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THE PĀŚUPATA OBSERVANCE (ATHARVAVEDAPARIŚIŚTA 40)*

INTRODUCTION

*Shingo Einoo, Dominic Goodall, Harunaga Isaacson, Mieko Kajihara and Judit Törzsök have read an earlier draft of this article. Each has provided important suggestions for its improvement. We are grateful for their help, as we are for the help received from two friends in Pune, Madhavi Kolhatkar and Shrikant Bahulkar, in procuring a copy of Modak 1967, a paper which at first proved elusive, because the reference in Dandekar’s Vedic Bibliography III: 54 to JKU(H) 9 is spurious.

The Pariśiśtas of the Atharvaveda

In 1909–1910, Bolling and von Negelein published their edition of the corpus of Pariśiśtas of the Atharvaaveda,1 72 in number.2 In the preface to their edition (p. vii) they expressed their hope “ultimately to publish a translation of the Pariśiśtas together with an exegetical commentary”. Before doing so, they intended to publish “a volume dealing with the many grammatical and lexicographical peculiarities which the texts present, and containing also a number of unpublished texts that throw light upon the subject matter of the Pariśiśtas”. Caland observed (1911: 514): “Die Bedeutung, welche diese Arbeit auch für die Religionswissenschaft haben wird, kann erst nach der Übersetzung ins volle Licht kommen; daß er [sic] von großer Bedeutung sein wird, lehrt uns schon die Inhaltsangabe”. Other scholars have expressed themselves in similar terms about the importance of this “detailed, valuable and informative survey – of course, from the atharvanic point of view – of various kinds of religious practices in vogue in definite milieus in the late Vedic and early Hindu period” (Gonda 1975:

1 See the important reviews by Fick in ZDMG 65 (1911), pp. 838–842, Keith in JRAS for 1912, pp. 755–776, Winternitz in WZKM 23 (1909), pp. 401ff., and 24 (1910), pp. 313ff., and the short notices by Caland (1911: 513–515) and Oldenberg in DLZ 1909 (pp. 2070f.), 1910 (pp. 930f.). Modak’s study of 1993, where the bibliography is unfortunately rather haphazard and outdated, contains i.a. an introduction (pp. 189–202) to, and useful summaries (pp. 203–399) of the contents of all the AV Pariśiśtas. On Vedic Pariśiśta literature in general, we refer for the sake of brevity to Gonda 1978, index p. 678 s.v. pariśiśta, and to Einoo 1996a.

2 Cf. Hatfield 1890.
307f.). Unfortunately, the plans of the editors were only very partially realized, and besides the few Parišištas which had already been translated by Caland and by students of Bloomfield in the nineteenth century, only a few more Parišištas have since been translated, by two students of Gonda: Kohlbrugge (1938) and van den Bosch (1978).

Since the information provided by van den Bosch (the last translator of a part of the corpus) in the introduction to his dissertation on AVPariš 21–29 is not in all respects correct, nor complete, we here provide in tabular form a survey of translations or – where a translation is not available – of studies pertinent to the individual Parišištas.

### Editions, translations and studies of individual AV Parišištas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr(s).</th>
<th>Ed. Princeps</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>NB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–18</td>
<td>B&amp;vN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>B&amp;vN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Gonda 1967⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Goodwin 1890</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–29</td>
<td>B&amp;vN</td>
<td>van den Bosch 1978</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>B&amp;vN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>B&amp;vN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Only 31.9.4c–9.5d ed. / transl. Caland 1900: 183f⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32–34</td>
<td>B&amp;vN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Magoun 1889</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>Böhtlingk 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–39</td>
<td>B&amp;vN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>B&amp;vN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–43</td>
<td>B&amp;vN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Caland 1893: 240–243</td>
<td>ibid., pp. 95–106</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>B&amp;vN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>B&amp;vN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Weber 1858a, Griffiths 2003a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>B&amp;vN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>B&amp;vN</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Bloomfield 1893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ The information on p. 1 is merely a reduced copy of Gonda 1975: 307f. n. 9.
⁵ Gonda’s article contains a translation of Kaušš 140, which this Parišišta closely follows, and the explanatory notes contain many remarks, with translations, on the variant readings of the Parišišta text as well.
⁶ The same portion was rendered into English by Türstig, WZKS 29 [1985], p. 92.
⁷ The lexicographical nature of this Parišišta does not allow translation.
It is the purpose of the present paper to fill one of the gaps in this table. Weber already observed (1858b: 339) that “die Atharvapaṭīśaṭṭa fast durchweg einen Rudra-sektarischen Charakter tragen”. This may be a slight exaggeration, but it is a fact that the corpus contains several documents that throw light on the cult of Rudra-Śiva. In the hope that we will be able in the future to offer further studies, e.g., of AVPariś 31 (Koṭihoma) and 36 (UcchusMALpaka), we focus now on AVPariś 40, the

---

8 Another Aṣṭarvavedic recension of the Caranavāyuḥa has been transmitted by the Paippalāda brahmins of Orissa, under the name Caranavāyuḥaṇapīṭa. The MA Thesis dealing with this recension, prepared in the early 1980s at Leiden University by Mrs. Christa Bastiaansen under the guidance of Prof. Michael Witzel, appears to have been lost. Griffiths is planning a study of this recension, on the basis of mss. collected by him in Orissa.

9 Text and translation of the first seven sections of this Paṭīśaṭṭa are given by Weber as parallels for seven sections of the Sāmavedic Adbhutaḥrīṁāṇa: 67.1 on pp. 320f., 67.2 pp. 324f., 67.3 pp. 322f., 67.4 pp. 329f., 67.5 p. 327, 67.6 pp. 340f., 67.7 p. 331; 67.8 has not been edited or translated by Weber.

10 Cf. the earlier translation by Hatfield (1893), and the notes by Böhtlingk (1892).

11 Cf. also Modak 1993: 445f.
Pāśupatavrata. We first offer some introductory comments on the study of the Pāśupata cult.

Pāśupata Śaivism

Our principal source for the interpretation of the Pāśupatasūtra – the fundamental text of Pāśupata Śaivism – is Kaundinya’s commentary, the Pañcarāthabhāṣya (Shastri 1940). However, an important aspect of the Pāśupata tradition which has not yet received much attention is the existence of paraphrases of the Pāśupatasūtra in other sources. The piece of text translated here contains clear parallels to some of the sūtras. Although it is therefore an important document for the history of Pāśupata Śaivism, it seems to have gone completely unnoticed by scholars studying this cult. Its main importance may be said to lie in the fact that it gives us insight into the social background of (some of) the Pāśupatas. Whereas the so-called Pāñcārthika Pāśupata scriptures, viz. Kaundinya’s Pañcarāthabhāṣya on the Pāśupatasūtra and the Ganaṅkārikā with the commentary Raimāṭikā attributed to Bhāsarvajña, have been studied with regard to their philosophical and theological contents by various scholars, much remains to be done on the social history of the Pāśupatas. We may refer to recent studies by Sanderson (2002: 29 with note 32) and Bakker (2000), which point out that there must have existed other types of Pāśupata cults whose teachings and practices differed considerably from those we read about in the Pāñcārthika scriptures.

Besides AVPariś 40 there are other texts which contain parallels or paraphrases of the Pāśupatasūtra. Well-known is the sixth chapter (Nakuliśkapāśupatadāsana) of Mādhava’s Sarvardārasamāngaṅgraṅga, the first source on Pāśupatas to be translated in the West (cf. Hara 1966, 1993, 1994, 1999; Dasgupta 1955 (pp. 130–149); Schultz 1958; Oberhammer 1984, 1986, 1995.

12 The entire commentary has been rendered into English by Hara (1966) and Chakraborti (1970). For the latter see the detailed review by Hara (1974).
13 Cf. AVPariś 40.1.8–9 (PāŚū 1.2), 40.1.11 (PāŚū 1.5–6, 1.8), 40.1.12 (PāŚū 1.8–9), 40.1.14 (PāŚū 1.10–11), 40.2.5 (PāŚū 4.22–24), 40.3.3 (PāŚū 3.21–26), 40.6.2 (PāŚū 1.13), 40.6.4 (PāŚū 1.14, 1.17). Note that except for PāŚū 3.21–26 and 4.22–24 all the sūtras for which there are parallels stem from the first part of the PāŚū. These parallels appear – intermingled with passages that have no parallel in the PāŚū – in precisely the same order they have in the PāŚū. AVPariś 40.2.5 and 40.3.3 may not go back to the PāŚū, because these are two of the five brahmamantras, which are transmitted in many other sources too (cf. our annotation).
15 For the little work that has been done on this subject, see the overview given by Lorenzen (21991: 173ff.). For epigraphical references to Pāśupatas, cf. Hara 1966: 35–70, and Pathak 1960: 4–19. For a theory on the milieu where the cult may have originated, cf. Oberlies 2000.
1958). No references are made in the secondary literature to a passage from Laks̄mīdhara’s _Kṛtyakalpataru_ where an otherwise unknown “Līṅgapūrāṇa” is quoted which i.a. describes a Pāṣupatavrata in terms reminiscent of some of the sūtras.16 Another example comes from the unpublished _Niśvāsamukha_, the first part of the Saiddhāntika _Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā_, which places the Saiddhāntika teachings taught in the major text in their non-Saiddhāntika context. It contains i.a. two accounts of the Atimārga,17 of which the first by and large follows the course laid down in the _Pāṣupatasūtra_.18 Finally, mention may be made of a late Purānic source, the _Pampāṃkāṭmya_, a eulogy of the pilgrimage centre Pampā (present Hampi in Karnataka), whose eleventh chapter of the _Uttarabhāgā_, entitled _Pañcārthacaraṇapraśāmsā_, also contains some clear echoes of the sūtras.19 A noteworthy feature of the last three passages is that they are all composed in śloka meter.20

Whereas there are many other texts purporting to give instruction about Pāṣupata yoga,21 they mostly do not show any signs of a direct knowledge of the sūtras.22 The sources referred to above, however, can tell us much about the transmission of the sūtras – possibly even give glimpses of some pre-_Pāṣupatasūtra_ form of them – and their interpretation in various Pāṣupata circles.

---

16 KKT _Tirhatīvivekanākāṇḍa_ p. 106, l. 7ff. These verses occur within a māhāmya of a līṅga called Mahāpāṣupateśvara in Vārānasi (p. 105, l. 12ff.). On the identity of this “Līṅgapūrāṇa”, see Bisschop 2002: 240 (n. 36).  
17 Cf. Sanderson 1988: 664, on the two great streams of Śaivism: the Outer Path (Atimārga) and the Path of Mantras (Mantramārga).  
18 NAK 1–227, NGMPP A 41/14, folios 17° and 17°. We thank Dominic Goodall for drawing our attention to this passage and providing us with a transcription. This passage is especially important because it has been transmitted in an early Nepalese manuscript (ca. CE 900). Cf. Goudriaan and Gupta 1981: 33ff.  
19 This chapter has been edited in an appendix by Vasundhara Filliozat (2001). Unfortunately, the edition is very poor and contains numerous mistakes and typographical errors. Filliozat does not note the paraphrases of the _Pāṣupatasūtra_ (p. 140: 2.12.20ff.) nor the even more obvious quotation of the entire _Gaṇakārikā_ in this chapter (pp. 139–140: 2.12.5–14).  
20 It has long been observed that parts of the _Pāṣupatasūtra_ itself are metrical. Cf. Oberlies 2000: 181 (n. 28).  
22 An exception to this is the _Athravātis-Upaniṣad_, which has a few lines in common with PŚū 5.35–38. Cf. Hara 1967: 60–61.
Geographical and onomastic links between Atharvavedic and Pāśupata traditions

How can we explain the presence of detailed knowledge of the Pāśupata cult among the Atharvavedic brahmins who composed AVPariś 40? The answer seems to lie in the fact that early medieval Atharvavedic tradition was centered in precisely the same area of western India (Gujarat, Malwa)\(^{23}\) as was the Pāśupata cult, and that Śaivism was a dominant stream among Atharvavedins.

