

Bulletin of the  
School of  
Oriental  
& African  
Studies

# An Atharvanic hymn to night: text-critical and linguistic remarks on the interpretation of Śaunakīya 19.50 = Paippalāda 14.9\*

Leonid Kulikov

Ghent University

[Leonid.Kulikov@UGent.be](mailto:Leonid.Kulikov@UGent.be)

## Abstract

This paper offers an analysis and a new translation of an Atharvanic hymn addressed to the goddess of Night, Rātrī, attested in both recensions of the Atharvaveda (AV), in the Śaunakīya, and in the Paippalāda. The translation is accompanied by a philological and text-critical commentary as well as an analysis of some linguistic features of the Vedic language of this period, such as the use of emphatic reflexive pronouns and the periphrastic progressive tense (usually disregarded in standard Vedic grammars).

**Keywords:** Atharvaveda, Vedic, hymn, emphatic reflexive, progressive tense

## Introduction

The Atharvaveda (AV) is undoubtedly one of the most fascinating Vedic texts. On the one hand, it belongs to the oldest layers of the Vedic heritage, being, in its oldest parts, essentially contemporaneous with the younger parts of the earliest Vedic text, the Ṛgveda (RV). Furthermore, this collection of hymns and spells contains extremely archaic fragments of common Indo-Iranian and Indo-European magic and ritual knowledge as well as the earliest specimens of Old Indian philosophical and cosmogonic thought (see, for instance, Bloomfield 1899, which to this day remains a useful survey of the field). On the other hand, since it was canonized much later than the RV and even some younger Vedic texts of the Yajurveda school, the AV reveals numerous traces of relatively recent editorial work. This also explains its lesser degree of preservation as compared with the RV and some other Vedic texts. Accordingly, the study of the textual history of the AV remains one of the most vital issues of Vedic philology. In particular, the relationship between the two recensions of the AV, Śaunakīya and Paippalāda, is one of the most challenging topics for a Vedicist. The Śaunakīya, which is much better studied and has many translations, represents a more recent development within the Atharvavedic tradition, while ample evidence from the more authentic Paippalāda (which is therefore

\* I would like to thank the participants of the Leiden Seminar on Paippalāda – Alexander Lubotsky, Arlo Griffiths, Marianne Oort and Kristen De Joseph – for important remarks, criticisms and comments on my translation of the Atharvavedic hymns. I am also grateful to Werner Knobl for many valuable suggestions and remarks on earlier drafts of this paper.

presumably closer to the hypothetical Atharvavedic archetype), originally only scarcely known from the Kashmir manuscript, has only recently become available to Indologists, thanks to the discovery of the much better-preserved Orissa manuscript tradition (see, in particular, Witzel 1985; for a general survey of research in the field, see also introductory chapters in Zehnder 1999 and Griffiths 2009).

Furthermore, although it is contemporaneous with the late Ṛgveda, the AV was probably not quite identical to the RV as regards its linguistic and dialectal basis: it exhibits several linguistic features quite different from both the language of the RV and the varieties attested in younger (middle Vedic) texts of the Yajurveda.

In this regard, book 19 of the Śaunakīya recension is of particular interest. This part of the Śaunakīya is borrowed almost entirely from the Paippalāda and, in many cases, helps us to trace editorial changes applied to the original Atharvavedic text. It also contains several important hymns testifying to new trends in the Vedic pantheon and religious system at the end of the early Vedic period.

This is also the case for a group of four hymns (AVŚ 19.49–52) dedicated to the goddess of night, Rātrī (only once becoming the object of devotion in the Ṛgveda, in RV 10.127).

The present paper offers an analysis of an Atharvanic hymn addressed to the goddess of night, Rātrī. The hymn is found in both recensions of the AV, in the Śaunakīya (AVŚ 19.50), and in the Paippalāda (AVP 14.9). In the Śaunakīya-Saṃhitā it concludes the group of the four Atharvavedic hymns (AVŚ 19.47–50) dedicated to Rātrī.<sup>1</sup> According to AV-Pariśiṣṭa 4.3–5, hymns 47–8 and 49–50 are thematically grouped into two “sense hymns” (*arthasūkta*; see Griffiths 2003: 5 f. and, most recently Rotaru (forthcoming)), applied in the ritual of worshipping night. The metre is anuṣṭubh: that is, stanzas normally consist of four octosyllabic verses or pādas (the number of syllables is indicated in brackets after each pāda).

