

Krisch Thomas Publikationen

1999 Edition of the Atharvaveda (Saunaka) for comparative philologists (presentation of a work in progress). In: *Studia Celtica et Indogermanica*. Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 70. Geburtstag, hg. von Peter Anreiter und Erzsébet Jerem. Budapest: Archaeolingua Alapítvány S. 179 – 185.

[the project has been discontinued, T.K.]

.

Edition of the Atharvaveda (Śaunaka) for comparative philologists (presentation of a work in progress)¹

THOMAS KRISCH

1. Outline of the project

This paper presents an outline and a sample of a project in which an edition of the Atharvaveda (Śaunaka-recension), henceforth „AVŚ“, is prepared for comparative philologists and also for linguists. Since the Atharvaveda is considered to be one of the oldest Vedic texts it is of great importance for Indo-European studies. From my teaching experience I know that students of linguistics and comparative philology hesitate to deal with Sanskrit texts in Devanāgarī. Thus there is a need (at least in the Western world) for editions in transliteration.²

My original plan was modest: I wanted to provide an edition similar to Aufrecht's handling of the Ṛgveda („RV“; Aufrecht 1968=1877), i.e. a transliteration of the hymns and parts of the Padapāṭha to facilitate recognition of sandhi phenomena. Now, after having transcribed most of Roth/ Whitney/ Lindenau's (1966=1924) („R/Wh/L“) edition I have discovered that a similar task had already been undertaken in Italy by Orlandi (1991), who has edited a transliterated version of Vishva Bandhu's (1960-62) edition („VB“).

Thus I have changed my plan. Though R/Wh/L remain to be the basis for my edition I include references to VB where he differs from them. I also mark all emendations and conjectures by putting the emended word between stars (*) so that it is immediately clear to the reader that the offered text between stars is not original and therefore cannot be used confidentially for linguistic analyses. In these cases important manuscript readings as presented in VB and Shankar Pandurang Pandit (1989 = 1895-1898) („SPP“) are given in footnotes. If I do not follow emendations and conjectures of R/Wh/L or VB but adhere to the text actually given in manuscripts I try to give an explicit translation in a footnote.

Furthermore my edition cites parallel passages, especially if they appear in the Paipplāda-recension and in the Ṛgveda. Help in the recognition of sandhi and metrical explanations are also standard features of the edition. Since I am doing my transcriptions with the aid of the computer I also plan to include a diskette or CD in ASCII-format with the pure text.

In order to reach a broader public the language of the explanations of my edition will be English.

2. Some technical details of the edition

a) Questions concerning the transcription

There is a certain problem when transcribing Anusvāra and Anunāsika, since the Atharvaveda Pratiśākhya („APr.“) does not know the term Anusvāra. As one may see under (1a) and (1b), the APr. acknowledges only nasal consonants and nasal vowels, terming both „anunāsika“.

¹ I owe special thanks to Deborah Fölsche-Forow for checking the correctness of my English. A prior version of this paper was presented at the 10th World Sanskrit Conference in Bangalore, India (1997). I thank Professor Meid for encouragement of my project and for his intention to publish my edition of the Atharvaveda in his „Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft“. It is a pleasure for me to present this paper to him for his Festschrift.

² This need for editions of Vedic texts in transliteration is also documented in Van Nooten's and Holland's 1994 edition of the Rīgveda in transcription with metrical readings.

- (1) a) APr. 1,11 *uttamā anunāsikāḥ* „the last ones (of the consonantal series) are nasals (respectively) (‘*anunāsika-*’). (= *ṇ, ṇ, ṇ, n* and *m*) cf. *k, kh, g, gh, ṇ; ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, ḍh, ṇ; c ch, j, jh, ñ* etc. in the alphabet.
 b) APr. 1,67 *nakāramakārayor lope pūrvasyānunāsikāḥ* „at the loss of *n* and *m* the preceding (sound) gets nasal character (‘*anunāsika-*’).“

