



HAL
open science

The Ancillary Literature of the Paippalāda School

Arlo Griffiths

► **To cite this version:**

Arlo Griffiths. The Ancillary Literature of the Paippalāda School: A Preliminary Survey with an Edition of the Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad. Arlo Griffiths; Annette Schmiedchen. The Atharvaveda and Its Paippalādaśākhā: Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition, 11, Shaker, pp.141-193, 2007, Indologica Halensis, 978-3-8322-6255-6. halshs-01914983

HAL Id: halshs-01914983

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01914983>

Submitted on 7 Nov 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.

The Ancillary Literature of the Paippalāda School

A Preliminary Survey with an Edition of the *Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad**

Arlo Griffiths

§1. Introduction

With this paper, I wish to shed light on the extent of Paippalāda ancillary literature still available in Orissa — the last remaining stronghold of this Śākhā —, mainly on the basis of material collected by me during several field-trips over the past 8 years.¹ The edition of the *Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad*, which forms the main part of this contribution, will serve as an example of what kind of literature the extant sources preserve, and as an introduction to one specific category of manuscripts. It will also form the basis of a comparison between what literature is still available today, and what we have reason to believe may have been extant in the past in the domain of the Paippalādins' ancillary literature. This will lead, in conclusion, to some hypotheses concerning the relationships between the textual corpora of the Paippalāda and Śaunaka schools of the Atharvaveda, as well as some proposals for further research.

The ancillary literature of this Śaunaka school is relatively well known. Brahmins of this school, abiding in western India and Benares,² have left us a Brāhmaṇa (the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa* [GB]), two Sūtras (the *Kauśikasūtra* [KauśS], the *Vaitānasūtra* [VaitS], with its supplement of Atharvan *Prāyaścittas* [AVPrāy]), two *Prātiśākhya*s, a large collection of *Pariśiṣṭas* (AVPariś), commentaries on most of the above texts, and even *Paddhatis* are available in published form.³

This enumeration shows that the difference from the sister school, the Paippalāda-Śākhā, could not be greater; because for this school, besides its *Samhitā* (partly), almost nothing has been published,⁴ and next to nothing is known

*Diwakar Acharya has read and commented on two versions of the edition of and commentary on the *Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad*, and given many suggestions for improvement. I am grateful to him, as I am to Peter Bisschop, Harunaga Isaacson and Shilpa Sumant, who have also made several suggestions for improvement of the paper.

¹The hitherto collected manuscripts of the *Paippalādasamhitā* (PS) have been described in GRIFFITHS 2003a. A few additional PS mss. have been obtained since 2003, and will be presented by me elsewhere.

²See BAHULKAR (forthc.).

³For information on editions and translations, see GONDA 1975 and 1977, the lengthy and valuable introduction to BAHULKAR 1977 (only very partially reproduced in the published version [1994]), and MODAK 1993; concerning the Atharvavedapariśiṣṭas, see also the introduction to BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003; on Śaunaka-Atharvan *Paddhatis*, BAHULKAR 2002 and 2003, DIWEKAR et al. 1972, LIMAYE et al. 1982; on *Prātiśākhya* and *Vikṛtipāṭha* literature, DESHPANDE 1997 and 2002 respectively.

⁴Concerning the two exceptions, viz. the two *Paddhatis* published by Umākānta PAṆḌĀ respectively in 2000 and 2003, see below, §2C and 2D; see also the contribution of Alexis Sanderson

about its corpus of ancillary texts. Till now, only the discoverer of the Orissa Paippalāda tradition, Durgamohan BHATTACHARYYA, in his collection of lectures entitled *The Fundamental Themes of the Atharvaveda*, published posthumously in 1968, has dedicated some paragraphs to this theme, and summarized them as follows (1968: viii): “The Paippalāda [Atharvaveda] had its *Brāhmaṇa* and a vast ancillary literature, a part of which has survived in Eastern India along with thousands of orthodox adherents almost unnoticed by Vedic scholars.”

It has to be admitted frankly, at the outset, that the tradition in Orissa, although there are a large number of manuscripts lying in private collections, has not left us a broad variety of ancillary genres, by which I mean in this context any kind of non-Saṃhitā literature: I have hitherto only found manuscripts containing collections of Upaniṣads, on the one hand, and several categories of manuals for the performance of various rituals, on the other. After having undertaken several field-trips, I am not optimistic that any further genres may still be lying undiscovered. The following two sections give a survey of the available manuscript sources. These sources are admittedly limited, but nonetheless worthy of study in and of themselves, besides the fact that some of them offer important information on the history of the Paippalāda canon. Such information will be discussed further below (§5), after I have presented an edition of a relevant text, the *Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad* (§4).

I call my survey preliminary, because it seems to me that I am at once trying to do too much and too little, and the reader will notice that the materials collected in the survey have been treated in rather varying measure of detail. I have simply not yet had the chance seriously to investigate the contents of mss. representing some of the genres to be introduced below (KS), while for others, considerably more progress has been made, but this article did not seem to be the appropriate place to publish the findings (KP). Finally, for a third category of mss. (AK), this volume contains a separate paper (the one by Alexis Sanderson) that provides a first glimpse into the nature of the concerned genre of Atharvavedic ancillary literature.

§2. Paippalāda Ancillary Literature: Sources

Rather differently from the text corpus of other Vedic traditions, that of the Orissa Paippalādins cannot be studied primarily on the basis of manuscripts lying in public library collections: besides the Tübingen *Paippalādasamhitā* ms. in Śāradā script, I am only aware of two Orissan mss. preserved in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune (see §2D), and of small collections in the Orissa State Museum (see MISHRA 1973, MOHAPATRA 2002–03) and the

to this volume. Some publications in (heavily sanskritised) Oriya language and in Oriya script are also mentioned below, §2E.

Parija Library of Utkal University (see DEV 1988), both in Bhubaneswar. The Paippalāda textual traditions must in the first instance be studied on the basis of private manuscript collections. This circumstance, which no doubt holds true for other traditions historically limited to Orissa — an area poorly covered by nineteenth century expeditions in search of manuscripts, due to various (political) reasons⁵ — has certainly contributed to the comparatively undeveloped state of Paippalāda studies.

This section offers a rapid overview of the primary sources for the study of Paippalāda ancillary literature that I have hitherto collected.⁶ Besides four locally published books, these sources are in manuscript form, and for (future) reference to these, sigla will be proposed. Because identical sigla are found under the different lettered categories, genre acronyms are also given, to allow for unambiguous expanded sigla of the type Up/Ku₁, AK/Ku₁ etc. Only the Upaniṣad (Up.) mss. will be described in detail, in the next section (§3). Due to constraints of time and space, no detailed presentation of the contents of the other sources could be provided in this article.

With the exception of P₁ and P₂ (§2D), all mss. are in Oriya script; with the exception of those same two mss., and the four OSM mss. listed under B and D, all mss. listed here are from private collections, and none have appeared in previous catalogs; all mss. are written on palm-leaves, bound by a single string in the middle and enclosed in cover boards.

A. Upaniṣads (Up)

1. Gu₁. Photographs only of the folios containing the *Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad*, from a ms. belonging to Veṇudhara Paṇḍā of the village Guhiāpāḷa.⁷
2. Gu₂. Photographs of a ms. in pristine condition, kept by Sudhākara Paṇḍā of the village Guhiāpāḷa. Complete.
3. Jā. Photographs only of the folios containing the *Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad*, from a badly damaged ms. belonging to Haraprasāda Miśra of the village Jāmbhaṇi.
4. Ku₁. Large and worn ms., received from the late Harihara Upādhyāya of the village Kurumcaini. Painting on insides of front and back coverboards.
5. Ku₂. Smaller ms., in good condition, from the same collection.

⁵See Bh. PANDA 2003: 346f. for a warmly nationalistic account.

⁶The survey does not aim at completeness for the limited number of sources accessible in the mentioned public libraries, but includes from their collections only those mss. to which I have access in photographs or photocopies at the time of writing (March 2007).

⁷For this place name, and all the other place names from Orissa (and Jharkhand) mentioned in this article, see WITZEL & GRIFFITHS 2002.

6. Ku₃. Previously uninked ms., now inked by the author, in good condition, from the same collection.
7. Ni. Photographs of an extensive (composite) ms., kept by Maheśvara Miśra of the village Nirmaḷā.

B. Karmaṇājikā (KP)

For preliminary information on this text, and some quotations from it, see BHATTACHARYYA 1968: 2, 23. The papers GRIFFITHS 2003b and 2004–05 contain some longer excerpts in edited form. A critical edition of this text is currently being prepared, on the basis of the following materials.

1. Dh/903. Photographs of a seemingly old, worn, and incomplete ms. covering only the third section (on Śrāddha), from the Orissa State Museum (Bhubaneswar), previously reported as lost (GRIFFITHS 2003b: 365, n. 55), but found and photographed in 2005. Listed in MISHRA 1973, ser. nr. 1077.⁸
2. Gu₁. Photographs of a large, complete, but rather carelessly written ms. kept by Veṇudhara Paṇḍā of the village Guhiāpāḷa.
3. Gu₂. Rather poorly legible photographs of a ms. belonging to Ambujākṣa Upādhyāya of the village Guhiāpāḷa.
4. Ku. A large ms. in perfect condition, received from the late Harihara Upādhyāya of the village Kurumṇaini. The scribe of this ms. seems to be identical to that of the dated and localized ms. Up/Ku₃, described in §3 below.
5. Ni. Photographs of a seemingly old, worn, and incomplete ms., with generally good readings, belonging to Prahlāda Upādhyāya of the village Nirmaḷā.

⁸This ms. does not seem to have been noticed in MOHAPATRA 2002–03, where however no mss. with serial number other than “V/” have been included. After my most recent visit to the OSM (in 2005), I found in MOHAPATRA’s work (p. 50), in the description of the contents of V/126, that this PS-ms. also contains *śrīdhara viracitāyāṃ vivāhādikarmaṇājikāyāṃ cyutavratipunarupanayanavidhiḥ* (the colophon for the *vidhi* coming immediately before the KP portion published in GRIFFITHS 2003b, see p. 7 of that article), i.e. possibly a substantial part of the first third (*upanayana* related) part of the KP. I had failed to notice this in my own description of the ms. (see GRIFFITHS 2003a: 364). The photographs available to me do not seem to cover anything but PS material, but this may be due to my not having realized that the bundle contained important other material, when I took the photographs.

C. *Karmasamuccaya* (KS)

For an early mention of this title, see BHATTACHARYYA 1968: 2. Despite the misguided information in the second sentence of the *pūrvābhāṣaḥ* to PAṆḌĀ [2003] (no page number), *karmapañjikā karmasamuccayo vā iti granthe*, where the *Karmasamuccaya* is confused with the *Karmapañjikā*, it is clear that only mss. attributed to the KS lay at the basis of PAṆḌĀ's *Paddhati* published in 2000. The text seems to consist of (at least) three distinct parts, that are referred to by the Paippalādins as *Vratapustaka*, *Vivāhapustaka* and *Durbalakṛtya[pustaka]* respectively.⁹

1. Go. Photographs of a ms. of the *Vratapustaka* kept by Raghunātha Miśra of the village Goruāḷa.
2. Gu₁. Photographs of a ms. of the *Vivāhapustaka* kept by Kṛṣṇacandra Upādhyāya of the village Guhiāpāḷa.
3. Gu₂. Photographs of a notebook copy of the *Vratapustaka* (beginning [p. 1] with *adhivāsa* and ending [p. 207] with *samāvartana*, to which are appended several short texts including, e.g., *vratare janmatithīra devatāṅka nāma* [p. 208], *pāṇipādārghyavidhi* [209], *nāndimukhaśrāddhavidhi* [228–231] and three and a half verses attributed to the *Vāstusūtropaniṣad*¹⁰ [unnumbered last page of the notebook]) from the collection of Venūdhara and the late Vidyādhara Paṇḍā, village Guhiāpāḷa.
4. Ku₁. A fine ms. of the *Vratapustaka*, nicely written and in good condition (dated to the 13th *anika* of a king Rāmacandradeva), received from the

⁹In the *Āṅgirasakalpa* materials presented in this volume by Alexis Sanderon, we also occasionally see attributions to the KS.

¹⁰I am not sure whether these verses occur in the edition of BONER et al. 1996. I transliterate:

prabhāte vāñchitaṃ puṣpaṃ, madhyāhne phalaḥvāñchitaṃ |
sāyāhne devanāmam tu, rātrau tu nadīnāmakaṃ |
praśnākṣaraṃ dvīgunitaṃ mātrā caturguṇaṃ bhavet |
tithivārasamāyukta ekikṛtyaṃ ca sthāpitaṃ |
muninā kurute bhāgaṃ, śeṣaṃ kāryye niyojayet
candrāgnau kaṣṭakāryyaṃ siddhiyugmaś ca vedake
vāṇarasau śighrakāryyaṃ śunye ca kāryyanāśanaṃ

See the article by BHATTACHARYA in the mentioned edition, where a convincing argument is made (pp. 38f.) against the commentator's acquaintance with the PS, and hence against the authenticity of the text's attribution to the Paippalāda tradition — although BHATTACHARYA claims actually to cast doubt on the authenticity of a Paippalāda-connection of the Sūtras themselves, his strongest arguments seem rather to involve the commentator. The authenticity of the entire text has been called into question as well (see e.g. the review of the edition by Frederick M. ASHER in JAOS 104 [1984], 599f.), but the verses found in this notebook, which are not likely to have been influenced by an acquaintance with the edition, confirm at least that a text of this name has been in circulation.

late Harihara Upādhyāya, village Kurumçaini. Attributions to *Karmasamuccaya* e.g. ff. 35r, 65v, 76v, 79r, 129r. Begins with *adhivāse śālāroṇavidhi*, ends with *nāndimukhaśrāddhavidhi*.

5. Ku₂. Another ms. in pristine condition, covering the same text, from the same collection.
6. Kk. Another ms. of the *Vratapustaka* (beginning with *adhivāsa* and ending with *samāvartana*) in reasonable, though uninked, condition, received from Praphulla Upādhyāya of the village Kukurājūjhā.
7. Publication *Paippalādavivāhādīśaṃskārapaddhati* (PAṆḌĀ 2000).

D. *Āṅgirasakalpa* (AK)

BHATTACHARYYA (1968) mentions and quotes some stanzas from the AK on pages: 2, 23, 35, 37. On this last page, it becomes clear that he had access to only one ms.

1. As. Photographs of a ms. kept by Dāmodara Miśra, village Asimilā,¹¹ which served as the basis of the last item in this list.
2. Ku₁. An old ms. received from the late Harihara Upādhyāya, village Kurumçaini, with very fine writing and illustrations of yantras at the back. Concerned with rituals involving Nṛsimha.
3. Ku₂. A younger, extensive ms. from the same collection.
4. Ku₃. A small sized ms. from the same collection.
5. Ni. Photographs of a ms. kept by Maheśvara Miśra, village Nirmaḷā.
6. P₁. Photocopies of the ms. 960 (1887–91) of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune. Devanāgarī, but most likely copied from an Oriya exemplar, because Oriya marginalia are found occasionally, and the folio numbering is largely in Oriya numerals.¹² For details of this manuscript's contents, see Alexis Sanderson's contribution to this volume, pp. 210–216.

¹¹The connection of this village with a transmission of the *Āṅgirasakalpa* was already suggested by VASU (1911: x–xi, n. 1), which places it among the first modern Paippalādin villages to have appeared in Indological literature, several decades before the famous discoveries of Durgamohan BHATTACHARYYA.

¹²At the time of writing (March 2007), my photocopies of this and the following BORI ms. were still in the custody of Alexis Sanderson. The codicological facts are mentioned here from memory, but no greater detail can be given. Although BAHULKAR (1987: 576) notes that the BORI records report these two mss. "to have been collected by R. G. Bhandarkar from some place in Maharashtra during 1887–91", he also concludes, although on other grounds, that "they belong to the Paippalāda recension prevalent in Orissa" (p. 579). BAHULKAR provides some codicological details for both mss., and refers to the descriptive catalog of BORI mss. (vol. XVI, pt. II, 1976, ser. nos. 16 and 17, pp. 18–25).

7. P₂. Photocopies of the ms. 959 (1889–91) of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune. Devanāgarī, but most likely copied from an Oriya exemplar (on the same grounds as P₁). For details of this manuscript's contents, see the same contribution to this volume, 217–224.
8. Sa. Photographs of a ms. from the collection of the late Vaidyanātha Paṇḍā of the village Saṅkhāmari, now kept by his son Mr̥tyuñjaya Paṇḍā. Contents (partially) shared with Ku₃.
9. T/121. Photographs of a ms. from the Orissa State Museum, Bhubaneswar (OSM). Listed in MISHRA 1973, ser. nr. 197.
10. T/187. Photographs of a ms. from the OSM. Listed in MISHRA 1973, ser. nr. 198.
11. V/124. Photographs of a ms. from the OSM. Listed in MISHRA 1973, ser. nr. 17. This being one of the Atharvanic "V/" mss. from the OSM collection, details of its contents are given by MOHAPATRA (2002–03: 31–34).
12. Publication *Paippalādavaśādiṣaṭkarmapaddhati* (PAṆḌĀ [2003]).

E. Miscellaneous

1. An old, worn and incomplete ms. received from the late Harihara Upādhyāya, village Kurumcaini. The text covers various *pūjās* and *vidhis*, seemingly connected with the Śrāddha rite. A *Śrāddhasūtra* is apparently cited f. 53v. A *Durbalakṛtyapaddhati* starts on f. 90r. Although it seems to be related to it in terms of genre, I have found no attribution to the *Kar-masamuccaya*.
2. Photographs of a *Grahaśānti* ms. from the collection of the late Vaidyanātha Paṇḍā of the village Saṅkhāmari, now kept by his son Mr̥tyuñjaya Paṇḍā.
3. Photographs of a ms. from the collection of (late) Vidyādhara Paṇḍā and his brother Veṇudhara Paṇḍā of the village Guhiāpāla, containing: *Abhicārikatantra*, *Gāyatrīkāvaca*, *Pratyāṅgirāmantra*, *Mr̥ttikaśaṅkaravidhi* (°*kāsaṅkara*°?), *Skandapurāṇe Śītalāstotra*, *Aśvatthapradakṣiṇavidhi*, *Agnisva-rūpakathana*, *Agnijvālākṣaṇa*, (*Ugra*)*tārāstotra*, *Svapnādhyāya*.
4. Publication *Atharvavedīya Nityakarmapaddhati* (in Oriya) compiled by Lalita Mohana BHATṬAŚARMĀ (Bhubanesvar, Khaṇḍagiri Pres 1993). Contents: *Sandhyāvidhi*, *Nūtana yajñopavīta dhāraṇa mantra*, *Bhojanavidhi*, *Tarpanavidhi*, *Vaiśvadevavidhi*, *Samkṣipta pañcopacāra pūjāvidhi*, *Śrī Vakratuṇḍa pūjāvidhi*, *Śrī Śiva pūjāmantra*, *Śrī Sūryya pūjāmantra*, *Śrī Lakṣmī pūjāmantra*, *Śrī Nṛsiṃha pūjāmantra*, *Śrī Gopāla pūjāmantra*, *Śrī Vanadurgā pūjāmantra*, *Śrī Lakṣmīnārayaṇa pūjāmantra*, *Ekoddiṣṭaśrāddhavidhi*, *Puṇyastotraṃ vā Somopaniṣad*, *Dīpadāna śrāddhavidhi*, *Aparapakṣa śrāddhavidhi*.

5. Publication *Ātharvaṇīya Pūjā Paddhati* (in Oriya) compiled by Veṇudhara PAṆḌĀ (Kendujhara, Manamohinī Priṇṭiṃ Pres 2004). Contents: *Ātharvaṇīya sandhyā prayoga, Madhyāhna sandhyāyām, Gāyatrī śāpoddhāra, Oṃ śrī śrī Satyanārāyaṇa pūjā, Arghya saṃskāra, Ghaṭa pūjā, Homa vidhi, Pūjā prakaraṇam, Āsana pramāṇa, Āsana śuddhi, Sāmānyarghya vidhi, Saṃkalpa vidhi, Śrī śrī Viśvakarmā pūjā, Rādhāṅka pūjā, Paītā mantra, Yajñopavīta pramāṇa, Sūryyaṅku prārthanā, Pañcāmṛta śodhana vidhi, Mitādi pūjā, Aṣṭalokapāla maṇḍale pūjajet, Brahmā maṇḍale, Pañcagavyaśodhana vidhi.*
6. A booklet, probably similar in contents to the preceding items, seems to have been published by Dāmodara PAṆḌĀ, of the former Pāṭhaśālā in Baiśiṅgā (WITZEL & GRIFFITHS 2002: 176), but I have not seen it yet.

§3. Detailed Catalog of Upaniṣad Manuscripts

The various extant corpora of Upaniṣadic literature have attracted attention in recent years through the publications of BOUY (1990a/b, 1994, 1995). The existence of a more or less standardized collection of Atharvanic Upaniṣads (or texts styled as such), that is commonly found among the Paippalādins in Orissa, was not yet known previously, and the existing mss. have hence not been utilized in the study of this branch of literature.

As is clear from §2A above, I presently have access to (photographs of) 5 full mss. containing this collection: Gu₂, Ku₁, Ku₂, Ku₃ and Ni. For the other mss. there listed, I possess only photographs of the *Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad*, the critical edition of which will be presented in §4. The five mentioned mss. will first be described in detail in this section. A number of mss. with largely identical contents is available also in two public libraries of Orissa: the Parija Library of Utkal University (see DEV 1988), and in particular the Orissa State Museum (see MISHRA 1973). MOHAPATRA (2002–03: 10–12) has drawn up an alphabetical synopsis showing which mss. from the latter collection contain each Upaniṣad.

A specific investigation of this previously unknown Atharvavedic corpus from Orissa, in continuation of BOUY's research, is beyond the scope of this article. However, the tables to be presented below, showing the contents of the five mss. that are accessible to me in their entirety, combined with MOHAPATRA's synopsis, are meant to facilitate such further research. For this same purpose, the orthography of titles has, to a large extent, been normalized in the tables. In principle, only the main part of each ms. is taken into account here, while some indication of the extra material that every bundle contains is given as part of the codicological information.

Gu₂

The description of this ms. was done from photographs, and for that reason lacks some of the detail given for other mss.

- Collection Sudhākara Paṇḍā of the village Guhiāpāḷa.
 Photos Digital photographs are available with the author.
 Physical This entire ms., which was in good condition when I photographed it in 1998, was written by one hand, that of the current owner's grandfather, Yadunātha Paṇḍā. Dimensions not recorded. 4–5 lines per folio-side.
 Foliation 4 + 237 = 241 folios. At the head of the codex, there are four separately numbered folios, the first three of which bear the legend *śucipatra* in the left margin of the recto, and indeed contain a table of contents, although apparently of a different ms. than this one — perhaps its exemplar — because the indicated folio numbers do not match with the body of the codex. The fourth separately numbered folio (which bears both a numbering 1 and 4) contains extraneous material, partly invocatory verses.

At the back of the ms., f. 233r contains a few unidentified verses, its verso is blank. Folios 234r–237r (237v is blank) contain the text of PS 16.133–135, introduced with a marginal comment in the left margin of 234r: *khirodrakāṇḍa mantrakāṇḍa pṛthivīdohana*, which must be an almost unrecognizably misspelt reference to the so-called *kṣudrakāṇḍa* of PS, i.e. PS 16. There are two blank folios to conclude this codex.

