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This article provides a survey of recent scholarship on the Paippalādasaṃhitā (PS) of the Atharvaveda, and presents the main lines of research that are currently being pursued. In particular, it discusses: the different approaches to the text-critical work on the PS; the debate on the history of its transmission; the linguistic studies based on the text; the hypothesis that the PS is a manual for the king’s purohita; the ongoing research on the connection between the Paippalādins, the Vṛāyas and the Pāśupatas; and recent scholarship on its ancillary literature.

1. Introduction

Within the literary corpus of Vedic India (ca. 1500–500 BCE), the Atharvaveda (AV) is second only to the Ṛgveda (ṚV) in importance, extent and antiquity. While the ṚV is a collection of praise hymns addressed to various gods and presumably recited during solemn public rites, the AV mainly contains healing charms, sorcery spells and prayers to be employed in domestic rituals. For this reason, the AV is an unparalleled source for the documentation of popular values, beliefs and realia from daily life in Vedic India.¹

In antiquity, the AV existed in numerous diverging recensions (saṃhitā) belonging to different schools of practice (śākhā).² However, only two of these have survived to the present day: the Śaunaka and the Paippalāda.

The Śaunakasaṃhitā (ŚS), also known as the “Vulgate,”³ has been preserved mostly in western India⁴ through uninterrupted oral transmission, as well as in numerous manuscripts (hereafter

---

¹ This article could be revised before publication thanks to the contribution of the J. Gonda Foundation of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences and the International Institute for Asian Studies (IIAS).

² On the AV in general, see Bloomfield (1899a), Gonda (1975: 267ff.) and Witzel (1997: 275-283).

³ There were nine schools, according to both the Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa (49.4.1) (which lists the following names: Paippalāda, Stauda, Mauda, Śaunikya, Jājala, Jalada, Brahmavada, Devadāra and Cāraṇavaidya) and the fifth Pariśiṣṭa of the Śuklayajurveda, known as Caranaṇayūha (which lists the following names: Paippalā, Pradānta, Dānta, Auta, Jābāla, Śaunaka, Brahmapalā, Kunakhivedadāsi and Cāraṇavidya). See Bloomfield (1899a §10), Renou (1947: 58) and Lopez (2010: 6ff.) for an overview of the evidence on the AV Śākhās.
“mss.”), equipped with a *padapāṭha*, *anukramanīs* and a commentary ascribed to Sāyaṇa, and accompanied by a set of ancillary texts (Gopathabrāhmaṇa, Kauśikasūtra and Vaitānasūtra, plus *prayaścittas*, *prātiśākhyaśas*, *pariśiṣṭas* and *paddhatiśas*). On the basis of these sources, several critical editions of the *saṃhitā* have been produced: Roth and Whitney (1856), revised by Lindenau in 1924 (2nd ed. 1966); Pandit (1894-1898), which was the first to include the *padapāṭha* and Sāyaṇa’s commentary; and Vishva Bandhu (1960). The standard translation of the collection (covering the first 19 of the 20 books) is Whitney (1905), although earlier translations also exist. Because of its diffusion and because of the early availability of reliable editions and translations, the Śaunaka has become the “reference” recension for the vast majority of scholarly studies on the Atharvaveda.

Conversely, the study of the Paippalāḍaṃhitā (PS) was long neglected, as the recension was known only through a single very corrupted and virtually incomprehensible manuscript stemming from Kashmir. However, the late 1950s discovery of a new set of mss. in Odisha sparked new enthusiasm in the Indological community, as these mss. contained a much better preserved text, which anticipated that a reliable edition of the *saṃhitā* could soon be produced. The ongoing task of editing the 20 books that constitute the PS has occupied a number of scholars for several decades since then; it has generated a number of publications, reviving interest in the Atharvaveda in general as well as promoting the study of the Atharvavedic ancillary literature. It thus seems useful at this point to provide, in the present article, a survey of the history of the scholarship devoted to the Paippalāḍa thus far, in order to assess the results achieved and illustrate the direction of recent research. This article is aimed both at those students who might wish to find guidance as they first approach this field of study, as well as experienced scholars who might benefit from an overview of the state of the art.7

---

3 This appellation is most likely unjustified, as in the past, the Paippalāḍa was probably more widespread, prominent and influential (cf. Bhattacharyya 1964: xxxii ff.).

4 The sources used for the editions of the ŠS mostly stem from Gujarat and Maharasthra (see Vishva Bandhu 1960: xiii-xxxii).

5 For information on these texts, see the references collected in Griffiths (2007b: 141 fn. 3).

6 Most previous studies on the PS refer to the country with the appellation “Orissa,” and to its language as “Oriya.” As the official English name of the country was changed to “Odisha” in 2011, and that of its language to “Odia”, it seems appropriate to me to adopt these new appellations in this and future publications.

7 May this double goal be a homage to my beloved teacher Prof. Pinuccia Caracchi, who first opened the door for me into the world of Indological studies with her courses, ever so accessible and engaging for us young students, while at the same time conveying the most rigorous and up-to-date scientific knowledge. It is an honour and a pleasure to dedicate this short work to her, just as it was a pleasure, while writing it, to recall, in the back of my mind, dear memories of my early twenties, spent learning about India as much as learning about life and myself. I feel grateful to have had Pinuccia’s guidance during those formative years.
2. History of research

It is thanks to Tübingen professor Rudolph Roth that the existence of a first manuscript containing the text of the Paippalāda recension of the Atharvaveda was brought to the attention of the academic community. Roth’s dissatisfaction with the mss. that he and Whitney had used to produce the editio princeps of the ŚŚ (1856) pushed him to look for better sources. In particular, he incited the authorities of the British Government of India to acquire mss. from Kashmir, as he was aware of the presence of brahmins in the region who claimed affiliation with the Atharvaveda. Eventually, as Bloomfield and Garbe (1901: 2) recall, “his Highness the late Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir, Ranbir Singh, announced that he had in his library, at his capital city, Srinagar, a manuscript of the Atharva-Veda ‘written in characters which could not be read by anyone outside of Srinagar’” (i.e., in the Śāradā script). What made this ms. so special was that the Atharvaveda recension it preserved did not correspond to the Śaunaka text, but rather, the colophons attributed it to the Paippalādaśākhā. Thanks to the efforts of Sir William Muir, the Lieutenant Governor of the North-Western Provinces, a Nāgarī copy of this ms. was made for Roth in Śrīnagara in 1873 and delivered to him in November 1874, leading to the publication of the essay Der Atharvaveda in Kaschmir (Roth 1875). Finally, in 1876, the Government of India loaned Roth the original birch-bark codex, and the German scholar could present a description of its characteristics at the Congresso internazionale degli Orientalisti, held in Florence in September 1878 (the proceedings were published in 1881). The ms. has remained in Tübingen ever since and, after Roth’s passing in 1895, it was preserved at the University Library, where it can still be consulted; hence it is often referred to as the “Tübingen ms.” Given the importance of this codex unicus, and aiming at making it available to the community of scholars, in 1901, Bloomfield and Garbe published a volume containing a chromophotographic reproduction, which is widely used and referenced by scholars to this day.

Unfortunately, the Kashmirian ms. contained only the text of the saṃhitā, mostly without accents, with neither padapātha nor commentary, and proved to be extremely corrupt. Leroy Carr Barret’s strenuous and commendable efforts towards a critical edition, carried out over the course of over 35 years (1905–40), did not suffice to produce a readable text of the 20 books (kāṇḍa) that constitute the saṃhitā. Even after Raghu Vira’s (1936–1942) revision, which introduced several

---

8 In his Abhandlung über den Atharva Veda (1956: 6), Roth refers to a report by the traveller Baron von Hügel (Kaschmir und das Reich der Siek, vol. ii, p. 364), according to whom the brahmins of Kashmir belonged to the “Atterwan” or “Atterman” Veda.

9 “In the entire domain of Indian manuscript tradition there is no single manuscript which claims so much interest as the unique birch-bark manuscript of the Kashmirian Atharvaveda” (Bloomfield 1899b: 184).

10 Since 2001, a digitalized version of the original ms. has also been available (see Griffiths 2009: xxii fn. 18).
improvements and provided references to parallel passages, much of the text remained incomprehensible.

The turning point in the history of PS research was Calcutta professor Durgamohan Bhattacharyya’s late 1950s discovery of the existence of Odisha brahmans who claimed affiliation with the Paippalādaśākhā (see Bhattacharyya 1957). Bhattacharyya was able to retrieve several palm-leaf mss. of the saṃhitā in their possession, and to witness the tradition first-hand, as it was still alive in Odisha at the time. The mss. that Bhattacharyya found also lacked a padapāṭha and commentary, but preserved a significantly better version of the text than the Kashmirian ms. Producing a critical edition of the PS had now become a feasible goal.

