

1.1: *Pāda* a is reminiscent of, among other famous passages, Bhagavadgītā 11.19:

*anādimadhyāntam anantavīryam
anantabāhuṃ śaśisūryānetram /
paśyāmi tvāṃ dīptahutāśavaktraṃ
svatejasā viśvam idaṃ tapantam //*

This faint reference to the Bhagavadgītā seems proper at the beginning of a work that claims to deliver a teaching based on, but also to surpass, the Mahābhārata (see following verses). See also e.g. Kūrmapurāṇa 1.11.237:

*rūpaṃ tavośeṣakalāvihīnam [tavā? CHECK]
agocaraṃ nirmalam ekarūpam /
anādimadhyāntam anantām [anantam? CHECK] ādyaṃ
namāmi satyaṃ tamasah parastāt //*

To say that a god has no beginning and no end in a temporal or spacial sense is natural (*anādi*...*antam*), but to have no ‘middle part’ (*madhya*) in these senses is slightly less so. Thus the rather commonly occurring phrase *anādimadhyāntam* is probably not much more than a fixed expression meaning ‘endless and/or eternal’. As to which god this stanza is referring to, it may be Śiva, his name not being listed among those who treat him as chief god, but the phrasing of the verse is vague enough to keep the question somewhat open: the impersonal Brahman might be another option, even more so if we look at 1.9–10, two verses nearby verses discussing *brahmavidyā*.

In *pāda* b *jagat-susāraṃ* is most probably not to be interpreted as *jagatsu sāraṃ*. Strictly speaking, *pāda* c is unmetrical, but it is better to simply acknowledge here the phenomenon of ‘muta cum liquida’, namely that syllables followed by consonant clusters such as *ra*, *bra*, *hra*, *kra*, *śra*, *śya*, *śva*, *sva*, *dva* can be treated as short. Thus *harīndrabrahmā*° can be treated as a regular beginning of an *upajāti* (. - . - -), the syllable *bra* not turning the previous syllable long. The reading *āsamagraṃ* in *pāda* c is difficult to interpret. The most tempting of all the possible corrections I have considered (*arcyam/arhyam/arghyam/īḍyam/agram*) seemed to be *āptam agram*, meaning ‘appointed/received/respected [by Hari, Indra, Brahmā etc.] as the foremost one’. The fact that the *akṣaras āsam* and *āptam* look similar in most of the scripts used in our manuscripts supports this conjecture.

Note how we could perceive the end of *pādas* a and b, as well as *pādas* c and d as rhymes.

Is *pāda* d hypermetrical? It is actually a *vaṃśastha* (*triṣṭubh* - *jagatī* change). See Apte App. A p. 4. **1.2:** The dialogue of Janamejaya and Vaiśampāyana make up the outermost layer of the VSS (except for the introductory stanzas 1.1-3), which mostly contains general *dharmaśāstric* material.

The hundred *parvans* of the Mahābhārata are listed in MBh 1.2.33–70.

1.3: For a similar unsatisfaction or dissatisfaction with previous teachings, see Nisīvāsa mūla 1.9:

*vedāntaṃ viditaṃ deva sām̐khyāṃ vai pañcaviṃśakam | na ca tṛptiṃ gamiṣyāmo
hy ṛte śaivād anugrahāt ||*

and Śivadharmasāstra... CHECK. Vaiśampāyana, a ṛṣi, the disciple of Vyāsa,

recited the Mahābhārata at the snake sacrifice of Janamejaya. CHECK SOURCE Note how we are forced to emend *pāda* c to contain a stem form proper noun (*janamejaya*) to maintain the metre, and note how the manuscripts struggle with this *pāda*. **1.4:** Note *dharma* as a neuter noun in *pāda* c and in the next verse.

1.5: The majority of the MSS consulted include a *vā* in *pāda* b, distinguishing between the ‘secret Dharma’ mentioned in 1.4c and the one taught by Vyāsa. This may or may not be the better reading. I decided to follow MS msCb because I suspected that the two Dharmas hinted at are the same. Note the odd syntax here: *viṣṇunā... dvijarūpadharo bhūtvā papraccha*. The agent of the active verb is in the instrumental case.

1.9: The translation of this verse, and the reconstruction and interpretation of *pāda* d, which is echoed in 1.10d, is slightly tentative.

1.10: I interpret *pāda* d, which is an echo of 1.9d, tentitively as a compound, slightly differently from the way I did above.

1.11: The word °*śivā*° in *pāda* b is slightly suspect, and could be the result of metathesis, from °*viṣā*° (‘by poison’). Nevertheless, jackals seems appropriate in this context, for they are commonly associated with human corpses, death and the cremation ground. (see e.g. Ohnuma 2019) (Reiko Ohnuma 2019 = Ohnuma, R. The Heretical, Heterodox Howl: Jackals in Pāli Buddhist Literature. Religions 2019, 10, 221.) The word *kāla* has, as usual, a double meaning in this verse: a *kālapāśa* is both Yama’s noose, and also the limitation caused by time, as becomes clear at the discussion on the different time units in verses 1.11–31. The variant *jijñāsyasi* seems to be the lectio difficilior as opposed to *viññāsyasi*, but the latter could also work fine here. 1.18d and 1.19a are problematic in the light of 1.19b, which redefines *kalā* in harmony with the traditional interpretaion, see e.g. Arthaśāstra 2.20.33: *trimśatkāṣṭhāḥ kalāḥ*.

1.22: Note the stem form noun *yuga*.

1.23: The element °*yugā*° seems to stand for °*yuga*° metri causa. If °*yugā* and *saṃkhyā* are to be separated, *eṣā* becomes problematic to interpret.

1.24: See 21.34ff. The plural form *pralīyante* in *pāda* a is metri causa for *pralīyate*, perhaps also influencing *utpadyante* (for *utpadyate*) in *pāda* d, which in turn is used here to avoid an iambic pattern (- - . - . - .).

1.27: Note the peculiar compound *bhṛgu-r-ādi-maharṣayaḥ*.

1.30: Note that *samatītāni* (neuter) most probably picks up *devarājāḥ* (masculine) in this verse, or rather *devarājā* stands for *devarājānām* and *samatītāni* picks up °*parārdhāni*.

1.32: The reading of all manuscripts consulted, *vinisṛtam*, may be considered metrical if we interpret it, loosely, as *vinisritam*. *Pāda* d is suspicious and my translation is tentative.

1.34: For *anta* meaning *ananta*, see 1.58cd-59ab.

1.37: The word *prāpitaṃ* is a conjecture for *cāpitaṃ*, which I find unintelligible. Another possibility could be *jñāpitaṃ*. The purport of *pādas* c and d is slightly obscure to me.

1.38: One would expect *brahmāṇḍāni* in *pāda* a instead of *brahmāṇḍānām*, but we should probably understand *brahmāṇḍānām viśeṣān prasamkhyātum...*

Note that in *pāda* d *mātariśvan* stands for the accusative *mātariśvānam* or the dative *mātariśvane* or the genitive *mātariśvanaḥ*. The claim that Brahmā taught Mātariśvan is confirmed in 1.64cd, again using the nominative for the accusative, dative or genitive, and also e.g. in Brahmanḍapurāṇa 3.4.58cd.

1.40: The cruxed *pāda* may have read *sarveṣām eva pūjitāḥ* originally ('They are worshipped by all').

In *pāda* c, understand *diśāṣṭānām* as *diśām aṣṭānām* or *diśaṣṭakānām*

1.41: I chose to supply an *avagraha* before *sabhā* only because all the sources consulted read *saṃhato* as the previous word, making the *sandhi o-s* suspicious. Note that many of the names here and in the following verses are, in the absence of any parallel passage, rather insecure. What is clear here is that the names evoke the name Sahasrākṣa, one of the appellations of Indra, the quadrian of the eastern direction. I have chosen the variant *saṃyano* in *pāda* c only to avoid the repetition of the name *saṃyama*, and the variant *yanoyanaḥ* because I suspect that most of the names here should begin with *ya*. All the name forms in this verse are to be taken as tentative. The only guiding light is the presence of *ya*, reinforcing their connection with Yama. Note that the reconstruction of these names are tentative. What is clear here is that the initials should be *na* and *ga*, probably suggesting a connection with *nāgas*. We are forced to follow Ed's readings here to make sense of this passage. Note that *vṛnda* is not a number here. Elsewhere in this chapter it is the word that signifies 'a billion'.

1.57: Note *śaṅkubhiḥ pṛthag...*: it stands for *śaṅkūṣu pṛthag...* (instrumental for locative). The translation of *pādas* c and d is tentative.

1.61: aṇḍānām plural...: a new egg in every mahākālpa? CHECK

1.63: Note the mixture of different grammatical genders and numbers here. Understand *pramāṇeṣu saṃkhyāḥ kīrtitāḥ samāsataḥ*. *Pāda* a should probably be analysed and interpreted as *purāṇam (purāṇānām aśītisahasrāṇi śatāni ślokāni) brahmaṇā kathitam*.

