

Title	Style and Language of the Agniciti Chapter in the Maitrayani Samhita (III 1-5)
Author(s)	AMANO, Kyoko
Citation	Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu) (2015), 63(3): 1161-1167
Issue Date	2015
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2433/242246
Right	© 2015 Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies
Type	Journal Article
Textversion	publisher

Style and Language of the *Agniciti* Chapter in the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* (III 1–5)

AMANO Kyōko

0. The *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* (*MS*) consists of four books, each of that is made up of over ten chapters: I 1–11, II 1–13, III 1–16, IV 1–14. These chapters were composed according to ritual items. There are chapters that are collections of *mantras*, those that are ritual elucidations, so-called prose parts, and those in which the both are compiled together.

Some of my recent studies threw a new light on the composition of *MS*. It is the view that every chapter has its own peculiarities of style and language, that could reflect the historic layer of the language it belongs to. It also became clear that the status of contact to other vedic schools is different in each chapter: there are chapters that indicate active exchanges of ritual opinions with the *Kāṭha-* (and also *Taittirīya-*) school, and also chapters where a phase of active exchanges with other schools is not found.

AMANO (2011)¹ examined expressions referring to divergent ritual opinions and discussions in the prose chapters of the books I and II and revealed the followings: in I 6 (*ādhāna* chapter) expressions characterizing discussions don't seem to have been developed and only *tād āhur* 'they say' is used; in I 8 (*agnihotra* chapter) the expressions characterizing ritual speculations, *brahmavādīno vadanti* 'the *brahman*-debaters exchange question and answer', *mīmāṃsante* 'they try to form an opinion', *tād āvakṣptatamam* 'this is the most suitable', were developed; I 6 and I 8 don't indicate a phase of active exchanges with other schools; I 10 (*cāturmāsya* chapter) indicates the active exchange with *KS*, that is shown by *tān nā sūrksyam* 'one doesn't have to worry about it' referring to divergent ritual opinions of another school; II 1–4 (*kāmyā-iṣṭi* chapter) shows the same phase to some extent; II 5 (*kāmya-paśu* chapter) uses a new phrase *átho āhur* 'but they say also' which doesn't refer to variation of ritual opinions, but to variation of myths. It is also peculiar in II 5 that some statements don't refer to *KS* (or *TS*) but to sources unknown to us.

AMANO (2012)² examined style and language peculiarities of I 4–7 and clarified the following: I 4 (*yajamānabrāhmaṇa* chapter) shows the style to prescribe ritual acts as

fixed process and as to covering all, that is reflected by the almost consequent use of indicative present, and to cite *mantras* quite often and comprehensively; in this chapter the myths are isolated; the style and composition of I 5 (*agniyupasthāna* chapter) are similar to I 4, but the use of *hī* explaining a *mantra* is characteristic especially in I 5; in I 6 the myth of *Prajāpati* and *Agni* runs through the entire chapter, so that it looks working as principal axis for composition of the chapter, and the description of ritual order doesn't seem to be the main interest, that is indicated by the scarce use of indicative present at ritual acts.

In that study and also in this paper I am focusing on the style each chapter has. I mean by 'style' the preferred and repeated use of an expression, a word, a sentence construction or a way to compose a passage which is used although it is possible to choose another one. It can be identified as feature the author of the text portion has and can also be a clue to know the influence of an author on others.

In this viewpoint, this paper is intended to consider the style of every of the prose chapters the entire *MS* contains and to deal with the appearances especially that can tell something about where the *agniciti* chapter (III 1–5) is (historically) located in the entire *MS*. The subjects of the prose chapters to be examined are the following:

I 4	<i>yajamānabrāhmaṇam</i>	III 1	} <i>agnicitibrāhmaṇa</i>
I 5	<i>agniyupasthānam</i>	III 2	
I 6	<i>ādihānam</i>	III 3	
I 7	<i>punarādihānam</i>	III 4	
I 8	<i>agnihotrabrāhmaṇam</i>	III 5	
I 9	<i>cāturhotārah</i>	III 6	} <i>adhvarānām trayāṇām vidhiḥ</i>
I 10	<i>cāturmāsyāṇi</i>	III 7	
I 11	<i>vājapeyaḥ</i>	III 8	
II 1	} <i>kāmyā iṣṭayaḥ</i>	III 9	
II 2		III 10	
II 3		IV 1	<i>puroḍāśabrāhmaṇam</i>
II 4		IV 2	<i>gonāmikah prapāthakah</i>
II 5	<i>kāmyāḥ paśavaḥ</i>	IV 3	} <i>rājasūyabrāhmaṇam</i>
		IV 4	
		IV 5	} <i>adhvarānām trayāṇām vidhiḥ</i>
		IV 6	
		IV 7	
		IV 8	