The task was taken up by Bhattacharyya himself, who published an initial critical edition of the first kāṇḍa in 1964, shortly before his untimely passing in 1965, leaving a collection of lectures on the PS and a volume with his edition of books 2, 3 and 4 to be published posthumously (1968 and 1970). His endeavour was picked up in 1976 by his son, Dipak Bhattacharya (see Bhattacharya 2016: c), who over the course of several decades succeeded in completing an editio princeps of the 20 books of the collection, published in four volumes (1997, 2008, 2011, 2016). Bhattacharya’s edition is an outstanding achievement of learned scholarship, even more so for its being the work of a single man, and it has been the starting point for all later editorial efforts. Nevertheless, starting from his 1997 publication, Bhattacharya’s work has been the target of harsh criticism. His work has been criticized for not matching the standards of a proper critical edition, failing to set forth clear editorial principles and apply them systematically; for making use of only the few mss. discovered by his father (while others had been retrieved in the meantime—see below); for generally adopting the text of the Odisha mss., while considering the Kashmirian evidence only when the Odisha one is insufficient; for neglecting metrical considerations; for lacking a translation and a philological commentary; and so forth (see Griffiths 2009: xviii–xx §1.5 for a summary of the problems raised by

---

11 Bhattacharyya also discovered texts belonging to the ancillary literature. See §4.5 below.
12 Bhattacharyya was able to find families of Paippalādins also in West Bengal and Bihar, and to consult ritual manuals in their possession. However, he discovered mss. of the saṃhitā only when he visited the districts of Puri and Balasore in Odisha (Bhattacharyya 1957: 81f.). The tradition is still alive today also in parts of what is now the state of Jharkhand.
13 The Odisha mss. also revealed the beginning of the collection, which was missing from the Kashmirian ms. as the first folio was lost and the following few are damaged (see Barret 1905: 198). This includes the very first line, ṣaṃ no devīr abhiṣṭaye (Bhattacharyya 1957: 83f., 1964: xx), which “is recited in daily prayer all over India as the initial stanza of the Atharvaveda” (Bhattacharya 1997: xiii)—but does not correspond to the incipit of the ŚŚ – and which various traditional sources attribute to the Paippalāda (see Bhattacharya 1997: xiii), a fact that testifies to the greater influence of the PS compared to that of the ŚŚ in ancient times.
14 Note the difference in the spelling of the family name with respect to his father.
critics). Therefore, in the last 25 years, several scholars at European and American universities have committed to improving Bhattacharya’s edition.

Karl Hoffmann offered a few important methodological observations in two articles on the topic (1968 and 1986), in which he also provides numerous suggestions for improvements on Durgamohan Bhattacharyya’s work; seminal work was later undertaken by Michael Witzel, especially during his appointments as associate and then full professor of Sanskrit language and literature at Leiden University, the Netherlands (1978–1986), where he inaugurated a “Veda project” (Ghosh 2002b: 8). In November 1981, he and Jan Heesterman provided Dipak Bhattacharya with a ZWO fellowship and invited him to carry out his editorial work in Leiden for one year (Bhattacharya 2016: ci; van Bijlert 2002: 19). Having had access to Bhattacharya’s mss., Witzel visited Odisha himself in 1983, collecting new ms. material as well as information on the Odisha Paippalāda tradition. In a series of articles (1973-1976, 1985a, 1985b; cf. also 1993), Witzel laid out the foundations for the study of the transmission of the text: by carefully studying the ms. errors in light of palaeographic considerations and an analysis of pronunciation mistakes in the oral transmission, Witzel posited the existence of a written archetype, redacted in Gujarat around the 9th century CE and written in a late form of Gupta script (and hence identified with the *siglum* *G*). From this archetype, the two extant traditions would have arisen. The Kashmirian birch-bark ms. and various late apographs are traced back to a lost hyparchetype referred to by the *siglum* *D*, written in Devanāgarī script and dating to ca. 1350 CE; the extant Odisha palm-leaf mss. (dating from the 17th to the 20th century CE) are believed to descend from a second lost hyparchetype, labelled *B*, written in Proto-Bengali script and dating to ca. 1400 CE. Besides these advances, the “Veda project” produced a first electronic transcription of the PS, known as “the Leiden e-text,” which has constantly been updated through the years as new critical editions were published.

The “Veda project” lagged as Prof. Witzel left Leiden to take up the chair of Wales Professor of Sanskrit at Harvard in 1987, but it was revived in the late ’90s as other scholars, such as Leiden professors Hendrik W. Bodewitz and Alexander M. Lubotsky, took an interest in the PS. Thomas Zehnder spent a year (1997-1998) in Leiden to collaborate with Prof. Lubotsky, while preparing his

---

15 See Griffiths (2003a: 336 fn. 8) and Griffiths (2009: vii).
16 The Kashmirian ms. itself has been dated to the mid 16th century CE. The ms. contains a colophon that bears a date which has been interpreted as referring to the year 1419 CE, but Witzel (1985a) has argued on the basis of paleographic considerations that this date was most likely copied from an exemplar (sometimes referred to with the *siglum* *K*) written in an older version of the Śāradā script. Thus the Kashmirian line of the genealogical tree is as follows: *D* (Devanāgarī) 1350 CE → *K* (Śāradā) 1419 CE → K (Śāradā) ca. 1550 CE. See Slaje (2007: 330-331, fn. 10), and the summary in Lopez (2010: 10).

Following Witzel’s example, Arlo Griffiths also went on several field trips to Odisha, and was able to uncover the existence of new manuscripts of the samhitā, as well as others containing ancillary literature belonging to the Odisha AV tradition. Meanwhile, in the previous years, the Odisha State Museum of Bhubaneshwar had also been able to collect a fair number of mss. Griffiths provided a description of all of these new sources (2003a) and strongly emphasized the necessity of collating these additional mss. in new editions of the PS kāṇḍas. Griffiths’s 2009 edition of kāṇḍas 6 and 7 set a new editorial standard for its attention to the constitution of the text by carefully collating additional mss., and by presenting a rich introduction with detailed discussions of a number of related problems, such as orthography and sandhi peculiarities, textual divisions, mantra abbreviations, the phenomenon of perseveration (and anticipation), etc. Griffiths also published extensively on PS-related topics (2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2004, 2007a, 2007b; with A. Lubotsky: 1999, 2000-2001, 2009, 2014; with P. Bisschop: 2003, 2007; with S. Sumant: 2018), and co-edited an important volume of collected studies on the PS (Griffiths and Schmiedchen 2007).

In recent years, Leiden has remained a centre of Paippalāḍa studies thanks to a number of scholars, such as Drs Marianne Oort, Dr Leonid Kulikov and Dr Werner Knobl. For many years Prof. Lubotsky has welcomed scholars and students into his office for weekly “Paippalāḍa readings.”

17 Thomas Zehnder had already devoted his Lizentiatsarbeit to editing PS book 1 (1993, unpublished). This kāṇḍa is now being re-edited by Zehnder within the Swiss Paippalāḍa project (see below).
18 Witzel and Griffiths have co-authored an article (2002) containing a list of the villages where they were able to meet Paippalāḍa Atharvavedins during their field trips to Odisha. Cf. also C. G. Kashikar’s report (2002) of a similar tour that he undertook in Odisha in 1969. Both articles are featured in a volume, Ghosh (ed.) 2002a, that collects a number of useful essays focussing on the Paippalāḍa.
19 On the latter, see Griffiths (2007b) and §4.5 below.
21 Griffiths has also been working on an edition of kāṇḍa 4 with Lubotsky (the unfinished material has now been passed on to the Zurich project, on which see below), and with Duccio Lelli on an edition of kāṇḍa 10.
22 Oort has been working on an edition of kāṇḍa 8. See also Oort (2002), a study on the preparation of the intoxicating drink surā, based on PS hymns 5.10 and 8.12.
23 See §4.2 below for a survey of Kulikov’s publications related to the PS.
24 Although based in Kyoto, Dr Knobl has been an active member of the Leiden Paippalāḍa community, not least by visiting Leiden yearly on the occasion of the Leiden Summer School in Languages and Linguistics, where he teaches Vedic poetry and prose, but also by having contributed to Griffiths’s dissertation through intense email correspondence, as well as to both mine and Lelli’s dissertations.
He has supervised Duccio Lelli’s doctoral dissertation on kāṇḍa 15 (2015), my Research MA thesis (2014) on kāṇḍa 17, anuvāka 1 (the Bhūmisūkta) and my doctoral dissertation (2019) on the three “new” anuvākas25 (3, 5 and 6) of the same kāṇḍa, and he is currently supervising Kristen De Joseph’s doctoral dissertation on the Wedding Hymn of kāṇḍa 18.

Other centres of Paippalāda studies besides Leiden have been the following: Harvard University, where Prof. Michael Witzel supervised Carlos Lopez’s 2000 doctoral dissertation on kāṇḍas 13-14 (publ. 2010); the University of Oxford, where Dr Elizabeth Tucker has been working on book 11 and supervised Victor D’Avella’s 2007 MPhil thesis on PS 10.10–16; the University of Bonn, where Philipp Kubisch defended his doctoral dissertation on PS 20.1–30 (2012); Paris, where Prof. Georges-Jean Pinauld and Prof. Nalini Balbir supervised Carmen Spiers’s 2016 MA thesis on kāṇḍa 3.1–20 (Spiers is now editing the whole of kāṇḍa 3 for her doctoral dissertation); the University of Würzburg, where from 2011 to 2014, Dr Jeong-Soo Kim carried out a DFG research project that resulted in his edition of kāṇḍas 8 and 9 (2014), and also produced a series of useful research tools – such a PS-ŚŚ concordance (Kim, Konk.) and collections of manuscript errors (Kim, Schreib., and Auss.) – that have been constantly updated and made available online. Kim has also produced an improved version of kāṇḍa 16 (Kim, K16, based on Bhattacharya 2008), and is now carrying out a new DFG project aimed at compiling an index verborum of the AV (PS and ŚŚ) – of which a preliminary version is already available online (Kim, Index) – and a new critical edition of the ŚŚ.26 Finally, a Swiss Paippalāda project was recently launched at the University of Zurich, involving Prof. Paul Widmer, Prof. Angelika Malinar, Dr Thomas Zehnder, Dr Oliver Hellwig and others.27 Among the aims of the project is the edition of some of the remaining kāṇḍas,28 as well as preparing an online version of the PS. Two Paippalāda workshops have been organized in Zurich, in June 2018 and 2019, and a major Atharvaveda conference is planned at the same university from 26–28 September 2019.