In what follows I offer a new translation of the hymn on the basis of textual evidence available from both recensions, accompanied by a philological and linguistic commentary. In spite of its relatively short length (seven stanzas), this hymn offers valuable evidence for a study of the peculiarities of the language of the Atharvaveda, which exhibits both archaisms typical of the early Vedic period and some innovations peculiar to the end of this period and marking a transition to the later, Middle Vedic, stage of Old Indo-Aryan.

I will use the standard edition by R. Roth and W. D. Whitney (hereafter abbreviated as RW), the edition by Viśva Bandhu (for the Śaunakīya recension) and the edition by Bhattacharya (for the Paippalāda). Instead of providing a full critical apparatus (which can be found in Pandit (ed.) and Viśva Bandhu (VB) (ed.) for the Śaunakīya recension; while for the Paippalāda recension, Bhattacharya’s edition provides the necessary references to the evidence from both the Orissa (Or.) and Kashmirian (Kashm.) manuscripts). I will only note

1 For an analysis and translation of another hymn from this group, AVŚ 19.49 = AVP 14.8, see Kulikov 2009.

the most important unclear passages and discrepancies between the two recensions.

Alongside the standard English translation by Whitney and Lanman (1905), there is also a German translation by Ludwig (1878: 465–6), an Italian translation by Sani (Orlandi and Sani 1992: 194–5), and a Russian translation by Elizarenkova (1976: 329–30, comm. on p. 396). Some verses are also translated by Insler (1970: 143–7).

### Śaunakīya 19.50 = Paippalāda 14.9: translation and commentary

AVŚ 19.50.1 = AVP 14.9.1      abd: AVŚ 19.47.8abd = AVP 6.20.9abd

<sup>+</sup>āndham rātri tṛṣṭādhūmam (<sup>+</sup>tīṣṭhad-dhūmam ?) (8)

aśīrṣānam āhiṃ kṛṇu (8)

<sup>+</sup>akṣyāu vṛkasya nīr jahy (8)

<sup>+</sup>ā <sup>+</sup>stēnam drupadé jahi (8)

O Night, make the tṛṣṭadhūma-snake (?) blind, headless [or: make the snake blind, breathless (?), headless]! Strike out the wolf's (robber's) eyes! Strike at the thief [bound] to the post.

- a. Śaun. mss. *āmdha*, ed. VB *ādha*, Paipp. *andham*  
Śaun. mss. *tṛṣṭādhūmam*, Paipp. Or. mss. *tīṣṭhadhūmam*, Kashm. *tīṣṭadhūmam*
- c. Śaun. mss. *akṣāu*, *akṣyāu*, Paipp. *akṣau*, ed. RW <sup>+</sup>*akṣyāu*
- cd. Śaun. mss. *nīr jahyās téna tām*, Paipp. Or. *nīr jahyās tenam*
- d. Śaun. *drupadé*, Paipp. Or. mss. *dupade*, *dupade*, Kashm. *nṛpate*

ab: *tṛṣṭadhūma-snake* (?) [or: <sup>+</sup>*tīṣṭhad-dhūmam* ?] – an unclear word, attested also in AVŚ 19.47.8 = AVP 6.20.9. Śaunakīya reads *tṛṣṭādhūmam*, Paipp. has *tīṣṭhadhūmam* (*tīṣṭha dhūmam*?). All interpreters understand this word as the epithet or name of a snake (thus rendered by Ludwig and Whitney; cf. also Griffiths 2009: 221: “the *tīṣṭhadhūma* snake”). The variant of this bahuvrīhi compound preserved in the Śaunakīya recension is translated as “mit dem gift[i]gen hauch” (Kuhn 1864: 132), “von beissendem Hauch” (Zimmer 1879: 180), “von widerlichem geruche” (Ludwig), “harsh-smoked (?)” (Whitney), “of pungent/poisonous smoke” (Griffiths).

