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INTRODUCTION

The Pariṣiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda

In 1909–1910, Bolling and von Negelein published their edition of the corpus of Pariṣiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda, 1 in number. In the preface to their edition (p. vii) they expressed their hope “ultimately to publish a translation of the Pariṣiṣṭas 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with the many grammatical and lexicographical peculiarities which the texts present, and containing also a number of unpublished texts that throw light upon the subject matter of the Pariṣiṣṭas”. 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: 315–348).
307f.). Unfortunately, the plans of the editors were only very partially realized, and besides the few Parišštas which had already been translated by Caland and by students of Bloomfield in the nineteenth century, only a few more Parišštas 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 Parišštas.

<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: 183f.6</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>Böhltingk 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 Pariššta closely follows, and the explanatory notes contain many remarks, with translations, on the variant readings of the Pariššta text as well.
6 The same portion was rendered into English by Türstig, WZKS 29 [1985], p. 92.
7 The lexicographical nature of this Pariššta 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 Atharva Pariṣiṣṭa 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 AVPariṣ 31 (Koṭihoma) and 36 (Ucchusmakalpa), we focus now on AVPariṣ 40, the

8 Another Atharvavedic recension of the Caranayāha has been transmitted by the Paippalāda brahmins of Orissa, under the name Caranayāhapanisad. 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 Pariṣṭa are given by Weber as parallels for seven sections of the Sāmavedic Adhutabṛihmaṇa: 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 Pañcarthabhāṣya (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 Pāncārtika Pāśupata scriptures, viz. Kaundinya’s Pañcarthabhāṣya on the Pāśupatasūtra and the Ganakārikā with the commentary Ramaṭikā 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 Pāncārtika scriptures.

Besides AVPatiś 40 there are other texts which contain parallels or paraphrases of the Pāśupatasūtra. Well-known is the sixth chapter (Nakulīśapāśupatadarsana) of Mādhava’s Sarvadarśanasamgraha, the first source on Pāśupatas to be translated in the West (cf. Hara 1974).
1958). No references are made in the secondary literature to a passage from Lakṣmiṇidhara’s Kṛtyakalpataru where an otherwise unknown “Līṅgapuruṇa” 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 Sāiddhāntika Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā, which places the Sāiddhāntika teachings taught in the major text in their non-Sāiddhāntika 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 Pampāṁhāṁtya, a eulogy of the pilgrimage centre Pampā (present Hampi in Karnataka), whose eleventh chapter of the Utтарābhāga, entitled Pañcarthacaranāprasāmsā, 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 Tiṁravivekanākānda p. 106, l. 7ff. These verses occur within a māhāṁtya of a līṅga called Mahāpāṣupateśvara in Vārāṇasī (p. 105, l. 12ff.). On the identity of this “Līṅgapuruṇa”, see Bissechop 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 17r and 17v. 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 Atharvaśiras-Upaniṣad, which has a few lines in common with PīṢā 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) 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: Bhadra (commentary lost), Rudra (lost), Dārilā, and Keśava. Meulenbeld, forthc., has confirmed the west Indian provenance of these last two writers. In the family of Keśava (11th century), the author of the Paddhati on the Kauśikasūtra, both Vaiśnava and Śaiva names were used. Cf. Kauśikapaddhati (Limaye et al. 1982), p. 482: Kauśiko Vatsaśarmā ca tatprapautro 'tha Dārilah. śāstravijnānam eṣāṃ hi caturtho nopapadyate || tad ayuktam hi yad vaktam bodhāraḥ saṃty anekaśaḥ || tathā yad eṣāṃ anvaye Kauśiko jñātavān || Vaihasāt Keśavotpānaḥ Keśavād Ananta ucyate || Anantāt Someśvaro jātaḥ Someśvarat Keśavas tathā || sarve te 'tharvavedinah . . .

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 Śākhā is concerned, it remained restricted to western India up to modern times. All AVPariś mss. hail from Gujarat and Maharashtra.


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 Dārilah. This conjecture has been made in order to bring Keśava’s statement in line with the colophon of the Dārilā ms. quoted by Diwekar et al. 1972: x: mahāvedātharvavida upādhyāyavatsārmanah praputraṃya bhṛttadārśaktau kauśikabhāṣyey . . .

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] Saṃvat 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 Saciti´sarman of the Draun.¯ayana gotra. The plates of the Maitraka ruler Dharasena II (Diskalkar, ABORI 4 [1923], pp. 33–41), [Gupta-Valabhi] Saṃvat 252 = ca. CE 572, found at Bhâdvå (15 miles south-east of Rajkot in Kathiawad) record a grant of a village Išikânaka to the Atharvavedin Rudragopa, son of Rudraghos.¯a, 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] Saṃvat 304 = ca. CE 624, record a grant to the Atharvavedin Mitraya´sas, son of Vis.n.uya´sas, of the ¯Atreya gotra, resident of Hastavapra.

If we turn now to epigraphical evidence for the Pāśupata 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 Pāśupata teachers date to the twelfth century, a time when the Solanki dynasty ruled Gujarat (Majmudar 1960: 111–117). If we turn now to epigraphical evidence for the Pāśupata 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 Pāśupata teachers date to the twelfth century, a time when the Solanki dynasty ruled Gujarat (Majmudar 1960: 111–117). 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 Kaušikasūtra.
33 Majmudar attributes the first epigraphical evidence for Pāśupata teachers in Gujarat to the eleventh century, but this is because he reckons three Šaiva ascetics mentioned as the recipients of grants in three earlier inscriptions among the Pāśupatas (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 Lakuliśa. They all seem to have belonged to Prabhāsapāṭa (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 mahāplūpati called ‘Pāśupata’. The early Kalacuris ruled over a vast area including Malwa, Maharashtra and Gujarat, and were followers of Śiva as Paśupati. Moreover, in a number of copper plates of the mahārāja Bhulunda of the Valkhās – a contemporary of Samudragupta (ca. CE 335–376) – which have been unearthed at Bāgh (Madhya Pradesh), Pāśupatācāryas are mentioned among the recipients of grants. These inscriptions testify to the presence of Pāśupatas at an early age in western India.

There is no reason to doubt the central role in the early history of the Pāśupata cult of Kārohaṇa, which lies in the immediate vicinity of the earliest inscription in which this tradition is recorded is the Somnathpattan Prāasti of Bhāva Brḥaspati (Ozha 1889; Peterson 1895), dated Valabhi Saṃvat 850 = ca. CE 1169, according to which Soma gave Somanatha to the Pāśupatas, who had gone to Vṛndāvana in the Kṛta age due to a curse of Pārvatī. On the command of Śiva, Nandīsvara incarnated in a brahmin family of the Gārgeya lineage in Vāṇārasi [sic] in Kanyakubja as Bhāvavṛhaspati and undertook the Pāśupata observance. After a pilgrimage, and having taught in various places, he came to Somanatha 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 Somanatha temple by Maḥmūd’s forces in CE 1026. The temple was rebuilt and then later on restored by Kumārapāla in the 12th century.

