

---

The **7<sup>th</sup>** International  
**VEDIC**  
WORKSHOP

August 19—24, 2019  
INTER-UNIVERSITY CENTRE  
CENTRE FOR ADVANCED ACADEMIC STUDIES  
DUBROVNIK, CROATIA

**PROGRAMME**  
**30 YEARS OF**  
**THE INTERNATIONAL VEDIC WORKSHOP**  
**1989–2019**



FFZG



FFRZ



HFD

IUC

IUC



CAAS



Indian Council for Cultural Relations  
भारतीय सांस्कृतिक सम्बंध परिषद्



सत्यमेव जयते  
Embassy of India

### **International Organizing Board**

- Prof. Michael Witzel, University of Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA
- Prof. Yasuke Ikari, Kyoto University, Japan
- Prof. Jan Houben, EPHE, Sorbonne, Paris, France
- Prof. Joel Brereton, University of Texas, Austin, USA
- Dr. Julieta Rotaru, Senior Researcher, CBEES, Södertörn University, Stockholm, Sweden
- Prof. Shrikant Bahulkar, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune, India
- Prof. Mislav Ježić, University of Zagreb, Croatia

### **Advisory Board**

- Dr. Vinod Bhattathiripad, Kozhikode, Kerala
- Prof. Masato Fujii, Kyoto University, Japan
- Prof. Toshifumi Gotō, Tohoku University, Sendai
- Prof. Hans Heinrich Hock, University of Illinois Urbana- Champaign, USA
- Prof. Joanna Jurewicz, Warsaw University, Poland
- Prof. Christopher Minkowski, Oxford University, UK
- Prof. Georges-Jean Pinault, EPHE, PSL, Paris, France
- Prof. Renate Söhnen Thieme, School of Oriental and African Studies, London, UK
- Prof. Ganesh Umakant Thite, Bhandarkar Oriental Research, Institute, Pune, India
- Prof. Zhen Liu, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

### **Croatian Hosting Committee (University of Zagreb)**

- Mislav Ježić, Professor
- Ivan Andrijanić, Associate Professor
- Krešimir Krnic, Senior Lecturer
- Višnja Grabovac, Lecturer
- Katarina Katavić, Lecturer

## Co-organizers of the 7<sup>th</sup> International Vedic Workshop

- Department of Indology and Far Eastern Studies, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb
- Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies, University of Zagreb
- Croatian Philosophical Society, Zagreb
- Inter-University Centre, Dubrovnik
- Centre for Advanced Academic Studies, Dubrovnik



## PROGRAMME

### Monday, August 19

- 10–11am **Opening ceremony**  
Representative of the **INTER-UNIVERSITY CENTRE** as host institution  
**H. E. ARINDAM BAGCHI**, Ambassador of India  
**PROFESSOR MICHAEL WITZEL**, founder of the International Vedic Workshop  
**PROFESSOR MISLAV JEŽIĆ**, on behalf of the Croatian Academy of Sciences  
**PROFESSOR SHRIKANT BAHULKAR** and **DR. POLPAYA VINOD BHATTATHIRIPAD**: presentation of the proceedings of the Kozikode 6<sup>th</sup> International Vedic Workshop
- 11–11.30am **Coffee break**
- 11.30am–1.30pm **General Topics**  
Chairperson: **Jan Houben**  
**WITZEL, MICHAEL** (Harvard University, Cambridge MA) *Micro-philology: the re-import of Vedic traditions to Kashmir under Sultān Zayn al-'Ābidīn (1419–1470)*  
**SÖHNEN-THIEME, RENATE** (School of Oriental and African Studies, London) *Frame structures in Vedic literature revisited*  
**SCHARFE, HARTMUT** (University of California, Los Angeles) *Fragments of ancient versified Sanskrit grammars?*  
**OGUIBÉNINE, BORIS** (Université de Strasbourg) *Vedic nāraka- 'hell', nṛ- 'man', nārī- woman, wife'. Etymology and chronology of the derivation*

5–7pm

### **Ṛgveda section**

Chairperson: **Shrikant Bahulkar**

**JEŽIĆ, MISLAV** (Zagreb University) *How to understand Ṛgvedic sūktas? On the examples of sūktas to Sūrya and Indra*

**SAKAMOTO-GOTŌ, JUNKO** (Miyagi Gakuin Women's College, Sendai) *On the prototype of the new moon sacrifice based on Ṛgveda X 85*

**LUBOTSKY, ALEXANDER** (Leiden University) *The Vedic deity Apām Nápāt and the “furnace-well” system of the Sintashta archaeological culture*

**KÖHLER, FRANK** (Universität Tübingen) *What explains what? On krāntakarman as a commentarial gloss for rigvedic kaví*

## **Tuesday, August 20**

9–11am

### **Yajurveda section**

Chairperson: **Ikari Yasuke**

**AMANO KYOKO** (Kyoto University) *Composition of the Mantra parts in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*

**NISHIMURA NAOKO** (Tohoku University, Sendai) *Pravara Mantras recited by yajamāna in the Yajurveda texts*

**IZAWA ATSUKO** (International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies, Tokyo) *Seven prāṇas / chidras as the exits for prāṇa from the head*

**SWENNEN, PHILIPPE** (Université de Liège) *The making of the Vedic yajamāna: an analysis of the upasad days*

11–11.30am

### **Coffee break**

11.30am–1.30pm

### Atharvaveda section (1)

Chairperson: **Michael Witzel**

Workshop: **Domestic Rituals in the Atharvaveda**

**BAHULKAR, SHRIKANT** (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune) *Gṛhya Darśapūrṇamāsa in the Atharvaveda tradition*

**GADGIL, MUGDHA** (Savitribai Phule Pune University) *Prāyaścittas in the Kauśika Sūtra*

**KHARE, AMBARISH** (Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, Pune) *Atharvavedīya Mahāśāntiprakaraṇa: a compendium of the Śānti rituals of the Atharvaveda*

**SUMANT, SHILPA** (Deccan College, Pune) *Puṁsavana rite in the Atharvavedic tradition*

5–7pm

### Atharvaveda section (2)

Chairperson: **Elisabeth Tucker**

**KULKARNI, NIRMALA** (Savitribai Phule Pune University) *On purchasing the herb ritually*

**ROTARU, JULIETA** (Södertörn University, Stockholm) *Construction rites in the Atharvavedic tradition*

**SPIERS, CARMEN** (École Pratique des Hautes Etudes, PSL, Paris) *Guilty dreams and the debt to death: duṣvāpn̄ya- and its transfer mechanism in the Atharvaveda*

**WHITAKER, JARROD** (Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem NC) *Vasiṣṭha's plea (RV.7.104/AV.8.4) as obligatory hate speech, not sorcery*

## Wednesday, August 21

9–11 am

### Brāhmaṇa section

Chairperson: **Kulkarni Nirmala**

**DAS GUPTA, MAU** (University of Calcutta)

*Understanding the metaphors of pratyadanti in the story of Bhṛgu (JaiminīyaBrāhmaṇa 1.42–44)*

**KOLHATKAR, MADHAVI** (Deccan College, Pune) *Some more peculiarities of the Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇa*

**ROSSI, PAOLA MARIA** (Università degli studi di

Milano) *Sources of the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa: the expression 'ānyaḥ krośati prānyaś śaṃsati' (JB 2.405) in agonistic scenes of the Vedic mahāvratā rite*

**KORNEEVA, NATALIA** (Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow) *Atirātra agnicayana: texts, tradition and present practice*

11–11.30 am

### Coffee break

11.30 am–1.30 pm

### Upaniṣadic section

Chairperson: **Masato Fujii**

**ANDRIJANIĆ, IVAN** (Zagreb University) *Search for the interior meaning of speech and ritual: upāsana and -vidyā in the early Upaniṣadic exegesis*

**DESNITSKAYA, EVGENIYA** (St. Petersburg State University) *Dialogue as a narrative strategy in the early prose Upaniṣads*

**JUREWICZ, JOANNA** (University of Warsaw) *Why Indra is Indha?*

**TESHIMA, HIDEKI** (Kyoto Bunkyo University) *Rebirth theory of the Mānava-Dharma-Śāstra with special reference to the correspondence with the doctrine in MaitU 3.3*

5–7pm

**Ritual section**

Chairperson: **Julietta Rotaru**

**IKARI YASUKE** (Kyoto University) *The knowledge of the heads of sacrificial animals (paśuśīrṣavidyā) – Vādhūla Śrautasūtra 8.8–11 on the Paśubandha of the Agnicayana ritual*

**ŌSHIMA CHISEI** (University of Tokyo)

*A comparative analysis of the structure of the Agniṣṭoma according to the Vedic schools with the thought on Vādhūla-Śrauta-Sūtra*

**SARMA, SUBRAMONIA IYER ANANTHA**

**SUBRAMONIA** (Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO), Pondicherry) *Malayalam manuals on domestic rituals with special reference to the Bādhūlakaccataṅṅu (domestic rituals of Bādhūla School)*

**BASU, SOMA** (Rabindra Bharati University, Kolkata) *Importance of critically editing the hitherto unpublished domestic ritual text Pākayajñanirṇayaḥ by Candracūḍabhaṭṭa: an appraisal*

**Thursday, August 22**

9am–5pm

**Boat trip with lunch** for participants, auditors, accompanying persons and students



## Friday, August 23

9–11am

### History and Material Culture

Chairperson: **Hartmut Scharfe**

**MAHADEVAN, THENNILAPURAM PARASURAM IYER**

(Howard University, Washington D.C.) *The Indo-European oral tradition, the śravas akṣitam, from its first appearance in Punjab, ca. 15<sup>th</sup> century, to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE in the Pāñcāla country*

**RATH, SARAJU** (Leiden University) *Early Brahmin migrations into and out of Odisha: inscriptional sources from the 6th century CE onwards*

**D'INTINO, SILVIA** (Chargée de recherche au CNRS, Paris) *The grammarian exegete: Venkaṭamādhava on the R̥gveda*

**YAMADA TOMOKI** (The Institute of Shin Buddhist Culture, Kyoto Koka Women's University) *On base metals and precious metals in Vedic literature*

11–11.30am

### Coffee break

11.30am–1.30pm

### Religion and mythology

Chairperson: **Renate Söhnen-Thieme**

**PINCHARD, ALEXIS** (Lycée Militaire, Aix-en-Provence, France) *Ritual archetypes in the Vedas and narrative archetypes in the Mahābhārata*

**DUPÉRON, ISABELLE** (EPHE / École Pratique des Hautes Etudes, PSL, Paris) *The depletion of the effects of sacrifice as expressed using forms of the root KṢI: a precursor of the punar-mṛtyu doctrine in the Saṃhitās?*

**YANCHEVSKAYA, NATALIYA** (Princeton University) *Varuṇa, the Time Lord?*

**GRABOVAC, VIŠNJA** (Zagreb University) *Notes on Indra or Śakra in Buddhist texts*

5–7pm

**Linguistic section (1)**

Chairperson: **Boris Oguibénine**

**HOUBEN, JAN** (École Pratique des Hautes Études, PSL, Paris) *Vedic verbs, Pāṇini and the Indo-Aryan verbal system*

**PINAULT, GEORGES-JEAN** (École Pratique des Hautes Études, PSL, Paris) *Vedic jénya- under new light*

**DŌYAMA EIJIRO** (Osaka University) *Yád, yadā, yádi, and the “subordinate clause” in Vedic*

**JUNICHI OZONO** (Tohoku University, Sendai) *Once again on the Vedic variants dakṣ / dhakṣ etc: the relative chronology between Grassman’s law and devoicing-desaspirating assimilation*

**Saturday, August 24**

9–11am

**Linguistic section (2)**

Chairperson: **Georges-Jean Pinault**

**TUCKER, ELISABETH** (Faculty of Oriental Studies, Oxford) *Two overlooked Atharvavedic words: gr̥tsī- ‘witch’ and ṛṣṇú- ‘sorcerer’ and their context in Paippalādasamhitā 11.3–4, Śaunakasamhitā 19.34–35*

**FUJII MASATO** (Kyoto University) *Vedic aghalá-/akhala-*

**LIU ZHEN** (Fudan University, Shanghai) *“Argaḍa” and “nirargaḍa”*

**BENEDETTI, GIACOMO** (Università degli studi di Firenze) *Considerations about the meaning of dāsa in the Vedas*

11–11.30am

**Coffee break**

- 11.30–12.30am **Linguistic section (3)**  
Chairperson: **Toshifumi Gotō**  
**KULIKOV, LEONID** (Ghent University) *The Vedic particle ghā and the primordial incest of Yama vs. Yamī: linguistic and comparative-mythological evidence from Indo-Iranian and beyond*  
**HELLWIG, OLIVER** (Heinrich-Heine-Universität, Düsseldorf / Universität Zürich) *Extending the set of temporal linguistic markers for Vedic Sanskrit*
- 12.30–1.30pm **Closing ceremony: 30 years of the International Vedic Workshop.** Arrangements, proposals and decisions concerning the publication and future of the International Vedic Workshop  
**MICHAEL WITZEL, YASUKE IKARI, JAN HOUBEN, JULIETA ROTARU, SHRIKANT BAHULKAR, MISLAV JEŽIĆ**
- 5pm **Dubrovnik city guided tour**
- 8pm **Get-together and dinner** for participants, accompanying persons, auditors and students

## ABSTRACTS

Kyoko Amano .....	14
Ivan Andrijanić .....	15
Shrikant Bahulkar .....	16
Giacomo Benedetti .....	17
Johannes Bronkhorst .....	18
Mau Das Gupta .....	18
Evgeniya Desnitskaya .....	20
Silvia d'Intino .....	21
Eijirō Doyama .....	22
Isabelle Dupéron .....	24
Masato Fujii .....	25
Mugdha Gadgil .....	26
Višnja Grabovac .....	27
Oliver Hellwig .....	28
Jan Houben .....	29
Yasuke Ikari .....	31
Atsuko Izawa .....	32
Mislav Ježić .....	33
Joanna Jurewicz .....	35
Mieko Kajihara .....	35
Ambarish Khare .....	37
Frank Köhler .....	38
Madhavi Kolhatkar .....	39
Natalia A. Korneeva .....	40
Leonid Kulikov .....	41
Nirmala R. Kulkarni .....	42

Liu Zhen .....	43
Alexander Lubotsky .....	44
Thennilapuram Parasuramiyer Mahadevan .....	45
Naoko Nishimura .....	47
Boris Oguibénine .....	48
Chisei Ōshima .....	50
Junichi Ozono .....	52
Georges-Jean Pinault .....	54
Alexis Pinchard .....	55
Saraju Rath .....	57
Paola Maria Rossi .....	58
Julietta Rotaru .....	61
Junko Sakamoto-Gotō .....	62
Subramonia Iyer Anantha Subramonia Sarma .....	63
Hartmut Scharfe .....	65
Renate Söhnen-Thieme .....	70
Soma Basu .....	71
Carmen Spiers .....	74
Shilpa Sumant .....	75
Philippe Swennen .....	76
Hideki Teshima .....	77
Elisabeth Tucker .....	79
Jarrod Whitaker .....	80
Michael Witzel .....	82
Tomoki Yamada .....	83
Nataliya Yanchevskaya .....	84

## KYOKO AMANO

Institute for Research in Humanities  
Hakubi Center, Kyoto University

### Composition of the Mantra parts in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā

It was the common perception about the chronology of composing Yajurveda texts that the mantras were older than the brāhmaṇa parts. But recently it is becoming clear that the composing process of the texts is not so simple as with these two stages, but more complicating with multi-layered construction. In my recent studies, it was attempted to clarify the historic layers of language in the brāhmaṇa parts in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā (MS) through examinations of linguistic features and style of statements. Likewise, also the mantra parts, that are counted as 16, belong to different historic layers and have different features among them. In this paper, I will try to clarify how the mantra parts in MS were constructed. I will focus on the following points:

1. different styles and purposes of composing of each mantra chapter;
2. relationship and chronology among the mantra chapters;
3. relationship with Ṛgveda and Atharvaveda.

The last point gives us the key for the question: Were Ṛgveda and Atharvaveda that MS found same as those we have now?