- Colophon The colophon at f. 232r1–232v4 reads: *je vedaśāstra samāpto yam || || bhimasyāpi raṇe bhaṅgo mūner api matibhramam ya-di suddhamm asuddham vā mama doṣaḥ na vidyateḥ || bhagnapr-ṣṭhakatīgriṇa tulādrṣṭir adhomukham duḥkhena likṣitam grantha pu-trapautravat pratipālayetaḥ || yathā ādrṣamṣ tathā lekhanamḥ lek-hako nāsti doṣaḥ || śakābdāḥ 1855 sna 1340 sāla kakadāmāsa va-śammate di 27 ne śanivāra dina 6 cha ghaḍi samāyare yekāśata .. viṃsam paṇiśata lekhā samāptamḥ || tailād rakṣam jalād rakṣamḥ drakṣa māṃ ślaṣṇabandhanamḥ pāṃkṣūmbhyo parahastena jēvam vadanti pustakamḥ || kāsyapagotraśrīyadunāthadevaśarmaṇam idam vedapustakapaniśat likhitam || (ornament) || || he sujñam janamāne suna e paṇiśata lekhā helā puṇa || mo vajasa 60 sāthīye jāna || mātrā-visargajñāna nāhim puṇa || āji re kṛṣṇa saptami jāna || tahim re ha-rījanma puṇa || nakṣatra asmīni aṭāi || rocahaṇi nakṣatra pāi nā. || pāñjire jāhā ukta thilā || āmbhamāne tāhā kaḥ bhalā || sādhumāne mo doṣa na dhariba || mu aṭe niśce murkhajiba || murkhakuḷare yanma mora || vidyā abhyāsa nāhi mora || je mate kalāim lekhanī || dosa na dharibe sujñā jana || e tarapa baharāgorā || siṃhabhuim aṭe jīlā ||*

maraganepaścisilā ho guhīyāpāla grāmare vāsa thāim || nāma mohara yadunātha || dayā karibe jagannātha || pitā mohara dā-dara || rakṣā karantu cakradhara || hasti caḷati pādena jihvāṭa ·· paṇḍitāḥ || (ornament) || rakṣā karibe {adhama} jagannātha mahāprabhu adhama śrīyadunātha paṇḍāṅku ghara sāḥ guhīyāpāla grāmyāvasthita || || śrī śubham astu sarvātraḥ || || (ornament) || śakābdā 1855 | 1340 | śrāvāṇa di 27 na.

Date According to the colophon, the copying of this ms. was concluded in Śaka 1855 = Sna 1340¹³ = 1932/33 CE, on a Saturday, the 27th of the solar month Karkaṭa (*ka[n̄]kaḍāmāsa*), also said to be the 7th *tithi* of the waning fortnight of an unspecified lunar month, Nakṣatra Aśvinī, and the 27th of the lunar month Śrāvāṇa. The various elements of the dating are in conflict with each other, so no exact date can be extracted from them — but that the copying was concluded in August 1933 seems certain.

Folios	Contain
1–6r4	Muṇḍakopaniṣad
6r5–12r5	Praśnopaniṣad
12v1–14v1	Garbhopaniṣad
14v2–16v4	Prāṇāgnihotropiṣad
16v4–18r3	Mahopaniṣad
18r3–20v1	Brahmopaniṣad
20v1–21r4	Brahmavidyopaniṣad
21r4–22v1	Kṣurikopaniṣad
22v2–23v2	Cūlikopaniṣad
23v2–24v3	Anucūlikopaniṣad
24v3–29r2	Atharvaśiropaniṣad
29r3–30r3	Atharvaśikhopaniṣad
30r4–31r5	Amṛtabindūpaniṣad
31r5–33v1	Amṛtanādotpaniṣad
33v2–34r2	Yogaśikhopaniṣad
34r2–34v5	Nārāyaṇopaniṣad
34v5–35r4	Śrutipratyagānandopaniṣad
35r5–36r2	Ātharvaṇopaniṣad
36r2–46v3	Ātharvaṇa Tāpanīya (in 5 upaniṣads) = Nṛṣimhapūrvatāpanīya
46v4–57r3	Nṛṣimhasyottaratāpanīya (in 9 khaṇḍas)
57r3–59r4	Viśvarūpākṣopaniṣad
59r4–60r4	Gāyatriyupaniṣad
60r4–63v3	Gāyatrīhṛdaya
63v3–64v5	Haṃsopaniṣad (in two khaṇḍas?) ¹⁴
64v5–66r3	Paramahaṃsopaniṣad
66r3–67v1	Āruṇyopaniṣad
67v1–68r5	Kālāgnirudropaniṣad

¹³On this era of the Mughal emperor Akbar, see GRIFFITHS 2003a: 339.

¹⁴In all mss. presented here, the 1st division of this text is explicitly called *khaṇḍa*, whereas the second is closed with a simple numerical indication.

68r5–68v5	Mantrāḥ (= Vibhūtigrahaṇamantrāḥ of Ku ₁ ?)
69r1–74r4	Śrīrāmacandrasya Pūrvatāpanīya (in 5 upaniṣads)
74r5–77v3	Ātharvaṇarahasye Śrīrāmacandrasyottaratāpanī
77v3–79v3	Ātharvaṇe Śrīrāmacandropaniṣad
79v3–83r3	Śrīkr̥ṣṇapūrvatāpanīya (in 5 sections)
83r3–84r2	Gāruḍopaniṣad
84r2–85r5	Saubhāgyakāṇḍe Kālikopaniṣad
85v1–86v4	Somotpattyupaniṣad ¹⁵
86v4–87r4	Piṇḍopaniṣad
87r4–88r1	Ātmopaniṣad ¹⁶
88r1–88v4	Māṇḍukyopaniṣad
88v5–91r3	Śrīkr̥ṣṇasya pūrvatāpanīye Kaivalyopaniṣad (?) ¹⁷
91r4–98v4	Kaivalyopaniṣad
98v4–116r4	Atharvaṇi Puruṣasubodhinī / Pūrvatāpanī (in 6 prapāṭhakas)
116r4–126r5	Atharvaṇi Puruṣasubodhinīyā Uttaraprapāṭhaka (in 6 prapāṭhakas)
126v1–131v5	Nṛsimhatāpanīyoktabṛhan-Mahopaniṣad (in 12 numbered sections)
132r1–133r4	Dhyānabindūpaniṣad
133r4–134r2	Tejobindūpaniṣad
134r2–139v5	Śrīkr̥ṣṇaśāntopaniṣad
139v5–143r3	Tripurīprakaraṇa
143r3–174v2	Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad (in 8 adhyāyas and 2 kāṇḍas)
174v2–179r5	Ānandavallī (in 2 adhyāyas)
179v1–183r1	Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad
183r1–184v5	Tāropaniṣad
184v5–186v2	Ugratāropaniṣad
186v3–191v4	Gaṇeśatāpanīya (in 3 upaniṣads)
191v4–199v2	Śvetāśvataropaniṣad (in 6 adhyāyas)
199v2–201v3	Hayagrīvasaṃhitāyāṃ Hayagrīvaikākṣaramantravidhānaṃ prathamō 'dhyāyaḥ
201v3–202r5	... Hayagrīvayantravidhānaṃ nāma dvitīyo 'dhyāyaḥ
202r5–204r5	Kenopaniṣad
204r5–207r4	Kumārabodhinī (in 4 prapāṭhakas)
207r4–211r1	Tattvabodhinī (12 th prapāṭhaka only?) ¹⁸
211r1–213r5	Yogabodhinī (in 2 prapāṭhakas)
213r5–215v1	Jābālopaniṣad
215v1–216v3	Atharvaṇi rahasye Gāyatrīvidyopaniṣad (?) ¹⁹
216v3–217r2	Atharvaṇi Śaunakīyaśākhāyā (!) Gāyatrīyantropaniṣad
217r2–217v4	Atharvaṇi rahasye Mahākālikopaniṣad
217v4–218v5	Advaitopaniṣad
218v5–219v2	Brahmajyotyupaniṣad
219v2–221r2	Ātharvaṇarahasye Vajraśucaupaniṣad (?)
221r2–221v4	Virojākṣetropaniṣad (= Virajā°?)
221v4–222v1	Kalisantaranopaniṣad
222v1–224r4	Aṅgirasō Sūryatāpanīyopaniṣad
224r4–226r4	Dakṣiṇāmukhopaniṣad

¹⁵The ms.: *ātharvaṇe somotpattih.*

¹⁶The ms.: *ātmanopaniṣat.*

¹⁷The ms.: *śrīkr̥ṣṇasya pūrvatāpanīkaivalyapaniṣat.*

¹⁸Note that this text seems to have three prapāṭhakas in Ku₃ and Ni.

¹⁹The ms.: *°vidyupaniṣat.*

Ku₁

- Collection** Formerly in the possession of Harihara Upādhyāya, Kurum-caini. Now deposited in the Kern Institute, Leiden.
- Physical** In the first half of the codex, most folios have lost one or two centimeters on the left side, due to wear, which has resulted in the loss of some akṣaras; in general, the ms. is in fairly fragile condition, and shows some mildew. Dimensions ca. 40 × 3.5 cm on average. 4 lines per folio-side.
- Foliation** 142 leaves. The codex opens with two unconnected, less stained/worn folios, partially filled with uninked text; then follow two folios of which the first — to judge by the staining of the leaves — was joined with the main part from early on; the main part starts on the verso of the second of these two leaves, which side bears the number 1. Numbering is on the right margin of the verso. Folio 18 has been flipped over, so that 18v comes before 18r; after f. 77, two fresher folios of slightly smaller dimensions, which do however carry numbering 78–79, are inserted, and the standard type of leaf resumes with 80; ff. 131–134 are in a different hand, on different (fresher, smaller) leaves, uninked and unnumbered: they have been added later, it seems. Four loose, inked but unnumbered folios, partially filled with writing by the first hand, conclude the codex.
- Colophon** The codex contains the following indications about the name of a former owner, Lokanātha Kara: *śrīṅṣiṃha rakṣā kara lokanātha karaṅku* (f. 45v4); *śrīgaṇeśa rakṣā kara arakṣita lokanātha karaṅku* (f. 111r3–4). A colophon (f. 121r3–v1) reads as follows: ... *ity ātharvaṇarahasye vajrasucaupaniṣat samāptā || agastyas ca pulastyas ca vaiśampāyanameva {·} ca | sumanto jayamunis caiva pañca ite vajravārṇā || 1 || śrī vīrakesārīdevaṅka 7 caitrakṛṣṇasaptamī guruvāre ekacāliā śāsanna mahājana kānukara {·}brahmāṅka putra idaṃ pustakaṃ likhitaṃ || bhīmasyāpi ... vidyate || ... putravat paripālayet ||*. Evidently, the ms. originates from the important Paippalāda village Ekacāliā, near Bhubanesvar.
- Date** According to the colophon (see above), the copying of a substantial part of this ms. was concluded in the 7th *aṅka* = 5th regnal year of a king Vīrakesārīdeva,²⁰ on the 7th *tithi* of the waning fortnight of Caitra. According to a genealogy of Gajapati incumbents kindly supplied to me by Professor G.N. Dash (Bhubaneswar),²¹ this dynasty has known three kings of the

²⁰On the calculation of regnal years from *aṅkas*, see GRIFFITHS 2003a: 338.

²¹Based on such sources as H.K. MAHATABS *History of Orissa*, Vol. II (Prajatantra Prachar Samiti, Cuttack: 1960), pp. 471f. and K.N. MAHAPATRA's *Khurudā Itihāsa* (1969) [both unavail-

indicated name: Vīrakeśari I (1737–1793), Vīrakeśari II (1856–1859), Vīrakeśari III (1956/7–1971). TRUHART (1985) gives “1739–1751 (dep.)” for the only Vīra Kishor Deva that is listed there (p. 1452).²² The data in the colophon are anyhow not sufficient in themselves to determine which ruler of this name was intended, but (Dash’s) Vīrakeśari II’s reign can be excluded for it lasted less than 5 years. The ms. is not likely to be more than 200 years old, so the conclusion would have to be that the ms. dates to Vīrakeśari III’s reign, i.e. to ca. 1961/2, if this did not seem equally unlikely to one who sees its physical condition.

Folios	Contain
1–6r1	Muṇḍakopaniṣad
6r1–11r1	Praśnopaniṣad
11r1–12v4	Garbhopaniṣad
12v4–14v4	Prāṇāgnihotropāniṣad
14v4–16r1	Mahopaniṣad
16r1–18r2	Brahmopaniṣad
18r2–18v2	Brahmavidyopaniṣad
18v3–19v3	Kṣurikopaniṣad
19v3–20v2	Cūlikopaniṣad
20v2–21v1	Anucūlikopaniṣad
21v1–25r3	Atharvaśiropaniṣad
25r3–26r2	Atharvaśikhopaniṣad
26r3–27r2	Amṛtabindūpaniṣad
27r2–29r1	Amṛtanādotpaniṣad
29r1–29v1	Yogaśikhopaniṣad
29v2–30r2	Nārāyaṇopaniṣad
30r2–30v1	Śrutipratyagānandopaniṣad
30v1–31r3	Ātharvaṇopaniṣad
31r3–40r3	Ātharvaṇa Tāpanīya (in 5 upaniṣads) = Nṛsiṃhapūrvatāpanīya
40r3–49v4	Nṛsiṃhasyottaratāpanīya (in 9 khaṇḍas)
49v4–54r3	Nṛsiṃhatāpanīyoktabṛhan-Mahopaniṣad (in 12 numbered sections)
54r3–55r3	Dhyānabindūpaniṣad
55r3–55v3	Tejobindūpaniṣad
55v3–56v3	Haṃsopaniṣad (in 2 khaṇḍas)
56v3–57v4	Paramahaṃsopaniṣad
57v4–58v4	Āruṇyopaniṣad
58v4–59v2	Kālāgnirudropaniṣad
59v3–60r3	Vibhūtigrahaṇamantrāḥ
60r3–61r1	Gāruḍopaniṣad
61r1–62v2	Saubhāgyakāṇḍe Kālikopaniṣad
62v2–63r3	Somotpattyupaniṣad
63r3–63v2	Piṇḍopaniṣad

able to me], but with improvements and updating by Professor Dash.

²²TRUHART’s list stops with the year 1871, but gives Rāmchandra Deva III (1810–1857) and Divya Siṃha Deva III (1857–1871) for the period covered by Vīrakeśari II of Professor Dash’s list.

63v2–64r3	Ātmopaniṣad
64r3–64v4	Māṇḍukyopaniṣad
65r1–66v1	Kaivalyopaniṣad
66v1–71r1	Śrīrāmacandrasya Pūrvatāpanīya (in 5 upaniṣads)
71r1–74r1	Ātharvaṇarahasye Śrīrāmacandrasyottaratāpanī
74r1–75v2	Ātharvaṇe Śrīrāmacandropaniṣad
75v2–78v2	Śrīkrṣṇapūrvatāpanīya (in 5 sections)
78v2–83v4	Śrīkrṣṇasyottaratāpanīya
83v4–88r4	Kṛṣṇasya śāntopaniṣad
88v1–91r1	Tripurīprakaraṇa
91r1–92v4	Viśvarūpākṣopaniṣad
92v4–93v1	Gātryopaniṣad
93v1–96v1	Gāyatrihṛdaya
96v1–103r3	Kāṭhavallī (in 2 adhyāyas, with further vallī subdivisions) ²³
103r3–112r2	Ātharvaṇīpuruṣasubodhinī (in 7 prapāṭhaka: contd. f. 124)
112r3–116r3	Gaṇeśatāpanīya (in 3 upaniṣads)
116r3–118r1	Hayagrīvasaṃhitāyām HGEAV (see Gu ₂) prathamā adhyāyaḥ
118r1–118v1	... hayagrīvayantravidhānaṃ nāma dvitīyo 'dhyāyaḥ
118v1–119v1	Advaitopaniṣad
119v1–120r1	Jyotyopaniṣad
120r1–121r3	Ātharvaṇarahasye Vajrasūcaupaniṣad (?)
121v1–123r3	Tāropaniṣad
123r3–124v1	Ugratāropaniṣad
124v1–126v4	Ātharvaṇī Puruṣasubodhinī (8 th –10 th prapāṭhaka)
126v4–130r4	Ātharvaṇī Puruṣasubodhinī 8 th prapāṭhaka (bis?)
130v1–130v6	Piṇḍikāpratiṣṭhā
131r1–134r5	Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad

Ku₂

Collection	Formerly in the possession of Harihara Upādhyāya, Kurum-caini. Now deposited in the Kern Institute, Leiden.
Physical	The codex is in excellent condition. Its dimensions are ca. 34 × 4 cm on average; 5 (rarely 4) lines per side.
Foliation	The codex contains 10 + 110 (– 9) + 2 = 113 folios. There are 9 blank leaves at the head. The verso of the 10 th contains one (partial) line. Then follow 1½ leaves with a <i>Mantrarājajapavidhi</i> , four lines per side, by a different scribe than the one of the main part of the codex. This text ends on f. 1r. The main part of the codex starts on 1v, with <i>śrī viḅnarājāya namaḥ</i> . There are two blank leaves at the back of the codex. Folios 48–56 are missing; numbering is on the right side of the verso of ff. 1–2, thenceforward on the right side of the recto.
Colophon	I have found no colophons giving extra information to be reported here.

²³The title does not seem to be mentioned in any of the colophons, but the text agrees with the one given an explicit title in ms. Ni.

Date I have found no indications concerning the date of this codex.

Folios	Contain
1v1–6v4	Muṇḍakopaniṣad
6v4–12v4	Praśnopaniṣad
12v4–14v5	Garbhopaniṣad
14v5–17r1	Prāṇāgnihotropiṣad
17r2–18r5	Mahopaniṣad
18r5–20v3	Brahmopaniṣad
20v3–21r5	Brahmavidyopaniṣad
21r5–22v4	Kṣurikopaniṣad
22v4–23v5	Cūlikopaniṣad
23v5–24v5	Anucūlikopaniṣad
24v5–29r2	Atharvaśiropaniṣad
29r2–30r3	Atharvaśikhopaniṣad
30r3–31r5	Amṛtabindūpaniṣad
31r5–33r5	Amṛtanādopaniṣad
33r5–33v5	Yogaśikhopaniṣad
34r1–34v4	Nārāyaṇopaniṣad
34v4–35r3	Śrutipratyagānandopaniṣad
35r4–40r1	Bṛhanmahopaniṣad (in 12 numbered sections)
40r1–47	Nṛsimhapūrvatāpanīya (in 5 upaniṣads) ²⁴
57r1–62r5	Nṛsimhasyottaratāpanīya (in 9 khaṇḍas) ²⁵
62r5–63r3	Ātharvaṇopaniṣad
63r3–66v5	Gopālatāpanī (in 5 numbered sections) ²⁶
66v5–73r3	Śrīkṛṣṇasyottaratāpanīya
73r3–74r4	Gāyatriyupaniṣad
74r4–77r5	Tripuryupaniṣad ²⁷
77r5–79v3	Viśvarūpākṣaparakaraṇopaniṣad ²⁸
79v3–80v3	Kālāgnirudropaniṣad
80v3–81r5	Mantrāḥ (= Vibhūtigrahaṇamantrāḥ?)
81r5–83r4	Kaivalyopaniṣad
83r4–84v3	Kālikopaniṣad
84v3–86v2	Tāropaniṣad
86v2–88r3	Ugratāropaniṣad
88r3–92r5	Śrīrāmacandrasya pūrvatāpanīye ātharvaṇarahasye 1 st –5 th upaniṣad
92r5–95v2	Śrīrāmacandrasyottaratāpanīya
95v3–97r5	Śrīrāmacandropaniṣad
97r5–98v1	Haṃsopaniṣad (in 2 khaṇḍas)

²⁴There is a gap of 9 folios in the ms. The 4th upaniṣad is incomplete, the 5th is entirely lost.

²⁵Due to the gap in the ms., khaṇḍas 1–5 are lost, 6 is incomplete, while 7–9 are complete.

²⁶BHATTACHARYYA (1968: 20) mentions Baladeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa's commentary on the *Gopālatāpanī Upaniṣad*, the text we see figuring here and in Up/Ni (below): "The work is introduced by Baladeva as a tract of the Paippalādaśākhā specially studied by the Atharvavedins of Utkala: *utkalādibhir ātharvaṇikair adhīyamānā pippalādisākhāntaḥsthitayaṃ gopālopaniṣat* |". The same quote had been given already by BHATTACHARYYA in 1955 (p. 2), where a reference is given to *Catalogus Catalogorum* III, 159, and another commentarial passage quoted that links this Upaniṣad rather to Brahmins residing in Gurjara and other regions.

²⁷The ms.: *tripurī*.

²⁸The ms.: *viśvarūpākṣaparakaraṇa*.

98v2–99v5	Paramahamsopaniṣad
99v5–103r2	Gāyatrīhr̥daya
103r3–110r2	Rudrābhiṣeka ²⁹
110r3–110v5	Siddhivināyakastotra ³⁰

Ku₃

Collection	Formerly in the possession of Harihara Upādhyāya, Kurumcaini. Now deposited in the Kern Institute, Leiden.
Contents	Atharvanic Upaniṣads: for details, see the list below. The bundle contains three more items. The first of these (A), by the same scribe, is separately numbered 1–13 (numbering on left margin of recto), and contains the <i>Muṇḍakopaniṣad</i> , <i>Praśnopaniṣad</i> , <i>Garbhopaniṣad</i> and <i>Prāṇāgnihotropaniṣad</i> ; the second (B), seemingly starting off in the hand of our main scribe, then continuing in that of another, and then once again in that of the first, consists of eleven unnumbered folios, containing i.a. various <i>Pratiṣṭhās</i> (<i>Prāsāda</i> °, <i>Dvāra</i> °, <i>Hṛdaya</i> °, <i>Dhvaja</i> °, <i>Pinḍikā</i> °), the <i>Puruṣasūkta</i> , and a <i>Madhuparkavidhāna</i> ; the third (C) consists of a single folio from another text (<i>Śaktabījākṣaranirṇaya</i> , part of an <i>Ātharvaṇīyopaniṣadbhāṣya</i> attributed to Śaṅkara), probably written by the same scribe, numbered 44.
Physical	This codex, which is in excellent condition, seems to have been written by the scribe of KP/Ku (see §2B). It was previously uninked, and ink has been applied by myself: in the process, some of the unnumbered folios may have been put in disorder. Dimensions ca. 35.5 × 4 cm on average. Up to f. 120, 6 lines per folio-side; thereafter 5 lines per side.
Foliation	160 (– 15) + 13 + 1 + 11 + 1 = 171 leaves. Numbering on right side of verso of ff. 1–14 (14: the recto is blank); numbering on right side of recto of ff. 15–160 (104: the verso is blank). Missing folios: 72–74, 121, 123, 126, 128–130, 149–151, 155–157; two folios are numbered 80.
Colophon	The colophon on f. 160v reads: ... <i>ity āṅgirasakalpe sahaśrākṣaranṛhamantraḥ samāptaḥ śrīnṛha rakṣā karibe adhama bhovanikaṅku ... bhimasyāpi ... vidyate tailād ... pustakaṃ ... samasta makundadeva mahārājāṅka 13 ṅka kumbha 25 nare āṭhagara tālukā bhitara muṭhā yemādeipurāsāsana{·}ra mahājana bhovanikare upādhyā ākula karena lekhitaṃm i{·}daṃ pustakaṃ </i> . Evidently, the ms. originates from the Paippalāda village Jemādeipura.

