



**HAL**  
open science

## The Pāśupata Observance (Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa 40)

Peter Bisschop, Arlo Griffiths

► **To cite this version:**

Peter Bisschop, Arlo Griffiths. The Pāśupata Observance (Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa 40). *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 2003, 46 (4), pp.315-348. 10.1023/B:INDO.0000009508.18900.ef . halshs-01908832

**HAL Id: halshs-01908832**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01908832>**

Submitted on 30 Oct 2018

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

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

THE PĀŚUPATA OBSERVANCE (*ATHARVAVEDAPARIŚIṢṬA* 40)\*

INTRODUCTION

*The Pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda*

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with the many grammatical and lexicographical peculiarities which the texts present, and containing also a number of unpublished texts that throw light upon the subject matter of the *Pariśiṣṭas*”.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

---

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

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

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Hatfield 1890.



307f.). Unfortunately, the plans of the editors were only very partially realized,<sup>3</sup> and besides the few *Parišištās* which had already been translated by Caland and by students of Bloomfield in the nineteenth century, only a few more *Parišištās* have since been translated, by two students of Gonda: Kohlbrugge (1938) and van den Bosch (1978).

Since the information provided by van den Bosch (the last translator of a part of the corpus) in the introduction to his dissertation on AV*Pariš* 21–29 is not in all respects correct, nor complete,<sup>4</sup> we here provide in tabular form a survey of translations or – where a translation is not available – of studies pertinent to the individual *Parišištās*.

Editions, translations and studies of individual AV *Parišištās*.

Nr(s).	Ed. Princeps	Translation	<i>NB</i>
1–18	B&vN	–	–
19	B&vN	–	Gonda 1967 <sup>5</sup>
20	Goodwin 1890	ibid.	–
21–29	B&vN	van den Bosch 1978	–
30	B&vN	–	–
31	B&vN	–	Only 31.9.4c–9.5d ed. / transl. Caland 1900: 183f. <sup>6</sup>
32–34	B&vN	–	–
35	Magoun 1889	ibid.	Böhrtlingk 1890
36–39	B&vN	–	–
40	B&vN	–	–
41–43	B&vN	–	–
44	Caland 1893: 240–243	ibid., pp. 95–106	–
45	B&vN	–	–
46	B&vN	–	Weber 1858a, Griffiths 2003a
47	B&vN	–	–
48	B&vN	– <sup>7</sup>	Bloomfield 1893

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Kohlbrugge 1938: 2f.

<sup>4</sup> The information on p. 1 is merely a reduced copy of Gonda 1975: 307f. n. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Gonda's article contains a translation of *KaušS* 140, which this *Parišištā* closely follows, and the explanatory notes contain many remarks, with translations, on the variant readings of the *Parišištā* text as well.

<sup>6</sup> The same portion was rendered into English by Türistig, *WZKS* 29 [1985], p. 92.

<sup>7</sup> The lexicographical nature of this *Parišištā* does not allow translation.

Nr(s).	Ed. Princeps	Translation	NB
49	B&vN	–	Siegling 1906 <sup>8</sup>
50	B&vN	–	–
51	Weber 1868	–	–
52–56	B&vN	–	–
57	B&vN	Kohlbrugge 1938: 20–27	–
58–61	B&vN	<i>op. cit.</i> , pp. 34–68	–
62	B&vN	<i>op. cit.</i> , pp. 27–31	–
63	B&vN	<i>op. cit.</i> , pp. 69–77	–
64	B&vN	<i>op. cit.</i> , pp. 141–144	Only 64.8.9–10.10 translated
65–66	B&vN	–	–
67	Weber 1858b <sup>9</sup>	ibid.	67.8 untranslated
68	B&vN	–	von Negelein 1912
69–70	B&vN	–	–
70bc	B&vN	Kohlbrugge <i>op. cit.</i> , pp. 78–140	–
71	Hatfield 1893	<i>op. cit.</i> , pp. 145–159 <sup>10</sup>	–
72	B&vN	–	–

It is the purpose of the present paper to fill one of the gaps in this table. Weber already observed (1858b: 339) that “die *Atharva Pariṣiṣṭa* fast durchweg einen *Rudra*-sektarischen Charakter tragen”.<sup>11</sup> This may be a slight exaggeration, but it is a fact that the corpus contains several documents that throw light on the cult of Rudra-Śiva. In the hope that we will be able in the future to offer further studies, e.g., of AVPariś 31 (*Koṭihoma*) and 36 (*Ucchuṣmakalpa*), we focus now on AVPariś 40, the

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

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

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

<sup>11</sup> Cf. also Modak 1993: 445f.

*Pāśupatavrata*. We first offer some introductory comments on the study of the Pāśupata cult.

### *Pāśupata Śaivism*

Our principal source for the interpretation of the *Pāśupatasūtra* – the fundamental text of Pāśupata Śaivism – is Kauṇḍinya's commentary, the *Pañcārthabhāṣya* (Shastri 1940).<sup>12</sup> However, an important aspect of the Pāśupata tradition which has not yet received much attention is the existence of paraphrases of the *Pāśupatasūtra* in other sources. The piece of text translated here contains clear parallels to some of the sūtras.<sup>13</sup> Although it is therefore an important document for the history of Pāśupata Śaivism, it seems to have gone completely unnoticed by scholars studying this cult. Its main importance may be said to lie in the fact that it gives us insight into the social background of (some of) the Pāśupatas. Whereas the so-called Pāñcārthika Pāśupata scriptures, viz. Kauṇḍinya's *Pañcārthabhāṣya* on the *Pāśupatasūtra* and the *Gaṇakārikā* with the commentary *Ratnaṭīkā* attributed to Bhāsarvajña, have been studied with regard to their philosophical and theological contents by various scholars,<sup>14</sup> much remains to be done on the social history of the Pāśupatas.<sup>15</sup> We may refer to recent studies by Sanderson (2002: 29 with note 32) and Bakker (2000), which point out that there must have existed other types of Pāśupata cults whose teachings and practices differed considerably from those we read about in the Pāñcārthika scriptures.

Besides AVParīś 40 there are other texts which contain parallels or paraphrases of the *Pāśupatasūtra*. Well-known is the sixth chapter (*Nakulīśapāśupatadarśana*) of Mādhava's *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, the first source on Pāśupatas to be translated in the West (cf. Hara

<sup>12</sup> The entire commentary has been rendered into English by Hara (1966) and Chakraborti (1970). For the latter see the detailed review by Hara (1974).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. AVParīś 40.1.8–9 (PāSū 1.2), 40.1.11 (PāSū 1.5–6, 1.8), 40.1.12 (PāSū 1.8–9), 40.1.14 (PāSū 1.10–11), 40.2.5 (PāSū 4.22–24), 40.3.3 (PāSū 3.21–26), 40.6.2 (PāSū 1.13), 40.6.4 (PāSū 1.14, 1.17). Note that except for PāSū 3.21–26 and 4.22–24 all the sūtras for which there are parallels stem from the first part of the PāSū. These parallels appear – intermingled with passages that have no parallel in the PāSū – in precisely the same order they have in the PāSū. AVParīś 40.2.5 and 40.3.3 may not go back to the PāSū, because these are two of the five *brahmantras*, which are transmitted in many other sources too (cf. our annotation).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. e.g., Hara 1966, 1993, 1994, 1999; Dasgupta 1955 (pp. 130–149); Schultz 1958; Oberhammer 1984, 1986, 1995.

<sup>15</sup> For the little work that has been done on this subject, see the overview given by Lorenzen (2019: 173ff.). For epigraphical references to Pāśupatas, cf. Hara 1966: 35–70, and Pathak 1960: 4–19. For a theory on the milieu where the cult may have originated, cf. Oberlies 2000.

1958). No references are made in the secondary literature to a passage from Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtyakalpataru* where an otherwise unknown "*Liṅgapurāṇa*" is quoted which i.a. describes a Pāśupatavrata in terms reminiscent of some of the sūtras.<sup>16</sup> Another example comes from the unpublished *Niśvāsamukha*, the first part of the Saiddhāntika *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, which places the Saiddhāntika teachings taught in the major text in their non-Saiddhāntika context. It contains i.a. two accounts of the Atimārga,<sup>17</sup> of which the first by and large follows the course laid down in the *Pāśupatasūtra*.<sup>18</sup> Finally, mention may be made of a late Purāṇic source, the *Pampāmāhātmya*, a eulogy of the pilgrimage centre Pampā (present Hampi in Karnataka), whose eleventh chapter of the *Uttarabhāga*, entitled *Pañcārthacaraṇaprasāmsā*, also contains some clear echoes of the sūtras.<sup>19</sup> A noteworthy feature of the last three passages is that they are all composed in śloka meter.<sup>20</sup>

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

<sup>16</sup> KKT *Tīrthavivecanakāṇḍa* p. 106, l. 7ff. These verses occur within a *māhātmya* of a *liṅga* called Mahāpāśupateśvara in Vārāṇasī (p. 105, l. 12ff.). On the identity of this "*Liṅgapurāṇa*", see Bisschop 2002: 240 (n. 36).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Sanderson 1988: 664, on the two great streams of Śaivism: the Outer Path (Atimārga) and the Path of Mantras (Mantramārga).

<sup>18</sup> NAK 1–227, NGMPP A 41/14, folios 17<sup>r</sup> and 17<sup>v</sup>. We thank Dominic Goodall for drawing our attention to this passage and providing us with a transcription. This passage is especially important because it has been transmitted in an early Nepalese manuscript (ca. CE 900). Cf. Goudriaan and Gupta 1981: 33ff.

<sup>19</sup> This chapter has been edited in an appendix by Vasundhara Filliozat (2001). Unfortunately, the edition is very poor and contains numerous mistakes and typographical errors. Filliozat does not note the paraphrases of the *Pāśupatasūtra* (p. 140: 2.12.20ff.) nor the even more obvious quotation of the entire *Gaṇakārikā* in this chapter (pp. 139–140: 2.12.5–14).

<sup>20</sup> It has long been observed that parts of the *Pāśupatasūtra* itself are metrical. Cf. Oberlies 2000: 181 (n. 28).

<sup>21</sup> E.g., MBh 13 App. I Nr. 15 ll. 4325–4402, LiP 1.88, VāP 11–15, SP<sub>Bh</sub> 174–182.

<sup>22</sup> An exception to this is the *Atharvaśīras-Upaniṣad*, which has a few lines in common with PāSū 5.35–38. Cf. Hara 1967: 60–61.

*Geographical and onomastic links between Atharvavedic and Pāśupata traditions*

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

The following names of commentators on the Atharvavedic *Kauśikasūtra* are known:<sup>24</sup> Bhadra (commentary lost),<sup>25</sup> Rudra (lost),<sup>26</sup> Dārila, and Keśava. Meulenbeld, *forthc.*, has confirmed the west Indian provenance of these last two writers.<sup>27</sup> In the family of Keśava (11th century),<sup>28</sup> the author of the *Paddhati* on the *Kauśikasūtra*, both Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva names were used. Cf. *Kauśikapaddhati* (Limaye et al. 1982), p. 482: *Kauśiko Vatsaśarmā ca tatprapautro 'tha Dārilaḥ* |<sup>29</sup> *śāstravijñānam eṣāṃ hi caturtho nopapadyate || tad ayuktaṃ hi yad vaktuṃ boddhāraḥ santy anekaśaḥ || tathā yad eṣāṃ anvaye Kauśiko jñātavān | Vāhasāt Keśavotpannaḥ Keśavād Ananta ucyate || Anantāt Someśvaro jātaḥ Someśvarāt Keśavas tathā | sarve te 'tharvavedinaḥ . . .*<sup>30</sup> The names Rudra, Bhadra and Someśvara suggest some involvement with Śaiva religion among western Indian Atharvavedins of the first millennium CE.

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

<sup>23</sup> At least as far as the Śaunaka Śākhā is concerned, it remained restricted to western India up to modern times. All AVPariś mss. hail from Gujarat and Maharashtra.

<sup>24</sup> The name Kauśika itself, by the way, has Pāśupata connections: cf. Bakker 2000: 6 and 14.

<sup>25</sup> See ed. of the *Kauśikapaddhati* (Limaye et al. 1982), p. xxi.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. xxi and xxv.

<sup>27</sup> It had already been proven on linguistic grounds by Bühler (1891), a review which has escaped Meulenbeld's attention. Bühler keenly noted (p. 246) that "their language is full of Gujaraticisms", of which he gives several telling examples.

<sup>28</sup> Meulenbeld (*forthc.*) is to our taste too skeptical about the dating proposed by Limaye et al. (1982).

<sup>29</sup> Quoted after the correction suggested on p. xxi of the edition. The text as edited [p. 482] in fact reads *tasya putro 'tha Dārilaḥ*. This conjecture has been made in order to bring Keśava's statement in line with the colophon of the Dārila ms. quoted by Diwekar et al. 1972: x: *mahāvedātharvavida upādhyāyavatsaśarmaṇaḥ prapautrasya bhāṭṭadārilaḥ kauśikabhāṣye . . .*

<sup>30</sup> Cf. also p. xxxv of the edition.

from Gujarat. The plates of the Maitraka ruler Dhruvasena I (Bühler, IA 5 [1876], pp. 204–206), found in erstwhile Bhaunagar State, [Gupta-Valabhī] Saṃvat 207 = ca. CE 527, record a grant of a well and pasture situated in Hastakavapra (“probably the modern Hâthab in the Bhaunagar territory”) to the Atharvavedin Sacitiśarman of the Drauṇāyana gotra. The plates of the Maitraka ruler Dharasena II (Diskalkar, ABORI 4 [1923], pp. 33–41), [Gupta-Valabhī] Saṃvat 252 = ca. CE 572, found at Bhādvā (15 miles south-east of Rajkot in Kathiawad) record a grant of a village Iṣikānaka to the Atharvavedin Rudragopa, son of Rudraghoṣa, of the Kauśravasa gotra, resident of Ānartapura. The Bhavnagar plates of the Maitraka ruler Dharasena III (Diskalkar, EI 21 [1931–1932], pp. 181–184), [Gupta-Valabhī] Saṃvat 304 = ca. CE 624, record a grant to the Atharvavedin Mitrayaśas, son of Viṣṇuyaśas, of the Ātreya gotra, resident of Hastavapra. The Kaira plates of the Early Gurjara ruler Dadda II Praśāntarāga (Mirashi, CII IV/1, 57–66), [Kalacuri] Saṃvat 380 = CE 629, found “in the town of Kēḍā or Kairā, the headquarters of a district of the same name in Gujarat”, record the grant of a village to 40 brahmins among whom 5 were Atharvavedins of the Cauli gotra, adherents of the P[a]ippalāda Śākhā, immigrated from Bharukaccha, resident in Bherajjikā. Their names were: Bhadra, Vāyuśarman, Droṇasvāmin, Rudrāditya, and Pūrṇasvāmin.<sup>31</sup> The plates of Śilāditya V (Bühler, IA 6 [1877], pp. 16–21), probably dated to [Gupta-Valabhī] Saṃvat 441 = ca. CE 761, found in “the Rāja’s palace at Lūṇāvāḍā”, record the grant of a village to the Atharvavedin Sambhulla, son of Dāṭalla, of the Pārāśara gotra, resident member of the community of Caturvedins of Ḍahaka. In these inscriptions, especially the names Rudragopa, Rudraghoṣa, Bhadra<sup>32</sup> and Rudrāditya call our attention: a connection of these brahmins with Rudra worship seems probable.