## IVAN ANDRIJANIĆ

Department of Indology and Far Eastern Studies  
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences  
Zagreb University

### How was the ritual internalized: upāsana and -vidyā in the early Upaniṣadic exegesis

Upaniṣadic passages containing some distinctive teachings are traditionally named *-vidyās*; this convention is often followed even in indological literature (L. Schmithausen ‘*Zur Textgeschichte der Pañcāgnividyā*’, O. Strauss ‘*Udgīthavidyā*’ etc.). Already Śaṅkara remarked in *Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya* 3,3.8 (while discussing *udgītha* chapters in ChU 1,2 and BĀU 1,3) that the title *udgītha-vidyā* does not appear in the *śrutī*; it is given conventionally ‘by ordinary men engaged in the subject’ (*laukikair vyavahartṛbhiḥ*) because the word *udgītha* appears in both Upaniṣadic texts under consideration. The aim of this presentation is to show how and why the concept of *-vidyā* in a sense of distinguishing certain Upaniṣadic text passage emerged and what was its role in the early Upaniṣadic exegesis and in the formation of the Vedānta as a school of Upaniṣadic interpretation. As an example, this paper will present a part of *Brahma-Sūtra* 3,3 that discusses whether *udgītha* passages in ChU 1,2 and BĀU 1,3 constitute the same *vidyā* or two distinctive *vidyās*. The oldest extant commentaries (Śaṅkara, Bhāskara and Rāmānuja) appear to incorporate elements of ancient Upaniṣadic interpretations composed prior to the aforementioned commentaries; these passages contain numerous references to ritual literature. Following textual clues in BrahSū and commentaries, it will be proposed that certain Upaniṣadic passages were interpreted similarly as the ritual passages from Brāhmaṇas are interpreted in the *Mīmāṃsā-Sūtras* and in *Śabara-Bhāṣya*. In this sense Upaniṣad passages present a kind of mental concept or ‘meditation’ (as *-vidyā* is often translated) formed on a pattern parallel to the treatment of ritual (and ritual texts) devised in the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā. In this context,

the concept of *upāsana* (only the verb *upavās* ‘taking a seat near, approaching, approaching mentally, examining, worshipping’ appears in the Upaniṣads) appears closely connected to *-vidyā* as a process of searching for the interior meaning inherent also in the rituals.

## SHRIKANT BAHULKAR

Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune

### Gr̥hya Darśapūrṇamāsa in the Atharvaveda tradition

Darśapūrṇamāsa, variously called as Ājyatantra and Pākatantra or Sthālīpākaprayeroga is the basic ritual for the performance of various domestic sacrifices in the Atharvaveda tradition. It has been described in the Kauśikasūtra (KauS) of the Śaunakīya Atharvaveda (AVŚ) and has been further explained by Dārila’s Bhāṣya, Keśava’s Kauśikapaddhati, the Ātharvaṇapaddhati and the Prayogas, such as the Sthālīpākaprayeroga, the Ājyatantraprayeroga, the Atharvavedaprayogabhānu and so on. The KauS describes it in the first six kaṇḍikās (KauS 1.1–6) and provides some additional information in kaṇḍika 137 (KauS 14.1). This portion covered in these kaṇḍikās appears to have been added to the original composition of the text. While the ritual is similar to that described in the tradition of other Vedic Śākhās, it has some special characteristics, peculiar to the tradition of the Atharvaveda. We get some more information in the exegetical works, from the Bhāṣya to Prayogas that attempt to elaborate the ritual performance.

The present paper discusses some points connected with the performance of this ritual, such as the time required for the performance, the place of the performance, the characteristics of the *ājyatantra* and the *pākatantra*, the *abhyātāna* offerings, the role of the Brahman and so on. It is important to note that this rite forms the



basic ritual setting (*tantra*) in which various ritualistic performances take place as the main rite (*pradhāna karman*), performed in the middle of the entire performance, thus dividing the entire ritual into two parts, namely, the *pūrvatantra*, ending with the *abhyātāna* offerings and the *uttaratantra*, beginning with the *abhyātāna* offerings again. The KauS does not mention this method explicitly; it can be understood only with the help of the later works. The discussion in the present paper is based on the material gathered from various works mentioned above.

---

## GIACOMO BENEDETTI

Università degli studi di Firenze  
Dipartimento di Lingue, Letterature e Studi Interculturalinteli

### Considerations about the meaning of *dāsa* in the Vedas

The Vedic term *dāsa*, which is given to demons and human enemies, has been interpreted as indicating the aborigines conquered by the 'Aryans', the Indo-European invaders. The fact that the meaning of *dāsa* (fem. *dāsī*) is normally that of 'slave' (sometimes also in the Vedas) was explained by the fact that the aborigines were enslaved. Considering that also in Iranian languages (and possibly Greek) the meaning of 'slave, servant' is attested for related terms, we propose to the contrary that *dāsa* originally meant 'slave' (perhaps from the verb *das* 'to become exhausted'), and consequently it was applied as a derogatory epithet to demons and non-Aryan peoples. It is remarkable that *ārya* and *dāsa* are used to denote opposite categories of beings, and that this classificatory meaning can be compared with the later opposition *ārya/śūdra*, also considering the use of *dāsaṃ varṇam* in RV 2.12.4 (= AV 20.34.4).

## JOHANNES BRONKHORST

Université de Lausanne  
Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies  
Faculty of Arts

### When and why did the Veda become eternal?

The belief that the Veda is eternal is a fundamental tenet of classical Brahmanism. It is central to Mīmāṃsā, but other schools of thought accepted it too. It is however completely absent from Vedic literature. When did this belief arise, and why? Clues that may allow us to answer this question are found in Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, a text composed soon after the collapse of the Maurya Empire. This paper will consider the evidence and make an attempt to interpret it.

---

## MAU DAS GUPTA

Department of Sanskrit, University of Calcutta

### Understanding the metaphors of pratyadanti in the story of Bhṛgu (JaiminīyaBrāhmaṇa 1.42–44)

The Brāhmaṇas are ancient memorized texts that offer explanations of the meaning and purpose of Vedic rituals and ritualistic formulas. The *JaiminīyaBrāhmaṇa* (*JB*) is associated with the *SāmaVeda*. In its discussion on the Agnihotra sacrifice *JB* brings in many tales and stories to eulogize the importance of the rite. The story of Bhṛgu (1.42–44) is such a tale of considerable length. The story has its parallel in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (*ŚB* 2.6.1.1) with a little variation. Bodewitz (1973:102) contends that both the Brāhmaṇas have used a common source to tell the story. Varuṇa, the father, sends his son Bhṛgu who was too proud of his theoretical knowledge, to the yonder world to learn a lesson about the punishments that await the guilty in

a future existence. Bhṛgu visits the place for six times and witnesses horrible visions like people dismembering other people into pieces and devouring them and so on. Varuṇa explains to his son that these atrocious people are the trees and plants and other animals that have been cut and eaten by human beings on earth, that in yonder world, taking human shapes eat those who ate them in their past life in return (*pratṛadanti* in *JB* 1.43 and *pratṛatti* in *ŚB* 12.9.1.1). It is by performing the Agnihotra that a man can save himself from this horrible fate in his afterlife. There has been much discussion on the import of the story. Scholars of Indology, from Weber (1855), Burnell (1878), Oertel (1892), Levi (1898), Caland (1919) and many others to Lommel (1950 and 1967), Bodewitz (1973) and lately Wendy Donieger O'Flaherty (1985) have contributed much to its translation and interpretation. They tried to detect its antiquity and even found out its parallels in the ancient folktales across the world.

This paper will attempt at explaining the metaphors used by a teacher to make his student understand hidden realities. The scene of a man devouring a man who was crying out represents the man who in this world cooks for himself the animals who cry out. In the same way, a man devouring a man who is inaudibly uttering sounds represents those who in this world cook themselves rice and barley. The silent crops, having taken human forms, eat their eaters in return in the yonder world. The paper will try to determine the exact topic and vehicle of the metaphors used in the Bhṛgu-story and their success in the cognition of something that cannot be known through mere theoretical learning.

## EVGENIYA DESNITSKAYA

St. Petersburg State University

### Dialogue as a narrative strategy in the early prose Upaniṣads

The early prose Upaniṣads present a number of dialogues on ritual and philosophical matters. These dialogues are often considered a textual representation of a living tradition of agonistic debates – probably the earliest depiction of philosophical disputes wide-spread in pre-modern India. Still, it should be noted that the form and the contents of the dialogues in BAU and ChU are far from what one can expect to be a ‘philosophical dispute’. The arguments are often monotonous; participants do not justify their opinion in rational terms. Both of these features were probably inherited from brahmodyas of the Brahmanic ritual, where questions and answers were known in advance and were performed in roles.

The view on the early prose Upaniṣads as ‘a loosely structured collection of assertions’ has been criticized by Brereton and Hock, who revealed an elaborate narrative composition in the case of BAU 2.1–4.5. Similar observation can be made on the micro-level, i.e. the level of single dialogues. In my paper I will analyze the structure of the dialogues in BAU and ChU aiming to demonstrate that in many cases it can be considered deliberate. The utterances of the disputants are not arbitrary. On the contrary, they are complementary to each other, in sum providing a multidimensional perspective. Particularly, in the dialogues BAU 2.1, BAU III.6, ChU V.11–17 the sets of questions and answers provide a comprehensive description of different topics, with each statement corresponding to a certain aspect of the object described. Every set of questions of this type is generally focused on a single theme, with the traditional distinction between adhyātma, adhiyajña, and adhidaiva thematic levels being observed.

So, the dialogue genre in the early prose Upaniṣads can be considered a narrative strategy, adopted in accordance with the general

tendency to polyphony (in Bakhtin's sense of the term). Different aspects of a question or alternative solutions of a problem appear as the words put into mouth of different disputants. Notably, the similar use of the dialogue genre can be observed in some more recent texts, namely in the dialogues in the 'Paspasā'-chapter of the 'Mahābhāṣya'.

## SILVIA D'INTINO

Chargée de recherche au CNRS

Directrice-adjointe de l'UMR 8210 ANHIMA

Coreponsable du Programme "Anthropologie et historiographie des polythéismes anciens"

### The grammarian exegete: Venkaṭamādhava on the Ṛgveda

The tradition of Vedic exegesis is a multiform process. Before the *bhāṣya* model was largely adopted, one comes across different exegetical genres, from the *anukramaṇī*, where the indication of the *ṛsi(s)*, meter(s), and *devatā(s)* provides for each hymn a minimal gloss, to the *padapāṭha*, more oriented via the correct phonetic (and syntactical) analysis towards the preservation of the texts and its material transmission. With the *Bṛhaddevatā*, Śaunaka engages for the first time in a fully hermeneutical exercise, which brings into play mythological matter. In the *Nighaṇṭu* and Yāska's *Nirukta*, however, the focus is mainly on single words and their semantic import. The masters of Pūrvā-Mīmāṃsā, Jaimini (ca. 2nd century BCE) and Śābara (ca. 2nd century CE), whose authority is repeatedly invoked by subsequent *Ṛgbhāṣyakāras*, set forth a new hermeneutic paradigm, where ritual becomes the crucial backdrop for the interpretation of mantras. Diverse approaches of the *Ṛgveda* thus rely on (and produce) different general view of the Veda itself.

The *Ṛksamhitā* has a special status within the Vedic corpus. As the oldest collection of "revealed" mantras, it usually appears as a

*sui generis* work, many elements of which are lost in an irrevocable past. This the commentators have to recreate, in a constant effort of restitution. That is already true for the oldest exegetes: the ancient ṛṣis' language was a challenge then as it is nowadays. When Veṅkaṭamādhava (12th century) composed his commentary on the hymns, he resumed the *bhāṣya* model already used by Skandasvāmin (7th century). Yet, in the versified introduction of his *bhāṣya* — thirty stanzas where he gives his general view and explains the main points of his project — Veṅkaṭa says that in order to understand the mantras, one has to master their “language”, and this is the proper task of a grammarian. Pāṇini is constantly and explicitly referred to in the *Veṅkaṭabhāṣya*; and the *Ṛksaṃhitā* is (for the first time) regarded as composed in a worldly language (*lokasiddham*), transmitted by personal “authors”— which was not the case with Skandasvāmin. The attention focuses now more on the sentence (*vākya*) than on the word. The science of the accent (*svara*) becomes decisive. Through the analysis of a few passages from the introduction, we will measure the importance and originality of Veṅkaṭa's exegesis.

## EIJIRŌ DOYAMA

Osaka University  
School of Letters

### yád, yadā, yádi, and the 'subordinate clause' in Vedic

Vedic *yád*, *yadā*, and *yádi* are widely used as 'subordinating conjunctions' or 'subordinators' to introduce 'subordinate clauses' expressing time or condition in a broad sense. *yád* is the neuter nominative-accusative of the relative pronoun stem *yá-*; *yadā* generally consists of the same stem and the indeclinable suffix *-dā*, forming adverb of time, while *yádi* remains without any convincing etymology.

In this paper, I argue that *yaḍā* and *yādi* can be or at least could have been respectively interpreted as the instrumental and locative cases even of the declined form, *yād*. Such a doubly marked case form seems impossible in terms of morphology. However, when we carefully observe the grammatical phenomena related with these conjunctions from both syntactic and semantic points of view, the analysis is justified.

First, I discuss the functions of the three conjunctions, specifically accentuating the rich functional variety of *yād*. I will then point out that the *yaḍā*-clause shows a semantic feature parallel to that of the quasi-clause construction of the gerund in *-tvā*, which originates from the instrumental case of the *-tu*-stem. Similarly, there is semantic parallelism between the *yādi*-clause and the so-called locative absolute construction that is only established as such comparatively late. The semantic features of the *yaḍā*-clause and *yādi*-clause are also partly shared by the simple instrumental and locative forms of a nominal stem. A similar relationship can be observed between the *yād*-clause and the adverbial use of the accusative. These syntactic and semantic analyses of the relevant constructions and other related grammatical phenomena not only support our argument for *yaḍā* and *yādi* as a doubly marked formation, they also suggest that what is generally called a ‘clause’ could be redefined as a “nominalization” of a sentence, providing important implications for why and how the functional domain of a verb, particularly a modal form, varies between a ‘main clause’ and ‘subordinate clause’.

## ISABELLE DUPÉRON

EPHE (Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes), PSL, Paris

### The depletion of the effects of Vedic sacrifice as expressed using the forms of the Sanskrit root *KṢI* : a precursor of the “*punar-mṛtyu*” doctrine in the *Śaṃhitās* ?

As is well known, the term “*punar-mṛtyu*” appears in the late Brāhmaṇa period to denote the second death “which happens in heaven” (Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I.252) and threatens the new life of the late sacrificer who, due to his ritual merits, has ascended to heaven. This *punar-mṛtyu* can be prevented by the means of special rituals associated with some esoteric knowledge.

However we also find in many texts of the same period a tradition according to which the *iṣṭāpūrta* (or sacrificial merits) of the sacrificers get depleted during their heavenly life; or alternatively it is their heavenly food supply which gets depleted: this phenomenon of depletion, as well as its much sought-after avoidance, are expressed through forms of the Sanskrit root *KṢI*. It seems likely that the shortage of celestial food was supposed to be a cause of *punar-mṛtyu*, though this is never explicitly said; in this way the threat of a second death could be theorized without having to name such an inauspicious event.

Now I intend to show that the tradition, which uses forms of the root *KṢI* to denote the depletion of the *iṣṭāpūrta* (or of the celestial food supply) and its avoidance, is far more ancient than the late Brāhmaṇa texts: it can already be found in some places in the Maitrāyaṇī, Kāṭhaka and Taittirīya *Śaṃhitās*, as well as in the Śaunaka and Paippalāda Atharvaveda *Śaṃhitās*. In a well-known passage of the Maitrāyaṇī *Śaṃhitā* (I, 8, 6), the above mentioned use of the root *KṢI* is associated with the description of the fall of the sacrificer from heaven – a fact which confirms that we are here facing a precursor of the “*punar-mṛtyu*” doctrine. This tradition which started with the Yajurvedic and Atharvavedic *Śaṃhitās* already implied an archaic form of the *karman* theory, albeit restricted to the ritualistic field.



## MASATO FUJII

Kyoto University  
Institute for Research in Humanities

### Vedic *aghalá-/akhala-*

The word *aghalá-* is derived from *aghá-* with the suffix *-la-*. It occurs only at AVŚ 8.8.10 (AVP 16.29.10); ŚBM 12.7.3.20 (ŚBK 14.4.3.18); JB 2.266 (Malayalam mss.: *akhala-*); KB 2.2 (Sarma 2.3.4: *akhala-*). In the JB and JUB, *akhala-* occurs at four places (JB 2.66; 2.254; 3.262; JUB 1.5). In his edition and translation of the JUB, Oertel (1894) reads [e] *ṣā khalā devatā* (1.5.1; 4) for [e] *ṣā khalā devatā*, and gives the meaning ‘base’ to *khalā-*. Later, Caland (1915) notices that *akhala- deva-* is a euphemism for Rudra in the JB (*Over en uit JB*, 47, n. 69), and finds that *aghalá-* and *akhala-* are the same word (103, Addenda). Then Oertel (1942) examines all the occurrences of *aghalá-* and *akhala-* (except JB 2.66), and proposes the meaning ‘grausig, furchtbar’ for *aghalá-/akhala-* (*Kl. Schr.*, II, 153off.). *Akhala-* is a phonetic variant by the interchange of voiceless and voiced stops, or possibly, because of its occurrences only in Jaiminīya and Kauṣītaki texts handed down in South India, an orthographic variant to be pronounced ‘*aghalā*’, being influenced by local languages in which a voiceless stop between vowels is pronounced as a corresponding voiced stop.

