CHAPTER I

LITERATURE AScribed TO GAUTAMA
Literature ascribed to Gautama

The Vedic literature is highly enriched with the thousands of works belonging to the numerous schools. It is quite known that, in old times, the sacred lore of the Vedas was communicated or transmitted through oral tradition of various groups of people, residing in different geographical areas. The differences in geographical conditions of these, naturally led to the differences in respect of pronunciation, and further to some extent, in respect of matter also. And this was the very reason which led to the development of an original Vedic Samhita into several versions. In the course of time, various groups of people, who followed these versions, were reckoned as separate schools after the names of the teachers of their group. The versions of a Samhita (may be differing merely in single words or verses) which were quite rigourously preserved through generations were admitted as the literature of the respective schools.

Later, towards the end of what is known as the Samhita-period, ritual was developing as the main-stay of the life of a Vedic man. And this development was so rapid and manifold that the ritual itself was getting complicated with the minor differences in actual procedure of the performance and with the local traditions of several schools. Automatically the situation resulted into the formation of the ritualistic literature according to the individual schools. Therefore,
ritualistic literature also was counted as the literature of its particular school.

Thus broadly viewing, the literature of a school seems to comprise of the works such as: **Saṃhitā (S)**, **Bṛhāmaṇa (B)**, **Upaniṣad (Up)**, six Vedaṅgas (which consist in 1) **Śiṣya** 2) **Kalpa** 3) **Vyākaraṇa** 4) **Nirukta** 5) **Chanda** and 6) **Jyotisa**); One of these six Vedaṅgas, the **Kalpa** contains four Sūtras, namely a Śrauta-Sūtra (ŚS), a Grha-Sūtra (GS) a Dharma-Sūtra (DS) and a Śulba-Sūtra. Further it (i.e. the school-literature) comprises of several ancillary works like a Pitṛmedha-Sūtra (PitrS), a Parāśīṭa (P), a Paddhati (Pd) a Prātiśākhya, a Paribhāṣā an Anukramani, a Prayoga and numerous commentaries on these works.

However, it is to be borne in mind that one could not expect each and every school to possess all the categories of works, since it was not (always) a pre-planned development.

A) In respect of the so-called Gautama-school of the ŚV, and its literature, one has first to consider its present situation which could be traced out through the available texts of Gautama.

Among the available texts, which are known as of Gautama, the first to be mentioned is the Gautama-Dharma-Sūtra (GDS) (A DS forms a part of the Kalpa-Sūtra). A GS, (which also is a part of the Kalpa) and a DS are both known as the
Both these works discuss some common topics such as Upanayana, Vivaha, Pance Mahayajna and different Sradhas etc. However, they differ basically in respect of their subject-matter and the treatment thereof. A GS concerns itself with an individual's domestic life, whereas a DS deals with the individual's life in the context of society. A GS prescribes the duties and sacraments for a Gṛhaṣṭha 'householder', while a DS offers instructions about the righteous conduct of all the classes of a society. A DS deals with the sacred law of a society and regulates the social-relations of everyday life. Therefore, as compared with a GS, a DS exhibits a wider compass of its contents.

The GDS consists of 28 chapters which are composed

1. See Max Müller - His. of A. Skt. Lit. 1912, p 106;
   (In the context of the धर्मसूत्राः)
   "They must therefore, be considered as independent collections of सूत्राः, later perhaps than the Śrauta and Gṛhya-sūtras, but enjoying the same authority on matters belonging to Śruti or tradition, as the Gṛhya-sūtras.

   GDS with Comm. Mitāṅgara of Hardatta, अस्स नो. 61, Poona, 1966.
   GDS with Maskari-Bhāṣya ed. LŚrīnivasacharya, Mysore, 1917.
entirely in prose. As a DS, it prescribes rules and regulations which determine the mode of the life of a Brahmācārin 'student', a Gṛhastha 'house-holder', a Vaikāhānasa 'hermit' and a Bhiksu 'mendicant'. It discusses the duties of a Brahmaṇa, a Ksatriya, a Vaiśya and of a Śūdra and those of a King and of a woman also. It prescribes śraddhas 'ancestral worship' and various penances and also expiations for appeasing the evil forces which are likely to affect one because of some (even involuntary) misbehaviour.

In the case of the GDS there arise two problems, namely:

1) Whether this work really belongs to the SV?
2) If this work can be regarded as earlier than the other Dharma-Sūtras?

In order to solve these problems, scholars have discussed a lot and they have concluded that it definitely belongs to the SV and should be regarded as an oldest DS. In this connection, the following reasons may be worth noting:

3. Max Müller - Hist. of A. Skt. Lit. 1912, p 128;
Führer - SBE Vol 2, Introduction to Gautama, pp 1-1
Ham Gopal - India of Vedic Kalpaśūtras, pp 52-53
1) External evidence:

Kumarila, the author of *Tantravārtika* mentions that, the *Dharma-Sāstra* of Gautama and the GS of Gobhila were originally accepted (as authoritative) by the Chandogas or the Samavedins alone.

In the context of the Sūtra -

Inferences being restricted in their application, usages can have only a limited authority; the question under discussion is whether the (Sūtra) works have an authority limited within certain areas, or they have a universal application? In answer to this, Kumarila explains -

that the works (except the *Purāṇas*, the *Smṛti* of Manu and the *Itihāsas*) on *Smṛti* and *Grhya* topics exhibit their relation restricted to a particular Veda, exactly like the *Prātiśākhyas*

---

4. *Tantravārtika* Benaras Ed. p. 179 :
(which contain phonetic rules peculiar to one of the different branches of the four Vedas). Hence, these works are studied exclusively by only certain sections of people, which indicate that they have therefore limited authority. In order to provide examples for this Kumārila mentions: 'For instance, the Śūtras of Gautama and Gobhila are accepted only by the Chandogas or the Śāmavedins, those of Vasītha only by the Śrīvedins' etc.

This indicates the association of the Gautama-Śūtras with the Śāmavedins. By the word Gautama-Śūtras, it seems Kumārila means to refer to the work of the GDS, since in other passages he refers to the Śūtras from the GDS for example: Tantravārtika - p 112 (in the context of the Śūtra हेतुद्वस्तमित् 1.3.4) reads: गात्रेनापि वद्वा दस्याधिक्यं कर्मणि कर्येदति .... । which is in the GDS II.52.

Internal evidence:

1) The twenty-sixth chapter of the GDS is almost identical with the 2nd Khanda of the 1st Prāpāthaka of the Śāmavidhāna 5 (SvB), which is known as one of the Brahmānas Belonging to the SV. This leads one to assume that the GDS might have borrowed this chapter from the SvB, which indicates Gautama's association with the SV.

2) The GDS prescribes the recitation of certain purificatory texts for expiating a blamable act or misbehaviour. Among these (18) purificatory texts, Gautama prescribes a few Sāmanas, which include some (namely the Brhat, Rathantara, Jyeṣṭha and Mahādevīkārtya) which seem to be popular in the texts belonging to the Rv and the Yv also, and in addition to them some others (namely the Puruṣagati, Rauhiṇa and Mahāvirāja) which especially occur in the texts belonging to the Śv. This indicates therefore, that the GDS also is definitely a work related to the Śv.

3) The GDS prescribes the employment of five vyāhrtis (I.57, XIV.12). In the Sūtra I.57, it mentions that 'satyam truth is the last (i.e. the 5th) vyāhrti'. In most of the Vedic works, there generally occur only three vyāhrtis (namely bhūḥ, bhuvah, svāḥ), sometimes, but four or seven occur very rarely. But, in the vyāhrti-Sāman

6. GDS XIV.13 : उपनिषदो वेदान्त: सर्वेच्छन्दसु सृंहिताम्
भूतवास्मयामर्गशीर्षांसु दु: पुरुषस्वतं राजनीतिस्वतं
कृत्यदेवताम् पुरुषस्वतिर्महानामम् महावेशां महाममक्षीत्
व्योजाभाव्याः समन्धमेव वद्धिव्यवमानं कृष्माण्डार्यं पावमान्यं भारतिते
पाव-नानि।

7. GDS I.57 - अः-पृष्ठम् व्याहृत्यम्: पल्लव सत्यान्तः।
and XIV.12 - प्रतियांत्यम्बुवास्मोरपवारे व्याहृत्यम्: पल्लव।
there occur five vyahrtis as Haradatta points out in Mitakṣara. This evidently indicates that Gautama has followed the tradition of the SV.

4) One more thing may be added here, as pointing to the association of the GDS with the Chandagas 'Sāmavedins'. The GDS (25.13) prescribes the recitation of the Mantra:

'अघु यादिनम् गूणानुि, सदिः मा बसलय गूणानुि'

while sipping water in the morning, 'May the Day and the Sun purify me' and in the evening, 'May the Night and Varuṇa purify me'.

These Mantras are quoted on the authority of Gautama, as the ācamana-Mantras of the Chandogas, by Devaṇa Bhaṭṭa in the Āhnikakāṇḍa of Samtimuktāphale. This also indicates

---

8. GDS (ĀSS No.61) 1.2.52, p. 10 - शीघ्रै स्थाप्तिः प्रयोजः सत्याञ्जीतः! हरदलृत्तः - यात्विलिसाम पूर्वस् सत्य पुनः प्रत्येक प्रत्येक प्रत्येक प्रत्येक प्रत्येक वक्तव्यः।

9. GDS (ĀSS No.61) 3.7.9, p 210 - काव्यायो वाचार्यदेहूः मादित्यवं पुनार्विविध ग्रातः, रात्रिष्वच मा वस्त्र्वच पुनार्विविध ग्रातः।

10. Āhnikakāṇḍa ed. L.Śrīnivesacharya p 361 - छद्देशाय तो आर्यानवौँ, अहस्यादित्यवं पुनादु जिति प्रातः, रात्रिष्वच मा वस्त्र्वच पुनादु जिति सायमिति।
Gautama's relation with the Samavedins.

Thus these evidences seem to point to the fact that the author of the GDS was a Samavedin, and his work definitely belongs to the SV.

As regards the question 'whether the GDS is earlier than the other Dharma-Sūtras,' one can point to the following evidence:

Baudhāyana refers to the views of Gautama in the Baudhāyana I 1.2.7 and II 2.4.17 and the tenth Adhyāya of the third Praśna of the Baudhāyana DS seems to have been borrowed from the nineteenth Adhyāya of the GDS. It follows, therefore, that the GDS is prior to the Baudhāyana DS and the Baudhāyana DS is considered to be earlier than that of Āpastamba and others. Hence the GDS seems to be earlier than the other Dharma-Sūtras.

The Gautama-Pitrmedha-Sūtra (GPitrs)

The Pitrmedha (the rite to be performed in respect of the deceased by his son or nearest relative) proper concerns with the funeral or the obsequial rites. It seems that, in some cases, the Pitrmedha is incorporated within the Śrauta-Sūtras whereas, in some other cases, it forms part of the Grhyasūtras. The reason behind this may be understood.
thus: the Pitrmedha-Sūtras prescribe the funeral rite of an āhitāgni (one who maintains the three sacred fires namely: the Āhavanīya, the Garhapatya and the Daksināgni) and of an anāhitāgni (i.e., one who does not maintain all the three—he maintains one fire namely the Grhyāgni) as well. The funeral of an āhitāgni may have been considered as a Śrauta rite and naturally, therefore, it was included in a ŚŚ and as against this, the funeral of an anāhitāgni was considered as a Grhya-rite and, therefore, included in a GS.

