



HAL
open science

The Practice Involving the Ucchuşmas (Atharvedaparişîşta 36)

Peter Bisschop, Arlo Griffiths

► **To cite this version:**

Peter Bisschop, Arlo Griffiths. The Practice Involving the Ucchuşmas (Atharvedaparişîşta 36). Zeitschrift für Indologie und Südasiestudien, 2007, 24, pp.1-46. halshs-01908883

HAL Id: halshs-01908883

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01908883>

Submitted on 30 Oct 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Peter Bisschop & Arlo Griffiths
**The Practice involving the Ucchuṣmas
(Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa 36)***

Introduction

In our recent study of the Pāśupata Observance (*Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* 40),¹ we expressed the intention to bring out further studies of texts from the corpus of Pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda, especially such as throw light on the cult of Rudra-Śiva. The *Pāśupatavrata* showed interesting interconnections between Atharvavedic ritualism and the Śaiva Atimārga. In the present study, we focus on the so-called *Ucchuṣmakalpa*, transmitted as the thirty-sixth Pariśiṣṭa of the corpus,² a text which takes us squarely onto the path of Tantric practices. We intend to continue our studies in the *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭas* with articles to appear over the coming years, one of which is likely to be devoted to the Koṭihoma,³ as previously announced.

* Shingo Einoo and Harunaga Isaacson have read an earlier draft of this article, and provided important suggestions for its improvement. We are grateful for their willingness to help us once again.

¹ BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003. In the introduction to that study, we presented all the epigraphical evidence known to us at the time which might help to explain the transmission among Atharvavedic brahmins of a text strongly influenced by the Pāśupatas and their literature. None of this evidence did more than suggest tolerably close geographical proximity in Gujarat, in early medieval times, of Atharvavedic and Pāśupata tradition. Since then, we have noticed a further inscription which demonstrates that adherents of both traditions actually inhabited the same city. An inscription dated to Vikrama Saṃvat 1131 mentions a Pāśupata teacher called Megharāśi, pupil of Bṛhaspatirāśi, himself the pupil of Viśuddharāśi. This Megharāśi lived in Aṇahilapātaka and had a Maṭha in Sedhagrāma (see BHOJAKA 1997–98; the plates accompanying the edition are not those of the edited inscription, although they do seem related to it). SANKALIA 1949: 185f. (see also the map for p. 42, found on p. 71, top left), makes clear that Aṇahilapātaka is another name for a town called Aṇahillapurapattana, the place of origin of many of the mss. of the primary and ancillary texts of the Śaunaka Atharvaveda: see e.g. VISHVA BANDHU 1960/I: xiii, xviii, xxii, xxiii, and BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN, p. XIV, where we find quoted the colophon of their source “Roth”, which refers to the same city, and mentions a date in Saṃvat 1488 (cf. on this date BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003: 324, n. 42), just a few centuries posterior to Megharāśi. On the localization of Atharvaveda tradition in medieval Gujarat, see now also MEULENBELD 2003–04, especially pp. 293 (n. 18) and 294 (n. 23).

² For basic information concerning translations/studies of parts of the corpus, we refer to pages 315–317 of our mentioned article.

³ This text is not as much devoted to Rudra-Śiva as we thought previously, only the framestory

The name Ucchuṣma

The name Ucchuṣma occurs in a number of texts of different religious affiliation, both Śaiva and Buddhist. An article by PADOUX in the *Tāntrikābhīdhānakośa*, vol. I (pp. 225f.), provides the following information: Ucchuṣma heads a series of ten Rudras, Ucchuṣma, Śavara, Caṇḍa, Mataṅga, Ghora, Yama, Ugra, Halahala, Krodhin and Huluhulu, who acted as teachers (*gurutvena*) in the past: see TĀ 28.390cd–393 (quoting the *Devīyāmālatantra*). From Jayaratha’s commentary *ad loc.*, it appears that teachers in general can be subdivided into ten classes according to their characteristics, which derive from the aforementioned Rudras. The same article of the *Tāntrikābhīdhānakośa* also mentions (1) that Ucchuṣma is a form of Śiva which has a Vedic origin, (2) that Ucchuṣma/ā or Mahocchuṣma/ā can refer to a *śakti* or to a *pītha*, (3) that there once existed an *Ucchuṣmatantra* or *Ucchuṣmaśāstra*, and (4) that Ucchuṣma is considered an emanation of Akṣobhya. We now propose to take up these four points one by one.

(1) As to the Vedic origin of the name Ucchuṣma, in the light of the fact that our text (36.2.1) calls the Ucchuṣmarudras *atharvavedodbhava*, it is remarkable that the exact words *uc chuṣmāḥ* occur (exclusively) in three different Atharvavedic mantra passages (only one of which has a parallel elsewhere in Vedic literature), namely AV(P) 4.5.3 *ud uṣā ud u sūrya uc chuṣmā oṣadhīnām | ud ejati prajāpatir vṛṣā śuṣmeṇa vājinā* || ‘Up [stirs] the Dawn, up also the Sun, up [stir] the energies of the plants, up stirs the bull Prajāpati with prize-winning energy’; 11.6.8 (= RV 10.97.8) *uc chuṣmā oṣadhīnām gāvo goṣṭhād iverate | dhanam sanīṣyantīnām ātmānam tava *pūruṣa* || ‘Up do the energies of the plants move, like cows from a stall, about to win wealth, and a body for you, O man’; AV(Ś) 4.4.4 *úc chūṣmāuṣadhīnām* [read *úc chūṣmā ō*] *sārā ṛṣabhānām | sām puṁsām indra vṛṣṇyam asmīn dhehi tanūvaśin* || ‘Up [move] the energies of the plants, [up] the powers of the bulls. O Indra, self-ruler, place the manly power of men in him here’.

The compound *ucchuṣma*, however, is not known from any Atharvavedic Śruti text, but is found at TS 1.6.2.2 *úcchuṣmo agne yajamānāyaidhi nīṣuṣmo abhidāsate* ‘Keep your energy up, O Agni, for the yajamāna, keep it low for the one who assaults him’.⁴

appealing to that deity’s role in divulsion of the knowledge of the *koṭihoma*.

⁴ At KauśS 40.14, CALAND (1900) interprets *ucchuṣmāparivyādhāv āyaseṇa khanati* as “gräbt er vermittelst eines eisernen (Schaufels, nach dem 33.6–11 mitgetheilten Ritual) eine *Mucuna pruritus* (*ucchuṣmā* oder *kapikacchu*) und einem *Calamus fasciculatus* (*parivyādha* oder *suravālaka*) aus”, after Dārila (who in fact reads *sūkaravālaka*, 115:13). It does not seem that our text anywhere has this plant *ucchuṣmā* in mind.

It is also noteworthy that the Atharvavedic *Nakṣatralakṣa* (AVPariś 1.7.10) contains another derivative, *ucchuṣman*: *kāmbojāḥ kālampaśās ca krandā ucchuṣmāṇaḥ śvānaś*

(2) A goddess Ucchuṣmā or Mahocchuṣmā⁵ figures in several Śaiva Tantras. She is included among different sets of female deities. In one such set she is listed together with three other female deities called Raktā, Karālā/ī and Caṇḍākṣī. Cf. HEILIGERS-SEELLEN (1994: 92–93), who observes that in the KubjMT 2.24ff., these four goddesses are installed as the main deities at the four Pīṭhas: Raktā in Oḍḍiyāna, Karālī in Jālandhara, Caṇḍākṣī in Pūrṇādrī and Ucchuṣmā in Kāmarūpa. They also play an important role in the system of the *Brahmayāmala* or *Picumata*, where they are the principal Śaktis of the Bhairava Kapālīśa (cf. GOUDRIAAN & GUPTA 1981: 43).⁶ It is possible that our text contains a reference to this same set of goddesses in a corrupt passage at the beginning (36.1.3).

The name Ucchuṣma is found as an element in three toponyms in the *Ṣaṣṣāhasrasaṃhitā* and *Kubjikāmatatantra*. Cf. SCHOTERMAN (1982: 54), who mentions a forest (Ucchuṣmavana), a river (Ucchuṣmā) and a pond (Mahocchuṣmahrada).

(3) GOUDRIAAN & GUPTA (1981: 42, n. 42) mention a lost *Ucchuṣmatantra*, referred to in the main text and some of the colophons of the *Brahmayāmala* or *Picumata*. SANDERSON (1986: 184, n. 76) writes that “[t]he PM-BY calls itself *Ucchuṣmatantra* frequently”. According to the information provided by DYCZKOWSKI 1988: 110, the *Jayadrathayāmala* reckons the *Ucchuṣmatantra* among the eight root Tantras of the Mata, among which the *Picumata* takes pride of place.⁷ Quotations from or references to an *Ucchuṣma(bhairava)tantra* or *Ucchuṣmaśāstra* occur in the writings of the Śaiva scholars from medieval Kashmir, and in some texts of esoteric Buddhism. These quotations and references often concern rules for the use of particular sounds and words in mantras to accompany magical ritual activities. Thus, e.g., the *Ucchuṣmatantra* quoted by Kṣemarāja *ad* NeT 16.33–34 (NeTU vol. II, pp. 16f.): *ākāraś chedane prokta ṛkāras tāḍane* ‘the sound Ā is prescribed during Cutting, the sound ṛ during Striking’. In the same vein are the following verses quoted from the *Ucchuṣmatantra* by Kṣemarāja in his commentary on the nine constituents of *mantravāda* listed in NeT 18.6–8 (NeTU vol. II, pp. 73–76): *dīpane tu mahābhāga* [read *mahābhāge*]⁸

cāvadhūmamarkaṭāś ca pūrvāṣāḍhā upayanti bhaktyā tatra || ‘The time-biding (?) Kāmbojas, and the roaring, up-energetic (*ucchuṣman*) dogs, as well as the down-vapored monkeys, make a reverent approach there during (?) the Pūrvāṣāḍhas, with devotion’.

⁵ See also the mention of an Ucchuṣmikā in the *Tantrasadbhāva* verses quoted below, p. 5.

⁶ In addition to the sources discussed by HEILIGERS-SEELLEN, we can refer to *Niśisaṃcāra* f. 19^v–19^v (names of the four goddesses installed at Dakṣapīṭha, identified with Uḍḍiyāna by SANDERSON *2001: 26–27; their consort is the Bhairava Kapālīśa) and LiP 2.27.88ab (included among a list of sixteen Śaktis).

⁷ On the doctrine of the Mata, see SANDERSON 1986: 183–185 and 1988: 682–683.

⁸ As is usually the case in Tantric literature, we assume that it is the Goddess who is instruct-

praṇavobhayayojanam | *bodhane tu namaskāraḥ svāhākāro 'male tathā* | *vauṣaḍantargataṃ mantraṃ abhiṣeke niyojayet* | *phaṭkārobhayasamṃyuktaṃ tāḍane viniyojayet* | *ādyantaṃ caiva huṃkāraṃ indhane viniyojayet* | 'During Lighting, O illustrious woman, the sound OM is used at both [beginning and end]; during Awakening the expressions NAMAḤ and SVĀHĀ [are to be used], O stainless woman; he should employ a mantra interspersed with VAUṢAṬ during Consecration; during Striking he should employ the sound PHAṬ at both [beginning and end]; during Kindling he should employ the sound HUṂ at beginning and end'.⁹

A verse quoted from the *Ucchuṣmabhairava* by Kṣemarāja *ad* SvachchT 7.249 (vol. III, p. 315), 10.927 (vol. VB, p. 382), and in his *Śivasūtravimarsinī* (ŚiSūVi p. 8, ll. 13–14) deals with the absence of impurity and suggests a Kaula environment: *yāvan na vedakā ete tāvad vedyāḥ kathaṃ priye* | *vedakaṃ vedyam* (*/vedyavedakam*) *ekaṃ tu tattvaṃ nāsty aśuci* (*/Jaśucis*) *tataḥ* || 'So long as these knowers do not exist, how can there be objects of knowing, my dear? But the knower and the object of knowing are one. Therefore there is no [such thing as an] impure substance'. The same verse is quoted without attribution by Jayaratha *ad* TĀ 10.166 (TĀVi vol. 7: 115, ll. 14–15) and 29.9 (TĀVi vol. 29: 7, ll. 10–11), while the first half is also quoted in the commentary (*Parimala*) on *Mahārthamañjarī* 6 (MMP, p. 20). A Kaula background of the lost *Ucchuṣmatantra* is likewise indicated by a verse attributed to it in Advayavajra's *Sekanirṇaya/nirdeśa* (nr. 7, pp. 48–66, in MIKKYŌ 1991: 50, vs. 10): *śivaśaktisamāyogāt satsukhaṃ paramādvayam* | *na śivo nāpi śaktiś ca ratnāntargatasamsthitaṃ* || 'Because of the union of Śiva and Śakti, true pleasure, supreme non-duality, is established within the jewel [of the penis]: there is no Śiva and also no Śakti'.¹⁰

The *Netratantroddyota* quotations seem most important in our context, because they show how, around Kṣemarāja's time (11th c.), a Tantra associated with Ucchuṣma was known to contain instructions on similar kinds of magical rituals as the ones our *Pariśiṣṭa* deals with.¹¹ The same commen-

ed also here. The small emendation is supported by the presence of the vocative *amale* in the next line.

⁹ In what follows on pp. 75–79 of the edition, further stanzas on the same theme from the *Netratantra* are elucidated with several quotations. The source of none of these quotations is identified more precisely than with *yad uktam*. It is likely they all come from the same *Ucchuṣmatantra* that was mentioned explicitly on p. 75. In the commentary on 18.12, then, a new explicit attribution is found, this time to the *Svacchandatantra*.

¹⁰ Harunaga Isaacson suggests to us that the expression *ratnāntargatasamsthitaṃ*, which to him sounds more (Tantric) Buddhist than Śaiva, indicates that this may not be a literal quote but rather a paraphrase.

¹¹ We are grateful to Alexis Sanderson for sharing with us his list of references to the *Ucchuṣma(bhairava)tantra*, on which the preceding discussion was based.

tary also quotes an interesting description of a female demon Ucchuṣmikā from the *Tantrasadbhāva* (NeTU ad 19.55, vol. II, p. 145): *rātrau bhūtvā vivastrā yā mūtrayitvā pradakṣiṇam | kṛtvā tu prāśayet raktaṃ* [D: *prāśayate nityam*]¹² *muktakeśī tu karṣayet* [D: *tv ākarṣayet* (unmetr.)] || *ucchuṣmikā tu sā jñeyā sādhakair vīranāyikā* [D: *vīravatsalā*]¹³ | ‘She who, going about at night without clothes, urinating in a circle, feeds blood and, with dishevelled hair, causes pain, should be recognized by the adepts as Ucchuṣmikā, the mistress of heroes’. According to the same text (*Tantrasadbhāva* quoted in NeTU ad 19.55, vol. II, p. 146), Ucchuṣmā is a portion of the mother goddess Vārāhī: *vārāhyamśā tathocchuṣmā kathitā vīravandite*.¹⁴

But there is also other evidence on the nature of *ucchuṣma* deities.

(4) Several references are found to an ‘Ucchuṣma form’ of the Buddhist counterpart of Kubera, viz. Jambhala, in the *Sādhanamālā*, a collection of short Buddhist tantric-magical tracts.¹⁵ Cf. *Sādhanas* 291–295 in the edition of BHATTACHARYYA (1925–28, vol. II, pp. 569ff.). This material, in the context of our discussion, does not help to confirm much more about the name *ucchuṣma* than that it could be applied as an adjective to wrathful forms of various deities, from which much was expected in magical ceremonies. In his introduction (p. cxxvi), BHATTACHARYYA quotes a typical verse: *dāri-dryaduḥkhāhatamānasānām kā cittavṛttiḥ sugatasya kṛteḥ | ataś ca kopād iva jambhalo ’sau ucchuṣmarūpaṃ bhayadaṃ cakāra* (*Sādhanamālā* 292, p. 570), which he translates: “People who are stricken down with the misery of poverty[,] what desire can they have for the rites laid down by Sugata [the Buddha]? It is for this reason it seems that Jambhala in his anger assumed the terrific form of Ucchuṣma” (cf. 36.2.6 below, and the *Tantrasadbhāva* verse quoted just above). The *Ucchuṣmajambhalasādhanas*, deriving from various authors, paint a fairly consistent picture of this figure’s iconography: in our context, it is only relevant to note that he is *piṅgorddhvakeśa*, *vāmanākāra*

¹² Readings between brackets are taken from DYCZKOWSKI’S provisional edition of the *Tantrasadbhāva*, made available on <http://www.muktabodhalib.org>. The present quotation is *Tantrasadbhāva* 16.187–188ab in that edition. The reading *prāśayate nityam* lacks an object of *prāśayate*.

¹³ DYCZKOWSKI adopts *vīravatsalā*, but the reading of the *Netratantroddyota* is attested in two of his three Nepalese manuscripts.

¹⁴ *Tantrasadbhāva* 16.218ab, reading *tatocchuṣmā* (typo?).