In my edition I follow the normalized spelling as stated by the late Karl Hoffmann: „*ṇ* Anunāsika: Vedic before *r, ś, ṣ, s, h* (and in Sandhi -*āṇ* instead of -*ān*); *ṇ* Anusvāra; before *y, v*, (later than Vedic also before *r, ś, ṣ, s, h*) and (as an aid for reading) also instead of a homorganic nasal in front of plosives at the morpheme boundary between members of a compound and in external sandhi.“³ The existing Devanāgarī-editions (R/Wh/L, VB and SPP) tend to use the Anunāsika very rarely.

b) Some details about metrics

I call the *pāda* „verse“ and the *c* „stanza“. The basic metre(s) of the respective hymn are quoted and then there is a section of „metrical readings“, i. e. readings that do not appear as such in the text. Mainly these readings are restitution of syllables through dissolution of external sandhi between vowels and through word internal semivowel resolution. For example Nr. (2) (Anuṣṭubh):

- (2) AVŚ 19,2,1:
śām ta āpo haimavatīḥ
śām u te santūtsyāḥ /
 „Well-being to you (be) the waters from the snowy mountains, and well-being be to you the ones from the fountains“

Here the metrical resolution *santu utsīyāḥ* will appear in the section „metrical readings“.

In quite a number of cases an exact interpretation is difficult and also the native tradition (*anukramaṇī*) is sometimes quite unclear (at least to me). Thus, all proposed metrical readings in my edition are provisional, partly also the basic metres. They only serve for discussion and are not intended to be a thorough special metrical analysis. Van Nooten and Holland (1994) demonstrate with material taken from the Ṛgveda how many possibilities there may be to resolve sandhis and change semivowels into vowels.

- (3) Holland, Van Nooten 1994, pg. ix: (Triṣṭubh with uncommon cadence)
 RV 5,33,2d: *vākṣo abhī prāryāḥ sakṣi jānān* „you shall drive (here), you shall be superior to the strangers, the tribes.“
 possible metrical resolutions
 — — — — — *vākṣo abhī prā aryāḥ sakṣi jānān*
 — — — — — *vākṣo abhī prāriyāḥ sakṣi jānān*

Such cases also appear in the AVŚ:

- (4) AVŚ 19,2,4:
*apām āha *divyānām**⁴
apāñ srotasyānām /
apām āha prañéjané
śvā bhavatha vājīnaḥ //4//
 „Of the waters indeed from the sky, of the waters from the streams, in the forth-washing indeed of the waters, ye become vigorous horses“ (Translation by Whitney (1984=1905) (= „Wh. transl.“)).

³ Hoffmann 1976, pg. 655 (my translation).

⁴ Accent emended with VB and R/Wh/L. Mss.: *divyānām*.

Let us have a look at the first line (an Anuṣṭubh-line) *apām āha *divyānām**, which is a 7 syllable line when read as prose. Metrically interpreted this line can be read either as *apām āha *divyānaam** (chosen in my edition) or as *apām āha *diviānām** or as *apām āha *divyānām**.

The internal structure of the metres is more irregular in the AVŚ than in the RV. If one compares e. g. AVŚ 19,6 with its original „model“, RV 10,90, there are obvious discrepancies in the cadences of the verses. This hymn is composed in the metre Anuṣṭubh throughout. This metre has as a rule a iambic cadence (◡◡). This rule is obeyed in the RV examples in (5) a) and (6) a) but not in their AVŚ parallels (5) b) and (6) b) which show a trochaic cadence:

- (5) a) RV 10,90,4: *tripād ūrdhvā út ait pūruṣaḥ* („with three feet Puruṣa went up turned upwards“); with regular iambic cadence (last two syllables): (◡◡)◡◡.⁶
vs.
b) AVŚ 19,6,2: *tribhīḥ padbhīr dyām arohat* („with three feet he [scil. Puruṣa, T. K.] ascended to the sky“) with (rare) trochaic cadence: –◡ –◡.⁷
- (6) a) RV 10,90,3: *etāvān asya mahimā* („such is his [scil. the one of Puruṣa] greatness“ with (regular) iambic cadence (last two syllables): (◡◡)◡◡.
vs.
b) AVŚ 19,6,3: *tāvanto asyā⁸ mahimānas* („So many are his [scil. the ones of Puruṣa, T. K.] greatnesses“) with (rare) trochaic cadence (last two syllables): (◡◡) –◡.