25 That is, the three anuvākas (two of which in prose) that have no parallel in the ŚŚ, and that have never been translated or studied in detail before.
26 For updates about the Würzburg project and for the material that has been made available, see https://www.phil.uniwuerzburg.de/vgsp/forschung.
27 See https://www.atharvavedapaippalada.uzh.ch.
28 The Zurich team is now focussing on the revision of kāṇḍa 1 (Zehnder’s 1993 MA thesis), kāṇḍa 4 (based on material initially prepared by Griffiths and Lubotsky) and kāṇḍa 12 (on which Gerhard Ehlers and others had been working in Berlin).
3. Approaches to the text-critical work

The superiority of the Odisha tradition over the Kashmirian one is immediately evident to anyone who sets out to edit any portion of the text. Let us consider, for instance, the text of PS 17.35.1, which is preserved in the Kashmirian ms. (K) as follows:

\[ \text{yathā hīnāśvatthād avravit tracā vrāhmaṇa nindyāni ādenam aśrṇunye juṣṭaṣṭpurtenaḥ vyabhavāṇīti} \] (transcription from Barret 1936: 181).

In his edition (based solely on K), Barret was not able to get much out of the above:

\[ \text{athā hīna āśvatthād avravit taṁ cāvrahmaṇam anindyan adevam aśrṇam ye juṣṭāḥ pūrtena} \]
\[ \hat{t}vyabhavāṇīti \] (Barret 1936: 182).

Now, compare the text that was preserved in most of the Odisha mss.:

\[ \text{athāhīna āśvatthīr abrāvīn na tād brāhmaṇaṁ nindāṇi yād enam aśrṇon ned iṣṭāṣṭpurtena vi bhavāṇīti} \]

This text is comprehensible, to the extent that no emendation is needed, and a translation is easily obtained:

Then Ahīnas Āśvatthi said: “Therefore I will not censure [this/a] brahmin for having learned about him (i.e. heard about Indra and imitated his observance [N.B. the topic of the chapter]), lest I be deprived of [my] merit, gained from worship and donations” (Selva 2019: 282).

However, this does not mean that the Odisha tradition always preserves the best readings. Griffiths (2002: 44) has rightly criticized Bhattacharya for his method, never explicitly acknowledged, of “basically follow[ing] the Orissa manuscripts, and consider[ing] readings from the Kashmir manuscript only when the reading of the Orissa manuscripts is evidently unacceptable.” Indeed, upon seeing the Odisha evidence, Bhattacharya did not fail to recognize that part of this line is cited in Vāmana’s Kāśikā with the aim of illustrating the use of the ending -āt as na tād brāhmaṇād nindāṁ, na tān brāhmaṇān iti prāpte, “One gets na tād brāhmaṇād nindāṁ while normally it should be na tān brāhmaṇān etc.” (Bhattacharya: 2004: 182); Bhattacharya (ibid.) also notes that Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita’s Siddhāntakaumudī (16th cent. ce) cites the same line as na tād brāhmaṇam. Even for a learned scholar like Barret, it was almost impossible to notice this on the sole basis of the Kashmirian text.

\[ \text{29 Indeed, upon seeing the Odisha evidence, Bhattacharya did not fail to recognize that part of this line is cited in Vāmana’s Kāśikā with the aim of illustrating the use of the ending -āt as na tād brāhmaṇād nindāṁ, na tān brāhmaṇān iti prāpte, “One gets na tād brāhmaṇād nindāṁ while normally it should be na tān brāhmaṇān etc.” (Bhattacharya: 2004: 182); Bhattacharya (ibid.) also notes that Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita’s Siddhāntakaumudī (16th cent. ce) cites the same line as na tād brāhmaṇam. Even for a learned scholar like Barret, it was almost impossible to notice this on the sole basis of the Kashmirian text.} \]
there are numerous cases in which K preserves the correct reading, or in which both traditions preserve a corrupt reading, and both variants should be treated equally. Nevertheless, in most cases the Odisha evidence, is fundamental to the constitution of the text, so that it is crucial for the PS editors to collate the Odisha manuscripts.

At the same time, it is also true that situations in which only one Odisha ms. preserves the correct reading, while all the other mss. have faulty variants, are extremely rare. This is because, in most cases, the most problematic passages were already corrupted in the PS archetype *G. Because of this fact, in the event that, after collating a number of mss., we do not find an acceptable reading, there is little hope that, after collating more Odisha mss., we will eventually come across one that preserves the correct reading. This is why editors like Lubotsky and Zehnder were content with availing themselves of the Odisha data collected in Bhattacharya's apparatus and did not collate any additional mss., yet they managed to produce high-quality editions, succeeding in emending difficult passages thanks to their great expertise and familiarity with the Vedic texts and their language.

However, even when it is not conclusive, the collation of the Odisha mss. can offer us a number of eye-opening insights into how to evaluate the manuscript evidence, so critical editions on the model of Griffiths (2009), who was the first to set out to carefully collate as many sources as possible, remain the most desirable. Moreover, whenever possible, the insights gathered from the reconstruction of a stemma codicum of the Odisha mss. can lead to significant improvements in the editorial work, as I shall illustrate below.

In my partial 2019 edition of kāṇḍa 17, I was able to draw a stemma codicum of the eight Odisha mss. that contain the kāṇḍa and that I indicate with the following sigla: Ma, Ja, V122, Ji, Pa, Mā, V71 and JM3. These mss. can be shown to belong to two sub-groups. The mss. Mā, V71 and JM3, 33

30 See for instance PS 17.28.29 tam ṛksāmābhīyām ādatta yajuṣā [...]. Here K reads ādatta (... but all of the O mss. have uttabhito, which is clearly due to perseveration from PS 17.42.6 (from the same anuvāka): ṛksāmābhīyām uttabhito yajuṣā [...]. On the importance of the phenomenon of perseveration (and anticipation) in a text based on formulas that are learned by heart, such as the PS, see Griffiths (2009: xxxvi--xxxvii §2.4).

31 It appears that Ma. the oldest ms., is the most reliable, and preserves the correct reading even when most of the other mss. have faulty variants.

32 The task of drawing a stemma codicum of the Odisha mss. has sometimes been neglected by the editors of single books. Other times it proved impossible to achieve, given the contradictory manuscript evidence and the high probability of conflation between the sources. Moreover, the possibility of reconstructing a stemma that is valid for all PS books and includes all mss. is highly problematic, as not all mss. contain the whole collection, but only smaller portions, e.g. one or two books. Thus, it is possible that parts of a single ms. were copied from different sources and that the history of their transmission followed a different path from that of the remaining parts of the same ms.

share a number of errors that cannot be due to chance, but must indicate a genetic relationship. 34 Accordingly, I posit the existence of a hypoarchetype *β, and refer to the sub-branch of the Odisha mss. derived from said hypoarchetype with the siglum Oβ. Furthermore, V71 and JM3 share a number of errors that are not featured in Mā, 35 which allows us to infer that they are derived from a common hypoarchetype *β2 that is sister of Mā. 36 All the other mss. generally preserve better readings than the Oβ mss. (especially Ma, which is the oldest) and may be grouped in a sister sub-branch, to which I refer with the siglum Oα, although it is difficult to demonstrate beyond doubt that they are all derived from a single hypoarchetype *α rather than being direct descendants of the Odisha archetype *B. 37

These observations allow us to draw the following stemma codicum: 38

---

34 For example, one such case is the reading kva prepasan pavate in PS 17.7.5b, preserved correctly in most mss., but which appears as kva prepasmanpavate (with the insertion of the sequence sman) in Mā. V71 and JM3.

35 For instance, the shared lacuna in 17.21.10, where the whole line is missing from V71 and JM3, but present in Mā. For other examples, see Selva 2019: 23f.

36 It can be shown that Mā cannot be the exemplar of V71 and JM3. In fact, it features errors that are not found in the other two mss. See Selva 2019: 24f.

37 One argument in favour of positing a hyparchetype *α is the agreement between Oα and K on reading devā (which is presumably also the correct reading) vs. devān, as preserved in all the other (Oβ) mss., in PS 17.28.26 (see Selva 2019: 20, 254).