In his study of *aghalá-/akhala-*, Oertel pays no attention to *aghá-*, which shows a semantic development in later Vedic texts. From the AV onward, *aghá-* increases its connection with death, and means an evil related with death or death itself. From the fact that the occurrences of *aghalá-* and *akhala-* are limited to later texts, it can be inferred that *aghalá-* is an adjective made from the *aghá-* that has a close semantic connection with death, and presumably has the meaning ‘related to or bringing the evil of death’ or ‘frightening to death’, which would be fit well for all the contexts of *aghalá-/akhala-*.

## MUGDHA GADGIL

Dept. of Sanskrit and Prakrit, S.P. Pune University, Pune, India

### Prāyaścittas in the Kauśika Sūtra

Vedic tradition is known for its ritualistic aspect. Vedic Indians believed that a ritual will be successful only when it is performed flawlessly. However, they knew that to err is human and hence the notion of *Prāyaścitta* (expiation, atonement) is found in both śrauta and *grhya* rituals.

Āpastamba (9.1) and Āśvalāyana (3.10.1) śrautasūtras define *Prāyaścitta* by using the phrase ‘vidhy aparādhe’. Thus expiation is prescribed when a mistake takes place or a rule is transgressed with reference to a ritual. Though many times śānti-rites and *Prāyaścitta*-rites are documented together, there is a demarcation between them.

We find descriptions of *Prāyaścittas* in multiple domestic rituals too. Kauśikasūtra (KauśS) has also recorded some rites which are identified by Dārila and Keśava as *Prāyaścittas*. In addition to chanting one or many mantras, these expiations are performed by following methods — 1) using śāntyudaka 2) offering ājyāhuti 3) chanting a mantra and replacing the damaged thing 4) burning with Agni 5) performing an action at the crossroads etc.

Curiously majority of cases identified by Dārila as *Prāyaścitta* are not labelled so by Keśava and vice-versa. E.g. in the case of a younger brother getting married before the elder one, both commentators prescribe a detailed expiation (46.26–29). Though Dārila hasn’t done it Keśava calls it *parivitti-parivetr-prāyaścittam*.

There are similar rites traced in other *Gṛhyasūtras* and they have the source in common with the AV. E.g. expiations prescribed for a Vedic student involves chanting of the mantra “punar maitv indriyam” (KauśS 57.15 and Mānava GS 1.1.3).

Present paper focuses on the study and analysis of the *Prāyaścittas* laid down in KauśS. A comparison of common occurrences from non-Atharva-vedic texts will be also done wherever possible.

## VIŠNJA GRABOVAC

Department of Indology and Far Eastern Studies  
Faculty of Philosophy and Social Sciences  
University of Zagreb

### Notes on Indra or Śakra in Buddhist texts

Indra, one of the most prominent Vedic deities, is found in Buddhist texts as well. Commonly known as Sakka in Pāli and Śakra in Sanskrit Buddhist texts, this deity exhibits some different qualities than ones attributed to him in Vedic or later Brahmanical texts, though there are other features that clearly connect Indra and Buddhist Sakka/ Śakra. On the whole, the role of Indra or Śakra in Buddhism bears witness to the stage in the history of Hinduism in which new cults of Viṣṇu and Śiva did not as yet overshadow the cult of Indra, just as is the case in the older layers of the Sanskrit epics too, and it is still a form of the Vedic religion that Buddhism is addressing as its counterpart. With the focus on the Mahāvastu, a work preserved in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit and belonging to Lokottaravāda subsect of the Mahāsāṅghikas, the intention of the paper will be to present the role of Śakra in the biographical episodes of Gautama Buddha and contained jātakas, to isolate his epithets, and to highlight some instances which complicate the understanding of the relationship between Indra and Śakra in the Mahāvastu.

## OLIVER HELLWIG

Heinrich-Heine-Universität, SFB 991, Düsseldorf /  
Universität Zürich, Institut für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft

### Extending the set of temporal linguistic markers for Vedic Sanskrit

When determining the (relative) chronology of Vedic texts, previous research mostly examined the distribution of a set of morphological and pragmatic markers such as the free injunctive, case terminations (*āsas* vs. *ās*, *ebhis* vs. *ais*) and the use of narrative tenses (Wackernagel 1896; Hoffmann 1967; Witzel 1989). The presence resp. gradual disappearance of such linguistic features has been shown to be a good indicator for studying, for example, the transition from the Ṛgvedic to the Mantra language.

The availability of morphologically tagged corpora of Sanskrit and of unsupervised machine learning methods, however, allow for exploratory research in the temporal relevance of other linguistic features or their combinations, especially if the frequency of such phenomena prevents their manual collection and evaluation. This presentation gives an overview of quantitative methods that can be used for such exploratory studies, and presents their outcomes with a special focus on the distribution of cases and flat syntactic structures (sequences of POS tags).

**JAN HOUBEN**

École Pratique des Hautes Études, PSL, Paris

**Vedic verbs, Pāṇini, and the Indo-Aryan verbal system**

In a recent article I observed that “from 1000 BCE to 1000 CE, Old (and Middle) Persian, Avestan, Vedic, Middle Indo-Aryan and classical Sanskrit evolved within a large area of Indo-Iranian dialect continuity (Meillet 1908: 24–30)” and emphasized that this evolution was from ‘linguistic area’ to ‘linguistic area’ ” (Jan Houben, “Linguistic Paradox and Diglossia... ” ... *De Gruyter Open Linguistics – OPLI*, vol. 4, issue 1: 1–18).

It is, indeed, well known that Avestan and Vedic are so close that expressions of the Avesta can often be transposed, phoneme by phoneme and word by word, to Vedic. It should equally be possible to transpose a Vedic verse into Avestan or Old Persian, although this is rarely done. Similarly, it is well known that classical Sanskrit and Prakrit expressions can often be transposed into each other, phonetically and lexically. Since Prakrit or ancient Middle Indo-Aryan (Pali, Aśokan Prakrit) is in some respects closer to Vedic than to classical Sanskrit, it should be equally possible to transpose Prakrit expressions to Vedic and vice versa, phonetically and lexically. Through the commentary of Sāyaṇa we are familiar with a reading of Vedic through the lens of classical Sanskrit: verbal forms such as the subjunctive are then systematically explained in terms of verbal categories that are current in classical Sanskrit, in the case of the subjunctive usually the indicative or the imperative.

In order to appreciate the synchronic value of Vedic sentences it should, however, be more useful to study it not only through a translation into a modern language or, with Sāyaṇa, from the perspective of classical Sanskrit, but from the perspective of chronologically closer languages and dialects: Prakrit (ancient Middle Indo-Aryan), and even Old Persian. One area where such “dialectal” reading of the Veda will frequently give problems is the Vedic verb,

where a simple transposition, phoneme by phoneme and word by word, cannot work if a formal “grammeme” available in the Vedic verbal system is simply absent in Prakrit, in Old Persian, or, as we have already seen, in classical Sanskrit. In a “dialectal” reading of Vedic, many nuances in the use of verbal forms will therefore fade or disappear. This applies even to a reading of the Veda according to Pāṇini, the ancient grammarian of the fourth century B.C.E.: Pāṇini did take Vedic forms into account, but not all verbal categories are distinctly accounted for. Starting from all formal possibilities available for the Vedic finite verb, we will map these with the realization of verbal forms in the other closely related languages or dialectal registers in a set of schemes that I have found to be useful in the course of several decades of teaching Vedic and Sanskrit. This will demonstrate not only *that* the richest realization of formal possibilities is found in Vedic and, to a more or less equal degree, Avestan – this we already know since long – but also *how much* and precisely *where* this realization differs in Pāṇini’s understanding of the language and in other languages and dialects: which Vedic verbal “grammemes” are, at least formally, “evergreen” until the time of classical Sanskrit, which remain elsewhere empty, which “grammemes” seem to be in competition, which developments can be seen over time. Finally, can this tell us something about Pāṇini’s familiarity or non-familiarity with, or interest or disinterest into, which Vedic texts?

## YASUKE IKARI

Kyoto University

### The knowledge of the heads of sacrificial animals (paśuśīrṣavidyā) – Vādhūla Śrautasūtra 8.8–11 on the Paśubandha of the Agnicayana ritual

The ritual of the *Agnicayana* represents the culmination of the development of Śrauta rituals in Vedic India. The rite of *Agnicayana* may be seen as the product of the synthesis of orthodox and non-orthodox rituals produced during the formative period of the Śrauta ritual system. The most characteristic aspect of this ritual is the construction of the grand altar of *Agni* made from the baked bricks.

Among its various peculiar rites, I have taken up here that of the *Paśubandha*, one of the preliminary rites performed before the start of actual construction of the grand brick-altar for *Agni* (*agniciti*). Along the *Ukhāsambharaṇa* (preparation of the matrix of fire called *ukhā*), this animal sacrifice is intended to prepare the requisite components to be set into the base layer of the *Agni* altar. With this animal sacrifice, five heads of animals, a man, a horse, a bull, a ram and a he-goat, are prepared and conformed to the ritual. What has annoyed the researchers of this rite is its ambiguous structure and treatment of the human head. Among the extant *brāhmaṇas* and the Śrautasūtras, there are three options of performing the rite: 1. Using a single *paśu* of a he-goat for *Prajāpati*, 2. Using a single *paśu* of a he-goat to *Vāyu Niyutvat*, 3. Using five *paśus* for various forms of *Agni*. All of the three methods agree with the ritual process upto the rite of *paryagnikaraṇa* (circumambulating of the *paśu* with a fire brand), which is performed just before the killing of the *paśu*. Then, the *paśu* animal is lead out of the ritual space and its head is cut off to be utilized for later use. At the same time, all of other heads of animals are cut off and, together with the *paśu* animal, are prepared for the same purpose. Afterwards, the rest of the procedure of the *Paśubandha* is performed with a single

*paśu*. In this manner, the acquisition of five animal heads is tried to be combined with the normal orthodox *Paśubandha* rite.

The actual process of the rite, however, is not in a uniform state among the extant *brāhmaṇas* and the *Śrautasūtras*. Further, there are observed ambiguous statements regarding the treatment of the human head. In this regard, the *Vādhūla Śrautasūtra* offers us an interesting perspective. While it generally gives a more detailed description of the ritual process than other *Śrautasūtras*, it shows the ambiguous wording that may invite us to get glimpse into the historical shift in ritual performance among the *Vādhūlakas*.

In my presentation, utilizing my new edition of the *Agnicayana* chapter of the *Vādhūla Śrautasūtra* and the *Vādhūla Anvākhyaṇa*, I shall examine the problems concerning the rite of *paśu* in the *Agnicayana* ritual and try to unravel the history of formation of this rite.

---

## ATSUKO IZAWA

International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies

### Seven *prāṇas*/chidras as the exits for *prāṇa* from the head

The plural form of the word *prāṇa* means the breaths or the sense organs (*indriyāṇi*), and *prāṇa* is the first member (a leader) of the other members. That is, however, not applicable to an expression 'seven *prāṇas*'. In Atharvaveda 10.8.9 the seven seers are mentioned, and later in Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad 2.2.3–4 it is explained that the seven seers are the seven *prāṇas* (seven orifices of the head). But according to AV 11.1.2, however, the seven seers are the breaths and expirations (*prāṇāpānās*).

The seven *prāṇas* are also mentioned several times in the *Agnicayana*. Regarding a human head to be put in the first layer of the fire altar, there is a prescription to deposit it near an ant-heap pierced in seven places, because the head is impure as bereft of the *prāṇas*.



Moreover the head is considered devoid of the followings: *indriyas* (Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā) / *indriya*, *prāṇas*, *vīrya* (vigor), *cakṣus*, *śrotra*, *vāc* (the faculties of sight, hearing, and speech) (Kāṭhaka-Saṁhitā) / *prāṇas* (Taittirīya-Saṁhitā)

Therefore, chips of gold are put on the *prāṇas* (TS) / *chidras* (MS) of the head, which is consequently united with the *indriya*, *vīrya* (MS). In short the seven *prāṇas* are the orifices and the same time the places where the *indriyas* function. Then what is the relationship between them and *indriya* (singular), *vīrya*? According to KS 19.10, *prāṇas* have various *vīryas* which are the faculties of sight, hearing, and speech. In the Agnicayana *ukhā* pot is fumigated for the sake of the strength. *ukhā* is regarded as the head of the sacrifice. Fumigating the pot means placing *prāṇas* (plural) in the head (MS, KS, TS). In Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 6.5.3.8, the smoke is identified with *prāṇa* (singular).

It seems that the *indriyas* are supposed to be controlled and powered by something like a chief *prāṇa*, which is also called *indriya*, *vīrya*. On the death it leaves the head through the seven orifices. But this notion seems still confused and incomplete. Later in ŚB 12.7.2.5 *prāṇa* is used synonymously with *vīrya*, and Praśna Upaniṣad 3.5 states that *prāṇa* assigns itself to eyes and ears along with mouth and nostrils.

---

## MISLAV JEŽIĆ

Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies  
Zagreb University

### How to understand Ṛgvedic sūktas? On the examples of sūktas to Sūrya and Indra

What we know about the Ṛgvedic poetry is already overwhelming: Vedic language, its complex morphology, etymology of roots and words, metrics, many features of poetic technique – on the phonetic and on the semantic level, the main outlines of the process

of composition and redaction of the Ṛksaṃhitā, etc. However, enigmatic formulations – on the semantic and on the phonetic level, structure of hymns – sometimes composed at once as a whole by means of different compositional devices, and sometimes possibly resulting from enlargements – all these make our efforts at understanding Vedic poems a real challenge. (a) In this paper I shall try to illustrate some compositional devices on the level of the whole hymn and some examples of enigmatic tactics on the level of particular formulations of Ṛgvedic poets. That will be illustrated on well-known examples of hymns to Sūrya and Indra, in continuation of my paper at the Vancouver WSC 17, where I tried to interpret the hymns to Parjanya. That can reveal some levels of meaning that seem to have mostly escaped the notice of scholars so far. (b) These three deities, Parjanya, Sūrya and Indra, have been chosen because I hope to have shown in my article in JIES 1988 (127-152) that some attributes of Parjanya and of Sūrya had been transferred to Indra, or absorbed in the character of Indra, in the period of the formation of the Indo-Iranian and the Ṛgvedic pantheons, in the process of Indra's elevation to the position of the king of the celestials. (c) Now I would like to show that the Vedic poets seem to have been aware of many changes of the pantheon of divinities they were praising in their hymns, and to have preserved the essential vital and sacred contents of their insights into the invisible reality throughout the changes or variations of divine names, characters and their relationships. It is a surprising hidden aspect of the continuity of the world-view throughout the changes of poetic formulations due to the changes in the real life.

## JOANNA JUREWICZ

University of Warsaw, Poland  
UNISA, RPA

### Why Indra is Indha?

The aim of the paper is to discuss how the concept of Indra was used in Vedic literature in the context of liberating cognition. I will begin with the redefinition of the *vṛtrahatya* myth in the *R̥gveda* thanks to which its main scenario could be used to conceive exultation under the influence of soma. Then I will discuss the accounts of *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 6.1.1.1–2 and *Aitareya Upaniṣad* 1.3.12–14 where the definitions of Indra as *indha* and *idandra* are presented and denote mental states: in the former case, it is the beginning of cognition connected with recitation and breathing, in the latter case, it is the climax of the vision. Finally, I will show how the conceptual tradition is continued: in the *Mahābhārata* 3.38–41, Indra appears to express the crucial moment of liberating cognition.

---

## MIEKO KAJIHARA

The University of Tokyo

### On the Śānti-mantras attached to the Āraṇyakas and the Upaniṣads

It is well known that to some Vedic texts – to the whole text, the chapters, or the sections – one or more prayers in verse and prose are attached at the beginning and the end. Such prayers are found since the *Āraṇyakas* which often include the *Upaniṣads* within.

The contents of those prayers attached to the *Āraṇyakas* and the *Upaniṣads* can be classified into the following three: (1) One proclaims his determination of reciting the text, saying “I will tell the truth” etc. at

the beginning, and “I have told the truth” etc. at the end; (2) One asks for the protection of the gods; (3) One praises a god or the gods. These kinds of prayers are traditionally called *śāntis* by the commentators.

From their positions, it is not difficult to presume that the *śānti*-mantras form the framework for the texts to which they are attached. Especially, type (1) above appears to have marked the beginning and the end of recitations and/or lessons of the texts. Type (1) is sometimes expressed in the dual form, implying its use at the time of lessons between the teacher and the student.

