

An Interpretation of *Baudhāyana-dharmasūtra* 2, 11, 26

Ryutaro TSUCHIDA

1

In an article entitled “The Buddha’s Book of Genesis,” which appeared in a special issue of the *Indo-Iranian Journal* in honor of Prof. K.R. Norman (*IJ* 35 [1992] : 159–178), Prof. Richard Gombrich takes up the *Agāññasutta* found in the Pāli canon, and sets forth several interesting ideas concerning the construction and background of that Sutta.

The most important point of Gombrich’s study is that the Buddhist Sutta alludes to particular Brahmanical scriptures at crucial points, which are used effectively by the Sutta author for the parodistic purpose of rendering ridiculous the Brahmin claim to superiority. One such Brahmanical passage that Gombrich suggests is used by the *AS* author in this way is *Baudhāyana-dharmasūtra* 2, 11, 16–26.¹⁾ This Baudhāyana passage has several expressions in common with *AS* 22 and shows some parallelism to it, even with regard to general contents.²⁾ For example, in the corresponding section in the *AS* we find ancient Brahmins who led a pure life as ascetics devoted to meditation, before degenerating into mere professional reciters of Vedic texts. The passage in the *BDhS* consists of several rules pertaining to the life of the wandering ascetic (*parivrājaka*). In Baudhāyana’s scheme, this description of *parivrājaka* life forms part of a comprehensive representation of the so-called *āśramas*, found in *BDhS* 2, 11, 9–26.³⁾ Gombrich calls special attention to *BDhS* 2, 11, 26, where Baudhāyana

appears to conclude his description of the *parivrājaka-āśrama*. The text of this sūtra, which I quote with Bühler's translation, runs as follows :

apavidhya vaidikāni karmāny ubhayataḥ paricchinnā madhyamaṃ padaṃ saṃśliṣyamaha iti vadantaḥ (*BDhS* 2, 11, 26).⁴⁾

[Ascetics shall] say, "Renouncing the works taught in the Veda, cut off from both [worlds], we attach ourselves to the central sphere (Brahman)" (Bühler 1882, p. 260).

With regard to the sūtra which I have just quoted, Gombrich makes the following statement : "There are so many points of interest in the Baudhāyana passage [i. e., *BDhS* 2, 11, 16-26] that it would deserve an article to itself; he [Baudhāyana] goes on to say in sūtra 26 that the ascetics he is describing reject Vedic rites and say that they are adhering to the middle path, delimited to both sides....., which sounds like an allusion to the Buddhists, even if the passage as a whole may be giving a more composite picture. (There are also variant readings to consider.)"⁵⁾ In a more recent article, entitled "Why is a *khattiya* called *khattiya*?—The *Agāñña Sutta* Revisited," Gombrich again says that "the brahmanical text [i. e., *BDhS*] shows awareness of Buddhists."⁶⁾ Judging from these statements, Gombrich obviously regards the contents of the above-cited sūtra to be expressing the inner spiritual state of Buddhist monks, who share not a few characteristics with the Brahmanical renunciators.

If Gombrich is right, then the sūtra should be treated as hitherto unnoticed testimony that a Dharmasūtra author was already acquainted with Buddhism. This valuable evidence could then be used to help in further elucidating chronological and other important problems concerning the relationship between Buddhism and Brahmanism. Even if, on the contrary, the sūtra does not contain any of the Buddhist elements assumed by Gombrich, the question still remains as to the exact identity and character of the renunciators dealt with by Baudhāyana. In either case *BDhS* 2, 11, 26 deserves more detailed investigation. In the present article I would like to reexamine Gombrich's ideas, and propose my own interpretation of the

sūtra by analyzing the text from various viewpoints.

2

BDhS 2, 11, 26 contains statements by a certain class of renouncers about their own condition. What they say about themselves amounts to two points : (1) they have already abandoned Vedic rites (literally: Vedic activities), and (2) they are cut off from both sides and now attach themselves to the middle state. The first point, i. e., the abandonment of Vedic rites, applies perfectly to the lifestyle of Buddhist monks, who are prohibited from performing any kind of sacrificial rites. As for the second point, the expression “middle state” reminds us almost automatically of the important Buddhist principle of the “middle path.” Obviously it is just this expression (*madhyamaṃ padam*) that induced Gombrich to regard the sūtra as alluding to Buddhists.

The Pāli designation for the middle path attested to in a good number of canonical passages is “*majjhimā paṭipadā*.” The most important passage in which the term *majjhimā paṭipadā* occurs is no doubt *Mahāvagga* 1, 6, 17. This Vinaya passage makes up the opening part of the Buddha’s famous sermon, shortly after his attaining enlightenment, delivered to a group of five former coascetics, who then become his first disciples. Here the Buddha first refers to indulgence in sense-pleasure and addiction to self-torment as the two extremities to be avoided by monks, and then enjoins his audience to follow the middle course (*majjhimā paṭipadā*), which is free from both extremities. In a subsequent passage, this middle course is identified by the Buddha as no less than the noble eightfold path (*ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo*) itself. Although even in the Pāli canon *majjhimā paṭipadā* acquires various connotations, which sometimes differ according to context,⁷⁾ it generally denotes something — whether a philosophical concept or an ethical standpoint — that takes an intermediate (middle) position between two opposites, transcending both.

In *BDhS* 2, 11, 26, those renouncers who hold fast to the middle position (*madhyamaṃ padam*) are also said to have been cut off from both sides (*ubhayataḥ paricchinnā[h]*). From the context, we may infer that the expression “both sides” means those dualities which must necessarily be overcome by the renouncers, although we cannot specify the particular dualities. So, in the sūtra as such, there does not seem to be any element that can be brought forward as evidence against Gombrich’s supposition that the text alludes to Buddhist renouncers. This, however, does not suffice as definite proof. Several problems still remain to be considered, before we can arrive at a solid conclusion about the renouncers of which the sūtra speaks.

3

As Gombrich briefly remarks at the end of his statement cited above, we are to “consider the variant readings” of the passage contained in the sūtra. So it is now necessary to make a brief survey of as many such readings of the passage as we can gather from various editions and translations of the *BDhS* as are available to us.

The entire text of the *BDhS* has been edited twice by Hultzsch, first in 1884 and again in 1922. To my regret, Hultzsch’s first edition is not available to me, and I am therefore not able to give an exact account of the materials used by him in the preparation of that edition. However, from a certain remark Hultzsch makes in the introduction to his second edition, it appears that he had at least three MSS (designated M, D, K) at his disposal when he edited the text of the *BDhS* for the first time.⁸⁷ Of these, the most important is an old MS in grantha-script, designated as M, which served him constantly as the basis of both the first and second editions. In preparing the second edition, he consulted seven other MSS (B, S, N, P, H, G, Cs), and one modern edition (Cm).⁸⁷ Among these additional materials, both Cs and Cm are furnished with a commentary

by Govindasvāmin, called the *Bodhāyanadharmavivaraṇa*.

The publication of Bühler's English translation of the *BDhS* took place in 1882, and so precedes that of Hultzsch's first edition. This translation is not based on any printed edition but on six MSS of the sūtra text and two copies of Govindasvāmin's commentary. Bühler divides these materials into two groups: northern (D, P, B, Bh, K), and southern (M, CI, CT). He then further divides the MSS belonging to the northern group into two subgroups, separating out K, which can be distinguished in some respects from the four other MSS. Of the two copies of Govinda's commentary (CI, CT), the former also contains the sūtra text.¹⁰ According to Bühler, M, which is very close to the copy commented on by Govinda, "gives on the whole the best form of the text," and he uses it as the basis of his translation. Nevertheless, in not a few cases he sets aside the readings of M in favor of those offered by the MSS of the northern group. Among the materials of this group, D alone was of real value to him, as P, B, and Bh are undoubtedly dependent on it.¹¹

The materials we have just surveyed show significant divergence with regard to the location of sūtra 2, 11, 26. With the aid of the relevant text-critical notes made by Hultzsch and Bühler, we can, for the purposes of our present study, rearrange their materials into the following three groups, each representing remarkably different treatments of the sūtra.