²⁹Including Śatarudriya/Rudrādhyāya.

³⁰The ms.: *nṛsimhapurāṅāntargataśrīsiddhivināyakastotra*.

Date According to the colophon, the copying of the main part of this ms. was concluded in the 13th *aṅka* = 11th regnal year of a king Mukundadeva, on the 25th day of the Nakṣatra Aquarius (*kumbha*). According to Professor Dash's genealogy of Gaṅgapatī incumbents mentioned under Ku₁ (p. 152), the dynasty has known three kings of the indicated name. Professor Dash gives 1795–1817 as the dates for Mukunda II and 1878–1926 as those of Mukunda III. TRUHART (1985) gives 1659–1661 (dep.) / 1662/3–1689 for Mukunda I, 1791–1810 for Mukunda II and does not cover Mukunda III because his list stops with the year 1871. Anyhow, the data are not sufficient to determine which ruler of this name was intended. Even if we choose the most recent of these reigns, the codex would date to ca. 1898, which seems unlikely in view of its pristine physical condition. We may suspect the colophon to have been copied from an exemplar.

Folios	Contain
1v1–5r5	Muṇḍakopaniṣad (also in A, see above)
5r5–10r3	Praśnopaniṣad (also in A, see above)
10r3–12r1	Garbhopaniṣad (also in A, see above)
12r2–14v2	Prāṇāgnihotropaniṣad (also in A, see above)
14v2–15v4	Mahopaniṣad
15v4–17v3	Brahmopaniṣad
17v3–18r3	Brahmavidyopaniṣad
18r4–19r4	Kṣurikopaniṣad
19r4–20r1	Cūlikopaniṣad
20r2–20v1	Anucūlikopaniṣad
20v2–23v6	Atharvaśiropaniṣad
23v6–24v4	Atharvaśikhopaniṣad
24v4–25v2	Amṛtabindūpaniṣad
25v2–27r5	Amṛtanādopaniṣad
27r6–27v5	Yogaśikhopaniṣad
27v5–28r6	Nārāyaṇopaniṣad
28v1–28v4	Śrutipratyagānandopaniṣad
28v4–29r5	Ātharvaṇopaniṣad
29r5–37v3	Nṛsimhapūrvatāpanīya (in 5 upaniṣads)
37v3–46r6	Nṛsimhasyottaratāpanīya (in 9 khaṇḍas)
46r6–50r3	Nṛsimhatāpanīyokta-Bṛhanmahopaniṣad (in 12 numbered sections)
50r4–50v5	Atharvaṇopaniṣad (not the same text as on 28v4–29r5)
50v5–53r5	Śrī-Kṛṣṇasya pūrvatāpanīya (in 5 numbered sections)
53r6–58r2	Śrīkṛṣṇasyottaratāpanīya
58r2–62r2	Kṛṣṇaśāntopaniṣad
62r2–68r2	Kāthavallī (in 6 vallīs) ³¹
68r2–69v1	Kenopaniṣad

³¹The title does not seem to be mentioned in any of the colophons, but the text agrees with the one given an explicit title in ms. Ni. The adhyāya division seems to be absent in this ms.

69v1–75r5	Śvetāśvataropaniṣad (incomplete)
75r5–79r2	Ānandavallī (in 2 adhyāyas)
79r2–79v1	Brahmajyotyupaniṣad
79v1–80r1	Ātmopaniṣad
80r1–80v2	Māṇḍukyopaniṣad
80v2–80bisr5	Advaitopaniṣad
80bisr5–80bisv5	Jyotyupaniṣad
81r1–82v5	Vajraśucyupaniṣad
83r1–84r6	Kaivalyopaniṣad
84r6–85r3	Haṃsopaniṣad (in two khaṇḍas)
85r3–86r2	Paramahaṃsopaniṣad
86r2–87r1	Āruṇyupaniṣad
87r1–88v6	Tripuryupaniṣad
89r1–90r5	Viśvarūpaprakaraṇa
90r6–91r1	Kālāgnirudropaniṣad
91r1–92r4	Kālikopaniṣad
92r4–93v1	Tāropaniṣad
93v1–94v3	Ugratāropaniṣad
94v3–95r4	Gāruḍopaniṣad
95r5–96r5	Somotpattyupaniṣad
96r5–96v3	Piṇḍopaniṣad
96v3–98r1	Hayagrīvaikākṣaravidhānaṃ nāma prathamo 'dhyāyaḥ
98r1–98r6	Hayagrīvayantravidhānaṃ nāma dvitīyo 'dhyāyaḥ
98v1–99r4	Dhyānabindūpaniṣad
99r4–99v4	Tejobindūpaniṣad
99v4–103r4	Śrīrāmacandrasya pūrvatāpanīye ātharvaṇarahasye 1 st –5 th upaniṣad
103r4–105v6	Śrīrāmacandrasyottaratāpanīya Ātharvaṇarahasya
105v6–107r3	Ātharvaṇī Śrīrāmacandropaniṣad
107r3–109r5	Gāyatrīhṛdaya
109r6–110r1	Gāyatoryupaniṣad
110r2–113r3	Gaṇeśatāpanīya (in 3 upaniṣads)
113r3–115r6	Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad
115r6–?	Puruṣasubodhinī (incomplete)
131r1–133r1	Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad (repeated [!], incomplete)
133r2–136r4	Tattvabodhinī (in 3 prapāṭhakas?)
136r4–158r1	Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad (in 8 adhyāyas, incomplete)
158r1–160v3	Āṅgirasakalpe Sahasrākṣaraṇṛ[siṃ]hamaṅtra

Ni

Collection	Maheśvara Miśra of the village Nirmalā.
Photos	Digital photographs are available with the author.
Physical	Condition fairly bad. Dimensions 41 × 3.5 cm, 4–6 (rarely 7/8) lines per folio-side. This is a composite ms. consisting of parts written by two quite different hands, probably compiled from two previously separate codices, as the multiple (re)numberings suggest (see below); some folios by the larger hand have been damaged by rodents/insects.
Foliation	1 + 172 + 8 = 181 folios. The folios are numbered in the right margin, with different (re)numberings on recto and on verso,

corresponding with changes from the larger to the smaller hand.

There is a separate folio numbered 102 at the front of the codex. The folio contains three uninked drawings on the unnumbered side, only one of which — the leftmost — is fairly clearly identifiable (as a rooster); on this same side we find two lines of inked writing: *ye pākha patra bhuli kari lekhī achi* [line] *dosa bāchiba nāhiṃ he pnamāne* || ‘This side of the leaf I have written by mistake, don’t mind this mistake, please, you all’. On the reverse (numbered) side, besides the number, there are only two lines of (uninked) writing: *danta kāṭhi bhāṅgi dāmatrae* | *ā{r}yju{bha}r va{ya}lam yaśo varccaṃ prajā paśu vaśūni ca* | [line] *brahma prajñā ca me pāpaṃ tvaṃ nno dhehi vanaspate* | 1 |.

In the main part of the codex, the larger (older?) hand is found on ff. 1–10, 61–91, 94–99, 112–159; the smaller (younger?) hand on 11–60, 92–93, 100–111, 160–171; it is not clear whether the remaining folios are attributable to one of these two hands, or to a third. In this description, the continuous numbering on the verso (from 166 on the recto) is followed; there is also numbering on the recto of ff. 1–39, 51–60, but this has been crossed out; ff. 40–44, 46–48 and 50 bear numbering only on the verso, but each time the present number is the result of correction of a previously noted number, which is still identifiable throughout (order: 45, 49, 48, 47, 46, 44, 43, 42, 54); ff. 61–91 bear numbering 11–41 on the recto (11–19 crossed out); ff. 94–99 (verso) bear 44–49 (recto); ff. 112–159³² bear 50–98.³³ Letter-numbering is found in the left margin of ff. 100–111, but with two mistakes: *ka kha ga gha ṛa ca*³⁴ *cha ja śrī ṛa ṭa ṭha ḍa*. The four folios comprising the *Kumārabodhinī* bear respectively the akṣaras *ku mā ra bodhinyāṃ* in the left margin of the verso. From f. 70 onwards, the verso numbering was not inked, and arabic numbering, up to 171, has been added before photographing by the author (also on the front folio numbered ‘102’). There is no numbering at all on the folios that follow 171, although (if we continue counting) up to 177, they are not extraneous. There are finally two folios with unrelated material at the back of the codex.

Colophon On f. 165r6, after the *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad*, in the smaller hand, there is a colophon which provides information about the scribe or his patron: *śrī nārāyaṇa uddharibe u{dhā}ddhāra karibe adhama arakhita mādhava miśraṅka putra banamāliku* | *jāṇimā hebe sujñā*

³²There are two folios numbered 133 on the verso, corresponding to recto 71, 72.

³³For the last number, the ms. in fact reads ‘998’.

³⁴On the verso of *ṛa*.

janamāne || ‘Śrī Nārāyaṇa will save, will perform the saving of Vanamālī, the lowly and unprotected son of Mādhava Mīśra. The intelligent people will know it’.

Date I have found no indications concerning the date of this codex.

Folios	Contain
1–5v3	Muṇḍakopaniṣad
5v3–11r4	Praśnopaniṣad
11r4–12v4	Garbhopaniṣad
12v4–14r5	Prāṇāgnihotropiṣad
14r5–15r4	Mahopaniṣad
15r4–17r1	Brahmopaniṣad
17r1–17v1	Brahmavidyopaniṣad
17v1–18v1	Kṣurikopaniṣad
18v1–19r4	Cūlikopaniṣad
19r4–20r2	Anucūlikopaniṣad
20r2–23r3	Atharvaśiropaniṣad
23r4–24r1	Atharvaśikhopaniṣad
24r1–24v3	Amṛtabindūpaniṣad
24v4–26r2	Amṛtanādropaniṣad
26r3–26v1	Yogaśikhopaniṣad
26v1–27r2	Nārāyaṇopaniṣad
27r2–27v1	Śrutipratyagānandopaniṣad
27v1–28r1	Ātharvaṇopaniṣad
28r2–36r1	Ātharvaṇa(pūrva)tāpanīya (in 5 upaniṣads)
36r2–43v1	(Nṛsimhasyottaratāpanīya) ³⁵ in 9 khaṇḍas
43v1–46v6	Mahopaniṣad (in 12 numbered sections)
47r1–48v1	Viśvarūpākṣopaniṣad ³⁶
48v1–50v3	Tripuryupaniṣad ³⁷
50v3–51v2	Hamsopaniṣad (in 2 khaṇḍas)
51v2–52r6	Paramahamsopaniṣad
52r6–55r5	Ātharvaṇe Gaṇeśatāpanīya (in 3 upaniṣads)
55r5–56r1	Saubhāgyakāṇḍe Kālikopaniṣad
56r2–56v1	Kālāgnirudropaniṣad
56v1–56v5	Vibhūtigrahaṇamantrāḥ
56v5–57v2	Somotpattyupaniṣad
57v2–57v5	Piṇḍopaniṣad
57v6–58r6	Gāruḍopaniṣad
58v1–59r1	Gāyatriyupaniṣad
59r1–60v6	Gāyatrīhr̥daya
61r1–61r4	(struck out: end of Praśnopaniṣad)
61r4–64v4	Gopālatāpanī ([Śrīkṛṣṇapūrvatāpanīyaṃ], in 5 numbered sections)
64v4–71v2	Śrīkṛṣṇasyottaratāpanīya
71v2–73v1	Atharvaṇi Tāropaniṣad
73v2–75r2	Ugratāropaniṣad
75r3–80v3	Rāmacandrapūrvatāpanīya ³⁸ (in 5 upaniṣads)

³⁵The ms. does not give this name.

³⁶The spelling of the colophon in Ni seems to be: *viśvōṣpā[+ kṣaparakaraṇa]kṣopaniṣat samāptaṃ*.

³⁷Precise spelling in Ni: *trīpuripaniṣat*.

³⁸The colophons give more fully: *śrīrāmacandrasya pūrvatāpanīye ātharvaṇasya rahasye*.

80v4–84v1	Rāmacandrottaratāpanīya ³⁹ (in 4 numbered sections)
84v1–86r4	Ātharvaṇe Śrīrāmacandropaniṣad
86r4–93v2	Kaṭhavallī (in 2 adhyāyas, with further vallī subdivisions)
93v2–98v3	Kṛṣṇasya Śāntopaniṣad
98v3–99v4	Advaitopaniṣad
100r1–100r4	Brahmajyotyupaniṣad ⁴⁰
100r4–101v3	Hayagrīvasaṃhitāyāṃ Hayagrīvaikākṣaravidhāna (in 2 adhyāyas)
101v3–102v2	Āruṇyupaniṣad
102v2–103r1	Ātmopaniṣad
103r1–103v1	Māṇḍukopaniṣad
103v1–104v3	Kaivalyopaniṣad
104v3–105r1	Brahmajyotyupaniṣad ⁴¹
105r1–105r5	Jyotyupaniṣad
105r6–106r5	Ātharvaṇarahasye Vajraśucyupaniṣad
106r5–109v2	Ānandavallī (in 2 adhyāyas)
109v2–110r7	Jābālopaniṣad
110r7–111r1	Ātharvaṇarahasye Śaunakīśākhāyā (!) Gāyatrīyantropaniṣad
111r2–111r5	Ātharvaṇīye Saubhāgyakāṇḍe Mahākālyupaniṣad
111r5–111v2	Īsopaniṣad
112r1–120r1	Śvetāśvataropaniṣad (in 6 adhyāyas)
120r1–123v1	Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad
123v1–139v4	Ātharvaṇīpuruṣasubodhinī (in 12 prapāṭhakas)
140r1–165r6	Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad (in 8 adhyāyas and 2 kāṇḍas) ⁴²
166r1–166v4	Dhyānabindūpaniṣad
166v5–167v5	Tejobindūpaniṣad
168r1–169r3	Ātharvaṇe rahasye Caitanyopaniṣad
169r3–171r3	Ātharvaṇakumārabodhinī (in 4 prapāṭhakas)
172r1–173v5	Ātharvaṇe Pippalādaśākhāyāṃ Vāsudevopaniṣad
174r1–177v4	Ātharvaṇe Tattvabodhini ⁴³ (in 3 prapāṭhakas)

³⁹The ms.: *ātharvaṇarahasye śrīrāmacandrasyottaratāpanī*.

⁴⁰The ms.: *brahmajyotipaniṣat*.

⁴¹The same text occurred already above, 100r1–100r4. The ms. here: *brahmajyotaupaniṣat*.

⁴²The colophon at the end of the text: *ity ātharvaṇarahasyeti mahānārāyaṇopaniṣadi paramasāyujyamuktisvāṛpanirpaṇaṃ nāmaṣṭamo dhyāyah | devadarśityākṣatharvaṇaśākhāyāṃ paramatve rahasyākhyātharvaṇamahānārāyaṇopaniṣadi paramamu[bha]ktimārgasvargasvāṛpa{.}nirpaṇaṃ nāma dvitīyottarakāṇḍaḥ samāptaḥ ||*. Note the association of this text with a non-Paippalāda-Śākhā (corr.: *devadarśityākhyātharvaṇa*^o); cf. also the *Gāyatrīyantropaniṣad* in this ms. (110r7–111r5) and Gu₂ (216v3–217v2).

⁴³The ms.: *ity ātharvaṇe tatvodhanyāṃ trītyaprapāṭhakaḥ*. The correct spelling of the title is found in mss. Gu₂ and Ku₃.

§4. The Orissa version of the Atharvavedic *Caraṇavyūha*

The Atharvavedic Caraṇavyūha

Since Wilhem SIEGLING's *Inaugural-Dissertation*, published a hundred years ago, the various recensions of the *Caraṇavyūha* appear to have sunk almost entirely into oblivion as a source on the history of Vedic Śākhās. SIEGLING's study contained only a sample edition of a small part (concerning the Yajurvedic canon) of the Yajurvedic recension of this text, but otherwise no serious study or attempt at critical edition of the Yajurvedic recension (YV-CV) is known to me.⁴⁴ In 1910, Herman Melville BOLLING und Julius VON NEGELEIN published an Atharvavedic recension as the 49th *Pariśiṣṭa* of the Śaunakīya Atharvaveda.

After passing through materials concerning respectively the Ṛgveda, the Yajurveda, and the Sāmaveda, this *Caraṇavyūha* depicts in some detail the extent of the Atharvavedic Mantra-collection, discusses the former and extant size of the Atharvavedic *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*, and cites a verse listing the five Kalpas of this Veda — the *Kauśikasūtra* alias *Samhitāvidhi*, *Vaitānakalpa* (presumably = °*sūtra*), the *Nakṣatrakalpa*, *Śāntikalpa*, and *Āṅgirasakalpa*. The resources developed for the correct transmission of the *Samhitā*, viz. the so-called *Lakṣaṇagranthas*, are also mentioned. The text gives two — only partially overlapping — lists of Atharvavedic Upaniṣads, surveys the collection of 72 *Paralipomena* (*Pariśiṣṭas*), which it itself forms part of, the final piece of the Śaunakīya canon, before closing with a list of 18 *vratas* said to be specific to the Atharvaveda. In short, the text offers a kind of catalog of Atharvavedic primary and ancillary literature, and may therefore be considered of indirect relevance to the topic of this contribution, despite its association with the Śaunaka school.⁴⁵

It is not generally known that the Atharvavedic *Caraṇavyūha* (AV-CV) not only exists as part of the corpus of Atharvavedapariśiṣṭas, but is also to be found among the Paippalāda brahmins in Orissa, transmitted in their Upaniṣad manuscripts under the title *Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad*. This text, by virtue of its association with the Paippalāda school, is directly relevant to my investigation. Making use of the mss. described above, I will first (§4.1) present an edition of the 'Upaniṣad' with some text critical commentary (§4.2), and will then (§5) analyze its contents mainly insofar as these contents throw light on the canon of Paippalāda ancillary texts.

Two recensions?

Although mention has been made by me elsewhere of the *Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad*

⁴⁴For the complete text, I use the edition by Pt. Anantarām DOGĀRĀ ŚĀSTRĪ.

⁴⁵This *Caraṇavyūha* has drawn attention in relatively recent years because of the two Upaniṣad-lists it contains in the BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN edition, which, according to BOUY (1994: 31, 65–67), are of importance to the determination of the chronology of some medieval Upaniṣads.

(CVU) as a second Atharvavedic recension of the *Caranavyūha*,⁴⁶ now, after studying the text, I think I should not have suggested so casually the existence of two Atharvavedic recensions, because there are few differences that cannot be ascribed merely to the very poor care that seems to have been taken in transmitting the Orissan Paippalāda (CVU) and the Śaunaka (AVPariś) versions of the text, and there are many common errors that suggest a descent from a common source.

On the other hand, this same poor transmission is perhaps one of the main reasons due to which WITZEL (1985: 288 n. 35) had to observe: “Obwohl weitgehend mit AV-Par. 49 übereinstimmend, kann die letztlich gujaratische Tradition der AV-Par. und die von Or[issa] nicht auf einen gemeinsamen (schriftlichen) Archetyp zurückgeführt werden”. There is one major difference between the two versions — namely in the listing of Atharvavedic Upaniṣads — which indeed demonstrates some redactional intervention at some stage, and justifies speaking of two versions, if not recensions.

My basic aim here is to restore the archetype only of the Orissan version (CVU_A), from which I believe all the presently extant Orissan mss. to descend. In other words, I am not taking the further step of reconstructing the Ur-AV-CV on the basis of systematic critical comparison of the CVU with AVPariś 49 (WITZEL’s “common (written) archetype”), because there are too many cases where no criteria for making a choice between the two seem to be at hand. However, I have not tried to keep my text wholly free of the positive influence that can be had from the AVPariś version, and have at times emended precisely on that basis, where I felt that bringing out the intended meaning of the text was more important than keeping the two versions distinct. My edition thus constituted is therefore, admittedly, somewhat hybrid. Important differences between the two versions have been pointed out in my commentary (§4.2).

About the edition

For this edition of the CVU, I use four of the mss. described in §3 (Ni, Ku₁, Ku₃, Gu₂) plus two extra mss. photographed in the village Guhiāpāḷa: the ms. Gu₁, belonging to Veṇudhara Paṇḍā, plus a ms. Jā, belonging to Haraprasāda Miśra of the village Jāmbhaṇi, who had brought it from there to show it to me in Guhiāpāḷa. Only the folios containing the CVU were photographed of these last two mss., and no descriptive notes were taken.

The text is found on the following folios in each ms.: Ni 120r1–123v1 (= *pr. m.* 58–61), Ku₁ on 4 unnumbered/uninked leaves (7 sides) immediately following

⁴⁶See BISSCHOP & GRIFFITHS 2003: 317, n. 8. Since writing that footnote, where I referred to the *Caranavyūhopaniṣad* as a second recension, I have managed to obtain an electronic file of Christa BASTIAANSEN’S MA thesis that I also mentioned, through the kind offices of Michael Witzel. The file does not contain a title page or a date, and the thesis that it contains does not offer an edition of the text, which was known to BASTIAANSEN only in one recent paper copy of a ms. from Baiśiṅgā. The only published information I am aware of is the short note by WITZEL 1985: 288 (n. 35), and the excerpt from the text on pp. 274f. of that article.

f. 131, Ku₃ 113r3–115r6, Gu₁ 153r2–155v1, Gu₂ 179b1–183r1. The numbering in Jā has been lost due to wear of the right side of every folio; I have made no attempt at precision in indicating the extent of the lacunae in this ms. Several variants make it clear that Gu₂ is a copy from Gu₁: e.g., at 3.3, the Gu₂ scribe has misinterpreted a correction in Gu₁ concerning *ṣaḍ bhedā*, which has led him to write *ṣaḍ bhedo*; at 4.1, Gu₁ marginally inserts *saubhagāḥ*, but this is found as part of the text proper in Gu₂.

The division of the text into paragraphs is mine, and follows that in the edition of AVPariś 49, for ease of comparison: this also entails some gaps in the CVU numbering, because this version does not contain every paragraph that is found in the Atharvavedic *Caraṇavyūha* of AVPariś 49. The CVU mss. do not make any subdivisions in the text above the *daṇḍa*-level. The punctuation of my edition to a large extent obeys the placement of *daṇḍas* in the manuscripts.

My apparatus is not fully positive, as variants judged to be insignificant have been omitted from it: among such insignificant variants figure prominently the presence or absence of visarga in prose context where the scribes often seem consciously not to apply sandhi, in order to make case endings explicit. In the absence of other errors, my critical apparatus does not report variants of punctuation (including confusion of *ḥ* and *|* in Gu₁ and Gu₂); errors involving sibilants; variants involving doubling around *r* (*rṇṇ*, *rṭṭ*, *rddh* etc.) and *y* (*ddhy*); variants/errors involving the signs *ṛ / ṝ / ru / rū*; absence of avagrahas inserted into the edited text for the sake of clarity. Typically Oriya spellings with *!* and *ȳ* are maintained when a variant is quoted for other reasons, but are not counted among variants in and of themselves. For those passages where the evidence from ms. Jā is lost due to lacuna, the apparatus has not been subjected to the above limitations, but has been given in full. Some other variants that could strictly speaking be considered insignificant have also been retained, in order to demonstrate particular irregular phenomena in the mss.

