

# **PROBLEMS IN VEDIC AND SANSKRIT LITERATURE**

Edited By:

**Maitreyee Deshpande**

COMPLEMENTARY COPY

**New Bharatiya Book Corporation**

**DELHI**

**(INDIA)**

Publishers :

**New Bhāratīya Book Corporation**

Shop No. 18, 2nd Floor,  
5574-A, Ch. Kashi Ram Market,  
New Chandrawal Delhi-110007.

Phone: 23851294, 55195809

Email: newbbc@indiatimes.com.

**First Edition : 2004**

**Price : 1200.00**

**ISBN : 81-87418-91-5**

**Type Setting:**

**A. R. PRINTERS**

D-102 New Seelampur, Delhi-53

Ph : 22560113

**Printers:**

**Jain Amar Printing Press**

Delhi- 11007

42. Meditation through the Vedic Ritual 318-327  
P. C. Sahoo
43. *Itihāsa Purāṇābhyāṁ Vedaṁ Samupabṛṁhayet* 328-336  
Thaneswar Sarmah
44. “कवि-समय एवं महाकवि कालिदास” 337-348  
शुकदेव शर्मा,
45. The Self-Space and Criteria for Actions 349-359  
Musashi Tachikawa
46. The *Prāśitra* Rite of the Animal Sacrifice 360-374  
-François Voegeli
47. Problems of Vedic Interpretation : In the light of the *R̥jubhāṣyam* 375-379  
M.L. Wadekar
48. Some Rare Manuscripts from the Aundh Museum 380-386  
Siddharth Y. Wakankar
49. Contribution of Ganesh Umakant Thite to the Field of 387-408  
Sanskrit and Allied Studies  
Editor
50. LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME 409-412

## The *Prāśitra* Rite of the Animal Sacrifice

-François Voegeli

More than a decade ago Prof. Thite introduced me to the intricacies of vedic ritual. During the series of lectures he gave at the University of Lausanne I was struck not only by the complexity of the ceremonies but also by the attention the *sūtrakāras* were giving to minutest detail of the ritual procedures. As a tribute to Prof. Thite's scholarship, which helped me many times after during my travels in the maze of the vedic lore, I shall discuss one of these details: the *prāśitra* portion of the animal sacrifice's offerings.<sup>1</sup>

The question of the *prāśitra* rite of the animal sacrifice is somewhat hazy. The uncertainties surrounding this sub-rite of the so-called "independent" animal sacrifice led HEESTERMAN (1993) n. 84, p. 273, to state: "It is significant that the animal sacrifice has no separate *prāśitra*". As I shall show below this affirmation is hasty and only partially correct. It hinges on some peculiarities of the youngest Śrauta Sūtras of the Yajur Veda where this particular rite is excluded from the *idā* ceremony of the NP. The causes of this exclusion are at first sight unclear but some commentaries and a textual feature of the VādhŚS point to a solution to this problem. Before proceeding further an investigation into the sources on which HEESTERMAN bases his affirmation is necessary.

There are actually two distributions of *idā* during the NP and thus two occasions to single out the *prāśitra* portion for the Brahman. Following the course of the ritual they are, in turn, the *idā* of the *paśupuroḍāśu* and the *idā* of the main offering. Concerning the latter, it is true that most of the younger Sūtras of the YV do not mention the *prāśitra* portion when giving directives for the partaking of the *idā*. Cf.:

BhārŚS 7.21.3-5 *upahūtāyām idāyām adhyuddhiṁ harati vaniṣṭhum agnīdhe* [3] *ṣaḍavattaṁ saṁpādayati* [4] *prāśnanti mārjayante* [5]

After the *idā* has been invoked he brings the (part called) *adhyuddhi*<sup>2</sup> to the Hotṛ (and) the lower intestine to the Āgnīdhra. [3] He makes six cuttings (out of the lower intestine). [4] They partake (of the *idā* and) cleanse themselves. [5]

ĀpŚS 7.26.5-7 *upahūtāṁ maitrāvaruṇaṣaṣṭhā bhakṣayanti / pratiprasthātā saptamaḥ* [5] *vaniṣṭhum agnīdhe ṣaḍavattaṁ saṁpādayati* [6] *adhyūdhnīm hotre harati* [7]

They eat (the *idā*) that has been invoked with the Maitrāvaruṇa as the sixth (officiating priest taking part into the meal and) the Pratiprasthātṛ (as) the seventh. [5] He makes six cuttings (out of) the lower intestine for the Āgnīdhra. [6] He brings the *adhyūdhnī* to the Hotṛ. [7]

HirŚS 4.5.31:440–33:441 *upahūtām maitrāvaruṇaśaṣṭhāḥ prāśnanti* [31:440] *adhyuddhiṃ hotre harati vaniṣṭhum agnīdhe<sup>3</sup> śadavattam sampādayati* [32:441] *prāśitāyām mārjayitvā* [33:441]

They partake (of the *idā*) that has been invoked with the Maitrāvaruṇa as the sixth (officiating priest taking part into the meal). [31:440] He brings the *adhyuddhi* to the Hotṛ (and) the lower intestine to the Āgnīdhra. He makes six cuttings (out of the lower intestine). [32:441] After they have partaken (of the *idā*) they cleanse themselves. [33:441]

MānŚS 1.8.5.35–36 *upahūyamānāyām adhyūdhnīm hotre haranti vaniṣṭhum agnīdhe* [35] *bhakṣayitvā mārjayante* [36]

When (the *idā*) is being invoked (by the Hotṛ) they bring the *adhyūdhnī* to the Hotṛ and the lower intestine to the Āgnīdhra. [35] Having eaten (the *idā*) they cleanse themselves. [36]

VārŚS 1.6.7.20–21 *upahūtāyām idāyām adhyūdhnīm hotre haranti* [20] *vaniṣṭhum agnīdha ādadhāti yathāgnīdhrabhāgam*

After the *idā* has been invoked they bring the *adhyūdhnī* to the Hotṛ. [20] He gives the lower intestine to the Āgnīdhra as the Āgnīdhra's share (of the remnants of the offering). [21]