¹⁵ Since no source is given for the reference to Ucchuṣma as emanation of Akṣobhya in the TAK lemma quoted above (p. 2), we surmise that what PADOUX had in mind was Buddhist material of the kind we discuss here. That Ucchuṣma may be regarded as an emanation of Akṣobhya seems to follow from passages such as *Sādhanamālā* 295, p. 577, where Ucchuṣma is described as *bhūsparśamudranilākṣobhyamunimudritamastakam* ‘with head marked by the Buddha (*muni*) Akṣobhya, who is dark-blue and shows the Earth-touch mudrā’, and *Sādhanamālā* 286, p. 564, where Jambhala — though not explicitly Ucchuṣmajambhala — is said to be *akṣobhyajaṭāmukuṭinam* ‘whose matted hair-diadem is Akṣobhya’.

and *damṣṭrāvant* (vol. II, p. 569), *ghoradamṣṭrākarāla* (p. 570) — attributes echoed especially in 36.9.1, 4, 15 below.¹⁶

Ucchuṣma-Jambhala is also notorious for his connection with impurities.¹⁷ He figures in several early eighth-century texts from the Turfan region in Chinese Central Asia, where he is called the ‘Vajra-being of Impure Traces’ (Hui-chi chin-kang).¹⁸ His cult became particularly popular in thirteenth century Chinese Buddhism and Daoism, in which he played a central role in exorcistic rites involving child-mediums.¹⁹ In addition to Ucchuṣma-Jambhala, Buddhist sources also know of a female demon Ucchuṣmā.²⁰ All of this takes us far away from our text, and in view of the Vedic material quoted above, the association with impurities is not likely to be original, but the link between Ucchuṣma and sorcery remains constant in the post-Vedic sources.

General remarks on the *Ucchuṣmakalpa*

The editors describe the contents of this *Pariśiṣṭa* as “[t]he ritual of ceremonies to obtain various wishes from certain forms of Rudra-Śiva known as the *ucchuṣma-rudras* or *ucchuṣmas*” (p. 222). The text has further been characterised by GOUDRIAAN (1978: 227) in the following terms:

¹⁶ Similar characteristics are repeated also on the following pages of BHATTACHARYA’S edition. Elsewhere in the *Sādhnamālā*, there is one more, unfortunately rather unclear, occurrence of *ucchuṣma*, without connection with Jambhala. Cf. the two verses at the top of vol. II, p. 410: *jvare gare tathā roge saṃgrāme ca tathaiṅva ca | dākinī[sa]bhūto cchuṣmanādīśatru-prapīḍite || aśanividyunmeghānām parvate vanamārgayoḥ | tasmān mantraṃ smaren nityaṃ sarvvaśaṅkānisūdanam* ‘In the case of fever, of disease, of illness, and of war; and in the case of trouble from Dākinīs, from Ucchuṣmas together with Bhūtas, from rivers and from enemies; on a mountain of (i.e. shrouded in?) clouds with thunderbolts and lightning; in the forest and on the road, he should therefore always mutter the mantra, which dispells all apprehension’ (it is not clear what the editor means to convey with his placing *sa* in square brackets — possibly that his manuscripts contained a hypometrical reading).

¹⁷ LINOTHE (1999: 20) claims that Ucchuṣma’s [*sic*] name means “he who burns up impurities”, referring in his n. 5 (p. 29) to BISCHOFF, *Mahābala*, 9, and to Mochizuki Shinkō and Tsukamoto Zenryū, *Bukkyō daijiten*, 3rd ed. (Tokyo, 1958–1963), 212.

¹⁸ On these texts, ascribed to Ajitasena, see STRICKMANN 2002: 156–170.

¹⁹ On this later development in China, see DAVIS 2001: 126–152.

²⁰ See the edition and translation of an *Ucchuṣmānāmasādhana* by BISCHOFF (1962), who remarks that “[v]on befreundeter lamaistischer Seite wurde mir in der Mongolei gesagt, es gäbe insgesamt 37 kanonische Texte, welche mit dem *Ucchuṣmā-nāma-sādhana* zusammenhängen; Ucchuṣmā werde im populären Lamaismus als Bu rji (wohl für *rjis*) lha mo, als “Göttin Kindsfrau” verehrt, und ihr *Sādhana* zum Kinderkriegen verwendet” (BISCHOFF 1962: 207).

The description of the rites themselves (in 36,2 ff.) includes some picturesque ceremonies which should not be missing from a history of magical practices. The aims expressed there are of the familiar kind: subjugation of people of the four grades, winning a lady, causing disease, separating a victim from his family or destroying that family ...

Some of the rites described in the text are included among the so called *şaṭkarmāṇi*, ‘Six Rites of Magic’, known from various, mainly Tantric sources.²¹ The text itself, however, does not contain any direct reference to this systematization. The seemingly unparalleled set of only four of the so-called *aṅgamantras* (if the relevant passage [36.1.12–36.1.15] has been transmitted without lacuna) would also seem to suggest that this text deviates somewhat from the Tantric norm. That there exists an intimate connection between Ucchuşma and magical practices is borne out by the Śaiva and Buddhist material presented above.

The structure of the text

The *Ucchuşmakalpa* first presents mantras and general rules; then, from 36.9.1 to 36.9.24, specific mantras to be applied in rituals described in the rest of the text (cf. 36.10.1). There is much unclarity about which mantras belong with which rituals, but occasionally we have the impression that connections can be established: if *khanakhanāyeti mantraḥ* (36.24.1) covers the mantras 36.9.17–19 (starting with the mantra *khanakhanāya namaḥ svāhā*), then the following mantra 36.9.20 (where we find the epithet Alepa) may belong with 36.25.1 *upalepayet*; in the same way, one might see a connection between the word *mukha* in 36.23.1, and the epithets Mahāvakra and Piṅgalanetra in 36.9.16. Note also the topic *paśu* in 36.27.1 in connection with the mantras 36.9.21–22. Other possible connections may be seen between the epithet Trivṛt in the mantras 36.9.1–2 and the element *trivarna sarsapa* in 36.12.1, between the epithet Anivarta in the mantra 36.9.8 and the warding off (*nivartana*) of an enemy in 36.11.1, between the epithet Tīkṣṇa in the mantra 36.9.15 and the reference to *tīkṣṇa taila* in 36.16.1, and between the epithet Suvarnacūḍa in the mantra 36.9.13 and the obtainment of gold (*rukmaḥ*) in 36.21.1. On the other hand, if the latter four mantras and rituals are indeed connected, this

²¹ On the *şaṭkarmāṇi*, see GOUDRIAAN 1978: 251–412, TÜRSIG 1985: 101–108, and BÜHNEMANN 2000.

would contradict the announcement (in 36.10.1) that the actions to be performed with the quoted mantras are explained in due order (*kramaṇa*).

Embedding in the corpus

Important elements must have been borrowed from other (i.e. non-Atharvavedic) sources, and despite the fact we have found no exact correspondences between the *Ucchuṣmakalpa* and any of the extant quotations from the lost *Ucchuṣma* literature, it seems likely that our text gives a fairly faithful impression of what such lost texts as the *Ucchuṣmatantra* may have contained. But as was true of the *Pāśupatavrata*, this *Pariśiṣṭa* also does not fail to show clear marks of its solid embedding in its own corpus: the Atharvaveda is explicitly referred to as such only in 36.2.1, but (technical) terminology and plant names known only from the Atharvavedic ritual tradition are noticed throughout (*śāntāḥ* [*vr̥kṣāḥ*], *kukusa*, *tumburu*). Furthermore, it may be observed that another text included among the Atharvavedapariśiṣṭas, the *Brahmayāga* (AVPariś 19b),²² prescribes the use of the *Ucchuṣma* mantras taught here (see n. 38 below).

Newly used manuscripts

The state of the *Ucchuṣmakalpa* as edited by BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN is just as deplorable as that of AVPariś 40. While our attempts to solve the textual problems in the *Pāśupatavrata* were made without the help of any (new) mss., since completion of that work Bisschop was able to obtain the two following mss. not used by the editors, during a visit to the Oriental Institute, Vadodara, in November 2003.

- B₁ incomplete ms. ending with AVPariś 36 (Oriental Institute, Baroda/Vadodara, Acc. No. 7604 [ŚĪROMAṆI 1942: 2, Serial No. 5]); the text begins at folio 56^v l. 2, and ends on the last folio, 60^r.
- B₂ complete ms. (Oriental Institute, Baroda/Vadodara, Acc. No. 378 [ŚĪROMAṆI 1942: 2, Serial No. 4]), with AVPariś 36 between folio 49^v l. 4 and 52^r l. 3.

²² On this text, see the observations by SANDERSON 2003–04: 386, with a list of emendations in n. 131.

Griffiths collected another set of two mss. at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in May 2005.

- P₁ complete ms. (BORI, Pune, No. 462 [NAVARATHE 1994: 3–4; = BORI 44 of 1884–87]), with AVPariś 36 between folio 105^v l. 3 and 112^r l. 5. After collation, this ms. turned out to be identical to the editors’ T (BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN, p. XII), and so we have refrained from reporting variant readings of this manuscript in our notes.
- P₂ complete ms. (BORI, Pune, No. 463 [NAVARATHE 1994: 4–5; = BORI 151 of 1879–80]), with AVPariś 36 between folio 94^v l. 7 and 100^r l. 7 (there is no folio numbered 95 between 94 and 96, but this is due to a numbering lapse of the copyist — the text of this Pariśiṣṭa is complete).

Consultation of these four mss. leads to the conclusion that the BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN edition does justice to the manuscript evidence, and entirely confirms the editors’ conclusion (p. XVII) that all mss. “are derived from a single archetype”. Our three new mss. (B₁B₂P₂) give hardly any readings not reported for any of their mss. in their apparatus, but consulting them has helped us in decoding the often rather cryptic information in that (negative) apparatus, and has enabled us to identify several problematic readings in the edition as misprints. We may note that a number of variants reported for the editors’ T are shared with our B₁ and P₂.²³ In the case of the 36th Pariśiṣṭa, B₁ frequently shows agreement of reading with the editors’ B, a ms. which “[i]n some portions of the work ... shows a remarkable independence” (p. XVIII). In several cases, readings reported for this B (often found also in our B₁) provided us a clue in improving the text.²⁴ In many others, we have been forced to go beyond the manuscript evidence and resort to conjectural emendation to make sense of the practice under study here.

²³ Cf. e.g. our n. 101 *ad* 36.9.3, n. 118 *ad* 36.10.3, and n. 162 *ad* 36.27.1 below.

²⁴ The conclusion reached on the basis of this Pariśiṣṭa might seem to disagree with our impression voiced in 2003 (p. 325), although for AVPariś 40, the editors’ B ms. was only very partially available. Note however the editors’ remark (p. XVII): “the nature of the work renders it probable that the relationship [between the mss.] should vary in various Pariśiṣṭas, and to some extent this expectation is verified”.

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

- 1.1 *om nama ucchuṣmebhyaḥ*
Om. Homage to the Ucchuṣmas!
- 1.2 *ucchuṣmāṇām²⁵ śikhāṃ devīm prapadye śaṃkarāyaṇīm |*
sarvārthasādhanīm vibhvīm sarveśīm brahmacāriṇīm ||
I resort to the crest of the Ucchuṣmas, the Goddess Śaṃkarāyaṇī,²⁶ who fulfills all aims, the chaste mistress who rules over all.
- 1.3 *te iṣṭakākārarālam aticaturmukham || caturvidhais tu*
*rūpaṃ dhyānam || ...*²⁷
- 1.4 *śive jaṭile brahmacāriṇi stambhani jambhani mohani huṃ*
phaṭ namaḥ svāhā ||
O gracious one, O hairy one, O chaste one, O paralyzer, O crusher, O deluder!²⁸ Hum! Phaṭ! Homage! Hail!
- 1.5 *ātmarakṣā ||*
[Thus]²⁹ the self-protection.

²⁵ The first four syllables are lost, and consequently the edition is metrically deficient. We conjecture *ucchuṣmāṇām*, the loss of which can be explained by eye-skip: *ucchuṣmebhyaḥ* ← *ucchuṣmāṇām*. Although one might also take *ucchuṣmāṇām* as fem. pl., in our reconstruction, the goddess referred to in pāda a is in fact a mantra, viz. the (*ucchuṣma*)*śikhā*, so we understand *ucchuṣmāṇām* [*mantrāṇām*]. This Śikhāmantra is given in 36.1.4 (cf. our note 34 ad 36.1.13). Another option would be to emend to *tām ucchuṣmaśikhāṃ devīm*, but in that case the eye-skip is more difficult to explain.

²⁶ We know of no other occurrence of this name. If its formation, with the *āyana* suffix, is taken at face value, we must understand something like ‘she, of Śaṅkara’s lineage’. Absence of *vṛddhi* in the first syllable is rare, but may be compared with *Piṅgalāyaṇī*, found in Buddhist Sanskrit.

²⁷ The text is evidently corrupt. Some words (*iṣṭakā* and *karāla*) recur in 36.9.3–4 below. The text seems to refer to four (*caturvidha*) forms of the deity, and considering the occurrence of the word *karāla*, we may speculate that this passage originally contained a reference to the four female deities Raktā, Karālā, Caṇḍākṣī and Ucchuṣmā: see p. 3 above (it is noteworthy that these four deities play an important role in the system of the *Picumata*, a text which calls itself *Ucchuṣmatantra*, apparently identifying itself as a recension of or supplement to it, cf. GOUDRIAAN 1981: 42–43).

²⁸ Concerning the names in this mantra, particularly *Stambhanī*, *Jambhanī* and *Mohanī*, see GOUDRIAAN 1978: 271, “Goddesses of fearsome figure which symbolize magical actions”.

²⁹ That 36.1.5 concludes the preceding passage and does not point forward follows from our interpretation of 36.2.3.

- 1.6 *prācyāṃ diśīndro rājā devānām ādhipatyam kurute | taṃ devaṃ bhagavantaṃ saganam sānucaram saparivāram saśirāḥ praṇipatya vijñāpayati | vajreṇa praharaṇemām diśam vidiśam ca sarvakalikaluṣam aśubham praśamayam namaḥ svāhā* ³⁰
 In the eastern direction King Indra establishes his sovereignty over the gods. That Lord-God together with his attendants, servants and followers, he requests, by prostrating with his head to him: ‘Throughout this direction and the intermediate direction, pacify all inauspicious foulness of the Kali [age], by striking with your cudgel. Om. Homage! Hail!’.
- 1.7 *dakṣiṇasyāṃ diśi yamo rājā pretānām ādhipatyam iti | daṇḍena praharaṇeneti* ||
 In the southern direction King Yama [establishes his] sovereignty over the deceased: ‘[...] by striking with your staff [...]’.
- 1.8 *pratīcyāṃ diśi varuṇo rājāpām ādhipatyam iti | pāśena praharaṇeneti* ||
 In the western direction King Varuṇa [establishes his] sovereignty over the waters: ‘[...] by striking with your noose [...]’.
- 1.9 *udīcyāṃ diśi kubero rājā yakṣāṇām ādhipatyam iti | gadayā praharaṇeneti* ||
 In the northern direction King Kubera [establishes his] sovereignty over the Yakṣas: ‘[...] by striking with your club [...]’.
- 1.10 *dhruvāyāṃ diśi vāsukī rājā nāgānām ādhipatyam iti | daṃṣṭrayā praharaṇeneti* ||
 In the fixed/lower direction King Vāsuki [establishes his] sovereignty over the Nāgas: ‘[...] by striking with your fang [...]’.
- 1.11 *ūrdhvāyāṃ diśi somo rājā nakṣatrāṇām ādhipatyam kurute | taṃ devaṃ bhagavantaṃ saganam sānucaram saparivāram*

³⁰ Now begins the *digbandha*, see our n. 41 *ad* 36.2.3 below.

*saśirāḥ pranipaty vijñāpayati | tejasā praharaṇenemāṃ
diśaṃ vidiśaṃ ca sarvakalikaluṣaṃ aśubhaṃ praśamayom
namaḥ svāhā ||*

In the upper direction King Soma establishes his sovereignty over the asterisms. That Lord-God together with his attendants, servants and followers, he requests, by prostrating with his head to him: ‘Throughout this direction and the intermediate direction, pacify all inauspicious foulness of the Kali [age], by striking with your splendor.³¹ Om. Homage! Hail!’.

1.12 *athocchuṣmahṛdayam || dyuru dyuru dara dara vidāraya
vidāraya mili mili namaḥ svāhā ||*

Now the heart³² of the Ucchuṣmas: ‘*dyuru dyuru dara dara vidāraya vidāraya mili mili.*³³ Homage! Hail!’.

1.13 *ucchuṣmaśikhā || śive jaṭila iti*³⁴ ||

³¹ Presumably this refers to the light of the moon. About the association between the six directions and six different regents in 36.1.6–11, in the context of *digbandha* (see our n. 41 *ad* 36.2.3), cf. GOUDRIAAN 1978: 270. We have found no exact parallel for the sixfold pairing:

East	South	West	North	Nadir	Zenith
Indra	Yama	Varuṇa	Kubera	Vāsuki	Soma

On the whole, it makes a considerably more orthodox (un-Śaiva, un-Tantric) impression than the classifications referred to by GOUDRIAAN. EINOØ’s recent article is based on a large number of such lists of Dikpālas: he knows our present list (2005: 118, n. 39), but has seemingly found no exact parallel either. The first four members of our list agree with the members of the last fourfold list taken by EINOØ (p. 112) from Hopkins’ *Epic Mythology* (p. 152). See EINOØ’s n. 26 for references to further literature, to which we add BODEWITZ 2000, and WESSELS-MEVISSSEN 2001. The latter work, with its clear tables and elaborate references, demonstrates how Vāsuki/Ananta intrudes in the Nadir position (see table VI, and the accompanying text on p. 11) in pseudo-Vedic texts of the same type as the Atharvavedic *Paśiṣṭas*, while Soma’s positioning in the Zenith seems to be unknown elsewhere.