It may not be a coincidence that the *śāntis* are first attached to the Āraṇyakas and the Upaniṣads. When the teacher teaches and the student learns the cryptic and dangerous teachings in those texts, they would have needed particular determination and protection. The pacification (*śānti*) may be also related to the major subjects of the Āraṇyakas, i.e. the Pravargya and the Mahāvratā, which are connected to the sun, fire, and heat.

The *śānti*-mantras appear to be secondary additions: they are found in confused situation in manuscripts, editions, and commentaries. Still, some may not be very late additions, but have formed a part of the texts by the late Vedic period. For example, in Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka 7 (= Taittirīya-Upaniṣad 1), we find a trace of a *śānti*'s being included into the body of the text. Some Gṛhyasūtras quote the *śāntis* attached to several Āraṇyakas in the ceremonies for the learning of the Veda.

The *śāntis* at first may not have been a part of the body of texts, but were the prayers of those who recite the texts such as the teacher and the student. In the course of the time, some were regarded to be a part of the texts, while others were secondarily added to various texts at several stages.

## AMBARISH KHARE

S. B. L. Centre of Sanskrit and Indological Studies  
Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth

### Atharvavedīya Mahāśāntiprakaraṇa: a compendium of the Śānti rituals of the Atharvaveda

The present study is based on the manuscript entitled Mahāśāntiprakaraṇa (Atharvavedīya), in possession of the BORI, Pune (Accession No. 132/1886–92). The manuscript is a sort of *prayoga* (but calls itself a *paddhati*) dealing with the *śānti* rituals in the tradition of the Atharvaveda. It is primarily based on the Śāntikalpa of the Atharvaveda. However, it does not restrict itself in explaining the thirty types of *śāntis* that are dealt with in the Śāntikalpa. It also takes an account of other types of *śānti* rituals that are present in the tradition of the Atharvaveda. These include the types explained in the Kauśika Sūtra of the Atharvaveda, such as the *vijātavikṛta-śānti*, *goyamalajanana-śānti*, *janmanakṣatra-śānti* and *sadantajanma-śānti*.

It can also be noticed that the manuscript employs several hymns in these rituals that are not prescribed for similar employment by the Kauśika Sūtra. It also prescribes the use of numerous prose mantras. It will be argued that the manuscript depicts a developed form of the *śānti* ritual which is not evinced by the earlier texts like the Kauśika Sūtra and the Śāntikalpa. The manuscript has brought together all the types of *śānti* ritual that are present in the tradition of the Atharvaveda. In this way it acts as a compendium of the *śānti* rituals.

## FRANK KÖHLER

Universität Tübingen  
Abteilung für Indologie und Vergleichende Religionswissenschaft  
Asien-Orient-Institut

### What explains what? On *krāntakarman* as a commentarial gloss for *rigvedic kaví*

The commentators of the Rigveda have used different terms to elucidate the meaning of *kaví*, often translated as “poet”, “sage” or “seer”. Especially the last meaning is suggested by commentarial explanations for this word such as *krāntadṛṣ-* (e.g. ad RV 3.5.1), *krāntadarśin* (e.g. ad RV 4.26.1) and *krāntadarśana* (e.g. ad RV 9.100.5); in these cases at least the second member of the explanative compound unanimously refers to the distinctive perceptive abilities of those persons who are addressed as *kaví*. It turns out to be more problematic to obtain a proper understanding of the first member of the compound, *krānta-*, due to its syntactic (adjective “gone, extended”, or substantive “going”?) and semantic (what is gone/extended? Which going?) ambiguity. These difficulties are enhanced in a further gloss for *kaví*, *krāntakarman*, used among others by Mādhava several times (e.g., ad RV 7.18.2; 8.40.3; 9.7.4 and 9.59.3). A tentative translation “creator of the going/course” is presumably not to widely off the mark, but it certainly needs a more specific formulation: who is creating, gods or human? What do they create? The ritual, or possibly its foundations? How? By a reversion of the common interpretative direction from commentary to source text, it will be attempted in this talk to find an explanation for the commentarial *krāntakarman* via an interpretation of the *rigvedic* stanzas that are commented this way.

## MADHAVI KOLHATKAR

Deccan College, Pune

### Some more peculiarities of the Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇa

The title is with reference to the article already published under the name “Some peculiarities of the Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇa.” In that article published in 2014 following points were discussed: Similarity with the other Vedic texts, Relation with Atharvaveda, The culture presented in the Jaiminīyabrāhmaṇa, Relation with Marathi language, vocabulary and grammatical peculiarities.

In present article some more examples on the same points will be given together with some new points of specialities of this text, which would throw light on the relative chronology of the text.

While working on this text it was noticed that it uses very rare but correct Paṇinian verbal forms, e.g. *apārāma*, *ūdāte*, *udvodha* etc. which occur only in this text and there also only once. Having this in mind, all the finite verbal forms are collected from the third chapter of the text and based on their analysis an attempt is made to draw some conclusions about the nature and also chronology of the text.

**NATALIA A. KORNEEVA**

Research Seminar, Institute for Oriental and Classical Studies  
Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow

## Atirātra agnicayana: texts, tradition and present practice

In antiquity, Vedic sacrifices constituted very important part of religious and cultural life, but over the time they lost successively their position under influence of metaphysical concepts, social, economic and other factors. If the study of Vedic ritual texts were in the focus of the most outstanding scholars from the very beginning of Vedic studies, actual performing of śrauta rituals was neglected during long time. Only after F. Staal's famous Agnicayana Project, the scholars began to pay attention to today's śrauta sacrifices.

The Atirātra Agnicayana is a rarely performed ancient Vedic twelve-day śrauta ritual. It also calls *Atirātra* as continues through last nights. *Agnicayana* means 'construction of the fire altar' — after three days of preliminary rites during next five days a big bird-shaped altar (*śyena-citi*) of 1000 bricks (200 in each of the five layers) is being constructed for Soma offerings. This very complex ritual consisting of numerous unique rites has been kept alive by Nambudiri Brahmins of Kerala. The Nambudiri tradition of Vedic recitations and rituals is an uninterrupted living tradition for centuries handed down mostly orally.

This paper analyzes several points of the Atirātra Agnicayana comparing them with related fragments of the śrautasūtras (Baudhāyana, Āśvalāyana, Āpastamba), with the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, where the Agnicayana rites are presented most fully, with the modern reports of the Agnicayana and other śrauta rituals and with the author's own experience of the Atirātra Agnicayana in Śukapuram performed by Nambudiri Brahmins in 2015. The paper demonstrates that in some cases the deviations concern not only the ancient texts but today's performances often bring various innovations. However, despite the fact that the changes of modern life provide more convenient



conditions for performing the ritual and inevitably bring artificial elements to it, the study of today's śrauta rituals gives important information for better understanding Vedic tradition.

## LEONID KULIKOV

Ghent University

### The Vedic particle *ghā* and the primordial incest of Yama vs. Yamī: linguistic and comparative-mythological evidence from Indo-Iranian and beyond

The linguistic analysis of discourse particles in a dead language poses serious problems: the available evidence is limited to attested texts and may often be insufficient to make conclusions about the semantics and usage of such linguistic units. Yet, a thorough philological study of the text corpus may help to achieve some progress in our understanding of the discourse structure in an ancient language. A case in point is the usage of the discourse particle *ghā* in Vedic Sanskrit.

The traditional translation of the Vedic particle *ghā* as 'perhaps, certainly, verily', albeit acceptable for some of its occurrences, yields quite weird interpretations for a number of passages from the Ṛgveda. This is, in particular, the case of a passage in the hymn dedicated to the first humans, the twins Yama and Yamī (RV 10.10.10). Here, *ghā* appears in Yama's answer to his sister Yamī, who persuades her brother to commit incest. Yama replies: "*ghā* other generations will come, where incest will be common". The traditional interpretation of *ghā* as 'perhaps, certainly, verily' leaves unexplained Yama's pessimism, badly fits the general content of the hymn and, eventually, leads to an inadequate analysis of this important Vedic text. On the basis of a pragmatic analysis of this dialogue as well as a philological study of other attestations of *ghā* in Vedic the interpretation of *ghā* can be reconsidered.

I argue that *ghā* functions as a consecutive connector, meaning ‘then, (if so) then, as a result’. That is, P *ghā* Q should be rendered as ‘if P happens, then Q will most probably happen, too’. This analysis clarifies Yama’s reply (“if we commit incest, the next generations will do the same”). For approximately half of the Ṛgvedic occurrences of *ghā* this interpretation is also appropriate and, in many cases, even yields better sense. Additional evidence in support of this analysis is provided by the cognates of *ghā* in some other Indo-European languages, such as, above all, Slavic *že* ‘since’, which also serves to express causal relations. A number of typological parallels, such as, for instance, Spanish *pues* (< Lat. *post*, cf. Fr. *puis*), meaning both ‘because’ and ‘then’, further corroborate the proposed analysis of *ghā*.

I also argue that the passage RV 10.10.10 is one of the key stanzas in the hymn in question, since it elucidates some important differences between the statuses of Yama and Yamī within the Vedic pantheon and, eventually, possible sources, prehistory and further development of this common Indo-Iranian myth of the incest of the twins.

---

## NIRMALA R. KULKARNI

Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit  
S. P. Pune University

### On purchasing the herb ritually

The KauśikaSūtra (KS) 33.1 to 33.29 prescribes six types of rituals for easy partuition and therefore are entitled as *sukhaprasavakarmāṇi* (rituals for easy delivery) by Sāyaṇa. One of such rituals (KS 33.7–16) is to tie a certain herb to the partuating woman which has been designated by the Kauśikapaddhati as *lāngalīośadhividhānam* (a ritual with the herb *lāngalī*). The herb is ritually purchased before it is tied to the woman. An attempt is made in the present paper to

Describe this curious ritual in detail in the light of the two commentaries Dārīlabhāṣya and Kauśikapaddhati

Trace and analyze the occurrences of the mantras employed in other Vedic texts and

Discuss the ritual contexts therein

Possible stages in the transmission of these *mantras*.

---

## LIU ZHEN

National Institute for Advanced Humanistic Studies  
Centre for Gandhian and Indian Studies, Director  
Fudan University, Shanghai

### ‘Argaḍa’ and ‘nirargaḍa’

The Vedic word “argaḍa” (bolt) first appears in the Brāhmaṇa literature. It is a lock to close a cowshed.

The development of this word can be found in the post Vedic literature, i.e. Hinduist, Buddhist and Jainist texts. It is a lock in form of a bolt used on the door of a house or city gate. The description in technique books and the imaging in works of art can offer a more detailed visualization. Furthermore, “argaḍa” and its antonym “nirargaḍa” have become a pair of religious metaphors.

Finally, a kind of sacrifice, “nirargaḍamedha”, will be discussed.

## ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY

Leiden University

### The Vedic deity Apām Nápāt and the “furnace-well” system of the Sintashta archaeological culture

In the Rigveda, the name Apām Nápāt, literally ‘The Grandson of the Waters’, usually refers to an aspect or form of Agni. To call the god of fire the Grandson of the Waters “might seem singularly inappropriate” (as Mary Boyce once remarked), which gave rise to a plethora of interpretations in the literature: Apām Nápāt was taken as the sun sinking into the ocean, as lightning, as aquatic deity, as Soma, as Varuṇa, or even as oil flares in the Caspian shores. In spite of all these efforts, many passages still remain obscure.

In my paper I will argue that an important clue to our understanding of Apām Nápāt may come from the Sintashta archaeological culture, which is commonly believed to have been inhabited by the speakers of Proto-Indo-Iranian. Archaeologists who excavate the Sintashta monuments have recently drawn attention to the stable combination of wells and furnaces, which are often connected by a blower channel.

## THENNILAPURAM PARASURAMIYER MAHADEVAN

Howard University, Washington D.C.

### The Indo-European oral tradition, the śravas akṣitam, from its first appearance in Punjab, ca. 15<sup>th</sup> century, to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE in the Pāñcāla country

In ongoing work, I see that we can trace the philology of the Indic vector of the IE oral tradition, the Śravas Akṣitam, from its first appearance in Punjab, ca. 15th through to 3rd BCE in the Pāñcāla country, that is, Witzel Level 1 W through 5 E or in my scheme, Phases 1 through III of the Vedic oral tradition. It generates a positive slope of Saṃhitā-ization, studded by three Vedic Saṃhitās and an epi-Vedic Saṃhitā (see Appendix I)

- i. the TMS-RV at Phase I and Witzel Level I W, 11th BCE, on the Sarasvatī banks under the Kuru auspices, if not fiat;
- ii. the Trayī-Vidyā Saṃhitā of the Classical Ritual over the next five generations, in the Sarasvatī-Draṣḍvatī doab, climaxing with Janamejaya Pārikṣita's Kurukṣetra Agnicayana at Phase II or Witzel Level 2–3 C; 11th to 9th BCE;
- iii. the Caraṇa Saṃhitās of the now areal Hautram, Ādhvaryavam, and Audgātram praxes, radially outward from Kurukṣetra, Phase III of the Vedic oral tradition; Witzel Level 5 E; 8th to 5th BCE;
- iv. an epi-Vedic Saṃhitā of the Indic vector, our Epic, occurring in a Pāñcāla arc of Caraṇa centers, 3rd to 2nd BCE.

An overall Śravas Ideology is clearly the final result, the “fame” in the inherited poetic formula of Śravas Akṣitam steadily transferred from the battle field to the ritual field, and thus, in the Indic context, from the kṣatra element to its brahma counterpart in the Vedic polity, and further ritually cohere the Śūdra and Vaiśya elements under the brahma-

kṣatra grid to give us a four-fold arrangement. Through the epic, this arrangement becomes civilizational, a continental religion based on the dynamic harmony of the varṇāśramadharmā of its elements.

We can nuance the above standard philology, based on texts, by noting that the “fame” of the poetic formula, thus power in the Vedic nation, lies with the brahma element rather than the kṣatra element. By this I mean more than the mere authorial and transitory cypher that we attribute to underlie texts; rather, in Vedic oral agency, we face an institutionalized entirety, co-axial with the texts, longitudinal from the start, a sort of parallel body. Thus the three Vedic Saṃhitās in the above slope were totally oral, at origin and transmission, thus necessarily always joined to a human agency, in absolute philological symmetry to each of the three Saṃhitās:

- iv. a *e pluribus Unum* origin, some fifty “wild” poetic agencies of different sizes, textualized, in a sort of reverse philology, through the Ten Maṇḍala Saṃhitā into a global Vedic oral agency in Phase I;
- v. a sort of domestication, in Phase II, of the earlier 50 human agencies into Gotra entities, with endogamic and exogamic regulations, reducing, even perhaps exapting, it into a genetically closed body and textualized by the Trayī Vidyā Saṃhitā, the sum of the knowledge of the Classical Ritual;
- vi. a radial dispersal of this Vedic oral agency, now after a “population explosion” of the Gotra-based genetic engineering through Phase II with plus population, from Kurukṣetra to areal Max Mueller centers and each later textualized in Phase III but as a branch of the Trayī Vidyā Saṃhitā of the Classical Ritual, the Hautram, Ādhvaryavam, or the Audgātram and canonized in due course as Caraṇa Saṃhitās, along the Saṃhitā-Brāhmaṇa-Āranyaka-Upaniṣad-Sūtra canonization.
- vii. The epic arises, quite reflexively, in an arc of such Caraṇa Centers, identifiable as Aitareya/Kauṣītaki Hautram; Baudhāyana/Vādhūla Ādhvaryavam; Jaiminiya Audgātram—thus still tied to the “back rooms” of the Vedic oral tradition, but also beyond it, appearing

as a traditional text, at First Textualization, and, thus, in ripeness of time, “tipping” a hat to the “epi” Veda and forge a “trans” continental religion, the Dhārmic Hinduism, with Sanskritization as the effective evangelical, and highly successful, weapon through the entire sub-continent.

In a way thus my book doubles as a history of Brahmans, but constrained in this light, first as the Vedic oral agency and then as the “plus” populations of Phase III of the Vedic oral traditions that textualized our epic, the NR M<sub>1</sub>, the first Mahābhārata. My book traces two Brahman groups from these Vedic and epic traditions to the peninsula, to substantiate my argument.

---

## NAOKO NISHIMURA

Tohoku University, Japan

### Pravara Mantras recited by yajamāna in the Yajurveda texts

This paper will examine the *mantras* recited by Yajamāna during the Pravara rite and their *brāhmaṇas*. Parallel passages are analyzed in order to clarify historical development and the relationship to each other. This research will contribute to clarification of the process in which Pravara was systematised as a ritual act. In addition, it will conduce to understanding of the Indo-Āryan society and of some Weltanschauung about afterlife. The main sources are the Saṁhitās, Brāhmaṇas, and Śrautasūtras belonging to the Yajurveda Schools.