I use the following editorial signs and symbols:

- A single raised dot represents an illegible akṣara. If a vowel follows, this means that the consonantal (basic) part of the sign is illegible, but that its vowel component is clear.
- [[...]] Editorial observations on the preceding reading(s) appear in double square brackets.
- {...} Curly braces enclose akṣaras or vowel elements thereof deleted by the scribe.
- ⟨...⟩ Angle brackets enclose akṣaras wholly or partially lost due to damage suffered by the palmleaves. The number of intervening raised dots (·) is an approximate reflection of the number of lost akṣaras.
- [...] Square brackets with open bottom enclose material appearing interlinearly or *in margine*. The sign + marks marginal additions. The sign → signals corrections: the marginal or interlinear material replaces the preceding material that appears in the actual line of writing. Both additions

and corrections are frequently followed by a number referring to the line in which the correction is to be made.

- (...) The same → sign is used to mark other scribal corrections, where the corrected reading appears in parentheses.
- om.* The word(s) in question is/are omitted in the following mss.
- em.* The reading has been established through emendation.
- Σ All collated mss.
- ms.^{ac}* The *ante correctionem* reading in the ms. concerned.
- ms.^{pc}* The *post correctionem* reading in the ms. concerned.
- sec. m.* Material written '*secunda manu*': in these mss., this often merely means that the correction or addition has been made after the ink was applied to the manuscript.

§4.1. Edition of the *Caranavyūhopaniṣad*

atha caranavyūhaṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ 1.1	1
tatra catvāro vedā bhavanti ṛgvedo yajurvedaḥ sāmavedo brahma-	
vedaḥ 1.2	3
ṛgvedasya śāstraveda upavedaḥ yajurvedasya dhanurveda upavedaḥ	
sāmavedasya gāndharvaveda upavedaḥ atharvavedasyāyurveda upavedaḥ	5
divyasāmpadaprāyaścittiyābhicārikāḥ 1.3	
ṛgvedasyātreya gotraḥ gāyatrī chandaḥ agnir devatā yajurvedasya	7
kāśyapagotraḥ traīṣṭubhaṃ chandaḥ vāyur devatā sāmavedasya bhāradvā-	
jagotraḥ jagatī chandaḥ viṣṇur devatā atharvavedasya vaikhāyanagotraḥ	9
ānuṣṭubhaṃ chandaḥ brahmā devatā 1.4	
ṛgvedaḥ pītavarṇena padmapatrākṣaḥ suvyaktagrīvaḥ kuñcitakeśaśmaśruḥ	11
supratiṣṭhitajānujaṅghāpramāṇena so 'pi viṣṭhitāḥ pañca 1.5	
ṛgvedasya sapta śākhā bhavanti tad yathā āśvalāyanā-śāṅkhāyanā-	13

1 caranavyūhaṃ] *em.*, °vyuham Ni^{pc}, °vyūhavidhi Ku₁, raṇavyuhavidhi Ku₃, °vyuhavidhi Ni^{ac}Gu₁Gu₂, caranavyuhavidhiṃ Jā 2 tatra] NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, tataḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 4 ṛgvedasya] NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, ṛgvedasya Gu₁Gu₂ 4 śāstraveda upavedaḥ] Ni, śāstravedo upa° Ku₁Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂, śāstravedopa° Jā 4 dhanurveda upavedaḥ] NiKu₁Gu₁, dhanurvedo upavedaḥ Ku₃, dhanurvedopavedaḥ Gu₁Gu₂, dhanurvedopa⟨veda.⟩ Jā 5 sāmavedasya] NiKu₁, sāmavedasya Ku₃, sāmavedo Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 5 gāndharvaveda] NiKu₁, gāndharvavedo Ku₃, gāndharvavedaḥ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 5 °vedasyāyurveda upa°] Ku₁, °vedasya āyurvedo upa° Ku₃, °vedasya āyurveda upa° NiGu₁Gu₂, °vedasyāyurvedopa° Jā 6 °cittiyābhi°] Ku₁Jā, °cittiyābhi° Ni, °cittābhi° Ku₃, °citā'bhi° Gu₁Gu₂ 8 vāyur] NiKu₁Ku₃, vāyur Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 8 devatā] NiKu₁Ku₃Gu₂, devatāḥ Gu₁; lost in lacuna Jā 8 sāmavedasya] NiKu₁Ku₃, śāma° Gu₁Gu₂, ⟨·ve⟩dasya Jā 9 vaikhāyana°] NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, vaikṣāyana° Gu₁Gu₂ 11 ṛgvedaḥ] Gu₁Gu₂Jā, ṛgveda{sya}ḥ Ni, ṛgvedasya Ku₁, ṛgveda Ku₃ 11 °śmaśruḥ] °śmaśru Ni, °śmaśruḥ Ku₁, °śmaśru Ku₃, °śmaśmṛḥ Gu₁, °śaśmṛ Gu₂, °⟨s·⟩ Jā 12 jaṅghāpramāṇena] NiKu₁, jaghapramāṇena Ku₃, yaghanapramāṇenaḥ Gu₁Gu₂; almost the entire compound (except °māṇena) is lost in lacuna in Jā 12 'pi] *om.* NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, pi Gu₁Gu₂ 12 viṣṭhitāḥ] Ku₁Jā, viṣṭhitamḥ Ni, niṣṭhitāḥ Ku₃, viṣṭitamḥ Gu₁Gu₂

- 1 sādhyāyanā-śākalā-bākalā-audumbarā-māṇḍūkyāś ceti || 1.6 ||
tāsām adhyayanam
- 3 ṛcām daśa sahasrāṇi ṛcām pañca śatāni ca |
ṛcām aśītiḥ pādaś cety etat pāraṇam ucyate || 1.7 ||
- 5 tatra yajurvedasya caturviṃśatiḥ śākhā bhavanti || tad yathā |
kaṇvā-madhyandinā-jābālā-śāpeyā-śvetā-śvetatarā-tāmrāyaṇīyā-paurṇarasā-
7 āvaṭikā-paramāvaṭikā-aukṣyā-bodhā-śāṇḍikā-āhvarakā-carakā-mitrāyaṇīyā-
hāritakarṇā-śālābalīyā-marcakathā-prācyakathā-kapiṣṭhalakathā-upavanā-
9 tittiriyaś ceti || 2.1 ||
tāsām adhyayanam
- 11 ṛcām dve sahasre śatam nyūne manṭre vājasaneyake |
ślokena paramam khyātam brāhmaṇam caturguṇam || 2.2 ||
- 13 aṣṭadaśa sahasrāṇi bhavanti | tāny eva triguṇam adhītya kramapāro bha-
vati | sapta sthāvarāś ceti || 2.3 ||
- 15 śākhās tisro bhavanti | pārāmsarvāpāraḥ samaśi pārakramajaṭam krama-
pāraś ceti || 2.4 ||
- 17 ṣaḍ aṅgāny adhītya ṣaḍaṅgavid bhavati |

1 sādhyāyanā] NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, sādhyāyanāḥ Gu₁, sādhyāyanāḥ Gu₂ 1 śākalā] NiKu₁Jā, śākalā Ku₃, śākalāḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 1 bākalā] NiKu₁Jā, bājalā Ku₃, bākalāḥ Gu₁Gu₂
2 adhyayanam] NiKu₃Gu₁Gu₂, adhyāyanāḥ Ku₁, adhyāyana Jā 3 ca] NiKu₁Ku₃, caḥ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 4 aśītiḥ] Ku₁, aśītiḥ Ni, aśītiḥ Ku₃, aśītiḥ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 4 cety etat] *em.*, ce{tye}tratra Ni, ceyetatra Ku₁, cetitatra Ku₃, cetatra Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 4 pāraṇam] *em.*, pārāyaṇam NiKu₁, pārāyaṇam Ku₃, pārāyaṇam Gu₁Gu₂, gaṇyaṇam Jā 6 kaṇvā] *em.*, kaṇvā NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, kānyāḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 6 madhyandinā] Ku₁Ku₃Jā, ma{kṣya}dhyandinā Ni, mādhyandināḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 6 jābālā] NiKu₁Jā, yābālā Ku₃, śākalāḥ bākalāḥ kābālāḥ Gu₁, śākalāḥ bākalāḥ kābālāḥ Gu₂ [[Gu₁Gu₂ inserted from RV] 6 tāmrāyaṇīyā] *em.*, tāmrākṣaṇīyā Ni, tāmrākṣaṇīyā Ku₁, tāmrā | kṣaṇīyā Ku₃, tāmrāḥyūṇīyāḥ Gu₁Gu₂, tāmrā | kṣaṇīyā Jā 7 aukṣyā] aukṣā NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, aukṣāḥ Gu₁, aukṣyāḥ Gu₂ 7 bodhā] Ku₁Ku₃, boddhā Ni, bodhāḥ Gu₁Gu₂, bo{.} Jā 7 śāṇḍikā] NiKu₁Ku₃, sāṇḍikāḥ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 7 āhvarakā] *em.*, āhurakā NiKu₁, āharakā Ku₃, āhvūrakāḥ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 7 carakā] Ku₃, carakā | {hvarakā} Ni, carakāhvarakā Ku₁, carakāḥ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 8 marcakathā] NiKu₃, marcikathā Ku₁, maricikathāḥ Gu₁Gu₂, marcika{ṭa}ṭhā Jā 8 prācyakathā] Ku₁Jā, [+ prācyakathā] Ni, *om.* Ku₃, prācyakathāḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 10 adhyayanam] NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, adhyāyana Gu₁Gu₂ 11 nyūne] nyūne | NiJā, nyūnam || Ku₁, nyun(+ e)m | Ku₃, nyuno Gu₁Gu₂ 11 vājasaneyake] *em.*, vājasanītyeke NiKu₃Jā, vājasanītyeke Ku₁, vā{ja}śa[+ ta 2]nītyekāḥ Gu₁, vā[line]śanītyekāḥ Gu₂ 12 khyātam] *em.*, khyāto Σ 12 caturguṇam] NiKu₁, caturguṇam Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂, {c...} Jā 12 ||] *om.* NiKu₁Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂; lacuna Jā 13 aṣṭadaśa] NiKu₁Ku₃Gu₂, aṣṭadāsa Gu₁; lost in lacuna Jā 13 sahasrāṇi] NiKu₁, sahaṇi Ku₃, sahaśrāṇi Gu₁, sahaśrāṇi Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 13 tāny eva] *em.*, tāne NiKu₁Gu₁Gu₂, tāneva Ku₃; lost in lacuna Jā 13 triguṇam adhītya] *em.*, triguṇam adhītyā NiJā, tiguṇa(+ ma)dhītyā Ku₁, triguṇam adhītyā Ku₃, triguṇam adhyātma Gu₁Gu₂ 14 sthāvarāś] NiKu₁Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂, sthāvaroś Jā 15 bhavanti] *em.*, bhavati Σ 15 pārāmsarvāpāraḥ] Ni, pārāmsarvāpāraḥ Ku₁Ku₃Jā, pārāmsarvāpāra Gu₁Gu₂ 15 samaśi] Ku₁, sama{rśa}{→ *sec. m.* śi) Ni, samaṇi Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂, samaśi Jā

śikṣā kalpo vyākaraṇaṃ niruktaṃ chando jyotiṣam	1
itihāsapurāṇaṃ ṣaḍ aṅgāni bṛhatsarvānukramaṇīś ceti 2.5	
atha yajurvedaḥ prāṃśuḥ pralambajaṭharaḥ sthūlagalakapālena rakto var-	3
ṇena prādeśāḥ ṣaḍ dīrghatvena yajurvedasya etad rūpaṃ bhavati 2.6	
sāmavedasya śākhāsahasram āsit anadhyāye 'dhiyamānāḥ sarve te śakre-	5
ṇa vinihataḥ pralīnāḥ 3.1	
tatra ke cid avaśiṣṭāḥ pracaranti tad yathā rāṇāyanīyā-satyamugrā-kālayā-	7
mahākālayā-kaithimā-lāṅgalikāś ceti 3.2	
kaithimānām api ṣaḍ bheda bhavanti tad yathā rāṇāyanīyā-vātarāyaṇīyā-	9
vainavṛthāḥ-prācīnā-tejasā-śaunakīyāś ceti 3.3	
tāsām adhyayaṇaṃ	11
aṣṭau sāmāsahasrāṇi sāmāni ca caturdaśa	
sohyāni sarahasyāni etat sāmagaṇaṃ smṛtam 3.4	13
atha sāmavedaḥ suvāsāḥ sugandhī tejasvī mṛduvaktā brahmaṇyaḥ pra-	
lambabāhuḥ susnigdhaḥ carmā kṛṣṇo varṇena kātaro vayanena 3.5	15

1 jyotiṣam] NiKu₁, yotiṣam Ku₃, jyotisam Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 2 itihāsapurāṇaṃ] *em.*, itihāsapurāṇānāṃ Ni, itihā{śa}sapurāṇānāṃ Ku₁, itihāsapurāṇaṃ Ku₃Gu₁, itihāsapurāṇyāṃ Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 2 ṣaḍ aṅgāni] NiKu₁, sāṅgāni Ku₃, ṣaḍ aṅgāni Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 2 bṛhatsarvānukramaṇīś ceti] NiKu₁Jā, bṛhatsā{māni}rvānukramaṇīśceti || tha Ku₃, bṛhatsarvānukramaṇīśāśr(sec. m. → śtr)eti Gu₁, bṛhatsarvānukramaṇīśāśtreti Gu₂ 3 yajurvedaḥ] Ku₃Jā, yajurvedasya NiKu₁, jaryurvedaḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 3 prāṃśuḥ] *em.*, prāṃśu NiKu₁Jā, prāśu Ku₃Gu₂, prāṇu Gu₁ 3 pralambajaṭharaḥ] pralambajaṭhara NiKu₃Gu₁Gu₂, prāla{mya}mbajaṭhara Ku₁, pralambijaṭhara Jā 3 sthūlagalakapālena] *em.*, sthūlagalakapālena NiJā, sthūlagalakapālena Ku₁Ku₃, sthūlagalakapālenaḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 4 prādeśāḥ ṣaḍ] *em.*, prādeśā Σ 5 sāmavedasya] Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂Jā, asya sāmavedasya Ku₁Ni^{ac}, atha sāmavedasya Ni^{pc} 5-6 śakreṇa] NiKu₁Ku₃, śakreṇaṃ Gu₁Gu₂, (<·)kreṇa Jā 6 vinihataḥ] NiKu₁, vinihitāḥ Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂Jā 6 pralīnāḥ] NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, patnīnāṃḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 7 cid] *em.*, cita NiKu₁Ku₃, citta Gu₁Gu₂, cit Jā 7 rāṇāyanīyā] Jā, rā{·}ṇāyanīyā Ni, rāgāyanīyā Ku₁, rāṇāyanīyā Ku₃, rāṇāyanīyāḥ vā tarāyanīyāḥ Gu₁Gu₂ [[see below]] 8 kaithimā] Jā, kai{nya}thimā Ni, kainyamā Ku₁Ku₃, kainyamānāḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 9 kaithimānām] *em.*, kainyamānām Σ 9 bheda] NiKu₁Ku₃Gu₁Jā, bhedo Gu₂ 9 rāṇāyanīyā] NiKu₁Ku₃, rāṇāyanīyāḥ Gu₁Gu₂, {nārāyā}rāṇā{y...} Jā 9 vātarāyanīyā] NiKu₁, vitarāyanīyā Ku₃, *om.* Gu₁Gu₂ [[see above]]; lost in lacuna Jā 10 vainavṛthāḥ] NiKu₁Ku₃, vainavṛthāḥ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 10 tejasā] *em.*, tejaḥ NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, *om.* Gu₁Gu₂ 12 aṣṭau] NiKu₁Jā, ṛcā aṣṭau Ku₃, aṣṭo Gu₁Gu₂ 12 sāmāsahasrāṇi] NiKu₁Jā, sahasrāṇi Ku₃, sāmāsahasrāṇi Gu₁Gu₂ 12 ca caturdaśa] Jā, caturdaśa(+ ḥ |) ca Ni, caturdaśa Ku₁, caturdaśaḥ Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂ 13 sohyāni] *em.*, saurjyeṇa NiKu₁Gu₁Gu₂, saujiyeṇa Ku₃, saurjyāṇa Jā 13 sarahasyāni etat] *em.*, māsahasrāṇy(→ kṣ)etataḥ Ni, {sā}māsahasrāṇyetaḥ Ku₁, māsahasrāṇyetaḥ Ku₃, samasahasrāṇyetaḥ Gu₁Gu₂, mīśahasrāṇyetaḥ Jā 13 sāmagaṇaṃ smṛtam] *em.* [[after AVParīś], sāmagaṇāḥ smṛtāḥ Σ 14 suvāsāḥ] Gu₁, suvāsā NiKu₁Ku₃, suvāśiḥ Gu₂, suvāśi Jā 14 sugandhī] NiKu₁Jā, sugandhaḥ Ku₃, sugandhiṃḥ Gu₁, sugandhiḥ Gu₂ 15 varṇena kātaro] varṇṇena kāta{r}(→ n)o Ni, varṇṇena | kā(→ jñā)taro Ku₁, varṇṇena.jñātano Ku₃ [[note punctuation with full stop]], varṇṇe(na·ā)tano Gu₁, varṇṇemṇamjñātano Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 15 vayanena] Ni^{ac}Gu₁Gu₂, varṇena Ni^{pc}, na(→ va)yanena Ku₁, vaḃyadena Ku₃, (<·)yanena Jā

- 1 ṣaḍaratnimātrapramāṇavayanaḥ smr̥taḥ || anye ṛṣayo brahmā sāmāni tiṣṭha-
nti sam̥nidhau | sa bhagavān sāmavedo maheśvarabhaktaḥ || 3.6 ||
- 3 tatra brahmavedasya nava śākhā bhavanti || tad yathā | pippalādā-pradāntā-
śaunakā-stodā-jājālā-jaladā-brahmavarti-devadarśi-caraṇavedās ceti || 4.1 ||
- 5 teṣām adhyayanam̥
- ṛcām dvādaśa sahasrāṇy aśītitriśatāni ca |
- 7 paryāyakam̥ dve sahasre anyāṃś caivārcikān bahūn || 4.2 ||
- tadgrāmyāraṇyakāni dvādaśa ṣaṭ sahasrāṇi bhavanti || 4.3 ||
- 9 tatra gopathabrāhmaṇam̥ śataprapāṭhakam̥ āsīt || tasyāvasiṣṭhe dve brāhma-
ṇe pūrvottare ceti || 4.5 ||
- 11 tatra ṣaḍ aṅgāni bhavanti || śikṣā kalpo vyākaraṇam̥ niruktam̥ iti || 4.6 ||
 tatra pañca kalpā bhavanti ||
- 13 nakṣatrakalpo vaitānakalpaḥ ṛṭṭīyaḥ sam̥hitāvidhiḥ |
 caturtho 'ṅgirasām̥ kalpaḥ śāntikalpaś ca pañcamah̥ || 4.7 ||

1 ṣaḍaratnimātrapramāṇavayanaḥ] ṣaḍaratnimātrapramāṇavayana NiKu₁, ṣaḍayarimātra-
pramāṇavinaḥ Ku₃, ṣaḍaratnimātrapramāṇavayana[*sec. m.* → ·](*sec. m.* + ḥ) Gu₁, ṣaḍaratni-
mātrapramāṇajayavaḥ Gu₂, ṣaḍaratnimātrepramāṇavana Jā 1 anye ṛṣayo] Ku₁, any{e}a(+
ka) ṛṣayo Ni, anyava ṛṣayo Ku₃, {·}samyak ṛṣayo Gu₁, samyak ṛṣayo Gu₂, anyakṛṣayo
Jā 1 sāmāni] *em.*, samāna NiKu₁Gu₁Gu₂, vamāmī Ku₃, samāni Jā 1–2 tiṣṭhanti] Jā,
tiṣṭhati NiKu₁Ku₃Gu₁, tiṣṭhatiḥ Gu₂ 2 sa] Gu₁Gu₂, sa(+ mi) Ni, samāna Ku₁, samī
Ku₃Jā 2 maheśvarabhaktaḥ] Ku₁Jā, maheśvarabhaktaḥ(→ vatkraḥ) Ni, maheśvaravaktaḥ
Ku₃, maheśvaro bhaktaḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 3 pradāntā] Ku₁Ku₃, {prahāntā} Ni, pradāntāḥ
Gu₁Gu₂, *om.* Jā 4 jājalā] NiKu₁Ku₃, jājvalāḥ Gu₁Gu₂, jāja{·} Jā 4 jaladā] NiKu₁,
jala{kā}dā Ku₃, jaladāḥ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 4 brahmavarti] Ku₁Ku₃, brah-
mavartī Ni, brahmaṇvartīḥ Gu₁, brahmavartīḥ Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 4 devadarśi]
devadarśi NiKu₁, devadarśi Ku₃, devadarśiḥ Gu₁Gu₂, {·}rśī Jā 4 caraṇavedās] Ku₁,
[+ saubhagā] caraṇavedās Ni, saubhagā | caraṇavedās Ku₃, [+ saubhagāḥ] caraṇavedās
Gu₁, saubhagāḥ caraṇavedās Gu₂, [+ sauradā 2] caraṇavedās Jā 5 adhyayanam̥]
NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, addhyayana Gu₁Gu₂ 6 aśītitriśatāni] aśītitreśatāni Ni, aśī{tri}titriśatāni Ku₁,
aśītatrasatāni Ku₃Jā, aṃśītatrasatāni Gu₁Gu₂ 7 paryāyakam̥] Ku₁Gu₁Gu₂, pāryāyakam̥
NiJā, pīparyāyasīya Ku₃ 7 anyāṃś] Ku₁, anvos̄ NiJā, anneś Ku₃, anvai(*sec. m.* →
au)ś Gu₁, anyaus̄ Gu₂ 7 caivārcikān] *em.*, cevārcikā Ni, caivārcikā Ku₁Jā, cenācilā Ku₃,
caivārcikā Gu₁Gu₂ 8 tadgrāmyāraṇyakāni] *em.*, tadgrāmyāraḥ NiKu₁, tadgrāmyāraḥ
Ku₃, tadgrāmyāra{nya}kam̥ Gu₁, tadgrāmyāraḥ Gu₂, tadgrāmyārikāḥ Jā 8 dvādaśa]
NiKu₁Gu₂Jā, dvedaśa Ku₃, dvādaśa Gu₁ 8 ṣaṭ sahasrāṇi] ṣaṭsaha[+ srā]ṇi Ni,
ṣaṭsahasrāṇi Ku₁Ku₃Jā, ṣaṭsahasrāṇi Gu₁Gu₂ 9 gopathabrāhmaṇam̥] °brāhmaṇe Ni^{ac},
°brāhmaṇa Ni^{pc}Ku₁Ku₃, gopathobrāhmaṇam̥ Gu₁, gopathobrāhmaṇam̥ Gu₂, go{p·} Jā
9 śataprapāṭhakam̥] NiKu₁Gu₂, śataprapāṭhak{e}am̥ Ku₃, [+ śata]prapāṭhakam̥ Gu₁; lost in la-
cuna Jā 9 āsīt] Ni, āsīta Ku₁Ku₃, āsīta Gu₁Gu₂, {·}ta Jā 9 tasyāvasiṣṭhe] *em.*, tasyāvastiṣṭhe
NiKu₁Gu₁Gu₂Jā, tasyāvastiṣṭhe Ku₃ 9–10 brāhmaṇe] *em.*, brāhmaṇo Σ 11 tatra ...
bhavanti ||] Ni adds *in margine*: tatra ṣaḍ a{·}ny adhītya ṣaḍaṅgavid bhavati |. Cf. 2.5
above. 12 kalpā] Ku₁Ku₃Jā, kalpā[*sec. m.* + ni] NiGu₁, kalpāni Gu₂ 13 vaitānakalpaḥ]
Ku₃Jā, vaitāyanakalpaḥ NiKu₁Gu₁Gu₂ 13 ṛṭṭīyaḥ] NiKu₁Jā, ṛṭṭīyakalpa Ku₃, ṛṭṭīya Gu₁Gu₂
14 'ṅgirasām̥] Ku₃, aṅgirasam̄ Ni, '{·}'ṅgirasām̄ Ku₁, aṅgirasa Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā

tatra lakṣaṇagranthā bhavanti || caturādhyāyikā | prātiśākhyam | pañca- 1
paṭalikā | bṛhatsarvānukramaṇīś ceti || 4.8 ||

tatra dvāsaptatiḥ pariśiṣṭāni bhavanti kauśikoktāni || kṛttikārohiṇī | rāṣṭra- 3
saṃsargaḥ | rājyaprathamābhiṣekaḥ | purohitakarmāṇi | puṣyābhiṣekaḥ |
piṣṭarātryāḥ kalpaḥ | ārātrikam | ghr̥tāvekṣaṇam | tiladhenuḥ | bhūmidānam | 5
tulāpuruṣam | ādityamaṇḍalaḥ | hiraṇyagarbhaḥ | hastirathaḥ | aśvarathaḥ |
gosahasradānam | hastidīkṣā | vṛṣotsargaḥ | indrotsavaḥ | brahmayāgaḥ | vi- 7
nāyakābhiṣekaḥ | araṇīlakṣaṇam | saṃbhāralakṣaṇam | yajñapātralakṣaṇam |
vedilakṣaṇam | kuṇḍalakṣaṇam | samidhalakṣaṇam | sruvalakṣaṇam | ha- 9
stalakṣaṇam | jvālālakṣaṇam | lakṣahomaḥ | kātyāyanavidhiḥ | koṭihomaḥ |
gaṇamālā | ghr̥takambalaḥ | anulomakalpaḥ | āsurīkalpaḥ | ucchuṣmakal- 11
paḥ | samuccayaprāyaścittāni | brahmakūrcavidhiḥ | taḍāgavidhiḥ | pāsu-
patavratavidhiḥ | snānavidhiḥ | sandhyopāsanavidhiḥ | tarpaṇavidhiḥ | 13
śrāddhavidhiḥ | agnihotravidhiḥ | uttamapaṭalam | varṇapaṭalam | ni-
ghaṇṭuḥ | caraṇavyūhaḥ | candraprātipadikam | grahayuddham | graha- 15