KātyŚS 6.9.3–7 *idām ādadhāti* [3] *upahūtāyām vaniṣṭhum agnīdhe* [4] *adhyūdhnīm hotre* [6] *avāntareḍā vā* [7]

He gives the (intermediate) *idā* (to the Hotṛ). [3] After (the *idā*) has been invoked (he gives) the lower intestine to the Āgnīdhra. [4] (He gives) the *adhyūdhnī* to the Hotṛ. [5] Or the intermediate *idā* (is made of the *adhyūdhnī*). [7]

These quotations show that the *prāśitra* rite did not take place in these Schools. They seem to be interested only in the remnants of the offering<sup>4</sup> especially assigned to the Hotṛ and the Āgnīdhra. That some Śrauta Sūtras passed over the *prāśitra* rite in the NP was known to Yājñikadeva, one of the commentators of the KātyŚS, as is shown by the following extract of his commentary to KātyŚS 6.8.13:

Yājñikadeva on KātyŚS 6.8.13<sup>5</sup> (ed. WEBER, p. 611, ll. 3–9) *śūkhāntare śrūyate daivatāny avadāya na tāvaty eva hotavyam sauviṣṭakṛtāny avadyati sauviṣṭakṛtāny avadāya na tāvaty eva hotavyam aiḍāny avadyatīti atas cātrāvadānam pradānāntam na bhavati vacanāt pūrvaṃ pradhānāvadānam tataḥ sauviṣṭakṛtānām tata aiḍānām iti kramah / prāśitraṃ tu kātyāyanāpastambamānavakāṭhasūtreṣu śatapathe ca paṭhitam nāsti sampradāyapaddhatikāreṇa karkācāryaiś ca kartavyatvenoktam bharṭṛyajñenu cānuktatvān na bhavātīty uktam*

(Because) in another *śūkhā* it is heard (as *śruti*): “having cut down portions for

the deity, the oblation is not to be made at that same time. He cuts down portions for (Agni) Sviṣṭakṛt. Having cut down portions for (Agni) Sviṣṭakṛt, the oblation is not to be done at that same time. He cuts down portions for the *iḍā*<sup>6</sup>, therefore also here (in the school of Kātyāyana) the cutting down of portions does not end with (the ones used for) the principal (offering)<sup>7</sup>. Because of (its) explicit mention (by the *śruti*) the regular sequence is: first the cutting down of portions for the principal (offering), then (the cutting down of portions) for (Agni) Sviṣṭakṛt, then (the cutting down of portions) for the *iḍā*. But the *prāśitra* is not mentioned in the Sūtras of Kātyāyana, Āpastamba, Mānava, Kaṭha, and in the Śatapatha(-brāhmaṇa). It was taught by the author of the *paddathi* of (Kātyāyana's) tradition and by the teachers of Karka as having to be performed, but Bharṭṛyajña has taught: "It is not (performed) because it is not taught (as *śruti*)".

As can be seen from the Sūtra quotations above, Yājñikadeva is absolutely correct in listing the KātyŚS, the ĀpŚS and the MānŚS as works which are silent on the *prāśitra* portion of the NP's main offering (as for the *kaṭhasūtra* we are unfortunately not in a position to decide on the rightness of his affirmation). According to him, this omission was remedied by some teachers or commentators who nevertheless prescribe to cut down the *prāśitra*, but agreement on this matter was not universal for at least one of them denies the NP of any such portion on the basis that no injunction concerning it is found in the *śrutis*. This argument is quite sound for no mention of the *prāśitra* is found in the sections of the TS, MS or ŚB dedicated to the dissection of the victim, the offering of its parts or the *iḍā* rite of the animal sacrifice<sup>8</sup>. The absence of comments on the *prāśitra* in the Saṃhitās or Brāhmaṇas of the YV could explain that some *sūtrakāras* passed over this rite in their description of the NP but the situation becomes complicated when we take a look at the VaikhŚS's account of the *iḍā* rite of the NP's main offering. In the following passage a new element comes into play:

VaikhŚS 10.20:119.8–11 *medasvinīm avāntareḍām avadyati, medasopastīrya hotur haste prakṛtivad iḍām avadāya medasābhighārayati, hotre 'dhyuddhīm haraty agnīdhe<sup>9</sup> medasvinam vaniṣṭhum brahmaṇe vakṣo, vyaṃ soma vrata taveti brahmā tat prāśnāti*

He cuts the fatty intermediate *iḍā*. Having strewn (the Hotṛ's palm) with fat (and) having cut down portions of the *iḍā* into the Hotṛ's hand as is done in the normal form (of the ritual)<sup>10</sup> he besmears (the *iḍā*'s portions cut down into the Hotṛ's hand) with fat. He brings the *adhyuddhi* to the Hotṛ, the fatty lower intestine to the Āgnīdhra (and) the chest to the Brahman. The Brahman eats it (after having recited) "(May) we, O soma, at your service (...)".

Besides the quarters reserved for the Hotṛ and the Āgnīdhra mentioned in the



previous Sūtra quotations, the chest is here brought to the Brahman who eats it after having recited RV 10.57.6. The *vakṣas* could at first sight be confused with the Brahman's share of the remnants of the offering that are apportioned to the officiating priests after they have solemnly partaken of the *idā*. In the ritual of the Full and New Moon, which is supposed to serve as paradigm for the NP<sup>11</sup>, the consumption of these remnants is done after they have been divided into four parts that are assigned by the Sacrificer to each of the four priests officiating in this ritual. A portion of this "fourfold division" (*caturdhākarāṇa*<sup>12</sup>) is set aside for the Brahman and brought to him by the Adhvaryu who usually carries it together with the Sacrificer's share of the *idā*<sup>13</sup>. That *vakṣas* in this passage of the VaikhŚS refers to the *prāśitra* and not to the Brahman's piece of the *caturdhākarāṇa* comes up clearly when we look at parallel passages in the oldest Sūtras of the Taittirīya tradition.

