

Laura Massetti

## ***And I Will Fix You: A ‘Chariot-simile’ in PS 4.15.6–7, ŚS 4.12.6–7***

**Abstract:** In this paper, I focus on the chariot-simile of PS 4.15.6–7 (= ŚS 4.12.6–7): in this passage, the healer is compared to a craftsman (Ṛbhū), his patient to a broken wagon. To reconstruct the *disiecta membra* of the metaphor, I focus on the phraseology applying to the Ṛbhū in the *Rigveda*. The verb *takṣ* ‘to fashion’ occasionally describes ‘rejuvenations’ effected by these gods and the Aśvins, healer deities of the Vedic pantheon. Moreover, I show that the metaphorical conceptions of the human body in terms of a chariot is widely attested in other Indo-European languages, where names of chariot parts are identical to those of the parts of the human body. I finally propose that the chariot-metaphor underlies the poetic expression τέκτων νοδυνίας ‘fashioner of painlessness’, a kenning referred to the healer Asclepius in Pindar’s *Pythian Three*.

1. In this paper, I investigate the Vedic background of the chariot-simile attested in PS 4.15.6–7 (cf. ŚS 4.12.6–7). In this passage, the healer of a fracture is compared to a craftsman, a Ṛbhū, while his patient is compared to a broken vehicle. First of all, my phraseological analysis will focus on the description of the Ṛbhū’s work in the *Rigveda*. Such a study aims at highlighting how Vedic *takṣ* ‘to fashion’ describes the divine work of the Ṛbhū as creators of things. Moreover, the paper aims at providing an Indo-European thematic comparandum for the metaphor of the healer as ‘fashioner’. In this regard, I propose that the poetic expression τέκτων νοδυνίας ‘fashioner of painlessness’ (Asclepius, in Pindar’s *Pythian 3*), reflects a similar state of things as the Atharvavedic passage. The comparison between Pindar *Pythian* 3.47–53 and ŚS 4.12.6–7 will reveal further thematic matches: the patients of the

---

**Note:** This paper is based on a talk given at the conference *The Atharvaveda and its South Asian Contexts*, University of Zurich, September 26–28, 2019. I would like to thank the participants for their suggestions and their comments, in particular Georges-Jean Pinault for providing me with some bibliographical references. The standard disclaimers apply. The talk was presented in the framework of the project ‘Family Myths: Phraseology and Inherited Indo-European Thematic Structures in Greek Myth’. This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 793479. The re-elaboration and final submission of the paper was done within the project “LORACOLA” (program NEXT Generation UE, funds NRRP M4C2, project nr. MSCA\_0000083-project LORACOLA, CUP C61B22002760001). Unless otherwise indicated, the printed translations are taken from Jamison – Brereton 2014 (RV); Griffiths – Lubotsky 2000–2001 (PS 4.15); Zysk 1985 (ŚS 4.12), Race 1997 (Pindar).

Greek healer and those of the Vedic one appear to have been hurt in a similar way. Finally, the expression ‘to stand upright’ applies to the response to the treatment performed by the healers in Greece and India.

2. The Paippalādasasṃhitā (PS) hymn 4.15 is a charm to heal open fractures. It parallels the Śaunakasasṃhitā (ŚS) hymn 4.12—PS 4.15.1–5 are indeed identical to ŚS 4.12.1–5—, whose central stanzas (3–5) have long been compared to the Old High German second Merseburg spell from a phraseological point of view<sup>1</sup> and to the Irish *Cath Maige Tuired* §33–35, from a thematic point of view.<sup>2</sup> In stanza 6 of PS 4.15, the work of the healer is directly compared to that of a Ṛbhu, while his patient is said to resemble a chariot. The passage in question reads as follows:

PS 4.15.6 (only PS ◇ b+d: cf. ŚS 4.12.7a+cd)<sup>3</sup>  
*yadi vajro viṣṛṣtas t<sub>u</sub> vā<sub>a</sub>ra*  
*\*kāṭam patitvā yadi vā viriṣṭam*  
*vṛkṣād vā yad avasad daśaśṛṣa*  
*\*ṛbhū rathasyeva saṃ dadhāmi te paruḥ*

‘If a vajra that has been hurled has hit you, or if there is an injury due to falling into a well (?), or one that is there [due to falling] from a tree: the ten-headed one shall remove [it]. I put together your joint as Ṛbhu [the parts] of a chariot.’<sup>4</sup>

The reference to the Ṛbhu as a term of comparison for the healer’s skill is unsurprising and, to be sure, not unparalleled.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, in early Vedic texts, the Ṛbhu is often referred to as a touchstone for the creativity of masters in any field:

RV 6.3.8cd     *śárdho vā yó marútā<sub>a</sub>m tatáksa, ṛbhúr ná tvesó rabhasāno adyaut*  
 ‘Or who **fashioned the troop of Maruts like a Ṛbhu**, he, turbulent and wild, has flashed.’

1 Kuhn 1864.

2 Krause 1930: 32; Campanile 1990; Watkins 1995: 523–532. One can also add the comparison with the Tocharian text “The Craftsmen and the Lion” (THT 644–646 a11–13, cf. also *Pañcatantra* 5.3), now discussed by Serangeli (2022) and Massetti (forthc./b).

3 ŚS 4.12.7 *yádi kartam patitvā saṃśasré yádi vāsmā prāḥṛto jaghána | ṛbhú ráthasyevāṅgāni sām dadhat páruṣā páruḥ*.

4 Differently, Bhattacharya (2008) reads *yadi vajro viṣṛṣtas tvāra kāṭāt, patitvā yadi vā viriṣṭam | vṛkṣād vā yad avasad daśaśṛṣa, \*ṛbhū rathasyeva saṃ dadhāmi te paruḥ*, and translates (p. 132) ‘if a thunderbolt, loosened, has moved towards you, and then falling into a pit if there is injury, or (by falling) from a tree (there is injury), that the ten headed genie he relieved, I put together your joint as Ṛbhu [the parts] of a chariot.’

5 Cf. PS 16.35.8ab (Kim 2019ab, 2021) *yas te parūṃsi saṃdadhau, rathasyeva \*ṛbhur dhiyā* (= ŚS 10.1.8ab).

RV 10.105.6 *prástaud ṛṣvaijā ṛṣvébhis, tatákṣa súrah sávasā*  
*ṛbhúr ná krátubhír mātariśvā*

‘He of lofty might has struck up the praise song with the lofty ones. The champion **fashioned** it with his swelling strength, **like an artisan [Ṛbhu]** in accord with his intentions, (like?) Mātariśvan.’

All the aforementioned similes rely upon the Rigvedic descriptions of the Ṛbhus,<sup>6</sup> a group of three deities, who are identified as skillful craftsmen.<sup>7</sup> Since they are *the fashioners par excellence*, their deeds are mostly described through Vedic *takṣ* ‘to fashion’ (Indo-European \**tetk-* ‘id.’, cf. Old Avestan *tašaṭ* ‘he built’, Lithuanian *tašau, tašyti* ‘to smooth, work’, Greek τέκτων ‘fashioner’, τεκταίνομαι ‘to fashion’).<sup>8</sup> The association between Vedic *takṣ* and the Ṛbhus must have been perceived as a distinctive trait of their divine personality. Indeed, the verb was not only applied to the Ṛbhus’ major accomplishments (see below), but it also came to refer to their doing in a variety of metaphoric contexts. Take, for instance, the invocation [FASHION – X], where ‘X’ may stand for the sacrifice (RV 3.54.12d *ūrdhvāgrāvāno adhvarām ataṣṭa* ‘with pressing stones raised, you have fashioned the ceremony’); wealth (RV 4.33.8c *tá ā takṣant<sub>u,v</sub> ṛbhávo rayīm naḥ* ‘let these Ṛbhus fashion wealth for us’); fame (RV 4.36.9b *ihá śrávo vīrávat takṣatā naḥ* ‘Fashion here for us the fame that heroes accompany’)<sup>9</sup> and poetry (RV 10.80.7a *agnáye bráhma ṛbhávas tatakṣuh* ‘For Agni did the Ṛbhus fashion their formulation’).<sup>10</sup>

Furthermore, the *Rigveda* often makes reference to the fact the Ṛbhus have attained immortality (e.g., RV 4.33.4d *tábhiḥ sámibhir amṛtatvám āsuḥ* ‘they attained

6 On the Ṛbhus as craftsmen see Hillebrandt 1891: 515; MacDonell 1897: 131–134; Ryder 1901; Oldenberg 1917: 239–240; Keith 1925: 176–178, Kramrisch 1959; Gonda 1960–1964: 72, Oberlies 2012: 157–158; Brereton 2012, with special focus on the ritual dimension of the Ṛbhus and their connection with the Third Soma Pressing.