The following names of commentators on the Atharvavedic Kauśikasūtra are known:\(^{24}\) Bhadra (commentary lost),\(^ {25}\) Rudra (lost),\(^ {26}\) Dārila, and Keśava. Meulenbeld, forthc., has confirmed the west Indian provenance of these last two writers.\(^ {27}\) In the family of Keśava (11th century),\(^ {28}\) the author of the Paddhati on the Kauśikasūtra, both Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva names were used. Cf. Kauśikapaddhati (Limaye et al. 1982), p. 482: Kauśiko Vatsaśarmā ca tatprapaturo ‘tha Dārilaḥ \(^ {29}\) śāstraviṇānam eśām hi caturttho nopapadyate \(\|\) tad ayuktaṁ hi yad vaktum boddhāraḥ santy anekāsaḥ \(\|\) tathā yad eśām anavye Kauśiko jñātavān \(\|\) Vāhasīt Keśavotpannaḥ Keśavād Ananta ucyate \(\|\) Anantāt Someśvaro jātaḥ Someśvarāt Keśavas tathā \(\|\) sarve te ‘tharvavedinah \(\ldots\)\(^ {30}\) The names Rudra, Bhadra and Someśvara suggest some involvement with Śaiva religion among western Indian Atharvavedins of the first millennium CE.

As Witzel has emphasized (1986: 46f. and 59), grants of villages or land to Atharvavedic brahmins have always been comparatively very rare. The only available early medieval grants to Atharvavedic brahmins hail

---

\(^{23}\) At least as far as the Śaunaka Śākha is concerned, it remained restricted to western India up to modern times. All AVPariś mss. hail from Gujarat and Maharashtra.

\(^{24}\) The name Kauśika itself, by the way, has Pāśupata connections: cf. Bakker 2000: 6 and 14.

\(^{25}\) See ed. of the Kauśikapaddhati (Limaye et al. 1982), p. xxi.

\(^{26}\) Ibid., pp. xxi and xxv.

\(^{27}\) It had already been proven on linguistic grounds by Bühler (1891), a review which has escaped Meulenbeld’s attention. Bühler keenly noted (p. 246) that “their language is full of Gujaraticisms”, of which he gives several telling examples.

\(^{28}\) Meulenbeld (forthc.) is to our taste too skeptical about the dating proposed by Limaye et al. (1982).

\(^{29}\) Quoted after the correction suggested on p. xxi of the edition. The text as edited [p. 482] in fact reads tasya putro ‘tha Dārilaḥ. This conjecture has been made in order to bring Keśava’s statement in line with the colophon of the Dārila ms. quoted by Diwekar et al. 1972: x: mahāvedātharvavida upāhyāyatvaśārmanah prapantrasya bhāṭṭadārīlakṛtau kauśikabhāṣye \ldots

\(^{30}\) Cf. also p. xxxv of the edition.
from Gujarat. The plates of the Maitraka ruler Dhruvasena I (Bühler, IA 5 [1876], pp. 204–206), found in erstwhile Bhaunagar State, [Gupta-Valabhi] Sanvat 207 = ca. CE 527, record a grant of a well and pasture situated in Hastakavapra (“probably the modern Hâthab in the Bhaunagar territory”) to the Atharvavedin Sacitiśarman of the Draunayana gotra. The plates of the Maitraka ruler Dharasena II (Diskalkar, ABORI 4 [1923], pp. 33–41), [Gupta-Valabhi] Sanvat 252 = ca. CE 572, found at Bhādvā (15 miles south-east of Rajkot in Kathiawad) record a grant of a village Iṣikānaka to the Atharvavedin Rudragopa, son of Rudraghoṣa, of the Kauśravasa gotra, resident of Anartapura. The Bhavnagar plates of the Maitraka ruler Dharasena III (Diskalkar, EI 21 [1931–1932], pp. 181–184), [Gupta-Valabhi] Sanvat 304 = ca. CE 624, record a grant to the Atharvavedin Mitrayaśas, son of Visṇuśas, of the Ātreya gotra, resident of Hastavapra. The Kaira plates of the Early Gurjara ruler Dadda II Praśāntarāga (Mirashi, CII IV/1, 57–66), [Kalacuri] Sanvat 380 = CE 629, found “in the town of Kēḍa or Kairā, the headquarters of a district of the same name in Gujarat”, record the grant of a village to 40 brahmins among whom 5 were Atharvavedins of the Cauli gotra, adherents of the Paippalāda Śākhā, immigrated from Bharukaccha, resident in Bherajjikā. Their names were: Bhadra, Vāyuśarman, Droṇasvāmin, Rudrāditya, and Pūrṇasvāmin. The plates of Śilāditya V (Bühler, IA 6 [1877], pp. 16–21), probably dated to [Gupta-Valabhi] Sanvat 441 = ca. CE 761, found in “the Rāja’s palace at Lūnāvādā”, record the grant of a village to the Atharvavedin Sambhulla, son of Dātalla, of the Pārśara gotra, resident member of the community of Caturvedins of Dāhaka. In these inscriptions, especially the names Rudragopa, Rudraghoṣa, Bhadra32 and Rudrāditya call our attention: a connection of these brahmins with Rudra worship seems probable.

If we turn now to epigraphical evidence for the Pāṣupata cult in early medieval western India, the absence of inscriptive records stemming from Gujarat itself is striking. The first inscriptions from Gujarat recording the names of Pāṣupata teachers date to the twelfth century, a time when the Solaṅki dynasty ruled Gujarat (Majmudar 1960: 111–11733). We

31 Whether these five Atharvavedins ever actually enjoyed the usufruct of this grant is doubtful: cf. Mirashi, CII IV/1, p. 68.
32 This recalls the name of the author of a lost commentary on the Kauśikasūtra.
33 Majmudar attributes the first epigraphical evidence for Pāṣupata teachers in Gujarat to the eleventh century, but this is because he reckons three Śaiva ascetics mentioned as the recipients of grants in three earlier inscriptions among the Pāṣupatas (Majmudar, p. 112): this conclusion cannot be validated. The other inscriptions which he discusses, however, record a succession of teachers who trace their origin back to Gārgya, the second pupil of Lakulīśa. They all seem to have belonged to Prabhāṣapāṭan (Somanātha). The
do, however, have the Ābhōṇa Plates of the Kalacuri ruler Śaṅkaragaṇa (Mirashi, CII IV/1, pp. 38–44), [Kalacuri] Saṃvat 347 = ca. CE 595, from Kalavana (Nasik district): the dūtaka seems to have been a mahāpilupati\textsuperscript{34} called ‘Pāsupata’. The early Kalacuris ruled over a vast area including Malwa, Maharashtra and Gujarat,\textsuperscript{35} and were followers of Śiva as Pāsupati.\textsuperscript{36} Moreover, in a number of copper plates of the maharāja Bhulunḍa of the Valkhās – a contemporary of Samudragupta (ca. CE 335–376) – which have been unearthed at Bāgh (Madhya Pradesh), Pāsupatācāryas are mentioned among the recipients of grants.\textsuperscript{37} These inscriptions testify to the presence of Pāsupatās at an early age in western India.\textsuperscript{38}

There is no reason to doubt the central role in the early history of the Pāsupata cult of Kārohana,\textsuperscript{39} which lies in the immediate vicinity of earliest inscription in which this tradition is recorded is the Somnāṭhattā Prasasti of Bhāva Brhaspati (Ozha 1889; Peterson 1895), dated Valabhi Saṃvat 850 = ca. CE 1169, according to which Soma gave Somanātha to the Pāsupatas, who had gone to Vṛndāvana in the Kṛta age due to a curse of Pārvatī. On the command of Śiva, Nandīśvara incarnated in a brahmin family of the Gārgeya lineage in Vānārasi [sic] as Bhājavṛhaspati and undertook the Pāsupata observance. After a pilgrimage, and having taught in various places, he came to Somanātha where the sacred site was handed over to him by Kumārapāla. Richard Davis (1994) suggests that behind the mythical motif of the curse a historical event is hidden, viz. the destruction of the Somanātha temple by Maḥmūd’s forces in CE 1026. The temple was rebuilt and then later on restored by Kumārapāla in the 12th century.

\textsuperscript{34} Mirashi (CII IV/1, p. 45 n. 2): “Mahāpilupati, the great commander of the elephant force, is a technical official title”.

\textsuperscript{35} Cf. CII IV/1, p. xliv and p. xlvii.

\textsuperscript{36} Cf. Mirashi (CII IV/1, p. cxlvii): “All the three Early Kalachuri kings, Krīṣṇa-rāja, Śaṅkaragaṇa and Buddha-rāja, are described in the Kalachuri grants as paramaḥēśvara, i.e., fervent devotees of Mahēśvara (Śiva). That they belonged to the Pāsupata sect of Śaivism is shown by the description of Krīṣṇarāja as devoted to Pāsupati from his very birth. Anantamahāyī, the queen of Buddha-rāja, is specifically mentioned as a follower of the Pāsupata sect. The Dūtaka of the Ābhōṇa plates bore the name Pāsupata itself. All this is a clear indication of the influence the Pāsupatas exercised in the court of the early Kalachuris”.

\textsuperscript{37} The hoard of copper plates has been published by Ramesh and Tewari 1990. Cf. plate nrs. III, V, VI, IX, X, XII, XIV. These plates contain the earliest known inscriptions references to Pāsupatas. Plate nr. X, dated [Gupta?] Saṃvat 56 (ca. CE 376) records a land grant to the shrine of the Mothers (mātrsthānadevakula) which had been established by the Pāsupatācārya Bhagavant Lokodadhi in the village of Piṅchikānaka.

\textsuperscript{38} Cf. also Hsuênn Tsang’s description of Mo-la-pō (Mālava). 2.000 li north-west [sic] of Bharukaccha (?): “There are 100 Dēva temples of different kinds. The heretics are very numerous, but principally the Pāsupatas (the cinder-covering heretics)” (tr. Beal 1884: 261).

\textsuperscript{39} Modern Karvan in Gujarat, 15 miles south of Baroda. Many epigraphical and archaeological finds have come to light which confirm its importance for the early Pāsupata movement. For a short bibliography on Karvan, see Hara 1967: 58–59. Other names
the localities mentioned in the grants to Atharvavedins referred to above, even though the relevant epigraphical evidence is not strictly contemporary with those grants. In the original Skandapurāṇa, whose earliest extant manuscript is dated to CE 810, we have clear evidence for the predominance of this āyatana. It is here that Śiva is said to have incarnated as Lakulīśa, after which he initiated his four pupils Kauśika (in Ujjayanī), Gārgya (in Jambumārga), Mitra (in Mathurā) and a fourth one, probably Kauṟuṣ(y)a (in Kuru).