c) The form of the text:

There are numerous difficulties with the text as presented in the edition of R/Wh/L. It is difficult and very time-consuming to find out what actually reflect the manuscripts and what is emended by the editors. One has to look into Whitney's translation or into other Devanāgarī-editions like the one of VB to get an idea. My edition in contrast aims to be self-explaining, i. e. it should be clear already at first sight what is a manuscript reading and what is emended. Another look at (4) shows that **divyānām** is between two asterisks, which means that there is an emendation which is explained in footnote 4 as being one of accent in contrast to the manuscripts. The footnote also says that I am following VB and R/Wh/L here.

The target group of this edition are students of comparative philology and so great care is taken that details of the translation are made clear. Thus, when I differ from the text which forms the basis of Whitney's translation, I try to translate it in a footnote. Whitney's translation uses quite often other emendations than his own text, the text in R/Wh/L.

To illustrate the points I have just made, consider Whitney's text (in R/Wh/L) of AVŚ 19,4,1:

- (7) AVŚ 19,4,1: *yām āhutim prathamām ātharvāyejé yāyā havyām akṛṇoj jātāvedāḥ / tām te etām prathamó johavīmi haviṣkṛto vahatu havyām agnīr agnāye svāhā //*

In his translation Whitney keeps distance to his own text and writes „our āyeje in a is indefensible“.⁹

If one compares R/Wh/L's text in (7) with Whitney's translation of the AVŚ 19,4,1 in (8) one quickly realizes that there are discrepancies especially in the last verse.

⁵ *ūrdhvā út* must be metrically read as *ūrdhvód*.

⁶ According to the statistics in Van Nooten/ Holland (1994, pg. -xvii-) the last two syllables of the verse are iambic (◡◡) in 2881 (from 3136) Anuṣṭubh-verses in the RV.

⁷ According to the statistics in Van Nooten/ Holland 1994, pg. -xvii- there are only 42 Anuṣṭubh-verses in the RV with a double trocheus in the cadence (out of 3136 Anuṣṭubh verses). It is also very rare that there is a trochaic cadence in the last two verses (–◡) (in 317 out of 3136 Anuṣṭubh-verses in the RV).

⁸ For *asyā* read 'syā.

⁹ Wh. transl., vol. 2, pg. 901.

- (8) Wh. transl., vol. 2, pg. 901: What oblation (*āhuti*) Atharvan sacrificed first, with what one Jātavedas made an offering, that same do I first call loudly for thee; gratified with that, let Agni carry the offering; hail to Agni.

If one wants to translate *haviṣkṛto vahatu havyām agnir* this would be something like „made into an offering Agni shall carry the offering.“ Whitney’s translation is: „gratified with that, let Agni carry the offering“. As he himself states in the translation,¹⁰ this implies *tāyā tṛptó* „gratified with that“, and he calls the whole stanza a make-shift. Nothing of this can be deduced from R/Wh/L’s edition (cf. (7) above). My edition tries to be very near to the manuscript readings and aims at stating immediately the fact when I have altered something.

(9) presents my text (in this case without emendations) with a translation.¹¹ One sees at a glance how much this text differs from Whitney’s admitted make-shift, but one also can perceive the effort to get a comprehensible text.

- (9) AVŚ 19,4,1:

*yām āhutiṃ prathamām ātharvā yā
jātāya havyām ākṛṇoj jātāvedāḥ |
tām ta etām prathamó johavīmi
tābhi śtuptó vahatu havyām agnir
agnāye svāhā ||1||*

Which oblation, which (is) for the progeny, the Atharvan sacrifices as oblation as the first one (and) Jātavedas (sacrifices as oblation), that same I as the first one call for you repeatedly. Praised with these (sacrifices) Agni shall carry the offering. Hail to Agni!

3. Sample hymn

I choose AVŚ 19,4 as an example which shows all the features of my edition mentioned above (cf. (10)). Of course, not every hymn needs such extensive commentaries.