The schools of Katyāyana, Manava and Śāṅkhāyana include the Pitrmedha in their Śrauta manuals, whereas these of Āśvalāyana, Agnivesya, Kaushitaki and Vaikhanasa consider it as a part of their Grhya-treatises.

There is a third category of works which form the manuals of the Pitrmedha-rite alone; the Pitrmedha-Sūtras of Baudhāyana, Bhāradvāja and Gautama belong to this category of works. The G Pitṛs consists of two Patalas, each of

which is subdivided into seven Khandas. This work is available in Anantayajvan's *Vivarana* commentary on the same. The Pitṛmedha proper is treated in the first *Pataľa* and in the first and the seventh *Khandas* of the second *Pataľa*. *Khandas* two to six of the second *Pataľa* discuss the śrāddha 'ancestral worship'.

The Pitṛmedha prescribed in this text comprises of the following rites:

I. 1-5 Obsequies - the rites of a deceased person (like adorning and worshipping the dead body), selecting the cremation-ground, constructing the pyre, the pre-cremation rites (like bathing and hair-cutting of an āhitāgni) and the proper cremation.

I. 6-7 Post-cremation rites - gathering of bones, pacificatory rites (like offering water-libations, sacrifice for the ancestral deities).

II. 1 (The second *Pataľa*) prescribes recremation of those whose corpses are lost.

II. 2-6 discuss the procedure of a śrāddha in detail including the *Ekodista-śraddha* (i.e. a śrāddha for one who has just died).

12. As seen in the **Ms.No. 15358** "*मैतलीमणिपुस्तकसूत्रकिसरण्*
available in the G.C.N.L. Madras
II.7 prescribes the cremation of one who had set up the sacred fires, since it mentions the placing of his sacrificial utensils on his bodily parts.

The Gātṛṣ seems to prescribe in general the rite of Pitrmedha for the āhitagni and the anāhitagni as well, since it specifically points out the difference of ritual by prescribing (I.1.9) 'a Grhastha should be cremated by using the domestic fire' and also by mentioning (II.7.7-33) the placing of sacrificial utensils of an āhitagni on his dead body.

The Gautama śrāddhakapla (GŚK)

A śrāddhakalpa is a text which prescribes the ancestral worship. Caland has given the text of the Gautama-śrāddhakalpa in, 'Overgedruckt uit die Bijdragen tot de taal, land en Volkenkunde Von Ned.Indre 6 Vol greeks deel 1; pp 9-13.'

The GŚK contains the same portion as that of the Khandas 2-6 of the 2nd Pātaḷa of the Gātṛṣ. There is one more śrāddhakalpa which is attributed to Gobhīla (GŚK), and hence known as belonging to the Kauthuma-Sāmaveda. It is available in print in the edition of the Gobhīla-Parīśīṭa.

Chandrakanta Tarkalamkara, Calcutta, 1909, pp 1-200.
It consists of 8 Kandikas 'sections'. In respect of the contents, it corresponds with the GSK, though at places it considerably differs from it. The main difference is that the GSK prescribes the Abhyudayika-sraddha (Kandika-4) 'a sraddha to be performed on the day previous to any auspicious performance and in honour of Fathers'; which the GSK does not describe.

In connection with the GSK there occurs the question: 'Why it should be treated as a Sraddhakalpa of the SV and to which recension of the SV does it belong?' One finds the answer to this question in the explanation given by Caland 14 as follows:

The quotations given in the commentary on the GSK from a Chandogas are all to be found in this text ascribed to Gautama. Also the quotations from a KhSK in the Mahayasa’s Bhasya on the GSK are all traceable in the GSK. This points to the identity of the GSK (contained in the Gpitras) with the Sraddhakalpas of Khadira or Chandoga and secondly indicates that, at least the GSK does not belong to the Kauthumas, since they have a separate Sraddhakalpa namely the GSK. The GSK seems to belong to the Ranyaniya SV for the

following reasons:

1) The text of the Sūtras 7-32 of II.7 of the GPitṛṣ is the same as that of the Drāhyāyana Śrāuta-Sūtra (BSŚ) XXIII 4.16-23 and not of the Lātyāyana Śrāuta-Sūtra (LSŚ).

2) Anantayajvan in his commentary, while referring to some Grhya-ritual, quotes everywhere the KhGS e.g. i) GPitṛṣ II.4.23, he quotes a whole passage from the KhGS 3.5.13-34 ii) GPitṛṣ II.2.19 while commenting on this he quotes the KhGS 3.5.37.

This satisfactorily indicates that the GŚK or the whole of the GPitṛṣ belongs to the Rāṇāyani SV, since it is quite well-known that the BSŚ and the KhGS belong to the Rāṇāyani SV. Further, it can be said that this GŚK (or the GPitṛṣ) originally belonged to a Gautama school of the SV since it is ascribed to Gautama.

The Gautama Smṛti (GŚm)

The term Smṛti 'remembrance, tradition' in its wider connotation is applied to all the ancient orthodox non-Vedic works such as the Grhya and Dharma-Sūtras, upto the Mahābhārata and also to the
Śloka-works of Manu, Yājñavalkya, Parāśara etc., since it (i.e. the Smṛti) furnishes the very foundation of these various works.

A Smṛti work concerns with numerous topics of the Dharmasāstra (which relate to a human being's social behaviour) as Manu says: (तद्विषेधानुनतिः प्रकटै दृष्टिः देशसास्त्रं) देशसास्त्रं स्वं देशसास्त्रं | II.10
'(Veda should be known as Śruti) whereas Dharmasāstra as Smṛti'.

There are various Smṛti-works attributed to different Acāryas 'teachers' such as Manu, Yājñavalkya, Harita, Dakṣa, Āpastamba, Yama, Kātyāyana, Śāmkha etc. It is noteworthy that some of them are entirely in prose or in prose mixed

---

15. See Max Müller H. is of A. Skt. Lit. 1912, p 44:

"It must be observed, however, before we proceed farther, that what is called Smṛti includes not only Sūtras, but also Śloka works, such as the laws of Manu, Yājñavalkya and Parāśara (the Mānava, Yājñavalkya and Parāśara-dharmasāstras), which sometimes are called the Smṛtis, in the plural." .... p.51 - "It might therefore be best to distinguish between Smṛti or tradition in general, and the Smṛtis or law-books in particular."
with verse, while a majority of them are in verse. It is also believed that some of them belong to considerably earlier period, but most of them are later compilations.

The GŚm as the text given by Shrīrāmaśharma Achārya in his edition of 'Ṛṣa Ṣmrtya' contains 13 Adhyāyas, which are the same as 1, 2, 5-11, 14, 16, 27 and 28th Adhyāya of the GDS. This clearly points to the later compilation of this GŚm. It prescribes the duties of a Brahmačārin, a Gṛhaṇa, a Brāhmaṇa, a Kṣatriya, a Vaiśya, a Śūdra and of a King. It discusses the Saṃskāras, the āśāvāca 'impurity' caused by the death of a relative, the reasons of anadhyāya 'absence of study' Cāndrayana penances and the dāyavibhāga 'distribution of the wealth'. Thus it prescribes for society ācāra (personal or social) conduct, vyavahāra 'mutual dealings (in respect of law)' and prāyaścitta 'expiation' which are the significant issues of a Dharmaśāstra.

It seems that sometimes the work is named as the Gautama-Saṁhitā and is included in the Dharmaśāstra Saṁgraha (ed. Vacaspati Upadhyaya, pp 765-852). However, this work is nothing but just the text of the GDS itself, entitled differently. It consists of 29 chapters, that means adds

16. See Dharmaśāstra Saṁgraha ed. Vacaspati Upadhyaya Introduction p XIX.
one chapter to the 28 chapters of the GDS. The additional chapter comes as the 20th chapter and discusses effects of sinful deeds and expiations thereof.

Thus, it seems that the text of the GDS is reckoned by the scholars as a GŚm, however, it does not seem convincing if one considers the following cases:

While going through the Mss and the references to the views of Gautama, one notices that at some places the mentions are made in such a way that indicate their origin from some GŚm:

1) At the end of the rite of Arkavivaha (1.23 of the GGP) B adds some portion from a GŚm: 

2) In the voluminous work of 'Caturvarga Cintāmaṇī' of Hemādri, there occur quotations of the views of Gautama at numerous places. Some of these quotations are in prose and some in verse. Most of the prose-quotations are traceable in the GDS. The metrical quotations contain, some, after the teachings of Vyḍḍha Gautama, yet some others of Śloka Gautama and a great number of them are

17. See p. no. 309

of some older authority called Gautama. Surprisingly, at 2-3 places, there occur some verses with the words "गौतमवाणि" which are, however, not traceable in the present GDS. The references to the views of Vṛddha Gautama which are not found in the Vṛddha-Gautama-Samhitā, and the citations from Śloka Gautama and Gautama which are not traceable in any relevant text raise a question: to which work/works do these metrical passages belong? The contents of these metrical passages, such as the importance of a cow, the period of different śrāddhas, various prāyaścittas, different types of hīṃsā 'violence' and the results of it etc. resemble those of the śrīmāta in general. This leads one to guess that there must have existed some śrīmāta of Gautama, and this must be definitely different from the available GŚm ed. by Shriramasharma Acharya, which is nothing but a recasting of certain adhyāyas of the GDS.

In connection with this guess about the existence of some metrical GŚm, I came to notice that Caland has already mentioned such a work in 'Der Gautama Śrāddhakalpa - Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Literatur der Sāmavedaschulen, Seite 6-9'. He mentions that there is a Ms of the metrical GŚm in the India Office Library, No. 180, and this GŚm is available in print also with the Telugu-Commentary, published in Madras 1890. Caland States that this metrical work comprises of

19. : साम्वारस्त्रश्चय ए. रामनाथ दिलिए, pp. 180-183
Adhyāya. He has further discussed in details the points of similarity between this GSm and the GPitṛs.

I could get neither any Ms nor the printed version of this GSm, hence I could not verify in it the metrical passages of Gautama which occur in the text of Caturvarga Cintāmani.

The Gautami-Śikṣā

Śikṣā is known as one of the six Vedāṅgas. Śikṣā is a work which pertains to Phonetics, i.e. the science of pronunciation of letters, accents etc. The Gautami-Śikṣā is available in print, it is divided into two Prapāthakas. The first Prapāthaka contains 8 Khandas whereas the second 7 Khandas. It discusses in the beginning the 33 vyanjanas 'consonants', their sthānas 'the place of (their) articulation' etc. It mainly discusses the issue of dvirbhāva or saṃyoga 'conjunction, combination' of the vyanjanas and also of vārās 'letters'. The saṃyoga 'conjunction' of upto 7 letters is discussed and then, at the end,

it is mentioned that: गौतमनिधि यदीष्ठितां/ प्रारम्भम्। अध्यात्म अभिवत्ति।
Gautama has declared that there will be no sāmyoga beyond 7 letters.

while giving examples it mentions:
i) The names of the Sāmans 'chants' for example 1.7

ii) In some cases the wording of the Sūtra from the GDS e.g. at 1.5 अकारभक्ति सामास्तुतियांमिति। 'अःस्तुतियांमें' which is in the GDS (ASS No. 61) 3.8.20. This is a clear indication of that, this work belongs to the SV and to the school of Gautama.