The reading attested in Paipp. mss. (*tīṣṭhadhūmam*) appears semantically more attractive: this might suggest the emendation <sup>+</sup>*tīṣṭhad-dhūmam*. Assuming the meaning ‘breath’ for the word *dhūma*- ‘smoke, vapour’ (cf. one of the glosses of the indigenous commentary *ni[ś]śvāsa-dhūma* (*viśvāsa-dhūma* ?) ‘vapour of exhalation’, which connects this epithet with the stinky breath of a snake), one might tentatively translate the compound in question as ‘(the one, whose) breath stopped’ – i.e.: <sup>+</sup>*tīṣṭhaddhūmam* ... *kṛṇu* ‘make (the snake) breathless’.

d: *thief [bound] at the post* – this translation is convincingly substantiated by Griffiths (2009: 222), instead of Whitney’s rendering ‘cast the thief into the snare’. As Griffiths explains, *drupadā*- is “not a snare into which a robber

can be cast, but a post to which or a fetter in which he can be bound [...], and then beaten”.

**AVŚ 19.50.2 = AVP 14.9.2**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| yé te rātr <sub>i</sub> y anaḍvāhas              | (8) |
| <sup>+</sup> tīkṣṇáśrngāḥ s <sub>u</sub> vāśávaḥ | (8) |
| tébhir no adyá pāraya-                           | (8) |
| -āti durgāṇi viśvāhā                             | (8) |

b. Śaun. mss. *tīkṣṇa*<sup>o</sup>

Those draft-oxen of yours, O night, which are sharp-horned, very swift – with them make us today pass over [regions which are] difficult to traverse, [and please do so] always.

cd. The juxtaposition of *adyá* ‘today’ and *viśvāhā* ‘always, every day’ is apparently nonsensical. Some translators tried to find a reasonable interpretation by separating the time of causing the event and the time of caused event from each other (cf. for instance, Whitney: “do thou today pass us always [...] over difficulties”; Sani: “facci oggi oltrepassare sempre i pericoli”), but this interpretation is hardly possible for a morphological causative (*pāraya*), which strongly implies the condition of the unity of time of the causing and caused events (see Wierzbicka 1975: 497–9).<sup>2</sup> Ludwig suggested a different (but hardly more acceptable) solution, rendering *viśvāhā* as ‘everywhere’: “mit denen sollst du uns heute retten über alle gefar und überall”. The problem can probably be solved by analysing the last request of this verse as containing a co-ordinating structure, i.e.: ‘today [and] always’ – as suggested by Elizarenkova (1976: 329): ‘... With them pass us today, Every day (pass) over dangers!’ [‘Na nix ty segodnja perevezi nas, / Každyj den’ (perevozi) čerez opasnosti’].

**AVŚ 19.50.3 = AVP 14.9.3**

|                                  |     |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| *rātrīm-*rātrīm áriṣyantas       | (8) |
| tārema tan <sub>u</sub> vā vayám | (8) |
| gambhīrām āplavā iva             | (8) |
| ná tareyur árātayaḥ              | (8) |

May *we ourselves* (*tanvā*) cross night after night unharmed, [while *our*] *enemies* may not cross [it], like floats that do not (properly) float [will not cross] a deep [water].

a: \**rātrīm*–\**rātrīm*: According to Wackernagel (1930: 185 f.) and Bloomfield and Edgerton (1934: 79 f.), after the Ṛgveda, *rātrī*– ‘night’ also occurs with the

2 Cf. Wierzbicka’s (1975: 497) explanation of this condition: “If John wounded Bill on Saturday as a result of which Bill died on Sunday, we could not say that John killed Bill on Saturday, nor that he killed him on Sunday. A sentence like “John killed Bill at the time *t*” implies that all the events involved took place simultaneously, and not successively”.

short vowel stem (*rātri-*). Note, however, that of eighteen occurrences of the accusative form in the Atharvaveda (AV), consistently transcribed in all editions as *rātrim*, in accordance with mss. readings and the Padapāṭha, the only three occurrences that appear in metrically distinctive contexts<sup>3</sup> (AVŚ 19.49.5a; 19.50.3a; and 19.55.1a) are attested in book 19. All these occur in contexts where we typically expect long syllables (all – in the fourth syllable, shown in bold type), in accordance with the triṣṭubh schemes (– – – –, – – | – – – – and – – – – –, – – | – – – –) and the two possible schemes for anuṣṭubh stanzas: – – – – | – – – – (the standard pattern prevailing in the early Ṛgveda) and – – – – | – – – – || – – – – | – – – – (the innovative pattern, which becomes common in the late Ṛgveda and Atharvaveda; see e.g. Macdonell 1916: 438 and 439, with n. 5). The relevant passages run as follows: *śivāṃ rātrim* <sup>+</sup>*ah<sub>u</sub>vi sūryaṃ ca* (AVŚ 19.49.5a); *rātrim rātrim āriṣyantas* (AVŚ 19.50.3a); and *rātrim rātrim āprayātaṃ bhāranto* (AVŚ 19.55.1a). This means that we have good reason to read *\*rātrīm* in these three occurrences (and, accordingly, in all other cases); see also Kulikov 2010: 174, n. 1.