If we turn now to epigraphical evidence for the Pāśupata cult in early medieval western India, the absence of inscriptional records stemming from Gujarat itself is striking. The first inscriptions from Gujarat recording the names of Pāśupata teachers date to the twelfth century, a time when the Solāṅki dynasty ruled Gujarat (Majmudar 1960: 111–117<sup>33</sup>). We

<sup>31</sup> Whether these five Atharvavedins ever actually enjoyed the usufruct of this grant is doubtful: cf. Mirashi, CII IV/1, p. 68.

<sup>32</sup> This recalls the name of the author of a lost commentary on the *Kauśikasūtra*.

<sup>33</sup> Majmudar attributes the first epigraphical evidence for Pāśupata teachers in Gujarat to the eleventh century, but this is because he reckons three Śaiva ascetics mentioned as the recipients of grants in three earlier inscriptions among the Pāśupatas (Majmudar, p. 112): this conclusion cannot be validated. The other inscriptions which he discusses, however, record a succession of teachers who trace their origin back to Gārgya, the second pupil of Lakulīśa. They all seem to have belonged to Prabhāsapāṭan (Somanātha). The



do, however, have the Ābhōṇa Plates of the Kalacuri ruler Śaṅkaragaṇa (Mirashi, CII IV/1, pp. 38–44), [Kalacuri] Saṃvat 347 = ca. CE 595, from Kalavana (Nasik district): the *dūtaka* seems to have been a *mahāpīlupati*<sup>34</sup> called ‘Pāśupata’. The early Kalacuris ruled over a vast area including Malwa, Maharashtra and Gujarat,<sup>35</sup> and were followers of Śiva as Paśupati.<sup>36</sup> Moreover, in a number of copper plates of the *mahārāja* Bhuluṇḍa of the Valkhās – a contemporary of Samudragupta (ca. CE 335–376) – which have been unearthed at Bāgh (Madhya Pradesh), Pāśupatācāryas are mentioned among the recipients of grants.<sup>37</sup> These inscriptions testify to the presence of Pāśupatas at an early age in western India.<sup>38</sup>

There is no reason to doubt the central role in the early history of the Pāśupata cult of Kārohaṇa,<sup>39</sup> which lies in the immediate vicinity of

---

earliest inscription in which this tradition is recorded is the Somnāthpattan Praśasti of Bhāva Bṛhaspati (Ozhā 1889; Peterson 1895), dated Valabhī Saṃvat 850 = ca. CE 1169, according to which Soma gave Somanātha to the Pāśupatas, who had gone to Vṛndāvana in the Kṛta age due to a curse of Pārvatī. On the command of Śiva, Nandīśvara incarnated in a brahmin family of the Gārgeya lineage in Vāṇārasī [*sic*] in Kānyakubja as Bhāvabṛhaspati and undertook the Pāśupata observance. After a pilgrimage, and having taught in various places, he came to Somanātha where the sacred site was handed over to him by Kumārapāla. Richard Davis (1994) suggests that behind the mythical motif of the curse a historical event is hidden, viz. the destruction of the Somanātha temple by Maḥmūd’s forces in CE 1026. The temple was rebuilt and then later on restored by Kumārapāla in the 12th century.

<sup>34</sup> Mirashi (CII IV/1, p. 45 n. 2): “*Mahāpīlupati*, the great commander of the elephant force, is a technical official title”.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. CII IV/1, p. xlv and p. xlvi.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Mirashi (CII IV/1, p. cxlvii): “All the three Early Kalachuri kings, Kṛṣṇarāja, Śaṅkaragaṇa and Buddharāja, are described in the Kalachuri grants as *paramamāhēśvara*, i.e., fervent devotees of Mahēśvara (Śiva). That they belonged to the Pāśupata sect of Śaivism is shown by the description of Kṛṣṇarāja as devoted to Paśupati from his very birth. Anantamahāyī, the queen of Buddharāja, is specifically mentioned as a follower of the Pāśupata sect. The *Dūtaka* of the Ābhōṇa plates bore the name *Pāśupata* itself. All this is a clear indication of the influence the Pāśupatas exercised in the court of the early Kalachuris”.

<sup>37</sup> The hoard of copper plates has been published by Ramesh and Tewari 1990. Cf. plate nrs. III, V, VI, IX, X, XII, XIV. These plates contain the earliest known inscriptional references to Pāśupatas. Plate nr. X, dated [Gupta?] Saṃvat 56 (ca. CE 376) records a land grant to the shrine of the Mothers (*mātṛsthānadevakula*) which had been established by the Pāśupatācārya Bhagavant Lokodadhi in the village of Piñcchikānaka.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. also Hsuēn Tsang’s description of Mo-la-pô (Mālava), 2,000 li north-west [*sic*] of Bharukaccha (?): “There are 100 Dēva temples of different kinds. The heretics are very numerous, but principally the Pāśupatas (*the cinder-covering heretics*)” (tr. Beal 1884: 261).

<sup>39</sup> Modern Karvan in Gujarat, 15 miles south of Baroda. Many epigraphical and archaeological finds have come to light which confirm its importance for the early Pāśupata movement. For a short bibliography on Karvan, see Hara 1967: 58–59. Other names

the localities mentioned in the grants to Atharvavedins referred to above, even though the relevant epigraphical evidence is not strictly contemporary with those grants. In the original *Skandapurāṇa*, whose earliest extant manuscript is dated to CE 810,<sup>40</sup> we have clear evidence for the predominance of this *āyatana*. It is here that Śiva is said to have incarnated as Lakulīśa, after which he initiated his four pupils Kauśika (in Ujjayanī), Gārgya (in Jambumārga), Mitra (in Mathurā) and a fourth one, probably Kauruṣ(y)a (in Kuru).<sup>41</sup> Similar statements appear in VāP 23.206–213 (= LiP 1.24.126–133) and in the Cintra Praśasti (see n. 39). According to the account given by Kauṇḍinya – tentatively dated to the 4th–6th century (Shastri 1940: 12) – in his commentary on PāSū 1.1 (pp. 3f.), the Lord incarnated at Kāyāvatarāṇa and (from there) walked to Ujjayinī where he initiated his first pupil Kuśika. Thus from early medieval times there existed a tradition which placed the home of the Pāsupata cult in Kārohaṇa, in Gujarat.

The inclusion of the *Pāsupatavrata* among the AV Pariśiṣṭas indicates the prominent role which Pāsupata Śaivism must have played in or around the Atharvavedic milieu in which these texts were composed.

#### *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa 40: the Pāsupatavrata*

Regarding the dating of the corpus of AV Pariśiṣṭas, it is to be kept in mind (Modak 1993: 470) that the “*Atharva-Veda Pariśiṣṭas* obviously represent a composite text, being a collection of tracts presumably belonging to different chronological periods”. Modak collects (pp. 471–473) various arguments based on the vocabulary of the corpus (occurrence of late words like *dīnāra*), dependence on presumably earlier sources (e.g., *Manusmṛiti* and *Arthaśāstra*), precedence with regard to dependent texts (notably Varāhamihira’s *Bṛhatsamhitā*), the state of astronomical knowledge etc. However, since none of these arguments makes use of textual material from AVPariś 40, we cannot for this particular text agree with Modak’s

---

referring to the same place are Kāyā(va)rohaṇa, Kāyāvātāra, Kāyāvatarāṇa. Epigraphical evidence for a connection between the Pāsupata cult and Kārohaṇa is recorded in: 1) the Ekliṅgi Stone Inscription, dated Vikrama Saṃvat 1028 = ca. CE 971 (Bhandarkar 1904–1907); 2) the Pālḍī Inscription, dated Vikrama Saṃvat 1173 = ca. CE 1116 (Akshaya Keerty Vyas, EI 30 [1933–1934], pp. 8–12); 3) the Cintra Praśasti of Śaraṅgadeva, dated Vikrama Saṃvat 1343 = ca. CE 1287 (Bühler, EI 1 [1892], pp. 271–287). A copperplate grant of the Gurjara ruler Jayabhāṭa III, dated [Kalacuri] Saṃvat 456 = ca. CE 706, was issued from the camp (*vāsaka*) at Kāyāvātāra (Bhagwānlāl Indrajī, IA 13 [1884], pp. 70–81).

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Adriaensen, Bakker and Isaacson 1998: 32. Yokochi (1999) has argued for a sixth-century origin of the *Skandapurāṇa* on the basis of iconographical evidence.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Bakker 2000: 13–14, quoting from *Skandapurāṇa* 167 as edited by Bisschop.

conclusion (p. 473) that “one may not be far from the truth if one assigns the *Atharva-Veda Pariśiṣṭas* to a period somewhere round about the beginning of the Christian era”. The only date that can be given is that of the earliest manuscript of the corpus, which also contains our *Pariśiṣṭa*: this is the ms. ‘Roth’ (Bolling and von Negelein, p. xiii) probably dating to CE 1431 ([Vikrama] *Samvat* 1488).<sup>42</sup> Since all mss. descend, according to the editors, from one already corrupt archetype, we can push this date back by at least another century, probably even further: there seems to be no reason to doubt that our text belongs to sometime in the second half of the first millennium CE. We know of no grounds for a more accurate dating.

The text seems to have some embedding in its corpus: at AVPariś 31.10.1–2, we read *evam proktavidhānena koṭihomasya śamkaraḥ | prītimān ucyate yena tac chubhaṃ bhautikaṃ dadau || atharvā bhautikaṃ labdhvā śiṣyebhyas tat punar dadau | śubhaṃ mokṣakaraṃ puṇyam priyam paśupater vratam ||*, and the same name *paśupater vratam* occurs in our *Pariśiṣṭa* at 40.6.14.<sup>43</sup> The Pāśupata observance laid down in AVPariś 40 partly goes back to the teachings of the *Pāśupatasūtra* – as the parallels with some of the sūtras show – , but at the same time it is embedded within an Atharvavedic context: cf. the recurrent Atharvavedic technical terminology (40.3.8, 40.6.10–11), and the presupposed familiarity with mantras of both the Śaunaka and the Paippalāda *Samhitā* (40.2.1, 40.2.4, 40.3.9, 40.6.13). Instead of the four-phased ascetic career taught in Kauṇḍinya’s commentary on the *Pāśupatasūtra*,<sup>44</sup> the present text prescribes a ritual which can be performed within a limited period of time or for one’s entire life (40.1.3). For many ritual details there are parallels in the Grhya- and Dharmasūtra literature, as can be observed from our annotation.<sup>45</sup>

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

<sup>42</sup> This dating is only tentative, as the lunar date given in the colophon does not yield a matching Friday (*bhṛguvāsara*) in 1431.

<sup>43</sup> Modak (1993: 446 with n. 9) further supposes AVPariś 51.4.5 (*mahiṣakavṛṣabhāḥ sabhasmapauṇḍrāḥ kṛṣipāśupālyaratās ca ye manuṣyāḥ | vividhabhayasamāhitās tu sarve kṣayam upayānti śanaiścarasya ghāte ||*) to refer to Pāśupata ascetic practices. But the sole basis for this is the doubtful conjecture *sabhasmapauṇḍrāḥ*, for which the mss. read *sabhāsa°/sabhāsā°*.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Sanderson 1988: 664–665.

<sup>45</sup> For a connection between Yajurvedic tradition and Pāśupata scripture, cf. Oberlies 2000.

“purely mechanical” as appears, according to Modak, to be the norm in the corpus. It is to be kept in mind that the following mss. were available to the editors for AVParīś 40: ABCDE T Roth, U from *tām it* to *viṣṇuḥ* in 40.4.2 and from *pṛthivī* in 40.6.6 to the end of the Parīśiṣṭa. B omits the text of this Parīśiṣṭa after 40.3.4 (the indications given by the editors, p. 257, about precisely where the omission commences, are not clear). The editors seem frequently to have rejected readings from the manuscripts ADE: we, however, are in several cases inclined to adopt rejected readings from these manuscripts.

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

### 1.1 *om atha pāśupatavratādeśo*

*Om.* Now the instruction about the Pāśupata observance.

### 1.2 *nāśrotriyāya nācaritavedavratāya nākṛtavapanāya dadīta* ||

He [i.e., the guru]<sup>46</sup> should not give<sup>47</sup> [this instruction / observance (?)] to one who is not conversant with the Śruti, nor to one who has not undertaken the Veda observance,<sup>48</sup> nor to one who has not undergone the shaving ceremony.<sup>49</sup>

### 1.3 *māsadvitricatuṣpañcasamvatsaradvādaśasamvatsaraparimitaṃ nai- ṣṭhikaṃ vā*

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

<sup>46</sup> In most cases the unspecified subject seems to be the student/practitioner, but here, and in one other clear case (40.3.1–2), it must be the preceptor.

<sup>47</sup> The medial optative of  $\sqrt{dā}$  might appear awkward, but the same usage occurs once more in 40.1.14 below, where it is clear (*dadāmi* / *dadīta*) that the opposition active / middle is insignificant here (cf. *vardhayasva* in 40.3.4). We have found no examples of *vratam* / *ādeśam*  $\sqrt{dā}$ .

<sup>48</sup> Cf. AVParīś 46 and Griffiths 2003a.

<sup>49</sup> This refers to the shaving of the beard and hair that is part of the *samāvartana* ritual at the end of the Vedic studenthood (Gonda 1980: 93, 384), or to the shaving at the end of the *godāna* (ibid., 462f.). The three restrictions imply that the practitioner should be a brahmin. This implication is made explicit by the words which the preceptor causes the practitioner to speak at 40.3.1. Cf. Kauṇḍinya *ad* PāSū 1.1, p. 3, l. 8: (*evam*)*ādirahitaḥ paṭvīndriyo brāhmaṇaḥ śiṣyaḥ* ‘The student is free from such [faults], sharp-witted [and] a brahmin’.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. the Harṣa Stone Inscription (from the Harṣa hill, 7 miles south of Sikar, Rajasthan), dated [Vikrama] Saṃvat 1030 = ca. CE 973, where a Śaiva ascetic called Bhāvadyota is described i.a. as follows: *āsīn naiṣṭhikarūpo yo dīptapāśupatavrataḥ* (Kielhorn, EI 2 [1894], p. 123, l. 26). On the *naiṣṭhika brahmacārin*, see Kane Vol. II part 1, pp. 375–376.