³² The passage 36.1.12–15 mentions four mantras whose names are identical with four of the five or six ‘limb-mantras’ (*aṅgamantras*) of Tantric Śaivism: Hṛdaya, Śikhā, Kavaca, Astra, Śīras and (in some sources) Netra; cf. TAK I, s.v. *aṅga* and *aṅgamantra*, and GOODALL 2004: 223, n. 288. These mantras may include a *bīja* (formed with the long vowels *ā, ī, ū, ai, au*), but there are also other ways of forming them (cf. BRUNNER 1986 and GOUDRIAAN 1978: 72–73). However, the form found here (ending with the element *namaḥ svāhā* that is applied to all mantras in this text), does not seem to be attested elsewhere (but cf. the application of these exclamations in *bodhana* as enjoined by the *Ucchuṣmatantra*, in the quotation from that text discussed above, p. 4).

³³ Elements of this mantra are attested elsewhere (e.g. in the *Agni-* and *Garuḍapurāṇa*), but we find no parallel for this precise sequence of words/sounds.

³⁴ The words *śive jaṭila iti* are a *pratīka* for the Śikhāmantra given in 36.1.4 above. The edi-

The crest of the Ucchuṣmas: ‘O gracious one, O you with matted hair!’.

- 1.14 *prathama prathama*³⁵ *kuru kuru muru muru mahā muñca mahā muñca vidu vidu namaḥ svāhā* || *iti kavacam* ||
 ‘*prathama prathama kuru kuru muru muru mahā muñca mahā muñca vidu vidu*. Homage! Hail!’. This is the cuirass.
- 1.15 *oṃ namo mahāpiṅgalāya*³⁶ *siṃhanādanādine namaḥ svāhā* || *ity astramantraḥ* ||
 ‘Om. Homage to the great yellow one, who roars the lion’s roar! Homage! Hail!’. This is the weapon mantra.
- 2.1 *eṣāṃ ucchuṣmarudrāṅām ataḥ kalpo nigadyate* | *atharvavedodbhavānām tithirḥṣādyayogataḥ*³⁷ ||

tion adds *prathamah* || after this *iti*, which makes no sense. We have omitted the word here, because we consider it to be a corruption of the beginning of the following mantra.

³⁵ As noted just above, the edition reads *prathamah* after the *iti* of the preceding mantra; it starts 1.14 with *kuru kuru*, but there can be no doubt that the text originally intended *kuru kuru* to be preceded by *prathama prathama*, which was written as ‘*prathama 2*’ (cf. the editors’ apparatus to *khaṇḍikā* 9, p. 231), and that the ‘2’ was lost during the transmission, with the *visarga* added afterwards, or that the ‘2’ was misread as *visarga*. This hypothesis is strengthened by the readings of ACDE which drop the *visarga*. For *prathama prathama* we can adduce a few instances from the *Niśvāsaguhya*, which indeed writes ‘*prathama 2*’ (f. 76^r ll. 5–6; f. 83^r ll. 3–4; f. 86^v l. 3). Shingo Einoo has suggested to us the possibility (supported by a few other Tantric texts) of emending *prathama prathama* to *pramatha pramatha*, assuming metaphysics of *ma* and *tha*. However, because of the *Niśvāsaguhya* passages we consider it likely that *prathama prathama* is intended here. We may note that our ms. B₁ reads *praśamaṃ* instead of *prathamah*, which is also interpretable, but certainly secondary.

³⁶ Cf. 36.9.1 below. Regarding the Rudra-epithet Piṅgala, cf. BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003: 336 n. 112. In his annotation on *Parākhyatantra* 3.74–75, GOODALL (2004: 222f. n. 288) discusses a set of names referring to the *aṅgamantras*, different from the more common names Śikhā etc.: Sarvātman, Suśiva, Jvālīnī, Piṅgala and Ghorāstra. These Mantra-names are explicitly identified with the names of the *aṅgamantras* in MatPĀ *vidyāpāda* 7.27–28b, where Piṅgala is identified with the Kavaca: *kavacaṃ piṅgalaṃ mahat*. The name Mahādīpta, on the other hand, is there considered to refer to the Astra-mantra (*śivāstraṃ ca mahādīptam*), so it is hard to establish a connection with the name Mahāpiṅgala occurring in the present Astra-mantra.

³⁷ We adopt the reading of B₁B₂P₂. The edition reads °*rksādyayogataḥ* which is certainly just a misprint.

Now the practice involving these Ucchuṣmarudras,³⁸ who spring from the Atharvaveda,³⁹ is recited, regardless of whether lunar day and Pleiades etc. are appropriate.⁴⁰

2.2 *grāme vāthāpy aranye vā pracareta yathāvidhi |
sadyaḥsiddhikarā hy ete ucchuṣmāḥ parikṛititāḥ ||*

³⁸ We presume these Rudras to be the *aṅgamantras* just mentioned in the preceding passage, but it is also possible that they are the mantras given in khaṇḍikā 9 (cf. 10.1). On the fact that the Ucchuṣmas represent a standard group of mantras, cf. AVParīś 19b.4.1 *homayet kutsasūktena ucchuṣmaīs ca yathāvidhi | japeṇ mantrān tathāyusyaṅ maṅgalyāṃś cāpi yatnataḥ* ‘He should offer with the Kutsa-hymn and with the Ucchuṣmas, according to the precept. He should also mutter the Āyusya- and the Maṅgalya-mantras with effort’. The *kutsasūkta* might (as suggested in BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN’S Index 1b, p. 559) be identical to the *kautsa* (hymn), whose use is enjoined at 42.2.10 among *adhyātma* hymns in the Snānavidhi. At ManuSm 11.250 (*kautsaṃ japtvāpa ity etad*), the pratīka indicates that ṚV 1.97 is intended (see also BÜHLER 1886: 480, with footnote). The AV parallel of that hymn, AV(Ś) 4.33, however, is attributed by the AVBSA to Brahmā as Ṛṣi and is in the KauśS (36.22, 42.22, 82.4) technically referred to as *apāgham*. The AVBSA attributes AV(Ś) 10.8, a mystical hymn, to the seer Kutsa. It seems slightly more likely that the *kutsasūkta* intended here is the same as the KauśS’s *apāgha*. — The Āyusyas are listed at AVParīś 32.9, but which mantras were intended with *maṅgalyas* is not clear to us.

³⁹ As to the qualification *atharvavedodbhava*, we could on the one hand imagine this is a mere attempt to incorporate these Rudras into the Atharvavedic tradition and hence to claim authority for this tradition in dealing with them. On the other hand, we must note the existence of a class called *atharvarudras* in NiGu f. 55’ l. 4, where they are said to be living in the town Ratnavatī in the sixth Pātāla. We do not know these *atharvarudras* from any other source. The same chapter 5 of the *Niśvāsaḡuhyasūtra*, which contains a list of the seven Pātālas with their towns and regents, locates two Ucchuṣmarudras (or Ucchuṣma and Rudra?) in the town Ucchuṣmā in the first Pātāla (NiGu f. 54’ l. 6 through f. 55’ l. 1): *āyāsī prathamā bhūmi[h] purī bhasma[vatī ...] | [(dhanam)]jalyasya nāḡasya tathā ucchuṣmarudrayoh | ucchuṣmeti purī khyātā āyāsī harma[read harmya]mālinī |* ‘The first world is made of metal. The city Bhasmavatī [there] belongs to the serpent Dhanamjaya. And the two Ucchuṣmarudras / Ucchuṣma and Rudra have the city of metal called Ucchuṣmā, garlanded with palaces’ (the readings between brackets are supplemented from the Kathmandu apograph). See, finally, also our discussion of the, in a sense, ‘Atharvavedic’ origin of the name Ucchuṣma (p. 2).

⁴⁰ On this type of indication dealing with the proper time for the execution of magical acts, cf. GOUDRIAAN 1978: 277. We owe our interpretation of *ayogatas* to Alexis Sander-son, who clarifies that this statement means that the practice is so powerful that its success is not dependent on any of the conditions that normally apply. A similar statement occurs in the preface of the preceding Parīśiṣṭa, the *Āsurīkalpa* (AVParīś 35.1.4): *athāta āsurīkalpaṃ upadeśād atharvāṇaḥ | nāsyās tithir na nakṣatraṃ nopavāso vidhīyate ||* ‘Now then the *Āsurīkalpa* following the teaching of Atharvan: for this [Āsurī], no [specific] lunar day, no [specific] constellation, no fasting is enjoined’. There are many parallels for such statements. Cf., e.g., AVParīś 2.5.5 *na tithir na ca nakṣatraṃ na graho na ca candramāḥ | atharvamantrasaṃprāptīyā sarvasiddhir bhaviṣyati ||* and Tantrāloka 29.65 *na tithir na ca nakṣatraṃ nopavāso vidhīyate | grāmyadharmarataḥ siddhyet sarvadā smaraṇena hi ||*

He should perform it in the village or also in the wilderness, in accordance with the rules: these Ucchuṣmas are renowned for bringing immediate success.

- 2.3 *ātmarakṣāṃ diśāṃ bandhaṃ śikhābandhaṃ ca sarvadā |
etair eva yathāyogam ādau kuryād vicakṣaṇaḥ ||*
At the beginning the wise should always conduct the self-protection, the tying up of the directions and the tying up of the crest⁴¹ with these [Ucchuṣmas], as is appropriate.
- 2.4 *khadirasyodumbarasya tathā bilvapalāśayoḥ |
dadhisarpirmadhuyujāṃ śāntānāṃ vāpi bilvataḥ ||*
Of Khadira, of Udumbara and of Bilva and Palāśa, or of the auspicious kinds of wood [which come] after Bilva⁴² [if they are] joined with curd, butter and honey,
- 2.5 *samitsahasratritayaṃ hutvā śāntir gavāṃ bhavet |
tikṣṇāsr̥gviṣayuktānāṃ phat̥kāraś ca vināśane ||*
he should offer three thousand pieces of fuel, and the pacification of cattle will result. In [a rite of] destruction [he should offer the same amount of those kinds of wood] joined

⁴¹ The three items listed seem to refer to the contents respectively of 36.1.1–4 (*ātmarakṣā*), 36.1.5–11 (*digbandha*) and 36.1.12–15 (four *aṅgamantras*, one of which is the Śikhā, i.e. *śikhābandha*?). For *ātmarakṣā*, cf. NiGu f. 84^r l. 3 (to drive away evils), f. 112^r l. 5 (cf. also n. 148 *ad* 36.23.1 below), and AgnP 133.29cd. For *digbandha*, cf. NiGu f. 97^r l. 5 *loṣṭubhiḥ diśābandhaṃ karoti*; f. 101^r l. 1; 112^r l. 5; AgnP 22.3d; VīnT 68–69 (for purification). On the rite of *digbandha* in a Balinese context, see GOUDRIAAN & HOOYKAAS 1971: 579, s.v. *digbandha*. For *śikhābandha*, tying up of the knot accompanied by the recitation of the (*śikhā*) mantra, cf. e.g. AgnP 123.25ab (*anenaiva tu manreṇa śikhābandhādikr̥j jaye*); AgnP 258.30cd; SvachT 3.204b; VDhP 2.124.35ab; HC p. 50, l. 25–26 *kusumaśekharasañcāribhiḥ kriyamāṇamantraśikhābandhā iva guñjadbhiḥ ṣaṭcaraṇaiḥ* ‘whose tying up of the crests was performed with mantras as it were by the humming bees, roaming around the crowns of flowers [on top of their heads]’.

⁴² Our interpretation is based on the assumption that the verse presupposes knowledge of the list of ‘auspicious’ (*śānta*) trees given at KauśS 8.15: *palāśa-udumbara-jambu-kāmpīla-srag-vaṅgha-sīrīṣa-sraktiya-varaṇa-bilva-jaṅgiḍa-kuṭaka-garhya-galāvala-vetasa-śimbala-sipuna-syandana-araṇikā-aśmayokta-tuṅyu-pūtudāraṇaḥ śāntāḥ*. We do not find *khadira* in this list, but its use as fuel is enjoined with protective/pacifactory force at KauśS 16.14 and 25.23 — twice as part of different lists showing no overlap with each other, with the list at KauśS 8.15, or with our present list, besides containing *khadira*, but the list at 25.23 does immediately follow employment of the same *śāntāḥ* in 25.20.

with mustard,⁴³ blood and poison, and [make] the sound ‘Phat’.⁴⁴

- 2.6 *prayogād apy asiddhiś cet tat*⁴⁵ *karmedaṃ samārabhet | ucchuṣmarūpī bhakṣayaṃś tīkṣṇasaktūdakāni*⁴⁶ *tu ||*
 And if there is no success resulting even from the performance/application [of this rite], then he should take up this act [again]:⁴⁷ he [should become one who] has the form of an Ucchuṣma,⁴⁸ consuming mustard- and barley-water.⁴⁹

⁴³ We adopt this interpretation of *tīkṣṇa* here on the basis of our interpretation of this word in the compound *tīkṣṇataila* at 36.16.1, as explained below in n. 133. Taking *tīkṣṇa* here as first member of a dvandva compound, and as denoting mustard, is supported by certain parallels pointed out to us by Harunaga Isaacson: VDhP 2.125.32cd *samidbhis tu rājikāśṛgviṣais*, and VīṅT 155c *rājikāviṣarakāktam ... homam*. Cf. MAGOUN 1889: 7 on the identification of *rājikā* as black mustard.

⁴⁴ Cf. AVParīś 40.2.8, BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003: 331 (with n. 84). Cf. GOUDRIAAN 1978: 73f. on the exclamatory *phat*. For the element *śṛgviṣayukta*, cf. AgnP 313.11 *kajjalam nimbani-ryyāsamajjāsṛgviṣasamyutam | kākapaḥṣasya lekhanīyā śmaśāne vā catuspāthe ||* ‘[He should use] ink mixed with the juice/resin of the Neem tree, with marrow, with blood and with poison, using a plume from the wing of a crow, at a cremation ground or at a cross-roads’.

⁴⁵ The editors take *tat* together with *karmedaṃ*, but sequences *cet tat* are very common in the meaning ‘if ... then’, and it is hard to make sense out of a compound *tatkarman* in this context.

⁴⁶ The edition reads *tīkṣṇaḥ saktūdakāni* (thus also our mss.), but we emend after the model of *tīkṣṇāśṛgviṣa-* in the preceding verse.

⁴⁷ It seems that *karmedaṃ* announces the rite described in khaṇḍikā 3, while presumably the ritual described in 36.3.1–2 is another means of assuring success. Note the connection between releasing impure excreta (36.3.1) and the ‘form of an Ucchuṣma’ in this ritual, a connection also evident in Buddhist sources on the nature of Ucchuṣma(s). See above, pp. 5f.

⁴⁸ Cf. pp. 5f. above, on what the ‘form of an Ucchuṣma’ may have been.

⁴⁹ The compound *saktūdaka* is only very rarely attested elsewhere, and we are not sure precisely what kind of water it denotes. That this kind of water was surrounded with specific taboos is clear, however, from VādhŚS 14.3.12–15 (rules for the Yajamāna during the Agniṣtoma): *tayā sarpiṛyūṣayāśnīyān, na saktūdakaṃ pibed, udaśvid dhaiva pibet, saktūn vādhyasyanna* (read *vādhyasyan na*) *śalākābhyāṃ mantham upamathya pibet* ‘He should eat with that [...] boiled in butter, he should not drink barley-water, he should only drink [pure] water-and-buttermilk (*udaśvit*), or [drink it] while sprinkling [coarsely ground and roasted] barley grains on top. But he should not drink it after stirring it up into a mixed-beverage (*mantha*)’. This is to be compared with Keśava’s *Kauśikapaddhati*, p. 23 (on KauśS 7.7 *manthaudanaṃ prayacchati*): *saktūdakaṃ dviśalākayā samidhā mathitaṃ mantha ity ucyate* (cf. also p. 134 on KauśS 27.9–11, to cure someone of thirst; p. 221 on KauśS 43.20, *kravyācchamanavidhāna*). NiGu f. 99° l. 4, prescribes consumption of the same water in a ritual to obtain almighty power: *udakasaktavāhāraḥ śatasahasraṃ japet mahad aiśvaryaṃ bhavati* ‘Consuming barley-water, he should mutter [the mantra] a hundred thousand times: great sovereignty arises’. Although *udakasaktavāhāraḥ* might seem to be in need of repair, it is probably to be taken as an Aiśa compound, as is suggested by its recurrence in NiGu f. 100° l. 5: *udakasaktavāhāraḥ śatasahasraṃ japet, sāmantarājyaṃ prayacchati*. We

- 3.1 *abhīṣṭām vā striyaṃ gatvā dhyātvā vā retam*⁵⁰ *utsrjet |*
mūtram purīṣaṃ cotsrjya gokāṅkālādhirohaṇam ||
 Either having gone to a desired woman, or having thought [of her], he should emit semen. After [also] emitting urine and faeces, he should perform⁵¹ the mounting of a cow's skeleton,⁵²
- 3.2 *kṛtvā mantraṃ niśi japed yāvad gośṛṅgataś caret |*
jvālābhaṅgaṃ tatas tasya karmasiddhiṃ samādiśet ||
 he should mutter the mantra⁵³ at night, and he should walk up to the cow's horn. The curve of the flame⁵⁴ will then announce to him the success of the ritual.⁵⁵
- 3.3 *dadhimadhughṛtāktānām iti śeṣaḥ ||*⁵⁶

assume that *prayacchati* here is an Aiśa passive form: 'complete sovereignty is given in return'. Cf. finally the consumption of *udakasaktu* to obtain the power of magical disappearance (*kṣipram antardhīyate*) at BaudhDhS 3.7.19 / JaimGS 2.8.