1 lakṣaṇagranthā ... caturādhyāyikā] lakṣaṇagranthā bhavanti || tatra lakṣagra caturādhyāyikā
Ku₁ 1 lakṣaṇagranthā] *em.*, lakṣaṇagranthā NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, lakṣaṇagranthā[+ ni] Gu₁,
lakṣaṇagranthāni Gu₂ 1 caturādhyāyikā] *em.*, caturādhyāyikā NiKu₁Jā, catu{rthā}rādhyāyikā
Ku₃, caturādhyāyikāḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 1 prātiśākhyam] *em.*, prātiśākhyam Ni, prātimākhyam Ku₁,
prātiśākham Ku₃, prātiśākhyamḥ Gu₁Gu₂, prātiśākhyam Jā 2 bṛhatsarvānukramaṇīś] Ku₁Jā,
°sarvā'nukramaṇīś Ni [[two vowel signs: i and ī], bṛhasarvānukramaṇīś Ku₃, °kramaṇś
Gu₁Gu₂ 3 tatra] NiKu₁Gu₁Gu₂Jā, tata Ku₃ 3 dvāsaptatiḥ] *em.*, dvyāsapta{tri} Ni,
dvāsaptatri Ku₁Jā, dvādisapta Ku₃, vyāsapta Gu₁Gu₂ 3 pariśiṣṭāni] Jā, pariśiṣṭā NiKu₁Ku₃,
pariśiṣṭā Gu₁Gu₂ 3 kauśikoktāni] *em.*, kauśikoktaḥ NiKu₁Jā, kauśikoktasa Ku₃, kauśikokta
om̄ Gu₁Gu₂ 3–4 rāṣṭrasaṃsargaḥ] NiKu₁Gu₁Gu₂, rāṣṭrasaṃsargaḥ Ku₃; lost in lacuna
Jā 4 rājyaprathamābhiṣekaḥ] NiKu₁, rājyapramābhiṣekaḥ Ku₃, rājyā° Gu₁Gu₂, ⟨.....⟩ka
Jā 5 piṣṭarātryāḥ] *em.*, śiṣyārātryā Ni, piṣyārātryā Ku₁, śiṣyārātryā Ku₃, śiṣyārātryāḥ
Gu₁Gu₂, śiṣyārātryā Jā 5 kalpaḥ] NiKu₃Jā, kalpa Ku₁, *om.* Gu₁Gu₂ 7 gosahasradānam]
NiKu₁Ku₃, gośahaśradānaḥ Gu₁Gu₂, gosaha⟨s...⟩ Jā 7 hastidīkṣā] NiKu₁, hastidīkṣā
Ku₃, hastidīkṣāḥ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 7 indrotsavaḥ] NiKu₃Gu₁Gu₂, indrochavaḥ
Ku₁, ⟨...⟩tsavaḥ Jā 8 araṇīlakṣaṇam] Ku₁Ku₃Jā, araṇīlakṣaṇam Ni, araṇīlakṣaṇamḥ Gu₁,
araṇīlakṣaṇaḥ Gu₂ 9 samidhalakṣaṇam] Ku₁, sami[+ dha 1]lakṣaṇam Ni, samilakṣaṇam
Ku₃, *om.* Gu₁Gu₂Jā 9 sruvalakṣaṇam] sruvalakṣaṇam NiKu₁, śrīvatsalakṣaṇam Ku₃,
om. Gu₁Gu₂Jā 9–10 hastalakṣaṇam] NiKu₁Jā, hastilakṣaṇam Ku₃, hastalakṣaṇamḥ
Gu₁, hastalakṣaṇaḥ Gu₂ 10 koṭihomaḥ] Jā, koṭihomaḥ NiKu₁Gu₁Gu₂, koṭahomaḥ Ku₃
11 ghr̥takambalaḥ | anulomakalpaḥ] *em.*, ghr̥tānuhomakalpaḥ Ni, ghr̥tānulomakalpaḥ
Ku₁Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂, ghr̥tanu'⟨·u...⟩ Jā 11 āsurīkalpaḥ] Ku₃, āsurīkalpaḥ NiKu₁, āsurīkalpaḥ
Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 11–12 ucchuṣmakalpaḥ] Ku₁Ku₃, ucchuṣma° Ni, uchūṣmaṃkalpaḥ
Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 12 brahmakūrcavidhiḥ] Ku₁, brahmakūrcavidhiḥ Ni,
brahmakūryavidhiḥ Ku₃Jā, brahmakūryavidhiḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 12–13 pāsupatavratavidhiḥ] Jā,
°vidhi Ni, {sadyopāsanavidhiḥ |} pāsupatavratavidhiḥ Ku₁, *om.* Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂ 13 snānavidhiḥ]
Jā, *om.* NiKu₁Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂ 14–15 nirghaṇṭuḥ | caraṇavyūhaḥ] *em.*, nirghaṇṭācara(sec. m. →
la)vruhaḥ Ni, {·}nirghaṇṭācaravruhaḥ Ku₁, nirghaṇṭātaravṛha Ku₃, nirghaṇṭācaravṛhaḥ
Gu₁Gu₂Jā 15 candraprātipadikam] candraprīt{i}apadikam Ni, candraprātipadikam
Ku₁Ku₃, candrapātipadipaḥ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 15 grahayuddham] Ni [[there
seems to be a sign under *ddham*, perhaps intending to alert to a marginal note, but none is
found]] Ku₁Ku₃, grahayuddhaḥ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 169.15–170.1 grahasaṃgrahaḥ]
Ku₁Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂, °graha Ni; lost in lacuna Jā

- 1 saṃgrahaḥ | rāhucāraḥ | ketucāraḥ | rtuketulakṣaṇaṃ | kūrmaṅvibhāgaḥ |
 maṅḍalāni | digdāhalakṣaṇaṃ | ulkālakṣaṇaṃ | vidyullakṣaṇaṃ | nir-
 3 ghātalakṣaṇaṃ | pariveṣalakṣaṇaṃ | nakṣatragrahotpātalakṣaṇaṃ | indra-
 cāpalakṣaṇaṃ | sadyovr̥ṣṭilakṣaṇaṃ | bhūmikampalakṣaṇaṃ | goṣāntiḥ |
 5 adbhūtalakṣaṇaṃ | svapnādhyāyaḥ | atharvahṛdayaṃ | bhārakī-gārgya-
 bārhaspatyośanādbhūtāni | mahādbhūtāni || 4.9 ||
- 7 tatrāṣṭādaśopaniṣado bhavanti || muṅḍaka | praśna | garbhopaniṣat | prā-
 ṅāgnihotra | mahopaniṣat | brahmopaniṣat | brahmavidyopaniṣat | kṣurika |
 9 cūlika | anucūlika | atharvaśira | atharvaśikha | amṛtabindu | amṛtanāda |
 yogaśikhā | nārayaṇo | śrutipratyagānando | nṛsimha | maho | brahmavedo |
 11 atharvaṇo | paramātmā | tatravāśāntīś ceti || 4.10 ||
- tatra brahmavede 'ṣṭādaśa vratāni carīṣyan || sāvitṛivratam | vedavratam |
 13 nīlavratam | nīlotpalavratam | mṛgāruvratam | rohitavratam | viśāsahivratam |
 yamavratam | śāntivratam | kalpavratam | ṛṣivratam | śirovratam | maila-
 15 vratam | śikhāvratam | anujavratam | dadhivratam | aṅgirovratam | pāsūpata-
 vratam caret || 4.11 ||

1 rāhucāraḥ] Ni^{ac}Ku₃, rāhusaṃcāraḥ Ni^{pc}, rāhucāra Ku₁, rāhucāraḥ Gu₁Gu₂, (·)hucāraḥ Jā 1–2 kūrmaṅvibhāgaḥ | maṅḍalāni] *em.*, °vibhāgo maṅḍāni NiKu₁Jā, kūrmaṅgabhāgo maṅḍāni Ku₃, kūrmaṅvibhāgo maṅḍāniḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 2 digdāhalakṣaṇaṃ] Ku₃, digbāha° NiJā, digāha° Ku₁, digbāhalakṣaṇaḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 2 vidyullakṣaṇaṃ] *em.*, vidyulakṣaṇaṃ NiKu₃Jā, {·}vidyulakṣaṇaṃ Ku₁, vidyulakṣaṇaḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 3–4 indracāpalakṣaṇaṃ] Ku₃, cāndro(→ indra)palakṣaṇaṃ Ni, [+ cāndropalakṣaṇaṃ] Ku₁, *om.* Gu₁Gu₂Jā 4 bhūmikampalakṣaṇaṃ] Ku₁Ku₃, °kampaṃlakṣaṇaṃ Ni, °kampaṃlakṣaṇaṃḥ Gu₁, °kampalakṣaṇaṃḥ Gu₂, bhūmika⟨mpa...⟩ Jā 4–5 goṣāntiḥ | adbhūtalakṣaṇaṃ] *em.*, goṣāntiradbhūta° NiKu₁, goṣāntirabhūta° Ku₃, goṣyāntiradbhūtalakṣaṇaṃḥ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 5–6 bhārakī-gārgya-bārhaspatyośanādbhūtāni | mahādbhūtāni] *em.*, bhārakī | gārgyaḥ | bārhaspatyāśanādbhūtāni {sumahābhūtāni} Ni, bhārakī | gārgyaḥ | bārhaspatyāśanādbhūtāni | mahābhūtāni Ku₁, bhārakīgārgyaḥ | bārhaspatyāśanādbhūtāni | mahābhūtāni Ku₃, bhārantīḥ grā(*sec. m.* + r)gyaḥ bārhasvatyāḥ sanābhūtāniḥ Gu₁, bhārantīḥ gārgyaḥ bārhasvatyāḥ sanābhūtāniḥ Gu₂, bhārakī | gārgyaḥ | bārhaspatyāśanādbhūtāni | mahābhūtāni Jā 7 muṅḍaka] Ku₃, ma(*sec. m.* → u)ṅḍakaḥ Gu₁, muṅḍakaḥ NiKu₁Gu₂Jā 8 brahmopaniṣat | brahmavidyopaniṣat] NiKu₁, bramavidopaniṣat Ku₃, brahmaṃvidyopaniṣataḥ Gu₁, {·}brahma{pani}vidyopaniṣataḥ Gu₂, brahmavidyopaniṣat Jā 8 kṣurika] NiKu₁Ku₃, kṣurikaḥ Gu₁Gu₂, kṣuri(·) Jā 9 cūlika] Ku₁, cuḷika NiKu₃, cuḷikaḥ Gu₁, cūlikaḥ Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 9 anucūlika] Ku₁Ku₃, anucūlika Ni, anucūlikaḥ Gu₁, *om.* Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 9 atharvaśira] NiKu₁Ku₃, °śiraḥ Gu₁Gu₂, ⟨...⟩ra Jā 10 nṛsimha] Ku₁, naraśiham Ni, naraśimha Ku₃, nṛsimhaḥ Gu₁Gu₂, naraśimha Jā 10 brahmavedo] NiGu₁Ku₃Jā, brahma{vidyo}vedyo Ku₁, brahmavedoḥ Gu₂ 11 tatravāśāntīś ceti] NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, tatravam śyānti(*sec. m.* → śce)tiḥ Gu₁, tatravam śyāntīścetiḥ Gu₂ 12 carīṣyan] NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, carīṣmaṅn Gu₁, carīṣmaran Gu₂ 12 vedavratam] NiKu₁Ku₃, *om.* Gu₁Gu₂, veda(·) Jā 13 nīlavratam] NiKu₁Ku₃, nīlavrantam Gu₁, nīlavrattam Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 13 nīlotpalavratam] NiKu₁Ku₃, nīlotpaḷamvrantamḥ Gu₁, nīlotpaḷamvrattam Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 13 mṛgāruvratam] NiKu₁Ku₃, mṛgārvrantamḥ Gu₁, mṛgārvrattamḥ Gu₂, ⟨...⟩rdratam Jā 14 yamavratam | śāntivratam] all mss. except Jā insert śikhāvratam between these two *vratas*. 14 yamavratam] *em.*, nāmavratam NiGu₂, yamavratam | nāmavratam Ku₁, vāmavratam Ku₃, nāmavratamḥ Gu₁, ⟨nāma⟩vratam Jā 14–15 mailavratam] *em.*, maiḷavratam NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, saiḷavrantamḥ Gu₁Gu₂ 15 anujavratam] Ku₃, anu[+ ḍu]havratam Ni, anujudavratam Ku₁, anujavrantam Gu₁Gu₂, anu[+ ja]vratam Jā 16 caret] NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, cared vrantamḥ Gu₁Gu₂

- kr̥chraṃ | atikr̥chraṃ | taptakr̥chraṃ | sām̐tapanam̐ | māṇḍūkīyaṃ | tulā- 1
 puruṣaṃ | mahāsām̐tapanam̐ ceti || 4.12 ||
- yo vai brahmavedeṣūpanītaḥ sarvavedeṣūpanītaḥ || 5.1 || 3
 yo vai brahmavedeṣv anupanītaḥ sarvavedeṣv anupanītaḥ || 5.2 ||
 anyavede dvijottamaḥ | brahmavedam adhītukāmaḥ | sa punarupa- 5
 neyo || 5.3 ||
- devāś ca ṛṣayaś ca || ko asmākam̐ jyeṣṭhaḥ | ka upanetā | ka ācāryaḥ || 7
 brahmā uvāca || 5.4–5 ||
- atharvā vai jyeṣṭhaḥ | atharvā upanetā | atharvā ācāryaḥ | atharvaṇā 9
 brahmatvaṃ ceti || 5.7 ||
- tad apy etad ṛcoktaṃ || 11
- brahmajyeṣṭhā saṃbhṛtā vīryāṇi brahmāgre jyeṣṭhaṃ divam ā tatāna |
 bhūtānām̐ brahma prathamota jajñe tenārhati 13
 brahmaṇā spardhituṃ kaḥ || 5.8 ||
- atharvavede caturṇām̐ vedānām̐ sāṅgopāṅgānām̐ savākovākyānām̐ itihāsa- 15
 purāṇānām̐ || 5.9 ||
- atha brahmavedaḥ | kapilo varṇaḥ | tīkṣṇaḥ | caṇḍaḥ | kāmārupī | viśvā- 17
 tmā | jitendriyaḥ | sa bhagavān brahmaveda iti || caturmukho dvīpakṣo ati-

1 sām̐tapanam̐] *em.*, sānt{i}apanam̐ Ni, sāntipanam̐ Ku₁Ku₃, śyāntipanam̐ Gu₁Gu₂, sānta{··} Jā 1 māṇḍūkīyaṃ] Gu₂, maṇḍukīyaṃ NiKu₁Ku₃, māṇḍukīyaṃ Gu₁; lost in lacuna Jā 1–2 tulāpuruṣaṃ] NiKu₁Ku₃Gu₂, tulāpuruṣaṃ Gu₁; lost in lacuna Jā 2 mahāsām̐tapanam̐] *em.*, mahāsāntapanam̐ NiKu₁Jā, mahāsāntipanam̐ Ku₃, mahāsā{panam̐}(sec. m. svāpanam̐) Gu₁, mahāsvāpanam̐ Gu₂ 3 brahmavedeṣūpanītaḥ] *em.*, °vedeṣupaniṣat NiKu₁, °vedeṣupaniṣata Ku₃Gu₁, °vedeṣupaniṣataḥ Gu₂, °vedeṣupaniṣata Jā 3 sarvavedeṣūpanītaḥ] *em.*, °vedeṣupaniṣat NiKu₃, °ve[+ de]ṣupaniṣat Ku₁, °vedeṣupaniṣataḥ Gu₁, *om.* Gu₂, °vedeṣupaniṣata Jā 4 yo vai ... sarvavedeṣv anupanītaḥ] *om.* Gu₁Gu₂ 4 anupanītaḥ] *em.*, anupanīt Ni, anupanīta Ku₁Ku₃Jā, *om.* Gu₁Gu₂ 4 anupanītaḥ] *em.*, anupanīt NiKu₁, anupanīta Ku₃, anupanīta Jā, *om.* Gu₁Gu₂ 5 dvijottamaḥ] *em.*, dvijottamāḥ Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂, dvijottamāḥ NiKu₁Jā 5 brahmavedam adhītukāmaḥ] *em.*, brahmavedemadhītukāmaḥ NiKu₁, brahmavedemadhītukāmaḥ Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂, brahmavedama{dhī··} Jā 5–6 punarupaneyo] *em.*, punarṣayo NiGu₁Gu₂, punarṣatyō Ku₁Ku₃; lost in lacuna Jā 8 brahmā] *em.*, brahma NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, brahmaṃ Gu₁Gu₂ 9 atharvā] *em.*, atharva Σ 9 atharvā ācāryaḥ] *em.*, atharva ācāryaḥ NiKu₁Ku₃Gu₁Gu₂, atharvācāryaḥ Jā 12 brahmajyeṣṭhā] NiKu₃, brahmajyeṣṭhā Ku₁Gu₁, brahmaṃjyeṣṭhā Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 12 saṃbhṛtā] NiKu₁, saṃbhṛtaṃ Ku₃, saṃbhṛta Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 12 vīryāṇi] NiKu₁Ku₃, dvīryāṇiḥ Gu₁, vīryāṇiḥ Gu₂, {·}ryāṇi Jā 13 jajñe] jajñe NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, jajñem̐ Gu₁Gu₂ 14 spardhituṃ] Ni, sparddhatuṃ Ku₁Jā, sparddham̐ntu Ku₃, syārd̐dha(sec. m. → sparddhi)tu Gu₁, sparddhitu Gu₂ 15 caturṇām̐] caturṇā NiKu₁Ku₃, caturvarṇṇām̐ Gu₁, catuvarṇṇām̐ Gu₂, catirṇṇām̐ Jā 15 vedānām̐] NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, devānām̐ Gu₁Gu₂ 15 savākovākyānām̐] *em.*, sarvāko(+nu)vākānām̐ Ni, sarvākonuvākānām̐ Ku₁, sarvākonuvādvā-nām̐ Ku₃, sarvākonuvākānī Gu₁Gu₂, sarvākovākyānām̐ Jā 17 atha] *em.*, atharva Σ 17 varṇaḥ] NiKu₁Ku₃, varṇṇam̐ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 17 tīkṣṇaḥ | caṇḍaḥ] NiKu₁, tīkṣṇataḥ || caṇḍaḥ Ku₃, tīkṣṇacaṇḍam̐ Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 17 kāmārupī] NiKu₁Ku₃, kāmārupiḥ Gu₁Gu₂, {·}rpī Jā 17–18 viśvātmā] Jā, viśvātmāna NiKu₁, viśva ātmā Ku₃, *om.* Gu₁Gu₂

- 1 dharmā ativantaprājñāḥ | kṣudratvāyukrūrah vaikhāyanagotraḥ | brahmā de-
 vatā || 5.10–11 ||
- 3 ya ekaikasmin vedānām nāmagotrāpamāṇam ca kīrtayet | sa sarva-
 pāpaviśuddho bhavati | mṛtaś ca brahmalokaṃ sa gachati brahmalokaṃ sa
 5 gachatīti ||
- iti caraṇavyūhopaniṣat samāptā || 5.12 ||

§4.2. Text Critical Commentary on the *Caraṇavyūhopaniṣad*

Since the primary focus of this article is on the ancillary literature of the (Paippalāda) AV, the first paragraphs of the text will be commented on only in a summary fashion. Variation in names of Śākhās is entirely excluded from discussion here. Three-digit textual references beginning with 49. are to the 49th Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa.

1.1. **caraṇavyūham**: I hesitantly adopt this reading, (a minimal emendation) based on the Ni^{pc} reading, which is corroborated by 49.1.1 *athātas caraṇavyūham vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*. But since all mss. in fact do contain the reading °*vidhiṃ*, it seems rather likely that CVU_A read thus, although our text can be called a Vidhi with just as little justification as it can be called an Upaniṣad. Note the tendency to style every text as °*vidhi* also in other Paippalāda ancillary texts (e.g. the *Karmaṇājikā* and the *Āṅgirasakalpa*).

