

यादृशा स्वराब्जादिना यादृशयन्स्वरानयोऽस्मिन्मन्त्रः सान्त्तिकः प्रथानरखानु-
 सान्त्तिया प्रयोगयोः, तदुचितायुष्णं शुभागीतेन क्रियते । (का. शा. निवेक. 8-1) ।

This brings out the point very clearly. In the Pāṭhya music and dance both are subordinate; they are principal in Geya. The Pāṭhya is a matter for Abhinaya and there is no place for music in it, in so far as the music cannot be the subject of अस्मिन्मन्त्र. If there is anything that can be suggested by Laya, Tāla etc., in so far as it is in keeping with the dramatic effect, that much is supplemented by the Dhruvāgātas.

This distinction between Pāṭhya and Geya in the drama may help us to some extent in solving a problem connected with the fourth act of Vikramovaśīya. This act contains many Prākṛt and Apabhraṁśin songs. There is a controversy whether these passages are from the poet's pen. We may now be able to say that the songs which are of the nature of Dhruvās were added by the producer. The same can be said about the songs connected with particular Abhinayas. There are however some Charcharis about which nothing can be definitely said. The whole problem of this act, however, is a matter for a separate paper.

Indian Antiquary 3rd ser. 1, 2 1964

THE VEDIC SACRIFICIAL RITUALS THROUGH THE AGES*

By C. G. KASHIKAR

The relation between the Vedic mantras and the Vedic rituals and the place of rituals in the Vedic religion have been discussed by scholars since the last century, and most divergent views have been expressed on these subjects. Attempts to define the character of the Vedic religion and rituals as found in the R̥gvedic hymns have also been made. The present paper is not intended to make a detailed survey of the work done so far in this field. It is proposed here to trace only the important hand-marks in the practice of the Vedic sacrificial rituals in India from the oldest period down to the present day.

THE SACRIFICE IN THE R̥GVEDA

It has been generally accepted that the sacrificial ritual which is contemplated by the hymns of the R̥gveda was different from what we find in the Yajurveda texts. Haug, Hillebrandt, Schefelowitz, Oldenberg, Keith and others have collected the data from the R̥gveda, and have drawn their own conclusions regarding the state of sacrificial rituals as brought out by the R̥gvedic hymns in relation to the ritual practices established in the Yajurveda period. From the numerous terms denoting the different sacrificial rites, oblations, implements, substances, officiating priests etc., it is reasonable to conclude that there existed variations in the rituals obtaining in the different families representing the various portions and Mandālas of the R̥gveda. However, a general character of the sacrificial ritual particularly in comparison with the one representing the Yajurvedic sacrifice can be determined.

* Paper read in the Indology (Vedic) Section of the XXVIIth International Congress of Orientalists held at New Delhi in January 1964.

Keith has pointed out the difficulty in assessing the character of the ritual in the *Rgveda*. "On the one hand", he says, "much which is recorded later is clearly old and is omitted in the *Rgveda* mainly because that collection is only concerned with a limited portion of the religious practice; on the other hand, religion is in the constant process of change, and things recorded first in the later texts may be new inventions".¹ K. R. Potdar,² who has recently collected the exhaustive materials bearing on the sacrificial rituals from the *Rgvedic* hymns, has tried to solve this problem: he has divided the entire ritual activity of the *Rgvedic* period into four stages: "The first stage was characterized by the worship of the individual divinities with the help of the fire kindled in the household and the hymns composed to propitiate the divinity concerned." "The second stage is characterized by cooperative effort which led towards the formation of a real system of sacrifice". "The third stage is characterized by all round development in the mode of performance." "The fourth stage is characterized by the transition to the brahmanical aspect of the sacrifice It is during this period that the idea of employing the available hymns in a mechanical fashion must have arisen."³

Now this fourfold division of the ritual-development can hardly be regarded as convincing, particularly because the chronology of the hymns which lie at the basis of the rituals in the different stages cannot be regarded as corresponding to that of the different stages of rituals themselves. It cannot be said that only individual divinities were worshipped at the initial stage. Potdar himself has made an exception by regarding the dual divinity of Mitra and Varuna as existing in the first stage. But another dual divinity, namely, *Dyāvāprthivī*, which is generally traced to the Indo-European period, can easily claim to belong to that stage. The composer of hymns might be officiating at the rites, but it cannot be said that each performance of rites involved fresh composition. The justification of cooperative effort in the second stage on the background of the clash of ideas regarding superiority of one divinity over the others attributed to the first stage is hardly convincing. The elaboration of ritual must no doubt have taken place at a particular stage, but the statement that the Adhvaryu was given as a hand to the Hotr at the second stage is hardly acceptable, because already in the *Avesta* we find Zaoatar and Rathvi corresponding respectively to the Hotr and the Adhvaryu. Potdar has taken the term *adhvarayū* in RV II.16.5 to mean the Hotr and the Adhvaryu, but the term can also mean the Adhvaryu and the Pratiṣṭhātrī. Iranians are said to have

branched off from the Aryans at the end of the second stage. There is, however, difference of opinion as to the stage at which the former parted with the latter. There is a view that they parted with each other before Aryans entered India. If the Iranians may be regarded to have gone to Iran from Punjab on account of differences with regard to the ritualistic religion, the schism might have taken place only at the initial stage. Indra is said to have attained prominence during the second stage, but in view of the very large number of Indra-hymns in the *Rgveda*, and also in view of the character of Indra, it can hardly be said that Indra attained prominence at a subsequent stage.