1. *Mantra* Citation

Ritual elucidation is intended to describe ritual acts and items, and one of them is *mantra* recitation. *Mantras* are cited in ritual elucidations, and their meanings and effects are explained. *Mantra* explanation appears in some chapters as the main subject of ritual description, but it doesn't in some chapters. I assume that this comes from the historic layer where each chapter was composed.

At first, the number of cited *mantras* in every chapter is brought up:

I 4	I 5	I 6	I 7	I 8	I 9	I 10	I 11	II 1–4	II 5
63	90	22	6	28	10	15	15	32	1
III 1–5	III 6–10	IV 1	IV 2	IV 3–4	IV 5–8				
234	305	167	50	71	114				

We can recognize that the chapters in III and IV have large numbers of *mantra* citations unlike the chapters I 6–II 5 which have quite small numbers. I 4 and I 5 contain relatively large numbers of *mantras*. There are different backgrounds why each chapter contains many or few *mantra* citations, but it is here notable that the chapters in III and IV give importance to *mantra* citation and explanation and I 4 and I 5 have this tendency to some extent.

Next, how to cite the *mantras* in the context of explanation will be examined. It can be divided roughly in two types, namely to accompany a ritual act with a *mantra*, for example I 4,6(1):53,16–17 [*sāṁ yajñāpatir āśīṣā =*] *īti yājamāno yajamānabhāgām prāśnāti* ‘The sacrificer eats the portion for sacrificer [saying:]’ “the lord of sacrifice with wish,” and to cite a *mantra* without accompanying a ritual act, for example I 5,5(2c):73,15–16 [*hōtā yājiṣṭho adhvarésv ūḍyā*] *īti* ‘[He says / The *mantra* reads:]’ “the *hotṛ* priest who praises best and is to ask to come to the rituals.”³⁾ In the following table **the number of *mantras* cited without a ritual act** and its rate in the all *mantra* citations are presented, reflecting to which extent each chapter has the tendency or the style to intend to cite many *mantras* or to give importance to *mantra* citation.

I 4	I 5	I 6	I 7	I 8	I 9	I 10	I 11	II 1–4	II 5
36	68	4	2	5	0	7	5	22	0
57%	76%	18%	33%	18%		47%	33%	69%	

III 1–5	III 6–10	IV 1	IV 2	IV 3–4	IV 5–8
167	222	145	16	41	66
71%	73%	87%	32%	58%	58%

The result tells that I 5, III 1–5, III 6–10 and IV 1 have the stronger tendency to cite *mantras* without a ritual act. We see now an example from III 1:

III 1,5:6,1–7 [*apām pṛṣṭhām asi =*] *ity āha =*; *apām hy étāt pṛṣṭhām. pṛṣṭhénaiváinat pṛṣṭhām akar. [yónir agnér] iti. yónir vā eṣò 'gnér, yát puṣkaraparnām. nābhir vādhakah. sāyonir evā sánābhīh sāmhbhriyate. [divò mātṛayā varīṇā prathasva =] ity. anāyor + eváinan mātṛayā varīṇā prathayati. [sárma ca stho vārma ca sthā] iti kṣṣṇājīnām ca puṣkaraparnām ca sāmstṛṇāti = . imé evāsmā etád dyāvāpṛthivī sāmstṛṇāti. [vyácasvatī sāmvasethām] iti. ná vā + etám manusyā yántum arhanty. ābhyaṁ eváinanāṁ párigṛhṇāti.*⁴⁾ ‘[The priest] says: “you are the back of water”, for that (the lotus leaf) is the back of water. He has made the back of it with the back. [The following reads:] “*Agni*’s birth place.” This lotus leaf, this is *Agni*’s birth place. A reed is navel. [The both] are brought together with mother’s body and navel. [The next reads:] “Expand by heaven’s length, its breadth.” He makes it expand by length and breadth of these both [heaven and earth]. He spreads the skin of black [antelope] and the lotus leaf together. In this way, he spreads these both heaven and earth together for him (*Agni*). [The next reads:] “Stay [you both] together, covering over [all]!”. The mankind can not restrain this (*Agni*). He holds of him with these both [heaven and earth], enclosing him.’