1. Hultzsch: H, G, Cs, CM

Bühler: CI, DT

Most probably M, which served Hultzsch as the basis of his two editions, can also be classified in this group. As far as our sūtra is concerned, this group represents the text commented on by Govinda, which was adopted by Hultzsch and Bühler as the basis of their respective editions, translation and interpretations. In this group, therefore, the sūtra is located immediately after those dealing with the life of the *parivṛājaka* and has the same reading as that quoted above on p. 182.

2. Bühler: D, P, B, Bh.

Our sūtra is not found in these MSS.

3. Bühler: M, K

Hultzsich: B, S, N, P

One or both of two of the three MSS Hultzsich consulted in preparing his first edition (D, K) also seem to belong to this group. In these MSS, our sūtra is not found in the place it is located in the MSS and the editions belonging to group 1. Instead, in the MSS that comprise this third group, the long passage, which contains our sūtra with only slightly different readings, is located just after the enumeration of the four *āśramas* (2, 11, 12)¹²⁾ and before the subsequent sūtra on *brahmacārin* (2, 11, 13).

Now our indispensable task is to examine the passage that is found only in the MSS of the third group.¹³⁾ It is regrettable that the whole text of the passage is printed only in the appendix to Hultzsich's first edition. In his second edition, he simply refers back to that appendix and then registers the variants of the passage offered by his newly acquired MSS, i. e., N, P, B, S, in his note to sūtra 2, 11, 12. On the other hand, in his note to the sūtra, Bühler gives the full text of the same passage, which he restored by means of M and K. Comparing this text in Bühler with the just-mentioned variants of N, P, B, S given by Hultzsich, we can easily ascertain that the text which the latter presupposes in giving the variants is the same as that in Bühler's note. Bühler's translatory note in which he reproduces the whole passage in question runs as follows:

K. omits this Sūtra [scil. *BDhS* 2, 11, 12]. After it M. and K. have the following passage: "brahmakāriṇo 'tyantam ātmānam upasamgrihyā 'kāryān bruvate vane srāmyantyeke [yāmyete, K.] savaneshvapa upasprisantō vanyenānnaikāgnim [nyenānna naikāgnim, K.; vānyenaikānāñ, M.] guhvānāh [guhvās, M.] satya-syaikē karmāni [karmani, M.] anagnayo 'niketanāh [tvāh kam, K.] kaupīnākkhādanā varshāsv ekasthā uddhṛitaparipūtābhir

adbhiḥ kāryam [apakāryam, M.] kurvānāḥ [kurvānās tatrodāharanti, K.] sannamusale vyaṅgāre nivṛttasārāvasampāte bhikṣantaḥ sarvataḥ parimokṣam [parimeke, M.] apavidhya vaidikāni karmāny abhayataḥ parikkhinnā madhyamam padam upasliṣyāmaha iti vadanto.' The commentary gives a few portions of this passage further on. Irrespective of minor corruptions, it gives no sense in the place where it stands, and it seems probable that we have to deal with a confused and badly corrupted text, which Govinda arranged either as seemed good to him, or on the authority of better MSS. (Bühler 1882, p. 258)

The passage quoted by Bühler in his note to sūtra 12 describes the respective lifestyles of *brahmacārin*, *vānaprastha* and *parivrājaka*. This means that, in the MSS belonging to the third group, we find two different versions of the three *āśramas*, and that version B comes down to us inserted just before the sūtra on *brahmacārin* of version A. According to the Hultsch edition, the latter begins with sūtra 12 and ends with sūtra 25 (or sūtra 26, if we regard it, as do Bühler, Gombrich, and others, as constituting the conclusion of the *parivrājaka* section.)

Examining the two categories of sūtras we notice that the greater part of description B is comprised of phrases and sentences also found in description A, i. e., *savaneṣv apa upasprśanto* (sūtra 15), *kaupīnācchādanā[h]* (19), *varṣāsv ekasthā[h]* (20), *uddhṛtaparipūtābhir adbhiḥ kāryam [apakāryam, M] kurvānāḥ [kurvānās tatrodāharanti, K.]* (25), *sannamusale vyaṅgāre nivṛttasārāvasampāte bhikṣantaḥ* (22), *apavidhya vaidikāni karmāni abhayataḥ paricchinnā madhyamaṃ padam upasliṣyāmaha iti vadanto* (26). On the other hand, in investigating several dharma-works for passages that might possibly throw some light on the formation of version B, we notice a certain textual parallelism between that version and some of Āpastamba's rules for the life of *parivrāja*. In order to examine this parallelism more closely we now place these two passages side-by-side together with the corresponding parts of Bühler's translation of the *ĀpDhS*.

āśrama description found in some MSS of *BDhS* (version B)

anagnayo 'niketanāḥ [tvāḥ kaṃ, K.] kauṣṭhīnacchādāna.....(above p. 186, ll. 1-2 from the bottom)

sarvataḥ parimokṣam [parimeke, M.] (p.187,1.3)

apavidhya vaidikāni karmāṇy abhayataḥ paricchinnā madhyamam padam upaśliṣyāmaha iti vadanto (= *BDhS* 2, 11, 26)

(p. 7, 187, 3-5)

ĀpDhS 2, 9, 21, 10-13)¹⁴⁾

anagnir aniketas syād aśarmāśaraṇo munih.....(10)¹⁵⁾

tasya muktam acchādānaṃ vihitam. (11)

sarvataḥ parimokṣam eke (12)

satyānṛte sukhaduḥkhe vedān imaṃ lokam amuṃ ca parityajyātmānam anvicchet. (13)

He [scil. parivrāja] shall live without a fire, without a house, without pleasures, without protection.....[10]

It is ordained that he shall wear clothes thrown away (by others as useless). [11]

Some declare that he should go naked. [12]

Abandoning truth and falsehood, pleasure and pain, the Vedas, this world and the next, he shall seek the *ātman*. [13] (Bühler 1879, p. 154)

MS M offers the variant “.....*parimeke*” in the second sentence of the just-cited part of version B. Although this variant itself is a corruption, it demonstrates the presence of the quantifier *eke* in the original reading of the sentence. This, therefore, must have been identical with *Āpastamba's* sūtra 12. This sūtra, in which the consensus of some (*eke*) dharma-teachers contemporaneous with *Āpastamba* is quoted, is of only supplementary nature, and presupposes the existence of a precedent sūtra (11), in which a more common rule on the same subject had been laid down. In version B, however, nowhere do we find a sentence corresponding to sūtra 11 by

Āpastamba. This alone is sufficient to rule out the possibility of version B being the source of Āpastamba's sūtras 10–13. Rather, the Āpastamba sūtras — or some unknown text closely related to them — were among the materials used by the author of version B.

At first glances, this state of affairs would induce us to assume that *BDhS* 2, 11, 26, which is virtually the same as the concluding sentence of version B¹⁶), would be interpreted following *ĀpDhS* 2, 9, 21, 13. Based on that, the phrase “*ubhayataḥ paricchinnā[h]*” would be taken as referring to the spiritual state of those ascetics who are liberated from such dualities as exist between truth and falsehood, pleasure and pain, this and the next world; while the expression “*madhyamaṃ padam*” would be understood as denoting the innermost self (*ātman*) to which the same ascetics should adhere. According to this interpretation, the utterances of the renouncers in the sūtra of Baudhāyana belong to the same class of ascetics as do the *parivrāja* dealt with in Āpastamba's sūtras cited just above. I have, however, some reason to doubt this identification, plausible as it appears at first sight.