Similar statements appear in VāP 23.206–213 (= LiP 1.24.126–133) and in the Cintra Praśasti (see n. 39). According to the account given by Kaundinya – tentatively dated to the 4th–6th century (Shastri 1940: 12) – in his commentary on Pāśū 1.1 (pp. 3f.), the Lord incarnated at Kāyāvataraṇa and (from there) walked to Ujjayinī where he initiated his first pupil Kuśika. Thus from early medieval times there existed a tradition which placed the home of the Pāṣupata cult in Kārohaṇa, in Gujarat.

The inclusion of the Pāṣupatavrata among the AV Pariśīṣṭas indicates the prominent role which Pāṣupata Śaivism must have played in or around the Atharvavedic milieu in which these texts were composed.

**Atharvavedapariśīṣṭa 40: the Pāṣupatavrata**

Regarding the dating of the corpus of AV Pariśīṣṭas, it is to be kept in mind (Modak 1993: 470) that the “Atharva-Veda Pariśīṣṭas obviously represent a composite text, being a collection of tracts presumably belonging to different chronological periods”. Modak collects (pp. 471–473) various arguments based on the vocabulary of the corpus (occurrence of late words like dīnāra), dependence on presumably earlier sources (e.g., Manusmriti and Arthaśāstra), precedence with regard to dependent texts (notably Varāhamihira’s Bṛhat samhitā), the state of astronomical knowledge etc. However, since none of these arguments makes use of textual material from AVPariś 40, we cannot for this particular text agree with Modak’s referring to the same place are Kāyā(va)rohaṇa, Kāyāvatāra, Kāyāvataraṇa. Epigraphical evidence for a connection between the Pāṣupata cult and Kārohaṇa is recorded in: 1) the Eklīngji Stone Inscription, dated Vikrama Samvat 1028 = ca. CE 971 (Bhandarkar 1904–1907); 2) the Pālḍi Inscription, dated Vikrama Samvat 1173 = ca. CE 1116 (Akshaya Keerty Vyas, EI 30 [1933–1934], pp. 8–12); 3) the Cintra Praśasti of Śaraṅgadeva, dated Vikrama Samvat 1343 = ca. CE 1287 (Bühler, EI 1 [1892], pp. 271–287). A copper-plate grant of the Gurjara ruler Jayabhata III, dated [Kalacuri] Samvat 456 = ca. CE 706, was issued from the camp (vāsaka) at Kāyāvatāra (Bhagwānlīl Indrājī, IA 13 [1884], pp. 70–81).


conclusion (p. 473) that “one may not be far from the truth if one assigns the Atharva-Veda Pariśiṣṭas to a period somewhere round about the beginning of the Christian era”. The only date that can be given is that of the earliest manuscript of the corpus, which also contains our Pariśiṣṭa: this is the ms. ‘Roth’ (Bolling and von Negelein, p. xiii) probably dating to CE 1431 ([Vikrama] Saṃvat 1488). Since all mss. descend, according to the editors, from one already corrupt archetype, we can push this date back by at least another century, probably even further: there seems to be no reason to doubt that our text belongs to sometime in the second half of the first millennium CE. We know of no grounds for a more accurate dating.

The text seems to have some embedding in its corpus: at AVPariś 31.10.1–2, we read evam proktavidhānena koṭhomasya śaṃkaraḥ \ pṛītim ā ucayate yena tac chubhaṃ bhautilkan dadau \ atharvā bhautilkan labdhvā śiṣyebhīyas tat punar dadau \ sūbhām moksakaraṃ punyam priyaṃ pāśupater vratam \, and the same name pāśupater vratam occurs in our Pariśīṣṭa at 40.6.14. The Pāśupata observance laid down in AVPariś 40 partly goes back to the teachings of the Pāśupataśūtra – as the parallels with some of the sūtras show –, but at the same time it is embedded within an Atharvavedic context: cf. the recurrent Atharvavedic technical terminology (40.3.8, 40.6.10–11), and the presupposed familiarity with mantras of both the Śaṅkara and the Paippulāda Śaṃhitā (40.2.1, 40.2.4, 40.3.9, 40.6.13). Instead of the four-phased ascetic career taught in Kaunḍinya’s commentary on the Pāśupataśūtra, the present text prescribes a ritual which can be performed within a limited period of time or for one’s entire life (40.1.3). For many ritual details there are parallels in the Grhyas- and Dharmasūtra literature, as can be observed from our annotation.

The text of the Bolling and von Negelein edition for AVPariś 40 is rather dubious at several points, and is at times beyond emendation. Below follows the text as we propose to read it, accompanied by our translation. In matters of punctuation (placement of danās), we follow the edition (cf. p. xxi). On the division of the Pariśīṣṭa into six sections (khāṇḍas), cf. Modak 1993: 197f.: the ‘khāṇḍa’ division of our Pariśīṣṭa is not as

---

42 This dating is only tentative, as the lunar date given in the colophon does not yield a matching Friday (bhrāguvāsara) in 1431.
43 Modak (1993: 446 with n. 9) further supposes AVPariś 51.4.5 (mahisakavyabhāb sabhasmapaunfrāh kṣipaśupāyaratāś ca ye manuyāḥ \ vividhabhayasamāhītās tu sarve kṣayaṃ upaśānti śanaścarasya ghaṭe ||) to refer to Pāśupata ascetic practices. But the sole basis for this is the doubtful conjecture sabhasmapaunfrāh, for which the mss. read sabhāsa²/sabhaṣā².
“purely mechanical” as appears, according to Modak, to be the norm in the corpus. It is to be kept in mind that the following mss. were available to the editors for AVPariśa 40: ABCDE T Roth, U from tāṁ it to viṣṇuh in 40.4.2 and from prthivi in 40.6.6 to the end of the Pariśiṣṭa. B omits the text of this Pariśiṣṭa after 40.3.4 (the indications given by the editors, p. 257, about precisely where the omission commences, are not clear). The editors seem frequently to have rejected readings from the manuscripts ADE: we, however, are in several cases inclined to adopt rejected readings from these manuscripts.

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

1.1 om atha pāṣūpatavratādeśo

Om. Now the instruction about the Pāṣūpata observance.

1.2 nāśrotriyāya nācaritavedavratāya nākṛtvapānāyā dadīta ॥

He [i.e., the guru]46 should not give47 [this instruction / observance (?)] to one who is not conversant with the Śruti, nor to one who has not undertaken the Veda observance,48 nor to one who has not undergone the shaving ceremony.49

1.3 māsadvitricatuspañcasaṃvatsaradvadāsasaṃvatsarasaraparimitaṃ naisthikam vā

[The observance] is of the length of a month, two, three, four, five years, of twelve years, or for the duration of one’s entire life.50

46 In most cases the unspecified subject seems to be the student/practitioner, but here, and in one other clear case (40.3.1–2), it must be the preceptor.
47 The medial optative of √dā might appear awkward, but the same usage occurs once more in 40.1.14 below, where it is clear (dadāmi / dadīta) that the opposition active / middle is insignificant here (cf. vardhayasya in 40.3.4). We have found no examples of vratam / ādesam ādā.
49 This refers to the shaving of the beard and hair that is part of the samāvartana ritual at the end of the Vedic studenthood (Gonda 1980: 93, 384), or to the shaving at the end of the godāna (ibid., 462f.). The three restrictions imply that the practitioner should be a brahmin. This implication is made explicit by the words which the preceptor causes the practitioner to speak at 40.3.1. Cf. Kaunḍinya ad Pāśū 1.1, p. 3, l. 8: (evam)ādirhatah pāyindriya brahmāṇaḥ śiyah ‘The student is free from such [faults], sharp-witted [and] a brahmin’.
50 Cf. the Haṟsa Stone Inscription (from the Haṟsa hill, 7 miles south of Sikar, Rajasthan), dated [Vikrama] Saṃvat 1030 = ca. CE 973, where a Śaiva ascetic called Bhāvadyota is described i.a. as follows: āsīn naisthikarūpo yo dītapāṣūpatavratā (Kielhorn, EI 2 [1894], p. 123, l. 26). On the naisthika brahmacārin, see Kane Vol. II part 1, pp. 375–376.
1.4 *athāsyāyatanāṇi* ||

Now the places of this [observance]:

1.5 *mahādevāyatane ‘pāṁ samīpe* ||

at a sanctuary of Mahādeva, in the vicinity of water,

1.6 *giriguhāyām gavaṁ gos̱the ‘gnyāgāre vā*

in a mountain cave,

1.7 *nadāṅm bahiṇāṃ pratiśraye*

at a confluence of many rivers.

1.8 *anusavanam* || 9. *bhasmanā snānam*  

[Once] per part of the day, [he should take] the bath in ash.

1.9 [contd.] *raudrahomāḥ snapananā ca sarpiḥkṣiṇagandhadakair*

The offerings dedicated to Rudra and the bathing [of the image, are to be performed] with clarified butter, milk, fragrant water.

1.10 *gandhapuspadhūpadīpodanapāyasayāvakalājādi pradaśināntaṁ ca* ||

[The observance / bathing / *pūjana (?)* begins with fragrances,

---

51 *asya* might rather refer to the practitioner, an interpretation that finds some support in Pāśu 1.7: *āyatanavāśi.* Cf. Kauntośa’s commentary for the Pāśupata definition of an *āyatana.* Cf. also Gonda 1969: 17ff. [= 1975/II, p. 194ff.].

52 Cf. Pāśu 5.9: *sūnyāgāraguhāvāśi.* This, however, refers to the specific dwelling of the practitioner in the third phase (*avasthāna*) of the observance, whereas here no such division seems to be intended.

53 Dresden 1941: 151 (on MāṅGS 2.12.3) gives the following glosses: ‘Feuer-häuschen’, ‘Feuergebäude’, ‘place for keeping the sacred fire’. The precise meaning of the word is not clear here. The variant *agnyāgāra* seems to be slightly more common: at BṛhaŚ 1.6.14, where this last term is interestingly juxtaposed with *āyatanā* (*parisamāñkānta agnyāgārāṇy upalimparīyā yātanaṁ*), Kashigar 1964, pt. II, p. 10, renders freely ‘The fire-chamber[s?] should be swept clean, and the fire-places besmeared (with cow-dung)’. Caland 1928: 198 (on ĀpŚS 19.16.12) takes it as referring to the Gārhapataya or Āhavanīya altar. The pair *agnyāgāra* and *gavaṁ gos̱tha* also occurs at ManuŚm 4.58a.

54 The word *pratiśraya* does not seem to be attested in the meaning we tentatively assume here, with Modak 1967: 7. The editors only report a useless variant *pratiśrayo.* An emendation *pratisravya* would be hapax (nor does the verb *prati-*√*srū* seem to exist), and *prasravaga(ta)* at (a) source(s) (cf. 40.4.5 below) does not convince from the point of view of the sense.