In this example, we recognize the simple construction that *mantra* and explanation are heaped up. This is the style seen in the above mentioned chapters where many *mantras* are cited without ritual acts. *apām pṛṣṭhām asi yónir agnér* builds a *mantra*, a sentence,⁵⁾ and is cited dividedly. This way to cite a *mantra* is often seen in III 1–5, but found only in I 5 among the first half of *MS*.

2. *hí* Sentence Explaining *Mantra*

The use of *hí* sentence to explain a *mantra*, as seen in III 1,5 above, is found only in certain chapters. In the following table, it is shown in which chapter this use of *hí* is attested and for which rate of all *mantra* citations the examples for this use account:

I 4	I 5	I 6	I 7	I 8	I 9	I 10	I 11	II 1–4	II 5
2 3%	19 21%	0	0	0	0	1 7%	0	2 6%	0

III 1–5	III 6–10	IV 1	IV 2	IV 3–4	IV 5–8
18 8%	51 17%	4 2%	0	7 10%	12 11%

The result tells that I 5 and III 6–10 have the most frequent use of *hī* sentence explaining *mantra* and III 1–5, IV 3–4 and 5–8 have this use to some extent.

3. *yád āha . . . iti* Citing *Mantra*

yád sentence is used to topicalize a ritual act.⁶⁾ The use of *yád* sentence to topicalize a *mantra* is found in III 1–5 and certain chapters, for example:

III 1,3:4,5–8 *raudrá vái pašávo. 'gní rudró. yád rudrát pašún ániyācyāgnīm cinvitá, rudrò 'sya pašún abhimánukah syād. yád āha: [rudrásya gāṇapatyān mayobhūr éhi =] iti, rudrād vá etát pašún niryācyāgnīm cinute.* ‘The cattle belongs to *Rudra*. *Rudra* is *Agni*. If [the sacrificer] may pile his fire altar, not having asked the cattle back from *Rudra*, *Rudra* may intend to hurt his cattle. If he says: “Come out from *Rudra*’s generalship, getting up your nerve!”, he piles his fire altar after having asked his cattle back from *Rudra* in this way.’

The following table represents how *yád āha . . . iti* / *yád . . . ity āha* is attested:

I 4	I 5	I 6	I 7	I 8	I 9	I 10	I 11	II 1–4	II 5
3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

III 1–5	III 6–10	IV 1	IV 2	IV 3–4	IV 5–8
13	34	6	0	0	4

The result tells that the use of *yád āha . . . iti* is peculiar in III 6–10, to some extent also in III 1–5, in addition to these few examples are found in I 4, 5, 8 and IV 1, 5–8.

4. *āśīṣam evāśāste* as Effect of *Mantra* Recitation

āśīṣam evāśāste ‘he offers his wish’ is attested in III 1–5 and some certain chapters. In the following table we see the distribution of this sentence, and it is interesting that the distribution of this lexical appearance is similar to that of the styles of *mantra* citation, namely it is common in (I 4), I 5 and the chapters from III and IV (except IV 2–4). In the table the number of attestations of *āśīṣam evāśāste* and its variation *āśīr evāśā* ‘this is [his]

wish' is shown:

I 4	I 5	I 6	I 7	I 8	I 9	I 10	I 11	II 1–4	II 5
1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

III 1–5	III 6–10	IV 1	IV 2	IV 3–4	IV 5–8
2	5	6	0	0	1

5. *átha* = *eṣá-/etá-* + Ritual Item

átha = *eṣá-/etá-* introduces a description about a ritual item, for example III 2,6 *áthaiśá púruṣo hiranyáyo. . . áthaitáni sarpanāmāni. . . áthaité srúcau. . . áthaiśá svayamātrṇṇā = . . . áthaiśá vāmabhṛd dvíryajur. . . ýhaité retaḥśicau*. The use of this idiom is very much preferred in III 1–5. In its distribution we see a different phase from the results of the other examinations above, namely that III 1–5 has this peculiar use common with I 10 and I 11. In the other cases we recognize common styles in III 1–5 and I 4–5 as well as the chapters from III and IV (except IV 2).