The third stage, according to Potdar, is characterized by all round development in the mode of performance, when there was no elaboration of the ritual. There is no evidence, says he, to indicate that all the different priests were employed in the same ritual at a time. Even in the *Aśvamedha* ritual only six priests are referred to. The argument based on non-mention cannot, however, be regarded as convincing. The introduction of the *Udgātṛ* as a priest seems, according to him, to belong to a later date. But this cannot be so, since the chanting of *Sāmans* is clearly mentioned in the *Rgveda*. According to Potdar, the oblations in the earlier stages consisted of clarified butter, milk and also Soma, and the animal-offerings were introduced in the third stage. On the point of the animal-offering he writes: "The existence of a common animal-sacrifice cannot be said to have been conclusively established. It may be noted that the sacrificial beast is very rarely referred to and the details of animal-offering are not available to the same extent as those of the offerings of *Chitra* and *Soma*. It can be understood that when the sacrificial performances came to be introduced, eating of animal-flesh must have been prevalent, and consequently the idea of offering the same as well to the divinity must have occurred to some persons. But this can neither be imagined to have been done right from the very early stages of the sacrifice nor have been prevalent on a large scale. Merely on the basis of the *Aśvamedha* hymn (I. 162) inference cannot be drawn about the common prevalence of the animal-sacrifice in the days of the *Rgveda*."⁴ All this argument is too weak to deserve a serious consideration. Potdar has later on (pp. 136-37) laid down eight reasons to disprove the existence of animal-offering in the *Rgveda* period. Six out of these are based on non-mention or inadequate mention, hence do not contain any force. The seventh is: "Purity in sacrifice with cleanliness of materials and purity of offerings have been occasionally stressed and hence animal-sacrifice cannot be imagined to have been in existence at least when the essential conceptions regarding the

1. Keith: *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*, p. 256.

2. *Sacrifice in the Rgveda*, Bombay, 1933.

3. *Sacrifice in the Rgveda*, pp. 284 ff.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 117.

sacrifice came to be evolved. Does Potdar mean to say that the Vedic Aryans had ignored the sense of purity and cleanliness when they introduced the animal-offering? One who has closely studied the procedure of a sacrifice involving an animal-offering will never submit to the argument of cleanliness put forward by Potdar. The Āpī hymns have been subjected by him to a critical study,⁶ which has led him to the conclusion that the Āpī hymns were artificially employed in the Prayāñā-offerings. He, therefore, says that "when even the Brāhmanas have no tradition of association of hymns with an animal-sacrifice, it is not possible to infer that the animal-sacrifice was widely prevalent in the days of the R̥gveda." Even granting that the employment of the Āpī hymns as the yājñās of the Prayāñā-offerings is secondary, it does not follow that there was no animal-offering at all in the R̥gvedic period. It is not impossible that the procedure of the animal-offering was a simple one at the earlier stage, and that later on it was developed in that form in which we find it in the Brāhmanas. Potdar has said that individual divinities were worshipped in the first stage. It is to be noted that even the Āpī hymn of the Vasishṭhas which he regards to be the oldest,⁷ is addressed, like the other Āpī hymns, not only to minor and abstract divinities such as Vanaṣpati, Svāhākriti, but also to dual and plural divinities like Daivyā Hotārī, Devī Dvārāñ and Samidhah.

According to Potdar, "Very possibly the idea of offering the animal-flesh as an offering came into existence after the introduction of the Pitryājñā". A goat is referred to in connection with the fire kindled for the Pitṛ-worship (RV. X 16.4: *gṛo bhūgas tapasī tañ tapasava*). "As people must have been flesh-eaters, offering of the flesh was considered desirable for the worship of the departed ones who were accustomed to eat it. It is therefore that the animal-offerings came to be introduced in the sacrifices as well."⁸ If the flesh-eating people offered flesh to their Pitṛs, there is no reason why they should have forbidden it to their gods. Whatever the people consumed, they must be offering it to their gods as also to their Pitṛs. It cannot be said that the divine worship followed the Pitṛ-worship. That the oblations at the sacrifice included also the animal-oblation from the very first has been accepted by all. The fact that the R̥gveda contains, besides the above-mentioned references, only one more reference to the animal-offering (in the hymn relating to the

Asvamedha, RV I. 162) cannot speak against the prevalence of animal-offering in the R̥gvedic period. The purpose of the R̥gvedic verses was not to record all the details of the different rituals. Moreover, references to the animal-offerings occur comparatively in a lesser quantity than those to the offerings of clarified butter and Soma probably because, as is quite natural, the animal-offering was not as frequent as the offerings of the other oblations, and also because the animal-offering was mostly a subordinate part of the great Soma-sacrifice.