38 Note that JM3, despite belonging genetically to Oα, frequently agrees with the Oα mss. against Mā and V71, as if JM3’s copyist had collated other sources together with *β1 and corrected various readings accordingly. This general influence of Oα on JM3 is indicated with arrows in the stemma.
I will now illustrate one case in which such a detailed knowledge of the history of transmission can help us with the editorial work. Consider stanza PS 17.14.10, belonging to the third anuvāka of kāṇḍa 17, containing spells to exorcize the Sadānuvās, female demons who threaten pregnant women and their children. In particular, we will discuss the opening of pāda e, which I shall omit from the edited text and leave untranslated at first:

a  āmādinīḥ krūrādinir
b  anagnigandhyādinīḥ |
c  amun parety,oddhitam

d  šavam atta sadān,vāḥ |
e  _ _ kevala ācāraḥ
f  kim u sālās, v *ichatha ||

O eaters of raw flesh, O eaters of bloody flesh, O eaters of what does not smell of fire (i.e. is uncooked), O Sadānuvās, having gone away [from here], eat that exposed corpse over there. _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ , so what do you seek in [our] houses?

Ms. readings for the opening of pāda e:

savaḥ  Ma V122 Ji, Pa,, śivaḥ Ja, śavaḥ Mā JM3, saśvavaḥ V71, savah K

Bhattacharya (2011 ad loc.), whose edition is based only on three mss., Ma, Ja and Mā, adopts Mā’s reading, śavaḥ kevala ācāraḥ, with śavaḥ featuring a palatal sibilant that is also found in Ja (śivaḥ), as opposed to Ma and K, which both have a dental/alveolar sibilant (savaḥ, savah). A few years earlier, Griffiths (2009: 277), who quoted this stanza in a comment, adopted the same reading, and translated the line with “The corpse is [your] only diet.” This reading makes sense semantically; the word śava-, “corpse,” is also used in pāda d; and Bhattacharya could have argued in favour of adopting a palatal ś on the basis of the majority criterion, as two out of his three Odisha mss. feature it—although, once again, Bhattacharya might be accused of neglecting the evidence from K.

However, if we avail ourselves of additional ms. evidence and take the stemmatic relationship between the mss. into consideration, we can make the following observations. All of the O₄ mss. preserve a dental sibilant: in fact, savah is found in Ma V122 Ji, Pa,, Ja śivaḥ is the sole exception. All of the O₃ mss. preserve a palatal sibilant: śavaḥ in Mā and JM3, saśvavaḥ V71. Considering that the O₄ mss. (and especially Ma) generally preserve the correct reading, and that K also has a dental sibilant (savaḥ), it seems reasonable to regard the O₃ reading śavaḥ with a palatal as a scribal error attributable to *β, and the palatal in Ja’s śivaḥ as a genetically independent error of little significance.
Moreover, the reading savaḥ with a dental sibilant can definitely be considered the *lectio difficilior*, as śavaḥ can easily be explained as being due to perseveration from the preceding pāda d (śavam atta sadānuvāḥ). If we interpret the reading savaḥ as consisting of two words, sa vaḥ, we obtain the following meaning: “That (sa) is your (vaḥ) customary conduct.” In this way, we also have the advantage of not having to supply the necessary word “your,” as Griffiths was forced to do in his translation.

4. The direction of recent and current research

4.1. The debate on the history of transmission of the PS

The history of the medieval tradition of the PS and the circumstances that led to the transmission of the text in Kashmir and Odisha have been a matter of debate. Bhattacharya (1997: xi–xii, xxxviii–li), following his father (Bhattacharyya 1964: xii–xiii), has claimed that the AV only entered Kashmir after the 15th century, pointing to an account by (Pseudo-)Jonarāja in his Rājatarāṅgini, according to which a Kashmirian scholar named Yuḍḍhabhaṭṭa, who had studied the AV among the Karṇāṭas, introduced the AV to Kashmir under the patronage of the influential scholar Śiryabhaṭṭa during the reign of Sultān Zayn-al-ʿĀbidin (ca. 1420–70 CE). Thus, the Paippalādaśākhā would have been present in South India and, from there, it would have spread to Kashmir and presumably to Odisha.

Griffiths (2002: 40–44) has questioned this hypothesis, first of all by pointing out that Bhattacharya had ignored Witzel’s articles on the topic (see §2 above), which identified Gujarat as the likely medieval home of the PS and hypothesized its diffusion from Gujarat to Kashmir and Bengal, then from Bengal to Odisha. Secondly, Griffiths suggests, on the basis of various observations on the historical use of the term karṇāṭa, that the word might actually refer to any other part of the Vijayanagara empire, at the time referred to as Karṇāṭa, and even to Odisha itself, whose Gajapati rulers claimed the title of “Gajapati Gauḍēśvara Navakoṭi Karṇāṭa-Kālavargeśvara.” Thirdly, stressing the lack of any positive evidence for a South Indian home of the PS, he points out the particularly evident knowledge of the PS displayed by North Indian grammarians, from Pāṇini to Patañjali and the Kāśikāvṛtti (cf. Bhattacharyya 1964: xxxii; Bhattacharya 1997: xl ff. and K. Bhattacharya 2001).

39 The stem savá- does not seem to yield much sense in this context; perhaps one might wish to translate with “[Your] customary conduct is [my] command (savaḥ) only.”

40 The precise reference is interpolation nr. 121, Ins. 74-89; see Kaul (1967: 173). Griffiths (2002: 42) specifies that this is “part of the extensive late 16th century interpolations inserted when the text was being translated into Persian on behalf of Mughal emperor Akbar.” Slaje (2007: 329-330) proposes distinguishing this longer version of the Rājatarāṅgini with interpolations from the shorter original text by Jonarāja by referring to its author as “Pseudo-Jonarāja.”
In his article in the edited volume Griffiths and Schmiedchen 2007, Walter Slaje (2007: 330 fn. 2) criticizes Griffiths’s suggestion, pointing to the existence of “epigraphical evidence for the presence of Atharvavedic brahmins in ‘Southern Karṇāṭa’ (~ the Vijayanagara area) around ad 1430” and that “in Kalhaṇa’s earlier Rājatarāṅgiṇī, Karṇāṭa is used clearly with reference to the South Indian region.” Slaje’s (2007) article further discusses the circumstances that might have led to the redaction of the Kashmirian ms.: he makes a strong case for the possibility that the PS was not introduced, but rather re-introduced into Kashmir in the 15th century, as there is evidence of the presence of the AV in Kashmir already from the 7th century (2007: 331 and fn. 11). In fact, the Kashmirian ms.’s (or its exemplar’s) date of 1419 points to the reign of the tolerant Sulṭān Zayn-al-Ābidīn who, following 30 years of violent persecution of Hindu worshippers and the forced Islamisation of the region during the reign of his predecessors, made great efforts to allow paṇḍits to resettle and re-import their lost literature. Slaje reconstructs these historical circumstances, and highlights the influential role played by the Kashmirian scholar Śīryabhaṭṭa at Zayn’s court, providing a credible scenario for (Pseudo-)Jonarāja’s account of Yuddhabaṭṭa’s authorship of the Kashmirian AV ms. under his patronage.

One additional piece of evidence for understanding the Paippalāda tradition in Kashmir is Kei Kataoka’s 2007 study of the likely Paippalāda affiliation of the 9th-century Kashmirian philosopher Bhaṭṭa Jayanta, featured in the same volume.

In the introduction to said volume (Griffiths and Schmiedchen 2007: v, fn. 3), Griffiths withdrew his 2002 suggestion to identify (Pseudo-)Jonarāja’s Karṇāṭa with Odisha, but remained open to the possibility that the reference was still “the result of some geographical misconception, because it cannot be made to fit with the other evidence at our disposal.”

Finally, building on Diskalkar 1959-1960 and 1962, Annette Schmiedchen’s 2007 contribution to the same edited volume provides additional epigraphical evidence for the presence of the Paippalāda in early medieval Gujarat and later medieval North Bengal and Odisha. The evidence consists mainly of copper-plate grants recording royal donations of land to (groups of) brahmins from the 4th to the 12th centuries CE.\(^1\) Thus, with regard to the early medieval diffusion of the Paippalādaśākhā, Witzel’s Gujarat hypothesis (see §2 above) is still the most widely accepted.

\(^{41}\) Schmiedchen (2007: 357) notes that “out of the twenty-three references to Atharvavedins [in the collected epigraphic evidence], only six explicitly specify the particular sākhā those Brahmins belonged to. In all the six instances [...], it is the Paippalādaśākhā that is referred to; there is not a single piece of epigraphical evidence for the Śaunakaśākhā”; moreover, “it remains a striking feature of the relevant data that, although almost all Indian dynasties that ever issued copper-plate charters between the 4th and the 10th centuries endowed first and foremost Brahmins and only secondly Buddhist and Jain monasteries or Hindu temples, just a minority of them seem to have supported Atharvavedic Brahmins.”
4.2. The linguistic and philological study of the PS

When compared with the ĒRV or the ŚS, the PS presents us with abundant new linguistic material, new words, new forms and grammatical innovations next to probably intentional archaisms.\textsuperscript{42} Besides a few early linguistic studies by Renou (1955, 1957a, 1957b, 1957c, 1964-1965) and a more recent one by Tucker (2016) that have a rather general character, and an important article by Insler (1998) on the redactional history of the AV recensions, the hymn-composition and the stanza arrangement techniques used by the ŚS and PS redactors, most recent works on the PS consist of single-word studies, or focus on the linguistic analysis of single hymns – which is frequently the occasion for providing a new critical edition of small new portions of the PS.