Firstly, the almost exact verbal coincidence between Āpastamba's sūtras 10 and 12 and their counterparts in B-version is not found between the next Āpastamba sūtra and the sentence identical with *BDhS* 2, 11, 26. In the latter case, the parallelism between the two texts is confined to the sphere of logical structure underlying their contents. Such a state of affairs would hardly have been brought about had Āpastamba's sūtras been the sole source of material of the author of B-version in fabricating the passage now under discussion. Rather, this passage seems to have come into being not only through borrowing from Āpastamba's sūtras but also through the influence of a text unknown to us, in which the renouncers might not necessarily have been represented as the classical type of *parivrājas*.

Secondly, the presence of the quantifier *eke*, already ascertained in the sentence corresponding to Āpastamba's sūtra 12, might provide us with some clue as to how the author of the version B interpreted Āpastamba's

sūtras 12-13. In version B we find this word employed in three different sentences. In the first two instances (see p. 186, ll. 2, 5 from the bottom), it is evident that *eke* (m. pl. nom.), referring to forest-hermits and wandering ascetics respectively, indicates people who fall under the category of a special *āśrama*. On the strength of this analogy we may attribute a similar sense to the third instance of the word in the sentence “*sarvataḥ parimokṣam eke.*” This sentence should then be translated: “Some people [strive to attain] perfect liberation from all [sorts of worldly attachments],” and the subsequent sentence (= *BDhS* 2, 11, 26) should be understood as the saying of those people indicated by *eke*.

When the author of version B incorporated Āpastamba’s sūtra 12 into his own text, he apparently took the word *parimokṣam* — which in the original context of the *ĀpDhS* meant nothing other than the nakedness of *parivrāja*-ascetics prescribed by some (*eke*) dharma-teachers¹⁷⁾ — in the more usual sense of liberation. Consequently, he treated the whole passage in sūtras 12-13 in such a manner, as though it referred to a special group of renouncers different from *parivrājakas*. Such manipulation of Āpastamba’s passage by the author of version B seems to have been motivated by the occurrence of *eke* in Āpastamba’s sūtra 12, on the one hand, and by the analogical relationship between sūtra 13 and the last sentence of his composition, on the other. We might furthermore speculate that this sentence had already existed in a form not essentially different from *BDhS* 2, 11, 26, and the author of version B made use of it as one of his text-materials.

So far our attention on the sūtra has been focused on the last sentence of version B of Baudhāyana’s *āśrama*-description. The same sentence, located at the end of version A, still remains to be examined.

In that version of Baudhāyana’s *āśrama*-description, being the text adopted by Hultsch and translated by Bühler, the sūtra is preceded by a set of precepts for wandering ascetics or “*parivrājaka*” (*BDhS* 2, 11, 16-25). Any scholar who has ever commented on this sūtra including Bühler

and Gombrich apparently took it for granted that the sūtra constitutes the last member of the sūtra-group on *parivrājaka*.¹⁸⁾ This naive presupposition should be called into question on the grounds of a grammatical incongruency found between sūtra 26 and the preceding sentences. For, in sūtras 16–25, in which all nouns and verbs referring to *parivrājaka* appear in the singular, we do not find a single word that can be identified as the subject of the plural verb-forms “*saṃśliṣyāmahe*” and “*vadantaḥ*” in sūtra 26. In other words, the sūtra stands isolated from the context of the *parivrājaka*-passage comprising sūtras 16–25. We need not, therefore, regard the renouncers of sūtra 26 as the same type of ascetics as the *parivrājakas* dealt with in the passage that precedes it. The present condition of the text-materials of the *BDhS* surveyed above (see pp.184–187) makes it almost impossible for us to disentangle the intricate problems including the relationship between the two versions of Baudhāyana’s *āśrama*-description. In the presence of some confusion in B, viewed against the well-ordered representation of A, we are inclined to regard B as mere a clumsy interpolation made by some later scribe into the more original text of A. Indeed, as far as the MSS and the editions of the third group (see p.186) are concerned, B always finds itself inserted into A between sūtra 12 and sūtra 13.

On the other hand, we cannot entirely dismiss B. As even Bühler suggests (see p.187), it is not quite unthinkable that Govinda arranged a preexisting text of B “either as seemed good to him, or on the authority of better MSS”. According to this, B represents a more original version of Baudhāyana’s discourse on the *āśramas* than does A, which acquired its present form only as the result of Govinda’s editorial activities.¹⁹⁾

Be the matter as it may, our texts do not afford any solid basis on which to decide the priority of one version over the other. This problem of priority, however, does not substantially affect our inquiry into the character of the renouncers dealt with in *BDhS* 2, 11, 26. For, whichever the case, our sūtra does not seem to form an integral part of Baudhāyana’s *āśrama*-

description. In view of the considerations made so far, it is far more likely that the sūtra was brought into its present position in both versions from some different context, and that in that original context the sūtra did not necessarily represent the ascetics of *parivrājaka*-type, but possibly a certain distinct group of renouncers whose lifestyle did not fall neatly into any category set up by the *āśrama*-theory.

4

So far we have discussed *BDhS* 2, 11, 26 in respect to its relationship to Baudhāyana's rules on *parivrājaka*. Now that it has become quite probable that the sūtra was only secondarily brought into connection with these rules, there seems to be no other way of gaining insight into the contents of the sūtra than to seek for some clue outside the *parivrājaka*-passage of Baudhāyana.

Crucial to interpreting the sūtra is what we are to make of the expression "*madhyamaṃ padam*" found in it. In several branches of Sanskrit literature we find examples of such adjectives as *madhya*, *madhyama*, *madhyastha*, indicating the attitude of neutrality, indifference or impartiality towards one's neighbours, partners, or environment.²⁰⁾ However, in extant early *dharma*-works, i. e. the Dharmasūtras ascribed to Gautama, Baudhāyana, Āpastamba and Vasiṣṭha, there is no instance where "*madhyamaṃ padam*" or similar expressions are employed in reference to the life of ascetics and renouncers.

Only in a verse of *Manusmṛti*, a work which should probably be dated later than the Dharmasūtras just mentioned, we find the word "*mādhyasthyam*." In this and a subsequent verse, quoted below together with Bühler's translation, Manu deals with the life of a certain class of aged householders:

*maharsipitrdevānāṃ gatvānrṇyaṃ yathāvidhi/
putre sarvaṃ samāsajya vasen mādhyasthyam āśritah||* (Manu-

smṛti 2, 257)

ekāki cintayen nityaṃ vivikte hitam ātmani/

ekāki cintayāno hi paraṃ śreyo 'dhigacchati|| (2, 258)

257. When he has paid, according to the law, his debts to the great sages, to the manes, and to the gods, let him make over everything to his son and dwell (in his house), not caring for any worldly concerns.

258. Alone let him constantly meditate in solitude on that which is salutary for his soul; for he who meditates in solitude attains supreme bliss.

The fourth *adhyāya* of the *MŚm* consists mainly of rules concerning several aspects of the lives of *snātakas* and householders. In the verses just quoted, located in the concluding part of the same *adhyāya*, Manu prescribes a certain kind of renunciatory life for those aged householders who are no longer capable of performing the duties ordained for them as heads of families.