- 1.4 *athāsyāyatanāni* ||  
Now the places of this [observance]:<sup>51</sup>
- 1.5 *mahādevāyatane 'pāṃ samīpe* ||  
at a sanctuary of Mahādeva, in the vicinity of water,
- 1.6 *giriguhāyāṃ gavāṃ goṣṭhe 'gnyāgāre vā*  
in a mountain cave,<sup>52</sup> in a cow-pen or in a fire-house,<sup>53</sup>
- 1.7 *nadīnāṃ bahūnāṃ pratiśraye*  
at a confluence<sup>54</sup> of many rivers.
- 1.8 *anusavanam* || 9. *bhasmanā snānam*<sup>55</sup>  
[Once] per part of the day, [he should take] the bath in ash.
- 1.9 [contd.] *raudrahomāḥ*<sup>56</sup> *snapanam ca sarpiḥkṣīragandhodakair*  
The offerings dedicated to Rudra and the bathing [of the image, are to be performed] with clarified butter, milk, fragrant water.
- 1.10 *gandhapuṣpadhūpadīpodanapāyasayāvakalājādi pradakṣiṇāntaṃ*  
*ca* ||  
[The observance / bathing / *pūjana* (?)] begins with fragrances,

<sup>51</sup> *asya* might rather refer to the practitioner, an interpretation that finds some support in PāSū 1.7: *āyatanavāsī*. Cf. Kauṇḍinya's commentary for the Pāsupata definition of an *āyatana*. Cf. also Gonda 1969: 17ff. [= 1975/II, p. 194ff.].

<sup>52</sup> Cf. PāSū 5.9: *śūnyāgāraguhāvāsī*. This, however, refers to the specific dwelling of the practitioner in the third phase (*avasthāna*) of the observance, whereas here no such division seems to be intended.

<sup>53</sup> Dresden 1941: 151 (on MānGS 2.12.3) gives the following glosses: 'Feuer-häuschen', 'Feueregebäude', 'place for keeping the sacred fire'. The precise meaning of the word is not clear here. The variant *agnyaḡāra* seems to be slightly more common: at BhārSS 1.6.14, where this last term is interestingly juxtaposed with *āyatana* (*parisamūhanty agnyagāraṇy upalimpanty āyatanāni*), Kashikar 1964, pt. II, p. 10, renders freely "The fire-chamber[s?] should be swept clean, and the fire-places besmeared (with cow-dung)". Caland 1928: 198 (on ĀpSS 19.16.12) takes it as referring to the Gārhapatya or Āhavanīya altar. The pair *agnyaḡāra* and *gavāṃ goṣṭha* also occurs at ManuSm 4.58a.

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

<sup>55</sup> For clarity's sake the numbering of the edition has been retained, but we divide the text at a different place: *anusavanam* and *bhasmanā snānam* have to be read together. This is suggested by PāSū 1.2: *bhasmanā triṣavaṇam snāyīta*.

<sup>56</sup> *raudrahomāḥ snapanam*: em. The edition reads *raudrahomasnapanam*, but there is a v.l. *raudrahomāsnapanam* (mss. T and Roth). We adopt the long *ā* of this variant in our light emendation, for which cf. 40.3.9 below: *vratena tvam ity ubhayīr aham iti pañcabhī raudrān homān hutvā homāvasānena bhasmanā snānam karoti*. The only other attestation of *raudrahoma* which we could trace, is in a passage promoting the employment of an Atharvavedin as Purohita, in a manner strongly reminiscent of many AVParīś passages: MBh 12 App. I Nr. 8 l. 13 (*raudrahomasahasram*) and l. 20 (*raudrair homair*).

flowers, incense, lights, rice-porridge, milk-porridge, barley-porridge, parched grain, and ends with circumambulation.<sup>57</sup>

- 1.11 *nivedya nirmālyagandhahārī*<sup>58</sup> *hāsaḡītavādanādyupahārān*  
Having presented the offerings of laughter, song, music etc.,<sup>59</sup> bearing  
fragrances and the garland which has been worn [by the image],
- 1.12 *dakṣiṇena tṛtīyam upatiṣṭhate*  
he worships the third (?)<sup>60</sup> to the right side<sup>61</sup> [of the image].

<sup>57</sup> Circumambulation is defined in PāSū 2.8: *apasavyam ca pradakṣiṇam* ‘And circumambulation is the reverse [of what it normally is]’. This surely is not intended here. The first four items in the list (*gandha, puṣpa, dhūpa, dīpa*) are standard *pūjā*-items (cf. Einoo 1996b). Some are found in an untraced quotation at RṬ p. 8, ll. 26–27: *pūrvam darbhāḥ punar bhasma candanam sūtram eva ca | puṣpāṇi ca punar dhūpaṃ mantrā eṣa kramaḥ smṛtaḥ* || (cf. Hara 1982: 190). The verse is introduced as a list of the various parts of the *dīksā* ceremony. In SP<sub>Bh</sub> 27.31–32 *pāyasa* and *yāvaka* are prescribed for the worship at the Dakṣiṇāmūrti: *dakṣiṇāyāṃ tu yo mūrtau pāyasam saghṛtam śubhe | nivedayed varṣam ekaṃ sa ca nandisamo bhavet* || 31 || *caravo daśasāhasrā yāvakaś ca caturguṇaḥ | śeṣāś ca caravaḥ yāvakārdhena sammitāḥ* || 32 ||.

<sup>58</sup> The edition assumes one long compound, of which *nirmālyagandhahārī*<sup>o</sup> would be the first member. Cf. however PāSū 1.5–6: *nirmālyam* || 5 || *liṅgadhārī* || 6 ||. Note that the Pāśupata description in the ‘*Liṅgapurāṇa*’ quoted at KKT *Tīrthavivecanakāṇḍa* 2, p. 106, l. 15, has a compound *liṅganirmālyadhārī*. We may thus reasonably assume that *nirmālyagandhahārī* is either a corruption or a conscious revision of *nirmālyaliṅgadhārī*. Anyhow it must be read as a separate word. Wearing the *nirmālya* is not one of the *upahāras* as defined in PāSū 1.8, whereas in the edition’s text, as part of the compound, it appears to be treated as such. For the Pāśupata definition of *nirmālya*, cf. Kauṇḍinya *ad* PāSū 1.5. On the *nirmālya* in general, see Brunner 1969. Cf. also AVParīś 36.28.1 (<sup>o</sup>*śivanirmālya*<sup>o</sup>).

<sup>59</sup> PāSū 1.8: *hasitaḡītanṛttaḡuṇḡumkāranamaskāraḡajapyopahāreṇopatiṣṭhet* ‘He should worship with the offering of laughter, song, dance, bellowing, homage and muttering’. <sup>o</sup>*ḡuṇḡumkāra*<sup>o</sup> in this sūtra seems to be an emendation by the editor for <sup>o</sup>*huḡukkāra*<sup>o</sup>. Sanderson 2002: 30 n. 32, lists a couple of passages from Śaiva sources which suggest that the intended vocalization is ‘HUḡḡUN’ (*huḡḡumkāra*).

<sup>60</sup> For the unconvincing conjecture *tṛtīyam* adopted by the editors, we have considered the following alternatives: *trivṛtam* (a name for Śiva at AVParīś 36.9.1–2); *nṛtyantam* (‘the dancing one’ = Śiva); *nṛtyann* (‘while dancing’). There is some evidence for all three conjectures in the manuscripts: ACDE *tṛtam*; B *nṛtyatam*; T Roth *nṛtam*. The third suggestion is partly supported by RṬ p. 18, ll. 26–27: *tad anu ḡitam ārabhya ḡāyann evottiṣṭhet | tato ḡītasahitam eva nṛtyam kuryāt* l.

<sup>61</sup> PāSū 1.8–9: . . . *upahāreṇopatiṣṭhet* || 8 || *mahādevasya dakṣiṇāmūrteḥ* || 9 ||. On the interpretation of these sūtras, cf. Bakker forthc. Bakker argues that the word *mūrti* does not refer to a concrete image but rather to a situation in which Śiva shows his right, auspicious, side. We assume, however, that at least in the present text an image is the object of reference, albeit not the iconographical Dakṣiṇāmūrti. Chakravarti 1943: 270, reports a variant reading <sup>o</sup>*mūrtim* for <sup>o</sup>*mūrteḥ* in this sūtra: this *lectio facillior* can probably be ignored. The reading <sup>o</sup>*mūrteḥ* is supported by the conclusion of Kauṇḍinya’s extensive commentary on PāSū 1.9, p. 38, ll. 10–11: *ata etad uktaṃ mahādevasya dakṣiṇāmūrteḥ iti*.

- 1.13 *kaṭakakeyūradhāriṇe namo vṛṣāya namo vṛṣabhadhvajāya namo*  
 ‘Homage to the wearer of bracelets and armllets,<sup>62</sup> homage to the bull,  
 homage to the one who has the bull for his banner’.<sup>63</sup>
- 1.14 *vānaram te mukhaṃ raudram anindyam śubhaṃ paśum evājanane-  
 vājanakaṃ ghoram jīvaṃ jātyam eva rukmaṃ dadāmiṭy  
 ekavāsā vivāsā vā virāgāṇi vastrāṇi dadīta ||*  
 Wearing one garment or wearing no garment at all,<sup>64</sup> he should give  
 undyed<sup>65</sup> clothes [to the image (?), with the words:] ‘Monkey-like  
 is (?) your face,<sup>66</sup> horrifying;<sup>67</sup> an irreproachable, auspicious animal  
*evājananevājanakaṃ* (?); I give a pure breastplate that is terrible, alive  
 (?)’.<sup>68</sup>
- 2.1 *gocarmamātram sthaṇḍilam upalipya gomayenollikhyābhyukṣyāgne  
 prehīty agniṃ praṇītyopasamādhāya paristīrya brahmāṇaṃ kalpa-  
 yitvā nānyadevatādiśi rudrasya dakṣiṇodapātram<sup>69</sup> sthāpayitvā  
 mahāvyaḥṛtibhir agnyāyatane nidhāya rudram āvāhayati ||*  
 Having smeared a piece of ground of the size of a cow’s hide  
 with cow-dung,<sup>70</sup> having drawn [an auspicious sign] on it, having

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

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

<sup>64</sup> PāSū 1.10–11: *ekavāsāḥ || 10 || avāsāḥ vā || 11 ||*. The words of the sūtras, which give rules for the dress-code of the practitioner, seem here to have provoked a ritual injunction that is focused rather on the image of Rudra. The dress-code of the sūtras is an infringement upon usual brahminical practice: cf. Kane Vol. II part 2, p. 671 and e.g., ĀgnivGS 2.6.3:98.12f. (≈ BaudhDhS 2.10.5) *nārdravāsā naikavastro daivatāni karmāny anusamcaret*.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. AVParīś 68.2.47, where the word *virāgavāsas* denotes ominous creatures.

<sup>66</sup> This seems to be related to AVParīś 36.25.2 (*śirasā vānareṇātha mukhavādyam tu kārayet | yatra tac chrūyate tatra āgacchanti vāstrīyaḥ ||*), which follows a verse describing the lighting of fire, in words similar to 40.2.1. The next verse but one describes the putting on of ash and six verses further (36.28.1) it is stated: *saṃjaptaśivanirmālyadānād unmattatām vrajet*. It is worth noting that Nandin, who is said to be a second Śaṃkara (*dviṭīya iva śaṃkaraḥ*), is sometimes described as having the face of a monkey: cf. Bhattacharya 1977: 1545, 1549 and 1560 (n. 7 and n. 12). To the passages listed there the following verses from the original *Skandapurāṇa* may be added: SP<sub>Bh</sub> 132.53, 159.54 and 162.13.

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

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

<sup>69</sup> Modak (1993: 466) is probably right that the text is to be understood as *dakṣiṇe udapātram*, with double sandhi.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. AVParīś 36.25.1ab: *gocarmamātram sthaṇḍilam gomayenopalepayet*.

besprinkled it,<sup>71</sup> having brought forth fire [with the mantra] ‘*agne prehi*’,<sup>72</sup> having added [fuel to it], having spread [grass] around [it], having prepared a brahmin (?),<sup>73</sup> having placed a water-vessel to the right side of Rudra – not in any other deity’s direction – he invites Rudra, installing him in the fire-place with the Great Utterances.<sup>74</sup>

2.2 *rudraṃ kruddhāsanimukhaṃ devānām īśvaraṃ param |*  
*śvetapiṅgalaṃ deveśaṃ<sup>75</sup> prapadye śaraṇāgataḥ ||*

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

2.3 *yasya yuktā rathe śimhā vyāghrāś ca viśamānanāḥ |*  
*tam ahaṃ pauṇḍarikākṣaṃ devam āvāhaye śivam*  
*ity āvāhyābhycarya ||*

<sup>71</sup> Cf. JaimGS 2.8:32.15f.: *gomayena gocarmamātraṃ sthaṇḍilam upalipya ... lakṣaṇam ullikhyādbhīr abhyukṣya*. Cf. also KauśS 2.25: *nānabhyukṣitam saṃstūrṇam upayogaṃ labheta* ‘If spread unbesprinkled, it would not obtain any effectivity’. As in the quoted JaimGS passage, the object of *ullikhya* is *lakṣaṇam* (cf. Gonda 1980: 232) also i.a. at ĀgnivGS 1.7.1:41.2, 2.4.8:68.17, BaudhDhS 3.9.4, and we supply this object here as well; this absolute is never accompanied by an instrumental. It is a curious fact that among the many Gṛhyasūtra passages (cf. also AVPariś 6.1.2) that enjoin the *upalepana* of a *sthaṇḍila*, there is not a single one where the instrumental *gomayena* follows the words (*gocarmamātraṃ*) *sthaṇḍilam upa-*√*lip*.

<sup>72</sup> This is AV(Ś) 4.14.5 ≈ AV(P) 3.38.3.

<sup>73</sup> The phrase *brahmānaṃ kalpayitvā*, for which the editors report no variants, is very doubtful. Although we do find one interesting passage that seems to be comparable (BaudhGŚS 4.20.2:352.4–8 *dvau dvau brāhmaṇau kalpayitvā navagrahaśāntyarthaṃ caturo brāhmaṇāms tayaiva saṅkhyayā grāmaśāntihomārthaṃ kalpayitvātha grāmaśāntihome grāmasyottarapūrvadeśe devāgāre catuṣpathe vā śucau same deśe gomayena gocarmamātraṃ caturaśraṃ sthaṇḍilam upalipya*), the meaning in our context remains obscure. The Gṛhyasūtras offer many examples of the phrases *sthaṇḍilam kalpayitvā* and *āsanam kalpayitvā*. Could *brahmānaṃ* be corrupt for a particular kind of *āsana*, e.g., *brahmāsanam* (KauśS 2.18, 3.5, 137.33+37)?

