. 3.

³ Tsuchiyama's translation of PS 10.2.6ab *tubhyaṃ saṃ yantu balkayas † tubhyaṃ śulkaḥ pra*

which, according to Witzel (1997), is a ‘thematically compact collection of royal hymns’.

Whilst the first four papers mostly concentrate on linguistic and philological analysis of the *Paippalādasamhitā* proper, the next three contributions bring to scholarly attention some younger texts belonging to the Paippalāda tradition. Timothy Lubin (‘The Nīlarudropaniṣad and the Paippalādasamhitā: a critical edition with translation of the Upaniṣad and Nārāyaṇa’s Dīpikā’) offers a study of the *Nīlarudropaniṣad*, which is dedicated to Rudra. This text is tentatively dated by the author to AD 800, and its origins are located in western India. Lubin draws special attention to the importance of the manuscripts of the *Nīlarudropaniṣad* for the study of the PS, since they quote a number of Paippalāda verses and may be relevant for better understanding of the corresponding passages. The edition of the text, accompanied with a translation and meticulous text-critical analysis, is followed by the edition and translation of the indigenous commentary, Nārāyaṇa’s *Dīpikā*.

In his paper ‘The ancillary literature of the Paippalāda school: a preliminary survey with an edition of the *Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad*’, Arlo Griffiths offers a useful overview of the texts belonging to the Atharvavedic tradition (and still available in Orissa, the only remaining locus of this Vedic śākhā), accompanied with an edition of another Atharvavedic (Paippalāda) Upaniṣad, *Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad*, the main purpose of which ‘seems to give an overview of the Atharvavedic canon’ (p. 179).

Alexis Sanderson’s paper (‘Atharvavedins in Tantric territory: the Āṅgirasakalpa texts of the Oriya Paippalādins and their connection with the Trika and the Kālīkula. With critical editions of the *Parāṅjapavidhi*, the *Parāmantravidhi*, and the **Bhadraḥ ālīmantravidhiprakaraṇa*’), which is the most voluminous contribution to the book (nearly 120 pages), deals with an even less known class of texts associated with the Atharvavedic tradition, tantras (attributed to Āṅgirasakalpa). After a short introduction to the Āṅgirasakalpa rituals, the list of available manuscripts, and a survey of the corpus of texts, Sanderson offers critical editions and translations of three tantric texts (or text fragments) dedicated to the goddess Parā. These texts belong to two tantric traditions, the Śākta Śaiva systems of the Trika and the Kālīkula, both associated with Kashmir.

The following two papers are dedicated to the Atharvavedic tradition in Kashmir. Kei Kataoka (‘Was Bhaṭṭa Jayanta a Paippalādin?’) argues that the 9th

vīyatām ‘Let the tributes come together to you. Let the toll go forth to you’ (p. 73) should be corrected, since the form *pra vīyatām* is impossible in the context. It cannot be a passive of *vī* ‘pursue, strive after, approach’ (*vīyá-*^{1e} ‘being striven after’ is only attested as simplex and does not have the non-passive meaning ‘go forth’). A passive of *prá-vyā* (*-vī*) ‘cover, impregnate’ (see Kulikov 2001, 192ff.) does not fit the context either. Most likely, we should read in pāda b *tubhyaṃ śūlkah pra* **dīyatām* ‘let the toll be given to you’.

century Kashmirian scholar Bhaṭṭa Jayanta was an Atharvavedin of the Paippalāda tradition. Walter Slaje, in his paper 'Three Bhaṭṭas, two Sultāns, and the Kashmirian Atharvaveda', concentrates on the social and political context which could surround the emergence of the famous Tūbingen (Kashmirian) Paippalāda manuscript, the Codex 'archetypus' which is tentatively dated to the year AD 1419 (Slaje adds an extensive postscript, providing additional evidence for this date). On the basis of a variety of data, ranking from the political history of the region to palaeographic evidence from the Kashmirian manuscript, the author arrives at the convincing conclusion that the Paippalāda tradition (which existed in Kashmir from the 7th century AD on) was re-imported to Kashmir from 'Karnataka' but had no chance to survive.

Annette Schmiedchen ('Epigraphical evidence of the history of Atharvavedic Brahmins') bring to scholarly attention some new epigraphic records which are relevant for the history of the Atharvavedic tradition in India and point to Gujarat, northern Bengal, and Orissa as mediaeval centres of this śākhā.

The book concludes with an index.

The volume under review offers a good representation of current studies on the Paippalāda recension of the Atharvaveda—nowadays, when large parts of the Paippalādasamhitā have become or are becoming available to Vedic scholars, one of the most vivid branches of classical Indology. It should be of great interest both for Vedic scholars and for all Indologists concentrating on the study of both ancient and mediaeval India and the traces of the Vedic traditions in modern South Asia.

References

- Kulikov, Leonid. *The Vedic -ya-presents*, Ph.D. thesis, Leiden University, 2001.
- . 'Vedic piśá- and Atharvaveda-Śaunakīya 19.49.4 = Atharvaveda-Paippalāda 14.8.4: A note on the Indo-Iranian bestiary', *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 37, 1–2 (2009): 141–54.
- Schaefer, Christiane. *Das Intensivum im Vedischen*, Historische Sprachforschung; Ergänzungsheft 37, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1994.
- Witzel, Michael. 'The Development of the Vedic canon and its schools: the social and political milieu (Materials on Vedic śākhās 8)', in *Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts. New Approaches to the Study of the Vedas*, ed. Michael Witzel, Harvard Oriental Series. Opera Minora 2, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997, 257–345.

Leonid KULIKOV, Leiden University