Whatever be the state of rituals in the different periods represented by the composition of the different hymns in the R̥gveda, there is a clear difference between the general character of the R̥gvedic ritual and the fixed character of the Yajurveda ritual. The stage of ritual represented by the Yajurveda and the one represented by the Brāhmanas may be regarded as identical. This is borne out by the fact that the Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda in all its schools is a combination of the Mantra and the Brāhmana portions. The separation of the Mantra and the Brāhmana portions of the Śukla Yajurveda is only an improved form of presentation of the materials; the compilations of these two portions broadly represent the same period.

THE BRĀHMANAS AND THE ŚRAUTASŪTRAS

The next stage of the rituals is represented by the Brāhmanas and the Śrautasūtras. Broadly speaking, there is no difference between the rituals represented by the Brāhmanas and those represented by the Śrautasūtras, because the latter have almost faithfully followed the injunctions in the latter of their respective schools. R. Lohbecker⁹ and a few others following him have concluded that the relation between the Brāhmana and the Śrautasūtra is rather loose. N. Tsujii¹⁰ has opposed this conclusion and has maintained that there is a very close relation between the Brāhmana and the Śrautasūtra. According to him, an author of a Śrautasūtra largely makes use of the Vidhi-elements of a Brāhmana-text of his own recension. He has pointed out that Lohbecker's conclusion was a result of adopting a wrong procedure. If one tries to seek each and every injunction from a Śrautasūtra in a Brāhmana-text of the same Vedic recension, he is sure to miss many of the injunctions of the Śrautasūtra in the Brāhmana, and will conclude therefrom the loose connection between the two. In fact one must go from the Brāhmana to the Śrautasūtra, and then he will find that almost every injunction from the Brāhmana is met with in the Śrautasūtra. This procedure is justified in view of the different objects of the authors of the Brāhmana and the Śrautasūtra. The purpose of

5. *Ibid.*, p. 137.

6. *Āpī hymns in the R̥gveda*, Journal of the University of Bombay, Vol. XIV & XV.

7. *Sacrifice in the RV.*, p. 136.

8. *Āpī hymns in the R̥gveda*, Journal of the University of Bombay, Vol. XV, p. 44.

9. *Sacrifice in the RV.*, p. 118.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 130.

11. *Über das Verhältnis von Brāhmanas und Śrautasūtras*, Leipzig, 1909.

12. *On the relation between Brāhmanas and Śrautasūtras*, Tokyo, 1932.

a *Brahmana* is to give the meaning of mantras and to explain the origin and mysterious significance of the various rites of the rituals to be performed to the accompaniment of a verse or a formula and also to give brief and, to a certain extent, vague injunctions not necessarily in an orderly manner. It is not generally the intention of a *Brahmana* to record all the detailed injunctions of any ritual. The character of the *Brahmanas* as regards the injunctions is not uniform. There are a few *Brahmanas* which give a proportionately larger number of injunctions than are found in others. The nature and purpose of the *Srautasūtras* are, on the other hand, quite different. The *Srautasūtras* give a systematic, thorough and orderly description of each Vedic ritual. If any injunction of a *Srautasūtra* is not found in the *Brahmana* belonging to the same Vedic recension, it does not necessarily mean that it was unknown to the author of the *Brahmana*. The author of the *Brahmana* might perhaps have regarded that injunction as too common or simple to need a special mention.

Apart from these facts, there is evidence to show that the authors of the *Srautasūtras* deviated from the strict discipline of their own Vedic recension at least to a certain extent. This deviation is of two kinds: (i) The *Sūtra*-writers ignored certain injunctions of their own recension and adopted those of others; (ii) They introduced certain new elements under the pressure of changed circumstances, and sought to make the ritual simpler. The first kind was the result of the contact with the followers of a different recension. Thus we find that the *Sūtras* belonging to the *Taittirīya Samhitā* have borrowed mantras and injunctions current in the rituals practised by the followers of the *Kāthaka* and *Maitrīyaṇī* recensions and even the *Sukla Yajurveda Mādhyandina* recension. Instances of the second kind are not difficult to find. Thus, to the pouring out of paddy (*uirāṇa*) from the bullock cart at the New-moon or the Full-moon sacrifice, an option is added by which one may pour out paddy from a basket—an option which is mentioned even in the *Satapatha Brahmana*. At the *Pravargya* rite, the earth for preparing the *Mahāvīra* is required to be procured from a suitable place at a distance. As a sort of convenience, the *Sūtra*-writers optionally prescribe the procuring of earth before the proper time, and the putting down of the same in front of the *Ahavanīya* fire. A twig of *Palāśa* is prescribed by the *Brahmanas* for being used to drive away the calves of the cows in the New-moon sacrifice. A twig of *Sami* is optionally prescribed by the *Sūtra*-writers. An important aspect of the *Srautasūtras* is that they prescribe many more incidental rites and expiation-rites than are found in the *Brahmanas*. This can probably be explained by the new situations felt by the *Sūtra*-writers. For instance, *ApSS.XV.9.9* prescribes that if at the *Pravargya* rite one is

unable to procure a cow and she-goat, he should procure their milk and should recite over it the mantras prescribed in connection with the *sāmānyā*.