Bühler is not quite correct when he comments on verse 257 that it “describes, as Medhātithi points out, a kind of informal *saṃnyāsa*.” For, according to Medhātithi’s own statement, it is just “another” kind of householder who is dealt with in the verse (*gr̥hasthasyaivedaṃ prakārāntaram ucyate*). What Medhātithi really says about the verse is that it describes a certain type of householder who, after having fulfilled his duties towards great sages, manes and gods, transfers every household-occupation to his adult-son and continues to live in his own house. With the exception of Rāmacandra, who apparently holds the subject of the verse to be a forest-hermit, all the important commentators of the *MŚm* seem to agree with Medhātithi’s assumption that the verse refers to aged householders who still stay in their homes even after they abandon Vedic rites and worldly engagements. For the moment, we have no clear idea of what Medhātithi means by “another kind of householder” (*gr̥hasthasya.....prakārāntaram*). In any case, we cannot bring this type of renouncer into the

strict concept of *grhastha*; nor does he fall into an exact category of one of the other *āśramas*.

Under these circumstances it is particularly noteworthy that Sarvajñānārāyaṇa, a commentator on the *MŚm*, identifies the aged householder described in *MŚm* 4, 257-258 as *Vedasaṃnyāsika*. This term occurs only once in *MŚm*. Namely, in *MŚm* 6, 56, a special class of renouncers are designated as *Vedasaṃnyāsikas*, and in the subsequent verses their mode of life is represented in some detail. Examining the contents of *MŚm* 6, 86, 94-96, the text runs as follows:

*eṣa dharmo 'nuśiṣṭo vo yatnāṃ niyatātmanām/
vedasaṃnyāsikanāṃ tu karmayogaṃ nibodhata||* (*MŚm* 6, 86)

*daśalakṣaṇakaṃ dharmam anuśiṣṭhan samāhitah/
vedāntaṃ vidhivoc chrutvā saṃnyased anr̥ṇo dvijaḥ||* (6, 94)

*saṃnyasya sarvakarmāṇi karmadoṣaṃ apānudan/
niyato vedam abhyasya putraiśvare sukhaṃ vaset||* (6, 95)

*evam saṃnyasya karmāṇi svakāryaparamo 'sṛhah/
saṃnyāsenāpahatyainah prāpnoti paramāṃ gatim||* (6, 96)

86. Thus the law (valid) for self-restrained ascetics has been explained to you; now listen to the (particular) duties of those who give up (the rites prescribed by) the Veda.

94. A twice-born man who, with collected mind, follows the tenfold law and has paid his (three) debts, may, after learning the Vedānta according to the prescribed rule, become an ascetic.

95. Having given up (the performance of) all rites, throwing off the guilt of his (sinful) acts, subduing his organs and having studied the Veda, he may live at his ease under the protection of his son.

96. He who has thus given up (the performance of all rites, who is solely intent on his own (particular) object, (and) free from desires, destroys his guilt by his renunciation and obtains the

highest state. (Bühler pp. 214-216)

According to the verses just quoted a *Vedasaṃnyāsika* is an old man who is no longer indebted to any kind of being and who, after abandoning the obligatory activities of a householder, lives in comfort under the authority and protection of his son. So far what *MŚm* 6, 86, 94-96 says about the life of a *Vedasaṃnyāsika* coincides with the contents of *MŚm* 4, 257-258. There is no doubt that both of these groups of verses have as their subject the same class of renunciators called *Vedasaṃnyāsikas*.²¹⁾

As for the religious practices connected with the life of a *Vedasaṃnyāsika*, *MŚm* 4, 257-258 refers only to meditation, without listing any other concrete activity. *MŚm* 6, 86, 94-96, on the other hand, provides somewhat more detailed information, consisting of the study of Veda, including the Upaniṣad-s (*Vedānta*), and the cultivation of ten items of inner morality designated collectively as *daśalakṣaṇaka-dharma*.²²⁾

According to Manu, however, the *Vedasaṃnyāsika* is not the sole cultivator of *daśalakṣaṇaka-dharma*. For the cultivation of these ten items of morality, a list of which appears in verse 6, 92, is enjoined in the verse that precedes it on all the twice-born men belonging to any of the four life-stages (*āśrama*); and the verse that follows it further says that Brahmins who study and observe the tenfold *dharma* attain to the highest state (*paramā gati*). Almost the same list of ten items is given by Yājñavalkya in one of the verses in which he lays out rules for the life of a *yogin*.²³⁾ In this verse (*YSm* 3, 66) these items are collectively called *sarva-dharma*, because, as the foregoing verse suggests,²⁴⁾ they are to be practised by everyone without regard to the *āśrama* to which one belongs.

We can gather a number of passages from the Dharmasūtras as well as the *Mbh* which contain enumerations of moral virtues similar to those described by Manu and Yājñavalkya. Some of the ideas underlying these passages seem to have been developed by a special group of Brahmanical thinkers who maintained a critical attitude towards the then prevailing *āśrama*-theory. At any rate, these passages deserve careful and comprehen-

sive study, which must be reserved for another opportunity. For the present, I only suggest that in some of the said passages the emphasis on inner morality has been brought into connection with the reaffirmation of the householder-life, and the outer criteria of renunciatory *āśramas* are rendered relatively unimportant as inner morality becomes the essential means of attaining liberation.

It is just this ideal process that we detect in the background of Manu's verses now under consideration, where the verses that precede the exposition of the tenfold dharma, i. e., *MŚm* 6, 87-90, are almost entirely dedicated to the glorification of the *gṛhastha-āśrama*. These verses first enumerate the four orders of life (*āśrama*) (6, 87 ab), and then exalt the order of householder (*gṛhastha*) above the other three (89 c). The arguments for the superiority of the *gṛhastha* advocated by Manu are that those belonging to the other three *āśramas* inevitably need the support of the *gṛhastha* for the maintenance of their own lives (89 d), and each of the three other *āśramas* springs from the householder (87 cd) and culminates in it (90).

Traditionally, the life of the *Vedasaṃnyāsika* had not attracted the attention due to it by experts on the Dharmaśāstra; if touched upon at all, it was done only incidentally.²⁵⁾ The first scholar to notice the importance of this institution, and throw ample light on it was Prof. Patrick Olivelle. The present article owes quite a lot to his penetrating investigation of the relevant passages. As Olivelle correctly points out, the *Vedasaṃnyāsika* appears in *MŚm* as "retired householder who aspires to holiness without resorting" to the houseless life of *yati* and *vānaprastha*.²⁶⁾ It then follows that the householder eulogy in *MŚm* 6, 87-90 is by no means an interpolation haphazardly placed within the description of the *Vedasaṃnyāsika* by a redactor, but stands in close and intrinsic connection with the ideal of this special type of renouncer. So according to *MŚm*, at least, the life of the *Vedasaṃnyāsika* represents an institution designed for those twice-born males who, in their conviction of the indispensability

and the superiority of householder-life, wish to retain some aspects of householder even after retirement from ritual and worldly activities.²⁷⁾ Thus Olivelle suggests, it is an institution that permits a person to remain a householder all his life.²⁸⁾ This essential character of the *Vedasamnyāsika* should always be borne in mind when examining references to the same institution in texts other than *MŚm*.