34 Mirashi (CII IV/1, p. 45 n. 2): “Mahāplūpati, the great commander of the elephant force, is a technical official title.”
35 Cf. CII IV/1, p. xliv and p. xlvii.
36 Cf. Mirashi (CII IV/1, p. cxlvii): “All the three Early Kalachuri kings, Krishṇarāja, Śaṅkaragaṇa and Buddhārāja, are described in the Kalachuri grants as paramamāhēśvara, i.e., fervent devotees of Mahēśvara (Śiva). That they belonged to the Pāśupata sect of Śaivism is shown by the description of Krishṇarāja as devoted to Paśupati from his very birth. Anantamahāyī, the queen of Buddhārāja, is specifically mentioned as a follower of the Pāśupata sect. The Dūtaka of the Ābhōṇa plates bore the name Pāśupata itself. All this is a clear indication of the influence the Pāśupatas exercised in the court of the early Kalachuris”.
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 inscriptive references to Pāśupatas. Plate nr. X, dated [Gupta?] Saṃvat 56 (ca. CE 376) records a land grant to the shrine of the Mothers (mātrasthānadevakula) which had been established by the Pāśupatācārya Bhagavant Lokodadhi in the village of Piṇcchikānaka. Cf. also Huên 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 Pāśupatas (the cinder-covering heretics)” (tr. Beal 1884: 261).
38 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 Pāśupata 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 Kaurus(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 Kāyavataraṇa 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 Pāśupata cult in Kārohaṇa, in Gujarat.

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

**Atharvavedapariśīṭa 40: the Pāśupatavrata**

Regarding the dating of the corpus of AV Pariśīṭas, it is to be kept in mind (Modak 1993: 470) that the “Atharva-Veda Pariśīṭas 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., Manusmṛti and Arthaśāstra), precedence with regard to dependent texts (notably Varāhamihira’s Brhatsamhitā), 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

---


conclusion (p. 473) that “one may not be far from the truth if one assigns the Atharva-Veda Pariṇiṣṭas to a period somewhere round about the begin-
ing of the Christian era”. The only date that can be given is that of the earliest manuscript of the corpus, which also contains our Pariṇiṣṭa: this is the ms. ‘Roth’ (Bolling and von Negelein, p. xiii) probably dating to CE 1431 ([Vikrama] Samvat 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 śaṁkaraḥ | prītimān ucye yena tac chubhaṁ bhautikam dadau || atharvā bhautikam labdhvā śīyebhyas tat punar dadau | subhaṁ mokṣakaraṁ panyam priyaṁ pasūpater vratam ||, and the same name pasūpater vratam occurs in our Pariṇiṣṭa at 40.6.14. The Pāṣupata observance laid down in AVPariś 40 partly goes back to the teachings of the Pāṣupatasūtra – 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 Śaunaka and the Paippalāda Śaṁhitā (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 Pāṣupatasūtra,[44] 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 Grhya- and Dharmasūtra literature, as can be observed from our annotation.[45]

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 Pariṇiṣṭa into six sections (khāṇḍas), cf. Modak 1993: 197f.: the ‘khāṇḍa’ division of our Pariṇiṣṭa is not as

---

42 This dating is only tentative, as the lunar date given in the colophon does not yield a matching Friday (bhṛguvasara) in 1431.
43 Modak (1993: 446 with n. 9) further supposes AVPariś 51.4.5 (maḥisākaṃbhah sabhasmaṇḍragṛha kṣipasaṇāyataś ca ye manuyāḥ | vīvidhahbhayasamāhitās tu sarve kṣayaṃ upayanti sanaiścarasya ghaṭe ||) to refer to Pāṣupata ascetic practices. But the sole basis for this is the doubtful conjecture sabhasmaṇḍragṛha, for which the ms. read sabhāsā2/sabhāsā2.
“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 AVParīśa 40: ABCDE T Roth, U from tām it to viṣṇuh in 40.4.2 and from prthīvī in 40.6.6 to the end of the Parīśa. B omits the text of this Parīśa 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 pāśupatavratādeśo
Om. Now the instruction about the Pāśupata observance.

1.2 nāsrotriyāya nācaritedavratāya nākṛṭavapanāya dadīta ||
He [i.e., the guru] should not give [this instruction / observance (?)] to one who is not conversant with the Śrutī, nor to one who has not undertaken the Vēda observance, nor to one who has not undergone the shaving ceremony.

1.3 māsadvitricatuspaññaravatsaradvādaśasanyavatsaraparimitanvai
[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.

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 √da 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. vardhayasva in 40.3.4). We have found no examples of vratam / ādēsam √da.
49 This refers to the shaving of the beard and hair that is part of the samāvartana ritual at the end of the Vēdic studenthood (Gonda 1980: 93, 384), or to the shaving at the end of the godūna (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. Kuṇḍinya ad Pāsā 1.1, p. 3, l. 8: (evam)adirahtah pāvyindriyo brāhmaṇāḥ sīyāḥ ‘The student is free from such [faults], sharp-witted [and] a brahmin’.
50 Cf. the Harṣa Stone Inscription (from the Harṣa hill, 7 miles south of Sikar, Rajasthan), dated [Vikrama] Śaṃvat 1030 = ca. CE 973, where a Śaiva ascetic called Bhāvadyota is described i.e. as follows: āsīn naṅghikārūyo yu dīptapāśupatvratāḥ (Kielhorn, El 2 [1894], p. 123, l. 26). On the naṅghika brahmacārin, see Kane Vol. II part 1, pp. 375–376.
1.4 *athāsyāyatanaṁ* ||
   Now the places of this [observance].51
1.5 *mahādevāyatanaṁ* 'pāṁ saṁīpe ||
   at a sanctuary of Mahādeva, in the vicinity of water,
1.6 *giriguḥāyam* gavāṁ gośthe *gnyāgāre vā*
   in a mountain cave,52 in a cow-pen or in a fire-house,53
1.7 *nadinyām bahīnāṁ pratīśraya*
   at a confluence54 of many rivers.
1.8 *anusavanam* || 9. *bhasmanā śnānam*55
   [Once] per part of the day, [he should take] the bath in ash.
1.9 [contd.] *raudrahomāḥ*56 *snapanam ca sarpiḥśiragandhodakahair*
   The offerings dedicated to Rudra and the bathing [of the image, are
   to be performed] with clarified butter, milk, fragrant water.
1.10 *gandhapus. padhūpapadīpodanapāyasayavakalājādi pradakṣīnāntaṁ ca ||
   [The observance / bathing / pūjana (?)] begins with fragrances,

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

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

53 Dresden 1941: 151 (on MānGS 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 *agnyāgarā* seems to be slightly more common: at BhārŚ 1.6.14,
where this last term is interestingly juxtaposed with *āyatana* (*parisamāhanty agnyāgarāuy
upalimpanty āyatanaṁ*), Kashikar 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 Gārhapatya or Āhavaniya altar. The pair
agnyāgarā and gavāṁ gośha also occurs at ManuŚm 4.58a.