Pravara is one of the Śrauta ritual procedures for choosing of the priests, especially the Hotṛ priest, on each occasion that a sacrifice is held. It has generally been understood since the systematisation and standardisation in the Śrautasūtras, that Pravara of Agni is prior to that of a human Hotṛ. Agni is considered to be a Hotṛ priest serving for

the gods or fathers. The genealogy of Yajamāna's family is required to be recited aloud at Pravara. In the case that the Yajamāna belongs to Rājanya/Kṣatriya or Vaiśya, it is allowed to recite the genealogy of his Purohita's or Guru's family.

Why, however, is the recitation of the genealogy of Yajamāna's family required on the occasion when the priest is chosen? Furthermore, what is the purpose of choosing a Hotṛ priest in the course of the sacrifice, although a Śrauta ritual needs a team of priests appointed in advance? Aiming at the solution of these problems, we will also verify the usage of the verb *vari/vṛ ± prá*; some observations will be gained about the relationship of the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā with the Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa.

---

## BORIS OGUIBÉNE

University of Strasbourg

### Vedic *nāraka*- 'hell', *nṛ́*- 'man', *nārī*- woman, wife'. Etymology and chronology of the derivation

1. While reconsidering extant views of the etymology of these words, I found out that statements on the chronology of their derivational patterns are noticeably contradictory. That prompted me to elaborate anew their interrelations. As a result, I suggest a new etymology of Vedic *nāraka*-, wholly at odds with the commonly supported view.
2. Vedic *nāraka*- 'hell' (or *nāráká* VS) is probably derived from *\*nara-ka* (Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik* (AiGr) II, 2, p. 124 notes Taittirīya Āraṇyaka *nāraka* as original form whose first syllable underwent the *vṛddhi*). The supposed relation with Greek *ἐνερθε* '(from) below, below' and *ἐνεροι* 'those below, those below the earth, the dead below the earth and the chthonic gods' is doubted by R. Beekes [Etymological Dictionary of Greek (EDG), p. 424].



3. According to M. Leumann, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 61, 1954, pp. 13–14, Vedic *nārī-* originates from Indo-European nom. sg. *\*nēr* extended by the suffix *-ī* (called “Motionsfemininum”). Thus the *-r* would belong already to Proto-Indo-European. If so, *nārī-* would be older than Vedic *nī-* (the nom. sg *nā-* is considered as morphological innovation due to the transition in the *a*-inflection) and all members of its inflectional paradigm, which underwent analogical levelling on the model of the stems in *-[t̪]r-* (Renou, *Grammaire védique*, § 239). It is then unnecessary to assume that *nārī-* would have taken its *-r-* from the members of the inflectional paradigm of *nī-* (acc. sg. *nāram*, gen. pl. *narām*, etc., see Renou, *ibid.*, §§ 97, 239 and 252). Add that AiGr II.2, p. 416, § 255 e, β states that *-ā-* of *nārī-* (Avestan *nāiri*) is not explicable by *vṛddhi* of the first syllable of Vedic *nāra* (agreeing with Leumann’s statement, *ibid.* of the archaic nature of such forms as Vedic nom. sg. *nā*, Avestan *nā* as in *nā vā nāirī vā* ‘man or woman’).

4. Beekes, EDG, pp. 103 considers that Greek *ἄνθρωπος* ‘man’ (if < IE *\*h<sub>2</sub>ner-*), presumably identical with Vedic *nī-* (*nā-*), is an innovation, since the older Homeric form is *ἄνερ* of which the short vowel concords with the short vowel of Vedic acc. sg. *nāram* and that of its oblique forms. If the short vowel is old, there is no full chronological concordance with Vedic *nārī-* which is an old formation. Thus the assumed identity of Greek and Vedic words should be called in question given the chronological divergences as shown by differing quantity of the vowels.

5.1. Mayrhofer (EWAi II, p. 37) still viewed the primary form *nāraká* giving rise to *nāraka-* ‘hell’ by *vṛddhi* (and compared both to Greek *ἔνεροι*) whereas AiGr II, 2, p. 530 stated that the derivation by *vṛddhi* was alien to the formations in *-ka*.

5.2. Uhlenbeck (apud AiGr II, 2, p. 150) submitted a reconstructed *\*nar-ka* (based on Vedic *nar-* with svarabhakti between *r* and *k*).

5.3. Taking in account the sceptic judgments (and especially, the scepticism of EDG, see above, 2.) as well as proposals presented above, there is room to suggest an alternative etymology connecting

Vedic words *nāraka-*, *nī-*, *nārī-* with the oldest shape reflected in IE nom. sg. *\*nēr-*. If the latter is considered as retaining the oldest long vowel, the basic meaning of *nāraka-* would be ‘the place populated by, inhabited by men and women’.

6. To support this conclusion, attention is drawn to the names of the 21 hells mentioned in Manusmṛti 4.89: among them are found such names as *saṃjīvana* ‘living together’ and *pratimūrtika* ‘[filled with] images or bodily forms [of men and women]’. These two hells match each other in the sense that their designations focus on the presence and involvement of human inmates. The designation of the hell called *nāraka-* fits well in this semantic framework.

---

## CHISEI ŌSHIMA

University of Tokyo

### A comparative analysis of the structure of the Agniṣṭoma according to the Vedic schools: the thought on Vādhūla-Śrauta-Sūtra

Vādhūla-Śrauta-Sūtra (=Vādh or VādhŚŚ, newly edited by Prof. Yaske Ikari) VI 1,1—4 (142 sūtras) describes a series of rituals mainly consisting of the Dīkṣā performed at the beginning of the Soma sacrifice. Since the VādhŚŚ has its peculiar feature in formulas to no small extent, recent scholars have dealt with the part of the VādhŚŚ comparing to other Śrauta-Sūtras of existing schools. Agniṣṭoma, however, the basic unit of the Soma Sacrifice written in the VādhŚŚ still remains to be synthetically studied.

In my presentation, its constitution of the Dīkṣā rituals is to be elaborately examined and compared with the Baudhāyana (Baudh) school, the new Taittirīya (Taitt) schools (also with some schools), White Yajurveda schools, and even those of Brāhmaṇas of all the

schools. Not only its constitution of rituals but also the way of adopting mantras is to be fully considered.

It is a typical example that the composition of the introductory topics, especially when to perform the Dīkṣaṇīya-iṣṭi supposed to be done at the very beginning of the Dīkṣā, is strikingly different according to each Śrauta-Sūtra as follows (though the structural complexity is considerably abbreviated):

Vādh	Baudh	New Taitt etc.	Kāty
		Preliminary procedures	
<i>saṃbhāra</i>	≈ <i>upakalpana</i>		
		Dīkṣaṇīya-iṣṭi	
<i>prācīnavanṣā</i>			
Dīkṣaṇīya-iṣṭi		D°-iṣṭi (accord. to some)	
(α) Peculiar topics			
Apsudīkṣā			
			Dīkṣaṇīya-iṣṭi
Dīkṣā preliminaries			
	Dīkṣaṇīya-iṣṭi		
Dīkṣā-āhuti			

Though the Vādh begins with *saṃbhāra* as the Baudh does, the new Taitt and Kātyāyana (Kāty) add preliminary procedures such as *somapravacana*, choosing officiants and requesting the sacrificial ground. And above all, as Āpastamba argued directly, it is a problem that whether Dīkṣaṇīya-iṣṭi should be performed before or after the construction of the hut, *prācīnavanṣā*. This matter is originally derived from the difference of the description between Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā and Kaṭha-Saṃhitā. The Vādh here goes against the Baudh, some of the new Taitt and Kāty. Furthermore, it has (α), some kinds of discussion on *iṣṭi* etc. that are difficult to understand its meaning and why they are here. This subject is also to be considered. In this

way further study would be needed on its agreement or disagreement to the Baudh, the new Taitt and others. The table above shows its movement of the reorganization of the Agniṣṭoma by each school. It is a valid assumption that the Vādh school, almost as old as the Baudh, could be the trigger which set off the reorganization. They were pioneers and it might be for this reason that they have a number of peculiar descriptions. We shall now look more carefully into it and discuss it in detail, that is, at which stage the Vādh is situated in the philological history of the Agniṣṭoma.

## JUNICHI OZONO

Tohoku University

### Once again on the Vedic variants dakṣ- / dhakṣ- etc.: the relative chronology between Graßmann's law and devoicing-deaspirating assimilation

It is well known that phonological variants such as *dak-ṣ-* / *dhak-ṣ-* (s-aor. of *dah* 'burn' < \**d<sup>h</sup>eg<sup>wh</sup>*) occur in early Vedic and that these go back to s-affixed formations of a Proto-Indo-European "diaspirate root" (a root composed of two mediae aspiratae, i.e. \**D<sup>h</sup>1eD<sup>h</sup>2*). Since the 1970s, a number of linguists and Indologists (e.g. Sag 1976, Schindler 1976, Kobayashi 2004) have addressed this issue, which since the 1990s has also been examined in light of the history of the Vedic texts, orthoepy, and regional peculiarities (e.g. Cardona 1991, Scharfe 1996).

According to the communis opinio, Graßmann's law operated prior to devoicing and deaspirating assimilation (DDA): \**d<sup>h</sup>eg<sup>wh</sup>-s-* > \**d<sup>h</sup>ag<sup>zh</sup>-* (Bartholomae's law) > \**dag<sup>zh</sup>-* (Graßmann's law) > *dakṣ-* (DDA); The aspiration in forms such as *dhakṣ-* is then generally understood to have been analogically introduced from the nominative singular of a root noun such as *-bhūit* 'awake' (Schindler 1976: 631; cf. also the

phenomenon called “aspiration throwback”, Sag 1976, Kobayashi 2004: 122ff.).

However, some stems made from a diaspirate root with s-affixes (e.g. the desiderative *bībhatsa*-<sup>16</sup> ‘be disgusted’ YV, Br., etc., adj. *bībhatsú*- ‘feeling disgust’ RV, AV) have no variant dissimilated by Graßmann’s law (i.e. *\*bībatsa*-), which would be comparable to the Hauchdissimilation in Greek, e.g. pres. *τρέφω* ‘thicken, make grow’ (< *\*d<sup>h</sup>reb<sup>h</sup>-e/o-*), aor. *ἔθρεψα* (cf. also pf. *τέθραμμα*). In addition, dissimilated forms such as *dakṣ*- almost always occur together with aspirated forms such as *dhakṣ*- (though a possible exception is *gṛtsa*, ‘skillful’). Although the phonological process of “aspiration throwback” (*dakṣ*- > *dhakṣ*-) is generally accepted today, it is still quite possible that the *dhakṣ*- type is inherited, as pointed out by Scharfe 1996: 375, who suggests that Graßmann’s law took place before DDA only in eastern Panjab.

In the proposed paper, I will examine all relevant forms attested in Vedic and attempt a simple and plausible explanation of forms such as *dakṣ*- / *dhakṣ*- in light of their development in Indo-Iranian.

### Literature cited

- Cardona, George 1991 “On the dialect status of Vedic forms of types *dakṣ*/*dhakṣ*” in *Studies in Dravidian General Linguistics: A Festschrift for Bh. Krishnamurti*. Hyderabad.
- Kobayashi, Masato 2004 *Historical Phonology of Old Indo-Aryan Consonants*. Tokyo.
- Sag, Ivan 1976 “Pseudosolution to pseudoparadox” *Linguistic Inquiry* 7: 609–621.
- Scharfe, Hartmut 1996 “Bartholomae’s law revisited or how the Ṛgveda is dialectally divided” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 20 (Fs. Paul Thieme): 351–377.
- Schindler, Jochem 1976 “Diachronic and Synchronic Remarks on Bartholomae’s and Grassmann’s laws” *Linguistic Inquiry* 7: 622–637.

## GEORGES-JEAN PINAULT

École Pratique des Hautes Études, PSL

### Vedic *jénya-* under new light

The lexicon of the Rigveda (i.e., the Saṁhitā of the Rigveda) contains words which are still puzzling after two centuries of Western scholarship. As a further case, the adjective *jén(i)ya-* (RV 15 x), to which should be joined the cognate forms *vijen(i)ya-* (RV 1.119.4) and *svájénya-* (RV 5.7.5) and the compound *jenyāvasu-* (RV 2 x, vocative dual), has not yet received a cogent interpretation. In the St. Petersburg dictionary, *jénya-* is glossed by ‘noble’, ‘of noble origin’, and connected to the root *janí-* ‘to give birth/be born’. An alternative translation by ‘true, real’ is proposed for *jénya-* as epithet of *vásu-* ‘good, riches’, and in the compound *jenyāvasu-* ‘provided with real wealth’. This doctrine has been endorsed by Grassmann (499): ‘edel, von höher Abkunft’, with a secondary sense in connection with *vásu-*: ‘herrlich, vorzüglich’. The root connection is however at variance with the received sound laws, and derivationally odd. There are some alternative etymologies (by F.W. Thomas, Debrunner), which did not meet full agreement, first of all because the alleged meanings fit only a part of the occurrences. As put by Mayrhofer (EWAia I: 598), the word is not yet ascertained from the exegetical point of view. The paper is based on the review of all occurrences and on the comparison of the available translations of the word, which are still contradictory. This survey points definitely to *jén(i)ya-* as referring to shining, brightness, and precisely to daylight, sunlight; *vijen(i)ya-* describes the nightly track of the Aśvins, deprived of daylight. This account will allow a new etymological assessment.

#### Selected references

EVP = Renou, Louis (1955–1969): *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes*. I–XVII. Paris : Institut de Civilisation Indienne.

EWAia = Mayrhofer, Manfred (1986–2001): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen*. I–III. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

1. Teil: Ältere Sprache.– Bd. I (A–DH), 1986–1992. Bd. II (N–H), 1992–1996.
- Geldner, RV = Geldner, Karl Friedrich (1951): Der Rigveda. Aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen. I–III. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press (Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 33–34–35).
- Jamison-Brereton = Jamison, Stephanie W. and Joel P. Brereton (2014): Rigveda. The earliest religious poetry of India. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, Frederick William (1946). Sanskrit *jenya*. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1946: 4–12.
- Witzel, Michael & Toshifumi Gotō (2007): Rig-Veda. Das heilige Wissen. Erster und zweiter Liederkreis. Aus dem vedischen Sanskrit übersetzt und herausgegeben unter Mitarbeit von Eijirō Dōyama und Mislav Jezić. Frankfurt am Main-Leipzig: Verlag der Weltreligionen.
- Witzel, Michael & Toshifumi Gotō (2013): Rig-Veda. Das heilige Wissen. Dritter bis fünfter Liederkreis. Aus dem vedischen Sanskrit übersetzt und herausgegeben von Michael Witzel (Buch III), Toshifumi Gotō (Buch IV) und Salvatore Scarlata (Buch V). Berlin: Verlag der Weltreligionen.
- 

## ALEXIS PINCHARD

Lycée Militaire of Aix-en-Provence

### Ritual archetypes in Vedas and narrative archetypes in the Mahābhārata

As Dumézil has shown, the doctrine of *avatāra*-s constitutes the original kern of the epic, so that the human drama can be read as a transposition of a Vedic — and maybe even pre-Vedic — mythology implying a kind of “twilight of the gods” and then a new dawn. But this

system of narrative transposition results from an extension as well as from an inversion of the logic that organizes Vedic sacrifice, which is already supposed to maintain the correct order of the world.

In the Vedas the concrete ritual performance must be experienced as a projection of a permanent intellectual archetype. Otherwise the sacrifice will not be efficient. The Ṛgvedic poet identifies through his “good thought” — he is *su-mānas* — with the very First Fathers who have established the rules of sacrifice. The historical poet mentally contemplates the first Institution as really present in another stratum of being and thus he personally acts in it. Reciprocally the human mind has to be defined as the part of a person that can always directly attend the Primordial Sacrifice. Thus, the Vedic priest has to lift his attention to an upper model, while in the epic divinity comes down on earth. The direction of the movement is reversed.

Moreover, the relationship between action and substance is not the same in the MBh and the Veda. In the MBh the substance of the god transmitted to the hero is the very cause why the deeds of this hero imitate the mythology of his chief god. But in the Vedic sacrifice, only the correct replication of the archetypal sacrifice by the priests can create the second *ātman* of the *yajamāna*. Action brings out substance. The divine paradigm primarily consists of a pattern of actions. The tools of the sacrifice, the materials of offering and the words of the *lingua sacra* are duplicated only inasmuch as they are inserted in such a pattern of action. The mimetic relationship has to be created. In the MBh the sense of action arises from the ontological features of those who act. Nevertheless, the epic heroes are not fully aware of who they really are whereas the Vedic priest has to be aware that his current sacrifice is a replication of a divine archetype, because otherwise he will not attend the primordial sacrifice with his mind and the earthly sacrifice will not be efficient.

Therefore, in the Mahābhārata, the connection between the divine level of reality and the human level is described as a matter of fact which has to be experienced in the self of each man and woman, but not as a task to be achieved by a peculiar social group. Brahmins, who



represent Vedic power, have no longer a monopoly over the salvation of external and internal worlds. The Kṣatriyas can participate therein, so that History, like a large sacrificial area, can get a sense.