7 The other prominent craftsman deity of the *Rigveda* is Tvaṣṭar, on whom cf. MacDonell 1897: 116–117. Just like the achievements of the Ṛbhus, those of Tvaṣṭar are also described by means of Vedic *takṣ* ‘to fashion’. However, the Ṛbhus and Tvaṣṭar fashion different things. Among other things, Tvaṣṭar, who is associated with fertility, fashions babies in women’s wombs. On Ṛbhus and Tvaṣṭar cf. Massetti (forthc./b).

8 On the IE root see Bendahman 1993: 246–247. On the etymology of Hittite *takš-* ‘to unite [harmoniously], to fit together’, *takšan* ‘jointly, together’ cf. Melchert 2018, who reconstructs a root \**tek-s-*, which also underlies Latin *texere*.

9 On [to FASHION – GLORY] underlying the Greek personal name Κλεοτέκτων see Massetti (forthc./a).

10 For the collocation [POETRY – *takṣ*], Greek ἐξ ἐπέων . . . τέκτονας (Pindar *Pythian* 3.113), Vedic [*vācam* – *takṣ*] ‘to fashion a (poetic/ritual) utterance’ (RV 1.130.6ab), Young Avestan *vacastaṣti-* ‘strophe’ see Darmesteter 1878, Schmitt 1967: 14–15; Nagy 2006; Massetti 2019: 192–194. For ‘to join words together’ (ἐξ ἐπέων . . . οἶα . . . ἄρμωσαν) and the name of Homer as ‘the one who joins the words together’ see Nagy 2006.

immortality by these labors’) after performing five great creative deeds: (a) the fashioning/carving of four cups from Tvaṣṭar’s soma cup; (b) the making of a chariot, which is sometimes identified as the Aśvins’ chariot; (c) the creation of a milk-cow and (d) of Indra’s two fallow bay horses; (e) the rejuvenation of their aging parents.<sup>11</sup>

– Achievements (b), (c):

RV 1.20.3 *tákṣan násatyābhyaṃ, párijmānaṃ sukhāṃ rátham*  
*tákṣan dhenúṃ sabardúghāṃ*

‘They fashioned for the Násatyas an earth-circling, well-naved chariot; they fashioned the juice-yielding milk-cow.’<sup>12</sup>

– Achievements (b), (d), (e), (c):

RV 1.111.1 *tákṣan rátham suvṛtaṃ vidmanápasas, tákṣan hári indraváhā vṛṣanvasū*  
*tákṣan pitṛbhyāṃ ṛbhávo yúvad váyas, tákṣan vatsáya mātáraṃ sacā-*  
*bhúvam*

‘They fashioned the smooth-rolling chariot,<sup>13</sup> working with their know-how; they fashioned the two fallow bays that convey Indra and bring bullish goods.<sup>14</sup> They fashioned—the R̥bhus—for their parents youthful vigor; they fashioned for the calf a mother to stay by it.’<sup>15</sup>

Although the *Rigveda* does not make reference to the R̥bhus’ medical skill(s), verbal allusions to achievement (e) (: rejuvenation of their parents, see RV 1.111.1c *tákṣan pitṛbhyāṃ ṛbhávo yúvad váyah* ‘they fashioned—the R̥bhus—for their parents youthful vigor’) deserve close consideration, since this miraculous deed may involve a healing process. In most of the texts, the rejuvenation is described by means of the expressions [*púnaḥ – kar*] or [*púnaḥ – takṣ*] ‘to fashion [young] again/to fashion back’, see RV 1.20.4 *yúvānā pitārā púnah, satyámantrā ṛjūyávaḥ / ṛbhávo viṣṭy ákrata* ‘They whose mantras come true, who aim straight—the R̥bhus—made

11 Achievement (a) is often described by means of other Vedic verbs, such as *kar* ‘to make’ (RV 4.33.5, 4.35.2, 3), and *peś* ‘to carve’ (RV 3.60.2). The latter also describes achievement (c), cf. RV 1.110.8, 1.161.10, 4.36.4.

12 ‘Sie zimmerten den beiden Násatyas (Aśvins) den ringsherum befindlichen Streitwagen mit gut (geschmierten) Nabelnöchern / sie zimmerten die Milchkuh Sabardughā.’ (Witzel – Gotō 2007: 36, for *sabardughā* as ‘etwa ›die saftig milchende‹ and bibliographical references see p. 507).

13 For the collocation [*takṣ – CHARIOT*] cf. RV 1.130.6, 5.2.11b, 5.29.15, 5.31.4, 5.73.10 (formulations/chariot), 10.39.14b.

14 Scarlata (1999: 474): ‘die zwei Falben, die den Indra fahren {und} soviel wert wie Stiere sind (?)’.

15 ‘Sie haben den gutrollenden Streitwagen (der Aśvins) mit Kenntnis vom Werk gezimmert. Sie haben das Falbenpaar, das den Indra fährt, das den Stier als (Lade)gut hat, gezimmert. Sie haben, die R̥bhus, ihren Eltern Jugendkraft gezimmert. Sie haben dem Kalb eine begleitende Mutter gezimmert.’ (Witzel – Gotō 2007: 195).

their parents young again through their toil.<sup>16</sup> In a slightly expanded version of the collocation, the Ṛbhus are said to have fashioned their parents young again *so that they could keep going* (Vedic *caráthāya*):

RV 4.36.3cd     *jívrī yát sántā pitárā sanājúrā, púnar yúvānā caráthāya táksatha*  
 ‘... that you **fashion** your **parents** as **youths for them to keep going**, even though they were enfeebled, worn out by age.’

A similar phraseology occurs in connection with a miraculous deed performed by the Ásvins:

RV 1.117.13ab     *yuvám cyāvānam ásvinā járantam*  
                          *púnar yúvānaṃ cakrathuḥ śácibhiḥ*  
 ‘You, o Ásvins, **made** the aging Cyavāna **a youth again** through your powers.’

This match is significant, because, as it is well known, the Twin-gods are associated with rescuing and healing. In particular, RV 1.117.13, quoted immediately above, alludes to the myth of the rejuvenation of Cyavāna,<sup>17</sup> which is told *in extenso* in the *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* (3.120–128), the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (4.1.5), in the *Mahābhārata* (3.121.20–125.10) as well as in the *Devībhāgavata* (7.2.30–7.43) and *Bhāgavata Purāṇas* (9.3.1–28). Cyavāna’s rejuvenation is compared to several concrete actions in the *Rigveda*, such as the removing of a garment (e.g. RV 1.116.10ab *jujurúšo nāsatyotá vavrím, prámuñcataṃ drāpím iva cyāvānāt* ‘and, Nāsatyas, from Cyavāna, who had become old, you removed his covering [=aged skin] like a garment’).<sup>18</sup> But significantly, in a passage from the tenth book, the Ásvins are directly compared to carpenters:

16 ‘Die (Ṛbhus) haben die Eltern (wieder) jung gemacht, deren Sprüche Wahrheit enthalten, die recht wandelnden (Ṛbhus), durch ihre Dienstleistung.’ (Witzel – Gotō 2007: 36). See also RV 1.110.8d, 1.161.3, 7; 4.33.2–3, 4.35.5ab always with *kar*.

17 Cyavāna, whose name is an *aequabile* of the Greek male personal name Σύμενος (Rhodes, Athens, see García Ramón 1999), is a ṛṣi who is rejuvenated by the Ásvins. For the narrative evolution of Cyavāna’s legend, see Witzel 1987 and West 2017.