1.3. 49.1.3 reads *tatra ṛgvedasyārthaśāstram upavedaḥ | ... āyurvedopavedaḥ | abhicārakārthaśāstram ity ucyate* ||. **śāstraveda upavedaḥ**: CVU_A had already become corrupt. Restore *arthaśāstram upavedaḥ* with 49.1.3, or perhaps *śāstravedaḥ*? **divyasāmpada**°: The text is almost completely different at 49.1.3. The balance of the variant readings might rather be taken to support restoring °*cittā abhi*°, but I prefer the reading of Ku₁ and Jā, cf. AVPariś 3.1.10 *yasyānyakulopayuktaḥ purodhāḥ śāntikapauṣṭikaprāyaścittīyābhicārikanaimittikordhvadehikāny atharvavihitāni karmāṇi kuryāt sa tasya pratyāṅgiro bhūtvā hastyaśvarathapadātikaṃ prakṛtimukhebhyo . . .* Could it be that the last phrase of this paragraph, if correctly preserved in CVU, associates the ṚV with *divya*, the YV with *sāmpada*, the SV with *prāyaścittīya*, and the AV — unsurprisingly — with *abhicārika*, i.e. with rites of those four types?

1 ativantaprājñāḥ] NiKu₁Jā, ativataprājñāḥ Ku₃, ativantadharmā ativantaprājñāḥ Gu₁, ativantadharmā ativantaprājñāḥ Gu₂ 1 kṣudratvāyukrūrah] kṣudratvāyukrūrah Ni [[two vowels u and ū marked]], kṣudratvāyukūrah Ku₁Jā, kṣudratvākṛrah Ku₃, kṣudratv[*sec. m.* + ·]kṛrah Gu₁, kṣudratvāyukṛrah Gu₂ 3 ya ekaikasmin] *em.*, ekasmin NiKu₁Ku₃Jā, yekasmin Gu₁Gu₂ 3–4 sarvapāpaviśuddho] NiKu₁Ku₃, sarvapāpoviśuddho Gu₁Gu₂; lost in lacuna Jā 4 mṛtaś ca] *em.*, mṛtaṃ sa NiKu₁Gu₂, mṛtasa Ku₃, mṛtaṃ sa Gu₁; lost in lacuna Jā 6 caraṇavyūhopaniṣat samāptā] caraṇavyūha upaniṣat samāptā Ni, caravyūha upaṣat samāptā Ku₁, caraṇavyūhapaniṣat samāptā Ku₃, caraṇavyūhapaniṣatsamāptāḥ Gu₁Gu₂, caraṇavyūha [+ u]paniṣat samāptā Jā

1.4. **vaikhāyanagotraḥ:** Cf. 49.1.4 *brahmavedo vaitāyanasagotro*, where BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN (p. 339), however, report AETU *vaikhā*^o. The same name Vaikhāyana occurs also at the end of the CVU (5.10–11).

1.5. On the allotment of a color per Veda, cf. GOUDRIAAN 1978: 176. **su-
vyaktagrīvaḥ:** Cf. 49.1.5 *suuibhaktagrīvaḥ* (thus also YV-CV, p. 47 l. 6). With a different division of words, and a few other differences, it seems that 49.1.5 *°jānujaṅghaḥ | pramāṇena sa vitastayaḥ pañca* has preserved the correct text here. YV-CV (p. 47, l. 7): *pramāṇam tāvat tiṣṭhan vitastīḥ pañca*.

1.6. In this list and subsequent lists of Śākhā names, NiKu₁Ku₃Jā omit visargas before all daṇḍas (here rendered by hyphens), while Gu₁ and Gu₂ omit all daṇḍas and seem to replace them by visarga. The Atharvavedic list in 4.1, with the names *brahmavarti* and *devadarśi*, which can certainly not be nom. pl. forms (as in AVPariś), and can be made into nom. sg. forms only with some good will, provides an argument for assuming long compounded lists of Śākhā-names throughout. The closing *ca* behind every list I then take to be a sign of pardonable confusion on the part of the redactor.

2.1. Between Carakas and Mitrāyaṇīyas, the Maitras, who figure there in AVPariś 49, are omitted in CVU. The Ni and Ku₁ insertion of *hvarakāḥ* after the Carakas does not seem to merit being taken seriously, as it is more likely to be due to eye-skip from the preceding Āhvarakas. Since our list thus only comprises 23 names, it seems that CVU_A had already lost the Maitras, unless the fact that the suspected eye-skip in Ni and Ku₁ occurs precisely at the place where the Maitras have gone missing is significant.

2.2. 49.2.2 reads: *teṣām adhyayanam | dve sahasre śate nyūne vede vājasane-
yake | sakalaṃ parisamkhyātaṃ brāhmaṇaṃ tu caturguṇam ||*. Our version ruins the meter by inserting *ṛcām* (probably under the influence of 1.7 and 4.2 — the same error, but less widely spread, at 3.4, in ms. Ku₃), and omitting *tu*. Note a similar omission in all mss. but one in the verse at 3.4 (*ca caturdaśa* → *caturdaśa*). The CVU reading *ślokena* could also be combined with a more incisive emendation after AVPariś: *parisamkhyātaṃ*. Emending the reading *khyāto* found in all CVU mss. anyhow seems unavoidable.

2.3. 49.2.3 reads *aṣṭādaśa śatāni bhavanti | tāny eva ... | saptasu vīrās ceti ||*. My emendation *tāny eva* rests on this basis. **kramapāro:** BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN observe (p. 340) that “the text is mutilated at this point”, and refer to SIEGLING, p. 32, where the Yajurvedic *Caraṇavyūha* is edited as follows: *teṣām adhyayanam | aṣṭāśataṃ yajuḥsahasrāṇy adhītya śākhāpāro bhavati | tāny eva
dviḡguṇāny adhītya padapāro bhavati | ... triḡguṇāny adhītya kramapāro ... | ṣaḍ
aṅgāny adhītya ...*

2.4. 49.2.4 reads *śākhās tisro bhavanti | tad yathā | vārcikam arthādhyayanīyāḥ |
pāraścaryāḥ | pāraśramaṇīyāḥ | pārakramavaṭaḥ | kramapāraś ceti ||*.

2.5. 49.2.5 finishes the list of six Aṅgas simply with *... iti ṣaḍ aṅgāni ||*. It seems that *itihāsapurāṇam* has entered our text under the influence of the *Nakṣatrakalpa*, AVPariś 1.15.1: *ṛgvedo yajurvedaḥ sāmavedo brahmavedaḥ śikṣā*

kalpo vyākaraṇaṃ niruktaṃ chando jyotiṣaṃ itihāsapurāṇaṃ vākovākyam idāvatsaraḥ parivatsaraḥ saṃvatsaro daśamaṃ śītoṣṇe ekādaśadvādaśe. Although I have no evidence yet that this Kalpa was ever transmitted as such in Orissa, there are frequent references to a *nakṣatrakalpoka tantra* in the ritualistic manuals (see §5.3). So we may either presume that the text was still being transmitted by Paippalādins after the separation between our two Atharvavedic *Caraṇavyūha* versions, or that a forerunner of the CVU-version was influenced by the *Nakṣatrakalpa* at an earlier medieval stage, when the ancestors of the Orissa Paippalādins still inhabited western Indian regions, along with Śaunakīya Atharvavedins. **br̥hatsarvānukramaṇīś:** This same ungrammatical form is supported by all mss. in 4.8 below. It has presumably been copied here under influence from that very Atharvaveda section of the text.

2.6. 49.2.6 reads ... *sthūlagalakapālo rakto ... prādeśāḥ ṣaḍ dīrghatvena yajurvedasyaitad ...* (YV-CV, p. 47 l. 9: *prādeśamātraḥ ṣaḍ dīrghatvena*). I have made the slight emendation of *prāmśu* (thus, disregarding trivial variants, all the CVU mss.) to *prāmśuḥ*; the same error is reported for mss. ABE in 49.2.6. AVPariś mss. TU read *kapola-*, as do all CVU mss. The instr. form in our text is probably unoriginal (YC-CV, p. 47, l. 8: *sthūlagalakapolas*). All mss. read *prādeśā dīrgha°*, but the erroneous omission is easily understandable as due to the similarity of the syllables *śāḥ* and *ṣaḍ*, and I have therefore followed the AVPariś reading in emending to *prādeśāḥ ṣaḍ dīrgha°*.

3.1. BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN print *vinihatāḥ | [pravilīnās]* at 49.3.1, presumably considering *pravilīnās* superfluous after the punctuation. The CVU parallel shows the punctuation to be misplaced, and a verbal adj. in *°līnās* to form an original part of this little *itihāsa*.

3.4. 49.3.4 has no doubt preserved better readings of this verse: ... *sohyāni sarahasyāni etat ...* Since confusion of the clusters *hy* and *jy* is rampant in Orissa mss. (see ZEHNDER 1999: 15), I suppose the error may be a rather recent one, and do not hesitate to emend on the basis of the parallel text.

3.5. The reading *vayanena* here is odd, as is *kātarāḥ svareṇeti* at 49.3.5. The unanimous reading *°vayanaḥ* in the next section of CVU shows that the *ante correctionem* reading *nayanena* in Ku₁ must be a learned guess — although probably a correct one (cf. YV-CV, p. 47 l. 11: *kātaranayana*); an alternative restoration would be *vacanena*. Both CVU_A and AVPariś have lost the original text here.

3.6. 49.3.6 reads *ṣaḍaratniḥ pramāṇena ca smṛtaḥ | stuvanty ṛṣayo brahmā sāmāni tiṣṭhati ...* It seems likely that AVPariś has here stayed close to the correct text for the first sentence, while *°vayanaḥ* entered CVU_A after the preceding section had become corrupt. Diwakar Acharya suggests to me that the extant CVU and AVPariś readings may conceal an originally metrical passage, which might diagnostically be restored as follows: [*tathā*] *ṣaḍaratnimātraḥ pramāṇena ca yaḥ smṛtaḥ | anye ṛṣayo brahmā ca sāmni tiṣṭhanti saṃnidhau ||*. I have brought the text of CVU as close to this restoration as the mss. permit.

4.1. It is to be noted first that AVPariś reads *bhedā* for CVU *śākhā*, but that

CVU, with its *teṣām* in the next section, preserves evidence that the AVPariś pairing *bhedāḥ . . . teṣām* is original; second, that most CVU mss. insert an extra Śākhā before the Carañavedas (mostly *in margine*), apparently called Saubhaga. Since it has no parallel in AVPariś, and would cause the list to exceed the indicated number 9, I reject it from my edition.

4.2. 49.4.2 reads *aśītis trīśatāni . . . paryāyikaṃ*. The number of *ṛcs* quoted, viz. 12380, exceeds that of both extant Atharvavedic Saṃhitās individually, but agrees remarkably closely with the sum total of Śaunaka *and* Paippalāda mantras, if for the former we take the total of 4432 stanzas calculated by LANMAN for the authentic parts of ŚS (WHITNEY 1905/I: cxlvii) and for the latter the provisional figure of 7899 given by BHATTACHARYA (1997: xxii): 12331 stanzas.

4.3. 49.4.3 reads *etadgrāmyāranyakāni ṣaṭ sahasrāṇi bhavanti*, with a rather different figure. Since we do not know which units are being measured, little more can be said, except that *dvādaśa* in the CVU version may have been copied from 4.2, and that the characterization *grāmyāranyakāni* seems to belong rather to the Sāmavedic domain, which might mean that the original Atharvavedic *Carāṇavyūha* had already suffered an intrusion here.

*4.4. No corresponding paragraph is found in CVU for 49.4.4, which lists 28 Upaniṣads of the Atharvaveda, a list that has been discussed at some length by BOUY (see n. 45 above). Note that BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN (p. 341) report this passage to be absent also in their mss. CTURoth, while it is placed elsewhere in their B.

4.5. 49.4.5 reads *tatra gopathaḥ śataprapāṭhakaṃ brāhmaṇam āsīt tasyāvaśiṣṭe dve brāhmaṇe pūrvam uttaram ceti*. This is the basis for my emendation *tasyāvaśiṣṭe*. We might also consider emending *pūrvottare iti*, to avoid the inelegant combination of dual dvandva with *ca*.

4.6. 49.4.6 reads *tatra ṣaḍ aṅgāny adhītya ṣaḍaṅgavid bhavati ṣaḍ aṅgāni bhavanti, śikṣā kalpo vyākaraṇam niruktaṃ chando jyotiṣam iti*. Our version of the Aṅga list seems to have been abbreviated, perhaps not erroneously, but because it has already occurred above (2.5). The AVPariś mss. BCTURoth reported by BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN agree with all but one of our mss. in entirely omitting here the words *ṣaḍ aṅgāny adhītya ṣaḍaṅgavid bhavati*.

4.7. On this verse, see n. 22 (pp. 202f.) in Alexis Sanderson's contribution to this volume.

4.8. I emend *lakṣaṇagranthā* on the basis of AVPariś. That version's *dantyoṣṭhavidhi* is omitted in our text. As far as I know, no one has ever attempted to prove that this text is connected only with the Śaunaka school; in fact, there seems to be some evidence against this assumption (MODAK 1993: p. 164 with n. 155). But even if we assume that this Lakṣaṇagrantha was not connected in any way with the Paippalāda tradition, this assumption cannot explain the omission in the CVU version, because the same seems to hold for the other Lakṣaṇagranthas listed here too — at least in the form they are known to us (as transmitted by Śaunakīya brahmins). AVPariś repeats *bṛhatsarvānukramaṇī*

ceti at the end of 49.9: the absence of this Lakṣaṇagrantha in the corresponding part of our text seems to identify it as unoriginal in the list of Paṛiśiṣṭas. It clearly belongs only here. We may note that the grammatically impossible form °*kramaṇīś*, supported by all CVU mss., has probably entered the text from the Śākhā-lists.

4.9. **tulāpuruṣam**: Note the neuter (AVPaṛiś °*puruṣaḥ*). **hastidīkṣā** | **vṛṣot-sargaḥ**: In comparison with AVPaṛiś, note the omission of *Aśvadīkṣā* between these two Paṛiśiṣṭas in our text. **vināyakābhīṣekaḥ**: No Paṛiśiṣṭa of this title is found in AVPaṛiś, where we find the *Skandayāga* (alternative title: *Dhūrtakalpa* ‘Practice of the Rogue’) in its place. *Skandayāga* (AVPaṛiś 20) 3.1 reads: *saṃviśasva varaḡhaṇṭāpsaraḡstave yatra subhujo hi nirmītāḡ | saṃviṣṭo me dhehi dīrḡham āyuh praḡjāṃ paśūṃś caiva vināyakasena* ||. In their apparatus (p. 133), the editors suggest that emending the obscure *vināyakasena* (left untranslated by GOODWIN 1893: xi) to *pinākasena* “would improve the metre”, and is supported by the parallel with *pinākasenāya* in 20.4.2.⁴⁷ Peter Bisschop has pointed out to me, however, that the *Ṣaṇmukhakaḡlpa*, a handbook of sorcery and thievery, contains in its §59 a vocative *vināyakasenāpate* which is (almost certainly) used of Skanda (see GEORGE 1991: 72f. and 133f.). This supports the authenticity of the reading *vināyakasena*, as voc. addressed to Skanda, at AVPaṛiś 20.3.1, and on this basis Bisschop proposes to emend as follows the uniformly transmitted CVU title for the text corresponding to the *Skandayāga*: *vināyakasenābhīṣekaḡ*. In AVPaṛiś, the order of the *araṇī*° and *saṃbhāralakṣaṇas* is different, which gives the sequence: *brahmayāḡaḡ | skandayāḡāḡ | saṃbhāralakṣaṇam | araṇīlakṣaṇam* |. **lakṣahomaḡ**: This corresponds to AVPaṛiś 30 (*Laghulakṣahoma*); the following item in our list, called **kātyāyanavidhi**, corresponds to AVPaṛiś 30b (*Brḡhallakṣahoma*). Note at the beginning of that Paṛiśiṣṭa: *atha kāṅkāyano bhagavantam atharvāṅnam papraccha* (30b.1.1). The editors record no variant for *kāṅkāyano*, but the connection with the name of the Paṛiśiṣṭa in CVU seems evident. **ghṛtakambalaṃ** | **anulomakalpaḡ**: Thus restored by emendation on the basis of AVPaṛiś. **taḡāḡavidhiḡ**: This is called *paithīnasitadāḡavidhiḡ* in 49.4.9 (cf. §6 on the name Paithīnasi). **snānavidhiḡ**: With support from only one ms. (Jā) — the other mss. omit it entirely — CVU lists this Paṛiśiṣṭa before, rather than after *Sandhyopāsanavidhi* (as in AVPaṛiś). **nakṣatragrahotpātalakṣaṇam** | **indracāpalakṣaṇam** | **sadyovṛṣṭīlakṣaṇam** | **bhūmikampalakṣaṇam**: In AVPaṛiś, note the different places occupied by *Bhūmikampalakṣaṇa* and *Utpātalakṣaṇa*, for which latter our text seems to substitute *Indracāpalakṣaṇa*. The order there is: *bhūmikampalakṣaṇam | nakṣatragrahotpātalakṣaṇam | utpātalakṣaṇam | sadyovṛṣṭīlakṣaṇam* |. Is it possible that our text preserves a trace of the correct order, in view of the mismatches between the titles and contents of Atharvaveda-paṛiśiṣṭas 61 and 63 noted by BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN, pp. 395 and 403?

All in all, we seem to have a few more than the announced 72 Paṛiśiṣṭas.

⁴⁷The re-occurrence of *pinākasena* in 20.7.11 would also seem to be relevant for this argument.

The three mss. Gu₁Gu₂Jā all omit the *Samidhalakṣaṇa*, *Sruvalakṣaṇa* and the *Indracāpalakṣaṇa*: the agreements between these mss. here is striking, because even though they originate from two neighboring villages, Jā generally shows more signs of affiliation with the mss. Ku₁ and Ku₃. The first two omitted *Parīṣiṣṭas* are found quite commonly in other Paippalāda ancillary texts (cf. §5.5), and it is therefore unlikely that these three mss. have preserved an older state of the text in omitting them from the list here. Note, finally, that CVU omits at the end the words *br̥hatsarvānukramaṇī ceti* that we find in AVParīś, and in this our version probably preserves the original state of the text.

4.10. The list in this section presents stem-forms for some Upaniṣad-names, a form in *o[paniṣat]* for others, while still others are given fully with the element *°upaniṣat*. I have not tried to impose any regularity in this regard.

Instead of the list of 15 Upaniṣads that AVParīś gives in the corresponding paragraph, we find a list of 18 announced here,⁴⁸ while the mss. quite uniformly present a list of 23 (with possible repetition of one if *mahopaniṣad* = *maho*). Up to the 17th Upaniṣad listed here (*Śrutipratyagānanda*), the list corresponds exactly with the texts found at the beginning of the five Upaniṣad mss. described in §3, where in all cases except Ku₂, the *Ātharvaṇa* follows as 18th: in our list, it comes after *nṛṣiṃha-maho-brahmavedo* (where *maho* might be a spurious element). The CVU contains no direct trace of the list of 28 Upaniṣads that the AVParīś version presents, entirely out of context, in 49.4.4 — there is some overlap between the list of 28 and especially the one of 15 in AVParīś, on the one hand, and the CVU list of '18'/23, on the other, but there are considerable differences too. **tatra-tvaśāntīś ceti**: This incomprehensible conclusion seems to correspond in some way to the conclusion of AVParīś 49.4.10: *vaitathyam | advaitam | alātaśāntīś ceti*.

4.11. Note the fact that all mss. except Jā insert the *Śikhāvratā* between *Yamavratā* and *Śāntivratā*. The parallel in 49.4.11 suggests that Jā may have preserved the original state of affairs here, although there the sequence *yamavratam | śāntivratam* is followed by a separate *śikhivratā*. **anujavratam | dadhivratam**: AVParīś here reads *marudvratam | dhivratam*. The readings clearly go back to the same original, but I cannot tell what it was: *anaḍudadhivratam?* *marudadhivratam?* *anaḍudvratam* (ŚS 4.11.11d) | *dadhivratam?* The CVU, as edited here, also reaches 18 *vratas*, but the ordering and names differ in several ways from the list in AVParīś. **mailavratam**: I have hesitantly made this emendation, relying for the name of the *vratā* on Gu₁Gu₂. However, the reading *mailāra°*, found in the better mss., may conceal the pair *mailavratam | mailottaravratam* found in AVParīś, in which case our list would come to exceed the indicated number of 18 *vratas*.

4.12. 49.4.12 has one more element, and a slightly different order for this additional list of *vratas* (see e.g. the index to GAMPERT 1939) that the tradition has seen fit not to announce as such: *kṛcchram | taptakṛcchram | atikṛcchram |*

⁴⁸Peter Bisschop has suggested to me that the number 18 may have entered the CVU here from the list of 18 *vratas* in 4.11.

sarvākṛcchram | maundabhāyah | tulāpuruṣaḥ | sām̐tapanam | mahāsām̐tapanam ceti.

5.2. 49.5.2 reads *yo vai brahmavedeṣv anupanītaḥ sa sarvavedeṣv anupanītaḥ ||*. The word *sa* is omitted in CVU.

5.3. **dvijottamaḥ**: Cf. 49.5.3 ... *dvijo yo brahmavedam adhītukāmaḥ sa ...*. The corrupt CVU reading, whose *dvijottamāḥ* I have corrected to *dvijottamaḥ*, spoils the connection between relative and main clause, which could be solved by emending still further to *dvijottamo yo*. **punarupaneyo**: The syllable *ne* had been lost already in CVU_A.

5.4–5. 49.5.4–6 reads: *devās ca ṛṣayaś ca brahmāṇam ūcuḥ || ko no [smo] jyeṣṭhaḥ | ka upanētā | ka ācāryaḥ | ko brahmatvaṃ ceti || tān brahmābravīt ||*. The words *brahmāṇam ūcuḥ* seem to have been lost in transmission before CVU_A, because they are indispensable. The same must be true for *ko brahmatvaṃ ceti* (the last phrase of 49.5.5), because the next paragraph shows that this is not likely to have been an intentional omission. The other differences seem to be redactional.

5.7. **vai ... atharvaṇā brahmatvaṃ**: Cf. 49.5.7, which reads *atharvā vo jyeṣṭho 'tharvopanētātharvācāryo 'tharvā brahmatvaṃ ceti ||*. *vo* (omitted in the editors' ADE, read *va* in their B: see apparatus, p. 342) is clearly the better reading, *atharvā brahmatvaṃ* very likely so.

5.8. 49.5.8 only gives a pratīka: *tad apy etad ṛcoktam | brahmajyeṣṭheti etayā |*, perhaps because the mantra had already been quoted in full at 46.9.21 = ŚS 19.22.21. The mantra is also found as PS 8.9.1. BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN report (p. 342) that their ms. T "gives AV. 19.23.30 in full, reading: *prathamota*." The significance of the last specification is unclear, because this is precisely the reading we expect (and find in CVU).

5.9. 49.5.9 opens with *iti tasyārhaṃ brahmavedaś caturṇām ...* (which seems somewhat more comprehensible than our *atharvavede caturṇām ...*), and then reads *setihāsa°*, although the reading *itihāsa°* is reported for ms. T by BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN: another agreement of that ms. with CVU.