Could we discover some textual, historical and conceptual mediations in order to explain such massive changes?

---

## SARAJU RATH

Leiden, Netherlands

### Early Brahmin migrations into and out of Odisha: inscriptional sources from the 6th CE onwards

As I observed in my study “Donees and their Śākhās in Epigraphical Sources: Orissa” (Rath 2016: 297), “migrants came to Orissa mainly from Madhyadeśa (Madhya Pradesh), Telengānā (Andhra Pradesh), Sahet-Mahet (Uttar Pradeśa), Magadha (South-East Bihar), Saurāṣṭra (Gujarat), Ayodhya, Kānyakubja (Central India), Cola country, Karṇāṭaka and Tamil Nāḍu, and Bengal (mostly from North-Bengal).” Brahmin migrants have also left Odisha and got settled in numerous places throughout India. In this present paper I present the results of a detailed study of available inscriptional sources about these migrations, into and out of Odisha from the 6th century CE onwards. The inscriptions are testimony to the then current conditions of brahmins, when the possession of a piece of land or a village was required to provide sufficient economic independence to brahmins in order to be engaged in their activities of study, teaching and ritual performance. This is very different from the conditions that appear in earlier Vedic texts, according to which not land but the possession of one or more cows was important to brahmins for their economic independence. Some inscriptions further provide instructions to the inhabitants of a donated village to be cooperative and not to disturb the new immigrants in their activities.

**PAOLA MARIA ROSSI**

Università degli studi di Milano

**Sources of the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa:  
the expression ‘ānyaḥ krośati prānyaś  
śaṃsati’ (JB 2.405) in agonistic scenes  
of the Vedic mahāvratā rite**

This paper is focused on the relationship between the process of textual canonization and the so-called *śrauta* reform applied to a specific case: the *mahāvratā* rite in the *Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa* (JB). As is well known, both these phenomena match a crucial social and political change, culminating in a new paradigm of sovereignty (e.g. Witzel 1995; Proferes 2007), a transition to agricultural settlement (Houben 2016), and the emergence of the Kuru-Pañcāla ‘dynastic chiefdom’ i.e. a large confederation whose power was more stable and centralized than previous clan-based and semi-nomadic society. This momentous cultural transformation also unfolded the hierarchical cosmic taxonomy, in compliance with which dharmic *varṇa* system was formulated in the second century BCE (Witzel 2006).

As regards the text of the *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*, its localization, its relation with other ritualistic texts, and its position within the Sāmavedic textual tradition, all these items have been controversially discussed by several scholars (e.g. Caland 1915; 1931; Keith 1932; Parpola 1967; 1973; 1984; Bodewitz 1973: 9–13; 1990; Witzel 1987; Mahadevan-Staal 2003; Ehlers 2004; Fujii 2012). Thus, such a scholarly debate seems to provide the *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* with a sort of ‘puzzle’ character: the critical edition has been a challenging work, since the scant number of manuscripts—mostly coming from Kerala region. Eventually, in this research I have employed the section of *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* edited by Akiko Murakawa (2007) under the supervision of H. Falk and G. Ehlers, the edition by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra (1954), and the remarks in Caland’s anthology (1919) are also often taken into account. From the linguistic and especially

lexical perspective, JB presents both earlier and recent traits, and it is stylistically prolix and rich of narrative sections, even encompassing a debate between ritual specialists, and a commentarial text. Finally, it refers to peculiar mythical and ritual materials, among which also the non-standard ritual elements of the *mahāvratā* rite, so that Caland (1931: XXI) concluded—though with some hesitation—that it must be older than the *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa* (PB). Lastly, Bodewitz (1990: 19–21) maintains that JB is later than PB, and can be considered as a break-away from the Sāmavedic Brāhmaṇa tradition, namely transmitted in the form of *Pañcaviṃśa*, with the inclusion of several addenda. On the other hand, Witzel (e.g. 1997: 307) postulated that this text might have been based on the earlier lost Śāṭyāyana *Brāhmaṇa*, and considers it as the result of a late textual development of an old kernel, belonging to the the Kuru-Pañcāla cultural sphere.

Against such a complex background, the present paper would concentrate on the peculiarity of the Vedic *mahāvratā* rite, which is considered as an annual festival, marking the winter solstice, (Keith 1909 *versus* Hillebrandt 1890; Rolland 1972; Parpola 1999; Witzel 2005), and taking place on the last but one day of the *gavām ayana* ritual, or “March of the Cows”. It is characterized by *sattra*-features (Falk 1986: 31–36; Malamoud 2002: 94–95), and non-standard śrauta’ ritual elements, which confer an ‘atmosphere of bacchanal’ upon it (Jamison 1996: 96–98); though, particular attention will be paid to several scenes of contests (e.g. ārya vs. śūdra, *brahmacārin* vs. *puṃścalī*, *māgadha* vs. *puṃścalī*). The final aim will be to try to understand whether these scenes are actually expressions of that ‘agonistic trait’, which characterized the ancient Vedic clan culture, especially in relation to the acquisition of social prestige (Kuiper 1962: 182), the foundation of the sacrificial violence itself (Heesterman 1993: 54–55), and the definition of clan-based society leadership (Proferes 2007: 12–19). The hypothesis that the Vedic *mahāvratā* rite is not only expression of a popular culture (i.e. Keith 1909: 27–28, Rolland 1972), but the evidence of that cultural transformation in act, toward a more settled and ‘ecumenical’ society, beyond the clan competitive tendencies,

combined with the new paradigm of ‘transcendent’ and ‘universal’ sovereignty will be advanced. Especially by going deep the analysis of a verbal contest, occurring both in PB 5.5.13 and related ancillary literature (LŚS 4.3.1–8 ~ DŚS XI 3.1–2), where the two protagonists are defined ‘praiser’ (*abhigara*) and ‘reviler’ (*apagara*), and in JB 405, where the specific terminology (*abhigara/apagara*) is lacking, but the same scene is simply represented as a part of a physical contest, a struggle for the possession of an animal hide—in particular a bull’s hide—, literally between an ārya and a śūdra, textually similar to Yajurvedic tradition, namely to the Taittirīya school (e.g. TB 1.2.6.6–7).

The point is how to interpret such a textual variation of the JB, in comparison to other Vedic ritualistic texts:

in the light of the specific textual tradition of the Jaiminīyas vs other specific textual traditions: it seems that the JB is a multi-layered texts in which different textual elements are overlapped; it may be considered as the outcome of the effort of ritualistic ‘revision’ as such, through which the Brahmanical school itself is established.

on the basis of the ritual peculiarities of the *mahāvratā* rite: in the process of ritualistic revision the primordial antonymic character, specific of the *mahāvratā* rite, in which peers were counterposed as rivals—especially in bardic competition—is duplicated in multiplied scenes, and turned into a radical dichotomy between purity and impurity. Thus, the hierarchical taxonomy is definitively formalized, and the Brahmanical ritualism has succeeded.

**JULIETA ROTARU**

Södertörn University

**Construction rites in the Atharvavedic tradition**

In comparison with the construction rite construed around worshipping the Lord of the House, *Vāstoṣpati*, found in the rituals of the other Vedic schools, the Atharvavedins had a complex ceremony completed by the worshipping of *Vāstoṣpati*. It is commonly considered that the *Kauśika Sūtra* prescribes two ceremonies accompanying the building of a dwelling, in two far-reached *kaṇḍikā*-s, 3.6 [23].1–11 and at 5.7[43].3–15. However, it is difficult to ascertain which the *sūtras* prescribing the construction rite in the 23rd *kaṇḍikā* are. The two rites are reconstructed with the help of the commentaries of *Dārila* and *Keśava*, of the unedited late *paddhati*, *Atharvaṇīya Paddhati*, and a late *prayoga Samskāraratnaprayoga*.

In fact the ceremony of *KauśS* 3.6[23].1–6 is done by one who wishes to enjoy prosperity in his new residence, hence it does not share any of the ritual pragmatics of the proper construction rite (*KauśS* 5.7[43].3–15). This assumption is supported by the position of the *sūtras*' sequence in the economy of the third *adhyāya* of the *KauśS*, following a string of rites connected with various forms of prosperity.

Besides the elucidation of the ritual, the paper deals with the textual intricacies of the *Kauśika Sūtra*: textual divisions of the surrounding context, the *mantrādhikāra* and *phalādhikāra* methods used by *Kauśika* in arranging the subjects of the *sūtra* text, etc. In the economy of the rite, there appear two verses which occur in the *Paippalāda Saṃhitā* (PS), and are found with minor variants as *ṚV* 7.54.1 and 7.55.1, which represent an invocation to *Vāstoṣpati*. The second part of the paper will focus on the identification of the verses addressing *Vāstoṣpati* in the ritual texts of the Atharvavedins, and the employment of *ṚV* 7.54.1–3 and 7.55.1 by the ritual texts of other Vedic schools: *AśvGS* 2.9.9, *ŚaṅkhŚS* 2.16.1–3, *ŚaṅkhGS* 2.14.5–6 and *ŚaṅkhGS* 3.4.1–8, *GoGS* 4.7.32, *ParGS* 3.4.7.

## JUNKO SAKAMOTO-GOTŌ

Miyagi Gakuin Women's College

### On the prototype of the new moon sacrifice based on Ṛgveda X 85

In the Śrauta ritual system, the New and Full moon sacrifices (*darśapūrṇamāsāu*), performed periodically according to the moon's waxing and waning cycle, are the basic form of the Iṣṭi, in which not Soma (juice of a plant, most probably of "ephedra") but only grain foods and dairy products are offered. The main oblation is usually *puroḍāśa*- 'a kind of pan-cake' for Indra (as Sun god) and Agni at the new moon and for Soma (as Moon god) and Agni at the full moon. In a special variation of the New moon sacrifice, however, *sāmnāyyā*- 'a mixture of sour milk and boiled sweet milk' is offered to Indra (or Mahendra). In this case, Sāmnāyya is considered to be equivalent with Soma juice, Indra's favorite drink. In the Gṛhya ritual system, the oblation for the both sacrifices is *odanā*- 'porridge of rice or barley'.

Ṛgveda X 85 is well known as a Sūkta consisting of 'the wedding hymns of Sūryā (Sun goddess) and Soma (Moon god)'. This marriage astronomically signifies nothing but the conjunction of the sun and the moon, which causes disappearance of the moon in the sky. RV X 85,1–5 describe, in fact, the monthly New moon sacrifice on earth, in which the Soma plant is pressed and its juice is drunk. On the other hand, the stanzas 6–13 of the same Sūkta treat the divine wedding procession of Sūryā to the moon Soma, accompanied with Sāman chanting and preceded by slaughter of cattle. This series of ceremonies are combined with two Nakṣatras, *aghā*- (pl., AV *maghā*-) and *árjuṇī*- (du., AV *pháluguṇī*- pl.), which suggests a yearly sacrifice of cattle and Soma juice at the new moon around the summer solstice, approximately dated to 2300 ± 500 B.C.

The above-mentioned hymns lead us to conjecture that Soma juice was offered in the New moon sacrifice at the stage of the Ṛgveda and the preceding Indo-Iranian period. It is assumed that, due to the Indo-

Aryans' expansion into the east India, where the plant Soma is difficult to obtain, the oblation in the New moon sacrifice was changed first to Sāmnāyā, drink which resembles Soma juice, then to Puroḍāśa on behalf of the uniformity of the New moon sacrifice and the Full moon sacrifice.

## SUBRAMONIA IYER ANANTHA SUBRAMONIA SARMA

Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO),  
Pondicherry

### Malayalam manuals on domestic rituals with special reference to the Bādhūlakacṣaṇṇu (domestic rituals of Vādhūla School)

Contribution of Kerala to Vedic Literature is well known and a good amount of research has been carried out in this area. But as Asko Parpola (1984 :11) suggests the “Vedic works written in Malayalam are scarcely known to Indologists outside Kerala”. Among the various Vedic works available in Malayalam, the Malayalam manuals on domestic rituals (*caṣaṇṇu*) are well known among the Nambudiri brahmins of Kerala, since these manuals become an essential guide for the performance of domestic rituals. The *Kriyāraṭnamālā athavā Kṛṣṇayajurvēdīya baudhāyana caṣaṇṇu*, *Pakalīyaṃ caṣaṇṇu*, *Kauṣītakam caṣaṇṇu*, *Jaiminīya-caṣaṇṇu* and the *Bādhūlakacṣaṇṇu* are such domestic ritual manuals (*caṣaṇṇu*) being used even today as a guide for performing domestic rituals.

Among these domestic ritual manuals, the *Bādhūlakacṣaṇṇu* by one Vāsudevan Nambudiri of Maṭham house (*Mana*) deserves special attention of scholars, since this manual explains the domestic rituals based on the *Vādhūlagṛhyasūtra*. The *Vādhūlagṛhyasūtra* still remains an unpublished *Gṛhyasūtra* (cf. Kajihara 2008–2009).

There is also a prayoga of this *sūtra* known to exist, namely the *Vādhūlagṛhyāgamaśāṅgraha* (Chaubey : 2006). While at present there are less than ten Nambudiri families in Kerala who follow the *Vādhūlagṛhyasūtra*, two families (*Kovāṭ* and *Pōṇallūr*) are known as *Vaidikas* (priests) of Vādhūla School.

Though most of the rituals prescribed in the *Bādhūlakacchaṇṇu* are similar to other *gṛhyasūtras*, there seems to be prescription of rituals that are unique in nature, such as the funeral ritual to be performed for a pregnant women. It may also be necessary to study and compare the rituals prescribed in the Malayalam *Bādhūlakacchaṇṇu* and in the *Vādhūlagṛhyasūtra* to know how closely the Malayalam text follows the Sanskrit *Gṛhyasūtra*.

In this paper, I propose to provide a detailed introduction to the Malayalam *Cataṇṇu* (domestic ritual) manuals and will include a detailed study of the *Bādhūlakacchaṇṇu*. The rituals that are unique to the Vādhūla school as described in the *Bādhūlakacchaṇṇu* will be discussed and also the Malayalam text will be compared with the *Vādhūlagṛhyasūtra* as well as with the *Vādhūlagṛhyāgamaśāṅgraha*. The paper will also include the details of the present *vaidikas* of the Vādhūla School and their views on the domestic rituals of the Vādhūla School.



## HARTMUT SCHARFE

University of California  
Asian Languages and Cultures

### Fragments of ancient versified Sanskrit grammars?

More than sixty years ago Helmer Smith<sup>1</sup> drew attention to the rhythmical structure of certain Sanskrit sūtra texts, notably the Mīmāṃsāsūtra in contrast to decidedly non-rhythmical texts like the Vaiśeṣikasūtra. He included Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī in the first group. Obvious examples are the beginning and the end of the text: the first two sūtras taken together form an anuṣṭubh pāda (*vṛddhir ād aic, ad eṅ guṇaḥ* "ā, ai, and au are vṛddhi, a, e, and o guṇa") as does the last sūtra, if we leave out the four names and the final *a a* which is just a correction of the initial pratyāhārasūtra: VIII 4 67 *nôdātta-svaritôdayam*. Actually *udātta-svaritôdayam* is consciously used as a metrical form in Ṛgveda-prātiśākhya III 9d and 12d. Smith also mentioned an operational sūtra (I 1 45 *ig yaṇaḥ saṃprasāraṇam*; one could add I 1 72 *vena vidhis tad-antasya*, II 1 35 *bhakṣyeṇa miśrī-karaṇam*, VI 1 71 *hrasvasya piti kṛti tuk*) or definitions like I 2 46 *kṛt-taddhita-samāsās ca*, I 1 65 *alo 'ntyāt purva upadhā*, I 2 52 *viśeṣaṇānāṃ cājāteḥ*, that look like pādas of an anuṣṭubh or śloka. But the general shortness of Pāṇini's rules makes it likely that some would have eight syllables and would look like pādas of an anuṣṭubh or śloka. Smith found rhythmic forms also in sūtras that went beyond the limit of an eight syllable meter such as I 2 43 *prathamā-nirdiṣṭam samāsa upasarjanam*, in which the last eight syllables resemble a śloka quarter.

But there are sūtras whose form cannot be explained by such accidental semblance to metrical form.

1 Helmer Smith, *Retractationes Rhythmicæ*, Helsinki 1951 (Studia Orientalia editid Societas Orientalis Fennica XVI:5): pp.24-32.

IV 4 77+78 *dhuro yad-ḌHakau*, *KHaḥ sarvadhurāt* “After the stem *dhur* stand the suffixes *ya*<sup>1</sup> or *ḌHa*<sup>k</sup> (i.e., *-eya*), *KHa* (i.e., *-īna*) after [the compound] *eka-dhura*” gives the forms *dhúrya*, *dhaureyá*, and *sarvadhurīṇa* “fit for the yoke”.