- (10) AVŚ 19,4:

1 yām āhutiṃ prathamām ātharvā yā¹²

¹⁰ Wh. transl., vol. 2, pg. 901: „This version represents neither of the edited texts, nor the mss., nor the comm. but is a pure make-shift. SPP reads in a-b *ātharvā yā jāta yā h-*, and at the beginning of d *tābhi śtuptó v-* ...; what *stuptāḥ* ... should be supposed to be is a complete mystery ... the translation implies *ejé (ā-tje)* or something equivalent; in d it implies *tāyā tṛptó v-* ... We ought to have in a *ākūtim* [„wish“ T. K.] as in the following verses, but it is not easy to reconstruct the verse so as to match that emendation.“

¹¹ The full translation is given here for the purpose of illustration only. In my edition only the parts which differ from Whitney are translated (cf. the third part of this paper where I have taken the hymn as a sample).

¹² Difficult passage; R/Wh/L do a lot of emendations and conjections here (cf. Wh. transl., vol. 2, pg. 901: „This version [scil. the text as presented by Whitney in his translation T. K.] represents neither of the edited texts, nor the mss., nor the comm., but is a pure make-shift“. Sāyaṇa’s („Sāy“) comment: *dvitīyāyā luk*, which means „missing morpheme for the accusative“, he thus thinks of *yā* as being an acc. *yām*. He explains: *yām atharvaṇā dattām āhutiṃ jātaya prādurbhūtāya devagaṇāya havyām hotum dātum arhām yathābhāgaṃ kalpaniyām akṛṇot akarot* „which oblation for the progeny, given by the Atharvan in favour of the flock of gods brought into light (by him), he made worthy as one to be sacrificed to perform an oblation, as one to be arranged according to the share.“ [the last word, *akarot*, is only a gloss for Vedic *akṛṇot* (5th class present) with the same verbal root, *kar*, but in the 8th present-class as usual in classical Sanskrit, T. K.]. As cited, Sāy. emends also to *havyām*. We do not make conjections and emendations, but we consider *havyām ākṛṇoj* as apo koinu. Our translation would be about this: „Which oblation, which is for the progeny, the Atharvan sacrifices as oblation as the first one (and) Jātavedas (sacrifices as oblation), ...“ (Agni, whose epithet is Jātavedas, is also described as sacrificing (cf. e. g. Geldner 1957, pg. 23 f.).

If one takes my text, which is identical to that represented in the manuscripts, there is one strange thing about it: The relative pronoun is situated at the end of the verse and thus causes an enjambement („run-on line“). In present day lite-

- jātāya¹³ havyām ákṛṇoj jātávedāḥ /
 tāṃ¹⁴ ta etām prathamó johavīmi
 tābhi¹⁵ ṣṭuptó¹⁶ vahatu havyām agnīr
 agnáye svāhā //1//
- 2 ákūtim devīm subhágām puró dadhe
 cittásya mātá suhávā no astu /
 yām āśām *émi¹⁷ kévalī sá me astu
 *vidéyam¹⁸ enām mánasi práviṣṭām //2//
- 3 ákūtyā no bṛhaspata
 ákūtyā na úpā gāhi /
 átho bhágasya no dhehy
 átho naḥ suhávo bhava //3//
- 4 bṛhaspátir ma ákūtim
 āngirasāḥ¹⁹ prátī jānātu vācam etām /