18 Cf. also RV 5.74.5ab *prá cyāvānāḥ jujurúšo vavrím átkaṃ ná muñcataḥ* ‘you remove the covering like a cloak from Cyavāna, who had become old.’ In post-Vedic literature, the image of ‘wearing new garments’ describes the process of rebirth, cf. *Bhagavad Gītā* 2.22 *vāsāmsi jīrṇāni yathā vihāya navāni grhṇāti naro* ‘parāṇi / tathā śarīrāṇi vihāya jīrṇānyanyāni saṃyāti navāni dehī’ ‘just as a man casts off his worn-out clothes and puts on other new ones, so the embodied soul casts off its worn-out bodies and takes new ones’ (Cherniak 2008).

RV 10.39.4ab    *yuvāṃ cyāvānaṃ sanāyaṃ yáthā rátham, púnar yúvānaṃ caráthāya takṣathuḥ*

‘You two (Ásvins) **fashioned** old **Cyavāna**, like a chariot, into a youth **again**, (for him) **to move about**.’

The comparison between the collocations occurring in the Ṛbhus-passages and in the Ásvins-passage is remarkable: RV 1.20.4, 4.36.3, and 10.39.4 contain a collocation [to MAKE/FASHION (Vedic *kar* or *takṣ*) – X – YOUNG – AGAIN – (to keep going)]:

*yúvānā . . . púnaḥ . . . ákrata* (RV 1.20.4 etc., Ṛbhus)

*púnar yúvānā caráthāya tákṣatha* (RV 4.36.3cd, Ṛbhus)

*púnar yúvānaṃ caráthāya takṣathuḥ* (RV 10.39.4b, Ásvins)

While all passages preserve ‘to make/fashion (Vedic *kar* or *takṣ*) X young again’ with an optional dative of purpose (*caráthāya*), ‘to keep going’, as the standard collocation for ‘rejuvenating’, RV 10.39.4 (: the Ásvins-passage) adds ‘like a chariot’ (*yáthā rátham*) in pāda a, creating a simile with the comparanda.

In light of all these collocations, RV 1.111.1c (*tákṣan pitṛbhyām ṛbhávo yúvad váyaḥ* ‘they fashioned – the Ṛbhus—for their parents youthful vigor’) may make reference to the same episode: when the Ṛbhus rejuvenated their parents, they *fixed* them (*púnaḥ . . . kar/takṣ*), by *fashioning* (*takṣ*) new vigor. From the examples in which *takṣ* applies to the healer-gods, it is clear that the verb does imply both the notion of ‘fashioning back’, i.e., ‘fixing, renewing’, and that of ‘production/creation’, just like τέκτων or τεκταίνουμαι in Greek (see below, §4).

3. In order to clarify the metaphor ‘healer’: ‘carpenter’, it is useful to take into account the complementary metaphor ‘body’: ‘chariot’, which is directly attested in PS 4.15.7<sup>19</sup> and elsewhere:

PS 4.15.7    *ut tiṣṭha prehi sam \*adhāyi te paruḥ  
saṃ te dhātā dadhātu tanvo viriṣṭam  
rathaḥ sucakraḥ supavir yathaiti  
sukhaḥ sunābhiḥ prati tiṣṭha evam*

‘Stand up, go forth, your joint has been put together. Let Dhātar put together the injury of your body. **Be steady in this way, as a chariot goes with good wheels, with good felloes, with good axle-holes, with good naves.**’<sup>20</sup>

This metaphor is not a mere poetic *topos*, it reflects a widespread conception in India, Greece and beyond. As the dossiers collected by Pinault (2003: 138–140) and

<sup>19</sup> Cf. ŚS 4.12.6 *sá út tiṣṭha préhi prá drava ráthaḥ sucakraḥ / supaviḥ sunābhiḥ práti tiṣṭhordhvāḥ*.

<sup>20</sup> Bhattacharya (2008: 135) instead reads (pāda a): *ut tiṣṭha prehi sam u dhāyi te paruḥ* ‘Stand up, go forth, your joint is, indeed, put together.’

Jamison (1987: 71–88) have made evident, the semantic field of 'body parts' crosses with that of 'chariot' and viceversa in at least three Indo-European languages: Old Indic, Greek, and Tocharian.<sup>21</sup> In Vedic, some parts of the chariot are designated through a compound or a simplex noun, which usually denotes a body part: Vedic *ratha-mukhá-* 'front part of a chariot' (AV, JB, TS), *ratha-śīrṣá-* 'id.' (ŚB 9.4.1.13), and *ratha-śīras-* 'id.' (ĀpŚS 17.20.5) contain terms for 'head' as their second compound members, viz. *mukhá-*, *śīrṣán-*, and *śīras-*; Vedic *nábhi-* (RV+) 'nave' and *nábhya-* (RV+) 'central part of a solid wheel' are etymologically related to Gk. ὀμφαλός, meaning both 'navel' and 'knob in the middle of a yoke' (*Iliad* 24.273, mule-cart); Vedic *kakṣyá-* 'girth' (RV) and *kákṣa-* (RV+) 'Achselhöhle' (Hoffmann 1966: 201) are connected to both Young Avestan *kaša-* 'id.' and Latin *coxa* 'hip', Old Irish *coss* 'foot'; Vedic *kukṣī-* 'nave' (Sparreboom 1985: 157) also means 'cheek', 'buttock' (Jamison 1987, Bodewitz 1992);<sup>22</sup> Vedic *ámśa-* 'panel which fitted into the rail at the top and the big beams at each side of the platform' (cf. Sparreboom 1985: 152) also means 'shoulder' (Höfler 2018) and is etymologically related to Greek ὤμος, Tocharian A *es*, Tocharian B *āntse* 'shoulders'; Vedic *ákṣa-* 'axle' is a genetic cognate of Latin *axis*, Lithuanian *ašis*, Greek ἄξων 'axis' and 'shoulder span'; Vedic *āṇi-* 'axle-pin' (RV) also denotes 'the part of the leg above the knee' and may be connected to Tocharian B *oñi-* 'hip'.<sup>23</sup>

To sum up: the phraseological analysis shows that stanzas 6 and 7 of PS 4.15 make reference to a robustly attested metaphor. Accordingly, a healer or a bone-setter can be compared to the Ṛbhu (*ṛbhū rathasyeva saṃ dadhāmi te paruḥ* 'I put together your joint as Ṛbhu [the parts] of a chariot', PS 4.15.6d), who is the *fashioner* (Vedic *takṣ*) *par excellence*. In particular, Vedic *takṣ* applies to the rejuvenation of aging parents by the Ṛbhū (RV 4.36.3d, see §2) and of Cyavāna by the Aśvins (RV 10.39.4ab *cyāvānaṃ . . . yáthā rátham, púnar yúvānaṃ caráthāya takṣathuḥ* 'You fashioned . . . Cyavāna, like a chariot, into a youth again, (for him) to move about'). The presented data help us to understand the metaphor attested in PS 4.15.7: the human body can be fixed back/rejuvenated like a broken wagon, because the chariot parts are described through the lexicon of body parts and viceversa.

21 Cf. also Johnson (1987) for further metaphors involving the body in modern languages.

22 Cf. also Greek κνήμη 'leg, shank' (Homer+), and 'spoke' (Pollux Grammaticus), cf. κύκλα . . . ὀκτάκιμα (*Iliad* 5.722–723).

23 A further West Tocharian parallel shall be brought out here: T5a8 *kwreṃntār lānte kokalyi ol-yapotstse pārsāñci | taik[n]esāk ra kektseñi kāsai[ññe]* [sic] [*yānmāskeṃ*] 'Old [even] grow the chariots of the king, the very splendid ones. Thus also the bodies reach old age' (CEToM, see also Adams 2012 s.v. *taiknesa*), which translates Sanskrit *Udānavarga* 1.28 *jīryanti vai rāja rathāḥ sucitrā hy atho śarīram api jarām upaiti*. The same metaphor also occurs in T5b2; for a discussion of this passage cf. Massetti (forthc./b).