As regards the practice of the rituals, it cannot be expected that even in the *Rgvedic* period each householder belonging to the class of the *Brahmana* or the *Ksatriya* or the *Viś* used to set up the sacred fires and perform all the different rituals directly or indirectly mentioned in the *Rgveda*. Only the Princes and the rich among the *Viś* might have been performing some of the rituals. The number of the *Brahmanas* setting up the sacred fires and performing regularly the simple rituals might have been comparatively larger. It is evidently impossible that every *Brahmana* householder was a sacrificer, because each sacrificer was in need of the help of officiating priests, and it was not convenient for each one always to act both as a sacrificer and an officiating priest. Besides there was the question of procuring the necessary *dakṣiṇā*. The case might have been still more difficult in the earlier period when the society might have been in a more or less migratory stage.

In the *Yajurveda* period when the Aryans were settled down in the Punjab, the *Kuru-Pāñāla* and the adjoining areas, the situation might not have been much more different. Even though the ritualistic religion must have flourished a little more than in the earlier period, it cannot be said that the *Srauta* ritual was observed by every householder belonging to one of the three social orders as a religious duty. In the *Sūtra*-period the ritualistic practices must have come to a low ebb. That the *Sūtra* works came to be written is itself a sign of the decline of the ritualistic religion. The *Sūtras* speak of an *Āhitāgni* as also of an *Anāhitāgni*, which clearly shows that the *Sūtra*-writers had to take into account even such householders as did not set up the sacred fires. Moreover, the *Sūtra*-writers had begun to feel that one could acquire the same credit which he acquired by performing a sacrifice involving a complicated ritual at a considerable cost, simply by performing a very small rite or by reciting a few mantras or by paying obeisance to the divinity¹⁹—an aspect which is fully developed in the later *Purānas*.

THE PRAYOGAS

The next stage in the evolution of the rituals is the introduction of the *Srauta*-manuals called *Prayogas*. It can be said that even before the composition of the *Srautasūtras* there must have been in existence works of the nature of the *Prayogas* for the purpose of the practical use of the officiating priests. Even after the *Srautasūtras* came to be written, the *Prayoga*-manuals was a necessity for the guidance on the spot of

19. Cf. *Āśv. G. S.* 1.1.5; *Sanh. G. S.* 11.17.2; *Par. G. S.* 11.9.10.

the officiating priests. The *Prayoga*-works are generally based on the *Srautasūtras*. The dates of their composition can hardly be ascertained. Just as the *Srautasūtras* differ a little from the *Brahmanas*, similarly the *Prayogas* differ a little from the *Srautasūtras*, and perhaps still more from the *Brahmanas*. They are influenced by the other schools of their own recensions and even by those belonging to the other recensions. Thus, for instance, the Nirūdhāpāsu *prayoga* of the Satyāsādhā-Hiranyakeśi school prescribes the oblations of clarified butter to be offered, as a rule, in connection with certain defects of the animal on the authority of the Bhāradvāja and also the Vāhniha *Srautasūtra*.

MEDIEVAL PERIOD

Coming down from the age of the *Srautasūtras* to the medieval period of Indian history, we find that the frequency of the ritualistic practices had still more lowered down. The various complicated sacrifices were being performed only by the Hindu Princes and a few highly placed Brahmanas under royal patronage as the epigraphical records show. An estimate of the ritual practices as recorded in historical documents is worthy of attempt in order to ascertain the frequency of the various sacrificial performances during the period represented by these records. The variety of Sattras seems to have gone out of practice long ago. The Saumika Caturmāsya, which involved the offering of a *vaśā*, were condemned. In Sautrāmaṇi the offerings of *surā* are to be made. Since *surā*-drinking was forbidden to a Brahmana in the Kali age, the preparation and the offering of *surā* at the Sautrāmaṇi was condemned, and the offering of milk in place of *surā* was introduced.

Originally, persons belonging to the first three social orders were entitled to perform the Vedic rites. In the medieval and modern periods the Kṣatriya and the Vaiśya seem to have generally kept away from the Vedic ritualistic practices. Only rarely we meet with a Kṣatriya sacrificer performing a Vedic sacrifice. In the seventeenth century A.D. Sawai Jaisingh of Jaipur had performed the *Aśvamedha*.