21 The Vṛddha-Gautama-Saṁhita

This work is entirely different from the GDS. This Smṛti or Saṁhitā text seems to be a part of the 22 Āśvamedhikaparvan of the Mahābhārata, where it bears the title as Vaiṣṇava-Dharmaśāstra. The prefatory verses indicate that Yudhīṣṭhīra intends to know from Kṛṣṇa about


the dharmas (duties) of the four castes. The work mentions various authorities such as Manu, Vasiṣṭha, Kasyapa, Garg, Gautama, Gopālaka, Pārśāra, Maitreya etc.

This Samhita consists of 22 chapters and approximately 1700 verses.

It discusses various topics such as:

1) Importance of Dharma.
2) The four Castes.
3) Description of different types of gifts and results occurring there.
4) Importance of Nitya-Naimittika-Karma and glory of the Vipra.
5) Description of different Lokas.
6-7) Nature of dāna, tapas and their results.
8) Nature of various deeds and their results.
9) Importance of giving of a 'Kapila' - Cow as a gift.
10) Enumeration of Dharma and Adharma.
11-12) About the prohibited and unprohibited food.
13) Importance of giving food-grains as gifts.
14) Eulogy of 'Tila-dāna'.
15) About some religious duties.
16) Importance of the sacrificial fire and the glory of the āhitagni.
17) Čandrayāna and other Vratas.
18) Description of the gifts to be given during the month of Kārtika and their importance.
xviii) Importance of fasting on different 'Tithis'.

xix) Importance of \( \text{Asvattha' tree} \).

xx) Description of Rahasya-prayascitta.

xxi) Glory of a Brāhmaṇa and the method of offering worship with devotion.

xxii) About the Śudras.

In this text (except that, it is attributed to Vṛddha Gautama, and has the colophon at the end of every Adhyāya in the manner: जिति पौराणिके श्रीब्रह्मचार्यसाये प्रथम (मात्र: 1) there is not available any reference or mention which could assure that this work belongs particularly to the ŚV.

Thus the works consulted so far (except that of the Vṛddha Gautama-Saṃhitā) satisfactorily indicate their association with the ŚV, and appear as the literature of the School of Gautama, to whom they are attributed. In connection with the so-called Gautama-school, it may be noted that the following information which is recorded in one of the redactions of Caranavyuha, strengthens the probability of its existence. The Caranavyuha reads:

23. Caranavyuha of Saunaka with comm. of Mahidāsa

There is found herein the mention of Gautama as the followers of one of the 9 subdivisions of the RāṣṭrāṇiYa SV.

Further, the Vāṃśa-Bṛahmana of the SV enumerates the names of four members of the Gautama-family in the list of the teachers who handed down this Veda viz. Rādhā Gautama, Gātri Gautama, Sumanta Bābhrava Gautama and Saṁkara Gautama. It reads:

a) ज्ञावानायाक्षणित्वायनांनालयांच गौतमानां घातमाल धिपाल गौतम: -- - - सुमन्तादु लाखूवाद गौतमाल सुमन्तोध्वंशक हैत्यम: - - - - (Khanda 2, p.5-6)

b) ... सहकरद गौतमाद सहकरो घातमोध्वंश परावाड गौतमाल पुनाभिनावच ... राघवच गौतमालस्मानव्रम् समानव्रम् ॥ (Khanda 3, p.7-8)

This also furnishes as an evidence about the existence of the Gautama school of the SV.

---

8) In respect of the school of Gautama (after considering the texts of Gautama which are available) as a next step, one has to study the references to the views of Gautama, which occur in the ritualistic literature in general.

At present it is sheerly difficult to know whether the Gautama-Sāmavedins were having their separate Sāṁhitā and Brāhmaṇa also, since there are not available any references as would point to these works.

In the Kalpa-literature particularly that of the SV the high authority of Gautama is apparent from the numerous references to his views. The Lāśś, the DŚŚ

25. The Lāśś (ed. A.C. Vedantavagisha, Delhi, 1982) cites the views of Gautama in 78 cases. In 70 of these, Gautama is mentioned along with the other authorities namely Śāṇḍilya, Dhānañjayya and Śāṇḍilyāyana, and in 8 cases Gautama is mentioned as the only authority on the respective subjects.

26. The DŚŚ (Prāśnas 1-11 ed. J.N. Reuter and 12-15 ed. Raghu Vira) seems to contain the same number of references as that in the Lāśś.
and the Nidāna-Sūtra of the SV quite frequently cite the views of Gautama. These citations of the views of Gautama are so numerous that it requires one to study them as a separate topic and from the various angles of investigation, such as:

i) The cases where Gautama's views have ritualistic significance.

ii) The cases where Gautama's view is upheld by the Sūtrakāras of the respective texts also.

iii) The cases where Gautama's view is superseded by other's views.

iv) Where Gautama's view is just quoted or noted for pointing out the ritualistic traditions of Gautama's school.

v) The teachers whose views are quoted along with the views of Gautama, this might indicate their chronology, their relations in the context of ritual.

27. The Nidāna Sūtra (ed. K.N. Bhatnagar, Delhi, 1971) quotes the views of Gautama at 51 places.
Besides in the Śrauta-Sūtras of the SV, Gautama is mentioned in the Āpastamba-Śrauta-Sūtra (ĀpŚŚ), the Āśvalāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra (ĀśvŚŚ) and in the Bodhāyana-Śrauta-Sūtra (BoŚŚ), but only in reference to gotra relation. It may be noted however, that once ĀśvŚŚ mentions the view of Gautama, which is related to some ritualistic detail viz.

The chapter is of Dārsāpūrṇamāsa-sacrifice and the context is of trīnaresana while taking the seat made of darbha-blades, the Hotṛ-priest throws away one darbha blade from that seat, with the Mantra: 'निरस्त: पराक्षु: ' and of upaveśana while taking seat then, he recites the Mantra 'अद्वध्वःक्षो: सदने सीदारमि'.

28. ĀpŚŚ 24.6.10-11 अथातोः परिसामायायस्य गैलम्: । ।
29. ĀśvŚŚ 12.11.1 गैलमायायस्य परिसामायायस्य गैलमेति।
30. BoŚŚ 18.52.11 उदल्लासमेतेन यन्ति ।...
  गैलमायायस्य गैलमस्य । । आप्नुसरितः ।
It seems that according to Āśvalāyana the Hotṛ-priest should perform the āṇaniṣana and upavesana along with the prescribed Mantras, at the first instance only, that means:

i) in the ritualistic procedure if he has to take different seats, then, while taking each seat for the first time,

or  ii) in the procedure of a ritual, if he has to take the same seat again, then at the first instance only,

or iii) if the ritual lasts for a few days, then every day at the first upavesana only.

But according to Gautama, in such cases he should recite those Mantras at second instance also.

As regards the Śrauta ritual and Gautama's authority in that field, the following is worth noting:

i) Parpola has held a conjecture in his article, 'On the quotations of ritualistic teachers in the Śrautasūtras of Lātyāyana and Drāhyāyana'³¹: p. 77:

"But it seems that generally the view given first is that accepted by Lāty himself, in so far as he has not stated his own opinion (cf. especially the cross-references with itaret, § 6). Of the four 'great' authorities this position is held in the first place by Gautama, also in the dvandvas (cf. also Caland on PB-7, 1, 5). But as he is not found in the Kṣudra-sūtra where Dhanamjayya and Saddilya are quoted, it is very likely that he is not the eldest of them. It is not improbable, then, that he is a pupil to the two just mentioned, and the teacher of Lāty. (Hence we in a certain sense may have a *Gautama-srautasūtra in the LŚS*).

This points to Gautama's relation with other ritualistic authorities, the importance of the views of Gautama in the field of Śrauta-ritual and the so called existence of the ŚŚ of Gautama.

ii) Vasiṣṭhabhārma-sūtra IV.36 quotes Gautama:
Gautama declares that if a person who has kindled the sacred fire, dies while on a journey, (his Sāpindas) shall again celebrate his obsequies (burning a dummy made of leaves or straw) and remain impure (during ten days) as if they had actually cremated the corpse.'
This view is not traceable in the GVS, but it is traced in the Vṛddha Gautama-saṁhitā (20.1-3). However, Buhler objects to this:

"Nevertheless, it seems to me very doubtful if Vasiṣṭha did or could refer to this work. As the same rule occurs sometimes in the Srautasūtras (note 3. See e.g. 303.5a), I think it more probable that the Srauta-sūtra of the Gautama-school is meant. And it is significant that the Vṛddha-Gautama declares its teachings to be kalpa-codita 'enjoined in the kalpa or ritual'. This also indicates the so-called existence of the Sū of Gautama.

In the field of Grhya-ritual Gautama is mentioned in the list of 7 seers, who deserve Tarpana, e.g. in the Āgniśeṣa-Grhya-Sūtra 1.2.2, 16-19

Further, it should be particularly noted that Gobhila, the author of a GŚ of the ŚV, refers to the view of Gautama viz.-

SBE Vol II, Bühler, Introduction to Gautama, p lviii
'There are four Astakas in (the four months of) the winter; one should endeavour to celebrate all these with (offerings of) meat; thus says Kaustabha. ('There are only) three Astakas (in the winter) says Audgahamani, and so say (also) Gautama and Varkakhandi.'

As regards the number of Astakas (that is to say, whether the Astakas should be performed on the 8th dark days of the three fortights after the Agrahayani), Gobhila mentions Kautsa's view and then that of Gautama and others, which he also (i.e. Gobhila also) follows in his prescription since at 3.10.9, 3.10.18 and at 4.4.17 he prescribes three Astakas. This clearly points to the fact that Gautama's views in the context of Grhya-ritual were regarded authentic by the Samavedins.

Then, in the context of Gautama's contribution to the Grhya-ritual, special reference has to be made of the quotations from the so-called Gautama-Grhya-Sutra (GGS) which occur in the text of Grhyaratna. In the introduction to the JGS (p. iv), Caland states: "In the Grhyaratna edited at Mysore in 1881, with commentary called Kanthabhushana we find several times..."
cited a Gautama-Grhya-Sūtra, and all the passages here attributed to Gautama are to be found in our Khādira-Grhya-Sūtra."

This originates a doubt — whether there was a GGS prevalent at some time? In order to solve this doubt, it is necessary to examine thoroughly the references to the views of Gautama which occur in the text of Grhyaratna. This examination begins with the question about the nature of the text Grhyaratna.

This text is in Telugu-script. From the information given in the colophon which is added at the end of each Khaṇḍa, one learns that the author of this text is Śrīvenkatesa (Ven.) a son of Śrīraṅganātha-sūrī and a grandson of Sarasvatīvallabhācārya. The author is a descendant of Ḥārita-Kūla. He does not mention his date and the place of his residence. There is a commentary (Comm.) on this text which is known as the Kanṭhabhūṣana or the Vibudhakāntabhūṣana. From the information recorded in the colophons, it appears that Ven. himself has written this commentary on

33. जिति भी हरितकुलकिल्कर्ष्य सरस्वतीवर्मणाचार्यवैत्तिकस्य भीसरस्वतीसुधिकर्ष्य स्येत्वेकडेक्ष्ठेन तेन्द्रिक-सर्वमाधयमं कृतं पृष्ठय-प्रथमे लातं: ।
his work, and Vaidika Sarvabhauma seems to be Upādhi 'an attribute' of Ven.