The BaudhŚS mentions the *prāśitra* in the following passage which is found at the very end of the section dedicated to the *idā* of the NP's main offering<sup>14</sup>:

BaudhŚS 4.9–10:124.14–16 *athāha brahmaṇe vakṣaḥ parihareti, tad brahmā pratigrhṇāti, vayan̄ soma vrata tava manas tanūṣu bibhrataḥ | prajāvanto aśimahīti*

Then he says: "Bring the chest to the Brahman (by going) around (the Āhavanīya fire)!" The Brahman receives it (with) "May we, O Soma, at your service, bearing the mind in (our) bodies, (blessed) with progeny obtain (you)." (= RV 10.57.6).

The use of the verb *pari-HR-* in the Adhvaryu's *saṃpraīṣa* and *prati-GRAH-* to describe the action of the Brahman receiving the *vakṣas* leaves no doubt on the *prāśitra* nature of the chest for the very same verbs are used in the aetiological myths related to the *prāśitra* portion in the TS and ŚB<sup>15</sup>. The *prāśitra*, being born out of Rudra's fury, is a dangerous portion of the offering which must be brought around (*pari-HR-*) the Āhavanīya fire to the Brahman who is sitting at this moment of the ritual on his dedicated seat at the southeastern corner of the sacrificial area. This path must be followed to avoid bringing the *prāśitra* into contact with the *vedi* and other sacrificial substances or implements<sup>16</sup>. Thereafter the *prāśitra* is to be received (*prati-GRAH-*) by the Brahman with great care and the appropriate mantras.

If we turn to the second oldest Sūtra of the Taittirīyas, the VādhŚS, we also find a reference to the chest as *prāśitra* but it has become only a passing mention in the following passage describing the *idā* of the NP's main offering:

VādhŚS 5.3.2.18–22 *atyākramya yathāyatanaṁ srucau sādāyitvābhigārya pratyaiṇ̄ āvṛtya hotra idām ādadhāti medasvad avāntareḍām [18] upahūtāyām idāyām matasne 'gnīdha ādadhāti [19] vakṣo brahmaṇa upohati [20] prāśnanti [21] mārjayante [22]*

Having walked past (the *vedi*) he seats the two ladles in their respective places (on the altar). Having poured (clarified butter) over (the quarters gathered into *iḍā*'s plate and) having turned towards the West he gives the *iḍā* — the intermediate *iḍā* together with fat — to the Hotṛ. [18] After the *iḍā* has been invoked he gives the two kidneys to the Āgnīdhra. [19] He pushes the chest towards the Brahman. [20] They partake (of their respective share of the *iḍā*) [21] They cleanse themselves. [22]

The dealings with this dreadful portion of the offering have been reduced in 5.3.2.20 to *vakṣo brahmaṇa upohati*. Although the wording differs significantly from BaudhŚS 4.9–10:124.14–16 in its use of *upa-ŪH-* (“push towards”) instead of the expected *pari-HR-*, this passage doubtless refers to the practice of carrying the *prāśitra* to the Brahman.

The BaudhŚS and VādhŚS show that the *prāśitra* rite was part of the *iḍā* of the NP's main offering in the oldest layer of the Taittirīya Sūtras. They also indicate that the animal sacrifice's *prāśitra* was a portion cut down from the chest of the victim. The choice of the chest as the quarter of the beast from which the *prāśitra* is taken is not surprising. TS 6.3.10.5 lists the *vakṣas* among the three parts from which portions have to be taken first to make up the main offering of the NP<sup>17</sup>. The chest is then one of the foremost *daivatāny avadānāni* and it is also used as a part of the *iḍā*<sup>18</sup>. It is then perfectly suitable to furnish the *prāśitra* in contradistinction to the quarters chosen for the Sviṣṭakṛt offering<sup>19</sup> or the ones used to “enrich” the *iḍā*.

The *prāśitra* rite of the NP's main offering has survived later only in the VaikhŚS. Considering Yājñikadeva's comment quoted above, does it mean that the oldest Taittirīya Sūtras and the VaikhŚS willfully diverged from their Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas by imposing a *prāśitra* to the NP where the *śrutis* required none? Or do the divergences among Sūtras imply that the *prāśitra* was considered as a kind of optional rite in the NP? Some indications favouring the second hypothesis are found in the VādhŚS's section related to the offering of the *paśupuroḍāśa*, offering which is, as I have said before, the second occasion to perform the *iḍā* in the animal sacrifice.

Explicit mention of the cutting down of a *prāśitra* portion of the *paśupuroḍāśa* is found in all Taittirīya Sūtras, except the BhārŚS<sup>20</sup>. The Maitrāyaṇīyas as well as the main text of the KātyŚS<sup>21</sup> are silent about it but for the latter Yājñikadeva's commentary fills the blank<sup>22</sup>. The mandatory or non-mandatory character of the *prāśitra* rite seems better asserted in the case of the *paśupuroḍāśa* than in the case of the NP's main offering. There is also a clear *sākhā* division on this matter: the Taittirīyas perform it whereas the Maitrāyaṇīyas do not. The question of the *paśupuroḍāśa*'s *prāśitra* would then make not much problem if it were not complicated by a textual peculiarity of the VādhŚS.