Compare this list to Viṣṇupurāṇa 3.3.11–19:

*dvāpare prathame vyastāḥ svayaṃ vedāḥ svayaṃbhuvā—
dvitīye dvāpare caiva vedavyāsaḥ prajāpatiḥ||
tṛtīye cośanā vyāsaś caturthe ca bṛhaspatiḥ|
savitā pañcame vyāsaḥ ṣaṣṭhe mṛtyuḥ smṛtaḥ prabhuh||
saptame ca tathaivendro vasiṣṭhaś caṣṭame smṛtaḥ|
sārasvataś ca navame tridhāmā daśame smṛtaḥ||
ekādaśe tu triśikho bharadvājas tataḥ paraḥ|
trayodaśe cāntarikṣo varṇī cāpi caturdaśe||
trayayārūṇaḥ pañcadaśe ṣoḍaśe tu dhanañjayah|
kratuñjayah saptadaśe tadūrdhvaṃ ca jayah smṛtaḥ||
tato vyāso bharadvājo bharadvājāc ca gautamaḥ|
gautamād uttaro vyāso haryātma yo 'bhidhīyate||
atha haryātmanonte ca smṛto vājaśravāmuniḥ|
somaśuśkāyaṇas tasmāt tṛṇabindur iti smṛtaḥ||
ṛkṣobhūdbhārgavas tasmād vālmīkir yo 'bhidhīyate|
tasmād asmatpitā śaktir vyāsas tasmād ahaṃ mune||
jātukarṇo 'bhavan mattaḥ kṛṣṇadvaipāyanas tataḥ|*

aṣṭaviṃśatir ity ete vedavyāsāḥ purātanāḥ||

Another relevant passage is Brahmanḍapurāṇa 3.4.58cd–67:

brahmā dadau śāstram idaṃ purāṇaṃ mātariśvane||
tasmāc cośanasā prāptaṃ tasmāc cāpi bṛhaspatih|
bṛhaspatis tu provāca savitre tadanantaram||
savitā mṛtyave prāha mṛtyuś cendrāya vai punaḥ|
indraś cāpi vasiṣṭāya so 'pi sārasvatāya cai||
sārasvatas tridhāmne 'tha tridhāmā ca śaradvate|
śaradvāṃs tu triviṣṭāya so 'ntarikṣāya dattavān||
carṣiṇe cāntarikṣo vai so 'pi trayyāruṇāya ca|
trayyāruṇād dhanañjayaḥ sa vai prādāt kṛtāñjaye||
kṛtāñjayāt tṛṇāñjayo bharadvājāya so 'py atha|
gautamāya bharadvājāḥ so 'pi niryantare punaḥ||
niryantaras tu provāca tathā vājaśravāya vai|
sa dadau somaśuṣmāya sa cādāt tṛṇabindave||
tṛṇabindus tu dakṣāya dakṣaḥ provāca śaktaye|
śakteḥ parāśaraś cāpi garbhasthaḥ śrutavānidam||
parāśarāj jātukarṇyas tasmād dvaipāyanaḥ prabhuh|
dvaipāyanāt punaś cāpi mayā prāptaṃ dvijottama||
mayā caitat punaḥ proktaṃ putrāyāmitabuddhaye|
ity eva vākyaṃ brahmādiguruṇāṃ samudāhṛtam||

The name *armyadvata* is probably a variant or a corrupted form of *armyātman*, who appears in lists of *vedavyāsas* in the Purāṇas (see note to 1.64).

1.75: Perhaps keep *jatu*°.

2.21: After *kāmarū*°, MS msCc has some folios missing and resumes only at 3.XX. CHECK Florinda's pics!

2.25: Pāda c is unmetrical, or rather, a *ra-vipulā* with licence (*tatraiva* as *SHORT-LONG*). Note also the gender problem (*bhogam akṣayas*), or rather take *-m-* as a sandhi-bridge (*bhoga-m-akṣayas*, for *bhogo 'kṣayas*).

2.28: Note the Aśa form *diśim* in jmsiCjsubi45i/subi45i/msi.

2.29: Note the Aśa form *diśim* in jmsiKjsubi07i/subi07i/msi in pāda b. In pāda d, we may suppose the presence of a sandhi-bridge: *sadya-m-iṣṭālayaḥ*.

2.30: Note the Aśa form *diśim* in jmsiCjsubi95i/subi95i/msi in pāda b.

2.31: Note how *vaktrasya* should refer to Śiva's Tatpuruṣa-face, given that the text lists Śiva's five faces: Īśāna, Tatpuruṣa, Aghora, Vāmadeva, Sadyojāta.

2.35: Understand *kṛcchrāditapa sarvāṇi* as *kṛcchrāditapāṃsi sarvāṇi*.

3.1: For the correct interpretation of pāda a, namely to decide whether these questions focus on the bull of Dharma or Dharma itself/himself, see MBh 12.110.10–11:

prabhāvārthāya bhūtānāṃ dharmapravacanaṃ kṛtam—
yat syād ahimsāsaṃyuktaṃ sa dharma iti niścayaḥ||
dhāraṇād dharma ity āhur dharmeṇa vidhṛtāḥ prajāḥ—
yat syād dhāraṇasaṃyuktaṃ sa dharma iti niścayaḥ||

Note the similarities with this chapter: the phrase *dharma ity āhur*, the fact that the present chapter from verse 18 on is actually a chapter on *ahimsā*, and that

the etimological explanation involves the word $[\bar{a}]dhāraṇa$ in both cases. These lead me to think that in *pādas* ab of this verse in the VSS, it is Dharma that is the focus of the inquiry and not the bull. Understand *pāda* d as *gatayas tasya kati smṛtāḥ*. I have accepted *smṛtāḥ* because this plural signals that *gatis* is meant to be plural, similarly to what happens in 3.6cd (*tasya patnī... mahābhāgāḥ*).

3.3: On a non-verbal stem being a *dhātu*, see e.g. Vāyupurāṇa 3.17cd: *bhāvya ity eṣa dhātur vai bhāvye kāle vibhāvyaṭe*; Vāyupurāṇa 3.19cd (= Brahmanḍapurāṇa 1.38.21ab): *nātha ity eṣa dhātur vai dhātujñaiḥ pālāne smṛtāḥ*; Liṅgapurāṇa 2.9.19: *bhaja ity eṣa dhātur vai sevāyām parikīrtitāḥ*; etc.

3.4: A similar image of the legs of the Bull of Dharma being the four *āśramas* is hinted at MBh 12.262.19–21:

dharmam ekaṃ catuṣpādam āśritās te naraṣabhāḥ|
taṃ santo vidhivat prāpya gacchanti paramām gatim||
gr̥hebhya eva niṣkramya vanam anye samāśritāḥ|
gr̥ham evābhisaṃśritya tato 'nye brahmacāriṇaḥ||
dharmam etaṃ catuṣpādam āśramaṃ brāhmaṇā viduḥ|
ānantiyaṃ brahmaṇaḥ sthānaṃ brāhmaṇā nāma niścayaḥ||

On the more frequently quoted interpretation of the four legs, see Olivelle ‘Āśrama’, 235: “Dharma and truth possess all four feet and are whole during the Kṛta yuga, and people did not obtain anything unrighteously (*adharmaṇa*). By obtaining, however, *dharmā* has lost one foot during each of the other *yugas* and righteousness (*dharmā*) likewise has diminished by one quarter due to theft, falsehood, and deceit. (MDh 1.81–82)”

Understand *pādas* c and d as *catvāri āśramāṇi kīrtitāni dharmo manīṣibhiḥ* or *yo dharmāḥ kīrtitaś caturāśramāṇi manīṣibhiḥ* or *yo dharmāś caturāśramāḥ kīrtito manīṣibhiḥ*.

3.5: Understand *gatiś* as *gatayaś* and note that *viññeyāḥ* is an emendation from *viññeyaḥ* following the logic of 3.1d. *tīrya* seems to be an acceptable nominal stem in this text for *tīryaṇc*. See e.g. 4.6a: *devamānuṣatīryeṣu*. *ādayaḥ* in *pāda* d seems superfluous.

3.6: Note the use of the singular in *pādas* c and d. I have left *sumadhyamāḥ* as the manuscripts transmit it: it signals the presence of the plural. And consider correcting *mahābhāgā* to *mahābhāgās*. In sum, understand *tasya patnyo mahābhāgās trayodaśa sumadhyamāḥ*.

3.7: *śraddhādhyāḥ* in *pāda* b is an attractive lectio difficilior (‘they were rich in faith/devotion’), but I have finally decided to accept the easier and better-attested *śraddhādhyā[h]*. Again, I have chosen/applied the plural forms *ādyāḥ* and *sumanoḥarāḥ* in *pāda* b to hint at the fact that the presence of the plural is to be preferred here; thus only *viśālākṣī* is problematic. As *patnī* in the previous verse, it should be treated as a plural. Note the use of the singular for the plural also in *pādas* cd, especially *babhūva ha* for *babhūvuḥ*.

MMW on Dakṣa: “daughters of whom 27 become the Moon’s wives, forming the lunar asterisms, and 13 [or 17 BhP.; or 8 R.] those of Kaśyapa, becoming by this latter the mothers of gods, demons, men, and animals, while 10 are married to Dharma, Mn. ix, 128f.” CHECK

3.8: Consider emending *tebhyaḥ* to the correct feminine form *tābhyāḥ*. Note

again the use of the singular (nominative) for the plural (accusative) in *pādas* ab. Alternatively, emend *dharmapatnī* to *dharmapatnīr* (plural accusative) and *putras* to *putrān* to make them work with *śrotum icchāmi*. For Dharma's thirteen wives and their sons, see Liṅgapurāṇa 1.5.34-37 (note the similarity between the first line and VSS 3.6cd-7ab above):

dharmasya patnyaḥ śraddhādyāḥ kīrtitā vai trayodaśa|
tāsu dharmaprajāṃ vakṣye yathākramam anuttamam||
kāmo darpo 'tha niyamaḥ saṃtoṣo lobha eva ca|
śrutā tu daṇḍaḥ samayo bodhaś caiva mahādyutiḥ||
apramādaś ca vinayo vyavasāyo dvijottamāḥ|
kṣemaṃ sukhaṃ yaśaś caiva dharmaputrāś ca tāsu vai||
dharmasya vai kriyāyāṃ tu daṇḍaḥ samaya eva ca|
apramādaś tathā bodho buddher dharmasya tau suta||

prasūtisambhavāḥ is a rather bold conjecture that can be supported by two facts: firstly, the readings of the manuscripts are difficult to make sense of and thus are probably corrupt; secondly, a corruption from the name Prasūti, that of Dakṣa's wife, to *ābhūti* is relatively easily to explain, *sū* and *bhū* being close enough in some scripts (e.g. in msCa) to cause confusion. Another option would be to accept *Ābhūti* as the name of Dakṣa's wife.