With regard to the subject matter of this text, it is informed in the beginning and at the end of the text that it discusses the grhya-rites after consulting several Grhya-Sūtras (of all the Vedas) and also different Smṛtis. Yet it follows mainly the

34. Colophon begins with

कृति श्रीहारिल ।... श्रीमेद्देवेभिष्म वैदिक-सार्वभोमस्य वुजितपु मूलवर्तमात्यायने किकुकण्डमूर्ति प्राम: परल: ॥

the comm. ends with the colophon -

अश्रु चौर्यस्य केवलोऽसां व्यासस्यानयोगम दशनिः (से ॥) मूलवर्तने ॥
रत्नाकरं किकुकण्डमूर्ति ६ प्राः प्रक्ष्णययिस्वति वैदिकसार्वभोम: ॥

cf. New Catalogus Catalogorum - ed.
K.Kunjunni Raja, Madras, 1971, Vol.6, p 106
Grhyaratna printed with author's commentary
Kanthabhūṣana or Vibhudhakaṇṭhabhūṣana etc.
Besides grhya-rites and sacraments, it discusses the rites, namely the Ankurarpana, the Pratisarabandha, the Punyāha, the Abhyudayaśrāddha, the Pāncāyudhadhāraṇādīni, the Tulyotsavanisadha, and the Punahsamskāra, which occur normally in the Grhya-Parisātas (GPs) of Āsvalayana, Hiranyakesin, Bodhāyana, (and of Gautama, Khādira and Drāhyāyana) which are obviously later than the respective Grhya-Sutras. Therefore, it may not be wrong to say that the Grhyaratna is also quite of a late date.

As regards the references to the views of Gautama, one notices that Ven in the Text as well as in the comm. quotes Gautama on several occasions. I have classified all these views according to the grhya-rites and according to

35. In the beginning :

\[ \text{...} \]

At the end :

\[ \text{...} \]

See p. no. 257 - 262
the order in which they occur in the *Khadira-Grhya-Sūtra* (KhGS).

This would point to the prescriptions (or teachings) of Gautama about some grhya-rites and would reveal to some extent the grhya-traditions of the school of Gautama, vice-versa of the other schools or Grhya-treatises of the SV, namely the GoGS, the KhGS and the JGS.

1) *Pākayajña* :

"नैति: 'स्थानेऽवैद्ययोग्य मेण्डविन्यासः मृदान्ययोग्यम् दशस्ती'।"  
(Comm. - Khaṇḍa 2)

'One should strew (the *dARBha*-grass), beginning with (the first line of the) Sthandila, so as to keep one's right side (turned to the Sthandila) covering the roots (of the *dARBha*-blades) with the points'; such is the view of Gautama.

In the procedure of *dARBha-paristarana* 'strewing of the *dARBha*-blades around the fire, i.e. around the Sthandila 'an elevated place', Ven. prescribes in the text that, one should strew the northward-pointed *dARBha*-grass to the East and West of the fire, and eastward-pointed *dARBha*-grass to the South and North of the fire. While strewing it in this way one should begin in the East of the fire, so as to keep one's right side (turned to the fire). Then he mentions the view of Bodhayana that, "the *dARBhas* which are strewed at the South should cover the *dARBhas* next to
them and those of the North should be covered with the succeeding darbhas." In order to clarify the view of Bodhayana and to explain the method of darbhoparistaranam quite properly, he quotes in the comm. this view of Gautama.

At KhGS and BS 1.2.11 one reads a prescription similar to that of Gautama:

पुत्रास्मिन प्रदशिपरिनं स्त्रिया मुखा व्यक्ता आद्यालोकानं पञ्चकृतं न।

11) Vivaha 'marriage ceremony'

1) अन्त मूलम्: "हवतुपुस्माख्यावेत वन्धु दशीकेन प्रपदेन प्रविष्टि।

(Text - Khaṭa.15)

'He (the bride-groom) should make the bride tread with the tip of her right foot on the upper millstone'; such ...

This view of Gautama pertains to the rite of asmarohana, one of the rites constituting the ritual of Vivaha. In this case Ven. first states his own view (following ApGS 2.5.3) viz.: 'to the north of the fire (the bride-groom) causes (the bride) to tread on the stone with her right foot with (the verse) 'Tread on ...'

37. Text:

पुरस्तात्त्वाच स्त्रिया द्वारा दशीकेन प्रपद्दे प्राप्तिः प्राप्तिः प्रदशिपरिनं परस्तः । दशीकेन प्रसारोत स्त्रिया मुखा व्यक्ता आद्यालोकानं पञ्चकृतं न।

38. Text:

ज्ञातः दशीकेन पद ( i देन न अश्वमाहस्माश्यायितः अतिशेष्टि।

(cf. ApGS 2.5.3)
Then he quotes the view of Gautama which indicates difference of tradition, since Gautama prescribes the upper mill-stone and not the right foot but the tip of the right foot for treading on it. At KhGS 1.3.18 and DGS 1.3.19, one finds a prescription similar to that of Gautama:

राजादत्तेऽवत्तप्राप्ताम्यं कथु देशितेऽप्पेद्वन्मानमिति।

2) "केवल्लो लज्ञानागवफेत प्राता चूहद वा" विति चालम:।

(Comm. Khanda 15)

"Her brother or some friend of hers should pour fried grains into the bride's joined hands" such...

It pertains to the Lajshoma 'offering of fried-grains' one of the prominent rites of the procedure of Vivaha. In the context of the Lajshoma, Ven. prescribes that her brother should twice fill her joined hands with the fried-grains. But in that case, in the comm. he mentions that in the absence of a brother, a friend or a nephew of hers can do that instead. In order to support this, he then quotes Gautama who allows a friend (and also Katyayana who allows a nephew) to pour fried-grains in the bride's...

39. Text: केवल्लो स्युस्ततीयं कथा: सेद्यम् दकिलानागावपति।
(Cf. ApGS 5.3.4)

40. Comm. : कथा: सेद्यम्-प्राक्कूलो वायन्य: चूहद वा-जलिना दकिलानागावपति।

41. Comm. : प्राता प्राक्कूलो वा दकिलानागावपति, विति काव्यायनः। (!)
joined hands in the absence of a brother.

At KhGS and DGS 1.3.20-21 a view similar to that of Gautama is traceable;

\[\text{क्रिया क्रियाविनियमः जानानां कविकल्पविनियमः अग्नि संपुट्वा कस्यक्षमः} \]

3) "सुपृष्ट सिद्धान्त लाजानेन्द्र, सुपृष्ट सुम्भीम्" 

\[\text{(Comm. Khanda - 15)}\]

'After she has poured the remnants (of the fried-grains) into the fire, silently, she should sacrifice the remnants of the fried-grains with the neb of a winnowing basket as seen in the followers of Asvalāyana and Gautama'.

The context is of the Lājāhoma. Ven. does not prescribe such an offering of the remnants. However, in the comm. he points out in that regard different traditions by quoting the views of Gautama and Asvalāyana. Further, he adds that, since Bodhāyana and Āpastamba do not prescribe it, hence we also omit it. At KhGS, DGS 1.3.26 one finds only "सुपृष्ट लाजानान्वायम् प्रायुदार्जी मुनु मयदेकभिष्ठ श्रिति".

\[\text{42. Comm. भोजालयाबिनियमः दिमुस्मुके कुशलवस्मांभि:} \]
which indicates that they do not prescribe the offering of the remnants, in the manner Gautama has prescribed it. But, in the JGS 1.21 one finds the relevant prescription; it reads:

Silently the person holding the fired-grains should pour (the remnants) as the fourth oblation for (the obtaining of) a special wish. The right neb of the winnowing basket they call "the wish."

iii) Garbhādhāna:

1) "पाणिनेप्रथमालम्ब बिषुपीनिन्द्र जिति जेपेत्" ज्ञिति शैलम् ।
   (Text - Khandā 1)
   'Touching her secret part with his hand, he should recite 'May Viṣṇu (make thy) womb ready', such . . .

   In the context of Garbhādhāna Ven. quotes only this view of Gautama, and that indicates that he agrees with Gautama and prescribes the same thing. In the comm. he adds that Kātyāyana also prescribes it.

43. Comm. :

शैतकाल्यानाने, "पाणिनेप्रथमालम्ब बिषुपीनिनिमित्त जेपेत्।"
At KhGS and DGS 1.4.15, one finds the same prescription:

\[ \text{छतुबारे दस्तिने नाथिनोपसर्पालय विशुपर्विन कप्चयहूँ} \]

\[ \text{मिति जितेत्} \]

iv) **Darsāpurṇamāsa**  'The new-moon and full moon sacrifice'.

1) \[ \text{पार्षमासोपक्षया दस्तिने पर्वपर्वात्}\]

(Text-Khanda - 16)

'Of the sacrifice of the new and full moon, the full moon sacrifice should be performed first' on the basis of Gautama's view (that occurs in the GSm ?)

In the context of **Darsāpurṇamāsa**, Ven. prescribes that if there is a full-moon-day, 'between the Vivāha marriage ceremony' and the **Sesahoma**; then he (i.e. the newly married householder) can perform the very first full-moon sacrifice on that day; but if it is a new-moon-day, then he should not begin his offerings of the **Darsāpurṇamāsa**-sacrifice

---

44. **Sesahoma** is a **home** which is to be performed late in the night of the fourth day after marriage,

See Text-Khanda - 17:

\[ \text{ि क्षुद्धोपपरावेचे... करे: पतियण्यः प्राणानाय-गेहोऽम करित्य जिति संकर्ष्य...} \]

on that darsa-day. In order to support this his statement, Ven. quotes here Gautama's view. At KhGS and DGS 2.1.1 one reads a similar prescription:

\[ \text{पौर्णमासे पौर्णमासे} \text{ दर्शेऽपूर्णमासे} \text{ चिंति।} \]

2) "स्त्र्य पूर्णमास घर्षिति गौतमेन कुण्डलस्य पूर्णमासस्थायीपाकः
   कालस्वेते किवनात्। (Text - Khanda-16)"

'..... for Gautama has prescribed the dark half of the month as the time for the (performance of) \( \text{पूर्णमासा} \)
(ritual) in 'The entire second half (of the month) is the time for (the performance of) \( \text{पूर्णमासा} \).'

In the context of the Darsapūrṇamās, Ven. prescribes that if there is a new-moon-day after the \( \text{शेषाहोमे} \) and the succeeding full-moon day is faulty for the sacrificial performance, then in that case (the newly married householder) can perform the full-moon sacrifice even before the new-moon day, and then proceed to the new-moon-sacrifice on its proper day. In order to strengthen this, Ven. quotes

\[ \text{किवाहैहर्ष्येतोमो:} \text{ महे वदि पौर्णमासी स्वाला।}
   \text{तस्मी स्थायीपाकै कृणात्} \text{ दर्शेऽपूर्णमासे कृणात्।} \]

\[ \text{सौकोमानन्तरं दर्शेऽपूर्णमासे} \text{ मायी पौर्णमासी केतु।}
   \text{दर्शेऽपूर्णमासे पौर्णमासस्थायीपाकै कृला स्तिकाले}
   \text{दर्शेऽपूर्णमासे। (अपूर्णमासा च)} \]

Th. 6607
this view of Gautama, who allows the performance of
full-moon-sacrifice, on any day of the dark fortnight.
In none of the Grhya-Sūtras of the SV one finds a
prescription similar to this view of Gautama.

v) Puṣāvaṇa 'a rite to be performed for securing a male child'.

1) अत्र गैतिः "कुमारी ब्रह्मचारी क्रत्तृत्वा ब्रह्मणी वा पेयेत्।"
   (Comm. - Khanda-5)

Here Gautama prescribes: a girl or a Brahmachārīn
'celebrate' or a Brāhmaṇa woman who observes her
vows should pound (that Nyagrodha-shoot).