THE PIṢṬAPASU

In the medieval period Vaiṣṇavism flourished in different parts of India. Non-violence—*mā hinṣyāt sarvabhūtāni*—was the main creed of that faith. *Sṛiṭi* was one of the means of cognition according to the different sects of the Vaiṣṇava faith; hence the expansion of Vaiṣṇavism was bound to have repercussions on the practice of Vedic sacrificial rituals involving immolation of animals. In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa it is said that the animals which are immolated in sacrifices become iron-horned and kill the sacrificer. The reaction against the violence in sacrifices was felt even in the period of Mahābhārata. Madhvācārya, who

nourished in the thirteenth century and established his own sect, tried to find out a compromise between the two opposites. He maintained that the animal prescribed in the Veda as an offering is not the living animal, but one made out of flour (*piṣṭapasu*). Since then the sacrificers following his sect have been offering animals of flour at the sacrifices. According to the practice followed by them, a wooden body of the animal is already got prepared, and at the time of the sacrificial performance, dough of the paddy is thickly applied to it, it is taken to the Śmitra-chamber, and its flour is extracted out and offered in the name of the omentum and the different organs. The Vedic interpretation of Madhvācārya was of course challenged by the orthodox Vedic tradition¹⁴ in recent times which evoked reaction among the Mādhyas.¹⁵ Even at present Mādhyas sacrificers in Karnataka and Maharashtra perform sacrifices according to their faith.

MODERN PERIOD

So far as the performances of the Soma-sacrifices were concerned, a sacrificer was required to perform the seven Soma-sacrifices from the Agniṣṭoma to the Aptoryāma one by one. Each one is performed for the fulfilment of a specific desire. The Aptoryāma is performed for the fulfilment of all desires. The sacrificer could also perform the optional sacrifices according to his will. Even in the XXth century there have been sacrificers in Maharashtra, Andhra and Madras States who performed the seven Soma-sacrifices serially and had even performed the great sacrifices like the Sarvatomukha and the Pauṇḍarika. Some sacrificers, however, who found it difficult to perform the seven Soma-sacrifices one by one, chose to perform, after the Agniṣṭoma, the Sarvasomasarvaṛṣṭhāptoryāma sacrifice—a Kāmya sacrifice characterised by the Agnicayana, and to rest satisfied that they had fully accomplished their duties as a sacrificer, so far as the performances of the Soma-sacrifices were concerned.

Now the Sarvasomasarvaṛṣṭhāptoryāma sacrifice which, like the normal Aptoryāma, is performed for the fulfilment of all desires, has certain characteristics which are not found in the normal Aptoryāma and which represent the main distinguishing characteristics of all the subsequent Soma-sacrifices. The main distinguishing feature of any Soma sacrifice is the peculiar aspect of the chanting of the Stotras. The numbers of the Stotras differ in the different sacrifices. Different Ṛṣha-stotras are to be chanted at the Midday-pressing of the different sacrifices.

14. Cf. Madhvācārya's *Bhāṣya* on Būkārāyana Sūtra, III.2.4.
 15. *Sandānadharmapradīpa*, compiled by M. M. Anantakrishna Sastri and others, pp. 539-49, Calcutta 1926.
 16. Cf. *Dharmapradīpoker-piṣṭapasusūnikaravakhaṅganam* by Dambal Ananta-śayanaachāryam, Bagalkot, 1926

There are six *Prsthas* in all: *Rathantara*, *Bṛhat*, *Vainīpa*, *Vairāja*, *Śakvara* and *Raivata*. Each *Stotra* is characterised by a particular *Stoma*. There are nine *Stomas* in all: *Trivṛt*, *Pañcadaśa Saptadaśa*, *Ekaviṁśa*, *Caturviṁśa*, *Catuṣcatvāriṁśa*, *Aṣṭācatvāriṁśa*, *Triṇava*, and *Trayastrīṁśa*.

The *Sarvastomasarvaprsthapṛtōryāma* sacrifice is of two kinds: i) *Ekāha* and ii) *Ahina*. The latter is called the *Jyotirapṛtōryāma*. It is customary to perform the former variety after first having performed the *Agniṣṭoma*. As its name denotes, the sacrifice is characterised by the chanting of the *Sāmans* involving all the six *Prsthas* and all the nine *Stomas*. For this purpose it has borrowed the elements of the *Viśvajit* sacrifice: out of the three *purgāgas* of each of the twelve *Stotras*—1 *Āyastotras*, 4 *Prsthastotras*, *Yajñyajñīyastotra* and the three *Uktha-stotras*—the middle one, properly called *garbha*, is taken up from the corresponding *Stotra* of the *Viśvajit*.

In the *Jyotirapṛtōryāma* of the *Ahina* type all *stotras*, beginning with the *Śodāśastotra* are different.