For Prasūti being Dakṣa's wife in other sources, see e.g. Liṅgapurāṇa 1.5.20-21 (but also note the presence of the name Sambhūti...): *prasūtiḥ suṣuve dakṣac caturviṃśatikanyakāḥ|śraddhāṃ lakṣmīṃ dhṛtiṃ puṣṭiṃ tuṣṭiṃ medhāṃ kriyāṃ tathā|| buddhiḥ lajjāṃ vapuḥ śāntiṃ siddhiṃ kīrtiṃ mahātapāḥ|khyātiṃ śāntiś ca sambhūtiṃ smṛtiṃ prītiṃ kṣamāṃ tathā||*

3.10: Understand *śraddhā* as a stem form noun for *śraddhāyāḥ* (gen./abl.). It is tempting to emend *abhayaḥ* to *ubhayaḥ*, thus matching the relevant line in the Kūrmapurāṇa cited above: *kriyāyāś cābhavat putro daṇḍaḥ samaya eva ca* and allotting only two sons to Kriyā, but in a number of sources Kriyā actually has three sons, see e.g. Viṣṇupurāṇa 1.7.29(ab? CHECK in book), where they are named as Daṇḍa, Naya and Vinaya: *medhā śrutam kriyā daṇḍam nayaṃ vinayam eva ca*. Perhaps read *kriyāyāś tu nayaḥ putro* in *pāda c*? Compare Vāyupurāṇa 1.10.34cd *kriyāyāś tu nayaḥ prokto daṇḍaḥ samaya eva ca* with Brahmandapurāṇa 1.9.60ab: *kriyāyāś tanayau proktau damaś ca śama eva ca*

3.12: In a very similar passages in Kūrmapurāṇa 1.8.20 ff., Apramāda is Buddhi's son and Lajjā has only one son, Vinaya. In the above verse (VSS 3.12), *sudhiyaḥ* (for *sudhiḥ*) may only be qualifying *apramāda*, thus Lajjā may have two sons: Vinaya and the wise Apramāda.

3.13: Note that *sukhaṃ* in *pāda d* is probably meant to be masculine (*sukhaḥ*), but e.g. in the Kūrmapurāṇa passage quoted above it is also neuter. For the emendation in *pāda e*, see Matsyapurāṇa 9.2cd: *yāmā nāma purā devā āsan svāyambhuvāntare* and Bhāgavatapurāṇa 6.4.1: *devāsuraṇṇām sargo nāgānām mṛgapakṣiṇām|sāmāsikas tvayā prokto yas tu svāyambhuve 'ntare||*

3.14: Note *dharma* as a neuter noun and the form *atīvaṃ* for *atīva* metri causa. My emendation from *kīrtaya* ('declare') to *kartaya* ('cut') was influenced by the combination of *chindhi* and *saṃśaya*, often with *kautūhala*, elsewhere in the VSS: 3.2b: *saṃśayaṃ chindhi tattvataḥ*; 10.XXcd: *kautūhalaṃ mahaj*

jātaṃ chindhi saṃśayakāraṃ; 15.2ab: *etat kautūhalaṃ chindhi saṃśayaṃ parameśvara*. The reading *kīrtaya* may have been the result of the influence of *kīrtitā* in 3.13b above (De Simini’s convincing observation).

3.15: The reading *°dvayī* in msNc in *pāda* a is attractive, but as Judit Törzsök has pointed out to me, it is probable that the slightly less convincing but widespread variant *°dvayor* is original. To state that the Smārta tradition is connected to *yamas* and *nīyamas* and the *āśramas* and then to discuss these at length (principally in chapters 3–8 and 11) can be seen as a clear self-identification with the Smārta tradition.

3.16: *Pāda* a should be understood as *yamanīyamayoś caiva*, but the author of this line may have tried to avoid the metrical fault of having two short syllables in the second and third positions. Note that this is the beginning of a long section in our text that describes the *yama-niyama* rules, reaching up to the end of chapter eight. The title given in the colophon of the next chapter, chapter four, namely *yamavibhāga*, would fit this locus better than the beginning of that chapter, which commences with a discussion on the second of the *yamas*, *satya*.

3.17: Note how all witnesses read *mādhūrya* instead of *mādhurya*. The former may have been acceptable originally in this text. Note the use of the singular in *pādas* cd referring back to the agents of the previous sentence. Most probably, *°vadhyam* is to be understood as *°vadham* and the form *vadhyam* serves only to avoid two *laghu* syllables in *pāda* d.

3.20: Understand *bhujoraś ca* in *pāda* a as *bhuje urasi ca*, in this case with an instance of double sandhi: *bhuje urasi ca – bhuja urasi ca – bhujorasi ca*. Alternatively, understand it as a compound: *bhujorasi*. Understand *vadhaḥ* in *pāda* b as *vadhyāḥ* metri causa. *Pāda* a is unmetrical. Note how elliptical this verse is and that *hīṃsakāni* is neuter although it refers to people, perhaps implying *bhūtāni*. Alternatively, take *°ny* in *hīṃsakāny* as rather unusual sandhi-bridge (*hīṃsakā-ny-āhu*). Note also that *āhu* stands for *āhur* metri causa.

3.24: Note *dharmā* as a neuter noun in *pāda* a and that *°vinirmuktaṃ* and *°pradam* are neuter accordingly.

3.25: Note that *parataro* is masculine in *pāda* d, picking up a neuter *°yaśaḥ*. This phenomenon is probably the result of *°yaśaḥ* resembling a masculine noun ending in *-aḥ* and also of the metrical problem with the grammatically correct *nātaḥ parataram ayaśaḥ*.

3.26: *Pāda* d (*nātaḥ paraṃ tapodhana*) is slightly suspicious. The text may have read *nātaḥ paratamo ’dhanāḥ* (‘There is no bigger loss of wealth’) or possibly something starting with *nātaḥ paraṃ tapo ...* (‘There is no greater austerity...’).

3.34: See Uttarottara chapter two for a similar section on meat-consumption. See a similarly phrased comparison in Manu 2.86:

*ye pākayaññās catvāro vidhiyaññāsamanvitāḥ —
sarve te japayaññāsya kalāṃ nārhanti ṣoḍaśīm ||*

3.39: Understand *phalam āhārā* as *phalāhārā* (-m- is a sandhi-bridge). *guṇākāśāt* in *pāda* c is difficult to interpret and *guṇākārṣāt* is a conjecture by Judit Törzsök which fits the context well, although the polysemy of *guṇa* may allow for other solutions.

Verses 3.40–42 may be echoing Brahmapurāṇa 216.64–66:

*māṃsān miṣṭataram nāsti bhakṣyabhojyādikeṣu ca —
tasmān māṃsaṃ na bhuñjīta nāsti miṣṭaiḥ sukhodayaḥ ||
gosahasraṃ tu yo dadyād yas tu māṃsaṃ na bhakṣayet —
samāv etau purā prāha brahmā vedavidāṃ varaḥ ||
sarvatīrtheṣu yat puṇyaṃ sarvayajñeṣu yat phalam —
amāṃsabhakṣaṇe viprās tac ca tac ca ca tatsamam ||* **3.41:** Pādas ab probably stand for *ahiṃsako nāsti samo dānayaññasamīhaiḥ puruṣaiḥ* CHECK and are reminiscent of Śivadharmasāstra 11.92:

*ahiṃsaikā paro dharmā śaktānāṃ parikīrtitam—
aśaktānāṃ ayaṃ dharmo dānayaññādīpūrvakaḥ ||*

Note the variant °dharmā in both msCc and Ed in *pāda* b. On *padma* meaning ‘ten trillion’, and on other words for numbers, see 1.32–35.

koṭiyajña in *pāda* d may refer to a special kind of sacrifice, mostly known as *koṭihoma* in the Purāṇas and in inscriptions (see e.g. Fleming 2010 and 2013). It probably involves a hundred fire-pits and a hundred times one thousand brāhmaṇas (hence the name ‘the ten-million sacrifice’). See e.g. Bhaviṣyapurāṇa uttaraparvan 4.142.54–58:

*śatānāṃ daśamukho dvimukhaikamukhas tathā | caturvidho mahārāja koṭihomo
vidhīyate || kāryasya gurutāṃ jñātvā naiva kuryād aparvaṇi | yathā saṃkṣepataḥ
kāryaḥ koṭihomas tathā śṛṇu || kṛtvā kuṇḍaśataṃ divyaṃ yathoktaṃ hastasaṃmitam
| ekaikasmimḥ tataḥ kuṇḍe śataṃ viprān niyojayet || sadyaḥ pakṣe tu viprāṇāṃ
sahasraṃ parikīrtitam | ekasthānapraṇīte ’gnau sarvataḥ paribhāvite || homaṃ
kuryur dvijāḥ sarve kuṇḍe kuṇḍe yathoditam | yathā kuṇḍabahutve ’pi rājasūye
mahākṛatau ||*

Note that the second syllable of *phalam* in *pāda* d is treated as a long syllable: this happens often at word-boundaries in this text; and note how msNc aims to restore the metre by inserting *tv* after its *phalam*.