IV 4 105+106 *sabhāyāḥ yaḥ*, *ḌHaś chandasi* “After the stem *sabhā* stands the suffix *ya*, the suffix *ḌHa* (i.e., *-eya*) in Vedic usage (to express ‘good at that’)” gives the general form *sábhyaḥ* and Vedic *sabhéyaḥ*.

VI 3 29+30 *divo dyāvā divasaś ca pṛthivyām* “[In *dvaṃdva* compound of the names of deities] for stem *div* the substitute is *dyāvā*, *divas* before *pṛthivī*”. We have thus *dyāvā-bhūmī*, but *divas-pṛthivyau*. The abnormal nominative *divasaḥ* is made up solely to fit the meter.<sup>2</sup>

These sūtras show a remarkable chiasmus, where the suffix in the second half stands in initial position – quite rare in the Aṣṭādhyāyī.

IV 4 35+36 *pakṣi-matsya-mṛgān hanti, paripanthaṃ ca tiṣṭhati* “[One who] kills birds, fish, and game and hangs around the path” rules in the suffix *ṬHa*<sup>k</sup> (i.e., *-ika*) to form words like *pākṣikaḥ*, *mātsyikaḥ*, and *pāripanthikaś cauraḥ*. The two sūtras combined look like a hemistich of an anuṣṭubh<sup>3</sup> and have an internal parallelism with a misplaced (in the opinion of the commentators!)<sup>4</sup> *ca*.

2 This was noticed already by I.S. Pawate, The structure of the Ashtadhyayi, Hubli 1935, pp.63f.

3 Noticed by S.M.Katre, Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini, Austin 1987, p. 489.

4 The Kāśikā calls it *bhinna-kramaḥ* and the Nyāsa says *tiṣṭhati cēti... draṣṭavyaḥ*. The odd position of this *ca* is clearly motivated by metrical necessity, but none of the commentators seems to have noticed the metrical nature of the two sūtras.

Chiasmus<sup>5</sup> as a poetical style is found in some of the stanzas quoted in the Mahābhāṣya, often called śloka-vārttika, though they are really fragments of a grammar in metrical form:

Mahābhāṣya

vol.I p.322,17 (on I 4 21) = vol.II p. 58,16

supām *karmādayo 'py arthāḥ, samkhyā caiva tathā* tiñām /

vol.II p.196,16+19 (on IV 1 3)

nāpuṃsakam *bhavet tasmin, tad-abhāve* napuṃsakam /

vol.II p.232,9+11 (on IV 1 78)

yo 'nantaro *na dhātuḥ saḥ, yo dhātuḥ* so 'nanantaraḥ /

and probably vol.II p.258,13+16 (on IV 1 120)

ārak *puṃsi tato 'nyatra, godhāyā* ḌHrag *vidhau smṛtaḥ* /

II p.284,14f. (on IV 2 60)

*anusūr lakṣya-lakṣaṇe sarvasāder dvigoś ca* Laḥ /

ikan *padōttarapadāc śataśaṣṭeḥ śikan pathaḥ* //

II p.398,13 (on V 2 116)

śikhādibhya inir vācya, *ikan yava-khadādiṣu* /

The figure is attested also in poetical texts as early as Ṛgveda I 86,8 śaśamānāsya vā naraḥ svédasya, satyaśavasah, vidā kāmasya vénataḥ, “Of the one laboring to exhaustion you know the sweat, O you men whose strength is real, [and] the desire of the one looking out [for you]” where the attributes śaśamānāsya and vénataḥ stand at opposite ends<sup>6</sup> Atharvaveda VI 23,1

sasrucīs *tad-apaso divā naktam ca* sasrucīḥ

5 While Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language, 2nd ed., New York 1965, narrowly defined chiasmus as “an inversion of the second of two parallel phrases, clauses, etc.; as, do not live to eat, but eat to live”, the term is now frequently used for various forms of inversion.

6 Other, perhaps less striking, examples are ṚV I 110,7; I 113,15; I 186,4; IV 1,1; V 87,5 and VII 31,10, identified in Stephanie Jamison, Commentary on the Translation of the Ṛgveda (Internet).

“Flowing on, devoted to it; by day and by night flowing on”<sup>7</sup>

Taittirīya-saṃhitā IV 5,1,1

námas te rudra manyáva utó ta ísave námaḥ;

námas te astu dhánvane bāhúbhṡām utá te námaḥ

“Homage to thy wrath, O Rudra,

To thine arrow homage also;

Homage to thy bow,

And homage to thine arms”<sup>8</sup>

and IV 5,1,3

utáinaṃ gopā adṡśann ádṡśann udahāryàḥ

“Him the cowherds have seen,

Have seen the bearers of water”

and later in

Kālidāsa’s Kumārasaṃbhava V 4

tapaḥ kva vatse, kva ca tāvakaṃ vapuḥ /

“Where is ascetic practice, my dear, and where is your beauty?”

and in stanzas quoted in the Kāvya prakāśa nr. 466<sup>9</sup>:

arucir niśayā vina śaśī, śaśinā sāpi vinā mahat tamaḥ /

“Dull is the moon without the night, and the night without the moon  
dense darkness”

and in Ruyyaka’s Alaṃkārasarvasva, p.101<sup>10</sup>

vinayena vinā kā śrīḥ, kā niśā śaśinā vinā /

- 
- 7 Cf. W.D. Whitney, Atharva-veda Saṃhitā, translated, Cambridge/Mass. 1905, vol. I p.297 and V. Sadovski in Indogermanica (Fs. G. Klingenschmitt), Taimering 2006, pp.525f.
  - 8 A.B. Keith, The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittiriya Sanhita, Cambridge/Mass. 1914, Part 2, p.353.
  - 9 Kāvya prakāśa of Mammaṭa, ed. R.D. Karmakar, Poona 1965, p.674 nr.496; Mammaṭa’s Kāvya prakāśa ed. Ganganatha Jha, 2nd ed., Varanasi 1967, p.414 nr.496. This stanza features an *alaṃkāra* called *vinôkti*, in the words of Ganganatha Jha “That is a Privative Description in which one thing, without the other, is either (a) not beautiful or (b) the contrary.”
  - 10 Alaṃkāra-sarvasva of Ruyyaka, ed. Kumari S.S. Janaki, Delhi 1965. This is given as an example of *vinôkti*.

“Without good conduct what grace is there, what night without the moon!”

In no case have Indian poeticians and their commentators pointed out the stylistic peculiarity, as they in principle were more concerned with ornamentation involving meaning (*arthâlaṃkāra*) than grammatical formality (*śabdâlaṃkāra*). J.S. Speijer in his Sanskrit Syntax stated his impression:

“Yet, as deviation from the traditional order of words is not striven at for itself, the idiom of the poets is rather characterized by the richness and size of the compounds, by the elegance of words and the melodiousness of sounds, by the elevation and perfection of style, than by an artificially disturbed arrangement of words.”<sup>11</sup>

That brings us back to Pāṇini's sūtras I 1 1 and I 1 2 *vṛddhir ā<sup>d</sup>-ai<sup>c</sup> a<sup>d</sup> e<sup>n</sup> guṇaḥ* which display two anomalies: since *a i u<sup>n</sup>* comes first in the pratyāhārasūtras before *ai au<sup>c</sup>*, *guṇaḥ* should be mentioned before *vṛddhiḥ*, and since the name typically follows the named, *vṛddhiḥ* should follow *ad-ai<sup>c</sup>*. We should have I 1 1 *a<sup>d</sup> e<sup>n</sup> guṇaḥ* I 1 2 *ā<sup>d</sup>-ai<sup>c</sup> vṛddhiḥ*. But then the auspicious word *vṛddhiḥ* would not stand in initial position. To this end the sequence of the two sūtras was reversed, and on top of it the sequence of the words in I 1 1 was reversed too. An additional benefit of this rearrangement was a poetical *alaṃkāra*, the chiastic position of *vṛddhiḥ* and *guṇaḥ*.

While the stanzas quoted in the Mahābhāṣya show that there were Sanskrit grammars (or a Sanskrit grammar) in metrical form, it seems improbable that they supplied secondary insertions in the Aṣṭādhyāyī; at least, I 1 1+2 *vṛddhir ā<sup>d</sup>-ai<sup>c</sup> a<sup>d</sup> e<sup>n</sup> guṇaḥ* is indispensable in Pāṇini's grammar and could not be a secondary insertion. It is equally improbable that Pāṇini would have formed a flawed stanza such as IV 4 35+36 or turned to a metrical style in IV 4 77+78 and 105+106. The most likely

11 J.S. Speijer, *Sanskrit Syntax* (Leiden 1886; reprint Delhi 1993), pp.12f.; also Edwin Gerow, *A Glossary of Indian Figures of Speech* (The Hague 1971), pp.64f. I thank Professor Gerow for responding to my inquiry and sharing his insights.

explanation is that Pāṇini used material of existing older grammars and incorporated them in his work. The use of a borrowed metrical line for opening of his work – in an important definition – shows the depth of the influence of his predecessors. We know, after all, that he built on the work of predecessors, including the use of terms like *sārvadhātuka* and *ārdhadhātuka* that are at odds with own term *dhātu*. Other contradictions have been noted: the instrumental singular ending is called <sup>ṭ</sup>ā in IV 1 2 but ā<sup>ṇ</sup> in VI 4 141, the nominative dual ending is called *au<sup>ṭ</sup>* in IV 1 2 but *au<sup>ṇ</sup>* in VII 1 18. Pawate concluded that Pāṇini had inherited a “Basic Book of Sutras” to which he added supplements, and in an exactly opposite theory S.D.Joshi and his collaborators assumed that Pāṇini’s grammar originally did not cover secondary noun formation, composition and Vedic data that were later inserted by other authors. The present study supports a middle solution, that Pāṇini incorporated much earlier material from predecessors in a new original work; George Cardona<sup>12</sup> has likened him to Vyāsa the “author” of the Mahābhārata, Artemij Keidan<sup>13</sup> to Homer the “author” of the Iliad and Odyssey.

---

## RENATE SÖHNEN-THIEME

School of Oriental and African Studies, London

### Frame structures in Vedic literature revisited

For the history of Indian literature, the study of the device of framing, well-known from narrative literature within Western as well as Oriental traditions, has now and then in the last decades been extended from epics and Purāṇas, and from narrative cycles like Pañcatantra, etc., back to the earlier Vedic literature, which is primarily not narrative.

---

12 George Cardona, Recent Researches in Pāṇinian Studies, Delhi 1999, p.140.

13 Artemij Keidan, Bulletin d’ etudes Indiennes 32 (2014 ), p.174.

What is often missing, is a clear definition of what is meant by ‘frame’ (and its derivations), contrasting it with other cyclic forms (such as, e.g., ring compositions), and differentiating its function on the basis of different text genres or textual categories. This will be attempted in this paper, in which different types of ‘frames’ will be distinguished and demonstrated with examples.

---

## SOMA BASU

School of Vedic Studies  
Rabindra Bharati University

### Importance of critically editing the hitherto unpublished domestic ritual text of Pākayajñanirṇayaḥ by Candracūḍabhaṭṭa: an appraisal

The text is of immense help in understanding and analyzing the long historical tradition of worship of deities like Lord Śiva, ancestral worship and rites like different types of śrāddha, the concept of change and community in such religious activities and deities personified as snake and the like. The manual feature of the text also enables to trace the development of such sacrifices as snake worship or cult of phallus worship down to modern days which are still prevalent amongst the priestly class in some form or other – may be in the form of *purāṇic*, *tāntric* or *gṛhya* rites. There remains always the scope of a comparative study in tracing the socio-historical and religio-mythological development of how far the modern-day applications of such sacrifice are based on or deducted their material from *gṛhya prayoga* texts like the present one.

The importance of the text lies mainly in its treatment of the *pākayajñas* forming an integral part of Vedic *gṛhya* rites. The Āsvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra (1.2) as well as the Āpastamba Gṛhyasūtra (2.9) explain the word ‘Pākayajña’ as pākena pakvena caruṇā sādhyo yajñāḥ pākayajñāḥ...

Some say...kecit tu pākayajñā ityatra pākaśabdasyālpavācakatvāt vivāhādayo'pi somādyapekṣayā pākayajñā iti.

While analyzing the rites in proper order, the text describes – *aupāsanahomādīnām pākayajñāśabdaḥ samjñātvena prasiddhaḥ. teṣām kramah oupāsanām vaiśadevaḥ parvānaḥ aṣṭakāmāsīrāddham sarpavaliṥānavalīriti*. The seven gr̥hya sacrifices namely *aupāsana*, *vaiśvadeva*, *parvāna*, *aṣṭaka*, *māsīrāddha*, *sarpavali*, *tīśānavali* have been described along with their derivative explanation and ritualistic application besides dealing with other important ancestral rituals like *piṇḍapitṛyajña* and other like *āgrāyaṇeṣṭi*. The text enjoys a unique place along with other manuals of śrauta sacrifices such as *Agnihotracandrikā*, *Darśapūrnamāśaprakāśa*, *Agniṣṭomapaddhati* for its significant characteristic of systematical analysis of different theories along with their practical applications as well, e.g. *atha parvaṇasthālipāka ucyaṭe... atha prayogaḥ...; athāṣṭakocyaṭe... atha dadhañjalihomapakramāśritya prayogaḥ...*, etc.

While doing so it quotes profusely from the śruti and smṛti, *purāṇa*, *itihāsapurāṇa*, *dharmasūtra*, *gr̥hyasūtra* and *śilpaśāstra* texts of celebrated authors, commentators while following mainly Āpastamba School. It has been said there—... *śrutismṛtyuditam karma na kuryād aśuciḥ kvacit ....* Hence, the text may claim its uniqueness for dealing with interrelationship between śrauta, gr̥hya and smārta rites and rituals.

There is no indication regarding this type of gr̥hya rites directly in the Vedas nor there is any detailed description about them though the idea of gr̥hya rites is as important as śrauta. Unlike śrauta sacrifices where the priest is responsible to himself and the deity he worships, in gr̥hya sacrifices, the sacrificer owes his responsibility to the welfare of all members of his family, the aim of the latter being attainment of worldly upliftment (*abhyudaya*) and ultimate goal (*niḥśreyas*).

About the date, author and scribe of the text, it can be said that it is composed later than 1550 AD and to be precise, 1575 – 1650 AD, according to P.V. Kane (*History of Dharmaśāstra*. Vol.1, p 697).

Candracūḍabhaṭṭa or Candraśekhara, the author of the text, is the son of Umanabhaṭṭa or Umāpatibhaṭṭa Sūri, elsewhere mentioned as Umāśaṅkara and grandson of Dharmabhaṭṭa or Dharmeśvara surnamed Paurāṇika.



In the text, authorities such as Aśvalāyana, Baudhāyana, Manu, Yājñavalkya, Gobhila, Kātyāyana, Bṛhaspati, Hemādri, Yama, Śātātapa, Bhāradvāja, Devala, Atri, Hārīta, Usanas, Nārāyaṇa, Mārkaṇḍeya, Pāraskara, Śaṅkha, Likhita, Pracetas, Jamadagni, Lalla, to name a few, have been cited.

The description of a few manuscripts is as follows:

Ms. A of my reference is procured from Prof. K.T. Pandurangi Collection entitled *Pākayajñanirṇayaḥ*. Substance country made paper. Folio 1b–59a/59b. Lines 9–11 on each folio with +39 words in a line. (The first five beautiful verses praise the family line of Āpastamba besides Umā Maheśvara. The colophon mentions the date as śaka 1754 and the name of the scribe as Vistesā, son of Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa and the place known as Bijapur.)

Ms. B of my reference

*Pākayajñanirṇayaḥ* by Candracūḍabhaṭṭa, son of Umāśaṅkara. Ms.no – S.C. III.E. 100 of the Asiatic Society, Kolkata. Substance country made paper. Folia -1b–61 a/b. Lines 10–11 on each folio with + 45 words in each line. Language – Sanskrit, Script – Devanāgarī. The post-colophon statement: *samvat*1860.

Ms. C

*Pākayajñanirṇayaḥ* by Candracūḍabhaṭṭa, son of Umāpatibhaṭṭa Sūri. Ms. no – G 936 of the Asiatic Society, Kolkata. Substance handmade paper 25cm x 11cm. Folia -115; Duplicate pagination (112–113) in one folio. Lines 7 on each folio with + 35 words in each line. Language – Sanskrit. Script – Devanāgarī. The author follows Āpastamba for so he states in the preamble. The post-colophon statement: *samvat*1933.

On a first hand checking, Ms. C seems to contain a larger work consisting of 115 folios than Ms-B (of 61 folios) and Ms-A (of 59 folios).

There are altogether 14 manuscripts procured from across India (4 of which are incomplete) on the basis of which the critical edition of the text is nearing completion.