4. The system of metaphors underlying PS 4.15.6–7 is thus well founded in Vedic. In order to seek parallels for it in at least another branch of the Indo-European linguistic family, I will now turn to the analysis of a Pindaric passage, which might conceal a chariot metaphor in connection with a healer, namely: Pindar's *Pythian* 3.1–7.<sup>24</sup>

Pindar *Pythian* 3.1–7

Ἦθελον Χίρωνά κε Φιλλυρίδαν,  
 εἰ χρεῶν τοῦθ' ἀμετέρας ἀπό γλώσσης  
 κοινὸν εὐξασθαι ἔπος,  
 ζῶειν τὸν ἀποιχόμενον,  
 Οὐρανίδα γόνον εὐρυμέδοντα Κρόνου,  
 βάσσαισι τ' ἄρχειν Παλίου φῆρ' ἀγρότερον,  
 νόον ἔχοντ' ἀνδρῶν φίλον· οἷος ἔων θρέψεν ποτέ  
τέκτονα νωδυνίας  
 ἡμερον γυιαρκέος Ἀσκλαπιόν,  
 ἦροα παντοδαπᾶν ἀλκτῆρα νοῦσων

'I wish that Chiron—if it is right for my tongue to utter that common prayer—were still living, the departed son of Philyra and wide-ruling offspring of Uranus' son Cronus, and still reigned in Pelion's glades, that wild creature who had a mind friendly to men. I would have him be as he was when he once reared the gentle **craftsman of** body-strengthening **relief from pain** [LM: 'painlessness'], Asclepius, the hero and protector from diseases of all sorts.'<sup>25</sup>

The collocation τέκτονα νωδυνίας,<sup>26</sup> with τέκτων from IE \**tetk-* 'to fashion', cf. Vedic *takṣ* 'id.', stands out as nearly unparalleled within the Greek repertory of poetic images.<sup>27</sup> The uniqueness and the metaphorical potential of this collocation

24 The ode celebrates Hieron of Syracuse, who was critically ill at time of composition. For a commentary see Young 1968: 27–68; Pelliccia 1987; Slater 1988: 55–61; Currie 2005: 344–405; Gentili 2012: 407–425; Pelliccia 2017: 63–73.

25 For ἡμερον vs. ἄμερον see Forssmann 1966: 41–45.

26 The term νωδυνία, as well as the adjective νώδυνος (Pindar *Nemean* 8.50+), first occur in Pindar. The etymology of these compounds is transparent: their first compound member goes back to the negative prefix \**n-*, while the second member(s) are related to Greek ὀδύνη 'pain', Aeolian ἐδύνη \*(biting) pain', cf. Proto-Indo-European \**h<sub>1</sub>ed-* '(to bite), to eat', Armenian *erkn* 'birth labor', Irish *idu* 'pain', as pointed out by Schindler 1975.

27 The pair τέκτονα νωδυνίας . . . ἀλκτῆρα νοῦσων might apparently recall *Iliad* 10.19–20: εἴ τινά οἱ σὺν μῆτιν ἀμύμονα τεκτῆναιτο, / ἢ τις ἀλξίκακος πᾶσιν Δαναοῖσι γένοιτο 'in the hope that he (: Nestor) might contrive with him (: Agamemnon) some incomparable device that would serve to ward off evil from all the Danaans.' Even if Pindar's words preserve a dimly epic phraseological memory, the *iuncturae* clearly apply to different situations. In the Homeric passage, Agamemnon hopes that Nestor might find the solution to the partiality that Zeus shows towards Hector (on *Iliad* 10.1–52 and the nature of Nestor's μῆτις ('plan') see Dué – Ebbott 2010: III 10.19ff., Nagy 2016, on vv. 10.43–52). Differently, Pindar refers to Asclepius as the contriver of health and protection against illnesses. Parallels between healers and craftsmen are then found in Plato (*Grg.* 503e–504a, *Cra.* 416d, *Prt.* 345a, *Ion* 537c, *spuria* 376d, 390c, 454d); cf. also Arist. *De an.* 403b, *Top.* 116a.



originate from the fact that Greek τέκτων, primarily denotes a ‘carpenter’, i.e., a ‘fashioner of objects’, see, e.g.:

*Iliad* 6.315–316 ἦσαν ἐνὶ Τροίῃ ἐριβόλακι τέκτονες ἄνδρες,  
οἳ οἱ ἐποίησαν θάλαμον καὶ δῶμα καὶ αὐλήν  
‘... Men who were at that time the best **builders** in deep-soiled Troy; they had made him a chamber and hall and courtyard.’

*Homeric Hymn* 5.12–13 Πρώτη τέκτονας ἄνδρας ἐπιχθονίους ἐδίδαξε  
ποιῆσαι σατίνας καὶ ἄρματα ποικίλα χαλκῶ  
‘She (: Athena) first taught earthly **craftsmen** to make **chariots of war and cars** variously wrought with bronze.’

Obviously, τέκτων ‘fashioner’ came to be used metaphorically in Greek, in order to designate ‘a master in any art’ (LSJ s.v. τέκτων, 2), see *POxy.* 2389, fr. 9.8–10 τέκτονι παρθενίων ‘to the craftsman of the parthenia’,<sup>28</sup> Pindar *Nemean* 5.49 χρῆ δ’ ἀπ’ Ἀθανᾶν τέκτον’ ἀθληταῖσιν ἔμμεν ‘a fashioner of athletes ought to be from Athens’; Pindar *Pythian* 3.113–114 ἐξ ἐπέων κελαδεννῶν, τέκτονες οἷα σοφοί || ἄρμωσαν ‘from such echoing verses as wise craftsmen joined (them together)’ (modified translation Massetti); and a ‘maker’, ‘creator’, e.g., Aeschylus *Supplikes* 592–594 αὐτὸς ὁ πατήρ φυτουργὸς αὐτόχειρ ἄναξ || γένους παλαιόφρων μέγας || τέκτων, ‘the father (: Zeus) is that, the lord, who planted our clan of his own hand, the great creator of our kin, who has the wisdom of age’. In order to reconstruct the process that led to the metaphorical use of τέκτων in Pindar’s *Pythian* 3, let us focus on the structure of τέκτων νωδωνίας.

I propose to interpret this nominal syntagma [A<sub>noun</sub> – of B<sub>noun</sub>] as a substitution kenning (type i, see below). A kenning is a compact and complicated, riddling metaphor. It has been defined as “a bipartite figure of two nouns in a non-copulative, typically genitival grammatical relation (A of B) or in composition (B-A/A-B) which together make reference to, ‘signify’ a third notion C” (Watkins 1995: 44).<sup>29</sup> According to the standard view (Mittner 1954: 15), two main types of kenningar can be identified within different Indo-European languages:

- i. The *substitution kenning* replaces one term in the poetic discourse, and can therefore be schematized as [A+B] → [C]. For instance, in *Reginsmál* 16, *mun-at vágmarar vind um standask* ‘the sea-steeds (=the ships) will not withstand the wind’, the kenning *vágmarar* ‘sea-steeds’ directly substitutes ‘ships’.
- ii. The *variation kenning* is juxtaposed to the term it refers to, as iteration, apposition, epithet etc., and can be schematized as [A+B] – [C]. For instance, in Homer,

<sup>28</sup> On the possible attribution of the passage to Pindar, see Recchia 2017.

<sup>29</sup> See also Krause 1930; Schmitt 1967: 277–284; West 2007: 81–83.

*Odyseus* 4.708–709, νηῶν ὠκυπόρων || ἐπιβαινέμεν, αἱ θ' ἄλως ἵπποι ἀνδράσι γίνονται '(he had no need) to go on board of swift-faring ships, which are for the men as horses of the sea', 'ships' (gen. νηῶν) is followed by the poetic simile 'horses of the seas' (ἄλως ἵπποι).