4.1: Should we read *satyalakṣaṇaṃ* in *pāda* d, following the rather similar Śivadharmasāstra 11.105cd?

4.2: *suduḥsaham* (singular) in *pāda* b picks up °*ādīni* (plural) in *pāda* a. The -*m* in *satyam* may be a sandhi-bridge and the phrase may refer to a masculine subject thus: *sa ca satya -m- udāhṛtaḥ*.

4.7: *Pāda* d is slightly problematic because it is difficult to ascertain if some of the MSS actually read *panthāna* or *pasthāna* (or *yasthāna*). I suspect that *panthāna* is a stem form noun formed (metri causa) to stand for an irregular nominative of *pathin*.

4.11: Here and several times below, *satye* is probably to be taken as standing for *satyena*.

4.12: *Pāda* b, *samayena priyavrataḥ*, probably stand for *samayena priyavratasya* although it is unclear to me what exactly *samaya* refers to here.

For Priyavrata’s story, in which he wanted to turn nights into days by circling around Mount Meru in a chariot, and by this produced the seven oceans, see e.g. Bhāgavatapurāṇa 5.1.30–31:

*yāvad avabhāsayati suragirim anuparikrāman bhagavān ādityo vasudhātalam
ardhenaiva pratapaty ardhenāvacchādayati, tadā hi [priyavrataḥ] bhagavadupāsanopacitātipuruṣaprabhāvas*

*tad anabhinandan samajavena rathena jyotirmayena rajanīm api dinam kariṣyāmīti
saptakṛtvā taraṇīm anuparyakrāmad dvitīya iva pataṇgaḥ|ye vā u ha tadrathacaraṇanemikṛtaparikhātās
te sapta sindhava āsan yata eva kṛtāḥ sapta bhuvo dvīpāḥ —*

Pādas cd: for a somewhat similar reference to the story of Mahābali, see e.g.
Vāmanapurāṇa 65.66: *evam purā cakradhareṇa viṣṇunā baddho balir vāmanarūpadhāriṇā
|śakrapriyārtham surakāryasiddhaye hitāya vipraṣabhagodvijānām ||*

4.13: Since *śāśi* (instead of *śāśin*) is a possible stem in this text, *śāśir ācaraḥ* could also be possible here in pāda b (see msNamsNbmsNc), perhaps standing for *śāśinaś caraṇam* or *śāśiś carati*. My emendation (*śāśinācaraḥ*) could stand for *śāśinā/śāśinaś cāraḥ* metri causa.

Pādas cd refer to the story of Agastya and the Vindhya mountain: Vindhya became jealous of the Sun's revolving around Mount Meru and when the Sun refused to him the same favour, he decided to grow higher and obstruct the Sun's movement. As a solution to this situation, Agastya asked Vidhya to bend down to make it easier for him to reach the south and to remain thus until he returned. Vindhya agreed to do what Agastya asked him to do but Agastya never returned. See Mahābhārata 3.102.1–14 (see in the word *samaya* in verse 13 and compare it to VSS 4.12b):

*yudhiṣṭhira uvāca —
kimartham sahasā vindhyaḥ pravṛddhaḥ krodhamūrchitaḥ —
etad icchāmy aham śrotuṃ vistareṇa mahāmune ||
lomaśa uvāca —
adrirājam mahāśailam meruṃ kanakaparvatam —
udayāstamaye bhānuḥ pradakṣiṇam avartata ||
taṃ tu dṛṣṭvā tathā vindhyaḥ śailaḥ sūryam athābravīt —
yathā hi merur bhavatā nityaśaḥ parigamyate ||
pradakṣiṇam ca kriyate mām evam kuru bhāskara —
evam uktaḥ tataḥ sūryaḥ śailendraṃ pratyabhāṣata ||
nāham ātmeccayā śaila karomy enam pradakṣiṇam —
eṣa mārگاḥ pradīṣṭo me yenedam nirmītaṃ jagat ||
evam uktaḥ tataḥ krodhāt pravṛddhaḥ sahasācalaḥ —
sūryācandramasor mārگاṃ roddhum icchan paraṃtapa ||
tato devāḥ sahitāḥ sarva eva; sendraḥ samāgamya mahādrirājam —
nivārayām āsur upāyatas taṃ; na ca sma teṣāṃ vacanam cakāra ||
athābhijagmur munim āśramasthaṃ; tapasvīnam dharmabhṛtaṃ variṣṭhaṃ —
agastyam atyadbhutavīryadīptaṃ; taṃ cārtham ūcuḥ sahitāḥ surās te ||
devā ūcuḥ —
sūryācandramasor mārگاṃ nakṣatrāṇāṃ gatim tathā —
śailarājo vṛṇoty eṣa vindhyaḥ krodhavaśānugaḥ ||
taṃ nivārayitum śakto nānyaḥ kaś cid dvijottama —
ṛte tvām hi mahābhāga tasmād enam nivāraya ||
lomaśa uvāca —
tac chrutvā vacanam vipraḥ surāṇāṃ śailam abhyagāt —
so 'bhigamyābravīt vindhyaṃ sadāraḥ samupasthitaḥ ||
mārگاṃ icchāmy aham dattaṃ bhavatā parvatottama —
dakṣiṇām abhigantāsmi diśam kāryeṇa kena cit ||*

*yāvadāgamanam mahyam tavat tvam pratipālaya —
nivr̥tte mayi śailendra tato vardhasva kāmataḥ ||
evam sa samayam kṛtvā vindhyenāmitrakarśana —
adyāpi dakṣiṇād deśād vāruṇir na nivartate ||
etat te sarvam ākhyātam yathā vindhyo na vardhate —
agastyasya prabhāvena yan mām tvam pariṣṛcchasi ||*

4.16: Another way to translate *ekena* in pāda a would turn the sentence into this: ‘If Truth is obtained by somebody, he will be one for whom Dharma is surely accomplished.’ It is not inconceivable that *tava* is meant to carry the sense of an ablative, as Kenji Takahashi has suggested to me: ‘I can’t have enough of learning about Dharma from you.’ Note *asau* in pāda c as an accusative form.

4.23: A line may have dropped out after pāda b, perhaps because a line similar to 4.22cd caused an eyeskip. Alternatively, this line may simply be elliptical. Note how *stena* and *steya* are used interchangeably (or chaotically) in the above passages in the MSS to denote both ‘thief’ and ‘theft/stealing’. The scribe of msNc ends up writing *stenya* in 4.27e.

4.28: It appears that *hriyate* in pāda a is to be taken as an active verb (*harate*). Note also how msCb and msNc read the same here. Take *°harīno* in pāda b as singular and *m* in *°nya-m-adhamo* as a sandhi-bridge. Understand *stenastulya na mūḍham asti* (the reading of Ed!) as a ‘metri causa’ version of *stenatulyo na mūḍho ’sti*, and see a similar case of a nominative ending inside of compound in pāda c below. One major concern remains here: the accepted reading here is that of Ed, an edition that rarely emerges as the sole transmitter of the best reading. A solution could be to emend to *stenam̐tulya...*, meaning ‘There is no bigger foolishness than theft’, but then the second part of pāda a is difficult to connect.

Understand *prāptaḥśāsana tīvrasyaviṣamaṁ* in pāda c as *prāptaśāsanas tīvram asahyam ca viṣamaṁ prāpnoti*. Alternatively, understand *tīvrasya*° as *duḥsahya*° (suggested by Törzsök).

The actual reading of msCa, *prāptaś* (lost in the process of normalization and standing in contrast with that of all other MSS that read *prāptaḥ*) may suggest a doubling of the *ś* of *śāsana* metri causa (suggestion by Törzsök). More likely is that a licence of having a nominative ending inside of a compound is applied here, as probably above in pāda a (also remarked by Törzsök). Note *°kalpa* for *°kalpaṁ* metri causa. I understand *vipule* as *vipulāyām*, *vipulā* appearing in Amarakośa 2.1.7 as a synonym of *dhātṛi*, ‘earth’. Note the switch from plural to singular in pāda d.

4.31: Note *pitur* and *mātur* used as accusative forms in pāda b, or alternatively understand: ‘who are hateful towards their fathers and mothers’.

4.32: See Śakuntalā 1.1:

*yā sṛṣṭiḥ sraṣṭur ādyā [1] vahati vidhihutam yā havir [2] yā ca hotrī [3]
ye dve kālāṁ vidhattaḥ [4,5] śruti-viṣaya-guṇā yā [6] sthitā vyāpya viśvam —
yām āhuḥ sarva-bīja-prakṛtir [7] iti yayā prāṇinaḥ prāṇavantaḥ [8]
pratyakṣābhīḥ prapannas tanubhir avatu vas tābhīr aṣṭābhīr īśaḥ ||*

The eight *tanus* here are: [1] jala [2] agni [3] yajamāna [4,5] sūrya + candra

[6] ākāśa [7] bhūmi [8] vāyu

For a similar interpretation of *aṣṭamūrti*, see e.g. Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati 2.29.34 (*mantrapāda*; note *yajamāna* for our *dikṣa*): *kṣmā-vahni-yajamānārka-jala-vāy-vindu-puṣkaraiḥ|aṣṭābhīr mūrtibhiḥ śambhor dvitīyāvaraṇaṁ smṛtam||* (For *puṣkara* as ‘sky, atmosphere’, see e.g. Amarakośa 1.2.167: *dyodivau dve striyām abhram vyoma puṣkaram ambaram.*) A closely related Aṣṭamūrti-hymn appears in Niśv mukha 1.30–41 (I owe thanks to Nirajan Kafle for drawing my attention to this); see Kafle 2018: 62, 63, 116, 119. Kafle notes that this hymn is closely parallel to some passages in the Prayogamañjarī (1.19–26), the Tantrasamuccaya (1.16–23), and the Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati (kriyāpāda 26.56–63). See also TAK I s.v. *aṣṭamūrti*.