- ⁵⁰ The edition has *reta*, a reading supported by only one of the editors' manuscripts (V). We adopt the Aiśa *a*-stem (or hiatus-breaking *m*), found in ACDETU (B has *retum*) and in our manuscripts B₁B₂P₂.
- ⁵¹ We take 36.3.1 and 36.3.2 together, and hence construe *gokāṅkālādhirohaṇam* with *kṛtvā*. Many parallels can be adduced for the pairing of a specific ritual (... *kṛtvā*) with the instruction to mutter a mantra: to mention just one example, NiGu f. 95^r l. 5 *devasya mahatīm pūjāṃ kṛtvā mantrasyāṣṭasahasraṃ japed tataḥ siddho bhavati* 'After performing the great worship of God, he should mutter the Mantra a thousand-and-eight times; he then becomes successful'.
- ⁵² The compound *gokāṅkāla* seems to be a hapax.
- ⁵³ We are not sure which mantra is intended here, and do not know why MODAK (as quoted in n. 54) suggests 36.1.13.
- ⁵⁴ For *ābhaṅga* in this sense, cf. e.g. *Abhijñānaśākuntala* 1.7, *grīvābhaṅgābhirāmaṃ* 'gracefully bending its neck'. See also APTe s.v. *ābhaṅgam*. One might consider dividing the compound as *jvālā/jvāla-abhaṅga* 'the non-extinction of the flame'. MODAK (1993: 320) interprets still differently: "One should recite the spell (36.1.13) at night, having stepped over the skeleton of a cow and should move up to the horns. The breaking out of flames would then indicate success in the task". We consider it more likely that the practitioner actually carries a flame in his hand — it is night after all — while he is performing the ritual, and that the curve of the flame produced during this act indicates his success. Or, alternatively, that some kind of fire was still in use during this particular nightly rite, and that a 'curve' in its flames is intended. Cf. e.g. AVParīś 70c.25.5, where the flame of a sacrificial fire moving around clockwise (*pradakṣiṇagatiḥ śrīmān agniḥ*) indicates a king's victory.
- ⁵⁵ MODAK (1993: 320) interprets the preceding as a ritual "to win over the heart of a woman", which seems unlikely to be correct.
- ⁵⁶ Thus also B₁B₂P₂. The apparatus states (p. 230): "A variant to 2.3^c", but the words *iti śeṣaḥ* (as opposed to *iti pāthaḥ*) rather suggest we have to do with a marginal annotation that has crept into the text. It may have been intended to explain that the flame referred to in 36.3.2c

- 4.1 *saptakṣīrāñjaligrāsaḥ sruvo hy asmin praśasyate |
kṣīraṃ tenātha juhuyād dhanakāmasya nityasaḥ ||*
[The use] during this [practice],⁵⁷ [of] a spoon containing
seven handfuls of milk is praised. And he should always
offer milk with it for one who desires wealth.
- 4.2 *ghṛtena tejaskāmasya āyuhkāmasya dūrvayā |
kukusaṃ tumburuṃ⁵⁸ vāpi vidyād uccātakarmaṇi ||*
[He should offer] with ghee for one who desires energy,
with Dūrvā grass for one who desires a [full] life-span, and
in the rite of eradication,⁵⁹ he should know [that] Kukusa⁶⁰
or Tumburu [is to be used].⁶¹
- 5.1 *brāhmaṇaṃ tu vaśīkartuṃ śālīpiṣṭamayīm tanuṃ |
kṛtvā catuṣpathaṃ gatvā gṛhītvā śastraṃ uttamam ||*
But to subjugate a brahmin, he should make a body⁶² out of
rice-flour, go to a crossroads, take an excellent sword,

(*jvālābhaṅgam*) should be ‘of [firewood] smeared with curd, honey and ghee’.

⁵⁷ We assume this still refers to the *kalpa* introduced in 36.2.1, presumably the same *Ucchuṣmakalpa* under which name the entire text has been transmitted.

⁵⁸ We emend *tumburuṃ* for transmitted *tuṃbaraṃ* (thus also B₁B₂P₂). On our reasons for assuming that *tuṃbaraṃ* is an error which has crept into the transmission of the AVParīś probably under the influence of one KauśS passage (where nearly all mss. show the same mistake), see GRIFFITHS 2004–05: 256 n. 19.

⁵⁹ For a discussion of this rite, cf. GOUDRIAAN 1978: 351–364.

⁶⁰ There are small variants for this name in the mss. (B [crit. app. under 36.5.1], B₁ *kukkusaṃ*; CTUV *kukrusaṃ* [also P₂]). We don’t know any other attestations of the plant name *kukusa* than the one in Dārila’s *Kauśikabhāṣya* (119:9 on 42.20, wrongly emended to *kukūla* by the editors, DIWEKAR et al. — see also their note on p. 40 of Appendix A) and the two in Keśava’s *Kauśikapaddhati* (LIMAYE et al., pp. 113, 216 [2 times]).

⁶¹ The verse partly agrees with AVParīś 26.5.3–4: *kakubhaṃ katabhaṃ vṛkṣaṃ kauvirālaṃ tu kauhakam | vaṃśaṃ vibhūtaṃ śigruṃ vidyād uccātane hitān || stambhane sarvasainyānām vijayārthe jayaṃ diṣet | apāmārgaṇa saubhāgyam āyuskāmo hi dūrvayā ||* ‘One should know that the *kakubha*, the *katabha*, the *kauvirāla*, and also the *kauhaka* tree, (further) the bamboo-cane (*vaṃśa*), the *vibhūta* and the *śigru* tree, are suitable (in a ceremony) for ruining an adversary (*uccātana*). In a ceremony which aims to paralyse (*stambhana*) the whole army one should designate the *jaya* plant for the sake of victory (*vijaya*); by means of the *apāmārga* plant one gets welfare (*saubhāgya*) and he who is desirous of a full length of life (*āyuskāma*), (will get it) by means of *dūrva* [*sic*] grass’ (transl. VAN DEN BOSCH).

⁶² On the use of images in the context of *vaśīkaraṇa* and rules for the use of different materials in accordance with the grade of society the victim in question belongs to, cf. SVidhB 2.5, referred to in GOUDRIAAN 1978: 293. As is the case here, the *Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa* ritual involves cutting the image of the victim into pieces (GOUDRIAAN 1978: 223, 314–315).

5.2 *aṣṭottarasahasreṇa kṛtvā tad abhimantritam*⁶³ |
aṣṭāṅgaṃ tena tāṃ chittvā mantrato vaśam ānayet ||
 perform its incantation with a thousand and eight mantras,
 cut that [body] into eight parts with that [sword], and lead
 him to subjugation from the mantra.

5.3 *aṣṭottarasahasraṃ vā ākṛter*⁶⁴ *juhuyād budhaḥ* |
brāhmaṇīm tu vaśīkartuṃ kuryān māśamayīm tanuṃ ||
 Or the wise man may offer a thousand and eight [oblations]
 of the image. And to gain power over a female brahmin he
 should make the body of beans.

6.1 *sarpirdadhimadhvaktānām*⁶⁵ *lājānām āhutīḥ śubhāḥ* |

⁶³ The editors emend to a compound *tadabhimantraṇam*, which is unnecessary. All the manuscripts either read exactly, or support the reading *tadabhimantritam*.

⁶⁴ The edition reads *prakṛte*, which can hardly be correct. BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN report *prakṛter* for their mss. ABE, which is also the reading of our B₂ (B₁ and P₂ read *prakṛte*). A corruption *ākṛter* → *prakṛter* is easily explained graphically, and was here possibly induced by the absence of sandhi over the pāda boundary. Our conjecture is supported by a similar passage in AVParīś 35.1.6–7, where we find: *hantukāmo hi śatrūṅ ca vaśīkurvan ca bhūpatīn | āsurīślakṣṇapīṣṭājyaṃ juhuyād ākṛtiṃ budhaḥ || arkendhanāgnīm prajvālya chittvāstrenākṛtiṃ tu tāṃ | pādāgrato 'ṣṭasahasraṃ juhuyād yasya vaśy asau ||* ‘The wise man, desiring indeed to kill [his] enemies and to subjugate kings, may offer an image made of [a mixture of] black mustard, fine flour and ghee. Having stoked up a fire kindled with wood of the Arka-plant (cf. also 36.22.1 below, with n. 146), he should cut that image with a sword and offer [the image that he has cut up, starting] from the tips of its feet a thousand-and-eight times. He becomes the master of the one whose [image has been treated thus]’ (the reading *°piṣṭājyaṃ* is problematic, and the editors (p. 218) suggest *°piṣṭiyām* or *°piṣṭasya*, while it seems to us that *°piṣṭājyām* would also be a possibility). There are parallels for similar rituals involving oblations from an image cut into pieces. GOUDRIAAN 1978: 324 refers to AgnP 260.8: *sarvavṛihimayīm kṛtvā rājñāḥ pratikṛtiṃ dvija | sahasraśas tu juhuyād rājā vaśagato bhavet ||* ‘One should make an image of the king consisting completely of rice grains and make an oblation of it by means of a thousand pieces; and the king will come under one’s power’ (transl. GOUDRIAAN). Quite a few instances of such a practice of *vaśīkaraṇa* are recorded in the 14th chapter of the *Niśvāsaguhyā*: e.g. f. 96^v ll. 4–5, *atha lavanamayīm pratikṛtiṃ kṛtvā *rudhireṇābhyaḥ* (em.: *rudhire[]bhyaḥ* ms.) *tikṣṇasastrenōtkṛtya pādau prabhṛti sthūtvāṣṭasahasraṃ *juhuyāt striyāḥ* (em.: *juhuyā striyā* ms.) *puruṣasya vā sa vaśyo bhavati* ‘Then he should make an image of salt, anoint it with blood, cut up [the image] with a sharp sword, starting with the feet, and offer a thousand-and-eight oblations, standing still. He becomes the master of a man or a woman’.

⁶⁵ In spite of the fact that this pāda is metrically poor (a bad *ma-vipulā*), we accept the emendation of the editors. It is supported by their ms. B (*sarpirdadhimadhvaktānām*). The reading of all their other mss. (ACDETUV: *sarpirdadhimadhūktānām*; thus also our B₂; *sarpipir*^o B₁; *sarpirmardahi*^o P₂) makes no sense and may have arisen precisely because the irregular metre was felt to be problematic (cf. also our n. 67 below). For the expression *sarpirdadhimadhvaktā*, cf. AVParīś 35.2.5c *sarpirdadhimadhvaktapattṛāṇām* (hypermetrical), where the editors in a note likewise suggest reading *sarpirdadhimadhvaktānām*.

kanyākāmo 'ṣtasahasraṃ hutvā kanyām avāpnuyāt ||
One who desires a girl should offer a thousand and eight⁶⁶
auspicious oblations of parched grains anointed with butter,
curd and honey, and he will obtain the girl.

6.2 *api vā juhuyāt piṣṭamayyāḥ prāksamkhyayāhutīḥ* |⁶⁷
*darbheṣīkām vābhimantrya*⁶⁸ *tadgṛhe niṣcalām nyaset* ||
Or else⁶⁹ he should offer oblations of the [body] made of
flour, in accordance with the previous number. Or he should
perform the incantation over a stalk of Darbha, and put it
down motionless in her⁷⁰ house.

6.3 *tāvad udvejayet sā tu vajrabhūtā hi tadgṛham* |
*kanyāyāḥ sādhanīyāyā*⁷¹ *yāval lābhas tato bhavet* ||
So long that [stalk], as a veritable cudgel, should cause her
house to shake,⁷² until thereupon the attainment of the girl
who is to be won over takes place.

7.1 *pradhānam anyam vā kaṃ cid*⁷³ *vaśīkartuṃ narottamam*⁷⁴ |

⁶⁶ Cf. our notes on 36.10.1.

⁶⁷ We follow the reading of all mss. (including our B₁B₂P₂). The edition reads *api vā piṣṭamayyāḥ prāg juhuyāt samdhyayāhutīḥ*. The editors felt compelled to correct the transmitted reading caesurae causa (p. 230), and apparently (consequently?) also saw reason to emend *samkhyayā* to *samdhyayā*. We agree with neither alteration. The metrical infelicity of the transmitted reading is not greater than what we find also elsewhere in the corpus of AV *Parīśiṣṭas* (in the present text, e.g. 8.3a, 10.1c [=11.1c], 16.1ab, 28.1ab [plus perhaps 27.1a, 29.1a] — see also KEITH 1912: 757–772, esp. 762 and 769, MODAK 1993: 486–470).

⁶⁸ Should we emend to *cābhimantrya*?

⁶⁹ On the semantic nuances which the turn of phrase *api vā* sometimes expresses in Vedic sūtra literature, see SPROCKHOFF 1999. We do not assume the author of our text chose specifically these words for more than metrical considerations.

⁷⁰ Probably this is what is meant, cf. the next verse.

⁷¹ The editors print *sādhan* <īy>āyās [tu]. They presumably mean to indicate that they add *īy* and propose to omit *tu*. This conjecture receives some support from B₁ *sādhanīyo stu*, while B₂ and P₂ read *sādhanāyās tu*, which is probably also the reading of the manuscripts to which the editors had access. However, the editors' conjecture leaves unsolved the problem that *-s* before *y-* is impossible, so we are forced to take it one step further, by omitting not only *tu* but *stu*. A more far-reaching alternative would be to read *sādhanīyāyās tāval* here, and *yāvad* at the beginning of the verse.

⁷² GOUDRIAAN (1978: 357) speaks of “causing upheaval” and refers to this passage, seemingly taking the girl as object of *udvejayet*.

⁷³ *kaṃ cid*: em. The edition and our three additional mss. read *kiṃ cid*.

⁷⁴ According to the apparatus, only V has this reading, but we also find it in our B₁ and B₂. The reported variants are: *nacottamaṃ* ACDETU (also our P₂), *narottamāḥ* B.

samidhaḥ khadirādīnām audumbaryaś ca homayet ||

To subjugate a minister or another kind of high person, he should offer fuel of Khadira etc., as well as [fuel-sticks] of Udumbara.⁷⁵

7.2 *śmaśānakhaṭvāṅgamayīm homayen mantrasādhane* |

palāṅḍulaśunaprasthaṃ hutvā mastam na saṃśayaḥ ||

During the mastering of mantras,⁷⁶ he should certainly offer [fuel] made of a skull-staff [prepared/found at?] a cremation ground, after [first] offering a measured *prastha*⁷⁷ of onion and garlic.⁷⁸

7.3 *śirīśāṅgamayīm rājño balis trimadhureṇa tu* |

brāhmaṇe pāyasaamayīm kṣatriyasya viśāṅikām ||

For a king [he should use fuel] made of pieces of Śirīśa.⁷⁹

The oblation is with the three sweets.⁸⁰ In the case of a brah-

⁷⁵ On the use of Khadira and Udumbara wood for magical purposes, cf. respectively KauśS 16.14 (see also n. 42 above) and 34.10 (Goudriaan 1978: 314).

⁷⁶ On the meaning of *mantrasādhana*, a term very common in Tantric literature, cf. e.g. ŚiP Vāyavīyasamhitā 19.9ab, where it is identified with another technical term, *puraścaraṇa*: *sādhanaṃ mūlamantrasya puraścaraṇam ucyate*.

⁷⁷ A particular weight or measure: cf. AK 2.8.89a. PW s.v. records several ways of measuring a *prastha*, among which “ein Prastha ist die höchste Quantität von Blut, welche einem kräftigen Menschen entzogen werden darf” (cf. i.a. SuS, Śārīrasthāna 8.14). The editors record a number of variants for the end of this pāda: *mastam na saṃśayaḥ* (CUV); *mastun na saṃśayaḥ* (T); *masāv asaṃśayaḥ* (B). B₂ presents the reading adopted here; the reading of CUV is also found in our B₁; that of T in our P₂. This last reading seems to point to *mastu*, in which case perhaps we should understand: ‘after [first] offering a *prastha* of onion and garlic, [along with] sour cream’.

⁷⁸ For the juxtaposition of *palāṅḍu* and *laśuna*, cf. e.g. MBh 13.91.38d and BrP 220.174b (among substances to be avoided during *śrāddha* rites), and GarP 96.72a (both substances to be consumed when observing a *cāndrāyaṇa*). The following additional references were traced by Somdev Vasudeva: ManuSm 5.5 (among substances banned for brahmins), TĀVi ad 29.17 (in a list of twelve substances used in Kaula ritual).

⁷⁹ Cf. KauśS 8.15, cited above in n. 42.