The provided examples can be enlightening for the distribution of the kenningar in Greek, especially in comparison to the distributional patterns found in other Indo-European languages: as observed by Campanile (1977: 108–122), the substitution type (i) is less well attested in Greek than the variation type (ii).<sup>30</sup> The following Pindaric examples of kenningar, paralleling those found in other Indo-European languages, partially confirm Campanile's analysis:

– [WAR/BATTLE]: [(devastating) SHOWER/TEMPEST – ZEUS<sub>GEN.</sub>], occurs as a type (ii) in Pindar. It can be compared to Latin *ferreus imber* 'iron-shower' (: battle, Ennius *Annales* 266 Skutsch; cf. also Vergil *Aeneid* 12.284), and Old English *þone ðe oft gebad isernscure* '(the warrior) who often passed through the iron-shower' (*Beowulf* 3116).<sup>31</sup>

Pindar *Isthmian* 5.48–50      ἐν Ἄρει [. . .] || ἐν πολυφθόρῳ [. . .] Διὸς ὄμβρῳ  
ἀναριθμῶν ἀνδρῶν χαλαζάεντι φόνῳ  
'in war . . . during Zeus' devastating rain, that hailstorm of gore for countless men.'<sup>32</sup>

– [RAIN(S)]: [CHILD(REN) – CLOUD<sub>GEN.</sub>] occurs as a type (ii) in Pindar. It recalls Vedic *mihó nápāt-*, 'child of the mist', a substitution kenning (type [il]) for 'cloud' or 'rain', cf. *tyāṃ cid ghā dīrghām pṛthúm, mihó nápātam āmyadhram / prá cyāvayanti yāma-bhīh* 'also this child of mist – long, wide, not negligible (in size) – do they (: the Maruts) stir forth with their journeys' (RV 1.37.11):<sup>33</sup>

Pindar *Olympian* 9.1–3      ἔστιν ἀνθρώποις ἀνέμων ὅτε πλείστα  
χρήσις· ἔστιν δ' οὐρανίων ὑδάτων  
ὄμβρίων παίδων νεφέλας

'There is a time when it is for winds that men have greatest need; there is a time when it is for heavenly waters, the drenching children of the cloud.'

<sup>30</sup> For a collection of Greek kenningar, see Wærn 1951: 114–144.

<sup>31</sup> West 2007: 83.

<sup>32</sup> See also Pindar *Isthmian* 3/4.35–35a.

<sup>33</sup> Geldner 1951–1957 interprets 'rain'. Differently, Jamison – Brereton 2017: "Although most tr. take the 'child of mist' to be the rain, its physical description here ('long and wide') makes better sense for a cloud." The Maruts are often associated with both clouds and rain (MacDonell 1897: 79–80; Oberlies 2012: 153), cf. their epithet *varṣānirṃjaḥ* 'having a cloak of rain' (RV 5.57.4a). At RV 5.32.4b Indra is the *mihó nápāt-*.

– [X (=WARRIOR/KING)]: [BASTION/PILLAR/BULWARK – COMMUNITY<sub>GEN.</sub>]<sup>34</sup> occurs as a variation type in Irish, see *Moryen mur trin* ‘Morien, bulwark of the battle’ (*Cyvoesi Myrddin* 121), and as a substitution type in Old English, see *biddan wille, / eodor Scyldinga* ‘I want to ask you (a favor), enclosure of the Scyldings (:chief of the Danes)’ (*Beowulf* 427–428), and may actually be considered a mixed type in Greek. In both Pindar *Olympian* 2.81–82 and *Paeon* 4.83–85, the kenning has a grammatical referent. However, from a semantic point of view, the *tropos* stands for [the STRONGEST WARRIOR (Hector in *Olympian* 2, Achilles in *Paeon* 4)]:

Pindar *Olympian* 2.81–82     ὃς Ἴκτορα σφᾶλε, Τροίας  
    ἄμαχον ἀστραβὴ κίονα [ . . ]  
 ‘He laid low **Hector**, **Troy’s** invincible **pillar** of strength.’<sup>35</sup>

Pindar *Paeon* 4.83–85     κυανοπλόκοιο παῖδα ποντίας  
    Θέτιος βιατάν,  
    πιστὸν ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν  
 ‘The powerful **son of** the dark-haired sea-goddess **Thetis**, the trusty **bastion of the Achaeans.**’

Back to Pindar *Pythian* 3.6: I propose that, just like [WARRIOR]: [BASTION/PILLAR of GROUP] τέκτων νωδυνίας is another example of a ‘mixed type’. It grammatically refers to Asclepius, cf. τέκτονα νωδυνίας . . . Ἀσκληπιόν, so, according to Mittner’s classification, it should be understood as type ii (variation kenning). Nevertheless, the taking into account of the *synchronic* evidence, i.e. internal Greek textual elements, indicates that ‘craftsman of the painlessness’ is a substitution kenning for ‘healer’ (type i). Two main facts support this assumption:

- i. According to ancient Pindaric commentators, τέκτων νωδυνίας meant ‘physician’, see *Scholium in Pindar Pythian* 3.11a.1 Drachmann τέκτονα νωδυνίας: τὸν κατασκευαστὴν τῆς νωδυνίας: **ιατρός** γάρ **‘craftsman of the painlessness: the contriver of painlessness, for (it means) a physician.’**
- ii. The lexical repetitions between the first and the central part of the ode might suggest that τέκτων νωδυνίας actually corresponds to *ιατήρ*:<sup>36</sup>

Pindar *Pythian* 3.63–67     εἰ δὲ σώφρων ἄντρον ἔναι’ ἐτι **Χίρων**, καὶ τί οἱ  
    φίλτρον <έν> θυμῷ μελιγάρυες ὕμνοι  
    ἀμέτεροι τίθεν, **ιατήρ**α τοὶ κέν νιν πίθον  
    καὶ νυν ἐσλοῖσι παρασχεῖν ἀνδράσιν θερμᾶν **νόσων**  
    ἢ τινα Λατοῖδα κεκλημένον ἢ πατέρος

<sup>34</sup> Schmitt 1967: 282–283; Campanile 1977: 120–121. As a more recent reference see West 2007: 454–455.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. [πύργος – COMMUNITY/CITY]: *Iliad* 4.334, Pindar *Pythian* 5.56.

<sup>36</sup> τέκτων νωδυνίας forms a lexical repetition with ἐξ ἐπέων . . . τέκτονες (v. 113). On the ring-composition and its Vedic comparandum, RV 10.39, cf. Massetti (forthc./b).

‘Yet if wise **Chiron** were still living in his cave, and if my honey-sounding hymns could put a charm in his heart, I would surely have persuaded him to provide a **healer** now as well to cure the feverish **illnesses** of good men, someone called a son of a Apollo or of Zeus.’

The set of lexical repetitions can be shortly presented as follows: Χίρωνα (v. 1) parallels Χίρων (v. 63), νούσων (v. 7) parallels νόσων (v. 66), τέκτονα νωδυνίας (v. 6) parallels ιατῆρα (v. 65)

**Table 1:** Lexical repetitions of Pindar’s *Pythian* 3, vv. 1–7, 63–67.

v. 1	Χίρωνα	v. 63	Χίρων
v. 6	<b>τέκτονα νωδυνίας</b>	v. 65	<b>ιατῆρα</b>
v. 7	νούσων	v. 67	νόσων

We can conclude: The image of the ‘craftsman of the painlessness’ is practically isolated in Greek literature. From the point of view of its synchronic meaning, the collocation may be interpreted as a substitution kenning for ‘physician’. By combining the Greek and the Vedic phraseological data, it is possible to recover a verbal link between healers and carpenters, namely: the metaphoric use of IE \**tetk-* ‘to fashion’. If the Vedic healer is compared to the Ṛbhu, who is the *fashioner* (Vedic *takṣ*) *par excellence*, Asclepius, the best healer, is directly called ‘fashioner of painlessness’ (Greek τέκτονα νωδυνίας).

5. A further look to the Atharvavedic contexts and to Pindar’s *Pythian* 3 reveals that the thematic and phraseological matches between these two texts may go beyond the metaphor ‘healer’: ‘carpenter’. In this regard, the use of the collocation ‘to stand upright’ has to be highlighted. Although Vedic [*ūrdhvā-* – *sthā*] and Greek [ὀρθός – ἵστημι] are documented in a variety of contexts,<sup>37</sup> the collocations denote the full recovery of the patient in both ŚS 4.12 and Pindar *Pythian* 3.<sup>38</sup>

ŚS 4.12.6      *sá út tiṣṭha prēhi prá drava ráthaḥ sucakráḥ*  
                   *supaviḥ sunābhīḥ **prāti tiṣṭhordhvāḥ***

‘You there stand up, advance, run along. [Your] chariot [has] strong wheels, rims [and] hubs.  
**Stand erect firmly!**’

While the Atharvavedic patient, directly equated to a chariot, *stands upright*, Asclepius’s patients, who happen to be injured in different ways, are released, once they are *made to stand upright* through several remedies:

<sup>37</sup> See the dossier presented by Schmitt 1967: 248–252.

<sup>38</sup> West 2007: 339.