ab: *tanvā* is the instrumental singular form of the emphatic reflexive pronoun, or intensifier, *tanū-*, employed in adnominal usage (see Kulikov 2007b: 1416 f.) (cf. Russian ‘sam’, German ‘selbst’). The emphatic reflexive usage of this lexeme often poses problems in translation, and we should recall here the main conclusions of a series of studies on reflexive constructions and the expression of reflexivity in Vedic published within the last decade (Kulikov 2000, 2007b, Pinault 2001, Hock 2006, and, most recently, with some criticisms contra the first four, Hettrich 2010). *tanū-*, alongside its original meaning (‘body’), has two grammatical functions. First, it can be used as a reflexive pronoun (although, according to Hettrich, not completely grammaticalized), i.e. for the expression of co-reference with the subject (constructions of the type “Peter cured himself” or “Peter heilte sich”: the Agent and the Patient are referentially identical). Second, *tanū-* can be employed as an emphatic reflexive, or intensifier.<sup>4</sup> One of the main functions of intensifiers is to signal that the referent “is to some degree unexpected in the discourse role or clausal role where it occurs” (Kemmer 1995: 57). This type can be illustrated by such usages as “Peter cured John himself / Peter heilte Hans selbst” (that is, without the help of a professional physician or someone else). Another subtype, called “adnominal”, singles out the referent from a set of items somehow related to it (cf. Mary ~ Mary’s children, Mary’s brother etc.; London ~ centre of London, London’s suburbs), as in “I prefer the surroundings of London to London itself” (note the ungrammaticality of “\*I prefer Paris to London itself”; example from König and Gast 2006: 228 ff.). The two functions, i.e. reflexive proper and emphatic reflexive, or intensifier, can be expressed by two different forms in some languages – for instance, in German (sich vs. selbst) or Russian (sebjā

3 By “metrically distinctive” contexts for the second syllable of this form I understand those where: (i) *-m* is followed by a vowel (that is, this syllable is not closed and therefore not necessarily long); and (ii) the metre requires either a long or a short syllable (i.e. is not indifferent with regard to the length).

4 On this function, see in particular, König and Siemund 1999, and König and Gast 2006.

vs. *sām*). By contrast, some other languages syncretically express them by means of the same form – as is the case with English (*-self*). Vedic exemplifies the latter type of language, using the same word, *tanū-* (and, in the later language, *ātmán-*), for both functions.

Although the reflexive function of *tanū-* is by no means a novelty, having been noted as early as Grassmann's (1873) dictionary and, later, in Wackernagel's grammar (1930)<sup>5</sup> (though without due attention to emphatic and heavy reflexives of the type 'sich selbst'), we still, and not infrequently, find inexact or confusing renderings of this word. For instance, RV 10.128.5c = AVŚ 5.3.7c *mā hāsmahi prajāyā mā tanūbhir* "let us not suffer loss in progeny, not in ourselves" is translated by Geldner (1951: III, 358) as "[n]icht möchten wir der Kinder noch des eigenen Leibes verlustig gehen".

Returning to our Atharvavedic passage, *tanvā* must belong with the finite verb (*tārema*), as Whitney suggested in his comments, rather than with the participle in *pāda* a (as it is rendered in Whitney's translation: "receiving no harm with ourselves"). The sense must be as follows: "May *we ourselves* cross [or: as for us, may *we* cross] . . . , (while *our*) *enemies* may not cross. . .".<sup>6</sup> Both the personal pronoun *vayām* (which is not necessarily overt in Vedic, typically being dropped) and the intensifier *tanvā* are used to emphasize the opposition "we" ~ "our enemies".

#### AVŚ 19.50.4 = AVP 14.9.4

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| yāthā <sup>+</sup> śyāmākāḥ (śāmyākāḥ?) prapātan | (8) |
| <sup>+</sup> preyivān nānuvidyāte                | (8) |
| evā rātri prā pātaya                             | (8) |
| yó asmāṁ abhyaghāyāti                            | (8) |

As a [tiny] millet-seed (or: particle of śamī-wood?) that is flying away cannot be found (anymore), once it has gone away, – so, O night, make [him] fly away who is trying to harm us.