54 The word *pratīśraya* does not seem to be attested in the meaning we tentatively
assume here, with Modak 1967: 7. The editors only report a useless variant *pratīśrayo.*
An emendation *pratīśraya* would be hapax (nor does the verb *prati-√sra seem to exist),
and *prasravatīga* 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 śnānam* have to be read together. This
is suggested by PaŚu 1.2: *bhasmanā triśavanāṃ śnāyita.*

56 *raudrahomāḥ snapanam: em.* The edition reads *raudrahomāśnapanam, but there is a
v.l. raudrahomāśnapanam* (mss. T and Roth). We adopt the long ā of this variant in our
light emendation, for which cf. 40.3.9 below: *vraṭena tvaṁ ity ubhayāḥ aham iti pañcācabhī
candrān homāḥ huvā homāvāsamānaḥ bhasmanā śnānam karoti.* The only other attestation of
raudrahoma which we could trace, is in a passage promoting the employment of an
Atharvaśreda as Purohita, in a manner strongly reminiscent of many AVPāṇi passages:
MBh 12 App. I Nr. 8 l. 13 (*raudrahomasahasraṁ*) and l. 20 (*raudraṁ homāī*).
flowers, incense, lights, rice-porridge, milk-porridge, barley-porridge, parched grain, and ends with circumambulation.\textsuperscript{57}

1.11 nivedya nirmāyaṅgandhāhāri\textsuperscript{58} hāsagītvadanādyupahārān

Having presented the offerings of laughter, song, music etc.,\textsuperscript{59} bearing fragrances and the garland which has been worn [by the image],

1.12 daksinena trīyam upatiṣṭhate

he worships the third (?\textsuperscript{60}) to the right side\textsuperscript{61} [of the image].

\textsuperscript{57} Circumambulation is defined in Pāśu 2.8: apasavyam ca pradaksinam ‘And circumambulation is the reverse [of what it normally is]’. This surely is not intended here. The first four items in the list (gandha, puspa, dhūpa, dīpa) are standard pūjā-items (cf. Einoo 1996b). Some are found in an untraced quotation at RT p. 8, ll. 26–27: pūrṇam darbāh kṣuṇam cāva ca | puspāṇi ca punar dhūpaṃ mantrā eva kramah smṛtaḥ || cf. Hara 1982: 190). The verse is introduced as a list of the various parts of the dīkṣā ceremony. In SPBH 27.31–32 pāyasa and yāvaka are prescribed for the worship at the Daksināmūrti: dakṣiṇāyam tu yo mārtau pāyasaṃ saṅgṛtam śūhe | nivedayed vārṣyaṃ ekam sa ca nandismamo bhavet || 31 || caravo dāsasahasrāṇa śavakaś ca caturgunaḥ līṣṭūḥ ca caravah yāvakārdhana sammitāḥ || 32 ||.

\textsuperscript{58} The edition assumes one long compound, of which nirmāyaṅgandhāhāri\textsuperscript{6} would be the first member. Cf. however Pāśu 1.5–6: nirmāyaṃ || 5 || līṅgadhārī || 6 ||. Note that the Pāśupata description in the ‘Līṅgapurāṇa’ quoted at KKT Tīrthavivekanāṇḍa 2, p. 106, l. 15, has a compound līṅganirmāyaḍhārī. We may thus reasonably assume that nirmāyaṅgandhāhārī is either a corruption or a conscious revision of nirmāyalingadhārī. Anyhow it must be read as a separate word. Wearing the nirmāya is not one of the upahāras as defined in Pāśu 1.8, whereas in the edition’s text, as part of the compound, it appears to be treated as such. For the Pāśupata definition of nirmāya, cf. Kaunḍinya ad Pāśu 1.5. On the nirmāya in general, see Brunner 1969. Cf. also AVPari 36.28.1 (‘śivanirmāya’).

\textsuperscript{59} Pāśu 1.8: hasitagītvatadāṃḍuṇḍikāraṇamaskārajagopahārenopatisṭhet ‘He should worship with the offering of laughter, song, dance, bellowing, homage and muttering’. ‘āṃḍuṇḍikāraṇa’ in this śūtra seems to be an emendation by the editor for ‘ḥudukkāraṇa’. Sanderson 2002: 30 n. 32, lists a couple of passages from Śaiva sources which suggest that the intended vocalization is ‘HUDDUN’ (ḥuddukkāraṇa).

\textsuperscript{60} For the unconvincing conjecture trīyam adopted by the editors, we have considered the following alternatives: trīyam (a name for Śiva at AVPari 36.9.1–2); nṛtyam (‘the dancing one’ = Śiva); nṛyan (‘while dancing’). There is some evidence for all three conjectures in the manuscripts: ACDE trīyam; B nṛyanam; T Roth nṛtāṃ. The third suggestion is partly supported by RT p. 18, ll. 26–27: tad anu gīkam ārabhya gīyam evottīṣṭhet | tato gītasahitam eva nṛyanam kuryāt |.

\textsuperscript{61} Pāśu 1.8–9: . . . upahārenopatisṭhet || 8 || mahādevasya daksināmūrtēḥ || 9 ||. On the interpretation of these śūtras, cf. Bakker forthc. Bakker argues that the word mūrte does not refer to a concrete image but rather to a situation in which Śiva shows his right, auspicious, side. We assume, however, that at least in the present text an image is the object of reference, albeit not the iconographical Daksināmūrti. Chakravarti 1943: 270, reports a variant reading mūrtim for mūrteḥ in this śūtra: this lectio facilior can probably be ignored. The reading mūrteḥ is supported by the conclusion of Kaundinya’s extensive commentary on Pāśu 1.9, p. 38, ll. 10–11: ata etad uktaṃ mahādevasya daksināmūrteḥ iti.
1.13 "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 Wearing one garment or wearing no garment at all,\(^{64}\) he should give undyed\(^{65}\) clothes [to the image (?), with the words:] ‘Monkey-like is (?) your face,\(^{66}\) horrifying;\(^{67}\) an irreproachable, auspicious animal eväjananeväjanakaṁ (?)\(^{68}\); I give a pure breastplate that is terrible, alive (?)’.\(^{68}\)

2.1 Having smeared a piece of ground of the size of a cow’s hide\(^{70}\) 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 mahākeyūrajadhārin.

\(^{63}\) 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: ekavasah.|| 10 || avasah. vā|| 11 ||. The words of the sutras, 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 sutras is an infringement upon usual brahminical practice: cf. Kane Vol. II part 2, p. 671 and e.g., ĀgnivGS 2.6.3:98.12f. (≈ BaudhDhŚ 2.10.5) nārdrvāsa naikavastro daivatāni karmān. yan usam caret.

\(^{65}\) Cf. A VPariś 68.2.47, where the word virāgavāsas denotes ominous creatures.

\(^{66}\) This seems to be related to AVPariś 36.25.2 (śīrasā vānareṇātha mukhaśādyam tu kārayet | yatra tae chṛīyate tatra āgacchanti varastrīpyah ||), 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: saṃjñapatśiavanirnmyādānād unnattatāmya vṛajey. It is worth noting that Nandin, who is said to be a second Śaṅkara (dvitīya īva śaṅkarah), 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 daksiṇe udapātraṁ, with double sandhi.

\(^{70}\) Cf. AVPariś 36.25.1ab: gocarmāitrāṇi sthāṇḍilam 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 rudram kruddhāśanimukham devānāṁ īśvaraṁ param \| svetapīṅgalaṁ deveśaṁ\textsuperscript{75} 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 yasya yuktā ratih śimhā vyāghrāś ca viśamānaṁ ||

tam ahaṁ pāṇḍartaṅkāṣaṁ devam āvāhaye śīvam ity āvāhaṁbhyaṁcya ||

\textsuperscript{71} Cf. JaimGS 2.8:32.15f.: gomayena gocarmanātram sthāṇilam upalipyva ... lakṣaṇam ullikhyāddhir abhyukṣya. Cf. also KauŚ 2.25: nānabhıyukṣitaṁ sansṭīrṇaṁ upayoṣaṁ labheta ‘If spread unbesprinkled, it would not obtain any effectivity’. As in the quoted JaimGS passage, the object of ullikhya is lakṣaṇam (cf. Gonda 1980: 232) also i.a. at ĀgniGS 1.7.1:41.2, 2.4.8:68.17, BaudhDhŚ 3.9.4, and we supply this object here as well; this absolutive is never accompanied by an instrumental. It is a curious fact that among the many Grhyaśutras passages (cf. also AVPariś 6.1.2) that enjoin the upalepana of a sthāṇila, there is not a single one where the instrumental gomayena follows the words (gocarmanātram) sthāṇilam upa-√lip.