In the ritual of Puṣāvaṇa, the husband inserts
the juice of a pounded Nyagrodha-shoot into her (i.e.
pregnant wife's) right nostril. In the ritualistic procedure
the question arises as to who should pound it. In answer
to it, Ven. prescribes similarly as Gautama has done.
However, Ven. does not mention Gautama in the Text, but in
the comm. he mentions Gautama's name. At KhGS 2.2.23
and at DGS 2.2.22 a similar prescription to the view
of Gautama is traceable:

कुमारी ब्रह्मचारी क्रत्तृत्वात् ब्रह्मणी वा पेयेदेवेप्रत्याहारत्वी।

47. Text: कुमारी ब्रतवत्या ब्रह्मणी ब्रह्मचारिण्या वा पेययित्वा।
vi) Nāmakaṇaṇa 'naming ceremony of a child'

1) Gālām: "नामाकरणां दसानणां रात्रिकालां वस्त्राद्वारा नाम कृपायत्।"

(Comm. Khanda - 6)

(Prescribes) Gautama, "after a period of ten nights, or of a hundred nights, or of one year, from the day of the child's birth (he i.e. the father) should give him a name."

Regarding the time of Nāmakaṇaṇa Ven. prescribes that the rite should be performed after the lapse of ten days i.e. on the eleventh day after the child's birth.

In order to point out that the eleventh day is the proper time, in the comm. he cites the views of several authorities including Gautama; and thus supports his own statement.

In the comm. he seems to have quoted the view of Gautama not only for the purpose (of supporting his own statement) but also for pointing out a different tradition of the

48. Text: दसमेव द्यापरवशेष सूक्तिवर्णानविग्रहम् स्तायत्। ततः प्रामाण्याद्वितीय धार्मिकां नाम कृपायता नाम धार्मिकां जिति सम्पूर्णा नाम कृपायता, तदतूत नामकरणम्।

(cf. UpGS. 15.8)

49. Comm.: तथा पारंपरिकम् दसमानुपुस्तकम् पिण्डित्वं पिण्डित्वं पिण्डित्वं तत् सान्निध्यात्मिति बोधायनम् च "दसमानुपुस्तकम् दानम् वदादश्या व नामकरणम् जिति, अत याज्ञवल्क्यः — "अहंचेतान्द्रे नाम कृपायत् कुसे मार्तिनविनिग्रहम्।" इ
Samavedins, which allows the performance of Namakarana even after hundred nights, or after a year from the day of the child's birth.

At KhGs and DGS 2.3.6 one finds a prescription similar to the view of Gautama:

\[\text{तत्त्वात् दशमेष्टिः सत्त्वात् तत्त्वात् नाम कृष्णातः} \]

2) गौतमः "\text{असार्विति नाम कृष्णातः तदेव मन्त्रास्ते, माये प्राणमाण्ड्यायः}" विवेकः।

(Comm. Khanda-6)

'In the place of assu, he should give him a name (and should pronounce) it at the end of the Mantra. He should tell it first to the mother' such . . . . .

As regards the Namakarana, Ven prescribes that both the mother and the father should announce his (i.e. child's) name. It seems that in the comm. he quotes the view of Gautama since, it differs from that of his own. Gautama seems to prescribe that the father should give the name to the child as he prescribes that he, i.e. the father, should tell it first to the mother of the child. At KhGs and DGS 2.3.10-12 one finds a view similar to that of Gautama: असार्विति नाम कृष्णातः तदेव मन्त्रास्ते। माये प्राणमाण्ड्याय।

50. Text:

\[\text{तस्यः प्रार्थो दिष्टा माया च प्राणायामाथ्य नृत्तालस्य नृत्तालस्य नाम धारायाय विस्तितं संक्षयं नाम भुयायस्य तदेव नामाभिः।} \]
vii) *Caula* 'the tonsure of the child's head'

1) "दर्शमुङ्गली: ( विङ्गली:) सत्तोद्याग्रा अमिनियाय "जिति गीतम्:।
   (Comm. *Khaṇḍa-8*)
   'He puts seven darbha-blades with their points upwards into (the child's hair); such ....'

   This view of Gautama pertains to the ritual of *Caula*. Ven. prescribes that he i.e. the performer should place three darbha-blades in his (i.e. in child's) hair with their points upwards. In the comm. in this context he seems to quote Gautama's view for pointing out different tradition since Gautama prescribes seven darbha-blades. At KhGS and DG3 2.3.24 one reads a similar prescription:

2) "ननु सङ्गमसेन प्रतिच्छवाहुः गोप्ये वेदान्तः कुषास्" जिति गीतमभाषात्।
   (Comm. *Khaṇḍa-8*)
   'Cutting the hair once with a razor of metal, he should throw it on a bull's dung - on the basis of Gautama's view (that occurs in the GŚm ?)

51. Text:

   विनिवि: दर्शि: चक्तोद्याग्रहितान् पुरस्त्रात्येशान् वेनावष्टि जिति
   (cf. *ApGŚ* - 10.6)
It also concerns with the ritual of Gaula. In the ritualistic procedure of the tonsure, the question arises: where should one keep the (cut-off) hair? In answer to it, Ven. quotes the view of Āśvalāyana, whereas in the comm. he adds the view of Gautama to it, for he also prescribes that the cut-off hair should be kept on the bull's dung. At KhGS and DGS 2.3.27 one reads a similar prescription: लक्षदासेन प्रचिख्यान्तहुः पाप्पमेक्षानु कुर्यात्.

3) "प्रज्ञो भैरवन्निक्षेपे:" मिति गौतमः। (Text Khanda 8)
   'Let them bury the (cut off) hair in the forest' such ...

   In the context of Gaula Ven. prescribes that the cut-off hair can be buried at the root of an Udumbara Tree, in the bunch of darbha-grass. Then he quotes there the view of Gautama which prescribes that one can bury it anywhere in the forest and not particularly at the root of Udumbara Tree etc. Ven. seems to quote the view of Gautama with a view to pointing out that as regards the disposal of the cut-off hair Gautama also prescribes that

52. Text: केतानु प्रचिक्ष्य प्रामाण्यं समीपं: सहमाये प्रामाण्यं
   लानान्तहुः पाप्पमेक्षानु मित्याश्वलम्। (cf. AsvGS 17.11)

53. Text: जादुम्बरे दर्ष्टवत्वे वा निक्षेत्। (cf. ApGS 10.8)
they should be buried. At KhGS and DGS 2.3.31 one reads

a prescription similar to that of Gautama: अरण्ये केवलानुसिद्धेः।

viii) **Upaṇayana** 'the initiation of the student'

1) 'तत्त अवान् भाज्यानुमुखम्' भिन्नविनियमितम्।

(Comm. Khaṇḍa-9)

'For this very reason, have Gautama and Āśvalāyana
generally prescribed that a Brāhmaṇa may be
initiated in his eighth year.'

The context is of *Upaṇayana*. As regards the proper
age for *Upaṇayana* of a Brāhmaṇa, i.e. whether the 8th year
should be counted after birth or after conception, there are
controversies among different authorities. In that connection
Ven. prescribes in the text, that, in Vasanta 'Spring' a
Brāhmaṇa may be initiated in his 8th year after birth or
after conception. Further, Ven. quotes a Śrutivacana which
prescribes the 8th year only, but does not specify whether
it is after birth or after conception. In the comm. Ven.
first refers to the views of Āpastamba and Bodhāyana who
prescribe it in the 8th year after conception, and then

54. Text: कस्ने ब्राह्मणपुपप्रित। शरीरश्वा जन्म्यो वा अभुते वर्मे।

अहोपरे ब्राह्मणपुपप्रित। जितिस्य कुले।
that of Vijnāneswara who allows it to be performed in the 8th year after birth or after conception. This indicates that Vijnāneswara leaves it to the performer to decide how to count the 8th year i.e. whether from birth or from the conception. Thus, when it is a question of the performer to decide it, it is better to make a general statement as Gautama and Āśvalāyana have done and also the śruti does. The view of Gautama corresponds to the KhGS and the DGS 2.4.1 and that of Āśvalāyana to the Āṅgīkṣ 1.19.1 and 1.19.2 but what about this?

2) गौतमः "धार्यं वहि वास युवीलालीं पिता" विति।
(Comm. Khanda 9)
Prescribes Gautama "he (i.e. the student) should wear a new garment (which has not yet been washed) and also the sacred thread and the upper garment."

55. Comm.

अनापस्तते "गर्भायुर्मेयु ब्राह्मणपन्नात्म, लस्ते जित्वा।
(BoGS. 2.5.2-6)
अन्बे बाधायनः "अथ तेनी गर्भायुर्मेयु कसलि ब्राह्मणपन्नात्म।
विस्थापनं गर्भायुर्मेयं बाधायनपन्नोपपत्तिः। गर्भाधानांदिकृत्त्वा, जनमः वा जन्तम् ब्राह्मणपन्नात्म।"
The topic is of the rite of Upanayana. The point of dispute is about: when he (i.e. the student) should wear the sacred thread. According to Ven, it should be worn before putting the fire-sticks into the sacred fire. In order to support his own view, in the comm. he cites the view of Gautama, which prescribes the wearing of the sacred thread at the time of putting on garment, that means obviously before adding fuel to the sacred fire. In the comm. he quotes the views of others also, namely that of Ásvalāyana and Kātyāyana, who prescribe that the sacred thread should be worn at the time of fastening the girdle, which takes place after samādādhāna 'putting the fire sticks into the sacred-fire.' Thus, Ásvalāyana and Kātyāyana prescribe

56. Text: अत: पुरस्तः समिदाधानात् जिति वक्नाच्छ, आयुङ्गेदेति समिदाधानात् फलाये भोग्येति धार्यम्। (ApGS ?)

57. Comm.: अन्नाचार्यानि दुर्भिष्ठित आस्मालामन: "मेलरू बलात्रे जिम्य दुस्प्रकारः अस्तित्वस्थः मेलस्प्रौतमाध्यात्तिर" जिति। अस्तित्व कालयांमयक्। (ÁsVGs 1.21.1-4 describes samādādhāna and 1.22.1 mekalābandhana. But yajnopavīte is not mentioned.)

58. cf. JGS 1.12 जनवे सकिद् दुस्प्रकारः जिम्य दुस्प्रकारः भेलोपाख्यािति। which indicates the order of the rites as samādādhāna preceds mekalābandhana.
different order (and hence tradition) of the procedure.

As regards the wearing of the sacred-thread, neither GoG5 nor KhG5 and DGS prescribe anything. However, it is worth noting that JGS seems to agree with the view of Gautama since it prescribes:

सन्होऽवऽ सावका पारिवारित पहुँचेर सेम .... 
.. जैसे पथवादने: प्राचुमुपुर्वे योहीफ्योतिन्याचे
शास्त्राचति
(JGS 1.12)

3) तथा शैलोऽत्रोऽन् दृष्टोऽपि: प्रत्यक्षुपुर्वाच्य संतुष्टमय
क्रियाविधित्रैति क्रियान्नतर्फः प्रत्यक्षुपुर्वाच्य
शुसेठाचर्ये दलिते पदार्थांत्यम्याचति, श्रमाचत्रमय
कैल तिथ्योऽववसे - मान्यत्यः जस्तफळपरिधानान्युक्त्या
कृष्णुपूर्वाचति'' विर्ति। (Comm. Khanda-9)

So has Gautama (stated) "he (i.e. the teacher) should cause the student to stand northwards of the fire, facing the West", beginning in such a way (Gautama further prescribes that) "the teacher should direct the student to sit down" and, after he is thus directed, only the student sits down; then the teacher causes the student to stand up and to tread on the stone with his right foot towards the North of the fire, thus having caused him to tread on the stone (Gautama prescribes that, then) just while the student stands there, the following should be performed: gift of vāsas, maṇḍi and ajīna
'garment (to wear), a girdle made of ānâja-grass and of the skin of a black antelope', hastagañhana 'holding of the students hand' and paridâna 'giving the student in the charge of different deities' (having prescribed thus Gautama further states) then he initiates him (the student).