I 4	I 5	I 6	I 7	I 8	I 9	I 10	I 11	II 1–4	II 5
0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	1	0

III 1–5	III 6–10	IV 1	IV 2	IV 3–4	IV 5–8
36	2	0	0	10	5

6. Conclusion

From these examinations it follows that the tendency to give importance to *mantra* citation and explanation became striking from the book III on. Along the same lines, the way to cite a *mantra* without a ritual act, the use of *hí* sentence to explain a *mantra* and the adverbial phrase *yád áha . . . íti* citing a *mantra* are more or less increasingly attested there in contrast to the books I and II. It can be explained from the new policy to cite *mantras* as many as possible and also to cite them part by part to explain as minutely as possible.

The manner according to *mantras* the books III and IV show is seen in I 5 (and I 4). Also the distribution of the formulaic sentence *āśiṣam evāśāste* represents this relationship. The use of *átha* = *eṣá-/etá-* shows, however, another relationship, namely between III 1–5 and I 10–11. From these remarks one may say that the *agniciti* chapter and other chapters

in III and IV could follow the styles of I and II by choice, especially often of I 4–5, also of I 10–11 in a few case.

〈Estimation of the results obtained from the examinations 1–5〉⁷⁾

	14	15	16	17	18	19	I 10	I 11	II 1–4	II 5	III 1–5	III 6–10	IV 1	IV 2	IV 3–4	IV 5–8
1	○	○									◎	◎	◎	○	○	○
	○	◎					○		○		◎	◎	◎	○	○	○
2	○	◎					○		○		◎	◎	○		○	○
3	○	○			○						◎	◎	○			○
4	○	◎									◎	◎	◎			○
5							○	○	○		◎	○			○	○

◎ many examples, strong tendency; ○ tendency to some extent; ◦ few examples

1) Kyoko AMANO, “Indication of Divergent Ritual Opinions in the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā*” (5th International Vedic Workshop, Bucharest, September 2011), in *Vedic Śākhās: Past, Present, Future*, ed. Jan E. M. HOUBEN, Julieta ROTARU, and Michael WITZEL (forthcoming). 2) AMANO Kyōko 天野恭子, “*Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā ni okeru gengosō no kaimei o mezashite*” *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā* における言語層の解明を目指して, presentation at 19th conference of Association of the Study for the History of Indian Thought, Kyoto, December 2012 = “Zur Klärung der Sprachschichten in der *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā*”, *Journal of Indological Studies* 26 (forthcoming). 3) See NISHIMURA Naoko 西村直子, *Hōboku to shikikusagari* 放牧と敷草刈り (Sendai: Tōhoku Daigaku Shuppankai, 2006), 45; AMANO (2012), §3, 4. 4) The text is from Leopold VON SCHROEDER, *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā: Die Saṁhitā der Maitrāyaṇīya-Śākhā* (Leipzig: Verlag der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 1881/1883/1885/1886; repr., Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1970/1971/1972/1972) and Ś. D. SATAVALEKAR, *Yajurvedīya Maitrāyaṇī-Saṁhitā* (1941–1942). The editions give the readings *evāinaṃ mātrāya* and *vā etān manuṣyā* to the portions corrected by me (with⁺). *n* and *m* can be mistaken before *m*. *vā etān m°* is analogy to *vā etād* standing quite frequent in sentences explaining effects of ritual acts where *etād* means ‘in this way’ (see K. AMANO, *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā I–II* [Bremen: Hempen Verlag, 2009], 11 and 71). Our passage *nā vā + etām manuṣyā . . .* is not that type of sentence. 5) This *mantra* stands in II 7,3:76,16 in the *mantra* collection for *agniciti*. 6) See AMANO (2009), 113–125. 7) From this table we also notice that I 6–9 and II 1–5 have hardly common tendencies with the chapters in III and IV according to the points examined. In AMANO (2011), §5 and (2012), §3.6.2, I made my inference clear that I 6 and I 8 can be old chapters and that II 5 shows new features of the language other chapters don’t have. To reveal the historic layers of language in *MS* further examinations in the line of these studies have to be attempted.

(This work is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 25·40173.)

〈Key words〉 *Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā*, *agniciti*, style, *mantra*

(JSPS Research Fellow, Dr. phil.)