In the *YSm*, just after a long discourse on the paths leading to final liberation, we find the following verse, based on Vijñāneśvara and some other commentators:

*athavāpy abhyasan vedam nyastakarmā vane vasan/
ayācitāśi mitabhuk parām siddhiṃ avāpnuyāt||* (*YSm* 3, 195)

Olivelle is not far off the mark when he remarks that Yājñavalkya here refers to a state similar to that which is described in *MŚm* 4, 257–258.²⁹⁾ Vijñāneśvara's reading of the second *pāda*, "*vane vasan*," is adopted by Losch in his edition and still followed by Olivelle. For this reading we find the variant "*.....sute vasan*" in the text commented on by Viśvarūpa. This variant found in the oldest extant *YSm*-commentary, no doubt represents the original reading. We can, therefore, translate the whole verse as follows:

Or even a man who has abandoned his [Vedic] rites, is moderate in eating the food which he gets unasked, and lives under the care of his own son studying the Veda can attain to the highest perfection.

It is certain that the type of recluse here referred to by Yājñavalkya is the same as that which Manu calls *Vedasamnyāsika*. Immediately following the above verse is one in which Yājñavalkya describes the ideal life of householder.

*nyāyārjitadhanas tattvajñānaniṣṭho 'tithipriyaḥ/
śrāddhakṛt satyavādī ca gr̥hastho 'pi vimucyate||* (*YSm* 3, 196)

Even a householder attains liberation, if he earns his property by just means, devotes himself to the [highest] truth and entertains

his guests with pleasure, if he [regularly] offers oblations to his ancestors and speaks only truth.

These two verses, which are complementary to each other in content, appear to have been arranged together with the intention of conveying the idea that those pious householders — who fulfill their religious and social duties with honesty and in devotion to the truth and whose last years are passed as a *Vedasamnyāsika* — can attain to final liberation without resorting to the homeless lifestyles of forest-hermit and wandering ascetics.⁸⁰⁾

We now return to *BDhS* 2, 11, 26 in order to reconsider its contents in light of these new observations. This sūtra, as long as it is viewed apart, remains ambiguous with respect to the exact identity of the recluses referred to in it. We can rid ourselves of these ambiguities by placing the sūtra alongside the above-cited passages of Manu and Yājñavalkya. The first part of the sentence put into the mouths of the recluses, “*apavidhya vaidikāni karmāni*” obviously indicates the same act of renunciation expressed in *MSm* 6, 95 a, 96 a as “*saṃnyasya sarvakarmāni*” and “*evaṃ saṃnyasya karmāni*” respectively. The remainder of the same sentence, “*ubhayataḥ paricchinnā madhyamaṃ paḍaṃ saṃśliṣyāmahe*” corresponds to “*madhyamaṃ paḍam āśritaḥ*” in *MSm* 4, 257 d.

In view of these correspondences, there is no need at all for us to suppose a non-Brahmanical background for the contents of *BDhS* 2, 11, 26. We may further assume that the type of recluse dealt with in the sūtra is identical to the one described in the above-quoted passages by Manu and Yājñavalkya, and given in *MSm* 6, 86, namely, the special designation of *Vedasamnyāsika*. This identification has the virtue of laying claim to much higher degree of probability or persuasiveness than does the one suggested by Gombrich. A reference to *Vedasamnyāsikas* can find its way far more easily into a Brahmanical dharma-text than any allusion to Buddhist mendicants.

We have so far left unanswered the question regarding the exact meaning of “*madhyamaṃ padam*” in Baudhāyana’s sūtra. We can hardly hope to give any definite answer to this question, because the context provides us no clue concerning the connection between “both sides” (*ubhayataḥ*) and the “the middle position”, which is juxtaposed to those sides in the same sentence.

According to Govindasvāmin, the middle position denotes the innermost self,³¹ Bühler translates it as “the central sphere (Brahman).” Such interpretations are problematic, unless we come across an unmistakable instance of *madhya* or other semantically related words qualifying or signifying *brahman-ātman*. As for the parallel “*mādhyasthyam*,” the interpretations made by commentators on, as well as modern translators to, *MSm* do not differ essentially from one another. They are all inclined, more or less, to regard the word as signifying the inner state of mind of the renouncer, i. e., his unselfishness, his detachment from sensory objects or his indifference towards worldly affairs.

The considerations made above on the life of *Vedasaṃnyāsika* rather points to quite a different understanding of the “*madhyamaṃ padam*” and “*mādhyasthyam*.” Both expressions seem to me to be derived from a certain character of neutrality which adheres to the position of the *Vedasaṃnyāsika* as opposed to several different lifestyles of the twice-born males. As we have already observed, a *Vedasaṃnyāsika* is neither a householder in the narrowest sense nor a homeless renouncer. He has, on the one hand, withdrawn once and for all from the activities pertaining to a householder; on the other hand, he has not entirely cut off his connection with his household, but still remains under the care of his son, thus retaining some aspect of householder. This attitude of neutrality should be ascribed to neither his indecisiveness nor his indolence, but rather to his firm reso-

lution to terminate his own life to no other status than that of ex-householder. From the verb “*saṃśliṣyāmahe*” by which the *Vedaśaṃnyāsikas* express their total and decisive adherence to “the middle position,” we might infer a strong confidence in the superiority of this chosen lifestyle over the other modes of renunciation.

As a consequence of all these considerations, I would like to propose the following interpretation of *BDhS* 2, 11, 26:

[There is a class of retired householders] who say, “Throwing off the activities [prescribed] in the Veda, being cut off from both [i. e., the status of active householder and that of homeless renouncer] we attach ourselves entirely to the middle position [of *Vedaśaṃnyāsika*].”

6

The sūtra following *BDhS* 2, 11, 26 runs:

aikāśramyaṃ tu ācāryā aprājananatvād itareṣāṃ (BDhS 2, 11, 27)

But [according to our] teachers, there is only one [true] order [of householder], because the other [three] orders do not beget offspring.

Here Baudhāyana comes out against the theory of four *āśramas*. He asserts the indispensability of householder-life which, according to his opinion and those of his teachers, is the sole genuine *āśrama*; the other three *āśramas* are rejected because they do not fulfil the duty of begetting progeny.

A general survey of sūtras 28-34, with which Baudhāyana concludes *khaṇḍa* 11, should suffice to recognize that this sūtra-group is a patchwork made from several different sources. In sūtra 28 Baudhāyana relates the story of how Kapila Prahlādi invented the four orders during his conflict with the gods. Baudhāyana cites this story about the origin of the *āśrama*-

theory only to refute it in the next sūtra (29) because it lacks Vedic authority. Sūtras 30–31, and 32 have already been noted as citations from *TBr* 3, 12, 9, 7 and *RV* 10, 71, 9, respectively, while sūtra 29 alludes to *TS* 5, 7, 2, 3. Further we find sūtra 34 in *ĀpDhS* 2, 9, 24, 8.

Obviously some larger collection of heterogeneous text-materials related to the theme of householder-life and its superiority were at Baudhāyana's disposal. When composing sūtras 28–34, he had only to select some verses and prose-sentences from this collection, to support and supplement the idea he expresses in sūtra 27. We need not regard this collection to have existed in a fixed literary form; perhaps it consisted of a loose series of shorter texts on the topic of the *gārhashthya* which Baudhāyana had learned by heart.

We have already observed that the life of the *Vedasamnyāsika* — who, as Olivelle rightly remarks, is essentially a retired householder — is closely associated with the idea of the indispensability and superiority of householder-life. On the grounds of this observation, we can go so far as to assume that sūtra 26 originally belonged to the said collection of texts which served Baudhāyana in composing sūtras 28–34. On this assumption, sūtra 26 should originally have been located not before sūtra 27 but somewhere among sūtras 28–34. How and by whom was this misplacement of sūtra 26 brought about? Should it be attributed to Baudhāyana himself or to the error of some later redactor? We cannot give any satisfactory answer to these questions. At any rate, it can hardly be looked upon as mere accident that *BDhS* 2, 11, 26 stands in close proximity to that sūtra-group which glorifies householder-life.