55 For clarity’s sake the numbering of the edition has been retained, but we divide the text at a different place: *anusavanam* and *bhasmanā snānam* have to be read together. This is suggested by Pāśu 1.2: *bhasmanā triśaṇamaṇaṁ snauyāta.*

56 *raudrahomāḥ snapananāḥ* em. The edition reads *raudrahosnapananāḥ* but there is a v.l. *raudrahomāsnapananāḥ* (mss. T and Roth). We adopt the long ā of this variant in our light emendation, for which cf. 40.3.9 below: *vratena tvaṁ ity ubhāyār ahām iti pañcaabhi raudrān homāṁ htuva homāvāsanena bhasmanā snānam karoti.* The only other attestation of *raudrahomaḥ* which we could trace, is in a passage promoting the employment of an Atharvavedin as Purohita, in a manner strongly reminiscent of many AVPariś passages: MBh 12 App. I Nr. 8 l. 13 (*raudrahomasahasram*) and l. 20 (*raudraṁ homair*).
Having presented the offerings of laughter, song, music etc.,\(^{59}\) bearing fragrances and the garland which has been worn [by the image],

he worships the third (?)\(^{60}\) to the right side\(^{61}\) [of the image].
1.13 *katākākeyūradhārīṇe namo vṛṣāya namo vṛṣabhādhyāya namo*

‘Homage to the wearer of bracelets and armlets,62 homage to the bull, homage to the one who has the bull for his banner’.63

1.14 *vānaraṃ te mukhaṃ raudram anindyaṃ śubhaṃ paśuṃ evājanane-

vājanakam bhoraṃ jīvam jāyam eva rukmaṇaṃ dadāṁity

ekavāsā vīvāsā vā virāgāṇi vastrāṇi dadātā ||

Wearing one garment or wearing no garment at all,64 he should give undyed65 clothes [to the image (?), with the words:] ‘Monkey-like is (?) your face,66 horrifying;67 an irreproachable, auspicious animal evājananevājanakaṃ (?); I give a pure breastplate that is terrible, alive (?)’.68

2.1 *gocarmamaṭram sthaṇḍilam upalipyā gomayonollikhyābyuksyaṅge

prehīty āgniṃ prāṇyopasamādhāya paristīrya brahmaṇaṃ kalpa-

yītvā nānyadevatādīśi rudrasya daksīṇodapṭraṃ69 sthāpayītvā

mahāvyāhiṁthiḥ agnyāyataṇe nidhāya rudram āvāhayati ||

Having smeared a piece of ground of the size of a cow’s hide with cow-dung,70 having drawn [an auspicious sign] on it, having

62 In a *stotra* at MBh 13 App. I Nr. 6 l. 33, Śiva is addressed as *mahākeyūradhārin*.

63 Presumably, these words are to be spoken by the practitioner as part of the worship enjoined in 40.1.12. Or do they belong together with the quotation in 40.1.14?

64 PāŚu 1.10–11: ekavāsāḥ || 10 || avāsāḥ vā || 11 ||. The words of the sūtras, which give rules for the dress-code of the practitioner, seem here to have provoked a ritual injunction that is focused rather on the image of Rudra. The dress-code of the sūtras is an infringement upon usual brahminical practice: cf. Kane Vol. II part 2, p. 671 and e.g., Āgiv GS 2.6.3:98.12f. (≈ BaudhDhŚ 2.10.5) nārḍravāsā naikavastro daivatāṇi karmāṇya anusamcarae.

65 Cf. A VPariś 68.2.47, where the word virāgyāvāsas denotes ominous creatures.

66 This seems to be related to AVPariś 36.25.2 (śīrṣā vānarenātha mukhavādyām tu kāraṇyaḥ yatra tāc cāryate tatra āgacchānti varastrīyaḥ ||), which follows a verse describing the lighting of fire, in words similar to 40.2.1. The next verse but one describes the putting on of ash and six verses further (36.28.1) it is stated: sanjñatāsvaniṁnirnāṇayād unnaattatāṁ vrajet. It is worth noting that Nandin, who is said to be a second Śaṃkara (dvītiya iva śaṃkaraḥ), is sometimes described as having the face of a monkey: cf. Bhattacharya 1977: 1545, 1549 and 1560 (n. 7 and n. 12). To the passages listed there the following verses from the original Skandapurāṇa may be added: SPbh 132.53, 159.54 and 162.13.

67 One could also consider taking *raudra* as ‘relating to Rudra’, in which case one would have to translate: ‘Your Rudra face is monkey-like . . .’.

68 The few variant readings reported by the editors give us no clue with which to improve the text here. As the editors observe (p. 256): “The meter shows a deep corruption”.

69 Modak (1993: 466) is probably right that the text is to be understood as daksīṇe udadapṭraṃ, with double sandhi.

70 Cf. AVPariś 36.25.1ab: gocarmamāṭram sthaṇḍilam gomayenopalepayet.
besprinkled it,\textsuperscript{71} having brought forth fire [with the mantra] ‘agne prehi’,\textsuperscript{72} having added [fuel to it], having spread [grass] around [it], having prepared a brahmin (?),\textsuperscript{73} having placed a water-vessel to the right side of Rudra – not in any other deity’s direction – he invites Rudra, installing him in the fire-place with the Great Utterances.\textsuperscript{74}

2.2 \textit{rudrám kruddhāśanimukhām devānām śvaraṃ param । svaṭepingalam deveśaṃ} prapadye saraṇāgataḥ ॥

‘I resort to Rudra, the supreme Lord of the gods, with a wrathful thunderbolt face, the white-yellow one, Deveśa (?), having come for refuge’.

2.3 \textit{yasya yuktā rathe simhā vyāghraś ca viṣamānanāḥ । tam ahaṃ pauṇḍartākṣayaṃ devaṃ āvāhaye śivam ity āvāhābhīryacarṣya} ॥

\textsuperscript{71} Cf. JaimGS 2.8:32.15f.: \textit{gomayena gocarmamātram sthāḍilam upalipya \ldots lakṣaṇam ullikhya\ddot{d}hir abhyukṣya}. Cf. also KauŚ 2.25: \textit{nānabhīṣa\dot{t}aṃ samśīrṇaṃ upayoγaṃ labbeta} ‘If spread unbesprinkled, it would not obtain any effectivity’. As in the quoted JaimGS passage, the object of \textit{ullikhya} is \textit{lakṣaṇam} (cf. Gonda 1980: 232) also i.a. at ĀgņivŚ 1.7.1:41.2, 2.4.8:68.17, BaudhDhŚ 3.9.4, and we supply this object here as well; this absolute is never accompanied by an instrumental. It is a curious fact that among the many Gṛhyasūtra passages (cf. also A VPariś 6.1.2) that enjoins the \textit{upalepaṇa} of a \textit{sthāḍilam}, there is not a single one where the instrumental \textit{gomayena} follows the words (\textit{gocarmamātram}) \textit{sthaṇḍilam upa-\ddot{l}ip}.

\textsuperscript{72} This is AV(Ś) 4.14.5 \approx AV(P) 3.38.3.

\textsuperscript{73} The phrase \textit{bṛhma\ddot{m}aṇaṃ kalpatyāvā, for which the editors report no variants, is very doubtful. Although we do find one interesting passage that seems to be comparable (BaudhGŚŚ 4.20.2:352.4–8 \textit{dvau dvau bṛhma\ddot{m}aṇau kalpatyāvā navagraha\ddot{d}antityartham caturu bṛhma\ddot{m}aṇaṃ tayaiva sakhya\ddot{y}a grāmaśa\ddot{n}thomārthaṃ kalpatyāvā\ddot{h}a grāmaśa\ddot{n}thome grāma\ddot{s}yottarapārvavede\ddot{e} deva\ddot{g}āre caturupade\ddot{h}e} \textit{svucau same deśe gomayena gocarmamātram caturāstraṃ sthāḍilam upalipva}), the meaning in our context remains obscure. The Gṛhyasūtras offer many examples of the phrases \textit{sthanāṃ kalpatyāvā and āśanaṃ kalpatyāvā}. Could \textit{bṛhma\ddot{m}aṇaṃ be corrupt for a particular kind of āśana, e.g., bṛhma\ddot{m}aṇaṣaṇaṃ} (KauŚ 2.18, 3.5, 137.33+37)?

\textsuperscript{74} On the number of utterances possibly intended with the injunction \textit{mahāvya\ddot{v}ahṝtibhīḥ} in the Atharvavedic tradition, cf. GB 1.1.6, 1.1.10, 1.3.3, 2.2.14; KauŚ 3.4, 3.11–14, 91.6–16, 92.13; AVPariś 72.4.6.

\textsuperscript{75} The edition reads \textit{svaṭepingalam devānāṃ \textless{}mahādevaṃ\textgreater{} prapadye}. No significant variants are reported. In the Corrigenda (p. 648), the editors state “\textit{mahādevaṃ} was intended”, but this does not help as they nowhere explain what they mean to convey with square/inverse brackets: one may surmise that they suggested the removal of the transmitted \textit{mahādevaṃ} to improve the meter. In the Addenda (p. 649), Bolling suggests that “\textit{mahādevaṃ saraṇāgataḥ prapadye} seems better”. We accept the deletion of \textit{mahādevaṃ}, and – despite some remaining metrical difficulties (on the frequently substandard meter in the AVPariś, cf. Keith’s review referred to in n. 1 above) – conjecture \textit{deveśaṃ}, a very common epithet, in place of \textit{devānāṃ}.
'This gracious, lotus-eyed god, to whose chariot lions are yoked, and tigers with terrible / incomparable faces, do I invite'.

2.4 na tam yakṣmēti guggulum dhūpaṃ ca dadyāt ||
He should give bdellium and incense [with the hymn] 'na tam yakṣma'.

2.5 tatpuruṣāya vidmahe mahādevāya dhīmahi ||
tan no rudrah pracodayāt ||
'We strive for Tatpuruṣa, we meditate for Mahādeva, Rudra shall propel it to us'.

2.6 tasmai devāya vidmahe mahādevāya dhīmahi ||
tan no rudro 'numanyatām ||
iti rudrasāvitrīṁ japtvā ||

76 In BaudhGīŚ 3.9 and 4.2 we find two similar verses, addressed respectively to Jyesthā and Skanda: yasyāḥ simhā rathe yuktav yāghrāś cāpy anugāminah ī tam imām puṇḍātrikōṣṭhm jyeṣṭhām āvāhāyāmy aham || (Harting 1922: 20, ll. 3–4) and yasya simhā rathe yuktā vāghhrāś cāpy anugāminah ī tam imām putrikāputraṁ skandam āvāhāyāmy aham || (Harting 1922: 25, ll. 4–5).

77 The edition reads: na tam yakṣmātu deva iti guggulum, and the editors report (p. 257) that the mss. ADE omit deva iti. While the same two hymns ('na tam yakṣma' and 'etu devaḥ') that the text of the edition quotes pratikāna are quoted also at AVPārī 4.4.7 and 4.5.10 (cf. also 6.2.2), there they accompany the giving of guggulukus. tāhadhūpam, as opposed to our guggulum dhūpaṃ ca. The first pratikā refers to AV(S) 19.38 = AV(P) 19.24.1–3, a hymn dedicated to guggulu: presumably guggulu corresponds with gandha in 40.1.10. The second pratikā refers to AV(S) 19.39 = AV(P) 7.10, dedicated to kusṭha, a plant that finds no correspondent in the list of 40.1.10, and that our text also does not enjoin to be given. We therefore suppose that the text originally quoted only the first pratikā, and that the ADE reading na tam yakṣmātu guggulum still reflects this.