\textsuperscript{72} This is AV($\tilde{S}$) 4.14.5 ≈ AV(P) 3.38.3.

\textsuperscript{73} The phrase brahmānaṁ kalpāyitā, 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 dvau dvau brahmaṇau kalpāyitā navagrahasāntyartham caturo brahmaṇaṁ tasyaiva sankhyāyā graṃaśāntihomāraṇau kalpāyitvātīh graṃaśāntihome graṃaṣottarapūrvadeśe devaṅgare catuṣpadhe vā śucu samā deśe gomayena gocarmanātram caturasram sthāṇilam upalipyavā), the meaning in our context remains obscure. The Grhyaśutras offer many examples of the phrases sthāṇilam kalpāyitāvā and āsanaṁ kalpāyitāvā. Could brahmaṇau be corrupt for a particular kind of āsana, e.g., brahmāsanaṁ (KauŚ 2.18, 3.5, 137.33+37)?

\textsuperscript{74} On the number of utterances possibly intended with the injunction mahāvyāhrtibhīḥ 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 svetapīṅgalaṁ devānāṁ <mahādevaṁ> prapadye. No significant variants are reported. In the Corrigenda (p. 648), the editors state “[mahādevaṁ] was intended”, but this does not help as they nowhere explain what they mean to convey with square/angle brackets: one may surmise that they suggested the removal of the transmitted mahādevaṁ to improve the meter. In the Addenda (p. 649), Bolling suggests that “mahādevaṁ saraṇāgataḥ [prapadye] seems better”. We accept the deletion of mahādevaṁ, 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 deveśaṁ, a very common epithet, in place of devānāṁ.
‘This gracious, lotus-eyed god, to whose chariot lions are yoked, and tigers with terrible / incomparable faces, do I invite’. 76 [With these two verses] he invites and worships [Rudra].

2.4 na tam yakṣmēti guggulum dhūpaṃ ca dadyāt
He should give bdellium and incense [with the hymn] ‘na tam yakṣmā’.

2.5 tatpurusāya vidmahe mahādevāya dhīmahi 
	tan no rudrah pracoḍayāt 78
‘We strive for Tatpuruṣa, we meditate forMahādeva, Rudra shall propel it to us’.

2.6 tasmai devāya vidmahe mahādevāya dhīmahi 

tan no rudro ‘numanyatām 79
iti rudrasāvitrirī japtvā

76 In BaudhGŚŚ 3.9 and 4.2 we find two similar verses, addressed respectively to Jyeṣṭhā and Skanda: yasyāḥ simhā rathe yuktā� yāgyhrāś cāpy anugāminah 1 tām imām puṇḍarikākim jyeṣṭhām āvahayāny aham \ (Harting 1922: 20, ll. 3–4) and yasya simhā rathe yuktā� yāgyhrāś cāpy anugāminah 1 tām imām puṇḍrīkāputraṃ skandam āvahayāny aham \ (Harting 1922: 25, ll. 4–5).

77 The edition reads: na tam yakṣmaitu deva iti guggulum, and the editors report (p. 257) that the mss. ADE omit deva iti. While the same two hymns (‘na tam yakṣmā’ and ‘etu devah’) that the text of the edition quotes pratikena are quoted also at AVPariś 4.4.7 and 4.5.10 (cf. also 6.2.2), there they accompany the giving of guggleukaṣṭhadhūpaṃ, as opposed to our guggleum dhūpaṃ ca. The first pratika refers to AV(S) 19.38 = AV(P) 19.24.1–3, a hymn dedicated to guggleum: presumably guggleum corresponds with gandha in 40.1.10. The second pratika 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 pratika, and that the ADE reading na tam yakṣmaitu guggulum still reflects this.

78 The edition divides tat purusāya. The accented versions of TĀ 10.46, MS 2.9.1:179.7–8 and KS 17.11:253.20–21 (tatpurusāya) 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 Pāṣū. The words of this mantra are also found as Pāṣū 4.22–24. Our translation partly follows the attempt made by Goudriaan and Hooykaas 1971: 227. On tad in pāda c, cf. Kaunḍinya ad Pāṣū 4.24: tad iti dyakritiṣākṣeyor graham.

79 This last mantra does not belong to the five brahmamantras and seems superfluous. Cf. Oertel 1942: 32ff. on the avoidance of Rudra’s name with the substitute ēṣa devah at AB 3.33, and with āyaṃ devah at KS 10.6:130.20–131.1, 20(recte 22). 12:67.16, 30.10:192.11. Cf. also Oberlies 2000: 182 n. 32. tasmai devāya might thus be a comparable case of ‘euphemistic substitution’ for Rudra’s name. It seems more likely, however, that it was intended as a gloss of tatpurusāya. Such an explanation could also be considered for anumanyatām (= pracoḍayāt).
‘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 āvāhana81 devadevasvāvāhāyāny aham iti ||

He should speak the mantra ‘yo agnau rudrah’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 sarvāsurasvānāśaya hūṃphaṭkāraṃ83 karoti ||

At the Crushing (?)84 he makes the sound Hūṃ Phaṭ for the sake of destroying all demons.

2.9 nivedane 'ham amukam nivedayāmīti jaṭi muniḍi paṅcaśikhi 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 anukasagotro bhagavato maheśvarasya vratam carisīyāmīti 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 'sya mauñjīm prayacchati ||86 sāvityā tu daṇḍam pālaśaṁ bailvam āsvaṭham87 vāsinī lakuṭaṁ khaṭvāṅgam paraśaṁ vā ||

---

80 The first of these two verses is called raudrī gāyatri by Kauṭambiya ad Pāṣāṇ 1.17. Note that although two verses are given in AVPāriṣ 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: anumāntrave 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 anumantraya 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: yāagnāu rudrō yō apsv āntār yā oṣadhī virādha āvīśa | yā imā vīśā bhāvanāni cākārpe tāsmai rudrāya nāmo astv agnāye.

83 The edition reads om phaṭkāraṃ, with all mss. except BCT, that read tu phaṭkāraṃ. We conjecture hauṅ, with reference to AVPāriṣ 36.1.4 and 36.9.3 (cf. also i.a. Vīṇṭ 229), although tu phaṭkāraṃ may also be considered.