- a. Śaun. mss. *śāmyākāḥ*, ed. RW <sup>+</sup>śyāmākāḥ, Paipp. *śāmyākāḥ*  
 b. Śaun. mss. *apavān*, ed. RW <sup>+</sup>aparām, Orissa mss. *predivān* (ed. Bhattacharya *predivān*, crit. app. *pre(ti → )divān*), Kashmir ms. *tedivām*

a: [tiny] millet-seed (or: particle of śamī-wood (?)) <sup>+</sup>śyāmākāḥ (śāmyākāḥ?) – Ed. Roth/Whitney emends <sup>+</sup>śyāmākāḥ 'millet-seed' (against the mss.), which perfectly fits the context. The reading *śāmyākāḥ*, found in the mss. of both recensions, Śaunakīya and Paippalāda, is, however, not entirely impossible. The word *śāmyākāḥ* 'made from śamī-wood' (*Prosopis cineraria*), attested in the Kauśika-Sūtra, might refer to a tiny particle of śamī-wood, which is used for producing fire (A. Lubotsky, personal communication).

5 For full references, see Kulikov 2007b.

6 Cf. the use of the emphatic reflexive in the Russian translation of this passage: "My-to *sami* da preodoleem . . . a vot naši vragi . . .".



b: ... is gone away ... (<sup>+</sup>*preyivān*) – Śaunakīya mss. read an unclear word (*apavān*), for which ed. Roth/Whitney emends <sup>+</sup>*aparām* ‘far, further’ (and this emendation is adopted in Ludwig’s translation). In his translation Whitney returns to the original reading, taking *apavān* as pres. participle of the verb *āpa-vā* and translating it as ‘blowing away’. Note, however, that the subject of the verb (*āpa*-*vā* ‘blow (away)’), both in transitive and intransitive usages, is typically wind, air flow, etc., not the object being blown or driven (away) by a wind. Accordingly, the participle of the transitive verb *āpa-vā* ‘blow away; drive away by blowing’ can hardly be an epithet of the subject of this sentence (be it a millet-seed or a particle of śamī-wood). An entirely different reading (which, obviously, cannot be reconciled with the Śaunakīya version) is attested in the Paipp.: Orissa mss. read *predivān*, while in Kashmir ms. we have *tedivān*. A possible conjecture might be <sup>+</sup>*preyivān* (= *pra-īyivān*) ‘gone away’ (with the *d/y* confusion, quite common in Orissa mss.), i.e. a perfect active participle of *prá-i* (Werner Knobl, personal communication).

### AVŚ 19.50.5 = AVP 14.9.5

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <i>āpa stenām</i> <sup>+</sup> <i>vāsomathām</i> | (*8) |
| <sup>+</sup> <i>goajām</i> <i>utā tāsakaram</i>  | (8)  |
| <i>ātho yó ārvataḥ śīro</i>                      | (8)  |
| <sup>’</sup> <i>a</i> <i>bhidhāya nīnīṣati</i>   | (8)  |

[Keep] away the thief who steals clothes(?), and the robber running off cattle (cattle-lifter), but also [the one] who, covering [their = coursers’] head[s], tries to lead [away] coursers.

a: Śaun. mss. *vāso*, Paipp. Or. *vāsomatham*, *vāsamatham* Kashm.

b: Śaun. mss. *gór ajām*, Pp. mss. *go’ajām*, *gorajām*, Paipp. Or. *goajām*, Kashm. *gotham* (ed. Barret *gomatham*)