In my critical edition of ch. V of the *VādhŚS* (VOEGELI forthcoming), which is based on 9 mss. of this *Sūtra*<sup>23</sup> among which two recensions of the text can be distinguished, I have decided to take one of these recensions (the “*K<sub>3</sub>*” recension<sup>24</sup>) and the independent ms. *K<sub>2</sub>*<sup>25</sup> as a basis for reconstructing the *ṣṭā* ceremony of the *paśupuroḍāśa*. The result is the following:

*VādhŚS* 5.3.1.20–28 *atyākramya yathāyatanaṁ srucau sādāyitvā prāśitram avadyaty* [20] *apa upasprśyeḍām avadyaty* [21] *upahūtāyām ṣṭāyām agnīdha ādadhāti* [22] *prāśnanti* [23] *mārjayante* [24] *pariharanti brahmaṇe* [25] *prāśite prāśitre sahaiva pātriyā puroḍāśam pūrveṇāhavanīyaṁ sahādbhir brahmaṇe pariharati* [26] *prāśnāti brahmā* [27] *mārjayate* [28]

Having walked past (the *vedi* and) having seated the two ladles in their respective places (on the altar) he cuts down the *prāśitra*. [22] Having touched water he cuts down the *ṣṭā*. [21] After the *ṣṭā* has been invoked he gives (his share) to the *Āgnīdhra*. [22] They partake of (their respective shares of the *ṣṭā*). [23] They cleanse themselves. [24] They bring (the *prāśitra*) to the Brahman (by going) around (the *Āhavanīya* fire). [25] After the *prāśitra* has been partaken of (by the Brahman), with the (*ṣṭā*’s) plate he brings the cake (remnants) to the Brahman together with water (by going) around the front of the *Āhavanīya*. [26] The Brahman partakes of (his share of the cake remnants). [27] He cleanses himself. [28]

These mss. clearly mention the cutting down of the *prāśitra* (5.3.1.20 *prāśitram avadyati*), its bringing to the Brahman by going around the *Āhavanīya* fire (5.3.1.25 *pariharanti*<sup>26</sup> *brahmaṇe*) and its consumption by the Brahman (5.3.1.26 *prāśite prāśitre*).

The *paśupuroḍāśa*’s *ṣṭā* rite is quite different in the other recension of the *VādhŚS* mss. (the “*K<sub>1</sub>*” recension) and in the independent ms. *N<sub>1</sub>*<sup>27</sup>. Using these mss. the *ṣṭā* rite can be reconstituted thus:

*atyākramya yathāyatanaṁ srucau sādāyitvā vadānāni saṁbhidyābhighārya hotra ṣṭām ādadhāti upahūtāyām ṣṭāyām agnīdha ādadhāti prāśnanti mārjayante sahaiva pātriyā puroḍāśam pūrveṇāhavanīyaṁ sahādbhir brahmaṇe pariharati prāśnāti brahmā mārjayate*

Having walked past (the *vedi*), seated the two ladles in their respective places (on the altar), put together the portions cut down (for the *ṣṭā* and) poured (clarified butter) over (them) he gives the (intermediate) *ṣṭā* to the *Hotṛ*. After the *ṣṭā* has been invoked he gives (his share) to the *Āgnīdhra*. They partake of (their respective shares of the *ṣṭā*). They cleanse themselves. With the (*ṣṭā*’s) plate he brings the cake (remnants) to the Brahman together with water (by going) around the front of the *Āhavanīya*. The Brahman partakes of (his share of the cake remnants). He cleanses himself.

The difference between the recensions of the VādhŚS is twofold. The  $K_2$  recension includes the *prāśitra* rite whereas it is absent from the  $K_1$  recension. Conversely the  $K_1$  recension briefly mentions the rite of the *avāntareḍā*<sup>28</sup> whereas the  $K_2$  recension is silent about it. Considering the parallel sources quoted above (nn. 20 and 21) these two versions of the *paśupuroḍāśa*'s *iḍā* rite in the VādhŚS are perfectly legitimate. We cannot dismiss one or the other on the basis of a putative corruption of the text. The obvious question becomes then: why is the *prāśitra* missing in one of these recensions?

Āryadāsa's Vyākhyā to the VādhŚS29 helps us to answer this question. He makes the following comment on VādhŚS 5.3.1.20–28:

*haviryajñavidhe prāśitram avadyati / prāśitrasthāne sahaiva pātriyā puroḍāśam  
iti bruvan sa yatrāsmāi paśupuroḍāśam pariharatītyādi prāśitrapraṭiṣedhasya  
puroḍāśaviṣayatvaṃ jñāpayati*

He cuts the *prāśitra* in (an animal sacrifice of) the *haviryajña* type. By saying “(he brings) the *puroḍāśa* together with the (*iḍā*'s) plate”, instead of (giving directions for) the *prāśitra*, (the author of the Sūtra) makes known that the *prāśitra* is excluded from the (*paśu*)*puroḍāśa*'s *iḍā* rite, also when he says) “When he carries the cake (remnant) to him (i.e. the Brahman) around (the Āhavanīya fire)”<sup>30</sup> etc.

Though far from being clear in all respects this passage distinctly instructs us that the performance of the *prāśitra* in the *paśupuroḍāśa*'s *iḍā* rite is tied to the difference between *haviryajña* and non-*haviryajña* type of animal sacrifice. One should cut down the *prāśitra* if one is performing a *haviryajña* type of animal sacrifice but one should, correspondingly, not do so if one is performing an animal sacrifice part of a larger Soma ceremony. Āryadāsa's explanation is actually verified in the text of the VādhŚS itself.

The VādhŚS's textual composition has a unique characteristic. Whereas the rest of the Śrauta Sūtras of the YV devote a separate section solely to the NP and refer back to this section when an animal sacrifice is done in the Soma context, the VādhŚS expounds twice the manipulations of the animal sacrifice. Its first account makes up the Vth *prapāṭhaka* which is dedicated to the NP but more than 95% of the text of this *prapāṭhaka* is found *exactly* as such in the VI and VIIth *prapāṭhakas* which expound the Agniṣṭoma, at these places where the ritual manipulations of the *agnīṣomīyapaśubandha*<sup>31</sup> are gone through. In the Agniṣṭoma section (VIth *prapāṭhaka*) the passage parallel to 5.3.1.20–28 is the following:

VādhŚS 6.6.1.21–27 *atyākramya yathāyatanam srucau sādāyitvāvadānāni  
saṃbhidyābhighārya hotra iḍām ādadhāty [21] upahūtāyām iḍāyām agnīdha ādadhāti  
[22] prāśnanti [23] mārjayante [24] sahaiva pātriyā puroḍāśam pūrveṇāhavanīyam  
sahādbhīr brahmaṇe pariharati [25] prāśnāti brahmā [26] mārjayate [27]*