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

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

86 The closest parallel that we have been able to find is KāṭhGS 41.12 mauñjīm trīvṛtaṁ brāhmaṇāya 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., BhārGS 1.2.3 bailvan
Then he gives him the muñja-girdle. And with the Śāvitrī verse [he gives him] a staff made of palāśa-, bilva- or asvaththa-wood, or [he gives] a knife, a club, a skull-staff or an axe.88

3.3 aghorebhyo 'tha ghorebhyo ghoraghoratarebhyaś ca | sarvatah śarva sarvebhya namas te rudrarūpebhyaś98 ity ādau śarvaṁ namaskṛtyopaviśyāyaṁ90 niratiśāyitvedhmān ādiṣpayaty 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 Rudras Śavitrī (tatpurus. āya vidmahe ...) is meant here. In the Grhyasūtras, the giving of the girdle and staff, and instruction in the normal Śavitrī (tat savitur ...) are basic elements of the Upanayana. The girdle and the staff are regular attributes of the Vedic brahmācārin, but the last four items stem from a different milieu. The skull-staff is one of the insignia of the Kāpālika; the laktu.n on the other hand seems to have been associated with the Kālamukhas, who are sometimes designated as Lāgud.ās. See Lorenzen 21991: 2 and 5.

89 This verse is found also (with considerable variation of reading and accentuation) i.a. MS 2.9.10:130.1–2 aghorebhya ātha ghorebhyo aghoraghoratarebhyaś ca | sarvataḥ śarvasarvebhyaḥ nāmas te rudra rūpebhyaḥ nāmaḥ || ; TA 10.45 aghorebhya 'tha ghorebhyo ghoraghoratarebhyaḥ [note double accent] | sarpataḥ śarva sarvebhyaḥ nāmas te astu rudrarūpebhyaḥ ||. It is also found as Pāśu 3.21–26: aghorebhyaḥ || 21 ātha ghorebhyaḥ || 22 ghoraghoratarebhyaḥ ca || 23 sarvebhyaḥ || 24 śarvasarvebhyaḥ || 25 nāmas te astu rudrarūpebhyaḥ || 26 ||. It is the fifth of the five brahmāmantra. There are many variants for this verse in various other sources as well. Cf. i.a. Goudriaan and Hoevckas 1971: 227. The edition reads 'ghoraghoratarebhyaś, and it is specified (p. 257) that mss. “ATURoth write the avagraha before ghorā:- C corrupts it to ra”. Apparently, mss. BDE have no avagraha, and the sense suggests this is the better reading. The edition further reads śarvaśarvebhyaḥ ... rudra rūpebhyaḥ. The mss. are reported to have sarvasarvebhya (ACDETURoth) and sarvatarsebhya (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, niratisāyitvā (?)91 ghee [and] kindles fuel, with the word(s)
‘antara (?)’.92

3.4 ya93 idhmā jātavedasah samiddhasya tebhya vardhayasva prajayā
paśubhiḥ śrīyā grhāir dhaneneti ||
‘The fuel sticks of Jātavedas who is kindled: increase [me (?)] from
them in offspring, cattle, glory, homestead, wealth’.

3.5 dvāv āghārav94 ājyabhāgau juhuyād
He should offer two sprinklings, two portions of ghee, [with the
words:]

3.6 vāyave svāhā || śarvāya rudrāya svāhā || paśupataye bhūmāya svāhā ||
sāntvāyādhipatey deśvāya svāhā ||
‘To Vāyu svāhā. To the horrific Śarva svāhā. To the fearful Paśupati
svāhā. To the peaceful sovereign God svāhā’.95

3.7 evam eva patnīnāṃ tāṣṇīm adhipasya juhuyād
Precisely in this way, [but] silently, he should offer to the wives of the
Sovereign.96

91 ājyam is regularly the object of verb forms like nirvapati, adhīṣrayati/adhīṣritya,
grhitvā, etc., but no convincing emendation of the reading niratisāyitve5 occurs to us. “M
niratisāyitve” 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?

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.

93 The edition reads simply idhmā . . . , without the relative pronoun. No variants are
reported. On our addition of ya, see the next note.

94 The edition reads yavāghārav, but it is reported (p. 257) that the archetype of all
mss. (M) must have read yadavāghārav. The conjecture of the editors is probably
wrong (the only compounds ending in āghāra known to us are uttarāghāra, srovaṅgaḥ,
vaṅgaṅaṅgāhāra, none of which is comparable to an ostensible yavāghāra). 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 dāvāgḥārav,
there is – with reference to such places as TB 1.6.3.3 dvāv āghāravā dvāv ājyabhāgau –
some reason to conjecture dvāv āghārav, as we do here, rather than entirely removing
dvā, as the various Grhyasūtra parallels would suggest: e.g., HirGS 1.2.15 āghārav-
āghārajyabhāgau juhoti, and JaimGS 2.8.32.16 āghārav ājyabhāgau hutvā (Caland 1922:
‘having sacrificed the two āghāras and the two ghee-portions’). On the meaning of āghāra,
see Gonda 1980: 177 and 314.

95 These four exclamations accompany the two āghāras and two ājyabhāgas of
the preceding rule. Cf. ĀpGS 1.2.5–6 . . . āghārav āghārayati dārśaprayamāsatas
āṣṭinīṃ || aṭahājyabhāgau juhoty aṅgasye svēhete uttarārādhāpurvaṁ deh samaya svēheti
dakṣinārādhāpurvaṁ samam pārveṇa.

96 Our interpretation follows from the injunctions for the Rudrapraṣṭihatkalpa described
BaudhGŚ 2.16 (see Harting 1922: 9; cf. also BaudhGŚ 2.7.19, ĀgniGŚ 2.5.8:87.6ff.),
where 8 forms of Rudra are offered a kṣaram ājyamiśram, followed by a gañodanam for
3.8 *evam sarvesu vrataṇīvedaneṣu vrātaAprāta jihotī* ||

In this way [i.e., as in 40.3.5–7 (?)] he offers while [reciting the verses] dedicated to the Lord of observances97 at all presentations of observances.98

3.9 *vratena tvam ity ubhayAIR aham*99 *iti paścabadhī raudrān homān huvā homāvāsānaṇa bhasmanā śnānaṃ karoti* ||

their 8 wives, and a *haridrodanam* for their 8 sons: here, each libation is followed by . . .