⁸⁰ The dictionaries and Kane’s *History of Dharmasāstra* (V/1, p. 309) define *trimadhura* as ‘sugar, honey, ghee’. It seems more likely that the author of our text had in mind curd in the place of sugar (cf. 36.2.4, 36.12.1 etc.) — it is especially the parallelism between 36.13.1 and 36.18.1 which supports the assumption that he understood *trimadhura* as ‘curd, honey, ghee’. Anyhow, his redefinition of *trimadhura* at 36.30.1 is in itself sufficient to prove that the gloss given by our reference works holds no universal validity. The present rule probably applies to all (five) cases listed in this and the following verse. For *bali*-offering of the *trimadhura*, cf. e.g. AVParīś 36.15.1e, VDhP 2.110.43b and VDhP 3.201.4a. Harunaga Isaacson suggests to us that the recipients of the oblation may be the Ucchuṣmas, or perhaps Sarvabhūtāni as at VDhP 2.110.43–44.

min [fuel] made of Pāyasa.⁸¹ For a kṣatriya [fuel] made of Viṣāṇī (?).⁸²

- 7.4 *vaiśyasya sādhanē homyāś cūrṇaiḥ surabhisamskṛtāḥ*⁸³ |
catuṣpathe tu śūdrasya padminyutkaraṇena tu ||
 In the case of the performance aiming at a vaiśya, [oblations] are to be offered that are given aroma by means of spices/powders. [In the case of a performance] aiming at a śūdra, [one should offer] at a crossroads, with a heap of lotuses.
- 8.1 *likhitvā nāma saṃgr̥hya karāgrāṅgulipīḍitām* |
śiraḥpīḍā jvaraḥ sūlaṃ vimatiḥ svastyasaṃgatiḥ ||
 Having written the name,⁸⁴ having seized [the body]⁸⁵ and squeezed [it] with the hand's finger-tips,⁸⁶ [the result will be] head-ache, fever, pain, aversion, hard times.
- 8.2 *balyādyā vā*⁸⁷ *prayoktavyā brāhmaṇādicatuṣṭaye*⁸⁸ |
*evaṃ saty abhicāraś ca*⁸⁹ *caturṇām api darśitaḥ* ||

⁸¹ PW, with reference to AK 2.5.124d–125ab, gives the meaning “das Harz der Pinus longifolia”, which, in the light of the other substances prescribed, may be what is intended here, rather than ‘something prepared with milk’.

⁸² We are not sure how to interpret the last material: in view of the element *-maya* affixed to the other materials in this list, we assume here a *-ka* derivation in the sense of *-maya* from *viṣāṇī* (PW s.v. *viṣāṇa*, *-ī*), but if we accept a rather clumsy construction, it is also possible that *viṣāṇikā* is intended.

⁸³ We adopt the emendation of the editors. Our B₁B₂P₂ all read *surabhisamskṛtaṃ*, the reading also reported for ACDETUV in the edition.

⁸⁴ For another description of a black-magic ritual which also involves causing fever by writing the name of the enemy, cf. KubjMT 7.101cd–102. Presumably the name is to be written on the body.

⁸⁵ It seems that this is the feminine word to be supplied here, as also in 36.8.3. Cf. 36.5.1–3.

⁸⁶ The compound strikes us as somewhat redundant, but it is not without parallels: cf. TĀ 32.45b *hastāgrāṅguli-*.

⁸⁷ For *balyādyā vā*, B₁P₂ read *balādyā vā* and B₂ *balyādyāvāt*. The latter is the reading of the mss. ADE (= “X”, cf. p. XVII) used by the editors; their B is reported to have *balyadyā vā*.

⁸⁸ The edition reads °*catuṣṭhaye*, without any indication of variant readings, so this must be a misprint (B₁B₂P₂ read °*catuṣṭaye*).

⁸⁹ Our ms. B₁ agrees with the reading *abhicārasya* reported for B in the edition (our other mss. agree with the text as edited).

Or the oblation etc. are to be employed in the case of the fourfold group,⁹⁰ beginning with brahmins. And thus sorcery against all four [classes] has been taught.⁹¹

- 8.3 *liṅgaṃ vā rājasarṣapaiḥ*⁹² *samālikhyātha dhūpayet |*
gaurair arghaṃ tathā dadyān mriyate sāpy asaṃśayam ||
 Or he should draw a sign with black mustard seeds⁹³ and incense it. With white [mustard seeds] he should offer the reception: and [the body]⁹⁴ certainly dies.
- 8.4 *abhakṣyabhakṣo*⁹⁵ *hy asvāsthyam sarvarogaprapokanam |*
niḥsaṃjñatā piṇḍapāto japāvṛṭtyā bhavanti hi ||
 Eating what is not to be eaten, unwellness, attack of every disease, unconsciousness, death,⁹⁶ indeed⁹⁷ occur by the repetition of muttering [the mantras to be quoted below].
- 8.5 *ekādaśaṃ na japtavyam kulotsādas tato bhavet ||*
 He should not mutter eleven times: the ruin of his [own] family⁹⁸ would result from it.
- 9.1 *om namo mahāpiṅgalāya trivṛte trivṛte namaḥ svāhā ||*
 Om. Homage to the great yellow one, to the threefold, to the threefold!⁹⁹ Homage! Hail!

⁹⁰ While 36.7.3 only mentioned a *bali* for the case of the king (as distinct from other Kṣatriyas), this is now prescribed for the four social classes.

⁹¹ Presumably this refers to the section starting with 36.7.3cd.

⁹² As an uneven pāda this pāda is metrically bad (cf. n. 67).

⁹³ Thus BÜHLER in his translation of ManuSm 8.133 *trasareṇavo 'ṣṭau vijñeyā likṣaikā parimānataḥ | tā rājasarṣapas tisras te trayo gaurasarṣapaḥ ||* 'Know (that) eight trasareṇus (are equal) in bulk (to) a likṣhā (the egg of a louse), three of those to one grain of black mustard (rāgasarshapa), and three of the latter to a white mustard-seed'.

⁹⁴ And consequently the person represented by this body. Or emend *so 'py?*

⁹⁵ *abhakṣyabhakṣo*: P₂. The edition has *abhakṣabhakṣo*, with the variants *abhakṣabhakṣoś* (found in the part of the text which the editors' ms. B gives twice, denoted by them as b, p. 230) and *abhakṣabhakṣyo* (CU). B₁ has *abhakṣabhakṣe*, while B₂ has the reading adopted by the editors.

⁹⁶ For other instances of this usage of *piṇḍapāta* in the sense of *dehapāta*, see e.g. TĀ 1.51b = 14.44d (quoting the *Niśātana / Niśi(sam)cāra*) *piṇḍapātāc chivaṃ vrajet* 'after death he will proceed to Śiva', and TĀ 24.8a *piṇḍapātād ayaṃ muktaḥ* 'he is released from death'.

⁹⁷ The first *hi* (pāda a) is probably a mere hiatus-breaker, the present *hi* seems not to have more than an emphatic meaning.

⁹⁸ For *kulotsāda*, cf. AgnP 138.3b and GOUDRIAAN 1978: 355.

⁹⁹ We do not understand why the word *trivṛte* is repeated here and in the next dedication, nor

9.2 *namaḥ †sarāntitevatevasu†¹⁰⁰ trivṛte trivṛte triparvaṇe
triśīrṣāya namaḥ svāhā* ||

Homage to ..., to the threefold, to the threefold, to the tri-
partite, to the three-headed! Homage! Hail!

9.3 *namaḥ kaṭavikaṭakaṇṭemāṭe pāṭale vikale asauryāsau
asauryāsau¹⁰¹ pṛthiviṣṭakā †iṣṭakājinātyūnyo† 'sau¹⁰²
galuṃṭigaluṃṭe kaṭam asi¹⁰³ kaṭapravrṛte pradviṣa rudra¹⁰⁴
raudreṇāveśayāveśaya hana hana daha daha paca paca ma-
tha matha vidhvamsaya vidhvamsaya viśveśvara yogeśvara
maheśvara¹⁰⁵ namas te 'stu mā mā himsīḥ huṃ phaṭ namaḥ
svāhā* ||

Homage *kaṭavikaṭakaṇṭemāṭe*, O pallid one, O cripple,
asauryāsau asauryāsau, earthen bricks, that *iṣṭakājinātyūnyo*,
O Galunti of Galunti,¹⁰⁶ you are *kaṭa*, O you who are chosen
by¹⁰⁷ *kaṭa*, be inimical (?), O Rudra, cause possession with
the Raudra[-gaṇa],¹⁰⁸ cause to be possessed, strike, strike,

do we understand what three-fold item is intended.

¹⁰⁰ The sequence *sarāntitevatevasu* remains utterly obscure. Our mss. B₁B₂P₂ share this reading; the editors in their apparatus report a sole variant *kāṭaśarāntitevastram* in their B, which does not help either.

¹⁰¹ Our B₂ agrees with the text as edited (*asauryāsau* 2); B₁, however, reads *asau paryāsau ra*, where the *ra*, as is clear from its recurrence after single *āveśaya* further on in the mantra, is a mistake for 2 (P₂ has the same reading but omits the 2 altogether). This reading agrees with that of T, recorded by the editors, who make it the basis for a bold reconstruction of the mantra's shape (p. 232): "*asau paryāso 'sau paryāsaḥ pṛthiviṣṭakājinanyūno* <'this is the refrain without the words *pṛthivī* &c.'>."

¹⁰² The editors take *sau* (without *avagraha*) with *galuṃṭigaluṃṭe*.

¹⁰³ The editors do not separate *kaṭam asi* from each other nor from what precedes. Our separation of these words is a mere guess.

¹⁰⁴ Or a compound *rudraraudreṇa*? Cf. AVParīś 18c.1.2 *rudraraudrābhyām ājyaṃ juhuyāt*; 33.1.9 *tasya ha vā etasya gḥṛtakambalasya ... rudraraudrau cakṣuṣī*; 33.6.11 *rudraraudraparair mantrair ājyahomo vidhīyate*.

¹⁰⁵ This last word is not found in our B₁B₂P₂, as in the mss. ACDETUV reported by the editors (p. 232). Thus it only occurs in their ms. B.

¹⁰⁶ It is impossible to gauge whether there is any connection between this obscure name and the equally obscure word *galuntās* at AV(Ś) 6.83.3cd *glāur itāḥ prā patiṣyati sā galuntō naśiṣyati* (≈AV(P) 1.21.4cd *galanto*). WHITNEY translates 'the boil shall fly forth from here; it shall disappear from the neck' (1905), but adds in his note: "The translation here given of *galuntās* is the purest conjecture, as if the word were a corruption of some form of *gala* (our [mss.] W.O.D. read *galantās*), with ablative-suffix *tas*."

¹⁰⁷ A possible emendation for °*pravrṛte* (thus our B₂) would seem to be °*pravrṛtte* 'arisen from ...'. Our B₁P₂ (and the editors' BCV) have *kaṭapravrṛte*, i.e. 'covered in/by ...', which is also possible.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. AVParīś 19b.3.4 *kṛtvājyabhāgaparyantaṃ tataḥ śāntiyudakaṃ punaḥ | brahmajajñāna sūk-*

burn, burn, boil, boil, destroy, destroy, crush, crush, O Universal lord, O Lord of Yoga, O Great lord, homage be to you, do not hurt me, Hum! Phaṭ! Homage! Hail!

- 9.4 *kālāya karālāya namaḥ svāhā* ||
To time, to the dreadful!¹⁰⁹ Homage! Hail!
- 9.5 *kṛtāntāya namaḥ svāhā* ||
To fate! Homage! Hail!
- 9.6 *amoghāya namaḥ svāhā* ||
To the unerring! Homage! Hail!
- 9.7 *aghorāya namaḥ svāhā* ||
To the non-terrible! Homage! Hail!
- 9.8 *anivartāya namaḥ svāhā* ||
To the one who does not turn back! Homage! Hail!
- 9.9 *bhagāya namaḥ svāhā* ||
To the dispenser! Homage! Hail!
- 9.10 *bhagapramathanāya namaḥ svāhā* ||
To the destroyer of Bhaga!¹¹⁰ Homage! Hail!
- 9.11 *vṛṣabhāya namaḥ svāhā* ||
To the bull! Homage! Hail!

tena kuryāc caivātra pūjanam | tathaiva raudramantraiś ca abhiṣekāya kalpayet || ‘Having performed the [rite of] sacred water, up to the butter-portion, he should then perform worship here with the *brahmajājñāna*-hymn (AV[Ś] 4.1). In the same way he should prepare [the ...] for consecration with the mantras dedicated to Rudra’, and 19b.4.4 *cārucāmarahastābhiś citradaṇḍaiḥ sadarpaṇaiḥ | snāpayed brahmasūktena raudreṇāpi tathārcaṇet* || ‘He should have [Brahmā] be washed by women holding beautiful fly-whisks, by men holding conspicuous sticks (? , or: with cotton-bulbs?) together with mirrors, and worship [him] in that way with the Brahma-hymn and the Raudra[-gaṇa]’. On these mantras forming a *gaṇa* dedicated to Rudra, see AVPariś 32.17.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. 36.1.3 above, and our references from the *Sādhanamālā*, p. 6.

¹¹⁰ Cf. LiP 1.21.64d = VāP 24.141b.

- 9.12 *indranetrāya*¹¹¹ *namaḥ svāhā* ||
To the eye of Indra! Homage! Hail!
- 9.13. *suvarṇacūdāya namaḥ svāhā*
To the golden crested! Homage! Hail!
- 9.14 *hāhā hīhī namaḥ svāhā* ||
hāhā hīhī. Homage! Hail!
- 9.15 *namas tīkṣṇāya tīkṣṇadamṣṭrāya bhīṣaṇāya sahasrapādāyān-
antaśīrṣāya vāmanāya namaḥ svāhā* ||¹¹²
Homage to the sharp, to the sharp-fanged, to the terrify-
ing, to the thousand-footed, to the endless-headed, to the
dwarf!¹¹³ Homage! Hail!
- 9.16 *mahāvakraṭrāya piṅgaline*¹¹⁴ *namaḥ svāhā* ||
To the great-mouthed! To the yellowish one! Homage!
Hail!
- 9.17 *khanakhanāya namaḥ svāhā* ||
To Khanakhana! Homage! Hail!
- 9.18 *ghanaghanāya namaḥ svāhā* ||
To Ghanaghana! Homage! Hail!
- 9.19 *ghusughusāya namaḥ svāhā* ||
To Ghusughusa! Homage! Hail!
- 9.20 *alepāya namaḥ svāhā* ||

¹¹¹ We know of no parallel for this name. BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN report the reading *rudranetrāya* from mss. ADE, and we also find it in our B₂ (cf. LiP 2.48.19, where it is a name of Vahni); our mss. B₁ and P₂ have *iṃdranetrāya*.

¹¹² Cf. MBh 14.8.21ab, where we find *tīkṣṇadamṣṭrāya tīkṣṇāya* used to praise Rudra. The context there contains several other parallels to ours.

¹¹³ Cf. the passages from the *Sādhanaṃālā* referred to in our introduction, p. 6.

¹¹⁴ The edition reads *piṅgalanetrāya*, which is an emendation by the editors; the mss., including our B₂P₂, have *piṅgaline* (miswritten as *piṅgalane* in our B₁), with the exception of the edition's B, which has *prāyapiṅgalanetra*. Piṅgalin may be uncommon but it is not without parallel: a masculine nominative *piṅgalī* occurs as the name of one of eleven Rudras in ŚiP Śatarudrasaṃhitā 18.26a. It may be compared with common attributes of the Buddhist Uccuṣmajambhala, such as *piṅgorddhvakeśa*, quoted above (p. 6).

- 9.21 To the stainless one!¹¹⁵ Homage! Hail!
paśave namaḥ svāhā ||
 To the animal! Homage! Hai!
- 9.22 *mahāpaśupataye namaḥ svāhā* ||
 To the Great Animal Lord! Homage! Hail!
- 9.23 *ucchuṣmāya namaḥ svāhā* ||
 To Ucchuṣma! Homage! Hail!
- 9.24 *ucchuṣmarudrāya namaḥ svāhā* ||
 To Ucchuṣmarudra! Homage! Hail!
- 10.1 *eṣāṃ krameṇa kr̥tyāni vakṣyamānāni yojayet |*
*aṣṭasahasrābhijaptam*¹¹⁶ *anyad dravyaṃ tu homataḥ* ||
 He should perform the actions that will [now] be taught, in
 due order, involving these [mantras/Ucchuṣmarudras (2.1)].
 But [in each case] a different substance [is used], muttered
 over a thousand and eight times,¹¹⁷ during the oblation.
- 10.2 *śatror nāmnā lavaṇasya sahasram aṣṭakādhikam |*
hutvā dhanāyusor hānir jvareṇa sa ca śuṣyati ||
 Having offered a thousand and eight [offerings] of salt, ac-
 companied by the name of the enemy, the loss of wealth and
 life-span [will be effected by him], and he (the enemy) dries
 up with fever.
- 10.3 *kṣipraṃ śāntir bhavet tasya kṣīrahomāt tu tāvataḥ* ||¹¹⁸

¹¹⁵ The epithet Alepa here, right before some clear allusions to Rudra as Paśupati, suggests a connection with the Alepakas, whose doctrines are mentioned side by side with those of the Śaivas and the Pāśupatas in Old Javanese sources, and who are seemingly identifiable with the Vaimalas known as a sect from rare references in early Indian sources: see ACRI *2006, and, for the time being, ZIESENIS 1958: 15–20. The use of *alepa* in an invocation to Ucchuṣma is in any case noteworthy in the light of Ucchuṣma's connection with impurities in esoteric Buddhism (on which, see our introduction, p. 6).