For instance, Griffiths and Lubotsky (1999) offers a preliminary edition of the trca 19.34.7–9, relevant for the interpretation of the form jangahe, an intensive of the root gandh-, “to smell, be fragrant,” according to Lubotsky (1997: 562f.) Griffiths and Lubotsky 2000–01 provides a critical edition of PS 4.15 (= ŚS 4.12), a charm to heal an open fracture, which contains a very old type of formulaic magic (“Let marrow come together with marrow, and your joint together with joint […] Let bone grow over [together] with bone […],” etc.) that we also find, for instance, in the Second Merseburg charm (“Like bone-sprain, so blood-sprain, so joint-sprain: Bone to bone, blood to blood, joints to joints, so may they be glued”\textsuperscript{43}). Griffiths and Lubotsky (2009) discusses the words yātar- and giri- on the basis of the trca PS 19.19.9–11, for which an edition is provided. Griffiths and Lubotsky (2014) contains a critical edition of PS 4.14, a charm to remove an arrow tip or another foreign body (śalyā) that has penetrated a victim’s body. Griffiths (2007a) studies the figure of Tumburu on the basis of PS 20.61.7–9 and 20.62.1–2. Lubotsky (2007) contains an edition of PS 8.15, a unique appeal to the brahmins to show solidarity and protest when one of them is abused. Lubotsky 2010 contains a list of words attested in PS 5 (edited by the author in 2002) that do not appear outside of the PS: each lemma provides the occurrences (also from elsewhere in the PS) and a brief discussion. Knobl (2007) discusses the word jatravya-, found in PS 7.15.7, and abhilī-, in PSO 20.62.9a–63.5d ~ PSK 20.58.7a–59.4b. Kulikov 2009 discusses PS 14.8.4 (= ŚS 19.49.4), containing the word piśī-, which the author proposes to translate with “cheetah” or “leopard” rather than as “antelope” or “stag.” Kulikov has also devoted three articles to the Vedic “night”: Kulikov (2010) discusses ŚS 19.49.1 = PS 14.8.1 and the

\begin{flushright}

\textsuperscript{42} This latter point has been stressed, among others, by Witzel (1997: 278), who has interpreted it in light of the Paippalādins’ efforts to be “accepted by the nobility and by the Brahmins who represented the Trayī, the three other Vedas” (more on this in §4.3 below). Indeed, the PS editors frequently inserted Ṛgvedic forms (e.g. Ṛgvedic kṛṇoti, kṛṇu, etc. in place of the allegro forms karoti, kuru, etc. as found in the ŚS), and hypercorrections can also sometimes be found.

\textsuperscript{43} Translation from Fortson (2010: 368-369).
\end{flushright}
etymology of the word rātrī; Kulikov (2013) offers a translation and text-critical and linguistic comments on the hymn to the night in ŚS 19.50 = PS 14.0, while Kulikov (2014) is similarly devoted to another hymn to the night. 44 ŚS 19.47 = PS 6.20. Kulikov (forth.) treats PS 15.3.4 ~ ŚS 19.44–45 dealing with the Traiakakuda ointment. Tucker (2007) contains an edition of PS 11.10–11 which deal with a harvest rite connected with Indra, while Tucker (2014) discusses feminine epithets belonging to the –van/-vari inflection that appear in PS 11.16, a praise to the Waters used in the royal unction rite. Lelli (2018) contains an edition of the ṭpca in PS 19.20.15–17, a unique charm against wrinkles. The same author, together with Kristen De Joseph, is preparing an article on the semantic development of the word méhana-, “urethra.” De Joseph in press analyses the textual variation between the PS Wedding Hymn (18.1–14) and the ŚS (14) and RV (10.85) versions.

Atharvavedic metre has been the focus of an article by Philipp Kubisch (2007), who has proposed an elaborate notation based on his statistical analysis of the stanza types found in the first seven books of the ŚS. 45 Kubisch then systematically applied this notation in his 2012 critical edition of PS 20.1–30. Lelli’s (2014) Macerata PhD dissertation offered the “Paippalāda counterpart” to Kubisch (2007) by analysing the then published editions of seven and a half PS kāṇḍas (2, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15 and 20.1–30), making use of Kubisch’s notation, which Lelli then also applied in his 2015 edition of PS 15. I have also employed this notation in my 2014 Research MA thesis, although with some minor criticism with regard to the notation’s failure to account for some possibly intentional use of break rhythms (see Selva 2014: xvili fn. 9). However, the scholarly community responded with mixed reactions, as many found the notation to be unnecessarily complicated. To give an example: in Kubisch’s notation, a Triṣṭubh pāda that deviates in both opening and break from what he has determined to be the standard (or most common) structure would be encoded with the notation “+(#)T”; one that deviates in both opening and cadence, with “+(+)#T”; one that deviates in both break and cadence, with “+(#)T.” Although such a concise notation might be useful for computer-based research, it is indeed little intuitive. Sharing this criticism, both Lelli (in his yet-to-be-published revision of his 2015 PhD dissertation) and I (in my 2019 PhD dissertation) have decided to revert to a simpler notation, providing, for each pāda, the number of syllables next to a metrical scheme. For instance, a Jagatī pāda would be provided with a notation such as the following: “12 [~ ~ ~ | ~ ~ | ~ ~ ~ × ]”. Nevertheless, Lelli’s painstaking (2014) analysis remains an important step in the study of the PS metre.

44 On the group of hymns dedicated to the night (ŚS 19.47–50), see also Rotaru (2012).
45 A limited sample was chosen due to time constraints.
The prose of the PS is a much neglected subject. Renou devotes to the PS only a “note additionelle” at the end of his 1955 work on the AV prose – although much of the observations he makes on the basis of the ŚS data in the main body of his article are also valid for the PS. In Selva (2019: 41-52 and 222-233), I provide a sketch of the syntax and style of the two prose anuvākas of PS book 17 – anuvāka 5 = 17.21–26, mainly composed in yajus-style prose, and anuvāka 6 = PS 17.27–43, in brāhmaṇa-style prose – both lacking a ŚS parallel. Werner Knobl has also studied the prose of the PS, and in particular PS 9.21.1–12, as the locus of the earliest appearance of the etād-yād (or yād-figē) construction (see Knobl 2009). Much still remains to be studied.

4.3. The interpretation of the PS as a manual for the king’s purohita

The Atharvavedins’ particular concern with exalting and promoting their own tradition was recognized early on. From the evidence collected by Bloomfield (1899a: 28-34), we gather that the Atharvavedins’ agenda was mainly focussed on achieving three goals, which can be summarized as follows: 1) having the Atharvaveda recognized as a “fourth” full-fledged Veda beside the already well-established trayī vidyā (the Rgveda, Yajurveda and Sāmaveda);46 2) claiming a prominent position for the AV priest, the brahmāṇ, within Śrāuta ritualism, next to the priests affiliated with the other Vedas (the hōṭṛ, the adhvaryū, the udgāṭi and their assistants); and finally 3) recommending themselves as the best candidates for the office of a king’s “house chaplain” and main adviser, the purohita (also called guru).47

The textual efforts aimed at promoting themselves over other schools sometimes reveal rivalries even between different śākhās of the AV itself. Much quoted is AVPariś 2.1–5: “The Atharvan keeps off terrible occurrences, and acts as a charm against portentous ones […] not the Adhvaryu, not the Chandoga, and not the Bahvṛca […] The Bahvṛca destroys the kingdom, the Adhvaryu destroys sons, the Chandoga dissipates wealth; hence the guru must be an Atharvaṇa […] A Paippalāda as guru increases happiness, sovereignty, health, and so does a Śaunakin who understands the gods and the mantras […] The king whose purodhā is in any way a Jalada or a Mauda [N.B. other AV śākhās] is deposed from the kingdom within the year” (quoted in Bloomfield 1899a: 30).

However, recent studies have pointed out that the Paippalāda in particular seems especially concerned with the necessity of obtaining royal patronage, much more so than the ŚS. Witzel (1997: 46).

46 Note the new term brāhmāṇi (neuter plural), with which the Atharvavedins refer to their own mantras, as opposed to the jcas, yējāṃsi and sāmāṇi belonging to the other Vedas. Accordingly, the Atharvaveda acquires the name of “Brahmaveda.”

47 See also the references collected in Sanderson (2007: 204ff., fn. 28, 29, 31).
278-279) has noticed a number of features in the PS, such as the tendency to use linguistic archaism
(see fn. 42 above), and the particular attention to developing special life-cycle-related Grhya rituals
(marriage, upanayana, royal consecration, etc.), that are absent from the ŚS, which he thinks are a
clear indication of this concern. In particular, he has also singled out PS book 10 as having a
specifically royal character. “The AV texts, as we have them now, have in all probability been
composed/adapted and collected under the Kuru hegemony, — or, to suggest a name, in the realm of
the famous king Parikṣit (see ṚV-Khil. 5.10 = ŚŚ 20.127). Book 10 of PS, little studied and even less
understood, provides further evidence for the time and the aims of the Atharvan collectors. It deals
with an early form of the royal consecration rituals as part of a Sava, that is, an uction ritual inserted
into a standard Soma sacrifice. While the Ṛgveda and Śaunaka Saṁhitās only contain a few simple
‘installation hymns,’ the priests of the Paiplalada school made an effort to provide the king with a
more solemn rite, a state ritual” (1997: 278).