devaY . . . devasya pariYayai . . . devasya suNāya śvāhā. It is not entirely clear to us what the words *evam eva* . . . *tiṣṭhīm* refer to. Comparing the ApŚS passage quoted in the last note, and this BaudhGŚS 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 *vrataAprātaḥ* (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 “vrataAprāta mantras” and of “vrataAprāta . . . hymns”. The mantras that might be referred to with this name could either be AV(P) 19.51.1–4 (quoted KauŚ 42.17 *idāvatsarīyā . . . iti vrataṇīmāpaṇītā ādadhatā* where Keśava in his KauŚkpadhātā [Limaye et al. 1982: 214] explains *idāvatsarīyā iti kalpajātī ca turbhīr [sic: masc.: rgybir ajYam juhuyāt], or more likely the prose mantras (agne vrataAprāta . . .) quoted at KauŚ 56.6–7, each containing the word *vrataAprāta*, which Keśava [p. 289] introduces with the words *agnaye gurave ca brahmaṇāri vrataṇī nivedayet*, but contrary to Modak’s suggestion (1993: 425 n. 618) probably do not include AV(Ś) 7.74.4 (vratēna Śvān vrataAprāta . . .), because this mantra is separately quoted pratīkena in 40.3.9. In this interpretation (for which one might compare examples of the accusative of duration with technical mantra-designations, such as SB 11.8.4.5 *spṛīty huvā, 14.2.2.1 vātānāmāni jihotī, and AVPariś 46.2.3 samāṣāṇa huvā*), one has to assume that the implicit fem. plural noun is rcah: as Shrikant Bahulkar kindly points out to us, this does not exclude the prose mantras of KauŚ 56.6–7, because in the Atharvavedic tradition even prose mantras are taken as rcah and the *BṛhatārŚvūnakramaṇi* designates them accordingly (also Keśava takes KauŚ 56.6–7 as rcah because he says [p. 290] . . . *iti pratṛtyam*). However, the technical term *vrataṇīmāpaṇītā* at KauŚ 42.17 does not imply rcah but refers back to 42.16 *samidhāḥ*. Moreover, the rule KauŚ 6.19 *vrataṇī vrataṇī vratapātya iti samidham ādadhatī, which quotes AV(P) 19.51.4, is paraphrased at VatŚ 4.22 *vrataṇī vrataṇī vratapātya iti vrataṇi vrataṇi ādadhatī, showing another technical term (*vrataṇi vrataṇi*), cf. also Dārila [Diwekar et al. 1972: 118] on KauŚ 42.16–17) that does not imply rc. One might thus rather think of supplying an accusative cognate with juhuyāt like ajYahutīh. Still, at AVPariś 46.2.2 *vrataṇī nivedyā vrataṇī vrataṇī *vṛataṇī vṛataṇīh samidhaḥ bhūyādhyād, the term vrataAprātaḥ 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 *evam* refers back.

99 The edition reads *ubhaYyāhram*. 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 ubhaYyāhram ayaYatiḥ paraYci akaram 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 Atharvavedins) pratīkena is therefore noteworthy.
With [the verse] ‘vratena tvam’ and the five [verses] ‘ubhayīr aham’, he brings the Rudra offerings, and bathes in ash at the end of the offering.

4.1 bhasmasnanaṁ [tāvad]

bhasmasnānena rudro hi snāto bhūt 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 snāyati

tenā snānena snāmy aham yena snāto maheśvaraḥ

Rudra is bathed in ash, Visnu is bathed in ash, in that bath do I bathe, in which Maheśvara is bathed,

4.3 yena snātā umā devī rudro bhartā maheśvaraḥ

yena snātā ganāḥ sarve yena snātā dvijātayaḥ

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 snātā sivaḥ śravaḥ śaṅkaraś ca vṛṣadhvajāḥ

snātāni sarvabhūtāni gaṅgāyamunasaṃgaṃ
daśa

in which Śiva, Śarva and the bull-banneed Śaṅkara is bathed, [in which] all beings are bathed [as if] at the confluence of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā.

4.5 snāto ‘ham sarvatīrtheṣu nadiśprasvanṛṣu ca

vāruṇāgnyeṣaṣuṣyaṇam bhasmanā snānam uttamaṃ

tenā snānena snāmy aham yena snāto maheśvaraḥ

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 homāsānena is not simply to be emended to homāsāne (it might be persevered from AVPārīś 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 snāyate, 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 gaṅgāyamunayagam, and a variant gaṅgāyamunayorgam is reported for mss. ADETROth, yamunayorgam for C. We, however, conjecture gaṅgāyamunasaṃgam, 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.\(^{109}\) In that bath do I bathe, in which Maheśvara is bathed.\(^{110}\)

5.1 bhūtis tu pīṅgalo babhrur bhūtir viṣṇuḥ sanātanaḥ
| bhūtir brahma mahendraś ca bhūtir devāḥ saha rśibhiḥ

Ash\(^{111}\) is Pīṅgala, Babhru,\(^{112}\) ash is Viṣṇu, Sanātana, ash is Brahmā, Mahendra, ash are the gods together with the sages.

\(^{109}\) The bath in ash is of the āgneya type. Cf. ŚiUp 5.13: bhasmasnānaṁ śivasnānaṁ vārunād adhiṅkam śrītam | jatataśivālānaṁrūnam āgneyaṁ paṅkavārjitaṁ ||. Cf. also Brunner, Oberhammer and Padoux 2000: 173ff. That it was known as āgneya among Pāṇḍavatās is confirmed by the following unidentified verse quoted by Kaundinya ad Pā Śa 1.9, p. 30 ll. 1–2: yah snānam ācaren niyam āgneyam sanyatendriyaḥ | kulaikavijñānāṁ uddhṛtya sa gacchet paramēm gatim ||. Cf. also Brunner, Oberhammer and Padoux 2000: 173ff. That it was known as āgneya among Pāṣupatās is confirmed by the following unidentified verse quoted by Kaundinya ad Pā Śa 1.9, p. 30 ll. 1–2:

\(^{110}\) The fifth and sixth pādās are here repeated from 40.4.2 above.

\(^{111}\) For bhūti (or vibhūti) in the meaning ‘ash’, cf. BJāUp 1.15: vibhūtir bhasitaṁ bhasma kāraṁ rakṣeti bhasmano bha vonti paśca nāmāṁ | paścādibhibhīṁ nāmaṁbhīṁ bhīṃṁ aśvaryaḥkarṣaṇaṁ bhūtiḥ | bhasma sarvā śhakṣaṇāṁ | . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Cf. in addition the following Skandapurāṇa verse quoted not only in Canḍesvara’s Grhaḥtharatnakara (cf. Adriaensen, Bakker and Isaacson 1988: 12f.), but also at KKT Niyatakālakānda p. 54, ll. 9–10:

\(^{112}\) Both epithets occur in a mantra addressed to Śiva at AVPariṣ 66.3.2: kālāya śvāha || pīṅgalāya tīkṣāya jatiḥśrī babhravā om bhūt om bhūva om svar om bhūr bhūvaḥ svar jāyajīvāya jāyajīpateye karalāya vikātāya katāmātāvāyāngirasaḥ-bhārhaspateyaikapakālakālakāpadeyavardhipataye karapade śvähet ||. Cf.
5.2 bhūtīr me 'laksām nīrṇuḍed bhūtīr me śriyam āvahet
bhūtīr ma āyuṣā 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 [full] life-span.

5.3 bhasmanā caranto nityam dhyāyinaḥ paricitakāḥ
yānti pāśupatam sthānam punarārvtyādurlabhām
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 manasā ca vicintītām
alaksām māścātha
duh. svapnam. bhasmaṁ tat pran. aśyatu
Whatever karman is produced in speaking and thought out in mind, misfortune and nightmares, let [all] that be destroyed by ash.

5.5 mokṣanām moksakāle ca bhasmaśeṣam visarjāyet
mukto 'ham sarvavāpebhīyo 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 snānaṁ vārṇaṁ
pāraśu śārtraleṇa yathākramāṇaṁ
pūrvaruṇāḥ

¹¹³ punarārvtyādurlabhā is a stock expression in Śaiva Purāṇas which mostly qualifies words like rudraloka (cf. 40.5.5 just below) or matsamāpana. In view of Pāṣaṇ 4.19–20 (anena vidhinā rudrasamāpana gatvā ī 19 ī na kaś cic brāhmaṇaḥ punar āvartate ī 20 ī) it is conspicuous that the expression occurs frequently (nine times) in VāP 23, a chapter stemming from Pāśupata circles, which gives an account of Śiva’s twenty-eight incarnations starting with Śveta and ending with the Pāśupata teacher Lakulīśa (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.