4.40: Not the peculiar verb forms *anugaccheta* and *anupūjyeta*) in this verse.

4.42: Pāda b seems to awkwardly repeat what *arghapādyena* in pāda a signifies. Some emendation may be required here, perhaps taking into account bathing (*snāna*) or an unguent (*abhyaṅga*). For the requirement that one could part with his wife or son, or his own life, for the benefit of someone else, see VSS 2.38 and the narrative in VSS chapter 12; these influenced my decision to emend *ātmano* to *ātmanā* in pāda a. The demonstrative pronoun *tasya* in pāda c may refer to the guest: ‘he will obtain all his [i.e. the guest’s] merits’, hinting at some sort of karmic exchange. Nevertheless, I think that *tasya* points at the merits one can obtain by rituals listed in the previous verse. This is suggested by passages such as the following:

Mahābhārata Supp. 13.14.379 ff.:

*ahany ahani yo dadyāt kapilāṁ dvādaśiḥ samāhi—
māsi māsi ca satreṇa yo yajeta sadā naraḥ||
gavām śatasahasraṁ ca yo dadyāj jyeṣṭhapaṣkare|
na taddharmaphalaṁ tulyam atithīr yasya tuṣyati||*

Brahmavaivartapurāṇa 3.44–46:

*atithiḥ pūjito yena pūjitāḥ sarvadevatāḥ—
atithīr yasya santuṣṭas tasya tuṣṭo hariḥ svayam||
snānena sarvatīrtheṣu sarvadānena yat phalam—
sarvavratopavāsena sarvayajñeṣu dikṣayā||
sarvais tapobhir vividhair nityair naimittikādibhiḥ|*

tad evātithisevāyāḥ kalām nārhanṭi ṣoḍaśim|| This verse is a reference to the story related by a mongoose in MBh 14.92–93: A Brahmin who practises the vow of gleanings (*uñcha*) and his family receive a guest. They feed the guest with the last morsels of the little food they have. In the end, the guest reveals that he is in fact Dharma (14.93.80cd) and as a reward the family departs to heaven. The noble act of the poor Brahmin and his family is depicted as yielding greater rewards than Yudhiṣṭhira’s grandiose horse-sacrifice. (See some remarks on this story in Takahashi 2021.)

We would be forced to accept the reading of Ed in pāda d if the expression were in the masculine (*saśarīro divaṁ gataḥ*). This would make sense and it would also echo expressions occurring e.g. in the Mahābhārata: 3.164.33cd: *paśya puṇyakṛtāṁ lokān saśarīro divaṁ vraja*; 14.5.10cd: *saṁjīvyā kalam iṣṭam ca*

saśarīro divaṃ gataḥ. It is tempting to emend the pāda accordingly, but I have retained *svaśarīraṃ divaṃ gatam* and I interpret it as referring to the Brahmin's whole family (*sva*). **4.52:** Note *kari* for *karī* metri causa, and the end of pāda b (*°mṛgāḥ*), which should be treated metrically as if it read *°mṛigāḥ*. Purūravas (double sandhi originally? *purūravās ati° – purūravā ati° – purūravāti°*). Pāda a may refer to the following passage in the Mahābhārata (1.70.16–18, 20ab):

*purūravās tato vidvān ilāyāṃ samapadyata—
sā vai tasyābhavan mātā pitā ceti hi naḥ śrutam||
trayodaśa samudrasya dvīpān aśnan purūravāḥ—
amānuṣair vṛtaḥ sattvair mānuṣaḥ san mahāyaśāḥ||
vipraiḥ sa vīgrahaṃ cakre vīryonmattaḥ purūravāḥ—
jahāra ca sa viprāṇāṃ ratnāny utkrośatām api||*

...

tato maharṣibhiḥ kruddhaiḥ śaptaḥ sadyo vyanaśyata—

(“The wise Purūravas was born to Ilā. We heard that Ilā was both his mother and his father. The great Purūravas ruled over thirteen islands of the ocean and, though human, he was always surrounded by superhuman beings. Intoxicated with his power, Purūravas quarrelled with some Brahmins and robbed them of their wealth even though they were protesting. [...] Therefore, cursed be the great Ṛṣis, he perished.”)

See also Buddhacarita 11.15 (Aīḍa = Purūravas):

*aiḍaś ca rājā tridivam vigāhya
nītvāpi devīm vaśam urvaśīm tām—
lobhād ṛṣibhyaḥ kanakaṃ jihṛṣur
jagāma nāśaṃ viṣayeṣv atṛptaḥ||*

For Daṇḍa(ka)'s story, see Rāmāyaṇa 7.71.31 ff.: Daṇḍa meets Arajā, a beautiful girl, in a forest and rapes her. As a consequence, her father, Śukra/Bhārgava, destroys Daṇḍa's kingdom, which thus becomes the desolate Daṇḍaka-forest.

For two versions of the destruction of Sagara's sons, who were chasing the sacrificial horse of their father's Aśvamedha sacrifice, and by doing so disturbed Kapila's meditation, and who in turn burnt them to ashes, see Mahābhārata 3.105.9 ff. and Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa 2.52–53.

As for Rāvaṇa's haughtiness, especially the fact that he chose to be invincible by all creatures except humans, and its consequences, one should recall the story of the Rāmāyaṇa and Rāvaṇa's destruction brought about by Rāma therein.

4.57: Saudāsa, also known as Kalmāṣapāda, hit Śakti, Vasiṣṭha's son, with a whip because the latter did not give way to him, and as a consequence Śakti cursed Saudāsa: Saudāsa had to roam the world as a Rākṣasa for twelve years. See Mahābhārata 1.166.1 ff.

As for the end of the Yādavas, see the short Mausalaparvan of the Mahābhārata (canto 16): cursed by the sages Viśvāmitra, Kaṇva and Nārada, and seeing menacing omens, the Yādavas take to drinking in Prabhāsa and destroy each other.

Most probably, *atitṛṣṇā* in the MSS stand for *atitṛṣṇāt* (intending *atitṛṣṇayā*). The form *māndhātō* in msCb stands for *māndhātā* (nominative of *māndhātṛ*). I have corrected it in spite of the fact that the authors' knowledge about his story

may come from Divyāvadāna 17, where it sometimes appears to be an a-stem noun (*māndāta*). *dvijavajñayā* in *pāda* d stands for *dvijāvajñayā* metri causa. Māndhātṛ was born from his father’s body who, being excessively thirsty once, had drank some decoction prepared for ritual purposes and as a result become pregnant with him. Nevertheless, Buddhacarita 11.13 suggests that Māndhātṛ himself was still unsatisfied with wordly objects even after he had obtained half of Indra’s throne:

devena vṛṣṭe ’pi hiraṇyavarṣe
dvīpān samagrāṃś caturo ’pi jītvā
śakrasya cārdhāsanam apy avāpya
māndhātur āsīd viṣayeṣv atṛptih||

In fact, as Monika Zin points out (2012: 149) Māndhātṛ/Māndhātā’s rise and fall is a very popular theme in the ‘Narrative Art of the Amaravati School’: “Statistics show that in the Amaravati School the most frequently represented narrative is the story of King Māndhātā, which appears 47 times.” See *ibid.* p. 151: “The story [e.g. *Divyāvadāna* XVII, see more sources in fn. 17 of this article] relates that Māndhātā was a miraculously born *cakravartin* with Seven Jewels who could cause rain to fall so that his subjects could prosper; not usual rain, but rain of coins, of grain or of cloth. By virtue of his moral strength alone, Māndhātā conquered the world - without any weapons. He conquered all the countries on earth, then Uttarakuru, Pūrvavideha and Aparagodānīya, after which he set out to conquer the heavens. When he was traversing from one abode of the gods to the next (Nāgas, Sadāmattas, Mālādharas, etc.) groups of gods pledged obeisance to him and immediately marched in front of his troops. Māndhātā reached the splendid city of the Trayastrimśa gods atop Sumeru, where Indra, in the meeting-hall, bequeathed to him half of his own seat and half of his heavenly realm. Māndhātā then ruled together with Indra for an unimaginable period of time during which 36 Indras changed. One day, shortly after he won a battle against the Asuras, a sinful thought came to his mind: why should he rule alongside Indra? It was he, after all, who won the war, not Indra - he was better and should, therefore, rule alone. At that very moment Māndhātā fell from heaven, down to his former realm, became sick and died. Shortly before his death, he preached a sermon to his subjects in which *gāthas* from the *Dhammapada* (186–187) appear...”