78 The edition divides tat puruṣāya. The accentuated versions of TĀ 10.46, MS 2.9.1:119.7–8 and KS 17.11:253.20–21 (tatpuruṣāya) and all of the later texts take this as one word, a name of Rudra. This is the fourth of the five brahmamantras, the prayers which end each of the five sections of the PāSū. The words of this mantra are also found as PāSū 4.22–24, ‘euphemistic substitution’ for Rudra’s name. It seems more likely, however, that it was intended as a gloss of tatpuruṣāya. Such an explanation could also be considered for anumanyatām (= pracodayāt).
‘We strive for this god, we meditate for Mahādeva, Rudra shall permit it to us’. Thus he mutters the Rudrasāvitri.80

2.7 yo agnau rudra ity anumantrayed āvāhane81 devadevasyāvāhāyany aham iti
He should speak the mantra ‘yo agnau rudraḥ’82 [over the fire (cf. 40.2.1) / image (?)], at the Invitation of the God of gods, [adding the words] ‘I perform the invitation’.

2.8 pramardane sarvāsuraviniśāṣya hūṃphaṭkāraṃ83 karoti ||
At the Crushing (?)84 he makes the sound Hūṃ Phat for the sake of destroying all demons.

2.9 nivedane 'ham amukaṃ nivedayāmīti jaṭi muniḍī paṇcaśikhi vā ||
At the Presentation, having matted hair, being bald or having five tufts [of hair],85 he [uses the words:] ‘I present this-and-this’.

3.1 brāhmaṇo ha vā ahām amukasagotro bhagavato maheśvarasya vratam carityāmīti vācayīvā ||
He should make [him] say: ‘I, a brahmin of such and such a gotra, shall undertake the observance of Lord Maheśvara’.

3.2 tato 'hya mauṇjjīṃ prayacchati ||86 sāvityāḥ tu daṇḍam pālaśaṃ bailvam āsvattham87 vāśīṃ lakutaṃ khatvāṁgaṃ paraśaṃ vā ||

---

80 The first of these two verses is called raudrī gāyatri by Kaṇḍinya ad Pāśū 1.17. Note that although two verses are given in AVPariṣ 40.2.5–6, they are not referred to as a dual, and so the second may be an interpolation.

81 The edition reads ity anumantrayen namo astu yāvad āvāhane, a conjecture following the reading of mss. A2 and D: anumam. trave namo astu yāvad āvāhane. The remainder of the mss. point, however, to the text we adopt here (as such in BCTURoth). If the words namo astu yāvad do belong in the text, they refer to the contents of the mantra: perhaps it is to be recited in the anumantra only ‘up to namo astu’ (see the next note, and cf. Modak 1967: 8 n. 7 and 1993: 424 n. 607).

82 This is AV(Ś) 7.87.1: yāagnā rudrō yō āpsv antār yā oṣadhir virādha āvivēṣa | yā imā vēṣā bhavarājanī ca kālpa[r]tām rudāyā nāmo astv agnaye.

83 The edition reads om phaṭkāraṃ, with all mss. except BCT, that read tu phaṭkāraṃ.

84 The word pramardana ‘crushing’ fits the intention sarvāsuraviniśāṣya, but seems not to be attested in any similar contexts. It probably corresponds to vināśana at AVPariṣ 36.2.5cd: tiṅkārayāyuktaṁ paṭkāraḥ ca vināśane.

85 On these hairstyles, cf. KūP 1.32.7c, LiP 1.34.31a, VāP 23.53cd (= LiP 1.16.37ab) and MBh 13 App. I Nr. 15 l. 4356, all passages dealing with Pāśupatas.

86 The closest parallel that we have been able to find is KāṭhGS 41.12 mauṇjjīṃ trīvṛtaṁ brāhmaṇaṁ prayacchati, the only Grhyasūtra parallel where the same verb prayacchati is used for the giving of the girdle.

87 With the exception of this third kind of wood, the instruction corresponds with the common Grhyasūtra injunction for the Upanayana ritual, e.g., BhāṛGS 1.2.3 bailvam
Then he gives him the muñja-girdle. And with the Śaṅkūrī verse [he
gives him] a staff made of palāsa-, bilva- or aśvattha-wood, or [he
gives] a knife, a club, a skull-staff or an axe.88

3.3 aghorebhyo 'tha ghorebhyo ghoraghoraterebhyaś ca | sarvataḥ śarva sarvebhya namas te rudrārūpebhyaḥ89 ity ādua śarvaṁ
namaskṛtyopaviśyāyānām90 niratiṣāyitvedhmān ādīpayaty antara iti

‘Homage from all sides, o Śarva, to all your horrific (rudra) forms,
the non-terrible ones, the terrible ones and the ones more terrible than
terrible’. After first paying homage to Śarva [with this mantra], he

88 Probably the Rudrāsāṅkūrī (tatpurus. āya vidmahe ... ) is meant here. In the
Grhyasūtras, the giving of the girdle and staff, and instruction in the normal Śaṅkūrī (tat
savitur ...) are basic elements of the Upanayana. The girdle and the staff are regular
attributes of the Vedic brahmacārin, but the last four items stem from a different milieu.
The skull-staff is one of the insignia of the Kāpañika; the lakutā on the other hand seems
to have been associated with the Kālamukhas, who are sometimes designated as Lāgudas.
See Lorenzen 21991: 2 and 5.

89 This verse is found also (with considerable variation of reading and accentuation)
i.a. MS 2.9.10.1–2 aghorebhya ātha ghorebhya aghoraḫoratarebhyaś ca | sarvataḥ śarvasarvebhyaḥ nāmaṁ te rudra rūpebhyaḥ nāmaṁ || ; TĀ 10.45 aghorebhya 'tha ghorebhya
ghoraṛoraterebhyaḥ [note double accent] | sarvataḥ śarva sarvebhyaḥ nāmaṁ te astu rudrārūpebhyaḥ ||. It is also found as Pāśū 3.21–26: aghorebhyaḥ || 21 ātha ghorebhyaḥ || 22 ||
ghoraghoraterebhyaḥ ca || 23 || sarvebhyaḥ || 24 || śarvasarvebhyaḥ || 25 || nāmaṁ te
astu rudrārūpebhyaḥ || 26 ||. It is the fifth of the five brahmamantraṃs. There are many
variants for this verse in various other sources as well. Cf. i.a. Goudriaan and Hooykaas
1971: 227. The edition reads ‘ghoraghorataterebhyaś, and it is specified (p. 257) that mss.
“ATURoth write the avagraha before ghora-; C corrupts it to ra”. Apparently, mss. BDE
have no avagraha, and the sense suggests this is the better reading. The edition further
reads śarvasarvebhyaḥ . . . rudra rūpebhyaḥ. The mss. are reported to have sarvasarvebhya
(ACDERTUROth) and sarvatasarvebhya (B).

90 The editors report, p. 257, that all mss. punctuate after ॐviśyā. It is not clear to us why
the editors could not accept punctuation here.
sits down, niratiśāyitvā (?)\(^\text{91}\) ghee [and] kindles fuel, with the word(s) ‘antara (?)’\(^\text{92}\)

3.4 ya\(^\text{93}\) idhmā jātavedasah samiddhasya tebhāyo vardhayasya praṇayā paśūbhiḥ śrīyā grhaḥ dhaneneti ॥

‘The fuel sticks of Jātavedas who is kindled: increase [me (?)] from them in offspring, cattle, glory, homestead, wealth’.

3.5 dvāv āghārav\(^\text{94}\) āyabhāgau juhuyād

He should offer two sprinklings, two portions of ghee, [with the words:]

3.6 vāyave svāhā ॥ śarvāya rudrāya svāhā ॥ paśupataye bhīmāya svāhā ॥ sāntāyādhipataye devāya svāhēti ॥

‘To Vāyu svāhā. To the horrific Śarva svāhā. To the fearful Paśupati svāhā. To the peaceful sovereign God svāhā’.\(^\text{95}\)

3.7 evam eva patnīṇām. tūṣm. n. ṭīṁ adhipasya juhotyād

Precisely in this way, [but] silently, he should offer to the wives of the Sovereign.\(^\text{96}\)

\(^\text{91}\) āyam is regularly the object of verb forms like nirvāpati, adhīśrayatiladhīśriyā, grhitvā, etc., but no convincing emendation of the reading niratiśāyitvē\(^\text{9}\) occurs to us. “M niratiśāyitvē” in the apparatus (p. 257), with the editors’ siglum for the archetype of all their mss., seems, by the way, to indicate that the long ā is a conjecture of the editors. How did the editors understand their text?

\(^\text{92}\) The ostensible pratīka cannot be identified, and the text may be corrupt. One may guess that behind the āti of āti, an original 3rd person sg. verb form is concealed.

\(^\text{93}\) The edition reads simply idhmā ..., without the relative pronoun. No variants are reported. On our addition of ya, see the next note.

\(^\text{94}\) The edition reads yavāgḥārav, but it is reported (p. 257) that the archetype of all mss. (M) must have read yadāvāgḥārav. The conjecture of the editors is probably wrong (the only compounds ending in āghāra known to us are uttarāgṛāra, sruvāgṛāra, vaisvadevāgṛāra, none of which is comparable to an ostensible yavāgṛāra). Our rather bold reconstruction is as follows: not claiming to have any certainty about the process which resulted in its assumed displacement, we move the aksara ya from here to the front of 40.3.4, where the syntax demands its presence. For the remaining elements dvāvāgṛārav, there is – with reference to such places as TB 1.6.3.3 dvāv āghārav l dvāv āyabhāgau – some reason to conjecture dvāv āghārav, as we do here, rather than entirely removing dvāv, as the various Gṛhyaśūtra parallels would suggest: e.g., HirGS 1.2.15 āghārav- āghāravāyabhāgau juhoti, and JaimGS 2.8.32.16 āghārav āyabhāgau hutvā (Caland 1922: ‘having sacrificed the two āghāras and the two ghee-portions’). Of the meaning of āghāra, see Gonda 1980: 177 and 314.

\(^\text{95}\) These four exclamations accompany the two āghāras and two āyabhāgas of the preceding rule. Cf. ĀpGS 1.2.5–6 ... āghārav āghārayati darśāpūrṇamāsvat tūṣṇīm ॥ ṭalāyādhvāgau juhoti agnaye svāhety uttarārdhapūrvardhhe somāya svāhēti daksinaḥśapūrvardhhe samam pārvena.