5.10–11. 49.5.10–11 reads *athāto brahmavedaḥ kapilo varṇena tīkṣṇaḥ pra- caṇḍaḥ kāmarūpī viśvātmā jitendriyaḥ | sa tasmin bhagavati duroārajoālah | 10 | kṣudrakarmā sa ca bhagavān brahmavedaś caturmukho dvīpakṣo dānto dharmī balavān prājñāḥ kṛtotthāpanīyaḥ krūraḥ ṣadrātrāṇi vimṛṣī [ṣadrātrāṇi ṣaḍ] vaiṭāyano gotreṇa*. There is a free field here for various emendations of the corrupt CVU readings. To mention just one: *atibalavanta°* (with thematization not unknown in low register Sanskrit), might do in the place of *ativanta°*. BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN (p. 342) again report the reading *vaikhā°* for several mss. (YV-CV, p. 47 l. 17 reads *vaitānasagotraṃ*).

5.12. 49.5.12 reads *ya ekaikasmin vedānām nāmavarnagotrārūpapramāṇam ca kīrtayed yo vidvān jātismaro bhavati mṛtaḥ sa brahmalokaṃ gacchati ||*. I have restored *ya ekaikasmin* on this basis. All CVU mss. point to *ekasmin*, a reading reported by BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN only for their ms. E (whether that ms. does have *ya*, or not, is unclear).

§5. Paippalāda Ancillary Literature: Evaluation of the *Caranavyūhopaniṣad* Evidence

The main purpose of the Atharvavedic *Caranavyūha* seems to be to give an overview of the Atharvavedic canon, and to this end it comprises a catalog of Atharvavedic ancillary texts. Neither of the two known versions of this *Caranavyūha* specifies for which Śākhā it describes the canon of Atharvavedic literature. Since only one version was known until recently, and it seemed to correspond fairly well with the Śaunaka canon as available in mss. transmitted by adherents of that Śākhā, it was naturally assumed to be valid for, and was compared with, the literature of this school in MODAK's detailed analysis (1993: 391–399) of the 49th *Parīṣiṣṭa* in BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN's edition, based on mss. transmitted by Śaunakīya Atharvavedins. The availability of the version styled *Caranavyūhopaniṣad* in mss. transmitted by Paippalādins in Orissa raises the question, to which I will also return at the end of this section, whether that natural assumption was a correct one.

In CVU and AVParīś 49 alike, mention is made of several texts, among which the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*, the *Vedāṅgas*, and the typically Atharvavedic five *Kalpas*. Then follows first a list of the so-called *Lakṣaṇagranthas* and after that a list of (somewhat more than) 72 *Parīṣiṣṭas*; finally, the CVU version of the text announces that it will enumerate 18 *Upaniṣads*, but when it enumerates them actually seems to give a few more than 18. Only for this last genre of ancillary literature does the CVU version differ substantially from the version that is AV-Parīś 49. The list of *Upaniṣads* in the CVU shows a remarkable overlap with what we actually find in the common initial parts of the *Upaniṣad*-manuscripts that are available in Orissa, and whose contents have been presented in detail in §3. At least for the *Upaniṣads*, the CVU thus seems to describe the Paippalāda rather than the Śaunaka canon.

I now propose to pursue this matter a bit further, and discuss the extent to which the other statements in the CVU can be verified directly or indirectly, if assumed to be valid for the Paippalāda school. By directly, I mean that mss. of the texts mentioned in the CVU are available among Paippalādins today; by indirectly, I mean that there is evidence that they may have been in the past, and that the CVU hence may be taken to describe a canon of which parts have subsequently been lost.

§5.1. The *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*

While there seem to be no extant mss. of the text other than the ones found in western India, among Śaunakīya brahmins, and used for the available editions, there is good evidence that the Paippalādins considered some version of this *Brāhmaṇa* to belong to their canon. In his contribution to this volume, Kei Kataoka has demonstrated that Bhaṭṭa Jayanta was probably a Paippalāda brah-

min. If this is correct, then the elaborate quotations in the *Nyāyamañjarī* virtually prove that the GB was known to Paippalādins in 9th century Kashmir, and that substantial parts of the text as known to them agreed with the GB as known to us. There is further indirect evidence from the Paippalādins in Orissa: references to the GB are found in their ritual manual called *Karmapañjikā*, composed by Śrīdhara. I have hitherto found one passage,⁴⁹ where a positively identifiable quotation is made from the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*: it is GB 1.2.6, referred to as *pūrvabrāhmaṇe*. This proves that Śrīdhara knew the same division of the text in two parts, that is found in the extant western Indian mss., and referred to in CVU. It may also mean that he still had access to the text, but this cannot be proved. The fact that he also quotes several passages as found *gopathabrāhmaṇe*, that are not found in that text as we know it, but of which most can be identified in the collection of Atharvavedapariśiṣṭas,⁵⁰ could be taken to suggest the contrary. This last phenomenon of possible misattribution, also observed in other ritual manuals from Orissa,⁵¹ may be compared with the observation made by BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN on p. XVI of their AVParīś introduction: “Hemādri in his *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* has also drawn extensively upon the Pariśiṣṭas, calling them either by their proper title or *Ātharvaṇa Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*.”⁵²

BHATTACHARYYA (1955: 7; 1968: 24) has pointed out that Veṅkaṭa Mādhava makes mention of a *paippalāda Brāhmaṇa*,⁵³ and that the *Prapañcahr̥daya*, a

⁴⁹Ni 83v5–84r1; Ku 94r2–3; Gu₁ 97v4 (see §2B above, about these manuscripts).

⁵⁰Ni 18v5–19r1, Ku 20v4, Gu₁ 23v4–5: *ke cit pūjanāt prāg darbhakoṣṭhīm triḥparyukṣaṇam cecchanti || tathā ca gopathabrāhmaṇe || tasmād devoatāḥ sarvakarmasv ādito antar udayaneṣu* (em., °yameṣu Ni Ku, °pameṣu Gu₁) *ca hūyanta iti* (em., *ca hūyanta ca iti* mss.) *vidhānāt* (unidentified — cf. GB 1.1.14d?); Ni 25v5–26r1, Ku 28v1, Gu₁ 31r5: *gopathabrāhmaṇe || gopuchāgrākṛtir daṇḍo hastamātra-pramāṇataḥ | ardhāṅguṣṭhapramāṇena nimnam śirasi khānayed iti* (cf. AVParīś 27.2.4–5: *gopucchāgrākṛtir daṇḍo maṇḍalāgra[m] śiro viduḥ | aṅguṣṭhāgrapramāṇena nimnam śirasi khānayet || etal lakṣaṇam uddiṣṭam sruvasya phalabhedataḥ | gopathena yathāśāstram uddhṛtam śruticodanāt | sruveṇa kurute karma hastenāpi tathā śṛṇu ||*); Ni 26r2, Ku 28v3, Gu₁ 31r2–3: *atha śruvagrahaṇalakṣaṇam || gopathe || hīyate yajamāno vai sruvasya mūladarśanāt | putrair iṣṭaphalaiḥ pūrtaiḥ śrutir eṣā purātānī || tasmāt saṃgopayen mūlam homakāle sruvasya ca* (unidentified); Ni 26v3–4, Ku 29v1–2, Gu₁ 31v5–32r1: *gopathabrāhmaṇe | adhunvan* (em., *dhunvan* mss.) *vāpi juhuyāc chruveṇāspḥuṭitāhutih* (em., *chruveṇo* mss.) *| dhunvan hinasti putrāmś ca rākṣasam sphuṭitāhutih || nānyat kiṃcid abhidhyāye ṛjuhadāpatatāhutih† | tad daivatam abhidhyāye āhutir yasya dīyate || sruve pūrṇe japen mantram uttānaḥ śāntike karaḥ | śāntike pauṣṭike caiva varjayet tu kanīnikām iti* (cf. AVParīś 27.1.4–5, 27.2.1); Ni 32v1–2, Ku 36v1–2, Gu₁ 37v1–2: *tathā ca gopathabrāhmaṇe || kriyāprasamsā brāhmaṇam haviḥsamśkārakam yajuḥ || stutipradānam mantrō vai vidhānam kalpa ucyata iti* (unidentified); Ni 85r3, Ku 95r4, Gu₁ 98v5–99r1: *gopathabrāhmaṇe yadā juhōti hastenetyādivākyaḥ pañcabhir aṅgulibhir annam hutvā* (cf. AVParīś 28.1.1: *om yadā juhōti hastena dakṣiṇenetareṇa vā | tadā vakṣye vidhiṃ tasya śreyasī syād yathāhutih ||*). All KP fragments quoted here and on the following pages are given in preliminary editions, without reporting most of the (rather substantial amount of) variant readings.

⁵¹Cf. the reference to AVParīś 37 (*Samuccayaprāyaścittāni*) as *Vaitānakalpa* in Bhūdhara’s *Āsurī-dīpikā*, discussed in Alexis Sanderson’s contribution to this volume, p. 209 n. 39 (end).

⁵²These passages have been listed as an appendix, pp. 645f., in their edition.

⁵³BHATTACHARYYA’s reference in 1968 was to *Ṛgvedabhāṣyānukramaṇī* (8.1), without specification of the edition used. In 1955 he had referred to “the *Anukramaṇī* portion of the *Ṛgarthadīpikā*,

probably fairly late South Indian text of doubtful reliability, states this text to have had eight Adhyāyas.⁵⁴ WITZEL (1977: 146f.), who does not discuss the possible relevance of Veṅkaṭa Mādhava's statement, is inclined to take the *Prapañcahrdaya* evidence seriously, and to connect it with the following statement by Śaṅkara in his *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* (3.3.25): *asty ātharvaṇīkānām upaniṣadārambhe mantrasamāmnāyaḥ "sarvaṃ pravīdhyā hrdayaṃ pravīdhyā dhamanīḥ pravṛjya śīro abhipravṛjya tridhā vipṛktaḥ" ityādiḥ*. WITZEL convincingly demonstrates (pp. 144ff.) that the passage from which this statement is taken lists texts that Śaṅkara knew to find their place "near to the Upaniṣads, in the arrangement of the Veda texts of the various schools quoted by him". Hence, WITZEL concludes, this Atharvavedic pratīka, which cannot be traced in any known source, is likely to have come from a lost Brāhmaṇa (or Āraṇyaka-Upaniṣad) of the Atharvaveda, which he assumes to be the lost *Paippalāda-brāhmaṇa* of (Veṅkaṭa Mādhava and) the *Prapañcahrdaya*.⁵⁵

There is some evidence that Śaṅkara, when using the term *ātharvaṇīka*, was indeed thinking specifically of a Paippalāda text. As BHATTACHARYYA also already pointed out (1955: 5; 1968: 46f.), he uses it at *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2.3.43 in discussing a *Brahmasūkta* with a stanza that is known only from the PS: *tathā hy eke śākhino dāśakitavādibhōvaṃ brahmaṇa āmananty ātharvaṇīkā brahmasūkte "brahma dāsā brahma dāsā brahmaiveme kitavā" [PS 8.9.11] ityādinā*.⁵⁶ This fact, then, comes in support of the connection that WITZEL wants to make be-

8, 1". With the kind help of George Cardona and Walter Slaje, I have been able to trace these divergent references to the text published under the title *Ṛgvedānukramaṇī* by KUNHAN RAJA (1932), where verses viii.i.10–12 read (p. 74):

atha ye brāhmaṇārthānāṃ vivektāraḥ kṛtaśramāḥ |
śabdarītiṃ vijānanti te sarvaṃ kathayanty api || 10
tāṇḍake śāṅghyāyanake śramaḥ śatapathe 'pi ca |
kauṣṭhake kāṅhake ca syād asyeha sa paṇḍitaḥ || 11
aitareyakam asmākam paippalādam atharvaṇām |
trīṅyan tittiriproktaṅ jānan vṛddha ihocyate || 12

⁵⁴Ed. MĪMĀMSAK 1987, p. 14 (Trivandrum ed. p. 21). On the uncertain date and doubtful reliability of this text, see BRONKHORST 2007: 292, n. 30; 294; 297, n. 44.

⁵⁵See BHATTACHARYYA 1968: 49f. for a different explanation of the passage as referring directly to PS 1.76.4cd *prabhañjaṅ chatrūn prati yāhy agne kṛtyākṛtaṃ duṣkṛtaṃ hrdaye vidhya marmaṇi* ||. This is not convincing because (a) the verbal correspondence is only very partial and moreover imprecise, and (b) PS 1.76.4 cannot clearly be said to be found *upaniṣadārambhe* in any sense.

⁵⁶Kengo Harimoto, whom I thank for helping me with the interpretation of these passages from Śaṅkara's work, points out to me that *ātharvaṇīka* is used elsewhere in the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* only to denote the *Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, a fact which tends to corroborate the hypothesis that Śaṅkara knew the Paippalāda-Śākhā, since that Upaniṣad stands at the head of all known Upaniṣad collections associated with the Paippalādins (see the mss. described in §3, and the list of Upaniṣads in CVU 4.10). — Peter Bisschop points out to me that the fact that it also stands at the head of the supposedly Śaunakīya list at AVParīś 49.4.4 reduces the force of this last argument.

tween the lost source of the mantra(s) *sarvaṃ pravīdhya* . . . and the Paippalāda school. We do know some Vedic texts styled °*brāhmaṇa* that consist partly or wholly of mantras, but the fact that Śaṅkara knew this particular *mantrasam-āmnāya* to be *ātharvaṇikānām upaniṣadārambhe*, which must here contextually be interpreted to mean ‘immediately preceding the beginning of the Upaniṣads in the Paippalāda-Atharvavedins’ canon’, does not seem to me sufficient evidence for assuming that this particular group of mantras stems from a lost Brāhmaṇa rather than some other kind of text that may have contained mantras. I know of no explicit evidence, besides that from Veṅkaṭa Mādhava and the *Prapañcahr̥daya*, that there was ever any Atharvavedic Brāhmaṇa, and specifically a *Paippalādabrāhmaṇa*, besides the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*.

If it were not for the information that this Brāhmaṇa had eight Adhyāyas, there would be no strong arguments at all against identifying the *Paippalāda*° with the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*. Since this information is found only in the *Prapañcahr̥daya* — a source which, as we will see below, offers some other uncorroborated information too — I in fact consider this the most likely hypothesis.⁵⁷ The idea, expressed in CVU, that the two extant books of the GB would be the remainder of a text which once contained 100 *prapāṭhakas* (5 of which remain forming GB 1, and another 6 forming GB 2) may well be a fiction,⁵⁸ but even if it is not, neither the number nor the name of the textual divisions quoted in the CV, and found in the extant GB, match with the *Prapañcahr̥daya* statement.⁵⁹

§5.2. The Six Āngas

Except the so-called *Kautsaovyaniruktanighaṇṭu* (AVPariś 48) and an *Atharvaveda-jyotiṣa* available e.g. in a BORI ms. of which I have a xerox but that I have not yet studied,⁶⁰ I know no evidence that could corroborate the implicit claim made in

⁵⁷Cf. the *Nyāyamañjarī* evidence presented in Kei Kataoka’s contribution to this volume, and §5.6 below.

⁵⁸BLOOMFIELD (1899: 101 with n. 2 on p. 106) expresses no opinion; neither does GAASTRA (1919: 9); PATYAL (1969: vii–viii) does take this information seriously, and uses it to explain the several attributions of verses, not found in the extant GB, to the *Gopatha* in AVPariś, and one in Pseudo-Sāyaṇa’s introduction to his AV *Bhāṣya* (referred to also by GONDA 1975: 355 n. 108), but this is a false attribution (see below, n. 67). On this phenomenon, see also above, p. 180 with n. 50.

⁵⁹Kei Kataoka has pointed out to me that the Mīmāṃsaka author Bhaṭṭa Someśvara, author of the *Nyāyasudhā*, a commentary on the *Tantravārttika*, refers to the Atharvaveda. Ed. MUKUNDA SHASTRI, p. 148, l. 2–3: *krītarājakabhojyānnatvasmṛtimūlasya tu tasmād dīkṣitasya vijñātasya krītarājakasya bhojyaṃ bhavātīy atharvavede paṭhyamānasya . . .* This passage must be a (rather imprecise) reference to the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa* (1.3.19:89.8–11): *tasyājātasya vijñātasya kṛitasomasyābhojanīyaṃ bhavātīy āhuh sa dīkṣāṇām prātar jāyate somaṃ krīṇanti tasya jātasya vijñātasya kṛitasomasya bhojanīyaṃ bhavātīy āhuh*. Unfortunately, both the time and the place at which Bhaṭṭa Someśvara was active seem to be unknown, so the possible significance of this quotation for the historical distribution of oral or written transmission of the GB cannot be determined.

⁶⁰I refer to BORI ms. 16 of 1870–71 (see no. 247, p. 9f., in NAVATHE 1990). Two or three more mss. of this text are listed in vol. I of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*. This *Catalogus* suggests that

the AV-CV that the Atharvaveda had its own Āngas, besides the Kalpas, to be treated in the next paragraph. In the case of the Paippalāda school, I don't even know any such Nirukta and Jyotiṣa exceptions. It seems that our *Caranavyūha* must not be taken literally here, in either of its two versions.

§5.3. The Five Kalpas

On the tradition of the five Atharvavedic Kalpas, see Alexis Sanderson's contribution to this volume, pp. 202f. Concerning the evidence for a specific Paippalāda transmission of these Kalpas, we can state the following.

(1) The *Nakṣatralpa*. There is a text transmitted under this name that stands at the head of the Atharvavedapariśiṣṭas in the mss. of that collection; in the list of Pariśiṣṭas that we find in both versions of the AV-CV, it is called *Kṛttikārohiṇī* after its initial words. BAHULKAR (1984) concludes from this and other facts that the *Nakṣatralpa* which is AVParīś 1 in fact consists of two originally separate texts, the first of which uses mantras from PS, while still showing internal signs of being affiliated to the Śaunaka school. No mss. of any version of this Kalpa seem to be extant in Orissa, and no other evidence is known to me for another transmission of a text under this name, except the fact that ritual manuals of the Paippalādins in Orissa refer very frequently to a *nakṣatralpokta tantra* — *tantra* here in the sense of ritual sequence: cf. the Atharvavedic technical terminology of *pūrva*^o and *uttaratantra* (CALAND 1900: VI f.), of which the *nakṣatralpokta tantra* indeed seems to be composed.⁶¹ I have not yet investigated how precisely this *tantra* is built up, but do not believe it has anything to do with the contents of the extant *Nakṣatralpa*. One may speculate that if any textual basis for it exists in extant literature, it may rather be in one of the other known Pariśiṣṭas, or a similar work, and that the Orissan usage may be a mistake resulting from the placement of the *Nakṣatralpa*, that would have taken up a large portion of the beginning of most Pariśiṣṭa-codices.⁶²

the text of this title is different from the *Atharvayjotiṣa* (Punjab Sanskrit Series 6) discussed by DIKSHIT (1969: 97–100). I thank Toke Lindegaard Knudsen for bringing DIKSHIT's work to my attention.

⁶¹The mss. of the *Karmapañjikā* contain a description. Ni 39v3–40v4, Ku 45r4–46v2, Gu₁ 45v4–47r4: *tatra nakṣatralpoktaṃ tantraṃ nigadyate || avyasaś cety uktvā | ... etā pūrvatantram iti || tataḥ kartā yajamānaṃ sprṣṭvā ayaṃ no 'gnir iti dvābhyāṃ mahedhmānaṃ sakṛd dhutvā | pūrvāvan māvāvyāhrtyādibhir hutvā | tataḥ pradhānahomaḥ | athottaratantram ucyate ... yasmāt kośād ity ātmano hṛdayābhimantraṇaṃ kuryāt | yatrayatra nakṣatralpoktaṃ tantraṃ iti bravīti tatratatraitat karma kuryād iti || ... nakṣatralpoktaṃ tantraṃ samāptaṃ*. This seems to agree quite well with the summary description of what is called the *ājyatantra* at the very end of the sixth *kaṇḍikā* in Keśava's *Kauśikapaddhati* (LIMAYE et al. 1982: 22). For an example of a reference to this *tantra*, see GRIFFITHS 2003b: 10.

⁶²Cf. BOLLING's speculation (1913: 267) involving a possibly similar phenomenon to explain Pseudo-Sāyaṇa's references to the second chapter of the *Śāntikalpa* under the name *Nakṣatralpa* in his *Bhāṣya* on ŚS: "The Chambers Codex of the Pariśiṣṭas is an edition in three volumes, containing respectively AVPar. i—the true *Nakṣatralpa*, AVPar. ii–xxxvi and AVPar. xxxvii–

(2) The *Vaitānakalpa*. BHATTACHARYYA (1955: 8; 1968: 24) quotes the *Prapañcahr̥daya* mention of an *Agastyaśrautasūtra* in 7 Adhyāyas.⁶³ I know of no evidence to support the veracity of this information, or for the existence of any other *Śrautasūtra* associated with the AV than the known *Vaitānasūtra*. I am not aware of any evidence that this text was ever known among the Paippalādins in Orissa.⁶⁴

(3) The *Samhitāvidhi*. This is the traditional name for the text that western scholarship refers to as the *Kauśikasūtra*.⁶⁵ There is some slim evidence that the text may have been known to Śrīdhara, in the following passages that I have found in his *Karmaṇājīkā*, two of which refer specifically to expiations deriving from the *Samhitāvidhi*. (1) Ni 41v2, Ku 46v2, Gu₁ 48r4: end of the *saṃhitāvidhikalpokataprāyaścittavidhi*; (2) Ni 58v1–2, Ku 66v3–4 (not traceable in Gu₁): *tathā ca saṃhitāvidhau | pākayajñakān samāsādya †ekavahuṣikaḥ†⁶⁶ | ekaḥ sviṣṭakṛtaḥ kuryān nānāpi sati daivata iti |* (quotation from KauśS 6.34⁶⁷); Ni 97r5–v1, Ku 108r5, Gu₁ 109r2: *prāyaścittavidhiṃ vakṣye yad uktaṃ saṃhitāvidhau*.

(4) On the *Āṅgirasakalpa*, see Alexis Sanderson's contribution to this volume.

(5) The *Śāntikalpa* has been published by BOLLING in two installments (1904–13), the latter publication containing the first of the text's two Adhyāyas. According to BAHULKAR (1984: 179) this text shows internal signs of being affiliated to the Śaunaka school. I have not yet undertaken any study of this or related Śānti-literature.⁶⁸ As for mss. from Orissa, I believe the only possibly relevant manuscript that I have seen is the *Grahaśānti* ms. listed in §2E.

lxxii. If we assume that Sāyaṇa had only a broken set, namely vol. ii., of such an edition, we can understand why his citations from the *Parīṣṭas* are so limited and also his ignorance of the *Nakṣatrakalpa*. He was however familiar with the tradition of the five *kalpas*, and as the second chapter of the *Śāntikalpa* began with an elaborate *nakṣatrayāga*, he identified this portion of the text with the *Nakṣatrakalpa* of which he had no knowledge except the name".

⁶³Ed. MĪMĀṂSAK 1987, p. 23 (Trivandrum ed. p. 33).

⁶⁴Cf. the misattribution of a phrase known from AVParīś 37 to the *Vaitānakalpa* in the work of a Bhūdhara from Orissa, mentioned by Alexis Sanderson in his contribution to this volume (see the reference in n. 51 above).

⁶⁵Cf. Sanderson's contribution to this volume, p. 203 n. 22.

⁶⁶Ni, *ekavahuṣikaḥ* Ku; both mss. insert a space after *eka*.