¹¹⁵ The release of the remainder of ash may be connected with the vārṇa 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 snānaṁ vārṇaṁ, cf. AVPariś 1.43.10: etat snānaṁ ... prajāstāpanaṁ (and 1.45.2, 7).

¹¹⁷ The edition reads yathākāmaṁ, while the reading adopted by us occurs in the three sources A₁CE.

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

6.2 strīśādram nābhibhāṣeta\(^{121}\) ||
He should not speak to a woman or a śūdra.

6.3 tada śāvitṛṃ japet ||
Then he should mutter the Śāvitṛ.\(^{122}\)

6.4 yadi bḥāṣeta tada rudrasāvitrīṃ japet ||
If he is to speak [to them], then he should mutter the Rudrasāvitrī.\(^{123}\)

---

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\(^{126}\) adopted by the editors could well be a corruption under influence of the preceding parvasu.\(^{119}\)

The vāruna 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.

\(^{120}\) From Kaundinya’s commentary on Pāśū 1.1 (p. 8, ll. 5–9) it follows that fasting was also prescribed before initiation: syā ity eye käle l yāvad ayam ácāryo gṛhaśādhīhyo ‘bhāyaśataṁ pṛvarvam atahśabdāt paraśītaṁ bṛāhmaṇaṁ vratopavāsāyaṁ mahādevasya daksīṇasyāṁ mārtau sadyojātādinsmārtena bhasmanā sanskaroti utpattilīngavāvṛṭīṁ kṛtvā mantrasravānaṁ ca karoti tāvad eyah kālāh kriyate l ‘“Shall” (syā) refers to the time required, namely the time that is required (before the exposition can begin) by the ácārya to consecrate a brahmin (who has started the fasting observance) at Mahādeva’s “right mārtī”, 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 Sūtra, and who comes (to him) from amongst the householders etc.’ (transl. Bakker forthc.).

\(^{121}\) Pāśū 1.13: strīśādram nābhibhāṣet. Note the difference between active and middle voice (also in 40.6.4 just below). Cf. among many other places KāhGS 5.3 strīśādram nābhibhāṣet; BaudhGS 3.4.24 na strīya na śūdreṣa saha sambhāṣeta yadi sambhāṣeta brāhmaṇena saha sambhāṣeta; BaudhDnŚ 3.8.17 strīśādrait nābhibhāṣeta mātrapurīśe ṅāveśeta; BaudhDnŚ 4.5.4 cd strīśādrait nābhibhāṣeta brahmacāri havirvṛataḥ ManuŚm 11.22 cd strīśādtrapatīṁ caiva nābhibhāṣeta kṛhī cīt; an active form finally at MBh 12.36.35ab strīśādarpaṭatīṁ cāpi nābhibhāṣed vratānītab.

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

\(^{123}\) Pāśū 1.14 and 1.17: yady avekṣed yady abhibhāṣet || 14 || raudrīṇi gṛyaṭrīṇi bahurūpyam vā japet || 17 ||. Note that Pāśū 1.15–16 (upasṛṣṇya || 15 || prāṇāyānaṁ kṛtva || 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-Pāśūpatasūtra formulation of the rule, which both in the Pāṇḍarāhika 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 kamaṇḍalukapāle bhīṁne bhūṁir bhūṁim āgād ity apsu praveṣayet
If his water pot or his begging bowl is broken, he should immerse it in water, with the mantra ‘bhūṁir bhūṁim āgād’.

6.6 retaḥskande
yan me retas tejasā sāṃniṣadāya
dehā praskandet punar na bhāvāya |
tad āgnir vāyuḥ . . . . .
api ceyāṁ prthivī kañcakhaṃteti
If semen is spilled: ‘My semen which, while sitting down (heat), should spill forth from my body without return (fire), or fire that . . . , life-span . . . , and this earth . . . ’.

---

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 tatpurusa (‘a pot-lid?’).
125 The pratīka refers to the probably late Vedic mantra quoted in full at Kauś Ś 136.2: bhūṁir bhūṁim āgān mātā mātaram apy āgāt | rāhvasām putraiḥ paśūḥir yo no dveṣṭi sa bhīṣyataṁ. It is noteworthy that the actual reading āgān of the Kauś Ś mss., which Bloomfield (1890) emended to avāgān on the basis of Kātyā ŚŚ 25.5.29, is confirmed by our pratīka. The indications of Bloomfield 1906: 672 show that all other texts (e.g., SādV 1.6.20, ĀpMP 2.15.17) read āgān, 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 brahmacārin) is a common theme in the Gṛhya/Dharma literature. Cf. Baudh ŚS 4.11.1, BaudhDhŚ 2.1.29, GautDhŚ 23.20, VaikhŚMŚ 8.2, and YājñŚM 3.278 yan me ‘dya reta ity abhīyāṁ skan̄ṇam reta bhīmantrayet | stanātaṇaṁ bhurvar madhiyaṁ tenānākikāya sṛṣṭēḥ. The corrupt and incompletely transmitted trīṣṭubhi verse shows agreement in some ways with the verses (existing in a few different forms) called Retasyā in the Vedic ritual sūtras. In their Taittiriya form (with defective accentuation), they are found TĀ 1.30.1: punar māṁ aitv indriyaṁ | punar āyāḥ punar bhāgaḥ | punar brahmanaṁ aitv mā | punar drāviṇaṁ aitv mā | yānaṁ ‘dya retaḥ prthivīṁ āskān | yād oṣadhīḥ apyaśaro yād āpaḥ | idāṁ tāt pūṉār ā daide dhīrghāyuṭvāya vārcase | yān me retaḥ praśīcyate | yān ma ājāyate pūnaḥ | tēna māṁ amṛtaṁ karaṇaḥ | tēna saṃprajaṇaṁ karaṇaḥ. In their (Mādhyandina) Vājasaneyin form, they are found SB(M) 14.9.4.5 (cf. BĀU(K) 6.4.4–5): bahāṁ vā idāṁ sāpata vā jātrato vā rāṇa skandati | tād abhiṁ mṛṣed ānu vā maṇḍrayeta yān me ‘dya retaḥ prthivīṁ āskāntēṇāḥ yād oṣadhīḥ apyaśaro yād āpaḥ | idāṁ ahāṁ tāt reta ā daide punar māṁ āvīr indriṣyām pūṇāḥ teṣaḥ pūṇar bhāgaḥ pūṇar agnīya dhīṣyata yathāhānaḥ kalpanāṁ ity anāvākaṇgaḥ teṣāṁ ādāyāntaṁ śūnaṁ vā bhūrva vā nā maṭhyaṁ |. We have considered the following emendations: saṃsāra- (cf. mss. DE Roth saṃsāra-), punar me bhāvāya (or bhagāvya), 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 dehaḥ praskandet na punarbhāvāya would rectify this. If punar na bhāvāya or na punarbhāvāya is correct, we may compare i.a. SViḍB 3.8.5 tatra me sīhāṇaṁ kury aprunārthbhāvāya punarjānmanah (cf. Konow 1893: 78 n. 4) and MBh 12.47.60 94* ll. 3–4 daśāśvamedhī punar eti janna kṛṣṇapraṇāmī na punarbhāvāya.
6.7 *samyak kva cit karoti*

He makes it good (?) / does it properly (?) somewhere.  