\(^\text{96}\) Our interpretation follows from the injunctions for the Rudrāpratīṣṭhākalpa described BaudhGŚS 2.16 (see Harting 1922: 9; cf. also BaudhGŚS 2.7.19, ĀgnivGŚS 2.5.8:87.6ff.), where 8 forms of Rudra are offered a kṣaram āyamīśram, followed by a gāṇodanam for
3.8 *evaṁ sarveṣu vrataniṣvedanēṣu vrātapatīr juhoti* ||

In this way [i.e., as in 40.3.5–7 (?)] he offers while [reciting the verses] dedicated to the Lord of observances\(^97\) at all presentations of observances.\(^98\)

3.9 *vratena tvam ity ubhayār ahām*\(^99\) *iti pañcaḥbār hauḍrān homān huvā homāvāsāṇena bhasmanā snānaḥ karotī* ||

their 8 wives, and a *haridrodanam* for their 8 sons: here, each libation is followed by . . . *devāya . . . devasya patnayā . . . devasya sutāya svāhā*. It is not entirely clear to us what the words *evaṁ eva . . . tāṣṭāṁ* refer to. Comparing the *ĀpGS* passage quoted in the last note, and this *BaudhGŚŚ* passage, one may guess that four more offerings are made in the four directions, but this time silently.

\(^97\) The interpretation of the technical term *vrātapatih* (also at 46.2.2, 46.7.3, 46.7.5, as well as 46.6.10 below) is problematic: it obviously refers to some group of grammatically feminine items dedicated to (Agni) the ‘Lord of observances’. Modak (1993: 300ff.) twice speaks of “vrātapatī mantras” and of “vrātapatī . . . hymns”. The mantras that might be referred to with this name could either be AV(P) 19.51.1–4 (quoted KaúśS 42.17 *idāvatsarīya . . . iti vrataśmaṇāpaṇī ādadhati* where Keśava in his Kaúśikapaddhati [Limaye et al. 1982: 214] explains *idāvatsarīya iti kalpaśaś catubhīr* [sic: masc.] *ṛgbhir āyam juhuyāt*), or more likely the prose mantras (agnē vratapate . . . ) quoted at KaúśS 56.6–7, each containing the word *vratapati*, which Keśava [p. 289] introduces with the words *agnaye gurave ca brahmaṇacāri vratam nivedayet*, but contrary to Modak’s suggestion (1993: 425 n. 618) probably do not include AV(Ś) 7.74.4 (vratēṇa tvāṃ vratatapa . . . ), because this mantra is separately quoted *pratikena* in 40.3.9. In this interpretation (for which one might compare examples of the accusative of duration with technical mantra-designations, such as ŚB 11.8.4.5 *spṛṭīḥ huvā, 14.2.2.1 vātānāmānī juhoti, and AVParīś 46.2.3 samāśān huvā*), one has to assume that the implicit fem. plural noun is *ṛcāḥ*: as Shrikant Bahulkar kindly points out to us, this does not exclude the prose mantras of KaúśS 56.6–7, because in the Atharvavedic tradition even prose mantras are taken as *ṛcāḥ* and the *Bṛhatasvarṇākramaṇi* designates them accordingly (also Keśava takes KaúśS 56.6–7 as *ṛcāḥ* because he says [p. 290] . . . *iti pratycām*). However, the technical term *vrataśmaṇāpaṇīḥ* at KaúśS 42.17 does not imply *ṛcāḥ* but refers back to 42.16 *samidhāḥ*. Moreover, the rule KaúśS 6.19 *vratani vratapatiyā iti samidham ādadhati*, which quotes AV(P) 19.51.4, is paraphrased at VaitŚ 4.22 *vratani vratapatiyā iti vrataśaś-arjuṇīṁ ādadhati, showing another technical term (*vrataśaś-arjuṇīṁ*; cf. also Dārila [Diwekar et al. 1972: 118] on KaúśS 42.16–17) that does not imply *ṛcāḥ*. One might thus rather think of supplying an accusative cognate with *juhuyāt* like *āyutahīḥ*. Still, at AVParīś 46.2.2 *vratam nivedya vrataśaśarīḥ samidhīḥ bhīyādaḥdyāḥ, the term *vrataśaśarīḥ* cannot be interpreted in any other way than as a technical mantra-designation, and that is how we take it here as well.

\(^98\) This general rule seems strangely out of place here. It is not clear to us to what precisely *evaṁ* refers back.

\(^99\) The edition reads *ubhayārāhanam*. The two prātikas refer respectively to AV(Ś) 7.74.4 = AV(P) 20.31.10 (a verse dedicated to Agni as Vratapati) and AV(P) 1.37.1–5 (whence our emendation: 1.37.1ab *ubhayār ahām āyutāḥ parācīr akaraṇ tvat 1 . . .*). These last mantras, constituting a hymn for protection from Rudra’s arrows, have no parallel in AV(Ś), and their citation here (in a text transmitted by Śaunaka Atharvedins) *pratikena* is therefore noteworthy.
With [the verse] ‘vratena tvam’ and the five [verses] ‘ubhayır aham’, he brings the Rudra offerings, and bathes in ash at the end of the offering.

4.1 bhasmasnānam [tāvad]102 grahiṣyāmi sarvapāpapraṇaśanam | bhasmasnānena rudro hi snāto 2bhūt pūta āmanā ||
I shall take a bath in ash, which destroys all evils, because Rudra, when bathed in a bath of ash, became purified by himself.103

4.2 bhasmanā śnāyati104 rudro viṣṇuḥ śnāyate bhasmanā ||
Rudra is bathed in ash, Visnu is bathed in ash, in that bath do I bathe, in which Maheśvara is bathed,

4.3 yena śnātā umā devi rudro bhartā maheśvarah ||
yena śnātā garuḍa sarve yena śnātā dvijātayah ||
in which the Goddess Umā is bathed, [in which] Rudra [her] husband, Maheśvara [is bathed], in which all the Gaṇas are bathed, in which the twice-born are bathed,

4.4 yena śnātā śivaḥ śravaḥ śaṅkaraś ca viṣadhvājaḥ ||
śnātāni sarvabhūtāni gaṅgāyamunasaṁgame106 ||
in which Śiva, Śarva and the bull-bannered Śaṅkara is bathed, [in which] all beings are bathed [as if] at the confluence of the Gaṅga and the Yamunā.

4.5 śnāto ‘ham sarvatīrtheṣu nadiḥprasravanyeṣu ca ||
vāruṇāṅgavanisaṁyānāṁ bhasmanā śnānam uttamaṁ ||
I have taken a bath at all fords and at the sources of rivers. The bath

100 Cf. 40.1.9 [contd.], with accompanying note.
101 If homāvasānena is not simply to be emended to homāvasāne (it might be persevered from A VPariś 33.6.8), it must be an instr. of time: cf. Speijer 1886: 57.
102 The editors presumably use the square bracket here to suggest that deletion of tāvad would improve the meter.
103 Rudra and ash are apparently identified.
104 The editors initially chose to emend śnāyate, but see their Corrigenda, p. 648, and the readings reported p. 257.
105 This hemistich is repeated in 40.4.5 below.
106 The edition reads gaṅgaṁyunasaṁgame, and a variant gaṅgaṁyunasaṁgame is reported for mss. AD ET Roth, gaṅgaṁyunasaṁgame for C. We, however, conjecture gaṅgaṁyunasaṁgame, a stock reference to Prayāga in Epic and Purānic literature (e.g., MBh 3.83.80d; MBh 5.118.1d; MtP 105.19a).
107 The contents seem to favor a different verse-division (and consequent deletion of ‘[in which]’): 40.4.4ab would become 3ef; 4cd together with 5ab would form a separate verse 5, and 5cdef verse 6.
108 Cf. the same equation of the bath in ash with a bath at Prayāga (and Kanakhala) in the SP verse discussed in n. 111 below.
in ash is the best among the water (vāruna), fire (āgneya) and cool (saumya) baths.\footnote{The bath in ash is of the āgneya type. Cf. ŚīUp 5.13: bhasmasnānam śivasnānam vārunād adhikam smṛtam | jatusaivālanirmuktam āgneyaṃ pankavarjītam ||. Cf. also Brunner, Oberhammer and Padoux 2000: 173f. That it was known as āgneya among Pāṇḍūpata is confirmed by the following unidentified verse quoted by Kaunḍinya ad PāSā 1.9, p. 30 ll. 1–2: yah snānam ācaren niyam āgneyaṃ samyātendriyaḥ | kulaikvīramaṃ uddhṛtya sa gacchet paramān gatim.\footnote{The fifth and sixth pādas are here repeated from 40.4.2 above.} |} In that bath do I bathe, in which Maheśvara is bathed.\footnote{Bhūtis tu pingalau babhru bhūtit vīṣṇuḥ sanātanaḥ l bhūtit brahma mahendraḥ ca bhūtit devaḥ saha rśibhiḥ l l.\footnote{Both epithets occur in a mantra addressed to Śiva at AVPariś 66.3.2: kālāyā svāhā l pingalāya tiṣṭhyā jātīlaya babhrau oṃ bhūr oṃ bhava oṃ svar oṃ bhūr bhuvah svar jayavisvāyah javāhipataye kapardine karālaya vikatāya kātarmātāryāyārgasah-bhūhashpataiyakapilamālamandalamadājatilakapālefvarādhipataye kapardine svāheta l. Cf.}  

5.1 bhūtis tu pingalo babhrur bhūtit vīṣṇuḥ sanātanaḥ l bhūtit brahmā mahendraḥ ca bhūtit devaḥ saha rśibhiḥ l l.

\footnote{\textit{Ash} is Pīṇgala, Babhru, \textit{ash} is Vīṣṇu, Sanātana, ash is Brahmā, Mahendra, ash are the gods together with the sages.}
5.2  bhūtir me 'lakṣmīṁ nirṇuded bhūtir me śriyam āvahet ।  
        bhūtir ma āyuṣa vittaṁ varco brahma prayacchatu ॥  
        Ash should drive away misfortune from me, ash should bring me  
        glory. Let ash give me wealth, splendor, Brahman, together with a  

5.3  bhasmana ca ranta nityaṁ dhyāyinaḥ paricintakāḥ ।  
        yānti pāṣupatam sthānam punarāvṛttidurlabham ॥  
        Those constantly engaged with ash, reflecting, meditating, reach the  
        abode of Paśupati, from which it is hard to be reborn.113

5.4  vācā tu yat kṛtam karma maṇasā ca vicintitam ।  
        alakṣmīś ca cātha114 duḥśvapnaṁ bhasmanā tatrāṇasyatū ॥  
        Whatever karman is produced in speaking and thought out in mind,  
        misfortune and nightmares, let [all] that be destroyed by ash.

5.5  mokṣaṇam mokṣakāle ca bhasmaśeṣaṁ visarjayet ।  
        mukto 'ham sarvapāpebhya rudralokam vṛajāmy aham ॥  
        And at the time of release he should shed the remainder of the ash,  
        which bestows release, [saying:]115 ‘Released I am from all evils. I  
        am moving towards the world of Rudra’.  

6.1  etat snānāṁ vārūṇaṁ116 parvasu śatrālepena yathākramaṁ117  
        pūrvaṁ tūpavaset118 ॥  

also MtP 47.138: babhrave ca piśāṅgāya piṅgalāyārūṣāya ca | pinākine cēsumate citrāya  
        rohitāya ca || ।

113  punarāvṛttidurlabha is a stock expression in Śaiva Purāṇas which mostly qualifies  
        words like rudraloka (cf. 40.5.5 just below) or matsamīpa. In view of Pāśū 4.19–20 (anena  
        vidhīnā rudrasamīpaṁ gatvā || 19 || na kaś cīd brāhmaṇaṁ punar āvartate || 20 ||) it is  
        conspicuous that the expression occurs frequently (nine times) in VāP 23, a chapter stem-  
        ming from Pāṇḍava circles, which gives an account of Śiva’s twenty-eight incarnations  
        starting with Śveta and ending with the Pāṇḍava teacher Lakulīsa (cf. Bisschop 2002: 239  
        n. 32). Cf. also MBh 12.327.67f and 12.335.76d.