rature that is familiar to me enjambements are partly the expression of political programs of poets (e. g. the „making unfamiliar“ („Verfremdung“) of the German poet Brecht, which causes the reader to be interrupted in his enjoying the poem, in order to get a political message, e. g. Brecht 1973, pg. 62 f., from the poem „Nachdenken über die Hölle“ („pondering about hell“) 1941: „Auch in der Hölle/ Gibt es, .../... Züge von Autos/ Leichter als ihr eigener Schatten, schneller als/ Törichte Gedanken, schimmernde Fahrzeuge, in denen/ Rosige Leute, von nirgendher kommend, nirgendhin fahren.“ („Also in hell there are .../... rows of cars/ Lighter than their own shade, coming from nowhere, faster than/ Silly thoughts, glittering vehicles, in which/ Rosy people, coming from nowhere, are travelling nowhere“). Partly only an increase of alertness is intended, as probably in the following poem by Rainer Maria Rilke (Rilke 1973, pg. 123), the 8th elegy of Duino: „Denn nah am Tod sieht man den Tod nicht mehr/ und starrt hinaus, vielleicht mit großem Tierblick./ Liebende, wäre nicht der andere, der/ die Sicht verstellt, sind nah daran und staunen .../“ („For one does not see death any more if one is near death/ one stares out, perhaps with a big glance of an animal./ Loving persons, were not the other who/ stands in the sight, are near to it and are amazed“). The uncommon concept of love in this poem by Rilke is formulated more clearly in his novel „Malte Laurids Brigge“. As I have stated elsewhere (Krisch 1979, pg. 62), „love“ in „Malte Laurids Brigge“ is at its best if both partners shine through each other without taking possession of one another.

Cf. also Shakespeare Sonnet 115: „Those lines that I before have writ do lie, / Even those that said I could not love you dearer:/ Yet then my judgement knew no reason why/ my most full flame should afterwards burn clearer.“

¹³ R/Wh/L make a conjecture: *ātharvāyejé yāyā h**; Wh. transl. vol. 2, pg. 901 presupposes a conjecture *ejé* (*a + ijé*); VB with many manuscripts *ātharvā yā jātā yā h**; we with mss. B, K, V and Sāy.

¹⁴ Refers back to *yām āhutim*; cf. also the next footnote.

¹⁵ The pronoun *tābhi* (Pl. Inst.) refers to both sacrifices, the one of the Átharvan and the other of Jātavedas. For the sandhi (loss of auslauting original *s* before *s* + voiceless stop) cf. Wackernagel 1978 = 1896, pg. 342.

¹⁶ R/Wh/L conjecture *haviṣkṛto* (instead of *tābhi ṣṭuptó*). Wh. transl. vol. 2 pg. 901 presupposes a conjecture of the same text to *tāyā ṣṭptó*. VB with mss., like in our text. I analyse the form *ṣṭuptó* as PPP of *stubbh-* „praise“ with analogical treatment of the auslauting consonant against Bartholomae's law, cf. Wackernagel 1978=1896, pg. 127 and pg. 132. There is a sound-law which makes *p* < **b^h* before an *s* e. g. *bābhasti* (3rd sg. pres) „consumes“ vs. *bāpsati* (3rd pl. pres.). In the case of *stubbh-* there are no forms attested with morphemes which start with an *s*, but they are possible from the point of view of the language system (the verb has a root present, all endings starting with *s* would have a *p* at the end of the root). There is another context where aspiration is lost: The absolute end of the word (cf. e. g. Thumb-Hauschild 1958, pg. 317). Here the model (all forms not attested by accident) after which an analogy is possible could be an injunctive present 2nd sg.: **stop* < **stobhzh* (Bartholomae) < **stobh-s* or a 3rd sg. inj. pres. **stop* < **stobhdh* (Bartholomae) < **stobh-t* or a 2nd/3rd sg. imperfect **astop* respectively (already in the RV there are attestations of presents of this verb in the 2nd present class). By such an analogically remodelled form of the PPP (to *stuptá-* in our text instead of the expected *stubdhá-*) the morphology appears as less opaque, because the morpheme *-ta-* appears unaltered. But: This analogy cannot be old and is most probably sporadic. The regular PPP of *stubbh-* in Vedic is formed morphologically opaque (*stubdhá-*). The Padapāṭha-mss. (Op and L) show *srupṭá*, a word which is unclear to me. Concerning the anlauting sandhi in *ṣṭuptá* for *stuptá* cf. Wackernagel 1978=1896 pg. 237.

¹⁷ Accent emended with R/Wh/L and VB. Mss.: *emi*.

¹⁸ Accent emended with R/Wh/L and VB. Mss.: *vidéyam*.