MINOR CHANGES IN THE RITUAL

The influence of *Vaiṣṇavism* and the abstention from meat-eating among the *Brahmana* class did not fail to affect the ritual practice at least to a certain extent even among the faithful followers of the Vedic tradition. The Animal-offering was an essential part of a *Soma*-sacrifice. The omentum and organs of the animal had to be offered, but the mode of obtaining the organs underwent a change in many parts of India. In order to extract the different organs properly, it was necessary to dissect the animal completely after its immolation. From the *Śrautasūtras* it appears that the *Samitṛ* was either a *Brahmana* or a non-*Brahmana*. In *Kālidāsa's Sakuntalā* reference is made to a *Brahmana Samitṛ*. The fact that the *Samitṛ* was a *Brahmana* provided additional reason for the change in the mode of obtaining the organs. According to the prescribed procedure, an incision is to be taken on the right side of the body of the animal after it was immolated, and the omentum is to be pulled out through the opening caused thereby. Thereafter at the proper time, the specific organs are to be taken out and cooked in a vessel. Generally speaking, the organs cannot be taken out unless the body of the animal is opened. But it is customary in *Karnatak*, *Andhra* and *Tamilnad* to extract the organs only having opened the aperture made on the body of the animal and without having opened the body. In *Kerala*, *Maharashtra* and north *India*, however, the animal's body is opened in order to extract the organs. Now among the organs there are some which cannot be taken out unless the body is opened. For example, *vakṣas* (sternum) and *pāṛśve* (the two thoracic

walls). It is understood that in order to obtain the *vakṣas* a small opening is made on the part of the body above the sternum, and a small part of the sternum is cut out. For *pāṛśve* two pieces of flesh on both the sides of the body are taken. It appears there is hardly any definite knowledge of the organ called *adhivṛddhi* (vestis with penis) at least in some parts of the country. In view of the dislike for flesh-eating there is no wonder that at the consumption of the *Idā* of the animal-offering only a nominal portion is partaken of, together with a mouthful of water, by the officiating priests.

Certain practices have been changed under the force of circumstances and also for the sake of convenience. According to the *Śrautasūtras*, the different *parvans* of the *Cāturmāsya* are to be performed at different periods and are to be finished within a year. The practice, on the other hand, has been for a long time to complete the series within a period of five consecutive days. There are three *Āgrayana* sacrifices to be performed every year: *Śyānakāgrayana* in the rainy season, *Vṛthūgrayana* in the autumn, and *Yavāgrayana* in winter. While in north India the first two *Āgrayanas* are performed, in the south only the first is performed. The prescribed mode of preparing the *puroḥita* is also changed to a certain extent. On the day of sacrifice the paddy is to be pounded, the rice-grains obtained thereby are to be crushed on a crushing stone, the flour is mixed with hot water and the dough is to be spread on the potsherds for cooking. Now the general practice is to procure ready-made flour, bake it in a pan, add hot water to it and cook the dough on potsherds. Of course, the different stages of preparation are gone through in the accompaniment of the relevant formulas, resorting to the well-known dictum, *siddhe mantrāḥ prayoktavyāḥ*."

THE PROBLEM OF YAJUṢA HAUTRA

As regards the *Hotṛ's* performance in a sacrifice performed by a sacrificer belonging to the *Satyāśāḍha-Hiranyakeśi* school of the *Taittirīya* recension, a problem had arisen in *Maharashtra* in the 19th century. The *Taittirīya* recension has recorded together with the relevant injunctions the mantras to be recited by the *Hotṛ* in the *New-moon* and the *Full-moon* sacrifices, and has also recorded the *Hautra*-mantras to be recited in the other *Iṣṭis*, the *Cāturmāsya*, the *Animal-sacrifice* and the *Kaukili Sautrāmanī*. The *Śrautasūtras* belonging to the *Taittirīya* recension have accordingly prescribed the *Hautra* to be performed in the *New-moon* and the *Full-moon* sacrifices. It is, therefore, natural for the followers of this recension to adopt the *Hautra* from their own scripture. The tradition in this connection is, however,

17. Cf. C. G. Kashikar, *The Present-Day Vedic Ritual in India*, Revashankar Bocharhat, Triveli, Abhinandana Grantha, Madras, 1958, pp. 56-64.

not uniform. The Āpastambins who form a major group of the followers of this recension have been living for hundreds of years in the southern states of India. The Āpastambins round about Kallidakuruchi in the Tinnevely District of Madras and many of those residing in South Maharashtra have been adopting the Yājusa Hautra, while all others have been traditionally adopting the R̥g-Hautra.