a: ... *who steals clothes* (?) (<sup>+</sup>*vāsomathām*) – Pāda a is lacking two syllables in Śaun. mss. The heavy emendation suggested in ed. Roth/Whitney, *āpa...* <sup>+</sup>*avāsayas* (in Whitney’s translation: “Thou didst make [the thief] stay away”) is unlikely. More plausible is the emendation suggested by Insler (1970: 147 f.) on the basis of the reading attested in the Paipp. (rejected by Whitney), <sup>+</sup>*vāsomathām*: ‘clothing-stealing (thief)’ (with the final accentuation, in accordance with the agentive meaning of this compound); a similar reading (*vāsamatham*) was noticed for Paipp. already by Barret (1927: 248).<sup>7</sup> A parallel emendation in pāda b, <sup>+</sup>*gomatham* (‘cow-stealing’), suggested by Insler on the basis of the Kashm. ms. of the Paipp. and in analogy with <sup>+</sup>*vāsomatham*, is unnecessary. The reading *gór ajām* (*ajá-* is a derivative of the root *aj* ‘drive’) is quite possible in the context; and the compound *go-ajām* (the emendation suggested already in Whitney/Lanman’s commentary ad loc.) attested in the Orissa mss. of the Paipp. is even more appropriate in this passage (W. Knobl, personal communication), being perfectly parallel with the compound

7 Cf. also the compound *vastra-māthi-* ‘cloth-thief’ attested in RV 4.38.5a.



*vāsomathā-* and indirectly corroborated by the compound *go-ājana-* attested in the Ṛgveda.

cd: ...covering the head of a courser ... (*ārvataḥ śīro* ' *ābhidhāya*) – i.e. slipping on a halter on the muzzle of a horse; thus in accordance with Whitney's interpretation, against that of Insler (1970: 147–8), who believed that this phrase must refer to a thief hiding his face (i.e.: 'covering [his] head'), rather than to covering the head of a horse with a halter.

**AVŚ 19.50.6 = AVP 14.9.6**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| yád <sup>+</sup> adyá (adyā?) rātri subhage      | (8) |
| vibhājantīy áyo vásu                             | (8) |
| <sup>+</sup> tád etád asmān <sup>+</sup> bhojaya | (8) |
| <sup>+</sup> áthéd anyān <sup>+</sup> upāyasi    | (8) |

When, you, O fortunate night, will be sharing (or: will come sharing?) out wealth today, then make this [wealth] benefit us, and only then you will go to the others!

- a. Śaun. mss. *adyā*, Pp. *adyá*, Paipp. *adya*
- c. Śaun. mss. *yád etád asmān bhójaya* [ed. RW <sup>+</sup>*tád etád* ...]; Paipp. *yadehy asmān bhrājaya-*
- d. Śaun. mss. *yáthedám nānupāyási* or *nānupāyāti* [ed. Vishva Bandhu *yáthéd anyān upāyasi*]; Paipp. *-athéd anyān upāyasi*

This stanza is discussed at length by Zehnder (2011: 59 f.), who offers the following translation: “Wenn Du heute, glückbringende Nacht, Gut verteilen gehst, so (\**tád*) lass dieses (Gut) uns Nutzen bringen; und dann erst (\**áthéd*) magst du zu anderen hingehen”. I essentially follow Zehnder's interpretation.

a: *adyā* – Whitney explains the final length as sandhi with the preverb (i.e. *adyā-ā*... *áyo* ‘you will come’), contra the Padapāṭha (Pp.) and ed. Pandit, which saw here a common metrical lengthening that is not very common in this metrical position, however (W. Knobl, personal communication). Accordingly, there are good reasons to adopt the reading attested in the Paippalāda (*adya*). *áyo*, taken by all translators as the subjunctive form of the verb *i* ‘go’ (or *ā* + *i* ‘come’), could be interpreted as a (semi-)auxiliary verb connected with the participle *vibhājantī*, to form a particular periphrastic formation that can be tentatively rendered as future continuous. Such periphrastic formations are quite common in the language of the AV.

c: Roth and Whitney's conjecture <sup>+</sup>*tád* (for *yád*, which must also be a secondary replacement, obviously responsible for the accent on *bhójaya*) is very likely. The Paipp. version must be corrupt, also in Orissa mss. The causative *bhrājaya-* hardly makes any sense in the context (‘make shine’?), while *bhojaya-* is attested from the AV onwards and perfectly fits the context.

d: and only then you will go to the others – A difficult pāda; the emendation of ed. Roth and Whitney: *yáthedám <sup>+</sup>nāpāyati* (‘that it [i.e. goods, riches] go not

away’) is unlikely. The Paippalāda version seems to preserve the original reading. The negative particle *ná* must result from misinterpretation of <sup>+</sup>*áthéd* <sup>+</sup>*anyān* ... (→ *yáthédam ná*...). In contrast to pāda a, the subjunctive *ayasi* should be taken as a full verb (‘you will go (to the others)’), rather than as an auxiliary (‘you will be [making this wealth benefit (?)] (the others)’), since in that case the preverb *úpa* will be unexplained.