In the ritualistic procedure of Upanayana, after the rite of āśmârohana is performed, there arises a question: where should the student stand and facing to which direction until the paridâna 'wearing of a girdle etc.' takes place? In order to answer it, Ven. prescribes in the text that the student should get down from the stone and should stand just there till the paridâna takes place. This clearly indicates that the fastening of a girdle etc. are to be performed at the North of the fire, where āśmârohana is performed, and the student should face towards West while performing the fastening of a girdle etc. In order to support his prescription, Ven. states in his comm. that Gautama has already prescribed the same mode of ritual.

59. Text:
लक्षणाष्टाध्यायः स्पृष्टाः, अध्यात्मात्रेयं
तिलहेतापरिष्ठानां अध्यात्मानं न प्रत्यासीदेत्...
The view of Gautama, or rather, the detailed prescription of Gautama, as quoted by Ven. indicates that Gautama prescribes the rite of aśmārohana in the procedure of Upanayana, as he has prescribed it in the procedure of Vivāha also (cf. Vivāha 1 p. 35-36).

In this connection, it is to be noted that the GoGS, the KhGS and the DGS do not prescribe it in the procedure of Upanayana, but only in that of Vivāha. Whereas the JGS prescribes it in the procedure of both Vivāha and Upanayana (as Gautama has done).

JGS: तेजंश्चानमानस्वाधायं तैः द्वितिशेषं पादेना शान्तम- मधिः क्षण-ग्वंद्वत्समार्थेत् । (1.12 Upanayana), and .. अपानग्नावृत्ताशान्तमधिः क्षण-ग्वंद्वत्स्त्रीकल् । (1.21 Vivāha)

4) "जुड़न्यान्य द्वारा केति गतावम् । (Comm. Khanda 9)

'The darbha-blades should be pointing towards North' such...

In the procedure of Upanayana, Ven. prescribes in the text that, after the teacher has tied the kramājina, 'the skin of a black-antelope' with its hair turned upwards for the purpose of uttarīya 'upper garment' around the student's waist, the teacher should strew the darbha-grass towards the north of the fire in such a way that the tips of the grass would point towards the North, and then should cause the student to stand on it, facing the West, for
the next rite of anjalipurana. In the comm. Ven. mentions, in that context, that Gautama also has prescribed that 'the darbhas should be strewn (here) as pointing towards North.

In the usual procedure of darbhaparistavana, it is prescribed that, to the North of the fire one should strew the eastward pointed darbhas, but here in the context of anjalipurana it is prescribed that the Northward pointed darbhas should be strewn. It seems that Ven here refers to the view of Gautama with a view to supporting his opinion in behalf of the peculiarity regarding the darbhaparistavana in the rite of Upanayana. In the rite of Upanayana stated in the KhGS and DGS (2.4) there does not occur a prescription similar to that of Gautama. However, one finds such a prescription in the GoGs 2.10.16: 

60. Text : कुण्डः चिन्तित्वं छोटने प्रद्युपि दस्ति धन्याय धारणम्। तद्विळोऽवज्ञनोऽन्तर तत: आचायतुः तस्ते। 

61. Of Text Khanda 2 : पुरुषन्तथासच्च अथात्स्य चिन्तित्वम्।
5) "दलिकरित तन मन्त्रानु ब्रह्मण आचार्योद्मालिक 'पुष्पेन' र्याति पात्मा।

(Text - Khandā-9)

'Standing towards the South, a Brāhmaṇa (who is) versed in the Mantras, should fill the teacher's joined hands with water' such . . .

This view of Gautama pertains to the anjalipurāṇa one of the rites constituting the large ritual of Upanayana. In the rite of anjalipurāṇa the teacher lets the water run out of his joined hands over the joined hands of the student. In connection with it Ven does not mention his own view but he first quotes the view of Gautama mentioned above, and then that of Āśvalāyana. Hence it would be right to say that Ven accepts the view of Gautama in this case - such was normally the practice of writers. At KhGŚ and BGS 2.4.10 there is a similar prescription:

दलिकरित तन मन्त्रानु ब्राह्मण आचार्योद्मालिक 'पुष्पेन' पुष्पे।

6) अयु गाल्मकर्तर "लक्ष्मा अन्वाह सार्विन पदेन बिषिष्ठे।

सर्वायु व्याहितिके भाषिको अभिवाहारे न क्रियति।

(Text - Khandā-10)

62. Text: "चुस्तेन रोधे प्रत्यक्ष आचार्यों सार्विन पदेन प्रत्यक्ष

किरेन, अयु क्रियते प्रमित्वम्। प्रयाया।

(ĀśvGŚ - 8)
But what Gautama prescribes, "He (i.e. the śācīrya) should teach him the Savitri-Pāda by Pāda, hemistich by hemistich, and finally the whole and the vyāhrtis one by one and the word om."

The context of the Gāyatrīupadesa 'the instruction of the Gāyatrī-Mantra (to the student)' is the most important rite in the ritual of Upanayana. There are controversies among the authors of the Gāyatrī and among the commentators thereon, about how the first instruction of the Sāvitrī is to be given. The point of dispute is: whether vyāhrtis should be recited in the beginning of the (Pāda of hemistich and of the whole of the) Sāvitrī, or similarly at its end, i.e. in the manners:

1) 

2) 

---

See History of Dharmasastra P.V. Kane, Vol. II, Pt I, p. 361
In this text Ven prescribes it in the first manner, whereas Gautama (whose view has been quoted by him in the comm) prescribes it in the second manner. Ven then points out the different śrutivacanas and śrātvacanas and argues on the basis of them, that the view of Gautama should be understood to be in accordance with śrutis and śrātvacanas which prescribe that the vyāhrtis and āraṇyakas should precede the Sāvitrī. At KhGS and DGS 2.4.22-23 one reads a prescription similar to that of Gautama:

तथा अन्वाहः सावित्रिः पदोः शर्लवास्य शर्वम् जिज्ञा सावित्रिः

वाक्यः सहस्रादित्यायेकः उपासाः

64. Text: पञ्चग्रुप्तद्वृत्ति मथ: (1 मथे:), सुवाहिम जिज्ञासुः।
अर्थयोगे पुष्पद्वृत्तीमध्यम: पुष्पद्वृत्तीमध्यम जिज्ञासुः कथे।
कुमारस्य दलिते शुभापद्वृत्तीमध्यम:।

65. Comm.: अर्थमध्यम जिज्ञासुः नामद्वृत्तीमध्यम: सावित्रिः जिज्ञासुः।
पदोः सर्वकामोऽन्यानां, अर्थमध्यम जिज्ञासुः।
कथे: प्रक्ष्यानाह जिज्ञासुः।

पत्न: - अवस्थमयेषां च जगात्माकहुःप्रकृतिकम्। अवस्थम् प्रकृति
कर्त्तव्याः गायणः।

66. Comm.: द्वृत्तिश्रृतिः गायणः स्वर्ण प्रक्ष्यानाहृत्यप्रकृतिः
 प्रतिपदनात्, कुश्चतिमुक्तिमूलरेषां शाल्मोकमपि
तत्त्वादनाधे एव सङ्क्षेपम्।
In the case of the view of Gautama, it should be noted that Āpastamba also (GS 4.11.14) allows the vyāhrtis either in the beginning or at the end of the Śāvitrī. Hence, it does not seem necessary to consider Gautama's view as improper, but it can be understood as pointing to the peculiar tradition of the Śāmadevins.

ix) Punyāha 'declaring the auspicious day'

1) वैधायनपैत्यतादिदीयत् आपस्तम्बेनागापि प्रवाहं भव विलिपादिदीयत्
पुन्यादिदीयत् मन्त्रानुकूल्यन प्रार्थनान्तरसिद्धेस्थ

(Comm. Khanda-4)

Like Bodhāyana and Gautama, Āpastamba also does not prescribe the Mantras, while describing the rites of Punyāha etc. as principal rites, since, in the case of these rites, the purpose of the Mantras can be served by other Prārthanās.

In the context of Punyāha, the question under discussion is whether one should specifically include the wishes, such as ‘धनेन्यस्मृद्रिष्टु’ (there should be prosperity of wealth and food) ‘गोव्राहःश्रेयः शुम्भ मक्खु’ (the cows and Brāhmaṇas should live in good fortune) and ‘आराधनेश्वरभस्मस्तु’ (may the evil or misfortune be averted) among the usual svastivacanas to be proclaimed by the Brāhmaṇas, namely ‘शान्तिरस्तु, शिरं कमलस्तु’ etc. In the comm. Ven. mentions that since Bodhāyana does not prescribe ‘धनेन्यस्मृद्रिष्टु’ etc.
separately i.e. in addition to the usual wishes, we also do not mention them. Further, he explains that when one proclaims 'प्रार्थनार्थस्तु' it includes the wish 'प्रार्थनार्थस्तु', and 'कृपा कर्मस्तु' includes that of 'कृपा कर्मस्तु'. Hence, like Bodhayana, Gautama and Apastamba have done, we also do not mention them with particular stress thereon.

The references to the views of Gautama which are traceable in the GDS:

1) "तत्त्वत् द्वीपूर्व निम्नम्:" ज्ञाति पालम्। (Text - Khanda-1)

'The rule (of obligation) is applicable in the case of which are earlier told (duties)', such . . . . .