¹¹⁶ This *ra-vipulā*, which is identical with 36.11.1c below, contains two metrical faults: it has light syllables in positions two and three and no caesura after the fourth syllable. Cf. our n. 67 above.

¹¹⁷ We assume this number (and not eight thousand) is meant, because of the explicit statement in the following verse; cf. 36.5.2–3, and 36.6.1. This line gives a general rule for the individual cases that follow. See our discussion above, pp. 7–8.

¹¹⁸ Our mss. B₁ and P₂ number this section as '9', and continue with this numbering till the end of the text. Cf. also the editors' ms. T.

But pacification will quickly arise for him (i.e. for the enemy), from a milk-oblation of the same proportions.¹¹⁹

- 11.1 *kaṅaiḥ puttalikāṃ kṛtvā gośṛṅgenārghadhūpane |
aṣṭasahasrābhijaptaṃ*¹²⁰ *madanasya tu kaṅṭakam |
tenāṣṭādaśavedhāt tu mūlakṣīrān nivartanam* ||¹²¹

Having made an image with grains, [and having performed] the reception and the incensing¹²² with a cow's horn, [he takes] a thorn of Madana¹²³ muttered [over] a thousand and eight times, but by piercing eighteen times with that, warding off [the enemy] from the root-milk (?)¹²⁴ [results].

- 12.1 *dadhnā ca madhusarpibhyāṃ*¹²⁵ *trivarnaiḥ sarṣapair hutaiḥ
gaurair aṣṭasahasreṇa japtair āveśayed ripūn* ||

¹¹⁹ For *kṣīrahoma*, cf. NiGu f. 81^vl. 5 (*kṣīrahomena pra[sāda]nam*: the reading *prasādanam* is suggested by the Kathmandu apograph, but *praśamanam* would also seem to be a plausible restoration) and KubjMT 8.44b = LiP 2.49.11b (*kṣīrahomena śāntikam*). Cf. also 36.16.2 below.

¹²⁰ Cf. our n. 116 above, under 36.10.1.

¹²¹ In pāda e, B₁ and B₂P₂ read, respectively, *teneṣṭām*^o and *teneṣṭā*^o. The latter reading is also reported for ADETUV in the apparatus, while C reads *toneṣṭā*^o. Apparently only B has the adopted reading.

¹²² For the compound *arghadhūpana*, cf. *arghadhūpa* at NīP 786c. The two elements occur also in 36.8.3 above, which likewise deals with a sorcery ritual involving an image.

¹²³ This name is applied to a variety of botanical species (for an overview, see MEULENBELD 1974: 586). Among thorny candidates, we may mention *Randia spinosa* Poir. syn. (*The Wealth of India: Raw Materials*, vol. VIII [New Delhi 1969], pp. 360ff.) or, perhaps more likely in our context, a species of the *Datura* genus (*The Wealth of India: Raw Materials*, vol. III [New Delhi 1952], p. 14: “A genus of poisonous herbs, shrubs or small trees”) such as the thorn-apple, *Datura stramonium* Linn. syn.

¹²⁴ Our B₁ and P₂ actually read *mūlakṣīrān*, the emendation proposed by the editors (all their mss. and our B₂ *mūlakṣīrā*, except B *mūlakṣīrām*). We are at a loss to explain this ‘root-milk’. The text is perhaps corrupt. There seems to be a connection between the instrument used (cow's horn) and the object of the act (something to do with milk, also a product of the cow). Some parallelism with 36.10.3 may underlie the text, but this is irrecoverable in its current, seemingly corrupt (incomplete?) state. The presence of the particle *tu* could indicate that a method of pacification (*śānti*) is described: note that milk is prescribed in pacification rituals also elsewhere (e.g. in 36.10.3 above and 36.16.2 below). In that case the intention of the text may rather be that one can avert (*nivartanam*) the effect of the ritual with milk (*kṣīrāt*).

¹²⁵ This is an emendation by the editors; all the mss. read *madhusarpibhyām*. It is conceivable that the Aiśā *i*-stem is original, but note that the stem *sarpis* is attested in the manuscripts in 36.2.4 and 36.6.1 above.

And with curd and honey and ghee,¹²⁶ with offerings of tri-color mustard seeds¹²⁷ [or] with white ones¹²⁸ muttered over a thousand and eight times, he should cause the enemies to become possessed.

13.1 *dadhyādyabhyaktalājānām homād aṣṭasahasrataḥ |
nāśayet satatajvaram dvitīyādiṃ ca dūrataḥ ||*
With a thousand-and-eight-fold offering of parched grains anointed with curd etc.,¹²⁹ he will destroy constant fever, and from afar [inimical] fellows and the like.

14.1. *parijapya darbheṣṭkāṃ kumbhakārādiveśmasu |
nyastvā pākam surāpānam kaivartādiṃ vināśayet ||*¹³⁰
Having muttered around the stalk of Darbha,¹³¹ and having placed [it] in the houses of potters and the like, he will destroy the imbecile, the alcoholic, the fisherman and the like.¹³²

15.1 *akṣatais taṇḍulaiḥ kṛtvā pratideham suśobhanam |
saṃsthāpya dhānyarāśau taṃ candanāguru dāhayet |
baliṃ trimadhuram dattvā syāt sa rāśiś caturgunāḥ ||*
Having made a beautiful effigy with unhusked rice grains, and having placed it in the grain heap, he should kindle sandal and aloe wood. Having given an oblation of the three sweets, that heap will become fourfold.

16.1 *khādiram kilakam tīkṣṇatailāktam*¹³³ *dvādaśāṅgulam |*

¹²⁶ Cf. our n. 80 above, under 36.7.3. See also 36.8.2–3.

¹²⁷ Cf. 36.18.1 below, and, e.g., VDhP 2.110.30d, where *sarṣapatrayam*, presumably also denoting mustard seeds of three colors, is prescribed for *śatrunāśa*.

¹²⁸ Cf. 36.8.3 above. We find the juxtaposition of the instruction to use tricolor mustard seeds with that to use white ones rather difficult to make sense of (and to construe syntactically).

¹²⁹ See the preceding verse, and also n. 80 above, under 36.7.3.

¹³⁰ We have made two small emendations. The edition reads *surāpākam kaivartādi* (also the reading of our additional mss.).

¹³¹ Cf. 36.6.2 above.

¹³² Our interpretation of this verse is problematic. It remains baffling that pāda b speaks of potters and the like, while these potters do not recur as victims in the second half-verse, unless all potters are imbeciles or drunkards.

¹³³ Thus our emendation for ed., mss. *tīkṣṇam tailāktam*. Cf. 36.30.1 below, and, e.g., NiGu f. 98^v ll. 1, 5, 6 etc. for the use of mustard oil to anoint (*tīkṣṇatāilenābhyaḥ*) a *kīlaka* to be dug (*nikhānayet*) in the ground for magical purposes. The metrical incongruity of a compound

*parijaptaṃ grāmamadhye nikhanet sadya udvaset*¹³⁴ ||
He should erect in the middle of the village a pole of Khadira wood of twelve *aṅgulas*’ [height]¹³⁵ smeared over with mustard oil, and muttered around — he should take off immediately.

16.2 *mahāpātakadoṣeṇa grāmī nirdhanatām vrajet |*
kṣīreṇa kīlakasnānāt kuryāt tuṣṭas tu śāntikam ||
The villager will become stripped of wealth because of the fault of a great crime.¹³⁶ When he (the performer) is satisfied [by the attainment of his aim], he should perform the pacificatory [rite]¹³⁷ by bathing the pole with milk.

16.3 *kṣīrasyāṣṭasahasraṃ ca juhuyāt tadanantaram ||*
And he should offer with a thousand and eight [offerings] of milk immediately thereafter.

17.1 *kalāyamātrām*¹³⁸ *guṭikāṃ tannāmnā gavyamāmsataḥ |*
mahāpātakasambandhāj jāyate ’sya dhanakṣayaḥ ||
[He should make] from cow’s flesh a pea-sized pill accompanied by [intoning] his (the enemy’s) name. Because of his

straddling the pāda-boundary is no impediment (cf. our n. 67 to 36.6.2). For our interpretation of *tīkṣṇataila* as ‘mustard oil’ we are indebted to Shingo Einoo, who drew our attention to a number of passages from ritual literature where we find *sarṣapataila* (or *sārṣapataila*) in black magic contexts similar to the present one, which suggests that *tīkṣṇataila* is synonymous with *sarṣapataila*. Cf. e.g. ṚVidh 3.[18.]93cd, and especially 3.[19.]101–102 *tena pratīkṛtīm kuryāt tām dhyātvā manasā striyam | aktām sarṣapatailena juhuyād aṅgaśaś ca tām ||* ‘With that [substance] one must prepare an image after visualising that woman in one’s mind and offer, member by member, that [image] anointed with mustard-oil’ (transl. BHAT).

¹³⁴ Thus also our B₂P₂; B₁ reads *sarvamudvaset*, cf. T *sarva udvaset*; no other variants are reported in the apparatus.

¹³⁵ Cf. MICHAELS 1978: 156f. on the technical meaning of *aṅgula*.

¹³⁶ Alternative translation: ‘... as if because of having committed a great crime’.

¹³⁷ Note use of milk for pacification also in 36.10.3. Cf. our note 119 *ad loc*.

¹³⁸ The edition reads *kalāpa*^o, while variants *kalāva*^o (A₁CTUV) and *kalāca*^o (B) are relegated to the apparatus; our B₁P₂ also read *kalāva*^o; B₂ *kalāva*^o corrected to *kalāpa*^o. None of these possibilities seems to yield any good sense. In the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* (Cikitsāsthāna 35.3, 35.5, 40.3, and Uttarasthāna 44.24), we find the compound *kalāyamātra*, and on this basis we emend our text. In the prose passage (?) following *Tantrasadbhāva* 23.255 in Dyczkowski’s edition (see n. 12), we do find *kalāpamātra*, but we assume this to be in need of correction as well.

connection with [this] great sin,¹³⁹ his (the enemy's) loss of wealth is brought about.

- 18.1 *trivarnasarṣapair homāt saha trimadhureṇa tu |
sampadyate sutas tasya medhāvī śrutadhāraḥ |
taddhomāt ke cid icchanti unmattatvaṃ na saṃśayaḥ ||*
Because of the offering with tricolor mustard seeds together with the three sweets,¹⁴⁰ a son is born to him, intelligent and with sound memory. Some, no doubt, seek [to induce] insanity from the offering of those [substances].
- 19.1 *tilā dūrvā trimadhuraṃ homato vyādhinigraham |
taṇḍulaprakṣepāś ca¹⁴¹ ||*
Sesame seeds, Dūrvā-stalks and the three sweets [when used] for an offering, as also the scattering of rice grains, [bring about] the suppression of disease.
- 20.1 *tryaktodumbarasamidho dogdhrīdhenvaṣṭakapradāḥ¹⁴² |
ekāhaṃ bhaiḥṣabhug bhūtvā māsāṣṭakayutasya vā ||*
Fuel-sticks of Udumbara [wood] anointed with the three [sweets] yield a group of eight milk-giving cows, if he has lived on alms for one day, or if he has been banished (?) for eight months.¹⁴³
- 21.1 *†prāde† sāntaṃ¹⁴⁴ bilvavr̥kṣaṃ mūlaśākhāsamanvitam |
kṛṣṇāṣṭamyāṃ caturdaśyāṃ sāyāṃ hutvā tu rukmabhāk ||*
But having offered ... the auspicious Bilva tree with roots and branches on the evening of the eighth of the dark half

¹³⁹ The great sin apparently is the use of a cow's flesh.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. 36.12.1.

¹⁴¹ The last pāda of this incomplete (?) verse is hypometrical.

¹⁴² As is clear from their remark on p. 222 that “[t]he text is mutilated”, the editors have not understood the verse. We do not claim to have done so with any certainty, but printing the words which make up pāda b as one compound, rather than the separate words which the edition gives, does seem to allow interpretation.

¹⁴³ The editors observe (p. 233) that “[t]here is probably a lacuna after this khaṇḍikā”. In any case, the text as it stands seems highly doubtful. We have considered emending *māsāṣṭakayutaś ca vā*.

¹⁴⁴ In the light of 36.2.4 above (with our note 42), we consider it most likely that the editors' *prādesāntaṃ* contains rather an as yet obscure (corrupt?) *prāde*, and the adjective *sāntaṃ*. Possible emendations: *prānte*; *prātar*; *proktaṃ*; *prāñcaṃ*; *prāptaṃ*; *ādau* (cf. our emendation in 36.5.3, and *ādau* in 36.2.3).

[of a lunar month] [or] on the fourteenth, he [becomes] en-joyer of gold.¹⁴⁵

- 22.1 *samidhām vaiṭasīnām tu agnāv arkendhanāhute |
ahorātrikahomāt syāt parjanyaḥ bahuvarṣadaḥ |
lakṣatrayam bhaikṣāhāro japtvā karmaitad ārabhet* ॥¹⁴⁶
When in a fire kindled with wood of the Arka-plant an of-fering has been made [with oblations] of fuel-sticks of the Vetasa-reed, there will, from daily and nocturnal offering, result a rainfall giving plentiful precipitation. Eating [only] alms, he should mutter [the mantra?] three lakh-fold, and commence this ritual.¹⁴⁷

- 23.1 *dugdāktān sarṣapān hutvā tasmād bhasma mukhe kṣipet |
sarveṣu vyavahāreṣu sa bhavaty aparājitaḥ* ॥
Having offered milk-anointed mustard seeds, he should place the ash from that in the mouth.¹⁴⁸ in all affairs he be-comes undefeated.

¹⁴⁵For the use of Bilva to obtain gold, cf. e.g. AVPariś 31.6.4d *bilvaiḥ prāpnoti kāñcanam*.

¹⁴⁶All mss. here support the editors' reading *arkendhanāddhute*. However, this verse re-occurs further on in the same corpus, as AVPariś 65.3.3 (although not in the mss. BCTRoTh, see p. 427 of the edition), where the mss. point to the superior reading *arkendhanāhute* (double sandhi for *arkendhana āhute*) we also adopt here. On the expression *arkendhana*, see AVPariś 35.1.7 *arkendhanāgnim prajvālya* quoted in n. 64: the commentary on that passage quoted by MAGOUN 1889: 25 (*ravikāṣṭhena prajvālya*) agrees with the one by Rāghavabhaṭṭa on ŚārTT 8.24d (*arkāgnāv arkakāṣṭhasamiddhe 'gnāv ity arthaḥ*), to which Harunaga Isaacson kindly referred us. Cf. on the rest of the verse ṚVidh 2.[17.]91 *nirāhāraḥ khinnavāsā acireṇa pravaraṣati | hutvāyutaṃ vaiṭasīnām kṣīrāktānām hutāśane* ॥ '[A person who is desir-ous of rain should employ the hymn beginning with *Acchā vada* [RV. 5.83]—]while he fasts and wears wet cloths. It will soon rain. Having offered ten thousand fuel-sticks of rattan smeared with milk into the fire, [one obtains ample rain ...]' (transl. BHAT).

¹⁴⁷Although the ṚVidh passage just quoted does make a connection between rain-magic and fasting, the link between *pādas a–d* on the one hand, and *e–f* on the other, seems question-able. Ought the last line, which announces a ritual, to be joined with 23.1 (against the indica-tions of the mss.)? Or is some portion of text missing?

¹⁴⁸Cf. NiGu f. 80^v l. 1 and 112^v l. 5, where *śvetasarṣapabhasman* is used respectively in rites of *utsāraṇa* and *āmarakṣā*. In the latter case one is said to become unobstructed (*[a]pratihatā*). We assume that the practitioner here should place the ash in his own mouth, because *mukhe + √kṣip* normally seems to have this sense: cf. e.g. the prose passage after *Tantrasadbhāva* 20.159 (ed. DYCZKOWSKI, see n. 12) ... *guḍikām kārayet | sahasrābhimantritām mukhe kṣipyādreṣyo bhavati* | 'He should make (or cause to make?) a ... pill. After reciting over it a thousand times, and placing it in his mouth, he becomes invisible' (a passage to be compared with *Tantrasadbhāva* 21.75 *mukhe prakṣipate yāvāt tāvad adreṣyatām vrajat | janapriyaś ca bhavate vyomacārī mahābalaḥ* ॥, which makes very clear that no enemy's mouth is involved).