Pindar *Pythian* 3.47–53      τούς μὲν ὦν, ὅσσοι μὸλον αὐτοφύτων  
 ἐλκέων ξυνάονες, ἢ πολιῶ χαλκῶ μέλη τετρωμένοι  
 ἢ χερμάδι τηλεβόλω,  
 ἢ θερινῶ πυρὶ περθόμενοι δέμας ἢ  
 χειμῶνι, λύσαις ἄλλον ἀλλοίων ἀχέων  
 ἔξαγεν, τοὺς μὲν μαλακαῖς ἐπαιοδαῖς ἀμφέπων,  
 τοὺς δὲ προσανέα πί-  
 νοντας, ἢ γυίοις περάπτων πάντοθεν  
 φάρμακα, **τοὺς δὲ τομαῖς ἔστασεν ὀρθούς**

'Now all who came to him afflicted with natural sores, or with limbs wounded by gray bronze or by a stone, *which smote (them) from afar* (translation Massetti), or with bodies wracked by summer fever or winter chill, he relieved of their various ills and restored them, some he tended with calming incantations, while others drank soothing potions, or he applied remedies to all parts of their bodies; **still others he made stand upright** with surgery.'

The three types of patients correlating with three types of remedies in the Pindaric passage parallel the properties and the medical treatments documented in other Indo-European languages, such as Vedic (Benveniste 1945), Avestan (Darmesteter 1877, Puhvel 1970<sup>39</sup>), Germanic (Dumézil 1958: 21–22) and Old Irish (Watkins 1995: 537–539), as summarized in the following table:<sup>40</sup>

**Table 2:** Patients and Remedies of Pindar's *Pythian* 3, RV 10.39.3, *Vidēvdād* 7.44.

Pindar ( <i>Pythian</i> 3.47–53)	Vedic (RV 10.39.3cd)	Pindar ( <i>Pythian</i> 3.47–53)	Avestan ( <i>Vidēvdād</i> 7.44ae)
αὐτοφύτων ἐλκέων ξυνάονες (vv. 47–48)	<i>andhásya</i> [. . .] <i>bhiśájā</i>	τοὺς μὲν μαλακαῖς <b>ἐπαιοδαῖς</b> ἀμφέπων (v. 51)	<i>mqrō.baešaza-</i>
ἢ πολιῶ χαλκῶ μέλη <b>τετρωμένοι</b> ἢ χερμάδι τηλεβόλω (vv. 48–49)	<i>bhiśájā rutásya</i>	τοὺς δὲ <b>τομαῖς</b> ἔστασεν ὀρθούς (v. 53)	<i>karatō.baešaza-</i>
ἢ θερινῶ πυρὶ <b>περθόμενοι δέμας</b> ἢ χειμῶνι (v. 50)	<i>křśásya</i> [. . .] <i>bhiśájā</i>	τοὺς δὲ προσανέα πίνοντας, ἢ γυίοις περάπτων πάντοθεν <b>φάρμακα</b> (vv. 52–53)	<i>uruuarō.baešaza-</i>

According to Benveniste, Dumézil, and Puhvel, the threefold description of ailments and treatments match the tripartite social structure proposed and exhaustively

<sup>39</sup> Puhvel (1970) adds Yašt 3.66 as a further comparandum to the Greek and Vedic evidence.

<sup>40</sup> In Irish (see Watkins 1995: 539) *Cath Maige Tuired* §§33–35: Míach restores Nuadu's hand by *incantation* (§33), then he is killed by four *cuts* of his father's sword (§34), and finally, from Míach's grave grow 365 *herbs* corresponding to the number of his joints and sinews (§35).

described by Dumézil (1941): the patients affected by natural sores and cured with spells could represent the priestly class, those wounded by weapons the warrior class, and those affected by exhaustion the ‘third estate’.

In Greek, just like in the Vedic context, [to (make) STAND UPRIGHT] describes the result, and, so to say, the culminating act of the healing process. Being restored of the capacity of ‘going’ (cf. Greek ἐξαγεν, Vedic *caráthāya*, see above), the patient stands up on his/her own legs. It shall thus be emphasized that Vedic *ūrdhvá-*, Greek ὀρθός and Avestan *arəduua-*, *rδβα-* could descend from IE *\*H<sub>3</sub><sup>dh</sup>-uó-* with initial *\*h<sub>3</sub>-*, as proposed by Vegas Sansalvador (1996: 282–288),<sup>41</sup> and may thus constitute a perfect match on the morphological level.

Finally, a further trait shared by Pindar’s *Pythian* 3 and *Atharvaveda Śaunaka* 4.12 must be stressed. The reference to the ‘stone smiting from afar’ in Pindar as a possible cause of injury for the patients with the broken limbs (μέλη τετρωμένοι / ἢ χερμάδι τηλεβόλω, vv. 48–49) parallels closely the accident of the Atharvavedic wounded patient in ŚS 4.12:

ŚS 4.12.7     *yádi kartāṃ patitvá saṃśásré yádi vāśmā práhrto jaghána*  
                   *ṛbhú ráthasyevángāni sám dadhat páruṣā páruḥ*

‘If falling in a hole, [he] has been injured, **or if a** hurled **rock has struck [him,** then] may [Dhātṛ] unite the limbs, joint with joint, as Ṛbhu [the parts] of a chariot.’<sup>42</sup>

The comparison between Greek ἢ χερμάδι τηλεβόλω and Vedic *vāśmā . . . jaghána* can go beyond the formal differences, especially on the strength of the combinatory evidence. As argued by Kölligan (2000–2001: 443–448), τηλεβόλος may be taken as a continuation of the phraseology [to SMITE – from AFAR],<sup>43</sup> which might ultimately underlie the Mycenaean male personal name *Qe-re-qa-ta /K<sup>u</sup>ēleg<sup>th</sup>ontas/* (PY En 659), Alphabetic Greek Τηλεφόντας\*, *Kurzform* Τήλεφος (Hesiod+). Indeed, in Homer βάλλω and θείνω indicate that the enemy is struck by the projectile of archer gods, namely, Apollo and Artemis:

<sup>41</sup> See also Sommer (2022).

<sup>42</sup> PS 4.15.6 mentions a different possible cause of injury, namely: the fall of the patient from a tree (see above). In this connection I would like to highlight what might be a trivial, but impressive coincidence with the healing practice performed by the bonesetters in the *siddha* tradition. According to Zysk (2008: 10): “the development of this special form of healing (scil. the art of *varmam*) appears to have evolved naturally from the fact that the men of this caste, while carrying out their task of climbing coconut and borassus trees to collect the fruits and sap for toddy, occasionally fell from great heights. In order to repair the injury or save the life of a fall-victim, skills of bone-setting and reviving an unconscious patient by massage developed [. . .].”

<sup>43</sup> Differently, Slater (1969) s.v.: ‘far-flung.’

*Iliad* 24.605 τούς μὲν Ἀπόλλων πέφνεν ἀπ’ ἀργυρέοιο βιοῦτο  
‘Apollo slew them with shafts from his silver bow.’

*Odyssey* 15.478 τὴν μὲν ἔπειτα γυναῖκα βάλ’ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα  
‘Then Artemis, the archer, struck the woman.’

The personal name *Qe-re-ḡo-ta* /*K<sup>u</sup>ēleg<sup>uh</sup>ontas*/ and τηλεβόλος partially match the Vedic collocation [to SMITE – from AFAR], in which ‘to smite’ is expressed by the Proto-Indo-European root\**g<sup>h</sup>en-* ‘smite, kill’, cf. RV 2.27.13cd *nákis tām ghnantī y ántito ná dūrād, yá ádityánām bhávati práñitau* ‘neither from near nor from afar do any strike down the man who comes to be under the leadership of the Ádityas.’ Given that τηλεβόλος is comparable to Vedic *ghnánti* . . . *dūrát*, the match between χερμάδι τηλεβόλω and Vedic *ásmā* . . . *jaghána* ‘a rock . . . has struck’ looks remarkable and counts as a further feature that Pindar’s description of Asclepius’s healing practice and ŚS 4.12 have in common.