Nahuṣa was elevated to the position of Indra for a period of time and he also wanted to take Śacī, Indra’s wife. Indra instructed Śacī to tell Nahuṣa to harness some Ṛsis to a vehicle and use this vehicle to take Śacī. Agastya, one of the Ṛsis, was insulted even further by Nahuṣa, therefore he cursed Nahuṣa, who then fell from the vehicle. See Mahābhārata 12.329.35 ff. and the verse in the Buddhacarita (11.14) that follows the one about Māndhātṛ:

bhuktvāpi rājyaṃ divi devatānām
śatakratau vṛtrabhayāt pranaṣṭe—
darpan maharṣīn api vāhayitvā

kāmeṣv atṛpto nahuṣaḥ papāta|| **4.58:** Pāda a is most probably a reference to Mahābali’s promises made to Vāmana that caused his fall. Arjuna: the exile? Flo Kirāṭārjunīya?? he killed Bhīṣma? Flo

King Nala was an expert in the game of dice and lost his kingdom to Puṣkara in a game. See e.g. Mahābhārata 3.56.1 ff.

As for Nṛga, see Mahābhārata 14.93.74:

*gopradānasahasrāṇi dvijebhyo 'dān nṛgo nṛpaḥ—
ekāṃ dattvā sa pārayāṇaṃ narakāṃ samavāptavān||*

(“King Nṛga had made gifts of thousands of cows for the twice-born. By giving away one single cow that belonged to someone else, he fell into hell.”) **4.59:** Note how flexible the gender of most nouns is in pāda b: *svarga*, *mokṣa* and *dama* are usually masculine in standard Sanskrit. The majority of the witnesses suggest that pāda c ends in a stem form noun (°*nāśa*). This pāda is unmetrical, or rather it applies the licence of a word-final short syllable being counted as potentially long (°*dharmA*°). Note how *viprā* in pāda d is probably an attempt in some MSS to restore the metre. This pāda is also unmetrical, or rather it applies the licence of a word-final short syllable being counted as potentially long (*viPRA*).

4.64: In pāda d, understand *caraṇācara* as *caraṇacara* (metri causa).

4.65: Note *mātā* as a stem form.

4.66: One should probably understand *śauṇḍe* in pāda c as *śauṇḍike* (alternatively, it may be corrupted from *śaṇḍhe*); see both in Vāsiṣṭhadharmaśāstra 14.1–3:

*athāto bhojyābhojyaṃ ca varṇayiṣyāmah| cikitsaka-mṛgayu-puṃścali-ḍaṇḍika-stenābhiśastar-
śaṇḍha-patitānām annam abhojyam| kadarya-dikṣita-baddhātura-somavikrayi-takṣa-
rajaka-śauṇḍika-sūcaka-vārduṣika-carmāvakṛtānām||* etc.

In Olivelle’s translation (DhSūtras 1999: 285): “Next we will describe food that is fit and food that is unfit to be eaten [...] The following are unfit to be eaten: food given by a physician, a hunter, a harlot, a law enforcement agent, a thief, a heinous sinner [...] a eunuch, or an outcaste; as also that given by a miser, a man consecrated for a sacrifice, a prisoner, a sick person, a man who sells Soma, a carpenter, a washerman, a liquor dealer, a spy, an usurer, a leather worker...” In support of reading *śaṇḍhe*, see Manu 3.239:

*cāṇḍālāś ca varāhaś ca kukkuṭaḥ śvā tathaiva ca—
rajasvalā ca śaṇḍhaś ca nekṣerann aśnato dvijān||*

4.67: Understand *kīrtir yaśo*° as *kīrtiyaśo*° (‘r’ being an intrusive consonant here metri causa). Understand *āyuṣa* as *āyuṣaṃ* (metri causa).

4.69: Is *sambhinna* a Buddhist term? See also Dharmaputrikā 1.31.

4.70: Possible direct sources for the idea that *kāma* is an enemy to be defeated include Buddhacarita 11.17:

*cīrāmbarā mūlaphalāmbubhakṣā
jaṭā vahanto 'pi bhujamgadīrghāḥ—
yair nānyakāryā munayo 'pi bhagnāḥ
kaḥ kāmasaṃjñān mṛgayeta śatrūn||*

and Bhagavadītā 3.43:

evaṃ buddheḥ param buddhvā saṃstabhyātmānam ātmanā—

jahi śatruṃ mahābāho kāmarūpaṃ durāsadam|| **4.71:** Is *āyatana* just a synonym of *vihāra* here or could this use of the term *āyatana* for the four Buddhist *brahmavihāras* have been influenced by the following passage in the Dhar-

masamuccaya (date?)?

mokṣasyāyatanāni śaṭ—

apramādas tathā śraddhā vīryārambhas tathā dhṛtiḥ—

jñānābhyāsaḥ saṃtāsleṣo mokṣasyāyatanāni śaṭ||1.3||

*nava śāntisamprāptihetavaḥ—j/br̥ḥ dānaṃ śīlaṃ damaḥ kṣāntir maitrī bhūteṣv
ahiṃsatā—*

karuṇāmuditopekṣā śāntisamprāptihetavaḥ||1.4||

4.72: Note the stem form *dhyāna* in °*dhyānādhunā* (for °*dhyānam adhunā*) in pāda a. For contrast, see VSS 6.8:

dhyānaṃ pañcavidhaṃ caiva kīrtitaṃ hariṇā purā—

sūryaḥ somo 'gni sphaṭikaḥ sūkṣmaṃ tattvaṃ ca pañcamam||

4.73: If pāda c is indeed a reference to a 36-tattva philosophical system, it is in striking contrast with the 25-tattva system described in VSS chapter 20.

4.75: Note the plural instrumental (*yair*) with a singular active verb (*vetti*). Note the stem form noun in pāda a (°*sthāna*) metri causa, and also that this stem form noun may function as a singular noun next to a number (*pañca*), a frequently seen phenomenon in this text. Note how *pāda* f deviates from Manu.

4.78: The translation of this verse is based on Olivelle's (Olivelle Crit Ed. p. 218).

4.82: Note syntax.

4.83: My emendation from °*manasā dhūryaś* to °*mana-mādhuryaś* is based on the fact that following the list of *yamas* in 3.16cd–17ab, we need some reference to *mādhurya* here and that it is easy to see how this corruption came about: °*mano-mādhurya*° would be unmetrical, thus the form °*mana-mādhurya*; °*mana-mā*° is easily corrupted to °*manasā*° (not to mention the fact that *manasā* comes up in the next verse); in addition we need five items in this line because of *pañcamah*. As always, I correct *mādhūrya* to *mādhurya*, although it seems that the former is acceptable in this text. I did not correct *mādhuryaś* to *mādhuryaṃ* because of the corresponding *pañcamah*. Understand *jātavedam* in pāda b as *jātavedasam* or *jātavedāḥ*, or rather as belonging to the compound °*dānaṃ: jātavedodānaṃ*. For pāda e, see Mahāsubhāṣitasamgraha 2558: *amṛtāyatām iti vadet pīte bhukte kṣute ca śataṃ jīva* ('When eating or drinking, one should say: "Let it turn into nectar!"; and after sneezing: "Live for a hundred years!"'.)

4.89: In pāda a °*pra*° does not make the previous syllable long: this is the phenomenon of 'muta cum liquida', one of the hallmarks of the *Vṛṣasārasamgraha*, that is, syllables such as *tra*, *pra*, *bra*, *dra* do not necessarily make the previous syllable long. In pāda b, *parata* most probably stands for *paratra* or *parataḥ* metri causa. We may correct it to *paratra* ('muta cum liquida'). °*malapahārī* in the MSS stands either for °*malāpahārī* or °*malaprahārī* metri causa. I could have chosen to emend it to °*malaprahārī* ('muta cum liquida' again), but I decided not to because *apahārin*, *apahāra* *apahāraka* are used in the text very frequently. See also 8.XX, which contains a very similar expression: *sakalamala-pahāre dharmapañcāśad etat*. In pāda a, *anyat* is a bit strange, but it could be echoing *apara* above in 5.1d. Note [or emend?] the form *śaucayīta*.

5.10: X For similar instructions, see a verse cited in Śaṅkara's commentary ad BhG 6.16: *uktaṃ hi|ardhaṃ savyañjanānnasya tṛtīyam udakasya ca|vāyoḥ*

saṃcaraṇārtham tu caturtham avaśeṣayet|| (“Half is for food with sauce, the third part for water, but in order to be able to move the air, he should leave the fourth part [empty].”) See also e.g. Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya 8.46cd-47ab: *annena kukṣer dvāv aṃśau pānenaikaṃ prapūrayet*|| *āśrayaṃ pavanādīnāṃ caturtham avaśeṣayet*— and Sannyāsopaniṣad 59: *āhārasya ca bhāgau dvau tṛtīyam udakasya ca*|*vāyoḥ saṃcaraṇārthāya caturtham avaśeṣayet*||

5.17: Understand *śaivabhāratasaṃhite* as *śaive bhāratasaṃhitāyām*. Note the stem form adjective *°jñā* and noun *°mānava* metri causa, the second syllable of *yadi* as a long syllable at the caesure, the plural *āpnuvanti* where one would expect a verb in the singular, *kīrtir* metri causa for a compounded stem form (*kīrti*°), and the sandhi-bridge *-m-* in *paratra-m-ihita*°.

6.1: Maybe *ījyām* is to be accepted. No, see 5.3a. Note pañcāitat for pañcāitāni or pañcete.

6.3: See Dharmasūtras, Niśv book, Kiraṇa, Svachanda, Tantrāloka etc.

6.5: Note vedādhyayana (stem form) and *°saṃhitam* for *saṃhitām* metri causa.

6.9: Note *śaśim* for *śaśinaṃ*.