- 24.1 *śastraṃ japtam upādāya raṇe grasto na jīyate |
khanakhanāyeti mantraḥ pūrvasevārtha ucyate ||*
Having taken up a sword [over] which [a mantra] has been
muttered, he is not conquered when engaged in battle. The
mantra ‘khanakhanāya’¹⁴⁹ is taught for the purpose of pre-
liminary service.¹⁵⁰
- 24.2 *uttarasyā viśeṣād vā cedānīm ata uttaram |
khādiratryaktasamidhām pūrvasevā sahasrataḥ |
atasāsamidhām evaṃ medhāvī viduṣāṃ prabhuḥ ||*
Or,¹⁵¹ by contrast with the subsequent [service?],¹⁵² now
from here on further, the preliminary service is [to be under-
stood as] thousand-fold [use] of Khadira fuel-sticks which
have been anointed with the three [sweets]. Thus, [through
the use] of flax fuel-sticks [he becomes] an intelligent lord
of sages.
- 25.1 *gocarmamātraṃ sthaṇḍilam gomayenopalepayet |
tatrāgniṃ trikapāleṣu jvālayitvā praṇamya ca ||*
He should smear a piece of ground of the size of a cow’s
hide¹⁵³ with cow-dung, stoke fire there on three sherds/
skulls¹⁵⁴ and pay reverence.
- 25.2 *śirasā vānareṇātha mukhavādyaṃ tu kārayet |
yatra tac chrūyate tatra āgacchanti varastriyaḥ ||*

¹⁴⁹ The mantra referred to was given above, as 36.9.17. Cf. our introduction, p. 7.

¹⁵⁰ For *pūrvasevā* (= *puraścaraṇa*), a preliminary rite during which a mantra is recited a great number of times to ensure the ritual’s success, cf. GOUDRIAAN 1978: 84 and SANDERSON 2002: 13, n. 11.

¹⁵¹ We agree with the editors’ suggestion (p. 233) that the particle *ca* has been inserted here rather for metrical purposes (as hiatus-breaker, cf. TÖRZSÖK 1999: xxxiv), than to effect coordination.

¹⁵² Our interpretation of this part of the verse is no more than a guess. One might speculate that the typically Atharvavedic ritual structure with a *pūrvatantra* and an *uttaratantra* (cf. CALAND 1900: VI–VII) has resulted in the concept of an *uttarasevā*, next to the well-established *pūrvasevā*.

¹⁵³ The first half of this verse is a variant of the beginning of AVParīś 40.2.1 (*gocarmamātraṃ sthaṇḍilam upalīpya gomayenollikhyābhyukṣyāgne prehīty agniṃ praṇīya*), for which we refer to our notes in BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003: 328f.

¹⁵⁴ We know of no parallel for the stoking of fire in three *kapālas*.

Then he should make the mouth-music¹⁵⁵ with his monkey-like face.¹⁵⁶ Where that is heard, there choice women arrive,

25.3 *damṣṭrāghaṇṭāninādās tu jvālāmukhabhayānakāḥ |
yat tvaṃ kāmāyase putra tat sarvaṃ dadmahe vāyam ||*
with roars coming from their bell-like fangs, inspiring fear with their flaming mouths. “We give all that you desire, O son”,

25.4 *iti bruvatyāḥ sarvās tā yatra homaḥ kṛto bhavet |
tadbhasmanā tu saṃsprṣṭo māṅgalyaṃ sa prayāsyati ||*¹⁵⁷
is what they all say, when an offering is performed. Smeared with the ash of that [offering], he proceeds to prosperity.

¹⁵⁵ The ‘mouth-music’ is included among such acts of worship as *huḍukkāra*, dance, song and *aṭṭahāsa* — reminiscent of *Pāśupatasūtra* 1.8 — in NiMu f. 5° l. 4 *kṛtvāsau gaṇatām yāti tantrīvādyasya vādakaḥ | huḍukkārasya nṛtyasya mukhavādyaṭṭahāsayoḥ ||* ‘Having performed [this ...], that performer of lute music, of the sound HUḌUK, of the dance, of the mouth-music and loud laughter, proceeds to the status of Gaṇa’. Cf. also TVK p. 64, ll. 12–13 *gandhadhūpanamaskārair mukhavādyaiś ca sarvaśaḥ | yo mām arcayate tatra tasya tūsyāmy ahaṃ sadā ||* ‘He who totally worships me there with fragrances, with incense, with obeisance, and with mouth-music, always makes me satisfied’ and TVK p. 82, ll. 15–18 *kṣīreṇa madhunā caiva toyena saha sarpiṣā | tarpayanti paraṃ liṅgam arcayanti devaṃ śubham || huḍumkāranamaskārair (read huḍukkāra°) nṛtyagītais tathaiva ca | mukhavādyair anekaiś ca stotramantraiś tathaiva ca ||* ‘With milk and with honey, with water and butter they satiate the supreme liṅga; they worship the auspicious god with the HUḌUK sound and with obeisance, as well as with dances and songs, with much mouth-music, as well as with laudatory mantras’. In *Carakasamhitā*, Cikitsāsthāna 9.20 *mukhavādya* is included among the characteristics of one who is possessed by a Gandharva. It remains unclear what kind of music precisely is intended, but cf. Kṣemarāja’s description (*ad SvachT* 2.182) of the process leading to the production of the *mukhavādya*: *bhaktivaivaśyonmiṣannādāmarśamāyo dhvanir mukhavādyāparaparyāyo huḍumkāraḥ (read huḍukkāraḥ)* ‘The HUḌUK-sound, which is also called ‘mouth-music’, is the sound, consisting of the representation of subtle sound originating from lack of self-control due to devotion’.

¹⁵⁶ Without, unfortunately, being able to draw any certain conclusions, we compared this stanza with the partly incomprehensible passage AVParīś 40.1.14 *vānaram te mukhaṃ raudram anindyaṃ śubhaṃ paśum evājananevājanakaṃ ghoram jīvaṃ jātyam eva rukmaṃ dadāmīty ekavāsā vivāsā vā virāgāṇi vastrāṇi dadīta ||*, in our study of the *Pāśupatavratā* (BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003: 328 n. 66).

¹⁵⁷ The edition reads *saṃsprṣṭās chāgalyaḥ suprabhāvataḥ*. This contains a small emendation, for the reading *saṃsprṣṭaḥ* found in ABCDTUV (thus also our B₁P₂); E reads *saṃtuṣṭaḥ*; our B₁, *saṃsprṣṭa*. Note the wrong sandhi with visarga before *ch*. Moreover, we cannot make sense of any ‘she-goats’ (*chāgalyaḥ*) in this context. We present our bold conjecture with all due reservations, but point out that the reading *suprabhāvataḥ* may have arisen under the influence of *suprabhātāṃ* in 36.26.2d.

- 26.1 *lakṣajāpottaraṃ gatvā nadīm udadhigāminīm |
vālukāsthāṇḍile liṅgaṃ tanmayaṃ tajjasadmani ||*
After a lakh-fold muttering, he goes to a river draining in
the ocean, [and erects] a liṅga on a sandy piece of ground,
made of that [sand] in a seat produced out of that.
- 26.2 *padmāṣṭaśatam āhr̥tya pūjayitvā vidhānataḥ |
udake nābhimātre ca suprabhātaṃ punar jāpet ||*
Having procured a hundred and eight lotuses, and having
performed worship according to the rules, in water reach-
ing up to the navel, he should mutter once again [over the
lotuses] beautifully illuminated by the dawn.
- 26.3 *tato māṅḍaliko¹⁵⁸ rājā dīnārāṇām¹⁵⁹ gavām śatam |
pranamyā śraddhayā tasmai dadyād uddhara mām iti ||*
Then, the local king will pay reverence and give him a hun-
dred dinars and cattle, [saying] devotedly: “Save me!”¹⁶⁰
- 27.1 *lakṣajāpād¹⁶¹ abādhyas tu paśūnām damṣṭriśṛṅgiṇām |
itareṣām paśūnām tu lakṣatritayavardhanam¹⁶² ||*

¹⁵⁸ The editors’ emendation *māṅḍaliko* is found as such in our P₂. Their mss. read *maṅḍaliko* (BCETUV, thus also our B₁B₂) and *maṅḍalako* (AD).

¹⁵⁹ The occurrence of the loan-word *dīnāra* in this *Pariśiṣṭa* has been considered relevant for the dating of this text, and, by extension, of the entire corpus (see MODAK 1993: 471), but the problem was always how a text corpus presumed to be ‘Vedic’ could be so late as the second century AD (believed by some early scholars to have been the period of the introduction of this coinage into India), while we have no qualms in dating this *Pariśiṣṭa* perhaps as much as a millennium later. With our wording (BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003: 323), we have misrepresented MODAK’s arguments, and our reference to *dīnāra* as “late word” might have to be rectified (see KEITH 1907 and 1915). But neither MODAK’s reference to *Mahābhāṣya* 4.1.19 nor the one to *Āpastambaśrautasūtra* 23.11.2 can be verified, in the available editions, as old attestations. In his review of the BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN edition, KEITH (1912: 769, n. 1) suggests that the term *māṅḍalika* is relevant as well: “It is noteworthy that in xxxvi, 26. 3, the term *māṅḍaliko rājā* is found, a clear sign of lateness; *māṅḍalika* occurs also in lxxi c. 31. 4.” We cannot follow him in this matter: the term is already attested at, e.g., Mbh 9.23.29b and BṛhatS 4.15c, 46.11d, 48.47c, 68.23a. Again, this is not to say that our *Pariśiṣṭa* must be as old as the *Mahābhārata* or *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*.

¹⁶⁰ The editors (p. 223) characterize the ritual described in this section as aiming “[t]o force a neighboring king to seek the priestly services of the performer.” Cf. also GOUDRIAAN 1978: 306f.

¹⁶¹ We adopt this emendation suggested by Harunaga Isaacson. The edition’s reading *lakṣajapād* (found in all mss.) contains a serious metrical fault: two short syllables in the second and third position (cf., however, n. 67). Cf. *lakṣajāpa* also in 26.1.

¹⁶² Thus the reading of the edition (and our B₂). However, the editors’ B reads *lakṣatritayavarttanāt*, while our B₁/P₂ read °*varttanam*°*vartanam*, and agree in this with the editors’ TV. The B

From the lakh-fold muttering [of the mantras 9.21–22 (?)] he [becomes] one who cannot be pained by animals with fangs or horns. But of other animals an increase by three lakhs [results].

- 28.1 *saṃjaptaśivanirmālyadānād unmattatām vrajet |
śamāya candanaṃ dadyāt triḥ śvetam*¹⁶³ *mantrasaṃskṛtam* ||
By the gift of a garland that has been worn by Śiva and has been muttered over, [his enemy] will become insane. For pacification he should give white sandal-wood which has been thrice (?) prepared with the mantra [9.23 (?)]
- 29.1 *samādhinānumantritaṃ*¹⁶⁴ *gośṛṅgam arimandire |
nikhātaṃ sadya evainaṃ mandiraṃ paridīpayet* ||
The cow's horn which has been consecrated in meditation and deposited in the enemy's palace will immediately cause conflagration of that palace.
- 30.1 *tīkṣṇatailaṃ kaṭu proktaṃ darvī grāmasruvas tathā |
trimadhuraṃ tv atra vijñeyaṃ*¹⁶⁵ *madhusarpistilātmakam*¹⁶⁶ ||
[Use of] strong scented mustard oil¹⁶⁷ is advised, as also [of] a ladle and a common spoon; but here the three sweets

reading could be translated as follows: 'but from the performance of three lakhs [he becomes one who cannot be pained] by other animals [either]'.

¹⁶³ The edition reads *triṣv etaṃ*, with all mss. (including our B₁B₂) except B *triśvetan* and our P₂ *tiśvetam*, and the editors' remark (p. 233) seems to mean they suggest that "possibly triśvetam" is to be read. While the compound *triśveta* is well known from various kinds of texts to denote a spike of the porcupine, this does not seem to yield any sense here. 'White' (*śveta*) sandal-wood is attested, e.g., at NiGu f. 85^v l. 6; 100^r l. 2 and *Bhṛgusaṃhitā*, Prakīrṇādhikāra 8.48d. The latter text also contains the turn of phrase *trissamskṛto laukikō gnir mathitāgnisamō bhavēt* 'Having been prepared triply, the common fire will become equal to the churned fire': with some reservations, we introduce *triḥ* into our text.

¹⁶⁴ The pāda, as it stands, is entirely iambic; this infringement upon metrical rules adds to our impression that the text may be corrupt. Or does the word *samādhi* have a different meaning here?

¹⁶⁵ Note that this pāda, as edited, is hypermetrical. Omitting *vi* and reading *jñeyaṃ* does not solve the problem: the fifth syllable is long as well. Perhaps one ought to read *trimadhuraṃ tu vijñeyaṃ*?

¹⁶⁶ As in 36.12.1 above, one could consider adopting the *i*-stem *sarpi*; it is found in all mss. (including our B₁B₂P₂) except the edition's B. Cf. however our n. 125 on that verse.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. 36.16.1 above, and KubjMT 25.228b *kaṭutailaṃ tu tīkṣṇakam*.

should be understood to consist in honey, ghee and sesame.¹⁶⁸

30.2 *saṃmukhaṃ mānasaṃ dhyāyañ chubhaṃ karma prayojayet |
vimukhaṃ bhañjanādau tu naraḥ karmaṇi siddhibhāk ||*
Concentrating in his mind, he should perform an auspicious rite facing straight at [the object], but in a rite such as routing [the enemy], a man obtains success with his head averted [away from it].¹⁶⁹

30.3 *aṣṭottaras trisāhasro homo hāsya prakīrtitaḥ |
kīlakāstrādi yac cānyat tat sahasrābhimantritam ||*
For him an offering with three thousand and eight [mantras/oblations?] is praised, and whatever other [material] such as pole or weapon [is used], over that he should perform the incantation a thousand times.

¹⁶⁸ This verse gives a redefinition of the ‘three sweets’, cf. n. 80 under 36.7.3 above. According to a suggestion of Shingo Einoo, this whole verse would consist of definitions, which would mean it has to be translated as follows: ‘With *tīkṣṇataila*, the strong scented one (i.e. mustard oil) is intended, and the *darvī* is the common spoon, while the three sweet should here be understood ...’. This seems convincing, i.a. because *katutaila* is used in the same corpus (at AVPariś 26.4.2, 35.1.10), and presumably in the same meaning. But the problem remains that no *darvī* has in fact been mentioned in the preceding instructions, and that *trimadhura* quite clearly seemed to be differently defined in its earlier occurrences.

¹⁶⁹ GOUDRIAAN (1978: 227) interprets this verse as prescribing “that during an abhicāra rite one should meditate, contrary to the usual ritual practice, on the deity as turning his back to the performer.” We do not have the impression that any deity comes into play here.

ABBREVIATIONS

AbhŚ	<i>Abhijñānaśākuntala</i> , ed. ĀCHĀRYA 1958
AgnP	<i>Agnipurāṇa</i> , ed. UPĀDHYĀYA 1966
AK	<i>Amarakoṣa</i> , ed. RAMANATHAN 1971–83
AV(P)	<i>Atharvavedasamhitā (Paippalāda)</i> , ed. BHATTACHARYA 1997
AV(Ś)	<i>Atharvavedasamhitā (Śaunaka)</i> , ed. VISHVA BANDHU 1960
AVBSA	<i>Atharvavedīyabṛhatsarvānukramaṇikā</i> , ed. VISHVA BANDHU 1966
AVPariś	<i>Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa</i> , ed. BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN 1909–10
BaudhDhS	<i>Baudhāyanadharmasūtra</i> , ed. OLIVELLE 2000
BṛhatS	<i>Bṛhatsamhitā</i> , ed. KERN 1865
BrP	<i>Brahmapurāṇa</i> , ed. SCHREINER & SÖHNEN 1987–89
GdP	<i>Garudapurāṇa</i> , ed. BHATTACHARYA 1964
HC	<i>Harṣacarita</i> , ed. KANE 1965
JaimGS	<i>Jaiminīyagṛhyasūtra</i> , ed. CALAND 1922
KauśS	<i>Kauśikasūtra</i> , ed. BLOOMFIELD 1890
KubjMT	<i>Kubjikāmatatantra</i> , ed. GOUDRIAAN & SCHOTERMAN 1988
LiP	<i>Liṅgapurāṇa</i> , ed. SHASTRI 1980
ManuSm	<i>Manusmṛti</i> , ed. OLIVELLE 2005
MatPĀ	<i>Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama</i> , ed. BHATT 1977
MBh	<i>Mahābhārata</i> , ed. SUKTHANKAR et. al. 1927–59
MMP	<i>Mahārthamañjarīparimala</i> , ed. DVIVEDA 1972
NeT(U)	<i>Netratantra(-Uddyota)</i> , ed. SHĀSTRĪ 1929–39
NiGu	<i>Niśvāsaḡhya</i> , ed. GOODALL *2005
NiMu	<i>Niśvāsamukha</i> , ed. GOODALL *2005
PW	Petersburger Wörterbuch, BÖHTLINGK & ROTH 1855–75
ṚV	<i>Ṛgveda</i> , ed. AUFRECHT 1877
ṚVidh	<i>Ṛgvidhāna</i> , ed. (& transl.) BHAT 1987
ŚārTT	<i>Śāradātilakatantra</i> , ed. AVALON 1933
ŚiP	<i>Śivapurāṇa</i> , ed. KRṢṆADĀSA 1954
ŚiSūVi	<i>Śivasūtravimarśinī</i> , ed. CHATTERJI 1911
SP _Y	<i>Skandapurāṇa</i> 34.1–61; 55–59; 62.1–63; 63–64; 66–69, ed. YOKOCHI 2004
SuS	<i>Suśrutasaṡhitā</i> , ed. JIBANANDAVIDYASAGARA 1889
SvacchT(U)	<i>Svacchandatantra(-Uddyota)</i> , ed. SHĀSTRĪ 1921–35
SvSūS	<i>Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṡgraha</i> , ed. ŚĀSTRĪ 1937
SVidhB	<i>Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa</i> , ed. BURNELL 1873
TAK	<i>Tāntrikābhidhānakośa</i> , see BRUNNER, OBERHAMMER & PADOUX
TĀVi	<i>Tantrālokaviveka</i> , ed. SHĀSTRĪ 1918–38
TS	<i>Taittirīyasaṡhitā</i> , ed. WEBER 1871–72