6. To sum up: In this paper, I have tried to frame PS 4.15.6–7 (cf. ŚS 4.12.6–7) in its Vedic poetic context. Additionally I made an attempt at identifying a possible parallel for the ‘healer’: ‘carpenter’ metaphor in the Greek tradition. The results of the comparison are presented in the following table:

**Table 3:** Common ‘state of things’: PS 4.15, ŚS 4.12, Pindar *Pythian* 3.

PS 4.15.6–7	ŚS 4.12.6–7	Pindar <i>Pythian</i> 3
6 * <i>ṛbhū rathasyeva sam dadhāmi</i>	7 <i>ṛbhū rāthasyevāñgāni sám dadhat</i>	v. 7 τέκτων νωδυνίας
<i>ṛbhu-</i> : <i>takṣ</i> cf. <i>tákṣan</i> . . . <i>rātham</i> (RV) <i>bráhma</i> . . . <i>tatakṣuh</i> (RV) <i>tákṣan</i> . . . <i>yúvad váyah</i> (RV) ‘body’: ‘chariot’ <i>rathah sucakraḥ</i> (PS, ŚS) <i>yáthā rātham púnar yúnānaṃ caráthāya takṣathuḥ</i> (RV)		Greek τέκτων cf. τέκτονας . . . ποιῆσαι . . . ἄρματα (Homer) v. 113 ἐξ ἐπέων . . . τέκτονες v. 7 τέκτονα νωδυνίας
—	7 <i>vásmā práñito jaghána</i> 6 <i>práti tiṣṭhordhváh</i>	v. 49 χερμάδι τηλεβόλω v. 53 τούς . . . ἔστασεν ὀρθοῦς

- a. The cross-reference to the Vedic phraseology applying to the *ṛbhu*, to whom the Vedic healer is compared, allows us to recover an association between Vedic *takṣ* and the *ṛbhus*’ work. As a consequence, although the term *tákṣan-* ‘carpenter, fashioner’ does not occur in PS 4.15.6–7, the reference to the verb is automatically implied by the mention of the *ṛbhu*, the god who fashions ‘fresh vigor’ and objects in the *Rigveda*.

- b. The metaphor ‘healer’: ‘carpenter’ can be understood as complementary to the metaphor ‘body’: ‘chariot’, which underlies both PS 4.15.7 (cf. ŚS 4.12.7) and several lexical items, denoting the chariot’s components.
- c. An isolated Pindaric expression, τέκτων νωδυνίας\*, a substitution *kenning* for ‘healer’ in *Pythian* 3.6, possibly shares the same background as PS 4.15.6–7 (cf. ŚS 4.12.6–7).
- d. Pindar’s ode displays further phraseological traits in common with ŚS 4.12.6–7. The successful healing process is identified with the capacity of ‘standing upright’, (re-)acquired by the patient, cf. τούς . . . ἔστασεν ὀρθούς (v. 53) with *prāti tiṣṭhordhvāḥ* (ŚS 4.12.6).
- e. The patients of Asclepius and those of the Vedic healer suffer similar injuries. One possible cause of the fracture is described in the same terms in both Greek and Vedic, i.e., ‘smiting stone’, cf. ἡ χερμάδι τηλεβόλω (v. 49) with *vāśmā* . . . *jaghána*.

In conclusion, the phraseological matches identified for PS 4.12.6–7, ŚS 4.12.6–7 and Pindar *Pythian* 3 are notable for both their quantity – three matches (c), (d), (e), occurring all together in passages dealing with the same themes – and quality – two partial matches (c), (e), and one perfect match (d). Comparanda of this kind speak strongly in favor of a common background, or ‘state of things’, reflected by two diverse but related traditions: the final stanzas of the Atharvavedic charms to heal an open fracture and Pindar’s *Pythian* 3.

## References

- Adams, Douglas Q. (2012). *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Revised and greatly enlarged. Amsterdam et al.: Rodopi.
- Bendahman, Jadwiga (1993). *Der reduplizierte Aorist in den indogermanischen Sprachen*. Dissertation: Egelsbach et al.
- Benveniste, Émile (1945). “La doctrine médicale des Indo-Européens.” In: *Revue de l’Histoire des Religions* 130: 5–12.
- Bhattacharya, Dipak (2008). “On Paippalāda-Saṁhitā 4.15.6–7.” In: *Journal of the Asiatic Society* 50: 125–136. Online: [https://www.academia.edu/9021220/On\\_AVP\\_4.15.6-7](https://www.academia.edu/9021220/On_AVP_4.15.6-7) (last visited 29.09.2019).
- Bodewitz, Henk W. (1992). “Belly, pelvis, buttocks or cheeks? Vedic *kukṣī-*.” In: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 35: 19–31.
- Brereton, Joel P. (2012). “Gods’ Work: The ṛbhus in the ṛgveda.” In: Leonid Kulikov & Maxim Rusanov (eds.): *Indologica. T. Ya. Elizarenkova Memorial Volume. Book 2*. Moskva: Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj gumanitarnyj universitet [Russian State University for the Humanities]: 111–134.
- Campanile, Enrico (1977). *Ricerche di cultura poetica indoeuropea*. Pisa: Giardini.
- Campanile, Enrico (1990). *La ricostruzione della cultura indoeuropea*. Pisa: Giardini.



- CEToM = A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts. Online: <https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian> (last visited 19.09.2019).
- Cherniak, Alex (trans.) (2008). *Mahābhārata. Book Six. Bhīṣma*. Vol. 1. Including the “Bhagavad Gītā” in context. New York: New York University Press.
- Currie, Bruno G.F. (2005). *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Darmesteter, James (1877). *Ormazd et Ahriman, leurs origines et leur histoire*. Paris: Vieweg.
- Darmesteter, James (1878). “Une métaphore grammaticale de la langue Indo-européenne.” In: *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 3: 319–321.
- Dué, Casey & Ebbott, Mary (2010). *Iliad 10 and the Poetics of Ambush: A Multitext Edition with Essays and Commentary*. Washington, DC. Online: [http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hul.ebook:CHS\\_Due\\_Ebbott.Iliad\\_10\\_and\\_the\\_Poetics\\_of\\_Ambush.2010](http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hul.ebook:CHS_Due_Ebbott.Iliad_10_and_the_Poetics_of_Ambush.2010) (last visited 29.09.2019).
- Dumézil, Georges (1941). *Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus: essai sur la conception indo-européenne de la société et sur les origines de Rome*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Dumézil, Georges (1958). *L'idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens*. Bruxelles: Latomus.
- Forssman, Bernhard (1966). *Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- García Ramón, José Luis (1999). Védico *Cyāvāna*:- griego Σῦμενος (Rodas). In: *Minerva* 13: 55–65.
- Geldner, Karl Fr. (1951–1957). *Der Rig-Veda, aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen*. 4 Vols. Cambridge, MA et al.: Harvard University Press.
- Gentili, Bruno (ed.) (2012<sup>5</sup>). *Pindaro. Le Pistiche. A cura di Bruno Gentili, Paola Angeli Bernardini, Ettore Cingano e Pietro Giannini*. Milano: Mondadori.
- Gonda, Jan (1960–1964). *Die Religionen Indiens*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Griffiths, Arlo & Lubotsky, Alexander (2000–2001). “Paippalāda Saṃhitā 4.15. To heal an open fracture: with a plant.” In: *Die Sprache* 42.1–2: 196–210.
- Hillebrandt, Alfred (1891). *Vedische Mythologie. Erster Band*. Breslau: Koebner.
- Höfler, Stefan (2018). “A look over Latin *umerus* ‘shoulder’.” In: David M. Goldstein, Stephanie W. Jamison & Brent Vine (eds.): *Proceedings of the 29th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Bremen: Hemen: 129–146.
- Hoffmann, Karl (1966). “JB. Vanākakā.” In: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 9.3: 199–202.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. (1987). “Linguistic and philological remarks on some Vedic body parts.” In: Calvert Watkins (ed.): *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985)*. Berlin et al.: de Gruyter: 66–91.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. & Brereton, Joel P. (trans.) (2014). *The Rigveda. The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*. 3 Vols. New York et al.: Oxford University Press.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. & Brereton, Joel P. (trans.) (2017). *Rigveda Translation: A Commentary*. Book I (1–99), Version 7-28-17. <http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/I.1-99-7-28-17.pdf> (last visited 17.10.2017).
- Johnson, Mark (1987). *The Body in the Mind. The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination and Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Keith, Arthur B. (1925). *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*. 2 Vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kim, Jeong-Soo (2019a). *Kāṇḍa 16 der Paippalādasamhitā des Atharvaveda. Eine verbesserte Version mit den Parallelstellen der Śaunakasamhitā*. Stand: April 2019: [https://www.phil.uni-wuerzburg.de/fileadmin/04080000/user\\_upload/Kanda\\_16\\_04.2019.pdf](https://www.phil.uni-wuerzburg.de/fileadmin/04080000/user_upload/Kanda_16_04.2019.pdf) (last visited 25.04.2019).
- Kim, Jeong-Soo (2019b). *Atharvaveda. Index verborum*. Stand: August 2019: [https://www.phil.uni-wuerzburg.de/fileadmin/04080400/2019/Atharvaveda\\_Index\\_verborum\\_08\\_2019.pdf](https://www.phil.uni-wuerzburg.de/fileadmin/04080400/2019/Atharvaveda_Index_verborum_08_2019.pdf). (last visited 03.08.2019).