7

In our investigation of *BDhS* 2, 11, 26 we cannot leave out the following sūtra, in which the term “*Vedasamnyāsīn*” occurs:

evam evaiṣa ā śarīravimokṣaṇād vṛkṣamūliko Vedasamnyāsī ||

(*BDhS* 2, 18, 24)

Bühler proposes to read this puzzling *sūtra* as “..... *vr̥kṣamūlika* *ṽVedasamnyāsī*,”³²⁾ while Olivelle simply remarks that the meaning of *Vedasamnyāsīn* is far from clear.³³⁾³⁴⁾

The whole section of *BDhS* 2, 18, in which the just-cited *sūtra* appears is devoted to the presentation of various rules relevant to the life of wandering ascetics. This gives us the impression that *Vedasamnyāsīn* is a term designating a certain subgroup of wandering ascetics. Indeed, its qualifying adjective *vr̥kṣamūlika* fits quite well into the established image of the wandering ascetic, who, according to several passages in Brahmanical law-books, is prescribed to make his abode at the roots of a tree.³⁵⁾ In Buddhist sources, also, we come across the Sanskrit word *vr̥kṣamūlika* or its Pāli equivalent *rukhamūlika* specifying the roots of a tree as one of the residing-places for mendicants.³⁶⁾

As for the present instance, however, careful examination of the context suggests that it is improbable that the word *vr̥kṣamūlika* was used in the literal sense. That the term should rather be construed only in a figurative sense can be discerned from the contents of the subsequent *sūtra*. Namely in *sūtra* 25 the entire corpus of the Veda is compared to a tree, where *praṇava*, i. e., the sacred syllable *om*, represents the root and essence:

*vedo vr̥kṣaḥ/tasya mūlaṃ praṇavaḥ/
praṇavātmako Vedah||* (*BDhS* 2, 18, 25)

Most probably, in *sūtra* 24 *vr̥kṣamūlika* denotes one who dedicates himself entirely to the recitation of, or the meditation on, the syllable *om*, representing eternal *brahman* itself.

The words “*evam eva*,” with which this *sūtra* begins, no doubt point to the purport of the preceding *sūtra*. *Sūtra* 23 emphasizes the infinity of *brahman* in contrast to *R̥g-*, *Sāma-* and *Yajurveda*, which are all limited in size, and then identifies *brahman* as *pratigara*, which is nothing other than the sacred syllable *om* to be uttered by the *adhvaryu*-priest in re-

sponse to the *cāturhotramantra* of the *hotṛ*-priest on a certain occasion in the twelve-day *soma*-rite. It is just this identity established between *brahman* and the *om*-syllable that is introduced into the immediately following *sūtra* by the expression "*evam eva*."

We, therefore, interpret *BDhS* 2, 18, 24 in the following manner:

For this very reason [i. e., that the sacred syllable *om* is identical to the infinite *brahman*], the *Vedasaṃnyāsin* lives as one who [recites or meditates on the *om*-syllable, which] is the root of the *Veda*-tree, until he is liberated from his body.

Govindasvāmin is certainly right when in commenting on *sūtra* 24, he identifies the *vr̥kṣamūlika-Vedasaṃnyāsin* as the *Vedasaṃnyāsika* whose life is dealt with in the above-cited *MSm*-verses. He even quotes *MSm* 6, 86 cd verbatim in the same note.

Discourse on the topic of the syllable *om* goes on in the remaining two *sūtras* of *khaṇḍa* 18. In *sūtra* 26, the meditation on *praṇava* as the means of realizing a unification with *brahman* is enjoined on the authority of god *Prajāpati*. In *sūtra* 27, the formula of *vyāhṛtis* is represented as the cleaning material for the vessel of *brahman*. Thus, *sūtras* 23-27, which constitute the concluding part of *khaṇḍa* 18, turn out to be a short treatise on *praṇava* appended to a general exposition of the life of wandering ascetics. This addition seems to have been occasioned by the contents of *sūtra* 22, where reference is made to the *svādhyāya* (Vedic recitation) of wandering ascetics. For these ascetics, too, *praṇava*-recitation must have constituted an indispensable part of daily religious practice.

Considering the nature of the *om*-syllable as the mystic essence of the whole *Veda*, we can safely assume that *Vedasaṃnyāsikas*, whose most important religious activity consists simply in the recitation of the *Veda*, include people who devote themselves almost exclusively to the recitation or the murmur of that holy syllable. For this reason, they too deserve to be called *vr̥kṣamūlikas* in the same sense as the term is used in *sūtra* 24.

Viewed against this background, the mention of *Vedasaṃnyāsin* in

sūtra 24 proves to be only incidental in nature. The enhancement of *Vedasamnyāsin* was certainly not the main objective of the author who composed the treatise on *prāṇava*. He refers to *Vedasamnyāsin* only as an example of those renouncers who strive to attain to the highest bliss by reciting the *prāṇava* and meditating on *brahman* embodied in the syllable.

Although *Vedasamnyāsikas* are only scantily represented in the extant Sanskrit literature,³⁷⁾ I have reason to believe that this type of renouncer made no small contribution to the evolution of Brahmanical theology. Discussion on several important but still unresolved problems about the life of this retired householder does not fall within the scope of the present study.³⁸⁾ As the matter stands, we must be content with the observation that the same type of renouncer as Manu calls *Vedasamnyāsika* is also spoken of in two different places of the Dharmasūtra ascribed to Baudhāyana.

NOTES

1 Cf. Gombrich 1992, pp. 172–174.

2 Gombrich refers also to *MSm* 6, 56 as the passage which stands parallel to both *BDhS* 2, 11, 16–22 and *AS* 22. See Gombrich 1992, pp. 173–174.

We can hardly say anything definite about the chronological and text-historical relationship between these three passages. It is, however, most unlikely, as Gombrich implies, that Baudhāyana or Manu stand in any kind of dependence on the Buddhist Sutta.

As Gombrich suspects, the ideal life of the ancient, still undegenerate Brahmins described in *AS* 22 does not represent a real historical phenomenon. Obviously it is merely the fictitious product of the Sutta-author. In that passage he manages to combine two originally different types of ascetics who receive separate treatment in Brahmanical literature. These two types, which — quite roughly speaking — correspond to *vānaprasthas* and *parivrājakas*, consist of hermits living in leaf huts (*pañṇakuṭis*) on the one hand, and

homeless renunciators subsisting on alms, on the other. Most probably the AS-author and Baudhāyana independently drew upon some older Brahmanical source no longer available to us.

- 3 In *BDhS* 2, 11, 9–34, where Baudhāyana undoubtedly deals with the *āśrama*-theory, the term *āśrama* is nowhere to be found, except for the word “*aikāśrama*” in sūtra 27. Further, the expressions “*etasya dharmasya caturdhā bhedam*” (sūtra 9) and “*catvāraḥ pathayo devayānā[h]*” (sūtra 11) both might possibly correspond to the four *āśramas*. For a general discussion on Baudhāyana’s treatment of the *āśrama*-theory as well as his critical attitude against it, Cf. Olivelle 1993, pp. 86–91.

- 4 The quotation is taken from Hultsch’s edition.

In Cinnaśwami Śāstri’s edition of the *BDhS* with Govindasvāmin’s commentary we find exactly the same text of the sūtra, numbered as *BDhS* 2, 6, 11, 28. No variant to this sūtra is given.

- 5 Gombrich 1992, p. 173.

- 6 Gombrich 1992², p. 214.

- 7 Cf. PTC, s. v. “*paṭipadā*.”

- 8 See Hultsch 1922, p. viii.