<sup>74</sup> On the number of utterances possibly intended with the injunction *mahāvvyāhṛtibhiḥ* in the Atharvavedic tradition, cf. GB 1.1.6, 1.1.10, 1.3.3, 2.2.14; KauśS 3.4, 3.11–14, 91.6–16, 92.13; AVPariś 72.4.6.

<sup>75</sup> The edition reads *śvetapiṅgalaṃ devānām <mahādevaṃ> prapadye*. No significant variants are reported. In the Corrigenda (p. 648), the editors state “[*mahādevaṃ*] was intended”, but this does not help as they nowhere explain what they mean to convey with square/angle brackets: one may surmise that they suggested the removal of the transmitted *mahādevaṃ* to improve the meter. In the Addenda (p. 649), Bolling suggests that “[*mahādevaṃ śaraṇāgataḥ [prapadye]* seems better”. We accept the deletion of *mahādevaṃ*, and – despite some remaining metrical difficulties (on the frequently substandard meter in the AVPariś, cf. Keith’s review referred to in n. 1 above) – conjecture *deveśaṃ*, a very common epithet, in place of *devānām*.



‘This gracious, lotus-eyed god, to whose chariot lions are yoked, and tigers with terrible / incomparable faces, do I invite’.<sup>76</sup> [With these two verses] he invites and worships [Rudra].

- 2.4 *na taṃ yakṣmeti gugguḷuṃ*<sup>77</sup> *dhūpaṃ ca dadyāt* ||  
He should give bdellium and incense [with the hymn] ‘*na taṃ yakṣmā*’.
- 2.5 *tatpuruṣāya vidmahe mahādevāya dhīmahi* |  
*tan no rudraḥ pracodayāt* ||<sup>78</sup>  
‘We strive for Tatpuruṣa, we meditate for Mahādeva, Rudra shall propel it to us’.
- 2.6 *tasmai devāya vidmahe mahādevāya dhīmahi* |  
*tan no rudro ’numanyatām* ||<sup>79</sup>  
*iti rudrasāvitrīm japtvā* ||

<sup>76</sup> In BaudhGŚS 3.9 and 4.2 we find two similar verses, addressed respectively to Jyeṣṭhā and Skanda: *yasyāḥ siṃhā rathe yuktā vyāghrās cāpy anugāmināḥ | tām imāṃ puṇḍarikākṣīm jyeṣṭhām āvāhayāmy aham* || (Harting 1922: 20, ll. 3–4) and *yasya siṃhā rathe yuktā vyāghrās cāpy anugāmināḥ | tam imāṃ putrikāputraṃ skandam āvāhayāmy aham* || (Harting 1922: 25, ll. 4–5).

<sup>77</sup> The edition reads: *na taṃ yakṣmaitu deva iti gugguḷuṃ*, and the editors report (p. 257) that the mss. ADE omit *deva iti*. While the same two hymns (‘*na taṃ yakṣmā*’ and ‘*etu devaḥ*’) that the text of the edition quotes *pratīkena* are quoted also at AVParīś 4.4.7 and 4.5.10 (cf. also 6.2.2), there they accompany the giving of *guggulukuṣṭhadhūpaṃ*, as opposed to our *gugguḷuṃ dhūpaṃ ca*. The first *pratīka* refers to AV(Ś) 19.38 = AV(P) 19.24.1–3, a hymn dedicated to *guggulu*: presumably *guggulu* corresponds with *gandha* in 40.1.10. The second *pratīka* refers to AV(Ś) 19.39 = AV(P) 7.10, dedicated to *kuṣṭha*, a plant that finds no correspondent in the list of 40.1.10, and that our text also does not enjoin to be given. We therefore suppose that the text originally quoted only the first *pratīka*, and that the ADE reading *na taṃ yakṣmaitu gugguḷuṃ* still reflects this.

<sup>78</sup> The edition divides *tat puruṣāya*. The accented versions of TĀ 10.46, MS 2.9.1:119.7–8 and KS 17.11:253.20–21 (*tātpuruṣāya*) and all of the later texts take this as one word, a name of Rudra. This is the fourth of the five *brahmanmantras*, the prayers which end each of the five sections of the PāSū. The words of this mantra are also found as PāSū 4.22–24. Our translation partly follows the attempt made by Goudriaan and Hooykaas 1971: 227. On *tad* in pāda c, cf. Kaṇḍīnya *ad* PāSū 4.24: *tad iti dṛkkriyāśaktiyor grahaṇam*.

<sup>79</sup> This last mantra does not belong to the five *brahmanmantras* and seems superfluous. Cf. Oertel 1942: 32ff. on the avoidance of Rudra’s name with the substitute *eṣa devaḥ* at AB 3.33, and with *ayaṃ devaḥ* at KS 10.6:130.20–131.1, 20[recte 22].12:67.16, 30.10:192.11. Cf. also Oberlies 2000: 182 n. 32. *tasmai devāya* might thus be a comparable case of ‘euphemistic substitution’ for Rudra’s name. It seems more likely, however, that it was intended as a gloss of *tatpuruṣāya*. Such an explanation could also be considered for *anumanyatām* (= *pracodayāt*).

‘We strive for this god, we meditate for Mahādeva, Rudra shall permit it to us’. Thus he mutters the Rudrasāvitrī.<sup>80</sup>

2.7 *yo agnau rudra ity anumantrayed āvāhane*<sup>81</sup> *devadevasyāvāhayāmy aham iti* ||

He should speak the mantra ‘*yo agnau rudraḥ*’<sup>82</sup> [over the fire (cf. 40.2.1) / image (?)], at the Invitation of the God of gods, [adding the words] ‘I perform the invitation’.

2.8 *pramardane sarvāsura vināśāya humphaṭkāraṃ*<sup>83</sup> *karoti* ||

At the Crushing (?)<sup>84</sup> he makes the sound *Hum Phaṭ* for the sake of destroying all demons.

2.9 *nivedane ’ham amukaṃ nivedayāmīti jaṭī muṇḍī pañcaśikhī vā* ||

At the Presentation, having matted hair, being bald or having five tufts [of hair],<sup>85</sup> he [uses the words:] ‘I present this-and-this’.

3.1 *brāhmaṇo ha vā aham amukasagotro bhagavato maheśvarasya vrataṃ cariṣyāmīti vācayivā* ||

He should make [him] say: ‘I, a brahmin of such and such a gotra, shall undertake the observance of Lord Maheśvara’.

3.2 *tato ’sya mauñjīm prayacchati* ||<sup>86</sup> *sāvitrīyā tu daṇḍaṃ pālāśaṃ bailvaṃ āśvatthaṃ*<sup>87</sup> *vāsiṃ lakuṭaṃ khaṭvāṅgaṃ paraśuṃ vā* ||

<sup>80</sup> The first of these two verses is called *raudrī gāyatrī* by Kauṇḍinya *ad* PāSū 1.17. Note that although two verses are given in AVParīś 40.2.5–6, they are not referred to as a dual, and so the second may be an interpolation.

<sup>81</sup> The edition reads *ity anumantrayen namo astu yāvad āvāhane*, a conjecture following the reading of mss. A<sub>2</sub> and D: *anumantrave namo astu yāvad āvāhane*. The remainder of the mss. point, however, to the text we adopt here (as such in BCTURoth). If the words *namo astu yāvad* do belong in the text, they refer to the contents of the mantra: perhaps it is to be recited in the *anumantraṇa* only ‘up to *namo astu*’ (see the next note, and cf. Modak 1967: 8 n. 7 and 1993: 424 n. 607).

<sup>82</sup> This is AV(Ś) 7.87.1: *yó agnáu rudró yó apsv àntár yá óśadhūr vīrúḍha āvivéśa | yá imá víśvā bhúvanāni cākḷpé tásmāi rudrāya námo astv agnáye*.

<sup>83</sup> The edition reads *oṃ phaṭkāraṃ*, with all mss. except BCT, that read *tuphaṭkāraṃ*. We conjecture *hum*<sup>o</sup>, with reference to AVParīś 36.1.4 and 36.9.3 (cf. also i.a. VṛT 229), although *tu phaṭkāraṃ* may also be considered.

<sup>84</sup> The word *pramardana* ‘crushing’ fits the intention *sarvāsura vināśāya*, but seems not to be attested in any similar contexts. It probably corresponds to *vināśana* at AVParīś 36.2.5cd: *tīkṣṇāsr̥gviṣayuktānām phaṭkāraś ca vināśane*.

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

<sup>86</sup> The closest parallel that we have been able to find is KāthGS 41.12 *mauñjīm trivṛtaṃ brāhmaṇāya prayacchati*, the only Gṛhyasūtra parallel where the same verb *prayacchati* is used for the giving of the girdle.

<sup>87</sup> With the exception of this third kind of wood, the instruction corresponds with the common Gṛhyasūtra injunction for the Upanayana ritual, e.g., BhārGS 1.2.3 *bailvaṃ*

Then he gives him the *muñja*-girdle. And with the Sāvitrī verse [he gives him] a staff made of *palāśa*-, *bilva*- or *aśvattha*-wood, or [he gives] a knife, a club, a skull-staff or an axe.<sup>88</sup>

- 3.3 *aghorebhyo 'tha ghorebhyo ghoraghoratarebhyaś ca | sarvataḥ śarva sarvebhyo namas te rudrarūpebhyaś<sup>89</sup> ity ādau śarvaṃ namaskṛtyopaviśyāyaṃ<sup>90</sup> niratiśāyitvedhmān ādīpayaty antara iti*  
 ‘Homage from all sides, o Śarva, to all your horrific (*rudra*) forms, the non-terrible ones, the terrible ones and the ones more terrible than terrible’. After first paying homage to Śarva [with this mantra], he

*pālāśaṃ vā daṇḍaṃ brāhmaṇasya*. Almost all authorities that enjoin a staff of *aśvattha* wood do so for the kṣatriya (cf. Gonda 1980: 110): the Atharvavedic KauśS reads ... *pālāśaṃ daṇḍaṃ brāhmaṇāya prayachati || āśvatthaṃ kṣatriyāya* (57.4–5); cf. KāthGS 41.22 *pālāśaṃ daṇḍaṃ brāhmaṇāya prayachaty āśvatthaṃ rājanyāya naiyagrodhaṃ vaiśyāya*, and GautDhS 1.22–23 *bailvapālāśau brāhmaṇadaṇḍau || āśvatthapailavau śeṣe*. VārGS 5.27 *pālāśaṃ daṇḍaṃ brāhmaṇāya prayacchati naiyagrodhaṃ kṣatriyāyāśvatthaṃ vaiśyāya* appears to be an exception. Also GobhGS 2.10.11 *pārṇabailvāśvatthā daṇḍāḥ* is probably to be interpreted as listing the types of wood for the three *varṇas* respectively, i.e., *aśvattha* for the vaiśya. Other authorities do not mention *āśvattha* wood, but generally enjoin *naiyagrodha* wood for the kṣatriya’s staff. Why the option of an *āśvattha daṇḍa* should have been added here for the brahmin practitioner remains unclear.

<sup>88</sup> Probably the Rudrasāvitrī (*tatpuruṣāya vidmahe ...*) is meant here. In the Gṛhyasūtras, the giving of the girdle and staff, and instruction in the normal Sāvitrī (*tat savitur ...*) are basic elements of the Upanayana. The girdle and the staff are regular attributes of the Vedic brahmacārin, but the last four items stem from a different milieu. The skull-staff is one of the insignia of the Kāpālika; the *lakuṭa* on the other hand seems to have been associated with the Kālāmukhas, who are sometimes designated as Lāguḍas. See Lorenzen <sup>2</sup>1991: 2 and 5.

<sup>89</sup> This verse is found also (with considerable variation of reading and accentuation) i.a. MS 2.9.10:130.1–2 *āghorebhyo ātha ghorēbhyo aghoraghoratarēbhyaś ca | sarvataḥ śarvaśarvēbhyo nāmas te rudra rūpēbhyo nāmaḥ ||*; TĀ 10.45 *aghōrebhyo 'tha ghōrebhyo ghōraghōratarebhyaḥ* [note double accent] | *sārvataḥ śarva sārvebhyo nāmas te astu rudrarūpebhyaḥ ||*. It is also found as PāSū 3.21–26: *aghorebhyaḥ || 21 || atha ghorebhyaḥ || 22 || ghoraghoratarebhyaś ca || 23 || sarvebhyaḥ || 24 || śarvasarvebhyaḥ || 25 || namas te astu rudrarūpebhyaḥ || 26 ||*. It is the fifth of the five *brahmantras*. There are many variants for this verse in various other sources as well. Cf. i.a. Goudriaan and Hooykaas 1971: 227. The edition reads *'ghoraghoratarebhyaś*, and it is specified (p. 257) that mss. “ATURoth write the avagraha before ghora-; C corrupts it to ra”. Apparently, mss. BDE have no *avagraha*, and the sense suggests this is the better reading. The edition further reads *śarvaśarvebhyo ... rudra rūpebhyaḥ*. The mss. are reported to have *sarvasarvebhyo* (ACDETURoth) and *sarvatsarvebhyo* (B).

<sup>90</sup> The editors report, p. 257, that all mss. punctuate after °*viśya*. It is not clear to us why the editors could not accept punctuation here.

- sits down, *niratiśāyitvā* (?)<sup>91</sup> ghee [and] kindles fuel, with the word(s) ‘*antara* (?)’.<sup>92</sup>
- 3.4 *ya*<sup>93</sup> *idhmā jātavedasaḥ samiddhasya tebhyo vardhayasva prajayā paśubhiḥ śriyā grhair dhaneneti* ||  
‘The fuel sticks of Jātavedas who is kindled: increase [me (?)] from them in offspring, cattle, glory, homestead, wealth’.
- 3.5 *dvāv āghārāv*<sup>94</sup> *ājyabhāgau juhuyād*  
He should offer two sprinklings, two portions of ghee, [with the words:]
- 3.6 *vāyave svāhā* || *śarvāya rudrāya svāhā* || *paśupataye bhīmāya svāhā* || *śāntāyādhipataye devāya svāhēti* ||  
‘To Vāyu *svāhā*. To the horrific Śarva *svāhā*. To the fearful Paśupati *svāhā*. To the peaceful sovereign God *svāhā*’.<sup>95</sup>
- 3.7 *evam eva patnīnām tūṣṇīm adhipasya juhuyād*  
Precisely in this way, [but] silently, he should offer to the wives of the Sovereign.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>91</sup> *ājyam* is regularly the object of verb forms like *nirvapati*, *adhiśrayati/adhiśritya*, *grhītvā*, etc., but no convincing emendation of the reading *niratiśāyitve*<sup>o</sup> occurs to us. “M *niratiśāyitve*” in the apparatus (p. 257), with the editors’ siglum for the archetype of all their mss., seems, by the way, to indicate that the long *ā* is a conjecture of the editors. How did the editors understand their text?