6.13: *tri*° in the MSS is a problem. Odd syntax plus gender.

6.19: Note how a plural imperative ātmanepada form (*jijñāsyantām*) stands for the singular (*jijñāsyatām*) metri causa. Note also that the last syllable of *dvijendra* counts here as long: this phenomenon of a word-ending syllable becoming long by position is common in the VSS. Note the form *janmena*. Note that *miśraka* in *pāda b* stands for *miśrakaṃ* metri causa. *ete* would be better for *etāni*? phps no, see 6.24c.

6.26: CHECK *abhrāvakāśa* in MBh, Manu and Śivadharmasaṃgraha.

6.29: Note the stem form *°pāśa* in *pāda b* metri causa.

7.1: *tathety* is suspicious. Note how *annaṃ*, *vastraṃ*, *hiraṇyaṃ* and *bhūmi* (the latter treated as neuter, or given in stem form) are all meant to go with *-dāna* (again, in stem form, metri causa).

7.8: The intention originally may have been this: “Even if he is a great soul, he will be avoided...”

7.11: It seems that *vidhena ca* stands for *vidhinā ca* or rather *vidhānena* metri causa in *pāda b*.

7.15: I suspect that *aṅguli* is used here in the sense of *aṅgulīya* (‘finger-ring’). The form *tuṭi* as a widespread variant of *tuṭi*, see e.g. CHECK.

7.17: I suspect that *phalaṃ vṛddhir* stands for *phalavṛddhir* (*phalasya vṛddhiḥ*) metri causa, meaning ‘the increase of the reward’.

7.20: I take *sādhāraṇā* as one word, but it is possible that the intention of the author was *sā dhāraṇā* in two words, in fact meaning *sādhāraṇ* (*sā ādhāraṇ*, ‘it is the basis’).

7.23: I think that *guṇāguṇi*, or perhaps *guṇaguṇi* (which would be unmetrical), should refer to the idea that e.g. the donation of a piece of land of 2 x 2 *hastas* would result in 4 x *koṭiśata* years in heaven, *guṇa* generally meaning ‘times’. But this is only a guess, and it needs to be supported by some similar passage. I suspect that *pāda c* is an awkward attempt at saying *śraddhādhikadāna(sya) phalaṃ*.

7.24: See entry ‘Paraśurāma’ in Purāṇic Enc.:

To atone for the sin of slaughtering even innocent Kṣatriyas, Paraśurāma gave away all his riches as gifts to brahmins. He invited all the brahmins to Samantapañcaka and conducted a great Yāga there. The chief Ṛtvik (officiating priest) of the Yāga was the sage Kaśyapa and Paraśurāma gave all the lands he conquered till that time to Kaśyapa. Then a platform of gold ten yards long and nine yards wide was made and Kaśyapa was installed there and worshipped. After the worship was over according to the instructions from Kaśyapa the gold platform was cut into pieces and the gold pieces were offered to brahmins. When Kaśyapa got all the lands from Paraśurāma he said thus:—“Oh Rāma, you have given me all your land and it is not now proper for you to live in my soil. You can go to the south and live somewhere on the shores of the ocean there.” Paraśurāma walked south and requested the ocean to give him some land to live. For *śakyānurūpaṃ* in *pāda* a understand *śakyatānurūpaṃ*.

7.27: I suspect that *khyātiś ca tulyaṃ* in the MSS stands for *khyātim atulyāṃ* (‘and unequalled fame’) metri causa. I have corrected those parts of this phrase that could be corrected without violating the metre. REVISE! ūrja? Note *svargaṃ* as a neuter in *pāda* d.

7.28: Revise. Note the accusative ending of *°saṃhitām* after a list consisting of words probably in the nominative. One may correct it to *°saṃhitā*.

8.2: Note that *śaivatattvaṃ* in *pāda* a is the result of a conjecture and that the reading *śaivapāśupatadvaye* in *pāda* b is based on one single manuscript (P). In spite of this uncertainty, I think that this form of the current half-verse is the only one that yields an appropriate meaning. In *pāda* d, *kīrtitāni* pick up an implied *tattvāni*.

8.4: Note that *tīrya* seems to be an acceptable nominal stem in this text for *tīryaṇc*. I understand the causative form *saṃpraveśayet* as non-causative, and interpret *°madhya*° as the ‘human world’ tentatively.

8.5: Compare *pāda* a with 3.15c. **8.8:** Understand *parve* as *parvani* (thematization of the stem in *-an*). Understand *°ādīnām* in *pāda* a as standing for the locative case. Understand *°sargaṃ* as neuter nominative (instead of *°sargaḥ*) or alternatively understand *pāda* c with a hiatus bridge: *garhitotsarga-m-ity etad*.

8.10: The conjecture that changes *anyonya*° to *ayonya*° in *pāda* a involves minimal intervention and makes the sentence much more meaningful than the version transmitted. Also consider *ayoni*°. The variant *strī* for *tām* in *pāda* d in the Ed may be an example of Naraharināth, the editor’s conscious interventions.

8.13: Note *°viṣṭha*° for *viṣṭhā* metri causa in *pāda* c (*ma-vipulā*). Alternatively, read *svaviṣṭhāmūtra bhūmīṣu*. Note the stem form *sūryasoma* for *sūryasomau* in *pāda* e. It is not entirely clear why cats would rejoice seeing the Sun and the Moon. Perhaps this remark refers to the fact that cats can be active both in the daytime and at night.

8.14: Cranes are compared to ascetics here probably because of the similarity of their tendency of relaxing standing on one leg to ascetics performing penance standing on one leg (such as the ascetic depicted on the famous relief in Mahabalipuram).

8.15: CITE source on dog being Bhairava’s vāhana...

8.16: I prefer reading *bhīma tuṣṭi*° as two separate words, the first one in stem form, to reading it as a compound because of the following *caiva*, and to the reading *bhīmas tuṣṭi*° because the corresponding witnesses are the ones that usually give inferior readings.

8.17: While *dārayanto* as an active participle in the masculine nominative is acceptable as an irregular form, the precise interpretation of pādas a and b is still problematic. Note the neuter *idaṃ* picking up the normally masculine *lokaṃ* in pāda c.

8.21: My translation here follows the parallel verse in the MBh and is based on that of Kisari Mohan Ganguli. The syntax of the version here in the VSS is less smooth than that in the MBh, and the VSS's reading *prāntarāśī* definitely required an emendation.

8.22: Note °*vele* for °*velāyāṃ* in pāda c.

8.23: The translation of *anārambhasya* ('of someone who has not yet started eating') is tentative. For a detailed discussion of the categories *bhakṣya*, *bhojya*, *lehya* and *coṣya*, see Kafle 2020:245, n. 534. See also Śivadharmottara 8.13:

*bhakṣyaṃ bhojyaṃ ca peyaṃ ca lehyaṃ coṣyaṃ ca picchilam —
iti bhedaḥ śaḍannasya madhurādyāś ca śaḍguṇāḥ || pāruṣya* seems to be the good reading in pāda a because in the following a short section on this category is coming up. As far as the readings *prṣṭavāg* and *prṣṭavāg* are concerned, I suppose *prṣṭavāg* is not inconceivable (as suggested by Judit Törzsök), for in 8.29 it is questions that are given as relevant examples. Nevertheless I conjectured *tikṣṇavāg* here, relying on the same verse, 8.29. My translation of pāda b, or rather of the whole verse, is tentative.

8.29: Understand *śīro* as standing for the locative (*śīrasi*). I take °*katham* in pāda b as an alternative nominative form of °*kathā* metri causa and as belonging to all the categories here thus: *dyūtakathā*, *bhojanakathā*, *yuddhakathā*, *madyakathā*, *strīkathā*. Understand *me* in pāda d as *mayā*.

8.32: The form *janme* for *janmani* often occurs in Śaiva tantras as a typically Aīśa phenomenon. See XXXXX

8.33: To make sense of pāda d, we are forced to take *śāstra* as a stem form noun and *naraḥ* as a (regular) genitive from *nṛ*. (I thank Judit Törzsök for this interpretation.) Another way of understanding the beginning of this sentence would be to separate *śāstrāneka*° as *śāstrān eka*°, treating the word *śāstra* as masculine.