- 9 For a description of these MSS and the edition see Hultsch 1922, p. vii–viii.

- 10 For a detailed description of the materials used by Bühler see his Introduction to his translation of *BDhS* pp. XLii–XLiv.

- 11 In editing the text of *BDhS* equipped with that of Govinda’s *Vivaraṇa* (Benares 1934), Chinnaswami Śāstri consulted the following MSS and editions :

A, Ā, I, II (for the text of the Sūtra),

Ka, Kha, Ga, Gha, Na (for the text of the *Vivaraṇa*).

I is one of Hultsch’s editions. As for the other eight materials, I cannot detect the relationship between the other eight materials and those used by Hultsch and Bühler.

- 12 K (Bühler) and S (Hultsch) omit this sūtra.

- 13 Among the MSS of the second group only D is of real importance for us, because these other MSS of the same group all descend from it or its prototype (see pp. 185–186). Perhaps the incongruity of sūtra 26 with the context

(see pp. 190–191) induced a scribe to leave it.

- 14 On the reading of the parallel sūtras in *HiDhS* see Sprockhoff 1991, pp. 7–8, nn. 12–18.
- 15 *ĀpDhS* 2, 9, 21, 10 runs parallel to *ĀpDhS* 2, 9, 21, 21 and *BDhS* 2, 10, 18, 22 (*śloka*).
- The first part of *ĀpDhS* 2, 9, 21, 10, which is quoted above, is a half-*śloka* corresponding exactly to the first half of *BDhS* 2, 10, 18, 22. Cf. Sprockhoff 1991, p. 17; Friedrich 1993, p. 190, n. 34.
- 16 “*abhayataḥ*” is no doubt the corruption of “*ubhayataḥ*.”
- 17 Haradatta interprets Āpastamba’s sūtra 12: “*na kiṃ cid api vāso bibhṛyāt*.” Almost all scholars who have ever translated the sūtra follow Haradatta in interpreting “*sarvataḥ parimokṣam*” in the sense of complete nakedness. Cf. Bühler 1879, p. 154; Skurzak 1948, p. 11; Sprockhoff 1991, pp. 10–12. Friedrich, who attributes a double meaning (*Doppelsinn*) to *parimokṣam* translates the sūtra: “Von allem gelöst, (aber) einige” (1993, p. 191).
- 18 Only Bronkhorst (1993, p. 33, n. 4) expresses some doubt about the intrinsic connection between sūtra 26 and the *parivrājaka*-passage.
- 19 Kane (*HDhS* Vol. 1, Part 1, p. 53) simply states that Govindaswāmin appears to be a very late writer. Moghe (1991, pp. 114–115) dates the author between 1650 and 1690.
- 20 Cf. PW, s. v. “*madhya*,” “*madhyama*,” “*madhyastha*”; also Scharfe 1989, p. 205.
- 21 Cf. Olivelle 1993, p. 142.
- 22 According to *MSm* 6, 92, the ten-fold dharma is comprised of constancy (*dhṛti*), forbearance (*kṣānti*), self-control (*dama*), not-stealing (*asteya*), purity (*śauca*), restraint of organs (*indriyanigraha*), intellect (*dhi*), truthfulness (*satya*), and abstention from anger (*akrodha*).
- 23 Yājñavalkya replaces *kṣānti* and *indriyanigraha* in the above list by Manu with *hrī* and *saṃyatendriyatā*, respectively.
- 24 *YSm* 3, 65. Cf. *MSm* 6, 66, 91.
- 25 Sprockhoff, who once discussed the *Vedasamnyāsika* of Manu (1979, p. 409), seems to view the life of this renouncer merely as an oldage-institution (*Altenteil*).

- 26 *MSm* 1, 114 is one of those *anukramaṇi*-like verses in which several topics of the whole work are enumerated. As the result of his examining Manu's terminology in this verse, Olivelle points out that in the *MSm* the life of *Vedasamnyāsika* is indicated by the term *saṃnyāsa* in contradistinction to the life of the wandering ascetic to which the term *mokṣa* is applied. In Manu's context, therefore, the term *saṃnyāsa* "means retirement rather than renunciation." See Olivelle 1984, pp. 132-135; 1993 pp. 140-141.
- 27 In Kullūka's commentary *Vedasamnyāsika* is identified as *kuṭīcara* (also spelled *kuṭīcaka*), i. e., one of the four classes of *saṃnyāsin* (Cf. Chakraborti, p. 120). In Olivelle's opinion the *Vedasamnyāsika* of Manu "served as the basis for *Kuṭīcaka*" (1984, p. 137; Cf. also 1981, p. 271, n. 41). Cf. also Sprockhoff 1974, p. 409.
- 28 Olivelle 1993, p. 142.
- 29 See Olivelle 1984, p. 136.
- 30 Among the rules on the life of *parivrājaka*, which are placed together in the tenth chapter of *VāDhS*, we find a sūtra: *grāme vā vaset* (*VāDhS* 10, 26). This sūtra might possibly be a reference to the life of *Vedasamnyāsika*, which Vasiṣṭha reckons merely as a special type of *parivrājaka*. Bühler (1882) translates the sūtra: "At his option (an ascetic) may (also) dwell in a village." He refers to *MSm* 6, 94-95 in the foot-note to this translation (p. 48, n. 26).
- 31 Of the expression '*madyamaṃ padaṃ saṃśliṣyāmahe*' Govinda gives the following paraphrase in his *Vivarāṇa* :
- sarvabhūtāntargataṃ padyate gamyate tadupāsakair iti padaṃ ātmānam saṃśliṣyāmahe.*
- Thus according to Govinda "*madhyamaṃ padaṃ*" means the innermost self (*ātman*). As for "*ubhayataḥ*" Govinda interprets "both sides" in the sense of the two worlds, i. e., the world of manes (*pitṛloka*) and that of gods (*devaloka*), which are both connected to the life of householder (*gārhashtyanibandhana*).
- 32 Bühler 1882. p. 283, n. 24.
- 33 Olivelle 1993, p. 141, n. 29.
- 34 In his *Yatidharmaprakāśa* (41, ed. Olivelle, part 1, p. 71), Vāsudevāśrama

- quotes *BDhS* 2, 18, 24–26. His reading of sūtra 24, given as “*vr̥kṣamūlakovidah saṃnyāsi*,” cannot be regarded as original.
- 35 Cf. *VāDhS* 10, 13; *Msm* 6, 44; *ViSm* 96, 11.
- 36 Cf. *JPTS* s. v. “*rukhamūlika*”; *BHSD* s. v. “*vr̥kṣamūlika*.” In Buddhist texts we find both terms as items on the *dhutaṅga*-list.
- 37 Besides *BDhS* 2, 18, 24, Olivelle (1981, p. 271 n.) gives two other instances of the term *Vedasaṃnyāsin*. Yādavaprakāśa’s *Yatidharmasamuccaya*, in which he ascertains the occurrence of the term, is not available to me. In the second instance, i. e. *KP* 1, 2, 82, *Vedasaṃnyāsin* is represented as one of the three classes of *pārameṣṭhika*. According to *KP* 1, 2, 82 *pārameṣṭhikas* are those mendicants who, in quest of true wisdom (*jñāna*), devote themselves to *yoga*-practices.
- 38 In *VāDhS* 10, 4, a sūtra on the life of *parivrajaka*, the word *Vedasaṃnyāsana* is used in the sense of abandonment of the Veda (Cf. Bronkhorst 1993, p. 27, n. 12). This meaning certainly does not apply to the term *Vedasaṃnyāsika/saṃnyāsin*. On the contrary, recitation of the Vedic text was the most important of all religious practices to which this class of renouncers was dedicated. It is still unclear how we are then to analyze the nominal compound *Vedasaṃnyāsika*. Perhaps *Vedasaṃnyāsika* is the one who abandons himself for the sake of the Veda or *brahman* embodied in it.