<sup>92</sup> The ostensible *pratīka* cannot be identified, and the text may be corrupt. One may guess that behind the <sup>o</sup>*ti* of *iti*, an original 3rd person sg. verb form is concealed.

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

<sup>94</sup> The edition reads *yavāghārāv*, but it is reported (p. 257) that the archetype of all mss. (M) must have read *yadāvāghārāv*. The conjecture of the editors is probably wrong (the only compounds ending in *āghāra* known to us are *uttarāghāra*, *sruvāghāra*, *vaiśvadevāghāra*, none of which is comparable to an ostensible *yavāghāra*). Our rather bold reconstruction is as follows: not claiming to have any certainty about the process which resulted in its assumed displacement, we move the akṣara *ya* from here to the front of 40.3.4, where the syntax demands its presence. For the remaining elements *dāvāghārāv*, there is – with reference to such places as TB 1.6.3.3 *dvāv āghārāu* | *dvāv ājyabhāgau* – some reason to conjecture *dvāv āghārāv*, as we do here, rather than entirely removing *dāv*, as the various Gṛhyasūtra parallels would suggest: e.g., HirGS 1.2.15 *āghārāv āghāryājyabhāgau juhoty*, and JaimGS 2.8:32.16 *āghārāv ājyabhāgau hutvā* (Caland 1922: “having sacrificed the two *āghāras* and the two ghee-portions”). On the meaning of *āghāra*, see Gonda 1980: 177 and 314.

<sup>95</sup> These four exclamations accompany the two *āghāras* and two *ājyabhāgas* of the preceding rule. Cf. ĀpGS 1.2.5–6 . . . *āghārāv āghārayati darśapūrnamāsavat tūṣṇīm* || *athājyabhāgau juhoty agnaye svāhety uttarārdhapūrvārdhe somāya svāhety dakṣiṇārdhapūrvārdhe samam pūrveṇa*.

<sup>96</sup> Our interpretation follows from the injunctions for the Rudrapatiṣṭhākālpa described BaudhGŚS 2.16 (see Harting 1922: 9; cf. also BaudhGS 2.7.19, ĀgnivGS 2.5.8:87.6ff.), where 8 forms of Rudra are offered a *kṣaram ājyamiśram*, followed by a *gulodanam* for

3.8 *evam sarveṣu vratanivedaneṣu vrātapatīr juhōti* ||

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

3.9 *vratena tvam ity ubhayīr aham<sup>99</sup> iti pañcabhī raudrān homān hutvā homāvasānena bhasmanā snānaṃ karoti* ||

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

<sup>97</sup> The interpretation of the technical term *vrātapatīh* (also at 46.2.2, 46.7.3, 46.7.5, as well as 40.6.10 below) is problematic: it obviously refers to some group of grammatically feminine items dedicated to (Agni) the ‘Lord of observances’. Modak (1993: 300f.) twice speaks of “*vrātapati mantras*” and of “*vrātapati . . . hymns*”. The mantras that might be referred to with this name could either be AV(P) 19.51.1–4 (quoted KauśS 42.17 *idāvatsarāya . . . iti vratasamāpanīr ādadhāti* where Keśava in his *Kauśikapaddhati* [Limaye et al. 1982: 214] explains *idāvatsarāya iti kalpajaiś caturbhir* [sic: masc.] *ṛgbhir ājyaṃ juhuyāt*), or more likely the prose mantras (*agne vratapate . . .*) quoted at KauśS 56.6–7, each containing the word *vratapati*, which Keśava [p. 289] introduces with the words *agnaye gurave ca brahmacārī vratam nivedayet*, but contrary to Modak’s suggestion (1993: 425 n. 618) probably do not include AV(Ś) 7.74.4 (*vratēna tvām vratapate . . .*), because this mantra is separately quoted *pratīkena* in 40.3.9. In this interpretation (for which one might compare examples of the accusative of duration with technical mantra-designations, such as ŚB 11.8.4.5 *spītīr hutvā*, 14.2.2.1 *vātanāmāni juhōti*, and AVParīś 46.2.3 *samāsān hutvā*), one has to assume that the implicit fem. plural noun is *ṛcaḥ*: as Shrikant Bahulkar kindly points out to us, this does not exclude the prose mantras of KauśS 56.6–7, because in the Atharvavedic tradition even prose mantras are taken as *ṛcaḥ* and the *Bṛhatsarvānukramaṇī* designates them accordingly (also Keśava takes KauśS 56.6–7 as *ṛcaḥ* because he says [p. 290] . . . *iti pratyṛcam*). However, the technical term *vratasamāpanīh* at KauśS 42.17 does not imply *ṛcaḥ* but refers back to 42.16 *samidhaḥ*. Moreover, the rule KauśS 6.19 *vratāni vratapataya iti samidham ādadhāti*, which quotes AV(P) 19.51.4, is paraphrased at VaitS 4.22 *vratāni vratapataya iti vratavisarjanīm ādadhāti*, showing another technical term (*vratavisarjanī*, cf. also Dārila [Diwekar et al. 1972: 118] on KauśS 42.16–17) that does not imply *ṛc*. One might thus rather think of supplying an accusative cognate with *juhuyāt* like *ājyāhutīh*. Still, at AVParīś 46.2.2 *vratam nivedya vrātapatībhiḥ samidho ’bhyādadyād*, the term *vrātapatīh* cannot be interpreted in any other way than as a technical mantra-designation, and that is how we take it here as well.

<sup>98</sup> This general rule seems strangely out of place here. It is not clear to us to what precisely *evam* refers back.

<sup>99</sup> The edition reads *ubhayīruham*. The two *pratīkas* refer respectively to AV(Ś) 7.74.4 = AV(P) 20.31.10 (a verse dedicated to Agni as Vratapati) and AV(P) 1.37.1–5 (whence our emendation: 1.37.1ab *ubhayīr aham āyatāḥ parācīr akaram tvat* | . . .). These last mantras, constituting a hymn for protection from Rudra’s arrows, have no parallel in AV(Ś), and their citation here (in a text transmitted by Śaunaka Atharvavedins) *pratīkena* is therefore noteworthy.

With [the verse] ‘*vratena tvam*’ and the five [verses] ‘*ubhayīr aham*’, he brings the Rudra offerings,<sup>100</sup> and bathes in ash at the end<sup>101</sup> of the offering.

- 4.1 *bhasmasnānam [tāvad]*<sup>102</sup> *grahīṣyāmi sarvapāpapaṇāśanam |*  
*bhasmasnānena rudro hi snāto ’bhūt pūta ātmanā ||*  
 I shall take a bath in ash, which destroys all evils, because Rudra, when bathed in a bath of ash, became purified by himself.<sup>103</sup>
- 4.2 *bhasmanā snāyati*<sup>104</sup> *rudro viṣṇuḥ snāyate bhasmanā |*  
*tena snānena snāmy aham yena snāto maheśvaraḥ ||*<sup>105</sup>  
 Rudra is bathed in ash, Viṣṇu is bathed in ash, in that bath do I bathe, in which Maheśvara is bathed,
- 4.3 *yena snātā umā devī rudro bhartā maheśvaraḥ |*  
*yena snātā gaṇāḥ sarve yena snātā dvijātayaḥ ||*  
 in which the Goddess Umā is bathed, [in which] Rudra [her] husband, Maheśvara [is bathed], in which all the Gaṇas are bathed, in which the twice-born are bathed,
- 4.4 *yena snātaḥ śivaḥ śarvaḥ śaṃkaraś ca vṛṣadhvajah |*  
*snātāni sarvabhūtāni gaṅgāyamunasamgame*<sup>106</sup> *||*  
 in which Śiva, Śarva and the bull-bannered Śaṃkara is bathed, [in which]<sup>107</sup> all beings are bathed [as if]<sup>108</sup> at the confluence of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā.
- 4.5 *snāto ’haṃ sarvatīrtheṣu nadīprasravaṇeṣu ca |*  
*vāruṇāgneyasaumyānām bhasmanā snānam uttamam |*  
*tena snānena snāmy aham yena snāto maheśvaraḥ ||*  
 I have taken a bath at all fords and at the sources of rivers. The bath

<sup>100</sup> Cf. 40.1.9 [contd.], with accompanying note.

<sup>101</sup> If *homāvasānena* is not simply to be emended to *homāvasāne* (it might be perseverated from AVParīś 33.6.8), it must be an instr. of time: cf. Speijer 1886: 57.

<sup>102</sup> The editors presumably use the square bracket here to suggest that deletion of *tāvad* would improve the meter.

<sup>103</sup> Rudra and ash are apparently identified.

<sup>104</sup> The editors initially chose to emend *snāyate*, but see their Corrigenda, p. 648, and the readings reported p. 257.

<sup>105</sup> This hemistich is repeated in 40.4.5 below.

<sup>106</sup> The edition reads *gaṅgāyamunayāgame*, and a variant *°yamunayorgame* is reported for mss. ADETRoth, *°yamunayorgame* for C. We, however, conjecture *gaṅgāyamunasamgame*, a stock reference to Prayāga in Epic and Purāṇic literature (e.g., MBh 3.83.80d; MBh 5.118.1d; MtP 105.19a).

<sup>107</sup> The contents seem to favor a different verse-division (and consequent deletion of ‘[in which]’): 40.4.4ab would become 3ef; 4cd together with 5ab would form a separate verse 5, and 5cdef verse 6.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. the same equation of the bath in ash with a bath at Prayāga (and Kanakhala) in the SP verse discussed in n. 111 below.

in ash is the best among the water (*vāruṇa*), fire (*āgneya*) and cool (*saumya*) baths.<sup>109</sup> In that bath do I bathe, in which Maheśvara is bathed.<sup>110</sup>

- 5.1 *bhūtis tu piṅgalo babhrur bhūtir viṣṇuḥ sanātanaḥ |*  
*bhūtir brahmā mahendraś ca bhūtir devāḥ saha ṛṣibhiḥ ||*  
 Ash<sup>111</sup> is Piṅgala, Babhru,<sup>112</sup> ash is Viṣṇu, Sanātana, ash is Brahmā, Mahendra, ash are the gods together with the sages.

<sup>109</sup> The bath in ash is of the *āgneya* type. Cf. ŚiUp 5.13: *bhasmasnānam śivasnānam vāruṇād adhikaṃ smṛtam | jantuśaivālanirmuktam āgneyam paṅkavarjitam* ||. Cf. also Brunner, Oberhammer and Padoux 2000: 173f. That it was known as *āgneya* among Pāśupatas is confirmed by the following unidentified verse quoted by Kauṇḍinya *ad PāSū* 1.9, p. 30 ll. 1–2: *yaḥ snānam ācaren nityam āgneyam samyatendriyaḥ | kulaikaviṃśam uddhṛtya sa gacchet paramāṃ gatim* ||. The *vāruṇa* type is done with water. Cf. e.g., ŚiUp 5.32: *āgneyam rudramantreṇa bhasmasnānam anuttamam | ambhasā vāruṇam snānam kāryam vāruṇamūrtinā* ||. ŚiUp 5.31 distinguishes altogether eight types of baths, but no *saumya* type is mentioned: *āgneyam vāruṇam māntram vāyavyam tv aindrapañcamam | mānasam śāntitoyam ca jñānasnānam tathāṣṭamam* ||. Śaiva Āgamas mostly give a list of six baths: *vāruṇa*, *āgneya* (or *bhasma*), *māhendra* (or *divya*), *vāyavya* (or *māruta*), *mantra* and *mānasa* (Bhatt 1964: 172f. n. 1). Similar lists occur in Dharmānibandha literature: KKT *Niyatakālakāṇḍa* pp. 51 ff., ParSm *Prāyaścittakāṇḍa* 12.9–11 (with commentary pp. 370ff.). In none of these passages is a *saumyasnāna* mentioned. Shingo Einoo has kindly provided us with a very elaborate collection of *snāna*-lists from late Vedic and Purāṇic sources, but a *saumyasnāna* is not found anywhere. If an emendation be made, it must be °*bhaum(y)ānām*: cf. Kane Vol. II part 2, p. 667f.

<sup>110</sup> The fifth and sixth pādas are here repeated from 40.4.2 above.

<sup>111</sup> For *bhūti* (or *vibhūti*) in the meaning ‘ash’, cf. BJābUp 1.15: *vibhūtir bhasitam bhasma kṣaram rakṣeti bhasmano bhavanti pañca nāmāni | pañcabhir nāmabhir bhṛṣam aiśvarya-kāraṇād bhūtiḥ | bhasma sarvāghabhakṣaṇāt | . . .* Cf. in addition the following *Skandapurāṇa* verse quoted not only in Caṇḍeśvara’s *Gṛhastharatnākara* (cf. Adriaensen, Bakker and Isaacson 1988: 12f.), but also at KKT *Niyatakālakāṇḍa* p. 54, ll. 9–10: *puṇyam kanakhale yac ca prayāge yac ca sundari | tat phalam sakalam devi bhūtisnāne \*vidhīyate* ||, with Lakṣmīdhara’s straightforward comment (l. 11): *bhūtir bhasma*. This verse does not occur in the older Nepalese recension of the *Skandapurāṇa*, but can be identified in the *Revākhaṇḍa* (ms. R 243<sup>r</sup> l. 8) and *Ambikākhaṇḍa* (ms. A<sub>4</sub> 214<sup>r</sup> l. 7) recensions. This confirms that Lakṣmīdhara had before him a recension of the *Skandapurāṇa* close to these two recensions, as has been argued in Bisschop 2002. Instead of the KKT edition’s *dinedine* we can now read *vidhīyate*, because this is the reading found in the *Skandapurāṇa* manuscripts and it is also reported for a number of manuscripts in the apparatus of the KKT. Instead of *yac ca sundari*, A<sub>4</sub> and R read respectively *yad athāpi vā* and *yad athāpi ca*. The verse quoted after this one can also be identified in the same two recensions (R 243<sup>v</sup> l. 7; A<sub>4</sub> 214<sup>v</sup> l. 2). The two verses stem from a chapter (only transmitted in the *Ambikākhaṇḍa* and *Revākhaṇḍa* recensions) which is devoted to a glorification of bathing in ash (*bhūtisnāna* c.q. *bhasmasnāna*).