Even though the Hautra, the Ādhvaryava and the Audgātṛa are the fields respectively of the R̥gveda, the Yajurveda and the Sāmaveda, parts of one's duties are mentioned in another's text also. Such parts are properly regarded as the *śeṣa*. The New-moon and the Full-moon sacrifices are to be performed with the help of the R̥gveda and the Yajurveda (*R̥gvedajajurvedādhyam darśanr̥namāsam*). The Hautra in the Yajurveda is in fact the *śeṣa* of the Hautra in the R̥gveda, as has been expressly stated by the ancient commentators of the Āpastamba Śrautasūtra, namely, Dhīrtasvāmīn, Rāmāgnicī, Gauṇḍapācārya and Haradattācārya. Āpastamba has prescribed the Hotṛ's duties in connection with the New-moon and the Full-moon sacrifices in ApSS. XXIV.11-14, and at the end he says that the remaining duties of the Hotṛ in connection with the New-moon and the Full-moon sacrifices have been prescribed along with the Adhvaryu's duties in that connection, and that his other duties (in connection with the modification-sacrifices) should be taken from the R̥gveda. Dhīrtasvāmīn adds that whatever Hautra relating to the modification-sacrifices might have been given in the Taittirīya recension, one should regard the R̥gvedic prescriptions as an alternative injunction. If the puronuvākyaś and yājīyās are given in the Taittirīya recension, the details of their employment should be taken from the R̥gvedic scripture. Rāmāgnicī, while commenting upon the Bhāṣya of Dhīrtasvāmīn, adds that even though the entire Hautra of the New-moon and the Full-moon sacrifices is prescribed in the Taittirīya recension, the R̥gvedic Hautra should be regarded as optional. Therefore, it is legitimate for a Taittirīya, if he so chooses, to take up the Hautra even for the New-moon and the Full-moon sacrifices from the R̥gveda and the Āśvalāyana Śrautasūtra. The tradition of adopting the R̥g-hautra throughout by a Taittirīya seems to have been originated probably from the fact that a Taittirīya had to resort to the R̥gveda for the Hautra at the Soma-sacrifice—the most significant part of the Vedic rituals. What was to be taken for the Soma-sacrifice was accepted for the other rituals also. According to Baudhāyana,¹⁸ all the sixteen officiating priests are to be formally chosen by the sacrificer at the setting up of the sacred fires itself. It was, therefore, natural that the sacrificer chose the Hotṛ belonging to the R̥gveda in view of his requirements at a Soma-sacrifice.

Now it was claimed by the followers of the Satyāśāḍha school in Maharashtra that a sacrificer belonging to the Satyāśāḍha school must adopt only the yājusa Hautra,¹⁹ not only that, even in a Soma-sacrifice being performed by him certain verses from the Taittirīya recension possessing the necessary indicative mark must be recited by the Hotṛ on the authority of a particular general rule²⁰ in the Satyāśāḍhasūtra. Thus the Hotṛ who obviously belonged to the R̥gveda must recite at the Dikṣayjēṣṭi the puronuvākyaś and yājīyā verses found in the Taittirīya recension; the officiating priests belonging even to the R̥gveda and the Sāmaveda must offer the *praur̥tāhūtis* with the verses prescribed in the Taittirīya recension.²¹ Similarly many other characteristics of the Taittirīya recension were applied by them to the Hautra in a Soma-sacrifice. This led the pendulum to the other extremity, and the followers of R̥gveda sought to question the authority of the Yājusa Hautra itself.²² The problem of the Yājusa Hautra cannot be solved in an isolated manner; it is a common problem of all the schools belonging to the Taittirīya recension. And it must be solved with a comparative study of the relevant scriptures of all those schools and also in consideration of the established tradition.

Another problem of a similar nature arose in the XXth century when Shri Shankar Ramachandra Rajawade of Poona set up the sacred fires. He was a follower of the Āśvalāyana school of the R̥gveda, and according to the tradition a R̥gvedin, at least a resident of southern India, is required to adopt either the Baudhāyana or the Āpastamba school for the duties of the Adhvaryu. Now most of the Taittirīyas in Poona were the followers of the Satyāśāḍha school, so Āhītāgnī Rajawade chose a follower of the Satyāśāḍha school as his Adhvaryu. This had created a storm among the Vedic Pandits of that time.

The number of Śrauta sacrificers has been on the decrease since a very long time for a number of reasons. Their number at present might be a hundred and odd. For a correct and comprehensive understanding of the Vedic religion and culture it is quite essential that the Vedic sacrificial institution should be maintained in all its aspects. Let us hope that it may live in spite of the pressure of material life.

18. *Satyāśāḍhasūtra* Part VIII, pp. 655-671, Anandāśrama Sanskrit Series, Poona (1929).

19. *Yajnopadīyān brāhmanavanto yajihvīyānam hare*, Sat. S.II.

20. Copināśha's commentary on the *Satyāśāḍhasūtra*, VII.8 (p. 749).

21. *Hautrasaṁhita-prakāśa* by Ganeshashastri Nānā, Poona, 1917, and other pamphlets.

22. For a reasonable stand defining the limitations of the Yājusa Hautra, cf. K. Rāmāśastri *Hautramimānśāha*, Srirangam, 1916.

not uniform. The Āpastambins who form a major group of the followers of this recension have been living for hundreds of years in the southern states of India. The Āpastambins round about Kallidakkuruchi in the Tinnevely District of Madras and many of those residing in South Maharashtra have been adopting the Yājusa Hautra, while all others have been traditionally adopting the Ṛg-Hautra.