Following Witzel’s observation, numerous other hymns have been identified as likely being
intended for royal ceremonies. Lelli (2015a: 32; 2015b: 377–378) provides a list of such hymns – mainly
from the books that had been edited at the time of publication (1, 5, 6, 7, 13, 14) – comprising over 20
items, only a couple of which are found in the ŚS. As Lelli (2015a: 32) writes, “the fact that almost all
the hymns mentioned above are found only in the PS and not in the ŚS means that there must be ‘a
conscious effort of Paippalāda Brahmins to appear as best suited to be the king’s purohita’ (Lopez 2010:
51), in competition with other ‘orthodox’ Brahmins; ‘although later Dharma texts point out that the
purohita of the king should be an Atharvavedin, the Śaunaka school do not seem to have the same
agenda in the redaction of its Saṁhitā’ (Lopez 2010: 83).”

A new, complete critical edition of PS 10 provided with a translation is still wanting. Above, I have mentioned D’Avella’s
(2007) MA thesis, covering only PS 10.10–16. However, Tsuchiyama has devoted a short study (2007) to the concept of rāṣṭra
and the dynamics surrounding the notion of kingship as it emerges from this book: the tribal alliances, the assembly (sāmiti),
the selection of the leader and his ascension (ruh-) to the role of king, his embodying of the notion of kingship (rāṣṭram bhū-
), the collection of tributes (bali), etc.

1 I cite from Lelli (2015a: 32): “PS 1.11 = ŚŚ 1.29 Ein Halsamulett (mani-), um Herrschaft (rāṣṭra-) zu erlangen; PS 1.19 = ŚŚ 1.9
Für Gedeihen und Reichtum; PS 1.53 (PS only) Für Respekt (upa-citi-) und Herrschaft (rāṣṭra-); PS 1.54 (PS only) Für Ansehen
(varcas-) und Macht; PS 1.74 (PS only) An einen König; PS 1.75 (PS only) Der König als Beschützer vor Feinden; PS 1.92 (PS
only) An die (Gerichts-)Versammlung (sāmiti-); PS 2.18 = ŚŚ 6.38 Bitte um Prestige (‘Funkeln’); PS 2.25 (PS only) Um in der
Schlacht den Sieg zu erringen; PS 2.65 (PS only) Zur Sicherung der Herrschaft; PS 2.72-73 (PS only) Zur Erhaltung der
Herrschaft; PS 2.86 (PS only) Prosaformel: für Feindlosigkeit in jeder Richtung; PS 2.88 = ṚV 10.152 An Indra (zum Schutz vor
Feinden); PS 5.29 (PS only) For splendor (varcas-); PS 6.9 (PS only) For a king, against enemies: with a bull; PS 7.12 (PS only)
For a queen, against rival wives: with pāṇi; PS 13.1-2 (PS only) Internalization of cosmic elements; PS 13.7-8 (PS only) A
riddle hymn (in the style of a brahmodya). PS 14.1-2 (PS only) The king-engendering (rājasūya) waters. PS 14.5-6 (PS only)
The offering of the Śataudanā-cow.”
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To this, Lelli (2015a, 2015b) adds evidence from book 15. He regards this book as consisting of two main divisions, the first of which, comprising PS 15.1–12 (five hymns spread over 12 sūktas) he calls a “collection of royal hymns” (2015a: 31): sūktas 1-2 contain spells for protection of the kingdom, many of which are borrowed from YV sections that deal with the Āsvamedha; 3-4 contain stanzas to be recited in a Mahāśānti ceremony, which borrow formulaic expressions normally employed in the royal consecration (Rājasūya); 5-6 deal with the king’s investiture; in the refrain found in 7-9, the reciter invokes various gods as “overseers” (ādhyakṣa) of various spheres, wishing for their help with his office of purohita (purodhā); and 10–12 deal with warfare. As Lelli points out, many of the stanzas found in these texts consist of material from the ṚV or YV texts that has either been directly borrowed or rearranged. This, he believes, betrays the Paippalādins’ intentional efforts aimed at collecting materials in order “to grant undisputed authority to their practices and literature” (2015b: 394), and establish themselves as potential purohitas.

The interpretation of the PS as a manual for the king’s purohita appears one of the most promising lines of research on the Paippalāda today. The presence of Vṛātya elements (see §4.4 below) in the saṃhitā might also be interpreted as being related to the Atharvavedins’ attempts to obtain royal patronage, either because they shared the Vṛātyas’ marginal status and preoccupation with finding means of subsistence, because they shared a common Rudraic cult or perhaps because they, as purohitas, needed to offer their services to the newly formed dynasties that emerged as a result of successful conquering expeditions by Vṛātya warrior brotherhoods.

The topic of kingship in relation to the Atharvaveda has also been treated in a recent book by Geslani, titled Rites of the God-King (2018). By focussing on the AV ancillary literature vis-à-vis the astrological (jyotiṣa) and Purāṇic literature, the author traces the emergence and development of the Śānti (“appeasement”) rituals as a specialty of the AV priests, and shows how these came to be “instituted within the office of kingship (rājadharma) [...] as the basis of the king’s annual ritual life” (Geslani 2018: 18). Moreover, he shows how, around the middle of the 1st millennium CE, AV royal priests became “creatively engaged with the problem of omens as delimited by the nascent astrological tradition” (Geslani 2018: 254) and how, at the same time, the astrological tradition appropriated the Śānti ritual techniques, so that it is possible to speak of an “Atharvan-astrological ritual regime” that was able to provide kings with efficient solutions for detecting bad omens as well

50 See also Whitaker’s (2004) article on the use of amulets (maṇī) as it emerges from the AV in relation to royal power and prestige, and Tucker 2014 on PS 11.16, a hymn to the Waters used in the royal unction rite.

51 On this latter dynamic, see Bollée (1981), Vassilkov (2015) and Selva (2019: Appendices I and II).
as for averting bad consequences by means of spells. Geslani further claims that this ritual regime informed the Purāṇic notion of kingship and that śānti-based ritual of royal consecrations even informed the later ritual of image installation (pratiṣṭhā).

If Geslani is correct, it seems to me that we need to recognize that the efforts at promoting themselves as royal advisers pervaded the AV tradition for the longest time and across multiple phases: first of all, in the early Vedic period, around the time of the Kuru realm, when the AV mantras were first collected; then when the first śākhās emerged with their own competing saṃhitās; then with the emergence of the Śānti ritualism as it appears from the AV ancillary literature; and finally, throughout the 1st millennium CE, in combination with the emerging astrological tradition.52

4.4. Paippalādins, Vṛātyas and Pāśupatas

The first scholar to suggest a connection between the Vṛātyas and the Paippalāda tradition was Duccio Lelli in his edition of PS 15 (2015a). The second of the two hymn collections identified by Lelli in this book comprises four hymns (across sūktas 15-23, possibly also including 13 and 14) dedicated to Rudra. Lelli (2015a: 33) identifies the “core” of the collection as sūktas 20-21, which are partially rearrangements of ṚV 2.33 (one of the threeṚgvedic hymns to Rudra), and invoke Rudra in the form of Bhava and Śarva, the “two lords of animals” (paśupati, PS 1521.1a, 2a). Lelli finds Rudraic references also in sūktas 18–19, to the Apsarases, and 22–23, in which the Maruts are mentioned as Rudra’s sons.

To highlight the prominent presence of Rudra in the PS, Lelli points to PS 14.3.1–10 and 14.4.1–7. These 17 stanzas were, in fact, also transmitted independently from the saṃhitā, as the first half of the second kāṇḍa of the Nīlarudropaniṣad, and are regarded as the Atharvan equivalent of the Yajurvedic Śatarudriya (Lubin 2007: 81, 85).

To explain Rudra’s prominence in the PS, Lelli suggests that the Paippalādins shared some elements of Vṛātya culture. He is hesitant to propose a one-to-one identification, but highlights the fact that Rudra was the tutelary deity of the Vṛātyas and, secondly, that “neither the Paippalādins nor the Vṛātyas were fully recognized as part of Vedic society, both living at its borders; this would explain both the references to specific cults, like the Rudraic one, in the PS, as well as the simultaneous effort to appear as the best candidates to be the king’s purohita, namely, as a means to

52 Also note the evidence from the Āṅgirasakalpa (see §4.5 below), which contains instructions for hostile rituals meant to be used by purohitas in the service of kings, and the social dynamics proposed by Sanderson (see fn. 55 below) to explain the presence of Śaiva rituals in AV texts as a reaction to the rise of Śaiva officiants threatening the Atharvavedins’ privileged status.
becoming honourably included in the highest ranks of Vedic society” (Lelli 2015a: 34)—thus connecting the Vrātya question with the question of royal patronage discussed in §4.3 above.