Bibliography

Agaññasutta, -suttanta [AS] In the *Digha Nikāya* Vol. III.

ed. by J. E. Carpenter. London 1911. pp. 80–98.

Āpastambadharmasūtra [*ĀpDhS*]

- Āpastambiya dharmasūtram. Āpastamba’s Aphorisms on The Sacred Law of the Hindus.by G. Bühler. Third Edition.....Bombay, 1932.
- The Āpastamba-Dharma-Sūtra with the ‘Ujjvalā’ commentary of Śrī Haradatta Miśra.....by Umeśa Chandra Pāṇḍeya. Varanasi 1969.

[translation]

- Sacred Laws of the Āryas as taught in the schools of Āpastamba, Gautama,

- Vāsishta and Baudhāyana. transl. by G. Bühler. Part 1: Āpastamba and Gautama. SBE vol. 14. Oxford 1879, Delhi 1969 (reprint.)
- Das Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra—Aufbau und Ausg. E. Friedrich. Frankfurt 1993.
- Ṛgvedasamhitā [RV] Rig-Veda-Samhitā. The Sacred Hymns of the Brāhmins together with the Commentary of Sāyaṇācārya. ed. by M. Müller. Second Edition. Vol. IV. Maṇḍala 10. London 1892.
- Taittiriyabrāhmaṇa [TBr] Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa.
With the commentary of Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Mīśra. Vol. IV. ed. by A. Mahadeva Sastri and L. Srinivasacharya. Mysore 1913, Delhi 1985 (reprint).
- Kūrmapurāṇa [KP] The Kūrma Purāṇa critically edited by Anand Swarup Gupta. Varanasi 1971.
- Taittiriyasamhitā [TS] Kṛṣṇayajurvediya-Taittiriyasamhitā Śrīmat Sāyaṇācāryavira-citabhāṣyasametā. ed. by Kāśīnātha Śāstrī Āgāśe. Vol. 7. Poona 1904.
- Baudhāyanadharmasūtra [BDhS]
• Das Baudhāyana-Dharmasūtra. von E. Hultsch. Leipzig 1922.
• The Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra with the Vivaraṇa Commentary by Śrī Govinda Swāmī. Ed.by Pandit A. Chinnaswami Śāstrī. Benares 1934.
[translation] Sacred Laws of the Āryas.....transl. by G. Bühler. Part II: Vāsiṣtha and Baudhāyana. SBE Vol. 2. Oxford 1882. Delhi 1969 (reprint).
- Manusmṛti [MSm] Manu-Smṛti with nine commentaries by Medhātithi, Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, Kullūka Rāghavānanda, Nandana, Rāmacandra, Maṇirāma, Govindarāja and Bhāruci. ed. by Jayantakrishna Harikrishna Dave. Vol. II (adhyāya 3-4) Bombay 1975. Vol. III (adhyāya 5-6) Bombay 1978.
[translation] The Laws of Manu translated with extracts from seven commentaries by G. Bühler. SBE vol. 25. Oxford 1886. Delhi 1970 (reprint).
- Mahāvagga The Vinaya pitakaṃ,Edited by H. Oldenberg. Vol. 1. London 1880.
- Yatidharmaparakāśa. A Treatise on World Renunciation critically edited by P. Olivelle, Vienna 1976 (part 1, text), 1977 (part 2, translation).
- Yājñavalkyasmṛti [YSm]
• Die Yājñavalkyasmṛti. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkunde des indischen Rechts. Von Hans Losch. Leipzig 1927.
• Yājñavalkyasmṛti of Yogīśvara Yājñavalkya. With the Commentary Mītākṣarā

- of Vijñāneśvara.....Fifth Edition.....by Narayan Ram Acharya. Bombay 1949.
• The Yājñavalkyasmṛti with the Commentary Bālakrīda of Viṣvarūpachārya.
Ed. by.....T. Ganapati Sastri. Second Edition. Trivandrum 1982.
- Vāsiṣṭhadharmasūtra [*VāDhS*] Śrīvāsiṣṭhadharmaśāstram. Aphorisms on the Sacred
Law of the Āryas as taught in the school of Vasiṣṭha by Alois Anton Führer.
Poona 1930.
[translation] see BDhS.
- Viṣṇusmṛti [*ViSm*] Viṣṇu Smṛti (The Institutes of Viṣṇu).....ed.by J. Jolly.
Calcutta 1881, Varanasi 1962 (reprint).
- Hiranyakeśidharmasūtra [*HiDhS*]
- BHSD Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. Grammar and Dictionary by F. Edgerton.
Vol. II: Dictionary. New Haven 1953.
- HDhS P. V. Kane, History of Dharma Śāstra, Vol. 1: Second Edition, Part 1,
Poona 1968.
- IIJ Indo-Iranian Journal
- JAOS Journal of the American Oriental Society
- JPTS Journal of the Pāli Text Society
- PTC Pāli Tipitakaṃ Concordance.....listed by F. L. Woodward, E. M. Hare
and others, arranged and edited by A. K. Warder, H. Saddhatissa and
N. R. Warder. Vol. III. Part II. London 1968.
- PTSD The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary ed. by T. W. Rhys Davids
and W. Stede. London 1921-1925, 1966 (reprint).
- PW Sanskrit-Wörterbuch.....bearbeitet von O. Böhtlingk und R. Roth. Fünfter
Theil. Nachdruck der Ausgabe St. Petersburg 1855-1875, Tokyo 1966.
- SBE The Sacred Books of the East
- WZKS Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für Indische
Philosophie

Bronkhorst, Johannes

1993 The Two Sources of Indian Asceticism. Bern.

Bühler, Georg

1879 see ĀpDhS

- 1882 see BDhS
1886 see MSm
- Chakraborti, Hariprada
1973 Asceticism in Ancient India in Brahmanical, Buddhist, Jain and Ajivika Societies.....Calucutta.
- Friedrich, Elvira
1993 see ĀpDhS
- Gombrich, Richard
1992 The Buddha's Book of Genesis? In : IJ 35, Nos 283, pp. 159-178.
1992 Why is a *khattiya* called *khattiya*?—The *Agañña Sutta* Revisited. In : JPTS Vol. XVII, pp. 213-214.
- Kane, Pandurang Vaman
1968 see HDhS
- Moghe, S. G.
1991 The Date of Govindasvāmī. In : Studies in the Dharmaśāstra. Delhi. pp. 114-115.
- Olivelle, Patrick
1884 Renouncer and Renunciation in the Dharmaśāstras. In : Studies in Dharmaśāstra ed. by. R. W. Lariviere. Calcutta. pp. 81-152.
1981 Contributions to the Sematic History of Saṃnyāsa. In : JAOS, Vol. 101, No. 3, 1981. pp. 265-274.
1993 The Āśrama System, Oxford.
- Scharfe, Hartmut
1989 The State in Indian Tradition. Leiden.
- Skurzak, Ludwik
1948 Études sur l'Origine de l'Ascétisme Indien. Wraclaw.
- Sprockhoff, Joachim Friedrich
1979 Die Alten im alten Indien, Ein Versuch nach brahmanischen Quellen. In : Saeculum Bd. 30. pp. 374-433.
1991 Āraṇyaka und Vānaprastha in der vedischen Literatur. Neue Erwägungen zu einer alten Legende und ihren Problemen. Zweiter Hauptteil (1. Fortsetzung). In WZKS Bd. 5, pp. 5-46.