¹⁹ Another name for Bṛhaspāti.

yāsya devā devātāḥ sambabhūvūḥ
sā supranītiḥ²⁰ kāmō ānv etv asmān //4//

19,4,2-4 cf. AVP²¹ 19,24,7-9

Resolution of sandhi: 19,4,1: ākṛnot; te; prathamāḥ; tābhiḥ; stuptāḥ; agnīḥ. 19,4,2: purāḥ; naḥ; 19,4,3: naḥ; bṛhaspate; naḥ ūpa ā; ātha u; naḥ; dhehi; ātha u; suhávaḥ. 19,4,4: bṛhaspātīḥ; me; devāḥ; sáh; kāmāḥ ānu etu.

metrical explanations: 19,4,1: Triṣṭubh, the fifth verse is an added exclamation in my opinion; 19,4,2: Triṣṭubh, but first verse: Jagatī with iambic cadence and 12 syllables; 19,4,3: Anuṣṭubh; 19,4,4: 8,12 (Jagatī-verse), 11, 11 (Triṣṭubh-verses). Metrical readings: 19,4,1: havyākṛnoj; 19,4,2: yāsām; 19,4,4: vācāitām.

Let us take a short look at this sample hymn. In the text all emendations are marked between asterisks, for instance in 19,4,2 verse 3 the accent in *émi*. There are footnotes to the text which relate to the making of the text and especially also to linguistic problems. One such example is footnote 16. Here I try to explain the participle *stuptó* as coming from the root *stubh-*, though it is an evident violation of Bartholomae's law.

At the end of (10) under the text there is information about parallel readings, esp. in the Paippalāda-version. I have to adhere to Barret's (1906-1940) and Bhattacharyya's (1964; 1970) editions, as long as Michael Witzel (Harvard) has not published his text.²²

As a further standard feature of the edition I provide resolutions of sandhi and metrical explanations. In these metrical explanations the basic metre(s) is (are) mentioned (ās e. g. Triṣṭubh, Jagatī etc.) and metrical readings are proposed.

The projected date of publication of my edition is the year 2005.

Bibliography

Aufrecht, Theodor 1968=1877: Die Hymnen des Rigveda. (4. Aufl. = fotomechanischer Nachdruck der 2. Aufl.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Barret, Le Roy Carr 1906-1940:

The Kashmirian Atharva Veda. Book 1: JAOS 26 (1906) S 197-295; Book 2: JAOS 30 (1910) S 187-258; Book 3: JAOS 32 (1912) S 343-390; Book 4: JAOS 35 (1915) S 42-101; Book 5: JAOS 37 (1917) S 257-308; Book 6: JAOS 34 (1915) S 374-411 by Franklin Edgerton; Book 7: JAOS 40 (1920) S 145-169; Book 8: JAOS 41 (1921) S 264-289; Book 9: JAOS 42 (1922) S 105-146; Book 10: JAOS 43 (1923) S 96-115; Book 11: JAOS 44 (1924) S 258-269; Book 12: JAOS 46 (1926) S 34-48; Book 13: JAOS 48 (1928) S 34-65; Book 14: JAOS 47 (1927) S 238-249; Book 15: JAOS 50 (1930) S 43-73; Books 16 and 17: American Oriental Series 9 (1936); Book 18: JAOS 58 (1938) S 571-614; Books 19 and 20: American Oriental Series 18 (1940).

²⁰ R/Wh//L emend to *supranītiḥ*. Translation of our text: „This wish [scil. everything expressed previously T. K.] shall follow the well guided ones [scil. *ākūti-* (fem.) and *vāc-* (fem.) T. K.], (shall follow) us.“ A 'sā figé'-construction is also possible with 'frozen' semantics of *sā* as a conjunction expressing continuation. The sense would be: „Then the wish shall follow the well guided ones [scil. *ākūti-* (fem.) and *vāc-* (fem.) T. K.], (shall follow) us.“ This construction, which is particularly common in later Vedic texts, is e. g. described in Speyer 1895, pg. 82. This type of construction has provoked a number of articles recently, cf. e. g. Jamison 1992.

²¹ AVP: Atharvaveda Paippalāda-version.

²² A very interesting and useful edition of the second book of AVP is Zehdner 1993. As far as I know, a new edition based on Witzel's text is presently under preparation by A. Griffiths and Th. Zehnder in Leiden.