The issue of Rudra’s prominence in the PS cannot be separated from the problem of the presence of numerous textual connections between the AV texts (and particularly the Paippalāda texts) and the Pāśupata cult. Above (see §§2 and §4.1), we have discussed Witzel’s proposed localization of the home of the Paippalādasākhā in Gujarat in early medieval times. This hypothesis is particularly relevant for the study of the relationship between the Atharvavedins (Paippalādins in particular) and the Pāśupata cult, because the latter was widespread in precisely the same area of western India (Gujarat, Malwa), as pointed out by Bisschop and Griffiths (2003: 320). Bisschop and Griffiths (2003) survey the epigraphic evidence and highlight the presence of Śaiva names among the recipients of land grants, as well as among western Indian Atharvavedic authors in the 1st millennium CE. A particularly important role was likely played by Kārohana (modern Karvan, Gujarat). This city, believed to be the place where Śiva was incarnated as Lakulīśa and consequently an important Pāśupata āyatana, lies in the proximity of localities where grants to Atharvavedins have been found. This, according to the authors, might contribute to explaining why we find detailed knowledge of the Pāśupata observance (pāśupatavrata) in AVPariś 40, which is the focus of their article.

At the time of Kauṇḍinya’s commentary to the Pāśupatasūtra (4th century CE), which is the main source for our knowledge of the cult, the second stage of the pāśupatavrata required the ascetic to behave in a deranged way, pretending to be mad, in order to attract the censure of onlookers. In this way, the ascetic believed he could provoke a magical exchange in which his detractors’ merits (iṣṭapūrta) were transferred to him, and his own demerits to his detractors. In a 2013 article, aptly styled “How to behave like a bull,” Acharya demonstrated that, in its original form, the pāśupatavrata, as illustrated in the Pāśupatasūtra, required the ascetic not simply to behave as a mad person, but

---

53 Lelli (2015a: 34) also identifies a possible explicit reference to the Vrātyas in 15.21.4ab (PS only), na praminanti vratino vratāni satyaṃ jinvantō vidathā vadamenteḥ, “The ones observing a vow do not violate their vows, furthering truth, announcing distributions of wealth” (Lelli).

54 In a later article devoted to another portion of the AVPariś (36) – known as Ucchuṣmakalpa, a text of Tantric character, dedicated to Rudra in the form of Ucchuṣma – the two authors claim that in at least one case, it can be proven that Pāśupatas and Atharvavedins inhabited the same city, namely Anahilapātaka or Anahillaipurapattana (Bisschop and Griffiths 2007: 1 fn. 1).

55 Note that Sanderson (2007: 196–197) explains the presence of the pāśupatavrata chapter and the Ucchuṣmakalpa (see previous footnote) in AV texts as the result of the co-opting and adaptation of Śaiva rituals to the ritual repertoire of AV priests who, in this way, hoped to react to the rise in popularity of Śaiva officiants who were challenging the their pre-eminence as the principal beneficiaries of royal patronage.
specifically to behave like a bull, i.e. like the cattle of his lord, Pašupati; and that it actually prescribed the imitation of the behaviour of a bull throughout all phases of the ascetic’s life. The ascetic was supposed to headbutt, eat grass, drink from puddles, defecate in public and sexually harass women. Acharya went on to investigate possible Vedic sources of this peculiar observance, and was able to prove the existence of an archaic Vedic bull vrata on the basis of numerous textual sources. Among these sources, he identified two Atharvavedic texts: the so-called Anadutsūkta, “the hymn to the draft-ox” (ŚŚ 4.11 ~ PS 3.25), and a prose text, the sixth anuvāka of PS kāṇḍa 17 (PS 17.27–43).

Building on Acharya’s work, I studied these two texts extensively as part of my PhD research (2015–2019). During a reading session in my adviser Prof. Lubotsky’s office in 2015, Prof. Bisschop noticed a textual parallel between PS 17.35.4 and Pāśupatasūtra 4.10–13. Prof. Bisschop’s presentation at the Indo-Iranian and its Indo-European Origins workshop, held in honour of Prof. Lubotsky on the occasion of his 60th birthday, 8–9 April 2016, Leiden, featured my preliminary critical edition of the relevant PS portion, which was then included in Prof. Bisschop’s contribution to the workshop’s proceedings (Bisschop 2018). The discovery of such striking textual parallel once again raised the question of the connection between the Paippalāda and the Pāśupatas.

In the following years, I went on to complete a critical edition of PS 17 anuvāka 6, as well as of the PS version of the Anadutsūkta (PS 3.25), both now included in my PhD dissertation (Selva 2019). Moreover, I provided these two editions with two studies on Acharya’s archaic bull vrata. In the first study (Appendix I of my dissertation), I investigate the ideology and praxis of this archaic vrata (referred to as anāḍuḥo vrataṃ in the texts), and trace its origins back to the initiation practices of the Indo-European Männerbund. I focus especially on two cultural traits: 1) the IE Männerbündler’s practice of identifying with wild animals during their initiatory period in the wilderness and of performing masked parades while impersonating dead ancestors at specific yearly festivals; and 2) the Männerbündler’s idea of being entitled to a “stealing right” or sakraler Stehlrecht, that is, to receiving gifts and means of subsistence from the community. I provide textual evidence to show that both traits were present, although, of course, in a different (but structurally comparable) fashion in Vṛātya culture, which I consider an intermediate stage towards the rise of the Pāśupata’s observance involving the identification with bulls and the idea of stealing merit. By highlighting the socio-economic factors that drove the development of the Männerbund from an institution devoted to the education of the youth to a warrior and ascetic brotherhood that provided a means of social mobility to marginalized people, I attempt to uncover the dynamics that led to the re-elaboration of these prehistoric Indo-European cultural practices into the culture of the Vedic Vṛātya warrior brotherhoods and later early Śaiva asceticism.
In the second study (Appendix II of my dissertation), which contains my critical edition of the PS आन्धुत्सूक्त (PS 3.25), I present a new interpretation of the hymn based both on the comparison with PS 17 anuvāka 6 and the data from my cultural reconstruction, outlined in Appendix I, uncovering the connections between the anāduho vrata and the celebrations of the solstices that are mentioned in the hymn: the Gharma ritual at the summer solstice, and the celebrations of the 12 vrātyā nights of the winter solstice. Both of these can be traced back to Indo-European practices. I once again expand on Acharya’s 2013 article, in which he claimed that the archaic bull vrata belonged to the cult of Indra, and I suggest that, in fact, both Indra and Rudra play a role in the observance, because they are both deities connected with the Vrātyas.

4.5. The study of the ancillary literature

In the late 1950s, together with the mss. of the सांहिता, Durgamohan Bhattacharyya also discovered mss. containing ancillary texts (1964: xvi; 1968, passim). In later years, other such mss. have been collected by the Odisha State Museum, the Parija Library of Utkal University and other institutions (see Griffiths 2007b: 142f.). However, most mss. still belong to private collections, although Griffiths has made some of them available to the scholarly community by producing numerous sets of photographs. Griffiths (2007b) describes these sources and the texts that they preserve, with particular attention to the upaniṣads and, in particular, to a version of the Caranāvyūha (= AVPariś 49) called Caranāvyūhopaniṣad (CVU), the purpose of which is to provide an overview of the Atharvavedic canon from the सांहिता to the ancillary literature.

This text, of which Griffiths (2007b: 162ff.) provides a critical edition, mentions the Gopathabrāhmaṇa, vedāṅgas56, five kalpas57, lakṣaṇa-granthis58, pariṣīṭas59 and a number of upaniṣads:60 “Only for this last genre of ancillary literature does the CVU version differ substantially from the version that is AVPariś 49. The list of Upaniṣads in the CVU shows a remarkable overlap with what we

56 No AV vedāṅga actually seems to exist (see Griffiths 2007b: 182-183).
57 See Sanderson (2007: 202ff.), Griffiths (2007b: 183f.) and Bahulkar (1984). The five texts are 1) the Nakṣatralkalpa (= AVPariś 1), not found in Odisha, although ritual manuals do refer to a nakṣatralkalpokta ritual sequence (tantra); 2) the Vaitānakalpa, not found; 3) the Saṃhitāvidhi, better known as Kauśikasūtra, possibly known to Śrīdhara, the author of the Karmapañjikā; 4) the Āṅgirasakalpa (see below); and the Sāntikalpa (see Griffiths 2007b: 184).
59 The text mentions 72 pariṣīṭas. On the Saunaka pariṣīṭas, see Modak 1993. No collection of pariṣīṭas has been found in Odisha, although a number of texts that could belong to this category are found within other collections (e.g. the Caranāvyūha or AVPariś 49 is found among the Odisha upaniṣads) (see Griffiths 2007b: 185f.).
60 The given number is 18, but more titles are listed. See Griffiths (2007b: 148-161).
actually find in the common initial parts of the Upaniṣad-manuscripts that are available in Orissa” (Griffiths 2007b: 179). Besides this major difference, and some minor variations probably due to carelessness in transmission, it is likely that the two texts descend from a common source, so it is not possible to speak of two recensions (Griffiths 2007b: 162-163). The original Caranaavyūha must have been shared by different śākhās.