TSā	<i>Tantrasāra</i> , ed. SHĀSTRĪ 1918
TVK	<i>Tīrthavivecanakāṇḍa</i> of the <i>Kṛtyakalpataru</i> , ed. AIYANGAR 1942
VādhŚS	<i>Vādhūlaśrautasūtra</i> , ed. CHAUBEY 1993
VāP	<i>Vāyupurāṇa</i> , ed. KRṢṆADĀSA 1983
VDhP	<i>Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa</i> , ed. KRṢṆADĀSA 1912
VīnT	<i>Vīṇāśikhatantra</i> , ed. GOUDRIAAN 1985

REFERENCES

- ĀCHĀRYA, N. R.
 1958 *The Abijñāna-Śākuntala of Kālidāsa. With the Commentary (Arthadyotānikā) of Rāghava Bhaṭṭa*. Twelfth edition. Bombay 1958.
- ACRI, A.
 2006* *The Vaimala Sect of the Pāsupatas: New Data from Old Javane-se Sources. Forthcoming.*
- AIYANGAR, K. V.
 1942 *Bhaṭṭaśrīlakṣmīdharaviracite Kṛtyakalpatarau Aṣṭamo bhāgaḥ. Tīrthavivecanakāṇḍam*. Baroda 1942.
- APTE, V. S.
 1957–59 *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary. 3 vols.* Revised and enlarged edition [by] P.K. Gode & C.G. Karve. Poona.
- AUFRECHT, T.
 1877 *Die Hymnen des Ṛgveda. 2 Parts*. Bonn 1877.
- AVALON, A.
 1933 *Śāradātilakatantram*. Text with Introduction. Reprint Delhi 1996.
- BHAT, M. S.
 1987 *Vedic Tantrism. A Study of Ṛgvidhāna of Śaunaka with Text and Translation*. Delhi 1987.
- BHATT, N. R.
 1977 *Mataṅgaparameśvarāgama Vidyāpāda, avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha (Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie 56)*, Pondichéry 1977.
- BHATTACHARYYA, B.
 1925–28 *Sādhnamālā. 2 vols. (GOS 26, 41)*. Oriental Institute, Baroda 1925–28.
 1964 *Garuḍapurāṇam (Kashi Sanskrit Series 165)*. Varanasi 1964.

- BHOJAKA, L.
 1997–98 Pāśupatācārya Megharāśinuṃ Tāmrapatra. *Sambodhi* 21 (1997–98) 103–104.
- Bhṛgusaṃhitā*
 1929 *Prakīrṇādhikāra Bhagavadbhṛgumaharṣiproktāsu Saṃhitāsu Prakīrṇādhikāraḥ (Kriyāpādaḥ Prathamādisaptatrimśapaṭa-lāntaḥ)*. Madras. 1929.
- BISSCHOP, P. & GRIFFITHS, A.
 2003 The Pāśupata Observance (*Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* 40). *IJJ* 46 (2003) 315–348.
- BISCHOFF, F. A.
 1962 Der Zauberritus der Ucchuṣmā. Tibetisch und Mongolisch (Tanjur-Text). *Central Asiatic Journal* 7 (1962) 205–211.
- BODEWITZ, H. W.
 2000 Classifications and Yonder World in the Veda. *WZKS* 44 (2000) 19–59.
- BÖHTLINGK, O. & ROTH, R.
 1855–75 *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. 7 parts. St. Petersburg 1855–75.
- BOLLING, G. M. & VON NEGELEIN, J.
 1909–10 *The Pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda. Volume 1: Text and Critical Apparatus, in 2 Parts*. Leipzig 1909–1910.
- VAN DEN BOSCH, L. P.
 1978 *Atharvaveda-pariśiṣṭa Chapters 21–29. Introduction, Translation and Notes*. Groningen 1978.
- BRUNNER, H.
 1969 De la consommation du nirmālya de Śiva. *JA* 257 (1969) 213–265.
 1986 Les Membres de Śiva. *ASt/ÉA* 40 (1986) 89–132.
- BRUNNER, H. & OBERHAMMER, G. & PADOUX, A.
 2000 *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa I. Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique*. Wien 2000.
- BÜHLER, G.
 1886 *The Laws of Manu. Translated with extracts from seven commentaries*. Oxford 1886.
- BÜHNEMANN, G.
 2000 The Six Rites of Magic. *Tantra in Practice* (ed. by DAVID GORDON WHITE) Princeton 2000, 447–462.
- BURNELL, A. C.
 1873 *The Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa (being the third Brāhmaṇa) of the Sāmaveda. Vol. I. Text and Commentary, with Introduction*. London 1873.

- CALAND, W.
 1900 *Altindisches Zauberritual. Probe einer Übersetzung der wichtigsten Theile des Kauśika Sūtra.* Amsterdam 1900.
- Caraka Saṃhitā*
The Caraka Saṃhitā. Expounded by the worshipful Ātreya Punarvasu, compiled by the great sage Agniveśa and redacted by Caraka & Dr̥ḍhabala. Edited and published in six volumes with translations in Hindi, Gujarati and English by Shree Gulabkumverba Ayurvedic Society. Jamnagar 1949.
- CHATTERJI, J. C.
 1911 *The Shiva Sūtra Vimarśinī being the Sūtras of Vasu Gupta with the Commentary called Vimarshinī by Kshemarāja.* Bombay and Srinagar (KSTS 1) 1911.
- CHAUBEY, B. B.
 1993 *Vādhūla-śrautasūtram. Critically edited with Introduction and Indices.* Hoshiarpur 1993.
- DAVIS, E.
 2001 *Society and the Supernatural in Song China.* Honolulu 2001.
- DIWEKAR, H. R. et al.
 1972 *Kauśikasūtra-Dārilabhāṣya.* Poona 1972.
- DVIVEDA, A.
 1972 *Mahārthamañjarī of Maheśvarānanda with the Auto-Commentary Parimala. Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya (Yogatantra Granthamālā V).* Varanasi 1972.
- DYCKOWSKI, M. S. G.
 1988 *The Canon of the Śaivāgama and the Kubjikā Tantras of the Western Kaula Tradition.* Albany 1988.
- EINOO, S.
 2005 *Ritual Calendar. Change in the Conceptions of Time and Space.* JA 293 (2005) 99–124.
- GOODALL, D.
 2004 *The Parākhyatantra. A Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta. A critical edition and annotated translation.* Pondichéry (Collection Indologie 98) 2004.
 2005* *Transcription of the Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā, from the Nepalese palm-leaf MS No. 1–227, NGMPP A 41/14 supplemented with readings from its Kathmandu apograph MS No.5-2406, NGMPP A 159/18. [Includes the Niśvāsamukha, Niśvāsamūla, Niśvāsottara, Niśvāsānaya and Niśvāsaguhya].*

- GOUDRIAAN, T
 1978 *Māyā Divine and Human. A study of magic and its religious foundations in Sanskrit texts, with particular attention to a fragment on Viṣṇu's Māyā preserved in Bali.* Delhi 1978.
 1985 *The Vīṇāśikhatantra. A Śaiva Tantra of the Left Current. Edited with an Introduction and a Translation.* Delhi 1985.
- GOUDRIAAN, T. & GUPTA, S.
 1981 *Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature.* Wiesbaden 1981.
- GOUDRIAAN, T. & HOOYKAAS, C.
 1971 *Stuti and Stava (Bauddha, Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava) of Balinese Brahman priests.* Amsterdam 1971.
- GOUDRIAAN, T. & SCHOTERMAN, J. A.
 1988 *The Kubjikāmatatantra. Kulālikāmnāya Version.* Leiden 1988.
- GRIFFITHS, A.
 2004–05 Tumburu: A Deified Tree. *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 22–23 (2004–05) 249–264.
- HEILJGERS-SEELLEN, D.
 1994 *The System of the Five Cakras in the Kubjikāmatatantra 14–16.* Groningen 1994.
- JIBANANDAVIDYASAGARA
 1889 *The Susruta or System of Medicine, taught by Dhanwantari, and composed by his pupil Susruta. Third edition.* Calcutta 1889.
- KANE, P. V.
 1930–62 *History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil Law in India).* 5 vols. Poona 1930–62.
 1965 *The Harshacarita of Bāṇabhaṭṭa. Text of Uchchvāsas I–VIII.* Delhi [2nd ed.; 1st ed. 1918.] 1965.
- KEITH, A. B.
 1907 Denarius and the Date of the Harivaṃśa. *JRAS* (1907) 681–683.
 1912 [Review of] The Pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda. Ed. by George Melville BOLLING and Julius VON NEGELEIN. Vol. I, in three parts: Text and Critical Apparatus. Leipzig, 1909–10. *JRAS* (1912) 755–776.
 1915 The Denarius as a Proof of Date. *JRAS* (1915) 504–505.
- KERN, H.
 1865 *The Br̥hat Sañhitá of Varáha-Mihira.* Calcutta 1865.
- KR̥ṢṆDĀSA, K.
 1912 *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa.* Bombay V.S. 1969 [= 1912 AD].
 1954 *Śivamahāpurāṇam.* Bombay V.S. 2011 [= 1954 AD].

- 1983 *Vāyumahāpurāṇam*. Delhi 1983 [reprint of Venkateśvara edition of AD 1895].
- LIMAYE, V. P. et al.
1982 *Keśava's Kauśikapaddhati on the Kauśikasūtra of the Atharva-veda*. Pune 1982.
- LINROTHE, R.
1999 *Ruthless Compassion. Wrathful Deities in Early Indo-Tibetan Esoteric Buddhist Art*. London 1999.
- MAGOUN, H. W.
1999 *The Āsurī-Kalpa: A Witchcraft Practice of the Atharva-Veda. With an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Thesis Baltimore (Johns Hopkins Univ.) [= AJPh 10 (1899) 165-197].
- MEULENBELD, G. J.
1974 *The Mādhavanidāna and its Chief Commentary. Chapters 1–10. Introduction, Translation and Notes*. Leiden 1974.
2003–04 *Āyurveda and Atharvaveda: their interrelationship in the commentaries on the Kauśikasūtra*. In: *Du corps humain, au carrefour de plusieurs savoirs en Inde*. Mélanges offerts à Arian Roşu = Studia Asiatica 4–5. Université de Bucharest: 289–312.
- MICHAELS, A.
1978 *Beweisverfahren in der vedischen Sakralgeometrie. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Wissenschaft*. Wiesbaden 1978.
- MIKKYŌ, S, K.
1991 *Advayavajra chosakusha – Bonbun tekisuto – wayaku (4)* [Advayavajrasaṃgraha – New Critical Edition with Japanese Translation (4)]. In: *Taishō daigaku sōgō bukkyō kenkyūjō nenpō* 13 (1991) 291(46)–242(95).
- MODAK, B. R.
1993 *The Ancillary Literature of the Atharva-Veda. A Study with special reference to The Pariśiṣṭas*. New Delhi 1993.
- NAVARATHE, P. D.
1994 *Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Government Manuscripts Library deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Serial No. 34. Vol. IV, Part II. Kalpasūtras: B. Gṛhya and Other Works*. Poona 1994.
- Niśisamcāra*
Palm-leaf manuscript NGMPP B26/25.
- OLIVELLE, J. P.
2000 *Dharmasūtras. The Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana, and Vasiṣṭha. Annotated Text and Translation*. Delhi 2000.

- 2005 *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmāsāstra* [sic]. New York 2005.
- RAMANATHAN, A. A.
 1971 *Amarakośa with the Unpublished South Indian Commentaries Amarapadavivṛti of Liṅgayasūrin and the Amarapadapārijāta of Mallinātha*. 3 vols. (Adyar Library Series 101). Madras 1971.
- SANDERSON, A.
 1986 *Maṇḍala and Āgamic Identity in the Trika of Kashmir. Mantras et diagrammes rituels dans l'Hindouisme* (ed. by A. PADOUX) Paris (1986) 169–207.
 1988 Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions. *The World's Religions* (ed. by S. SUTHERLAND et. al.), London 1988, 660–704.
 2001* *Topography*. Unpublished draft: December 3, 2001.
 2002 History through Textual Criticism in the study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras. In: *Les Sources et le Temps. Sources and Time A Colloquium. Pondicherry 11–13 January 1997* (ed. by FRANÇOIS GRIMAL). Pondicherry (2002) 1–47.
 2003–04 The Śaiva Religion among the Khmers, Part I. *BEFEO* 90–91 (2003–04) 349–462.
- SANKALIA, H. D.
 1949 *Studies in the Historical and Cultural Geography and Ethnography of Gujarat. (Places and Peoples in Inscriptions of Gujarat: 300 B.C. – 1300 A.D.)*. Reprint 1997 (1st edition Pune 1949).
- ŚĀSTRĪ, V. S.
 1937 *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*. Mysore 1937.
- SCHREINER, P. & SÖHNEN, R.
 1987–89 *Sanskrit Indices and Text of the Brahmapurāṇa; Brahmapurāṇa, Summary of Contents, with Index of Names and Motifs*. 2 vols. (Purāṇa Research Publications Tübingen 1 & 2). Wiesbaden 1987–89.
- SHASTRI, J. L.
 1980 *Liṅgapurāṇa of Sage Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa. With Sanskrit Commentary Śivatoṣiṇī of Gaṇeśa Nātu*. Delhi 1980.
- SHĀSTRĪ, M. K.
 1918–38 *Tantrāloka of Abhinava-Gupta with Commentary [Tantrāloka-viveka] by Rājānaka Jayaratha*. (KSTS 23: 28–30, 35–36, 41, 47, 52, 57–59). Bombay 1918–38.
 1921–35 *The Svacchandra-Tantram (/Swa^o) with the commentary [-Uddyota] by Kshemarāja*. 6 vols., vol. V in two parts. (KSTS 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, 56). Bombay 1921-35.

- 1926–39 *The Netra Tantram with commentary [-Uddyota] by Kshemarāja*. 2 vols. (KSTS 46, 61). Bombay 1926–39.
- SHĀSTRĪ, M. R.
1918 *The Tantrasāra of Abhinava Gupta*. (KSTS 17). Bombay 1918.
- ŚĪROMAṆI, R. N.
1942 *An Alphabetical List of Manuscripts in the Oriental Institute, Baroda. Vol. I (GOS 97)*.
- SPROCKHOFF, J. F.
1999 *api vā* „oder auch / or also“ –oder was? Vom Fehlgriff bei der Wahl in einer Alternative: erster Versuch (Studien zu den rituellen Sūtras III). *IIJ* 42 (1999) 141–156.
- STRICKMANN, M.
2002 *Chinese Magical Medicine* (ed. by BERNARD FAURE). Stanford 2002.
- TÖRZSÖK, J.
1999* *The Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits. A critical edition of selected chapters of the Siddhayogeśvarīmatatantra with annotated translation and analysis*. D. Phil. thesis, Merton College, Oxford 1999.
- UPĀDHYĀYA, B.
1966 *Agnipurāṇa of Maharṣi Vedavyāsa (Kashi Sanskrit Series 174)*. Varanasi 1966.
- TÜRSTIG, H. G.
1985 The Indian Sorcery called Abhicāra. *WZKS* 29 (1985) 69–117.
- VISHVA BANDHU
1960 *Atharvaveda (Śaunaka) with the Pada-pāṭha and Sāyaṇācārya's Commentary. 4 parts*. Hoshiarpur 1960 [2nd edition: 1990].
1966 *Atharvavedīya-bṛhat-sarvānukramaṇikā*. Hoshiarpur 1966.
- WEBER, A.
1871–72 *Die Taittirīya-Saṁhitā. 2 vols. Indische Studien* 11 (1871) & 12 (1872). Berlin 1871–72.
- WESSELS-MEVISSSEN, C.
2001 *The Gods of the Directions in Ancient India. Origin and Early Development in Art and Literature (until c. 1000 A.D.)*. Berlin 2001.
- WHITNEY, W. D.
1905 *Atharva-Veda Saṁhitā: translated with a critical and exegetical Commentary. Revised and brought nearer to completion and edited by Charles Rockwell Lanman*. 2 vols. Cambridge (Mass.) 1905.

YOKOCHI, Y.

2004* *The Rise of the Warrior Goddess in Ancient India. A Study of the Myth Cycle of Kauśikī-Vindhyavāsini in the Skandapurāṇa.* Thesis University of Groningen 2004.

ZIESENISS, A.

1958 *Studien zur Geschichte des Śivaismus II. Die Śaiva-Systematik des Vṛhaspatitattva (Śata-Piṭaka, Indo-Asian Literatures 7).* New Delhi 1958.

Dr. Peter Bisschop
Lecturer in Sanskrit
Asian Studies
University of Edinburgh
7/8 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW
Scotland, U.K.
e-mail: Peter.Bisschop@ed.ac.uk

Prof. Dr. Arlo Griffiths
Instituut Kern, Universiteit Leiden
Postbus 9515
2300 RA Leiden, the Netherlands
e-mail: arlo.griffiths@let.leidenuniv.nl