114  The edition has cāpad, but on p. 258 the editors propose the conjecture adopted here.  
        The mss. ACDE Roth read cāpa duḥśvapnaṁ. T reads cāpa duḥśvapnaṁ. A corruption of  
        tha to pa is very plausible.

115  The release of the remainder of ash may be connected with the vārūṇa bath mentioned  
        above in 40.4.5, and just below, in 40.6.1. The practitioner perhaps has to wash off the  
        remainder of ash which still clings to his body on parvan days (cf. 40.6.1). The ‘time of  
        release’ would then be identical to parvan days. It seems that the verse plays with two  
        meanings of the word mokṣa, viz. release from the remainder of the ash and release from  
        sansāra.

116  On the words etat snānāṁ vārūṇaṁ, cf. AVPariś 1.43.10: etat snānam ...  
        prajāśhāpanam (and 1.45.2, 7).

117  The edition reads yathākāmaṁ, while the reading adopted by us occurs in the three  
        sources A1,CE.

118  The edition reads parvasītūpavase. A variant pūrvasūt (ADE) is recorded in the  
        apparatus. We conjecture pūrvaṁ tūpavaset, because we consider -nt- → -st- a rather
This water (vāruṇa) bath\textsuperscript{119} [is done] on parvan days, accompanied by the rubbing [of fragrant substances] on the body, in due course, but first he should fast.\textsuperscript{120}

6.2 *strīśudram nābhibhāṣeta*\textsuperscript{121} ||

He should not speak to a woman or a śūdra.

6.3 *tadā śāvitrīṁ japet* ||

Then he should mutter the Śāvitrī.\textsuperscript{122}

6.4 *yadi bhaśeta tadā rudrasāvitrīṁ japet* ||

If he is to speak [to them], then he should mutter the Rudrasāvitrī.\textsuperscript{123}

---

plausible corruption. Our conjecture seems more suitable than the predicative nominative (cf. Speijer 1896: 31) that the mss. ADE actually seem to offer. The reading *parvasū* adopted by the editors could well be a corruption under influence of the preceding *parvasu*.

\textsuperscript{119} The vāruṇa bath probably refers to the washing off of the remaining ash described in 40.5.5. These lines seem to imply that the bathing in ash and the subsequent washing off of the ash on parvan days are recurrent rituals, which form part of a ritual cycle of the practitioner.

\textsuperscript{120} From Kaundinya’s commentary on Pāñ Śū 1.1 (p. 8, ll. 5–9) it follows that fasting was also prescribed before initiation: *sya ity eye käle yāvad eyam ācāryo ghṛsthāḥdhiyāḥ bhyāṣataṁ pūram atahśabādāt parikṣitaṁ brāhmaṇaṁ vratopavāśāyaṁ mahādevasya dakṣināṣyaṁ mūrtau sadyoṣādāsūṃṣkṛtena bhasmaṁ saṃskaroṁ utpattīlingavyāvṛtīṁ kṛtvā maṅgaṅravāṇaṁ ca karotī tāvad eṣyah kālāḥ kriyate* | “Shall” (syā) refers to the time required, namely the time that is required (before the exposition can begin) by the ācārya to consecrate a brahmin (who has started the fasting observance) at Mahādeva’s “right mūrti”, with ashes that are consecrated with the (five) mantras “Sadyojāta” etc., and to initiate him in the mantra, after he has made him lay off the signs of his origin – a brahmin whose (antecedents) have earlier been screened, as follows from the word “therefore” (atah) in the Śūtra, and who comes (to him) from amongst the householders etc.” (transl. Bakker forthc.).

\textsuperscript{121} Pāñ Śū 1.13: *strīśudram nābhibhāṣet*. Note the difference between active and middle voice (also in 40.6.4 just below). Cf. among many other places KābGS 5.3 *strīśudram nābhibhāṣeta*; BaudhGS 3.4.24 na strīya na śūdreṣa saha sanmābhāṣeta yadi sambhāṣeta brāhmaṇaṁ saha sanmābhāṣeta; BaudhDhŚ 3.8.17 strīśuḍrair nābhibhāṣeta mātrapūrṣe nāvekte; BaudhDhŚ 4.5.4c: strīśuḍrair nābhibhāṣeta brahmācārī h avarṇeṣāḥ; ManuŚm 11.223cd: strīśuḍrapattīṁ caiva nābhibhāṣeta karhi ca; an active form finally at MBh 12.36.35ab: strīśuḍrapattīṁ cāpi nābhibhāṣed vratāntvāḥ.

\textsuperscript{122} Does this refer to the Rudrasāvitrī? Is a conditional clause also implicit here, as in the next injunction?

\textsuperscript{123} Pāñ Śū 1.14 and 1.17: *yady ayekeṣa yady abhibhāṣet* || 14 || *raudrōm gāyatṛṁ bahurūpōṁ va japet* || 17 ||. Note that Pāñ Śū 1.15–16 (upasprṣya || 15 || *prājaśyānaṁ kṛtvā* || 16 ||) are not reflected in our text. The apparent redundancy of rules 40.6.3 and 40.6.4 is awkward. Could it be that 40.6.3 preserves a highly condensed pre-Pāñ śuṭaṣṭra formulation of the rule, which both in the Pāñcārthikha and in our tradition was felt to be in need of being made more explicit (40.6.4)? For the Rudrasāvitrī, cf. 40.2.5–6 above.
6.5 *kmanḍalukapāle bhīnne bhūmī bhūmīm agād ity apsu praveśayet* ||

If his water pot or his begging bowl\(^{124}\) is broken, he should immerse it in water, [with the mantra] ‘bhūmī bhūmīm agād’\(^{125}\).

6.6 *retaḥskande*

\[\text{yan me retaḥ tejasā saṃniṣadaya}
\text{dehāt praskandet punar na bhavāya} \]

\[\text{tad āgnir vāyuḥ . . . . . .}
\text{api ceyam prāthī kañcakhaṇṭeti} ||

If semen is spilled: ‘My semen which, while sitting down (?) with heat, should spill forth from my body without return (?), or fire that . . . , life-span . . . , and this earth . . . .'\(^{126}\)

\(^{124}\) The interpretation of this compound is uncertain. One could also take it as a karmadhāraya (‘a bowl, i.e., a pot’) or as a tatpurusā (‘a pot-lid?’).

\(^{125}\) The *pratikā* refers to the probably late Vedic mantra quoted in full at KauśīŚ 136.2: bhūmī bhūmīm agān mātā mātaram apy āgāt | nāhyāsaṃ putraih paśūhīr yo no dveṣī sa bhīyātām. It is noteworthy that the actual reading agān of the KauśīŚ mss., which Bloomfield (1890) emended to avāgān on the basis of Kāṭyā ŚŚ 25.5.29, is confirmed by our *pratikā*. The indications of Bloomfield 1906: 672 show that all other texts (e.g., SādīvB 1.6.20, ĀpMp 2.15.17) read agān, and Bloomfield’s emendation is thus to be undone (as is his reference to it, loc. cit.).

\(^{126}\) Expiation for inadvertent ejaculation (on the part of the brahmācārin) is a common theme in the Grhyā/Dharma literature. Cf. BaudhŚ 4.11.1, BaudhDhŚ 2.1.29, GautDhŚ 23.20, VaikhŚMŚ 8.2, and YajñŚM 3.278 yan me ‘dya reta ity abhiyāṃ skannaṃ reto bhimantrayet | stāntaraṃ bhivravu madhiyaṃ tenaṃaniyakāṃ sprṣet ||. The corrupt and incompletely transmitted trisṭubh verse shows agreement in some ways with the verses (existing in a few different forms) called Retasyā in the Vedic ritual sūtras. In their Tāitīrīya form (with defective accentuation), they are found TĀ 1.30.1: pūnār mām ātīv indrīyaṃ | pūnār āyāh pūnār bhāgāḥ | pūnār bhājanamātāt maḥ | pūnār drāvīnaṃ aitū | yān me ‘dya retaḥ prthivyān āśkāṃ | yād oṣadhīr apyāsaraḥ yād āpāḥ | idāṁ tāt pūnār ā dade dhīhāyāvāyā vārcaṃ | yān me retaḥ prāśicyate | yān ma ādyāye pūnāḥ | tēna mām amṛtāṃ karaṃ | tēna suprajāśaṃ karaṃ. In their (Mādhyandina) Vājasaneyin form, they are found SB(M) 14.9.4.5 (cf. BĀU(K) 6.4.4–5): bahāvī vā idāṃ suptāśya vā jāgṛato vā retaḥ skandati | tād abhi mṛdāṃ ānu vā mantrayeta yān me ‘dya retaḥ prthivyān āśkāṃ tāt oṣadhīr apyāsaraḥ yād āpāḥ | idāṁ aḥāṃ tāt retaḥ ā dade pūnār mām ātīv indrīyaṃ pūnār tēṣāḥ pūnār bhāgāḥ pūnār agnaḥ ātīv yāḥ yāḥ yāḥ yāḥ yāḥ kalpaṇāṃ ity anumākāyaṃgūthāhāyāṃ adhyāntareṇa stūnaṃ vā bhrīvaṃ vā nī mṛjyaḥ ||. We have considered the following emendations: saṃastiṣya (cf. mss. DERoth saṃastiṣya), pūnar me bhavāya (or bhagāvyā), and cāyuḥ. We do not understand the editors’ assertion (p. 258) that pāda b lacks a syllable: only the cadence is not satisfactory. Their suggestion to read dehāt praskandet na punarbhavāya would rectify this. If pūnār na bhavāya or na punarbhavāya is correct, we may compare i.a. SVidhB 3.8.5 tatra me sthānāṃ kury apunarbhavāya punarjanmanah (cf. Konow 1893: 78 n. 4) and MBh 12.47.60 94* ll. 3–4 daśāśvamedhī pūnar eti janma kṛṣṇapraṇāmī na punarbhavāya.
6.7 *samyak kva cit karoti*
He makes it good (?) / does it properly (?) somewhere.\(^{127}\)

6.8 *vratam upādhyāyacchando*\(^ {128}\) vartayet \(\|
He should practise the observance according to the wish of his teacher.