⁶⁷*athāpi ślokaḥ bhavataḥ | ājyabhāgāntaṃ prāktantram ūrdhvaṃ sviṣṭakṛtā saha | havīmṣi yajña āvāpo yathā tantrasya tantavaḥ | pākayajñān samāsādyaikājyān ekabarhiṣaḥ | ekasviṣṭakṛtaḥ kuryān nānāpi sati daivata iti ||*. The second verse = ĀśvGS 1.3.10, also found as the concluding verse of MānGS (after 2.18.4). The second is unidentified, but is attributed to GB by Dārila (DIWEKAR et al., p. 32), who is followed herein by Keśava (LIMAYE et al. 1982: 20), and ultimately by Pseudo-Sāyaṇa (at the very end of the *Upodghāta* to his *ŚS Bhāṣya*), who is known to have used Keśava's *Paddhati* extensively (LIMAYE et al., pp. xxiv f.). Since the KauśS itself does not hint at a Śruti source for these verses, the attribution is likely to be fictitious.

⁶⁸I may mention the random collection of BORI mss. that any such systematic study should probably cover: 208/1880–81 and 209/1880–81 (NAVATHE 1994: 341–343, nos. 708 and 709); 190/1884–87 (I do not know whether this ms. has been described in any catalog).

§5.4. The Lakṣaṇagranthas

As noted above (p. 175), the only discrepancy between the lists of Lakṣaṇagranthas that the two versions of the AV-CV contain, is that the CVU omits the *Dantyoṣṭhavidhi*, and that too possibly as a mere accident. Among the Lakṣaṇagranthas listed we find the *Prātiśākhya* called *Caturādhyāyikā*. Now this text, as we know it, belongs without any doubt to the Śaunaka school, because it is called *Śaunakīyā Caturādhyāyikā*. There is no evidence known to me that for any of the texts which the CVU mentions under the heading of Lakṣaṇagranthas — the *Caturādhyāyikā*, *Prātiśākhya*,⁶⁹ *Pañcapāṭalikā*, *Bṛhatsarvānukramaṇī* —, there existed once upon a time, next to the known Śaunaka texts, also independent but parallel Paippalāda-recensions, with precisely the same titles. In any case, no mss. of texts with such titles are found today among the Atharvavedic brahmins in Orissa, nor do any of the extant ancillary text from Orissa seem to refer to them.

§5.5. The Seventy-two Pariśiṣṭas

I have found several cases of a reference to a Pariśiṣṭa in the *Karmapañjikā*, but none can be connected with any text known as part of AVPariś. No collection of Pariśiṣṭas as such is known to me to exist in Orissa, but several of the listed titles are found as parts of other texts: one example is the *Caraṇavyūha*, that we have seen figuring in Upaniṣad mss. As part of *Āṅgirasakalpa* mss., but also in quotations in the *Karmasamuccaya* and the *Karmapañjikā*, I have noticed that texts called *Vedilakṣaṇa*, *Samidhalakṣaṇa*, *Jvālālakṣaṇa*, *Agnivārṇalakṣaṇa* are found quoted in the Paippalāda ritual manuals, and that these show some clear correspondences with the texts known respectively as AVPariś 24.1, 26, 29 and 24.2. See further n. 50 above for quotations from AVPariś 27 (*Sruvalakṣaṇa*) and 28 (*Hastalakṣaṇa*), attributed to the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*, and n. 39 (end) in Alexis Sanderson's contribution to this volume for a quotation from AVPariś 37 (*Samuccayaprāyaścittas*), attributed to the *Vaitānakalpa*. Some of the *Āṅgirasakalpa* mss., including the ms. As that was used for PAṆḌĀ [2003], contain an *Āsurīdīpikā* (attributed to a Bhūdhara) besides the actual verses of the *Āsurīkalpa* also known as AVPariś 35.⁷⁰ In the ms. listed above (§2E) as item 3 under Miscellaneous Sources, I have found a text called *Svapnādhyāya* (cf. AVPariś 68). I expect that a specific investigation of the Orissa sources with a view to identifying Pariśiṣṭa texts might yield some more, and that a comparison with the

⁶⁹Mention may be made here also of the *Vārṇapaṭala*, AVPariś 47, which is a supplement to these two phonetic ancillary texts of the AV, which “do not contain the treatment of the *varṇas* which they take for granted. The purpose of the *Vārṇapaṭala* is to make up for this deficiency” (MODAK 1993: 383–388). Whether this Pariśiṣṭa has any specific Śākhā affiliation has not, to my knowledge, been investigated.

⁷⁰See PAṆḌĀ [2003]: 42ff., 113ff., and Sanderson's contribution to this volume, pp. 211f., items 14–29, p. 216, and p. 220, item 38; see also MAGOUN 1899.

versions of these texts as contained in the western Indian Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa collections, used by BOLLING & VON NEGELEIN for their edition, will lead to interesting text-historical findings.

Not (yet) traced in Orissa, but preserved in quotations in Hemādri's *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, and partly reconstructed on that basis by CALAND (1893: 96f., 107f., 243f.), is a *Paippalādaśrāddhakalpa*, as well as a separate Atharvanic Śrāddha description attributed to Paiṭhīnasi (pp. 99, 110f.),⁷¹ both of which correspond to a Śaunaka recension entitled *Śrāddhavidhi* or *Śrāddhakalpa*, known as AVPariś 44 (see BHATTACHARYYA 1955: 8).

§5.6. Evaluation

All in all, we might say that the evidence of the CVU seems to be rather misleading. Only for the category of Upaniṣadic texts do its indications match fairly well with the Paippalāda canon, if we define that canon as the corpus of literature transmitted by the Paippalādins of Orissa.

Now it could be that the Atharvavedic *Caranavyūha*, as implicitly assumed by previous scholarship, was compiled at some early period by Śaunakīya priests, to give a fitting description of *their* canon. The fact that it is found also in Orissa, in an only marginally altered version, could then mean that it was taken over for some unknown reason by the Paippalādins, was taken along by them when they settled in Eastern India, and was changed consciously only in the list of Upaniṣads. On the other hand, it seems to be the case that for many Atharvavedic ritual texts, such as the *Kauśikasūtra*, the *Gopathabrāhmaṇa*, the *Vaitānasūtra* with its appendix of *Atharvaprāyaścittas*, and the *Pariśiṣṭas*, the Śākhā-distinction Śaunaka/Paippalāda is only a vague one, because mantras are quoted in them from both Śākhās. So could it not be that these texts, although (with marginal exceptions that I have just discussed) transmitted only by Śaunakīyas, were originally in fact canonical for both Śākhās?⁷²

In my 2004 study of Paippalāda Mantras in the *Kauśikasūtra*, I have argued that this question may be answered in the affirmative as regards the KauśS. Since writing that article, I have prepared collections of similar data concerning the GB and the AVPrāy, that I hope to publish in the future, after I have done the same for the VaitS. All of these texts show the striking phenomenon that PS mantras are sometimes quoted first in *pratīka*, followed almost immediately by their *sakalapāṭha*, a phenomenon on whose explanation I have speculated for the KauśS (2004: 60, n. 28). I now consider it quite likely that all of these were originally conceived as multi-Śākhā texts, and were used by Śaunakīyas and Paippalādins alike, during the time that they inhabited the same (western) part of India. If this is true, it is also easily imaginable that the Atharvavedic *Caranavyūha*

⁷¹See below, p. 187, on the Paippalāda affiliation of Paiṭhīnasi.

⁷²This suggestion has been made, in a slightly different form, already by RENO (1947: 78ff.). See also BHATTACHARYYA 1955: 7, with n. 30.

was originally intended to describe the canons of both Śākhās jointly with some degree of accuracy.

An enticing piece of evidence that may support this assumption seems to lie in the indication of the total number of Atharvavedic ṛcs (CVU 4.2; AVParīś 49.4.2; see p. 175), that MODAK could not explain with reference to the Śaunaka-Śākhā (1993: 396). The only real problem for my hypothesis is posed by that small portion of the AV-CV which lists texts for which no direct or indirect evidence is known to connect them (also) with the Paippalāda-Śākhā, or to assume a separate (now lost) Paippalāda-recension besides the known Śaunaka one: the Lakṣaṇagranthas. At this stage, I am willing to keep open the possibility that a few of such separate Paippalāda Lakṣaṇagranthas did exist at one point of time. That independent Anukramaṇī-type material existed also for the Paippalāda school is in any case very likely, as we see fragments of it ubiquitously in the Ṛṣi-Chando-Devatā-Viniyoga-indications of the ritual manuals from Orissa.⁷³

The fact that we cannot confidently associate with the Paippalāda-Śākhā all of the ancillary literature that the CVU mentions, I would like to explain, in short, as a result of the Paippalādins' in Orissa having transmitted only a small fragment of their original canon, that was largely shared with the Śaunakīyas. But the CVU does not only mention too much, it also mentions too little. Concerning those ancillary texts that we do have good direct evidence for, but that it ignores, we now turn to the final section of this contribution.

§6. Ancillary Literature Ignored by the *Caranavyūhopaniṣad*

The direct evidence for Paippalāda ancillary literature ignored by the CVU comes from the sources listed in §2, particularly, once again, Śrīdhara's *Karma-pañjikā*.⁷⁴ I have not yet undertaken a careful collection and analysis of the evidence, but may mention here, once again (cf. GRIFFITHS 2002: 39), the elaborate quotations from a Sūtrakāra called Paithīnasi, of Ślokas attributed to him, and of a *Paribhāṣā*, also composed in Ślokas, that may or may not have been authored by this Paithīnasi.⁷⁵ A proper weighing of the evidence and attempt to

⁷³Where this habit is even taken over into Tantric materials: see Sanderson's contribution to this volume, p. 225.

⁷⁴The CV clearly does not aim to cover secondary (non-canonical) ancillary texts, like *Paddhatī* and *Prayogas*. Hence, the AVParīś version ignores Pseudo-Sāyaṇa's and Dārila's *Bhāṣyas* on the ŚS and the KauśS, respectively, as well as Keśava's *Kauśikapaddhati*; similarly, the fact that the CVU version does not mention the *Karmapañjikā* or the *Karmasamuccaya* is in no sense an omission. That the composition of the AV-CV likely predates most or all of these ancillary texts is not necessarily relevant in this connection, because we do not know when its CVU version became closed to additions.

⁷⁵On Paithīnasi, see RENO (1947: 85, n. 1) and the references given there, one of which is to Pseudo-Sāyaṇa ad ŚS 2.16. It may be observed that Keśava after KauśS 6.37 (ed. LIMAYE et al. p. 22 l. 5) is the source for the *paithīnasiparibhāṣā* mentioned by Pseudo-Sāyaṇa; further refer-

place this author in the development of Atharvavedic ancillary literature will have to await a serious study of the *Karmapañjikā* and the many previously unknown quotations it transmits. The same holds true, *mutatis mutandis*, for the question whether any of the texts mentioned by Sanderson (p. 202) from AK mss. can be shown to have had a properly Atharvavedic (Paippalāda) affiliation. Not mentioned by SANDERSON is the author Nīlakaṇṭha, whose work entitled *Brahmavedoktaviṣṭāriyajñapaddhati* has been referred to by BAHULKAR (1987: 578) on the basis of the AK/P₂ ms., and is found also in my AK/Ni. This text seems to take PS 6.22 as its starting point, and is thus far the only text known to me that might perhaps be called a direct commentary on any Paippalāda-Sūkta. Finally, mention may be made here of the *Atharvavidhāna* belonging to the Paippalāda school reconstructed from *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* (II.127) and *Agnipurāṇa* (262) by BHATTACHARYYA (1955: 8–14).

Bibliography

Bahulkar, S.S.

- 1977 Bhaiṣajyāni in the Kauśika-Sūtra. [Unpublished] Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Ph.D. (Faculty of Arts), University of Poona.
- 1984 The Nakṣatrakalpa and the Śāntikalpa. In: Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference 31 (University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, 1982), 179–184.
- 1987 Āṅgirasakalpa: A Brief Survey. In: Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute LXVIII (Ramakrishna Gopal Bhandarkar 150th Birth-Anniversary Volume), 571–579.
- 1994 Medical Ritual in the Atharvaveda Tradition. Pune: Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth [Shri Balmukund Sanskrit Mahavidyalaya Research Series, No. 8].
- 2002 AtharvaVeda-PrayogaBhānu (Dharmaśāstra of the AtharvaVedins). In: Abhijit Ghosh (ed.), Ātharvaṇā (a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition) (Kolkata), 146–154.
- 2003 Saṃskāraratnamālā: An Ātharvaṇic Prayoga. In: Kalyan Kale, N.B. Marathe, Shreenand L. Bapat (eds.), *Pramodasindhu. Professor Pramod Ganesh Lalye's 75th Birthday Felicitation Volume* (Pune: Man-sanman Prakashan), 28–35.

ences by Keśava to *paiṭhīnāsī* and a *paribhāṣā* are traceable through the index in the edition of the *Kauśikapaddhati*. Some material on Paiṭhīnāsī has also been collected, and referred to in recent publications by S.S. BAHULKAR (2002: 148; 2003: 32ff. and n. 8 on p. 34 where a forthcoming article "On the *Paiṭhīnāsīsmṛti*" is announced). See also p. 323 in the contribution to this volume by Kei Kataoka.

- forthc. The Tradition of the Atharvaveda in Varanasi. In: Asko Parpola, Masato Fujii & Stanley Insler (eds.), Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference held in Helsinki, 2003. Vol. 1 (Veda). Delhi.
- Bhattacharya, Dipak
1996 The Position of the Vāstusūtropaniṣad in the Atharvavedic Literature. In: BONER et al. (eds.), 35–42.
- Bhattacharyya, Durgamohan
1955 Lights on the Paippalāda Recension of the Atharvaveda. In: Our Heritage 3, 1–14.
1968 The Fundamental Themes of the Atharvaveda (with special reference to its Paippalāda-saṃhitā). Poona: S.P. Mandali.
- Bisschop, Peter & Arlo Griffiths
2003 The Pāśupata Observance (*Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* 40). In: Indo-Iranian Journal 46, 315–348.
- Bloomfield, Maurice
1899 The Atharva-Veda and the Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa. Strassburg.
- Bolling, George Melville
1904–13 The Çāntikalpa of the Atharva-Veda. In: Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 35 (1904), 77–127; Journal of the American Oriental Society 33 (1913), 265–277.
- Bolling, George Melville & Julius von Negelein
1909–10 The Pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda. Volume 1: Text and Critical Apparatus, in 2 Parts. Leipzig.
- Boner, Alice, Sadasiva Rath Sarma & Bettina Bäumer
1996 Vāstusūtropaniṣad. The Essence of Form in Sacred Art. Sanskrit Text, English Translation and Notes. Third Revised Edition. Delhi.
- Bouy, Christian
1990a Matériaux pour servir aux études upaniṣadiques (I). Un manuscrit sanskrit de Tanjore. In: Journal asiatique 278, 71–134.
1990b Matériaux pour servir aux études upaniṣadiques (II). La *Rāmātāpanyupaniṣad*. In: Journal asiatique 278, 269–326.
1994 Les Nātha-Yogin et les Upaniṣads. Étude d’histoire de la littérature hindoue. Paris.
1995 Matériaux pour servir aux études upaniṣadiques (III). La *Mudgalopaniṣad*. In: Journal asiatique 278, 71–134.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes
2007 Greater Magadha. Studies in the culture of early India. Leiden.
- Caland, Willem
1893 Altindischer Ahnencult. Das Śrāddha nach den verschiedenen Schulen mit Benutzung handschriftlicher Quellen dargestellt. Leiden.

- 1900 Altindisches Zauberritual. Probe einer Uebersetzung der wichtigsten Theile des Kauśika Sūtra. Amsterdam.
- Deshpande, Madhav M.
 1997 Śaunakīya Caturādhyāyikā. A Prātiśākhya of the Śaunakīya Atharvaveda. With the commentaries Caturadhyāyībhāṣya, Bhārgava-Bhāskara-Vṛtti and Pañcasandhi. Critically edited, translated & annotated. Cambridge (Mass.).
 2002 Recitational Permutations of the Śaunakīya Atharvaveda. Critically Edited with an Introduction. Cambridge (Mass.).
- Dev, A.K.
 1988 A Descriptive-Alphabetical Catalogue of Manuscripts. Utkal University Library, Vanivihar. Bhubaneswar.
- Dikshit, Sankar Balakrishna
 1969 English Translation of Bharatiya Jyotish Sastra (History of Indian Astronomy). Translated by Prof. R. V. Vaidya. Part I: History of Astronomy During the Vedic and Vedanga Periods. Delhi.
- Diwekar, H.R., V.P. Limaye, R.N. Dandekar, C.G. Kashikar & V.V. Bhide
 1972 Kauśikasūtra-Dārilabhāṣya. Poona.
- Dogārā Śāstri, Pt. Anantarām
 1938 The Charaṇavyuha Sūtra of Śaunaka with the Commentary of Mahidāsa. Edited with Introduction and Critical notes etc. Benares: Jaya Krishna Dās Hari Dās Gupta.
- Gaastra, Dieuke
 1919 Das Gopatha Brāhmaṇa. Leiden.
- Gampert, Wilhelm
 1939 Die Sühnezeremonien in der altindischen Rechtsliteratur. Prague.
- George, Dieter
 1991 Ṣaṇmukhakalpa. Ein Lehrbuch der Zauberei und Diebeskunst aus dem indischen Mittelalter. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Gonda, Jan
 1975 Vedic Literature (Samhitās and Brāhmaṇas). [A History of Indian Literature, I.1.] Wiesbaden.
 1977 The Ritual Sūtras. [A History of Indian Literature, I.2.] Wiesbaden.
- Goodwin, Charles J.
 1893 The Skandayāga, text and translation. In: Journal of the American Oriental Society 15 [PAOS 1890], v–xiii.
- Goudriaan, Teun
 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.

Griffiths, Arlo

- 2002 Aspects of the Study of the Paippalāda AtharvaVedic Tradition. In: Abhijit Ghosh (ed.), *Ātharvaṇā* (a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition) (Kolkata), 35–54.
- 2003a The Orissa Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā. In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 153, 333–370.
- 2003b The Textual Divisions of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā. In: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 47 [appeared 2004], 5–35.
- 2004 Paippalāda Mantras in the Kauśikasūtra. In: A. Griffiths & J.E.M. Houben (eds.), *The Vedas: Texts, Language and Ritual. Proceedings of the 3rd International Vedic Workshop* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten), 49–99.
- 2004–05 Tumburu: A Deified Tree. In: *Bulletin d'Etudes Indiennes* 22–23 [appeared 2007], 249–264.

Kunhan Raja, C.

- 1932 The Ṛgvedānukramaṇī of Mādhavabhaṭṭa (Son of Veṅkaṭārya). [Madras University Sanskrit Series, vol. 2.] University of Madras.

Limaye, V.P., R.N. Dandekar, C.G. Kashikar, V.V. Bhide & S.S. Bahulkar

- 1982 Keśava's Kauśikapaddhati on the Kauśikasūtra of the Atharva-veda. Pune.

Magoun, H.W.

- 1899 The Āsurī-Kalpa: A Witchcraft Practice of the Atharva-Veda. With an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary. Thesis Baltimore (Johns Hopkins Univ.) [= *American Journal of Philology* 10, 165–197].

Mīmāṃsak, Yudhiṣṭhir

- 1987 Prapañcahrdayam tathā Prasthānabhedah. Ajñātanāmagranthakāraḥ / Śrīmadhusūdāna-Sarasvatī. Bahālgarh, Sonīpat / Har-yāṇa: Rāmlāl Kapūr Ṭraṣṭ.

Mishra, Nilamani

- 1973 An Alphabetical Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Collection of the Orissa State Museum, Bhubaneswar. Part-1. Bhubaneswar.

Modak, B.R.

- 1993 The Ancillary Literature of the Atharva-Veda. A Study with special reference to The Pariśiṣṭas. New Delhi.

Mohapatra, Pranati

- 2002–03 Atharvanic Manuscripts of Orissa State Museum: A Study. Unpublished MPhil thesis, prepared under supervision of Prafulla Kumar Mishra. Utkal University.

Mukunda Shastri

- 1901–09 Nyāyasudhā Tantravārttika Ṭikā Bhaṭṭasomeśvara-viracitā. [Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series Nos. 45–7, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55–7, 60, 71, 73, 107, 121, 123.] Benares.

Navathe, P.D.

- 1990 Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Government Manuscripts Library deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Serial Number 30. Volume III, Part II. Vedāngas. D. Jyotiṣa. Poona.
- 1994 Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Government Manuscripts Library deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Serial Number 30. Volume IV, Part II. Kalpa-sūtras. B. Gr̥hya and Other Works. Poona.

Panda, Bhagavan

- 2003 Palm-leaf Manuscripts of Orissa. In: Kalyan Kale, N.B. Marathe, Shreenand L. Bapat (eds.), *Pramodasindhu. Professor Pramod Ganesh Lalye's 75th Birthday Felicitation Volume* (Pune: Mansanman Prakashan), 344–352.

Paṇḍā, Umākānta

- 2000 Paippalada Bibahadi Samskara Paddhati (*Paippalādavivāhādisaṃskārapaddhatiḥ*). Private publication of the author, printed at Raghunath Press, Balasore, Orissa.
- [2003] Paippalada Vashadisatkarma Paddhati (*Paippalādavaśādiṣaṭkarmapaddhatiḥ*). Private publication of the author, printed at Khirachora Offset, Balasore, Orissa [no date indicated, but printed and despatched in 2003].

Patyal, Hukam Chand

- 1969 Gopatha Brāhmaṇa. English Translation with Notes & Introduction. [Unpublished] Thesis, University of Poona.

Renou, Louis

- 1947 Les écoles védiques et la formation du Vēda. Paris.

Siegling, Wilhelm

- 1906 Die Rezensionen des Caraṇavyūha. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde genehmigt von der philosophischen Fakultät der Friederich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin.

Truhart, Peter

- 1985 The Regents of Nations. Systematic Chronology of States and Their Political Representatives in Past and Present. A Biographical Reference Book. Part II: Asia / Australia-Oceania. München-New York-London-Paris.

Vasu, Nāgendranāth

- 1911 The Archaeological Survey of Mayurbhanja. Vol. I. [Baripada:] The Mayurbhanja State. Reprint: Delhi, Rare Reprints, 1981.

Whitney, William Dwight

- 1905 Atharva-Veda Saṃhitā: translated with a critical and exegetical Commentary. Revised and brought nearer to completion and edited by Charles Rockwell Lanman. 2 vols. Cambridge (Mass.).

Witzel, Michael

- 1977 An Unknown Upaniṣad of the Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda: The Kaṭha-Śikṣā-Upaniṣad. In: Journal of the Nepal Research Centre 1, 139–153.
- 1985 Die mündliche Tradition der Paippalādins von Orissa. In: Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 44 [= Festgabe für Karl Hoffmann, Teil I], 259–287.

Witzel, Michael & Arlo Griffiths

- 2002 A List of Paippalāda-AtharvaVedin Settlements. In: Abhijit Ghosh (ed.), Ātharvaṇá (a collection of essays on the AtharvaVeda with special reference to its Paippalāda tradition) (Kolkata), 167–179.

Zehnder, Thomas

- 1999 Atharvaveda-Paippalāda, Buch 2, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Idstein: Schulz-Kirchner Verlag.