<sup>112</sup> Both epithets occur in a mantra addressed to Śiva at AVParīś 66.3.2: *kālāya svāhā || piṅgalāya tīkṣṇāya jaṭilāya babhrava oṃ bhūr oṃ bhuvā oṃ svar oṃ bhūr bhuvāḥ svar jayavijayāya jayādhipataye kapardine karālāya vikatāya kaṭiramāṭarāyāṅgirasa-bārhaspatyaikakapilamaṇḍalamuṇḍajaṭilakapāleśvarādhipataye kapardine svāheti* ||. Cf.

- 5.2 *bhūtir me 'lakṣmīm nirṇuded bhūtir me śriyam āvahet |  
bhūtir ma āyusā vittam varco brahma prayacchatu ||*  
Ash should drive away misfortune from me, ash should bring me  
glory. Let ash give me wealth, splendor, Brahman, together with a  
[full] life-span.
- 5.3 *bhasmanā caranto nityam dhyāyinaḥ paricintakāḥ |  
yānti pāśupataḥ sthānaḥ punarāvṛttidurlabham ||*  
Those constantly engaged with ash, reflecting, meditating, reach the  
abode of Paśupati, from which it is hard to be reborn.<sup>113</sup>
- 5.4 *vācā tu yat kṛtaḥ karma manasā ca vicintitam |  
alakṣmīś cātha<sup>114</sup> duḥsvapnaḥ bhasmanā tat pranaśyatu ||*  
Whatever karman is produced in speaking and thought out in mind,  
misfortune and nightmares, let [all] that be destroyed by ash.
- 5.5 *mokṣaṇam mokṣakāle ca bhasmaśeṣam visarjayet |  
mukto 'haḥ sarvapāpebhyo rudralokaḥ vrajāmy aham ||*  
And at the time of release he should shed the remainder of the ash,  
which bestows release, [saying:]<sup>115</sup> 'Released I am from all evils. I  
am moving towards the world of Rudra'.
- 6.1 *etat snānam vāruṇam<sup>116</sup> parvasu śarīralepena yathākramaḥ<sup>117</sup>  
pūrvam tūpavaset<sup>118</sup> ||*

also MtP 47.138: *babhrave ca piśaṅgāya piṅgalāyāruṇāya ca | pinākinē ceṣumate citrāya rohitāya ca ||*

<sup>113</sup> *punarāvṛttidurlabha* is a stock expression in Śaiva Purāṇas which mostly qualifies words like *rudraloka* (cf. 40.5.5 just below) or *matsamīpa*. In view of PāSū 4.19–20 (*anena vidhinā rudrasamīpaḥ gatvā || 19 || na kaś cid brāhmaṇaḥ punar āvartate || 20 ||*) it is conspicuous that the expression occurs frequently (nine times) in VāP 23, a chapter stemming from Pāśupata circles, which gives an account of Śiva's twenty-eight incarnations starting with Śveta and ending with the Pāśupata teacher Lakulīśa (cf. Bisschop 2002: 239 n. 32). Cf. also MBh 12.327.67f and 12.335.76d.

<sup>114</sup> The edition has *cāpad*, but on p. 258 the editors propose the conjecture adopted here. The mss. ACDErth read *cāpa daḥsvapnaḥ*, T reads *cāpa duḥsvapnaḥ*. A corruption of *tha* to *pa* is very plausible.

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

<sup>116</sup> On the words *etat snānam vāruṇam*, cf. AVParīś 1.43.10: *etat snānam ... prajāsthāpanam* (and 1.45.2, 7).

<sup>117</sup> The edition reads *yathākāmaḥ*, while the reading adopted by us occurs in the three sources A<sub>1</sub>CE.

<sup>118</sup> The edition reads *parvasūpavaset*. A variant *pūrvastū<sup>o</sup>* (ADE) is recorded in the apparatus. We conjecture *pūrvam tūpavaset*, because we consider *-nt-* → *-st-* a rather



This water (*vāruṇa*) bath<sup>119</sup> [is done] on *parvan* days, accompanied by the rubbing [of fragrant substances] on the body, in due course, but first he should fast.<sup>120</sup>

6.2 *strīśūdraṃ nābhibhāṣeta*<sup>121</sup> ||

He should not speak to a woman or a *śūdra*.

6.3 *tadā sāvitṛiṃ japet* ||

Then he should mutter the *Sāvitṛī*.<sup>122</sup>

6.4 *yadi bhāṣeta tadā rudrasāvitṛiṃ japet* ||

If he is to speak [to them], then he should mutter the *Rudrasāvitṛī*.<sup>123</sup>

plausible corruption. Our conjecture seems more suitable than the predicative nominative (cf. Speijer 1896: 31) that the mss. ADE actually seem to offer. The reading *parvasū*<sup>o</sup> adopted by the editors could well be a corruption under influence of the preceding *parvasu*.<sup>119</sup> The *vāruṇa* bath probably refers to the washing off of the remaining ash described in 40.5.5. These lines seem to imply that the bathing in ash and the subsequent washing off of the ash on *parvan* days are recurrent rituals, which form part of a ritual cycle of the practitioner.

<sup>120</sup> From Kauṇḍinya's commentary on PāSū 1.1 (p. 8, ll. 5–9) it follows that fasting was also prescribed before initiation: *syā ity eṣye kāle | yāvad ayam ācārya grhasthādibhyo 'bhyāgatam pūrvam atahśabdāt parīkṣitam brāhmaṇam vratopavāsādyam mahādevasya dakṣiṇasyām mūrtau sadyojātādisaṃskṛtena bhasmanā saṃskaroti utpattiliṅgavyāvṛttiṃ kṛtvā mantraśravaṇam ca karoti tāvad eṣyaḥ kālaḥ kriyate* | “‘Shall’ (*syā*) refers to the time required, namely the time that is required (before the exposition can begin) by the *ācārya* to consecrate a brahmin (who has started the fasting observance) at Mahādeva's “right *mūrti*”, with ashes that are consecrated with the (five) mantras “*Sadyojāta*” etc., and to initiate him in the mantra, after he has made him lay off the signs of his origin – a brahmin whose (antecedents) have earlier been screened, as follows from the word “therefore” (*ataḥ*) in the *Sūtra*, and who comes (to him) from amongst the householders etc.” (transl. Bakker forthc.).

<sup>121</sup> PāSū 1.13: *strīśūdraṃ nābhibhāṣet*. Note the difference between active and middle voice (also in 40.6.4 just below). Cf. among many other places KāthGS 5.3 *strīśūdraṃ nābhibhāṣeta*; BaudhGS 3.4.24 *na striyā na śūdreṇa saha sambhāṣeta yadi sambhāṣeta brāhmaṇena saha sambhāṣeta*; BaudhDhS 3.8.17 *strīśūdrair nābhibhāṣeta mūtrapurīṣe nāvekṣeta*; BaudhDhS 4.5.4cd *strīśūdrair nābhibhāṣeta brahmacārī havirvrataḥ*; ManuSm 11.223cd *strīśūdrapatitāṃś caiva nābhibhāṣeta karhi cit*; an active form finally at MBh 12.36.35ab *strīśūdrapatitāṃś cāpi nābhibhāṣed vratāmviṭaḥ*.

<sup>122</sup> Does this refer to the *Rudrasāvitṛī*? Is a conditional clause also implicit here, as in the next injunction?

<sup>123</sup> PāSū 1.14 and 1.17: *yady avekṣed yady abhibhāṣet* || 14 || *raudrīṃ gāyatṛiṃ bahurūpīṃ vā japet* || 17 ||. Note that PāSū 1.15–16 (*upasprśya* || 15 || *prāṇāyāmaṃ kṛtvā* || 16 ||) are not reflected in our text. The apparent redundancy of rules 40.6.3 and 40.6.4 is awkward. Could it be that 40.6.3 preserves a highly condensed pre-*Pāśūpatasūtra* formulation of the rule, which both in the Pāñcārthika and in our tradition was felt to be in need of being made more explicit (40.6.4)? For the *Rudrasāvitṛī*, cf. 40.2.5–6 above.

6.5 *kamaṇḍalukapāle bhinne bhūmir bhūmim agād ity apsu praveśayet* ||  
If his water pot or his begging bowl<sup>124</sup> is broken, he should immerse  
it in water, [with the mantra] ‘*bhūmir bhūmim agād*’.<sup>125</sup>

6.6 *retahskande*

*yan me retas tejasā samniṣadya*  
*dehāt praskandet punar na bhavāya* |  
*tad agnir vāyuh* . . . . .  
*api ceyam pṛthivī kañcakhanteti* ||

If semen is spilled: ‘My semen which, while sitting down (?) with  
heat, should spill forth from my body without return (?), or fire that  
. . . , life-span . . . , and this earth . . .’.<sup>126</sup>

<sup>124</sup> The interpretation of this compound is uncertain. One could also take it as a karmadhāraya (‘a bowl, i.e., a pot’) or as a tatpuruṣa (‘a pot-lid?’).

<sup>125</sup> The *pratīka* refers to the probably late Vedic mantra quoted in full at KauśS 136.2: *bhūmir bhūmim agān mātā mātaram apy agāt | ṛdhyāsma putraiḥ paśubhir yo no dveṣṭi sa bhidyatām*. It is noteworthy that the actual reading *agān* of the KauśS mss., which Bloomfield (1890) emended to *avāgān* on the basis of KātyŚS 25.5.29, is confirmed by our *pratīka*. The indications of Bloomfield 1906: 672 show that all other texts (e.g., ṢaḍvB 1.6.20, ĀpMP 2.15.17) read *agān*, and Bloomfield’s emendation is thus to be undone (as is his reference to it, loc. cit.).

<sup>126</sup> Expiation for inadvertent ejaculation (on the part of the brahmacārin) is a common theme in the Gṛhya/Dharma literature. Cf. BaudhGS 4.11.1, BaudhDhS 2.1.29, GautDhS 23.20, VaikhSmS 8.2, and YājñSm 3.278 *yan me ’dya reta ity ābhyāṃ skannaṃ reto ’bhimantrayet | stanāntaraṃ bhrūvor madhyaṃ tenānāmikayā spr̥set* ||. The corrupt and incompletely transmitted triṣṭubh verse shows agreement in some ways with the verses (existing in a few different forms) called Retasyā in the Vedic ritual sūtras. In their Taittirīya form (with defective accentuation), they are found TĀ 1.30.1: *pūnar mām aītv indriyām | pūnar āyuh pūnar bhāgaḥ | pūnar brāhmaṇam aītu mā | pūnar drāviṇam aītu mā | yān me ’dyā rétaḥ pṛthivīm āskān | yād oṣadhīr apyāsaraḥ yād āpaḥ | idāṃ tát pūnar ā dade dīrghāyutvāya vārcase | yān me rétaḥ práśicyate | yān ma ājāyate pūnaḥ | téna mām amītam kuru | téna suprajāsam kuru*. In their (Mādhyandina) Vājasaneyin form, they are found ŚB(M) 14.9.4.5 (cf. BĀU(K) 6.4.4–5): *bahú vā idám suptásya vā jāgrato vā réta skandati | tād abhí m̐śed ánu vā mantrayeta yān me ’dyā rétaḥ pṛthivīm āskāntsīd yād oṣadhīr apyāsaraḥ yād apāḥ [-] idám ahám tát réta ā dade pūnar mām aītv indriyām pūnaḥ téjaḥ pūnar bhāgaḥ pūnar agnāyo dhīṣṇyā yathāsthānām kalpantām ity anāmikānguṣṭhābhyām ādāyāntareṇa stānau vā bhrūvau vā ní m̐ñjyāt* ||. We have considered the following emendations: *samniṣicya* (cf. mss. DERoth *samniṣidyā*), *punar me bhavāya* (or *bhagāya*), and *cāyuh*. We do not understand the editors’ assertion (p. 258) that pāda b lacks a syllable: only the cadence is not satisfactory. Their suggestion to read *dehāt praskanden na punarbhavāya* would rectify this. If *punar na bhavāya* or *na punarbhavāya* is correct, we may compare i.a. SVIDhB 3.8.5 *tatra me sthānaṃ kurv apunarbhavāya punarjanmanaḥ* (cf. Konow 1893: 78 n. 4) and MBh 12.47.60 94\* ll. 3–4 *daśāśvamedhī punar eti janma kṛṣṇapraṇāmī na punarbhavāya*.

- 6.7 *samyak kva cit karoti*  
He makes it good (?) / does it properly (?) somewhere.<sup>127</sup>
- 6.8 *vrātam upādhyāyācchando*<sup>128</sup> *vartayet* ||  
He should practise the observance according to the wish of his teacher.
- 6.9 *tata udikṣaṇam* ||  
Then [follows] the upward gaze.<sup>129</sup>
- 6.10 *vrātapatīr juhōti* ||  
He offers while [reciting the verses] dedicated to the Lord of observances.<sup>130</sup>
- 6.11 *samāso 'haṃ vratasviṣṭakṛta iti hutvādityābhimukhas tiṣṭheta* ||  
Having offered [with the words] '... to Vratasviṣṭakṛt' he should stand facing the sun.<sup>131</sup>

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

<sup>128</sup> Instead of *upādhyāyācchando* the edition reads *upādhyāyāchando* (on the editors' use of *cha* for *ccha* see their statement p. xx). There are other ways of solving this line (see the preceding note). If the present conjecture is not taken up then *vartayet* should be emended to *varjayet*.

<sup>129</sup> The teacher making the brahmacārin gaze at the sun is a common element of the Upanayana according to the Gṛhyasūtras. Cf. BhārGS 1.9:9.14 *ādityam udikṣayati*; cf. also Kane Vol. II part 1, p. 286 and Gonda 1980: 381. In our context, it seems to mark the end of the observance.

<sup>130</sup> Cf. 40.3.8 above.

<sup>131</sup> The problems which the text of this rule poses cannot yet be solved satisfactorily. The editors only report one useless variant *tiṣṭhet* (Roth). We suppose that *samāso* conceals a form of *samāsa*, a technical designation for the hymns AV(Ś) 19.22–23 (cf. Bolling and von Negelein, p. 290, and Sāyaṇa's introductions to the two hymns) that is used immediately after *vrātapatīh* also at 46.2.3 (*samāsān*) and 46.7.3 (*samāsau*). Cf. also 46.2.9 *samāsavat*, and perhaps 46.8.1 *sāmāsikam* (?). In the light of 46.7.3 one might think of an emendation to *samāsau*, maybe as a separate rule, but this would leave 'haṃ hanging in the air. Adjectives of the type *sviṣṭakṛta* are not attested, so a nominative interpretation seems impossible.