While explaining the duties which are obligatory on the Traivarnikas, Ven. quotes the view of Parasara: 'साध्यं, स्नानं, जपं, होमं, देवपुजं and वैशवदेवातिथ्यं, these six are obligatory duties for the Traivarnikas. Further, Ven. states hence याज्ञा 'sacrificing for others' etc. are the non-obligatory duties. In order to clarify it,

67. Comm. : वैधमने निमेषुपुष्पाहिन्यायवस्था स्वत्स्वूभाविकानां नर्मान्तरानां

68. Text : नन्दन्यास्याः न्योत्प्रस्तुतो न्द्येवन्यो च पूजनम्। कैव्यदेवतित्वेऽव 'परक्षिपि

दिने दिने।। ज्ञिति द्वारातः, अतः याज्ञाद्यम अनावश्यकार्यः।
Ven. then quotes the view of Gautama, which can be understood as in the comm. he explains it: adhyayana, yajana, dāna and adhyāpana, yajana and pratigraha indicate the duties of the Traivarnikas, however, only the first three of them should be regarded as obligatory and not the last three, since they are the duties only of a Brāhmaṇa and moreover, they serve as the means of livelihood for the Brahmaṇas. For this view of Gautama of GDS 10.1-3:

दुविनामयात्मक: आभाविक: प्रक्षण:-
-यज्ञनिर्माण:। प्रेयु: नियमस्य।

2) तत्र श्रीलम. "गप्पादान पुस्तक-सीमन्तो-साक्षर-सामान्य-नामवर्णान् -
-प्रासा-सोपकारम्, चतवारिजुटानि, स्त्रानि तथा सहार्याहरिणीसिद्धां:
पशुनाब भवानामपुमुनान, अर्थान पार्वें: भार्यं भावन्याहार्यनि
चैव चामुचुतुणु चेति साधारणक्रस्तं:। अन्यायधिशयित्वान्ति दलितोपमानानि
हार्यानिवर्तकस्य चालुक्यस्याणि नित्यपूजयन्ते:
- सौग्रामणीति साधारणक्रस्तं:।
अग्निमोहोऽत्वगिरि नोष्ट्योऽहातित्येऽंत्रित्वेऽत्यंत्रित्वानि
शिति सत्य सामस्तं:। जित्येते चतवारिजुटं सौग्रामण:।"

(Comm: Khanda -1)

while explaining the word सामकर्षया of the very first 70 सूत्रा of the text in the comm. he quotes this view of Gautama which enumerates 40 सामकर्षयास देवासमेत:।

69. Comm.: पुथु: नियम सिद्धित-अ:मामनादिपु: दिनरे तस्वितावशस्तो निम्न:।
अ:भायन-भाजन-प्रतिरिश्ता नावश्चक्रयाथे जीत्येते:।

70. Text: अथ निवेदाद्विनू संस्कार-स्थायवास्याम:।
For this view of Gautama cf. GDS 8.13-19.

3) "कार्य से वस्त्रपर्देश्निति" जिति ब्रह्मापस्तम्भादिदिनः
      सामाज्येन समनाৎ नैतिकस्य कार्यमेव धार्यम्
      (Comm. Khanda-1)

'Some prescribe that the cloth (used may be) of reddish colour' thus Gautama, Āpastamba and others have stated generally, therefore, a Naiṣṭhika Brahmācarin should wear a garment only of reddish colour.

The question is about the colour of the cloth of a Naiṣṭhika Brahmācarin. Ven. prescribes that it can be a "कसायवासां 'garment dyed with reddish colour'. While in his comm., Ven. mentions that it should be of that colour only; since Gautama and Āpastamba also seem to recommend it as they have quoted this, as an opinion of somebody else. At GDS 1.21 and ĀpDS 1.1.2.4 and 1.1.3.2 there occurs the Sūtra 'कार्यमेवे'. It is not known whether Ven. (i.e., their Dharma Śūtras) intends to refer to them by the word Śmarana.

4) गौतमः - "कृषि सप्तमाल पिक्कनिमो दीन (ि जि) माल्याक्षेमः
      पञ्चमाले" (Comm. Khanda-1)

71. Text: कैपीन धृत्य धारिनो (ि) यथात-येलो धारयम्यक्षासा
      येठि चरन्, अधेर्यक्षाधार्यमभिन्नै निम्नो केले।
'(A marriage may be contracted between the persons)
who are not related within seven ancestors on the father's
side or, on the side of the begetter, nor within five
ancestors on the mother's side,' such . . . . .

In the context of marriage, Ven. prescribes that one
should marry a girl who is not regarded as nisiddha
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'prohibited' for marrying. While explaining the word
nisiddha, in his comm., Ven. mentions this view of Gautama
which pertains to the number of ancestors that are restricted
in respect of marriage. For this view of Gautama cf.
GDS - 4.3-5.

5) "अ ताजुपेयात्, स्वतं वा प्रतितीक्षणमन्त् रावैतिषि दारानेष"
बिनिदि भैरवापरस्तमभिष्रुक्ताराहि। (Comm. Khandâ. 1)

'(A householder) shall approach (his wife) at proper time
or (he may do so) at any time, except on the forbidden
(days). Let him approach (his wife) in the interval also,
if his wife (desires it), thus state Gautama, Āpastamba
and others.'

72. Text : परिणीतःगोपुरस्या् वेद्य ज्ञातानि वेयार्थं वा पारस्तित्वं
युक्तानुसारः स्याते निषिद्धस्योऽव्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽन्योऽ
Ven. states that except on the day of Vyatipata 'an astronomical yoga when the sun and the moon are in the opposite ayana 'path' and have the same declination' and of a śrāddha 'ancestral worship', he can approach his wife. In order to strengthen this statement, in his comm. Ven. quotes this view of Gautama and Āpastamba etc. which state the same thing in general. For this view of Gautama cf. GDS-5.1-2 अन्तलुप्यमात् कर्तव वा प्रतिविकट्त्वम् whereas cf. ĀpDS-2.1.1.8 - अन्तलापि दास अते।

6) "पुःसवना पूक्तकामलयात् नमस्त् आः श्री कारानुक्षेत्रे सौम्यत्वाल्पक्षेष पुःसवन् परिगमनात्।
(Comm. Khanda - 5)
'Since Gautama has enumerated Puṁsavana before Simantonnayana in the list of the Samskaras thus; Garbhādhana Puṁsavana, Simantonnayana.'

Ven. prescribes that Puṁsavana should be performed first and then Simantonnayana even if they are to be performed at the same time. In the comm. he quotes the

73. Text : व्यातिपत्यात्रादद्विकं स परित्यज्य स्व-दाराज्जलुप्यमात्।

74. Text : सहस्राष्ट्रे तु पूंर्णे पुंकत्वे कुत्वा पवत्तदेव सौम्यतं कुर्यात्।
view of Gautama and mentions then that "Vidhanagranthas
do prescribe the rite of Pumśavana before that of the
Simantonnayana". One finds such order of these two
rites in the list of 40 Samakaras given by Gautama in
his DS (8.15-19).

After examining these quotations, the following
points come to the fore:

1) In none of these quotations, there is a clear mention of
the GS of Gautama in the manner: 'निर्देशा गौतमसङ्गीते' or
'नैगामसङ्गीते', though most of the citations pertain to views
relating to different grhya-rites. Moreover, they have
correspondence with passages in the KhGS, the DGS and
as shown in a number of cases, with those of the GoGS
and the JGS. Further, in some cases they agree word to
word with those passages of the GDS also.

2) The views of Gautama quoted in this text indicate that
Gautama and his views (or his so-called manuals) have
close affinity with the grhya-traditions of the SV since
the works, which contain prescriptions similar to the
views of Gautama, are known as belonging to the SV.

75. Comm. स्यें वियानसङ्गीते पुमस्वनसङ्गीते प्रथमोक्तत्वात्।
It is not known to which texts Ven. names
the here as Vidhanagranthas.
3) Ven. refers at places to the views of Gautama, 'the Dharmasūtrakāra', who is well-known as an age-old authority. This leads one to doubt whether other references pertaining to the grhya-rites and traceable in the Śāmaavedic Grhya-Sūtras are also of that same ancient authority?

4) Ven. declares in the prefatory verses: 'I have written this work after consulting various Grhya-Sūtras of all the Vedas and different Sāmītis', he refers to some of these at places. In the case of the SV, one notices that (except only once that of Gobhila in the context of Upākarma), Ven. quotes the views mainly of Gautama and therefore seems to treat Gautama as a high authority on the Grhya-ritual of the SV. It should further be noted that he refers to the ĀśvGS, the BGS, the ĀpGS etc. in the manner 'प्रस्तावमञ्चः'; जिति आदयणः, ज्ञात्यापर्ष्ठम्बः' and, in the same way, he quotes Gautama, which reasonably leads one to conjecture 'whether it refers to the GGS?'

76. Upākarma Comm. Khanda-11 -

ज्ञात्यानामुपार्क्ष कर्यत् कार्ये पराके ।
पूर्वीः तु किसर्कः स्थादिक्रियेकंदनो विद्यः ॥
जिति गीत्यस्त्रिप्रार्थ्योष ऐसोत्सर्वः
कार्यसिद्धिः ॥ ॥ (GoGS)
5) The fact that in the KhGS (and the DGS) there are prescriptions similar to those of Gautama would possibly lead one to doubt in the first instance, whether the available text of the KhGS (and of the DGS) should be known therefore, as the so-called GGS' and secondly 'if by any chance Khādīra and Gautama, could signify the same individual'.

As regards these questions one comes to the conclusion after thorough investigation, that the present KhGS cannot be regarded as the so-called GGS and it is also difficult to treat Khādīra and Gautama as identical personalities, this for the following reasons:

1) Though the KhGS and the DGS contain prescriptions parallel to those of Gautama, nowhere is there a mention made of Gautama in the words - 'विला गौतम: ' or 'तथा गौतम: '. Furthermore, if one compares the

---
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relevant passages from the KhGS and the DGS with those of Gautama, it appears that these works modify the views of Gautama by adding some words and the Mantras with a view to supplying details of the ritualistic procedures.

e.g. a) गौतमः - स्थानिलोपक्रमः प्रदलिनं स्त्रुष्या-मूला-न्यैरेचा चादेन्।
KhGS, DGS 1.2.11 - पूर्वोपक्रमः प्रदलिनमिः स्त्रुष्या-मूला-न्यैरेचा द्वरकिष्ठस्तु पक्षुः चादेन्।

In this case, the later texts read पूर्वोपक्रमम instead of sthandilopakramam may be in order to precisely prescribe the beginning of strewing of the darbhas, since 'beginning with the first line of Sthandila', itself means 'beginning in the East' (cf. GoGS 1.9). Then they add the word agnim which indicates that the darbhas should be strewn around (the Sthandila on which they perform establishes) the fire, further they explain the darbhaparistarana completely by adding the words trivrtam pācavrtam va 'the darbhas should be strewn in three or five layers'.

b) अन्य गौतमः - 'प्रस्तुतस्तुत्रामेद्वूऽ दलितः प्रदेशेऽविविधे।
KhGS, DGS 1.3.18 - प्रस्तुतस्तुत्रामेद्वूऽ दलितः प्रदेशेऽविविधे।
Here, the later texts add, in the first instance, the word *pascadagnah* 'towards the West of the fire' and thus prescribe exactly the place where the rite of *asmārohaṇa* should be performed; secondly, they procure the Mantra *Iīmatn asmanam* to be recited by the groom while he causes the bride to tread on the stone.

c) 'क्व ज्ञातावयवेदं श्रावत्सुदुवा' जिति गैतं: ।
KhGS, DGS 1.3.20-21 - ।

Here the later texts supply a minor detail viz. *sakrī grhītam anjalim* that a brother or a friend of bride should fill once his joined hands with fried grains and then pour it into her joined hands, which is not provided in the view of Gautama quoted by Ven.

d) अव गैतं: - 'कुमारी ब्रह्मचारी क्रस्वति ब्राह्मणी वा पैस्मेत् ।
KhGS, DGS, 2.2.22 - ।

Here the later texts add the word *spratyāharanti* 'while pounding that (Nyagrodha-shoot), she should do it without moving backward (the stone with which she pounds it)' and by means of that word indicate the particular method of pounding which is required in the context of *Pumsavana*. 
In this case, the later texts prescribe the Mantra 'Osadhayah . . . . ' with which the performer, is enjoined to put seven darbha-blades on the boy's head; this Mantra is not provided in the former.

ii) The commentator Rudraskanda on the KhGS refers to the views of Gautama at 4 places, such as -

a) 2.1.25 - तथा नाथाय - सम्बन्धायां नामाः। सम्बन्धायां नामायुक्तेऽञिताः। त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो त्रिशृङ्गिनिहितो