The text of this passage is exactly the same as the one found in the  $K_1$  recension and in the independent ms.  $N_1$ . Āryadāsa undoubtedly refers to the Vādhūla's practice when he asserts that the *prāśitra* takes place during the *paśupuroḍāśa*'s *idā* rite only if one is performing a *haviryajña* type of animal sacrifice. His comment nevertheless does not explain why such a discrepancy is found among the mss. of the Vth *prapāṭhaka*. Two hypotheses come to mind when trying to explain this divergence. Either the maker of the original ms. that served as the basis of the  $K_1$  recension (and of the independent ms.  $N_1$ ) carelessly copied what was in the Agniṣṭoma section (VIth *prapāṭhaka*) into the NP section (Vth *prapāṭhaka*), or there existed among the followers of Vādhūla two different ways of performing the *idā* of the *paśupuroḍāśa* (which may have been competing side-by-side). The first hypothesis seems implausible for one does not expect a simple copyist to copy into the section he is currently copying a passage from a section occurring much later in the original text. Such a slip of the pen would not have gone unnoticed among the ritual specialists for whom these texts were transmitted and it would certainly have resulted in a correction of some kind. Interpolating a text in this way also implies a certain amount of proficiency with the matter at hand from the copyist's part, in which case he would be no more a simple scribe but rather the "reviser" of a work.

The second hypothesis is more likely for we know that different opinions on ritual procedures co-existed within the same *carana* and were even duly recorded in writing as is shown by the *dvaidha* section of the BaudhŚS. There may have existed among the Vādhūlas different ways of performing some sub-rites of major sacrifices that were not recorded in a dedicated section of their Sūtra, maybe because the divergences were too few to deserve a separate treatment<sup>32</sup>.

Do the new elements drawn out of the VādhŚS help us to solve our initial problem of knowing why some Śrauta Sūtras perform the *prāśitra* of the NP's main offering whereas others do not? It does but in a slightly indirect manner.

As is known from a variety of sources (discussed at length in GONDA (1982)) the NP has an awkward status among the different classes of vedic ceremonies. The animal sacrifice is basically a secondary *iṣṭi* of the larger Agniṣṭoma and as such the Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas do never consider it apart from this basic form of the Soma ritual. In the course of the Agniṣṭoma three animal sacrifices are performed: one on the *upavasatha* day where the victim is a he-goat dedicated to the dual deity Agni-Soma (thus its technical name *agnīśomīyapaśubandha*), one during the pressing day (thus its technical name *savanīyap*<sup>o</sup>) where the victim is a he-goat dedicated to Agni, and finally one after the conclusive oblation (*udayanīyeṣṭi*) which follows the purificatory bath (*avabhṛta*) of the Agniṣṭoma where the victim is a heifer<sup>33</sup> dedicated to Mitra-Varuṇa (thus its technical name of *vaśā*, "heifer", *anūbandhyā* "which must be tied after"). In the course of time,



the ritualists “extracted”<sup>34</sup> the procedure of the first of these three animal sacrifices out of its Soma context and turned it into a single sacrificial session lasting at most two days and which should be performed by an *āhitāgni* either once or twice a year during his whole life. The main oblation material of the *agnīṣomīyap*<sup>o</sup> being very different from that of the DP the ritualists termed the NP a *haviryajña*. It is this process of adaptation of the *agnīṣomīyap*<sup>o</sup> into a *haviryajña* which, in my view, holds the key to our *prāśitra* problem. Turning the *agnīṣomīyap*<sup>o</sup> into a stand-alone sacrifice the ritualists must have availed themselves of some freedom, more precisely of the freedom to integrate into their *haviryajña* some features of the DP. In the case of the *paśupuroḍāśa* the *prāśitra* makes not much problem because a single cake is involved in this offering and so the standard procedure of the DP can be applied with but few hindrances. The case of the NP’s main offering is more complex. Some specific quarters of the beast provide materials for the offering to the principal deity of the sacrifice, other quarters are employed for the offering to Agni *Sviṣṭakṛt* and some more are used in making up the *iḍā*. The sections of the *Samhitās* and *Brāhmaṇas* treating of the *agnīṣomīyap*<sup>o</sup> moreover do not refer to a *prāśitra* portion, even if the *avadāna* operation is far more complex in the animal sacrifice than in the DP. Some ritualists may have felt that the “independent” animal sacrifice required to be more in tune with the DP’s structure and added a *prāśitra* to the main offering. They chose to take it from one of the *daivatāni* quarters of the animal, which seems logical when one considers the tripartite nature (*daivatāni*, *sauviṣṭakṛtāni* and *aiḍāni*) of the different parts taken out of the beast’s carcass. Other masters of the ritual lore adhered more closely to the word of the *śrutis* and passed over the *prāśitra* despite its important symbolical nature.

### Abbreviations

ĀpŚS	Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra [ed. GARBE]
BaudhŚS	Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra [ed. CALAND]
BhārŚS	Bhāradvāja Śrauta Sūtra [ed. KASHIKAR]
DP	<i>darśapūrṇamāsau</i> , ritual of the Full and New Moon
HirŚS	Hiraṇyakeśin (Satyāśāḍha) Śrauta Sūtra [ed. ĀNANDĀŚRAMA]
KātyŚS	Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra [ed. WEBER]
KapS	Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha Samhitā [ed. RAGHU VIRA]
KS	Kāthaka Samhitā [ed. VON SCHROEDER]
MānŚS	Mānava Śrauta Sūtra [ed. VAN GELDER]
MS	Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā [ed. VON SCHROEDER]
ms./mss.	Manuscript/Manuscripts



<b>NP</b>	<i>nirūḍhapaśubandha</i> , "independent" animal sacrifice
<b>RV</b>	Ṛg Veda [ed. MÜLLER]
<b>ŚB</b>	Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (Mādhyandina) [ed. WEBER]
<b>TS</b>	Taittirīya Saṃhitā [ed. WEBER]
<b>VādhŚS</b>	Vādhūla Śrauta Sūtra
<b>VārŚS</b>	Vāraha Śrauta Sūtra [ed. KASHIKAR]
<b>VaikhŚS</b>	Vaikhānasa Śrauta Sūtra [ed. CALAND]
<b>YV</b>	Yajur Veda

### Bibliography

W. CALAND (ed.) *The Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra belonging to the Taittirīya Saṃhitā*, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1982 [2d repr.].