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 upādhyāyācchando varjayet* ‘He makes the observance right somewhere. He should avoid what his teacher disapproves of’; 2) *samyak kva cit karoti vṛttam upādhyāyācchando vartayet* ‘He makes it right somewhere. He should comport himself in a manner approved of by his teacher’; 3) *samyak kva cid vṛttam upādhyāyācchando vartayet* ‘Throughout he should comport himself in a manner approved of by his teacher’; 4) *samyak kva cid vṛttam upādhyāyācchando 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 *dvérttam* 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* / *dvrr*. We are inclined to opt for one of the last two suggestions, and read 6.7 and 6.8 as one line.

6.8 *vratam upādhyāyācchando* \[vartayet\]

He should practise the observance according to the wish of his teacher.

6.9 *tata udiḳṣaṇam* \[vṛūtapatīr juhoti\]

Then [follows] the upward gaze.

128 Instead of *upādhyāyācchando* the edition reads *upādhyāyācchando* (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*.

6.10 *vṛūtapatīr juhoti* \[vṛūtapatīr juhoti\]

He offers while [reciting the verses] dedicated to the Lord of observances.

129 The teacher making the brahmacārin gaze at the sun is a common element of the Upanayana according to the Gr̄hyasūtras. Cf. BhārGS 1.9:9.14 *ādityam udiḳṣayati*; 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.

6.11 *samāso ’ham vrataviṣṭakta iti huvādityabhimukhas tīṣṭheta* \[tāta iti hutvadityabhimukhas tīṣṭheta\]

Having offered [with the words] ‘… to Vrataviṣṭakta’ he should stand facing the sun.

130 The problems which the text of this rule poses cannot yet be solved satisfactorily. The editors only report one useless variant *tīṣṭhet* (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 Sāyaṇa’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 *viṣṭakta* are not attested, so a nominative interpretation seems impossible.
6.12 yan me duruktaṁ durhutam durdhyātaṁ durvicintitam
tan me bhagavān īśānaṁ sarvaṁ tvam kṣantum arhasi
‘May you, O Lord Īśāna, please forgive me whatever has been badly
spoken, badly offered, badly meditated, badly understood by me’.132

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

6.14 ye śraddhayedam paśupater vrataṁ caranti
tetām madhu viśakse he dadate na punargamanam madhurivādye-
haiva ca

6.15 tad esa ślokaṁ
Regarding this there is the following śloka:

6.16 vilānapāśapatijārāḥ samāptaṭattvāgocarāḥ
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 Śvistakṛt, and Vrataśvistakṛt may be a contamination of this with the
name Vratapati. With reference to dedications idam agnaye found in some Vedic śūtras
(e.g., Kauś 87.8), we hesitantly propose to restore the text as follows: samāsa [i ] idam
vratasvistakṛta iti hatvā . . . ‘Having offered [reciting] the two Śamāsa-hymns, [and stating]
“this is for Vratasvistakṛt”, . . .’. On the Śvistakṛt oblations, cf. Gonda 1980: 349ff., and
AVParīṣī 20.4.2.

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(S) 7.81.2 = 14.1.24 / AV(P) 18.3.3.
134 The sequence ity apsu pravāhaya 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 prāvāhana ‘dismissal (of a deity
or the ancestors) at the end of a worship’, immediately following the Śvistakṛt oblation,
at BaudhGŚŚ 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; paśapatiḥ (ADE) for paśupati9.
Furthermore it is reported that CTUROth omit na punargamanam to prayāṁ (in 16c).
136 The ultimate goal of the Paśupatas. Cf. Pāśa 5.33: labhatu rudrasvistakṛt.
137 Cf. Modak 1993: 469: “The purely iambic metre prāmāṇikā used at the end of the
paśupata-vrata is noteworthy”.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Aitareyabrāhmaṇa, ed. Aufrecht 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgnivGS</td>
<td>Āgniṣṭoṣya-ग्रहhyaśītra, ed. V. Varma 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀpGS</td>
<td>Āpastaṃba-grhaḥyasūtra, ed. Winternitz 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀpMP</td>
<td>Āpastaṃba-मanta-पथa, ed. Winternitz 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀpŚŚ</td>
<td>Āpastaṃba-śrautaśūtra, ed. Garbe 1882–1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV(P)</td>
<td>Atharvavedasamhitā (Paiyapāla), ed. Bhattacharya 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV(Ś)</td>
<td>Atharvavedasamhitā (Śaunaka), ed. Vishva Bandhu 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BĀU(K)</td>
<td>Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad (Kāṇva), ed. Olivelle 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaudhDhŚS</td>
<td>Baudhāyana-dhardharmasūtra, ed. Olivelle 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaudhdGS</td>
<td>Baudhāyana-grhaḥyasūtra, ed. Shama Sastri 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaudhdGSŚS</td>
<td>Baudhāyana-grhaḥyasūtra, ed. Shama Sastri 1920, cf. Harting 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BhārGS</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja-grhaḥyasūtra, ed. Salomons 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BhārŚŚ</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja-śrautaśūtra, ed. Kashikar 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJābUp</td>
<td>Bhajābālo-paṇiṣad, ed. Sastri 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GautDhŚS</td>
<td>Gautamadhardharmasūtra, ed. Olivelle 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Gopāthabrāhmaṇa, ed. Gaastra 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GobhGS</td>
<td>Gobhilagṛhaḥyasūtra, ed. Knauer 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HirGS</td>
<td>Hiranyakeshi-grhaḥyasūtra, ed. Kırste 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JaimGS</td>
<td>Jaiminīya-grhaḥyasūtra, ed. Cudlind 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KāṭhGS</td>
<td>Kāṭhakagṛhaḥyasūtra, ed. Cudlind 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KātyŚŚ</td>
<td>Kātyāyana-śrautaśūtra, ed. Weber 1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KauŚŚ</td>
<td>Kauśikasūtra, ed. Bloomfield 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKT</td>
<td>Kṛtyakalpataru, ed. Aiyangar 1942, 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Kāṭhasamhitā, ed. von Schroeder 1900–1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KūP</td>
<td>Kūmapurāṇa, ed. Gupta 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiP</td>
<td>Līngapurāṇa, ed. Shastri 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MānuGS</td>
<td>Mānavagṛhaḥyasūtra, Knauer 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ManuSm</td>
<td>Manusmrty, ed. Jolly 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBh</td>
<td>Mahābhārata, ed. Sukthankar et al. 1927–1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Maitreya-śamhitā, ed. von Schroeder 1881–1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiP</td>
<td>Mātysparanā, ed. Apte 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParSm</td>
<td>Parīśarasmrty, ed. Tarkalakāra 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PāŚū</td>
<td>Pāśupatāsūtra, ed. Shastri 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Rtaṇṇikā, ed. Dalal 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SadvB</td>
<td>Saḍvinśabrahmaṇa, ed. Eelsingh 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚB(M)</td>
<td>Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa (Mādhyananda), Weber 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚŚUp</td>
<td>Śivopaniṣad, ed. Kunhan Raja 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPṁ</td>
<td>Śkandaparāṇa, ed. Bhaṭṭarāṇi 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVidB</td>
<td>Śāmavidhānabrahmaṇa, ed. Konow 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TĀ</td>
<td>Taṭṭiriyāraṇyaka, ed. Phaṭaṅka 1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Taṭṭiriya-brāhmaṇa, ed. Śāstri ‘Goḍbole’ 1898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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