Even though the Hautra, the Athvarya and the Andgūtra are the fields respectively of the Ṛgveda, the Yajurveda and the Sāmaveda, parts of one's duties are mentioned in another's text also. Such parts are properly regarded as the *śeṣa*. The New-moon and the Full-moon sacrifices are to be performed with the help of the Ṛgveda and the Yajurveda (*Ṛgvedayajurvedābhyām darsopṛānamāsanu*). The Hautra in the Yajurveda is in fact the *śeṣa* of the Hautra in the Ṛgveda, as has been expressly stated by the ancient commentators of the Āpastamba Śrautasūtra, namely, Dhūrtaśvāmin, Rāmāgnicit, Gauṇḍapācārya and Haradattācārya. Āpastamba has prescribed the Hotr's duties in connection with the New-moon and the Full-moon sacrifices in ĀpSS. XXIV.11-14, and at the end he says that the remaining duties of the Hotr in connection with the New-moon and the Full-moon sacrifices have been prescribed along with the Athvaryu's duties in that connection, and that his other duties (in connection with the modification-sacrifices) should be taken from the Ṛgveda. Dhūrtaśvāmin adds that whatever Hautra relating to the modification-sacrifices might have been given in the Taittirya recension, one should regard the Ṛgvedic prescriptions as an alternative injunction. If the puronuvākyaś and yājyaś are given in the Taittirya recension, the details of their employment should be taken from the Ṛgvedic scripture. Rāmāgnicit, while commenting upon the Bhāṣya of Dhūrtaśvāmin, adds that even though the entire Hautra of the New-moon and the Full-moon sacrifices is prescribed in the Taittirya recension, the Ṛgvedic Hautra should be regarded as optional. Therefore, it is legitimate for a Taittirya, if he so chooses, to take up the Hautra even for the New-moon and the Full-moon sacrifices from the Ṛgveda and the Āśvalāyana Śrautasūtra. The tradition of adopting the Ṛg-Hautra throughout by a Taittirya seems to have been originated probably from the fact that a Taittirya had to resort to the Ṛgveda for the Hautra at the Soma-sacrifice—the most significant part of the Vedic rituals. What was to be taken for the Soma-sacrifice was accepted for the other rituals also. According to Baudhāyana,¹⁹ all the sixteen officiating priests are to be formally chosen by the sacrificer at the setting up of the sacred fires itself. It was, therefore, natural that the sacrificer chose the Hotr belonging to the Ṛgveda in view of his requirements at a Soma-sacrifice.

Now it was claimed by the followers of the Satyāśāḍha school in Maharashtra that a sacrificer belonging to the Satyāśāḍha school must adopt only the yājusa Hautra;²⁰ not only that, even in a Soma-sacrifice being performed by him certain verses from the Taittirya recension possessing the necessary indicator mark must be recited by the Hotr on the authority of a particular general rule²¹ in the Satyāśāḍhasūtra. Thus the Hotr who obviously belonged to the Ṛgveda must recite at the Dikṣanyeṣṭi the puronuvākyaś and yājyaś verses found in the Taittirya recension; the officiating priests belonging even to the Ṛgveda and the Sāmaveda must offer the *praotṛāhuṭis* with the verses prescribed in the Taittirya recension.²² Similarly many other characteristics of the Taittirya recension were applied by them to the Hautra in a Soma-sacrifice. This led the pendulum to the other extremity, and the followers of Ṛgveda sought to question the authority of the Yājusa Hautra itself.²³ The problem of the Yājusa Hautra cannot be solved in an isolated manner; it is a common problem of all the schools belonging to the Taittirya recension. And it must be solved with a comparative study of the relevant scriptures of all those schools and also in consideration of the established tradition.

Another problem of a similar nature arose in the XXth century when Shri Shankar Ramachandra Rajawade of Poona set up the sacred fires. He was a follower of the Āśvalāyana school of the Ṛgveda, and according to the tradition a Ṛgvedin, at least a resident of southern India, is required to adopt either the Baudhāyana or the Āpastamba school for the duties of the Athvaryu. Now most of the Taittiriyas in Poona were the followers of the Satyāśāḍha school, so Āhltāgnī Rajawade chose a follower of the Satyāśāḍha school as his Athvaryu. This had created a storm among the Vedic Pandits of that time.

The number of Śrauta sacrificers has been on the decrease since a very long time for a number of reasons. Their number at present might be a hundred and odd. For a correct and comprehensive understanding of the Vedic religion and culture it is quite essential that the Vedic sacrificial institution should be maintained in all its aspects. Let us hope that it may live in spite of the pressure of material life.

19. *Satyāśāḍhasūtra* Part VIII, pp. 655-671, Anandāśrama Sanskrit Series, Poona (1929).

20. *Yathopastambam brāhmanavanto yathānupam tare*, Sat. S.II.

21. Gopinātha's commentary on the *Satyāśāḍhasūtra*, VII.8 (p. 746).

22. *Haūtrādattita-prakāśa* by Ganeshhaṣṭri Nana, Poona, 1917, and other pamphlets.

23. For a reasonable stand defining the limitations of the Yājusa Hautra, cf. *Śrautasūtra*, I.1.1.