### AVŚ 19.50.7 = AVP 14.9.7

|                        |     |
|------------------------|-----|
| uśāse naḥ pári dehi    | (8) |
| sárvān rātriḥ anāgāsaḥ | (8) |
| uśā no áhne ā bhajād   | (8) |
| áhas túbhyaṃ vibhāvari | (8) |

O Night, commit us undamaged, free from sins, to the Dawn; may the Dawn deliver us to the Day, the Day (back) to you, O multiply shining one.

a: Śaun. mss. *pári dehi*, Paipp. *pari dhehi*

b: *sárva-* is rendered in accordance with the interpretation of this word as ‘whole, undamaged’ (cf. Lat. *salvus*; see Gonda 1955), rather than as ‘all’ (Whitney: ‘commit us all’, etc.).

d: The epithet *vibhāvan-* (vocative singular feminine form *vibhāvari*) ‘multiply shining, wide-shining’ (derived from the verb *ví-bhā* ‘shine out, shine widely, multiply shine’, where the preverb *ví* should probably be understood in the distributive meaning; see, for instance, Kulikov 2007a: 723) is common in the context of hymns to night (cf. AVŚ 19.49.6ab = AVP 14.8.6ab *stómasya no vibhāvari* ‘*rātri rājeva joṣase* ‘you will enjoy our prayer, O multiply-shining Night, like a king’, AVŚ 19.49.4d = AVP 14.8.4d *purú rūpāni kṛṇuṣe vibhātí* ‘You make for yourself [i.e. you take] many forms, multiply shining’; see Kulikov 2009: 10 ff.) and may refer to the starry night-sky: multiply shining = shining with many stars.

## References

### Text editions

- Atharva Veda Sanhita*. Ed. R. Roth und W. D. Whitney. Zweite verbesserte Auflage besorgt von Max Lindenau. Berlin: Ferd. Dümmler, 1924.
- Atharvaveda Samhitā*. With the commentary of Sāyanācārya. Ed. Shankar Pāndurang Pandit. Bombay: Government Central Book Depot, 1895–98.
- Atharvaveda (Śaunaka) with the Pada-pāṭha and Sāyanācārya’s commentary*. Ed. Vishva Bandhu et al. Part IV. Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, 1962. (Vishveshvaranand Indological Series 16.)
- The Paippalāda Samhitā of the Atharvaveda*. Volume One: Consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas [books I–XV]. Ed. Dipak Bhattacharya. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society, 1997. (Bibliotheca Indica 319.)

## Secondary literature

- Barret, L.C. 1927. "The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, book fourteen. Edited with critical notes", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 47, 238–49.
- Bloomfield, Maurice. 1899. *The Atharvaveda*. (Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde 2, Heft 1.) Strasbourg: Trübner, 1899.
- Bloomfield, Maurice and Franklin Edgerton. 1934. *Vedic Variants*. Vol. III. *Noun and pronoun inflection*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.
- Elizarenkova, Tatjana Ja. (trans.) 1976. *Atxarvaveda: izbrannoe* [Atharvaveda: selected hymns]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Geldner, Karl Friedrich. 1951. *Der Rig-veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt*. . . Bd. 1–3. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gonda, Jan. 1955. "Reflections on *Sarva-* in Vedic texts", *Indian Linguistics* 16, 53–71.
- Grassmann, Hermann. 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Griffiths, Arlo. 2003. "The textual divisions of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 47, 5–35.
- Griffiths, Arlo. 2009. *The Paippalādasamhitā of the Atharvaveda. Kāṇḍas 6 and 7: A new edition with translation and commentary*. (Groningen Oriental Studies 22.) Groningen: Forsten.
- Hettrich, Heinrich. 2010. "*tanū-* als Reflexivpronomen im Ṛgveda?", in J.C. Fincke (ed.), *Festschrift für Gernot Wilhelm anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 28. Januar 2010*. s.l. ISLET, 175–83.
- Hock, Hans H. 2006. "Reflexivization in the Rig-Veda (and beyond)", in B. Tikkani and H. Hettrich (eds), *Themes and Tasks in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan Linguistics. Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference*. Vol. 5. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 19–44.
- Insler, Stanley. 1970. "Sanskrit *tāskara-* and text criticism to AV. xix 47–50". *Die Sprache* 16/2, 38–48.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1995. "Emphatic and reflexive *-self*: expectations, viewpoint, and subjectivity", in D. Stein and S. Wright (eds), *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation: Linguistic Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 55–82.
- König, Ekkehard and Volker Gast. 2006. "Focused assertion of identity: a typology of intensifiers", *Linguistic Typology* 10/2, 223–76.
- König, Ekkehard and Peter Siemund. 1999. "Intensifiers and reflexives: a typological perspective", in Z. Frajzyngier and T. S. Curl (eds), *Reflexives: Form and Function*. (Typological Studies in Language.) Amsterdam: Benjamins, 41–74.
- Kuhn, Adalbert. 1864. "Indische und germanische segenssprüche", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der deutschen, griechischen und lateinischen [KZ]* 13, 49–74, 113–57.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2000. "RV 1.120.11: a note on the Vedic reflexive", in M. Ofitsch and C. Zinko (eds), *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz. Festband ....* Graz: Leykam, 231–8.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2007a. "Reciprocal constructions in Vedic", in Vladimir P. Nedjalkov et al. (eds), *Reciprocal Constructions*. (Typological Studies in Language 71.) Vol. 2. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 709–38.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2007b. "The reflexive pronouns in Vedic: A diachronic and typological perspective", *Lingua* 117/8, 1412–1433.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2009. "Zametki po vedijskoj morfologii i sintaksisu: k analizu atharvaničeskogo gimna noči (Šaunakija 19.49 = Paippalāda 14.8)" [Notes on the Vedic morphology and syntax: An analysis of the atharvanic hymn to the Night (Šaunakīya 19.49 = Paippalāda 14.8)]. *Vostok/Oriens*, 2009, 3, 5–16.