W. CALAND (ed.) *The Vaikhānasa-Śrautasūtram. The description of vedic rites according to the Vaikhānasa school belonging to the black Yajurveda*, Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1941.

B. B. CHAUBEY (ed.) *Vādhūla-Śrautasūtram. Critically edited with Introduction and Indices*, Hoshiarpur: Katyayan Vaidik Sahitya Prakashan, 1993.

R. GARBE (ed.) *The Śrauta Sūtra of Āpastamba belonging to the Taittirīya Saṃhitā with the commentary of Rudradatta*, 3 vols, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1983 [2d repr.].

J. GONDA *The Haviryajñāḥ Somāḥ. The interrelations of the Vedic solemn sacrifices. Śāṅkhāyana Śrautasūtra 14,1–13. Translation and notes*, Amsterdam, Oxford, New York: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1982.

J. C. HEESTERMAN *The Broken World of Sacrifice. An Essay in Ancient Indian Ritual*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Y. IKARI *Vādhūla Śrautasūtra 1.1–1.4 [Agnyādheya, Punarādheya]. A New Critical Edition of the Vādhūla Śrautasūtra, I*, Zinbun: Annals of the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University, No. 30 (1995), Kyoto: Zinbun Kagaku Kenkyusyo.

Y. IKARI "A Survey of the New Manuscripts of the Vādhūla School — MSS. of  $K_1$  and  $K_4$ ," Zinbun: Annals of the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University, No. 33 (1998), Kyoto: Zinbun Kagaku Kenkyusyo, pp. 1–30.

C. G. KASHIKAR (ed., transl.) *The Śrauta, Paitrmedhika and Pariśeṣa Sūtras of Bhāradvāja. Part I Text & Part II Translation*. 2 vols., Poona: Vaidika Saṃśodhana Maṇḍala, 1964.

C. G. KASHIKAR (ed.) *Vārāha Śrautasūtra, belonging to the Maitrāyaṇī recension of the Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda*, Poona: Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapeeth, 1988.

KĀSINĀTHAŚĀSTRĪ (eds.) *Satyāṣādhaviracitaṃ Śrautasūtram*, Ānandāśramasamskṛtagranthāvaliḥ, No. 56, 1907.

F. MAX MÜLLER (ed.) *Rig-Veda-Saṃhitā. The Sacred Hymns of the Brāhmins together with the commentary of Sūyaṇācārya*, 5 vols, Krishnadas Sanskrit Series No. 37, 55, Varanasi: Krishnadas Academy, 1983–1984 [repr.]

RAGHU VIRA (ed.) *Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā. A text of the Black Yajurveda*, New Delhi: Meharchand Lachmandas Publications, 1996 [repr.].

F. D. VOEGELI “Du rôle du *pratiprasthātṛ* dans la version Vādhūla du Nirūdhapaśubandha à la question de la “vache stérile” (*vaśā anūbandhyā*) dans le rituel védique”, *Asiatische Studien/Etudes Asiatiques*, LV.2, 2001, Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 455–491.

F. D. VOEGELI (forthcoming) *Chapter V of the Vādhūla Śrauta Sūtra. Critically edited text with translation and notes.*

J. M. VAN GELDER (ed.) *The Mānava Śrautasūtra belonging to the Maitrāyaṇīya Saṃhitā*, Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series Nr. 31, New Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1985 [repr.].

L. VON SCHROEDER (ed.) *Kāṭhaka. Die Saṃhitā der Kaṭha-Śākhā*, 3 vols, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1970–1972 [repr.].

L. VON SCHROEDER (ed.) *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā. Die Saṃhitā der Maitrāyaṇīya-śākhā*, 4 vols, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1881–1886 [repr. 1970–1972].

A. WEBER (ed.) *The Śrautasūtra of Kātyāyana, with extracts from the commentaries of Karka and Yājñikadeva*, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1972 [repr.].

A. WEBER (ed.) *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa in the Mādhyandina-Śākhā, with extracts from the commentaries of Sāyaṇa, Harisvāmin and Dvivedagaṇḍa*, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1997 [3d repr.]

A. WEBER (ed.) *Die Taittirīya-Saṃhitā*, Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus 1871–1872 [repr. 1973, Hildesheim-New York: Georg Olms].

### NOTES:

References to the BaudhŚS, VaikhŚS and MS give the page and line numbers in CALAND and VON SCHROEDER's editions after the column. References to the HirŚS give the page number in the ĀNANDĀŚRAMA's ed. after the column.

References to ch. V of the VādhŚS are taken from my critical edition of this chapter (VOEGELI forthcoming). The numbering is different from and should not be confused with CHAUBEY (1993).

References to ch. VI of the VādhŚS are taken from an unpublished draft of the critical edition of ch. VI and VII (Agniṣṭoma section) done by Prof. Ikari that he kindly lent to me. My thanks go to him for having let me use this draft throughout my Vādhūla studies. As with the references to ch. V the numbering is different from and should not be confused with CHAUBEY (1993).

The semi-*danḍa* used by CALAND in his editions of the BaudhŚS and VaikhŚS is here transcribed as a comma. The *danḍa* of other editions is transcribed as a slash.

All translations are mine, and I would like to thank Prof. Werner Knobl from Kyoto University for his help with some difficult *vyākhyā* passages.