## CARMEN SPIERS

École Pratique des Hautes Etudes, PSL, Paris

### Guilty dreams and the debt to death: *duṣvápnya-* and its transfer mechanism in the Atharvaveda

The Vedic “bad dream,” *duṣvápnya-* (RV +), is a complex concept, more than just a word for nightmare. This was already noticed by Geldner in his translation of RV 8.47.18, where he noted that probably a dream in which one does something bad is meant. R. Stuhmann, in his 1982 thesis on the subject, concludes that it is the effect of the bad dream which is meant by *duṣvápnya-*, that the many attempts to escape it are to escape from the realization of the bad omen that it represents. Although these two interpretations are parts of the puzzle of *duṣvápnya-*, the repeated mention of an *awake* person’s bad dreams in the Atharvaveda hints at a scope of meaning for this word beyond sleep-state occurrences. I will examine some expiatory formulae from both Atharvaveda schools in which this word clearly means “crime,” and describe the transfer-to scapegoat mechanism used to get rid of the *duṣvápnya-*, the same as that used to get rid of crimes called as such with the usual vocabulary. The goal is to escape punishment and make an enemy undergo it for us. The special role of two concepts in these passages both complicates and explains the use of the transfer mechanism: one, that of debt and appeasement of “creditors” by substitutes and portions; two, the figure of Yama as the ultimate creditor (see Malamoud 1980). Yama’s henchman is Sleep, who comes to shake the criminal up for his dues in the form of a bad dream inspiring guilt (the psychological aspect of the Vedic treatment of dreams has been noted by J. Houben in his 2008 article). The meaning of *duṣvápnya-* in many cases wavers between “crime,” the guilt/debt resulting from this crime, and the psychological manifestations of guilt in the subject (including but not limited to bad dreams). In some cases, it can refer specifically to crimes committed by someone in a compromised mental state (frenzy, drunkenness, insanity), bearing similarity to sleep by the weak self-control of the subject.

## SHILPA SUMANT

Deccan College, Pune

### Puṁsavana rite in the Atharvavedic tradition

Puṁsavana is a rite performed for obtaining a male child. Among all Vedic traditions this ritual is prescribed to be performed during pregnancy. About the time of performance the Gṛhyasūtras vary to a great extent from the immediate after conception till the eighth month of pregnancy. The present paper will study the features of this rite in both the Atharvavedic traditions, Śaunaka and Paippalāda and will try to trace its historical development in the Āyurvedic texts as well.

For Śaunaka school I will begin with the Puṁsavana rite prescribed in the Kauśikasūtra 35.1–10 along with the Dārilabhāṣya and Kauśikapaddhati. I will also study Ātharvaṇapaddhati, and prayoga-texts such as Daśakarma, Prayogabhānu and Saṁskāratnamālā. For the Paippalāda school, I shall study the primary material in the Karmapañjikā and Karmasamuccaya manuscripts and Paippalādavivāhādi-saṁskārapaddhati (PAṆḌĀ 2000).

Further development of this rite in the Āyurvedic medical texts will be traced in consultation with the Bṛhatṭrayī, namely the Suśrutasamhita, Carakasamhita and Vagbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya, Suśrutasamhitā, Carakasamhitā and Vāgbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya.

## PHILIPPE SWENNEN

Université de Liège

### The making of the Vedic yajamāna: an analysis of the upasad days

The vedic *agniṣṭoma*, the simplest form of the *soma* sacrifice, lasts five days. The first one is dedicated to the *dīkṣā*, or consecration, of the sacrificer. Then come three days called *upasad*. They allow the main actors of the rite to prepare the sacrificial ground, to welcome the king *soma* and to achieve the immolation of a first animal victim, a goat. They eventually include the performance of the very ancient *pravargya* rite, which will probably not be into account, because it is not always present.

During these three days, the sacrificer carries on the achievement of his personal liturgical course, which is perceptible through the *avāntaradīkṣā*, or intermediate consecration. It begins during the second day, in the context of the welcome of *soma*, and ends in the afternoon of the fourth day, just before the sacrificer takes part to the eating of the sacrificed goat. This conclusion is named *avāntaradīkṣāvisarjana*.

The aim of this paper is to describe the relation of this *avāntaradīkṣā* with the beginning of the process, showing how the sacrificer is gradually built, and with the content of the important ceremonies developed during these three days. The meaning of this liturgical step will be taken into account on the basis of the *brāhmaṇas*, intending to show how the archaic vedic doctrine has been first enounced, before knowing secondary evolution.

The aim of the research is to better perceive the mythical identity of a vedic sacrificer.

**HIDEKI TESHIMA**

Kyoto Bunkyo University

**Rebirth theory of the Mānava-Dharma-Śāstra with special reference to the correspondence with the doctrine in MaitU 3.3**

The final chapter, no. 12, of the Mānava-Dharma-Śāstra (MDhŚ) shows peculiar theory on the rebirth, especially in the part 12.3–82. This part contains four sorts of explanations: the karmic retribution caused by the acts of mind, speech, and body (12.3–11 = portion [A]); the individual soul after death and process for its rebirth (12.12–23 = portion [B]); various rebirths related to the condition of three attributes (*sattva*-, *rajas*-, and *tamas*-) (12.24–51 = portion [C]); and bad rebirths as results of particular sins in the previous life (12.52–82 = portion [D]). Regarding the explanations in the portions [A] and [C], Bronkhorst (2012: 147–153) already discussed their relationship with statements in the preceding chapters of the MDhŚ. On the other hand, the explanations in the portions [B] and [D], though they show peculiar thoughts, have not been thoroughly dealt in any scholarly works with. This report will focus on the rebirth theory given in both the portions, and point out especially the correspondence between the thought regarding “the structure of the self” shown in the portion [B] of the MDhŚ and that found in the Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad (MaitU).

The clear correspondence to the view of the MaitU is found in MDhŚ 12.12, where the Kṣetrajña (the knower of field) is called “Kārayitar” (the one who makes [the Ātman] act), and the Bhūtātman (the elemental self) is explained as “the one who does actions” (*yaḥ karoti karmāṇi*). Similarly, MaitU 3.3 explains the Antaḥpuruṣa (the inner soul) as “Kārayitar”, and Bhūtātman as “Kartar” (the doer of acts) which actually accords with the expression “*yaḥ karoti karmāṇi*” in the MDhŚ. Only difference between the two texts is the way of naming the “Kārayitar”: the Kṣetrajña in the MDhŚ; the Antaḥpuruṣa in the MaitU. As to this point, the statements in MDhŚ 8.85 and 96, both related to

the rightness of testimony, are worth referring. The MDhŚ says in 8.85 that any act done by the individual is observed by the “Antarapuraṣa” inside the doer. Thereafter, in 8.96, it is said that the rightness of testimony is acknowledged by the Kṣetrañña, as the observer of all acts of the witness. In this context the Kṣetrañña is to be understood as another name of the Antarapuraṣa. Thus the fundamental thought on the structure of the self is shared with both the texts, MDhŚ 12.12 and the MaitU 3.3, and no other text has a view fairly corresponding to them. It is, however, also remarkable that the following part MDhŚ 12.13–23 presents the unique theory on the rebirth, which does not have any connection to the MaitU. The evolution of the thought in this part would be considered with its socio-cultural background. In addition, the topic whether the MDhŚ had a connection to the Maitrāyaṇīya school or not has been discussed since the nineteenth century. Bronkhorst (1985) and Jamison (2000) offered some arguments pleading in favor of the existence of a connection between them. This report may provide a clue for rethinking about the possibility of the “Maitrāyaṇī / Manu connection.”

### References:

- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1985. “The origin of an Indian dietary rule: evidence for a lost Mānava work on Dharma.” *Aligarh Journal of Oriental and Classical Studies* 2 (1–2) (Ram Suresh Tripathi Commemoration Volume), 123–132.
- 2012. “Manu and the Mahābhārata.” *Indologica: Papers of the Institute of Oriental and Classical Studies* 40 (T. Ya. Elizarenkova Memorial Volume Book 2). Ed. L. Kulikov & M. Rusanov), 135–156.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. 2000. “A Sanskrit maxim and its ritual and legal applications,” *Anusantatyaī: Festschrift für Johanna Narten zum 70. Geburtstag*. Ed. Almut Hintze & Eva Tichy. Dettelbach: J.H. Röhl. (*Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, Beiheft 19). Pp. 111–125.

**ELISABETH TUCKER**

Faculty of Oriental Studies, Oxford

**Paippalādasamhitā 11.3–4, Śaunakasamhitā 19.34–35 and the Atharvavedic words *gr̥tsī-* ‘witch’ and *ṛṣṇú-* ‘sorcerer’**

It was noted already by Rudolf Roth in 1875 and Maurice Bloomfield in 1899 that Śaunakasamhitā kāṇḍa 19 is a supplement and consists mostly of Paippalādasamhitā material. This has been amply demonstrated by subsequent studies: the corresponding stanzas are normally pāda by pāda, word by word identical. It might be expected that this would help with editing the PS, but the converse now sometimes turns out to be true: the Oriya palm leaf manuscripts not only provide a better PS text than the single Kashmiri birch bark manuscript but also help to establish problematic parts of the ŚS 19 text on a firmer basis. An example of this is the composition (PS 11.3–4 and ŚS 19.34–35) extolling the Jaṅgiḍa plant and its Indra-like qualities. The text of ŚS 19.34–35 best known to Western scholars, that of Roth and Whitney (1856, 2nd ed. by Max Lindenau 1924), carries heavy emendations of the manuscript readings in a number of stanzas, obscuring both the original syntax and some unusual lexical items.

My paper will focus on two interesting words, *gr̥tsī-* ‘witch’ and *ṛṣṇú-* probably ‘sorcerer’, which are now confirmed by the Oriya PS tradition for this Jaṅgiḍa sūkta. Even though they were read in the 1898 edition of ŚS 19.34–35 by Shankar Pandurang Pandit, they do not appear in lexica and they have not received any recent linguistic discussion.

The Oriya reading *gr̥tsyas* in PS 11.3.2a supports the ŚS 19.34.2a manuscript variants *gr̥tsyas* / *gr̥tsyás* and the conjecture by H. Lüders (1907: 25) that this pāda contains a nom. pl. (i.e. *gr̥tsiyàḥ*) of *gr̥tsī-*, a *vr̥kī-*-type feminine of *gr̥tsa-*. In the Ṛgveda *gr̥tsa-* functions as an epithet of gods such as Agni, Indra and Varuṇa, and is normally translated ‘wise, clever’. In this Atharvaveda stanza *gr̥tsī-* can be interpreted

as ‘wise woman, witch’. A pejorative meaning is also likely for the masculine *gr̥tsa-* in two Yajurveda passages (VS 16.25, TS 4.5.4.1).

*ṛṣṇávaḥ* nom. pl. in PS 11.4.5a has been completely ignored, although it was already known from the Kashmiri Paippalāda tradition and the ‘Sāyaṇa’ commentary. The context, which is the only clue to the meaning of this once-occurring noun, is to some extent parallel to that of *gr̥tsiyàḥ* as both PS 11.3.2 and PS 11.4.5 share the same final pāda. The text of the whole stanza PS 11.4.5, ŚS 19.35.5 will be discussed, and it will be suggested that *ṛṣṇú-* may be related in its linguistic history and morphology (via the well-known pattern of Caland suffix alternation) to Vedic *ṛṣi-*, Old Avestan *ərəši-*. If *ṛṣṇú-* continues an Indo-Iranian noun meaning ‘seer, sage’, it may, in parallel fashion to *gr̥tsa-* and *gr̥tsf-*, have developed a sinister or pejorative sense ‘sorcerer’ in some linguistic registers of Vedic.

---

## JARROD WHITAKER

Wake Forest University  
Winston-Salem, NC

### Vasiṣṭha’s plea (R̥V.7.104/AV.8.4) as obligatory hate speech, not sorcery

In a well-known hymn contained in the *R̥gveda* (7.104.1–25) and *Atharvaveda* (≈ŚS.8.4.1–25; cf. PS.16.9–11), the family priest Vasiṣṭha vociferously counters an accusation leveled at him of being a *yātudhāna* or “sorcerer,” as the term is usually translated. This paper questions our standard interpretation of the terms *yātú* and *yātudhāna* in early Vedic culture, and seeks to shift our focus away from the language of sorcery, and the wider theoretical category of magic, which is analytically bankrupt. The paper argues that the term *yātú* and its derivatives appear in a narrow semantic context that consistently describes the disruptions caused by animals to ritual performances



since such creatures bite and sting, steal offerings, disrupt hymns with screeching, mess up the fire, and in general pester performers. These associations allow us to draw some tentative conclusions about the meaning of *yātú*, which I believe denotes something like our English words “disruption, discord, strife” or simply “trouble.” The compound *yātudhāna* can thus be translated as “disruption-sack, strife-bag,” or less literally as “one who sows discord.” Since the term indicates that such a person harbors strife, then the English phrase “trouble-maker” best captures its underlying sense. For *Vasiṣṭha*, it is the worst thing a priest could be accused of doing; namely, of disrupting the performance of a ritual in the manner of a wild animal. Consequently, the terms *yātú* and *yātudhāna* function as extreme insults, as strident forms of hate speech that mark the vilest kinds of anti-social behavior and cosmically abhorrent realities. The terms are part of a larger discursive formation—priestly hate speech—that at its heart is exclusionary, designating insider from outsider, truth from untruth, order from chaos, and sacred liturgical speech from falsehoods, lies, and aberrant practices. In these terms, such language is a necessary component of priestly discourse because insults, preemptive verbal strikes, and retaliatory speech acts demonstrate performatively the truth of the priest’s verbal power and his willingness to defend it. This paper will thus demonstrate that the ritualized use of hate speech defines the enemy-other in absolute terms, as well as functioning as a core strategy to assert and reestablish the integrity, normative identity, and authority of *Vasiṣṭha*, specifically, and Vedic priests, in general.

## MICHAEL WITZEL

Department of South Asian Studies  
Harvard University, Cambridge MA

### Micro-philology: the re-import of Vedic traditions to Kashmir under Sultān Zayn al-'Ābidīn (1419–1470)

After less than a century of gradual Islamization of Kashmir (1339 -- CE), around 1400 CE a severe, decades-long persecution of Brahmins occurred under Sultān Sikandar and his minister Sūha Bhaṭṭa (Saif ad-Dīn). It resulted in an almost total loss of Vedic tradition in the Valley. Sikandar's son Zayn al-'Ābidīn reversed this policy and re-imported Vedic and other Brahmins from India proper. Detailed testimony for these developments is found in the contemporaneous Rājatarāṅgiṇīs of Jonarāja, Śrīvara, and in the writings some Muslim historians.

Here, the testimony of Kashmiri mss. is of importance, though the import is visible only in minute peculiarities that have been overlooked so far. In this talk, I will present such data from Śāradā manuscripts of the Kaṭha Yajurveda, Ṛgveda and Paippalāda Atharvaveda. They indicate import from a Nāgarī using area.

This runs counter to the general impression conveyed by in Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's Nyāyamañjarī (c. 890 CE) of the lively predominance of Kashmiri Veda tradition. Micro-philology, in spite of its common neglect, has its uses.

## TOMOKI YAMADA

The Institute of Shin Buddhist Culture, Kyoto Koka Women's University

### On base metals and precious metals in Vedic literature

Wilhelm Rau conducted a comprehensive and detailed study of metals in Vedic literature in his book *Metalle und Metallgeräte im vedischen Indien* in 1974. Even today, it remains the most significant such study. However, little attention has been given to the chronological order of each Vedic text in his study and since its publication, additional research has been completed in the field of Vedic study, allowing us to improve on his findings.

The aim of this paper is to understand, using philological methods, the material culture of ancient times in South Asia. Through comprehensive analysis of recent studies and examples concerning base metals, precious metals and metallurgy at every stage of Vedic literature, this study aims to examine how the usage of metals developed during the Vedic period.

## NATALIYA YANCHEVSKAYA

Princeton University

### Varuṇa, the Time Lord?

The paper analyses Varuṇa, a complex Vedic deity whose functions include being in charge of the Cosmic Order/Truth (*ṛta*) and the celestial ocean. It clarifies Varuṇa's mythological functions, powers, and attributes in the *R̥gveda* and proposes a probable etymology of *vrata*, his major power, and of his very name. The proposed etymology is analyzed within the framework of the Indo-European lexical units denoting temporal notions. Then, the paper proceeds to showing that mythology of Varuṇa is filled with time-related motifs. It demonstrates Varuṇa's explicit connections with the sun that represents the solar year; with the year itself as well as with different other time units; with human lifespan, "personal time", and destiny. Varuṇa is presented as the guardian of eternity who arranges and distributes events and time-units. In conclusion, the paper establishes Varuṇa's possible role as a Vedic time-deity.