- Kulikov, Leonid. 2010. "Atharvaveda-Śaunakīya 19.49.1 = Atharvaveda-Paippalāda 14.8.1: An etymological note on Vedic *rātrī*- 'night'", in T.M. Nikolaeva et al. (eds), *Issledovanija po lingvistike i semiotike. Sbornik statej k jubileju Vjač. Vs. Ivanova* [Studies in linguistics and semiotics: Festschrift for Vjač. Vs. Ivanov]. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskix kul'tur, 174–9.
- Ludwig, A. 1878. *Der Rigveda oder die heiligen hymnen der Brāhmaṇa*. Bd. III. *Die mantraliteratur und das alte Indien als Einleitung zur Uebersetzung des Rigveda*. Prague: F. Tempsky.
- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony. 1916. *Vedic Grammar for Students*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Orlandi, C. and S. Sani. 1992. *Atharvaveda. Inni magici*, a cura di C. Orlandi e S. Sani. Turin: Unione Tipografico – Editrice Torinese.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2001. "Védique *tanū-* et la notion de personne en indo-iranien", *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 96/1, 181–206.
- Wackernagel, J. 1930. *Altindische Grammatik*. Bd. III. *Nominalflexion – Zahlwort – Pronomen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Whitney, W.D. and Lanman, C.R. 1905. *Atharva-Veda Samhitā*. Translated into English with critical notes and exegetical commentary by William Dwight Whitney. Revised and edited by William Dwight Whitney. (Harvard Oriental Series 7–8.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1975. "Why 'kill' does not mean 'cause to die': the semantics of action sentences", *Foundations of Language* 13, 491–528. (Reprinted as Ch. 5 in: A. Wierzbicka. *Lingua mentalis*. Sydney: Academic Press, 1980).
- Witzel, Michael. 1985. "Die Atharvaveda-Tradition und die Paippalāda-Samhitā". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. Supplementband 6. (XXII. Deutschen Orientalistent ag.) 22, 256–71.
- Zehnder, Thomas. 1999. *Atharvaveda-Paippalāda: eine Sammlung altindischer Zaubersprüche vom Beginn des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr. Buch 2. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Idstein: Schulz-Kirchner Verlag. (Wissenschaftliche Schriften: Reihe 3. Beiträge zur Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft; 107.)
- Zehnder, Thomas. 2011. *Das Periphrastische Kausativ im Vedischen*. (Münchner Forschungen zur historischen Sprachwissenschaft 12.) Bremen: Ute Hempen.
- Zimmer, H. 1879. *Altindisches Leben. Die Cultur der vedischen Arier nach den Samhitā dargestellt*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.