Indeed, Griffiths’s study of the CVU has re-ignited the old debate on the affiliation of the known AV ancillary texts with the Śaunaka or the Paippalāda tradition. It seems likely that a number of texts, such as the Kausūkasūtra, Vaitānasūtra, the AV prāyaścittas and AV pariśītastas might in fact have originally belonged to both the Śaunaka and the Paippalāda canons (see Griffiths 2004; 2007b: 186ff. and ibid. fn. 72). The affiliation of the Gopathabrāhmaṇa (GB) has been a matter of discussion: the Paippalāda tradition knew a now lost brāhmaṇa text, but it is unclear whether this can be identified with the GB. Kataoka (2007) showed that the famous Kashmirian philosopher Bhaṭṭa Jayanta was a Paippalādin; therefore, his quotations of the GB in the Nyāyamañjari at least seem to prove that the GB was known to 9th-c. Kashmirian Paippalādins. Griffiths also mentions GB quotations in the Karmapañjikā, a ritual manual of the Odisha Paippalādins (see below), and still other evidence has been brought to light (see Griffiths 2007b: 179ff.). However, the traditional notion that the Paippalāda brāhmaṇa consisted of eight adhyāyas does not match with what we know of the GB. However, this information is actually only attested in the Prapañcahrdaya, a late South Indian text, and Griffiths (2007b: 180–182) is inclined to question its reliability.

As for the ancillary texts that were actually found in the private collections of Odisha Paippalāda brahmins, three are most prominent and widespread: the Karmapañjikā, the Karmasamuccaya and the Āṅgirasakalpa.

The Karmapañjikā (KP) (see Griffiths and Sumant 2018; Griffiths 2007b: 144), authored by Śrīdhara, is a paddhati-type ritual manual for the performance of domestic rituals that belong to the tradition of the Odisha Paippalādins. This text, composed “during the 16th century CE, and possibly in the precise year 1589” (Griffiths and Sumant 2018: xli), is divided into two parts: the first deals with the various rites (saṃskāra) that a male Paippalāda brahmin must undergo during his life,63 with

62 Note that an additional Paippalāda sūtra (as well as a pariṭhāṣṭa), ascribed to Paiṭhāṇasi, is cited in Śrīdhara’s Karmapañjikā (Griffiths 2007b: 187). On this author, see Rotaru (2016).
63 KP 10 identifies seven saṃskāras: vivāho garbhakaraṇaṁ tataḥ purisavanam tathā | jātakarma ca godānopanayanapālavanāṇi ||, “[The rituals are] marriage, rite of impregnation, rite for obtaining a male child, rite for new-born child, rite of shaving the
special focus on the marriage ritual (Griffiths and Sumant 2018: xxxi), whereas the second focuses mainly on funerary rites (Griffiths and Sumant 2018: xxxv). Arlo Griffith and Shilpa Sumant have been working for several years on a critical edition to be published in three volumes, although only the first part of book 1 has been published so far (Griffiths and Sumant 2018). Sumant, a pupil of Prof. Shrikant Bahulkar in Pune, began focussing on the Karmapaṇjikā while working on her doctoral dissertation (2007), a study of the development of the marriage ritual throughout the history of AV ancillary literature. She later produced numerous related publications: Sumant (2009), on the Mitādiṣṭā, that is, the practice of worshipping 57 deities (“Mita, etc.”) at the start of religious ceremonies, according to the Odisha Paippalādins’ ritual manuals; Sumant (2010–11), again on the Paippalāda wedding ritual; Sumant (2010b) on the worship and iconography of Nṛṣimha as the iṣṭadevatā of the Odisha Paippalādins, especially as it emerges from the KP; Sumant (2011) on the quotation of saṃhitā mantras in the KP and their ritual use, with attention also to the present-day oral tradition; Sumant (2017a), with a survey on the gaṇaś (group of mantras) found in the KP; Sumant (2017b) on the instructions for the construction of the pavilion (bahiṣṭāḥ) used for conducting domestic rituals according to the KP; and Sumant (2017c) on the ritual application of mantras from the PS, ŚŚ and RV versions of the Wedding Hymn, especially according to the Kauśikasūtra.

The Karmasamuccaya (see Sumant 2016; Griffiths 2007b: 145f.) is “a corpus of anonymous prayoga-texts used by the Paippalāda Atharvavedins of Orissa for conducting domestic rituals” (Sumant 2016: 883). It consists of three books (pustaka): Vratapustaka, Vivāhapustaka and Durbalakṛtyapustaka. Its focus is on the same saṃskāras treated by the KP: the first book deals with a great variety of these life-rites (Puṇīsavana, Godāna, Upanayana, etc.) and related rituals (the preparation of a ritual hall, the selection of the priests, the Śāntyudaka, etc.); the second deals with the marriage ritual in particular; and the third deals with funeral and Śraddhā rites (Sumant 2016: 885). Sumant (2010-11: 394) notes that “even today this ritual guide-book is copied in smaller sections, called khāta, ‘notebook’ in Oriya and is used by the priests in the performance of rituals.” A critical edition is still wanting.

64 In 2000, Umākānta Paṇḍā published a modern ritual manual, the Paippalādadvīdhadānsaṃskārapaddhati, on the basis of mss. containing this text (see Sumant 2016: 893), but this does not constitute a critical edition. As Sumant (2016: 893) notes, “due to the scarcity of published material, [Paṇḍā’s] book is useful to some extent for understanding the rituals. However, one must know that this book is an attempt to compose a prayoga-text in modern times. Though KS manuscripts are at the base of this prayoga, it does not give a faithful rendering of them. At several places, the author deviates from the
The Āṅgirasakalpa ⁶⁵ (see Griffiths 2007b: 146f.; Bahulkar 1987; Sanderson 2007), or Abhicārakalpa, is an open corpus of texts, ⁶⁶ mainly consisting of “instruction in the procedures of hostile ritual through the propitiation of post-Vedic Mantra-deities following Tantric rather than Vedic liturgical models” (Sanderson 2007: 201). Such instructions are provided in the form of answers given by the sage Āṅgiras to questions posed by the sage Pippalāda (Sanderson 2007: 201). The rituals are explicitly tailored for kings as sponsors and beneficiaries, and the rituals’ goal is the subjugation of the kings’ enemies; ⁶⁷ thus, the priests involved were clearly rājapurohitas (Sanderson 2007: 203–204). Sanderson (2007) has provided a survey of the ms. sources, highlighted the Odia character of the corpus (as evinced from the pre-eminence of Nṛṣimha and other pieces of evidence) and discussed the period of composition of the corpus, ⁶⁸ its evolution and its distinct Tantra character.⁶⁹

In recent years, there has also been renewed attention towards the rest of the AV ancillary literature that had been traditionally associated with the ŚŚ, especially towards the Kauśikasūtra (KauŚŚ). Griffiths (2004) has collected those mantras quoted in the KauŚŚ that can be found in the PS, re-opening the debate on how much this text is indebted to the Paippalāda tradition – although it is not to be excluded that the sūtrakāra could have taken these mantras from other lost recensions or from the “undifferentiated mass of atharvanic tradition” (Gonda, cited by Griffiths 2004: 50). Julieta Rotaru has also published extensively on the KauŚŚ (2007, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2014, 2018, forth.) and, together with Shilpa Sumant (who herself published on the KauŚŚ: 2010a), is preparing a new critical manuscripts.” Sumant (2016: 893) also mentions the existence of other ritual manuals in Odia language: the Durbalakṛtyavidhi and the Śrāddhapaddhati.

⁶⁵ According to Sanderson (2007: 203), the content of this text shows that this can’t be the same Āṅgirasakalpa that the tradition enumerates among the five AV kalpas (e.g. the Caranāvvyūha: see fn. 57 above), “but by taking on this title it asserts that it is; and in this capacity it adds the claim that of all the five Kalpas it is the foremost.”

⁶⁶ “The manuscripts that I have seen […] do not transmit a single, constant work but contain varying but overlapping collections of texts” (Sanderson 2007: 201). Note that, in 2003, Umākanta Panḍā privately published one such ms. with the title Paippalādavaśādīśākarmapaddhati (see Sanderson 2007: 201).

⁶⁷ As an exception, Sanderson (2007: 239-254) provides the edition and translation of one text from the corpus, called Parājapavidhi, “The Procedure for the Japa of the [Mantra of the Goddess] Parā,” that originally belongs to the Trika Tantra corpus, and is “taught exclusively for the personal spiritual benefit of the priests themselves, as the means by which in spite of being ritualists (karmī) they may attain meditative absorption (yogāḥ) and final liberation (mokṣāḥ).”

⁶⁸ According to Sanderson (2007: 234), if the pre-eminence of Nṛṣimha is not simply due to the hostile character of the hymns, it is possible that the bulk of the Odisha Āṅgirasa material predates the 12th century CE, when the cult of Puruṣottama supplanted Nṛṣimha as the main deity of Odia Vaiṣṇavism.

⁶⁹ Besides a Trika influence (see fn. 67 above), Sanderson identifies a Kālikula influence, and provides an edition (2007: 255-276, followed by a discussion) of the Bhadrakālamantravādhi prakaraṇa, “the Section on the Rites of the Mantras of Bhadrakāli” [the tile is given by Sanderson], which contains mantras by which a king can propitiate Bhadrakāli and obtain victory in battle.
edition of the text on the basis of additional ms. sources (see Rotaru and Sumant 2014). This initiative comes after the efforts of Bahulkar (1977, 1990, 1994, 1999) and other scholars in Pune, who inaugurated a new wave of studies on the KauśŚū with a critical edition of Dārila’s Bhāṣya (Diwekar et al. 1972) and Keśava’s Paddhati (Limaye et al. 1982). Despite these new studies, the world of AV ancillary literature remains largely unexplored: careful text-critical work on yet unedited texts remains a desideratum, translations are few and old editions would greatly benefit from revisions.
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