- Kim, Jeong-Soo (ed.) (2021). *Atharvaveda. A New Edition*. [https://opus.bibliothek.uni-wuerzburg.de/opus4-wuerzburg/frontdoor/deliver/index/docId/27703/file/Kim\\_AVS\\_Neuedition\\_2021.pdf](https://opus.bibliothek.uni-wuerzburg.de/opus4-wuerzburg/frontdoor/deliver/index/docId/27703/file/Kim_AVS_Neuedition_2021.pdf) (last visited 13.05.2024).
- Kölligan, Daniel (2000–2001). “Myk. *qe-re-qo-ta*, alph.-gr. *τηλεβόλος*.” In: *Minos* 35–36: 443–449.
- Kramrisch, Stella (1959). “The Ṛg Vedic Myth of the Craftsmen (The Ṛbhus).” In: *Artibus Asiae* 22.1–2: 113–120.
- Krause, Wolfgang (1930). *Die Kenning als typische Stilfigur der germanischen und keltischen Dichtersprache*. Halle (Saale): Niemeyer.
- Kuhn, Adalbert (1864). “Indische und germanische Segensprüche.” In: *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 13: 49–74, 113–157.
- LSJ = Liddell, Henry G., Scott, Robert & Jones, Henry S. (2006<sup>9</sup>). *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MacDonell, Arthur A. (1897). *Vedic Mythology*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Massetti, Laura (2019). *Phraseologie und indogermanische Dichtersprache in der Sprache der griechischen Choralryk: Pindar und Bakchylides*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cologne. Online: <https://www.chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/6930> (last visited 05.09.2024).
- Massetti, Laura (forthc./a). “‘Fashioning glory’, ‘Shining of glory’. Two case studies in Greek Onomastics.” In: Velizar Sadovski, Karin Stüber & Philip Huyse (eds.): *\*Ṛtamanas-, Ṛtavacas-, Ṛtadipi-\* – ‘Of Right Thoughts, Right Speech, Right Writings’. A Jubilee Volume in Honour of Prof. Dr. Rüdiger Schmitt, Foreign Member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Massetti, Laura (forthc./b). *Fashioning Immortality: Comparative Studies in Three Pindaric Odes*.
- Melchert, Craig H. (2018). “Semantics and Etymology of Hittite *takš*.” In: Lucien van Beek, Alwin Kloekhorst, Guus Kroonen, Michäel Peyrot & Tijmen Pronk (eds.): *Farnah. Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Sasha Lubotsky*. Ann Arbor, MI et al.: Beech Stave Press: 209–216.
- Mittner, Ladislao (1954). *Wurd. Das Sakrale in der altgermanischen Epik*. Bern: Francke.
- Nagy, Gregory (2006). “Homer’s Name Revisited.” In: Georges-Jean Pinault & Daniel Petit (eds.): *La langue poétique indo-européenne. Actes du colloque de travail de la Société des études indo-européennes (Indogermanische Gesellschaft / Society for Indo-European Studies), Paris, 22–24 octobre 2003*. Leuven et al.: Peeters: 317–330.
- Nagy, Gregory (2016). “A sampling of comments on *Iliad*. Rhapsody 10.” In: *Classical Inquiries* (2016.09.15): <https://classical-inquiries.chs.harvard.edu/a-sampling-of-comments-on-iliad-rhapsody-10/>. (last visited 05.09.2024).
- Oberlies, Thomas (2012). *Der Rigveda und seine Religion*. Berlin: Verlag der Weltreligionen.
- Oldenberg, Hermann (1917<sup>2</sup>). *Die Religion des Veda*. [1894]. 2. Auflage. Stuttgart: Cotta.
- Pelliccia, Hayden (1987). “Pindarus Homericus. Pythian 3.1–80.” In: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 91: 39–63.
- Pelliccia, Hayden (2018). “The violation of Wackernagel’s law at Pindar *Pythian* 3.1.” In: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 109: 63–82.
- Pinault, Geroges-Jean (2003). “Sanskrit *kalyāṇa*- interprété à la lumière des contacts en Asie centrale”. In: *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 98.1: 123–161.
- Puhvel, Jaan (1970). “Mythological Reflections of Indo-European Medicine.” In: George Cardona, Henry M. Hoenigswald & Alfred Senn (eds.): *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press: 369–382.
- Race, William (ed. and trans.) (1997). *Pindar. Olympian Odes. Pythian Odes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Recchia, Marco (2017). "Pindaro e i poeti di Sparta arcaica: un frammento pindarico in "POxy" 2389?" In: *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* N.S. 115: 53–65.
- Ryder, Arthur W. (1901). *Die ῥβhus im ῖgveda*. Ph.D. dissertation, Leipzig.
- Scarlata, Salvatore (1999). *Die Wurzelkomposita im ῖg-Veda*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Schindler, Jochem (1975). "Armenisch *erkn*, griechische *ὀδύνη*, irisch *idu*." In: *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 89: 53–65.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger (1967). *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Serangeli, Matilde (2022). "Craftsmen healing with words. A phraseological comparative approach to the Tocharian *Punyavantajātaka* (A 10 b2 – 13 a5)." PowerPoint presented at 14<sup>th</sup> Deutscher Orientalistentag 2022 – FU Berlin (Panel: Indogermanistik).
- Slater, William J. (1969). *Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin et al.: de Gruyter.
- Slater, William J. (1988). "Pindar's *Pythian* 3: Structure and Purpose." In: *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* N.S. 29.2: 51–61.
- Sommer, Florian (2022). "Artemis Orthia. Eine linguistisch-mythologische Genealogie." In: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 127.1: 307–342.
- Sparreboom, Marcus (1985). *Chariots in the Veda*. Leiden: Brill.
- Vegas Sansalvador, Ana (1996). "Φορβασία, Ὀρθία γ' Ἀρτεμις Ὀρθία en Laconia." In: *Emerita* 64.2: 275–288.
- Watkins, Calvert (1995). *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetry*. New York et al.: Oxford University Press.
- Wærn, Ingrid (1951). *ῖῖς ὄστεα. The Kenning in Pre-Christian Greek Poetry*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- West, Emily (2017). "The Transformation of Cyavana: A Case Study in Narrative Evolution." In: *Oral Tradition* 31.1: 77–122.
- West, Martin L. (2007). *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Witzel, Michael (1987). "On the Origin of the Literary Device of the 'Frame Story' in Old Indian Literature." In: Ulrich Schneider & Harry Falk (eds.): *Hinduismus und Buddhismus: Festschrift für Ulrich Schneider*, Freiburg: Falk: 380–414.
- Witzel, Michael & Gotō, Toshifumi (trans.) (2007). *Rig-Veda. Das heilige Wissen. Erster und zweiter Liederkreis*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag der Weltreligionen.
- Young, David C. (1968). *Three Odes of Pindar. A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7*. Leiden: Brill.
- Zysk, Kenneth G. (1985). *Religious Healing in the Veda: with translations and annotations of medical hymns from the ῖgveda and the Atharvaveda and renderings from the corresponding ritual texts*. Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society.
- Zysk, Kenneth G. (2008). "Siddha Medicine in Tamil Nadu." In: *Tranquebar Initiativets Skriftserie* 4: 2–20.