- 2 In his translation of this sūtra, KASHIKAR (1964) p. 188, takes *adhyuddhi-* as “the testis with penis”. As I will show in another publication (VOEGELI forthcoming) this identification is questionable. The different sources available are very vague about the exact location of the *adhyuddhi-* (TS, or *adhyūdhni-* in MS). I shall thus leave this term untranslated.
- 3 Emended. The ed.: *agnīdhre*.
- 4 Called *caturdhākaraṇa* in the Full and New Moon ritual (cf. below in the text, p. 3).
- 5 KātyŚS 6.8.13 *śeṣam idāpātryām āsicya kroḍam anasthīni ca prāsyati śroṇivarjam*  
Having sprinkled the rest (of the broth) into the *idā*’s vessel he throws (in it) the chest and the boneless (parts), with the exception of the buttock.
- 6 I could not find the source of this quotation but it has an obvious *brāhmaṇa*-like flavour, especially in its use of *tāvati*.
- 7 *pradānāntam* is probably WEBER’s mistake and should really be read *pradhānāntam*.
- 8 Cf. TS 3.8.3, MS 3.10.3–4:133–135, ŚB 3.8.3.15–29. The *avadāna* of the beast is not discussed in the KS/KapS.
- 9 Emended. The ed.: *agnīdhre*.
- 10 Cf. VaikhŚS 6.12:68.1–4.
- 11 As GONDA (1982) p. 94, n. 1 to the translation of ŚāṅkhŚS 14.5.1, rightly points out the translation of *darśapūrṇamāsau* by “Full and New Moon” is preferable to the usual “New and Full Moon”. In the same work (p. 7–10, among others), GONDA aptly discusses the extent to which the DP can be considered as a paradigm for the NP.
- 12 On the term *caturdhākaraṇa* cf. BaudhŚS 24.29:214.8–12.
- 13 On the share of the Brahman in the DP cf. BaudhŚS 1.18:27.15 (where the expression *brahmabhūga* is used); BhārŚS 3.3.2,8; ĀpŚS 3.3.3,9; HirŚS 2.3.32,36:211; VaikhŚS 7.2:69.17–20, 7.2:70.4–5; MānŚS 1.3.3.20,23.
- 14 The *idā* of the NP’s main offering is discussed in BaudhŚS 4.9–10:124.11–16.
- 15 Cf. TS 2.6.8.3–7, ŚB 1.7.4.6–17.
- 16 Cf. TS 2.6.8.4 *yāt tirascīnam atihāred ānabhividdham yajñāsyābhi vidhyed āgreṇa pāri harati tīrthēnaivā pāri harati*

If he were to bring (the *prāśitra* by going) crosswise over (the altar) he would pierce what is unpierced of the Sacrifice. He brings it (by going) around in front (of the *Āhavanīya*). He brings (it) around by this path.

The Vājasaneyins have an opposite version of the ritual that requires the *prāśitra* to be carried across (*tiryák*) the *vedi*. This peculiarity is self-explanatory in the ŚB for the gods first carried the *prāśitra* around the altar with the dreadful results that ensued (cf. ŚB 1.7.4.6 *té hocuḥ / bhāgāyeinad dakṣiṇatā ūsīnāya pári hatrata*, etc.). The ŚB nevertheless mentions the practice of "some" who carry the *prāśitra* around the *vedi* in 1.7.4.12 (*tán ná pūrvena pári haret / pūrvena háike pári haranti*). The Taittirīyas are doubtless to be counted among these *eke*.

- 17 Cf. TS 6.3.10.5 *hṛdayasyāgrē 'vadyaty ātha jihvāyā ātha vākṣaso (...)' yasyaivām avadāya yathākāmām ūttareṣām avadyāti*

First he cuts down a portion of the heart. Then (he cuts down a portion) of the tongue (and) then (he cuts down a portion) of the chest. (...) Having thus cut down portions of this (animal) he cuts down portions from the rest (of the quarters) at will.

These three parts are always mentioned in the parallel passages of the MS 3.10.3:132.14-133.9 and of the ŚB 3.8.3.15-17 as the ones from which portions have to be cut down first to make up the main offering.

- 18 Seven parts are cut down to constitute the *idū*. The first six of them are also used to produce the main offering: the heart, the tongue, the chest, the liver and the two kidneys. To these *daivatāny avadānāni* the lower intestine is added as the seventh part (cf. BaudhŚS 4.9:123.6-8; BhārŚS 7.19.10; ĀpŚS 7.24.10; HirŚS 4.5.11:437-438). To these basic *idū* pieces one can add some "boneless" parts as supplement among which the (right?) lung (*kloman*), the spleen (*plīhan*), the pericard (?), *purītata*) are specified in some Sūtras (cf. VādhŚS 5.3.1.64; BhārŚS 7.19.11; ĀpŚS 7.24.11-12; MānŚS 1.8.5.20; KātyŚS 6.8.12).

- 19 The parts used for the *Sviṣṭakṛt* offering are the same everywhere, viz. the right foreleg, the left buttock and a part of the rectum (BaudhŚS 4.9:123.4-6; VādhŚS 5.3.1.47,54-62; BhārŚS 7.19.4; ĀpŚS 7.22.6; HirŚS 4.4.57-58:433; MānŚS 1.8.5.19; KātyŚS 6.8.8).

- 20 Cf. BaudhŚS 4.121:18-19 *athodanī atyākramya yathā yatanamśrucan sādāyivā prāśitram avadāyeḍām avadyati, upahūtāyām idūyām agnīdhā ūdadhāti ṣaḍavattam, prāśnanti, mārjayante*

Then, having walked north past (the *vedi*), having seated the ladles in their respective places (on the altar and) having cut down the *prāśitra* he cuts down (portions for) the *idū*. After the *idū* has been invoked he gives to the *Āgnīdhra* (his share of it) in six cuttings. They partake (of the *idū*). They cleanse themselves.

ĀpŚS 7.23.1 *prāśitram avadāyeḍām na yajamānabhūgam*

Having cut down the *prāśitra* (he cuts down) the *idū* (but) not the Sacrificer's share.