- 6.12 *yan me duruktaṃ durhutaṃ durdhyātaṃ durvicintitaṃ |  
tan me bhagavān īśānaḥ sarvaṃ tvaṃ kṣantum arhasi ||*  
'May you, O Lord Īśāna, please forgive me whatever has been badly spoken, badly offered, badly meditated, badly understood by me'.<sup>132</sup>
- 6.13 *navonavo bhavasi jāyamāna ity apsu pravāhayed |*  
[With the mantra] 'navonavo bhavasi jāyamānaḥ'<sup>133</sup> he should dismiss [the sun, being Rudra] into the water.<sup>134</sup>
- 6.14 *ye śraddhayedam paśupater vrataṃ caranti |  
teṣāṃ madhu viśakṣe he dadate na punargamaṇaṃ madhurivādye-  
haiva ca |  
te rudrā viratau paśupatisāyujyaṃ gaccha <n>ti<sup>135</sup>*  
Those who undertake this observance of Paśupati with faith, to them they give nectar *viśakṣe he* (?) and there is no return here and now . . . . On dying (*viratau*) they, as Rudras, reach union with Paśupati.<sup>136</sup>
- 6.15 *tad eṣa ślokaḥ ||*  
Regarding this there is the following śloka:
- 6.16 *vilnapāśapañjarāḥ samāptatattvagocarāḥ |  
prayānti śaṃkaraṃ paraṃ patim vibhuṃ sadāśivam<sup>137</sup> ||*  
Those for whom the net of bonds is dissolved, who have attained the realm of Truth, they reach Śaṃkara, the Supreme, the Lord, the Powerful one, the Eternal Śiva.

Agni is often called Sviṣṭakṛt, and Vratasviṣṭakṛt may be a contamination of this with the name Vratapati. With reference to dedications *idam agnaye* found in some Vedic sūtras (e.g., KauśS 87.8), we hesitantly propose to restore the text as follows: *samāsau [ | ] idam vratasviṣṭakṛta iti hutvā . . .* 'Having offered [reciting] the two Samāsa-hymns, [and stating] "this is for Vratasviṣṭakṛt", . . .'. On the Sviṣṭakṛt oblations, cf. Gonda 1980: 349ff., and AVParīś 20.4.2.

<sup>132</sup> This verse seems to be addressed to the sun, apparently identified with Rudra: cf. KūP 2.18.34–47 and Hazra 1935: 286.

<sup>133</sup> AV(Ś) 7.81.2 = 14.1.24 / AV(P) 18.3.3.

<sup>134</sup> The sequence *ity apsu pra-* might be thought to have been copied from 40.6.5 just above, but the presence of *apsu* agrees nicely with the contents of the quoted mantra, which is dedicated to the sun, hence to Rudra. We find no other examples of an *apsu pravāhana* (of the sun). We do, however, find references to a simple *pravāhana* 'dismissal (of a deity or the ancestors) at the end of a worship', immediately following the Sviṣṭakṛt oblation, at BaudhGŚS 2.5.6 and 3.15.8 (for the latter passage, dealing with the worship of Rudra, cf. Harting 1922: 23 and 53).

<sup>135</sup> We are not able to solve the many textual problems we encounter here. The following variants are reported: *yaḥ* (ACDEURoth) for *ye*; *kāmadhu* (CTROth) for *madhu*; *viśikṣe* (T) for *viśakṣe*; *deha* (E) for *he*; *vistaratau* (D) for *viratau*; *paśupatiḥ* (ADE) for *paśupati*<sup>o</sup>. Furthermore it is reported that CTUROth omit *na punargamaṇaṃ* to *prayāṃ* (in 16c).

<sup>136</sup> The ultimate goal of the Pāśupatas. Cf. PāSū 5.33: *labhate rudrasāyujyam*.

<sup>137</sup> Cf. Modak 1993: 469: "The purely iambic metre *pramāṇikā* used at the end of the *pāśupata-vrata* is noteworthy".

## ABBREVIATIONS

AB	<i>Aitareyabrāhmaṇa</i> , ed. Aufrecht 1879
ĀgnivGS	<i>Āgniveśyaghyasūtra</i> , ed. Ravi Varma 1940
ĀpGS	<i>Āpastambaghyasūtra</i> , ed. Winternitz 1887
ĀpMP	<i>Āpastambamantrapāṭha</i> , ed. Winternitz 1897
ĀpŚS	<i>Āpastambaśrautasūtra</i> , ed. Garbe 1882–1902
AV(P)	<i>Atharvavedasamhitā</i> (Paippalāda), ed. Bhattacharya 1997 <sup>138</sup>
AV(Ś)	<i>Atharvavedasamhitā</i> (Śaunaka), ed. Vishva Bandhu 1960
AVPariś	<i>Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa</i> , ed. Bolling and von Negelein 1909–1910
BĀU(K)	<i>Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad</i> (Kāṇva), ed. Olivelle 1998
BaudhDhS	<i>Baudhāyanadharmasūtra</i> , ed. Olivelle 2000
BaudhGS	<i>Baudhāyanaghyasūtra</i> , ed. Shama Sastri 1920
BaudhGŚS	<i>Baudhāyanaghyasēśasūtra</i> , ed. Shama Sastri 1920, cf. Harting 1922
BhārGS	<i>Bhāradvājaghyasūtra</i> , ed. Salomons 1913
BhārŚS	<i>Bhāradvājaśrautasūtra</i> , ed. Kashikar 1964
BJābUp	<i>Bṛhajjābālopaniṣad</i> , ed. Sastri 1950
GautDhS	<i>Gautamadharmasūtra</i> , ed. Olivelle 2000
GB	<i>Gopathabrāhmaṇa</i> , ed. Gaastra 1919
GobhGS	<i>Gobhilaghyasūtra</i> , ed. Knauer 1885
HirGS	<i>Hiranyakeśighyasūtra</i> , ed. Kirste 1889
JaimGS	<i>Jaiminīyaghyasūtra</i> , ed. Caland 1922
KāthGS	<i>Kāthakaghyasūtra</i> , ed. Caland 1925
KātyŚS	<i>Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra</i> , ed. Weber 1859
KauśS	<i>Kauśikasūtra</i> , ed. Bloomfield 1890
KKT	<i>Kṛtyakalpataru</i> , ed. Aiyangar 1942, 1950
KS	<i>Kāthakasamhitā</i> , ed. von Schroeder 1900–1910
KūP	<i>Kūmapurāṇa</i> , ed. Gupta 1971
LīP	<i>Līṅgapurāṇa</i> , ed. Shastri 1980
MānGS	<i>Mānavaghyasūtra</i> , Knauer 1897
ManuSm	<i>Manusmṛti</i> , ed. Jolly 1887
MBh	<i>Mahābhārata</i> , ed. Sukthankar et al. 1927–1959
MS	<i>Maitrāyaṇīsamhitā</i> , ed. von Schroeder 1881–1886
MtP	<i>Matsyapurāṇa</i> , ed. Apte 1907
ParSm	<i>Parāśarasamṛti</i> , ed. Tarkālaṅkāra 1893
PāSū	<i>Pāśupatasūtra</i> , ed. Shastri 1940
RṬ	<i>Ratnaṭikā</i> , ed. Dalal 1966
ṢaḍvB	<i>Ṣaḍviṃśabrāhmaṇa</i> , ed. Eelsingh 1908
ŚB(M)	<i>Śatapathabrāhmaṇa</i> (Mādhyandina), Weber 1855
ŚiUp	<i>Śivopaniṣad</i> , ed. Kunhan Raja 1933
SP <sub>Bh</sub>	<i>Skandapurāṇa</i> , ed. Bhaṭṭarāi 1988
SVīdhB	<i>Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa</i> , ed. Konow 1893
TĀ	<i>Taittirīyāranyaka</i> , ed. Phāḍake 1898
TB	<i>Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa</i> , ed. Śāstri ‘Goḍbole’ 1898

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

VaikhSmS	<i>Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra</i> , ed. Caland 1927
VaitS	<i>Vaitānasūtra</i> , ed. Garbe 1878
VāP	<i>Vāyupurāṇa</i> , ed. Khemarāja 1983
VārGS	<i>Vārāhagrhyasūtra</i> , ed. Raghu Vira 1932
VīṇT	<i>Vīṇāśikhatantra</i> , ed. Goudriaan 1985
YājñS	<i>Yājñavalkyasmṛti</i> , ed. Acharya 1949

## REFERENCES

- Acharya, Narayan Ram (1949) *Yājñavalkyasmṛti of Yogīsvara Yājñavalkya*. With the Commentary Mitākṣarā of Vijnāneśvara, Notes, Variant Readings, etc., Bombay.
- Adriaensen, R., Bakker, H.T. & Isaacson, H. (1998) *The Skandapurāṇa*. Volume I. Adhyāyas 1–25. Critically Edited with Prolegomena and English Synopsis, Groningen.
- Aiyangar, K.V. Rangaswami (1942) *Bhaṭṭaśrīlakṣmīdharaviracite Kṛtyakalpatarau Aṣṭamo bhāgaḥ. Tīrthavivecanakāṇḍam*, Baroda.
- Aiyangar, K.V. Rangaswami (1950) *Bhaṭṭaśrīlakṣmīdharaviracite Kṛtyakalpatarau Tṛtīyo bhāgaḥ. Niyatakālākāṇḍam*, Baroda.
- Apte, H.N. (1907) *Śrīmad-Dvaipāyanamuni-praṇītam Matsyapurāṇam, etad pustakam Ānandāśramasthapaṇḍitaiḥ saṁśodhitam*, Poona [Reprint Poona 1981].
- Aufrecht, Theodor (1879) *Das Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, Bonn.
- Bakker, H.T. (2000) Somaśarman, Somavaṁśa and Somasiddhānta. A Pāśupata tradition in seventh-century Dakṣiṇa Kosala. In Ryutaro Tsuchida and Albrecht Wezler (eds.), *Harānandalaharī*. Volume in Honour of Professor Minoru Hara on his Seventieth Birthday (Reinbek), pp. 1–19.
- Bakker, H.T. (forthcoming) *At the Right Side of the Teacher. Imagination, Imagery and Image in Vedic and Śaiva Initiation*. Lecture delivered at a Conference on ‘Images in Asian Religions: Texts and Contexts’, held at McMaster and University of Toronto, 10–12 May 2001.
- Beal, Samuel (1884) *Si-Yu-Ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World*. Translated from the Chinese of Hiuen Tsiang (A.D. 629), London [Reprint Delhi 1969].
- Bhandarkar, D.R. (1904–1907) An Eklingji Stone Inscription and the Origin and History of the Lakulīśa Sect. *JBBRAS* 22, 151–165.
- Bhatt, N.R. (1964) *Ajitāgama*. Vol. I. Édition critique, Pondichéry.
- Bhattacharya, Dipak (1997) *The Paippalāda-Saṁhitā of the Atharvaveda*. Volume One, Consisting of the first fifteen Kāṇḍas, Calcutta.
- Bhattacharya, Gouriswar (1977) *Nandin and Vṛṣabha*. *ZDMG* Suppl. III, 2 (XIX). Deutscher Orientalistentag, Freiburg), 1545–1567.
- Bhaṭṭarāi, Kṛṣṇaprasāda (1988) *Skandapurāṇasya Ambikākhaṇḍaḥ*, Kathmandu.
- Bisschop, Peter (2002) On a Quotation of the *Skandapurāṇa* in the *Tīrthavivecanakāṇḍa* of Lakṣmīdhara’s *Kṛtyakalpataru*. *IJJ* 45, 231–243.
- Bloomfield, Maurice (1890) *The Kauçika Sūtra of the Atharva Veda*. With Extracts from the Commentaries of Dārila and Keçava, New Haven [= *JAOS* 14 (1889)].
- Bloomfield, Maurice (1893) On the so-called Nirukta of Kāutsavaya. *JAOS* 15 [*PAOS* 1890], xlviii–l.
- Bloomfield, Maurice (1906) *A Vedic Concordance*, Cambridge (Mass.).
- Böhtlingk, O. (1890) Einige Conjecturen zur Āsurī-Kalpa. *ZDMG* XLIV, 489–491.

- Böhlingk, O. (1892) Einige Bemerkungen zu den Auçanasâdbhutâni. *Ber. über die Verh. der Kön. Säch. Ges. der Wiss.* **24**, 188–194.
- Bolling, George Melville & von Negelein, Julius (1909–1910) *The Parisiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda*. Volume 1: Text and Critical Apparatus, in 2 Parts, Leipzig.
- Bosch, L.P. van den (1978) *Atharvaveda-pariṣiṣṭa*. Chapters 21–19. Introduction, Translation and Notes, Groningen.
- Brunner, H el ene (1969) De la consommation du *nirm lya* de Śiva. *JA* **257**, 213–265.
- Brunner, H., Oberhammer, G. & Padoux, A. (eds.) (2000) *T ntrik bhidh nakoṣa I. Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la litt rature hindoue tantrique*, Wien.
- B hler, Georg (1891) Review of M. Bloomfield, *The Kauṣika-S tra of the Atharvaveda*. *WZKM* **5**, 244–247.
- Burnell, A.C. (1873) *The S mavidh nabr hmaṇa (being the third Br hmaṇa) of the S maveda*. Vol. I. Text and Commentary, with Introduction, London.
- Caland, Willem (1893) *Altindischer Ahnencult*, Leiden.
- Caland, Willem (1900) *Altindisches Zauberritual*. Probe einer Uebersetzung der wichtigsten Theile des Kauṣika S tra, Amsterdam.
- Caland, Willem (1911) Vedische Religion (1907–1910). *Archiv f r Religionswissenschaft* **14**, 497–516 [*Kleine Schriften*, ed. M. Witzel (Stuttgart 1990), pp. 640–659].
- Caland, Willem (1922) *The Jaiminigrhyas tra belonging to the S maveda*, Lahore.
- Caland, Willem (1925) *The K thakagrhyas tra with Extracts from Three Commentaries, an Appendix and Indexes*, Lahore.
- Caland, Willem (1927) *Vaikh nasasm rtas tram*, Calcutta.
- Caland, Willem (1928) *Das Śrautas tra des  pastamba*. Sechszehntes bis vierundzwanzigstes und eiunddreissigstes Buch, aus dem Sanskrit  bersetzt, Amsterdam.
- Chakraborti, Haripada (1970) *P supatas tram with Pañc rtha-Bh ṣya of Kauṇḍinya*. Translated with an Introduction on the history of Śaivism in India, Calcutta.
- Chakravarti, Chintaharan (1943) P supatas tra. *IHQ* **29**, 270–271.
- Dalal, Dhimanlal (1966) *Gaṇak rik  of  c rya Bh sarvaj na (With four appendices including the K ravaṇa-m h tmya)*, Baroda.
- Dasgupta, Surendranath (1955) *A History of Indian Philosophy*. Vol. V, Southern Schools of Śaivism, Cambridge.
- Davis, Richard (1994) The Rebuilding of a Hindu Temple. In Donald S. Lopez Jr. (ed.), *Religions in India in Practice* (Princeton), pp. 627–636.
- Diwekar, H.R., Limaye, V.P., Dandekar, R.N., Kashikar, C.G. & Bhide, V.V. (1972) *Kauṣikas tra-D rilabh ṣya*, Poona.
- Dresden, Mark Jan (1941) *M navagrhyas tra. A Vedic Manual of Domestic Rites*. Translation, Commentary and Preface, Groningen/Batavia.
- Eelsingh, H.F. (1908) *Ṣaḍviṃṣabr hmaṇam Vij n panabh ṣyasahitam*, Leiden.
- Einoo, Shingo (1996a) Review of C.G. Kashikar, *A Survey of the Śuklayajurveda Parisiṣṭas*. *IJJ* **39**, 259–268.
- Einoo, Shingo (1996b) The Formation of the P j  Ceremony. *StII* **20**, 73–87.
- Filliozat, Vasundhara (2001) *K l mukha and P supata Temples in Dharwar*, Chennai.
- Gaastra, Dieuke (1919) *Das Gopatha Br hmaṇa*, Leiden.
- Garbe, Richard (1878) *Vait na S tra. The Ritual of the Atharvaveda*, London.
- Garbe, Richard (1882–1902) *The Śrauta S tra of  pastamba*. 3 vols, Calcutta.
- Gonda, Jan (1967) The Indra Festival according to the Atharvavedins. *JAOS* **87**, 413–429 [*Selected Studies IV* (Leiden 1975), pp. 207–222].