8.37: Note *tryāyuṣa* in the sense of the three *punḍra*-lines on the forehead and compare with 11.28c. Understand *sthitam* as *sthitāḥ* or rather *sthitāḥ* if we are to connect this line to the next (8.37cd). Grammatical notes on *kṛtam* and *ātmanāḥ*

8.38: It is not clear which story concerning Vīrabhadra is referred to here. Is it the destruction of Dakṣa's sacrifice, after which the gods were relieved? Or, which is a less likely possibility, another in which Kaśyapa and other Ṛṣis were burnt to ashes then reanimated by Vīrabhadra in the Śokara forest? For the latter, less well-known story, see Padmapurāṇa 5.107.1–14ff:

śucismitovāca

kaśyapaṃ jamadagniṃ ca devānāṃ ca purā katham |

rarakṣa bhasma tad brahman samācakṣva mune mama ||1
dadhīca uvāca
kaśyapādīyutā devāḥ pūrvam abhyāgaman girim —
śokaram nāma vikhyātāṃ girimadhye suśobhanam ||2
nānāvihāṃgasamkīrṇaṃ nānāmunigaṇāśrayam |
vāsudevāśrayaṃ ramyaṃ apsarogaṇasevitam ||3
vicitravṛkṣasaṃvītaṃ sarvartukusumojjvalam —
tathāvidhaṃ praviśyaite giriṃ vyaṃ athāpare ||4
stuvantaḥ keśavaṃ tatra gatāḥ sma giriśeśvaram —
dṛṣtvā tatra mahājvalāṃ praviṣṭāśca vyaṃ ca tām ||5
māmekam tu tīraskṛtya hy adahad devatā munīn —
māṃ dadāha tataḥ paścād bhasmībhūtā vyaṃ śubhe ||6
asmān etādṛśān dṛṣtvā vīrabhadraḥ pratāpavān |
kenāpikāraṇenāsau gataṃ parvataṃ ca tam ||7
bhasmoddhūlitasarvāṃgo mastakasthaśivaḥ śuciḥ —
ekākī niḥsṛjāḥ śānto hāḥāśabdāṃ athāśṛṇot ||8
atha cīmtāparaś cāśīn mriyamāṇa śavadhvaniḥ |
śavānāṃ iva gaṇdhaś ca dṛśyate tannirīkṣaṇe ||9
iti niścītya manasā jagāmāgnīm atiprabham —
sa vahnir vīrabhadraṃ ca dagdhum ārabdhavān atha ||10
tṛṇāgnir iva śānto 'bhūd āśādyā salilāṃ yathā |
tato 'paraṃ mahājvalāṃ vīrabhadraḥ tu dṛṣṭavān ||11
khaṃ gacchamāṇaṃ mahākālo jvalāṃ nīpatitāṃ api —
manasā cīmtayac cāpi vīrabhadraḥ pratāpavān ||12
sarveṣāṃ nāśīnī jvalā prāṇināṃ śatakotīśaḥ |
tat sarvaṃ rakṣaṇārthaṃ hi pipāsuś cāpy ahaṃ tv imāṃ ||13
prāśnāmi mahatīm jvalāṃ salilāṃ tṛṣṭito yathā |
etasmīnn āptare vīraṃ vāg āha cāśarīriṇī ||14
 “Śucismitā said:

1. O brāhmaṇa, O sage, tell me how formerly the sacred ash protected Kaśyapa, Jamadagni of the gods? Dadhīca said:

2–6. Formerly gods accompanied by Kaśyapa and others went to a well-known mountain named Śokara. In the middle of the mountain was a very beautiful (forest) which was full of many birds, which was resorted to by various hosts of sages, which was the resort of Vāsudeva, which was charming, which was resorted to by bevy of celestial nymphs, which was crowded with strange trees, which was bright with flowers of all seasons. We and others entered the best mountain (forest) like that and praising Viṣṇu went there to lord Śiva. We saw a great flame there and we entered it. Excepting me that deity (i.e. that flame) burnt (other) sages. After that it (also) burnt me. O auspicious one, we were reduced to ash.

7–14. Seeing us like this, that brave Vīrabhadra went to that mountain for some reason. With his entire body smeared with sacred ash, he remaining at the top, auspicious and pure, all alone, desireless and tranquil, heard the sound of wailing. Then he was full of thought: ‘The sound of the bodies of dead men and the smell as it were of dead bodies, are being perceived.’ Deciding like

this in his mind, he went to the fire of great brilliance. Then that fire also started to burn Vīrabhadra. But it went out as the fire of (i.e. burning) grass (i.e. hay) would go out on receiving (i.e. being sprinkled over with) water. Then Vīrabhadra saw a great, mighty flame, which went (up) to the sky even (like) flame falling (i.e. dropped by) Śiva (obscure!). The brave Vīrabhadra thought in his mind: ‘(This) flame is the destroyer of hundreds of crores of beings. So for the protection of all I desire to drink it. As a thirsty man drinks water, I shall consume this great flame.’ In the meanwhile a divine voice said to (Vīrabhadra) the hero [...] (translation by N.A. Deshpande, in: Padma-purāṇa, Delhi: MLBD, 1951)” One could simply accept the reading of msCc(°*hetunā*) in pāda d, but all other rejected readings hint at an original *hetutaḥ* (as pointed out by Judit Törzsök).

8.40: The reading *vidham* in pāda b seems to be the lectio difficilior as opposed to the rejected *vidhivat*. The Ṛgvedic mantra starting with *āpo hi śthā* (RV 10.9) is traditionally associated with *mārjana* (‘cleaning, wiping’). According to Kane (A History of Dharmaśāstra, vol. 4, p. 120), a Brahmin “should bathe thrice in the day, should perform *mārjana* (splashing or sprinkling water on the head and other limbs by means of *kuśas* dipped in water after repeating sacred mantras) with the three verses ‘apo hi sthā’ [sic] (Ṛg. X.9.1–3) [...]” This suggests a method of bathing that is more of a ritual than an actual bath. This version of bathing seems to be rather a kind of bathing in the holy dust raising from under the hooves of cows.

8.44: Understand *sarvalokānukampya* in pāda b as *sarvalokān anukampya*. Understand *sakalamalapahārī* in pāda c as *sakala-mala-apahārī*, which would be unmetrical. Understand *etan/etad* as either picking up °*pahārī* or a plural corresponding to °*pañcāśad*. I have included the element *trai*° in the lemma in pādas ab only because msCc has a slightly unusual ligature there (*mtrai*) Understand *adhogatis* in pāda c as a bahuvrīhi in plural (*adhogatayas*).

9.19: °*mahiṣyāś* seems to be an equivalent of °*mahiṣāś* metri causa. Understand °*pūtī* in pāda a as standing for °*pūti* metri causa, and note that °*amedhya*° in the same pāda is an emendation. Read *āmayārāsa* in pāda c?

10.8: Note *bindusāraṃ* for *bindusaras*/°*saraṃ*/°*sarasam* metri causa. Is perhaps *pūrvavat* used in the sense of *pūrvam* here? There seems to be only two yogic tunnel here (and in 10.20–21): Suṣumṇā and Idā, instead of the usual three (Idā, Piṅgalā, Suṣumṇā). This is strikingly similar to what we see in the archaic yoga of the Nīśvāsa Naya, see Goodall et al. pp. 33–34.

Note Ed’s attempt to make pāda a metrical, but also note how some similar passages in other texts have the same hypermetrical reading as all our manuscripts; MBh Indices 6.3A.41–44:

idā bhagavatī gaṅgā piṅgalā yamunā nadī —
tayor madhye tṛtīyā tu tat prayāgam anusmaret ||
idā vai vaiṣṇavī nādī brahmanādī tu piṅgalā —
suṣumṇā caīśvarī nādī tridhā prāṇavahā smṛtā —

See also *Haṭhayogapradīpikā* 3.110:

idā bhagavatī gaṅgā piṅgalā yamunā nadī —

iḍāpiṅgalayor madhye bālaraṇḍā ca kuṇḍalī || **10.23:** *hṛdi* might be meant to be a nominative, as in 12.17, here compounded with *madhyastham*. Understand *mānasasara°* in pāda a as *mānasasaro* (metri causa). Note *hṛdi* as a nominative in pāda c and possibly also in pāda d (and see 10.23a).

10.30: Note that **kaṇṭhōra* is a conjecture based on the context: this line probably talks about sounds and the production of sounds. For this *uraḥ/ura* (‘chest’) seems better than *ūru* (‘thigh’). *alpakleśa -m- anāyāsa* (sandhi bridge)

11.3: Understand *dayā* as instrumental: *tava dayayā bhūteṣu na tulyaṃ paśyāmi*. Context: Viśvarūpa was a son of Tvaṣṭṛ. Viśvarūpa’s heads were struck off by Indra. In the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, Indra’s sin are distributed among the ground, water, trees and women.

11.15: Or emend to *°indhana-samuḥjvālā°*, where *°samuḥjvālā°* is metri causa for *°samuḥjvala°*?

11.17: Understand: *dhāraṇām adhvaryuvat kṛtvā* (*dhāraṇā* is a stem form noun). Understand: *padam śāśvatam* (*pada* is a stem form noun metri causa).

11.22: On the *guṇātīta* state of mind, see 9.39–43. Understand *guṇātītatvaṃ* and *niraṇjanatvaṃ*? *hāvana* = *havana* metri causa

11.37: *°mṛgākūla* for *°mṛgākulaḥ* metri causa? Or: [For him] the gist of the Śāstras is friendship[?], self-control, compassion etc.

11.40: *pūrṇa-m-itihāsa°*: *-m-* is a filler. The Śivasamkalpa is R̥gvedakhila 4.11 ff: *yenedam bhūtaṃ bhuvanaṃ bhaviṣyat pariḥhītam amṛtena sarvaṃ*, *yena yajñas tāyate saptahotā tan me manaś śivasamkalpam astu*, etc. See also Manu 11.251ab: *sakṛt japtvāsyavāmīyaṃ śivasamkalpam eva ca*. Gender!

11.43: *msNa* only corrects *°haraṇamanitya°* to *°haraṇam anitya°* (CHECK this), but its scribe probably meant an *anusvāra* at the end of *°haraṇam*, perhaps trying to correct the metre. He tries to correct the metre also with *anityaharaṇam tajñā°*. The fourth line of this verse could be Naraharinātha’s invention.

11.49: Check if *saṃyama* is a technical term here. *tridaṇḍa* = the three staves of the Parivrajaka MMW, check. Olivelle p. 173: “There are numerous scriptural passages cited by the Vaisnavas that prescribe the carrying of a triple staff—that is, three bamboos tied together—by renunciators.” *°kṣaram avyayam* would be unmetrical, so the nominative is used here.

11.57: Buddhist terms. *vihita* here in the sense of ‘devoid’.