HirŚS 4.4.71:435 *prāśitram idū ca kriyete prāśitāyām mārjanam piṣṭalepaphalikarāṇahomau prāñītāsu mārjanam upaveśodasanaṁ kapūlavimocanaṁ ca kriyante*

(The procedures pertaining to) the *prāśitra* and the *idū* are done (by the *Adhvaryu*). After (the *idū*) has been eaten the cleansing (of the partakers of the *idū*), the oblations of the scrap of the dough and the chaff of grains, the cleansing (of the Wife) in the *prāñīta* waters, the banishment of the poker and the loosening of the potsherds are done.

VaikhŚS 10.18:116.16-17 *prāśitram avadyatīdām ca na yajamānabhūgam*



He cuts down the *prāśitra* and the *iḍā* but not the Sacrificer's share.

But cp.:

BhārŚS 7.17.13ū14 *upahūtām iḍām maitrāvaruṇaṣaṣṭhā ṛtvijaḥ prāśnanti* [13] *mārjayante* [14]

The officiating priests partake of the *iḍā* that has been invoked with the Maitrāvaruṇa as the sixth (officiating priest). [13] They cleanse themselves. [14]

- 21 Cf. MānŚS 1.8.5.8 *āgnīdhrabhāgam apāyātyeḍāyai puroḍāśam pratyabhigārayati*

Having set apart the Āgnīdhra's share he pours in return (clarified butter) over the cake for the *iḍā*.

VārŚS 1.6.6.24 *iḍāntam kṛtvā pṛṣadājyasya sruveṇopahatya paraiti*

Having done (the procedure) that ends with the *iḍā* (and) having scooped up speckled butter with the *sruva* he goes away (to the Śāmitra fire-hall).

KātyŚS 6.7.25 *iḍām avadyati*

He cuts down the *iḍā*.

- 22 Yājñikadeva on KātyŚS 6.7.25 *iḍāgrahaṇam prāśitrahāgādīnām apy upalakṣaṇārtham*

The word *iḍā* has also the implied meaning of *prāśitra* portion etc.

- 23 Which are also used by Prof. Ikari in his *New Critical Edition of the Vādhūla Śrautasūtra* and which he describes in IKARI (1995), pp. 4–12.

- 24 Which consists of three mss.: the mss. K<sub>1</sub> (described IKARI (1995) p. 10), N<sub>2</sub> (described IKARI (1995) p. 11) and T<sub>1</sub> (described IKARI (1995) p. 11–12). N<sub>2</sub> is a direct copy of K<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>1</sub> a direct copy of N<sub>2</sub> (cf. the stemma in IKARI (1998) p. 6).

- 25 Described IKARI (1995) p. 9–10.

- 26 The plural implies that it is not the Adhvaryu who carries it to the Brahman but some unnamed "assistants".

- 27 The K<sub>1</sub> recension consists of four mss.: the mss. K<sub>1</sub> (described IKARI (1995) p. 5–6, probably the oldest ms. of the VādhŚS found so far by Prof. Ikari), K<sub>4</sub> (described IKARI (1998), p. 5, 6, 10), M (described IKARI (1995) p. 6–7) and C (described IKARI (1995) p. 8–9). K<sub>4</sub> and M are direct copies of K<sub>1</sub>. C is a copy made by Caland of a copy of M sent to him during the years 1923–26. This nāgarī copy sent to Caland has unfortunately been lost.

The ms. N<sub>1</sub> is described in IKARI (1995), p. 10–11.

- 28 The portion of the *iḍā* brought to the Hotṛ and divided by the Adhvaryu into the Hotṛ's right hand. Immediately after the cutting down of this special part of the *iḍā* the Hotṛ starts his invocation to the goddess Iḍā (*iḍopahvāna*, the text of which is found in ĀśvŚS 1.7.7 and ŚāṅkhŚS 1.12.1).

The text of the K<sub>1</sub> recension alludes to this subrite of the *iḍā* ceremony by the laconic *hotra iḍām ādudhātṛ*.

- 29 Āryadāsa is the main commentator of the VādhŚS. His *vyākhyā* is yet unpublished. The following extract is based on the two mss. of this work I have at my disposal: ms. No. T1147 of the Oriental Research Institute and MSS. Library, Trivandrum and ms. No. R2978 of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras.

- 30 Cp. this last quotation with the Brahmatva section on the *prāśitra* of the DP in VādhŚS 3.5.2.2 *sa yatrāsmāi prāśitram praharati tad āpa upasṛṣya pratikṣate sūryasya tvā cakṣuṣā pratipaśyāmīti*.

When he (i.e. the Adhvaryu) brings forward the *prāśitra* to him, he (i.e. the Brahman), having touched water, beholds it (saying) "I behold thee with Sūrya's eye".

- 31 The animal sacrifice which takes place during the Upavasatha day of the Agniṣṭoma, cf. below in the text, p. 8.

The remaining less than 5% of the Vth *prapāṭhaka*'s text which does not correspond to what is found in the VI and VIIth *prapāṭhaka*s exposes sub-rites of the animal sacrifice which are not done in its Soma version like, e.g., the introductory libation with recitation of the *ṣaḍdhotṛ* formula or the preliminary *iṣṭi* of a cake baked on eight potsherds dedicated to Agni. The names of the deities to which the main oblations are addressed are also different in the *saṁpraiṣas* of these two sections.

- 32 This handling of the *prāśitra* is the only divergence between mss. of the Vth *prapāṭhaka* which is not the result of obvious scribal errors or irreparable corruptions of the text.

When the new critical edition of the VādhŚS undertaken by Prof. Ikari and some of his students (among whom the author of the present paper) will be completed, it will be interesting to check how many discrepancies of the kind discussed here actually exist between the two recensions.

Incidentally, Āryadāsa's comment seems to imply that he knew the text as it has been handed down in the K<sub>3</sub> recension. Otherwise he would not have bothered to specify "*haviryajñavidhe*".

- 33 And not a "barren cow" as it is often referred to, cf. VOEGELI (2001).

- 34 Thus the name *nirūḍha-paśubandha*. *nirūḍha*° can be understood either as the participle of *nir-VAH-* or as that of *nir-ŪH-*. In my view the former option better reflects the historical situation that led to the creation of the NP.