6.9 *tata udiśaṇam* \(\|
Then [follows] the upward gaze.\(^ {129}\)

6.10 *vṛūtapatīr juhoti* \(\|
He offers while [reciting the verses] dedicated to the Lord of observances.\(^ {130}\)

6.11 *samāso ’ham vratasvīṣṭakṛta iti huttvādityābhimukhas tiṣṭheta* \(\|
Having offered [with the words] ‘… to Vratasvīṣṭakṛ’ he should stand facing the sun.\(^ {131}\)

\(^{127}\) Could this refer to the expiatory wiping of some semen between the breasts or the eyebrows? See the preceding note. There are several options for emending the text, which are all interlinked with the interpretation of 40.6.8 below: 1) *samyak kva cit karoti vratam upādhyāyacchando varjayet* ‘He makes the observance right somewhere. He should avoid what his teacher disapproves of’; 2) *samyak kva cit karoti vṛttam upādhyāyacchando vartayet* ‘He makes it right somewhere. He should comport himself in a manner approved of by his teacher’; 3) *samyak kva cid vṛttam upādhyāyacchando vartayet* ‘Throughout he should comport himself in a manner approved of by his teacher’; 4) *samyak kva cid vṛttam upādhyāyacchando varjayet* ‘Throughout he should avoid behavior that his teacher disapproves of’. There is some evidence in the manuscripts for all the suggested readings: CTU Roth read *cid* (for *kva cid*) and omit *karoti*; AD have *dvṛttam* and E *dvratam* for *vratam*; T has *upādhyāyacchando* and Roth *upādhyāyechando*. The evidence for *karoti* seems to be very weak, especially because ADE, although they do have *karoti*, at the same time transmit a ligature *dvra/dvrr*\(^{˚}\). We are inclined to opt for one of the last two suggestions, and read 6.7 and 6.8 as one line.

\(^{128}\) Instead of *upādhyāyacchando* the edition reads *upādhyāyāccando* (on the editors’ use of *cha* for *ccha* see their statement p. xx). There are other ways of solving this line (see the preceding note). If the present conjecture is not taken up then *vartayet* should be emended to *varjayet*.

\(^{129}\) The teacher making the brahmacārin gaze at the sun is a common element of the Upanayana according to the Gṛhyaśūtras. Cf. BhārGS 1.9:9.14 *ādityam udiśayati*; cf. also Kane Vol. II part 1, p. 286 and Gonda 1980: 381. In our context, it seems to mark the end of the observance.

\(^{130}\) Cf. 40.3.8 above.

\(^{131}\) The problems which the text of this rule poses cannot yet be solved satisfactorily. The editors only report one useless variant *tiṣṭhet* (Roth). We suppose that *samāso* conceals a form of *samāsa*, a technical designation for the hymns AV(Ś) 19.22–23 (cf. Bolling and von Negelein, p. 290, and Śayana’s introductions to the two hymns) that is used immediately after vṛūtapatīr also at 46.2.3 (*samāsān*) and 46.7.3 (*samāsau*). Cf. also 46.2.9 *samāsavat*, and perhaps 46.8.1 *sāmāsikam* (?). In the light of 46.7.3 one might think of an emendation to *samāsau*, maybe as a separate rule, but this would leave *’ham* hanging in the air. Adjectives of the type *svīṣṭakṛta* are not attested, so a nominative interpretation seems impossible.
6.12 yan me duruktam durhutanm durdhyātām durvicintitam ।
tan me bhagavān śānaḥ sarvaṁ tvam kṣantum arhasi ॥
‘May you, O Lord Śāna, please forgive me whatever has been badly
spoken, badly offered, badly meditated, badly understood by me’.132

6.13 navonavo bhavasi jāyamāna ity apsu pravāhayed ।
[With the mantra] ‘navonavo bhavasi jāyamānah’133 he should
dismiss [the sun, being Rudra] into the water.134

6.14 ye śraddhayedam paśupater vratam caranti ।
teṣāṁ madhu viśakṣe he dadate na punargamanam madhurivādyehaiva ca ।
te rudrā viratau paśupatisāyujyam gaccha<\n>ti135
Those who undertake this observance of Paśupati with faith, to them
they give nectar viśakṣe he (?) and there is no return here and now . . .
On dying (viratau) they, as Rudras, reach union with Paśupati.136

6.15 tad esa ślokah ॥
Regarding this there is the following śloka:

6.16 vilānapāṣapajjāraṁ samāpatattvāgarāh ।
prayānti śāmkaraṁ paraṁ patim vibhum sadāśivam137 ॥
Those for whom the net of bonds is dissolved, who have attained
the realm of Truth, they reach Śāmkara, the Supreme, the Lord, the
Powerful one, the Eternal Śiva.

Agni is often called Śviṣṭakṛt, and Vratasviṣṭakṛt may be a contamination of this with the
name Vratapati. With reference to dedications idam agnaye found in some Vedic sūtras
(e.g., Kauś. 87.8), we hesitantly propose to restore the text as follows: samāsa [1] idam
vratasiṣṭakṛta iti hatvā . . . ‘Having offered [reciting] the two Śamāsa-hymns, [and stating]
“this is for Vratasviṣṭakṛt”, . . .’. On the Śviṣṭakṛt oblations, cf. Gonda 1980: 349ff., and
AVP pariś 20.4.2.

This verse seems to be addressed to the sun, apparently identified with Rudra: cf. KūP
2.18.34–47 and Hazra 1935: 286.

The sequence ity apsu pravāha might be thought to have been copied from 40.6.5 just
above, but the presence of apsu agrees nicely with the contents of the quoted mantra, which
is dedicated to the sun, hence to Rudra. We find no other examples of an apsu prāvāhana
(of the sun). We do, however, find references to a simple pravāhana ‘dismissal (of a deity
or the ancestors) at the end of a worship’, immediately following the Śviṣṭakṛt oblation,
at BauḍhGīś 2.5.6 and 3.15.8 (for the latter passage, dealing with the worship of Rudra,

We are not able to solve the many textual problems we encounter here. The following
variants are reported: yah (ACDEURoth) for ye; kāmadhu (CTRoth) for madhu; viśakṣe (T)
for viśakṣe; deha (E) for he; vistaratau (D) for viratau; paśupatiḥ (ADE) for paśupati°.
Furthermore it is reported that CTURoth omit na punargamanam to prayāṁ (in 16c).

The ultimate goal of the Paśupatas. Cf. Pāś. 5.33: labhate rudrasāyujyam.

Cf. Modak 1993: 469: “The purely iambic metre pramanākā used at the end of the
pāśupata-vrata is noteworthy”.

132 This verse seems to be addressed to the sun, apparently identified with Rudra: cf. KūP
2.18.34–47 and Hazra 1935: 286.
133 AV (Ś) 7.81.2 = 14.1.24 / AV(P) 18.3.3.
134 The sequence ity apsu pravāha might be thought to have been copied from 40.6.5 just
above, but the presence of apsu agrees nicely with the contents of the quoted mantra, which
is dedicated to the sun, hence to Rudra. We find no other examples of an apsu prāvāhana
(of the sun). We do, however, find references to a simple pravāhana ‘dismissal (of a deity
or the ancestors) at the end of a worship’, immediately following the Śviṣṭakṛt oblation,
at BauḍhGīś 2.5.6 and 3.15.8 (for the latter passage, dealing with the worship of Rudra,
135 We are not able to solve the many textual problems we encounter here. The following
variants are reported: yah (ACDEURoth) for ye; kāmadhu (CTRoth) for madhu; viśakṣe (T)
for viśakṣe; deha (E) for he; vistaratau (D) for viratau; paśupatiḥ (ADE) for paśupati°.
Furthermore it is reported that CTURoth omit na punargamanam to prayāṁ (in 16c).
136 The ultimate goal of the Paśupatas. Cf. Pāś. 5.33: labhate rudrasāyujyam.
137 Cf. Modak 1993: 469: “The purely iambic metre pramanākā used at the end of the
pāśupata-vrata is noteworthy”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Editions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Aitareyabrāhmaṇa</td>
<td>ed. Aufrecht 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgnivGS</td>
<td>Āgniyeṣāghṛtyasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Ravi Varma 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀpGS</td>
<td>Āpastambaṃghṛtyasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Winternitz 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀpMP</td>
<td>Āpastambamāṇtrapāṭha</td>
<td>ed. Winternitz 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀpŚŚ</td>
<td>Āpastambaśrautasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Garbe 1882–1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV(P)</td>
<td>Atharvavedasamhitā (Paippalāda)</td>
<td>ed. Bhattacharya 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV(Ś)</td>
<td>Atharvavedasamhitā (Śaunaika)</td>
<td>ed. Vishva Bandhu 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BĀU(K)</td>
<td>Bhadāraṇyakopaniṣad (Kāṇva)</td>
<td>ed. Olivelle 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaudhDhŚ</td>
<td>Baudhāyanadharmasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Olivelle 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaudhGS</td>
<td>Baudhāyanagṛhyasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Shama Sastri 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaudhGSŚ</td>
<td>Baudhāyanagṛhyasūtra, ed. Shama Sastri 1920, cf. Harting 1922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BhārGS</td>
<td>Bhāradvājagṛhyasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Salomons 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BhārŚŚ</td>
<td>Bhāradvājaśrautasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Kashikar 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJābUp</td>
<td>Bhājājābālopaniṣad, ed. Sastri 1950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GautDhŚ</td>
<td>Gautamadharmasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Olivelle 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Gopāthabrāhmaṇa</td>
<td>ed. Gastra 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GobhGS</td>
<td>Gobhilagṛhyasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Knuwar 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HirGS</td>
<td>Hiranyakēṣīgṛhyasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Kirste 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JaimGS</td>
<td>Jaiminiyagṛhyasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Caland 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KāthGS</td>
<td>Kāthakagṛhyasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Caland 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KātyŚŚ</td>
<td>Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Weber 1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KauŚŚ</td>
<td>Kauśikasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Bloomfield 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKT</td>
<td>Kṛtyakalpataru</td>
<td>ed. Aiyangar 1942, 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Kāthakasamhitā</td>
<td>ed. von Schroeder 1900–1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KūP</td>
<td>Kūrmaparāṇa</td>
<td>ed. Gupta 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiP</td>
<td>Lingaparāṇa</td>
<td>ed. Shastri 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MānGS</td>
<td>Māṇavaṇagṛhyasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Knuwar 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ManuSm</td>
<td>Manusmrtyī</td>
<td>ed. Jolly 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBh</td>
<td>Mahābhārata</td>
<td>ed. Sukthankar et al. 1927–1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Maitrāyanisamhitā</td>
<td>ed. von Schroeder 1881–1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiP</td>
<td>Matsyāparāṇa</td>
<td>ed. Apte 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParSm</td>
<td>Purāśāramrtyī</td>
<td>ed. Tarkālaṅkāra 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PāŚū</td>
<td>Pāśupatiasūtra</td>
<td>ed. Shastri 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Rituṣṭikā</td>
<td>ed. Dalal 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SaddvB</td>
<td>Saddvinśabrāhmaṇa</td>
<td>ed. Eelsingh 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚB(M)</td>
<td>Śatapathabrāhmaṇa (Mādhyananda)</td>
<td>ed. Weber 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚīUp</td>
<td>Śivopaniṣad</td>
<td>ed. Kunhan Raja 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚPbh</td>
<td>Śkandaparāṇa</td>
<td>ed. Bhaṭṭarāṭi 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚViddB</td>
<td>Śaṃavidhānabrāhmaṇa</td>
<td>ed. Konow 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TĀ</td>
<td>Taśṭṭīrīyāragyaṇa</td>
<td>ed. Phaṭjake 1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Taśṭṭīrīyabrāhmaṇa</td>
<td>ed. Śastri ‘Goḍbole’ 1898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

138 For Kāṇḍas 16–20, we rely on and follow the numbering of the Orissa manuscripts (Griffiths 2003b).
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