- Gonda, Jan (1969) Āyatana. *ALB* 23, 1–79 [*Selected Studies* II (Leiden 1975), pp. 178–256].
- Gonda, Jan (1975) *Vedic Literature*, Wiesbaden.
- Gonda, Jan (1978) *The Ritual Sūtras*, Wiesbaden.
- Gonda, Jan (1980) *Vedic Ritual. The Non-Solemn Rites*, Leiden.
- Goodwin, Charles J. (1893) The Skandayāga, text and translation. *JAOS* 15 [PAOS 1890], v–xiii.
- Goudriaan, T. (1985) *The Vīṇāśikhatantra. A Śaiva Tantra of the Left Current*. Edited with an Introduction and a Translation, Delhi.
- Goudriaan, T. & Gupta, S. (1981) *Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature*, Wiesbaden.
- Goudriaan, T. & Hooykaas, C. (1971) *Stuti and Stava (Bauddha, Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava) of Balinese Brahman priests*, Amsterdam.
- Griffiths, Arlo (2003a) The Textual Divisions of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā. *WZKS* 47.
- Griffiths, Arlo (2003b) The Orissa Manuscripts of the Paippalāda Saṃhitā. *ZDMG* 153, 333–370.
- Gupta, Anand Swarup (1971) *The Kūrma Purāṇa*. Critically edited, Varanasi.
- Hara, Minoru (1958) Nakulīśa-Pāśupata-Darśanam. *IJJ* 2, 8–32.
- Hara, Minoru (1966) *Materials for the Study of Pāśupata Śaivism*. Thesis Harvard Univ. [Unpublished].
- Hara, Minoru (1967) Miscellanea Pasupatica. In *Kavirāj Abhinandana Grantha* (Lucknow), pp. 55–65.
- Hara, Minoru (1974) Review of H. Chakraborti, Pāśupata Sūtram with Pañcārtha-Bhāṣya of Kauṇḍinya. *IJJ* 16, 57–80.
- Hara, Minoru (1982) Quotations found in the Ratnaṭikā of Bhāsarvajña. In L.A. Hercus et al. (eds.), *Indological and Buddhist Studies*. Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday (Canberra), pp. 187–209.
- Hara, Minoru (1992) Pāśupata Studies (I). In Teun Goudriaan (ed.), *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism*. Studies in Honor of André Padoux (Albany, NY), pp. 209–226.
- Hara, Minoru (1994) Pāśupata Studies II. *WZKS* 38, 323–335.
- Hara, Minoru (1999) Pāśupata and Yoga. *Pāśupata-sūtra* 2.12 and *Yoga-sūtra* 3.37. *AS/ĒA* 53, 593–608.
- Harting, P.N.U. (1922) *Selections from the Baudhāyana-Gṛhyaparīṣiṣṭasūtra*, Amersfoort.
- Hatfield, James Taft (1890) On the numbering of the Atharvan Parīṣiṣṭas. *JAOS* 14 [PAOS 1889], clvi–clxi.
- Hatfield, James Taft (1893) The Āuçanasādbhūtāni, Text and Translation. *JAOS* 15, 206–220.
- Hazra, R.C. (1935) The Smṛti-chapters of the Kūrma-Purāṇa. *IHQ* 11, 265–286.
- Jolly, Julius (1887) *Mānava Dharma-Śāstra*, London.
- Kane, P.V. (1930–1962) *History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil Law in India)*, 5 vols. Poona.
- Kashikar, C.G. (1964) *The Śrauta, Paitṛmedhika and Parīṣeṣa Sūtras of Bharadvāja*. Critically Edited and Translated. 2 parts, Poona.
- Khemarāja, Śrīkṛṣṇadāsa (1983) *The Vāyumahāpurāṇam*, Delhi [Reprint of the Venkateśvara edition].
- Kirste, J. (1889) *The Gṛhyasūtra of Hiraṇyakeśin with Extracts from the Commentary of Mātridatta*, Vienna.
- Knauer, Friderich (1885) *Das Gobhilaḡhyasūtra*. Erstes heft: Text (nebst einleitung). Zweites heft: Uebersetzung und commentar, Leipzig.



- Knauer, Friderich (1897) *Das Mānava-gr̥hya-sūtra*, St. Petersburg.
- Kohlbrugge, Dina Johanna (1938) *Atharvaveda-Pariśiṣṭa über Omina*, Wageningen.
- Konow, Sten (1893) *Das Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa*. Ein altindisches Handbuch der Zauberei. Eingeleitet und übersetzt, Halle.
- Kunhan Raja, C. (1933) *Un-published Upanishads*. Edited by the Pandits of Adyar Library under supervision of Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, The Adyar Library.
- Limaye, V.P., Dandekar, R.N., Kashikar, C.G., Bhide, V.V. & Bahulkar, S.S. (1982) *Keśava's Kauśikapaddhati on the Kauśikasūtra of the Atharvaveda*, Pune.
- Lorenzen, David N. (1991) *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas. Two lost Śaiva Sects*. Second Revised Edition [First Edition: 1972], Delhi.
- 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.) [= *AJPh* 10, pp. 165–197].
- Majmudar, M.R. (1960) Lakulīśa Images from Western India. In H.L. Hariyappa and M.M. Patkar (eds.), *P.K. Gode Commemoration Volume*, Part III (Poona), pp. 108–121.
- Meulenbeld, G.J. (forthcoming) Āyurveda and Atharvaveda: their interrelationship in the commentaries on the Kauśikasūtra. In *Felicitation Volume Arian Rosu*, to be published as *Studia Asiatica*, vol. V, by the Centre for the History of Religions and Asian Studies, University of Bucharest.
- Modak, B.R. (1967) The Pāsupatavrata. *Journal of the Karnatak University (Humanities)* 11, 7–10.
- Modak, B.R. (1993) *The Ancillary Literature of the Atharva-Veda*. A Study with special reference to The Pariśiṣṭas, New Delhi.
- Negelein, Julius von (1912) *Der Traumschlüssel des Jagaddeva*, Giessen.
- Oberhammer, Gerhard (1984) *Wahrheit und Transzendenz*. Ein Beitrag zur Spiritualität des Nyāya, Wien.
- Oberhammer, Gerhard (1989) The Use of Mantra in Yogic Meditation. The Testimony of the Pāsupata. In H.P. Alper (ed.), *Understanding Mantras* (Albany, NY), pp. 204–223.
- Oberhammer, Gerhard (1995) Der Tod in der Spiritualität des Pāsupata. In Gerhard Oberhammer (ed.), *Im Tod gewinnt der Mensch sein Selbst. Das Phänomen des Todes in asiatischer und abendländischer Religionstradition*, Arbeitsdokumentation eines Symposions (Wien), pp. 141–179.
- Oberlies, Thomas (2000) Kriegslisten und ungeziemendes Benehmen: Die Askesepraktiken der Pāsupatas. In Ryutaro Tsuchida and Albrecht Wezler (eds.), *Harānandalaharī*. Volume in Honour of Professor Minoru Hara on his Seventieth Birthday (Reinbek), pp. 175–191.
- Oertel, Hanns (1942) *Euphemismen in der Vedischen Prosa und euphemistische Varianten in den Mantras*. *Sitzungsber. der Bay. Ak. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abt.*, Heft 8. München [*Kleine Schriften*, eds. H. Hettrich & T. Oberlies (Stuttgart 1994), Teil II, pp. 1501–1548].
- Olivelle, J.P. (1998) *The Early Upaniṣads*. Annotated Text and Translation, New York.
- Olivelle, J.P. (2000) *Dharmasūtras. The Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana, and Vasīṣṭha*. Annotated Text and Translation, Delhi.
- Ozhā, Vajeshāṅkar G. (1889) The Somnāthpattan Praśasti of Bhāva Bṛihaspati. With an introduction by G. Bühler. *WZKM* 3, 1–19.
- Pathak, V.S. (1960) *History of Śaiva Cults in Northern India from Inscriptions (700 A.D. to 1200 A.D.)*, Varanasi.

- Peterson, Peter (1895) Stone-Inscription in the Temple of Bhadrakālī at Prabhās Pāṭana of the time of King Kumārapāla. In *A Collection of Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions* (Bhavnagar), pp. 186–193.
- Phadake, V. S. R. R. Bābāśāstrī (1898) *Taittirīyāranyakam*, Poona.
- Raghu Vira (1932) *Vārāha-Gr̥hya-Sūtra with short extracts from the Paddhatis of Gaṅgādhara and Vasiṣṭha*, Lahore: University of the Panjab.
- Ramesh, K.V. & Tewari, S.P. (1990) *A Copper-plate Hoard of the Gupta Period from Bagh, Madhya Pradesh*. Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi.
- Ravi Varma, L.A. (1940) *Āgniveśyagr̥hyasūtra*, Trivandrum.
- Salomons, H.J.W. (1913) *Het Hindoesche Huisritueel volgens de School van Bhāradvāja*, Leiden.
- Sanderson, Alexis (1988) Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions. In S. Sutherland et al. (eds.), *The World's Religions* (London), pp. 660–704.
- Sanderson, Alexis (2002) History through Textual Criticism in the study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras. In François Grimal (ed.), *Les Sources et le Temps. Sources and Time. A Colloquium*. Pondicherry 11–13 January 1997 (Pondicherry), pp. 1–47.
- Sastri, A. Mahādeva (1950) *The Śaiva Upaniṣads with the Commentary of Śrī Upaniṣad-Brahma-Yoginī*, The Adyar Library.
- Śāstrī 'Goḍbole', V.S.R. Nārāyaṇa (1898) *Taittirīyabrāhmaṇam*, Poona.
- Schroeder, Leopold von (1881–1886) *Mâitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā. Die Saṃhitā der Mâitrāyaṇīya-Çākhā*, 4 vols, Leipzig.
- Schroeder, Leopold von (1900–1910) *Kāthakam. Die Saṃhitā der Kātha-Çākhā*, 3 vols, Leipzig.
- Schultz, Friedrich August (1958) *Die philosophisch-theologischen Lehren des Pāśupata-Systems nach dem Pañcārthabhāṣya und der Ratnaṭikā*, Walldorf-Hessen.
- Shama Sastri, R. (2) (1920) *The Bodhāyana Gr̥hyasūtra*, Mysore.
- Shastri, J.L. (1980) *Liṅgapurāna of Sage Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa. With Sanskrit Commentary Śivatoṣiṇī of Gaṇeśa Nātu*, Delhi.
- Shastri, R. Ananthakrishna (1940) *Pāśupatasūtra. With the Pañcārthabhāṣya of Kaunḍinya*, Trivandrum.
- Siegling, Wilhelm (1906) *Die Rezensionen des Caranavyūha*, Berlin.
- Speijer, J.S. (1886) *Sanskrit Syntax*, Leyden.
- Speijer, J.S. (1896) *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, Strassburg.
- Sukthankar, V.S. et al. (1927–1959) *The Mahābhārata*. For the first time critically edited by V.S. Sukthankar and others, 19 vols, Poona.
- Tarkālaṅkāra, Mahāmahopadhyāya Candrakānta (1893–1899) *Parāśara Smṛti. Parāśara Mād̥hava*, 3 vols. [Reprint Calcutta 1974].
- Vishva Bandhu (1960) *Atharvaveda (Śaunaka) with the Pada-pāṭha and Sāyaṇācārya's Commentary*, 4 parts, Hoshiarpur [Second edition: 1990].
- Weber, Albrecht (1855) *The Çatapatha-Brāhmaṇa in the Mādhyandina-Çākhā*, Berlin & London.
- Weber, Albrecht (1858a) Zur Textgeschichte der Vedasaṃhitās, insbesondere der Atharva-Saṃhitā. *Indische Studien* 4, 431–434.
- Weber, Albrecht (1858b) Zwei Vedische texte über Omina und Portenta. *Abh. der Kön. Ak. der Wiss. zu Berlin*, pp. 320–413.
- Weber, Albrecht (1859) *The Çrautasūtra of Kātyāyana with Extracts from the Commentaries of Karka and Yājñikadeva*, Berlin & London.

- Weber, Albrecht (1868) Ein Atharvaparīṣhṭa über *grahayuddha*. *Indische Studien* **10**, 317–320.
- Winternitz, Moriz (1887) *Āpastambīya Gṛihyasūtra*. With extracts from the commentaries of Haradatta and Sudarśanārya, Vienna.
- Winternitz, Moriz (1897) *The Mantrapāṭha or the Prayer Book of the Āpastambins*, Oxford.
- Witzel, Michael (1986) Regionale und überregionale Faktoren in der Entwicklung vedischer Brahmanengruppen im Mittelalter. In H. Kulke & D. Rothermund (eds.), *Regionale Tradition in Südasien* (Heidelberg), pp. 37–76.
- Yokochi, Yuko (1999) Mahiṣāsūramardīnī Myth and Icon. *Studies in the History of Indian Thought* **11**, 65–103.

PETER BISSCHOP  
*University of Groningen,*  
*The Netherlands*

ARLO GRIFFITHS  
*University of Leiden,*  
*The Netherlands*