In the procedure of the Darśapūrṇaṁāsa sacrifice before the yajñavāstu (i.e. at the end of the procedure the performer offers the darbhas which were strewn around the fire for the purpose of sacrifice cf. GoGS 1.8.26-29.) Khādira prescribes adding of a fire-stick to the sacred fire. Rudraskanda mentions there that it includes paryuksana 'sprinkling water around (the fire) also according to Gautama's vacana 'prescription'. Thus, this view of Gautama pertains to the gṛhya rite of Darśapūrṇaṁāsa; and it is not traceable in the GGS or in the GS.
b) 3.2.26:

किन्नुस्तानमित्वु पुर्विन्दु व
संदर्कन्द्वृत्ति - स्तन्यायार्थेनहाथाकालिकमन्दः।
तथा गौतम: स्तन्यागत्व सन्यासिनिः प्राद्वृत्तारित्विः।
जिति पश्चिते वर्षः। cf. GDS 16.23

c) 2.5.34 -

अनुपुल्लिणी: साम सदस्यनिमित्वम चार्ध्य जुह्यान।
पुद्दन्द्वृत्ति - नेमानार्दि वत्सारी ज्ञानिः, वत्सारिः
वेदांतानि जितिः पारस्कप्यान। cf. GDS 8.14

d) 3.5.58 किन्न्राण्या: स्थापनाकार्स्तकृणः कृणात।
संदर्कन्द्वृत्ति - कैली पारम्पराकार्कः: 'गैयाः कृणाः।
जिति पारस्कप्यान। cf. GDS 8.16

Thus Rudraskanda, who is known as earlier even to
Sayana cites the view of Gautama, the Dharmasutrasaka,
this indicates in the first instance that Gautama and
Khädira are definitely separate authorities, since,
if they were the same individuals, Rudraskanda would
have mentioned their identity somewhere in his comm.
Secondly, the reference to the view of Gautama, which
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pertains to the rite of Dārsapūrṇāmās a and which is not traceable in the GDS, particularly leads to a doubt: whether in this case Rudraskanda is referring to some Grhya-manual of Gautama?

iii) In the Prayoga texts on the KhGS, Gautama is mentioned:

1) Khādira-Grhya-Prayoga-Vṛtti by Rāngarāja
   (Ms. No. 56/2, Folios 38-69, available in the C.R.I. Mysore)

   a) On Folio 53 (स्वाध्यायिकास्त: ल्या गैत्रम: पिठुम्यमोदयकदानसं ' फलसित)
      cf. GDS 5.5
   b) Folio 54 a ल्या केवलपर्यंत गाह्यम् (ि ) प्रयोगम् स्मार्यम्यं ययम्
      क्षुद्रवित्स्थः ि) गोल्धना स्वयम्ममांसंहृदय्यादित्या गैत्रंयोक्ति
      काम्यसं कायासुःृयृति ।
   c) Folio 65 a (आवध)
      आवृत्ती गैत्रीकीलोकुद्धे: गिरिं गैत्री प्रायम्यालोकीलो: कुर्वा
      'तेधे चुनितो यो भिक्षुद्यासः के गैत्राद्वितिः कुल्या चारण गैत्रम्
      जित्यादि स्वयम् इत्यं ..... जित्यादिन्न युग्ममयमुः
      पुनिष्काः यादिन् ।

2) Khādira-Grhya-Prayoga-Candrika/ Drāhyāyaṇa-Grhya-
   Prayoga-Candrika of Kṛṣṇa Dīkṣita (Ms. No. 5881, Folio 1-128, available in the C.R.I. Baroda)
a) On Folio 5a - त्त्वापि गौतमस्वरूपा गौरी दानप्रमुखतिसंचारयोगी
परिगणनात् गौरी दानप्रमुखतिसंचारयोगी प्रयोगिन्या प्रयोगम: गौतमः
गौरी दान . . . . भिन्नते बत्त्वारिस्तसंचारय: जिति।

cf. GDS. 8·13-19.

b) Folio 47b (प्रवसर्गोंदानान्नाति)

t्वारिस्ति रजसनिर्मिती चन्द्रप्रतिष्ठाम् आ प्राप्यस्य जिति गौतमः।

c) Folio 50b (कृष्णमन्दे)
वे वेदादित्ता मेयो जयो पर देवोभानु कुलो गौतम मात्रवामायम्।

d) Folio 70b (गुणमन्दे) . . . मथाह गौतमः।
गौरी द्वार वर्ध्या रात्रि तदगतीं जन्मेति। cf. GDS.1.9-10

e) Folio 87b (समावर्त्तप्रयोग: ) मथा च गौतमः।
किबाह्ये पुत्रांने निम्नम्। cf. GDS.2.55

f) Folio 97a (किबाह्य-प्रयोग:) गौतमेऽपि प्रायः
परिशुस्त्वामकं च समुद्रते न द्वारः। cf. GDS.5.25

g) Folio 120a (आपास्तनिर्मितिः)
अभ्या मात्रवासादित्तं लाभान्नाति जिति गौतमेऽते।

cf. GDS - 5.5

Thus these Prayoga-texts refer to the views of Gautama, some of which are traceable in the GDS while some others
are not found in the GDS. This certainly leads to the assumption that there must have existed a separate Grhya-treatise of Gautama and further that Khadira and Gautama were definitely two different authorities.

It may be noted here, that the GDS agrees almost word to word with the KhGS, this means under different titles they contain just the same text. Hence, it would naturally lead one to assert that whatever can be proved (said) about the problem of identity of the KhGS and the so-called GGS and of Khadira and Gautama can be applicable in the case of the DGS (and the so called GGS and of Drāhyayana and Gautama) also.

iv) According to different scholars, the KhGS is an abridged edition of the GoGS; that means the KhGS is undoubtedly a composition later than that of the GoGS. If one assumes in this condition that, the KhGS itself was known in some past days as the so-called GGS, then one has to accept that the GGS must have been a work later than that of the GoGS. But this goes against the fact that the GoGS cites the view of Gautama in the context of Aṣṭakā. Therefore, it appears more reasonable to understand that the KhGS cannot be treated

See India of Vedic Kalpasūtras - Ramgopal, p 24
as the so-called GGS and consequently Khēdira and Gautama cannot be by any means represent the same individual.
To the contrary, it also indicates the existence of some Grhya-work of Gautama.

6) Some of the citations do not tally word to word with the relevant passages of the GGS and the JGS, though they prescribe the same contents e.g. See discussion on Vivāha – 3 and Upanayana – 2, 3, 4

These strongly indicate that these views of Gautama may be from some Grhya-manual of Gautama, which also belonged to the SV.

7) The untraced quotations such as:

सतेः पर्यन्तः पूर्णार्थस्तव श्रिति गैलोन कुण्डलस्य पूर्णास्थालि यापाकालवेष चिनाति।
वेदाध्यायार्मिदिवसदिपस्तम्भेनागंग्य राज्यमय विरितमादिलेवु।
पूर्णास्थालि मन्त्रानु-लोधेत्र वार्तेनाव्यपक सिद्धोऽः।

which seem to pertain to the grhya-rites दार्सपुर्णास्या and फुन्याहास which strengthen the doubt about the existence of some Grhya-work of Gautama.

8) The quotations which mention:

viz. "शैवासास्याक्ष दर्माणानानीस" श्रिति गैरस्मस्वरार्थ।
"नमु सुस्वायेत ग्रा श्रवन्धु गैलोन कुण्डलिति गैरस्मस्वरार्थ।"
at the first instance raise a question: 'Do they mean here to refer to the G3m?' But these are traceable in the KhGS and the DGS, and not in the GDS or G3m. Therefore, it seems quite possible that they refer to a Grhya-work of Gautama by the word smarena, which is not improper, since the Grhya-Sūtras also are said to belong to the Śrāvī-literature.

As regards Gautama's contribution to the Grhya-ritual of the Śaavedins, it is worth noting that the text of Gobhila-Smṛti (which is known as Karmapradīpa or Chandoga- parisīṣṭa or Kātyāyana-Smṛti) refers to the views of Gautama, which pertain to some topics of the Grhya-ritual as follows:

a) 'Since while one rite is being performed, another rite like fire (worship) etc. is not (or cannot be) performed, therefore a homa prescribed by Gautama and others, cannot be performed (while) one prescribed by Sākalya (is being performed).

80. See His. of A. Skt. Lit. Max Müller, 1912, p 44
b) Some tell (i.e. prescribe) that the going around of what (?) should be on its left and that it should end the North (but) Gautama, Śāṇḍilya and Śāṇḍilyāyana state that the going around of (?) should be complete.

c) Gobhila, Gautama and Vārkakhaṇḍi prescribe the rite of Anvāṣṭakya (śrāddha) in the performance of middle Āstakā, whereas Kausta prescribes it in the procedure of each Āstakā.
Here the context is of Āstakā, a grhya-rite.

d) If the eldest wife of one who has many wives dies, due to aticāra 'transgression of conduct' then some prescribe in that case reestablishment of the sacred fire but Gautama does not prescribe it. Here the context is of Punarādhāna 'reestablishment of the fire', cf. GGP 1.10.

e) Āsaniṇḍikānanda states in dṛṣṭānta-pratimaṃśīkṣṇ in
After having performed Sapindikarana one should not offer every month (a ṭāddha), according to Gautama one may offer it (on the occasion) when the Skoddiṣṭa-ṭāddha is prescribed.

f) वर्म नाम अक्षिकस्वर श्रीद्वादन्तिकात।
   प्रतिन वस्त्रां साधवाण्यमानिनित प्रात:।। १.१०

'Before (the student has observed) Godānika-Vratas 'observances' his vapana 'hair cutting' (i.e. the Godāna ceremony) should not be performed. The period of Godānika observances lasts for one year; however according to Gautama, it may last for 6 months.' The context is about the rite of Godāna; and Godānika-Vrata.

g) संहार: वसुस्मृति सम्म्यः मैताविद्यम:।
   अथोऽव्रतांकार्यः क्षणः क्षेत्रभाविदित:।। २.३०८

'These sacraments are to be performed in the case of a man as are known to have been prescribed by Gautama and others. Therefore, the rite of Astakā and other rites have all to be performed at their proper (prescribed) time.'

h) स्वाध्यायसेव निःश्रृंगुर पिपले विन्ध्यस्त: सदा।
   तदाकारे कस्मसां धुर्ये नैताविद्यम:।। १.११

'The bali in honour of the Fathers should always be offered with the formula svadhā. In respect of that some hold that obeisance should be offered to the Fathers, but Gautama holds this should not be so.'
This verse is available only in the Kātyāyana-Smṛti (1.13).

Another thing to be noted is that the text of the Chandogāhnika contains the prayoga of Vaiśvadeva from the Gautama-Kalpa, this corroborates the assumption about the existence of the grhyas or at least of the grhya-traditions of the school of Gautama. It reads: p.48 (वैभवदेशप्रयोग)

\[ \text{Another thing to be noted is that the text of the Chandogāhnika contains the prayoga of Vaiśvadeva from the Gautama-Kalpa, this corroborates the assumption about the existence of the grhyas or at least of the grhya-traditions of the school of Gautama. It reads: p.48 (वैभवदेशप्रयोग).} \]
Our discussion so far originates the query if there existed the GS of the school of Gautama. Therefore, while searching for (or inquiring about) the so-called GG$^c$, I came to find that unfortunately there does not exist any proper GS of Gautama; however, there are some MSS, whose subject-matter definitely pertains to Śāmavedic-Grhya-ritual and points to the significant contribution of Gautama (or of his descendants or followers) to that ritual. In the following chapter, I shall present the critical editions of some MSS though they present mere fragments of the Grhya ritual \textit{acceptable} of Gautama or the Gautamiyas.