- Bhattacharyya, Durgamohan 1964: Paippalāda Saṁhitā of the Atharvaveda. First Kāṇḍa. Calcutta: Sanskrit College.
- Bhattacharyya, Durgamohan 1970: Paippalāda Saṁhitā of the Atharvaveda. Volume Two. Calcutta: Sanskrit College.
- Brecht, Bertolt 1973: Ausgewählte Gedichte. Auswahl von Siegfried Unseld, Nachwort von Walter Jens. 7. Aufl. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp (= edition suhrkamp 86).
- Geldner, Karl Friedrich 1957: Der Rig-Veda, 4. Teil: Namen- und Sachregister zur Übersetzung, dazu Nachträge und Verbesserungen. Aus dem Nachlaß des Übersetzers herausgegeben, geordnet und ergänzt von Johannes Nobel. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (= Harvard Oriental Series 36).
- Hoffmann, Karl 1976: Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik Band 2, hg. von Johanna Narten. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Jamison, Stephanie 1992: Vedic „*sá figé*“: An inherited sentence connective? In: HS 105, S 213-239.
- Krisch, Thomas 1979: Einheitsstiftende Aspekte und Elemente in Rilkes 'Malte Laurids Brigge'. Masch. Hausarbeit (Germanistik), betreut von Walter Weiss. Salzburg: Institut für Germanistik.
- Orlandi, Chatja (Ed.) 1991: Gli inni dell' Atharvaveda (Śaunaka). Pisa: Giardini editori e stampatori.
- R/Wh/L = Roth/Whitney/Lindenau 1966=1924.
- Rilke, Rainer Maria 1973: Ausgewählte Gedichte, einschließlich der Duineser Elegien und der Sonette an Orpheus. 2. Auflage Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp (= Bibliothek Suhrkamp).
- Roth, Rudolf und William Dwight Whitney (Edd.) 1966 =1924: Atharva Veda Saṁhitā. 3. Auflage (nach der von Max Lindenau besorgten zweiten Auflage). Bonn, Hannover, Hamburg, München: Ferd. Dümmler (= Dümmlerbuch 8451).
- Shankar Pandurang Pandit 1989=1895-1898: Atharvaveda Saṁhitā with the commentary of Sāyanācārya. Varanasi: Krishnadas Academy (= Krishnadas Sanskrit Series 109) Bombay.
- SPP = Shankar Pandurang Pandit 1989 = 1895-1898.
- Speyer, J. S. 1895: Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax. Straßburg: Karl J. Trübner (= Grundriß der Indoarischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, hg. v. G. Bühler, 1. Band, 6. Heft).
- Thumb, Albert 1958:
Handbuch des Sanskrit I. Teil: Lautlehre. 3. stark umgearbeitete Auflage von Richard Hauschildt. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Van Nooten, Barend A. und Gary B. Holland 1994: Rig Veda. A metrically restored text with an introduction and notes. Cambridge, Mass. und London: Harvard University Press.
- VB = Vishva Bandhu (ed.) 1960-1962.
- Vishva Bandhu (Ed.) 1960-1962: Atharvaveda (Śaunaka) with the Pada-pāṭha and Sāyanācārya's commentary. Hoshiapur: Vishveshvaranad Vedic Research Institut.
- Wackernagel, Jakob 1978=1896: Altindische Grammatik. Band I Lautlehre. 2. unveränderter Nachdruck der 1896 erschienenen ersten Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wh. transl. = Whitney 1984=1905.
- Whitney, William Dwight 1984=1905: Atharvaveda Saṁhitā. Translated into English. With critical and exegetical commentary. Revised and edited by Charles Rockwell Lanman 2 vols. (= Harvard Oriental Series vol 7 and 8).
- Zehnder, Thomas 1993: Vedische Studien: Textkritische und sprachhistorische Untersuchungen zur Paippalāda-Saṁhitā. Kāṇḍa 1. Lizentiatsarbeit im Fach Vergleichende indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft, Philosophische Fakultät I, Universität Zürich. Vorgelegt bei Prof. G. E. Dunkel.